UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 87th CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 108—PART 2

FEBRUARY 2, 1962, TO FEBRUARY 22, 1962
(PAGES 1421 TO 2850)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1962

J
11
.R
v.108
pt.2

DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

United States
of America

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 87th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

SENATE

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 1962

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

God of all mercy, bowing at this noontide altar of Thy grace, may we be vividly conscious that we need not turn back to bygone centuries to hear Thy voice, as if Thou dost no longer speak to men.

Above the noise of crashing systems, yea, in and through the change and confusion of our day, give us to see that the day of judgment has come and that Thou art searching out the souls of men before Thy judgment seat. Through the want and woe of Thy world and of Thy children, our brothers, Thy voice to us is sounding.

Join us to those who labor to the utmost to bring sense and system to this disordered globe, and grant that our eyes may yet look upon a world that has found a pathway leading to the plains of universal peace where all men's good shall be each man's rule, through all the circle of the golden years.

In the Redeemer's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, January 31, 1962, was dispensed with.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 15, 1962, Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Appropriations, on February 1, 1962, reported the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 612) making supplemental appropriations for the Veterans' Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes, and submitted a report (No. 1194) thereon; which joint resolution was placed on the calendar.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements during the morning hour be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Upon request of Mr. MUSKIE, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair hereby appoints the Senators from New Jersey [Mr. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR. and Mr. CLIFFORD P. CASE] as members on the part of the Senate to the Woodrow Wilson Memorial Commission established by Public Law 364 of the 87th Congress, approved October 4, 1961.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AMENDMENT OF BRETTON WOODS AGREEMENTS ACT

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to implement the recommendations of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems relating to special borrowing arrangements of the International Monetary Fund (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ACT OF 1962

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend certain acts relating to Food and Agriculture Act (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORTS ON OVEROBLIGATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS

A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on overobligations of appropriations within that Department (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT ON MEDICAL STOCKPILE OF CIVIL DEFENSE EMERGENCY SUPPLIES

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, reporting, pursuant to law, on actual procurement receipts for medical stockpile of civil defense emergency supplies and equipment purposes, for the quarter ended December 31, 1961; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON ACTIVITIES UNDER FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on certain activities under the Federal Airport Act, for fiscal years 1962 and 1963; to the Committee on Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954, RELATING TO MONEYS RECEIVED IN PAYMENT FOR SPECIAL STATISTICAL STUDIES

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to moneys received in payment for special statistical studies and compilations and certain other services (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

EXTENSION OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE AND CHILD WELFARE SERVICES PROGRAM OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend and improve the public assistance and child welfare services programs of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT ON SALES AND TRANSFERS OF FOREIGN EXCESS PROPERTY BY VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Deputy Administrator, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the sales and transfers of foreign excess property by that Administration, for the period January 1, 1961, through December 31, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF WAGE ACCOUNTING AND UNEMPLOYMENT CONTRIBUTION COLLECTION ACTIVITIES, RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of wage accounting and unemployment contribution collection activities, Railroad Retirement Board, July 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Examination of Pricing of Selected Spare Parts for ARC-34 Communication Equipment

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the examination of the pricing of selected spare parts for ARC-34 communication equipment under Department of the Air Force fixed-price contracts negotiated with the Magnavox Co., Fort Wayne, Ind., dated January 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Federal Wire Interception Act

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to prohibit wiretapping by persons other than duly authorized law enforcement officers engaged in the investigation or prevention of specified categories of criminal offenses, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Reconstitution of Eastern Judicial District of Wisconsin

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 130(a) of title 28, United States Code, so as to reconstitute the eastern judicial district of Wisconsin to include Menominee County, Wis. (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Claim of Sorensen Fish Company *v.* the United States

A letter from the clerk, U.S. Court of Claims, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of the court's order of January 26, 1962, discontinuing further proceedings in the claim of the *Sorensen Fish Company* v. *The United States*, Congressional No. 3-61 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Amendment of Bankruptcy Act, Relating to Certain Deposits

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Bankruptcy Act to permit a trustee to deposit estate money in interest-bearing time deposits (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Reports Under Fair Labor Standards Act

A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report under the Fair Labor Standards Act, dated 1962, together with four reports of the Wage and Hour Division, Department of Labor, relating to exemptions available for employment in laundries and cleaning plants, hotels and motels, restaurants, and other food service enterprises, and the handling and processing of agricultural products (with accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Reports on Positions in Grades GS-16, 17, and 18 of General Schedule of Classification Act of 1949

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, reports from various departments and agencies, relating to positions in grades GS-16, 17, and 18 of the general schedule of the Classification Act of 1949 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A letter from the Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that department relating to positions in grades GS-16, 17, and 18 of the general schedule of the Classification Act of 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Disposition of Executive Papers

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Archivist of the United States on a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interests, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. Johnston and Mr. Carlson members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

Two resolutions of the Sixth Guam Legislature; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Resolution 331

"Resolution relative to requesting the President and Congress of the United States to enact legislation to create the position of territorial deputy or delegate to be elected by the people of Guam as their representative to the Congress of the United States

"*Be it resolved by the Legislature of the Territory of Guam*—

"Whereas the people of Guam since their union with the United States beginning in 1898 have been generously educated in the practices and principles of democracy, and as they have learned and lived this American way of life, the U.S. Government has generously extended more and more elements of popular government, culminating in 1950 in the extension of U.S. citizenship and the granting of a locally elected legislature; and

"Whereas since that date the people of Guam have carried out in a democratic manner their responsibilities as voters and have elected six legislatures which have attempted to carry out the will of the people, one principal desire of the voters being that of having representatives of Guam in Washington to confer with the national leaders on Guam's problems; and

"Whereas, as a result of this desire, the Guam Legislature has almost annually sent delegations to Washington to speak on behalf of the people of Guam, which delegations have been received with kindness and understanding by both the Congress of the United States and the executive offices in our Capital, and much of great benefit to the territory has been gained as a result of these delegations, although such were in a sense unofficial and without statutory standing in either Congress or the administration; and

"Whereas it is the manifest will of the people of Guam that, in lieu of these informal congressional delegations to Washington, statutory provision be made for an officially elected representative of the people of Guam, called a territorial deputy, delegate, or whatever, to act on Guam's behalf in Congress and in the Federal offices, such desire being exemplified by the following:

"(1) The numerous resolutions similar to this adopted by the various Guam Legislatures;

"(2) The efforts made by the unofficial Guam delegations to Washington to obtain such representation; and

"(3) Over 10,000 signatures obtained on petitions, a clear and unmistakable indication of the wish of the people of Guam, forwarded to the Congress requesting such legislation; and

"Whereas the people of Guam are grateful and appreciative for the efforts that have been made by those Congressmen interested in Guam's problem who have introduced and fought for legislation to provide a territorial representative, and hope that this further expression of their desire for representation in Washington will be helpful in assisting the faithful friends of Guam in obtaining the same: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Sixth Guam Legislature does hereby on behalf of the people of Guam respectfully petition and memorialize the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to provide the territory of Guam with an elective representative in the Congress of the United States and the Federal agencies in Washington, such representative to be without a vote but to have the standing and authority of Guam's official representative in our Nation's Capital; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the speaker certify to and the legislative secretary attest the adoption hereof and that copies of the same be thereafter transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the chairman of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, to the chairman of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, to the Secretary of the Interior and to the Governor of Guam.

"Duly adopted on the 24th day of January 1962.

"A. B. Won Pat,
"*Speaker.*
"V. B. Bamba,
"*Legislative Secretary.*"

"Resolution 316

"Resolution relative to acknowledging and recognizing the many salubrious legislation enacted by the Senate of the United States

"*Be it resolved by the Legislature of the Territory of Guam*—

"Whereas many Senators from the various States of the Union have introduced bills all of which are in one way or another for the benefit and well-being of the people of the territory of Guam; and

"Whereas the committees of the Senate of the United States have on many occasions acted favorably on bills referred to such committees and have reported out the same to the full Senate with recommendations to do pass such bills which would inure to the benefit of the territory of Guam and its people; and

"Whereas although the territory of Guam is not presently honored with a delegate or a representative to our Nation's Capital, and although the people of Guam do not vote in the national elections or in the elections for national offices, nevertheless, the Members of this honorable body have granted audiences with delegations from the Guam Legislature, and have taken notice of the various problems and aspirations of the people of Guam, and although these Senators do carry a tremendous responsibility and burden on their shoulders as it relates to national and international problems, that notwithstanding their busy schedule, out of their generosity and of their interest in

Guam they have found time to listen to the problems and aspirations of the people of Guam; and

"Whereas this august body as a whole, beginning with the enactment of the Organic Act of Guam, voted favorably on legislation beneficial and advantageous to Guam and its people, and the people of Guam recognizing and appreciating all that the U.S. Senate has done for them: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Sixth Guam Legislature does hereby, on behalf of the people of Guam, express its sincere thanks and appreciation to the U.S. Senate for the beneficial legislation passed by such body; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Sixth Guam Legislature, on behalf of the people of Guam, respectfully petition and pray the Senate of the United States to enact legislation for a locally elected delegate or territorial deputy to represent Guam in the U.S. House of Representatives, and for legislation providing for a locally elected Governor of Guam; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the speaker certify to and the legislative secretary attest the adoption hereof and that copies of the same be thereafter transmitted to the Presiding Officer of the Senate, to the chairman of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, and to the Governor of Guam.

"Duly adopted on the 25th day of January 1962.

"A. B. Won Pat,
"*Speaker.*
"V. B. Bamba,
"*Legislative Secretary.*"

By Mr. TALMADGE:

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Georgia; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Senate Resolution 118

"Resolution proposing to our congressional delegation that they do oppose the participation of these United States of America in the purchasing of $100 million of bond issue of the United Nations; and for other purposes

"Whereas even though it has been the custom and the tradition of this great Nation, since its founding, to do everything within its power to preserve the liberty of all freedom-loving people of this world; and

"Whereas even though it has also been the custom and tradition of this great Nation, whenever it was possible, to strive to reach agreements with other nations in order to avoid any military action; and

"Whereas even though this Nation has wholeheartedly endeavored to back the United Nations in trying to maintain and preserve world peace and coexistence; and

"Whereas even though this Nation has in the past contributed more than its fair share of financial responsibility to the United Nations in helping carry out and finance the work of this world-renowned organization; and

"Whereas there are nations which belong to this world organization whose sole purpose seems to be to cause dissension and defeat the objectives of the member nations and which have not, in the past, and in all probability, will not in the future, contribute their financial responsibility to this great organization: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the General Assembly of Georgia*, That the United States of America should not purchase $100 million of United Nations bond issue unless or until the other great powers of this world do show some initiative in sharing the financial burden of carrying out the mammoth endeavors of this great worldwide organization; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of the senate is hereby authorized and directed to send appropriate copies of this resolution to each Georgia Senator and Representative in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Georgia; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Senate Resolution 124

"Whereas the general assembly has through its appropriations committee made a diligent search for funds to raise teachers' salaries, carefully reviewing the appropriations bill for the purpose of reducing or eliminating any excessive or unnecessary expenditure; and

"Whereas through this procedure we were able last year to find only enough money to provide a $300 raise for teachers; and

"Whereas the State of Georgia is already investing 53 percent of its total revenue in public education; and

"Whereas we must hold our good teachers, stop the present exodus of thousands of them away from Georgia classrooms each year, and attract young people into the profession if we are to educate our Georgia children and sustain the progress our schools have made in the past decade; and

"Whereas the teachers of this State are an important factor in Georgia life and make a valuable contribution to the State's economy; and

"Whereas we recognize the urgent need of increasing teacher salaries in Georgia to at least the national average: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the senate*, That the senate endorse increased Federal support for public education, provided that such funds be received and expended by the Georgia State Board of Education as State funds; be it further

"*Resolved*, That in the event Congress does provide this increase in Federal funds for teacher salaries and/or buildings, the State board of education be directed to give priority to teacher raises; be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each Member of the Georgia delegation in Congress, to the president and secretary of the Georgia Education Association, and to the State superintendent of schools."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Georgia; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

"Senate Resolution 117

"Resolution commending the Honorable Glenn Cunningham, Representative from the State of Nebraska, for his influential speech and introduction of a bill concerning the free flow of Communist propaganda through our U.S. Postal System; and for other purposes

"Whereas the Honorable Glenn Cunningham did on Thursday, August 31, 1961, propose and introduce a bill to hinder, delay, and stop the unwanted flow of Communist propaganda into this country; and

"Whereas pursuant to such introduction, the Honorable Glenn Cunningham did address the House of Representatives, which address was readily and wholeheartedly received by the Members of the House of Representatives; and

"Whereas the speech condemned the continous flow of Communist propaganda which spreads Communist beliefs, stirs up international ill will, and constantly threatens the principles, beliefs, and liberty for which the founders of our great Nation strived and died to achieve and maintain; and

"Whereas such propaganda is not only undesirable and unwanted by the American public, but the burden of paying the expense of such an outlandish undertaking by our Federal Government falls upon and is paid by the American taxpayers; and

"Whereas the Communist Party is continually striving to improve their methods of infiltrating the beliefs of communism in the minds of the American public and especially in the uncultivated minds of our unsuspecting youth: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the General Assembly of Georgia*, That the Honorable Glenn Cunningham, of Nebraska, be highly commended for having the foresight, initiative, and integrity in taking such a strong stand against this most unwanted, undesirable, and seemingly illicit use of our traditionally great postal system and for introducing the proposed law by which to remedy this situation; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of the senate is hereby authorized and directed to send appropriate copies of this resolution to the Honorable Glenn Cunningham, of the State of Nebraska, and to each Georgia Senator and Representative in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Georgia; ordered to lie on the table:

"House Resolution 457

"Resolution recommending the appointment of Mrs. Orville Tyler (Bruce) Schaefer as Treasurer of the United States; and for other purposes

"Whereas the lovely and distinguished lady who is serving as Treasurer of the United States is reportedly resigning that esteemed position in our Federal Government; and

"Whereas because of her eminence in the field of public service to her community, State, and country, Mrs. Orville Tyler (Bruce) Schaefer, of Toccoa, Stephens County, Ga., is being seriously considered for the position of Treasurer of the United States; and

"Whereas Mrs. Schaefer's career is exemplary in that she has served as president of the State medical auxiliary, is now serving the State of Georgia as a member of the State board of education, as State vice president of the Parent-Teachers Association, and as a member of the board of trustees of her alma mater, Brenau College; and in that Mrs. Schaefer's public service activities are not limited to those in aid of the State, as she has been a member of the Ninth District Democratic executive committee, vice chairman of the Georgia State Democratic executive committee and is now the Democratic National Committeewoman from Georgia and a member of the executive and resolution committee of the National Democratic Party. Mrs. Schaefer has been honored by selection to Who's Who in America for 1962. She is also a charter member of the Georgia committee of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency; and

"Whereas Mrs. Schaefer is married to one of Georgia's outstanding surgeons, and has assisted him in his humanitarian profession and has been widely sought after as a speaker in behalf of numerous progressive movements related to church, school, and civic affairs; and

"Whereas this body feels that it is only Mrs. Schaefer's due that we highly commend and recommend her to the people of Georgia and the people of the United States as the best possible choice for the next Treasurer of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of Georgia*, That this body do highly recommend the able, lovely, and distinguished Mrs. Orville Tyler (Bruce) Schaefer as the next Treasurer of the United States of America; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the clerk of the house be instructed to transmit copies of this resolution to Hon. John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, to the Members from Georgia of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to the Honorable Richard B. Russell and the Honorable Herman E. Talmadge, senior and junior Senators from Georgia and to Dr. and Mrs. Schaefer at Toccoa, Ga.

"GLENN W. ELLARD,
"*Clerk.*"

LIBERALIZING AID FOR AGING—RESOLUTION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, today, I received a resolution adopted by the Legislature of Wisconsin, urging a liberalization of Federal policies for distributing surplus commodities to homes for the aging.

In the past, some efforts have been made to make foodstuffs available to, for example, homes for the needy. However, these policies, without interference of normal economic channels, should be liberalized.

I request unanimous consent to have the resolution urging the Federal Government to liberalize the distribution of surplus commodities, as adopted by the Wisconsin State Assembly, printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 30, A

Resolution urging the Federal Government to liberalize the distribution of surplus commodities

Whereas the vast majority of nonprofit homes for the aged, nonprofit convalescent homes, and other eleemosynary institutions are operating at a loss; and

Whereas these homes provide a definite public service by providing care for the aged and helpless; and

Whereas present Federal regulations pertaining to distribution of surplus commodities are too restrictive and do not fully recognize the charitable nature of these institutions: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Wisconsin State Assembly, That the Federal Government be urged to liberalize the rules in regard to surplus commodity distribution to these institutions; and, be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent forthwith to the President of the United States, the Solicitor General, the Comptroller General, the Secretary of Agriculture, and all Wisconsin Congressmen.

DAVID J. BLANCHARD,
Speaker of the Assembly.
ROBERT G. MAROTZ,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—FEDERAL STOCKPILE INVENTORIES

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures has been reporting monthly on inventories of nine Federal stockpiles since December 1959.

The total cost value of materials and commodities in these stockpiles as of November 30, 1961, was $14,249,536,000 according to reports submitted to the committee by responsible officials in Federal agencies having jurisdiction over the inventories.

The nine stockpiles include:

Two under the Department of Agriculture, relating to the price-support program, with inventories totaling $5,441,013,000, as follows:

Agricultural commodities	$5,340,323,000
Exchange (strategic and critical materials) commodities	100,690,000

Five under the General Services Administration, relating to strategic and critical materials, totaling $8,616,573,000, as follows:

National stockpile (classified as to quantities)	$6,089,500,000
Federal Facilities Corporation, tin inventory	4,412,000
Defense Production Act program	1,484,731,000
Supplemental stockpile	1,037,931,000
Supplemental stockpile inventory in transit[1]	--------------

[1] In November reported no materials.

One under the Department of Defense, relating to civil defense, totaling $21,123,000; and

One under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, relating to civil defense medical supplies, totaling $170,827,000.

In a press conference of Tuesday, February 1, 1961, the President of the United States made some interesting and pertinent references to the conditions in certain of these stockpiles, and circumstances surrounding them, and the nonessential Federal expenses involved, requiring full investigation.

I agree with his observations indicating the belief that billions of dollars may be recaptured and saved as the result of thorough review and effective action.

Unfortunately such review and action will be difficult until the mantle of secrecy is lifted from the quantities of materials and commodities in the so-called national stockpile. The cost value of these materials and commodities is more than $6 billion.

I commend the President for the actions he has directed with respect to Federal stockpiles and the interest he created. It would be a helpful first step if the secrecy ban would be lifted, by Executive order or otherwise, to the maximum extent possible consistent with national security requirements.

As of yesterday, Thursday, February 1, 1962, I wrote a letter to the President on the subject of these stockpiles, and his press conference relative to them. I ask unanimous consent to have published in the RECORD, as part of these remarks, the text of that letter.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 1, 1962.

The Honorable JOHN F. KENNEDY,
President of the United States.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Please allow me to commend you for the action you have directed, and the interest you have created with respect to Federal stockpiles. Your press conference references yesterday to this matter were welcomed indeed.

The Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, of which I am chairman, has been reporting monthly on this subject for 2 years.

The so-called cost value of materials in all of the stockpiles covered by the committee's reports run to a total of some $14 billion.

The conditions in these stockpiles, the circumstances surrounding them, and their cost to Federal taxpayers are demanding deep examination.

The secret classification applied to the national stockpile, with a cost value of more than $6 billion, has hindered the joint committee's work in this important area.

The national stockpile contains scores commodities and materials such as aluminum, nickel, tin, tungsten, manganese, copper, zinc, cobalt, chromite, castor oil, industrial diamonds, asbestos, silk, etc., but the quantities are secret.

I agree with your observations indicating the belief that billions of dollars in nonessential Federal expenditures may be recaptured and saved through investigation, review, and action with respect to these stockpiles.

The joint committee was created for the purpose of investigating and reporting on nonessential Federal expenditures. The committee will continue investigating and reporting on these stockpiles to the extent that they can be effectively reached outside of the secrecy ban.

But effective work in this area will continue to be difficult until the mantle of secrecy is lifted from the so-called national stockpile to the maximum limit consistent with national interest. I would hope that such declassification could be accomplished by Executive order. It would be an extremely helpful first step.

I am firmly convinced that the whole area of Federal stockpiles should be subjected to continuing thorough examination and review, and that this should be done publicly to the absolute maximum consistent with military security requirements.

With my very best wishes.

Faithfully yours,

HARRY F. BYRD.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. The latest report on stockpile inventories published by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures was for the month of November 1961. The report was released on January 25, 1962. As chairman of that committee, I ask unanimous consent to have that report printed at this point in the RECORD, together with a related statement by me.

There being no objection, the report and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL STOCKPILE INVENTORIES, NOVEMBER 1961

INTRODUCTION

This is the 24th in a series of monthly reports on Federal stockpile inventories under the Department of Agriculture, General Services Administration, Department of Defense, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It is for the month of November 1961.

The report is compiled from official data on quantities and cost value of commodities in these stockpiles submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures by the agencies involved.

The four agencies reported that as of November 1, 1961, the cost value of materials in their stockpile inventories totaled $14,315,440,000, and as of November 30, 1961, they totaled $14,249,536,000, a net decrease of $65,904,000 reflecting acquisitions, disposals, adjustments, etc., during the month.

PRICE SUPPORT INVENTORY REVALUATION

The Department of Agriculture, as of June 30, 1961, revaluated the price-support inventory downward by $1,268,525,000. It should be noted that revaluated cost value figures for the price-support inventory and affected totals are not strictly comparable to corresponding figures in previous committee reports on the subject. (See Committee Print No. 19 of this series.)

Different units of measure make it impossible to summarize the quantities of commodities and materials which are shown in tables 1, 2, 3, and 4, but the cost value figures are summarized by agency and program, as follows:

Summary of cost value of stockpile inventories

[In thousands]

Agency and program	Beginning of month, Nov. 1, 1961	End of month, Nov. 30, 1961	Net change, reflecting acquisitions, disposals, adjustments, etc.
Department of Agriculture:			
Price support program:			
Agricultural commodities	$5,411,000	$5,340,323	−$70,677
Exchange commodities—strategic and critical materials	86,780	100,690	+13,910
Total, Department of Agriculture	5,497,780	5,441,013	−56,767
General Services Administration:			
Strategic and critical materials:			
National stockpile	6,093,996	6,089,500	−4,496
Federal Facilities Corporation: Tin inventory	5,247	4,412	−835
Defense Production Act program	1,488,674	1,484,731	−3,943
Supplemental stockpile	1,037,898	1,037,931	+33
Supplemental stockpile inventory in transit			
Total, General Services Administration	8,625,814	8,616,573	−9,241
Department of Defense: Civil defense stockpile	21,120	21,123	+3
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Civil defense medical stockpile	170,726	170,827	+101
Grand total	14,315,440	14,249,536	−65,904

NOTE.—Figures are rounded and may not add to totals.

Detailed tables in this report show opening inventories at the beginning of the month in quantity and cost, transactions during the month, and the closing inventories at the end of the month. Each inventory is shown by commodity except the national stockpile, for which commodity detail is classified.

Pertinent information and explanation are set forth in notes accompanying the respective tables. Statutory authority and program descriptions are shown in the appendix to the report.

The inventories covered by the report are tabulated in detail as follows:

Table 1: Agricultural price-support program inventories under Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, November 1961, including agricultural commodities and strategic and critical materials acquired by exchange or barter.

Table 2: Strategic and critical materials inventories under General Services Administration, November 1961, including materials in the national stockpile, Federal Facilities Corporation tin inventory, Defense Production Act purchase program, the supplemental stockpile of materials acquired by exchange or barter of agricultural commodities, etc., and inventory in transit from Commodity Credit Corporation to the supplemental stockpile.

Table 3: Civil defense stockpile inventory under the Department of Defense, November 1961.

Table 4: Civil defense medical stockpile inventory under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, November 1961.

TABLE 1.—*Agricultural price-support program inventories under Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, November 1961: Including agricultural commodities, and strategic and critical materials acquired by exchange or barter*

EXPLANATORY NOTES

The Department of Agriculture defines the content of the columns as follows:

Program and commodity: Lists each commodity in the form in which it exists. In some instances, commodities have been processed after acquisition by the Corporation, to increase marketability or to make them suitable for program outlets. The commodities are grouped under the appropriate statutory subclassifications as "Basic," "Designated nonbasic," "Other nonbasic," and "Exchange."

Unit of measure: The applicable unit used in the accounting records and reports of the Corporation.

Inventory, beginning of month: Quantity: In number of units. Cost value: Represents acquisition cost plus cost of any packaging or processing performed after acquisition. Acquisition cost for commodities stored in commercial warehouses, acquired from price support loans or purchase agreements, is generally the amount due on the loan, excluding interest, or the purchase agreement settlement value of the commodity, plus any accrued warehouse charges assumed by the Corporation. Acquisition cost for commodities stored on farms, acquired from price support loans or purchase agreements, is generally the loan or purchase agreement settlement value of the commodity plus any additional costs of obtaining delivery in storage or on board cars for shipment to storage. For purchases from commercial vendors, acquisition cost is the purchase price. Acquisition cost of materials acquired through barter is the exchange value of the materials stated in the contracts.

Adjustments: Warehouse settlements, processing and/or packaging costs, exchanges and transfers (net): Warehouse settlements include the net differences in quantity and/or value represented by the net of overdeliveries, premiums, underdeliveries, and discounts arising from movement of commodities. Processing and/or packaging costs include only such costs incurred by the Corporation after acquisition of commodities. Exchanges represent the net change in quantity and/or value for inventories exchanged or in process of exchange. On completed exchanges, the change in value represents differentials due to location, quality, and quantity. Unprocessed commodities removed from inventory for conversion or processing (on a contractual or fee basis and excluding conditional sales) are included as a reduction of inventory. Processed commodities acquired as a result of this conversion or processing are included as an addition to inventory.

Acquisitions: As reflected in accounting records and reports; and includes commodities acquired by delivery of collateral securing loans, commodities purchased under terms of purchase agreements, commodities purchased directly from producers or processors as a part of the support operation but not under purchase agreements; and processed commodities acquired by purchases which offset conditional sales of unprocessed commodities from inventory. The cost value of acquisitions is described under the explanation of the cost value of inventory.

Disposals: As reflected in accounting records and reports. Inventory transactions generally are recorded on the basis of transfer of title. Disposition commitments are not reflected in the accounts. Cost value: Represents acquisition cost plus cost of any packaging or processing performed after acquisition, computed on the basis of average unit cost. Cost allocated to commingled commodities removed from price-support inventories is computed on the basis of national average unit cost of the commodity acquired from the oldest crop year for which any quantity remains in the inventory accounts. Cost allocated to identified commodities is computed on the basis of average unit cost for the identified crop year as reflected in the records of the office accounting for the inventory.

Inventory, end of month: Closing inventory after transactions for the month have been applied to the inventory at the beginning of the month.

[In thousands]

Program and commodity	Unit of measure	Inventory, beginning of month, Nov. 1, 1961		Transactions during the month						Inventory, end of month, Nov. 30, 1961	
				Adjustments		Acquisitions		Disposals			
		Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value
Agricultural commodities:											
Basic commodities:											
Corn	Bushel	1,470,408	$1,892,126	−326	−$464	46,267	$51,116	43,504	$64,592	1,472,845	$1,878,186
Cornmeal	Pound					45,287	1,539	45,287	1,539		
Cotton, extra long staple	Bale	32	8,748					5	1,346	27	7,402
Cotton, upland	do	1,449	245,290	(1)	(1)	(1)	−5	(1)	2	1,449	245,283
Peanut butter	Pound			+2,783	−4,702			2,783	702		
Peanuts, farmers' stock	do					47	5	47	5		
Peanuts, shelled	do	20,710	3,322	−2,911	−467	3,226	483	3,772	578	17,262	2,760
Rice, milled	Hundredweight	587	5,909		(1)	59	890	129	1,383	517	5,416
Rice, rough	do	2,612	12,187	(1)	(1)			64	310	2,548	11,877
Tobacco	Pound					3,651	2,076	3,651	2,076		

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Agricultural price-support program inventories under Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, November 1961: Including agricultural commodities, and strategic and critical materials acquired by exchange or barter*—Continued

[In thousands]

Program and commodity	Unit of measure	Inventory, beginning of month, Nov. 1, 1961		Transactions during the month						Inventory, end of month, Nov. 30, 1961	
				Adjustments		Acquisitions		Disposals			
		Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value
Agricultural commodities—Continued											
Basic commodities—Continued											
Wheat	Bushel	1,159,529	$2,299,844	−182	−$612	49	$99	14,053	$29,837	1,145,343	$2,269,494
Bulgur	Pound			+5,730	+340			5,730	340		
Wheat flour	do					168,280	9,057	168,280	9,057		
Total, basic commodities			4,467,426		−501		65,260		111,767		4,420,418
Designated nonbasic commodities:											
Barley	Bushel	45,209	40,038	−13	+58	112	100	2,331	2,304	42,977	37,892
Grain sorghum	Hundredweight	361,543	694,468	−7	+10	76	144	11,239	23,922	350,373	670,700
Milk and butterfat:											
Butter	Pound	198,568	119,824	−1	+219	19,896	12,034	18,852	11,533	199,611	120,544
Cheese	do	54,091	20,487	+212	+73	10,104	3,911	6,780	2,576	57,627	21,895
Milk, dried	do	348,635	54,730	+1	+202	62,315	11,348	55,522	9,716	355,429	56,564
Milk, fluid	do					22,713	988	22,713	988		
Oats	Bushel	8,524	5,264	−18	−17	13	10	324	193	8,195	5,064
Oats, rolled	Pound			+386	+25			386	25		
Rye	Bushel	3,784	3,821	−13	−15	(1)	(1)	530	596	3,241	3,210
Tung oil	Pound	820	172					288	60	532	112
Total, designated nonbasic commodities			938,804		+555		28,535		51,913		915,981
Other nonbasic commodities:											
Beans, dry, edible	Hundredweight	579	3,862		+8		(1)	114	854	465	3,016
Turpentine	Gallon	1,730	908							1,730	908
Total, other nonbasic commodities			4,770		+8				854		3,924
Total, agricultural commodities			5,411,000		+62		93,795		164,534		5,340,323
Exchange commodities: [2]											
Strategic and critical materials:											
Antimony, metal	Pound	2,243	677			707	215			2,950	892
Asbestos, amosite	do	5,542	633			2,863	342			8,405	975
Asbestos, chrysotile	do	1,021	240							1,021	240
Asbestos, crocidolite	do	5,500	703			1,596	201			7,096	904
Bauxite	do	2,978,681	16,757			461,395	3,622		−1	3,440,076	20,380
Beryllium copper master alloy	do	231	469							231	469
Boart	Carat	1,000	2,758							1,000	2,758
Cadmium	Pound	363	556			1				364	556
Chrome ore, chemical grade	do	247,494	2,024							247,494	2,024
Chrome ore, refractory grade	do	5,705	72							5,705	72
Chrome ore, metallurgical grade	do	34,761	644			7,711	143			42,472	787
Chromium metal	do	124	104							124	104
Diamonds	Carat	1,401	14,756			557	6,056		−10	1,958	20,822
Ferrochrome, high carbon	Pound	3,501	514							3,501	514
Ferrochrome, low carbon	do	3,202	669			1,311	269			4,513	938
Ferromanganese	do	83,506	7,645				(1)			83,506	7,645
Fluorspar, acid grade	do	75,654	1,324			31,470	530			107,124	1,854
Iodine	do	61	63			38	39			99	102
Lead	do	21,656	1,901			7,216	634			28,872	2,535
Manganese ore, chemical grade	do	84,842	2,670				15			84,842	2,685
Manganese ore, metallurgical grade	do	319,719	6,119			36,264	809			355,983	6,928
Manganese ore, natural, battery grade	do	78,452	3,918			6,714	331			85,166	4,249
Mica	do	1,180	2,866			118	226			1,298	3,092
Palladium	Troy ounce	100	2,255							100	2,255
Platinum	do	50	3,987							50	3,987
Quartz crystals	Pound	150	2,030							150	2,030
Rare earths	do	10,056	3,100							10,056	3,100
Rutile	do	2,406	95			−3				2,403	95
Silicon carbide	do	30,304	2,862			1,333	125			31,637	2,987
Titanium sponge	do	2,410	3,143				(1)			2,410	3,143
Tungsten carbide powder	do	501	1,226			140	342			641	1,568
Total, strategic and critical materials			86,780				13,899		−11		100,690
Total, Department of Agriculture			5,497,780		+62		107,694		164,523		5,441,013

---

[1] Less than 500.

[2] See appendix, p. 16, for notes relating to reporting of strategic and critical materials required by exchange or barter of agricultural commodities.

NOTE.—Figures are rounded and may not add to totals.

TABLE 2.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories under General Services Administration, November 1961: Including materials in the national stockpile, Federal Facilities Corporation tin inventory, Defense Production Act purchase program, the supplemental stockpile of materials acquired by exchange or barter of agricultural commodities, etc., and inventory in transit from Commodity Credit Corporation to the supplemental stockpile*

EXPLANATORY NOTES

The General Services Administration defines the content of the columns as follows:

Program and commodity: Identifies the program and the minerals, metals, fibers and oils acquired under the program.

Unit of measure: The standard weight or measure of minerals, metals, fibers, and oils determined to be the stockpile unit of measure.

Inventory, beginning of month: Opening inventory represents quantity and cost of material in storage at the beginning of the accounting period.

Adjustments: Represents increases (+) or decreases (−) of material in inventory other than increases from acquisitions or decreases from disposals. Decreases occur from theft, loss incurred while in transit to stockpile location, repacking from one type of container to another, beneficiation of a low-grade material to a higher grade, and the removal of material for sampling and testing purposes. Increases occur from return of material previously removed for sampling and testing purposes and from quantities received at storage locations in excess of quantities billed by the contractor. A new chemical analysis of the materials may cause an increase or decrease where the weights are based on chemical and moisture content. Increases or decreases are also made from findings of audits of inventory and accounting records.

Acquisitions: For the National Stockpile and Defense Production Act acquisitions include open market purchases at contract prices; intradepartmental transfers at market or appraised value at time of transfer; transportation to first permanent storage location; and, beneficiating and processing cost in upgrading materials. For the supplemental stockpile acquisitions include the market value or CCC's acquisition cost whichever is the lower at time of transfer from CCC.

Disposals: Cost of disposals are calculated at the average unit price of inventory time of removal from inventory. For the national stockpile inventory disposals consist of sale of materials that by their nature would deteriorate if held in storage for lengths of time; and, sale of materials that have been determined to be obsolete or excess to the needs of Government. For the Defense Production Act inventory disposals consist of sale of materials that have been determined to be obsolete or excess to the needs of Government.

Inventory, end of month: Closing inventory represents quantity and cost of material in storage at the end of the accounting period.

TABLE 2.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories under General Services Administration, November 1961: Including materials in the national stockpile, Federal Facilities Corporation tin inventory, Defense Production Act purchase program, the supplemental stockpile of materials acquired by exchange or barter of agricultural commodities, etc., and inventory in transit from Commodity Credit Corporation to the supplemental stockpile*—Continued

[In thousands]

Program and commodity	Unit of measure	Inventory, beginning of month, Nov. 1, 1961		Transactions during the month						Inventory, end of month, Nov. 30, 1961	
				Adjustments		Acquisitions		Disposals			
		Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value
National stockpile: Total (classified detail omitted)			$6,093,996		+$8		$795		$5,300		$6,089,500
Federal Facilities Corporation: Total, tin	Long ton	2	5,247					(1)	835	2	4,412
Defense Production Act:											
Aluminum	Short ton	798	405,136			4	1,849			802	406,985
Asbestos, chrysotile	Short dry ton	2	2,103							2	2,103
Bauxite, metal grade, Jamaica type	Long dry ton	1,370	18,168							3,170	18,168
Beryl	Short ton	2	1,255			(1)	24			2	1,279
Bismuth	Pound	23	52							23	52
Chromite, metallurgical grade	Short dry ton	986	35,880							986	35,880
Cobalt	Pound	25,213	52,110							25,213	52,110
Columbite	do	10,624	51,736							10,624	51,736
Copper	Short ton	125	69,848					1	624	124	69,224
Cryolite	do	36	9,951					(1)	100	36	9,850
Fluorspar, acid grade	Short dry ton	20	1,394							20	1,394
Lead	Short ton	8	3,036							8	3,036
Manganese, battery grade, syntnetic dioxide	Short dry ton	4	2,524							4	2,524
Manganese, metallurgical grade	do	3,125	180,328							3,125	180,328
Mica, muscovite block and film	Pound	6,359	38,239			19	341			6,378	38,579
Nickel	do	116,951	101,229					6,449	5,413	110,502	95,816
Palladium	Troy ounce	8	177							8	177
Rare earth residue	Pound	6,086	658							6,086	658
Rutile	Short dry ton	18	2,725							18	2,725
Tantalite	Pound	1,531	9,734							1,531	9,734
Thorium	do	849	42							849	42
Titanium	Short ton	22	172,868							22	172,868
Tungsten	Pound	79,785	325,458							79,785	325,458
Subtotal, DPA commodities			1,484,650				2,213		6,137		1,480,726
Machine tools inventory:											
In storage	Tool	(1)	20					(1)	20		
On lease	do	(1)	3,966							(1)	3,966
On loan	do	(1)	39							(1)	39
Subtotal, DPA machine tools			4,024						20		4,005
Total, Defense Production Act			1,488,674				2,213		6,156		1,484,731
Supplemental stockpile: [2]											
Aluminum oxide, fused, crude	Short ton	178	22,728		−13					178	22,715
Antimony, metal	do	13	6,966		+18					13	6,984
Asbestos, amosite	do	9	2,143		+13					9	2,156
Asbestos, chrysotile	Short dry ton	5	3,739							5	3,739
Asbestos, crocidolite	Short ton	8	2,289		+21					8	2,310
Bauxite, metal grade, Jamaica type	Long dry ton	3,189	49,165		+134					3,189	49,298
Bauxite, metal grade, Surinam type	do	1,847	28,482		+77					1,847	28,560
Beryl	Short ton	11	22,337							11	22,337
Bismuth	Pound	1,497	3,348							1,497	3,348
Cadmium	do	6,609	10,967							6,609	10,967
Chromite, chemical grade	Short dry ton	279	14,476							279	14,476
Chromite, metallurgical grade	do	1,394	217,362							1,394	217,362
Chromite, refractory grade	do	177	4,961							177	4,961
Cobalt	Pound	1,077	2,169							1,077	2,169
Colemanite	Long dry ton	68	2,636							68	2,636
Columbite	Pound	389	782		(1)					389	782
Copper	Short ton	11	7,398							11	7,398
Diamond, industrial, bort	Carat	3,510	9,653							3,510	9,653
Diamond, industrial, stones	do	11,511	147,511		−15					11,511	147,496
Fluorspar, acid grade	Short dry ton	570	29,831		−186					570	29,645
Fluorspar, metallurgical grade	do	43	1,506		−6					43	1,500
Graphite, natural, Ceylon, amorphous lump	do	1	341							1	341
Iodine	Pound	242	231							242	231
Lead	Short ton	222	58,676							222	58,676
Manganese, battery grade, natural	Short dry ton	70	6,926		+424					70	7,349
Manganese, chemical grade, type A	do	39	2,903		−115					39	2,788
Manganese, chemical grade, type B	Short ton	56	4,186		−166					56	4,020
Manganese, metallurgical grade	Short dry ton	2,307	174,128		+176					2,307	174,303
Mercury	Flask	16	3,446							16	3,446
Mica, muscovite block, strained and better	Pound	263	698							263	698
Mica, muscovite film	do	27	212							27	212
Mica, muscovite splittings	do	4,826	6,226							4,826	6,226
Mica, phlogopite splittings	do	503	484		+1					503	485
Palladium	Troy ounce	548	9,872							548	9,872
Quartz crystals	Pound	82	1,099							82	1,099
Rare earths	Short dry ton	2	2,427							2	2,427
Ruthenium	Troy ounce	15	$560							15	560
Rutile	Short ton	10	1,007	(1)						10	1,007
Selenium	Pound	157	1,071							157	1,071
Silicon carbide, crude	Short ton	116	23,232		−11					116	23,221
Tantalite	Pound	8	21							8	21
Thorium nitrate	do	4,080	9,954		+12					4,080	9,966
Tin	Long ton	8	16,404							8	16,404
Titanium	Short ton	8	28,130		−331					8	27,799
Tungsten	Pound	4,493	15,627							4,493	15,627
Zinc	Short ton	324	79,592							324	79,592
Total, supplemental stockpile			1,037,898		+33						1,037,931
Total, General Services Administration			8,625,814		+42		3,008		12,291		8,616,573

---

[1] Less than 500.

[2] See appendix, p. 16, for notes relating to the reporting of strategic and critical materials acquired by exchange or barter of agricultural commodities.

NOTE.—Figures are rounded and may not add to totals.

TABLE 3.—*Civil defense stockpile inventory under the Department of Defense, November 1961*

EXPLANATORY NOTES

The Department of Defense defines the content of the columns as follows:

Commodity: Composite groups of many different items.

Unit of measure: Shown only for engineering supply units; not feasible for other composite groups.

Inventory-quantity: Shown only for one item, namely, engineering supply units. It is not feasible to furnish quantity figures on the other commodity groups because they are composite groups of many different items. To report quantities, it would be necessary to list numerous different items.

Inventory-cost value: Dollar value figures on commodities in the stockpile inventory essentially reflect their actual cost. The stockpile inventory is generally augmented by acquisition of Government excess property without reimbursement to the several holding agencies. The value assigned to these materials is (1) original acquisition cost if known, (2) estimated current market value of items in similar condition, or (3) average unit cost of identical or similar items purchased in the open market for stockpiling. Government excess property acquired by reimbursement is assigned a value equal to the amount of the fair-value reimbursement required.

Adjustments: Represent inventory pricing adjustments resulting from recalculation of fixed average unit prices, transfers of commodities from one composite group to another, etc., during the month.

Acquisitions: Materials placed in inventory during the month, including return to inventory of items previously released from inventory for reworking, etc. Value stated in terms of actual costs of the commodities.

Disposals: Materials removed from inventory during the month, including items released from inventory for reworking, etc. Values shown are based on average unit costs.

Inventory, end of month: Closing inventory after transactions for the month have been applied to the inventory at the beginning of the month.

[In thousands]

Commodity	Unit of measure	Inventory, beginning of month, Nov. 1, 1961		Transactions during the month						Inventory, end of month, Nov. 30, 1961	
				Adjustments		Acquisitions		Disposals			
		Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value
Engineering stockpile (engine generators, pumps, chlorinators, purifiers, pipe and fittings)	10-mile units	(1)	$10,206		−$19		$6		$1	(1)	$10,192
Chemical and biological equipment			2,010		−11				[2] 5		1,994
Radiological equipment			8,903		+11		187		[3] 164		8,936
Total, civil defense stockpile, Department of Defense			21,120		−19		192		170		21,123

[1] Less than 500.

[2] Grants to other Federal agencies and to States.

[3] Grants to other Federal agencies and to States in the amount of $162,976, and inventory writeoff of $1,061.

NOTE.—Figures are rounded and may not add to totals.

TABLE 4.—*Civil defense medical stockpile inventory under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, November 1961*

EXPLANATORY NOTES

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare defines the content of the columns as follows:

Commodity: Composite groups of many different items.

Unit of measure: Shown only for hospital functional units; not feasible for other composite groups.

Inventory cost value: The dollar value figures in the civil defense medical stockpile inventory reflect essentially the average acquisition costs per unit of the commodities. No transportation, delivery, or storage costs are included.

Adjustments: Represents increases (+) or decreases (−) of materials in commodity groups other than increases from acquisitions or decreases from disposals. Normally these transactions result from inventory pricing adjustments due to recalculation of fixed average unit prices, transfers of commodities from one composite group to another, removal of material for sampling during testing or reworking, etc., during the month.

Acquisitions: Materials placed in inventory during the month, including new procurement and acquisition of Government excess property.

Disposals: Materials removed from inventory during the month. Costs of disposals are calculated on a basis of the average unit price of items in inventory at the time of removal. Disposals consist principally of items no longer suitable for stockpiling due to deterioration and of samples consumed through testing.

Inventory at end of month: Closing inventory after transactions for the month have been applied to the inventory at the beginning of the month.

TABLE 4.—*Civil defense medical stockpile inventory under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, November 1961*—Continued

[In thousands]

Commodity	Unit of measure	Inventory, beginning of month, Nov. 1, 1961		Transactions during the month						Inventory, end of month, Nov. 30, 1961	
				Adjustments		Acquisitions		Disposals			
		Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value
Medical bulk stocks and associated items at civil defense mobilization warehouses			$110,764		−$21		$216		[1] $76		$110,882
Medical bulk stock at manufacturer locations			3,957								3,957
Civil defense emergency hospitals	Each	2	38,268		+13				[1] 10	2	38,270
Replenishment units (functional assemblies other than hospitals)			17,738		−20						17,718
Total, civil defense medical stockpile, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare			170,726		−29		216		86		170,827

[1] Inventory writeoff—certificate of destruction.

NOTE.—Figures are rounded and may not add to totals.

APPENDIX

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Commodity Credit Corporation

The Price-Support Program

Price-support operations are carried out under the Corporation's charter powers (15 U.S.C. 714), in conformity with the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1421), the Agricultural Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1741), which includes the National Wool Act of 1954, the Agricultural Act of 1956 (7 U.S.C. 1442), the Agricultural Act of 1958 and with respect to certain types of tobacco, in conformity with the act of July 28, 1945, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1312). Under the Agricultural Act of 1949, price support is mandatory for the basic commodities—corn, cotton, wheat, rice, peanuts, and tobacco—and specific nonbasic commodities; namely, tung nuts, honey, milk, butterfat, and the products of milk and butterfat. Under the Agricultural Act of 1958, as producers of corn voted in favor of the new price-support program for corn authorized by that act, price support is mandatory for barley, oats, rye, and grain sorghums. Price support for wool and mohair is mandatory under the National Wool Act of 1954, through the marketing year ending March 31, 1962. Price support for other nonbasic agricultural commodities is discretionary except that, whenever the price of either cottonseed or soybeans is supported the price of the other must be supported at such level as the Secretary determines will cause them to compete on equal terms on the market. This program may also include operations to remove and dispose of or aid in the removal or disposition of surplus agricultural commodities for the purpose of stabilizing prices at levels not in excess of permissible price-support levels.

Price support is made available through loans, purchase agreements, purchases, and other operations, and, in the case of wool and mohair, through incentive payments based on marketings. The producer's commodities serve as collateral for price-support loans. With limited exceptions, price-support loans are nonrecourse and the Corporation looks only to the pledged or mortgage collateral for satisfaction of the loan. Purchase agreements generally are available during the same period that loans are available. By signing a purchase agreement, a producer receives an option to sell to the

Corporation any quantity of the commodity which he may elect within the maximum specified in the agreement.

The major effect on budgetary expenditures is represented by the disbursements for price-support loans. The largest part of the commodity acquisitions under the program result from the forfeiting of commodities pledged as loan collateral for which the expenditures occurred at the time of making the loan, rather than at the time of acquiring the commodities.

Dispositions of commodities acquired by the Corporation in its price-support operations are made in compliance with sections 202, 407, and 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, and other applicable legislation, particularly the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7. U.S.C. 1691), title I of the Agricultural Act of 1954, title II of the Agricultural Act of 1956, the Agricultural Act of 1958, the act of August 19, 1958, in the case of cornmeal and wheat flour, and the act of September 21, 1959, with regard to sales of livestock feed in emergency areas.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Strategic and critical materials stockpiling and related programs

1. National Stockpile

The Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98–98h) provides for the establishment and maintenance of a national stockpile of strategic and critical materials. GSA is responsible for making purchases of strategic and critical materials and providing for their storage, security, and maintenance. These functions are performed in accordance with directives issued by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning (formerly Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization). The act also provides for the transfer from other Government agencies of strategic and critical materials which are excess to the needs of such other agencies and are required to meet the stockpile objectives established by OEP. In addition, GSA is responsible for disposing of those strategic and critical materials which OEP determines to be no longer needed for stockpile purposes.

General policies for strategic and critical materials stockpiling are contained in DMO V–7, issued by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning (formerly Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization) and published in the Federal Register of December 19, 1959 (24 F.R. 10309). Portions of this order relate also to Defense Production Act inventories.

2. Tin Received From Federal Facilities Corporation

Public Law 608, 84th Congress (50 U.S.C. 98 note), provided, among other things, for the continuation of operation of the Government-owned tin smelter at Texas City, Tex., from June 30, 1956, until January 31, 1957. It provided also that all tin acquired by the Federal Facilities Corporation by reason of such extension should be transferred to GSA.

3. Defense Production Act

Under section 303 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2093) and Executive Order 10480, as amended, GSA is authorized to make purchases of or commitments to purchase metals, minerals, and other materials, for Government use or resale, in order to expand productive capacity and supply, and also to store the materials acquired as a result of such purchases or commitments. Such functions are carried out in accordance with programs certified by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning (formerly Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization).

4. Supplemental Stockpile

As a result of a delegation of authority from OEP (32A C.F.R., ch. I, DMO V–4) GSA is responsible for the maintenance and storage of materials placed in the supplemental stockpile. Section 206 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 (7 U.S.C. 1856) provides that strategic and other materials acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation as a result of barter or exchange of agricultural products, unless acquired for the national stockpile or for other purposes, shall be transferred to the supplemental stockpile established by section 104(b) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1704(b)). In addition to the materials which have been or may be so acquired, the materials obtained under the programs established pursuant to the Domestic Tungsten, Asbestos, Fluorspar, and Columbium-Tantalum Production and Purchase Act of 1956 (50 U.S.C. App. 2191–2195), which terminated December 31, 1958, have been transferred to the supplemental stockpile, as authorized by the provisions of said Production and Purchase Act.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Civil defense stockpile program

This stockpiling program, conducted pursuant to section 201(h) of Public Law 920, 81st Congress, as amended, is designed to provide some of the most essential materials to minimize the effects upon the civilian population which would be caused by an attack upon the United States. Supplies and equipment normally unavailable, or lacking in quantity needed to cope with such conditions, are stockpiled at strategic locations in a nationwide warehouse system consisting of general storage facilities.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Civil defense medical stockpile program

As authorized under Public Law 920, 81st Congress, and following the intent of Reorganization Plan No. 1, 1958, the Director, Office of Emergency Planning (formerly Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization) has delegated responsibility to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to plan and direct operation of the medical supply portion of the OEP stockpile. The warehousing of the medical stockpile is principally within the OEP warehouse system; in addition, the medical stockpile includes a program designed to pre-position emergency hospitals and other treatment units in communities throughout the Nation.

EXPLANATORY NOTES RELATING TO THE REPORTING OF STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS ACQUIRED BY EXCHANGE OR BARTER OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Surplus agricultural commodities in the Commodity Credit Corporation's price-support inventory may be exchanged or bartered for strategic and critical materials under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480), and other basic legislation including the CCC Charter Act, as amended, the Agricultural Act of 1954, and the Agricultural Act of 1956.

Except for small amounts which may go to the national stockpile, the strategic and critical materials acquired by Commodity Credit Corporation under the barter program are transferred to the supplemental stockpile.

Direct appropriations reimburse Commodity Credit Corporation for materials so transferred from the price-support inventory.

The General Services Administration is charged with the custody and management of strategic and critical materials, and becomes the responsible reporting agency when title to these bartered materials is placed in the supplemental stockpile.

For purposes of this report, strategic and critical materials acquired by barter may appear in three inventories, reflecting the stages of the transfer of title.

1. The Department of Agriculture reports those to which the Commodity Credit Corporation still has title, prior to transfer to the supplemental stockpile.

2. The General Services Administration reports those which have been transferred from the Commodity Credit Corporation exchange inventory in two parts:

(a) Materials for which title is "in transit" from Commodity Credit Corporation to the supplemental stockpile.

(b) Materials for which title has passed to the supplemental stockpile.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA

The cost value of materials in nine Federal stockpile inventories as reported by the Agriculture Department, General Services Administration, Department of Defense, and Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, on November 30, 1961, totaled $14,249,536,000. November activity in these stockpiles resulted in a net decreased of $65,904,000.

Net change in these stockpile inventories reflect acquisitions, disposals, and adjustments. November activity and end-of-month totals are summarized:

[In thousands of dollars]

Inventories by agency and program	Cost value, November 1961	
	Net change during month	Total, end of month
Department of Agriculture—Price support program:		
1. Agricultural commodities	−70,677	5,340,323
2. Exchange, strategic and critical materials	+13,910	100,690
Total, Department of Agriculture	−56,767	5,441,013
General Services Administration—Strategic and critical materials:		
3. National stockpile	−4,496	6,089,500
4. Federal Facilities Corporation, tin inventory	−835	4,412
5. Defense Production Act program	−3,943	1,484,731
6. Supplemental stockpile	+33	1,037,931
7. Supplemental stockpile inventory in transit	----------	----------
Total, General Services Administration	−9,241	8,616,573
Department of Defense:		
8. Civil defense stockpile	+3	21,123
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:		
9. Civil defense medical stockpile	+101	170,827
Grand total	−65,904	14,249,536

These figures are from reports certified by the agencies involved as compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

INCREASES AND DECREASES

The major net decreases in cost value during November were $30 million in wheat, $23 million in grain sorghum, and $14 million in corn. The major net increases were reported in aluminum with $6 million and diamonds with $6 million.

AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Of 17 agricultural commodities in Commodity Credit's $5.4 billion price-support inventory on November 30, 1961, those leading in cost value include: Wheat, with 1.1 billion bushels at a cost of $2.3 billion; corn, with 1.5 billion bushels at a cost of $1.9 billion; and grain sorghum with 350 million hundredweight at a cost of $671 million.

STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

Strategic and critical materials are shown in six inventories totaling $8.7 billion, including the $6.1 billion national stockpile for which itemized detail is classified. Combined figures from the other five inventories show materials (in all grades and forms) leading in cost value as follows: Aluminum, bauxite, etc., with 9.1 million tons at a cost of $546 million; manganese (and ores) with 5.9 million tons at a cost of $393 million; and tungsten, with 85 million pounds at a cost of $342 million.

CIVIL DEFENSE SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT

Supplies and equipment in two civil defense stockpile inventories total $192 million. Nearly 90 percent is in the medical stockpile valued at $171 million.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Also in this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the Record at this point a column by Arthur Krock headed "Fourteen Billions Is Still a Lot of Money" as published in the New York Times of today, February 2, 1962.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record as follows:

In the Nation—Fourteen Billions Is Still a Lot of Money

(By Arthur Krock)

Washington, February 1.—About 2 years ago Bernard M. Baruch, watching Government activities from one of his eyries, fixed his eagle gaze on what appeared to him to be the excessive growth and imbalance of the national stockpiles of strategic materials and farm commodities. So he proposed to Senator Byrd of Virginia, chairman of the Joint Congressional Committee on Reduction of Non-Essential Federal Expenditures, that the committee issue a monthly report of the contents of the stockpiles. It is this accumulation which President Kennedy viewed with concern at his news conference yesterday, explaining that he had asked the subcommittee headed by Senator Symington to take a hard look at it.

The Byrd committee has been issuing these monthly reports ever since Baruch made the suggestion. But the reports have been inadequate because the Pentagon marks for "secret" classification about $6 billion which has been spent for certain items. The details were made known to Senator Byrd under a seal of strict confidence. But he said today that his examination of these schedules had failed to disclose any sound reason for the "secret" classification, and that in a letter to the President today he requested that the items be made public. This view Senator Symington also has long been pressing, and the President's comments yesterday indicated his agreement.

Even Director Bell of the Budget Bureau, who the other day smilingly forecast an annual Federal budget of $100 billion, would concede that $14 billion—the amount represented by the stockpiles—is still a lot of money. And the President has made plain his conviction, not only that the stockpiles are "overgrown," but that they are a "potential source of excessive and unconscionable profits" for persons unnamed. For these reasons, the subject seems big enough to warrant the two investigations by Congress that now are projected.

The second was suggested by Senate Minority Leader Dirksen to the Byrd committee today. The roles of the two inquiries would be different, and one could be a complement of the other. Senator Byrd's is a fact-finding group, with authority to check related factfinding by other groups and report its findings, but not to recommend action to Congress and the Executive. Senator Symington's Armed Services subcommittee is authorized to recommend what should be done, legislatively and otherwise, about conditions it discovers that, in its judgment, require correction.

THE FARM STORAGE ITEM

One of the most costly and burdensome items in the stockpiles is about $5.4 billion worth of stored farm commodities. In addition to the cost of purchase, there is the huge cost of storage for agricultural produce. And, with respect to other outgrown stockpiling, there are the instances of $6 million in commercial diamonds, and the glut of metal on which the President commented in words that bear repetition: "The value of [this] aluminum exceeds the amount we would need for 3 years in the event of war by $347 million." And, if any further evidence were required that the situation demands thorough probing, the President supplied it also in saying: [yet on three items] "* * * on which we have spent less than $2 million * * * we are critically short."

By a corollary to Parkinson's law of inevitable bureaucratic expansion the problem created by the stockpile excesses and shortages creates another: How to transact the vast market operation of buying and selling that correction will require without disrupting national and world commodity prices and pulling out the props under the economies of several nations. It will be the business of the Symington subcommittee to propose methods of grappling with this acute corollary problem through gradual marketing. But this may prove to be a more difficult task than to discover the whys of the stockpiles and what adjustments there should be.

Solutions of these tough questions, as close to adequate as the background of Government errors—if nothing worse—puts within the realm of possibility, could add great amounts to the cash balance of the Treasury and eventually obviate further increases in the national debt. Hence from every aspect the need is apparent of the two investigations now proposed—for factfinding, and for developing conclusions from the facts for the critical official surgery that is already established as overdue.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations:

Bernard L. Boutin, of New Hampshire, to be Administrator of General Services.

By Mr. CLARK, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Michael H. Sura, of Pennsylvania, to be Superintendent of the Mint of the United States at Philadelphia, Pa.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BYRD of West Virginia:

S. 2782. A bill to authorize the conveyance to Hancock County, W. Va., of certain Government-owned surplus property; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 2783. A bill to repeal the provision of law relating to the mailing of matter by Members of the Senate and House of Representatives under congressional frank with a simplified form of address; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 2784. A bill to provide civil remedies to persons damaged by unfair commercial activities in or affecting commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Javits when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia (for himself and Mr. Robertson):

S. 2785. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to sell certain property owned by the District of Columbia located in Prince William County, Va., and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 2786. A bill to improve and protect farm income, to reduce costs of farm programs to the Federal Government, to reduce the Federal Government's excessive stocks of agricultural commodities, to maintain reasonable and stable prices of agricultural commodities and products to consumers, to provide adequate supplies of agricultural commodities for domestic and foreign needs, to conserve natural resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. Ellender when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 2787. A bill for the relief of Bobby G. Pounders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 2788. A bill to amend section 6 of the Agricultural Marketing Act, as amended, to reduce the revolving fund available for subscriptions to the capital stock of the banks for cooperatives; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. DODD:

S. 2789. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Annie Yang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 2790. A bill to amend the Reorganization Act of 1949; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Bennett when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HICKEY (for himself and Mr. McGee):

S.J. Res. 151. Joint resolution permitting the Secretary of the Interior to continue to deliver water to lands in the Third Division, Riverton Federal reclamation project, Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Hickey when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself and Mr. Saltonstall):

S.J. Res. 152. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Dr. Caryl P. Haskins as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; and

S.J. Res. 153. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Dr. Crawford H. Greenewalt as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. KUCHEL:

S.J. Res. 154. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim a week in March of each year as National Health Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Kuchel when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

AUTHORIZATION TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT REPORT ENTITLED "A REPORT OF U.S. FOREIGN POLICY AND OPERATIONS"

Mr. ELLENDER submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 56); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed with illustrations, as a Senate document, a report entitled "A Report of U.S. Foreign Policy and Operations," submitted by Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER to the Senate Committee on Appropriations on January 24, 1962; and that four thousand additional copies be printed for use of that committee.

RESOLUTION

COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS OF REPUBLICAN SENATORS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution for which I request immediate consideration. I ask that the resolution not be read; it is the usual resolution by the minority with respect to nominations of Republican Senators for committee assignments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from California submits a resolution regarding committee assignments, and asks that it not be read.

Is there objection to the request for the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 291) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] are hereby excused from further service on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] is hereby excused from further service on the Committee on the Judiciary; that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] is hereby excused from further service on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is hereby excused from further service on the Committee on Public Works and the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] are hereby excused from further service on the Committee on Rules and Administration: Be it hereby

Resolved, That the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] be and he is hereby assigned to service on the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences; that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] be and he is hereby assigned to service on the Committee on Rules and Administration; that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] be and he is hereby assigned to service on the Committee on Armed Services; that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] be and they are hereby assigned to service on the Committee on Appropriations; that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] be and he is hereby assigned to service on the Committee on the Judiciary; that the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] be and he is hereby assigned to service on the Committee on Commerce; that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] be and he is hereby assigned to service on the Committee on Public Works and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MURPHY] be and he is hereby assigned to service on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

CIVIL REMEDIES TO PERSONS DAMAGED BY UNFAIR COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES IN OR AFFECTING COMMERCE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill to provide civil remedies to persons damaged by unfair commercial activities in or affecting commerce, to replace S. 1036, which is the bill I introduced at the behest of the Bar Association of the City of New York last year. The substitute bill contains certain revisions which the association considers appropriate in order to clarify the bill and to meet some criticisms.

I ask unanimous consent that there may be incorporated as a part of my remarks the text of the new bill, together with a brief memorandum showing the changes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and memorandum will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2784) to provide civil remedies to persons damaged by unfair commercial activities in or affecting commerce, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That any person damaged or likely to be damaged by unfair commercial activities in or affecting commerce shall be entitled to an injunction in a civil action brought by that person against any person who has engaged in such activities. The prevailing party in any such action also shall be entitled to judgment for taxable costs and disbursements and, in the discretion of the court, reasonable attorneys' fees.

SEC. 2. Unfair commercial activities under this Act shall be—

(a) the commission of any act or practice or the use of any statement which is likely (1) to cause confusion as to the affiliation, connection, or association of the person charged therewith or (2) to cause confusion as to the origin, source, or sponsorship of the goods or services of such person or (3) to dilute the distinctive quality of a trademark or trade name of another;

(b) the use for purposes of profit of any statement of fact as to the goods or services of either party which is false or misleading by reason either of misstatement or omission of a material fact;

(c) the commission for purposes of profit of any other act or practice which is likely to deceive or which violates reasonable standards of commercial ethics; or

(d) the institution of an action under this Act in bad faith.

SEC. 3. Absence of competition between the parties, of actual damage to the person seeking protection, or of a public interest in such unfair commercial activities shall not be a defense to an action brought under this Act.

SEC. 4. The relief provided for by this Act shall be in addition to and not in exclusion of those rights and remedies otherwise available under the common law or pursuant to the statutes of any State or of the United States. Nothing in this Act shall be construed so as to preempt the jurisdiction of any State to grant relief in cases of unfair commercial activities.

SEC. 5. Absence of knowledge or intent shall be a defense to any action brought under this Act against a publisher or broadcaster in respect of any contents of any news, literary, educational, advertising, or entertainment medium.

SEC. 6. Relief shall not be available under this Act in respect of an issue of a newspaper, magazine, or other similar periodical, the broadcast of any radio or television program, or the showing of any motion picture when restraining the appearance or performance of any particular issue of such periodical, program, or picture would delay its dissemination after the regular time therefor, and such delay would be due to the method by which dissemination is customarily conducted in accordance with sound business practice and not to any method or device adopted for the evasion of this Act or to prevent or delay the issuance of an injunction or restraining order.

SEC. 7. This Act shall not be construed so as to extend or enlarge the rights and remedies provided under the patent or copyright laws of the United States.

SEC. 8. The district and territorial courts of the United States shall have sole original jurisdiction and the circuit courts of appeal of the United States and the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia shall have sole appellate jurisdiction, of all actions whatsoever under this Act without regard to the amount in controversy or to diversity or lack of diversity of the citizenship of the parties. Writs of certiorari may be granted by the Supreme Court of the United States for the review of cases arising under this Act.

SEC. 9. The intent of this Act is to regulate all commerce which may lawfully be regulated by Congress by making actionable solely in a Federal forum all unfair commercial activities set forth herein thereby to protect any person engaged in interstate commerce against such unfair commercial activities whether used or committed locally or in interstate commerce. In the construction of this Act, unless the contrary is plainly apparent from the context—

1. The term "person" includes any individual, partnership, corporation, association, union, or other organization capable of suing or being sued in a court of law.

2. The term "commerce" means all commerce which may lawfully be regulated by Congress.

3. Words used in the singular include the plural and vice versa.

4. The term "trademark" includes any word, name, symbol, or device or any combination thereof adopted and used by a manufacturer or merchant to identify his goods and distinguish them from those manufactured or sold by others, any mark used in the sale or advertising of services to identify the services of one person and distinguish them from the services of others, including without limitation the marks, names, symbols, titles, designations, slogans, character names, and distinctive features of radio or other advertising used in commerce, any mark used upon or in connection with the products or services of one or more persons other than the owner of the mark to certify regional or other origin, material, mode of manufacture, quality, accuracy, or other characteristics of such goods or services or that the work or labor on the goods or services was performed by members of a union or other organization or any mark used by the members of a cooperative, an association, or other collective group or organization, including marks used to indicate membership in a union, an association, or other organization.

5. The term "trade name" includes individual names and surnames, firm names and trade names used by manufacturers, industrialists, merchants, agriculturists, and others to identify their businesses, vocations, or occupations or the names or titles lawfully adopted and used by persons, firms, associations, corporations, companies, unions, and any manufacturing, industrial, commercial, agricultural, or other organizations engaged in trade or commerce and capable of suing and being sued in a court of law.

SEC. 10. If any provision of this Act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of this Act shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 11. This Act shall be in force and take effect immediately upon its enactment but shall not affect any suit, proceeding, or appeal then pending.

SEC. 12. This Act may be cited as the "Unfair Commercial Activities Act".

The memorandum presented by Mr. Javits is as follows:

Memorandum of Changes

The changes are primarily matters of clarification rather than of substance. They may be summarized as follows:

Section 1: The possibility of recovering reasonable attorney's fees has been extended to the prevailing party (not merely a successful plaintiff) and such fees are specifically made subject to the discretion of the court.

Section 4: This section has been rewritten to make it clear that the act shall not be construed as to preempt the jurisdiction of any State to grant relief in the field of unfair commercial activities.

Section 5: The final clause, which would have shifted the burden of proof of knowledge and intent in an action against a publisher or broadcaster, was considered unnecessary and has been eliminated.

Section 7: This section has been revised to make its intention clearer.

All other sections remain unchanged.

RESTORATION OF CONGRESS TO ITS CONSTITUTIONAL ROLE IN THE CREATION OF NEW EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill which would restore to Congress some of the constitutional authority which it abdicated to the President through the Reorganization Act of 1949.

The bill provides that each of the two Houses of Congress must pass an affirmative resolution of approval "in the case of a reorganization plan creating a new department, commission, authority, administration, or other establishment which is independent of any existing executive department."

Under the bill, President Kennedy's proposal to create a Department of Urban Affairs could only be approved through the traditional, affirmative legislative action of Congress, rather than under the 1949 Reorganization Act which reverses the roles of the President and Congress. The 1949 act permits the President to submit reorganization plans to Congress which have the effect of law after the expiration of the first period of 60 calendar days of continuous session of the Congress following the date on which the plan is transmitted, provided that neither the Senate nor the House has passed a resolution of disapproval in the meantime. Thus the President legislates while Congress has only a weak veto power over the President's proposals. In other words, their respective roles as set forth in the Constitution are twisted almost beyond recognition.

The procedure under the 1949 Reorganization Act is virtually the same as that rejected by both the House and the Senate last year, contained in the ill-conceived Freeman-Cochran agriculture bill of 1961. In my opinion, the 1949 Reorganization Act should reflect the current attitude of Congress toward such procedure, at least with respect to reorganization plans which would create new departments or other executive agencies which are independent of any existing department. The act, in my opinion, constitutes an unlawful delegation by Congress of the powers reposed in it by the Constitution.

CONCENTRATION OF POWER IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH—AND THE DECLINE OF CONGRESS

The procedure followed by President Kennedy in connection with his effort to establish a Department of Urban Affairs is symptomatic of the dangerous trend toward concentration of power in the executive branch of Government at the expense of Congress and the States. Instead of using the Calendar Wednesday rule which has been used successfully in the past when the Rules Committee has rejected legislation, the President impatiently decided to plunge ahead on a partisan political basis under the Reorganization Act.

In effect, the President has decided that he will try to bypass Congress because he cannot get his way with the House Rules Committee. Unfortunately, Congress in the 1949 act apparently gave him authority to do so. It is interesting to note that the only new department in the Eisenhower administration was created by a specific affirmative act of Congress rather than through the Reorganization Act. I refer to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The only justification for the steps taken by the President, other than narrow partisan motives, would be a national crisis. It is difficult to believe that absence of a new department would result in such a fearful state of affairs.

The handling by the administration of the proposed new department is one of a kind with the request by the President that Congress abdicate its congressional authority over trade and tariff legislation and over a substantial portion of the taxing power. Each constitutes an effort to amass power in the executive at the expense of Congress. Moreover, in the case of the Urban Department proposal, the States would be bypassed with a consequent loss of authority in our State and county governments. The mayors from the big cities would bypass the counties and State legislatures and march to Washington for Federal handouts. The temptation would be so great that little effort will be made on the local level to solve local problems.

CREATION OF A NEW DEPARTMENT—TOO IMPORTANT FOR REORGANIZATION ACT PROCEDURES

The proposal to create a new department of government with all that it implies in expanded authority and a multiplication of bureaucracy is far too important to be handled under the reverse-legislative procedures of the Reorganization Act. The burden should be on the President, and not Congress, to show the need for such a new department and to demonstrate conclusively that the national interest requires its existence. Instead, the Reorganization Act places the burden upon opponents of the President's proposal to show that it is undesirable and to defeat it. My bill would permit the President to continue use of the existing reorganization procedures for housekeeping changes. But Congress may wish to apply the procedure required in my bill to all reorganization measures. This could be done without too great a burden on either the President or the committees of Congress, since during the last 11 years only 30 reorganization plans have been submitted to Congress, an average of less than 3 a year.

NEW DEPARTMENT NOT JUSTIFIED

It is my firm conviction that the proposed new department is not justified under whatever procedure is followed. It is obviously intended to be the excuse for more vast Federal handouts to big, political machine-ridden cities. Supporters of the new department admit that the existing authority is only half of what they want. We can be sure that Washington bureaucrats will soon be directing the affairs of every major metropolitan city in the United States, if the authority desired by the new department's sponsors is granted. This will mean that the interests of our smaller cities, counties, rural areas, and our State governments will be overlooked.

I do not propose that Congress refuse to consider the President's proposal; rather that we should legislate in the traditional constitutional manner. S. 1633, a bill to establish a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, has been on the Senate Calendar since September 6, 1961. Let the Senate consider it, and preferably reject it. Meanwhile, I hope that my bill will be given early consideration by the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that editorials from the Wall Street Journal and the Washington Daily News for January 31 be included in the Record following my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the editorials will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2790) to amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, introduced by Mr. Bennett, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The editorials presented by Mr. Bennett are as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 31, 1962]

Why an Urban Affairs Department?

A lot more heat than light is being generated around the administration's efforts to create a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. The President, now that the House Rules Committee has pigeonholed a bill to create the new agency, is trying to win his point by setting up the Department by Executive decree. So it is a good time to review just what this program involves and to see what its implications are.

The proposal provides for transferring to a new Cabinet-level Department the functions of many existing Federal housing agencies. The Secretary would be charged with studying the Nation's housing problems and development of urban communities, advising the President, and providing leadership, technical assistance, and information to State and local governments.

Proponents of the plan themselves have advanced, unintentionally, persuasive reasons why it is neither desirable nor necessary. For they have said again and again that the plan would create no new Federal programs nor would it alter substantially existing laws on Federal housing and urban development. If that is so, as the National Association of Manufacturers and others have observed, there surely is no crying need for a whole new Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

But a much more likely prospect is that the proposed Department would actually be a device by which the Federal Government could extend and consolidate control over its farflung housing and urban redevelopment projects, at the expense of urban areas. Since the plan defines an "urban area" as a city or township of any size, whether incorporated or unincorporated, it would cover a pretty broad territory.

The President himself hinted at the possible extent of this Department's invasion of localities when, commenting on the Rules Committee action, he referred to the administration's "concern for some effective management and responsibility of the problems of two-thirds of our population who live in cities."

The Government might well be concerned. For just such massive intrusions into municipal affairs as a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing would be empowered to make have helped to contribute to the urban mismanagement and irresponsibility with which many cities are well acquainted. Too often political machines have become involved with millions of dollars of construction contracts with scandalous results. Nor is the profligate example of the Government itself one that suggests prudent management to municipal governments.

What the cities need far more urgently than Federal "concern" for their failings is a hard look by their own administrators and citizens at what Federal housing programs already are doing to them. What is happening as the result of paper plans imposed upon them from Washington whether relevant to local problems and conditions or not? What has been the effect of municipal rubber-stamping of Federal standards and specifications, imposed under the threat of withdrawal of Federal funds? What has been the effect on cities of swallowing projects which in the absence of local control had been better not begun at all?

That sort of realistic appraisal is the last thing the localities can expect from the Federal Government. And it surely would not come from a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. What would inevitably come are still more and more elaborate paper plans, more Federal standards and specifications, more Federal say-so about where, how and for what the taxpayers' dollars are used. The only logical end to all this is complete abdication of municipal control over urban development.

It may be vain to expect that the Federal housing and urban 'improvement" juggernaut as it now exists can be rolled back. But its further invasion, under the banner of a new Cabinet-rank department, can be checked. Now that the President, in a message yesterday, has notified Congress he is setting up the Department, the House or Senate has 60 days in which to reject it. On its merits alone, rejection is what it deserves.

[From the Washington Daily News, Jan. 31, 1962]

False Issue

It isn't likely that one person in a thousand is running a fever on the proposed Cabinet Department of Urban Affairs. It is a question of technical organization with about as much human interest and political appeal as an argument over a cash versus accrual system of keeping the books.

This is a plan which should be approved, or disapproved, on its merits. Now that a wholly extraneous issue—the matter of race—has been forced, that will be difficult to do, if not impossible. Here is a place where tempers run strong, setting up a hot political issue for the fall congressional elections. Its deliberate emphasis is a disservice to a country trying desperately to digest a whole series of such issues and still maintain a semblance of national unity.

It also is a disservice to the man formally designated for this new Cabinet post, and to the race he ably represents.

Robert C. Weaver is a citizen of dignity and culture who has not sought to trade on his Negro race but has demonstrated high ability as Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. If the new Department is created, he is the rather obvious choice to head it. But as the issue has developed it is made to appear he is being preferred largely because of his race rather than his ability.

This is belittling to Mr. Weaver and to Negroes in general, who want to be respected as free and equal American citizens. This phony "Negro in the Cabinet" issue was raised in the last presidential campaign, in a clumsy play for votes. It obviously got from Negro votes the scorn it deserved.

Dispassionate hearings could help to establish whether such a new Department would facilitate more efficient Government operation or, as some suspect, open the way for bigger and bigger expenditures plus more Federal management of local affairs.

With the new emphasis on race, such a calm investigation does not now seem possible. It is regrettable the plan is being sent to Congress in this atmosphere. It should, in our opinion, be rejected until the congressional elections are out of the way and it can be considered on its merits.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR DELIVERY OF WATER TO LANDS IN THIRD DIVISION OF RIVERTON FEDERAL RECLAMATION PROJECT, WYOMING

Mr. HICKEY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee] a joint resolution. The purpose of the resolution is to extend the current law for a period of 2 years, which will permit the Secretary of the Interior to continue to deliver water to lands in the third division of the Riverton Federal reclamation project, Wyoming.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 151) permitting the Secretary of the Interior to continue to deliver water to lands in the third division, Riverton Federal reclamation project, Wyoming, introduced by Mr. Hickey (for himself and Mr. McGee), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

NATIONAL HEALTH WEEK

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words about the state of the Nation's health. Increasingly, I have come to realize that the strength of our Nation can be no greater than the health and vigor of our citizens. The tasks ahead are great. But they can only be met with the attributes of a strong and stalwart people.

Advances in medicine, as we know, have been extensive and laudable. New techniques and drugs have vastly decreased death and suffering from disease. Nonetheless, there still exist preventable diseases, avoidable tragedies, enslaving habits, unnecessary nutritional, and mental disorders. All are a special threat to our population, and particularly to the youth of our population.

Because many diseases are preventable, I see the need for a concerted effort in encouraging health education, motivation, and application.

Consequently, I want to propose a united and positive health and educational effort to be known as a National Health Week. With such emphasis, private and public health organizations, schools, business, labor, civic, and religious organizations on local, State, and National levels can serve as vehicles for coordinated community work in stamping out disease and the ignorance of disease. Such emphasis offers a special opportunity, in behalf of the Nation's youth, for a vigorous campaign against the insidious vices of alcoholism and narcotic addiction, which all too commonly sap the potential of much of our youth today.

As a Californian, I am particularly anxious and proud to make this proposal. It was in California in 1945 that the first Health Week was celebrated, in the county of Los Angeles. In 1961, California celebrated a statewide Health Week. A fellow Californian, Representative McDonough, has introduced a companion resolution in the House of Representatives.

Therefore, Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution designating a week in March of each year as National Health Week, and I ask that the text of the resolution be printed in the Record following my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the Record.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 154) to authorize the President to proclaim a week in March of each year as National Health Week, introduced by Mr. Kuchel, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Whereas an indispensable element of the strength of any nation is the good health of its citizens; and

Whereas an ever larger number of communities are observing Health Week, originally sponsored by the Community Health Association, Incorporated, in the Los Angeles area under the leadership of Doctor Ruth J. Temple; and

Whereas Health Week has afforded and continues to afford an opportunity for a united positive health educational effort in which private doctors, voluntary health organizations, public health departments, and other public and private organizations and individual citizens cooperate in the common cause of preventing disease and tragedy and of attaining positive health and human betterment: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is hereby authorized and requested to issue annually a proclamation designating the week in which the third Wednesday of March occurs as National

Health Week and calling upon public health agencies at all levels, as well as private organizations and citizens, to observe such week in educational efforts and other appropriate activities to encourage good health practices throughout the country.

COLLEGE ACADEMIC FACILITIES AND SCHOLARSHIP ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I submit, along with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. Keating], amendments to S. 1241 which would strengthen the National Defense Education Act by making available additional funds for loans to capable and needy students who enter institutions of higher learning. The amendment would replace the scholarship title in the committee-reported bill that would increase bureaucracy by requiring the establishment of 50 new State commissions.

The proposal we present would place a premium on academic excellence and activity in the teaching field.

Up to 50 percent of the national defense student loans authorized by our amendment could be forgiven if the borrower teaches in an elementary or secondary school or institution of higher learning and half of a student's loan would be forgiven if he ranks in the top 25 percent of his class academically.

The Prouty-Keating amendments give proper recognition to the national defense student loan program and this program would be the vehicle utilized for further Federal assistance to students.

By making available additional funds for loans under the National Defense Education Act we would cut down costs considerably since all loans will be repaid in part or in full by the recipients.

The distinguished junior Senator from New York and I feel we are taking a very practical and realistic approach since the House-passed college aid bill has no scholarship provisions and since the chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee has indicated that his committee will consider the question of student assistance only in conjunction with a review of the operation of the National Defense Education Act.

At this time when State budgets are running very tight it seems unwise to force the States to set up 50 new commissions as a condition prerequisite to getting money to assist students.

In addition, it should be noted that the language in the committee-reported bill could increase authorizations for scholarships to astronomical heights. State commissions through simple devices could even boost them to a figure exceeding the national debt.

The amendments which I am offering, together with the junior Senator from New York, would be very reasonable costwise and would make use of the very successful procedures and programs now being carried out by institutions of higher learning.

I now send to the desk the amendments I am proposing and I urge that they be considered very carefully by all Senators.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be received, printed, and lie on the desk.

Mr. PROUTY. An explanation of the amendments is on each Senator's desk, and I hope they will give it their attention.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am very happy to cosponsor with the distinguished junior Senator from Vermont the proposed amendment to S. 1241. As the present ranking minority member of the Education Subcommittee, he has done a public service in presenting the Senate with this clear, reasonable, highly practical, and to my way of thinking unquestionably superior alternative to the unwieldy scholarship program that is proposed in S. 1241 as presently constituted.

The purpose of the amendment is to eliminate the present title II entirely from S. 1241. In its place we would increase the funds available under title II of the National Defense Education Act, the loan program by the amounts requested in S. 1241 for the next 2 years—that is, by $17.5 million for fiscal 1962, and by $26.250 million for fiscal 1963, plus, as in S. 1241, the sums required to make loans as needed for these students in the remaining years of their college education.

We would also extend the forgiveness provisions so that not to exceed 50 percent of any loan might be forgiven for each year in which a student is in the top 25 percent of his class academically. Also loans could be forgiven at the rate of 10 percent per year for any recipient teaching in an elementary or secondary school in a State or at an institution of higher learning up to a total not exceeding 50 percent.

The virtues of this amendment are, I believe, very evident. It makes use of the highly successful, existing loan program now underway as a part of the National Defense Education Act, title II. The program is administered by the colleges and institutions themselves. They are in the best position to know the needs and capabilities of the students they admit. Education is their business and they are fully equipped and qualified to carry it out without benefit of any commissions or new State bureaucracies.

Secondly, there are very real merits to a loan program as opposed to a scholarship one. Human nature is such that inevitably we all prize more what we have to work for—and pay for—than what comes to us free. Students who know they will have to repay a loan, in part at least, are far more likely to try to get the very most from their education than those who receive it gratis through a Federal scholarship. Moreover, a loan program automatically singles out those who are most determined to get an education, while the foregiveness feature rewards those who are most conscientious.

The forgiveness feature provides an additional incentive to loan recipients to work for academic excellence and to make the most of their opportunities. Such incentive is wholly lacking in the committee bill.

Finally, Mr. President, over the years—for it is my expectation that this bill in whatever form it is now passed will ultimately be extended over the years—if this program is established on a loan basis, there will be continuing funds available as repayments come in. For considerably less money from the Federal Government, the program will be able to reach more students, and make a college education available to more students than would be the case under the bill as now conceived.

Mr. HARTKE submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 1241, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I submit amendments, intended to be proposed by me, to the bill (S. 1241) to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities, and to authorize scholarships for undergraduate study in such institutions. I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be printed in the Record, together with a section-by-section analysis of their contents.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be received, printed, and lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendments and analysis will be printed in the Record.

The amendments are as follows:

On page 37, between lines 5 and 6, insert a new title IV, as follows, and redesignate the following title and sections of the bill accordingly:

"TITLE IV—SCHOOL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1962

"Sec. 401. This title may be cited as the School Assistance Act of 1962.

"DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

"Sec. 402. It is the purpose of this title to authorize a three-year program of Federal grants to States to assist their local education agencies to construct urgently needed public elementary and secondary school facilities. It is the intent of Congress that with this assistance the quality of public elementary and secondary education will be substantially improved in all States and that inequalities of educational opportunities within and between States will be substantially reduced.

"ASSURANCE AGAINST FEDERAL INTERFERENCE IN SCHOOLS

"Sec. 403. In the administration of this title, no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the policy determination, personnel, curriculum, program of instruction, or the administration or operation of any school or school system.

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"Sec. 404. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, without any limitation of such appropriation or condition inconsistent with or contrary to the terms or purposes of this title, for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1962, and for the succeeding fiscal year, $325,000,000, for the purpose of making payments to State education agencies as provided in this title.

"ALLOTMENT TO STATES

"Sec. 405. (a) The sums appropriated pursuant to section 404 shall be allotted among the States on the basis of the income per child of school age, the number of children of school age, and the effort for public school purposes of the respective States. A State allotment under this section for any fiscal year shall be available for obligation by the State, in accordance with the provisions of this title, during such year and the next fiscal year (and for those two years only). Except as provided by section 406, such allotments shall be made as follows: The Commissioner shall allot to each State for each fiscal year an amount which bears the same ratio to the sums appropriated pursuant to section 404 for such year as the product of—

"(1) the number of children of school age in the State in the preceding fiscal year, and

"(2) the State's allotment ratio (as determined under subsection (b)),

bears to the sum of corresponding products for all the States.

"(b) For purposes of this title—

"(1) The 'allotment ratio' for any State shall be 1.00 less the product of (A) .50 and (B) the quotient obtained by dividing the income per child of school age for the State by the income per child of school age for all the States (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the District of Columbia, and the Virgin Islands), except that (i) the allotment ratio shall in no case be less than .25 or more than .75 and (ii) the allotment ratio for Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands shall be .75, (iii) the allotment ratio for the District of Columbia shall be .50, and (iv) the allotment ratio of any State shall be .50 for any fiscal year if the Commissioner finds that the cost of education in such State exceeds the median of such costs in all the States by a factor of 2 or more as determined by him on the basis of an index of the average per pupil cost of constructing minimum school facilities in the States as determined for such fiscal year under section 15(6) of the Act of September 23, 1950, as amended (20 U.S.C. 645), or, in the Commissioner's discretion, on the basis of such index and such other statistics and data as the Commissioner shall deem adequate and appropriate.

"(2) The allotment ratios shall be promulgated by the Commissioner for each fiscal year, between July 1 and August 31 of such fiscal year, except that for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1962, such allotment ratios shall be promulgated as soon as possible after the enactment of this title. Allotment ratios for each fiscal year shall be computed on the basis of the average of the incomes per child of school age for the States and for all the States (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the District of Columbia, and the Virgin Islands) for the three most recent consecutive fiscal years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce. Such promulgation shall be conclusive for the purposes of this title, except that the Commissioner may estimate and subsequently revise such allotment ratios, and, as so revised and promulgated, such promulgation shall be equally conclusive.

"(3) The term 'income per child of school age' for any fiscal year for a State or for all the States means the total personal income for the State or for all the States in the calendar year ending in such fiscal year (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the District of Columbia, and the Virgin Islands), respectively, divided by the number of children of school age in the State or in all such States, respectively, in such fiscal year.

"(4) The term 'child of school age' means a member of the population between the ages of five and seventeen, both inclusive.

"MAINTENANCE AND IMPROVEMENT OF STATE AND LOCAL SUPPORT FOR PUBLIC SCHOOL FINANCING

"SEC. 406. (a) The sum otherwise allocable to any State under section 405 for any fiscal year after the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1962, shall be reduced if such State's effort for such fiscal year is not at least equal to such State's base effort for such year. The amount of such reduction shall be the difference between the State's public school expenditures in such year and the public school expenditures it would have made in such year had it exerted the State's base effort for such year.

"(b) The sum otherwise allocable to any State under section 405 for any fiscal year after the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1962, shall also be reduced if such State's effort for such year is not at least equal to the State's base effort for such year plus the average annual rate of increase in the national effort over the five fiscal year period beginning July 1, 1957, and ending June 30, 1962. The amount of the reduction under this subsection (which shall be in addition to the reduction, if any, under subsection (a)) shall bear the same relation to the sum otherwise allocable to the State under section 405, (1) as the difference between the State's effort and the national effort for such year bears to the national effort for such year, or (2), if it would result in a smaller reduction, as the difference between the State's expenditure per public school pupil and 110 per centum of the national expenditure per public school pupil for such year, bears to 110 per centum of the national expenditure per public school pupil for such year. This subsection shall not apply to any State for any year for which the State's effort equaled or exceeded the national effort for such year or the State's expenditure per public school pupil equaled or exceeded 110 per centum of the national expenditure per public school pupil for such year.

"(c) The total reductions which may be made under subsections (a) and (b) from the sum otherwise allocable to a State for any fiscal year shall not exceed one-third of such sum.

"(d) The sum of the reductions under this section for each fiscal year shall be reallotted by proportionately increasing the allotments under section 405 for such year of those remaining States (other than the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands) whose allotments for such year have not been reduced under this section.

"(e) For purposes of this section—

"(1)(A) A 'State's effort' for any State for a fiscal year is the quotient obtained by dividing (i) the State's expenditure per public school pupil by (ii) the income per such pupil for the State; except that the State's effort shall be deemed to be equal to the State's base effort and to the national effort in the case of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the District of Columbia.

"(B) A State's 'base effort' for a fiscal year means the average State effort over the three immediately preceding fiscal years.

"(C) The 'income per public school pupil' for a State or for all the States for any fiscal year means the total personal income for the State or for all the States in the calendar year ending in such fiscal year (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands), respectively, divided by the number of public school pupils in the State or in all such States, respectively, in such fiscal year.

"(2)(A) The 'national effort' for any fiscal year is the quotient obtained by dividing (i) the expenditure per public school pupil for all the States (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia) by (ii) the income per such pupil for all such States.

"(B) The average annual rate of increase in the national effort over the five fiscal year period beginning July 1, 1957, and ending June 30, 1962, shall be determined by dividing the difference between the national effort for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1957, and for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1961, by four.

"(3)(A) The 'public school expenditures' of any State in any fiscal year means the total expenditures by the State and subdivisions thereof in such year for public elementary and secondary education made from funds derived from State and local sources in the State (including payments in the nature of payments in lieu of taxes from any source).

"(B) The 'expenditure per public school pupil' for any State for any fiscal year means the quotient obtained by dividing the State's public school expenditures in such year by the number of its public school pupils for such year.

"(C) The 'national expenditure per public school pupil' for any fiscal year means the quotient obtained by dividing (i) the public school expenditures of all the States in such year (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia) by (ii) the number of public school pupils in all such States for such year.

"(4) The Commissioner's determinations of the State effort, base effort, income, public school expenditures, and expenditure per public school pupil, for any State, and his determinations of the national effort, average rate of increase, and expenditure per public school pupil, shall be conclusive for purposes of this title, except that the Commissioner may estimate and subsequently revise any such determination, and as so revised, such determination shall be equally conclusive.

"PAYMENT OF ALLOTMENTS TO STATES

"SEC. 407. Payments to States which have submitted and had approved their applications under this title of Federal funds allotted to them pursuant to section 405 (as adjusted by the application of the provisions of section 406 and as adjusted on account of overpayments or underpayments previously made) shall be made by the Commissioner on the basis of such estimates, in such installments, and at such times, as may be reasonably required for expenditure by the States of the funds so allotted.

"STATE AGENCY ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS

"SEC. 408. From the sums allotted to it under section 405, as adjusted by section 406, for each fiscal year, a State education agency may use such amount as it deems necessary for any supervision, services, and other costs of administering its activities under this title in that year, except that such amount shall not be more than whichever is the lesser of (1) ten cents multiplied by the number of public school pupils in the State during the prior fiscal year, and (2) $150,000, except that if, for any State, such lesser amount is less than $25,000, such amount shall be increased to $25,000.

"STATE APPLICATION

"SEC. 409. (a) A State which desires to receive its allotments under this title shall submit through its State education agency an application to the Commissioner which—

"(1) provides assurance that the State education agency shall be the sole agency for administering the funds received under this title;

"(2) provides that such allotment, except for sums used in accordance with section

408, shall be used exclusively for the construction of public elementary and secondary school facilities;

"(3) sets forth criteria and procedures to insure that in allocating funds received under this title (exclusive of amounts to be used under section 408) to local education agencies priority will be given to local education agencies which, in the judgment of the State education agency, have the greatest need for additional school facilities and which are least able to finance the cost of needed school facilities;

"(4) provides assurance that every local education agency whose application for funds under this title is denied will be given an opportunity for a hearing before the State education agency;

"(5) sets forth procedures for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, funds paid to the State and by the State to the local education agencies under this title, which procedures shall include provision for repayment to the United States of any sums received by the State from its allotment for any fiscal year under this title which are not obligated by it in accordance with the provisions of this title by the end of the fiscal year following that for which such allotment was made, or which are not expended in acccordance therewith by the end of the second fiscal year following that in which they were obligated (unless such sums have been deducted from subsequent payments pursuant to section 407);

"(6) provides assurance that the requirements of section 504 will be complied with on all construction projects in the State assisted under this title; and

"(7) provides for making such reports in such form and containing such information as the Commissioner may from time to time reasonably require and for access by the Commissioner, upon request, to the records upon which such information is based.

"(b) With respect to any public school operated by a public agency or institution other than a State or local education agency, and in the case of any State in which a State education agency has exclusive responsibility for financing the construction of school facilities within the entire State, within a given geographical area within the State, or with respect to particular categories of public schools, the Commissioner may modify or make inapplicable any of the provisions of subsection (a), to the extent he deems such action appropriate in the light of the special governmental or school organization of such State.

"REVIEW OF STATE APPLICATIONS

"SEC. 410. (a) (1) The Commissioner shall approve an application of a State which fulfills the conditions specified in section 409(a), and shall not finally disapprove a State application except after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State education agency.

"(2) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State education agency, finds that such agency is not complying substantially with the provisions required to be included in its application under section 409(a), or that any funds have been diverted from the purposes for which they have been paid, the Commissioner shall forthwith notify the State education agency, and he shall thereafter withhold further payments to the State under this title until there is no longer any such failure to comply, or, if compliance is impossible, there is a repayment, or an arrangement for repayment, of Federal moneys which have been diverted or improperly expended.

"(b) (1) A State education agency dissatisfied with a final action of the Commissioner under subsection (a) of this section may appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such State or agency is located by filing a petition with such court within sixty days after such final action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Commissioner, or any officer designated by him for that purpose. The Commissioner thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code.

"(2) Upon the filing of the petition referred to in paragraph (1) of this subsection, the court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part, temporarily or permanently. The findings of the Commissioner as to the facts, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive, but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall file in the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence.

"(3) The judgment of the court affirming or setting aside, in whole or in part, any action of the Commissioner shall be final, subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 411. For the purpose of this title—

"(1) The term 'local education agency' means a board of education or other legally constituted local school authority having administrative control and direction of public schools in a city, county, township, school district, or political subdivision.

"(2) The term 'State education agency' means the State board of education or other agency or officer primarily responsible for the State supervision of public schools.

"(3) The term 'public school pupils' means pupils in average daily attendance at public schools within a State, or within all of the States, as determined by the Commissioner in accordance with criteria developed by him to assure uniform determinations for all the States.

"(4) The term 'public schools' means schools providing free education at public expense, under public supervision and direction and without tuition charge to resident pupils, and which is provided as elementary or secondary school education—

"(a) by a State or local education agency, or

"(b) if the State application approved under this title so provides, by another State or local public agency or institution.

"(5) The term 'elementary and secondary education' shall not include any education provided below the kindergarten level or beyond grade 12.

"(6) The terms 'school facilities' and 'public school facilities' means classrooms and related facilities (including furniture, instructional materials other than textbooks, equipment, machinery, and utilities necessary or appropriate for school purposes) for public schools, and interests in land (including site, grading, and improvement) on which such facilities are constructed. Such terms shall include gymnasiums and similar facilities, except those intended primarily for exhibitions for which admission is to be charged to the general public.

"(7) The terms 'construct', 'constructing', and 'construction' include the preparation of drawings and specifications for school facilities; erecting, building, acquiring, altering, remodeling, improving, or extending school facilities; and the inspection and supervision of the construction of school facilities."

On page 41, line 16, strike the words "Title III," and insert the following: "titles III or IV,"

On page 43, after line 10, strike the amendment to the title and insert in lieu thereof, the following:

"Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities, to authorize scholarships for undergraduate study in such institutions, to provide financial assistance to the States for the construction of public community colleges, and to provide a two-year program of financial assistance to the States for public elementary and secondary school construction."

The section-by-section analysis presented by Mr. McNAMARA is as follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

SECTION 401. SHORT TITLE

This section provides that the amendment may be cited as the "School Assistance Act of 1962."

SECTION 402. DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

This section declares that it is the purpose of this title to provide for a 2-year program of Federal grants to States to assist their local education agencies to construct urgently needed public elementary and secondary school facilities. The section also states the intent of Congress to improve the quality of public elementary and secondary education in all of the States, and to reduce inequality of educational opportunity within and between States.

SECTION 403. ASSURANCE AGAINST FEDERAL INTERFERENCE IN SCHOOLS

This section provides that in the administration of the title, no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States may exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the policy determination, personnel, curriculum, program of instruction, or administration or operation of any school or school system.

SECTION 404. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

This section authorizes appropriations of $325 million for each of the next 2 fiscal years, without any limitation of such appropriation or condition inconsistent with or contrary to the terms or purposes of the title.

SECTION 405. ALLOTMENTS AND PAYMENTS TO STATES

Subsection (a) provides that the funds appropriated in any year would be allotted among the States on the basis of relative school-age population as weighted by relative income per school-age child. The allotments for the second fiscal year of the program would be subject to adjustment (under sec. 406) to take account of the effort for public school purposes exerted by the States in those years.

The U.S. Commissioner of Education would allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to the funds appropriated for the year as the product of (1) the number of children of school age in the State in the preceding year multiplied by (2) the State's allotment ratio, bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States.

The amendments make clear that a State's allotment for any year remains available for 2 years. Thus a State may first apply for Federal funds during the second year of the program without loss of its first year's allotment. The amendment would also require a State to obligate funds allotted to it no later than the fiscal year following that for which it was appropriated.

Each State's share of the funds appropriated each year will depend on its number of children aged 5 to 17, inclusive, rather than on the number of children it has in its elementary and secondary public schools.

A State's allotment ratio would vary inversely with the ratio which exists between the income per child of school age for the State (as averaged over 3 years) and the income per such child for all the States, with the ratio for a State at the national average being 0.50. The amendment provides that no State shall have an allotment ratio greater than 0.75 or less than 0.25. The equalization formula will result in a 3 to 1 difference between funds allocated per school-age child to the lowest and highest income States, before the adjustment for effort provided by section 406. The allotment ratio for Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands would be set at 0.75 and the same ratio (0.75) would apply to American Samoa. The amendment sets at 0.50 the ratio of any State in which the costs of education exceed the median costs of all the States by a factor of 2 or more. This will assure an increased allotment to any State in which educational costs are unusually high.

The income per school-age child for any State for any fiscal year is defined as the total personal income for the State for the calendar year ending in the fiscal year divided by the number of children of school age in the State in such fiscal year. The income per child of school age for all the States would be similarly computed. Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands would be excluded from these computations inasmuch as their allotment ratios are specified.

SECTION 406. MAINTENANCE OF STATE AND LOCAL SUPPORT FOR SCHOOL FINANCING

Subsection (a) provides that, for each fiscal year following fiscal year 1962, the allotment of any State would be reduced by the difference between the State's public school expenditures in such year and the public school expenditures it would have made had it exerted in the year the average State effort that it exerted over the three immediately preceding fiscal years.

Subsection (b) provides that, for each fiscal year after fiscal year 1962, the allotment of any State would also be reduced in proportion to its failure to maintain the above-mentioned average State effort, as incremented by an amount equal to the average annual rate of increase in the national effort between July 1, 1957, and June 30, 1962. If a State's allotment is subject to this reduction for any fiscal year, it would bear the same relation to the sum otherwise allocable to a State under section 405 as either (1) the State's effort bears to the national effort for that year, or (2) the State's expenditure per public school pupil bears to 110 percent of the national expenditure per such pupil for that year, whichever resulted in the higher allotment. No reduction would be made under this subsection for any year in which the State's effort equaled or exceeded the national effort, or in which the State's expenditure per public school pupil equaled or exceeded 110 percent of the national expenditure per such pupil.

Subsection (c) provides that the total reductions under subsections (a) and (b) shall not exceed one-third of the sum otherwise allocable to a State for any fiscal year.

Subsection (d) provides for the reallotment of the sum of the reductions under the section to the remaining States (other than the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands).

Subsection (e) defines the terms used in the preceding subsections. A State's effort for any fiscal year is obtained by dividing the State's expenditure per public school pupil in that fiscal year by the income per such pupil for the State in the calendar year ending in such fiscal year. (In order to exempt the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands from the effort requirements of this section, they are deemed, inter alia, to exert the national effort in every year.)

The public school expenditures are expenditures by the States and subdivisions for public elementary and secondary education made from funds derived from State and local sources in the States, including payments in the nature of payments in lieu of taxes from any sources.

The expenditure per public school pupil is obtained by dividing public school expenditures of a State, or of all the States, in any year by the number of public school pupils in a State, or in all the States, for that year.

The Commissioner's determinations of State and National effort, effort increases, income and expenditures per public school pupil, and total public school expenditures would be conclusive.

SECTION 407. PAYMENT OF ALLOTMENTS TO STATES

This section authorizes the payment of allotments on the basis of estimates by the Commissioner of Education, and in such installments as may be reasonably required for expenditure by the States of the allotted funds.

SECTION 408. STATE AGENCY ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS

This section authorizes the States to use a portion of their allotments for each fiscal year for State agency administrative expenses. This portion may not exceed the lesser of 10 cents per public school pupil in the preceding year, or $150,000, except that if 10 cents per public school child is less than $25,000, it may use $25,000.

SECTION 409. STATE APPLICATIONS

Subsection (a) of this section prescribes the contents of the State application for allotments. In its application, a State would indicate the portions of its allotment which it will use for public school teachers' salaries and for the construction of public school facilities, and set forth its criteria and procedures for allocating the funds within a State so as to give priority or preferences to the local agencies most in need of assistance. A State application would also provide assurance that the State education agency would be the sole administering agency for the funds received; provide assurance that every applicant whose application for funds is denied will be given an opportunity for a hearing before the State education agency; set forth procedures for fiscal control and fund accounting; provide assurance that the title's provision with respect to labor standards (sec. 504) will be complied with; and provide for the making of such reports as the Commissioner of Education may reasonably require.

Subsection (b), as amended by your committee, provides that the Commissioner of Education may, in light of the special school organization of a State, modify any of the provisions of subsection (a), in regard to funds specified for school construction, with respect to any public school operated by a public agency or institution other than a State or local education agency, and with respect to any State in which the State agency has exclusive responsibility for financing the construction of some or all school facilities.

SECTION 410. REVIEW OF STATE APPLICATIONS

Subsection (a) provides that the Commissioner must approve any State application which meets the conditions in section 409(a), and requires that he afford an opportunity for hearing to the State education agency before finally disapproving an application. He is also required to withhold payments to a State, after notice, upon a State's failure to comply substantially with the provisions required to be included in its application or upon diversion by a State of Federal funds from the purposes for which paid. Payments would not be resumed until the State resumed compliance, or, if compliance were impossible, repaid any Federal moneys improperly expended.

Subsection (b) provides for judicial review in the U.S. courts of appeals, upon petition of a State education agency, of a final action of the Commissioner under subsection (a).

SECTION 411. DEFINITIONS

This section defines the terms "local education agency," "State education agency," "public school pupils," "public schools," "elementary and secondary education," "school facilities and public school facilities," and "construct, constructing, and construction."

The term "public school pupils" means pupils in average daily attendance at public schools within a State, or within all of the States, as determined by the Commissioner.

The term "public schools" means schools providing free education at public expense, under public supervision and direction and without tuition charged to resident pupils and which is provided as elementary and secondary school education (not below the kindergarten level or beyond grade 12). As amended, it would be required that such schools be operated by a State or local education agency, or, if the State application approved under the title so provides, by another State or local public agency or institution.

The term "school facilities" means classrooms and related facilities, including furniture, instructional materials other than textbooks, equipment, machinery, and utilities appropriate for school purposes, and interests in land on which such facilities are constructed. The term includes gymnasiums and similar facilities, except those intended primarily for exhibitions for which admission is to be charged to the general public.

The terms "construct," "constructing," and "construction" include the preparation of drawings and specifications for school facilities; erecting, building, acquiring, altering, remodeling, improving, or extending school facilities; and the inspection and supervision of the construction of school facilities.

Mr. ERVIN submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 1241, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY TO FILE CERTAIN REPORTS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I ask unanimous consent that the time for the filing of reports pursuant to Senate Resolution 48, and Senate Resolutions 50 through 60 of the 87th Congress, 1st session, be extended to March 31, 1962. This request concerns annual reports of certain subcommittees of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF DAVIS-BACON ACT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask permission of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Humphrey] and the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel] to be joined by unanimous consent in the sponsorship of the bill they have introduced, S. 1360. I understand that what I request is agreeable to them.

I wish to state that I consider this measure to propose a logical and necessary extension of the Davis-Bacon Act, so as to include fringe and other benefits, in addition to its present inclusion of the level of wages and salaries. Inasmuch as I am a member of the committee which undoubtedly will be dealing with this measure, I felt that I wished to be identified with the sponsorship of the bill itself.

Let me ask the Senator from California whether what I propose is agreeable to him.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I wish to say—and I am sure I speak for the acting majority leader [Mr. Humphrey], as well as for myself—that we are delighted and honored to have the distinguished Senator from New York join us in the sponsorship of this legislative effort, which I hope will become the law of the land this year.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from California.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to make a similar request, so that my name will also be included among those of the sponsors of the bill.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I join in the request that the name of the Senator from Oregon also be included in the list of sponsors of the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I so request and agree.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE CONCERNING CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Alexander Greenfeld, of Delaware, to be U.S. attorney, northern district of Florida.

Harry M. Miller, of Kentucky, to be U.S. marshal, western district of Kentucky.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Friday, February 9, 1962, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1962

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on January 30 the President of the United States transmitted to Congress Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962, which would create a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. On January 31, Senate Resolution 288 was introduced by the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], calling for Senate disapproval of that plan. The plan and the President's message of transmittal thereof, together with the resolution of disapproval, have been referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

It develops that the reorganizations proposed in said plan are highly controversial. A number, some favoring and some opposing the plan, have already requested to be heard by the committee before it takes action on the resolution. Accordingly, the committee has scheduled public hearings for that purpose, to hear witnesses who may desire to testify, to begin at 10:30 a.m., Wednesday, February 14, 1962, in room 3302, New Senate Office Building.

Senators and others interested who may desire to present their views on this issue to the committee are requested to so notify the clerk of the committee in order that arrangements may be made for their appearance.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF JAMES J. SAXON TO BE COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, February 6, 1962, at 10 a.m., in room 5302, New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of James J. Saxon, of Illinois, to be Comptroller of the Currency.

All persons who wish to appear and testify on this nomination are requested to notify Mr. Matthew Hale, chief of staff, Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, room 5300, New Senate Office Building, telephone Capitol 4-3121, extension 3921.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of the United States Code 1126c, the Speaker had appointed Mr. Carey, of New York, and Mr. McIntire, of Maine, as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy on the part of the House.

The message also informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of 10 United States Code 9355(a), the Speaker had appointed Mr. Rogers, of Colorado, Mr. Marshall, of Minnesota, Mr. Chenoweth, of Colorado, and Mr. Ostertag, of New York, as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Air Force Academy on the part of the House.

The message further informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of 14 United States Code 194(a), the Speaker had appointed Mr. Daddario, of Connecticut, and Mr. Chamberlain, of Michigan, as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy on the part of the House.

The message also informed the Senate that pursuant to the provisions of 10 United States Code 6968(a), the Speaker had appointed Mr. Bailey, of West Virginia, Mr. Flood, of Pennsylvania, Mr. Betts, of Ohio, and Mr. Laird, of Wisconsin, as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Naval Academy, on the part of the House.

The message further informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of 10 United States Code 4355(a), the Speaker had appointed Mr. Teague, of Texas, Mr. Natcher, of Kentucky, Mr. Rielman, of New York, and Mr. Minshall, of Ohio, as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Military Academy on the part of the House.

The message announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6025) to confer jurisdiction on the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of George Edward Barnhart against the United States.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 320) to amend the provisions contained in part II of the Interstate Commerce Act concerning registration of State certificates whereby a common carrier by motor vehicle may engage in interstate and foreign commerce within a State, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. BYRD of West Virginia:

Address delivered by him on January 27, 1962, before the 1st Congressional District Democratic Women's Workshop, in Wheeling, W. Va., describing some of the accomplishments of President Kennedy and the Democratic Congress.

STOCKPILING OF METALS—WHO'S ASTONISHED NOW?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, yesterday there appeared in the press throughout the country large headlines, "Kennedy Hits Overstockpiling, $7.7 Billion Tieup Held Excessive."

In these articles the President is quoted as saying that the total stockpile now amounts to $7.7 billion worth of materials, and that it greatly exceeds America's needs—by nearly $3.4 billion worth.

The President said that he was astonished to make this discovery, in a review of the stockpiling program after he took over the Presidency. Continuing, he said:

> It was apparent to me that this excessive storage of costly materials was a questionable burden on public funds, and in addition a potential source of excessive and unconscionable profits.

I was intrigued with the President's reaction that since he has taken over the Presidency he was astonished to make the discovery of this excessive stockpile of minerals.

My remarks here today are no doubt going to astonish him even more.

In the first place, for the past several years the Joint Committee on the Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, of which I am a member, and of which the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is chairman, has been making monthly reports listing the total amounts of the inventory in this excessive stockpile; and Mr. Kennedy, as a Member of the U.S. Senate, was furnished in his Senate office with copies of all these reports.

I shall ask to have incorporated in the RECORD at the end of my remarks one of these reports, dated May 10, 1960, as it was released to the press nearly 2 years ago. This report was available to every Member of the U.S. Senate. The report shows that at that time—in May 1960—the total value of the strategic and critical materials in our stockpiling program was $8,402,218,000.

Not only will the President be astonished to find that this information was so readily available; but what may astonish him even more is the fact that this program, which he now describes as scandalous, has been strongly denounced on the floor of the Senate at periodic intervals over the past several years. For example, on June 27, 1955, I strongly denounced this program as "one of the boldest raids on the Federal Treasury," and at that time placed in the RECORD letters signed by Mr. Arthur S. Flemming, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, in which, in answer to my request, he commented on a then pending bill which proposed to expand this program. Mr. Flemming stated:

> There would be no justification in the name of national defense for either extending or enlarging these programs in the manner proposed by S. 922 (the bill in question).

On June 23, 1955, I had called to the attention of the Senate the manner in which this procurement program was resulting in unwarranted windfall profits to certain mining companies.

Both these statements appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS of June 23 and June 27, 1955, volume 101, part 7, pages 9060-9061 and 9212-9213, respectively.

However, criticism of these programs was not all that took place. Over the past 5 years there was a series of votes on amendments, the purpose of which was to curtail or stop further procurement of some of these minerals that were not needed in our defense stockpile.

The **VICE PRESIDENT**. The time available to the Senator from Delaware, under the 3-minute limitation, has expired.

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The **VICE PRESIDENT**. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. The President may be astonished to know that in the nine different rollcall votes in the U.S. Senate, he voted against these subsidies on the first vote, but that on the next eight rollcalls between 1956 and 1960 he voted for them every time.

His 5-year voting record as a Member of the U.S. Senate has been consistently in support of providing more and more money to buy these minerals which were being piled up in unnecessary quantities.

While I regret that the President did not support those of us who were trying to curtail this extravagant program before so many unnecessary millions of the taxpayers' money had been wasted, nevertheless, I am glad that he has now awakened to the need for a full-scale investigation of this situation.

As one who has consistently denounced and voted against these unwarranted subsidies in the past, I now pledge to him my wholehearted support in his proposed investigation, and I will venture to say that if the investigation is pursued diligently the President will be even more astonished by the disclosures than he is to find that by his votes as a Member of the U.S. Senate he had supported this program which he now denounces as bordering on a national scandal.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have incorporaed in the RECORD the summary of a report released under date of May 10, 1960, by the chairman of the Joint Committee on Nonessential Federal Expenditures, in which are listed our inventories of strategic and critical materials as being $8,402,218,000. Immediately following this report I ask that there be incorporated a record of the recorded votes on the mineral stockpiling program during the past 6 years. This report shows that President Kennedy as the Senator from Massachusetts voted against these subsidies on the first rollcall vote, but on each of the eight succeeding votes he is recorded in favor of the expansion of the program.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD, DEMOCRAT, OF VIRGINIA, CHAIRMAN, JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES, IN RE COMMITTEE REPORT ON FEDERAL STOCKPILE INVENTORIES

(For release in morning papers Tuesday, May 10, 1960)

The cost value of materials in nine Federal stockpile inventories as reported by the Department of Agriculture, General Services Administration, and the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, on March 31, 1960, totaled $15,603,074,000. March activity in these stockpiles resulted in a net reduction of $35,157,000.

The net change in these stockpile inventories reflects acquisitions, disposals, and adjustments. The March activity and the end-of-the-month totals are summarized as follows:

[In thousands]

Inventories by agency and program	Cost value, March 1960	
	Net change during month	Total, end of month
Department of Agriculture:		
Price-support program:		
1. Agricultural commodities	−$46,604	$6,933,542
2. Exchange, strategic and critical materials	+15,805	95,349
Total, price-support program	−30,799	7,028,891
3. Defense Production Act program		3
Total, Department of Agriculture	−30,799	7,028,894
General Services Administration:		
Strategic and critical materials:		
4. National stockpile	−5,496	6,188,123
5. Federal Facilities Corporation, tin inventory		9,519
6. Defense Production Act program	+1,246	1,450,836
7. Supplemental stockpile	−221	693,543
8. Supplemental stockpile inventory in transit		60,196
Total, General Services Administration	−4,470	8,402,218
Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization:		
9. Civil defense stockpile	+112	171,962
Grand total	−35,157	15,603,074

These figures are from reports certified by the agencies involved as compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

INCREASES AND DECREASES

Major net decreases in cost value during the month were reported as follows: $44 million in cotton; $22 million in wheat; and $16.5 million in corn.

These decreases were partially offset by major net increases including: $20 million in milk and butterfat; $12 million in aluminum and aluminum ores; and $10 million in rice.

AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Of 23 agricultural commodities in Commodity Credit's $6.9 billion price support inventory on March 31, 1960, those leading in cost value include:

Wheat, with 1.1 billion bushels at a cost of $2.8 billion;

Corn, with 1.2 billion bushels at a cost of $2.1 billion; and

Cotton, with more than 5.6 million bales at a cost of $988 million.

STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

Strategic and critical materials are shown in six inventories totaling $8.5 billion, including the $6.2 billion national stockpile for which itemized detail is classified. Combined figures from the other five inventories show materials (in all grades and forms) leading in cost value as follows:

Aluminum, bauxite, etc., with 5.8 million tons at a cost of $454 million; Tungsten, with 84 million pounds at a cost of $341 million; and manganese and manganese ores, with 4.4 million tons at a cost of $292 million.

CIVIL DEFENSE SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT

The civil defense stockpile is shown in 7 composite groups totaling $172 million. Nearly 63 percent is in medical bulk stocks valued at $108 million.

Senate record votes on mineral stockpiling: 83d Cong. through 86th Cong.

(Compiled Feb. 1, 1962)

Congress and session	Description of bill or amendment and votes	Vote No.	Date of vote
83d, 1st	No record votes.		
83d, 2d	No record votes.		
84th, 1st	H.R. 6373, amending the Domestic Minerals Program Extension Act of 1953 to encourage the discovery, development, and production of certain domestic minerals. (Authorizes Office of Defense Mobilization to borrow up to $150,000,000 to extend programs affording American producers of tungsten, manganese, chromite, mica, asbestos, beryl, and columbium-tantalum a period of certainty in which they can make and execute plans and investments to reach production goals sufficient to maintain a stable economy in the mining industry and the military might necessary in case of an all-out war. Bill provides that quantity additions for each material may be increased through stockpiling by 100 percent where necessary to carry the individual program to June 30, 1958, provided the cost is not to exceed a total of $150,000,000.) Vote on passage: 54 yeas, 34 nays. Kennedy, nay; WILLIAMS, nay.	84	July 29, 1955
84th, 2d	S. 3982, as amended, the Domestic Tungsten, Asbestos, Fluorspar, and Columbium-Tantalum Production and Purchase Act of 1956. Dworshak amendment limiting purchases of tungsten. (Amendment provides for a limitation of 5,000 short tons per calendar month which GSA may purchase from any one producer.) Vote on amendment: 22 yeas, 32 nays. Kennedy, nay; WILLIAMS, yea.	177	June 18, 1956
85th, 1st	H.R. 4249, urgent deficiency appropriations for 1957. Hayden amendment providing an additional $30,000,000 for acquisition of certain strategic minerals, the funds to remain available until Dec. 31, 1958. Vote on amendment: 64 yeas, 17 nays. Kennedy, yea; Williams, nay.	4	Feb. 18, 1957
	H.R. 7221, 3d supplemental appropriation bill for fiscal 1957. Hayden amendment providing an additional amount for "Acquisition of strategic materials," $30,000,000. (Amendment, in practically identical language, was adopted by Senate on Feb. 18, 1957 (see vote immediately above). However, above bill (H.R. 4249) remained in conference until this date. By following procedure contemplated in pending bill, the Hayden amendment, together with 3 other appropriation amendments agreed to by the conferees on H.R. 4249, would return to House for consideration after passage by the Senate.) Vote on amendment: 61 yeas, 17 nays. Kennedy, yea; Williams, nay.	26	May 20, 1957
85th, 2d	S. 4036, Domestic Minerals Stabilization Act of 1958. 1st Williams amendment. (Amendment provides for the elimination of tungsten trioxide from provisions of the bill.) Vote on amendment: 25 yeas, 57 nays. Kennedy, nay; Williams, yea.	242	July 11, 1958
	S. 4036, Domestic Minerals Stabilization Act of 1958. 2d Williams amendment. (Amendment would eliminate from bill authority for Secretary of Interior to borrow $350,000,000 from Treasury for the purpose of making subsidy payments to domestic minerals producers.) Vote on amendment: 28 yeas, 54 nays. Kennedy, nay; Williams, yea.	243	Do.
	S. 4036, Domestic Minerals Stabilization Act of 1958. Vote on passage: 70 yeas, 12 nays. Kennedy, yea; Williams, nay.	244	Do.
	S. 3186, to extend for 1 year certain programs under the Domestic Tungsten, Asbestos, Fluorspar, and Columbium-Tantalum Production and Purchase Act of 1956. Bill vetoed Aug. 12, 1958 (S. Doc. 116, Congressional Record, p. 17056). No attempt made to override veto.	Voice	May 19, 1959
86th, 1st	H.R. 6940, Alaska—mineral leasing. Allott motion to recommit bill to Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. (Bill would increase certain acreage limitations in Alaska.) Vote on motion: 32 yeas, 55 nays. Kennedy, nay; Williams, yea.	149	Aug. 4, 1959
86th, 2d	H.R. 8860, lead and zinc mining stabilization for small domestic producers. (Bill provides for payments from the Treasury to small lead or zinc producers who mined not more than 2,000 tons per year at a rate which gave them a return equivalent to what they would have received if the market price for zinc were 14½ cents a pound and if the market price for lead were 17 cents a pound. The bill does not apply to large producers of lead and zinc.) Vote on passage: 59 yeas, 28 nays. Kennedy, yea; Williams, nay.	403	Aug. 19, 1960

PROPOSED DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS AND HOUSING

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, in the past few days, at least four of Pennsylvania's leading newspapers have editorialized on the subject of the proposed Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, which would be created by President Kennedy's pending reorganization plan.

Three of these newspapers support the proposal. They are the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, the Harrisburg Patriot, and the York Gazette and Daily. The fourth, the Philadelphia Inquirer, suggests the proposal be studied by a special commission.

The opponents of this measure sometimes contend that it is intended only for the major metropolitan cities, like New York City, Philadelphia, and Los Angeles. It is perhaps significant that in my Commonwealth editorial support comes from newspapers in the middle-sized cities of Harrisburg and York, which realize that smaller communities as well as major metropolises will benefit from this measure, while opposition comes from the Inquirer, published in the fourth largest city in the Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that these four editorials be reprinted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. I ask also that the text of a letter which I have written to the editor of the Philadelphia Inquirer, commenting upon the Inquirer's editorial, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, Jan. 4, 1962]

THE URBAN BLOCKADE

President Kennedy's renewed request for a Department of Urban Affairs will face a hard test in Congress this week. It is scheduled for a vote in the House Rules Committee, which is dominated by rural and conservative interests. The urban affairs bill has the additional impediment of a racial angle, since the President has indicated that if the new Cabinet post is created, he will nominate Dr. Robert C. Weaver, a Negro, to fill it. Dr. Weaver is now Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, which would become a part of the new department.

To get the support of all eight Democrats on the Rules Committee the bill will need the votes of two southerners, Congressmen JAMES TRIMBLE, of Arkansas, and HOMER THORNBERRY, of Texas. If these two should defect because of the racial issue, the votes of at least two of the seven Republicans will be needed. Republicans have tended to oppose the new department.

Beyond the initial obstacle of the Rules Committee, the legislation has to get past the rural bias of Congress resulting from a failure to promptly realine congressional districts in accordance with population shifts. Though 70 percent of Americans are now urban dwellers, Federal programs of direct benefit to farmers still get higher outlays from Congress than those for city residents.

Senator CLARK, of Pennsylvania, the original sponsor of the bill to create an Urban Affairs Department, has offered compelling arguments as to why metropolitan area residents now deserve the kind of special attention from the Federal Government that farmers have been getting since the creation of the Department of Agriculture in 1862. With city populations spilling over into broad suburban developments, municipal governments, Senator CLARK observes, are no longer able to cope adequately with the growing problems of health care, garbage collection, sewage disposal, recreation, zoning, and planning. Often the problems, and consequently the need for remedies, stretch across the State lines, as in the case of the vast metropolis reaching from Boston to Washington, D.C.

Senator CLARK pointed out last year that the Federal debt had risen less than 5 percent in 14 years, while State and local debt had more than quadrupled. Thus he argued that the National Government could more easily take on an enlarged role in urban affairs than could local governments. In the Senator's view, the new department should have a broad charter to survey the urban scene in its entirety, should be a point of contact in Washington for harassed local officials, should have general responsibility for coordinating all Federal activities affecting the city.

If eventual urban chaos is to be avoided, some sort of coordinated approach to the problems of rising megalopolises will have to be provided.

[From the Harrisburg (Pa.) Patriot, Jan. 24, 1962]

OUR HUGE URBAN POPULATION DESERVES CABINET STATUS

"Both equity and commonsense require that our Nation's urban areas, containing three-fourths of our population, sit as equals at the Cabinet table," said President Kennedy in his state of the Union address.

This is the simple and logical case for the President's proposal to create a new Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. The trouble is that the ways of Congress so often fail to reflect simplicity and logic.

Last year this proposal fizzled, and this year, with a vote imminent in the House Rules Committee, it is in trouble again. It is entangled in the racial issue, and it faces the obstacle of the rural and small-town inclinations of many Members of the House.

The leading candidate to head the Department, if it is created, is Dr. Robert C. Weaver, Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. He is a Negro, and this fact has cooled off a good bit of southern Democratic support for the President's legislation.

The Rules Committee, which has a virtual hammerlock power over scheduling bills for floor action, was expanded last year to produce an 8-to-7 majority that works for most administration proposals. It doesn't work for all of them, however, and there's a chance that one or two moderate southern Democratic members will defect on the urban affairs bill.

The five Republican members on the committee are strongly conservative, and Republican congressional leadership apparently has agreed on solid opposition to the urban affairs proposal. This is a grave mistake. For the interests of the Republican Party lie not in momentary partisan advantage but with long-term identification with America's predominately urban-suburban population.

In the coming years the proportion of Americans living in metropolitan areas will rise still further, and the scope and complexity of urban problems will also increase. It only makes sense for these areas to get equal attention in Washington with agriculture, commerce, and labor. It makes sense, too, that the party which does the most to support reasonable legislation for helping urban areas will benefit most at the polls.

[From the York (Pa.) Gazette and Daily, Jan. 27, 1962]

URBAN AFFAIRS

There is a Department of Agriculture in the Federal Government. It was established in 1862, when the majority of the people of the United States lived in rural areas. Today, about two-thirds of the population is concentrated in or near the cities, the urban centers. But no Federal department concerned with urban problems has been created.

In recent years a number of persons in public life, prominent among them Senator JOSEPH CLARK, of Pennsylvania, has called attention to this inadequacy. Mr. CLARK, former mayor of Philadelphia, learned at firsthand, as has his successor, Richardson Dilworth, of the need for an agency in the Federal Government which would have jurisdiction over all the questions of relationship between cities and the Government in Washington. But it was not until this session of Congress that a bill to establish a Department of Urban Affairs got into position to be considered.

Its first reception was not too good. On Wednesday the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives by a vote of 9 to 6—five Republicans and four southern Democrats comprised the majority—turned it down. (The Rules Committee, by the way, which is a sort of a gatekeeper for all introduced bills, has been an object of reforms suggested by liberal Democrats, who resent the life-or-death powers of the committee over legislation which in the opinion of liberals ought to be submitted to a vote of the whole House of Representatives.)

But hardly 15 minutes after the committee had acted on the bill, President Kennedy told a news conference he would create a Department of Urban Affairs under authorization given him by the Government Reorganization Act. This means that if Members of either House or Senate wish to react to the President's move, they will have to submit the proposition to the full body of one or the other legislative divisions. Mr. Kennedy's Executive power, in other words, is subject to veto by House or Senate.

It remains to be seen, however, whether Representatives or Senators who might be willing to hide behind a committee action against a Department of Urban Affairs will dare to oppose the proposal in the open. No doubt the President gave this some consideration when he declared his intention to create the Department. He has, in effect, put the opposition on the spot. The urban population figures not only make an irrefutable argument for a Cabinet-level department to deal with the many city problems which have national significance, they also have something to do with voting trends. In short, a vote in House or Senate against a Department of Urban Affairs risks a loss of votes for the fellow who thereby signifies his disinterest in city dwellers.

We think that President Kennedy has acted wisely in declaring his intention to establish a department. We think he has done well, too, to announce that he intends to appoint as head of the new Department the extremely competent Robert C. Weaver, now chief of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, which will form the nucleus of a Department of Urban Affairs.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Jan. 31, 1962]

NEW CABINET POST NEEDS STUDY

The vast and growing needs of metropolitan areas for Federal aid in such fields as housing, urban renewal and mass transportation, among others, are fairly well recognized.

What is not evident is the necessity for a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing at Washington, and a new Cabinet officer to head it.

President Kennedy has placed before Congress his reorganization bill setting up the proposed Department, and has urged the Senate and the House to approve his recommendations.

The President has assured Congress that there will be more efficient operation at greater economy than is possible under the present setup, once the new Department embraces the Federal agencies now dealing with mass transportation and other problems affecting the big cities.

Mr. Kennedy may be proved absolutely correct, and the reorganization may turn out to be a gem of economy and waste-killing centralization. But history and experience are all against it. Bureaucracy spawns jobs; creating a new bureaucratic agency in the Federal Government is almost bound to create new jobs pyramided one on top of the other.

Impatience with the present arrangement at Washington on the part of many big-city mayors, and their endorsement of a single Cabinet-status department to handle all urban matters, are quite understandable. In the case of many cities, the officials have found themselves unable to obtain financial aid from their States in satisfactory amounts, or cooperation in helping secure Federal assistance. Yet more than two-thirds of the U.S. population now lives in metropolitan centers, and the tax revenues they contribute to State and Federal Governments are disproportionate to the return in various types of appropriations.

Finding themselves unable to pay for many needed improvements, in slum clearance, in low-cost housing, in highway construction and transportation projects, many cities have been turned down by their State governments when they sought help in that quarter. Unfair legislative districting in many States, giving rural legislators a large voting edge, has severely handicapped the cities.

Federal assistance has been turned to instead, and has been increasingly relied upon. States rights advocates who dislike this trend as transferring to Washington responsibilities that belong to the States should do their complaining in the legislatures which have been indifferent to the plight of the cities.

There remains, nevertheless, the question whether the consideration of urban problems at the Federal level, and the channeling of Federal funds to the cities where desirable, cannot be handled by administrative agencies now in existence instead of by a costly and controversial new department.

President Kennedy's injection of politics into the situation is not conducive to any quick and sober appraisal of his plan. Probably the best thing Congress can do under the circumstances is to set up a special commission to study the President's proposal, to determine if the new Urban Affairs Department is actually needed.

FEBRUARY 1, 1962.

EDITOR,
The Philadelphia Inquirer,
Philadelphia, Pa.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE INQUIRER: It is disappointing to read the Inquirer's recommendation, expressed in your lead editorial of January 31, that President Kennedy's proposal for a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing should be referred to a special commission for study.

This proposal has already been studied exhaustively. Extensive hearings were held last year by the Committees on Government Operations of both the Senate and the House of Representatives before they approved the President's bill, of which I was the sponsor in the Senate. In the preceding Congress, hearings were conducted by the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, which likewise approved the proposal. In 1953, the Kestnbaum Commission published its comprehensive report on intergovernmental relations, and we now have a permanent Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

A new study is therefore unlikely to bring out new facts. The record is already quite complete. The time has come to act.

Your conclusion appears to arise from a misunderstanding that the President's proposal is much more complex than it actually is. You refer to it, for instance, as "costly." The reorganization, in fact, costs nothing, because it authorizes no new programs and no new expenditures.

All that President Kennedy proposes is to change the name of the Housing and Home Finance Agency and elevate it to Cabinet status. Over the years, those functions of the Federal Government most closely related to urban planning and development have been clustered in the HHFA. The only question is whether this cluster of activities is of sufficient importance to warrant departmental status—whether they are as important as, let us say, the Federal functions relating to agriculture or to the post office, both of which are organized in departments of Cabinet rank.

I think they are. I believe that the extensive Federal activities relating to housing, urban renewal, aid for community planning, assistance for mass transportation, aid for acquisition of open space and loans for community facilities—all of which functions are already in the HHFA—are of such importance that they deserve to be headed by an official of Cabinet status with prestige equal to that of the official who administers functions for the benefit of agriculture.

Others may disagree. But the question is a simple one on which anybody can render a judgment, based on information which is readily available. A special commission is not needed to obtain information we already have.

It is sometimes argued that departmental status would inevitably lead to new programs for Federal aid to cities, towns, villages, and unincorporated suburban areas and the reorganization is therefore a spending measure. But this is tortured reasoning. Any new program—such as further aid to mass transit—would have to be considered and authorized by the Congress on its merits, whether a department exists or not. True, a Secretary of Urban Affairs and Housing may be a more effective advocate of new programs than a Housing and Home Finance Administrator can be. But is it not an unfair tactic for the Senators and Congressmen from rural States to contend that their spokesman should be, in effect, a major general while ours must be held to the rank of major?

Sincerely,

Joseph S. Clark.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie] is about to introduce a very interesting commentary on an article by the distinguished columnist, Walter Lippmann, I shall refrain at this time from placing that article in the Record.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, within a matter of weeks we will be called upon to vote on the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1, establishing a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. The issue raised by the proposal is a simple one: Do we wish to perform currently existing responsibilities of the Federal Government in the important area of urban affairs and housing with maximum efficiency and effectiveness, or do we prefer to limp along with a ramshackle collection of agencies which Congress has created in response to particular needs?

But in the flow of rhetoric which has billowed over us before and since the President's Executive order, there has been an excess of misrepresentation and misunderstanding and a minimum disclosure of what is involved. In the Thursday, February 1, edition of the Washington Post, Walter Lippmann, with his usual gift for clarity and wisdom, illuminated the real issue on the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing and wiped away some of the misapprehensions to which we have been subjected. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Record at this point, and I commend it to my colleagues.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 1, 1962]

Much Ado

(By Walter Lippmann)

In the political hullabaloo about the proposed Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, it is useful to remember that the Department will possess no new Federal powers and will possess no new money to spend. All the powers which are to be in the new Department have long since been voted by Congress. These powers will come from four existing agencies and all the Department will be able to spend is what Congress has authorized these agencies to spend. For this is a reorganization and not a new grant of power.

What ground, then, is there for thinking that the new Department creates anything new? Can it do anything which cannot already be done by one of the four constituent agencies? The answer is, it seems to me, that it can focus attention on the mounting problems of the cities and of the metropolitan areas. It can bring together and encourage those who know and care about these problems, and it can do much to get them a hearing.

The new Department will have no power and no money to replan the old cities and to plan the development of the new metropolitan areas. But it can promote the studies which must precede the replanning and the development. This will have to be done in order to make life decent and convenient for the three-quarters of the American people who live in urban areas. Over and above the work of the old agencies which would be grouped in the new Department, it would be essentially a department of research and education in urban affairs.

Why, it will be asked, is this a good thing to have done from Washington? The answer is that it cannot be done adequately and, as a matter of fact, is not being done adequately by the States and municipalities. There are several reasons for that. One reason is that in the State legislatures the urban voters are grossly underrepresented as against the rural voters. Another reason is that the expanding metropolitan areas overlap State and county and municipal lines, and if they are to be governed properly, development must be planned on a metropolitan scale. The planning and development cannot be done merely by the localities of the past which are now being swallowed up by the metropolis.

As for the politics which now swirl about the proposal, the fact is that there would have been little of it had the Republican leaders not made so much ado about nothing. It was wrong and it was foolish of them to gang up with a few southern Democrats in the House Rules Committee in order to refuse to let the House vote on the proposal. On what principle, constitutional, moral, or political, can it be argued that the House of Representatives should not be allowed to vote on a proposal made by the President of the United States?

This wrong was a silly one to commit because the Republican leaders seem to have forgotten that the President could force the House to have a chance to vote by doing with the Department of Urban Affairs what President Eisenhower did with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—to send it to Congress under the Reorganization Act of 1949. If there was any political trap in all this, the Republican leaders laid the trap into which they have fallen. They should not have forgotten the Reorganization Act of 1949.

I do not know what part the proposed appointment of Mr. Weaver has played in promoting the coalition of southern Democrats and Republicans. Mr. Weaver is already the head of the Housing Administration, which will be the largest component of the Department, and a refusal to promote him when he is so preeminently qualified could have been explained only as racial discrimination.

Nevertheless, he is no doubt the main reason for the opposition of the southern Democrats. But he cannot be the reason for the opposition of the Republican leaders who are making all sorts of gestures, no doubt sincerely, to prove themselves to be friends of the Negro voters.

I cannot help thinking that the Republicans did not stop to consider what they were doing, and that they acted on their reflexes, which take it for granted that any new proposal to deal with the changing world is automatically undesirable.

USE OF ANTHRACITE IN ARMY INSTALLATIONS IN WEST GERMANY

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I have in the past made efforts to persuade the administration of the benefits in the use of anthracite coal in Army installations in West Germany. I have received a letter from the president of the Anthracite Institute indicating how satisfactory the use of that coal has been in terms of heating Army installations in West Germany and also the benefits received by citizens of Pennsylvania.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks a letter addressed to me by J. D. Jillson, president of Anthracite Institute.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Anthracite Institute,
Wilkes-Barre, Pa., January 29, 1962.

Hon. Joseph S. Clark, Jr.,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Clark: In view of your great assistance in securing the use of anthracite in the Army installations in West Germany, I thought you would be interested in receiving the copies of reports from Mr. Paul A. Mulcey, consulting engineer, retained by the Anthracite Institute under a grant from the Coal Research Board of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

As you may know, Mr. Mulcey has been in West Germany since December 7 to insure that the Army received optimum results with its use of anthracite. You will note that, despite certain problems that might be expected in the changeover from one fuel to another, the use of anthracite in the Army installations in West Germany has met with general acceptance.

In addition to assisting the Army in the utilization of anthracite, the supplying producers have taken every precaution to insure that the Army would receive a grade of anthracite of even higher quality than covered by the Army specifications. To guarantee this result, an impartial testing laboratory, Fuel Engineering Co. of New York, has been retained to test all the anthracite before it is put aboard the vessels for shipment.

In short, we believe that the industry has done everything possible to make sure that the Army would receive the best possible results in the use of anthracite in its German installations.

As of this date, approximately 300,000 tons of the total 485,000 tons have been produced and shipped to Germany and there are many indications that the economy of the area has received a definite stimulus as a result of this export business.

Sincerely yours,

J. D. Jillson, *President.*

SENATOR THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., AND CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the Missouri Law Review has devoted its November issue entirely to commentaries on our distinguished former colleague, the late Thomas Hennings, of Missouri. One of the best of the articles was written by the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse]. I ask unanimous consent that the remarks be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., AND CIVIL RIGHTS

(By Hon. WAYNE MORSE, U.S. Senator from Oregon)

Of the hundreds of men and women who have sat in the Congress of the United States, few have the opportunity to place a personal imprint upon the work of the Congress. Senator Thomas C. Hennings, Jr., of Missouri, was one who did, and he did it in the area of legislation most difficult to achieve—that of civil rights.

While the record and contributions of Senator Hennings in the field of civil rights and liberties must extend to the full list of them specified in our Constitution, perhaps his most notable contribution lay in the extension of equal protection to colored Americans. This area of public law is commonly referred to as civil rights legislation. Yet the foundation of his work stems from Senator Hennings' accurate and frequent restatement of the fact that civil rights are really constitutional rights, and that Americans who seek to exercise them and those who seek to prevent others from exercising them would do well to remember that it is the Constitution itself which carries in it not only the powers of the Government but the supposedly inviolable rights of each citizen.

Senator Hennings once said of the former Civil Rights Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee:

"Because of the semantics involved, and because of a general misunderstanding of what constituted civil rights, it being generally understood that civil rights relate to race relations, I moved that the name be changed to the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights; and the committee agreed with me. It was done because many matters coming within the purview of the first 10 amendments to the Constitution would be considered by the subcommittee."[1]

But nearly all governments with written constitutions—including Communist governments—have similar statements of rights. The vital question is whether they are respected and enforced by legislatures, administrators, and courts.

The greatest difficulty America has had in enforcing constitutional rights has come in the area of race relations, and it was to this area that Hennings devoted much of his time and energy. He did not read only those parts of the Constitution which pleased and furthered the interest of a particular faction or class, be it economic or social. He read and believed in the entire Constitution; more important, he tried to make it a reality for every American.

In 1956, when he told the Senate of the correspondence of the Judiciary Committee with the Justice Department about pending civil rights legislation, he said:

"I know of no elected Member of this assembly who was chosen to come here to represent merely the fortunate, or the privileged, or the secure within his community. I know of no Senator here who was chosen to represent only the white men or only the Negroes within the State which gave him the high privilege and honor of our legislative responsibilities. As for me, I was sent here to represent as best I may, an entire community, including rich and poor, young and old, people of diverse faiths, and diverse ancestries. And in particular, it seems to me, a responsibility was laid upon me to speak and to vote and to act on behalf of those people within this American Republic who are wrongfully deprived of their just rights, under our Constitution."[2]

It was no accident that the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee developed and flourished under Senator Hennings' chairmanship. This subject was probably more important to him than any other aspect of his service in Government, though his range of interests was wide.

To those of us who sought the same objectives, it was a helpful coincidence that Senator Hennings came from the border State of Missouri. His leadership in the effort to enforce the rights guaranteed under the 14th and 15th amendments was never subject to any charge of "outside agitation" in the affairs of the South. Hennings frequently referred to his southern ancestors and was rightfully proud of the fact that many of them had fought for the South in the Civil War. But he was a thoughtful student of that war. He knew what it was all about, and he knew what the meaning of its outcome was for the history of the United States and the world.

Moreover, Missouri is a border State both geographically and in its race structure. The impact of school integration was hard in Missouri, but there was not the inclination to resist it which has existed in other States. Negro voting rights have not been contested in Missouri as elsewhere. Senator Hennings was both a product of the progressive race relations in his State and a contributor to them.

But the simple statement of his creed is never the test of any man's contribution. The test is what he did to apply his principles to specific situations, what efforts he made to effectuate them. It was here that Senator Hennings rose far above the ordinary. There is probably no field of congressional endeavor which is more frustrating, more difficult, and more painstaking in which to labor than that of extending equality of the law to colored Americans.

No one knew better than Hennings that civil rights was, and is, a time-honored political football, an issue to which more lipservice is given and less accomplished than in any other area of political promises.

The reason has never been lack of devotion; the reason has been the legislative obstacles in the way of the enactment of such legislation. Carrying any civil rights measure, however meager, through to final enactment is a time-consuming task that requires the constant attention not of just one Member, but of many Members. It demands attention often to the exclusion of other business which Members may consider just as important. It demands constancy of purpose and attention, because our legislative system is designed to put the burden upon those who seek to enact laws, rather than upon those who oppose them. A determined minority in Congress can very often prevail over a determined majority.

Behind this legislative situation lies the social and economic basis for opposition to civil rights legislation which is only reflected in the Congress.

It is simply true that great numbers of Americans do not want Negroes to have the same rights as white Americans. They do not want Negroes to vote, to hold public office, or to receive the same treatment in public places and in public services as white people receive. This feeling is held most strongly in the South, but it is held in the North, East, and West, too.

It has a social meaning for many white people that Negroes have been used for servile purposes in the past, and that association with them now on a basis of equality is demeaning to the white. The differences in color and appearance accentuate this attitude and make it easier to hold.

It has an economic meaning, too. Colored labor is still cheap labor, especially in the South. Just as the northern immigrant of Civil War days saw the Negro slave and even Negro freemen as competition for work already poorly paid, so Negroes today are commonly regarded by working white people as men and women who are to do the menial work for the lowest wages while whites are to have the more skilled jobs and the higher wages. Again, the visible racial differences of color and appearance become the focal point of economic grievances.

I think it has also been true that the Negro minority in America has been less insistent upon its rights than almost any other, except possibly the American Indian. The Germans, the Irish, the Jews, the Italians, quickly learned what political rights they had coming and demanded them. The Negro has had a much more difficult time because of his more evident differences, but even so, Negroes have been late in asserting their rights as Americans.

To relate these generalities to the Congress, it is evident that the subject of civil rights means far more to the South and to its Representatives in Congress than to nonsoutherners. The full participation by Negroes in the political life of the South would mean the end of many political careers, and even of political dynasties. For Members of Congress coming from the north, east, and west, civil rights is just one more of many political battles; to the southern politician, civil rights is a question of political survival. The southern Member of Congress fights for his life on civil rights issues; most other Members fight only another legislative battle, and one which means nothing at all in many States. This fact works to the great advantage of the southerners, because a civil rights filibuster always works its attrition not on the northern Members with many colored voters who are watching proceedings closely but on the midwesterners and westerners whose constituents simply prefer that Congress get on with other things.

The struggle over civil rights in 1957 was a good example of how much time and effort must go into this subject by the proponents of the legislation, as well as the opponents. At that time, Senator Hennings demonstrated vividly the tenacity he was willing to put into the effort.

The chronicle of his work to bring a civil-rights measure before the full Senate Judiciary Committee and get it reported to the Senate was detailed on the Senate floor by Senator Hennings on June 20, 1957.[3]

In the opening days of the 85th Congress, Hennings had reintroduced four bills which had been considered and favorably reported by his subcommittee the previous year. They were to expand the safeguards of Federal voting rights, to outlaw lynching, to improve the handling of civil rights violations in the Justice Department by creating an Assistant Attorney General in charge of Civil Rights Division within the Department, and to extend to all people in the Armed Forces the Federal protection against bodily attack now enforcible for Coast Guard and certain other Federal employees.[4]

In introducing them, he described the first by saying:

"The full, free, and unhampered right to vote is one of the most distinguished rights of the American citizen. The right itself, or the unfettered use thereof, today is still denied to millions of people in other lands, principally due to the continued presence of tyranny in the world. But there can be no excuse for any failure of the U.S. Government to adequately protect this right in the full process of participating in the selection of Government officials. * * * The right here recognized, protected by criminal sanctions and strengthened with civil remedies, should no longer be denied to anyone on such inexcusable grounds as race, color, religion, or national origin." [5]

---

[1] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 103, pt. 1, p. 1281.

[2] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 102, pt. 5, p. 6192.

[3] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 103, pt. 7, pp. 9791–9792.

[4] S. 426, 427, 428, 429, 85th Cong., 1st sess. (1957).

At almost the same time, Senator DIRKSEN introduced a bill for himself and 32 other Republican Senators.[6] It provided for the establishment of a Civil Rights Division in the Justice Department, the creation of a Civil Rights Commission, greater protection for voting rights, and also empowered the Attorney General to initiate action to protect civil rights other than the voting right of the 15th amendment. This latter provision was intended to permit the Justice Department to enter school desegregation cases on behalf of children who were being denied the equal public education which is their right under the 14th amendment.

A similar provision in the House bill [7] came to be best known as title III, and became the focal point of the civil rights debate of 1957.

Senator Hennings promptly began a campaign to get action on these measures within the Judiciary Committee of the Senate. On January 22, he moved in full committee that a deadline be set for ending hearings on civil rights bills, and that a decision on them by the full committee should follow within a week. The motion was not acted on. On January 30, he presented an omnibus civil rights bill and sought to have it reported to the full committee; this motion was defeated.

The subcommittee did agree to hold hearings, although the ground had been fully covered in hearings held by the subcommittee in the previous Congress. Hennings moved to limit these hearings to 2 weeks, with a decision by the subcommittee to follow promptly. This motion was defeated. The subcommittee hearings lasted 3 weeks; 2 weeks later a civil rights bill with bipartisan backing was reported to the full Judiciary Committee.

Throughout April and May, Senator Hennings sought repeatedly to bring the bill out of the Judiciary Committee. Each time he was unable to obtain recognition to make a motion, or a quorum was lacking, or his motions were not voted on. At the June 10 and June 13 committee meetings, Hennings was unable to gain recognition at all.

On June 17, the House of Representatives passed its own version of a civil rights bill, and it was then that the decision was made by many civil rights supporters in the Senate to have the House bill go directly to the Senate calendar instead of being referred to the Senate Judiciary Committee.[8]

Had not Senator Hennings demonstrated by his persistence that the Judiciary Committee was itself the scene of a filibuster on civil rights legislation, the Senate would never have taken the drastic step of bypassing the committee.

Thereafter, Senator Hennings was a central figure in the fight to enact a meaningful civil rights bill.

Whenever the Senate acts without benefit of a committee report, and without the formal leadership of a committee or subcommittee chairman who is managing a bill, the backers of any measure find themselves severely handicapped. One Senator's opinion of the meaning of a phrase has equal standing with every other Senator's opinion in the absence of a report, and this measure was especially subject to endless legal and technical questions and interpretations of its meaning and effect.

But Senator Hennings served as an informal floor manager for civil rights supporters. He could not bring the measure past the roadblock of the full committee, but he did respond to questions which would have been put to a floor manager; he gave us the benefit of his expert advice and opinion on the meaning and intent of the language of the bill and of the amendments offered to it.

Throughout the lengthy Senate sessions on the bill, Senator Hennings was constantly at hand to guide the proponents of that measure and to point out publicly and privately the defects in the arguments of its opponents.

It was over his strenuous objections that the bill was stripped of its provisions extending Federal enforcement of rights supposedly guaranteed by the 14th amendment. It was over his telling arguments that the so-called jury trial amendment was added, greatly reducing the power and responsibility of the Federal courts to uphold the 15th amendment.

Yet, if there was any virtue, any advancement in what finally became the 1957 Civil Rights Act,[9] as much credit for it must go to Tom Hennings as to any one man. The main argument made for the bill by the time the Senate voted on its final passage was that for the first time in two generations a measure bearing the title of a civil rights bill would go on the books. It did enable the Justice Department of the United States to initiate action to help people vote who were being denied the right to do so by State or local officials. It established a Civil Rights Commission. It created an Assistant Attorney General in charge of a Civil Rights Division in the Justice Department.

If it did nothing to enforce the guarantee of equal protection of the law, perhaps it might be said for the 1957 law that it established a modern precedent for further legislative enforcement of constitutional rights.

Hennings renewed his battle within the Senate Judiciary Committee immediately upon the outset of the new Congress. In January of 1959, he joined several of us in reintroducing the stricken title III. The Constitutional Rights Subcommittee commenced hearings on March 18 on all civil rights measures introduced to that date. The hearings continued for 21 days, during which time 60 witnesses were heard.

When the subcommittee finished its work, the only measure reported to the full committee extended the Civil Rights Commission for 2 more years and required the States to preserve records relating to fulfillment of voting requirements for at least 2 years. When he introduced this "clean bill," [10] on behalf of the subcommittee on July 15, Hennings expressed his disappointment with its inadequacy, and introduced as amendments several versions of title III of the 1957 bill.

At that time, he also took note of the fact that of the three branches of the Federal Government, the Congress alone had remained silent on the Supreme Court decisions on the 14th amendment. He and Senator CARROLL, of Colorado, also a member of the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee, tried to remedy this failure of the Congress by offering a concurrent resolution. It declared it to be the sense of Congress that "a healthy public school system is an essential element today in American life," and that—

> "In the field of public education the doctrine of 'separate but equal' has no place; separate facilities on the basis of racial discrimination are inherently unequal; and racial discrimination in public education should be eliminated with all deliberate speed." [11]

As the first session of the new Congress drew to a close, it was evident that once again the chances for Senate action on civil rights were dim, if the Senate was to wait for a bill to come from the Senate Judiciary Committee. Senator Hennings himself told the Senate on August 17 that he was offering civil rights provisions as amendments to still another bill, because he was convinced the full Judiciary Committee was no closer to reporting S. 2391 than when it came from the subcommittee.

A reluctant Senate leadership took note of the difficulty, and the following year the majority leader felt obliged to bring civil rights to the floor by offering civil rights amendments to a bill which transferred certain Federal property to a Missouri school district.

On February 15, 1960, the Senate was again plunged into a lengthy debate on civil rights. Again, the Senate was acting without benefit of a committee report or a floor manager. And again, those of us working for the fulfillment of the 14th and 15th amendments found our bulwark of strength in Senator Hennings.

The hearings of his Constitutional Rights Subcommittee were the best single source of information at hand.[12] They indicated that the suits authorized in 1957 had proven ineffective in obtaining the suffrage for Negroes in States where a determined effort was made to keep the great mass of them from voting. It was the Hennings amendment calling for enrollment of voters by Federal officers which became the key enforcement provision of the bill.[13] Under the Hennings proposal, these Federal enrollment officers would be brought into the picture when a Federal court found the Negroes had been denied the right to vote because of their color, or when the Civil Rights Commission made a similar finding.

The tabling of the Hennings amendment by a vote of 58 to 26 was perhaps the most severe blow to the effective protection of the right to vote. All that remained in the protection of the 15th amendment was a complex referee system, requiring a long and costly court proceeding to bring it into play.

The Congress of the United States still has not gotten down to the earnest protection of the right to vote which is set forth in the 15th amendment as a right which shall not be denied because of race or color.

But in 1957 and 1960, it made some tentative, hesitant steps in that direction. That it did so is due in large part to Tom Hennings. These two laws have opened the door. If the American people are now ready and able to walk through that door, Senator Hennings will have left a mark on the Nation's history that will stand in the company of the statement of those ideals of representative government which he helped make a reality.

PRESIDENT'S BUDGET MESSAGE FOR FISCAL YEAR 1963

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, we are in the middle of the hunting season on the budget. Within the next 2 weeks the firing should be pretty intense as some of our colleagues leave the Capitol for their forays in the field.

---

[5] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 103, pt. 1, p. 348.

[6] S. 83, 85th Cong., 1st sess. (1957).

[7] H.R. 6127, 85th Cong., 1st sess. (1957).

[8] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 103, pt. 7, p. 9365.

[9] 71 Stat. 634 (1957); 5 U.S.C. 295–1, 28 U.S.C. 1343, 1861; 42 U.S.C. 1971, 1975a–c, 1995 (1958).

[10] S. 2391, 86th Cong., 1st sess. (1959); remarks printed in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 105, pt. 10, p. 13448.

[11] S. Con. Res. 64, 86th Cong., 1st sess. (1959).

[12] Hearings on S. 435 before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, 86th Cong., 1st sess. (1959).

[13] Amendment to H.R. 8315, 86th Cong., 2d sess. (1960); printed in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 106, pt. 4, p. 5108.

I claim no prowess as a fiscal forecaster, but if the opening blasts of some of our budget-hunting nimrods are any indication, there will be plenty of wild shooting, with not a few misses.

In the hope of clearing some of the smoke from the air now, I offer the appraisal of the President's fiscal estimates by the distinguished financial reporter, Sylvia Porter. I ask unanimous consent to have her article, which appeared in the Bangor (Maine) Daily News, January 31, printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Chances Good J.F.K.'s Federal Budget for Next Fiscal Year Underestimated

(By Sylvia Porter)

Is the slimly balanced Federal budget which President Kennedy has just submitted for the next fiscal year a fraud?

This is among the milder words being used to describe it not only by a large percentage of Republicans and some top Democrats in Congress but by many business and labor leaders too. They scoff at his estimates of $93 billion in Government receipts in the new year as entirely too optimistic. They insist that our economy won't expand enough in coming months to produce the personal and corporation income taxes to cover spending of $92.5 billion. They conclude that just as President Eisenhower's final full-year budget was phony because Eisenhower grossly underestimated spending so President Kennedy's first full-year budget will turn out phony because he is grossly overestimating income.

It could be. Any forecast of the Government's income 18 months from now is educated guessing at best.

But since all of us are guessing, I hereby take the calculated risk of suggesting that if Kennedy has made a mistake on estimating income, the chances are as good that his error is on the low side as on the high side.

Kennedy could be understating the Governments tax take in the next fiscal year, not overstating it. He could be unduly pessimistic on revenues, not unduly optimistic.

BASED ON ASSUMPTIONS

To get right down to specifics, a careful analysis of the revenue estimate for the year to begin July 1 emphasizes it is based on the assumptions:

1. That the total output of our economy will rise to $570 billion in calendar year 1962. But reputable authorities—including the conservative Federal Reserve System—believe the total easily could be running at $580 to $585 billion by this year end. The level is already above $540 billion and climbing sharply. If at the end of 1962, the rate is only $570 billion, the rise wouldn't even reach the modest rate of gain of 2 percent a quarter Kennedy uses as a basis for his own projections. That $570 billion projection for gross national product—from which all estimates of personal and corporation incomes stem—could end up as significantly conservative.

2. That corporation profits in 1962 will total $56.5 billion, up 25 percent from 1961. But huge as this rise appears, it's only a tiny bit larger than the rise of 24 percent in profits in 1959—a year in which prosperity was choked off by a brutal squeeze on credit and an historically abrupt and excessive shift in the budget from deficit to deflationary surplus. Says Kennedy flatly, "This will not be repeated." Corporation profits in 1962 could be pleasantly surprising.

ONLY 4 PERCENT

3. That personal incomes will be running at $448 billion at the end of 1962 against a rate of $431 billion now. But that's a rise of only 4 percent this year. It's conservative compared with the record in 1961—and 1961, mind you, started in a recession and didn't move into high gear until it was half gone.

4. That businessmen's spending on new plants will increase moderately this year and thus give only a moderate impetus to jobs, paychecks, profits. But this projection doesn't take into consideration the stimulous to business spending if Congress passes the 8 percent tax credit proposal—and this plan is gaining support daily. The informed conviction is that businessmen will be steadily stepping up their spending on plants and equipment as the year progresses.

Moreover, there is the probability that the Treasury will collect a lot more taxes in the next fiscal year because of its tightened enforcement; Kennedy puts the extra collections at $300 million. There is the hefty chunk to be collected from higher first-class and airmail rates; the postal bill is moving through Congress.

Of course, the skeptics may be right on the red ink. Who can foretell what a worsening world crisis might do to the spending side? But the cheerful possibility as of this date is that as far as tax take is concerned, Kennedy may have just given us a conservative budget—and as a guess, that's as educated as any of the cynics have publicized.

TESTIMONIAL TO THE LATE SENATOR STYLES BRIDGES

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, on August 10, 1960, Mr. Robert Austin presented to Senator Styles Bridges a testimonial scroll on behalf of the National Committee for a Representative Congress of which Mr. Austin is chairman.

Since this testimonial scroll so eloquently pays tribute to our late friend and colleague, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the scroll printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the text of the scroll was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Following is text of a testimonial scroll awarded by the National Committee for a Representative Congress, Robert Austin, chairman, to Senator Styles Bridges at a presentation ceremony August 10, 1960, text written by Charlie Kress, a personal friend of Senator Bridges:

"TO THE HONORABLE STYLES BRIDGES, U.S. SENATOR

"For an outstanding record of distinguished service as a U.S. Senator—

"In adhering most faithfully to the principles of representative government, to preserve Government of the people, by the people, for the people;

"In rendering highly constructive services to the people of New Hampshire, faithfully and vigorously representing their ideals and objectives, and making many important contributions to the welfare, progress and betterment of that State;

"In making, as a sturdy champion of America, a strong and unceasing fight against the menace of Communist aims of conquest, and to build our national defense to protecting strength for our precious liberties which give us freedom to live, to work, to worship as we choose;

"In carrying on with unrelenting zeal, a continuous and effective battle against waste, corruption, inefficiency and the eroding effects of inflation, to protect the taxpayer's dollar—also the economic welfare of the farmer, the small businessman, the wage earner, and other modest income citizenry, and to aid them to obtain a fair share of the national prosperity;

"In standing forth as a determined, fighting advocate of foreign policies which will protect our country and bring about advancement of peace, freedom, justice, and a better way of life for all humanity;

"In establishing a brilliant and enduring record of shining public service as a Senator of greatness, with humility—of dauntless courage, with kindliness—of unswerving integrity, with understanding—of forthrightness, with courtesy—of wholehearted dedication to faithfully serving the best interests of the people of New Hampshire and the Nation as a whole with unselfish disregard of any personal political consequences."

OPPOSITION TO U.S. PURCHASE OF U.N. BONDS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the President has recommended enactment by the Congress of a bill to authorize and appropriate up to $100 million for the purchase of U.N. bonds.

The Congress, of course, can and should, microscopically examine: First, the validity of such a request; second, the necessity; and, third, the significance of such a proposal as a precedent in U.S. policy.

Over the years, the U.N.—with its brief 16-year lifetime—has made constructive contributions to settling differences among nations and promoting peace. Obviously, too, the U.N. has weaknesses and shortcomings; generally, however, these can be attributed to the reluctance of U.N. members to live up to the worthy standards of the charter.

As a world leader in the promotion of peace and in the support of the U.N., the United States, however, must continuously reexamine its policies relating to the U.N. as well as to world affairs generally.

For this reason, the Congress must, in my judgment, exhaustively analyze the short- and long-range significance of our present U.N. policy, including the proposal for purchase of $100 million of U.N. bonds.

The major factors requiring reexamination include the following:

First. The significance—growing or lessening—of U.N. influence in (a) thwarting the aggressive aims of communism and (b) serving the interests of world peace.

Second. Should the United States continue its present policy of supporting the U.N.? Or should there be revisions or rejections of some of the existing policies?

Third. What would be the result, as some recommend, of: Weakening the U.N.—by lack of support—and letting it die on the vine; or withdrawing from the U.N.?

If these latter alternatives were adopted:

First. What would be the impact on world peace of disintegrated relations among non-Communist nations as a result of the "withering away" of the U.N.?

Second. Would this, then, require additional U.S. expenditures for defense and national security, now estimated at more than $52 billion—of which about 1½ percent is earmarked for support of the U.N.?

The Congress and the people, then, must also ask the question—of immediate and historical significance: What will be the long-range effect of U.S. policy, not only upon the U.N. itself but also upon humanity's effort to establish the necessary machinery to settle differences among nations, without war, and promote peace in the world?

Following the President's recommendations for purchase of U.N. bonds, there has been a groundswell of opposition from the people.

Now, the Congress must do what—in its judgment—best serves the interests of the country.

The President, however, I believe has a further responsibility—that is: If he deems the bond purchase essential to national security and the execution of effective national policy, then he must do a better job of telling the story to the people; not just drop this controversial proposal—like a "hot potato"—in the lap of Congress.

If there is justification for such a substantial investment of the taxpayers' money, as well as a radical change in U.S. policy, then the people will need to be informed—and persuaded—that this best serves the interests of the country.

In accordance with the philosophy of a maxim attributed to the wise and venerated Abraham Lincoln:

> With the support of the people, we can do anything; without their support, we can do nothing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. WILEY. May I have another moment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator will be granted an additional minute.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the Presiding Officer very much.

At this time, I ask unanimous consent to have messages—including opposition to U.S. purchases of U.N. bonds, as well as a brief of support by the State Department—printed in the RECORD.

Mr. President, I have received numerous letters and telephone calls in this regard. I have seen what one might call a great surge of resentment. People do not understand what is involved. That is why I have made this statement.

There being no objection, the letters and brief were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I was most disturbed to read recently that the U.S. Government would be shortly requested to purchase a half of the bond issue currently being issued by the United Nations.

It is my understanding that there are many nations that have not contributed their proportionate share toward the current operations of the U.N.

Until such time as all nations belonging to the U.N. contribute and pay their fair share of the expenses of the United Nations, I for one, oppose any underwriting or payment on the part of our country to this organization.

It has become increasingly apparent that our country has been spending more on foreign aid than it actually can afford which has resulted in the unfavorable foreign balance of payments. If this trend continues, we are going to be faced with either devaluation of the dollar or complete and total bankruptcy via the road of inflation.

I hope that you will keep my opinions in mind when this subject of further support to the United Nations comes before the Congress of the United States which I trust will be done before being enacted by the current administration.

Sincerely yours,

F. R. FUNK,
——— ———.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: The President has asked for authority from the Congress to buy one-half of the $200 million bond issue of the U.N. I would urge you to vote against granting this request.

Many of the nations have not paid their assessments, including the Soviet Union. The United States has only one vote in the U.N. and is carrying nearly one half of the financial burden. If these nations just want to have the right to speak and vote and not pay their fair share of the expenses then the United States should withdraw its membership.

No reasonable person expects that these bonds ever will be repaid. It will be an expenditure of our Government which the taxpayers of this country will have to pay, and the interest for years to come. We do not have this money, we will have to borrow it.

——— ———.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Since you are representing me in the U.S. Senate, I wish to go on record in opposition to the recently proposed purchase of U.N. bonds. If the other nations are not prepared to contribute their alloted financial support to the activities of that body, I strongly object to having any moneys collected from me in taxes used to make up for their default.

At best, I have never been convinced that tax money of U.S. citizens could be legally converted to use in the pattern of the United Nations, and feel that this proposal is even more questionable, from a legal aspect.

I urge you to vote against this measure.

Sincerely yours,

——— ———.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I urge you to vote against participation in any type of U.N. bond issue proposed by President Kennedy. The record shows that since the approval of the U.N. Charter in 1945 by the U.S. Senate the United Nations has failed miserably as a peace organization, while on the other hand it has been able to do nothing to slow down the conquest of the free world by the Communist conspiracy.

I, therefore, believe it is time that the United Nations be allowed to die a long overdue death. It seems painfully clear that the United Nations which we Americans hoped would put a stop to aggression has been so stymied by a powerful aggressor—Soviet Russia and international communism—within its own setup that its stated idealistic objectives have been defeated at the start.

I trust that you agree.

Respectfully,

——— ———.

DEAR MR. WILEY: We do not believe the United States should buy United Nations bonds. Please do all you can to defeat this measure.

Sincerely yours,

——— ———.

DEAR SIR: I would like to voice my opposition to the purchase of $100 million of U.N. bonds by the United States. With our national debt what it is, and always getting larger, we can't afford to keep up the cost of an organization whose value to our interests is certainly doubtful; and of which other countries think so little that they do not even pay their due assessments.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Since I believe that it is time the United States stopped footing the U.N.'s bills, I urge you to do whatever you can to prevent this country's buying the proposed $100 million bond issue of the U.N. In fact we should stop all payments to the U.N. until other delinquent nations have paid their dues.

Sincerely yours,

——— ———.

[Department of State release]

THE UNITED NATIONS BOND ISSUE

BACKGROUND PAPER

The President is requesting authorization from the Congress in his current budget to purchase up to $100 million of United Nations bonds. This request follows action by the General Assembly of the United Nations, making it possible for the Acting Secretary General to issue $200 million worth of bonds to finance the U.N.'s peace-and-security operations in the Congo and the Middle East.

This decision naturally gives rise to two questions: Should the United States purchase some of them? And why does the United Nations have to issue bonds?

WHY SHOULD THE UNITED STATES PURCHASE U.N. BONDS?

For 16 years the United Nations has served the national interest of the United States as well as the interests of most of its other members, through its many regular functions and its peacekeeping functions. There are, of course, strict limits to United Nations action, limits set by the willingness of its members to support extension of the U.N.'s executive role. These limits are gradually widening.

But the United Nations growing capacity to act goes well beyond its much publicized military operations. It provides various kinds of advice and self-starting aid for all of its less-developed members. It also provides a wide range of peaceful settlement procedures, ranging from single representatives of the Secretary General to peace observation teams, mediators, conciliation commissions, and the general supervision of progress toward self-government. The peacemaking role of the United Nations serves our interest because many of the disputes contain the seeds of war. While some of the crises taken to the U.N. continue to be dangerous, in many instances the trend has been reversed.

The bond issue proposal has several distinct advantages for the U.N. and for the United States:

It will be large enough to solve the U.N. cash problem for this year and next. This will provide a much-needed breathing space without financial crisis to complicate the carrying out of the functions entrusted to the U.N.

Payments for the heavy immediate costs of the peacekeeping activities in the Middle East and the Congo will be spread out over a period of 25 years. Annual repayments to cover these costs will only amount to $10 million. Shares of this amount are considered within the ability of even smaller, less advanced nations to pay. Through this means the principle of collective responsibility can, we believe, be reaffirmed.

The bonds will bear a 2-percent interest rate. This will keep annual costs at a level enabling all governments to pay and will give some return to governments purchasing the bonds. But this interest rate should avoid the charge that this is a profitmaking venture by capital exporting nations, who will purchase the largest share of the bonds.

None of the member states has disputed the fact that regular budget assessments are binding obligations which each member must pay under the charter.

The U.S. contribution for peace-and-security operations will be reduced from the present 47½ percent to our regular budget assessment scale of 32 percent.

The nonpaying member states will still owe their dues: the bond issue will not relieve any country of amounts its owes to any of the U.N. accounts. The restoring of the credit of the United Nations and the settlement of its obligations will be assisted by the anticipated favorable decision of the International Court of Justice (discussed later).

WHY THE U.N. BOND ISSUE?

Twice within the past 5 years the General Assembly—with full U.S. support—has taken action to set up military forces to prevent and to remove threats to the peace. This is one of the basic purposes for the existence of this international organization.

In 1957 the United Nations Emergency Force (UNEF) was established. This is a force of 5,100 troops on the Gaza strip, along the Israeli-Egyptian border, near the Gulf of Aqaba, maintaining the precarious peace in the still unliquidated war between Israel and its Arab neighbors.

The other peace-and-security operation, the United Nations Operation in the Congo (UNOC), was established in July 1960. It consists of about 17,000 troops provided by 21 countries, none of them great powers.

The cost of these operations has been the principal factor leading to the financial crisis in the United Nations, details of which are given in later paragraphs.

Expenses of regular U.N. activities. The regular expenses of the United Nations are financed by annual assessments against each member government. These regular expenses of the organization in 1961, excluding the troop costs mentioned above, totaled $72.7 million of which the U.S. paid $22.3 million. This was 32.5 percent which was our regular percentage contribution to U.N. activities in 1961. All member states, including the Soviets, have been paying their regular dues within the time limits provided by the charter. Some countries are slow to pay, but no nation objects on principle to making these payments.

Cost of peace-and-security operations: The U.N. budget for the peace-and-security operations, UNEF and UNOC, is running about $140 million per year. In 1961, UNEF cost about $19 million of which we paid $7.9 million. UNOC's budget was $100 million for the first 10 months of 1961 of which the United States paid $47.5 million.

The cost of UNEF and UNOC is also assessed against every member of the United Nations by action of the General Assembly. In addition, the United States and other nations have made voluntary contributions, in cash and services, to reduce the burden on the smaller, less developed countries. However, the Soviets and their satellites take the position that they will pay only when they agree with the operation; they therefore have refused to pay their assessments to either UNEF or UNOC. The Arabs also do not pay for UNEF, and the French and the Belgians have declined to pay their share of UNOC. Although most of the smaller, less advanced nations believe the UNOC operation is important and necessary, many of them have been unable to keep up their payments on these special assessments on top of paying their regular assessments. All these nonpayments have produced the cash shortage in which the U.N. finds itself.

The Secretary General's dilemma: When U Thant became Acting Secretary General he found that one of the basic problems of the U.N. was this cash deficit. As indicated above, this resulted from the inability of some members and the unwillingness of others to pay their assessed shares. As of December 31, 1961, the total unpaid contributions on the regular budget, the UNEF, and the UNOC accounts totaled about $94 million. Unpaid U.N. bills, plus borrowing from other accounts, were estimated at nearly $110 million.

Moreover, the Secretary General found that widespread opposition existed to continuing the financing of UNEF and UNOC from special budgets as they had been in the past. Principal among the reasons was the inability of many of the smaller countries to pay these heavy short-term emergency costs—in addition to their regular assessments—on a pay-as-you-go basis.

The Secretary General's program: The Secretary General made three interrelated proposals, each of which was adopted by large votes:

1. Advisory court opinion on arrearages: The General Assembly voted to ask the International Court of Justice for an advisory opinion to settle the question of whether the assessments levied to pay the expenses of UNEF and UNOC create mandatory obligations on member States under the United Nations Charter. It is the opinion of the United States that such assessments, like other assessments levied to finance the activities of the United Nations, do bind governments. Several states, however, have refused to pay their assessments for UNEF and UNOC, claiming that they are not obligated to do so. We anticipate an opinion from the Court which will confirm the binding character of these assessments. Such an opinion should be of great value in inducing delinquent States to honor their financial obligations.

2. Interim financing: The General Assembly voted a new appropriation, assessed against all members, to carry UNEF and UNOC operations through June 30, 1962. This interim financing is needed to permit governments time to secure the approval of their legislatures for the longer range bond issue financing.

3. U.N. bond issue: The General Assembly authorized the Secretary General to issue $200 million worth of U.N. bonds, repayable at 2 percent over a 25-year period. These funds will finance peacekeeping operations for approximately 18 months from July 1, 1962. The bond issue will be repaid out of the regular budget. Repayments will amount to an annual charge of about $10 million, which will be assessed against all members as a part of the regular budget.

SUMMARY

The reasons for continued support by the United States of the United Nations and of our subscription to United Nations bonds were summed up in President Kennedy's state of the Union message:

"No policeman is universally popular, particularly when he uses his stick to restore law and order on his beat. Those members who are willing to contribute their votes and their views—but very little else—have created a serious deficit by refusing to pay their share of special U.N. assessments. Yet they do pay their annual assessments to retain their vote, and a new U.N. bond issue, financing special operations for the next 18 months, is to be repaid with interest from these regular assessments. This is clearly in our interest. It will not only keep the U.N. solvent, but require all voting members to pay their fair share of its activities. Our share of special operations has long been much higher than our share of the annual assessments, and the bond issue will, in effect, reduce our disproportionate obligation. For these reasons, I am urging Congress to approve our participation."

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the Senate consideration of S. 1241 all members of the professional staff of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be admitted to the floor for the purpose of rendering assistance on the bill to Senators on both sides of the aisle.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

UNITED NATIONS BONDS

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, next Tuesday the administration representatives will appear before the Committee on Foreign Relations to support the proposal of the President that the United States purchase $100 million worth of United Nations 25-year, 2-percent bonds.

In the words of the President of the United States, "failure to act"—I presume he means act favorably—"would serve the interests of the Soviet Union."

I take this occasion to serve notice that I do not intend to accept this kind of dictation from anyone.

Let me say that I do not believe that the President meant those words as they sound. I do believe that some of his advisers meant them.

It is apparent that they are attempting now to discourage a thorough airing of the financial situation of the United Nations, and the particular relationship of that situation to the present and future policies of the United States toward the United Nations.

The United Nations is no more sacrosanct from careful review and public accounting than our own Government.

I intend before this issue is put to the U.S. Senate for a vote to assure myself that our policies are sound, and that the financial house of the United Nations is in order.

Aside from the fact that we are confronted by one of these situations in which the Executive has committed the Congress without consultation or consent—and thus put this Nation in the position of putting up, or failing to honor its obligations—I will say that the last 10 days since I have been seeking information on the bond issue have been characterized by frustration and exasperation.

Ten days ago I asked the Department of State for a simple accounting: To whom does the United Nations now owe money—about $100 million—and for what?

Apparently this information was not available at the time the President made his state of the Union message stating that he would ask the Congress for authority to purchase these bonds. I say this because it took the Department of State 10 days of frantic scurrying around to get the information to me. And when I got the names of 26 United Nations creditors and the amounts purportedly due them, I was requested not to make the information public.

I do not know yet whether the President knows that something in the neighborhood of $32 million of the United Nations debt is owed to the United States, mostly to the Air Force, and that we are being asked to buy $100 million worth of 25-year bonds of the United Nations so that it can turn around and pay $32 million to the United States.

What kind of financing is this?

And the information as to estimates of other United Nations indebtedness to other nations is classified. Why should this be? The reason given me is that the amounts owed to other nations and funds are negotiable.

In other words, we do not know how much Ghana is charging the United Nations for the service of Ghanaian soldiers in the Congo, or how much Sweden will bill the United Nations for the service of their forces in the Congo.

Let me make it clear, Mr. President, I am not out to shoot down the United Nations. I have supported that organization and our full participation in it from the beginning.

I do not criticize the bond issue because of disagreement with U.N. policies in the Congo or in the Middle East.

There are two things I seek. First, I propose to scrutinize this issue most carefully in order to bring home to all members of the United Nations that their relationships with that organization itself are to be financially responsible.

Second, I propose to scrutinize this issue most carefully in order to put on the public record the attitude of various members toward the organization. I do not propose to condemn the Russians or the Arabs or the French because they have failed to pay their assessments, and then permit other so-called cooperating states to pad their bills to help them redress their hard currency balances.

I propose to find out in some detail whether U.S. aid programs have been the direct or indirect means by which some nations have paid their dues to the United Nations.

I propose to find out whether the United States has been selling or leasing equipment or services to the United Nations at bargain rates, only to have other members charge all the traffic will bear.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Vermont has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Vermont may have an additional minute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, these are things which we—and the people at large in the world—have a right to know.

The American people have supported the United Nations with lives and with funds. We did not quibble in loaning funds for the construction of a headquarters. Even today we support the regular budget to the tune of nearly one-third of its total. We have supported 60 to 70 percent of the cost of most of its special activities.

In some instances, such as the children's fund, we have measured our contributions not only by what others have given, but by what they have included in their own regular budgets for children's welfare.

I do not quarrel with those acts of generosity. I do not now quarrel with the importance of the United Nations and the contributions it has made and can make toward international peace. But I do quarrel, Mr. President, with any effort to link careful scrutiny of this problem with the charge of being pro-Soviet, or anti-United Nations.

If the United Nations is to be the kind of organization which most Americans want, certainly its financial activities must be above reproach.

The way to keep those activities above reproach is to make them public and not try to hide them behind maneuvers that partake of slickness, the kiting of funds from one account to another, and the use of the organization in indirect ways to help nations, friendly or otherwise, to evade their responsibilities to that organization.

PUBLIC HEARINGS ON CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF MILITARY PERSONNEL

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights will hold its first public hearing on the constitutional rights of military personnel on Monday morning, February 5, 1962, beginning at 10 a.m., in room 357 of the Old Senate Office Building. This will mark the start of a week-long series of hearings focusing on military discharge procedures and the administration of military justice. The hearings will be held in the same room each day through Friday, February 9.

The constitutional rights of persons subject to military jurisdiction has been a subject of continuing concern to the subcommittee for a number of years, and special problems of the rights of the several classes of persons involved, servicemen, dependents, and civilian employees, have been examined in the course of staff studies. In 1957, for instance, the subcommittee investigated the extent to which Americans abroad enjoy basic rights when they are accused of violating Armed Forces regulations or the criminal laws of this country or the country where they are stationed. In connection with that study, a subcommittee observer attended the Japanese criminal trial of a U.S. soldier, William Girard, and cases similar to his in other countries were carefully monitored to learn whether rights were denied to U.S. personnel.

The present investigation into the rights of the military, however, has been prompted by numerous recent complaints and reports of the arbitrary use of military discharges. In these hearings, the subcommittee plans to explore some of these charges that administrative discharges and other techniques are being used to deny or bypass protections which Congress assured the serviceman in the Uniform Code of Military Justice. Also, the subcommittee will inquire whether commanding officers have tried to influence the personnel of courts-martial, whether servicemen have been provided the aid of legally trained counsel, and whether the three services are providing the same brand of justice.

In short, we shall seek to determine more precisely just what the constitutional rights of a serviceman are, and whether they are being observed by the armed services in the issuance of discharges and in the administration of military justice.

More than a score of witnesses including law professors, attorneys, representatives of the Armed Forces, veterans' organizations, bar associations, and other groups are scheduled to discuss these matters before the subcommittee during the coming week.

It is my hope that as a result of their interest and the efforts of the subcommittee in this investigation, new light may be shed on the problems in this area of the law and information may be elicited which will assist Congress in prescribing any necessary remedies to further safeguard the constitutional rights of our military personnel.

As I have said elsewhere, in today's troubled times we cannot afford to hinder our Armed Forces in their primary mission of protecting this country against aggression. I have always believed that high standards of military justice will, in the long run, improve, rather than impair, military discipline, morale, and efficiency.

THE LATE J. SPENCER LOVE OF GREENSBORO, N.C.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the Nation was saddened to learn recently of the death of J. Spencer Love, of Greensboro, N.C. At the time of his death, Mr. Love was the chief executive of Burlington Industries.

His passing is eloquently noted editorially in the January 23, 1962, edition of the Smithfield (N.C.) Herald. Spencer Love did a great deal for the town of Smithfield. He brought his company there, bought a run-down mill, improved it, and elevated its residential facilities and general standard of living of employees. The editor concluded:

> Smithfield is better, North Carolina is richer, and America is stronger because James Spencer Love had imagination, wisdom, and limitless energy which he put to full use, and because he also had a heart.

What Burlington Industries, through his guidance, did for Smithfield is characteristic of what Spencer Love achieved in innumerable communities throughout North Carolina. It is representative of his effort to improve whatever he touched.

The rise of Spencer Love from payroll clerk to the chief executive of the largest textile company in the world, is a chronicle of the successful history of the system of capitalism, a system which he used, and to which he made an enormous contribution. He was a capitalist in every sense of the word. The newspapers have called him a tycoon. But his friends and his competitors knew him as their leader, as the principal force behind the tidal wave of expansion that has thrust the textile industry in the South and in the entire United States to a position of primacy in the world.

Although not a native of North Carolina, he was the grandson of North Carolinians, and North Carolina is where he made his indellible mark; a mark that does not expire at his passing, a mark that will endure beyond our time. When he left Harvard in 1918 and took a job in Gastonia, N.C., as a payroll clerk in a run-down cotton mill, his salary was $23 a week. A year later, he controlled the business. He borrowed $80,000, paid it back 3 years later, sold the plant for $200,000 took his profit to Burlington, N.C., and what was to become the 48th largest industrial corporation in America was born. This was a prelude to the enterprise of Spencer Love. He capitalized, bought, sold, added, borrowed, expanded, grew.

Today Burlington Industries is the largest textile organization in the world. It operates 147 plants in the United States and seven foreign countries, employs 65,000 persons, and is the spinner, weaver, knitter, dyer, and finisher of more than 35 natural and manmade fibers. There is nothing quite like Burlington Industries and there was no one quite like Spencer Love either. He worked long hours 7 days a week; he was a great competitor; a man of enormous energy and vigor; and his success and contribution to us all are evidence of his vision.

He saw a future, long ago, in a crude new synethic called rayon. And later something called nylon came to his attention. He produced both and was the first troubador of their virtues. He said:

> We tried to believe that we could produce more and sell it cheaper than anybody else.

He obviously did it. He bet on the future of the textile in the South, and he won. The South won, too, and in a large measure, he is responsible for the winning. He provided jobs, income, products of superior quality and lower price. Therefore, he did well what a businessman sets himself to do. This is a time to grieve at his passing and to say that we miss him, but it is also a time to acknowledge what he did, and to learn a lesson from him. He demanded performance, and he got it. He exerted himself, drove himself, worked and thought, produced and refined what he had already produced. He was a responsible leader of industry and a humanitarian; he made a contribution and a fortune at the same time, and millions of people can thank him for something better than they had before, for jobs and educations, for prosperity and security. These are the products of his excellence, and we are the beneficiaries.

We mourn him because we have lost a leader of the industrial community, but we also grieve because we have lost a great citizen, an outstanding North Carolinian. He gave expansively of himself, and of his possession, to the great benefit of education and scholastic enterprise. His interest in Davidson College and the University of North Carolina, of which he was a trustee, was constant. He gave a fortune to education, and his contributions to charity were legion.

Spencer Love is mourned throughout the Nation, but North Carolina feels a particular loss. We rejoice that he lived, and are grateful for his achievements.

I ask unanimous consent to have the aforementioned editorial from the Smithfield Herald printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Smithfield Herald, Jan. 23, 1962]

SPENCER LOVE GAVE AMERICA STRENGTH

Unscrupulous men of business and finance who always place profits above humanity weaken America's free enterprise system and give substance to the complaints of radical reformers and revolutionists. Enlightened, responsible leaders of industry like James Spencer Love have given our economic system strength.

Mr. Love was a dynamic personality from his youth to the very end. He died Saturday at the age of 65 while playing tennis at Palm Beach, Fla.

He began his industrial career more than 40 years ago by investing $3,000 in a cotton mill. When he died he was head of Burlington Industries, an industrial giant operating 147 plants in eight countries and employing 65,000 persons.

One of those plants is operating in Smithfield, and the story of the Smithfield plant gives some insight into the kind of man Spencer Love was.

When Mr. Love's Burlington company arrived in Smithfield to take over an obsolete textile factory, a typical situation was confronted. There was a mill village that was looked upon as a slum district. The mill had experienced many ups and downs. Its machinery was outmoded. The owners who preceded Burlington had labored hard to squeeze profits out of what was actually an unprofitable operation.

Burlington enlarged and modernized the Smithfield mill. The company eliminated the mill village, selling the homes to individuals, who remodeled them and transformed them into comfortable residences. The old village soon became enmeshed with the rest of Smithfield.

Wages rose. Working conditions improved greatly. An industry that once was a drag on Smithfield's economy became an asset. Spencer Love never became a resident of Smithfield, but his hand was clearly at work in the midst of Smithfield. And Smithfieldians came to admire him as they witnessed the fruits of his labors.

Spencer Love believed in hard work. He practiced his belief himself and expected hard work from his associates. He was imaginative and often charted new courses in the industrial world. Less imaginative industrialists predicted failure for his enterprises, but his pioneering paid off in bigger profits for his company and many thousands of stable jobs for workers.

He was the son of a Harvard professor and the grandson of Cornelia Phillips Spencer, "the woman who rang the bell" when the university reopened at Chapel Hill after reconstruction. Perhaps it was inevitable that he should become a lover of education and a major contributor to educational institutions such as the University of North Carolina and Davidson College. An industrialist with a broad humanitarian outlook, he supported innumerable charitable projects with the fortune he had accumulated

Smithfield is better, North Carolina is richer, and America is stronger because James Spencer Love had imagination, wisdom, and limitless energy which he put to full use, and because he also had a heart.

NEW YORK BAR SUPPORTS ELECTORAL COLLEGE REFORM

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, one aspect of the administration's recently introduced literacy test bill that pleases me is that it may indicate a new sense of urgency on electoral reforms. As one who is deeply interested in making our voting machinery work better, I hope this proves to be the case.

The heart of a democracy is the ballot box. We must revise our hopelessly out-of-date election laws. We must give every American the right to vote and assure him that his ballot will be counted.

Progress is being made in this field, but it is arduous and it is limited. The Senate, last year, passed a watered-down Clean Elections bill which is now before the House. The administration's literacy test bill which I just mentioned has wide support. The constitutional amendments subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee has reported out an important constitutional amendment to liberalize restrictive residence requirements for voting in presidential elections. This amendment is authored by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, Senator KEFAUVER, and myself. Both this subcommittee and the Privileges and Elections Subcommittee of the Senate Rules Committee have held extensive hearings on electoral reforms. Their hearings and reports will be of great usefulness to scholars and interested citizens.

Mr. President, I was delighted to learn recently that the Association of the Bar of the City of New York has issued a report on one further area of electoral reforms in which I favor change. I refer to the electoral college system for electing the President and Vice President. The association's report on this subject is carefully drawn and ably documented. It was issued on December 15, 1961.

The association goes on the record in support of abolishing the role of the individual electors and keeping the electoral college system for distributing the votes of the 50 States. One member of the committee on Federal legislation of the bar association, Mr. Robert A. Kirtland, dissented in favor of the direct popular election of the President.

Mr. President, while I do not completely share all of the majority conclusions of this report, I am delighted that such an influential and important group as the New York City bar has taken a stand on the need for action in this field. Their report should receive wide attention. I hope that it will be read and studied in conjunction with the excellent summary report on proposed electoral college reforms issued by the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Senate Judiciary Committee. This report is entitled "The Electoral College—Operation and Effect of Proposed Amendments to the Constitution of the United States." It was issued on October 10, 1961.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent at this point in the Record to have printed the above referred to report of the committee on Federal legislation of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Report on the Method of Electing the President and Vice President

(By the Committee on Federal Legislation of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York)

Proposals are pending in the 87th Congress for amendments to the Constitution which would abolish the electoral college, divide the electoral votes within each State, and provide for the direct popular election of the President and Vice President. The background of these proposals is the opinion that the present operation of the electoral college may allow unpledged electors to determine the election of the President and Vice President, and that this is a hazard which should be eliminated in the interests of democratic government.

The subject of changing the constitutional method of electing the President and Vice President has had a long history. A prior report of this committee (The Record of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, vol. 4, No. 5, May 1949), approved provisions for the abolition of the electoral college but disapproved provisions for the proportionate division of the electoral vote within each State. The report was approved by the association at its annual meeting in May 1949.

THE PRESENT SYSTEM

The present system for election of President and Vice President is embodied in article II, section 1, and the 12th amendment (1804) of the Constitution. It provides that they shall be chosen by electors appointed by each State in the manner directed by its legislature, each State to have a number of electors equal to the total of its Senators and Representatives. The electors for each State must meet separately in their respective States and ballot separately for the President and Vice President, at least one of whom shall not be an inhabitant of their State. A majority vote of all the electors is necessary for election to each office. Absent a majority, the House of Representatives elects the President from the three candidates receiving the largest number of votes. In such an election, each State casts but a single vote, a majority of the State congressional delegation thus controlling the vote of the State. A majority of votes is necessary to elect, and in the absence of such majority the Vice President acts as President. In the absence of a majority of Vice Presidential electoral votes, the Senate elects the Vice President from the two highest candidates by a simple majority vote.

The current proposals embodied in Senate joint resolutions have been the subject of hearings during the 1st session of the 87th Congress by the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Senate Judiciary Committee and would involve the following changes:

1. Abolition of the electoral college with continuance of the electoral votes assigned to the States.
2. A proportionate allocation of the electoral votes in each State in accordance with the popular vote within the State.
3. The division of electoral votes among special or congressional districts within the State.
4. The substitution of a joint session of the House and Representatives and Senate to name the President and Vice President in the absence of a majority of electoral votes.
5. The substitution of direct popular election for the electoral vote method.

CONSIDERATION OF THE PROPOSED REFORMS

The method of electing the President and Vice President is a vital part of the machinery of democratic government in the United States. Its importance in preserving national unity cannot be overemphasized and is evidenced by the inclusion in the Constitution of provisions relating to the election procedure. The President and Vice President are personifications of the Nation and are the only elected officials chosen by an electorate outside the boundaries of a single State.

The present system has functioned since the founding of the Nation and controversies arising from its operation have been successfully resolved. It has the incalculable advantage of history and tradition. In the operation of the democratic process these play a large and crucial part. An example is the functioning of the British Government over many centuries without a written constitution. In the consideration of reforms in this area, we believe that the burden lies on those who advocate a change.

Basic features of a sound election procedure are simplicity and speed in the determination of the elected candidate so that the country may unite after the divisive contentions of an election campaign by opposing political parties, and the acquiescence of the minority in the outcome of a presidential election. These are virtues of the present system.

The proposed changes are considered from the viewpoint stated above.

The office of elector was intended to be an intermediate instrumentality between the citizenry and the choice of the Nation's highest official, with the discretion of the electors to be the assurance of a wise judgment. The electoral college itself is largely an anachronism by reason of the development of the system of pledged electors. Its continued existence allows the possibility of having the electors disavow their mandate and exercise their discretion in the vote for the presidential office. This is contemplated and permissible by the provisions of the Constitution and when this has occurred, the vote of the electors has been sustained. The elector's discretion in casting the vote would be eliminated with the elimination of the office of elector.

The artificial nature of the function of the elector is shown by the fact that 32 States require or permit the names of the party candidates for President and Vice President to appear on the ballot in lieu of the names of the nominees for the office of elector. In 14 other States the names of the prospective electors, together with the names of the candidates, appear on the ballot. By legislation adopted in 1958 and 1959, Arkansas and Georgia have provided that only the names of the political party and the nominees for electors can appear on the ballot. (See Wilkinson, "The Electoral Process and the Power of the States," 47 A.B.A.J. 251, 253 (1961).) The effect of this legislation is to return some importance to the office of elector.

Foreclosing the naming of unpledged electors would give legal sanction to the present practice of almost all States. The elimination of the device of an unpledged slate, as employed in certain States in the election of 1960, is a meritorious reform. This would not only be in accord with our democratic ideals but would also eliminate the uncertainty in the final result becoming known, which would occur if the votes of unpledged electors should prove decisive in any election.

It is necessary, however, to prescribe a procedure for certifying the electoral vote of the State. This function should remain with the States, where it belongs by reason of our Federal Government structure. It is suggested that the certification be provided by the Governor or official performing the function of chief executive of the State. The certification of the candidate receiving a majority of the popular votes within the State would become a ministerial function, as it should be by standards of democratic government.

PROPOSALS FOR DIVIDING THE ELECTORAL VOTES OF EACH STATE (A) ACCORDING TO THE POPULAR VOTE WITHIN THE STATE OR (B) BY CONGRESSIONAL OR SPECIAL DISTRICTS

Certain proposals call for requiring the electoral votes of each State to be divided according to the popular vote within the State or by congressional or other districts. This is now permissible by the terms of article II of the U.S. Constitution, although for many years all States have adopted the single-slate or unit system, by which all electors vote for one candidate. The object of the present proposals is to make a division by districts or by proportion of the popular vote within each State mandatory in order to eliminate the winner-take-all feature of present practice.

The most serious objections to the proposal for allocating the electoral vote within each State arise from the necessity for having a method of presidential election which is simple and quick. The maintenance of free elections depends, in the last resort, on public acceptance of the results of the election and acquiescence by the minority in the declared victor. The proposals for dividing the vote would complicate the election machinery so that prompt determination of the elected candidate may not be possible. Any system which leaves the vote uncertain for the ordinary voter for any appreciable length of time would undermine public confidence.

In addition, the proposals would seriously upset the existing balance of political power among various parts of the country, groups of States, and rural and urban voters.

In the Senate, each State is represented by two Senators regardless of population, thus giving greater representation to the voters in small States. This provision is irrevocably fixed by the Constitution and is not subject to change.

The districting of the House of Representatives, controlled by State legislatures, has tended to discriminate against urban voters. Although Congress itself has the power to remedy this situation under article I, section 4, of the Constitution, no effective action has been taken, and to date the Federal courts have declined to afford relief. (*Colegrove* v. *Green*, 328 U.S. 549 (1946)). See Lewis, "Legislative Apportionment and the Federal Courts," 71 Harvard L. Rev. 1057 (1958).

The State legislatures, which draw congressional district boundaries and ratify constitutional amendments are also districted so as to give more weight to rural than to urban voters in most cases.

In the electoral college, each State is accorded two electoral votes for its Senators, regardless of its population, thereby giving additional weight to the vote in the smaller States.

In both the electoral college and the House of Representatives each State is accorded a number of votes based upon its population, regardless of the number of citizens actually voting. Therefore, if any class of voters are discriminatorily disenfranchised in a particular State, by one means or another, the electoral and congressional votes representing them give a disproportionate effect to the choice of those citizens who do vote.

To eliminate the winner-take-all feature while retaining all of the above features favoring rural areas and small States would seriously upset the existing political balance between rural and urban voters and between large and small States.

The proposal for dividing electoral votes by congressional single-elector or other districts has a further disadvantage. Congressional district lines have been fixed by State legislatures influenced by partisan considerations. Such districting would then affect the election of the President as well as the composition of the House of Representatives.

We conclude that neither of the proposals for dividing the electoral votes within a State merits approval.

PROPOSAL FOR ELECTION BY CONGRESS IN ABSENCE OF MAJORITY OF ELECTORAL VOTES

It is proposed that article XII of the Constitution be amended to provide for a joint session of the Senate and House to name the President and Vice President where no candidate has obtained the requisite majority of electoral votes. Such a joint session would determine the matter by a majority vote for the top two or three candidates for both offices. If, for example, there are three candidates, none of whom obtains an absolute majority, each Senator and Representative at the joint session would cast one ballot. If there is no absolute majority for any of the three candidates on the first ballot, then a second vote would be taken for the top two candidates.

The change proposed would give each State the same proportionate weight in the election when it devolves upon the Congress as that State has in the electoral college. The existing provision, which gives Nevada an exactly equal voice with New York and California, is archaic and has nothing to recommend it.

If this proposal should be adopted, existing statutes establishing procedures for receiving electoral ballots (see 3 U.S.C. 17–20) should be amended so as to provide that one officer, such as the Speaker of the House, be designated to preside over the joint session of Congress for the purposes of receiving electoral votes and resolving questions and disputes concerning the ballots.

PROPOSAL FOR DIRECT POPULAR ELECTION

The proposal that the President be elected by direct popular vote has a theoretical appeal, but presents serious practical difficulties. Under the present system, the President may be elected with a majority of the electoral votes while his opponent may receive a majority of the popular vote. This is generally considered an imperfection of the present system.

The direct popular vote method would require a choice between a majority or plurality for election. If a majority should be required, provision would have to be made for runoff elections, with attendant complexities and delay. If a plurality was sufficient, there would be serious consequences to the present two-party political arrangement. Splinter parties and candidacies would be encouraged and they might be determinative in a close election. It has been suggested that provision for a 40-percent plurality might overcome certain of the difficulties.

A factor of significance is the greater potential for challenging the result of the election in the case of a national popular vote. At present such challenges, necessarily disturbing the election process, must be confined to the States whose electoral vote is critical. In the case of the proposed system, however, all votes in any State could be the subject of challenge when the vote spread between the candidates was not large.

Those favoring the direct popular vote argue that it is consistent with the greatest measure of democracy, it eliminates the anachronistic electoral college, it maintains the proper balance between the populous and less populated States, has the virtue of simplicity, would encourage a larger vote by giving weight to every vote, irrespective of the predominant politics of the particular State, would avoid the possibility of having fraud in one State affect the national result by virtue of its electoral votes, and would distribute the political influence that States with a large number of electoral votes now have among all the States. The force of these arguments cannot be denied and some members of this committee favor the adoption of a system of direct nationwide popular election.

There is, however, in the opinion of the committee, such doubt of the effective operation of a direct vote system, as compared with the known advantages of the present system, as to lead us to conclude that these proposals should not be approved at this time.

RECOMMENDATIONS

For the reasons stated, (a) we endorse the proposed abolition of the electoral college and abolition of the discretion of electors in casting votes for the offices of President, and Vice President; (b) we disapprove of the proposals for a division of the electoral vote within a State; (c) we approve a proposal for a joint session of the House of Representatives and Senate to name the President and Vice President, by a majority of the votes of the Members, in the case where no candidate has received a majority of the electoral votes; and (d) we do not recommend the substitution of a direct popular vote system for the present electoral vote system at this time.

FAST ACTION ON STATE WIRETAPPING NEEDED

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, there is no reason why the Attorney General's wiretapping proposals should delay the progress of legislation already pending to deal solely with the State wiretapping problem. District Attorneys Edward Silver, Frank Hogan, and Frank O'Connor in New York, universally respected law enforcement authorities, have informed me that hundreds of prosecutions have now been stymied by the confusion over wiretapping. Recently, Mr. Hogan was compelled to ask for the discharge of seven narcotics defendants who were caught redhanded in a conspiracy involving almost $500,000 of heroin. In my own city of Rochester members of a statewide gambling syndicate, rounded up after a painstaking investigation over a period of many months, had to be freed under similar circumstances. We have already tolerated this threat to law and order for too long. The Attorney General's bill should be given early and full consideration, but I cannot believe that he intended his 11th-hour proposals to further delay action on the State law enforcement crisis.

My State wiretapping bill, S. 1086, now on the agenda of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, is an emergency bill intended to provide relief at the earliest possible date. It is not very different from the proposals in the Attorney General's bill relating to State wiretapping. However, the Attorney General has lumped together the very different problem of regulating wiretapping in Federal cases and the problem of dealing with wiretapping on the State level in States which have their own carefully drawn regulatory statutes.

There are many separate issues raised by the Attorney General's Federal wiretapping proposals. There will be considerable controversy, for example, over the Attorney General's proposal to allow wiretapping by the FBI and other agencies in some cases without any court supervision. There is also serious question as to whether a Federal wiretapping bill which does not deal with forms of electronic eavesdropping which do not involve physical interference with telephone wires will not be obsolete almost as soon as it becomes effective.

The situation on the Federal level has not altered in recent years and is unaffected by the Supreme Court decisions which have caused such chaos at the State level. The Senate Constitutional Rights Subcommittee, after many days of hearings and volumes of testimony, concluded that the State and Federal problems should be separately considered. I hope that this will be the procedure we continue to follow and that the Attorney General's action, instead of being an obstacle to finding a remedy for State law enforcement, will be a spur to completing this task.

HAWAII'S VOICE OF DEMOCRACY WINNER

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, as my colleagues in the Senate know, each State has its finalist here in Washington for the selection of the national winner in the annual Voice of Democracy contest.

Gail Fujimoto of Kahului, Maui, won the Hawaii finals with her speech entitled, "What Freedom Means to Me." The approach in her personal expression of the meaning of her birthright of freedom was sincere, mature and, to me, intriguing. Her presentation is so thought provoking I feel compelled to share her speech with my colleagues.

I might say that all Hawaii is proud of Gail Fujimoto, but especially the Valley Island of Maui which has produced two State winners in the last three contests of the Voice of Democracy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the complete text of Miss Fujimoto's speech be printed in the body of the Record.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

What Freedom Means to Me

(By Gail Fujimoto, of Hawaii)

It was night although we couldn't tell down in the old dingy fallout shelter, except by dad's pocket watch, which went on ticking, ticking, ticking calmly. The booms had been steadily continuing, since we first came underground until now, but what was that? Silence—plain silence—a deafening, nerve-wracking silence. An hour—another hour—a day—God, what had happened?—3 days—a week. What does life have in store for us now? Are we to have freedom or bondage? Then we heard the tramp, tramp, tramp of soldiers—nearer and nearer toward us they came. Who were they, friend or foe? Then I woke up.

Maybe you have had a similar dream. With this constant bombardment on fallout shelters and threats of war, it is small wonder.

However, I am thankful for this nightmare, which has made me realize that all my life I have taken my country and the freedom it offers for granted.

"Freedom"—such a commonly tossed around word—that isn't fully appreciated here in America. I think of my family and our freedom, our liberty of actions with mutual respect for the rights of one another.

My brother and I may quarrel, but we respect each other's right to speak. Although mom may not agree with my ideas, she will listen to them, and in turn I am expected to listen to her. Since my sister and I share a room, problems that arise are settled on the basis that each of us has certain definite rights. Grandpa respects my God and Christ just as much as I respect his Buddha.

The Maui News printed an article against the present county government and dad supported that position. Neither the editors nor dad has any fear of speaking up against the administration. Sometimes our family has a discussion at the dinner table on current events—worldwide, nationwide, statewide, but especially locally. In October when we had the school-lunch strike, I was not afraid to speak out against the management, although I knew that dad has always thought that we of the younger generation are too demanding, too spoiled. But then, we who have had things more or less handed to us, how many of us are able to imagine life to be anything else?

Is it only American propaganda about the ruthless force that threatens freedom in this world? Are people actually fleeing from East Germany? Was our mighty country actually founded by forefathers who were desperately seeking freedom? Although these questions are directed against our Government, I have no fear of thinking thus. How much more freedom can we ask of a government?

Yes, I mean we, for freedom doesn't only exist in my family. Freedom is my family a millionfold in every home across our great Nation. It exists in all our homes, radiating into all our communities, tying our 50 States together, flourishing across our Nation, and touching parts of our world.

Freedom is the common respect between my brother and me on right of speech, the mutual understanding between my mother and me, the belief of individuality between my sister and me, religious tolerance between my grandfather and me, our local newspaper editors' and my father's criticisms against their government, and even my own doubts about our Government—all this multiplied in every home across our Nation, is what freedom means to me.

Merely recognizing and appreciating this freedom is not enough however. We must keep freedom alive—vital not only on the world fronts but at home in our everyday life. Let us keep informed of happenings about us, ever watchful of ideologies contrary to our beliefs, from flourishing in the leniency of our freedom. Let us, you and me, practice and preserve this priceless privilege—freedom.

Yes; all this is what freedom means to me.

HENRY B. GONZALEZ, TEXAS REPRESENTATIVE, PIONEER, NEW ERA IN TEXAS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, a few months ago, a distinguished and able member of the Senate of the State of Texas campaigned for election to Congress in the 20th Congressional District.

He adopted a slogan which became a byword to his hometown, San Antonio, Bexar County: "Send Henry B. to D.C."

The 20th Congressional District responded by electing to Congress the Honorable HENRY B. GONZALEZ, whom I supported for election.

The Honorable HENRY B. GONZALEZ is a Democrat of great eloquence, determination, and energy. He is completely bilingual, being a fluent speaker and writer of both the English and Spanish languages, the tongues of Shakespeare and Cervantes. He is the first person of Texas-Mexican-Spanish descent ever to be elected to the Congress of the United States from Texas. His election reflects credit upon the constituency he serves and his voice in Congress will be a national asset. He ran and was elected as a supporter and personal friend of President John F. Kennedy.

He had the active support of the able Vice President, who is now in the chair. The Vice President spoke in the 20th Congressional District, and former President Eisenhower likewise spoke in that district for the opponent of Mr. GONZALEZ.

Congressman GONZALEZ is the official spokesman for his district, Bexar County, Tex., but he is also looked to as a leader by the 1,600,000 Texans with Spanish surnames.

In view of the esteem held for Congressman GONZALEZ in the 20th Congressional District and in Texas, I ask unanimous consent of the Senate to print in the RECORD a Texas State Senate resolution passed on January 15, 1962, by Representative GONZALEZ' former colleagues in the State Senate of Texas.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE RESOLUTION 22

Whereas our former colleague from Bexar County, the Honorable HENRY B. GONZALEZ, has been elected to the Congress of the United States from the 20th Congressional District; and

Whereas he served in the Texas Senate during the 55th, 56th, and 57th sessions of the Legislature until his election to the U.S. House of Representatives in November 1961; and

Whereas he is a man of outstanding ability who distinguished himself as a member of this Senate; and

Whereas he possesses the true qualities of a statesman, integrity, tenacity of purpose, and a strict adherence to the principles of democracy, and has demonstrated at all times his devotion to his office and his responsibility to the people he represents; and

Whereas it is our desire to congratulate the Honorable HENRY B. GONZALEZ: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the senate of the 57th legislature, 3d called session, congratulate our former colleague on his elevation in office and extend to him our best wishes for his success in the Congress of the United States, and convey to his fine family our affection and hope for their happiness; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded under the seal of the Senate to the Honorable HENRY B. GONZALEZ and to the members of the Texas delegation in the Congress of the United States.

CHARLES F. HERRING,
President Pro Tempore of the Senate.
CHARLES SCHNABEL,
Secretary of the Senate.

STRENGTHENING THE CAUSE OF FREE PEOPLE THROUGH LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, on January 27 my colleague in the House, Representative DAVID S. KING, spoke to the Western Regional District Workshop of the National Association of County Officials. His address is of particular significance because he outlines effectively the areas in which local government can do a better job than the Federal Government as well as those situations where the Federal Government can do a better job than local government.

I have served in local government and I too know and appreciate its strength and its capabilities. Congressman KING has pointed out how local government has risen in the past 15 years to better meet its responsibilities and he demonstrates that the argument that the Federal Government is swallowing up local government is completely false. It is the judgment of Congressman KING that local government is superior in those situations where it is necessary to be close to the people, where individual responsibilities must be fixed, and where experimentation is involved. On the other hand the Federal Government can be effective where a large-scale operation is involved, where the national point of view is required and where remoteness can produce a more dispassionate and even administration of the law. I am particularly pleased that Congressman KING has emphasized that freedom is not free and that our county officials, if they can give our citizens a more lively sense of responsibility to their community, nation and freedom, then even the President cannot do more than they to strengthen the cause of free people.

I ask unanimous consent that the address of Representative KING be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE DAVID S. KING TO THE WESTERN REGIONAL DISTRICT WORKSHOP OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COUNTY OFFICIALS, PHOENIX, ARIZ., JANUARY 27, 1962

On one occasion Vincent van Gogh, the great 19th century French painter, wrote his brother Theodore a letter. In it he painfully described his destitution, his struggles, and his frustrations as an artist. He went on to tell his brother that he had just finished a painting upon which he had been working for some time. It was a painting of a family of peasants eating potatoes. He concluded his letter with a thought, the substance of which was this:

"When I say I have finished my painting, I use that word only in a relative sense. In truth and in fact, one never finishes a painting. He can labor on it as long as he will, and he will never capture with his brush what he can see with his soul. It is a tormenting struggle which never ends. Perfection eludes us, and we grope our way through the dark, with only the light of bright expectations to guide us."

Now if this be true of an artist, it is certainly true of a Congressman, invited out from Washington to address a group of hardworking county officials in Phoenix, Ariz., at the conclusion of their regional convention. No matter what he says, he will always hear ringing in his ears a faint echo of the message he would like to have given, but didn't.

And what is true of Congressmen is also true of county officials. I am sure you have had an excellent convention. You have covered much ground and resolved many problems. Yet now, as you start home, you may well find yourself pondering upon some of the things that were not done, the words which were not said, and actions not taken.

Let me urge, however, that you not despair. The miracle is not that we do so little, but that, being human, we nevertheless do so much. The miracle is that men of diverse backgrounds, who come from widely separated places, can be drawn together through common interest, and can work together for common fulfillment. During your convention you have accomplished much. You have wrestled with some of the toughest problems brought on by the social changes of modern times. County administration will be better because of your having met here. If discouragement should overtake you, I commend to you the three lines of Oliver Wendell Holmes written to John Greenleaf Whittier, on the latter's 80th birthday:

"Look forward! Brighter than earth's morning ray
Streams the pure light of Heaven's unsetting sun,
The unclouded dawn of life's immortal day."

Now, gentlemen, I should like to say a few words about changes in our society, because it is changes which bring about problems, and it is problems which bring you together here in Phoenix. Our Founding Fathers, looking down the vistas of time, knew that there would be changes in the society which they created, but in all their wisdom and vision, they didn't realize how profound and rapid these changes would be. I am told that Franklin felt that it would take many hundreds of years to settle and populate the American Continent. Jefferson opined that the Louisiana territory might be completely populated in 25 generations, which would be 800 years. In 1900 a far-sighted automobile manufacturer took a long look forward, and courageously prophesied that some time in the future the automobile might really become a smash hit in America. There might, he said, be as many as a hundred of them in each of our large cities.

Gentlemen, it was only in 1948 that we were spending $100 million a year in propeller research, which was more than we were then spending on rocket and missile research. Today, 14 years later, missiles and rockets are bidding fair to become America's largest industry, and propellers are almost a thing of the past. I am told by scientists, moreover, that we have accumulated as many scientific data from the end of World War II to the present time as we had done from the dawn of history until World War II.

Abraham Lincoln, in addressing Congress 100 years ago, said: "The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate for the stormy present * * *. As our case is new, so we must act anew, and think anew. * * *" The newness which confronted him was a civil war and the destruction of an institution called slavery. My word, look at us now. Today we are confronted with the possibility of a global conflict, and the destruction of a much bigger institution called mankind. If Lincoln faced strange and baffling new problems, what would you call those which we face?

As a nation, we face the threat of communism; the specter of a nuclear war; the urbanization of a continent; the congestion of huge populations; the proliferation of slums; the appearance of automation, and specialization in industry; the contamination of lifegiving air, water, food, and soil; the rise of rapid mass transportation with staggering problems of creating an adequate road system; the need for improved education; the need for conserving our dwindling natural resources, developing our water, reclaiming our waste places, improving and protecting our soil, providing parks and recreation for the masses—our list could go on and on almost without end.

These are the new problems which are with us and upon us. They are here, and must be solved. Their existence is no longer open to debate. They are pressing realities.

In early English history, as I remember, it was King Canute who went down to the seashore and, according to legend, commanded the tides to advance no further, lest his royal foot get wet. But they had honest historians in those days, for the chronicler makes it very clear that as between King Canute and the tide, something had to give, and it wasn't the tide. Those with a Canute complex, in our generation, would turn their backs on the realities of today, and commanded the hands of time to move back. But they command in vain.

The problems which I have mentioned have brought about profound changes in our society. One of these changes is the birth of a new breed of giants. There are three giants in particular which all of us know: big government, big business, and big labor. These giants must not be regarded as intruders; nor are they Communists; nor are they trying to smash the American system. They sprang very naturally from our concerted attempts to solve the problems created by the great changes in society, for which the Americans themselves were responsible.

This phenomenon gives rise to the provocative question: Are Government, industry, and labor too big? This is a subject which I cannot cover today. It goes without saying that Americans are unanimous in wanting to keep our Federal Government as small as possible, consistent with its legitimate functions, and to keep it efficient and free from waste, duplication, and redtape.

But this question raises still another question which I can discuss here, today, and that is this: In this world of giants which we have created, is there still room for individual effort and community effort? Or, to put the question in terms closer to you, today: In an age when so much activity is being conducted by the Federal Government, is there still room for strong dynamic county governments? The answer of course, is an emphatic "Yes." My explanation of this answer is what this talk is all about.

The Federal Government is big, and of that there can be no doubt. This year's Federal budget is $92.5 billion. That means Uncle Sam will be spending money at the rate of more than $10 million an hour. We will be paying out $9 billion this year on interest on our national debt, or approximately $1 million every hour of every day of every month.

Let me add parenthetically, however, that it is not true that Federal expenditures are increasing at a faster rate than those of State and local governments. The figures show exactly the opposite. In 1946 the Federal Government spent $37 billion, and State and local governments spent $11.1 billion. In 1959 Federal expenditures had risen to $90.8 billion, and State and local expenditures had risen to $47.2 billion. Expressed in terms of percentage of gross national product, however, national expenditures had gone up only 1.4 percent in 13 years, but State and local expenditures had increased 4.6 percent. These figures refute the argument that the Federal Government is swallowing up State and local governments. For the past 15 years, the trend has been slightly in the other direction; in other words, State and local governments have been increasing, rather significantly, in their expenditures relative to those of the Federal Government.

This brings me back, therefore, to my basic question: Is there still room for strong local governments in this age of supergiants? My answer is not only, "Yes, there is," but, "Yes, there must be," if democracy is to survive, and if human individuality is to be protected.

Men are not formless, shapeless, faceless cogs in a great social machine. They are people, endowed with divine attributes, with individual differences, with moral responsibility, and with almost infinite capacity to sacrifice, to work, to struggle, and to love. Where they are not intellectually shackled, men are resourceful, imaginative, and creative. My strong feeling is that though giants may be here to stay, they must never, never be allowed to swallow up the little man, for if they do, America will become morally, intellectually, and spiritually sterile. Mother Nature's fertility is sucked up by the giant oak tree through its millions of little roots and tendrils which proliferate in the rich black earth. If those little rootlets are destroyed, the mighty oak dies. Let not our American giants forget from whence comes their strength. It comes from millions of freemen who may be willing to surrender a small portion of their own strength to feed the giant in the knowledge that the giant serves a useful purpose, but who are not willing for the giant to suck from them all of their life's juices. Woe unto that man who upsets the fine balance in nature. He is inviting ruin upon himself and the countryside. Woe unto the nation who upsets the fine balance in human society as between freedom and regimentation, for it is paving the way for its inescapable self-destruction.

It has become fashionable these days to make a great campaign issue every 2 years out of this matter of bigness. There are extremists on both sides. On the one hand there are those who compare the Federal Government to a gigantic octopus, insinuating its repulsive and insatiable tentacles into every sheltered crevice and nook of community and private life. They would thrust a spear into the heart of this octopus, hack its tentacles to pieces, and return all power and all governmental functions to the counties and the States. On the other hand are those who would turn over all power to the Federal Government, and take the counties and the States and stuff them with cotton and place them on the shelf in a museum of natural history, alongside the tyranosaurus rex and the dodo bird.

The truth is, gentlemen, that there is little wisdom in extremism, and the solution to our problem does not lie in either camp. The Federal Government is not a monster, competing grimly with the local governments for power and survival. Both have their indispensable function. Both are needed. Without either one, our society would wither. It is in cooperating one with the other, that each can best perform the function for which it is fitted.

Let's be reasonable about it. There are some things which local governments can do much better than the Federal Government, and vice versa. To fail to recognize this is to repudiate the American system. Let me list a few areas where local governments have clear superiority.

1. Because local governments are smaller, mistakes are not as costly. Therefore there can be more experimentation, and experimentation is the soul of progress. Many States or local communities can experiment with different ideas, just as many scientists can go into their respective laboratories, each one carrying out his own experiment. Fifty scientists will have 50 times as much of a chance of coming up with the right answer as just 1 scientist, acting alone.

2. Local governments are close to the people. They know the problems of the people—they know their idiosyncracies, their customs, their mores. They are more approachable by the people. They can be reached more easily. Complaints are heeded more readily. Local governments are more personal, and ordinarily more democratic.

3. Individual responsibility can be better fixed in local government than in National Government. As governments become large and remote, governmental officials find it easier to cover their identity, and thus escape all blame for poor decisions. Many decisions in the Federal Government are made by men who are not responsive to the wants of the people because they are not directly

responsible to the voters. They sit in their ivory towers, removed from the people whom they serve, beyond recall or discharge, and grind out decisions and regulations for the millions to follow. It is hard to gain access to these functionaries to rectify a grievance, and hard to get them to change their minds.

But in the spirit of fairness, we must admit that the Federal Government has certain very definite advantages over local governments, and we would be less than honest if we did not consider some of them. Consider the following:

1. Generally speaking, significant economies can be effectuated through large-scale operations. This is a fact of political life that we can't deny. It is as true in government as it is in industry. It is not by accident that dozens of our major companies are merging, consolidating, and growing larger and larger. They can realize significant economies by cutting down overhead, and by placing their output on a mass production basis. Take for example the Federal income tax. Contrary to popular belief, the Federal income tax is probably the most efficient significant tax ever devised by man. Its cost of collection, per dollar collected, is considerably less than one-half what it costs most counties to collect their property tax, or States to collect their income or estate taxes.

2. Generally speaking, the Federal Government can get a better overall picture of what is needed, from a national point of view, than can local communities. Take for example, schools. The U.S. National Office of Education is constantly examining comparative statistics on education from all over the country, and the world. It can inform any county just where it stands with regard to the comparative quality of its education. This can serve to stimulate counties to better performance, and show them where their own weaknesses are.

The Federal Government is also in a better position to engage in long-range planning. It has superior facilities, and a broader outlook. May I say, incidentally, gentlemen, that we must get away from the idea that the word "planning" is a nasty word. It is not a nasty word. It is a condition to our survival. We are competing against a ruthless adversary, the Soviet Union, which has detailed plans on its planning boards for 10-, 15-, and 20-year periods.

These plans deal with industrial expansion, power development, improved education, missile production, and a host of other objectives bearing upon their strength and ability to outdistance us in the grim race in which we find ourselves engaged.

3. The fact that the Federal Government is more remote from the people can, in itself, be an advantage in some situations. In local agencies, there sometimes is a tendency to relax law enforcement for fear of offending close personal friends. This might be very disastrous. Let me illustrate. A State, it recently came to my attention, had been working for 30 years, or more, through its State board of health, to get its municipalities to clean up their water. Some of them had very poor water systems because of their failure to bring them up to date. These municipalities had failed to cope with the problems of industrial pollution and the other health hazards caused by an expanding population. The director of the State board of health had tried, unsuccessfully, to get the communities to comply with standards prescribed by the State law, but with little success. Finally he turned to the Administrator of the FHA in Washington, and induced the latter to issue an order suspending the further distribution of any FHA funds until these unsatisfactory conditions had been corrected. Some 90 communities were hard hit by this freeze order. I am not suggesting that this is an ideal way to handle the problem. I am suggesting, however, that next spring the inhabitants of this particular State will be drinking pure and clean water, largely because a Federal agency did not hesitate to act in the best interests of the people.

It has been suggested by many, usually in political speeches, that the reason why the Government has grown so big is that it has been staffed by power-hungry bureaucrats whose insatiable appetites are never satisfied. Many leave the innuendo that these men are closely allied with the Communists, or at least with the Socialists, and that the only way to kill them off is to starve them at the pockets.

The examination I have made of the history of the development of Federal programs convinces me that this has not been the way in which these programs have come about. The typical pattern of growth has been as follows: First, a great social need has become evident. This need was usually the product of changing conditions in society. For example, water pollution. During the past 20 years at least one-half million new chemical compounds have come into being. We manufacture these substances, we use them, and then we dump them into our streams and rivers, or on the ground, where they seep down into our underground watercourses. In 1947 housewives used 275 million pounds of detergents. Last year, they used more than 3.2 billion pounds (an increase of over 1,000 percent). The chemical industry's production has increased 176 percent since 1947, and a good share of this increase has ended up in our waterways.

Well, as I say, we start out with a problem. The problem is water pollution. The facts shows that generally speaking the local communities were not handling the problem. Some were doing a good job, but most were not. The reasons why they were not were, first, because they didn't understand the seriousness of the problem; second, they were underfinanced; third, they were confronted by serious problems involving interstate jurisdiction over interstate streams which they were not equipped to handle; fourth, the community causing the pollution was frequently not the community which had to suffer the danger of the polluted water, which would flow downstream and away from the source of contamination; and finally, local politics in some cases obstructed action. As a result, billions of gallons of much-needed water became unusable, with resulting loss to the country of billions of dollars.

It was inevitable, then, for the Federal Government sooner or later to come into the picture and offer a joint Federal-local program to lick the problem. The Federal Government has usually been very slow in getting into new fields of activity, and only after it has been demonstrated that local governments were either unable, or unwilling, to do something about pressing problems. Now I am not saying that intervention by the Federal Government has always been good. On the contrary, I am persuaded that there are situations in which it would be better if it had not intervened. What I am saying is that it is unrealistic to blame the Federal Government for trying to solve a problem, and to accuse Government employees of being power-hungry, and socialistically oriented bureaucrats, simply because they make an honest attempt to do a job that apparently no one else wanted to do, yet which everyone admitted had to be done.

This, then, brings me to the whole point of my discussion. The way to strengthen local governments is not to starve or cripple the Federal Government. The way to strengthen local governments is for local governments to come to grips with their own problems. If local communities resent a Federal program, then let them come up with a better one, and no one will complain.

There is one proposition that we might as well face honestly. Where a serious social problem grows steadily, without action, and where someone suddenly comes up with an answer, no one else has the right to throw a roadblock in his way, unless the latter has something better to offer.

Actually, it grieves me to hear some people try to turn the county governments and the Federal Government into arch competitors. In my opinion, they should be regarded as partners. In the spirit of cooperation, programs can be worked out in which different levels of government can participate, and without violating the American system of free enterprise.

I accept the fact without question that the Federal Government should do nothing which can be done as well, or better, by State or county governments. I accept the fact without question that all other things being equal, the more responsibility one can place on the shoulders of people, the stronger and the better citizens they will be. I accept without question that primarily it is the responsibility of each man to clean up his own backyard; to paint his own house; to feed and educate his own children; and to bring culture, refinement, and respectability into his own neighborhood. I believe that this responsibility can be better discharged through the instrumentality of local governments than through that of the Federal Government.

I do feel, however, that where a great social problem becomes bigger than a local community can adequately handle, there is nothing inconsistent in working out a cooperative program of Federal-local participation, as long as local initiative and responsibility are utilized as fully as possible. Take for example, the problem of depressed areas. The prime responsibility will always remain with a local community to take care of its unemployed. I see nothing un-American, however, in our recognition that chronic unemployment is not only a local problem, but a national problem, as well. If 150,000 coalworkers are thrown out of work because the Nation has changed to gas furnaces, it can hardly be said that the entire brunt of that disaster should fall on the coal counties of West Virginia, Pennsylvania, and Ohio. In a sense, the problem also belongs to the Nation. Local initiative should and must be encouraged. The Federal Government must not step in and start running the show. This could produce a cure that would be worse than the malady.

The Area Redevelopment Administration offers an acceptable pattern for solving such problems. Under ARA, each local community is encouraged to come up with its own plan for community economic expansion and development. The Federal Government merely assists where it is wanted and needed. It offers its facilities, which in many cases are beyond the means of the local communities. The important thing is that the local community leads out, and takes the initiative, and activates the plan. This is in the best American tradition of self-help. It marshals the resources of the Nation in the solution of a nagging social problem, but it leaves initiative on the local level, where it belongs.

I suggest that this is an approach to the solution of some of our toughest social problems which does no violence to any basic American principles.

I urge county governments to do all in their power to bring life and activity into local communities. The building of better playgrounds and recreation facilities; the installation of municipal swimming pools; the improvement of street and parking facilities; the improvement of schools and educational facilities; the stimulation of drama, music, literature, sporting events, and cultural activities of all sorts—these are things which historically have been your particular domain. They should remain so.

Communities should be encouraged to develop local traditions, differences, and cultural deviations from the national patterns.

In this age when every American kid, from Maine to California, grows up on the same TV shows, the same commercial ads, the same movies and magazines, there is an inevitable tendency for all to become uniform in their thinking. We eat the same food, we wear the same clothes, we drive the same cars, we think the same monotonous dull thoughts. North, south, east, and west, tend more and more to be the same. In the face of this trend, county governments can perform one of their most useful functions; namely, preserving and developing local values, local cultural patterns, local traditions which can add to the infinite variety and versatility which has always been the charm, and the vitality of America.

Inasmuch as we are all talking about communism, let me add the thought that the great bastion against the encroachments of communism is a strong American citizenry. The strengthening of county governments helps promote better citizenship, and good citizenship never succumbs to communism. It is idle, confused, frustrated, and embittered men and women who flirt with communism. It is your responsibility to see that your communities help these people overcome their troubles and worries.

It was once thought that freedom was free, a costless benefit guaranteed by history to all virtuous and respectable men. How tragically false this assumption is. Freedom comes through effort, dedication, self-discipline, and social ingenuity. George Bernard Shaw said: "Liberty means responsibility, and that is why most men dread it." If you, as county officials, can give the citizens of your counties a more lively sense of their responsibility to their community, to their nation, and to freedom throughout the world, then even the President of the United States could not do more than can you to strengthen the cause of free people.

I close with the words of Adlai Stevenson: "We are the freemen of this universe, the children of liberty, the beneficiaries of unequaled abundance, and heirs of the highest, proudest political tradition ever known to man. Our paralysis of will arises not from deficiency in technology or resources, but in our forgetting that political freedom can be sustained only by continuing individual commitment. Freedom must be remade and rearned in each in each generation."

PROPOSED CANYONLANDS NATIONAL PARK IN UTAH

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, in his state of the Union message, President Kennedy called for "expansion of our superb national parks and forests." This, he said, was one of the actions the Congress must take "if we are to bequeath our full national estate to our heirs."

And in the long-awaited report of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, upon which eight Members of the Congress served, the role of the Federal Government in meeting our recreation resource needs, is described in part, in these words:

> Preservation of scenic areas, natural wonders, primitive areas, and historic sites of national significance.

I now briefly call the attention of my colleagues to an area of natural wonders within my State of Utah which S. 2387 proposes to add to the National Park System. I do so because seldom, I believe, has the National Park Service and the Department of the Interior been so laudatory in urging such an addition.

I have introduced a bill which establishes a new national park centered at the confluence of the Colorado River and the Green River. Both rivers are entrenched in labyrinthine gorges, and below the confluence, their waters slide into the echoing depths of Cataract Canyon. Benches a mile to 15 miles wide extend from the inner canyons to the cliffs of orange-red sandstone rimming the highlands that surround the confluence.

Far beyond stand the La Sal, Henry, and Abajo Mountains, impressive and often snow-clad landmarks.

Within the basin bounded by the orange cliffs is landscape almost indescribably diverse. It is a land of arches, needles, spires, and standing rocks; of broad plains, steep scarps, bold mesas, and crenelated buttes; of roaring rapids, placid reaches, sandbars, bits of level bottomland, and intricately dissected tributary canyons. Because the rivers and their canyons have been effective barriers to travel through the area, and because steep cliffs and rough terrain have hindered movement within it, much of it is little known, and some is unexplored. This highly colored complex of geologically significant and scenically inspiring wilderness is the proposed Canyonlands National Park.

In the portion of this area called the Needles, the sandstone is broken into blocks by close-set joints, and has eroded into a fantasy of rounded pillars, spires, and balanced rocks. Close by, the sandstone is faulted into sunken valleys, or has been cut by winding streams into a wilderness of alcoves, ridges, pockets, and massive arches.

Across the Colorado, a broad bench extends for miles, laced by narrow canyons. Part of it is chopped into a network of little-known canyons, called the Maze. The tip of a skyline plateau, Grandview Point, affords a vantage point from which to scan the canyon lands, and a bold thrust of cliff-ringed highland is aptly called the Island in the Sky.

The Department of the Interior reports that it strongly advocates the enactment of legislation to create a national park in this canyon country, and that it will be a very significant addition to the national park system.

Here are a few short statements from that report:

> Within this area are three distinct scenic divisions separated by these two deep-canyoned rivers. All three divisions are spectacularly significant scenically and provocative scientifically. They contain visible archeological remains, distant panoramic views that defy description, and a geological exhibit in stereoscopic relief that is unsurpassed in any other area of the national park system.
>
> This canyon country of Utah unqualifiedly merits preservation as a national park. Its rugged landscape contains a profusion of impressive red rock canyons, sandstone spires, arches, and other erosive features that may well be of worldwide significance.

Last summer, Secretary Udall and Secretary of Agriculture Freeman led an inspection party on a trip down the Colorado into this canyon country. I made that trip, as did Utah's Congressmen, DAVID S. KING and M. BLAINE PETERSON. Gov. George D. Clyde, of Utah, later joined the party at Island in the Sky. Several representatives of conservation organizations and the press made the trip.

Although I had been there before, as had Secretary Udall, I marveled again at the scenic spectacle and the remoteness of that country, a remoteness that has prevented all but a few of our citizens from seeing it.

It was on that trip that Secretary Udall conceived of what he calls the "golden circle" of parks and monuments located at the four corners area of Utah, Colorado, Arizona, and New Mexico, an area which, the Secretary said, "contains the greatest concentration of scenic wonders to be found in the country, if not in the world."

Within that part of Utah included in the circle are Bryce and Zion National Parks; and Arches, Capitol Reef, Cedar Breaks, Natural Bridges, and Rainbow Bridge National Monuments—all colorful, highly scenic canyon and erosion country. In Hovenweep National Monument, which straddles the Utah-Colorado line, are prehistoric pueblos and cliff dwellings.

In Colorado, Mesa Verde National Park, which has the best preserved cliff dwellings in the United States, lies within the circle; just outside the circle are Colorado National Monument and Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Monument.

Adjacent to the circle in New Mexico are Aztec ruins, Chaco Canyon, and El Morro National Monuments. Within the circle is Monument Valley in the Navajo Indian Reservation.

Both the famed Grand Canyon National Park in Arizona and the newly formed Glen Canyon recreation area astride the Arizona-Utah line are within the circle, as are five national monuments in Arizona. And several others are nearby, including the famous Petrified Forest. Eventually, roads will connect this four-State galaxy of scenic areas, making them accessible for those seeking recreation and adventure.

The Members of the Senate are familiar with the tremendous increase in tourism in the United States, and the resulting growth in visits to the national parks and the national forests. But let me emphasize that this increase is occurring more rapidly than predicted even in the most generous estimate of the forecasters.

In 1955, the Forest Service drew a 5-year plan—Operation Outdoors. It predicted 66 million annual visits to our national forests by 1962. By 1960, the halfway mark, visits had already leaped to 81 million; and they have had to take another look in the crystal ball. The Forest Service now forecasts 92 million visits in 1962. That will be a hundred percent growth in 5 years.

The National Park Service has had a similar experience. Visits to the national parks have gone up like a skyrocket, and those to our shoreline areas—seashores, lakes, and reservoirs—have shown a growth rate as high as 28 percent a year.

As our population grows, as we become more and more a nation of city dwellers, as we drive more automobiles longer distances, the more we will need and use remote and restful areas, the more these trends of increasing use of outdoor facilities must increase.

The Outdoor Recreational Resources Review Commission points to the need for additions of quality to the national park system when it speaks of the bumper-to-bumper traffic on the roads to such popular areas as Yellowstone National Park and the Yosemite Valley.

And the Commission's report sums up the total problem, saying:

> In summary, vast as the demand for outdoors recreation presently is, it pales beside what may be expected in future years.

Mr. President, now is the time to set aside the park areas we know America will need. Virtually all of the Canyonlands National Park is already in Federal ownership; it is already managed by the Federal agencies. The balance is owned by the State of Utah, and can be acquired by equal value land exchanges. We can establish this superb park without land acquisition costs.

As part of the program of the Department of Commerce to solve our balance of payments problem, foreign tourists are being encouraged to visit the United States. Secretary Hodges is seeking the establishment and promotion of attractions in America that will lure Europeans here, and make their visits memorable. This great golden circle of natural wonders offers visitors from abroad sights they have not beheld elsewhere, sights many will be pleased to travel a third of the way around the globe to behold.

One more point. The Interstate Highway stretching between Denver and Los Angeles will go from Grand Junction, Colo., to Green River, Utah, which is only 75 miles north of the Canyonlands National Park; and through Cedar City, Utah, which is within the golden circle. So it will be a matter of only a few years until thousands of travelers will be passing near and through this area of spectacular scenery.

My bill—S. 2387—is now before the Interior Committee, and will be the subject of public hearings which are being arranged for Washington, D.C., and for the State of Utah. It is my hope, however, that this can be done quickly, and that the Senate will have the opportunity to vote this year on this authorizing legislation.

It is in the national interest, as well as the interest of the West and of my State of Utah, that we begin as soon as possible to develop access to the wonders of the Canyonlands National Park.

BOB FELLER, GREAT PITCHER AND FINE CITIZEN ELECTED TO BASEBALL'S HALL OF FAME

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, for more than 20 years we in my home city of Cleveland, Ohio, and many thousands of baseball fans throughout the Nation thrilled to the exploits of one of the greatest pitchers of all time, Bob Feller. They were proud he represented our city as a member of the Cleveland Indians.

Recently, Bob Feller received the highest recognition and the greatest honor that can befall a former professional baseball player. He was elected to the Baseball Hall of Fame.

Mr. President, few players in history more richly deserve this honor. From the time he pitched his first major league game in 1936, it was apparent that Bob Feller possessed the qualities of greatness. In his first game, at the age of only 17, he struck out 15 opposing batters.

He still holds the record of most strikeouts in a season and shares the record for most strikeouts in a nine inning game. In his career, he won 266 games, pitched 3 no-hit games and 12 one-hitters.

It was not only Bob Feller's outstanding pitching record that made him a credit to baseball and Cleveland, he was, and remains, a fine gentleman and a good citizen. He has reason to be as proud of his reputation in this regard as he is of his phenomenal successes in baseball.

I, too, am proud because Bob Feller represented Cleveland baseball long and well. His honors have been many and were well earned. Many of us went to games principally because it was announced that Bob Feller would pitch.

Mr. President, excellent coverage was given Bob Feller's entry into the Baseball Hall of Fame by Cleveland's two great newspapers, the Plain Dealer and the Cleveland Press. I ask unanimous consent to embody two of the news items as part of my remarks and that they be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Cleveland Press, Jan. 24, 1962]

(By Frank Gibbons)

It came as no surprise to anybody that Bob Feller was named to baseball's Hall of Fame. This was an automatic.

When you think about it, however, the story is that Feller was not an athlete in a professional sense. He was a baseball pitcher and one of the greatest anybody ever saw.

Baseball is a specialty sport, and Jim Piersall has proved that every day since he came into the major leagues. Feller happened to be born with the kind of arm and coordination which enabled him to throw a baseball faster than anybody ever did before, with the possible exception of "Lefty" Grove, and a few others who go back to the neolithic age in baseball.

This is an old story about Feller, but it never ceases to surprise me how few people know it. He was a great fastball pitcher but he did what he did with his curve.

If you have ever played baseball you must know about the curve. The ball is gripped and thrown differently than the fast ball. There is a snap of the wrist as you allow the ball to roll off two fingers.

Feller has always admitted that he struck out more men with his curve ball than he did with his fast ball. This is understandable because if you are batting against a pitcher such as Feller you must always be prepared to hit the fast ball. When you got the curve you were in trouble.

The odd thing about Feller's career was that his greatest season came along after he was over the hill, so to speak. He struck out 348 men in 1946 and he did it with the aid of a pitch known as the slider.

This is a pitch which has been abused by a great number of people, but Feller will tell you to this day that it helped him. The slider is a pitch which you allow to roll off your fingers without a wrist snap. It doesn't curve, it slides.

Of course, the true art of pitching is contrast and when you start with a fast ball such as Feller had you are in business. Anything you throw in relation to such a fast ball has got to be a surprising pitch. Feller even toyed around with a knuckle ball in the latter days of his career, but he never got serious about it. He just retired in a dignified fashion.

Feller was the fastest pitcher I ever saw and I have seen a few. I will never forget the day in Fort Myers, Fla., when I was much younger than I am now and so was "Rapid" Robert.

I warmed up Feller that day and there was an agreement that he would indicate whether he was going to throw a curve or a fast ball. In the process of warming up he threw me a group of lazy curves and then, quite suddenly, he threw a fast ball without informing me what was going to happen.

From that day on I realized full well how tough it was to hit against Feller and try to guess what he was going to throw. It still amazes me that anybody ever got a hit off him, and a lot of players did.

Well, there is no doubt that this one man belongs in the Hall of Fame. I would say that there isn't a dissenting vote in the country, which is rather unusual. "Babe" Ruth, "Ty" Cobb, "Christy" Mathewson, Rogers Hornsby—those are the great names and Feller belongs with them.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, Jan. 25, 1962]

(By Gordon Cobbledick)

The painfully shy 17-year-old with the funny splay-footed walk (someone observed that he seemed to be trudging behind an unseen plow) emerged from the first-base dugout at old League Park and lobbed his first warmup pitches to Johnny Bassler.

It was a July afternoon in 1936. The St. Louis Cardinals, the legendary Gas House Gang, were in town for an exhibition game with the Indians. It was a meaningless affair, and what interest the small crowd showed in the pregame exercises was concentrated on the visiting team. The adolescent stranger drew scarcely a look.

Now he was sufficiently warmed up, and Bassler nodded his permission to cut loose. Soon such pitches as were within the old coach's reach were boring into his mitt with a sound like a thousand giant firecrackers exploding.

Players of both teams stopped to watch in wide-eyed fascination. They saw one pitch shoot over Bassler's head and into the stand, where it shattered the back of a $1.50 seat.

FRISCH KNOWS TALENT WHEN HE SEES IT

Frankie Frisch, the Cardinals' manager and second baseman, summoned one of his coaches, Clyde (Buzzy) Wares.

"Get over there," he ordered, "and find out who the kid is. Ask him if he's just here for a look, or if the Indians have got him tied up. If he isn't signed, tell him to do nothing 'til he hears from me."

Then Frisch beckoned to Lynn King, a reserve outfielder.

"You ever played second base?" he asked.

King had not.

"You're playin' second base today," said Frisch. "I'm too old to risk my life against that wild man."

START OF 21-YEAR FELLER SAGA

That was the first appearance in a major league ball park for Robert William Andrew Feller. As everyone who has read baseball history knows, he pitched three innings against the Cardinals that day, and eight of the National Leaguers' nine outs were strikeouts.

It was a preface to one of the greatest stories the old game has produced, a story that covered 21 years and that was climaxed only the other day when Bob Feller was voted into the Hall of Fame at Cooperstown, N.Y., to take his rightful place in the company of the immortals.

The Indians left after that exhibition against the Cards to launch an eastern trip to Philadelphia. Feller didn't accompany them. After all, you couldn't expect a 17-year-old kid to pitch against the best hitters in baseball. Two or three years from now, maybe, after a period of training in the minors. But certainly not now.

O'NEILL FINDS GOOD SPOT FOR FIREBALLER

In the mind of Manager Steve O'Neill, however, an idea refused to die. There would be occasions when the opposing team would have the winning run on third base with one or none out in the last of the ninth or in extra innings. If it scored, the game would be over. And only a strikeout or two could prevent it scoring. Why not bring the kid east for just that purpose? If he lost those games—well, the probability was that they'd have been lost anyway. And he just might save a couple.

Accordingly Feller was sent for, and the minor leagues never saw him. Neither did many of the batsmen against whom he fired the most fearsome assortment of speed and curves that any hitters of any generation ever had known. There may have been two or three pitchers who could throw a ball as fast or faster, but none who could mix it with such an explosive curve.

Without Bob Feller, the Hall of Fame would have no meaning.

THE NUCLEAR PREPAREDNESS OF THE UNITED STATES AND HER ALLIES

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, last fall when I was in California I read a series of excellent articles written by a distinguished newspaperman, Robert Considine, which appeared across the country under the rather intriguing and, I must say, wholly accurate description, "We Can Bury You, Mr. K."

To quote Mr. Considine:

> The West today is capable of destroying the Soviet Union's ability to support a great war in a matter of hours—not days, weeks, months or years.

These eight articles present a powerful picture of America's awesome arsenal of nuclear weapons and of our unerring capacity to deliver them against an aggressor. It points to the prodigious military might possessed by the United States of America, and our free world allies. In an informative and factual account, Mr. Considine examines Thor, Jupiter, Polaris, Skybolt, B-52's, B-58's, B-47's and many other weapons systems. Most important, he examines the character and ability of our gallant airmen on duty 24 hours a day year in and year out. Most perceptively he has illustrated his own belief that "the greatest weapon in the arsenal of the West as it faces its ideological foe across a no man's land of timorous or rebellion-minded slave states is Western man himself."

As we in this Chamber and throughout the land enjoy the benefits of freedom, as we attempt to discharge the responsibilities which that freedom imposes upon us, we take strength from our own determination never, never, never to surrender our liberty.

I ask consent that this series of articles be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the San Francisco Examiner, Dec. 3, 1961]

WE CAN BURY YOU, MR. K.—UNITED STATES COULD DESTROY RUSSIA IN HOURS

(By Bob Considine)

There is no need to prolong the suspense in this first article of a series devoted to firsthand reports on nuclear preparedness of the United States and her allies:

We could reverse a familiar threat and bury Khrushchev and his entire empire.

The West today is capable of destroying the Soviet Union's ability to support a great war in a matter of hours—not days, weeks, months, or years.

Britain alone has 60 H-bombs in place atop reliable Thor IRBM's able to reach Moscow and beyond. Seventy-five percent of all Russian cities with a population of 100,000 or more are within the range of the Thors.

Italy has 30 more of these megaton-range bombs ready to be launched, via Jupiter IRBM's, by superbly trained Italian crews, in the event of attack.

Six Polaris submarines, each carrying an estimated 30 megatons of destruction, roam the depths, could reach the vitals of the U.S.S.R. from submerged positions ranging from the North Pole to the Persian Gulf.

Nearly 30 NATO divisions, which are or can be quickly equipped with tactical atomic weapons, form an explosive shield that reaches from Norway to Turkey.

By the end of this month the United States will have 65 intercontinental missiles in place, some of them buried in shielded silos all but impervious to enemy attack. All carry area-leveling thermonuclear warheads.

The U.S. 6th Fleet, probing the Mediterranean to its innermost reaches, mounts atomic bombs, mines, and rockets aboard its supersonic air arm—ready to be catapulted off carrier decks on an instant's notice.

Finally, and supremely, there is the Strategic Air Command's manned bomber force, chief deterrent of Soviet expansionism since the start of the cold war 15 years ago. With the impending operational status of the Skybolt air-launched ballistic missile, a single B-52 will be able to hurl four of its load of H-bombs while still 1,000 miles away from the chosen targets.

The U.S. Air Force has 630 B-52's, 55 supersonic B-58's, and 1,000 B-47's, all capable of becoming airborne within 15 minutes after radar barrier—BMEW's, Dew Line, picket ships and planes—flash warning of an impending Soviet attack.

POINT AT HEART

Western man has on his side in these tense but hardly hopeless times the reassuring "bonus" strength of the RAF's superb manned bomber force and literally clouds of NATO fighters and fighter-bombers capable of striking like lightning.

SAC bases overseas point at the heart of the enemy from virtually all readings of the compass. The great command's Reflex program puts bomb-laden B-47's on those oversea strips on a rotation basis. Ground crewmen live in trailers within a few feet of the poised bombers. Bomber crews take their flying suits to bed with them at night.

When parked, the station wagons the crews use for transportation around assigned bases are always aimed—hood first—at the airstrip, to save a few precious seconds.

A Reflex crew never leaves a base during a tour. Wherever they roam on the reservation they can be summoned instantly by blaring klaxon or, if they are attending church services, by a blinking red light atop the altar.

STRENGTHEN NATO

The search for better hardware never ends. NATO soon will be at least 25 percent more powerful than it is today, on the ground, and much more than that in the air. The Titan II intercontinental missile will have storable fuels and be launched from the bottom of its 16-story-deep silo.

The B-70, if put into production, will give the free world the awesome protection of a 2,000-mile-per-hour bomber able individually to carry more havoc than all the bombs dropped by all the air forces of World War II, plus all the shells, bullets, and torpedos exchanged by the antagonists in that greatest war in history.

There are technological breakthroughs that notably increase the efficiency of the Nation's missile arsenal. On its recent shakedown cruise, the atomic powered submarine *Ethan Allen* shot six improved Polaris missiles while submerged, without a hitch. The solid fuel Minuteman ICBM demonstrated its ability to come roaring up out of its silo at the press of a button, last month at Cape Canaveral. A system of moving Minutemen about the United States on special launching trains, to make more difficult by many thousand-fold the targeting tasks of the enemy, is well beyond the drawing board stage. The RAF has perfected a dispersal plan which would enable it to launch all its manned bombers—all of them—in less than 2 minutes.

TARGETS PINPOINTED

There is no prime or even minor target within the sprawling and largely indefensible land mass of the U.S.S.R. which is not clearly pinpointed by allied nuclear forces. In the event of full-breasted war, the world would see unfolded a master target program beyond the comprehension of the average man.

Each nuclear weapon is virtually earmarked for a specific task—all the way from a huge thermonuclear warhead blazing down from outer space after an 8,000-mile flight to short-range atomic shells fired by artillerymen.

There would be no confusion, and a minimum of duplication of effort.

In the course of researching this series, I visited military installations at Vandenberg Air Force Base, Calif.; Strategic Air Command Headquarters, Omaha; the Pentagon, the Polaris submarine yards at Groton, Conn., Cape Canaveral, SHAPE at Versailles, Italian-American Tactical Missile Commands in Vincenza and Verona, and Strategic Air Command bases in Spain.

SOVIETS DWARFED

The collective might utterly defies description. It dwarfs the Soviet Union's military power, makes almost ludicrous the boasts and threats of Khrushchev. It is said, and probably truthfully, that the Western coalition could over-kill any enemy target by five times, or, in other words could win a great war with but 20 percent of its arms.

But the greatest weapon in the arsenal of the West as it faces its ideological foe across a no man's land of timorous or rebellion-minded slave states, is Western man himself.

I saw him in California tinkering with a Titan that loomed 10 stories above him. He was poised near a red telephone in a steel and concrete command post beneath a Nebraska plain—a phone whose lines and impulses reach every allied bomber and missile base, every bomb-filled plane on air alert. He was behind a desk in Washington, chewing a dead cigar as he concentrated on his mission.

I saw him in 15 different uniforms at SHAPE. I saw him bundled against a sleety gale that lashed an RAF Thor base in Lincolnshire. He browsed through "Sherwood Forest," the double row of Polaris containers aboard an atomic submarine. At Cape Canaveral he was heard to shout "there goes your Goddamned missile gap." When the Minuteman first took off.

He is everywhere, this Western man with undreamable power in his hands, compassion in his heart.

He is slow to anger. Rather than throw a first punch, he will submit to a measure of pushing around. He has stood by and remained in a mood to negotiate while his rights were impinged in Berlin and his interests molested in Laos. He has shrugged off the taunts of Castro, all of whose peoples and possessions he could obliterate from the face of the earth with one saturation swipe, as a man swats a flea. He patiently gives the Nehrus, Sukarnos, Jagans and Titos time to make up their minds.

He wants peace. But if it is snatched from him he has the means and the will to hit back with fission and fusion holocausts too ghastly to describe.

[From the San Francisco Examiner, Dec. 4, 1961]

WE CAN BURY YOU, MR. K.—BRITAIN: MISSILE MUSCLE APLENTY—KEYS TO TOTAL DESTRUCTION

(By Bob Considine)

HIGH WYCOMBE, ENGLAND, December 3.—The beribboned air marshal leaned forward in his desk chair to give emphasis to his words. The line of his chin recalled the jut of jaws of younger RAF types who had won the battle of Britain.

"It may interest you to know that right at this moment you're talking to the biggest missile force in the West," he said and, I daresay, readiest.

This was the beginning of an impressive look at Britain's ability and resolution to engage herself to the hilt, should nuclear war be visited upon Western civilization.

Before the visit ended we were given an extensive briefing in a fortresslike bunker here at RAF Bomber Command, a stirring aerial tour of East Anglia deterrent country, and a realistic demonstration of Anglo-American cooperation at a hydrogen-tipped Thor intermediate range missile base.

TWO KEYS

At the base we were shown two conventional looking keys, one in the hand of an Englishman, the other held by an American. If turned in their proper keyholes they could hurl total destruction against now-determined targets as separated as Murmansk on the Barents Sea to Baku on the Caspian.

The air marshal touched on the credits and debits of British retaliatory power, and that of the free world as a whole.

"It is militarily unachievable to knock us out complete in the U.K.," he said in the voice of a man discussing a bridge hand. "Whatever happens to us, in the event of nuclear war, we are going to get off X number of missiles from 20 sites dispersed all over the land. Our dispersal faces him (the enemy) with insurmountable timing and targeting problems.

"We have the advantages and disadvantages of geography. We are several thousand miles nearer to him than you are, and he is consequently closer to us. We should form the largest part of the first wave of retaliation.

FOUR MINUTES

"We have got down to the point of counting seconds in our defense and retaliatory exercises. If he puts intermediate missile bases in East Germany, and one supposes he will, we will have a 4-minute warning after he launches—4 minutes in which to react and prepare to respond.

"We take a drastic figure such as that and constantly find ways of doing more things better within that time limit. There is good reason to believe, of course, that we might have more warning time than 4 minutes. But we reckon on the worst theoretical threat, and plan accordingly."

"We think it inconceivable that he would hit us first," he said after a time. "That would give the States its one missing impetus—proof positive that he has started world war III.

But suppose he does? Well. Whatever comes, however he might choose to do us in, it would be almost certain death for him. We are overwhelmingly strong, and I think he knows it. There's not the slightest doubt about our being able to visit complete ruination, once the political decision has been made."

HARD DECISION

He paused thoughtfully before soberly continuing, "the political decision will be the hard one, the heartache job, one might say. For our part, the rest would be a drill, an exercise. Even an easy one."

Bomber command is as proud of its American-built Thor IRBM's as it was of the prehistoric-looking World War II Lancaster bomber, one sagging relic of which now sits at the gate of the futuristic missile site.

"Our Thor sites are 'soft'," the air marshal pointed out, referring to the above-ground and unshielded nature of the British-manned installations. "But we feel that the missile itself makes up for that. It is one of the most reliable in the world. Our British crews have proved that most conclusively.

"Four times each year bomber command selects a Thor and its crew, at random, and flies the lot off to your Vandenberg Air Force Base in California. There, our people put the Thor on its pad, check it, fuel it and fire it. We have had nine such shots without a failure. Our firing time and accuracy constantly improve. The exercise keeps our crews fit and ready, and it proves that the Thor can endure all kinds of exposure, weather and handling for extended periods and still remain at ready."

MANNED CRAFT

"Our manned bomber mission differs from that of our friends in your Strategic Air Command," he remarked. "Geography again is the compelling factor. Our bombers—all medium by your standards—are designed to take off quickly and climb at a steeper angle than yours. We must be airborne in less time than you, and we must get to altitude more swiftly because his air defenses extend so much closer to us than to you.

"The new engines going into our Vulcan II will turn up better than 20,000 pounds of thrust and knock from 10 to 15 seconds off takeoff time. We are seconds-conscious. The Blue Steel air-to-ground weapons our bombers now carry would enable crews to launch nuclear warheads at his targets from outside his air defense system. In time, we will get your Skybolt. The Vulcan II will carry two under its wing, each able to deliver a hydrogen bomb a thousand miles from the point of launch.

"The serviceability of our manned bomber fleet has been extensively proved, as we showed when we flew from here to take part in your recent Operation Sky Shield over North America. 'Bombed' your Boston, by the way. We do not anticipate many very long missions, but we're prepared. We flew a Vulcan II nonstop from here to Sydney not long ago. Three air refuelings.

"It is quite within our power under special circumstances to launch our entire strategic bomber force, with a variety of nuclear weapons aboard, in well under the 4 minutes' time which we might be alloted."

UNDERGROUND

We were taken in tow and led across a compound and down into a heavily reinforced underground room lined with maps and charts.

The briefing officer outlined bomber command's mission:

"The nation must possess an independent nuclear deterrent (1957) * * * retaliatory forces must not be thought capable of being knocked out on the ground (1958) * * * an enemy's will and ability to fight must be destroyed in the shortest possible time (1959)."

He made it clear that sheer size, mass of numbers, mean little in an age when nuclear war is a possibility.

"Bomber command is made up of 24,320 officers and men of which 4,183 are assigned to missiles," the man in RAF blue detailed. "Hardly much larger than a single infantry division of World War II. The command has only a small fraction of the planes we launched from 700 airdomes in that war, but it can wreak the damage of millions of Lancasters carrying the biggest bombs then available."

He described the farflung radar systems whose warnings would give Britain her excruciatingly tight period between the blast-off of Soviet missiles and the giant mushrooms those would raise on British soil. He spoke of the measures the RAF would take if faced with such a crisis. He dealt with the foolproof, panicproof, and secret method whereby political decisions reached by the President of the United States and the Prime Minister would be quickly translated into military action.

"We don't need your airborne alert, even if we could afford it," he said of SAC's program of keeping about 10 percent of its 1,685 bombers aloft around the clock and ready.

QUICK ACTION

"We can take off and get where we'd have to go in a very short period because of the accident of geography," he explained. "Our answer to your Airborne Alert is our 'Cockpit Readiness' alert. From time to time, either because of a drill or a worsening of the world situation, we keep a quarter of our bomber crews in their craft and ready to start the engines.

"We've devised a system whereby all four engines on many of our V-bombers can be started simultaneously. That saves from 3 to 5 minutes. We have rid our system of such luxuries as taxiing leisurely to the end of the strip, turning and taking off. Our aircraft are parked just off the runway, pointed at the starting mark only a few yards away.

"At Farnborough last year we demonstrated that we could get four Vulcans started and airborne in, a total elapsed time of 1 minute and 24 seconds. As little as 8 seconds separated wheels-up times. Our crews used different paths down the same strip so as not to eat dust and fumes from other jets taking off from the strip at the same time.

WORLD AMAZED

Another officer led us to a map of Europe extending from where we stood in England to as deep into the Soviet Union as Sverdlovsk.

"A thought about the Thors," he said, scanning the map. "The development of this system in a little more than 2 years is a magnificent achievement. It has confounded and amazed the military world, and it must have deeply impressed our friends over here." He touched the U.S.S.R.

"In just 16 minutes or less from time of liftoff from our bases, Thors could very well decide the outcome of a great atomic war," he said with a shattering matter-of-fact manner. "Seventy-five percent of all Russian cities of 100,000 or more population are within the 1,500-mile range of the Thors. Eighty-six percent of all places of that size or larger are within 2,000 miles of us—a modest trip for our V-bombers—and 89 percent of such places are within 2,500 miles.

"One could forget the last 11 percent."

[From the San Francisco Examiner, Dec. 5, 1961]

We Can Bury You, Mr. K.—Britain's Bristling Missiles

(By Bob Considine)

At An RAF, Thor Base, Lincolnshire, England, December 4.—Skeptics who question the scope of Britain's contribution to an East-West atomic war should meet the men and see the hardware assembled by the Royal Air Force to discourage the Soviet Union from initiating the conflict.

It is more than a reassuring experience. It is eye-popping.

England today bristles with the determination and the means to retaliate swiftly and terribly if nuclear war comes to the West. At 19 other sites similar to this one in gentle but enormously powerful East Anglia, 3 Thor IRBM's stand or lie on pads built and manned by Britons.

Each of these 60 dependable missiles has a thermonuclear megaton-range warhead in place, supplied and maintained by a small U.S. Air Force contingent living on the base. Every Thor possesses a sophisticated guidance system whose black box can instantly be set to take out either of two predetermined targets behind the Iron Curtain, targets as separated as the vital port of Murmansk in the north of the Soviet Union to the irreplaceable oil refineries at Baku in the south.

RETALIATION

RAF and USAF men, living in the harmony of a historic crusade to defend Western civilization, led me step by step through the swift moves they would make in the awesome opening minutes of a colossal war that might well be decided, one way or the other, in a matter of a few hours.

"There would be four phases of retaliation," an RAF vice marshal began as we walked in the rain across what had been a Spitfire and Hurricane base in a war of long ago.

"The first reaction would come from our Thors here in Britain. Matter of geography and, I might add, readiness. Then, not too long after, the Italy-based Jupiters would be hitting their targets. They would be followed, we feel, by the Polaris missiles launched from your submarines. Your Atlases, Titans, and Minutemen would then begin coming in from America.

PHASE NO. 2

"Phase two would be NATO's supersonic fighters and fighter-bombers, going at him from all directions along a line fanning from Norway to Turkey.

"Then our V-bombers would be reaching their targets as phase No. 3, accompanied by SAC B-47s which happened to be standing by, at the ready, in Spain, North Africa, and other bases.

"'Finally, a few hours later, the saturation effort: the arrival over places from one end of the Soviet Union to the other of the American based B-52s. A tremendous number of them, one supposes, each one of them carrying more destruction than all sides dropped in World War II.

"But we were talking of the first punch—the Thor." he said. "Here, meet a crew."

He had led us to where stood, at stiff attention, 15 men and two menacing-looking German shepherd dogs. When he clipped off a friendly "at ease," the men relaxed. The dogs sat down, but kept their eyes on the stranger. Their attendants held tight reins.

STRANGE ROLE

A wing commander introduced the crew, not by name but by the odd terms and ratings born of the age of missiles. As each was called, the bearer of that particular title or responsibility froze back to attention.

The gallant men who once flew propellered little fighters from these fields would have been puzzled as the wing commander's voice called the strange roll:

"Launch control officer." A young RAF flight lieutenant stiffened. There was a long, thin chain reaching down from his neck, but no "dog tags" dangled from it. Instead, there was a ring and three keys.

"Authentication officer." An American second lieutenant galvanized. He wore a similar chain, ring, and key arrangement, but is not considered a member of the crew.

DOG HANDLERS

Then came three "missile service ready men," three "power production men," four MP's, two "dog handlers," a "fireman-driver" and, like a link reaching back to Hannibal, a cook.

We were led to the heart of the operation, an anchored trailer hard by the three-pronged launching site.

Most of its interior is given over to three consoles, studded with bewildering lights, buttons, switches, meters, and other mystifying products on whose accuracy the course of history might turn. RAF men wearing big-cushioned earphones kept up a constant chatter with master control, elsewhere in the bomber command. Partitioned off from this portion of the trailer is a bleak and chilled room with a little desk, chair, and couch.

A red telephone sits on the desk, Its line reaches northward and westward across England, Wales and Ireland, then over the Atlantic and into the United States as far and as deep as the underground command post of SAC, Offut Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebr. The "go to war" signal could come only through that deceptively gay looking instrument.

The little room was manned this day by Capt. Luther M. Hawkins, USAF, of San Bernardino, Calif., a crewcut, resolute type who has been thus assigned for 2 years and 10 months.

His keys, mark of his status as authentication officer on duty, jangled a bit as we shook hands.

We moved to the prime console as a simulated retaliatory attack began to unfold.

Captain Hawkins' opposite number in the RAF had already inserted his three keys into evenly separated keyholes along the instrumented face of the organlike control arrangement.

The countdown had begun.

Outside, a raw wind and bursts of cold rain were ignored as the words and actions of the men at the three consoles were translated into action.

Heated sheds the size of large barns rolled back on railroad-type wheels, revealing three cradled Thors. Giant, elongated steel hands carefully lifted the Thors to vertical position. They stood there, trim, white, and as tall as six-story buildings, their thermonuclear warheads bluntly confronting the elements. Men attached thick hose pipes, spun valve wheels and, theoretically, 7,000 gallons of liquid oxygen and 5,000 gallons of kerosene plunged into each missile.

The cradling gantries leaned back to the pad. The Thors stood alone, breathtakingly still on their launch platforms.

Inside the trailer, at console No. 2, the operator called a "hold" on Thor No. 1. A make-believe flaw in its guidance system, 1 of 32 possible malfunctions in the bird had illuminated the proper portion of his panel. It was theoretically fixed, and the countdown continued.

Less than 15 minutes had been consumed since the "go to war" signal. If the exercise had been for real, all would now be ready—sheds away, missile elevated and fueled, target selected, all systems checked electronically, gantries withdrawn, area cleared of personnel, umbilicals ready to jettison.

"That's as far as we go," the RAF vice marshal said with the suggestion of a smile. "You chaps must ignite the pyrotechnics."

Captain Hawkins came to console No. 1, his keys in his hand. Only he could start those 152,000 pounds-thrust engines in the Thors. He could start them by inserting the keys into three keyholes alined above those of the British. His keys do not fit their holes; theirs do not fit ours. One side could not start a war from this base. The American's key is useless unless the missile is prepared for launching. The Briton's preparation key means nothing unless the American turns on the ignition.

The captain tucked his keys back in his tunic. The drill had ended.

Darkness had fallen, but off to the right was a great blob of light, made spooky by the incoming fog. We drove over to the illuminated place, a complex of buildings surrounded by a high wire fence. This is the home of the warheads, American controlled by U.S. law.

There is no thought of using a conventional high explosive warhead in the event of a great war—at least there is not at this base and others like it.

MEGATON RANGE

"The warheads are in the megaton range, otherwise it wouldn't be worth the effort," the vice marshal told us, with a shrug.

I asked him where the spare Thors were stored. He started with surprise.

"We have no spares," he said. "There is no intention to refire, as one would refire a cannon. The Thor's exhaust as it lifts off would almost certainly warp and destroy the launch pad. There would be no way to fire additional salvos.

"Besides," he added thoughtfully, "the chances are we would be hit soon after we launch—if not before."

[From the San Francisco Examiner, Dec. 6, 1961]

We Can Bury You, Mr. K.—Why U.S. Panic, NATO Wonders

(By Bob Considine)

SHAPE, Versailles, December 5.—Officers and men of 15 Western nations, headquartered here in the strongest military alliance in history, expresses astonishment over the shelter debates now sweeping the United States, thousands of miles from where the Great Bear growls.

"What do those panicky people think we're over here for?" an American colonel asked me today, in the course of toting up the relative strengths and weaknesses of NATO and the Communist forces it faces unceasingly.

"We're here to see to it that there never will be any use for those shelters they're yapping about. There's just no question that we could handle anything the other side's got. No question."

Even a casual look around the headquarters of Gen. Lauris Norstad, USAF, Supreme Commander of the colossal confederation, confirms the fact that unity, dedication, and determination reside here to a marked degree.

HUGE SHIELD

The comparatively wobbly and reluctant Warsaw Pact powers look out each day upon a shield anchored in the north at Oslo, in the center at Fontainbleau, in the south at Naples, and to the east in Malta and Turkey.

It is in the process of being refitted with new tanks, new rifles, and considerable tactical automatic weapons. It has atomic-tipped missiles ranging from 300-mile range Redstones down to the 2-man bazooka-type Davy Crocket fieldpiece. Its 30 divisions have much more firepower than all the armies of World War II.

Its F-100's, 104's, and 105's, all on 15-minute alert, can carry catastrophic megaton bombs over the Iron Curtain at supersonic speeds. Its Fiat-built subsonic fighter, the G-91, can use roads and pastures as takeoff and landing strips and lay down shattering support of ground forces. It is coming up soon with vertical takeoff planes which will need little or no run before vaulting into action.

NAVAL POWER

Its 6th Fleet can strike enormous blows from its sea, the Mediterranean. Ten years age, the security of Western Europe depended on 20 military and air bases. Today there are 200. It was hampered, a decade ago, by the task of transshipping oil and gasoline over railroad tracks of varying gages. Today it has a 5,200-mile network of pipelines reaching from Norway to Turkey, 25 ports where tankers may drop lines to the pipe, 250 pumping stations.

In that 10-year period its telephone circuits have jumped from 40 to 1,600; its teletype circuits from 25 to 1,150, its facsimile transmission hookups from none to 40. It clicks and glows with 15 multi-million-dollar IBM "electric brains."

TWO LANGUAGES

SHAPE's Americans, British, Belgians, Canadians, Danes, French, Germans, Greeks, Icelanders, Italians, Luxembourgers, Norwegians, Hollanders, Portuguese, and Turks speak 10 languages, but do business in two required tongues, English and French. Every command is integrated. Nationals of each nation serve, and are served under.

No crusade ever had a more simply stated mission in life:

1. To prevent war.
2. To defend NATO if attacked.

If the "shield" is hit by enemy action, it is prepared to lash back fiercely with the hardware and men it has in hand, and then embrace the many other divisions and varieties of arms not now assigned to SHAPE.

West Germany is the only NATO nation that has assigned its entire land forces to the command of General Norstad. It has eight crack divisions on the line and four more ready to move up if needed. The United States is beefing up its five divisions to full strength and buttressed them recently with three cavalry regiments. France, with so many men mired in the Algerian dispute, is not up to its promised four divisions, but President de Gaulle has indicated it soon will be. The contribution of the other powers is similarly modest, but particularly in the case of Britain could be upped dramatically if needed.

WORK TOGETHER

SHAPE is no Babel. It trains together, works together, lives together, thinks together. Nor is it an autonomous force. It is tied into the general picture of Western and hemispheric defense, with CENTO, in the Middle East, and SEATO, in Asia. If war came, the targets for its nuclear weapons—at least those beyond the line of sight—would be selected and assigned by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and be issued from SAC Headquarters, Omaha.

"I cannot speak of specific targets if we are attacked," General Norstad said as he sat trimly in a leather chair offered by his bewhiskered British public information officer. "But I can say that our targets would have a direct bearing on our carrying out the defense of Europe."

FULL COORDINATION

"There is complete coordination.

"As for how quickly we could react if hit—well, the democracies have the reputation of being slow to anger, slow to react. But we always do get things done, don't we?"

There is quiet confidence at SHAPE, at an hour when Berlin might light the fuse of a mammoth powder keg. But that confidence is never conducive to cockiness. SHAPE's people do not forget the measurements of the enemy.

A briefing officer ran through those measurements for me, turning his charts and fencing with his pointing wand as he spoke.

The Soviet Union, as of today, has 2,225,000 men in the Red army, 135 full divisions and 20 cadres of divisions. Seventy-four of the divisions are in the west. Twenty-six are concentrated generally opposite the middle of the SHAPE "shield." These are the most mobile and have an atomic capability.

RED STRENGTH

The Red air force, purely defensive in World War II, now has 8,500 fighters, most of them jets and many of them supersonic; 2,500 medium bombers and 125 intercontinental propjet bombers. Its naval air arm is land based, for there are no carriers in the Soviet Navy. The Red navy also has given up on battleships, cut its World War II cruiser strength in half—to 15—but has tripled its destroyer strength to 190.

Its biggest gain, SHAPE feels, is in submarines—from few or none in World War II to 450. About half of these are of the long-range snorkel type and perhaps able to launch some form of air-breathing or ballistic missile. The Red navy has no Polaris-type nuclear submarine, but the cliche here is "in 30 years they have come from the bottom of the list to the point of having the second navy in the world."

TURKISH VIEW

The Turks, who could turn the Black Sea into a Soviet lake and bottle up an appreciable portion of the Red navy, do not subscribe to the cliche of their brothers-in-arms.

The rundown sounded and looked impressive to this reporter. But not quite to one of the top men at SHAPE.

"You think we have trouble with our Dew Line, BMEWS and the other means we have of building a radar screen around us?" he asked. "Think of those poor ______. The U-2 showed how fundamentally vulnerable that great land mass of theirs is.

RUSS TROUBLES

"And if they attacked us along our line, they would have to move up all their supplies across the satellite countries, depend on those peoples for roads, transport, communication and everything else that goes with fighting any kind of war. Those countries just couldn't support such an attack. The sabotage and defections would be tremendous.

"We have unity in NATO. They have a scrap of paper called the Warsaw Pact."

Allied lines reach back across Western Europe, the British Isles, the Polaris and nuclear fleet-guarded Atlantic and deep into the heart of North America. It is inconceivable that they could cut or erode from within for want of a sense of purpose.

SHAPE today stands ready to fight back with almost every weapon in the arsenal of the free world, including such sophisticated examples of rocketry as the Honest John, Corporal, Nike-Ajax, Nike-Hercules, Mace, Matador, Hawk, Sidewinder, Sergeant and—soon—the Pershing.

They come under the heading of "Shield."

LONG STRIKE

"Then there is Sword," the briefing officer concluded. "That's the long-range strike from Britain and the United States to such a degree of obliteration that it makes war unthinkable."

There was something else he wanted to add.

"We've spoken of the Shield and the Sword," he said, turning a final chart. "There's a third vital element here," and he pointed to the page that spelled it out. In bold print it read:

"The will * * * the determination of NATO peoples, individually and collectively to maintain the strength of the Sword and Shield forces and to use them as required in defense of the NATO community. This determination is expressed in SHAPE's motto:

Vigilance Is the Price of Liberty.

[From the San Francisco Examiner, Dec. 7, 1961]

WE CAN BURY YOU, MR. K.—ITALY MISSILEMEN TRAINED AND READY

(By Bob Considine)

SOUTHERN EUROPEAN TASK FORCE HEADQUARTERS, VERONA, ITALY, December 6.—Italy's substantial contribution to the nuclear defense of the West has not been properly spelled out, and for two reasons.

In the first place, there is a new Italian fighting man in the world, and he has profited from the excessive boasts, ranting claims and abysmal end of Mussolini and the Fascists of another generation. He is quieter, more composed, possessed of arms indescribably more powerful than those of Il Duce, and he is alined with sober and industrious NATO.

KEPT SECRET

In the second place, the Italian Government feels it is best not to permit too much publicity to appear about its nuclear strength and close association with the U.S. Army and U.S. Air Force. Italy's Communist Party of 1,700,000 is the largest in Europe, a perpetual anti-American sounding board and—in the event of war—a serious sabotage threat.

Several U.S. congressional groups, inspecting Western European military might have been surprised lately to be turned down when they requested permission to look in on what the Italians are providing. Their requests have been bucked all the way up to Gen. Lauris Norstad, Supreme Allied Commander, Europe, and to the highest echelons of the Fanfani government, to no avail.

This can be recorded however:

Italy has two well-trained Jupiter IRBM squadrons equipped with thermonuclear warheads. There are 30 of these, 1,720-mile-range missiles in place on well-guarded pads south of Naples. Their targets behind the Iron Curtain are pinpointed. In the event of a Soviet attack on the West, Italy could—and would—launch a tremendous retaliatory punch in 15 minutes or less.

The country has a streamlined, hard-hitting air force whose fighters, some of them supersonic F-104's, would join in well-rehearsed counterattacks with American-supplied tactical A-bombs.

The Italian Army is the first foreign force trained and tested with the Honest John rocket by U.S. Army personnel.

AT CANAVERAL

It was at Cape Canaveral, Fla., last April when Italy's first Jupiter team fired its first shot down the Atlantic range. It was an unqualified success. The 20-man team from the 36th Aerobrigade Jupiter Missile Group, commanded by Brig. Gen. Giulio Cesare Granziani, is a portion of the Italian armed forces committed to NATO.

It had undergone exhaustive training at 7230th Technical Training Group Headquarters, USAFE, Wiesbaden, Germany, and at language and missile training at Lackland AFB, Tex., and Huntsville, Ala. The April launch, which hit the target area more than 1,500 miles downrange, was witnessed by Maj. Gen. Mario Bucchi, Vice Chief of Staff, Italian Air Force. The launch control officer of this test—which got little attention because Comdr. Alan Shepard was about to be launched into suborbit—was Maj. Enrico Dallari.

BOTH HOLD KEYS

The pact that links the United States and Italy in the operation of the Jupiters is similar to that involved in the Anglo-

American Thor bases in Britain and, soon to be, the Turkish-American Jupiter program.

A small detachment of USAF officers and men live on the Italian missile sites. U.S. "authentication" officers hold the keys—literally keys—which would send the Jupiters roaring off toward their targets in the event of war. Italian officers, and they alone, hold the keys that enable the Jupiters to be prepared for the takeoff. Thus it is a joint operation, with neither side in complete control of the weapon—and both sides subservient to a series of checks and balances ranging down from the White House through the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the British Prime Minister, NATO and the Italian Government.

No Jupiter could conceivably be shot off by a trigger-happy patriot. But they would go in a hurry, if ordered, and tear out the soft underbelly of the U.S.S.R.

Maj. Gen. Eugene F. Cardwell, one of the U.S. Army's foremost authorities on missiles, heads up the unique SETAF, which was born 6 years ago in the wake of our withdrawal of troops from Austria. There are 12 Italian officers at his headquarters here in this gentle, fabled town of Romeo and Juliet. Eleven of them saw service against Allied forces in World War II.

FINE RELATIONS

"You can't find better relationships anywhere in the military than right here," General Cardwell told us emphatically.

The general stood up and walked across the room to a map.

PREVENT BREAKTHROUGH

"If the Red Army came across Yugoslavia and broke through here," he said, pointing to the border, "NATO would be cut in half. The lines that extend from Norway around to Turkey would be broken. If SETAF 'gave' and broke, well, they would have the richest part of Italy, and good flat country in which to press forward.

"We are here to see that that won't happen."

Any such frontal attack would be met by two of the most dependable weapons in the West's arsenal of missiles capable of carrying nuclear warheads—the Honest John and the Corporal.

The Honest John, an unguided but remarkably accurate rocket with ranges up to 20 miles, was turned over to Italian forces in 1959. The missile brigade, commanded by Brig. Gen. Giovanni de Gennaro, has two crack American-trained battalions, and itself is training a third.

General de Gennaro's deputy, Col. Vincenzo Leonelli, is another Italian officer greatly trusted and respected by American forces.

Lean, tough Col. Arthur J. Read, commander of SETAF's 1st U.S. Army Missile Command, showed me the hardware with which he would deal in the event of war.

The Corporal is a most formidable artillery weapon. It is 45 feet long and its rocket motor, burning red fuming nitric acid aniline, can propel it 75 miles at speeds up to 2,000 miles per hour.

COMPLICATED GEAR

Then he explained and showed us the gear that would guide the Corporal to its tactical target—perhaps a concentration of Red army tanks coming through an alpine pass, or a key bridge, enemy field headquarters, etc. It is delicate gear—radar, electronic computers, and the like—but mobile as a good halfback and built to stand the jars and jolts of cross-country travel.

The missile, capable of carrying a thermonuclear warhead, is completely controlled from the ground. After launch, radar tracks it continuously, measuring its range, arc, and elevation errors. Computers match the errors with preset standards, and correct them instantly. A radio beam, called the doppler, shuts off the Corporal's motor at the precise second, and the whole four-story tall weapon plunges on its bull's-eye.

SETAF, in short, is a prime example of the coordination of the free world in its militant stand against any Communist aggression. It is probable that some of its men once faced each other in battle. Today, brothers in arms, they stand ready to fight an enemy who would enslave both.

[From the San Francisco Examiner, Dec. 8, 1961]

We Can Bury You, Mr. K.—Polaris Subs: Mighty Deterrent

(By Bob Considine)

Groton, Conn., December 7.—It is a fact that nothing has given the aggressively minded militarists and theorists around Khrushchev more pause than the incredibly swift development of the Polaris-missile nuclear submarine.

Five of these awe-provoking vessels are now on station. A sixth is ready to go out any day. Two dozen more are in the process of being built. In a remarkably short time, as time is measured in weapon systems, there will be 45 or 50.

Each Polaris submarine carries 16 solid fuel missiles in 2 rows of 8, standing in what the crews refer to as "Sherwood Forest." Each submarine packs more destructive vehemence than descended from all the skies of World War II. Each has two crews, labeled "blue" and "gold." "Blue" or "gold" takes the fantastic weapon down below the surface as it leaves its American port and does not come up until it nears that same port 2 months later, at which time the alternative crew takes over and goes back under the sea.

AND STILL BETTER

From that submerged position, and forever underway, a Polaris could now hurl tremendous retaliatory might against Soviet or any other Iron Curtain targets 1,200 nautical (1,380 statute) miles away.

The second generation of Polaris subs, beginning with the *Ethan Allen,* is equipped to handle the 3-foot longer Polaris A-2, whose range is 1,500 nautical miles, 1,725 statute miles. The following (and now building) *Lafayette* class, 7,000-ton, 425-foot dreadnaughts of the deep, five times as big and infinitely more powerful than the best submarines of World War II, will carry the Polaris A-3, with a range of 2,500 nautical and nearly 3,000 statute miles.

"When we get out to that one they'll have to search the whole ocean, looking for us," Rear Adm. Lawrence R. Daspit, Deputy Commander, Submarine Force, Atlantic Fleet, told this reporter today, after a tour of the almost-ready Polaris sub named for Thomas A. Edison, who would have marveled.

DETERRENT AGE

On many a wall in offices and headquarters of U.S. military leaders hangs a chilling photograph of the Deterrent Age. It is a seascape, an endless expanse of water extending to the horizons. There is not an islet, not a tree, not a rock nor reef. Simply water, as desolate as that beheld by the Ancient Mariner.

There is a caption under the photograph. It reads: "Polaris Station".

"This you may say with confidence," remarked Senator Clinton P. Anderson, chairman, Joint Congressional Atomic Committee, in summing up the Navy's super-weapons, "the nuclear-propelled ballistic missile submarine marks the closest approach now foreseeable to an ultimate deterrent."

It is not probable but theoretically possible that the Soviet Union's ICBM's, IRBM's, manned bombers and saboteurs—working in terrible concert—could destroy the West's power to retaliate from land bases. The Kremlin does not need a very astute espionage network to learn where missile sites, airfields and control points are located. One cannot hide or camouflage a Vandenberg Air Force Base. Russian commercial planes flying regular runs to London have thoroughly photographed the RAF Bomber Command airdromes and Thor sites over which they pass.

APPALLING RETALIATION

But even under circumstances as wildly improbable as suggested above, there would still be appalling retaliation from beneath the seas.

"The Navy does not say an enemy could not track and destroy a Polaris submarine," Admiral Daspit remarked evenly. "But it is simply beyond comprehension that he could find enough of us."

"Take a look at this globe," he added, moving across his office and indicating with a gesture the predominance of the seas which cover three-quarters of the planet. "It makes retaliation inevitable."

A Polaris can circumnavigate the globe without refueling, without surfacing, without need of fresh provisions for its crew of 90 highly skilled men and 12 officers. It can transport its fearsome and incredibly accurate missiles and nuclear warheads beneath the Polar icefields and strike northern U.S.S.R. targets from those frozen wastes. It can knock out Vladivostok and neighboring targets from more than a thousand miles out in the Pacific, annihilate Leningrad and Moscow from beneath the mists of a Norwegian fjord, clobber Sverdlovsk from the Black Sea.

SPACE TO MOVE

It has 140 million square miles of oceans, seas, and gulfs in which to maneuver, 330 million cubic miles of water in which to hide.

"We'd be terrified if they had the Polaris and we didn't," a man from General Dynamics muttered.

The creation of the Navy's Fleet Ballistic Missile Weapon System can be ranked in naval history with the transitions from sail to steam, wood to iron, coal and oil to fissioning atoms. At a time when the naval arm's ability to assist in or survive an atomic war was being questioned, an extraordinary team of American naval and civilian experts devised a deterrent of startling imagination and breathtaking technology.

SUREST HAND

Many hands shaped the Polaris missile system, but the surest of these, it is agreed, were those of tough-minded, dedicated Rear Adm. (now Vice Adm.) W. F. "Red" Raborn (much as the nuclear sub itself was forced from stubborn determination of Adm. H. G. Rickover).

Raborn was handed an almost preposterous job late in 1955. The Department of Defense wished to graft the Army's land-locked, 1,500-mile range Jupiter missile on to the Navy, preferably its submarine arm. The Jupiter stands as tall as a six-story building and requires 50 tons of kerosene and highly volatile liquid oxygen. It was soon apparent that a 16-Jupiter submarine would have to be about the size of a battleship and could easily be turned into an inferno.

At that point of frustration and impending abandonment, an astonishing sequence of scientific breakthroughs began to unfold.

In January 1957, Lockheed Aircraft's missile division laid before Raborn its plans and hopes to develop a small solid fuel (and thus easily stored) missile capable of delivering a warhead to targets 1,200 nautical miles away.

Dr. Edward Teller, "father of the H-bomb," was able to report to Raborn that the best brains of the Atomic Energy Commission felt that the size and weight of even a thermonuclear weapon soon could be drastically cut without serious impairment of its destructive yield.

Dr. C. Stark Draper and his associates at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology almost simultaneously produced a compact and miraculously efficient guidance system, a complex of extremely precise gyroscopes and accelerometers containing its own electronic computer.

AEROJET FUEL

Aerojet-General Corp., of Sacramento, Calif., came up with an enriched solid fuel which made it possible to reduce the weight of the Polaris missile to 15 tons—as compared to the Jupiter's 55.

In time eight major contractors and more than 6,000 subcontractors spread from coast to coast were to take part in fitting together the fabled jigsaw of the system. Parts were built to fit into machinery not yet designed. Contractors, knowing that every inch would count in the submarine-to-be, often requested space for their special gear before work began on the gear itself.

SAVED YEAR

The Electric Boat Division of General Dynamics, given the contract to build the first missile sub from the keel up, saved a year by cutting in two a partly finished nuclear submarine of the *Skipjack* class and inserting the 130-foot 3-deck missile section. She was renamed the *George Washington*.

The missile cut its teeth at Cape Canaveral, Fla., and San Clemente, 50 miles off the coast of California.

The bugs were difficult to eradicate. Problems multiplied because this missile would be called upon to perform jobs never asked of any other. It must separate smoothly from the submerged submarine, have hydrodynamic stability in order to rise straight and true to the surface, and stand the pressures of the sea on the way up through the depths. It must be strong enough to hold itself together under the tremendous kick of air pressure, but light enough to enable that kick to send it 100 feet above the surface. Its first stage must fire at that precise split second, to keep it from falling back on the vessel it just departed.

Once in the air it must survive the jolting "G" strains of bullet-speed acceleration, fight its way aloft, orient itself to its position in the world and head for the target.

TWO STAGES

In space, its first stage must separate when exhausted and its second stage must fire immediately. The second stage's power must be shut down at the right minisecond, while traveling at 15,000 miles per hour, and the warhead must then separate itself and, in time, weather its brazen descent through the atmosphere over the target.

All these titanic tasks, assignments, unresolved problems and hopes converged at 1:39 p.m., e.d.t., July 20, 1960, when "the match was lit" inside the *George Washington*, proceeding underwater off Cape Canaveral.

The men aboard, tense and drawn, felt the 380 feet long, 5,900 ton whale shudder as the 30,000 pound Polaris burst through the pressurized plastic shield which kept the ocean out of its well after its heavy steel "manhole" had been automatically lifted out of the way.

WITNESSES CHEER

On the surface, aboard the U.S.S. *Observation Island*, 500 witnesses gasped and then cheered as the bottle-shaped black and white Polaris popped out of the churning sea like a huge cork erupting from a bottle of champagne. At 100 feet, its dripping first stage ignited with a fierce bellow and scalding light. The dummy warhead spun more than 1,000 miles down the Atlantic Testing Range and plunged into the target area.

A message was flashed to President Eisenhower from Raborn. It read:

"Polaris, from out of the deep to target. Perfect."

Adm. Arleigh Burke, the Chief of Naval Operations who had risked his reputation in naval annals by giving Raborn an open checkbook, could say with justification—on that momentous day:

"As Polaris-carrying submarines take their unknown stations throughout the world, the knowledge by free peoples of the world—and those desiring freedom—that a Polaris submarine might be in the depths of international oceans, will give them additional determination to guard their freedom."

Capt. Leonard Erb, skipper of the "blue" crew of the *Abraham Lincoln* joined us just before we left the yard.

I asked him how close he had eased his stupendous submarine to Russian targets.

Captain Erb seemed surprised.

"To within 1,200 miles, of course," he said.

WE CAN BURY YOU, MR. K.—EYEWITNESS TO TITAN MISSILE LAUNCHING—AWESOME SIGHT, AN INFERNO OF FLAME

(By Bob Considine)

VANDENBERG AIR FORCE BASE, December 8.—The control center, built like a brick smokehouse, was crowded when Brig. Gen. Roger Crow, deputy commander of the 1st Strategic Aerospace Division of the Strategic Air Command, led me in and pointed to a seat in front of one of the bewildering consoles.

Crowded and tense.

Across the room, high on the wall, hung two TV sets whose screens showed nothing more enchanting than a view of the bleak California wasteland which once had been Camp Cooke, infantry training center.

The room was alive with the compelling cadence of a countdown. Men hunched over their consoles and desks, chanting off the minutes and the readings of their dials and buttons.

Col. Joseph J. Cody, a sandyhaired Texan with a lean jaw, worked in the center of what sounded, to the reporter, like a sound track from the Tower of Babel. This was to be his "bird," all 10 stories of it, all 110 tons, all 380,000 pounds of thrust—and all those millions it cost to build.

SIGNIFICANT PHONES

A major crouched over a panel whose phones perhaps might be—in time of war—the most important telephones in the free world. Their lines led to the underground command headquarters of SAC, Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, and to the Pentagon and the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Five shrill beeps now burst from the room's loudspeakers.

"That's SAC, simulating the 'Go to War' signal," General Crow said, in a room that now buzzed with new intent. "Watch the screens."

A miracle of technology began to unfold before our eyes.

Two 400-ton steel and reinforced concrete doors, like modernistic doors on an old-fashioned cyclone cellar, lifted themselves from the deserted land.

And up from a silo, dug 165 feet into the earth, appeared a glittering Titan I, a simulated multimegaton bomb forming its warhead. It rose on its elevator and launch pad until it stood revealed in all its impressive length and bulk. The sun at noon glinted off its ice-caked sides as tons of liquid oxygen, colder than minus 300° Fahrenheit, seethed in its tanks.

"It won't be long now," the general said. "Let's go outside and watch it."

CRITICAL MOMENTS

In less time than it would take N. S. Khrushchev to remove his shoe, the umbilical cords began dropping from the towering intercontinental missile. A great silence fell upon the little group of observers—officers and their wives, engineers from the Martin Co., who built it, and myself, by chance the only reporter present.

The countdown, in what seemed the voice of God, reached its breathtaking "zero" and an inferno of flame belched from the bottom of the monster, sending a great expanding plume of fire, gases, and seared soil skimming across the forlorn land.

The Titan rose as if reluctant to leave the earth which had harbored it so long. It literally inched its way upward, and now the observers could speak again.

"Go, go, go," they implored.

It went.

ROARS ALOFT

It went aloft with a roar that caused the ground to dance in a miniature earthquake, the white-hot eyes of its twin exhausts too bright for the human eye to endure.

"Separation in 5 seconds from, ah, now," the general muttered.

This was the missile's and the operation's moment of truth. The huge Titan itself was hardly a pinpoint in the blue dome above us by now, but behind it flowed a great white telltale vapor trail.

Suddenly, that trail was snipped as if by a gigantic unseen scissors. Another deep silence hovered over the observers, and then they let loose a triumphant shout.

SECOND TRAIL

A second vapor trail had appeared farther along in the trajectory of the Titan. The second stage, the payoff stage, had ignited on schedule. The Titan and its warhead were en route to the target area off Eniwetok, more than 6,000 miles away, and at 15,000 miles an hour.

What the 395th Missile Squadron Launch Team had proved in and around the Titan's silo that day was that the United States can prepare and launch one of these incredible objects, as a retaliatory stroke, within an astonishingly short time. The precise number of minutes and seconds is classified material, but it is safe to say that—if the cold war ever heated up to the boiling point—such missiles could be well on their way to planned Soviet targets while Soviet ICBM's were still in space.

The earth far beneath Vandenberg's Titan sites is veined with a bizarre network of tunnels, piping and wiring. Great underground pumping stations force liquid oxygen into the missiles at tremendous pressure. Kerosene pipelines run for miles to appointed bungs in the hides of the missiles. Enormous blast doors are spaced here and there in the tunnels, for personnel safety.

Nothing has been overlooked that would stand in the way of fast reaction, if the free world is attacked. If the vast doors of a silo were ripped off by a Soviet warhead, what is believed to be the largest complex of steel springs in the world would cradle and cushion the shock below, and the Titan I could still rise in terrible retribution.

IT'S OBSOLESCENT

Astonishingly, what with the state of the art moving as swiftly as it does, the test I witnessed was the test of an already obsolescent weapon. Titan I, now operational in its silo-lift configuration, is an awesome but interim weapon. But, until it can be phased out, the United States will continue to build Titan I's and provide hardened silos for them.

We were taken down into an empty silo that awaits the impending development of Titan II. The new ICBM will be even larger than Titan I, have a more streamlined configuration, and a newly developed self-contained, all-inertial guidance system which cannot be jammed by any known method.

Its prime advantage is that it will be fueled with new and storable liquids, and thus dispense with the time-eating infusions of highly volatile and quickly-evaporating liquid oxygen.

Thus, Titan II will be as ready to fire as a cocked pistol. It will be fired from the bottom of its silo, once the heavy overhead protective cover, an improvement on silo doors, is rolled back on its railroad wheels.

The minutes saved, at a cost of countless millions, could mean the difference in the Western World's way of life.

If war rained down on the West this minute, and it did not cripple our ballistic counterpunch, the Air Force could give a colossal account of itself, using "obsolescent" missiles alone.

READY TO GO

In place, and ready to be fueled and launched, are 6 Atlas ICBM squadrons, 45 H-bomb missiles in all.

The solid-fuel Minuteman, the "third generation" of ICBM, is years ahead of scheduled integration into the Nation's counterwallop arsenal. The first Minuteman wing—150 of these small but mighty and infinitely less complicated ICBM's—has been assigned to Mahlstrom AFB, Great Falls, Mont.

Construction is under way for 600 additional Minutemen.

All of the above information has been made public by the Department of Defense. It must give the Soviet High Command much thoughtful pause—particularly when Soviet military leaders realize, as they unquestionably do, that this incredible ballistic missile might would constitute considerably less than 25 percent of our manned-bomber havoc.

[From the San Francisco Examiner, Dec. 11, 1962]

WE CAN BURY YOU, MR. K.—SAC COMMAND CAVERN HOLDS FATE OF FOE

(By Bob Considine)

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND HEADQUARTERS, OFFUTT AIR FORCE BASE, OMAHA, NEBR.—It is a pity security regulations prohibit Gen. Thomas S. Power, realistic-minded commander in chief of SAC, from inviting Nikita Khrushchev to visit the sights and wonders of this overwhelmingly mighty deterrent force.

The Russian dictator, overlord of all Communist aggression, could only be stunned and stupefied by what he would be shown, if such a trip were possible.

As he drove up to the main entrance of this busy command, he would have gawked at the towering Atlas missile that stands symbolic guard over the premises.

It is a replica of those intercontinental missiles capable of annihilating great areas of the U.S.S.R. from their deep silos on this continent.

General Power, the free world's most appropriately named military figure, awaited us in an office decorated with a world map covering one entire wall, models of the missiles which play an increasingly important role in SAC's breathtaking retaliatory plans, and a framed color photo of a nuclear bomb immediately after fiery detonation.

The general has a pair of steel-blue eyes that can look through walls. He had just briefed and conferred with a number of SAC combat crews, and clearly he liked what he had seen.

"These crews are men this country can be proud of," he said in his positive way. "They're dedicated men, and I stress the word 'men.' We don't have boys any more.

"Boys just can't stand the 74-hour workweek the crews have been putting in, since we went on 50 percent alert status. That's a damned hard duty week."

The SAC moves with the times. As the Soviet threat grows and problems are created, SAC meets these challenges with new concepts, weapons, and tactics. Here are some of the more striking changes in the past few years of the cold war.

General Power heads up the Joint Strategic Target Planning Staff. It has pinpointed every major and minor target in the Soviet Union, the satellites, and Red China. The 100-man staff, working from the most sensitive intelligence reports, and perhaps U–2 photographs, apportions responsibility for retaliatory bombing among the U.S. services and NATO allies.

SAC headquarters, once the sanctuary of Air Force types alone, now bristles with Navy, Army, Marine Corps, and RAF officers—the first such integrated force in the history of war.

For the past year SAC has maintained airborne command posts, jet tankers outfitted to serve as headquarters if an enemy H-bomb knocked out the rugged, deeply dug regular headquarters here and its alternates elsewhere.

The jets are filled with communication marvels that could direct even the most colossal of wars from on high.

New training techniques have made virtually every mission a potential retaliation thrust. Efficiency of crews has jumped 400 percent.

SAC now has twice as many combat-ready crews as it had 5 years ago, though it has had to bring them to that readiness in recent months with half as many bombers as it then had, the other half remaining on ground alert—cocked, and ready to go.

SAC no longer bases squadrons of bombers overseas. Its new reflex program has streamlined and strengthened the advance base posture.

Rotational B–74's fly into an oversea base from a stateside base, ready to fight on arrival, and for the next 2 weeks are on constant alert with bombs aboard.

Ground crews live in trailers a few yards from their bomber.

Flying crews do not leave the base, sleep with their flying gear on a chair next to the bed, eat together at tables located nearest to the door of the officers' mess, can be summoned instantly to war from any point on the post, including the chapel.

As the solid fuel Minuteman ICBM moves into SAC's inventory, it brings with it revolutionary changes. A handful of men, perhaps only two or three, will be able to care for each of these siloed thermonuclear-tipped missiles. And fire them in 32 seconds.

In its relentless war on minutes and seconds, SAC has refined the dispersion and takeoff procedures of its bomber force to a degree beyond the comprehension of even outstanding airmen of World War II and the Korean conflict.

Operation MITO (Minimum Interval Takeoff) hurls bombers into the air with the density of a bird flock taking wing.

If Mr. K. were persona grata around the premises today, he would have been taken into the heavily guarded underground command post in which the defense of Western civilization would be directed.

It is an experience that leaves a deep impression.

The ramp that leads to it appears cut through the core of a vast subterranean block of granite. Periodically, there are blast doors, as if in a mine.

Stacked along one wall are rows of rations. The underground command post has its own powerplant, own wells, and—in effect—hangs suspended below the earth, to cushion any nuclear blow.

In the high-ceilinged map and chartroom closed-circuit color TV cameras cruised about the floor, their lenses trained on the ever-changing information sent to the charts. Two elevations of observation tables faced the map wall.

In the event of war, General Power would direct his indescribable forces from one of those posts.

Lt. Col. Wesley G. Kille took us in tow, now, and moved to a complex of consoles to demonstrate advances that make SAC more powerful than ever.

He picked up a phone, touched a button, and said "Dropkick to Looking Glass. Report, over."

There was a second or two of static in the loudspeakers overhead.

Then, loud and clear, "Looking Glass to Dropkick. We are at 33,000 proceeding north about 90 miles from Offutt." Looking Glass was the airborne command post then on duty.

Colonel Kille walked a few steps to the phone that Mr. K. has heard so much about and never seen. It is the famous "Red Telephone," the most important telephone in the world.

It sits in its cradle on the side of a large console. (Actually, there are two red phones—"In case the operator drops and breaks the first one," Kille explained solemnly.)

On the face of the console are blocks of tiny bulbs—one group marked "2d Air Force"; the next labeled "8th Air Force," a third "15th Air Force," and then two smaller clusters captioned "Overseas" and "Other Commands."

The colonel lifted a red phone, pushed a red button, and instantly every clustered bulb on the console lighted up. A fluttering beep-beep-beep-beep sound filled the room, just as it was filling every SAC command post in the world.

"It is the "go to war" sound.

"This is a maintenance test," Kille said into the red phone. "Respond."

In the space of less than 5 seconds, every light on the console blinked off. An incredibly farflung complex of missile and manned bomber bases had responded in a twentieth of a minute.

If it had not been a maintenance test, the command posts around the Nation and the world would have sounded klaxons within seconds after the word from SAC. Crews would have raced to their ready and bomb-loaded planes, or begun the preparation of their missiles, and then would have waited further word from the command post to go.

After a bit, Colonel Kille reached across the console, touched a single bulb button in the section marked "Overseas," picked up another phone and said into it, "Would you count 10, please?"

He handed me the phone immediately, and when I put it to my ear a voice was saying, "* * * three, four, five * * *."

"Who is it?" I asked.

"Guam," Colonel Kille said.

He moved us along to the magic panel known as BMEWS (for Ballistic Missile Early Warning System). Its beams, reaching across the top of the world from Alaska to Greenland, extended into the North American Air Defense Command and into the room in which we stood, below the Nebraska plain.

The chart that gives meaning to those guardian beams is like a very large TV screen with a test pattern showing the North American Continent from pole to Mexico.

The images of planes appeared, superimposed on the picturama, and any Soviet ICBM that would rise from the Russian land mass, would be detected by BMEWS in a matter of seconds, and would be flashed into the vortex of calculators at SAC and show its face on this screen.

Retaliation would commence immediately.

At the press of a button to the side of the screen, the system can draw a quick yellow ring around the general area in which the on-coming ICBM would land. The number of rockets launched by the enemy, and the number of minutes left before the first impact, can also be determined.

It is an incredible system, but SAC won't rest. It soon will complement it with what it calls the 465–L SAC Command and Control System, developed by Air Force and civilian wizards at the International Electric Corp. at Paramus, N.J.

This will achieve such wonders as instantly informing the SAC commander as to the number of bombers, missiles and tankers he has ready to go, latest worldwide weather summaries, running commentaries on exercises unfolding anywhere around the globe

> and, in time, be tied in with information being received from manned and unmanned space systems.
>
> Mr. K would have been interested to have it confirmed to him that General Power can order his entire manned bomber force into the air and head it for its predetermined targets while the President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff are deliberating whether to go to war.
>
> The bombers would fly to designated points on the way to their targets.
>
> If no "go" signal was then flashed to a bomber, it would turn back.
>
> If the "go" did come, it would be flashed in the form of a code divided into three parts. Three members of the crew would then open small sealed envelopes which they carry on all simulated missions and compare their part of the code to that which was flashed.
>
> All of which is just a part, a small part, really, of the elaborate system which makes virtually impossible any unilateral bombardment by a single crew or missile launching group.
>
> Only the Congress can declare war, and the war it might declare, would commit only American arms. Our Allies could join or refrain, as their governments saw fit.
>
> But it seems incomprehensible that they could avoid engagement in any war such as Mr. K. boasts he can wage, and which the United States could respond to with such holocaustic effect.

CALIFORNIA BOMBINGS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on the subject to which I shall now refer, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for a few additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair.) Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I refer to a newspaper article which appears in today's Washington Daily News. It relates to a very shocking and dastardly crime which was committed in my State of California last night. The article in part reads:

> The homes of two San Fernando ministers were bombed last night while the clergymen were involved in a panel discussion on "radical right" groups at a West Los Angeles synagogue.
>
> Police said the explosions that rocked the homes of Rev. John Simmons and Rev. Brooks Walker were "obviously linked" with remarks the ministers made at the synagogue. The forum was entitled "Radical Right—Threat to Democracy."
>
> Although families of both men were home when the bombings occurred, neither Rev. Simmons' wife nor his three children, nor Rev. Walker's wife and baby were hurt.

Mr. President, I do not believe there is any more infamous or corrupt criminal activity than that which revolves around the attempt of degenerates to blow up homes and the families that live in them. I very much hope, as a U.S. Senator from California, that the police and other authorities out there may successfully ferret out the culprits and punish them.

In that connection I wish to refer to an act which was passed by Congress a year ago, which deals in part with this subject. I still remember the debate on it. I read from Public Law 86-449, subsection (b):

> (b) Whoever transports or aids and abets another in transporting in interstate or foreign commerce any explosive, with the knowledge or intent that it will be used to damage or destroy any building or other real or personal property for the purpose of interfering with its use for educational, religious, charitable, residential, business, or civic objectives or of intimidating any person pursuing such objectives, shall be subject to imprisonment for not more than one year, or a fine of not more than $1,000, or both; and if personal injury results shall be subject to imprisonment for not more than ten years or a fine of not more than $10,000, or both; and if death results shall be subject to imprisonment for any term of years or for life, but the court may impose the death penalty if the jury so recommends.

If State or local authorities believe there is any reasonable grounds to assume an interstate activity, the Federal Government may be invited in. I understand that FBI facilities have already been made available to the police in this instance.

It is quite obvious that no one knows where these explosives came from. But I urge the Federal Government and the Federal Bureau of Investigation to intervene, if it appears at all the explosives used in these awful bombings were or might have been brought in across State lines.

The radical right in this country is as grave a danger to the security of our country and the faith of our people in the constitutional system of government as is the radical Communist left.

There were instances in California last fall when people calling themselves "Minutemen" armed themselves with all kinds of sidearms and rifles and announced that they were going to protect this Government. That is paranoia.

I was glad to note that by reason of the press in California the ringleaders of that amazing group finally were dealt with. I believe that today the so-called Minutemen are a thing of the past.

Mr. HUMPHREY and Mr. McGEE addressed the Chair.

Mr. KUCHEL. In a moment I shall be glad to yield to my friend, the acting majority leader; then to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. President, let us have faith in America and in the American Government. Let us stand up and object as vigorously as we may desire to any recommendations the President makes. Let us, unhindered, state our views. Let us be forceful in criticizing when we believe criticism ought to be engaged in. Let the criticism be constructive.

Let us not give any encouragement to extremist groups which do the service of Mr. Khrushchev so well that he himself, I am sure, would be glad to underwrite their expenses.

Now I am glad to yield to the distinguished acting majority leader.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from California. I commend him for his forceful and courageous statement. It is the sort of statement that I would expect from him. I know of his fight in his home State against the radical right wing extremists, just as I know he has fought the radical left wing extremists.

The reason I have asked to be heard in this colloquy is that one of the ministers who was involved in the discussion last evening and whose home was bombed is one of my closest and best friends, the Reverend John Simmons. He was a Lutheran minister in Minneapolis, Minn., for several years. He is a close personal family friend of ours. He and his wife and children are close friends of the Humphreys. They moved to North Holywood, out in the San Fernando Valley, Calif. He has a wonderful church and a fine congregation there. He is a spirited, intelligent, forceful, courageous minister of the Gospel. I suppose it is fair to say that the Reverend John Simmons is one of those men of the cloth who engages in controversy because he has strong convictions and ideals. He is an outstanding American. He is a generous, true Christian. He is a tolerant and understanding man. For example, he has actively participated in the Round Table of Christians and Jews. He is the most tolerant of people, one of the most understanding men I have ever known. He has led the fight against all forms of discrimination, bigotry, and intolerance, whether racial, religious, or of any other sort.

I was deeply shocked when I read that his home had been victimized by a bombing. I thank God that his wife and those three wonderful children were not injured.

I am confident that the police of the metropolitan area of Los Angeles will do their duty, as the Senator from California has indicated, and will apprehend the culprits. The Senator is so right: What a bunch of cowards they are to throw a rather crude, apparently handmade bomb into the yard of a minister, when the wife of the minister and her children were in the home, and when the minister himself was somewhere else, engaged in a forum or discussion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from California has expired.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we may proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the other minister, also, the Reverend Mr. Walker, and his family, are every bit as deeply concerned. The article states that Mrs. Walker told police she was feeding her baby in the kitchen of her home when the explosion occurred.

This kind of incident has happened before when synagogues have been bombed. Now the homes of clergymen have been bombed.

There are fanatics, but, thank God, there are only a few. Nevertheless, I think it is the duty of Congress and of other public officials who have taken an oath to uphold the Constitution to call the attention of the American public to the danger to our democratic and republican institutions that exists in this kind of extremism and this kind of violence.

One of the things that greatly disturbs the Senator from Minnesota is that this extreme radical right wing, by its self-appointed, super-duper patriotism, by its constantly reiterated antagonism to communism, has a tendency to attract followers, without the people knowing that they are being caught up in the web of a Fascist movement or an extreme radical movement which does nothing but aid and abet the cause of destruction, disorder, and totalitarianism. The Senator from California is correct. The Communist Party ought to pay their costs, because they are doing a work of disorder, seeking to disrupt the parliamentary institutions designed for human freedom.

I commend the Senator from California for taking the stand he has taken. I knew he would, and I know other Members of Congress will.

The attention of the public must be called to such outrages; the people must be alerted to them. Simply because a man stands up and shouts, "I am anti-Communist," does not make him a champion of freedom. Hitler was anti-Communist, but he was a scoundrel the like of which the world has never known. We need people who are profreedom, proconstitutional government, people who stand up for civil liberties, civil rights, and human rights. We must have people who will really do the cause of democracy a service. But it is nothing short of disastrous to equate the lovers of freedom with only those who profess to be anti-Communist, because some of the biggest political hoodlums in the world have proclaimed their anticommunism simply to cloak their own selfish, dictatorial designs.

There is the black Fascist, and there is the Red Communist. The difference is in color, not in substance, and not in terms of their basic philosophy.

Mr. President, I extend the profound regrets of all of us to the families of the two clergymen. I hope Senators will permit me to speak personally of the Reverend John Simmons and his family, in particular, because they are some of the finest people the State of Minnesota ever knew. The Simmons family went to California to start a life with their young family in a church in that State. They are a real credit to California.

I may say, by the way, that the Reverend Mr. Simmons thinks very kindly of the distinguished senior Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I am grateful to the Senator from Minnesota for those comments.

Mr. JAVITS and Mr. McGEE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. KUCHEL. I first yield to the able Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Wyoming for his forbearance, and I thank the Senator from California for yielding.

This particular news strikes me with particular sensitivity, because I myself, within the last 5 weeks, have spoken at the Temple Isaiah in West Los Angeles on this very subject. I addressed a very responsive audience of many people and many faiths.

First, I wish to commend the Senator from California for understanding that protest is essential. It is not simply that this infamous act will speak for itself and appear to the American people as the disgrace that it is. A protest and a denunciation of acts of this kind are essential by persons in high places. So I am delighted that the Senator from California has led off in that regard, especially with respect to his home community.

In fairness to him, I should say that he understands full well the degree of the ultraright arm into which he may be hurling his own shots in the days to come. I feel it is a great credit to him as an American and as a Senator that he has never had any doubt about that matter or any question about what he ought to do because of any political implication which may be involved.

I understand that under the 1960 Civil Rights Act the Justice Department requires some finding by local officials that an interstate aspect is involved before the Federal Bureau of Investigation can get into this matter. I should like to add my voice to that of the Senator from California in urging the local officials to ask for the assistance of the FBI at the earliest possible moment because of the greater means for investigation which the FBI has.

Finally, we must remember that the atmosphere in which these events occur is an atmosphere of nihilism on the right, challenging the confidence of the American people in their own leaders, such as President Eisenhower, President Truman, and Earl Warren, Chief Justice of the United States. In that atmosphere, in that climate, what else can we expect? People may feel that if they have suffered an injustice, there is no other way to redress it except by some form of violent action. Therefore, I should like to leave the point in our Record, whatever note it may receive, that we must, by denunciation and by effective and quick police action, give assurance to others, so that they will not be intimidated into closing their minds upon this issue.

Those who commit such crimes are either crackpots or intimidators. Therefore, it is the rapidity and the vigor with which they are brought to justice, while extending protection to all others who may be similarly situated in this community, which will determine the effectiveness of our approach.

I know the Senator from California will move into this situation as he would if it were in New York, and as I have on previous occasions. I certainly pledge to him any aid I can offer, and I know, as the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Humphrey] has said, that that goes for all of us.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the very able Senator from New York. He is quite correct, and I think that more of us need to point the finger at things that are wrong. Certainly it is completely wrong for people in America to take extreme positions—on either side of the political spectrum—which do a horrible disservice to our country, and seek to undermine the faith of people, and attempt to push and prod good people to do the sort of thing which was done last night in my State.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President——

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield to my friend, the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. McGEE. I thank the Senator from California for yielding to me.

I wish to associate myself vigorously with the comments of the Senator from California and with those of the Senator from Minnesota and those of the senior Senator from New York.

In a speaking tour through California last fall—a nonpolitical tour, for the purpose of making statesmanlike utterances—I was assaulted may times, verbally, and sometimes with physical gestures, by apparent spokesmen of extremist groups; and in recent days, when I have been responding here on the floor of the Senate to some of the outbursts characteristic of the excessive rightwingers, I have found it necessary, I may state to the Senator from California, to assign one secretary to work full time in order to handle such mail from California. I am glad to be able to report—because I consider it a noble cause—that we have been able to devote this much of our time to helping put down the sort of fanaticism which is a dangerous sickness in the minds of some people. Why so many of them gravitate to the Los Angeles area, I do not know. [Laughter.] Perhaps the Senator from California has an explanation for that.

But certainly we should do whatever we can about this matter, because such criticisms are not proper. Instead, these people attempt to assault all constructive conservatives in the country.

So I hope we shall stand united in setting forth, for the benefit of all our people, the true objectives of our Government and the procedures of freedom which are guaranteed in our orderly society.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I thank my able friend for his comments.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire text of the wire service article to which I have referred be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

MINISTERS' HOMES BLASTED DURING TALK ON RADICAL RIGHT—CALIFORNIA BOMBINGS LINKED TO EXTREMISTS

North Hollywood, Calif., February 2.—The homes of two San Fernando ministers were bombed last night while the clergymen were involved in a panel discussion on radical right groups at a West Los Angeles synagogue.

Police said the explosions that rocked the homes of the Rev. John Simmons and Rev. Brooks Walker were obviously linked with remarks the ministers made at the synagogue. The forum was titled "Radical Right—Threat to Democracy."

Although families of both men were home when the bombings occurred, neither Reverend Simmons' wife nor his three children nor Reverend Walker's wife and baby were hurt.

POTENT

One investigator said the bombs were not something to knock down a house or blow it up but could put a pretty good size hole in a man.

Mrs. Walker told police she was feeding her baby in the kitchen of her Canoga Park home, when the explosion occurred, sending fragments into the walls of the house. She said she was too frightened to do anything but call the police and stay in the kitchen.

Mrs. Simmons said she was also in the kitchen and her three children were in rear bedrooms when the bomb exploded in her front yard, showering pieces of the bomb's pipe casing and broken glass through a shattered living room window.

ACTRESS ON HAND

Actress Marsha Hunt was also speaking at the discussion session at Mt. Sinai Temple, but officers said they had no reports of any incidents at her residence.

Witnesses at the temple said white and gray leaflets containing a Star of David, a hammer and sickle and the inscription "know your enemy" were scattered on the ground before the program.

"My husband was speaking of anti-Semetics and the wrongfulness of the right wing," said Mrs. Walker. "This may be a repercussion of his talks along this line.

"But I don't know who would resort to these measures," she added.

Reverend Simmons, a former candidate for mayor of Minneapolis and a member of the American Civil Liberties Union, said, "I've been quite controversial but have received no threats."

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION FOR VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I was going to speak briefly to the acting minority leader [Mr. KUCHEL]. There is an urgent deficiency appropriation for the Veterans' Administration, which has been cleared unanimously by the Appropriations Committee; and it must be acted on today, because this is the first part of the month.

Mr. KUCHEL. I am sure there will be no objection. Since my Republican leader is out of the Chamber at the moment, I wonder whether I may now suggest the absence of a quorum.

ECONOMIC VALUE OF THE MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, there is an old adage to the effect that everyone is entitled to his own opinion; but I believe there should be added a proviso, namely, that one should come by such opinion honestly. Many opinions concerning the American maritime industry are not arrived at honestly, in that they are not based on complete information or on proper evaluation of the available facts.

Some months ago there was made public a study undertaken by a university research group to determine the economic value of this country's merchant marine. By some fantastic metal legerdemain the researchers arrived at the conclusion that the maritime subsidy program and the operations of the subsidized merchant fleet make no substantial net contribution to the economy.

So absurd were these findings and the rationalizing incident to the findings, that it would take almost as lengthy a document to refute them as the one the research group concocted to justify them. However, the Maritime Reporter, an excellent publication in this field, has come forward editorially in the January 15 issue, to emphasize how unrealistic the university group's findings were. I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the RECORD, in conjunction with my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN ASSIGNMENT THAT FAILED

In 1958 the Committee for American Steamship Lines, which is composed of the Nation's subsidized ship companies, made a generous grant to Northwestern University's Transportation Center for a careful study by competent and practical transportation experts to document the economic value of the U.S. merchant marine.

The Maritime Administration and the industry cooperated wholeheartedly by making all requested facts available to the team of six researchers. After financing the study and cooperating to this utmost extent, here is the final conclusion presented at the end of a 473-page printed report:

"The study reported here has found that the subsidy program and the subsidized merchant fleet make no substantial net contribution to the economy. Further, the manner of paying the subsidies both introduces distortion in the factor price structure and contains some self-defeating aspects. The high cost of the subsidy program derives largely from the requirements that American-built ships and American crews be employed. The failure of the subsidized liner fleet to create major economic values derives at least in large part from price policy as reflected in conference practices. Participation in restrictive practices cannot be justified, according to the analysis, on the ground that open competition is not economically feasible or effective.

"Whether military advantage is best served by requiring the use of American ships and seamen, and whether the requirements of practical politics dictate participation in the conferences, were not explicitly examined.

"However, the economic aspects of the problems strongly suggest that alternatives to the present policies should be explored."

To arrive at this amazing conclusion, the economic researchers said they weighed the entire subsidy system from this angle: "What is the value of the U.S. merchant marine? It is the value in exchange of an increment of its output—the services it provides—minus the value in exchange of the productive resources—materials, fuel, labor, etc.—required to produce the increment of those services."

In other words, the economists maintain that unless the services produced by the American merchant fleet are worth as much, or more, than the value of the resources put into it, the Nation's merchant marine has no economic value.

Good enough, if all the factors are considered before reaching a conclusion. This the Northwestern study failed to do.

The hundreds of pages of factual material presented in the report are quite good—as far as they go. This was the result of the excellent cooperation given the researchers. There are also some factual errors. For example, the report errs in stating that only subsidized lines can be the beneficiaries of construction subsidies. This is simply not true. The research team's failure to learn this fact betrays somewhat the sloppiness of their work.

More serious, however, are the accidental and deliberate omissions of material that should have been carefully weighed.

Either accidentally or deliberately, the report omits any mention of the merchant marine's contribution to the Nation's balance of trade. For the last 15 years this balance has been running against the country—to the tune of $3 billion in some years. We have endured this unfavorable balance to help our allies but obviously we could not let this continue indefinitely at a high figure. We have been able to allow it to exist only because the American merchant marine has helped to keep the unfavorable balance within bounds by contributing almost $1 billion to the credit side. This the report failed to consider—accidentally or deliberately.

There was no accident in the team's refusal to include the maritime industry's contribution to the Nation's economy through wages, taxes, and purchases. These were airily dismissed because "in this study, the purpose is to determine the economic value of the industry in a broad social sense, not just from the point of view of those individuals whose economic well-being is directly involved."

How could any practical economist deliberately ignore, in an economic study, the impact on the national economy of an industry that employs 60,000 American seafarers; spends $49 million annually on fuel; $40 million on subsistence and stores; $40 million for insurance; $32 million for repairs; provides jobs for 15,000 to 19,000 shipyard workers; will in the foreseeable future provide shipbuilding employment for 50,000 to 70,000 Americans; and pays taxes amounting to some $40 million annually?

They must be living in an economic dreamworld.

Even more serious, in our estimation, is the deliberate refusal to consider the unmeasurables—conditions that cannot be measured until they actually occur. Aside from its value as a military auxiliary, the Nation's subsidized merchant marine exerts a powerful deterrent effect on any attempt by foreign ship lines to place freight rates at levels that would place our exporters at a disadvantage on the world market. This is particularly true at the moment.

But the extent of the deterring effect cannot be measured in dollars and cents because no critical instances have arisen of rate gouging since the Nation's present merchant fleet was established through the subsidy program.

But delve back to World War I, when there was virtually no American flag ships in foreign trade. Ask cotton exporters and virtually every other exporter and importer what occurred to rates when foreign ship owners withdrew their vessels from our trade because they could get higher returns elsewhere. Why did we have serious coffee, sugar, and other shortages? Because we did not have our own merchant fleet. For a while our entire national economy was in peril.

To conclude that the subsidy program makes no economic contribution is equivalent to concluding that the tax support for firefighting equipment, for prisons, for snow removal equipment, for safety equipment, and for hundreds of other public-supported items is uneconomic because their effect on our economy cannot be measured in terms of material output. The report itself admits that its "concept of an economic optimum ignores questions of moral, political, or social values" as outside its domain of economics.

The said consequence of the report is that, as a published document in book form, it will endure long after this or other criticism is forgotten.

SILVER QUILL AWARD TO VICE PRESIDENT JOHNSON

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, last evening there was held at the Sheraton Park Hotel an unusual and very significant testimonial dinner in honor of the Vice President of the United States Lyndon B. Johnson. It was the 11th annual State of the Nation and Silver Quill Award dinner, which is sponsored by the business publications of the United States.

The Society of the Silver Quill is composed of those who are honored for their work in behalf of our Nation and of world peace. The recipients of this singular honor thus far have been the late Paul Wooten—in 1951; Bernard C. Duffy—in 1952; the former Vice President of the United States, Richard M. Nixon; the former President of the United States, Herbert Hoover; the late Charles F. Kettering, former director and research consultant, General Motors Corp.; Harry F. Byrd, chairman of the Committee on Finance, U.S. Senate; the late Benjamin F. Fairless, former chief executive officer, United States Steel Corp.; the former Speaker of the House of Representatives, Joseph W. Martin, Jr.; the late beloved Sam Rayburn, Speaker of the House of Representatives; Lt. Gen. James H. Doolittle, chairman of the board, Space Technology Laboratories; in 1960, the former Chief of Naval Operations, Adm. Arleigh A. Burke; and, as I have stated, last night the Vice President of the United States, Lyndon B. Johnson, was honored for distinguished leadership in behalf of the prestige and progress of the United States. He was introduced by the Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, to the large audience of business and professional people.

I wish to pay a personal tribute to Dean Rusk for attending the dinner so soon after his very difficult and arduous journey back from South America, and following the many days of negotiation in which he was engaged at the Conference at Punta del Este. All of us owe a debt of gratitude to the Secretary of State for his remarkable achievements at the conference.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the message delivered by Vice President Johnson at the dinner be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Address by Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson, Vice President of the United States, at the 11th Annual State of the Nation and Silver Quill Award Dinner, Washington, D.C., February 1, 1962

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Secretary, and guests, after listening to your remarks, there are two people I wish could have been here tonight: my father, who would have enjoyed them; and my mother, who would have believed them.

We are all deeply humbled by the presence of Secretary Rusk, who returned only this afternoon from an exhausting and successful mission for his country.

After what you've been through the past few days, to get dressed up and be here tonight must make you feel like the group of Army soldiers who had to take a 30-mile march with full field equipment on their backs. It was pretty rugged going. And when they reached the end of this 30-mile hike the sergeant, something of a joker, said: "Attention, I have orders from headquarters that we must about-face and march back the 30 miles without stopping. Any man not able to march back the 30 miles take three paces forward."

Well, the whole outfit took three paces forward except one soldier who stood tall and straight and never moved an inch. The sergeant went up and said, "Mac, I'm proud of you—the only man in the outfit willing and able to march back the 30 miles. I admire your pluck and stamina."

"What do you mean pluck and stamina," the soldier said. "I'm so pooped I can't walk the three steps forward."

Thank you, Mr. Secretary, for walking the three steps forward tonight.

I am grateful for the generous decision of Silver Quill to give me this award. Your decision has placed my name on a scroll of honor which testifies to the achievement of many men who have graced the public life of the United States.

Perhaps I can best express my thanks for being judged worthy of inclusion in the gallant company by making one or two points, very briefly, about the partnership which should exist between the press and the government in our common devotion to freedom and peace.

The American press enjoys a stature and exerts an influence that can be touched in no other country. Our Constitution has given the press certain guaranteed freedoms to enable it to act as one of the guardians of the public interest.

In fulfillment of that trust, you are sometimes required to be critical of men and events in Washington. No public official, regardless of his political allegiance, has any right to complain of that criticism so long as it respects the facts and is marked by a sense of responsibility.

I am confident that these high traditions of fairplay and public duty will guide your judgment of our various national policies.

My pleasure tonight in speaking to our national business press serves to remind me that our goal today is to preserve the strength and prosperity of our country. The American people cannot protect the endangered heritage of freedom, cannot resist the thrust of Communist power, if there is unnecessary confusion or needless division in our national affairs.

In everything that touches our economic abundance, or our Nation's security, we should achieve unity of action while resisting all attempts to impose unity of opinion.

In the last year, under the vigorous and enlightened leadership of President Kennedy and with the help of most Americans, we have taken long strides toward our goals.

1. The gold outflow was decreased and the dollar held stable.

2. A record $8.4 billion was placed in State and municipal securities to finance schools, roads, and vital community facilities.

3. New home construction rose 4 percent above 1960 as $16.9 billion was spent on new homes.

4. Gross national product rose from an annual rate of $500 billion in the first quarter to an alltime high of $525.8 billion in the third quarter. For the last quarter the estimated annual rate was $540 billion.

5. Corporate profits before taxes were an estimated $46 billion, higher than any year except 1959, and corporate profits after taxes were an estimated $23.3 billion—$600 million above the previous year.

6. Industrial production, total employment, wage rates, and personal income climbed to alltime peaks.

7. Farm income gained by a billion dollars or more than 6 percent.

8. In both October and November there were more people at work than in any autumn in our history—an average of more than 67½ million people.

9. Personal income in November ran at the annual rate of $429 billion, or more than 6 percent more than a year earlier.

10. Per capita purchasing power reached a new high in the third quarter of 1961. It continued to expand in the last quarter. Purchasing power of the average factory worker was 6 percent greater in November than a year earlier. It was a full 30 percent greater than the average for 1947–49.

On the debit side, unemployment has remained a serious and stubborn problem. Total unemployment is down only slightly from a year ago, but we are facing it squarely. President Kennedy has called it our No. 1 issue. Under his guidance a number of steps have been taken to put us on the road and get this Nation going.

In the next few months many great themes, of urgent concern to our public community, will be under strenuous debate. In that debate your views, I trust, will be expressed with candid courage, with scrupulous accuracy, and with constant respect for the national interest.

A debate conducted in these terms, without bitterness and without rancor, will enable us to develop with respect and to act with vigor over that broad area where we shall be able to reach agreement.

But we all know that we must also look beyond our shores toward a world of angry fear and armed hatred, if our purpose as a nation is to be fulfilled in freedom. The presence of my friend and colleague, Secretary of State Rusk, who has honored us all by taking part in our meeting tonight, should remind us of the vast efforts that unite and solidify the free nations in their resistance to tyranny.

Our President and our Secretary of State, who has spoken here so eloquently and so generously tonight, have stressed time and again that America has a responsibility which we must face. That responsibility is to leadership and we cannot maintain our position in the world unless we maintain our strength at home.

For America there can be no reprieve from responsibility, no retreat from greatness, no surrender of principle, no experiment in appeasement. With our friends and allies, we shall yet journey in unity and in strength toward that great goal of peace with justice that remains the constant incentive and inspiration of our policy.

I close by wishing you unbroken good fortune over the coming years. I believe that Thomas Jefferson spoke for us all when he affirmed his faith that "to preserve the freedom of the human mind and freedom of the press, every spirit should be ready to devote itself to martyrdom, for as long as we think, as we will, and speak as we think, the condition of man will proceed in improvement."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the names of the other participants in the roundtable discussion, which included questions and responses by leading officials of our Government, Cabinet officers, and leading businessmen.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARKETING, AMERICA'S FUTURE

Sequence of questions and answers gaging the state of the Nation within the area of interest enunciated by theme. All questions are asked by the moderator—with answers in the following order—all operating under a 2-minute rule.

Moderator: Richard L. Harkness, distinguished NBC news analyst and commentator.

Responses: Luther H. Hodges, Secretary of Commerce; Birny Mason, Jr., president, Union Carbide Corp.; C. Douglas Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury; Louis Scheyven, Ambassador of Belgium; Frederick R. Kappel, chairman of the board, American Telephone & Telegraph Co.; J. Edward Day, the Postmaster General; Wilhelm C. Grewe, Ambassador of Germany; Lawrence Litchfield, Jr., president, Aluminum Co. of America; Robert S. McNamara, Secretary of Defense.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to join with the Senator from Minnesota in extending high compliments to the Vice President for the very deserved honor that was bestowed upon him in receiving the Silver Quill.

MINNESOTA NET FARM INCOME UP 15 PERCENT IN 1961

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I call to the attention of the Senate a news story that appeared in the Minneapolis Morning Tribune for Wednesday, January 31. This is good news. It is the kind of news that people of the Midwest, and particularly of Minnesota, like to read. The headline of the story reads, "Net Farm Income Up 15 Percent in 1961."

This is the kind of evidence and testimony that dispels any doubt as to the effectiveness of the Kennedy-Freeman farm program and agricultural policies.

Last evening there were certain speakers at dinners throughout the Nation. They were fundraising dinners at which there was a certain amount of political fun underway. At those dinners comments were made as to the "terrible" things that were happening under the Kennedy administration to American agriculture. I noticed again the Governor of New York was still on that "wavelength." I regret that fact, because I think he is a much better man than his remarks indicated. The fact that farm income is up $1 billion in the Nation is surely worthy of comment and commendation. Speaking as a Minnesotan, I am pleased to see it went up 15 percent in the State of Minnesota.

I ask unanimous consent that the news article to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NET FARM INCOME UP 15 PERCENT IN 1961

Minnesota farm income climbed substantially in 1961, aided by a record crop and a stepped up program of Federal payments.

Net farm income increased some 15 percent.

Cash receipts from sales of Minnesota farm products were up for the second consecutive year and showed an increase of $45 million.

Government payments increased from $32 million in 1960 to $79 million in 1961.

Those were the highlights of the annual farm income report compiled by Elmer Learn, University of Minnesota agricultural economist, and reported in the January issue of Farm Business Notes, department of agricultural economics publication.

Cash receipts in 1961 totaled $1,468 million compared with $1,423 million in 1960. The increase was due mainly to better prices for hogs, milk, and soybeans.

Despite drought in northern Minnesota and the Government's program to retire corn and sorghum acres, total crop production exceeded the 1960 record by 2 percent. Feed grain tonnage was reduced about 2 percent by the emergency feed grain program but higher production of other crops, principally soybeans, was responsible for the overall increase.

Cash receipts from crops totaled $386 million compared with $374 million in 1960.

Corn, the State's leading cash crop, set a new record with an average of 64.5 bushels an acre, up 10.5 bushels from 1960. Market prices for corn averaged only slightly higher than 1960 but the increased support price to $1.20 a bushel helped boost cash receipts.

Minnesota's soybean acreage increased for the first time in 3 years. The 2,341,000 acres were far below the 1958 record harvest of 3,082,000 acres but a large yield increase of 24 bushels an acre resulted in a new record yield of 56,184,000 bushels.

The highest market prices since 1953—at $3.01 a bushel last April—and an increase in support price to $2.30 a bushel were factors that led to increased production and higher income from soybeans.

Sales of livestock and livestock products continued at record levels with an increase of almost $40 million over 1960. Higher prices for dairy products and hogs were mainly responsible.

Cash receipts for cattle and calves rose slightly to $359 million in 1961. Hog producers had their best year since 1958 as prices were up more than 7 percent. Cash sales rose to $231 million, up $22 million from 1960.

Minnesota dairy farmers received $315 million from sales of milk and cream, the first time that cash receipts for dairy products exceeded $300 million. Production remained relatively constant but average prices rose more than 5 percent.

Most of the price rise was the result of increase in national average support prices for manufacturing milk—from $3.06 to $3.22 in November 1960, and to $3.40 in April 1961.

Direct Government payments rose from $32 million to $79 million. Most of the increase resulted from payments for land retirement under the new emergency feed grain programs. These payments amounted to $47 million. Storage payments for Commodity Credit Corporation resealed grain on Minnesota farms were $8 million in 1961.

Production expenses probably rose slightly above the 1960 record of $1,159 million as farmers continued to employ more off-farm inputs.

PROCEDURE IN MORNING HOUR

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, are we still in the morning hour?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senate is still in the morning hour.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have been twice taken off the floor when I have exceeded 3 minutes. I have never, in the last 2 years, been able to speak more than 3 minutes. During this morning the distinguished acting minority leader and the distinguished assistant majority leader have kept the floor beyond the 3 minutes. I expect to be treated like every other Senator in the future. If Senators are going to exceed the 3-minute limitation during the morning hour, I am going to exercise my rights under the rules and ask that they be seated, or I am going to ask for 10 minutes——

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Chair will state that the Senators held the floor by unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I ask the Chair if the Senator from Minnesota got unanimous consent to hold the floor.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Minnesota got unanimous consent.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It must have been in a low voice. I was listening as carefully as I could. I did not hear it. I have the greatest respect for the Presiding Officer, but I would appreciate it if, when a unanimous-consent request is made, he would repeat it so every Senator can hear it. I have 20–20 hearing. [Laughter.]

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Minnesota has been here since 12 o'clock. We had the 3-minute rule. A number of Senators asked to have it amended so they might speak longer, to which the Senator from Minnesota acceded, not out of desire, but for comity in this body. I will see that each Senator adheres to 3 minutes; I do not care who asks that the time be changed. The Senator from Minnesota does not want it changed. Every Senator who has exceeded the time specified has asked that the rule be amended. If the Senator from Wisconsin wants the rule amended so that he is on an equal basis with the other Senators, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Wisconsin gets all the time he wants.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am going to take a short time.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President——

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from New York reserves the right to object.

Mr. JAVITS. I wish the Senator from Minnesota would amend that request to 10 minutes or 15 minutes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Wisconsin is going to take only 3 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Of course; I know that.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, how long is the morning hour?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The morning hour will expire at 2 o'clock.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Two o'clock. Very well.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I have often asked unanimous consent that my time be extended; I have never received permission. It has always been denied me. I appreciate the courtesy of the distinguished acting majority leader.

SMALL BUSINESS IN BETTER POSITION TO SHARE BIG GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, as chairman of the Small Business Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee, I rise to inform the Senate on the administrative implementation of the law we enacted last year to give small business a greater opportunity to share in the Government's defense contracts.

The Defense Department, General Services Administration, and the Small Business Administration are to be complimented for the dispatch with which the small business subcontracting program has been implemented and put into effect. The regulations to be issued conform to the law. We appear to have made a good beginning to the program.

We will have to wait to see how the program develops and what changes are needed in both the basic law and the regulations.

Of course, the success of the program will depend upon the cooperation that exists between SBA and the procuring agencies. I understand that this cooperation so far is satisfactory. It will also depend on the cooperation of the various prime contractors. Also, the success of the program will depend on the caliber of men that SBA will be able to secure to carry out SBA's part of the program. SBA will request 15 additional men to work on this program. I earnestly hope the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate will agree to this number. The SBA is already recruiting men to serve in these jobs. It wants to get capable men from industry and possibly from some of the procuring agencies of the Government, and also assign capable men from existing SBA personnel.

I understand that SBA's tentative plans are to place a man in New York, one in Philadelphia, one in Chicago, one in Los Angeles, one in Dayton, and two or three here in Washington. This should cover the main areas in the country where a majority of the procurements are made. This seems to me to be a big order for such a small staff, but during the long fight we pointed out that the program would not require a large SBA force to administer.

I expect to receive a monthly report on the development of this program, and will watch closely as the program develops.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter from Assistant Secretary of Defense Thomas D. Morris, reporting to me on this program, together with an analysis of the small business subcontracting program, a copy of the 15 principles or concepts agreed upon by SBA, GSA, and Defense as appropriate for special regulations, and a copy of the existing implementing regulations, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., January 17, 1962.

Hon. WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: Public Law 87-305, approved September 25, 1961, amended the Small Business Act in several respects, including a requirement that the Small Business Administrator, the Secretary of Defense, and the Administrator of General Services Administration cooperatively develop a small business subcontracting program within 90 days. The Secretary of Defense and the Administrator of GSA are also required to promulgate regulations implementing the program as developed after obtaining the concurrence of SBA in such regulations.

Prior to enactment of this legislation, the Department of Defense had rather extensive procurement regulations and directives which together constituted a small business subcontracting program. Immediately after approval of Public Law 87–305, representatives of the three agencies met and conferred on this matter at length. As the result of these conferences, some 15 principles or concepts were agreed upon as appropriate for implementation by more specific regulations. It was also agreed that these principles and their implementing regulations, along with existing regulations, would constitute the small business subcontracting program contemplated by the law.

I believe you were previously furnished, by letter from SBA, a preliminary set of these specific points. Since that time, they have been modified in minor respects, and enclosure B is a copy of the revised principles. The implementing regulations are enclosure C. For your convenience, we are also providing in enclosure A an analysis of our overall small business subcontracting program, including the relationship between the principles and their implementing regulations.

Sincerely,

THOMAS D. MORRIS,
Assistant Secretary of Defense,
Installations and Logistics.

ENCLOSURE A

Section I, part 7, of ASPR is the principal source of policy and procedural guidance available to procurement officials regarding small business generally and, as is noted in ASPR 1–700, this part contains a section devoted to subcontracting. ASPR 1–702 states the general policy of the Department of Defense regarding small business participation in defense contract work and specifically refers procurement officials to the paragraph (ASPR 1–707) concerning subcontracting.

ASPR 1–707.1 states the general policy that small business concerns shall be considered fairly as subcontractors. This policy statement includes a provision implementing that part of Public Law 87–305 requiring prime contractors and subcontractors in the small business subcontracting program to consult with the administration at its request and through the procuring agency. It also provides, in accordance with Public Law 87–305, that SBA is not authorized to prescribe the extent to which any contractor shall subcontract or specify concerns to which subcontracts shall be granted and further provides that the policy does not vest in the administration authority respecting the administration of individual contracts.

ASPR 1–707.2 prescribes two types of contractual provisions to insure small business participation at the subcontract level. This subsection of ASPR, and the clauses cited therein, have already been revised to eliminate reference to labor surplus area subcontracting, in accordance with the first principle developed under Public Law 87–305.

The first clause, found at ASPR 1–707.3(a), is required in contracts in the range of $5,000 to $500,000 and is a general requirement to use small business subcontractors to the maximum extent practicable.

The second clause, which is the principal part of the small business subcontracting program, is found at ASPR 1–707.3(b), and is required for use in certain large contracts offering substantial subcontracting possibilities. It places more specific requirements on contractors than the first clause. A similar clause, used in the subcontracting program prior to Public Law 87–305, was included in all contracts (except negotiated contracts with foreign concerns, contracts for personal services, contracts to be performed entirely outside the United States, its possessions and Puerto Rico, and contracts for construction) in excess of $1 million and which offered substantial subcontracting possibilities. Regarding similar contracts, but for an amount of less than $1 million, ASPR previously had required that contractors be urged to follow the requirements of this clause.

In accordance with the second principle, the scope of this defense small business subcontracting program has been revised to conform to Public Law 87–305, i.e., so as to be applicable to all contracts, except contracts to be performed entirely outside the United States (the clause is also not included in personal services contracts since, by their nature, they do not involve substantial subcontracting possibilities), which offer substantial subcontracting possibilities; however, whereas Public Law 87–305 requires application to contracts of $1 million or more, it has been agreed that the clause shall be included in contracts of only $500,000 or more. Contractors having similar contracts but for an amount of less than $500,000 are encouraged to accept the clause. Public Law 87–305 provides for inclusion of this subcontracting clause in subcontracts of $500,000 or more, whereas ASPR previously had required inclusion only in subcontracts of $1 million or more. The requirement regarding inclusion of the clause in subcontracts has been revised to conform to Public Law 87–305.

As has been noted, the clause found in ASPR 1–707.3(b) is the principal component of the small business subcontracting program. There follows a description of the requirements and scope of this clause with particular emphasis on the changes which have been made to accommodate some of the principles developed in accordance with Public Law 87–305.

The first paragraph of the clause sets forth the overall requirement of the contractor to conduct a subcontracting program which will enable small business concerns to be considered fairly as subcontractors and suppliers. This portion of the clause had previously provided that the contractor would afford small business concerns an equitable opportunity to compete for defense subcontracts within their capabilities. Having established the general requirement, the clause then sets forth the following specific requirements:

"1. The designation of a liaison officer to maintain liaison with the Government (the previous clause had required liaison with the purchasing activity and this was increased in scope to provide for liaison with the Government since the new subcontracting program contemplates more extensive participation by the administration than had been the case previously). This liaison officer will also supervise compliance with the small business subcontracting clause and administer the contractor's small business subcontracting program.

"2. As had been the case in the previous clause, the contractor is required to provide adequate and timely consideration of the potentialities of small business concerns in all make-or-buy decisions, and to assure that small business concerns will have an equitable opportunity to compete for subcontracts by arranging solicitations, time for the preparation of bids, quantities, specifications and delivery schedules so as to facilitate small business participation. To this part of the clause, in accordance with the 11th principle, there has been added the requirement that, if a contractor's lists of potential small business subcontractors are excessively long, a reasonable effort shall be made to give all small business concerns an opportunity to compete over a period of time.

"3. The clause also requires the contractor to maintain records indicating which of its subcontractors are small business concerns and the procedures which have been adopted to comply with the provisions of the clause. To this record maintenance requirement has been added an additional requirement in accordance with the 10th principle (i.e., with respect to the letting of any subcontract exceeding $10,000 information must be retained indicating whether the award went to small business; whether less than three or more small business concerns were solicited; the reason for nonsolicitation of small business, if such was the case; and the reason for small business failing to receive the award, if such was the case, when small business is solicited. With respect to this new requirement, the information must be summarized quarterly and submitted by the purchasing department of each individual plant or division to the contractor's small business liaison officer. The records need not be submitted to the Government but must be kept available for review.

"4. Another new requirement which has been made a part of the clause in implementation of the fifth principle, is one requiring the contractor to notify the contracting officer before soliciting bids or quotations on any subcontracts in excess of $10,000 if: (1) no small business concern is to be solicited, and (2) the contracting officer's consent to the subcontract was required by another provision of the contract. The notice will state the contractor's reason for nonsolicitation and will be given as early as possible in the procurement cycle in order that the contracting officer may give the administration timely notice to permit the administration to suggest potentially qualified small business concerns through the contracting officer; however, in no case will the procurement action be delayed by this procedure, when to do so would delay performance of the contract.

"5. The clause, as has been the case prior to Public Law 87-305, also requires the contractor to include the ASPR 1-707.3(a) clause in all subcontracts, without regard to amount but which offer substantial small business subcontracting opportunities.

"6. Another new requirement, included to satisfy the seventh principle, requires the contractor to cooperate with the contracting officer in any studies and surveys of the contractor's subcontracting procedures and practices which the contracting officer may from time to time conduct.

"7. The requirement to submit reports on DD Form 1140 (a copy of which is attached) has been continued in the new clause. In accordance with the eighth principle, an effort is underway to develop a standard subcontract report for use by contractors throughout the Government.

"8. That part of the clause which defines small business concerns has been revised in accordance with the 13th principle to provide that SBA size standards for prime contractors shall be utilized by the contractor in ascertaining those subcontractors and suppliers which are in the small business category.

"9. In implementation of the 14th principle, the clause has been expanded to include a provision to the effect that, in the event the contractor fails to comply with the obligations of the clause, the contract may be terminated in whole or in part for default.

"10. The last provision of the clause, which requires the contractor to insert provisions substantially similar to the small business subcontracting program clause in subcontracts, has been amended to include a provision requiring the contractor to notify the contracting officer of the names of any subcontractors."

Section 1-7074 of ASPR establishes responsibility for the review of contractor's subcontracting programs. Two new features, subsections (c) and (d), have been added to this section, in accordance with the 15th principle, to insure assignment of responsibility for review of individual contracts and subcontracts.

Section 1-707.5 provides for the proper submission of reports of contractor's subcontracting activities on DD Form 1140. This section is the same as had previously been included in ASPR.

Section 1-707.6 is a new section, added to implement the seventh principle, providing for purchasing office and contracting officer cooperation in studies and surveys of subcontracting undertaken by the Administration. It requires purchasing activities to assist the Administration in obtaining reasonably obtainable information and records, as the Administration may deem necessary, concerning subcontracting by prime contractors and subcontractors in the small business subcontracting program. It provides that the contracting officer or his representative, separately, or together with a representative of the Administration may periodically conduct studies and surveys of contractor's subcontracting activities. These surveys may be initiated by the purchasing activity in order to be available for use by the Administration or they may originate upon the request of the Administration. This section also provides that on the basis of the studies and surveys, and records obtained thereby, the Administration may make recommendations to the purchasing activities regarding methods to increase small business participation in subcontract awards, and further provides that the SBA and the purchasing activity will freely interchange, at the operating level, information resulting from these surveys.

Section 1-707.7 has been added to implement the ninth principle and provides that, to the extent subcontracting records are maintained by the purchasing activity, such records shall be made available to SBA, upon request, for review.

ASPR section III is devoted to the technique of negotiating contracts. A number of individual provisions contained in this section had constituted a major part of the small business subcontracting policy of the DOD. ASPR 3-000 describes the scope of section III as including subcontracting policies and procedures.

ASPR 3-101 sets forth the factors to be considered when negotiating contracts. ASPR 3-101(x) provides that consideration should be given to the size of the business concern and contains a reference to section I, part 7 which is the principal small business section. ASPR 3-101(xv) provides for the consideration of the extent to which subcontracting will be utilized and this provision together with a revision of ASPR 3-808 constitutes the implementation of the sixth principle which has been agreed to. It should also be noted that provision has been made to give favorable consideration to the extensive use of small business subcontractors in advertised procurement. ASPR 2-407.6(a)(3) which deals with the disposition of equal low bids and the award of contracts in such situations, has been revised to include an additional priority, i.e., if, after application of the small business and labor surplus considerations, two or more bidders are eligible for award, the award will be made to that eligible bidder which will make the most extensive use of small business subcontracting, rather than by drawing lots.

ASPR 3-104, headed "Aids in Small Business in Negotiated Procurement," refers the procurement personnel to section I, part 7.

ASPR 3-107 deals with the selection of research and development contractors and requires substantial effort on the part of purchasing activities to encourage small business participation.

ASPR 3-800 describes part 8 of section III as relating to price negotiation policies and techniques applicable to negotiated prime contracts and those subcontracts subject to approval or review. ASPR 3-807.5 sets forth specific considerations regarding the effect of subcontracting on contract pricing and includes a reference to part 9 of section III. ASPR 3-808.2(h) sets forth the factors for determining fee and profit and includes, in subparagraph (h), the nature and extent of subcontracting. This paragraph contains the significant policy statement that the extent of the contractor's past and present effectiveness in offering subcontracting opportunities to small business concerns should be favorably considered in establishing the fee. It has been agreed that this policy should be continued as a part of the small business subcontracting program and it has been expanded to give more detailed guidance.

Section III, part 9 pertains to subcontracting policies and procedures including policies and procedures for the evaluation, review, and approval of contractor's make-or-buy programs, purchasing systems, and proposed subcontracts. Throughout this part ample provision is made for consideration of the extent to which small business will be afforded an opportunity to participate at the subcontract level. There are clauses to be included in contracts to implement this part. These clauses insure control and review of the contractor's subcontracting practices.

Section 3-901, which provides general guidance to contracting personnel concerning subcontracting, contains the statement that a contractor's proposed subcontracting program may be important regarding the contractor's compliance with Government policies regarding small business. It provides that, where make-or-buy decisions will have a substantial impact on the small business policy, the contractor's make-or-buy and subcontracting programs should, to the extent practicable, be evaluated and agreed on during negotiations.

Section 9-902, which relates to make-or-buy programs, has been amended by adding a new subsection which has been inserted as subparagraph (g) immediately following the existing subparagraph (f). The remaining subsections have been renumbered (h) through (l). This new (g) provides guidance to the contracting officer with respect to a contractor's proposal to make an item in situations where the contractor either does not regularly manufacture the item or provide the service, or where the contractor does regularly manufacture the item or provide the service. This provision was added to implement the third principle.

ASPR 3-902.1(e) and 3-903.3(IV) provide for consideration of the Government's small business policies in reviewing and approving a contractor's make-or-buy and purchasing systems.

In implementation of the fourth principle, ASPR section 3-902.1(f), which had provided that in evaluating a contractor's make-or-buy program, the purchasing activity would obtain the advice and assistance of all appropriate personnel whose knowledge would have contributed to all facets of the review, has been revised to include a requirement that, before the purchasing activity agrees to a make-or-buy program (or consents to any changes therein which in the opinion of the contracting officer would reduce the anticipated participation of small business), the purchasing activity shall invite the advice and counsel of the Administration by permitting Administration representatives regularly assigned to the activity to review all pertinent facts and make recommendations thereon. This review by the Administration should be concurrent with the review by the purchasing activity and, where urgent circumstances do not permit such a concurrent review, or where SBA fails to respond on a timely basis, the contracting officer should include an explanatory statement in the file, transmitting a copy to the Administration representative.

The 12th principle provides that the Administration will conduct educational programs, in collaboration with Government contractors and others, designed to provide small business capability for future contracts for types of procurement where no qualified small business concerns are currently available. No specific implementation of this principle is necessary in procurement agency regulations since the burden rests with the Administration. Certain of the recordkeeping and reporting requirements will assist the Administration in this regard.

ENCLOSURE B

PRINCIPLES TO BE INCORPORATED IN THE SMALL BUSINESS SUBCONTRACTING PROGRAM CONTEMPLATED BY PUBLIC LAW 87-305

1. Separation of small business subcontracting program from labor surplus program

Small business subcontracting programs and labor surplus area programs are combined under ASPR 1-707 and FPR 1-1.710. In view of the fact that a statute now prescribes the content of and the manner of establishing a small business subcontracting program, which is not the case with respect to labor surplus area subcontracting, there was general agreement regarding the desirability of divorcing the small business subcontracting program from the labor surplus subcontracting program. In reaching agreement on this principle, it was recognized that a restatement of the labor surplus subcontracting program, elsewhere in the procurement regulations, would be necessary.

2. Conform scope of present program to new law

The scope of the subcontracting program will provide that—

"Every contract for property or services (including but not limited to contracts for research and development, maintenance, repair, and construction, but excluding contracts to be performed entirely outside of the United States or its territories) in excess of $1 million made by a Government department or agency, which in the opinion of the procuring agency offers substantial subcontracting possibilities, shall require the contractor to conform to the small business subcontracting program promulgated under this subsection, and to insert in all subcontracts and purchase orders in excess of $500,000, which offer substantial possibilities for further subcontracting, a provision requiring the subcontractor or supplier to conform to such small business subcontracting program."

Notwithstanding the fact that the statute sets a $1 million figure above which prime contractors must be included in the subcontracting program, there was general agreement that prime contractors obtaining contracts over $500,000 should be included in the program.

3. Modify make-or-buy program

In order to give small business firms a better opportunity to participate in subcontracting, "make" programs of prime contractors, subject to approval under ASPR 3-902, shall not be approved when the products or services to be supplied in fulfilling the contract:

(a) Are not regularly manufactured or provided by the contractor, and are available—quality, quantity, delivery, and other essential factors considered—from other firms at prices no higher than if the contractor makes or provides the product or service; or

(b) Are regularly manufactured or provided by the contractor, and are available—quality, quantity, delivery, and other essential factors considered—from other firms at prices lower than if the contractor makes or provides the product or service.

4. Small Business Administration's role in make-or-buy decision

Prior to approving make-or-buy programs, or changes therein which, in the opinion of the contracting officer, would reduce the contemplated participation of small business, contracting officers shall invite the advice and counsel of the SBA by enabling SBA personnel to review all pertinent facts and make recommendations thereon to the contracting officer. Such review by SBA should be on a concurrent basis with the review of the contracting officer. Where urgent circumstances do not permit such a concurrent review, or where SBA fails to respond on a timely basis to the invitation to participate, the contracting officer shall document the file with a full statement of the reasons therefore, and transmit a copy for the information of the SBA.

5. Providing for SBA assistance in locating qualified small businesses

On any purchase orders or subcontracts requiring the approval (or ratification) of the contracting officer under the terms of the prime contract with the Government, where no small businesses are to be solicited, the contractor shall, prior to soliciting quotations or bids for the placement of purchase orders or subcontracts, notify the contracting officer of the procurement, together with the reasons why no small business firms are to be solicited. It will be the responsibility of the contracting officer to notify the SBA of any such transactions and the reasons therefor. Such notification by the contracting officer will be made as early in the procurement cycle as possible so that the SBA may suggest potentially qualified small business firms through the procuring agency. SBA will be given a reasonable period in which to suggest such sources, but in no case will the procurement action be held up when such action would delay the contractor's performance under the contract.

6. Consider incentive provisions of new law

Consideration shall be given to extensive subcontracting in evaluating bids or selecting contractors for negotiated contracts.

7. Studies and surveys

Each procurring agency shall assist the Small Business Administration to obtain such reasonably obtainable information and records concerning the subcontracting of its prime contractors and its subcontractors as the Small Business Administration may deem necessary. Accordingly, each procuring agency shall provide in all of its prime contracts containing the small business subcontracting program clause that the contracting officer may periodically conduct studies and surveys of the contractor's subcontracting procedures and practices and those of his subcontractors. Such studies and surveys may originate with the procuring agency in order to have available the pertinent data concerning subcontracting by its primes, or, if such data is not currently available, the studies and surveys may originate upon the request of the Small Business Administration for such data. They may be made by the contracting officer or his designated representative, or by the contracting officer or his designated representative together with a representative of the Small Business Administration. On the basis of the foregoing studies and surveys, the Small Business Administration may make recommendations to the procuring agency regarding methods for increasing small business participation in the contractor's subcontract awards. SBA and the procuring agency will freely interchange, at the operating level, information resulting from these surveys.

8. Subcontract statistics

To the extent practicable, it will be desirable to employ a standard subcontract report throughout the Government.

9. SBA review of agency records

The program shall provide that, to the extent subcontracting records are maintained by Government offices, such records shall be made available to SBA, upon request, for review.

10. Buyer's records

Contractors subject to the program shall be required to maintain records with respect to the letting of each subcontract or purchase order exceeding $10,000, which records will reflect information substantially as follows:

(a) How many large and how many small firms were solicited.

(b) How many large and how many small firms bid.

(c) What firm(s) received the award.

(d) Why small business did not receive the award if bids were received from one or more small businesses.

11. Management of long bidder's list

Prime and subcontractors within the subcontracting program, which have excessively long lists of small business suppliers need not solicit all such suppliers on each procurement but should make efforts to give all such small business suppliers an equitable opportunity to compete over a period of time.

12. Educational programs

In connection wth types of procurement where no qualified small business concerns are available, but procurement potentially could be performed by small business, SBA shall arrange educational programs in collaboration with Government contractors and others, which are designated to provide small business capability for future contracts.

13. Size standards

The same size standards which apply to prime contracting shall apply to subcontracting.

14. Remedial action in the event of noncompliance with subcontracting program

In the event any prime contractor fails to comply with his contractual obligations concerning the small business subcontracting program, his contract may be terminated pursuant to the standard default clause of the contract.

15. Agency responsibilities

In furtherance of the provisions of section 8 of the Small Business Act, as amended, the SBA, in carrying out its responsibilities pertaining to Government contracts, will deal through the appropriate Government contracting officer who will continue to be responsible for all final actions with contractors, subcontractors, and prospective contractors.

ENCLOSURE C

1-707 Subcontracting with small business concerns.

1-707.1 General.

(a) It is the policy of the Government to enable small business concerns to be considered fairly as subcontractors to contractors performing work or rendering services as prime contractors or subcontractors under Government procurement contracts, and to assure that prime contractors and subcontractors having small business subcontracting programs will consult through the purchasing activity with the SBA at its request.

(b) The SBA is not authorized, however, to prescribe the extent to which any contractor or subcontractor shall subcontract or specify the concerns to which subcontracts shall be granted, nor does it vest in SBA authority respecting the administration of individual prime contracts or subcontracts.

1-707.2 Small business subcontracting program.

The Government's small business subcontracting program requires Government prime contractors to assume an affirmative obligation with respect to subcontracting with small business concerns. In contracts which range from $5,000 to $500,000, the contractor undertakes the obligation of accomplishing the maximum amount of small business subcontracting which is consistent with the efficient performance of the contract. This undertaking is set forth in the contract clause prescribed in 1-707.3(a). In contracts which may exceed $500,000, the contractor is required, pursuant to the clause set forth in 1-707.3(b) to undertake a number of specific responsibilities designed to assure that small business concerns are considered fairly in the subcontracting role and to impose similar responsibilities on major subcontractors. (The liaison officer required by the latter clause may also serve as liaison officer for labor surplus area matters.)

1-707.3 Required clauses.

(a) The "utilization of small business concerns" clause below shall be included in all contracts in amounts which may exceed $5,000 except (i) contracts which, including all subcontracts thereunder, are to be performed entirely outside the United States, its possessions, and Puerto Rico; and (ii) contracts for services which are personal in nature:

Utilization of small business concerns (January 1958):

(a) It is the policy of the Government as declared by the Congress that a fair proportion of the purchases and contracts for supplies and services for the Government be placed with small business concerns.

(b) The contractor agrees to accomplish the maximum amount of subcontracting to small business concerns that the contractor finds to be consistent with the efficient performance of this contract.

(b) The "small business subcontracting program" clause below shall be included in all contracts which may exceed $500,000, which contain the clause required by (a) above and which, in the opinion of the purchasing activity, offer substantial subcontracting possibilities. Prime contractors who are to be awarded contracts that do not exceed $500,000 but which, in the opinion of the purchasing activity, offer substantial subcontracting possibilities, shall be urged to accept the clause.

Small business subcontracting program (January 1962):

(a) The contractor agrees to establish and conduct a small business subcontracting program which will enable small business concerns to be considered fairly as subcontractors and suppliers under this contract. In this connection, the contractor shall—

(1) Designate a liaison officer who will (i) maintain liaison with the Government on small business matters, (ii) supervise compliance with the "utilization of small business concerns" clause, and (iii) administer the contractor's "small business subcontracting program."

(2) Provide adequate and timely consideration of the potentialities of small business concerns in all "make-or-buy" decisions.

(3) Assure that small business concerns will have an equitable opportunity to compete for subcontracts, particularly by arranging solicitations, time for the preparation of bids, quantities, specifications, and delivery schedules so as to facilitate the participation of small business concerns. Where the contractor's lists of potential small business subcontractors are excessively long, reasonable effort shall be made to give all such small business concerns an opportunity to compete over a period of time.

(4) Maintain records showing (i) whether each prospective subcontractor is a small business concern, (ii) procedures which have been adopted to comply with the policies set forth in this clause, and (iii) with respect to the letting of any subcontract (including purchase orders) exceeding $10,000, information substantially as follows:

(A) Whether the award went to large or small business.

(B) Whether less than three or more than two small business concerns were solicited.

(C) The reason for nonsolicitation of small business if such was the case.

(D) The reason for small business failure to receive the award if such was the case when small business was solicited.

The records maintained in accordance with (iii) above may be in such form as the individual contractor may determine, and the information shall be summarized quarterly and submitted by the purchasing department of each individual plant or division to the contractor's cognizant small business liaison officer. Such quarterly summaries will be considered to be management records only and need not be submitted routinely to the Government; however, records maintained pursuant to this clause will be kept available for review.

(5) Notify the contracting officer before soliciting bids or quotations on any subcontract (including purchase orders) in excess of $10,000 if (i) no small business concern is to be solicited, and (ii) the contracting officer's consent to the subcontract (or ratification) is required by a "subcontracts" clause in this contract. Such notice will state the contractor's reasons for nonsolicitation of small business concerns, and will be given as early in the procurement cycle as possible so that the contracting officer may give the Small Business Administration timely notice to permit SBA a reasonable period to suggest potentially qualified small business concerns through the contracting officer. In no case will the procurement action be held up when to do so would, in the contractor's judgment, delay performance under the contract.

(6) Include the "utilization of small business concerns" clause in subcontracts which offer substantial small business subcontracting opportunities.

(7) Cooperate with the contracting officer in any studies and surveys of the contractor's subcontracting procedures and practices that the contracting officer may from time to time conduct.

(8) Submit DD Form 1140 reports, in triplicate, to the military department that reviews his subcontracting program, except that where the contractor elects to report on a corporate rather than a plant basis, he may submit his reports to the military department having industrial readiness planning responsibility at the corporate headquarters.

(b) A "small business concern" is a concern that meets the pertinent criteria established by the SBA and set forth in paragraph 1-701 of the armed services procurement regulation.

(c) The contractor agrees that, in the event he fails to comply with his contractual obligations concerning the small business subcontracting program, this contract may be terminated, in whole or in part, for default.

(d) The contractor further agrees to insert, in any subcontract hereunder which is in excess of $500,000 and which contains the "utilization of small business concerns" clause, provisions which shall conform substantially to the language of this clause, including this paragraph (d), and to notify the contracting officer of the names of such subcontractors; except that the subcontractor will submit the DD Form 1140 reports to the military department having industrial readiness planning responsibility or plant cognizance. (A subcontractor may request advice from the nearest military purchasing or contract administration activity as to the military department to which he should submit his reports.)

1-707.4 Responsibility for reviewing the subcontracting program.

(a) Only one department shall be responsible for reviewing a contractor's small business subcontracting program. Subject to (b) below, such review shall be the responsibility of—

(1) The department having industrial readiness planning responsibility at the plant where the contract is being performed; or

(2) If (1) above is inapplicable, the department having plant cognizance procurement responsibility (see 5-1100.2(ii)); or

(3) If neither (1) nor (2) above is applicable, the department assigned the responsibility through coordinated action of the Director of Small Business Policy of the Department of Defense and the small business advisors of the departments.

(b) In appropriate instances, however, when jointly determined by the Director of Small Business Policy and the small business advisors of the departments, criteria other than those specified in (a) above may be used in assigning responsibility to a department for reviewing an individual contractor's small business subcontracting program.

(c) The department placing a contract with a prime contractor containing the "small business subcontracting program" clause shall either (i) assume responsibility for reviewing the subcontracting program of the prime contractor if such department meets the criteria specified in (a) or (b) above, or (ii) promptly request in writing the small business advisor of the department which does meet such criteria to assume responsibility for review of this program.

(d) Promptly upon receipt of the names of subcontractors who will participate in the small business subcontracting program, the department concerned will assume, or provide for the assumption of, responsibility for review of each subcontractor's program in accordance with the procedures set forth in (a) or (b) above.

(e) The responsible department will determine the adequacy of the contractor's small business subcontracting program and bring any deficiencies to the attention of the contractor's designated liaison officer with a request for corrective action.

1-707.5 Reports on DD Form 1140.

(a) In connection with the submission of DD Form 1140 reports under the "small business subcontracting program" clause, a subcontractor may contact the nearest military purchasing or contract administration activity and request advice as to the department to which he should submit reports. The military purchasing or contract administration activity shall, through channels, submit such a request to the small business advisor of the department concerned. The small business advisor shall submit it to the Director for Small Business Policy of the Department of Defense for his determination in coordination with the small business advisors of the departments.

(b) Each department shall forward to the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), by March 15 and September 15, a copy of each DD Form 1140 received for the semiannual periods ending December 31 and June 30, respectively.

1–707.6 Subcontracting studies and surveys: Each purchasing activity shall assist the SBA to obtain such reasonably obtainable information and records concerning the subcontracting of its prime contractors and its subcontractors, having contracts that contain the Small Business Subcontracting Program clause, as the SBA may deem necessary. Accordingly, the contracting officer or his representative, separately, or together with a representative of SBA may periodically conduct studies and surveys of the contractor's subcontracting procedures and practices and those of his subcontractors. Such studies and surveys may originate with the purchasing activity in order to have available the pertinent data concerning subcontracting by its primes, or, if such data is not currently available, the studies and surveys may originate upon the request of the SBA for such data. On the basis of the foregoing studies, surveys, and records, the SBA may make recommendations to the purchasing activity regarding methods for increasing small business participation in subcontract awards. SBA and the purchasing activity will freely interchange, at the operating level, information resulting from these surveys.

1–707.7 SBA review of agency records: To the extent that subcontracting records are maintained in purchasing or contract administration activities, such records shall be made available to SBA, upon request, for review.

1–805 Subcontracting with labor surplus area concerns.

1–805.1 General policy: It is the policy of the Government to promote equitable opportunities for labor surplus area concerns to compete for defense subcontracts and to encourage placement of subcontracts with concerns which will perform such contracts substantially in areas of persistent or substantial labor surplus, in the order of priority described in 1–802 where this can be done, consistent with efficient performance of contracts, at prices no higher than are obtainable elsewhere.

1–805.2 Labor surplus area subcontracting program: The Government's labor surplus area subcontracting program requires Government prime contractors to assume an affirmative obligation with respect to subcontracting with labor surplus area concerns. In contracts which range from $5,000 to $500,000, the contractor undertakes the simple obligation of using his best efforts to place his subcontracts with concerns which will perform such subcontracts substantially in areas of persistent or substantial labor surplus where this can be done, consistent with the efficient performance of the contract, at prices no higher than are obtainable elsewhere. This undertaking is set forth in the contract clause prescribed in 1–805.3 (a). In contracts which may exceed $500,000, the contractor is required, pursuant to the clause set forth in 1–805.3(b), to undertake a number of specific responsibilities designed to insure achievement of the objectives referred to above and to impose similar responsibilities on major subcontractors.

1–805.3 Required clauses.

(a) The "utilization of concerns in labor surplus areas" clause set forth below shall be inserted in all contracts in amounts which may exceed $5,000, except—

(1) Contracts with foreign contractors which, including all subcontracts thereunder, are to be performed entirely outside the United States, its possessions, and Puerto Rico;

(2) Contracts for services which are personal in nature; and

(3) Contracts for construction.

Utilization of concerns in labor surplus areas (January 1962):

It is the policy of the Government to place contracts with concerns which will perform such contracts substantially in areas of persistent or substantial labor surplus where this can be done, consistent with the efficient performance of the contract, at prices no higher than are obtainable elsewhere. The contractor agrees to use his best efforts to place his subcontracts in accordance with this policy. In complying with the foregoing and with paragraph (b) of the clause of this contract entitled "utilization of small business concerns," the contractor in placing his subcontracts shall observe the following order of preference: (i) persistent labor surplus area concerns which are also small business concerns; (ii) other persistent labor surplus area concerns; (iii) substantial labor surplus area concerns which are also small business concerns; (iv) other substantial labor surplus area concerns; and (v) small business concerns which are not labor surplus area concerns.

(b) The "labor surplus area subcontracting program" clause below shall be included in all contracts which may exceed $500,000, but which contain the clause required by (a) above and which, in the opinion of the purchasing activity, offer substantial subcontracting possibilities. Prime contractors who are to be awarded contracts that do not exceed $500,000, which in the opinion of the purchasing activity offer substantial subcontracting possibilities, shall be urged to accept the following clause:

Labor surplus area subcontracting program (January 1962):

(a) The contractor agrees to establish and conduct a program which will encourage labor surplus area concerns to compete for subcontracts within their capabilities. In this connection, the contractor shall—

(1) Designate a liaison officer who will (i) maintain liaison with duly authorized representatives of the Government on labor surplus area matters, (ii) supervise compliance with the utilization of concerns in labor surplus areas clause, and (iii) administer the contractor's labor surplus area subcontracting program;

(2) Provide adequate and timely consideration of the potentialities of labor surplus area concerns in all "make-or-buy" decisions;

(3) Assure that labor surplus area concerns will have an equitable opportunity to compete for subcontracts, particularly by arranging solicitations, time for the preparation of bids, quantities, specifications, and delivery schedules so as to facilitate the participation of labor surplus area concerns;

(4) Maintain records showing procedures which have been adopted to comply with the policies set forth in this clause; and

(5) Include the utilization of concerns in labor surplus areas clause in subcontracts which offer substantial labor surplus area subcontracting opportunities.

(b) A labor surplus area concern is a concern which will perform, or cause to be performed, a substantial proportion of any contract awarded to it in areas of substantial and persistent labor surplus or in areas of substantial labor surplus, as designated by the Department of Labor. A concern shall be deemed to perform a substantial proportion of a contract in a labor surplus area if the costs that the concern will incur on account of manufacturing or production (by itself or its first-tier subcontractors) in such areas amount to more than 50 percent of the price of such contract.

(c) The contractor further agrees, with respect to any subcontract hereunder which is in excess of $500,000 and which contains the clause entitled "utilization of concerns in labor surplus areas," that he will insert provisions in the subcontract which will conform substantially to the language of this clause, including this paragraph (c), and that he will furnish the names of such subcontractors to the contracting officer.

1–805.4 Responsibility for reviewing subcontracting program. Only one department shall be responsible for reviewing a contractor's labor surplus area subcontracting program. Departmental responsibility shall be assigned and carried out in accordance with 1–707.4.

Revise ASPR 3–902 by placing the following subparagraph (g) immediately following subparagraph (f), redesignating the present paragraphs (g) through (k) as (h) through (l).

"(g) Proposed 'make' items shall not be agreed to when the products or services under consideration—

"(i) are not regularly manufactured or provided by the contractor, and in the opinion of the contracting officer are available—quality, quantity, delivery, and other essential factors considered—from other firms at prices no higher than if the contractor should make or provide the product or service; or

"(ii) are regularly manufactured or provided by the contractor, and are available—quality, quantity, delivery, and other essential factors considered—from other firms at prices lower than if the contractor should make or provide the product or services;

Provided, that such items may be agreed to, notwithstanding (i) and (ii), if in the opinion of the contracting officer the overall cost of the contract to the Government would be increased if the item were 'bought.'"

Revise ASPR 3–902(f) as follows:

"(f) The purchasing activity will review the "make-or-buy" program, to determine if all appropriate items are included or if it contains items that should be deleted because of their relatively minor importance. In all considerations relative to a "make-or-buy" program, the purchasing activity will obtain the advice and assistance of all appropriate personnel whose knowledge would contribute to the adequacy of all facets of the review. Before agreeing to a "make-or-buy" program (or consenting to any change therein which, in the opinion of the contracting officer, would reduce the anticipated participation of small business), the purchasing activity shall invite the advice and counsel of the SBA by permitting SBA representatives regularly assigned to the activity to review all pertinent facts and make recommendations thereon. Such review by SBA should be concurrent with the review of the purchasing activity (or, in the case of changes, the contracting officer). Where urgent circumstances do not permit such a concurrent review, or where SBA fails to respond on a timely basis, the contracting officer shall include an explanatory statement in the contract file and shall transmit a copy to the SBA representative."

Revise the following parts of section VII to read as follows:

"7–104.14 Utilization of small business concerns: In accordance with the requirements of 1–707.3(a) insert the clause set forth therein.

"7–104.20 Utilization of concerns in labor surplus areas: In accordance with the requirements of 1–805.3(a) insert the clause set forth therein.

"7–104.22 Small business subcontracting program: In accordance with the requirements of 1–707.3(b) insert the clause set forth therein.

"7–104.38 Labor surplus area subcontracting program: In accordance with the requirements of 1–805.3(b) insert the clause set forth therein.

"7–203.9 Utilization of small business concerns: In accordance with the requirements of 1-707.3(a) insert the clause set forth therein.

"7-203.26 Utilization of concerns in labor surplus areas: In accordance with the requirements of 1-805.3(a) insert the clause set forth therein.

"7-204.19 Small business subcontracting program: In accordance with the requirements of 1-707.3(b) insert the clause set forth therein.

"7-204.29 Labor surplus area subcontracting program: In accordance with the requirements of 1-805.3(b) insert the clause set forth therein.

"7-302.8 Utilization of small business concerns: In accordance with the requirements of 1-707.3(a) insert the clause set forth therein.

"7-302.26 Utilization of concerns in labor surplus areas: In accordance with the requirements of 1-805.3(a) insert the clause set forth therein.

"7-303.11 Small business subcontracting program: In accordance with the requirements of 1-707.3(b) insert the clause set forth therein.

"7-303.25 Labor surplus area subcontracting program: In accordance with the requirements of 1-805.3(b) insert the clause set forth therein.

"7-402.9 Utilization of small business concerns: In accordance with the requirements of 1-707.3(a) insert the clause set forth therein.

"7-402.27 Utilization of concerns in labor surplus areas: In accordance with the requirements of 1-805.3(a) insert the clause set forth therein.

"7-403.13 Small business subcontracting program: In accordance with the requirements of 1-707.3(b) insert the clause set forth therein.

"7-403.24 Labor surplus area subcontracting program: In accordance with requirements of 1-805.3(b) insert the clause set forth therein."

Revise 2-407.6(a)(1) as follows:

"2-407.6 Equal low bids.

"(a)(1) Where two or more low bids are equal in all respects, considering all factors except the priorities set forth in (2) below, award shall be made in accordance with the order of priorities therein. Where two or more low bids are equal in all respects, considering all factors including the priorities set forth in (2) below, award shall be made by a drawing by lot which shall be witnessed by at least three persons and which may be attended by the bidders or their representatives, subject to (3) below.

"(3) If the application of the priorities in (2) above results in two or more bidders being eligible for award, the award shall be made to the concern that will make the most extensive use of small business subcontractors, rather than by drawing lots. If two or more bidders still remain eligible for award, the award shall be made by a drawing by lot limited to such bidders."

ASPR changes to reflect consideration in the contractor's fee for profit in support of the Government's small business and labor surplus area programs.

Revise 1-308(b) to insert a new subparagraph (xxiv) reading as follows:

"(xxiv) information appropriate for renegotiation purposes (see 3-808.6)."

Revise 3-808.2(h) to read as follows:

"(h) Subcontracting: (1) In negotiating the profit or fee, the nature and extent of any subcontracting should be considered, particularly as it bears on the contractor's performance, administrative responsibility, financial investment, and degree of risk as outlined above. The degree and nature of subcontract programs vary on a broad spectrum. While it is not possible to define precisely the exact profit or fee treatment to be accorded each situation, the general guidelines which follow will be taken into consideration.

"(2) The evaluation of a contractor's subcontracting program should not consist merely of applying arbitrary percentages of profit to subcontract prices in negotiating the prime contract price. A relatively large amount of subcontracting need not make for negotiation of a lesser profit or fee—the character and circumstances of the subcontracting and the effect on the prime contractor's costs must be taken into account. Although purchased material and subcontracted work are usually properly included in the base upon which profit is computed, instances may arise in which a significant portion or portions of the contract are subcontracted in such a way that only a minimum amount of responsibility or risk remains with the prime contractor. In such a case, the amount of fee or profit should be less than where the contractor assumes substantial risk. Of primary importance is the degree to which the subcontracting provides a better product and lower costs, with timely delivery, and in which the contractor assumes heavy managerial effort, responsibility and risk.

"(3) In establishing a contractor's fee or profit, favorable consideration shall be given to:

"(i) the company's policies and procedures which energetically support Government, small business, and labor surplus area programs;

"(ii) any unusual efforts which the contractor displays in subcontracting with small business and labor surplus area concerns, particularly for developmental type work likely to result in later production opportunities; and

"(iii) effectiveness of the company in subcontracting with and furnishing assistance to such concerns, as compared to other comparable contractors.

In this connection, it is the responsibility of the purchasing activity to examine the contractor's past and present effectiveness and plans for seeking out qualified small business and labor surplus area concerns, and to require the contractor during negotiations to document his past, present, and planned performance in these areas."

Insert a new paragraph 3-808.6 as set forth below:

"3-808.6 Renegotiation information. The purchasing activity will document the contract file in sufficient detail to indicate those factors considered under 3-808.2(h)(3), so that appropriate information can be supplied to the Renegotiation Board."

FURTHER ARTICLES BY MILWAUKEE JOURNAL'S RUSS LYNCH DOCUMENT NEED TO OVERHAUL WATER DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in a recent series of articles, Mr. Russell G. Lynch, the eminently qualified writer on conservation and natural resources for the Milwaukee Journal, carefully documents the need for a broad overhaul of present Federal policies and programs affecting water management and development. I inserted the first part of Mr. Lynch's series in the Congressional Record of January 29, 1962, where they appear on pages 1061-1063.

These articles brilliantly analyze the present situation in the water development field, describing the policies of the key Federal agencies involved—the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Soil Conservation Service—in great depth. They draw attention to the significant differences of approach and attitude that characterizes these three agencies, each of whom has responsibility for expending vast sums of money for water development and management.

This is a subject with tremendous implications for the future economic and social development of our Nation. The wise management of our resources today is vital for our Nation's wealth and well-being in the future.

The questions raised in Mr. Lynch's articles are challenging. All of us, I believe, have a responsibility to respond to them in a constructive, responsible spirit. In the coming weeks I hope to examine and discuss the subject of water resource development at greater length. In the light of the vast sums spent for this purpose by the Federal Government, sums which are likely to continue to rise at a rapid rate in the future, I intend to do all I can to make certain that programs in this field are guided above all by the national interest.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Lynch's additional articles, completing the series, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Jan. 2, 1962]

Water Policy Is Criticized—Major U.S. Agencies Don't Like Their Own Development Programs or Nation's Approach to River Basin Problems

(By R. G. Lynch)

Major Federal agencies have become critical of their own water development programs and of the Nation's splintered approach to river basin development. All have called for remedial legislation, but the Army Corps of Engineers has gone much farther than the others.

The corps, obviously bidding for leadership in the emerging era of comprehensive basin planning, outlined the handicaps in plain terms in its report to the Select Senate Water Resources Committee, which recently finished its work.

Pointing out that there were important differences in the legislative policies underlying the various programs, the corps said:

"It would be most helpful to the Federal agencies concerned if the Congress would enact a clear-cut statement of its major objectives and intent with respect to the development, utilization and conservation of the water resources, and bring existing laws into harmony with that objective.

TITLE CHANGE WANTED

The corps suggested that language be written into the flood control acts, as the main body of applicable law, which would make it possible for the responsible agencies to develop reservoir systems to serve all desirable purposes. The flood control acts' "confusing and misleading" title, the report added, should be changed to one more appropriate for the broad program.

The corps, the Agriculture Department (USDA) and the Reclamation Bureau all have called for elimination of inequities in cost sharing on projects.

All three reclaim land—the Bureau with irrigation, the corps and the SCS with flood protection. The corps' levee and channel work has reclaimed 8 million acres; the Bureau has irrigated 6 million. The SCS small watershed program protects small areas.

Economists of leading universities and foundations argue that if landowners were made to pay for these benefits to a larger degree, the pressure for uneconomic projects would be largely eliminated. The agencies' concern, however, is over inequitable treatment of citizens in comparable projects. The USDA commented:

"Under some water resources programs, beneficiaries bear substantial costs; under others, practically none. Requirements also vary for similar programs administered by different agencies. The absence of consistent practices contributes to ineffective resource use and inequitable patterns of net benefit distribution."

IRRIGATORS PAY 25 PERCENT

Downstream landowners get flood protection from the corps free. Upstream farmers in small watershed projects share costs and also undertake a lot of soil and water conservation work. Irrigation farmers pay, on the average, perhaps 25 percent, of reclamation costs. All three programs involve drainage. The corps charges the landowner; the SCS does not. The Bureau includes it in the project cost.

"The differences between cost-sharing policies," the corps warned, "will become increasingly obvious and increasingly troublesome. In fact, they already are so obvious that immediate steps should be taken to develop a uniform national policy on cost sharing for the reclamation components of all Federal resource development activities."

The Reclamation Bureau expressed concern only about the variation in interest rates among its own projects. Irrigators pay no interest, but project costs allocated to power, municipal water, and sometimes other things must be paid for with interest. The Bureau wants a uniform interest rate.

The contrast between the corps' broad viewpoint and the Bureau's narrow one appears so sharp that their programs and views are discussed in other articles on this page.

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Jan. 2, 1962]

BILLION DOLLAR QUESTION MARKS POSED

Flood control works to cost about $11.5 billion and potential navigation investments totaling $7.9 billion have been outlined for Congress by the Army Corps of Engineers, looking to the year 2000.

At the same time, the corps warned Congress that the flood control program was grossly inadequate without regulation of flood plain use, and that other transportation facilities might be more economical than some of the waterways.

Flood damage in the United States has increased greatly, despite a huge Federal investment in protection.

SAVINGS ARE ESTIMATED

Weather Bureau estimates (adjusted to 1957 dollar value) give a mean of $105.7 million of damage for the years 1903 to 1935 and a $329.2 million mean for the years 1936 to 1955. Yet, between 1936 and 1957 at least $4 billion were spent on flood control with estimated annual prevention of $491 million in damage.

Increased flooding and better reporting of damage account for some of the difference, but students of the problem ascribe 45 to 75 percent of the increased damage to expanded use of flood plains, fostered to some extent by the protective works.

A University of Chicago group, headed by Gilbert F. White, that worked on flood plain occupance, has suggested that there should be collaboration by local agencies both to regulate flood plain use and to see that part of the profits of development go to reimburse the Federal Treasury.

MORE DAMAGE PREDICTED

The corps, which cooperated with White's group, informed Congress that if flood control expenditures continued at the present rate, without regulation of flood plain use, the flood damage potential would increase more than $300 million annually by 1980.

In its report, the corps suggested expansion of flood control programs—its own and those of the reclamation bureau and the soil conservation service—to encourage flood plain regulation by State and local governments.

The Tennessee Valley Authority went much further in a 1959 presentation to Congress, recommending that future flood control projects be made contingent on State or local flood regulation. The corps wrote such a requirement into the 1941 Flood Control Act in connection with authorization of levees along the Missouri River. It was stricken at the request of Senator BUTLER, Republican, of Nebraska.

As to navigation, the corps recommended that parts of 3,245 miles of waterway no longer carrying traffic be abandoned. It commented that 27 stretches recommended for abandonment or curtailment as long ago as 1926 were still on the list.

The report commented that studies at the proper time of potential new waterways probably would show that some of the needed facilities could be provided more economically by railroad or truckline expansions or by pipeline construction.

Economists have criticized the waterway program for providing windfall savings to a few shippers and receivers, while damaging other parts of the national economy. It has been suggested that better overall results might be obtained by a subsidy to railroads.

USER FEES PROPOSED

The Commerce Department has been studying a proposal that user fees be collected on waterways. This has led to the organization of the National Waterways Conferences, Inc., to oppose fees.

A Missouri basin survey commission reported in 1953, after its economists studied shipping potentials:

"It is questionable if navigation should be continued as an objective of basin development."

This waterway carried less than 3 million tons in 1960, aside from waterway improvement materials.

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Jan. 2, 1962]

MORE IRRIGATION, LESS WASTE ARE KEY TO FUTURE OF WEST

Both the Reclamation Bureau and the Agriculture Department see a potential need to irrigate 9.5 million more acres in the West by the year 2000.

The Bureau proposes Federal spending of $12 billion to provide the water, an average cost of $1,260 an acre, and favors spreading much of the cost among public power users all over the 17 reclamation States.

The Department says the expected demand can be met by saving water now wasted and predicts that research, technical assistance, and education will accomplish the necessary reduction of losses by evaporation and seepage.

And economists warn that the West's future prosperity depends on making water available for industry and recreation, rather than favoring agriculture.

The stopping of present wasteful irrigation practices and the provision of water for other purposes than agriculture will depend on changing water laws and water administrations now controlled by agricultural interests. Such changes will be extremely difficult to obtain from legislatures dominated by farmers and ranchers.

The suggestion has been made that desires of States for Federal recognition of State jurisdiction over water be used as a lever, with such recognition made contingent on the meeting of minimum standards for water laws in the national interest.

Most of the reclamation States have prior appropriation water rights. The first person to use a certain source has the strongest right, forever, to the same quantity. The earliest users were predominantly ranchers and farmers. Reclamation also ties water to agriculture; repayment contracts run 50 years, sometimes extended.

Of the $1,260 per acre cost of projects outlined by the Bureau as reasonable and within economic reality only $920 would be allocated to irrigation. The rest would be public expense for flood control, recreation, etc., or user charges for electricity.

The $920 would, of course, far exceed what water users could pay. This would not be new. Since 1939, irrigators have been assessed according to ability to pay and the rest of irrigation cost has been loaded on public power users.

This arrangement is not at all equitable, because power production varies greatly among projects. Some produce none. To overcome this, Congress spread irrigation costs over all public power users in the Missouri Valley, the Central Valley of California, and the upper Colorado programs. There has been pressure for such a basin account for the Columbia River.

The Bureau suggested in its report to the select Senate water committee that more basin accounts be authorized, looking eventually to a westwide account covering all 17 States.

No critical appraisal of continuing reclamation on a large scale appears in the Bureau report—nothing like the Army Engineers' comments about the failure of flood control to meet national needs. In fact, the Bureau raised the possibility of extending the reclamation law into the Eastern States.

The Bureau seems merely to be projecting the past into the future. Vigorous disagreement with this attitude has come from students of western problems, including men born and raised in the West.

Marion Clawson, a Nevada native, director of land use and management for Resources for the Future, Inc., told a 1959 western resource conference:

"The West, or at least some parts of it, has been and is obsessed with irrigation development, equating it with sound economic development and often under the delusion that it is the only means of economic expansion.

"The West can ill afford to squander its limited remaining unused water for irrigation which must be heavily subsidized if it is to proceed at all. Other uses of water are much more in the western, as well as the national, interest."

Edward F. Renshaw, while a University of Chicago economist, commented in the preface to his book, "Toward Responsible Government" (Idvia Press), that he was born in South Dakota and had lived in the Pacific Northwest.

"With this heritage and an agricultural background," he wrote, "it is impossible for me to believe that the dream associated with Federal participation in water resource development has been anything but good—not only from the standpoint of the locality but also from the standpoint of the country as a whole.

"A careful analysis of the fact, however, has convinced me that the old dream, if it is to meet the test of changing circumstance, must give way in part to a new dream; one that is better able to meet the needs of future generations."

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Jan. 5, 1962]

CHANGE OF ATTITUDE VITAL TO IMPROVE WATER POLICY—LEGISLATION IS NOW PENDING TO OVERCOME CONFUSION OF OBJECTIVES THAT HAS EXISTED IN THE PAST

(By R. G. Lynch)

President Kennedy's proposals for improving the Nation's water development programs were outlined at the start of this series, which ends here. Intervening articles have discussed some of the problems.

To anyone who has followed the series, it must be apparent that the President is only trying to show the way; that the essential changes must be in the attitude of Congress and in the laws.

A year has passed since the Select Committee on Water Resources reported. Legislation is pending to improve the existing method of coordinating programs and to foster State participation. But no bill has been introduced to remedy any of the other glaring defects clearly pointed out in the report.

THREE MAJOR CRITICISMS

Three major criticisms of national efforts are made by men who have spent years studying river basin development:

1. Objectives are confused and conflicting, a realistic, overall objective is lacking.
2. Congress never gets information on which to base a choice; projects are submitted on a take-it-or-leave-it basis.
3. Total costs and total benefits are never shown; Congress is not told what the impact on the national economy and welfare will be.

The select committee held hearings all over the country and obtained informative reports from Federal agencies and private consultants. Its report last January pointed the way to policymaking, but in some respects it was as cautious as the President's approach.

The desirable objective of a coordinated Federal program was defined as full, comprehensive development of river basins.

NEED FOR GUIDANCE STATED

The need of Congress for guidance in choosing among alternatives for basin programs was clearly stated.

But when it came to cost sharing and accurate appraisal of total costs, the committee made a wide detour around the pork barrel.

A preceding article told how political pressure resulted in distorted reports and approval of uneconomic projects. Economists say that this would be curtailed greatly if local interests expected to share the cost.

The committee said it was "not overly concerned with the cost-sharing aspect * * * because it believes that the present policies tend to even out the sharing of costs over the long run, among all the people."

The committee said that national or nonlocal benefits should be given more stress and that methods should be devised for measuring such benefits. But it said not a word about reporting the comparative costs.

LITTLE ATTENTION EXPECTED

This indicates that a June 1961 report by a panel of economists will get little attention from Congress, whatever effect it may have on the interagency committee on water resources that presently is revising the executive department's criteria for evaluating projects.

The panel, engaged by the Budget Bureau soon after Kennedy took office, consisted of Maynard M. Hufschmidt, of Harvard University, chairman; Julius Margolis, of the University of California; and John V. Krutilla, of Resources for the Future, Inc.

Where distribution of income is an objective, say these economists, cost sharing should be limited accordingly and the benefits to the favored population segments should be clearly shown. But where this is not an aim, they recommend that costs should be recovered from the beneficiaries.

OTHER FACTORS SUPPORTED

In figuring costs, they said, the curtailment of private activities and the displacement of both private and public investment that result from a Federal project should be considered, and the benefits should be discounted according to the timelag in realization.

A couple of examples will indicate their thinking. They say that no benefits should be included from sale of farm products for any year that surpluses of such products are expected. And where additional storage capacity for flood control must be provided because of hydroelectric generation, the added cost should be allocated to the hydroplant.

Other economists have pointed out the "social" cost of water projects. Irrigation in the West, for example, has caused the retirement of agricultural land in other regions, particularly the Southeast. Wisconsin has felt minor effects. Potato growers here, for example, compete in a glutted market with potatoes from farms which their taxes have helped irrigate.

SOCIAL ASPECT STRESSED

E. F. Renshaw, University of Chicago, estimated that 29 percent of the gross value of reclamation crops in 1957 came from sugarbeets (subsidized), short staple cotton (chronic surplus) and potatoes, which have contributed to one of the costliest overproduction fiascos in U.S. agricultural history.

The Bureau's panel suggested that estimated benefits from water projects be discounted 4 or 5 percent to cover the social and opportunity costs mentioned above. This would make it more difficult to justify a project.

As to public power, the panel said that steam generation should be used where it was cheaper than hydro, and that hydropower should be developed for its most efficient role in a regional system, perhaps for peaking loads in conjunction with steamplants.

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Jan. 5, 1962]

Test of River Basin Projects Is Not Merit, but Weight of Political and Special Interests—Although Alternatives Exist, They Are Not Presented to Congress in a Way To Permit Choice

Each river basin project now goes to Congress with a single dominant purpose: Flood control (with hydroelectric plants and navigation fitted in) or irrigation (with flood control and power worked in). Never are there two or more comprehensive plans affording Congress a chance to decide which is best.

Alternatives always exist, but they do not get weighed against each other in the policymaking process, Charles M. Hardin, University of Chicago political scientist, told a western resources conference.

"The test is not the relative merits of alternative programs," he said, "but rather the accumulation of enough political weight by adding enough interests into a general program to sweep aside all opposition."

PLAN CALLED SYMPTOMATIC

Gilbert F. White, a University of Chicago geographer, who was chairman of a United Nations river basin panel, has called the upper Colorado River plan symptomatic of such decisions.

"As it was presented to Congress," he said in a Washington, D.C., forum of Resources for the Future, Inc., "the choice was essentially to accept it with reservations or to reject it."

White said there was no estimate of the probable effects of the plan's irrigation and power development on the region, no detailed examination of possible industrial expansion or other different uses of water, no broad assessment of the recreation potential, no comprehensive appraisal of the national need for more agricultural production or different means of achieving it.

SAN JUAN RIVER EXAMPLE

How such analyses might change river basin planning was demonstrated by a University of New Mexico study, directed by Nathaniel Wollman under a grant from Resources for the Future.

A Colorado River tributary, the San Juan, is to be developed and eventually part of the water is to be diverted to the Rio Grande. The study group projected economic development in the areas of 1975.

It found that irrigation emphasis would result in maximum gains of $265 million in the State's gross product and 60,000 in its work force, while municipal-industrial water use could bring maximum gains of $900 million and 214,000 workers.

Water also was found to be five times as valuable for recreation as for agriculture.

Allen V. Kneese, a Resources for the Future economist, reported that the group thought these results had a bearing on regional planning and subsidization of water uses. This fits in with a recommendation made to the select committee in the Ackerman report, described elsewhere on this page.

COMMISSIONS SUGGESTED

The Ackerman group suggested that regional study commissions be created to design experimental, comprehensive basin developments in nine Southwestern States and in the Northeast-Midwest urban complex.

A preceding article mentioned the lack of consideration of flood plain regulation as an alternative, or supplement, to flood control works, and of rail, truck and pipeline facilities in place of barge freighting.

Edward F. Renshaw, while he was a University of Chicago economist, pointed out that because Federal agencies (except TVA) were limited to hydroelectric developments the alternative of steam generation was never considered.

Commenting that the Missouri basin had 40 percent of the Nation's coal reserves and the Colorado basin was close to extensive natural gas supplies, he said that if hydro development in marginal areas was not already more costly than steam it soon would be.

URGES INDEPENDENT REVIEW

"To provide assurance that the interest and tax subsidy accorded public power is not used to develop uneconomic sites," he said, "an independent review of alternative costs is desirable."

An economists' report to the Budget Bureau last June commented similarly:

"It is clear that if the Federal planning agency had authority to develop any means (of generation)—hydro or thermal—all alternatives would be valued at public economic costs."

Harvard University, in a water resource project directed by Arthur Maass and financed by the Rockefeller Foundation, has been trying since 1956 to improve methods of planning and designing river basin developments so that the maximum of choices can be considered.

In order to make such comparative studies less expensive and time consuming, a way has been worked out to feed data to an electronic computer.

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Jan. 5, 1962]

More Stress on National Welfare Sought in Development of Streams

What should the Nation's objectives be in river basin development?

"Full regulation of nearly all of the Nation's streams," said a group of experts hired by the Select Senate Committee on Water Resources in 1960.

"The greatest possible contribution to the national welfare," said a trio of economists engaged by the Budget Bureau in 1961.

The report to the select committee was made by Edward A. Ackerman, Washington, D.C., who headed the experts. Ackerman has been a consultant to the State, Interior, and Army Departments and has worked for the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The present approach to river basin development in terms of specific purposes—irrigation, flood control, and so forth—was called confusing and contradictory in the Ackerman report. It warned that if this continued in the rapid moving, complicated, technical and economic future "the confusion can become compounded and true popular understanding of a regulation program can become impossible."

The report suggested that a start be made immediately on organizational changes to fit the concept of comprehensive development and that advisory staffs of professionals be set up to guide further changes.

The Budget Bureau's panel of economists was headed by Maynard M. Hufschmidt, of Harvard University, a native of Catawba, Wis. The panel said that there was no single, simple measure for the total contribution to the national welfare, since social, economic, and cultural elements were involved.

The most efficient use of water would result if the sole objective were gain in productivity or national income, said the economists, but other national aims are equitable distribution of the national income and filling certain needs and desires of the people.

Regional development by means of irrigation and public power are examples of both income distribution and need filling. The 160-acre limitation on a single ownership in Federal reclamation projects and the preference given to cooperatives in allocating public power are income distributing devices.

Under the head of needs and desires fall such things as recreational opportunities and preservation of esthetic and cultural values.

Whatever combination of these objectives is deemed desirable, the economists pointed out that Congress must see to it that they are carried out in estimating benefits and costs of with a particular eye to recoving "windfall" benefits from those not intended to be included in income distribution.

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Jan. 5, 1962]

VARIOUS REPORTS USED IN WATER POLICY STUDY

References have been made in this series to material from prints of the Select Senate Committee on National Water Resources; papers of western resource conferences, University of Colorado Press; papers of a forum of Resources for the Future, Inc., Johns Hopkins Press.

Changes in "Urban Occupance of Flood Plains," White and others, University of Chicago Press; "Muddy Waters," Mass, Harvard University Press; "The Dark Missouri," Hart, University of Wisconsin Press; "The Flood Control Controversy," Leopold and Maddock, Ronald Press; "Toward Responsible Government," Renshaw, Idyia Press.

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Jan. 5, 1962]

URGENCY PROMPTS SERIES ON U.S. WATER RESOURCES

Important decisions about the Nation's water resources await Congress. Because of the urgency of the problems and Wisconsin taxpayers' interest in the tremendous expenditures involved, the Journal is reviewing the situation in a series of half-page presentations.

The paper's natural resources reporter, R. G. Lynch, wrote the articles. His material was gathered in several months of travel; interviewing and corresponding with river basin authorities and Washington (D.C.) officials and examining the voluminous literature in this field.

Lynch is the author of "Our Growing Water Problems," published and distributed nationally by the National Wildlife Federation. Its preparation in 1957–58 gave him some knowledge of water problems and water laws in every State. He attended a September meeting of the Columbia Basin Interagency Committee and later visited the headquarters of the Southeastern Basins Study Commission.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have just talked to the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. He is agreeable to my taking 5 minutes. He has a bill. I ask unanimous consent——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I will object. I suggest we move from the morning hour, if there is no further morning business.

Mr. JAVITS. I have morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York has morning business.

Mr. JAVITS. I wish to be heard in the morning hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will be recognized for 3 minutes.

(Mr. JAVITS addressed the Senate on a bill, which remarks appear elsewhere.)

THE PREFORMING ARTS — NEW YORK STATE COMMISSION ON THE ARTS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the first annual report of the New York State Council on the Arts offers a record of successful achievement which I hope will encourage other States to adopt similar programs for the encouragement and advancement of the performing and visual arts. New York, under the leadership of Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, was the first to pioneer on this level with a well-planned program. Its example should also be encouragement for the Congress to take action on legislation now pending for a nationwide program of assistance to the arts. The need for such help is graphically demonstrated in a recent survey by the Bureau of Statistics of the Department of Labor which offers a discouraging outlook for our talented young artists.

The great benefits that come to our country from artists who participate in our cultural exchange programs in terms of national prestige and the promotion of good relations with other countries is demonstrated in a report on the South American tour of the ANTA—Theater Guild American Repertory Co. This is the same company that the State Department sent on tour of Europe and the Middle East last year and which met with spectacular success wherever it performed.

These three reports illustrate different aspects of the performing and visual arts where Federal aid is necessary for the prestige of our country. Legislation, among which is my own bill for a U.S. Arts Foundation, S. 1250, carrying out the same type of plan as is working so well in New York, is pending in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and I urge that hearings be held at the earliest possible date.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD with my remarks the report of the New York State Council on the Arts, the report in the New York Herald Tribune on January 28 headlined "Performing Arts Found No Gold Mine"; and the report on the South American tour, by Dorothy Sands, entitled "Round Two," which appeared in Equity magazine, February 1962.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK STATE COUNCIL ON THE ARTS 1961

"The practice and enjoyment of the arts are of increasing importance and the general welfare of the people of the State will be promoted by giving further recognition to the arts as a vital aspect of our culture and heritage and as a valued means of expanding the scope of our educational programs."—From the legislative act creating the council.

FOREWORD

A year ago, on the occasion of the first meeting of the New York State Council on the Arts as a group, I noted in my letter of welcome that we were beginning what I was confident would be one of the most exciting and significant pioneering experiences ever undertaken by a State government. I suggested further that in a long-range sense, the council's task is to assure individuals of the opportunity of attaining a fuller degree of self-realization through participation in, and appreciation of, our national cultural resurgence.

Since that time I have closely followed the progress of the council, first as it surveyed our cultural resources and later as it proceeded to put into effect its recommendations to me and to the legislature.

In appointing the members of the council it was my determination to have it function as an administrative entity developing imaginative programs, not a mere committee of well-known names. No more conclusive evidence of its acceptance of this responsibility could be offered than the report that follows.

One of the most rewarding experiences of my administration has been the opportunity to participate in the State's recognition of the arts as essential to the welfare of our people. Indeed, we have gone beyond recognition, and in the success of the council's first programs we may point to conclusive justification for our concern.

To the council on the arts, to each of the participating institutions, and to all who have given impetus to this project goes my deepest gratitude. There is no doubt that through your cooperation our State will continue to lead the Nation toward the fulfillment of its high cultural aspirations.

GOV. NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER.

INTRODUCTION

Whether a nation gets the culture it deserves, or deserves the culture it gets, are not questions beyond conjecture. Some governments, notably in Europe, devote substantial portions of their annual budgets to operas, symphonies, and theaters; and some societies, even the most primitive, give over quantities of time and effort to dancing, ornamenting their objects of daily use, or simply telling and retelling the tales that form their literature. After life has been made possible, the natural impulse seems to be to make it worth living. From there on it is only a matter of how much trouble you want to take. In one country the arts may be nourished; in another, they starve.

Currently the support of the arts in America has become the topic of a more vigorous public debate than ever. The authorization of a national cultural center by Congress, the building of culture centers in large cities, and the effect of the cultural endeavors we send abroad, all have drawn attention to the question of how the arts are to thrive and grow—how much should government do, how much should private citizens pay for, how much should be treated as commercial entertainment?

It would be impossible here to do justice to the variety and complexity of the arguments on these issues. They range from the extreme view that the state owes every artist a living to the equally extreme position that support of the arts should be left to chance, or to the whim of individual patrons. Artists themselves may be found as widely distributed across the spectrum as their critics and commentators. They naturally welcome assistance; they naturally fear control of their work. Sometimes participants in the discussion seem to be taking both sides at once, hoping for a millennium in which the problem did not exist, just as you may sometimes find the same people denying the Government's obligation in the arts at the same time that they ask it to make the country more beautiful; rebuild cities, preserve the countryside, and educate Americans in esthetic judgment. All of which is perhaps another way of saying that the issue, like any serious and significant one, has attracted the interest of lively and intelligent minds, and has brought to bear their passions and convictions.

On one aspect of the debate there is perhaps less argument than elsewhere. We hardly need ask if the Government ought to intervene in the arts when in fact it already does—and, as Louis C. Jones shows in the pages which follow, has traditionally done so. Government, no matter what its intentions are, has a wide and penetrating impact on the arts if only in its tax laws. Some institutions are granted complete exemption; some are specially taxed as entertainment. Some provisions favor the artist; some make his life more difficult than that of the professional or entrepreneur. Government also builds, and makes building easy or difficult. Can a community afford a gallery or concert hall? To attempt to answer such a question without considering government would be absurd. The issue is not one of whether but of how.

In such a situation there is nothing more useful than factual accounts of what is actually being done, today, throughout the country. We enjoy the advantage of national multiplicity; different localities may try different solutions. But they are of little value unless they can be known and studied, and the lessons put to use. This chronicle of the New York State Council on the Arts' first year is just such a laboratory report. It is an example of what the possibilities are, where they begin and where they can lead and it thus offers the theoretical debaters a recourse to experience. A State council on the arts is an adventuresome idea; it will be watched, and its success or failure will have much to do with what is done, or not done, elsewhere. For the argument, of course, is not over; nor will it ever be, as long as the quality of a nation is judged not only by its wealth and power, but by its poets and painters, the dreams of its dreamers and the songs it sings.

ERIC LARRABEE,
Horizon Magazine.

OUR CULTURAL HERITAGE

With the council on the arts undertaking a program of nourishing the growth of the arts throughout our State, it is appropriate that we test the richness of our cultural soil. We have no comprehensive histories to turn to; the evidence lies scattered in old newspapers, village histories, town libraries, and county historical societies. But these sources indicate that the pioneer steps we are taking today find inspiring precedents in our longstanding tradition of fostering enjoyment of the arts.

With neighboring New England we shared an early interest in and respect for books and ideas, the basic creators of a cultural climate. In 1796 a general library law was written into our statutes which encouraged library societies all over the State. These libraries grew not only in our urban centers but in the rural communities as well; the Wheatland library in Monroe County was established in 1805 and soon had 1,500 volumes including the works of Plutarch, Shakespeare, Goldsmith, Scott, Cooper, and Byron. Hard on the heels of free schools came the development of free school-district libraries so that by 1850 New York State had 10,802 libraries, or four-fifths of all of the libraries in the United States. And it is interesting to note that this system got a special surge from the Federal Government when upon finding, in 1836, that there was an unprecedented national surplus, $4 million of which was New York's share, $55,000 was allotted each year to the libraries of New York State.

While our collectors were building our libraries, our authors were busy creating a national literature filled with the flavor of New York. James Fenimore Cooper and Washington Irving made the romance of their time and place familiar throughout the world with their stories of the Hudson Valley, the Susquehanna, the Adirondacks, and the Catskills. They told the inspiring sagas of the American Indian, frontier days, the Revolution, the "Headless Horseman," "Natty Bumpo," "Rip Van Winkle," and "Chungachook," and they became symbols of the excitement of the New World. A generation later we continued to be the wellspring of the American novel and short story with Herman Melville from Albany and Mark Twain from Buffalo and Elmira, while from Long Island came that giant of American poetry, Walt Whitman.

We shared this interest in literature with New England, but we surpassed them in our friendliness for music and the theater, and the role of New York in the emergence of American painting is extraordinary. Between 1700 and 1750 vigorous, bold and arresting pictures by the Patroon Painters established the first school of American portraiture, to be followed after the Revolution by the more sophisticated masters, Ralph Earl, Ezra Ames, Samuel F. B. Morse, and John Vanderlyn. From 1825 to 1875 the Hudson River School developed around Cole and Durand to become the first and unsurpassed American interpretation of landscape painting. Meanwhile, all over the State, itinerants and craftsmen turned limners were recording our faces, our villages, our way of life, and our history.

With the opening of the Erie Canal in 1825, culture flourished along its banks. Art, along with music and the theater, went on tour. Dioramas of the Hudson, the Mississippi, and the burning of Moscow became popular attractions; in 1824 William Dunlap sent out on tour his painting "Christ Rejected" and, encouraged by the success of this venture, he followed it, in 1827, with "Death on a Pale Horse." Along with these works of epic history went simpler instructive shows of the American scene, its birds and its flowers. The influx of European painting after the Civil War, together with the development of the daguerreotype and the photograph, tended to alter this picture somewhat, but the visual arts continued to thrive, to be admired, to be created and enjoyed. And in this climate, great art museums began to grow in Buffalo, Rochester, Utica, and Albany as well as in New York City.

While our bookshelves grew and pictures covered our walls, our air was becoming filled with music. With a strong amateur tradition, our ancestors gathered for musical evenings at home for folk song and religious singing; soon singing schools were started. Bands formed to march with the militia. Music throve particularly in the 1820's and in 1824 Buffalo, by popular subscription, formed a band in time to play for the opening of the Erie Canal, the arrival of LaFayette, and the hanging of the three Thayer brothers.

Rochester, with the strong ethnic talents of its German and Italian immigrants, early became the musical capital of upstate New York. The superb acoustics of Corinthian Hall drew the great musical talent of the world to perform there; in 1835 the keeper of a music store organized the Academy of Sacred Music and during the 15 years that followed the people turned out to hear Ole Bull, the Hutchinson family, Leopold De Myer and finally, in 1851, Jenny Lind. And while this heady fare was being served up to the city people, everywhere the smaller towns had their banjo players and singers, operatic soirees, Swiss bell ringers, plantation players, and always a strong offering of home products with songs written for special occasions, band concerts, choral groups, and little orchestras. That all of this did not fall on discriminating ears is evidenced by a critic, writing a review of a concert in Cooperstown in 1826: "I'd about as soon listen to a kitten mew as hear one of those ballad singers, or any other singer * * * but the rural gentry was out in full force."

It is perhaps comforting to know that the theater as a social force, for good or evil, has always had to fight for its freedom. In 1759, following a theatrical performance by British army officers in Albany, the Reverend Freylinghausen launched what must have been a particularly vituperative attack upon the stage as "the devil's cockpit." The following morning, in rejoinder, he found before his door a staff, boots, a loaf of bread, and some money and, taking the hint, he went back to Holland where presumably he lived out his life publicly despairing the fate of the coming generations of New Yorkers. Church criticism continued, though not as strong as that in more puritan New England, and the populace was instructed by such debates as "Resolved: that theaters are productive of more good than evil." But Thespis proceeded undaunted; one village records a puppet show in 1796, local amateurs performing "Julius Caesar" in 1800 and, finally, the welcoming of a professional touring company from Albany in 1813.

These traveling companies, out of New York City, Albany, and Philadelphia, carried their trappings in Conestoga wagons while the actors walked alongside. They played in courthouses, or on crude stages erected on sawhorses, before easily adapted curtains and scenery. A classical drama, such as "Lady of the Lake," together with comic songs and a farce for audience relief, was served up for the price of 25 cents a seat. As a somewhat prophetic note it should be recorded that by 1830 the price had risen to 37½ cents, at least one theatrical trend which has continued its upward course undeflected for the past 150 years. After following the canal, these companies spread out to the surrounding hill towns; theaters throve from Albany to Buffalo and by 1900 upstate New York provided informed and sophisticated audiences for the constant flow of good road companies. Of course, this evidence of upstate cultural prosperity was a reflection of the fact that New York City was concurrently emerging as one of the great world centers of the arts, reaching unrivaled stature during the first half of the 20th century.

Thus we find that our people have traditionally created, supported and loved the arts and they continue to do so. And when the New York State Council on the Arts acts to strengthen community support, encourage ever-rising standards and extend the outward flow from our great cities of the best of our cultural heritage, it will work in soil that is very rich and fertile indeed.

LOUIS CLARK JONES,
New York State Historical Association.

STATEMENT OF OBJECTIVES

A year ago the council on the arts submitted a survey of New York State's cultural institutions to the Governor and the legislature. This survey was accompanied by the recommendation that the services of our great cultural institutions be extended to give to all of our people a greater opportunity to appreciate and participate in the arts, an endeavor unprecedented in the history of this country. The legislature tangibly demonstrated its faith in the value of this opportunity by appropriating funds for these purposes.

The charge to the council on the arts was strongly stated in the enabling legislation of 1960. The act, sponsored in the senate by MacNeil Mitchell and in the assembly by Dorothy Bell Lawrence and Bentley Kassal, declared that "the general welfare of the people of the State will be promoted by giving further recognition to the arts as a vital aspect of our culture and heritage and as a valued means of expanding the scope of our educational programs." It further defined the obligation of the council to be "to insure that the role of the arts in the life of our communities will continue to grow and will play an ever more significant part in the welfare and educational experience of our citizens."

In our planning, certain principles served as guideposts along the way. Rather than seek arbitrary limits which might simplify our operation, we chose to establish broad principles and objectives and to determine the merits of each step by whether or not it upheld these principles and moved toward these objectives.

Standards are fundamental to the arts. They are hard to define, but the council has, in the members of its advisory panels, the benefit of the most respected authorities, and we continue to insist on the constant raising of standards. To a degree these will be relative, but it is a valid principle that performances or the exhibiting of visual materials which lack intrinsic quality are of no educational value whatever and, indeed, may be harmful.

High standards of performance in the arts, extended to expanding audiences are, then, our immediate objective. While the use of existing institutions to help achieve this objective may be of incidental benefit to them, these benefits cannot be in the nature of subsidies. While we recognize the very real financial predicament in which many worthy institutions find themselves, we feel that to attempt to aid them directly without further challenge could not contribute significantly to the achieving of our goals. We do, however, look forward hopefully to the time when, in part because of our efforts, the statewide appetite for the arts is so whetted as to make it possible for quality institutions to find more economic stability.

In developing its programs the council on the arts recognizes that these three basic factors are essential to any art: the creator, the interpreter, and the audience. They are so interdependent that it is hard to help one of them without also benefiting the others. It is true, however, that since in its broadest interpretation the council most effectively represents the public, it is on their behalf that our greatest efforts should be directed. In helping the audience we logically make use of the interpreter: the museum, the orchestra, the theater, and so forth. Because of the highly complex problems involved in any selective aid to a particular creator, the benefits to him must again be incidental. We hope, however, that with an overall stimulation in the arts he will eventually benefit in a more tangible way.

With these guiding principles, then, our goals have been to cherish a climate in which the creator, the interpreter, and the audience are free to grow, to work toward the day when experiencing the arts will be equally natural with all aspects of our daily life, and finally, to assure to each one of our people an opportunity to bring forth and nourish his endowed creative resources.

A chronicle of our efforts in this direction follows. During our first year of active programing, we have been able to achieve much in the way of bringing art experiences into the lives of many of our citizens. They have rewarded us with their gratitude; and this gratitude has in turn made us more keenly aware of the depth of our responsibilities. It would be remiss for us not to mention here the truly vital contributions which have been made by our initial cooperating institutions: the Phoenix Theater, the New York City Center Opera Co., the Buffalo Philharmonic Orchestra, the New York City Ballet, and the American Federation of Arts. Without the dedicated help of their managements and of each member of their companies, we could not point to this fine beginning. Beyond this, in each community some organization or agency has come forward to share with us the responsibility for bringing this program to its citizens. They too must surely share the credits.

Finally, each of us must recognize the imaginative thinking of Governor Rockefeller and the legislature. There are moments, history has shown, when from amid the often cumbersome tangle of detail inherent in administering a democracy true inspiration emerges. The legislation creating the council and the determined support of its program is truly such a moment; we have only just begun to recognize the implications of New York State's leadership for our Nation in support of the arts.

SEYMOUR H. KNOX,
Chairman.

REPORT ON PRESENT PROGRAM

February 1: A survey of New York State's cultural institutions and the council's recommendations for encouraging participation in and appreciation of the arts is submitted to the Governor and the legislature pursuant to chapter 313 of the laws of 1960.

April 1: A budget request for the sum of $450,000 to implement the recommendations of the New York State Council on the Arts, approved by the legislature, becomes effective.

April 13: The council meets in New York City with the Governor in attendance. A detailed program for the 1961–62 season is reviewed and approved. The executive director is instructed to advise the participating organizations to proceed with the planning of productions and exhibitions and the arrangements for performances in the maximum number of communities throughout the State.

During the spring many of the technical details of contracts, bookings, and programs were taken care of. At the same time conversations were held with members of the advisory panels to explore the further possibilities for efforts in their special fields.

July 1: The executive director begins a statewide tour to seek local guidance in developing the council's future programs. Meetings were held in Oneonta, Binghamton, Corning, Albany, Schenectady, Utica, Syracuse, Auburn, Geneva, Geneseo, Middletown, New Paltz, Glens Falls, Saratoga Springs, Plattsburgh, Massena, Elmira, Alfred, Potsdam, Canton, Watertown, Rochester, Buffalo, Mineola, and Olean.

These meetings were rewarded by greater mutual understanding of local problems and of the council's objectives. In many communities these people became the nucleus of an association of representatives from various local arts groups who joined together to study their local programs and objectives in the arts. This was the beginning of a community arts council movement throughout the State.

July 13: The first of two performances of the New York City Ballet Co. at the Empire State Festival is presented at Bear Mountain under council sponsorship.

July 17: A performance of a pas de deux from the New York City Ballet Co., sponsored jointly by the council and the Munson-Williams-Proctor Institute, is presented to a standing-room-only audience of children and parents in Utica.

August 24: The technical assistance program gets underway with a visit to the Fort Stanwix Museum in Rome by Sheldon Keck, director of the Conservation Center of New York University's Institute of Fine Arts.

This service of the council offers smaller museums and historical societies throughout the State an opportunity to benefit from expert advice on a number of problems ranging from conservation to cataloging, from lighting and display to community relations. By the first of 1962 more than 30 such projects had been assigned.

September 29: The Phoenix Theater opens in Mineola, a tour that will take Shakespeare's "Hamlet" and Shaw's "Androcles and the Lion" to Middletown, Oneonta, New Paltz, Saratoga Springs, Glens Falls, Plattsburgh, Massena, Potsdam, Batavia, Corning, Alfred, Geneva, Niagara Falls, Buffalo, Auburn, Schenectady, Canton, Utica, Geneseo, Ithaca, Endicott, Poughkeepsie, and Scarsdale.

These performances played to an aggregate audience of more than 37,000 children and adults, giving to many of them their first opportunity to see live drama.

October 3: The council meets at Arden House in Harriman to review the current program and develop future plans. In principle, the members approve a modest extension of the touring program and expansion of the technical assistance service to include all of the arts on the community level.

October 15: "Masterpieces of Photography," the first of seven exhibitions organized by the American Federation of Arts for the council, opens in Brooklyn and will tour to 11 communities including Jamestown, Corning, Utica, Ithaca, New York City, Massena, Hornell, and Rochester.

October 17: The New York City Ballet opens in Corning on a tour that will include full company performances in Farmingdale, Mineola, Rochester, Buffalo and Albany, and lecture demonstrations in Batavia, Geneseo, Oswego, Massena, Plattsburgh, Poughkeepsie, Binghamton, Glens Falls, Middletown, Ithaca, and Syracuse.

October 24: The Buffalo Philharmonic Orchestra opens in Watertown on a tour that includes performances in Plattsburgh, Mineola, Southampton, Syracuse, Norwich, Oyster Bay, Alfred, East Meadow, Suffern, Ithaca, Peekskill, Brooklyn, Oneonta, Malvern, Westbury, Geneva, Queens Village, Merrick, and Hamilton.

November 1: The first showing of the exhibition "Indian Art in the United States" opens in Corning on a tour of 11 communities including Auburn, Rye, Rochester, Troy, Hornell, Schenectady, and others.

The first showing of the exhibtion "Fifteen Years of Award-Winning Prints" opens in Cazenovia and will tour to Oneonta, Jamestown, Staten Island, Brooklyn, Corning, Utica, New York City, and others.

The council meets in New York City to review in detail its proposed programs and budget for 1962–63.

November 10: A 2-day conference and workshop on community arts councils opens at the Roberson Memorial Center in Binghamton under New York State Council on the Arts sponsorship.

Over 200 persons from every corner of the State gathered to seek guidance for their local arts programs from Mr. Seymour Knox, Dr. Louis Clark Jones, of the New York State Historical Association, and a distinguished group of experts including Mr. Ralph Burgard, of the St. Paul Council of Arts and Sciences, Mr. Keith Martin of the Roberson Memorial Center, Mr. John Gutman, from the Metropolitan Opera Association, Mr. Donald Engle, of the Martha Baird Rockefeller Aid to Music Program, Mr. George Balanchine, of the New York City Center Ballet, Dr. Paul Bruce Pettit, from the drama department of the State university, and Mr. James M. Brown, the director of the Corning Glass Center. This historic meeting again focused attention on the leadership of New York State in the encouragement of the arts.

November 22: The New York City Center Opera Co. opens to a packed house in Batavia with a performance of "La Boheme" and goes on to play to enthusiastic audiences in Rochester, Albany, Middletown, Geneseo, Ithaca, Amsterdam, Syracuse, Buffalo, Mineola, and White Plains with productions of "Madame Butterfly," "Mikado," "Marriage of Figaro," and "Cosi Fan Tutte."

November 27: A 1-day workshop on the problems of display and conservation for historic houses, sponsored by the council, is held at the Suffolk Museum in Stony Brook.

With the cooperation of the director, Mrs. Jane des Grange; and with Mr. Carl Dauterman, curator of postrenaissance art at the Metropolitan Museum; Miss Alice Beer, curator of textiles for the Cooper Union Museum; Mr. Marvin Schwartz, curator of decorative arts for the Brooklyn Museum; and Mr. Per Guldbeck, research associate at the New York State Historical Association acting as panelists, representatives of more than 30 Long Island institutions were guided in the preservation and presentation of material.

January 4, 1962: The exhibition, "Occupations in the World of Japan," organized by the Everson Museum of Art in Syracuse opens at Solvay High School.

As part of a program to more broadly disseminate our museum resources, other packaged exhibitions are organized for circulation to regional schools and libraries, by the Rochester Memorial Gallery on "Art Takes Shape" and "The Imagination in Art," by the Schenectady Museum Association on "The Self-Reliant Americans" and "Fossils of Schoharie County," and by the Everson Museum of Art in Syracuse on "Print Making Highlights."

January 7: The first showing of the exhibition "The Hudson River School" opens in Hempstead on an 11-stop tour which will include Rochester, Binghamton, Syracuse, Oneonta, Albany, Poughkeepsie, and other communities.

The first showing of the exhibition "Masters of American Watercolor" opens in Binghamton on a tour which, among other stops, will include Staten Island, Syracuse, New York City, Utica, Albany, and Oneonta.

January 26: The Rochester Philharmonic Orchestra gives the first of two young people's concerts, with council support, including the performance of new orchestral works.

February 1: "Three Centuries of Architecture in New York," an exhibition under council sponsorship, opens in Brooklyn and will tour Corning, Troy, New York City, Utica, Syracuse, Oneonta, New Platz, and Albany.

February 17: The New York Philharmonic Orchestra with Leonard Bernstein conducting gives a children's concert at the R.P.I. fieldhouse in Troy under council sponsorship.

March 1: The first of 11 stops, including Auburn, Utica, Brooklyn, Corning, Hempstead, Rye, and New York City, of the exhibition "How To Look at a Painting" takes place in Schenectady.

SUMMARY OF FUTURE PLANS

The preceding pages record our heritage, our objectives, and our current record. With these in mind, we proceed with plans for the immediate year ahead and aim to define our efforts toward the future. The New York State Council on the Arts is a temporary State commission, but it must seek to make permanent headway while avoiding a position wherein the ultimate health of the arts in our State might become disproportionately dependent on our existence. The council seeks to develop sound programs based on community initiative which will ultimately reach the point where they can continue to exist and expand without further significant aid from the State. We feel that a council representing evidence of the concern of New York State for its cultural growth must always exist, but the selection of methods to encourage this growth should remain flexible.

During the coming year we hope to continue to support the touring of top quality performances and exhibitions, somewhat extending the scope of this year's program. In justification for this step we point to the positive response to our present offerings. Described in the Buffalo Evening News as a plan "to send caravans of the arts down the new cultural highways, both to principal cities and to communities which will be hosts to such events for the first time," these troupes have been received with warm enthusiasm.

We are also conscious of our obligation to encourage participation in the arts. The technical assistance program to small museums and historical societies has indicated that professional advice is needed and welcome at this level. We hope to expand these activities to encompass all of the arts on the premise that expert guidance can improve standards, and improved standards will encourage more rewarding participation.

At a panel discussion, broadly labeled "New Horizons for the Arts in Your Community," held in Binghamton as part of the council-sponsored conference and workshop on community arts councils in New York State, representatives from all corners of the State heard of the tempting prospects in store for them. John Gutman, assistant director of the Metropolitan Opera, said that any community could make the "plunge" into local opera provided it were assured of a hard core of support: financial, musical and in willingness to work hard. He advised such local groups to seek promising young singers and train them. Extending opera in this way could make a contribution of enormous significance to the general welfare of the arts in this country. Similar aspirations for community or regional ballet companies were set forth by George Balanchine, director of the New York City Ballet Co. Mr. Balanchine also stressed the importance of providing qualified professional training as fundamental to the development of any community ballet. Donald Engle from the Martha Baird Rockefeller aid to music program, Paul Bruce Pettit from the drama department of the State university, and James Brown III, director of the Corning Glass Center speaking for the visual arts, each proposed the encouragement of the arts on the community level through the aid of qualified professional guidance. During the coming year the council proposes to answer requests for this guidance, on a temporary basis, wherever it is possible.

In these two areas, then, support for touring performances and exhibitions and technical assistance for local programs, the council proposes to concentrate its efforts for the coming year. We hope, however, to keep our eye on the ultimate goal, to touch the miracle of human creation. The wealth of our country does not lie in our banks or industries or in our forests or beneath our soil. The wealth of our country lies in our people and it is the unique quality of our form of Government that we are dedicated to nurturing this wealth. Every child that is born is a miracle of natural resources. Ultimately, it is the purpose of the New York State Council on the Arts, as it is of each of us, that these endowed human resources of any resident of our State should not remain unexhausted because of our failure to provide the opportunity to stimulate or express them.

We will continue to search for new methods which will contribute toward our purpose. This year the legislature will be asked to consider additional provisions to help implement our search. With this support we resolve to meet our challenge, to insure that the role of the arts in the life of our communities will continue to grow and will play an ever more significant part in the welfare and educational experience of our citizens.

JOHN H. MACFADYEN,
Executive Director.

MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

Seymour H. Knox, chairman, Henry Allen Moe, vice chairman, Reginald Allen, Cass Canfield, Angus Duncan, Theodore M. Hancock, Mrs. W. Averell Harriman, Wallace K. Harrison, Miss Helen Hayes, Louis Clark Jones, David M. Keiser, Richard B. K. McLanathan, Alfred J. Manuti, Richard Rodgers, Lewis A. Swyer.

ADVISORY PANELS TO THE COUNCIL

Ballet advisory panel: George Balanchine, Lucia Chase, Agnes DeMille, Jose Limon, Jerome Robbins.

Concert advisory panel: Donald Engle, Howard Hanson, William Kolodny, Carlos Moseley, William Schuman, Samuel Spurbeck.

Historical advisory panel: Jane des Grange, Wilbur Glover, Robert Bruce Inverarity, Keith Martin, Ralph Miller.

Opera advisory panel: Frank Forest, John Gutman, Peyton Hibbitt, Gian Carlo Menotti, Douglas Moore, Julius Rudel.

Theater advisory panel: Ralph Bellamy, Edith Dappert, Sawyer Falk,[1] Howard Lindsay, Gertrude Macy, Donald Oenslager, Herman Shumlin.

Visual arts advisory panel: James Brown III, Lloyd Goodrich, Sheldon Keck, Beaumont Newhall, Gordon Smith, Harold Weston.

STAFF

On February 1, 1961, John H. MacFadyen was appointed temporary executive director to succeed Laurance Roberts who resigned, as planned, following the completion of the initial survey. On April 1 this appointment was made permanent.

On October 16, 1961, William Hull, former director of the Everson Museum of Art, Syracuse, was appointed assistant director.

On April 6, 1961, Mrs. Herman W. Hertweck was appointed office manager and Miss Sally Wasylik, secretary. Both were transferred to the council's staff from the temporary commission on the revision and simplification of the Constitution.

Financial statement

Support for touring programs:	
Opera	$70,000
Ballet	70,000
Orchestra	95,000
Theater	95,000
Visual arts	40,400
Technical assistance program:	
Museums and historical societies	27,600
Miscellaneous	2,000
Administration:	
Salaries, printing, travel, maintenance, and operation	50,000
Total	450,000

STATE OF NEW YORK, EXECUTIVE CHAMBER, ALBANY—PROCLAMATION

The National Federation of Music Clubs has set aside the month of February for the past 7 years to honor the American composer. The purpose is to encourage a greater knowledge of American music and its composers through workshops and performance. The Federation urges concert programs to include some compositions by Americans, whenever feasible, and asks that special effort be given to feature works of this Nation's composers, both native and naturalized.

The Parade of American Music is spectacular and effective. Its tremendous impact each February turns the eyes of our Nation, and those of other nations, upon the composers of the United States. Through this concentrated effort, hundreds of their works are now being performed while the music of past decades is reheard and examined. The native composer is known and respected as never before, along with the undisputed distinction of his work. Thus we demonstrate our pride in American music, paying tribute to our artists of the past, and to our living composers, through a living art: Now, therefore,

---

[1] Deceased, Aug. 30, 1961.

I, Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York, do hereby proclaim the month of February 1962, as American Music Month in New York State.

Given under my hand and the Privy Seal of the State at the capitol in the city of Albany this 22d day of January in the year of our Lord 1962.

NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Jan. 28, 1962]

PERFORMING ARTS FOUND NO GOLD MINE—U.S. SURVEY SHOWS ALL ARE OVERCROWDED

WASHINGTON.—A just released Government survey indicates the field of performing arts is overcrowded.

Aspiring music instrumentalists, singers, actors or actresses, and dancers have little hope of adequate recompense these days or in the foreseeable future.

Authority for this is the Bureau of Statistics of the Department of Labor, which covers the situation in its newest occupational outlook handbook. The volume, based on conditions in 1960, is recommended to young people as a reference guide in selecting their chosen fields.

CENTERED IN BIG CITIES

Musically talented young people according to the book, are doomed to disappointment if they expect to make money making music.

The survey says somewhat fewer than 100,000 musicians were employed in the United States as performers and teachers in mid-1960.

It said probably fewer than 75,000 singers were earning the major part of their incomes from vocal engagements or from teaching. This figure took into account jazz singers as well as opera singers. Also, it said, singers have a career span expectancy about half that of instrumentalists. Ditto dancers versus actors.

Not quite 20,000 actors and actresses were employed in their field in 1960, the survey said, and these professionals were more densely located in New York City, Los Angeles and Hollywood and, to a much lesser degree, Chicago. Very few were rated stars or big money earners.

About 15,000 dancers—half of them teachers—practiced their profession in 1960, the handbook says. Those who danced had to locate in the country's entertainment centers also frequented by the actors, singers and jazz musicians—Las Vegas, New York, Hollywood and Chicago.

SHORT OF MUSIC TEACHERS

While there was an overabundance of performing musicians, there was a shortage of music teachers. The survey said more are needed in the public schools where the main object is to produce music consumers and appreciators of art rather than professional performers. There were 9 million youngsters playing instruments in 1960.

There also was a shortage of church musicians—professional organists, choir directors, and singers. Most church musicians are paid little or volunteer their services.

ONE EXPANDING FIELD

There is need for musicians, actors, and dancers in the field of therapy in mental hospitals, the survey said, adding that this is an expanding and interesting field.

It said music students should forego the ranks of performers and concentrate on teaching if they are determined to stay in the field. It pointed out performing artists quite often have long periods of unemployment between jobs. With no steady employment, the overall level of their earnings is generally lower than many other occupations.

Also, performers rarely work steadily for one employer. Consequently few can qualify for unemployment compensation and seldom get sick leave or paid vacations as most other workers do.

The survey said these statistics point to one conclusion: pleasure, not money, is derived from making music, and all the highly competitive performing arts offer many frustrations, much insecurity and inadequate thriving for all the striving—even for the most gifted.

[From Equity magazine, February 1962]

ROUND TWO: MISS SANDS REPORTS ON THE SECOND LAP—THE SOUTH AMERICAN PORTION OF THE AMERICAN REPERTORY COMPANY'S TOUR

(By Dorothy Sands)

The sides of the auditorium of Queen's Hall Theater were open, and we competed with the raucous croaking of frogs and the roar of traffic. It was August in Port of Spain, Trinidad, the rainy season. The jungle heat was steaming. But the inhabitants of the island were desperately hungry for the taste of professional theater, and our welcome was as warm as the weather.

We had begun the second installment of our two-part tour for the U.S. Department of State (Equity magazine, January 1962; August, July, May 1961). Back from Europe last June, the ANTA-Theater Guild American Repertory Company was honored by Government officials, given 3 weeks' rest, rehearsed with cast replacements, and flown to Trinidad on August 3. On August 7 we were on. The South American tour was underway.

Trinidad behind us, we next rose 8,600 feet to Bogotá, Columbia, where some of us required whiffs of oxygen offstage to get through our scenes. There we played two student matinees at minimum prices, and invited actors and technicians to a technical rehearsal of "The Miracle Worker" which began at 11 o'clock one night. At our next stop, Lima, Peru, there was a student strike, so no such arrangements could be made.

In Chile we found the keenest theater interest and the greatest opportunity to fulfill our mission. Santiago has two universities, the State and the Catholic, and each sponsors a professional theater company. A number of Chilean students have attended Yale, Carnegie Tech, and other U.S. colleges to study theater on Fulbright scholarships. Attending a rehearsal of a student production of "Rhinoceros," we were tremendously impressed by the brilliance of the direction and the superior quality of the acting. To my mind, much of it surpassed the Broadway version.

We also accepted the students' invitation to attend a class in acting, where we saw excellent demonstrations of their work. The session was climaxed by a group of four young actors joining in an improvisation, a mixture of Spanish and English, that was hilarious.

We had flown down over the trackless desert that borders the western coastline of South America. From Chile we crossed the jagged snow-capped peaks of the Andes and vast green stretches of the Argentinian pampas to Buenos Aires. There we opened in a marvelous new theater, the San Martine, the last word in modern architecture: a mammoth structure with three auditoriums and a lobby as vast as Times Square. Most South American theaters are modeled on European-type opera houses with tiers of ornately decorated boxes. The Municipal Theater in Rio and the Palacio de Belles Artes in Mexico City were two of the largest of this type. We gathered the energy required to fill that enormous Rio theater, and relaxed with wonderful swimming and sunning on Copacabana Beach. Rio is breathtakingly beautiful with its glorious harbors and jetting peaks.

Cordoba in Argentina and São Paulo in Brazil are great industrial cities, the latter most like New York with stunning skyscrapers and briskly paced pedestrians.

Uruguay was a theatrical highlight as well as a democratic oasis. There we felt a stability that every other country we visited sadly lacked. We had been terribly shocked by the incredible contrast between the fabulously rich and the pitifully poor. In Uruguay there was a substantial, prosperous, middle class and very few beggers. Here, too, was a thriving theater and an eager, enlightened public. And here was Concepcion Zorrilla, the beautiful leading actress of Uruguay who had been the star of the State Theater Co. until she established one of her own. She invited our company to see her production of "Hotel Paradiso"—the Spanish title, "A Flea in Your Ear." This was a French farce played to the hilt by Latins who had the temperaments and the technique to do it justice. We cheered them. And the Montevidean audiences responded with equal enthusiasm to our three productions.

In general, the South Americans were less effusive than the Europeans. They are more conventional and restrained. They did not share the Nordic enthusiasm for "Skin of Our Tenth." It baffled them. "Glass Menagerie" received the greatest critical acclaim. "The Miracle Worker" evoked the warmest audience response. But there was unanimous praise for the productions and the acting. This tour has certainly proved that the American theater has made its mark and can stand eye to eye with the theater in any country. It is admired and respected for its technical efficiency and its high acting standard.

The long flight over the Brazilian jungles—a solid green carpet broken only occasionally by rivers twisting like brown snakes until we reached the delta at the mouth of the Amazon, and then across the Orinoco—took up to Caracus, Venezuela, the scene of much anti-American unpleasantness.

The students at the university invited us to visit the campus and see a dance demonstration. When the American Ambassador had gone out there they had burned his car. We met only hospitality and friendliness. We were impressed by the amazing modern buildings—second only to the university in Mexico City. The dance group performed superbly in their great auditorium which has a tremendous Calder mobile on its ceiling.

Central America enchanted us with its physical beauty and ravishing color: San José and Guatemala City from which we made trips to the ruins of Antigua and the market of Chichicastenanga. Then climaxing the tour, we played Mexico City, Guadalajara, and Monterrey.

In South America, as in Europe, there were the embassy receptions, official teas and luncheons, television and radio appearances, visits to universities and hospitals, and whatever meetings the State Department officials arranged with interested theater groups and individuals. These were a most important part of our job and I think the great majority of the company felt the seriousness and importance of the ambassadorial angle of our mission.

No account of our tour—even as sketchy and superficial as this limited space demands—would be in any way complete without a mention of the unique contribution that Helen Hayes made, not only as an artist, but as a diplomat.

Soon after our arrival in each city the stars and featured players attended a press conference. There were always several members of the Communist press and often "Yankee-go-home" sympathizers whose questions and manner indicated their hostility. Helen's ability to meet these situations with complete poise and charm, and with no rancor and her extraordinary gift for choosing exactly the right word, was exemplified in a roundtable conference at Caracas. The first question came like a shot. "What would you do, Miss Hayes, if you were asked to play 'Mother Courage' by Bertholdt Brecht in Moscow?" Helen looked startled and there was laughter. "In Moscow? Well, that is a dream, isn't it? But I like to dream, too," she said. "Nothing would make me happier than to play 'Mother Courage' in Moscow."

The second questioner was even more belligerent. "Why didn't you do a play by Arthur Miller? For my money he's worth all three of the authors you brought."

"I'm sorry we couldn't do a Miller play," Helen replied. "I'd love to play in 'Death of a Salesman.' I suppose the gentleman infers that we didn't do a Miller play because of the subject matter. He is quite mistaken. We are not interested in the political ideas of playwrights except insofar as the playwrights present them properly as dramatists. As actors we demand only one thing: good theater. We always admire, support, and respect good theater. In our country the artist is free to say and write whatever he pleases. We have no Pasternaks in our country."

Could Dean Rusk have done better?

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to propound a parliamentary inquiry, with respect to which I invite the attention of the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JAVITS. My parliamentary inquiry is as follows: After all other Senators have been recognized in the morning hour for 3 minutes, may a Senator who has already been recognized be recognized again?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator may be recognized again.

I say to the Senator, I really regret having to be a little bit strict on this, but I have had enough abuse on this, and that is it.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator has his own view on that. I have had my parliamentary inquiry answered. I yield the floor.

CONCENTRATION IN GIANT CHAINSTORES OF DIFFERENT OPERATIONS OF THE MEAT INDUSTRY

Mr. HICKEY. Mr. President, the wide spread between the prices received by stockgrowers for their animals and those paid by the housewife for lamb and beef has long been a matter of the utmost concern to the stockmen of Wyoming and the West. They have been watching with alarm the growing concentration in the giant chainstores of the different operations of the meat industry. The practices of these large corporations, which have entered the packing field and which are able to control meat buying throughout the country because of the magnitude of their operations, plus the importation of meat from abroad, cause a larger and larger spread between livestock prices and finished meat prices. Today this spread is wider than ever before.

At a recent meeting of the Colorado Cattlemen's Association, one of our Wyoming ranchers, Courtenay Davis of Horse Creek, spoke on this subject so vital to our country. His perceptive and illuminating remarks were carried in the January issue of Cattle Guard, the association publication, and I ask unanimous consent that this exceptionally informative article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Rancher Asks Law To Restrain Chainstore Practices

(By Courtenay Davis)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following talk was presented to the annual midwinter convention of the CCA at Colorado Springs in December. Those who were on hand were very impressed with the remarks made by Mr. Davis. As a matter of information to the producer, the complete talk is reprinted here. Cattle Guard would welcome pro and con comments from Colorado producers on this subject and any received will be reprinted in future issues.)

Cow business is the biggest piece of American agriculture. Eighty-two percent of the agricultural land in this country is used for feeding livestock and this land is owned and operated by millions of individual enterprisers. In 1958 cattle and calves returned more cash receipts to producers than the combined receipts of all six basic crops—wheat, corn, cotton, tobacco, rice and peanuts.

In the year 1960, sales of cattle and calves provided 21 percent of cash receipts for farmers, the largest single source of receipts.

Beef is the largest volume item sold in our food stores, and produces approximately 12 percent of their total dollar sales.

With these statistics as background, you can appreciate my hesitance in appearing before you on a subject so complex that no man can truthfully say he completely understands all its ramifications.

In many respects the interests of ranchers and cattle feeders are identical.

Over the long pull, range cattle prices have been governed by fat cattle prices. So what is good for the cattle feeder is good for us.

One of the main factors affecting the long range outlook for cattle prices is the tremendous buying power now concentrated in the hands of the chainstores.

While the packing industry has been decentralizing, the distribution of meat at retail which was formerly decentralized in small retail stores, has been centralized in huge chainstore operations.

Of the 25 largest food retailing organizations in the United States 13 are corporate-type chains and 12 are voluntary or cooperative chains. (Over 70 percent of the beef sold at retail today is handled by chainstores.)

This centralization of the distribution of meat has shifted the possible power to control or manipulate meat prices from the packers to the chain organizations.

They can shut off or turn on the demand for beef, pork, lamb, poultry, or fish by shifting their advertising emphasis to feature whatever product they wish to promote.

Meat is approximately one-quarter of the total dollar sales in chainstores, and beef dominates meat sales.

In many such stores beef is approximately 50 percent of all meat sales.

Meat to the grocery shopper is the main item on the grocery list.

The chains have found beef so important to their competitive success that they build their whole store around their meat departments.

Recent press releases indicate the U.S. Department of Agriculture under the provisions of the Packers and Stockyards Act is finally going to investigate certain practices of the chainstores to determine if they are using their concentrated buying power to the detriment of livestock interests or the public.

There has been a great deal of smoke and talk about whether the chains are manipulating the price of cattle through the dressed meat trade.

Many ranchers like myself are interested in seeing a full-scale, no-holds-barred, investigation.

I am not intimating that chainstore buying methods are illegal under present laws, but if the investigation discloses that those methods and the tremendous power they exercise are directly or indirectly depressing the prices of fat cattle while they maintain their relatively fixed profit margins, then in my view producers and feeders should both press for adequate legislation making such practices and power illegal.

In the proposed investigation the profit or losses, the margins maintained, and the overhead of the total operation charged to the meat end of the business should be fully investigated and the facts and figures opened to the public.

The concentration of power in the distribution of food held by the chains, in my opinion, has made them a public utility and as such they should be, like Caesar's wife. above suspicion.

The facts are clear that today there is the largest spread in history between wholesale beef prices and retail beef prices. In 1951 the producer got 75 percent of the retail dollar, and today his share is less than 60 percent of that same dollar. (About 57 percent.)

At Omaha in November, 1951 (when fat steers then sold up to $40 and $41), retail beef prices then prevailing there were 65 to 79 cents for choice roasts and steaks.

Current fat cattle top at Omaha is $25 for fat steers, while choice roasts and steaks there are largely 89 cents to $1.09.

What's more, although retail prices are still in line with a year ago, carcass beef at wholesale (choice steer and heifer beef) is selling to the retailer at 50 cents to $1 less than a year ago.

When you look at these comparative prices, and the ever-widening spread, is it any wonder some of us ranchers are interested in a thorough investigation?

Another factor vitally affecting the long-range outlook for cattle prices is the growing practice of certain packers and chainstores to feed cattle for their own account or to contract with large commercial cattle feeders to fatten cattle for them, or to finance cattle feeding operations, or to contract with commercial feedlot operators for the future delivery of fat cattle.

These practices give certain packers and chains a constant supply of fat cattle in reserve to call on whenever the supply is short and prices start to rise.

The reserve of fat cattle enables the packer or chain to withdraw from the market at will and draw on their own supplies of fed cattle to meet the needs of their killing crews, if the market is not to their liking.

This removes competition from the market and restrains trade, and as such tends to manipulate the price.

Packer and chainstore feeding is relatively small at present, but is growing fast, and on the west coast it has become firmly entrenched.

A recent report from Denver is that another large chain has just purchased a commercial feed yard in that area and proposes to enlarge it to a 75,000 head per year capacity.

How are we to maintain a free enterprise and competitive system supposed to be regulated by the law of supply and demand, if the packers and chains are on both sides of the supply and demand equation?

For the individual feeder this condition means he sits in a stiff poker game with high stakes, with the other players, the packers and chains, using marked cards.

You are no doubt all familar with the recent decision of the U.S. district court which refused to modify those provisions of the 1920 consent decree which provides, among other things, that the big four packers of yesteryear cannot engage in the retail distribution of food.

If you recall, Swift, Armour, and Cudahy asked that the consent decree be modified to enable them to enter the retail field to distribute food so they could compete with the chains.

The district court refused to modify the decree. The language of Judge Hoffman in this case interested me when he stated: "It is sometimes necessary to restrict competition in order to preserve it."

If the U.S. district court believes the big packers should stay out of the retail field, in all fairness, why shouldn't the chains be kept out of the packing business?

The few chains now in the packing business are not in it on too large a scale as yet, but if they continue to encroach on this field, they will have another means of unfair competition and another means to restrain trade.

In my opinion, the right of chainstore organizations to engage in the packing business should be made illegal.

This whole problem of packer and chainstore feeding, chains getting in the packing business, the leverage in the buying power of chains in the dressed meat trade through their purchasing methods is unregulated at the present time.

These tremendous aggregations of corporate wealth and power in the hands of a few men affect the daily lives of hundreds of thousands of individual ranchers, cattle feeders, and the millions of consumers of meat products in this country.

Please don't misunderstand me. I am not opposed to bigness as such, but to protect all those who are affected by these big enterprises and to insure fair play for all in a competitive free society, it seems high time that rules and laws should be enacted under which all can live and prosper without one segment of the industry being allowed to dominate or exploit the others.

The Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921 was enacted 40 years ago.

It was a good law for that period, but in the meantime the industry from producer to feeder, to packer to retail distributor, has changed drastically.

New pressures have developed in the industry and new concentrations of economic power have been created which do not bode well for the industry's future if they are not restrained in a reasonable way to preserve a fair competitive business.

The present meat trade outlook reminds me of that era in the securities business and the investment banking field in the period of the twenties and early thirties before the passage of the Securities and Exchange Act.

In the securities business there were unscrupulous groups of men of so-called high standing who exploited the investing public unmercifully.

There was unlimited speculation, rigged markets, short selling by insiders, faked information about corporate activities, and so forth.

The SEC Act was not then, and is not now, a panacea for all ills of the securities business, but most open-minded people will admit, I'm sure, that it brought relative order out of chaos and helped reestablish a real measure of common honesty in most securities dealings.

Many upright and well intentioned people who were not guilty of any wrong-doing were hurt financially by the realinement of functions which took place at that time.

Many big banks were compelled to divorce their investment banking affiliates, for example. In other words, banks were required to confine their activities to the general banking field and securities investment houses compelled to engage only in the securities business under strict regulations.

There were tremendous outcries from the upright, as well as the unscrupulous who were hurt by those changes, but in retrospect who will deny that those severe changes were not in the long run for the best interest of everyone?

To return to the meat trade, there are times when the concentration of economic power in a few hands hurts the overall economy—as Judge Hoffman said, "It is sometimes necessary to restrict competition in order to preserve it."

As an individual rancher, expressing only my own opinion, I think that time has arrived.

Government interference in private industry is not to my liking, but whenever one group or quasi-monopoly gets so strong that it can squeeze the public—producers or consumers—then it is time for the Government to act as umpire in the game to restore the equilibrium of fair competition.

Another of the main factors concerning the long-term outlook for cattle prices is the present unbridled importation of meat. Old cows and bulls provide ranchers and dairymen with a good share of their income. From 1952 to 1958 ranchers and dairymen were receiving very low prices for them.

This cow and bull beef normally is approximately 30 percent of total beef production. Two-thirds of this beef is used for hamburger and one-third for sausage, frankfurters, bologna, and so forth, that is, processed meat.

When prices started to rise a bit in 1957 a flood of imported beef suitable and used for processed meat entered this country. As a result in 1958, 8.4 percent of the total beef (or beef equivalent of live imported cattle) consumed here was imported.

In 1959 imports were 8.3 percent and in 1960, 5.9 percent. Now, mind you, all this imported into a country supposedly plagued by a surplus of cattle, hogs, poultry, feed grains and so forth.

In 1957 and 1958 the United States moved up to the unusual position of being the second largest meat importer in the world.

As a result of this competition the ratio of slaughter cow prices to all beef prices is lower than the average for the previous 10 years.

On September 15, 1961, the average price received by farmers for cows was $14.20 and the so-called parity price worked out by University of Wyoming statisticians was $19.40 on that date. Even today, as you can see, cow prices are only 73 percent of parity while parity price for all beef cattle is 85 percent.

What has caused this flood of imported beef and when will it stop? The former president of the Nebraska Stock Growers Association in the April issue of Western Livestock wrote as follows:

"Prices of dressed cow beef in Australia last fall, that is 1959, were from $16 to $20 per hundredweight. At that time, similar meat was selling at from $31 to $35 per hundredweight in the United States.

"Australian prices would probably have been even lower except for their large exports. But these prices show that producers in those countries can operate at price levels that would bankrupt our domestic livestock industry. What has been the effect of those imports on cattle prices? Prices on the Chicago and San Francisco markets for utility cows and choice steers during this period of heavy importation dropped $2.50 and $7 per hundredweight below 1958 prices in the same market on the same dates. What is the solution?

"Let's look at our present tariff provisions. In 1947 import duty on beef and veal, fresh chilled or frozen, was reduced from 6 cents per pound to 3 cents per pound, although the 6 cent rate had been in effect since 1930.

"The United States also reduced the duty on cattle weighing less than 200 pounds from 2½ cents to 1½ cents per pound on the first 200,000 head imported annually.

"Cattle between 200 pounds and 700 pounds remained at 2½ cents per pound, but the tariff rate on cattle weighing more than 700 pounds was reduced from 3 cents per pound to 1½ cents per pound for not over 400,000 head entered in a 12-month period of any year, and also a reduction from 3 cents per pound to 2½ cents per pound for cattle entered in excess of the foregoing limitations.

"Preserved meats and other meat not otherwise provided for was reduced from 20 percent ad valorem to 10 percent ad valorem.

"The injustice of this and other reductions is apparent when we look at the change in our economy since 1930.

"General price levels have more than doubled since 1930.

"Percentagewise the cut in tariff has, therefore, been more than doubled. Any talk of these rates now furnishing any protection to the American producer shows a lack of understanding of our problem."

In this same article it was stated that 40 times as much mutton, 15 times as much beef, and about 16 times as much pork entered the United States from abroad as we imported only 8 years previous.

Whether we like it or not, I submit to you that we are living in a managed economy when the Federal Government forces ever higher wage costs through stepped up minimum wages, annual wage boosts through the connivance and acquiescence of the National Labor Relations Board, and ever mounting Federal taxes.

Most Government advisers and economists seem to feel an annual depreciation of the currency of about 2 percent per annum under the guise of the "growth cult" is a desirable aim for Federal policy. In such an atmosphere it is my belief producers and feeders should insist on and are entitled to a doubling of the tariff provisions in effect in 1930, namely a raise from 6 cents per pound to 12 cents per pound, and so on down the line to preserve a fair cattle price for domestic producers and finishers.

In addition we should ask that processed meat products, if made with imported meats should bear a stamp readily visible to the consumer, "Made with imported meat from ———" and the name of the country.

Many manufactured articles imported here from other countries bear such labels. The dumping of a boatload of beef carcasses in a given area creates an impact on the market price for beef far beyond what it should.

What is the present situation regarding imports? The U.S. Agricultural Service recently stated: "Despite the fact that the United States is the world's largest red meat producer, imports during the first 7 months of 1961 showed an increase of 14 percent." With this sort of dumping going on is it any wonder farmers are receiving only $14.20 per hundredweight for cows?

Why should American meat producers be compelled to bear the full brunt of subsidizing our manufacturers who wish to export to the countries dumping cheap meat here?

We are already subsidizing our own consumers by giving them meat at low prices.

An hour of labor here buys more meat than ever before.

Ranchers and feeders here are not making much of a return for their labor and investment—and yet Australian and New Zealand producers are planning on increasing their exports of meat to us.

New refrigerator ships are constantly being put in service. Even the Australian Meat Board has urged its producers to go slow on invading the U.S. market.

In time these imports may have the effect of putting too low a ceiling on domestic cattle prices.

In my opinion we cattle producers for our own protection in order to secure fair prices for our products in a free and competitive market should demand of Congress that we have:

1. A realistic tariff program protecting domestic producers. (Remember, 82 percent of our agricultural land is used for feeding livestock.)

2. A thorough investigation of unfair practices now prevalent in the meat industry.

3. Modification and enlargement of the Packers and Stockyards Act making it unlawful for—

(a) Packers and chains to feed cattle directly or indirectly for their own account, or to finance cattle feeding operations in any way.

(b) Packers and chain organizations to contract with anyone to feed cattle for them or to contract for fat cattle for future delivery.

(c) Chain organizations to engage in the packing industry.

To sum up: My remarks and opinions may seem to you to be too critical of certain methods and practices of the packers and chainstore organizations.

The other side of the coin is, we producers have nothing but praise for the marvelous manner in which the packers and chains have processed and moved into consumption the tremendous tonnages of meat ranchers and farmers have produced. Our entire meat team of producer, finisher, packer, and distributor is the marvel and envy of the world.

What suggestions I have made are no panacea for the industry, but I believe my suggestions are not unreasonable.

In brief, let the producer and feeder raise and finish the cattle, the packer process them, the chainstore distribute the product, and each confine his activities to his own field under regulations and practices which are fair to all.

RESIDUAL FUEL OIL PRICES AND IMPORT RESTRICTIONS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, if there are no other Senators seeking recognition in the morning hour, I seek recognition in the morning hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. JAVITS. I have a few brief remarks to make on residual fuel oil prices and import restrictions.

In May of last year the President instructed the Director of OCDM, now the Office of Emergency Planning, to conduct a study in depth to ascertain whether or not residual fuel oil imports were endangering national security—the reason for the original application of these controls. I understand that this study is now complete, and urge the President to instruct the Director of OEP to forward that report to the White House so that prompt and decisive action can be taken by the President.

The continuation of import restrictions on residual fuel oil is also causing serious economic harm to our friends overseas. Venezuela, a country that is not only our loyal friend but a leader in the alliance for progress, is the primary supplier of residual fuel oil to us.

In New York State, both marketers and consumers of residual or heavy fuel oil are suffering hardships and are being penalized by restrictions on residual or heavy fuel oil imports. The marketer, particularly the independent small businessman, is fighting for his business life because controls have concentrated quotas in the hands of a few major suppliers—and even the latter are against this arbitrary allocation of business volume by the Government. Competition has been restrained and a product that is already in short supply in our country has been further curtailed as to available stocks by restrictions on imports.

Residual fuel import restrictions have supply and price repercussions, directly or indirectly, on every consumer throughout the country, wherever the product is or can be used for heating or electric power purposes.

In view of the steady long-term decline in domestic fuel oil production—about 4 percent in 1961 alone—the east coast, which accounts for over 60 percent of the total U.S. consumption of this product, must rely increasingly on foreign supplies to meet its growing requirements. However, the import restrictions which were placed on residual fuel oil in April 1959 have put an absolute ceiling on its importation. This ceiling, together with the declining rate of domestic output, has caused a tightness in total supply which has forced prices up. Such a development is the natural—in fact, inevitable—consequence of restriction in supplies.

Probably the clearest indication of this situation is found in the changing price level of published bids for the residual fuel oil requirements of the city of New York. These bids generally represent the lowest prices at which the product is available for this type of consumer. In the five boroughs of New York, average annual quotations for the last 3 years are as follows: in 1959, $2.268 per barrel; in 1960, $2.410 per barrel; and in 1961, $2.776 per barrel; a 22.4-percent increase in 3 years.

Since the city of New York uses annually more than 3 million barrels of residual fuel oil for public consumption, the price increases in 1961 alone have cost the public authorities $1.1 million. Public bid quotations from other areas, such as Boston, show that the price trends in New York are definitely not isolated cases.

Further evidence of the price rise is provided by the monthly price data on residual fuel oil issued by the Office of Emergency Planning in Washington, D.C. These data show that average east coast cargo prices for resellers and direct users rose to $2.28 in the first 10 months of 1961, compared to $2.21 in the same period of 1960 and $2.14 in 1959.

Since New York State is the largest consumer of residual fuel oil on the east coast, the price increases have fallen particularly heavily on the people of that State who in 1960 consumed over 76 million barrels of this commodity, about 70 percent of which came from abroad.

It should also be pointed out that the increase in residual fuel oil prices has had the indirect effect of raising the cost of electric power to many consumers in New York. The largest utility in the State has an automatic fuel adjustment clause in its rate structure. Since this utility uses considerable quantities of residual fuel oil, any price increase is automatically passed on to consumers. Evidence of such a price increase is provided not only by the previously cited figures but also by the Office of Emergency Planning's latest price data on east coast cargo sales of residual fuel oil. These show the following prices for cargo sales to utilities only October 1958, $2.11 per barrel; October 1959, $2.04 per barrel; October 1960, $2.21 per barrel; and October 1961, $2.24 per barrel, a 6 percent increase over 1958 and a 10 percent increase over 1959.

In the last several days prices of residual fuel oil have increased sharply in California which usually supplies a small quantity of residual oil to the east coast. At the same time, price increases have occurred in the Midwest which draws a large share of its residual oil supplies from the U.S. gulf coast which is also the source for about 20 percent of the east coast's residual oil supplies for internal consumption. The indications are clear that east coast consumers can expect no price relief on residual fuel oil under the present import restrictions.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a statement on this subject prepared by the Independent Fuel Oil Marketers of America, Inc.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RESIDUAL FUEL OIL SITUATION IN 1961

U.S. residual fuel oil consumption declined in 1961 while prices rose and domestic production continued its long-term downward trend, according to Edward M. Carey, president of the Independent Fuel Oil Marketers of America, the trade association of the independent residual fuel oil cargo buyers.

In a review of the residual fuel oil market in 1961 Mr. Carey said that on the basis of preliminary government and industry data total U.S. consumption of this product amounted to 1.5 million barrels daily, reflecting a 2-percent decline from the previous year. The decline was the second in a row, following a 1-percent drop in 1960. Mr. Carey called attention to the fact that consumption of all other major oil products had risen in both 1961 and 1960.

The lower consumption was particularly pronounced on the east coast, which accounts for 60 percent of the Nation's total residual fuel oil requirements, Mr. Carey stated. In this 16-State region, extending from Maine to Florida, total consumption in 1961 declined by about 3.1 percent to 881,000 barrels daily. Here, too, the IFOMA president explained, the annual decline was the second in 2 years. The east coast drop was registered in both bunkers for ships in international trade and the domestic use of the fuel, such as industrial processing, space heating, and so forth.

Residual fuel oil consumption by steam-powered electric utilities on the east coast increased by about 4.7 percent to 155,000 barrels daily in 1961. Outside the east coast, residual oil consumption by utilities was a gain of only marginal significance—about

1 percent of total fuel demand—except on the west coast where no coal is consumed. Mr. Carey stated that according to Federal Power Commission data the increase in residual oil demand by east coast utilities was entirely due to a higher level of total fuel consumption by the utilities and not to a displacement of other fuels. Oil's share in this market remained, therefore, stationary at 15 percent of total fuel consumption. Coal, by contrast, increased not only its volume sales to east coast utilities but also its share of total consumption, which rose from 73.5 to 75 percent in 1961, while natural gas declined by a corresponding percentage.

Turning to the supply picture, Mr. Carey pointed out that while licensed imports of residual fuel oil in the year 1961 had increased by 24,000 barrels daily to a total of 446,000 barrels daily, preliminary figures indicated that the domestic production of this commodity had decreased by 38,000 barrels daily to about 889,000 barrels daily. Hence, he said, total new supplies from all sources were less than in the previous year. Again, the east coast, where virtually all imported residual fuel oil is consumed, was hit particularly hard by the decline in domestic production, according to the IFOMA spokesman. Combined refinery production on the east coast and its major outside domestic supply source, the U.S. gulf coast district, declined throughout 1961, from 397,000 barrels daily in the first quarter to about 338,000 barrels daily in the fourth quarter. For 1961 as a whole, production was at least 6 percent below the previous year's.

Mr. Carey explained that the lower availability of residual fuel oil on the east coast was not paralleled by a corresponding decline in the potential demand for this product. This, he said, is evidenced by the increase in residual oil prices in 1961 which could not have occurred if the gap between supply and requirements had not grown. The IFOMA president ascribed this gap to the existing rigidity in supplies, caused by the Government-established absolute ceiling on imports and the steady decline in domestic production in order to raise the yield of other petroleum products per barrel of crude oil. In 1961 the yield of residual fuel oil at east and gulf coast refineries had dropped to the record annual low of 8.4 percent per barrel of crude oil processed.

The price increases in 1961 occurred at most levels of sales. Thus, the posted New York Harbor barge price rose from an average of $2.53 per barrel in 1960 to $2.61 in 1961, while posted gulf coast cargo prices rose from $2.24 to about $2.31 per barrel. Actual prices, which sometimes differ from posted ones, followed the same trend. According to the monthly price series published by the Office of Emergency Planning, the average east coast price for cargo sales to resellers and direct users during the first 10 months of 1961 amounted to $2.28 per barrel compared to $2.21 for the same period of the previous year.

Mr. Carey predicted a continuation of high prices and declining consumption for 1962 unless the present system of import restrictions was abolished. He pointed out that the coal industry, the principal advocate for import restrictions, did not appear to have suffered from residual fuel oil competition in 1961. Coal's 4-percent production decline in 1961 had been due almost entirely to a sharp cutback in coking operations by steel plants, a process for which only bituminous coal can be used. Mr. Carey repeated that in coal's principal market, the electric utilities, oil's share had not increased in 1961.

PUBLIC HEALTH RESEARCH PROJECTS

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a letter from the Director of the Budget, Mr. David E. Bell, dated January 25, 1962, in which he confirms a report I have received relating to a grant made by the National Institute of Mental Health.

I am making a statement today based largely on this confirmation. I ask unanimous consent to have this statement printed as a part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA, IN RE HEALTH INSTITUTE GRANTS FOR MONKEY STUDY

The Federal Government of the United States, which is operating on deficits reaching billions of dollars a year and running a debt of $300 billion, plans to spend $1,201,925 in 6 years to study the "affectional relationship of an infant monkey and his mother."

This fact was confirmed to me in a letter of January 25, 1962, from Federal Budget Director David E. Bell, who said such a grant had been made by the National Institute of Mental Health to a professor of psychology at the University of Wisconsin.

I am advised that the professor has been supported by the National Institutes of Health since 1954 in his research on the behavior of the rhesus monkey, and that this new money is for 6 additional years, "subject to the availability" of Federal appropriations.

I understand from the Budget Director that the professor now plans to undertake studies on "the nature and development of the affectional relationship of the infant monkey and his mother, as well as behavioral changes resulting from metabolic disorders."

I am told also that the professor "plans to continue and expand his work on the developmental aspects of learning, problem solving, development of visual exploration and curiosity and related matters."

Since it appears that this is not the first Federal grant to this project or its predecessors, I have asked the Budget Director to advise me as to the amount of prior grants. In addition, I am requesting additional information from other sources as to other projects in this field which are wholly or largely financed with Federal funds.

It is difficult to be critical of health research, but it seems to me that much more care should be exercised in the expenditure of taxpayers' money even in this important area. These research grants are running into the thousands of projects which are costing tremendous sums of money.

I cite two other projects as examples to be found in the first 2 pages of a list running to more than 350 pages: One is for studying biological control of snails by shellcracker sunfish, and another is for the study of diving reflex and volume receptors in the seal.

Over the past 5 years the President has requested more than $1.6 billion for the National Institutes of Health, Congress has appropriated nearly $2.3 billion, and actual expenditures have totaled $1.9 billion.

It is my purpose to make further inquiry into the nature and costs of research projects which are being undertaken in the name of public health.

THE 1961 EDWARD P. MORGAN ESSAY CONTEST

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, all of us are agreed that everything of the present and the future belongs to youth. Most of us are willing to agree, also, that today's young people will be the heirs to our mistakes of the past.

That they must be equipped to face a critical future and to correct the errors of their elders is a plain fact of life. We all realize full well that their equipment must be manufactured in our schools and our churches, and then must be transmitted to each and every American child.

How to disseminate an abiding interest and a sense of urgency is a problem, however.

The radio network of the American Broadcasting Co. has opened the door to do the job. The 1961 Edward P. Morgan essay contest has as its stated purpose "to increase the awareness of American youth to its national and international responsibilities."

The contest serves effectively in focusing the analytic thought of young people on the problems that bestir our society. The topic selected for this year's competition, "Youth's Role in U.S. Foreign Policy," is particularly apt and provocative in this age of young people and young nations. Such a project would be worthwhile on behalf of any industry, firm, or individual.

It is of special pleasure to me—and of special interest to us all—that this contest is sponsored by an arm of the broadcasting industry. This effort certainly reflects all that is best in the public service philosophies of the broadcast media.

Under the leadership of President Robert R. Pauley, the ABC radio network has undertaken this project in order to encourage the Nation's undergraduate college students to think through their role in our Government and in our society.

I asked, and was allowed, to read a sampling of the entries, and was pleased to note the clarity and thoroughness of thought with which these young people approached their problems and ours.

It seems to me to be particularly appropriate that a man who is personally known to many of us and is deeply respected by all of us is both nominally and intellectually represented by this contest. Edward P. Morgan is well known to all of us in this Chamber as a longtime champion of youth and education. His liberal and enlightened attitudes are equally valuable to both generations.

The ABC radio network has succeeded, in addition, in attracting a list of eminent Americans as judges of the 1961 contest: Chester Bowles, Special U.S. Ambassador to Africa, Asia, and Latin America; Senator Fulbright, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee; Senator Dirksen, Senate minority leader; R. Sargent Shriver, Director of the Peace Corps; and Mr. Morgan.

In addition to planning, implementing, and widely promoting this worthy effort, the network called upon its affiliate stations to contribute money toward the two graduate scholarships which will be awarded, by volunteering most of the $2,800 to be presented in the form of college tuition.

I also offer my commendations because of the fact that the balance of this money was provided without fanfare by the AFL–CIO, longtime sponsor of Ed

Morgan's weekday program of news commentary, by the union's advertising agency, and by Mr. Morgan himself.

In reading through a number of these essays by America's enlightened youthful minds, one is struck by the fervor with which today's college populace views America's world role. This must be regarded as more than mere youthful enthusiasm.

I believe that I have read in these essays a demonstration of young people's faith in democracy.

If the spirit which pervades these writings can be preserved and encouraged—perhaps through such efforts as the Edward P. Morgan Essay Contest—then this Nation need not fear the future. There is indeed copious cause for optimism if an educated American youth can concern itself with questions such as neutrality and disarmament, the critical issues of international relations. These problems will be theirs, and the solutions must be theirs.

The 1961 Edward P. Morgan Essay Contest stands as a major contribution to the welfare of young America, through the process of alerting and stimulating our youth to the awesome responsibilities of tomorrow's world. I commend this effort.

This year's competition has earned the praise of many Members of the U.S. Senate and the House of Representatives, as well as Cabinet members and broadcasting leaders. I wish to acknowledge my recognition of this highly unusual public service by a network. I want, further, to call the Nation's attention to a prime example of the radio-television industry's finest efforts as a constructive social force.

I congratulate ABC radio, Mr. Morgan, Mr. Pauley, and the contest's winners—who are even now being chosen, as well as all the other entrants in this fine competition. They offer great hope to the America of tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

AID FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 1241) to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities and to authorize scholarships for undergraduate study in such institutions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1173, House Joint Resolution 612, which is an emergency resolution relating to supplemental appropriations for the Veterans' Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. A resolution (H.J. Res. 612) making supplemental appropriations for the Veterans' Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, House Joint Resolution 612 is an urgent deficiency appropriation for the Veterans' Administration. The Veterans' Administration is out of money for carrying out two of its programs. In one program it has been out of money since January 1, and in the other out of money as of yesterday.

The resolution involves a deficiency appropriation, first, for readjustment benefits. The Administration made an estimate last year, and it was understood it might be necessary to come back to the Congress for further funds for this particular education and training program. The Administration estimated there would be 85,000 Korean veterans who would take advantage of the education and training allowances. It has turned out that more veterans have filed for the training and education allowances, and the Veterans' Administration now has 98,000 such veterans in the program; $55 million is urgently needed, as is provided in the joint resolution, to make the needed payments.

As I say, Mr. President, it was understood last year, when representatives of the Veterans' Administration appeared before the committee on the regular budget estimate, that they were merely making the best estimate they could make at that time and stated they probably would have to come back to the Congress for additional funds for this program.

The second item is the Loan Guaranty Revolving Fund. The estimate last year of the properties to be acquired has been increasingly exceeded for each quarter of the fiscal year.

The Congress provided an expenditure ceiling of $120,624,000 for the Loan Guaranty Revolving Fund. This is the fund which is used for the GI loans for housing. There have been more mortgages foreclosed in the housing field, on the GI loans, in the past two quarters, than were anticipated when the regular budget estimate was presented. Many of the foreclosures have occurred after the so-called recession of 2 years ago, or a year ago.

The Veterans' Administration needs an increase of $115,247,000 in the expenditure ceiling for this program. The fund is used to take over the properties on which there has been a default, as to the guaranteed or insured loans.

The Administration took in 9,414 properties in the first half of fiscal year 1962, and it is expected they will take in another 8,400 properties by June 30. This situation results mainly from economic conditions in 12 States. It is a spotty situation, in pockets. There are 12 State offices involved. It is not a nationwide situation.

The Administration was operating under an original expenditure ceiling of $120,624,000, and needs an increase of $115,247,000 in the expenditure ceiling, which is provided in the joint resolution under consideration.

That is a lot of money, Mr. President, but I think the Senate should understand that it relates to the entire program. This is money required to pay the mortgages when the property is taken in. There is a return to the Government later on. The Administration may rent the property, may refinance it, or may sell it. There is an offset, and the balance sheet does not look as bad as the presentation might sound. There is, however, a warning signal, in that there is an increase in the takeover of GI mortgages.

Under the program 5 million homes have been insured with mortgages totaling $51 billion. Those mortgages have been paid down to $27 billion. Recoveries on properties as a whole are good. The total cost of the program, even under the ceiling that the agency must use to take over the mortgages, and including making the payments when a veteran is unable to do so, has cost the United States $13 million. That is the balance sheet. But the money provided in the bill is urgently needed in order to take over these units.

There are some warning signals that these foreclosures are increasing in number. They have doubled over last year. Of course, the Treasury will receive back the resale price, the refinancing, or the rental received from the properties. Because of the ceiling the use of the fund last year was limited to $120 million. The Loan Guaranty Revolving Fund has been out of money since December 1. For that reason there is urgency in passage of the bill.

I thank the leadership for allowing the Committee on Appropriations to bring the bill before the Senate today.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. It is my understanding that the bill has been cleared on this side of the aisle. That ought to be said for the Record.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. The report of the Senate Committee on Appropriations is unanimous.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 612) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WELFARE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 325)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Senate has received from the President of the United States a message on welfare. I ask that the Chair lay the message before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate a message received from the President of the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the message be printed in the RECORD and be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The message was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

Few nations do more than the United States to assist their least fortunate citizens—to make certain that no child, no elderly or handicapped citizen, no family in any circumstances in any State, is left without the essential needs for a decent and healthy existence. In too few nations, I might add, are the people aware of the progressive strides this country has taken in demonstrating the humanitarian side of freedom. Our record is a proud one—and it sharply refutes those who accuse us of thinking only in the materialistic terms of cash registers and calculating machines.

Our basic public welfare programs were enacted more than a quarter century ago. Their contribution to our national strength and well-being in the intervening years has been remarkable.

But the times, the conditions, the problems have changed—and the nature and objectives of our public assistance and child welfare programs must be changed, also, if they are to meet our current needs.

The impact of these changes should not be underestimated:

People move more often—from the farm to the city, from urban centers to the suburbs, from the East to the West, from the South to the North and Midwest.

Living costs, and especially medical costs, have spiraled.

The pattern of our population has changed. There are more older people, more children, more young marriages, divorces, desertions, and separations.

Our system of social insurance and related programs has grown greatly: in 1940 less than 1 percent of the aged were receiving monthly old age insurance benefits; today over two-thirds of our aged are receiving these benefits. In 1940 only 21,000 children, in families where the breadwinner had died, were getting survivor insurance benefits; today such monthly benefits are being paid to about 2 million children.

All of these changes affect the problems public welfare was intended to relieve as well as its ability to relieve it. Moreover, even the nature and causes of poverty have changed. At the time the Social Security Act established our present basic framework for public aid, the major cause of poverty was unemployment and economic depression. Today, in a year of relative prosperity and high employment, we are more concerned about the poverty that persists in the midst of abundance.

The reasons are often more social than economic, more often subtle than simple. Some are in need because they are untrained for work—some because they cannot work, because they are too young or too old, blind or crippled. Some are in need because they are discriminated against for reasons they cannot help. Responding to their ills with scorn or suspicion is inconsistent with our moral precepts and inconsistent with their nearly universal preference to be independent. But merely responding with a relief check to complicated social or personal problems—such as ill health, faulty education, domestic discord, racial discrimination, or inadequate skills—is not likely to provide a lasting solution. Such a check must be supplemented, or in some cases made unnecessary, by positive services and solutions, offering the total resources of the community to meet the total needs of the family to help our less fortunate citizens help themselves.

Public welfare, in short, must be more than a salvage operation, picking up the debris from the wreckage of human lives. Its emphasis must be directed increasingly toward prevention and rehabilitation—on reducing not only the long-range cost in budgetary terms but the long-range cost in human terms as well. Poverty weakens individuals and nations. Sounder public welfare policies will benefit the Nation, its economy, its morale, and, most importantly, its people.

Under the various titles of the Social Security Act, funds are available to help the States provide assistance and other social services to the needy, aged and blind, to the needy disabled, and to dependent children. In addition, grants are available to assist the States to expand and strengthen their programs of child welfare services. These programs are essentially State programs. But the Federal Government, by its substantial financial contribution, its leadership, and the standards it sets, bears a major responsibility. To better fulfill this responsibility, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare recently introduced a number of administrative changes designed to get people off assistance and back into useful, productive roles in society.

These changes provided for:

The more effective location of deserting parents;

An effort to reduce that proportion of persons receiving assistance through willful misrepresentation, although that proportion is only a small part of the 1.5 percent of persons on the rolls found to be ineligible;

Allowing dependent children to save money for educational, employment, or medical needs without having that amount deducted from their public assistance grants;

Providing special services and safeguards to children in families of unmarried parents, in families where the father has deserted, or in homes in danger of becoming morally or physically unsuitable; and

An improvement in the training of personnel, the development of services, and the coordination of agency efforts. In keeping with this new emphasis, the name of the Bureau of Public Assistance has been changed to the Bureau of Family Services.

But only so much can be done by administrative changes. New legislation is required if our State-operated programs are to be fully able to meet modern needs.

I. PREVENTION AND REHABILITATION

As already mentioned, we must place more stress on services instead of relief.

I recommend that the States be encouraged by the offer of additional Federal funds to strengthen and broaden the rehabilitative and preventive services they offer to persons who are dependent or who would otherwise become dependent. Additional Federal funds would induce and assist the States to establish or augment their rehabilitation services, strengthen their child welfare services, and add to their number of competent public welfare personnel. At the present time, the cost of these essential services is lumped with all administrative costs—routine clerical and office functions—and the Federal Government pays one-half of the total of all such costs incurred by the States. By separating out and identifying the cost of these essential rehabilitation, social work, and other service costs, and paying the States three-fourths of such services—a step I earnestly recommend for your consideration—the Federal Government will enable and encourage the States to provide more comprehensive and effective services to rehabilitate those on welfare. The existing law should also be amended to permit the use of Federal funds for utilization by the State welfare agency of specialists from other State agencies who can help mount a concerted attack on the problems of dependency.

There are other steps we can take which will have an important effect on this effort. One of these is to expand and improve the Federal-State program of vocational rehabilitation for disabled people. Among the 92,500 disabled men and women successfully rehabilitated into employment through this program last year were about 15,000 who had formerly been receiving public assistance. Let me repeat this figure: 15,000 people, formerly supported by the taxpayers through welfare, are now back at work as self-supporting taxpayers. Much more of this must be done—until we are restoring to employment every disabled person who can benefit from these rehabilitation services.

The prevention of future adult poverty and dependency must begin with the care of dependent children—those who must receive public welfare by virtue of a parent's death, disability, desertion, or unemployment. Our society not only refuses to leave such children hungry, cold, and devoid of opportunity—we are insistent that such children not be community liabilities throughout their lives. Yet children who grow up in deprivation, without adequate protection, may be poorly equipped to meet adult responsibilities.

The Congress last year approved, on a temporary basis, aid for the dependent children of the unemployed as a part of the permanent aid-to-dependent-children program. This legislation also included temporary provisions for foster care where the child has been removed from his home, and an increase in Federal financial assistance to the aged, blind, and disabled. The need for these temporary improvements has not abated, and their merit is clear. I recommend that these temporary provisions be made permanent.

But children need more than aid when they are destitute. We need to improve our preventive and protective services for children as well as adults. I recommend that the present ceiling of $25 million authorized for annual appropriations for grants to the States for child welfare services be gradually raised, beginning with $30 million for 1963, up to $50 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and succeeding years.

Finally, many women now on assistance rolls could obtain jobs and become self-supporting if local day care programs for their young children were available. The need for such programs for the children of working mothers has been increasing rapidly. Of the 22 million women now working, about 3 million have children under 6, and another 4½ million have school-age children between 6 and 17. Adequate care for these children during their most formative years is essential to their proper growth and training. Therefore, I recommend that the child welfare provisions of the Social Security Act be changed to authorize earmarking up to $5 million of grants to the States in 1963 and $10 million a year thereafter for aid in establishing local programs for the day care of young children of working mothers.

II. PROMOTING NEW SKILLS AND INDEPENDENCE

We must find ways of returning far more of our dependent people to independence. We must find ways of returning them to a participating and productive role in the community.

One sure way is by providing the opportunity every American cherishes to do sound and useful work. For this reason, I am recommending a change in the law to permit States to maintain, with Federal financial help, community work and training projects for unemployed people receiving welfare payments. Under such a program, unemployed people on welfare would be helped to retain their work skills or learn new ones; and the local community would obtain additional manpower on public projects.

But earning one's welfare payment through required participation in a community work or training project must be an opportunity for the individual on welfare, not a penalty. Federal financial participation will be conditioned upon proof that the work will serve a useful community or public purpose, will not displace regular employees, will not impair prevailing wages and working conditions, and will be accompanied by certain basic health and safety protections. Provisions must also be made to assure appropriate arrangements for the care and protection of children during the absence from home of any parent performing work or undergoing training.

Moreover, systematic encouragement would be given all welfare recipients to obtain vocational counseling, testing, and placement services from the U.S. Employment Service and to secure useful training wherever new job skills would be helpful. Close cooperative arrangements would be established with existing training and vocational education programs, and with the vocational and on-the-job training opportunities to be created under the manpower development and training and youth employment opportunities programs previously proposed.

III. MORE SKILLED PERSONNEL

It is essential that State and local welfare agencies be staffed with enough qualified personnel to insure constructive and adequate attention to the problems of needy individuals—to take the time to help them find and hold a job—to prevent public dependency and to strive, where that is not possible, for rehabilitation—and to ascertain promptly whether any individual is receiving aid for which he does not qualify, so that aid can be promptly withdrawn.

Unfortunately, there is an acute shortage of trained personnel in all our welfare programs. The lack of experienced social workers for programs dealing with children and their families is especially critical.

At the present time, when States expend funds for the training of personnel for the administration of these programs, they receive Federal grants on a dollar-for-dollar basis. This arrangement has failed to produce a sufficient number of trained staff, especially social workers. I recommend therefore that Federal assistance to the States for training additional welfare personnel be increased; and that in addition, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare be authorized to make special arrangements for the training of family welfare personnel to work with those children whose parents have deserted, whose parents are unmarried, or who have other serious problems.

IV. FITTING GENERAL CONDITIONS OR GENERAL GUARDS TO INDIVIDUAL NEEDS

In order to make certain that welfare funds go only to needy people, the Social Security Act requires the States to take all income and resources of the applicant into consideration in determining need. Although Federal law permits, it does not require States to take into full account the full expenses individuals have in earning income. This is not consistent with equity, commonsense, or other Federal laws such as our tax code. It only discourages the will to earn. In order to encourage assistance recipients to find and retain employment, I therefore recommend that the act be amended to require the States to take into account the expenses of earning income.

Among relatives caring for dependent children are a few who do not properly handle their assistance payments—some to the extent that the well-being of the child is adversely affected. Where the State determines that a relative's ability to manage money is contrary to the welfare of the child, Federal law presently requires payments to be made to a legal guardian or representative, if Federal funds are to be used. But this general requirement may sometimes block progress in particular situations. In order to recognize the necessity for each State to make exceptions to this rule in a very limited number of cases, I recommend that the law be amended to permit Federal sharing to continue even though protective payments in behalf of children—not to exceed one-half of 1 percent of ADC recipients in each State—are made to other persons concerned with the welfare of the family. The States would be required to reexamine these exceptions at intervals to determine whether a more permanent arrangement such as guardianship is required.

When first enacted, the aid to dependent children program provided for Federal sharing in assistance payments only to the child or children. Inasmuch as Federal sharing in any assistance given to one adult in the household as well as to the child or children. Inasmuch as under current law there may be two parents in homes covered by this program, one incapacitated or unemployed, I recommend in the interest of equity the extension of Federal sharing in assistance payments both to the needy relative and to his or her spouse when both are living in the home with the child.

V. MORE EFFICIENT ADMINISTRATION

Under present public assistance provisions, States may impose residence requirements up to 5 of the last 9 years for the aged, blind, and disabled. Increased mobility, as previously mentioned, is a hallmark of our times. It should not operate unfairly on either an individual State or an individual family. I recommend that the Social Security Act be amended so as to provide that States receiving Federal funds not exclude any otherwise eligible persons who have been residents of the State for 1 year immediately preceding their application for assistance. I also recommend that the law be amended to provide a small increase in assistance funds to those States which simplify their laws by removing all residence requirements in any of their federally aided programs.

In view of the changing nature of the economic and social problems of the country, the desirability of a periodic review of our public welfare programs is obvious. For that purpose I propose that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare be authorized to appoint an Advisory Council on Public Welfare representing broad community interests and concerns, and such other advisory committees as he deems necessary to advise and consult with him in the administration of the Social Security Act.

No study of the public welfare program can fail to note the difficulty of the problems faced or the need to be imaginative in dealing with them. Accordingly, I recommend that amendments be made to encourage experimental, pilot, or demonstration projects that would promote the objectives of the assistance titles and help make our welfare programs more flexible and adaptable to local needs.

The simplification and coordination of administration and operation would greatly improve the adequacy and consistency of assistance and related services. As a step in that direction, I recommend that a new title to the Social Security Act be enacted which would give to States the option of submitting a single, unified State plan combining their assistance programs for aged, blind, and disabled, and their medical assistance programs for the aged, granting to such States additional Federal matching for medical payments on behalf of the blind and disabled.

These proposed far-reaching changes—aimed at far-reaching problems—are in the public interest and in keeping with our finest traditions. The goals of our public welfare programs must be positive and constructive—to create economic and social opportunities for the less fortunate—to help them find productive, happy, and independent lives. It must stress the integrity and preservation of the family unit. It must contribute to the attack on dependency, juvenile delinquency, family breakdown, illegitimacy, ill health, and disability. It must reduce the incidence of these problems, prevent their occurrence and recurrence, and strengthen and protect the vulnerable in a highly competitive world.

Unless such problems are dealt with effectively, they fester and grow, sapping the strength of society as a whole and extending their consequences in troubled families from one generation to the next.

The steps I recommend to you today to alleviate these problems will not come cheaply. They will cost more money when first enacted. But they will restore human dignity; and in the long run, they will save money. I have recommended in the budget submitted for fiscal year 1963 sufficient funds to cover the extension of existing programs and the new legislation here proposed.

Communities which have—for whatever motives—attempted to save money through ruthless and arbitrary cutbacks in their welfare rolls have found their efforts to little avail. The root problems remained.

But communities which have tried the rehabilitative road—the road I have recommended today—have demonstrated what can be done with creative, thoughtfully conceived, and properly managed programs of prevention and social rehabilitation. In those communities, families have been restored to self-reliance, and relief rolls have been reduced.

To strengthen our human resources—to demonstrate the compassion of freemen—and in the light of our own constructive self-interest—we must bring our welfare programs up to date. I urge that the Congress do so without delay.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 1, 1962.*

ACTIVITIES OF U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. 326)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, today the Senate received from the President a message reporting on the activities of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency for the year ending December 1961. The message is pursuant to the requirements of law. I ask that the message be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the message from the President of the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the message be printed in the RECORD and be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The message was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

I have the honor to transmit the first annual report of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

The Agency was established by the act of September 26, 1961, and has thus been in existence for only 4 months. This report, submitted pursuant to law, describes not only its own initial activities, but also the work of predecessor agencies which it is continuing.

The existence of this new Agency is a source of strength to me, in the performance of my responsibility to pursue a new type of world security which will increase our own prospects of living in peace and freedom. I know that this goal is the desire of the Congress and the American people to leave no stone unturned in their search for a peaceful world.

This report of activities indicates that the new Agency is moving surely toward the achievement of greater effectiveness and flexibility in disarmament negotiations. The development of this kind of skill and responsibility is essential to the serious pursuit of security through disarmament.

On March 14, our representatives will meet with the representatives of 17 other nations in a forum established by resolution of the United Nations General Assembly to seek to negotiate a comprehensive disarmament treaty program. When I appeared before the United Nations last September, I submitted a program for general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world. It is my hope and expectation that the forthcoming conference will make significant progress toward the achievement of the goal of disarmament with effective methods of insuring compliance.

Never before in the history of man has the importance of arms control and disarmament been so great. For this reason, I urge your support of this Agency in the great and difficult tasks which it will face in the future.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 1, 1962.*

AID FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume consideration of the unfinished business, the bill S. 1241.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 1241) to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities and to authorize scholarships for undergraduate study in such institutions.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon will lead off in the debate on the pending bill.

INTER-AMERICAN CONFERENCE AT PUNTA DEL ESTE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, before the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] speaks on the unfinished business, he will make a significant report on the outstanding Conference that took place at Punta del Este. Since I must leave the Chamber for a few moments, I believe in this instance, I speak for every Member of the Senate in expressing to the Senator from Oregon and to his colleague, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] the profound thanks, appreciation, and commendation of the Senate for the splendid and significant work that was undertaken and accomplished by the two Senators, the other members of the congressional delegation and, of course, the Secretary of State and the executive branch delegation at the Punta del Este Conference relating to the Cuban situation. Every one of us was much impressed by the accomplishments and achievements, and we were particularly impressed by the significant contributions made by our colleagues of the Senate. I thank in particular the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I appreciate very much the remarks of the Senator from Minnesota. Time will tell how important the Conference was. I believe in time it will prove to be one of the most historic Latin American conferences in which our country has ever participated. But as the Senator will note shortly, as I make my very brief report to the Senate, that the credit for the great accomplishments of the Conference goes to a man of great stature in world affairs today, who proved himself to be a giant in diplomacy, the Secretary of State, Dean Rusk.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the general observation of the distinguished Senator from Oregon in his commendation of our Secretary of State, because I surely feel the same way.

Mr. President, so that Senators might be informed and given an opportunity, if they wish, to come to the Senate Chamber, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE PUNTA DEL ESTE CONFERENCE OF FOREIGN MINISTERS OF THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, next week, after Senator HICKENLOOPER and I have made our respective reports to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on the Punta del Este Conference of Foreign Ministers of the Organization of American States, I shall make a detailed speech on the floor of the Senate about my observations and experiences and conclusions reached at Punta del Este.

Today, I wish to take only a few minutes to make a few general observations and insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some very important material relating to the Conference.

At the outset of these brief remarks, I wish to express my appreciation to Senator HICKENLOOPER, of Iowa, the ranking Republican member of the Senate Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs, for the very effective, statesmanlike work he performed at Punta del Este for the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate and the country.

As chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs, permit me to say, Mr. President, that Senator HICKENLOOPER was a tower of strength to both the congressional delegation and to the Secretary of State. He and I stood shoulder to shoulder on issue after issue that arose in the Conference, and we were joined at all times in unanimity of congressional delegation point of view and action by our very able colleagues from the House of Representatives, the Honorable ARMISTEAD I. SELDEN, chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs of the House of Representatives, and his Republican colleague, the Honorable CHESTER MERROW, the ranking Republican member of the House Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs.

The four of us placed ourselves at the disposal of Secretary of State Rusk, in making it clear to him from the very beginning of the Conference that we stood ready and willing to serve him in any way in which he believed we could be of help to him, consistent, of course, with what we considered to be our congressional responsibility as congressional advisers to him and the other members of the U.S. delegation at Punta del Este.

From the very beginning of the Conference, the Secretary of State called upon us frequently to perform special conferring assignments with other delegations in his behalf. We held regular daily conferences with the Secretary of State as the delegation moved from problem to problem as they developed in the Conference. There is no doubt about the fact that the close working arrangement existing between the Secretary of State and his State Department associates and the congressional delegation made a very deep impression on the Conference. It was a demonstrative example constantly before the eyes of all the delegates to the Conference as to the meaning of our constitutional system of checks and balances.

In behalf of the congressional delegation, I wish at this time to express publicly from the floor of the Senate what we expressed personally to the Secretary of State, namely, our deep appreciation to him for the privilege that he gave to us of both working with him and serving him as the spokesman for the United States at this historic Conference.

The Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, performed brilliantly for his country at Punta del Este, demonstrating a diplomatic ability of such a high order that it is proper and factually correct to state that all the other delegations of the free nations of Latin America recognized that he is a world statesman of great stature. The marked success of the Conference is due, in no small measure, to his firm, patient, enlightened statesmanship.

A final appraisal of the historic act of Punta del Este will depend on what the member nations of the OAS put into action in respect to the resolutions agreed to.

The congressional delegation made it clear in conference with representatives of other delegations that the most important and effective check that can be used against the threat of communism in the Western Hemisphere is for each government to take whatever steps are necessary to put into effect the underlying thesis of the Act of Bogotá of 1960.

Senator HICKENLOOPER and I were the two Senate delegates and the two Senate advisers sent to Bogotá in 1960 to work under the leadership of the then Under Secretary of State—and now Secretary of the Treasury—C. Douglas Dillon. The very able leadership of Mr. Dillon at the Bogotá Conference in 1960 resulted in the Act of Bogotá. It was the forerunner of the Alliance for Progress program.

At that Conference, just as at Punta del Este, there was complete agreement between the head of the American delegation and in respect to the need for cooperation between the Latin American countries themselves and the United States in regard to any mutual aid program.

At the Bogotá Conference we stressed the importance of this underlying thesis of the Conference that, so far as the U.S. delegation was concerned—and I reemphasize it today—the Latin American countries must help themselves if they expect to receive any help from the United States.

As we said, unless they are willing to invest in their own future by adopting necessary reforms where needed, such as land reform, tax reform, and governmental procedural reform, they cannot expect a continuation of great help from the taxpayers of the United States.

Any program of economic aid from the outside is bound to result in failure, so far as checking effectively communism in the Western Hemisphere is concerned, unless the countries of Latin America are willing to bring about the necessary reforms in order to assure that any help will go directly to the masses of the people of Latin America.

Let us not forget that communism is working on the fear, the privation, the ignorance of the masses of the people of Latin America.

It was encouraging to note at Bogotá in 1960 and also at Punta del Este in recent days, that the representatives of country after country in Latin America fully appreciate the importance to the underlying thesis of the Act of Bogotá and the Alliance for Progress program.

Economic freedom must be made available to the individual men and women who comprise the mass of the population of each of the Latin American States. I am convinced that the actions taken at Punta del Este and the resolutions which were adopted and comprise the Act of Punta del Este will lead to actions on the part of the individual states, including the United States, that give great assurance for a strengthening of the economic and political freedom in Latin America and the decline and final elimination of the threat of communism.

FINAL DECLARATION UNANIMOUS

It is very significant that 20 nations signed the final act of the Conference declaring the communistic regime of Cuba to be incompatible with the inter-American system, and taking appropriate steps to effectuate a quarantine. Two-thirds of them voted exclusion of this regime from all the organs and agencies of the OAS. It is true that six nations abstained from voting on the exclusion resolution on so-called juridical grounds. The U.S. delegation rejected, and rightly so, the strained legalisms of the six whose juridical arguments emphasized legalistic form over a sound, substantive legal position.

In my speech next week I shall deal in some detail with the answer to the highly legalistic position that these six nations took. I say most respectfully—but I said it at Punta del Este to delegation after delegation—that the legalistic argument which these six nations made can best be described as an escape hatch. It was one they made use of at the time they voted on this particular resolution, to avoid standing up and facing squarely the great issue which confronted them, namely, the existing threat of communism in Latin America.

There is a great deal of misunderstanding, however, in regard to the resolution. Two-thirds, or 14 members, voted for the resolution, 6 abstained, and 1—Cuba—voted against.

Let me point out that throughout the voting on these resolutions there was not a single vote for Cuba. An abstention vote is not a vote for Cuba. We are accustomed to a procedure in the Senate under which, when there is a bill before the Senate, and various amendments are offered to the bill, some of us will vote against an amendment, which may be adopted. Later, when we come to vote on the final bill, very frequently, although some of us have voted against amendments which were incorporated in the bill, we still vote for the final form of the bill. Actually, these six nations did not even vote against this one proposal—they simply did not vote when it was put into the declaration.

There is an analogy here which I have not seen recognized in any press stories which I have read dealing with the Conference at Punta del Este. Although six nations abstained on this particular resolution, let me take Senators through the subsequent procedure. When the vote on this particular resolution was taken, the foreign ministers were sitting as a general committee, or what we might call a committee of the whole. They were not sitting as a plenary session of the general conference itself. The individuals were the same, but this was a committee meeting. A report had to be made from the general committee to the Conference. Although the six nations abstained in their vote on this particular resolution, to exclude the present regime of Cuba from participating any further in the activities of the Organization of American States, it is interesting to note that a few hours later, when the vote was taken on transmitting to the Conference the resolutions adopted by that general committee meeting, that vote was 20 to 1.

In other words, although six of them abstained in regard to this particular resolution, all of them, a few hours later, voted to transmit that resolution to the plenary session of the Conference of Foreign Ministers itself.

It is also important to draw attention to another procedural fact. Later, after the Conference of Foreign Ministers adopted the committee report of the general committee, which contains this particular resolution excluding Cuba from further participation from the organs of the Organization of American States, there was held what is known as a signing session. That is a ceremonial session, although procedurally it could lead to great debate. A debate did not take place at that session, but some very able speeches were made at the ceremonial session, speeches dealing with the action taken by the general committee and by the Conference of the Foreign Ministers at their two sessions.

The interesting thing is that when the head of each delegation, in the process of this ceremony, was called upon to make the decision as to whether or not, in behalf of his country, he would walk up to the front of the conference room, sit down and sign in behalf of his country, and commit his country to the agreements reached by the majority, 20 foreign ministers signed in behalf of their countries.

Cuba was absent, of course, because by this time Cuba knew the position that was being taken by the 20 nations. Its delegation left Punta del Este that afternoon and was not there for the signing ceremony. But I stress that there is no question about the 20 nations committing themselves, by their signatures to the Act of Punta del Este, to the exclusion of the present regime of Castro communism in Cuba from any further participation in the organs of the Organization of American States.

Mr. GRUENING rose.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in just a minute I will yield to the distinguished Senator from Alaska, but I feel certain that what I am about to state will bear upon what he may wish to say.

There was considerable discussion at Punta del Este, and there has been considerable writing in the American press, about the six abstentions. However, I wish to give the Senate what I think is the most significant sentence spoken in all the days we were at the Conference. The sentence came from the lips of that great Secretary of State of the United States, Dean Rusk.

The Communist leader of the Cuban delegation sought to make propaganda out of the fact that the Conference had not reached unanimity in the vote on the resolution which provided for excluding any further participation by the Cuban regime now controlling Cuba in any of the activities of the Organization of American States. I shall never forget that telling, one-sentence answer of Secretary of State Rusk, when he pointed out to the Conference that this was not a meeting of the Warsaw Pact. It was not a meeting of the Warsaw Pact. It was a meeting in keeping with all the ideals, aspirations, and principles of the democratic processes.

CONFERENCE ACTED ON PRINCIPLE OF MAJORITY RULE

The Secretary of State then went on to point out that under the totalitarian police state system which prevails in Communist States, such as Russia, unanimity is, of course, a requirement. But under the democratic process, sincere and honest men can gather in a parliamentary assembly and express their differences in points of view, as were expressed by the delegates concerning this particular resolution. Then, under the rule, that precious guarantee of freedom in democratic societies will work; namely, the principle of majority rule. Under the rules of this type of foreign ministers consultation and conference, a two-thirds vote is required. But once that vote has been reached, then the democratic process has spoken.

All those foreign ministers recognized that fact; and that explains, I think, more dramatically than anything which can be said about the Conference, their rededication to the democratic process by their act of then signing the document itself, agreeing in general committee to transmit the resolution to the Conference of Foreign Ministers, and then, as I say, signing, in behalf of their governments, the Act of Punta del Este, which contains the resolution that the present regime of Cuba shall be denied any further participation in any of the organs of the Organization of American States.

I now yield to the distinguished Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, it is not my purpose to interrupt or to delay this extremely eloquent and important report. I wish to ask a question, but first I desire to tender my warm congratulations, which I feel certain are shared by all Americans, upon the performances of Dean Rusk and his assistants, our colleagues in the Senate, the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the distinguished senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and to the two Members of the House, Representative SELDEN and Representative MERROW.

The question I wish to ask relates perhaps to an inadvertence of mine, but I did not see in the press the report that 20 nations had united. It seems to me that that was a strange omission. The impression I got, as perhaps others did, from a reading of the newspapers was that by the narrowest margin and only after a tremendous effort, were 14 nations persuaded to sign; whereas the Senator from Oregon reports that there was unanimity after that initial action. That is a tremendous fact which he has just brought out. I wonder if he would explain whether there was a shortcoming in reporting, or whether I and others simply failed to note this fact in the newspapers.

Mr. MORSE. I have not been back long enough to familiarize myself with what appeared in the American press with regard to that action. However, this Conference was, in my judgment, a marked success. The resolutions are strong resolutions, as I shall point out in a few minutes.

We did not bring back to the United States any weak resolutions. In my judgment, the action taken at Punta del Este could not have occurred a year ago. What has happened in Latin America, is a recognition of the growing, terrible threat of communism in this hemisphere. This recognition has gone forward with leaps and bounds and dramatic speed. I think there is no question that there is a recognition in all the 20 states which signed the Act of Punta del Este that we shall have to stand together, united against the threat of communism in this hemisphere.

When the Senator from Alaska hears a brief description I shall give, or simply a reference to the titles of some of the resolutions which were adopted, which have not received, as I understand, the same newspaper attention that the one resolution which resulted in six abstentions received in this country, I think he will agree with me that the Secretary of State has brought back a set of resolutions with biting teeth in them.

Mr. LAUSCHE rose.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I wish, first, to express the surprise and great joy which took hold of me when I read about what happened at the Conference. A year ago, based upon information which came to the Senator from Oregon and other members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I felt quite certain that the results obtained were not then in foresight. I did not believe that we would obtain the necessary two-thirds vote initially, much less obtain the unanimous vote finally. I believe it is a great encouragement to the people of our country, and it is a message that the people of the Western Hemisphere will not tolerate communism on our continent.

I understand that the initial vote cast was 14 out of 21, or a two-thirds majority, and that 6 abstained. That meant that six nations thought the demands should be a little milder.

Mr. MORSE. I do not think the Senator's statement that six nations thought the demands should be a little milder accurately describes their position, at all. Let me state my interpretation. I conferred with many of their delegates, as did the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]. They took the position that under the Charter of the Organization of American States, it was necessary first to amend the charter, before they could exclude from participation in the organs of the Organization of American States any member state; and they took the position that Cuba is still a member of the Organization of American States, and that therefore the amendment procedure of the Organization of American States should apply to Cuba. I shall answer it next week in greater detail, but in brief, I took the position that it was a completely fallacious argument on the part of those six states. I did not agree with them at all from the standpoint of the proper interpretation of the charter or the proper interpretation of the treaty at Rio de Janiero, under which the meeting at Punta del Este was held. I thought they were completely wrong as a matter of treaty interpretation, and I thought they were completely wrong as a matter of international law; and next week I shall set forth my detailed argument in rebuttal of the position which those six nations took. First, however, I wanted this summary report to be available to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Let me say to the Senator from Ohio that the Secretary of State was aware of the fact that that judicial argument was making headway with some delegations. To the everlasting credit of the congressional delegation, we fulfilled an assignment which the Secretary of State gave us—namely, from time to time to confer with members of other delegations who seemed to be impressed with that argument by the six. We met with them and presented, as congressional advisers, our point of view in opposition to what we termed was the highly legalistic argument of the six. It was in those conferences that I described the position of the six as seeking an escape through what I called a legalistic escape hatch, whereby they were failing to face up to this very serious threat of the Castro regime. It would be proper for me simply to state—by way of an indication of my position in regard to that juridical argument—that I pointed out to them that when the Charter of the Organization of American States was signed, it was signed by free nations. The charter itself made clear that the purpose of the charter is to promote freedom in the Western Hemisphere, and when it was signed there was not a Communist nation among them.

So, as the Senator from Ohio knows—for he is a distinguished lawyer and a former judge—the doctrine of unforeseen conditions, with the resulting implied power that frequently is applicable in the law when unforeseen conditions develop, certainly was applicable in this case, because the Communist regime of Castro seeks to tear down the structure of freedom symbolized by the Organization of American States, and we have in our midst a regime which seeks to destroy the very purpose of the Organization itself.

So my argument, in part, to those delegations was, "Do you mean to tell me that procedurally we are so limited in our power to act that we have to wait 2 years for an amendment of the Charter of the Organization of American States, before we can exclude from within the citadel Communist Cuba which is seeking to tear down the pillars of freedom that are holding up the citadel?"

They understand that argument; and I stressed the point that this unforeseen condition—one never contemplated when the nations put their signatures to the Charter of the Organization of American States—placed upon the members of the Organization the inherent power to protect the Organization itself from destruction by Castro communism. Therefore we argued that, on the basis of implied powers, that juridical argument of the six fell, in our judgment, as a fallacious argument to the floor of the conference.

We made a number of other arguments upon which I shall dwell on in my report to the Foreign Relations Committee and to the Senate.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I understand.

Is it fair to conclude that those six nations, whether right or wrong in their legalistic interpretation of the charter, nevertheless, after their argument was rejected, finally declared that the Cuban regime had to be separated from any right to participate in the activities of the Organization of American States, until communism is eliminated from that country?

Mr. MORSE. Absolutely, and I wish to stress that point. The Senator from Ohio will also observe, from examining the individual resolutions for which they did vote, that they left no room for doubt about that matter. I wish to say that it is fair to them—because, as the Senator from Ohio knows, I respect honest differences of opinion in debate—to state that in my judgment no nation at the conference was clearer in its opposition to communism or stood firmer on the proposition that the Castro regime is incompatible with the purposes, ideals, and goals of the Organization of American States than those six nations; and let us name them: Mexico, Ecuador, Brazil, Argentina, Chile, and Bolivia. They made perfectly clear that they, too, consider Castro communism incompatible with the inter-American system when they signed the declaration. Their difference with the 14 nations was a legalistic difference over the procedure for accomplishing an end which all of the nations desired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I think the Senator from Oregon did state that what took place was reflective of the liberties which are inherent in our democratic processes. I understand that those six nations felt that the charter had to be amended before Cuba could be expelled from participating in the activities of the Organization of American States; but when the argument of those six nations was rejected, they did what so frequently is done by Senators here on the floor of the Senate—namely, they proposed amendments, voted for them, and finally accepted the draft that had been adopted by the majority.

Mr. MORSE. Yes; the Senator from Ohio is completely correct in the way he has stated the analogy. When their position was voted down, they agreed to the set of resolutions approved by the necessary two-thirds majority. There was no nullification at work at Punta del Este.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I wish to repeat what I said a moment ago: I think the majority which developed at the Conference was most encouraging. I did not anticipate that there would be 14 votes on the side our country favors. However, finally there were 20 votes on the side we favor. I believe the world will recognize that the solidarity in the Western Hemisphere about the menace of communism is far greater than has been realized. The nations in this hemisphere may occasionally be divided in regard to the technique which should be followed in repelling communism, but basically there is uniformity of thought among the nations of the Western Hemisphere.

I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Ohio very much for his comments, and I completely agree with the observations he has made.

Mr. President, the resolutions adopted at the Conference—which I wish to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks—were very strong ones.

The final act of the Conference included, in addition to the expulsion of Cuba from the OAS and the unanimous finding of incompatibility of Cuban communism with the aims and purposes of the inter-American system, agreements to stop trade with Cuba in arms and other implements of war, the setting up of a committee of experts in hemispheric security, a determination to effectuate the guarantees of human rights and economic freedom for the people of the member states, and a recognition that only through the successful implementation of the democratic processes to which the inter-American system has always been dedicated, can freedom be preserved and strengthened in the hemisphere.

There was full agreement that all nations in the OAS have a joint responsibility of cooperating in a program of economic and social justice for their people as envisioned in the challenging Alliance for Progress program.

I wish to make a very brief comment on the resolution dealing with trade. Here was an agreement with 20—not Cuba, of course, but with 20—free nations at this Conference to stop trade with Cuba in arms and other items of strategic importance.

The problem is not a problem of Latin American countries selling arms to Cuba. The problem is Cuba making arms available to dissident groups, Communist groups, in Latin American countries.

I consider this resolution on arms and trading in arms as one of the most important resolutions adopted. How can it be stronger? Here is unanimity among them to do what is necessary to stop this trade in arms, though there were some abstentions here, too, on putting this resolution into the declaration.

This issue also raises the whole question of trade. The agreement reached in regard to this whole general matter is going to have, and I hope it will have, worldwide effects among other free nations. I speak respectfully and only by passing remark today, but I mention it because I shall deal with it in greater detail later as I discuss some of our Latin American problems that come before my Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs vis-a-vis some of our allies in other parts of the world.

Mr. President, there is a Communist threat in Latin America presented by the Castro regime, and that Communist threat imperils freedom in this hemisphere. I say most respectfully that this declaration serves notice upon free nations in all parts of the world to do what is necessary to prevent a weakening of freedom in Latin America. Profit dollars in trade can never be justified as a rationalization for threatening freedom in Latin America.

Members of the Senate know whereof I speak when I stand on the floor of the Senate today and deplore the fact that there are free countries in other parts of the world that carry on trade with Cuba, including a trade in spare parts, that strengthens the military and economic might of Cuba for successful forays into other Latin American countries, seeking to overthrow them.

There is no one in this body who can possibly have a higher regard for the great free nation to the north, but as I have been heard to say before on the floor of the Senate, and I want to repeat today, it saddens me whenever we receive authentic reports that Canada continues to trade with Communist Cuba, continues to send into Cuba spare parts necessary for the rebuilding of the industrial power of Cuba and the strengthening of the military might of Cuba. Canada knows full well that Canada must be charged with judicial notice that there can be but one result of the trade. It results in weakening the cause of freedom throughout Latin America.

I speak on the floor of the Senate on this point as a Senator, not as any adviser to Punta del Este, but I speak as chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs. I say to our friends in the cause of freedom throughout the world that, in my judgment, it is incompatible with freedom to conduct a trade with a Communist nation, knowing full well that the results of that trade will strengthen the sinews and power of that Communist nation to carry out an aggressive course of action against freedom around the world. In my judgment, it is a day devoutly to be wished for when the announcement will be made, I pray, by all the free nations of the world, that they are not going to put the dollars of trade ahead of the cause of freedom in Latin America or anywhere else in the world.

So there is much to be done in the field of international diplomacy in rallying around the banner of freedom on the part of nations who recognize that their own survival depends upon freedom being sustained elsewhere in the world if they are to continue to enjoy it in their own country. This is what the great battle for freedom in Latin America, and this hemisphere, is all about.

We need the cooperation, the partnership, of Canada in the Organization of American States. We need Canada represented in the Organization of American States. We need Canada to march forward shoulder to shoulder with us—not only Canada, but every other nation that at the present time continues to trade with Communist Cuba.

I am not talking about meeting humanitarian needs. I am not talking about drugs and medicine that may be needed behind the Iron Curtain, in keeping with our great spiritual philosophy that we are our brother's keeper. I am talking about providing a communistic nation with the economic sinews to make it possible for that communistic nation to continue an aggressive course of action against the cause of freedom anywhere in the world.

One of the observations that was indelibly written in Punta del Este is the importance of our impressing on the rest of the world as rapidly as possible the complete determination of the OAS that we are not going to build up communism in the hemisphere by strengthening the economic sinews of Cuba.

The February 1 issue of the New York Times provided a summary of the actions of the Conference, and I ask unanimous consent to have this clipping appear at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the clipping was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACTIONS BY THE AMERICAS

PUNTA DEL ESTE, URUGUAY, January 31.—Following, in capsule form, are the provisions of resolutions adopted by the Eighth Meeting of Consultation of American Foreign Ministers, together with the voting:

Declaration on the offensive of communism in America: The principles of communism are incompatible with the principles of the inter-American political system and the people of the hemisphere are warned of the intensification of the subversive offensive. Faith in social progress and representative democracy through free elections and respect for human rights as countermeasures to communism are affirmed. Vote, 20 to 1 (Cuba).

Declaration on the Alliance for Progress: It restates the principles of foreign aid, trade liberalization, social reforms and self-help embodied in the Alliance for Progress agreement as essential to the security of the hemisphere. Vote, 20 to 1 (Cuba).

Exclusion of the present Government of Cuba from participation in the inter-American system: Cuba's Marxism-Leninism is incompatible with the principles and objectives of inter-American system. The Council of the Organization of American States and its commissions are instructed to "adopt without delay the measures necessary to carry out this resolution." Vote, 14 to 1 (Cuba), with 6 abstentions (Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Ecuador and Mexico).

Resolution on the Inter-American Defense Board: It excludes the present Government of Cuba from membership immediately. Vote, 20 to 1 (Cuba).

Resolution on economic relations: It suspends immediately trade with Cuba in arms and implements of war and instructs the Council to study the feasibility and desirability of extending the suspension to other items, with special attention to items of strategic importance. Vote 16 to 1 (Cuba), with 4 abstentions (Brazil, Ecuador, Mexico and Chile).

Resolution on the Advisory Committee of Experts on Security Measures Against Communist Subversion: It directs the Council to establish a five-man committee to help countries requesting assistance and report by May 1, 1962, on general measures to be taken. It calls on member governments to cooperate in countering subversion. Vote, 19 to 1 (Cuba), with one abstention (Bolivia).

Resolution on the holding of elections in all American countries: Vote, 20 to 1 (Cuba).

Resolution on revision of the statute of the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights: It recommends the amplification and strengthening of the commission. Vote, 20 to 1 (Cuba).

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have checked against the official document, which I shall later put in the RECORD, the record of the votes printed by the New York Times. I find one or two variations. Nonetheless, this pertains to the comments made by the Senator from Alaska and the Senator from Ohio, and I wished to have that record of the votes taken on the various resolutions in the RECORD.

The strong, firm, rededicated support of freedom and the vigorous determined rejection of communism as a political, social, and economic way of life for mankind may very well be the most important historic contribution of Punta del Este to the urgent need of a successful carrying out of the aims and purposes of the Alliance for Progress program in Latin America.

The congressional delegation appreciated the honor and opportunity to serve the President, Secretary of State, and Congress at the Conference. We summarized our reactions to the Conference by pointing out that it is now up to each member state of the OAS to do its full part in giving meaning to the language of the resolutions adopted at the Conference by enacting those reforms necessary to strengthen political and economic freedom as well as social justice for the masses of their people.

It is only by making political and economic freedom become the living experience and opportunity of each individual that the democratic way of life can be an effective answer to the threat of enslavement of the people through a series of Communist revolutions throughout Latin America and many other parts of the world.

Mr. President, it will now be my privilege to ask unanimous consent to incorporate in the RECORD certain documents.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the joint press release which was issued by the four congressional advisers as we got off the plane yesterday on our return from Punta del Este.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 1, 1962.

JOINT PRESS RELEASE ISSUED BY SENATOR WAYNE MORSE, DEMOCRAT, OF OREGON; SENATOR BOURKE HICKENLOOPER, REPUBLICAN, OF IOWA; REPRESENTATIVE ARMISTEAD SELDEN, DEMOCRAT, OF ALABAMA; REPRESENTATIVE CHESTER MERROW, REPUBLICAN, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

The four of us from the U.S. Congress who had the honor and privilege of serving the Secretary of State as congressional advisers at the Eighth Conference of Foreign Ministers make the following statement:

"The Conference of Foreign Ministers at Punta del Este grappled realistically for the first time with the Cuban Communist problem. With the exception of the Castro regime itself, the remaining 20 American Republics participating in the Conference clearly condemned the present Government of Cuba by the passage of a number of far-reaching resolutions. While there were abstentions on several points by governments who expressed reservations due to internal pressures and legalistic contentions, not one country voted with Cuba on any point.

"It is very significant that 20 nations signed the final act of the Conference declaring the communistic regime of Cuba to be incompatible with the inter-American system. Two-thirds of them voted exclusion of this regime from participating in the organs and agencies of the OAS. It is true that six nations abstained from voting on the exclusion resolution on so-called juridical grounds. The U.S. delegation rejected. and rightly so, the strained legalisms of the six whose juridical arguments emphasized legalistic form over a sound substantive legal position.

"While the U.S. delegation was realistic in its approach to problems facing the foreign ministers, it stood resolutely against Castro communism and its threat to the Western Hemisphere through Sino-Soviet control. The marked success of the Conference was due in no small measure, in spite of extremely trying circumstances, to the patient, firm, and enlightened statesmanship of Secretary of State Dean Rusk.

"The people of the United States will not be satisfied until communism is eliminated from Cuba and other areas of the Western Hemisphere and a free Cuba is again an integral part of the inter-American system. We are confident that the good faith implementation of the strong resolutions passed at Punta del Este will advance constructively the realization of this objective against the threat of communism.

"The action of the Conference, together with vigorous programs of essential reforms and self-help in the various cooperating American nations, can be the firm and stimulating basis for the success of the Alliance for Progress."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the very brilliant and eloquent speech made by the Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, at the plenary session of the General Assembly when he spoke in behalf of the U.S. Government and outlined the position of the United States at the Conference.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE DEAN RUSK, SECRETARY OF STATE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, DELIVERED AT THE THIRD SESSION OF THE GENERAL COMMITTEE, HELD ON JANUARY 25, 1962

Mr. Chairman, fellow foreign ministers, it is a very great personal pleasure for me to be here for my first meeting with my colleagues of the Americas. The fact that I find among them a number of old friends enhances that pleasure.

I join my colleagues in expressing our deep appreciation to the Government of Uruguay for the warm hospitality which we are enjoying in this lovely place, and for all the arrangements which were made on relatively short notice to make this meeting possible. Secretary of State Stettinius once said that there might not have been a Charter of the United Nations had it not been for the weather and charm of San Francisco. I am confident that Punta del Este is making its own special contribution to the unity, strength, and progress of the inter-American system.

For the second time in 6 months, the nations of the Americas meet here in pursuit of their common goal—social progress and economic growth within a community of free and independent nations. But this time we come to take measures to safeguard that freedom and independence—so that in the future we may devote all our efforts to social progress and economic growth.

We are assembled again on the eastern shore of a vast continent. Across this continent millions of our people are struggling to throw off the bonds of hunger, poverty, and ignorance—to affirm the hope of a better life for themselves and their children. Last August we joined in historical document—the Charter of Punta del Este—setting forth the goals, the machinery, and the commitments necessary to transform that hope into reality. Last August we joined hands in a great alliance—the alianza para el progreso.

Since that time, in every part of the hemisphere, we have moved forward with fresh energy in fulfillment of the pledges we solemnly undertook to the people of the Americas. The task ahead is vast. Everyone in this hall knows the mighty effort which will be required to break the ancient cycle of stagnation and despair. But the need for action is urgent. Across the world the winds of change are blowing: awakening peoples are demanding to be admitted to the promise of the 20th century. For Americans, North and South, this is a historic challenge. As the 19th century saw the Western Hemisphere enter the epoch of political independence, so the 20th century—if those of us in this room, and the governments we represent, have boldness and faith—will see this hemisphere enter the epoch of economic abundance.

The means by which we seek our ends are the intelligence, decision, and will of the governments and people of the hemisphere. We cannot hope to make progress unless the governments of our nations faithfully meet the needs of their peoples for education and opportunity—unless we press steadily forward with the measures of self-help and social reform which make development possible and spread its benefits among all the people. This work has already begun. Let me say that it is unfinished business in the United States itself. Many Latin American nations are engaged in national plans and programs, internal reforms and action to build houses, schools and factories, roads and dams. My own country has already made large commitments for this fiscal year and will have no difficulty in meeting the more than $1 billion pledged to the first year of the Alliance for Progress. We have together established international machinery to stimulate and review national plans.

This is a notable beginning. There is, of course, much more to be done. Our task is to be measured, not in the months of this year, but in the years of this decade. I wish there were some way in which we could transmit to you the depth of our affectionate interest in the economic and social prospects of this hemisphere. Perhaps you would forgive me for a personal recollection. Like millions of present-day North Americans, I spent my earliest years in what people would now call underdeveloped circumstances. We were prescientific and pretechnical; we were without public health or medical care; typhoid, pellagra, hookworm, and malaria were a part of the environment in which providence had placed us. Our schools were primitive. Our fathers and mothers earned a meager living with backbreaking toil.

But the great adventure through which many of us have lived has seen the transformation of our lives in a short period—a transformation brought about by the magical combination of education, health, and increasing productivity. On our farms we felt the impact of the indispensable partnership among education, scientific research, and the extension of knowledge to those who could put it to practical use. Neighbor helped neighbor to build a house, a barn, or to pass along news about new prospects and new methods. They joined together to build roads until public funds could take over the burden. They pooled their limited resources to hire a schoolteacher or a doctor. Bits of capital began to accumulate and this was reinvested in growth and development. More and more young people managed to get to the university and more and more of these brought their learning back to the benefit of their own people.

These changes did not take place without struggle. Years of thought and work and debate were required to prepare America for the necessary steps of self-help and social reform. I remember well the bitter resistance before Franklin Roosevelt was able to win support for the Tennessee Valley Authority, that immense network of dams and power stations and fertilizer factories and agricultural extension offices which has wrought such miraculous changes in our South. But a succession of progressive leaders, determined to bring about social change within a framework of political consent, carried through an Alliance for Progress within the United States.

Other parts of the hemisphere have experienced similar improvements. What has been done for some must now be done for all. It shall be our common purpose to labor without cease to advance the cause of economic progress and social justice within the hemisphere—to advance the autonomous and peaceful revolution of the Americas.

There are those in every land who resist change—who see the society they know as the climax of history, who identify their own status and privilege with the welfare of their people, and who oppose the vital land and tax reform necessary for the completion of our work. But their resistance is doomed to failure. The 19th century is over; and, in the 20th, people across the earth are awakening from centuries of poverty and oppression to claim the right to live in the modern world. "The veil has been torn asunder," wrote Bolivar, "we have seen the light; and we will not be thrust back into the darkness." No one can hope to prolong the past in a revolutionary age. The only question is which road we mean to take into the future.

This is not a question alone for this hemisphere. It is a question faced everywhere in the world. On the one hand are those who believe in change through persuasion and consent—through means which respect the individual. On the other are those who advocate change through the subjugation of the individual and who see in the turbulence of change the opportunity for power.

I do not believe that I have to argue the moral superiority of free society anywhere in the Americas. I do not think, other things being equal, that any rational person would prefer tyranny to tolerance or dictatorship to democracy. But there are some who doubt the capacity of freedom to do the job, and turn in resentment and desperation to totalitarian solutions. They are wrong. History shows that freedom is the most reliable means to economic development and social justice, and that communism betrays in performance the ends which it proclaims in propaganda. The humane and pragmatic methods of freemen are not merely the right way, morally, to develop an underdeveloped country; they are technically the efficient way.

We meet here at Punta del Este to consider the tragedy of Cuba. There have been many elements in that tragedy. One was the failure of the dictatorship which preceded Castro to concern itself with the elementary needs of a people who had a right to be free. Another was the disillusionment of the hopes which rode with Castro at the beginning of his resistance movement. And now we see the Cuban people subjected to a regime which has committed itself to Marxist-Leninist doctrines at the very time when this answer to economic and social problems has proved itself to be brutal, reactionary and sterile. If there is one lesson which we in the Americas can learn from observing what is happening from East Germany to North Vietnam, it is that Castroism is not the answer to economic and social development. If there is tension in Berlin today, it is because of the failure of the regime in East Germany and the flight of tens of thousands of its people toward freedom and expanding opportunity. It is worth noting that vast areas of the world with remarkable natural resources have failed to provide even the elementary needs of food, contrasted with the surpluses which abound throughout much of the free world. The needs of the individual have been ruthlessly subjected to the requirements of the power-hungry apparatus of the state. What we know in the free world as the consumer is brushed aside and men are called upon to submit themselves to the requirements of ambition and appetite.

Wherever communism goes, hunger follows. Communist China today is in the grip of a vast and terrible famine, which, in turn, has led to the stagnation and decline of industry. There is hunger in North Vietnam. Whatever contribution communism has appeared to make to industrial development comes only because it does what Marx charged 19th-century capitalism with doing: that is, it grinds down the faces of the poor and forces from their postponed consumption the capital necessary for arms and industry. Communism—once in power—has turned out to be the most effective and brutal means known to history for exploiting the working class.

Recognizing its failure in the underdeveloped world, recognizing that its greatest enemy is the process of peaceful and democratic development, communism in recent years has concentrated—in Asia, in Africa, in the Middle East, now in our own hemisphere—on using the troubles of transition to install Communist minorities in permanent power. The techniques by which communism seeks to subvert the development process are neither mysterious nor magical. Khrushchev, Mao Tse-tung, and Che Guevara have outlined them in frankness and detail. They seek first to lay the political basis for the seizure of power by winning converts in sections of the populations whose hopes and ambitions are thwarted by the existing order. They then try to capture control of broadly based popular movements aimed ostensibly at redressing social and economic injustice. In some cases, they resort to guerrilla warfare as a means of intimidating opposition and disrupting orderly social progress. At every point, the Communists are prepared to invoke all the resources of propaganda and subversion, of manipulation and violence, to maximize confusion, destroy faith in the democratic instrumentalities of change and open up the way for a Communist takeover.

As for its claim to social justice, Chairman Khrushchev himself has given the most eloquent testimony of the inevitability of monstrous injustice in a system of totalitarian dictatorship. The crimes of Stalin—crimes fully acknowledged by his successor—are the inescapable result of a political order founded on the supposed infallibility of a single creed, a single party, and a single leader. Under the banner of the classless society, communism has become the means of establishing what the Yugoslav Communist Milovan Djilas has termed the "new class"—an elite as ruthless in its determination to maintain its prerogatives as any oligarchy known to history.

Nothing shows more clearly the failure of communism to bring about economic development and social justice than the present condition of Europe. The bankruptcy of communism is etched in the contrast between the thriving economies of Western Europe and the drab stagnation of Eastern Europe—and it is symbolized in the wall of Berlin, erected to stop the mass flight of ordinary people from communism to freedom.

The proponents of free society need have no apologies. We have moved far beyond the rigid laissez-faire capitalism of the 19th century. The open society of the mid-20th century can offer the reality of what the Communists promise but do not and can not produce—because the means they are using, the techniques of hatred and violence, can never produce anything but more violence and more hatred. Communism is not the wave of the future. Communists are only the exploiters of people's aspirations—and their despair. They are the scavengers of the transition from stagnation into the modern world. The wave of the future is the peaceful, democratic revolution symbolized for the Americas in the Alliance for Progress—the revolution which will bring change without chaos, development without dictatorship, and hope without hatred.

This is our faith. Because we have pledged ourselves to this road into the future, we have no more urgent obligation than to guarantee and protect the independence of the democratic revolution. Because communism recognizes everywhere that democratic change is the greatest threat to its own ambitions, communism everywhere directs its most intense effort to making democratic change impossible. It is in this setting that I ask you to consider the question of the purposes and methods of communism in our hemisphere.

If the one striking development of the last years in our hemisphere has been the rise of the Alliance for Progress, the other striking development has been the defection of Cuba from the inter-American system.

Let us be clear about the character of the problem presented by Castro and his government.

We have no quarrel with the people of Cuba. As this week we have welcomed a free Dominican Republic back into the inter-American community, so we look forward to the day when a free and progressive government will flourish in Havana, and the Cuban people can join with us in the common undertakings of the hemisphere.

Many of us in this hemisphere had no quarrel with the avowed purposes of the revolution of 1959. Many rejoiced in the aspirations of the Cuban people for political liberty and social progress. Nor would we have any quarrel with changes in the economic organization of Cuba instituted with the consent of the Cuban people. Our hemisphere has room for a diversity of economic systems. But we do condemn the internal excesses of the Castro regime—the violations of civil justice, the drumhead executions, the suppression of political, intellectual and religious freedom. But even these things, repellent as they are, have been known to our continent. If kept within the confines of one unhappy country, they would not constitute a direct threat to the peace and the independence of other American States. What we cannot accept—and will never accept—is the use of Cuba as the means through which extracontinental powers seek to break up the inter-American system, to overthrow the governments of other countries and to destroy the autonomous democratic evolution of the hemisphere.

The Castro regime has extended the global battle to Latin America. It has supplied communism with a bridgehead in the Americas, and it has thereby brought the entire hemisphere into the front line of the struggle between communism and democracy. It has turned itself into an arsenal for arms and ammunition from the Communist world. With Communist help Dr. Castro has built up the largest military establishment in Latin America.

Within the United Nations, the Cuban delegation has abandoned its brethren of the hemisphere to play the smirking sycophant for the Communist bloc. Out of the 37 rollcall votes taken on the most important issues in the last session of the General Assembly, a majority of the members of the Organization of American States voted together 35 times. But, of these 37 votes, Cuba voted 33 times with the Soviet bloc—and only 5 times with the OAS majority. Cuba opposed the resolution appealing to the Soviet Union not to explode the 50 megaton bomb; it was the only delegation in the United Nations, besides the 10 avowed members of the Soviet bloc, to do so. In the same manner, Cuba alone joined the Communist bloc to oppose the resolution calling for a nuclear test ban treaty with international controls. On several occasions, Cuban representatives followed other members of the Communist bloc in walking out of the General Assembly when delegates of states not approved by the Soviet Union dared take the floor.

At the seventh meeting of foreign ministers at San José in August 1960, our governments together rejected any attempt on the part of the Communist powers to exploit the political, economic or social troubles of any American State. Since San José, the Cuban Government has alined itself more flagrantly than ever with those dedicated to the overthrow of the inter-American system and the destruction of inter-American freedom. The Soviet-Cuban communique of September 20, 1961, and the Chinese-Cuban communique of October 2, 1961, both signed by President Dorticos, proclaim an identity of views on foreign policy between the Cuban and the Soviet and Chinese Communist regimes. Only a few weeks ago, Dr. Roa, the Cuban Minister of Foreign Affairs, made clear once again that the primary allegiance of the Castro government is not to its brethren in the Americas but to its comrades beyond the Iron Curtain. "The Socialist camp, led by the invincible Soviet Union, is with the Cuban revolution," Dr. Roa said. "We are neither alone nor helpless. The world is with the Cuban revolution, and the future belongs entirely to the universal Socialist society that is coming, and of which, forever, Cuba already forms a part."

When Dr. Castro himself said on December 2, "I am a Marxist-Leninist and I shall be a Marxist-Leninist until the last day of my life," he could have surprised only those who have paid no attention to the evolution of the Castro regime. This public oath of fealty to Marxism-Leninism underlines Dr. Castro's commitment to the Leninist use of deception and violence, to the Leninist contempt for free institutions, and to the Leninist injunction that obedience to the international Communist movement is the highest duty.

Driven by this Marxist-Leninist faith, the Castro regime has dedicated itself, not to the struggle for democracy within the hemisphere or even within Cuba, but to the perversion and corruption of this struggle in the interests of world communism. Part III of the Report of the Inter-American Peace Committee sets forth the ties of the Government of Cuba with the Sino-Soviet bloc, its subversive activities within the hemisphere, its violations of human rights and the incompatibility of its behavior with the Charter of the Organization of American States.

Fourteen years ago at Bogotá, the Ninth International Conference of American States in its resolution XXXII on "the preservation and defense of democracy in America" declared that "by its antidemocratic nature and its interventionist tendency, the political activity of international communism or any other totalitarian doctrine is incompatible with the concept of American freedom." This resolution condemned "interference by any foreign power, or by any political organization serving the interests of a foreign power, in the public life of the nations of the American Continent." The American Republics solemnly resolved "to adopt, within their respective territories and in accordance with their respective constitutional provisions, the measures necessary to eradicate and prevent activities directed, assisted, or instigated by foreign governments, organizations, or individuals tending to overthrow their institutions by violence, to foment disorder in their domestic political life, or to disturb, by means of pressure, subversive propaganda, threats, or by any other means, the free and sovereign right of their peoples to govern themselves in accordance with their democratic aspirations."

Three years ago at Santiago, the Foreign Ministers of the American Republics reaffirmed the Bogotá resolution in the Declaration of Santiago, condemning "the methods of every system tending to suppress political and civil rights and liberties, and in particular the action of international communism or any other totalitarian doctrine."

No one can doubt, on the basis of hard evidence compiled by committees of the OAS and known to every observer in our hemisphere, that the Castro regime has placed itself in a position of systematic and contemptuous hostility to these principles of our inter-American system. Beyond the evidence, every delegate in this hall knows in his mind and heart that those behind Castro hope to overthrow his government and every other government in Latin America. The Castro regime, by repudiating the principles and philosophy of the inter-American system and making itself the American agent of world communism has created a clear and present danger to the prospects of free and democratic change in every country in Latin America. The time has come for the American Republics to unite against Communist intervention in this hemisphere. We believe in the inter-American system. We stand on the principles of the charter of the Organization of American States. We are faithful to the ancient hope of a hemisphere of free democracies, bound together in independence and common purpose. Else we would reject that hope, forsake our faith in the spiritual unity of the continent, and let each nation fend for itself, exposed in its isolation to every gust of political or ideological fanaticism.

The Alliance for Progress is the best way of attacking the long-run sources of the Communist appeal—poverty, hunger, and ignorance. But the Alliance cannot by itself provide a means of warding off the short-run Communist tactics of disruption and subversion. Vitamin tablets will not save a man set upon by hoodlums in an alley. If the Alliance is to succeed, we need to protect the democratic processes of change—we need a shield behind which constructive measures can take effect in steady and secure progression. We have seen the effect of Communist disruptive tactics in other lands and other continents. Let us take action now to guard our own continent and our programs of democratic reform against those who seek to replace democracy by dictatorship—those who would transform our fellowship of free states into a bondage of satellites.

I am confident that this meeting of Foreign Ministers will hearten the democratic forces of this continent by making it clear that we will not stand still while the enemies of democracy conspire to make democratic change impossible. Against Dr. Castro's Communist allies, let us reaffirm our faith in our own good neighbors; let us commit our minds and our hearts to the success of our free Alliance for Progress.

What is our working task, here at this meeting? I suggest we must move in four major directions:

First, we must recognize that the alinement of the Government of Cuba with the countries of the Sino-Soviet bloc, and its commitment to extend Communist power in this hemisphere, are incompatible with the purposes and principles of the inter-American system and that its current activities are an ever-present and common danger to the peace and security of the continent.

Second, we must now make the policy decision to exclude the Castro regime from participation in the organs and bodies of the inter-American system; and to direct the Council of the Organization to determine how best to give rapid implementation to this decision. Within our own competence, since the IADB was created by a meeting of consultation, we can and should now exclude the Government of Cuba from membership in the Inter-American Defense Board. This step would correct at once the most obvious incongruity arising from the participation of a regime alined with the Sino-Soviet bloc in a body planning the defense of the hemisphere against the aggressive designs of international communism.

Third, we must interrupt the limited but significant flow of trade between Cuba and the rest of the hemisphere, especially the traffic in arms.

Fourth, we must set in motion a series of individual and communal acts of defense against the various forms of political and indirect aggression mounted against the hemisphere. The acts of political aggression which the Castro regime is committing have an immediate and direct impact in the general Carribean area near the focus of infection. Yet with one exception there is not a foreign minister present whose country has not felt the impact of the interventionist activities which constitute essential elements of the international Communist design. We must find adequate means to strengthen our capacity to anticipate and overcome this constant gnawing at the security of our peoples. In particular, we should direct the Inter-American Defense Board to establish a Special Security Committee to recommend individual and collective measures to the Governments of the American States for their greater protection against any acts or threats of aggression, direct or indirect, resulting from the continued intervention of Sino-Soviet powers or others associated with them.

As we confront these decisions let us face, as old friends and neighbors, a few basic facts in our situation. The weight of Communist aggressive techniques is felt unequally among us; the nature of the Communist threat is understood in different ways among our peoples; and the OAS itself is confronted, as a body, with a form of aggressive action relatively new in its history.

We have heard references to the intrusion of the cold war into this hemisphere. There may be some who wonder whether the Americas are being caught up, as innocent bystanders, in a struggle among the giants.

But let us think clearly about what the cold war is and what it is not. The Communist world has dedicated itself to the indefinite expansion of what it calls its historically inevitable world revolution. The cold war is simply the effort of communism to extend its power beyond the confines of the Communist bloc and the effort of free men to defend themselves against this systematic aggression. The cold war would have been unknown to us had the Soviet Union determined, at the end of World War II, to live in peace with other nations in accordance with its commitments under the Charter of the United Nations. The cold war would end tomorrow if those who control the Communist movement would cease their aggressive acts, in all their many forms. Nothing would be more gratifying to the citizens of my country than to have the Soviet Union bring about the revolution of peace by a simple decision to leave the rest of the world alone.

But the cold war is not a contest between the Soviet Union and the United States which the United States is pursuing for national ends. It is a struggle in the long story of freedom, between those who would destroy it and those who are determined to preserve it. If every nation were genuinely independent, and left alone to work out its relations with its neighbors by common agreement, the tensions between Washington and Moscow would vanish overnight.

Speaking last October, before the 22d Communist Party Congress, Mr. Khrushchev said:

"We firmly believe that the time will come when the children and grandchildren of those who do not understand and do not accept communism will live under communism."

This is his belief. Were it only his belief we need not care; but it is also the program of action of the Communist powers—and about that we care a very great deal.

We know that the Communist effort to impose their system on other nations and peoples will fail and that the next generation will dwell in a community of independent nations, each freely pursuing the welfare of its people. We know this is so because history confirms that freedom must win because it is rooted in the nature of man and in his relations with God.

Our problem today is to combine a sense of the necessities of the harsh realities with the dreams upon which civilized man has steadily built. A shining future is waiting for us in this hemisphere—a future in which every child will have a decent chance for life, for education, for medical care, for constructive labor, and creative contribution; in which every republic on this continent will cooperate to improve living standards, to elevate culture, and to raise man to his full dignity in freedom.

We have the talents, the resources, and the aspirations. We need not retreat into the murky shadows of a conspiratorial society developed on the steppes of central Asia because we can move ahead in the great tradition of a civilization which was born in the free discourse of the early Mediterranean world more than 2,000 years ago, was nourished in western Europe, and came to this hemisphere to be extended by Bolívar and San Martín, by Martí, Jefferson, and Lincoln.

Our task today is not to let a petty tyrant who has appeared among us divert us from these great tasks but to put him in his place while we proceed with the great adventure upon which we are embarked together.

Mr. MORSE. The speech, I wish to say, was very moving. It came early in the Conference. Its impact was tremendous on the Conference. In my judgment it brought about a unity on the part of the delegations which resulted in the large majority votes to which I have referred.

The question has been asked, since I have returned, "Why did the U.S. delegation, if this is true, wait so long in order to call for a vote on the resolution in regard to excluding the Castro regime from further participation in the activities of the Organization of American States?"

It was because we wished to have a full discussion. That is why. It was because we wished a complete understanding of our position to be had, because we wished every opportunity to be given to all delegations to have their say, to subject us to cross-examination, to debate pro and con the legal issues raised by the particular resolution.

Mr. President, we believe in the democratic process. We practiced the democratic process at Punta del Este. We did not take the position that because we had 14 votes at the start we would exercise our majority position at that time, because we thought every opportunity should be given in an endeavor to convince the minority that they ought to join the majority on the basis of the merits of our position. When it became perfectly clear that 14 was to be the vote for that resolution, then we finally took the position the time had come to go to a vote.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very short speech which the Secretary of State made at the Conference at a subsequent session.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY OF STATE DEAN RUSK FOLLOWING THE AFFIRMATIVE VOTE EXCLUDING CUBA FROM THE OAS

We have witnessed a remarkable unanimity among the democratic nations of the hemisphere in the deep concern they have manifested concerning the existence of a Marxist-Leninist government in Cuba which is now an accomplice of international communism. Moreover these same democratic governments have reaffirmed their determination to demonstrate the superior results of democratic methods to achieve the social and economic development to which the peoples of their countries aspire. With respect to the action resolving that the incompatibility between the Marxist-Leninist government of Cuba and the principles and purposes of the inter-American system excludes the present government of Cuba from participation in the organs of the system, we have seen a vivid demonstration of the democratic process of a vigorous community of nations. Once again, the Organization of American States has shown its capacity to provide protection to the member states that require assistance, this time from the subversion of the Communist conspiracy working through Cuba, even though many of these nations which require protection are not the most populous in the hemisphere.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, at a later date, I shall place in the RECORD a very fine speech by the Secretary of State in reply to the Cuban charges. It speaks for itself as to its eloquence. In public, as I did personally to Secretary Rusk at the Conference, I wish to express my pride that we have a diplomat of his stature who presented as ably as he did the final American position, which, I think Senators will agree with me when they read it, was unanswerable. It was not answered to any degree of effectiveness by the Cubans or by any other delegation which might have disagreed with us in regard to the one major difference of opinion which developed at the Conference among the six nations, the difference over this juridical issue.

Lastly, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD what I am sure will become known as the Act of Punta del Este, which is the final act of the Conference, which sets forth the table of contents with respect to the various resolutions and sets forth the resolutions themselves.

I have noted in the master copy, Mr. President, the vote by which each resolution was passed. I shall appreciate it if the Official Reporters of Debates of the Senate will put the vote at the end of each resolution.

I think it is important that the Congress and the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD have this official document readily available to them. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the document was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

EIGHTH MEETING OF CONSULTATION OF MINISTERS OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS, SERVING AS ORGAN OF CONSULTATION IN APPLICATION OF THE INTER-AMERICAN TREATY OF RECIPROCAL ASSISTANCE, PUNTA DEL ESTE, URUGUAY, JANUARY 22–31, 1962

FINAL ACT

The Eighth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, serving as organ of consultation in application of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, was held in the city of Punta del Este, Uruguay, from January 22 to 31, 1962.

The meeting was convoked by a resolution of the Council of the Organization of American States adopted on December 4, 1961, the text of which is as follows:

"The Council of the Organization of American States,

"Considering—

"The note presented by the delegation of Colombia, dated November 9, 1961, in which it requests the convocation of a Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, in accordance with article 6 of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, to consider the threats to the peace and to the political independence of the American States that might arise from the intervention of extracontinental powers directed toward breaking American solidarity,

"Resolves—

"1. To convoke a Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs to serve as organ of consultation, in accordance with articles 6 and 11 of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, in order to consider the threats to the peace and to the political independence of the American States referred to in the preamble of this resolution, and particularly to point out the various types of threats to the peace or certain acts that, in the event they occur, justify the application of measures for the maintenance of the peace and security, pursuant to chapter V of the Charter of the Organization of American States and the provisions of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, and to determine the measures that it is advisable to take for the maintenance of the peace and security of the Continent.

"2. To set January 10, 1962, as the date for the inauguration of the meeting.

"3. To authorize the Chairman of the Council to present to the Council, at the appropriate time, after consultation with the representatives of the member states, a recommendation on the site of the meeting of consultation."

On December 22, 1961, the same Council modified the provisions as to site and date of the meeting by a resolution that reads as follows:

"The Council of the Organization of American States,

"Resolves—

"1. To thank the National Council of the Government of Uruguay and accept its generous offer to be host, in Punta del Este, Uruguay, to the Eighth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs to serve as organ of consultation in application of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, which was convoked by a resolution of December 4, 1961, of the Council of the Organization.

"2. To set the date of January 22, 1962, for the opening of the Meeting."

The Members of the Meeting, in the order of precedence determined by lot, are listed below:

Panama: His Excellency Galileo Solís, Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Paraguay: His Excellency Raúl Sapena Pastor, Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Cuba: His Excellency Osvaldo Dorticós Torrado, Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Nicaragua: His Excellency René Schick, Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Honduras: His Excellency Andrés Alvarado Puerto, Minister of Foreign Affairs.

El Salvador: His Excellency Rafael Eguizábal Tobías, Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Argentina: His Excellency Miguel Angel Cárcano, Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Peru: His Excellency Luis Alvarado G., Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Chile: His Excellency Carlos Martinez Sotomayor, Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Colombia: His Excellency José Joaquín Calcedo Castilla, Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Bolivia: His Excellency José Fellman Velarde, Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Costa Rica: His Excellency Alfredo Vargas Fernández, Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Mexico: His Excellency Manuel Tello, Secretary of Foreign Affairs.

Venezuela: His Excellency Marcos Falcón Briceño, Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Haiti: His Excellency René Chalmers, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.

Guatemala: His Excellency Jesús Unda Murillo, Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Dominican Republic: His Excellency José Antonio Bonilla Atiles, Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Ecuador: His Excellency Francisco Acosta Yépez, Minister of Foreign Affairs.

United States of America: His Excellency Dean Rusk, Secretary of State.

Brazil: His Excellency Francisco Clementino de San Tiago Dantas, Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Uruguay: His Excellency Homero Martínez Montero, Minister of Foreign Affairs.

The meeting was also attended by His Excellency José A. Mora, Secretary General of the Organization of American States.

His Excellency Eduardo Víctor Haedo, President of the National Council of Government of Uruguay, opened the meeting on the afternoon of January 22, 1962. At the inaugural session the speakers were: His Excellency Homero Martínez Montero, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Uruguay; His Excellency Alfredo Vargas Fernández, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Costa Rica; and His Excellency José A. Mora, Secretary General of the Organization of American States. The Government of the Republic of Uruguay designated His Excellency Romero Martinez Montero, Minister of Foreign Affairs of that country, as provisional president of the meeting. Mr. Martínez was elected permanent president at the first plenary session, held on January 23. At the same session His Excellency Galileo Solís, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Panama, was elected vice president of the meeting.

Pursuant to the regulations of the meeting, the Government of the Republic of Uruguay appointed Mr. Gustavo Magariños, as secretary general of the meeting.

The meeting was governed by the regulations of the Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, Serving as Organ of

Consultation in Application of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, approved by the Council of the Organization of American States at its meeting of July 29, 1960.

In accordance with the regulations, the meeting designated a credentials committee composed of El Salvador, Mexico, and Uruguay. A style committee composed of Colombia, Haiti, United States of America, and Brazil was also appointed.

In conformity with the provisions of article 20 of the regulations, a general committee, composed of all the members, was established to consider the topics of the meeting and to submit its conclusions to a plenary session of the meeting for approval. The general committee appointed His Excellency Marcos Falcón Briceño, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Venezuela, and His Excellency Alfredo Vargas Fernández, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Costa Rica, as chairman and rapporteur, respectively. When the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Costa Rica found it necessary to return to his country, His Excellency Rafael J. Oreamuno, special delegate from the same country, was elected to serve as rapporteur.

At the closing session of the meeting, which took place on January 31, this Final Act was signed. At that session addresses were given by His Excellency Homero Martínez Montero, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Uruguay, and His Excellency Luis Alvarado G., Minister of Foreign Affairs of Peru.

As a result of their deliberations, the Eighth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs approved the following resolutions:

"I. Communist offensive in America

"1. The Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the American Republics, convened in their eighth meeting of consultation, declare that the continental unity and the democratic institutions of the hemisphere are now in danger.

"The ministers have been able to verify that the subversive offensive of Communist governments, their agents and the organizations which they control, has increased in intensity. The purpose of this offensive is the destruction of democratic institutions and the establishment of totalitarian dictatorships at the service of extracontinental powers. The outstanding facts in this intensified offensive are the declarations set forth in official documents of the directing bodies of the international Communist movement, that one of its principal objectives is the establishment of Communist regimes in the underdeveloped countries and in Latin America; and the existence of a Marxist-Leninist government in Cuba which is publicly aligned with the doctrine and foreign policy of the Communist powers.

"2. In order to achieve their subversive purposes and hide their true intentions, the Communist governments and their agents exploit the legitimate needs of the less-favored sectors of the population and the just national aspirations of the various peoples. With the pretext of defending popular interests, freedom is suppressed, democratic institutions are destroyed, human rights are violated and the individual is subjected to materialistic ways of life imposed by the dictatorship of a single party. Under the slogan of "anti-imperialism" they try to establish an oppressive, aggressive, imperialism, which subordinates the subjugated nations to the militaristic and aggressive interests of extracontinental powers. By maliciously utilizing the very principles of the inter-American system, they attempt to undermine democratic institutions and to strengthen and protect political penetration and aggression. The subversive methods of Communist governments and their agents constitute one of the most subtle and dangerous forms of intervention in the internal affairs of other countries.

"3. The Ministers of Foreign Affairs alert the peoples of the hemisphere to the intensification of the subversive offensive of Communist governments, their agents, and the organizations that they control and to the tactics and methods that they employ and also warn them of the dangers this situation represents to representative democracy, to respect for human rights, and to the self-determination of peoples.

"The principles of communism are incompatible with the principles of the inter-American system.

"4. Convinced that the integrity of the democratic revolution of the American States can and must be preserved in the face of the subversive offensive of communism, the Ministers of Foreign Affairs proclaim the following basic political principles:

"(a) The faith of the American peoples in human rights, liberty, and national independence as a fundamental reason for their existence, as conceived by the founding fathers who destroyed colonialism and brought the American Republics into being;

"(b) The principle of nonintervention and the right of peoples to organize their way of life freely in the political, economic, and cultural spheres, expressing their will through free elections, without foreign interference. The fallacies of Communist propaganda cannot and should not obscure or hide the difference in philosophy which these principles represent when they are expressed by a democratic American country, and when Communist governments and their agents attempt to utilize them for their own benefit;

"(c) The repudiation of repressive measures which, under the pretext of isolating or combating communism, may facilitate the appearance or strengthening of reactionary doctrines and methods which attempt to repress ideas of social progress and to confuse truly progressive and democratic labor organizations and cultural and political movements with Communist subversion;

"(d) The affirmation that communism is not the way to achieve economic development and the elimination of social injustice in America. On the contrary, a democratic regime can encompass all the efforts for economic advancement and all of the measures for improvement and social progress without sacrificing the fundamental values of the human being. The mission of the peoples and governments of the hemisphere during the present generation is to achieve an accelerated development of their economies and to put an end to poverty, injustice, illness, and ignorance as was agreed in the Charter of Punta del Este; and

"(e) The most essential contribution of each American state in the collective effort to protect the inter-American system against communism is a steadily greater respect for human rights, improvement in democratic institutions and practices, and the adoption of measures that truly express the impulse for a revolutionary change in the economic and social structures of the American Republics."

Twenty nations for, one against (Cuba).

"II. Special Consultative Committee on Security Against the Subversive Action of International Communism

"Whereas—

"International communism makes use of highly complex techniques of subversion in opposing which certain states may benefit from mutual advice and support;

"The American States are firmly united for the common goal of fighting the subversive action of international communism and for the preservation of democracy in the Americas, as expressed in resolution XXXII of the Ninth International Conference of American States, held in Bogotá, in 1948, and that for such purpose they can and should assist each other, mainly through the use of the institutional resources of the Organization of American States; and

"It is advisable, therefore, to make available to the Council of the Organization of American States a body of an advisory nature, made up of experts, the main purpose of which would be to advise the member governments which, as the case may be, require and request such assistance,

"The Eighth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, serving as organ of consultation in application of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance,

"Resolves—

"1. To request the Council of the Organization of American States to maintain all necessary vigilance, for the purpose of warning against any acts of aggression, subversion, or other dangers to peace and security, or the preparation of such acts, resulting from the continued intervention of Sino-Soviet powers in this hemisphere, and to make recommendations to the governments of the member states with regard thereto.

"2. To direct the Council of the Organization to establish a Special Consultative Committee of experts on security matters, for the purpose of advising the member states that may desire and request such assistance, the following procedures being observed:

"(a) The Council of the Organization shall select the membership of the Special Consultative Committee on Security from a list of candidates presented by the governments, and shall define immediately terms of reference for the committee with a view to achieving the full purposes of this resolution.

"(b) The Committee shall submit reports to such member states as may request its assistance; however, it shall not publish these reports without obtaining express authorization from the state dealt with in the report.

"(c) The Special Consultative Committee on Security shall submit to the Council of the Organization, no later than May 1, 1962, an initial general report, with pertinent recommendations regarding measures which should be taken.

"(d) The Committee shall function at the Pan American Union, which shall extend to it the technical, administrative, and financial facilities required for the work of the committee.

"(e) The Committee shall function for the period deemed advisable by the Council of the Organization.

"3. To urge the member states to take those steps that they may consider appropriate for their individual or collective self-defense, and to cooperate, as may be necessary or desirable, to strengthen their capacity to counteract threats or acts of aggression, subversion, or other dangers to peace and security resulting from the continued intervention in this hemisphere of Sino-Soviet powers, in accordance with the obligations established in treaties and agreements such as the Charter of the Organization of American States and the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance."

Nineteen nations for, one against (Cuba); one abstain (Bolivia).

"III. Reiteration of the principles of nonintervention and self-determination

"Whereas—

"This meeting has been convoked by a resolution of the Council of the Organization of American States that invoked article 6 of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance;

"It is necessary to maintain the principles of nonintervention and self-determination set forth in the Charter of the Organization of American States, because these principles are a basic part of the juridical system that governs relations among the republics of the hemisphere and makes friendly relations among them possible;

"In the Charter of the Organization of American States and in the Declaration of

Santiago, signed in August 1959, all the governments of the American States agreed voluntarily that they should result from free elections;

"The will of the people, expressed through unrestricted suffrage, assures the formation of governments that represent more faithfully and without yielding to the interests of a privileged few the basic aspirations to freedom and social justice, the constant need for economic progress, and the call of brotherhood that all our peoples feel throughout the hemisphere;

"Formation by free elections of the governments that comprise the Organization of American States is therefore the surest guarantee for the peace of the hemisphere and the security and political independence of each and every one of the nations that comprise it; and

"Freedom to contract obligations is an inseparable part of the principle of the self-determination of nations, and consequently a request by one or more countries that such obligations be complied with does not signify intervention,

"The Eighth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, serving as organ of consultation in application of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance,

"Resolves—

"1. To reiterate its adherence to the principles of self-determination and nonintervention as guiding standards of coexistence among the American nations.

"2. To urge that the governments of the member countries of the Organization of American States, bearing in mind the present situation, and complying with the principles and aims set forth in the Charter of the Organization and the Declaration of Santiago, organize themselves on the basis of free elections that express, without restriction, the will of the people."

Twenty nations for, one against (Cuba).

"*IV. Holding of free elections*

"Whereas—

"The preamble to the Charter of the Organization of American States proclaims that the true significance of American solidarity and good neighborliness can only mean the consolidation on this hemisphere, within the framework of democratic institutions, of a system of individual liberty and social justice based on respect for the essential rights of man;

"The same charter reaffirms, among its principles, the requirement that the political organization of the American States be based on the effective exercise of representative democracy, even as it reasserts the fundamental rights of the individual;

"The charter confirms the right of each State to develop, freely and naturally, its cultural, political, and economic life, while respecting in this free development the rights of the individual and the principles of universal morality;

"The Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance affirms as a manifest truth, that juridical organization is a necessary prerequisite of security and peace, and that peace is founded on justice and moral order and, consequently, on the international recognition and protection of human rights and freedoms, on the indispensable well-being of the people, and on the effectiveness of democracy for the international realization of justice and security; and

"According to the principles and attributes of the democratic system in this hemisphere, as stated in the Declaration of Santiago, Chile, the governments of the American Republics should be the result of free elections, and perpetuation in power, or the exercise of power without a fixed term and with the manifest intent of perpetuation, is incompatible with the effective exercise of democracy,

"The Eighth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, serving as organ of consultation in application of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance,

"Resolves—

"To recommend that the governments of the American States, whose structure or acts are incompatible with the effective exercise of representative democracy, hold free elections in their respective countries, as the most effective means of consulting the sovereign will of their peoples, to guarantee the restoration of a legal order based on the authority of the law and respect for the rights of the individual."

Twenty nations for, one against (Cuba).

"*V. Alliance for progress*

"Whereas—

"The American States have the capacity to eradicate the profound evils of economic and social underdevelopment;

"Resolution XI of the Fifth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs and resolution V of the Seventh Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs declare that economic cooperation among the American States is necessary for the stability of democracy and the safeguarding of human rights, and that such cooperation is essential to the strengthening of the solidarity of the hemisphere and the reinforcement of the inter-American system in the face of threats that might affect it; and

"In view of the fact that all the nations of the Americas have recognized their urgent need for economic and social development, it is necessary that they intensify immediately their self-help and cooperative efforts under the alliance for progress and the Charter of Punta del Este, on the basis of the adoption of vigorous reforms and large-scale internal efforts by the developing countries concerned and a mobilization of all the necessary financial and technical resources by the highly developed nations,

"The Eighth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, serving as organ of consultation in application of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance,

"Declares—

"1. That the preservation and strengthening of free and democratic institutions in the American Republics require, as an essential condition, the prompt, accelerated execution of an unprecedented effort to promote their economic and social development for which effort the public and private, domestic and foreign financial resources necessary to those objectives are to be made available, economic and social reforms are to be established, and every necessary internal effort is to be made in accordance with the provisions of the Charter of Punta del Este.

"2. That it is essential to promote energetically and vigorously the basic industries of the Latin American countries, to liberalize trade in raw materials by the elimination of undue restrictions, to seek to avoid violent fluctuations in their prices, to encourage the modernization and expansion of services in order that industrialization may rest on its own appropriate bases, to mobilize unexploited natural resources in order to increase national wealth and to make such increased wealth available to persons of all economic and social groups, and to satisfy quickly, among other aspirations, the needs for work, housing, land, health, and education."

Twenty nations for, one against (Cuba).

VI. Exclusion of the present Government of Cuba from participation in the inter-American system

"Whereas—

"The inter-American system is based on consistent adherence by its constituent states to certain objectives and principles of solidarity, set forth in the instruments that govern it;

"Among these objectives and principles are those of respect for the freedom of man and preservation of his rights, the full exercise of representative democracy, nonintervention of one state in the internal or external affairs of another, and rejection of alliances and agreements that may lead to intervention in America by extracontinental powers;

"The Seventh Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, held in San José, Costa Rica, condemned the intervention or the threat of intervention of extracontinental Communist powers in the hemisphere and reiterated the obligation of the American States to observe faithfully the principles of the regional organization;

"The present Government of Cuba has identified itself with the principles of Marxist-Leninist ideology, has established a political, economic, and social system based on that doctrine, and accepts military assistance from extracontinental Communist powers, including even the threat of military intervention in America on the part of the Soviet Union;

"The report of the Inter-American Peace Committee to the Eighth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs establishes that—

"'The present connections of the Government of Cuba with the Sino-Soviet bloc of countries are evidently incompatible with the principles and standards that govern the regional system, and particularly with the collective security established by the Charter of the OAS and the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance' (p. 39);

"The above-mentioned report of the Inter-American Peace Committee also states that—

"'It is evident that the ties of the Cuban Government with the Sino-Soviet bloc will prevent the said Government from fulfilling the obligations stipulated in the Charter of the Organization and the Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance' (p. 40);

"Such a situation in an American State violates the obligations inherent in membership in the regional system and is incompatible with that system;

"The attitude adopted by the present Government of Cuba and its acceptance of military assistance offered by extracontinental Communist powers breaks down the effective defense of the inter-American system; and

"No member state of the inter-American system can claim the rights and privileges pertaining thereto if it denies or fails to recognize the corresponding obligations,

"The Eighth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, serving as organ of consultation in application of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance,

"Declares—

"1. That, as a consequence of repeated acts, the present Government of Cuba has voluntarily placed itself outside the inter-American system.

"2. That this situation demands unceasing vigilance on the part of the member states of the Organization of American States, which shall report to the Council any fact or situation that could endanger the peace and security of the hemisphere.

"3. That the American States have a collective interest in strengthening the inter-American system and reuniting it on the basis of respect for human rights and the principles and objectives relative to the exercise of democracy set forth in the Charter of the Organization; and, therefore,

"Resolves—

"1. That adherence by any member of the Organization of American States to Marxism-Leninism is incompatible with the inter-American system and the alignment of such a government with the Communist bloc breaks the unity and solidarity of the hemisphere.

"2. That the present Government of Cuba, which has officially identified itself as a Marxist-Leninist government is incompatible with the principles and objectives of the inter-American system.

"3. That this incompatibility excludes the present Government of Cuba from participation in the inter-American system.

"4. That the Council of the Organization of American States and the other organs and organizations of the inter-American system adopt without delay the measures necessary to carry out this resolution."

Fourteen nations for, one against (Cuba), six abstain (Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Mexico, and Ecuador).

"VII. Inter-American Defense Board

"Whereas—

"The Inter-American Defense Board was established pursuant to Resolution 39 of the Third Meeting of Consultation of Foreign Ministers, held in Rio de Janeiro in 1942, recommending the immediate meeting of a commission composed of military and naval technicians appointed by each of the governments to study and to suggest to them measures necessary for the defense of the hemisphere;

"The Inter-American Defense Board, on April 26, 1961, resolved that the participation of the Cuban regime in defense planning is highly prejudicial to the work of the Board and to the security of the hemisphere; and

"The present Government of Cuba is identified with the aims and policies of the Sino-Soviet bloc.

"The Eighth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, serving as organ of consultation in application of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance,

"Resolves—

"To exclude immediately the present Government of Cuba from the Inter-American Defense Board until the Council of the Organization of American States shall determine by a vote of two thirds of its members that membership of the Government of Cuba is not prejudicial to the work of the Board or to the security of the hemisphere."

Twenty nations for, one against (Cuba).

"VIII. Economic relations

"Whereas—

"The report of the Inter-American Peace Committee to the Eighth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs states, with regard to the intense subversive activity in which the countries of the Sino-Soviet bloc and the Cuban Government are engaged in America, that such activity constitutes 'a serious violation of fundamental principles of the inter-American system'; and

"During the past 3 years 13 American States have found it necessary to break diplomatic relations with the present Government of Cuba,

"The Eighth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, serving as organ of consultation in application of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance,

"Resolves—

"1. To suspend immediately trade with Cuba in arms and implements of war of every kind.

"2. To charge the Council of the Organization of American States, in accordance with the circumstances and with due consideration for the constitutional or legal limitations of each and every one of the member states, with studying the feasibility and desirability of extending the suspension of trade to other items, with special attention to items of strategic importance.

"3. To authorize the Council of the Organization of American States to discontinue, by an affirmative vote of two-thirds of its members, the measure or measures adopted pursuant to the preceding paragraphs, at such time as the Government of Cuba demonstrates its compatibility with the purposes and principles of the system."

Sixteen nations for, one against (Cuba); four abstain (Chile, Mexico, Ecuador, and Brazil).

"IX. Revision of the statute of the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights

"Whereas—

"The Fifth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, by Resolution VIII, created the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, and charged it with furthering respect for human rights in the American States;

"Notwithstanding the noble and persevering effort carried on by that Commission in the exercise of its mandate, the inadequacy of the faculties and attributions conferred upon it by its statute have made it difficult for the Commission to fulfill its assigned mission;

"There is a pressing need for accelerating development in the hemisphere of the collective defense of human rights, so that this development may result in international legal protection of these rights; and

"There is an obvious relation between violations of human rights and the international tensions that work against the harmony, peace, and unity of the hemisphere.

"The Eighth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, serving as organ of consultation in application of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance,

"Resolves—

"To recommend to the Council of the Organization of American States that it revise the statute of the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, broadening and strengthening the Commission's attributes and faculties to such an extent as to permit it effectively to further respect for these rights in the countries of the hemisphere."

Nineteen nations for, one against (Cuba); one abstention (Uruguay).

STATEMENTS

Statement of Honduras

Honduras wishes to have the explanation of the position it adopted in voting for resolution VI, exclusion of the present Government of Cuba from participation in the inter-American system, recorded in the final act.

With regard to the observations of a juridical nature made by several distinguished foreign ministers, Honduras maintains the existence of sufficient bases in the letter and in the spirit of the treaties and conventions of the regional system.

In the last analysis, however, in view of the threat to the peace and security of the hemisphere, in view of the threat to the dignity and freedom of the inhabitants of the Americas, and in view of the political presence of the Soviet Union in America, the delegation of Honduras, aware of the juridical doubt that might arise, has not hesitated to give the benefit of the doubt to the defense of democracy in America.

Statement of Argentina

In view of the statement made by the representative of Uruguay at the second plenary session, held on January 31, 1962, the delegation of Argentina wishes to record that it reiterates the juridical views expressed by Dr. Miguel Angel Cárcano, Minister of Foreign Affairs and Worship, at the ninth session of the general committee, in explanation of his vote on resolution VI of this final act.

Statement of Colombia

The position of Colombia has been defined in the two statements that will be shown in the minutes of the second plenary session of this eighth meeting of consultation, and that refer to general policy and to resolution VI.

Statement of Mexico

The delegation of Mexico wishes to make it a matter of record in the final act of the Eighth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, that, in its opinion, the exclusion of a member state is not juridically possible unless the Charter of the Organization of American States is first amended pursuant to the procedure established in article 111.

Statement of Haiti

My country is proud to have participated in these discussions, which have taken place in an atmosphere of calm, of courtesy, and of mutual respect.

Haiti came to Punta del Este with the firm intention of defending the principles of nonintervention and self-determination of peoples, with all that they imply. Haiti remains firmly attached to these intangible principles, which guarantee an order of mutual respect in relations among peoples of different languages and cultures.

Here Haiti has become persuaded that "the fallacies of Communist propaganda cannot and should not obscure or hide the difference in philosophy which these principles represent when they are expressed by a democratic American country, and when Communist governments and their agents attempt to utilize them for their own benefit."

This is the sole reason for the change in the position and attitude of my country, which is honored to have had a modest part in resolving a problem which jeopardized the peace, the solidarity, and the unity of the hemisphere.

Statement of Ecuador

The delegation of Ecuador wishes to state in the record that the exclusion of a member state from the inter-American system could only be accomplished through the prior amendment of the Charter of the Organization of American States to grant the power to exclude a state.

The charter is the constitutional juridical statute that prevails over any other inter-American instrument.

Statement of Ecuador on Resolution VIII

Ecuador abstained from voting, inasmuch as sanctions are being applied, by invoking the Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, sanctions that begin with the suspension of traffic in arms with the possibility of being extended to other items, with special attention to items of strategic importance, a concept that might include basic necessities of which the Cuban people should not be deprived and thus make the present situation more critical.

Of course, Ecuador, as a peace-loving country, reaffirms its faith in peaceful methods to settle controversies between states and condemns illegal traffic in arms.

Statement of Brazil

In view of the statement made by the representative of Uruguay at the plenary session held on January 31, 1962, the delegation of Brazil reaffirms the validity of the juridical bases of the position taken by its country with respect to resolution VI of the Eighth Meeting of Consultation, which position was explained at length by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Brazil in statements made at the sessions of the general committee held on January 24 and 30, 1962.

Statement of Uruguay

The delegation of Uruguay wishes to state in the record that, in adopting its position in the Eighth Meeting of Consultation, far from violating or forgetting the juridical standards applicable to the Cuban case, it adhered strictly to them, as befits its old and honorable tradition of being a defender of legality. The bases for this position were explained at the plenary session held on January 31, as will be shown in the minutes of that session.

In witness whereof, the Ministers of Foreign Affairs sign the present final act.

Done in the city of Punta del Este, Uruguay, on January 31, 1962. The secretary general shall deposit the original of the final act in the Archives of the Pan American Union, which will transmit the authenticated copies thereof to the governments of the American Republics.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I close by expressing a word of personal thanks to the President, to the Secretary of State, and to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate for giving me the opportunity to attend this great educational conference, because to me it was a series of seminars in international relations and international law. I shall always be grateful to those leaders of my Government, including the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the very able chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, for giving me this opportunity to serve my country within the limits of my ability, in accordance with the sights I have.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. McGEE. I am sure other Senators have already voiced to the Senator from Oregon their appreciation for the role which the Senate representation of the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Iowa played at the conference at Punta del Este during the past few days, but I think the RECORD ought to show it would be difficult to exaggerate the pride which the Senator's colleagues shared in the performance which was reported from time to time on the part of our representation at the conference. It was tough. It was fair. It was farseeing. It seems to me it could do not but strengthen the position of our Government and of our friends in this hemisphere in assaulting the kinds of difficulties and problems we seek jointly to conquer in the whole Alliance for Progress program.

I think the Senator should know that earlier today I placed in the RECORD some of the critically evaluating editorials and comments praising the conduct of Secretary Rusk and the congressional delegation backing him up in these at times very delicate and strained negotiations. It is commendable to the conduct of this body that it should play the role the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Iowa filled on that occasion.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, for one controlling and compelling reason I shall not attempt to make a formal report today about the Punta del Este Conference.

That controlling reason, I believe, is fully sufficient. While the senior Senator from Oregon and I in the 17 or 18 years we have been here have not always seen eye to eye on some issues, no two people could be more closely in agreement on every detail, action, and position which we took than the two of us at that Conference. I have great affection for the Senator from Oregon. I have great respect for his ability, courage, and perception.

One of the satisfying results of the Conference, so far as I was concerned, was the fact that not only was there complete agreement on the part of all four congressional consultants or advisers who were at Punta del Este, but also that agreement became completely evident as the Conference went on. In fact at one time, under the leadership of the senior Senator from Oregon, the four of us held a specific meeting in a hotel room at Punta del Este at which the Senator from Oregon said:

> Now, is there the slightest deviation from any position which we have discussed here? Is there the slightest disagreement? If there is, this is the time for us to hear it and talk it out.

There was not the slightest disagreement. We stood as one in our suggestion and advice to the delegation that the American people were sick and tired of the Communist—I was about to say "nonsense," but it is not necessarily nonsense, for it goes further than that—the Communist threat to the integrity of the freedom and liberty in this hemisphere.

I wish to pay a special tribute to my colleagues who were at Punta del Este. They include the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the distinguished Representative from Alabama, Mr. ARMISTEAD I. SELDEN, JR., who is the chairman of the Latin American Affairs Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the distinguished Representative CHESTER E. MERROW, of New Hampshire, who is the ranking Republican member of that committee in the House of Representatives.

As I said a moment ago, I shall not make a formal report at this time because the Senator from Oregon has so ably covered the subject. I not only find no disagreement, but I find complete agreement with his statement, which has been much more ably presented than I could present it. Later, from time to time I hope to discuss certain phases of the problems which faced our country at the Conference, and which were met with such vigor and success.

I join the senior Senator from Oregon today in paying my highest respects to a great statesman and a great leader, Secretary of State Dean Rusk. It has been my fortunate experience to be in attendance at a number of international conferences as a representative of the Senate or as consultant, not only in the Latin American field, but also in the foreign relations field and in the atomic energy field. I have never seen a more able, vigorous, patient, consistent, and statesmanlike approach to the issues involved than that demonstrated by the Secretary of State at the inter-American conference. Mr. Rusk has a brilliance of mind and a patience which I am frank to say I could not find within myself. I think I would have "blown my stack" several times a day if I had had to endure the disquieting and irritating things which he endured with tremendous patience and kindness, and yet with complete vigor and firmness.

It was not an easy task.

I am sorry, but I was unavoidably called from the Chamber for about 10 minutes while the Senator from Oregon was making his presentation. He might have mentioned the subject about which I shall now speak. I think he probably did during that period of my absence. I assure the Senate that it was frustrating to sit hour after hour and listen to what I, as a lawyer—and I am quite sure it was true of the Senator from Oregon, who was a distinguished dean of a law school and a professor of law and a great lawyer himself—believed to be juridical or legalistic thimblerigging that went on in strained interpretations of either hypothetical or suggestedly actual legal principles of an involvement which were attempted as a basis for resistance. It was very difficult. On many occasions I saw the blood rise above the collar of the Senator from Oregon when some things were said that I know violated the principles he used to tell his students were true about law and various other questions. I do not know whether the blood likewise rose above my collar, but certainly the difficulty was very great.

In fairness, I will say that if one should consider the minuteness with which on occasion the Latin system of law approaches certain problems, perhaps he could understand that they were attempting to be meticulous in their analysis, even though we believed it was strained to the point of—the words I would like to use would probably not be the best words to use—but strained to the point where we could not accept them as a matter of sound legal principle.

Another point I have in mind, which may have been mentioned by the Senator from Oregon in my absence for a few minutes—and if so, I apologize for the repetition—is that much is being made today by the Castro propaganda that, after all, the representatives of 120 million in Latin America did not vote to impose the exclusionary provisions upon Cuba, and much is being made in the Communist press that that is a majority of the people of Latin America.

The thing we must remember is that the Conference was not a meeting of the people of Latin America or their representatives alone. It was a meeting of the Organization of American States, and I think 180 million citizens of the United States are a part of that Organization. So if one should desire to count noses, he would find that the representatives of the approximately 250 million people in the Western Hemisphere voted the exclusions against the present Communist government of Cuba, and that the representatives of only 120 million people in the Western Hemisphere voted against such exclusions. For more than two-thirds of the people as represented at the Conference by their foreign ministers voted to cast the Cuban Government outside the pale of association, contribution, and participation in the affairs of the Organization of American States; and well over two-thirds of the people of this hemisphere condemned the Cuban situation from the standpoint of exclusion. Those who abstained from voting on the particular proposition of exclusion clearly stated that it was not the moral question they were voting on, but the legalistic principle that this meeting of foreign ministers was not clothed with sufficient legal authority to take this step of exclusion, and that it would have to be taken by the Organization of American States itself in general convocation in Washington. They put their entire abstention on the basis of the legal restraint which they thought existed, not on the basis that they thought Cuba should not be excluded.

Some interesting sequels have developed. I say this with all respect to the very able statesman to whom I shall refer, because he is able. However, when it is said that the representatives of some of these countries who abstained from voting had the support of their people, and when it is claimed that they represented, for instance, 65 million people in Brazil, or 28 million people in Argentina, let us look at that proposition. I say this with respect, but I point out that this is what the leading newspapers of Brazil are saying today after this action by the Foreign Minister of Brazil. His name is Mr. Santiago Dantes, a very able statesman. I have great respect for him. What I say is not said in any way to belittle him. I am only referring to what the major newspapers of Brazil said about him the next day and, I am told, are saying about him today. They are referring to that gentleman not as Mr. Santiago Dantes, but as Mr. Santiago de Cuba. They are referring to him in their editorials in that way and saying that he did not represent the feeling of the people of Brazil when he abstained from voting in the same way in which the United States voted.

I am told that of the nine daily newspapers in Buenos Aires, Argentina, eight are vigorously attacking the failure and refusal of their Prime Minister to vote in favor of the exclusion of Cuba, and are criticizing the use of the legalistic argument of the lack of power in abstaining.

I say this with respect to these gentlemen: All I am doing is pointing out that just as I am sure 180 million people in the United States approve the strong and vigorous condemnatory proceedings which were taken at Punta del Este, I am also equally sure that that is true in the major countries in Latin America whose delegates abstained from voting.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will I interrupt the Senator's continuity of thought if I disturb him at this point for comment and to ask a question?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I say to my distinguished friend from West Virginia that there is not very much continuity to what I am saying, so I do not believe his interruption would bother me. I am merely making some observations.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I wish to commend the Senator and propound an inquiry.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I say that there is not much continuity to what I am saying, and the Senator will not disturb me at all if he asks me a question. In fact, I will be delighted to answer his question.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I was not privileged to be in the Chamber to hear the diligent and distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] or the beginning remarks of the equally effective and distinguished Senator from Iowa. I wished to inquire particularly with respect to the impression that the Senator from Iowa received from the representatives of the Central American countries who stood steadfastly with the United States during the affirmative efforts in having approved a most positive position by the Conference.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. My impression of them is that they see clearly the threat and the danger to freedom and self-determination and liberty and democracy which is posed by the dagger of communism, controlled by the Sino-Soviet block through Cuba. They see it clearly. They understand it. They are willing to act vigorously, to the point of sacrificing their lives to defend it. They courageously stood firm with the United States and were a bulwark of strength to our U.S. position in this meeting at Punta del Este. I have the highest admiration for them.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Senator's assurance is, in my opinion, based on personal conferences and observations I have experienced. It is fitting to indicate for the RECORD, that, in company with the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], it was my privilege and my official responsibility as a member of the Subcommittee on Public Roads, to visit the Central American countries during the last few days of 1961 and the first few days of 1962. We were in that area primarily to study the progress which has been made in the construction of the Inter-American Highway. Yet there was opportunity, in fact, we sought the opportunity, to talk with the Presidents of some of these countries in Central America. Where the Presidents were not readily available, we held discussions with their foreign ministers and other cabinet officials.

We learned that in these countries, moving from Panama to Mexico, there was this solidarity, there was this strength, to which the Senator has just been referring. We were somewhat concerned, when during that work visit, we read that the President of the United States had indicated that he would visit Mexico during 1962. It was my feeling, at the time of the announcement, and again today, that the President could well say in essence to these Central American peoples, "I wish to come among you, as well as to visit Mexico, and I plan to do so."

Mr. President, we have vigilant support for justice and liberty in these lands. These persons, in official and in private life, are actively engaged in a common cause against the fomenters of communism. There are, in some key government positions and legislative posts, those who aid the Soviet lines and the Cuban moves. A visit from President Kennedy will encourage the fearless and dedicated people who wage an unrelenting battle against communism.

I believe that the time has come, and perhaps it is long overdue, when we should indicate to these cooperative nations, which are relatively small countries acreage-wise and population-wise, but which have stood with us, that there is no priority of Presidential visitation. If a visit to Mexico is to be made, and I favor such a trip, we should certainly want our Chief Executive to visit Honduras and El Salvador and Nicaragua and Guatemala and Costa Rica, all the countries which are embraced in Central America. Would the Senator agree?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. In my judgment, visits by the President of the United States, when he can make them, are extremely helpful. Those countries are honored and pleased by such visits. They contribute immeasurably to the bettering of relations and understanding. I think it would be a fine thing. I certainly would applaud a visitation by the President, especially to the small countries, which feel that their small population and their lack of great wealth may relegate them to a little less consideration at times, although that is not necessarily true. I think that visits by the President are commendable.

As the Senator from West Virginia knows, one of the difficulties, when the President of the United States goes to a continent or an area, is that if he visits one country but not another, not because he does not want to visit the other, but because of a lack of time, a misunderstanding is created. Such visits have to be handled carefully, because manifestly on one visit the President could not visit all the countries. That is something which will have to be worked out. However, so far as the theory is concerned, I agree with the Senator from West Virginia. So far as the Central American countries and those bordering on the Caribbean are concerned, I thoroughly agree with him that we must long remember the stalwart cooperation which they have given and are continuing to give us.

The fact that they have stood with us means that I, for one, shall stand with them. They deserve such consideration. They are not strong countries from the standpoint of physical strength; but from the standpoint of moral courage, clarity of thought, and a realization of what the Communist menace is, they are stalwart, indeed. Sometimes those countries are stalwart away beyond the physical size of their country or the amount of their national treasury. Their stalwart courage often exceeds that of some larger countries that should be in the forefront of this battle.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I thank the Senator from Iowa. Permit me one other observation. We have every reason to believe that with the use of the Inter-American Highway, which runs from Laredo, Tex., into Mexico, and through the Central American countries to Panama, we are forging a lifeline of justice, liberty, and understanding. The participation by those countries in providing funds with which we cooperatively construct the road is most valuable. I think the road will be of real value in the future.

I offer this final thought:

At the time we visited Honduras, we found a contest in progress at the university of that country between the forces of communism and of anti-communism. This was not communism by indirection, but of direction. An election was held for the presidency of the student body. One of the individuals who ran for the presidency of the student body of the University of Honduras designated himself openly as a Communist candidate. The student opposed to the Communist candidate on that campus prevailed by 11 votes. It was a close contest, to be sure; but to find the concern and alertness of the people there toward the Communist threat—yes, I use the word "threat" advisedly—was heartening. As the Senator from Iowa has indicated, these nations, even with lesser resources than many other countries, there are those diligent citizens who are determined to stand with us in this time of need.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thank the Senator from West Virginia. At a later date, and from time to time, I am sure we shall discuss this particular meeting and its results. While I should have liked to see certain other declarations come out of the meeting, nevertheless, under all the circumstances, considering all the forces at work and, sometimes, the confusion of thinking, we came out with a firm, definite, and vigorous statement, one which I believe will unite the Americas, and which, I think, makes the meeting at Punta del Este a markedly successful one.

In closing, I again pay my tribute to the leadership, the patience, the courage, and the high intelligence of Dean Rusk. I express appreciation for the fine cooperation and complete unity which obtained among the members of the congressional delegation who went to Punta del Este, understanding thoroughly, I believe, what the American people are determined to have vis-a-vis communism, and who did not hesitate for one minute to stand firmly and vigorously in support of those very principles for the elimination of communism and its threat in this hemisphere. It was a stimulating experience for me. As I said a while ago, I have attended a number of these conferences. This was one of the most complicated conferences I have ever attended. The display of cooperative effort and vigorous unity achieved one of the most satisfactory results I have ever experienced.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield for a question?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Was there any discussion of the Alliance for Progress program at the Conference held recently in Uruguay?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Practically none. In a collateral way it was mentioned. It was always present as a part of the cooperating effort between hemispheres; but basically this Conference was concerned and preoccupied with the Communist threat and what we were going to do about it in order to achieve unity, because we realized that unless we had unity in fighting and opposing the Communist threat, the Alliance for Progress could not make any progress at all, even in a general way.

Undoubtedly the question of the Alliance for Progress will come up at a later date. I think some countries will progress a little more than others, and some countries may ally a little more than others. However, that question will come up at a later date.

Mr. KUCHEL subsequently said: Mr. President, I would be recreant in the performance of my duty if I did not salute the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Hickenlooper] for the splendid contributions they made at Punta del Este and also here on the floor of the Senate today. I was called from the Chamber at the time when other Senators spoke on this matter, but I desire publicly to express my very real gratitude about the success which has been achieved, a success in which both of these Senators participated.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I deeply appreciate the kindly and flattering remarks of the Senator from California; but I wish the Record to show—as he knows that I believe it to be true—that the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel] is one of the great students in this body on Latin American affairs. In fact, in times past he and I have worked on some Latin American matters; and I had the privilege of serving with him on the delegation when the two of us represented the Senate at the inauguration of the present President of Mexico. Let me say that it means a great deal to me to have the confidence of the Senator from California.

I repeat what I said earlier today, namely, that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Hickenlooper] was a tower of strength on this delegation. Furthermore, let me say that I am always pleased when I can help bring back to the Senate a unanimous report; and throughout the Conference we stood in complete unanimity.

Mr. KUCHEL. I am sure that was so, Mr. President; and I merely wish to reflect the thinking of all colleagues of the Senator, by the manner in which I have endeavored to express that feeling.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I desire to join my colleagues in expressing to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] what I think is the debt of the entire Nation for his outstanding and historic service on the delegation at Punta del Este.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator very much.

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ACT OF 1962

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, the administration's farm bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2786) to improve and protect farm income, to reduce costs of farm programs to the Federal Government, to reduce the Federal Government's excessive stocks of agricultural commodities, to maintain reasonable and stable prices of agricultural commodities and products to consumers, to provide adequate supplies of agricultural commodities for domestic and foreign needs, to conserve natural resources, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Ellender, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a digest of the bill. The bill is rather voluminous, but I think its provisions will be made clear when the committee of which I am chairman, and which has charge of the bill, proceeds to hold hearings on the bill.

There being no objection, the digest was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Digest of Food and Agriculture Act of 1962

I. Land-use adjustment (title I of the bill).

1. Amends the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act:

(a) By repealing certain provisions of sections 7 and 8 of the act, the effect of which would be to provide permanent authority for a Federal agricultural conservation program under sections 7 to 17 of that act. Section 8 of the act authorizes a Federal program only until January 1, 1963, after which it is contemplated that the program authorized by sections 7 to 17 would be carried out under State plans approved by the Secretary.

(b) By providing new authority to promote the conservation and economic use of land through long-term agreements with farm operators and owners under which payments would be made for changes in cropping systems and land uses, and for other measures for the purpose of conserving and developing soil, water, forest, wildlife, and recreation resources. This authority could be used without regard to a number of limitations in the present law relating to distribution of funds to States, increases in small payments to producers, limitations on the size of payments, and prohibition against acquiring any right or interest in land.

2. Amends title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act to include as a purpose the more economic use of land, including among other specified uses public recreation and fish and wildlife protection; and authorizes the Secretary to acquire any lands, or rights or interests therein, which he deems necessary to carry out the purposes of the title as amended except that land purchases are limited to those which will not have a serious adverse effect on the economy of county or community in which the land is located. The law now authorizes only the acquisition of submarginal land and land not primarily suitable for cultivation. The Secretary is also authorized to dispose of lands acquired under this title, as amended, to any agency or person, except that such authority would not be applicable to lands acquired in exchange for lands acquired prior to the date of this amendment.

3. Amends the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act by providing that when a local organization agrees to operate and maintain any reservoir or other area for public fish and wildlife or recreational development, the Secretary would be authorized to bear the cost of the land, easements, or rights-of-way acquired by the local organization for such reservoir or other area. The Secretary would also be authorized to bear the cost of minimum basic facilities needed for public health and safety, access to, and use of the reservoir or other area for such purposes. There is also included authority for the Secretary to make advances to local organizations from funds appropriated for construction of works of improvement of the amounts required for the immediate acquisition of land, easements, or rights-of-way necessary for the preservation of sites for works of improvement from encroachment by residential, commercial, industrial, or other development.

II. Agricultural trade development (title II of the bill).

1. Amends title II of Public Law 480 (83d Cong.) to permit acquisition of commodities for title II programs from private stocks.

2. Amends title IV of such law to—

(a) Expand purposes for which sales may be made to include market development.

(b) Authorize Secretary to make sales to private trade for market development purposes in underdeveloped countries.

(c) Provide discretionary rather than mandatory authority under which other friendly supplying countries would be permitted to participate in supplying commodities.

(d) Make certain provisions of title I relating to foreign currency sales (use of private trade channels, special consideration to market development) applicable to sales under title IV of Public Law 480.

3. Adds a new title V to Public Law 480 to authorize multilateral food program through intergovernmental organizations.

(a) Authorizes use of surplus agricultural commodities from CCC stocks or from private stocks.

(b) Authorizes CCC to pay procurement costs, processing, packaging, transportation, handling and other charges up to time of delivery f.o.b. point of export.

(c) President required to secure commitment from international organization that reasonable precautions will be taken not to displace sales of U.S. agricultural commodities.

(d) Requires advance appropriations after June 30, 1963.

III. Marketing orders (title III of the bill).

1. Permits producer allotments or quotas for milk, turkeys, and turkey-hatching eggs as follows:

(a) The allotments or quotas for turkeys and turkey-hatching eggs would limit or restrict marketings or other disposition by producers on the basis of marketings during a representative period or current supplies available for marketing.

(b) Producer allotments for milk would be based upon marketings during a representative period and would not place a quantitative restriction on marketings or other disposition by producers but would result in a limitation on the price received for milk marketed in excess of such allotments. Where producer allotments are proposed for an existing milk order fixing minimum prices, coordinating pricing amendments must be considered and producer disapproval of the revised order with allotment provisions would not affect the existing order. If milk quotas are established the supply-demand pricing standard of section 8c(18) would not apply but instead the parity standard now applicable to other commodities would be used, and a standard for pricing milk for fluid use is provided. Provision is made that the Secretary shall suspend milk allotment regulation if he finds that consumer interests are not being protected by reason of excessive prices being received by producers or an inadequate supply of fluid milk being available. Where national quotas are made effective for milk under other statutory authority provision is made for coordinating the penalty provisions of such national quota program with a milk marketing order.

(c) When producer allotments are in effect coordinating handler allotments are authorized.

(d) Special procedure is provided for producers seeking review of allotments which permits the use of local committees.

2. Authorizes marketing research and development programs for milk orders heretofore limited to commodities other than milk with provision that producer approval of such programs shall be separately determined and the cost thereof may be assessed against milk producers.

IV. Feed grains (title IV, subtitle A of bill).

1. Secretary would proclaim a national marketing quota for each year equal to the total requirements of corn, oats, grain sorghums, and barley (rye could be included at discretion of Secretary) for livestock feed, human food, seed, industrial uses, and exports; less estimated imports and, if CCC stocks are excessive, less such amount as the Secretary determines to be necessary. Secretary could increase quota to assure adequate carryover or to meet national emergency or increase in demand.

2. A national acreage allotment would be proclaimed equal to the number of acres which Secretary determines will, on the basis of expected yields, together with production in noncommercial area and on increased acreages resulting from the small-farm exemption, produce the national marketing quota.

3. The national acreage allotment (less small reserves to take care of "missed" farms and new farms) would be apportioned to the States, counties, and farms on the basis of the average acreage of feed grains produced during the base period as adjusted.

(a) Base period for 1963–65 crops is 1959–60; for subsequent crops, the two most recent calendar years for which statistics are available.

(b) Adjustments in farm bases authorized for abnormal conditions.

4. Farms with feed grain base (i.e., average acreage during base period) of 25 acres or less would not be subject to program unless producer elects to be subject to it. If producer does not so elect, he can plant up to his base, but he is not eligible for land-use payments or price support.

5. All producers who have a feed grain base established for their farm would be eligible to vote in referendum except a producer wtih feed grain base of 25 acres or less who does not elect to be subject to the program. Two-thirds vote required in order to have quotas.

6. Production on excess acreage of feed grains would be subject to a marketing penalty at the rate of 65 percent of the parity price per bushel.

7. Secretary may permit wheat to be planted as a substitute for feed grains and count it against the feed grain allotment.

8. Producers would be required to devote to conservation uses an acreage equal to the difference between the acreage of feed grains during the base period and the farm acreage allotment for feed grains.

(a) Acreage so diverted must be in addition to the acreage normally devoted to conserving uses, summer fallow and idle land.

(b) A penalty would apply if producer uses the diverted acreage to produce crops, unless the crop is one which is designated by the Secretary as not being in surplus supply or one which will not substantially impair the purposes of the program.

(c) The Secretary may permit the diverted acres to be grazed.

9. The Secretary would be authorized to make payments with respect to the 1963, 1964, and 1965 crops in amounts determined by the Secretary to be fair and reasonable to producers who divert acreage from feed grains.

(a) The Secretary could permit producers to divert an acreage, in addition to the acreage required to be diverted as explained in item 8, equal to 20 percent of the farm acreage allotment.

(b) Producers may, at their election, divert such acreage, in addition to the acreage diverted as explained in item 8, as will bring the total diverted acreage to 20 acres.

10. Level of price support for feed grains would be between 70 and 90 percent of parity as determined by the Secretary.

(a) If marketing quotas are in effect for feed grains, price support on feed grains would be available only to producers who stay within all acreage allotments on the farm and all acreage allotments on any other farm, and comply with the land-use requirements explained under item 8.

(b) No price support if marketing quotas are voted down by producers.

11. If marketing quotas are disapproved by producers, CCC authorized to sell up to 10 million tons of feed grains for unrestricted use at market prices.

12. Effective date of feed grain provisions: 1963 crops and thereafter.

V. Wheat (title V, subtitle B of the bill).

1. Secretary would proclaim a national marketing quota equal to total yearly requirements for wheat for human food, seed, and exports, less estimated imports, and, if CCC stocks are excessive, less such amount as the Secretary determines to be necessary. Secretary could increase quota to assure adequate carryover or to meet national emergency or increase in demand.

2. A national acreage allotment would be proclaimed equal to the number of acres which Secretary determines will, on the basis of expected yields, together with production in noncommercial area and on increased acreages resulting from the small farm exemption, produce the national marketing quota.

3. The national acreage allotment (less small reserves to take care of new farms) would be apportioned to the States and counties, on the basis of the average acreage of wheat produced during the last 5 years. The county allotment would be allocated to farms on the basis of past acreage of wheat, tillable acres, etc.

4. Farms with an average acreage of wheat during 1960 and 1961 (or other representative period) of 15 acres or less would not be subject to program unless producer elects to be subject to it. If producer does not so elect, he may plant up to such base, but he is not eligible for land-use payments or price support.

5. All producers who have a farm acreage allotment would be eligible to vote in referendum except a producer with farm base of 15 acres or less who does not elect to be subject to the program. Two-thirds vote required in order to have quotas.

6. Production on excess acreage of wheat would be subject to a marketing penalty at the rate of 65 percent of the parity price of wheat per bushel.

7. Secretary may permit feed grains to be planted as a substitute for wheat and count it against the wheat allotment.

8. Producers would be required to devote to conservation uses an acreage on the farm in proportion to the amount by which the national acreage allotment is reduced below 55 million acres.

(a) Acreage so diverted must be in addition to the acreage normally devoted to conserving uses, summer fallow, and idle land.

(b) A penalty would apply if producer uses the diverted acreage to produce crops, unless the crop is one which is designated by the Secretary as not being in surplus supply or one which will not substantially impair the purposes of the program.

9. The Secretary would be authorized to make payments with respect to the 1963, 1964, and 1965 crops in amounts determined by the Secretary to be fair and reasonable to producers who divert acreage from wheat.

(a) The Secretary could permit producers to divert an acreage, in addition to the acreage required to be diverted as explained in item 8, equal to 20 percent of the farm acreage allotment.

(b) Producers may, at their election, divert such acreage, in addition to the acreage diverted as explained in item 8, as will bring the total diverted acreage to 15 acres.

(c) The Secretary may permit the diverted acres to be grazed.

10. Each farm would receive a wheat marketing allocation, on which marketing cer-

tificates would be issued, equal to the number of bushels obtained by multiplying the estimated production on the allotted acres by the percentage estimated by the Secretary to be the percentage of the wheat crop which will be used during the marketing year for (i) human food in the United States less a portion of the number of bushels reserved for reducing CCC stocks and (ii) that portion of the exports on which the Secretary determines that certificates will be issued.

(a) The marketing certificates would have a value per bushel equal to the difference between the price support on noncertificate wheat and the price support on certificate wheat. Export certificates could have a different value from that of domestic certificates.

(b) Marketing certificates acquired from the producer must be accompanied by an equivalent amount of wheat. Marketing certificates would be required to cover (i) wheat products marketed for human consumption in the United States, and (ii) wheat and wheat products exported.

(c) CCC would be authorized to buy and sell marketing certificates. CCC would be authorized to establish discounts and premiums not exceeding 5 percent of the face value of the certificate in order to encourage the purchase and sale of such certificates through commercial channels.

(d) The Secretary would establish conversion factors to determine the amount of wheat contained in any food product.

(e) Penalties are provided for failure to acquire certificates, and other violations.

11. Level of price support for wheat accompanied by domestic certificates would be between 75 and 90 percent of parity as determined by the Secretary; level of price support for wheat accompanied by export certificates would be not more than 90 percent of parity as determined by the Secretary; and level of price support for noncertificate wheat would be at such level as the Secretary determines appropriate taking into consideration competitive world prices of wheat, the level at which price support is made available for feed grains, and the feeding value of wheat in relation to feed grains.

(a) If marketing quotas are in effect for wheat, price support on wheat would be available only to producers who stay within all acreage allotments on the farm and all acreage allotments on any other farm, and comply with the land-use requirements explained under item 8. If excess wheat is stored, producer may receive price support on wheat produced within allotment.

(b) No price support if marketing quotas are voted down by producers.

12. If marketing quotas are disapproved by producers, CCC authorized to sell up to 200 million bushels of wheat for unrestricted use at market prices.

13. Effective date of wheat provisions: 1963 crops and thereafter.

VI. Dairy (title IV, subtitle C of bill).

1. Removes present requirement that butterfat and its products be supported at a separate level and provides that milk be supported through loans on or purchases of milk and the products thereof.

2. Establishes new criteria for price support and limits the support level to that which the Secretary determines will not result in acquisition of stocks (i) in excess of those which can be utilized in the national interest, including school lunch, domestic levels and foreign assistance, or (ii) having a total acquisition cost in excess of $300 million if marketing allotments are not in effect, or in excess of $300 million plus an amount equal to the surplus marketing fees collected if marketing allotments are in effect.

3. Authorizes the establishment of producer marketing allotments and a referendum thereon if the Secretary determines that the desired level of support cannot be achieved without marketing allotments. Authorizes the Secretary to review his determination of the national marketing allotment and to (1) increase such allotment if there has been substantial increase in factors upon which it was based and (2) subject to producer referendum, to reduce such allotment if there has been a substantial reduction in any of such factors. If more than one-third of producers vote down the allotment in any such referendum, price support will be at level determined to be in effect without marketing allotments.

4. Provides for:

(a) Each producer to have a marketing base equal to his sales during 1961 or such other 12-month period as the Secretary deems more representative.

(b) Allocation of this marketing base among quarterly or other marketing periods of the marketing year, to match his pattern of marketing in 1961, adjusted so as to permit him to carry out his herd management plan.

(c) Adjustments of the marketing base for abnormal conditions, deficient production areas, and other factors.

(d) Transfer of marketing bases.

(e) Authorize Secretary to use funds available for price support of dairy products to purchase and cancel marketing bases voluntarily offered for sale by producers.

5. Authorizes producer marketing allotments. A national marketing allotment is to be established by the Secretary equal to the quantity of milk needed to meet domestic commercial and welfare needs, and export requirements, including foreign assistance. A producer's marketing allotment is that percentage as the national marketing allotment for milk during the marketing period is of the aggregate of all producers' marketing bases for such period. The Secretary may establish minimum allotments if such action would not impair effective operatiton of programs.

6. Provides for:

(a) A surplus marketing fee on all milk marketed in excess of allotments.

(b) Such fee to be in that amount, not more than $2.75, as the Secretary determines necessary to yield a fund sufficient to cover any acquisition costs in excess of the smaller of (i) $300 million or (ii) the acquisition cost of those quantities of dairy products which can be utilized in the national interest, including school lunch, domestic welfare and foreign assistance.

(c) Refunds of any overpayment by the producer of his surplus marketing fee.

7. Establishes a Dairy Stabilization Advisory Committee of 21 members, 15 producer-members to be elected from 15 dairy districts and 4 industry members to be appointed by the Secretary from processors, marketers, cooperatives, dairy associations, and farm organizations, and 1 member appointed by the Secretary to represent consumer interests, and 1 from the Department of Agriculture.

8. Provides that the level of support for the 1962 marketing year in effect when this act becomes effective shall not be changed until producers have voted in a referendum on marketing allotments.

VII. General (title V of the bill).

1. Amends the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 as follows:

(a) Adds long-term and short-term loans to individual farmers for recreational uses of land.

(b) Adds to section 306 of the act loans and planning authority to associations and public bodies, for development and improvement of sewers, primarily serving rural residents, and for changes in land use for conservation measures, including recreational facilities.

(c) Increases amount of insurance fund available under section 309(f)(1) of the act for making loans to be sold and insured from $10 million made and undisposed of at any one time to $25 million.

2. Amends section 3 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, to establish a single fund account to be used for all REA loans. This account would include all appropriations and funds borrowed from the Treasury under authorization contained herein, as well as all funds to be collected under outstanding loans. There would also be transferred to the account all notes, mortgages, and other obligations of electrification and telephone borrowers. The amended section would continue the authorization for appropriations and also for the Administrator to borrow funds from the Secretary of the Treasury. The amounts to be loaned in any one fiscal year would continue to be subject to annual provision therefor by the Congress in appropriation acts. The funds in the account will also be available for the payment of principal and interest to the Treasury.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I am again troubled with my throat. I shall not be able to talk too long. I have just returned from the hospital for a little checkup. I still have the "dog tag" on me. I did not observe it until just now. Such a tag is attached to one when he goes to the hospital. I went there for a checkup; fortunately I think everything is all right.

The objectives of the new program, as indicated by the President and enunciated by the provisions of this bill, are first, to make maximum use of our productive abundance; second, to seek a balance between production and requirements that will avoid the waste of private effort and public resources; third, to provide for conservation of our land and water resources; and fourth, to initiate and expand programs for the development of human resources and renewal of rural communities.

Mr. President, as I understand the bill, this is not an attempt by the Government to regiment farmers, to stifle initiative, or to impose programs upon agriculture.

I say that, Mr. President, because as I envision the new commodity programs, they seek to impose the same rules and regulations as those now applied to cotton, rice, and tobacco. It is true that it means a curtailment of acres and acreage allotments, but this program cannot become effective unless and until two-thirds of those who grow these commodities vote that they desire to have the program applied.

As the President has said:

> This is a program for maximum freedom and flexibility in the operation of individual farm enterprises. Improvements in farming efficiency as well as shifts among enterprises must not only be allowed—they must be encouraged. They are in the long-run national interest; they are consistent with this program's overall objectives.
>
> The new commodity programs recommended could become effective only after they are approved democratically by a two-thirds majority in a producer referendum. Producers of cotton, tobacco, rice, peanuts, and wheat have long followed this procedure of choosing jointly to exert a measure of control over the production and marketing of their crops, just as industry groups exercise control over the product of their labor and investment. This democratic procedure can be extended to other farm commodities.

I express the hope, Mr. President, that those who will be called upon to testify or who offer to testify will not merely assume a negative attitude, as has been the case in the past, but that they will offer constructive testimony to the end that the purposes of the legislation will accomplish the goals outlined by President Kennedy.

Mr. President, I certainly hope that the farm organizations will not vie with each other as to the program we should have. I express the hope that these organizations, which are supposed to represent the farmers, will make an effort to work together, so that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry can devise a much needed bill which will cut production and lower Government costs.

This bill provides for, first, feed grain and wheat marketing quota, land diversion, and price support programs; second, a dairy allotment and price support program; third, producer allotments for milk, turkeys, and turkey hatching eggs under marketing orders; fourth, land use adjustment directed toward conservation and more economic use, including recreation and fish and wildlife protection; fifth, amendment of Public Law 480 to provide broader authority for the disposal of surplus agricultural commodities; and, sixth, miscellaneous provisions dealing with marketing research and development projects for milk, loans for recreational facilities and sewers, use of the Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund for direct loans for immediate resale, and budgetary handling of REA loan funds.

Mr. President, by merely reading a list of provisions of the bill, I can point out a few which are very controversial. As a matter of fact, last year we held hearings on some of them, and they were stricken from the bill we then considered. But there is no doubt in my mind that something must be done to prevent an accumulation of more of the commodities which we now have in such large surpluses, and which may increase in the future if Congress were not to pass a law such as the one incorporated in this measure or one which may be suggested by interested parties as the committee holds its hearings on the bill.

Title I of the bill provides for land use adjustment. Under it the present authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to administer the agricultural conservation program would be made permanent. The Secretary would be authorized, through acquisition and contract, to bring about the more economic use of land for conservation, recreation, fish, wildlife, and other purposes. The Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act would be amended—

> to authorize the Secretary to bear the cost of land for reservoirs or other areas used for public recreation, fish, or wildlife development, together with the cost of facilities needed for access to, and use of, such areas;
>
> to authorize the Secretary to advance funds for the immediate acquisition of lands needed for the work of improvement before they are devoted to other uses; and
>
> to base the local share of the project installation cost upon "national needs and assistance authorized for similar purposes under other Federal programs" instead of "direct identifiable benefits."

Mr. President, this provision simply incorporates what is now the law with respect to flood-control projects. We propose that it now be applied with respect to watershed and flood prevention projects.

Title II of the bill amends Public Law 480 to broaden the authority to dispose of surplus agricultural commodities. It would permit commodities from private stocks to be acquired and donated to foreign countries under title II of Public Law 480. Title IV of that act, which provides for the sale of surplus agricultural commodities on long-term credit in order to permit the recipient country to use its funds for current economic development, would be amended—to make market development a purpose of such sales; to authorize such sales to the private trade; to provide for reasonable, instead of approximately equal, annual payments; to permit the beginning of the repayment period to be deferred 2 years; to provide discretionary, rather than mandatory authority for permitting participation by other supplying countries; and to require use of private trade channels and special consideration for market development.

A new title V would be added to the act, to authorize grants of surplus agricultural commodities from private or Government stocks to intergovernmental organizations for use in programs of economic development, emergency assistance, and special feeding.

Title III amends the marketing order law to permit marketing orders for turkeys, turkey hatching eggs, and milk to contain provision for producer allotments.

That is a very contentious subject; and I certainly wish that those who do not favor this method would come forward with something better, if they can, because something must be done. During the present year we will purchase, under the Commodity Credit Corporation, more than $500 million worth of butter, cheese, and dried milk. This program cannot possibly continue in the direction in which it is now proceeding unless we amend the law in such a way that we can regulate the production of milk. Those farmers producing in marketing areas which do not want to be regulated do not have to be included in the program under this law.

Title III would also permit marketing orders for milk to provide for marketing research and development projects, as is now permitted for other commodities.

Title IV provides programs for feed grains, wheat, and dairy products.

Subtitle A of title IV provides for marketing quotas, land diversion, and price support for feed grains, beginning with the 1963 crop. The program would cover corn, grain sorghums, oats, barley and, at the discretion of the Secretary, rye.

A national marketing quota would be proclaimed for 1, 2, or 3 years whenever the supply is likely to be excessive. The quota would be an amount calculated to result in such reduction, if any, in Commodity Credit Corporation stocks in such year as the Secretary deemed desirable and to provide an adequate carryover. It could be increased or terminated, if necessary because of a national emergency or material increase in demand. The quota would be converted into a national acreage allotment and apportioned to States, counties, and farms on the basis of their base acreages. For the 1963 through 1965 crops, the base acreages would be the adjusted average plantings in 1959 and 1960. Thereafter, the base acreage years would be the two most recent calendar years for which quotas were in effect and for which statistics were available. Quotas and allotments would be ineffective if disapproved by more than one-third of the producers voting in a referendum.

Up to 1 percent of the national allotment could be reserved to increase county allotments on the basis of relative needs because of reclamation and other new areas coming into production. Up to 3 percent of each State allotment could be reserved for farms which, through error, failed to receive allotments, for farms receiving inadequate allotments, and for new feed grain farms.

Any farm with a feed grain base of 25 acres or less, unless it elected to be subject to its allotment or exceeded its base, would be exempt from quotas, land diversion, price support, and the quota referendum.

In order to facilitate administration, the program could be restricted to a commercial feed grain area determined by the Secretary. Producers violating their allotments would be subject to penalty at the rate of 65 percent of parity, on an amount equal to twice the normal production of their excess acreage, or, if established by the producer, an amount equal to the actual production of the excess acreage. If more than one feed grain were produced, the penalty would be computed for the feed grain which would result in the highest penalty. The Secretary could permit wheat to be planted on a farm's feed grain allotment.

Feed grain producers would be required to divert an acreage of cropland equal to the excess of the farm's feed grain base over its acreage allotment. This acreage could not be planted to any crop in surplus or which might impair the program, unless the farm abandoned feed grain production and did not participate in the payment program. Penalties for violation of this restriction would be computed on the basis of 65 percent of the parity price for the principal feed grain produced in the county, the normal yield of such feed grain, and the acreage in violation.

Payments could be made during 1963, 1964 and 1965 for such required diversion at fair and reasonable rates. In order to qualify for payment, the diverted acreage would have to be devoted to conserving uses, and the total acreage on the farm devoted to conserving uses would have to be increased by the amount of such acerage. The Secretary might permit an adidtional acreage equal to 20 percent of the farm acreage allotment to be similarly diverted and paid for. Any producer could elect to divert additional acreage to bring the total diversion to 20 acres and receive payment therefor.

The price support level for corn would be fixed at from 65 to 90 percent of parity—which, by the way, is the same as for rice and cotton—with price support for other four feed grains at reasonable levels in relation to corn. Price support and diversion payments would be available only if quotas were not disapproved, and only to producers in the commercial area who complied with diversion requirements, did not violate any acreage allotment other than wheat, and, in the case of a wheat acreage allotment violation, disposed of any wheat marketing excess in such manner as to postpone or avoid payment of penalty.

Subtitle B or the title IV provides for marketing quotas, land diversion, price support, and marketing certificates for wheat, beginning with the 1963 crop.

The wheat marketing quota and land diversion provisions of the bill are generally similar to those for feed grains. Quotas for one, two, or three years would be proclaimed when the supply was likely to be excessive, and would be calculated to reduce Commodity Credit Corporation stocks and provide an adequate carryover. The present 55 million acre minimum allotment would be repealed. A farm with a small farm base acreage of 15 acres or less, unless it elected to be subject to its allotment or exceeded its base, would be exempt from quotas, land diversion, price support, and the quota referendum. The Secretary could permit feed grains to be planted on wheat allotments.

A diversion program generally similar to that for feed grains is provided for. The required diversion would be based on the amount by which the national allotment is less than 55 million acres. Payments could be made in 1963, 1964, and 1965 for the required diversion and, if the Secretary saw fit, for diversion of an additional 20 percent of the allotment. The producers on the farm could elect to divert and receive payment for such adidtional acreage as might bring the total diversion to 15 acres.

Subtitle B also provides for a wheat marketing allocation program. Under this program producers would receive domestic marketing certificates for the amount of wheat to be used for domestic food, less not to exceed 50 percent of the reduction in Commodity Credit Corporation stocks desired to be effected by the allotment; and export marketing certificates for a sufficient portion of estimated exports to achieve the price and income objectives of the program.

Each farm's share of domestic marketing and export certificates would be based upon its acreage allotment and estimated yield and the total amount of wheat for which certificates were to be issued to producers. Processors and exporters would be required to acquire domestic and export certificates, respectively, for wheat processed or exported by them. Domestic and export certificates would have values equal to the respective amounts by which the price support levels for domestic and export certificate wheat exceed the support level for noncertificate wheat. The price support level for domestic certificate wheat would be between 75 and 90 percent of parity. The price support level for export certificate wheat would be not more than 90 percent of parity.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Would not the wheat proposal have a good many of the characteristics of the two-price wheat plan which the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] and the Senators from Oregon have been urging on the Senate for some time?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Yes. I commend the Senator very highly for the inclusion of this principle in the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. There was quite a tussle over it. It was finally included. I am very hopeful we can get a bill enacted, even though it is on a trial basis. I think something ought to be done to get rid of our surpluses without affecting the income of the farmers too greatly.

The price support level for noncertificate wheat would be determined after consideration of the world price for wheat and the support level for feed grains. Commodity Credit Corporation would be authorized to issue, buy, and sell certificates in order to facilitate operations of the program. Farms in the noncommercial area would receive marketing certificates as deemed appropriate by the Secretary. Price support and diversion payments would be limited to producers in the commercial area who complied with diversion requirements, did not violate any acreage allotment other than wheat, and in the case of a wheat acreage allotment violation disposed of any wheat marketing excess in such manner as to postpone or avoid payment of penalty. No price support would be available if quotas were disapproved by producers. Support would be available at 75 to 90 percent of parity in accordance with existing law for any crop for which quotas were not proclaimed.

Subtitle C of title IV provides for price support for milk instead of separately for milk and butterfat. The level of support could not exceed 90 percent of parity and could not be such as would result in the acquisition of quantities in excess of those utilizable in the national interest, including school lunch, domestic welfare, and foreign assistance and having a total cost in excess of $300 million, plus an amount equal to the surplus marketing fees collected under a marketing allotment program.

Subject to approval in a producer referendum, marketing allotments would be in effect whenever the price support level determined appropriate by the Secretary would result in an acquisition cost in excess of $300 million. The national allotment would be such as to make available a supply equal to domestic consumption and exports and an adequate carryover. Each producer would have a marketing base equal to his marketings during 1961 or such other 12-month period as might be deemed more representative. The marketing base would be apportioned among the marketing periods within the marketing year and the producer's allotment for each period would be a uniform percentage of his base, so that the total of all producer allotments for the year would equal the national allotment. The marketing of milk in any period in excess of the allotment would be subject to a surplus marketing fee fixed by the Secretary for the period at not more than $2.75 per hundredweight.

If marketing allotments are disapproved by producers, price support would be made available at a level which would not result in acquisition of stocks costing in excess of $300 million.

A Dairy Stabilization Advisory Committee would be established to advise the Secretary with respect to administration of the program.

Title V of the bill would—

Provide for FHA real estate and operating loans to farmowners or tenants for recreational facilities;

Provide for loans and planning assistance to associations for recreational facilities and sewers;

Increase the amount of direct real estate loans for immediate resale which can be made from the agricultural credit insurance fund from $10 million to $25 million; and.

Establish a single loan fund for REA loans to include funds appropriated, borrowed from the Treasury, or received in repayment of loans, so that appropriations would not lapse and repayments would not be covered into the Treasury. The fund could be used however only in amounts authorized in appropriation acts.

Mr. President, no one can doubt the need for corrective legislation in the case of feed grains, wheat, and dairy products. On June 30 of last year, the U.S. Government had a total of $2.7 billion invested in 1.4 billion bushels of wheat. Since only about 1.2 billion bushels are needed for both domestic and export requirements, this means that we have a surplus in excess of a full year's supply.

In the case of feed grains, the Government had $3.3 billion invested in about 2.5 billion bushels—almost a 6-month supply.

While it is anticipated that the temporary programs in effect for wheat in 1962 and for feed grains in both 1961 and 1962 will cause some reduction in these excess supplies, the fact remains that we will still have substantially more of these commodities than are needed for normal carryover. Further, if corrective legislation is not passed by this Congress, both wheat and feed grains will revert to the old programs under which there was a constant buildup in supplies.

Senators will remember that previously this body has faced up to its responsibilities, and in both 1959 and 1960 passed legislation affecting wheat which would have resulted in cutbacks in both acreage and production had this legislation become law. There is no doubt in my mind that this body will again face up to its responsibilities and pass a realistic program for wheat, as well as for feed grains, which will be fair to producers as well as to consumers and taxpayers.

Some changes also appear necessary in the dairy program. As Senators know, present laws affecting dairy products provide for price supports at from 75 to 90 percent of parity and permit unlimited production. Farmers can produce as much as they wish, whether we need it or not, and get price supports on the entire production. Over the years this has been one of the most costly of the farm programs. Total price support losses on dairy products as of June 30, 1961, were in excess of $2 billion. This does not include expenditures under the school milk program or the military milk program, which at the present time are costing about $100 million in the case of the school milk program and about $24 million in the case of the military milk program.

In the 1960-61 marketing year alone, purchases of dairy products by the Commodity Credit Corporation totaled about $265 million. The President estimates that this year's purchases will be in the vicinity of a half billion dollars.

I have in the past stated on many occasions that this Government cannot continue to acquire stocks of agricultural commodities which are unneeded and extremely costly.

The President in his message said:

> The Federal Government [cannot] be expected to undertake an indefinite program of large and unpredictable budget expenditures to acquire stocks of commodities that we do not need and cannot use. By the beginning of 1961—when the emergency legislation was introduced to reduce inventories—the Commodity Credit Corporation had over $9 billion in loans and inventories. Carrying costs exceeded $1 billion a year.

In my humble judgment, programs must be enacted which will result in getting supplies more in line with requirements and reduce the cost to the Government.

I am introducing this bill because, in my opinion, it is imperative that Congress study ways and means of correcting the ills of the present programs for these commodities. Extended hearings will have to be held in order to explore all ramifications and aspects of the proposed legislation.

While I am in agreement with the administration that corrective legislation is needed for certain crops, I do not agree completely with all of the details of the programs that are in the bill I offer for introduction. For example, it appears to me that some provisions related to dairying may well create more problems than they correct. Nor am I sure that certain of the wheat provisions will achieve the desired results. There are also certain other provisions in the bill with which I disagree. However, it is essential that the Congress begin to consider legislation in these areas for the reasons that I have stated.

I know that farmers do not want to continue programs that result in huge expenditures by the Government for stocks of commodities that we neither need nor can use. In my judgment, the American farmer of today wants from his Government only such assistance which will enable him to market his crops at fair and reasonable prices. I hope that after due consideration the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will be able to recommend to this body a program which will be realistic, as well as fair and reasonable to farmers and consumers.

I announce that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will have a meeting next Wednesday, February 7. At that meeting I shall ask the committee to begin hearings on the bill on or about February 14. I give notice now that those who expect to appear as witnesses should file their names with the committee so that a schedule may be arranged without too much delay.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes, I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Recently I have received a number of communications dealing with the soft currency or counterpart funds that we have in the Federal Government. On page 2 of the Senator's paper, at which point he discusses title II of the bill introduced, I observe that he contemplates broadening the authority set forth in Public Law 480 to dispose of surplus agricultural commodities. The Senator from Louisiana stated that title II "would permit commodities from private stocks to be acquired and donated to foreign countries under title II of Public Law 480."

Will the Senator from Louisiana explain the purpose of that provision and whether or not it would, in fact, put the Government into expanded spending to get rid of the surplus rather than reduce the spending?

Mr. ELLENDER. The particular section to which my good friend from Ohio has referred was brought to the attention of the committee last year and was deleted. It is one of the provisions that I, as chairman of the committee, do not favor.

But I wish to point out to my good friend that, under the law as it now stands, when the Government disposes of commodities under that law, they must be in surplus. Only surplus commodities may be sold or given away under the four titles of Public Law 480. Under section 32 of Public Law 320 of the 74th Congress in the past we have been able to get rid of much of the food that we are now talking about, that is, from private stocks. Private stock food does not mean any kind of food. It must be in surplus and not owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it not a fact that under Public Law 480 there are four divisions under which food may be disposed of?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. One of the important aspects of the law is that soft currency or counterpart funds may be used.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator refers to title I.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Funds from foreign countries.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The provision to which I referred in title II of the bill introduced by the Senator from Louisiana would expand operations under Public Law 480.

Mr. ELLENDER. It could, but within the present $300 million limitation. Title II provides for gifts that might be made in case of disaster, but the limitation would still remain, even though the other food to which we referred would be included in the $300 million.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the Senator from Louisiana state why that provision was deleted last year or 2 years ago? Why was it rejected?

Mr. ELLENDER. There was a great deal of opposition to the provision. As the Senator from Ohio stated, it was believed that such a provision would expand the program too much. Many countries would become dependent upon us to a greater extent than they would if we were to limit the program to wheat, corn, and other staple crops.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Then my statement is correct, that, rather than reducing the cost, title II will expand the cost. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. There is no doubt about it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have one further question to ask of the Senator. Is the Senator familiar with the accuracy of our accounts covering the soft currency or counterpart funds that we have in the various countries?

Mr. ELLENDER. To a large extent I am. I would say that as a result of my investigations last year we were able to incorporate into the present law a provision which requires us to sell at the current going rate of exchange of these countries, not at the fixed legal rate. To be specific, I had an investigation made last year by a staff member of our Committee on Appropriations with respect to sales made in Brazil. He found, for example, where, even though cruzeiros were selling at the rate of 450 to a dollar, we negotiated sales at the exchange rate of 51 cruzeiros to the dollar. That cannot happen any more under the law, as I understand it, because we clamped down on it. It is my hope that the State Department will not find a loophole through which to get around it, although a good many people who represent us in these negotiations will go a long way in order to make sales.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is the deduction accurate that the Senator has become concerned about the quantity of the counterpart funds that we have and the manner in which they are being spent?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes, indeed. Here is something else we did. Because of the huge amount that has accumulated, these counterpart funds were used by the banks in the host country without paying any interest. In many instances, these banks held millions of these local currencies, and they loaned the money out at 15 to 20 percent interest. However, Uncle Sam did not get anything for it. We have changed that situation to some extent. I am hopeful that it will work, to the end that a fair amount of these funds will be used and that we will get a fair return of interest on the money.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What is the understanding of the Senator as to the quantity of the counterpart funds we have?

Mr. ELLENDER. It depends on the countries to which the Senator is referring, because under Public Law 480 it is not very excessive, except in perhaps two or three countries. One of them is Pakistan. There may be an excess in Poland also. However, we have other counterpart funds for sales of goods made during World War II and since. I do not recall the exact amount, but I can say to the Senator that it is quite a huge sum.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is a huge sum. The thought I have is that so far as the counterpart funds are concerned we will find a similar situation to what was found in connection with the stockpiling of strategic materials. I have not been able to find out what the quantity of counterpart funds is. My belief is that we are artificially trying to find ways and means of getting rid of those funds. They are running out of our ears. We do not know what to do with them. I believe that the time is at hand when just as an investigation is to be made on the stockpiling of strategic materials, we should investigate the piling up of counterpart funds and the methods that have been used.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is being done right now. Up to the present, a member of our staff has visited 7 of the 20 countries in South and Central America. We propose to have that investigation continued. I recall that I brought this matter to the attention of the Senate 5 or 6 years ago. In Greece and in South Korea we had canceled out much of these counterpart funds because of the effect they were having on the stability of the currency of the host country in which we had the money. I do not want to have that happen again.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I understood the Senator to say that there are certain aspects of the proposed bill with which he does not agree. Why have we abandoned the program that was so vigorously fought for last year, and are now apparently substituting a new program?

Mr. ELLENDER. We are not doing that. The program we had last year expires this year, and we are merely reenacting it with a few little changes. That is what we are doing.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Did we reduce the surplus supplies by last year's bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. We did.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Was the cost greater under last year's act than it was under previous acts?

Mr. ELLENDER. We have reduced the production of corn and other feed grains by well over 250 million bushels. We do not have to pay storage on that amount. However, if we had not had that program, the chances are that in addition to what we had when we ended last year we might have had from 500 to 600 million bushels more. This year, for the first time since the program started, we have had a cutback in the number of bushels on hand.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I said, the administration's new program makes the program we had last year on corn and other feed grains more or less permanent as well as mandatory, with a few other changes included. I am sure the changes will receive opposition on the part of some farmers in the Senator's State.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes; I think they will.

Mr. ELLENDER. The changes we are making apply to milk sales as well as to corn. We say that a farmer should not expect his Government to give him price support unless he is willing to cut back his acres or his milk production. That is what the bill provides for. It is done in a democratic way. We have succeeded in doing it very well in the case of cotton and in the case of rice and in the case of peanuts and in the case of tobacco. We hope to apply the same principle to corngrowers and milk producers.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I should like to correct in a measure what the Senator from Louisiana has said. The Ohio farmer has not subscribed to the program of being put in a harness under the sop that if he will submit to the harness the Government will make a gift to him. The Ohio farmer to a substantial degree wants to be emancipated, and he will complain if there is any further attempt made to regulate him.

Mr. ELLENDER. If the Ohio farmer wishes to be emancipated—and no doubt there are others who feel the same way—all they have to do is to vote against it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. They have voted against it in a substantial degree.

Mr. ELLENDER. Then they will be emancipated, if enough of them vote against it, and they will be free to do what they want, but without price supports.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes; I understand that.

SUBSIDY FOR LEAD AND ZINC

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, in the closing days of the last session there was enacted a bill providing subsidies for the miners of lead and zinc. A similar bill was passed 2 years ago, and was opposed by me on the floor. It was also opposed by other Senators.

Two years ago the bill was vetoed. Last year the bill was signed into law. My recollection is that the bill provided payments for lead of 75 percent and for zinc of 55 percent of the difference between 14½ cents per pound and the market price whenever the latter fell below 14½ cents—current prices were 11 cents for lead, 11½ cents for zinc—the payments were limited to those producers who had not mined in any year since 1955 more than 3,000 tons, combined, of the two metals. The bill was accepted by administration officials after the 4-year limit was put on the program. A ceiling of $16.5 million in subsidy payments for the 4-year program was included in the bill.

The Government was to make up the difference between the market price and the guaranteed price set forth in the bill. The newspapers state that an investigation will be made of the strategic supplies in the possession of the Federal Government. With respect to the bill passed last year, no appropriations have been made to finance it. I have obtained information, which was in my possession both a year ago and 2 years ago, that the supply of lead and zinc in the possession of the Federal Government for its strategic stockpile are in such a quantity that the Government does not know what to do about them. The Government does not know how to get rid of these metals. Still, Congress passed a law a year ago to subsidize the mining of lead and zinc in the United States.

My deep belief is that no appropriations should be made to implement the bill which was passed last year. That bill is in complete conflict with the pronouncement made by the President of the United States the day before yesterday, concerning the need for reducing our strategic supplies. It is folly to say that we have too much lead and zinc, too much tungsten, and too much magnesium, while at the same time we pass laws to subsidize the mining and producing of more of those metals.

I shall have more to say about the lead and zinc bill as the session proceeds, and especially as the investigation moves forward on the subject of strategic materials.

AID FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1241) to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities and to authorize scholarships for undergraduate study in such institutions.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I submit an amendment to S. 1241. In doing so, I wish to make a short explanation of the purpose of the amendment.

The first amendment to the Constitution of the United States prohibits Congress from giving aid to any institution for the purpose of teaching the tenets of any religion. Under the bill in its present form, loans can be made to nonprofit institutions of higher learning which are operated by churches for the purpose of constructing facilities to be used for the teaching of the tenets of the faith of those particular churches. I think this clearly violates the provisions of the first amendment.

My amendment provides that loans under the provisions of S. 1241 shall be restricted to public colleges, that is, colleges supervised and operated by the public. This amendment will eliminate from the debate any controversy concerning the meaning of the first amendment to the Constitution and will make it certain that in passing the bill Congress will not be violating the provisions of that amendment, which each of its Members has sworn to uphold.

Mr. President, I ask that my amendment be printed and lie on the table until it is called up. I also ask unanimous consent that the text of the amendment be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table; and without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 2, line 17, before "institutions" insert "public".

On page 3, line 7, strike out "institutions of higher education or to" and insert in lieu thereof "public institutions of higher education or to public".

On page 3, line 12, strike out "institutions of higher education or" and insert in lieu thereof "public institutions of higher education or public".

On page 12, line 15, strike out "an institution" and insert in lieu thereof "a public institution".

On page 14, line 10, before "higher education" insert "public".

On page 14, line 11, strike out "(1)".

On page 14, line 13, before "institutions" insert "public".

On page 14, line 16, beginning with ", or (2)" strike out all to the period on page 15, line 4.

On page 38, strike out lines 18 through 20 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(c) The term 'public institution of higher education' means an institution of higher education under public supervision and control, but does not include a school or institution of any agency of the United States."

Strike out the amendment to the title and insert in lieu thereof the following: "A bill to authorize assistance to public institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities, to authorize scholarships for undergraduate study in institutions of higher education, and to provide financial assistance to the States for the construction of public community colleges."

THE PUNTA DEL ESTE CONFERENCE

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, a firm and determined policy has paid us great dividends at the recent Punta del Este Conference in Uruguay. I was pleased, as I am sure all Senators were, in following the proceedings at Punta del Este, to see the firm but at all times complete reasonable stand taken by Secretary of State Dean Rusk, the chairman of the U.S. delegation.

Mr. Rusk performed an extremely valuable service for the inter-American family of nations by providing the leadership which branded Cuba as a Communist fester within the healthy body of the Western Hemisphere.

I also wish to compliment the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Relations; the distinguished senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]; Representative ARMISTEAD SELDEN, of Alabama; and Representative CHESTER E. MERROW, of New Hampshire, for the part they played in the success of the Conference.

The firm view of this delegation prevailed, and the United States, as the leader of the nations which voted to oust Red Cuba from the inter-American system, won a prestigious victory.

To me, it was gratifying that Mr. Rusk's position in dealing with Castro was the one which was finally adopted, rather than the much softer policy on Cuba so many times espoused and sometimes practiced by some others within the State Department.

There are those who criticize and have criticized the activities of the United States at Punta del Este, saying that it would have been better to have sought unanimity among the nations meeting there rather than merely to win a vote by a majority or by two-thirds. I think the very opposite is true.

By pressing through with our firm position, the United States made it plain to all the American nations that the day of easy-going treatment of Fidel Castro and his dictatorship was over. The most heartening thing of all is that 13 nations voted with us on that stand, and not a single nation voted against us, although, in fact, 6 nations abstained for reasons which they called legal or juridical, but which some felt were political.

Secretary Rusk deserves much credit for the outcome of the Punta del Este Conference. Great credit is due the congressional representatives, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], Representative ARMISTEAD SELDEN, and Representative CHESTER MERROW. They strongly supported Secretary Rusk's position and reminded him of congressional sentiment concerning the Punta del Este meeting and its relationship to the success of the entire Alliance for Progress.

I wish to make two other points: If the United States had advanced a soft-line policy at Punta del Este, so that such resolutions as we proposed would receive the unanimous support of the nations taking the soft line, we would have been embarrassed to discover that the hard-line nations would have refused to support us. Then we would have been pictured as an ineffectual, insipid leader, not certain as to where we stood on communism in the hemisphere, and unable to exercise leadership in the American family of nations. Therefore, rather than to be placed in a position in which we could conceivably have been placed, had we supported the soft-line position, I am delighted that the Secretary of State and our representatives from Congress determined that they would reflect what is, in the opinion of the majority of the American people, as well as the overwhelming opinion of the Members of Congress, a strong position with respect to dealing with Fidel Castro.

There has been some criticism of our action at Punta del Este by those who claim that while 13 nations voted with us on the resolution to oust Castro from the inter-American system, 6 nations abstained, and that those 6 nations represent two-thirds of the population of Latin America. But it should be remembered that the United States is a member of the inter-American system, and we have a population of 180 million. By simple mathematics, therefore, a sizable majority of the population of the Western Hemisphere has been alined on the side of those who have called for this strong position against Fidel Castro.

Furthermore, I feel certain that if a referendum were conducted among all the peoples of the Americas on what sort of posture the nations of the hemisphere should take in dealing with the Communist dictatorship in Cuba, we would find that a preponderant percentage of the people in Argentina, Brazil, and Chile would support a stand fully as strong as that which the United States proposed at the Conference. For example, I have read that there has been a popular resentment expressed in some of the countries whose representatives abstained from supporting the strong resolutions against Castro. We know that in Brazil today newspapers are editorializing at great length against the position taken by the government of Mr. Goulard. We know there is a great popular resentment among the people of Argentina against the position taken by Mr. Frondizi.

I believe that the Conference of Foreign Ministers at Punta del Este may mark an important turning point in our dealings with Latin America and may set the start of a firm and realistic policy by the United States in all our future relations with the peoples of that very important area of the world.

Again, I congratulate the Secretary of State and the distinguished members of congressional group who served with him upon their splendid achievement.

ANAHEIM'S EDUCATIONAL CONTRIBUTION

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, earlier this week I had occasion to speak with the president of the board of education of my hometown of Anaheim, Calif., and to learn firsthand of the contributions Anaheim is making toward the improvement of American education. In the face of keen competition, Anaheim has recognized the need to produce better citizens, better scientists, better soldiers.

To accomplish these ends and to accommodate swelling student enrollments, Anaheim has utilized a mass medium to supplement, strengthen, and enrich its basic elementary school courses. Educational television programs of up to 25 to 35 minutes a day provide instruction in a variety of subjects, under the supervision of teaching teams. Subjects covered in the program, known as the "Instructional Television Project," include social studies, science, conversational Spanish, health, music, and art. By this method, they are also able to reduce and redistribute teacher workloads, so as to allow teachers the badly needed opportunity for more careful and thorough lesson preparation.

In their experience and in the experience of other cities that have also pioneered in this field, the program has been gratifying. Anaheim's reorganization has partially solved one of the most perplexing problems facing elementary teachers—how to provide proficient and expert instruction in all subjects.

Needless to say, I am proud of the educational advances of my home city and the contribution it is making to our Nation's educational progress. Anaheim is an inspiration in the educational challenges we face.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article on this outstanding accomplishment, entitled "Thanks to Television, This Town Has No More School Problems."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THANKS TO TELEVISION, THIS TOWN HAS NO MORE SCHOOL PROBLEMS

(By Ed Kiester)

ANAHEIM, CALIF.—As one of the Nation's fastest growing communities, this Los Angeles suburb has had school problems to match. Enrollment increased 900 percent in 8 years. Qualified teachers could not be hired fast enough. Badly needed courses could not be added. The tax rate threatened to soar completely out of sight.

Then Anaheim hit upon a remarkable solution—one most schoolmen would have rejected as too costly, too controversial, or both. For $489,000, with a minimum of outside help, and without increasing the tax rate, Anaheim built its own educational TV station. Today every student in the third through sixth grades attends TV classes at least 43 minutes a day. And there have been these results:

Elementary science, enriched arithmetic, and Spanish are being taught in all schools for the first time.

Hard-pressed classroom teachers have been relieved of some lesson and planning loads.

Costs of an additional school building and of 27 hard-to-find teachers have been saved.

TV-taught students are showing faster progress than those not taught by TV.

The whole project has become a model for other fast-growing communities.

"TV has put real quality into our schools," says Robert E. Shanks, superintendent of the Anaheim City School District. "Take science, for instance. Who can find 20 elementary teachers really qualified in science these days? Our science program usually consisted of some kid bringing in his rock collection. But today we have one crackerjack science teacher. And by TV she can teach all the fourth-graders in the system."

Shanks's words are being echoed by many educators around the United States. In 8 years of development, educational TV has had vast impact on American schools—"the most important educational tool since the invention of movable type," a recent report called it.

This year a million students in a thousand schools will be getting part of their education by TV. And thousands of adults will attend the living room classes of "Sunrise Semester" and "Continental Classroom."

ON THE AIR, LITERALLY

As opposition melts, new frontiers of teaching by television are being explored. One of the most startling experiments, the Midwest project on airborne television instruction, is due for tests in February and full operation next fall.

From an airplane circling above Indiana, programs on electronic tape will be televised to schools and colleges in five States. More than 5 million students will be within range of the telecast. Engineers consider this a practical—and economical—way of televising classes.

Of all TV experiments, however, the most ambitious is in Washington County, Md., where a six-channel network has been set up as a pilot project in closed-circuit operation.

The Washington County experiment now is in its fifth year. From a central control studio in Hagerstown, classes are piped into 37 county schools with an enrollment of 16,500. Every student watches at least one program a day. Every grade level has at least one special program. The experiment has even attempted to use TV to shore up the guidance program. Educators have come to Hagerstown from all over the world to admire and observe.

Among Hagerstown's visitors in 1958 were Anaheim's Superintendent Shanks and a school board member, David Snow. Like many others, Shanks and Snow were awed, but went home shaking their heads about the cost. To duplicate the operation, they found, would cost more than $1.5 million. In the Hagerstown project studio equipment and cable had been donated and the Ford Foundation had contributed nearly $800,000. Anaheim had no such resources and could not expect such donations.

Anaheim's five-member school board, however, began looking for ways to whittle the estimate. A $250,000 appropriation for a new school office was diverted to build studios. Snow, an electronics executive, and Shanks negotiated a rockbottom price of $163,000 for studio hardware and classroom receivers. They effected similar bargains for coaxial cable.

From the Ford Foundation, the schools obtained $25,000. The Federal Government contributed $30,000 to subsidize science, math, and language courses. The remainder of the money came from the general budget. It made up less than 3 percent of the schools' annual expenditure last year.

AMATEURS IN CHARGE

CCTV is built on ingenuity, with few frills. It has no cameramen, for instance—zoom lens cameras are controlled from a booth. Of the 16-person staff, only Producer Charles Callaci and an assistant have had previous TV experience. The others are teachers, who double as cable-pullers and lighting experts.

"This is every teacher's dream," says John Shea, the fifth-grade social studies TV teacher. "I've never really had enough time for preparation in the past. This way, I can spend 6 or 8 hours getting ready for a single class. I can make exhibits and drawings that really help the children see what I'm talking about."

THREE WEEKS' WORK IN 25 MINUTES

A frequent complaint about TV is that students have no chance to question the teacher. "That's been overrated," Shea says. "A teacher worth his salt can anticipate about 90 percent of the questions the students will ask." And classroom teachers who feared TV would push them to the sidelines have found they are more active and stimulated than ever.

What Shea teaches by TV is outlined in a study guide planned by all the fifth-grade teachers. For a typical program on Hawaii recently, he worked off and on for 3 weeks.

The other teachers follow a similar procedure, producing about 5 hours of programing daily. This fall the schedule includes Spanish, social studies, science, mathematics, and music, for each grade from third through sixth.

Let's look at the typical TV day of an Anaheim student—Bob Cranston, a fifth-grader at Jefferson School. Bob's class is part of Anaheim's "redeployment project." This means that he and 74 other students spend all morning in a large "resource room" made over from the school auditorium. The class has two teachers, a clerical helper, and six TV sets.

The sets are switched on for 55 minutes—25 for science or social studies, 15 for Spanish, 15 for arithmetic. Bob's morning centers around the set. In Spanish, for instance, Classroom Teacher Robert Gasio and TV Teacher Frank Robles follow the same study guide. Before the program begins, Gasio will warm up the students with a game in Spanish. Afterward, he will help them to review what Robles has just taught.

Afternoons, Bob Cranston and other members of his group take reading, spelling, and other skill subjects in 25-pupil classes, switching places with 75 other students. Unconventional as this setup seems, it has produced results in the four schools tried.

According to Dr. Weldy Lefever, of the University of Southern California School of Education, Anaheim's TV classes are substantially superior in arithmetic, somewhat better in fifth-grade social studies, and slightly better in science than those taught by conventional methods. Only in fourth-grade social studies has TV failed to show a measurable advantage.

"We believe that television has very definitely improved the quality of education in the district," Superintendent Shanks says. "It has made possible many opportunities which otherwise could not have been provided for boys and girls who attend our schools. To a rapidly growing school district like Anaheim, TV seems to offer the best possible means of guaranteeing every child the sound education he needs today."

ANSWERS TO PARENTS' QUESTIONS ABOUT EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION

"Why bother with televised teaching? What can it do that ordinary teaching can't?"

Television can bring students educational experiences far beyond the potential of the conventional classroom. In literature, instead of reading the poems of Robert Frost, for instance, students can hear Robert Frost read them and talk about them. In social studies, students can visit many historic places that they otherwise would not be able to visit. In science, television's magnifying power gives all the students a look into the microscope. Many science demonstrations require hours of preparation to set up cumbersome equipment. With television, the experiment is set up once.

"How can I be sure my child will learn as well with television as without it?"

During 1958–59, 141 separate tests were administered by the National Program in the Use of Television in the Public Schools. These tests involved 69,197 pupils. In 97 cases results favored those studying with television. In 40 of these 97 cases, the difference was statistically significant.

"Don't students tend to sit back and look for entertainment in the televised course?"

On the contrary, students are learning early the art of taking notes and the ability to concentrate. Many have been stimulated to make greater use of the school library than students in conventional classes. And most TV lessons are designed to make students respond. For example, the teacher says, "And when you connect line A with line B, you know what we've formed, don't you?" It's common for the class to answer.

"Don't children suffer from not being able to ask questions?"

TV teachers are able to anticipate many student questions. Moreover, many students like the idea of having the teacher present the lesson without interruptions. Finally, classroom teachers have learned to handle questions in the followup part of the lessons.

"Isn't TV bad for the children's eyes?"

The maximum amount of daily instruction on television is 1½ hours—far less than the average child sees outside of school.

"Isn't TV forcing teachers out of work?"

The U.S. Office of Education estimates that schools are short more than 100,000 qualified teachers. Besides, television doesn't replace teachers, it temporarily redeploys them; that is, some teach in the studio and some specialize in the classroom followup. Almost all those teaching in the studio for a year or find it necessary to get back before the class for a year.

"Isn't there a discipline problem when students are told to watch the set with no supervision?"

The usual procedure in the national program was for two or three normal-sized classes to watch the televised lesson with one or two supervisors. A few honor classes have no supervision. Only in unforeseen circumstances does an average class view the televised lesson without a teacher in the classroom.

"My daughter is especially gifted. How can TV reach both her and the standard student?"

The reactions of gifted children to TV varied. Some were bored. Others said they found the TV teacher superior to their classroom teacher. But three things should be remembered: (1) With TV, the classroom teacher has more time to devote to individual students and is better able to devise a program for each gifted student; (2) the idea of TV is to make the best teacher available to present the best lesson. The superior student probably sees a lesson better than the one offered by his classroom teacher; (3) it's not unusual in conventional teaching for a class to fall behind while the teacher repeats for slower students.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PELL in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AID FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1241) to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities and to authorize scholarships for undergraduate study in such institutions.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before I enter upon my major presentation in regard to the higher education bill, I wish to pay to the chairman of the committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the highest of compliments for his unfailing courtesy and for the fullness of the cooperation he has always extended to me and to the other members of my subcommittee in connection with this bill.

Mr. President, having served for many years in this body with the Senator from Alabama, I wish to say that I know of no Member of the Senate who is deserving of more expressions of appreciation for his leadership in the field of education legislation and in the field of health legislation than is the Senator from Alabama. I repeat that no Member of the Senate has done a better job, over the years, in the field of education legislation and in the field of health legislation than has the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. I particularly wish the RECORD to show that as chairman of the subcommittee, I have special appreciation of the cooperation Senator HILL has always extended to me in connection with this bill. It has not been easy to take through the hearings, through the subcommittee, and through the full committee a bill such as this one, with its many ramifications and controversial sections; and in the absence of the cooperation we have received from the Senator from Alabama, this subject matter would not today be under debate on the floor of the Senate. All who serve on the committee are deeply indebted to Senator HILL.

Mr. President, I also wish to thank with deep appreciation the members of the subcommittee who worked as a team in bring this measure to the floor of the Senate. The members of the subcommittee are the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from New Jersey, [Mr. CASE], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER].

Mr. President, public thanks also are due the majority leader, the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], who graciously accommodated the committee in connection with scheduling this debate. To his assistance in large measure and to that rendered by the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] must go the credit in large part for the legislation which I am sure will be enacted following the debate we begin this afternoon.

Mr. President, I have been asked about the procedure for the remainder of today. I wish to state that it is my plan to make my speech in explanation and in support of the bill, and then to obtain, if I can, adoption of the committee amendments and the technical amendments, but without prejudicing the right of any Senator subsequently to submit amendments dealing with the same subject matters. I propose then to close the presentation for today, unless other Senators wish to make speeches today on the bill; and on Monday to begin the voting on other amendments to the bill.

I have discussed this question with the leadership of the Senate. It seems to be the most desirable procedure, because a number of our colleagues are necessarily absent today and are anxious to participate in the debate and to be present Monday when the voting starts.

Mr. President, I submit several technical amendments to S. 1241, and I ask unanimous consent that these amendments and the committee amendments be considered en bloc and that the bill as thus amended be considered as original text for the purpose of amendment.

I send the technical amendments to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, the committee amendments and technical amendments are agreed to en bloc.

The committee amendments and technical amendments agreed to en bloc are, as follows:

On page 2, line 18, after the word "facilities", to strike out "and"; in line 21, after the word "college", to insert "and through assistance to the States in constructing public community college facilities in such locations as will make such facilities accessible to the homes of as many individuals as may be possible"; on page 3, line 5, after the word "after", to strike out "in this title"; on page 4, line 5, after the word "be", to strike out "more" and insert "less", in the same line, after the world "than", to strike out "the higher of (1) 2¾ per centum per annum, or (2)"; on page 5, line 5, after the word "be", to strike out "not more than the higher of (1) 2½ per centum per annum, or (2)" and insert "equal to"; on page 6, after line 5, to strike out:

"LABOR STANDARDS

"Sec. 104. (a) The Commissioner shall not approve any application for a loan under this title except upon adequate assurance that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors in the performance of work on construction assisted by such loan will be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a—276a-5), and will receive compensation at a rate not less than one and one-half times the basic rate of pay for all hours worked in any workweek in excess of eight hours in any workday or forty hours in the workweek, as the case may be; but the Commissioner may waive the application of this subsection in cases or classes of cases where laborers or mechanics, not otherwise employed at any time in the construction of the project, voluntarily donate their services for the purpose of lowering the costs of construction and the Commissioner determines that any amounts saved thereby are fully credited to the educational institution undertaking the construction.

"(b) The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to the labor standards specified in subsection (a) of this section, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 46 Stat. 1267), and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c)."

On page 7, after line 9, to strike out:

"Sec. 105. (a) In the performance of, and with respect to, the functions, powers, and duties vested in him by this title the Commissioner, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, shall—

"(1) prepare annually and submit a budget program as provided for wholly owned Government corporations by the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended; and

"(2) maintain an integral set of accounts which shall be audited annually by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial transactions as provided by the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, and no other audit shall be required: *Provided*, That such financial transactions of the Commissioner as the making of loans and vouchers approved by the Commissioner in connection with such financial transactions shall be final and conclusive upon all officers of the Government."

On page 8, after line 4, to insert:

"Sec. 104. (a) Such financial transactions of the Commissioner as the making of loans and vouchers approved by the Commissioner in connection with such financial transactions, except with respect to administrative expenses, shall be final and conclusive on all officers of the Government."

On page 9, line 7, after the word "section", to strike out "107" and insert "402"; on page 11, after line 5, to strike out:

"(6) obtain insurance against loss in connection with property and other assets held;"

In line 8, to change the "(7)" to "(6)"; in line 14, to change the "(8)" to "(7)"; after line 17, to insert:

"RECORDS AND AUDITS

"Sec. 105. (a) Each recipient of a loan under this title shall keep such records as the Commissioner shall prescribe, including records which fully disclose the amount and disposition by such recipient of the proceeds of such loan, the total cost of the project or undertaking in connection with which such loan is made and the amount of that portion of the cost supplied by other sources, and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit.

"(b) The Commissioner and the Comptroller General of the United States or any of their duly authorized representatives shall have access for the purpose of audit and examination, to any books, documents, papers, and records of the recipients that are pertinent to loans received under this title."

On page 15, after line 4, to strike out:

"(e) The term 'institution of higher education' means a public or other nonprofit educational institution in any State which

"(1) admits as regular students only individuals having a certificate of graduation from a secondary school, or the recognized equivalent of such a certificate;

"(2) is legally authorized within such State to provide a program of education beyond secondary education;

"(3) provides an educational program for which it awards a bachelor's degree, or provides not less than a 2-year program which is acceptable for full credit toward such a degree; and

"(4) is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association listed by the Commissioner pursuant to this paragraph or, if not so accredited, is an institution whose credits are accepted, on transfer, by not less than three institutions which are so accredited, for credit on the same basis as if transferred from an institution so accredited. For purposes of this paragraph the Commissioner shall publish a list of nationally recognized accrediting agencies or associations which he determines to be reliable authority as to the quality of education or training offered.

"(f) The term 'nonprofit educational institution' means an educational institution owned and operated by one or more corporations or associations no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

"(g) The term 'public educational institution' does not include a school or institution of any agency of the United States.

"(h) The term 'State' includes, in addition to the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virign Islands, and Guam.

"Sec. 107. (a) The Commissioner of Education may delegate any of his functions under this title, except the making of regulations, to any officer or employee of the Office of Education.

"(b) In administering the provisions of this title, for which he is responsible, the Commissioner is authorized to utilize the services and facilities of any agency of the Federal Government and of any other public or other nonprofit agency or institution in accordance with appropriate agreements, and to pay for such services either in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be agreed upon.

"(c) The Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, may appoint one or more advisory committees to advise and consult with the Commissioner with respect to the administration of any of his functions under this title. Members of any such committee, while attending conferences or meetings of the committee, shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, but not to exceed $50 per diem; and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 73b 2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently. The provisions of section 1003 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 shall apply to members of such committees.

"Sec. 108. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed as authorizing a department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over, or impose any requirements or condition with respect to, the personnel, curriculum, methods of instruction, or administration of any educational institution.

"Sec. 109. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized, subject to the procedures prescribed by section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949 (5 U.S.C. 1105) to place a total of 10 positions in the Office of Education in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule in addition to positions placed in or authorized for such grades in such Office prior to the enactment of this act. Such positions shall be in addition to the number of positions authorized to be placed in such grades by subsection (b) of such section 505.

"SHORT TITLE

"Sec. 110. This title may be cited as the 'Academic Facilities Act of 1961'."

On page 13, after line 15, to strike out:

"AMENDMENTS TO TITLE II OF NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT

"Sec. 201. Title II of the National Defense Education Act is hereby amended by changing the heading of such title to read 'Title II—Financial Assistance to Students in Institutions of Higher Education', by inserting immediately below such heading the words 'Part A—Student Loans', by changing the words 'this title' wherever they appear in such title to read 'this part', and by adding immediately after section 209 the following new part:

" 'PART B—UNDERGRADUATE SCHOLARSHIPS' "

On page 19, at the beginning of line 4, to strike out the quotation mark; at the beginning of line 5, to strike out the quotation mark, in the same line, to change the section number from "221" to "201"; in line 11, after the word "this", to strike out "part" and insert "title"; in line 18, after the word "this", to strike out "part" and insert "title"; in line 21, after the word "this", to strike out "part" and insert "title"; at the beginning of line 23, to strike out the quotation mark; at the beginning of line 24, to strike out the quotation mark, in the same line to change the section number from "'222" to "202"; in line 25, after the word "this", to strike out "part" and insert "title"; on page 20, line 2, after the word "section", to strike out "226" and insert "206"; in line 12, after the word "this", to strike out "part" and insert "title"; at the beginning of line 14, to strike out the quotation mark; in line 18, after the word "this", to strike out "part" and insert "title"; at the beginning of line 21, to strike out the quotation mark; at the beginning of line 22, to strike out the quotation mark, in the same line, to change the section number from "223" to "203"; in line 23, after the word "this", to strike out "part" and insert "title"; on page 21, line 2, after the word "this", to strike out "part" and insert "title"; in line 3, after the word "this", to strike out "part" and insert "title"; at the beginning of line 18, to strike out the quotation mark; at the beginning of line 19, to strike out the quotation mark, in the same line, to change the section number from "224" to "204"; in line 20, after the word "this", to strike out "part" and insert "title"; on page 22, at the beginning of line 5, to strike out the quotation mark; in line 8, after the word "section", to strike out "226" and insert "206"; in line 9, after the word "section", to strike out "225" and insert "205"; at the beginning of line 14, to strike out the quotation mark; at the beginning of line 25, to strike out the quotation mark; on page 23, at the beginning of line 3, to strike out the quotation mark; at the beginning of line 15, to strike out the quotation mark; at the beginning of line 16, to strike out the quotation mark, in the same line, to change the section number from "225" to "205"; in line 17, after the word "section", to strike out "221" and insert "201"; in line 20, after the word "Guam", to strike out "and", in the same line, after the word "Islands", to insert "and American Samoa"; on page 24, at the beginning of line 9, to strike out the quotation mark; in line 10, after the word "section", to strike out "221" and insert "201"; at the beginning of line 14, to strike out the quotation mark; at the beginning of line 15, to strike out the quotation mark, in the same line, to change the section number from "226" to "206"; in line 16, after the word "this", to strike out "part" and insert "title"; in line 22, after the word "this", to strike out "part" and insert "title"; on page 25, at the beginning of line 1, to strike out the quotation mark; at the beginning of line 3, to strike out the quotation mark; at the beginning of line 10, to strike out the quotation mark; in line 11, after the word "this", to strike out "part" and insert "title"; at the beginning of line 24, to strike out the quotation mark; on page 26, at the beginning of line 3, to strike out the quotation mark; at the beginning of line 7, to strike out the quotation mark; at the beginning of line 9, to strike out the quotation mark; at the beginning of line 11, to strike out the quotation mark; at the beginning of line 17, to strike out the quotation mark; in line 20, after the word "this", to strike out "part" and insert "title"; at the beginning of line 21, to strike out the quotation mark; in line 24, after the word "this", to strike out "part" and insert "title"; after line 24, to insert:

"(b) The Commissioner shall not finally disapprove any State plan submitted under this title, or any modification thereof, without first affording the State commission submitting the plan reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing."

On page 27, at the beginning of line 4, to strike out "(b)" and insert "(c)"; at the beginning of line 8, to strike out the quotation mark; at the beginning of line 11, to strike out the quotation mark; at the beginning of line 17, to strike out the quotation mark; in line 22, after the word "this", to strike out "part" and insert "title"; on page 28, at the beginning of line 1, to strike out the quotation mark; at the beginning of line 2, to strike out the quotation mark, in the same line, to change the section number from "227" to "207"; in line 3, after the word "this", to strike out "part" and insert "title"; at the beginning of line 5, to strike out the quotation mark; at the beginning of line 6, to strike out the quotation mark, in the same line, to change the section number from "228" to "208"; in line 10, after the word "this", to strike out "part" and insert "title"; after line 17, to strike out:

"PAYMENTS

"Sec. 229. The Commissioner may arrange for the payment of the amounts due recipients of scholarships, institutions, and State commissions under this part in accordance with section 1006."

At the top of page 29, to insert a new title, as follows:

"TITLE III—PUBLIC COMMUNITY COLLEGE ASSISTANCE

"Authorization of funds

"Sec. 301. For the purpose of this title there is authorized to be appropriated $50,000,000 for each of the five successive fiscal years beginning with the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1961.

"Allotments to States and Federal share

"Sec. 302. (a) The sums appropriated pursuant to section 301 shall be allotted among the States on the basis of the income per person and the number of high school graduates of the respective States. Such allotments shall be made as follows: The Commissioner shall allot to each State for each fiscal year an amount which bears the same ratio to the sums appropriated pursuant to section 301 for such year as the product of—

"(A) the number of high school graduates of the State, and

"(B) the State's allotment ratio (as determined under subsection (c))

bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States.

"(b) The allotment to any State under this section for any fiscal year shall be available until the end of the succeeding fiscal year for payment to it of the amounts certified, not later than the end of the fiscal year for which the allotment was made, by the State agency as the Federal share of the cost of the junior college facilities constructed by it under the State plan approved pursuant to section 304.

"(c) For purposes of this title—

"(1) The 'allotment ratio' for any State shall be 1.00 less the product of (A) .50 and (B) the quotient obtained by dividing the income per person for the State by the income per person for all the States (not including Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and Guam), except that (i) the allotment ratio shall in no case be less than .25 or more than .75, and (ii) the allotment ratio for Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and Guam shall be .75; and

"(2) The allotment ratios shall be promulgated by the Commissioner as soon as possible after enactment of this Act on the basis of the average of the incomes per person of the States and of all the States for the three most recent consecutive calendar years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce.

"Matching requirement

"Sec. 303. Payment of the full Federal allotment to a State shall be contingent upon the matching of Federal funds by State funds, as follows: Each State shall add to the Federal allotment an amount equal to the product of (1) the number of high school graduates in the State and (2) the difference between the national base and the Federal allotment to the State per high school graduate of the State: *Provided*, That in no case shall the State matching payment be more than twice the Federal allotment. To the extent that a State's matching payment falls short of the matching requirement, its Federal allotment shall be proportionately reduced.

"State plans

"Sec. 304. (a) Any State desiring to accept the benefits of this title shall submit a State plan for carrying out the purpose of this title. The Commissioner shall approve any such plan which—

"(1) designates the State agency responsible for administering the plan throughout the State;

"(2) contains satisfactory evidence that such State agency will have authority to carry out such plan in conformity with this title;

"(3) provides fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement and accounting for Federal funds under this title and to assure proper application of non-Federal funds used in connection therewith;

"(4) provides for the establishment of standards, in accordance with the purpose of this title, for locating, planning, and constructing public community college facilities;

"(5) provides for affording to every applicant, whose application for funds for a construction project under the State plan is denied, an opportunity for a hearing before the State agency; and

"(6) provides that the State agency will make such reports to the Commissioner, in such form and containing such information, as are reasonably necessary to enable the Commissioner to carry out the provisions of this title.

"(b) The Commissioner shall not finally disapprove any State plan submitted under this title, or any modification thereof, without first affording the State agency submitting the plan reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

"(c) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency, finds that—

"(1) the State plan submitted by such agency and approved under this section has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of subsection (a); or

"(2) in the administration of such plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision;

the Commissioner shall withhold further payments under section 305 to the State or withhold further payments for any project designated by the Commissioner as being directly affected by such failure, as the Commissioner may determine to be appropriate under the circumstances, until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure to comply, or if compliance is impossible, until the State repays or arranges for the repayment of Federal moneys which have been diverted or improperly expended; except that the foregoing provisions of this subsection shall not apply to payment of any amount already reserved under section 305(a) with respect to any public community college facilities project not directly affected by such failure. After notice as provided in this subsection to any State, the Commissioner may suspend the making of further reservations of funds under section 305(a) for projects in such State pending the making of the findings under this subsection.

"Payments to States

"Sec. 305. (a) Upon a certification by a State agency—

"(1) listing a public community college facilities project (or projects) approved by it during a fiscal year under a State plan approved under section 304; and

"(2) setting forth the estimated cost of each such project, the amount of the Federal share of such cost, and such further description of such project as may be required by the Commissioner in order to carry out the provisions of this title,

the Commissioner shall reserve an amount equal to such Federal share of such cost out of the State's allotment for such fiscal year. Payment of such amount shall be made by the Commissioner to the State, upon request of the State agency, through the disbursing facilities of the Department of the Treasury and prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, at such time or times and in such installments (in advance of the incurring of cost or otherwise) as the Commissioner may determine. Such payments shall be used exclusively to meet the cost of construction of the project (or projects) for which such amount has been reserved. The Commissioner shall change any amount so reserved upon request of the State agency and receipt of an amended certification from such agency, but only to the extent such change is not inconsistent with the other provisions of this title.

"(b) If any project with respect to which payments have been made under this section is terminated or abandoned or not completed within such reasonable period as may be determined in accordance with the regulations of the Commissioner, the States which certified such project shall be liable to repay to the United States, for deposit in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts, the amount of such payments or such lesser amounts as the Commissioner deems reasonable under the circumstances.

"Definitions

"Sec. 306. As used in this title—

"(1) The term 'public community college' means an educational institution under public supervision and control and limited to first and second year college grade courses.

"(2) The terms 'construct', 'constructing', and 'construction' include the preparation of drawings and specifications for public community college facilities, erecting, building, acquiring, and expanding public community college facilities, and the inspection and supervision of the construction of such facilities.

"(3) The term 'public community college facilities' means classrooms and related facilities, initial equipment, machinery, utilities, and land (including interests in land and land improvements) necessary or appropriate for the purposes of a public community college, but shall not include athletic stadiums or structures or facilities intended primarily for the purpose of athletic exhibitions, contests, or games or other events for which admission is to be charged to the general public.

"(4) The term 'high school graduate' means a person who has received formal recognition (by diploma, certificate, or similar means) from an approved school for successful completion of four years of education beyond the first eight years of schoolwork, or for demonstration of equivalent achievement. For the purposes of this title, the number of high school graduates shall be limited to the number who graduated in the most recent school year for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The interpretation of the definition of 'high school graduate' shall fall within the authority of the Commissioner of Education.

"(5) The term 'national base' means with respect to any fiscal year, an amount equal to three times the quotient of (A) the amount appropriated for such year under the authorization in section 301, divided by (B) the number of high school graduates.

"(6) The term 'State agency' means the agency designated by a State in its State plan in accordance with section 304(1)."

And on page 37, after line 5, to insert a new title, as follows:

"TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

"Definitions

"Sec. 401. As used in this Act—

"(a) The term 'institution of higher education' means an educational institution in any State which—

"(1) admits as regular students only individuals having a certificate of graduation from a high school, or the recognized equivalent of such a certificate;

"(2) is legally authorized within such State to provide a program of education beyond high school;

"(3) provides an educational program for which it awards a bachelor's degree, or provides not less than a two-year program which is acceptable for full credit toward such a degree;

"(4) is a public or other nonprofit institution; and

"(5) is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association listed by the Commissioner pursuant to this paragraph or, if not so accredited, is an institution whose credits are accepted, on transfer, by not less than three institutions which are so accredited, for credit on the same basis as if transferred from an institution so accredited. For the purposes of title II, such term includes any private business school or technical institution which meets the provisions of clauses (1), (2), (3), (4), and (5). For the purposes of this paragraph the Commissioner shall publish a list of nationally recognized accrediting agencies or associations which he determines to be reliable authority as to the quality of education or training offered.

"(b) The term 'nonprofit educational institution' means an educational institution owned and operated by one or more corporations or associations no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

"(c) The term 'public educational institution' does not include a school or institution of any agency of the United States.

"(d) The term 'State' includes, in addition to the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.

"Federal administration

"Sec. 402. (a) The Commissioner may delegate any of his functions under this Act, except the making of regulations, to any officer or employee of the Office of Education.

"(b) In administering the provisions of this Act for which he is responsible, the Commissioner is authorized to utilize the services and facilities of any agency of the Federal Government and of any other public or nonprofit agency or institution in accordance with appropriate agreements, and to pay for such services either in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be agreed upon.

"(c) The Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, may appoint one or more advisory committees to advise and consult with the Commissioner with respect to the administration of any of his functions under this Act. Members of any such committee, while attending conferences or meetings of the committee, shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, but not to exceed $50 per diem, and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently. The provisions of section 1003 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 shall apply to members of such committees.

"Judicial review

"Sec. 403. (a) If any State is dissatisfied with the Commissioner's final action with respect to the approval of its State plan submitted under title II or III or with his final action under section 206(c) or 304(c), such State may appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such State is located. The summons and notice of appeal may be served at any place in the United States. The Commissioner shall forthwith certify and file in the court the transcript of the proceedings and the record on which he based his action.

"(b) The findings of fact by the Commissioner, unless substantially contrary to the weight of the evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall certify to the court the transcript and record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive unless substantially contrary to the weight of the evidence.

"(c) The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in title 28, United States Code, section 1254.

"Labor standards

"Sec. 404. (a) The Commissioner shall not approve any application for a loan under title I or reserve any amount for a grant under title III except upon adequate assurance that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors in the performance of work on construction assisted by such loan or grant will be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a—276a–5), and will receive compensation at a rate not less than one and one-half times the basic rate of pay for all hours worked in any workweek in excess of eight hours in any workday or forty hours in the workweek, as the case may be.

"(b) The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to the labor standards specified in subsection (a) of this section, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 64 Stat. 1267), and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c).

"(c) The Commissioner may waive the application of subsection (a) in cases or classes of cases where laborers or mechanics, not otherwise employed at any time in the construction assisted by such loan, voluntarily donate their services for the purpose of lowering the cost of construction.

"Method of payment

"Sec. 405. Payments under this Act to any individual or to any State or Federal agency, institution of higher education, or any other organization, pursuant to a grant or loan, or pursuant to a scholarship, may be made in installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement, and with respect to grants or loans with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments.

"Administrative appropriations authorized

"'Sec. 406. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for each fiscal year thereafter, such sums as may be necessary for the cost of administering the provisions of this Act.

"Federal control not authorized

"Sec. 407. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed as authorizing a department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over, or impose any requirements or condition with respect to, the personnel, curriculum, methods of instruction, or administration of any educational institution."

TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS

On page 4, line 12, strike out "1961" and insert in lieu thereof "1962".

On page 4, line 19, strike out "1962" and insert in lieu thereof "1963".

On page 4, line 23, strike out "1962 to 1965" and insert in lieu thereof "1963 to 1966".

On page 19, line 6, strike out "1962" and insert in lieu thereof "1963".

On page 19, line 7, strike out "1963" and insert in lieu thereof "1964".

On page 19, line 9, strike out "1964" and insert in lieu thereof "1965".

On page 19, line 15, strike out "1963" and insert in lieu thereof "1964".

On page 28, line 16, strike out "1963" and insert in lieu thereof "1964".

On page 29, line 7, strike out "1961" and insert in lieu thereof "1962".

On page 30, line 6, strike out "the junior college facilities constructed by it" and insert in lieu thereof "constructing public community college facilities".

On page 30, line 20, after "Act" insert a comma and "and annually thereafter,".

On page 31, line 4, beginning with "funds" strike out all through "allotment" in line 5 and insert in lieu thereof "or local funds, or both, as follows: Each State shall match the Federal allotment by".

On page 34, line 9, after "reserve" insert a comma and "subject to the requirements of section 303,".

On page 35, line 1, strike out "if any" and insert in lieu thereof "If any".

On page 35, line 5, strike out "States" and insert in lieu thereof "State".

On page 35, beginning with line 12, strike out all through line 15 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "The term 'public community college' means an educational institution, or branch thereof, in a State, which (1) is under public supervision and control, (2) is organized and administered principally to offer educational programs, of not more than two years' duration, beyond the high school level, (3) has as one of its major purposes the provision of a two-year program which is acceptable for full credit toward a bachelor's degree upon the student's transfer to an institution of higher education, and (4) if a branch of an institution offering four or more years of higher education, is located in a community different from that in which its parent institution is located."

On page 42, line 25, strike out "1962" and insert in lieu thereof "1963".

So as to make the bill read:

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "College Academic Facilities and Scholarship Act".

"FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

"Sec. 2. The Congress hereby finds that the security and welfare of the United States require that this and future generations of American youth be insured ample opportunity for the fullest development of their intellectual capacities, and that this opportunity will be jeopardized unless the Nation's colleges and universities are encouraged and assisted in their efforts to accommodate rapidly growing numbers of youth who aspire to a higher education, and unless steps are taken to encourage promising youth in their pursuit of this goal by holding out to them both the prospect of national recognition of their promise and the assurance that economic obstacles to self-fulfillment can be overcome. The Congress further finds and declares that these needs are so great and these steps so urgent that it is incumbent upon the Nation to take positive and immediate action to meet these needs through assistance to institutions of higher education in providing classrooms and other academic facilities, through undergraduate scholarships for young people of outstanding ability who need such scholarship assistance to go to college, and through assistance to the States in constructing public community college facilities in such locations as will make such facilities accessible to the homes of as many individuals as may be possible.

"TITLE I—LOANS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF ACADEMIC FACILITIES

"Lending authority

"Sec. 101. The Commissioner of Education (hereinafter referred to as 'Commissioner') may, in accordance with the provisions of this title, make loans to institutions of higher education or to higher-education building agencies for construction of academic facilities.

"Loan limit for any State

"Sec. 102. Not more than 12½ per centum of the funds provided for in this title in the form of loans shall be used for loans to institutions of higher education or higher-education building agencies within any one State.

"Eligibility conditions, amounts, and terms of loans

"Sec. 103. (a) No loan pursuant to this title shall be made unless the Commissioner finds (1) that not less than one-fourth of the development cost of the facility will be financed from non-Federal sources, (2) that the applicant is unable to secure the amount of such loan from other sources upon terms and conditions equally as favorable as the terms and conditions applicable to loans under this title, and (3) that the construction will be undertaken in an economical manner and that it will not be of elaborate or extravagant design or materials.

"(b) A loan pursuant to this title shall be secured in such manner, and shall be repaid within such period not exceeding fifty years, and may be determined by the Commissioner; and shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Commissioner which shall not be less than a per annum rate that is one-quarter of 1 percentage point above the rate of interest paid by the Commissioner on funds obtained from the Secretary of the Treasury as provided in subsection (d) of this section.

"(c) In order to obtain funds for loans under this title, the Commissioner may, on or after July 1, 1962, from time to time issue notes and obligations for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury. The maximum aggregate principal amount of such notes and obligations outstanding at any one time shall be such amount as may be specified from time to time in appropriation Acts, but the amount so outstanding at any time shall not exceed (1) the initial sum of $300,000,000 until June 30, 1963, inclusive, and (2) thereafter, $300,000,000 plus such additional sums as are equal to a rate of annual increase of $300,000,000 in such initial sum as of July 1 of each of the calendar years 1963 to 1966.

"(d) Notes or other obligations issued by the Commissioner under this title shall be in such forms and denominations, have such maturities, and be subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, and shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury which shall be equal to the average annual interest rate on all interest-bearing obligations of the United States then forming a part of the public debt as computed at the end of the fiscal year next preceding the issuance by the Commissioner and adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase any notes and other obligations of the Commissioner issued under this title and for such purpose is authorized to use as a public-debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under such Act, as amended, are extended to include any purchases of such notes and other obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury may at any time sell any of the notes or other obligations acquired by him under this section. All redemptions, purchases, and sales by the Secretary of the Treasury of such notes or other obligations shall be treated as public-debt transactions of the United States.

"(e) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Commissioner such sums as may be necessary, together with loan principal and interest payments made by institutions of higher education or higher education building agencies assisted hereunder, for payments on notes or other obligations issued by the Commissioner under this section.

"General provisions

"SEC. 104. (a) Such financial transactions of the Commissioner as the making of loans and vouchers approved by the Commissioner in connection with such financial transactions, except with respect to administrative expenses, shall be final and conclusive on all officers of the Government.

"(b)(1) Funds made available to the Commissioner pursuant to the provisions of this title shall be deposited in a checking account or accounts with the Treasurer of the United States. Receipts and assets obtained or held by the Commissioner in connection with the performance of his functions under this title, and all funds available for carrying out the functions of the Commissioner under this title (including appropriations therefor, which are hereby authorized), shall be available, in such amounts as may from year to year be authorized by the Congress, for the administrative expenses of the Commissioner in connection with the performance of such functions.

"(2) The Commissioner is authorized (A) to prescribe a schedule of fees which, in his judgment, would be adequate in the aggregate to cover necessary expenses of making inspections (including audits) and providing representatives at the site of projects in connection with loans under this title, and (B) to condition the making of such loans on agreement by the applicant to pay such fees; and, if such fees are prescribed, the Commissioner's expenses for such purposes shall be considered nonadministrative. For the purpose of providing such services, the Commissioner may, as authorized by section 402 (b), utilize any agency, and such agency may accept reimbursement or payment for such services from such applicant or from the Commissioner, and shall, if a Federal agency, credit such amounts to the appropriation or fund against which expenditures by such agency for such services have been charged.

"(c) In the performance of, and with respect to, the functions, powers, and duties vested in him by this title, the Commissioner, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, may—

"(1) prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section;

"(2) sue and be sued in any court of record of a State having general jurisdiction or in any district court of the United States, and such district courts shall have jurisdiction of civil actions arising under this title without regard to the amount in controversy; but no attachment, injunction, garnishment, or other similar process, mesne or final, shall be issued against the Commissioner or property under his control, and nothing herein shall be construed to except litigation arising out of activities under this title from the application of sections 507(b) and 2679 of title 28 of the United States Code and of section 367 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 316);

"(3) foreclose on any property or commence any action to protect or enforce any right conferred upon him by any law, contract, or other agreement, and bid for and purchase at any foreclosure or any other sale any property in connection with which he has made a loan pursuant to this title; and, in the event of any such acquisition (and notwithstanding any other provisions of law relating to the acquisition, handling, or disposal of real property by the United States), complete, administer, remodel and convert, dispose of, lease, and otherwise deal with, such property: *Provided,* That any such acquisition of real property shall not deprive any State or political subdivision thereof of its civil or criminal jurisdiction in and over such property or impair the civil rights under the State or local laws of the inhabitants on such property;

"(4) enter into agreements to pay annual sums in lieu of taxes to any State or local taxing authority with respect to any real property so acquired or owned;

"(5) sell or exchange at public or private sale, or lease, real or personal property, and sell or exchange any securities or obligations, upon such terms as he may fix;

"(6) subject to the specific limitations in this title, consent to the modification, with respect to the rate of interest, time of payment of any installment of principal or interest, security, or any other term of any contract or agreement to which he is a party or which has been transferred to him pursuant to this section; and

"(7) include in any contract or instrument made pursuant to this section such other covenants, conditions, or provisions as he may deem necessary to assure that the purposes of this title will be achieved."

Records and audits

SEC. 105. (a) Each recipient of a loan under this title shall keep such records as the Commissioner shall prescribe, including records which fully disclose the amount and disposition by such recipient of the proceeds of such loan, the total cost of the project or undertaking in connection with which such loan is made and the amount of that portion of the cost supplied by other sources, and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit.

"(b) The Commissioner and the Comptroller General of the United States or any of their duly authorized representatives shall have access for the purpose of audit and examination, to any books, documents, papers, and records of the recipients that are pertinent to loans received under this title.

Definitions

"SEC. 106. As used in this title—

"(a) (1) Except as provided in subparagraph (2) of this paragraph, the term "academic facilities" means structures suitable for use as classrooms, laboratories, libraries, and related facilities necessary or appropriate for instruction of students, or for research, or for administration of the educational or research programs, of an institution of higher education, and maintenance, storage, or utility facilities essential to operation of the foregoing facilities.

"(2) The term "academic facilities" shall not include any facility intended primarily for events for which admission is to be charged to the general public.

"(b) (1) The term 'construction' means (A) erection of new or expansion of existing structures, and the acquisition and installation of initial equipment therefor; or (B) acquisition of existing structures; or (C) rehabilitation, alteration, conversion, or improvement (including the acquisition and installation of initial equipment, or modernization or replacement of built-in equipment) of existing structures; or (D) a combination of any two or more of the foregoing.

"(2) The term 'equipment' includes, in addition to machinery, utilities, and built-in equipment and any necessary enclosures or structures to house them, all other items necessary for the functioning of a particular facility as an academic facility, including necessary furniture, except books and except items of current operating expense such as fuel, supplies, and the like; the term "initial equipment" means equipment acquired and installed in connection with construction as defined in subparagraph (1) (A) or (B) of this paragraph or, in cases referred to in subparagraph (1) (C), equipment acquired and installed as part of the rehabilitation, alteration, conversion, or improvement of an existing structure which structure would otherwise not be adequate for use as an academic facility; and the terms 'equipment', 'initial equipment', and 'built-in equipment' shall be more particularly defined by the Commissioner by regulation.

"(c) The term 'development cost,' with respect to an academic facility, means the amount found by the Commissioner to be the cost, to the applicant for a loan under this title, of the construction involved and the cost of necessary acquisition of the land on which the facility is located and of necessary site improvements to permit its use for such facility, but excluding any cost incurred before, or under a contract entered into before, the enactment of this Act. There shall further be excluded from the cost of construction, in determining the amount of any loan under this title, an amount equal to the amount of any Federal financial assistance which the institution has obtained, or is assured of obtaining, under any other law, with respect to the construction that is to be financed with the aid of a loan under this title.

"(d) The term 'higher education building agency' means (1) an agency, public authority, or other instrumentality of a State authorized to provide, or finance the construction of, academic facilities for institutions of higher education (whether or not also authorized to provide or finance other facilities for such or other educational institutions, or for their students or faculty), or (2) any corporation (no part of the net earnings of which inures or may lawfully inure to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual) (A) established by an institution of higher education for the sole purpose of providing academic facilities for the use of such institution, or for such purpose and the additional purpose of providing housing or 'other educational facilities' (as defined in section 404 of the Housing Act of 1950 as amended) for students or students and faculty of such institution without regard to their membership in or affiliation with any social, fraternal, or honorary society or organization, and (B) upon dissolution of which all title to any property purchased or built from the proceeds of any loan made under this title will pass to such institution.

"TITLE II—SCHOLARSHIPS FOR COLLEGE STUDENTS

"Appropriations authorized

"Sec. 201. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, the sum of $17,500,000, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, the sum of $26,250,000, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years the sum of $35,000,000 for scholarships to persons who have not previously been awarded scholarships under this title and who are selected for award of such scholarships by the State commissions on scholarships (hereinafter referred to as 'State commission'). In addition there are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for each of the seven succeeding fiscal years such sums as are necessary for making payments to individuals who have been awarded scholarships under this title for previous years. Sums appropriated pursuant to the first sentence of this section shall remain available for the award of scholarships under this title until the close of the fiscal year succeeding the fiscal year for which they were appropriated.

"Amount of scholarships

"Sec. 202. (a) Any person awarded a scholarship under this title who is determined by the State commission, in accordance with the provisions of the State plan approved under section 206, to need financial assistance to continue his education at an institution of higher education shall be paid an amount, not to exceed $1,000 for any academic year or its equivalent (as defined in the regulations of the Commissioner), based on his financial need for assistance during such year (or equivalent) as determined in accordance with such provisions. Any person so awarded a scholarship who is determined by the State commission, in accordance with such provisions of the State plan, not to be in sufficient need for such assistance to be paid any amount under this title for his first year shall receive an appropriate certificate from the Commissioner.

"(b) The Commissioner shall by regulation, prescribed after consultation with the other Federal agency or agencies concerned, provide for such adjustment (including, where appropriate, total withholding) of scholarship payments under this title as may be necessary to avoid duplication of educational assistance received under programs administered by such agencies.

"Duration of scholarships

"Sec. 203. The duration of a scholarship awarded under this title shall be the period, not in excess of four academic years or the equivalent (as defined in regulations of the Commissioner), required for completion by the recipient of the work for his first bachelor's degree. Notwithstanding the preceding provisions of this title, a scholarship awarded under this title shall entitle the recipient to payments for such period only if the Commissioner finds that he (1) is maintaining satisfactory progress in the course of study which he is pursuing, according to the regularly prescribed standards and practice of the institution which he is attending, and (2) devotes essentially full time to educational work leading to a bachelor's dergee, during the academic year (or equivalent), in attendance at an institution of higher education, except that failure to be in attendance at an institution during vacation periods or periods of military service, or during other periods during which the Commissioner determines, in accordance with regulations, that there is good cause for his nonattendance (during which periods he shall receive no payments), shall not be deemed contrary to this clause.

"Selection of recipients of scholarships

"Sec. 204. (a) An individual shall be eligible to compete in any State for a scholarship under this title if he (1) is living in the State or, if not living in any State, is domiciled in such State; (2) makes application at the time and in the manner prescribed by the State commission; (3) is not, or has not been, enrolled full time in any course of study at an institution of higher education; and (4) is attending a high school whose graduates meet the requirements established by the State in which such school is located for graduation from high schools accredited by such State.

"(b) From among those competing in any State for scholarships for each fiscal year, the State commission shall, in accordance with the provisions of the State plan approved under section 206 and within the amount allotted to the State for such scholarships under section 205, select persons who are to be awarded such scholarships and determine the amounts, if any, to be paid to them. The Commissioner shall award a scholarship to a person so selected, and in the amount so determined, if—

"(1) the State commission certifies that such person (A) has received a certificate of graduation, based on completion of the twelfth grade, from any high school whose graduates meet the requirements established by the State in which such school is located for graduation from high schools accredited by such State, or (B) in the case of an individual who has not received such a certificate, is determined by such State commission to have attained a level of advancement generally accepted as constituting the equivalent of that required for graduation from such a high school;

"(2) such person has become enrolled in an institution of higher education for educational work leading to a bachelor's degree; and

"(3) such person's graduation from high school occurred (or the equivalent level of educational advancement was attained) during or at the close of the school year in which he was selected for the scholarship, and his enrollment at an institution of higher education was for the first academic year that commenced following his graduation (or attainment of the equivalent level of advancement) and occurred upon the first opportunity for such enrollment, except that the State commission may, in accordance with regulations of the Commissioner, for good cause waive or modify the requirements of this clause or clause (4) of subsection (a).

"Allotment of appropriations for scholarships

"Sec. 205. (a) From the sum appropriated for any fiscal year pursuant to the first sentence of section 201 the Commissioner shall allot amounts, but not in the aggregate to exceed 2 per centum of such sum, among Puerto Rico, the Canal Zone, Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa according to their respective needs for scholarship assistance as determined by him. The remainder of such sum shall be allotted by the Commissioner among the remaining States, one-half on the basis of the relative number of individuals graduating from public or other nonprofit high schools in the respective States, as determined by the Commissioner for the most recent year for which satisfactory data for such States are available to him, and one-half on the basis of their relative populations aged fourteen to seventeen, inclusive, as determined by the Commissioner for the most recent year for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce.

"(b) Sums appropriated under the second sentence of section 201 shall be allotted by the Commissioner among the States on the basis of the relative amounts he estimates are needed to make payments to persons awarded scholarships for previous years.

"State commissions and plans

"Sec. 206. (a) Any State desiring to participate in the scholarship program under this title may do so by establishing a State commission on scholarships broadly representative of high schools and colleges, and of the public, in the State, or designating an existing State agency with equivalent representation to serve as the State commission on scholarships, and by submitting, through such commission, a State plan for carrying out the purposes of this title which is approved by the Commissioner under this section. The Commissioner shall approve any such plan which—

"(1) provides that it shall be administered by the State commission;

"(2) provides for the selection of individuals to receive scholarships from among applicants eligible to compete therefor, and for determination of the amounts (if any) of payments under such scholarships, in accordance with standards, procedures, and criteria, established by the State commission, which the Commissioner finds provide reasonable assurance—

"(A) that selection of individuals to receive scholarships under this title will be based solely on ability to pursue successfully, at an institution of higher education, a course of study leading to a bachelor's degree, determined in accordance with objective tests and other measures of ability and achievement, and that the amount of each individual's scholarship each year will be based solely on his need for financial assistance to continue his education at an institution of higher education, which need shall be determined without regard to tuition, fees, and other expenses of attendance at the particular institution of higher education chosen by the individual,

"(B) that any eligible applicant who is not living in, but is domiciled in, the State is provided a reasonable opportunity to be selected for a scholarship, and

"(C) that scholarship examinations or other tests required to be taken by applicants are given, insofar as practicable, in the high school the individual attends;

"(3) provides for certification to the Commissioner of—

"(A) individuals selected pursuant to the State plan for scholarships and the amounts thereof, and

"(B) the financial need of individuals previously awarded such scholarships (and the amounts, if any, of payments under their scholarship), as determined in accordance with the State standards, procedures, and criteria established as provided in paragraph (2);

"(4) provides for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the State under this title; and

"(5) provides for the making of such reports, in such form and containing such information, as may be reasonably necessary to enable the Commissioner to perform his functions under this title.

"(b) The Commissioner shall not finally disapprove any State plan submitted under this title, or any modification thereof, without first affording the State commission submitting the plan reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

"(c) In the case of any State plan which has been approved by the Commissioner, if the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State commission administering such plan, finds

"(1) that the plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of subsection (a), or

"(2) that in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with such provisions,

the Commissioner shall notify such State commission that the State will not be regarded as eligible to participate in the program under this title until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure to comply.

"(d) The Commissioner shall pay to each State such amounts as the Commissioner determines to be necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the State plan (including reimbursement to the State for expenses which the Commissioner determines were necessary for the preparation of the State plan) approved under this title. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to make such payments.

"Selection of institution

"SEC. 207. An individual awarded a scholarship under this title may attend any institution of higher education which admits him.

"Cost of education allowances

"SEC. 208. In order partially to compensate institutions of higher education for expenses, in excess of student tuition and other fees, incurred by such institutions in providing education to persons awarded scholarships and receiving payments with respect thereto under this title, the Commissioner shall, in accordance with regulations, pay each institution which such a person attends during the major portion of each academic year for which such person receives scholarship payments, the amount of $350. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for each of the seven succeeding years such sums as may be necessary to make such payments.

"TITLE III—PUBLIC COMMUNITY COLLEGE ASSISTANCE

"Authorization of funds

"SEC. 301. For the purpose of this title there is authorized to be appropriated $50,000,000 for each of the five successive fiscal years beginning with the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1962.

"Allotments to States and Federal share

"SEC. 302. (a) The sums appropriated pursuant to section 301 shall be allotted among the States on the basis of the income per person and the number of high school graduates of the respective States. Such allotments shall be made as follows: The Commissioner shall allot to each State for each fiscal year an amount which bears the same ratio to the sums appropriated pursuant to section 301 for such year as the product of—

"(A) the number of high school graduates of the State, and

"(B) the State's allotment ratio (as determined under subsection (c))

bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States.

"(b) The allotment to any State under this section for any fiscal year shall be available until the end of the succeeding fiscal year for payment to it of the amounts certified, not later than the end of the fiscal year for which the allotment was made, by the State agency as the Federal share of the cost of constructing public community college facilities, under the State plan approved pursuant to section 304.

"(c) For purposes of this title—

"(1) The 'allotment ratio' for any State shall be 1.00 less the product of (A) .50 and (B) the quotient obtained by dividing the income per person for the State by the income per person for all the States (not including Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and Guam), except that (i) the allotment ratio shall in no case be less than .25 or more than .75, and (ii) the allotment ratio for Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and Guam shall be .75; and

"(2) The allotment ratios shall be promulgated by the Commissioner as soon as possible after enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, on the basis of the average of the incomes per person of the States and of all the States for the three most recent consecutive calendar years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce.

"Matching requirement

"SEC. 303. Payment of the full Federal allotment to a State shall be contingent upon the matching of Federal funds by State or local funds, or both, as follows: Each State shall match the Federal allotment by an amount equal to the product of (1) the number of high school graduates in the State and (2) the difference between the national base and the Federal allotment to the State per high school graduate of the State: *Provided*, That in no case shall the State matching payment be more than twice the Federal allotment. To the extent that a State's matching payment falls short of the matching requirement, its Federal allotment shall be proportionately reduced.

"State plans

"SEC. 304. (a) Any State desiring to accept the benefits of this title shall submit a State plan for carrying out the purpose of this title. The Commissioner shall approve any such plan which—

"(1) designates the State agency responsible for administering the plan throughout the State;

"(2) contains satisfactory evidence that such State agency will have authority to carry out such plan in conformity with this title;

"(3) provides fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement and accounting for Federal funds under this title and to assure proper application of non-Federal funds used in connection therewith;

"(4) provides for the establishment of standards, in accordance with the purpose of this title, for locating, planning, and constructing public community college facilities;

"(5) provides for affording to every applicant, whose application for funds for a construction project under the State plan is denied, an opportunity for a hearing before the State agency; and

"(6) provides that the State agency will make such reports to the Commissioner, in such form and containing such information, as are reasonably necessary to enable the Commissioner to carry out the provisions of this title.

"(b) The Commissioner shall not finally disapprove any State plan submitted under this title, or any modification thereof, without first affording the State agency submitting the plan reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

"(c) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency, finds that—

"(1) the State plan submitted by such agency and approved under this section has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of subsection (a); or

"(2) in the administration of such plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision;

the Commissioner shall withhold further payments under section 305 to the State or withhold further payments for any project designated by the Commissioner as being directly affected by such failure, as the Commissioner may determine to be appropriate under the circumstances, until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure to comply, or if compliance is impossible, until the State repays or arranges for the repayment of Federal moneys which have been diverted or improperly expended; except that the foregoing provisions of this subsection shall not apply to payment of any amount already reserved under section 305(a) with respect to any public community college facilities project not directly affected by such failure. After notice as provided in this subsection to any State, the Commissioner may suspend the making of further reservations of funds under section 305(a) for projects in such State pending the making of the findings under this subsection.

"Payments to States

"SEC. 305. (a) Upon a certification by a State agency—

"(1) listing a public community college facilities project (or projects) approved by it during a fiscal year under a State plan approved under section 304; and

"(2) setting forth the estimated cost of each such project, the amount of the Federal share of such cost, and such further description of such project as may be required by the Commissioner in order to carry out the provisions of this title,

the Commissioner shall reserve, subject to the requirements of section 303, an amount equal to such Federal share of such cost out of the State's allotment for such fiscal year. Payment of such amount shall be made by the Commissioner to the State, upon request of the State agency, through the disbursing facilities of the Department of the Treasury and prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, at such time or times and in such installments (in advance of the incurring of cost or otherwise) as the Commissioner may determine. Such payments shall be used exclusively to meet the cost of construction of the project (or projects) for which such amount has been reserved. The Commissioner shall change any amount so reserved upon request of the State agency and receipt of an amended certification from such agency, but only to the extent such change is not inconsistent with the other provisions of this title.

"(b) If any project with respect to which payments have been made under this section is terminated or abandoned or not completed within such reasonable period as may be determined in accordance with the regulations of the Commissioner, the State which certified such project shall be liable to repay to the United States, for deposit in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts, the amount of such payments or such lesser amounts as the Commissioner deems reasonable under the circumstances.

"Definitions

"Sec. 306. As used in this title—

"(1) The term 'public community college' means an educational institution, or branch thereof, in a State, which (1) is under public supervision and control, (2) is organized and administered principally to offer educational programs, of not more than two years' duration beyond the high school level, (3) has as one of its major purposes the provision of a two-year program which is acceptable for full credit toward a bachelor's degree upon the student's transfer to an institution of higher education, and (4) if a branch of an institution offering four or more years of higher education, is located in a community different from that in which its parent institution is located.

"(2) The terms 'construct', 'constructing', and 'construction' include the preparation of drawings and specifications for public community college facilities, erecting, building, acquiring, and expanding public community college facilities, and the inspection and supervision of the construction of such facilities.

"(3) The term 'public community college facilities' means classrooms and related facilities, initial equipment, machinery, utilities, and land (including interests in land and land improvements) necessary or appropriate for the purposes of a public community college, but shall not include athletic stadiums or structures or facilities intended primarily for the purpose of athletic exhibitions, contests, or games or other events for which admission is to be charged to the general public.

"(4) The term 'high school graduate' means a person who has received formal recognition (by diploma, certificate, or similar means) from an approved school for successful completion of four years of education beyond the first eight years of schoolwork, or for demonstration of equivalent achievement. For the purposes of this title, the number of high school graduates shall be limited to the number who graduated in the most recent school year for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The interpretation of the definition of 'high school graduate' shall fall within the authority of the Commissioner of Education.

"(5) The term 'national base' means with respect to any fiscal year, an amount equal to three times the quotient of (A) the amount appropriated for such year under the authorization in section 201, divided by (B) the number of high school graduates.

"(6) The term 'State agency' means the agency designated by a State in its State plan in accordance with section 304(1).

"TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

"Definitions

"Sec. 401. As used in this Act—

"(a) The term 'institution of higher education' means an educational institution in any State which—

"(1) admits as regular students only individuals having a certificate of graduation from a high school, or the recognized equivalent of such a certificate;

"(2) is legally authorized within such State to provide a program of education beyond high school;

"(3) provides an educational program for which it awards a bachelor's degree, or provides not less than a two-year program which is acceptable for full credit toward such a degree;

"(4) is a public or other nonprofit institution; and

"(5) is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association listed by the Commissioner pursuant to this paragraph or, if not so accredited, is an institution whose credits are accepted, on transfer, by not less than three institutions which are so accredited, for credit on the same basis as if transferred from an institution so accredited. For the purposes of title II, such term includes any private business school or technical institution which meets the provisions of clauses (1), (2), (3), (4), and (5). For the purposes of this paragraph the Commissioner shall publish a list of nationally recognized accrediting agencies or associations which he determines to be reliable authority as to the quality of education or training offered.

"(b) The term 'nonprofit educational insituation' means an educational institution owned and operated by one or more corporations or associations no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

(c) The term 'public educational institution' does not include a school or institution of any agency of the United States.

"(d) The term "State" includes, in addition to the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.

"Federal administration

"Sec. 402. (a) The Commissioner may delegate any of his functions under this Act, except the making of regulations, to any officer or employee of the Office of Education.

"(b) In administering the provisions of this Act for which he is responsible, the Commissioner is authorized to utilize the services and facilities of any agency of the Federal Government and of any other public or nonprofit agency or institution in accordance with appropriate agreements, and to pay for such services either in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be agreed upon.

"(c) The Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, may appoint one or more advisory committees to advise and consult with the Commissioner with respect to the administration of any of his functions under this Act. Members of any such committee, while attending conferences or meetings of the committee, shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare but not to exceed $50 per diem, and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently. The provisions of section 1003 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 shall apply to members of such committees.

"Judicial review

"Sec. 403. (a) If any State is dissatisfied with the Commissioner's final action with respect to the approval of its State plan submitted under title II or III or with his final action under section 206(c) or 304(c), such State may appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such State is located. The summons and notice of appeal may be served at any place in the United States. The Commissioner shall forthwith certify and file in the court the transcript of the proceedings and the record on which he based his action.

"(b) The findings of fact by the Commissioner, unless substantially contrary to the weight of the evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall certify to the court the transcript and record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive unless substantially contrary to the weight of the evidence.

"(c) The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in title 28, United States Code, section 1254.

"Labor standards

"Sec. 404. (a) The Commissioner shall not approve any application for a loan under title I or reserve any amount for a grant under title III except upon adequate assurance that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors in the performance of work on construction assisted by such loan or grant will be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a—276a–5), and will receive compensation at a rate not less than one and one-half times the basic rate of pay for all hours worked in any workweek in excess of eight hours in any workday or forty hours in the workweek, as the case may be.

"(b) The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to the labor standards specified in subsection (a) of this section, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 64 Stat. 1267), and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c).

"(c) The Commissioner may waive the application of subsection (a) in cases or classes of cases where laborers or mechanics, not otherwise employed at any time in the construction assisted by such loan, voluntarily donate their services for the purpose of lowering the cost of construction.

"Method of payment

"Sec. 405. Payments under this Act to any individual or to any State or Federal agency, institution of higher education, or any other organization, pursuant to a grant or loan, or pursuant to a scholarship, may be made in installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement, and with respect to grants or loans with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments.

"Administrative appropriations authorized

"Sec. 406. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for each fiscal year thereafter, such sums as may be necessary for the cost of administering the provisions of this Act.

"Federal control not authorized

"Sec. 407. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed as authorizing a department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over, or impose any requirements or condition with respect to, the personnel, curriculum, methods of instruction, or administration of any educational institution."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in opening the debate upon S. 1241, the College Academic Facilities and Scholarship Act, an administration measure, it is proper and desirable in my judgment to recall the language of the state of the Union message on the importance of this legislation. But first let me point out that this bill was introduced by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill]. It was introduced by him in carrying out the policy of the Kennedy administration on the subject matter of education.

In his state of the Union message, President Kennedy said:

> Finally, a strong America cannot neglect the aspirations of its citizens—the welfare of the needy, the health care of the elderly,

> the education of the young. For we are not developing the Nation's wealth for its own sake.
>
> Wealth is the means and people are the ends. All our material riches will avail us little if we do not use them to expand the opportunities of our people.
>
> I shall also recommend bills to improve educational quality, to stimulate the arts, and, at the college level, to provide Federal loans for the construction of academic facilities and federally financed scholarships.
>
> If this Nation is to grow in wisdom and strength, then every able-bodied high school graduate should have the opportunity to develop his talents. Yet nearly half lack either the funds or the facilities to attend college. Enrollments are going to double in our colleges in the short space of 10 years.
>
> The annual cost per student is skyrocketing to astronomical levels, now averaging $1,650 a year, although almost half of our families earn less than $5,444 a year. They cannot afford such costs, but this Nation cannot afford to maintain its military power and neglect its brain power * * *.
>
> "Civilization," said H. G. Wells, "is a race between education and catastrophe." It is up to you in this Congress to determine the winner of that race.
>
> These are not unrelated measures addressed to specific gaps or grievances in our national life. They are the pattern of our intentions and the foundation of our hopes.
>
> "I believe in democracy," said Woodrow Wilson, "because it releases the energy of every human being. The dynamic of democracy is the power and the purpose of the individual."
>
> And the policy of this administration is to give to the individual the opportunity to realize his own highest possibilities.
>
> Our program is to open to all the opportunity for steady and productive employment, to remove from all the handicap of arbitrary or irrational exclusion, to offer to all the facilities for education and health and welfare, to make society the servant of the individual and the individual the source of progress, and thus to realize for all the full promise of American life.

I think there is no doubt that the overwhelming majority of the Members of Congress were deeply moved by the sound philosophy of President Kennedy's state of the Union message, and in particular this great discussion of his about the responsibility of the Nation and the people of the Nation, and particularly the educational obligations of the Federal Government toward the youth of this country, to the end of seeing to it that every boy and girl in this country has an opportunity to develop to the maximum extent possible the potential God gave him at birth.

S. 1241, the bill now before us, seeks to translate into statute the noble aspirations and ideals of this part of the President's program for this session of the Congress.

In assessing the role the Federal Government should assume with respect to the financing of higher education, it is helpful, in my judgment, first, to develop an analysis of the needs of the Nation for educated citizens, particularly those with technical, scientific, and professional skills; second, to set forth the magnitude of the problem in terms of our population growth; third, to discuss the cost factors involved, particularly those concerned with the financing of scholarships; and finally, to conclude with a description of S. 1241, the bill before us.

ANALYSIS OF THE NEED

Education is a principal source of strength in the struggle for economic growth and world understanding. It not only improves the quality of the labor force, but also creates the potential for finding new goods, new technologies, new instruments of social policy, and new understanding of domestic and world problems. Therefore, mobilization of our intellectual resources in this decade can be more crucial to the Nation's future than was mobilization of physical resources in World War II.

There are three overriding forces operating in this country which work toward a continued, and even an accelerating, demand and need for professional personnel: First, there has been a continued, evolutionary, structural change industrially and occupationally that contributes to growth of the service-producing, white-collar sectors of the economy; second, current projections suggest about a 40-percent increase in employment among professional and technical personnel during the 1960's—on top of a similar expansion in the 1950's; and third, the conjunction of an expected substantial increase in demand, with an actual downturn in the number of workers in the prime working age of 35 to 44 years, as a result of the low birthrate of the 1930's.

Two examples point up these shortages. To provide even for maintaining present levels of supply of health manpower in relation to population over the next 10 to 15 years will require vigorous action. And yet, medicine and dentistry have become professions which few persons can afford to enter unless they come from families with relatively high income, or have wives who can work to provide substantial financial assistance.

I am sure the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill] will agree with me and underwrite what I now say. I point out that there is great, great need for a substantial increase in the number of doctors and dentists in this country. There will be before the Senate in the weeks ahead some further proposed education legislation, again sponsored by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill] to deal with the whole question of medical school education. My speech pertains to the point that in the light of the growing population of this country, there is in fact a serious shortage in the number of doctors and dentists.

Let no one argue that we have more doctors per capita than some other countries. What does that have to do with America's responsibility to her people? The fact that some other countries do not have nearly enough doctors does not justify our continuing a situation in which we, also, do not have enough.

When we urge the Federal Government to assume its fair share of responsibility in the whole field of higher education, leading to the training of a larger number of professional workers in medicine, dentistry, and other professions, we are only arguing to put the democratic system to work. We must never forget the teachings of Jefferson; that, after all, the purpose of the democratic system of government is to promote the general welfare of all the people, rather than of only a few—to do those things which are necessary to promote the welfare of our people as a mass.

When we make a plea, as we shall repeatedly make in the debate we are now starting, for greater assistance to the institutions of higher learning, we are making a plea for Federal help which will result in providing for the people of this country more doctors, more dentists, and more professionally trained men and women to serve their needs in this democracy.

I shall never let the Senate forget that responsibility to democracy during the course of this debate, because I know that when I am pleading for the passage of the bill, I am pleading for putting into practice one of the cardinal purposes of the democratic system of government. The people of this country are entitled to health protection. If we are to give them health protection we must see to it that the medical schools are adequately financed and that there are enough medical schools to train the doctors needed to take care of the health problems of the people of this country.

Forty percent of the medical students come from families with annual incomes that exceed $10,000, compared to only about a fourth of the male students in all fields. Even with support from parents and working wives, 40 percent of the married medical students owe over $5,000 at graduation, and 17 percent over $10,000, according to the Association of American Medical Colleges' "Study of Financial Problems of Medical Students in May 1959."

The Bureau of Labor Statistics estimates that we shall require approximately 550,000 scientists and 1,485,000 engineers by 1970.

That is only 8 years from now. That is but a flash of a second in terms of history.

Mr. President, we cannot delay any longer meeting this need. The first major argument I make in support of the bill introduced by the Senator from Alabama is that there is no question about the need for it; and we as a Congress cannot justify walking out on our responsibility of meeting the needs of the American people.

The statistics I have cited were obtained from "The Long-Range Demand for Scientific and Technical Personnel, a Methodological Study," prepared for National Science Foundation by Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1961.

Since our national labor force contains no unutilized reservoir of trained manpower adequate to meet national requirements of this magnitude, the requirements will have to be met through training large additional numbers. Thus, the need for scientists and engineers becomes translated into a requirement for the higher education necessary to produce them.

The demand for higher education, however, extends beyond those particular professional areas in which shortages have been predicted and includes the provision of education for all who can benefit by it. Within the past 50 years, the educational attainment of large numbers of our young people has moved up from less than high school to one or more years of college. Business, industry and the public, in my judgment, want still further advances to meet anticipated needs.

MAGNITUDE OF THE PROBLEM

Mr. President, having spoken about the need for the bill, I ask, "What about the magnitude of the problem?"

At the turn of the century, only 7 percent of children aged 14 to 17 were attending high school.

Talk about progress, Mr. President. I ask Senators to take another look at that vital statistic.

In 1950–52, 20.7 percent of those aged 18 to 19 years were in college as were 14.2 percent of those 20 to 24 years old; in 1958–60, 32.7 percent of those 18 to 19 years old were in college as were 19.3 percent of those 20 to 24 years old. Causes for the increased demand include: increasing educational attainments of parents; increasing incomes of families so that within each generation a larger fraction have been able to afford the costs involved in extending the education of their children; and a substantial movement of population from rural, agricultural environment to urban industrial areas where educational facilities are more readily accessible and in which more education is demanded of those seeking employment.

Assuming that the step-up relationship will continue to hold for children born to the present generation, we can expect between one-half and two-thirds of the next generation to seek education beyond the high school. The opening fall enrollment in 1960 was 3.6 million. Projections indicate that we can expect between 5.2 million and 7 million by 1970 and further increases in the years following. If the present trend of collegegoing continues, there is a serious question of the ability of the colleges to absorb an average of 300,000 more undergraduates each year for 10 years, an annual increase of almost 10 percent of present enrollments.

That statistic, Mr. President, gives us some idea, I respectfully submit, as to the magnitude of the problem with which we are confronted. I give it again:

If the present trend of collegegoing continues—and who among us would not wish to have it continue, from the standpoint of the welfare and the security of our country—there is a serious question of the ability of the colleges to absorb an average of 300,000 more undergraduates each year for 10 years, an annual increase of almost 10 percent of present enrollments.

A person may reside in one State, be educated in another, utilize his education in a third, and have the fruits of his training dispersed throughout all the States. Therefore, in my judgment, education to develop our human resources is a national responsibility. During the next 10 years, the population of college age is expected to increase at a rate almost twice that of the 1950's, and technological advances are expected to move at an unprecedented pace. Actual enrollment in colleges and universities, however, will depend upon the policies adopted by the educational institutions, including the level of tuition, the availability of scholarships and loans, the distributions of college facilities, and the type of education offered. The important question is "What national policies should be chosen in order to obtain the size and quality of college enrollment the Nation needs?"

We can reduce the attendance at college. We can do so by placing presidents and boards of trustees in a position in which they would be compelled to take the necessary action of exclusion which would limit the number of students in colleges in accordance with the facilities they have to offer. I am disturbed no little when I listen to sincere people make that suggestion. I think they are shortsighted and attempt to take the easy way out. There is a shuffling off of responsibility by saying, "Raise the standards. Merely let in those students who can meet a higher standard level, and put those who cannot meet the entrance requirements to digging ditches."

One might ask, "What ditches?"

We should look at what automation is doing from the standpoint of its effects on the educational needs of this country. We will not stop automation. We are moving rapidly into a technology of automation in which there will be an ever-increasing reduction in the menial jobs which can be performed by those who do not have educational training. The great need of modern American industrial development is for more highly trained men and women.

I stand on the floor of the Senate today as a former professor to raise my voice, once again, in support of the most valuable student that we have in the long run—the C student, the average student, the backbone of the American educational system. If we ever start discriminating against the C student—the average student—we shall strike a serious blow against the welfare of this country.

I have frequently spoken out against a growing tendency in the American academic world toward constantly raising college entrance requirements because physical facilities do not permit the colleges to take the students for whom, in the national interest, we ought to provide a college education.

We are not talking about educational philosophy alone. We are talking about the philosophy of the democratic system of government. I make that statement because I know before the debate is over we shall hear from those who cite the price-tag argument. We shall be told that we cannot afford the program.

NATION CANNOT AFFORD INACTION

Mr. President, we cannot afford not to support the educational needs of this Republic. In the course of the debate, as one who has the honor and privilege of seeking to carry the bill through the Senate, I will never concede the lowering of standards. It must always be remembered that this is not the first time the economy argument has been used when proposed legislation seeking to promote the general welfare of the mass of the American people has been on the floor of the Senate. It is an old bromide argument.

It is an escapist argument. It is an argument of alibi and rationalization on the part of those who wish to walk out on the Jeffersonian doctrine that the fundamental purpose of this system of self-government of democratic people is to promote the general welfare of all the people. There is no possible subject matter in the field of legislation so close to the welfare of the people of this country as is legislation which seeks to strengthen the enlightenment of the free people of this land. As Jefferson said—and I have said it before, but I shall continue to repeat it—

> A democracy can be no stronger than the enlightenment of its people.

For the purpose of this debate, Jefferson's statement could be paraphrased in this way:

> The strength of a democracy can be no stronger than its school system—elementary, secondary, and higher education, including graduate education.

The C student, the average man and woman who graduates from the colleges of America, makes such a great contribution to the development of America that we cannot justify supporting the kind of discriminatory policy that would result if we should take the easy way out and say, "After all, we will settle this problem, not by giving the necessary financial support to the colleges, not by developing new colleges, not by aiding the development of the community college. We will merely limit attendance at colleges to meet the physical facilities now present, and those students who cannot meet the entrance requirements will have to do something else."

What else? We had better start thinking about that question, Mr. President. Because if we should start closing the doors of the colleges of America to students who would be qualified to do average college work—the so-called C student—and deny to them a college education, we would thereby sentence them to an economic stratum in our society in which they would not have the economic purchasing power, because of a lack of earning power, in turn to raise their families so that they might have the opportunities we want every American boy and girl to have. We would only make trouble for America in many walks of life by doing this.

If the sociologists and economists were present it would not take very long to get witnesses who would testify as to what the results would be in the field of juvenile delinquency and crime, what the results would be in regard to unemployment, and what the results would be in respect to one social disjointure after another.

I wish to point out that making an education available to every boy and girl and young man and woman in this country who has the intellectual potential to do average college work is one of the great stabilizers of our whole economic, social, and political system. I will not support an educational program on the part of our Government which would force the college presidents and the boards of trustees of our colleges into a position in which they would have to exercise an arbitrary and discriminatory policy in determining who is to have the privilege and opportunity of a college degree.

We must consider this question carefully in connection with the philosophy of the bill.

I know of no more important defense weapon, no greater guarantee of preserving freedom in the contest with communism in the decades ahead, than the adoption and putting into practice of the principle that a democracy can be no stronger than the school system it supports.

As I am sure some have heard me say before, I am always thrilled when I think of the courage and the foresight, as well as the insight, of the great leader of the past in Pennsylvania, Thaddeus Stevens, who fought in Pennsylvania for support for a public school system. He was called all manner of names. In those days, sometimes when a person fought for the general welfare of the people he was called not a creeping socialist, but an outright socialist. So Thaddeus Stevens was called a socialist and many other unkind names.

Mr. President, I never read a successful rebuttal to the great premise that Thaddeus Stevens laid down in answer to his critics, who said that Pennsylvania could not afford a public school system, that Pennsylvania taxpayers could not afford to pay the taxes necessary to give the little boys and girls of Pennsylvania an opportunity to go to public school and develop their intellectual potential. His answer was that he hoped the people of Pennsylvania would fear ignorance more than taxation.

I use his statement as the basis of my argument to those who raise the price tag question, by saying it is as true today as it was in the time of Thaddeus Stevens, that the American people must always fear ignorance more than taxation.

EDUCATION COST A CAPITAL INVESTMENT

Mr. President, when I talk about taxation for the American school system, when I talk about the taxation which will be necessary to pay for the development of the institutions of higher education encompassed in the pending bill, I am not talking about an outgo with no return; on the contrary, I am talking about a capital investment through taxes on the part of the taxpayers in an investment institution which will return to the Treasury of the United States many times the cost of the investment. If Senators wish, I can put it this way: I am talking about a policy of underwriting a loan to future generations of American boys and girls who will be the recipients of benefits of an improved higher education system, creating greater opportunities for more of them to go to college.

Why do I say that? I say it because I stand on the floor of the Senate this afternoon and dare any opposition that may arise in this debate to come forward with any proof that the resulting expenditures which the Federal Government will pay out for the benefit of these people will not return many times the cost of the investment.

I have pretty good authority for that statement. We have had considerable experience in this subject matter. The Senator from Alabama (Mr. Hill) knows that in committee I argued against the price tag advocates by pointing out what the results have shown, as the Senator from Texas, who joined me in this argument, is well aware, and what the facts show with respect to the results of the so-called GI bill of rights educational program. Even when we launched that program, there were those who thought we could not afford it. Even when that legislation was before us, the price tag proponents were among us.

What has been the result? The undeniable fact is that the recipients of the benefits of the GI bill of rights, so far as its educational program is concerned, have returned or are returning to the Treasury of the United States more money in increased taxes, which they are now able to pay, than they would have been able to pay had they been denied education under the GI bill.

I do not see why anyone should be surprised. It is inevitable. Yet there are those who go around the country appealing to the temporary, tentative, selfish interest of American taxpayers and saying, "Oh, that fellow Morse, that fellow Hill, that fellow Randolph, and that fellow Yarborough, and all the rest of them who voted for the bill, are a bunch of spendthrifts."

The time has come to answer them. Speaking for myself I say to the people of Oregon today that when I urge the expenditures necessary to support the institutions of higher learning, I am supporting the best interests of the taxpayers of this country. To them I say that freedom comes high, but it is worth it. I say to them, "Do you want to trade it for a totalitarian state? Do you want to trade it for enslavement to totalitarianism?"

EDUCATION VITAL TO NATIONAL SECURITY

We shall not remain free in the decades ahead unless we have the greatest defense weapon we can make available to ourselves, an enlightened citizenry, a highly educated citizenry—scientists, doctors, professional people, and the great mass of highly educated people who are necessary to operate a modern industrial society.

Enough of the argument about a price tag. Enough of the argument that we cannot afford it. Enough of political partisanship. Enough of emotional, prejudicial appeal to the taxpayers, urging that we be pressured to vote against these expenditures because the taxpayers will have to pay for them.

Certainly we as taxpayers will have to pay for them. However, we will pay for them by way of an investment, which will return to the Treasury of the United States many times its cost. Each generation has a solemn obligation to generations yet to come. Where would we in this country be today had it not been for our forefathers, who had the patriotism, the insight, and the foresight to recognize that in their generation they owed the obligation to pay the taxes necessary to strengthen this Republic of ours in all the various fields in which taxes are paid?

When I fight for the development of educational opportunities for the young people of this country, I am not following the course of a wastrel. I am pleading for a sound economy, not a false economy. This country will be poorer if we do not meet the magnitude of the educational program that I am talking about this afternoon. I do not want to see my country become poorer. I want to enrich it. Therefore, when I plead in my speech this afternoon for support for the institutions of higher learning, I am pleading for sound economy. There is no true economy in weakening the economy of the country.

Now I wish to talk for a moment about meeting the costs.

MEETING THE COST

To cope with the increasing demands of a changing and growing society, we must effect a positive improvement in the quality of higher education and add the programs needed. Not all of the increased demand for high-quality education can be met simply by a more complete utilization of existing educational plants through lengthening the school day and the school year, or through better utilization of existing faculty, although some of the demand can be met in these ways.

No matter how successful colleges and universities are in using their resources more wisely and more effectively, they still will need to boost their incomes substantially to provide quality education for increasing enrollments. The current expenditure of institutions of higher learning is estimated to increase by approximately three times or more during the sixties, in order to make replacements for depreciation and obsolescence and to provide additional accommodations for increasing enrollments. In the meantime, marked changes are taking place in the responsibilities of colleges and universities, as society makes ever broadening demands upon them. The important question relative to providing the necessary investment in higher education is the same as for investment in physical capital: "Who pays?" is the question that must be answered.

PROVIDING ADDITIONAL RESOURCES

The major issue is not whether we can afford to finance the projected expenditures, but rather what the relative shares in the financing will be for students, private philanthropy, and governments. In 1957–58, current income of colleges and universities for student higher education—including administrative and operating expenses allocable to teaching but excluding organized research, other nonteaching activities, and living accommodations—came from the following sources: tuition and fees, 36.2 percent; gifts and endowment earnings, 14.7 percent; State and local governments, 42.4 percent; and other sources—including the Federal Government—6.7 percent. Projections of the amounts expected from these sources in 1970 have been made, based on the assumption that tuition charges will be increased in proportion to the rise in family incomes, that State and local governments—as a minimum—will continue to make as high a tax effort for student higher education as they have in the past, and that other funds for the purpose, both public and private, will be enlarged in amounts consistent with the growth in the national economy and with past trends. If there is no change in the basic structure of financing, the estimated income will provide only about three-fourths of that needed to finance the costs of student higher education for the enrollments expected in 1970. This means that the additional fourth, approximately $2 billion, will have to come from increased effort through existing sources or from new sources. As other groups increase their contributions, it does not seem unreasonable to expect the Federal Government to do the same. Let us look first at the prospects for increasing the contributions from other sources.

Is increased tuition the answer? Increased tuition, offset by scholarship aid, has been a method frequently mentioned for deriving the additional resources needed by higher education. The idea that students pay the full cost of their college education is a dangerously beguiling one, and the possibility that extra tuition be collected from the affluent to supplement scholarship aid for the needy is only a part of the problem. If education is dispensed as a commodity, all the laws of the market must apply, and we shall wind up offering not the kind of education we believe to be valid but the kind that will sell. What, then, is to happen to basic research and other responsibilities of our colleges and universities? And what will happen to the quality of instructional programs?

Mr. President, I recently received a letter from Mr. R. E. Lieuallen, the new chancellor of the Oregon State System of Higher Education. He was formerly president of one of the fine divisions of our State higher education system at Monmouth, Oreg.—Monmouth College. I ask unanimous consent that the entire letter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OREGON STATE SYSTEM OF
HIGHER EDUCATION,
Eugene, Oreg., January 30, 1962.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR WAYNE: Here in Oregon all of us who have the interests of higher education at heart, are following with keen interest your efforts to push through some assistance for the colleges and universities of the United States. We hope that you can duplicate your feat of the last session in steering a higher education bill through to victory in the Senate.

I am sure that you are already well aware of the crisis we are facing here in Oregon because of unanticipated high enrollment and a minimum appropriation. Last fall throughout the State system, we had an overall 15 percent growth in enrollment with a legislative appropriation allowing for only a 6.7 percent increase. Nearly 29,000 students were enrolled in the public colleges here and conservative estimates indicate that 10 years from now, in 1972, this enrollment will approach 50,000.

We estimate our capital construction needs for academic facilities during the next 5 years at $41 million. This figure does not include dormitories, student centers, and other types of buildings which are normally financed by self-liquidating bonds.

Our need of new classroom buildings, library additions, new laboratory and research facilities is already desperate. I do not believe that it will be possible for the State to supply our building and operating needs over the next 2 or 3 years, much less in the decade to come when our enrollment will probably be more than doubled. It seems to me that the future of higher education in Oregon—and in this I include both public and private facilities—is dependent upon assistance from the Federal Government.

Here in Oregon, Federal loans for capital construction will not be of great assistance to us. However, the section of the bill sponsored by Mrs. GREEN permitting outright grants on a matching basis would be extremely helpful.

We are sympathetic to any bill extending Federal aid in the form of scholarships; however, since the State of Oregon underwrites about two-thirds of the cost of every student's tuition, extension of Federal scholarships would create hardships for publicly supported institutions. It is our hope that any scholarship bill would include some relief for the institution, where tuition fees do not cover the cost of instruction.

Because of our vital interest in this and other higher education bills, would you be kind enough to instruct your office to send us two copies of any proposed legislation that would affect us?

We deeply appreciate your long record as the champion of education here in Oregon and throughout the Nation. I know that we do not have to ask your assistance; we can expect it.

With warm personal regards.

Cordially yours,

R. E. LIEUALLEN, *Chancellor.*

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in his letter, Mr. Lieuallen said, in part:

> We are sympathetic to any bill extending Federal aid in the form of scholarships; however, since the State of Oregon underwrites about two-thirds of the cost of every student's tuition, extension of Federal scholarships would create hardships for publicly supported institutions. It is our hope that any scholarship bill would include some relief for the institution, where tuition fees do not cover the cost of instruction.

There are scores of colleges throughout the country in the same situation as the public-supported institutions in Oregon. Their tuition is low. In the bill, we have provided a $350 cost of education allowance which flows to the institution through the conduit of the scholarship recipient in order to meet a part of the cost of the educational institutions.

So I say scholarships are not the full answer. Raising tuition fees is not the total answer. It is necessary to have a composite and combination of all these factors, including low cost interest bearing loans, in order to adopt a sound program; and we think we have done that in this bill. We do not claim we have achieved perfection, but we say the bill is sound in light of the magnitude of the problem and in light of the varying adjustments which have to be made in order to meet the exigencies which arise in the various States.

Let us look at some facts about tuition charges and scholarship aid. Since about 1954, tuition charges both in public and in private institutions have been increasing at a rate faster than that of the cost of living, and scholarship increases have lagged far behind tuition increases.

While the average institutional scholarship grant during the last 4 years increased by $63—from $277 to $340—during the same period the average increase in tuition was $242, or almost four times as great, according to the testimony of Secretary Ribicoff on pages 68–69 of our hearings record on the desk of each Senator. Room and board and other costs of attending college have also increased.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an excerpt, including a table, from the hearings, pages 68 and 69, entitled "Increases in Tuition and Required Fees."

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INCREASES IN TUITION AND REQUIRED FEES

An important consideration in dealing with student financial assistance is the adequacy of scholarship stipends to meet college costs and the trend, which has been sharply accelerated since 1954, toward higher institutional tuition and required fees. A comparison of the average annual charges for tuition and required fees of the colleges and universities between the academic years of 1949–50 and 1959–60 is suggested by the following table:

Average institutional tuition and required fees in 196 representative colleges and universities, 1959–60 to 1960–61

Academic year	Public institutions			Private institutions		
	Amount	Increase		Amount	Increase	
		Amount	Percent		Amount	Percent
1960–61	$207	$95	85	$938	$473	102
1959–60	194	82	75	890	425	91
1958–59	179	67	60	820	365	76
1957–58	168	56	50	741	276	59
1956–57	155	43	38	690	225	48
1955–56	147	35	31	638	173	37
1954–55	135	23	21	590	125	27
1949–50	112			465		

(These figures are for 196 representative institutions for which continuous data are available. These colleges and universities account for approximately 55 percent of the Nation's undergraduate students and a larger proportion of graduate students.)

Although the percentages of increase in the charges for tuition and required fees for the two types of institutions between 1950 and 1961 are not too dissimilar (85 percent in the case of the public institution and 102 percent for the private institution) there are marked differences in the average tuition charge and the amount of the increase of the two groups of institutions. During the 11-year period of the comparison, the public colleges and universities increased their tuition fees by $95 while the corresponding figures for the private institutions was $473.

Of special interest in relation to the adequacy of scholarship awards is the fact that, while the average institutional scholarship grant during the last 4 years increased by $63 (from $277 to $340), during the same period the average increase in tuition fees was $242, or almost four times as great.

It is evident that the end of tuition increases is not yet in sight. In recent months tuition increases for the next academic year have been announced for such well-known institutions as Amherst, Antioch, Beloit, Clark, Colgate, Drexel, Georgetown, Harvard, Lehigh, Middlebury, Occidental, Seton Hall, Stanford, Tulane, Washington and Lee, and Wooster. Among the State universities which likewise have raised their tuition fees are those in Arizona, Florida, Idaho, Massachusetts, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Texas, and West Virginia.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the typical scholarship pays only a relatively small portion of the basic charges for tuition, required fees, and room and board. Therefore, unless a student and his family already have considerable resources to cover the other costs of attending college, a scholarship sufficient to pay his entire tuition can do little to bridge the gap. Furthermore, the fact that more than 40 percent of the scholarship and other student aid funds available are provided by transfer from the general funds of the institutions serves further to increase the tuition and other basic charges to those who can pay for them.

Moreover, even if the United States had nothing to gain from higher education, and even if the individual could be expected to pay the full costs of his education through tuition and other charges, it cannot be assumed that the private economy would lend sufficient money to individuals who need it, since the capital created by education is within the mind—not a separate piece of machinery upon which the lender can foreclose. Even if loans did not create undesirable discrimination among groups of potential borrowers, it should be recognized that an 18-year-old may be least impressed by the long-run returns on educational investment, to himself and to society, and most sensitive to both the educational hinderances and the alternative lures of the private economy.

If the Senate will permit a personal note and reference, I recall very well my mental attitude at the age of 18. I knew that if I were to go on to college, I would have to borrow money. Therefore, I was rapidly losing interest in going to college. I was a typical 18-year-old, somewhat fascinated by the "quick buck." I saw an opportunity to get a job which would at least give me a pay check every Saturday night.

However, I had a wonderful biology teacher in high school, to whom I shall ever be grateful, and who, as I have said to her many times, is responsible for the fact that I went to college. I have said to her, "You should not be blamed for any of the things that I have done in public life with which people may disagree, but you will have to assume, really, the full responsibility for the fact that I ended up in public life, because I am sure it is true that had I not gone on to college I never would have entered public life."

She worked on me, as the saying is, and pointed out how important she thought it was that I go to college. When I said, "I do not have the money," she said, "I will lend it to you."

That wonderful woman—she is still alive; for many years she has been retired from high school teaching—took out an insurance policy on my life; and on the basis of that insurance policy, as security, she loaned me the money which made it possible for me to go to college.

Mr. President, I recognize that there are many examples of that sort. But the point I wish to make is that we shall not meet the higher education needs of the United States if we assume that there will be enough men and women who will provide that sort of philanthropic stimulation and devotion which will save many of our young people from foregoing the opportunity to obtain a college education.

Today I stand on the floor of the Senate as a recipient of such generosity; but I say that I do not think such a happenstance or such an operation of the law of chance should be the determining factor in connection with the decision as to whether a young man or a young woman who lacks the financial resources required for college attendance shall have the advantage of college training.

I say the Federal Government has a responsibility to cooperate with the States and the institutions of higher education, by bearing part of the investment burden in order to make it possible for such young people to go to college, following which they will repay the Federal Government, through the increase in their earning capacity, many times the cost of their college education. Mr. President, that point of view is basic to the philosophy of this bill.

I wish to say that by a vote of 13 to 2 the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has voted to have this bill reported to the floor of the Senate; and the philosophy of the bill is in accordance with the statement I have just made—namely, a recognition that the Federal Government has a share of the responsibility for helping finance the cost of higher education in the United States, so that young people who wish to obtain college education, and who have the intellectual ability it requires, will not have it denied to them.

There are three main sources of undergraduate scholarship assistance in the Nation today: First, from funds controlled directly by the colleges and universities; second, from State scholarship programs; and, third, from scholarships sponsored by foundations, corporations, and other agencies not directly connected with colleges and universities.

I. COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY AWARDS

Mr. President, we hear much about college and university awards. Let us consider the facts in that connection:

For the college year 1959-60, 1,677 colleges and universities granted $98,157,544 in undergraduate scholarships to 287,589 students. This was an increase of 52 percent over the $65,738,000 granted to 237,000 students in 1955-56, 4 years earlier.

The average award per student increased from $278 in 1955-56 to $350 in 1959-60. In the same 4-year period, the average cost of attending college has increased from $1,350 a year to nearly $1,700. For both years in which this survey was conducted, the 50 institutions granting the largest amounts of money controlled 34.3 percent of all institutional awards in 1955-56, and 34.4 percent of all institutional awards in 1959-60. In other words, approximately 3 percent of the colleges in the Nation grant more than one-third of all institutional scholarships.

So, Mr. President, do college and university scholarship awards provide the answer? Certainly the statistics I have presented constitute a complete rebuttal of the argument made by those who claim that college and university scholarship awards do provide the answer—for I repeat that approximately 3 percent of the colleges in the Nation grant more than one-third of all institutional scholarships.

II. STATE SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAMS

As of 1961-62, 16 States maintain State scholarship programs which provide awards in varying amounts for undergraduate students. Approximately $23,200,000 has been granted for the current year to 57,000 students in these States. The average award per student is only $400.

It must be strongly emphasized that of the total referred to, the vast majority of awards are concentrated in only four States, as follows:

California	[1] 3,200	$1,900,000
Illinois	4,000	2,400,000
New Jersey	6,156	2,500,000
New York	38,911	14,900,000
Total	52,267	21,700,000

[1] Awards.

Thus, Mr. President, we see 92 percent of the awards and 94 percent of the available funds for these scholarships are found in 4 of the 50 States.

By way of summary, Mr. President, let me ask again whether scholarship awards are the entire answer. The answer is "No." They are of assistance; but they do not offer an effective solution in accordance with the magnitude of the great problem of providing higher education opportunities to all young people in this country who wish to have those opportunities and who also have the intellectual ability required in order to take advantage of them.

III. CORPORATION AWARDS

Mr. President, what about corporation awards? In the committee, we found that some of the witnesses, particularly those who were not particularly enthusiastic about having the Federal Government provide the necessary help, referred to the funds contributed by corporations, foundations, and business organizations. However, I wish to state that such contributions do not provide a solution of the problem.

It is quite difficult to establish a definitive figure for the total amount of money contributed by corporations, foundations, and business organizations.

In the four volumes of "Scholarships, Fellowships and Loans," the author lists 19,000 undergraduate awards annually, totaling $11.4 million. Other estimates supplied by agencies which provide services to many scholarship sponsors, place the total estimate for the Nation at approximately $20 million. The latter figure includes a fairly generous estimate for many small local or community awards which are never listed nationally. In these corporate programs the average award is approximately $600 per students, per year.

Summary for 1961–62:

For the current year, total undergraduate scholarship assistance may be best summarized as follows:

	Funds	Number of awards
Institutional scholarships	$110,000,000	287,589
State scholarship programs	23,200,000	57,000
Corporation, foundation awards	11,400,000	19,000
Total	144,600,000	363,589

Mr. President, it should be noted that many students, especially those with extensive need, receive scholarship assistance from more than a single source, so that the actual number of students assisted is closer to 330,000 than 363,000.

In contrast, including all three sources for 1955–56, the total amount of scholarship assistance was at the level of approximately $80 million for 270,000 students.

From 1955 to 1961, a 7-year period, college enrollments increased 43 percent; yet the number of students receiving assistance increased only 29 percent.

Similarly the cost of attending college increased, from 1955 to 1961, by 30 percent; yet the average scholarship award increased by slightly more than 25 percent—$299 in 1955 to $400 in 1961.

With the average cost of attending college above $1,650 per year in 1961–62, the 1 out of 11 students with scholarship assistance must still meet a bill of $1,300 for the cost of each year's education. Average family income for 1960 approached $5,700, a level far too low to provide more than a portion of this unmet bill for those students who do hold scholarships.

What I wish to stress again, Mr. President, is that scholarships are not the total answer. The scholarships for the most part are small in amount to the individual student. They do not begin to pay the cost of his yearly expenses. Many people would be surprised by what we have learned in regard to the number of scholarships which have been turned down by students because they did not have enough other money to go with the scholarship in order to make it possible for them to accept the scholarship. Thereby the country has lost many a precious resource, the maximum development of a brilliant mind which would have been developed if it had been possible to make available the amount of money needed to enable the student to go on to college.

After all, I think personal experience puts one in the best position to be a witness on these things. How well I know. I received a scholarship of $1,800 to go to Columbia 1 year. I took it, but that $1,800 did not begin to pay the cost of that year in Columbia, and I had to borrow the additional money to make up the difference.

There are many who are not in a position to follow the course of action I followed. They cannot accept a scholarship, because they do not have available to them either resources of their own or easy loans so that they can go into debt, to pay off the debt at a later time.

Mr. President, there has arisen so frequently in our hearings talk to the effect that "We ought to lend the money to the students." I say we must not forget that when students get an education it is also in part an enriching service to the country. The country is the beneficiary of the intellectual enrichment of any graduate of college.

It is easy for us to look upon education as only a matter of benefit to the individual concerned. What we need to do is to raise our sights and see the direct relationship to the enrichment of the country which flows from increasing the number of students for whom we make available a college education. Those enriched minds create an increased wealth in our country. It is very difficult, because it deals somewhat with an abstraction, for many people to see the importance of the type of an investment in brainpower that I am talking about this afternoon.

As I have said many times, and as I shall continue to say, because the American people must understand it, we cannot keep ahead of the Communist segment of the world in manpower, but we must keep ahead of it in brainpower. I make a plea this afternoon for an educational program which will strengthen one of the greatest defense weapons we have, the intellectual potential of the American people.

I close this segment of my speech by saying that scholarships are not the entire answer. They are only a part of the answer. Of course I think there should be more of them. Of course I think the amounts should be increased. Of course I urge corporations and businesses to make more contributions to colleges for scholarships. Of course I support an increase for the scholarship program. There is no question about my support for a Federal scholarship program. We have it in the bill. But we will not solve the higher educational needs of this country through a scholarship program. It will make an important contribution, but only a contribution.

TITLE I DISCUSSION

Mr. President, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare during the course of his testimony, reproduced on pages 41 through 57 of the printed hearings record, has presented in comprehensive detail the need for the provisions of title I of the bill before us. I ask unanimous consent that this portion of his testimony be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSTRUCTION OF ACADEMIC FACILITIES

Title I of S. 1241 would aid colleges and universities directly.

The facts that support the need for prompt assistance to colleges and universities for the construction of physical facilities can be identified very specifically and briefly.

First, the Nation's colleges and universities must spend, between now and 1966, at least $8.6 billion for physical facilities, in order to accommodate increased enrollments and to provide adequate facilities for the numbers of students they now have.

Second, projections of anticipated resources for investment in physical plant by these institutions, taking into account every source of income now anticipated for this purpose, indicate that resources will fall short of facilities needs to the extent of $2.9 billion by 1965, $3.5 billion by 1966, and $5.2 billion by 1970.

It is conservatively estimated that enrollments in higher education will increase from 3,610,000 in the fall of 1960 to 6,006,000 in the fall of 1970. The accommodation of this increase of 2.4 million will cost the Nation's colleges and universities some $15.4 billion for added facilities. In addition, they must remedy present deficiencies.

The plants of our institutions are already strained to capacity. In many of them, three or four students are occupying dormitory rooms designed for two. Approximately 11 percent of the Nation's higher education physical plant is now obsolete and in urgent need of replacement, at a cost of $1 billion. Replacement and renovation costs through the next decade will add another $1 billion.

Many institutions are still using buildings donated by the Federal Government for temporary use after World War II. It is estimated that these constitute about 10 percent of all buildings currently in use on college and university campuses. The point has been reached at which the use of these buildings cannot be continued without mounting danger of serious safety hazards.

But hazards to the physical well-being of the students represent only one element of danger. A far greater danger is the eroding of quality in higher education that comes about when institutions are overcrowded, overloaded, and subjected to costs beyond their ability to find resources. This erosion of quality has already begun, and it will continue unchecked in the decade ahead unless action is taken promptly to avert it.

The problem of accommodating these students is not simply one of providing more chairs and more teachers in more classrooms, or of placing more beds in more dormitory rooms. Higher education grows higher as society's requirements become greater; it probes further into man's capacity for specialized skills and develops more advanced competencies than were required in earlier decades.

The Office of Education has compiled a considerable amount of data that support and amplify the conclusions cited. I would like your permission to insert in the record at the conclusion of my remarks a memorandum on "Physical Facilities Needs of American Higher Education, 1961–70."

Senator **MORSE.** Without objection, so ordered.

(The document referred to follows:)

"PHYSICAL FACILITIES NEEDS OF AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION, 1961–70

"Higher education physical facilities

"The National Objective

"To provide adequate physical facilities for the accommodation of every student properly admissible to our colleges, universities, and professional schools in the next decade. This includes all instructional, research, residential, and auxiliary facilities requisite to each institution's performance of its full function.

"The achievement of this objective will require major efforts as follows:

"1. An increase in residential and service facilities sufficient to accommodate expanded enrollments of both single and married students who live on campus.

"2. An increase in instructional facilities—classrooms, laboratories, libraries, and equipment—quantitatively sufficient for the needs of expanded enrollments and qualitatively sufficient for the ever-changing requirements of an advancing culture.

"3. Rehabilitation, renovation, and new construction to wipe out the accumulated backlog of wornout, outmoded, and unsuitable facilities now in use.

"4. Expansion of research and graduate instructional facilities and equipment, in keeping with both the growing needs of the Nation for research and for highly trained manpower, and the mounting potential of undergraduate enrollments from which graduate students and research personnel in increased numbers will be drawn.

"I. Factors affecting facilities requirements for higher education

"The Increasing Student Load

"Facilities needs, like staff needs, are related specifically to enrollments, though in neither case is the relationship a direct proportion. Shifts in the proportions of resident and commuting students, of married and single students, and of graduate and undergraduate students will affect facilities needs, as will also modifications in institutional calendars, scheduling, and utilization of space. It has been pointed out that between 1959 and 1970 enrollments in higher education can be expected to increase by about 2 million full-time students. Some idea of the attendant facilities requirements may be gained by multiplying this increase by an estimated average capital investment per (additional) student; say, $6,500.[1] The resulting total, $13 billion, represents a very rough approximation of the cost of expansion dictated solely by increased enrollments, without reference to replacement and renovation costs, or to the cost of special facilities and equipment needed for instruction or research, all of which might easily add another $6 billion. More refined methods will be used to estimate this cost more accurately and to determine the additional facilities costs which should be included.

"Specialized Equipment and Space Requirements

"The need to accommodate increasing numbers of students accounts for only a part of the upsurge in physical facilities requirements. The provision of special kinds of space and equipment appropriate to particular instructional functions represents a growing burden on the colleges and universities, many of which will need to replace makeshift arrangements they have had to use even in some areas of graduate instruction and research. Proper facilities for graduate level programs, it should be noted, are generally more costly than for undergraduate.

"New developments in both subject matter and methods of teaching are continuously generating new needs for physical facilities. The increasing emphasis on foreign language study, for example, will require the construction of language laboratories for the application of new learning techniques. Particularly expensive space and equipment are required in the physical sciences, where knowledge of established subjects is expanding rapidly, and where whole new fields of study are evolving. The purchase and installation of a nuclear reactor today represents an investment of funds greater than would have been spent for a whole scientific establishment a half century ago.

"Much attention is being focused also on new media of instruction and on new techniques in the use of special media, such as television and audiovisual devices. While these developments hold some hope for savings in instructional costs, a point we shall discuss later, we must consider also the requirements that such use could generate for specially constructed facilities.

"Medical and dental training facilities are currently being utilized to capacity, but the number of physicians and dentists graduating yearly is not sufficient to maintain current standards of service to our increasing population. To maintain a satisfactory population-physician ratio of 757 to 1, the output of physicians would have to expand to 9,600 in 1970, or 2,100 over the 1960 output. It has been estimated[2] that between 14 and 20 new medical schools will have to be built if the existing population-physician ratio is to be upheld. The financial cost involved here is great since the construction of a medical school requires a capital investment of between $10 and $20 million, depending on whether a teaching hospital is already available or must be included in the investment. The factor of urgency also enters into the consideration inasmuch as there is a lag of 10 years between the planning of a school and the production of the school's first graduating class.

"Contributing further to the need for medical training facilities is the need for dental schools. According to projections of trends in the supply, the number of dentists in practice in 1975 will total only 96,000, which is about 15,000 fewer than will be needed to assure that dentists will be as widely available as now. To forestall such a shortage will require by 1970 facilities capable of graduating 6,180 dentists annually. This is about 2,700 more per year than are now in prospect, and will require a 75-percent increase in training capacity.[3]

"The preparation of many professional and semiprofessional technicians also require specific kinds of facilities, other than those we have already mentioned in connection with the advanced training of scientists, engineers, physicians, and dentists.

"Colleges and universities have increased their organized research activities tremendously since the end of World War II. Approximately 20 percent of total education and general expenditures in 1957–58 went toward the support of organized research. This is twice the percent so expended in 1945–46.[4] Although the major portion of these expenditures is underwritten by foundations, industry, and the Federal Government, the main burden of providing physical facilities needed to carry on research normally falls on the institutions themselves. Since organized research activities are expected to continue to increase, colleges and universities will have to devote a significant portion of their funds to equip, construct, and rehabilitate the facilities in which college and university researchers carry on their work.

"Still other factors will influence requirements. More and more institutions are catering to a year-round student enrollment and will have to make additional capital outlays to counteract the more rapid deterioration of buildings and to provide a more satisfactory environment for summer work (e.g., air conditioning), even as they thereby accommodate more students. There is also a need for married student housing and associated auxiliary facilities such as nursery schools, university laboratory schools, health centers, and dining areas.

"Special Factors Relating to Residential Requirements

"The growing number of married students on college campuses in recent years has caused institutions to make increased investments in residential facilities for married students. A study by the Association of College and University Housing Officers shows that nearly two out of five institutions responding to their questionnaire have assumed responsibility for married students by constructing at least some of the necessary facilities.

"There is ample evidence that colleges and universities consider the accommodation of married students a permanent responsibility. The Office of Education's physical facilities survey reveals that 4.6 percent of college and university expenditures for construction of housing during 1951–55 was for married students. Institutions estimated that during 1956–70, 9.7 percent of the expenditure for housing would be for married students. Since about 2½ times as much residence space is required for a married student as for a single student, and since increasing numbers of married students are attending colleges and universities, proportionate increases in housing expenditures are unavoidable. A factor that further complicates the task of financing residential facilities is the increase in the proportion of women students in our colleges and universities, since dormitories for women are more expensive to construct than those for men.

"Urban universities are faced with the responsibility of providing additional housing for their expanding students bodies, as they increasingly attract undergraduate and graduate students from outside their immediate areas.

"Additional residential facilities will be needed by junior colleges, many of which have experienced increased enrollments. As of this date, about 240 of 276 private junior colleges provide some residential facilities for their students, as do also a few of the 391 public junior colleges. States where junior colleges abound, such as California and Texas, estimate that an increasing number of their public junior colleges will need to operate student dormitories. Other States that either are planning or will have to plan dormitories for their public junior colleges are Colorado, Mississippi, and North Dakota.

"One decided economic advantage of the community junior college, its proximity to the students' homes, has tended to limit the need for dormitories and other physical facilities in the public junior colleges. Whether the number of junior colleges will continue to increase as rapidly as it has since World War II is not known. However, increase in the number of these institutions will continue to receive prime consideration by States as one method of alleviating the crowded conditions in existing colleges and universities. Students who complete the training available at the community junior college will either terminate their formal education at that point or transfer to a 4-year college or university. Transfer students will then strain the instructional and residential facilities of 4-year colleges.

---

[1] This is a rough estimate derived from the six-State study mentioned on p. 33.

[2] Final report of the Secretary's consultants on medical research and education, "The Advancement of Medical Research and Education," U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C., June 1958.

[3] Bane, Frank, "Physicians for a Growing America," October 1959, p. 67. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Public Health Service.

[4] Comparison developed from data in the "Biennial Survey of Education in the United States," ch. IV, "Statistics of Higher Education," published edition of 1944–46 and advance data to be published in edition of 1956–58, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education.

"Although junior colleges offer some opportunity for saving in total plant investment in dormitories, a rapid rate of increase in the number of junior colleges will nonetheless require substantial additional investments in instructional and general facilities.

"II. Magnitude of facilities requirements, 1960–70

"Review of Related Studies

"Several research studies conducted at national and State levels furnish important clues to the magnitude of the investment that must be made in the Nation's higher education facilities in the years immediately ahead.

"A study made by Long & Black[5] projected 1957–58 enrollments to 1970 and, on the basis of this projection, estimated the additional physical plant facilities that would be required to accommodate the anticipated enrollments. The estimated enrollment increases over the 3,027,029 figure of 1957–58 ranged from a low of 2,017,000 to a high of 2,851,000.

"In addition to estimating the needs for expansion of facilities for the period 1957–70, Long & Black considered the cost of replacement of existing substandard facilities. Using a replacement rate of 2 percent per year, they estimated replacement of other-than-residential facilities to cost $240 million per year and the replacement of residential facilities $80 million per year. Adding the cost of replacement between 1957 and 1970 ($4.32 billion for other-than-residential and $1.38 billion for residential) to the cost of facilities expansion, they estimated the total amount of funds needed for physical facilities at $12.19 billion to $15.26 billion, exclusive of the cost of additional land, equipment, and campus improvement.

"A study published by the Council for Financial Aid to Education in 1959[6] surveyed the plant needs of 885 leading colleges and universities during the 1957–67 decade. The estimated cost of buildings, equipment, and improvements for the 820 institutions that responded was $6.04 billion. With this figure as a base, it was estimated that the total cost of construction, equipment, and improvements for all higher education institutions during these 10 years would be $11.5 billion, or approximately $3,834 per student increase in enrollment, exclusive of the costs of acquisition and improvement of sites and of deterioration of buildings.

"In the second of its five reports of studies[7] dealing with higher education physical facilities, the Office of Education included a chapter on projections of buildings needed through 1970. On the basis of assumptions pertaining to 1970 enrollments, additional instructional and residential needs, construction costs, needed replacement of buildings, rehabilitation of buildings, and normal plant replacement, this report estimated that for 1956–70 the cost of new construction needed to accommodate 2,823,000 additional students by 1970 would be $12.36 billion, or over $824 million per year for the 15-year period. Of the $12.36 billion needed for new construction, it was estimated that approximately $7.06 billion would be needed for instructional, research, general, and auxiliary facilities, and $5.30 billion for residential facilities.

"Another Office of Education statistical study[8] indicates that 15 percent of the college facilities first occupied between 1940 and 1957 are unsatisfactory and should be razed. This heavy rate of obsolescence is due largely to the acquisition by colleges of temporary buildings under the Government's surplus disposal program immediately following World War II. Make-do measures during the money shortages of the depression and the materials shortages of the war period have produced a backlog of deferred replacements which cannot be indefinitely prolonged. The same study indicates that 12 percent of the buildings occupied before 1901 and still in use in 1957 should be razed, that 17 percent of those occupied between 1901–20 should be replaced, and that 5 percent of those occupied between 1921–40 are obsolescent. If this requirement for replacement, rehabilitation, and depreciation is projected into the predictable future, a computation based upon probable needs during the period 1958–70 places the estimated cost of such measures at $4,782,650,000, or about $400 million per year. Of the $4.78 billion, $1.40 billion would be required for replacement, $505 million for rehabilitation, and $2.87 billion for depreciation.

"In this study it was assumed that colleges and universities were constructing both instructional and residential facilities to accommodate the additional students during the 1956–58 period, but that replacement, rehabilitation, and depreciation would continue to be deferred and that these factors would need to be cared for during the remaining 12-year period, 1958–70. Therefore, the needed construction for accommodating additional students, estimated to cost $12.36 billion, was averaged over 15 years, at $824 million per year. The cost of replacement, rehabilitation, and depreciation, estimated at $4.78 billion, was averaged over 12 years, at $399 million per year. For the 12 years, 1958–70, the average for buildings alone was determined to be in excess of $1.22 billion annually.

"The report of the American Council on Education included summary data of research studies made by 15 States. A compilation of the data of six States (Florida, Indiana, Louisiana, Mississippi, New Mexico, and Tennessee) that had comparable data in each of the categories was made to obtain an estimate of what the cost per additional student would be to meet the needs by 1970 for residential and other-than-residential needs. For these six States, it was found that average per student need in other-than-residential facilities would average $1,938 and that the average residential facilities cost per full-time student housed would average $4,635. It is estimated that one out of every three additional students would require housing.

"The estimates reached in the studies mentioned naturally differ. They constitute conclusive evidence, however, that the per-student investment in additional facilities required between now and 1970 is great indeed.

"Basic Assumptions of This Report

"To determine the cost of needed facilities for any target date in the future is a complex problem in statistical forecasting. The latest comprehensive data on facilities are now 4 years old. The rate of planned construction of new facilities has certainly been modified by the constant forces of obsolescence and depreciation. A further complication is the fact that we must project into the indefinite future a rational balance among the types of facilities to be provided: new classrooms and laboratories, new residence halls, administrative office space, auditoriums, libraries, gymnasiums, hospitals, student unions, and other auxiliary facilities. The proportions in which investment must be divided among these, as well as the total amount required, are dependent upon a wide variety of factors.

"Data are reliably established on two important factors to be considered in estimating future building requirements: college-age population and the condition of buildings now in use. The trend in the proportion of college-age population actually in college, while it cannot be forecast with certainty, is reasonably well established, and has already been applied in part 1 of this paper. Other factors needed for making physical facilities cost estimates, such as space per student and cost per construction unit, can be established from data available on State, regional, or national levels. It is difficult, however, to assess to what extent better utilization of existing campuses will affect the total estimated cost, or to what extent the college population of the future will have to be housed. These and many other factors can be used in projecting facilities costs only through arbitrary assumptions based upon the record of the past and one's best judgment as to the future.

"The following assumptions have been made in projecting, for the decade ahead, the total cost of necessary expansion and improvement of the facilities of the Nation's institutions of higher education:

"1. Student enrollments

"(a) That the percentage of full-time students in the total enrollment will continue to be 75 percent, the same percentage that existed in 1958.

"(b) That the 1959–60 full-time enrollment of 2,551,723 will increase to 4,504,500 full-time students by 1970–71, an increase of 1,952,777 full-time students, and that part-time enrollment will increase from 850,574 in 1959–60 to 1,501,500 by 1970–71.

"2. Condition of plant

"(a) That because of obsolescence and substandard conditions, 12.3 percent of the instructional buildings and 10.5 percent of residential buildings need to be replaced. The gross area of instructional buildings at present is 408,275,680 square feet, of which 12.3 percent needs replacing. This amounts to an estimated need of 50,217,909 square feet. The gross area of residential buildings is 229,925,000 square feet, of which 24,142,125 square feet needs replacing (229,925,000×0.105). The total area which needs replacing amounts to 74,360,034 square feet.

"(b) That, in addition to the obsolete and substandard buildings mentioned above, 9.8 percent of instructional and related buildings (408,275,680×0.098) and 9.1 percent of residential buildings (229,925,000×0.091) are presently in rundown condition and functionally obsolete. These need to be returned to satisfactory condition as soon as possible. The number of additional square feet required for instructional and related buildings will amount to 40,011,017; the number for residential, 20,923,175.

---

[5] Long, John D., and Black J. B., "Needed Expansion of Facilities for Higher Education, 1958–70. How Much Will It Cost?" The American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., 1958.

[6] "Nearing the Breakthrough." Council for Financial Aid to Education, New York, N.Y., June 1959.

[7] Bokelman, W. Robert, and Rork, John B., "College and University Facilities Survey, Part 2: Planning for College and University Physical Plant Expansion, 1956–70." U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Washington, D.C., April 1960.

[8] D'Amico, Louis A., and Higgins, E. Eugene, "College and University Facilities Survey. Part 3: Inventory of College and University Physical Facilities, Dec. 31, 1957 (A Preliminary Report)." U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Washington, D.C.

"3. Instructional facilities requirements

"(a) That a more efficient utilization of all existing instructional facilities, including those which are presently not being used, will provide accommodations for 200,000 full-time students. (This is considered a reasonable inference from the unoccupied space data presented in the 'College and Universities Facilities Survey,' pt. 2, p. 3.) This means that instead of planning to provide instructional facilities for 1,952,777 additional full-time students by 1970, it will be necessary to provide for only an additional 1,752,777 (1,952,777−200,000).

"(b) That each additional full-time student will require an average of 160 square feet of space for instructional and related purposes. (This figure is based on the calculation of 125 square feet per student developed in the facilities survey, pt. 2, and is derived by adjusting for inclusion of full-time students only.)

"4. Residential facilities requirements

"(a) That any present excess capacity in residential facilities in colleges and universities throughout the country is more than balanced by the serious overcrowding in many other institutions—an inference based on data from page 4 of the facilities survey, part 2.

"(b) That institutions will continue to provide housing for one-third of the full-time students. This fraction was derived by analysis and extrapolation of residential-enrollment data also in the facilities survey. One-third of 1,952,777 (the number of anticipated full-time students by 1970) is 650,926.

"(c) That 90 percent of the full-time students will be single. Dormitory accommodations, therefore, will have to be made for 585,833 single students (90 percent of 650,926).

"(d) That 10 percent of the additional students furnished institutional-owned housing will be married, as our earlier discussion indicated. (The pertinent data are from pt. 2 of the facilities survey (table 33).) Accordingly, it is estimated that living accommodations will be necessary for 65,093 married students.

"(e) That each additional single student housed in institutional-owned dormitories will require 237 gross square feet of space; each student family, 572 gross square feet (amounts also derived from the facilities survey, table 4). Therefore, 138,842,421 square feet will be required for single students (585,933×237) and 37,233,196 square feet for married students (65,093×572). This amounts to a total requirement of 176,075,617 square feet.

"5. Construction and related costs

"(a) That construction costs of buildings will remain at the current level, an average of approximately $20 per square foot for all types of buildings (facilities survey, table P). Although construction costs have increased 43 percent during the past 10 years, 1959 cost figures have been used for the projections of this paper. Other capital costs, including land, equipment and furniture, and campus improvements will cost 50 percent of building construction costs, making a total capital expenditure of $30 per square foot. The 280,444,320 square feet additional space required by 1970 for instructional facilities will cost $8,413,329,600, and the 176,075,617 square feet required for residential facilities will cost $5,282,268,510.

"(b) That the cost per square foot for replacement of obsolescent and substandard buildings, instructional and residential, will be $20. The cost for replacing 74,360,034 square feet will amount to $1,486,642,430.

"(c) That the cost of returning buildings to satisfactory condition averages 50 percent of the construction cost of new buildings (i.e., $10 per square foot). The cost of rehabilitating 60,934,192 square feet will amount to $609,341,920.

"6. Additional total cost (special categories)

(a) That identifiable needs for specialized research-related facilities in medicine, dentistry, agriculture, engineering, and other sciences—over and above the growth assumed for increased enrollments—will require capital outlays in excess of $3 billion. This figure is based on a combination of the estimates of several other agencies concerned with these respective fields.[9]

"Factors which may alter the projections

"Many unmeasurable influences may turn out to have a marked effect upon the projections resulting from the assumptions stated. Some of these are as follows:

"1. Factors that may reduce facilities needs:

"More effective space utilization, through changes in scheduling patterns, summer usage, weekend usage.

"Development of more economical building materials.

"Development of more economical construction techniques.

"Advances in building design.

"Interinstitutional sharing of facilities.

"Increased use of new instructional media such as television and new instructional methods.

"2. Factors that may increase facilities needs and costs:

"Inflation, as reflected in increased costs.

"Additional functions assumed by higher education; e.g., adult education.

"Emergence of new areas of study and research.

"Accommodation of increased numbers of foreign students.

"In considering the possible effects of any of the foregoing innovations in reducing the need for facilities, account must be taken of the delays in communication, the lag in the adoption of new approaches, inevitably associated with human limitations, and the length of the time responsible officials will need to give careful considerations to questions of change. They cannot, without abdicating their responsibilities, substitute entirely the experience of others for their own, in matters of capital outlay. Most of these factors, therefore, which now appear as rays of hope on the horizon, are likely to become influential only in the later stages of the projections in question. Factors which may increase facility needs are likewise considered intangible and can be applied only to the longer range projection. Accordingly, projections have been made for 1965 and 1970.

"Estimate of Physical Facilities Costs, 1960 Through 1970

"The total cost figure (in terms of current cost levels) resulting from the application of the assumption stated is approximately $18.9 billion by 1970. The following summary shows the cost of physical facilities required for additional students, replacements, and rehabilitation.

"Summary of estimated physical facilities costs, 1960 through 1970

Instructional	$12,900,797,950
Additional students	8,413,329,600
Graduate and professional school facilities	3,083,000,000
Medical and dental	1,143,000,000
Research	1,940,000,000
Replacements	1,004,358,180
Rehabilitation	400,110,170
Residential	5,973,784,510
Additional students	5,282,268,510
Replacements	482,284,250
Rehabilitation	209,231,750
Total	18,874,582,460

"Cost of Buildings Needed for Additional Students

"The estimates in the above summary are based on the following computations:

"Instructional

Additional full-time students	1,952,777
Less present additional capacity	−200,000
Net additional students requiring physical facilities	1,752,777
Times square feet per student	160
Total square feet	280,444,320
Cost per square foot	×$30
Total cost	$8,413,329,600

"Residential

	Married	Single
Additional students	65,093	585,833
Area per student (square feet)	×572	×237
Area needed (square feet)	37,233,196	138,842,421
Cost per square foot	×$30	×$30
Total cost	$1,116,995,880	$4,165,272,630

"Cost of buildings needing to be replaced

	Instructional	Residential
Gross area in square feet	408,275,680	229,925,000
Percentage in need of replacement	×0.123	×0.125
Area needing to be replaced	50,217,909	24,142,125
Cost per square foot	×$20	×$20
Total cost	$1,004,358,180	$482,284,250

"Cost of buildings needing rehabilitation

	Instructional	Residential
Gross area in square feet	408,275,680	229,925,000
Percentage in need of rehabilitation	×0.098	×0.091
Area needing rehabilitation	40,011,017	20,923,175
Cost per square foot	×$10	×$10
Total cost	$400,110,170	$209,231,750

---

[9] Figures developed from National Science Foundation, "Federal Financial Support of Physical Facilities and Major Equipment for the Conduct of Scientific Research," June 1957; "The Advancement of Medical Research and Education" (footnote 2); and data provided by executive secretary, Association of Land-Grant Colleges.

"III. *Sources of facilities financing—past and future*

"Expenditures for Higher Education Facilities in the Past

"Expenditures for capital additions by colleges and universities increased rather steadily from 1949 through 1958, except for a slight dip (1952–53) caused by a curtailment of building supplies in the Korean war period. Capital expenditures estimated for 1959 indicate a tapering off from the rate of maximum construction which prevailed in the 3-year period, 1956–58.

"In order to provide meaningful comparisons, the 9-year period, 1950–58, of this 11-year period, 1949–59, has been separated into three equal parts to show the sharply increased burden assumed by the colleges and universities in recent years for the provision of physical facilities. Capital expenditures were as follows:

"Years	Total capital		Buildings only	
	Total	Annual average	Total	Annual average
1949	$416,831,000	$416,831,000	$313,400,000	$313,400,000
1950–52	1,278,836,000	426,279,000	961,531,000	320,500,000
1953–55	1,718,039,000	572,680,000	1,291,759,000	430,600,000
1956–58	3,165,975,000	1,055,325,000	2,380,432,000	793,000,000
1959 (estimate)	931,000,000	931,000,000	700,000,000	700,000,000
Total or average	7,510,681,000	682;789,000	5,647,122,000	513,375,000

"More than $7.5 billion was spent by colleges and universities for capital additions during the 11 years, 1949–59, at an annual average rate slightly less than $683 million. More was spent during the 3-year period, 1956–58, than in the preceding 6-year period, 1950–55. Expenditures during these 11 years for buildings only were slightly in excess of $5.6 billion.

"Over a period of time prior to 1949, colleges and universities spent an average of 75 percent of total capital costs for the construction of buildings and an average of 25 percent for other capital additions such as furniture and equipment, land, landscaping, and campus improvements (utility extensions, walks, roads, and parking areas). For the 11-year period, 1949–59, these other capital items amounted to about 33 percent of the cost of buildings. It is believed that the upward trend in these costs will continue and, as noted in the assumptions, will approximate 50 percent of the total cost of future construction.

"Sources of Financing Used in the Past

"Probably no other social institution receives funds from so large a variety of sources as does higher education. The construction of residential buildings during the 9-year period, 1951–59, of this 11-year period and the construction of auxiliary buildings during the 4-year period, 1956–59, was significantly enhanced by the college housing loan program. Up to December 31, 1959, 954 loans totaling about $936 million had been approved for residential and auxiliary facilities; bonds awarded to the Federal Government as of that date totaled $730,111,000. Since 1957 about $1 out of every $4 expended by colleges and universities for the construction of buildings has been obtained from the Federal Government under the college housing loan program.

"The portion of the Office of Education's college and university facilities survey that dealt with sources of funds for the construction of buildings during 1951–55 showed that governmental appropriations provided the principle source of funds for the construction of instructional, research, and general buildings. The primary source for residential and auxiliary facilities was revenue bonds. In both instances, gifts and grants were the principal secondary source. Although sources of funds for capital additions, other than buildings, were not gathered in obtaining the data, it is assumed that the principal sources would be governmental appropriations of the revenue bonds, depending on whether the funds were to be used for instructional or residential purposes, and that gifts and grants would be the primary secondary source. Funds obtained from the Housing and Home Finance Agency under the provisions of the college housing loan program were not available for other capital purposes.

"Additional data gathered by the Office of Education for its study, "Higher Education Planning and Management Data, 1958–59," indicate changes in the proportion of funds obtained from various sources for the construction of buildings between the period 1951–55 and the academic year 1958–59. Table 1 indicates the trend toward reliance upon the college housing loan program for capital funds for the construction of residential and auxiliary facilities and a trend toward miscellaneous sources and direct tax levies for instructional, research, and general building funds. Of particular significance in table 1 is the percentage decrease, from the period 1951–55 to 1958–59, in the use of current funds for construction purposes.

"TABLE 1.—*Sources of funds used to finance capital facilities for the period 1951–55 and the year 1958–59*

"[Dollar amounts are in thousands]

"Sources	Combined total		Instructional, research, and general				Residential and auxiliary			
	1951–55 average	1958–59	1951–55 average		1958–59		1951–55 average		1958–59	
			Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
Total	$395,249	$1,050,000	$259,778	100.0	$586,950	100.0	$135,471	100.0	$463,050	100.0
Governmental appropriations and direct tax levies	141,661	329,840	123,914	47.7	278,801	47.5	17,747	13.1	51,039	11.0
Bonds:										
State and local obligation	22,080	76,957	18,964	7.3	40,500	6.9	3,116	2.3	36,457	7.9
Institutional obligation	5,240	13,265	4,156	1.6	8,217	1.4	1,084	.8	5,048	1.1
Revenue, non-Housing and Home Finance Agency	49,303	67,982	6,494	2.5	15,261	2.6	42,800	31.6	52,721	11.4
Revenue, Housing and Home Finance Agency	18,153	200,364			326	.1	18,153	13.4	200,038	43.2
Gifts and grants	94,421	186,533	66,243	25.5	146,150	24.9	28,178	20.8	40,383	8.7
Current	28,333	38,567	18,444	7.1	22,304	3.8	9,889	7.3	16,263	3.5
Other	36,058	136,491	21,563	8.3	75,390	12.8	14,495	10.7	61,101	13.2

"Expenditures and Sources of Funds for the Future

"To meet the projected physical plant expansion needs described on pages 38–39 will require greatly increased effort on the part of the American people. If only the present rate of expenditure were maintained throughout the decade, a deficiency of great proportions would develop. As shown in table 1, however, there is encouraging evidence that certain sources of support are growing, and there is ample reason to believe that they will continue to grow. The doubling of gifts and grants for capital facilities, for example, is an evidence of increasing support from the private sector of the Nation's economy, a form of support that can be expected to grow further. An effort has been made to project the future growth of support from existing sources, in order to measure better the actual extent of the facilities gap that may confront the Nation in 1965 and in 1970.

"In table 2 are shown anticipated funds to finance capital facilities expansions to 1970, estimated on the basis of financing patterns followed from 1951 to 1959. The principal sources identified are State and local appropriations, gifts, and different types of borrowing. In making this projection, it has been assumed that sources that had declined in recent years would provide as much in the succeeding years as in 1959, that those increasing by an average of 10 percent or less per year from 1951 to 1959 would continue the same rate of increase, and that those that had increased at a greater rate than 10 percent would continue to increase 10 percent per year. This may be an optimistic viewpoint since it appears that investments in capital facilities have declined during the past year.

"TABLE 2.—*Projection of sources and amounts of funds for plant expansion, 1960–70*

[Amounts are in thousands]

"Sources	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970
Total	$1,054,420	$1,159,970	$1,225,530	$1,296,790	$1,374,270	$1,458,510	$1,550,110	$1,649,730	$1,758,090	$1,875,990	$2,004,270
Governmental appropriations and direct tax levies	327,730	356,230	384,730	415,510	448,750	484,650	523,420	565,290	610,510	659,350	712,100
Bonds:											
State and local obligation	76,190	84,650	93,120	102,430	112,670	123,940	136,330	149,960	164,960	181,460	199,610
Institutional obligation	13,160	14,460	15,760	17,180	18,730	20,420	22,260	24,260	26,440	28,820	31,410
Revenue, non-Housing and Home Finance Agency	67,740	72,060	76,380	80,960	85,820	90,970	96,430	102,220	108,350	114,850	121,740
Revenue, Housing and Home Finance Agency	210,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000
Total bonds	367,090	421,170	435,260	450,570	467,220	485,330	505,020	526,440	549,750	575,130	620,760
Gifts and grants	184,670	205,190	225,710	248,280	273,110	300,420	330,460	363,510	399,860	439,850	483,840
Current	38,430	40,880	43,330	45,930	48,690	51,610	54,710	57,990	61,470	65,160	69,070
Other	136,500	136,500	136,500	136,500	136,500	136,500	136,500	136,500	136,500	136,500	136,500

"Total:	
1960–65	$7,569,490
1966–70	8,838,190
Grand total, 1960–70	16,407,680

"In this projection it was assumed that the college housing loan program, which has accounted for one-fourth of total expenditures for higher education construction during the past few years, will be extended at the rate of $250 million annually. The Congress has endorsed the principle of Federal assistance for both residential and academic facilities. Differences of opinion regarding the extent and method of Federal assistance have temporarily deferred action other than extension of the college housing loan program, but it seems likely at the time of this writing that additional Federal programs will be enacted. Direct Federal loans, direct grants for assistance in the retirement of debt, and matching grants are the three principal methods of Federal assistance that have been proposed.

"In addition to general construction assistance there are several other established forms of Federal assistance in the construction of academic and/or related facilities. These include: (1) Matching funds for the construction of hospitals connected with colleges and universities under the Hospital Survey and Construction Act of 1946 (Hill-Burton program); (2) disposal of surplus properties—both real and personal—to public and private institutions on a nominal cash and/or donation basis;[10] (3) grants-in-aid to public and private institutions for science research facilities, administered through the National Science Foundation; and (4) grants-in-aid to public and nonprofit institutions for constructing and equipping facilities for research in the sciences related to health (Health Research Facilities Act of 1956).

"The cost of facilities needed in the 6 years, 1960–65, based upon assumptions previously discussed, will be $9 billion. Institutions may be expected to provide $6.1 billion of this need. Assuming that the requirements to 1965 have been met, the cost of facilities needed in the 5-year period, 1966–70, will be $9.8 billion. Institutions may be expected to provide $7.6 billion of this need. Thus, deficits of $1.5 billion by 1965 and $2.5 billion by 1970 appear to be in prospect, as shown in chart 2. Without the $250 million a year projected for the college housing program, the gaps would be approximately doubled, reaching $2.9 billion by 1965 and $5.2 billion by 1970 (see chart 2).

"The Nation faces the challenge of providing its youth with the training required to meet the ever-increasing responsibilities of a highly complex world. In order to meet this challenge, it will be necessary to take constructive action in all areas in which deficiencies exist, or in which gaps between needs and anticipated resources are in prospect. In this paper, careful effort has been made to estimate what will be required over a period of 10 years to overcome present and prospective deficiencies in the area of physical facilities in institutions of higher learning. The manner in which this deficit is to be overcome is a problem to be decided by the American people."

Secretary RIBICOFF. Title I of the bill provides for loans to institutions of higher education in order to finance up to three-fourths of the cost of construction, acquisition, or repair of any needed academic facility. The total amount authorized to be available for such loans is $1.5 billion, to be made available over a 5-year period at a rate of $300 million per year.

Loans would be at a rate identical with that of the college housing loan program (3.375 percent). Loans could have a maturity of up to 50 years, but practice is more likely to follow that of college housing loans, where the average maturity is under 40 years.

The program would be administered by the Commissioner of Education, on an application and approval basis. No provision is made for State allotments of funds, but a limit of 12½ percent is placed on the amount of total loans authorized that may be made to institutions in any State.

All accredited public and nonprofit private institutions of higher education would be eligible, so long as they offer work toward the bachelor's degree. Excluded from eligibility would be facilities that are intended primarily for events for which admission is to be charged to the general public.

The President also recommended amendments to extend the college housing loan program. These amendments, extending the program for 4 years at a rate of not to exceed $300 million a year, have been enacted as part of the housing law.

These construction loan programs, if fully utilized, would provide the Nation's colleges and universities with funds for physical plant expansion and improvement totaling $2.75 billion over the 5-year period. In our opinion, these funds, when combined with other Federal construction expenditures—such as the proposed medical teaching facilities grant program—would make an important contribution toward closing the projected financial gap to which I referred a minute ago. They would account for about $1 out of every $3 needed to meet projected construction costs. They would thus be a substantial addition to higher education sources of financing, without preempting the role of other traditional sources.

Our projections of need are based upon the assumption of continuing growth of construction aid from traditional sources, including State appropriations, gifts, and grants from alumni, friends, and industry. Even assuming this growth, however, one-third of the Nation's higher education construction needs would go unmet if the Congress did not enact the President's recommendations into law.

The figures speak for themselves. Without the proposed aid, our educational system would be crippled by a deficiency of one-third of needed construction.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Dr. Alan T. Waterman, of the National Science Foundation, told us, and his testimony to this effect may be found on page 184 of the printed hearings, that:

> The total bill, the total investment, during the next 10 years, according to this projection is about $3.5 billion, and as I say, we are already in arrears by something like $500 million just for laboratory buildings in the universities for basic scientific research alone.

During his testimony Dr. Waterman referred to a publication of the National Science Foundation entitled, "Investing in Scientific Progress 1961–70." A section of that report, which may be found on pages 210–215, shows very ably the needs for investment in the education of scientists and engineers. I ask unanimous consent that the material from the hearings to which I have alluded be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOWARD THE GOAL

The increasing numbers of people going into science and engineering have been projected in the graphs. During the 1960's, at least this many people must be expected to show both the desire and the capacity in these fields. This supply of new scientists and engineers will be available for the many kinds of work in science and technology, in industry, government, colleges and universities, and in other nonprofit institutions. All these activities are important and must grow. They all depend on the keystone of scientific progress. Therefore, the needs for science education and basic research in the colleges and universities are given particular attention in this report.

---

[10] In the last 3½ years, real property transfers to higher education institutions have had an acquisition cost value of slightly more than $10 million.

To insure opportunity for all science education and the related research, much more is needed: more teachers, more buildings, more equipment, and more supporting costs. These items are the subject of the discussion that follows. It ends with a summary of present expenditures and of future expenditures required by the goal.

TEACHERS, STUDENTS, AND RESEARCH WORKERS

In 1961, about 100,000 professional scientists and engineers are teaching about 645,000 students enrolled for degrees in science and engineering in colleges and universities. They also teach many students specializing in other fields. If the present ratio of students to teachers is maintained, in 1970 there will be about 175,000 teachers of 1,130,000 students in science and engineering. The assisting staff for teaching will rise from 100,000 to 175,000.

New teaching aids and techniques may somewhat reduce the needs for teacher time, but the rapidly increasing amount and complexity of scientific knowledge are putting even heavier demands on personal contacts between teacher and student. Therefore we must keep the number of teachers in step with student enrollment if we hope to insure a superior education.

Basic research in colleges and universities occupies now about 45,000 full-time equivalent professional scientists and engineers, including graduate students and post-doctoral fellows, supported by 35,000 nonprofessional personnel. The total will rise from approximately 80,000 now to 150,000 in 1970. This prediction is based on the assumption that the ratio of doctoral faculty to doctoral candidates will remain constant. Superior quality of research training necessitates the maintenance of this ratio. For the same reason, the ratio of supporting personnel to research personnel should remain constant.

BUILDINGS

The Nation will need far more space than it now has in classrooms for the teaching of science and engineering students in colleges and universities. The total investment required during the next 10 years is about $3.5 billion.

Laboratory buildings for basic research in colleges and universities are likewise in short supply. The present deficiency is at least $500 million worth of space. To fill this shortage and to fill projected requirements will cost about $2.8 billion during the decade. The investment estimated for the year 1970 is $360 million.

Technical note (data and assumptions used in estimating the needs for buildings):

Buildings for teaching: In the United States today, the gross area of buildings in colleges and universities used for instruction in all fields is about 410 million square feet; the space is used by 2.75 million students (full-time equivalent). At the same space per capita, the 0.645 million students of science and engineering in 1961 use about 96 million square feet and the expected 1.13 million students in 1970 will need 168 million square feet. By 1970, about 16 million will have become obsolete, thus leaving 80 million of the present square feet usable. Therefore 88 million new square feet will be needed by 1970. At an average of $40 per square foot, this will cost $3.5 billion. If the present shortages are met within the next few years, the investment required in 1970 will be about $350 million. The price of land is not included in the estimates given here and may add significantly to the building cost in some cases.

Research laboratories: In 1961, the laboratories for basic research in the colleges and universities are occupied by about 80,000 full-time equivalent personnel; 10,500 faculty and staff holding doctors' degrees in science and engineering; 19,500 other professional scientists and engineers, including postdoctorals and graduate students compensated for research; 15,000 research fellows and graduate students not directly compensated for research; and 35,000 supporting personnel (technicians, machinists, and other nonprofessional assistants).

The 80,000 becomes 150,000 in 1970 in parallel with the projected number of doctorates.

Adequate research space averages 300 square feet per full-time equivalent person; this is gross space including shops, storage space, corridors, and everything else.

The cost of adequate research space is now about $40 per square foot gross and is expected to rise to $60 per square foot by 1970. This cost covers fixed equipment and up-to-date facilities. The increase of $2 per year reflects increasing complexity of modern facilities needed for research as well as features that have not normally been included in laboratory buildings in the past.

In addition, obsolescence and depreciation of 6 percent per year is allowed. Even now much of the existing laboratory space is obsolescent and seriously overcrowded. In order to make up the present shortage, about $500 million is needed.

Combining all of these factors yields a total cost of $2.8 billion during the decade. The construction schedule assumed in making this calculation brings the annual investment up to $360 million in 1970.

EQUIPMENT

Many kinds of equipment and apparatus are used for laboratory experiments and for lecture demonstrations in the teaching of science and engineering. An average expenditure of $200 million a year for the next 10 years will be required for such teaching equipment. This amount is necessary if we are to fill present shortages, to keep up with increased needs, and to teach science with its latest advances.

Demands for basic research equipment in colleges and universities will rise sharply during the decade for two reasons. The number of students and staff will nearly double. Furthermore, equipment for specialized research becomes increasingly complex and intricate and therefore more costly. The required expenditure for "general" research equipment in the year 1970 is $180 million. This figure is not expected to cover the growing need for certain "specialized" and very costly equipment such as high-energy accelerators and space vehicles.

Technical note: (Data and assumptions used in projecting the needs for equipment.)

Equipment for teaching: A recent estimate made for the National Science Foundation indicates that the colleges and universities now have some $500 million inventory value of equipment for teaching science and engineering, and that an additional $300 million is needed to meet existing shortages. The total $800 million would provide an average equipment inventory of about $1,200 per student. At this ratio, which is consistent with a high standard of instruction, inventory needed in 1970 will be $1.5 billion. The 10-year investment, including depreciation and obsolescence, will be about $2 billion. If existing shortages are met during the first few years, the expenditure in 1970 will be about $200 million.

Equipment for research: The cost of research equipment is related to the expected number of people who will use it. This cost is taken to be about one-half of the cost of the building. This ratio yields a required expenditure of $180 million in 1970. This amount is believed to be realistic for "general" research equipment, but it will not cover all "specialized" equipment.

SUPPORTING COSTS

Expenditures for research and teaching in science involve far more than buildings and equipment. Other supporting costs include salaries for professional staff and nonprofessional assistants, costs of books and other informational media, and all other operating expenses and indirect costs.

Such supporting costs for the teaching of science and engineering in colleges and universities will rise from $1.9 billion in 1961 to $5 billion in 1970. This estimate is based on the increased number of personnel plus an expected increase of 50 percent in real salaries during the decade to maintain high quality in faculties and research staffs. Recent trends in academic salaries and the growing competition from other professions and opportunities indicate that the actual increase may have to be more than 50 percent.

The cost of textbooks will probably rise from about $26 per student in 1961 to $35 per student in 1970, and the cost of library operations will rise from about $30 to $45 per student. Multiplied by figures for enrollment, these numbers yield about $36 million in 1961 and $90 million in 1970 for disseminating information in science and engineering education.

Other operating and overhead costs may be expected to rise in proportion, from $648 million in 1961 to $1.7 billion in 1970.

The same methods of analysis yield a total supporting cost of about $2.2 billion for basic research in colleges and universities in 1970. The 1961 figure is $760 million.

Summary of present and future investment in science and engineering education and in basic research

[In millions]

	Education in science and engineering		Basic research	
	1961	1970 (required)	1961	1970 (required)
Colleges and universities:				
Professional staff: Salaries	$800	$2,100	$345	$970
Assisting staff: Salaries	425	1,100	158	450
Operating and overhead expenses	648	1,700	227	665
Information	36	90	33	95
Equipment	80	200	30	180
Facilities	150	350	85	360
Actual total	2,139	5,540	878	2,720
Rounded total	2,100	5,500	900	2,700
Secondary schools	2,200	--------	--------	--------
Elementary schools	400	--------	--------	--------
Other nonprofit institutions	--------	--------	100	--------
Industry	--------	--------	500	--------
Federal Government	--------	--------	300	--------
Totals for 1961	4,700	--------	1,800	--------

The cost shown for basic research in universities in 1970 is about three times the cost in 1961. Related education costs rise by almost the same ratio. This expansion stems directly from expected increases in staff and students, from increases in real salary needed to maintain high quality faculties, and from critical demands for equipment and facilities. Just to fill present shortages of equipment and facilities for academic research and for education in science will cost about $1.5 billion; $10 billion additional will be required for these items during the decade to keep up with increasing manpower and changing science.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I hope that my colleagues will review with care the committee discussion printed in Senate Report No. 1072 with respect to each title of the bill. At this time, I shall not repeat in detail the material covered in that document, but I would note for the information of the Senate the short summary of those titles set forth on page 3 of the committee report. I ask unanimous consent that this summary of "Provisions of Legislation" be printed at this point in my remarks.

The being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF PROVISIONS OF LEGISLATION

Title I of the bill would authorize a 5-year program of loans to public or private nonprofit institutions of higher education for constructing, acquiring, remodeling, and/or equipping academic facilities other than those intended primarily for uses for which admission would be charged the general public. Loans would be for a maximum of 50 years, at an interest rate not less than ¼ percent plus the average annual interest rate on all interest-bearing obligations of the United States. The maximum amount of outstanding notes for loans authorized by the title would be $1.5 billion in the 5-year period of the bill. Loans would not be approved unless sums needed by the institution or building agency were not available elsewhere at comparable interest rates, and unless at one-fourth of the development cost (construction, site acquisition and improvement) of projects to be aided under the title were to be financed from non-Federal sources.

Title II would authorize a 5-year program of scholarship aid to high school graduates. It would authorize the appropriation of $17.25 million and $26.25 million for the first 2 years and $35 million for each of the next 3 years to provide new scholarships. It would further authorize such sums as are necessary to continue scholarship payments to students over the remainder of their 4-year college courses. Selection of recipients would be made by State scholarship commissions, on the basis of competitions planned and conducted by those agencies. Amounts of individual scholarships would be determined by the State commissions, based on the evaluation of each student's financial need; however, maximum payment authorized for any recipient would be $1,000 per year. A scholarship recepient would be permitted to attend any institution of higher education which would admit him. Appropriated funds for new scholarships would be allotted to the States on the basis of the number of students graduating each year from its high schools and the size of its population of high school age. Institutions selected by scholarship holders for academic study would be entitled to receive $350 per year payment for each such recipient as a "cost of education" allowance. Such payments are conditioned upon the scholarship and flow to the institution by virtue of the scholarship.

Title III would authorize the appropriation of $50 million for each of 5 years to provide matching grants to the States to assist in the construction of public community colleges which provide the first and second year of college grade courses. Appropriated funds would be allotted to the States on the basis of relative per capita income and the relative number of high school graduates in each State. Each State would be required to match the annual Federal allotment in varying amounts (in accordance with a formula set forth in the bill), but not to exceed in any State an amount equal to twice the State allotment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have attempted in this review to bring to the attention of the Senate the need for academic facilities, that is, structures suitable for use as classrooms, laboratories, libraries, even educational material centers, and the related facilities necessary or appropriate for instruction of students, or for research, or for administration of the educational or research programs of an institution of higher education and necessary utilities, storage facilities, and maintenance facilities which support the educational endeavor.

TITLE II OF S. 1241

I have attempted to develop for the Senate the need our committee has found for the scholarships title of the bill to provide the educational opportunity for the talented and the able though needy student who, by very definition must come from families who lack the economic resources of most Americans.

TITLE III OF S. 1241

Title III of the bill, which relates to the matching grant for construction of public community colleges, in my judgment, will be of material assistance in the immediate future in supplementing the 4-year institutions in meeting the anticipated educational demand while at the same time they provide great service in educating the supporting personnel which our scientists and our engineers are urgently requesting. I do not wish to detain the Senate with a long exposition of the need for title III, since it has been set forth on pages 11, 12, and 13 of the committee report. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pages of the report to which I have alluded be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TITLE III—EMERGENCY PUBLIC COMMUNITY COLLEGE INSTRUCTION

Testimony presented to the subcommittee demonstrated that community colleges have proved to be one effective answer to the problems in higher education created by rapidly growing enrollments. These 2-year institutions (variously termed junior colleges, extension centers, and technical institutes, but generally referred to as community colleges) provide a widespread opportunity for post-high-school education, of college grade, at a reasonable cost both to the student and to the supporting public. The committee regards the community college as a major new hope for the successful accommodation of increasing college enrollments.

At the present time publicly controlled community colleges are operating in 41 States and attention to their further establishment is evident throughout the Nation. In the fall of 1959 they enrolled approximately 12 percent of the degree credit students attending college in the United States, and in addition enrolled approximately 110,000 students in organized occupational curriculums leading directly to employment in technical and semiprofessional work. The increase in first-time degree credit students enrolled in college between the fall of 1959 and the fall of 1960 in all colleges of the Nation was 12.4 percent; for community colleges this increase was 17.9 percent. If community colleges are to accommodate an increasing share of the Nation's college students, some stimulus will be needed.

Testimony presented to the committee indicated that a serious impediment to a more rapid and widespread establishment of community colleges lies in the difficulty of financing needed physical plant and equipment. Dr. May Russell, spokesman for the American Association of Junior Colleges, told the subcommittee that—

"The problem in financing new 2-year colleges looms as the major obstacle to the passage of adequate State legislation. Current State and local tax programs seem unable to meet all the increasing demands for supporting elementary and secondary education plus additional public services. Federal encouragement and assistance is essential (p. 313, of the hearings).

* * * * *

"The supply of skilled technicians needed for the economy and for national defense cannot be maintained and replenished at necessary levels through existing educational programs * * * the community college serves the student who wants to become an electronic, automotive, or agricultural technician, medical or business secretary, practical nurse, or specialist technician in one of many fields. Community colleges fill a vital national need in providing these 2-year college level programs and will be called on for even greater service in the next few years (pp. 313–314 of the hearings)."

Even States which have well established programs of State financial aid, augmented by local effort to finance capital construction of public community colleges, are falling behind the need. In Florida, for example, the 1961 legislature appropriated funds which increased the enrollment capacity of the State's community colleges by 50 percent; yet this seemingly striking increase was not sufficient to provide the facilities needed by the anticipated increase in enrollment in the biennium for which the appropriation was made. There is, therefore, a cumulative deficiency in physical facilities developing. This is the general phenomenon over the Nation.

The essence of title III, emergency public community college construction, is to provide Federal financial assistance to the States on a matching basis to stimulate increased State and local effort in constructing community colleges. Federal outlays of $50 million a year for 5 years are a modest contribution toward the costs that are faced by the States in community college construction. In California alone, for example, it is anticipated that in the next few years about 50,000 more community college students than now are enrolled will have to be housed, with a resultant additional cost of over $200 million.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a January 24, 1962, letter from the president of the Central Oregon College, a community college serving central Oregon at Bend, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CENTRAL OREGON COLLEGE,
Bend, Oreg., January 24, 1962.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Chairman, Education Subcommittee,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I greatly appreciate your giving me the opportunity to comment on S. 1241.

I have read the Calendar No. 1053 in its entirety, including minority report by Senators GOLDWATER and TOWER and I find great encouragement for the future of the community college in both the majority and minority views. Having had some experience in lobbying for community college legislation in the State of Oregon and having dealt over the years with a few State senators that opposed community college legislation, I can appreciate this slight deviation from what I thought was the firm conviction of Senators GOLDWATER and TOWER; so as far as community colleges are concerned, even the minority report sounds encouraging.

In fact, Senator MORSE, I am sure you will appreciate the fact that I have given some encouragement to some of the central Oregon service clubs during the last week by telling them I have at last found something on which Senators Morse and Goldwater agree.

All kidding aside, and in all seriousness, I am very appreciative of the effort that you are making to secure Federal aid to education and, of course, particularly to community colleges. I can find no criticism that I would wish to offer to the bill. I know it will be difficult in the final analysis to secure passage of this type legislation and, as one of your constituents, I want to hereby approve of the action that you are taking and give you every possible encouragement to try and secure passage of this bill.

You will recall that I have written to you over a period of years and referred to proposals that Senator Case has made, as well as attempts made by our own Representative Ullman, and I wish at this time to be more emphatic than ever in stating that in my opinion the community colleges are not going to be built, at least in Oregon, without a program of State and Federal aid. Local property tax simply cannot stand the strain of any part of community college buildings along with the demands placed upon this source of revenue by our elementary and secondary schools. Our present Oregon law, as you probably well know, has provided a small amount of State money to be matched on a 75 percent State and 25 percent local. The present State amount is inadequate, and as I have been going about in our central Oregon area day after day, speaking to service clubs and various groups, the specter of increasing local property taxes for any part of the building costs on top of what we will be asking them for operating costs, as well as fixtures, equipment and site development, etc., is simply more than we can sell. I would hope that the State would be able to provide matching money for this Federal grant and then in turn provide 100 percent of classroom construction costs at the State level. If this happens, then I believe we in Oregon at least will be able to get along.

We will be voting this coming Tuesday, January 30, on the formation of a central Oregon area education district including Crook, Deschutes, and Jefferson Counties; that part of Wasco that is included in the Indian Reservation as well as a small section of northern Lake and Klamath Counties in a college district to provide the local tax base for Central Oregon College.

We have felt that we could not pass this issue unless we could promise that the local cost would not exceed a 2-mill levy and it is my belief that we will be able to keep within the levy within the foreseeable future for operating purposes, but we simply will not be able to provide the matching money that the State is now requiring on the buildings and stay at that level.

We are counting on Federal aid to come to the rescue. We will appreciate your continued efforts on behalf of this type of legislation.

Sincerely yours,

Don P. Pence, *President*.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make clear that I am a strong community college man. I am a great advocate of community college centers, particularly for the liberal arts courses, which make it possible for young men and women to live at home, to engage in some part-time work at home, and yet to get a start on their first college degree.

I see the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel] in the Chamber. I wish to make a statement of high commendation of the policy of his State, for there is no doubt in my mind, as the hearings will show, if Senators will study them, that no State in the entire Union has a more effective, efficient, and better junior college and community college program than has the State of California. If one wants any proof of the argument I now make in support of this section of the bill, I say, as an Oregonian—and it is pretty hard for me to say it—"Go to California—but while you are out there come to Oregon, too."

Though I have spoken jocularly, I wish seriously to say that I believe California is one of the great educational laboratories of this country in respect to the community college and the junior college. The people of California have been doing a grand job. The findings that we have made in regard to the work in California have lent support to the position we have taken on the bill. I wish strongly to urge that we see to it that funds are made available in the bill for the community college and the junior college.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank my able friend from Oregon for the generous comment he has made with respect to the school system in my State, and particularly for singling out the junior colleges. Last fall when I was at home I enjoyed participating in the dedication of a new junior college. The population of California will increase by leaps and bounds. I was rather astounded to learn that some people have estimated that within the next half century there will be more than 50 million people living in my State. That is one reason why I joined my friend last year in the aid-to-education bill. When I returned home to California I tried to point out to the citizens to whom I was then privileged to speak why this kind of activity by the Federal Government, in which my able friend has participated as a leader, is one of the most important responsibilities that he, I, and our colleagues have today—to prepare for the education of our youth tomorrow.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from California very much. I want him also to know that I appreciate the support he has always given me on education bills.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record at this point certain pages from the hearings on the subject of Community Campuses of State Universities.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

COMMUNITY CAMPUSES OF STATE UNIVERSITIES

(By Christian K. Arnold, assistant to the president, the Pennsylvania State University)

One of the newest, most significant, and least well-known developments in American higher education is the growth of branch, or community, campuses of public universities. Virtually nonexistent as recently as 20 years ago, at least 143 such branch institutions[1] are now being operated by 41 State universities and land-grant institutions in 28 different States. Together, these branches comprise more than a quarter of all the public junior colleges in the country. Yet no standard for listing or classifying them has been devised. Federal legislation in support of junior colleges should certainly provide for these community campuses.

These developments are called community colleges in Alaska, Commonwealth campuses in Pennsylvania, off-campus centers in Wisconsin and Indiana, and lower division centers in Kentucky. Some are not even identified by designation with their parent institutions: the Southern Technical Institute in Chamblee is a branch of the Georgia Institute of Technology, and Snow College is a branch of the Utah State University. At least one university stoutly maintains that its branches are not junior colleges, while another insists that its branches "meet all the different requirements" of 2-year institutions. What sort of institutions, then, are these?

Typically, they are small community colleges stripped of most academic nonessentials in order to provide, at a minimum, the first year or two of the parent institution's 4-year baccalaureate program to commuting students at the lowest possibe cost. Through local advisory groups, county boards, and other agencies, they gear their adult education and terminal programs to the needs and interests of the local community. Academically, however, they are fully integrated components of the parent institution. President Dickey of the University of Kentucky speaks for most institutions with community campuses when he says that "students at Covington are just as much a part of the university as are those on the main campus at Lexington."

Although, in the typical instance, the branch campus has a resident director and faculty, its academic programs are usually under the supervision of the subject-matter administrative heads on the main campus. The quality of the programs is jealously guarded, for the branches share the accreditation of the institution as a whole. The students are admitted to the university, and not just to a branch, and generally must meet the same admissions standards that students at the main campus must meet. The credits they receive for their studies are fully transferable to the main campus and to any other academic institution that accepts the university's credits. Many studies show that students who start at the branch campuses do at least as well during their last 2 years as those who started on the main campus.

In addition to the regular freshmen and sophomore programs, practically all the branch campuses serve as a base at which the university offers late afternoon and evening adult education classes. These are classes in which undergraduate, graduate, and "informal" (special not-for-credit) instruction is provided largely for part-time students whenever there is a need for a program and enough students to justify offering it. Traditionally, many of the adult education credit classes are aimed at helping elementary and secondary teachers improve their knowledge and skills and qualify for positions of increased responsibility. In contrast with the typical baccalaureate program offered, much of the instruction for the adult education programs is provided by faculty who commute from the main campus. In general, the number and kind of programs offered are limited only by the extent of the need, demand, and competence of the university. Most of the universities restrict the number of credits that can be earned toward a degree in the evening adult education programs. As do the lower division day programs, the adult programs serve as a means through which the university makes available its resources to fill the educational needs of the people within their local communities.

---

[1] Undergraduate campuses and technical institutes; excludes extension centers.

A particularly important departure from this typical pattern lies in the area of technical education. One of the country's fastest developing manpower needs is for people with semiprofessional knowledges and skills beyond the level of those taught in the high schools but short of those acquired during a 4-year baccalaureate program. Although accepted as a basic junior college function, programs to meet this need have developed only slowly in the junior colleges and still fall far short of meeting the demand. The 1960 Henninger report, based on a study sponsored by the American Society for Engineering Education, listed the lack of academic prestige for technical institute training as a principal reason for this inadequacy. "The basic question of educational status," the report said, "seems to stem broadly from the American tendency to regard a 4-year collegiate degree as the hallmark of social establishment or distinction."

Recognizing that "the impetus for changing this attitude can come * * * from institutions with unassailable reputations for academic excellence," President Eric Walker, of the Pennsylvania State University, pioneered the establishment of 2-year associate degree programs as a basic element of programs offered at Penn State's 14 Commonwealth campuses. In fact, six of these campuses offer only terminal associate degree work at the lower division level, and almost half the 5,000 students enrolled at the campuses are registered for this sort of program.

Other patterns are followed in other States. In Wisconsin and Ohio, where terminal-technical programs have made a strong growth in specialized vocational high schools, it is felt by some that there is little need for the branch campuses to offer associate degree programs. In Indiana, Indiana University offers only baccalaureate programs at its branch campuses; while Purdue University, the land-grant institution, concentrates on terminal semiprofessional programs in its branches. Plans are now being made for the two institutions to cooperate in offering both programs at a single branch campus at Fort Wayne. In New York, many of the public junior colleges are locally controlled and operated under the board of trustees, but the State University of New York operates directly six technical institutes.

Altogether, 23 of the 143 branch campuses concentrate on technical institute programs and many of the others offer such programs along with their baccalaureate degree courses.

Much of the diversity that characterizes these branch campuses stems from the fact that they were developed to satisfy specific educational needs in specific communities. Historically, these branches have grown from the basic land-grant commitments. John B. Bowman, first president of the college that became the University of Kentucky, laid down the basic commitment when he said, in 1861, "I want to build up a people's institution * * * eventually open and accessible to the poorest boy in the land." To this was added the ideal of service—the "Wisconsin idea" that the "boundaries of the campus are the boundaries of the State." In time, these commitments led to extension programs through which the colleges and universities extended their usefulness by sending their faculty members out into the State to conduct short courses, lecture series, seminars, and the like whenever and wherever the information they had was needed by the people. In some locations, the need persisted, and extension centers were established to provide special courses and programs to satisfy specific needs within the local community. Characteristically, these programs were organized for adults—that is, for people older than the usual college student whose participation in the program was a part-time activity carried out in addition to their regular work. Those taking the courses were often not required to meet the usual admissions requirements, and extension rather than academic credit was given for the work. Most of the students were not seeking to satisfy degree requirements but simply to increase their knowledge and skills.

In recent years, some universities have built buildings and even developed campuses to house these programs and have established resident administrative staffs and faculties to conduct them. Some have grown into full 4-year branches of the parent institution.

A natural outgrowth of the extension-center development, the real beginning of the 2-year branch campuses was made during the depression years. State universities opened centers in rented office buildings and other temporary quarters in response to a need for low-cost collegiate education for regular students who could not afford the board-and-room costs of going away from home to attend college. It was expected that these centers would be discontinued with the return of normal economic conditions, but it didn't work that way. The need continued, and, following World War II, the already established centers were expanded and new ones were founded to help handle the surge of returning veterans. At one time the Pennsylvania State University enrolled no freshmen at all at its central campus. Now, as it becomes increasingly clear that one way to keep the college doors open in the face of the tremendously expanding college-age population lies in the 2-year commuting college, these branch campuses take on a new significance and increased importance.

According to the latest count, 52 State and land-grant universities in 37 States operate over 232 permanently located extension centers. One hundred and twenty of these can be classified as branch campuses on the basis of their emphasis on 2-year, lower division instruction. Twenty-three are primarily technical institutes. Taken together, the programs they offer form an impressive record of service. They all share one common characteristic: They exist as instruments through which the competence and the resources of the State and land-grant universities are made available to satisfy legitimate educational needs in the local communities at the lowest possible cost consistent with the maintenance of high quality.

Beyond this insistence on quality, there is a great deal of variation from one system of branch campuses to another. While most of the 2-year branches are administered through the extension divisions of the universities, notable exceptions exist at Penn State, where the operation of its Commonwealth campuses has been completely divorced from extension, and in the several States that operate 2-year institutions as part of State university systems. Besides the six technical institutes operated by the State University of New York, the university system of Georgia operates seven undergraduate lower division campuses, the Oregon State system of higher education operates five, and the North Dakota State system operates two. Somewhere in between these patterns are the five branches operated by the Oklahoma Board of Regents of Agricultural and Mechanical Colleges coordinately with Oklahoma State University and the four Alaskan community colleges, supervision of which the university shares with the State board of education.

The same sort of variation is seen in the financing of the programs in the different systems. Traditionally, extension programs, with the exception of those in agriculture and home economics, have been self-supporting—that is, no State subsidies have been made available for them, and fees paid by the students have had to cover all the direct instructional costs. This pattern has been carried over at most of the branch campuses, even where a large share of the programs consist of regular degree-credit courses taught to regularly matriculated undergraduate students. Important exceptions exist at some institutions (notably at the Universities of Wisconsin and Kentucky and at the Pennsylvania State University) where there has been full financial integration as far as instruction is concerned. At the branches of these institutions, the degree-credit students are charged the same fees and tuition that are charged on the central campus, and each student shares in the institution's State support with the students on the main campus. The branches operated by State university systems receive substantial State subsidies under separate budgets, just as do the other units in the systems. Almost without exception, none of the branches receive operational funds from local tax sources.

Buildings and grounds are quite another thing. For the most part, the branch campuses have depended on a wide variety of sources for their physical plants. The Ohio branches conduct their classes in high school buildings in cooperation with the local school boards. The DuBois Campus of the Pennsylvania State University is housed in an old mansion deeded to the university. The Beaufort Center of the University of South Carolina has taken over historic ante bellum Beaufort College. Among others, Kentucky has constructed new buildings on land owned by the university. For the most part, the financing of these plants has depended heavily upon students' fees and "university sources." Both Pennsylvania and Wisconsin, however, require the bulk of capital financing to come from within the community or area served, although Penn State has adopted a policy that enables it to seek State funds for buildings at the branches that will serve statewide responsibilities.

In Wisconsin, counties and urban communities provide land and erect buildings for the university's centers. The university equips and operates the centers, but title to the property remains with the political unit constructing the buildings.

In an unusual step for branch campuses, Penn State is planning a dormitory at one of its Commonwealth campuses to be financed largely through interest-bearing bonds that will be retired from revenue. The physical plants at branches of State university systems are constructed with public funds.

Anxious to avoid duplication of programs and wasteful competition. State universities have rarely established centers without first carefully evaluating the real need for such centers and without consulting with the other institutions of higher education in the vicinity. This often leads to the highest type of interinstitutional cooperation. Penn State conducts a center in Harrisburg, the State capital, in conjunction with four private colleges and universities, none of which is located within the city itself. Perhaps the most fully developed types of cooperation, however, occurs in Indiana. Branches of both Indiana and Purdue Universities share fully "the Indiana plan" under which 33 Indiana institutions of higher education voluntarily coordinate their operations. In addition, Indiana University and Purdue have coordinated the activities of their branches, already cooperate actively in the presentation of several programs, and are planning a completely integrated joint center. Further Indiana University conducts center operations on the campuses of and in complete coordination with two private institutions: Earlham College in Richmond and Vincennes University, which is a junior college.

A major characteristic of the branch campuses is the cooperation and coordination between the branches and the main campus and among the branches. In this way, the total resources of the university are made available to each branch and campus. Faculty members with unusual or special abilities, knowledges, or talents are shared widely. The Indiana University branches share in the university's artist and lecture series. Students entering college at the Penn State branches receive the same extensive preregistration counseling services that students enrolling at the main campus receive. The five centers of the University of South Carolina comprise the Carolina League and compete among themselves in baseball, basketball, swimming, and other sports. The University of Wisconsin offers its center faculty members summer research appointments on the main campus with its graduate faculty and well-equipped laboratories. In addition, Wisconsin has an extensive activities program involving intercampus cooperation in a variety of workshops, conferences, and tournaments, including an annual music workshop, an annual speech tournament, and an intercampus athletic program.

Plans for linking university systems through educational television create exciting possibilities for making more effective use of outstanding scholars and expensive fixed equipment in a closely coordinated comprehensive university program.

Traditionally State universities and land-grant institutions have dedicated themselves to the extension of educational opportunity to all who may benefit by it. With the same ingenuity that helped take care of the veterans' bulge following World War II, they are expanding their efforts to meet the even greater bulge of the veterans' children. Through an unique partnership with local communities, many of these universities are now providing their States with systems of fully accredited 1- and 2-year institutions designed to make their total resources and experience available to students close to their own homes. Combining the highest collegiate standards with sensitivity to local needs and problems, these community campuses furnish an effective means of expanding educational opportunity at minimum cost to the student in the various States in which they have been tried.

COMMUNITY CAMPUSES OF STATE UNIVERSITIES

(Tentative list, subject to revision)

Undergraduate campus: A facility at which is offered, at a minimum, 1 or 2 years of a regular 4-year baccalaureate program to full-time students.

Technical institute: A facility at which terminal 2-year programs, usually technical in nature, are offered to full-time students, who usually receive an associate degree.

Extension center: A permanent facility at which is offered degree-credit courses and programs, usually during the late afternoon and evening hours, to part-time students, many of whom are older than the usual college or university student.

ALABAMA

University of Alabama:

Extension centers: Birmingham, Gadsden, Huntsville, Montgomery, Dothan, Selma, Mobile.

ALASKA

University of Alaska:

Undergraduate campuses: Anchorage, Juneau-Douglas, Ketchikan, Palmer.

Extension centers: Ladd, Eielson, Elmendorf, Fort Richardson.

ARKANSAS

Arkansas State:

Undergraduate campus: Beebe.

CALIFORNIA

University of California:

Extension center: San Francisco.

COLORADO

University of Colorado:

Extension center: Denver.

CONNECTICUT

University of Connecticut:

Undergraduate campuses: Torrington, Hartford, Stamford, Waterbury.

DELAWARE

University of Delaware:

Extension center: Wilmington.

GEORGIA

Georgia Institute of Technology:

Technical institute: Chamblee (Southern Technical Institute).

University of Georgia:

Extension centers: Columbus, Gainesville, Waycross, Rome, Marietta, Albany, Warner Robins.

University System of Georgia:

Undergraduate campuses: Augusta. Savannah, Columbus, Americus, Cochran, Douglas, Tifton.

HAWAII

University of Hawaii:

Undergraduate campus: Hilo.

IDAHO

University of Idaho:

Undergraduate campus: Boise (2-year program for elementary teachers).

Extension center: Lewiston.

ILLINOIS

Southern Illinois University:

Undergraduate campus: Edwardsville (replaces both Alton and East St. Louis.

Technical institute: Southern Acres.

INDIANA

Purdue University:

Technical institutes: Fort Wayne, Hammond, Indianapolis, Michigan City.

Indiana University:

Undergraduate campuses: Indianapolis, Gary, East Chicago (Calumet), South Bend, Fort Wayne, Kokomo, Jefferson-New Albany, Richmond (with Earlham College), Vincennes (with Vincennes University), Evansville.

KENTUCKY

University of Kentucky:

Undergraduate campuses: Covington, Ashland, Henderson, Fort Knox, Cumberland.

MARYLAND

University of Maryland:

Undergraduate campus: Munich.

Extension centers: Baltimore, Heidelberg, London, Tokyo.

MAINE

University of Maine:

Undergraduate campus: Portland.

MASSACHUSETTS

University of Massachusetts:

Extension center: Pittsfield.

Technical institute: Stockbridge.

MICHIGAN

University of Michigan:

Undergraduate campuses, mostly last 2 years: Flint, Dearborn.

Extension centers: Battle Creek, Detroit, Escanaba, Grand Rapids, Port Huron, Saginaw, Traverse City.

MINNESOTA

University of Minnesota:

Technical institutes: Crookston, Grand Rapids, Waseca.

NEVADA

University of Nevada:

Undergraduate campus: Las Vegas.

Extension centers: Elko, Ely, Hawthorne, Winnemucca.

NEW JERSEY

Rutgers University:

Extension centers: Paterson, Jersey City.

NEW MEXICO

University of New Mexico:

Undergraduate campuses: Gallup, Taos.

New Mexico State University:

Undergraduate campuses: Carlsbad, Alamogordo, Clayton, Raton, Farmington.

NEW YORK

State University of New York:

Technical institutes: Alfred, Canton, Cobleskill, Delhi, Farmingdale, Morrisville.

NORTH CAROLINA

North Carolina State College:

Technical institute: Gastonia.

NORTH DAKOTA

University of North Dakota:

Extension center: Williston.

North Dakota State System of Higher Education:

Undergraduate campuses: Bottineau, Wahpeton.

OHIO

Bowling Green:

Undergraduate campuses: Bryan, Fostoria, Fremont, Sandusky.

Central State College:

Undergraduate campus: Wilberforce.

Kent State University:

Undergraduate campuses: Ashtabula, Cleveland, Elyria, Medina, Warren, Canton, Wadsworth, East Liverpool, Euclid.

Miami University:

Undergraduate campuses: Norwood, Hamilton, Middleton, Dayton, Piqua.

Ohio State University:

Undergraduate campuses: Mansfield, Marion, Newark..

Extension center: Wright-Patterson Air Force Base.

Ohio University:

Undergraduate campuses: Chillicothe, Ironton, Lancaster, Martin's Ferry, Portsmouth, Zanesville, Lockbourne Air Force Base.

OKLAHOMA

Oklahoma State University:

Undergraduate campuses: Lawton, Warner, Wilburton, Tishomingo, Miami.

OREGON

Oregon State System of Higher Education:

Undergraduate campuses: Coos County, Clatsop County, Tillamook County, Salem, Eugene.

Extension center: Portland.

PENNSYLVANIA

Pennsylvania State University:

Undergraduate campuses: Altoona, Du Bois, Erie, Hazleton, McKeesport, Abington, Pottsville, Mont Alto.

Technical institutes: Allentown, Scranton, Wilkes-Barre, Wyomissing, York, New Kensington.

RHODE ISLAND

University of Rhode Island:

Extension center: Providence.

SOUTH CAROLINA

University of South Carolina:

Undergraduate campuses: Aiken County, Florence, Lancaster, Beaufort, Coastal Carolina.

TENNESSEE

University of Tennessee:

Extension centers: Martin, Memphis, Oak Ridge.

TEXAS

Texas A & M. system:

Undergraduate campus: Arlington.

UTAH

University of Utah:

Undergraduate campus: Price (Carbon College).

Utah State University:

Undergraduate campuses: Ephraim (Snow College).

Extension centers: Ogden, Richfield, Brigham City, Kanab.

VIRGINIA

College of William and Mary:

Undergraduate campus: Norfolk.

University of Virginia: Undergraduate campuses: Wise (Clinch Valley), Northern Virginia Branch.

Extension centers: Bristol, Roanoke, Hampton Roads, Richmond, Lynchburg, Alexandria.

Virginia Polytechnic Institute:

Undergraduate campuses: Danville, Bluefield, Richmond, Norfolk.

Virginia State College:

Undergraduate campus: Norfolk.

WASHINGTON

University of Washington:

Extension center: Richland.

WEST VIRGINIA

West Virginia University:

Undergraduate campus: Keyser.

Extension center: Institute (graduate center).

WISCONSIN

University of Wisconsin:

Undergraduate campuses: Green Bay, Kenosha, Manitowoc, Marinette, Menasha, Racine, Sheboygan, Wausau.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as a part of my discussion of the specific provisions of the bill, I ask unanimous consent that the section-by-section analysis of S. 1241 which appears on pages 13–22 of the committee report; the cost data which appears on page 23 of the committee report; the table entitled "Estimated Federal and State Share of Public Community College Construction Under Provisions of Title III of S. 1241, Fiscal Year 1962," which appears on page 24 of the committee report; and a table entitled "Estimated Total High School Graduates, 1959–60 and Total Fall College Enrollment, 1960 With Projected Total Fall College Enrollment, 1965, and 1970"; which I now submit, be printed at this point in my remarks together with a cost data table on title II dated September 6, 1961.

There being no objection, the analysis and tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION DESCRIPTION OF THE BILL

Section 1. Short title

This section provides that the act may be cited as the "College Academic Facilities and Scholarship Act."

Section 2. Findings and declaration of policy

In this section the congressional findings and declaration of policy are set forth.

TITLE I—LOANS FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF ACADEMIC FACILITIES

Section 101. Lending authority

This section contains the basic authority for the Commissioner to make loans to institutions of higher education and to higher education building agencies for construction of academic facilities.

Section 102. Loan limit for any State

This section limits the amount of loans which may be made in any one State to 12½ percent of the total loans made.

Section 103. Eligibility conditions, amounts, and terms of loans

Under subsection (a) of this section a loan may be made only if the following conditions are met: Not less than one-fourth of the facility's development cost (as defined in sec. 106(c)) must be financed from non-Federal sources. The applicant must be unable to secure the amount of the loan from other sources upon terms and conditions which are as favorable as those applicable to these loans. The construction must be undertaken in an economical manner and not be of elaborate or extravagant design or materials.

Subsection (b) of this section requires these loans to be secured in such manner, and repaid within such period, not exceeding 50 years, as may be determined by the Commissioner. The provision as to security is not intended to require that the Commissioner obtain a mortgage or other lien on property of the borrowing institution. This subsection further directs the Commissioner to establish the interest rate on these loans, subject to a specified minimum. The minimum permissible annual rate of interest will be one-fourth of 1 percent above the rate of interest paid by the Commissioner on funds obtained by him for this purpose from the Secretary of the Treasury. How this latter rate is determined is explained below in the description of subsection (d).

Subsection (c) of this section provides that funds for loans under the part will be obtained by the Commissioner through borrowings from the Treasury. It should be noted that though in form this method of financing is through so-called public debt transactions, it is unique in that the rate of borrowing will be controlled by Congress through provisions in appropriation acts. In addition, the maximum amount which the Commissioner may owe the Treasury is not permitted to exceed $300 million during the first year. nor to increase above that level at a rate of more than $300 million per year during the following 4 years. Thus the maximum amount of loans which could be outstanding at the end of this 5-year program or thereafter will be $1.5 billion.

Under subsection (d) the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, will determine the forms, denominations, maturities, and other terms and conditions of the notes and other obligations which he issues in the course of obtaining funds for loans under the act. The rate of interest on funds so borrowed by the Commissioner will be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, and will be the average annual interest rate on all interest-bearing obligations of the United States then forming a part of the public debt as computed at the end of the fiscal year next preceding the issuance of the notes or obligations in question by the Commissioner and adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of 1 percent. These transactions will be handled by the Secretary of the Treasury under the Second Liberty Bond Act, in the same manner as are similar transactions carried on under other similar acts.

Subsection (e) authorizes appropriations to the Commissioner for payments on notes or other obligations issued to obtain funds for loans, to the extent that loan repayments and interest on loans are inadequate for the purpose.

Section 104. General provisions

Subsection (a) provides that such financial transactions of the Commissioner as the making of loans, and vouchers approved by the Commissioner in connection with such financial transactions, exclusive of administrative expenditures, shall be final and conclusive upon all officers of the Government.

Subsection (b) provides that funds available under the part will be available for administrative expenses of the Commissioner, in the amounts provided in appropriation acts. The Commissioner is authorized to prescribe fees to cover expenses of inspections and representatives at project sites, and such fees could be used to defray such expenses.

Subsection (c) grants the authority, usual in these programs, for the Commissioner to prescribe rules and regulations, sue and be sued, foreclose on property and manage it thereafter, make payments in lieu of taxes, dispose of real property, modify the terms of contracts in certain cases, and include in contracts and agreements other covenants, conditions, and provisions necessary to assure that the purposes of this loan program will be assured.

Section 105. Records and audit

This section requires recipients of loans under this title to keep records and to permit access thereto for auditing purposes.

Section 106. Definitions

This section defines the following terms for the purposes of title I.

"Academic facilities" will include classrooms, laboratories, libraries, and related instructional, research, or administrative facilities. The term also includes service facilities essential to operation of the foregoing facilities. Excluded from the term are facilities intended primarily for events for which admission is to be charged to the general public.

"Construction" will mean the erection or expansion of structures, and providing their initial equipment, the acquisition of existing structures, and the rehabilitation, alteration, conversion, or improvement (including initial equipment, or modernization or replacement of built-in equipment) of existing structures, or any combination of the foregoing.

"Equipment" will include all items (such as projectors, tape recorders, teaching machines, screens, language laboratories, etc.), necessary for the functioning of a facility as an academic facility, except books and items of current expense. "Initial equipment" is that equipment which is provided in connection with construction, as defined, except that in case of rehabilitation, alteration, conversion, or improvement of existing structures, it includes only the equipment necessary to make the structures adequate for use as an academic facility.

"Development cost" will mean the construction cost and the necessary costs of land acquisition and site improvements, but not including any such costs incurred, or arising under a contract entered into, prior to the date of enactment of the bill. In determining the amount of a loan under the title, there will be excluded from the development cost an amount equal to the amount of any Federal financial assistance obtained under other laws with respect to the construction in question.

"Higher education building agency" means a State instrumentality or agency authorized to provide, or finance the construction of, academic facilities under part B, and any nonprofit corporation established by an institution of higher education to provide academic facilities for its use, if, upon its dissolution, title to any property purchased or built from the proceeds of any loan made under title I will pass to the school.

TITLE II—SCHOLARSHIPS FOR COLLEGE STUDENTS

Section 201. Appropriations authorized

This section authorizes appropriations of $17,500,000 for fiscal 1962, $26,250,000 for fiscal 1963, and $35 million for fiscal 1964 and each of the next 2 fiscal years, for scholarships to persons who have not previously been awarded scholarships under the title. Sums so appropriated will remain available for the award of scholarships under the title until the close of the fiscal year following that for which they were appropriated.

The section also authorizes appropriations for fiscal 1963 and the next 7 fiscal years of such sums as are necessary for making payments to individuals who have been awarded scholarships under the title for previous years.

Section 202. Amount of scholarships

Subsection (a) of this section provides that any person awarded a scholarship under the title who is determined by the State commission, in accordance with the approved State plan, to need financial assistance to continue his education at institutions of higher education, shall be paid an amount of not more than $1,000 for any academic year, or its equivalent as defined in the Commissioner's regulations. The amount so paid would be based on the individual's financial need for assistance during the year. An individual awarded a scholarship who is determined by the State commission not to be in sufficient need for assistance to be paid any amount for his first year, shall receive an appropriate certificate from the Commissioner.

Subsection (b) of section 202 directs the Commissioner to provide by regulation for such adjustment of scholarship payments under the title as may be necessary to avoid duplication of educational assistance under other Federal programs. Such regulations are to be prescribed after consultation with the other Federal agency or agencies concerned.

Section 203. Duration of scholarship

Under this section, the duration of a scholarship under the title will be the period not in excess of 4 academic years required for completion of work toward the recipient's first bachelor's degree. However, continued entitlement to payments under a scholarship award shall depend upon a finding by the Commissioner that (1) the individual is maintaining satisfactory progress in the course of study he is pursuing, according to the regular prescribed standards and practices of the institution he is attending, and (2) the individual is devoting essentially full time to educational work leading to a bachelor's degree at an institution of higher education, except that nonattendance during vacation periods or periods of military service or during other periods during which the Commissioner determines that there is good cause for his nonattendance, is excused.

Section 204. Selection of recipients of scholarships

Subsection (a) of this section provides that an individual, to be eligible to compete in any State for a scholarship, must (1) be living in the State or, if not living in any State, be domiciled in the State, (2) make application as prescribed by the State commission, (3) not be and not have been enrolled full time in any course at an institution of higher education, and (4) be attending a high school whose graduates meet the requirements established by the State for graduation from high schools accredited by the State.

Subsection (b) provides for the selection by the State commission in accordance with the State plan of persons to be awarded scholarships, and for the determination of the amounts, if any, to be paid to them. The Commissioner of Education must award a scholarship to any person so selected and provide for the payment of the amount determined payable by the State commission if specified conditions are met. First, the State commission must certify that he has graduated from any high school whose graduates meet the requirements established by the State in which such high school is located for graduation from accredited high schools or, in the alternative, that it has determined that the individual has attained a level of advancement generally accepted as constituting the equivalent of such graduation; second, the individual has become enrolled in an institution of higher education for work leading to a bachelor's degree; and third, the individual's graduation from high school occurred during or at the close of the school year in which he was selected for the scholarship and his enrollment at an institution of higher education was for the first academic year following his graduation and upon the first opportunity for such enrollment. The State commission may, however, under regulations of the Commissioner of Education, waive or modify the third requirement, as well as the requirement of section 204(a)(4) that a competitor for a scholarship must be attending an accredited high school.

Section 205. Allotment of appropriations for scholarships

From the appropriation for each fiscal year for new scholarships, the Commissioner will allot up to 2 percent to Puerto Rico, the Canal Zone, Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa, according to their respective needs for scholarship assistance. The remainder will be allotted among the 50 States and the District of Columbia, one-half on the basis of their relative numbers of high school graduates and one-half on the basis of their relative populations aged 14 to 17, inclusive.

Subsection (b) of section 205 provides that sums appropriated for payments to persons awarded scholarships in previous years are to be allotted among the States on the basis of the relative amounts the Commissioner estimates are needed to make such payments.

Section 206. State commissions and plans

Subsection (a) provides that a State desiring to participate in the scholarship program may do so by establishing a State commission on scholarships broadly representative of high schools and colleges, and of the public, in the State, or by designating an existing State agency with equivalent representation to serve as the State commission. The State commission then submits a State plan for carrying out the purposes of the title and the Commissioner of Education must approve the plan if it (1) provides for its administration by the State commission, (2) provides for the selection of individuals for scholarships from among eligible applicants and for determination of the amounts of payments under the scholarships, in accordance with standards, procedures, and criteria established by the State commission which the Commissioner finds provides reasonable assurance that selection of scholarship recipients will be based solely on ability to pursue successfully at an institution of higher education a course of study leading to a bachelor's degree, determined in accordance with objective tests and other measures of ability and achievement, and that the amount to be paid under the scholarship will be based solely on the individual's need for financial assistance to continue his higher education, such need to be determined without regard to tuition fees and other expenses at the particular institution he attends. The State standards, procedures, and criteria must also provide assurance that eligible applicants domiciled in the State but not living therein are provided a reasonable opportunity for selection, and that scholarship examinations or other tests are given, insofar as practicable, in the high school the individual attends; (3) provides for certification by the State commission of the individuals selected for scholarships and the scholarship amounts, as well as for certification of the financial need of individuals previously awarded scholarships; (4) provides for necessary fiscal control and fund accounting procedures; and (5) provides for the making of reports needed by the Commissioner to perform his functions under the title.

Subsection (b) requires the Commissioner, prior to finally disapproving any State plan or State plan amendment submitted to him, to afford the State commission reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

Subsection (c) provides for withdrawal of a State's eligibility to participate in the program whenever the Commissioner finds after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State commission that the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the requirements of the title or that there has been a failure to comply substantially with such requirements.

Subsection (d) provides for Federal payments to each State of such amounts as the Commissioner determines to be necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the State plan, including necessary expenses entailed in its preparation, and authorizes appropriations for this purpose.

Section 207. Selection of institution

This section provides that a scholarship recipient may attend any higher education institution which admits him.

Section 208. Cost of education allowances

This section provides for payments by the Commissioner to institutions of higher education which scholarship recipients attend during the major portion of each academic year for which the student receives scholarship payments. The payment to the institution is $350 a year. Appropriations for fiscal year 1963 and each of the next 7 fiscal years are authorized to be made for these payments.

TITLE III—PUBLIC COMMUNITY COLLEGE ASSISTANCE

Section 301. Authorization of funds

This section authorizes appropriations of $50 million for each of the fiscal years 1962, 1963, 1964, 1965, and 1966, for making grants under this title.

Section 302. Allotments to States and Federal share

Subsection .(a) of this section allots the appropriated sums among the States on the basis of the income per person and the number of high school graduates of the respective States. The allotment formula is as follows: Each State shall receive an amount which bears the same ratio to the sums appropriated under section 301 as the product of the number of high school graduates of the State, and the State's allotment ratio (determined under subsection (c)) bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States.

Subsection (c) provides that the allotment ratio shall be less the product of 0.50 and the quotient obtained by dividing the income per person for the State by the income per person for the continental United States (defined to include Alaska), except that the allotment ratio shall in no case be less than 0.25 or more than 0.75 and the allotment ratio for Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa shall be 0.75. The Commissioner of Education shall promulgate the allotment ratios as soon as possible after enactment of this act on the basis of the average of the incomes per person of the continental United States for the three most recent consecutive calendar years for which the Department of Commerce has available satisfactory data, and on the basis of the number of high school graduates as determined by the Commissioner for the most recent year for which the Office of Education has available satisfactory data.

Subsection (b) provides that the State allotment for any fiscal year shall be available until the end of the succeeding fiscal year for payment of the certified Federal share of the cost of the junior college facilities constructed by it under an approved State plan.

Section 303. Matching requirement

This section provides that each State in order to receive payment of the full Federal allotment shall add to the Federal allotment an amount equal to the product of the number of high school graduates in the State and the difference between the national base (defined under sec. 306 as meaning with respect to any fiscal year, an amount equal to three times the quotient of the amount appropriated for such year under the authorization in sec. 301, divided by the number of high school graduates) and the Federal allotment to the State per high school graduate of the State. If the State's matching payment is less than the matching requirement, its Federal allotment shall be proportionately reduced. In no case is the State matching payment required to be more than twice the Federal allotment.

Section 304. State plans

Subsection (a) of this section provides that a State interested in receiving assistance under this title shall submit a State plan which the Commissioner shall approve if it designates the State agency responsible for administering the plan, contains satisfactory evidence that such State agency will have authority to carry out such plan, provides appropriate fiscal control and fund-accounting procedures, provides for establishing standards relating to the location, planning, and construction of public community college facilities, provides an opportunity for a hearing for an applicant whose request for funds is denied, and provides that the State will make such reports as are reasonably necessary to enable the Commissioner to carry out the title's provisions.

Subsection (b) of this section provides that the Commissioner shall not finally disapprove any State plan or modification without providing reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing to the State agency.

Subsection (c) provides that whenever the Commissioner, after affording the State agency reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing, finds that an approved State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of subsection (a) or the administration of the plan fails to comply substantially with any such provision, the Commissioner shall withhold further payments under section 305 to the State or shall withhold payments for a project designated by the Commissioner to be directly affected by the failure, until he is satisfied that there no longer is a failure, or if compliance is impossible, until arrangement is made for repayment by the State of diverted or improperly expended Federal funds. Exception is provided for a payment under section 305 for a public community college facility project not directly affected by such failure. After notice to the State, the Commissioner may suspend making further reservations of funds under section 305(a) pending making further findings under this subsection.

Section 305. Payments to States

Subsection (a) of this section provides that the Commissioner shall reserve the amount of the Federal share upon certification by a State agency listing a State-approved public community college facilities project (or projects) under an approved State plan, and setting forth the estimated cost of each project, the amount of the Federal share, and such further description as may be necessary. The Commissioner shall pay such amount to the State through the disbursing facilities of the Department of the Treasury and prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, at such times or in such installments as the Commissioner may determine. Payments shall be used exclusively to pay the construction cost of projects for which the amount has been reserved. The Commissioner shall change such amount upon request of the State agency and receipt of an amended certification to the extent such change is not inconsistent with the title's provisions.

Subsection (b) provides that if a project is terminated, abandoned, or not completed within a reasonable time, as determined in accordance with regulations issued by the Commissioner, the States shall be liable to the United States for the amount of the payments made under this section which the Commissioner deems reasonable.

Section 306. Definitions

The term "public community college" is defined to mean an educational institution under public supervision and control and limited to first- and second-year college grade courses.

"Construct," "constructing," and "construction" are defined to include the preparation of drawings and specifications for public community college facilities, erecting, building, acquiring, and expanding public community college facilities, and the inspection and supervision of the construction of such facilities.

"Public community college facilities" is defined to mean classrooms and related facilities, initial equipment, machinery, utilities, and land (including interests in land and land improvements) necessary or appropriate for the purposes of a public community college, but shall not include athletic stadiums or structures or facilities intended primarily for the purpose of athletic exhibitions, contests, or games or other events for which admission is to be charged to the general public.

The term "high school graduate" is defined to mean a person who has received formal recognition (by diploma, certificate, or similar means) from an approved school for successful completion of 4 years of education beyond the first 8 years of schoolwork, or for demonstration of equivalent achievement. For the purposes of this act, the number of high school graduates shall be limited to the number who graduated in the most recent year for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Commissioner of Education is authorized to interpret the definition of "high school graduate."

"Per capita income" is defined as the average of the per capita income for the 3 most recent years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce.

"National base" is defined to mean with respect to any fiscal year, an amount equal to three times the quotient of the amount appropriated for such year under the authorization in section 301, divided by the number of high school graduates.

"State agency" is defined as meaning the agency designated by a State in its State plan.

TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Section 401. Definitions

This section contains definitions of the following terms which are used throughout the act.

"Institution of higher education" will mean an institution which meets all of the following criteria:

1. It must admit as regular students only individuals having a certificate of graduation from a high school, or the recognized equivalent of such a certificate.
2. It must be legally authorized within the State to provide a program of education beyond high school.
3. It must provide an educational program for which it awards a bachelor's degree, or provide at least a 2-year educational program which is acceptable for full credit toward such a degree.
4. It must be a public institution (other than a school or institution of the United States) or a private institution owned and operated by one or more nonprofit corporations or associations.
5. It must be accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency listed by the Commissioner, or, if not so accredited, be an institution whose credits are fully accepted, on transfer, by not less than three institutions which are so accredited.

For purposes of the loan title (title I), the term includes any private business school or technical institution which meets all the above requirements.

The Commissioner will publish a list of nationally recognized accrediting agencies or associations which he determines to be reliable authority as to the quality of education or training offered.

"State" is defined to include the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa, as well as the 50 States.

Section 402. Federal administration

Subsection (a) gives the Commissioner authority to delegate his functions, exclusive of his regulationmaking authority, to any of the officers or employees of the Office of Education.

Subsection (b) authorizes the Commissioner to utilize other agencies in carrying out his duties under this act.

Subsection (c) permits the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, to appoint advisory committees. The usual provisions relating to advisory committees, including (by reference) the provisions of the National Defense Education Act relating to the application of conflict-of-interest laws to members of such committees, will apply to these.

Section 403. Judicial review

Under this section, any State dissatisfied with the Commissioner's final action with respect to the initial approval of its State plan or with his final action under section 206(c) or 304(c) could obtain judicial review of such final action. This review would be based on the record of the proceedings on which the Commissioner based such final action and would take place in the U.S. court of appeals for the circuit in which the State is located. Such a judgment of a U.S. court of appeals would be subject to review by the Supreme Court. The commencement of proceedings under this section will operate as a stay of the Commissioner's action only if so specifically ordered by the court.

Section 404. Labor standards

This section provides that before making a loan the Commissioner will obtain assurances that the laborers and mechanics employed by contractors (and subcontractors) in working on a project will be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, and will receive overtime pay after 8 hours in a workday or 40 hours in a workweek.

The section permits the Commissioner to waive these requirements in certain cases where services are voluntarily donated to lower the costs of construction.

Section 405. Method of payment

Payments under the act can be made in installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement, with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments and underpayments.

Section 406. Administrative appropriations authorized

This section authorizes the appropriation of sums necessary to meet the costs of administering this act, including those costs of State commissions for which the Commissioner is authorized to pay under other provisions of the bill.

Section 407. Federal control prohibited

This section provides that nothing in the act may be construed to authorize any Federal department, agency, office, or employee to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over, or impose any requirements or conditions with respect to, the personnel, curriculum, methods of instruction, or administration of any educational institution.

TABLE C.—*Estimated Federal and State share of public community college construction under the provisions of title III of S. 1241, fiscal year 1962*

State	Federal allotment	State matching	Total
Total	$50,000,000	$87,962,288	$137,962,288
Alabama	1,192,055	1,480,050	2,672,105
Alaska	24,998	49,996	74,994
Arizona	344,697	588,735	933,432
Arkansas	727,969	841,286	1,569,255
California	3,349,834	6,699,668	10,049,502
Colorado	456,597	913,194	1,369,791
Connecticut	517,854	1,035,708	1,553,562
Delaware	69,069	138,138	207,207
Florida	1,205,416	2,041,288	3,246,704
Georgia	1,245,608	1,676,788	2,922,396
Hawaii	221,968	417,567	639,535
Idaho	263,722	414,760	678,482
Illinois	2,201,526	4,403,052	6,604,578
Indiana	1,367,583	2,633,272	4,000,855
Iowa	995,678	1,746,521	2,742,199
Kansas	667,575	1,202,817	1,870,392
Kentucky	996,594	1,304,900	2,301,494
Louisiana	1,039,695	1,446,513	2,486,208
Maine	329,504	522,826	852,330
Maryland	683,199	1,366,398	2,049,597
Massachusetts	1,369,953	2,739,906	4,109,859
Michigan	2,220,705	4,441,410	6,662,115
Minnesota	1,261,501	2,270,785	3,532,286
Mississippi	804,742	843,225	1,647,967
Missouri	1,146,261	2,270,621	3,416,882
Montana	226,601	408,281	634,882
Nebraska	460,961	850,877	1,311,838
Nevada	$48,596	$97,192	$145,788
New Hampshire	201,118	362,355	563,473
New Jersey	1,317,316	2,634,632	3,951,948
New Mexico	278,807	433,094	711,901
New York	3,284,375	6,568,750	9,853,125
North Carolina	1,604,690	2,098,138	3,702,828
North Dakota	266,793	394,596	661,389
Ohio	2,610,497	5,220,994	7,831,491
Oklahoma	851,614	1,345,155	2,196,769
Oregon	570,922	1,141,844	1,712,766
Pennsylvania	3,435,281	6,870,562	10,305,843
Rhode Island	225,955	443,929	669,884
South Carolina	856,840	1,003,231	1,860,071
South Dakota	261,998	388,927	650,925
Tennessee	1,219,694	1,597,025	2,816,719
Texas	2,401,135	4,044,476	6,445,611
Utah	352,132	576,597	928,729
Vermont	139,861	220,453	360,314
Virginia	1,022,616	1,605,805	2,628,511
Washington	819,235	1,638,470	2,457,705
West Virginia	755,446	1,072,028	1,827,474
Wisconsin	1,285,476	2,463,836	3,749,312
Wyoming	102,256	204,512	306,768
District of Columbia	89,164	178,328	267,492
American Samoa	----------	----------	----------
Canal Zone	----------	----------	----------
Guam	19,611	19,741	39,252
Puerto Rico	579,326	581,509	1,160,835
Virgin Islands	7,381	7,437	14,818

Estimated total high school graduates, 1959–60, and total fall college enrollment, 1960, with projected total fall college enrollment, 1965 and 1970

State	Estimated total public and nonpublic high school graduates 1959–60 [1]	Total fall college enrollment		
		1960	Projected [2]	
			1965	1970
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
United States	1,837,838	3,582,726	5,220,000	6,959,000
Alabama	33,000	45,843	66,816	89,075
Alaska	1,152	2,312	3,393	4,523
Arizona	11,528	34,344	50,060	66,737
Arkansas	19,380	25,040	36,488	48,643
California	160,871	447,995	652,708	870,154
Colorado	17,148	47,579	69,322	92,416
Connecticut	27,113	50,841	74,072	98,748
Delaware	4,220	7,144	10,388	13,848
Florida	40,096	67,022	97,666	130,203
Georgia	36,091	50,220	73,184	97,565
Hawaii	7,898	10,396	15,138	20,181
Idaho	8,379	11,551	16,808	22,408
Illinois	100,922	200,152	291,641	388,799
Indiana	49,414	94,679	137,965	183,926
Iowa	33,867	57,376	83,572	111,414
Kansas	23,100	52,052	75,847	101,114
Kentucky	28,423	47,799	69,635	92,833
Louisiana	30,705	57,155	83,259	110,996
Maine	10,526	12,673	18,479	24,635
Maryland	27,573	52,496	76,473	101,949
Massachusetts	58,765	134,108	195,385	260,475
Michigan	86,667	160,261	233,491	311,276
Minnesota	43,627	75,763	110,403	147,183
Mississippi	20,353	35,473	51,678	68,894
Missouri	42,197	82,155	119,695	159,570
Montana	7,841	13,080	19,053	25,400
Nebraska	16,201	33,384	48,650	64,858
Nevada	2,428	4,141	6,055	8,072
New Hampshire	6,959	12,699	18,479	24,635
New Jersey	61,342	85,522	124,601	166,111
New Mexico	8,792	17,489	25,474	33,960
New York	164,407	351,208	511,716	682,191
North Carolina	45,731	69,144	100,746	134,309
North Dakota	8,168	13,383	19,523	26,027
Ohio	102,462	175,139	255,154	340,156
Oklahoma	27,131	57,584	83,885	111,831
Oregon	21,305	43,405	63,266	84,343
Pennsylvania	130,554	191,180	278,539	371,332
Rhode Island	8,273	19,442	28,345	37,787
South Carolina	22,973	31,542	45,936	61,239
South Dakota	8,039	14,498	21,141	28,184
Tennessee	34,786	63,200	92,081	122,757
Texas	79,600	185,722	270,604	360,755
Utah	11,470	33,688	49,068	65,415
Vermont	4,450	8,945	13,050	17,398
Virginia	32,462	57,986	84,460	112,597
Washington	31,738	66,009	96,152	128,185
West Virginia	22,569	30,044	43,796	58,386
Wisconsin	46,304	75,160	109,516	146,000
Wyoming	3,839	6,571	9,553	12,735
District of Columbia	4,999	46,480	67,703	90,258
U.S. service schools	----------	13,652	19,888	26,514

[1] Includes estimate of nonpublic high school graduates.

[2] Assuming that enrollment in each State will be distributed in same proportion as in 1960.

Aid to higher education

Scholarship program	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	Total
AUTHORIZATION										
Scholarship payments to students	$17,500,000	$43,750,000	$78,750,000	$113,750,000	$131,250,000	$105,000,000	$70,600,000	$35,000,000	----------	$595,000,000
Institutional costs for scholarships	8,750,000	21,875,000	39,375,000	56,875,000	65,625,000	52,500,000	35,000,000	17,500,000	----------	297,500,000
Grants for State commissions [1]	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
Total authorization	26,250,000	65,625,000	118,125,000	170,625,000	196,875,000	157,500,000	105,000,000	52,500,000	----------	892,500,000
NEW OBLIGATIONAL AUTHORITY										
Scholarship payments to students	17,500,000	43,750,000	78,750,000	113,750,000	131,250,000	105,000,000	70,000,000	35,000,000	----------	595,000,000
Institutional costs for scholarships	8,750,000	21,875,000	39,375,000	56,875,000	65,625,000	52,500,000	35,000,000	17,500,000	----------	297,500,000
Grants for State commissions	2,700,000	3,250,000	3,950,000	4,650,000	5,350,000	4,500,000	3,750,000	3,400,000	----------	31,550,000
Total new obligational authority	28,950,000	68,875,000	122,075,000	175,275,000	202,225,000	162,000,000	108,750,000	55,900,000	----------	924,050,000
EXPENDITURES										
Scholarship payments to students	----------	17,500,000	43,750,000	78,750,000	113,750,000	131,250,000	105,000,000	70,000,000	$35,000,000	595,000,000
Institutional costs for scholarships	----------	8,750,000	21,875,000	39,375,000	56,875,000	65,625,000	52,500,000	35,000,000	17,500,000	297,500,000
Grants for State commissions	2,700,000	3,250,000	3,950,000	4,650,000	5,350,000	4,500,000	3,750,000	3,400,000	----------	31,900,000
Total expenditures	2,700,000	29,500,000	69,575,000	122,775,000	175,975,000	201,375,000	161,250,000	108,400,000	52,500,000	924,050,000

[1] No specific amount authorized.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, since our hearings, many noted citizens have addressed themselves to the pressing problems of financial need for both students and our colleges and universities. Because of the wealth of documentation contained in these public statements of responsible officials, I ask unanimous consent that these speeches be printed at this point in my remarks.

I further ask unanimous consent that certain telegrams I have received on this subject be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the addresses, telegrams, and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHALLENGE OF EQUAL OPPORTUNITY TO THE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

(An address by John A. Hannah, president, Michigan State University, to the Conference on Equal Opportunity for Higher Education, Washington, D.C., Jan. 4, 1962)

I would like to begin this opening address to this significant conference with an expression of the gratification felt by those of us in the land-grant colleges and universities that the AFL–CIO has chosen to concern itself with one of the major issues confronting higher education today. Russell I. Thackrey, the executive secretary of the Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, who appears later on this program, pointed out recently in a circular letter to the membership that new ground is to be broken here in Washington today. My colleagues in the land-grant universities would want me to say that we are delighted to have the major body of organized labor in our country aline itself with us in consideration of problems which must be solved and of questions which must be answered if higher education is to yield the benefits to the Nation of which it is capable.

It should be no surprise to anyone in this country to see again that organized labor is interested in higher education. I well recall when the State of Michigan was considering undertaking an extensive program of construction at its colleges and universities immediately following the close of World War II to provide facilities for the returning veterans, and other Michigan students in increasing numbers. The question arose as to whether, in that time of shortages, there would be enough workers in the construction trades to carry on a building program of such magnitude. The then Governor asked the legislative representative of the AFL for his opinion on this point. He looked the Governor in the eye and replied:

"You forget, Governor, that these are our sons and our daughters you are talking about. You'll have all the construction workers you need." And that promise was faithfully kept.

One of the little-noted developments in the postwar years is the increasing participation of labor leaders in positions of responsibility in educational affairs at every level. They are serving on hundreds of local school boards, and on governing boards of our public colleges and universities. They are there, not to intrude the official views of organized labor into deliberations and decisions, but to represent the interests of millions of Americans whose stake in education is a very large stake indeed. That participation in educational affairs should be welcomed, for out of it well may come other significant developments such as this historic conference in which we are participating today.

Meeting as we do in this centennial year of the act that created the land-grant colleges, the historical perspective is not only helpful but essential to clarification of the problems of today.

It is clear beyond all question that Justin Morrill and the others who labored with him to bring the land-grant colleges into being were fighting to correct an inequality in opportunities for higher education in the United States of that day. The record is eloquent on that point. Perhaps you would be interested in a brief review of exactly what the founding fathers said.

I begin with the words of a man from Michigan, because my native State was the first of many to petition Congress to grant public lands for the support of a new kind of college, a proposal eventually incorporated in the Morrill Act. Michigan can validly claim to be the pioneer in this new educational movement, for while many States were discussing the establishment of colleges to offer a new kind of higher education, Michigan was the first to act. The Michigan Agricultural College, now Michigan State University, was authorized by the State constitution of 1850 and chartered by the State legislature in 1855, and opened its doors in May 1857, 5 years in advance of the passage of the Morrill Act. At the opening ceremonies, President Joseph R. Williams defended Michigan's educational experiment by pointing out that hitherto, higher education has been reserved for the favored few and that "seven-eighth of a race, on whose toil all subsist, have been deemed unworthy of mental cultivation." Michigan proposed to correct that flagrant inequality.

Jonathan Baldwin Turner, of Illinois, is properly credited with being in the van of the fight for greater educational opportunity for underprivileged Americans. He was a tireless, eloquent exponent of education for the masses, and some notion of his philosophy may be gained from the very name of the institutions he proposed to establish—industrial universities.

One passage from his famous Griggsville speech will demonstrate his concern:

"All civilized society is, necessarily, divided into two distinct cooperative, not antagonistic, classes: a small class, whose proper business it is to teach the true principles of religion, law, medicine, science, art, and literature; and a much larger class, who are engaged in some form of labor in agriculture, commerce, and the arts. For the sake of convenience, we will designate the former the "professional," and the latter the "industrial class * * *." The vast difference, in the practical means, of an appropriate liberal education, suited to their wants and their destiny, which these two classes enjoy, and ever have enjoyed the world over, must have arrested the attention of every thinking man * * *."

Later, in the same address, Turner asked the key question: "What do the industrial classes want? This was his answer:

"They want, and they ought to have, the same facilities for understanding the true philosophy, the science and the art of their several pursuits (their life business), and of efficiently applying existing knowledge thereto, and widening its domain, which the professional classes have long enjoyed in their pursuits."

There we have it in plain terms: The industrial classes should have the same opportunities for higher education as the professional classes enjoy—a plain, honest plea for equality of opportunity.

Justin Morrill adopted Turner's phrase, and in his Morrill Act made provision for the colleges whose purpose was to be "to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions of life."

In the light of what we know of the discussion and agitation preceding the passage of the Morrill Act in 1862, there can be no doubt that the foremost objective was to give what Morrill himself termed "the sons of toil" opportunities for education equal to those available to the favored few.

Morrill, the Vermont Yankee, tariff expert, and custodian of the National Capital's architectural heritage, has unfortunately come down to us as a rather cold, forbidding figure. Actually, he laced his public addresses with dry New England humor, which added a certain charming pungency to them. In his speech at the Massachusetts Agricultural College on the 25th anniversary of the passage of his famous act, he had something to say about higher education at the time the land-grant colleges were established. He spoke of the great majority of mankind who had then been without access to more than the rudiments of education, and then commented:

"If this uncounted and unrepresented multitude sought to acquire knowledge of more practical value in the voyage of life, they soon found that useful knowledge was often estimated in ancient and richly endowed institutions to mark the humble station of steerage passengers, while the august institutions assumed to provide alone for passengers in the cabin."

And then he added a criticism of the philosophy that education should be for a small elite alone in these words:

"All persons, however humble their pursuits, become more valuable by education, more useful to themselves and to the community, and especially so where each one has a visible and responsible share in the government under which he lives."

No modern educational philosopher, with the benefit of the experience of three-quarters of a century since Morrill spoke, has phrased more eloquently the philosophy of the land-grant universities. All persons become more valuable by education, more useful to themselves and to the community.

It is abundantly clear, then, that the land-grant colleges were established to correct an existing inequality in educational opportunity. That inequality was first expressed in terms of vocations and professions—Turner and others pointed out that the agricultural and mechanical workers were not getting a fair shake when compared with the professions. This, they said, was unfair—and the American people, with their love of fairplay and sympathy for the underdog, gave overwhelming approval to their proposals.

Reading closely, and between the lines as well, we can find that these pioneers were protesting against another kind of unfairness. It was not fair to the country, they were saying, to deprive it of the skilled manpower it needed to grow and develop. Morrill repeatedly pointed out that wealth depended upon agriculture and industry, and that America had need of knowledge and trained manpower with which to develop its tremendous potential.

It is important for us of this date to note that inequality was seen as inequality between the two classes into which Turner divided civilized society—the small, aristocratic, privileged professions on the one hand, the rest of mankind on the other. It is important because it is a measure of the success of the land-grant colleges that the class distinctions of a century ago have been blurred where they have not been eliminated. Those unique institutions have raised a score and more of vocations to equal rank with the professions. They have done it in the only way it could have been done, and that is to have opened the doors of educational opportunity to all, regardless of class and irrespective of the kind of work they were preparing to do.

It is important to keep that century-old definition of inequality in mind because the fundamental land-grant philosophy is being threatened today, both directly and indirectly, on different grounds. It is almost inconceivable that this should be so, considering the unmatched record of success it has achieved.

The threats to the land-grant philosophy are posed by those who say that this country is too poor—or has too many other uses for its money—to continue to give generous support to worthy young men and women seeking an opportunity to acquire higher education. We are hearing critics say repeatedly that students and their parents should pay more and more of the cost of education—what they really are saying is that the State should pay less and less. This they are saying with increasing vehemence in the face of Morrill's dictum that all persons become more valuable by education, more useful to themselves and to the community. This they are saying despite the record, despite the plain fact that America would not be what she is today had not the doors of educational opportunity been forced open a century ago and the sons of farmers and factory workers been invited into the halls of learning previously reserved for their privileged fellows.

The economists are not in agreement as to the contributions of education to our growth and prosperity, except that they are most impressive. An economic publication of the Chase Manhattan Bank recently summarized one economic study as indicating that 24 percent of the increase in gross national product from 1929 to 1957 and 44 percent of the advance in the increase per worker could be attributed to the higher level of education in the labor force. In addition, it was reported, increased knowledge and its application accounted for another 17 percent of the growth in gross national product, and 31 percent of the rise in the output per employee. The publication stated that these are probably overestimates, but does point out the obvious: that the better educated the labor force, the more productive it will be, and that the advance in technology, which is basic to growth, rests on education.

The thought that financial barriers should be placed in the path of young people seeking higher education was furthest from Morrill's mind. In fact, his whole idea was to endow the people's colleges he envisaged as a means of making education both readily available and inexpensive.

In his speech at the Massachusetts Agricultural College in 1887, he put it thus:

"The land-grant colleges were founded on the idea that a higher and broader education should be placed in every State within the reach of those whose destiny assigns them to, or who may have the courage to choose industrial vocations where the wealth of nations is produced. * * * The design was to open the door to a liberal education for this large class at a cheaper cost from being close at hand. * * *"

In this conference we are to discuss whether Morrill's dream of a good, liberal education available at cheaper cost to all who can benefit from it must be allowed to fade away, or whether we can keep it alive, bright, and shining, in our time and in the future.

It is in this very area that the great and thriving land-grant colleges and universities of today, successors of those courageous struggling institutions of a century ago, find one of their greatest challenges.

Restricted resources are forcing them into paths of action on which they would not willingly venture if they were uninhibited in their decisions. Most of them, consciously or unconsciously, are restricting educational opportunities to some degree. When there are operating funds and physical facilities to care for only a given number of students at an institution, certainly prudence and integrity demand that those best qualified by way of native intelligence and motivation be those who are admitted. The cutting score must be set somewhere.

There would not be so much uneasiness about all this if our tests and measures of ability and motivation were more reliable. But they are recognized as imperfect instruments at best, and it is to be doubted that any admissions officer in a large university in America can go to sleep at night satisfied that he has not denied admission to candidates who might have made the grade if given the chance.

The land-grant colleges and universities, for the most part, find themselves in a true dilemma here. On the one hand, they are obligated by philosophy and tradition not to deny educational opportunity to any who can profit by higher education, and on the other they are being forced by a number of circumstances to curtail their services. The times put a premium on brains, and all of us, encouraged by our faculties, are trying to attract the best possible students to our campuses. The quality of the entering freshman class, marked by high school rank or test scores, is something to boast about. It is the currently fashionable status symbol. And still there remains the nagging question: Are we fulfilling our mission when we raise the cutting score higher and higher? Are we, the exponents of equality in education, ourselves restricting opportunities by our selection policies. Are we diminishing, rather than enlarging, the area of opportunity in America?

Perhaps part of our difficulty arises from the fact that so many of the onetime small land-grant colleges having narrow fields of interest have developed with the years and in response to public demands into great, complex institutions. Perhaps a true university with its mandatory concern for graduate study and research cannot be as sympathetic as it once was to the needs of the lowly freshman fresh from the farm or from a city home across the railroad tracks.

It would be regrettable if this were so. We dare not seek to fit ourselves to the pattern of a university referred to by Morrill, as described by a Harvard orator, as a place where nothing useful is taught, and where a man can make a living by digging Sanskrit roots.

It is devoutly to be hoped that the discussions to insure in this conference will help us find our way out of this dilemma, show us how we can continue to perform our traditional function as land-grant universities and still maintain our academic standards and honor our scholarly traditions.

If there were time, it would be interesting to identify some of the other factors serving to impede us in the struggle to achieve true equality of educational opportunity in America, a struggle that is a part of a larger struggle for full equality in every field of human activity. However, the design of the conference is such that attention will be paid to these factors, so it should suffice only to mention some of them here.

My work with the Commission on Civil Rights has opened my eyes to the appalling extent that artificial considerations, principally racial, but not excluding community environment, family attitude, and economic circumstances, impose conditions of inequality upon talented youngsters who belong in college. It required a sizable volume to record the findings of our Commission in the field of higher education alone, so I could not hope to do justice to this phase of the question here today. I refer you to that report, and the education section of the Commission's 1961 report to the President and the Congress, for the unhappy details.

There are hopeful signs amid the current public discussion of the role of higher education in our society, and how to meet its costs. The economists, for one thing, are beginning to report on some interesting studies on the economic value of higher education.

The publication of the Chase Manhattan Bank quoted earlier summarizes some of these studies by saying that the rate of return on investment in education is about the same as the rate of return on business investment. Then it adds: "What is more, the record shows that the growth in gross national product resulting from education has been sufficient to cover much of the cost of our school system despite the rapid rise in enrollment and expenditures. Thus, year for year as well as over time, a large part of the expenditure on education is self-financed."

That is what educators and friends of education have been saying for years, without quotable facts to back up their statements. Perhaps the economists will succeed now where we have failed in persuading business and industry that investment in education is a sound investment. Considering that most of the opposition to increased tax support for our colleges and universities comes from the business and industrial community, it would be a clear and decided gain if its leaders could be convinced that education benefits the community more than it benefits the individual.

There are other hopeful signs. The social scientists are beginning to expose to public view the intolerable situation existing in many communities, especially in the slums and near-slums, where everything works against the bright boy or girl who wants to go to college—community attitude, parental indifference, inadequate counseling, schools that for one reason or another are less than excellent.

It is a happy circumstance that the author of one such study that is attracting much favorable attention—Patricia Cayo Sexton—will participate in one of the discussions this afternoon. I am sure she will have much to say on this point, and will say it eloquently and forcefully.

Dr. Conant's book entitled "Slums and Suburbs" should be read by every thoughtful American. It dramatizes one of the greatest problems America faces in this decade.

I say these are hopeful signs because the American people are instinctively on the side of the underdog. That instinct led them to support Morrill and Turner and the other leaders in the fight for equality of opportunity in higher education a century ago, and it will lead them to do the right thing again if they know the true situation. Sometimes that instinct is blunted or dulled by extraordinary circumstances—political, social, or economic—but up to now the American people have usually made the right decisions and taken the right actions, and I am confident that they will continue to do so.

It is because of these hopeful signs, and my confidence in their instinctive good judgment that I am encouraged to predict that the land-grant colleges and universities of this era will meet the challenges of today with the same success as their predecessors met the infinitely more difficult challenges of a century ago. I have confidence that somehow we shall find a way out of our financial difficulties. I believe we shall find a way to come ever closer to true equality of educational opportunity. I believe our universities and the secondary schools will find ways to discover and motivate the possessors of native ability now being allowed to go to waste. I believe, in short, that the land-grant philosophy as first put into practice a century and more ago is just as vital in the United States of today as it was in an undeveloped country just entering into the industrial age, wracked by internal dissension and still to find its rightful destiny.

I can offer no finer, more eloquent justification for faith and confidence that all will yet be well than the words spoken by Justin Morill himself in justification of his own faith and philosophy:

"We live in a Christian age, and do not ignorantly worship an unknown God. We accept it as a blessing that to Adam it was ordained, 'In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread.' We rejoice in the fact that we live under a republican form of government, where all men are equal before the law, where the income of capital is not wholly dominant, where social conditions are not fixed by heredity, and where the rank of men depends upon their own personally earned and individual merits."

That was Justin Morrill's statement of faith. We could do no better than to adopt it as our own.

ADDRESS MADE BY JOHN M. STALNAKER, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL MERIT SCHOLARSHIP CORP., TO THE DELEGATES TO THE CONFERENCE ON EQUAL OPPORTUNITY FOR HIGHER EDUCATION SPONSORED BY THE AFL–CIO AT THE SHOREHAM HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C.

The purpose of a scholarship is to help an able, ambitious boy or girl go to college.

We want our able young people to go to college for a number of important reasons.

In the first place, we need educated brains. No one will deny that. We need talented, educated people in labor, in government, in science, if we are to hold our own, in business, if we are to compete in the world markets, in the health professions, in teaching. In fact, in just about every field of importance there is a need for more educated people able to do a job. The demand for educated talent has never been greater.

Higher education is especially important in times of rapid social changes, such as are taking place today. Never in history has there been a time when important social changes were more numerous and rapid.

One need not tell labor that this is a period of increasing automation, of technological advances, of great scientific progress. It is also a time of the growth of bigness in all fields: industry, labor, science, business, and government. Bigness requires trained educated brains for the leaders, and even for productive followers. This is an age when some education is almost a necessity for everyone to get along in the growing complexities which surround us. Higher education is needed if we are to make progress, if we are to be victorious in the great international struggle over which ideology will rule the world. Our very freedom depends upon our winning. The winner almost certainly will be the nation which identifies, honors, respects, and develops its talented young people to productive levels. Progress is usually dependent upon a very small number of truly able people. We cannot afford to overlook a single one.

The greatest natural resource of any nation is the ability of its people. No one nation has a corner on raw brain power. Talent, like gold, is where you find it. Brains are no respecter of race, color, religion, or nationality. There are talented boys and girls to be found among all groups. But raw talent is of little use. It must be refined and processed through education so that it can be useful. Our problem is to see to it that all of our able children get the education their ability deserves. Only in this way can we conserve our most precious of all resources, talented young people. Scholarships are for this purpose.

The most important reason for us to educate every ambitious person in this Nation to the extent his ability deserves is for the sake of the person himself. We must, if we be true to the purpose of this country, give every young person the opportunity for an education so that he can expand his vision, increase his capacity to do things, become a more informed citizen, and in short become the person he is capable of being. Ignorance, it has been said, is not only a chain on your mind, it is also a chain that binds your will. The choice you can never make is the choice you do not know exists.

In this country education is widely available. At this time about a fourth of our entire population is in school. We have compulsory education covering the elementary grades and into high school. Illiteracy is confined to less than 2 percent of our population. It is true that somewhat over a third of our fifth-graders do not graduate from high school, but the proportion is decreasing each year. High school graduation will be the rule for almost all of our youth soon.

Elementary and high schools are located in communities throughout the Nation. Higher education is also widely available, although typically the boy or girl goes away from home to college. The low-cost community or junior college is spreading, but still uncommon in many States.

Higher education at this time is more widely available in the United States than in any other major country of the world. No other nation has as large a proportion of its college-age youth in college as we do. We have a great variety of colleges and universities. Every State has colleges. We have private colleges and public ones, academically oriented institutions and vocationally oriented ones, colleges with great football stadiums and those with great libraries and scientific laboratories.

If our need is to educate our able youth through college, and if we have the facilities, what is the problem? What is the need for scholarships?

The problem is to keep the doors of college open to the able student who wants a college education even if his parents cannot afford it. No able young person should be denied a college education because of lack of money.

Higher education in this country is a privilege, not a requirement. In most other major countries higher education is subsidized by the government as an activity carried on as a public responsibility for the common good. In this country higher education is considered to be a private opportunity, available to those who can gain entrance and meet the costs. The cost is not inconsiderable, and it is increasing and shows every likelihood of increasing more. As a result, many able students are discouraged from even thinking about a college education. They have to earn money, not spend it.

We do have ways to help some of the able impoverished students. For one thing we have State-supported universities which offer education at a low cost. And we have scholarships, loans, and job opportunities. And we try to convince able students that a college education is a sound and paying investment for them. Sometimes it is difficult to make an investment without any money.

College costs vary greatly according to the institution and whether or not it is possible for the student to live at home. By and large, college is costly for the student and his parents. This is in large part because the student is away from home and has room and board to pay. For the unmarried student living away from home, college at a public institution will cost on the average about $1,300 to $1,500 a year or $130 to $150 a month of schooling. At a private college the cost is higher largely because the tuition is higher. It will average today about $2,200 a year. At the much sought-after popular private colleges the tuition will in many cases exceed $1,500 a year, and the total costs will be upward of $3,000 a year.

The main source of funds to pay for college in this country is the parents. They actually meet about 61 percent of the cost. The savings and student earnings while in college are the next biggest factor. Scholarships and financial aid account for a relatively small part of the cost, under 10 percent. The current move is to encourage able but poor students to borrow money for their education, and the Government has made loan funds available through the colleges to the extent of some $200 million. Efforts are being made now to have commercial sources lend money to students for their education, at higher terms, of course.

Hidden talent, talent in the children of poor parents, or minority groups, or from backward areas, needs to be discovered just as hidden oil reserves, and brought to the surface. The National Merit Scholarship Corp. was created in mid-1955 to encourage the development of all talent and to arouse public interest in and respect for our talented young people.

Briefly, the merit program is a cooperative effort conducted jointly with the schools, colleges, and sponsors. Each year some 15,500 of our high schools test some 600,000 students, at the time they are juniors, with the national merit scholarship qualifying test. From this group we select for some recognition some 35,500, or about 2 percent of the graduating class of seniors. A smaller group numbering about 10,000 of these are further examined and their records reviewed. These are awarded certificates of merit and from them the merit scholars—about 1,000 a year—are selected. These scholars attend the college of their choice and study the subject of interest to them. The amount of support given them depends upon their need (i.e., what their parents can pay) and the cost of attending the college they select. Merit scholarships cover the 4 years of college.

To support the proposition that ability is where you find it, I might point out that the merit finalists include children of parents in a great variety of occupations: physicians, barbers, executives, teachers, policemen, mail carriers, truckdrivers, bartenders, carpenters, lawyers, clerks, inspectors, technicians, dispatchers, writers, electricians, janitors, repairmen, night watchmen. About a tenth of this very select top group have parents who are members of an AFL–CIO union.

The merit program is open to sponsors who want to support some of the very able young people we find, and sponsorship has been widespread. AFL–CIO sponsors merit scholarships and has for a number of years.

The operation of the merit program for the past 6 years has permitted us to gather more data about able students than has ever before been possible, to study the scholarship scene, and to come face to face with some of the problems in the task of bringing talent, including hidden talent, to light and developing it. I want to discuss a few of our findings to date. These tentative and preliminary findings are useful and in some cases provocative since they go against the grain.

The first problem we get into is the matter of understanding what we mean by the words we use. Quibbling over word meaning is a meatless bone to chew on, I know, but permit me to give just two illustrations of my point. The first is the word "scholarship," meaning a grant to a student. One college says that 25 percent of its students are on scholarships. What does this mean? Some scholarships, of course, carry no money at all and others a very large grant of money. A scholarship may be for as little as $10 or as much as $2,500 a year. The average scholarship covers less than one-fifth of the cost of a year of college. The size of a scholarship should, in a sense, be considered in terms of the amount of money it costs to go to the institution making the award. A $500 scholarship has a different meaning at a college where the tuition is $1,500 from one where the tuition is $150.

To some of us a scholarship is recognition for some sort of distinction in the intellectual realm. However, athletic scholarships still flourish and may be given to a promising halfback and have nothing to do with brains or even with the intellectual side of education.

My point is that the term "scholarship" has many meanings and we need to be sure we understand what is meant when it is used

The other term I want to mention which has various meanings is "talent." We are searching for talent. It is the great loss of talent which is mentioned frequently today. Talent is usually defined high marks in school or a high score on some test. There is nothing wrong with high marks and high test scores. They are useful but limited signs of talent. As parents we urge our children to mind the teacher and do what is necessary to get the high marks. High marks have many values. Without them the student will have a difficult time today in getting into graduate or professional schools. Our national need, however, is for young people who will be productive after college, who will use their education to accomplish something, who will have ideas and ideals, who will be independent thinkers, yes even nonconformists. The top grade getters, the much sought after well-rounded chaps, some evidence indicates, may be the conforming followers who learn fast but get their pleasure from minding the teacher and doing what they are told. Our talent searching, if it is to be of value in the long run, must be for the youngster who will perform after his schooling is completed and he is on his own in a world which can be cold and cruel. In this world the teacher does not always sit at the head of the class giving orders, making assignments and awarding A grades to those who do well what they are told to do. The goal is talented performance in a practical setting.

You may have seen the statement that scholarships are plentiful, that scholarships go begging, that any ambitious student can get help to get a college education if he really wants one. We have studied this issue and find such statements false and misleading. There is a relatively small amount of scholarship money and the applicants for each scholarship of any value are numerous and growing.

In our studies we find that most scholarship money is controlled by the colleges, about $100 million a year now. However, the amount of money for scholarships is probably not increasing as rapidly as college costs or in proportion to the increase in the numbers of students seeking a college education. College scholarship funds are used largely to attract college-bound youth to a particular college and therefore away from another one. Colleges are competitive in more than sports, and indeed there is nothing wrong with this. A college cannot be superior without topflight students. Given an input of able students, properly oriented before the college gets them, the college cannot avoid graduating superior stuff 4 years later. Private colleges are sensitive to their competitive positions in attracting the students they want. By the adroit use of scholarship funds a college can improve its competitive position.

Most of the college-controlled scholarship money is held by a small group of private colleges. Three percent of the colleges control over one-third of the scholarship funds. In the main these institutions are the ones which have the highest student charges. Even with the scholarship help the student may have to pay more than he would to attend a State or low-cost institution.

Several of our States—New York, California, Illinois, New Jersey, are examples—have scholarship programs. These State-supported programs may spread. In these programs, able youth are selected, usually based on a single test performance, and given money, which varies according to need, to attend a college typically limited to those within the State. The award is made to the high school senior, who in turn, selects his own college. The maximum award is usually small relative to the total cost of attending the college selected.

The Federal Government has been active in the fellowship field—support for students in graduate education—but the scholarship bills have not won congressional approval and indeed their design, in the opinion of some observers, has left something to be desired. The National Science Foundation could offer scholarships according to its charter, but thus far has not done so.

Private scholarship programs are also probably increasing. It is difficult to determine just how extensive they are. An increasing number of companies are providing scholarships for unusually able children of their employees.

Because of the concentration of college-controlled scholarship funds in a small number of colleges, we decided to check the preferences of the able students for specific colleges. We have almost 2,000 colleges in this country if we include the junior colleges. In the merit program we comb the country for what we call top talent. Where do the cream of this crop, the top 2 percent (35,000) of high school graduates, say they would like to go to college if they could? We ask them to name their preference. This type of vote does not mean the student would be acceptable to that college or that the college is suitable for him. It is a public opinion poll among very bright students.

Would you expect these bright young people from every State to spread themselves among the various colleges? On the contrary, while they voted for a total of over 1,500 colleges, there was a heavy concentration in a few institutions. Ten colleges attracted the vote of a third of the men. Harvard and M.I.T., two neighboring institutions in Cambridge, Mass., together got the vote of 14 percent of the entire group of very bright boys. Half of the group wanted to go to one of 26 colleges (9 were public and 17 private).

The votes of the girls were only slightly less concentrated. The 10 most popular colleges with these superior girls attracted about a fifth of them. That the most popular college with the girls, Stanford University, is at the opposite end of the country from the college most popular with the boys, Harvard College, is accidental, I am sure. Of the 26 colleges most popular with this group of girls, 7 are State institutions.

This finding of the concentration of the interests in a small number of colleges led us to consider how colleges differ. There are, we find, major differences among the colleges in each of the factors we studied. These included the type of student who attends and his field of interest, the formal education of the faculty, the money spent by the college for education, research funds, plans of the students admitted, and so on. Here again we find a small number of private and public universities are outstanding in every factor.

We did not study the incomes of the parents of the students. A professor of economics at Harvard has estimated that the average income of Harvard parents in 1960 was $17,000 to $18,000, while that of all families sending students to college was $7,000 to $8,000. A Harvard dean has recently estimated that if present trends continue the annual price tag for a Harvard education will be $4,000 to $5,000 by 1970 and that less than 5 percent of American families will be able to pay for it from their own resources.

I want to point out explicitly and unmistakably that our own studies do not give any indication of which is the best college or where a particular student should attend college in order to get the education which will be best for him. We guess that no one college is good for all students, and that the matching of student with college which is best for his development is a task worthy of more attention. We also have a hunch that education depends more on the students than has been acknowledged. Education is a very personal thing. It is not something, we judge, which is given to a student but rather something he earns by his own efforts. If a student tries, he can gain a superior education in a relatively unknown college.

Our researchers have also turned to the problem of finding the able, talented student, and here we run into many serious problems, involving issues on which most of of us have strong feelings.

To some people talent means a high IQ. These people think that talent is inherited, that it is a sort of unitary trait which you either have or you don't. It follows that if we use the right test we can locate these high IQ children in every area of the country and among all depressed peoples.

This view is as false as it is simple. The IQ is an empirically determined index which may have certain limited uses for the professional psychologist. To the public which has taken it too seriously, the IQ presents a grossly oversimplified picture of the nature of ability or talent. The IQ with children in the upper years of high school reflects background and education to some extent. It does not in any case make any attempt to include those characteristics which distinguish those who accomplish something in the world from those who are relatively unproductive and of little value. Superior performance is the goal, and superior performance results from a combination of factors of which drive or ambition or motivation is a key element. High IQ without the character to back it up is lifeless and useless.

At the other extreme is a group who condemns all tests, who believes that the paper and pencil tests widely used today discriminate in favor of the children who have had superior advantages and against children from the depressed areas and certain minority groups. This group wants to develop culture-free tests so that the bright can be found without reference to their past development. Even if tests could be developed which are "fair" to pupils from all backgrounds, what purpose would they serve? We live in a society which is culture laden. You cannot succeed in an engineering school if you don't know some mathematics; you cannot succeed in college if you cannot read.

Mr. Conant points out in his book "Slums and Suburbs," that if a child does poorly on a test because he comes from the wrong side of the tracks, it is not because the test is unfair but because the social circumstances are unfair. There is no point in changing the tests, which will accomplish nothing. What we must do is improve the educational opportunity for all of our children.

Let us face the facts. Superior homes (which cannot be measured in terms of income), superior schools, superior communities, and superior friends all have measurable effects on children. If they did not we would be less concerned about improving them. Do not underestimate the importance of good schooling and good homes that have purpose and direction. There is no way to bypass these influences.

Of course, if any group of our population is forced to live under substandard conditions and is deprived of adequate schooling, their development will suffer accordingly. The need is to improve the conditions, not change the tests.

The more serious issue in the discovery of talent is the appreciation and recognition of the great variety of talent and its complex nature. To the extent we put a premium on uniformity and conformity, to that extent we tend to suppress individuality.

Because scholastic aptitude can be measured inexpensively and reliably and because school marks are easily obtained and of some significance, we tend to overemphasize the importance of these factors. They are, to be sure, important, but they are not sufficient. They relate more to predicting success in college marks than to excellence of performance in life.

If the independent creative person is to be found and encouraged, we must broaden our sights. The difficult-to-measure but important characteristics cannot be ignored. Intellectual competence is necessary but not enough. How ambitious is the person? Does the lad have a sense of destiny? Can he work at a sustained level for a long period of time toward a distant goal? What influence does he have on his friends? Does he have a high level of energy? Does he have a sense of integrity and purpose?

In the National Merit Scholarship Program, we are experimenting with new ways to find the young person of talent. The problems are many but we are making some headway. Our emphasis is on performance as well as potential. One of our groups selected consists of boys and girls who have overcome unusual handicaps to succeed and who desperately want to continue their education. Another group consists of those who have demonstrated some creativity in work outside the school control.

In summary, may I say that of all the wastes in our country, the stunting of the development of our able youth is the most serious. The proper use of scholarships can stimulate the able, encourage the recognition of the great diversity of talent, and make higher education available to those who can profit by it most. The full development of our talented youth is the responsibility of all of us. No able boy or girl should be denied a college education because of his inability to pay the going rate.

Address Made by Louis T. Benezet, President, Colorado College, Colorado Springs, Colo., to the Delegates of the Conference on Equal Opportunity for Higher Education, Sponsored by the AFL–CIO, at the Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D.C.

At a recent conference of business representatives in Washington this question was seriously asked: "Are too many people going to college?" The question as explained to me was not so much a matter of student numbers as of accomplisment. The taxpaying citizen cannot suppress fondness for the idea that many young people may be going to college because it is the thing to do and thus are wasting our money.

This question strangely enough is close to the question posed for this conference, how to open the college door to more American young people, even though it seems to be saying the opposite. Both questions imply wrongly that college education is still a class privilege given to a certain proportion of American youth; and that going to college is a unique type of experience which is the same everywhere.

Nobody knows how many Americans one way or another are studying lessons at the post-high-school level. To find out would require an impossible search for all those people who take on evening studies, extension courses, correspondence courses, TV courses, public lectures and forums and whatever else comprises the immense universe of adult education. In actuality, almost anyone of average intelligence in America today can go to college, if by going to college we may include all the kinds of learning past high school that are made available throughout the country; much of it so inexpensive as to be within the reach of the most modestly-to-do. This availability grows by leaps and bounds each year.

The gap between this claim of availability, which is based on our astonishingly widespread post-high-school learning in America, and the nagging fact that nearly half our most able students are not going to college at all—this gap is what America needs first to understand and next to cure.

The first step in understanding will come if we can identify more clearly the many different kinds of college opportunity available in America. Many failures to go to college come from public misunderstanding that the only college that really counts is the ivy-clad 4-year institution of liberal arts offering residential college life with all the trimmings and an eventual degree carrying prestige in the best-known circles. As the representative of a college which might roughly be thus described, I will admit that our student disappointments come largely from young people who have come or rather have been sent to us for the wrong reasons. About these people I would still say, not too many are in college; they are simply in the wrong kind of college for them and might have justified themselves quite well in some other kind, such as a business school, a junior community college, a large State university, or a part-time evening course in some city institution, with the maturing influence of a job held during the day.

I should much like to exchange such students for an equal number—say 20 percent of each class—which had been drawn from population sources now sending very few if any young people away to college.

As important therefore as the quantity problem of enabling more young Americans to obtain higher learning in some form is the quality problem of selecting the right kind of higher learning for each qualified boy and girl. In the selection, what is commonly called the private liberal arts college needs a broader range of young Americans than it is getting. We are becoming distressingly homogenized. The liberal arts college needs more students from among people who now consider this kind of college not only financially impossible but personally and socially unsuited to them.

First let us look at the term "private." All human institutions are cursed by stereotypes of the image as we now call it. There is no one kind of college distinct from all others. Colleges like corporations, labor unions, and cities overlap each other in innumerable ways, so that we have gradations of many kinds and not separate classes. Is New York University, the world's largest private college, more similar to Hartwick, an upstate residential private college of 700 students, than to the College of the City of New York? Is MIT, a great private technical institution, to be lumped with other private colleges in its region such as, say, Wellesley; or is it closer in what it actually does in education to the University of Illinois? The word "private" to some may imply no public interest or support. Yet all private colleges have public support in being exempt from ad valorem, income, and excise taxes; even the income-producing properties of some private colleges are tax exempt, such as large rental office buildings belonging to Northwestern University in Chicago. Several old private colleges were originally set into being by State grants of cash. Some private colleges have been given by their States the right to condemn property by eminent domain; on the other hand the private colleges in Colorado must pay the State unemployment insurance tax, whereas the public colleges do not.

Even if "private" were not such an arbitrary term, most so-called private colleges tend to avoid it because it connotes privatism and exclusiveness. Any private college educator worth his salt wants to make his education less exclusive and more available to those who can truly benefit by it. Admittedly, this is becoming harder to do.

For these reasons the term "independent college" is now more often used to describe that institution supported by endowment, fees, and gifts rather than by public taxation. The independent college is like private enterprise in business and labor, at least to the extent that it is free to prosper or starve; and in every decade both have happened. Its board of control is made up of private citizens, usually selected by the college itself. It makes its own decisions: what curriculum to offer, what textbooks to use, what teachers and students to select and retain. It even decides its own fate in intercollegiate football, unlike some State universities which must perform annual sacrifice as the doormat of their interstate conference.

The other term that needs a brief look is "liberal arts." No term in education has been so misunderstood or badly used. Well-meaning neighbors, for instance, have asked me, "Why are you building a science hall? I thought you were a liberal arts college." We must keep explaining that in our kind of college we try to study science as broadly as we do English or history.

Any attempts to rope off liberal arts colleges into one section according to what they teach are as hopeless as the attempt to agree on what each means by the word "private." Most of them have given up the so-called pure curriculum. There are liberal arts colleges which offer vocational specialties of many kinds including home economics, TV production, engineering, and even agriculture. Many offer degrees in business administration. In contrast, a number of institutions officially known as teachers colleges offer programs more strictly within the liberal arts than do neighboring institutions which call themselves liberal arts colleges. How mixed up can we get?

And yet there is in American higher education a distinct emphasis known traditionally as the independent liberal arts college. Seen in its best form it has three distinguishing features which make it a basic element if not the core element in the strength of American higher education. These three distinguishing features are: a philosophic approach to knowledge; an attention to the individual personality in learning; and a freedom to change. All three date from the dawn of higher education, which took place among the free citizens in the groves of Athens 2,500 years ago.

By a philosophic approach to knowledge I mean a belief in the length, depth, and breadth of all things worth knowing. It commits a college to the study of history, of the natural world, and of the nature of man and his problems of living in society. Belief in a philosophic approach to knowledge explains why the independent liberal arts college is the largest source of people who become the researchers of new knowledge; for new knowledge must grow out of broad understanding of old knowledge.

By attention to the individual personality I mean those practices of teaching and college life which support close relations between one teacher and his student as essential to the learning process. No one has yet discovered anything that might be called group learning. Learning is a reaction to environment that takes place in one mind at a time; it takes place differently in each different mind. No one learns even a cold fact in the same way as someone else. This simple but often neglected truth explains better than anything else why young people are willing to pay additional tuition to go to a college of small size, where attention to the individual personality is built into the process.

By freedom to change I mean all the freedoms of speech, thought, and inquiry without which progress in knowledge becomes impossible. This obviously is not to say such freedoms do not exist in large and publicly supported colleges and universities. But if freedom of speech and inquiry does exist in the large public institution, much is due to the fact that we have had, side by side, independent colleges where freedoms of these kind constitute a main reason for existence. In the same way if we have, as we do have, in large public universities an increasing amount of attention to independent study and honors programs emphasizing the individual student, much of the credit can be traced to a healthy competition for individual attention in learning which the strong independent colleges have helped stimulate within the public universities.

Perhaps the greatest contribution of the independent college is its reminder to society that good education like other first-rate things cannot be bought at the bargain counter. A few colleges currently are trying to disprove this. They will not succeed. The independent liberal arts college has a problem of rising tuition, which I shall mention in a moment. But the chief reason for its rising tuition cost is that an adequate modern higher education costs money—money for books, laboratory equipment, and teaching devices; but much more than this, money to engage the careful time of thoroughly educated and gifted teachers sufficient in number.

This public university by definition must meet the demands of its total public over a broad range in ways that require inevitable compromises. I learned the other day of a large State college where a class in early Greek civilization had been canceled because it had not met the State requirement of a minimum of 10 students enrolled. Did the public lose or gain by that cancellation? Impossible to say; but it is possible to say that the effort of that large State college to give early Greek civilization was originally stimulated by the fact that it will be given, small class or large, in a neighboring private college. Good students and teachers know that almost all our experiments in democracy, except the abolition of slavery, were tried out in Greece from 600 to 300 B.C.

So both kinds of higher education are useful to strengthen each other. If the independent liberal arts college is to survive, it must continue to show that it can hold up its end. It will do this better as it is able to select and attract more young Americans from all population sources, whose mental talents can be particularly well developed by the broad and deep learning that the best independent liberal arts colleges stand for.

In 14 years as an independent liberal arts president I can remember for instance, the enrollment of only one child of a labor official: the daughter of an officer of the American Federation of Musicians. I am sure her experience did much for her, and I know she added much to the Allegheny College campus. At the same time I can remember dozens of students from homes where the salary was lower than the rather modest salary paid the union official.

For every calling we need people gifted and trained in broad and deep learning. We need people in corporations, in labor organizations, in government, in the professions, and in community life who will insist on taking time to think their way past the point of the obvious. How that stoppage at the obvious is plaguing public thinking today. Huston Smith, philosophy professor at MIT, has stated that certain questions underlie all of the turmoil in current society and must be faced intelligently by our leaders, if not by all people. They are:

1. Absolutism versus relativism.
2. Objective thought versus commitment.
3. Authority versus freedom.
4. Egoism versus altruism.
5. The state (and all other large corporate organizations) versus the individual.
6. The secular versus the sacred.

Is it fair to propose that all prospective leaders, whether they be leaders for business, labor, government, or community life, should be charged with an education dealing with questions like these? How do we produce the leaders unless we identify in early life these young people with the talents and ambition to pursue learning as broad as this? How then can we make sure they get the education they need?

The independent liberal arts college that sticks to its mission should be preserved in America. The reason indeed is not because, as Mallory said of Mount Everest, "It is there." No institution can be issued a ticket to immortality, independent institutions least of all. This type of college should be preserved only if it has a job to do and if it needs to do that job for more truly responsive young Americans than it is now doing. To accomplish it will require a broadening of student financial aid. It also will require a broader program of interpreting to the public, through the high schools, what liberal arts education has done and can do. Sociological studies agree that where a boy lives has more to do with whether or not he goes to college than how rich or poor his family is. To repeat, we are not getting the college message to enough of the right young people.

The independent colleges currently are becoming selective faster by price than by real student ability. The top selective colleges have, discovered, to their inner dismay, that the higher they raise their tuition the more desperate is the scramble to get children in, among the narrowing stratum of the public who can pay. This is the time-honored technique of selling diamonds, Rolls Royces, and Rembrandts. It is not a good way to select the best liberal arts prospects from among American youth. Even though almost all colleges have increased scholarship aid budgets and utilized the fast growing Federal student loan program there is evidence that a smaller percentage of students each year are coming from low-income homes to the leading (that is, most costly) independent colleges. In the years from 1955 to 1959 direct scholarship aid in this country rose from $66 million to $98 million; yet this aid went to 14 percent of all students in 1955 and to only 11 percent of all students in 1959. In that same time private college tuitions rose by an average of nearly 50 percent; between 1949 and 1960 independent college tuitions rose by an average of 102 percent. True, public college tuition also rose 85 percent; but that means a rise from $112 to only $207 for tuition and fees. In the private college the 1960–61 average was $938. The current average tuition in the most selective eastern independent colleges is around $1,500, plus $950 for board and room. Travel plus incidental and personal expenses brings this to $3,000 a year for a student in these colleges. A figure of $2,500 to $2,700 would apply to their counterparts in the West and Midwest.

With costs like these, which have risen four times as fast as the concurrent rise in national family income, it seems likely that the leading independent liberal arts colleges ere long will be catering entirely to the same small economic class that now patronizes the independent secondary schools. Another indication lies in the rapidly dropping percentage of American youth going to privately controlled higher education of all types as against public higher education. In the 7 years between 1955 and 1961, inclusive, that proportion has dropped from 44 percent to 39.6 percent, and in first-time enrollments—that is, entering students—the percentage by 1961 had dropped to 36.3 percent. (There were 1,325 private and 703 public colleges in the United States in 1960.) Part of this trend is due to the creation of new large public colleges every 6 months in the most populous States, junior colleges especially.

But new public-college growth is not the whole story. Of the 725 independent liberal arts colleges in the country, all but the top 50 at most are struggling annually to fill their enrollment quotas with students of the college's choice. Most will admit they compete for students with area public colleges, and that their tuition charges are being kept lower than they should be by the competition. So far as most small independent colleges are concerned, the American people have been wildly misled by the picture of the college bulging at the seams and turning down bright ambitious student applicants by scores. There is much unused capacity. Only where a State scholarship program is operative, as in California, Illinois, New Jersey, and New York, do the small independent colleges have an opportunity to draw the students they want, at a tuition fee which will permit the non-tax-supported college the base for an adequate teaching program.

The foregoing recital of independent college fees on the one hand and enrollment difficulties on the other may sound like an obituary notice for this type of institution in America. Such a notice, once more quoting Mark Twain, would be exaggerated. The independent colleges will stay alive if for no other reason than that the United States will need every classroom building, library and laboratory, public or private, that it can lay its hands on in the next decade. What will probably happen is that the trend of increasing public aid to private colleges will continue—building loans, student loans and scholarships, research grants, science equipment grants, teacher fellowships, etc. The prospect of outright budgetary subsidies may or may not come to us as it came years ago to Oxford and Cambridge through Britain's university grants program. Before that time comes numbers of independent colleges may have decided it makes sense to sell out lock, stock and barrel to the surrounding city, county and State. Yet it seems likely that those colleges which can maintain strong programs under independent boards of control and predominantly private financing will stay alive and independent.

There are more than private reasons for believing it is in the country's interest that those independent colleges strong enough to remain independent be encouraged to do so. In the first place they have a tradition of broad and deep learning to maintain. Second, they have set and should continue to set the pace for college learning as an individual experience, stimulated by individual professors who take time for their students. Third, they can use their freedom to demonstrate flexibility in projects concerning whom, what, and how to teach. We are still far from teaching as well as we should. Fourth, and perhaps most important, they can use their freedom to be the keepers of our conscience concerning integrity of the intellect. If the independent colleges were to do no more than keep national standard for the freedom of thought and inquiry, they would justify their survival on those grounds alone.

Yet my summary of the case for the independent liberal arts college has not solved the problem of its tuition cost. This fact threatens progressively to deny it from being the very opportunity to leading students from all backgrounds that it ought to be. The solution is for America to take whatever steps are needed to guide the good liberal arts prospect irrespective of means toward the college of his choice. This may require greatly increased public scholarship programs, with emphasis preferably on State rather than Federal scholarships, since all colleges typically draw their best students from within their own State boundaries.

The Illinois State scholarship program, for instance, has helped a strong independent liberal arts college like Knox increase its enrollment toward 1,200 able students, while offering a total student aid budget of over $400,000 per year, not counting loans and part-time campus jobs. However, it seems certain both State and Federal scholarships will be needed.

It may also require expanded programs of aid to teaching facilities and equipment, made perhaps as matching grants in the style of the recently begun National Science

Foundation science equipment grant program. It may in time require an honest facing of a possible general grants program to independent colleges. This last I should hope to see forestalled until it should become bluntly evident that individual and corporate philanthropy from the private sector cannot meet the challenge of supporting high-quality college education. As of now, that issue is in doubt.

The practical argument for public aid to the independent colleges is that it is much the cheapest way taxwise of expanding college facilities, since private college endowments, gifts, and at least partial student payments will continue to contribute most of the educational dollar. It would be silly to build great new public university cities so long as independent college capacity remained unfilled as it does now.

Yet the final argument for public aid, insofar as it may be needed to help the independent colleges fulfill their role, rests on a matter of belief. If these colleges because of the tradition and quality of their teaching and the hardiness of their intellectual freedom can strengthen the fabric of American higher education, then they should be aided to do so.

Aiding them, however, is not the end of it. Whether or not the independent colleges accept a dime of public money, they can face themselves only to the extent they are able to demonstrate the results of what they claim they do for the government of able young people. The worst that could happen would be the creation of islands for the economic elite; for students educate each other more than professors educate them. Evidence is growing moreover that the current ritualistic insistence upon high college board scores and top high school grade index is having some undesirable results. Our student bodies for one thing are becoming tense and worrisome. The desire for a liberal education—that process of broadly human as well as scholastic learning—is not limited to the top grade-getters and aptitude-test scorers. How to measure a real desire for liberal education is the frontier of the admission office. Creative abilities, for one thing, such as are seen in the fine arts and in group relations, are found to be rather independent of top academic intelligence. It is in the interest of the independent liberal arts colleges to build student bodies of young people who are ready to give themselves to the spirit of liberal education as well as to its exercises.

A long step in that direction will be taken if the problem of the increasing economic exclusion can be relieved. Colleges need bright youngsters from the city streets and the farms as well as from the suburbs. It will be up to the American people to decide whether or not the independent liberal arts colleges have enough to offer the country so that their economic problems should be shared and the right students helped to go there, while the college's basic independence is preserved. It will be the least surprising statement of this discussion that I hope the American public's answer is yes. We must, and I believe we shall, be ready to take it on from there.

Address by Russell I. Thackrey to Delegates of the Conference on Equal Opportunity for Higher Education, Sponsored by the AFL–CIO, at the Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D.C.

I hesitate to use the word "crisis" in a country in which every day's newspaper records a new and apparently insoluble crisis. The one I'm going to talk about is a great opportunity as well as a crisis. It is clearly solvable, if the American people really understand what is involved.

Within the next 10 years, this country will make a major decision, or a series of decisions, about its system of education beyond the high school. Involved in this is the kind of society we are going to have in the future. Will it be one in which there is a reasonable degree of opportunity or not? Will it be much more stratified along economic, social, and other caste lines than it has been? Indeed, can this Nation survive as a free, democratic and reasonably well off people?

I do not mean to separate higher education from that which goes before, nor from other developments in our society. Of course no such separation can be made. Every study of the problem—including the notable one on "Education and Income" by Mrs. Patricia Sexton—shows that college attendance is determined by a wide variety of factors which may include family income, whether or not your parents went to college; the kind of high school you attend and the kind of staff and program it has; your father's or mother's occupation; the color of your skin; whether you are a man or a woman. I shall touch on some of these factors later, but first I want to sketch what I see as the general problem and the basic choices open to us.

The reason the next decade is so critical is that during that decade two major trend lines will come together: One is the social trend toward increased demand and need for higher education, and the other is the trend line of a rapidly increasing population of college age.

Since 1939 college enrollments have increased from 1.4 millions to 3.6 millions, as of this fall. Up until the last year or two, the college age population has been no greater than it was in 1939. We can take 1939 as a reasonable base year, because it avoids the World War II years and the postwar bulge. When the postwar bulge leveled off and college enrollments returned to normal they did not return to 1939 levels, but to about 50 percent above these, and they have been rising ever since, without an increase in college age population. If the trend of past years toward increasing percentages of young people going to college continues, we will have 6.9 million in higher education by 1970, or roughly double 1960. If we simply hold our own—that is, keep the same percentage of young people in college that we have now—1970 enrollments will be about 5.2 million, or 50 percent more than present figures. To put it another way, between 1951 and 1960 enrollments increased 163,000 a year. Less than 8 percent of this was caused by population growth. During the next 10 years, if the past trends continue, we will need to accommodate an average of 335,000 new students a year. (If we merely hold our own we will still need to accommodate average increases of 157,000 each year.) To accommodate this increase will require very substantial additional expenditures, including some increase in proportionate expenditures for higher education as compared to other purposes.

Among those who consider themselves as experts, two general camps of opinion have formed. They represent broad divisions of opinion which have always existed, at any given time, in our society, based on conflicting viewpoints as to the merits of aristocracy versus democracy; of the responsibility of society for education as against the responsibility of the individual; of the philosophy of restricting advanced education to the few or opening it to the many.

We have always had these differing viewpoints. What makes the decade of the 1960's stand out is that the decisions we make are likely to set a trend and pattern for some years and decades after that; just as the Land-Grant College Act of a century ago set in motion the trend toward an open system of higher education rather than one serving the needs of 1 percent of the population.

The reason the American public is confused about the nature of the choices before it is that both camps of opinion fly the banner and use the slogans of democracy in education and equality of educational opportunity.

Briefly, and I exaggerate the distinctions and make them somewhat sharper than they are for the purpose of clarity:

One school of thought is that higher education is essentially a privilege beneficial to the individual; that the individual should, to the maximum extent practicable, be asked to pay for higher education. Also, that higher education should be restricted to those "able to benefit from it"—a very elusive term which means many different things to the different people who use it—and that much time and money can be saved by the application of rather rigid standards of admission to higher education. This school of thought, for the most part, also recognizes the social value of higher education, and the social justice of making it accessible to those who cannot pay. They would solve this problem by making scholarships available to the very bright few who cannot possibly finance higher education by their own resources or by borrowing; and they would also make subsidies available to a selected group in occupations essential to the national interest but whose financial reward is hardly adequate to attract a substantial cash investment by the individual. Generally speaking, however, this school of thought calls for the colleges charging amounts which cover a fairly high proportion of the cost; borrowing to pay the bill by those whose parents can't pay; and subsidies to selected individuals who can't make it any other way.

The second broad school of thought places primary emphasis on the value of higher education to our society, and on its essential character as a means of equalizing opportunity for the individual. It recognizes the potential economic value, as well as other values, of higher education to the individual, but believes that primary contribution toward its support should be made at the time when earning power is the greatest, and that it should be made both by those who do and those who do not go to college. It holds that, while the education of the especially talented is absolutely essential to our survival and progress, that the education of large numbers who are less specially talented is also essential. It would finance higher education so far as possible through private gifts and contributions and public taxation, keeping the cost to the student down to a level at which the average individual, through his own efforts, can hope to attend college without special individual subsidy. This group also would favor a relatively open admissions policy, under which high school graduates who were determined to go on for advanced education would have the opportunity to try.

If the first viewpoint prevails, higher education in this country will be increasingly expensive to the individual who can afford to pay and to the one who cannot. Young men and women will increasingly leave college, if they are in the lower economic groups, with heavy loads of debt at the time they should be establishing families.

Opportunity to go to college at all will increasingly be determined by the decision of a scholarship committee in making or not making an award, not by the individual's determination and will. Families at higher and higher income levels will be thrown into the competition for scholarships, making it harder on the economically less fortunate who, by and large, are also less fortunate in access to the cultural experiences which make for good test scores. The average student who is perfectly able to do college work and benefit from it will be severely handicapped in the competition for scholarships—unless the whole present connotation of the term is abandoned. In short, we will have to have hundreds of thousands—millions would not be an exaggeration—of scholarships, or else many people will not go on beyond high school who should have that chance.

If the second viewpoint prevails, educational opportunity will still be open to the determined individual who wants to go ahead on his or her own, regardless of the decision of a scholarship board or a test scoring machine. College tuitions will be relatively low, as they have traditionally been, because society subsidizes them. Scholarships will still be desirable and necessary, but the number needed will be manageable and not in terms of a very high proportion of the total college-age population.

Let me again emphasize that this picture is drawn in broad terms, and as such I believe it to be accurate. But I do not mean to say or to imply that all colleges should be all things to all students. I have no criticism of any college which wishes, for example, to limit its student intake to the upper 2 or 3 percent on test scores, or to charge a very high admission fee and provide generous scholarship funds, or limit itself in other ways in terms of what it conceives its mission to be. My point is solely that we must see that there are other institutions where quality higher education is open to our young people. For example, as long ago as 1956–57 the annual report of the director of admissions at Harvard indicated great concern over the fact that rising tuition charges and extremely high entrance competition were sharply cutting down the number of students from low-income families entering Harvard, despite the availability of large scholarship funds and the desire to use them to equalize opportunity.

In the Harvard class of 1955, 10 percent of scholarship winners came from families with income of more than $8,300. By the class of 1962 (entering in the fall of 1957) this upper 10 percent of scholarship winners came from families with incomes of $11,500 or more. In the Harvard class of 1957, 32.2 percent of graduates were sons of fathers who did not attend college. For the class of 1961 the figure was 19.3 percent. At the University of Massachusetts at the same time, fathers of 58 percent of the students did not attend college. At Harvard parents of 8 percent of the students work at blue-collar jobs. At Massachusetts the figure is 16 percent. May I note, in passing, that the University of Massachusetts, because of limited capacity, turns down annually many more qualified applicants than it admits.

I have used the above comparison simply because the figures happen to be available through a series of articles in the Harvard Crimson. This is not a matter of public or private institutions, but of differing purposes, philosophies, policies. Harvard, great university that it is, is worried about what is happening, and it will be interesting to see the outcome. My personal belief is that if we are to do what needs to be done in the years ahead, we will have to find ways of helping both our private and public colleges keep down their charges to students. Private colleges already receive substantial public aid in the form of tax exemption and participation in a wide variety of Federal research and other programs. Whether they wish to accept direct public aid for general purposes will vary with the individual institution. Many problems are involved but I believe that ways can be found to solve them.

Some have suggested that the way to assure the continued expansion of privately controlled higher education is to require public institutions to raise their charges to students. This reminds me of the old story of the Procrustean bed, whose occupants were either stretched or chopped off to fit the bed. Our first consideration is to see that young people have access to higher education, and starting from this premise, to find ways of making it available in a variety of institutions, with a variety of purposes, and under a variety of auspices.

Up to now I have talked only in broad terms about who will go to college in the 1960's, and that largely in terms of the general problem. What do we know about who goes to college now?

First, we know depressingly little, really, about who goes to college. We have pretty good figures on college enrollments, nationally and by States, but we don't know much about what they mean. For example, we have some national studies on a sampling basis which indicate that half of the upper 20 percent of our high school graduates don't go on to college, many for financial reasons. But we have figures from only a few States which tell us what percentage of high school graduates in those States go to college, by ability levels. Interestingly enough, in these States, all in the central section of the country, all but one show a much higher percentage of young people in the upper 20 to 25 percent on test ratings going to college than the national studies show. I don't doubt the validity of the national studies, but I would like to have a better idea of where the talent loss is occurring. What are the figures for New Jersey? Pennsylvania? or, for that matter, for any of the 40-odd States for which figures are not available? Studies by the National Merit Scholarship Corp. staff show that of the upper 5 percent on its test scores, more than 90 percent go to college, through merit scholarships or other awards, or on their own.

We know how many people are enrolled in the colleges of each State, and people frequently compare these with the college-age population of the State as a basis for getting an idea of ratios of college attendance. This is all right for some States but let us take the case of the District of Columbia. In the fall of 1958 there were 23,000 undergraduates enrolled in its colleges, a fairly impressive figure. But only 7,000 of these were residents of the District, and only 3,500 District residents went outside the District to college. Thus the figure on District enrollments exaggerates, by 130 percent, the figure on District students who go to college.

To put it another way, 69 percent of college students in the District are from outside the District. For Vermont it is 64 percent, for New Hampshire 62, for Rhode Island 48.5 percent. At the other extreme, Delaware sends 48 percent of its students who go to college outside the State; New Jersey 41.6 percent; Connecticut 39 percent. New Jersey imports 11.8 percent of its students, exports 41.6 percent. Texas, on the other hands, imports 8 percent, exports 6 percent.

I comment on this only to sound a warning that high college attendance in a State does not necessarily mean that the State's own residents go to college in substantial numbers. The presence of nationally known institutions, or good scenery, or climate, or both, may mask the fact that the State really is doing a poor job of getting its own into college. Some of the factors or combinations of factors influencing college attendance, as shown by the figures, are these:

1. Sex: If you are a man the chances of your going to college in the United States are 50 percent better than if you are a woman. There are a good many reasons for this, and they vary in specific cases and by areas, but these are the national figures.

2. Aptitude and class rank: Students who score well on entrance tests, or who stand high in their high school classes, go to college in substantially higher percentages than those who don't. This is not surprising, but it raises many questions, particularly if tests or class ranks are used as rigid cutoff determinants for entrance or for financial aid. Everyone agrees that tests are useful instruments. But a midwestern university with an excellent reputation for quality founo that of a graduating class of 1,000, one-fifth would have been denied entrance on the basis of a test cut-off score in rather widespread use. Among these 200 were one Phi Beta Kappa, four members of other scholastic honor societies, 46 students who made the dean's honors list at least once. It included 22 engineers, 40 teachers, 7 lawyers, 7 doctors, 7 pharmacists, 5 journalists, 59 arts and sciences graduates, 24 fine arts graduates, 37 in business. If one assumes that a fairly rigid application of test scores would eliminate a substantial number of those later failing, what about this "efficiency" as contrasted with the efficiency of saving capable students whose test scores were a reflection of poor high schools, inadequate cultural backgrounds, but who had the will and determination to catch up? The fact is that there is a very high percentage of self-selection among high school graduates, and that it can be improved with counseling and guidance.

3. Occupation of parents: It makes a difference. A Wisconsin study showed that 30 percent of all high school graduates in a given year went to college. But 64 percent of children of professional or executive workers went; 46 percent of parents doing office or sales work; 43 percent of children of small businessmen; 28 percent of children of skilled workers; 18 percent of children of farmers. This is about the pattern shown by other studies. Horace Mann Bond, you may recall, found that it took 3,581,370 laborers "other than farm and mines" to produce one national merit scholarship winner; but that on the other hand it took only 12,672 professional and technical workers.

5. Income: All the studies show that children of parents having high incomes tend to go to college in greater numbers than those with lower incomes. This may be a good place to point out again that combinations of factors are involved. Ministers, teachers, librarians tend to be in the modest income group, but a high percentage of their children go to college. Farmers in the higher income brackets don't send their children to college as often as other high-income people.

6. The culturally and economically deprived: I started out to put down a category called "race" or "color" but decided it was not accurate for my purpose here. What I am getting at is the fact that people from low-income families, whose parents didn't go to college, who attend relatively poor schools, don't go to college in large numbers. In fact they don't get through the elementary and secondary system in large numbers. In the case of two groups, the Negro and in some areas the American Indian, there are color-related factors which tend to keep them from breaking out of the vicious circle, as many minority groups have done at various periods of our history. This country is now engaged in a genuine effort to break down these special color-related barriers. While we are doing this, we must also remember that this is only one part—though a major part—of the needed effort to make economic educational and cultural opportunity genuinely available to all.

This is a good place to emphasize that there are great differences between individuals which are not the result of differences in social, economic, or cultural background. We are not, thank God, created identical, or equal in the sense that we all have the same interests and capacities and aptitudes. Everybody should not go to college, and the sooner we remove the social prestige of a college degree, the better—or perhaps as pragmatic Americans we will wind up by giving everybody a bachelor's degree at a specified age and then get on with the business of providing the kind and variety of educational opportunity we need.

What I hold as an article of educational faith, of faith in democracy, of faith in this country, is that we ought to provide the maximum degree of equality of opportunity. No man or group of men is wise enough to judge the heights to which an individual may rise, the contributions he or she may make, if given the chance. Time was when the physical frontier was the guarantee of mobility in our society. The disadvantaged, the oppressed, those who felt frozen in a static community structure, could move west and create new communities of their own. The physical frontier closed about 1890. By that time the Land-Grant Act of 1862, whose centennial we celebrate, had begun to open the educational frontier at the college level.

The land-grant institutions were, of course, not alone in this movement, have never been more than a segment of it. Colleges founded by individual benefactors, by churches, by other colleges, by communities, by all kinds of public and private effort were necessary to give us a system of higher education, and a degree of educational opportunity—unequal as it still is—unmatched by any other major country. The contribution of the Land-Grant Act was to provide an example, a spur, a demonstration of a new spirit, new range, and variety in higher education.

The men and women of a century ago, in a country torn by internal dissention to the point that its existence was threatened, bankrupt and dependent on printing press money, had the courage to give away vast areas of the public domain in the faith that education of young people was a better investment by far than the hope that a huge land speculation might sometime balance the budget. I hope and believe that we have the same courage and faith to meet the opportunity of the 1960's.

Address by AFL–CIO President George Meany to the AFL–CIO Conference on Equal Opportunity for Education Held at the Shoreham Hotel in Washington, Thursday, January 4

We in the AFL–CIO are delighted at the warm response to this conference within the academic community. I want to express our deep appreciation to the distinguished educators who have come here from all parts of the country to discuss with us the problem of equal opportunity in higher education. Their presence is convincing evidence to me that those who administer the affairs of our colleges and universities are as deeply concerned about this problem as we are in the trade union movement.

Obviously it wouldn't make sense for me to speak to you tonight in technical terms. When it comes to the mechanics of higher education, the experts are all in the audience. What I would like to discuss with you is the status of the educational system as it appears to us in the labor movement, and what we believe the goals of that system should be.

One of those goals found expression in the Morrill Act establishing land grant colleges. As you know, we are celebrating the 100th anniversary of that law this year. I think it is worth noting that we as a nation are about as far from realizing the objectives of the Morrill Act, after a century, as we are from fulfilling the purpose of the 14th and 15th amendments, which are nearly as old.

It seems to me the analogy is appropriate. In both educational opportunity and civil rights our country has failed to live up to standards we established a century ago. In both respects the time has come for reality to catch up with ideals.

Speaking only of higher education, what has caused the delay? There are 63 land-grant colleges in operation today. There's a considerably greater number of State colleges and universities, set up independently. While the physical facilities of these institutions may not be adequate in the light of today's needs, this hasn't always been so. There have been long periods when colleges were in search of students, rather than the other way around. Yet at no time has the opportunity for higher education been genuinely available to all.

What this indicates, of course, is that the mere physical existence of colleges and universities in adequate number, even with rock-bottom tuition fees, does not assure equal opportunity. Classrooms and teachers are essential, but they aren't enough.

My own mail reveals the greatest additional need. I'm sure you can guess what it is: Money.

Hundreds of letters from parents—union members, with the normal desire to see their children get ahead—come into AFL–CIO headquarters each year. Hundreds more flow into the headquarters of our affiliated unions. And I have no doubt that at least as many others are directed to college officials. These are letters that say, in effect:

"Our boy—or girl—gets fine marks in school. He wants to go to college, and I think he deserves the chance. But on my wages I just can't afford it. Can you tell me what to do?"

Now how can we answer letters like that? How do you answer them?

Yes, we can talk about scholarships. There are more scholarships available now than ever before. I would like to pay special tribute, in that connection, to the strictly private schools, many of which are represented here, for their desire to include students chosen by ability rather than by financial resources.

We in the labor movement have also made a contribution. About a thousand students are now attending college with the help of scholarships created by unions. A large number, I'm sure, are being financed by industry, by foundations of one kind or another, by fraternal organizations, by regional alumni groups, by other alumni concerned with football players, and by local, State, and Federal governments themselves.

This may sound like an impressive array of assistance. To get it into perspective, let me remind you that all these scholarships put together meet only 5 percent of the total expenses of the college population. And while some individual scholarships are generous, the average amount is only $145 a year.

I'm sure you covered this ground in detail during your discussions this afternoon. And I hope you concluded that the first essential step toward redeeming the 100-year-old promise of the Morrill Act is a comprehensive program of Federal scholarships.

Congress has been moving in that direction, but not fast enough nor far enough. The National Defense Education Act has unquestionably been of great help, but its approach is far too narrow. The proposed College Academic Facilities and Scholarships Act is much better, yet the 50,000 scholarships it contemplates would take care of only the neediest 5 percent of the freshmen who will enroll next September.

What we ought to have in this country is a program that will finally eliminate financial barriers to higher education; a program that offers each student freedom to choose both his college and his course of study; a program for which ability is the only requirement.

I am convinced that the American people want this kind of program, and that Congress will ultimately adopt it.

But assuming this first and most important step is taken, much more will remain to be done. As we solve the money problem for students, we will increase their numbers. And, therefore, we will need more classrooms, more dormitories, and more teachers.

It may be harder to rally public support for adequate Federal outlays of this kind, especially to private institutions. You and I know that tuition fees seldom cover the actual costs of a college education. You and I also accept this as proper. Since full educational opportunity is in the public interest, the general public—meaning the taxpayers as a whole—should help the schools as well as the students. In our view, education is not a product that should be paid for by the immediate consumer, like a car or a suit of clothes.

Here again, the proposed College Academic Facilities and Scholarship Act recognizes the principle but skimps on the appropriations. Three hundred million dollars in loans may sound like a considerable sum, but as you know, it is only a fraction of what's needed.

Although I have been speaking in terms of Federal legislation, I don't mean to minimize the continuing responsibilities of the States. A few minutes ago I referred to the letters we receive from parents. Now let me read from another letter—one from a college president in response to my invitation to this conference.

"While I would be most interested in attending the conference," he wrote, "the restricted out-of-State travel budget allotted to this State college by the legislature prevents me from doing so. Unfortunately this budget, which consists of $750 for the total institution of 104 faculty members, means a per capita allowance which would enable our faculty to spend 1 day at a conference just across the river from our school."

This may not be typical, but as some of you can testify, it's not unique, either. Those who cry out the loudest against the "dangers" of "Federal interference" in education should take a close look at their own State legislatures.

Let us suppose that adequate measures were enacted to help both the students and the institutions. There would still be much to do before true equal opportunity in higher education became an accomplished fact.

To return to the question of student finances, it must be recognized that the most generous scholarship program may not be enough for the children of wage earners if they must go away to college. It's probably true that campus life has a value in itself that contributes to the educational process, but alternatives must be provided for those who just can't afford it. This means bringing college to the students, in the form of junior colleges, community colleges, and branches of universities. A number of State and private institutions have made great strides along this road in the last 15 years, and the future legislation should be designed to encourage similar developments elsewhere.

Up to now I have dealt entirely with the direct financial problems of the colleges and of students who are ready and anxious to enroll in them. But if our goal is equal opportunity in the fullest sense, we have to go much further back.

We cannot sensibly discuss equal opportunity for higher education without considering equal opportunity for primary and secondary schooling. This is not the place for an extensive discussion of general Federal aid to education, but surely that issue is an inherent part of the problem you are considering.

Certainly students who attend classes in shifts, crowded elbow to elbow in shabby or even dilapidated buildings; who must share their books because there aren't enough to go around, and who have little hope of a personal word from harried, overworked and undertrained instructors aren't the equals—educationally speaking—of those from schools in better endowed areas.

Today true equality of opportunity for education does not exist and the differences are too great to be tolerable in a democratic society.

We in the labor movement believe it is the responsibility of the Federal Government, as representative of all the people, to bring equal educational opportunity closer to reality. More than that, we are convinced that a Federal program is the only way in which that objective can be achieved.

We're for Federal aid to education and we're determined to win it. After all, America deserves nothing less than the best—and Federal aid is the only way we can get it in education.

I hope those of you from the colleges and universities have, from your own experiences, come to share our conviction.

There is another, special form of inequality that afflicts schooling at all levels—the poisonous evil of racial segregation, still the official practice in most of the South, and far too often the unofficial practice in the North and West as well. Let me say that I was dismayed to learn that racial segregation has not been entirely eliminated even in the land-grant colleges—institutions established in the administration of Abraham Lincoln. Clearly there can be no equality of opportunity when there is no equal access to the schools.

Now let me turn to another kind of higher education. Quite naturally, this conference is primarily devoted to the problems that involve colleges and universities as such. But we in the labor movement are especially aware that there are other important avenues.

Under the best of circumstances, there will continue to be millions of young people who won't go to college, who don't want to go to college, who shouldn't go to college. Among them will be some of the ablest high school graduates.

This in itself is not necessarily bad. There are many ways in which young people can develop their abilities to the fullest. Going to college is one of the ways, but it is not the only way. We need lawyers and doctors and physicists. But we also need intelligent young people who will go into the skilled trades.

It's a great misfortune that somewhere along the way, many Americans have mislaid the old concept of the dignity of labor. Too few of our citizens realize that modern technology has increased, rather than diminished, the skills required of the individual craftsman. Today's machinist is taught to work routinely with tolerances of a thousandth of an inch. The pipefitter on a Polaris submarine must be able to keep allowable seepage down to one drop a year. The men who can do these things deserve every bit as much respect as the man who can prepare a legal brief.

I would welcome a sort of competition between the universities and the skilled trades apprenticeship programs over which would get the choicest share of each year's high school graduates. But that is not happening. The real tragedy is that so many of the young people who do not enter college don't do anything else to fulfill their potential. Their education and training is finished when they graduate from high school. Fewer than 40,000 young people a year enter the skilled trades through apprenticeship training. A large number of our most able young people neither enter college nor learn any real job skills. Most of them will be condemned to a lifetime of low-skill jobs interspersed with long periods of unemployment. This is the real tragedy. And the loss to America is tremendous.

On the one hand there are alarming levels of unemployment, especially among young workers. On the other hand the want ad sections of the newspapers are filled with advertisements in which employers vie with one another to lure highly skilled workers and technicians away from their competitors.

These trends are going to continue all through the 1960's. Present estimates indicate that by 1970 we will need 5 million new skilled workers. At the rate we are presently turning out apprentices, we won't come within 10 percent of that goal.

Organized labor has vigorously urged enlargement of the apprenticeship programs and the removal, by legislative process, of any vestige of discriminatory practices.

But if able young people are to be attracted to these apprenticeship programs, we need better guidance and counseling programs at the elementary and secondary school level. Too often guidance counselors have looked upon high school and post-high school vocational education as a sort of dumping ground for the misfits and the academic failures. We will never know how many potential young craftsmen are lost through the well-intentioned efforts of guidance counselors who believe that above-average manual ability and below-average mental ability are the most important requirements for a craftsman.

Here we come to a point that we in the AFL–CIO have been emphasizing with special force for the last 2 years. The post-high school training of skilled workers requires jobs to be available for the young workers who are trained. It is not reasonable to expect intelligent young people to enter into a 4- or 5-year apprenticeship in order to acquire skills for which there is no market. And quite frankly, unions with unemployed members are not likely to respond with much enthusiasm when they are urged to expand their apprenticeship programs. Training for the manpower needs of the future is directly related to the present health of our economy and to the whole problem of full employment today.

There are in fact very few problems which will be discussed in this conference that could not be more easily solved if we had full employment in America, if we had full utilization of our manpower and our resources.

Finally, we in the labor movement hope for a more widespread recognition that higher education is not only for the young. For example, the extension work of the land-grant colleges was among their most important functions from the very beginning. This sort of service should include workers, just as it is now available to farmers, businessmen, and manufacturers.

Organized labor is an undeniable part of the society in which a university exists; therefore it is a proper beneficiary of university services. The stubborn denial of this fact by some legislatures has isolated the institutions they control from a major part of the world in which they operate. The imaginative recognition of this fact on the part of other universities has resulted in a rich and stimulating relationship for both the schools and the unions. It is a relationship in keeping with the spirit of the Land Grant Act—the belief that higher education belongs to the working people as much as to scholars.

To sum up, the labor movement is inalterably committed to a massive assault on inequality of educational opportunity. We as a people need once and for all to establish it as a matter of public policy that an individual's ability must be the only ceiling on educational opportunity. We need Federal aid for elementary and secondary schools to insure minimum standards in every community. We need to wipe out the disgrace of racial segregation in public schools. We need greater support for vocational education, technical training, and apprenticeship programs. We need a Federal scholarship program to guarantee that no young person need be deprived of higher education because he can't afford it. And we need a stepped-up program of State and Federal aid to the institutions of higher education to enable them to meet the educational challenge of the 1960's.

Inevitably the question will be raised, "What will it cost?" I can't offer a firm figure, but the legislation introduced last year can serve as a guide.

For general Federal aid to education, it was proposed to spend $850 million a year for 3 years. For aid to higher education, the figure was $600 million a year for 5 years. That's a top figure of less than $1.5 billion a year. A billion and a half, when our gross national product is nearly $540 billion a year, and our Federal tax receipts are almost $70 billion.

But in a very real sense the dollar amounts don't matter. We are not really talking about an expenditure; we're talking about an investment, an investment in our most valuable resource, an investment in our future. The danger is not that America will go bankrupt by making such an investment. The danger is a far more disastrous kind of bankruptcy by not making it.

It was in that spirit that we initiated this conference, and it is in that spirit that we look to you in the colleges and universities as allied in a common cause.

Portland, Oreg., *January 31, 1962.*

Hon. Wayne L. Morse,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Understand S. 1241 will soon be on floor. Title 3 in bill would mean over $500,000 for community college building in Oregon. This would benefit Oregon at critical time. Urge your support of S. 1241.

J. T. Marr,
Executive Secretary, Oregon AFL–CIO.

Salem, Oreg., *January 31, 1962.*

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Understand Senate bill 1241 under consideration. Title III section providing funds for community college buildings urgently needed in Oregon. Passage of this legislation will greatly aid in meeting Oregon education needs.

Leon P. Minear,
Superintendent, Public Institutions.

Salem, Oreg., *February 1, 1962.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge your active support of Senate bill 1241 and especially title 3 of such which carries financial support community colleges. Oregon desperately needs this.

Paul F. Wipmeth,
Executive Secretary, Oregon Vocational Association.

Chicago, Ill., *February 1, 1962.*

Hon. Wayne Lyman Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The executive committee of the National Congress of Parents and Teachers (national PTA) meeting today in Chicago is opposed to legislation that provides financial grants to private institutions of higher education. Such legislation would be contrary to our long-established policy that Federal support for education should go only to public institutions. We are confident that the U.S. Senate will be mindful of this policy as it deliberates pending legislation.

Mrs. Clifford N. Jenkins,
President, National Congress of Parents and Teachers.

Portland, Oreg., *January 31, 1962.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Will you please support House of Representatives bill for classrooms and laboratories for independent colleges.

Frank E. McCaslin,
Vice Chairman Board of Trustees,
Lewis and Clark College.

Portland, Oreg., *January 29, 1962.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

H.R. 8900 and S. 1241 are most important to us. Every effort would be greatly appreciated. Regards,

Richard H. Sullivan,
President, Reed College.

Portland, Oreg., *February 1, 1962.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Noted passage of H.R. 8900 particularly section 122(a) (2) regarding matching grants. Much prefer this solution to sectarian problem than S. 1241 exclusion of private institutions should these bill go to conference. S. 1241 scholarships provision excellent.

Richard H. Sullivan,
President, Reed College.

Sarah Lawrence College,
Bronxville, N.Y., February 1, 1962.

Dear Senator Morse: I should like to place Sarah Lawrence College on record as urging early passage of legislation along the line of H.R. 8900, to provide Federal funds for the construction of academic facilities by colleges and universities.

Responding to the demand that American colleges and universities find more room on their campuses for the increasing number of students seeking higher education, this college embarked in 1959 upon an expansion of 40 percent in its student enrollment. Two-thirds of this expansion have now been accomplished—but only at the expense of a serious straining of academic facilities and a hazardous increase in the college's debt structure by reason of FHA borrowing for new dormitories.

We hope that Members of the Senate of the United States will be mindful, as they consider proposed legislation in this field, that colleges which have expanded enrollment and are therefore most needful of expanded academic facilities, are least likely to be able to run the economic risk of further borrowing even at favorable rates. A program under which at least a portion of Federal funds for academic facilities may take the form of grants is strongly needed.

This letter is written following consultation with our relevant faculty committees and with our board of trustees, and represents our strong hopes that Congress will take favorable action on the subject in the days ahead. But I must also add my personal gratitude for the courtesy shown me by you and your subcommittee last spring when I asked permission to appear at the hearings in connection with the disclaimer affidavit provision.

Sincerely yours,

Paul L. Ward.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in concluding my statement this afternoon, I wish only to reiterate what the committee pointed out on page 4 of the report:

> To meet this challenge in such a constructive spirit, the President has recommended, and this committee has endorsed, two basic approaches:
>
> 1. To assist colleges and universities of the Nation in their efforts to accommodate increasing numbers of students.
> 2. To help able but needy students finance their college education.
>
> To these approaches, the committee has added a third; namely, assistance in the development of 2-year public community colleges, whose continued growth and extension offers the promise of accommodating a large part of anticipated enrollment increases at reasonable cost to the students themselves.
>
> The committee believes that those avenues of approach constitute a sound Federal program for meeting the most urgent needs in American higher education. The committee is convinced, moreover, that these urgent needs must be met in the interests of the security of the Nation and of the realization of the brightest hopes and ideals of the American people.

In closing, I wish to make a statement relative to the floor policy that I propose to follow in my endeavor to take the bill through the Senate. Subject always to review by my able colleagues on the subcommittee and the full committee, as any exigency may develop in the course of the debate on the floor of the Senate, it will be my policy, as the spokesman for the bill, to seek to have it passed without any crippling amendments. I will state why. I wish the Senate to take note of the fact that the House of Representatives, under the very able leadership of a colleague of mine from Oregon, Representative Edith Green, chairman of the Subcommittee on Higher Education in the House of Representatives, has already passed a bill to aid higher education.

The bill is at variance in some respects with the Senate bill. As a result, we shall go to conference on the two bills. I need not tell experienced Senators that if we go to conference, we should be in the strongest possible position. I do not want the bill weakened on the floor of the Senate if I can prevent it. I am sure that my colleagues on the committee agree with me that we should do whatever we can to pass the bill without any crippling amendments. We are open to the consideration of any proposals that would strengthen the bill. We do not claim perfection for the bill. But we do claim that the passage of the bill would mean a great advancement in this country so far as concerns the assumption by the Federal Government of a greater responsibility, long overdue, in connection with the support of institutions of higher learning. Therefore, I make my plea, at the beginning of this debate, that Senators keep in mind the fact that we are going to conference on this subject matter. I would like the Senate conferees to go into conference with the strongest possible position. I am satisfied that under the able leadership on the House side of Representative Green and her associates on the House committee, we shall come out of the conference with an exceptionally strong bill that will keep faith with the philosophy of education and the philosophy of democratic government that I discussed earlier in my speech this afternoon.

I wish to say to my colleagues on the committee who have been so gracious and courteous as to hear me through on this subject—the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Smith]—and others who were present earlier but who have sent messages to me or dropped me notes pointing out that they had other engagements that made it necessary for them to leave before I finished my speech, that I not only deeply appreciate the courtesy that they have extended to me this afternoon, but I intend to put the committee members to work in the course of the debate. I make that statement because we have a mutual responsibility in connection with the bill. I am a great believer in division of work. I know I can count upon the committee members to come to the defense of the committee in support of the bill whenever, in the course of the debate, such support may be needed.

Mr. President, I have asked for unanimous consent to have certain materials printed in the Record. I now make a general unanimous-consent request that, if we decide later today that certain other supporting material that we have in the committee files in relation to the bill should be printed in the Record, we may have general approval to have printed such material as is relevant to the subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Excerpts From Source Materials Relating to College Enrollment Prepared by the Office of Education

SUPERIOR HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES WHO DO NOT ENTER COLLEGE

Between 160,000 and 200,000 youth of high ability annually fail to attend college. Of these, 60,000 to 100,000 might be reached if financial assistance was made available to them.

Charles C. Cole, Jr., of Columbia University, has made the most comprehensive and significant study of able high school graduates who fail to go to college. He writes:

"Despite the increased interest in the bachelor of arts degree, higher education is still losing up to one-half of the top 30 percent or so of the Nation's high school seniors. Each year, apparently, between 60,000 and 100,000 highly able secondary school graduates with aptitude and interest for college fail to continue their education for financial reasons. Another group of similar size and ability lack the interest or motivation for college. This is a serious waste of intellectual resources which should not be overshadowed by the rising tide of college enrollments (Charles C. Cole, Jr., 'Encouraging Scientific Talent, 1956')."

A study[1] of the top 25 percent of the graduating classes in Wisconsin public and private high schools showed:

1. Forty-seven percent did not go on to college.
2. Between one-third and one-half of these students said lack of money was the major deterrent to going to college (J. Kenneth Little, "A Statewide Inquiry Into Decisions of Youth About Education Beyond High School, 1958").

A study[1] of the top 25 percent of the June 1957 graduating classes of 25 Utah high schools located 25 miles from a junior or 4-year college showed:

1. Eighty percent to college.
2. Thirty percent in college indicated they anticipated financial difficulties which might force them to withdraw prior to graduation.
3. Fifty-eight percent of the top quarter of those not going on to college would attend if given sufficient financial assistance.
4. If a suitable system of financial assistance were put into effect, about 93 percent of Utah's top quarter high school graduates could be induced to attend and remain in college.

---

[1] Testimony presented to the House Subcommittee on Education and Labor, Salt Lake City, Utah, Nov. 1, 1957, by David R. Dixon.

A study[2] of the top 10 percent of the 1956 South Carolina high school graduates showed:

1. Of the top 10 percent of students graduating from South Carolina high schools, 30 percent did not continue their education in college.

2. Of the 1,282 who enrolled in college, 513 received some sort of financial aid, averaging $377 per white students and $200 per Negro student.

3. Although a number of superior students were offered scholarships, most of these awards were not sufficiently large to enable the student to enter college.

A study[3] of 18,000 high school seniors expecting to graduate in June 1957 from Philadelphia public, private, and Catholic diocesan schools showed:

1. Nearly half of the top 25 percent of all the high school graduates were not entering college.

2. 17 percent of those students stated that finances were the principal barrier to achievement of their post-high-school goals.

A study[4] based on a questionnaire received from 744 Ohio public and private high schools concerning June 1960 graduates showed:

1. Number of high school graduates, June 1960	78, 452
2. Number academically prepared to attend college	41, 383
3. Number who entered college, September 1960 (70.5 percent of item 2)	29, 185
4. Number known not to have entered college due to lack of scholarships and/or other financial resources (10.5 percent of number of qualified high school graduates, item 2)	4, 352

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the Nation's investment in education in the past explains in large part its economic growth and our advanced standard of living. And what happens to American education in the years ahead will eventually happen to America.

Through a combination of increasing college-age population and advancing technology, which requires more and more college-trained workers, we are facing an unprecedented demand on our institutions of higher education. The magnitude and urgency of this demand is such that existing institutions must be given assistance in their efforts to expand productivity and some new institutions must be established in order to bring the opportunities for higher education within the reach of all qualified students.

We must provide, at the same time, safeguards so that no superior student will be denied a college education simply because he lacks the resources with which to pay for it. In the pending bill, S. 1241, we propose a timely and positive approach to the needs of the deserving young men and young women of our Republic.

Senator MORSE, with penetrating prose and constructive advocacy, has set forth the purposes of the bill.

NEED FOR HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES IN THE DECADE OF THE 1960'S

To accommodate more than 3 million additional college and university students expected in the next 10 years, it has been estimated that we will need to spend at least $19 billion to provide the new buildings, land, and equipment, and to replace buildings now in use which are obsolete and substandard. In the areas of the various physical sciences, a serious problem is recognized in being able to provide and equip the laboratories to teach and demonstrate the new findings resulting from the research explosion during and since World War II. In addition, laboratories for doing research as well as the facilities needed for training greater numbers of doctors, dentists, and other specialists and technicians are needed.

Since a well-planned college or university instructional building requires at least 4 years' time for planning, financing, and constructing, any stimulus given to construction in 1962 cannot have an impact on a completed and usable building before 1966.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE SMALL COLLEGE IN AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION

There are more than 2,000 institutions of higher education providing education acceptable toward a degree. Approximately 600 of these institutions limit their offering to a 2-year program. Of the some 1,400 colleges and universities offering at least a 4-year program, one-third have enrollments below 500 students and an additional one-fourth have enrollments between 500 and 1,000. Slightly more than 10 percent of the 4-year colleges and universities have enrollments in excess of 5,000 students.

In West Virginia, there are 20 colleges and universities, consisting of 2 private junior colleges, 7 private liberal arts colleges for a total of 9 private institutions, and 11 State-supported institutions consisting of 1 junior college, 1 technical institute, 7 teachers colleges, 1 liberal arts college, and 1 university. Of the 20, 2 have enrollments below 500, 10 have enrollments from 500–999, 6 have enrollments from 1,000–2,499, and 2 have enrollments in excess of 2,500. Range in enrollments is from 163 in Greenbrier College to 8,282 in the University of West Virginia.

Not only does the small liberal arts college provide work leading to the bachelor's degree, but it also provides the basic educational background for study toward advanced degrees.

According to the Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, on whose advisory council I serve, many splendid small colleges have been operating below capacity while some of the larger institutions must reject students because of lack of facilities. Staffed by highly dedicated faculty, many of the smaller colleges offer good basic programs and necessary diversification, sometimes in classes too small to be really economical, especially in junior- and senior-level subjects.

Nevertheless, as a result of careful management and effective fund drives among alumni and friends, many of the private liberal arts colleges are able to compete with the out-of-State tuition charged in public universities. Students from these colleges have been transferring successfully to other institutions at both the graduate and undergraduate levels for years and their alumni have distinguished themselves in areas of service and in industry and government.

With a minimum of assistance through facilities loans, these institutions are in a position to absorb some of the increasing enrollments at a smaller total cost for additional facilities than if completely new institutions were constructed. In scattered communities throughout the country, these colleges offer expansion possibilities now, at a minimum of expense, thereby helping to stretch further the funds needed to establish new institutions in other localities.

COMPARISON WITH COLLEGE HOUSING LOAN PROGRAM

The "Loans for construction of academic facilities" title of this bill have certain features comparable to the college housing loan program which since 1950 has helped to finance the construction of student residences, dining halls, and student centers costing $1¾ billion. The housing program provides long-term loans for auxiliary facilities as S. 1241 would for academic or instructional buildings.

By the nature of the use of the two types of buildings, the college housing program has the advantage over the proposed program for instructional facilities in that the student can be charged enough so that after the operating costs have been paid a reserve remains to amortize the principal sum of the loan over a period up to 50 years.

The source or sources of funds to make the annual payments on principal and interest to amortize the borrowed sum for instructional buildings will be a real problem. Can other sources of funds be pledged for this purpose? Will students be assessed a building fee to guarantee the annual payments?

The building fee has been used frequently for financing libraries, student centers, and even gymnasiums. But the student has been accustomed to attending his classes in buildings provided for his use at no immediate cost to him. Will the urgency of providing adequately for the buildings needed in the immediate future justify this new approach to financing—payment for the building by those using it at the time it is being used? Families buy their homes over a period of 20 or more years. Long-term loans are used to finance industrial and commercial expansions. Is it not logical that this plan should be used in higher education if the alternative is to restrict enrollments because of a shortage of classrooms?

Since 1950 more than $1¾ billion has been loaned—or reserved for loans—to colleges and universities to construct dormitories, dining halls, and student centers. The amount approved or reserved for colleges in West Virginia is $21,628,000. In addition to the dining halls and student centers financed, this sum will provide dormitory accommodations for some 3,500 students in West Virginia institutions.

DEFINITE NEED FOR SCHOLARSHIPS

It is both urgent and compelling for our future strength that able students be encouraged to improve their potential by pursuing an academic program in line with their interests and capacity. The student loan title of the National Defense Education Act makes loans available to students who might otherwise be unable to attend or to complete a college program. For balancing the incentives and stimulus to able students, a scholarship program has a definite role to play in higher education. Charges to students have been increasing rapidly in recent years, both in publicly supported and in privately supported institutions.

---

[2] By the State department of education.

[3] Joint study by Temple University and the Philadelphia Board of Higher Education.

[4] Ohio Scholarship Funds Study, 1960.

Mr. President, with the sponsorship of my colleague, the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Byrd], I introduced S. 391, which would give certain tax credits in providing for higher education.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the bill, certain comments I made on the bill, some material dealing with the tremendous cost of higher education, and certain correspondence be included in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the bill and other material were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 391

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to allow a deduction for certain amounts paid by a taxpayer for tuition and fees in providing a higher education for himself, his spouse, and his dependents

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) part VII of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to additional itemized deductions for individuals) is amended by renumbering section 217 as section 218, and by inserting after section 216 the following new section:

"Sec. 217. Tuition and fees for higher education.

"(a) Allowance of Deduction.—In the case of an individual, there shall be allowed as a deduction amounts paid by the taxpayer during the taxable year to an institution of higher education for—

"(1) tuition and fees required for the attendance of the taxpayer, his spouse, or a dependent at such institution, and

"(2) fees required for courses of instruction in which the taxpayer, his spouse, or a dependent is enrolled at such institution.

"(b) Limitations.—

"(1) Each individual.—Deduction shall be allowed under subsection (a) for amounts paid during the taxable year for tuition and fees with respect to any one individual only to the extent that such amounts do not exceed $600.

"(2) Spouse.—Deduction shall be allowed under subsection (a) for amounts paid during the taxable year for tuition and fees for the spouse of the taxpayer only if—

"(A) the taxpayer is entitled to an exemption for his spouse under section 151(b) for the taxable year, or

"(B) the taxpayer files a joint return with his spouse under section 6013 for the taxable year.

"(3) Personal and living expenses.—Deduction shall not be allowed under subsection (a) for any amount paid, directly or indirectly, for any personal or living expense. In the event an amount paid as tuition or fees includes an amount for any personal or living expense which is not separately stated, the portion of such amount paid which is attributable to such personal or living expense shall be determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate.

"(c) Reduction for Certain Scholarships and Fellowships.—The amount paid for tuition and fees with respect to any individual which (but for this subsection) would be taken into account under subsection (a) shall, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, be reduced by any amounts received by or for such individual during the taxable year as a scholarship or fellowship grant (within the meaning of section 117(a)(1)) which under section 117 is not includible in gross income.

"(d) Definitions.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) Institution of higher education.—The term 'institution of higher education' means an educational institution (as defined in section 151(e)(4))—

"(A) which is accredited to confer any baccalaureate or higher degree, or

"(B) whose curriculum consists of courses at least two-thirds of which are courses of instruction within the meaning of this section.

"(2) Course of instruction.—The term 'course of instruction' means only a course of instruction for the successful completion of which credit is allowed toward a baccalaureate or higher degree—

"(A) by the institution of higher education offering such course, if such institution is an institution described in paragraph (1)(A), or

"(B) by an institution of higher education described in paragraph (1)(A), if the institution offering such course is an institution described in paragraph (1)(B).

"(3) Dependent.—The term 'dependent' has the meaning assigned to it by section 152(a).

"(e) Exception.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to any amount paid which is allowable as a deduction under section 162 (relating to trade or business expenses)."

(b) The table of sections for such part is amended by striking out:

"Sec. 217. Cross references."

and inserting in lieu thereof:

"Sec. 217. Tuition and fees for higher education.

"Sec. 218. Cross references."

Sec. 2. Section 62 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to the definition of adjusted gross income) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(7) Tuition and fees for higher education.—The deduction allowed by section 217 (relating to tuition and fees for higher education)."

Sec. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1960.

Parents Need Special Tax Credits in Providing Higher Education; Support Given to Bills for This Purpose

Mr. Randolph. Mr. President, I have introduced, for myself and my colleague [Mr. Byrd of West Virginia], a bill (S. 391) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to allow a deduction for certain amounts paid by a taxpayer for tuition and fees in providing a higher education for himself, his spouse, and his dependents.

During the recent election campaign in my home State, I discussed the advisability and need for such legislation. At Beckley, W. Va., October 12, 1960, I stated that the years during which parents have one or more children in college are heavy impact years on the family budget and there is cause for recognition of this expense by our Government. The problem is one of importance.

I said, too, that our Nation needs more expertly trained teachers, more diplomats educated to speak foreign languages fluently, and more engineers, if we are to meet the requirements of our country's rapidly expanding population and the trend of world affairs.

Mr. President, if we are to meet the challenge of the Soviets, and if we are to have adequate representation in a world in which scores of new nations are coming into being as colonialism disappears, we must prepare our youth for positive leadership.

Our young people need to be encouraged and helped to acquire the best obtainable education compatible with their talents, and many parents must likewise be encouraged and assisted if their children are to acquire college educations.

I call to the attention of my colleagues a sensible article in the educational section of the Washington Daily News, Wednesday, January 11, 1961, under the heading: "Start Budgeting Now—High College Costs Are Worry to Parents." Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

"START BUDGETING NOW—HIGH COLLEGE COSTS ARE WORRY TO PARENTS

"One of the tragedies of our era is the high cost of education.

"A Government survey reports some 50 to 60 percent of students, eligible for college on the basis of school marks, are unable to meet the expense.

"A just completed poll from the Institute of Student Opinion shows one secondary school student in four needing financial aid to continue his education and not sure how to get it.

"Tuition

"Count on $1,700 a year for tuition, living expenses, transportation, clothes, books, and incidentals if you're planning on a public college, $2,500 for private colleges.

"These costs are double what they were in 1940. Worse still, they are expected to double again by 1970. What is the solution?

"Many factors are involved, including whether you are faced with this problem immediately or a couple of years from now, whether you must raise the total cost of college or whether a portion of it might come from current earnings.

"Don't be lulled into complacency by the thought that the Government's National Defense Education Act and the thousands of available scholarships will solve your problem.

"Competition

"Competition for the latter is at a peak. The Government Aid Act, unless renewed by Congress expires in 1962.

"Don't be lulled into complacency by the thought of financing college solely on the installment plan.

"One banker, who is hesitant to make such loans to parents whose retirement may not be secure, points equally to the tragedy of saddling students with debt which they must repay at just the time when they might be starting out in life.

"Don't be lulled into complacency by the thought that savings alone will provide for college costs, unless perhaps you have a toddler and you budget from this very minute, taking into consideration the projected cost of college in the 1970's.

"Plans

"One unhappy parent of two college-age youngsters tells how when his children were infants and he could ill afford the premiums, he bought insurance to cover the cost of college. What he bought 20 years ago now covers 1 year's cost.

"Dependent upon how many years lie ahead, you must work out your own formula of savings, investment, borrowing, and perhaps add additional earnings both from parent and student.

"Don't count on a scholarship, but don't overlook the possibility.

"If you are planning to borrow, shop your education loan carefully.

"One of the most interesting savings plans come from Don Lester Waage, manager for finance in the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Department of Taxation and Finance.

"He shows how, using 3 percent interest compounded quarterly, annual college expenses ranging up to $2,500 can be met with 5½- and 7½-year plans.

"Savings

"The monthly deposits range from $33 to $154, depending on the amount you are planning to save and the number of years you have in order to meet this savings goal.

"If you are facing the dilemma of immediately financing a college education, possibly there is a company which would hire your youngster and send him through college at their expense.

"Most often this means going to college at night. Banks and insurance companies are among the leaders in this type of aid.

"Educators report much good brainpower going to waste because of the high cost of education. The younger your child is today the more aware you are of this problem, and the greater the chance that you can solve it."

Mr. RANDOLPH. Also, Mr. President, I would wish to share with you a most constructive communication on this subject, from the Honorable Ralph J. Bean, of Moorefield, W. Va., former president of the West Virginia State Senate. I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 4, 1961.

Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR RANDOLPH: I write you concerning a matter in which I have a keen personal interest, as well as a firm belief that prompt action is needed for the good of hundreds of thousands of American citizens.

I have no objection to paying our Federal income taxes, as I realize that our Government must have money for the multitude of purposes set forth in our budget. I consider it a privilege to pay my small share in helping to keep our country great and good.

However, within the past 2 years, two of my children have been fortunate enough to enter West Virginia institutions of higher education, and I have, under our American way of life, been fortunate enough to have the needed income to pay all of their expenses. For the school year of 1960-61, it will cost me approximately $4,000, or $2,000 per student, to keep these two in college. At the same time, under our income tax laws I am allowed an exemption of only $600 per student or a total of $1,200. Within the next 3 years, if providence permits, I shall have a third child in college, and my average cost for the three will be $6,000 per year, and my total exemption will be $1,800.

I firmly believe that higher education affords one of the best ways of providing better American leadership, and I have always strongly urged every American father to attempt to provide his children with college educations. If this recommendation is followed, I believe that America will become a better country in which to live, and that we will thereby make certain that America will always remain the greatest leader among world powers.

Accordingly, I urge that legislation be enacted to increase the personal exemption under our income tax laws to at least $1,200 for each child that the taxpayer wholly provides with a college education.

In addition to giving the interested parents a deserving break, such enactment will stimulate an interest in the field of higher education, and will contribute much to making our country a better one in which to live, work, and play.

I sincerely hope you will give my recommendations your very careful consideration.

Very sincerely yours,

RALPH J. BEAN.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, without the prospect of aid and recognition, many more students may be tempted to compromise their future for something less than full development unless they have scholarship assistance.

It is also recognized that while a scholarship may be of vital assistance to the student, the institution itself must provide supporting funds ranging from a sum equivalent to the tuition charge to a sum 8 times as much as the tuition charge. Students, as we know, do not pay the total cost of their college education.

Mr. President, I advocate the provisions in this legislation. It is my hope and conviction that Senators, in a substantial majority, will pass the pending measure. We did so on other education bills, including general aid for school construction and salaries of teachers. There is an urgency to act now.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the very able chairman of the Senate Education Subcommittee, the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has made the most forceful statement on the floor of the Senate that has been made thus far this year in support of the aid-to-higher-education measure. I believe that it is the most forceful speech on the subject that has been made on the floor at any time.

Among the many factual bases for the need for the proposed legislation which he has included in his oral statement and by reference, I believe one of the things that should strike everyone with particular force is the fact that 36 percent of the cost of these institutions of higher learning is derived from tuitions and fees. What is the effect on the student body of this 36 percent of the total cost of higher education coming out of tuitions and fees? I can find the answer in two sentences in the hearings, at page 264, in the testimony of Dr. Boehm, superintendent of public instruction of the State of Pennsylvania, who said:

> Higher education represents the most serious educational crisis of this decade. The whole system of higher education is under great strain. Alumni funds and private philanthropies have been magnificent and generous in their support of higher education, but there is a limit to what these sources can provide. Tuition rates, which have been ever increasing by alarming proportions, some doubling since World War II, have closed the doors to many capable students.

Mr. President, I commend the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon, not only for his drive and energy and leadership in his chairmanship of the subcommittee and his sponsorship of the bill, but also the drive and energy he has put into this entire effort.

The 17th, 18th, and 21st of August, were but three of the many days on which the committee held hearings on these measures, as the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the present occupant of the chair, and a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, who is greatly interested in this subject, well knows. He knows also of the many conferences we had and of the many executive sessions which were held on this subject.

The bill finally before the Senate is a compromise bill; we might say a watered-down bill. To me, it seems to be the irreducible minimum. I agree with the distinguished chairman of the committee that if the Senate changes the bill in anywise, it ought to strengthen it and provide more funds for higher education. The bill should not be further weakened.

The responsibility of the United States to make the fullest use of good American minds; and to seize upon the use of good American minds at this time ranks as a national emergency.

Excellence in American education will be achieved and maintained only through increased interest and timely financial support—and, I might say, tax support, because even with all the generosity of corporations, alumni, and others who have made gifts, as shown by the factual statements so ably presented by the Senator from Oregon, only 14 and a fraction percent of the support of institutions of higher learning came from gifts and endowment earnings. That is less than half the amount. The students themselves pay their tuition fees. So those sources of support have proved inadequate to the demands of the hour.

The other place from which to get support for institutions of higher learning is tax dollars. The time has come in the tax structure when many States are no longer able to raise that money. They have taxed themselves to the limit. There is an increasing need for education, both qualitatively and quantitatively. We need more students in college doing a higher quality of work. It is possible to hire teachers having the requisite training only by aid from the Federal Government, not to supplement any local money or to supplement gifts which have been made, but to support such education and to make available higher education for tomorrow.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator very much for the unanswerable contribution he is making in this debate. I support him further in regard to what the country will suffer if facilities and means are not provided so that students may go on to college.

I hold in my hand a table which deals with the upper 30 percent of our high school graduates from the standpoint of proven ability. This relates to the ablest 30 percent. How many of them will not go on to college? The statistics are appalling. For example, 68,000 boys would not go on to college in the school year 1960-61. Projected to 1961-62, there will be another 68,000. In the year 1962-63, there will be 72,000. That is a grand total of 292,000.

I ask the question, What price tag do those who want to argue against this proposal on economic grounds seek to place on those students? What is their price tag on a nuclear physicist who might have come out of this group had we made it possible for him to go on to college? What is their price tag on a surgeon? How much for a philosopher? What are they willing to pay for a historian? For a teacher? For any trained mind?

We simply have to say to them, "Do not talk to us about a price tag. Do not talk to us about what we cannot afford." Here is a statistical table that shows the ugly realities of one of the greatest wastes of which the American people are guilty, a waste of one of the most precious resources we have, the brainpower of America being wasted in the heads of those 292,000 boys and girls. We simply cannot justify that waste on any ground.

I close my support of the Senator from Texas by saying: We cannot support such waste on moral grounds, because we have the moral responsibility of an older generation to a younger generation. We of the older generation simply cannot justify morally putting our selfish pocketbook interests above the needs of the generation which is to follow, upon whose shoulders will depend the survival of America.

So far as I am concerned, I do not intend to trim my sails or support a trimming of the bill on any ground of economy; for, as I said in my speech this afternoon, freedom comes high; but at any price it is a good buy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the table and supporting material to which I have alluded be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table and data were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Estimated number of ablest high school graduates who will not go to college in the next 4 years

Year	High school graduates (boys) [1]	Top 30 percent ability group	Expected to go to college (75 percent) [2]	Expected not to go to college
1960-61	903,000	271,000	203,000	68,000
1961-62	908,000	272,000	204,000	68,000
1962-63	954,000	286,000	215,000	72,000
1963-64	1,119,000	336,000	252,000	84,000
Subtotal				292,000

Year	High school graduates (girls)	Top 30 percent ability group	Expected to go to college (55 percent)	Expected not to go to college
1960-61	970,000	291,000	160,000	131,000
1961-62	972,000	292,000	160,000	131,000
1962-63	1,018,000	305,000	168,000	137,000
1963-64	1,190,000	357,000	196,000	161,000
Subtotal				560,000
Total:				
Boys not expected to go to college				292,000
Girls not expected to go to college				560,000
Total				852,000

[1] High school graduate projection from "A Fact Book on Higher Education," American Council on Education—Source, Reference, Estimates and Projections Section, Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

[2] Percentages estimated by Donald S. Bridgman, "Where the Loss of Talent Occurs," College Admissions 7: The Search for Talent, published by the College Board, 1960. Figures rounded to nearest thousand.

STATISTICS RELATING TO COLLEGE COST AND REASONS FOR FAILURE OF HIGH-ABILITY SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS TO PURSUE COLLEGE TRAINING

1. COST OF GOING TO COLLEGE

It costs the average student attending the average college or university about $1,900 a year, including tuition and fees, books, rent, board, travel, and clothing:

Private liberal arts college	$2,350
Private university in a large city (living at home)	1,650
State university in a small city	1,650
Municipal university	1,100

These costs have risen almost 90 percent since 1950, and all indications are they will continue to rise.

2. FAMILY INCOME AND STUDENT WORK OPPORTUNITIES

In 1959, 23 percent of American families made under $3,000 and 45 percent made under $5,000 a year.

Also, we know that the median family income of college students who persisted to graduation—$5,947—is more than $1,000 above that of students who dropped out during or at the end of the first registration period.

As to efforts to help students work their way through college, the latest figures we have (1959-60) show that colleges and universities have 340,000 students on their payrolls and these students earned $98.5 million.

3. HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS FAILING TO GO ON TO COLLEGE

About 435,000 high school seniors graduate in the upper half of their high school classes, but failed to go on to college this fall. We estimate that one-half of these failed to do so for financial reasons.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I heartily agree with the distinguished Senator from Oregon. I am glad to hear him put the need for the bill on an additional ground. We know that on the ground of opportunity, on the grounds of expanding democracy, on the ground of education, on the ground of national survival, on the ground of maintaining our position in the world—on all those many grounds—the proposed legislation is necessary. But the Senator from Oregon has put the need for the bill on a higher ground, a moral ground, the soundest ground of all. The people of this country spend each year more on tobacco, alcohol, and foreign travel, thay they spend on education at all levels.

Mr. MORSE. Do not forget costume jewelry.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. It is not necessary even to add that. More is spent on the three items I have mentioned than on all education in this country.

We owe a moral obligation to the younger generation. We should not heed the talk we hear over the country to the effect that banks can provide private loans; that arrangements can be made for a kind of Federal FHA insured loans, so that our young people can be sent out of the colleges and into life, looking for a job, hoping they can get a job tomorrow and establish a family, with a mortgage hanging over them, as if they had physical assets to back them. That is mortgaging the opportunity of the child in the schoolroom.

I fully support the view of the Senator from Oregon that we have a moral responsibility. I applaud him for raising the issue that the basis for the dream, the ideal, the hope on which the bill is based is moral as well as economic.

The estimate presented by the Subcommittee on Education shows that enrollment in 1961, in the colleges of this country in the fall of last year, was about 3,900,000 students. But the projected estimates, without any increase in the potential number of students going to college, is that there will be nearly 7 million in 1970. That is without the expanded opportunities we hope for.

There is such a disparity of opportunity in the United States that in some States the percentage of people going to college, between the prime college ages of 18 and 21, is 18 percent, while in other States more than 50 percent of the same age group attend college.

The need for an increased educational opportunity today all over the Union is the greatest single governmental need facing the American people. The increasing complexity of today's political, social, scientific, and economic structure requires that the Nation have a highly educated populace.

Without a doubt, the scope of knowledge at the command of the people today was not even imagined by Americans of two generations ago. Much more education will be needed in the future. Increase is needed in both quantity and quality. Neither can be ignored; both are needed for our national growth and progress.

People often ask me, "Do you favor quantity? Do you want a large number of students attending college? Or do you want quality?" That is the reaction they have toward the youth of America today. It is felt that if more students attend college, the level of achievement will be pulled down.

The figures just cited by the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon show that of the upper 30 percent in the high school grades, 68,000 this year will not attend college. We are not only missing many capable minds; we are missing approximately half of the most capable minds in the country who will never see the inside of a college. We shall miss half of the top 30 percent; and, in addition, we shall miss more than half of the more brilliant minds. In the long pull, due to health or other reasons, many will be missed who would, if given the opportunity, outstrip others of the more brilliant in the battle of life.

It is not possible to tell what any man's potential is in the age group from 18 to 21 to 23 or 30—he must run his course to see what his future may be—and, because some do not happen to be in the top 30 percent, to say, "We shall leave them out, and we shall have a scholarship program for only those who have made the higher grades." Mr. President, that is simply a way of attempting to dodge the obligation of the Nation in connection with the education of its people.

I am convinced that the survival of this Nation under a flag of freedom is dependent in large part upon our recognition of and our immediate action to meet the emergency nature of the need for higher education.

This is a heavy, nontransferrable responsibility.

The estimates presented by the Education Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare are that enrollment in college will increase by more than one-half by 1970—from 3.9 million in 1961 to a total of 6.9 million in 1970.

In more immediate terms, a tremendous increase in college enrollments is expected to come about in 1965, when high school graduates born in 1946 apply for admission.

The best time to have acted on this information was in 1946. We would be 15 years late if we acted today.

First we must catch up with our needs for higher education. And learning from experience, we must move ahead.

Our colleges and universities need more classrooms, more academic and dormitory facilities, and more qualified teachers in specialized areas of study. And our national need for highly trained and professional people must be met through greater opportunities for our high school graduates.

A recent study showed that only 51 percent of those in the top 20 percent of their high school graduating class enter college. Of this select 20 percent, half are lost to any further brainpower development. Of the 51 percent of this 20 percent who go to college, 82 percent of this select group graduate from college.

The reason most often given as to why superior students do not go to college is this one: "I can not afford it." "I can not afford it." These are graveyard words, fitted only for a nation's epitaph. What we seek are words for a monument to a nation's greatness.

We need a determined drive for education for the survival of democracy. We need higher education for millions of young Americans not now receiving it. Two million young Americans who are out of college today ought to be in college—2 million with the brains to do good work, but without the means to walk inside those ivy towers.

I support the administration's proposal of scholarship aid to high school graduates, and of loans to public or private nonprofit institutions of higher education. I also strongly support a program of matching grants to the States to assist in construction of public junior colleges.

As a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, over the years I have studied closely the volumes of testimony setting forth the needs for higher education. As a partial solution, I have sponsored the cold war GI bill, a readjustment program for post-Korean conflict veterans that would provide educational incentives for over 4,500,000 young Americans.

The scholarship provisions of the bill now under debate—S. 1241—would educate 212,500 college students over this 5-year period, an average of 42,500 new students per year, a bare fraction of the number of students graduating each year from the more than 22,000 American high schools. I strongly support this scholarship program—although it is for a few gifted students only, and although the number educated under it would be small—because any and all aid to higher education is needed.

The distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] stated a moment ago that during the next 5 years there will be 292,000 high school graduates, out of the top 30 percent of their class, who never will see the inside of a college. However, Mr. President, if only that part of the upper 30 percent were to be considered, this scholarship program will not even cover all of them, but will leave wholly untouched by this program the other 70 percent of high school graduates.

Mr. President, I strongly support this bill—although not because it provides enough. In fact, this bill is only a beginning.

The numbers to be educated under this bill are too small for these scholarship provisions to have any influence on the pressing need for the GI bill—S. 349—which each year would open college doors to hundreds of thousands of students thirsting for education and willing to suffer in its quest.

That GI bill will provide a broad base of interested students trained to move into all levels of the technically sophisticated Nation we are building. The bill before us today will provide the basic plant and equipment in which these young people can get the education which they and the country require.

Mr. President, S. 349 is on the calendar, awaiting action by the Senate. In fact, that bill is on the first page of the Legislative Calendar, and it has been on the calendar since August 10, 1961. This GI bill provides for readjustment assistance to the veterans, and it will make education available to 5 million veterans—5 million, Mr. President, not just 40,000 a year. We need millions more in the schools and colleges. So the bill now before the Senate is only a small starter. I favor it; I favor any such bill. In fact, I am a coauthor of the bill; but it is only a starter. The really important measure will come before us later—this month, we hope.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I cannot miss this opportunity again to reassure the Senator from Texas that I think his GI education bill is the most democratic scholarship bill which could be devised. As he knows, I support it; I am one of the cosponsors of the bill, under his able leadership. I certainly hope that before this session ends we shall have an opportunity to vote on his bill.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I thank the Senator from Oregon for his very able support and leadership in connection with the bill in 1959, when it was passed by this body by a vote of 57 to 31, only to get bogged down at the other end of the Capitol.

This year the bill has been reported from the committee by a heavier vote than the one it received in 1959; and this bill is cosponsored by 37 Members of the Senate.

I particularly approve of the committee amendment to the pending bill authorizing a 5-year program of matching grants to the States, for the construction of public junior colleges. The growth of junior colleges in recent decades has been a remarkable response to the national need for a more educated citizenry, while avoiding the overburdening of the already heavily burdened 4-year colleges and universities.

Junior and community college development is one of the most significant methods by which the Congress can be sure to meet effectively the general ends of this bill: insuring the availability of higher education to all qualified students. For years, before coming to Washington, I have worked for more public junior colleges in my home State of Texas. I have continued that effort here, on a national scale.

Complementing this action, the committee has included the scholarship provisions, a much needed attempt to insure that some of these young people who have the potential for education to the very highest degree, will have an opportunity to receive that higher education.

We cannot risk or afford the waste involved in showing no concern as a nation with these losses from our national reservoir of talent.

Mr. President, the pending bill is but a modest proposal, considering the needs of our country. As a member of the Senate's Subcommittee on Education, as a coauthor of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, and as a coauthor of the higher education bill now before the Senate, I have listened to weeks of testimony on this great, emergency, national need. In my service in the Senate I have devoted more time to education than to any other one subject. I think widely diffused educational opportunity the great hope of this country, and the greatest accomplishment of our democracy.

I urge the speedy passage of this measure by the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Texas.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BERYL ORE PURCHASE PROGRAM

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, on March 24, 1961, I introduced along with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], S. 1419, a bill to extend the purchase program for beryl ore. Due to certain unfavorable reports filed by affected agencies, no action has been taken on the measure.

In a résumé of the needs for S. 1419 the following facts were presented by U.S. Beryllium Corp.: Under the Defense Production Act of 1950 the beryl regulation initiated in 1952 had as its stated basis and purpose to encourage expansion in the production of beryl ore by small producers by providing a uniform price scale and the establishment of Government purchase depots for such ore. In 1952, beryl ore was the only source of beryllium oxide given any consideration for practical purposes—beryl ore in the form of hexagonal crystals visible to the naked eye and usually aquamarine in color. Specifications under section 4, paragraph (C), state, "beryl ore as acceptable under this program, shall be in the form of clean crystals, cobbed free of waste." Further specifications require a minimum of 8 percent BeO content.

The original regulation provided a quota of 1,500 tons and an expiration date of June 30, 1955. By subsequent amendments the quota was increased to 4,500 tons and the expiration date made June 30, 1962, whichever occurs first. At the beginning of 1961, a total of 2,697 tons had been purchased by the GSA, leaving 1,803 tons to be purchased if offered by June 30, 1962.

The Bureau of Mines' Mineral Market Report MMS No. 3065, June 1, 1960, reported that "domestic consumption of beryl in 1959 was the greatest recorded, but domestic production was the smallest since 1948." Consumption was 8,173 tons—imported beryl; domestic mine production 328 tons, or less than 5 percent of consumption. It should be pointed out that this country's large processors, Brush Beryllium Co., and the Beryllium Corp., without proof of adequate domestic reserves for mine production capabilities, cannot be attracted away from foreign sources of supply.

In 1960 the GSA was offered and purchased only about 210 tons indicating a further drop from 1959 of about 33 percent. The GSA pays $400 and up per short ton of beryl ore that meets specifications beginning at 8 percent beryllium oxide content. This is an attractive price. However, it is obvious from the decline of GSA purchases that producers are not bringing to buying depots the type of beryl ore that meets specifications—or, more likely, that such ore is not being found.

In the fall of 1959 a new type beryllium ore was discovered, composed of berylbertrandite, high in beryllium oxide content, assaying 8 percent and better. This ore was offered to the GSA by U.S. Beryllium Corp., of Pueblo, Colo., a small mining company. U.S. Beryllium Corp. discovered a new type in its Boomer Mine west of Pikes Peak, Colo. The Boomer Mine, prior to its acquisition by U.S. Beryllium Corp., had been a leading supplier of crystal-type beryl ore to the GSA, but the crystal-type beryl was largely replaced in formation by the new-type ore in the Boomer Mine. The new-type ore was turned down by GSA because it was not in the form of "clean crystals, cobbed free of waste." In other words, it did not coincide with the specific requirements set out in the Defense Production Act, and because in the opinion of the counsel for OCDM any purchase of the new-type beryllium ore would amount to an expansion of the purchase program.

S. 1419 was designed to meet the specific objections which had been interposed and offer a very modest amount of relief to a segment of our mining industry. I feel certain there is no need to explain in detail the plight of our domestic mining industry today, nor of the need to offer it a measure of encouragement. I wish to make perfectly clear that my bill in no way expanded the beryl ore purchase program as set out under the Defense Production Act, but simply permitted GSA to review the progress of the purchase program for domestic beryl ore, and if it was found that the present rate of purchase would be inadequate to fill the overall quota of 4,500 tons by the termination date, June 30, 1962, that it could then include the purchase of any form of beryllium ore which has a beryllium oxide content and other characteristics satisfactory for the purposes and objectives of the program, including beryllium ore containing the minimum 8 percent beryllium oxide content.

I turn now to a statement prepared and submitted by Mr. Willard D. Egolf, vice president, secretary, and general counsel, U.S. Beryllium Corp., in support of the bill. Mr. Egolf indicated in a statement dated April 28, 1961, that the U.S. Beryllium Corp. advocated, and was the proponent of, S. 1419, and identical bills in the House for the following reasons:

First. Passage will entail no greater expenditure of Government funds than was originally contemplated. It is corrective legislation.

Second. The stated purpose of the domestic purchase program, established in 1952, was "to encourage expansion in the production of beryl ore by small producers."

Third. Despite attractive and favorable inducements, GSA purchases of beryl ore in 1959 and 1960 reached an all-time low since the inception of the program—with little or no ore being diverted from GSA through sales to mills by producers.

Fourth. Because of 1952 wording which limits GSA purchases to beryl ores in the form of clean crystals, cobbed free of waste, new types of beryllium ore, discovered with modern exploration methods and devices such as the berylometer or nuclear analyser, cannot be recognized for purchase.

Fifth. As a result, GSA purchases of beryl ores are declining. New types of beryllium ore, rich in BeO content offering promise of further dissemination in our country, cannot be recognized for purchase. Producers of the new types of beryllium ore, and prospectors, instead of receiving encouragement, are discouraged. While intending to aid in the establishment of beryllium mineral reserves so badly needed by our country, the domestic purchase program was inflicted with unfortunate language in its 1952 specifications which actually has caused it to throttle itself. Meanwhile, domestic processors such as Brush Beryllium Co. and the Beryllium Corp. cannot be assured of sufficient domestic ore reserves to attract them away from their attractive foreign sources, and the United States produces less than 5 percent of beryllium minerals needed for domestic consumption, including strategic military and space applications.

On June 16, 1961, the Department of the Interior reported its views on S. 1419. In part, Mr. John M. Kelly, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, stated that "the Department of the Interior does not favor enactment of this bill. Total Government stocks of beryl are in excess of the maximum stockpile objective."

Mr. Frank B. Ellis, Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, reported on June 16, 1961:

> The mobilization position in beryl is excellent, and other forms of beryllium ore are therefore unnecessary for defense purposes. In the circumstances, no defense justification can be established for an extended purchase program for beryllium ore.

Mr. Edward Gudeman, Under Secretary of Commerce, in reporting on the same bill said, in part, on June 28, 1961:

> Enactment of this bill which amends a Defense Production Act program, cannot be justified on the basis of defense needs, since the national stockpile inventory of beryl ore substantially exceeds the miximum inventory requirements. Therefore, the Department of Commerce does not favor enactment of S. 1419.

In further response to questions raised by Mr. Egolf himself in a letter to me, Secretary Udall of the Department of the Interior, on August 14, 1961, said in part:

> S. 1419 was the subject of the most careful consideration and intensive studies as we made our appraisal of the bill and prepared our report.
>
> We reviewed our position most carefully after studying the points raised in Mr. Egolf's letter, and after reconsideration, the Department is of the opinion that our position was and still is the right one.
>
> The Department is interested in the development of the Nation's mineral resources, not merely because they contribute to the national security, but because they contribute to our economic strength and welfare. When, however, stockpile objectives have been met, as in the case of beryl, we were not able to justify further assistance to domestic mining as a security measure.

I now would call attention to Mineral Market Report MMS No. 3237 from which I quote:

> BUREAU OF MINES LAUNCHES LARGEST BERYLLIUM RESEARCH PROGRAM
>
> The largest research program in beryllium ever conducted by the Bureau of Mines has started under fiscal year 1962 appropriations, the Department of the Interior announced today.
>
> The work, based on the Nation's need for enough beryllium for industrial, defense, nuclear energy, and space exploration uses, will include search for new sources of beryllium ores, proving beneficiating techniques, and methods for producing high-purity metal and compounds.
>
> Domestic low-grade deposits, especially nonpegmatites will be examined closely for indications of beryllium which may lead to new sources of beryl, bertrandite, phenacite, or other beryllium minerals, the Bureau said.

I call the Senate's attention to the fact that this mineral market report is dated August 1961. The apparent inconsistency in the Department of Interior's position defies belief or understanding.

From that point the situation remained dormant until January 18, 1962, when I was astounded to read in the American Metal Market of that date an article which carried the headline: "White House Announces Beryllium Barter Deal." I ask unanimous consent that at this point there be reprinted in full the article on that subject.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHITE HOUSE ANNOUNCES BERYLLIUM BARTER DEAL

WASHINGTON.—The White House announced yesterday that the U.S. Department of Agriculture has agreed to the essential terms of a multilateral barter proposal made by Continental Ore Corp., New York City.

"Under the proposal approximately $8,700,000 in wheat, tobacco, feed grain, nonfat dry milk and butter will be exchanged for an equal value of beryllium metal," the White House announcement said.

This is the second barter arrangement of this magnitude which utilizes surplus agricultural commodities to assist in maintaining employment in domestic industry, the announcement said.

Beryl ore will be imported, and the Beryllium Corp. of Reading, Pa., will process the raw ore into beryllium metal at its facilities in Hazleton, Pa.

"The commitment by the Department of Agriculture will not only make possible more effective use abroad of abundant U.S. agricultural commodities, but will also bring into the supplemental stockpile a strategic material and will assist in relieving the labor surplus problem of the affected area in Pennsylvania," the administration said.

It is understood that Brush Beryllium Co., of Cleveland, recently received a similar contract to convert the beryl into metal. The beryl ore is expected to come from Latin America and Africa.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, this was in the face of the Department of Commerce's declared position, which on June 28, 1961, was "enactment of this bill (S. 1419) which would amend a Defense Production Act program, cannot be justified on the basis of defense needs since the national stockpile inventory of beryl ore substantially exceeds the maximum inventory requirements."

It was in the face of the U.S. Department of the Interior's stated position of August 14, 1961, "when, however, stockpile objectives have been met, as in the case of beryl, we are not able to justify further assistance to domestic mining as a security measure." It was in the face of GSA's position, announced June 19, 1961, in reporting on S. 1419 "and the objectives are now calculated on the basis of providing for a 3-year emergency period. As a result, the stockpile objectives for beryl have been substantially reduced, and the stockpile inventory exceeds the current maximum stockpile objective. Additional quantities of beryl are included in other inventories in our custody. Accordingly, there is no stockpile requirement for the beryl ore now being delivered under the domestic purchase program."

No matter from what viewpoint this barter arrangement is viewed, it fails to enlist the support of reasonable individuals.

To begin with, I have seen no report which would indicate that our position in regard to beryl has been substantially altered in the past 5 or 6 months. Accordingly, we should conclude perhaps that this barter arrangement amounts to the old saw of robbing Peter to pay Paul—that is to say, substituting one overabundant commodity for another.

If, however, a material decrease in our stockpile or a material increase in our needs for beryllium in fact serves as a basis for this barter arrangement, then I suggest that it is a serious mistake not to give relief where it is pressingly needed and most deserved; namely, not only to our domestic mining industry as help, but to build our own strategic sources at home.

I would urge that the Department of Agriculture and the White House reach some logical single conclusion; then reconsider their position before taking final action.

In my judgment, it is insufficient to look to the needs of our domestic industry after the barter agreement, as the President has announced he will, but these needs should be examined in advance and appropriate steps be taken to provide help first domestically. As the expression has it: "The time to fix the roof is when the sun is shining."

On January 26, H.R. 992 was introduced. The bill would extend the beryl ore purchase program another 3 years to June 30, 1965. This simply points up the fact that, with our beryl ore program likely to be continued, the Government's position is surely in need of reevaluation.

INCREASE IN DEBT LIMIT

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the administration is coming before us again for one or more increases in the legal limit on the national debt. This is despite last year's permanent increase of $13 billion. We cannot afford to live beyond our means, regardless of the specious reasoning of some economists.

As a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, I will continue to urge a sound fiscal policy, based, not on indulgence, but upon need.

The lack of concern, even the indifference, which greets these continuing increases in our debt in so many quarters is becoming alarming to many. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent at this point in my remarks to insert in the RECORD a thought-provoking analysis on this subject which Mr. Lyle Wilson wrote in the Washington Daily News for January 15 and commend it to my colleagues for study.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE ARE ON OUR WAY

(By Lyle C. Wilson)

War and the welfare state have created a crushing burden for somebody. That somebody probably will be your grandkids, and mine, and their grandkids.

The measure of the burden is in the public debt of the United States. World War I hiked the U.S. public debt to levels then considered to be high. About $27 billion. The immediately succeeding Presidents worked hard at reducing the debt.

They were Warren G. Harding, Calvin Coolidge and Herbert Hoover, Republicans. Franklin D. Roosevelt inherited from Mr. Hoover a public debt of about $20 billion. F.D.R. never was able to balance the Federal budget during his terms of office. Harry S. Truman had a better record, but not much better. Dwight D. Eisenhower was an in-and-outer.

F.D.R. was not much impressed by the swelling public debt. He would just say, "We owe it to ourselves," and smile that smile, tilting a long cigarette holder anchored between molars. World War II and F.D.R.'s spending policies got the debt off to a big new start. The latest debt figure is almost $296 billion.

President Kennedy has kept up the good work. The public debt is more than $6 billion greater today than it was a year ago as Mr. Kennedy prepared for his inauguration. In the past 12 months Mr. Kennedy has spent $5.633 billion more than Mr. Eisenhower spent in the previous year. And Mr. Eisenhower was a big-time spender in a class by himself.

Secretary of Treasury Douglas Dillion now says the administration will ask Congress soon to increase the debt limit. That is, to increase the total sum by which the U.S. Government can be in hock by reason of the years-long policy of Congress and Presidents to spend beyond Government income.

As the public debt increases, the problem of how and who is to pay it increases, too. Taxes will need to be very high, of course, to create any surplus for debt retirement. Mr. Kennedy expects the taxpayers to pour about $93 billion into the Treasury in the next, 1963, fiscal year. At most, he expects a surplus of about $400 million in that fiscal year.

At the rate of $400 million annually, it would take about 750 years to retire the current public debt. Retirement date: A.D. 2712. The United States will have to do better than that. Better, that is, if the debt is to be retired. There is an alternative. The debt could be repudiated. The Government could welsh on its bonds.

Unthinkable? Perhaps it is. But other countries have done it. It would have been unthinkable some years ago that the U.S. dollar would be debased and rotted to less than half its 1939 purchasing power. But the U.S. dollar was rotted and debased, just so. The debt already has been repudiated precisely to the extent that the dollar has been debased.

We are on our way.

LEAD AND ZINC APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, very near the close of last session Congress passed an emergency lead-zinc bill designed to give assistance to an industry which has been hard pressed for a number of years. It is a modest subsidy program which, over the next 5 years, will entail a maximum Federal expenditure of $16,500,000. At long last the needs of the small lead-zinc miners are being recognized, and all that remains, in order to implement the program, is an appropriation of funds. I am advised by the Department of the Interior, whose responsibility it is to administer the program, that a number of applications for assistance have been received already. Moreover, many inquiries have been made of the Department for information on procedures to follow in order to qualify. In my own mail, requests have been coming in for application forms. The Department of Interior is, of course, unable to initiate the program until funds are made available to it. Miners have been seriously affected by the depressed conditions in their industry—and prompt relief is urgently needed. I would hope, therefore, that a portion of the authorized sum will be considered and approved in the fiscal year 1962 supplemental appropriations bill which will be before the Congress early in this session, in order that the Department of the Interior may begin implementation of this program immediately.

PROCLAMATION BY DENVER JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, during adjournment this past fall, I traveled the length and breadth of my State of Colorado, talking with people in an effort to determine their thinking and views. One of the most constant and recurring themes dealt with our Government's attitude and position in Berlin. I repeated over and over my opinion that Berlin and the whole of Western Europe was looking to us for a strong and consistent policy. Such a policy must be based on firmness in our dealings with the Russians, expressed in such a manner as to avoid any doubt of our intentions.

A strong America is a key to our survival. A resolute America will carry us a long way toward ultimate peace.

I have been provided with a commendable proclamation from the Denver Junior Chamber of Commerce on just this point, and ask unanimous consent that it appear at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROCLAMATION

To President JOHN F. KENNEDY:

We, the members of the Junior Chamber of Commerce of Denver, Colo., do strongly urge that you, as our Commander in Chief, take a firm stand not only on the borders of West Berlin, but elsewhere whenever necessary to insure our security.

With democracy now facing its greatest challenge, our faith in God is the one hope above all others to which we must hold. We have a heritage that we cannot and will not relinquish. There is no greater cause to which we can dedicate our lives. As Americans and as members of the junior chamber of commerce, we pledge our lives and our future to the basic concepts upon which our great country was founded.

The Denver Junior Chamber of Commerce represents 240 young men of action.

GEORGE A. WESTER,
President.

Dated January 10, 1962.

WHITE HOUSE REGIONAL CONFERENCES

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, there arrived on my desk the most amazing document ever to be printed on Government press. I refer to that 84-page, heart-rending publication compiling the true life adventures of the traveling medicine show known as the White House Regional Conferences.

The literary style is slightly reminiscent of the "Perils of Pauline." It leaves the reader quivering in anxiety over the evil influences which must be overcome so that the President's programs can become a reality. It is full of clever and thought-provoking conclusions which leave the reader fairly breathless.

I was pleased to know that, in addition to the fact that these meetings showed "that the American people were far from satisfied with the status quo. Representatives of many different Federal departments and agencies were brought together in close association by their participation, and jurisdictional rivalries that thrive in the segmented pattern of Washington life were broken down."

This is indeed good news for all of us. In the rather unlikely event that it has escaped the attention of those concerned, I would like to point out that the photographs contained therein will be suitable for reprinting during future election campaigns. There is one montage of pictures designed to melt the hardest heart, for it truly and poignantly paints the face of America—a Cabinet officer holding a tiny tot, an elderly man signing something with not one, but two pictures of the President looking on benignly; even a picture of the Liberty Bell.

I was also pleased to note that the Forest Service is embarking on a 10-year development program. I had been laboring under some misconception that this was begun during the previous administration.

Mr. President, I commend a reading of this publication to all my Republican colleagues. Only there will we learn where we have been, where we stand, and where some would lead us.

I congratulate the administration on the publication of this gem of advertising which I presume will even find acceptance by the master of growthsmanship, the Honorable John Kenneth Galbraith, who heretofore has been known to attack the validity of advertising. It would appear, alas, in the final analysis, that all of us are victims of Madison Avenue.

CONDITIONS IN LATIN AMERICA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, today we have heard a very splendid report on developments in Latin America; and comments have been made by a number of Senators in regard to the services of the Senator from Oregon, Mr. Morse, and the Senator from Iowa, Mr. Hickenlooper; and, of course, also in regard to the services of the Secretary of State, Mr. Rusk. All those commendatory comments are justly deserved; in fact, they are most modest.

Recently there came to my attention a speech delivered by Peter R. Nehemkis, Jr., who is the Washington counsel for the Whirlpool Corp., one of our large companies. His speech was delivered before the Rotary Club of St. Joseph-Benton Harbor, Mich., on November 27, 1961. The title of the speech was "The Hour of Decision for Latin America."

Mr. President, I wish to commend a reading of the speech to every Member of Congress. In fact, I wish there were some way by which we would get every adult citizen of the Nation to read the speech, for it is one of the most persuasive, informative, and provocative speeches on the Latin American situation that I have ever read. Mr. Nehemkis was in Latin America a few months before I visited that area. He visited in Colombia, Venezuela, Peru, Chile, the Argentine, Uruguay, Brazil, and Mexico. It was my privilege to visit Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, Chile, the Argentine, and Brazil. During my tour in those six countries I dictated memoranda and observations in regard to the economic, political, and social conditions in the countries in which I traveled. I also noted down for my own use, and ultimately to report to the Congress, the conversations—or at least their substance—which I had in those Latin American countries with political leaders, labor leaders, educators, students, farmers, business people, and professional people.

The report by Mr. Nehemkis is so revealing in regard to what is occurring in the Latin American area that I believe his speech is required reading for the officials of our Government who are managing the Alliance for Progress programs.

At this time I should like to quote one or two paragraphs of the speech which indicate the nature of the entire speech:

> I am bound to report to you that the Alliance for Progress is in critical trouble. That means that the United States is in critical trouble.
>
> At the outset, let us be clear that the Alliance for Progress was not designed to be another conventional foreign aid program, utilizing only the conventional tools of foreign aid—men, materials and money. The keystone of the alliance requires the recipients of our aid to undertake drastic actions, the kind of reforms which historically have been achieved only through a profound revolutionary upheaval of the social structure. In the Western Hemisphere, the Mexican revolution of 1911 is the classic example.
>
> The results which Latin American initiative is expected to achieve peaceably and democratically have been cogently formulated by that U.S. citizen whom Latin Americans most admire—Adlai Stevenson. This is the way Ambassador Stevenson puts it: "They will have to take the bold, brave, difficult steps to achieve better land use and distribution, better housing and better education at all levels. They will have to clear away the ghastly slums that surround every city. They will have to reform tax collection, cut corruption, reduce the waste on arms, and increase the rate of savings, and they will have to narrow the gap between the rich and the poor."

Mr. President, the Alliance for Progress is a mutual assistance program. It is basically a program that is predicated upon self-help. If the Alliance for Progress is to succeed, the words of Mr. Stevenson, quoted here by Mr. Nehemkis will have to become a reality.

All of us are deeply concerned lest these reforms and readjustments are not taken in due time or in proper time, or lest they fail to have the required effect of giving new hope, new inspiration, to the people.

It is of the utmost importance that the Alliance for Progress program be a success. I say this because the greatest experiment in representative government outside the United States and Western Europe is now underway in Latin America; and, if that experiment should fail, then representative government and democratic institutions will have suffered a severe blow.

It is my belief that the Alliance for Progress can succeed, but it is going to require a sense of urgency on the part of those who administer it and a deep sense of urgency on the part of the recipient nations.

I point out that the foreign aid program passed by this Congress last year and the Alliance for Progress program made possible assistance not only to governments, but to private groups such as cooperatives, trade unions, housing authorities; and in some countries in Latin America that aid program is available to provinces or states as well as national governments.

I mention this because I think we must look for every possible way to bring about the necessary results of economic progress and social reforms.

Mr. Nehemkis, in his speech to which I have referred, has made comments on each of the countries visited, and I believe these comments give us a very good picture of what is developing in the respective countries. The country upon which he places a great deal of emphasis is the Argentine, and I agree with him, because I believe that in that country, above all others, there is opportunity for genuine progress and tremendous economic growth. The major problem in that country, as noted in this address, is the inadequacy of housing. On that note, I say that our foreign aid administration and those who are responsible for the Alliance for Progress resources, such as the Inter-American Development Bank—all of those agencies and instrumentalities—should see to it that a large enough housing program is undertaken so that it makes an impression, so that it is not scattered in such a loose and thin manner that it fails to leave an impact upon those who observe it and those who are in need.

> Latin America is hemorrhaging while we persist in applying a band-aid to severed arteries.

I conclude by quoting these words:

> We have mesmerized ourselves with a cliche that self-help by Latin America will do the trick; that, having set the stage for remedial action, we can be a spectator while the Latin American characters assemble to play their appointed roles.
>
> Unfortunately, there isn't enough time for the characters in this historic drama even to learn the script. For standing in the wings are an impatient, angry people who want fast results. And just behind them stand the local Dr. Castros ready to follow the dictates of the people, but who will impose their own brand of solutions with a Moscow or Peiping trade-mark.

Mr. President, one reason that certain foreign ministers at the conference at Punta del Este failed to take the strong action that we thought was required is that in their countries they have native brands of Dr. Castros who are stirring up trouble, who are mobilizing the impatient and angry people. I am confident that every one of the foreign ministers present at the conference at Punta del Este would have liked nothing better than to have imposed every kind of sanction and restriction on Dr. Castro and his communistic-oriented Cuba, but they were afraid of the political troubles back home.

What Mr. Nehemkis has said in this address, and what Adlai Stevenson and others have said, is that action needs to be taken, quickly, affirmatively, and in large enough measure so that the problems of mass unemployment, poverty, and illness can be remedied, and in a dramatic manner.

I quote again from the address:

> How many Cubas do we need before we wake up to the realization that Latin America is a volcano about to erupt—and that our own head is in the crater?
>
> The Alliance for Progress could be this century's greatest experiment in democracy. Its failure would be one of history's greatest disasters.
>
> The hour for decision in Latin America is already very late, but perhaps not too late if we will but act—in time.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of this remarkable, provocative, thoughtful, informative address be printed at this point in the RECORD. I repeat my admonition and hope that it be read by everyone who is concerned with what is developing on that continent.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HOUR OF DECISION FOR LATIN AMERICA

(By Peter R. Nehemkis, Jr., Washington counsel, Whirlpool Corp., before the Rotary Club of St. Joseph-Benton Harbor, Mich., November 27, 1961)

When President Kennedy announced his Alliance for Progress, he recaptured the hearts of Latin America after a lapse of two decades. The democratic leaders of a continent who had lost faith in the United States were again confident that this Nation would not forsake the aspirations and the needs of the people of Latin America.

Then came the Cuban fiasco. The exhilarating promise of the Alliance for Progress had a hollow ring in Latin American ears.

This fall, on behalf of my company, I had occasion to visit eight of the principal Latin American countries—Colombia, Venezuela, Peru, Chile, Argentina, Uruguay, Brazil, and Mexico. It was my good fortune to be able to expose myself to a broad spectrum of political and economic opinion.

Among other things, it fell within my purview to ascertain how well the Alliance for Progress was working.

I am bound to report to you that the Alliance for Progress is in critical trouble. That means that the United States is in critical trouble.

At the outset, let us be clear that the Alliance for Progress was not designed to be another conventional foreign aid program, utilizing only the conventional tools of foreign aid—men, materials, and money. The keystone of the alliance requires the recipients of our aid to undertake drastic actions—the kind of reforms which historically have been achieved only through a profound revolutionary upheaval of the social structure. In the Western Hemisphere, the Mexican revolution of 1911 is the classic example.

The results which Latin American initiative is expected to achieve peaceably and democratically have been cogently formulated by that U.S. citizen whom Latin Americans most admire—Adlai Stevenson. This is the way Ambassador Stevenson puts it: "They will have to take the bold, brave, difficult steps to achieve better land use and distribution, better housing, and better education at all levels. They will have to clear away the ghastly slums that surround every city. They will have to reform tax collection, cut corruption, reduce the waste on arms, and increase the rate of savings, and they will have to narrow the gap between the rich and the poor."

Will they do it? I don't believe they will.

My doubts are grounded as much in what I believe to be our own shortcomings as in the shortcomings of those we have undertaken to assist. These two sets of responsibilities are insoluble to my way of thinking.

I find myself uneasy with respect to our own diplomatic and administrative capabilities in managing a social revolution of the magnitude to which our financial support has been pledged.

I have disturbing doubts as to whether we possess sufficient understanding as to what makes a social revolution tick.

I have a gnawning anxiety as to whether we have really made a commitment of the heart to rescue Latin America from a peril which, as in the Greek tragedy, is proceeding inexorably toward its inevitable doom.

But my most serious concern is that the basic foundation upon which the Alliance for Progress is built; namely, that those who are to receive our aid must first help themselves, is not now working, is not likely to work in the future; and that the self-generating features of the plan—upon which its successful operation depends—may be grounded on an illusion.

Throughout Latin America the smell of revolution is in the air. Popular demand for action from governments which can't or won't act is rapidly reaching the boiling point. The recent upheaval in Ecuador is a foretaste of things to come.

The Alliance for Progress—as it is presently conceived—may be out of business even before it has the chance to open its doors.

If the Alliance for Progress fails, it is a foregone conclusion that Latin America will become a gigantic Cuba.

There is no question but that the United States can obliterate Castro's Cuba whenever it elects to use the might of its arms to do so.

There should, however, be no illusion that we could ever wipe out a whole continent of Cubans.

Time has almost run out for Latin America. It is ticking away fast for the United States, too.

The crucial issue in Latin America, the issue on which Latin Americans must make up their minds before the Alliance for Progress has any meaning, was articulated with brutal candor by a feminine representative of Latin America's ruling and governing class. Speaking in Washington last spring, Madame Prado, the wife of the President of Peru put the dilemma of her own oligarchic class this way: "Either we give; or they take."

The Latin American oligarchy is unable to resolve this dilemma because it is incapable of accommodating itself to a revolutionary situation. Latin America's oligarchy does not yet grasp the hard fact of life that, either it moves over and shares its power with the democratic parties of the left, or it invites having its collective throat slit from ear to ear by a machete made in Havana.

Unlike the English Tories who successfully made their accommodation by capturing the Labor Party's "welfare state," Latin America's oligarchy does not yet comprehend that its survival depends upon its willingness to preside over the liquidation of its own economic and social empires.

I am also bound in all candor to say to you that the majority of Latin America's business elite (whose true interests are not tied to the preservation of the status quo) have been astonishingly shortsighted. With few notable exceptions, they have not shown any sense of noblesse oblige, any pronounced willingness to accept public responsibilities, or to furnish progressive leadership, or to exert an enlightened leverage on their governments. (As an aside, I suspect that much of the mistrust for American business throughout Latin America stems from the mistrust of most Latin Americans for their own rich. Guilt by association thereby attaches to U.S. business.)

The stark naked truth is that the majority of Latin America's ruling and business elite have so little confidence in the future of their countries and their governments that over the past 10 years they have transferred out of their countries more than $10 billion into the sheltering haven of numbered Swiss bank accounts or other safe investments. This is roughly about the same amount of dollars which the Secretary of the Treasury has committed the United States to supply to Latin America over the next decade.

It is not an academic question for the hard-pressed U.S. taxpayer to ask just why he should be expected to fill this vacuum.

An impediment which puts the Alliance for Progress into something of a straitjacket arises from still another fact of international life: Governments can conduct their business only with governments. This, of course, means that we are obliged to deal with some governments in Latin America which do not bear even a reasonable facsimile to the exacting standards of public service which characterize, for example, the contemporary parliamentary system of England or the federal system of the United States.

For these governments, the prevailing attitude regarding public office was inherited from the Spanish vice royalty and captains general reign over Spain's new world empire, or the Portguese colonial and monarchic tradition of government. It is a conception of government which regards public office as an opportunity for the personal aggrandizement of the incumbent in office, his family, his friends, and the friends of his friends. The notorious plundering of the national treasuries by Peron and his Evita in Argentina, by Perez Jimenez in Venezuela, by Rojas Pinilla in Colombia, by the Trujillos in the Dominican Republic, by Batista in Cuba, by the Somozas (both past and present) in Nicaragua—even by some who masquerade as statesmen of democracy—should make my point abundantly clear.

I need add only that the long-suffering U.S. taxpayer has the right to expect from those who administer our new AID program a policy which should have as its guiding principle this paraphrase of a celebrated American slogan: "Millions to help the people of Latin America, but not one cent for their corrupt dictators and politicians."

Corruption recognizes no geographical boundaries whether in the United States or in any other part of the world. Aren't we being too sensitive about hurting the feelings of national pride by not insisting upon the recipients of our financial aid being required to accept the kind of supervision which any bank or insurance company takes as a matter of course in the North American business community?

These mental blind spots and inherited attitudes reveal themselves strikingly when attention is focused upon Latin America's No. 1 problem—land reform.

With the exception of Venezuela (which began its land redistribution before the Alliance for Progress was enunciated) the reluctance of every other Latin American government or its legislative bodies to come to grips with land reform in the places where it really matters is readily understandable: it touches the sensitive nerve of the big landowners. For it must not be forgotten that in Latin America 90 percent of the land belongs to 10 percent of the owners, a degree of land concentration "far greater than that in any other world region of comparable size."[1]

Keep in mind, too, that, as much as 65 percent of Latin America's population is rural; that over half of Latin America's labor force is on the land; that Latin America's rural workers are the least productive; that this vast population is largely outside of the cash economy.

Consider the circumstance that Latin America is not richly endowed with good, arable land; that 5 countries—Mexico (southern), Brazil, Chile, Argentina, Uruguay—have 47 percent of the total arable soil, and that the remaining 15 countries, containing 37 percent of the population, have only 20 percent of the arable land. Consider this additional circumstance that in five countries—Paraguay, Bolivia, Peru, Venezuela and Colombia—less than 3 percent of the land is even suitable for cultivation.[2]

This is not the situation, therefore, where the solution lies solely in redistributing a commodity in abundant supply.

A revealing commentary on why land reform in Latin America isn't being accomplished—when Latin America's governments are left to their own devices—may be found in the remarkably frank statement from the Chilean Government's official reply to a United Nations questionnaire. May I read this excerpt to you? "Owing to the economic and political structure of the country, land reform in Chile is difficult to carry out. Landholders who would be affected by any action of an economic, political, administrative, legal, or social nature will vigorously oppose its implementation, and their political and economic influence is very powerful.[3]

With the exception of Venezuela—as I have previously noted—you can substitute the name of just about any other country for Chile and you have the story of why land reform in Latin America exists only on paper or has been legislatively paralyzed—and will continue to remain so.

I have touched only on Latin America's No. 1 problem. The catalog of Latin America's other problem areas is almost endless. Everything needs to be done—housing, health and sanitation; education; establishing a better balance between industrialization and agriculture; arresting inflation which devours each new social gain; the need to accelerate private investment through the expansion of regional markets; creating conditions of confidence so that local capital will not find it necessary to flee the national borders; and so on.

We have delayed far too long in fulfilling the commitment made at Punta del Este on primary commodity stabilization agreements. Without such commodity agreements we make a mockery of asking the Latin Americans to help themselves. For without sufficient dollar earnings derived from the sale of their primary commodities, it is impossible for Latin America to import its capital requirements and to provide for its social programs. The result is economic stagnation for the great majority of the one-crop countries.

I am persuaded that there is a practical solution to the problem of governments that won't or can't save themselves from their destiny.

This will, however, necessitate a drastic shift in our policy position and attitude toward Latin America.

As the first vital step, we have got to throw overboard the outworn, foolish dogma that the United States is powerless to set up the kind of administrative machinery which will turn the switch on the business of getting something done.

We merely indulge in self-deception when we assume that the majority of the present Latin American governments have either the technical skills or the administrative organizations, or that they are going to rid themselves of a paralysis of the will, to accomplish their necessary basic reforms unless and until the U.S. Government decisively leads the way.

We shall continue to deceive ourselves if we mistakenly assume that, when most—not all—Latin American governments submit a beautifully drawn plan replete with charts and statistics for implementing the Alliance for Progress, they have thereby placed themselves on the road to salvation.

I hope my Latin American friends will forgive me if I say that they have two commodities which are in oversupply: These are talk and paper plans.

A beautifully conceived plan is one thing. Making it work is quite another thing. Our Latin American friends are long on plans but woefully short on how to get the plan off the paper.

If taking the initiative for putting a specific program into action is going to raise the old Latin American bugaboo of intervention in the affairs of another state, it is high time to forget about the other sovereign state. Let it get its help elsewhere.

A great power intervenes in the affairs of other nations as much by what it does as by what it fails to do. Right now, we are guilty of a failure to do.

The strategic interests of this Nation—and they are in the final reckoning the only interests that count—will no longer permit us to genuflect before a shopworn and threadbare policy, a mystique, if you please, which says you mustn't do what Americans have done for each other since the founding of the Republic—helping our neighbors to help themselves.

Those Latin American leaders who really believe in the Alliance for Progress will welcome with open arms and with heartfelt respect a posture on the part of the United States such as I have suggested. They would welcome this attitude because it is the only proper attitude for a great power to assume. Moreover, they know that it is the only way that Latin America can be saved from itself.

Let's see how we could go about the job of making the alliance work on Latin America's No. 1 problem—land redistribution.

There exists a readymade managerial and administrative device—with proven success in the United States as well as in Europe—for handling land acquisition: it is the public authority. Some of you may recall that last October, I had occasion to urge the utilization of this device in Latin America as an ideal vehicle for, among other things, acquiring land and financing its purchase without having to resort to expropriation.[4]

Since I advanced this suggestion, the Congress has enacted legislation in connection with our new AID program which offers still another possibility of financing land acquisition. Our Government could guarantee up to a fixed amount that the cash and bond payment to the landowner from his government will not so depreciate in value as to make the transaction uninteresting. This is really the nub of the matter. Essentially, this same principle of guarantee against inflation is utilized by many U.S. companies who put dollars into a Brazilian investment and obtain a commitment from the Banco do Brasil (which exchanges dollars for cruzeiros) that, at the time of take-out, the dollar will bear a fixed ratio to the cruzeiro regardless of what happens to the cruzeiro.

Many landowners have seen the handwriting on the wall; the shadow of expropriation without compensation haunts them. If there is an opportunity to sell out at a reasonable price, with assurance that ultimate payment will not be in "wallpaper," there are large landowners who will obviously prefer the bird in hand to the one in Castro's bush.

The essence of this proposal turns on the use of the carrot and the stick. The local authority would offer to buy outright that portion of the land which today lies idle. A condition of the purchase of the idle land would turn, however, on the landowner increasing the productivity of that portion which he would retain. In this way the landless would be given land and the landowner by increasing the productivity of his own holdings would add to the employment opportunities and the economic stability of his particular region.

---

[1] See, Carroll, "The Land Reform Issue in Latin America," Latin American Issues (20th Century Fund, 1961) at 164.

[2] See, "Land Problems in Latin America" (1961), the Chase Manhattan Bank.

[3] United Nations, "Progress in Land Reform," Department of Economic Affairs (New York, 1954) at 43 (quoted from Carroll, op. cit. supra at 190).

[4] See, "Latin America: The Clear and Present Danger."

For the Latin American scene, the greatest, single virtue of the public authority would be that, as an independent body, it would be removed from the bureaucratic and political jealouses of existing governmental ministries. It can work horizontally across a broad spectrum by integrating into its activities all of the related functions in a problem area—something which no single ministry or department charged with a single responsibility can possibly accomplish. For instance: it isn't enough merely to redistribute land. This is only the first phase—although, politically, perhaps the most important phase—of a comprehensive program which must exist to create a balanced agricultural economy. Capital must be made available to farmers for long terms and at low rates of interest for the payment of their farms, for the purchase of seed, insecticides and equipment. Storage and marketing facilities must be organized to make farming profitable and safe for the land. Roads must be built to reach urban markets. Better agricultural methods must be taught. Assistance in building and owning houses must be provided. Campesinos must be taught to plant diversified crops to overcome nutritional deficiencies—the hidden hunger of two-thirds of the people of the continent.

Health and sanitation measures must be provided. And most importantly, the scourge of illiteracy must be attacked, if you are to have healthy farmers and knowledgeable farmers.

The public authority provides the mechanism for planning and dealing administratively with all of these related activities.

A second great advantage for Latin America in the utilization of the public authority is that it would enable the superbly trained and highly dedicated younger technicians (who now lack the power of political decision) to function effectively and decisively where they have heretofore experienced only futility and frustration. These younger men throughout Latin America do possess the Anglo-American conception of the exacting high standards of public service. Theirs is "the punctilio of honor, the most exacting," in Justice Cardozo's phrase. The U.S. taxpayer's dollar administered by these younger men would—I am confident—be money well and wisely spent.

Indeed, it is not too much to say that, unless we are prepared to invest in the leaders of tomorrow by placing our support behind Latin America's new generation of technicians and public administrators, there is precious little hope of accomplishing anything in Latin America—let alone insuring that our tax dollars are not used to create more political millionaires, or to finance more political campaigns.

It would be totally misleading if I conveyed the impression that the mere establishment of the authority mechanism is in and of itself a panacea. The success of this type of managerial operation will depend on the support and cooperation which it receives from the political executive. The Tennessee Valley Authority, the Port of London Authority, the independent agencies which functioned in Costa Rica under the presidency of Jose Figueres, and other similar independent corporate devices, are and were successful because they enjoyed public acceptance and political support.

In the conversations which I had with responsible South Americans in public and private life, I took occasion to explore the feasibility of the public authority as an instrument for attacking land redistribution, housing, and other critical problems. I found no one who did not believe that this managerial device offered unique and signal advantages; or who did not believe that, if the United States seriously sponsored the idea, it would not be welcomed. As a matter of fact, the public authority mechanism is today being used in Colombia, a variant of the concept has long been employed in Chile, and it is about to be put into operation in Venezuela in connection with the establishment of savings and loan associations.

Its application to Latin America's most sensitive and urgent problem—land redistribution—requires only the initiative of our own Government.

If the Alliance for Progress is to become a dynamic and powerful weapon on Latin America's revolutionary battleground, we have got to regroup our forces and establish a new order of battle priorities.

Across the map of the continent we continue to fritter away our limited resources on peripheral technical assistance programs and projects. Many have outlived their usefulness. Some are nothing more than the vested interest of the field bureaucracy. All belong to the obsolete school of foreign aid which, lacking any master plan, is content to dole out a little bit for everybody.

Needed are bold, new, fresh ideas—ideas which are responsive to the vastness of Latin America's impending social upheaval. Needed, too, are the managerial skills to translate these ideas into action.

What we now require with compelling urgency is a maximum concentration of attention and resources on a few countries and on a few strategically important problems—problems whose immediate solution could spell the difference between Latin America falling into the Castro camp; or being able to buy time for the development of its own special and unique democracy.

Our objective should be the creation of a few, spectacularly successful showcases of democracy which will supply the multiplier effect for the rest of the continent.

By way of illustration, we might select four Latin American countries for the accomplishment of this objective.

These countries might well be (1) the Dominican Republic; (2) Venezuela; (3) Brazil; and (4) Argentina.

(1) Dominican Republic: Circumstances and events have handed the Kennedy administration a golden opportunity for the assertion of initiative and leadership to overcome the Castro propaganda that Fidelismo is the true faith and that Fidel is its only true prophet. If we don't fumble our chance, the Dominican situation presents us with the one big break we need to put the alliance on its feet, and in the process to deal Castro a devastating blow. We could do this by launching an impressive program of land reform utilizing the authority concept on an experimental basis. In addition, work could be started at once to unravel the intricate personal ownership and investments of the Trujillo clan and returning them to the people of the island Republic. This undertaking will require the corporate skills of the most experienced "Swiss watchmakers" so involved and intricate is this nexus of relationships.

It is not necessary that we lose precious time while we mobilize a battalion of technical experts from the United States. We can use Puerto Rico as the staging area. Puerto Rico has the trained specialists who could move into the Dominican Republic overnight. Moreover, there would be no opposition to the employment of Puerto Rican technicians (as there well might be in some countries in South America). For between the two islands there exists the bond of close family and commercial ties. The respect of the Dominican people for the towering figure of Governor Luis Muñoz Marín would guarantee the success of the operation. Such an all-Caribbean undertaking would have an electric effect through Central and South America. It would give the lie to the Castro propaganda that Castro alone has a patent on the social revolution.

Here is the opportunity to demonstrate to all Latin America that the United States can and will help a new and struggling democracy to make up a 30-year exile from the 20th century.

The people of the Dominican Republic are hungry—after 30 years of a brutal dictatorship—for the sweet taste of representative government and individual liberty. How we go about helping them in this endeavor will have greater significance to Latin America than just about anything else we might do.

If through bureaucratic ineptness, lack of imagination and boldness, this opportunity is allowed to slip through our fingers, we can kiss the alliance off: it will be dead.

I have limited my recommendation to three countries of South American for these reasons. Colombia: I doubt that more can be done in Colombia than is now being done. Colombia's critical, immediate problem is political—how to effect an orderly transition from a government by Liberals to a government by Conservatives under the Colombian formula requiring this transition. Colombia has a grave internal security problem. Colombia has a grave land problem. That the Conservatives can solve these two problems any more effectively than the Liberals (who represent the majority party) is doubtful. Peru: We are too late. Washington's "darling," Premier Pedro Beltran, has missed the boat. With a veritable passkey to the Treasury, Don Pedro has done very little, even for one with an eye cocked on the presidency, to accomplish any significant social reform—especially land reform. Indeed, Don Pedro does not believe it to be necessary to break up the big haciendas of his country. Like Moses, he would lead his Peruvian Indians into the promised land which lies across the alto plano—a vast, virgin hinterland of some 62,000 square miles, comprising the valleys of the Apurimac and Urubamba Rivers between the main cordillera (Andean chain) on the west, and the Brazilian frontier on the east.

Nor has Don Pedro shown any understanding of or concern with integrated planning. Nor has there been any serious attempt to deal with Peru's housing shortage (which, as in every Latin American country, is enormous). Just 10 minutes driving time from Don Pedro's official residence, are Lima's barriados—which most observers would agree are about the most appalling and degrading collection of shanty towns which exist anywhere in the hemisphere.

If there is to be any drastic social reform in Peru, it will be accomplished in all likelihood by the Apra Party, provided the army allows the Apristas to take control under Victor Haya de la Torre as the next President of Peru. Chile: Here, too, in my judgment we are too late. Chile has about as critical a land problem as exists anywhere on the continent. Yet the Alessandri government has made no real effort to grapple with this problem. Only about 2 years and 8 months is left before the next election. In the last election, 41 percent of the vote went to the left. In the coming election, it is confidently being predicted in Santiago that at least 51 percent of the vote will go left—a left which will probably have little or no interest in the Alliance for Progress.

(2) Venezuela: Venezuela is the democratic bastion of the entire Caribbean, if, indeed, it does not occupy this role for the entire continent. With troubled winds blowing from Colombia, with Ecuador groping and searching for a new orientation, Venezuela becomes the democratic anchor to windward. Venezuela, unique among all of Latin America, has already undertaken, under the leadership of Romulo Betancourt's

Accion Democratica Party, a number of the social reforms called for by the Alliance for Progress.

Venezuela offers an important lesson which some of my colleagues in the international business community along with a number of professionals of the Foreign Service of the State Department can learn and relearn: You have to back political parties of the people; you have to live with their mistakes. Betancourt has demonstrated that, a moderately left of center party with a program, with understanding and help from the United States, can accomplish two things: solidify its right and gradually chew up its own left—the Castro-Communist opposition. The business community supports Betancourt. His military, if not tamed, is at least quiescent. Although the cacophony from the extreme left diverts Betancourt's attention and energy from creative tasks, he is bringing it under his control.

Betancourt's major problem still remains—as it has been from the beginning—to establish the climate of confidence which will keep money at home and attract it from overseas.

From his years of exile in Costa Rica and Puerto Rico, Betancourt learned that a democratic party of the left must obtain its basic, hard-rock support from the rural workers. This Betancourt has done through settling some 30,000 campesino families on new land—land paid for in cash and in bonds. And, as Romulo Betancourt is fond of pointing out, it is more land—paid for in cash and bonds—than Castro ever distributed—under expropriation.

Betancourt's unfinished business is to solidify himself with the urban electorate where he is weak (in the last election Betancourt received only 10 percent of the votes from Caracas, the largest population concentration in Venezuela).

We could help President Betancourt by offering to increase and accelerate agricultural education programs for his campesinos; with farm-to-market roads, along with the whole sweep of requirements for a balanced agricultural economy.

We could help with large-scale slum clearance and the obliteration of the wretched ranchos inhabited by the poorest of the poor, which punctuate the hills surrounding Caracas.

Without waiting for any prodding by us, Betancourt's administration is already in the process of establishing a pilot savings and loan association. With the highest per capita income in Latin America, Venezuela offers a perfect environment for a concentrated effort to establish low-cost housing for middle- and low-income groups—the groups throughout the continent where our own future lies.

Some of the leaders of the North American business community might take it upon themselves to engage in some quiet diplomacy to accelerate the flow of private U.S. investment to Venezuela.

We could, if we would, help make Venezuela a showcase of democracy for the entire continent.

(3) Brazil: Brazil is drifting dangerously into chaos. The characteristically Brazilian compromise which averted a bloody civil war by removing power from the chief executive and investing it in a Prime Minister is not functioning. The Prime Minister, in whom all power reposes, reigns but does not rule. The President, whose office was supposed to have been stripped of power and reduced to a ceremonial figurehead, reaches out for the levers of power, urges drastic social reform and declaims against foreign "exploitation." Inflation eats up each new wage boost and precipitates another round of strikes. Brasilia may be an architect's dream. Legislatively speaking, it is a nightmare: the wheels grind, but nothing comes out.

(It would be one of history's consummate ironies if Janio Quadros, the man who lost himself in the presidency, were yet to return as the dictator of all Brazil, thereby fulfilling his original ambitions.)

Brazil is like a gigantic suction pump in the heart of Latin America. It can pull into its own chaos the whole of the continent. A Brazil which is solidly based, a Brazil moving toward effective social reform, provides a powerful incentive for the rest of the continent.

Brazil is at the peril point because of the revolutionary ferment occurring in its northeast. If the northeast of Brazil explodes, Cuba will seem like a firecracker by comparison.

So here is the third strategic area for concentration of attention and resources. I would urge a three-point program.

First, the immediate establishment of an agricultural school to train 5,000 Brazilians as county agricultural agents who, after 6 months of indoctrination, could be let loose on agricultural training for the northeast's impoverished, diseased, and hungry sertanejos. Arrangements could be made with the Inter-American Institute of Agricultural Sciences in Turrialba, Costa Rica, to establish a replica o the institute in the northeast of Brazil for this specialized training.

Second, the launching of a widespread campaign to attack illiteracy through the radio techniques established by Monsignor Salcedo in Colombia. The Catholic Church is prepared to undertake such a program in the northeast. Radios and transmitters are needed. (The request for assistance has been lost in bureaucratic misunderstandings between the Field Mission in Rio de Janeiro and the policymakers in Washington.) One of the most heartening developments in South America is the increasing awareness of the Catholic hierarchy of the urgency for social reform, particularly land reform. (In Peru, I was told that the church has begun to distribute its own lands at Cuzco. In Chile, the most severe critic of the oligarchy is the bishop of Talca. In Sao Paulo, Msgr. Dom Jorge Marcos Oliviera has been branded a Communist because of his preoccupation with improving labor-management relations through collective bargaining agreements modeled after those employed in the United States.)

Third, the strongest persuasion from Ambassador Lincoln Gordon, supported by the full weight of official Washington, should be brought to bear on Sudene—the Brazilian governmental agency charged with developmental responsibility for the northeast of Brazil—to concentrate on programs which will have an immediate impact rather than the delayed impact of two decades—when it will be too late. Sudene is not short of ideas. What it needs is a heavy infusion of practicality.

Colonization schemes, such as the Sudene proposal to colonize the State of Maranhao with a million peasants from the northeast over a period of 7 years, is a visionary dream, a diversionary measure and an escape from reality. The cost of such a mass migration would be fantastic. Its greatest defect, however, is that it fails to get to the heart of the problem: A better distribution of land and an opportunity for the ownership of land in the northeast.

What Celso Furtado, the director of Sudene, needs is effective power to back him up. It is idle to expect this strength to be supplied out of Brasilia. It has to be supplied from the American Embassy—and from Washington.

Plainly, these measures in and of themselves are not the answer to the endemic problems of the northeast. But if they have any merit at all, they would at least serve to keep the lid from blowing off. They would enable Sudene to buy time in order to accomplish its long-range goals.

4. Argentina: Argentina ought to be the fourth country where strategic assistance should be mobilized immediately. Because of its geography, Argentina always exerts a strong pull on the neighboring countries of Uruguay, Paraguay, Chile, and Brazil. An Argentina at peace and tending to her own economic knitting helps keep her neighbors at peace and intent upon their own developmental problems. An Argentina in turmoil has a magnetic effect upon her neighbors.

Argentina's most critical problem is housing—not land reform. If President Frondizi does not soon deliver on his promise to the Argentine people to supply housing on a massive scale, his already shaky government is bound to collapse. The alternative is another military junta incapable of coping with Argentina's economic complexities, or a Peronista regime which would be a poor bargain for Argentina—and the hemisphere.

Slum clearance and the bulldozing of Buenos Aires' villas miserias (the ironically poetic title of the portenos for their slums) can only be dealt with by the United States taking the initiative, by introducing into Argentina the equivalent of six Levitts (of famed Levittown) to provide the technical skills of modern mass low-cost housing construction. In addition to supplying housing technology, we need to take the lead in supplying financial technology—the system for financing low-cost housing through low-interest home mortgage financing and savings and loan associations.

It may be contended that, rather than accept anything which smacks of a U.S. operated housing construction scheme, Argentina would elect to go without housing—the application of the ancient doctrine of cutting off your nose to spite your face.

Surely, we are not so lacking in diplomatic skill that we can't "sell" a joint venture in low-cost housing and low-cost financing to the Argentine Government?

Latin America is hemorrhaging while we persist in applying a bandaid to severed arteries.

We have mesmerized ourselves with a cliche that "self-help" by Latin America will do the trick; that, having set the stage for remedial action, we can be a spectator while the Latin American characters assemble to play their appointed roles.

Unfortunately, there isn't enough time for the characters in this historic drama even to learn the script. For standing in the wings are an impatient, angry people who want fast results. And just behind them stand the local Dr. Castros, ready to follow the dictates of the people, but who will impose their own brand of solutions with a Moscow or Peiping trademark.

How many Cubas do we need before we wake up to the realization that Latin America is a volcano about to erupt—and that our own head is in the crater?

The Alliance for Progress could be this century's greatest experiment in democracy. Its failure would be one of history's greatest disasters.

The hour for decision in Latin America is already very late, but perhaps not too late, if we will but act—in time.

A PLEA FOR MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, over the past few years I have received literally thousands of letters from citizens of my State urging passage of the medical care bill, popularly known as the

Forand bill and now as the King-Anderson bill.

I am very privileged and pleased to be one who has cosponsored this legislation. In fact, the very first bill I introduced in the Senate in the field of social security was to include persons aged 65 and over under the terms of social security for hospital and medical care. That was some 11 years ago. I am very proud it was my good fortune to be one of the original sponsors. The late Senator Murray, of Montana, was really the main sponsor of that legislation for years.

What has impressed me about these letters is the earnestness and sincerity that go into each one of them. They are written from the heart. I have never read more moving letters.

Just recently I received a letter on this subject from a gentleman in Minnesota I have known for many years. He is now 65 years old, and has been confined to a hospital since last November with a cardiac condition. He is a respected member of his community, who has dedicated his life to education and conservation work. He has always stood on his own two feet—served his country in World War I, owned his own home, raised and educated fine children, and played an active role in his church. Here is a good, honest, industrious citizen.

He has not asked for charity. He has never asked for it in his life. He has been what we call a good, patriotic citizen, a taxpayer, and a hard worker. Let me read what he wrote me. On January 8, 1962, I received this letter:

> MY DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: I have been confined here since November 13, undergoing two surgical bouts and weeks of concentrated attention on matters cardiac. I have had much time for serious thought, some spiritual and some dwelling solely on earthly and economic matters. So illness and pain do not have to be wasted, instead physical setbacks can afford a grand opportunity for serious meditation and reflection.
>
> I listened attentively to your TV suggestion for citizens to express their views for transmission to Members of Congress on old-age medical assistance, tied in with social security and which is scheduled for major consideration in the forthcoming congressional session. I now desire to express to you my innermost conscientious feelings on the subject.
>
> Please be kind enough to pardon me for trying to tell you what I have to say in script, however, I do not have a typewriter available, and if I did, I could not operate same while lying prone on a hospital bed.
>
> So here goes. Senator, I have always been a conservative frame of mind, at times even to a point of being an extremist, but in later years I have developed a changing viewpoint on many matters, especially social matters. I have concluded, and satisfyingly so, that I have not been in tune with a changing world.
>
> I am now 65 years old. I have worked every day of my life. I have tried to be a decent citizen, a creditable member of society. My salary throughout a span of some 50-odd years has not been large, mainly because I have been mainly interested and concerned with being a school man, a former superintendent at a time when salaries were very low, and in conservation of natural resources which has never offered large pay. However, I have always been solvent, owning my own little home, educating my children, paying my taxes and contributing as best I could to church and worthy charity programs.
>
> I am a college graduate (B.A.), a veteran of World War I, with an honorable discharge and a surgeon's certificate of disability. I have never asked nor received one thin dime of medical help for medical purposes because of service connections. I have been happy to have been able to pay my own way.
>
> But now I am 65 years old. I am not in good physical condition and my life span is problematical. If I cannot continue to work every day, remain on a payroll, and I am now listed as being off the payroll, I am faced with trying to afford the bare necessities of life for my wife and myself on a social security payment of $118 per month and a pension of $52.50 per month. I do have some insurance which still demands monthly payments. We do have some savings. When I entered the hospital in November, I was solvent.
>
> But now fear has set in. My health may preclude continued employment, worse still, when I am discharged from the hospital, I will have an item amounting to from $500 to $1,500 to pay my 20-percent share of the total cost of my illness.
>
> Now I may be one of the more fortunate of citizens for I hope to find ways and means to pay my share of said costs. But even so, I must now be burdened with the worry that it can happen again and again to both my wife and myself, and when that happens I shall be without benefit of insurance help. The only recourse then is to hope for an early dismiss or an appeal to some welfare setup for help, in my concept a dole. This thought sickens me and scares me and goes entirely against a philosophy that I have nursed for an entire lifetime.
>
> I, of course, am selfishly thinking only of myself, but how about the millions of other good citizens that have lived decent and creditable lives who must face comparable or worse dilemmas? I find myself now thinking about them.
>
> Thus I write to tell you that the greatest argument for the cause that you and your like-thinking colleagues are striving to do for these people is to give them opportunity to maintain their dignity to their end of time. There are, of course, many other worthy reasons for adoption of such an assistance for medical care, but none approach in importance the hope for elimination of old age fear of losing one's dignity that has been kept and adhered to so religiously throughout a life of decency.
>
> It has been my observation that nothing is so insecure as security.

I wish to repeat that line. Sometimes I think we forget the full meaning of what he had to say.

> It has been my observation that nothing is so insecure as security. Bank failures, rising medical costs, periods of depression, to name a few, can soon destroy the best of security plans.
>
> F.D.R. will be remembered for his social reforms, his innate feeling for the oppressed and helpless. President Kennedy is an intellectual blessed with the same desire to help erase fear for those, namely the helpless majority. You have been the most ardent of men in Congress with a true sense of humanitarianism. I hope and pray that your colleagues will support your view. I have poured out to you my innermost feelings. Please, for now at least, do not use my name. Fear of consequences makes me request this. Some day I may be able to chat with you. I have much to tell and all shall be told in an impersonal way. I admire you and I am thankful that we have men in your position who speak out plainly, honestly and with feeling for all things that are best for the people of America and the world.
>
> Most sincerely,
>
> ———.

Mr. President, when I received this letter and read it over, I was deeply moved by this man's eloquent expression of support for medical care legislation. That is why I wanted to share this letter today with my colleagues. I have never heard or read more persuasive testimony as to the crying need for protection against the fear of illness and crushing medical expenses in the twilight of one's life.

I wish to publicly express my thanks and appreciation to this constituent for having shared with me his innermost thoughts and feelings on this vital matter. What he wrote in such fluent language expresses, I am sure, the heartfelt convictions and emotions of countless millions of men and women.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of the medical care legislation offered in the Senate by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

With the all-out support of President Kennedy, I am confident we shall enact this humanitarian legislation before this Congress adjourns.

Every Member of this body and of the other body ought to do some soul searching on this subject, because when public opinion samplings are made in State after State, it is seen that the overwhelming majority of the people, young and old, men and women, support unqualifiedly the extension of social security to include hospital and nursing home care for our elderly. I submit that this is long overdue.

I took the time to read this letter today, because while the Chamber is relatively empty and my colleagues have gone to their respective offices or homes, I felt at least it ought to be heard, because this man wrote from a heart filled with a sense of compassion and social justice.

I repeat, this man is no freeloader. He is one of the finest of citizens. He is representative of millions of Americans. I wonder whether we are to face this responsibility or whether we are to let a handful—a minority—drive us away from what is a requirement of social concern for our senior citizens.

AID FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1241) to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities and to authorize scholarships for undergraduate study in such institutions.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a comparison of the major provisions of H.R. 8900 and S. 1241, which are the college education aid bills, as prepared by the Library of Congress, Legislative Reference Service, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the comparison was ordered to be printed in the RECORD,

COMPARISON OF MAJOR PROVISIONS OF H.R. 8900 AND S. 1241

H.R. 8900, AS AMENDED AND PASSED BY THE HOUSE, JANUARY 30, 1962	S. 1241, AS REPORTED TO THE SENATE
PURPOSE	**PURPOSE**
Assistance through grants and loans to public and nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities.	Assistance through (1) loans to public and nonprofit institutions of higher education to help construct, or improve needed academic and related facilities; (2) scholarships; (3) matching grants for construction of public junior community colleges.
ACADEMIC FACILITIES	**ACADEMIC FACILITIES**
Would include structures suitable for use as classrooms, laboratories, libraries and related facilities including maintenance, storage, or utility facilities essential to operation. Would not include facilities which (a) are intended primarily for physical education or for events for which admission is charged to the public; (b) are or will be used for sectarian instruction or for religious worship, or (c) are or will be used primarily in connection with a school or department of divinity.	Similar provision. Would not include facilities intended primarily for events for which admission is to be charged to the general public.
DURATION FOR TOTAL PROGRAM	**DURATION FOR TOTAL PROGRAM**
Five years.	Same.
GRANT PROGRAM	**GRANT PROGRAM**
1. Amounts: Authorizes appropriations of $180 million for each year of program. 2. Eligibility: Applicant must show that project will result in urgently needed expansion to accommodate increased enrollments. 3. Allotments: Funds to be allotted among States as follows: (a) one-half on basis of relative higher education enrollment in State, and (b) one-half on basis of relative enrollment of students in grades 9 to 12 in State (inclusive). 4. Federal share: May be uniform for all projects within a State as determined by State agency under State plan and regulations prescribed by Commissioner, but cannot be more than one-third of the cost of development. (Applicant may use Federal loan funds to match remaining two-thirds but at least 25 percent of the two-thirds matching funds must be non-Federal.) 5. Administration of grant program: State commission (or existing agencies) which are broadly representative of institutions of higher education and public will administer the program within the States. State commission must submit acceptable State plan meeting basic criteria prescribed by the Commissioner. Commissioner is to approve application for grant if such application meets certain conditions and requirements. One of the State commission's primary functions is to determine project priorities of applicants within its jurisdiction under regulations issued by the Commissioner. 6. Period of Federal interest and recapture: Period of Federal interest in a facility is 20 years after completion. If project ceases to be used as a nonprofit academic facility during 20-year period after completion, Federal Government may recover an amount equal to its interest. Commissioner may waive such right to recapture except where project is used for religious or sectarian purposes.	No similar provision.
LOANS TO INSTITUTIONS	**LOANS TO INSTITUTIONS—TITLE I**
1. Authorizes appropriation of $120 million for each year of the program.	1. Amount: Authorizes Commissioner to obtain funds for loans through borrowing from the U.S. Treasury up to $300 million for each year. Loans to the Commissioner will bear interest not more than the higher of 2½ percent or the current average annual interest rate on all interest-bearing obligations of the United States adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of 1 percent.
2. Length, interest rate and limit: Loans must be repaid within 50 years; and will	2. Length, interest rate and limit: Identical provision, except that loans bear interest

COMPARISON OF MAJOR PROVISIONS OF

(H.R. 8900—Continued)

bear interest at rate not more than the higher of 2¾ percent per year or one-fourth of 1 percent above the interest paid by the Commissioner to the Treasury.

(NOTE.—The latter alternative for determining interest rates appears to be inoperative because the bill was amended on the floor by deleting the authority of the Commissioner to borrow funds from the Treasury.)

Limits the amount which may be made for loans in any one State to 12½ percent of the total amount of the loans made.

3. Eligibility: Applicant must show that: (a) it is unable to borrow from non-Federal sources on equally favorable terms; (b) not less than one-fourth of the cost will be financed from non-Federal sources, and (c) construction will be economical—not elaborate.

4. Administration: Program to be administered by the Commissioner who will prescribe rules and regulations to carry out the loan program. Commissioner may sue and be sued, foreclose on property, etc.

SCHOLARSHIPS FOR COLLEGE STUDENTS—TITLE II

No similar provision.

H.R. 8900 AND S. 1241—Continued

(S. 1241—Continued)

at rate not less than a per annum rate that is one-quarter of 1 percentage point above the rate of interest paid by the Commissioner.

3. Eligibility: Identical provision.

4. Administration: Identical provision.

SCHOLARSHIPS FOR COLLEGE STUDENTS—TITLE II

1. Amounts authorized: $17,500,000 for first fiscal year of program; $26,250,000 for second fiscal year; $35,000,000 for each of 3 remaining fiscal years.

2. Method of allotment: From the funds available up to 2 percent will be allotted to Puerto Rico, the Canal Zone, Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa. The remainder of the funds available will be allotted among the 50 States and District of Columbia, one-half on the basis of their relative numbers of high school graduates and one-half on the basis of their relative populations aged 14 to 17, inclusive.

3. Amount of scholarships: Up to $1,000 for any academic year. This amount would be based on the individual's financial need for assistance as determined by a State scholarship commission.

4. Duration of scholarship: Not to exceed 4 academic years.

5. Selection of recipients: To be eligible to compete in any State for a scholarship, student must (a) be living in the State or, if not living in any State, be domiciled in the State, (b) make application as prescribed by the State commission, (c) not be and not have been enrolled full time in any course at any institution of higher education, and (d) be attending a high school which is accredited by the State.

Provides for the selection by the State commission in accordance with the State plan of persons to be awarded scholarships, and for determination of the amounts, if any, to be paid to them.

6. State commissions and plans: Provides that a State desiring to participate in the scholarship program may do so by establishing a State commission on scholarships broadly representative of high schools and colleges, and of the public, in the State, or by designating an existing State agency with equivalent representation to serve.

Provides that State commission must submit a State plan for carrying out the purposes of the title. Outlines requirements for State plan which must be approved by the U.S. Commissioner of Education.

Provides for Federal payments to each State for the administration of the State plan.

7. Selection of institution: Provides that a scholarship recipient may attend any qualified higher education institution which admits him.

8. Cost of education allowances: Provides for payments of $350 to institutions for each year a scholarship recipient attends as a grantee.

COMPARISON OF MAJOR PROVISIONS OF H.R. 8900 AND S. 1241—Continued

(H.R. 8900—Continued)

PUBLIC COMMUNITY COLLEGE GRANTS—TITLE III

No similar title except that junior colleges would be eligible for grants and loans under this bill.

(S. 1241—Continued)

PUBLIC COMMUNITY COLLEGE GRANTS—TITLE III

1. Amount: Authorizes appropriations of $50 million for grants for each of the 5 years of the program.

2. Method of allotment: Provides for funds to be allotted to the States on the basis of relative per capita income and relative number of high school graduates.

3. Matching requirement: Provides that a State matches in an amount determined by a formula based on its number of high school graduates and its Federal allotment. In no case would the State's matching payment be required to be more than twice the Federal allotment.

4. Requires that a State plan be submitted for the approval of the U.S. Commissioner of Education.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on the matter of loans to institutions, under title I, I note that the Library of Congress was not complete in its description of the provisions under S. 1241. However, that has been discussed by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. It will be discussed on Monday by others, including myself.

I am very hopeful that this comparison will be studied, because it is a simplified, concise comparison of the provisions title by title, paragraph by paragraph, and will help us to understand the differences between the two bills.

I note also, with reference to the comments of the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], the high cost of college education.

I do not know how many Members of this body have sons or daughters or members of the family who go to private colleges. I am surely not complaining on behalf of any Member, including myself, but the cost of education today is mounting, so that it is not uncommon for a student to have to plan to spend $2,000, $2,500, $3,000, or $3,500 a year for a college education.

Mr. President, we are going to make higher education the province of the rich unless we do something to better finance it out of public resources.

It is nothing short of a shame—and, in fact, a disgrace—that the richest Nation on the face of the earth should find it necessary literally to price thousands—yes, millions—of students out of higher education. That is what has happened.

One of the leading college authorities, in a recent address in New York City, made this very point. It is not original with the Senator from Minnesota. He pointed out that we were in danger of pricing out of education thousands of students who are qualified, able, brilliant, and some of the best students in the land. We know who the good students are. We test students in high school through IQ tests, college aptitude tests, and other aptitude tests. Our young people are tested again and again. The trouble is that we have an inadequacy of higher education facilities and an inadequacy of competent teachers and professors. Let every Senator know, as we come to vote on the college education bill, that between now and 1975 the enrollment in American colleges will double. So every day we delay on a college education assistance bill is another day that we shall have put off the fulfillment of opportunity for young people or, should I say, put off our responsibilities, because there is no doubt that the need of trained manpower in the days ahead will be an increasing need and a constant demand upon the economy.

The recent study and report of the National Science Foundation on the educational structure of the Soviet Union, giving the projection into the future of the numbers of scientists, technicians, engineers, and professional people being graduated in the Soviet Union, should alarm every single American if he believes that we are in what is known as competitive coexistence with the Soviet Union. I make that statement because there will be no competition 25 years from now if we do not step up our activities. We will be left at the starting post. What the bill provides and what the Senator from Oregon, along with his associates in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, have been pleading for today, is a national recognition of the urgent necessity to strengthen our institutions of higher learning and to do it on a systematic basis in terms of grants, loans, scholarships, and fellowships, so that both the educational personnel and educational facilities will be adequate for the requirements, and also so that students will be given a better opportunity themselves to participate in higher educational activities.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on Monday the Senate will continue the debate on the college education bill. We hope to be able to complete action on it on Monday. If we do, we will then move to the consideration of the so-called money resolutions for the Senate committees. Following action on those resolutions, it is the instruction of the leader that we move to the consideration of the bill to amend the Health and Welfare Act.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate at this time, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, February 5, 1962, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 2, 1962:

Federal Aviation Agency

Maj. Gen. Harold Winfield Grant, of the U.S. Air Force, to be the Deputy Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency.

U.S. Circuit Judge

J. Skelly Wright, of Louisiana, to be U.S. circuit judge for the District of Columbia circuit, vice J. Barrett Prettyman.

U.S. District Judge

Frank B. Ellis, of Louisiana, to U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Louisiana, vice J. Skelly Wright, elevated.

Diplomatic and Foreign Service

John Calvin Hill, Jr., of South Carolina, a Foreign Service officer, for promotion from class 3 to class 2.

Walter P. McConaughy, of Alabama, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Pakistan, vice William M. Rountree.

Office of Emergency Planning

Edward A. McDermott, of Iowa, to be Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, vice Frank Burton Ellis.

In the Marine Corps

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of lieutenant colonel, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

*Mobley, Warren L.
*Leader, Samuel F.
*Davis, Merle C.
*Powell, J. B.
*McKean, Edgar A.
*Vroegindewey, Robert J.
*Grimes, Doyle
*Youngs, Clifford A.
*Assad, Albert J.
McGuire, James L.
*Smith, Edgar L.
*Keim, Robert M.
*Pearce, James T.
*Rash, Richard S.
*Fenton, Donald L.
*Dorsey, James A.
*Edelmann, George J., Jr.
*Rowe, Carroll D.
*Cline, Richard W.
*Bland, Richard L.
*Rooney, John J.
*Fink, Gerald
*Mueller, Godfrey
*Crew, Erskine B.
*Riffle, James C.
*Berger, Ernest J.
*Bowen, Ralph E.
*Artnak, Edward J.
*Hart, Henry
*Armstrong, Charles B., Jr.
*Williams, Royce M.
*Fornonzini, Benjamin A., Jr.
*Coleman, Thomas A.
*Hodde, Gordon V.
*Oglesby, Edward D.
*Ritter, Darrell L.
*Davis, Raymond R.
*Willis, Robert L.
*Maloney, Emmons S.
*Slaton, Clyde H., Jr.
*Geissinger, Robert S.
*Waskom, Wendell M.
*Takala, David O.
*Hinshaw, Don M.
*Sienko, Walter
*Urell, John
*Aldworth, James
*Johnston, Thomas J., Jr.
*Herndon, John L.
*Stien, Laurence J.
*Beach, William L.
*Cassidy, Earl W.
*Gillis, Alexander J., Jr.
*Winneberger, George L., Jr.
*Maire, Gerald J.
*Eldridge, William W., Jr.
*Shields, John E.
*Davis, Oliver R.
*Moore, John T.
*King, George J.
*Allen, Norris D.
*Huffstutter, Hardy V., Jr.
*Miller, Lewis L.
*Denny, Rex C., Jr.
*Dykes, Kenneth T.
*Hall, W. C.
*Stewart, Walter C., Jr.
*Sullivan, John W.
*Dennis, Nicholas J.
*Gould, Charles H.
*Williams, Lynn F.
*Albers, George H.
*Smith, Jerry B.
*Seabaugh, Paul W.
*Zorn, Elmer J.
*Snapper, John N.
*O'Hara, Frank J., Jr.
*Boswell, Charles E., Jr.
*Ritter, Leland C.
*Lovette, Lenhrew E.
*Stender, Bernard J.
*Daniel, Walter E.
*Githens, Daniel P., Jr.
*Brown, Williams P.
*Zitnik, Robert J.
*Barden, Arnold W.
*Leis, Sylvester F.
*Roark, Walter N., Jr.
*Mulvihill, Thomas E.
*Hines, Cloyd V.
*Campbell, Marshall S.
*Tucker, Lud R.
*McGlade, Lawrence
*Voth, Stanley B.
*Elder, Thomas G.
*McCain, Warren E.
*Stewart, Grover S., Jr.
*Connell, Herschel G.
*Jernigan, Curtis D.
*Olsen, Willard C.
*Mason, John B.
*Robertson, Robert S.
*Cavalero, John H.
*Weaver, James R.
*Walker, William L.
*Bushnell, Richard H.
*Foss, Donald H.
*Haley, Harold L.
*Whitlock, Roy B.
*Hanes, John V.
*Crooks, William M.
*Heitzler, Joseph S.
Koster, Edward A.
Stanton, Eldon C.
Wolf, Howard
Haskins, Gahan J.
Tomlinson, Francis K., Jr.
Kuprash, George
Leon, James
Watson, William D.
Childers, Lloyd F.
Browne, John
Mixson, Herman L.
Tweed, McDonald D.
Calhoun, Loren W.
Harrell, William F.
McCormick, Herbert F.
Clark, Truman
Clarke, Thomas W.
Nelson, Joseph A.
Bianchi, Rocco D.
Hunter, Harry, Jr.
Champion, Cecil L., Jr.
Di Frank, Joseph, Jr.
Sparling, Walter E.
Hitchcock, Paul L.
Quinn, William R.
Dunwiddie, Stanley G.
Jones, Elwin M.
Bass, Julian G., Jr.
Somerville, Daniel A.
Shank, James W.
Engelhardt, Lloyd J.
Corcoran, Clement T.
White, Thomas A.
Costello, Keith W.
Goebel, Jerome L.
Kelly, William D.
Schwartz, Leo R.
Harris, William S.
Curtis, Paul F.
Gleason, Thomas E.
Vale, Sumner A.
Roeder, Horton E.
McCulloch, William L.
Blanchard, Don H.
Joens, Ray N.
Dionisopoulos, James G.
Gasser, James C.
Tope, Lyle V.
Opeka, Francis C.
Mullane, Raymond W.
Smith, Burneal E.
Gibson, George A.
Mendenhall, Herbert E.
Rainer, Mark A., Jr.
Taylor, Robert W.
Spielman, Harvey E.
Hixson, Wilmer W.
David, Maurice A.
Williams, James F.
Schick, Edwin S., Jr.
Schwenk, Adolph G.
Vickers, Earl K., Jr.
Matthews, Lyle B., Jr.
Blue, Miller M.
Finch, Francis E.
Mample, Richard H.
Affleck, William R., Jr.
Crompton, Wallace W.
Zeugner, Robert
Odenthal, Joseph T.
Hess, Theodore D.
Horgan, Thomas J., Jr.
Snell, Albert W.
Bailey, Almarion S.
Wydner, Charles E., Jr.
Farmer, Chester V.
Evans, Daniel R.
Lanagan, William H., Jr.
Poage, Jay V.
Watterson, Donald E.
Robinson, Harry G., Jr.
Eldracher, Frank A., Jr
Volkert, Marvin D.
Cail, Ralph D.
Beat, Nolan J.
Watson, Warren C.
Busick, Clarence J.
Lee, Harry
Fulton, Floyd K., Jr.
Nahow, Theodore
Schmid, Clarence H.
Vaught, Francis W.
Kirk, Walter C.
Evans, Harold W., Jr.
Sinclair, Robert B.
Doty, Duane J.
Murphy, John J.
Nichols, Robert L.
Dunbar, Michael J.
O'Donnell, Andrew W.
Burnett, Loren E.
Mann, Clyde R.
Coffeen, Albert E.
Nelson, William L.
Hershey, Gilbert R.
Donahue, William F., Jr.
Pommerenk, Albert C.
Fisher, Sidney
Slenning, Bradford N.
Soper, James B.
Skotnicki, Anthony J.
Michaux, Alexander L., Jr.
Gore, Willis L.
Wagenhoffer, Martin T.
Doering, John H., Jr.
Domina, Walter E.
Bailey, Edward A.
Bain, Herbert J.
Bell, Van D., Jr.
Franzman, Freddie L.
Lauck, John H.
Landrigan, James M.
Raphael, Milton L.
Kurth, Harold R., Jr.
Camporini, Edward E.
Moritz, Andrew B.
Allen, Robert B.
Rogal, Edward R.
Priddy, James R.
Alexander, Leland G.
Thomas, Alfred I.
Herndon, Wilber N.
Sullivan, Arthur J.
Adair, Harold F.
Wilkerson, Herbert L.
Crispen, Richard W.
Taylor, William W.
Defenbaugh, Neil F.
Broome, Norris C.
Campbell, Frederick H.
House, Arthur E., Jr.
MacDonald, James A., Jr.
Culver, Ralph K.
Oliver, Verne L.
Scribner, Robert G.
Storm, William W., III
Wood, Frederick S.
Brunnenmeyer, Sherwood A.
Meyers, Bruce F.
Goggin, William F.
Fisher, Joseph R.
Barcus, Paul W.
Gibson, Gerald W.
Holben, Donald E.
Piehl, Robert H.
Moody, Clarence G., Jr.
Preston, Herbert, Jr.
Clement, David A.
Kirstein, Lee A.
Dyroff, William F.
Freeman, Thomas R.
Draper, William H.
Wilcox, Edward A.
Vance, Robert N.
Van Meter, Jo M.
Sims, John B.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of major, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

*Blake, Leonard F.
*Marshall, Henry R. III
*Scott, Joseph W., Jr.
*Draper, William W.
*Sobol, Harold
*Catallo, Merico L.
*Hedin, John A.
*Sandy, Allen D.
*De Fazio, Ernest L.
*Stone, James E.
*Cignotti, Louis J.
*Stark, Clifford M.
*Hardee, Lee H.
*Matthews, Jeter R., Jr.
*Sawyer, Harold L.
*Herndon, Gerald G.
*Weatherspoon, James A.
*Harris, James B., Jr.
*Gordon, Abie
*Cappeletto, Nicholas
*Simmons, Bernard P.
*Arceneaux, Ewell J.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of major, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

*Blakeslee, Rollin Q.
*Ruos, George V., Jr.
*Ingalls, Jack F., III
*Roberson, Clinton
*Spence, Charles E., Jr.
*Seitz, Frederick H.
*Marron, Joseph J.
*Unkle, John W.
*Henderson, Paul F., Jr.
*Sharpe, Whitlock N.
*Donaldson, Joseph R.
*Mincey, Andrew V.
*Forde, John E., Jr.
*Bacher, Louis J.
*Fennessy, Mark P.
*Alexander, Maurice H.
*Plante, Donald P.
*Caslin, William E.
*McGee, James H.
*Hansford, John R.
*Kieswetter, Gerard M.
*Armstrong, Marshall B.
*Highhouse, Laverne D.
*Ohlgren, Arthur S.
*Koehler, Robert F.
*Wallach, Albert W.
*Reitz, Charles M.
*Bedwell, Everett D.
*Tremmel, Robert M.
*Damon, Robert K.
*Williams, Tom W.
*Newton, George L.
*Molesky, Richard V.
*Wolff, Warren F.
*Spiesel, William J.
*Kiracofe, Walter E.
*Wilder, Gary
*Dinse, William J.
*Smith, Herbert O.
*Bartlett, George L.
*O'Leary, Raymond J.
*Kent, William D.
*Nelson, Albert O.
*Livingston, Gordon M. B.
*Watson, John E.
*King, Edwin C.
*Snyder, Elmer N.
*Albert, Alan D., Jr.
*Burhans, Robert N.
*Kerr, Charles R., Jr.
*Miller, William R., Jr.
*Norton, Robert J.
*Mitchell, Donald L.
*Ziegler, Arnold G.
*Wilson, Paul E.
*Kutz, Richard E.
*Bourne, Frank L., Jr.
*Englisch, Henry
*Morris, Harry L., Jr.
*Holthus, Elmer H.
*Rourke, Rodger E.
*Whisman, Ermil L.
*Pearce, Garry M., Jr.
*Austin, Conway L.
*Brown, Arthur M.
*Simonis, Robert L.
*Frey, Hubert I.
*Weston, Walter A.
*Mead, Howard R. Jr.
*Adrian, Billy M.
*Lowdermilk, Theodore, Jr.
*Vielhauer, William C.
*Etheridge, Marion M., Jr.
*Schoen, Joseph F., Jr.
*Fuchs, Leonard E.
*Fogarty, Herbert L.
*Branen, Wade E.
*Griffis, Joseph K., Jr.
*McDaniel, Roland L.
*Evans, Jack W.
*Turner, James S. G.
*Figard, Charles R.
*Robinson, Richard L.
*Hodges, Thomas A.
*Barnard, Roger H.
*Clelland, William M.
*Toner, Edward R.
*Schulze, Richard C.

*Hildebrand, Donald H.
*Stoetzer, William H.
*Butler, William O.
*Grabowski, Edward Z.
*Slawter, Louis Z., Jr.
*Mulligan, Bernard J.
*Carr, John B., Jr.
*Little, Charles G.
*Fimian, Charles
*Cain, Jack W.
*Twohey, Richard B.
*Everett, James Jr.
*Simanikas, William C.
*Smith, Thomas C.
*Glowicki, Walter F.
*Moore, Karl E.
*Daniels, William S.
*Kephart, William R.
*Burnette, Lowell R., Jr.
*Parchen, John W.
*Jones, Richard K.
*Shatzer, Dale E.
*Metz, John G.
*Sudhoff, Richard I.
*De Atley, Hillmer F.
*Unterkofler, John J.
*Donabedian, Haig.
*Francis, David D.
*Grube Frederick E.
*Cobb, John H., Jr.
*Fitzgerald, Garret J.
*Conlin, Henry J.
*Palmer, Robert E. B.
*Stinemetz, Broman C.
*Frazier, Kenyon J.
*Howland, Robert W.
*Larson, Lavern W.
*Christian, Robert L., Jr.
*Murphy, Rowland M.
*Thousand, William H.
*Schueler, Robert
*Parker, Eric B.
*Kruck, Frederick H.
*Woods, John L.
*Donahue, John J.
*Johnson, Richard P.
*Reece, Lee C.
*Crosby, Hiram B., III
*Thuesen, Ralph
*Frazier, Philip N.
*McClure, Val R.
*Newton, Donald E.
*Chaney, Robert P.
*Olmstead, Stephen G.
*Coffman. John L.
*Hughes, Robert C. V.
*Marsh, Richard C.
*Hagedorn, Elvyn E.
*Kelly, Thomas R.
*Jolley, Malcolm S.
*Lawler, Gerard E.
*Standley, Billy R.
*Deal, Carroll T.
*Wickwire, Peter A.
*Clayborne, John W.
*Davis, Dale N.
*Holmberg, William C.
*Utley, Edward H.
*Blaz, Vincente T.
*Pape, Richard A.
*Rowe, Ben C.
*Nicholas, Charles E.
*Cannon, Frank S.
*Thomas, Gerald C., Jr.
*Hutchison, William E.
*Jones, Chester T.
*Jones, David E., Jr.
*Riddle, Robert G.
*Dausman, Jack E.
*Duncan, William B.
*Heim, William P.
*Goodson, Joseph P.
*Wood, Leonard E.
*Parker, Landon W.
*Connolly, James P., II

Sellers, Donald L.
Balderston, Francis G.
Bumpas, Hugh R., Jr.
Matthews, Drew I.
Collin, John R.
Taber, Richard B.
Roberts, Charles D., Jr.
Trainor, Bernard E.
Boicey, Charles G.
Stockton, Richard C.
Meeker, Robert R., Jr.
Sylvester, Vernon L.
Maxwell, Edward K.
Lynch, Maurice B.
Buergey, William L.
Abrams, Lewis H.
Bradley, John R.
Hartman, Richard S.
Ingrando, Raymond B.
Smith, Richard W.
Tonnacliff, Charles W.
McKinney, Harold E.
Hohmann, William F.
Megna, Phillip E.
Chaplin, Duncan D., III
McElheny, Charles L.
Casey, Charles R.
Clark, Stuart T.
Bailey, James D.
Mogensen, Paul C.
Mallard, Frederick F.
Stranahan, Jerome W.
Morley, Dean H.
Maloney, William R.
Siegmund, Paul L.
Beeler, William R.
Hazard, Gilbert C.
McMath, James B.
Shrader, Paul A.
Smith, Joseph T.
Schramel, Raymond F.
Love, John R.
Hart, Herbert M.
Lawrence, William A.
Young, Donald P.
Culkin, Thomas J.
Moore, Marc A.
Grace, John J.
MacLean, Fred D., Jr.
Reddy, John J. P.
Dooley, Philip J.
Harris, Robert E.
Mille, Robert J.
Searles, Robert M.
Fields, Thomas C.
Fuller, Robert A.
Barker, David B.
Mattimoe, Thomas E.
Haebel, Robert E.
Morgan, Pat
Carpenter, Harry U.
Cottrell, Harold E.
Woodham, Tullis J., Jr.
Williamson, Charles T.
Cawthron, John C., Jr.
Webster, Charles B.
Thomaidis, Speros T.
Navorska, Donald R.
Read, Brooke F., Jr.
McQuinn, Donald E.
Loferski, Stanley J.
Murray, Frank J.
Proudfoot, Ronald M.
Reiniche, Harvey T.
Landers, James H.
Yundt, Gary L.
Hawes, Richard E., Jr.
Eidson, Robert E.
Edwards, Thomas C.
Morrow, Samuel M.
Vanairsdale, James B.
Maysilles, David J.
Drummond, Milton D., Jr.
Howard, Eugene R., Jr.
Atkinson, Harry E.
Fortin, Victor G.
Wray, Richard E., III
Bates, William G.

Kitterman, Warren P.
Stewart, Roderick M.
Baylor, John D.
Chene, Jerry P.
Bowie, Frederick R.
Westenberger, Paul H.
Rice, William R.
Gorski, William P.
Hollen, Kent D.
Van Den Berg, Oliver W., Jr.
Rowley, Jack D.
Silverthorn, Eugene A.
Anderton, Richard L.
Farmer, Martin E.
Qualls, Thomas F.
Rice, William H.
Hayes, David B.
Black, James L., Jr.
Stanaro, Chester J.
Kelly, Walter H., Jr.
Desselle, Albert M.
Rosecrans, Robert D.
Gifford, Cedric C.
Dinegar, Wilbur W.
Pearson, Paul E.
Hogan, Clarence E.
Gentry, George H., Jr.
Wozencraft, Clark R.
Hilgartner, Peter L.
Stuart, Thomas R.
Macklin, Daniel K.
McPheeters, Thomas A.
Benson, Robert E.
Dyer, Robert W.
Paredes, Oswald O.
Kull, William M.
Quisenberry, James R.
Cook, Henry T.
Fahey, John E.
Croft, Alfred J., Jr.
Norman, Jack L.
Woodcock, Cecil E., Jr.
Peeler, John J.
Bowman, Albert R., II
Etter, Richard L.
Kyle, Dudley N.
Elder, Robert A.
Wilkinson, James B.
Roth, Harold B., Jr.
Keefe, John J.
Watson, Clarence E., Jr.
Skaugen, Carl W.
Tinius, David H.
Netka, William
Willis, Theodore J.
Long, George G.
Manis, Joseph V., Jr.
Leigh, Philip A. E.
Barnes, Robert O.
Swilley, Charles R., Jr.
Kauffman, Thomas M.
Graham, Ernest H.
Hubbard, George
Tolle, David S.
Walsh, John J., Jr.
McQuown, Max
Hunter, Paul R.
Stephens, Glenn A.
Wilson, William E., Jr.
Jones, Charles F.
Havlik, John
Dicillo, Frank, Jr.
McNally, Thomas E.
Rauh, Stanley H.
Van Deusen, Larry R.
Bruce, Horace A.
Townsend, Kyle W.
Wilkinson, Bobby R.
Heintz, William H.
Bouldin, Billy D.
Parrish, Darold D.
Gulling, Louis A.
Shoup, John D.
Colia, John
Vorgang, Carroll R.
Quinn, James W.
Topley, Frank D.
Spiro, Michael E.
Scott, William A., Jr.

Hemmingway, Richard E.
Miller, Russell H.
Cliff, Donald K.
Ryckman, James B.
Clark, David A.
Holmberg, Harry H.
Herich, Emil W.
Ivins, Maurice H., Jr.
West, Morgan W.
Chisholm, Charles C., Jr.
Wood, Rondell K.
Seamon, Lawrence R.
Sullivan, Lawrence F.
Fischer Herbert G.
Drumright, William C.
Ferrell, Benjamin B.
Woodruff, Richard L.
Doering, Roy L.
Buchmann, Carl E.
Chase, Harlan C.
Brown, Bruce G.
Waite, Anthony G.
Poppe, Charles R., Jr.
Skinner, Benjamin B.
Moss, Roy E.
Nelson, Neil A.
Rogers, Walter F.
Cryan, William M.
Rice, Robert C.
Keller, Robert J.
Robison, Donald G.
Seaver, Roy A.
Paratore, Joseph F.
Richard, James L.
Dezer, Charles N., III
Anker, Harold R.
Huntzinger, Henry J.
Britt, William C.
Coody, James K.
Sheehan, William F.
Garner, Kenneth C.
Taylor. Wylie W., Jr.
Cresswell, Charles F.
Hopkins, Delos M.
Robbins, William L.
Bruser, George L.
Hochenauer, Max J.
Weaver, Vonda
Hutchisson, William R.
Farrell, Frederick L., Jr.
Gerard, James C.
Vaughan, Gerald W.
Marciniak, Richard H.
Day, Marvin E.
Rudy, Rylen B.
Janssen, Paul G.
Spencer, Richard T.
Willis, Coyle H.
Hawkins, Lawrence R.
Duvall, Raymond L., Jr.
Hutchings, William K.
Sauls, Reginald G., IV
Miller. Edison W.
Anderson, Donald W.
Kimball, Alan B.
Robertson, John W. P.
Stewart, William H., Jr.
Le Blanc, Leo J., Jr.
Taylor, Laurence A.
Campo, Guy R.
Kenyon, Ralph F.
Drago, Alfred N.
Thompson, James S.
Schwindt, Louis W.
Ciaburro, Michael A.
Lawrence, George M., Jr.
Graham, Wallace H.
Garman, William E.
Hawley, Richard L.
Kucharski, Charles R., Jr.
Lichtenwalter, Eugene
Sample, Edward, Jr.
Stansel, Edward H.

Stanton, David R.
McMullen, Harold J.
Zuern, Robert L.
Jameson, Robert D.
Purcell, Robert D.
Brown, Joseph B., Jr.
Conrad, Billy D.
Fox, John R.
Mitchell, Joseph P., Jr.
Bugg, John S., Jr.
Lepp, Joseph R.
Willis, Joe E.
Rochford, Thomas F.
Keith, William H.
Nicholson, Robert E.
Love, John C.
Cook, Robert E.
Broadwell, Franklin C.
Hennelly, John A.
Dion, James W.
Strandquist, John H.
Spence, Morgan L.

Aschenbeck, Theo F.
Griffith, Jack K.
Keister, Charles F.
Fulton, Samuel J.
Robinett, Henry M.
Harper, Francis R., Jr.
Clements, Frederick D.
Hergert, John C., Jr.
Grayson, Edward F., Jr.
Vanwinkle, Archie
Kerrigan, Hunt S.
Elkins, Jim T.
Greer, MacDonald
Quinn, Francis X.
Detroy, John W.
Day, James L.
Fitch, William E. H., III
Iverson, Ronald L.
Davis, Thomas G.

The following-named women officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of major, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

*Reinholz, Ruth F.
*Ritter, Anne S.
*Bane, Mary E.
*Brewer, Margaret A.
*O'Holleran, Ruth J.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of captain, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

*Waite, Haines D.
*Fraser, James H.
*Beeunas, Lawrence F.
*Drake, James R.
*Trapp, Earl G.
*Germagian, Barker P.
*Katen, Arthur C.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of captain, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

*Firing, Fritz
*Adams, Robert T.
*Fox, Clifford G.
*Brown, Bruce L.
*Trent, Anthony
*Van Nortwick, John, III
*Daas, Robert F.
*Newton, Carl W.
*Connors, Jeremiah P.
*Steele, Orlo K.
*Sheridan, Robert F.
*Huston, Harold V.
*Hancock, Thomas W., Jr.
*Long, William H.
*Compton, James L.
*Donovan, Walter J., Jr.
*McDaniel, Clarence E.
*McGrath, William J.
*Blackwell, Clay D.
*Dauster, Edward E.
*Clanton, Edward E.
*Hargraves, Wesley B., II
*Foulger, Stephen R.
*Aliyetti, John E.
*Von Carp, Hermann E. F., Jr.
*Wilson, Donald D.
*Barkovich, Michael J.
*Pirnie, David M.
*Chapin, Howard
*Andreas, Ronald C.
*Harnden, Milton D.
*Skinner, Barry F.
*Getchell, James A.
*Fraser, Paul E., Jr.
*Long, Howard L.
*Hall, Robert C.
*Weeks, John F.
*Jordan, Robert M.
*Widdows, Richard A.
*Hickethier, Robert A.
*Gould, Bernard A.
*Dixon, Charles A.
*Sahaydak, Edwin

*Deitrick, Roger E.
*Ekholm, Wallace H., Jr.
*Lewis, Dale E.
*Davis, Gary A.
*Gast, Harry H., Jr.
*Clayes, Alfred I., Jr.
*Homer, Eugene A., Jr.
*Delaney, John F.
*Goodman, Robert B.
*Pulcheon, Jack H.
*Collins, Harry, II
*Griffay, Donnie M.
*Keathley, Jesse N.
*Dawson, James P.
*Carr, Frederic S., Jr.
*Wehrell, William K., Jr.
*Wilson, Jerry W.
*Cronkrite, Charles L.
*Schwaninger, Marvin E.
Roberts, Kent L.
Martin, David R.
Crouch, Logan A.
Doman, Tom R.
Philon, Robert H.
Lawrence, Robert L.
Condon, Edward A., Jr.
Eastin, Ray F.
Gatliff, James I.
Sheridan, Michael K.
Johnson, Theodore C., Jr.
Cate, Bradley F.
Champlin, Jimmy C.
Cerreta, Michael D., Jr.
Giordano, Joseph F.
O'Connor, Martin E.
Manzo, Frank M.
Johnston, Gordon R.
Moore, Brian D.
Rich, Thomas W., Jr.
Orth, Allan J.
Marsh, John O.
Andrews, Burk
Phillips, John E.
Kinard, David W.

Kozischek, Donald A.
Knapp, James V.
Dunning, Cleveland L.
Thomas, Bernard H.
Becker, Norman G., Jr.
St. Clair, James J.
Langrock, Donald A.
Thompson, Wayne D.
Manwarring, Charles L.
Schultz, Joseph P.
Anderson, Hugh F., Jr.
Berry, Eugene A.
Hatch, Everard E.
Fix, Herbert M.
Nordell, Wayne F.
Johnson, Sven A.
Reckewell, Carl A.
Falzarano, Vincent L.
Stroman, Herbert F.
Knudson, George A.
Maines, Howard D., Jr.
Warren, William C., Jr.
Robertson, Olin J.
Shay, John M.
Layman, Phillip B.
Ruggles, Donald R.
Dewan, John R.
Cassity, James E.
Skinner, James L.
Stofer, John M.
Cantrell, Robert L.
Sharr, Danny A.
Llewellyn, Leonard F.
O'Mahoney, Terrence P.
Rinehart, Benny D.
Kasdorf, Lenn G.
Rathbone, David L.
Howe, Edward L., Jr.
Uhlenhake, Dale J.
Bruce, Robert C.
Dolan, John J.
Derieg, Patrick L.
Root, Roland W.
Whipple, Lawrence A.
Orey, Ralph B.
Steele, Victor D.
Hoffman, Richard C.
Carrigan, David H.
Radich, John T.
Morgan, John E.
Raiselis, Donald R.
Rilling, David S.
Fairbanks, Edward J.
Sellers, Wiley J.
Ram, Cornelius H.
Irwin, William R.
Shearer, William L.
Drake, Clancy G.
Morris, Donald L.
Laaksonen, Charles D.
Cole, Paul M.
Pozza, John B.
Drost, Ronald S.
Airola, John B.
Tiernan, William H. J.
Busby, Marion G.
Gentry, William R.
Brutcher, Samuel P.
Cook, Donald G.
De Pietro, Carmine W.
Fitzgerald, Dennis C.
Richardson, Ronald G.
Mannix, William J. P.
Crabtree, Robert A.
Harte, James H., III
Beamer, Henry G., III
Little, John D.
Dasch, Robert D.
Jones, Stanley E.
Baldwin, Joseph C.
Jackson, Howard D.
Connolly, Richard P.
Leach, Don L., Jr.
Harlan, Garry
Grant, Gary R.
Hayes, Jackye W.
Babitz, Donald M.
Gligorea, Thomas J.
Mackey, William W.
Miller, Huey P. L.
Ridings, William H.
Grooms, Henry O.
Cooper, John G.
Campbell, James R.
Heald, Ronald E.
Watson, John L.
Downing, Glenn H.
Jezsik, Louis C.
Wood, Bruce P.
Beatty, Donn C.
Brown, Charles W.
Simpson, Robert N.
Kretsinger, John M.
Goddard, Charles D.
Gustafson, Richard A.
Tirschfield, William J.
Osterman, Joseph V., Jr.
Hart, John G., III
Landis, John P.
Chenault, Richard F.
Baker, Owen C.
Hollabaugh, Jon D.
Buckley, John C., Jr.
Esau, Richard H., Jr.
Kruthers, James M.
Draper, William B., Jr.
McWilliams, James P., Jr.
Cisewski, Fred L.
Fowler, John W.
Ossenfort, Richard C.
Kauffman, Francis M.
Smeltzer, Gareth W.
O'Rourke, John F.
Baker, Daryl E.
Kreppein, Donald U.
Lo Presti, Philip A.
Modrzejewski, Robert J.
Murray, William R.
Ellison, George V.
Murray, Ronald L.
Amidon, Alton L.
Welzant, Charles M.
Frank, George R., Jr.
Winglass, Robert J.
Beans, James D.
Smart, Robert H.
Duggan, Peter T.
Bugbee, James F.
Arnold, Roy F.
Orr, James W.
Peterson, Jerry D.
Stonum, Burl V.
Garcia, Robert E.
Saye, Dicky A.
Morgan, Louis L.
Conaty, Donald B.
Doyle, Cyril W.
Lilla, John M.
Shafer, Roger L.
Howard, Medford W., Jr.
Bond, William H., Jr.
Peterson, William P.
Miller, John G.
Hunter, Harold L.
Kruger, Stanley P.
Allen, Earl R.
Sweeney, James R.
Mount, Fred H.
Mundy, Carl E., Jr.
Johnson, Edward T., Jr.
Rogers, Robert P.
Schuppe, Robert H.
Chelius, Carl R.
Robillard, George N., Jr.
Bateman, Kent C.
Houchin, Gerald R.
Hall, Donald D.
Warren, George F.
Chwatek, Walter T.
Mullally, Daniel E., Jr.
Colcombe, David D.
Knight, Howard E., Jr.
Boulton, Jerry D.
Kelly, Michael J.
German, Richard T.
Rodenbach, William J.
Hoff, Robert M.
Mabry, David R.
Westmoreland, James H.
Ingels, Larry T.
Harrison, Kenneth P.
May, Jacob T.
Swartwood, Robert E., Jr.
Thorp, Joseph C.
Eddins, James C.
Fitts, William D., III
Oates, Richard H.
Murphy, Gerald P.
Brennan, Gene E.
McLennan, Charles C.
Le Fevre, Pierre L.
Moore, Wilbur N., Jr.
Wuthrich, John R.
Gould, Walter D.
Wells, Harry E.
Burtson, William A.
Joy, Jim R.
Blake, James L.
Miller, Justus K.
Webb, Richard J.
Townsend, Bruce E.
Smith, Stanley L.
Hines, David R.
Strickland, William C.
Shaw, Robert W.
Elwell, Leo R., Jr.
Wright, Donald L.
Williams, Larry R.
House, David W.
Bevis, Milton H., Jr.
Kilday, Thomas P.
Browne, Randolph M., III
Olf, Nelson M.
Moore, David J.
Smalley, David P.
Shaw, Philip G.
Hicks, Donald L.
Carroll, James T., Jr.
Kemp, Gerald G.
Junger, Frank
O'Brien, Paul M., Jr.
Benjamin, William D.
Borland, Joseph P.
Simmons, Roger E.
Dziarnowski, Ronald F
Easley, John T.
Wimmler, Charles A.
Babbin, Robert R.
Samuelsen, Conrad J.
McIlhenny, John B.
Hopkins, John T., Jr.
Bell, Francis W.
Jones, Duncan H.
Prescott, George S.
Huff, Emmett S., Jr.
Sargent, Richard H.
Nolan, James M.
Mead, James M.
Beckwith, Ronald L.
Michael, Larry K.
Carew, Frederick R., Jr.
Phillips, Robert A., Jr.
Bullard, Donald E.
Perry, Raymond F.
Baulch, Ernest F.
Chandler, James R. F.
Tivnan, John M.
Braun, Robert C.
Flynn, John F.
Vazquez, Pedro R.
Hunt, Richard V.
Prochaska, Joseph F.
Merritt, Richard O.
Carpenter, Charles L., Jr.
Wuerch, George P.
Clapp, Wiley M., Jr.
Leighton, David J.
McIntyre, David S.
Hammond, George L.
Mixson, Joseph G.
Dahlquist, Martin J.
Hart, Richard T.
Ridge, Paul E.
Black, Robert M.
Wiebrecht, David A.
Nelson, Harold M.
Haven, Thomas W.
Jessup, William B.
Monteith, Joseph W., Jr.
O'Donnell, John W.
Farber, James F.
Jensen, Redmond R.
Tricca, Chester J.
Vogt, John S.
McGinn, James A.
Cockell, Robert C.
Piper, Earl S., Jr.
Layer, Robert W.
Patterson, Roy A., Jr.
Inglisa, Angelo M.
Johnson, Richard R.
Waterbury, Mark H., III
Manzo, Joseph V.
Roush, Paul E.
Fredricksen, Ronald A.

The following-named women officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of captain, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Boyd, Barbara M.
Johnson, Mary A.
Lee, Barbara J.
Throwsdale, Annie M.
Smith, Vea J.
Dayton, Valerie M.
Black, Lois J.
Draper, Leah M.
Day, Marilyn F.
Murphy, Irene M.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of first lieutenant, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Adams, Gene A., Jr.
Allegretti, Joseph J.
Allen, Bryan K.
Atchley, Robert C.
Ayer, Willard F.
*Baker, Clarence L.
Barber, Frederick C.
Barbour, George F.
Barraclough, Harold T.
Barrier, Robert C.
Barton, Armin E.
*Bechtol, Bruce E.
Bendrick, Frank A.
Bennett, Jesse D., Jr.
Bernath, Donald L.
Bledsoe, Carl R.
Bomkamp, Norman H.
*Bowers, Gene W.
Brady, Frank D.
Brady, Philip O.
Briggs, James H.
Brooks, Robert C.
Brousseau, Andre R.
Brown, Claiborne, H.
Brown, George W.
Bruner, Robert T.
Burgess, Alan E.
Butler, John A., III
Butsko, Frank
Byrne, Peter E.
Cahaskie, Charles S.
Calta, Ronald F.
Campbell, William R., Jr.
Canaday, Michael C.
Carlson, Keith E.
Cassidy, James A.
*Cavallaro, Joseph M.
Cavin, Robert C.
Chapman, Jack A.
Chowen, Wesley J.
Cloud, David F.
Coates, Sterling K.
Cody, Ernest L.
Coleman, Bobby L.
Coleman, Roland W.
Connell, James J.
Connell, Terence P.
Conrad, John E., Jr.
*Cooke, John P.
Costa, Richard L.
Coulter, Wayne F.
Crowley, Jerome J., Jr.
*Culver, John L.
*Dabney, William H.
Daley, Roderic S.
*Daniel, Jack N.
Dastugue, Marcel F., III
*Daubenspeck, Lynn A.
Daughtridge, Albert S., Jr.
Davenport, Wayne A.
Davis, Arthur G.
Davis, Charles E.
Dean, Dale D.
Departee, Nelson C.
Depreker, Peter L.
Despotakis, John A.
Dietz, Harry L.
Dobies, Ronald S.
*Donnelly, Francis L.
Dove, Thomas R.
Doyle, James R.
Dukes, John E.
Dunn, Bernard
Dunning, Clifford R.
East, James C.
East, James T.
Eckert, James D.
Egger, Walter J.
Eustratiades, Peter
Evans, Donald L.
Everage, John M.
Fallon, John J., Jr.
Fidelle, Thomas P., Jr.
Fish, William D.
Fitts, William W., Jr.
*Flaharty, John P., Jr.
Flint, Jon T.
Flood, Noret E., Jr.
Follett, John F.
Fosnocht, Bruce A.
Fox, Kim E.
French, James H.
*Fuqua, Beverly B.
Gacusana, Jose M.
Gallagher, Dennis O.
Gardner, Dayne G.
Gardner, Jackie R.
Gibbons, Terrence A.
Gignilliat, Julian H.
*Gillespie, Gary L.
Gleason, Theodore A.
Gleeson, Richard
Golemon, Ronald K.
Gonyea, Darrell E.
Gordon, Charles R.
Gorski, Allan A.
Graham, Gordon L.
Greeley, Brendan M., Jr.
Greene, Benjamin W., Jr.
Greenwood, William R.
Gresham, James W.
Grice, Stephen T.
Griffin, James P.
Griffin, James R.
Grubb, Edgar H.
*Grubbs, William A., III
Gruhler, Jean A.
Guenther, John J.
Hadley, Allen C.
Hadley, William C.
Hall, Richard V.
Halliday, Bartholomew G., III
Halvorsen, John P.
Hamlon, John S., Jr.
Hampton, Glen L.
Hardiman, David W.
Harris, Andrew D.
Harris, Ernest A., Jr.
Hart, James A.
Hart, William R.
Hassler, John R.
Hathcock, Frank W.
Havel, John H.
*Hayes, Frank S.
Heigel, Roger C.
Heikkila, Frank L.
Heller, Kim F.
Hendricks, Gordon E., Jr.
Hippner, Richard C.
Hock, Kemper L.
Hoffman, George F.
Holder, Kenneth M.
Hook, Sanders H. B.
Hopper, Robert A.
Huckelbery, Charles T.
*Hutchison, Samuel G.
Hyde, Wilton H., Jr.
Irvine, Edmund J., Jr.
James, Jack J.
Jessen, Donald W.
Johnson, Gene F.
Johnson, Gerald W.
Johnson, Philip L.
Johnson, Richard F.
Johnston, Donald W.
Jones, Newell M.
Joyner, Alfred R.
Judd, David W.
Kaff, Robert N.
Kane, Thomas F.
*Keefe, Edmund M., Jr.
Kennedy, Thomas J.
Keough, Francis T.
Kievit, Richard J.
*Klapinsky, Raymond J.
Kleiboeker, Ronald W.
Koellner, Carl A.
Kolakowski, Henry, Jr.
Krueger, Bruce E.
Kummeth, Eugene P.
Lakin, William P.
Lasley, Rex W.
Laster, James M.
Lawson, Walter J.
Lecornu, John
Lenzini, Martin J.
Lewan, Lloyd S.
Lewis, Frederick E.
Lindley, Edward A.
Lippmann, Robert C.
Livezey, James W.
*Lokken, Wesley A.
Long, Edward D.
Long, Melvin H.
Lotz, Denton
*Loveland, Gary N.
*Loving, Francis L.
Lucas, Albert F., Jr.
Luebben, John F.
Lunde, Dennis E.
Lusk, Rudolph F.
MacMullan, Hugh A., III
Madison, Gerald M.
Mahle, Walter S., Jr.
Maiden, Joseph C.
Maloney, Terrance B.
Mann, Frank, Jr.
Marchand, David M.
Marshall, Joseph W., III
Marshall, Willard D.
*Matson, Claude A.
Mattiace, John M.
Mauldin, Joe A.
Mayhan, Lynn B.

Maylan, Stephen M.
McAdams, William R.
McCaughan, Frederick A.
McClellan, William O., Jr.
McCreedy, Edwin J.
McDonough, James G.
McFadden, Andrew G., Jr.
McGehe, John D.
McGill, George M.
McHenry, James P.
McIndoe, Robert A.
McKeown, Thomas K.
McKnight, James M.
McLaughlin, John L.
McMillian, Bruce F.
McNease, Colin A. P.
Mears, Charles J., Jr.
Meece, Donald O.
Miecznikowski, Robert S.
*Miller, Allen H.
Mitchell, Robert W., Jr.
Mize, Alfred L.
Morgan, Robert F.
Morris, John C., Jr.
Mullen, Michael J.
Myers, Donald J.
Nelms, Ralph
*Newton, David B.
Niotis, John D.
Nolen, Roy L., III
Norman, Jay R.
Norred, Caldwell V., III
Obyrne, Elton C.
O'Connor, John R.
Ogle, Larry R.
O'Keefe, Edward S., Jr.
Oleata, Edward A.
Olin, John H., Jr.
*Olson, Joseph C., III
O'Neill, Robert R.
Owen, James T., Jr.
Palumbo, Fred J.
*Parks, John R., Jr.
Pearce, Frank G.
Peat, Harry C., Jr.
Peet, Alva E., Jr.
Pelott, Robert O.
Pettis, Ronald E.
Pinson, Joseph W.
Phelps, Fred A.
Porterfield, Charles W.
Price, Charles E.
Prichard, John L.
Prouty, Russel C.
Rakow, William M., Jr.
Ray, Revedy C., III
Rea, George R., Jr.
Rentto, Robert L.
Robb, Charles S., II
Roberson, Willie G.
Robinson, Dayton L., Jr.
Robison, John W.
Rose, John M.
*Roth, Ronald K.
Rothwell, Richard B.
Rountree, Neal T.
Russell, Leo K.
Ryan, Justin M.
Saunders, James A.
Sayer, Donald L.
Schlotzhauer, William P.
Schulzke, Delbert L.
*Schwab, William F.
Seitz, Karl J., Jr.
Seymour, Jack T.
Shapiro, Bruce L.
Sharp, William C.
Sheahan, John J.
Shelton, Charles H.
Sherretz, Lundie L.
Sherzer, Russell R.
Shirley, Jerry C.
Shrivalle, Wade B.
Simpson, Jerry I.
Sims, Samuel R.
Slack, Willard E.
Sloan, Todd M.
Smith, Frank W.
Smith, Paul J., Jr.
Smith, Richard P.
Smyth, James P.
Snow, Denman T., III
Sobieski, Alezander J.
Soderstrom, Frank R.
Speicher, John A.
Still, Leo J., Jr.
Stone, David T.
Straumanis, Eric R.
Stroud, Luther P., Jr.
Stull, Jay W.
*Sturkey, Charles E.
Sumler, Lamar
Swart, Arnold R.
Sykes, Waverly E., Jr.
*Symns, Steven D.
Talcott, Roy T.
Taylor, Charles C.
Taylor, Kenneth T.
Terrell, Thomas C.
Thomas, Francis A.
Thomas, Sidney E.
Thompson, Albert K.
Thompson, Orville M.
Thompson, Raymond S. III
Thoreson, Bruce D.
Tilley, William A., Jr.
Trice, William H., Jr.
Tripp, William E., Jr.
Trowbridge, Larry W.
Truax, Thomas M.
VanderBerg, Paul A.
Varn, Robert M.
Vazquez, Amilcar
Vertrees, Robert L.
Wagner, Benny D.
Wagor, Jaris L.
Walker, John F., III
Walter, Sam T., Jr.
Walters, Francis M., Jr.
Walters, Hugh L.
Warman, David A.
Webber, Frederick L.
Webster, Ralph D.
Weede, Richard D.
Wehrung, Malcolm W., Jr.
White, Thomas A.
White, William H.
Whitesel, Robert N.
Whitley, Walter H.
Wiele, Frederick J.
Williams, Daniel B.
Williams, John A.
Wills, Duane A.
Wilson, Willis A., Jr.
Windham, Benjamin T.
Winer, Peter D.
Winn, Paul C.
Witzgall, Wilton K.
Yarbrough, George E.
Zimmerman, Ralph A.
Zittle, David R.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of chief warrant officer, W–4, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Stogner, Arnold W.
Green, Harlice H.
Thomas, Walter H.
Thornton, Algie W.
Wandron, Harold F.
Blinkovitch, Julius
Roberson, John H.
Lewis, Darrol
Hazen, Charles E.
Bell, Walter C.
Quattlebaum, Jesse C., Jr.
Van Fleet, Thomas R.
Gonzalez, Frederick A., Jr.
Lesem, Henry F., Jr.
Czechowski, Walter L.
Pietrzak, Walter
Ross, Jerome
Propotnik, Matthew A.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of chief warrant officer, W–3, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Ciampa, Angelo P.
Miller, Fred C., Jr.
Cosby, Leslie C.
Madden, John
Wyatt, John B.
Long, Elmer E., Jr.
Kerr, Wayne H.
Ninichuck, Paul
Cline, Frank E.
Cushman, James R.
Brownson, John C., Jr.
Mitchell, Edward M.
Everson, Robert T.
Lennen, Harry T., Jr.
Demmond, Jack W.
Hales, Noel J.
Clements, Francis M.
Kolva, George Y.
Herman, George C.
Arnold, John L.
Cabral, Louis A.
Deuser, James F.
Rhymer, Roy H.
Kennicutt, Orlis E.
McMaster, Bingham A.
Lucht, Robert W.
Navolanic, Joseph G.
Finkbohner, Edward C.
Purdy, Stephen J.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of chief warrant officer, W–2, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Holdridge, Forrest B.
Johnson, Harvey B.
Forman, James R.
Pryor, Richard E.
Spangler, Donald E.
Sagar, Harry L.
Hattaway, Earle
Schaeffer, Henry J.
Baird, Jesse F.
Manning, Rosslyn D.
Sophos, Michael
Buckley, John D., Jr.
Root, Edward R.
Conroy, Eugene L.
Wells, Glenn T.
Bierhaalder, Dirk C.
Barger, Ronald M.
Bressler, Alexander, L., Jr.
Hasler, Frederick R.
Kramer, Vernon S.
Maximin, William K.
Becker, Robert P.
Brooks, Harry L.
Templeton, Gilbert R.
Paige, Joseph J.
Grant, Edward G., Jr.
Inman, Richard L.
Wildfang, Henry
Losey, Charles E.
Farkas, Julius
Willis, John
Evans, William T., III
Haynes, John L.
Reilly, John, Jr.
Houser, John J.
Wheeler, Eugene M.
Cox, Gordon H.
Devitt, John R.
Briggs, James D.
Wicker, Sherman T.
Spahr, Edward J.
Delacqua, Raymond J.
Tinsley, Hubert
Shea, Robert E.
Norton, John J.
Hutton, John W.
Godley, Richard O., Jr.
Smith, Donald M.
McCarthy, William J.
Milland, Harvey B.
Garrett, Carl, Jr.
Hinds, George E.
Mueller, Charles J.
McGuire, Terrence W., Jr.
Darrow, Marvin L.
Johnson, James E.
Eoff, Harold
Meshke, George E.
Cotten, Cecil R.
Androsko, William E.
Johnson, Richard W.
Heinz, Lester, Jr.
Nagy, William
Sutton, Joe R.
Vaughan, Edwin R.
Gendron, Lawrence G.
Carnahan, Delbert K.
Work, Robert G.
Currier, Burton D.
Nagy, Conrad
Flynn, Robert F.
Bernier, Richard J.
Andre, John W.
Garris, Berle
Smiley, Pierce L.
Amick, Dewey E.
Lorch, Robert E.
Sheppard, William F., Jr.
Fletcher, Cecil H.
Corbett, Maurice
Ditty, Guy L.
Harris, Walter R.
Thompson, Mary E.
Dowling, Charles H.
Whelchel, Leonard A.
Holden, William H.

In the Navy

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for temporary promotions to the grade of captain in the staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

MEDICAL CORPS

Arentzen, Willard P.
Becker, Frederick B.
Bond, George F.
*Burdick, Robert L.
Diklich, Milan, Jr.
Featherston, John S.
Greer, James W.
Hamill, James E.
Hansen, Walter F.
Heaton, Samuel A., Jr.
Krech, William G.
Lewis, Thomas H.
Lieurance, Richard E.
Luehrs, Richard E.
Marshall, Francies
Moschella, Samuel L.
O'Brien, Robert W.
Parker, Edward E.
Poynter, James M.
Schwenker, Harry F., Jr.
Sederstrom, Leslie W.
Shook, Daniel M.
Steele, Marshall K., Jr.
Strunk, William M.
Taylor, George J., III
Thorn, James I.
Walter, Herbert L.
Watters, Lorrain E., Jr.
Wells, Peter F., II
Whatley, Joseph L.
Wiegand, Frederick G. F.
Williams, Robert G. W., Jr.
Wilson, Theodore H., Jr.

SUPPLY CORPS

Anderson, Eugene F., Jr.
Baldwin, Frank A.
Barbero, Francesco M.
Daniels, Royce L.
Flowers, Woodford L.
Garrett, John H., Jr.
Griffin, Gerald L., II
Grimsley, Geleter
Guelff, Pierre H.
Haskell, John W.
Hauge, George E.
Kennedy, Austin J., Jr.
Klofkorn, Kenneth R.
Knapp, Michael J.
Leedy, Ralph G.
Lewis, John M., Jr.
Lewis, Wellington H.
MacDonald, Albert M.
Mago, Bernard A.
Nicks, Paul B.
Normile, Walter G.
Parrish, Melvin O.
Peach, William T., III
Sirginson, Arthur W.
*Skipper, Henry J.
Stickles, Robert
Tolleson, Carlos L.
Tolson, Walter W.
Wade, John W.
Waters, George C., Jr.
Whitcher, Lamar D.
Williams, Douglas O.
*Wolfe, John P.
Wright, Jack L.

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Lindquist, Loren M.
MacNeill, Harold A.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Bartlett, James V.
Brown, Woodrow M.
Callahan, John F.
Cline, Warren F.
Gorman, Joseph W.
Grubb, Clarence A.
Meeks, Arthur F.
Miller, William A.
Pickett, Bryan S.
*Wright, James A., Jr.

DENTAL CORPS

Blackwell, Richard T.
Giammusso, Anthony P.
Grossman, Frank D.
Johnson, Van L., Jr.
Pablos, Tomas C.
Rinck, Theodore J. H.
Staples, William R.
Traeger, Kimble A.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Barunas, George A.
Buckner, James F.
Chartier, Armand P.
Dreitlein, William M.
Duwel, Bernard F.
Elsasser, Leo J.
*Goren, Sidney
Haase, Edward F.
*Handford, Stanley W.
Hill, Stanley E.
Hirst, John M.
Isert, Lawrence
Luckie, Robert G.
Stains, George S.
Vasa, Ralph L.
Westbrook, Francis L.
Witcofski, Louie K.

NURSE CORPS

Monahan, Dorothy P.

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of commander in the line and staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

*Abbott, Edwin W., III
Adams, Frank M.
*Adams, Fred I.
Adelman, Joseph L.
Aicklen, William J., Jr.
Alexander, Aaron G.
Allen, Charles D., Jr.
*Allred, Jimmie "B"
Amme, Richard D.
Anderson, Paul E.
Anderson, Charles R.
Anderson, James L.
Anderson, Richard W.
*Andrus, Richard C.
Ansel, David D.
Appert, Edward P.
Apthorp, Grant B.
Arguelles, John R.
*Armstrong, Frank D., Jr.
Atkinson, Roy C.
Bacchus, Robert E.
Bach, Nicholas R.
Bagley, Worth H.
Bailey, Daniel L.
Bailey, Edward C.
*Baker, Robert G.
Balfe, John M.
Banks, Charles A., Jr.
Barksdale, David A.
Barnes, Alan F.
Barnes, Jerald D.
Barnes, William B.
Barry, James H.
*Bartholomew, Barton W.
Barton, Charles A.
Baxter, James A.
Beam, Jay K.
Beck, Charles E.
Becken, Bradford A.
Becker, Karl E.
Benson, William D.
Berry, Henry M.
Beyer, Delbert A.
*Beyer, George M.
*Biordi, Rudolph V.

Bivin, Homer R.
Blair, James A.
Blanks, Alva L.
Blevins, William D.
Blondin, John L.
Blount, Robert H.
Bobek, William J.
Bodamer, Robert E.
Boland, Paul
Boller, Jack W.
Borgstedt, Forest C.
Bothwell, John H.
Boulding, Austin L.
*Boule, Arthur E., Jr.
Bouwman, Fredric G.
Bowdey, Floyd D.
*Bowen, Alva M., Jr.
Bowen, Thomas J.
Bowerman, Robert G.
*Boyd, Carl J.
Brady, Donald P.
Braid, Robert A.
Braly, Henry L., Jr.
Brand, Richard G.
*Brazzell, Robert J.
Breen, Charles E., Jr.
Brenner, Thomas B.
*Brett, Robert P.
Brittain, Thomas B., Jr.
Broadfield, Ward H., Jr.
Bromley, Frederick B.
Brooke, Rupert
Brooks, Richard I., Jr.
*Brotherton, William D., Jr.,
Brown, Bryan B., Jr.
Brown, Francis T.
Brown, Kenneth
Brown, Robert L.
*Brubaker, Donald E.
Brumbaugh, Dale C.
*Bryan, George S., Jr.
*Bryant, Bobby D.
Burgesser, Charles B.
Burgin, Wilbur J.
Burkart, John C.
Burke, James A.
Burke, Robert E.
*Burns, Robert
Burton, James B.
*Butler, Frank J., Jr.
Byington, Ward G.
Caine, Arthur D.
*Callas, Edward G.
Callaway, John D., Jr.
*Campbell, Joseph W.
Campbell, William M.
Campbell, Richard D.
Cardillo, Robert J.
Carlisle, Charles S.
Carment, Frederick, Jr.
Carnahan, Ralph H.
Carpenter, Harold L.
Cartwright, Harold J.
*Casey, Robert M.
Casper, William F., Jr.
*Casseday, Jack N.
Causey, Charles W., Jr.
*Chamberlain, Charles H.
Chamberlain, Raymond E., Jr.
*Chambers, Lloyd S., Jr.
Chandler, Donald E.
Chapman, James H.
Chapman, Kendall J.
*Chastain, John A.
Chrisler, Robert P.
Chute, Charles L.
*Clause, Harold
*Cleland, William H.
Clement, Marwood R., Jr.
Cobean, Warren R., Jr.
Cockrell, Jack R.
Cole, Ben N.
Cole, Kenneth J.
Coleman, Yale
Colquhoun, Richard G.
Comet, Robert E.
Cone, Warren M.
Conn, Robert H.
*Constantine, James R.
Coppedge, John O.
Counihan, Henry R.
Covert, Lawrence W.
*Cowan, Paul G.
Crandall, Walter R.
*Crandall, Jack C.
Crane, John W., Jr.
Creighton, Bert H., Jr.
Crockett, Charles B., Jr.
Cronemiller, Carl F., Jr.
Crowe, Thomas H.
Crowe, William J., Jr.
*Cuccias, Robert F.
Cummings, Charles W.
Cummins, Peter P.
*Czerwenka, Adolph P.
Damon, William Q.
Dandrea, Frank A.
Darr, James, Jr.
*Daughtrey, Ezekiel H.
*Davenport, Fred W.
Davidson, Alan N.
Davies, Henry E.
*Davis, Calvin R.
Davis, Hector W., Jr.
Davis, Ray E.
Davis, Theodore F.
*Davison, Morgan L.
Davison, Richard R.
De Camp, Dwight E.
Deganahl, James A.
DeLorenzi, Robert M.
Denton, Jeremiah A., Jr.
DeVeas, Thomas E.
Dew, Carlos, Jr.
*Dickson, John E.
Diffendorfer, Jarl J.
*Ditzler, David D.
Doak, William C.
Doescher, Walter W., Jr.
Donaldson, Charles E., III
Dorman, Alvin E.
*Doty, William K.
*Dougherty, John J.
Douglass, Dee W.
Douglass, Walter M.
Doyle, James H., Jr.
*Doyle, William A., Jr.
Dozier, James H.
Drake, John F.
Duacsek, Anthony W.
Duckett, John P.
*Dudley, Sherman F.
Dunton, Stanley W.
Durey, Orin J.
Eadie, Charles J.
Ebel, Stanley T.
Edwards, Harold L.
Ekelund, Kenneth O., Jr.
Elefante, Frank L.
Elliott, Chester E.
*Elliott, Thomas J.
Ellis, Samuel S.
Ellis, William H.
Endacott, Jack A.
Enright, Robert E.
Estelman, Herman J.
Evans, Joseph D.
Everett, James G.
Ewald, Arden A., Jr.
Farley, James E.
*Farley, John W.
Farley, Russell J.
Farshing, Donald D., Jr.
Faughman, Franklin P.
Faull, Joe D.
Fenwick, Joseph E.
*Ferguson, James C.
Filson, Paul L.
Finneran, John G.
Fischer, David W.
Fisher, Lee W.
Fisher, William B., Jr.
Fiske, Clarence O.
Foote, Edward J.
*Ford, Frank W.
Forsyth, Donald D.
Fortson, Thomas E.
Fosdick, Theron D.
Foster, William L.
*Foust, James W.
Fowler, Earl B., Jr.
Foy, George E.
*Francis, Samuel
Fritsch, Edward C., Jr.
Fritz, Ernest S.
Gallup, Frederick S., Jr.
Gammill, James L.
Gardiner, Richard S.
Gardner, James S.
Garrison, Walter V.
Gary, Stanley P.
Gay William W.
Geary, John T.
Geary, Mervyn O.
Geer, Jon R.
George, Robert M.
Georgen, William M.
Gerecke, Thomas F.
*Gerhard, Harry "E", Jr.
*Gernert, Harold F.
Ginn, Benjamin F.
Girard, Jean L.
*Glab, Joseph T.
Glaser, William R.
Glauser, Clarence J.
*Gless, Richard D.
*Glover, John W.
Glowasky, William A.
Goodpasture, Joseph H.
Gorder, Merle H.
Gott, Charles L.
Gower, Harry T., Jr.
Gower, Robert F.
Graham, Thomas A.
*Grantham, Joseph A., Jr.
Grantham, Robert D.
Grantham, Delbert D.
Graves, Jack C.
Gray, Gordon L., Jr.
Gregory, Grover K., Jr.
Gremer, Charles E.
Griffin, James W.
Grove, George S.
Guertin, Louis H.
*Gunter, Monchie M., Jr.
*Guthrie, Charles E.
*Guthrie, Charles A.
Gygax, Rex
Haecherl, Frank S.
Hafner, Joseph J.
*Hahs, Orrie A.
*Haines, John B.
Haizlip, John W., Jr.
Hall, Ray E.
Hallett, Oliver S.
*Hamaker, William R.
Hancock, David L.
*Haney, William E.
*Hannah, Glyde B.
Hansen, Hans P.
Hansen, Herman C.
Hanson, Edgar G.
Hardy, Willis A.
*Harmer, Frank D., Jr.
*Harris, Eli P., Jr.
Harris, William L., Jr.
*Harrison, William M.
Hartley, Paul J., Jr.
Hartman, Willard R.
Harvey, Donald P.
Hauser, William F.
Haycraft, Logan, Jr.
Hays, Seymore T., Jr.
Hayward, Thomas B.
Hazen, Alan M.
Hedgepeth, Charles H.
*Heekin, Robert P.
*Heldorn, Lawrence H.
Heile, Donald H.
Heimbach, Hilton R., Jr.
*Heller, Lester M.
Hemmer, Edgar H.
Henriques, David N., Jr.
Henry, Eugene M.
Herbert, Christopher A.
Herbert, Edward D.
Hessom, Robert C.
*Higley, Warren A.
Hilton, Jack
Hinkle, William L.
*Hodge, Carl L.
*Hoffman, Paul J.
*Hoffman, Raymond L.
Hollyer, Richard S.
Holm, Kenneth C.
Holmberg, Frank E.
Holmes, Robert E.
Hooffstetter, William B.
Horn, Francis R.
*Horn, Maurice A.
*Horner, Walter R.
Horton, William P.
Houck, Donald F.
Houston, Willard S., Jr.
Howe, Thomas
*Howell, Raymond, S., Jr.
*Hoy, Hugh A.
Hudner, Thomas J., Jr.
Hughes, Arthur J.
Hughes, Thomas J., Jr.
Hulihan, John W.
Hunter, Perry F., III
Husty, Richard M.
*Hutchinson, Thomas H., Jr.
Hutchinson, Harold R.
Hutton, William L.
Huval, Willard R.
Irish, Edelbert E.
Irvine, Harry B.
Irwin, Charles M., Jr.
Iselin, Earl C., Jr.
*Ives, Thomas K.
Jensen, William G.
Jewett, Frederick F., II
Jex, Donald R.
Johnson, Charles E.
Johnson, Theodore R., Jr.
Johnston, John W.
Jones, Allen, Jr.
*Jorgensen, George D.
Joynton, Harry D., Jr.
Junghans, Robert C.
Justice, James O., Jr.
Karlowicz, Mitchell J.
Kasner, Edmund B.
Keiser, George R.
Kellam, Raymond O.
Kemp, Glenn E.
*Kennedy, James R.
*Kessing, Oliver O., Jr.
Kiehl, Elmer H.
Kilgore, Frank J.
Killingbeck, William E.
Kimble, Elbert D.
King, Ogden D., Jr.
*Kingsbury, Chester E.
Kinney, Donald E.
Kirk, George G. E.
Kirkpatrick, James
Kiser, Charles A.
Kline, Edward C., Jr.
Knueven, William H.
Kochis, Peter C.
Koepcke, William W.
Korb, Frank J.
Kosnik, Joseph T.
Kovanic, Francis J.
Krebs, Edward C., Jr.
*Kriss, John
Kuehn, Walter J.
Lackore, Raymond C., Jr.
LaHaye, James D.
Lakey, Keith G.
Lambert, Joel, Jr.
Lammers, Lorin R.
Langford, John D.
*Languedoc, Arthur J.
Laperche, Jacques B.
Larcombe, Howard N., Jr.
Lasseter, Joe F., Jr.
Lassiter, A. C., Jr.
Layser, Richard G.
Lebreton, Guy J., Jr.
Leddick, Roth S.
Lee, Robert E.
Leib, James M.
Leidholdt, Edwin M.
Leisk, William H., Jr.
Lenihan, Jeremiah E.
Lennon, Gerard T.
Leutz, Leon H.
Lewis, John C.
*Liles, Percy L.
*Lindberg, Charles H.
Linder, Isham W.
Longley, Wilbur E.
Loranger, Donold
Macomber, Mark M.
Macon, Benjamin H.
Malan, Max E.
Mann, Philip L.
*Manring, Alvin B.
March, George P.
*Marker, Raymond K.
*Marsh, John C.
Martin, Barney
Martin, Frederick V.
*Martz, David J.
Marvin, Stephen D.
Matejceck, John F.
Matthews, Walter L., III
Matthews, William R.
Matthews, Howard L., Jr.
Mattson, Kenneth B.
Matula, Valentin G.
Maxwell, Raymon C., Jr.
*May, Robert C.
Maynard, Allison L.
McAdams, Lee T.
McCabe, Robert E.
*McClaugherty, Bernard M.
McCracken, William H.
*McCrary, Robert D.
McDonald, Wesley L.
*McDonnel, James L.
McGrane, Clarence V., Jr.
McGrath, Charles J.
*McIntyre, Douglas E.
McKee, David A.
McKeever, Elmer V.
McMullen, Frank D., Jr.
McMurray, Samuel P.
*McNeil, Robert K.
*McNett, Edgar L.
McOmie, Donald B.
McRostie, Richard J.
McVey, Don C.
Meginniss, Walter M.
Melick, Roger E.
*Mentzer, Howard D.
Merrell, Chadler V.
Metzel, Jeffrey C., Jr.
Meyer, Wayne E.
*Miller, John W.
Mills, Jack O.
Mills, William P.
Mingo, John J.
Mongilardi, Peter, Jr.
Moore, Harry R.
Moore, James I.
*Moore, Ralph L., Jr.
*Moorhead, Kenneth W.
Moreland, Herbert A., Jr.
*Morey, William C., Jr.
*Morgan, Horace H.
*Morgan, Robert L.
*Moro, Albert J.
Moseley, Richard E.
Moss, James L.
Mount, Harold W.
Muncie, Maurice O.
Munnikhuysen, Henry F.
Murray, Harrison C.
Nagler, Gordon R.
*Nelson, Albert N., Jr.
*Nelson, Gerald L.
Nelson, Perry W.
Nemoff, Alfred J.
Nevitt, Fred M., Jr.
*Newsome, William R.
*Ney, Kenneth C.
*Nichols, Robert L.
Nicholson, John H.
Nicholson, Robert H.
Nimitz, Charles E. C.
Nippert, Glenn E.
Nivison, William
Noble, Guy E.
Noble, Lee V.
Noesen, Harold
*Nolta, Cornelius V., Jr.
Nordberg, Delbert W.
*Norris, Crockett J.
Nuss, Jerry J.
Oberg, Owen H.
O'Callaghan, Edmund W.
Odell, Robert L.
Oechslin, Robert E.
Ogden, Samuel B., Jr.
*Ogle, Robert J.
*Olivari, Louis
*Oliver, Stephen
O'Neil, Timothy R.
*O'Neill, Thomas H. R.
Orton, Robert D.
Ostertag, Carl J., Jr.
Owen, Howard J.
Owens, Haydn, Jr.
Owens, John D.
Pace, Robert D., Jr.
Packer, Duncan
Packer, Samuel H., II
Paddock, Richard A.
Panther, James E.
Parks, Larry G.
*Paxson, Roy H., Jr.
Pedneault, Henry R.
Peeler, James C.
Peniston, Robert "C"
Pepple, Donald J.
Perez, Raul B.
Petersen, Richard L.
Phillips, Harvey R.
Phillips, Billy

Piatek, John A.
Pickert, Aloysius J., Jr.
Pierozzi, Constantino N.
Pierucki, Ervin J.
Pietrowski, Edward L. F.
Pinkepank, Merril C.
*Pirro, John J.
*Pittman, Shelly B.
Ploetz, John D.
Plunkett, Robert D.
Pomeroy, Leslie K., Jr.
Poplin, Glenn O.
Porter, William R.
Posch, Frank M.
Postlethwaite, Charles W.
*Potter, Eugene W.
Potter, Horace S.
Powell, Arthur E.
Presson, Herman W., Jr.
Price, Charles H.
*Price, Harold B.
Pringle, Robert C.
Probyn, Robert W.
Purcell, Stephen E., Jr.
*Putman, Orlin N.
*Quisenberry, William R.
Rae, William C., Jr.
*Randall, Craig E.
Ranzau, Walter W.
*Rasmussen, Merwin E.
Rayner, Donald E.
Readdy, Francis J.
*Reed, Robert F.
Reese, John W., Jr.
Reese, Walter "H"
Regan, William F.
*Reich, Charles A.
Reider, Richard K.
Reilly, Jeremiah D., Jr.
Rex, James F.
Reynolds, George R.
Rezzarday, Joseph, Jr.
Rich, Harold G.
Richardson, James P.
Richelieu, Charles F.
Riddick, John C.
Rieke, Norbert A.
Riggan, James M., Jr.
*Riggs, Wallace M.
Riley, Edward E.
*Robb, William H.
*Robcke, Jack H.
*Roberts, John
Roche, Robert F.
Rodgers, Hollis "T"
Rodgers, Lawrence G.
Rodier, Richard L.
Roetman, Orvil M.
*Rogers, Bernard L.
Rogers, Frank W.
Rogers, William H.
Romatowski, Louis A., Jr.
Rose, Charles J.
Rose, Vernon D., Jr.
Rowe, Donald E.
Rupp, Herbert "H"
Rushin, Thomas E.
Russell, William M.
Ruxton, Robert T., Jr.
Ryan, Bayliss Q.
Sabin, Nelson
*Sanders, Rodney D.
Sanders, Wilton T., Jr.
Schatz, Clifford E.
Scheer, Lawrence E.
Scherrer, David E.
Schmieder, Arthur H.
*Schneiders, Joseph M.
Schneider, Robert F. J.
Schoenherr, Charles G.
Schoultz, Robert F.
Schuknecht, Arnold R.
*Scott, Benedict J.
Scott, Norvell O., Jr.
*Scott, Walter
Scripp, John L., III
Searl, Floyd C.
Sentman, Albert G.
Shakshober, Maclean C.
*Sharer, Keith W.
Shea, Stephen J.
Shelton, John P.
*Sherman, Hildreth G.
Shipman, James L.
Shonk, William H., Jr.
Shrake, Francis B.
Sigafoos, John J.
Sigler Edward E., Jr.
Simmons, Mitchell M.
Sinclair, George T., Jr.
Sisson, Luther B.
Slonim, Charles E.
Small, Rufus C.
Smerdon, John E., Jr.
Smith, Albert J.
Smith, Billie E.
Smith, Donald L.
*Smith, Emory P.
Smith, George T.
Smith, George E.
*Smith, Henry L.
Smith, James V.
Smith, John C.
*Smith, Richard C.
Smith, Robert S.
Smith, Rush S.
*Smith, Wallace E.
Smith, Wayne H.
Smith, Wendell K.
Snead, Leonard A.
Snyder, Jack L.
Spann, Willis L.
Spencer, William A.
Spruit, Robert E.
Stadter, George B.
Stanfield, Henry L.
*Stanfill, Joseph F., Jr.
Stanley, Henry T., Jr.
Stanley, Hilton L.
Starr, Mark R.
St. Clair, William F.
Stecker, Kenneth W.
*Steeves, Harold M.
*Stephenson, Clarence B.
Stevens, Jack M.
Stewart, Richard C.
St. George, William R.
St. Marie, John W.
Stobie, Edwin F.
Stockdale, James B.
Stokes, Robert E. L., Jr.
*Stone, Courtenay M.
Stone, Robert S.
Strayve, Jerome R.
Strong, James T.
Summitt, Charles D.
*Suther, Thomas W., Jr.
*Sutherland, Robert S.
*Swainson, Gustav F., Jr.
Swanson, Hjalmer E.
Sweeney, James R.
Swope, John R.
Taft, Jesse W.
Talago, Joseph, Jr.
Taylor, James D.
*Taylor, Waymon
Teasley, William A., Jr.
Thayer, Wirt C.
*Thede, William L.
Thomas, Robert E.
*Thompson, Lewayne
Thompson, William
Thompson, William F.
Thomson, Robert G., Jr.
Thornton, John L.
Thorson, Robert L.
Thurtell, Frank A.
Tice, John J., III
*Tiderman, Otto D.
Tilghman, Walter W., Jr.
Tilley, Herbert S.
Titcomb, Edmund B.
Tolson, George F., Jr.
Toohill, Donald L.
*Trahan, Paul K.
Travers, Edward P.
*Travers, Martin J.
Treadwell, Archie B.
*Trube, Alfred G., Jr.
Tucker, Ralph M.
Tucker, William W.
Turner, Stansfield
Twaddell, Miles E.
Twarog, George E.
Vail, Malcolm E.
*Vail, Ronald A.
Vallely, James R.
*VanDemark, James L.
VanSickle, John R.
VanTuyl, Andrew J., Jr.
Vaughan, Jack A.
Vaught, Thomas B.
Vereen, Jackson E.
Viney, Irwin J.
VonGerichten, Robert L.
VonSchrader, Chandler L.
Voorhees, Jack R.
Vose, Frederic H. E.
*Wade, William D.
*Wahl, Clyde F.
Walden, Walter A.
Walker, William O.
*Walters, Joseph F.
Ward, Raymond E.
*Warren, George V.
Weaver, Keith T.
Wells, Donald M.
Wells, John T.
Wells, John W.
*Welty, Wayne J.
Wenger, Donald B.
Werle, Joseph P., Jr.
*Werner, Paul F.
*West, Earle L.
Westmoreland, Arthur E.
Whaley, Lucien O. G.
Whitmire, Donald B.
Whitney, William J.
Whyte, Herbert E.
*Wieland, Daniel T.
Wiggins, Bryan D.
*Wiggins, Thomas E.
*Wilkinson, Roland F.
Williams, Joseph N., Jr.
Williams, Elmer R.
Williams, John H. D.
Williams, Joseph L., Jr.
Williams, John G., Jr.
Williams, Buck D. Jr.
Wilson, George B., Jr.
*Wilson, Irving G.
Wilson, James B.
Wilson, James G.
Wilson, Kenneth E., Jr.
Wilson, Phillip A.
Wilson, William D.
Wineman, Glenn W.
*Wise, Maurice H., Jr.
Wolfe, George M.
Wollam, Raymond L.
Woody, William S.
Working, Patrick L.
Wrzesinski, Robert
Yelton, Harold M.
Young, Austin V.
Yuengling, Douglas J.
Zebrowski, Walter T.
Zimmerman, George G.
Zimmerman, Wayne L.
Zuehlke, Lloyd T.

MEDICAL CORPS

*Baker, Robert L.
*Boswell, "J" Thornton
Britton, Joseph H.
*Craighead, John T.
*Garrett, Robert I.
Gaylor, Donald H.
Gordon, John J.
Hamilton, Warren W., Jr.
Kretzschmar, Hanns O.
Lagerquist, Howard W.
*Latham, Ernest F.
Maher, Robert W.
*McGreevy, John J.
Miller, Charles H.
Murray, Dermot A.
*Musgrave, Max E.
*Olson, Marshall W.
*Parkinson, Leonard S. C.
Risi, George F.
*Sanderlin, Joseph M.
Stephens, David L.

SUPPLY CORPS

*Adrian, Rodger J.
*Ainlay, Henry L., Jr.
Allen, Paul M.
Anderson, Carl I. B.
Anderson, John J., Jr.
Anderson, Oscar M., Jr.
Applegate, Richard C.
Avellone, Francis P.
*Baker, Conway C.
Bandish, Bernard J.
Barron, Willard D.
Boltwood, Chester M.
Borchers, Alyn L.
Breeden, Robert L.
Bruening, Paul M.
Butler, Arthur G., Jr.
Canalejo, Armando, Jr.
Challain, Leonard J.
Chapman, Edgar C., Jr.
Charette, Author E.
Cherney, Boris "E"
Collins, James H.
Condon, Thomas P.
Cooper, William M.
Creekman, Charles T.
*Crook, Lewis J.
Crouch, Perry B.
Cullen, Curtis
Davis, Albert S.
*Dellasega, Joseph L.
Depew, Robert W.
DeSanto, James V.
Dorion, William E.
Erickson, Allwyn B.
Evans, Stuart J.
*Fernas, William M., Jr.
Fisher, Robert D.
Flock, Jens B., Jr.
Fowler, George O., Jr.
Fronke, Robert E.
Gaetz, Edward F., Jr.
Gallagher, Granville W., Jr.
Galligan, Charles H., Jr.
Gallup, Mearl
Gobel, Carl F.
Goetzmann, John C.
Griffith, Stephen S. D.
*Haberlin, William E.
Hassenger, William E.
Hatch, James C.
Hawley, William F.
Hay, Patrick M.
Hein, Joseph J., Jr.
Heurich, Robert G.
*Hilderbrant, Earl F.
*Hill, Roger E.
Holfield, Arthur W., Jr.
Holmes, John W.
Horngren, Earl W.
Hynes, Edward J.
Irwin, Harry E.
Johnson, Warren B.
Jones, Ivor H., Jr.
*Jones, Joe L.
Jones, Thomas W.
Kamps, John H.
Kash, William B.
Keenan, Joseph I.
Keener, James C.
*Keidel, Charles J.
Keller, Bruce W.
Kilcourse, William R.
King, Edward D.
Knight, Reed H.
Knipple, John D.
Kuhlman, Norman H. C.
Laning, George H.
LaPlante, Robert W.
*Larson, Albert G.
Manore, Thomas E.
Marx, James H.
McElhanon, Byron F.
*McGlaun, Albert L., Jr.
McKee, Richard N.
Means, James M.
*Meng, Edwin "L," Jr.
Mercadante, James A.
Miller, James H.
Miller, John C.
Minton, Horace L.
Moore, Alvin
Murauskas, William A.
Nichols, Horace E.
Oller, William M.
Orr, Raymond J.
Orrill, Donald P.
Pavelka, Albert K.
Phillion, Thomas F.
Polk, Donald E.
Polk, Robert B.
Polk, William E., Jr.
Pollitt, Ernest A.
Poor, John L.
Potts, Stanley W.
Prehn, John L., Jr.
*Prosch, Edmund J.
*Randolph, Karl W.
Reese, Lawrence W.
Riley, George D., Jr.
Ristan, Albert G., Jr.
Rossi, Louis P.
Salmon, Douglas A.
Schirmer, August A., Jr.
Shepard, John C.
Sloan, Waldo D., Jr.
Smith, Carlton B.
Smith, Courtenay A.
Smith, Joseph F.
Sprague, Raymond E.
*Steele, James H.
*Swenson, Sigurd E.
Sylvest, Robert S.
Sylvester, Nelson J., Jr.
Taylor, Albert T., Jr.
Teichler, Alfred H., Jr.
Tetrault, Joseph H.
Thompson, Charles E
Thompson, Robert W.
*Thompson, Woodrow W.
*Thurman, Horace E., Jr.
Tice, "J" Philip
Tippin, Jesse R.
Toomey, John F.
Turnage, Robert E.
VanOsdol, Robert C.
Victor, William V.
Waller, Thomas C., Jr.
Weihrich, Walter F.
Worden, Frank N.
Xefteris, Zefter C.

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Abucewicz, John A.
Bakker, Peter J.
Brown, Jonathan E., Jr.
Darkowski, Leon S.
Davis, Benjamin J.
Fay, John P.
Fitzpatrick, Francis J. N.
*Forney, Fredric J.
Griffin, Cornelius J.
Hayes, Jack W.
Maguire, Connell J.
Mahoney, Vincent J.
Rademacher, Glen A.
*Rossback, George F.
Zoller, John E.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Allen, Max H.
Andrews, James D.
Arn, John A. M.
Barron, William W.
Briggs, Fred M.
Burfield, James A.
Cole, Marvin L.
Dalton, Donald F.
Daub, Leland A.
*Devlin, John G.
*Draves, Albert W., Jr.
Dunnells, Robert E.
Feinman, David M.
Fisher, John R.
Flippen, Homer W.
Goetzke, George A., Jr.
Hill, James M., Jr.
Hudson, Richard I.
Koonce, Stephen J.
Lennox, Frederick E.
Locke, Harry A.
Magneson, Norman J.
Mallory, Charles W.
*Marshall, Robert W.
Merrill, Bergen S., Jr.
*Merritt, Harold W.
*Mitter, Wayne S.
Morgan, Joseph E.
Paul, Edwin C.
*Petersen, John H.
Powell, Joseph E.
*Reeve, John J., Jr.
Rumble, James D.
Russell, William F., Jr.
Sears, Kenneth P.
Snyder, Donald C.
Stacey, Ernest R.
*Sturman, William H.
*Theriault, John P.
Walls, Worthen A.
Whyte, David P.
Williams, Thomas C.

DENTAL CORPS

*Bartlett, Stephen O.
*Davies, Ernest E.
*Echols, Archie D., Jr.
*Gregory, Worth B., Jr.
*Jasper, William J.
*Kramer, Howard S., Jr.
Lehmann, William G.

Mann, William H.
*O'Malley, John E.
*Reitz, Phillip V. D.
*Woodworth, George K.
*Wortham, Maury E.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

*Anderson, William S.
Bates, Marion D.
*Bohannan, Ray
Brofft, Beltran F.
*Broulik, Frank
*Chapdelaine, Jack A.
*Colburn, Kenneth R.
*Coleman, Frederick R.
*Combs, Harrison T.
Conway, Theodore H., Jr.
*Cox, Walter R.
Cumming, William G., Jr.
Deriso, Dominic J.
diGiambattista, Italina
*Fennel, Chester C.
*Garrett, John L.
*Gault, John W.
*Gleason, Edmund H.
*Grafius, Melba A.
*Hobson, Claude T.
*Hull, William B.
Hunter, Russell E.
Joslin, Leslie H.
*Lasco, John, Jr.
*Mason, Anderson T.
McKearly, Georgia M.
McMillin, Charles R.
Meade, Charles D.
Meckes, Maurine M.
*Moeller, Ruth
*Moore, Granville M.
Nelson, William H.
O'Malley, Elizabeth
*Pipkin, Alan C.
*Reeves, Elizabeth
Ricker, Robert E.
*Smith, Orville E.
*Tipton, Stewart P.
*Tompkins, Franklin H.
Vick, Ella M.
*Vickroy, Robert K.
*VonRadesky, Horace
Ware, Robert M.
*Will, Robert C.
*Young, John L.

NURSE CORPS

Alwyn, Florence E.
Andrews, Lois A.
Bareford, Louise
Barton, Verna D.
Boothe, Mayme R.
Butler, Anna T.
Caesar, Marion F.
Champion, Ruth A.
*Check, Anne
Coffman, Ruth M.
Conrad, Arline C.
*Covington, Margaret L.
Davis, Virginia A.
Duerk, Alene B.
*Eaton, Dorothy E.
*Elmore, Audrey I.
Feeney, Elizabeth
*Fisher, Emilie L.
Fraser, Mary A.
Fritch, Christine A.
Galindo, Mary W.
Gearing, Mary V.
Gilmore, Zoe P.
Harris, Bertha E.
Jungersen, Helen H.
Kloetzli, Margaret A.
*Linnenbruegge, Hedwig M. E.
*Maguire, Eleanor J.
Morgan, Marion L.
Morin, Aline E.
Murray, Elizabeth M.
Nelson, Frances A.
Perron, Roberta E.
Pikutis, June
Schmid, Pauline W.
Simon, Lenore
Stafford, Wilhelmina H.
St. John, Elizabeth
Upchurch, Ouida C.
VanGorp, Dymphna P. A. M.
Walmsley, Rita H.
Walsh, Claire M.
Watson, Ann O.
Weden, Marion E.
Witherow, Martha A.

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant commander in the line, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

*Abbott, William B., III
*Ackerman, Richard F.
Adair, Frederick S.
Adams, George J., Jr.
*Audis, Robert W.
*Alexander, Adam G., Jr.
*Alexander, Marvin G.
Alexander, William H.
*Alexich, Milton P.
Allen, Douglas A.
*Allen, Richard C.
*Allen, Robert J.
*Allen, Robert D.
Allen, Winfred P.
*Altwegg, David M.
Amick, Benjamin C., Jr.
*Amor, Raymond C.
Anaston, Tommy K., Jr.
Anderle, Charles K.
Anderson, Alden B.
Anderson, Duane E.
*Anderson, Robert J.
Andes, Paul G.
*Andrews, Charles E. III
Andrews, Leon L.
*Anthony, David J.
*Argiro, Vincent J.
Arison, Rae E.
Armel, Lyle O., II
*Armstrong, Edward M.
Arnold, John E.
*Arp, Phillip S.
Ashley, William H.
Ashman, Lee E.
*Askin, Thomas B. H., Jr.
*Atherton, Robert F.
*Avallone, Eugene M.
Averyt, Howell D.
*Ayres, James H.
*Babine, Arthur L., Jr.
Baciocco, Albert J., Jr.
*Backman, Fred M.
Bademan, Harold W.
*Badgett, John J.
*Bahm, John J.
*Bailey, Kenneth R., Jr.
*Baillie, Richard H.
*Balchunas, Robert C.
*Baldridge, Louis D., Jr.
*Ball, Millard C.
*Bandurraga, Thomas, Jr.
Banghart, Leslie L.
Banks, Bruce R.
Banks, William E., IV
*Barbee, Delbert F.
*Bariteau, Frederick J.
Barker, Merle M.
*Barnett, Gerald P.
*Barrett, Gardner S.
*Barrett, Roy F.
Barringer, Malcolm L.
Barron, William T.
Bates, John A., Jr.
Bath, Alan H.
Bathurst, Robert B.
*Batten, Charles G.
Beard, Donald W.
Beavers, Roy L., Jr.
*Beecher, John D.
Beem, Jack M.
Belcher, Sylvester A.
Bell, Clyde R.
*Bender, Leslie C., Jr.
*Benson, Charles W.
Berg, Richard C.
Berkley, Lawrence N.
Berndt, Donald J.
Berry, George H., Jr.
Berry, Joel H., Jr.
Biedenweg, Frederick M.
*Bingham, Thomas, Jr
*Bird, Charles S.
*Bixby, Harry L., Jr.
Blackadar, Paul F.
Blackwood, Jack D.
*Blades, Lawrence T.
*Blair, Closkey L. Jr.
*Blake, Harry R., Jr.
Blanding, Robert L.
*Blass, Richard H.
Bohannan, William L.
Boles, Lee R.
*Boles, Richard L.
Bolst, Albert L.
Booth, Roger F.
Bos, Roger C.
*Boschen, Henry C., Jr.
*Bosse, Joseph H., Jr.
*Bouvette, Albert J.
*Bowen, William J.
Bowen, William S.
Bowers, Henry H.
*Brackett, Gerald F.
*Bradford, Gerald R.
*Bradshaw, Brice L.
Brady, John H., Jr.
*Brandel, William J., Jr.
*Bress, Allyn V.
*Bridge, Daniel T.
Bridges, Kenneth K.
*Brooks, Walter A.
*Brown, Bobby J.
*Brown, Charles H.
Brown, Donald N.
Brown, George W. M.
*Brown, Gideon L. Jr.
Brown, Jacob C.
Brown, James R.
Brown, Robert L.
Brown, Robert M.
Brownley, John H.
Bruner, James R.
*Bryla, Dominic A.
Buchanan, Alvin J., Jr.
Buck, Donald D.
*Buckholts, Walter H., Jr.
*Bucklin, Jerald W.
*Bunyan, Lawrence P.
*Burkemper, Raymond G.
Burkhart, Paul C.
Burley, John R.
*Burnett, John H.
*Burnham, Rowland E.
Bush, James T.
*Bush, Robert H.
*Butler, Charles A.
Cagney, Thomas P.
*Cahill, William A., Jr.
*Califf, Toxey H.
Calkins, Donald L.
*Callan, John F.
*Campbell, Ronald A.
Cantacuzene, Rodion
Carlisle, David R.
*Carlson, Howard L.
Carroll, William E.
Carson, Ernest H.
Carson, Ralph
*Carter, Tandy W.
Case, George P., Jr.
*Case, Richard W.
*Cassani, Henry L.
Cassidy, Joseph B., Jr.
*Caudill, William E.
Caulk, Robert F.
*Cave, John G.
*Cecil, Durward C.
Chadwick, John R.
*Chambers, Lawrence C.
*Charbonneau, George L.
*Chasse, Robert L.
*Cheatham, Augustus B.
*Cherrier, Herbert A.
*Chesebrough, Richard
Chesky, James A.
Chewning, Robert W.
Chinn, Clarence E.
*Chisum, Oscar C.
*Christensen, Donald A.
Christensen, Eugene J.
*Christie, Francis J.
*Clare, James S.
*Clark, Andrew
*Clark, Robert T.
Clarke, Robert R.
*Clermont, William J., Jr.
Clingenpeel, William A.
Cloughley, William D.
*Cochrane, James H.
*Coffman, Charles L.
*Coiner, John A.
*Collier, John H.
*Collins, Frank C., Jr.
*Collins, Harold E.
*Combs, Robert E.
Conn, Lannie, Jr.
*Connally, Robert F., III
*Connell, Lewis E.
*Connelly, Robert B.
*Connors, Eugene T.
*Conrad, Harry E.
Conrad, Peter C.
Conrey, James R.
Cooke, Robert A.
*Corbett, William J., III
*Cornwell, James W.
Corrick, Max E.
*Corsepius, Everett D.
*Coski, Bernard J.
Cotten, Thomas R., Jr.
*Craig, Robert E.
Craven, Robert C. E.
*Cretsinger, Wilbur B.
Cronin, Francis W.
Cross, Douglas E.
*Cross, William F.
Cruden, David S.
*Cunningham, Alan R.
Curran, Robert W.
Cush, Casimo J.
Cywin, Lawrence
*Dahlen, Wallace A.
*Dalpian, Joseph H.
Damian, John L.
Daniels, Verlyne W.
Dapogny, Robert J.
*Darodda, Aldo J.
*Darrell, Charles G.
*Darwin, William C.
Davidson, Charles H.
Davidson, Christie H.
Davis, Michael C.
*Davis, Paul H., Jr.
Davis, William B.
Davison, David D.
*Deaton, Paul
*DeFriez, Edwin H.
*DeMun, Taylor K.
Denbigh, Robert S., Jr.
Denton, David N.
Deer, John P.
*Dersin, Clement
Desjardin, John W.
*DeView, Joseph R.
DeWispelaere, Earle L.
*Dietz, Richard C.
Dimmick, David K.
Dion, Laurent N.
*Dodge, Robert S.
Doelling, Robert D.
*Doggett, William K.
*Dorn, Gerald W.
*Dorney, William J.
*Dorso, James N.
Dowse, Herbert B., Jr.
*Drews, Sheldon
Driskell, Omer L.
Duckett, Philip V. L.
Dudley, Paul L., Jr.
*Dunn, Theodore Y., Jr.
Dyer, George T., Jr.
*Dykers, Thomas M., Jr.
Eakle, Burke E.
*Eastman, Alfred C., III
*Ebbert, Edwin L.
Echols, Kenneth W.
*Ecklund, Hugo L., Jr.
Eddy, William P., III
*Edmunds, Philip H.
Eggert, Lowell F.
*Ekman, Roger E.
*Elder, James C.
Elliott, Charles L.
*Elliott, Jack "B"
Ellison, John C.
*Engel, Richard E.
*Engquist, Gordon W.
*Enos, Ralph L.
*Eshman, John R.
Everist, Philip W.
Ewy, Howard W.
Faessel, Matthew W.
Fakoury, Ernest P.
*Farley, James W.
*Farrell, Joseph A., III
Farris, George K.
*Fay, Edward S.
*Federico, Charles D.
*Feely, Robert J.
Fellingham, Robert W.
Fellowes, Frederick G., Jr.
Ferguson, Andrew C.
*Fink, Edward R.
*Finn, Gerard P., Jr.
*Fisher, Robert W.
Fisher, William G., Jr.
Fitts, Jean M.
Fleeman, Frederick M.
Fleeson, Richard J.
Fletcher, Richard M.
Fonville, Henry P.
Ford, James M., Jr.
Ford, Leon E., Jr.
Ford, Maurice E.
*Forrester, James H.
*Foster, John F.
*Fowler, John W.
Fox, Raymond G.
Foy, Edward W.
*Franklin, Billy D.
French, William L.
Frost, John F., III
*Fruchterman, Richard L., Jr.
Gahafer, Joseph G.
*Gair, Bruce O.
Garcia, Jaime
*Gardner, Howard W.
*Gardner, John E., Jr.
*Garland, Daniel H.
Garner, Pat M.
Gaskin, Richard G.
Gatje, George C.
Gauthier, John O.
*Gehres, Francis C.
*Gerlach, Richard E.
*Gibbins, Gareth W.
Gillan, Martin J., III
*Gire, Howard A.
*Glancy, Thomas J., Jr.
*Gleason, Richard E.
*Gnadt, Fredric
*Goetschius, Forrest D.
Goldstein, Jonas L.
*Goodwin, Bruce G.
*Gordon, David E.
Graffam, Earl H.
Grammer, Frederick E., Jr.
*Grant, Richard T.
*Grappi, Robert L.
*Gray, Gene P.
Gray, Harvey, Jr.
Gray, James H.
Gray, Walter S., III
Green, William C.
*Greenleaf, Wilbur E.
*Greff, Clarence H., Jr.
*Griffin, Jack E.
Groder, Robert E.
*Groehn, Gerhard C.
Grosshuesch, David K.
Gulsinger, Lawrence B., Jr.
Gumser, Dale L.
Gunn, William J.
*Gurney, Charles E., III
*Gustaff, Vito J. V.
*Hagensick, William H.
Haigh, Alfred D., Jr.
*Haight, Gardiner M.
*Hale, William T.
*Hallen, Byron W.
*Haltom, Joseph H.
Hamilton, Leo L.
Hamilton, Leroy A.
Handford, Richard C.
Hannegan, Frank N.
Hansen, Robert F.
*Hansen, Ronald R.
Hantz, Francis A.
*Harbick, Donald L.
Hardesty, John F.
*Hardisty, Huntington
Harp, Robert M.
*Harper, Roger W.
Harris, Jack R.
*Harrison, James H., Jr.
*Harsh, Loinel R.
Hart, John R.
*Hart, Richard L.
Hartley, John D.
*Hartnett, Bernard E., Jr.
Hatcher, George M.
Hatcher, William K.
Havel, Edward F.
*Hawkins, Phil "R"
*Hayes, Morris L.
Head, William N.
Headley, Allen B.
*Healy, Richard H.
Heath, Frederick T.
Hedberg, Arthur J., Jr.
*Hedges, Ralph R.
*Heenan, Richard D.

*Heffernam, George A.
*Helgerson, Warren A.
Helland, Gerald H.
*Helme, Charles R.
*Hennessy, William J.
*Henson, Otis A.
Hess, Adolph W., Jr.
Hetu, Herbert E.
*Hey, George B.
Hickman, William J.
*Hicks, Harold F., Jr.
*Hicks, John W.
*Higgins, Clinton K., Jr.
Hilder, Frederick A.
Hill, Lucio W.
*Hinkley, Harold L.
Hipple, William J.
*Hirz, Joseph D.
*Hoffman, Merle L.
Hoffman, Robert B.
Hollandsworth, Roy M.
*Hollick, Frederick B.
*Holmberg, Lennart G.
*Holt, Neil G.
*Horne, Charles F., III
*Hubbard, Dwight E.
*Hughes, James R.
*Hughes, Wayne P., Jr.
*Hull, George T.
*Hunter, Glenn A.
Hunter, Herbert P.
*Hurlbut, Francis D., Jr.
Hyde, Robert A.
*Ilsemann, Frederick J., Jr.
*Ingersoll, Richard W.
*Ingley, Edmund W.
Inman, Wayne D.
*Irlandi, Santo A.
*Jaburg, Conrad J.
Jackson, Dempster M.
*Jackson, Robert G.
Jackson, Thomas, L.
Jacob, Robert E.
*James, Charlie N., Jr.
*Jameson, Henry C., Jr.
*Jarrett, Alonzo C.
Jaycox, Randall E., Jr.
*Jayne, Gordon H.
*Jewell, Thomas A.
*Johansen, Wayne A.
*Johns, Arthur J.
Johnson, Clifford D.
Johnson, Donald L.
Johnson, Donald M.
Johnson, Emil L.
Johnson, Frederick C.
Johnson, George M.
*Johnson, Guy D.
Johnson, Philip E.
*Johnson, Robert M.
*Johnston, Maurice M. Jr.
*Jones, John E.
Jones, Richard H.
Josephson, Henning C.
*Kaczmarek, Carl C.
*Kaiser, Karl D.
*Kalmus, William B.
*Karvala, Curtis A.
*Kasehagen, Arthur T.
*Keane, James P.
*Kearns, James T.
*Kebschull, Herbert W
Keefe, Thomas J., Jr.
*Kehoe, James W., Jr.
*Kelley, Byron C.
Kelley, Frank A., III
*Kelley, Frederick W.
*Kelsey, Robert L.
*Kemble, Richard E.
*Kennedy, Ronald W.
Kennedy, Robert C.
Kennedy, William B.
Kershaw, Daniel J.
*Kidd, William S.
Kilduff, Paul E.
Kim, Alfred H. S., Jr.
King, Everett D.
*Kinnebrew, Thomas R.
Kirby, Albert D.
*Kirk, Robert L.
*Kirschke, Ernest J.
*Kniely, Joseph L.
*Knopp, William A.
*Knutson, Wilbert D.
Koehler, Walter C., Jr.
Koehne, Richard J.
*Kollmann, Glenn E.
Kosmela, Walter T.
*Kovarick, Frank L.
Kraft, Frederick W.
*Kraft, Leroy M.
Kuder, Dalton L.
Kuehner, Karl E.
*Kully, Sheldon D.
Kuncas, John W.
Kunze, Martin W.
*Kvello, Alan
Lacy, Joe R.
Lafferty, Jerry D.
*Lancaster, Robert W.
Langford, John M.
Langton, Charles E., Jr.
Larkins, Burton J.
*Larocque, George N.
*Larsen, Richard L.
*Lasowski, Donald T.
Laux, William J., Jr.
Lavin, Charles V.
*Law, Thomas L.
Lawton, Lewis S.
*Layman, Lawrence
Leblanc, Georges E., Jr
*Leftwich, James M.
*Lenox, Glen W.
Leonard, Robert W.
Leverone, Robert M.
Lewis, Harold M. J., Jr.
*Lewis, James T.
*Lidel, Carl J.
*Lighter, Elbert D.
*Lippincott, James E.
*Loberger, James C.
Locke, Walter M.
*Lockwood, Forrest P.
Loggan, Wilfred J.
*Logner, Robert L.
*Looney, Francis L.
*Loposer, Avery K., Jr.
Louchheim, William S., Jr.
*Louden, Robert O.
*Lounsberry, Jack A.
Lovvorn, John D.
*Luckett, Thomas W.
Ludwick, Louis L.
Lumsden, Richard E.
Lykes, William F. G.
Lyons, James A., Jr.
Lyons, Thomas W., Jr.
MacDonald, William P.
MacKercher, John C.
*MacPherson, John J.
*Madeo, Joseph F., Jr.
Madigan, James A.
*Maggay, Isidoro, Jr.
*Mains, Homer O., Jr.
Malaney, Robert E.
Malone, Thomas L., Jr.
Maloney, Peter M.
*Manara, Vincent J., Jr.
Mandel, Cornelius E., Jr.
Manduca, Theodore W.
Manfredi, John P.
*Mann, Robert E.
*Manring, Charles D.
*Marbott, Henry W.
Marsh, Lee S.
*Marshall, Samuel R.
Martin, Tyrone G.
*Masse, Donald M.
*Massimi, Robert F.
*Matherson, Richard
Mathis, Thomas R.
*Mau, George W., Jr.
*Maus, Lee J.
*Maveety, Patrick J.
McCafferty, William E.
McCall, John M.
McCarty, Richard W.
McCollum, Arthur H., Jr.
McCormick, Daniel G., III
McCoy, Roy E.
McCune, Joe D.
*McCutcheon, Edwin L.
*McDaniel, Clarence L.
McDonald, Clyde D.
McDowell, Russell N.
*McGaughy, Richard W.
McGuire, Orville W.
McHugh, James J.
*McIntyre, John J.
McKee, Robert X.
McLaird, Preston, Jr.
*McLeod, Kenneth M.
*McMillan, Donald G.
McMillan, Louis K., Jr.
McMillan, Oden L.
*McNeely, James S.
McPadden, Donald F. X.
*McWey, Russell B.
McWilliam, John R.
*McWilliams, Frederick F.
Meacham, James A.
*Mead, Theodore E.
*Meadows, Okey I.
*Meek, Kenneth L.
*Meeks, Thomas L.
*Meltzer, Melvin
*Merrill, Forest "J"
*Meserve, Charles L.
Messer, Jarvis N.
*Messina, Sylvester C.
*Metcalf, Louis E., Jr.
*Metz, Forrest E.
*Mhoon, Fred M.
Miale, Robert E.
*Michaels, Robert J.
*Milius, Paul L.
Miller, Floyd H., Jr.
Miller, James L.
Miller, John R.
*Miller, Kenneth R.
Miller, Richard J.
*Miner, Duane A.
Mircheff, Robert A.
Mischke, Gayland J.
Mitchell, Grant L.
*Mitchell, "J" Wallace
*Mitchell, Leland G.
*Monroe, Charles H., Jr.
*Montanaro, Luciano P.
Montgomery, Stephen C.
*Moody, Thomas J.
Moore, Arthur H.
Moore, Charles J.
Moore, Charles E.
Moore, Ernest M., Jr.
*Moore, Mallie B.
*Moore, Robert S.
Moore, Rufus J.
*Moore, Tommy C.
Morris, Henry C., Jr.
Morris, Robert E.
Morrison, Daniel N.
Morrison, Royden U.
*Morse, Harold C.
*Moss, William C., Jr.
Mounce, Claude E.
*Mountford, Edward J.
Mullane, Thomas, F.
Mulloy, Paul J.
*Muncy, William E.
*Murdock, Lloyd E.
*Murphy, Douglas C.
Murphy, Gerald E.
*Murphy, Gilbert F., Jr.
*Murphy, Ray D.
Myers, Carroll E.
*Myers, William S.
Mylander, Stig J.
*Nation, William C.
*Naugle, James O.
*Nelson, Frank C., Jr.
*Nelson, Jack H.
Nelson, Leroy C.
*Nesky, Anthony, Jr.
Newsome, James W.
Newton, Howard J., Jr.
*Newton, Robert B.
Niedbala, Thomas F.
*Nolan, Joseph D.
Nordtvedt, Ernest R.
*Norman, Thomas V., Jr.
North, Dean B.
*Northup, Wilmer R., Jr.
Norton, Earl W.
*Norton, Richard J.
Numbers, Earl W.
O'Brien, Austin C., Jr.
*O'Brien, Jerome L.
O'Bryan, Michael E.
*O'Connell, James M.
O'Connell, John F.
O'Connor, Dennis E. W.
O'Connor, John E.
Oder, Howard W.
*Odman, William A.
*O'Donnell, John H., Jr.
O'Donnell, John W.
*Ogden, Howard "A," Jr.
*Ohan, Harry
*O'Kane, John D.
Oldham, Albert W.
*O'Leary, William E.
Olson, James W.
Olson, John R.
*Olson, Thane N.
O'Neil, Louis C., Jr.
*Organ, James W.
*Orrik, Frederick J., Jr.
*Orvis, Peter H.
*Orzalli, John B.
*Outlaw, Thurber A., Jr.
Pacl, Lawrence J.
*Palatini, Glenn L.
*Palmer, Wallace C.
*Panarese, Adam F.
*Pankratz, Carl J.
Pappas, George T.
Parkhurst, David C.
*Parrish, Donald E.
*Paul, Raymond E.
*Paul, Robert F.
Payne, Douglas W.
*Pearce, Earl H.
*Pearson, Charles T., Jr.
*Pearson, John F., Jr.
Peelle, Morris A.
*Penney, William R.
Pennypacker, William S.
*Perl, Burton K.
*Perry, William N.
*Peters, Herbert J.
Peters, Paul F.
*Petherick, George L.
Phillips, Robert A.
*Pierce, Ray E.
*Pierce, William H., Jr.
*Pilon, Jerome R.
Ping, Vernon "S", Jr.
Piper, Harold L.
*Placchi, Howard S.
Platt, Grafton S.
*Plow, Arthur E.
*Pogson, Charles H.
Pohli, Richard R.
*Polatty, Donald B.
Poling, William E.
*Pollak, Charles D.
*Pollak, Morris
Pope, Daniel K., IV
Post, Robert E., Jr.
*Pouls, Michael C., Jr.
Powell, George W.
*Powell, William V.
*Powers, Trent R.
Preble, Russell A., Jr.
*Prezioso, Ronald
*Prisby, Donald E.
*Pulley, Gerald P.
Quartararo, Michael A.
Quick, Jay E.
Quin, Clayton W.
*Quinn, Robert T.
*Rabun, Floyd K.
Rafalowski, Joseph W., Jr.
*Rainville, Duane D.
Ramsey, William E.
Randall, Thomas R.
Randolph, Joseph L.
*Rankin, George M., Jr.
Rapkin, Jerome
Rasmussen, Robert L.
*Ratenburg, Robert N.
*Ravan, Landrum E.
Ray, Glen P.
*Rayburn, Ralph G.
*Raymer, Edward C.
*Raynes, Robert R.
*Rea, Maurice W.
*Redifer, Andrew P., III
*Reed, Richard W.
Reed, Robert G.
Reed, William H.
Reeder, Ralph J.
*Reeks, Richard W.
*Reep, Harlan E.
Reischauer Robert E.
*Renicky, Donald D.
*Rhodes, Francis E., Jr.
Rhodes, John P.
*Riba, Robert
*Ricardo, Benny J.
*Rice, James O.
Rich, Richard
Richard, Jackson B.
Richards, William C.
Richards, William D.
Ricks, Robert R.
*Ries, Allen L.
Riley, Tad T.
*Riordan, Edward J.
*Ritchey, Donald D.
*Rivers, Wendell B.
Roane, Donald P.
*Roberts, Charles T.
*Roberts, Dean E.
*Roberts, Douglas H.
*Roberts, John A.
*Roberts, William E.
Robinson, Donald W.
Robinson, Kirby L.
*Roby, Grady H.
*Rochford, John M.
*Rockett, John S.
Rodda, John D.
Rodgers, Frederick A.
Rollins, James "J"
Ross, William A., III
*Rossoe, John W. F.
*Roush, Randall C.
Rowden, William H.
*Rowland, James C.
*Rowland, Mervin
*Rozell, Curtis J.
*Ruecker, Kenneth H.
Rumplik, Rudolph H.
*Russell, William D.
*Sagerholm, James A.
*Salomon, Ferdinand L.
Sanford, Stephen J.
Sapp, John Jr.
*Saunders, William H., III
*Saxton, Frank
Sayer, William D.
*Sayers, Robert M., Jr.
Scalese, Anthony C., Jr.
*Scarafone, Ronald
*Schaer, Oscar
*Scheidler, Willard E.
Schluter, Hugo E.
*Schonenberg, Hans P.
*Schroder, Austin R.
Schulze, Robert H.
Schurr, Thomas P.
Scott, Edward T.
*Scott, John H., Jr.
*Searfus, William H.
*Seeger, Charles E.
Selby, Howard K.
Seljos, Lloyd T.
*Service, James E.
Seymour, Ernest R.
*Shafer, Lawrence
Shaffer, George W.
Shanahan, William F.
*Sheehan, William F., Jr.
Sheldon, Robert E.
*Shellman, Curtis B., Jr.
Shepherd, David C.
*Sherar, Robert C.
Sherman, John W.
*Sherman, Lee H.
*Sibert, George C.
Simms, James T.
*Simon, Philip C.
Simons, Donald W.
*Sims, Gelzer L., Jr.
Sisson, Donald E.
*Skyrud, Jerome P.
Smallidge, Robert L.
Smith, Carol C., Jr.
Smith, Clifford R.
*Smith, Gilbert E.
*Smith, Hugh T.
Smith, James R.
Smith, John V.
*Smith, Kenneth G.
*Smith, Ordell
*Smith, Paul D.
Smith, Richard C.
*Smith, Scott L.
*Smith, St. Clair
*Sneed, Beckom U.
*Snell, Glen A.
Snyder, Herbert J.V.
Snyder, James M.
Snyder, Ned "C"
*Sorensen, Everett B.
Sothan, Norman L.
Sowinski, Stanislaus J
*Span, William F.
*Speer, Richard T.
Spencer, Harry A., Jr.
Sperling, David J.
*Sprunk, William, Jr.
Squier, Lucius R., Jr.
*Squires, Walter G., Jr.
*Stadelhofer, Robert R.
*Stalder, Roy F., Jr.
Stangl, Richard J.
Stanley, Edward E.
Staple, David F.
Stark, Peter A., Jr.
Starkey, Nelson R., Jr.
Steckbeck, Francis J.
Stein, Norman F.
Stinner, Robert J.
Stolle, Edward S., Jr.
Stone, James M.
Story, Warren L.
Stout, Edward N.
*Stovall, Walter W.

*Straney, Charles N.
*Strockbine, Richard E.
*Strong, William L.
*Strunk Arthur A.
Sudduth, Roger M.
*Sugg, Ross E.
*Sullivan, Alfred B.
*Sullivan, Francis L.
*Sullivan, James J.
*Sullivan, Robert H.
*Summerfield, Edward R.
Summers, Howard P.
Suthèrlin, Benjamin T. W.
*Sutton, John F.
Swarztrauber, Sayre A.
Sweet, William J.
*Sylvester, Gerald D.
*Talkin, Philip S.
*Tallman, Elmer C.
*Tate, Charles G.
*Taylor, Clinton W.
*Taylor, James D., Jr.
*Taylor, Jesse J.
Tetreault, Paul J.
*Thiel, Louis H. C., Jr.
Tholl, Jack C.
*Thomas, David H.
Thomas, Douglas N.
*Thomas, George C.
Thomas, Kenneth G.
Thomas, Robert J.
*Thomas, Robert F.
Thompson, Arthur R., Jr.
Till, Ernest A.
*Tillerson, Leonard E.
*Tompkins, George E.
*Tonseth, Thomas H., III
*Treiber, Arthur E.
*Trimble, Richard W.
*Troffer, George J., Jr.
*Troutman, Burl A., Jr.
*Turnage, Robert L.
*Turner, James D.
*Turpin, Lander H.
Tuszynski, Raymond S.
*Tuzo, Lamar W.
*Tyson, Billie C.
*Upton, Don L.
Usilton, William B.
*Valade, Larry G.
*VanArsdol, Robert A.
*VanBuskirk, George F.
VanHouten, Laurence P.
*Varley, James F.
Varney, Jack E.
*Verser, John K.
*Victor, Francis W.
Vine, Victor J.
*VonWantoch, Harvey
Voorhees, John E.
*Waggoner, Kenneth K.
*Wahrmund, Louis M.
Wakeland, Max W.
Wakeman, Curtiss O.
Walczak, Norbert F.
*Walden, John W.
*Walker, Homer L.
*Walker, Samuel B.
*Walker, William T.
Walker, William B.
*Wall, Joseph E.
Wallace, Cedric S.
*Wallace, Robert J.
Walling, Eugene K.
*Ward, Carl B.
Ward, Conley R.
*Ward, John E.
Warren, Tommy H., Jr.
*Waterloo, Francis C.
*Weaver, Edward H.
*Webber, Gene D.
*Webster, Charles H.
*Webster, Edward W., V.
Weeks, George H.
Weimerskirch, John R.
*Weintraub, Allan P.
*Weller, Thomas G., Jr
Wells, Eugene R., Jr.
Wells, Lawrence H.
Wessman, Robert L.
Wev, Bosquet N., Jr.
*Wheeler, James W., Jr.
*Wheeler, Robert L.
*Whelan, Edward C., Jr.
*White, Paul G., Jr.
Whitley, Clyde T.
*Whorton, William R.
Widder, John A., Jr.
*Wilde, Stanford R.
Wilder, William E.
Wiley, Kenneth R.
*Wilkens, John, Jr.
*Wilkins, Howard W.
*Wilkinson, Joseph B., Jr.
Williams, Douglas A.
*Williams, James E.
Williams, James G., III
Williamson, Paul W.
*Williard, Bobbie D.
*Willis, Chesley E., Jr.
*Wilson, Charles E.
*Wilson, Donald K.
Wilson, Edward W.
*Wilson, Jack L.
*Wilson, James E., Jr.
*Wilson, Robert R.
*Wimberly, Tommy C.
*Winant, Barent P., III
*Winkel, Raymond N.
*Winkler, Richard C.
Winkler, Thomas Q., Jr.
*Winter, Harold I.
Winters, Charles A.
*Wisdom, Jessie R.
*Wise, William E.
*Wiseman, Charles H.
Wiseman, Hobart J.
Withers, Christopher
*Witty, Robert D.
*Wolff, Kenneth E.
Wolff, Kenneth L.
Wolff, William M., Jr.
*Wood, Cecil E.
*Wood, Ralph E.
Wood, Thomas H.
*Woodbury, Robert E.
*Woods, Searle W.
*Woody, William R.
Woolway, James E.
*Wright, Richard L.
*Wright, Ross W.
*Wright, Sidney V., Jr.
Wyatt, William C., III
*Yamnicky, John D.
*Yetman, William R.
*Yocom, Ernest
*Young, John W.
*Youngquist, John A.
*Yount, Tim B.
*Zacharias, Jerrold M.
Zastrow, Robert R.
Zeithaml, Donald P.
Zemaitis, Robert J.
*Zibilich, Michael A.
*Zong, Donald E.
*Zvanovec, Ladimir J.

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the line, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Abraham, Thomas J.
*Ackart, Leon E.
Adams, Douglas N.
Adams, John W.
Adams, Kenneth W.
*Adams, Robert J.
Adkins, James N., Jr.
Adler, Roy W.
Akers, Max N.
*Akin, Hurston B.
Albert, David R.
Albert, Virgil E.
Albright, Donald W.
Albright, John D.
*Alden, Robert F.
Alexander, Richard K.
Alexander, Dawson, Jr.
Alkire, James C.
Allard, David L.
Allender, George R.
Allman, John I., III
*Altergott, Harvey K.
*Alvarez, Marcos I.
*Alvarez, Raoul
Amick, Carl W.
Anderson, Harold R.
Anderson, John W.
Anderson, Richard S., Jr.
Anderson, William A.
Arata, William A., III
Archibald, George R.
Aronson, Jack M.
*Artim, Ronald N.
Ashley, Wallace T.
Askey, Henry B.
Atwater, Francis X.
Atwell, Marion A.
Avery, Francis A.
Ayars, James E.
Babb, Richard L.
*Bacon, Vernon W.
Baggett, Marvin L.
*Bailey, Richard C.
Baker, Charles H., Jr.
Baldwin, Benjamin G., Jr.
Baldwin, Edwin M.
Baldwin, Roger E.
Ballard, Ronald H.
Ballard, William L.
*Balsley, Stanley P.
Banman, Robert E.
Banta, Clifton E., III
*Barclay, James A.
Barker, Francis O.
Barnes, Donald W.
Barnes, Kinnon W.
Barnum, Lewis B.
Barr, Norman R.
Barrett, Stephen P.
*Barrier, Lee E.
Barron, Douglas W.
Barry, John R., Jr.
Barry, Thomas J.
Bartels, Harlan B.
Bartels, Malcolm G.
Bartholomew, Thomas C.
Bass, Robert L.
*Bassett, Charles H., Jr.
Bassett, Frank E.
Bateman, Theodore T.
Batterby, Robert E.
Batton, James B., Jr.
Bauer, George T.
Bayne, James L.
Beadles, Thomas J.
Beamer, Barton D.
Beard, Percy M., Jr.
*Beasley, Edwin L.
Beath, Arnold R.
Beatty, John R.
Beaube, James D.
Beausang, Michael F., Jr.
Bechtel, Henry M., Jr.
Beckner, Roy T.
Belcher, Samuel A., III
Bellay, Daniel J.
Bellows, Gerald E.
Bence, Frederick W.
*Bender, Wayne C.
Benham, James T.
Bennett, Arthur J.
Bennett, David G.
Benton, Chestley M.
Berg, Robert P.
Berg, Roger L.
Berkenstock, Howard R., Jr.
Berkowitz, Harris I.
Bernet, Karl R.
Bernsen, Harold J.
Bertke, David E.
Besecker, John A.
Betts, Clyde L.
Bickel, Robert M.
Biggs, Gene E.
Binczak, Joseph F.
Bird, John P.
Bissell, Chesney O.
Blackburn, Harry L., Jr.
Blackler, Harvey R.
*Blackwell, Michael J.
Blair, Frederick E.
Blakemore, William T.
*Blakeslee, Albert D., III
Blancq, James V.
Blank, Murray D.
Blass, Richard G.
Blatchley, Robert D.
Blatt, Russel N.
Blevins, Villard, Jr.
Bliss, John R.
Bloh, William C.
Boatright, Jimmie R.
Boehm, Roy H.
Boerner, Donald A.
Boling, Olin E.
Bond, Robert J., Jr.
Booriakin, Walter A.
Borcik, David E.
Borden, Edward L.
Borders, Lowell J.
Bough, Bennie E.
Bower, William J.
Bowery, Robert J.
Bowles, Howard A., Jr.
Bowman, Andrew L.
Boyd, James P., Jr.
Boyle, Ronald A.
Brace, James R.
*Bradbury, Craig M.
Bradley, Carlton "S"
Bradley, Edward J.
Brainerd, Walter S.
Brake, Robert L.
Branch, Lyle F.
Branch, Nathan E.
*Braswell, Oscar D.
Brest, Jerry C.
Bredbeck, William J.
Breidenstein, John F.
Brennan, John J.
Brenner, George H.
Brewer, August W.
Brewer, James G.
Brewer, Richard B.
Bridgman, Walter E., Jr.
*Brightman, James M.
Brining, George
Brock, Virgil E.
*Brodersen, Henry H.
Brooks, Paul E.
Brown, Albert H.
Brown, Bruce P.
Brown, Charles H.
Brown, David N.
Brown, Dorsey A.
Brown, Elvin F.
Brown, Frank H.
Brown, Harry D.
Brown, John W.
Brown, Paul L.
Brown, Robert S.
*Brown, Thomas W.
Brown, William F.
Brune, Charles M.
Bruni, Richard L.
Brunner, Danny J.
Bryant, James H.
Bryant, Lawrence D.
Buchberger, Harold F.
Buck, Ralph V.
Buell, Thomas B.
Buerger, Newton W., Jr.
Bump, Stanley E.
Bunting, Keith M.
Burchardt, Robert J.
Burnett, James R.
Burns, Charles E., Jr.
Burns, Francis R.
*Burns, Gerald J.
Burns, Robert E.
Burton, Charles D.
Busenlehner, Charles E.
Bussard, Vernon R., Jr.
Busse, Arnold L.
Butterworth, Frank W., III
*Buxton, Donald G.
Buzby, John S.
Byman, William E.
Caggiano, Robert R.
Caldwell, Billy F.
Caldwell, James F.
Caldwell, Robert K.
Calhoun, John F.
Calkins, Delos S., Jr.
Callahan, James A.
Calvert, John F.
Calvin, Donald U.
Camp, William G.
Campbell, Craig S.
*Campbell, Robyn M., Jr.
Campbell, "V" "O"
*Campbell, William, Jr.
Camper, James R.
Cannon, John W.
Cantrell, Walter H.
Capps, James B.
Cargill, Denny B.
*Carleton, Reid P.
Carpenter, Lawrence J.
Carr, Bernard W.
Carr, Samuel F.
Carretta, Albert A., Jr.
Carrington, Robert C.
Carroll, Robert D.
*Carroll, Thomas D.
Carson, Aubrey W.
Carter, George W.
Carter, Jere S.
Carter, William L.
*Casagranda, Raymond J.
Casebeer, Macey M.
Cash, Beveardge L.
Cass, Elijah J., Jr.
Caswick, Anthony F.
*Catalano, David A.
Cater, Michael C.
*Cavalier, Anthony J.
Chadick, Wayne L.
Chafee, George B., Jr.
Chamberlain, John D.
Chapman, Frederick W.
Chapman, William F.
Chapple, Michael W.
Chase, Bertram P.
Cheney, Theodore C., Jr.
*Childs, Johnny H.
Chiocchio, Oddino S., Jr.
Chodorow, Alan M.
Chrisman, John A., Jr.
Chrisman, Virgil E.
Christenson, William C.
*Clark, Allen H.
Clark, Charles W., Jr.
Clark, Donald L.
Clark, Earl C.
Clark, Frederic M.
Clark, George
*Clark, Marfred C.
Clark, Warren C., Jr.
Clason, Roy E.
Clement, Frank J.
Clement, James M., Jr.
Clendenon, William D.
*Cleveland, Robert M.
Clifton, Claremont J.
Cline, Calvin J.
Clinton, John C.
Clower, William E.
Clune, Edward M.
*Coats, Barry W.
Cobb, John B.
Coe, Freddy W.
Collins, Gayle V.
*Comer, Robert F.
Comly, Samuel P., III
*Compton, William H.
*Condon, Robert E.
Conery, Francis A., III
*Conklin, Frank M., Jr
Conley, Thomas H., Jr.
Conway, Clyde M., Jr.
Conzelman, Bruce T.
Cook, Dennis P.
*Cook, Elmer J.
Cook, Jan W.
Cook, Lawrence W.
Cooke, Richard H.
Coon, Morris E.
Cooper, Grant A.
Corbett, Robert L.
*Cordek, David
Corder, James L.
Cordova, Richard N.
Corey, Thomas V.
Corr, Peter S., Jr.
Correll, Ward W.
Cortesini, Edward P.
Cotham, "L" "C", Jr.
Cotton, William R.
*Coupe, Alan G.
Courtney, Carl M.
Cowart, Elwood A.
Cowdrill, David T.
Cox, David R.
Cox, David B.
*Cox, Duane A.
Cox, Kenneth E.
Cox, Thomas L.
Coyle, Francis X.
Coyne, George K., Jr.
Craft, Don C.
Craig, Bruce L.
Crane, Hugh R.
Crane, Peter W.
Crawford, Lawrence R.
Creighton, Liles W., Jr.
Creighton, George C., III
Crusinberry, Walter O.
*Cummings, Michael A.
Cummins, Paul Z., II
*Cunningham, Shane A.
*Curry, Raymond L.
Curtis, Wayne
Cuseo, Michael A., Jr.

Cutter, Jasper R.
Cyr, Albert J.
Cyr, Joseph H., Jr.
Daniels, Shane P.
Darby, Jack N.
Dargis, Stanley "W", Jr.
Darius, Henry A., Jr.
Darling, Donald L.
Darmand, Monte
*Darnauer, David E.
Daugherty, Marvin P.
David, George J.
Davies, Richard E.
Davies, William
Davis, Billy E.
Davis, Chester C.
Davis, Dan A.
Davis, James V.
Davis, John R.
Davis, Lewis N.
Davis, Marvin R.
Davis, Vernie R.
Davis, William R.
Dawson, Harry B.
Dawson, James F.
Dawson, Phillip E., Jr.
Dawson, William H.
Day, George L.
Dayharsh, Charles E.
*Deboer, Johan W.
*Decarlo, John A.
Dee, James D., Jr.
Degnan, Thomas F.
Deibert, Edgar M.
Delanoy, Billie L.
*Dellwo, Richard E.
DeLong, Edgar E.
Demand, Daniel H.
Demchak, William A.
Demoss, Harold G.
Denham, Michael E.
*Dennison, Terry A.
Denny, George L., II
Desko, Daniel A.
Devenger, Ralph A.
*Dewalt, Gary L.
Dewey, Robert T.
Dewrell, Martell E.
*Dexter, Lincoln A., Jr.
Dietrich, William H.
Dietz, Raymond E.
Dillard, Theodis
Disney, Donald G.
Dittrick, Alfred S.
Dittrick, John J., Jr.
*Doe, Burdell F.
Doe, Francis P.
*Doherty, Edward F.
Doherty, John T.
Donahue, Leonard P., Jr.
Dorriety, Arnold D.
Dorsey, Edward B.
Doss, Marion T., Jr.
Dotson, William A.
Dougherty, William A., Jr.
Dougherty, Eugene J.
Dougherty, Thomas F., Jr.
Dowling, James D.
Downey, Howard F.
Downham, Max C.
Doyle, Carroll L.
Doyle, Thomas J.
Drake, James
*Drees, Marvin J.
Driggers, Theodore F.
Duffey, Russell G.
*Duggan, Charles E., Jr.
Dukes, Charles G.
Dunbar, Peter B.
Dunbar, Richard P.
Duncan, Donald G.
Duncan, Pat
Duncan, Robert M.
Duncan, William E.
Dunlap, Harry A., Jr.
Dunn, William P.
Dunsmore, Alan L.
Durbin, Ira L.
Durbin, James D.
Durham, James L.
Duvall, Michael R.
Duvall, Thomas R.
Duxbury, Richard B.
Earley, William L.
Eastman, David R.
Eaton, David G.
*Eddleman, Harold E.
Eddy, Roger A.
*Edmonds, James R.
Edmunds, Frank L., Jr.
Edson, Roger L.
Edwards, Scott
Edwards, Steven H.
Eggleston, John R.
Eikel, Harvey A.
*Eldredge, Floyd W.
Elison, Augustus T., Jr.
Elliott, David J.
Elliott, Donald R.
Elliott, Don N.
Elliott, Norman S., Jr.
*Elliott, Thomas J.
Elliott, Walter L.
Elliott, William L.
Ellis, Howard R.
Elmore, Floyd L.
Emmert, David L.
Ensley, Arthur F.
*Entwistle, Thomas W., Jr.
Epley, James M.
Eppling, David C.
Erbacher, Anthony E.
*Erhardt, Francis J., Jr.
Ericksen, Peter E.
Estep, James A., Jr.
Estep, Vonnie D.
Estes, Albert R., Jr.
Estock, George, Jr.
Ethell, Donald E.
*Evans, Gordon E.
Evans, Larry D.
Evans, Rowland G.
Evers, Dovard J.
Eytchison, Ronald M.
Fabrizio, Charles B.
Fancher, Harold W., Jr.
*Fannon, James E., Jr.
Farlee, Bennett W.
*Farrell, Edmund F.
Feeney, John S., Jr.
Fees, Howard J., Jr.
Feil, James R.
Felderman, John L.
Feldhausen, Peter H.
Felix, Henry K.
Felton, Paul E., Jr.
Fendley, John N.
Fenick, Joseph D., Jr.
Fentriss, Robert B., Jr.
Feran, Paul M.
*Ferguson, Earl A.
Ferguson, John K.
Ferguson, Robert H.
Ferraro, Romauldo C.
Fidler, Paul P.
*Field, Blake E.
Figura, Robert R.
Finley, James C.
Finley, Robert H.
Fisher, James R.
Fisher, Troy R.
Fiske, Harry K.
Fisler, Louis H.
Fitzgerald, James L., Jr.
*Fitzpatrick, Thomas J.
Flanagan, Thomas L.
Flavin, George H.
Fleming, Thomas E.
Flood, Thomas P.
*Flowers, Thomas C., Jr.
*Fluke, William L.
Foley, Peter J.
*Ford, Frank R., Jr.
Ford, Raleigh R.
Fordham, Charles R.
Fordham, Warren, J.
Forrestal, Thomas P., Jr.
Forsberg, Robert C.
Forsman, Charles J.
Foster, Eugene V.
*Fowler, Norwood V., Jr.
*Fowlkes, John H.
Fox, John F.
Fraher, Jeremiah
Frailey, David A.
Francis, Donald E.
Frank, Nickolas J., III
Frankford, Marshall J.
Franks, Vernon M.
Frawley, Michael P.
Freakes, William
Fredda, Victor I., Jr.
*Frederick, Keith J.
Freeman, Richard C.
*Frick, Robert M.
Friedman, Ronald S.
Fulghum, Judson D.
Fuller, Gran F.
Fuller, Henry I.
Fuller, Robert H.
Furry, Richard P.
Gadbaw, Coleman J., Jr.
Gaines, Larry L.
*Gales, George M.
Galla, John H.
Gallagher, Francis J.
Gamboa, John F.
Gann, Dewey L.
Gard, Perry W., III
Gardner, John T., Jr.
Garland, Keith P.
Garrison, Donald W.
Garvey, William A.
Gary, Harris P., Jr.
Gassner, John A.
Gates, Hugh H.
Gatje, Peter H.
*Gaudette, Merton E., Jr.
Gauthier, Joseph A., Jr.
Gay, Warren L.
Gearhart, Richard D.
Gebhart, Kenneth L.
Gee, Kirby L. B.
*Geesaman, Wilbur L.
Gengenbach, Carl E.
Gentry, Kerry F.
George, Charles H.
*Geraldson, Elmer L.
Gerdes, Walter H.
Gessner, Bernard F., Jr.
Ghiselin, John S.
Gibbons, Thomas
Gibson, David B.
Gibson, Richard C., Jr.
*Gibson, Ronald C.
Gibson, William J.
Giddens, Jack L., Jr.
Gies, Leo C.
Giese, Carl E., Jr.
Giesea, James R.
Gifford, Laurence S.
*Gilbert, William G.
*Gillen, James F.
Gilles, John M.
Gilligan, John K.
Gilmore, Russell E.
Given, Philip R.
Gladin, Jack R.
Glaser, Frederick K.
Glenn, Walter H.
Gloeckner, Frank J., III
*Glossner, Locke H.
Goldenstein, Gordon R.
Goldsberry, Harold A.
Gollnick, Gregory E.
Golson, Richard L.
Good, Raymond L.
Goodie, Robert J.
Goodman, Michael "E"
Goodrow, John E.
Goodwin, James J.
Goodwin, James C., Jr.
Goodwin, James L.
Goolsby, John A.
Gordon, Bruce P.
Gorham, David S.
Gorton, Roderick M.
Gosebrink, Fred J.
Goss, Michael T.
Goth, Thomas S.
Goto, Irving K.
Gottlieb, Richard F.
Gottsche, Albert L., Jr.
Gough, Melvin N., Jr.
Goulding, Robert S.
Graceffa, Joseph D.
Graf, John G.
Graham, Jesse T.
Graham, Richard H.
Graham, William A., Jr.
Gram, Emil G.
Grande, Fiore
Granzin, Kent L.
Grasmuck, Robert J.
Gray, Robert
Green, Edward P.
Green, William H.
Greer, George B., Jr.
Greer, Marshall R., Jr.
Greer, Norman D.
Gregg, Samuel W.
Griffin, Hoke D.
Griffin, Samuel M., Jr.
Griffiths, John B.
Griggs, Eugene D.
Grimes, Lahon H.
Grimm, Thomas D.
Grocki, Chester J.
Groder, Richard A.
Gross, Alvin C., Jr.
Grosse, Robert G.
Guccione, Joseph, Jr.
Guffey, Earl W.
Guinn, Julian P.
Gunn, William T.
Guntrum, Edward J.
*Gurke, Donald L.
Gustafson, Kenneth R.
Gustaveson, Robert E.
Guthman, Stephen F.
Guthrie, James "J"
Guy, William E.
Haag, Ernest V.
Haesloop, Carl G., Jr.
Hagedorn, Edwin C.
Hagen, John W.
Hagen, Peter A.
Hale, James W., Jr.
Hale, William B.
Hall, Marshall B.
Hall, William R.
Haller, Hubert M.
Hallier, Manuel A.
Hallowell, Albert G.
Halm, Terrence W.
Halverson, Ralph A.
Hamblin, Donald W.
Hamernik, Joseph A.
Hamilton, Elliott M.
Hammett, Joseph H.
Hammond, Frederick I.
Hamrick, James M.
Hanna, Donald V.
Hansen, Harry J., III
Hansen, Herbert W., Jr.
Hanson, Richard E.
Hardy, Ray S., Jr.
Harkins, John J.
Harlen, Donald A.
*Harmon, Jimmy J.
Harned, David W.
*Harper, Glynn C.
Harper, Thomas J.
Harrell, Dowel W.
Harrell, Haywood H.
Harris, Jess M., III
Harrison, Charles E.
Harriss, David J.
Harshberger, Robert L.
*Hartman, Phillip G.
Harvey, David D.
Harvey, James E., III
Harvey, Wilford H. H.
Harwell, Layne H.
*Hassel, Rolland R.
Hastings, Ralph L.
Haugen, Adolph B.
Haughey, Charles H.
Hawkins, Clyde D.
Hawkins, James R.
Hawkins, James H., Jr.
Hawkins, Ray M.
Hawn, Jere R.
*Hawthorne, John L.
Hayden, James H.
Hayes, Charles R.
Hayes, William V.
Haynes, Gene B.
Haynes, Jerry R.
Hayward, Richard W.
Hebert, Larry
Heckathorn, Clair E.
Hedgepeth, Ernest L.
Heggie, David E.
Heimbuecher, Frederick J.
Heisler, Joseph F.
Hekman, Peter M., Jr.
Helweg, Otto J.
Henderson, Noel B.
Henderson, Arnold H.
Henderson, Joseph R., Jr.
Hendrix, Marion F.
Henris, James B.
Henry, Robert A.
*Henshall, John H.
Hensley, Doyle W.
Herman, Robert W.
Hernandez, Jesse J.
Herner, Ernest P., Jr.
Herold, Lance
Herrick, Austin W.
Herrin, William F.
Hess, Ronald A.
Hewell, John P.
*Heyduck, William R.
Hice, James R.
Higbee, Robert C.
Higgins, James D., Jr.
Higgins, John L., Jr.
Hildabrand, James P.
Hill, Glendon E.
Hill, Martin G.
Hines, Frederick A.
Hines, Rubert, Jr.
Hinson, Elbert F.
Hite, Tom B.
Hladik, Bernard L.
Hobbs, Watson L.
Hoch, James E.
Hodgens, Jack A.
Hodgkins, William S.
Hodkins, William F.
Hoeffel, Jan C.
Hoel, Jack I.
Hoff, Michael G.
Hofstedt, Peter D.
*Hogan, Donald F.
Hohmann, William D.
Holdeman, George R.
Holdorf, John C., Jr.
Holland, John D., Jr.
Hollister, Floyd H.
Holloman, Floyd W.
Holmberg, Bruce A.
Holmes, Dan N.
*Holmes, Edward C.
Holroyd, Robert E.
Holt, Fred C.
Holt, Jerry L.
Holthaus, Hollis L.
Holzhaeuser, Arthur E.
Homuth, Richard W.
Hopkins, Jae E.
Hord, Paul O.
Horn, Leslie J.
Horne, William F.
Hoskins, Mattison H.
Hospes, Alan E.
Hotard, William C.
Hough, Ronald W.
Houston, Guy M., Jr.
Howard, William S., III
Hubbard, Finley N., Jr.
Huddleston, Charles R., Jr.
Hudgins, Harry H.
Hudson, Alton R.
Huff, Walter E.
Hughes, Francis M., Jr.
Hula, Robert J.
Hulderman, George H.
Hulme, John B.
Hume, Thomas H.
Humiston, Norman L.
Hummer, John J.
Humphrey, Harold C.
Hunt, Alan G.
Hunter, Harold C.
Huntington, Stuart L.
*Huntress, Donald L., Jr.
Hurwitz, Paul M.
Hutchinson, Joseph D.
Hutchinson, Peter A.
Hutchinson, Robert A.
Hynes, Donald J.
Ianson, Lawrence W., Jr.
Illick, Walter S., Jr.
Immel, Arthur R.
Immerman, Arthur L.
Ingle, Carl E.
Ingram, Forney H., Jr.
Ingram, Ronald F.
Irvin, Robert M.
Ivey, Clarence G., Jr.
Izard, James
Jackson, Kermit J.
Jackson, Milton, Jr.
Jackson, Paul F.
Jackson, Perry Y., Jr.
Jackson, Warren D.
Jacobs, Paul H.
Jacobs, Thomas L.
*Jacobson, Mark A.
Jaeger, James W.
*Jakubczak, Jerome F
Jamroga, John J.
Janson, Thomas L.
Jasman, David A.
Jastremski, Richard E.
Jelks, John L., III
Jenkins, George J., Jr.
Jenkins, Roger G.
Jensen, Charles R.
John, Arthur D.
Johns, George A.
Johns, Robert L.
Johnson, David H.
Johnson, Everett L.
Johnson, Frank R., Jr.
Johnson, Lester O., Jr.
Johnson, Richard V.
Johnson, Ronald L.
Johnson, Robert D.
Johnson, Ronald G.

Johnston, William A.
Jokanovich, Peter
Jones, Arden W., F., Jr.
*Jones, Daniel P., Jr.
Jones, David L.
Jones, Donald W.
Jones, Eugene P.
Jones, Jenus "B"
Jones, Joseph U., Jr.
Jones, Melvin L.
Jones, Ralph W., Sr.
Jones, William R.
Jones, William L.
Joslin, Ivan L.
Judis, Billy F.
Juliano, Julius R.
Kallal, James J.
Kane, Fredric C., Jr.
*Karr, Harold L.
*Karr, Richard P.
Kauber, Rodney K.
*Kauffman, William A.
Kaufman, Jerald D.
Kaufman, Larry E.
Kazimir, Donald J.
Keays, William E.
Keen, Arthur E.
*Keesler, Byron H.
*Keiler, Joseph A.
Keim, Clarence H.
Keith, Frederick W., Jr.
Keith, Robert T. S., Jr.
Kele, Jordan, III
Kellems, Archie T.
Kelley, Robert W.
Kellum, William C.
Kelly, Charles W.
Kelly, Robert S.
Kelly, William S.
Kendall, Robert P.
Kennedy, Harry W.
Kennedy, Philip J.
Kenney, James A.
Kenney, William F.
*Kensinger, Roy A.
Kent, Philip S.
Kerby, Donald C.
*Kerman, William O., Jr.
Kersh, John M.
Kessler, Edward L., Jr.
Kesterson, Windolan W.
Kimmel, Leigh G.
Kineke, John I.
King, James W., Jr.
King, Jerry L.
*King, Larry N.
Kingston, Kenneth H.
Kinney, Gordon E.
Kirby, George W., Jr.
Kirby, Peter A.
Kirk, Ronald B.
*Kirk, William P., II
*Kirkconnell, William B.
Kistler, James L.
Kitchens, Charles R.
Klinedinst, Paul R., Jr.
Klipp, Eugene R.
*Knapp, Norman E., Jr.
Knight, Bobby W.
Knight, Walter E.
Koch, Frank J.
Koenig, John W.
Kofoed, Robert M.
*Kolb, John R.
Konkel, Harry W.
Kornegay, Robert R.
Korslund, Robert G.
Korzinek, Charles J.
Kosoff, Tracy M.
Kraft, Jacob C.
Kramer, James S.C., Jr.
Kreitner, Clinton W.
Krueger, Orton G.
Krumrei, William H.
Kryway, John T.
Kuechmann, Jerome A.
Kuehn, Gordon N.
Kufahl, Marvin J.
*Kuhn, Joseph L.
Kuhneman, Martin F.
Kunz, Chester A., Jr.
Lachance, George M., Jr.
*Lamaur, Virgil J.
Lamb, Thomas J.
Lamoureux, Robert J.
Landers, John D.
Landrum, Raymond G.
Lane, Robert E.
Lane, Robert L.
*Langford, Richard A.
Larson, Charles R.
Larson, Jerold J.
Larson, Lawrence P.
Larzelere, Charles W., III
Laseter, Jesse L.
Latorra, Benny V.
Lawrence, Charles M.
Lawrence, Kent B.
Lawrence, Robert D.
Laws, Charles F.
Lawson, John R.
*Lax, Lee C.
Lazor, Edward T.
Leake, Milton H.
*Leake, Robert W.
Leary, John A., II
Leber, Jean R.
Lecour, Richard M.
Ledbetter, Wayne H.
Lee, Arthur R.
*Lee, Bobby C.
Lee, Robert C.
Legrande, Jake G., Jr.
Leiser, Edward L.
*Leroy, Franklin T.
Leslie, William H.
Leszcynski, Vincent J.
Levaugh, Richard C.
Levin, Roger L.
Lewis, Frederick E.
Lightstone, John L.
Lima, John A.
Lindsey, Eugene E., Jr.
Lindstrom, Axel L.
*Lineback, Harry W.
Lipman, Joseph R.
*Lipske, Robert S.
Lisle, George F.
*Livens, Charles H.
Livingston, Waylon A.
Livzley, James G.
Lobb, Clarence E.
Logan, Robert S., Jr.
Loker, Robert E.
Long, David E.
Longo, Anthony J.
Longton, Joseph N.
Loomis, David W.
Loonam, Walter L., Jr.
Lorts, Bryan M., Jr.
Lorusso, John M.
*Louis, David R., Jr.
Love, Philip E.
Lovejoy, Richard E.
Lovitt, Lewis D., Jr.
Lowe, Larry T.
Luallen, Joseph H., Jr.
Lubbers, Gary W.
Luders, Ernest C.
Luhrs, Larry L.
Lukenas, Leo A.
Lupfer, Alexander M., Jr.
Lusk, James R.
Lyon, Hylan B., Jr.
Lyons, Michael D.
Lysaght, Claude O.
Mabrey, Richard L.
MacAuley, William F.
MacGregor, Robert M.
Machowski, Walter
MacKenzie, Franklin F.
Mackey, James A.
MacKinnon, John H.
MacLean, Rupert E., Jr.
MacNeill, Donald W.
MacNintch, Donald A.
Madden, Jerome T.
Madsen, Marvin D.
Magee, Francis H.
Magee, James A.
Magee, Robert F.
Mahoney, Robert D.
Major, James A.
Malina, William E.
Malone, Robert S.
Maloney, Thomas C.
Manahan, Maurice H.
Mangiafico, Anthony
Manley, James F.
Mansfield, Joseph S., Jr.
Marcoux, Russell L.
Marr, William T.
*Marshall, Harold C., Jr.
Marshall, Wallace W., Jr.
Martella, Alex A., Jr.
Martin, Bruce E.
Martin, Carl M.
Martin, Glenn R.
*Martin, James J., Jr.
Martin, Richard W.
Martyniak, Richard
Martz, Bruce D., Jr.
Mason, Frank H., III
*Masson, Robert H.
Massa, Lawrence L.
Massey, Lance B.
Masson, Robert H.
Matheson, John W.
Mathis, Elliott L.
Mattingly, Thomas K., II
*Maviglia, Frank A.
Maxton, James C.
May, Wesley
Maye, George T.
Mayers, Daniel F.
*Mazeika, Robert G.
McBee, Albert E.
McCain, John S., III
McCandless, Bruce, II
McCarter, Jonathan C.
McCartney, James R., III
McCarty, Herman L.
McCarty, Kenneth R.
McClure, Kenneth G.
McConnell, Harry E.
McCoole, Raymond A.
McCoy, Charles "H"
*McCroskey, Bobby R.
McCullogh, Martin L.
McDermott, James J.
McDonald, George B.
McElroy, Robert F.
McFadyen, John B.
McFarlane, James W.
McGinty, Douglas "R"
McGrath, Paul N.
*McGruther, Gordon T.
McIntyre, William J.
*McKee, Junious A., Jr.
McKee, Richard G.
McKenzie, Gene T.
*McKinnon, Patrick C.
McLane, Michael J.
McLaughlin, Walter E.
McLaughlin, Truman J.
McLaurin, Kenneth E.
McLocklin, Francis C.
*McMahon, Marvin R., Jr.
McMichael, John C., Jr.
McMillan, John G.
McNelly, Allen D.
McNergney, Robert P.
McNulla, James E., III
McNulty, George R.
McPadden, Joseph G.
*McRight, Clarence, Jr.
McVadon, Eric A., Jr.
McVicker James L.
Meador, Lee M.
Medlin, William R.
Meese, Richard E.
*Megonigle, Carl E.
Meinig, George R., Jr.
Meixell, Robert C.
Melillo, Michael J., Jr.
Melonson, George G.
Melville, Reid T.
*Meneke, Kenneth N.
Menzel, Herbert E., Jr.
Merriken, Stuart A.
Merritt, Ernest A.
Merry, Theodore R.
Metzger, Delbert S.
Meyer, Dale A.
*Meyer, Donald C.
Meyer, Donald J.
Michels, Francis B.
Mickle, Clinton J.
Middleton, Wesley L.
Midgarden, Peter N.
Midtvedt, Harold L.
*Miklas, Ramutis K.
Miller, Aloysius R.
Miller, Billy G.
Miller, Charles L.
Miller, Clarence D.
Miller, David B.
Miller, Douglas A.
Miller, Edward A.
Miller, Francis J.
Miller, Henry W., Jr.
Miller, John A.
*Miller, Larry S.
Miller, Latnay H., Jr.
Miller, Paul J.
*Miller, Robert R.
*Miller, Robert D.
Miller, Robert L.
Miller, Wayne W.
Mills, Charles M.
Milne, Robert D., Jr.
Miltenberger, James R.
Mitchell, Clarence E.
Mitchell, Kenneth F.
Mitchell, Walter F.
Moffett, Ora M.
Moll, Herbert
Moore, George E.
Moore, Jack R.
*Moore, James S.
Moore, Leonard M.
Moore, William N.
Moran, Francis J., Jr.
Moran, John W., Jr.
Moreland, Floyd E.
Morgan, Bobby S.
Morgan, David E.
Morgan, James L.
Morgan, Kenneth R.
Morris, Clyde C.
Morrison, Irving J.
Morrison, Jerry E.
Morrison, Orrin L.
Morrow, Billy R.
Morse, William B.
Mortenson, William P.
Moser, Robert L.
Mott, George E., III
Mowery, Russell V.
Moynihan, John J.
Mueller, Ermett T.
Mueller, Lincoln H.
Mullaly, William J.
Muller, Deighton J.
Mullin, John J., Jr.
*Murdoch, Thomas M.
Murphree, Tom S.
*Murphy, Norbert P.
*Murray, Gerald W.
*Murray, Gordon L., Jr.
Murray, Jack L.
Musgrove, Robert W.
Myers, George D., II
Myers, Russell D.
Myers, William L.
Nageotte, Richard R.
Nagle, Chester A.
Nakagawa, Gordon R.
Nance, Ivan V. A., Jr.
Narro, Arthur T.
Nash, Norman B.
Nazak, Robert M.
Nedry, Robert D.
*Nelson, Henry E.
Nelson, Mark V. V.
*Nelson, Richard M.
*Nesbit, Arthur M.
Newcomb, David A.
Newell, James F., Jr.
Newlon, Benjamin F.
Newton, George B., Jr.
Nicholas, Jack R., Jr.
Nichols, John B., III
*Nichols, William T.
Nicholson, Walker D.
Nickerson, John P.
Nicolls, Robert P.
Niedbala, Joseph T., Jr.
*Nolan, Bruce F.
Nollan, Walter J.
*Noonan, David J.
Nordhaugen, Lyle G.
Norfleet, Eric H.
Norris, Joseph P.
North, William J.
Norton, John H.
Norton, Lee E., Jr.
*Notbohm, Lester W.
Novak, Howard M.
Nulty, John L., Jr.
Nutting, Roger M.
Nystrom, Peter C.
Oakey, Eugene S.
Oates, William B., Jr.
O'Beirne, Frank, Jr.
O'Connor, Henry S., Jr.
O'Connor, Michael G., II
O'Donnell, John T.
*Odor, David R.
Oker, Albert C.
Oldham, Edwin W.
*O'Leary, John P., Jr.
Oleson, Charles A.
Oliver, Eugene E.
Oliver, William H.
Olivera, Clifford E.
Olmstead, Clifford D.
Olmstead, Edward A.
*Olsen, Kenneth A.
Olsen, Peter B.
Olsen, Roy C.
Olson, Donald A.
Olsonoski, Richard L.
O'Malley, Thomas E.
Omberg, William F.
Oncea, George
Ondishko, Christian N.
O'Neal, Edward A.
O'Neil, William A.
O'Neill, Cornelius T.
O'Neill, Thomas E.
Onorato, Dominick
Opheim, David G.
Orgill, Dale V.
Orme, Douglas L.
*Osberg, John W., III
Osborn, Jack D.
Osborne, James T.
Osborne, Robert B.
Ostrander, Peter H.
Otto, Carl H.
*Overholser, Merlin K.
Overton, Dudley R.
Owens, Ramon R.
Pabst, Howard L.
Page, Fred A.. Jr.
Page, Richard L.
*Paine, Paul W.
Painter, Philip C.
Palmer, Hugh L.
Palmer, James A., Jr.
Panzarino, Joseph N.
Paradis, Paul A.
Parker, Allen L.
*Parker, Donald F.
Parks, Terrence J.
Parks, William H.
Parrish, David F.
Parshall, Walter E.
Pass, Robert L.
Pate, Zachariah T., Jr.
Patella, Lawrence M.
Patrick, Meredith W.
Patrick, William D.
Patterson, Richard F.
*Paty, Charles R.
Payne, Bunyan
Pearce, Michael A.
Pederson, Charles L.
*Peechatka, Larry O.
Peele, Charles R., Jr.
Pellerin, Alfred E., III
Pelton, Lawrence E.
Pendleton, David L.
Pendley, William T.
Penny, Lawrence A.
Penta, Albert M.
Pentz, Louis E.
Peri, Victor P.
Perkins, Robert S., Jr.
Perkins, Russell O.
Peters, John D.
Peters, Milton G.
Peters, William J., III
Peterson, Carl J.
Peterson, Charles B.
Petraccoro, Frank M.
Petrin, John R.
Pettit, John T., Jr.
Pfister, Donald L.
Phelps, George T.
Phillips, Giles R.
*Phillips, Ronald J.
Phillips, Robert E.
Phillips, Robert W., Jr.
Phillips, Raymond C.
Pidgeon, Robert H.
Pierce, John P., Jr.
*Pietkiewicz, Wesley
*Pilcher, Eugene T.
Pinson, Peter C.
Pinto, John M., Jr.
Piper, James S.
Pisano, Patrick A.
Piskorski, Stanley
Pitman, John R.
Pittenger, Richard F.
Pivarnik, William D.
Pizinger, Donald D.
Plum, George E.
Poarch, Charles E.
Poarch, William H.
Poe, Gary R.
Poindexter, John M.
Pollock, Grant H.
Polski, Paul A.
Poole, Robert
*Poore, James S.
Popa, Emil
Poremba, Stanley, Jr.
Port, Joseph C.
*Porter, Donald R.
Porter, Gene H.
Porter, John J.
Porterfield, Glen C.
Potter, John L.
Powell, Frederick C.
Powell, Ralph E.
Powelson, Robert W.
Powers, Richard M.
Prather, Robert J., Jr.
Pratt, Byron C.
*Pratt, John L.
Prebeck, Carl A.
*Pressly, James M.

Price, Billie L.
Price, Robert P.
Priebe, Terry R.
Prince, William G.
Pritchard, William J.
Proctor, Robert R.
Pulling, Wayne E.
*Purnell, Clement I.
Putnam, Wayne A.
Pyatt, Arnold F.
Pyle, Ronald W.
Quelland, Norman R.
Quinn, Eugene F.
Quinn, Richard H.
Rachap, Allan
Raczek, Raymond J.
Radigan, John M.
Radziej, Thomas J.
Ranes, George J.
Rasmussen, John D.
Rasmussen, Keith L.
*Rauber, Carl A., Jr.
Raudio, Victor J.
Rawcliffe, Leonard H.
Ray, Samuel F.
Redding, Lloyd S.
Redford, Maury E., Jr.
Reed, Calvin H.
Reed, John C.
*Reed, Robert A., II
Reed, Roberts V., Jr.
*Reed, William T.
Reeger, Harold L.
Regal, Peter R., Jr.
Rehder, William A.
Reich, William F.
Reid, Lawrence R., Jr.
Reid, William F.
Reilmann, Theodore T.
Reinarz, Roy L., Jr.
Reinhardt, Richard L.
Reister, Walter A.
*Remoll, Charles M.
Rennie, John C.
*Rentle, Norman L.
Rentsch, Russell B.
*Retz, Michael J.
Retzlaff, Robert R.
Reuscher, David L.
Reveal, Leonard T.
Reynolds, Bernard J.
Rhodes, Basil R.
Rhodes, Cecil O.
Rice, Bill B.
Rice, Dennis H.
Rice, Lloyd K.
*Rich, Roger L., Jr.
Richard, Ronald D.
Richards, Thomas E.
Riches, Raymond C.
Rickman, Roy L.
Rigdon, William H.
Riggs, Donald E.
Rikli, Albert F.
Ringler, Arnold H.
*Riordan, William P.
*Ripple, James E., Jr.
Rische, Roy W.
Ritch, Thomas J.
Rivera, Daniel R.
Roach, Alan G.
Robbins, Berton A., III
Robbins, John E.
Robbins, William T., Jr.
Roberts, Gary K.
*Roberts, James H.
*Roberts, Jack L.
Roberts, Joel T.
*Robins, Harry B., Jr.
Robinson, Kenneth G.
Robison, Delma C.
Rocray, Samuel E.
Roder, Peter S.
Rogers, Richard D.
Rohrbough, John D.
Ronken, Roland H.
Rorer, William H., III
Rosen, Robert S.
*Ross, James W.
Rossi, James A.
*Rothrauff, Thomas B.
*Roubik, Arthur F.
Rowden, Donald R.
Rowe, David V.
Rowe, Robert W.
Rowell, Glendon
Rowley, Cornelius M.
Roy, Arthur
Royse, Perry R., Jr.
Rubel, Bernard J.
Rueckert, Nils
Rufe, Robert W.
Runzo, Melvin A.
*Ruona, Keith V.
Russ, Carl F.
Russell, Harold B.
Ruth, John
Ruwwe, George R.
Ryan, Bernard A., Jr.
Ryan, Walter R., Jr.
Sachse, William R.
Sample, Bobbie L.
Sanderson, David B.
Sansom, Robert G., Jr.
Sauer, Robert C.
Sause, Robert J.
Scanlon, Edward P.
*Scantlin, William S.
Scarbrough, Vernon R.
Scarbrough, William C., Jr.
Schaaf, Gordon M.
Schaefer, Edward E.
*Schaffer, Ruben W.
*Schermer, Richard L.
Schlang, Lawrence H.
Schlauder, Wallace J.
*Schloemer, Robert D.
Schmidt, John C.
Schnepper, Ronald A.
Schoen, Charles F.
Schoenfeld, Jay K.
Schramm, William G.
Schroeder, Stephen F.
Schultz, Paul M.
Schultz, Robert F.
Schultz, Robert J.
*Schulz, Russell K.
Schulz, William J.
Schupp, Ronald J.
Schwanemann, William L.
*Scott, Milton M.
Scott, Wayne E., Jr.
Scram, Andrew D.
Seeberger, John J.
Segelbacher, George F.
*Seidel, Melvin L.
Sellden, Carl I.
Sendek, Joseph M.
*Seng, William R.
Setterberg, Edwin P.
Severson, Laverne E.
Shafer, Jack L.
*Shand, Richard M.
Shane, Louis P.
Shapero, Allen L.
Sharp, Stanley E.
Shattuck, George W.
Shearer, Robert L. I.
Sheehan, James E.
Sheets, William A.
Shelton, James W.
Shepherd, Harold D.
Sheppard, Donald D.
Sherman, John E.
Shibsted, Gordon D.
Shiflett, Edward E.
*Shoemaker, John C.
Shope, Theodore L.
Shoquist, David R.
Showman, Loyd "C", Jr.
Shriver, Norman W.
Shriver, Robert A.
Sickman, John F., Jr.
*Siegwarth, Charles E., Jr.
Silldorff, James S.
*Sillery, Charles D.
*Silvey, William E., Jr.
*Simmons, James L.
Simonson, Gerald L.
Siqveland, Ralph L.
Sisk, Kenneth H.
Sissel, George A.
Skezas, George C.
Skiles, Alvin V., III
Skinner, Albert G.
Skrukrud, Clare E.
Slater, Charles E.
Slaven, Robert K., Jr.
Slayman, Kelson E.
Slizewski, Raymond
Smarz, John, Jr.
Smedberg, Edwin B.
Sminkey, Robert L.
Smith, Bryant K.
Smith, Charles J.
Smith, Charles D.
*Smith, David R.
Smith, Frank W.
Smith, Gordon M.
Smith, James C.
Smith, Kenneth M.
Smith, Nepier V.
*Smith, Paul D.
Smith, Richard F.
Smith, Richard F.*
Smith, Roger A., Jr.
Smith, Russell A.
Smith, Samuel
Smith, Thomas A.
Smith, Tom R.
Smith, Wallace H.
Smith, William B.
Smith, William L.
Smolnik, Daniel
Smotherman, Thomas A., Jr.
Smyth, Lorne H.
Snow, Barry I.
Sorensen, Howard W.
Sorensen, Richard S.
Sorna, Ronald E.
Soules, Charles W.
Spadoni, Eugene A.
Spane, William T., Jr.
*Spencer, Thomas J.
Spillos, George B.
Spires, Fred, Jr.
*Spivey, Walter H.
Sprague, Gordon P., Jr.
Spraker, Irvin L.
Spydell, Robert E.
Stack, Richard B.
*Stark, William R.
Starrin, Roy E.
Stavropoulos, Ernest G.
*Stebbins, Donald J.
Steckler, Joseph L.
Steed, Samuel
Steele, Robert J.
Stehlin, Donald A.
*Stephens, Melvin P., Jr.
Stephenson, Graves B.
Steveley, Robert V.
Stibler, Robert W.
Stiff, Herbert L.
Stiller, David J.
*Stiller, Paul F.
Stinson, William O.
St. Michel, Kenneth A.
Stockton, Cecil G.
Stokes, Carl J., Jr.
Stone, Robert L.
*Storey, Edward L.
Story, Roy K.
Stoudt, William E.
*Stred, Gordon J.
Street, Robert W.
Street, William L.
Streeter, Gregory F.
*Stringer, Kenneth H.
*Strole, Dennis S.
Stryker, Josiah D.
Stubbs, David W.
Stubbs, George R.
Stumcke, Frederick B., Jr.
Sturgill, Jack D.
Sturr, Henry D., Jr.
Suit, James H.
Sullivan, Donald K.
*Sullivan, Gerald F.
Summers, Carl R.
Surles, Glynn
Surratt, Henry C., Jr.
Surrells, Roy E.
Susalla, Ernest F.
Sutton, Jack D.
*Swain, Donald D.
Swain, John R.
Swanson, Alasdair E.
Swanson, Ronald R.
Swarthwood, Willis M.
*Swendsen, Donald M.
Swisher, Dale W.
Swope, John P.
Sword, Curtis S., Jr.
Symons, Harry, Jr.
*Szczecinski, Joseph L.
Tabb, James W.
Taft, Denis J.
Tallant, James G.
Talmadge, James T., Jr.
*Tarkowski, Ronald C.
Tarquin, Donald C.
Taylor, Brent W.
Taylor, Donald A.
Taylor, James T., Jr.
Taylor, James R. C.
Taylor, Philip H.
*Taylor, Thomas P.
Taylor, Walter T.
Teagle, Harvey M., Jr.
Tedder, James E.
Tennent, Richard "E", Jr.
Tew, Ben R.
Thacher, Eric F.
Therrien, Leo E., Jr.
Thiemann, Henry J. F., Jr.
Thomas, Angus B.
Thomas, Arthur C.
*Thomas, David D.
Thomas, Edgar A.
Thomas, Jack R.
*Thomas, John D.
Thomas, John C.
Thomas, Kinnison H.
Thomas, Robert H.
Thomas, William L., Jr.
Thompson, Albert R.
Thompson, Charles R.
Thompson, Durwood O.
*Thompson, Glynn M.
*Thompson, Tyler H.
*Tibbatts, Thomas N.
Tingle, Adrian A.
Tisdale, Robert W.
Tomcavage, Norman J.
Tomko, James J.
Top, Thomas W.
Topping, Robert L.
Toy, George E.
Trask, Robert J.
Trayer, Edgar G.
Trepanier, Joseph L.
Treptow, Harold C.
Trickel, Norman E.
Triebes, Carl J., Jr.
*Triemer, William L.
Tripp, James D.
Troolin, Leslie P.
*Trout, Michael D.
Troutman, Darrell C.
Troutman, Fred G.
Trumbull, Thomas O.
Tucker, Derry E.
Tucker, John A.
Tucker, Paul C.
Tuft, Markham D.
Turlay, William E.
Turner, Danny W.
Turner, Harris O.
Turner, Lewis D.
Uhlhorn, Walker S., Jr.
Usalis, Jerome T.
*Vaiana, James G.
*Valentine, Harold K.
VanHoose, James B.
VanLandingham, Richard D.
VanMoppes, Russell G.
VanPetten, Thomas L.
VanWormer, Thomas P.
Vargo, Henry G.
Vaughan, Robert R.
Veasey, Guy D.
*Veenstra, Robert M.
Venable, Robert L.
Verner, Michael J.
Vettese, Joseph J.
Viccellio, John S.
Vick, John C.
Victor, Alfred E.
Vinson, John T.
*Vold, Almer C.
Voll, Matthew W.
*Voss, John W.
Wachter, Gary L.
Wade, Fredric J.
Wales, Frederick L.
Walker, Dodson D., Jr.
Walker, Stewart F.
Wall, "N" "T" Washburn
*Walsh, Robert F.
Walters, Robert L.
Walton, David M.
Wandell, John J., Jr.
*Wanglie, Eugene E.
Wareham, John M., Jr.
*Warner, James S.
Warren, Robert L.
*Wasloski, John E.
Watkins, Robert M.
Watson, Ian M.
Weaver, Daniel C.
Weaver, Robert E.
Weber, Edwin E.
Webster, Stephen T.
*Weeks, James W.
Weeks, Theodore G., Jr.
Weibly, Robert L.
Weigand, James G.
*Weiler, Antone M.
Weir, Robert H.
Weller, Wallace L.
Welles, Bradford W.
Wells, Robert D.
Wenn, Lloyd E.
Werner, Thomas A.
West, Edward C.
West, Eugene H.
West, James F.
West, Ralph W., Jr.
Westberry, Willie
Westbrook, Dale A.
Westphal, Kenneth A.
Whalen, Thomas A.
Whaley, Orville R., Jr.
Wharton, Christopher H.
Wharton, James B.
*Wheeler, George C.
White, Alfred N.
*White, Charles E.
White, Clayton R.
*White, Ervin E.
White, Howard G.
White, Robert
White, Theodore C.
Whitehead, James L.
Whitmire, Robert L.
Wiedemann, Franz R.
*Wiedenbauer, Fred
Wiener, Thomas F.
Wilburn, Donald L.
Wilcox, Bruce A.
Wilcox, John B.
Wilcox, John C.
Wilcox, Philip R.
Wilder, Wallace G.
Wiles, Samuel M.
Wilhelmy, Christopher B.
Wilkerson, Charles A.
Wilkinson, Alan C.
Williams, Claude E.
*Williams, Eldon G.
Williams, George W.
Williams, James D.
Williams, James R.
Williams, James E.
Williams, Kenneth W.
Williams, Orville M.
Williams, Patrick H.
Williams, Theodore M.
Williams, Wayne A.
Williams, Willis T.
Williams, William A.
Williams, William C.
Wills, Everette D.
*Wilson, Claude D., Jr.
Wilson, Harold I.
Wilson, James S., Jr.
Wilson, Richard J.
Wilson, Robert D.
Wingo, Robert F.
Withers, William Z.
Withsosky, James H.
Wold, Robert M.
*Wolfe, Philip W.
Wolfskill, Donald A.
Wood, Leland E., Jr.
Woodbury, Michael G.
Woodley, Richard P.
Woods, Daniel C.
Woods, Robert N., Jr.
Woodworth, Bruce M.
Woody, Melvin R.
Worden, Everett F.
Worel, George L.
Wright, James C.
*Wright, Lee F.
Wright, Leo C.
Wright, Thomas T.
*Wurth, John G.
Wynne, Allen D.
Yarbrough, Charles R.
Yasuk, John, Jr.
Yates, Robert H.
Yeager, Robert D.
Yoes, Ernest C.
Yost, Albert N.
Youmans, John L.
Young, Bobbie R.
Young, Delmar D.
Young, Thomas E.
*Young, Wayne G.
Young, William H.
Young, William K., Jr.
Zanin, Norman R.
Zimits, John J.
Zon, Ernest
Zorn, Nicholas D.
Zorn, Robert M., Jr.
Zuffinetti, Mario J.
Zwart, Ronald P.

The following-named women officers of the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of commander in the line and staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Francis, Dorothy H.
Stewart, Jean M.

SUPPLY CORPS

Bell, Natalie T.

The following-named women officers of the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant commander in the line, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Deerkop, Barbara J.
*Gravatt, Margaret J.
Hamilton, Frances
Harrison, Mary L.
Hopf, Margaret E.
Marshall, Alice C.
McMillan, Margaret A.
Meining, Olive A.
Thompson, Allyn R.
Walsh, Rosemarie C.

The following-named women officers of the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the line, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Calene, Mary L.
Clark, Patricia A.
Costas, Maria I.
Elpern, Shirley B.
Field, Grace L.
Fish, Paula G.
Fulton, Sandra J.
Johnston, Edith E.
Kirk, Mary E.
McDermott, Mary M.
McGowan, Letitia M.
Mombrum, Iola M.
Reardon, Helen J.
Sullivan, Jean P.
Tombes, Suzette B.
Two, Doreen J.
Wadsworth, Evelyn C.

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line and staff corps, as indicated, subjected to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Alkire, James C.
Armbruster, William A.
Been, John T., II
Brown, Dale S., Jr.
Cameron, Ronald D.
Davidson, Donald D.
Dougherty, J. Alvin
Fox, Sharon L.
Franklin, Ernest C.
Gustaveson, Robert E.
Hahn, Donald L.
Ives, David W.
Ledrew, Carol S.
Mascola, Richard F., Jr.
Milanytch, Nickolas I.
Moore, David W.
Pidgeon, Edward T., Jr.
Pinson, Firman L.
Poff, David E.
Schluntz, Frank R.
Schwanemann, William L.
Stout, Richard D.
Templeton, Robert N.
Webber, George E.
Wright, William A.

SUPPLY CORPS

Blackburn, Albert E.
Bush, William J.
Jones, Everett L., III
Keiser, James A.
Kenin, David
Parker, Charles E.
Verplaetse, Ronald A.

NURSE CORPS

O'Neal, Eleanor D.

Jimmy J. King, for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant commander in the Medical Corps of the U.S. Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

*Charles B. Mear, for temporary promotion to the grade of chief warrant officer, W-2 in the U.S. Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grades indicated:

LINE

To be captains

Holmquist, Carl O.
Peet, Raymond E.
Calvert, James F.
Anderson, William R.
McKee, Craig
Tuttle, John E.
Bailey, Max P., Jr.
Garver, Donald L.
Montgomery, John A., Jr.
Gibbons, John P.
Sherman, Vining A.
Wirth, Hubert P.
Greenlee, Pleas E., Jr.
Norton, Mohl C., Jr.
Celustka, Robert J.
Allen, Roger H.
Kohler, Karl B.
Grainger, Charles H.
Dye, Philip G.
Harris, John S.
Laurich, James A.
Gladding, Everett B.
McDowell, William R., Jr.
Dahlstrom, Vincent A.
Piper, Max A.
Cantlon, Clifton E.
Belcher, Roy S., Jr.
Russell, Charles E.
Wilbur, Charles C.
Griffin, Charles D.
Pitts, Raymond L.
Lahodney, William J., Jr.
Weissenborn, Donald E.
Craven, William H., Jr.
Sisley, William R.
Tallman, Humphrey L.
Chick, Lewis W.
Neill, Dugald T.
Price, William McK.
Runk, Theodore W.
Azab, John C.
Ginn, Wilbur N., Jr.
Davis, Lewis E., Jr.
Lee, Florn L.
Keys, James E.
Mansueto, Edmund J.
Woosley, David G.
Bill, Wells R., Jr.
Soll, Orlan A.
Murphy, Pleasant L.
Smith, Leroy P.
Williams, Joe W., Jr.
Kendrick, David C.
Clifford, John K.
Evans, Jack L.
Allman, John C.
Johnson, Ace
Thompson, Robert A.
Savadkin, Lawrence
Bunting, Curtis W.
Cramer, Donald S.
Hankey, John R.
Hutchinson, John L.
Bennett, Walter F. V.
Zigler, Frederick W.
Lemmon, Robert "H"
Dickerson, Vincent M.
Black, Robert G.
Eggeman, Benjamin R., Jr.
Warren, Harry S.
Romanick, Frank M.
Devine, Richard O.
McNees, Richard B.
Caton, Clifford E.
Cook, James L., Jr.
Brink, John D.
Saylor, Philip G.
Lowentrout, Jack L.
Hartley, Gordon E.
Blair, Alfred F.
Vincent, Manuel daC.
Elliott, Ralph E., Jr.
Kelly, William W.
Rawls, William A.
Savage, Jimmie E.
Shireman, Richard H., Jr.
Cason, Arthur C., Jr.
Suerstedt, Henry, Jr.
Nasworthy, George F.
Whited, Ciro N. V., Jr.
Pugh, Paul E.
Jones, Bennie W., Jr.
Dietz, Willard D.
Brango, Nicholas
Schroeder, Charles J.
Hunt, Robert J.
Forrest, Gaylord T.
Forrer, Samuel W.
Thompson, Harley F.
Tanner, Charles S.
Myers, Robert I.
Sigley, Claredon H.
Timmes, Francis X.
Thienes, Robert L.
Carmody, Martin D.
Doner, Landis E.
Haszard, Harry A.
Dillard, Chester L.
Fraser, LeRoy B., Jr.
Friedman, Malcolm C.
Halpin, Paul DeM.
Boe, Nils W.
Seitz, Eugene W.
Smith, James W.
Vita, Harold E.
Krantz, William F.
Erwin, Virgil A., Jr.

To be captains (Medical Corps)

Muehe, Charles C.
Curtis, Donald L.
Garland, Charles M., Jr.
Davis, Harold A.

To be captains (Supply Corps)

ReDavid, Louis F.
Angelopoulos, John C.
Ironmonger, Richard
Meilandt, Ralph L.
O'Toole, Charles W.
Ellis, Robert L.
Anderson, Niels H.
Botkin, Dwight M.
Crane, Frank E., Jr.
Hennessy, James L. F.
Graham, Jack L.
Bjorlo, Loyd S.
Power, Richard T.
Smith, John D.
McNeill, Dan C.
Zerfoss, Allan B.

To be captain (Chaplain Corps)

Buckingham, Herbert W.

To be captains (Civil Engineer Corps)

Urquhart, James B., Jr.
Young, James C.
Smisek, Joseph J.

To be captains (Dental Corps)

Parks, Clyde R.
Castner, David V., Jr.
Caldwell, Warren C., Jr.
Valentin, Enrique, Jr.
Scofield, Henry H., Jr.
Kaller, Charles E.
Wood, Quentin L.
Pape, Thomas J.
Koch, John A.

To be commanders (line)

Abele, Stanley F.
Abernathy, William F.
Adelfson, Norman O.
Agness, Robert J.
Alden, John D.
Alden, Franklin H.
Alldredge, Walter W.
Allen, Bain S.
Anglemyer, Robert E.
Athow, James K.
Aydelott, William "L"
Bagby, Lee A.
Baker, Lawrence H., Jr.
Baribault, Arthur B.
Barnette, James B.
Barnes, Robert J.
Bates, Edwin J.
Batten, Hugh N.
Baumgaertel, Lawrence F.
Beaudoin, Jerome W.
Beaulieu, Maurice E.
Bell, George M.
Bennett, Darrell "C"
Bergen, Franklin S.
Bergquist, Alvin C.
Berkey, Ward L.
Bixler, Jene M.
Black, Sherman C.
Blumenthal, Stanley H.
Bohlken, John R.
Borley, Clarence A.
Boudinot, Edgar J., Jr.
Bouldin, James M.
Boutwell, Emmett B.
Bowen, Charles H., Jr.
Bowen, James W.
Bradford, Charles R.
Braid, Herbert C.
Brender, Bernard W.
Brennan, William F.
Briggs, Claude "M", III
Brooks, Charles L.
Brown, Melvy M.
Brown, Russell E.
Buker, George E.
Burkhart, Calvin
Burns, Robert J.
Bushy, Willard L.
Butler, Thomas E.
Call, Melvin E.
Callahan, John C.
Capozzalo, Daniel S.
Carlson, Nils A. A.
Carlson, Elmer "P"
Carroll, Billy
Carroll, Charles H.
Carter, Harry E.
Cassidy, Melvin W.
Cerney, Ralph S.
Chanik, Evan M.
Chartier, Wilfred G.
Chellew, Homer W.
Cheuvront, Harlan R.
Christiansen, John S.
Clack, Bryce L.
Clapp, Walter C.
Clark, Richard M.
Cleland, Henry G., Jr.
Cobb, Paul W.
Cockrell, Fred T.
Coe, Carl W.
Cole, "R" "K" Stewart
Coleman, Robert G., Jr.
Coleman, Joseph L.
Collins, Walter V.
Collier, James R.
Constance, Walter E.
Cooke, Emmett M., Jr.
Cooper, Parker C.
Corson, Ralph W.
Cory, Kenneth "J"
Cote, Joseph J.
Cousins, John E.
Craig, James R.
Crawford, James H., Jr.
Crosby, Derrill P.
Curtin, Robert H.
Curtis, Theodore E.
Cyr, Hector C.
Czerwinski, Walter J.
Dace, Carl C.
Davenport, John A.
Davidson, Paul D.
Davis, John W.
Davis, Richard L.
Davis, Richard M.
Delaney, John A.
Desel, Robert F. P.
Dewing, Lawrence A.
Dickerson, Claude L.
Dittler, Harry C., Jr.
Ditto, Carl B.
Dooge, "B" Russell, Jr.
Dooley, Raymond J.
Dorchester, Chester H.
Dow, John F.
Downey, Richard S.
Downing, Robert C.
Drew, Brand W.
Duhon, Willis P.
Duncan, Richard E.
Dunlap, Larry E.
Dunn, Charles A., Jr.
Dunn, Richard J.
Duquette, Herbert E., Jr.
Dwyer, Thomas L.
D'zamba, John A.
Eason, William R.
Eckert, Robert V.
Edwards, Lewis L.
Edwards, William E.
English, Addison R.
Erickson, Jack L.
Erwin, Mason O.
Even, Glen M.
Everson, John K.
Fairbanks, George W.
Farmer, Roy E.
Farrell, Ted L.
Faulk, Joseph R.
Feaster, Joseph E.
Featherstone, Thomas A.
Feely, William F.
Feliz, Jack M.
Fields, Thomas
Fierce, Vernon R., Jr.
Fitzwater, Harry E., Jr.
Fledderjohn, Donald W.
Fletcher, Keith G.
Foley, John J.
Folsom, Riley T.
Ford, "J" "D"
Forrester, David L., Jr.
Fortner, Leslie O.
Franklin, George E.
Franz, Edward D.
Freeman, John T.
Freeman, John K.
French, Dean M.
Frink, Clifford L.
Gallagher, Paul M.
Gay, John W.
Gayle, Robert E., Jr.
Gentry, Harold R.
Gibbs, Charles W.
Gillespie, Donald R.
Glenzer, Hubert, Jr.
Goben, Howard G.
Goodberlet, Alphonse G.
Goodnow, Harold J.
Gordinier, Harold R.
Grant, James "A"
Greenstein, Marvin W.
Greene, William M. A.
Griffin, Mitchell C.
Groves, Albert R.
Guhse, Donald E.
Gustafson, Harris F.
Guyer, George F.
Hall, Alfred J., Jr.
Hall, Richard L.
Hall, William D.
Hamilton, Charles B., Jr.
Hansen, Ivol E.
Harding, Charles F., Jr.
Harmon, Alfred W.
Harrell, William C.
Harris, David D.
Harris, Richard A.
Hartung, William C.
Harward, Robert S.
Hashmall, Benjamin
Hawkins, Jack H.
Hawkins, John F.
Hayes, George M.
Henderson, James C.
Henderson, Henry H.
Henson, Alton R.
Herrick, Ralph E., Jr.
Hertig, William S.
Hess, William J.
Higgins, Roy T.
Holcomb, John W.
Holley, Horace C.
Holt, Leahman J.
Hoop, Louie B., Jr.
Horner, Spencer W., Jr.
Howe, Lee V.
Huggins, Judson D.
Humphries, George E.
Hussey, Patrick F.
Hutcheson, Edward L.
Iglesias, Edward
Ihrig, Lewis C.
Inman, Bryce D.
Irvin, Leroy E.
Irwin, William F. H.
Isen, Forester W.
Itte, Charles M.
Jackson, Mercer L., Jr.
Jay, Darrel H.
Jenkins, Henry C.
Jenkins, James D.
Jenkins, James E.
Jenkins, John W.

Jester, Richard H.
Johns, Walter "V.
Johnson, Francis F.
Johnson, Lauren M.
Johnson, William R.
Johnston, Roy S.
Johnston, William S.
Jones, Ben G., Jr.
Jones, Charles C.
Jones, Thomas R., III
Jordan, LeRoy K.
Juillard, Floyd
Kalnitzky, Myron R.
Karonis, Peter
Kaye, Jack G.
Kelley, Arthur R.
Kelley, Lawrence W.
Kelley, Edward G.
Kelone, Emerick S.
Kemp, Edmond D.
Kenney, Robert F.
Kipe, Richard E.
Klepak, Philip H.
Knoeckel, Richard C., Jr.
Knott, Zebulon V., Jr.
Koch, John L.
Kodis, Anthony "J"
Koen, George
Koon, Jackson L.
Koressel, William J.
Krueger, Duane M.
Kruger, Ira K.
Krupp, Leo
Kurz, Lloyd A.
LaCava, John, Jr.
Lake, Julian S.
Lambing, Clarence L.
Lampman, Lester B.
Lanaghan, Donald P.
Lane, Frederick E.
Lawrence, Clayton G.
Lee, Ellis E.
Leslie, John K.
Light, Robert C.
Linker, Duan W.
Little, Charles E.
Long, Donald B.
Long, John G.
Loudermilk, "L" "B"
Loveridge, George W., Jr.
Lowman, Robert W.
Ludwig, David W.
Lundy, Robert T.
Lyons, John T.
Lyons, Robert F.
Maberry, Lewin A.
MacGillivray, Donald A.
MacKinnon, John D.
MacKnight, Harding C.
Mancini, Armido E.
Mann, Richard W.
Marn, Albin
Masek, William, Jr.
Matthews, Herbert S., Jr.
Mattus, Ralph J.
May, William C.
Maynard, Vincent D., Jr.
McDermott, Frederick P.
McEwen, Richard C.
McFadden, Joe M.
McGarvey, James F., Jr.
McKee, Gaddis G.
McKeel, Alonza B., Jr.
McKinley, Donald E.
McMullen, Birton E.
Mell, Kenneth L.
Mikulich, John L.
Millar, Robert W.
Miller, David
Miller, John R., Jr.
Miller, Robert W.
Miller, Samuel J.
Mitchell, George A.
Mix, Leroy R.
Moffit, Lloyd W.
Monahan, Alfred E.
Moore, Horace N., Jr.
Moore, William B.
Moreland, Milton B.
Morgan, Theodore L.
Morris, John
Morris, Lester
Morris, Lloyd C.
Morris, Robert E.
Motley, Arthur W., Jr.
Munson, Arthur H.
Murray, John T.
Murray, Royal C., Jr.
Murray, William B., Jr.
Neal, Charles
Neasham, Robert S.
Neeb, Lewis H.
Nelson, James A.
Nelson, Lionell H.
Nelson, Robert A.
Nelson, Roger D.
Norman, Robert J.
Oas, Clifford J.
O'Connor, Harry N.
Ogilvie, Ernest J.
O'Hearn, Charles C.
O'Hopp, Michael
Oliver, Almon "D"
Oliver, John D.
O'Neill, John W.
Orcutt, Robert E.
O'Rourke, Vincent P.
Otti, Charles L.
Overall, Sidney R., Jr.
Packard, Donald E.
Parady, James T.
Parks, David P.
Parramore, Douglas G.
Parsley, Clarence L.
Pattillo, William H.
Payne, James A.
Perkins, "J" "W", Jr.
Perry, Walter I.
Petersen, Chester L.
Pierce, Robert L.
Porter, James W., Jr.
Powell, John C.
Preston, William R.
Prout, Russell K.
Quick, Thomas J.
Quinn, Thomas D.
Raehn, Raymond V.
Rairden, Percy W., Jr.
Rank, Standlee L.
Rasche, Bruce C.
Raymond, John E.
Reardon, William L., Jr.
Reese, Frank G.
Reynolds, Herbert E.
Richards, Floyd D.
Riggan, Thomas H.
Rink, Victor B.
Rippey, William H.
Rishel, Maurice O.
Roberts, Owen A.
Robinson, Charles D.
Rodgers, Charles E.
Ronimus, Arthur D., Jr.
Roth, Jerome S.
Roth, Paul
Rothermel, James L.
Rusk, Stephen L.
Russell, James C.
Sackett, Albert M.
Sampson, Russell
Sanderson, Veriel E.
Sargent, Keith N.
Satterthwaite, Fred C.
Savage, Homer D.
Savage, Vann E.
Sawick, Theodore
Schaedler, George A.
Schellenberg, Albert
Schexnayder, Robert L.
Schmidt, Lavon C.
Schwem, William A.
Seiberlich, Carl J.
Serrell, Andrew
Setzer, Andrew R.
Severns, Robert L.
Shaw, William H.
Sibert, Victor J.
Simcox, William A.
Sistrunk, Vernon J.
Slattery, Thomas G.
Slifer, Allen W.
Smith, Barclay W.
Smith, Bruce B.
Smith, Raymond D.
Smyth, Robert P.
Snowden, Harold F.
Somervell, Willis L., Jr.
Sowar, Joseph F.
Sparks, Samuel A.
Speciale, Joachim F.
Spencer, Frank O.
Stadler, Paul C.
Steinbeck, Albert A.
Stevenson, James E.
Stevenson, Robert J., Jr.
Stewart, Harold E.
Stewart, Marlar E.
Stoll, Ralph F.
Stone, James F.
Sullivan, Patrick L.
Swinburne, Harry W., Jr.
Swint, George, III
Tall, Harold R.
Tanner, Carl B., Jr.
Tarleton, George L.
Tate, Hugh J.
Teal, Thomas W.
Thomas, John B., Jr.
Tierney, John F., Jr.
Tilley, Joel E., Jr.
Tobin, William F., Jr.
Tomkins, Lewis A.
Toon, Owen R.
Toponce, Harvey E.
Tracy, Gilbert L.
Truesdale, Ross R.
Turner, Frederick C.
Turner, William W.
Tuttle, James F.
Tyler, Ellery E.
Van Pelt, Wallace V.
Vegelahn, Norbert P.
Vehorn, Robert N.
Vittek, Albert W.
Von Egger, Harold K.
Walker, Ralph LaR.
Walker, John S.
Walker, Jack A.
Wallace, Howard K.
Wallace, Joseph W., Jr.
Walsh, William J.
Walstrom, Clifford C.
Ward, Lyttleton T.
Ward, Marshall D.
Warlick, Wilbur W.
Webb, William L.
Weidner, Jack W.
Weisse, Carl
Welsh, John D.
Whisler, William G.
Whiteman, Stephen J.
Whitworth, Billis L.
Wieland, Dicky
Wiley, Howard F.
Wilhide, Charles R.
Wilkinson, William L.
Williams, Reginald M., Jr.
Willyard, Harold A.
Wilson, Ernest E.
Wilson, William R.
Winslow, George H.
Wiseman, Eugene R.
Wolf, Jerome L., Jr.
Woodward, LaMar L.
York, Daniel A.
Young, Earle B.
Zeitvogel, James R.
Zimmerman, Ernest L.

To be commanders (*Medical Corps*)

Arnold, Homer S.
Barton, Robert K.
Bird, Edward W.
Christiansen, David V.
Cowart, Elgin C., Jr.
Imburg, Jerome
Lehman, Ross M., Jr.
Marks, Thomas S.
McLean, Donald H.
Morris, David P., Jr.
Ostapowicz, Frank
Randel, Harvey O.
Rohrs, Lloyd C.
Rupnik, Edward J.
Schulte, John H.
Workman, Robert D.

To be commanders (*Supply Corps*)

Aicken, John E.
Aitken, Douglas G.
Appleby, Dan P.
Ard, James H.
Bahl, Donald W.
Baldwin, Frank E.
Baumgartner, Donald F.
Bergen, Richard
Breault, Roland W.
Brown, Roger W.
Cassin, Thomas A.
Clement, Earl G.
Conry, William H.
Cooil, Robert W.
DeHart, Kenneth P.
DeYoung, Warren R.
Farley, William B.
Foulkes, William O.
Graham, Rupert E.
Halley, Harry J.
Hawkins, Noble "T"
Hopkins, Warren G.
Jenne, Frank L.
Johannesen, William A.
Johnson, Carl M.
Jones, Morton D.
Keever, Karl N.
Killion, Clyde D.
Koontz, Richard R.
Larson, Jay E.
Lobaugh, Leslie E.
Long, John J.
Madden, Robert H.
Mason, Charles M.
Maugans, Frank O.
McCulloh, Merlin L.
McDaniel, Roy M.
McGlothlin, Houston W.
Miller, DeWayne C.
Needham, Donald A.
Nelson, Merlyn A.
Purviance, Raymond E., Jr.
Scaturro, Albert V.
Schneider, Willard N.
Sellman, Lloyd E.
Smith, Bert E.
Sparks, Wainard H.
Stevenson, Thomas E.
Urquhart, Lennus "B"
Utterback, Carl W.
Wells, Robert A.
Whitchurch, Frank H.
Whitver, John A.
Wilson, Bentley L.
Wilson, Roquel A.

To be commanders (*Chaplain Corps*)

Carpenter, Malcolm A.
Cusack, Joseph P.
Danielsen, John M.
Dominy, Arthur L.
Doyle, William F.
Fenning, Robert C.
Harrison, Robert M.
Heyl, Richard P.
Martin, George L.
Oglesby, Glynn A.
Sobel, Samuel
Swanson, Eugene S.

To be commanders (*Civil Engineer Corps*)

Anderson, William C., Jr.
Bowman, Harlan L.
Daniels, John M.
Grauten, Henry S.
Phillips, Cushing, Jr.
Shepard, George R.

To be commanders (*Dental Corps*)

Bursey, Don C.
Hawkins, Kenner F.
Hoerman, Kirk C.
Kennedy, William J.
Koester, Frederick W., III
Kohler, Milton C.
Rogers, William J., Jr.
Selfridge, George D.
Sharp, Ben C.
Smith, Alan E.
Zustiak, Michael

To be commanders (*Medical Service Corps*)

Andersen, Albert L.
Rigg, Robert F.
Thompson, Lester K.
Van Landingham, Emmett L., Jr.

To be lieutenant commanders (*line*)

Adams, Hershel L.
Adams, Richard C.
Addicott, Leslie, Jr.
Adkins, Joe D.
Aiken, Robert A.
Alford, Zeb D.
Allen, James B.
Allison, George E.
Almonrode, Roland H.
Ames, Lionel E., Jr.
Anderson, Arthur H.
Armstrong, Colin L.
Arnold, Charles E.
Austin, Carl B.
Bailey, George G.
Ball, George F.
Barnett, Gene A.
Bartlett, Ronald D.
Bartow, William R.
Bauer, Lawrence R.
Baumann, Hugh B.
Beaman, Percy S.
Beatty, William F.
Beavers, Harrison J.
Becker, Jerry T.
Beesley, David L.
Beltzer, Francis J.
Bendel, Roland M.
Black, Charles H.
Black, Don "H"
Blackwell, Logan C.
Blair, Ira W.
Borgert, Duane D.
Borlaug, Paul V.
Boston, Ward, Jr.
Boulware, James R.
Boushee, Frank L.
Boyer, Keith D.
Brady, James "L", III
Briand, Rene L.
Brockmann, Victor D.
Brooks, Francis E.
Broscha, Neil J.
Brown, Edward J.
Brown, Vergil N., Jr.
Brown, Barry W.
Brown, George
Brown, Woolson S.
Brownell, Stuart M.
Bryan, Paul E., Jr.
Bublitz, Robert E.
Buck, Edward G.
Bueler, Charles M.
Bunganich, John, Jr.
Byrd, William J.
Campbell, Ivan R.
Carlquist, Roger
Carpenter, John G.
Carpenter, Earl C., Jr.
Carpenter, Ramon L.
Carr, Herbert W.
Carruth, David C.
Carter, John T., Jr.
Carter, Rodney B.
Cartwright, Billie J.
Case, Richard E.
Castruccio, Nicholas A.
Chapman, Roger A.
Chew, Robert S., Jr.
Christie, Eugene R.
Clark, William E.
Clark, James R. D.
Clasen, Robert C.
Classen, Robert E.
Clawson, Frederic J.
Conklin, William F.
Cook, Murray C.
Corrigan, Paul T.
Cowden, Jack
Crabtree, Alan B.
Cranston, Julius B., Jr.
Crawford, Wayne H., Jr.
Crawford, Donald H.
Crevier, Albert W.
Crispin, Robert E.
Crouter, Robert W.
Crump, Frank L., Jr.
Cullen, James H.
Cullison, Chester D.
Darling, Richard B.
Dassler, Edward M.
Davis, William J.
Decker, Harvey L.
DeLong, George E.
Denham, John G.
Denny, Lewis E.
Devonchik, Joseph M.
Dewenter, John R., Jr.
Dias, Robert F.
Dittmar, William D.
Dodd, James R.
Doheny, John F.
Donaldson, William I.
Donnelly, William N.
Donovan, Walter J.
Downing, Joseph H., Jr.
Doxey, Robert C.
Dryer, Harold M.
Dunbar, John P.
Durfos, Robert E.
Eareckson, Frederick L., Jr.
Edwards, Maurice M., Jr.
Egger, Donald L.
Ellis, Harry B.
English, Harold G.
Epps, Charles W.
Erickson, Philip W.
Ettinger, Harry E., Jr.
Evans, Delmar H., Jr.
Fasig, Richard D.
Ferguson, Robert E.
Fitzgerald, Jean
Fleiner, Fred J.
Flood, Robert H.
Floyd, Albert O.
Flynn, Frank J.
Fogarty, Francis C.

Foltz, Robert L.
Foulds, Donald D.
Fowler, Alfred N.
Foxwell, David G.
Franklin, Isaac N., Jr.
Frasier, Elmer L.
Freer, Milburn K.
Gabriel, Wallace S.
Gammon, James M.
Garlinghouse, Bruce B.
Gauthier, Gene F.
Gaydos, Michael, Jr.
Gentry, John H.
Gibbs, John D., Jr.
Gildow, William E.
Gilmore, Frank C.
Godfrey, Joseph V.
Goldman, Peter J.
Goodman, Ben, Jr.
Goodsell, Norton H.
Gormley, Robert H.
Gose, Charles K.
Graham, Horace E.
Green, Norman K.
Griffith, Harold F.
Grobmeier, Alvin H.
Guerrieri, Louis M.
Guilday, Thomas J., Jr.
Gurney, Sumner
Hamilton, Jack M.
Hancock, Burton W.
Hanley, Richard J.
Hanlon, Kevin
Hantzes, Savas
Harker, Theodore R.
Harlan, James D.
Harrison, James L., Jr.
Hart, George L.
Hartman, Richard V.
Harvey, Donald P.
Hasler, Arthur R., Jr.
Hathaway, Charles E.
Hauber, Erwin E. J.
Hawley, Bennie O.
Hayes, James T.
Hayes, Donald J.
Haynes, Kenneth G.
Herron, Russell G.
Hess, Lawrence E., Jr.
Hickey, Joseph P.
Hill, Hughes
Hilton, Robert P.
Himelick, Ronald V.
Hoag, Harold
Hodder, Arthur J., Jr.
Hodge, Alan G.
Hofer, Frank N., Jr.
Hoffman, Richard A.
Hofto, Leslie C.
Hogg, Gordon McG., Jr.
Hokenson, Carl L., Jr.
Holbrook, Jack G.
Holland, John P.
Holshouser, Jesse A., Jr.
Holton, Wallace C.
Horn, Kenneth A.
Hovde, Albin L.
Howard, Alfred M.
Hubbell, George E.
Hughes, David L.
Hunt, Robert S.
Hunter, "H" Reid
Hunter, Robert E., Jr.
Huntzinger, Robert E.
Illgen, Richard W.
Jackson, Frederick D., Jr.
Jacobi, Richard C.
Jacobs, Eldon A.
Jagoe, William H.
Janiec, Roy T.
Jefferson, Harry P.
Jenista, James F., Jr.
Jenkins, Harry T., Jr.
Jensen, John L., Jr.
Jimmerson, Thomas J., Jr.
Johnson, Harvey J.
Joss, Herbert L.
Juntilla, Harry W.
Jussel, Alfred R.
Kanak, Robert A.
Kauflin, James A.
Keenan, Paul C., Jr.
Keener, Bruce, III
Keller, Harry S., Jr.
Kelly, Eugene F.
Kent, William R.
Kent, Theodore R.
Kern, John S.
Kidd, John W.
Kile, Newton A.
Kirkpatrick, Donald McL.
Klause, Joseph E.
Klemm, Wilbur C.
Kline, John L., Jr.
Klinefelter, John W.
Knaebel, William E.
Knock, Franklin C.
Koett, Lee E.
Kojm, Leonard R.
Krimmel, John E.
Kuhn, Francis X.
Lamoreaux, Lewis S.
Lansden, Humphrey B.
Larry, Walter C.
Latham, George R.
Lawrence, Kenneth W.
Lawson, Robert F.
Lee, George H.
Lee, Harry B.
Lewis, Chantee
Lilleboe, Monard L.
Lindenmayer, Louie L.
Little, George L., III
Livesay, Alvin R., Jr.
Lockwood, Warren H.
Loper, Ollie J.
Lorenz, Joseph D.
Lowry, Charles H., Jr.
Lynn, Doyle W.
Madden, William E.
Maguire, Joseph W.
Mahaffey, Dick D.
Maier, Arthur R., Jr.
Mangold, John F., Jr.
Marsh, Marvin D.
Marsolais, Lawrence D.
Martin, Ward K.
Marts, Robert S.
Masek, Floyd E.
Mashaw, Andrew J.
Matthew, William McG.
McAdams, Robert B.
McArthur, Robert R.
McCaig, James A.
McCamont, John A.
McCann, Carl J.
McClary, William D.
McClellan, Thomas G.
McClinton, Robert B.
McCook, John A.
McDannold, Raymond K.
McDowell, Charles E.
McEachern, Harold O.
McGihon, Robert S.
McGonagle, William L.
McKinley, William
McLaughlin, Robert M.
McLeod, Murdock M.
McVeigh, Paul J.
Mead, Frank C.
Mead, Merle P.
Meissner, Robert W.
Mertz, Charles, III
Metcalf, Wayne C., Jr.
Metzger, Robert P.
Miko, Charles R.
Miller, David W.
Milligan, Donald F.
Mitchell, William T., Jr.
Mixon, Cameron O., Jr.
Monger, Albert J.
Moore, Randolph
Moorman, Eugene R.
Morel, Albert A., Jr.
Morey, Leonard, Jr.
Morris, Adrian B., Jr.
Morris, James H.
Moss, Eugene C.
Moureau, Peter R.
Munly, Richard E.
Murdoch, George D.
Neiss, Norman J.
Nellis, Donald P.
Nelson, Frank A.
Nelson, Leland E.
Nelson, Perry W.
Nelson, Robert E.
Nesbitt, James D.
Neville, Joseph T.
Newell, William C., Jr.
Noble, Robert E.
Nord, Clifford E.
Norman, Oliver L., Jr.
Nuber, George E., Jr.
Nylen, William E.
O'Connor, Roderick J., Jr.
Olsen, Phil G.
Osborn, Neri, III
Painter, Joel R.
Painter, John L.
Parish, George R., Jr.
Parker, Hugh G., Jr.
Partridge, Harry, Jr.
Patterson, Randolph F.
Peksa, Charles F.
Pendleton, Ralph E.
Perry, Donald W.
Pfeiffer, Willard D.
Phillips, Edward
Pickering, John H.
Poitras, Robert R.
Porcari, Thomas J.
Poteet, Alonzo M., Jr.
Prange, William L.
Pray, Robert E.
Previati, Louis J., Jr.
Prewett, Clarence L.
Prisley, John P.
Pyle, Robert E.
Quasebarth, Edmund A., Jr.
Rader, Jack B.
Rawlins, Robert D.
Reavis, Jackson B.
Redel, Adrian T.
Reeder, William H. L.
Reh, Donald E.
Resch, Earl F.
Richmond, John W., Jr.
Rideout, Joseph M., III
Riley, Paul A.
Roberts, James W.
Roberts, Louis V.
Robinson, William H., Jr.
Robins, Clarence O.
Rockman, Abraham
Rogers, Edmund D., Jr.
Rose, Meyer H.
Ross, William W.
Rowan, Russell A., Jr.
Ruehrmund, James C.
Ruff, Ernest D., Jr.
Rumfelt, Milo
Russell, George E.
Russell, William H.
Saar, Charles W.
Sallada, William F.
Sansom, Bayard T.
Sapp, Earle W.
Savage, Glenn A.
Schleuning, Henry H., Jr.
Schock, Robert E.
Schwoeffermann, Robert E.
Scoggins, Marvin C., Jr.
Seale, Thomas "M", Jr.
Seligman, Irwin H.
Sheehan, William R.
Shelton, Benjamin A.
Sheppard, Bruce B.
Shidle, John H.
Short, Edward A.
Shute, John W.
Siergiej, Edward S.
Simmons, Joseph, Jr.
Skelly, Harold F.
Slater, Robert W.
Small, William N.
Smith, Richard C.
Smith, Meredith A.
Smith, Philip C., Jr.
Smith, Ronald M.
Smith, Frank A.
Smith, Ray E.
Somme, Maurice L.
Speed, Lincoln J.
Spry, Warren L.
Stansfield, Richard J.
Steer, George L.
Steinberg, Philip
Stephan, Charles R.
Stevenson, Norman M.
Stickel, Robert H.
Stiles, Robert G.
Stohl, James R.
Stolpe, Richard H.
Strong, Willard L.
Sturm, Charles B.
Suchodolski, Petro
Summitt, Charles K.
Sundberg, John P.
Talmadge, Charles J.
Taylor, Dean, Jr.
Taylor, Boone C.
Taylor, Robert L.
Teed, John
Tegfeldt, Carl G.
Thomas, Lee R., Jr.
Thomas, William J.
Thompson, Robert K.
Thompson, Robert M.
Thomson, James
Tilton, Charles N.
Tissot, Ernest E., Jr.
Townes, John W., Jr.
Truesdale, Francis E.
Trusso, Sebastian
Tucker, Richard McK.
Underwood, John "L", Jr.
Vagianos, Nicholas J.
Van Gundy, Bryson, Jr.
Van Lunen, Lloyd M.
Vecchione, Felix S.
Vollertsen, Russell A.
Wade, John A.
Wadsworth, Dwight
Walker, Harrison M., Jr.
Walston, William G.
Ward, Edgar F.
Ward, "J" "D"
Washburn, Douglas A.
Waterman, John T.
Weeks, Robert E.
Wegner, William
Weidman, Robert M., Jr.
Welch, Edward F., Jr.
Wellons, Alfred G., Jr.
Wells, Frank P.
Werner, David J.
Wheat, Newton L.
Wheeler, Clifford D.
Whitby, Walter T.
Wiener, Richard "A"
Wilder, James D.
Wilkinson, Thomas R.
Williams, David T.
Williams, George A.
Wilson, Robert E.
Wilson, Thomas B., Jr.
Wineman, Gordon L.
Winkler, Cornelis, Jr.
Wold, John C.
Wooten, Guy G.
Wurlitzer, Robert E.
Zagorski, Raymond E.
Zeleznock, Louis J.
Zimmerman, William R., Jr.
Zinsler, Frank G.

To be lieutenant commanders (Medical Corps)

Arnest, Richard T., Jr.
Arthur, Ransom J.
Bennett, Wayland
Burgoyne, David S.
Cox, John W.
DeForest, Robert E.
Edens, Fred R.
Esterly, Harold D., Jr.
Ewing, Channing L.
Gossett, Clarence E.
Horgan, Joseph T.
Jauchler, Gerard W.
Johnson, Thomas S.
Jones, Warren R.
Kitrinos, Nicholas P.
Milnes, Roger F.
Mitchell, George D.
Monahan, George F., Jr.
Oftedal, Sverre J., Jr.
Simpkins, Carl N., Jr.
Sode, Jonas
Spaulding, Raymond C., Jr.
Szakacs, Jeno E.
Turner, Thomas W.
Watkins, Tommie K.
Wilson, Almon C.

To be lieutenant commanders (Supply Corps)

Acree, Calvin "H"
Ahern, James R.
Allshouse, Thomas J.
Andrus, Harold R., Jr.
Baccaro, Michael V.
Banghart, Robert J.
Baratta, Alfred A.
Barnett, William H., Jr.
Beale, John W.
Benson, Bruce A.
Blassic, Robert S.
Bollens, Alfred P.
Bow, Joseph R.
Braley, Charles R., Jr.
Byrd, James L.
Calhoun, Thomas N.
Chapman, John A., II
Child, Arthur L., III
Colbert, Bryan R.
Cosby, Francis B.
Coughlin, James E. M.
Czarnecki, Chester B.
Daniel, James C.
Dasovich, Michael
Deutch, Martin J.
Donahue, Daniel F.
Downs, Thomas R.
Dunbar, Robert F.
Edsall, Arthur R., Jr.
Eliot, Edward C.
Elwood, Joseph L.
Emery, William McL.
Fabian, Robert G.
Finn, John F.
Flaherty, Timothy G.
Futral, Herschel E., Jr.
Garbalinski, Walter
Gentel, Robert A.
Gifford, Robert L.
Goldstein, Gerald H.
Granger, Howard P.
Graziadei, John D.
Grechanik, Walter
Growden, Ellwood W.
Hagedorn, Lawrence D.
Hamill, William T., Jr.
Hardy, John F.
Hatch, Bobby L.
Hatfield, John H.
Havener, Millard F.
Heasley, Gail L.
Heindel, Donald D.
Hereford, James D., Jr.
Herr, Gordon M.
Hoffman, Rex V., Jr.
Hopkins, LeRoy E.
Houkom, Leif A.
Jackson, Dale E.
Keyser, Carroll R.
Kirkwood, "J" Scott
Kraus, Walter L.
Ledbetter, Lee R.
Leslie, Myrton "J"
Long, Samuel M., Jr.
Malerich, Francis J.
Malone, Francis E.
Manion, Uriel V., Jr.
Martin, John T.
Matthews, Chester S.
McCabe, John N.
McCrory, Walter J.
McGovern, Austin F.
McKeen, Edward N.
McMullen, Marvin E.
Mereness, Lyman T.
Morgan, James P., Jr.
Murphy, Thomas F., Jr.
Naismith, James A.
Newman, Carl H.
Nunnally, Roy S.
Olin, William C.
Oliver, James C., Jr.
Ortland, Warren H.
Ouellette, Joseph F.
Packard, Harrison G.
Park, Jack M.
Pawlowski, Thomas J., Jr.
Perschy, John L.
Pflueger, Paul J.
Phelps, Gordon W., Jr.
Prestwich, John P.
Purnell, Rodney K.
Rainey, Richard L.
Reichert, Harold H.
Rendelson, Paul L.
Reynders, William J.
Riegle, Chester F.
Robinson, Kenneth McD.
Ryder, John K.
Ryon, George G.
Saksa, Frank A.
Selden, Claiborne T.
Sharp, Herbert C.
Slater, Thornton L.
Snyder, William J.
Spalding, Joseph E.
Stephens, Samuel S.
Stratton, Ogden K.
Strohm, James R.
Sullivan, John J.
Sundberg, Daniel G.
Sutherland, Lawrence E., Jr.
Swanke, Charles C.
Taylor, William L.
Thomas, Carl W.
Thurner, Alfred J.
Van Tol, Peter H. B., Jr.
Veazey, John W.
Von Kennel, Harry P., Jr.
Wallace, William E.
Walters, Melville J., Jr.
Ward, John A.
Watson, Raymond A.
Watson, Lawrence A.
Watt, Robert J.
Weiss, Richard A.
Whelan, David W.
Wier, Richard A.

Will, James C.
Wills, Thomas J., II
Wilson, Dorsey V.
Winfrey, William L.
Woodbury, Orpheus L., Jr.
Ziegler, Bryan W.

To be lieutenant commanders (Chaplain Corps)

Anderson, Robert E.
Barlik, Robert F.
Byrnes, John P.
Caldwell, Ralph G.
Duncan, Henry C.
Gibbons, Alan R.
Hailstone, Charles E.
Hammerl, Paul C.
Hardman, Samuel R.
Hoar, Martin J.
Hunter, William M.
Mattiello, Lucian C.
Michael, Don M.
Powell, Willie D.
Riley, George B.
Robertson, Alla W.
Rogers, Lowell R.
Tillberg, Harlin E.

To be lieutenant commanders (Civil Engineer Corps)

Anderson, Gordon A.
Bafus, Raymond A.
Bibbo, Domenico N.
Buck, Robertson W.
Butterfield, Ossian R.
Cavendish, Lynn McG.
Doerpinghaus, Robert C.
Douthitt, Roy W.
Floyd, Archie E.
Graessle, Howard D., II
Hardy, Richard T.
Held, Charles C., Jr.
Hoffman, George L.
Johnson, William M., Jr.
Jones, Frank W.
Kauffman, Steven K.
Litke, Robert A.
Marsh, Edward H., II
McCoy, Arley E., Jr.
McEleney, Philip J.
McManus, Edward A.
Michael, Edwin M.
Nims, William E.
Portner, Eugene M.
Reed, William F., Jr.
Richeson, William J.
Schley, Gordon W.
Semple, William H.
Stroh, Alfred, Jr.
Trompeter, Richard W.
Vance, Robert C.
Washburn, Jack E.
White, Lawrence M.

To be lieutenant commanders (Dental Corps)

Amman, Fred M.
Bagby, Robert W.
Brown, William R.
Farrell, Paul E.
Hartnett, Joseph E.
Hickey, Loren V.
Hotz, Philip C.
Howard, Roger H.
Johnson, Walter N.
Montgomery, Wendell E.
Scruggs, Charles "S"
Smith, Scott McD.
Spicer, Robert H.
Weber, Irving J., Jr.
Wyda, Andrew, Jr.

To be lieutenant commanders (Medical Service Corps)

McGrael, Lawrence J., Jr.
Williams, Wayne E.

To be lieutenant commanders (Nurse Corps)

Alexander, Betty J.
Barrett, Mary F.
Brady, Eleanor M.
Broker, Irene W.
Burcham, Janice M.
Carmine, Barbara E.
Christopher, Floy M.
Cornelius, Dolores
Crawford, Minnie R.
Doherty, Katheryn L. T.
Emery, Lura J.
Feagin, Lenore S.
Gillmann, Annabelle B.
Heimberger, Peggy S.
Hoover, Joyce J.
Hovis, Vila J.
Idarola, Rose V.
Krone, Dora
Lesho, Veronica A.
Marsh, Kathleen
Matheis, Agnes F.
Pelkington, Alva B.
Podosek, Sophie A.
Quillin, Rose M.
Rapp, Gloria V.
Richards, Margaret R.
Searcy, Owedia M.
Segin, Olga
Sharp, Louise W.
Thurnau, June R.
Venverloh, Dorothy J.
Wujcik, Irene

To be lieutenants (Line)

Abrom, Richard M.
Adams, John L.
Aden, Melvin O.
Agnew, William F.
Ailes, John W., IV
Albritton, Charles R.
Alderson, Donald M., Jr.
Alecxih, Donald A.
Alexander, Howard W.
Allen, John C.
Allen, Galen B.
Alligood, Bruce T., Jr.
Anderson, Roland F.
Anderson, Erns M.
Anderson, George R.
Anderson, James C.
Andrae, Albert W.
Ansel, Frank N.
Anthony, Charles B.
Arthur, Glenn N., Jr.
Ashford, James P.
Astley, James J.
Aven, Donald J.
Awbrey, Roy D.
Bader, Allen L.
Bailey, John P., Jr.
Baird, Winfield S., Jr.
Baker, David E.
Baker, Richard L.
Baldauf, Laurence C., Jr.
Baldry, George K.
Baldwin, John A., Jr.
Baleme, Leroy C.
Ballinger, Robert MacQ.
Balsamo, Leo J.
Banbury, Floyd R.
Bannon, John M.
Barber, James A., Jr.
Barnes, Richard A.
Barr, Walter A.
Barr, Ronald L.
Barry, Richard E.
Bastin, Carl A.
Batdorf, Paul D.
Bates, Walter F.
Bates, Glenn D.
Batzler, John R.
Bauder, James R.
Baumgartner, John P.
Bausch, Francis A.
Baxter, William J., Jr.
Bean, Alan L.
Beardslee, Ralph C., Jr.
Bechelmayr, Leroy R.
Bel, Douglas W., Jr.
Belflower, Horace J.
Bennett, Raymond "D"
Bennett, Joseph E.
Benton, Joseph D.
Bernard, George O.
Bethany, Jesse E.
Biegel, Herbert K.
Bigney, Russell E.
Billings, Clare B.
Birdsall, David M.
Bishop, Michael E.
Blackmar, Fredrik S.
Black, Cole
Black, George E.
Blaine, Robert D.
Blair, Peter S.
Blandford, James R.
Blenkhorn, James M., Jr.
Blythe, Russell M.
Bodensteiner, Wayne D.
Bond, John R.
Bonner, James T., Jr.
Bonz, Philip E.
Borden, Douglas H., Jr.
Boslaugh, David L.
Bossart, Edmund B., Jr.
Bosworth, Kirk L.
Boucher, Francis T.
Boudreaux, Byron F.
Bowler, Peter P.
Boyd, Robert L.
Brace, Robert L.
Bracken, Leonard A., Jr.
Bradley, Bedford C.
Brady, Joseph G.
Brady, Frederick L., Jr.
Brannon, Robert M., Jr.
Braun, Carl T.
Braun, Peter J.
Briggs, Donald R.
Browder, Edward H.
Brown, Harold E.
Brown, Leo P.
Brubaker, Joseph D., Jr.
Buchanan, Auda E.
Buck, Harry J.
Buck, Wallace A.
Bullard, Jerry L.
Burch, William J.
Burden, Harvey W.
Burgess, Harold E., Jr.
Burke, Thomas J., Jr.
Burnham, Leonard
Burns, John A.
Bush, William L., Jr.
Butterfield, Frederick D.
Buzzard, Robert D.
Byers, James "Z"
Byrne, Patrick S.
Byrne, Joseph L.
Cajka, Anthony C.
Callahan, Robert L.
Cameron, Jim F.
Camp, John R.
Campbell, Harry F., Jr.
Campbell, Gerald D.
Campbell, Richard F.
Campbell, Richard H.
Cann, Thomas P.
Caraway, Elisha B., Jr.
Carlson, Dudley L.
Carlson, Leland J.
Carr, James McL., Jr.
Carry, Allan H.
Carson, Burton E., II
Carter, Powell F., Jr.
Caruso, Amedeo B.
Carver, Robert L.
Caston, Terry G.
Caswell, David W.
Chaney, Conner F.
Channell, Ralph N.
Chapman, William R.
Chase, Warren P.
Christian, Robert R.
Christmas, Walter B.
Christensen, Howard E.
Cicolani, Angelo G.
Clark, Robert E.
Clark, Robert "C"
Clausen, Carroll E.
Clement, Carl C., Jr.
Cleveland, Gary M.
Cliff, Gene L.
Clinton, Samuel T.
Coakley, William F.
Coakley, Stephen A.
Cobb, George W.
Cockfield, David W.
Coffey, Roger L.
Coleman, Theodore L., Jr.
Coleman, Charles L.
Colley, Richard T.
Colmie, Joseph V.
Combs, Lawrence L.
Comstock, Richard I.
Conley, David J.
Conmy, Walsh J.
Conway, James McN.
Cook, Charles F.
Cooper, James A.
Copeman, Thomas H., Jr.
Corcoran, Martin F.
Cornett, Paul A.
Coupe, Richard H.
Courtney, Warren, P., Jr.
Cowles, Robert R.
Cox, Dwight H.
Creech, Worley Y., Jr.
Currie, Raymond M.
Curtis, William R.
Curtis, Dennis E.
D'Aloia, John, Jr.
Dartnell, William H.
Davis, George W., Jr.
Davis, Thomas A. E.
Davis, Charles N.
Davis, Harry L.
Dawson, Albert L.
Deal, James W.
Debroder, Glen G.
Dedrickson, Charles R.
DeGroff, James L.
DeLano, George B.
Del Plato, Lawrence S.
Dennison, Daniel C.
Devalois, Edwin W.
Dietz, Warren C.
Dingle, James W., Jr.
Donahue, Joseph M.
Donovan, Ian E. M.
Doonan, Robert J.
Dopazo, Anthony J.
Dougherty, Gerald P.
Dougherty, James McC.
Doyle, Robert C.
Dresel, Loring P.
Duffy, Francis J.
Duke, Louie C.
Dunn, Joseph J.
Dunne, Francis R.
Durbin, Robert H., Jr.
Durgin, David A.
Earley, Joseph M., Jr.
Echard, Richard D.
Eckels, Donald E.
Edberg, Walter O.
Edson, Charles T.
Egan, William P.
Elder, William N.
Elias, William, Jr.
Elliott, Charles P.
Elliott, Fredrick H.
Emery, Robert E.
Emery, Thomas R. M.
Emmett, Joseph R.
Englert, Robert J.
Eppler, Billy M.
Erickson, Kenneth J.
Ervin, Billy M.
Estocin, Michael J.
Etcheson, Gerald R.
Evans, Richard P.
Evans, Irvin R.
Evans, James J.
Evrard, Leroy
Exley, William F.
Fairchild, Joseph D.
Fall, Robert H., III
Fancher, Allen P.
Farino, Francis J.
Farris, David E.
Fassett, Harold S., Jr.
Feakes, George E., Jr.
Fend, Clarence E., Jr.
Fetterman, John H., Jr.
Fillingane, Hulon P.
Finch, Albert
Finke, Walter J., Jr.
Fischer, Herman V., Jr.
Fisher, John C.
Fitzgerald, John
Fix, Vernon H.
Fladager, Myles E.
Flanigan, John E., Jr.
Fleming, James T., Jr.
Fleury, Clement E.
Flick, John P.
Flory, Richard L.
Flowers, Walter R.
Foley, Harvey D.
Foote, Theodore P.
Ford, James N.
Ford, Wilbur S.
Ford, Harold L.
Fordham, Barton W., Jr.
Fountain, Robert R., Jr.
Fox, Evarts C., Jr.
Francis, Nigel D.
Frederick, Peter G.
French, Maynard D.
French, Henry A.
Froid, James C.
Frye, Richard H.
Fryksdale, Frans H.
Fueston, Vernon M., Jr.
Fulford, John A.
Fullerton, Richard F.
Fuller, Milo W.
Funck, James R.
Gallagher, John W.
Gallagher, Patrick J.
Galvin, Robert J.
Gammell, Clark M.
Ganey, John R.
Gardner, Geoffrey L.
Garrett, Theodore C.
Garrow, Jack A.
Gasser, Thomas A.
Gauthey, J. Richard
Geer, Richard G.
Gehring, Gary J.
Gerhan, Charles F., Jr
Gerl, Neil D.
Gerrity, William J.
Giedzinski, Henry B.
Gilchrist, Richard B.
Gillett, Jerry T.
Gilmore, Kenneth D.
Glickman, Walter
Goetz, Robert B.
Golanka, Stanley R.
Gooden, Milford I.
Gooding, Charles L., Jr.
Goodman, Forrest H.
Goppert, Charles W.
Grady, Michael T.
Graf, Howard F.
Grafius, Guy A. B.
Graham, Joel H.
Grant, Edwin H., Jr.
Granum, Roger B.
Graue, Clifford R.
Greathouse, Edwin A.
Greene, George W., Jr.
Greene, Donald L.
Greene, James F., Jr.
Greenhalgh, William T., Jr.
Gregory, Nelson B.
Grego, James M.
Griffin, James L.
Griffing, Edward P.
Grimes, Laurence H., Jr.
Grozen, Paul B.
Grunenwald, John W.
Guerra, Albert H.
Guilday, Daniel S.
Guille, Sherred L.
Guimond, Gordon R.
Gunther, Howard P.
Hagee, Charles "R"
Hagen, Elmer C.
Hager, Donald G.
Hague, John D.
Haines, Collins H.
Hall, Charles W.
Hamilton, Harry D.
Hamilton, David G.
Hamilton, Robert B.
Hamilton, Frank P.
Hammond, Leroy L.
Haney, Norman L.
Hanson, Robert P.
Harden, Thad H.
Harmony, Lee D., Jr.
Harmon, "J" "E"
Harper, Elwood N.
Harper, Norman W.
Harsh, Kenneth C.
Harter, John V.
Hartsaw, David R.
Harvey, Richard M.
Harvey, Neil L.
Hastoglis, Anthony A.
Hauser, Donald L.
Heckman, Donald C.
Heisel, Lawrence L.
Henderson, Thomas F.
Henderson, Raymond R.
Hendricks, Richard A.
Hendricks, George H.
Hepworth, Robert W.
Hernandez, Diego E.
Herzog, Louis L.
Hettinger, Louis P.
Hickey, John A.
Higgins, Leo A.
Highfill, Kenneth L.
Hine, William G.
Hine, Raymond W.
Hines, Marion L.
Hinger, Carl K.
Hinton, Robert M.
Hobbs, William L., Jr.
Hoehne, Ralph L.
Hogg, Robert L.
Holland, William J., Jr.

Hollinshead, William G.
Holloway, Lowell J.
Holte, Hartley O.
Honeycutt, Jackson H.
Hoover, Harry A.
Horne, Hainyard L., Jr.
Hoskins, Perry D.
Houston, Chester E.
Huggins, Harry L.
Hughes, Richard McB.
Hunt, Herman L.
Hunt, Richard L.
Hunt, James H.
Hurst, Lee R.
Hyde, Willis G.
Ives, Richard H.
Ives, Clarence D.
Jackson, Joe T., Jr.
James, Harry R., III
Janes, William E., Jr.
Jardine, Edward F., Jr.
Jaudon, Johns P.
Jefferis, Lawrence R.
Jenkins, John C.
Jewett, Robert G.
Johnson, Thomas J.
Johnson, Virgil J.
Johnson, Grant R.
Johnson, Roger D.
Johnson, Lauren A.
Johnson, William T.
Johnson, Raymond F., Jr.
Johnson, George L.
Johnson, John R.
Johnson, Max R.
Johnson, Donald L.
Jones, Harry W.
Jones, Roycroft C., Jr.
Jones, Gerald L.
Jones, John L.
Jordan, Douglas S.
Jordan, Arliss L.
Judd, Robert G.
Jumper, Eugene A., Jr.
Jurgensen, Kenneth I.
Kaag, William C.
Kaiser, Donald S.
Karlen, James H.
Katzman, Marvin S.
Keaney, Mark J.
Keating, Leo P., Jr.
Keener, Delbert V.
Keil, Louis D.
Keiser, Robert B.
Keller, Constantine C., III
Kellerman, Donald W.
Kelly, James P., Jr.
Kelly, Donald C.
Kemp, Ernest E.
Kennedy, Calvin E.
Kennington, William A.
Kerrigan, Paul R.
Kerrigan, Robert J.
Kewley, Leslie P.
Keyes, Roy V., Jr.
Keys, Robert C.
Kibler, Timothy M.
Kiefaber, Thomas G.
Kilborn, Edgar L.
Kingston, Edward A.
Kingston, John J., Jr.
Kirby, Alexander G., Jr.
Klugman, Dale R.
Knepper, Donald E.
Knepper, Robert R., Jr.
Knoth, Larence W., Sr.
Kobler, Robert H.
Koch, Richard J., Jr.
Koehler, Robert L.
Koester, Earl C., II
Koester, Frederick H., Jr.
Kohn, Edwin R., Jr.
Kolaras, Demosthenes N.
Kolb, Stanley D., Jr.
Kopfman, Theodore F.
Kornblatt, Raymond H.
Kozischek, Albert J.
Krag, George H.
Krienke, Henry P.
Kronzer, Joseph J., Jr.
Kruegen, Richard H.
Kucera, Ronald C.
Kuligowski, Theodore J.
Kuplinski, Stanley J.
Lachut, Herbert M.
Lake, Rodney D.
Lam, Chapman L.
Lambert, Russell G.
Lamers, John P.
Lancaster, William L., Jr.
Larson, John P.
Laughlin, Alvin T.
Lavallee, William F.
Lavallee, David O.
Lawhon, Eugene M.
Lawniczak, George E., Jr.
Laye, John E.
Layn, Samuel W.
Leaver, John M., Jr.
Lee, Leonard M.
Lengel, Robert C.
Lennon, Richard H.
Leonard, Richard R., Jr.
Leopold, Robert K.
Lett, Raymond E.
Levey, Gerald
Lewis, John R., Jr.
Lighton, Paul G.
Lightsey, Elvin G., Jr.
Ligon, Richard R.
Lilienthal, Donald H.
Lilly, John E., Jr.
Lindsey, Austin M.
Linehan, Donald B.
Lipford, William L.
Lipster, Donald C.
Liptak, Richard D.
Locke, William J.
Lockhart, John Van G.
Loeb, Gerald K.
Long, John F.
Lotton, Donald E.
Low. Joseph L.
Lowery, Willis E.
Luitjens, Robert H.
Lukomski, Fred J.
Lull, Edward W.
Lund, Eugene P.
Lundy, Robert H.
Lusk, Charles T.
Lynch, Hugh F.
Lyons, William P.
Mack, John A.
MacKenzie, Joseph D.
MacKinnon, Malcolm, III
MacLean, Robert E.
Magee, Donald C.
Maki, Arthur O., Jr.
Mandly, Charles R.
Mann, John A.
Manthorpe, William H. J., Jr.
Marquardt, John C.
Marquis, Ronald A.
Marsh, Lloyd P.
Martin, George H.
Martin, Donald
Martin, George W.
Masalin, Charles E.
Mathews, Richard L.
Mathies, Carter C.
Matthews, Mitchell D., Jr.
Matzner, Rudolph, Jr.
Mauldin, James H.
McCarron, William E., Jr.
McCarthy, Philip R., Jr.
McCauley, William F.
McClellan, Gordon
McComis, Charles W.
McCrimmon, Douglas R.
McDonnell, John R.
McGonegal, Donal E.
McHale, Edward B.
McIsaac, Alban T.
McKay, Richard D.
McKeown, Thomas J., Jr.
McKinzie, Raymond C.
McLaren, Alfred S.
McNish, John E.
McQuaid, Robert W.
McSweeny, Robert H.
McVoy, Robert P.
Meek, Roger S.
Meloy, Robert T.
Melton, Wade I.
Meltzer, Herbert S.
Mengle, Kenneth J.
Merritt, Robert S.
Meyer, William F.
Meyer, Glenn H.
Michael, Benjamin H.
Mieldazis, Richard J.
Miesse, Walter T.
Miles, Robert W.
Miles, Dewitt C., Jr.
Miller, Ronald C.
Miller, Robert N.
Miller, Robert W.
Miller, Ronald D.
Miller, Justin A., Jr.
Milligan, Jack R.
Minnich, Donald E.
Miyagawa, George R.
Moats, Lewis D.
Moody, Dewitt H.
Moore, Thomas H.
Moore, Gene R.
Morgan, John R.
Morrison, Robert McK.
Moss, David L.
Mott, Charles E.
Moxley, Donald F.
Munger, Burton L.
Munsey, Malcolm H.
Murphy, James F.
Murton, David B.
Mustin, Henry C.
Myers, Robert U.
Narmi, Ronald E.
Nash, Gordon C., Jr.
Nelson, Roger E., Jr.
Newbegin, Robert G., IV
Newbegin, Edward C.
Newell, Byron B., Jr.
Nixon, Robert T.
North, Henry C., Jr.
Norton, James
Nyquist, John W.
Oakes, Winslow B.
O'Brien, Charles M., Jr.
O'Connell, Daniel E.
O'Donnell, John L.
Oehlbeck, Edward W.
Ogden, Edward G.
Oliver, Charles P.
Olmstead, Stanley E.
Olsen, Walter E.
Olson, Ross S.
Osborn, Harold N.
Osborn, Lloyd C.
Osher, Victor E., Jr.
Overbay, William A.
Overdorff, William R.
Overman, William J., Jr.
Owen, James V., Jr.
Palmer, Philip M.
Parker, John T., Jr.
Parker, Elton C., Jr.
Patterson, Joel D.
Paul, Roy C.
Payne, Thomas G.
Pearce, James H.
Pearl, Robert E.
Peckham, Daniel E.
Peebles, Edward M.
Peirce, William B.
Perez, Joseph F.
Perry, Gilbert R.
Perry, Timothy J.
Pesenti, Francis V.
Peterson, Richard A.
Peterson, Fred C.
Peters, Richard A.
Petri, Gordon L.
Petty, Dale B.
Pfeiffer, Paul N.
Phillips, George S.
Phillips, James C.
Pielstick, Blake H.
Pierce, John T.
Pillow, George E., Jr.
Pirie, Robert B., Jr.
Platz, Bruce W.
Plowman, Herschel L.
Plumly, Charles M.
Poissot, Marvin S.
Pollak, Robert K.
Pollmann, Eugene L.
Poppa, Lawrence G.
Porter, Edwin D.
Potter, Willis F.
Potter, Thomas B., Jr.
Powell, John H.
Powers, Edward F., Jr.
Prager, William R.
Pray, William L.
Prentice, Gordon R.
Pressly, George B.
Pugliese, William N.
Ralston, Richard L.
Rammelmeyer, Ross
Rasmussen, Lloyd W.
Ratliff, William E.
Rausch, Leonard M.
Redd, John L.
Reed, Richard L.
Reed, Calvin C.
Reeder, John G.
Rees, Malcolm C., Jr.
Reid, Gerald E.
Reise, Thomas L.
Reitzel, Philip M.
Renard, John W.
Rentz, William O. K.
Reszetar, Stephen W.
Reynolds, David B.
Reynolds, Preston A.
Reynolds, Keith A.
Rhodes, William K., Jr.
Rice, Robert V.
Rice, Eugene M.
Ricketts, Myron V.
Riddell, Alvin R.
Ries, Ronald E.
Riley, Thomas R., Jr.
Riviere, James P.
Roach, Harold S., Jr.
Roberts, John W.
Roberts, Wilson J.
Roberge, Francis D.
Roberts, Lloyd C.
Robinson, Robert M.
Rockwell, William A.
Roe, John E., Jr.
Rollins, Everett F., Jr.
Rose, Russell L.
Roth, James F.
Roth, James A.
Rouchon, Alvin A.
Rowe, Kirk W.
Rule, Robert R.
Ruotolo, Anthony P.
Russell, Melbert E.
Sample, Chester G.
Samuelson, Charles R.
Sanders, Carl H., Jr.
Sanders, James D.
Sanstol, George S.
Saunders, Wesley W.
Schleichardt, Robert K.
Schmidt, Edward A.
Schrader, Harry C., Jr.
Schultz, Thomas D.
Schwartz, Robert J.
Scott, Ronald D.
Scott, Gary L.
Scott, Austin B., Jr.
Scott, George W.
Scott, MacGregor G.
Scott, Augustus E., Jr.
Searight, Murland W.
Seely, James M. G.
Segal, Robert "B"
Seibert, Markley R.
Shanahan, Thomas E.
Shearin, John W.
Sheldon, Charles "B"
Shelton, Donald C.
Shepard, Rolf A.
Shields, Dan G.
Shine, Thomas, Jr.
Shows, Ned H.
Shulick, John, Jr.
Shurtleff, Bruce K.
Sides, Winfield M., Jr.
Sievert, Robert G.
Silberstein, George W.
Sill, John R.
Simmering, Larry K.
Simon, Roger O.
Sineath, George E.
Singer, Charles VanD., Jr.
Skorupski, Stanley S., Jr.
Slayton, Marshall T.
Sleet, Harold D.
Smith, Cyril P.
Smith, Richard J. W.
Smith, Richard H.
Smith, Dickinson M.
Smith, Charles R.
Smith, Charles R.
Smith, William D.
Smith, Barton L.
Smith, Robert L.
Smith, John W.
Smith, Edward G.
Smith, Winchester "C", Jr.
Smith, Darrel
Smith, Donald A.
Smith, Marvin G., Jr.
Snow, James R.
Snyder, Gary L.
Sousa, Manuel B., Jr.
Southall, Charles M.
Southard, David F.
Spencer, Walton R.
Spisak, Thomas J.
Staggs, Dudley V., Jr.
Stanley, Herbert L.
Steenstra, George A.
Stehle, Leroy R.
Stembel, David M., Jr.
Stephens, Gordon L.
Stetz, Elias J.
Stevens, James R.
Stevens, William
Stewart, John E.
Stoneback, Charles K.
Stott, George W., Jr.
Stouter, Leland R.
Straley, Ralph N., II
Strange, Robert C.
Streit, John B.
Striffler, Willard C., Jr.
Stromeyer, Anthony J.
Stuart, Donald B.
Stuntz, Harley L., III
Sullivan, Thomas E.
Sullivan, Dennis J., Jr.
Sullivan, Florence M.
Sutherland, Paul E., Jr.
Sympson, William G. A., Jr.
Sznyter, Edward W., Jr.
Tallman, John MacD.
Tansey, Eugene A.
Tarka, Thadeus
Tarver, Charles A., Jr.
Taylor, Patterson C.
Taylor, John E.
Thomas, Spencer J.
Thune, John R.
Tice, George D., Jr.
Tindall, Frederick W.
Todaro, Donald G.
Todd, James F.
Toncray, James R.
Toney, Albert L., Jr.
Toupin, Ernest J., Jr.
Toutant, Donald J.
Tracy, William K.
Trimble, Delmer
Tsantes, George, Jr.
Tucker, James R.
Tucker, James W.
Turley, John W.
Turner, Lee R., Jr.
Turner, Edmund L.
Underwood, Fred S.
Van Dermay, Robert E.
Van Kleeck, Loring E.
Vaught, Gerald C.
Vehorn, Raymond C.
Vilhauer, Levern T.
Villemaire, Grant J., Jr.
Vinson, Howard E.
Waggoner, Donald L.
Wahl, John E.
Walden, William A.
Walker, William R.
Walker, Eugene R.
Walker, John A., Jr.
Wallin, Homer N., Jr.
Walsh, Lawrence P.
Walsh, William A.
Walter, Donald W.
Walter, Joseph J.
Walther, Peter E.
Warburton, Thomas G.
Wardwell, Edward A.
Ware, Larry E.
Warrick, Richard P.
Watson, Jerome F.
Watson, John
Ways, Raymond A.
Weaver, John C.
Weber, Richard M.
Webster, Hugh L.
Weigand, David K.
Weimorts, Robert F.
Weller, James R.
Werblow, John W.
Wernimont, Donald J.
Westbrook, Darrel E., Jr.
Westfall, Ronald C.
White, Danforth E.
White, Trentwell M., Jr.
White, Bernard A.
White, Billy J.
White, Marvin L.
Wigley, Lawrence S.
Wilkinson, Edward A., Jr.
Willett, Richard S.
Willis, James L., Jr.
Williamson, John P., Jr.
Williams, Gerald G.
Williams, David E.
Williams, Gordon R., Jr.
Wilson, Gordon B.
Wilson, John R., Jr.
Wilson, Victor L.
Wilster, Gunnar F.
Winiker, David R.
Winn, John C., Jr.
Wittner, Carroll H. J.
Wolfe, Glenn C.
Wolkensdorfer, Daniel J.
Wood, John D., Jr.
Woolnough, Robert M.
York, Howard L.
Yost, David A.
Young, Leonard R.

Yurso, Joseph F.
Yuscavage, John M.
Zaborniak, Walter J.
Zadd, Charles J.
Zipf, Otto A.
Zseleczky, Emil J.

To be lieutenants (*Medical Corps*)

Akin, Richard W.
Alexander, Ronald W.
Alpert, Laurence I.
Ames, Richard A.
Anastasi, Gaspar W.
Anderson, William C.
Armstrong, Robert B.
Atkins, Claude C.
Bagley, Carter S.
Bellinger, Sidney B. Jr.
Bently, Philip E.
Besecker, Joseph A.
Birkeland, Ivar W., Jr.
Black, Paul L.
Blocker, Donald R.
Blower, Donald V.
Boop, Warren C., Jr.
Brennan, Richard L.
Briggs, John R.
Brodhead, Charles L., Jr.
Brough, James W.
Brown, Lawrence L., Jr.
Brown, John A.
Bundy, Bernard L.
Campbell, Mike C., Jr.
Cefalo, Robert C.
Chapman, Marvin J.
Chenault, Oran W., Jr.
Chesnut, John K.
Chmielewski, Robert E.
Choquette, Armand J., Jr.
Cirmo, William F.
Colburn, James E.
Coleman, James D.
Colson, Richard L.
Copman, Louis
Corcoran, Paul J.
Cotten, Milam S.
Darby, Clement H., Jr.
Davis, David B., II
Davis, Reginald M.
Davis, Gerald L.
Daywitt, Robert L.
Delisser, Robert B. M.
Dickson, Larry G.
Dionne, Roger R.
Dodgen, John C.
Dolce, Rosario G.
Dynes, Terry F.
Ebel, Ronald G.
Eddington, William R.
Engelke, Harold A., Jr.
Erde, Allan
Evans, Thomas M.
Fackler, Martin L., Jr.
Faust, Kenneth J.
Feldman, Bernard H.
Field, Martin G., Jr.
Fout, Larry R.
Gainer, James V., Jr.
Gannon, Robert P.
Gaskill, John R.
Giles, John H.
Goodwin, Joel S.
Gordon, William F. J.
Graves, Thomas W.
Green, Robert L.
Green, Howard H.
Griffin, Charles N., Jr.
Griffin, Gerald C.
Gustafson, Donald H.
Haag, Eugene J.
Hall, Marvin K., Jr.
Hall, Jack W.
Hanauer, Franklin A.
Harkins, Hugh H.
Harrison, Howard C.
Hartford, Charles E.
Hayen, Donald O.
Heck, Alan L.
Heldt, Robert P.
Henderson, John A., III
Herman, Clifford M.
Hines, Donald E.
Hines, Thomas K.
Hood, Robert W.
Howery, Stephen E.
Hughes, Edward W., Jr.
Hunsaker, Darrell H.
Hurite, Francis G.
Imbrie, James D.
James, David R., Sr.
Johnson, Richard F.
Jorgensen, Morton C., Jr.
Joyce, Thomas H., III
Kallet, Henry A.
Kaplan, George W.
Kardish, Thomas J.
Kelly, Harold V.
Kelly, Joseph A.
Kent, Richard B.
Kepner, Robert S.
Kesler, Kelvin F.
Ketchum, Thomas L.
Kettering, Donald L.
Kinney, Robert J.
Kirkconnell, Waite S.
Klatsky, Alan U.
Kornblum, Ronald N.
Kurland, Howard "D"
Lenartz, Henry F.
Leonard, Lonnie F.
Lloyd, Bruce H.
Lynch, William F., Jr.
Magenheimer, Richard J.
Marlowe, James M.
McEntyre, James M.
McFadden, Philip R.
McFarlin, Robert L.
McGuigan, Patrick M., Jr.
McLean, Paul E.
McMahon, John E., Jr.
Meaders, Robert H.
Middlekaff, Robert K.
Moore, Morgan J.
Morris, Thomas E.
Morris, Arthur S., Jr.
Mosher, John F., Jr.
Mueller, Julius H.
Mulhatten, Donald E.
Murray, Wayne L.
Mushet, George R.
Musselman, Bernard C.
Nase, Paul K.
Nelson, Rodger K.
Nichols, Thomas M.
Nigro, Bernard A.
Noble, Richard F.
Noury, John P.
O'Bannon, Mose C., Jr.
O'Toole, John B., III
Pare, Norman G.
Pavlik, Kenneth K.
Plavcan, William G.
Poole, Edward K.
Price, Albert C.
Raffaelly, Nicholas R.
Randels, Paul H.
Ray, Larry G.
Reitman, Sanford
Riley, John D.
Rogers, James A.
Romine, John S.
Root, Fayette C.
Roper, Ted J.
Routledge, James A.
Rumble, Wilson B.
Sablan, Ralph G.
Salatino, Ralph N.
Savage, James F., Jr.
Schulaner, Frederic A.
Schweinefus, Raymond L.
Scott, Charles I., Jr.
Sennett, Charlie O., Jr.
Shackelford, Joseph R., III
Sheppard, Lee C., Jr.
Shute, Howard E.
Simmons, William W.
Sirois, Edward P.
Sleszynski, Raymond A.
Smith, James W.
Smith, Buren S.
Solomon, Alexandre
Spaulding, Abbot G.
Stallworth, William P.
Stone, Charles S., Jr.
Stormo, Alan C.
Sullivan, Robert M.
Swisher, Louis B., Jr.
Tabb, Waller C.
Tanner, Terrell B.
Tatum, Joseph C.
Thomas, Joseph J., Jr.
Thomas, David F.
Thompson, John W.
Thornton, James L.
Tolmie, John D.
Tope, Stephen L., Jr.
Towle, Parker A.
Trail, Mervin L.
Tubb, Grayden A.
Tyler, Paul E.
Usselman, James A.
Vanhove, Eugene D.
Vollman, Don B., Jr.
Vorlicky, Loren N.
Wahl, Donald H.
Walden, Archie D.
Walk, Donald R.
Warmolts, John R.
Warrender, William F.
Warrington, James E.
Weil, William S.
White, Steven M.
Williams, Jay D., Jr.
Wilson, James T.
Witt, Frederick J.
Woodstein, Ira J.
Yarborough, John M., Jr.
Zimble, James A.

To be lieutenants (*Supply Corps*)

Allen, Samuel B., Jr.
Andersen, Elif A.
Ardizzone, Joseph C.
Beals, Donald A.
Bedford, Arthur G.
Bennett, Charles A., Jr.
Biddison, Ted A.
Blake, James F., Jr.
Buehler, Cyril H.
Carlson, Verner R.
Causbie, Edgar S.
Chrisman, Alfred B.
Clamp, Robert W.
Clark, Davis L.
Collier, William G.
Conway, James P.
Cornwell, Stanley R.
Davis, Robert W.
Devenney, James J.
Dolloff, Robert H.
Douglass, Jerry B.
Dowling, Richard M.
Duffy, Leonard G.
Dugue, Regis G.
Ellis, Richard W.
Erickson, Barry M.
Erwin, Charles H.
Flynn, John J., Jr.
Foreman, Clarence P., Jr.
Frost, Laurence W.
Fulks, Logan G.
Gaddis, Glenn L.
Gallagher, Robert F.
Gallaher, James H.
Graessle, Ernest J.
Hamilton, Michael H.
Hamilton, John F.
Hamilton, James W.
Hayes, Lester D., Jr.
Haynsworth, Hugh C., III
Henseler, Richard C.
Hirschy, Henry E., Jr.
Holder, James R.
Jerauld, William E.
Jones, Bobby J.
Jones, John M., Jr.
Kaiser, Robert A.
Killoran, Joel D.
Lampton, George H.
Leal, Milford A.
Lemma, Paul A.
Lovelace, James B., Jr.
Lovelace, Donald A.
Manley, Eugene T.
Mara, Ray A.
McCahon, John T.
McLaughlin, Richard B.
McSwain, Billy G.
Mead, George W., III
Mehrens, Arthur J., Jr.
Miller, David O.
Narducci, Charles C., Jr.
Newcomb, Frank N.
Olinger, Richard S.
O'Neal, James R.
Pace, Earl H.
Perkins, James O.
Powell, William M.
Prudenti, Joseph J.
Rader, Farrell J.
Robertson, David C.
Ruese, Edward F., II
Ruth, Stephen R.
Ruth, Richard A., IV
Shumaker, Carl
Singer, David A.
Smith, Jack L.
Soens, Robert P.
Sojka, Casimir E.
Sorensen, Jackie R.
Speer, John W.
Stayner, Robert L.
Steadman, Willard G.
Stephens, Dennis R.
Stombaugh, William E.
Straw, Donald G.
Sullivan, Patrick D.
Tauriello, Frank S.
Taylor, Robert R.
Tokay, Ronald N.
Turcotte, William E.
Virden, Frank S.
Vogel, Carl P., Jr.
Washburne, William K.
Webb, Jimmy D.
Webb, Carl R., Jr.
Webb, Hoyt T.
Wildman, John E.
Willenborg, Harold H.
Wilson, Donald E.
Wilson, Frank K.
Wilson, Richard F.
Wright, James H.
Wright, Walter F., Jr.

To be lieutenants (*Chaplain Corps*)

Alexander, Don C.
Earnest, Ralph E.
Gately, Robert E.
Goad, John T.
Johns, Harry D.
Klapperich, Owen B.
Lecky, Hugh F., Jr.
Linzey, Stanford E., Jr.
McGonigal, Richard A.
Miller, Harry R.
Murphy, Michael A.
Neal, Aubrey M.
Parrish, Whitney W.
Pitts, Charles H.
Ruud, Carl E.
Simmons, David E.
Struthers, Basil H.
Willson, William G.

To be lieutenants (*Civil Engineer Corps*)

Andress, Hyneman M.
Bair, William A.
Burdick, William E.
Busche, Robert E.
Clark, Jerry L.
Conner, Donald L.
Donaldson, Jacques E.
Grinke, Walton J.
Jacobs, Aaron B.
Kramer, Robert L.
Lowe, Stephen D.
Mielich, Robert M.
Miekush, Matt C.
Myers, Russell, Jr.
Oliver, Philip, Jr.
Peace, Robert C.
Phenix, Robert P.
Ruff, Lowell H., Jr.
Rusk, Willard H.
Shafer, Willard G.
Shumate, James W.
Skrinak, Vincent M.
Smith, Ralph A., III
Stallman, Thomas F.
Tate, Thomas N.
Weis, John M.
Westberg, Robert J.

To be lieutenants (*Dental Corps*)

Anderson, John W. R.
Bennett, Robert D.
Blanchard, Richard E.
Bright, Henry C., Jr.
Brown, Thomas G.
Brown, Allen K.
Butler, William D.
Cavness, Raymond L.
Charlick, Richard E.
Colavincenzo, Raymond M.
Connole, Peter W.
Corbett, Maurice C.
Courtney, Richard M.
Cozza, Vincent J.
Crawford, Benton E., Jr.
Crowe, Reuben A., Jr.
Crowther, Daniel F.
Daughtry, Max B.
Devos, Brice J.
Eastwood, Gerald W.
Gaston, David L.
George, Chester L.
Glendenin, Don "D", Jr.
Gourley, James V.
Grisius, Richard J.
Guarnieri, Lewis J.
Hack, Maurice C., Jr.
Hancock, Frederick L., II
Hancock, Edwin J.
Hanley, John H.
Harrison, Willis K.
Hart, Gerald L.
Hatrel, Paul P.
Hodge, Laurence K., Jr.
Holladay, Donald W., Jr.
Holloway, Norman L.
Hulse, Richard S.
Johnson, James I.
Kellner, Frank H.
Kennedy, Paul T.
Kimmel, William D., Jr.
Koch, Robert W.
Landel, Alden W., Jr.
Landry, Antime J., II
Losert, Robert E.
Lusk, Samuel S.
McMurdock, Robert C., Jr.
Montgomery, Steve
Moore, Dorsey J.
Morse, Ronald P.
Nash, Larry L.
Osetek, Edward M.
Pollard, Jerry L.
Porter, Myron R.
Preece, Richard G.
Preiner, Gerald F.
Reaume, Charles E.
Reisman, Paul J.
Rogers, John D.
Schlieman, David R.
Scruggs, Bertice Q., Jr.
Shoemaker, "O" "L"
Smith, David J.
Stepnick, Robert J.
Stevens, John T.
Tennyson, Lloyd R.
Thornton, Robert D.
Trout, Donald W.
Tussing, Gerald J.
Walkowiak, Gene J.
Weigel, Eugene J., Jr.
White, Warne H.
Williams, John P.
Yaple, Warren A., Jr.

To be lieutenants (*Medical Service Corps*)

Andersen, Walter A.
Barker, Samuel D.
Coulson, Harold H.
DeCesaris, Chester A.
Devine, Robert G.
Dickerson, Kenneth H.
Floan, Kenneth F.
Forrester, George G. Jr.
Harvey, Billy D.
Herrin, James H.
Jordan, Thurman O.
Kendrick, Allison N.
Ksenzak, Joseph F.
McGehee, Thomas L.
Neuman, Richard
Passaglia, Martin, Jr.
Paxton, Arthur W.
Ramirez, Gale
Ruffin, Robert S.
Shaneyfelt, Carl "L"
Sims, John L.
Skidmore, Wesley D.
Smith, Dewey L., Jr.
Snowden, Donald J.
Spahn, James A., Jr.
Stallings, Orlando
Tanner, Millard F.
Whitlock, William E.

To be lieutenants (*Nurses Corps*)

Connolly, Barbara A.
Effner, Dorothy J.
Hall, Jean C.
Hunt, Florence E.
Merritt, Patricia A.
Mullian, Sheila E.
Nester, Mary L.
Perreault, Madelon M.

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officer's Training Corps candidates) to be ensigns in the Line of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*David J. Anderson
*William K. Arnold, Jr.
*Merlin G. Bell
*John W. Benepe
*Charles M. Brown, Jr.
*Charles E. Campbell
*William J. Commins
*David C. Crawford
*Stephen G. Creps
*Ronald E. Crellin
*William J. Donaldson
*Denis C. Duffy, Jr.
*Dan W. Durham
*John P. Eppinger
*John L. Ferrell
*Frederick F. Forte
*John W. Foster
*Thomas A. Fournie
*Gary E. Gill
*Bobby L. Hartleroad
*William G. Hoffman
*Ben H. Holcomb
*Jerry G. Jamieson
*Terry L. Johnson
*James R. Johnston
*Robert F. Kerwin
*Michael W. Kilgore
*Richard H. Klippert, Jr.
*Herbert A. Klukas
*Albert W. Landeck
*Robert L. Lhuillier
*William C. Livingston
*Gary C. Lorentzen
*John V. McCormick
*Thomas A. McDonald
*Robert K. McQuarrie
*Steven L. Merchant
*Charles J. Moritz
*Vance H. Morrison
*Michael F. Morrison
*Homer S. Nakayama
*Leonard M. Nelson
*Michael K. Nolan
*Charles W. Oakes
*Richard J. Palma
*Peter M. Reber
*Jeffery H. Roski
*Jerome B. Scanlon
*Marion C. Schmitz
*John R. Schiffer, Jr.
*John Y. Schrader, Jr.
*James G. Schwalbert
*Gene B. Shelton
*Jan M. Sobierski
*Pete E. Stiehr
*Jack C. Thornton, Jr.
*Samuel L. Vernallis
*Benny H. Walker
*Roger B. Whitaker
*Raymond H. Wickman
*Lowell K. Williams
*Ronald L. Woodfin

*Jack W. Watkins (Naval Reserve Officer's Training Corps candidate) to be an ensign in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officer's Training Corps candidates) are being nominated as ensigns for both Line and Staff Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*Kaspar G. Berget, Jr.
*John H. Bratzler
*Fred S. Coffey
*John C. Connor
*Harold S. Crain, Jr.
*Richard C. Emanuel
*Emory J. George
*Jerome D. Kasriel
*Keith R. Lillico
*William G. McCanne
*James R. Mortimer
*James F. Parker
*Dale J. Peterson
*James D. Phillips
*John A. Redick
*Arden R. Taube

The following-named graduates from naval enlisted scientific educational program to be permanent ensigns in the Line of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*William V. Adams, Jr.
*Maurice D. Bauer
*John F. Bulharowski
*Bennie A. Chinnes
*Kenneth M. Crombie
*Donald G. Dempewolf
*Donald E. Fish
*Gerald W. Gobel
*Lawrence S. Gray
*Lewis W. Grigg
*Philip N. Hatfield
*Harold E. Hewlett
*Charles O. Horton
*William B. Ison, Jr.
*Dennis E. Kihlstrand
*Benton J. McClure
*Donald C. McCullough
*William L. McCullough
*Collin K. Myers
*Charles L. Nichols
*Glenn R. Olsen
*John M. Panian
*Richard D. C. Schrade
*Christian R. Snyder
*Robert H. Woller

The following-named graduates from naval enlisted scientific educational program to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) in the Line of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*John M. Glasier
*James C. Henry, Jr.
*Benjamin L. Vance
*Roland L. Waters

*Angelo M. Petrillo (civilian college graduate) to be a permanent lieutenant and a temporary lieutenant commander in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenant commanders and temporary commanders in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*Donald F. Blair.
*George T. Critz.

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants and temporary lieutenant commanders in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*Robert J. Aiken.
*Robert C. Speckhals.

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*John D. Fite
*John R. Davy
*Ervin L. Lobpreis
*Hector M. Rivas
*William M. Soybel

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*James B. Boorstin
*John W. Brown
*Larry R. Fout
*Maurice J Lewis
*James F. McConnell
*David M. Weber

*"B" Frank Taylor (civilian college graduate) to be a permanent lieutenant and a temporary lieutenant commander in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants and temporary lieutenant commanders in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*Reinald J. Chutter
*William P. Kelly
*Earl E. Little, Jr.
*Thomas L. Whatley

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*Delmar D. Albers
*Dale M. Anderson
*Herbert R. Hedge
*William H. Henry
*Darel D. Viles
*John E. Williams, Jr.

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*John W. R. Anderson
*Robert B. Annis
*Gerald T. Ballard
*Richard S. Baumgarten
*Max W. Brown
*Richard M. Courtney
*Albert R. Hube,
*Arthur E. Krzeminski
*Ralph N. Lehman
*Ralph B. Maw
*Irwin J. Parker
*Robert E. Pike
*John D. Rogers
*Gale L. Scott
*Ronald A. Shelin
*George A. Short
*Mark M. Stevens
*Robert D. Thornton
*Wayne J. Toth
*Norman H. Tracy Jr.
*Warne H. White
*Robert E. Williams, Jr.

*Charles S. Thomas, Jr., U.S. Navy retired officer to be a permanent commander in the Line of the Navy, engineering duty, pursuant to title 10 United States Code 1211.

*Lillian B. Schoonover, U.S. Navy retired officer, to be a permanent lieutenant commander in the Nurse Corps of the Navy, pursuant to title 10 United States Code 1211.

Lt. (jg.) Donald M. Waymire, U.S. Navy, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, limited duty only, for temporary service, in the classification of Ordnance, Surface, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named warrant officers to be permanent chief warrant officers, W–4, in the Navy, in the classifications indicated subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

To be boatswain

*Joseph S. Albin
*Herman B. Barger
*Frederick J. Blahnik
*John L. Brewer
*Charles P. Campbell
*Porter A. Carson
*Hol C. Cayton
*James D. Cobb
*Alfio Colonghi
*Charles F. Craig
*Jack R. Davis
*Walter J. Domagala
*Louis G. Farthing
*Cortis P. Fraley
*George W. Frost
*John W. Genheimer
*King O. Golden
*Russell W. Hanson
*Robert E. Harper
*Crawford J. Hayden, Jr.
*Alphonse B. Holtel
*Donald E. Huffman
*Richard R. J. Jaillet
*Merlyn M. Jones
*George L. Kilcrease, Jr.
*Justin R. Lanne
*David J. McCafferty
*Olan J. McMillian
*James H. Manning
*Lester M. Peterson
*Clinton R. Piel
*Rex T. Shook
*Leslie R. Smith
*Joseph L. Sullivan
*Henry L. Vanbenthem, Jr.
*James F. Webb
*Rankin W. Wheatly
*Alfred J. Wilson
*Daniel B. Woodward, Jr.

To be aviation ordnance technicians

*Carl M. Berglund
*Alvin C. Mix
*Franklin B. Owen
*Norman F. Savage
*Werner W. Thomas
*Homer E. Wittstruck

To be surface ordnance technicians

*Robert K. Arant
*Donald Blue
*Fitzgerald O. Boteler
*Charles J. Falbo
*Johann P. Feldscher
*Norwood I. Fewell
*Paul H. Fox
*Stanley J. Haydon
*Richard P. McHale
*Earl H. Pecotte
*Joseph P. L. Proulx
*Charles S. Russell
*Thomas I. Suggs
*Henry E. Tullock
*Samuel A. Weaver
*Samuel F. Wells

To be ordnance control technicians

*Myrl W. Breedlove
*John D. Hancock
*Henry A. Lantelme
*Raymond J. Walter

To be underwater ordnance technicians

*Robert P. Cassel
*Byron K. Gradoville
*Henry H. Merritt, Jr.
*Samuel F. Simpson

To be aviation maintenance technicians

*Marvin E. Barlow
*Arnold J. Bradford
*Edward H. Carpenter
*Andrie P. D'Heilly
*Johann G. Dietz
*Clarence E. Hall
*Henry B. Hopson
*Charles T. Jones
*Roland M. Roy
*Edmond C. Spires

To be machinists

*Douglas J. Allred
*Robert H. Armstrong
*Jay M. Balfour
*William P. Bauguess
*Hugh H. Bush
*Russell C. Cammer
*Dirk D. Coggburn
*James A. Cone
*William T. Ehrhart
*Howard L. Farwell
*Augustus K. Goffe
*Harrison H. Green, Jr.
*William E. Green, Jr.
*Ray G. Haliwell
*Nathan A. Hall
*Ira L. Hood
*Bernise F. Johnson
*William L. Jolly
*Pete "A" "W" Jones
*Clayton A. Lackman
*Kenneth F. Lindley
*Harry L. Peel
*Richard E. Peterson
*Willis M. Peterson
*Lawrence R. Petroski
*Edgar A. Poe
*Orin R. Prashaw
*Elmer T. Reeves
*Robert C. Schlag
*Henry J. Shotter
*Ryan L. Sitton
*Edward S. Solomon
*Raymond A. Tice
*Robert L. Voils
*Jesse E. Weeks
*Torbet T. Williamson
*Harry J. Wonderland
*Fredrick A. Young

To be electricians

*Merwin "J" Cagley
*Eugene T. Chandler
*Samuel W. Christopher, Jr.
*Gerald C. Crump
*Everett R. Feldt
*Joseph F. Flinn
*Charles Galik
*Leslie G. Haggett
*James W. Irvin
*Marion R. McKinney
*Lawrence M. Miller
*Aloysius J. Monschein
*Howard L. Morrison
*Joseph H. Priset
*Walter C. Strenk
*David W. Vest
*John H. Winkelman

To be aviation electronics technicians

*Murl Benefiel
*James W. Dalzell
*Alfred A. Ege
*"J" Harold Harveston
*John C. Holman
*Raymond D. Manning
*Clayton W. Perry

To be communications technician

*Douglas W. Harold

To be electronics technicians

*Arthur G. Duggan
*Raymond S. Foster
*William R. Frederick
*Willie M. Howell
*Henry L. Jarvis
*Robert E. Johnsen
*Joseph B. Lanier
*Allen F. Manley
*William I. Marshall
*George F. Murphy
*Lawrence Pratico
*William A. Speir
*Gordon C. Windon

To be ship repair technicians

*William W. Aylor
*Charles W. Baker
*Pryor S. Bennett
*Laurence A. Brown
*Lonnie V. Bruner
*Raymond S. Cosby
*William J. Cramer
*Donald Engelsman
*Lawrence G. Engle
*Charles E. Gorman, Jr.
*Ottis F. Hall
*David C. Holley
*Paul Joyce
*Harry L. Keller
*Norman Mowery
*Robert J. Schuster
*Harold F. Sessions
*Marvin L. Snowe
*Noel R. Stewart
*William C. Trettin
*Paul T. Waltz
*Charles W. West
*Clarence J. Wickstrom
*Earlsell T. Williams
*Raymond Wilson
*Edward Zygar

To be ship's clerks

*John W. Borger
*Frank M. Boyd
*Walter R. Brodahl
*Raymond K. Crabtree
*Salvador V. Dantoni
*Sterling B. Giles
*Philip C. Haynes
*Henry E. Irvine
*Wendell D. Levan
*Melvin L. Neuschwanger
*Clifton J. Perry
*Richard H. Pinar
*Kenneth J. Slamon
*James L. Snyder

To be supply clerks

*Vincent S. Allen
*Justin A. Anderson
*Carl Bottoni
*John J. Cantor
*Dean L. Coe
*Robert L. Curtis
*Albert E. Edwards, Jr.
*John W. Emberton
*Donald R. Evans
*Roland S. Forgrave
*George C. Hall
*Henry L. Hall
*Elza L. Helton
*Harry D. Hettmannsperger
*Lester E. Holste
*John J. Kelly
*George D. Kenney
*Robert H. Lesesne
*Wesley H. McFarland
*Kenneth P. Monroe
*Louis E. Paul
*Marion L. Platte
*Lawrence V. Qualey
*Joseph J. Reano
*John R. Ross
*Arthur M. Rowell, Jr.
*James Sadler
*Raymond L. Scharback
*Hershel "B" Scoggins
*Ben C. Shirley
*Walter J. Sicard
*Delmo R. Siler
*Robert L. Strouder
*Ray E. Thomas
*Mark Tilley
*Elbert W. Tippett
*Walter C. Vandenbusch
*Rex A. Wamsley
*Cornelius P. Wegman
*James F. Williams
*John R. Wolfe
*George L. Zeunges

To be medical service warrants

*Raymond E. Bard
*William H. Bassett, Jr.
*Rowe F. Christopher
*Louis G. Cox
*William J. Johnston
*Richard J. Kapsch
*Vernon "V" Parker
*Robert H. Reed
*Jesse D. Walker
*Dave E. Wallace
*James E. Webber

To be dental service warrants

*Clyde H. Greene
*George E. Mulcare

To be aerographer

*John E. Robbins

To be photographer

*Milburn V. Helms

The following-named warrant officers to be permanent chief warrant officers W-3, in the Navy in the classifications indicated subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

To be aviation operations technician

*John "D" LeRoy, Jr.

To be boatswains

*Charles N. Allen
*Kenneth E. Anderson
*Fredrick E. Bailey
*Harry L. Barron
*Timothy A. Barry
*Russell Bates
*Michael R. Bell
*Robert E. Bradley
*Donald E. Brotherton
*Charles E. Brown
*Leo E. Brown
*Alan B. Davis
*Franklin D. Deal
*Sheldon Ettling
*Joseph L. Evans
*Malcolm C. Gailing
*Granville E. Gordy
*Tom B. Gorman, Jr.
*James C. Hammock
*Robert R. Hammond, Jr.
*Albert F. Harvey
*Alfred M. Henking
*Louis H. Huddleston
*James R. James
*William C. Jordan
*Douglas R. Kemp, Jr.
*Wesley E. Lapham
*Samuel M. Lee
*Henry R. McFall
*Rex U. McKinney
*Francis M. Matson
*Theodore W. Miller
*William A. Molnar
*Adrian A. Morais
*Carl A. Nelson
*Donald N. Nolan
*Jack W. Page
*Gerald O. Palermo
*Jerry K. Peek
*David W. Perkins
*Daniel S. Rafalovich
*Rudel E. Ramage
*Richard P. Rauenzahn
*Raymond R. Resch
*Louis H. Richard
*Joe Ringhoffer
*George F. Rowan
*Philip J. Sawin
*George H. Sweeney
*Leland F. Swift
*George E. Tait
*Benjamin L. Tripodi
*Claude W. Welch
*William O. West

To be aviation ordnance technicians

*Paul N. Collins
*Kenneth D. Girkey
*Edward B. Glass
*Robert L. Leonard
*Lester B. Tucker
*James R. Westover

To be surface ordnance technicians

*Howard E. Bergman
*Sidney A. Brahin
*Lloyd C. Briggs
*Marion H. Brinson
*Euly C. Creed, Jr.
*Warren A. Frye
*Dexter E. Harrell
*Allen E. Helma
*Harold L. Helms
*Edwin W. J. McDonald
*Alfred Mello
*William J. Pfister
*Thomas J. Rachford, Jr.
*Stanley D. Robards
*Nelson Schweers
*Earl Strain
*Cecil L. Suggs
*Roy D. Watson
*Chester D. Wiggs

To be ordnance control technicians

*Leon K. Barksdale
*Walter N. Coan, Jr.
*Earl M. Johnston
*Earl D. Mable
*Frank J. Maroney
*Edwin C. Michael
*Kermit T. Mintz
*William M. Morrison
*Lowell I. Noble
*Roger A. Palmer

To be underwater ordnance technicians

*Herbert W. Buch
*Jack R. Hale
*Douglas H. Ischar
*Joe Parks
*George R. Stark

To be mine warfare technician

*Alvin F. Putman

To be aviation maintenance technicians

*Charles F. Allen, Jr.
*Frans O. Brooks
*Vernon J. Jeter
*Shely W. McGuire
*Frank Modic

To be machinists

*Arthur Auvermann, Jr.
*Eugene V. Baker
*Hiawatha E. Blood
*David Bly
*Carl Brad
*Allen C. Bryson
*Claude R. Davis
*Richard F. Davison
*Robert E. Dixon, Jr.
*Daniel C. Douglas
*Richard M. Edwards
*Helge W. Erlandson, Jr.
*LeRoy D. Falconer
*George L. Gay
*Paul H. Grant
*Roy W. Greenlees
*William F. Hamlin
*Richard S. Harter
*Leonard H. Heckendorf
*William T. Hull
*Michael Kerekesh
*Robert L. King
*Marcus G. Klein
*Sylvester H. Lathen
*Richard W. Lee
*Peter P. Ligeski
*John W. McCaffrey
*Edwin L. McInnis, Jr.
*Douglas J. McNair
*Orange J. Moore, Jr.
*Benjamin F. Morris
*William E. Mullins
*Russel E. Myers
*Samuel K. Perdue
*Craig J. Queel
*Charles C. Ramet
*Donald W. Reddoch
*Lee D. Rivers
*Robert P. Roth
*Michael J. Sabota
*Rene F. Serghison
*Raymond R. Shirley
*Frank M. Simko
*George H. Smith
*Robert W. Tibbs

To be electricians

*Clyde R. Ainsworth
*Stanley H. Anderson
*Norman R. Barrett
*Arthur R. Bell
*Robert C. Booth
*Denton C. Brown
*Loyd R. Burdyshaw
*Julian E. Calfee
*John H. Dehnbostel
*George E. Dersham
*Edward H. Doss
*William A. Evans
*James L. Flynn
*Jack V Goodman
*Joseph M. Hamill
*Loyd G. Hintz
*Luther M. Hudgins
*James H. Hudson
*Charles G. Johnson
*Homer Kirkpatrick
*Michael Kovacs
*Leonard H. Mayer
*Ruben A. Mund
*Gus Noll, Jr.
*James F. Perdue
*Alexander J. Powell
*George T. Radcliff
*Victor L. Redding
*Luther W. Smith
*Thurlow S. Smith
*Royden O. Snuffin
*Thomas "W" Williams
*Don W. Zarr

To be aviation electronics technicians

*Roy E. Blood, Jr.
*Richard E. Hirte
*Melvin L. Martin
*Joseph H. Wilson, Jr.

To be communications technicians

*Ralph J. Clement
*Howard E. McConnell

To be electronics technicians

*Elton R. Adams, Jr.
*Vernon Avery
*George R. Ballweber
*Raymond E. Boone
*Walton B. Campbell
*Irving Citron
*Robert H. Conrardy
*Robert E. Davis
*William H. Davis
*Paul J. Derocher
*Waldo E. Dickenson
*Fred H. Eldred
*Alexander Gould
*Warren H. Griswold
*Clair C. Hartley
*Raymond M. Huppee
*Drennen G. Ikard
*Eugene F. Jamison
*William D. Jarrett
*Wilbur C. Johnson
*Oliver E. Lee
*Lee Lorenz
*Melville E. McElvain
*George L. Marion
*Joseph S. Marsh
*John D. Metcalfe
*Robert J. Mohan
*Clessen Moore
*Joseph F. Osterman
*Allan C. Peringer
*Lionel B. Ragan
*Elmer G. Ripple
*Durward E. Rowan
*Gernie G. Saunders
*Gerald F. Smith
*Edward L. Stuckrath, Jr.
*Alfred J. Tarantino
*Robert A. Thompson
*Charles M. Unfried
*George W. Unger, Jr.
*Faye L. Willig

To be ship repair technicians

*Clair F. Axtell, Jr.
*Marvin T. Brooks
*John H. Chapman
*Jack Crawford
*Wilbur S. Dool, Jr.
*Max K. Drechsler, Jr.
*Lawrence G. Engle
*Daniel A. Frieson, Jr.
*Layton A. Hayes
*Albert W. Howell
*James W. Hudler
*Horace G. Lenon
*Eugene I. Lewis
*Byron C. McKinney
*Frank Marit, Jr.
*Daniel J. Miller
*James L. Mooney
*Harold L. Moorehead
*Edwin B. Moye
*Kenneth P. Nash
*Charles T. Orr
*Anthony P. Rangus
*Virgil L. Reed
*Paul F. Smith
*Rex C. Taylor
*Charles A. Warwick, Jr.
*Gerald W. Wright

To be ship's clerks

*Eugene J. Acosta
*Robert A. Barchenger
*Norman B. Barnett
*Everett K. Barnsdale
*Francis L. Beeby
*Billy Buck
*Lesta D. Burdett
*Mary L. Burke
*Franklin P. Carr
*Salvatore Carrozza
*Junior R. Chapin
*John A. Dinga
*William F. Fant
*Ralph D. Fuller
*Donald L. Hamilton
*Charles W. Hinson
*William S. Jones
*Herbert R. Jorgensen
*Peter R. Jorgensen
*Alfred G. Lunt
*John T. McGuigan
*Junior D. McLeod
*Bernell C. Mansfield
*Richard H. Maurer
*Gordon J. Nelson
*Charles P. O'Donnell
*Charles E. Palmer
*Leroy E. Scheppmann
*Charles J. Simpson
*George W. Skoldberg
*Leland R. Smith
*Charles J. Speckert
*Wallace A. Swenson
*Adalbert F. Swirk
*Robert D. Thume
*Edgar C. Trotter
*Flavius S. Tworek
*James A. Wise

To be bandmaster

*John H. Norris.

To be supply clerks

*Donald F. Albee
*August H. Asseier
*Joseph J. Baglioni
*Encell T. Baker
*William L. Bateman
*William C. Blevins
*Lloyd E. Bracy
*Glen R. Brown
*Lawrence C. Burns, Sr.
*James L. Crowell
*John Cseselka
*Noel R. Davidson
*Thomas P. Delaney
*Roger V. Doyle
*Melvin L. Dudley

*Tyson Edalgo
*Herman H. Fitzhugh, Jr.
*Cloris D. Fraim, Jr.
*Wilton J. Frazee
*James H. Freel
*Charles A. Gore
*Walter B. Harris
*Walter L. Henke
*Wayne F. Kesterson
*Clinton R. King
*Louis P. Lacey
*James M. Lalley
*Robert A. Livezey
*Robert G. Long
*Walter Martindale, Jr.
*Hammett Mitchell
*William N. Moon
*Robert M. Morrissey
*Lawrence E. Newill
*Coy T. Plaster
*James L. Reeder
*John P. Roby
*Richard H. Shea
*Charles Slater
*Francis H. Smith
*Hugh W. Smith, Jr.
*Arne R. Svenningsen
*Troyce D. Vaughan
*William H. Wallace
*Adrian F. Webb
*William W. Webster
*Virgil W. Wright
*Peter G. Zachko

To be medical service warrants

*Carlos D. T. Bagwell
*Lewis V. Barbarick, Jr.
*Charles A. Barnes
*Ernest J. Blanchard, III
*Oscar M. Buchanan
*James E. Coates
*William E. Cook, Jr.
*Howard B. Dressel
*Ward W. Frye
*Jeffrey J. Hardison
*Joseph J. Holewinski
*John R. Howard
*Jack R. Jermier
*Barney T. Jones
*Jack R. Kanavel
*Michael A. Leone
*Darrel M. Lovelace
*Floyd L. Matthews
*Robert J. Mazza
*Henry W. Minehan
*Robert L. Parker
*Robert M. Peltier
*Walter J. Powner, Jr.
*Robert M. Prestwood, Jr.
*Lyle J. Richards
*Clyde R. Roy
*Clifford D. Shick
*John L. Sullivan
*George E. Vogel
*Herbert B. Warrick
*George E. Willi

To be dental service warrants

*Thomas W. Birch
*Mac Book
*Samuel N. Brooks
*James B. Holden
*Gerald W. Hudson
*Marvin A. Mount
*Keith N. Oulie
*Reid B. Wimer, Jr.

To be aerographers

*Sanford L. Childers
*Carl W. Matthews
*Robert B. Nowlan

To be photographer

*Robert M. Scott

To be Civil Engineer Corps warrants

*William E. Bannon
*Carl R. Beach
*Frank E. Corn
*Newton U. Crawford
*Offie L. Drennan
*Charles N. Dyer
*William Elkins
*William C. Jackson
*Howard T. Janes
*Arthur J. Kummer
*Ross D. Moss
*Forrest "B" Rinehart
*Lee R. Robinson
*Eugene D. Wheeler
*Raymond R. Winters

The following-named warrant officers to be permanent chief warrant officers, W-2, in the Navy, in the classification indicated, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

To be aviation operations technicians

*Albert B. Bloomfield
*Richard L. Evans, Jr.
*Muscoe C. Holland, Jr.
*Richard W. Phillips
*Frederick R. Rupert

To be boatswains

*Wilbur L. Adkins
*Gasper R. Altomare
*Frank Alves
*James B. Anderson
*William A. Ansley
*Walter P. Barek
*John M. P. Bean
*William P. Berthney
*Peter P. Bocko
*James G. Cannon, Jr.
*Joseph A. Caporicci
*James C. Carden
*Henry F. Casey, Jr.
*Charles H. Cavanaugh
"E" "J" Corbin
*Stephen J. P. Croughan
*Glenn A. Dean
*Bernard E. Eaton
*Augustine H. Forgey
*Maurice C. Greer
*John H. Gross
*Francis G. Hanson
*James E. Heafner
*Dean S. Higgins
*James P. Hinckle
*William C. Hollingsworth
*Francis X. Isselhardt, Jr.
*Arthur J. Jeffra
*Daniel G. Jones
*John C. Jones
*Harold F. Keites
*Charles F. Lawson
*Eugene E. McNiff
*Jerone A. Monaghan
*Robert W. D. Overly

*Eddie R. Parris
*Richard J. Petersen
*Lloyd E. Prisk
*Arthur H. Racette
*Charles W. Rodina
*Wallace V. Sloan
*James R. Smith
*Carlos R. Soler
*Richard M. Stoughton, Jr.
*Thomas L. Swift
*Lewis E. Talton
*Carroll L. Tarver
*Perry T. Thompson, Jr.
*Jacque E. VanCleef
*James A. White
*Joe C. Windham
*Hilton A. Wylie
*Wallace G. Yates

To be aviation ordnance technicians

*Howard M. Fousie
*Joseph J. Kanicki
*Alfred O. Kelsay
*Leonard H. Preston
*Arthur R. Slaughter
*Charles E. Tether
*Theodore J. Wilson

To be surface ordnance technician

*Thomas E. Belcher
*Gustave W. Bieber
*Albert E. Bowser
*Charles O. Brown
*Robert A. Brown
*Roland H. Brown
*Louis W. Brugler
*Harlan D. Clark
*Ralph H. Conaway
*Charles F. Drucker, Jr.
*William F. Elrod
*George W. Furqueron, Jr.
*Joseph P. Gabler
*Charles J. Gerard
*Walter L. Giblin
*Gerald E. Hermsen
*Lewis L. Jackson, Jr.
*Paul Klimkewicz
*Edward A. Kopchinsky
*Harvey R. Laird
*John H. McCarron
*Richard Murray
*Richard R. Nagle
*Fred W. Nolting
*Alfred E. Olson
*Leon D. Olson
*John T. Pillow
*Lendo G. Renegar
*Ernest E. Sanchez
*Rogelio Sanchez, Jr.
*Virgil G. Sharpe
*John E. Stroberg
*George E. Waller
*James T. Wheeling
*Harry R. Worrell

To be ordnance control technicians

*Orin A. Brooks
*Arthur L. Carter
*William F. Meeler, Jr.
*Robert W. Wooten

To be underwater ordnance technicians

*Nilo J. Baldasari
*Abner D. Reed

To be mine warfare technician

*Robert F. Dredger

To be aviation maintenance technicians

*Thomas F. Cunniff
*William T. Elliott
*Daniel G. Gimmel

To be machinists

*Burnis R. Acuff
*Samuel E. Andress
*Robert A. Brett, Jr.
*Creighton F. Butler
*Frank Byars
*William O. Carroll
*Hughie S. Carter
*Homer L. Chapman
*Rubel D. Chapman
*Virgil R. Childers
*Christian A. Christiansen
*Jack C. Christensen
*Benjamin F. Cowell
*Lewis E. Early
*Walter W. Ellison
*Clarence W. Engle
*Donald A. Engler
*Wilbert M. Epoch
*James F. Fagan
*Frank M. Fellrath, Jr.
*Raymond T. Goodson
*William B. Grimes
*Peter J. Hamryszak
*Donald A. Hansen
*William Hensler
*George T. Hilt
*Joseph M. Hollowell
*Theron C. Holmes
*Lester P. Jensen
*Edward H. Johnson
*Richard I. Kenley
*Thomas C. Lawrence
*Harry Layne
*John T. Mansell, Jr.
*Ottis N. Morgan
*Martin U. Pellerin
*Herbert G. Prater
*George H. Rowland, Jr.
*Ormond H. Sandell
*Alvin E. Schlais
*Leslie R. Servies
*Dan B. Shipman, Jr.
*Frank W. Smallwood, Jr.
*William R. Smith
*John V. Sullivan
*Domenic N. Tancredi
*Jodie "V" Taylor
*David J. Thompson
*Seibert A. Ungemach
*William K. Walsh
*Howard J. Webb, Jr.
*George E. Williams
*Bryce H. Wooldridge
*Albert M. Worrells
*Don O. Zwer

To be electricians

*Timothy J. Ambrose
*William A. Berglund
*John J. Billington
*Ralph T. Blalock
*James D. Brooks
*George E. Clarke, Jr.
*Francis R. Dale
*Theodore A. Dietz
*John E. Ewing, Jr.
*Delbert E. Franck
*William E. Gibson
*Billy T. Gamble
*John E. Hogan
*Abbie R. Howell
*Harley Johnson, Jr.
*Thomas F. Johnson
*Harold A. Kelly
*William W. Kelly
*Herbert E. Kodger
*Edward H. Kracker

*Joseph F. Loftus
*Edward F. Marbourg, Jr.
*Elmer L. Mathison
*Willie C. May, Jr.
*Harmon L. Pierson
*Louis F. Prince
*John A. Rutkofske
*John R. Sheppard
*John H. Spain
*Delbert D. Sprague
*Stephen R. Still, Jr.
*John R. Travis
*James M. Whiteside
*Donald W. Willis
*Charles E. Wilson

To be aviation electronics technicians

*Kenneth C. Baier
*James D. Barker
*Marvin R. Barnhart
*John H. Benson
*Franklin H. Booth
*Gerald R. Brayton
*Russell L. Burkhart
*Henry L. Claude
*Charles B. Cook
*Stuart H. Cooper
*Billy R. Cottrell
*Vernon D. Duenwald
*Harry M. Edwards
*Raymond F. Elworth
*Ralph W. Fore
*John F. Gardner
*Gerald H. Gentry
*Sidney L. Grueser
*Robert F. Hauser
*Andrew S. Holland
*Johnathan J. Hults
*Harvey C. Johnston, Jr.
*John G. Koerner
*Earl W. Lofgren
*Albert P. Peebles
*Henry Rewucki
*Thurman R. Stone
*Jack W. Storey
*John L. Tennant
*Joel W. Timmons
*Richard D. Travis
*Elmer C. Uhlhorn
*Charles W. Valentine
*Arthur J. Warp
*Stanley C. Welch
*Edwin A. Wright

To be communications technicians

*Floyd B. Athow
*Harry J. Depp
*James W. Hill
*Robert W. Jones
*Howard J. LaFave
*Oscar B. Lee
*Henry A. Long, Jr.
*Vernon J. Nelson
*Robert G. Pich
*William T. Ramsey
*Marvin L. Segler
*Frank Spisak
*William K. Taylor
*Robert B. Toomey
*Peter F. Treanor

To be electronics technicians

*Joseph R. Arnott
*James M. Beatty
*Harry J. Belles
*Louis R. Benson
*Leo P. Boucher
*James R. Breeding
*Warren W. Broome.
*Hugh A. Burwell
*Audrey G. Coslett
*Herman F. Crouss
*William M. Curry
*Walter A. Dagdigian
*George R. Davis
*Kenneth C. Dedering
*Richard A. Doherty
*Frederick J. Donnelly
*George B. Faircloth, Jr.
*Vernon T. Fazer
*Gilbert C. Fergerstrom
*Hugh P. Gallagher
*Leo Gribkoff
*William B. Hammond
*Leo Q. Harvey
*Thomas E. House
*Donald F. Jacobs
*Robert J. Kasson
*Harold B. Keim
*Frank J. Konopa
*Ralph R. Leight
*Calvin C. Lynch
*John A. Madewell
*Vincent E. Martin
*Carlyle M. Meints
*Lucian G. Morissette
*Erick J. Myrman
*Bernard Orner
*Joseph W. Peironnet
*Robert O. Poirier
*Dennis J. Redden
*Harley M. Rittgers
*Joseph T. Rhatigan, Jr.
*Edward W. Romanski
*Philip W. Schroeder
*Charles H. Seaton
*Harold A. Shannon
*Cyril M. VeDomske
*Glenn E. Werts
*George L. Whyte

To be ship repair technicians

*John C. Bohline
*Rodman C. T. Burpeau
*Lessie H. Colter
*Donald F. Droddy
*Harvey W. Elkins
*Donald K. Jablonske
*James H. Lamb
*Earl W. Lang
*Forrest E. Leamons
*Eugene R. Lord
*Jennings L. Lyon
*Vernon A. Mathiasen
*Harold F. Miner
*Harold H. Mitchell
*Joseph L. Nestor
*Newell H. Porter
*Wiley B. Parrish
*George Reich, Jr.
*Rolf W. Rotnem
*Raymond A. Scalise
*Philip T. Scanlan
*Clyde R. Tyre
*Osborne L. Unkle
*Mack R. Wilcox

To be ship's clerks

*Junior E. Britton
*John D. Carey
*Lonnie E. Conway
*James F. Feeney
*Clifford C. Hayter
*John B. Hernandez
*Richard O. Hyland
*Don A. Kelso
*Theresa Leone
*Donald D. Learned
*Charles R. Marlitt
*Verne L. Moore
*Llew M. Powers
*Philip J. Rooney
*Vernon G. Smith
*William R. Thomas

*Franklin I. Triplett, Jr.
*Harvey J. Westfall

To be bandmasters

*George L. Briley
*Richard E. Larson
*Frederick O. LeGrande
*Kenneth A. Lowe
*Donald W. Stauffer

To be supply clerks

*Angelo Anagnostou
*Justin J. Andries, Jr.
*Marjorie G. Bender
*Lewis Blackwell
*Anthony Bruno
*Andrew Calabro
*William A. Coffey
*Richard S. Collins
*James T. Cox
*James C. Creek
*Carlton D. Dowdy, Jr.
*John B. Duran
*Ernest Flores
*Norman C. Frates
*Elbert R. Fussell
*Edward R. Garms
*Harold R. Gilliatt
*Robert C. Gordon
*Dale Grudt
*Earl W. Haubert, Jr.
*Richard H. Jinnette
*Leonard F. Jones
*Oriel Lake
*John B. Leamons
*Charles P. Luke
*Edward J. McGroarty
*Lewis A. Nader
*Vanita F. Parrett
*Henry Schmidt
*John C. Shedd
*Aubrey E. Swan
*Albert F. Swenson, Jr.
*Edward D. Swirka
*Leslie F. Thorpe

To be medical service warrants

*Fred A. Allen
*Charles C. Beckner
*Richard P Davis
*Otho E. Dyer
*Sol Goldberg
*Francis E. Hill
*Thomas M. Johnson
*Charles F. Maxwell
*William V. Merrick
*Edgar C. Miller
*William V. Parkin
*William M. Patterson
*Gaylord L. Proper
*John V. Reische
*James M. Rose
*William J. Schimpf
*Welland T Shoop
*William C. Soule
*Robert M. Taylor
*Theodore L. White
*Robert D. Williams

To be dental service warrants

*William M. Bird
*Kermit E. Broyles

To be aerographers

*Kenneth L. Chesmore
*Victor L. Clark
*Charles J. Hudock
*Earl P. Taylor
*"L." "R." Upton
*Dominick M. Zizzi

To be photographers

*Vernon D. Emmerson
*Frank R. Foust
*John L. Steward

To be Civil Engineer Corps warrants

*Harold E. Cox, Jr.
*Max L. Cramer
*William D. Haynes
*Jack J. Hofmann
*Kenneth B. Kayton
*William V. Miller
*Eugene C. Murray
*Willis R. Nolan
*George W. Partlow
*Walter R. Revolinsky
*Robert F. Schroeder
*Scott E. Wright

The following-named Warrant Officers to be permanent chief warrant officers W–3, and temporary chief warrant officers W–4, in the classifications indicated subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

To be aviation operations technicians

*Andrew B. Cooper
*Harvey B. Eggeling

To be boatswains

*Marion Breeding
*Knud H. Christensen
*Robert F. Hanseroth
*Eugene R. Kline
*John B. Knightly
*John R. Lepard
*Don E. Lewis, Jr.
*Russell L. Ludwig
*Frederick F. Pressel
*Jack W. Roberts
*William H. Sadler

To be surface ordnance technicians

*Everett R. Bacon
*Alexander Case
*Samuel C. Chuckta
*Joseph B. Dickey
*Victor L. Ebersole
*Rudolph T. Miller
*Joseph E. Moriarty
*Bernard B. Padget
*Roy E. Parker
*Salvatore P. Rossitto
*Louis Russo
*Kenneth R. Stabler
*Harold L. Still

To be ordnance control technicians

*Nicholas Adams, Jr.
*Vernor Feild
*Harold L. Mason
*Frank B. Miller

To be underwater ordnance technicians

*Frederick E. Clarke
*William E. Hans
*Edmund Simanowicz

To be mine warfare technician

*Roy K. Schardin, Jr.

To be aviation maintenance technicians

*William D. Bowen
*Gorden H. Crawford
*Kenneth O. Kalberg
*Hal L. Malone
*Guy J. Parker
*Henry O. Thomas

To be machinists

*George E. Bateman
*Wesley O. Collette
*Wilbur D. Coultas
*Harold M. Daniels
*John M. Gittinger
*Merwin G. Hansen
*George J. Hunter
*Ralph W. Holte
*Rudolph Klecky
*Frank J. Kurtz
*Robert A. Pappano
*Harold M. Pfeifer
*Guiseppe Riposa
*Henry A. Rodes
*Stanley W. Senkus, Jr.
*George P. Teche
*Robert H. Wootton
*Henry C. Yates

To be electricians

*Forrest G. Adams
*Cecil A. Adcock
*Loyn R. Brooks
*George R. Carruth
*Damaso Corpuz
*Phillip S. Gronvold
*Max L. Leech
*Lewis C. Severance
*Wesley J. Truelove

To be aviation electronics technicians

*John Dmoch
*James H. Lazenby
*Garland M. McCarty
*Harold E. McLaughlin
*Joao C. Santos
*Rodney "W" Skaggs
*Jakob Snoey

To be communications technician

*Roy E. Tresback

To be electronics technicians

*Cyril H. Albert
*Herbert P. Chambliss
*Robert B. Epperson
*Eddie L. Farmer
*Robert N. Hart
*George W. Johnson
*Milo J. Olhausen
*Elmer O. Schoenfelder

To be ship repair technicians

*Carl L. Bauer
*James E. Cruce
*William L. Farmer
*Carl B. Hatchell, Jr.
*Kenneth E. Houghton

To be ship's clerks

*John S. Danaher
*Charles C. Dorton
*Paul E. Farmer
*Donald A. Felton
*Charles H. Greene
*William "H" Hofman
*John "W" Holland
*Harold E. Jones
*John R. Lankford
*Joseph Malik, Jr.
*Eugene K. Messersmith
*Paul E. Morrow
*Samuel C. Red
*James W. Robinson
*Daniel W. Smith
*Merrill J. Vanauken
*Robert H. Ward
*Clifford C. Wicks
*Victor F. Winn

To be supply clerks

*Joseph C. Baldwin
*Howard G. Bartow
*George A. Bennett
*Eli "J" Brown
*Carlton C. Chestnut
*Earl F. Corday
*Charles H. Cornelison
*Frederick N. Crosthwaite
*Albert L. Cunningham
*Terrence H. Emerson
*John M. Farrell
*Marvin J. Ferguson
*Randolph J. Garrison
*Otto A. Grumwald, Jr.
*Homer L. Haughey
*William R. Hayes
*Howard J. Jackson
*Claude H. Lasley
*Lee Pasvogel
*Max B. Reed
*Herschel E. Robinson
*William G. Spence
*Foster Worthington

To be medical service warrants

*Charles B. Bernard III
*Victor C. Giuliani
*Orton L. Knutson
*Mark L. Shannon

To be dental service warrants

*Glenice B. Tindall

To be photographer

*Joseph P. Malito

The following-named warrant officers to be permanent chief warrant officers W–2, and temporary chief warrant officers W–3, in the classifications indicated subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

To be boatswain

*Carl L. Brehm

To be surface ordnance technicians

John J. San Felippo
*Sumner K. Midgett, Jr.

To be underwater ordnance technician

*Joseph C. Mastantuno

To be machinists

*William C. Gay
*Grady E. Gilbert

To be electricians

*George R. Bonnette
*Glenn R. Canfield
*Emanuel J. Endrizzi
*Eugene Robinson
*Russell L. Schuler

To be electronics technician

*William F. Whitt

To be ship repair technicians

*Edward L. Golden
*Frank Hutchison
*Walter P. Leu

To be ship's clerks

*Allen D. Bodine
*William H. Campbell
*Arthur "J" Coleman
*Norman B. Cyr
*Peter B. Donovan
*Orlando R. Faini
*Bill Mendenhall
*Joseph A. Pinto
*Wayne A. Shrum

To be supply clerks

*Glenn P. Bowman
*Otis H. Cagle
*James T. Hixson
*Leonard T. Mitchell
*Arthur E. Neyer
*Charles R. White

To be medical service warrants

*Donald M. Rhoades
*Earl B. Robbins

The following-named warrant officers to be chief warrant officers W–2, in the Navy, for temporary service, in the classification indicated, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

To be boatswains

*William J. Bilderback
*Frederick M. Bolling
*Bernard E. Burgett
*Edward C. Chastain
*Roland F. Cote
*John R. Ferguson
*William G. Greenfield
*Walter D. Hogle
*Alfred E. King
*Van Melvin
*Glenn F. Minard, Jr.
*William J. Murphy
*Benjamin C. Neely
*Christopher G. Schmidt, Jr.
*Joseph D. Steadman
*Harley V. Taylor

To be aviation ordnance technicians

*Daniel C. Bostick
*Albert L. Brown, Jr.
*William J. Dyer
*Solomon A. Parrish
*Robert E. Stanton
*Richard Turetz

To be surface ordnance technicians

*Theodore H. Agidius
*Cornelius R. Bartholomew
*James E Gray
*Arnold W. Kliem
*Garth F. Lindholm
*George T. Markward
*Leo L. Rodrigues
*Norman E. Wheeler

To be ordnance control technicians

*James E. Hagen
*Morrison Powell, Jr.

To be underwater ordnance technician

*Stanley Porter

To be aviation maintenance technicians

*Henry C. Butler
*James E. Cochrane
*Joseph B. Conner
*Joseph F. Jaggard
*Claude F. Peak
*Robert J. Surber
*Kenneth W. Woods

To be machinists

*Raymond S. Allen
*Lynwood A. Beverly
*Neil B. Chandler
*William C. Hillhouse
*Dana C. Jensen
*Phillip B. Kinnie, Jr.
*Gene H. Lacy
*Robert J. Martin
*Warren H. Nelson
*James C. Pace, Jr.
*Alvin E. Roberts
*Homer E. Robinett
*Bernard Scarlett
*Edgar A. Schardein

To be electricians

*Marvin G. Block
*James W. Huffman
*John A. Larrin
*Ernest R. Witte

To be aviation electronics technicians

*Arthur B. Isebrands
*Donald E. LeDuc
*Nicholas Pehosh
*Donald L. Petersen
*James M. Schneider
*Dewey A. Tarkington
*John P. VanArtsdalen

To be communications technician

*Arthur M. Mann, Jr.

To be electronics technicians

*William C. Arnett
*Ernest R. Blankman, Jr.
*Karl Boesenhofer, Jr.
*John P. Budrevich
*Kenneth L. Carlson, Jr.
*George Early, Jr.
*Charles J. Johnson
*Edward J. Kellner
*Robert H. Munger
*Killraine Newton, Jr.
*Robert W. Noble
*Joseph V. Peragine
*William J. Preston
*Daniel D. Schuman
*Charles T. Shaffer
*Fred J. Teagle
*George J. Voelp
*Benjamin W. Wright

To be ship repair technicians

*James F. Barratt
*John D. Billodeau
*Lawrence Cassie
*John C. Hughes
*James R. Kraft
*Roy L. Perry

To be ship's clerks

*Bryon H. Price
*John J. Pursel
*William F. Rolland

To be supply clerks

*George R. Bodge
*Ray M. Durland
*Homer F. Erdner
*Howard F. Gohrband, Jr.
*Leonard D. Haldeman
*Robert H. Hasfslund
*Willard E. Jones
*Stewart N. Landon
*John A. Lewis
*Francis J. McDonough
*Jaime B. Nadal
*Claudious A. Powell, Jr.
*George D. Smith
*Bernard L. Stowers
*Richard M. Talley
*Byron C. Vautier
*Charles P. Wagner, Jr.

To be medical service warrants

*Wendell Beckley
*Thomas G. Booth
*Gene R. Dick
*Ernest R. Gall
*William W. Glass
*Albert N. James
*John B. McLeod
*Robert F. Mitchell
*Paul Robinson
*Roy W. Wilkes, Jr.
*Von C. Yoder

To be dental service warrant

*Kelly Butler, Jr.

To be photographers

*Don L. Lash
*Robert G. Minor

To be Civil Engineer Corps warrants

*Charles R. Saffell
*Joseph M. Wilson II

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officer for permanent appointment to the grade of first lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*Harold H. Clark

The following named (Army Reserve Officer Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

aPtrick G. Farrell
Martin E. Hamer

The following named (meritorious noncommissioned officers) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*William M. Harborth
John W. Lugar, Jr.
*Charles B. McCoy
*James G. Sketoe

The following named (Naval Reserve Officer Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*Russel A. Chambers
Paul B. Dailey, Jr.
*Benjamin G. Hammond
*Frederick P. Henderson, Jr.
*Wendell H. Kerr, Jr.
Paul D. Novak
*Francis L. Shafer, Jr.

The following named (from the temporary disability retired list) for permanent appointment to the grade of major in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*Allen F. Stockdale

The following named (platoon leaders class) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Isaac Ayala
Chester A. Bamforth, Jr.
Boyd L. Barclay
William F. Bell
James W. Bierman
Robert D. Caskey
Thomas W. Choate
Robert F. Clemmons
*Herbert L. Currie
*Robert W. Custer
*John B. Da Grosa
Earl R. De Hart, Jr.
Robert M. Dennis
James D. Devine
Robert A. Doyle
Kenneth P. Dunlavy
Gary R. Fallon
Ben R. Goodwyn
William B. Gray
*Jerry M. Green
*Richard D. Hearney
Hans R. Heinz
John W. Hobbs
*Jerrold T. Irons
Michael S. Jelenic
Ken H. Johnson
David M. Jordan
Gary K. Lambert
Roger K. Lehr
Calvin A. Lloyd
Eugene J. Martin
Richard C. Martinsen
Michael J. McGowan
Richard G. McPherson
Floyd D. Merrey, Jr.
Donald Morris
John R. Myrdal
Gerald J. Oberndorfer
William J. Odle
Thomas H. Ralph, Jr.
Richard A. Romine
Earl R. Rutledge
Rogers A. Severson
*Donald K. Shockey, Jr.
Travis N. Smith
Eddie J. Suber, Jr.
Reiss P. Tatum
Thomas C. Taylor
Preston L. Waddington
Robert D. Williams
Peter B. Wyrick

*Indicates ad interim appointment.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

West Virginians Have Faith in President Kennedy and the Democratic Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 2, 1962

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on Saturday, January 27, 1962, I had the honor of addressing the First Congressional District Democratic Women's Workshop, in Wheeling, W. Va. It was an inspiring affair, and it was indicative of the growing support, in West Virginia, for the principles and actions of the Democratic Party in the State and in the Nation.

My address related some of the accomplishments of President Kennedy and the Democratic Congress. These accomplishments demonstrate how Democratic officeholders, and the Democratic Party, are helping to bring about an economic renaissance in West Virginia. I therefore ask unanimous consent to have my remarks before the First Congressional District Democratic Women's Workshop printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR BYRD OF WEST VIRGINIA, TO THE DEMOCRATIC WOMEN'S WORKSHOP, WHEELING, W. VA., JANUARY 24, 1962

The faith of the people of West Virginia in John F. Kennedy, and in the Democrats of their congressional delegation, and in the Democratic administration of Gov. William Wallace Barron, is being repaid in the coin of economic progress. The clouds of adversity that have hung over our State for so long are being pushed back. New employment opportunities for our people are arriving almost daily. An atmosphere of despair has given way to the exhilarating air of hope, because the Democratic Party is making good on its promises to revitalize the economy of West Virginia.

Here are the facts:

New industries are being encouraged to come to West Virginia by Senator Jennings Randolph and I, and by Governor Barron, and by our Democratic Congressmen, including your Congressman from the First District, Cleveland Bailey. To date, those we have succeeded in bringing to the State provide almost 5,000 new jobs. Moreover, we have been actively seeking Government contracts for the established industries of our State, and those which have already been awarded should mean employment for at least another 5,000 workers.

The previous administration in Washington vetoed all efforts on the part of Congress to enact an area redevelopment program. On the other hand, President Kennedy and a Democratic Congress moved quickly to enact such a program. Now $798,740 "seed" money in the form of loans and grants has been made available by the Area Redevelopment Administration for West Virginia projects. The ARA is currently reviewing several other West Virginia projects, and may soon act upon them.

The economic renaissance of West Virginia is being spurred in all possible ways by President Kennedy, by Governor Barron, and by the Democrats of your congressional delegation. All Government agencies are keeping our State in mind when formulating their various programs. This is plainly evident by the following facts:

In calendar year 1960, the Small Business Administration made 31 loans in our State, for a total of $1,830,000. This, of course, was during the last year of the Republican administration. In calendar year 1961, under a Democratic administration, that agency made 57 business loans to West Virginia firms, about half with local bank participation, for a total of $4,782,000.

Moreover, in calendar year 1960, the Small Business Administration helped 34 West Virginia firms to get Government contracts worth $2,620,000. But in 1961, under Democratic leadership, that agency helped 69 firms in our State to get Government contracts worth $3,709,000.

Fortunately, there were no natural disasters in West Virginia in calendar year 1960. However, last year, when a sudden flood hit the Charleston area, the Small Business Administration saw to it that 100 disaster loans, at the low interest rate of 3½ percent, were immediately made. These loans now total $575,000.

Then there is the case of the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads. In fiscal year 1962, in a budget prepared by the previous administration, $27,135,000 was allocated to that agency for interstate highway work in West Virginia, and another $8,123,000 for the State's primary and secondary roads. In fiscal year 1963, in President Kennedy's budget, $36,024,000 is being requested for the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads for interstate highway work in our State, and $8,689,000 is also being requested for our primary and secondary roads. In other words, a Democratic administration is seeking an increase of $9,455,000 for more road work in West Virginia than was allotted to the State in fiscal 1962.

The fiscal year 1963 budget for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, to carry out projects and programs in and affecting West Virginia, is also being recommended for a substantial increase by the administration. In fiscal year 1962, for the same purposes, the Army Engineers were allotted $38,574,600. Now $42,105,200 is being requested—an increase of $3,530,600. You can be sure that I, as a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, will make every effort to secure these budget recommendations for West Virginia.

The projects and activities of the U.S. Department of the Interior in West Virginia have always been of prime importance to our State. This Department is concerned not only with the conservation and development of our natural resources, and the safety of our mines, but also with aid to our State parks, and with the improvement of hunting and fishing in the State. Thus, an examination of that Department's fiscal year 1963 budget also gives heartening evidence of the administration's determination to aid West Virginia. It is requesting $4,843,463 for work in the State—$362,435 more than was allotted to it for such purposes in fiscal year 1962.

The efforts of President Kennedy and your Democrats in Congress in behalf of West Virginia would take too much time to relate. Let us not forget his memorable action to increase the amount and the kinds of surplus foods to the unemployed, an action he took on the very first day he assumed the Presidency. Let us also remember the legislative program he urged Congress to enact, and which a Democratic Congress did enact, aid to dependent children of the unemployed; a temporary extension of unemployment insurance payments; increased social security payments to widows and surviving children, and to the disabled; and the lowering to age 62 for voluntary retirement with reduced benefits, a measure of great importance to many of our elderly citizens, and a measure I am proud to say I originally introduced in the House of Representatives in 1953.

Today, thanks to President Kennedy's program for economic recovery, gratifying gains are being made by both business and industry. By the end of this calendar year, our gross national product may reach the unprecedented height of $560 billion. This is undeniable economic progress.

Understandably, President Kennedy has a warm spot in his heart for West Virginia. State officials and businessmen coming to Washington have found, and are continuing to find, the doors of Government agencies open to them.

But, understandable, too, is the warm spot which West Virginians have in their hearts for John F. Kennedy. For, under his strong hand, the people of our State are finding new confidence in themselves, and new assurances of a better, more productive, and more abundant future.

There are many persons in this audience tonight whom I would wish to thank, to congratulate, and to commend—not only for myself, but for all Democrats in West Virginia. But I must mention one in particular. She is your associate chairman of the State's Democratic executive committee, Mrs. Thelma Hall.

From the moment Thelma Hall assumed this office, she has worked ceaselessly to organize the Democratic women of West Virginia into a vital working force. Her success in these efforts is a matter of record.

And now, both she and Mrs. Virginia Mae Brown, are heading Operation Support, which has been discussed with you today, in order that West Virginians, particularly West Virginia Democratic women, may have a direct voice in the formulation of our Nation's legislative policy.

Now, I want to talk about another top-notch Democrat, and to say of him that his record in the House of Representatives, in behalf of the people of the First Congressional District, as well as in behalf of the people of the Nation, is one of remarkable achievement—Congressman CLEVE BAILEY. He is a man for whom it can be truthfully said: "There is no substitute for experience."

His record of accomplishments is far too long to enumerate. But let me tell you about some of them:

CLEVE BAILEY is the author or coauthor of all educational legislation approved by the Congress in the last 14 years—including the National Defense Education Act, and Public Laws 815 and 874, which deal with school impact bills. In fact, in September 1960, he was awarded a national citation for his activities in the field of education by Parents magazine. He also sponsored legislation to enlarge the program of vocational education, and to establish rural library service, including bookmobiles.

He was the author of legislation providing for a $40 million, multiple-purpose reservoir on the Elk River at Sutton, which was recently completed. And together with me, he sponsored a $50 million, multiple-purpose reservoir on the Gauley River near Summersville.

CLEVE BAILEY sponsored the Bureau of Mines building at Mount Hope, Fayette County, which cost $1 million.

Moreover, he sponsored channel clearing projects at Cairo, Ritchie County; at West Union, in Doddridge County; at Wyatt, in Harrison County; at Elk Creek, in Harrison County; at Stone Coal, in Lewis County; and upstream development projects at Salem, in Harrison County; at Bond's Creek, in Ritchie County; and at Polk Creek in Lewis County.

As I have said before, CLEVE BAILEY's record of accomplishments is far too lengthy to relate. But in addition to education and conservation, his accomplishments embrace veterans' affairs; health and welfare legislation; social security; agriculture; labor-management relations; and postal and civil service.

We want to keep CLEVE BAILEY in Congress. We need his experience. We need his seniority on the committees of Congress. We need his devotion to the people of West Virginia. Let all of us work hard to assure the victory of CLEVE BAILEY in the First Congressional District in November. There is no worthier cause to which we can dedicate ourselves.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rabbi Harold T. Miller, Temple Judea, Philadelphia, Pa., offered the following prayer:

Our God and God of our fathers, grant us the peace that is Thine alone to give, and imbue us with the wisdom and determination to pursue it unswervingly. Render our hearts and minds sensitive to the real needs of all the people, our hands and tongues swift to serve them.

Bless Thou, we beseech, our beloved country that it may shine far and wide its beacon light of freedom, hope, and honest good will. Strengthen and guide our elected Representatives who serve as Members of this governing body; help them to make the vital choices which confront them today. Hear Thou their prayers, and may their decisions manifest Thy divine will.

Praised be Thou, O Lord, source of all wisdom and truth, giver of peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 1, 1962, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 612. Joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the Veterans' Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 364, 87th Congress, had appointed the Senators from New Jersey, Mr. WILLIAMS and Mr. CASE, as members of the Woodrow Wilson Memorial Commission.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas, Mr. RAY ROBERTS, be permitted to take the oath of office today. His certificate of election has not arrived, but there is no contest, and no question has been raised with regard to his election.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTS appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THIS WEEK

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the majority leader as to the program for the week, particularly having regard to the order in which the bills listed on the whip notice may be called.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, we plan to call the bills that were announced to be taken up last week in the following order:

First. H.R. 6360, additional Assistant Secretary, Department of Commerce.

Second. H.R. 8723, the Welfare and Pensions Plan Disclosure Act.

Third. H.R. 8399, Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, if a rule is reported.

Fourth. H.R. 8617, Philippine War Damage Claims.

It is our hope and intention that we may finish this legislative program by Thursday afternoon.

Mr. HALLECK. May I say that certainly on this side of the aisle we will cooperate in that effort, because, as the gentleman knows, and as we have discussed with the Speaker, many Members on our side of the aisle are going to be out in their districts for services at the end of the week, and it would be helpful if we can conclude action on these matters by Thursday.

May I ask the majority leader, Has a rule been granted on all of these?

Mr. ALBERT. All but the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. The Rules Committee will meet on that tomorrow.

Mr. HALLECK. I thank the gentleman.

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE U.S. COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The **SPEAKER** laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C., February 2, 1962.
Hon. John McCormack,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
U.S. Capitol Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to section 194 of title 14 of the United States Code, I have appointed the following members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to serve as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy for the year 1962: Hon. Edward A. Garmatz, of Maryland; Hon. Alton Lennon, of North Carolina; Hon. William S. Mailliard, of California.

As chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I am authorized to serve as an ex officio member of the Board.

Sincerely,
Herbert C. Bonner,
Chairman.

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE U.S. MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY IN 1962

The **SPEAKER** laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., February 2, 1962.
Hon. John W. McCormack,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
U.S. Capitol Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to Public Law 301 of the 78th Congress, I have appointed the following members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to serve as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy in 1962: Hon. Herbert Zelenko, of New York; Hon. Thomas N. Downing, of Virginia; Hon. William K. Van Pelt, of Wisconsin.

As chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I am authorized to serve as an ex officio member of the Board.

Sincerely,
Herbert C. Bonner,
Chairman.

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON ROADS OF THE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Subcommittee on Roads of the Public Works Committee of the House may have permission to sit during the sessions of the House this week.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXPORTATION OF CERTAIN MATERIAL TO RUSSIA

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, why does not the left hand let the right hand know what it is doing? Frequently in this House we hear impassioned pleas that we must enact this legislation or that legislation to defeat communism, to halt Russia. January 31, 1962, the U.S. Commerce Department authorized the exportation of approximately one-half million dollars worth of parts and equipment to Russia for the construction of a pulp mill.

One of the major problems facing the pulp and paper industry is the competition from the Scandinavian countries and the Common Market. Now add to this the competition created by the United States in providing this equipment to Communist Russia and we will be compounding the industry's problems.

Russia has tremendous resources of timber and, with the advantage of American equipment and machinery, can, in the long run, be a very potent problem in the pulp and paper industry.

The Commerce Department should stop this threat before it gets out of hand and it should rescind these export licenses forthwith.

This action by the Department of Commerce has the potential of not only adding to the unemployment in this country and to the emasculation of another great industry but it is in effect sustaining the economy of the enemy.

Competition from Russia in this field would not only affect those who work directly with the industry, but also the farmers who supplement their income by the sale of pulp wood and the loggers who cut and deliver it to the mills.

The President is asking for greater authority in tariff reduction "to promote the strength and unity of the West" as one of the answers to the Communist trade offensive.

The President, in this message to Congress stated that "the Communist bloc, largely self-contained and isolated, represents an economic power already by some standards larger than that of Western Europe and hoping someday to overtake the United States."

Now are we going to assist them in this goal?

Such actions certainly make the embargo of Cuba appear hollow. We attempt to shut Castro off with the one hand and with the other continue to assist and support the country that is furnishing him arms, supplies, and missiles with which to infiltrate the Western Hemisphere. When will we wake up?

CONSENT CALENDAR

The **SPEAKER.** This is Consent Calendar Day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

PRACTICABILITY OF ADOPTING THE METRIC SYSTEM

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2049) to provide that the National Bureau of Standards shall conduct a program of investigation, research, and survey to determine the practicability of the adoption by the United States of the metric system of weights and measures.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

THE JOHN A. BLATNIK LOCK IN MICHIGAN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 947) to designate the new lock on the St. Marys River at Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., as the John A. Blatnik lock.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL BOTANIC GARDEN IN HAWAII

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5628) to provide for a study and investigation of the desirability and feasibility of establishing and maintaining a National Tropical Botanic Garden.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, if my memory serves me correctly, this bill was called up under suspension of the rules and failed to obtain a two-thirds vote in the last session of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING EASEMENTS IN REAL PROPERTY OF THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8355) to authorize executive agencies to grant easements in, over, or upon real property of the United States under the control of such agencies, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask someone representing the committee or some other Member whether or not it is contemplated that an amendment will be offered which will correct the provision to make this bill acceptable to those who object to its consideration on the Consent Calendar.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, such is the case. There is an amendment at the desk which has been requested by the Committee on Agriculture which excludes from the operation of the bill lands administered by the U.S. Forest Service.

Mr. FORD. May I ask the gentleman from California whether one such amendment, I believe on page 3, would read substantially as follows: "and including lands administered by the U.S. Forest Service"?

Mr. McFALL. That is correct.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman the purpose of the bill, the necessity for the bill. It is not apparent to me in reading the report.

Mr. McFALL. If the gentleman will yield——

Mr. GROSS. Yes; I am happy to yield.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, this bill was requested by the General Services Administration to give to the U.S. Government departments which do not now have the right, permission to grant easements over Federal lands to States and to persons where such is requested by those persons.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman cite to us some difficulties that have been encountered? Can we have a specific example of difficulties that have been encountered in this respect?

Mr. McFALL. It is possible to do this at the present time, but it is necessary to have this land declared surplus. The General Services Administration advised us that the procedure for doing that is unnecessarily cumbersome. They feel that the department should have the right to do this in a simplified way, since the Attorney General now has that right and the Department of Defense has that right.

Mr. GROSS. What is the gentleman saying? Is the gentleman saying that the bill will facilitate the disposal of property held by the Government?

Mr. McFALL. No. It will facilitate the granting of easements to States and other public agencies where such would be required in the operation of the departments. For example, if the gentleman will yield further——

Mr. GROSS. Yes; that is what I want.

Mr. McFALL. Suppose there is a building and it is necessary to grant an easement to a city for an alleyway over that property, the agency would have the right to grant this to the city, in accordance with the provisions of the bill.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield, would this facilitate in some way the construction of a $75 million cultural center down in Foggy Bottom? Would this in any way affect that deal?

Mr. McFALL. I would not think it would have any connection with that operation. I do not believe it would have any connection with it at all.

Mr. GROSS. Will this bill have any effect upon the deal near the Capitol where someone is talking about a monument to former President Madison, and someone else talks about an underground vault for Presidential papers?

Mr. McFALL. I do not know of any such connection.

Mr. GROSS. This bill will not have anything to do with burying Presidential papers in the area near the Capitol that was recently acquired by the Government?

Mr. McFALL. I do not think so. So far as I know it is confined to the granting of an easement for right-of-way purposes.

Mr. GROSS. This will not have anything to do with the action which the Justice Department has taken to convene a grand jury or go to Federal court over the negotiated settlements for some of that property? This will not have anything to do with that, will it?

Mr. McFALL. I do not believe so. The Attorney General already has this authority to deal with lands which are under his jurisdiction at the present time.

Mr. GROSS. And, if it does, does the gentleman suppose the Justice Department will investigate the Democrats as well as the Republicans insofar as those negotiated settlements are concerned?

Mr. McFALL. I would have no information concerning that.

Mr. GROSS. I see.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the requested consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That whenever a State or political subdivision or agency thereof or any person makes application for the grant of an easement in, over or upon real property of the United States for a right-of-way or other purpose, the executive agency having control of such real property may grant to the applicant, on behalf of the United States, such easement as the head of such agency determines will not be adverse to the interests of the United States, subject to such reservations, exceptions, limitations, benefits, burdens, terms, or conditions, including those provided in section 2 hereof, as the head of the agency deems necessary to protect the interests of the United States. Such grant may be made without consideration, or with monetary or other consideration, including any interest in real property. In connection with the grant of such an easement, the executive agency concerned may relinquish to the State in which the affected real property is located such legislative jurisdiction as the executive agency deems necessary or desirable. Relinquishment of legislative jurisdiction under the authority of this Act may be accomplished by filing with the Governor of the State concerned a notice of relinquishment to take effect upon acceptance thereof or by proceeding in such manner as the laws applicable to such State may provide.

SEC. 2. The instrument granting any such easement may provide for termination of the easement in whole or in part if there has been—

(a) a failure to comply with any term or condition of the grant, or

(b) a nonuse of the easement for a consecutive two-year period for the purpose for which granted, or

(c) an abandonment of the easement.

If such a provision is included, it shall require that written notice of such termination shall be given to the grantee, or its successors or assigns. The termination shall be effective as of the date of such notice.

SEC. 3. The authority conferred by this Act shall be in addition to, and shall not affect or be subject to, any other law under which an executive agency may grant easements.

SEC. 4. As used in this Act—

(a) The term "State" means the States of the Union, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the possessions of the United States.

(b) The term "executive agency" means any executive department or independent establishment in the executive branch of the Government, including any wholly owned Government corporation.

(c) The term "person" includes any corporation, partnership, firm, association, trust, estate, or other entity.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 3, after line 16, insert the following:

"(d) The term 'real property of the United States' excludes the public lands (including minerals, vegetative, and other resources) in the United States, including lands within reservations formed from the public domain and other lands permanently or temporarily withdrawn from any or all forms of appropriation provided for in the public land laws."

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McFALL to the committee amendment: On page 3, line 22, strike the period, insert a comma, and add the following language: "and including lands administered by the U.S. Forest Service."

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PARTICIPATION IN 1962 FEED GRAIN PROGRAM

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8914) to amend subsection (d) of section 16 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it is my recollection that on September 18, 1961, by a vote of 213 to 149 this bill was not approved under suspension of the rules. Inasmuch as there was substantial objection to the legislation, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection and ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PRINCE GEORGES COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD, MARYLAND

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6759) for the relief of the Prince Georges County School Board, Maryland.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE BANKRUPTCY ACT, AS AMENDED

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5393) to amend the Bankruptcy Act, as amended.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That clause (1) of subsection a of section 2 of the Bankruptcy Act approved July 1, 1898, as amended (11 U.S.C. 11(a)(1)), is amended to read as follows:

"(1) Adjudge persons bankrupt who have had their principal place of business, resided, or had their domicile within their respective territorial jurisdictions for the preceding six months, or for a longer portion of the preceding six months than in any other jurisdiction, or who do not have their principal place of business, reside, or have their domicile within the United States, but have property within their jurisdiction, or in any cases transferred to them pursuant to this Act;".

SEC. 2. Subsection a of section 2 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 11(a)) is amended (1) by deleting the word "and" at the end of clause (20); (2) by striking out the period at the end of clause (21) and inserting "; and"; and (3) by adding the following new paragraph:

"(22) Exercise, withhold, or suspend the exercise of jurisdiction, having regard to the rights or convenience of local creditors and to all other relevant circumstances, where a bankrupt has been adjudged bankrupt by a court of competent jurisdiction without the United States."

SEC. 3. Subsection i of section 57 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 93(i)) is amended to read as follows:

"i. Whenever a creditor whose claim against a bankrupt estate is secured, in whole or in part, by the individual undertaking of a person, fails to prove and file that claim, that person may do so in the creditor's name, and he shall be subrogated to the rights of the creditor, whether the claim has been filed by the creditor or by him in the creditor's name, to the extent that he discharges the undertaking except that in absence of an agreement to the contrary, he shall not be entitled to any dividend until the amount paid to the creditor on the undertaking plus the dividends paid to the creditor from the bankrupt estate on the claim equal the amount of the entire claim of the creditor. Any excess received by the creditor shall be held by him in trust for such person."

SEC. 4. Clause (6) of subsection a of section 58 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 94 (a)(6)) is amended to read as follows:

"(6) the proposed compromise of a controversy unless the court, for cause shown, directs that notice be not sent;".

SEC. 5. Subsection b of section 59 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 95(b)) is amended to read as follows:

"b. Three or more creditors who have provable claims not contingent as to liability against a person, amounting in the aggregate to $500 in excess of the value of any securities held by them, or, if all of the creditors of the person are less than twelve in number, then one or more of the creditors whose claim or claims equal that amount, may file a petition to have him adjudged a bankrupt; but the claim or claims, if unliquidated, shall not be counted in computing the number and the aggregate amount of the claims of the creditors joining in the petition, if the court determines that the claim or claims cannot be readily determined or estimated to be sufficient, together with the claims of the other creditors, to aggregate $500, without unduly delaying the decision upon the adjudication."

SEC. 6. Clause (1) of subsection a of section 64 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 104 (a)(1)) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) the costs and expenses of administration, including the actual and necessary costs and expenses of preserving the estate subsequent to filing the petition; the fees for the referees' salary and expense fund; the filing fees paid by creditors in involuntary cases or by persons other than the bankrupts in voluntary cases; where property of the bankrupt, transferred or concealed by him either before or after the filing of the petition, is recovered for the benefit of the estate of the bankrupt by the efforts and at the cost and expense of one or more creditors, the reasonable costs and expenses of the recovery; the trustee's expenses in opposing the bankrupt's discharge or in connection with the criminal prosecution of an offense punishable under chapter 9 of title 18 of the United States Code, or an offense concerning the business or property of the bankrupt punishable under other laws, Federal or State; the fees and mileage payable to witnesses as now or hereafter provided by the laws of the United States, and one reasonable attorney's fee, for the professional services actually rendered, irrespective of the number of attorneys employed, to the bankrupt in voluntary and involuntary cases, and to the petitioning creditors in involuntary cases, and if the court adjudges the debtor bankrupt over the debtor's objection or pursuant to a voluntary petition filed by the debtor during the pendency of an involuntary proceeding, for the reasonable costs and expenses incurred, or the reasonable disbursements made by them, including but not limited to compensation of accountants and appraisers employed by them, in such amount as the court may allow. Where an order is entered in a proceeding under any chapter of this Act directing that bankruptcy be proceeded with, the costs and expenses of administration incurred in the ensuing bankruptcy proceeding shall have priority in advance of payment of the unpaid costs and expenses of administration, including the allowances provided for in such chapter, incurred in the superseded proceeding and in the suspended bankruptcy proceeding, if any;".

SEC. 7. Subsection b of section 70 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 110(b)) is amended to read as follows:

"b. The trustee shall assume or reject an executory contract, including an unexpired lease of real property, within sixty days after the adjudication or within thirty days after the qualification of the trustee, whichever is later, but the court may for cause shown extend or reduce the time. Any such contract or lease not assumed or rejected within that time shall be deemed to be rejected. If a trustee is not appointed, any such contract or lease shall be deemed to be rejected within thirty days after the date of the order directing that a trustee be not appointed. A trustee shall file, within sixty days after adjudication or within thirty days after he has qualified, whichever is later, unless the court for cause shown extends or reduces the time, a statement under oath showing which, if any, of the contracts of the bankrupt are executory in whole or in part, including unexpired leases of real property, and which, if any, have been rejected by the trustee. Unless a lease of real property expressly otherwise provides, a rejection of the lease or of any covenant therein by the trustee of the lessor does not deprive the lessee of his estate. A general covenant or condition in a lease that it shall not be assigned shall not be construed to prevent the trustee from assuming the same at his election and subsequently assigning the same; but an express covenant that an assignment by operation of law or the bankruptcy of a specified party thereto or of either party shall terminate the lease or give the other party an election to terminate the same is enforcible. A trustee who elects to assume a contract or lease of the bankrupt and who subsequently, with the approval of the court and upon such terms and conditions as the court may fix after hearing upon notice to the other party to the contract or lease, assigns the contract or lease to a third person, is not liable for breaches occurring after the assignment."

SEC. 8. Subsection f of section 70 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 110(f)) is amended to read as follows:

"f. The court shall appoint a competent and disinterested appraiser and upon cause shown may appoint additional appraisers, who shall appraise all the items of real and personal property belonging to the bankrupt estate and who shall prepare and file with the court their report thereof. Real and personal property shall, when practicable, be sold subject to the approval of the court. It shall not be sold otherwise than subject to the approval of the court for less than 75 per centum of its appraised value. Whenever a sale of real or personal property of a bankrupt is made by or through an auctioneer employed by the court, receiver, or trustee, the auctioneer must be a duly licensed or authorized auctioneer in the place where the sale is to be conducted."

SEC. 9. Subsection a of section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 205(a)) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Any railroad corporation may file a petition stating that it is insolvent or unable to meet its debts as they mature and that it desires to effect a plan of reorganization. The petition shall be filed with the court in whose territorial jurisdiction the corporation, during the preceding six months or the greater portion thereof, has had its principal executive or operating office, and a copy of the petition shall at the same time be filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission (hereinafter called the 'Commission'). When any railroad, although engaged in interstate commerce, lies wholly within one State, the proceedings shall be brought in the United States district court for the district in which its principal operating office has been located during the preceding six months or the greater portion thereof. The petition shall be accompanied by payment to the clerk of a filing fee of $100. Upon the filing of such a petition, the judge shall enter an order either approving it as properly filed under this section, if satisfied that it complies with this section and has been filed in good faith, or dismissing it, if he is not so satisfied. If the petition is so approved, the court in which the order is entered shall, during the pendency of the proceedings under this section and for the purposes thereof, have exclusive jurisdiction of the debtor and its property wherever located, and shall have and may exercise in addition to the powers conferred by this section all the powers, not inconsistent with this section, which a court of the United States would have had if it had appointed a receiver in equity of the property of the debtor for any purpose. Process of the court shall extend to and be valid when served in any judicial district. The Supreme Court of the United States shall promulgate rules relating to the service of process outside of the district in which the proceeding is pending, and any other rules which it may deem advisable in order to aid district courts and courts of appeal in exercising the jurisdiction herein conferred upon them. The railroad corporation shall be referred to in the proceedings as a 'debtor'. Any railroad corporation the majority of the capital stock of which having power to vote for the election of directors is owned, either directly or indirectly through an intervening medium, by any railroad corporation filing a petition as a debtor may file, with the court in which the other debtor has filed such a petition, and in the same proceeding, a petition, a copy of which shall also be filed at the same time with the Commission, stating that it is insolvent or unable to meet its debts as they mature, and that it desires to effect a reorganization in connection with, or as a part of the plan of reorganization of the other debtor; and upon the filing of the petition, the judge shall enter an order either approving it as properly filed under this section, if satisfied that it complies with this section and has been filed in good faith, or dismissing it if not so satisfied, and thereupon the court, if it approves the petition, shall have the same jurisdiction with respect to such debtor, its property and its creditors and stockholders, as the court has with respect to the other debtor. Creditors of any railroad corporation, having claims aggregating not less than 5 per centum of all the indebtedness of the corporation as shown in the latest annual report which it has filed with the Commission at the time when the petition is filed, may, if the corporation has not filed a petition under this section, file with the court in which the corporation might file a petition under this section, a petition stating that the corporation is insolvent or unable to meet its debts as they mature and that the creditors have claims aggregating not less than 5 per centum of all such indebtedness of the corporation and propose that it shall effect a reorganization; copies of the petition shall be filed at the same time with the Commission and served upon the corporation. The corporation shall, within ten days after such service, answer the petition. If the answer admits the jurisdiction of the court and the material allegations of the petition, the judge shall enter an order approving the petition as properly filed if satisfied that it complies with this section and has been filed in good faith, or dismissing it, if not so satisfied. If the answer denies either the jurisdiction of the court or any material allegation of the petition, the judge shall summarily determine the issues presented by the pleadings without the intervention of a jury, and if he finds that the material allegations are sustained by the proofs and that the petition complies with this section and has been filed in good faith, the judge shall enter an order approving the petition; otherwise, he shall dismiss the petition. If such a petition is so approved, the proceedings thereon shall continue with like effect as if the railroad corporation had itself filed a petition under this section. If a petition is dismissed, neither the petition nor the answer of a debtor constitute an act of bankruptcy or an admission of insolvency or of inability to meet maturing obligations or be admissible in evidence, without the debtor's consent, in any proceedings then or thereafter pending or commenced under this Act or in any State or United States court. If, in any case in which the issues have not already been tried under the provisions of this subdivision, any of the creditors, prior to the hearing provided for in paragraph (1) of subsection (c) of this section, appear and controvert the facts alleged in the petition, the judge shall determine, as soon as may be, the issues presented by the pleadings, without the intervention of a jury, and, unless the material allegations of the petition are sustained by the proofs, shall dismiss the petition."

Sec. 10. Section 160 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 560) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 160. In any case, the judge at any time, without or upon cause shown, may appoint additional trustees and cotrustees, or remove trustees and appoint substitute trustees; and upon each such appointment the judge shall fix a hearing to be held within thirty days to consider objections to the retention in office of the trustee. At least ten days' notice of the hearing shall be given to the persons designated in section 161 of this Act."

Sec. 11. Section 247 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 647) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 247. The judge shall fix a time of hearing for the consideration of applications for allowances, of which hearing notice shall be given to the applicants, the trustee, the debtor, the creditors, stockholders, indenture trustees, the Securities and Exchange Commission, and such other persons as the judge may designate, except that notice need not be given to any class of creditors or stockholders which does not participate under the plan as confirmed by the court by an order as to which the time to appeal has expired or from which no appeal has been taken. In the case of allowances for services and reimbursement in a superseded bankruptcy proceeding, notice need be given only to the applicants, the debtor, the trustee, and the unsecured creditors, and may be given to such other classes of creditors or other persons as the judge may designate. In the case of the dismissal of a proceeding under this chapter and the entry of an order therein directing that bankruptcy be proceeded with, notice of the hearing to consider allowances need not be given to stockholders."

Sec. 12. Clause (6) of subsection a of section 265 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 665(a)(6)) is amended to read as follows:

"(6) copies of plans, alterations or modifications in plans, and any notices of hearings on the plans, alterations, or modifications;"

Sec. 13. Clause (7) of subsection a of section 265 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 665(a)(7)) is amended to read as follows:

"(7) the orders approving any plan or plans or alterations or modifications in plans;"

Sec. 14. Clause (2) of subsection a of section 393 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 793(a)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) any transaction in any security issued pursuant to an arrangement in exchange for claims against the debtor or partly in exchange and partly for cash and/or property, or issued upon exercise of any right to subscribe or conversion privilege so issued, except (A) transactions by an issuer or an underwriter in connection with a distribution otherwise than pursuant to the arrangement, and (B) transactions by a dealer as to securities constituting the whole or a part of an unsold allotment to or subscription by the dealer as a participant in a distribution of such securities by the issuer or by or through an underwriter otherwise than pursuant to the arrangement."

With the following committee amendments:

No. 1: On page 2, beginning on line 14, insert new sections 3 and 4 to read as follows:

"Sec. 3. Subsection d of section 21 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 44d) is amended to read as follows:

"'d. Certified copies of proceedings before a referee, or of papers, when issued by the clerk, referee, or an employee of the referee designated by his order, which shall be filed in the office of the clerk, shall be admitted as evidence with like force and effect as certified copies of the records of district courts of the United States are now or may hereafter be admitted as evidence.'

"Sec. 4. The first paragraph of subsection c of section 48 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 76c) is amended to read as follows:

"'c. Trustees. The compensation of trustees for their services, payable after they are rendered, shall be a fee of $10 for each estate, deposited with the clerk at the time the petition is filed in each case, except where installment payments may be authorized pursuant to section 40 of this Act, and such further sum as the court may allow, as follows:'

No. 2: Renumber sections 3 through 14 of the bill accordingly.

No. 3: On page 8, line 14, strike out "$100" and insert in its place "$150".

No. 4: On page 12, lines 23 through 25, strike out "by an order as to which the time to appeal has expired or from which no appeal has been taken" and insert instead "from which no appeal is pending and the time allowed for appeal has expired."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ACQUISITION OF PATENTED MINING CLAIM ON SOUTH RIM OF GRAND CANYON NATIONAL PARK

The Clerk called the bill (S. 383) to provide for the acquisition of a patented mining claim on the south rim of Grand Canyon National Park, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that this proposal is scheduled for consideration today under suspension of the rules. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. That concludes the call of the Consent Calendar.

ACQUISITION OF PATENTED MINING CLAIM ON SOUTH RIM OF GRAND CANYON NATIONAL PARK

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the

bill (S. 383) to provide for the acquisition of a patented mining claim on the south rim of Grand Canyon National Park, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in order to acquire for Grand Canyon National Park certain private land strategically located inside the park on the south rim of Grand Canyon and to provide for the removal of surface structures thereon and the termination of mining activities in connection with such land which intrudes upon the rim of Grand Canyon and adversely affects the public enjoyment of the park, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to accept on the terms hereinafter stated the conveyance of title to the Orphan Claim, a mining claim of approximately 20.64 acres patented to D. L. Hogan and C. J. Babbitt on March 23, 1906, patent numbered 43506: *Provided,* Said authority is conditioned upon the grantor releasing any extralateral rights it may have to follow under adjoining park lands any mineral discovery made on the aforesaid Orphan Claim. The grantor shall, within six months following the passage of this Act, execute to the United States deeds of conveyance of good and sufficient fee simple title to the said claim, subject to the following reservations and conditions:

(a) All mineral rights on the said claim shall be reserved to the said grantor for a period of twenty-five years, but the exercise of said rights shall be limited to underground mining.

(b) Until the close of 1966 the grantor shall be permitted to maintain and operate the Grand Canyon Inn and related cottages and facilities and may reserve for said period the customary rights to use so much of the surface area of the claim as is necessary for mining operations.

(c) After 1966 and until the expiration of the mineral reservation the grantor shall have reserved to it the surface rights to only the following described tract of approximately three acres which is necessary to operate the said mine:

Beginning at an iron stake known as corner numbered 2 of the Orphan Claim, mineral survey numbered 2004 in section 14, township 31 north, range 2 east, Gila and Salt River base and meridian; thence north 41 degrees 03 minutes east 500 feet; thence north 60 degrees 15 minutes west 300 feet; thence south 41 degrees 03 minutes west 500 feet to the south end center of said claim; thence south 60 degrees 15 minutes east 300 feet to place of beginning, including all buildings and improvements as per survey of April 21, 1905.

(d) Any structures erected on the reserved portion of surface rights shall be no more than two stories in height and shall be so designated as to be appropriate to the region.

(e) The grantor shall be permitted to maintain and operate the present aerial tramway for not to exceed two years from the date of the conveyance to the United States; and throughout the allowable period of its mining to maintain and operate the sixty-thousand-gallon water tank; the access road across the claim to the mine area, the portal area of the present adit, and such ventilators from the mine as may be required by mine safety laws.

(f) The grantor shall be permitted to haul ore from its mining operations to such mills as directed by the Atomic Energy Commission or otherwise, over roads of the Grand Canyon National Park upon payment of use charges therefor, as agreed between the parties but reasonably calculated to provide such additional cost of maintenance of said roads, if any, as may be occasioned by such operations.

SEC. 2. (a) In exchange for the foregoing conveyance to the United States of the said Orphan Claim and the release by the owner thereof of any claims to pursue any apex rights to the ore body under park land, the grantor shall have the right for a period of twenty-five years to mine and remove on a royalty basis all uranium ore and such other metalliferous ore of commercial value as can be recovered through the shaft existing on the Orphan Claim and additional underground workings beyond the northeast boundary of said claim, along the dip of any ore body apexing within the said claim: *Provided,* Said mining and removal rights shall be limited to underground mining, which shall be conducted so as not to disturb in any manner the surface of park land or the canyon walls, except for ventilation as required in accordance with mine safety laws: *Provided further,* That nothing in this Act shall be construed to create any obligation on the Atomic Energy Commission for the purchase of uranium derived from ores removed from beyond the vertical boundaries of the Orphan Claim:

(b) The United States shall be paid a royalty for ore extracted from under Government lands pursuant to this section, in accordance with the following Uranium Percentage Royalty Schedule:

Mine value per dry ton	Royalty percentage of mine value per dry ton
$0.01 to $10.00	5 per centum
$10.01 to $20.00	5½ per centum
$20.01 to $30.00	6 per centum
$30.01 to $40.00	6½ per centum
$40.01 to $50.00	7 per centum
$50.01 to $60.00	7½ per centum
$60.01 to $70.00	8 per centum
$70.01 to $80.00	8½ per centum
$80.01 to $90.00	9 per centum
$90.01 to $100.00	9½ per centum
$100.01 or more	10 per centum

"Mine value per dry ton" is hereby defined as the dollar value per dry ton of crude ores at the mine as paid for by the Atomic Energy Commission or other Government Agency before allowance for transportation and development; however, if the Government at any time hereafter does not establish and pay for said ores on a fixed or scheduled dollar value per dry ton of crude ores at the mine, or said ores contain salable minerals, some or all, or which are disposed of to a custom treatment plant or smelter for treatment and sale, then mine value per dry ton shall be the gross value per dry ton of said crude ore as paid for by the Atomic Energy Commission or other Government authorized agency mill or other buyer, less any allowances or reimbursements for the following specific items: (1) transportation of ores, and (2) treatment or beneficiation of ores; which specific items shall in such event be deducted from the gross sales price received from the metal content of said ores by the seller before said percentage royalty is calculated and paid.

Whenever mineral or other products are recovered which are not included in determining mine value per dry ton as defined herein, there shall be paid for such minerals or other products a royalty of 5 per centum of the gross value of such products at the mine site.

Provided, That on all ore having a mine value dry ton of less than $50, the royalty to be paid hereunder shall not exceed 15 per centum of the grantor's net profit on such ore which shall be determined by the amount remaining from the total sales price of such ore after the payment of reasonable operating expenses, taxes, and cost depletion.

(c) When paid, the royalty shall be deposited to miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury in accordance with the provisions of title 31, United States Code, section 484.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 10]

Addonizio
Alford
Anfuso
Ashbrook
Auchincloss
Ayres
Bailey
Bass, N.H.
Belcher
Blitch
Boykin
Brademas
Buckley
Cahill
Carey
Casey
Celler
Chiperfield
Clark
Coad
Cohelan
Colmer
Cooley
Corbett
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis, Mass.
Davis, Tenn.
Dulski
Dwyer
Elliott
Farbstein
Feighan
Fino
Fisher
Fulton
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gary
Gavin
Glenn
Granahan
Grant
Harding
Harrison, Va.
Healey
Henderson
Hoffman, Ill.
Hoffman, Mich.
Hosmer
Inouye
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Jones, Mo.
Landrum
Lesinski
Macdonald
Madden
Magnuson
Mathias
Miller, N.Y.
Moorhead, Pa.
Moulder
Multer
Nelsen
Passman
Pilcher
Powell
Quie
Rains
Randall
Reece
Rodino
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Ryan
St. Germain
Schenck
Sheppard
Sibal
Spence
Springer
Ullman
Wallhauser
Wickersham
Williams
Wilson, Calif.
Wilson, Ind.

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 344 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Education be allowed to sit this afternoon during debate on the floor of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

ACQUISITION OF PATENTED MINING CLAIM ON SOUTH RIM OF GRAND CANYON NATIONAL PARK

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. RUTHERFORD] is recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I strongly recommend the passage of S. 383. This bill concerns a patented mining claim in Grand Canyon National Park which achieved a good deal of notoriety last year when flamboyant newspaper stories appeared about a proposal to build a big hotel down the slope of the canyon. Nothing has come of that proposal and it is quite unlikely that anything ever will. Nevertheless the stories served a useful purpose in calling to the attention of the country the dangers of uncontrolled private inholdings in our national parks.

Put briefly, what S. 383 proposes with respect to this patented land is an immediate acquisition of title to the entire tract at no monetary cost to the Government in exchange for an agreement under which the owners will be permitted for 25 years to mine the uranium and other metals that are in and immediately adjacent to the claim and to occupy three acres of the surface for use in connection with the mining operations during the same period. In addition, the bill provides that the owners of the claim shall be permitted to continue to operate their Grand Canyon Inn for 4 years and to operate their present aerial tramway for 2 years and that they will pay certain specified royalties to the United States that may bring into the Federal Treasury perhaps as much as $600,000 or $650,000.

I am sure I reflect the thinking of the Members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs when I say that we all regard as highly desirable the elimination of inholdings not only in Grand Canyon National Park but throughout the national park system. I think also that I reflect the thinking of all, or nearly all, of my colleagues on the committee when I say that, although some of us may still have lingering doubts about the circumstances in which the publicity concerning the hotel on the slope of Grand Canyon appeared, we regard S. 383 as a good bill and one that ought to be enacted.

Mr. Speaker, there are many other aspects of this problem that our committee went into and other points in the legislation that could well be brought out. I am going to leave that job to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RUTHERFORD] who is chairman of the Subcommittee on National Parks. I want at this time only to reiterate my recommendation that my colleagues in the House consider this bill favorably and that it be enacted.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, first I should like to thank the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for his very gracious comments on my service as chairman of the Subcommittee on National Parks of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, I want to concur in everything that the chairman of our Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs [Mr. ASPINALL] has said and to elaborate on some points that he did not mention.

First, however, I want to say this. When S. 383 and its House companion, H.R. 9130, came along late last year and we were under great pressure to dispose of it before the end of the first session, I was one of those who was very suspicious and who insisted that we have a full hearing on it, notwithstanding that an apparently fair understanding had been reached between officials of the National Park Service and officials of Western Equities, Inc., the present owners of the Orphan Mining Claim.

I was suspicious, I say, because of the very fact that there was the sort of pressure I have spoken of and because of the great publicity that was given in a Sunday supplement of a newspaper of a hotel development and a cocktail lounge to be built on the south rim of the Grand Canyon National Park.

As a result of this, we had a full-scale hearing before our Subcommittee on National Parks. We had before us the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior, Mr. Frank Barry, to whom the Secretary of the Interior had given the job of making an independent investigation of the arrangement. We had before us the director of the National Park Service, Mr. Conrad Wirth, and his assistants. And we had before us the president of Western Equities, Mr. Richard Ince.

Some very frank—some might even consider, harsh words, were said both by myself and by other members of the committee as the story of the hotel proposal was unfolded. I shall not repeat them here for I am convinced that, whatever the motives that may have led to the publicity that attended it, no permanent damage has been done and that S. 383 gives us a good opportunity, at no cost to the Government, to work the whole thing out on a fair, reasonable, and equitable basis under the circumstances.

Now there is one factor in the picture that has not yet been mentioned but that deserves to be brought out. That is the legal situation with respect to the Orphan mining claim. There is no question that the claim is private property and that it was acquired from the Goverment before Grand Canyon National Park was established. There is also no doubt that if it were necessary to resort to condemnation, a rather considerable amount of money might be involved. The estimates range from $50,000 to $180,000. But the big question is whether the owners of the claim have a right to mine extralaterally or not—that is, whether they have a right to follow the ore body beyond the vertical boundaries of their claim. We were advised by attorneys for the Government that, in the particular circumstances that the Orphan claim presents, the legal profession could have a good long argument in court about this question, but no one could tell us for sure what the outcome of a case would be. In the circumstances, the parties have done the sensible thing—in my opinion—they have compromised. And what we are, in effect, being asked to do is to ratify the compromise and make it possible for it to become effective. As I said, our committee explored the ins and outs of the situation very thoroughly and we were convinced that the opportunity to acquire this land without cost to the Government ought to be taken.

Let me recapitulate the main items of the agreement:

First. The company will convey to the Government its title to all 21 acres of the land which it owns in the park and will relinquish any claim of right to mine extralaterally.

Second. It will retain the use of 3 acres in connection with its mining operations.

Third. It will have the right to mine for 25 years, but the mining will have to be conducted underground—there will be no surface destruction at all.

Fourth. It will be permitted to maintain its present Grand Canyon Inn which is an eyesore until the end of 1966, which it has long been the desire of the National Park Service to eradicate.

Fifth. It will be permitted to operate its aerial tramway for 2 years.

Sixth. It will pay a royalty to the Government for all ore removed from the mine. The royalty rate is approximately half the usual rate and may bring in something like $650,000 to the Government. This will be net increase in the Government's income since, if the company's claims were sustained in court, the Government would be entitled to no royalty at all.

Our committee has amended the bill in one particular. Because there were suggestions that the company may already have mined outside the boundaries of its claim, the bill has had added to it a provision to the effect that it is not to be construed as a ratification of any such trespass and that Government reserves all its rights in the premises.

Apart from this, the bill has already been amended in the Senate to include suggestions made by the Atomic Energy Commission, the Department of the Interior, and the Bureau of the Budget. These make it clear that the royalty proceeds will go into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury and that the Atomic Energy Commission is not obligated to purchase any ore derived from any part of the mine which may lie outside the vertical boundaries of the Orphan claim.

Mr. Speaker, I think that this summarizes the situation. I am glad to recommend to the House the enactment of S. 383, as amended.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUTHERFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee if it is not true that this is an unusual deposit of minerals, and rather than a vein, it is in what is known as a pipe formation; is that correct?

Mr. RUTHERFORD. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. ASPINALL. Is it the intention of the bill to permit mining of all the ore and along the breccia diatreme which apexes on the Orphan claim?

Mr. RUTHERFORD. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of reluctance that I find myself in a position of having to oppose the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Aspinall], and the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Rutherford] on this matter. I realize that the differences I am about to point out to you might be minimized in the minds of some people, and that this bill might be considered by some people to have been the best bargain that could have been arrived at in a very difficult situation; however, after testimony which was taken before our committee I have wrestled with myself, and I cannot in conscience support this legislation. I earnestly hope it is defeated.

As was stated by the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Rutherford], the Orphan mining claim was patented before the Grand Canyon National Park was created. It comprises 20.64 acres. Approximately 4 acres of that mining claim are on the surface of the rim of the Grand Canyon and 16.64 acres are on the face of the Grand Canyon. This mining claim was patented, and the fee rested in various owners, eventually becoming the property of the present owners, Western Equities, Inc. I do not know anyone connected with Western Equities, Inc., except from the testimony of Mr. Inch, chairman of the board of directors. I have discovered that this stock is listed on the American Stock Exchange. The price varies.

The president of the company is one Lee Ackerman, and the chairman of the board is a man named Richard W. Inch. When the chairman of any board of directors of a corporation that sells its stock to the American people appears before a congressional committee and cannot tell where the home office of the company is, I feel there is something basically wrong. I felt there has been something basically wrong in this entire case and in this entire bill last year, because with no warning whatsoever, in a Sunday magazine called Parade there appeared a fancy drawing done by an architect who, I have been informed, received a fee of $10,000 for preparing this plan. About the same time bills were introduced or were called up for consideration to ask the Federal Government to buy this property.

As far as I am concerned, there was only one word that describes the action of the then Western Gold & Uranium Co., now the Western Equities Co., Inc., and that is blackmail. They have definitely intended to blackmail the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States in the passage of a bill concerning their property under the threat of building a monstrosity on the face of the Grand Canyon. Immediately every conservation group throughout the length and breadth of the land became very much concerned, and they have certainly hoped that something could be worked out.

Let us take a look at this proposition and what they intended to do. It says that they intend to give up a great deal of rights. Well, they only have 4 acres on the surface of the plateau in the Grand Canyon. They are going to keep 3 acres throughout their entire mining operation. They say they have now, held by a holding company, this inn and motel that is out there. They have not spent any money to improve it except $5,000 last year to build a kitchen. It is a wholly owned subsidiary of Western Equities. They are going to milk it for the next 5 years and then turn it over to the park service. We are supposed to get out and let these people continue to mine for 25 years.

These people do not know what they have. There is a strange phenomenon in nature that has occurred on this 20-plus acres of land. As near as I am able to determine, no mining engineer will say it has a duplicate anywhere else in the United States or in the world. It is a uranium deposit basically in the shape of a milk bottle. How far out or down it goes no one knows. They have done some drilling on the 4 acres on the surface, and this uranium ore is found at least as far out as those 4 acres go. If this bill is passed, these people, the Western Equities, or their successors will have the right for 25 years to continue to mine on this operation, not only on their own land but as far out in any direction as the ore goes and recover and sell to Uncle Sam its own ore.

I have made a few further inquiries. I discovered that Western Gold & Uranium Co. have had a publicity group from Madison Avenue, headed by a man called Molesworth, known as Molesworth Associates. I inquired, and I found out Mr. Molesworth was a former employee of the Atomic Energy Commission.

I have only the following statement on rumor, but I understand that Molesworth and associates have not been paid in cash for their services. They have been paid in stock of the Western Gold & Uranium Co. I do not accuse them of misdoing, but I only assert the fact that Mr. Molesworth who was a former employee of the Atomic Energy Commission, now is in the publicity business for Western Gold & Uranium, now Western Equities, Inc. They have no right at the present time to continue to furnish the Atomic Energy Commission with ore.

In view of the fact that the President just last week in his press conference announced he wanted to look into the future stockpiling program, and in view of the fact that we already have an adequate supply of uranium, I certainly hope this bill is defeated.

As much as I am in favor of getting rid of the inholdings in all our national parks, I am perfectly willing to support a bill that will come in and condemn this property and seize the hotel, motel, and mining operation at the present time and to pay the owners thereof the fair market value thereof. I am not in favor of this bill as it is drafted before you today, and I hope it is defeated.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. It is my understanding that the Atomic Energy Commission, when the bill first came before us in the 86th Congress, was adamant in its opposition to any agreement to buy ore from this mine. Now, something seems to have happened, and I wonder if this has any relation to what the gentleman just said in connection with the former employee now being a stockholder in this Western Equities, Inc.

Mr. SAYLOR. I can only say to my colleague from Iowa that the last administration refused to approve this bill. I had a discussion, after the bill was introduced, with certain people in the department. They were very much opposed to it. Now we get a favorable report from the same Government. This in and of itself is not too surprising, but this, on other occasions, has caused Congress to pause and consider carefully any such legislation. In view of the information that I have given to the House, I certainly hope that this bill is defeated.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. I think it ought to be clear. I know the gentleman did not want to leave any misunderstanding. I know from statements made, and also the report, that the Atomic Energy Commission is not required to purchase ore from this mine. The purchase of ore is not conducted through Western Equities. Western Equities, who owns this property, sells no ore to the stockpile and sells no ore to the Government in any way whatsoever.

Mr. SAYLOR. I will say the gentleman's statement is correct. They do not sell it directly, but they supply ore to one of the suppliers of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. Morris K. Udall].

Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address myself briefly to the remarks made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. Reference was made to the stockpiling program, and I think all of us are concerned about this. But, this bill has nothing whatsoever to do with the stockpiling program.

On page 4 of the bill the committee wrote into it:

> Nothing in this Act shall be construed to create any obligation on the Atomic Energy Commission for the purchase of uranium derived from ores removed from beyond the vertical boundaries of the Orphan Claim.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL. Yes, I yield.

Mr. ASPINALL. The reason that that was written in there was so that the Atomic Energy Commission would not be impliedly bound to buy any ore out of this deposit. Now, it so happens that the Atomic Energy Commission does have a contract with Western Gold and Uranium, Inc., and Western Gold has a right to deliver ore to the mill, which is largely being managed by the Navajo Indians; is that not correct?

Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL. That is correct.

Mr. ASPINALL. Whether the bill is passed or not, the ore will be mined in accordance with the original contract and delivered to that mill.

Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL. That is correct.

I think the point that the gentleman has overlooked is that the alternatives we have are to either go ahead with this bill, which removes a blight from the Grand Canyon, one of our great centers of attraction, or leave the situation as it is. Right today this company owns 20 acres of land in this area. If this bill is voted down, they will still own the land, still have the mine, and still haul out ore and have a mining shaft at the Grand Canyon rim. This is not a giveaway, which I would not be for. We are not asked to give away anything. They are giving up a mining claim. They are saying, "We will deed this 20 acres to Uncle Sam; we will give up our rights after 25 years to do anything including mining on this property."

Mr. Speaker, mention was made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] of a proposal to have the Government buy this property. I would call to the attention of my colleagues the fact that we are not buying anything. Under the agreement the company will pay a royalty to the United States of America. Therefore we acquire this valuable inholding free. This is a rare opportunity, I would say to the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle, of having a bill sponsored by both the Senators from Arizona. In our shop in the House Office Building this is known as the Goldwater-Udall bill. There is something in it for everyone. With one stroke we can remove a blight from the face of one of our national monuments and provide continued employment for the Navajo Indians. We can make them happy as well as make the conservation people happy, who want to see this monument preserved. We can do all of this without spending a dime.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL. I yield to the chairman of our committee.

Mr. ASPINALL. Just what values are involved here in this legislation? There are the extralateral values; are there not?

Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL. Yes, sir.

Mr. ASPINALL. Will the gentleman explain to the Members of the House what is meant by "extralateral" values?

Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL. Under the mining law—and this is a complex point—if you file a mining claim—and this was filed as a patent in 1906, I believe—you can go out under the mining claim and follow a vein wherever it goes. They own this mining claim. If we do not pass this bill they can go out under the Grand Canyon National Park as far as the vein continues. This is a compromise in order to get rid of this eventuality and in order to get them out of the Grand Canyon National Park eventually.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that this bill would have the support of Members of the House on both sides of the aisle. I think it is a necessary and fair compromise. I am not interested in the welfare of this mining company, but I am interested in the welfare of the United States and the welfare of the Navajo Tribe. This bill will do a good job for both.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS.]

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, at the outset let me say to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL], who mentioned the Senator from Arizona, that I talked to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], this morning, and he authorized me to say—and I assume that under the circumstances this is permissible on the floor of the House—that he has divorced himself from this bill; that he is not for this bill in its present form or under the present conditions.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. No, not at this point. Let me get started. I have a question or two for the gentleman from Texas.

The first question is this: Who controls the roads in and out of this site?

Mr. RUTHERFORD. They are controlled by the National Park Service.

Mr. GROSS. In other words, the Federal Government controls them?

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Yes, sir.

Mr. GROSS. The Federal Government controls all the right of ingress and egress; does it not?

Mr. RUTHERFORD. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. So the mining company in trying to put over its blackmail threat of building a big hotel on the face of the cliff did not even have a road it could control? They would have been completely beholden to the Federal Government for the right to get in and out of that hotel?

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Not exactly. The road that they prefer to use, because of the heavy equipment, was blacktopped by the National Park Service and, therefore, they willingly acceded to paying the National Park Service for the use of any other road as long as the Government made this other road available.

Mr. GROSS. That is all right; but the Federal Government still controls the roads and controls the right of ingress and egress over the surrounding lands; is not that correct?

Mr. RUTHERFORD. They do not deny them the right——

Mr. GROSS. I did not say they did. But the Government controls these rights.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. No, sir; they do not, by law.

They own the land, but they cannot by law deny them ingress and egress. So, therefore, this is not a stickup on the part of the National Government.

Mr. GROSS. You mean if they hold a patent for mining purposes the Government cannot deny them the right to use the roads for other purposes, no matter what the other purposes may be?

Mr. RUTHERFORD. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. I am not a lawyer, but that is awfully hard to believe.

Why has not the Federal Government determined these extralateral rights? Is that the correct word?

Mr. RUTHERFORD. I believe so.

Mr. GROSS. The Acting Solicitor for the Department of Interior on December 15, 1960, said this:

> We think on the basis of the facts now of record that the owner of the Orphan Claim has no right to the deposits in the national park lands."

Mr. RUTHERFORD. That is his opinion.

Mr. GROSS. Why does not the Federal Government take this case to court? The Attorney General can move into the Federal courts pretty quickly over other deals. For instance, in the property acquired on Capitol Hill by Congress, and I opposed that deal, the Attorney General is moving in now to find out what happened in the negotiated settlements. I am not saying that that is wrong; but if he can move in there so quickly, why cannot this matter be taken to the courts to determine who has these rights? One administration says the mining company has no extralateral rights. Another administration comes along now and says, "Oh, yes; they have all the extralateral rights and you have got to pass this bill to protect the Government." Why does not the Government go into the courts and settle this thing?

Mr. RUTHERFORD. I might say this to the gentleman, that that same solicitor was in with a subsequent report and backed down on that statement. He said it was his opinion that he would not want to go to court with the case that he had.

Mr. GROSS. I find this in writing before me here and now. I find nothing in writing with respect to what the gentleman has just said.

I should like to ask the gentleman this further question. What is the arrangement on the part of the Atomic Energy Commission to buy the ore that is mined?

Mr. RUTHERFORD. None whatsoever, sir.

Mr. GROSS. And so the Members of the House do not know whether the Government is going to get $650,000 in royalties or whether the mining company is going to get $10 million; is that right?

Mr. RUTHERFORD. It is not contingent on who buys the ore. If the ore is sold, regardless what it is, the revenue comes to the Federal Government and we have estimated $650,000.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman says that this costs the Government nothing. But the Federal Government or the taxpayers of this country will buy the uranium ore in the end, is that not true?

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Not necessarily.

Mr. GROSS. Where is it going to be sold if not to the Government? Where is uranium used in any substantial quantity if the Government does not buy it?

Mr. RUTHERFORD. There is no contract with Western Equities to purchase the ore in question.

Mr. GROSS. So the taxpayers are going to have to pick up the bill. This is not just a nice cozy deal in behalf of the taxpayers. The taxpayers are going to have to pick up the bill in the end.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. It has no connection whatsoever with stockpiling.

Mr. GROSS. The Federal Government has to buy the uranium.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, I want to inform the Members of the House that I have just had Senator GOLDWATER's office call and was authorized to make the statement on the floor that he has withdrawn his support of this proposed legislation.

Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL. This withdrawal of support, did that occur at any time before today? I ask the question because this is the first I ever heard of it.

Mr. SAYLOR. I am not in a position to say. I just asked whether or not he had withdrawn his support and I was authorized to say on the floor of the House that he had withdrawn his support of this measure.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. It really does not make any difference whether it was today or yesterday or the day before, does it? The gentleman has withdrawn his support of the bill; that is the important thing. He just cannot swallow this sort of situation.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I am glad to yield.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, let me state this. The only change that has been made in Senator GOLDWATER's bill, which we are considering on the floor today, S. 383, is the amendment that was placed in the bill by myself, with the concurrence of the ranking minority leader in the committee. This is the only difference that there is in Senator GOLDWATER's bill:

> *Provided further*, That neither the enactment of this Act nor anything contained in it shall be construed to relieve any party from any liability which would or might otherwise exist for the removal of ore from beyond the boundaries of said Orphan Claim, if any such removal occurred prior to the enactment of this Act.

In other words, all that the House has done or that the committee has done to change Senator GOLDWATER's bill, is this:

> In the event the miners should have trespassed on the Federal Government land—and we are not now apprised of it—if we later learn they have trespassed, then we are not ratifying the trespass.

That is the only difference in Senator GOLDWATER's bill and the bill we are considering now by Senator HAYDEN and Senator GOLDWATER, S. 383. That is the only difference and the Senator has objected primarily, I presume, to the ratification of the trespass.

Mr. SAYLOR. He has withdrawn his support on that bill and his bill also.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, there is a misunderstanding surrounding this issue. First, the gentleman from Pennsylvania and I know it was unintentional, discussed a bill that is not on the floor today and that was as to 1,100 feet around the rim of the mine that was going to be permitted to be trespassed upon. If the gentleman would read the present bill, he would see that it does not make any such statement and that that proviso was completely removed. Let me say this, and I think the gentleman is well aware of it—in fact, I have my Irish dander up on the organization. I do not endorse Mr. Ince and his paper-thin corporation. I would not buy his stock for paperhanging on my wall. I would not have any use for Western Equities whatsoever. I think they did blackmail or attempt to blackmail, but it was thwarted. Regardless of what you may say, there is this damsel whose reputation is colored. She has a legitimate, fair and, I might say, a cause that can be taken to court and which will cost the Federal Government anywhere from $50,000 to $180,000. Then when the court decides and it is against the Federal Government, we will lose some $660,000. Let me say that if this bill is not passed, they can continue to mine the ore. You will not be accomplishing anything. You have not gotten on your white chargers. You have not saved anybody anything. All you will be doing is to deny the Federal Government $660,000 plus the value of these surface rights forever which would go to the Government without cost to the Government. What will the surface rights be to this cost? I would say it would be a quarter of a million dollars to purchase the ground surface. Also, there would be a loss of $650,000 in royalty. What would you be accomplishing by killing the bill? You will be costing the Federal Government in excess of a million dollars. I thought these people were for economy. You can bring out all of these extraneous matters as to the corporate stock and about the individuals, and I share the views of the gentleman from Pennsylvania when the chairman of a board cannot tell you where his home office is. But, I think this should be elaborated on and this should be considered. The fact is that this gentleman is not in this on a full-time basis. This is a part-time operation of his, and he has taken this on as more or less advisory. I think there is too limited amount of time to bring in the whole corporate structure here and tear these people apart. I hold no brief for them, but I do hold a brief for saving my Government some funds where the Government will be getting something without cost.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUTHERFORD. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is this not a fair summary of this legislation? First, the Government needs a tract of land which is an inn held by the Grand Canyon National Park. Second, this bill provides a way for the Government to get ultimate ownership of this mine without any cost to the taxpayers and, third, the only consideration going to the owners of the land is the right to work a vein of ore under ground now owned by the Park Service, a right which is limited as to the distance and a right which they probably already have. That is the legal discussion. Fourth, the Government will get paid a royalty on all minerals taken out from under the Government land.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. The gentleman is correct.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say to my colleagues that the analysis my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR] gave is correct as far as it goes. But, this bill does one thing more. These people now own 20.64 acres of land.

If this bill passes we give them a quitclaim deed to mine under the national park land, a right which they now admit they do not have. This is a matter which the Justice Department says would involve a lawsuit. There is no precedent that anyone can point to that says this company has the right to follow the vein outside of the park, and if this bill is passed they will have that right. This will create a mining claim, though not on the surface, within a national park; and, even though it is fixed at a term of 25 years, I think it should not be allowed.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I wonder why it is that this bill is brought up at this time when the gentleman who wants it, who just left the floor, said there was not time enough to discuss all the details of the matter.

Mr. SAYLOR. That I do not know.

I now yield to the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman from Texas did not make that statement whatsoever; the gentleman from Texas made the statement that he could not take the time to go ahead and talk about the corporate structure of the body that the gentleman from Pennsylvania referred to. It is not a question of names; it is a question of whether or not we can get to the real argument of the case, and I think we have gotten to the real argument of the case.

I asked the gentleman to yield for the purpose of making one correction. He did not mean to state that this company admitted that they did not have any right to go beyond the so-called perpendicular line.

Mr. SAYLOR. No, the company has not admitted it, but they admit they do not have title to more than 20.64 acres. As a result of this bill they will have a great deal more.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, let me sum up by stating that I feel that this issue, a very subtle issue, has been blown into partisan politics—implying possibly some hanky-panky going on somewhere, and possibly somebody has some of this stock in their back pocket.

Let me say that in the beginning, no one was more suspicious or hard-nosed about the propriety of this legislation the last time it was considered than the gentleman from Texas. Let me say that no one received more brutal treatment or, I should say, thorough treatment in the committee than the people who came before them. But regardless of the color you might place upon this there are a few things that are very simple:

You accomplish nothing, you stop no one; you do not stop one bucket of ore from coming up out of this mine by the defeat of this legislation, not one bucket. You change the situation only to this extent: The only thing that will happen if this bill is defeated is that the Federal Government will then have to purchase this property.

The Federal Government will lose from $600,000 to $650,000 estimate of net revenue.

There will be no change whatsoever except we will possibly then have to go to court, and then the court will decide who is right and who is wrong. Very confidentially, people on both sides feel like the other one possibly has the better case. The Government lawyer told me: "I do not want to take it to court." He spoke to me as a lawyer, not as a Government employee. "I am pointing out to you that the law involved in this thing is very difficult, there are many points undetermined: What is the sideline? What are the extralateral rights? The law is not plain."

If the bill is passed what is going to happen? These people will continue as they are going to continue if the bill is not passed, except we will ultimately and conclusively get all of this property in 25 years, and in 4 years we will get all of the eyesore construction—at least we will be receiving compensation for damages to the roads of the park system caused by the use of this company.

So what have you accomplished if you defeat this bill? You have cut off your nose to spite your face.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 383, as amended.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Iowa) there were ayes 73, noes 52.

Mr. **RUTHERFORD**. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **SPEAKER**. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were yeas 202, nays 136, not voting 96, as follows:

[Roll No. 11]

YEAS—202

Abbitt
Abernethy
Albert
Alexander
Andrews
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Bailey
Baldwin
Baring
Barry
Bass, Tenn.
Beckworth
Bennett, Fla.
Berry
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bonner
Brademas
Breeding
Brewster
Brooks, Tex.
Burke, Ky.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson
Byrne, Pa.
Cannon
Celler
Chelf
Chenoweth
Cohelan
Cook
Corman
Daniels
Davis, James C.
Davis, John W.
Dawson
Dent
Denton
Dingell
Dominick
Donohue
Dooley
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Doyle
Durno
Edmondson
Everett
Evins
Fascell
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Forrester
Fountain
Frazier
Gary
Gathings
Giaimo
Gonzalez
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Gubser
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Hansen
Harding
Hardy
Harris
Hébert
Hechler
Hemphill
Herlong
Holifield
Holland
Horan
Huddleston
Hull
Ichord, Mo.
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Md.
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Kee
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
Kilburn
Kilgore
King, Calif.
King, Utah
Kitchin
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kunkel
Lane
Lankford
Lennon
Loser
McDowell
McFall
McMillan
McSween
Mack
Mahon
Mailliard
Matthews
May
Merrow
Miller, Clem
Miller, George P.
Mills
Moeller
Monagan
Montoya
Morris
Morrison
Moss
Murray
Nedzi
Norrell
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen
Patman
Perkins
Peterson
Pfost
Philbin
Poage
Price
Purcell
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Roush
Rutherford
Ryan
Santangelo
Saund
Scott
Selden
Shelley
Shipley
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Miss.
Smith, Va.
Spence
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Toll
Trimble
Tuck
Udall, Morris K.
Vanik
Vinson
Walter
Watts
Westland
Whitener
Whitten
Wickersham
Willis
Winstead
Wright
Yates
Young

NAYS—136

Alger
Andersen, Minn.
Anderson, Ill.
Arends
Avery
Baker
Bates
Battin
Becker
Beermann
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Mich.
Betts
Bow
Bray
Bromwell
Broomfield
Brown
Broyhill
Bruce
Byrnes, Wis.
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Church
Clancy
Collier
Conte
Cramer
Curtis, Mo.
Dague
Derounian
Derwinski
Devine
Dole
Fallon
Fenton
Findley
Finnegan
Ford
Garland
Gavin
Goodell
Goodling
Griffin
Gross
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Harrison, Wyo.
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hiestand
Hoeven
Jensen
Johansen
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Judd
Kastenmeier
Kearns
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Knox
Kowalski
Kyl
Laird
Langen
Latta
Libonati
Lindsay
Lipscomb
McCulloch
McDonough
McIntire
McVey
MacGregor
Marshall
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mason
Meader
Michel
Milliken
Minshall
Moore
Moorehead, Ohio
Morse
Mosher
Natcher
Norblad
Nygaard
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Hara, Ill.
Osmers
Ostertag
Pelly
Pike
Pillion
Pirnie
Poff
Pucinski
Ray
Riehlman
Robison
Rousselot
St. George
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scherer
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scranton
Seely-Brown
Short
Shriver
Siler
Smith, Calif.
Stafford
Taber
Teague, Calif.
Thomson, Wis.
Tollefson
Tupper
Utt
Van Pelt
Van Zandt
Waggonner
Weaver
Weis
Whalley
Wharton
Widnall
Younger

NOT VOTING—96

Adair
Addabbo
Addonizio
Alford
Anfuso
Ashbrook
Ayres
Barrett
Bass, N.H.
Blitch
Bolton
Boykin
Buckley
Cahill
Carey
Casey
Chiperfield
Clark
Coad
Colmer
Cooley
Corbett
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis, Mass.
Daddario
Davis, Tenn.
Delaney
Diggs
Dulski
Dwyer
Elliott
Ellsworth
Farbstein
Feighan
Fino
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gilbert
Glenn
Granahan
Grant
Harrison, Va.
Hays
Healey
Henderson
Hoffman, Ill.
Hoffman, Mich.
Hosmer
Inouye
Jarman
Jennings
Jones, Mo.
Landrum
Lesinski
Macdonald
Madden
Magnuson
Mathias
Miller, N.Y.
Moorhead, Pa.
Morgan
Moulder
Multer
Murphy
Nelsen
Nix
O'Neill
Passman
Pilcher
Powell
Quie
Rains
Randall
Reece
Rodino
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
St. Germain
Schenck
Sheppard
Sibal
Springer
Staggers
Thompson, La.
Ullman
Wallhauser
Williams
Wilson, Calif.
Wilson, Ind.
Zablocki
Zelenko

So (two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof) the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Zablocki and Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Schenck against.

Mr. Jennings and Mr. Anfuso for, with Mrs. Reece against.

Mr. Ullman and Mr. Powell for, with Mr. Wilson of California against.

Mr. Multer and Mr. Addabbo for, with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan against.

Mr. Farbstein and Mr. Garmatz for, with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois against.

Mr. Dulski and Mr. Rodino for, with Mr. Fino against.

Mr. Zelenko and Mr. Friedel for, with Mr. Chiperfield against.

Mr. Daddario and Mr. Addonizio for, with Mrs. Bolton against.

Mr. Delaney and Mr. Gilbert for, with Mr. Ayres against.

Mr. Moorhead of Pennsylvania and Mr. O'Neill for, with Mr. Adair against.

Mr. Healey and Mr. Carey for, with Mr. Rostenkowski against.

Mr. St. Germain and Mr. Gallagher for, with Mr. Nelsen against.

Mr. Barrett and Mr. Macdonald for, with Mr. Bass of New Hampshire against.

Mr. Madden and Mr. Magnuson for, with Mr. Roudebush against.

Mr. Clark and Mrs. Granahan for, with Mr. Springer against.

Mr. Rains and Mr. Sheppard for, with Mr. Murphy against.

Mr. Diggs and Mr. Morgan for, with Mr. Wallhauser against.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana and Mr. Lesinski for, with Mrs. Dwyer against.

Mr. Inouye and Mr. Moulder for, with Mr. Mathias against.

Mr. Harrison of Virginia and Mr. Staggers for, with Mr. Miller of New York against.

Mr. Williams and Mr. Colmer for, with Mr. Ellsworth against.

Mr. Henderson and Mr. Coad for, with Mr. Ashbrook against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Feighan with Mr. Glenn.

Mr. Hays with Mr. Hosmer.

Mr. Cooley with Mr. Cahill.

Mr. Alford with Mr. Corbett.

Mrs. Blitch with Mr. Sibal.

Mr. Boykin with Mr. Wilson of Indiana.

Mr. Davis of Tennessee, with Mr. Curtin.

Mr. Jarman with Mr. Fulton.

Mr. Landrum with Mr. Quie.

Mr. Nix with Mr. Cunningham.

Mr. Pilcher with Mr. Frelinghuysen.

Mr. Elliott with Mr. Curtis of Massachusetts.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

APPOINTMENT TO COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 3, Public Law 86-380, the Chair appoints as a member of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order I have for today be inserted in the RECORD following the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN] with permission to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

A TRIBUTE TO THE BOY SCOUTS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] may address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend his remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, seldom in the history of the Nation has there existed an organization so widely respected as the Boy Scouts of America; respected not merely by a select class, but by the majority of every class. Examine, if you will, the popularity of any other organization in the country and you will find none with the immediate appeal of the Boy Scouts, nor any with a more devoted following over a long term period.

One year ago today, the Boy Scouts of America celebrated the close of their first half century in the field of organizational activity. This, of course, required a perusal of their record, as of that date. Yet there was nothing but exultation at their meeting; nothing but the victory-shout of a job well done. And why not? There was, after all, no choice but to react in such a manner. For in the period comprising their 50 years' existence, the Boy Scouts of America had managed to fulfill every promise set forth by their founders, as well as the hopes and dreams of every boy who ever donned their uniform. If that is not a cause for joyful shouting, I would like to know what is.

In 1910 the Boy Scouts were incorporated in the District of Columbia, setting forth their purposes in the following terms:

> That the purpose of this corporation shall be to promote, through organization, and cooperation with other agencies, the ability of boys to do things for themselves and others, to train them in scoutcraft, and to teach them patriotism, courage, self-reliance, and kindred virtues, using the methods which are now in common use by Boy Scouts.

By placing emphasis upon the Scout oath or promise and law for character development, citizenship training, and physical fitness.

So immediately apparent was the success of the undertaking that it received the wholehearted support of President Taft at the first annual meeting of the Boy Scouts, held in Washington in the year 1911. In his address to the gathering, the President commended the several national campaigns launched that year under the auspices of the Boy Scouts; namely, the National Cleanup Campaign, the Safe and Sane Fourth of July, and the charitable Thanksgiving and Christmas basket campaign.

That year—1911—the total membership of the Boy Scouts numbered 61,495—a rather large number, in view of the recent incorporation of the group. Yet 4 years later the membership was up to 182,000; and by 1925 had skyrocketed to 756,000—4 times the membership total of the preceding decade.

With the passage of time, the membership lists have continued to swell, until today the total has almost reached the 5 million mark, to the deep satisfaction of the Boy Scout leadership, the Scouts, themselves, and all of their well-wishers.

This is as it should be. For the goals of the organization are truly American in nature, and deserve the thunderous support they have all along received.

Originating in the concept that adults of good character can provide the most constructive leadership to youth, the Boy Scouts of America have won the support and assistance of thousands upon thousands of community leaders throughout the land.

Moreover, the products of the Boy Scout movement, numbering in the vicinity of 30 million persons, have, in turn, assumed leading roles in their communities, thereby rewarding their benefactors through devoted service.

The Boy Scouts' overall desire, to do "good turns" at every opportunity, can therefore be said to extend into adult life. For indeed the final good turn is the end product: a responsible adult, with acute awareness of community needs.

It is a pleasure to join with millions of other Americans today, in saluting the achievements and designs of this remarkable organization, and in wishing it well in all its future operations.

May it prosper in the years ahead, as in years gone by, to the benefit of people, the flag, and the national welfare.

TOWARD SOVIET AMERICA

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, "Toward Soviet America," a bloody blueprint for conquering the United States, is the title of a book by the late William Z. Foster, longtime national chairman of the Communist Party of the United States. It was first published in this country in 1943, but quickly proved to be too revealing. It disclosed so bluntly and in such detail the Red conspiracy's evil program for America that the Communists, fearful it could hurt their cause, attempted to track down and destroy all copies of the book. They nearly succeeded. Now the book has been published again, not by the Communists for the benefit of communism as Foster originally intended, but by Elgin Enterprises, Inc., of Balboa Island, Calif., a patriotic organization determined that the book will be used as a weapon against the Communist conspiracy. I had the honor of writing a foreword to the reprinted edition.

In the Washington Evening Star of January 23, 1962, columnist Gould Lincoln wrote a thoughtful piece about the timeliness of the book's revival and how it can help bolster the Western Hemisphere against further Communist penetration. I commend Mr. Lincoln's article as highly worthwhile reading and include it in the RECORD at this point.

A COMMUNIST BLUEPRINT FOR AMERICA

(By Gould Lincoln)

While the Organization of American States is tackling the Castro-Cuban move toward international communism, the interested parties should take a look at "Toward Soviet America," written by the late William Z. Foster and published in this country in 1943. It has been republished recently, with a foreword by Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER of Pennsylvania, chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee. While the Un-American Activities Committee had nothing to do with the new publication of this volume, which sets forth in detail the plans of the Communists to take over this country and the Western Hemisphere—by force if necessary—Mr. WALTER is providing Members of Congress with copies. In his foreword Mr. WALTER calls it "the book the Communists tried to destroy" because it tells too much. They were so successful that few copies remained, and the Department of Justice had a difficult time finding even a few needed in the Smith Act trials, when the first defendant was Foster himself, who had been head of the Communist Party in this country.

THE RED THREAT

Foster renounced the book, calling it obsolete. It was embarrassing world communism—which was attempting a softer line. Chairman WALTER wrote:

"Foster could orphan his book, but he could not wipe out what it reveals about communism. With the revival of the era of force and violence, 'Toward Soviet America' once more has come into its own. Again it fits the international Communist line. And again it threatens the United States with the stark horrors of becoming a conquered province, under the bayonets of a Red army. The Communist line changes often. The Communist purpose—to conquer the world—does not change at all."

Mr. WALTER referred to the Communist manifesto proclaimed by Nikita Khrushchev in January 1961, which declared: "If the ruling classes counter revolution with force and are unwilling to bow to the will of the people, the proletariat must break their resistance." This was clear proof that the Communists have returned, Mr. WALTER wrote, to the hard line of 1932, when the United States was marked for revolution, and Foster described how such a resolution was to be carried out.

The last chapter of the Foster book—"The United Soviet States of America" it was called, is a blueprint for a takeover of the Government by the "workers." It called for elimination of capitalism, of the church, of the two-party political system, for the infiltration and takeover of the American Federation of Labor and other unions, for ownership of all property by a Soviet government—with a Red army, such as Russia has, ready to enforce such Communist rule. While it was all to start with infiltration and subversion, it would end with the use of force and the elimination of all who stood in the way.

In chapter notes, added by Maurice Ries, a former consultant of the Un-American Activities Committee, Mr. Ries commented:

"Foster's volume might almost have been the handbook by which Castro came into power in Cuba."

Foster painted a glowing picture of life in this country under a Communist society. "It will be varied and interesting," he wrote. "Individual will vie with individual, as never before, to create the useful and beautiful. Locality will compete with locality in the beauty of their architecture. The impress of individuality will be upon everything. The world will become a place well worth living in and what is the most important, its joys will not be the niggardly monopoly of a privileged ruling class but the heritage of the great producing masses."

No signs of such beauty and joy of living have been evidenced in any of the Communist-dominated countries to date. Suppression and murder—political purges to bring new leaders and dictators—have been the order of the day. The dictators in Russia and China have spent most of their energies and money in developing arms strong enough—they hope—to give them control of all the world, strong enough to threaten annihilation and to annihiliate, if the "ruling classes" do not bow their heads.

CASTRO DID IT IN CUBA

What Castro has done in Cuba is what Foster wanted to do in the United States. Castro had more fertile ground on which to work, for the workers of Cuba had been ground down to a degree that none have been in the United States since the days of slavery—days which Foster contended still exist in this country.

The other Latin American Republics are becoming more and more aware of the fact that what happened in Cuba could happen to them. These countries have the opportunity, in their meeting in Uruguay, to do something about this Communist bridgehead which has been raised in Cuba. The probabilities are they will do little unless the United States takes firm leadership in the move for economic sanctions against Communist Cuba.

Secretary Rusk has stated that if these countries are to have the benefit of U.S. aid in the Alliance for Progress $20 billion program they had better give heed to that leadership. But entirely aside from that, these nations must reckon on their chances of preventing Communist dictatorship from arising within their own borders. Military dictators, capitalist dictators they have had, as we have never had in the United States.

The Alliance for Progress is a program for greater democracy, for improvement of the lot of peoples within the Western Hemisphere. Yet some of the largest of the South American Republics hesitate in this day of decision.

MEMBERS OF THE PEACE CORPS TO JAPAN

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, while in Japan last December, my attention was directed to an article which appeared on the front page of the Japanese Times of December 14. The United States had proposed to send 100 members of the Peace Corps to Japan as English teachers.

I reluctantly voted for the establishment of the Peace Corps last year, but it was with the very definite understanding that the Corps was to operate only in undeveloped countries, and then only upon the invitation of the country concerned.

It seems that in Japan, both of these principles were violated, and I can well understand why. The Japanese people felt their national prestige was impaired when considered by us to be an undeveloped country.

I sincerely hope that we can have better examples than this to justify our action in establishing the Peace Corps.

The Times article was as follows:

MINISTRY SAID RELUCTANT TO ACCEPT PEACE CORPS OFFER

The Education Ministry is reportedly taking a lukewarm attitude toward the recent U.S. proposal to send 100 members of the Peace Corps to Japan as English instructors.

Education Minister Masou Araki and other Ministry officials are said to be reluctant to accept the offer made by U.S. Ambassador Edwin O. Reischauer to Foreign Minister Zentaro Kosaka November 7 on grounds that the U.S. Peace Corps program is primarily aimed at helping underdeveloped nations and that Japan's national prestige would be impaired if it accepted aid under this program.

The informants said the Ministry also feared that it could not issue teaching licenses to the American youths if they were not fully experienced in teaching in America.

In such an event, the activities of the visiting English instructors in Japan would be restricted to the holding of special courses or lectures at public halls or at meetings of Japanese English teachers.

The Japan Teachers Union also is opposed to the plan, but from a different point of view.

The militant union, claiming a membership of 600,000, says that the sending of the English instructors is being proposed to foster pro-American leanings in Japan.

The union also claims that the dispatching of such a mission from the United States is not necessary in the light of the present state of English education in Japanese schools.

Foreign Minister Kosaka is scheduled to reply to the proposal by the end of this month.

PREVENTION OF SALES OF IMPORTED PRODUCTS IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill similar in almost every respect to H.R. 10021 introduced last week by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER]. I am pleased to join with my colleague in seeking to prevent sales of imported products in the United States at prices below those for which they are sold abroad. This results, under the Anti-dumping Act, in the imposition of a special dumping duty if the sales injure an American industry. The act protects against injurious price cutting and does not involve the question of protectionism versus free trade. Differentials must be found to exist by the Treasury Department which then refers the case to the Tariff Commission for determination as to whether injury has occurred. The Tariff Commission has a statutory 3-month deadline; the Treasury Department has no time limit. We propose by this legislation to correct that time lag.

The cement industry which is very important to the economy of my district has been severely injured in the past by the long delays in the Treasury Department making its report to the Tariff Commission.

Inordinate delay in processing cement complaints by the Treasury Department in its administration of the Anti-dumping Act has had a serious effect upon domestic cement companies, especially those in Eastern United States. Many of these States have had their markets near the coast invaded by dumped foreign cement in recent years.

Since 1958 12 complaints of unfairly priced cement from foreign countries have been filed by 12 cement producers. Of eight completed by Treasury, sales below fair value were found in all but one—Norway. Three of the cases have been referred to the Tariff Commission where cement producers have secured affirmative findings of injury—Sweden, Belgium, and Portugal. The remaining four cases were not referred to the Tariff Commission in view of cessation of imports or price increases to the United States and adequate assurances as to future pricing. Of the eight cases thus far completed by Treasury, the fastest processing required 7 months from the date of complaint to the date of final determination. The slowest took 25 months—and the average for all eight cases was 15½ months. Of the four remaining cases not yet closed by Treasury, one has been pending 27 months. The complainants thus far have had to wait an average of 11¼ months without final Treasury action on any of these four cases.

It is only from effective enforcement of the Antidumping Act that domestic producers can expect relief from the unfair trade practices of dumping. There is no compensation for injury suffered, nor are treble damage suits available under the act. Inordinate delays constitute a severe restriction on the effectiveness of the act.

Effective enforcement of the Antidumping Act is urgently needed for the benefit of all concerned. There is no question but that a speedup in Treasury processing would benefit the importer as well as the domestic producer. The order to suspend duty assessments results in a significant contingent liability and faster action by Treasury would obviate such large contingencies.

Clearly, such an amendment to the Antidumping Act as proposed would be a step in the right direction and in the best interest of all concerned.

ACTION TAKEN BY THE CONFERENCE OF FOREIGN MINISTERS AGAINST FIDEL CASTRO'S COMMUNIST REGIME IN CUBA

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, events subsequent to the conclusion of the Foreign Ministers' meeting at Punta del Este have served to emphasize the truly historic significance of that Conference.

From Buenos Aires, there is news that the Argentine Government now supports the prompt ouster of Castro's Cuba from the inter-American system.

Here in Washington, our Government has announced a total ban on imports from Cuba.

As these events indicate, the Conference at Punta del Este has signaled the beginning of a new, long-awaited phase in our struggle against the hemispheric threat posed by Castro and communism.

The United States and our hemispheric allies at last have seized the initiative in this struggle—diplomatically, psychologically, and otherwise. As a result, Sino-Soviet aspirations in the Americas have been dealt a telling blow.

Fidel Castro's government now stands stripped of its pretensions to leadership and influence in the Western Hemisphere's community of nations. Indeed, Communist Cuba is now isolated, quarantined, and exposed as an agent of international communism, a nation whose aims are incompatible with the inter-American system.

As a member of the four-man congressional group which accompanied Secretary of State Rusk and the U.S. delegation to Punta del Este, I am heartened to be able to report the success of that mission.

To be sure, this success was not unlimited. Yet through firmness, perseverance and skillful handling, our delegation did accomplish its two basic objectives.

First, the United States sought at Punta del Este to have the Castro regime condemned and isolated by the nations of the hemisphere—the nations which Cuba would subvert and overthrow on behalf of international communism.

Second, the United States sought at Punta del Este to demonstrate the capacity of the inter-American system to face up to its most serious challenge—the presence in Cuba of a base of Soviet aggression against the Americas.

Both these objectives were achieved, despite serious obstacles. Along with the other members of the congressional group at Punta del Este—Senators MORSE and HICKENLOOPER and our House colleague, Congressman MERROW—I have attributed the achievement of these objectives to the tireless, dedicated, and inspired efforts of our Secretary of State, Dean Rusk.

Secretary Rusk, his assistants, and his staff deserve the gratitude of every American for their efforts and accomplishments at Punta del Este. Further, the Conference could not have been as great a success without the exceptional job done by our Ambassador to the Organization of American States, deLesseps S. Morrison.

Our four-man congressional group attended the Conference in Uruguay at the request of Secretary Rusk. With the Secretary's knowledge and consent, we, the elected representatives of the people of the United States, made known to the Latin American delegates at the meeting what the American people demanded by way of action against Castro's Cuba.

My own opinions in this area are well known and of long standing. As chairman of the House Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, I have continuously urged strong and vigorous OAS action against Castro.

As early as January 1960, I stated that there was no hope for democracy in Cuba and asked that the United States take a firmer stand against Castro.

In March 1960, I called attention to the mounting campaign of anti-U.S. propaganda coming from Cuba, and I asked for immediate action to counter this propaganda.

In June 1960, I called a special meeting of the House Inter-American Affairs Subcommittee to examine the threat of communism, and of Castro's Cuba, to the Western Hemisphere. At that time, I declared that "this country can ill afford to ignore mounting evidence that the present Cuban Government is being used to further the international Communist conspiracy."

In August 1960, I publicly criticized the results of the Inter-American Conference at San José, Costa Rica. At that Conference, the United States was unable to persuade the other American countries to adopt a resolution which singled out Castro's Cuba by name.

In March 1961, I urged our Government to end trade with Cuba. I am gratified that one of the initial results of the meeting of Punta del Este is the termination by the United States of one of the last remaining sources of Castro's dollar exchange.

In April 1961, I introduced a resolution calling for the imposition of sanctions against Cuba and the immediate exclusion of Cuba from the Inter-American Defense Board. The House of Representatives overwhelmingly approved this resolution—one which has proven to be of significant value in the fight against Castro, for every measure proposed in that resolution was supported by the United States at last week's meeting and approved by the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the Americas.

In June 1961, I warned that unless collective action was taken against Castro the American people would soon demand a solution supported by those Latin American governments willing to honor their hemispheric commitments.

And in October 1961, I pointed out that if the Organization of American States did not soon act against Castro, its usefulness would be undermined and the United States would have to take a hard, new look at its OAS commitments.

With this background, I attended the meeting at Punta del Este, and I am pleased to report that at that Conference the voice of this House, regarding Fidel Castro and the Communist threat to the hemisphere, was clearly heard. Equally audible was the voice of the Senate as expressed by the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the distinguished senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER].

I have said that the U.S. delegation went to Punta del Este with two basic objectives—the isolation of Castro and the strengthening of the inter-American system. Toward these ends, Secretary Rusk proposed the following measures in his opening speech at the conference:

First, that the Foreign Ministers declare that Cuba's alinement with the Sino-Soviet bloc is incompatible with the purposes and principles of the inter-American system.

Second, that the present Government of Cuba be expelled and barred from all the organs and agencies of the inter-American system, beginning with Cuba's immediate exclusion from the Inter-American Defense Board. This is a far-reaching action, one never before applied to any American government in the entire history of inter-American relations.

Third, that economic sanctions be applied against Cuba in the same manner in which they were applied against the Dominican Republic.

Fourth, that a special group be established with direct responsibility for defending the Caribbean area against Cuban subversion.

These were the goals which Secretary Rusk and the U.S. delegation sought at Punta del Este, and these were the measures embodied in the final act of Punta del Este. In the end, thanks to the firm, undeviating course taken by Secretary Rusk and vigorously endorsed by our congressional group, the United States achieved every single objective set forth in the Secretary's speech and in the resolution of the House passed last May.

But the true measure of the Conference is not limited to the terms of the act. Of great importance to the future of the inter-American system is the manner and method by which the United States and its Latin American neighbors worked toward their objectives.

Despite publicized disagreements among some nations regarding how best to deal with Castro, let us not lose sight of the fact that in the entire Conference, throughout dozens of votes, not a single American nation voted even once with Cuba.

Where there was disagreement, some countries abstained. But by this course of action these nations deliberately made it clear that although they might disagree with us on some points, they did not stand with Cuba.

In the assembly of free nations of the Western Hemisphere, Cuba stood alone—undeniable evidence of Fidel Castro's betrayal of the hemisphere and of the Cuban people.

Consider the votes cast at Punta del Este:

Twenty nations—all save Cuba—voted to maintain a position of unyielding hostility to international communism and to its efforts to undermine the freedom of the hemisphere.

Twenty nations voted to expel Cuba from the Inter-American Defense Board immediately—and Cuba is no longer a member of that vital agency.

Twenty nations voted to reaffirm the Alliance for Progress as the only true path to democratic development, social justice, and economic improvement for the people of the hemisphere.

Twenty nations voted to declare that adherence by any member of the Organization of American States to Marxism-Leninism is incompatible with the inter-American system.

Twenty nations voted that the present Government of Cuba, as a Marxist-Leninist state, is incompatible with the principles and objectives of the inter-American system.

Nineteen nations voted to establish a special Caribbean defense organization to protect against Cuban efforts at infiltration and subversion.

Sixteen nations voted to apply immediate economic sanctions to Cuba, identical to those sanctions applied against the Dominican Republic.

The only serious division at the conference was upon the question of whether Communist Cuba's incompatibility with the inter-American system—about which 20 nations agreed—required immediate exclusion from the organs and agencies of the system.

Two-thirds of the American Republics, 14 nations, voted for immediate exclusion. Six nations abstained. Only Cuba voted against. Of the six abstaining nations, Argentina has now announced a reversal of its position at the Conference and will support immediate exclusion.

While unanimity in the face of the international Communist threat would have been preferred, we must keep in mind that there was such unanimity in recognizing that threat. And while the United States was and is disappointed that some countries—including the largest nations of Latin America—would not support immediate exclusion, the fact is that the resolution was passed, the action was taken, and Cuba is now out of the inter-American system.

All that remains is for the OAS to carry forward the necessary legal and technical procedures to implement this resolution.

Moreover, in the wake of the Conference, the boldness of the action taken is having reverberations throughout the Americas. The reversal of Argentina's position is encouraging, and it has its special irony.

There is no doubt that many of the abstaining delegations from the larger Latin American nations feared that a firm stand against Cuba on immediate exclusion might inflame leftwing elements in their respective countries. Their "go slow" approach to the Castro menace represented a form of appeasement of domestic pro-Castro forces.

Yet it would seem that at least some of these delegations underestimated the strength and courage of prodemocratic forces in their countries, and perhaps overestimated the appeal of Castroism. For the fact is that communism is always a minority movement, one which plays on the fears of the majority to achieve its goals. Where the majority is hesitant or impotent, communism gains. Where the majority acts boldly and with courage, the Communist threat dissipates.

For 3 years, Fidel Castro has grown bold while faced with timid half-measures. But we are hopeful that Punta del Este marks an historic turning point. Here it was that the hemisphere faced up to its responsibilities. Here it was that Fidel Castro first saw the handwriting on the wall—the handwriting which branded him an outcast, a pariah from the family of the Americas.

At Punta del Este we took a step, a large step, but this step is merely the beginning of the end for communism in Cuba. Fidel Castro still controls Cuba, and international communism remains today a menace to the hemisphere.

The United States and its hemispheric allies must proceed with the work set out by the final act of Punta del Este. We must continue and intensify our efforts to free the Cuban people from the tyranny of Castro and to turn back the international threat his government poses.

There is no doubt that the long-range answer to this threat lies in the Alliance for Progress and through cooperative hemisphere efforts to reduce and eliminate hunger, poverty, and need in the Americas. The act of Punta del Este reaffirms this principle.

But it is in the reaffirmation of the principle of collective action to meet the immediate threat of Castro's Cuba that the act of Punta del Este will best be remembered in the years to come. For facing up to this threat—the ugly threat of violence, subversion, and bloodshed—required courage on the part of every Latin American delegation supporting action against Castro.

Had the Conference failed to meet this challenge, a tragic chapter would have been written in the history of the hemisphere. Had Punta del Este ended by an evasion of responsibility and an appeasement of Cuban communism, the inter-American system itself would stand condemned.

But the system did not fail. When the showdown came, our Latin American allies proved their determination to meet hemisphere responsibilities, and their devotion to the inter-American principle.

In the long view, this may well be the greatest accomplishment of the Conference at Punta del Este. Not only was Castro dealt a critical blow, but his efforts to destroy the inter-American system proved in vain.

In the end, it was Castro and not the system which suffered defeat. In the end, it will be Castro's government and not the unity of the Western Hemisphere which will suffer dissolution.

Ultimately, when the promise of Punta del Este is fulfilled, the people of Cuba themselves will share fully in the fruits of this historic Conference. For make no mistake about it, by condemning those who have betrayed the hemisphere, the act of Punta del Este speaks up for the millions of Cuban people who long for freedom.

Castro's Cuba has been expelled from the inter-American system to speed the day when the Cuban people will see the Communist blight removed from their land. Castro's Cuba has been expelled to speed the day when the Cuban people will once again take their proper place in the hemisphere family of nations.

For my own part, I am gratified to have participated in the efforts at Punta del Este to achieve this goal. I know that the efforts of our four-man congressional delegation at the Conference helped to make our Latin American friends realize and understand the deep feeling of the Congress and of the people of the United States concerning Castro's Communist government.

I am especially pleased to be able to report that the Selden resolution of last May, which became the resolution of the House of Representatives, served as a basis from which U.S. recommendations were submitted and from which the Conference took final action.

At Punta del Este, the hemisphere took a constructive step forward in our struggle against Castro and communism. Let us now hope and pray that the bright promise of the Conference is fulfilled. Let us now make certain that the inter-American system, which has boldly reaffirmed its principles, is safeguarded and encouraged in its work to maintain and foster freedom in this hemisphere.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SELDEN. I yield to our distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I join our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Alabama, in this tribute, first of all, to our Secretary of State. The quality of his leadership at the Punta del Este meeting was, in my opinion, superior. I want particularly to congratulate our colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Alabama, and our colleague, the gentleman from New Hampshire, for the very important, if not indispensable, part they played in the Punta del Este Conference. Officials of the Department of State have advised me that the presence of our colleagues at that meeting was very significant for many reasons, and that their performance there was of the highest order. I think the House of Representatives and the country will salute their efforts and the results of their toil at that Conference.

Mr. SELDEN. I am grateful to the distinguished gentleman for his very kind remarks.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SELDEN. I yield to our distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY].

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I join with our very able majority leader in the compliments he has paid to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Alabama, and to our colleague, the gentleman from New Hampshire, for the report they have made to the House of

Representatives and for their efforts in making the Conference of Ministers at Punta del Este so successful. I am sure the achievements obtained at that Conference were in no small degree due to their presence at that meeting. While reports of the Conference may at times have been disheartening, I think I should emphasize at this point that I feel, as our colleague, the gentleman from Alabama, has said in his statement, that the real true value of this Conference is the proof that it has given to the world of the determination of our allies and the countries in the Western Hemisphere of our unity of purpose in the hemisphere and their devotion to the inter-American principle. That was the most important thing to come out of this meeting. Again, I want to join our distinguished majority leader in complimenting our colleagues for doing so much.

And, Mr. Speaker, may I say at this time while I miss our colleague from Alabama very much as one of the outstanding members of my Subcommittee on Europe of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, I feel that the gentleman's work as chairman of the Subcommittee on South America has proved to be so important and so noteworthy that I am glad we suffered that loss on my subcommittee so that this important work could be handled so ably by our colleague.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I am very grateful, indeed, to the gentlewoman from New York for her very kind and generous words.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SELDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I join the distinguished majority leader and others here today in paying tribute and to compliment the gentleman from Alabama and the other distinguished gentleman from the other side for the fine work they did in this recent Conference. However, I would also like to call to the attention of the gentleman just for the sake of the record that out of that Conference came some rather disturbing things. First, I think that this action taken by the South American and Latin American countries is rather late in coming. I think it should have come a long time ago. When the real chips were down, those nations that just did not go along with the others—I note the population of those nations amounts to 140 million people—out of the 14 that did go along when the chips were down, there are only approximately 56½ million people. I just wonder if we are going to continue to pour out the wealth of this country to the six nations that at a time when they must have known that the security of this hemisphere was at stake did not want to face up to their responsibility. So I think, Mr. Speaker, it is high time that we began to evaluate where we are putting out our foreign aid and if these people will not stand with us, let them say so and let us stop pouring American dollars down these ratholes because it has not done us any good. I also see an item in this morning's paper, Mr. Speaker, and it is an item which is disturbing to me.

> A spokesman for the Pan American Health Organization said yesterday Cuba cannot be ousted from the Organization until it holds its yearly conference in August.

The budget this year of this Organization is $13,178,869. The Organization of American States contributes only about $650,000; the rest of it comes from the United Nations, and we pour our money into that organization. In the first place, who are these spokesmen for the Pan American Health Organization who say we cannot get rid of this cancerous growth right away? It could be done; it should be done.

There is another thing I think we ought to take into consideration. I said at the time Castro captured our servicemen and held them in the mountains there was only one thing to do, one thing that should have been done. We shout about the immediate return of our servicemen. Failing that we should have gone into Cuba and taken prompt measures to protect the men who are serving under our flag. That was not done. We lost tremendous prestige not only in Latin and South American countries, but all over the world because we plainly said we were unable or unwilling to protect our own servicemen. Those men should have been returned immediately.

Somebody in the State Department was certainly somewhat responsible for the rise of Castroism in Cuba; as a matter of fact, we encouraged it, and I think that the State Department had better take a long look at the personnel who was responsible in the original instance for the Cuban situation and do some knocking together of heads down there. Once that is done I think the American people will have a little more confidence.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SELDEN. I yield to my colleague from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself wholeheartedly with the statement of the gentleman from Alabama and to disagree rather sharply with the first part of the remarks of our friend the gentleman from Florida, especially those remarks that seemed to be critical of our not having taken drastic and singlehanded action against Castro earlier. I think that both the previous administration and this administration were right in resisting the understandable pressures to do that. I am not in the least making excuse for the failure of our Government to recognize earlier the nature and danger of Castro, still less for the assistance he got from some in our Government; the responsibility for his takeover in Cuba is ours to a considerable degree—I think what the gentleman from Florida said on that point is correct. But once Castro was in power, the worst thing we could have done would have been to follow the advice of those who demanded we get rid of him forcibly and immediately. For the stake was bigger than Cuba; it was the whole hemisphere. To have taken unilateral action against Castro at that time when many believed he was merely the leader of a long overdue uprising of people desiring greater freedom and better living conditions, would have alienated those countries sympathetic to him, and invited them to go with him, not with us. The wise course was patiently to hold things steady until Latin America realized too that Castro was not leading a spontaneous revolution of Cubans for Cubans but was a tool of the Communist world conspiracy dedicated to subversion and conquest of the whole hemisphere. Not drastic actions by us, but the truth about Castro himself has won the doubters to our way of thinking. It would have been a bad trade to crush communism in Cuba and thereby help it take over in far more important countries to our south.

The whole episode has demonstrated afresh that the Monroe Doctrine has never had any tinge of partisanship. For 140 years the world has found that whether a Democrat or a Republican was in the White House the United States would not permit this hemisphere to be subverted or taken over by alien or extra-continental forces. With one unfortunate exception the Kennedy administration has followed right along the line adopted by the Eisenhower administration in holding firm against Castro while working to develop greater strength and well-being and unity in the hemisphere; until Castro could be exposed.

He helped enormously by his own actions, climaxed by the brazen boast that he is and will always be a Communist. Surely it is better all round to get this action at Punta del Este now with substantial agreement among all the free countries of the hemisphere than it would have been to take strong unilateral action, which might have relieved us of a little of our indignation but surely would have alienated much of the hemisphere.

There is a further good result of the Conference. Apparently the action there has finally induced our Government to announce that it is going to embargo all trade with Cuba. We did not have clean hands when we told Canada, Australia, or England they should not trade with Communist China while we ourselves were trading with Communist Cuba. We have now done for ourselves what we have been urging others to do, namely; to stop building up Communist enemies.

This Conference has also shown once more that whenever in our dealings with Communists or with countries we have pursued a sound and honorable course of action, with patient firmness and strength in support of that action, the free world has gone along with us; the Communists have been checked, and generally backed down. If we have learned this lesson that has been demonstrated so often since 1945, this Conference will have greater and wider benefits than the immediate gains in this hemisphere, substantial and real as they are.

These are some of the good results of the successful leadership of our Secretary of State and his team, including our two very distinguished Members from this House. I congratulate them and commend them.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SELDEN. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. speaker, the people of this country are tired of bashful and timid measures; the people of this country are tired of high-sounding, loose expressions that do not mean a thing to our security. This is a historic stand. The State Department has gone further than it ever went before. That is the historic good about it. But it is hard to believe that those rattle boys will do anything with it. They are going to continue to lend money down there. I am surprised they got $50 million. I was not surprised at Argentina, I was not surprised at Brazil, I was not surprised at Chile. They are not going to stick with us if we decide to walk into Cuba. They will do exactly as they did at Punta del Este.

I want to congratulate the gentleman for the fine work he did. I think it is a great tribute to all of them, their ingenuity and their dedication. But the people of this country are restless, the people of this country are mad, the people of this country want the Monroe Doctrine reenunciated, the people of this country want to go to war, if necessary, to get rid of Castro.

Let me tell you something else. If we get these bargain basement missiles and it comes to pointing them at the city of Miami, Miami Beach, Key West, and the lower peninsula of Florida, it will be too late. They have many Mig airplanes. I do not know whether the gentleman knows the number or not, but they have a lot of them. They also have tanks.

We can wait, and we can have all of these speeches, but the American people want action in this matter. I do think it is a historic step. I think the gentleman favors strong action also, and I congratulate him.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SELDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend the gentleman from Alabama for his clear, concise, and very intelligent statement that he has made on the liberation of actions taken by the Organization of American States in Punta del Este. His statements, Mr. Speaker, are consistent with the caliber of his mind. The gentleman from Alabama for quite a while now has been recognized as one of the respected and best posted members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and looms ever larger in importance during these critical times.

It was under the leadership of the gentleman from Alabama that last year this House passed a resolution expressing itself in rather unequivocal terms about the Castro regime. As I started to say, I am not sure whether the predictions of the gentleman with respect to what might happen to the Castro regime have come about, but of one thing I am sure and very proud for myself and many other Members, and that is that the House had the comfort to have as its congressional observer the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN].

Mr. SELDEN. I am deeply grateful to the gentleman from Louisiana for his very kind remarks.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW] a very able and distinguished member of the congressional group which attended the Conference at Punta del Este. Mr. MERROW did a very fine job in expressing to the delegates at Punta del Este the opinion of his people and the views of the Congress on the Castro menace.

Mr. WILLIS. I wonder if I could interrupt to say that the statement I made about the gentleman from Alabama also applies to my colleague from New Hampshire.

Mr. MERROW. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate and compliment my colleague, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN], chairman of the Inter-American Affairs Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House for the excellent statement which he has made here today. This is a very clear and lucid summary of what took place at the Conference in Punta del Este. I was pleased to serve with him as the ranking minority member on the subcommittee at this important Conference, also to serve with the two Members from the Senate, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER].

The congressional delegation to the Conference was of one mind. We were determined to obtain as strong a resolution as we possibly could. As a matter of fact, we were of one mind in saying that we would not support a weak resolution or a set of weak resolutions if they were to come out of the Conference. May I say that, as far as background is concerned, I have maintained the position for many months that we ought to take strong and decisive action with respect to Cuba and I introduced a resolution in the last Congress, calling for the implementation of the Monroe Doctrine by imposing a naval and air blockade of Cuba. So, you can very readily see that no resolution adopted by the Conference which we have just come away from would have been too strong for me.

I am very happy that we were able to obtain strong resolutions at Punta del Este, and I compliment the Secretary of State, who is an able statesman, for his leadership and for his unyielding efforts in bringing about the adoption of the resolutions that finally came out of the Conference.

I think perhaps it is well to call attention to one of the most important resolutions and the most controversial resolution adopted by the Conference. There were four parts to the resolve section. These are not very long and I would like to read them. They were mentioned in the very able speech given by the chairman of the subcommittee only a few moments ago. First it was resolved:

> That adherence by any member of the Organization of American States to Marxism-Leninism is incompatible with the inter-American system and the alinement of such a government with the Communist bloc breaks the unity and solidarity of the hemisphere.

I think it is important to point out that there were 20 votes in favor of this statement, which indicates that we have considerable unity.

Second, it was resolved:

> That the present Government of Cuba, which has officially identified itself as a Marxist-Leninist government, is incompatible with the principles and objectives of the inter-American system.

And there were 20 votes in favor of this statement.

Now, as to the two sections where there were 14 votes, which have already been alluded to, they are:

> 3. That this incompatibility excludes the present Government of Cuba from participation in the inter-American system.
>
> 4. That the Council of the Organization of American States and the other organs and agencies of the inter-American system adopt without delay the measures necessary to carry out this resolution.

On the above two sections there were 14 votes, as has already been pointed out. The nations abstaining were: Argentina, Equador, Mexico, Brazil, Bolivia, and Chile. But, mind you, that was not a vote against—as the chairman has stated—the resolutions. There were abstentions.

Mr. Speaker, what has taken place since the Conference is, I believe, telling testimony to the fact that if we are willing to take a strong stand and maintain an unyielding position in foreign affairs, we can accomplish a great deal. I hope that what has happened in Argentina within the last few days is an indication that the nations abstaining—and I think that there is a great deal of feeling among the people in these nations for the position the United States took at the Conference—will put into effect the measures that are necessary to implement the decisions made at Punta del Este. At least, it is a most significant beginning. It was a historic Conference, and I am sure it is a turning point in inter-American affairs. It may well be that it is a turning point in whole fields of foreign affairs as well. Here a firm, resolute, determined stand was taken.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that all the people in this hemisphere who love liberty will applaud the results of the Conference at Punta del Este.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SELDEN. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

Mr. FASCELL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I am very happy to commend and congratulate our House delegation which attended the Conference at Punta del Este under the very capable leadership of my chairman of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN].

Mr. Speaker, it has been my pleasure and privilege for many years now to serve with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN] on this subcommittee. However, I want to say some personal things about him, because in the light of the report which he has made—excellent report which he and the ranking subcommittee minority member has made—today to this House, that these personal allusions are very important.

Mr. Speaker, I find the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN] to be a man who recognizes the responsibilities of his position, particularly with respect to his chairmanship of this subcommittee. Whatever the problem may be that is inter-American in nature, he has risen to the responsibility of meeting that problem head on early. He is a man who is dedicated to his work. Hours mean nothing to him in the service of his country. He is intelligent, and certainly a hard worker. Everything he has done with respect to the events which led up to the Punta del Este Conference and the fine course of events and the results which have come out of that Conference shows that he has pursued diligently every avenue available to him as a representative and that the Congress, at least, the House, has supported him overwhelmingly every time he has laid down a plan of action for this country to follow.

Mr. Speaker, I was happy to be one of those few who early in January 1960, stood with him on this House floor when he made his remarks on this subject, and joined with him, and also was one to join with him in his efforts in the passage of the resolution demanding action.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is wisely said, notwithstanding some doubt and in some quarters some criticism, to recognize and to realize exactly what a historical event has taken place under the able leadership which represented this House of Representatives at the Conference. The seizing of the initiative in hemispheric affairs at this time in history is truly, as the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW] has said, a turning point in all international affairs for the United States in dealing with the problem of communism, not only with Castro, not only with communism in the Western Hemisphere, but with the whole problem of communism.

I know that because of my close association with the gentleman from Alabama, whatever future problems will arise certainly he will apply the same dedication, the same planning, and the same initiative which he has in the past. I am proud that we have in this country the kind of partnership and association between the legislative branch and the executive branch which made it possible for the distinguished gentleman from Alabama and the distinguished gentleman from New Hampshire to go down to a diplomatic mission and to participate actively and to cooperate, not as observers, but as members of the team, to do a very fine job for the United States and for the free world.

And so, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I extend my heartiest congratulations to the gentleman from Alabama and the gentleman from New Hampshire for a job well done.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Florida for his very kind remarks and say that coming from him they are particularly appreciated, because certainly no one in this Congress knows better the threat of Castro's Cuba than does the gentleman from Miami. And certainly there has been no Member of Congress who has stood more firmly and more strongly against this threat.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SELDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join my colleagues who have already spoken in expressing appreciation to the gentleman from Alabama and the gentleman from New Hampshire of the manner in which they represented the House of Representatives at Punta del Este.

There is one matter that has been touched on by the gentleman from Florida and by the gentleman from New Hampshire as well; and I should like to ask the gentlemen about the value and importance of our having a congressional delegation present at the Conference. We all know that sometimes there is a failure to communicate between the executive branch and the legislative branch. I gather from brief conversations that I have had—and I am confident that it is true—that the fact that we had representatives from this body and from the other body present was a very important factor in the degree of success that we had at the Conference. I should like to ask the gentleman to comment on that.

Mr. SELDEN. I think it was very fine that the Secretary of State saw fit to invite two Members of the House and two Members of the Senate to attend this Conference as advisers. Certainly we in no way infringed on the rights of the Executive. We cooperated fully, however, with the Secretary of State and, as I pointed out in my statement, with his knowledge and consent we attempted to communicate to the delegates of the other nations of the Americas just what public opinion was in the United States on this particular issue. I think it was extremely helpful in securing the favorable action that took place at the Punta del Este Conference. I hope that in future conferences the executive branch of our Government will see fit to invite representatives of both Houses of Congress to attend, certainly in an advisory capacity.

Mr. MONAGAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SELDEN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I want to join in the commendations that have been extended today to the gentleman from Alabama and to his colleagues from the Congress who went to the conference at Punta del Este. I particularly want to commend the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN] who has done an exceptional job in trying to firm up the policy of this Nation in respect to getting rid of communism in this hemisphere. In fact, I think the gentleman from Alabama, over the past number of years, has been one of the most effective forces to bring this about. It gave me great confidence about what might happen at the Conference to know that he would be present, because I know his views and I know of his work here in the Congress in helping to firm up our policy.

Passage of the measure introduced by the gentleman from Alabama in the last session of the Congress calling for economic action, and the passage of the bill which I introduced calling for the cutoff of Cuban trade, which the President has now done, I think serves as a notice to those in the Department of State that the American people are growing discontented with the course this Nation has been pursuing. I now believe that those who would have the United States exercise its leadership are coming to the fore and I think the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN] has been one of the dominant forces in bringing that result about.

Mr. Speaker, the Foreign Ministers' Conference of the Organization of American States has come to a close. The result of that Conference is a historical event in the happening of the Western Hemisphere and the free world. The Conference has produced nine resolutions, all of which uphold the principles of freedom and democracy—at least on the surface. All nine resolutions recite pledges of cooperation with the cause of freedom. But the drama of this Conference is not reflected in the 20-to-0 vote cast for the final act adopted at the close of the Conference.

The most significant action taken at the Conference was the exclusion of Cuba from the Organization of the American States. This action represents the kind of policy the United States should have long ago adopted in its dealings with Fidel Castro. This Nation has far too long held to the wait-and-see policy of hoping Fidel Castro, his Communist cabinet, and his Red Chinese and Soviet technical advisers would lay down their Czech-made arms and ask to be absolved of their brutality.

It is encouraging to see that the United States has realized once again the necessity for exercising its leadership in this hemisphere. Congratulations are in order for those members of the U.S. delegation to the OAS Conference who had the courage and perception to exercise the U.S. position as leader and obtain the ousting of Communist China from the OAS.

The Secretary of State has proven his effectiveness by his determined work at the Conference. Although the Secretary was unable to get the Conference to adopt economic sanctions against Communist Cuba, he did press for a hard line against Castro. His role as leader of the U.S. delegation stands as a measure of endurance, both personal and national in scope. As spokesman for this Nation's policies, the Secretary ably stated the feelings of the American people in his closing remarks when he said:

> The friends of freedom must stand together.

Further notation should be given to OAS Ambassador deLesseps Morrison, whose knowledge in dealing with the

Latin American Community further aided the U.S. cause.

The presence of U.S. congressional leaders at the Conference was of great reassurance to the American people. With such men as Chairman ARMISTEAD SELDEN, of the House Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, there to advise our State Department personnel and to interpret the feeling of Congress to other delegates, this first step toward ridding the hemisphere of communism and strengthening inter-American ties has now become a reality.

But, as we all know, this task was not easy. There were many obstacles to be cleared. By allowing Fidel Castro to stay in power as long as he has, the inter-American community had allowed communism to fester and expand into a genuine threat to the hemisphere, deeply entrenched just 90 miles from the U.S. mainland. The action which came at the OAS Conference was the result of much deliberation on the part of the attending Latin American Governments. Castro's organized agitators have kept Latin America in a high state of pitch for weeks prior to the Conference, and Communist leftwing minority groups in the larger nations became extremely vocal during the preconference period.

But in addition to the obstacles posed by Cuban Communist agitators, the delegates to the OAS Foreign Ministers Conference had other barriers. Prior to the arrival of Secretary Rusk, Ambassador Morrison, and the attending congressional leaders at Punta del Este, other U.S. emissaries had been at work on U.S. policy. These emissaries were in Latin America for the purpose of making preliminary arrangements with the Latin American nations in order that the United States could muster support and emerge successful from the Conference. But these emissaries conducted themselves as though the United States had no definite policy to pursue at the Conference. These emissaries gave many of the Latin American leaders the impression that we had no predetermined policies to urge at the OAS Conference. Consequently, much of Latin America saw fit to disregard the United States and pay more attention to Castro's vocal minority which had been hard at work stirring up anti-American activity. In the face of this clamor these preconference emissaries were ready to compromise even before the Foreign Ministers had met. They wanted to accept much of the pro-Castro sympathy in order to save U.S. reputation at the Conference. The stage was set for compromise before the drama had begun, and the ground was nearly cut from under Secretary Rusk and the U.S. delegation even before they had reached Punta del Este.

Fortunately, the United States did develop a definite policy to pursue. In the weeks leading up to the Conference, national leaders in Washington had talked of expelling Cuba from the OAS. There had been talk of sanctions against Castro, and many forms of sanctions were under consideration.

After repeated attempts to get the State Department to take some kind of action, it was evident that only action by the Congress could become effective. Congressional demands for action against Castro has thus far been met by State Department reassurances that alternative proposals were under consideration. After using this policy to mollify the Congress, the State Department then switched its rebuttal to the Congress by stating that we as a nation could not take unilateral action against Castro, that any action taken against Castro would have to be of a multilateral nature.

The theory of multilateral action in international affairs has been the growing and dominant philosophy in our State Department since World War II. This concept has reached such proportions that those in the State Department who hold the minority view of unilateral action by this Nation have been smothered, their voices muted in the conduct of our Nation's affairs.

This condition is particularly true in our Latin American policy, and painfully so in our handling of Communist Cuba.

As the United States and its Latin American neighbors stood by, Fidel Castro became more odious to the spirit of freedom and democracy. He emerged as not just another dictator, but as another international Communist puppet. He transformed Cuba into a bridgehead for the Communist drive into Latin America. He employed thousands of Soviet, Czech, and Red Chinese agents to hasten this effort. He set up a network of Communist agitators, spies, and technicians throughout Latin America, and built a brutal police state within Cuba.

And while Castro busied himself expanding communism in Latin America, U.S. trade with Cuba continued. Even though a partial embargo was in effect, restrictions were placed on all exports except food and medicine, and these items were allowed for humanitarian reasons. Yet sugar was the only banned import, and quantities of fruits, vegetables, and tobacco flowed into the United States freely, providing Fidel Castro with American dollars to finance Communist expansion in this hemisphere.

As this exchange went on, congressional demands for action against Castro increased. After constantly being met with reassurances of impending measures against Castro, it became apparent that the action against Cuba would have to be initiated in the Congress of the United States.

On August 2, 1961, I introduced legislation which would ban trade with Cuba. That legislation was intended to halt the shipment of Cuban goods in interstate or foreign commerce with the United States. Similar measures were introduced by Members of Congress from 10 States representing many sections of the Nation.

That legislation was reported unanimously from the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It was brought up before the House shortly thereafter, and passed the House without a single dissenting vote, giving ample proof that the American people were united in the call for strong action against the Communists in Cuba.

I feel that passage of this legislation strengthened the hand of the U.S. delegation at the Punta del Este Conference. Not only did such passage serve as proof of the feelings of the American people, but it served as notice that the American people were growing discontent with the concept of multilateral action as our only recourse. To have multilateral action there must be leadership—and for leadership there must be a leader—and for the leader, unilateral action is at times the moving force.

There have been encouraging signs in the last number of months that those who believe in the exercise of U.S. leadership are coming to the fore.

There has been growth in the concept that positive action by the United States will help to develop and crystallize concurrence and like action from our allies and friends, the result being multilateral action.

There are incidents of proof in this regard. Last fall, during the upturn in events within the Dominican Republic, attempts were made by Communist agents to fill the void left by the Trujillo family and thereby gain control of the Dominican Government. In the face of this threat, the United States sent warships to stand guard just off Santo Domingo, and give presence to the watchful eye of freedom. This action hampered the Communist effort and paved the way for democratic government in that Caribbean nation.

The Secretary of State's position for a hard line against Castro at the OAS Conference is regarded as a more recent example of U.S. leadership in action.

The President's proclamation which came last Saturday followed in the wake of the spirit of Punta del Este. This action, in effect, cuts off more than $30 million a year which Castro has been using to finance Cuban communism. I express the hope that it is the first in a chain of measures bent on hastening Castro's downfall.

Latin American public opinion is the explanation given for the abstention of Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Ecuador, and Mexico from the vote to oust Castro from the OAS. We are told that if a hard line were taken against Castro in those abstaining countries, that great internal turmoil would be the result—turmoil in Castro's favor. Yet the present reaction in Argentina make this rationale suspect.

What then of American public opinion? Who has neglected to let these abstaining nations know about American public opinion? Who has failed to say that we are tired of always—I repeat always—modifying, compromising, giving in to the reported public opinion of a few other nations.

This absurdity increases when we know that to approach communism in this hemisphere with a "Chamberlain umbrella" simply erodes and undermines the effort and the will to carry on the fight. Such a condition is frustrating, and seems at times interminable with no conclusion in sight.

I say there are encouraging signs, and they are found in those who believe in exerting American leadership, for it is these men who won out over those who believed in a compromise with communism in this hemisphere.

I urge that we have more unilateral action by the United States, and that we move such action in an exercise of leadership. I further urge a greater use of congressional delegates to conferences such as that just held at Punta del Este. The presence of elected representatives affords a clear interpretation of the strong, determined will of the American people in their fight against communism. Too often there has been no clear interpretation of their will, and as a result there has been a void in prior negotiations. This void was filled at Punta del Este, and our delegation did not compromise, but instead pressed those who are our friends in this same fight for freedom.

We have stood idle too long. In order to retain the U.S. position as the directive force in the destiny of freemen, the United States must do all in its power to see that the will of freemen is carried out.

Events in this hemisphere have taken a turn. Unilateral action begets multilateral action. The time has come to move.

Mr. SELDEN. I am very grateful to the gentleman from Florida. I am sure the gentleman derives much personal satisfaction from the announcement of the President this weekend that all imports from Cuba are to be cut off, since the gentleman as well as other Members of the Congress introduced a resolution which was passed by the House last year calling for just such action.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I thank my colleague.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SELDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. What happens from here on? You have adopted a set of resolutions and, if I remember correctly, and I do not pose as any authority on the subject, they are not mandatory but they are in the nature of recommendations; is that not correct?

Mr. SELDEN. That is not correct. As a matter of fact, with a two-thirds vote, for example, exclusion from the inter-American defense board is mandatory.

Mr. GROSS. When will Castro be excluded?

Mr. SELDEN. Immediately. Cuba will immediately be excluded from that organ of the Organization of American States, and I might say, as to the other organs of the OAS, the OAS is meeting Wednesday to take up the proper method of excluding them from the other agencies of the OAS.

Mr GROSS. What meaning does that have?

Mr. SELDEN. It simply means they must meet to implement the decision at Punta del Este.

Mr. GROSS. How does this affect Castro? What happens of any importance to Castro or to his government as a result of this exclusion?

Mr. SELDEN. I think I pointed out in my statement earlier that in the first place, he was isolated from the inter-American system. The countries of this hemisphere have stood up at this meeting and have been counted, and in the voting that took place not one country in the American system stood up and voted with Cuba.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask the gentleman this question. It is true, of course, that the A-B-C countries of South America and I suppose Mexico, on this continent refused to go along and they sat on the sidelines and figuratively thumbed their noses at us and the small nations, some 14 of them, that voted for this exclusion resolution or whatever you have in mind to call it—what part do they play in this business of ostracising Cuba?

Mr. SELDEN. They are bound by the two-thirds vote of the Organization of American States and I assume they will go along with what the two-thirds decided at the meeting. As a matter of fact, Argentina has already come out with a public statement to that effect.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is well aware of what happened on Friday when Prime Minister Diefenbaker addressed the Canadian Parliament and said that Canada would continue to trade with Castro—the gentleman from Alabama is aware of that statement; is he not?

Mr. SELDEN. I am very much aware of it.

Mr. GROSS. And we are sitting here between Canada on the north and Mexico on the south, and does the gentleman think that Mexico is going to be bound with Canada on the north trading with Cuba, that Mexico will not trade with Cuba?

Mr. SELDEN. I may say to the gentleman, I feel one of the results of this Conference is the fact that the United States itself has discontinued all imports from Cuba. I think, as the gentleman from Minnesota pointed out, we are certainly in a better position now than we were prior to this action to urge other nations in the Western alliance to discontinue trade with Castro and communism.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield, what happened was that after the Prime Minister of Canada addressed Parliament and was roundly applauded for stating that he would not stop trading with Cuba, that they would continue to trade with Cuba because the United States had hypocritically carried on six times as much trade with Cuba as had Canada, that they would continue to trade—I think this brought Secretary Rusk out in the open and compelled the President to issue his embargo; and it was only by virtue of the fact that Canada served notice upon the world that it was not going to follow the U.S. practice of "do as we say, not as we do."

Mr. SELDEN. I might say to the gentleman from Iowa that he is incorrect in that assumption because we were notified before we left Punta del Este that the embargo would be put into effect over the weekend.

Mr. GROSS. We did not hear anything about it here.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SELDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I do not want to take much of the able gentleman's time, but I join with my colleagues who have paid tribute to him and to the gentleman on the other side of the aisle for the magnificent leadership they gave us in the Punta del Este Conference.

And, Mr. Speaker, if I may also say a word of personal tribute to the gentleman from Alabama I would be grateful for the opportunity because, as he knows, I have been close to him in Congress now for nearly 10 years. I know of no Member of Congress more earnestly dedicated to the suppression of communism than the gentleman from Alabama. He is particularly knowledgeable in the field of Latin American affairs with my colleague from Florida [Mr. FASCELL], and my colleague from north Florida [Mr. ROGERS]. I recall last year and in previous years how they joined together in fighting Castro communism; and I, for one, sir, feel that you have made a great contribution. I thank you and your colleagues who represented us at this Conference.

Mr. SELDEN. I thank my distinguished friend from Florida and say that we feel secure with the support the gentleman always gives us in our endeavors.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SELDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I wish to associate myself with the remarks made earlier by various Members congratulating the gentleman from Alabama and the gentleman from New Hampshire for their service to the Conference. I would like to point out, however, that the recent developments in Argentina have been the result of deflection of Argentine public opinion as expressed by leading and influential members of that country rather than the result of our State Department's activities in the matter. In keeping with that doctrine I believe that leadership—and I deliberately stress the word "leadership"—provided by the Members of the House and Senate at the Conference reflect the opinion of the American public.

I believe that the Congress maintaining its contact with the public reflects the American foreign policy position rather than the State Department. With that point in mind, speaking as a Member of the legislative branch of Government, I feel that our legislators who attended the Conference actually provided leadership to the State Department that might otherwise not have been forthcoming. I believe that these gentlemen deserve not only the commendation of the Members here, but also that of the people of the country for having helped the State Department achieve a degree of effectiveness, that while belated is nevertheless welcome.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SELDEN. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. MERROW. I rise again to associate myself with the position taken by the chairman in reference to congressional representation on various delegations, whether it be in South America or elsewhere in the world. I also would like to express deep appreciation for the kind words that have been said about the congressional delegation at Punta del Este.

The reason why it is so important to have Members of Congress, Members of the House and Senate, attend these various conferences is that through them there is a reflection of public opinion in the United States. We set this forth in no uncertain terms. The clarification to others of public opinion in the United States is very helpful in establishing our leadership among the other nations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Johnson of Wisconsin). The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my appreciation for the service rendered by the American congressional delegation at the Punta del Este Conference. I think the Conference was a great milestone in our efforts to block the Communist penetration of Latin America and to help the Cuban people achieve freedom.

The howls that have been emanating from Fidel Castro the last few days are indicative of the fact that the action at Punta del Este struck real blows at communism in the Western Hemisphere. The unity achieved there is of major importance now and in the future.

My good friend and colleague, Representative Armistead Selden, is entitled to an important share of the credit for the success achieved at Punto del Este. He, together with his other congressional colleagues, has stoutly upheld the position of the U.S. Congress in support of the overall American position of freedom from subversive inroads within our hemisphere.

I am pleased to be able to extend my personal congratulations to Representative Selden.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment my colleague the gentleman from Alabama, Mr. Armistead I. Selden, for this report upon the action taken by the Conference of Foreign Ministers meeting at Punta del Este. I am sure that the positive action achieved was due in a large degree to the presence of Representatives from Congress. I do not want to withhold any credit from our able Secretary of State, Mr. Rusk, nor our able Ambassador to the Organization of American States, deLesseps S. Morrison, but I feel that the presence of Members of Congress helped achieve the positive results which have been so ably presented by our colleague. I also want to compliment our colleague, the gentleman from New Hampshire, Chester Merrow, for joining with and taking equal part with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Selden] in the achievement of the outcome.

To me, while many reports coming from the meeting were unfavorable, I must admit that after hearing the report of our colleague, I feel greatly encouraged. I feel that one of the outstanding achievements is that it has proved that our Latin American allies are determined to meet hemispheric responsibilities and their devotion to the inter-American principle. I join with our able majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma, Carl Albert, in paying tribute to our colleague and our Government for achieving that which has been accomplished.

GENERAL PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all those who have spoken may have permission to revise and extend their remarks, and that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the Record on this subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

WHAT IS THE FUTURE OF OUR MERCHANT MARINE?

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my intense concern as to the future of the American merchant marine. This concern is occasioned by the budget request for the fiscal year 1963 for ship construction funds which is substantially a cutback from the sum appropriated for that purpose in the previous year. The 1963 budget request for ship construction funds is roughly half of that appropriated the previous year—a decrease from $98 million to $50 million.

The real issue involved here is not revealed so much in the relationship of this year's request to that of last year's. On the contrary to see the problem in full perspective we must look at the overall status of our merchant marine, with particular reference to the objectives of the vessel replacement program as a whole, as I will demonstrate later in these remarks. Such a broad view will demonstrate that the 1963 fiscal year budget request is not only inadequate to bring the replacement program into phase with last year's, but constitutes another backward step in a process of erosion going back to 1958 and beyond.

The issue which must be honestly recognized by the Congress, Mr. Chairman, is that this budget request is woefully inadequate support for the U.S. ship replacement program. This budget request affects thousands of employees in the shipyards and in the allied merchant marine industry, and sounds clearly the ultimate destruction of the mobilization potential of our shipbuilding and ship repairing facilities which have been so vital in our history.

This inadequate budget request underscores a tendency in the executive branch to request amounts insufficient to provide for replacement of our hard core merchant fleet. If a competitive, modern American merchant fleet is to exist, a long range ship replacement program must be vigorously supported. In a program of impulsive stops and starts, a modern American merchant fleet is doomed. A curtailment of this program as envisaged in the current budget request marks the ultimate close-down of American shipyards. When this occurs, shipbuilding skills and know-how will be lost, with the result that we seriously impair not only our ability to service the American merchant marine fleet but our ability to respond to the demands of a national emergency.

Mr. Speaker, President Franklin D. Roosevelt, in his merchant marine message of March 1935, said:

> I present to the Congress the question of whether or not the United States should have an adequate merchant marine.

In response to his question, the U.S. Congress enacted the magna carta of the American merchant marine—the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. The answer to President Roosevelt's question was a resounding and emphatic, "Yes."

In my mind, the budget request submitted to Congress for the 1963 fiscal year calls for serious consideration of the question whether the Congress of today is even being asked to provide sufficient money to maintain a practical and adequate American merchant fleet.

A key to the maintenance of a full-blooded American merchant marine is adequate financial assistance to our ship construction program. If it is to be the policy of the United States to foster the development and to encourage the maintenance of an American merchant marine, then I seriously question if the budget proposal will adequately implement this national policy by slashing ship construction subsidy funds in 1963. More importantly, Mr. Speaker, does not this budget recommendation reflect a philosophy which portends the strangulation of our American merchant marine, despite administration protestations to the contrary? I believe it does. Claims of temporary fiscal stress only hide the real motivation. And further, as one with some experience in this field, I know that there are those who believe we do not need an American merchant marine at all. With this I most emphatically disagree, and I believe that history supports me.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I am faced, as are all of our colleagues, with the question: Is the expenditure of Federal funds required to implement an aspect of our national policy? If that question is answered in the affirmative, then the requisite amount must be determined by the Congress.

Recognizing that the American merchant marine can only maintain a reasonable place in ocean commerce with Government aid to make up the difference between American and foreign shipbuilding and operating costs, it becomes a question of judgment as to the amount of money needed to adequately support American ships.

Such a substantial cutback as recommended in the budget request is, to my way of thinking, poor judgment in that it does not adequately implement our national policy by providing available funds for ship construction to meet our defense and commercial necessities. And this in the face of a request to reduce our tariffs to increase our foreign trade. Are we going to turn the carriage of our goods over to foreign ships, too?

Mr. Speaker, adequate ship construction aid is a requisite to place American-built and operated ships in a posture of parity with their foreign competitors. Government aid is given, recognizing that a number of foreign nations similarly grant indirect peacetime subsidies to their national merchant marine and in recognition of the fact that higher wages and prices in the United States account for the higher cost of ships built on our shores. We, if we want American ships when we might most need them, must have a subsidy program to build and man them. This construction subsidy granted by the Government makes it possible for American ship operators to acquire American-built ships at a price for which that operator could purchase his ship in a foreign shipyard.

Assuming, then, that the need for a strong American merchant marine to assist in the development of our domestic and foreign commerce and as an instrument of our national defense policy is as urgent in the 1960's as it has been at any time in our history, we must, Mr. Speaker, then ask what is the amount of money needed to adequately foster the objectives of our national shipping policy. Again, the budget recommendation relative to ship construction aid is woefully inadequate to face squarely and honestly the costs to support this policy.

The portion of the proposed Federal budget, which concerns the prospects for building oceangoing merchant ships in the coming fiscal year has been received with mixed feelings not only by my constituents but the entire shipyard industry throughout the country. Personally, I have difficulty in finding calm and measured words with which to express my concern over the aimless direction on national maritime policy which is being permitted to drift. As I see it, the new budget does not remedy this condition.

The fact that only approximately $50 million for ship construction has been recommended and the fact that the same fund will be unexpended from the fiscal year 1962 appropriations are signs of a complete state of indifference to the serious deficiencies existing in the Nation's merchant marine, as defined by the Department of Defense. A persistent danger lies in the inadequacy and inconsistency of actions to correct these deficiencies. In my memory, the Department of Defense on different occasions in as many years has said that our maritime capability to meet the defense requirements of the United States is at best only marginal.

As a step toward remedying this marginal deficiency, to implement further the objective of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 and the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, the Congress authorized in 1958 a vessel replacement program to be administered by the Maritime Administration with funds appropriated by the Congress. This move was considered necessary because our merchant fleet, built up during World War II is now at the point of block obsolescence. Long-range contracts were entered into with shipping lines calling for the replacement of about 300 ships over a period of 10 years, to be built in U.S. shipyards. Later, under the guise of economy, this minimal program was scaled down to 20 ships per year—and the stretchout procedure was begun. The stretchout, it would seem, has acquired a permanent set. Here is what has happened to date: Contracts for 15 vessels were signed in fiscal year 1958; 14 in fiscal year 1959; 13 in fiscal year 1960; and 31 in fiscal year 1961. Until the budget for fiscal year 1963 was released last Thursday, it was expected that contracts for only 7 ships would be placed during fiscal year 1962. However, by changing the contract award date on 6 other ships from July 2 to June 29—in other words from 2 days into the next fiscal year back to 2 days before the close of the fiscal year—it now appears that contracts to be signed in fiscal year 1962 will total 13 ships, leaving 18 others to be contracted for in fiscal year 1963. I would call this statistical legerdemain.

The average number of contracts placed annually from fiscal year 1958 through fiscal year 1962 would be 17 ships, and, the money available in fiscal year 1963 will enable the average to be maintained—assuming no more legerdemain is practiced. But 17 is a long way from 30, and less than the minimum target of 20 ships per year, which the defense and economic planners have said is essential to maintain a minimum defense and commercial posture.

Except for fiscal year 1961 in which contracts for 31 ships were awarded, the program has been below that minimum—it has been but a drop in the ocean of world shipping. To some extent, bipartisan blame can be charged, but I would like to hope that bipartisan support, particularly here in the House, will seize on this unpromising maritime situation and lead the way out of the morass of indifference and insufficiency to a brighter day when a strong and adequate U.S.-flag merchant marine will sail the oceans and the seas as a lofty symbol of our trade, commerce, and strength. An old proverb reads that "the longest journey begins with the first step," and in this instance, under present circumstances, the first step means the building of more and good oceangoing ships.

In my section of the country—and I am positive in every shipbuilding area all over the country—many able and experienced shipyard workers are affected by the vicissitudes of maritime policies and the starts and stops of inconsistent shipbuilding programs. As evidence of the concern which these individuals have in regard to the current situation, I include in the RECORD an excellent letter from Thomas A. Rotell, secretary-treasurer of the Pacific Coast Metal Trades Council, addressed to the Honorable Arthur J. Goldberg, Secretary of Labor, dated January 4, 1962:

PACIFIC COAST METAL
TRADES DISTRICT COUNCIL,
San Francisco, Calif., January 4, 1962.

Hon. ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG,
Secretary of Labor, U.S. Department of Labor, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GOLDBERG: On behalf of the 10,000 families who make their living in shipbuilding and ship repair on the Pacific coast of the United States, I ask leave to bring to your personal attention a combination of circumstances and apparent Government policies which are a threat to jobs for these 10,000 American families and which, in the opinion of many, constitute a threat to our national security.

This commences with a threefold report first circulating about 5 weeks ago, to the effect that:

1. Department of Commerce is considering freezing all shipbuilding funds for the balance of fiscal 1962, which would affect contracts for several ships scheduled to be bid during this period.

2. A high-placed administration official has recommended a 3-year moratorium on any further ship construction in the Federal Maritime Commission's fleet replacement program, which is designed to build 30 ships per year to 1972.

3. An outside study, prepared for and submitted to the Federal Maritime Commission, points out the opportunities for savings in Federal appropriations by having American merchant vessels built abroad in foreign shipyards, with foreign labor.

Since this report first circulated, repeated inquiries have been made of the Department of Commerce, all of which have elicited the same reply—

1. That Department of Commerce has not issued and does not plan to issue orders discontinuing use of shipbuilding funds,

2. That Commerce cannot estimate the number of shipbuilding contracts that will be let next year,

3. That Commerce plans are proceeding on the "assumption that a goodly number of American ships will be built in American shipyards during the next few years with the aid of construction subsidies."

No comments have been made concerning the reported 3-year moratorium or the citation of savings that could be made if we built our ships in foreign yards with foreign labor.

As the chief operating official of the Pacific Coast Metal Trades Council, I have made an earnest effort to determine just what the facts are. I respectfully submit to your office that the following is an accurate description of the situation facing our union members today:

1. The Congress and the executive branch of our Government in 1957 embarked on a long-range fleet replacement program, aimed at building 30 ships per year to replace our World War II built ships, now obsolete.

2. In reliance on this program, thousands of families, hundreds of small businesses, and numerous large shipbuilding yards, made heavy financial commitments, which for the families as well as the companies cannot be amortized unless this program goes forward to completion or substantially to completion.

3. Now, however, these same families and business organizations are faced with a full 6-month period—from January 1 to about June 30, 1962, during which only one ship will be contracted for.

4. This gap in the shipbuilding program, while now in terms of contract signing, will in the months ahead turn out to be a period of unemployment in the shipbuilding trades in the United States, and a serious gap in the replacement program, which Defense Department officials have repeatedly stated is so important to our national security. Shipbuilding cannot operate on a stop-start basis and be efficient.

5. We are informed on what we believe to be reliable authority that this threat to jobs and national security has resulted from:

(a) A willingness on the part of some steamship operators to postpone—or "stretch out"—the performance of their contracts with the Maritime Commission to replace their World War II ships with new vessels built in American yards.

(b) An equal willingness for, and even implied urging by certain Commerce Department officials, of a slowdown in the program, instead of some effort to adhere to the 30 ships per year objective.

Most alarming of all, we are reliably informed—and Commerce officials have broadly hinted—that in the budget proposals now being discussed with the White House, no funds whatsoever will be requested for shipbuilding for fiscal 1963. This reportedly is on the ground that the 6-month gap outlined above has left some $120 millions over in this year's appropriations which can be used in 1963. Obviously if this occurs, no extra funds would be available in 1963 to make up for a half year of no contracts in 1962.

We are not military people, and we know that military decisions are not the province of our Department of Labor. However, we cannot help but be astonished when our Nation embarks upon a long-range fleet replacement program with the full endorsement of the Defense Department and after a few halting years of operation, we find the program scuttled by some mysterious indifference or desire to smother it—all of this at a time when the Congress and the administration are calling for full speed ahead in every other area of defense.

We have no desire to suggest the involvement of your Department in matters not in the realm of labor's interest. And should inquiries by you result in a determination that your Department has no legitimate interest in this matter, we should not expect your Department to pursue it further. In view, however, of the extraordinary circumstances surrounding this important defense program, and its impact on American jobs—plus the overtones of building foreign with foreign labor, we respectfully request that you make such inquiries as you deem appropriate and furnish us with what information you feel can properly be passed along to our members.

Yours very truly,

THOMAS A. ROTELL,
Secretary-Treasurer,
Pacific Coast Metal Trades Council.

Mr. Rotell has very ably summarized the fears and opinions of many. Of course, now that the budget has been announced, rather than "no funds" for merchant ship construction in fiscal year 1963, there will be $50 million. But, I wonder whether or not these $50 million would be there if it had not been for the effort of the Pacific Coast Metal Trades Council, the Western Shipbuilding Association, and many, many other well-intentioned and patriotic citizens throughout the country. I think not.

You will note Mr. Rotell also refers to "an outside study" of maritime affairs. I have some familiarity with the long history of maritime study after maritime study which have been conducted by "inside" as well as "outside" groups. The reports of these studies are today gathering dust, and the pages are turning yellow. Someone has said that the U.S. merchant marine is being studied to death. Events in recent years, unfortunately, would seem to give more than an ounce of truth to this statement. Instead of more studies—and I know of three now in process or under consideration—it seems to me that the time has come for action—action on the Department of Defense appraisal of our maritime deficiencies. The time for action is long overdue.

Ironically, while the Russians are building with haste and almost unlimited funds a modern and efficient merchant fleet, we are permitting, with lethargy and insufficient funds our maritime capability to be marginal at best. It should be added that the Russian merchant marine is totally subsidized while ours is only partially subsidized. But, regardless, the diagnosis of the Russian merchant fleet is apparently strong, healthy, and growing—while the diagnosis of ours is infirm, ailing, and shrinking.

Will it be too late in taking an overdue first step in the long journey toward a strong and adequate U.S.-flag merchant marine? If the executive departments, on whom the responsibility falls to formulate an adequate policy in this field and ask for sufficient funds to carry out such a policy, do not know their business enough to do the job, then I am sure the Congress must and will do it. In fact, Mr. Speaker, maybe the time is here for the appropriate committees of each body of the Congress to ask the present administration what, if any, is the policy on the American merchant marine.

PROTECTIONISM—TARIFFS—SURVIVAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I want to call your attention to the fact that within the next 4 or 5 months we will be facing probably one of the most serious decisions this generation of Americans will have to make.

I should like to talk about protectionism, tariffs, survival, and so forth.

This morning I received correspondence from one of the largest tool steel companies in America, which I would like to read into the RECORD, as follows:

LATROBE STEEL CO.,
Latrobe, Pa., February 1, 1962.

HON. JOHN H. DENT,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: We have just received a copy of H.R. 9900, the bill introduced on January 25 in the House of Representatives by Mr. MILLS. If this bill is enacted, we will concede to Europe our tool steel market in the United States and will have to close our doors within 5 years.

The relief sections are completely inadequate and would force us to become wards of the Federal Government and plead on bended knee for tax relief or Federal aid, which should never have been necessary in the first place. We never thought to live long enough to see the day when our war planes, missiles, and guns would, in effect, be bought in another country under the guise of free trade. Those of us who are supporting industries to the primary defense contractors will not be around to participate in the kind of defense business that can be protected under the wording of the bill.

I hate to get emotional about this situation, but it certainly looks as though Congress would be handing the President and the Tariff Commission carte blanche permission to put anyone out of business who had incurred displeasure. If this bill is enacted, you may look for a tremendous exodus of companies to foreign soil and a rash of unemployment, the like of which has not yet been seen in this country. I shudder to think of its total impact.

Sincerely,

JOE,
President.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately those of us who are most interested in our survival as a people and as a free nation are the first to be ridiculed as protectionists, high tariff advocates and isolationists.

Like most cases where abuse and intolerance replace logic and understanding, the very ones who ridicule their opposition are the real protectionists and isolationists.

In this trade and tariff fight before the Congress and the people let us look at the opponents, the logic and the record.

On one side lined up behind the State Department's spokesman, George Ball, we find an army of many generals, unlimited resources and tools, for propaganda, for subsidies, for favors, for pressure and for reprisals.

On the other side, we find an army made up of workers and foot soldiers, small industry with very limited resources of the kind that win a war that depends upon the creation of public opinion.

The reasons for the one-sided views in the fight are many. Some are publicly known, others are hidden from view.

One reason that is seldom mentioned but one of the most important is fear. Fear of being called by one of many degrading and derogatory names. Fear of reprisals politically, businesswise, socially. Fear of being wrong because of a lack of knowledge of the issues involved. Fear of being ostracized by your party, your friends, your associates, partners, and even your family. This goes for both pros and cons.

However, the issue is not protectionism because even the proponents of free trade believe in protectionism and practice it when it serves to protect their own interests whether they be political, commercial, or financial.

Proof of this can be found in the acts of Congress, the trade agreements, Executive orders and gentlemen's agreements.

The President has already veered away from three specific phases of the original program. We are not to join the Common Market—right now—we are not including agriculture in the program—right now—and we are to exempt textiles from the tariff cutting across-the-board powers asked for by the executive branch—for the moment.

What prompted these decisions. Protectionism of course. First, to protect the legislation against defeat because of the farm bloc, the textile bloc and last the constitutional bloc who believe that entrance into the Common Market means giving up sovereign and constitutional rights and powers over the monetary and industrial economy of our Nation.

Second, to protect the agricultural products externally that are protected internally by subsidies.

Third, to protect the economy of the jobs and investments in the textile industry which could be wiped out overnight in a free trade world.

Let us examine the picture of protectionism a little further. Let us look at textiles and why the free traders have to resort to protectionism to keep this industry alive in our country.

Textiles are one of the three personal essentials of all peoples—food, clothing, and shelter. They can be produced anywhere. Raw materials and labor are in oversupply and easily obtainable. They are competitive pricewise because they fill personal consumer needs.

This is especially true of cotton textiles. Any textile producing nation can produce more than their needs so each nation tries to export to markets in other nations with or without textile production of their own.

At this point we get away from the sound trade principle of exchanging goods for need and get into the exchange of goods for profit. There are four categories of textile producers:

First. Some nations pay more for raw material, less for labor.

Second. Some pay less for raw material, more for labor.

Third. Some pay less for raw materials and less for labor.

Fourth. Some pay more for raw material and more for labor. For the sake of this analysis we will set aside taxes and budget.

Which nation in a world free market will suffer most in competition? Naturally the high cost raw material and labor producer in a free trade economy will be eventually pushed out of world markets first and its home market next, unless it devises some method of equalizing competition in the marketplace.

Our own Government while promoting free trade for other industries recognizes this in the textile field.

We are at the present time operating under a voluntary 18-nation agreement on quotas for export and import to save our domestic textile industry.

Next we are giving the industry special tax consideration in depreciating its investment in machinery in order that it can automate to meet the lower costs of competitive production from abroad.

We are going further and are at this very moment working on an equalizing tariff markup at customs which will charge customs based upon the cotton content of the textile product in order to protect domestic industry against higher costs of production due to higher costs of raw material. Is this protectionism or is it free trade?

If our Government recognizes the logic and justice of protection because our mills pay a fixed price for cotton of $42.50 a bale more than their competitors in order to protect the cottongrowers—why then is it out of order to protect the same mill that pays 3 to 10 times as much per hour for labor to produce textiles.

One can ask an honest question at this point. Is this protectionism political or economical? Is there any difference in the end result whether an American-made product is noncompetitive in a free market because of the cost of raw material on one hand or the cost of labor on the other, to transform the raw material into a salable product.

Why is it necessary to protect the cottongrower? Simply because our economic level of living demands a certain amount of income for food, shelter, clothing, taxes, transportation, education, utilities, and purchasing power.

If this is true for the cottongrower why is it not equally true for the wage earner? Is it not true that a loaf of bread, a kilowatt of power, a ticket on a train, a newspaper, all cost the same in a given economy to both the cottongrower, the management of the textile plant, and the wage earner in the mill and cottonfield?

All of us admit the need for foreign trade, but do we better our economy by paying a subsidy to foreign nations on our exports and then allowing the products made from exports to compete against our own products, in our own markets, let alone in foreign markets?

The answer is obvious, and that is why the very men who advocate free trade are promoting a tariff based upon quotas and a tariff based upon a differential in raw materials cost for the textile industry.

If this is sound economics for textiles why is it wrong for glass, coal, rubber, watches, binoculars, and other American-made products?

In a booklet entitled "The A B C's of Trade," put out by the State Department this past week, trade is described as "an exchange of goods for something else of value."

This is a sound economic fact. However, after this opening statement, the pamphlet becomes an out-and-out propaganda piece and attempts to justify trade for trade's sake with or without economic reality.

The main themes of this treatise are two; one tends to prove that this Nation cannot exist, cannot fight a winning war and cannot provide employment without free trade.

In answer, one must admit that no one proposes that this Nation should not have foreign trade; that with safeguards on our trade we did win three wars in one generation; we have had, under so-called protective tariffs, the greatest growth of any Nation on earth. When the argument is made that we sell $20 billion abroad and buy $15 billion worth of imports we fail to count the 30 percent of our exports sold to American taxpayers and shipped abroad. Finally, when the State Department claims 2 million jobs from exports, they fail to show how many jobs are lost by imports.

The claim is made that 15 percent of our farm production is exported, chiefly rice, wheat, cotton, soybeans, and tobacco. They fail to tell the people and Congress how much it costs us to sell these products. This is a case of selling more and losing more money. It is like the merchant who paid 4 cents a pair for shoestrings and sold them three pairs for 10 cents based upon the theory that volume would take care of his losses.

The State Department was very careful about not telling Congress how much we import in farm products.

For the record let us take a minute to put some interesting farm facts before the people. In 10 years, we paid our farmers $26 billion in subsidies while we imported $42 billion worth of farm products.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 107, part 5, page 6177, states as follows:

> From 1949 to 1959, we imported twice as much barley as our surplus grew during that period. In fact, we imported more during that period than we had on hand as surplus at the end of 1959. In oats, we imported four times as much from 1949 to 1959 as our surplus grew during the same period—imports approximately equaled the surplus on hand at the end of 1959. The situation in rye is even more vivid. From 1949 to 1959, we produced 46.5 million less bushels than the amount of the total of this crop. Yet during this same period, our surplus increased by 4.5 million bushels, due to the fact that we imported 52.7 million bushels.

To cite another example, the Department of Agriculture is presently engaged in a lamb-buying program to improve prices. As of March 24, 1961, they had acquired 4½ million pounds of lamb at a cost of $1¾ million. We have imported over 14 million pounds of lamb at a cost of over $3½ million during the past 13 months. The Department is buying lamb at about the same rate that it is being imported. The latest purchase, March 24, was 1.7 million pounds and we imported 1.6 million pounds in January.

From another angle, in 1957, this country imported 3.5 million pounds of these commodities. In 2 years, these increased to 56.8 million pounds—a very drastic increase, and one which has been severely felt by our domestic industry.

And so, like the textile industry, agriculture is feeling the effects of large agricultural imports. It would be my hope that consideration may be given to this import situation, the goal being a policy that will be beneficial to agriculture and the entire national economy.

In 1960, the U.S. Department of Agriculture stated that the value of our agricultural imports is in rather close balance with the value of our agricultural exports. In the past 2 years fully one-half of our imports of agricultural products of $4 billion annually were made up of items directly competing with the products we produce at home. We have no quantitative import restrictions on beef, pork, lamb, poultry, fruits, vegetable oils, barley, corn, sorghums, and many other products.

Without getting into the flood of statements that upset all the propaganda figures let us examine what we lose in wage dollars on a typical textile transaction. In order not to be considered unrealistic we will draw a comparative wage rate for imports at the highest level and reduce our American wage to the lowest minimum wage paid.

According to the U.S. News & World Report, the average wage including all fringe benefits in the eight industrial nations of Europe is 85 cents an hour and in the United States $2.96 an hour. The Japanese, Hong Kong, and Taiwan average is 34 cents an hour. This includes all wages. Wages in textiles are much lower in all nations when compared to higher cost products.

Giving every break possible to the foreign countries, we will say that foreign wages, fringes and all amount to one-third of that of American workers.

Staying strictly in the field of agricultural products forgetting subsidies, and taxes and using only wage equations, the following interesting figures emerge from the trade in agriculture alone.

Again giving the benefit to imports over exports we will say we sold as much as we bought in the last 10 years. The record of course shows we export more but sold less.

In order to find the labor content of a contracted product let us use figures issued by the United States-Japan Trade Council in its pamphlet put out to prove how Japan creates American wages.

Page 10 shows these figures—cotton exporters:

Dollar volume of purchases by Japan:	
Texas	$128,181,000
Arkansas	32,570,000
Mississippi	31,942,000
Jobs created (their figures):	
Texas	33,800
Arkansas	10,470
Mississippi	11,620

Using these three typical States and their own figures, putting the minimum wage of $1 an hour on all jobs, we find that in Texas wages are about 50 percent of the value of exports, while in Arkansas and Mississippi they represent a higher percentage of the value or about 60 to 65 percent.

However, we will discount this because obviously the intent of the propaganda pamphlet is to show as many jobs as possible, and use the mean average of 50 percent of export value to be wages.

This means that for every million dollars' worth of exports we create one-half million dollars in wages. Now let us see what happens to our wage and job economy when we import $1 million worth of goods from Japan. Using the one-third-wage ratio we find that $1 million worth of Japanese imports costs only one-third of the wages paid to American workers, or $170,000.

It follows then that when we import from Japan every million dollars costs American wage earners $330,000 in wages and the economy two-thirds of its purchasing power.

Again we will give the Japan Trade Council the benefit of the doubt when they claim they buy from the United States $1,324 million and sell to the United States $1,126,529,000. U.S. exports are all computed at Japanese c.i.f. value while U.S. imports are computed f.o.b. Japan—a difference of about 25 percent volume value plus including exports under aid and food programs.

Let us see how it shapes up for the American worker. We sell $1,324 million divided by $1 an hour minimum wage, $2,000 a year, we will have 331,000 jobs created by total exports.

We import $1,126 million, 50 percent of which is wages paid to Japanese workers at rates one-third of our rates, or $563,000.

American wages for the same volume of products would be 3 times $563,000, or $1,689 million. Divide this by our minimum wage and we find that Japanese imports took 844,500 jobs away from American workers. Deduct the 331,000 jobs created by exports from the 884,500 jobs displaced by imports and the job loss to the United States is 553,000 jobs and $1,689 million wages at minimum rates.

Even the Japanese admit to only 290,000 jobs created by their purchases of American-made goods and no one can deny both the ratio of one-third of our wages bring a liberal allowance for Japanese wage levels, and the ratio of $1 Japanese import value displacing $3 American value in the marketplace.

The 50-percent-of-cost ratio for wages in American production is reasonable in the types of goods imported from Japan.

We have worked out the ratios for three typical Southern States—now let us look at a Pennsylvania figure supplied by the Japanese Trade Council.

Page 10: Exports from Pennsylvania to Japan, $60,700,000. Jobs created, 4,850.

Page 8: The reason for fewer jobs per million dollars of exports is because Pennsylvania exports steel and metal products, machinery, chemicals, metal scraps, petroleum products, and so forth, with a lower labor content to volume dollar selling price.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Is the gentleman suggesting that the average wage in the State of Mississippi is higher than a dollar an hour?

Mr. DENT. Am I suggesting what?

Mr. PUCINSKI. Is the gentleman suggesting that the average worker in the State of Mississippi is earning a minimum of $1 or more an hour?

Mr. DENT. I am suggesting taking the whole United States and allowing every job that is created by the imports to be paid no more than $1 an hour.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I notice the gentleman listed $32 million of imports into the State of Mississippi, and the gentleman projected the loss of jobs on the basis of $1 an hour for the State of Mississippi.

Mr. DENT. I am only giving the figures that the Japanese Trade Council puts out, sir. They said they did business in that State of $31,947,000, and that it created 11,620 jobs. Even if they paid a minimum wage of $1 an hour—

Mr. PUCINSKI. I know what the gentleman has said, but during the minimum wage hearings that our committee conducted it was very apparent that there were many, many workers in the State of Mississippi not getting a minimum $1 an hour.

Mr. DENT. I do not know what point the gentleman is trying to make; I can only say that no matter what the lowest wage is in Mississippi, I will guarantee that the wage paid in Japan is a lot lower than anything paid in any State of the Union.

Having no figures yet, although the Government is busy working up some schedules for congressional use, we can guess at the job losses in Pennsylvania.

As the Representative of the 21st District of Pennsylvania, with glass, rubber goods, household wares, tool steel, steel powders, toys, secondary manufacturing in general industry, wire fencing, and so forth, and classified as a depressed area, I would hazard a guess that more than the total of 4,850 jobs created in the whole State by exports to Japan are lost in my one district alone to American workers.

I have kept within the scope of wages, jobs, and their relationship to protective covenants in the law whether they be subsidies, tariffs, quotas, or gentlemen's agreements and the evidence both factual, documented, and hypothetical concluding proves that free trade is a desirable and worthwhile goal for all nations but that its attainment depends upon the economic equality between nations in the fields of wages, taxes, services, and raw materials costs. Until that time comes, if our Nation is to survive it must maintain its economic stability by keeping all five pillars of our economy equal in proportion of protection.

The five pillars of our economy are:

Investment is the first pillar. Investment creates production.

Production is the second pillar. Production creates payrolls.

Payrolls are the third pillar. Payrolls create consumption.

Consumption is the fourth pillar. Consumption creates profits.

Profits are the fifth pillar. After you get profits you start all over again the cycle of investment, production, payroll, consumption, and profit. There is no other basis of competition in making a sound economic industrial environment. This holds true in any national or international industrial nation: You cannot operate a successful industrial complex without the cycle of investment, production, payroll, consumption, and profits.

The trouble with our picture today while we are soaring into new economic heights in this country of ours, we find that employment is going down in the production industry. Let me just give you a figure that ought to keep you awake at night if you are interested in the United States of America: In 1953 we had 17,234,000 jobs in manufacturing. In 1959, we had 15,462,000, or 2 million jobs fewer than we had in 1953 with millions more of consumers in the country.

If you will go into the field of trade and tariffs, I think there is an interesting comment. We talk about reducing tariffs, and I understand that there is a new plan on foot whereby we are going to have a 20-percent-across-the-board cut with the Common Market countries. I will take one particular product, and the reason I take it is because 4 years ago we were talking about a 4-year extention of that pact. It relates to the shoe industry. Incidentally, my State is second in the Nation in the manufacture of shoes, and you know, "all of us chillun gotta have shoes." So let us see what happened. The United States of America has a duty at the present time against shoes from Belgium of 6.7 percent.

Belgium has a duty of 20 percent, plus an additional 12 percent compensating tax applied after the tariff, or 30 percent.

France. We have an 11.4-percent tariff against France. France has a 53-percent tariff combined with tax against American shoes.

West Germany a 16-percent tariff, plus a 6-percent tax, or 22 percent, compared to an American tax of 8.6.

Italy has 24.8 percent against 13.6 percent.

Japan has a 50-percent tariff against American shoes, ad valorem value, against 18 percent by the United States.

What has happened because of this? This has all happened since 1954.

In 1954 this Nation imported 5½ million pairs of shoes. We exported 5 million pairs of shoes.

In 1957 we imported 16 million pairs of shoes. We exported 3½ million pairs of shoes.

In 1960 we imported 126 million pairs of shoes. We exported 2½ million pairs of shoes.

There are those in our Government who say that certain industries are expanding. There are 25 less plants in the shoe industry in Pennsylvania, because in the last 10 years 385 shoe manufacturing plants have gone out of business in the United States; 876 textile plants have gone out of business in the United States.

Maybe we can exist on an economy of paying subsidies to wheat and cotton and selling cotton in the world market, but I do not think we can.

This is an industrial nation. When we allow another nation to build its economy base upon a percentage growth in the U.S. market, we are being unfair to that country and we are building deep-seated ill feeling, and opening up wounds that may destroy everything we are making the sacrifice for, world peace, good fellowship, and good feeling.

Why is it that everywhere we go we hear ourselves being taunted with the statement, "Go home, Yank." I will tell you why. Because in the last 6 years we have invested in oversea production facilities $13,700 million but we have taken out in profits from these underdeveloped countries, Latin America, central Europe, and others $15,700 million. We have not given them anything. We have exploited their people. We are working them at wages we fought against in this country from the dark days before 1900 when my father was an immigrant working for 80 cents a day. We fought that issue out.

Why are they running away? Because they are producing in areas where they can work people for 15 cents an hour, 7 cents an hour, 11 cents an hour. They want a free trade compact, taking all of the tariff down, so that they can ship these products right back here to the United States and sell them in a high economy market, one of the most inflexible rules of economics, and anyone who has studied economics or who has worked in a 5-and-10-cent store knows this is a rule that is inflexible in economics. The production of goods will flow to the low cost protection areas, and the sale of goods will flow to the high income areas.

In closing, this Nation of ours was not built industrially on low prices. It was built industrially on high income. These nations, after 28 years of so-called tariff cuts by this Government of ours that has reduced our tariff from 46.7 percent to a little over 11.3 percent, these same nations are now coming to us and asking us to cut our tariffs further. Does anybody in this room believe an 11-percent tariff is a detriment to the sale of imported products in the United States when they have a market advantage of anywhere from one-third to one-tenth of that paid by the American people?

There are only two deterrents to foreign imports in this country of ours. These two deterrents have kept us from being flooded even more than we have been flooded in the last 3 years. And, I want to say this for the record at this time, that what we are doing now with this new trade program is pulling the chestnuts out of the fire for the last administration in its ill-advised program of extending the trade agreements for a 4-year period, thereby opening up the floodgates to the exodus of American products, to the runaway of American facilities, and the dumping in the U.S. market of low-cost produced goods that are taken in.

I say to this membership—and I can prove it by the record—that for every job created by exports we lose five American jobs taken from us by imports. It is simple arithmetic. You do not have to be a Harvard professor to know that two and two make four. You do not have to go to any particular school to find out that if a man is out of work he becomes a liability upon the community in this country of ours. Every product manufactured has to carry the cost of a $92.5 billion budget in a population of 183 million people, but in Japan, which is the most devastating of our competitors today, they have 70 million people and their 70 million people only have to carry a total budget of $6 billion, which means that for every penny added to the cost of production in Japan because of their budget, the American product has to carry 5 cents on every one of their products.

Then, what are we supposed to do? How can you compete with fixed mandated costs more than the cost of manufacture in some of these countries? If we want to talk about the logic of this situation, that is one thing, and if we want to talk about the economics of this situation, that is another thing, but if you want to talk about trade, you have to talk dollars and cents, and a little bit of commonsense, otherwise what has happened to us in the last 4 years is nothing compared to what will happen in the next 5 years. That prediction I make, hoping never to see it happen.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I want to commend the gentleman for the statement he has made, including the statement—and I will not put words in the gentleman's mouth—but it went to this effect, as I recall it, that one of the tragic mistakes we made was the passage of the last 4-year extension of the Trade Agreements Act. The gentleman made a statement along that line, did he not?

Mr. DENT. I did.

Mr. GROSS. And I want to go further. He said, since making that statement, that this would be, in effect, a mere bagatelle by comparison to what would happen if this bill is passed, this bill now proposed and pending before the Congress. I wonder if the gentleman read the details of this debt settlement with the Japanese the other day. I found it very interesting. From about 1946 to about 1956 we gave the Japanese—they called it a loan—or loaned the Japanese $1,889 million. The other day we settled that debt or went through the motions of settling the debt. And, how was it settled? For $490 million. That is, the Japanese are presumably going to pay us $490 million for the loan of $1,889 million. Now, just a moment; $25 million of the $490 million was immediately earmarked for educational and cultural relations between the United States and Japan. The rest of the $490 million, subtracting the $25 million, is to be spent according to the terms of the agreement, for the development of markets in the Far East for the Japanese—not for Americans—and of the $490 million no part of it is going back into the Federal Treasury to take up some of the slack that the $1,889 million created, but the bulk of the lousy settlement of less than 25 cents on the dollar, with Japan going through an industrial boom, is going to go to the proposition of developing more markets for Japanese products in the Far East and the Near East.

Mr. DENT. I thank the gentleman. I did not know the details, but I am happy to know them.

I might say to the gentleman that 4 years ago when the bill was up, the very thing I predicted has come about. I said then that there would be a flood of products. I said then that the 4-year extension would not do what its proponents said it would do. The gentleman will remember that we were told the reason the Reciprocal Trade Act had to be amended was to achieve lower tariffs all over the world and, also, because they did not have a duration of time in which to negotiate and that they needed a 4-year period. At the end of that time they would have developed in the world a low tariff atmosphere for all our production, and it would increase our exports.

Mr. Speaker, let me say for the record, in order that there is no misunderstanding, that the exports for the year 1961 are false, fictitious, and have come about because of collusion. The exporting countries have agreed to export less to the United States and to import more from the United States, to make agreements to pay off long-standing debts in order that in this year of our Lord 1962 we are called upon to pass their desired trade bill. The same thing happened in 1957, when out of a clear sky we were handed the same malarkey we are getting today—that exports were $5 billion greater than imports. Everyone knew then, who wanted to know, that the reason our exports were greater was because the Suez Canal was closed, and there was a tremendous upsurge in foreign buying of petroleum products.

Mr. Speaker, right now today we are counting in our exports free food at the value of the subsidized prices in the United States as part of our export total. Let us at least be honest to the people of this country. I do not care. It might be the best thing in the world to cut out everything and give everything away, if it will save lives. Maybe it is. But, Mr. Speaker, there was an American once a long time ago whose words still ring out in the halls where men gather and talk about patriotism and Americanism, who said, "Give me liberty or give me death."

Mr. Speaker, what good is the kind of freedom that we are working up to today when a great percentage of our people would not be allowed to work in the trade of their fathers, will not be allowed to live in the communities where their roots are deep, but may be uprooted and put into some position where the Government says they must work? This is the kind of stuff they do in the countries which we are trying to fight, where they say, "You and your family move to this area."

Mr. Speaker, we have enough industry, we have enough consumption of our own goods in America to keep every man that wants to work at a job to maintain his family. It is a very terrible situation when 11 million Americans are living on relief, 3.5 million Americans on unemployment compensation and 17.5 million Americans are living on social security benefits. What has happened to us as a nation? What has got into us anyway?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman never made a more correct statement in his life than when he said that the public is being fed the same malarkey that it was fed 4 years ago when the extension of the Trade Agreements Act came up. Let me point this out to the gentleman: Tomorrow or the next day the Members of this House are going to have an opportunity to vote for or against the bill to create another Assistant Secretary of Commerce, another propagandist over there, to carry the torch as they did under the Eisenhower administration when they raided the President's contingent fund for $400,000 to propagandize and carry on the meetings that Eric Johnston held and Alfred Gruenther and the rest of the boys over here in Washington and all over the country in order to promote the extension of the Trade Agreements Act. If the Members of this House vote for the additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce—this brandnew one, he will become another propagandist for the same bunch of people.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman for the statement which he has made here in the House today. As a member of the same committee on which I have the privilege of serving, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. DENT, has certainly spent more time studying this subject than anyone I know. I do not think anyone can question either his sincerity or his determination to make his views known.

As chairman of the subcommittee that has just concluded the study of the impact of foreign imports on the American economy he has certainly distinguished himself in trying to assemble as many facts on the subject as he could.

I, myself, while I have the highest regard for his views and the depth of his sincerity and his determination to bring those views to the Congress, have but one question to ask and that is that while the gentleman has certainly spelled out the great challenge and the great problem that confront America in the stream of international commerce, what are the alternatives? There is no question in my mind that we have shored up the whole of Western Europe to the point where today I do not think the Communists have a chance in the world of success in that area; whereas immediately after the war, during those years immediately following the war, there was a constant fear of that.

I recall I was in Italy in 1952 and we were making a great appeal then to Americans to write to their friends in Italy to make sure that Togliatti would not get a foothold. And this was done with great success. Today I think the Italian economy is a model for the free world to follow. They are having a tremendous prosperity and are strong. Today I think that the Italian people are just about as sound in their free enterprise system as we have ever imagined.

So that the question is this, as I see it. There is no question we are going to have extremely difficult problems. Nobody knows this better than I, coming from Chicago, where a vast section of our electronics industry has been very badly hit by foreign imports. I am fully aware of the problem that the gentleman raises. The question is, What is the alternative? The alternative is to sit back and help Mr. Khrushchev make good his promise that he is going to bury us. We are trying to deal with most difficult problems in this vast struggle today against international communism. I wish I had easy answers. I wish we could pass a trade agreement bill that would protect all of our rights. The fact remains that we have got to look at this from an extremely broad standpoint.

The President has made many sound suggestions on how to meet this. Nobody has stated more eloquently his concern for the loss of American jobs due to foreign competition than the President in his recent message to this Congress. He has outlined a series of moves that this Government can make to try and make up the difference and at the same time not plunge these nations into economic chaos and make them easy prey to our enemies. The gentleman knows better than I do—he has been in this business longer than I have and there are few Members of Congress I respect as highly as I do the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT]—but the gentleman knows that the one thing that international communism breeds on is poverty, economic chaos. This is what we have been fighting for the last 15 years after the war.

Have we made mistakes? Of course we have made mistakes. I do not think we can ever find the perfect solution in an imperfect world. But I would like to hear the gentleman's alternatives. I would like to hear what he proposes we do to keep in this stream of international commerce and help these nations survive economically.

Mr. DENT. If the gentleman will quit talking, I will tell him.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I should like to hear the gentleman's answer.

Mr. DENT. The gentleman asked what the alternative is and then he proceeds to answer it himself. He said that the alternative, in his opinion, was to turn these countries over to communism and let Mr. Khrushchev's boast come true. Now, it might interest the gentleman to know that in speaking of trade, Mr. Karl Marx of unhappy memory made this statement—and I would like to quote it and I hope I am right in every word, because it has been burned into my brain over the years of study; Mr. Karl Marx said that free trade was the greatest of all avenues for the promotion of the social revolution. And that insofar as this aspect of free trade was concerned he was dedicated to free trade.

Insofar as the alternatives are concerned I would suggest that the gentleman go back to 1812 and read the alternative suggested by the Founding Fathers.

Then I would suggest you go to 1832 and read the contents of the Clay Compromise and the succeeding action within 4 years, in 1836. I would suggest you go to 1857 and read what happened when your Congress of the United States took the same position, with a different bogeyman than they have now; and then read again what happened just prior to the Civil War. I would have you go back to 1957 and complete the categorical counting of items imported into the United States. I want you at the same time to measure the nations and our relationship with the nations of the world and then take 1960 categorically again accumulating the figures on trade items imported and exported and then measure and equate that against the so-called goodwill byproduct that we are supposed to buy.

Mr. Speaker, I am not opposed to free trade. The solution I offer is one that would wipe out trade barriers all over the world. There would not be any tariff walls standing anywhere in the world, and yet each economy would be protected within that economy to compensate and to give to industry and to labor the incentive required to meet the cost of living in the economy. The gentleman asked what would I do. I would present to the Congress, if the Congress will permit and if the rules of the House will allow, I will present to the President of the United States within the next 10 days, and he will see it, a tariff plan that cannot be objected to by any honest nation or by any honest leaders in any nation because sublime above everything else, there must be the integrity of the people within a given nation. Otherwise national lines mean nothing. The flag is just a symbol and the Constitution becomes just a piece of paper. But, I do not think the Constitution is a piece of paper, Mr. Speaker. I do not think the flag is just a symbol. I do not believe these United States are yet ready to say that the 50 United States are as one with the world. We may be ready in our ideals. We may be ready in our Christian concept of neighborliness and brotherhood. But in the fight of economics, remember one thing—economics and trade are commercial. All the countries you are talking about—when you talk about Italy, do not say that things are well with the little peoples there. The peoples below the meridian in Italy are lucky to have meat twice a year. I know. I visited the people there right in their homes way down in the provinces. I know because they are relatives of mine and they told me the truth.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I shall be looking with great anticipation and enthusiasm for the plan the gentleman proposes to submit to the President and to the Congress within the next 10 days.

Mr. DENT. The plan will not be presented to the Congress within 10 days. It will be presented to the President in the next 10 days.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I do hope this plan will follow more or less along the lines that I had the pleasure and honor of discussing here about a week ago when I pointed out that in my judgment the only way we can really approach this problem of international trade relations is to set up international fair labor standards agreements in lieu of arbitrary quotas so that we will be able to give these people higher standards of living and at the same time protect our American workers from competing against the cheap labor markets of the world. I am sure the gentleman and I see eye to eye on many aspects of this plan. I am not quite sure, however, that I agree entirely with many of the views the gentleman has expressed today. Nevertheless, I do think that everyone in this Congress will join me in congratulating the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] for his sincerity of purpose that he has put in on this assignment. I do not know of any Member of the Congress who has devoted as much time and effort and study to this problem than has the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] and I think his presentation here today certainly reflects the great work that he has done in this field. I congratulate the gentleman for his remarks today.

Mr. DENT. I thank my colleague for his kind remarks.

BOMBING ATROCITY IN CALIFORNIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. CORMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, on the night of February 1, 1962, tragedy struck the 21st and 22d Districts in California, the San Fernando Valley. The homes of two Protestant ministers were bombed while they participated in a meeting in a synagogue to discuss radical right groups in our community.

Substantial destruction was done to the homes of the Reverend John Simmons and the Reverend Brooks Walker.

As the senior Senator from California observed on the floor of the Senate last Friday, "there is no more infamous or corrupt criminal activity than that which revolves around the attempt of degenerates to blow up homes and the families that live in them."

The police observed at the time that the explosions were obviously linked with remarks the ministers made at the synagogue. In the face of this anarchy and violence, it is well to look at the San Fernando Valley, a typical prosperous suburban area, and see what a handful of psychotic extremists have done to it and its million residents.

Most of the people living in the San Fernando Valley have come there since the end of World War II. The community which they have built is a model development—almost totally free from racial, religious, or political prejudices. Schools of every level from elementary through college have been provided. Churches and synagogues have flourished, even though it has been some financial strain on young families to provide needed places of worship and religious education.

Political, civic, and service organizations have found vigorous support. These activities have been, particularly in both political parties, spontaneous, grassroots movements without "bossism" or outside control.

About 18 months ago, the community became aware of a new movement, gathering support for activity claimed to be anticommunism. Insofar as the objective of these new groups was opposed to communism, it coincided with the platform and principles of both major parties.

But it soon became apparent to the critical observer of these self-styled saviors of our Republic that these new experts found the threat in strange places and proposed remedial action abhorrent to most responsible citizens. The pattern of organization and action ran from small study groups to mass fund-raising rallies, to the extreme—for the few belligerent zealots—action bodies.

This new movement specialized in undermining confidence in government at every level, from the local school board to the U.S. Supreme Court and the United Nations.

Turning their attention to the churches, they attacked across the board, from local ministers and bishops to the National Council of Churches and the World Council of Churches.

To further retain their effectiveness and counter attacks delivered at them by a responsible Los Angeles press, they purported that the press was Communist controlled and the only reliable news was that disseminated by their own groups and fronts.

Almost 6 months ago people in our community began to suffer the consequence of this campaign of distrust and fear and hate. Any public statement criticizing the extremists or supporting the maligned teacher, preacher, or Supreme Court Justice resulted in one being branded "a Communist" and in some circumstances ostracized.

The next fearful but logical step in this campaign of the hate-mongers was the bombing of February 1.

Los Angeles is fortunate in that it has a highly efficient police and sheriff's department. Both organizations are headed by competent professionals, perfectly capable of protecting the community, of detecting and prosecuting these anarchists.

It is imperative that the attorney general of California carefully investigate this incident to ascertain the scope of the conspiracy.

The U.S. Attorney General should, and I am certain will, conduct such investigation as is necessary to find whether Federal laws have been violated. If there is such evidence, Federal authorities must assist local and State police units.

Of equal importance, if we are to rid ourselves of this cancerous growth of hate and violence, is the need for every citizen in the valley to carefully study and evaluate the motives and dangers of the extreme right.

Speaking on the floor of the U.S. Senate, February 2, 1962, Senator KUCHEL said:

> The radical right in this country is as grave a danger to the security of our country and the faith of our people in the constitutional system of government as is the radical Communist left.

Insofar as these extremists purport to conduct political action, that action must be unmasked and thwarted by both major parties.

When these extremists attempt in the name of the Prince of Peace, to broadcast their evil hatred and violence, they must be the target for disclosure of every minister, priest, and rabbi.

Under our system of freedom, there is room for every shade of political and theological view. There is no place for those who conspire to destroy our political and religious institutions through force and violence.

THE HILL-BURTON HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION ACT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to strike a so-called equal-but-separate provision from another major Federal program, the Hill-Burton Hospital Construction Act.

Recently, I introduced legislation to strike a similar equal-but-separate provision from the so-called Morrill Act, or Land Grant College Act. I repeat today what I said on that occasion. The separate-but-equal doctrine has been shown to be a fraudulent one. It is a device that under a seemingly plausible rationale permits the pernicious practice of discrimination against certain groups of our fellow Americans to continue. Such a glaring vestige of segregation should be stricken from this and any other statute. Not only is it held contrary to public policy, but the Supreme Court in May 1954 struck down this doctrine when it declared that enforced segregation in the public schools is unconstitutional.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Hill-Burton Act is an extremely worthwhile program. Since funds were first appropriated by this Congress in 1948, a total of 5,888 projects have been approved to help communities meet the demand for additional hospital facilities.

A total of approximately $5.1 billion, including $1.6 billion in Federal funds, has been appropriated between 1948 and 1961 in an effort to keep abreast of hospital needs. My amendment, in turn, would keep the program abreast of the growing receptiveness of Americans for equality of treatment for all.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. MURPHY (at the request of Mr. LIBONATI), for Monday, February 5, 1962, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. DENT (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 1 hour today, and 1 hour on Monday, February 12.

Mr. CORMAN (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS, for 1 hour, on February 19.

Mrs. MAY (at the request of Mr. DERWINSKI), for 30 minutes, on February 8, 1962.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. SCHADEBERG (at the request of Mr. WALTER) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WICKERSHAM.

Mr. ANFUSO.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DERWINSKI) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri.

Mr. GOODLING.

Mr. ALGER.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BUCKLEY.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 6025. An act to confer jurisdiction on the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of George Edward Barnhart against the United States; and

H.J. Res. 612. Joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the Veterans' Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 6, 1962, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1631. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, relative to reporting that the appropriations listed herein have been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for supplemental estimates of appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1632. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report of actual procurement receipts for medical stockpile of civil defense emergency supplies and equipment purposes, for the period ending December 31, 1961, pursuant to subsection 201(h) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1633. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to change the names of the Edison Home National Historic Site and the Edison Laboratory National Monument, to authorize the acceptance of donations, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1634. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 130(a) of title 28, United States Code, so as to reconstitute the Eastern Judicial District of Wisconsin to include Menominee County, Wis."; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1635. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to moneys received in payment for special statistical studies and compilations and certain other services"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1636. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1637. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of the orders entered under the authority contained in section 13(b) of the act as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 13(c) of the act of September 11, 1957; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1638. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a copy of the order suspending deportation in the case of Leong Gee Keong, A12648341, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1639. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to improve and protect farm income, to reduce costs of farm programs to the Federal Government, to reduce the Federal Government's excessive stocks of agricultural commodities, to maintain reasonable and stable prices of agricultural commodities and products to consumers, to provide adequate supplies of agricultural commodities for domestic and foreign needs, to conserve natural resources, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1640. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting 20 reports covering 21 violations of section 3679, Revised Statutes, and Department of Defense Directive 7200.1, entitled "Administrative Control of Appropriations Within the Department of Defense," pursuant to section 3679(i)(2), Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1641. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the Annual Report of the Secretary of Defense for fiscal year 1961, together with the reports of the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, pursuant to the National Security Act of 1947, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1642. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act to authorize the United States to participate in loans to the International Monetary Fund to strengthen the international monetary system"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1643. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report covering the progress made in liquidating the assets of the former Reconstruction Finance Corporation covering the quarterly period ending December 31, 1961, pursuant to the RFC Liquidation Act, as amended (67 Stat. 230), and Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1957 (22 F.R. 4633); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1644. A letter from the Chairman, District of Columbia Armory Board, transmitting the annual reports and financial statements for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961, pursuant to Public Law 605, 80th Congress, and Public Law 85-300; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1645. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting four reports prepared by the Wage and Hour Division in accordance with section 13 of the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1961 and congressional requests, pursuant to section 4(d) of the Fair Labor Standards Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1646. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to prohibit wiretapping by persons other than duly authorized law-enforcement officers engaged in the investigation or prevention of specified categories of criminal offenses, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1647. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office, U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act to permit a trustee to deposit estate money in interest-bearing time deposits"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1648. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting the annual report relating to positions in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, pursuant to Public Law 854, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GALLAGHER: Committee on Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group. Report on the fifth meeting of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group (Rept. No. 1297). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 10049. A bill to extend the application of certain laws to American Samoa; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 10050. A bill to provide for a further temporary increase in the public debt limit set forth in the Second Liberty Bond Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CANNON:

H.R. 10051. A bill to direct the Commissioner of Education to assist in the establishment of a Carver Memorial Library, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DOOLEY:

H.R. 10052. A bill to provide for the temporary suspension of the duty on cork-board insulation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 10053. A bill to amend the hospital survey and construction provisions of the Public Health Service Act to strengthen the provisions thereof relating to the use of facilities without discrimination on account of race, creed, or color; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 10054. A bill to make the civil forfeiture provisions of section 222(h) of the Interstate Commerce Act applicable to unlawful operations and safety violations by motor carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 10055. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 10056. A bill to amend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, relating to construction and maintenance and operation of public schools in federally impacted areas, to deny payments to school districts which are not in compliance with constitutional requirements that public schools be operated on a racially nondiscriminatory basis; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 10057. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Antidumping Act, 1921, to provide for greater certainty, speed, and efficiency in the enforcement thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of Utah:

H.R. 10058. A bill to amend the Administrative Procedure Act, to prohibit Federal agents from issuing prejudging public statements on pending cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KYL:

H.R. 10059. A bill to amend title V of the Housing Act of 1949 to provide additional funds for farm housing loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H.R. 10060. A bill to establish a cropland retirement program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MacGREGOR:

H.R. 10061. A bill to repeal the provision of law relating to the mailing of matter by Members of the Senate and House of Representatives under congressional frank with a simplified form of address; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H.R. 10062. A bill to extend the application of certain laws to American Samoa; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 10063. A bill to amend section 8 of the Organic Act of Guam and section 15 of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands, to provide for appointment of acting secretaries for such territories under certain conditions; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ST. GERMAIN:

H.R. 10064. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow income tax deductions for certain payments to assist in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SILER:

H.R. 10065. A bill to provide for the establishment and administration of the Allegheny Parkway in the States of West Virginia and Kentucky and Maryland, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 10066. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide additional compensation for veterans suffering the loss or loss of use of both vocal cords, with resulting complete aphonia; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 10067. A bill to provide that the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall be informed before the initiation of construction of any new veterans' hospitals; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 10068. A bill to amend section 742 of title 38, United States Code, to permit veterans holding U.S. Government life insurance to exchange such insurance for a policy providing death protection only, with correspondingly reduced premiums; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 10069. A bill to amend section 216 of title 38, United States Code, relating to prosthetic research in the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON:

H.R. 10070. A bill to amend chapter 641, title 10, United States Code, by adding thereto a new section No. 7439 entitled, "Office of Naval Petroleum and Oil Shale Reserves"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WESTLAND (by request):

H.R. 10071. A bill to extend the application of certain laws to American Samoa; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 10072. A bill to change the name of the Big Bend Reservoir in the State of South Dakota to Lake Sharpe; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 10073. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Samuel Prescott National Historic Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SLACK:

H.R. 10074. A bill to provide that one employee in the office of a Member or Resident Commissioner of the House of Representatives may receive a gross salary equal to the highest gross salary paid in the House or Senate to employees in the offices of Members, Senators, or the Resident Commissioner; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H.R. 10075. A bill to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 to extend its application to poultry and hatching eggs, and the products thereof; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WHARTON:

H.R. 10076. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Antidumping Act, 1921, to provide for greater certainty, speed, and efficiency in the enforcement thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PIKE:

H.R. 10077. A bill to amend the Administrative Procedure Act with respect to public statements of Federal agencies which tend to discredit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa:

H.R. 10078. A bill to authorize loans for undergraduate study in public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 10079. A bill to amend section 104 of the Immigration and Nationality Act; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YATES:

H.R. 10080. A bill to amend section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to certain organizations for judicial reform; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 10081. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Antidumping Act, 1921, to provide for greater certainty, speed, and efficiency in the enforcement thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CANNON:

H.J. Res. 618. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Dr. Caryl P. Haskins as citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.J. Res. 619. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Dr. Crawford H. Greenewalt as citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H.J. Res. 620. Joint resolution designating March 27, 1962, as Gen. "Billy" Mitchell Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Con. Res. 408. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of the publication entitled "Our Flag" as a House document, and providing for additional copies; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. YATES:

H. Con. Res. 409. Concurrent resolution to condemn Communist persecution of Lithuanians and persons of the Catholic faith in Lithuania; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, relative to expressing regret at the passing of the Honorable Sam Rayburn, an eminent and distinguished citizen of our Nation; to the Committee on House Administration.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Guam, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting the enactment of legislation to create the position of Territorial Deputy or Delegate to be elected by the people of Guam as their representative to the Congress of the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CLEM MILLER:

H.R. 10082. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Angela Jarosin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 10083. A bill for the relief of Georgies Kotsiou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10084. A bill for the relief of Ioannis Kalergis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 10085. A bill for the relief of Gabriel Papp; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY (by request):

H.R. 10086. A bill for the relief of Inge Hemmersbach; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SLACK:

H.R. 10087. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anna S. Hall; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 10088. A bill for the relief of Sek-Yau Quan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 10089. A bill for the relief of Melborn Keat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H.R. 10090. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Annie Zambelli Stiletto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

235. The SPEAKER presented a petition of E. P. Riley, chairman, State Democratic Executive Committee, Greenville, S.C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to going on record as commending the statesmanlike service rendered the people of his district, State and Nation by the late Hon. John J. Riley of South Carolina, a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives, which was referred to the Committee on House Administration.

SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 1962

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

God of all mercy, whose goodness faileth never: With all our pressing needs, the one towering high above all others is our need of Thee—for having Thee we have all. Without Thee we are forsaken orphans in a heartless universe of blind force. So at the beginning of another week of responsibility we bring our hearts and our homes to the healing of Thy presence.

It is never a long journey to Thee, for Thou art closer than breathing, nearer than hands or feet.

For this day we would fare forward cheered by the assurance that as our day, so shall our strength be.

For all the perplexities that may comfort us, give us grace sufficient; for all the questions which call for decision, give us wisdom beyond our limitations; and for all the temptations which may lie in ambush to trap us, give us overcoming power. Enable us so to live as not to spoil a single day or grieve a single heart by deeds that might never be undone or words that can never be recalled.

We ask it in the name of the One whose spotless record shames us all. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 2, 1962, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H.R. 6025. An act to confer jurisdiction on the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of George Edward Barnhart against the United States; and

H.J. Res. 612. Joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the Veterans' Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

CALL OF THE CALENDAR DISPENSED WITH

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Legislative Calendar be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection with the morning hour be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATOR FROM KANSAS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I understand that a new Member of the Senate is waiting to be sworn in. I believe it would be judicious to attend now to that matter of business. We wish to have the Senate proceed thereafter to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I submit the certificate of the Governor of Kansas, the Honorable John Anderson, Jr., appointing JAMES B. PEARSON to be a Member of the U.S. Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The credentials will be read.

The credentials were read by the legislative clerk, and were ordered to be placed on file, as follows:

CERTIFICATE OF APPOINTMENT

TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that, pursuant to the power vested in me by the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the State of Kansas, I, John Anderson, Jr., the Governor of said State, do hereby appoint JAMES B. PEARSON, a Senator from said State, to represent said State in the Senate of the United States until the vacancy therein, caused by the death of Andrew F. Schoeppel, is filled by election as provided by law in section 25-318 of 1949 General Statutes.

Witness. His Excellency our Governor, John Anderson, Jr., and our seal hereto affixed at Topeka this 31st day of January, in the year of our Lord 1962.

By the Governor:

[Seal] JOHN ANDERSON, JR.

PAUL R. SHANAHAN,

Secretary of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senator-elect will present himself at the desk, the oath of office will be administered to him.

Mr. PEARSON, escorted by Mr. CARLSON, advanced to the Vice President's desk; and the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to him by the Vice President, and was subscribed by the new Senator.

[Applause on the floor and in the galleries.]

COMMITTEE SERVICE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I submit a resolution for which I request immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 292) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] be and he is hereby assigned to service on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Agency for International Development.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

UNITED NATIONS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United Nations.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

AMBASSADORS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of ambassadors.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

U.S. ATTORNEYS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of U.S. attorneys.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

U.S. MARSHALS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of U.S. marshals.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGES

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of U.S. circuit judges.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGES

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of U.S. district judges.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. HART subsequently said:

Mr. President, earlier today the Senate, by a unanimous vote, advised and consented to the nomination of Talbot Smith to be the U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Michigan.

I ask unanimous consent that a remarkable letter written by Roscoe Pound, dated January 27, 1962, in connection with the nomination and the nominee, be printed in the RECORD at the point of confirmation of the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Michigan? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

LAW SCHOOL OF HARVARD UNIVERSITY,
Cambridge, Mass., January 27, 1962.

Hon. PHILIP A. HART,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HART: For many years I have regularly made a systematic study of the decisions of our State courts as reported week by week in the national reporter system of the West Publishing Co. Some 5 years ago my attention was attracted to some opinions of Judge Talbot Smith, then a recently appointed judge of the Supreme Court of Michigan. Since that time I have followed his work with much interest. I have no hesitation in saying that his work stands along with that of Judge Traynor of the Supreme Court of California, and Chief Justice Schaefer of the Supreme Court of Illinois. I also have no hesitation in saying that the work of these three judges has stood out along with that of Mr. Justice Cardozo in the Supreme Court of the United States, and of Judge Learned Hand in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit in the progress of American law. Indeed I should feel that Judge Smith ought to be on the bench of the circuit court of appeals. But at any rate he is eminently qualified in every way for a Federal judiciary appointment. It would be a serious loss to the administration of justice if his appointment were not confirmed. He is preeminently the type of judge who should be upon the bench of our highest courts.

Yours very truly,

ROSCOE POUND.

COMMISSIONER OF IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Raymond F. Farrell, of Rhode Island, to be Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, the Senate has just confirmed the nomination of Raymond F. Farrell, of Rhode Island, to be Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization.

This signals not only the recognition of a career man in the public service; but also the recognition of the application of humane and commonsense qualities in the administration of our immigration laws.

Ray Farrell is truly a career man. Since his graduation from the schools of Rhode Island and from Georgetown Law School his Government career has included the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Department of the Interior, the Federal Works Agency, and assistant to the general counsel of the joint committee of the Congress studying the administration of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

His 21 years in the Immigration Service has been interrupted only by his military service abroad in World War II. Constant earned advancement has marked these 21 years—advancement from assistant district director to Associate Commissioner—and now Commissioner.

Mr. Farrell was the unanimous recommendation of the Rhode Island delegation in the Congress. Ours was not the automatic endorsement of a man merely because he had given long years of public service. We are keenly alive to the image of America that can be created in a world where so many wish to come here and so few—under our laws—can be chosen. All of us have had personal experience with hardship cases in this very sensitive area.

In commenting upon Mr. Farrell's appointment, the New York Times editorially expressed itself in these words:

> For many years the Immigration Service has had a reputation for narrow, illiberal administration of laws which are themselves not noted for their humanity.

The Times would bring new wisdom and breadth of vision into immigration enforcement which it hopes Mr. Farrell will have the largeness of spirit to accomplish.

This is the very spirit, nature, and character of Ray Farrell. We know him personally and officially—intimately and most favorably. We of the Congress have enjoyed complete cooperation in those areas in which Mr. Farrell had dealt personally or directed action.

In his acceptance of the honor and responsibility of this office, Mr. Farrell said:

> Congress makes the immigration laws and my job will be to execute them. But Congress expects us to get into the spirit of the law as well as the letter.

Immigration policies will be firmly based on the premise that aliens have a right to fair treatment.

Commissioner Farrell declared:

> We have to remember that these immigrants are God's creatures, too. After all, my own grandparents came from Ireland and my wife's parents came from Austria.

If I have dealt with this nomination beyond the customary length I wish it first of all to be an encouragement to long and faithful workers in the vineyard of Government service. Then I wish it to have a humane impact on the peoples of the world we would have as friends. I want them to know that in the Immigration Service, where our relations are so individual, that the humblest and the lowliest may be assured of equity and humanity in the interpretation and enforcement of the laws that govern our welcome to the ambitious to our shores—a welcome upon which our progress and prosperity has been founded.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I wholeheartedly approve confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Raymond Farrell for the position of Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization.

First, let me say that I know Ray Farrell personally as a fine and honorable man. He was born in my own State of Rhode Island in the city of Pawtucket. He graduated from both Georgetown University and Georgetown Law School. Shortly after leaving Georgetown Law School, he was admitted to the District of Columbia bar and became a special agent of the Federal Bureau of Investigation on August 3, 1931. From 1932 to 1941 he worked for various Government agencies, such as the Public Works Administration, Interior Department, and the Federal Communications Commission. In 1941 he joined the Department of Immigration and Naturalization as a special inspector. Eighteen months later in 1942 he entered the Army Air Force, where he served as a major in Italy and received a bronze star for his work as an intelligence officer. On March 18, 1946, he returned to the Immigration Service, where he became chief of the New York investigation division. Because of the fine work he did in this capacity, he was appointed Assistant Commissioner in 1949 and once again he was promoted as Associate Commisisoner for Operations in 1958.

I know that in his performance as Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, he will combine and practice those two necessary qualities that are so necessary and both of which he already possesses, a compassionate heart with a thorough knowledge of the law.

Mr. President, I believe that President Kennedy most wisely made an excellent appointment in his selection of a career official, Ray Farrell, for this responsible post, and I congratulate the President on his choice.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James Allan Reed, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Ben David Dorfman, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the U.S. Tariff Commission for the term expiring June 16, 1967.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COMPTROLLER OF CUSTOMS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Andrew M. Bacon, of Louisiana, to be comptroller of customs, with headquarters at New Orleans, La.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

SURVEYOR OF CUSTOMS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John A. Vaccaro, of New York, to be surveyor of customs in customs collection district No. 10, with headquarters at New York, N.Y.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of collectors of customs.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all these nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

SUPERINTENDENT OF THE MINT

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Michael H. Sura, of Pennsylvania, to be Superintendent of the Mint of the United States at Philadelphia, Pa.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

ADMINISTRATOR OF GENERAL SERVICES

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Bernard L. Boutin, of New Hampshire, to be Administrator of General Services.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of all these nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Report on Reapportionment of Appropriations

A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that certain appropriations had been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for supplemental estimates of appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Report on Reconstruction Finance Corporation Liquidation Fund

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the progress made in liquidating the assets of the former Reconstruction Finance Corporation, for the quarter ended December 31, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Change of Names of Edison Home National Historic Site and Edison Laboratory National Monument

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to change the names of the Edison Home National Historic Site and the Edison Laboratory National Monument, to authorize the acceptance of donations, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Suspension of Deportation of Certain Aliens

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law pertaining to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Kentucky; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

"Senate Resolution 25

"Resolution endeavoring to persuade the President of the United States and the Postmaster General of the United States to provide a pension system for substitute rural mail carriers who have 30 or more years of service.

"Whereas Kentucky is one of the States with a large rural population; and

"Whereas many of its citizens have served the United States loyally by carrying the United States mails to these rural areas; and

"Whereas it is believed to be in the public interest of this State and the United States that such rural mail carriers be covered by a pension fund; Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky*:

"Section 1. That the Senate of the Commonwealth of Kentucky urge the President of the United States and the Postmaster General of the United States to provide a pension system for substitute rural mail carriers with 30 or more years of service.

"Sec. 2. That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the clerk of the senate to the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the

United States, and the Honorable Edward Day, Postmaster General of the United States."

A concurrent resolution of the legislature of the State of Arizona; ordered to lie on the table:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 12

"Concurrent resolution on the death of the Honorable Sam Rayburn

"On the 16th day of November 1961, at the age of 79 years, the Honorable Sam Rayburn quietly passed away in Bonham, Tex.

"The Honorable Sam Rayburn, Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States for almost two decades, was a great American. His achievements as an American statesman will undoubtedly stand as a monument for many years in the future.

"Sam Rayburn served in the Congress of the United States for more than 48 consecutive years. The citizens of Texas recognized his greatness and afforded him the opportunity not only to serve Texas but the Nation.

"Speaker Sam Rayburn had all of the human characteristics of greatness. He had integrity, maturity, wisdom, humility, and a kindness for his fellow man. His passing is a very real loss to every citizen in the United States: Therefore be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona* (the Senate concurring):

"1. That the members of the Arizona State Legislature, on behalf of all of the people of the State, wish to express their regret at the passing of the Honorable Sam Rayburn, an eminent and distinguished citizen of our Nation. His passing has saddened all of our people but the memory of his achievements shall remain for many years.

"2. That the Honorable Wesley Bolin, Secretary of State of Arizona, is directed to transmit a certified copy of this resolution to each of the following: The President of the United States; the President of the U.S. Senate; the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives; the Governor of the State of Texas; the president of the Texas State Senate; and the speaker of the Texas State House of Representatives."

INVESTIGATION OF PROBLEMS CREATED BY FLOW OF ESCAPEES AND REFUGEES FROM COMMUNISTIC TYRANNY

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 293) to investigate problems created by flow of escapees and refugees from communistic tyranny, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the problems created by the flow of escapees and refugees from Communist tyranny.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee from February 1, 1962, to January 31, 1963, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ on a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1963.

SEC. 4. The expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $100,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—FEDERAL PERSONNEL AND PAY

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit a report on Federal employment and pay for the month of December 1961. In accordance with the practice of several years' standing, I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed in the RECORD, together with a statement by me.

There being no objection, the report and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH, DECEMBER AND NOVEMBER 1961, AND PAY, NOVEMBER AND OCTOBER 1961

PERSONNEL AND PAY SUMMARY

(See table I)

Information in monthly personnel reports for December 1961 submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures is summarized as follows:

Total and major categories	Civilian personnel in executive branch			Payroll (in thousands) in executive branch		
	In December numbered—	In November numbered—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	In November was—	In October was—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Total [1]	2,430,999	2,437,709	−6,710	$1,199,039	$1,186,670	+$12,369
Agencies exclusive of Department of Defense	1,371,838	1,377,372	−5,534	664,425	653,559	+10,866
Department of Defense	1,059,161	1,060,337	−1,176	534,614	533,111	+1,503
Inside the United States	2,267,834	2,273,941	−6,107			
Outside the United States	163,165	163,768	−603			
Industrial employment	567,667	568,664	−997			
Foreign nationals	170,110	170,322	−212	26,630	[2] 25,164	+1,466

[1] Exclusive of foreign nationals shown in the last line of this summary.

[2] Revised on basis of later information.

Table I breaks down the above figures on employment and pay by agencies.

Table II breaks down the above employment figures to show the number inside the United States by agencies.

Table III breaks down the above employment figures to show the number outside the United States by agencies.

Table IV breaks down the above employment figures to show the number in industrial-type activities by agencies.

Table V shows foreign nationals by agencies not included in tables I, II, III, and IV.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during December 1961, and comparison with November 1961, and pay for November 1961, and comparison with October 1961*

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands)			
	December	November	Increase	Decrease	November	October	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):								
Agriculture	91,673	94,216		2,543	$45,870	$45,586	$284	
Commerce [1]	28,437	28,783		346	17,102	17,815		$713
Health, Education, and Welfare	72,871	72,747	124		35,862	35,995		133
Interior	53,953	54,546		593	29,731	29,867		136
Justice	30,862	30,998		136	19,327	19,425		98
Labor	7,709	7,728		19	4,429	4,396	33	
Post Office	[2] 586,235	587,042		807	256,770	252,581	4,189	
State [3] [4]	39,084	[5] 39,284		200	18,830	17,641	1,189	
Treasury	80,193	80,498		305	44,801	44,406	395	

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during December 1961, and comparison with November 1961, and pay for November 1961, and comparison with October 1961*—Continued

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands)			
	December	November	Increase	Decrease	November	October	Increase	Decrease
Executive Office of the President:								
White House Office	439	419	20		$254	$254		
Bureau of the Budget	458	453	5		349	380		$31
Council of Economic Advisers	46	43	3		30	32		2
Executive Mansion and Grounds	73	73			36	36		
National Aeronautics and Space Council	14	16		2	13	10	$3	
National Security Council	43	44		1	35	35		
Office of Emergency Planning	503	525		22	468	489		21
President's Commission on Campaign Costs [6]	13	[5] 11	2		1		1	
Independent agencies:								
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	30	33		3	12	12		
American Battle Monuments Commission	414	414			82	85		3
Atomic Energy Commission	6,784	6,813		29	4,809	4,790	19	
Board of Governor of the Federal Reserve System	603	609		6	380	379	1	
Civil Aeronautics Board	776	778		2	559	556	3	
Civil Service Commission	3,833	3,867		34	2,270	2,258	12	
Civil War Centennial Commission	7	6	1		4	4		
Commission of Fine Arts	6	6			5	5		
Commission on Civil Rights	52	56		4	35	32	3	
Development Loan Fund						101		101
Export-Import Bank of Washington	259	261		2	180	177	3	
Farm Credit Administration	238	239		1	165	168		3
Federal Aviation Agency	43,232	43,279		47	27,958	27,363	595	
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	7	7			5	5		
Federal Communications Commission	1,361	1,366		5	886	900		14
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,275	1,275			788	793		5
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	1,139	1,138	1		718	713	5	
Federal Maritime Commission	142	134	8		92	86	6	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	356	360		4	309	297	12	
Federal Power Commission	900	905		5	613	609	4	
Federal Trade Commission	984	976	8		655	643	12	
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	61	61			44	45		1
General Accounting Office	4,767	4,813		46	2,944	2,959		15
General Services Administration	30,601	30,713		112	14,216	14,010	206	
Government Printing Office	6,865	6,887		22	3,707	3,814		107
Housing and Home Finance Agency	12,261	12,069	192		7,261	7,231	30	
Indian Claims Commission	20	20			17	18		1
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,396	2,397		1	1,543	1,535	8	
James Madison Memorial Commission	1	1			1	1		
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	19,130	18,630	500		12,859	12,428	431	
National Capital Housing Authority	420	424		4	182	182		
National Capital Planning Commission	56	56			31	37		6
National Capital Transportation Agency	67	65	2		42	35	7	
National Gallery of Art	310	311		1	136	127	9	
National Labor Relations Board	1,848	1,830	18		1,215	1,216		1
National Mediation Board	139	153		14	125	117	8	
National Science Foundation	760	846		86	502	470	32	
Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission	47	47			28	35		7
Panama Canal	14,391	14,426		35	4,575	[5] 4,323	252	
President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity	38	39		1	24	25		1
Railroad Retirement Board	2,115	2,133		18	1,102	1,111		9
Renegotiation Board	250	259		9	203	212		9
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	155	164		9	97	97		
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,179	1,158	21		755	738	17	
Selective Service System	6,791	6,826		35	2,120	2,121		1
Small Business Administration	2,876	2,858	18		1,749	1,909		160
Smithsonian Institution	1,146	1,156		10	566	556	10	
Soldiers' Home	1,031	1,031			338	333	5	
South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida Water Study Commission	56	56			43	41	2	
Subversive Activities Control Board	27	26	1		21	25		4
Tariff Commission	267	267			188	186	2	
Tax Court of the United States	148	149		1	109	110		1
Tennessee Valley Authority	18,545	18,759		214	11,123	11,179		56
Texas Water Study Commission	30	33		3	17	23		6
U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency	57	53	4		34	34		
U.S. Information Agency	10,994	11,030		36	4,630	4,460	170	
Veterans' Administration	176,458	177,026		568	77,327	72,786	4,541	
Virgin Islands Corporation	531	652		121	118	106	12	
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,371,838	1,377,372	928	6,462	664,425	653,559	12,511	1,645
Net change, excluding Department of Defense			5,534				10,866	
Department of Defense:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense [7]	3,213	3,211	2		2,297	2,306		9
Department of the Army	397,509	398,059		550	189,948	192,160		2,212
Department of the Navy	352,930	353,644		714	192,503	189,238	3,265	
Department of the Air Force	305,509	305,423	86		149,866	149,407	459	
Total, Department of Defense	1,059,161	1,060,337	88	1,264	534,614	533,111	3,724	2,221
Net change, Department of Defense			1,176				1,503	
Grand total, including Department of Defense [8]	2,430,999	2,437,709	1,016	7,726	1,199,039	1,186,670	16,235	3,869
Net change, including Department of Defense			6,710				12,369	

---

[1] December figure includes 113 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration, and their pay.

[2] Exclusive of 225,052 temporary Christmas employees.

[3] December figure includes 14,866 employees of the Agency for International Development as compared with 14,905 in November, and their pay. These AID figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The December figure includes 3,396 of these trust fund employees and the November figure includes 3,432.

[4] December figure includes 402 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 417 in November, and their pay.

[5] Revised on basis of later information.

[6] New agency created pursuant to Executive Order 10974, dated Nov. 8, 1961. November totals have been revised to include employment for this agency.

[7] December figure includes 1,119 employees of the Office of Civil Defense, as compared with 1,118 in November.

[8] Exclusive of personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency and the National Security Agency.

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside the United States employed by the executive agencies during December 1961, and comparison with November 1961*

Department or agency	December	November	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	90,618	93,178		2,560
Commerce [1]	27,835	28,171		336
Health, Education, and Welfare	72,368	72,240	128	
Interior	53,436	54,034		598
Justice	30,525	[2] 30,664		139
Labor	7,628	7,643		15
Post Office	[3] 584,832	585,654		822
State [4] [5]	9,977	10,065		88
Treasury	79,617	79,916		299
Executive Office of the President:				
White House Office	439	419	20	
Bureau of the Budget	458	453	5	
Council of Economic Advisers	46	43	3	
Executive Mansion and Grounds	73	73		
National Aeronautics and Space Council	14	16		2
National Security Council	43	44		1
Office of Emergency Planning	503	525		22
President's Commission on Campaign Costs [6]	13	[6] 11	2	
Independent agencies:				
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	30	33		3
American Battle Monuments Commission	10	10		
Atomic Energy Commission	6,753	6,781		28
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	603	609		6
Civil Aeronautics Board	775	777		2
Civil Service Commission	3,831	3,865		34
Civil War Centennial Commission	7	6	1	
Commission of Fine Arts	6	6		
Commission on Civil Rights	52	56		4
Export-Import Bank of Washington	259	261		2
Farm Credit Administration	238	239		1
Federal Aviation Agency	42,281	42,320		39
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	7	7		
Federal Communications Commission	1,358	1,363		5
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,273	1,273		
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	1,139	1,138	1	
Federal Maritime Commission	142	134	8	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	356	360		4
Federal Power Commission	900	905		5
Federal Trade Commission	984	976	8	
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	58	58		
General Accounting Office	4,701	4,747		46
General Services Administration	30,599	30,712		113
Government Printing Office	6,865	6,887		22
Housing and Home Finance Agency	12,097	11,908	189	
Indian Claims Commission	20	20		
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,396	2,397		1
James Madison Memorial Commission	1	1		
Independent agencies—Continued				
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	19,117	18,618	499	
National Capital Housing Authority	420	424		
National Capital Planning Commission	56	56		
National Capital Transportation Agency	67	65	2	
National Gallery of Art	310	311		1
National Labor Relations Board	1,816	1,799	17	
National Mediation Board	139	153		14
National Science Foundation	753	836		83
Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission	47	47		
Panama Canal	161	157	4	
President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity	38	39		1
Railroad Retirement Board	2,115	2,133		18
Renegotiation Board	250	259		9
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	155	164		9
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,179	1,158	21	
Selective Service System	6,634	6,669		35
Small Business Administration	2,838	2,819	19	
Smithsonian Institution	1,135	1,146		11
Soldiers' Home	1,031	1,031		
South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida Water Study Commission	56	56		
Subversive Activities Control Board	27	26	1	
Tariff Commission	267	267		
Tax Court of the United States	148	149		1
Tennessee Valley Authority	18,539	18,753		214
Texas Water Study Commission	30	33		3
U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency	57	[2] 53	4	
U.S. Information Agency	2,935	2,976		41
Veterans' Administration	175,420	175,980		560
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,311,906	1,317,175	932	6,201
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense			5,269	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense [7]	3,155	3,153	2	
Department of the Army	345,774	346,378		604
Department of the Navy	329,513	330,210		697
Department of the Air Force	277,486	277,025	461	
Total, Department of Defense	955,928	956,766	463	1,301
Net decrease, Department of Defense			838	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	2,267,834	2,273,941	1,395	7,502
Net decrease, including Department of Defense			6,107	

---

[1] December figure includes 113 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration.

[2] Revised on basis of later information.

[3] Exclusive of 224,856 temporary Christmas employees.

[4] December figure includes 2,278 employees of the Agency for International Development as compared with 2,287 in November.

[5] December figure includes 361 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 380 in November.

[6] New agency, created pursuant to Executive Order 10974 dated Nov. 8, 1961. November totals have been revised to include employment for this agency.

[7] December figure includes 1,119 employees of the Office of Civil Defense as compared with 1,118 in November.

TABLE III.—*Federal personnel outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during December 1961, and comparison with November 1961*

Department or agency	December	November	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	1,055	1,038	17	
Commerce	602	612		10
Health, Education, and Welfare	503	507		4
Interior	517	512	5	
Justice	337	[1] 334	3	
Labor	81	85		4
Post Office	[2] 1,403	1,388	15	
State [3] [4]	29,107	[1] 29,219		112
Treasury	576	582		6
Independent agencies:				
American Battle Monuments Commission	404	404		
Atomic Energy Commission	31	32		1
Civil Aeronautics Board	1	1		
Civil Service Commission	2	2		
Federal Aviation Agency	951	959		8
Federal Communications Commission	3	3		
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	2	2		
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	3	3		
General Accounting Office	66	66		
General Services Administration	2	1	1	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	164	161	3	
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	13	12	1	
National Labor Relations Board	32	31	1	
National Science Foundation	7	10		3
Independent agencies—Continued				
Panama Canal	14,230	14,269		39
Selective Service System	157	157		
Small Business Administration	38	39		1
Smithsonian Institution	11	10	1	
Tennessee Valley Authority	6	6		
U.S. Information Agency	8,059	8,054	5	
Veterans' Administration	1,038	1,046		8
Virgin Islands Corporation	531	652		121
Total, excluding Department of Defense	59,932	60,197	52	317
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense			265	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	58	58		
Department of the Army	51,735	51,681	54	
Department of the Navy	23,417	23,434		17
Department o. the Air Force	28,023	28,398		375
Total, Department of Defense	103,233	103,571	54	392
Net decrease, Department of Defense			338	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	163,165	163,768	106	709
Net decrease, including Department of Defense			603	

---

[1] Revised on basis of later information.

[2] Exclusive of 196 temporary Christmas employees.

[3] December figure includes 12,588 employees of the Agency for International Development as compared with 12,618 in November. These AID figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The December figure includes 3,396 of these trust fund employees and the November figure includes 3,432.

[4] December figure includes 41 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 37 in November.

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during December 1961, and comparison with November 1961*

Department or agency	December	November	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	3,927	3,844	83	
Commerce	5,154	5,592		438
Interior	8,133	8,120	13	
Post Office	251	246	5	
Treasury	5,147	5,219		72
Independent agencies:				
Atomic Energy Commission	246	243	3	
Federal Aviation Agency	1,891	1,892		1
General Services Administration	1,643	1,624	19	
Government Printing Office	6,865	6,887		22
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	19,130	18,630	500	
Panama Canal	7,379	7,381		2
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	126	126		
Tennessee Valley Authority	15,660	15,866		206
Virgin Islands Corporation	531	652		121
Total, excluding Department of Defense	76,083	76,322	623	862
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense			239	
Department of Defense:				
Department of the Army:				
Inside the United States	[1] 140,800	[2] 141,052		252
Outside the United States	[1] 4,500	[2] 4,504		4
Department of the Navy:				
Inside the United States	205,484	206,410		926
Outside the United States	458	457	1	
Department of the Air Force:				
Inside the United States	138,958	138,525	433	
Outside the United States	1,384	1,394		10
Total, Department of Defense	491,584	492,342	434	1,192
Net decrease, Department of Defense			758	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	567,667	568,664	1,057	2,054
Net decrease, including Department of Defense			997	

---

[1] Subject to revision.

[2] Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE V.—*Foreign nationals working under U.S. agencies overseas, excluded from tables I through IV of this report, whose services are provided by contractual agreement between the United States and foreign governments, or because of the nature of their work or the source of funds from which they are paid, as of December 1961 and comparison with November 1961*

Country	Total		Army		Navy		Air Force		National Aeronautics and Space Administration	
	December	November	December	November	December	November	December	November	December	November
Australia	1	1							1	1
Canada	35	35					35	35		
Crete	50	50					50	50		
England	3,386	3,686			57	[1] 54	3,329	3,632		
France	21,912	21,488	18,322	18,296	11	11	3,579	3,181		
Germany	80,663	80,988	67,587	67,614	84	85	12,992	13,289		
Greece	273	265					273	265		
Greenland	49						49			
Japan	54,130	54,181	19,332	19,486	14,740	14,732	20,058	19,963		
Korea	6,212	6,226	6,212	6,226						
Morocco	2,723	2,733			828	829	1,895	1,904		
Netherlands	53	50					53	50		
Norway	24	24					24	24		
Saudi Arabia	4	4					4	4		
Trinidad	595	591			595	591				
Total	170,110	170,322	111,453	111,622	16,315	16,302	42,341	42,397	1	1

---

[1] Revised on basis of later information.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA

Executive agencies of the Federal Government reported civilian employment in the month of December totaling 2,430,999. This was a net decrease of 6,710 compared with employment reported in the preceding month of November.

Civilian employment reported by the executive agencies of the Federal Government, by months in fiscal year 1962, which began July 1, 1961, follows:

Month	Employment	Increase	Decrease
July	2,435,804	16,700	
August	2,445,078	9,274	
September	2,427,216		17,862
October	2,429,691	2,475	
November	2,437,709	8,018	
December	2,430,999		6,710
Net increase for 1st 6 months of fiscal year 1962			11,895

Total Federal employment in civilian agencies for the month of December was 1,371,838, a decrease of 5,534 as compared with the November total of 1,377,372. Total civilian employment in the military agencies in December was 1,059,161, a decrease of 1,176 as compared with 1,060,337 in November.

Civilian agencies reporting larger decreases were Agriculture Department with 2,543, Post Office Department with 807, Interior Department with 593, and Veterans' Administration with 568. The largest increase was reported by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration with 500.

In the Department of Defense decreases in civilian employment were reported by the Department of the Navy with 714, and the Department of the Army with 550. The Department of the Air Force reported an increase of 86.

Inside the United States civilian employment decreased 6,107, and outside the United States civilian employment decreased 603. Industrial employment by Federal agencies in December totaled 567,667, a decrease of 997.

These figures are from reports certified by the agencies as compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

FOREIGN NATIONALS

The total of 2,430,999 civilian employees certified to the committee by Federal agencies in their regular monthly personnel reports includes some foreign nationals employed in U.S. Government activities abroad, but in addition to these there were 170,110 foreign nationals working for U.S. Agencies overseas during December who were not counted in the usual personnel reports. The number in November was 170,322. A breakdown of this employment for December follows:

Country	Total	Army	Navy	Air Force	National Aeronautics and Space Administration
Australia	1				1
Canada	35			35	
Crete	50			50	
England	3,386		57	3,329	
France	21,912	18,322	11	3,579	
Germany	80,663	67,587	84	12,992	
Greece	273			273	
Greenland	49			49	
Japan	54,130	19,332	14,740	20,058	
Korea	6,212	6,212			

Country	Total	Army	Navy	Air Force	National Aeronautics and Space Administration
Morocco	2,723		828	1,895	
Netherlands	53			53	
Norway	24			24	
Saudi Arabia	4			4	
Trinidad	595		595		
Total	170,110	111,453	16,315	42,341	1

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 2791. A bill to authorize certain improvement of the Wabash River for flood control purposes in the vicinity of Mount Carmel, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. DIRKSEN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 2792. A bill to authorize the exchange of certain lands at Antietam National Battlefield site; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 2793. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended, to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to assess reasonable fees for the restoration of motor vehicle operators' permits and operating privileges after suspension or revocation thereof;

S. 2794. A bill to amend section 6 of the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended, and to amend section 6 of the act approved July 2, 1940, as amended, to eliminate requirements that applications for motor vehicle title certificates and certain lien information related thereto be submitted under oath;

S. 2795. A bill to prohibit the use by collecting agencies and private detective agencies of any name, emblem, or insignia which reasonably tends to convey the impression that any such agency is an agency of the government of the District of Columbia; and

S. 2796. A bill to provide that the Commissioners may accept or permit the acceptance of the performance by volunteers of services for and on behalf of the municipal government of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts:

S. 2797. A bill for the relief of Constantinos Agganis; and

S. 2798. A bill for the relief of Eduardo Pires; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 2799. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the President to take possession and assume control of transportation systems in time of national emergency;

S. 2800. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to make permanent a temporary increase in the maximum construction differential subsidy that may be paid under such act and to provide that such maximum shall not apply with respect to reconstructing or reconditioning of ships; and

S. 2801. A bill to amend section 510 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to extend for 2 years the time during which a certain definition of the term "obsolete vessel" shall be used; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the first and last above-mentioned bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. HART:

S. 2802. A bill to provide for the free entry of structural and reinforcing steel and steel products presented as a gift for use in constructing an addition to the Chippewa County War Memorial Hospital, Sault Ste. Marie, Mich.; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KEATING:

S.J. Res. 155. Joint resolution designating the third week in June of each year as National Amateur Radio Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

CONDEMNATION OF COMMUNIST PERSECUTION OF LITHUANIANS AND OF THE CATHOLIC FAITH IN LITHUANIA

Mr. DOUGLAS submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 57) to condemn Communist oppression of Lithuanians and of persons of the Catholic faith in Lithuania, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. DOUGLAS, which appears under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

COMMITTEE SERVICE

Mr. DIRKSEN submitted a resolution (S. Res. 292) assigning Senator PEARSON, of Kansas, to service on standing committees of the Senate, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. DIRKSEN, which appears under a separate heading.)

INVESTIGATION OF PROBLEMS CREATED BY FLOW OF ESCAPEES AND REFUGEES FROM COMMUNISTIC TYRANNY

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 293) to investigate problems created by flow of escapees and refugees from communistic tyranny, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. EASTLAND, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

FLOODWALL FOR MOUNT CARMEL, ILL.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize certain improvements of the Wabash River for flood purposes in the vicinity of Mount Carmel, Ill.

The Army Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors acted favorably on the proposal at its meeting on January 24, 1962. The Board recommended construction of levees, a wall section and related works for flood protection at Mount Carmel at an estimated Federal cost of $1,147,000 for construction subject to certain conditions of local cooperation, which I feel sure will be met by local interests.

The Mount Carmel floodwall is an arm of the overall flood control program for the entire Wabash River Basin in Illinois and Indiana. The program has the sanction of the Corps of Engineers of the Department of the Army, the Wabash Valley Association with headquarters at Mount Carmel, and the Wabash Valley Interstate Commission located at Terre Haute, Ind.

Following the southerly route of the Wabash for many miles, one comes to a point on the river in a rich agricultural area on the Indiana side of the river that has been established as the location of a project known as levee unit No. 5, opposite the city of Mount Carmel. That project has been authorized and is now in the planning stage. Some objections were raised in the past to the construction of levee unit No. 5 which were mainly centered on the presumption that the development of the project would force floodwaters into Mount Carmel.

I might add that my colleagues from Indiana have gone on record before the Senate Appropriations Committee favoring flood protection for their people, as well as flood protection for Mount Carmel, across the river from Indiana levee unit No. 5.

We feel strongly that we should get the Mount Carmel project underway in order that both of these areas will receive flood protection at about the same time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2791) to authorize certain improvement of the Wabash River for flood control purposes in the vicinity of Mount Carmel, Ill., introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

CONTROL OF TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS IN TIME OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request of the Secretary of the Air Force, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the President to take possession and assume control of transportation systems in time of national emergency. I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Secretary relating to the proposed legislation be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2799) to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the President to take possession and assume control of transportation systems in time of national emergency, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, D.C., January 26, 1962.
Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation "To amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the President to take possession and assume control of transportation systems in time of national emergency."

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for the 87th Congress. The Bureau of the Budget has advised that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there is no objection to the presentation of the proposal for the consideration of the Congress. The Department of the Air Force has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

Sections 4742 and 9742 of title 10, United States Code, now provide as follows:

"§ 4742. Control of transportation systems in time of war.

"In time of war, the President, through the Secretary of the Army, may take possession and assume control of all or part of any system of transportation to transport troops, war material, and equipment, or for other purposes related to the emergency. So far as necessary, he may use the system to the exclusion of other traffic."

Section 9742 is identical to section 4742, except that the President will take the action "through the Secretary of the Air Force."

The purpose of the proposed legislation, as attached hereto, is to amend title 10, United States Code, with respect to the authorities contained in these two sections. The amendment would simplify the code in relation thereto and expand the discretionary power now contained in sections 4742 and 9742 to include times of "national emergency." To that end, the proposed legislation would repeal sections 4742 and 9742 of title 10, United States Code, and add a section 2634 to chapter 157 of title 10.

This legislative proposal is needed to fill a gap in the present statutory authority available to the President for taking possession or assuming control of any system of transportation, or any part thereof, for military purposes. Sections 4742 and 9742 of title 10 vest this authority in the President only in time of war. The need for such authority may be as great or greater in conditions of national emergency short of war. It is apparent that extremely grave military situations could arise in a matter of hours which would require the exercise of this authority to muster surface transportation and to augment the military airlift with civil airlift without regard to whether a state of war exists. In fact, prompt action in conditions short of war may act to avert a state of war.

Submission of this proposal in no way signifies any intention of taking over transportation systems under present conditions but is designed merely to modernize existing authority and make it operative during a period of national emergency should future circumstances so require.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

It is not possible to estimate the additional costs which may result from the enactment of the proposed legislation. It is conceivable that international incidents may occur in the future with the resultant additional costs to the Government.

Sincerely,

EUGENE M. ZUCKERT,
Secretary of the Air Force.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR TRADE-IN OF CERTAIN VESSELS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to extend the time for trade-in of vessels not less than 12 years old.

The Merchant Marine Act, 1936 authorizes the Government to acquire obsolete vessels as trade-ins on new construction. As defined in section 510(a) of that act, obsolete vessels must be citizen owned for a stated period, of at least 1,350 gross tons, not less than 17 years old and, in the judgment of the Maritime Administrator, inadequate for successful operation in our country's foreign or domestic trade.

In 1952, in order to accelerate the replacement of war-built vessels, this section of the act was amended to include vessels not less than 12 years old. This provision gained added importance when the current phased vessel replacement program was initiated, and in 1958 it was extended to June 30 of this year.

It develops now that a number of war-built vessels which operators would like to trade in on their required replacement vessels have not reached their 17th birthday, for which reason further extension of the 12 year provision is being sought. While the keels of these vessels were laid during World War II the vessels were not delivered until as late as 1947 because of extensive modifications made following the war to fit them for peacetime purposes. The requested 2-year extension to June 30, 1964, it is felt, would resolve this trade-in question finally.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2801) to amend section 510 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to extend for 2 years the time during which a certain definition of the term "obsolete vessel" shall be used, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

DESIGNATION OF THIRD WEEK IN JUNE OF EACH YEAR AS NATIONAL AMATEUR RADIO WEEK

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, more and more interest is being shown in amateur radio by Americans in every section of our Nation. I know that in the State of New York there are now between 15,000 and 20,000 amateur radio operators. Amateur radio always stands ready to serve the Nation. In addition these operators learn a great deal of technology which develops the technical skills of our people. Amateur radio has served the Nation well, and I am confident will do so in the future.

I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution designating the third week of June of each year as National Amateur Radio Week.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 155) designating the third week in June of each year as National Amateur Radio Week, introduced by Mr. KEATING, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONDEMNATION OF COMMUNIST OPPRESSION AND THE CATHOLIC FAITH IN LITHUANIA

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, it has come to my attention that Communist officials have once again stepped up their activities to destroy the last vestiges of freedom in Lithuania. The prosecution of Roman Catholic priests on false charges, which has taken place in the last month, may indicate a final program to eliminate the priesthood in Lithuania and a growing campaign against all people who believe in God. The National Council of Catholic Men adopted a resolution protesting this trial at the close of its annual meeting on January 21. I believe that the Congress should go on record in this matter and therefore, Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, the following resolution condemning the false and oppressive persecution of Roman Catholic priests by the Communist Government of Lithuania and the Communist persecution of religion everywhere behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. President, February 16 will be the 47th anniversary of Lithuanian independence, and I think it highly appropriate to submit this concurrent resolution at this time.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution passed by the general assembly of the National Council of Catholic Men be printed in the RECORD.

Further, Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that the text of the concurrent resolution I have just introduced also be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and, under the rule, will be printed in the RECORD; and, without objection, the resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 57) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas the atheistic governments of the Soviet Union and the captive nations of international communism have directed their forces toward the complete destruction of all religious worship and other liberties; and

Whereas the persecution of Roman Catholic priests in January of 1962 by the Government of Lithuania represents the latest oppression of religion in the Communist bloc nations; and

Whereas the false charges upon which such persecution is maintained may indicate a final program by the Government of Lithuania to eliminate the Catholic priesthood in Lithuania; and

Whereas the persecution of Roman Catholic priests in Lithuania may demonstrate a growing campaign throughout the Communist bloc of severe persecution of all peoples who believe in God: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress condemns the false and oppressive persecution of Roman Catholic priests by the Communist government of Lithuania and the Communist persecution of religion everywhere behind the Iron Curtain.

The resolution presented by Mr. Douglas is as follows:

Resolution Adopted by the National Council of Catholic Men, January 21, 1962

Whereas, early this month, as the latest act in the brutal campaign of Soviet Communist oppression of the Baltic Nations, a group of Lithuanian Roman Catholic priests were put on trial in Lithuania on charges of criminal currency operations and speculation, charges which Bishop Vincent Brizgys, the Lithuanian bishop in exile in Chicago, brands as false. Vatican sources immediately noted that the trial could indicate harsher activity generally against the Catholic Church behind the Iron Curtain. Since the hierarchy in Lithuania has already been eliminated by the house arrest of the last active bishop in that country, this latest trial may mean a final program to eliminate the priesthood there as well: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the general assembly of the National Council of Catholic Men protests the Soviet Communist oppression of Lithuania and of the Catholic faith in Lithuania for the past 22 years, as it protests the Soviet and Chinese Communist oppression of all satellite nations and of the church everywhere; and it requests its affiliates and the American Catholic laity generally never to forget in prayers and sacrifices our fellow Catholics in the church of silence.

TRADE ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1962—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on January 11, 1962, I introduced the bill (S. 2663) to provide assistance to business enterprises and individuals to facilitate adjustments made necessary by the trade policy of the United States. I ask unanimous consent that on the next printing of the bill the name of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Carroll] be added as a cosponsor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXCLUSION FROM GROSS INCOME GAIN REALIZED FROM SALE OF CERTAIN PROPERTY BY A TAXPAYER 60 YEARS OF AGE AND OLDER — ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on January 15 of this year I introduced Senate bill 2666, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, so as to exclude from gross income the gain realized from the sale of the principal residence of taxpayers who have attained the age of 60 years. A number of Senators who wished to join in sponsoring the bill missed the opportunity to do so. I ask unanimous consent that the names of the following Senators be added as cosponsors of Senate bill 2666; and since the bill is out of print, I also ask unanimous consent that it be reprinted: the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Bush], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott], the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel], the Senator from New York [Mr. Keating], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Capehart], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Case], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Mundt], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Murphy] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJUSTMENTS OF VETERANS BENEFITS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, on January 29, 1962, I introduced the bill (S. 2756) to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide increases in rates of disability compensation, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the bill the name of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Carroll] be added as a cosponsor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NEW AND IMPROVED USES FOR FARM AND FOREST PRODUCTS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 29, 1962, the name of Mr. Long of Missouri was added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 2759) to provide for further research relating to the new and improved uses for farm and forest products and for development of new crops, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Johnston (for himself and Mr. Humphrey) on January 29, 1962.

ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 31, 1962, the name of Mr. Yarborough was added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 2771) for the establishment of a Commission on Science and Technology, introduced by Mr. McClellan (for himself and other Senators) on January 31, 1962.

U.S. COMMISSION ON AGING ACT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 31, 1962, the names of Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. Randolph, and Mr. Pell were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 2779) to provide for the establishment of a U.S. Commission on Aging and to authorize Federal grants to assist in the development of programs which will benefit older persons, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McNamara on January 31, 1962.

NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announced that Friday, February 2, the Senate received the nominations of Walter P. McConaughy, of Alabama, to be Ambassador to Pakistan, and John Calvin Hill, Jr., of South Carolina, a Foreign Service officer, for promotion from class 3 to class 2.

Mr. President, I also wish to announce that today the Senate received the nomination of Philip J. Farley, of Virginia, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 1, a consul general, and a secretary in the diplomatic service, and numerous others in the diplomatic service.

In accordance with the committee rule, these pending nominations may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days of their receipt in the Senate.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS BY SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, hearings on the rights of military personnel, originally scheduled by the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights to begin this morning, will commence at 2 p.m., on Tuesday, February 6.

The 5-day series of hearings will continue through Friday, and conclude on Tuesday, February 13. As far as possible, witnesses will be heard in the order previously scheduled by the subcommittee.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. WILEY:

Excerpts from address delivered by himself recently over Wisconsin radio stations, on the subject of the dairy outlook.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Remarks made by him at a meeting of the West Virginia Council of the White House Conference on Children and Youth, Charleston, W. Va., January 26, 1962.

HEALTH OF FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, a regular column of great interest to the hundreds of Government employees in this area is "The Federal Dairy," ably edited by Jerry Kluttz.

The column which appeared in yesterday's Washington Post is of particular interest to me; and I wish to call it to the attention of my colleagues, as well as the State Department.

One of the great divisions of our Government is the family of devoted Foreign Service officers who have made international diplomacy their career. They go with their families to posts around the world, to carry out our programs of aid and information. Before they go, they have a period of training in the politics of the country, in the economy and sociology of the people, and in the language. Our Government invests time and money in this education program, so that they may be the very best representatives of the United States.

If illness and lack of preventive medicine or poor hospital facilities keep these men and women away from their posts for any length of time, we suffer an actual loss of man-hours and efficiency. The figures which Mr. Kluttz cites are startling: 1 of every 5 of the 11,700 Foreign Service employees had to be evacuated from their posts and be hospitalized with service-connected illnesses.

Today we are aware of the increasing number of cases of infectuous hepatitis; and doctors from the Public Health Service tell me that this disease, alone, accounts for the largest number of illnesses among our Foreign Service personnel. As Mr. Kluttz points out, the present confining illness of our Ambassador to India, Mr. John Kenneth Galbraith, has focused attention once more on the prevalence of this disease.

I believe the State Department should set up a committee of doctors and their own officials to take steps to prevent this high incidence of disease. I have been reading the material of the AMA, which so often says, "Americans have the best medical care in the world." Surely we can extend some of that to those who serve us so capably around the world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The health hazards of our Foreign Service are pointed up by the illness of John Kenneth Galbraith, our Ambassador to India, who is hospitalized with hepatitis and amoebic dysentery.

(And they're becoming even worse in this day of "wonder" drugs as America recognizes new and underdeveloped countries in Africa and elsewhere and exchanges diplomatic missions with them. Modern medicine is merely a dream in those nations.)

Throughout our vast Government the Foreign Service has by far the largest percentage of its staff who are hospitalized with service-connected illnesses. Yet almost no one considers Foreign Service a hazardous occupation, a category reserved for FBI and other law enforcement officers, prison guards, etc. But consider these revealing statistics:

In the 1960 calendar year, the latest available figures, at least 1 of every 5 of the 11,700 Foreign Service employees overseas with State, Agency for International Development and U.S. Information had to be evacuated from their posts and hospitalized with service-connected illnesses.

A total of 1,282 employees and 716 dependents were evacuated and taken to oversea hospitals during that 12-month period. But, in addition, 1,143 employees and 642 dependents had to be evacuated and brought back to this country for treatment during the last 6 months of 1960, all with service-connected illnesses.

The incomplete count for 1961 shows that 3,783 employees and dependents—there were 17,300 dependents in the three agencies—were evacuated and hospitalized out of the total of 20,000 overseas. It is estimated that 1,500 others were brought back to this country for hospital treatment during the first 6 months of 1961, which makes a grand total of 5,283 employees and dependents.

Furthermore, preliminary estimates indicate that an even larger number of employees and dependents had to be taken from their posts and given medical treatment last year. They point to a 20-percent increase, or more than 6,000 who required treatment.

Death figures in 1961 show a total of 49 Foreign Service personnel fatalities from all causes, mainly from heart conditions and cancer. Twenty-four were in AID; 22 in State, of which 16 were during the last 4 months of the year, and 3 in USIS.

During my recent tour of Europe and the Middle East, I soon discovered that proper medical and dental attention was a major problem for Foreign Service personnel and their families as well as adequate housing, schools, and living conditions generally.

To my amazement, there was the minimum of griping about them. The Foreign Service people spoke of them matter-of-factly. They and their families were willing to risk disease, to endanger their health, and to put up with the many inconveniences to serve their country. They were interested in their jobs and they worked hard at them.

Being human, the Foreign Service people became upset and resented the broad attacks on them for everything from their ability to their patriotism. A few of them were discouraged because they felt the Foreign Service had become a prime target for political attacks from those who blame it for every American disappointment or failure in foreign policy.

CENSORSHIP OF SPEECHES BY MILITARY PERSONNEL

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, perhaps nowhere has our lack of a policy of victory in the cold war been more dramatically illustrated than in the Senate Armed Services Subcommittee hearings on the censorship of speeches by the Nation's military leaders. These sessions have shown that officials of the State Department and others into whose hands the delicate job of censoring has fallen are particularly allergic to words like "victory" and "win"—because such words have been stricken from the texts of speeches prepared for military commanders.

I suggest, Mr. President, that we owe our esteemed colleague from South Carolina, Senator STROM THURMOND, a debt of gratitude for bringing this situation to the attention of the American people. Our people have the right to know that we have embarked on a defeatist, no-win policy in the cold war and that such a policy is the guiding rule for deletions and changes made in the prepared speeches of our military leaders.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to include in the body of the RECORD at this point a speech entitled "The Choice Is Ours," delivered by Senator THURMOND before the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies in the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C., on February 1, 1962.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHOICE IS OURS

(By Senator STROM THURMOND, Democrat, of South Carolina)

I am honored to have the opportunity to address the membership and guests of the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies. This is a great federation of organizations dedicated to the preservation of liberty, to the principles of constitutional government, and to basic American patriotism. I salute you for your patriotism, superpatriotism, or by whatever term it may be labeled by your friends or foes. Some may consider it old-fashioned to be tabbed as a patriot, or even a superpatriot, in these modern times, but I can think of no higher attribute or descriptive term I would prefer to have conferred on me, unless I should be called an extreme American. I believe like Adm. Arleigh Burke that we can't teach too much "love of God and patriotism in this country."

I am also pleased to be able to step into the shoes of that great American statesman and sound thinker, Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, in addressing you this year. Another Harry, Harry S. Truman, once made the sharp retort—as he is prone to do—that we have too many "Byrds" in the Senate, in singling out this great watchdog of the Treasury and stanch defender of constitutional government for special Presidential disfavor. My only regret is that we do not have a Senate and House full of HARRY BYRD's so we can get this country back on the road to sound fiscal policies and dedicated to winning the greatest conflict this country has ever become enmeshed in—the total war which the Communist conspiracy has forced on us in its relentless and cancerous drive toward world domination.

I am speaking in harsh terms here today about the international Communist conspiracy because I—thank goodness—am not gagged and bound by State Department and Defense Department censorship policies. The State Department censors do not have the authority to write into my speeches the secret defeatist policies devised for meekly meeting the vicious challenge the Communist masters have laid down for us in their strategic objective to level all persons in the world to the lowest common denominator. When I play ball I play hardball and not softball, and I do not try to buy the umpire. What the American people have got to decide for themselves and the rest of the free world is whether our Government is going to play hardball in the major league competition forced on us or whether we are going to continue in the softball arena of negotiation, concession, and coexistence with an enemy which has vowed "to bury us."

This is the subject about which I wish to talk with you today for a brief while. I regret that I cannot be with you longer today, but I must return to the Hill for resumption of the hearings into censoring out of military speeches most statements with reference to communism—particularly those which deal harshly with the Communist menace, which state the aims and objectives of world communism, and those which indicate that the Communist goals have not changed or that there is such a thing as a world Communist conspiracy.

You people here today realize the importance of this investigation. It is one which will show to the American people not so much the caprice or Communist leanings of any Defense or State Department censors; but rather it will lay bare to the American public some of the defeatist, no-win policies formulated by policy planners and leaders who have determined that we do not want to win the cold war.

A deep study of these censored statements and the censors' comments, coupled with consideration of present and past policies in meeting the Communist menace, will reveal what I have called a defeatist or no-win cold war policy.

I only wish that every American could study the censored items and the censors' comments to get the real picture—the picture which will be difficult to get across to the American people except by careful individual study because of the complexities involved and the efforts to keep these facts from the American people so these policies can be continued.

The rollcall of free world defeats at the hands of the wily Communist masters of deceit—as they have appropriately been described by FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover—is long and unpleasant to recall. But, as George Santayana has so ably forewarned us, "Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it."

We could start many years ago with the unfortunate recognition of the Soviet Union in 1933. We can trace step after step, defeat after defeat, in dealing with the Communists because we have steadfastly refused or failed to either understand or recognize the nature of the enemy we face. We could count in the nonmilitary lend-lease assistance to the Soviet Union during World War II. We could also figure in the gift and theft of atomic secrets for the enemy, together with the uranium which provides the necessary spark to make our adversaries a world power with which to reckon. We could also add in the many conferences, such as those held at Yalta, Teheran, and Potsdam, as well as the smiles we received at Geneva and Camp David, and the lessons we should have learned at all summit conferences, especially in Paris in 1960 and Vienna in 1961.

Agreements have been broken again and again, as Lenin warned us years ago, "like piecrusts—made to be broken." Some contend that we should not say anything about communism or Communists because we might lose something or some point at a conference table. If we followed this recently thought up rule of sensitive negotiations then we would bind our military people and everyone else not to whisper the term "communism" because the Communists have kept us negotiating while they have been nibbling us to death ever since World War II.

Today the Communists control 26 percent of the world's land mass and 36 percent of the world's population, taking approximately 15 countries and 900 million people behind the Iron, Bamboo, or Cactus Curtains since World War II.

Judging from the censored items, censors' comments, and what I know of present and past policies, our State Department policy planners have sold our leaders on the naive idea that if we can just contain the Communists long enough—and we aren't even doing a good job of containment—then we can rely on a change or mellowing of the Soviet Union into a nonaggressive and peaceful socialist state. After all, the censors' comments indicate that we are concerned only with the militarily aggressive nature of communism. To quote another censor's note, "some of our best friends are Socialists," and judging from the fairly consistent deletion of any references to the conspiratorial nature of world communism we don't have to worry about this myth of some conspiracy to dominate the world. Substitution of the term "Sino-Soviet bloc" in place of "international Communist conspiracy" indicates that this is only a bloc of "potential aggressors," not real enemies, to quote another fairly consistent change by the censors.

My reference to this reliance on the evolutionary concept—that is, a mellowing of the Soviet Union into a peaceful Socialist state—has been pointed up by a censor's comment that "this might well be tempered since it rules out any chance of an evolution of the Soviet system."

I wish I could report to you that our leaders hold out some hope that we will win this struggle with communism, but instead I can only pass on to you their comments that we are in a "long twilight struggle" when America's role in determining the outcome of this struggle will be "only marginal." Or as the President warned us on the west coast recently, "we must face the fact that the United States is neither omnipotent or omniscient, therefore, there cannot be an American solution to every world problem."

I must report to you that the censors likewise think little of the terms "victory" or "win"—or have been instructed to strike them—because they have fairly consistently eliminated these terms from speeches by not only military leaders but also by the civilian Secretary of the Air Force in this administration. The term "war" is likewise to be avoided, as is "offense" or even "attack," even in speaking of an "attack aircraft carrier."

To illustrate how far the censors go—or are instructed to go—in cutting out any references to the term "war," listen to this proposed speech item, how it was completely censored, and what the censor commented about it:

"The X-15 is the Man O' War of the stable of research aircraft to date."

The censor struck this and stated: "Let's use another steed—Zev, Gallant Fox, and so forth, but not this one." Even in this remote connotation the word "war" could not be used.

Now I am not here today trying to defend the idea of going to war. Far from that, I am going to propose to you today some ideas as to how we can win the cold war so we do not have to fight a hot war.

The first ingredient necessary to any hope of attaining victory in any endeavor, whether it be in the sports arena, in politics, or in war—hot or cold—is to have the will to win. To date I have not been assured that we have made a firm resolve to win the cold war. Have you?

Second, we need to inform our people and our military personnel about this deadly menace we face. They need to have a thorough understanding of every facet of this total threat posed to us. They must know and understand that it is not just a military threat, but that it also constitutes a political, economic, diplomatic, social, psychological, subversive—yes, even a global threat to our people and all people everywhere who yearn for freedom.

J. Edgar Hoover has warned time and again that "we cannot hope to successfully meet the Communist menace unless there is a wide knowledge and understanding of its aims and designs."

The events of recent years provide unimpeachable proof that we do not understand the nature or methods of Communists and communism. Had we understood and appreciated the menace of communism, we would not today be suffering from the losses of our blind negotiations at Yalta and Potsdam, as I mentioned earlier in this speech. Had we understood and recognized communism when we saw it, we would never have been bamboozled into officially characterizing the Communist Chinese as "agrarian reformers." Had we the ability to detect a Communist movement, Castro would never have had our support in establishing a Communist dictatorship over the Cuban people 90 miles off our shores, only to finally enlighten many leaders and the State Department a few years later that he has been a dedicated Marxist-Leninist Communist for some time and will continue to be one "until the day I die."

No, ladies and gentlemen, if we as a people understood communism and Communist tactics, we would never have fallen prey to subversion at the hands of Alger Hiss, the Rosenbergs, Greenglass, Fuchs, or Harry Dexter White, and the many other Communist spies and agents who were caught—not to mention the many who remain undetected and unapprehended. We would never have acceded to the ban-the-bomb cries, only to later express dismay and regret at having been duped by the Communists, as expressed by U.N. Ambassador Adlai Stevenson in an address before the United Nations in October of last year. Nor would so many of our boys who fought in Korea have succumbed to Communist brainwashing techniques. An official study shows that 38 percent of our POW's collaborated in some way with the enemy and not one was able to escape from an enemy camp. If only these boys had known what to expect—if they had had some knowledge of modern brain warfare concepts and techniques—we would not have to recall these unpleasant experiences.

It is also imperative that we understand that it is not empty bellies which give rise to communism. Rather, it is communism which spawns communism by infiltration, subversion, propaganda, etc. No people have ever voted in any Communist regime, and none who suffer the deprivation of liberty which inevitably accompanies communism have ever had the opportunity to vote communism out.

Quite clearly, ladies, and gentlemen, the postwar years have proved beyond any doubt that Americans, by and large, do not understand communism and its tactics.

Third, we must realize that we are now at war—a cold war, something new and different from any war we have ever known. At the same time, people are losing their liberties and even their lives—even some Americans—at the hands of Communists using infiltration, subversion, propaganda, blackmail, diplomacy, economic power, and a bullet fired now and then by some proxy volunteer or some partisan guerrilla in southeast Asia.

Fourth, we must learn to act decisively to call Communist bluff and bluster tactics which have won far more victories for them in the field of diplomacy than have any steel bullets or atomic weapons on the field of battle. In employing these bluff and bluster tactics, the Communists have pushed us as far as possible without provoking the devastation power of the United States—and believe me, ladies and gentlemen, we do have the edge in destructive power, and they know it—even in times when we have had not only the monopoly on nuclear power but also in means of delivery. The only time they overshot their bounds was when they misjudged our withdrawal of troops from Korea in 1950 and then-Secretary of State Dean Acheson's ill-timed statement that Korea was not within our defense periphery. Even when the Communists fought us to a standstill and we failed to win—that is, to elect to win—the only war we have ever failed to win in the history of our country. I agree fully with Gen. Douglas MacArthur's assessment that our decision to forgo victory in Korea marked a turning point in the history of our country, from which we have yet to recover in reeling and reacting to Communist aggressive actions and achievements. The Communists bluffed us into going only so far in Korea for fear of an all-out war at a time when we had both the conventional and nuclear means to insure victory. Our State Department planners sold Mr. Truman on the idea that we should not win, and they have successfully peddled this defeatist idea in almost every serious conflict which has followed between the free world and communism. Our failure to knock down the wall when it was first being erected in Berlin is one such example. Another example was the decision not to provide the vitally needed air cover over the Bay of Pigs in Cuba last spring.

On the other hand, the record will reveal that in practically every instance when we have moved to meet the Communist threat we have proved our mettle and successfully called the Communist bluffs with bold and courageous actions in Greece, Turkey, Iran, Formosa, and in Lebanon.

On almost every occasion that we have succumbed to communism, we have done so because we have not dared to stamp out the sore planted by communism in the initial instance. Our policy is to step aside and hope that we can buy off the sore or ignore the sore and that the festering will evolve itself into a peaceful accommodation with our desires. We turn the other cheek or naively walk the extra several miles and then awaken to find that the sore has festered to the point where only a nuclear holocaust can put it out. We hear the favorite State Department cries of "escalating into a nuclear war," and so we bark out a few tough phases of eloquence and then retreat to a conference table to concede or set up a coalition government for the Reds to infiltrate and subvert.

Such has been the all too familiar pattern since World War II. What we need to counter this strategy is a firm, resolute determination by our leaders to fight, if necessary, to preserve liberty and insure our survival as a nation, and this attitude must be communicated, without equivocation, to the Communists. If we don't dare to win, then we don't deserve to win in the protracted conflict with communism.

Fifth, we must move on the offensive—if I may use this suggestive term—to sell our own system abroad and at home. Some of our own people have forgotten that our free enterprise capitalistic system, under a constitutional republic, has given us more liberty and more of the material things of the world than any system has ever provided, including the materialist-minded system of world communism. We have 6 percent of the world's population, but our capitalistic system, under the blessings of God, has rewarded us with 75 percent of all the automobiles and 57 percent of all the telephones in the world. We also have the finest churches, schools, colleges, and we enjoy the highest per capita incomes and standards of living of any people the world has ever known. Above all, our system has provided what I deem to be the highest end of Government—individual freedom and opportunity.

Yes, ladies and gentlemen, we have the system to sell, but we are not selling it. Too many are apologizing for a system which merits only our praise and thanks. If we are going to run down our own system or junk it gradually here at home, then how can we expect to sell it to the rest of the world?

Sixth, we must maintain a military establishment "second to none in the world." In this area, we are making good progress, although we are still not giving enough attention to certain aspects of air power and to speedy development of an antimissile capability.

The Communists respect only power—raw power, not sweet words—so we must insure not only an adequacy of deterrent power but a supremacy of power and destructive capabilities. In recent years, while we have been trying, like an adult, to hold off a child which has been swinging wildly at us by containing him with an outstretched arm, the child has been growing in military and economic power. What are we going to do when the child, now a good-sized teenager, becomes a monster which we can no longer fend off by an outstretched arm? This points up the fallacy of our defeatist, no-win, appeasement, containment, coexistence—or call it what you will—policy and the importance of maintaining a supremacy of military power.

Seventh, we must keep this Nation strong economically. The idea that we can spend ourselves into prosperity and a strong and viable economy is as false as the idea that we can continue deficit financing without experiencing the high costs of interest on the national debt and the premium of inflationary spirals. This year the President is asking for authority to give the Treasury the power to borrow up to a limit of $308 billion. While there is talk of a balanced budget for the next fiscal year, the President's requests from the Congress and his heavy reliance on vastly increased revenues lead me to predict another red-letter year to make the score read at the conclusion of fiscal year 1963, still only six balanced budgets in 33 years.

We can lose this cold war by economic bankruptcy just as easily as we can by any of the other means the Soviet Union has planned for us.

Eighth, we must be ever alert to the threat of internal subversion and infiltration. The Attorney General today lists 283 Communist-front organizations, and the FBI has 185 organizations under investigation. I am sure that you people here today realize full well that a Communist front can be even more dangerous to our internal security than can an open and easily identifiable Communist Party. It is true that Mr. Hoover and his agents are primarily responsible for this task—and they are doing a good job—but vigilance is everyone's responsibility.

Ninth, we must guard against being lulled into a deep Socialist sleep where we permit the slow but subtle establishment of an all-powerful Central Government with "gimme" gimmicks and which controls the means of production and distribution either through outright ownership or through the clever stratagem of control and regulation.

President Kennedy has just proposed in his state of the Union address financial aid and assistance for practically every facet of life. If all of his proposals should be enacted into law, we would witness a measure of centralization of power in Government which would severely endanger beyond recapture the valued American concept of individual responsibility and liberty.

Ladies and gentlemen, there is only so much power in this country. If most or all of it is to be exercised by the Central Government, then the people and the State and local governments must surrender power to Washington.

The framers of the Constitution contemplated that the greater part of the governmental functions in our federated Republic would be undertaken and exercised by the State and local governments. They incorporated throughout the Constitution innumerable devices to prevent a concentration of power in the General Government and the growth of that entity. Despite their preventive efforts, the National Government has increased to mammoth size. It has grown so large that not only does it constitute a burden on the sustenance of the people, but it has long since passed the point of diminishing returns in terms of efficiency so that we suffer not only from the financial burden of its upkeep, the deprivations of liberty which its mammoth operations achieve, but also the unfortunate dilemma of an inefficient government. Too many Americans have lost sight of the elementary but undeniable fact that any government big enough to give them everything they want is big enough to take everything they've got.

At this point I want to give you a bit of advice that a military officer tried to present to his audience. I pass on this proposed statement by this censored officer because I feel it is so vital to America today. Here is what the officer tried to say: "History fairly brims over with examples of proud nations which have slowly sunk into oblivion because they sowed the seeds of their own decay. Nations who will learn nothing from these examples are doomed to repeat them. The eminent British historian, Arnold Toynbee, has pointed out that 19 of 21 notable world civilizations have died from within and not by conquest from without. Ours must not be No. 20."

The State Department did not let this officer pass on this wise admonition from the eminent historian, Mr. Toynbee, because as the censor expressed it in his note: "Toynbee is a highly questionable historian, not likely to impress this audience."

As my 10th and final point, I urge that we, individually and as a nation, dedicate ourselves to a moral and spiritual regeneration all across the length and breadth of this great land. This struggle in which we are currently locked with the Communists is essentially a fight between those who believe in a supreme being and atheists who deny the existence of a supreme being and all morality stemming from God. The true Communist believes that materialism is the end to be sought and that if anything is to be worshiped it is to be man because he accidentally has the highest intelligence of all the animals.

Marx long ago stated as his objective in life to "dethrone God and destroy capitalism."

God has offered His people a way out of any national dilemma with this promise in II Chronicles, chapter 7, verse 14:

"If my people, which are called by My name shall humble themselves and pray, and seek My face, and turn from their wicked ways: then will I hear from Heaven and will forgive their sin, and will heal their land."

Spiritual and moral power will give us courage, strength, wisdom, and faith in the struggle to maintain our freedom and insure our survival as a nation. Spiritual and moral power will also save us from softness and decay—physically, mentally, and morally. We must be fully fit and alert for the struggle, both individually and as a nation.

If we give heed to the 10 points I have outlined for you today, I have faith that we can win the cold war and avert a disastrous hot war. We cannot rely on the Communist bear to mellow or change his objective to dominate the world and reduce us all to one common level without even any access to the God of our choice. We must be realistic and face up to the distasteful fact that we must force the bear to change. We must show him that there is no hope of victory for his side, only for ours, for we have the will, the determination, and the power to win. And, in addition—and this is the most important point—we can, if we choose, make certain, as Mr. Lincoln warned so many years ago, not only that God is on our side, but more importantly that we are on God's side. We have the ace in the hole to win, a supreme being, and I am confident that we will win this cold war if we but invoke His blessings and guidance, both individually and as a nation.

The choice is ours—yours and mine, all of the American people. I implore you to give of your best efforts to make certain that the right choice is made before our Nation has passed the point of no return.

UNITED NATIONS AND LAW—EXCERPT FROM SERMON BY REV. P. MALCOLM HAMMOND

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, war and the threat of war have plagued mankind for centuries. Into most of the controversies that man has endured, certain groups have seen fit to insert emotionalism, rather than endure the longer processes of patient study that lead to an understanding of the problem. Some of these groups would rush headlong into appeasement, while others would urge war. Some would accuse their neighbor of consorting with the enemy, or suspect the patriotism of the individual who seeks peaceful solutions.

Today this mental decay under stress has not changed. Today a Senator's mail is filled with pamphlets accusing minorities of plotting with the enemy, officials of being duped, and schools of being undermined by subversives. In almost every instance, they use slogans rather than fact; and emotion, rather than reason.

After reading some of this irresponsible and emotional propaganda, it is refreshing to read a well-organized sermon on the dangers of the extreme right and left, and showing a logical and reasonable approach to our problems. Such a sermon was recently delivered at the Methodist Church in Ashland, Oreg., by Dr. P. Malcolm Hammond; and I ask that the portion of the sermon which deals with the United Nations be printed in the Record, at this point in my remarks. I find this section exceptional, because it answers many of the irresponsible attacks that have been made upon the United Nations.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the sermon was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Excerpt of a Sermon Delivered by Dr. P. Malcolm Hammond

UNITED NATIONS AND LAW

In 1945 the United Nations was established in San Francisco. The churches of the United States and the Methodist Church in particular had a lot to do with this. I myself recall sharing the platform in Spokane, Wash., with Bishop Bruce Baxter in 1944 urging our people to write to Congressmen in support of the proposed United Nations. There were numerous other people on that platform that day also. In October of this year the Department of International Affairs of the National Council of Churches issued the following statement: "Within the framework of the United Nations or closely allied to it, Christians should help build, as rapidly as possible, a body of world law and effective international courts. We must move toward the establishment of international instruments for the administration and enforcement of law. This means full support by our own Nation for such international institutions for peace and justice. The alternative is not freedom and independence but confusion and strife." Clearly if we are to have the machinery for world peace, it must come through United Nations we already have.

In other words, the United Nations must be supported, strengthened, and, if necessary, reconstructed. It is far easier to start with what we have, in the way of international organization, and build it up to desired proportions, than it would be to start all over again. We went through that once when the League of Nations died. It must not happen again. What we must have is an adequate legislative body with power to make laws, a judicial body with power to enforce its decisions, and an executive body with a police power to maintain order under a democratically controlled legislative body. We already have all of this—in rudimentary form. It must be completed. It must be given power. The world must be led to have confidence in it. It must be given a chance to prove worthy of that confidence.

Let us now turn our attention to the objections we are certain to hear to the proposals we here espouse.

OBJECTIONS

First, we will be told we are too idealistic, and, like all religious approaches to matters of social affairs, we are not sufficiently realistic. We do not think we are too idealistic. To begin with we are not proposing anything in the international arena that we have not learned by hard practical lessons on the western frontier of our own United States to be absolutely indispensable. Also, we rise to ask, just how realistic is it to expect our free democratic society to continue if we do not find the machinery of peace, and that as rapidly as possible. It is military planning that we see as hopelessly utopian, even sentimental, and not peace planning, such as we are trying to do.

Second, we will be told that nothing you plan to do through the United Nations will work; that through the veto power, the Soviet Union has the Security Council hopelessly hamstrung. But this does not apply to the Assembly. In any case the main effort would be to get all small nations and so-called neutral nations to work with the Western nations toward those ends here outlined. What the great majority of nations really want, they will get. We must marshal world opinion.

Third, we will be told that you cannot do business with Communist Russia, that every time we have trusted them, they have broken their word. This, I think, is not entirely accurate, but in any case it is unclear how it bears on the present question. We are not proposing to secure a strengthened United Nations through negotiations with the Soviet Union. Sooner or later they would be involved. But it would not be dependent on their action, as I see it. If the nations of the world demanded it, would they try to stop it? If so, would they succeed? It all depends on how much demand there is for it.

Fourth, we must be ready to meet the objection that the last thing in the world we want is a big super-government of the world. With our Federal Government growing and growing like a giant octopus, what do we want with another government that might become even worse yet? This will be a difficult argument to meet—the most difficult, in fact. Yet if this view prevails, it means chaos, war, and obliteration. The measure of the strength needed for any government in a given situation is the strength of the forces of disorder that that government has to meet and overcome. A weak force for law and order cannot hope to cope with the forces of disorder abroad in the world today. Big government is required to keep peace in a world where trouble can—and does—break out in five or six different places all at the same time. The proper reply to this argument, in my view, is this: What is the other alternative? How long will our Government—or any other, for that matter—maintain its solemn sovereignty in a full-scale war today? "The other alternative," as the Department of International Affairs has said, "is not freedom and independence but confusion and strife."

Fifth, we will hear it said that instead of trying to strengthen the U.N., we ought to pull out of it altogether and go it alone; we could go further and faster that way. But this is a counsel of despair. This is the isolationism of 1962. This is faint-hearted desperation. No one can seriously think that we can stop war all by ourselves. If there is a war, we will be involved. The only way to keep from getting involved is to keep it from starting at all. Except as the peoples of the world are willing to work with us, and we are willing to work with them, there is no hope. But the encouraging thing is that many nations are willing and anxious to work with us, and look to us for leadership. Shall we, then, withdraw ourselves from them? This is unthinkable.

Sixth, we will be told, finally, that the international police force, of which I speak, is still force; and that force can give birth only to more force. Violence and force of arms, they will say, can sire only more violence and more force of arms. It is the main thesis of this paper that this is not so. I maintain that there is an enormous moral difference between the responsible use of force (as in police work) and the irresponsible use of force (as in war). I have not lost my faith in the power of nonviolence to solve problems. I believe Gandhi and Martin Luther King and many others have amply demonstrated its powers. But I do believe that peaceful powers of persuasion have a better chance to operate under the restraining influence of disciplined and law-abiding police officers than they have of operating in a primitive and backward society where justice and right count for nothing and only guns and bombs dictate the terms of agreement. This primitive and backward society is exactly where we are at the present time, as far as our international relations are concerned. It is as though the voice of God has acquired a tone of finality when it speaks and says, "This time make the machinery of peace that will really work, or die, and let Me raise up another race of men that can do better."

RECOGNITION OF SENATORS DURING MORNING HOUR

The **VICE PRESIDENT**. The Chair desires to follow the policy of recognizing a Senator on the majority side and then a Senator on the minority side, provided Senators address the Chair under the rules. The Chair must recognize a Senator who addresses the Chair. So if Senators will bear that in mind, we will try to be fair and just in recognition of Senators.

SHALL ALL FARMING BE LICENSED?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, South Dakota is said to be the most agricultural State in the Union, and over two-thirds of our agricultural income is from livestock. Therefore, anything which affects farming and the production and feeding of lifestock is of the utmost importance in South Dakota.

Over the weekend I read the digest of S. 2786, which was introduced by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender], chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, as the administration's farm bill of 1962. Since the chairman stated there were provisions in the bill with which he did not agree, and since it was apparently prepared in the Department of Agriculture to carry out the proposals in the President's farm message, I shall refer to it as the Kennedy-Freeman bill.

The bill has not been passed. It has only been introduced. Its technical provisions need explanation. Hearings will be held. But a careful reading of the digest of the bill and the statement by Chairman Ellender lead me to say:

In my opinion, titles III, IV, and V of the Kennedy-Freeman farm bill will destroy farming as a way of life as we have known it in America. These titles, in effect, would put the producers of milk, turkeys, feed grains, and wheat on a franchise basis. Under them, the long arm of big Government would put its hand at the wheel of every farm tractor in America and on the desk or table of every farmer or farmer's wife in the country as they tried to figure out how they could operate the farm, stay within the law, and yet meet mounting costs.

Government clerks would tell the farmer how much milk he could market, how many turkey eggs he could hatch, how many acres he could plant to any feed grain, how much wheat he could sell at home and abroad.

If he planted excess acreage, the product would be marketed only by paying a penalty at the rate of 65 percent of parity.

And if his hard work or know-how enabled him to produce above his marketing quota on allotted acres, he would face the competition of Washington-directed dumping of Government-owned stocks.

Such is the picture proposed for farming on the New Frontier.

I venture to predict if this system of franchised farming becomes law, then livestock, too, will not be far behind.

SHOTGUN WEDDING IN LAOS

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, in the last issue of Reporter magazine there is an article written by Denis Warner under the title, "Shotgun Wedding in Laos." This article, in my opinion, describes the situation prevailing in Laos with an accuracy that commands attention and respect. It reads:

> On December 11, Malcolm MacDonald, the British cochairman of the 14-nation Geneva Conference on Laos, opened the day's session with a brief review of past progress and future prospects. "We are, in fact, on the point of creating a practical and just system of international guarantees which will assure to Laos neutrality, untroubled peace, and sovereign independence," he said. A week earlier the acting leader of the U.S. delegation, William H. Sullivan, had called it a pattern for peace not only in Laos, not only in southeast Asia, but throughout the world.
>
> In the long, sorry story of Laos these comments merit a special place. For what Geneva is, in fact, creating for Laos is calculated neither to assure its neutrality nor its sovereignty, while the peace it promises is likely to be of the kind that Mao Tse-tung once said grew out of the barrel of the gun.
>
> With a unanimity and a determination that were sadly lacking in their earlier efforts to keep Laos out of the hands of the Communists, the Western embassies in Vientiane are driving the reluctant Lao rightwingers into a coalition government which they know, and privately admit, may be temporarily and ostensibly neutral but which will lead almost inevitably to a takeover by Prince Souphanouvong and his Communist Neo Lao Hak Xat Party.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have an additional minute and a half.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio for additional time? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. Warner goes on to state:

> Samar Sen, who recently stepped down from the chairmanship of the International Control Commission and returned to his post as High Commissioner for India at Canberra, is one of the more optimistic observers of the Lao scene. But even he thinks the most the West can hope for from Lao neutrality is that it will be "of the Austrian type in reverse"; in other words, whereas Austria faces west culturally and in every other way except by formal alliances, Laos will be technically neutral but effectively within China's sphere of influence.

My colleagues, Souvanna Phouma has been labeled as a neutralist, a middle-of-the-roader. The fact is that all of the proof indicates he is oriented to Peiping. There is not a single nation in the Far East whose superior officials have confidence in the suggestion that Souvanna Phouma is a neutral. The fact is that there is likely to happen in Laos what happened in China under a coalition government; what happened in Poland and Rumania: There will be a neutralist government for a period, but a final takeover by the Communists.

Mr. SCOTT. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. What the Senator from Ohio has been saying is exactly what I have been saying for a great period of time. I commend the Senator for bringing this matter to the floor. As I understand, there is a proposal that there shall be 18 Cabinet officers, of which 4 are for the present anti-Communist Premier, 4 for the Communists, and 10 for the neutralists, and either the Communists or the neutralists are to get key positions. The Communists always demand the defense and interior positions, to control the minds and the military forces of the people.

I have predicted time and again that if our Government continues to pursue what I think is the unwise policy of "playing ball" with the neutralists, they are in effect, and even in actuality, "playing ball" with the Communists, because the only difference between Souvanna Phouma and Souphanouvong, as I understand, besides the slight dissimilarity in names, is that one of them is an outright Communist and the other is an underground Communist.

We are actually dragging our feet in financial help to the only anti-Communist force in Laos, in order to force him to surrender to the neutralists, who in turn will surrender to the Communists. Then the same old cycle we saw in China will be repeated. We shall have lost Laos. We shall have lost the confidence of our friends in Thailand and elsewhere. We shall have shaken the respect of people for the firmness of our anticommunism.

After all this is done, the Senator from Ohio and I and other Senators will have the pleasure of reading in newspaper columns throughout the land of the tremendous success of the policy of the administration in Laos; that they averted war and brought about peace.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have an additional 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio for additional time? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. SCOTT. I should like to ask the Senator if he agrees with me that this kind of peace is the peace of the grave, the peace of surrender, and a peace without honor?

Mr. LAUSCHE. In my opinion they are trying to create a troika government in Laos, which was so repulsive when offered to the United Nations. It will not be a neutralist government. It will not be a middle-of-the-road government. It will be preponderant in the direction of Peiping and Moscow.

The only way I can answer the question of the Senator from Pennsylvania is to point out what happened in China under a supposed coalition government, what happened in Poland, what happened in Czechoslovakia, and what happened in Rumania. I anticipate the identical occurrence will develop in Laos.

I further add, I believe it can positively be said that none of the nations adjacent to Laos is comfortable at the prospect of the creation of this alleged neutral, middle-of-the-road government. Souvanna Phouma has been labeled with the sort of commanding and appealing term of "neutralist." When we speak to those high officials of adjacent nations we find they fear dreadfully what will happen in the event the coalition government is established.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the Senator from Ohio for yielding to me. I agree with him entirely.

A TRIBUTE TO PRIME MINISTER CYRILLE ADOULA OF THE CONGO

Mr. McGEE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald, relating to the presence in our Nation's Capital of Prime Minister Cyrille Adoula of the Congo, stating applauding words for the stability and solidification of the position his personality and his efforts have come to connote in this very difficult and troublesome Congo situation. While it is still far from being out of the woods, so far as its problems go, the Congo, through Mr. Adoula's leadership, has come a long, long way. This suggests the wisdom of more restraint and less "shooting from the hip" on the part of critics in our own country in regard to the Congo question.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAN FROM THE CONGO

> Cyrille Adoula, the Prime Minister of the Congo, comes to Washington today as a leader who has given the world hope that his country may find a decent and dignified solution to an unprecedented ordeal. In a few short months, Mr. Adoula has helped to give substance to the claim of the central government in Léopoldville to speak for a united Congo. He has done this by dealing as firmly with secessionists who favor new-style Soviet colonialism as with those who look backward to old-fashioned financial colonialism.
>
> In his address to the United Nations last week, Mr. Adoula displayed those traits that have enabled him to succeed. He is no firebrand, but he understands the uses of tact and temperateness. He was conciliatory to the Belgians, and yet careful to praise Patrice Lumumba, who still has a following

among African nationalists. He made clear that he wishes the Congo to be neutral and independent while following a moderate course.

On this point, United States and United Nations policy are in harmony. This country does not wish to dominate the Congo or force the government in Léopoldville to aline itself with any bloc. American policy has sought from the beginning to help the Congo maintain its independence and to end the violence that has scarred its birth. Mr. Adoula should find a sympathetic audience in a capital that does not seek to impose either capitalists or commissars on a country struggling to be free.

THE DOCTORS AND THE AMA

Mr. McGEE. Madam President, I invite to the attention of the Members of this body an editorial published in the Saturday Evening Post for February 3 entitled "The Doctors and the AMA." The burden of the editorial is that many doctors in America have finally begun to repudiate their own professional organization.

As the editorial says:

> Lamentably the AMA has done precious little in our lifetimes to make us patients feel that medicine is on our side.

So the editorial petitions that doctors all take a hard look at the health of the people of our country and financial costs applying to that health, instead of spending so much time on the bugaboo of socialized medicine the AMA tries to preach.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DOCTORS AND THE AMA

A wholly fictitious doctor named Jones was awakened at 4 a.m. recently by the sound of running water. Investigation showed that a basement pipe had burst; the water was slowly rising on the cellar floor.

"Call the plumber," said Mrs. Jones.

"At 4 a.m.?" the doctor asked.

"Certainly," his wife replied. "He wouldn't hesitate to call you if he had a medical problem."

So Dr. Jones called his plumber and explained the emergency.

"You were quite right to call me," the plumber said. "I'll tell you what to do. Drop two aspirin tablets into the broken pipe every 2 hours. If the leak hasn't cleared up by 9 o'clock, call me at the office."

The wry humor of that anecdote has enlivened a good many gatherings these past few months. What makes it funny? Like all good jokes, it is reality exaggerated. The kindly family doctor does not give us the around-the-clock service he once did. We resent it—and thinly cloak our resentment in a veil of comedy.

To state the same proposition more bluntly, the American doctor is more widely criticized today than at any other time. There is a rising clamor against the impersonality of medical care, coupled with a mounting indignation over the increased costs of medical services. For the first time in its long and distinguished history, our medical profession is in trouble. It has a public-relations problem, and you can prove it by looking at just two sets of figures: the vast increase in the number of suits against doctors for medical malpractice; the sharp decrease in the number and caliber of applicants for medical education.

It is both strange and frightening that this should be so. In this century no profession has contributed quite so much to our national well-being as the doctor's. Even a handful of names—Salk, Menninger, Mayo, Hench, White, Rusk, Ravdin—suggests the magnitude of our debt to medicine. We have a reverence for the "men in white" that is based on their achievements, their solid and devoted service. Why is that reverence now tinged with cynicism?

Some of us are resentful because our doctors aren't on call 168 hours a week—as they are supposed to have been in the good old days—even though most of us feel overworked after an 8-hour day. Some of us resent our doctors' obvious affluence—even while remembering his costly years of preparation and the peon's wages of his internship.

These two beefs are much talked about on the cocktail circuit, but they seem to us to have little or nothing to do with the deterioration in the doctor-patient relationship. That deterioration has come about for one primary reason: The doctor knows how far scientific medicine has come these last 20 years, but he seems incapable of understanding that the patient has come at least an equal distance.

More than 40 percent of last year's high school graduates are in college. Almost every daily newspaper now has a medical column, usually well written and authoritative. Almost every mass-circulation magazine devotes a significant fraction of its space to medical topics. And just try to turn on TV without encountering some new Ben Casey or Dr. Kildare.

The fact is that today's patient, on average, is vastly more sophisticated medically than his counterpart of, say, 20 years ago. He has the brains and the vocabulary to participate in medical decisions. He will not be conned by those practitioners who turn aside reasonable questions with "let me worry about that." He is equipped for at least limited partnership in discussions that involve his own welfare. He can be pardoned, therefore, for resenting the authoritarian doctor—and there are a lot of them—who is appalled that anyone should question his judgment.

The "papa knows best" school of medical practice—so popular in the 1860's—is, in short, wholly out of place today. Not all doctors are guilty of it, of course, but enough strike the I'm-the-doctor-you're-a-layman pose to produce great strain in the relationship. The strain gets even greater when the doctor carries this pompous attitude outside his sphere of competence (medicine) and into the political and social arenas.

Traditionally medicine has spoken to the Nation through its chosen instrument, the American Medical Association—although a good many doctors do not belong to or believe in their own organization. Lamentably the AMA has done precious little in our lifetimes to make us patients feel that medicine is on our side. The AMA, for example, opposed hospitalization insurance. Despite that opposition, approximately 130 million Americans now are covered by some kind of prepaid medical insurance; they have clearly expressed their lack of confidence in the AMA in this regard. Similarly, the AMA opposed all kinds of group practice. We now know that some of medicine's finest work has been done in the voluntary clinics. The doctors as a group have in essence been against almost everything that America is for—and usually because the suspicious eye of the medical association espied the bugaboo of socialized medicine lurking beneath every new proposal.

The irony of this is that, so far as we know, there is no serious support anywhere in America for anything resembling socialized medicine. The politicians don't want it; the press doesn't want it; it is not wanted by labor or management, rich or poor, North or South. We can't help wondering if the doctors and their AMA seriously believe that they are fighting the socialized dragon—or whether, perhaps, they use this nonexistent threat to mask a pathological fear of change. It is a strange thing that the profession which has been the most progressive in accepting scientific progress has also been the most reactionary in the face of social reform.

All this has a special significance just now as Congress prepares to consider the President's bill to provide better medical care for the elderly by way of an extension of the social security program. Once again the AMA has sounded the too familiar alarm. If medical care for citizens over 65 is financed through the social security system, says the AMA, we are headed down the broad highway toward socialized medicine. To us this seems the rankest sort of nonsense. Anyhow, the AMA's forecasts of disaster have seldom been right in the past; why should we have confidence in their warning now?

Nevertheless, the AMA does have one solid point in the current debate, which, surprisingly, it has consistently underplayed. That point is the fact that Mr. Kennedy's plan for the elderly will be seriously handicapped—even unworkable—unless it has the enthusiastic cooperation of the doctors. Money and buildings can't practice medicine. Only doctors can do that—and even they can't do it very well unless their hearts are in it.

If the AMA people were to voice their objections to the Kennedy proposal in those terms, we might be with them. We certainly would be with them if they came up with a counterproposal, acceptable to doctors, that would do the job the President envisages.

As always, though, the American Medical Association seems to us to have confused where we want to go with how we're going to get there. Once again—as in the case of hospitalization insurance—they have allowed themselves to appear to be opposed to humane care when what they actually resist is a method of financing that care. We are not entranced with the administration's plan to finance this bill; we doubt that the administration itself would argue that theirs is the best of all possible solutions. It could be that the American Hospital Association's proposal to extend Blue Cross to all persons over 65 is a better idea. We do feel, however, that the doctors—as responsible citizens of the Republic—have an obligation not merely to say what's wrong but to tell us what's right. No reasonable American can be against providing needed care for the elderly. There has to be a way to get the job done while protecting the doctor from even his imaginary fears.

We call on you members of the American Medical Association for this kind of responsible statesmanship. There are very few Americans who do not have reason to look on your profession with gratitude—even awe. You have literally saved our lives. We want you to be as concerned about us as people as you are about us as patients. We want you on our side, not only in those anguished moments of illness but also when we are facing up to the hard and nervous task of trying to make this a better place for us all.

How about it, doc?

PEACE CORPS GIRL LIKES SHAGAMU, NIGERIA

Mr. McGEE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article written by Crosby S. Noyes and published in the Washington Evening Star for Friday, February 2, 1962. The article concerns a Peace Corps girl in Nigeria, Miss Cynthia Berry, who comes from the city of Philadelphia. It is a heart-warming account of her activities, and it will be of benefit to all of us to peruse the article.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEACE CORPS GIRL LIKES SHAGAMU

(By Crosby S. Noyes)

SHAGAMU, NIGERIA.—Few persons, perhaps, would choose Shagamu as the ideal spot to set up housekeeping.

Some 40 miles west of the capital at Lagos you reach Shagamu over the bumpy asphalt highway that winds its way through the steamy, tangled, Nigerian rain forest in the direction of Ibadan. When it reaches Shagamu the highway narrows, allowing barely enough room for two cars to pass between the crowding walls of mud-brick huts. Impatient motorists honk their way through swarms of chickens, goats, and darting barebottomed African youngsters.

There is the inevitable, teeming marketplace, public water fountains where long-robed women pound away at the family washing. A few stores, an open-air movie showing blood-and-thunder Indian films, a gas pump or two, and then the jungle closes in again.

HER PLACE FOR 2 YEARS

Ideal or not, Shagamu will be home for the next 2 years for Cynthia Berry, 24, lately of Philadelphia. She has chosen it, in fact, in preference to Washington. A few months ago, after winding up her studies at Pittsburgh University she decided to volunteer for the Peace Corps, as she puts it, "to escape a 9-to-5 office job at the Department of Commerce."

For Cynthia, an attractive brunette endowed with unusual bounce and sparkle, the road to Shagamu led through Harvard University where she went through 3 months of intensive training in peace corpsmanship as it applies to West Africa. There followed 3 more months of indoctrination, acclimatization and practice teaching at the University College of Ibadan. And finally the moment of truth, when she faced her first class of geography students at the Ramo Secondary School for girls run by the Anglican mission a few miles down the road.

To live alone in a town where the visitor is greeted with excited cries of "Ayibo" (white man) is apparently just a question of everyone getting used to it.

"It really hasn't been bad at all," Cynthia says. "They are still puzzled about what I'm doing there, and I think it shocks them a little to see me carrying out my own garbage and hanging up the laundry. But they've all been very friendly. I've learned to say 'hello' and 'thank you' in Yoruba (the local tribal language) and whenever I go into a store they always say 'Welcome.'"

Cynthia is housed by Shagamu standards—and for that matter by Peace Corps standards—in some luxury at the expense of the Nigerian Government. Her bedroom and sitting room are over a store in one of the town's larger buildings and one of the few wired for electricity. There is a small kitchen underneath. From her bedroom window she can see about one-third of the screen of the Indian movie theater and there is no lack of distractions.

"The goats are a real problem," she admits. "For some reason they never seem to shut up and go to sleep. And the people are the same way. In every family there seems to be at least one person awake and making a racket all night long."

Sleep or no sleep, Cynthia must be on hand early every morning to catch a ride to school with one of the other teachers who has a car. Critically short on transportation, the Peace Corps provides cars only where they are indispensable. The rest, like Cynthia, beg rides wherever they can get them.

GETS WARM WELCOME

At the school itself she has been cordially received. In an education-hungry country like Nigeria, where only 10 percent of graduating primary students can find space in a secondary school, any graduate teacher—even one who has never taught before—is assured a warm welcome.

"We were all a little nervous at first," Cynthia says. "The girls thought my accent was pretty funny and sometimes I couldn't understand them at all. But after a few days things settled down and I think it's going to be all right."

Her superiors in the Peace Corps—the staff of professionals responsible for launching 78 volunteers scattered over a country with an area of 339,000 square miles—are inclined to agree. The Peace Corps experiment, they know, will be not better or more successful than the quality of the program's volunteers—their good sense, good humor and their determination to see the thing through.

In any experiment of this kind there are more than enough headaches and problems to go around. But when it comes to Cynthia Berry and others like her, the Peace Corps in Nigeria is off to a promising start.

"MUZZLING"(?)

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Madam President, ex-Maj. Gen. Edwin A. Walker, busy undertaking a lecture tour and opening letters with checks from wealthy rightwingers, who apparently consider several of the prominently mentioned potential presidential candidates for 1964 of that grand old party of which I am not a member to be too liberal, or too much to the left, and desire this ex-general as their hope in 1964, has now filed as a conservative Democratic candidate for Governor of Texas.

Last week he addressed a meeting in Cleveland, Ohio, but as far as I can learn, said nothing noteworthy for the fee he received, except to claim the military were muzzled and that Communists had infiltrated our free press.

Apparently, this John Birch Party member believes that as a man on horseback he will ride to the White House come 1964 as a Confederate cavalryman after enjoying a brief interregnum as Governor of Texas. Some Texas businessmen and oil millionaires are supposed to be backing him.

Far be it from me, living in a northern State, to comment on ex-General Walker's political ambitions in Texas in 1962. However, in looking over the formidable list of candidates for Governor in the forthcoming Democratic primaries in Texas, including John B. Connally, Jr., former Secretary of the Navy; Price Daniel, present Governor; Don Yarborough, outstanding attorney and bearer of a famed Texas vote-getting name; Attorney General Will Wilson; and others, I suspect that ex-General Walker will run about fifth in the field of six. Or, perhaps if there are seven or eight who file, he may place even lower.

The wise men who wrote the Constitution of our country provided that civil authority must always remain supreme over military authority. The business of military officers is defense—not politics, not policymaking, not propaganda. Officers in our armed services may condemn communism as a form of government or draw unfavorable comparison between the Communist system and our system. They may not sound off on foreign policy, nor make political speeches, nor direct soldiers how they and their dependents should vote.

General Walker was off base. In fact, he violated the military code when he engaged in political activity and urged men under his command as to how they and their dependents should vote. For anyone to claim that General Walker was muzzled is to assail the American way of life. This officer admitted membership in the John Birch Society and selected its literature for reading by his soldiers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have an additional 2 minutes to complete my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Madam President, when placed on trial, he pleaded the Army fifth, refusing to answer some questions. It was proven he termed President Truman and Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt Communist sympathizers, and said;

> Even our free press is exploited by Communist propagandists; we employ the agents of communism in the teaching profession. They long ago have infiltrated our Government, so that a scheme of subversion can be traced through three decades.

Ex-General Walker, a segregationist, tried to resign when President Eisenhower placed him in command to suppress riots at Little Rock. As a private citizen, this former general may be as eccentric politically as he chooses. However, every officer of our Armed Forces must accept the restrictions imposed on his position by custom and the Constitution.

Recently army officers, by force and violence, took over the government of Ecuador. A few months ago, French generals revolted against De Gaulle and blood was shed in suppressing this revolt. They are now threatening revolt against law and order in France. In Brazil, army and navy officers usurped civil authority, interfering with the orderly succession to the presidency.

We live in a grim period. It is unfortunate there are persons who fail to see the terrible threat of Communist aggression from the Soviet Union and Red China, but instead make outlandish statements against fellow Americans as does ex-General Walker.

On the subject of muzzling of the military, former Adm. Arleigh Burke, whose speeches were on occasion censored in the Eisenhower administration, recently said;

> There are certain things which military men should not say. There are certain things which if said would do harm to the Government. So there is no objection to having speeches cleared. I don't think that military leaders are muzzled.

MIDTERM SPELL MAY BE BROKEN—ANOTHER 1934 IN 1962

Mr. ENGLE. Madam President, in a speech before the California Democratic

Council at Fresno on January 27, I predicted that the Democrats would gain seats, not lose seats, in the upcoming midterm elections. My prediction was based on the fact that nearly 80 percent of the people of this country support the policies of President Kennedy and believe that his party, the Democratic Party, is the best qualified to handle the issues in which the people are most interested.

I am glad to note now that the famous election analyst, Mr. Louis H. Bean, comes to the same conclusion. In an article in the Washington Post of February 4, 1962, Mr. Bean says:

> As I see the fundamental elements in the New Frontier's developing tide—the rise in President Kennedy's popularity to a sustained high level; the improvement in business conditions; the spreading of public support for the Kennedy administration; the substantially greater voter preference for Democratic congressional candidates than in 1960—the Democrats will again shatter the midterm tradition.

Mr. Bean goes on to say:

> If these developments prevail through the coming campaign, the Democrats, not the Republicans, will gain in the 1962 elections.

At the California Democratic Council convention in Fresno, I called for another 1934 in 1962. I believe that the Democratic Party will break the historic midterm tradition in 1962, and I am glad to be joined in that prophesy by so distinguished an election analyst as Louis H. Bean, who predicted President Truman's victory in 1948.

I ask unanimous consent to insert Mr. Bean's article in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEMOCRATIC VICTORY SEEN—MIDTERM SPELL MAY BE BROKEN

(By Louis H. Bean)

It is generally assumed that the Democrats are headed for the typical midterm setback in November. This expectation is based on solid historical fact: there has been only one exception in 26 midterm elections since 1856 to the rule that the party in power loses ground in the offyear congressional elections.

President Kennedy referred to this historical phenomenon at the recent Democratic dinner celebrating the first anniversary of the New Frontier administration when he said that this year "history is not with us." But as I see the fundamental elements in the New Frontier's developing tide—the rise in President Kennedy's popularity to a sustained high level; the improvement in business conditions; the spreading public support for the Kennedy administration; the substantially greater voter preference for Democratic congressional candidates than in 1960—the Democrats will again shatter the midterm tradition.

If these developments prevail through the coming campaign, the Democrats, not the Republicans, will gain in the 1962 elections.

This conclusion may be something of a surprise, coming from one who has helped popularize the midterm rule and who has used it effectively several times in forecasting the outcome of midterm elections, such as those of 1946, 1950, 1954 and 1958.

I grant that it is not easy to cast doubt on the prophetic value of such a long established tendency—to go against a rule historically weighted 25 to 1 against the Democrats. But I feel that there is much in the present political tide that makes the one exception since 1856—the Democratic gain in 1934 following Franklin D. Roosevelt's first presidential victory—a valid analogy for this year.

Let me first tabulate part of the long election record on which the accepted generalization is based. The table shows the numbers of Democratic Congressmen elected since 1920:

Presidential years		Midterm years		Difference
1920	132	1922	207	+75
1924	183	1926	195	+12
1928	163	1930	216	+53
1932	313	1934	322	+9
1936	333	1938	262	−71
1940	267	1942	222	−45
1944	243	1946	188	−55
1948	263	1950	234	−29
1952	213	1954	232	+19
1956	234	1958	283	+49
1960	263	1962	?	

Note how after the five Republican presidential victories of 1920, 1924, 1928, 1952, and 1956, the Democrats picked up congressional seats, the gains ranging from 12 to 75. Note also that following the 5 Democratic presidential victories of 1932, 1936, 1940, 1944, and 1948, the Democrats lost seats in 4 cases, the Republican gains ranging from 29 to 71. In the one exception, 1934, the Democrats gained nine seats following the outstanding gains of 1932.

One needs to look to domestic business conditions and international involvements for explanations of the wide variations in these midterm gains and losses. The Democratic gain in 1930 reflected the onset of our greatest depression. The sharp loss in 1938 was brought about by a marked recession in production and employment, by sitdown strikes and by mounting disappointment with the New Deal.

The 1942 loss represented wartime political apathy and that of 1946 the adverse political effects of immediate postwar adjustments. The notable gain of 1958 was partly a reaction to unemployment but probably was more a reflection of rural as well as other disillusionment with the Eisenhower administration.

From all this there emerges a pattern (in terms of Democratic Congressmen elected) for presidential election years paralleled by a similar course for midterm election years. The second course is normally lower than the first by about 25 to 30 seats. This difference I have called the measure of the pulling power of the President's coattails in presidential election years and the normal weakness of the party in power in the midterm years.

But while the Democrats face a normal loss of 25 to 30 seats this year, let me show why an analogy with 1934 points to another exception in 1962.

What were the elements in the political trend immediately after 1932 that gave the Democrats a gain of nine seats, contrary to precedent? Simply, and briefly, they were Mr. Roosevelt's growth in presidential experience and the public's approval of his relief and recovery measures during the first 2 years of the New Deal.

The Democratic percentage of the popular vote in the 1934 congressional elections was practically as high as that of 1932. The dynamics of the political tide of that period indicate that a Gallup Poll taken in 1934 would have given Mr. Roosevelt an even wider margin over Herbert Hoover than he obtained in 1932.

The political developments of the present early phase of the New Frontier may also be put simply and briefly. President Kennedy, it is generally agreed, has also grown in presidential experience. His popularity has risen sharply and that of the New Frontier with him, reflecting widespread public approval. Compared with attitudes in 1960, a larger proportion of all segments of the population today prefers the Democratic Party "as best able to handle the most important problems facing the Nation."

In a public opinion poll a year after the 1960 election, President Kennedy was favored by a 20-point margin over Richard M. Nixon in contrast with the hairbreadth margin in 1960. Other polls show that if congressional elections were held today, Democratic candidates would receive 3 percentage points more than in 1960, and this usually translates into more Democratic Congressmen.

For every percentage point increase in popular support this year over 1960, the Democrats should gain 9 or 10 seats.

Whether this improvement in Democratic strength can be sustained until election time is of course anybody's guess. But the country, having watched Mr. Kennedy in office through his first trying year, is no longer concerned over his lack of experience; the religious factor that reduced his margin and that of other candidates no longer troubles as many people as it did; his administration has gained in popular support, and, finally, business recovery seems to be moving toward even greater prosperity. All of these elements could make the 1962 congressional elections the second exception to the historic rule.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. CAPEHART. Madam President, 1 week from tomorrow, February 13, 1962, will be the 44th anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

For all of us, this is an appropriate date to reflect on the blessings of freedom which we enjoy and once were enjoyed by a valiant people now writhing under the iron yoke of communism.

I know that every Member of the Senate will join me in pledging to the hundreds of thousands of Lithuanian-Americans in the United States and to their families and forebears continuing support in their effort to throw off the shackles of totalitarianism which now besets their native land.

ENGLER'S "POLITICS OF OIL" A MUST FOR UNDERSTANDING WASHINGTON POLITICS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, a brilliant young professor from Sarah Lawrence College has written a powerfully documented, thoroughly responsible indictment of the political power of the oil industry in America.

The vast power of this industry is easily the greatest held by any economic combine in America. And Professor Engler's book shows how all encompassing this power is.

Madam President, I have often risen on the floor of the Senate to protest this corrupting oil power. There can be no realistic understanding of how American politics really operates without grasping the role of the big black hand of oil.

Is this book an honest appraisal?

What does the oil industry itself think of it?

In the NPN bulletin, a four-page McGraw-Hill publication subscribed to by oilmen throughout the country and published weekly by the editors of the National Petroleum News and Platt's Oilgram News and Price Services appeared the following review. I ask unanimous consent to have the brief review of Engler's "Politics of Oil" printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the review was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE MARKET TREND—A CRITICAL REVIEW OF THE OIL BUSINESS

(By Halsey Peckworth)

If you want a chastening experience, read "The Politics of Oil," by Robert Engler (Macmillian, $7.50). It's a long, heavily documented indictment of the industry, mostly the production side of industry.

It's trite to say this, but Engler's book is bound to be banned in Austin. The book is a study, as Engler says, of the "relation of power and responsibility."

Engler's thesis is that a cluster of integrated corporations controls oil, a basic resource. "They operate as political institutions, and together they take on the full nature of a government." Engler even goes further, claiming that the "global interests and jurisdictions of these corporations * * * may be called the first world government."

And the author further alleges that the oil industry has "harnessed public law, governmental machinery, and opinion to the ends that directly challenge public rule." These are strong words. And to spell out his argument, Engler takes 565 pages, with 65 pages of footnotes and indexes.

Engler claims the industry has furthered its ends under the banners of "prosperity," "national security," "private enterprise," and in the name of "right of representation." His last claim is that "in the name of freedom, the oil industry has received substantial immunity from public accountability."

As I have complete trust in the broadmindedness of my employer, I have to say that Engler's study appears to be a very substantial document. His facts seem impeccable. His conclusions at times are too harsh. But the important thing is that Engler approaches his subject first and foremost as a citizen.

So, if the daughter comes home from Sarah Lawrence next vacation, and quizzes Dad sharply about his oil business, blame it on Engler. That's where he's a professor of political science.

REFORESTATION PROGRAM IN ISRAEL

Mr. McCARTHY. Madam President, a reforestation program is being carried out in Israel under the auspices of the Jewish National Fund. A section of a forest in the hills near Jerusalem has been named the Hubert H. Humphrey Forest in recognition of the work done for the cause of freedom by my colleague from Minnesota.

Senator Humphrey was in Israel for the dedication of the Hubert H. Humphrey Forest last October 29. In his remarks at the dedication Senator Humphrey spoke not only about the value of reclamation and conservation of natural resources but also of the necessity for peace and understanding between nations, a goal to which he has given so much time and effort. I believe that Members of the Senate will find his comments of interest and I ask unanimous consent that his address at the dedication be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ODE TO AFFORESTATION

First of all it is wonderful to see the red, white, and blue flag and the 50 stars of the United States of America on this great area, known as the Judean Hills, and see next to it the flag of Israel with the star of David. Two stars dedicated to freedom—two countries dedicated to humanity. This is an added experience these days. While many people speak of their independence and their national sovereignty, all too few are dedicated to the real meaning of freedom—freedom of the soil, the very kind that makes life worth while to humanity, to the lame and to the sick, to the hungry and to the poor, to just God's people. When I see these two emblems, one very rich, very powerful—that of the United States, of which I am justly proud; the other, smaller in size and so rich in human gifts, strong in spirit, in vitality, energy and human resources, when I see the U.S. stars and the flags of Israel with their star of David, all I can say is that this is a good sign for today and tomorrow, a kind of symbol during these days of strife, and I salute them.

Something else comes to my mind. You are planting the evergreens here. I am very happy to plant the evergreens, for the evergreen is a tree so characteristic of the State of Minnesota. When I tell you that we have 20 million acres of forest land, over 11 million acres of public forests, we are proud of our forests. We did not take such good care of them; we exploited our God-given resources. That is what happened to these hills, when the people of Israel were driven from these hills that were known as the land of milk and honey. The land was left to the ravages of nature and rock took the place of what was once very fertile land, but you, through the Jewish National Fund, are rebuilding this country, helping divine providence in restoring that what He has given to mankind. But we of the United States learned some lessons too—much of our land was ravaged by erosion. Mankind in his urgent need to get ahead, ripped and ploughed the land, chopped up the trees and we found ourselves faced with a national crisis and a great American by the name of Theodore Roosevelt and another by the name of Governor Pinchot, two great people (although I might add that they were in the opposite party to the party I belong to). They led a crusade for the conservation of resources.

For the past 50 years we have started to rebuild much of these wasted areas. We are producing today more timber than we are cutting. We are reclaiming more land than what was eroded. We are conserving these natural resources for the future. The people of Israel had to start with so little. They started primarily with the challenge of doing the impossible and by doing the impossible, they have today turned the corner. The Jewish National Fund today is reclaiming land. I have seen it with my own eyes. Masses of trees are being planted, hills are being covered with forests, new forests will come into being. This changes the landscape, it changes the climate too; it brings back the water, it helps build a better land and a better people. I am singularly honored and thrilled that a little section will be known as the Hubert H. Humphrey Forest.

It can be noted very distinctly, to your right and to your left, just a few feet away, lies the border of Jordan. How peaceful it all looks and how peaceful it all should be. And if there is any purpose for my being here in Israel, besides this noble dedication, it is to promote peace and understanding and try to lift my voice, not only as an American, but just as a person, to urge the great people of the Middle East, that they join together and work together for their common cause. I am an optimist. It has to take time, for it takes time to bind up wounds, a great deal of time. Our great leader, Abraham Lincoln, called on our Nation 100 years ago to bind up the wounds and we have been binding wounds for many a generation. Most of them have been healed. I believe that many of these wounds that are here will be healed in a much shorter period, and the waters of the River Jordan, which were put here for the people all through this area will be used to bring water to the parched and thirsty land and other areas, to both Jew and Arab alike, in cooperation and friendship. This can be done, if only the political leaders will have the courage to do it. I talked with your Prime Minister this morning and he told me that this is what he would want, that the political problems be solved and start working together for the benefit of all.

Yesterday we have been at the Huleh Lake area, which thanks to the Jewish National Fund is no longer a lake, but a fertile valley. We were at the Sea of Galilee, the Lake of Tiberias. This is a wonderful place. We also visited some of the areas to the south of the Huleh, that vast area that was once a worthless swampy land. It was the Jewish National Fund that bought it 40 years ago at a very reasonable price and did that wonderful work of reclamation. It was Menachem Ussishkin who had the courage, many years ago, to go and buy land and drain swamps and plant trees. These early pioneers proved that you can take the rock and make water run through it, you can drain swamps filled with malaria, you can reap the harvest not once but thrice a year. This is the story of the Jewish National Fund, of Israel, of the pioneers of the early days. It is a story that everyone can profit by, when I hear people saying, How can we overtake the problems, how can we hope for peace and tranquillity in a world that wishes to destroy us? We have done it before. Man can do whatever he wills, if he only has the faith in God and in himself to do it.

I want to conclude my remarks. The place where we most need to reason together, is where Isaiah lived and spoke, where bitterness prevails and the voice of passion has been raised, where refugees have been used politically. As an American I say that on that day when the political leaders of the nations in this wonderful, fascinating, potential, and prosperous area in the world can sit down together as neighbors and resolve their differences, on that day indeed will this land be called blessed. This is the objective of the foreign policy of America. We shall help those who wish to help themselves, and those who dedicate their resources and institutions for the betterment of humanity. I could not help to think that Israel has such abundance. You do not have so many oilfields, you would be happy if you could find water, and I imagine you would not mind a gold mine, or two. But there is something that you do have—a healthy, a wonderful, a vital and vigorous youth. These children, they are healthy, they are pretty, they are bright, courageous, they are strong. When you have young people like that, plus the determination to make something of their life, you have an energy more than atomic, and resources richer than gold.

RESOLUTION ON DEATH OF SENATOR SCHOEPPEL

Mr. MAGNUSON. Madam President, I send to the desk a copy of a resolution on the death of our late colleague, Senator Andrew F. Schoeppel, which was adopted by the Committee on Commerce at its executive session held Tuesday, January 23, 1962. I have been asked by the members of the committee to have this resolution printed in the body of the Record, and accordingly I ask unanimous consent that this may be done at this point.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> Whereas the members of the Senate Committee on Commerce were shocked to learn of the sudden passing from this life of our friend and associate, Andrew Frank Schoeppel, and
>
> Whereas his friendly and wise cooperation and counsel in all the activities and decisions of the committee have been most helpful and most deeply appreciated, and
>
> Whereas the sense of personal loss to each one of us at his passing is keenly felt: Now, therefore, be it
>
> *Resolved*, That the members of our committee, mindful of his long association and unfailing friendliness and wisdom, do hereby express our sincere sorrow that he can no longer be with us, and direct that the clerk of the committee send a copy of this resolution to the family of the deceased.

STOCKPILING PROGRAM—PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S VOTES IN SENATE

Mr. ENGLE. Madam President, in answer to a statement made on Friday, February 2, by my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams], I issued a press release on Saturday relating to President Kennedy's votes on the stockpiling program when he was a Member of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent to have my statement printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator Clair Engle on Defense Stockpiling

> Senator John J. Williams, Republican, of Delaware, in his speech on defense stockpiling attempts to make two points: That the President should not have been astonished and that his voting record helped pile up our defense stockpile. The astonishment expressed by the President related not simply to the total value of our stockpiles figures that have been known, but rather to the great excesses over presently determined objectives rising in some instances to as much as 700 percent of stated goals.
>
> With respect to the listing of rollcall votes by Senator Williams, I have examined them and have the following comments:
>
> (a) Of the so-called eight wrong votes which, according to Senator Williams, provided "more and more money to buy these minerals which were being piled up in unnecessary quantities," five of them related to providing direct subsidies to our hard-pressed American mining industry and were unrelated to the national stockpile.
>
> (b) Of the remaining three, one went to the question of imposing a limit of 5,000 tons of tungsten per month which could be purchased from any one producer. This, therefore, related not to the total acquisition but to the distribution among different producers.
>
> (c) The remaining two votes were on the same amendment proposed by Senator Hayden, chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, providing an additional $30 million for acquisition of strategic materials. On the 2 votes, the amendment carried by 64 to 17 and 61 to 17. As a matter of usual practice, classified information on our stockpiles was made available to the members of the Appropriations Committees. Because of the classified nature of the material, it was impossible for the specific information to be discussed or debated on the Senate floor. Thus, the traditional practice has been to accept the recommendations of the Appropriations Committees on items of this character.
>
> In short, the President did not intend by his announcement to attack the mining and minerals industry, as apparently Senator Williams does. The President's basic point is that in any program involving billions of dollars, as this one does, and which has been shrouded in secrecy, there should be public awareness and an opportunity to open up the cold facts on the subject. I would have thought that this would have pleased Senator Williams rather than annoyed him.

THE DU PONT TAX BILL

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Madam President, the President of the United States on Saturday, February 3, 1962, signed the so-called Du Pont tax bill. This bill, which became law when the President's signature was affixed, was passed by the Senate January 23, 1962, after continual study of the problems involved over nearly 4 years.

Enactment of the law was made necessary by a 1957 Federal Supreme Court decision compelling the E. I. du Pont de Nemours Co. to rid itself of stock in the General Motors Corp. which it had owned for years.

The decision affected each of the 210,000 stockholders who own the Du Pont Co. These include not only members of the Du Pont family, but also some 50,000 employees of the company who bought stock through a company savings plan, and tens of thousands of others. There is no tax relief for the Du Pont Co. as a corporation.

The purpose of the law is to provide fair and equitable Federal tax treatment of all who are affected—rich and poor, and regardless of whether they are members of the Du Pont family or among the thousands who are not.

The bill as passed was a revenue measure which originated in the House of Representatives. Several proposals were introduced in the House, and the bill finally approved was sponsored by Representative Hale Boggs of Louisiana.

After it was passed by the House of Representatives, the bill was referred to the Senate Finance Committee of which I am chairman. In the committee I voted for the bill, without change, as it was approved by the House. The Finance Committee reported the bill, unchanged, with only 2 of the 17 committee members voting against it.

The test vote in the Senate came on a motion to recommit the bill to the committee. This motion was defeated 67 to 25. After this vote, opponents of the bill did not request a roll call on final passage. The Senate passed the bill, without change, by voice vote.

The Washington, D.C., Post, in its edition of January 16, 1962—page B-12—carried a syndicated column written by Drew Pearson dealing with this legislation under the headline: "Byrd Champions Relief for Rich." In addition to this headline misstatement, the column itself carried numerous misstatements.

The Washington Post, in its edition of January 25, 1962—page A-22—9 days after it circulated the Pearson column—carried an editorial entitled "Du Pont Controversy," which clearly analyzed the reasons which made the bill necessary.

In that editorial the Washington Post renounced the theme of the Pearson column, refuted its own headline over the column, and accurately interpreted the purpose of the legislation. The editorial in part said:

> Legislators rallied around the bill because they came to believe that it will protect small investors against discriminatory taxation and that it will aid an orderly transfer of 63 million shares of General Motors common stock of which the E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. must divest itself under court order. The bill is not intended to thwart enforcement of the antitrust laws; rather it expresses a strong belief that the rank and file of investors should not be hurt in the process.

Technically, one of the key tax problems which had to be solved by legislation lay in the fact that assets, as distinguished from earned income, were to be distributed under compulsion of court decree. The Washington Post editorial recognized this distinction. It said:

> If Du Pont should distribute General Motors shares of its stockholders, under present (prior) law, they would have to pay income taxes on the value of stock as if it were current income. It is generally conceded that this would be unfair, since the stock is really capital which is being technically shifted from one owner to another solely because of court decree.

Pearson, in his column of January 16, called the bill "Byrd legislation" and in part said:

> Senator Byrd is now rushing special tax benefits through the Senate for the millionaire Du Pont family.

The documented history of the legislation provides no reason based on fact for referring to the bill or the statute as "Byrd legislation."

The Washington Post itself, which circulated the Pearson column, says the bill expresses strong belief that the rank and file of investors should not be hurt.

The Christiana Securities Co. is a holding company which owns 29 percent of the Du Pont Co. stock. The Christiana Co. is owned by some 7,000 stockholders, including members of the Du Pont family.

Pearson quoted "legal experts" as claiming the bill, which is now law, "would provide special benefits if Christiana turns its General Motors stock over to individual members of the Du Pont family."

The Washington Post editorial said:

> Under the present (prior) law only a light tax would be imposed on the transfer of General Motors shares from Du Pont to Christiana. Congress more than doubled this in the bill it passed, but Senator Douglas' amendment designed to levy capital gains taxes against the holding company, on the same basis as if it were an individual, went down in defeat.

Pearson's clear inference that I was rushing the bill through the Senate is completely refuted by official records of the consideration given since 1957 to the tax problems created by the Court decision in this case.

Both the Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee have considered legislative proposals with respect to these problems on at least three separate occasions.

Both the Treasury Department and the Justice Department have thoroughly studied every reasonable legislative remedy which has been proposed.

The bill, which is now a law, was approved by the House Ways and Means Committee and passed, after debate, by the House of Representatives.

When this bill came to the Senate Finance Committee, after House passage, it had the positive approval of Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon, and the Department of Justice advised the committee that it had no objection to passage of the legislation.

The Finance Committee hearings on the bill last September were expedited at the request of the Senate Democratic policy committee, of which I am not a member; and the same committee scheduled the date and time for it to be taken up on the Senate floor.

The debate was started last September under policy decision—not mine. When it was found that completion of the debate at that time would delay adjournment of Congress, continuation of the debate, under another policy decision, was postponed to a date fixed as January 15, 1962.

The bill was fully debated in the Senate, first during 3 days last September, and later during more than a week in January of this year. Relatively few bills receive fuller or more thorough consideration and study.

Pearson, in his January 16 column, said it was possible under the bill to "thwart the Justice Department which brought the antitrust case in the first place."

Attorney General Robert Kennedy, in a letter to me dated January 13, 1962—3 days before the Pearson column was published—repeated the Department of Justice position that:

> It did not object to passage of the bill if the legislative history made it clear that Congress did not intend unduly to restrict the courts with respect to methods to be decreed in the divestiture of General Motors stock by the Du Pont Co. and the Christiana Co.

The Senate Finance Committee, in its report on the bill dated September 21, 1961, had already made this point clear, and Attorney General Kennedy specifically recognized this fact. I repeated this intention for the record of the Senate on this bill on January 15, 1962.

When he signed the bill, the President said:

> This legislation clearly does not attempt to express a judgment upon the question that is now before the court. The Senate Finance Committee report pointed out that all issues dealing with the manner of divestiture should be determined judiciously, solely with reference to antitrust principles, and without regard to the provisions of the bill before it. The debate discloses a unanimity of intent on this point.

The President continued with the statement that:

> In view of this unequivocal construction of the legislation, I am approving it. It should be clearly understood that neither the Congress nor I have approved a divestiture which will permit the stock of General Motors to pass through Christiana to the stockholders of Christiana.

The Washington Post, in its editorial of January 25, said:

> The bill is not intended to thwart enforcement of the antitrust laws.

Pearson said how much the special tax benefits I was rushing through the Senate would deprive the Treasury in tax revenue is a matter of dispute, but the estimates run as high as $160 million.

Estimates that the new law would develop approximately $460 million were made in testimony on the bill before the Finance Committee; and Treasury officials did not dispute testimony before both the Ways and Means and the Finance Committees that the Treasury would be deprived of no revenue.

In summary, now that H.R. 8847 has now become Public Law 87–403, I think the record should show that:

It was signed by President John F. Kennedy.

There was no objection by Attorney General Robert Kennedy.

It was positively approved by Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon.

It was favorably reported with heavy majorities by both the Ways and Means and Finance Committees.

It was approved and scheduled for consideration by the Senate Democratic policy committee.

It was passed by Congress with overwhelming votes in both the House and the Senate.

I shall not take the time of the Senate for an item by item refutation of the misstatements, inferences, and innuendoes contained in the column relating to this bill by Drew Pearson, as it appeared in the Washington Post of January 16, 1962. It suffices to say that this can be done with documented facts.

Significantly, sufficient refutation has already been made by the Washington Post which itself published the Pearson column, and the Washington, D.C., Star, which is one of the most highly respected newspapers in the country.

I have had long experience in reading newspapers. In all these years, I have seldom seen a newspaper censure a nationally syndicated columnist so thoroughly as the Washington Star censured Pearson in the leading editorial entitled "Wild Blue Yonder" of its January 17, 1962, edition—page A–20.

In the order stated, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD as a part of these remarks, and at this point, the column by Drew Pearson, headed "BYRD Champions Relief for Rich," as it appeared in the Washington Post on Tuesday, January 16, 1962; an editorial from the Washington Star of January 17, 1962, entitled "Wild Blue Yonder"; and an editorial from the Washington Post of January 25, 1962, entitled "Du Pont Controversy."

There being no objection, the article and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 16, 1962]

BYRD CHAMPIONS RELIEF FOR RICH

(By Drew Pearson)

Virginia's cherubic, charming Senator HARRY BYRD, sometimes called the Scrooge of the Senate, has started out the new session characteristically. He is vigorously opposing Federal aid for the needy but enthusiastically championing Federal relief for millionaires.

BYRD wasted no time last week in proclaiming his opposition to President Kennedy's welfare program. As Senate Finance chairman, he also served notice that he won't hold hearings on medical care for the aged until the House has acted first—a delaying tactic that probably will hold up the bill until adjournment day.

Yet the same Senator BYRD is now rushing special tax benefits through the Senate for the millionaire Du Pont family. How much this would deprive the Treasury in tax revenue is a matter of dispute, but the estimates run as high as $160 million.

But this doesn't seem to trouble the Senator from Virginia, who issues press releases on how much money Government bureaus use on press releases, and cries to the rafters every time a penny is appropriated for the public.

The Du Pont bill, as the Du Pont tax relief measure is called, would provide special loopholes for the Du Pont Co. to escape paying full taxes on the General Motors stock which the courts have ordered it to sell.

The biggest tax break, under the Byrd legislation, would be to the Du Pont family which owns 29 percent of Du Pont stock through a holding company called Christiana.

Legal experts, who have analyzed the bill's complex language, claim it would provide special tax benefits if Christiana turns its General Motors stock over to the individual members of the Du Pont family.

This would encourage the courts, which haven't yet ruled how the General Motors stock should be divested, to let individual stockholders keep it.

REVERSING HIGH COURT

Thus, the Du Pont family might end up in full possession of their General Motors stock, as individuals—not as a holding company. This would completely thwart the Justice Department which brought the antitrust case in the first place in order to break the Du Pont family's hold on General Motors.

In other words, the bill would reverse the antitrust case and the Supreme Court, and offer tax concessions to the Du Ponts in the bargain.

BYRD tried to ram the bill through Congress during the closing logjam last fall; the usual tactic for pushing a bill which can't bear too much public scrutiny.

BYRD even began hearings on the Du Pont bill before the House had acted. Yet he has now refused to hold advance hearings on medical care, citing the fact that the House is supposed to act first on financial measures.

For the Du Ponts, however, BYRD not only waived this procedure but actually scheduled a hearing in the evening for the first time in the memory of Finance Committee Members.

He was finally blocked by Senators PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, and ALBERT GORE, of Tennessee, who threatened to keep the Senate in session beyond the adjournment date to debate the bill.

In a signed statement, they complained: "Although it has been impossible to move in both the House and the Senate on the tax reform proposals of the President, we find that a bill for the relief of those who are among the highest income groups in the country is treated with loving care and tender mercy by the committees of Congress."

Now BYRD is trying to complete the chore he began last fall for the Du Ponts.

TWO GOP CONTRIBUTORS

The two biggest contributors to Republican campaign funds during recent years have been members of the Du Pont family and General Motors executives. In 1956, the last year that the Senate did a workmanlike job of keeping accurate accounts—thanks to Senator Gore—the Du Pont family was listed as giving the huge total of $138,745 to the Republicans, nothing to the Democrats. In that same year, General Motors executives were listed as giving $163,250 to the Republicans, nothing to the Democrats. Total from the two groups, $301,995.

Senator Byrd, nominally a Democrat, has either voted or worked against his own Democratic national ticket in the last three elections and for the Republicans.

In addition to the amounts listed in national elections, the Du Pont family sprinkled money lavishly in various States, from South Dakota to Delaware, to elect local Senate and congressional candidates. None of these contributions was tax-exempt. But the effect of the Byrd legislation would give the Du Ponts and General Motors benefits far greater than the generous gifts to Republican campaigns.

[From the Evening Star, Jan. 17, 1962]

Wild Blue Yonder

If Columnist Drew Pearson is right, it follows that Virginia's Senator Byrd is a scoundrel and that the bill to regulate the tax bite on Du Pont's divestiture of its General Motors stock, as decreed by the Supreme Court in its recent antitrust ruling, is a thoroughly iniquitous piece of legislation.

Mr. Pearson, however, is not right. In this particular flight into the wild blue yonder he is about as far off the beam as a man can get.

He says that the bill which Senator Byrd is sponsoring as chairman of the Senate Finance Committee would reverse the antitrust case and the Supreme Court. This is complete nonsense. He also says that Democratic Senator Byrd is championing Federal relief for millionaires, that the biggest tax break under the bill would go to members of the Du Pont family through a holding company called Christiana, and he implies that the Virginia Senator is trying to perpetuate this outrage to reward Du Pont and General Motors executives for political contributions made to Republicans.

Among pertinent facts which the columnist ignores are these: This bill is not a measure that Senator Byrd personally is trying to ram through Congress in the dark of the night. A nearly unanimous House Ways and Means Committee, after hearings, reported it out at the last session and it was approved overwhelmingly in the House. The Senate Finance Committee endorsed it with only two dissenting votes. The Treasury and Justice Departments, while presumably not enthusiastic about the measure, have said they have no objection to it provided it is made clear, as has been done, that there is no intent to impose any particular method of stock divestiture on the courts.

What about the millionaires? Under this bill the big stockholders in Christiana, according to Senator Williams, Republican, of Delaware, will pay practically all of the tax in event of divestiture to its stockholders. Also according to Senator Williams: "The more than 50,000 employees of the Du Pont Co. who purchased stock under their company's stock purchase plan—and most of that stock has been purchased since 1950—will be exempt from all taxation under this bill. Under this bill we shift the tax burden to those who the committee feels are best able to pay the tax—that is, those who have the least cost factor and the largest amount of gain."

This is a complex measure and there are, of course, arguments against it, such as those advanced by Senators Gore and Douglas. It is also a very important measure, however, and it should be voted up or down on its merits—not on the baseless suggestion that it is something dreamed up by Senator Byrd to further line the pockets of a handful of Republican millionaires.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 25, 1962]

Du Pont Controversy

Controversy may be expected to continue to swirl around the Du Pont bill, but it is easy to see why it has passed both the House and Senate. Legislators rallied around the bill because they came to believe that it will protect small investors against discriminatory taxation and that it will aid an orderly transfer of the 63 million shares of General Motors common stock of which E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. must divest itself under court order. The bill is not intended to thwart enforcement of the antitrust laws; rather, it expresses a strong belief that the rank and file of investors should not be hurt in the process.

If Du Pont should distribute the GM shares of its stockholders, under the present law, they would have to pay income taxes on the value of the stock as if it were current income. It is generally conceded that this would be unfair, since the stock is really capital which is being technically shifted from one owner to another solely because of the court decree. Under the bill, the recipients of General Motors stock from Du Pont will be taxed on their capital gains, if and when they sell their stock. This is no windfall or special privilege. It merely leaves the investor in the position he would have occupied if he had originally divided his funds between General Motors and Du Pont shares.

The major controversy arose over the treatment accorded the Christiana Securities Co., a holding company which owns 29 percent of all the stock in the Du Pont Co. Under the present law only a light tax would be imposed on the transfer of General Motors shares from Du Pont to Christiana. Congress more than doubled this in the bill it passed, but Senator Douglas' amendment designed to levy capital gains taxes against the holding company, on the same basis as if it were an individual, went down to defeat. Sponsors of that amendment fear that enactment of the bill without it will encourage Judge LaBuy, who is now drafting the final antitrust decree, to allow Christiana to pass on to its own shareholders the 18 million shares of General Motors stock it may receive. These Christiana shareholders are largely members of the Du Pont family. The effect would be, it is said, to leave the Du Ponts in control of General Motors, thus defeating the purpose of the Department of Justice in bringing its antitrust case in the first place.

More will be heard of this aspect of the case. The Senate was arguing for delay until Judge LaBuy's ruling has been handed down. If President Kennedy signs the bill, however, the judge will at least have the advantage of a definite statute before him. That might help him to decide whether the Du Ponts should be allowed to receive their share of the General Motors stock as individuals or whether the equivalent should be paid to them in cash. While the controversy on this point continues, it is a relief to know that rank and file investors will not be penalized by a high policy decision over which they had no control.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM — ORDER FOR THE CALL OF THE CALENDAR ON WEDNESDAY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, I should like to direct a question to the distinguished majority leader and see what he anticipates with respect to the amendments that have been filed to the pending bill and also what he would like to cover for the remainder of the week before Senators depart from town on the Lincoln tour.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, in response to the question raised by the distinguished minority leader, I think that I should call to the attention of the Senate the fact that a specific agreement has been entered into that there will be no votes on the 9th, 10th, 11th, 12th, and 13th of this month. That is Friday through Tuesday.

We cannot give definite assurance that there will not be votes on the 8th or the 14th, the period preceding and following the Lincoln's birthday recess, so-called. It is hoped that it may be possible to dispose of S. 1241, the pending business, tonight, even if it means remaining in session until a reasonably late hour in the evening. However, the Senate will not be pushed on this question. If the bill cannot be disposed of within a reasonable period of time, of course, consideration will be resumed tomorrow.

Tomorrow, if necessary, consideration of the bill, S. 1241, will continue; and on the completion of consideration of that measure, the Senate will turn to S. 2520, a bill to amend the Welfare and Pension Plans and Disclosure Act with respect to the method of enforcement and to provide certain additional sanctions, and for other purposes.

I have talked with the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen] about this particular subject. I announce on our behalf that it is our present intention to consider the money resolutions on the calendar on Wednesday next. I hope most sincerely that the items on the calendar to which there is no objection can be disposed of at that time. In that respect I hope that the unanimous-consent request which I am about to make will be granted.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, at the conclusion of the morning business, there be a call of the calendar for the consideration of measures to which there is no objection, beginning with Calendar No. 1142.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. To summarize the proposed legislative program, we shall continue to consider the bill now before the Senate until action has been completed.

We shall follow consideration of that bill with consideration of the bill S. 2520, a bill to amend the Welfare and Pension Plan and Disclosure Act with respect to the method of enforcement and supervise certain additional sanctions, and for other purposes.

On Wednesday we shall take up the items on the calendar to which there is no objection and also the money resolutions about which announcement has already been made. That is all I have to announce.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, for further clarification, I understand that the distinguished Senator from

Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] has an amendment that he desires to offer. I am wondering whether he intends to press the amendment, and how long a period of time consideration of the amendment might take.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Madam President, I contemplate pressing the amendment. It is an amendment which would strike from the bill title II, which would create grants for scholarships as distinguished from loans, as set forth in the National Defense Act. I believe I ought to have at least an hour to present the amendment. I do not think I shall take that length of time, but others may wish to participate in the debate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, I am informed that an effort will be made to table some of the proposed amendments that may be offered. I believe that the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] has an amendment, and I presume he will be pressing that amendment, also.

Mr. ERVIN. Madam President, I have an amendment which would strike out the proposal that the Government make loans out of tax money to private nonprofit colleges. I believe that my amendment is a highly important one, because, as I see it, it would prevent Congress from violating the plain precepts of the establishment of religion clause of the first amendment. Under the bill as it is now phrased the Federal Government would be authorized to make loans not only to church schools which blend a secular and sectarian education, but it would actually be authorized to make loans to theological institutions, whose sole function is to train their students to be Protestant clergymen, Catholic priests, or Jewish rabbis.

I do not believe that provisions of this kind can be reconciled with the clause of the first amendment to the Constitution relating to religion. It may be that Senators other than myself will assume the same position I take, and there may be considerable discussion on the amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have a question to address to the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair reminds Senators that the Senate is still in the morning hour. Is there objection to a continuation of the present colloquy? The Chair hears none. The Senator from Illinois may proceed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, I believe that the distinguished Senator from New York has an amendment that is jointly sponsored by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY]. Does the Senator from New York expect to press that amendment?

Mr. KEATING. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What about the time factor?

Mr. KEATING. I will let the distinguished Senator from Vermont speak for me on that question.

Mr. PROUTY. I think we shall require at least 2 hours, which would be divided jointly, in order to explain our amendment thoroughly.

Mr. KEATING. The amendment is somewhat like the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Ohio. Our amendment seeks to convert the proposed scholarships into loans and then to provide for an extension of the forgiveness provisions in the National Defense Education Act in two respects: First, to allow teachers in any school to have the loans; secondly, to provide that if a student is in the upper quarter of his class, he may receive a forgiveness up to 50 percent of the loan. So the amendment would require a little discussion on our side.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, I yield the floor on that point.

AID FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair lay before the Senate the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1241) to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities and to authorize scholarships for undergraduate study in such institutions.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 12 strike out lines 18 through 20, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

> (2) The term "academic facilities" shall not include (A) any facility intended primarily for events for which admission is to be charged to the general public, (B) any facility used or to be used for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship, or (C) any facility which (although not a facility described in the preceding clause) is used or to be used primarily in connection with any part of the program of a school or department of divinity. For the purposes of this subparagraph, the term "school or department of divinity" means an institution, or a department or branch of an institution, whose program is specifically for the education of students to prepare them to become ministers of religion or to enter upon some other religious vocation or to prepare them to teach theological subjects.

Mr. MORSE. The amendment is offered in my behalf as chairman of the Subcommittee on Education and on behalf of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], as chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I should like to have the amendment show the joint authorship of it by the senior Senator from Oregon and the senior Senator from Alabama.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, there is pending before the Senate now an amendment which I offered a few minutes ago on behalf of the senior Senator from Oregon and the senior Senator from Alabama. In our opinion, the amendment provides thorough and ample constitutional safeguards to the loan program authorized under title I of the bill.

Madam President, the amendment is a definition amendment. The Senator from Alabama and I, in our capacities as leaders on the floor of the higher education bill, believe the amendment is essential for the clarification of the bill and the strengthening of the bill.

The amendment speaks for itself in large part. It incorporates the safeguards on the loan program which appear in the House-passed version of the bill.

I wish to read the language from the House bill, which appears at page 23, at line 25 of H.R. 8900, as follows:

> (2) The term "academic facilities" shall not include (A) any facility intended primarily for events for which admission is to be charged to the general public, or any gymnasium or other facility specially designed for physical education or athletic or recreational activities, or (B) any facility used or to be used for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship, or (C) any facility which (although not a facility described in the preceding clause) is used or to be used primarily in connection with any part of the program of a school or department of divinity. For the purposes of this subparagraph, the term "school or department of divinity" means an institution, or a department or branch of an institution, whose program is specifically for the education of students to prepare them to become ministers of religion or to enter upon some other religious vocation or to prepare them to teach theological subjects.

I note particularly that under the Morse-Hill amendment, if it is adopted, the term "academic facilities" shall not include (1) any facilities used or to be used for sectarian instruction or as a place of religious workship or (2) any facility which although not a facility described under (1) above is used or to be used primarily in connection with any part of a program of a school or department of divinity.

Much concern has been expressed, and in my judgment, will be expressed in this debate, over the constitutional provisions and the interpretation of the constitutional provisions in the context of the first amendment. I would point out to the Senate that loans for restricted purposes are currently being made to nonprofit private schools under title III of the National Defense Education Act.

Twelve percent of each appropriation for the acquisition of science, mathematics, or foreign language equipment—or minor remodeling of space for such equipment—is required to be allotted by the Commissioner of Education for loans to private, nonprofit, elementary, and secondary schools. Affiliation or nonaffiliation with a religious organization is immaterial. The loans are authorized to enable the borrowing school to acquire equipment of the types referred to above—and do minor remodeling—and must bear interest at marketable obligations of the United States, adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of 1 percent. Such loans must mature within 10 years.

I point out to the Senate that in the committee amendments to S. 2345, the National Defense Education Act amendments, which are pending on the calendar, the committee has specifically previously excluded from section 305(a) classrooms for religious purposes and that, therefore, the amendment I am now offering is in harmony with the position taken by the committee in that other important portion of the President's educational program.

As a similar parallel in NDEA committee amendments, I cite the prohibition placed in title IV of the NDEA fellowship program, which denies fellowships to any individual for study at a school or department of divinity or religion. No fellowship in that S. 2345 amendment can be awarded any individual for study in religious or theological subjects.

Madam President, it has become quite apparent that in this gray area of constitutional interpretation of church-state relationships, there is an ever-growing need for a definitive statement by the Supreme Court of the United States upon the meaning of the first amendment with respect to the aid which can be given to the nonpublic sectors of all education, elementary and secondary, as well as higher education.

The distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and I have jointly introduced a bill, S. 1482, which would provide procedures to insure cutting through the constitutional snarl. It is my hope that in this session it will be possible for the Senate to have the opportunity to act upon this bill, because it will, if enacted, go far to remove the ambiguities presently existing. That, however, is suitable for debate at another time.

The opening statements on S. 1241 have been presented by many Senators. I wish to thank them all for the courtesy and help that they have been to the committee and to the Senate. We now approach the period for the offering of amendments previously submitted, and this is the first amendment which the committee wishes to have the Senate consider.

Madam President, I have discussed this amendment at great length with the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. We believe the amendment will clarify the definition sections of the bill and will bring it into an alinement with the House bill in the matter of definition. In my judgment, quite frankly, it will avoid serious difficulties within the conference, because the House and the Senate would then stand together, making it perfectly clear that none of the money provided in the bill by way of a loan may go to any religious activity of any private institution.

I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. ERVIN. Madam President, does the Senator from Oregon expect to ask for a vote on the amendment soon?

Mr. MORSE. The amendment is now before the Senate. I have called up the amendment on behalf of the Senator from Alabama and myself.

Mr. ERVIN. Madam President, I wish to speak against the amendment. I believe it to be a confession of the truth of my assertion that the bill in its original form is a violation of the establishment-of-religion clause of the first amendment.

In order for me to speak against the amendment, it will be necessary for me to state my position at some length in respect to the bill in its original form. During the course of my remarks, I shall refer to three decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States. Those decisions are as follows: First, the case of Everson against Board of Education of the township of Ewing and others, which is reported in 330 U.S. Reports, beginning at page 1; second, the case of McCollum against Board of Education, which is reported in 333 U.S. Reports at page 203; and third, the case of Zorach against Clauson and others, constituting the Board of Education of the City of New York, which is reported in 343 U.S. Reports at page 306.

I consider the first of these decisions, the decision in the Everson case, to be so important to an understanding in respect to what is involved in the original bill, in respect to the amendment which I have offered to strike out certain portions of the bill, and in respect to the amendment offered by the able and distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], that I think it ought to be included in the body of the RECORD, so that any persons who are interested in the debate may have the benefit of what the decision recites. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the complete text of the decision of the Supreme Court in the Everson case be printed in the body of the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I believe in education. I believe in the purposes which prompt the proponents of the bill, so far as they seek to afford the youth of this land an opportunity to procure an education. I think I have illustrated throughout my life my devotion to the cause of education. As a citizen, as a member of the board of trustees of the public schools of my community, as a member of the board of trustees of the University of North Carolina, and as a member of the board of trustees of a private, nonprofit institution of higher learning, Davidson College, I have done everything within my power to assist education, both at the grade school level and at the collegiate and university levels.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield?

Mr. ERVIN. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. In my capacity as chairman of the Subcommittee on Education, I wish to say to the Senator's constituents in North Carolina that although the Senator and I may disagree on this particular segment of the bill, I testify that the Senator from North Carolina has been a tower of strength and assistance to me many, many times in connection with education legislation. There is no question in my mind as to the support the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] has given to us many times in our efforts to do what we can to strengthen the development of the minds of the young people of this country. The Senator from North Carolina has shared my view and has supported me many times on the proposition that one of the things which confronts our country in the great contest between freedom and totalitarianism is the need to strengthen one of our great defense weapons. This defense weapon is the educational system of the United States.

So, Mr. President, at the beginning of what may be a disagreement in regard to an amendment, I wish him to know that I shall disagree with him with reluctance, but I greatly appreciate the help he has been to me on issue after issue.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I greatly appreciate the courteous remarks of the Senator from Oregon; and I wish to practice reciprocity to the extent of saying that I know of no American of our generation who has shown more devotion to the cause of education at all levels than has the able and distinguished senior Senator from Oregon. Not only has he demonstrated this in the career he selected for himself before he became a Member of the Senate, but he has also demonstrated it time and time again in his activities in the Senate in behalf of the cause of education.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from North Carolina very much for his flattering generosity.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I would also like to say, as evidence of my devotion to the cause of education, that as a member of the North Carolina State Legislature, I have supported bills making liberal appropriations for the education of the children of North Carolina; and as a Member of the U.S. Senate, I have twice voted for Federal aid to the public schools of the several States, under bills which specify that there shall be no Federal control, and that such aid shall be extended to public schools only.

Mr. President, I also have a deep conviction and respect for the place of religion in the life of the people of this Nation. I think our country today stands in need of the robust faith of our forefathers. I believe that we in America would be absolutely secure against the threat which imperils the very survival of our country and the survival of the rest of the free world if we had such a robust faith. This would be true because in that event we could certainly keep our hearts in the necessary courage and patience and lift up our hands with the necessary strength at all times. We need a faith which teaches us that as the stars in their courses fought against Sisera in the days of the Old Testament, there is an Almighty God who is going to fight against any men who seek to extinguish the lights of liberty all around this earth, as do the leaders of communism.

Mr. President, since I will discuss to some extent religious education, I should like to call attention to what I consider the primary source of religious education; namely, the Bible. I wish to call attention to some of the beautiful words and sublime observations to be found in the King James version of the Bible, with reference to the character of the temptations which assail us. Believing as I do in education and its importance to our Nation, I must confess that I sought for some way which I thought would justify me in voting for the provisions of this bill which undertake to extend long-term loans to private, nonprofit institutions of higher learning.

Mr. President, one thing that the King James version of the Bible teaches us is that the temptations which are presented to us never come to us in an ugly fashion; they always present to us something that is desirable.

So in this case a temptation confronts us. Frankly, I was strongly tempted to vote for the pending bill, notwithstanding my misgivings about it, because of my devotion to the cause of education and because of my conviction that our country can remain great only if its youth are educated.

It is a strange paradox, however, that the temptation which came to me to vote for this bill in its original form, notwithstanding the provisions which would allow the Federal government to make loans to private, nonprofit colleges, is strikingly similar in character to the first temptation recorded in the King James version of the Bible. I wish to read from Genesis, chapter 3, verses 1 through 6:

> Now the serpent was more subtil than any beast of the field which the Lord God had made. And he said unto the woman, Yea, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden?
>
> And the woman said unto the serpent, We may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden:
>
> But of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die.
>
> And the serpent said unto the woman, Ye shall not surely die:
>
> For God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil.
>
> And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat, and gave also unto her husband with her; and he did eat.

Mr. President, this bill in its present form presents a temptation strikingly similar in nature to that which the serpent presented to Eve. We are told that if we commit constitutional evil by ignoring the provisions of the first amendment of the Constitution, educational good will result.

That is exactly what the serpent said to Eve. He said, "If you will just disobey the Lord and eat of the fruit of the tree in the midst of the garden, you shall have knowledge. You shall know good from evil." And Eve succumbed to the temptation, because she was convinced that the fruit of the tree which grew in the midst of the garden would make her wise.

And so we are presented here in this bill with the temptation to do constitutional evil in order that our youth may acquire knowledge and become wise.

I maintain that this bill in its present form will enable the Federal Government to use tax moneys for the benefit of private, nonprofit colleges and universities which are affiliated with churches and which are engaged, either directly or indirectly, in the teaching of the tenets and the faiths of the churches with which they are affiliated.

I maintain that this bill will enable the Federal Government to use tax moneys for the benefit of institutions of higher learning which blend secular and sectarian education.

I maintain that the bill in its present form would even authorize the Federal Government to make loans of money for the purpose of acquiring land and erecting on such land classrooms and other educational facilities for theological seminaries whose sole function is to train their students to be Protestant clergymen or Catholic priests or Jewish rabbis.

I maintain that the amendment proposed by the Senators from Oregon and Alabama constitutes a confession of the soundness of my views in these respects.

I assert that the amendment now under consideration affords no protection whatever against the threatened use of Federal tax moneys for the dissemination of religious instruction.

Why do I say that? I say it is true for two reasons. In the first place, the Supreme Court of the United States has developed a doctrine which seems to bar the courthouse door against any American who attempts to call in question the constitutionality of any use of Federal moneys. As I read its decisions, the Supreme Court of the United States holds, in substance, that the interest of each individual American taxpayer in Federal moneys appropriated for any use is so infinitesimal that he cannot raise the question of the constitutionality of their use.

Any violation of the terms of the amendment proposed by the Senators from Oregon and Alabama cannot be called into question in the courts of the United States by reason of this rule adopted by the Supreme Court of the United States during recent years. That is the first reason why the amendment is ineffective and inadequate.

The amendment is ineffective and inadequate for a second reason. It has no sanction in it. While it expresses, in a sense, a pious hope that none of the institutions which are devoted to teaching the tenets and faiths of churches will use any of the property they acquire under the loans for that purpose, it contains no provision whatsoever whereby they can be compelled to abide by that pious hope.

It is to be remembered that the value of any law is no higher than the sanction provided for the enforcement of that law; and there is no provision in the pending amendment for any enforcement of the pious hope that institutions benefited by the loans will not violate the first amendment to the Constitution.

The land to be acquired as sites for academic facilities under the bill is to be held in fee simple by the religious institutions involved. The buildings which will be constructed upon those lands will also be owned in fee simple by those religious institutions. There is no method whatever, either under the decisions of the Supreme Court or under the terms of the proposed amendment, providing any way in which what I say is a pious hope expressed in the amendment can be made an actuality.

What is going to happen after the buildings are constructed and after the loans are paid? It is absurd to express a pious hope in this legislative proposal that colleges shall use certain buildings for certain purposes and not for other purposes without any means or procedure being available to enforce it.

If we are to appraise aright the current demands for Federal tax aid to church schools, we must begin with a study of history. This is true because we can understand the institutions and laws of today only if we know the historical events out of which they arise.

The most heart-rending story of history is that of man's struggle against civil and ecclesiastical tyranny for the simple right to bow his own knees before his own God in his own way.

As one of America's wisest jurists of all time, the late Chief Justice Walter P. Stacy, of the Supreme Court of North Carolina, declared in the opinion he wrote in *State* v. *Beal* (199 N.C. 278):

> For some reason, too deep to fathom, men contend more furiously over the road to heaven, which they cannot see, than over their visible walks on earth [and] It would be almost unbelievable, if history did not record the tragic fact, that men have gone to war and cut each other's throats because they could not agree as to what was to become of them after their throats were cut.

The Founding Fathers who wrote the Constitution of the United States were acutely aware of these truths.

They saw with the eyes of history the cruelties of the Spanish Inquisition, the massacre of the Huguenots of France, the slaughter of the Waldensians in the Alpine valleys of Italy, the hanging and jailing of English and Irish Catholics by Protestant England, the hunting down of the Covenanters upon the crags and moors of Scotland, the branding, hanging, and whipping of Quakers and the banishing of Baptists by Puritan Massachusetts, and the hundreds of other atrocities committed in the name of religion.

The Founding Fathers knew, moreover, that even during their own lifetimes those who did not conform to the doctrines and practices of the churches established by law in the places they lived, such as Scotch-Irish Presbyterians in Ulster, Catholics in England and Ireland, and dissenters in various American colonies, had been barred from civil and military offices because of their faiths, had been compelled to pay tithes for the propagation of religious opinions they disbelieved, and had had their marriages annulled and their children adjudged illegitimate for daring to speak their marriage vows before ministers of their own faiths, rather than before clergymen of the established churches.

The Founding Fathers were determined that none of these tragic historical events should be repeated in the Nation they were creating.

To this end, they inserted two provisions in the Constitution of the United States.

The first of these provisions appears in article 6, and declares that "no religious Test shall ever be required as a Qualification to any Office or public Trust under the United States."

The second appears in the first amendment, and states that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

These provisions embody in the Constitution the abiding conviction of the Founding Fathers that the complete and permanent separation of the spheres of religious activity and civil authority is best for religion and best for the state.

I cherish the constitutional principle of the separation of church and state as the most precious part of our heritage as Americans. It must be preserved if liberty of any kind is to endure. This is true because political liberty cannot exist where any church dictates to the state and religious liberty cannot exist where the state interferes with religion.

I cannot reconcile the provisions of title I of the pending bill, S. 1241, authorizing loans for construction of academic facilities to private nonprofit institutions of higher learning, with the establishment-of-religion clause of the first amendment. This is true because a very large proportion of these private nonprofit institutions of higher learning are either owned by churches or are controlled by churches for the purpose of teaching to their students either directly or indirectly the tenets and the faiths of the churches which own or control them.

Many of these institutions of higher learning bar from their faculties any teachers except those who have been trained in the instruction of youth in the tenets and faith of the religion of the institutions.

One of the great judges of the Supreme Court of the United States, the late Justice Robert M. Jackson, made an observation which should be cherished by those of us who believe that some things belong to Caesar and other things belong to God, and that the things of Caesar should be controlled by Caesar and that the things of God should be controlled by God. He stated in his separate opinion in the Zorach case that "what should be rendered to God does not need to be decided and collected by Caesar."

I charge that the bill in its present form undertakes to do precisely what Justice Jackson said in that separate opinion ought not to be done; it undertakes to let Caesar decide what should be done and what sums should be collected for the purpose of rendering to God a means of instructing persons in religion.

A few moments ago I made the statement that if we are to understand the institutions and laws of today we must know the events of yesterday which brought them into being.

If we are to understand the purpose and the meaning of the establishment-of-religion clause of the first amendment, we must know the history of the drafting and adoption of that clause. In a general way I have discussed the history which inspired the Founding Fathers to believe that it was essential to keep separate the spheres of civil government and religion.

The author of the establishment-of-religion clause of the first amendment was James Madison, who was in a sense a disciple of Thomas Jefferson. James Madison collaborated with Thomas Jefferson in the solution of the basic problem which is dealt with in the establishment-of-religion clause of the first amendment. James Madison and Thomas Jefferson acted together in the great fight in Virginia which preceded the establishment of this Republic. Thomas Jefferson drafted what is known as the Virginia statute for religious freedom, and James Madison piloted the statute through the Legislature of Virginia. The statute was designed to end for all time in Virginia the practice of compelling the people of that State to pay taxes or tithes for the support of the established church. Jefferson's and Madison's fight to prevent the levying of taxes to aid religion arose from the conviction of their supporters that individual religious liberty could be achieved best under a government which was stripped of all power to tax, to support, or otherwise to assist any or all religions or to interfere with the beliefs of any religious individual or group.

I think it is interesting to note the importance Thomas Jefferson attributed to the Virginia statute for religious freedom.

This statute decreed that in Virginia, there should be a separation of church and state, and it contained a declaration that to compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of opinions which he disbelieves is sinful and tyrannical.

Thomas Jefferson's appraisal of the importance of the statute of Virginia for religious freedom, and its declaration that to compel a man to make contributions of money for the propagation of opinions which he disbelieves is sinful and tyrannical, is shown by the epitaph inscribed upon his gravestone. This epitaph was approved, if not written, by Thomas Jefferson himself before his death. At that time Thomas Jefferson had been honored many times by his generation. He had been a member of the State Legislature of Virginia. He had been twice elected Governor of the State of Virginia. He had served in the Continental Congress. He had represented our country as Minister to France.

He had been Secretary of State in the Cabinet of George Washington. He had been elected Vice President of the United States under John Adams, and he had twice been elected to the highest office within the gift of our people, the Presidency of the United States. Yet when Thomas Jefferson approved the epitaph which he wished to mark for all time his last resting place, he did not consider any of the honors which had been paid to him by his generation to be the things which he wished to have himself remembered for by future generations of our country. So the epitaph which marks his last resting place reads as follows:

> Here was buried Thomas Jefferson, author of the Declaration of American Independence; of the Statute of Virginia for Religious Liberty; and father of the University of Virginia.

Thomas Jefferson did not care whether he was remembered for the honors which he had received and the offices which he had held, but he wanted Americans to remember for all time that he was the author of the statute of Virginia for religious freedom.

I have mentioned the fact that Thomas Jefferson's protege, James Madison, was the author of the establishment-of-religion clause of the first amendment.

Irving Brant has recently written a book entitled "James Madison, Father of the Constitution." Chapter 21 of that book is entitled "The Bill of Rights," and describes in detail the activities of Madison as a Member of the first Congress in drafting and seeking to secure the adoption of the establishment-of-religion clause of the first amendment. On page 268 of that book Mr. Brant stated:

> Religious freedom was Madison's first concern, both in drafting his amendments and in the deliberations which now ensued.

The author then tells us in detail of the various drafts which were made of the proposed clause and he makes it crystal clear that James Madison's main objective was to secure an amendment barring all sort of Federal support of religion.

On pages 271 and 272 of this book, the author tells us that the Members of the House were unable to agree upon a draft of the clause and that a conference committee was appointed to reconcile the different proposed drafts. He tells us how this drafting committee, of which Madison was a member, came up with the wording of the clause as it now appears in the first amendment:

> Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

The author then tells us that this was written by Madison, and he says this, in addition:

> Of all the versions af the religious guarantee, this most directly covered the thing he was aiming at, absolute separation of church and state and total exclusion of Government aid to religion.

I have referred at length to the statute of Virginia for religious freedom, because historians and courts unite in the conviction that the purpose of the first amendment is virtually identical with the objective of the statute of Virginia for religious freedom. I wish to quote on this point these words of the Supreme Court from page 13 of the Everson case:

> This Court has previously recognized that the provisions of the first amendment, in

the drafting and adoption of which Madison and Jefferson played such leading roles, had the same objective and were intended to provide the same protection against governmental intrusion on religious liberty as the Virginia statute.

This brings us to this inquiry: What does the establishment-of-religion clause of the first amendment do? What is its purpose? What does it provide?

The general purpose of the clause is to keep the hands of the state out of religion, and to keep religion's hands off the state. That is its overall objective. The Founding Fathers so provided because they knew from their study of history that we cannot have political liberty where the state is controlled by religion, and that we cannot have religious liberty where religion is controlled by the state.

To effect this general purpose, the establishment-of-religion clause of the first amendment does two things: First, it strips the Government of all power to tax, to support, or otherwise to assist any or all religions; second, it forbids the Government to interfere with the beliefs of any religious individual or group.

We are concerned primarily here with the first of these objectives, because the provisions of the pending bill, I respectfully submit, which allow Federal loans to church-owned or church-controlled institutions of higher learning offend the first specific objective, namely, the objective embodied in the provision which strips the Government of all power to tax, to support, or otherwise to assist any or all religions.

Those words are not my words. I borrow them from page 11 of the decision in the Everson case, where it states in express words that the people in Virginia supported the statute for religious freedom, whose principles were later embodied in the first amendment to the Constitution, because they had "reached the conclusion that individual liberty could be achieved best under a government which was stripped of all power to tax, to support, or otherwise to assist any or all religions, or to interfere with the beliefs of any religious individual or group."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, would it be convenient for the Senator from North Carolina to yield to me at this point in his address?

Mr. ERVIN. Yes; I should be delighted to yield to the able and distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I notice that the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina is directed to prohibiting loans to any private institution of higher education, and would instead confine them solely to public institutions.

Mr. ERVIN. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I ask my good friend from North Carolina if he is not aware of the fact that there are many private colleges and universities which do not have a religious affiliation?

Mr. ERVIN. I am aware of that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. For example, a great many colleges in this country, such as Bowdoin, Williams, Harvard, Yale, Amherst, Oberlin, Grinnell, Beloit, Whitman, Pomona, Colorado, and others were originally started by the Congregational Church, but I think over the passage of time without exception all of these religious connections have been severed, and they are undenominational. They are Protestant, I suppose, in their general orientation, but they are undenominational. As I read the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina, these too would be barred from receiving loans as well as those which have a distinctly doctrinal or religious connection.

Mr. ERVIN. Yes; that is correct. I may say to the Senator from Illinois that if I had been drafting the bill, which I did not, and had been a member of the committee which I was not, I would probably have favored an amendment which would take care of colleges and universities of that character. The Senator from Illinois knows that many times we must work here under terrible pressure. I did not know the provisions of the pending bill and did not have an opportunity to study them until the bill was brought to the floor. So I drafted my amendment as I did for two reasons.

In the first place, under the existing interpretations of the establishment-of-religion clause of the first amendment, public colleges are forbidden to teach the tenets and faiths of any religious denominations.

As a consequence, my amendment would make it certain that there would be no violation of the first amendment, either now or in the future, by restricting the loans to public colleges. In the second place, I was compelled to draw my amendment under the impediment of a lack of time. I would have supported a proposal distinguishing between the two classes of private nonprofit colleges if the committee had drawn a distinction to that effect in its bill. The time at my disposal did not permit me to draw the distinction.

So I had to draw my amendment as I did because I realized that a very large proportion of all private nonprofit colleges either are owned by churches or are controlled by churches and engage in a blending of secular and religious teaching.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am not blaming the Senator from North Carolina in the slightest; but before Congress adopts his amendment—if it does—does he not think it would be well if we guarded against this difficulty, at least?

Mr. ERVIN. I agree with the Senator from Illinois. In the event Congress adopts my amendment, I think it would be appropriate to re-refer the bill to the committee with specific instructions to take care of the situation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Then is it the purpose of the Senator from North Carolina to have the bill recommitted to the committee? Is this merely a smokescreen in order to prevent action upon the bill?

Mr. ERVIN. No. I am engaging in no smokescreen activity. I do not care to recommit the bill to the committee. However, I would be willing to do so for that one purpose.

When I became a Member of the Senate, I took an oath that I would support the Constitution. In my honest judgment, for me to support the bill in its present form would be a violation of my oath to support the Constitution. Therefore, I offered an amendment which would make it certain, as I see it, that I am not violating my oath to support the Constitution.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Without wishing to make any derogatory comment about my very dear friend, the distinguished Senator from North Carolina, for whom I have the greatest respect, what he seems to be saying thus far is that because of defects in the draftsmanship of his own amendment, he believes the bill ought to be referred back to committee for further study. I suggest that the Senator from North Carolina study his own amendment a little more carefully and present it in the light of his own convictions.

Mr. ERVIN. If I ever get a moment of leisure, I will certainly do that. Frankly, I had to draw this amendment on Saturday. I did not have an opportunity to study the bill before that time. I did not imagine that a committee of the Senate would report a bill predicated on the thesis that constitutional evil ought to be done in order to accomplish educational good. So I did not anticipate what happened.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from North Carolina is always gracious. Would he be willing to yield for a further question?

Mr. ERVIN. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator from North Carolina think the first amendment to the Constitution would be violated by the Federal Government making low-interest loans for the construction of buildings in which sciences, mathematics, and foreign languages would be taught, and which would also provide recreational and possibly lunchroom facilities? Is there a Protestant or a Catholic system of mathematics or of science or of physical exercise? Do we have a Baptist, Methodist, or Episcopalian algebra or French grammar? Are not these subjects which do not have any religious connotation? Philosophy, possibly, yes; but I fail to see how the other subjects I have mentioned involve religion.

Mr. ERVIN. The Senator from Illinois has propounded to me a question which I think I could answer in an adequate manner provided I took 3 or 4 hours, which I do not intend to do. I was just reaching the point, when I first yielded to the Senator from Illinois, where I was about to discuss what the first amendment actually does—not what I say it does, but what the Supreme Court says it does. I think I will make my position clear with respect to those points in just a moment. I would say to the Senator from Illinois, however, that the Supreme Court of the United States has said on two occasions that Government cannot support schools which blend secular and sectarian education. That is exactly what would be done under the bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I merely wish to ask the Senator if he believes that a sectarian education is blended with secular education if one studies calculus or differential equations or chemistry or astronomy or French grammar or conversational German or Italian literature. How can the establishment of religion be involved in the construction of buildings where such subjects as those are to be taught?

Mr. ERVIN. The answer to that question is relatively simple. Where an institution undertakes to teach students both calculus and religion, it blends secular and sectarian education. I refer the Senator for an answer to that question to a decision which arose in litigation between persons in Illinois—the McCollum case.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In other words, does the Senator maintain that if in one building philosophy and religion are taught, and in another building mathematics is taught, the teaching of religion in the one building will inevitably affect the teaching of differential and integral calculus in the other?

Mr. ERVIN. I think the Senator from Illinois, as have the rest of us, has read much lately about a dance called the twist. The Senator from Illinois is doing a little intellectual twisting. He asked the Senator from North Carolina about courses of instruction. Now the Senator from Illinois is twisting to convert his inquiry into one about buildings.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The amendment involves only buildings; it does not involve instruction. It is the Senator from North Carolina who is doing the twisting.

Mr. ERVIN. Yes, it involves buildings; but the first amendment to the Constitution involves what is taught in those buildings.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The first amendment relates to the establishment of religion. I must say that I heartily agree with the amendment; but I do not believe it should be twisted out of its original purpose or its commonsense application.

Mr. ERVIN. Unless the Senator from Illinois has some further questions, I shall resume my discussion to show that I am not attempting to twist the matter under discussion out of its constitutional aspects but, on the contrary, am attempting to show that I am entirely in harmony with what James Madison and the Supreme Court said about the first amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall await with interest the comments of the Senator from North Carolina. I know it is sometimes annoying to be asked questions before one completes one's presentation; but having suffered at the hands of others in the same manner, and at times the Senator from North Carolina has been very adept in propounding questions which he has asked me prior to my development of a point, I feel quite confident that with his usual good humor he will not object to my asking these questions.

Mr. ERVIN. I am always delighted to yield to my good friend from Illinois. I will bear witness to the fact that he has always been willing to yield to me. Despite the fact that sometimes the Senator from Illinois does not entertain the same sound opinions I do on some of the questions we discuss, I have a deep affection for the Senator from Illinois and profound respect for his judgment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from North Carolina. I shall await with interest his exposition of 3 or 4 hours to deal with the question I have propounded, which the Senator from North Carolina has said he would need in order to reply fully.

Mr. ERVIN. I shall not undertake to answer that question, because it involves many points which have no germaneness to what is really in question here. I wish to make this assertion: The establishment-of-religion clause of the first amendment outlaws the use of all Federal funds for religious purposes. Everybody I know concedes that the Government is not allowed to take tax money and give it away directly for the teaching of religion. I think all of us agree on that point.

Mr. President, I have referred on several occasions to the Everson case. I wish to say that on the first aspect of the establishment-of-religion clause of the first amendment, tax-raised funds cannot be used for the support of an institution which teaches the tenets and the faith of any church. In that connection I invite attention to page 16 of the opinion in the Everson case:

> New Jersey cannot consistently, with the establishment-of-religion clause of the first amendment, contribute tax-raised funds to the support of an institution which teaches the tenets and faith of any church.

I take it there is no controversy of any character with respect to the soundness of that proposition. The Everson case dealt with a New Jersey statute; and the opinion in that case—as, indeed, the opinions of the Supreme Court in other cases—states that the first amendment is made applicable to the States by the 14th amendment. Since in its original form it was applicable to the Federal Government, it necessarily follows that the first amendment applies with equal force to both the Federal Government and the States. So the declaration that New Jersey cannot contribute tax funds for this purpose also implies that the Federal Government cannot devote tax-raised funds to a like purpose.

Mr. President, a while ago the Senator from Illinois raised the point of whether loans can be made for such purpose. Those who support the bill in its original form have expressed the opinion that such loans can be made; but I respectfully submit that that is not sound constitutional doctrine. The Constitution of the United States is not so puerile or puny that it can be circumvented by any such device. This is made exceedingly clear by the opinion in the Everson case and by the opinion in the Zorach case. The opinion in the Zorach case states it very plainly. Here is what the opinion in the Zorach case states on page 314:

> Government may not finance religious groups.

That would seem to be plain English, and would seem to be broad enough to cover not only gifts and grants, but also loans. I think that is made very evident by common parlance, for when we talk about a man who borrows money with which to build a house, we say he has financed the contruction of his house by borrowing money on a deed of trust. The Supreme Court used language of similar import in its opinion in the Zorach case, when it said:

> Government may not finance religious groups.

I wish to make this point plain by citing two excerpts from the opinion of the Supreme Court in the Everson case. When the Court spoke of the conviction of the people as to how best to achieve religious liberty, it said:

> Achieve it under a government stripped of all power to tax, to support, or otherwise to assist any or all religions.

I respectfully submit that that opinion states in plain English that loans are forbidden, when the opinion states that "government" is "stripped of all power to tax, to support, or otherwise to assist any or all religions."

So it is sticking in the intellectual bark to maintain that religious colleges are not aided when they are given long-term loans bearing the lowest possible rate of interest, and repayable over a period of 50 years.

I wish to read from pages 15 and 16 of the opinion in the Everson case, where there is the following clear statement of the meaning of the establishment-of-religion clause—as clear a statement as can be made:

> The "establishment of religion" clause of the first amendment means at least this: "Neither a State nor the Federal Government can set up a church. Neither can pass laws which aid one religion, aid all religions, or prefer one religion over another. No tax in any amount, large or small, can be levied to support any religious activities or institutions, whatever they may be called, or whatever form they may adopt to teach or practice religion. In the words of Jefferson, the clause against establishment of religion by law was intended to erect a 'wall of separation between church and state.' "

Mr. President, that is very interesting. It states that the Government cannot aid any religion or all religions; it does not say the Government cannot make grants or gifts. It says the Government cannot aid any religion or all religions. I respectfully submit that those who drafted this bill admit in the very title of the bill that the bill is designed to aid these institutions, which are owned, in many instances, and controlled, in other instances, by churches, for the purpose of directly or indirectly instructing their students in the tenets and the faith of such churches. The title of the bill recites that it is "A bill to authorize assistance" to private nonprofit institutions. Certainly that is a confession of the fact that loans are assistance, and that the making of loans is certainly aiding these institutions within the interpretation clause of the establishment-of-religion clause of the first amendment, as made by the Supreme Court in the Everson case.

A moment ago I also read the following excerpt from page 16 of the opinion in the Everson case:

> Neither a State nor the Federal Government can openly or secretly participate in the affairs of any religious organizations or groups, or vice versa.

Then, Mr. President, how can it be said that the Federal Government is not participating in the affairs of religious organizations when it loans money to church-owned or church-controlled colleges which directly or indirectly teach the tenets and the faith of those churches?

I wish to make another point; and I am sorry that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has left the floor at this time, because I shall refer now to the very point he tried to raise when he referred to my statements concerning commingling or blending secular and sectarian education.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ERVIN. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I am very much interested in the entire field of higher education and its financing. I have followed what the distinguished Senator has said about the separation of church and state.

What is the opinion of the Senator with respect to what the Government has already done when it has gone into the field of lending or assisting in the financing of dormitories? I refer to cases where a dormitory and religious institution are more or less controlled by a church established for the purpose, among other things, of promulgating the faith, where one corporation owns all the property, including the chapel, the classrooms, and the dormitories, and the Federal Government has made loans referred to as self-liquidating loans, for dormitories.

I am not quarreling with the distinguished Senator. I am somewhat disturbed about this entire situation. Does the Senator have an opinion on that question?

Mr. ERVIN. The Senator has raised a very interesting question. I must confess I am unable to give him a satisfactory answer. It may be argued with much reason, or at least much show of reason, that dormitories are places where people sleep and are not used in any way for the purpose of giving instruction, and for that reason, when the Federal Government makes loans for the construction of dormitories, it makes loans for sleeping quarters, which are not used for instruction of any kind, either religious or sectarian.

Mr. CURTIS. I understand that is part of the reasoning. I am very much concerned and disturbed about this entire area. I think we may be approaching the time when the only institutions of higher education that have academic freedom, freedom to follow the truth wherever it leads, are those institutions that get no part of their funds from any level of government.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. ERVIN. I think there are very serious questions involved. That is one reason why many Senators would prefer that the Federal assistance in the form of loans should be confined in all cases to public institutions of learning. The reason why I say this is that under the decisions of the Supreme Court, tax-supported or tax-financed public institutions cannot teach the tenets and faith of any religion. If grants and loans are confined to them, we would have an absolute assurance that there would be no violation of the first amendment. We would also have the assurance that if Federal gifts and Federal loans are restricted to public institutions, there will be no temptation on the part of private institutions of learning to bend the pregnant hinges of their intellectual knees in the hope that thrift might follow fawning.

Mr. CURTIS. Does the Senator know of any cases of financial assistance furnished by agencies of the Government to businesses which were engaged in an activity in which the Federal Government has no authority to engage?

Mr. ERVIN. Offhand, I would have to admit that I am rather ignorant in that field at this moment. I was not anticipating that question.

Mr. CURTIS. I do not know that there have been such cases, but there have been many instances in the past where business has been assisted by the Federal Government, RFC, and other lending agencies, and the business has been of a type in which I doubt the Federal Government has authority to engage. I wondered if there was any parallel between that situation and that of lending money to church-related schools.

Mr. ERVIN. I must say I cannot answer the Senator's question, because I have been devoting my attention, under rather adverse circumstances, to one subject, namely, the establishment-of-religion clause of the first amendment.

I am sorry the Senator from Illinois has left the Chamber, because he was saying that if calculus is taught in one place and religion in another, it is not the blending of secular and sectarian education. The Supreme Court of the United States reached quite a different decision in a case which originated in the home State of the Senator from Illinois. I read from page 212 of the opinion in the McCollum case. I read from the separate opinion from Mr. Justice Frankfurter:

> Illinois has here authorized the commingling of sectarian with secular instruction in the public schools. The Constitution of the United States forbids this.

When an institution teaches religion and calculus, it is blending sectarian and secular instruction, regardless of the rooms or buildings where they are taught.

This statement about commingling sectarian and secular education was approved in a later case, the Zorach case, in which the Court upheld the principle that the Government cannot assist institutions in blending secular and sectarian education. I read from page 314 of the Zorach case, omitting certain portions of the statement not germane to this particular question:

> Government may not blend secular and sectarian education.

I wish to read at this point a statement describing a great university of this city which could borrow money to construct buildings under this bill in its present form. It could also borrow money under the bill in the form in which it would be if the amendment of the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Alabama were accepted, even though the loans would have to be restricted to certain buildings.

I am referring to the Catholic University of America simply because I have a statement describing it. If time permitted, I could undoubtedly obtain similar statements concerning some Protestant and Jewish institutions of learning—statements which would make it obvious that Federal loans to religious institutions "aid" such institutions in violation of the establishment-of-religion clause of the first amendment.

This statement reads:

> THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA—THE NATIONAL PONTIFICAL UNIVERSITY UNDER THE DIRECTION OF THE BISHOPS OF THE UNITED STATES
>
> Graduate and professional programs in arts and sciences, philosophy, social sciences, engineering, architecture, law, canon law, social work, nursing, sacred theology and Sacred Scripture.
>
> Undergraduate programs in arts and sciences, philosophy, engineering, architecture and nursing. Preprofessional program. Coeducational. Air Force ROTC.

Under the bill loans could be made to build buildings on the campus of that great university, and they could be made under the amendment which is offered by the Senators from Oregon and Alabama, if they were restricted to certain buildings. It is absurd to argue that such loans would not "aid" this great religious university. They would certainly enable it to acquire title to the buildings erected by the proceeds of the loan.

In closing this phase of my argument I wish to summarize in brief language the purpose and the objective of the establishment-of-religion clause of the first amendment.

The first amendment is designed to prevent every form and degree of official relation between religion and civil authority. To this end, it secures the right of every person to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience and prohibits every kind of public aid or support, financial or other, for religion.

Even if there were no constitutional prohibition on such action, Congress should not grant or loan Federal tax moneys to church schools or any other schools teaching the tenets of any religion.

The ringing declaration of Thomas Jefferson's Statute of Virginia for Religious Freedom that "to compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of opinions which he disbelieves is sinful and tyrannical" is just as true today as it was when Jefferson wrote these immortal words. It would be "sinful and tyrannical" to tax Catholics and Jews to aid the teaching of Protestantism, or to tax Catholics and Protestants to aid the teaching of Judaism, or to tax Protestants and Jews to aid the teaching of Catholicism, or to tax adherents of other faiths, or unbelievers, to aid the teaching of Protestantism, of Judaism, or of Catholicism.

A great American, the late Justice Rutledge, had this to say on this subject:

> The great condition of religious liberty is that it be maintained free from sustenance,

as also from other interferences, by the state. For when it comes to rest upon that secular foundation it vanishes with the resting. Public money devoted to payment of religious costs, educational or other, brings the quest for more. It brings too the struggle of sect against sect for the larger share or for any. Here one by numbers alone will benefit most, there another. That is precisely the history of societies which have had an established religion and dissident groups. It is the very thing Jefferson and Madison experienced and sought to guard against, whether in its blunt or in its more screened forms. The end of such strife cannot be other than to destroy the cherished liberty. The dominating group will achieve the dominant benefit; or all will embroil the state in their dissensions.

Mr. President, in closing I say this—and I say it in all solemnity, and with complete confidence in its accuracy—if we are to preserve religious liberty, or, indeed, any kind of liberty, we must keep the state's hands out of religion and religion's hands off the state.

Exhibit 1

Cases Adjudged in the Supreme Court of the United States at October Term, 1946—Everson *v.* Board of Education of the Township of Ewing et al.

APPEAL FROM THE COURT OF ERRORS AND APPEALS OF NEW JERSEY

(No. 52—Argued Nov. 20, 1946; decided Feb. 10, 1947)

Pursuant to a New Jersey statute authorizing district boards of education to make rules and contracts for the transportation of children to and from schools other than private schools operated for profit, a board of education by resolution authorized the reimbursement of parents for fares paid for the transportation by public carrier of children attending public and Catholic schools. The Catholic schools operated under the superintendency of a Catholic priest and, in addition to secular education, gave religious instruction in the Catholic faith. A district taxpayer challenged the validity under the Federal Constitution of the statute and resolution, so far as they authorized reimbursement to parents for the transportation of children attending sectarian schools. No question was raised as to whether the exclusion of private schools operated for profit denied equal protection of the laws; nor did the record show that there were any children in the district who attended, or would have attended but for the cost of transportation, any but public or Catholic schools. Held:

1. The expenditure of tax-raised funds thus authorized was for a public purpose, and did not violate the due process clause of the 14th amendment. Pages 5 to 8.

2. The statute and resolution did not violate the provision of the first amendment (made applicable to the States by the 14th amendment) prohibiting any "law respecting an establishment of religion." Pages 8 to 18.

133 N.J.L. 350, 44 A. 2d 333, affirmed.

COUNSEL FOR PARTIES

In a suit by a taxpayer, the New Jersey Supreme Court held that the state legislature was without power under the state constitution to authorize reimbursement to parents of bus fares paid for transporting their children to schools other than public schools. 132 N. J. L. 98, 39 A. 2d 75. The New Jersey Court of Errors and Appeals reversed, holding that neither the statute nor a resolution passed pursuant to it violated the state constitution or the provisions of the Federal Constitution in issue. 133 N. J. L. 350, 44 A. 2d 333. On appeal of the Federal questions to this Court, affirmed, p. 18.

Edward R. Burke and E. Hilton Jackson argued the cause for appellant. With Mr. Burke on the brief were Challen B. Ellis, W. D. Jamieson, and Kahl K. Spriggs.

William H. Speer argued the cause for appellees. With him on the brief were Porter R. Chandler and Roger R. Clisham.

Briefs of amici curiae in support of appellant were filed by E. Hilton Jackson for the General Conference of Seventh-Day Adventists et al.; by Harry V. Osborne, Kenneth W. Greenwalt and Whitney N. Seymour for the American Civil Liberties Union; and by Milton T. Lasher for the State Council of the Junior Order of United American Mechanics of New Jersey.

Briefs of amici curiae in support of appellees were filed by George F. Barrett, Attorney General of Illinois, William C. Wines, Assistant Attorney General of Illinois, and James A. Emmert, Attorney General of Indiana, for the States of Illinois and Indiana; by Fred S. LeBlanc, Attorney General, for the State of Louisiana; by Clarence A. Barnes, Attorney General, for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; by Edmund E. Shepherd, Solicitor General, and Daniel J. O'Hara, Assistant Attorney General, for the State of Michigan; by Nathaniel L. Goldstein, Attorney General, and Wendell P. Brown, Solicitor General, for the State of New York; and by James N. Vaughn and George E. Flood for the National Council of Catholic Men et al.

OPINION OF THE COURT

Mr. Justice Black delivered the opinion of the Court.

A New Jersey statute authorizes its local school districts to make rules and contracts for the transportation of children to and from schools.[1] The appellee, a township board of education, acting pursuant to this statute, authorized reimbursement to parents of money expended by them for the bus transportation of their children on regular busses operated by the public transportation system. Part of this money was for the payment of transportation of some children in the community to Catholic parochial schools. These church schools give their students, in addition to secular education, regular religious instruction conforming to the religious tenets and modes of worship of the Catholic faith. The superintendent of these schools is a Catholic priest.

The appellant, in his capacity as a district taxpayer, filed suit in a state court challenging the right of the Board to reimburse parents of parochial school students. He contended that the statute and the resolution passed pursuant to it violated both the State and the Federal Constitutions. That court held that the legislature was without power to authorize such payment under the state constitution. 132 N. J. L. 98, 39 A. 2d 75. The New Jersey Court of Errors and Appeals reversed, holding that neither the statute nor the resolution passed pursuant to it was in conflict with the State constitution or the provisions of the Federal Constitution in issue (133 N. J. L. 350, 44 A. 2d 333). The case is here on appeal under 28 U.S.C. § 344(a).

Since there has been no attack on the statute on the ground that a part of its language excludes children attending private schools operated for profit from enjoying State payment for their transportation, we need not consider this exclusionary language; it has no relevancy to any constitutional question here presented.[2] Furthermore, if the exclusion clause had been properly challenged, we do not know whether New Jersey's highest court would construe its statutes as precluding payment of the school transportation of any group of pupils, even those of a private school run for profit.[3] Consequently, we put to one side the question as to the validity of the statute against the claim that it does not authorize payment for the transportation generally of schoolchildren in New Jersey.

The only contention here is that the state statute and the resolution, insofar as they authorized reimbursement to parents of children attending parochial schools, violate the Federal Constitution in these two respects, which to some extent overlap. First. They authorize the State to take by taxation the private property of some and bestow it upon others, to be used for their own private purposes. This, it is alleged, violates the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. Second. The statute and the resolution forced inhabitants to pay taxes to help support and maintain schools which are dedicated to, and which regularly teach, the Catholic faith. This is alleged to be a use of state power to support church schools contrary to the prohibition of the First Amendment which the

---

[1] "Whenever in any district there are children living remote from any schoolhouse, the board of education of the district may make rules and contracts for the transportation of such children to and from school, including the transportation of school children to and from school other than a public school, except such school as is operated for profit in whole or in part.

"When any school district provides any transportation for public school children to and from school, transportation from any point in such established school route to any other point in such established school route shall be supplied to school children residing in such school district in going to and from school other than a public school, except such school as is operated for profit in whole or in part." New Jersey Laws, 1941, c. 191, p. 581; N. J. R. S. Cum. Supp., tit. 18, c. 14, § 8.

[2] Appellant does not challenge the New Jersey statute or the resolution on the ground that either violates the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment by excluding payment for the transportation of any pupil who attends a "private school run for profit." Although the township resolution authorized reimbursement only for parents of public and Catholic school pupils, appellant does not allege, nor is there anything in the record which would offer the slightest support to an allegation, that there were any children in the township who attended or would have attended, but for want of transportation, any but public and Catholic schools. It will be appropriate to consider the exclusion of students of private schools operated for profit when and if it is proved to have occurred, is made the basis of a suit by one in a position to challenge it, and New Jersey's highest court has ruled adversely to the challenger. Striking down a State law is not a matter of such light moment that it should be done by a Federal court ex mero motu on a postulate neither charged nor proved, but which rests on nothing but a possibility. *Cf. Liverpool, N.Y. & P.S.S. Co.* v. *Comm'rs of Emigration*, 113 U.S. 33, 39.

[3] It might hold the excepting clause to be invalid, and sustain the statute with that clause excised. N.J.R.S., tit. 1, c. 1, § 10, provides with regard to any statute that if "any provision thereof, shall be declared to be unconstitutional * * * in whole or in part, by a court of competent jurisdiction, such * * * article * * * shall, to the extent that it is not unconstitutional * * * be enforced * * *." The opinion of the court of errors and appeals in this very case suggests that State law now authorizes transportation of all pupils. Its opinion stated: "Since we hold that the legislature may appropriate general State funds or authorize the use of local funds for the transportation of pupils to any school, we conclude that such authorization of the use of local funds is likewise authorized by Pamph. L. 1941, ch. 191, and R.S. 18:7-78." 133 N.J.L. 350, 354, 44 A. 2d 333, 337.

Fourteenth Amendment made applicable to the states.

First. The due process argument that the state law taxes some people to help others carry out their private purposes is framed in two phases. The first phase is that a state cannot tax A to reimburse B for the cost of transporting his children to church schools. This is said to violate the due process clause because the children are sent to these church schools to satisfy the personal desires of their parents, rather than the public's interest in the general education of all children. This argument, if valid, would apply equally to prohibit state payment for the transportation of children to any non-public school, whether operated by a church or any other non-government individual or group. But, the New Jersey legislature has decided that a public purpose will be served by using tax-raised funds to pay the bus fares of all schoolchildren, including those who attend parochial schools. The New Jersey Court of Errors and Appeals has reached the same conclusion. The fact that a state law, passed to satisfy a public need, coincides with the personal desires of the individuals most directly affected is certainly an inadequate reason for us to say that a legislature has erroneously appraised the public need.

It is true that this Court has, in rare instances, struck down state statutes on the ground that the purpose for which tax-raised funds were to be expended was not a public one. *Loan Association* v. *Topeka*, 20 Wall. 655; *Parkersburg* v. *Brown*, 106 U.S. 487; *Thompson* v. *Consolidated Gas Utilities Corp.*, 300 U.S. 55. But the Court has also pointed out that this far-reaching authority must be exercised with the most extreme caution. *Green* v. *Frazier*, 253 U.S. 233, 240. Otherwise, a state's power to legislate for the public welfare might be seriously curtailed, a power which is a primary reason for the existence of states. Changing local conditions create new local problems which may lead a state's people and its local authorities to believe that laws authorizing new types of public services are necessary to promote the general well-being of the people. The Fourteenth Amendment did not strip the states of their power to meet problems previously left for individual solution. *Davidson* v. *New Orleans*, 96 U.S. 97, 103–104; *Barbier* v. *Connolly*, 113 U.S. 27, 31–32; *Fallbrook Irrigation District* v. *Bradley*, 164 U. S. 112, 157–158.

It is much too late to argue that legislation intended to facilitate the opportunity of children to get a secular education serves no public purpose. *Cochran* v. *Louisiana State Board of Education*, 281 U. S. 370; Holmes, J., in *Interstate Ry.* v. *Massachusetts*, 207 U. S. 79, 87. See opinion of Cooley, J., in *Stuar* v. *School District No. 1 of Kalamazoo*, 30 Mich. 69 (1874). The same thing is no less true of legislation to reimburse needy parents, or all parents, for payment of the fares of their children so that they can ride in public busses to and from schools rather than run the risk of traffic and other hazards incident to walking or hitchhiking. See *Barbier* v. *Connolly*, *supra*, at 31. See also cases collected 63 A. L. R. 413; 118 A. L. R. 806. Nor does it follow that a law has a private rather than a public purpose because it provides that tax-raised funds will be paid to reimburse individuals on account of money spent by them in a way which furthers a public program. See *Carmichael* v. *Southern Coal & Coke Co.*, 301 U. S. 495, 518. Subsidies and loans to individuals such as farmers and home-owners, and to privately owned transportation systems, as well as many other kinds of businesses, have been commonplace practices in our state and national history.

Insofar as the second phase of the due process argument may differ from the first, it is by suggesting that taxation for transportation of children to church schools constitutes support of a religion by the State. But if the law is invalid for this reason, it is because it violates the First Amendment's prohibition against the establishment of religion by law. This is the exact question raised by appellant's second contention, to consideration of which we now turn.

Second. The New Jersey statute is challenged as a "law respecting an establishment of religion." The First Amendment, as made applicable to the states by the Fourteenth, *Murdock* v. *Pennsylvania*, 319 U.S. 105, commands that a state "shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof * * *." These words of the First Amendment reflected in the minds of early Americans a vivid mental picture of conditions and practices which they fervently wished to stamp out in order to preserve liberty for themselves and for their posterity. Doubtless their goal has not been entirely reached; but so far has the Nation moved toward it that the expression "law respecting an establishment of religion," probably does not so vividly remind present-day Americans of the evils, fears, and political problems that caused that expression to be written into our Bill of Rights. Whether this New Jersey law is one respecting an "establishment of religion" requires an understanding of the meaning of that language, particularly with respect to the imposition of taxes. Once again,[4] therefore, it is not inappropriate briefly to review the background and environment of the period in which that constitutional language was fashioned and adopted.

A large proportion of the early settlers of this country came here from Europe to escape the bondage of laws which compelled them to support and attend government-favored churches. The centuries immediately before and contemporaneous with the colonization of America had been filled with turmoil, civil strife, and persecutions, generated in large part by established sects determined to maintain their absolute political and religious supremacy. With the power of government supporting them, at various times and places, Catholics had persecuted Protestants, Protestants had persecuted Catholics, Protestant sects had persecuted other Protestant sects, Catholics of one shade of belief had persecuted Catholics of another shade of belief, and all of these had from time to time persecuted Jews. In efforts to force loyalty to whatever religious group happened to be on top and in league with the government of a particular time and place, men and women had been fined, cast in jail, cruelly tortured, and killed. Among the offenses for which these punishments had been inflicted were such things as speaking disrespectfully of the views of ministers of government-established churches, nonattendance at those churches, expressions of nonbelief in their doctrines, and failure to pay taxes and tithes to support them.[5]

These practices of the old world were transplanted to and began to thrive in the soil of the new America. The very charters granted by the English Crown to the individuals and companies designated to make the laws which would control the destinies of the colonials authorized these individuals and companies to erect religious establishments which all, whether believers or nonbelievers, would be required to support and attend.[6] An exercise of this authority was accompanied by a repetition of many of the old-world practices and persecutions. Catholics found themselves hounded and proscribed because of their faith; Quakers who followed their conscience went to jail; Baptists were peculiarly obnoxious to certain dominant Protestant sects; men and women of varied faiths who happened to be in a minority in a particular locality were persecuted because they steadfastly persisted in worshipping God only as their own consciences dictated.[7] And all of these dissenters were compelled to pay tithes and taxes[8] to support government-sponsored churches whose ministers preached inflammatory sermons designed to strengthen and consolidate the established faith by generating a burning hatred against dissenters.

These practices became so commonplace as to shock the freedom-loving colonials into a feeling of abhorrence.[9] The imposition of taxes to pay ministers' salaries and to build and maintain churches and church property aroused their indignation.[10] It was these feelings which found expression in the first amendment. No one locality and no one group throughout the Colonies can rightly be given entire credit for having aroused the sentiment that culminated in adoption of the Bill of Rights' provisions embracing religious liberty. But Virginia, where the established church had achieved a dominant influence in political affairs and where many excesses attracted wide public attention, provided a great stimulus and able leadership for the movement. The people there, as elsewhere, reached the conviction that individual religious liberty could be achieved best under a government which was stripped of all power to tax, to support, or otherwise to assist any or all religions, or to interfere with the beliefs of any religious individual or group.

---

[4] See *Reynolds* v. *United States*, 98 U.S. 145, 162; *cf. Knowlton* v. *Moore*, 178 U.S. 41, 89, 106.

[5] See e.g., Macaulay, History of England (1849) I, cc. 2, 4; The Cambridge Modern History (1908) V, cc. V, IX, XI; Beard, Rise of American Civilization (1933) I, 60; Cobb, Rise of Religious Liberty in America (1902) c. II; Sweet, The Story of Religion in America (1939) c. II; Sweet, Religion in Colonial America (1942) 320–322.

[6] See e.g., the charter of the colony of Carolina which gave the grantees the right of "patronage and advowsons of all the churches and chapels * * * together with license and power to build and found churches, chapels and oratories * * * and to cause them to be dedicated and consecrated, according to the ecclesiastical laws of our kingdom of England." Poore, Constitutions (1878) II, 1390, 1391. That of Maryland gave to the grantee Lord Baltimore "the Patronages, and Advowsons of all Churches which * * * shall happen to be built, together with Licence and Faculty of erecting and founding Churches, Chapels, and Places of Worship * * * and of causing the same to be dedicated and consecrated according to the Ecclesiastical Laws of our Kingdom of England, with all, and singular such, and as ample Rights, Jurisdictions, Privileges * * * as any Bishop * * * in our Kingdom of England, ever * * * hath had * * *." MacDonald, Documentary Source Book of American History (1934) 31, 33. The Commission of New Hampshire of 1680, Poore, supra, II, 1277, stated: "And above all things We do by these presents will, require and comand our said Council to take all possible care for ye discountenancing of vice and encouraging of virtue and good living; and that by such examples ye infidle may be invited and desire to partake of ye Christian Religion, and for ye greater ease and satisfaction of ye sd loving subjects in matters of religion, We do hereby require and comand yt liberty of conscience shall be allowed unto all protestants; yt such especially as shall be conformable to ye rites of ye Church of Engd shall be particularly countenanced and encouraged." See also *Pawlet* v. *Clark*, 9 Cranch 292.

[7] See e.g., Semple, Baptists in Virginia (1894); Sweet, Religion in Colonial America, supra at 131–152, 322–339.

[8] Almost every colony exacted some kind of tax for church support. See e.g., Cobb, op. cit. supra, note 5, 110 (Virginia); 131 (North Carolina); 169 (Massachusetts); 270 (Connecticut); 304, 310, 339 (New York); 386 (Maryland); 295 (New Hampshire).

[9] Madison wrote to a friend in 1774: "That diabolical, hell-conceived principle of persecution rages among some * * * This vexes me the worst of anything whatever. There are at this time in the adjacent country not less than five or six well-meaning men in close jail for publishing their religious sentiments, which in the main are very orthodox. I have neither patience to hear, talk, or think of anything relative to this matter; for I have squabbled and scolded, abused and ridiculed, so long about it to little purpose, that I am without common patience. So I must beg you to pity me, and pray for liberty of conscience to all." I Writings of James Madison (1900) 18, 21.

The movement toward this end reached its dramatic climax in Virginia in 1785–86 when the Virginia legislative body was about to renew Virginia's tax levy for the support of the established church. Thomas Jefferson and James Madison led the fight against this tax. Madison wrote his great Memorial and Remonstrance against the law.[11] In it, he eloquently argued that a true religion did not need the support of law; that no person, either believer or nonbeliever, should be taxed to support a religious institution of any kind; that the best interest of a society required that the minds of men always be wholly free; and that cruel persecutions were the inevitable result of government-established religions. Madison's Remonstrance received strong support throughout Virginia,[12] and the Assembly postponed consideration of the proposed tax measure until its next session. When the proposal came up for consideration at that session, it not only died in committee, but the Assembly enacted the famous "Virginia Bill for Religious Liberty" originally written by Thomas Jefferson.[13] The preamble to that Bill stated among other things that—

"Almighty God hath created the mind free; that all attempts to influence it by temporal punishments or burthens, or by civil incapacitations, tend only to beget habits of hypocrisy and meanness, and are a departure from the plan of the Holy author of our religion, who being Lord both of body and mind, yet chose not to propagate it by coercions on either * * *; that to compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of opinions which he disbelieves, is sinful and tyrannical; that even the forcing him to support this or that teacher of his own religious persuasion, is depriving him of the comfortable liberty of giving his contributions to the particular pastor, whose morals he would make his pattern."

And the statute itself enacted—

"That no man shall be compelled to frequent or support any religious worship, place, or ministry whatsoever, nor shall be enforced, restrained, molested, or burthened in his body or goods, nor shall otherwise suffer on account of his religious opinions or belief." [14]

This Court has previously recognized that the provisions of the First Amendment, in the drafting and adoption of which Madison and Jefferson played such leading roles, had the same objective and were intended to provide the same protection against governmental intrusion on religious liberty as the Virginia statute. *Reynolds* v. *United States, supra* at 164; *Watson* v. *Jones,* 13 Wall. 679; *Davis* v. *Beason,* 133 U.S. 333, 342. Prior to the adoption of the Fourteenth Amendment, the First Amendment did not apply as a restraint against the states.[15] Most of them did soon provide similar constitutional protections for religious liberty.[16] But some states persisted for about half a century in imposing restraints upon the free exercise of religion and in discriminating against particular religious groups.[17] In recent years, so far as the provision against the establishment of a religion is concerned, the question has most frequently arisen in connection with proposed state aid to church schools and efforts to carry on religious teachings in the public schools in accordance with the tenets of a particular sect.[18] Some churches have either sought or accepted state financial support for their schools. Here again the efforts to obtain state aid or acceptance of it have not been limited to any one particular faith.[19] The state courts, in the main, have remained faithful to the language of their own constitutional provisions designed to protect religious freedom and to separate religions and governments. Their decisions, however, show the difficulty in drawing the line between tax legislation which provides funds for the welfare of the general public and that which is designed to support institutions which teach religion.[20]

The meaning and scope of the First Amendment, preventing establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, in the light of its history and the evils it was designed forever to suppress, have been several times elaborated by the decisions of this Court prior to the application of the First Amendment to the states by the Fourteenth.[21] The broad meaning given the Amendment by these earlier cases has been accepted by this Court in its decisions concerning an individual's religious freedom rendered since the Fourteenth Amendment was interpreted to make the prohibitions of the First applicable to state action abridging religious freedom.[22] There is every reason to give the same application and broad interpretation to the "establishment of religion" clause. The interrelation of these complementary clauses was well summarized in a statement of the Court of Appeals of South Carolina,[23] quoted with approval by this Court in *Watson* v. *Jones,* 13 Wall. 679, 730: "The structure of our government has, for the preservation of civil liberty rescued the temporal institutions from religious interference. On the other hand, it has secured religious liberty from the invasion of the civil authority."

The "establishment of religion" clause of the First Amendment means at least this: Neither a state nor the Federal Government can set up a church. Neither can pass laws which aid one religion, aid all religions, or prefer one religion over another. Neither can force nor influence a person to go to or to remain away from church against his will or force him to profess a belief or disbelief in any religion. No person can be punished for entertaining or professing religious beliefs or disbeliefs, for church attendance or non-attendance. No tax in any amount, large or small, can be levied to support any religious activities or institutions, whatever they may be called, or whatever form they may adopt to teach or practice religion. Neither a state nor the Federal Government can, openly or secretly, participate in the affairs of any religious organizations or groups and vice versa. In the words of Jefferson, the clause against establishment of religion by law was intended to erect "a wall of separation between church and State." *Reynolds* v. *United States,* supra at 164.

We must consider the New Jersey statute in accordance with the foregoing limitations imposed by the First Amendment. But we must not strike that state statute down if it is within the State's constitutional power even though it approaches the verge of that power. See *Interstate Ry.* v. *Massachusetts,* Holmes, J., supra at 85, 88. New Jersey cannot consistently with the "establishment of religion" clause of the First Amendment contribute tax-raised funds to the support of an institution which teaches the tenets and faith of any church. On the other hand, other language of the amendment commands that New Jersey cannot hamper its citizens in the free exercise of their own religion. Consequently, it cannot exclude individual Catholics, Lutherans, Mohammedans, Baptists, Jews, Methodists, Non-believers, Presbyterians, or the members of any other faith, because of their faith, or lack of it, from receiving the benefits of public welfare legislation. While we do not mean to intimate that a state could not provide transportation only to children attending public schools, we must be careful, in protecting the citizens of New Jersey against state-established churches, to be sure that we do not inadvertently prohibit New Jersey from extending its general state law benefits to all its citizens without regard to their religious belief.

Measured by these standards, we cannot say that the First Amendment prohibits New Jersey from spending tax-raised funds to pay the bus fares of parochial school pupils as a part of a general program under which it pays the fares of pupils attending public and other schools. It is undoubtedly true that children are helped to get to church schools. There is even a possibility that some of the children might not be sent to the church schools if the parents were compelled to pay their children's bus fares out of their own pockets when transportation to a public school would have been paid for by the State. The same possibility exists where the state requires a local transit company to provide reduced fares to school children including those attending parochial schools,[24] or where a municipally owned transportation system undertakes to carry all school children free of charge. Moreover, State-paid policemen, detailed to protect children going to and from church schools from the very real hazards of traffic, would serve much the same purpose and accomplish much the same result as State provisions intended to guarantee free transportation of a kind which the State deems to be best for the school children's welfare. And parents might refuse to risk their children to the serious danger of traffic accidents going to and from parochial schools, the approaches to which were not protected by policeman. Similarly, parents might be reluctant to permit their children to attend schools which the state had cut off from such general government services as ordinary police and fire protection, connections for sewage disposal, public highways and sidewalks. Of course, cutting off church schools from these services, so separate and so indisputably marked off from the religious function, would make it far more difficult for the schools to operate. But such is obviously not the purpose of the First Amendment. That amendment requires the state to be a neutral in its relations with groups of religious believers and nonbelievers; it does not require the state to be their adversary. State power is no more to be used so as to handicap religions than it is to favor them.

---

[10] Virginia's resistance to taxation for church support was crystallized in the famous "Parsons' Cause" argued by Patrick Henry in 1763. For an account see Cobb, op. cit., supra, note 5, 108–111.

[11] II Writings of James Madison, 183.

[12] In a recently discovered collection of Madison's papers, Madison recollected that his Remonstrance "met with the approbation of the Baptists, the Presbyterians, the Quakers, and the few Roman Catholics, universally; of the Methodists in part; and even of not a few of the Sect formerly established by law." Madison, "Monopolies, Perpetuities, Corporations, Ecclesiastical Endowments," in Fleet, Madison's "Detached Memorandum," 3 William and Mary Q. (1946) 534, 551, 555.

[13] For accounts of background and evolution of the Virginia Bill for Religious Liberty see e. g., James, "The Struggle for Religious Liberty in Virginia" (1900); Thom, "The Struggle for Religious Freedom in Virginia: The Baptists" (1900); Cobb, op. cit., supra, note 5, 74–115; Madison, "Monopolies, Perpetuities, Corporations, Ecclesiastical Endowments," op. cit., supra, note 12, 554, 556.

[14] 12 Hening, "Statutes of Virginia" (1823), 84; Commager, "Documents of American History" (1944), 125.

[15] *Permoli* v. *New Orleans,* 3 How. 589. *Cf. Barron* v. *Baltimore,* 7 Pet. 243.

[16] For a collection of state constitutional provisions on freedom of religion see Gabel, Public Funds for Church and Private Schools (1937) 148–149. See also 2 Cooley, Constitutional Limitations (1927) 960–985.

[17] Test provisions forbade officeholders to "deny * * * the truth of the Protestant religion," e.g. Constitution of North Carolina (1776) § XXXII, II Poore, supra, 1413. Maryland permitted taxation for support of the Christian religion and limited civil office to Christians until 1818, id., I, 819, 820, 832.

[18] See Note 50 Yale L. J. (1941) 917; see also cases collected 14 L. R. A. 418; 5 A. L. R. 879; 141 A. L. R. 1148.

[19] See cases collected 14 L. R. A. 418; 5 A. L. R. 879; 141 A. L. R. 1148.

[20] Ibid. See also Cooley, op. cit., supra, note 16.

[21] *Terrett* v. *Taylor,* 9 Cranch 43; *Watson* v. *Jones,* 13 Wall. 679; *Davis* v. *Beason,* 133 U.S. 333; *Cf. Reynolds* v. *United States, supra,* 162; *Reuben Quick Bear* v. *Leupp,* 210 U.S. 50.

[22] *Cantwell* v. *Connecticut,* 310 U.S. 296; *Jamison* v. *Texas,* 318 U.S. 413; *Largent* v. *Texas,* 318 U.S. 418; *Murdock* v. *Pennsylvania, supra; West Virginia State Board of Education* v. *Barnette,* 319 U.S. 624; *Follett* v. *McCormick,* 321 U.S. 573; *Marsh* v. *Alabama,* 326 U.S. 501. *Cf. Bradfield* v. *Roberts,* 175 U.S. 291.

[23] *Harmon* v. *Dreher,* Speer's Equity Reports (S.C., 1843), 87, 120.

This Court has said that parents may, in the discharge of their duty under state compulsory education laws, send their children to a religious rather than a public school if the school meets the secular educational requirements which the state has power to impose. See *Pierce* v. *Society of Sisters*, 268 U. S. 510. It appears that these parochial schools meet New Jersey's requirements. The State contributes no money to the schools. It does not support them. Its legislation, as applied, does no more than provide a general program to help parents get their children, regardless of their religion, safely and expeditiously to and from accredited schools.

The First Amendment has erected a well between church and state. That wall must be kept high and impregnable. We could not approve the slightest breach. New Jersey has not breached it here.

Affirmed.

MR. JUSTICE JACKSON, DISSENTING

I find myself, contrary to first impressions, unable to join in this decision. I have a sympathy, though it is not ideological, with Catholic citizens who are compelled by law to pay taxes for public schools, and also feel constrained by conscience and discipline to support other schools for their own children. Such relief to them as this case involves is not in itself a serious burden to taxpayers and I had assumed it to be as little serious in principle. Study of this case convinces me otherwise. The Court's opinion marshals every argument in favor of state aid and puts the case in its most favorable light, but much of its reasoning confirms my conclusions that there are no good grounds upon which to support the present legislation. In fact, the undertones of the opinion, advocating complete and uncompromising separation of Church from State, seem utterly discordant with its conclusion yielding support to their commingling in educational matters. The case which irresistibly comes to mind as the most fitting precedent is that of Julia who, according to Byron's reports, "whispering 'I will ne'er consent'—consented."

I

The Court sustains this legislation by assuming two deviations from the facts of this particular case; first, it assumes a state of facts that record does not support, and secondly, it refuses to consider facts which are inescapable on the record.

The Court concludes that this "legislation, as applied, does no more than provide a general program to help parents get their children, regardless of the religion, safely and expeditiously to and from accredited schools," and it draws a comparison between "state provisions intended to guarantee free transportation" for school children with services such as police and fire protection, and implies that we are here dealing with "laws authorizing new types of public services * * *." This hypothesis permeates the opinion. The facts will not bear that construction.

The Township of Ewing is not furnishing transportation to the children in any form; it is not operating school buses itself or contracting for their operation; and it is not performing any public service of any kind with this taxpayer's money. All schoolchildren are left to ride as ordinary paying passengers on the regular buses operated by the public transportation system. What the Township does, and what the taxpayer complains of, is at stated intervals to reimburse parents for the fares paid, provided the children attend either public schools or Catholic Church schools. This expenditure of tax funds has no possible effect on the child's safety or expedition in transit. As passengers on the public buses they travel as fast and no faster, and are as safe and no safer, since their parents are reimbursed as before.

In addition to thus assuming a type of service that does not exist, the Court also insists that we must close our eyes to a discrimination which does exist. The resolution which authorizes disbursement of this taxpayer's money limits reimbursement to those who attend public schools and Catholic schools. That is the way the Act is applied to this taxpayer.

The New Jersey Act in question makes the character of the school, not the needs of the children, determine the eligibility of parents to reimbursement. The Act permits payment for transportation to parochial schools or public schools but prohibits it to private schools operated in whole or in part for profit. Children often are sent to private schools because their parents feel that they require more individual instruction than public schools can provide, or because they are backward or defective and need special attention. If all children of the state were objects of impartial solicitude, no reason is obvious for denying transportation reimbursement to students of this class, for these often are as needy and as worthy as those who go to public or parochial schools. Refusal to reimburse those who attend such schools is understandable only in the light of a purpose to aid the schools, because the state might well abstain from aiding a profit-making private enterprise. Thus, under the Act and resolution brought to us by this case, children are classified according to the schools they attend and are to be aided if they attend the public schools or private Catholic schools, and they are not allowed to be aided if they attend private secular schools or private religious schools of other faiths.

Of course, this case is not one of a Baptist or a Jew or an Episcopalian or a pupil of a private school complaining of discrimination. It is one of a taxpayer urging that he is being taxed for an unconstitutional purpose. I think he is entitled to have us consider the Act just as it is written. The statement by the New Jersey court that it holds the Legislature may authorize use of local funds "for the transportation of pupils to any school," 133 N. J. L. 350, 354, 44 A. 2d 333, 337, in view of the other constitutional views expressed, is not a holding that this Act authorizes transportation of all pupils to all schools. As applied to this taxpayer by the action he complains of, certainly the Act does not authorize reimbursement to those who choose any alternative to the public school except Catholic Church schools.

If we are to decide this case on the facts before us, our question is simply this: Is it constitutional to tax this complainant to pay the cost of carrying pupils to Church schools of one specified denomination?

II

Whether the taxpayer constitutionally can be made to contribute aid to parents of students because of their attendance at parochial schools depends upon the nature of those schools and their relation to the Church. The Constitution says nothing of education. It lays no obligation on the states to provide schools and does not undertake to regulate state systems of education if they see fit to maintain them. But they cannot, through school policy any more than through other means, invade rights secured to citizens by the Constitution of the United States. *West Virginia State Board of Education* v. *Barnette*, 319 U.S. 624. One of our basic rights is to be free of taxation to support a transgression of the constitutional command that the authorities "shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof * * *." U. S. Const., Amend. I; *Cantwell v. Connecticut*, 310 U.S. 296.

The function of the Church school is a subject on which this record is meager. It shows only that the schools are under superintendence of a priest and that "religion is taught as part of the curriculum." But we know that such schools are parochial only in name—they, in fact, represent a world-wide and age-old policy of the Roman Catholic Church. Under the rubric "Catholic Schools," the Canon Law of the Church by which all Catholics are bound, provides:

"1215. Catholic children are to be educated in schools where not only nothing contrary to Catholic faith and morals is taught, but rather in schools where religious and moral training occupy the first place * * *. (Canon 1372.)"

"1216. In every elementary school the children must, according to their age, be instructed in Christian doctrine.

"The young people who attend the higher schools are to receive a deeper religious knowledge, and the bishops shall appoint priests qualified for such work by their learning and piety. (Canon 1373.)"

"1217. Catholic children shall not attend non-Catholic, indifferent, schools that are mixed, that is to say, schools open to Catholics and non-Catholics alike. The bishop of the diocese only has the right, in harmony with the instructions of the Holy See, to decide under what circumstances, and with what safeguards to prevent loss of faith, it may be tolerated that Catholic children go to such schools. (Canon 1374.)"

---

[24] New Jersey long ago permitted public utilities to charge school children reduced rates. See *Public S. R. Co.* v. *Public Utility Comm'rs*, 81 N.J.L. 363, 80 A. 27 (1911); see also *Interstate Ry.* v. *Massachusetts*, *supra*. The District of Columbia Code requires that the new charter of the District public transportation company provide a three-cent fare "for school children * * * going to and from public, parochial, or like schools." 47 Stat. 752, 759.

"1224. The religious teaching of youth in any schools is subject to the authority and inspection of the Church.

"The local Ordinaries have the right and duty to watch that nothing is taught contrary to faith or good morals, in any of the schools of their territory.

"They, moreover, have the right to approve the books of Christian doctrine and the teachers of religion, and to demand, for the sake of safeguarding religion and morals, the removal of teachers and books. (Canon 1381.)" (Woywod, Rev. Stanislaus, The New Canon Law, under imprimatur of Most Rev. Francis J. Spellman, Archbishop of New York and others, 1940.)

It is no exaggeration to say that the whole historic conflict in temporal policy between the Catholic Church and non-Catholics comes to a focus in their respective school policies. The Roman Catholic Church, counseled by experience in many ages and many lands and with all sorts and conditions of men, takes what, from the viewpoint of its own progress and the success of its mission, is a wise estimate of the importance of education to religion. It doesn't leave the individual to pick up religion by chance. It relies on early and indelible indoctrination in the faith and order of the Church by the word and example of persons consecrated to the task.

Our public school, if not a product of Protestantism, at least is more consistent with it than with the Catholic culture and scheme of values. It is a relatively recent development dating from about 1840.[25] It is organized on the premise that secular education can be isolated from all religious teaching so that the school can inculcate all needed temporal knowledge and also maintain a strict and lofty neutrality as to religion. The assumption is that after the individual has been instructed in worldly wisdom he will be better fitted to choose his religion. Whether such a disjunction is possible, and if possible whether it is wise, are questions I need not try to answer.

I should be surprised if any Catholic would deny that the parochial school is a vital, if not the most vital, part of the Roman Catholic Church. If put to the choice, that venerable institution, I should expect, would forego its whole service for mature persons before it would give up education of the young, and it would be a wise choice. Its growth and cohesion, discipline and loyalty, spring from its schools. Catholic education is the rock on which the whole structure rests, and to render tax aid to its Church school is indistinguishable to me from rendering the same aid to the Church itself.

III

It is of no importance in this situation whether the beneficiary of this expenditure of tax-raised funds is primarily the parochial school and incidentally the pupil, or whether the aid is directly bestowed on the pupil with indirect benefits to the school. The state cannot maintain a Church and it can no more tax its citizens to furnish free carriage to those who attend a Church. The prohibition against establishment of religion cannot be circumvented by a subsidy, bonus or reimbursement of expense to individuals for receiving religious instruction and indoctrination.

The Court, however, compares this to other subsidies and loans to individuals and says, "Nor does it follow that a law has a private rather than a public purpose because it provides that tax-raised funds will be paid to reimburse individuals on account of money spent by them in a way which furthers a public program. See *Carmichael* v. *Southern Coal & Coke Co.*, 301 U.S. 495, 518." Of course, the state may pay out tax-raised funds to relieve pauperism, but it may not under our Constitution do so to induce or reward piety. It may spend funds to secure old age against want, but it may not spend funds to secure religion against skepticism. It may compensate individuals for loss of employment, but it cannot compensate them for adherence to a creed.

It seems to me that the basic fallacy in the Court's reasoning, which accounts for its failure to apply the principles it avows, is in ignoring the essentially religious test by which beneficiaries of this expenditure are selected. A policeman protects a Catholic, of course—but not because he is a Catholic; it is because he is a man and a member of our society. The fireman protects the Church school—but not because it is a Church school; it is because it is property, part of the assets of our society. Neither the fireman nor the policeman has to ask before he renders aid "Is this man or building identified with the Catholic Church?" But before these school authorities draw a check to reimburse for a student's fare they must ask just that question, and if the school is a Catholic one they may render aid because it is such, while if it is of any other faith or is run for profit, the help must be withheld. To consider the converse of the Court's reasoning will best disclose its fallacy. That there is no parallel between police and fire protection and this plan of reimbursement is apparent from the incongruity of the limitation of this Act if applied to police and fire service. Could we sustain an Act that said the police shall protect pupils on the way to or from public schools and Catholic schools but not while going to and coming from other schools, and firemen shall extinguish a blaze in public or Catholic school buildings but shall not put out a blaze in Protestant Church schools or private schools operated for profit? That is the true analogy to the case we have before us and I should think it pretty plain that such a scheme would not be valid.

The Court's holding is that this taxpayer has no grievance because the state has decided to make the reimbursement a public purpose and therefore we are bound to regard it as such. I agree that this Court has left, and always should leave to each state, great latitude in deciding for itself, in the light of its own conditions, what shall be public purposes in its scheme of things. It may socialize utilities and economic enterprises and make taxpayers' business out of what conventionally had been private business. It may make public business of individual welfare, health, education, entertainment or security. But it cannot make public business of religious worship or instruction, or of attendance at religious institutions of any character. There is no answer to the proposition, more fully expounded by Mr. Justice Rutledge, that the effect of the religious freedom amendment to our Constitution was to take every form of propagation of religion out of the realm of things which could directly or indirectly be made public business and thereby be supported in whole or in part at taxpayers' expense. That is a difference which the Constitution sets up between religion and almost every other subject matter of legislation, a difference which goes to the very root of religious freedom and which the Court is overlooking today. This freedom was first in the Bill of Rights because it was first in the forefathers' minds; it was set forth in absolute terms, and its strength is its rigidity. It was intended not only to keep the states' hands out of religion, but to keep religion's hands off the state, and, above all, to keep bitter religious controversy out of public life by denying to every denomination any advantage from getting control of public policy or the public purse. Those great ends I cannot but think are immeasurably compromised by today's decision.

This policy of our Federal Constitution has never been wholly pleasing to most religious groups. They all are quick to invoke its protections; they all are irked when they feel its restraints. This Court has gone a long way, if not an unreasonable way, to hold that public business of such paramount importance as maintenance of public order, protection of the privacy of the home, and taxation may not be pursued by a state in a way that even indirectly will interfere with religious proselyting. See dissent in *Douglas* v. *Jeannette*, 319 U. S. 157, 166; *Murdock* v. *Pennsylvania*, 319 U.S. 105; *Martin* v. *Struthers*, 319 U.S. 141; *Jones* v. *Opelika*, 316 U.S. 584, reversed on rehearing, 319 U.S. 103.

But we cannot have it both ways. Religious teaching cannot be a private affair when the state seeks to impose regulations which infringe on it indirectly, and a public affair when it comes to taxing citizens of one faith to aid another, or those of no faith to aid all. If these principles seem harsh in prohibiting aid to Catholic education, it must not be forgotten that it is the same Constitution that alone assures Catholics the right to maintain these schools at all when predominant local sentiment would forbid them. *Pierce* v. *Society of Sisters*, 268 U.S. 510. Nor should I think that those who have done so well without this aid would want to see this separation between Church and State broken down. If the state may aid these religious schools, it may therefore regulate them. Many groups have sought aid from tax funds only to find that it carried political controls with it. Indeed this Court has declared that "It is hardly lack of due process for the Government to regulate that which it subsidizes." *Wickard* v. *Filburn*, 317 U.S. 111, 131.

But in any event, the great purposes of the Constitution do not depend on the approval or convenience of those they restrain. I cannot read the history of the struggle to separate political from ecclesiastical affairs, well summarized in the opinion of Mr. Justice Rutledge in which I generally concur, without a conviction that the Court today is unconsciously giving the clock's hands a backward turn.

Mr. Justice Frankfurter joins in this opinion.

MR. JUSTICE RUTLEDGE, DISSENTING

Mr. Justice Rutledge, with whom Mr. Justice Frankfurter, Mr. Justice Jackson, and Mr. Justice Burton agree, dissenting.

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." U.S. Const. Amend. I.

"Well aware that Almighty God hath created the mind free; * * * that to compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of opinions which he disbelieves, is sinful and tyrannical;

"*We, the General Assembly, do enact,* That no man shall be compelled to frequent or support any religious worship, place, or ministry whatsoever, nor shall be enforced, restrained, molested, or burthened in his body or goods, nor shall otherwise suffer, on account of his religious opinions or belief."[26]

I cannot believe that the great author of those words, or the men who made them law, could have joined in this decision. Neither so high nor so impregnable today as yesterday is the wall raised between church and state by Virginia's great statute of religious freedom and the First Amendment, now made applicable to all the states by the Fourteenth.[27] New Jersey's statute sustained is the first if indeed it is not the second breach to be made by this Court's action. That a third, and a fourth, and still others will be attempted, we may be sure. For just as *Cochran* v. *Board of Education*, 281 U.S. 370, has opened the way by oblique ruling[28] for this decision, so will the two make wider the breach for a third. Thus with time the most solid freedom steadily gives way before continuing corrosive decision.

---

[25] See Cubberley, Public Education in the United States (1934) ch. VI; Knight, Education in the United States (1941) ch. VIII.

[26] "A Bill for Establishing Religious Freedom," enacted by the General Assembly of Virginia, January 19, 1786. See 1 Randall, "The Life of Thomas Jefferson" (1858), 219–220; XII Hening's Statutes of Virginia (1823), 84.

This case forces us to determine squarely for the first time[29] what was "an establishment of religion" in the First Amendment's conception; and by that measure to decide whether New Jersey's action violates its command. The facts may be stated shortly, to give setting and color to the constitutional problem.

By statute New Jersey has authorized local boards of education to provide for the transportation of children "to and from school other than a public school" except one operated for profit wholly or in part, over established public school routes, or by other means when the child lives "remote from any school."[30] The school board of Ewing Township has provided by resolution for "the transportation of pupils of Ewing to the Trenton and Pennington High Schools and Catholic Schools by way of public carrier."[31]

Named parents have paid the cost of public conveyance of their children from their homes in Ewing to three public high schools and four parochial schools outside the district.[32] Semiannually the Board has reimbursed the parents from public school funds raised by general taxation. Religion is taught as part of the curriculum in each of the four private schools, as appears affirmatively by the testimony of the superintendent of parochial schools in the Diocese of Trenton.

The Court of Errors and Appeals of New Jersey, reversing the Supreme Court's decision, 132 N.J.L. 98, 39 A. 2d 75, has held the Ewing board's action not in contravention of the state constitution or statutes or of the Federal Constitution, 133 N.J.L. 350, 44 A. 2d 333. We have to consider only whether this ruling accords with the prohibition of the First Amendment implied in the due process clause of the Fourteenth.

I

Not simply an established church, but any law respecting an establishment of religion is forbidden. The Amendment was broadly but not loosely phrased. It is the compact and exact summation of its author's views formed during his long struggle for religious freedom. In Madison's own words characterizing Jefferson's Bill for Establishing Religious Freedom, the guaranty he put in our national charter, like the bill he piloted through the Virginia Assembly, was "a Model of technical precision, and perspicuous brevity."[33] Madison could not have confused "church" and "religion," or "an established church" and "an establishment of religion."

The Amendment's purpose was not to strike merely at the official establishment of a single sect, creed or religion, outlawing only a formal relation such as had prevailed in England and some of the colonies. Necessarily it was to uproot all such relationships. But the object was broader than separating church and state in this narrow sense. It was to create a complete and permanent separation of the spheres of religious activity and civil authority by comprehensively forbidding every form of public aid or support for religion. In proof the Amendment's wording and history unite with this Court's consistent utterances whenever attention has been fixed directly upon the question.

"Religion" appears only once in the Amendment. But the word governs two prohibitions and governs them alike. It does not have two meanings, one narrow to forbid "an establishment" and another, much broader, for securing "the free exercise thereof." "Thereof" brings down "religion" with its entire and exact content, no more and no less, from the first into the second guaranty, so that Congress and now the states are as broadly restricted concerning the one as they are regarding the other.

No one would claim today that the Amendment is constricted, in "prohibiting the free exercise" of religion, to securing the free exercise of some formal or creedal observance, of one sect or of many. It secures all forms of religious expression, creedal sectarian or nonsectarian, wherever and however taking place, except conduct which trenches upon the like freedoms of others or clearly and presently endangers the community's good order and security.[34] For the protective purposes of this phase of the basic freedom, street preaching, oral or by distribution of literature, has been given "the same high estate under the First Amendment as * * * worship in the churches and preaching from the pulpits."[35] And on this basis parents have been held entitled to send their children to private, religious schools. *Pierce* v. *Society of Sisters*, 268 U.S. 510. Accordingly, daily religious education commingled with secular is "religion" within the guaranty's comprehensive scope. So are religious training and teaching in whatever form. The word connotes the broadest content, determined not by the form or formality of the teaching or where it occurs, but by its essential nature regardless of those details.

"Religion" has the same broad significance in the twin prohibition concerning "an establishment." The Amendment was not duplicitous. "Religion" and "establishment" were not used in any formal or technical sense. The prohibition broadly forbids state support, financial or other, of religion in any guise, form or degree. It outlaws all use of public funds for religious purposes.

II

No provision of the Constitution is more closely tied to or given content by its generating history than the religious clause of the First Amendment. It is at once the refined product and the terse summation of that history. The history includes not only Madison's authorship and the proceedings before the First Congress, but also the long and intensive struggle for religious freedom in America, more especially in Virginia,[36] of which the Amendment was the direct culmination.[37] In the documents of the times, particularly of Madison, who was leader in the Virginia struggle before he became the Amendment's sponsor, but also in the writings of Jefferson and others and in the issues which engendered them is to be found irrefutable confirmation of the Amendment's sweeping content.

---

[27] *Schneider* v. *State*, 308 U.S. 147; *Cantwell* v. *Connecticut*, 310 U.S. 296; *Murdock* v. *Pennsylvania*, 319 U.S. 105; *Prince* v. *Massachusetts*, 321 U.S. 158; *Thomas* v. *Collins*, 323 U.S. 516, 530.

[28] The briefs did not raise the First Amendment issue. The only one presented was whether the state's action involved a public or an exclusively private function under the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. See Part IV infra. On the facts, the cost of transportation here is inseparable from both religious and secular teaching at the religious school. In the Cochran case the state furnished secular textbooks only. But see text infra at note 40 et seq., and Part IV.

[29] Cf. note 3 and text Part IV; see also note 35.

[30] The statute reads: "Whenever in any district there are children living remote from any schoolhouse, the board of education of the district may make rules and contracts for the transportation of such children to and from school * * * other than a public school, except such school as is operated for profit in whole or in part.

"When any school district provides any transportation for public school children to and from school, transportation from any point in such established school route to any other point in such established school route shall be supplied to school children residing in such school district in going to and from school other than a public school, except such school as is operated for profit in whole or in part." Laws of New Jersey (1941) c. 191.

[31] The full text of the resolution is given in note 59 infra.

[32] The public schools attended were the Trenton Senior High School, the Trenton Junior High School, and the Pennington High School. Ewing Township itself provides no public high schools, affording only elementary public schools which stop with the eighth grade. The Ewing school board pays for both transportation and tuitions of pupils attending the public high schools. The only private schools, all Catholic, covered in application of the resolution are St. Mary's Cathedral High School, Trenton Catholic Boys High School, and two elementary parochial schools, St. Hedwig's Parochial School and St. Francis School. The Ewing board pays only for transportation to these schools, not for tuitions. So far as the record discloses, the board does not pay for or provide transportation to any other elementary school, public or private. See notes 58, 59 and text *infra*.

[33] IX Writings of James Madison (ed. by Hunt, 1910) 288; Padover, Jefferson (1942) 74. Madison's characterization related to Jefferson's entire revision of the Virginia Code, of which the Bill for Establishing Religious Freedom was part. See note 15.

[34] See *Reynolds* v. *United States*, 98 U.S. 145; *Davis* v. *Beason*, 133 U.S. 333; *Mormon Church* v. *United States*, 136 U.S. 1; *Jacobson* v. *Massachusetts*, 197 U.S. 11; *Prince* v. *Massachusetts*, 321 U.S. 158; also *Cleveland* v. *United States*, 329 U.S. 14.

Possibly the first official declaration of the "clear and present danger" doctrine was Jefferson's declaration in the Virginia Statute for Establishing Religious Freedom: "That it is time enough for the rightful purposes of civil government for its officers to interfere when principles break out into overt acts against peace and good order." 1 Randall, The Life of Thomas Jefferson (1858) 220; Padover, Jefferson (1942) 81. For Madison's view to the same effect, see note 28 infra.

[35] *Murdock* v. *Pennsylvania*, 319 U.S. 105, 109; *Martin* v. *Struthers*, 319 U.S. 141; *Jamison* v. *Texas*, 318 U.S. 413; *Marsh* v. *Alabama*, 326 U.S. 501; *Tucker* v. *Texas*, 326 U.S. 517.

[36] Conflicts in other states, and earlier in the colonies, contributed much to generation of the Amendment, but none so directly as that in Virginia or with such formative influence on the Amendment's content and wording. See Cobb, Rise of Religious Liberty in America (1902); Sweet, The Story of Religion in America (1939). The Charter of Rhode Island of 1663, II Poore, Constitutions (1878) 1595, was the first colonial charter to provide for religious freedom.

The climactic period of the Virginia struggle covers the decade 1776–1786, from adoption of the Declaration of Rights to enactment of the Statute for Religious Freedom. For short accounts see Padover, Jefferson (1942) c. V; Brant, James Madison, The Virginia Revolutionist (1941) cc. XII, XV; James, The Struggle for Religious Liberty in Virginia (1900) cc. X, XI; Eckenrode, Separation of Church and State in Virginia (1910). These works and Randall, see note 1, will be cited in this opinion by the names of their authors. Citations to "Jefferson" refer to The Works of Thomas Jefferson (ed. by Ford, 1904–1905); to "Madison," to The Writings of James Madison (ed. by Hunt, 1901–1910).

For Madison, as also for Jefferson, religious freedom was the crux of the struggle for freedom in general. Remonstrance, Par. 15, Appendix hereto. Madison was coauthor with George Mason of the religious clause in Virginia's great Declaration of Rights of 1776. He is credited with changing it from a mere statement of the principle of tolerance to the first official legislative pronouncement that freedom of conscience and religion are inherent rights of the individual.[38] He sought also to have the Declaration expressly condemn the existing Virginia establishment.[39] But the forces supporting it were then too strong.

Accordingly Madison yielded on this phase but not for long. At once he resumed the fight, continuing it before succeeding legislative sessions. As a member of the General Assembly in 1779 he threw his full weight behind Jefferson's historic Bill for Establishing Religious Freedom. That bill was a prime phase of Jefferson's broad program of democratic reform undertaken on his return from the Continental Congress in 1776 and submitted for the General Assembly's consideration in 1779 as his proposed revised Virginia code.[40] With Jefferson's departure for Europe in 1784, Madison became the Bill's prime sponsor.[41] Enactment failed in successive legislatures from its introduction in June, 1779, until its adoption in January, 1786. But during all this time the fight for religious freedom moved forward in Virginia on various fronts with growing intensity. Madison led throughout, against Patrick Henry's powerful opposing leadership until Henry was elected governor in November, 1784.

The climax came in the legislative struggle of 1784–1785 over the Assessment Bill. See Supplemental Appendix hereto. This was nothing more nor less than a taxing measure for the support of religion, designed to revive the payment of tithes suspended since 1777. So long as it singled out a particular sect for preference it incurred the active and general hostility of dissentient groups. It was broadened to include them, with the result that some subsided temporarily in their opposition.[42] As altered, the bill gave to each taxpayer the privilege of designating which church should receive his share of the tax. In default of designation the legislature applied it to pious uses.[43] But what is of the utmost significance here, "in its final form the bill left the taxpayer the option of giving his tax to education." [44]

Madison was unyielding at all times, opposing with all his vigor the general and nondiscriminatory as he had the earlier particular and discriminatory assessments proposed. The modified Assessment Bill passed second reading in December, 1784, and was all but enacted. Madison and his followers, however, maneuvered deferment of final consideration until November, 1785. And before the Assembly reconvened in the fall he issued his historic Memorial and Remonstrance.[45]

This is Madison's complete, though not his only, interpretation of religious liberty.[46] It is a broadside attack upon all forms of "establishment" of religion, both general and particular, nondiscriminatory or selective. Reflecting not only the many legislative conflicts over the Assessment Bill and the Bill for Establishing Religious Freedom but also, for example, the struggles for religious incorporations and the continued maintenance of the glebes, the Remonstrance is at once the most concise and the most accurate statement of the views of the First Amendment's author concerning what is "an establishment of religion." Because it behooves us in the dimming distance of time not to lose sight of what he and his coworkers had in mind when, by a single sweeping stroke of the pen, they forbade an establishment of religion and secured its free exercise, the text of the Remonstrance is appended at the end of this opinion for its wider current reference, together with a copy of the bill against which it was directed.

The Remonstrance, stirring up a storm of popular protest, killed the Assessment Bill.[47] It collapsed in committee shortly before Christmas, 1785. With this, the way was cleared at last for enactment of Jefferson's Bill for Establishing Religious Freedom. Madison promptly drove it through in January of 1786, seven years from the time it was first introduced. This dual victory substantially ended the fight over establishments, settling the issue against them. See note 33.

The next year Madison became a member of the Constitutional Convention. Its work done, he fought valiantly to secure the ratification of its great product in Virginia as elsewhere, and nowhere else more effectively.[48] Madison was certain in his own mind that under the Constitution "there is not a shadow of right in the general government to intermeddle with religion" [49] and that "this subject is, for the honor of America, perfectly free and unshackled. The government has no jurisdiction over it." [50] Nevertheless he pledged that he would work for a Bill of Rights, including a specific guaranty of religious freedom, and Virginia, with other states, ratified the Constitution on this assurance.[51]

Ratification thus accomplished, Madison was sent to the first Congress. There he went at once about performing his pledge to establish freedom for the nation as he had done in Virginia. Within a little more than three years from his legislative victory at home he had proposed and secured the submission and ratification of the First Amendment as the first article of our Bill of Rights.[52]

All the great instruments of the Virginia struggle for religious liberty thus became warp and woof of our constitutional tradition, not simply by the course of history, but by the common unifying force of Madison's life, thought and sponsorship. He epitomized the whole of that tradition in the

---

[37] Brant, cc. XII, XV; James, cc. X, XI; Eckenrode.

[38] See Brant, c. XII, particularly at 243. Cf. Madison's Remonstrance, Appendix to this opinion. Jefferson of course held the same view. See note 15.

"Madison looked upon * * * religious freedom, to judge from the concentrated attention he gave it, as the fundamental freedom." Brant, 243; and see Remonstrance, Par. 1, 4, 15, Appendix.

[39] See Brant, 245–246. Madison quoted liberally from the Declaration in his Remonstrance and the use made of the quotations indicates that he considered the Declaration to have outlawed the prevailing establishment in principle, if not technically.

[40] Jefferson was chairman of the revising committee and chief draftsman. Corevisers were Wythe, Pendleton, Mason and Lee. The first enacted portion of the revision, which became known as Jefferson's Code, was the statute barring entailments. Primogeniture soon followed. Much longer the author was to wait for enactment of the Bill for Religious Freedom; and not until after his death was the corollary bill to be accepted in principle which he considered most important of all, namely, to provide for common education at public expense. See V Jefferson, 153. However, he linked this with disestablishment as corollary prime parts in a system of basic freedoms. I Jefferson, 78.

Jefferson, and Madison by his sponsorship, sought to give the Bill for Establishing Religious Freedom as nearly constitutional status as they could at the time. Acknowledging that one legislature could not "restrain the acts of succeeding Assemblies * * * and that therefore to declare this act irrevocable would be of no effect in law," the Bill's concluding provision as enacted nevertheless asserted: "Yet we are free to declare, and do declare, that the rights hereby asserted are of the natural rights of mankind, and that if any act shall be hereafter passed to repeal the present or to narrow its operation, such act will be an infringement of natural right." 1 Randall, 220.

[41] See I Jefferson, 70–71; XII Jefferson, 447; Padover, 80.

[42] Madison regarded this action as desertion. See his letter to Monroe of April 12, 1785; II Madison, 129, 131–132; James, cc. X, XI. But see Eckenrode, 91, suggesting it was surrender to the inevitable.

The bill provided: "That for every sum so paid, the Sheriff or Collector shall give a receipt, expressing therein to what society of Christians the person from whom he may receive the same shall direct the money to be paid." See also notes 19, 43 *infra*.

A copy of the Assessment Bill is to be found among the Washington manuscripts in the Library of Congress. Papers of George Washington, Vol. 231. Because of its crucial role in the Virginia struggle and bearing upon the First Amendment's meaning, the text of the Bill is set forth in the Supplemental Appendix to this opinion.

[43] Eckenrode, 99, 100.

[44] *Id.*, 100; II Madison, 113. The bill directed the sheriff to pay "all sums which * * * may not be appropriated by the person paying the same * * * into the public Treasury, to be disposed of under the direction of the General Assembly, for the encouragement of seminaries of learning within the Counties whence such sums shall arise, and to no other use or purpose whatsoever." Supplemental Appendix.

[45] See generally Eckenrode, c. V; Brant, James, and other authorities cited in note 11 above.

[46] II Madison, 183; and the Appendix to this opinion. Eckenrode, 100 ff. See also Fleet, Madison's "Detached Memoranda" (1946). III William & Mary Q. (3d Series) 534, 554–562.

[47] The major causes assigned for its defeat include the elevation of Patrick Henry to the governorship in November of 1784; the blunder of the proponents in allowing the Bill for Incorporations to come to the floor and incur defeat before the Assessment Bill was acted on; Madison's astute leadership, taking advantage of every "break" to convert his initial minority into a majority, including the deferment of action on the third reading to the fall; the Remonstrance, bringing a flood of protesting petitions; and the general poverty of the time. See Eckenrode, c. V, for an excellent short, detailed account.

[48] See James, Brant, op. cit. supra note 11.

[49] V Madison, 176. Cf. notes 33, 37.

[50] V Madison, 132.

[51] Brant, 250. The assurance made first to his constituents was responsible for Madison's becoming a member of the Virginia Convention which ratified the Constitution. See James, 154–158.

[52] The amendment with respect to religious liberties read, as Madison introduced it: "The civil rights of none shall be abridged on account of religious belief or worship, nor shall any national religion be established, nor shall the full and equal rights of conscience be in any manner, or on any pretext, infringed." 1 Annals of Congress 434. In the process of debate this was modified to its present form. See especially 1 Annals of Congress 729–731, 765; also note 34.

Amendment's compact, but nonetheless comprehensive, phrasing.

As the Remonstrance discloses throughout, Madison opposed every form and degree of official relation between religion and civil authority. For him religion was a wholly private matter beyond the scope of civil power either to restrain or to support.[53] Denial or abridgment of religious freedom was a violation of rights both of conscience and of natural equality. State aid was no less obnoxious or destructive to freedom and to religion itself than other forms of state interference. "Establishment" and "free exercise" were correlative and coextensive ideas, representing only different facets of the single great and fundamental freedom. The Remonstrance, following the Virginia statute's example, referred to the history of religious conflicts and the effects of all sorts of establishments, current and historical, to suppress religion's free exercise. With Jefferson, Madison believed that to tolerate any fragment of establishment would be by so much to perpetuate restraint upon that freedom. Hence he sought to tear out the institution not partially but root and branch, and to bar its return forever.

In no phase was he more unrelentingly absolute than in opposing state support or aid by taxation. Not even "three pence" contribution was thus to be exacted from any citizen for such a purpose. Remonstrance, Par. 3.[54] Tithes had been the lifeblood of establishments before and after other compulsions disappeared. Madison and his coworkers made no exceptions or abridgments to the complete separation they created. Their objection was not to small tithes. It was to any tithes whatsoever. "If it were lawful to impose a small tax for religion, the admission would pave the way for oppressive levies." [55] Not the amount but "the principle of assessment was wrong." And the principle was as much to prevent "the interference of law in religion" as to restrain religious intervention in political matters.[56] In this field the authors of our freedom would not tolerate "the first experiment on our liberties" or "wait till usurped power had strengthened itself by exercise, and entangled the question in precedents." Remonstrance, Par. 3. Nor should we.

In view of this history no further proof is needed that the Amendment forbids any appropriation, large or small, from public funds to aid or support any and all religious exercises. But if more were called for, the debates in the First Congress and this Court's consistent expressions, whenever it has touched on the matter directly,[57] supply it.

By contrast with the Virginia history, the congressional debates on consideration of the Amendment reveal only sparse discussion, reflecting the fact that the essential issues had been settled.[58] Indeed the matter had become so well understood as to have been taken for granted in all but formal phrasing. Hence, the only enlightening reference shows concern, not to preserve any power to use public funds in aid of religion, but to prevent the Amendment from outlawing private gifts inadvertently by virtue of the breadth of its wording.[59] In the margin are noted also the principal decisions in which expressions of this Court confirm the Amendment's broad prohibition.[60]

III

Compulsory attendance upon religious exercises went out early in the process of separating church and state, together with forced observance of religious forms and ceremonies.[61] Test oaths and religious qualification for office followed later.[62] These things none devoted to our great tradition of religious liberty would think of bringing back. Hence today, apart from efforts to inject religious training or exercises and sectarian issues into the public schools, the only serious surviving threat to maintaining that complete and permanent separation of religion and civil power which the First Amendment commands is through use of the taxing power to support religion, religious establishments, or establishments having a religious foundation whatever their form or special religious function.

Does New Jersey's action furnish support for religion by use of the taxing power? Certainly it does, if the test remains undiluted as Jefferson and Madison made it, that money taken by taxation from one is not to be used or given to support another's religious training or belief, or indeed one's own.[63] Today as then the furnishing of "contributions of money for the propagation of opinions which he disbelieves" is the forbidden exaction; and the prohibition is absolute for whatever measure brings that consequence and whatever amount may be sought or given to that end.

---

[53] See text of the Remonstrance, Appendix; also notes 13, 15, 24, 25 supra and text.

Madison's one exception concerning restraint was for "preserving public order." Thus he declared in a private letter, IX Madison, 484, 487, written after the First Amendment was adopted: "The tendency to a usurpation on one side or the other, or to a corrupting coalition or alliance between them, will be best guarded agst. by an entire abstinance of the Govt. from interference in any way whatever, beyond the necessity of preserving public order, & protecting each sect agst. trespasses on its legal rights by others." Cf. note 9.

[54] The third ground of remonstrance, see the Appendix, bears repetition for emphasis here: "Because, it is proper to take alarm at the first experiment on our liberties. The freemen of America did not wait till usurped power had strengthened itself by exercise, and entangled the question in precedents. They saw all the consequences in the principle, and they avoided the consequences by denying the principle. We revere this lesson too much, soon to forget it. Who does not see that * * * the same authority which can force a citizen to contribute three pence only of his property for the support of any one establishment, may force him to conform to any other establishment in all cases whatsoever?" II Madison 183, 185–186.

[55] Eckenrode, 105, in summary of the Remonstrance.

[56] "Because the bill implies either that the Civil Magistrate is a competent Judge of Religious truth; or that he may employ Religion as an engine of Civil policy. The first is an arrogant pretention falsified by the contradictory opinions of Rulers in all ages, and throughout the world: The second an unhallowed perversion of the means of salvation." Remonstrance, Appendix, Par. 5; II Madison 183, 187.

[57] As is pointed out above, note 3, and in Part IV *infra*, *Cochran* v. *Board of Education*, 281 U.S. 370, was not such a case.

[58] See text supra at notes 24, 25. Madison, of course, was but one of many holding such views, but nevertheless agreeing to the common understanding for adoption of a bill of rights in order to remove all doubt engendered by the absence of explicit guaranties in the original Constitution.

By 1791 the great fight over establishments had ended, although some vestiges remained then and later, even in Virginia. The glebes, for example, were not sold there until 1802. Cf. Eckenrode, 147. Fixing an exact date for "disestablishment" is almost impossible, since the process was piecemeal. Although Madison failed in having the Virginia Bill of Rights declare explicitly against establishment in 1776, cf. note 14 and text supra, in 1777 the levy for support of the Anglican clergy was suspended. It was never resumed. Eckenrode states: "This act, in effect, destroyed the establishment. Many dates have been given for its end, but it really came on January 1, 1777, when the act suspending the payment of tithes became effective. This was not seen at the time. But in freeing almost half of the taxpayers from the burden of the state religion, the state religion was at an end. Nobody could be forced to support it, and an attempt to levy tithes upon Anglicans alone would be to recruit the ranks of dissent." P. 53. See also pp. 61, 64. The question of assessment however was revived "with far more strength than ever, in the summer of 1784." Id., 64. It would seem more factual therefore to fix the time of disestablishment as of December 1785–January 1786, when the issue in large was finally settled.

[59] At one point the wording was proposed: "No religion shall be established by law, nor shall the equal rights of conscience be infringed." 1 Annals of Congress 729. Cf. note 27. Representative Huntington of Connecticut feared this might be construed to prevent judicial enforcement of private pledges. He stated "that he feared * * * that the words might be taken in such latitude as to be extremely hurtful to the cause of religion. He understood the amendment to mean what had been expressed by the gentleman from Virginia; but others might find it convenient to put another construction upon it. The ministers of their congregations to the Eastward were maintained by the contributions of those who belonged to their society; the expense of building meeting-houses was contributed in the same manner. These things were regulated by by-laws. If an action was brought before a Federal Court on any of these cases, the person who had neglected to perform his engagements could not be compelled to do it; for a support of ministers or building of places of worship might be construed into a religious establishment." 1 Annals of Congress 730.

To avoid any such possibility, Madison suggested inserting the word "national" before "religion," thereby not only again disclaiming intent to bring about the result Huntington feared but also showing unmistakably that "establishment" meant public "support" of religion in the financial sense. 1 Annals of Congress 731. See also IX Madison, 484–487.

[60] The decision most closely touching the question, where it was squarely raised, is *Quick Bear* v. *Leupp*, 210 U.S. 50. The Court distinguished sharply between appropriations from public funds for the support of religious education and appropriations from funds held in trust by the Government essentially as trustee for private individuals, Indian wards, as beneficial owners. The ruling was that the latter could be disbursed to private, religious schools at the designation of those patrons for paying the cost of their education. But it was stated also that such a use of public moneys would violate both the First Amendment and the specific statutory declaration involved, namely, that "it is hereby declared to be the settled policy of the Government to hereafter make no appropriation whatever for education in any sectarian school." 210 U.S. at 79. Cf. *Ponce* v. *Roman Catholic Apostolic Church*, 210 U.S. 296, 322. And see *Bradfield* v. *Roberts*, 175 U.S. 291, an instance of highly artificial grounding to support a decision sustaining an appropriation for the care of indigent patients pursuant to a contract with a private hospital. Cf. also the authorities cited in note 9.

[61] See text at note 1.

[62] "But no religious Test shall ever be required as a Qualification to any Office or public Trust under the United States." Const., Art. VI, § 3. See also the two forms prescribed for the President's Oath or Affirmation. Const., Art. II, § 1. Cf., *Ex parte Garland*, 4 Wall. 333; *Cummings* v. *Missouri*, 4 Wall. 277; *United States* v. *Lovett*, 328 U.S. 303.

[63] In the words of the Virginia statute, following the portion of the preamble quoted at the beginning of this opinion: "* * *

The funds used here were raised by taxation. The Court does not dispute, nor could it, that their use does in fact give aid and encouragement to religious instruction. It only concludes that this aid is not "support" in law. But Madison and Jefferson were concerned with aid and support in fact, not as a legal conclusion "entangled in precedents." Remonstrance, Par. 3. Here parents pay money to send their children to parochial schools and funds raised by taxation are used to reimburse them. This not only helps the children to get to school and the parents to send them. It aids them in a substantial way to get the very thing which they are sent to the particular school to secure, namely, religious training and teaching.

Believers of all faiths, and others who do not express their feeling toward ultimate issues of existence in any creedal form, pay the New Jersey tax. When the money so raised is used to pay for transportation to religious schools, the Catholic taxpayer to the extent of his proportionate share pays for the transportation of Lutheran, Jewish and otherwise religiously affiliated children to receive their non-Catholic religious instruction. Their parents likewise pay proportionately for the transportation of Catholic children to receive Catholic instruction. Each thus contributes to "the propagation of opinions which he disbelieves" insofar as their religions differ, as do others who accept no creed without regard to those differences. Each thus pays taxes also to support the teaching of his own religion, an exaction equally forbidden since it denies "the comfortable liberty" of giving one's contribution to the particular agency of instruction he approves.[64]

New Jersey's action therefore exactly fits the type of exaction and the kind of evil at which Madison and Jefferson struck. Under the test they framed it cannot be said that the cost of transportation is no part of the cost of education or of the religious instruction given. That it is a substantial and a necessary element is shown most plainly by the continuing and increasing demand for the state to assume it. Nor is there pretense that it relates only to the secular instruction given in religious schools or that any attempt is or could be made toward allocating proportional shares as between the secular and the religious instruction. It is precisely because the instruction is religious and relates to a particular faith, whether one or another, that parents send their children to religious schools under the Pierce doctrine. And the very purpose of the state's contribution is to defray the cost of conveying the pupil to the place where he will receive not simply secular, but also and primarily religious, teaching and guidance.

Indeed the view is sincerely avowed by many of various faiths,[65] that the basic purpose of all education is or should be religious, that the secular cannot be and should not be separated from the religious phase and emphasis. Hence, the inadequacy of public or secular education and the necessity for sending the child to a school where religion is taught. But whatever may be the philosophy or its justification, there is undeniably an admixture of religious with secular teaching in all such institutions. That is the very reason for their being. Certainly the purposes of constitutionality we cannot contradict the whole basis of the ethical and educational convictions of people who believe in religious schooling.

Yet this very admixture is what was disestablished when the First Amendment forbade "an establishment of religion." Commingling the religious with the secular teaching does not divest the whole of its religious permeation and emphasis or make them of minor part, if proportion were material. Indeed, on any other view, the constitutional prohibition always could be brought to naught by adding a modicum of the secular.

An appropriation from the public treasury to pay the cost of transportation to Sunday school, to weekday special classes at the church or parish house, or to the meetings of various young people's religious societies, such as the Y.M.C.A., the Y.W.C.A., the Y.M.H.A., the Epworth League, could not withstand the constitutional attack. This would be true, whether or not secular activities were mixed with the religious. If such an appropriation could not stand, then it is hard to see how one becomes valid for the same thing upon the more extended scale of daily instruction. Surely constitutionality does not turn on where or how often the mixed teaching occurs.

Finally, transportation, where it is needed, is as essential to education as any other element. Its cost is as much a part of the total expense, except at times in amount, as the cost of textbooks, of school lunches, of athletic equipment, of writing and other materials; indeed of all other items composing the total burden. Now as always the core of the educational process is the teacher-pupil relationship. Without this the richest equipment and facilities would go for naught. See *Judd* v. *Board of Education*, 278 N.Y. 200, 212, 15 N.E. 2d 576, 582. But the proverbial Mark Hopkins conception no longer suffices for the country's requirements. Without buildings, without equipment, without library, textbooks and other materials, and without transportation to bring teacher and pupil together in such an effective teaching environment, there can be not even the skeleton of what our times require. Hardly can it be maintained that transportation is the least essential of these items, or that it does not in fact aid, encourage, sustain and support, just as they do, the very process which is its purpose to accomplish. No less essential is it, or the payment of its cost, than the very teaching in the classroom or payment of the teacher's sustenance. Many types of equipment, now considered essential, better could be done without.

For me, therefore, the feat is impossible to select so indispensable an item from the composite of total costs, and characterize it as not aiding, contributing to, promoting or sustaining the propagation of beliefs which it is the very end of all to bring about. Unless this can be maintained, and the Court does not maintain it, the aid thus given is outlawed. Payment of transportation is no more, nor is it any the less essential to education, whether religious or secular, than payment for tuitions, for teachers' salaries, for buildings, equipment and necessary materials. Nor is it any the less directly related, in a school giving religious instruction, to the primary religious objective all those essential items of cost are intended to achieve. No rational line can be drawn between payment for such larger, but not more necessary, items and payment for transportation. The only line that can be so drawn is one between more dollars and less. Certainly in this realm such a line can be no valid constitutional measure. *Murdock* v. *Pennsylvania*, 319 U.S. 105; *Thomas* v. *Collins*, 323 U.S. 516.[66] Now, as in Madison's time, not the amount but the principle of assessment is wrong. Remonstrance, Par. 3.

IV

But we are told that the New Jersey statute is valid in its present application because the appropriation is for a public, not a private purpose, namely, the promotion of education, and the majority accept this idea in the conclusion that all we have here is "public welfare legislation." If that is true and the Amendment's force can be thus destroyed, what has been said becomes all the more pertinent. For then there could be no possible objection to more extensive support of religious education by New Jersey.

If the fact alone be determinative that religious schools are engaged in education, thus promoting the general and individual welfare, together with the legislature's decision that the payment of public moneys for their aid makes their work a public function, then I can see no possible basis, except one of dubious legislative policy, for the state's refusal to make full appropriation for support of private, religious schools, just as is done for public instruction. There could not be, on that basis, valid constitutional objection.[67]

---

even the forcing him to support this or that teacher of his own religious persuasion, is depriving him of the comfortable liberty of giving his contributions to the particular pastor, whose morals he would make his pattern, and whose powers he feels most persuasive to righteousness, and is withdrawing from the ministry those temporary rewards, which proceeding from an approbation of their personal conduct, are an additional incitement to earnest and unremitting labours for the instruction of mankind." Cf. notes 29, 30, 31 and text supra.

[64] See note 63.

[65] See Bower, Church and State in Education (1944) 58: "* * * the fundamental division of the education of the whole self into the secular and the religious could not be justified on the grounds of either a sound educational philosophy or a modern functional concept of the relation of religion to personal and social experience." See also Vere, The Elementary School, in Essays on Catholic Education in the United States (1942) 110–111; Gabel, Public Funds for Church and Private Schools (1937) 737–739.

[66] It would seem a strange ruling that a "reasonable," that is, presumably a small, license fee cannot be placed upon the exercise of the right of religious instruction, yet that under the correlative constitutional guaranty against "an establishment" taxes may be levied and used to aid and promote religious instruction, if only the amounts so used are small. See notes 30–31 *supra* and text.

Madison's objection to "three pence" contributions and his stress upon "denying the principle" without waiting until "usurped power had * * * entangled the question in precedents," note 29, were reinforced by his further characterization of the Assessment Bill: "Distant as it may be, in its present form, from the Inquisition it differs from it only in degree. The one is the first step, the other the last in the career of intolerance." Remonstrance, Par. 9; II Madison 183, 188.

[67] If it is part of the state's function to supply to religious schools or their patrons the smaller items of educational expense, because the legislature may say they perform a public function, it is hard to see why the larger ones also may not be paid. Indeed, it would seem even more proper and necessary for the state to do this. For if one class of expenditures is justified on the ground that it supports the general cause of education or benefits the individual, or can be made to do so by legislative declaration, so even more certainly would be the other. To sustain payment for transportation to school, for textbooks, for other essential materials, or perhaps for school lunches, and not for what makes all these things effective for their intended end, would be to make a public function of the smaller items and their cumulative effect, but to make wholly private in character the larger things without which the smaller could have no meaning or use.

Of course paying the cost of transportation promotes the general cause of education and the welfare of the individual. So does paying all other items of educational expense. And obviously, as the majority say, it is much too late to urge that legislation designed to facilitate the opportunities of children to secure a secular education serves no public purpose. Our nationwide system of public education rests on the contrary view, as do all grants in aid of education, public or private, which is not religious in character.

These things are beside the real question. They have no possible materiality except to obscure the all-prevading, inescapable issue. *Cf. Cochran* v. *Board of Education, supra.* Stripped of its religious phase, the case presents no substantial Federal question. Ibid. The public function argument, by casting the issue in terms of promoting the general cause of education and the welfare of the individual, ignores the religious factor and its essential connection with the transportation, thereby leaving out the only vital element in the case. So of course do the "public welfare" and "social legislation" ideas, for they come to the same thing.

We have here then one substantial issue, not two. To say that New Jersey's appropriation and her use of the power of taxation for raising the funds appropriated are not for public purposes but are for private ends, is to say that they are for the support of religion and religious teaching. Conversely, to say that they are for public purposes is to say that they are not for religious ones.

This is precisely for the reason that education which includes religious training and teaching, and its support, have been made matters of private right and function, not public, by the very terms of the First Amendment. That is the effect not only in its guaranty of religion's free exercise, but also in the prohibition of establishments. It was on this basis of the private character of the function of religious education that this Court held parents entitled to send their children to private, religious schools. *Pierce* v. *Society of Sisters, supra.* Now it declares in effect that the appropriation of public funds to defray part of the cost of attending those schools is for a public purpose. If so, I do not understand why the state cannot go farther or why this case approaches the verge of its power.

In truth this view contradicts the whole purpose and effect of the First Amendment as heretofore conceived. The "public function"—"public welfare"—"social legislation" argument seeks, in Madison's words, to "employ Religion [that is, here, religious education] as an engine of Civil policy." Remonstrance, Par. 5. It is of one piece with the Assessment Bill's preamble, although with the vital difference that it wholly ignores what that preamble explicity states.[68]

Our constitutional policy is exactly the opposite. It does not deny the value or the necessity for religious training, teaching or observance. Rather it secures their free exercise. But to that end it does deny that the state can undertake or sustain them in any form or degree. For this reason the sphere of religious activity, as distinguished from the secular intellectual liberties, has been given the twofold protection and, as the state cannot forbid, neither can it perform or aid in performing the religious function. The dual prohibition makes that function altogether private. It cannot be made a public one by legislative act. This was the very heart of Madison's Remonstrance, as it is of the Amendment itself.

It is not because religious teaching does not promote the public or the individual's welfare, but because neither is furthered when the state promotes religious education, that the Constitution forbids it to do so. Both legislatures and courts are bound by that distinction. In failure to observe it lies the fallacy of the "public function"—"social legislation" argument, a fallacy facilitated by easy transference of the argument's basing from due process unrelated to any religious aspect to the First Amendment.

By no declaration that a gift of public money to religious uses will promote the general or individual welfare, or the cause of education generally, can legislative bodies overcome the Amendment's bar. Nor may the courts sustain their attempts to do so by finding such consequences for appropriations which in fact give aid to or promote religious uses. Cf. *Norris* v. *Alabama,* 294 U. S. 587, 590; *Hooven & Allison Co.* v. *Evatt,* 324 U. S. 652, 659; *Akins* v. *Texas,* 325 U. S. 398, 402. Legislatures are free to make, and courts to sustain, appropriations only when it can be found that in fact they do not aid, promote, encourage or sustain religious teaching or observances, be the amount large or small. No such finding has been or could be made in this case. The Amendment has removed this form of promoting the public welfare from legislative and judicial competence to make a public function. It is exclusively a private affair.

The reasons underlying the Amendment's policy have not vanished with time or diminished in force. Now as when it was adopted the price of religious freedom is double. It is that the church and religion shall live both within and upon that freedom. There cannot be freedom of religion, safeguarded by the state, and intervention by the church or its agencies in the state's domain or dependency on its largesse. Madison's Remonstrance, Par. 6, 8.[69] The great condition of religious liberty is that it be maintained free from sustenance, as also from other interferences, by the state. For when it comes to rest upon that secular foundation it vanishes with the resting. *Id.,* Par. 7, 8.[70] Public money devoted to payment of religious costs, educational or other, brings the quest for more. It brings too the struggle of sect against sect for the larger share or for any. Here one by numbers alone will benefit most, there another. That is precisely the history of societies which have had an established religion and dissident groups. Id., Par. 8, 11. It is the very thing Jefferson and Madison experienced and sought to guard against, whether in its blunt or in its more screened forms. *Ibid.* The end of such strife cannot be other than to destroy the cherished liberty. The dominating group will achieve the dominant benefit; or all will embroil the state in their dissensions. Id. Par. 11.[71]

Exactly such conflicts have centered of late around providing transportation to religious schools from public funds.[72] The issue and the dissension work typically, in Madison's phrase, to "destroy that moderation and harmony which the forbearance of our laws to intermeddle with Religion, has produced amongst its several sects." Id., Par. 11. This occurs, as he well knew, over measures at the very threshold of departure from the principle. Id., Par. 3, 9, 11.

In these conflicts wherever success has been obtained it has been upon the contention that by providing the transportation the general cause of education, the general welfare, and the welfare of the individual will be forwarded; hence that the matter lies within the realm of public function, for legislative determination.[73] State courts have divided upon the issue, some taking the view that only the individual, others that the institution receives the benefit.[74] A few have recognized that this dichotomy is false, that both in fact are aided.[75]

---

[68] "Whereas the general diffusion of Christian knowledge hath a natural tendency to correct the morals of men, restrain their vices, and preserve the peace of society; which cannot be effected without a competent provision for learned teachers, who may be thereby enabled to devote their time and attention to the duty of instructing such citizens, as from their circumstances and want of education, cannot otherwise attain such knowledge; and it is judged that such provision may be made by the legislature, without counteracting the liberal principle heretofore adopted and intended to be preserved by abolishing all distinctions of preeminence amongst the different societies of communities of Christians." Supplemental Appendix; Foote, Sketches of Virginia (1850) 340.

[69] "Because the establishment proposed by the Bill is not requisite for the support of the Christian Religion. To say that it is, is a contradiction to the Christian Religion itself; for every page of it disavows a dependence on the powers of this world . . . . Because the establishment in question is not necessary for the support of Civil Government. . . . What influence in fact have ecclesiastical establishments had on Civil Society? . . . in no instance have they been seen the guardians of the liberties of the people." II Madison 183, 187, 188.

[70] "Because experience witnesseth that ecclesiastical establishments, instead of maintaining the purity and efficacy of Religion, have had a contrary operation." II Madison 183, 187.

[71] "At least let warning be taken at the first fruits of the threatened innovation. The very appearance of the Bill has transformed that 'Christian forbearance, love and charity,' which of late mutually prevailed, into animosities and jealousies, which may not soon be appeased." II Madison 183, 189.

[72] In this case briefs amici curiae have been filed on behalf of various organizations representing three religious sects, one labor union, the American Civil Liberties Union, and the states of Illinois, Indiana, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Michigan and New York. All these states have laws similar to New Jersey's and all of them, with one religious sect, support the constitutionality of New Jersey's action. The others oppose it. Maryland and Mississippi have sustained similar legislation. Note 49 infra. No state without legislation of this sort has filed an opposing brief. But at least six states have held such action invalid, namely, Delaware, Oklahoma, New York, South Dakota, Washington and Wisconsin. Note 49 infra. The New York ruling was overturned by amendment to the state constitution in 1938. Constitution of New York, Art. XI, 4.

Furthermore, in this case the New Jersey courts divided, the Supreme Court holding the statute and resolution invalid, 132 N. J. L. 98, 39 A. 2d 75, the Court of Errors and Appeals reversing that decision, 133 N. J. L. 350, 44 A. 2d 333. In both courts, as here, the judges split, one of three dissenting in the Supreme Court, three of nine in the Court of Errors and Appeals. The division is typical. See the cases cited in note 49.

[73] See the authorities cited in note 49; and see note 54.

[74] Some state courts have sustained statutes granting free transportation or free school books to children attending denominational schools on the theory that the aid was a benefit to the child rather than to the school. See *Nichols* v. *Henry,* 301 Ky. 434, 191 S.W. 2d 930, with which compare *Sherrard* v. *Jefferson County Board of Education,* 294 Ky. 469, 171 S.W. 2d 963; *Cochran* v. *Board of Education,* 168 La. 1030, 123 So. 664, aff'd, 281 U.S. 370; *Borden* v. *Board of Education,* 168 La. 1005, 123 So. 655; *Board of Education* v. *Wheat,* 174 Md. 314, 199 A. 628; *Adams* v. *St. Mary's County,* 180 Md. 550, 26 A. 2d 377; *Chance* v. *State Textbook R. & P. Board,* 190 Miss. 453, 200 So. 706. See also *Bowker* v. *Baker,* 73 Cal. App. 2d 653, 167 P. 2d 256. Other courts have held such statutes unconstitutional under state constitutions as aid to the schools. *Judd* v. *Board of Education,* 278 N.Y. 200, 15 N.E. 2d 576, but see

The majority here does not accept in terms any of those views. But neither does it deny that the individual or the school, or indeed both, are benefited directly and substantially.[76] To do so would cut the ground from under the public function—social legislation thesis. On the contrary, the opinion concedes that the children are aided by being helped to get to the religious schooling. By converse necessary implication as well as by the absence of express denial, it must be taken to concede also that the school is helped to reach the child with its religious teaching. The religious enterprise is common to both, as is the interest in having transportation for its religious purposes provided.

Notwithstanding the recognition that this two-way aid is given and the absence of any denial that religious teaching is thus furthered, the Court concludes that the aid so given is not "support" of religion. It is rather only support of education as such, without reference to its religious content, and thus becomes public welfare legislation. To this elision of the religious element from the case is added gloss in two respects, one that the aid extended partakes of the nature of a safety measure, the other that failure to provide it would make the state unneutral in religious matters, discriminating against or hampering such children concerning public benefits all others receive.

As will be noted, the one gloss is contradicted by the facts of record and the other is of whole cloth with the "public function" argument's excision of the religious factor.[77] But most important is that this approach, if valid, supplies a ready method for nullifying the Amendment's guaranty, not only for this case and others involving small grants in aid for religious education, but equally for larger ones. The only thing needed will be for the Court again to transplant the "public welfare—public function" view from its proper nonreligious due process bearing to First Amendment application, holding that religious education is not "supported" though it may be aided by the appropriation, and that the cause of education generally is furthered by helping the pupil to secure that type of training.

This is not therefore just a little case over bus fares. In paraphrase of Madison, distant as it may be in its preesnt form from a complete establishment of religion, it differs from it only in degree; and is the first step in that direction. Id., Par. 9.[78] Today as in his time "the same authority which can force a citizen to contribute three pence only * * * for the support of any one [religious] establishment, may force him" to pay more; or "to conform to any other establishment in all cases whatsoever." And now, as then, "either * * * we must say, that the will of the Legislature is the only measure of their authority; and that in the plenitude of this authority, they may sweep away all our fundamental rights; or, that they are bound to leave this particular right untouched and sacred." Remonstrance, Par. 15.

The realm of religious training and belief remains, as the Amendment made it, the kingdom of the individual man and his God. It should be kept inviolately private, not "entangled * * * in precedents"[79] or confounded with what legislatures legitimately may take over into the public domain.

V

No one conscious of religious values can be unsympathetic toward the burden which our constitutional separation puts on parents who desire religious instruction mixed with secular for their children. They pay taxes for others' children's education, at the same time the added cost of instruction for their own. Nor can one happily see benefits denied to children which others receive, because in conscience they or their parents for them desire a different kind of training others do not demand.

But if those feelings should prevail, there would be an end to our historic constitutional policy and command. No more unjust or discriminatory in fact is it to deny attendants at religious schools the cost of their transportation than it is to deny them tuitions, sustenance for their teachers, or any other educational expense which others receive at public cost. Hardship in fact there is which none can blink. But, for assuring to those who undergo it the greater, the most comprehensive freedom, it is one written by design and firm intent into our basic law.

Of course discrimination in the legal sense does not exist. The child attending the religious school has the same right as any other to attend the public school. But he foregoes exercising it because the same guaranty which assures this freedom forbids the public school or any agency of the state to give or aid him in securing the religious instruction he seeks.

Were he to accept the common school, he would be the first to protest the teaching there of any creed or faith not his own. And it is precisely for the reason that their atmosphere is wholly secular that children are not sent to public schools under the Pierce doctrine. But that is a constitutional necessity, because we have staked the very existence of our country on the faith that complete separation between the state and religion is best for the state and best for religion. Remonstrance, Par. 8, 12.

That policy necessarily entails hardship upon persons who forego the right to educational advantages the state can supply in order to secure others it is precluded from giving. Indeed this may hamper the parent and the child forced by conscience to that choice. But it does not make the state unneutral to withhold what the Constitution forbids it to give. On the contrary it is only by observing the prohibition rigidly that the state can maintain its neutrality and avoid partisanship in the dissensions inevitable when sect opposes sect over demands for public moneys to further religious education, teaching or training in any form or degree, directly or indirectly. Like St. Paul's freedom, religious liberty with a great price must be bought. And for those who exercise it most fully, by insisting upon religious education for their children mixed with secular, by the terms of our Constitution the price is greater than for others.

The problem then cannot be cast in terms of legal discrimination or its absence. This would be true, even though the state in giving aid, should treat all religious instruction alike. Thus, if the present statute and its application were shown to apply equally to all religious schools of whatever faith,[80] yet in the light of our tradition it could not stand. For then the adherent of one creed still would pay for the support of another, the childless taxpayer with others more fortunate. Then too there would seem to be no bar to making appropriations for transportation and other expenses of children attending public or other secular schools, after hours in separate places and classes for their exclusively religious instruction. The person who embraces no creed also would be forced to pay for teaching what he does not believe. Again, it was the furnishing of "contributions of money for the propagation of opinions which he disbelieves" that the fathers outlawed. That consequence and effect are not removed by multiplying to all-inclusiveness the sects for which support is exacted. The Constitution requires, not comprehensive identification of state with religion, but complete separation.

VI

Short treatment will dispose of what remains. Whatever might be said of some other application of New Jersey's statute, the one made here has no semblance of bearing as a safety measure or, indeed, for securing expeditious conveyance. The transportation supplied is by public conveyance, subject to all the hazards and delays of the highway and the streets incurred by the public generally in going about its multifarious business.

Nor is the case comparable to one of furnishing fire or police protection, or access to public highways. These things are matters of common right, part of the general need for safety.[81] Certainly the fire depart-

---

note 47 *supra; Smith* v. *Donahue,* 202 App. Div. 656, 195 N.Y.S. 715; *State ex rel. Traub* v. *Brown,* 36 Del. 181, 172 A. 835; *Gurney* v. *Ferguson,* 190 Okla. 254, 122 P. 2d 1002; *Mitchell* v. *Consolidated School District,* 17 Wash. 2d 61, 135 P. 2d 79; *Van Straten* v. *Milquet,* 180 Wis. 109, 192 N. W. 392. And cf. *Hlebanja* v. *Brewe,* 58 S.D. 351, 236 N.W. 296. And since many state constitutions have provisions forbidding the appropriation of public funds for private purposes, in these and other cases the issue whether the statute was for a "public" or "private" purpose has been present. Se Note (1941) 50 Yale L. J. 917, 925.

[75] *E.g., Gurney* v. *Ferguson,* 190 Okla. 254, 255, 122 P. 2d 1002, 1003; *Mitchell* v. *Consolidated School District,* 17 Wash. 2d 61, 68, 135 P. 2d 79, 82; *Smith* v. *Donahue,* 202 App. Div. 656, 664, 195 N.Y.S. 715, 722; *Board of Education* v. *Wheat,* 174 Md. 314, dissenting opinion at 340, 199 A. 628 at 639. This is true whether the appropriation and payment are in form to the individual or to the institution. *Ibid.* Questions of this gravity turn upon the purpose and effect of the state's expenditure to accomplish the forbidden object, not upon who receives the amount and applies it to that end or the form and manner of the payment.

[76] The payments here averaged roughly $40.00 a year per child.

[77] See Part V.

[78] See also not 46 supra and Remonstrance, Par. 3.

[79] Thus each brief filed here by the supporters of New Jersey's action, see note 47, not only relies strongly on *Cochran* v. *Board of Education,* 281 U.S. 370, but either explicitly or in effect maintains that it is controlling in the present case.

[80] See text at notes 17–19 supra and authorities cited; also Foote, Sketches of Virginia (1850) c. XV. Madison's entire thesis, as reflected throughout the Remonstrance and in his other writings, as well as in his opposition to the final form of the Assessment Bill, see note 43, was altogether incompatible with acceptance of general and "nondiscriminatory" support. See Brant, c. XII.

[81] The protections are of a nature which does not require appropriations specially made from the public treasury and earmarked, as is New Jersey's here, particularly for religious institutions or uses. The First Amendment does not exclude religious property or activities from protection against disorder or the ordinary accidental incidents of community life. It forbids support, not protection from interference or destruction.

It is a matter not frequently recalled that President Grant opposed tax exemption of religious property as leading to a violation of the principle of separation of church and state. See President Grant's Seventh Annual Message to Congress, December 7, 1875, in IX Messages and Papers of the Presidents (1897) 4288–4289. Garfield, in a letter accepting the nomination for the presidency said: "* * * it would be unjust to our people, and dangerous to our institutions, to apply any portion of the revenues of the nation, or of the States, to the support of sectarian schools. The separation of the Church and ment must not stand idly by while the church burns. Nor is this reason why the state should pay the expense of transportation or other items of the cost of religious education.[82]

Needless to add, we have no such case as *Green* v. *Frazier*, 253 U.S. 233, or *Carmichael* v. *Southern Coal Co.*, 301 U.S. 495, which dealt with matters wholly unrelated to the First Amendment, involving only situations where the "public function" issue was determinative.

I have chosen to place my dissent upon the broad ground I think decisive, though strictly speaking the case might be decided on narrower issues. The New Jersey statute might be held invalid on its face for the exclusion of children who attend private, profit-making schools.[83] I cannot assume, as does the majority, that the New Jersey courts would write off this explicit limitation from the statute. Moreover, the resolution by which the statute was applied expressly limits its benefits to students of public and Catholic schools.[84] There is no showing that there are no other private or religious schools in this populous district.[85] I do not think it can be assumed there were none.[86] But in the view I have taken, it is unnecessary to limit grounding to these matters.

Two great drives are constantly in motion to abridge, in the name of education, the complete division of religion and civil authority which our forefathers made. One is to introduce religious education and observances into the public schools. The other, to obtain public funds for the aid and support of various private religious schools. See Johnson, The Legal Status of Church-State Relationships in the United States (1934); Thayer, Religion in Public Education (1947); Note (1941) 50 Yale L. J. 917. In my opinion both avenues were closed by the Constitution. Neither should be opened by this Court. The matter is not one of quantity, to be measured by the amount of money expanded. Now as in Madison's day it is one of principle, to keep separate the separate spheres as the First Amendment drew them; to prevent the first experiment upon our liberties; and to keep the question from becoming entangled in corrosive precedents. We should not be less strict to keep strong and untarnished the one side of the shield of religious freedom than we have been of the other.

The judgment should be reversed.

Appendix

Memorial and Remonstrance Against Religious Assessments

To the Honorable the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Virginia:

We, the subscribers, citizens of the said Commonwealth, having taken into serious consideration, a Bill printed by order of the last Session of General Assembly, entitled "A Bill establishing a provision for Teachers of the Christian Religion," and conceiving that the same, if finally armed with the sanctions of a law, will be a dangerous abuse of power, are bound as faithful members of a free State, to remonstrate against it, and to declare the reasons by which we are determined. We remonstrate against the said Bill,

1. Because we hold it for a fundamental and undeniable truth, "that Religion or the duty which we owe to our Creator and the Manner of discharging it, can be directed only by reason and conviction, not by force or violence."[87] The Religion then of every man must be left to the conviction and conscience of every man; and it is the right of every man to exercise it as these may dictate. This right is in its nature an unalienable right. It is unalienable; because the opinions of men, depending only on the evidence contemplated by their own minds, cannot follow the dictates of other men: It is unalienable also; because what is here a right towards men, is a duty towards the Creator. It is the duty of every man to render to the Creator such homage, and such only, as he believes to be acceptable to him. This duty is precedent both in order of time and degree of obligation, to the claims of Civil Society. Before any man can be considered as a member of Civil Society, he must be considered as a subject of the Governor of the Universe: And if a member of Civil Society, who enters into any subordinate Association, must always do it with a reservation of his duty to the general authority; much more must every man who becomes a member of any particular Civil Society, do it with a saving of his allegiance to the Universal Sovereign. We maintain therefore that in matters of Religion, no man's right is abridged by the institution of Civil Society, and that Religion is wholly exempt from its cognizance. True it is, that no other rule exists, by which any question which may divide a Society, can be ultimately determined, but the will of the majority; but it is also true, that the majority may trespass on the rights of the minority.

2. Because if religion be exempt from the authority of the Society at large, still less can it be subject to that of the Legislative Body. The latter are but the creatures and vicegerents of the former. Their jurisdiction is both derivative and limited: it is limited with regard to the coordinate departments, more necessarily is it limited with regard to the constituents. The preservation of a free government requires not merely, that the metes and bounds which separate each department of power may be invariably maintained; but more especially, that neither of them be suffered to overleap the great Barrier which defends the rights of the people. The Rulers who are guilty of such an encroachment, exceed the commission from which they derive their authority, and are Tyrants. The People who submit to it are governed by laws made neither by themselves, nor by an authority derived from them, and are slaves.

3. Because, it is proper to take alarm at the first experiment on our liberties. We hold this prudent jealousy to be the first duty of citizens, and one of [the] noblest characteristics of the late Revolution. The freemen of America did not wait till usurped power had strengthened itself by exercise, and entangled the question in precedents. They saw all the consequences in the principle, and they avoided the consequences by denying the principle. We revere this lesson too much, soon to forget it. Who does not see that the same authority which can establish Christianity, in exclusion of all other Religions, may establish with the same ease any particular sect of Christians, in exclusion of all other Sects? That the same authority which can force a citizen to contribute three pence only of his property for the support of any one establishment, may force him to conform to any other establishment in all cases whatsoever?

4. Because, the bill violates that equality which ought to be the basis of every law, and which is more indispensible, in proportion as the validity or expediency of any law is more liable to be impeached. If "all men are by nature equally free and independent,"[88] all men are to be considered as entering into Society on equal conditions; as relinquishing no more, and therefore retaining no less, one than another, of their natural rights. Above all are they to be considered as retaining an "equal title to the free exercise of Religion according to the dictates of conscience."[89] Whilst we assert for ourselves a freedom to embrace, to profess and to observe the Religion which we believe to be of divine origin, we cannot deny an equal freedom to those whose minds have not yet yielded to the evidence which has convinced us. If this freedom be abused, it is an offense against God, not against man: To God, therefore, not to men, must an account of it be rendered. As the Bill violates equality by subjecting some to peculiar burdens; so it violates the same principle, by granting to others peculiar exemptions. Are the Quakers and Menonists the only sects who think a compulsive support of their religions unnecessary and unwarrantable? Can their piety alone be intrusted with the care of public worship? Ought their Religions to be endowed above all others, with extraordinary privileges, by which proselytes may be enticed from all others? We think too favorably of the justice and good sense of these denominations, to believe that they either covet preeminencies over their fellow citizens, or that they will be seduced by

---

the State in everything relating to taxation should be absolute." II "The Works of James Abram Garfield" (ed. by Hinsdale, 1883) 783.

[82] Neither do we have here a case of rate-making by which a public utility extends reduced fares to all school children, including patrons of religious schools. Whether or not legislative compulsion upon a private utility to extend such an advantage would be valid, or its extension by a municipally owned system, we are not required to consider. In the former instance, at any rate, and generally if not always in the latter, the vice of using the taxing power to raise funds for the support of religion would not be present.

[83] It would seem at least a doubtfully sufficient basis for reasonable classification that some children should be excluded simply because the only school feasible for them to attend, in view of geographic or other situation, might be one conducted in whole or in part for profit. Cf. note 5.

[84] See note 7 supra. The resolution was as follows, according to the school board's minutes read in proof: "The transportation committee recommended the transportation of pupils of Ewing to the Trenton and Pennington High Schools and Catholic Schools by way of public carrier as in recent years. On Motion of Mr. Ralph Ryan and Mr. M. French the same was adopted." The New Jersey court's holding that the resolution was within the authority conferred by the state statute is binding on us. *Reinman* v. *Little Rock*, 237 U.S. 171, 176; *Hadacheck* v. *Sebastian*, 239 U.S. 394, 414.

[85] The population of Ewing Township, located near the City of Trenton, was 10,146 according to the census of 1940. Sixteenth Census of the United States, Population, Vol. 1, 674.

[86] In *Thomas* v. *Collins*, 323 U.S. 516, 530, it was said that the preferred place given in our scheme to the great democratic freedoms secured by the First Amendment gives them "a sanctity and a sanction not permitting dubious intrusions." Cf. Remonstrance, Par. 3, 9. And in other cases it has been held that the usual presumption of constitutionality will not work to save such legislative excursions in this field. *United States* v. *Carolene Products Co.*, 304 U.S. 144, 152, note 4; see Wechsler, Stone and the Constitution (1946) 46 Col. L. Rev. 764, 795 et seq.

Apart from the Court's admission that New Jersey's present action approaches the verge of her power, it would seem that a statute, ordinance or resolution which on its face singles out one sect only by name for enjoyment of the same advantages as public schools or their students, should be held discriminatory on its face by virtue of that fact alone, unless it were positively shown that no other sects sought or were available to receive the same advantages.

[87] Decl. Rights, Art: 16. (Note in the original.)

[88] Decl. Rights, Art. 1. (Note in the original.)

[89] Art. 16. (Note in the original.)

them, from the common opposition to the measure.

5. Because the bill implies either that the Civil Magistrate is a competent Judge of Religious truth; or that he may employ Religion as an engine of Civil policy. The first is an arrogant pretension falsified by the contradictory opinions of Rulers in all ages, and throughout the world: The second an unhallowed perversion of the means of salvation.

6. Because the establishment proposed by the Bill is not requisite for the support of the Christian Religion. To say that it is, is a contradiction to the Christian Religion itself; for every page of it disavows a dependence on the powers of this world: it is a contradiction to fact; for it is known that this Religion both existed and flourished, not only without the support of human laws, but in spite of every opposition from them; and not only during the period of miraculous aid, but long after it had been left to its own evidence, and the ordinary care of Providence: Nay, it is a contradiction in terms; for a Religion not invented by human policy, must have preexisted and been supported, before it was established by human policy. It is moreover to weaken in those who profess this Religion a pious confidence in its innate excellence, and the patronage of its Author; and to foster in those who still reject it, a suspicion that its friends are too conscious of its fallacies, to trust it to its own merits.

7. Because experience witnesseth that ecclesiastical establishments, instead of maintaining the purity and efficacy of Religion, have had a contrary operation. During almost fifteen centuries, has the legal establishment of Christianity been on trial. What have been its fruits? More or less in all places, pride and indolence in the Clergy; ignorance and servility in the laity; in both, superstition, bigotry and persecution. Enquire of the Teachers of Christianity for the ages in which it appeared in its greatest lustre; those of every sect, point to the ages prior to its incorporation with Civil policy. Propose a restoration of this primitive state in which its Teachers depended on the voluntary rewards of their flocks; many of them predict it downfall. On which side ought their testimony to have greatest weight, when for or when against their interest?

8. Because the establishment in question is not necessary for the support of Civil Government. If it be urged as necessary for the support of Civil Government only as it is a means of supporting Religion, and it be not necessary for the later purpose, it cannot be necessary for the former. If Religion be not within [the] cognizance of Civil Government, how can its legal establishment be said to be necessary to civil Government? What influence in fact have ecclesiastical establishments had on Civil Society? In some instances they have been seen to erect a spiritual tyranny on the ruins of Civil authority; in many instances they have been seen upholding the thrones of political tyranny; in no instance have they been seen the guardians of the liberties of the people. Rulers who wished to subvert the public liberty, may have found an established clergy convenient auxiliaries. A just government, instituted to secure and perpetuate it, needs them not. Such a government will be best supported by protecting every citizen in the enjoyment of his Religion with the same equal hand which protects his person and his property; by neither invading the equal rights of any Sect, nor suffering any Sect to invade those of another.

9. Because the proposed establishment is a departure from that generous policy, which, offering an asylum to the persecuted and oppressed of every Nation and Religion, promised a lustre to our country, and an accession to the number of its citizens. What a melancholy mark is the Bill of sudden degeneracy? Instead of holding forth an asylum to the persecuted, it is itself a signal of persecution. It degrades from the equal rank of Citizens all those whose opinions in Religion do not bend to those of the Legislative authority. Distant as it may be, in its present form, from the Inquisition it differs from it only in degree. The one is the first step, the other the last in the career of intolerance. The magnanimous sufferer under this cruel scourge in foreign Regions, must view the Bill as a Beacon on our Coast, warning him to seek some other haven, where liberty and philanthrophy in their due extent may offer a more certain repose from his troubles.

10. Because, it will have a like tendency to banish our Citizens. The allurements presented by other situations are every day thinning their number. To superadd a fresh motive to emigration, by revoking the liberty which they now enjoy, would be the same species of folly which has dishonored and depopulated flourishing kingdoms.

11. Because, it will destroy that moderation and harmony with the forbearance of our laws to intermeddle with Religion, has produced amongst its several sects. Torrents of blood have been spilt in the old world, by vain attempts of the secular arm to extinguish Religious discord, by proscribing all difference in Religious opinion. Time has at length revealed the true remedy. Every relaxation of narrow and rigorous policy, wherever it has been tried, has been found to assuage the disease. The American Theatre has exhibited proofs, that equal and compleat liberty, if it does not wholly eradicate it, sufficiently destroys its malignant influence on the health and prosperity of the State. If with the salutary effects of this system under our own eyes, we begin to contract the bonds of Religious freedom, we know no name that will too severely reproach our folly. At least let warning be taken at the first fruits of the threatened innovation. The very appearance of the Bill has transformed that "Christian forbearance,[30] love and charity," which of late mutually prevailed, into animosities and jealousies, which may not soon be appeased. What mischiefs may not be dreaded should this enemy to the public quiet be armed with the force of a law?

12. Because, the policy of the bill is adverse to the diffusion of the light of Christianity. The first wish of those who enjoy this precious gift, ought to be that it may be imparted to the whole race of mankind. Compare the number of those who have as yet received it with the number still remaining under the dominion of false Religions; and how small is the former! Does the policy of the bill tend to lessen the disproportion? No; it at once discourages those who are strangers to the light of [revelation] from coming into the Region of it; and countenances, by example the nations who continue in darkness, in shutting out those who might convey it to them. Instead of levelling as far as possible, every obstacle to the victorious progress of truth, the bill with an ignoble and unchristian timidity would circumscribe it, with a wall of defence, against the encroachments of error.

13. Because attempts to enforce by legal sanctions, acts obnoxious to so great a proportion of citizens, tend to enervate the laws in general, and to slacken the bands of Society. If it be difficult to execute any law which is not generally deemed necessary or salutary, what must be the case where it is deemed invalid and dangerous? and what may be the effect of so striking an example of impotency in the Government, on its general authority.

14. Because a measure of such singular magnitude and delicacy ought not to be imposed, without the clearest evidence that it is called for by a majority of citizens: and no satisfactory method is yet proposed by which the voice of the majority in this case may be determined, or its influence secured. "The people of the respective counties are indeed requested to signify their opinion respecting the adoption of the bill to the next Session of Assembly." But the representation must be made equal, before the voice either of the Representatives or of the Counties, will be that of the people. Our hope is that neither of the former will, after due consideration, espouse the dangerous principle of the bill. Should the event disappoint us, it will still leave us in full confidence, that a fair appeal to the latter will reverse the sentence against our liberties.

15. Because, finally, "the equal right of every citizen to the free exercise of his Religion according to the dictates of conscience" is held by the same tenure with all our other rights. If we recur to its origin, it is equally the gift of nature; if we weigh its importance, it cannot be less dear to us; if we consult the Declaration of those rights which pertain to the good people of Virginia, as the "basis and foundation of Government,"[31] it is enumerated with equal solemnity, or rather studied emphasis. Either then, we must say, that the will of the Legislature is the only measure of their authority; and that in the plenitude of this authority, they may sweep away all our fundamental rights; or, that they are bound to leave this particular right untouched and sacred: Either we must say, that they may controul the freedom of the press, may abolish the trial by jury, may swallow up the Executive and Judiciary Powers of the State; nay that they may despoil us of our very right of suffrage, and erect themselves into an independent and hereditary assembly: or we must say, that they have no authority to enact into law the bill under consideration. We the subscribers say, that the General Assembly of this Commonwealth have no such authority: And that no effort may be omitted on our part against so dangerous an usurpation, we oppose to it, this remonstrance; earnestly praying, as we are in duty bound, that the Supreme Lawgiver of the Universe, by illuminating those to whom it is addressed, may on the one hand, turn their councils from every act which would affront his holy prerogative, or violate the trust committed to them: and on the other, guide them into every measure which may be worthy of his [blessing, may re]dound to their own praise, and may establish more firmly the liberties, the prosperity, and the Happiness of the Commonwealth.

II Madison, 183–191.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPENDIX

A bill establishing a provision for teachers of the Christian religion

Whereas the general diffusion of Christian knowledge hath a natural tendency to correct the morals of men, restrain their vices, and preserve the peace of society; which cannot be effected without a competent provision for learned teachers, who may be thereby enabled to devote their time and attention to the duty of instructing such citizens, as from their circumstances and want of education, cannot otherwise attain such knowledge; and it is judged that such provision may be made by the Legislature, without counteracting the liberal principle heretofore adopted and intended to be preserved by abolishing all distinctions of preeminence amongst the different societies or communities of Christians;

Be it therefore enacted by the General Assembly, That for the support of Christian teachers, per centum on the amount, or in the pound on the sum payable for tax on the property within this Commonwealth, is hereby assessed, and shall be paid by every person chargeable with the said tax at the time the same shall become due; and the Sheriffs of the several Counties shall have power to levy and collect the same in the same manner and under the like restrictions and limitations, as are or may be prescribed by the laws for raising the Revenues of this State.

---

[30] Art. 16. (Note in the original.)

[31] Decl. Rights-title. (Note in the original.)

And be it enacted, That for every sum so paid, the Sheriff or Collector shall give a receipt, expressing therein to what society of Christians the person from whom he may receive the same shall direct the money to be paid, keeping a distinct account thereof in his books. The Sheriff of every County, shall, on or before the day of in every year, return to the Court, upon oath, two alphabetical lists of the payments to him made, distinguishing in columns opposite to the names of the persons who shall have paid the same, the society to which the money so paid was by them appropriated; and one column for the names where no appropriation shall be made. One of which lists, after being recorded in a book to be kept for that purpose, shall be filed by the Clerk in his office; the other shall by the Sheriff be fixed up in the Court-house, there to remain for the inspection of all concerned. And the Sheriff, after deducting five per centum for the collection, shall forthwith pay to such person or persons as shall be appointed to receive the same by the Vestry, Elders, or Directors, however denominated by each such society, the sum so stated to be due to that society; or in default thereof, upon the motion of such person or persons to the next or any succeeding Court, execution shall be awarded for the same against the Sheriff and his security, his and their executors or administrators; provided that ten days previous notice be given of such motion. And upon every such execution, the Officer serving the same shall proceed to immediate sale of the estate taken, and shall not accept of security for payment at the end of three months, nor to have the goods forthcoming at the day of sale; for his better direction wherein, the Clerk shall endorse upon every such execution that no security of any kind shall be taken.

And be it further enacted, That the money to be raised by virtue of this Act, shall be by the Vestries, Elders, or Directors of each religious society, appropriated to a provision for a Minister or Teacher of the Gospel of their denomination, or the providing places of divine worship, and to none other use whatsoever; except in the denominations of Quakers and Menonists, who may receive what is collected from their members, and place it in their general fund, to be disposed of in a manner which they shall think best calculated to promote their particular mode of worship.

And be it enacted, That all sums which at the time of payment to the Sheriff or Collector may not be appropriated by the person paying the same, shall be accounted for with the Court in manner as by this Act is directed; and after deducting for his collection, the Sheriff shall pay the amount thereof (upon account certified by the Court to the Auditors of Public Accounts, and by them to the Treasurer) into the public Treasury, to be disposed of under the direction of the General Assembly, for the encouragement of seminaries of learning within the Counties whence such sums shall arise, and to no other use or purpose whatsoever.

This act shall commence, and be in force, from and after the day of in the year .

A Copy from the Engrossed Bill.

JOHN BECKLEY, C. H. D.

Washington Mss. (Papers of George Washington, Vol. 231); Library of Congress.[92]

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, replying briefly to the very distinguished Senator from North Carolina, I have the highest regard and great esteem for the legal learning of my friend from North Carolina. When I find myself in disagreement with him, I make absolutely certain I am satisfied my judgment is a sound one.

I have reviewed again, during the course of the very able remarks of the Senator from North Carolina, with whose major premises I find myself in major disagreement, the position our Senate committee has taken on the education bill and the position taken on a related subject matter in connection with S. 1021, the elementary and secondary school bill.

I wish to say for the record again, I am satisfied our bill is constitutional and that those of us supporting the bill are keeping faith with their oath of office in the Senate to uphold the Constitution.

I say to my friend from North Carolina, this once again demonstrates how sincere lawyers can disagree on some particular legal point.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for me to make a statement?

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. ERVIN. I wish again to engage in reciprocity. I regard the Senator from Oregon as one of the great lawyers of the country. I should like to bear witness to this fact.

The Senator from Oregon and I have disagreed on some things in times past, but I think I can truthfully say this is the first time he and I have reached a disagreement on any question relating to a constitutional or a legal proposition.

Mr. MORSE. I think that is true.

Mr. ERVIN. As a lawyer, I am aware of the fact that sometimes, as my chief justice used to say, "Brethren read the same books but draw different conclusions therefrom."

Mr. MORSE. The Senator has put it very aptly. I appreciate very much his remarks.

Mr. President, I wish to point out that to date the Federal Government has made available under the college housing loan provisions a total of $1,565,156,000. I hope to obtain in the next hour a breakdown of the $1,565,156,000, as to the amount of those loans which has gone to private colleges. It is a very large amount. Sixty percent of the colleges of the United States are private colleges, and we have loaned a great deal of money to private colleges under the college housing loan bill.

It will be recalled that we passed that bill, S. 2539, in the 86th Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks a portion of title 6 of that bill, which deals with the college housing.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TITLE VI—COLLEGE HOUSING

SEC. 601. Section 401(d) of the Housing Act of 1950 is amended to read as follows:

"(d) To obtain funds for loans under subsection (a) of this section, the Administrator may issue and have outstanding at any one time notes and obligations for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury in an amount not to exceed $1,175,000,000: *Provided,* That the amount outstanding for other educational facilities, as defined herein, shall not exceed $125,000,000: *Provided further,* That the amount outstanding for hospitals, referred to in clause (2) of section 404(b) of this title, shall not exceed $50,000,000."

SEC. 602. (a) Title IV of the Housing Act of 1950 is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"Loans for classroom buildings and other academic facilities

"SEC. 405. (a) In addition to the other purposes for which financial assistance may be extended under this title, the Administrator may make loans to educational institutions for (1) the construction of new structures suitable for use as classrooms, laboratories, and related facilities (including initial equipment, machinery, and utilities) necessary or appropriate for the instruction of students or the administration of the institution, and (2) the rehabilitation, alteration, conversion, or improvement of existing structures for the uses described above if such structures are otherwise inadequate for such uses. As used in this section, the term 'educational institution' means any educational institution offering at least a two-year program acceptable for full credit toward a baccalaureate degree, including any public educational institution, or any private educational institution no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

"(b) Any educational institution which, prior to the effective date of this section, has contracted for the construction, rehabilitation, alteration, conversion, or improvement of any structures for the uses described in subsection (a) above may, in connection therewith, receive loans authorized by this section, as the Administrator may determine, but no such loan shall be made in connection with the construction, rehabilitation, alteration, conversion, or improvement of any such structure if the work thereon was commenced prior to the effective date of this section, or was completed prior to the filing of an application under this section.

"(c) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $50,000,000 which shall be deposited in a revolving fund to be used for the purpose of making loans under this section."

(b) Title IV of such Act is further amended by—

(1) striking out "HOUSING" in the heading of such title and inserting in lieu thereof "LOANS";

(2) striking out "FEDERAL" in the heading of section 401 and inserting in lieu thereof "COLLEGE HOUSING";

(3) inserting after "loan" in clause (1) of the proviso in section 401(a) the following: "(including any loan under section 405 of this title)";

(4) striking out "A loan to an educational institution may be in an amount not exceeding the total development cost of the facility, as determined by the Administrator" in section 401(c) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "A loan under this section to an educational institution may be in an

---

[92] This copy of the Assessment Bill is from one of the handbills which on December 24, 1784, when the third reading of the bill was postponed, were ordered distributed to the Virginia counties by the House of Delegates. See Journal of the Virginia House of Delegates, December 24, 1784; Eckenrode, 102–103. The bill is therefore in its final form, for it never again reached the floor of the House. Eckenrode, 113.

amount not exceeding the total development cost of the facility, as determined by the Administrator, and a loan under section 405 of this title to an educational institution may be in an amount not exceeding the cost of construction of the structures involved (including related facilities), and the land on which the structures are located, as determined by the Administrator";

(5) striking out section 401(f) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(f) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this title."

(6) inserting before the semicolon in section 402(c)(2) a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That the Administrator shall extend financial assistance to educational institutions under section 405 only after consultation with, and in accordance with the advice and recommendation of, said Office of Education";

(7) adding the following new subsections at the end of section 402:

"(e) The provisions of section 309 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1950 (63 Stat. 662), which are applicable to corporations or agencies subject to the Government Corporation Control Act, shall also be applicable to the activities of the Administrator under this title.

"(f) The Administrator shall take such action as may be necessary to insure that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on any project assisted under this title, the construction or rehabilitation of which was commenced after the date of enactment of the Housing Act of 1959, (1) shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on the same type of work on similar construction in the immediate locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Act of March 3, 1931 (Davis-Bacon Act), as amended, and (2) shall be employed not more than forty hours in any one week unless the employee receives wages for his employment in excess of the hours specified above at a rate not less than one and one-half times the regular rate at which he is employed; but the Administrator may waive the application of this subsection in cases or classes of cases where laborers or mechanics, not otherwise employed at any time in the construction of such project, voluntarily donate their services without full compensation for the purpose of lowering the costs of construction and the Administrator determines that any amounts saved thereby are fully credited to the educational institution undertaking the construction."; and

(8) Inserting after "For the purposes of this title," in section 404 the following: "except as otherwise provided in section 405,".

SEC. 603. (a) Section 404(b) of the Housing Act of 1950 is amended by striking out "and (4)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(4)" and by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ", and (5) any nonprofit student housing cooperative corporation established for the purpose of providing housing for students or students and faculty of any institution included in clause (1) of this subsection".

(b) Section 401 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(g) In the case of any loan made under this section to a nonprofit student housing cooperative corporation referred to in clause (5) of section 404(b), the Administrator shall require that the note securing such loan be co-signed by the educational institution (referred to in clause (1) of such section) at which such corporation is located; and in the event of the dissolution of such corporation, title to the housing constructed with such loan shall vest in such educational institution."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, from page 75 of that bill I read this language:

LOANS FOR CLASSROOM BUILDINGS AND OTHER ACADEMIC FACILITIES

SEC. 405. (a) In addition to the other purposes for which financial assistance may be extended under this title, the Administrator may make loans to educational institutions for (1) the construction of new structures suitable for use as classrooms, laboratories, and related facilities (including initial equipment, machinery, and utilities) necessary or appropriate for the instruction of students or the administration of the institution, and (2) the rehabilitation, alteration, conversion, or improvement of existing structures for the uses described above if such structures are otherwise inadequate for such uses. As used in this section, the term "educational institution" means any educational institution offering at least a two-year program acceptable for full credit toward a baccalaureate degree, including any public educational institution, or any private educational institution no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

Mr. President, we have used millions of dollars of Federal money for such loans to private institutions under the College Housing Act. I say most respectfully that on August 18, 1959, when the yea-and-nay vote in the Senate was 71 for and 24 against the bill that resulted in the College Housing Act, my good friend the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] was recorded in support of that bill, which provided loans for private institutions for college housing. I say most respectfully that the principle is identical. It is identical also with the principle in the National Defense Education Act, which my friend from North Carolina has supported. Through the National Defense Education Act since 1958 we have been making loans to private institutions to the tune of millions of dollars. We have made loans in the sum of $2,127,197 to nonprofit private schools alone. I say most respectfully that the principle which is in the higher education bill has been in the College Housing Act. It has been in the NDEA. In fact, we have been making available loans for equipment to help in the academic training of secondary school students in mathematics, science, and modern foreign languages when the students are attending private institutions just as we have made grant assistance available to public institutions for the same purposes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table showing, State by State, the loans which have been made under title III-B of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to nonprofit schools be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TITLE III-B, SEC. 305.—*Loans to nonprofit schools, as of Jan. 31, 1962*

	Number	Amount
1. Alabama		
2. Arizona	1	$19,475
3. Arkansas	1	13,000
4. California	7	47,475
5. Colorado	1	2,100
6. Connecticut	1	18,000
7. Delaware		
8. District of Columbia	4	13,835
9. Florida	2	8,585
10. Georgia	2	$12,300
11. Idaho		
12. Illinois	13	213,767
13. Indiana		
14. Iowa	2	51,449
15. Kansas	6	62,950
16. Kentucky	5	52,191
17. Louisiana		
18. Maine	2	25,256
19. Maryland	5	77,250
20. Massachusetts	6	303,575
21. Michigan	6	25,162
22. Minnesota		
23. Mississippi	1	20,000
24. Missouri	9	124,934
25. Montana	1	8,700
26. Nebraska	7	23,261
27. Nevada	1	5,000
28. New Hampshire	2	41,500
29. New Jersey	3	68,141
30. New Mexico		
31. New York	29	342,460
32. North Carolina	2	10,500
33. North Dakota	2	18,798
34. Ohio	17	131,850
35. Oklahoma	2	24,100
36. Oregon	3	14,167
37. Pennsylvania	5	57,300
38. Rhode Island		
39. South Carolina	1	5,956
40. South Dakota		
41. Tennessee	2	17,100
42. Texas	7	62,400
43. Utah		
44. Vermont	1	5,000
45. Virginia	6	60,045
46. Washington	3	56,790
47. West Virginia	1	10,000
48. Wisconsin	7	68,900
49. Wyoming		
50. Alaska		
51. Hawaii		
52. Puerto Rico	2	3,925
53. Virgin Islands		
Total	178	2,127,197

Total loans made	178
Loans paid in full	6
Loans referred to GAO for collection	1
Total loans outstanding	171

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, once again I invite the attention of Senators to a point that we must not lose sight of. I shall necessarily emphasize it over and over again in the debate. So far as private institutions are concerned, the pending bill S. 1241, is a loan bill and not a grant bill. We are proposing no grants to private institutions. We are proposing in this particular section of the bill loans on the basis of the same principle that we have followed in connection with college housing and such as we followed in connection with the NDEA. What do we propose to do in the Hill-Morse amendment is to bring the bill into line with the House passed bill, H.R. 8900. We are adopting the House definition of "academic facilities," by providing that—

> (B) any facility used or to be used for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship, or (C) any facility which (although not a facility described in the preceding clause) is used or to be used primarily in connection with any part of the program of a school or department of divinity. For the purpose of this subparagraph, the term "school or department of divinity" means an institution, or a department or branch of an institution, whose program is specifically for the education of students to prepare them to become ministers of religion or to enter upon some other religious vocation or to prepare them to teach theological subjects.

I always try to give Senators every pertinent fact that I know of which involves me in connection with any proposed legislation that I am advocating in the Senate. I am a strong supporter of private institutions of higher education because they perform a great academic service to this country. I happen to be a member of the board of trustees of Pacific University in Oregon, which was originally a Congregational college. Pacific University can still be considered a denominational college in the sense that it is of Congregational origin. But Pacific University is a great academic institution, as are many other so-called denominational universities.

I call attention to Willamette University in Salem, Oreg., which was started under the Methodist denomination. We have such colleges in every State in the Union.

I think it would be most unfortunate if, for example, we came to the point of view that a nuclear physicist or a student who wants to be a nuclear physicist, is denied training in a great college such as Linfield College, McMinnville, Oreg., which has one of the strongest science departments in the development of certain aspects of nuclear power of any of the institutions in our whole part of the country, if not in the Nation. The fact that the school is a denominational college should in no way prevent us from seeing to it that a loan can go to that college for the development and enlargement of its physics laboratory, its chemistry laboratory, or any other of its scientific or classroom needs. Yet Linfield has connections with the Baptist denomination.

Reed College, in Portland, Oreg., whose graduates have a most enviable record in the achievement of graduate degrees, originally had ties with the Unitarian denomination.

Surely we would not wish to deny to these institutions loan assistance for academic facilities, nor would we wish to deny loan assistance to the University of Portland, an institution with Catholic denominational affiliation.

We now come to the legal question as to whether or not the proposed legislation is in any way a violation of the first amendment. I point out that there has been no successful challenge of the policy of loans with the restrictions that we have adopted in legislation passed to date. But when this subject, in connection with the bill S. 1021, was before the Senate committee, there was a considerable amount of debate on it, both in committee and in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

I assure the Senate that we have consulted the legal counsel of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. That Department supplied to the committee a legal brief. I agree with many of the observations in that brief, which I now read in connection with the subject of loans. The legal brief of the Department reads, as follows:

> Loans for construction of facilities may be less constitutionally vulnerable than grants for the same purposes. But this distinction is not here the only one or perhaps even the crucial one. More important are the distinctive factors present in American higher education: the fact that the connection between religion and education is less apparent and that religious indoctrination is less pervasive in a sectarian college curriculum; the fact that free public education is not available to all qualified college students; the desirability of maintaining the widest possible choice of colleges in terms of the student's educational needs in a situation no longer limited by the necessity of attending schools located close to home; the extent to which particular skills can be imparted only by a relatively few institutions; the disastrous national consequences in terms of improving educational standards which could result from exclusion of, or discrimination against, certain private institutions on grounds of religious connection; and the fact that, unlike schools, the collegiate enrollment does not have the power of State compulsion supporting it.

Mr. President, I have no question as to the constitutional defense ability of our bill. I would not have sponsored it if I thought it was subject to successful constitutional attack. We have checked it very closely with the legal advisers of our Government. They share the point of view that I am now stressing, that we have offered a bill that is constitutional. A loan section in the bill itself, which is repeated in the provisions of the Hill-Morse amendment, makes perfectly clear that all the checks and safeguards that anyone could possibly want are now in the bill.

I should like to go back to the comment I was making on the college housing program. At this point in my remarks I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the loans made to all institutions in the country, including private institutions, as of August 31, 1961, under the College Housing Act. We find every State listed there, including the State of North Carolina. We find that North Carolina receives $33,112,000 in loans. There is a long list of institutions in North Carolina, including St. Andrew's Presbyterian College, and Duke University.

There being no objection, the compilation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLLEGE HOUSING PROGRAM, APPROVED LOANS, AUGUST 31, 1961

INSTITUTIONS AND LOCATIONS

Alabama, $23,996,000: The Marion Institute, Marion; Spring Hill College, Spring Hill; Auburn University, Auburn; Howard College, Birmingham; Tuskegee Institute, Tuskegee Institute; St. Bernard College, St. Bernard; Jacksonville State Teachers College, Jacksonville; Alabama A. & M. College, Normal; Troy State College, Troy; Florence State College, Florence; Birmingham Southern College, Birmingham; University of Alabama—Medical, Birmingham; Huntingdon College, Montgomery; University of Alabama, University; Alabama College, Montevallo; Athens College, Athens; Livingston State College, Livingston; Judson College, Marion; Sacred Heart College, Cullman.

Alaska, $2,920,000: University of Alaska, College.

Arizona, $15,398,000: Arizona State College, Tempe; University of Arizona, Tucson; Arizona State College, Flagstaff.

Arkansas, $20,922,000: Ouachita Baptist College, Arkadelphia; State A.M. & N. School, Pine Bluff; Henderson State Teachers College, Arkadelphia; Hendrix College, Conway; University of Arkansas, Fayetteville; Arkansas State Teachers College, Conway; University of Arkansas—Medical, Little Rock; Arkansas State College, State College; Harding College, Searcy; Arkansas Polytechnic College, Russellville; Little Rock University, Little Rork; Philander Smith College, Little Rock; John Brown University, Siloam Springs; Arkansas A. & M. College, College Heights.

California, $86,029,000: Menlo College, Menlo Park; University of San Francisco, San Francisco; Whittier College, Whittier; LaVerne College, LaVerne; University of Santa Clara, Santa Clara; University of Southern California, Los Angeles; Occidental College, Los Angeles; College of the Pacific, Stockton; University of Redlands, Redlands; Mount St. Mary's College, Los Angeles; Loyola University of Los Angeles, Los Angeles; College of the Holy Names, Oakland; College of Notre Dame, Belmont; University of California, Berkeley, Los Angeles, Goleta, Davis, Santa Barbara, Riverside; California Western University, San Diego; Westmont College, Santa Barbara; California State Colleges, Sacramento (11 campuses); Pasadena College, Pasadena; Marymount College, Palos Verdes Estates; Chapman College, Orange; California College of Arts & Crafts, Oakland; Stanford University, Stanford; Los Angeles College of Optometry, Los Angeles; St. Mary's College of California, St. Mary's College; San Francisco College for Women, San Francisco.

Colorado, $39,095,000: Colorado State University, Fort Collins; Colorado School of Mines, Golden; University of Colorado, Boulder; Colorado College, Colorado Springs; Western State College, Gunnison; Loretto Heights College, Loretto; Colorado State College, Greeley; Regis College, Denver; Colorado Women's College, Denver; Fort Lewis A. & M. College, Durango; University of Denver, Denver; Adams State College, Alamosa; Pueblo Junior College, Pueblo.

Connecticut, $15,810,000: University of Bridgeport, Bridgeport; Yale University, New Haven; Albertus Magnus College, New Haven; St. Joseph College, West Hartford; Connecticut College for Women, New London; Wesleyan University, Middletown; Trinity College, Hartford; Fairfield University, Fairfield.

Delaware, $4,404,000: University of Delaware, Newark; Wesley College, Dover.

District of Columbia, $14,789,000: Georgetown University, District of Columbia; The American University, District of Columbia; Trinity College, District of Columbia; the Catholic University of America, District of Columbia; the George Washington University, District of Columbia; Dunbarton College, District of Columbia.

Florida, $36,054,000: University of Florida, Gainesville; Florida A. & M. College, Tallahassee; University of Miami, Miami; John B. Stetson University, DeLand; Florida Southern College, Lakeland; Bethune Cookman College, Daytona Beach; Florida State University, Tallahassee; Rollins College, Winter Park; University of Tampa, Tampa; University of South Florida, Tampa; Barry College, Miami.

Georgia, $22,936,000: Emory University, Atlanta; Mercer University, Macon; Morries Brown College, Atlanta; Clark College, Atlanta; Georgia Military College, Milledgeville; Wesleyan College, Macon; University of Georgia, Athens; Georgia Teachers College, Statesboro; Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta; North Georgia College, Dahlonega; Tift College, Forsyth; Morehouse College, Morehouse; Gordon Military College, Barnesville; Young Harris College, Young Harris; Norman College, Norman Park; Shorter College, Rome; Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College, Tifton; Albany State College, Albany; LaGrange College, LaGrange; West Georgia College, Carrollton; Middle Georgia College, Cochran; Georgia Southern College, Statesboro.

Hawaii, $1,077,000: University of Hawaii, Honolulu.

Idaho, $4,640,000: University of Idaho, Moscow; the College of Idaho, Caldwell; Northwest Nazarene College, Nampa; North Idaho Junior College, Coeur d'Alene; Boise Junior College, Boise.

Illinois: $7,902,000: Knox College, Galesburg; Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago; Southern Illinois University, Carbondale; Illinois College, Jacksonville; North Central College, Naperville; Loyola University, Chicago; North Park College and Theological Seminary, Chicago; Lake Forest College, Lake Forest; Lincoln College, Lincoln; Quincy College and Seminary, Quincy; University of Illinois, Urbana; Aurora College, Aurora; University of Chicago, Chicago; Barat College of the Sacred Heart, Lake Forest; Greenville College, Greenville; Shimer College, Mount Carroll; Illinois State Normal University, Normal; National College of Education, Evanston; Western Illinois University, Macomb; Northern Illinois University, DeKalb; Eastern Illinois University, Charleston; MacMurray College, Jacksonville; Milliken University, Decatur; Augustana College, Rock Island; Saint Xavier College, Chicago; Monmouth College, Monmouth; Rosary College, River Forest; Elmhurst College, Elmhurst; St. Procopius College, Lisle; Mundelein College, Chicago; Olivet Nazarene College, Kankakee; Bradley University, Peoria.

Indiana, $59,620,000: Butler University, Indianapolis; Anderson College and Theological Seminary, Anderson; Indiana University, Bloomington; St. Joseph's College, Rensselaer; Franklin College of Indiana, Franklin; Manchester College, North Manchester; Earlham College, Richmond; Taylor University, Upland; Marion College, Marion; Purdue University, Lafayette; Ball State Teachers College, Muncie; Indiana University-Medical, Indianapolis; the Vincennes University, Vincennes; Evansville College, Evansville; Valparaiso University, Valparaiso; Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute; University of Notre Dame du Lac, Notre Dame; Oakland City College, Oakland City; St. Francis College, Fort Wayne; Rose Polytechnic Institute, Terre Haute.

Iowa, $13,456,000: Drake University, Des Moines; Morningside College, Sioux City; Iowa Wesleyan College, Mount Pleasant; Simpson College, Indianola; Upper Iowa University, Fayette; Luther College, Decorah; Waldorf College, Forest City; Buena Vista College, Storm Lake; Parsons College, Fairfield; St. Ambrose College, Davenport; Grinnell College, Grinnell; Northwestern College, Orange City; Coe College, Cedar Rapids; William Penn College, Oskaloosa; University of Dubuque, Dubuque.

Kansas, $29,437,000: University of Wichita, Wichita; Ottawa University, Ottawa; Baker University, Baldwin; Sterling College, Sterling; Kansas State College, Pittsburg; University of Kansas, Lawrence; Kansas Wesleyan University, Salina; Fort Hays Kansas State College, Hays; St. Benedict's College, Atchison; Bethany College, Lindsborg; Kansas State Teachers College, Emporia; The Friends University, Wichita; The Southwestern College, Winfield; The College of Emporia, Emporia; Tabor College, Hillsboro; Sacred Heart College, Wichita; McPherson College, McPherson; Kansas State University of Agriculture and Applied Science, Manhattan; Bethel College, North Newton.

Kentucky, $38,408,000: University of Kentucky, Lexington; Murray State College, Murray; Western Kentucky State College, Bowling Green; Transylvania University, Lexington; Georgetown College, Georgetown; University of Louisville, Louisville; Eastern Kentucky State College, Richmond; Bellarmine College, Louisville; Kentucky State College, Frankfort; Morehead State College, Morehead; Union College, Barbourville; Pikesville College, Pikesville; Centre College of Kentucky, Danville; Nazareth College at Louisville, Louisville.

Louisiana, $39,056,000: Tulane University, New Orleans; Centenary College of Louisiana, Shreveport; Northwestern State College, Nachitouches; McNeese State College, Lake Charles; Louisiana College, Pineville; Southeastern Louisiana College, Hammond; Louisiana Polytechnic Institute, Ruston; St. Mary's Dominican College, New Orleans; Dillard University, New Orleans; Grambling College, Grambling; Southern University and A. & M. College, Baton Rouge; Northeast Louisiana State College, Monroe; Loyola University, New Orleans.

Maine, $680,000: Nasson College, Springvale.

Maryland, $11,192,000: The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore; University of Maryland, College Park; Washington College, Chestertown; Ner Israel Rabbinical College, Baltimore; Hood College, Frederick; College of Notre Dame of Maryland, Baltimore; Loyola College, Baltimore; Mount St. Agnes College, Baltimore; Mount Saint Mary's College, Emmittsburg; Goucher College, Towson.

Massachusetts, $40,417,000: Tufts College, Medford; Brandeis University, Waltham; Assumption College, Worcester; Boston University, Boston; Lesley College, Cambridge; Bouve-Boston College, Medford; Stonehill College, North Easton; Worcester Polytechnic Institute, Worcester; Clark University, Worcester; New England Conservatory of Music, Boston; Emmanual College, Boston; Springfield College, Springfield; Wheaton College, Norton; Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley; Anna Maria College for Women, Paxton; Merrimack College, North Andover; Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge; Wellesley College, Wellesley; Dean Academy and Junior College, Franklin; Wheelock College, Boston; Eastern Nazarene College, Wollaston; College of the Holy Cross, Worcester; Regis College for Women, Weston; American International College, Springfield.

Michigan, $29,484,000: University of Detroit, Detroit; Hope College, Holland; Olivet College, Olivet; University of Michigan, Ann Arbor; Michigan State University, East Lansing; Eastern Michigan University, Yosilanti; Marygrove College, Detroit; Central Michigan College, Mount Pleasant; Michigan College of Mining and Technology, Houghton; Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo; Aquinas College, Grand Rapids; Adrian College, Adrian; Calvin College, Grand Rapids.

Minnesota, $27,614,000: Gustavus Adolphus College, St. Peter; Concordia College, Moorhead; Augsburg College and Theological Seminary, Minneapolis; Bethel College and Seminary, St. Paul; St. Olaf College, Northfield; Macalester College, St. Paul; Hamline University, St. Paul; University of Minnesota, St. Paul, Minneapolis, Duluth; St. Mary's College, Winona; Carleton College, Northfield; St. John's University, Collegeville; College of St. Thomas, St. Paul; The College of St. Catherine, St. Paul; College of Saint Teresa, Winona.

Mississippi, $21,046,000: University of Mississippi, University; Mississippi State University, State College; Mississippi Southern College, Hattiesburg; Millsaps College, Jackson; Mississippi State College for Women, Columbus; Delta State College, Cleveland; Mississippi College, Clinton; Alcorn A. & M. College, Lorman; Jackson State College, Jackson; William Carey College, Hattiesburg; Mississippi Vocational College, Itta Bena.

Missouri, $67,743,000: University of Kansas City, Kansas City; St. Louis University, St. Louis; Central Missouri State College, Warrensburg; Drury College, Springfield; Rockhurst University, Kansas City; University of Missouri, Columbia; School of Mines & Metallurgy (University of Missouri), Rolla; Park College, Parkville; William Jewell College, Liberty; Westminster College, Fulton; Northwest Missouri State College, Marysville; Webster College, Webster Groves; William Woods College, Fulton; Southwest Missouri State College, Springfield; Tarkio College, Tarkio; Northeast Missouri State Teachers College, Kirksville; Southeast Missouri State College, Cape Girardeau; Wentworth Military Academy, Lexington; the Washington University, St. Louis; Cottey Junior College, Nevada; Stephens College, Columbia; Christian College, Columbia; Parks College (St. Louis University), East St. Louis, Ill.; Kirksville College of Osteopathy and Surgery, Kirksville; Maryville College of the Sacred Heart, St. Louis; Culver-Stockton College, Canton; Missouri Valley College, Marshall.

Montana, $11,305,000: Montana State University, Missoula; Northern Montana College, Havre; Eastern Montana College of Education, Billings; Western Montana College of Education, Dillon; Montana State College, Bozeman; Montana School of Mines, Butte; Carroll College, Helena; Rocky Mountain College, Billings.

Nebraska, $5,474,000: Nebraska Wesleyan University, Lincoln; the Creighton University, Omaha; McCook College, McCook; Hastings College, Hastings; Dana College, Blair; Midland College, Fremont; Doane College, Crete; Duchesne College, Omaha.

Nevada, $2,012,000: University of Nevada, Reno.

New Hampshire, $4,959,000: Dartmouth College, Hanover; Rivier College, Nashua; St. Anselm's College, Manchester; New England College, Henniker.

New Jersey, $24,164,000: Fairleigh Dickinson University, Rutherford; Westminster Choir College, Princeton; Upsala College, East Orange; Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton; Rutgers University, New Brunswick; Drew University, Madison; Rider College, Trenton; Bloomfield College and Seminary, Bloomfield; Georgian Court College, Lakewood; Stevens Institute of Technology, Hoboken; Centenary College for Women, Hackettstown; Seton Hall University, South Orange.

New Mexico, $10,796,000: New Mexico School of Mines, Socorro; New Mexico Highlands University, Las Vegas; New Mexico State University, University Park; New Mexico Western College, Silver City; University of New Mexico, Albuquerque; College of St. Joseph on the Rio Grande, Albuquerque; St. Michael's College, Santa Fe; Eastern New Mexico University, Portales.

New York, $140,381,000: Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Troy; Syracuse University, Syracuse; St. Lawrence University, Canton; Clarkson College of Technology, Potsdam; St. Bonaventure University, St. Bonaventure; Alfred University, Alfred; New York University, New York; Briarcliff College, Briarcliff Manor; Cazenovia Junior College, Cazenovia; Yeshiva University, New York; Manhattan College, New York; Iona College, New Rochelle; Russell Sage College, Troy; Adelphi College, Garden City; Wagner Lutheran College, Staten Island; Colgate University, Hamilton; Fordham University, New York; University of Rochester, Rochester; Elmira College, Elmira; Hamilton College, Clinton; Hartwick College, Oneonta; Keuka College, Keuka Park; Bard College, Annandale-on-Hudson; Skidmore College, Saratoga Springs; Vassar College, Poughkeepsie; Houghton College, Houghton; Columbia University, New York; St. Bernardine of Siena College, Loudonville; the University of Buffalo, Buffalo; College of New Rochelle, New Rochelle; Nazareth College of Rochester, Rochester; Manhattanville College of the Sacred Heart, Purchase; Rochester Institute of Technology, Rochester; D'Youville College, Buffalo; the College of St. Rose, Albany; Hobart College, Geneva; Long Island University, Brooklyn; Union College, Schenectady; New York State Dormitory Authority, Albany (11 campuses); C. W. Post College, Brookville; Sarah Lawrence College, Bronxville; Barnard College, New York; Brooklyn College Student Services Corp., Brooklyn; Utica College (Syracuse University), Utica; Rosary Hill College, Buffalo; College of Mt. St. Vincent, New York; Ithaca College, Ithaca; Fashion Institute of Technology Dormitory Authority, New York; Marist College, Poughkeepsie; William Smith College, Geneva; Bennett College, Millbrook; LeMoyne College, Syracuse.

North Carolina, $33,112,000: Elon College, Elon College; Campbell College, Buies Creek;

St. Mary's Junior College, Raleigh; East Carolina College, Greenville; North Carolina State College of A&E, Raleigh; University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill; Wingate Junior College, Wingate; Western Carolina College, Cullowhee; Pfeiffer College, Misenheimer; Appalachian State Teachers College, Boone; Lenoir Rhyne College, Hickory; Louisburg College, Louisburg; The Woman's College of the University of North Carolina, Greensboro; Atlantic Christian College, Wilson; Queens College, Charlotte; Agricultural & Technical College of North Carolina, Greensboro; North Carolina College at Durham, Durham; Livingstone College, Salisbury; Bennett College, Greensboro; Chowan College, Murfreesboro; St. Andrews Presbyterian College, Laurinburg; Belmont Abbey College, Belmont; Meredith College, Raleigh; Winston-Salem Teachers College, Winston-Salem; Duke University, Durham.

North Dakota, $6,018,000: Jamestown College, Jamestown; Mayville State Teachers College, Mayville; State Teachers College, Dickinson; University of North Dakota, Grand Forks; State Teachers College, Minot; North Dakota State University of Agriculture and Applied Science, Fargo.

Ohio, $68,251,000: University of Dayton, Dayton; Antioch College, Yellow Springs; Xavier University, Cincinnati; Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware; Findlay College, Findlay; Baldwin Wallace College, Berea; Heidelberg College, Tiffin; Ashland College, Ashland; John Carroll College, Cleveland; Oberlin College, Oberlin; Muskingum College, New Concord; Case Institute of Technology, Cleveland; Wittenberg University, Springfield; Miami University, Oxford; Marietta College, Marietta; University of Akron, Akron; Hiram College, Hiram; Central State College, Wilberforce; Ohio State University, Columbus; College of Mount St. Joseph, Mount St. Joseph; Defiance College, Defiance; University of Toledo, Toledo; Ohio Northern University, Ada; University of Cincinnati; Cincinnati; Lake Erie College, Painesville; Ohio University, Athens; Kent State University, Kent; Denison University, Granville; Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green; Mount Union College, Alliance; Western Reserve University, Cleveland; College of Wooster, Wooster; College of Steubenville, Steubenville; Otterbein College, Westerville; Rio Grande College, Rio Grande; Kenyon College, Gambier.

Oklahoma, $16,200,000: Oklahoma Baptist University, Shawnee; Oklahoma State University, Stillwater; Oklahoma City University, Oklahoma City; University of Oklahoma, Norman; Phillips University, Enid; Southwestern State College, Weatherford; Oklahoma Christian College, Oklahoma City; Northeastern Oklahoma A&M College, Miami; Northeastern State College, Tahlequah; Bethany Nazarene College, Bethany; Central State College, Edmond; Eastern Oklahoma A&M College, Wilburton; Cameron State Agricultural College, Lawton.

Oregon, $11,130,000: Lewis and Clark College, Portland; Reed College, Portland; University of Portland, Portland; Linfield College, McMinnville; Pacific University, Forest Grove; Eastern Oregon College, La Grande; Southern Oregon College of Education, Ashland; Mount Angel College, Mount Angel; Willamette University, Salem; George Fox College, Newberg.

Pennsylvania, $80,550,000: LaSalle College, Philadelphia; Philadelphia Textile Institute, Philadelphia; Villanova College, Villanova; Duquesne University, Pittsburgh; Allegheny College, Meadville; Juniata College, Huntingdon; Elizabethtown College, Elizabethtown; Moore Institute of Applied Science & Industry, Philadelphia; St. Francis College, Loretto; Beaver College, Jenkintown; Dickinson College, Carlisle; Temple University, Philadelphia; Lincoln University, Lincoln University; Thiel College, Greenville; Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster; Lebanon Valley College, Annville; Westminster College, New Wilmington; Wilson College, Chambersburg; Lycoming College, Williamsport; University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia; the Waynesburg College, Waynesburg; Gettysburg College, Gettysburg; Gannon College, Erie; Seton Hill College, Greensburg; Pennsylvania Military College, Chester; Carnegie Institute of Technology, Pittsburgh; University of Scranton, Scranton; Eastern Baptist College, St. Davids; St. Joseph's College, Philadelphia; Mercyhurst College, Erie; Delaware Valley College of Science & Agriculture, Doylestown; Moravian College, Bethlehem; Drexel Institute of Technology, Philadelphia; Chatham College, Pittsburgh; the Pennsylvania State University, University Park; Pennsylvania Military College, Chester; Muhlenberg College, Allentown; Susquehanna University, Selinsgrove; Geneva College, Beaver Falls; Mount Mercy College, Pittsburgh; Villa Maria College, Erie; University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh; St. Vincent College, Latrobe; Albright College, Reading; Lafayette College, Easton.

Puerto Rico, $8,243,000: Catholic University of Puerto Rico, Ponce; Inter-American University, San German; University of Puerto Rico, Rio Piedras.

Rhode Island, $9,663,000: University of Rhode Island, Kingston; Rhode Island School of Design, Providence; Bryant University, Providence; Brown University, Providence; Rhode Island College, Providence.

South Carolina, $14,580,000: Medical College of South Carolina, Charleston; Allen University, Columbia; Wofford College, Spartanburg; The Columbia College, Columbia; Newberry College, Newberry; Furman University, Greenville; Converse College, Spartanburg; Presbyterian College, Clinton; Erskine College, Due West; Lander College, Greenwood; Benedict College, Columbia; College of Charleston, Charleston; Claflin College, Orangeburg; University of South Carolina, Columbia; Anderson College, Anderson.

South Dakota $10,341,000: Augustana College, Sioux Falls; Dakota Wesleyan University, Mitchell; Southern State Teachers College, Springfield; South Dakota School of Mines and Technology, Rapid City; Black Hills Teachers College, Spearfish; South Dakota State College of A & M, Brookings; University of South Dakota, Vermillion; Northern State Teachers College, Aberdeen; General Beadle State Teachers College, Madison; Sioux Falls College, Sioux Falls; Huron College, Huron.

Tennessee, $25,280,000: Memphis State University, Memphis; the Vanderbilt University, Nashville; Tennessee A. & I. State University, Nashville; University of Tennessee, Martin, Knoxville; the Tennessee Wesleyan College, Athens; Carson-Newman College, Jefferson City; East Tennessee State College, Johnson City; Tennessee Polytechnic Institute, Cookeville; Christian Brothers College, Memphis; the Fisk University, Nashville; George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville; Maryville College, Maryville; Knoxville College, Knoxville; Middle Tennessee State College, Murfreesboro; Lambuth College, Jackson; Siena College, Memphis; Bethel College, McKenzie; Southwestern at Memphis, Memphis.

Texas $93,715,000: St. Mary's University, San Antonio; Baylor University, Waco; Howard Payne College, Brownwood; Trinity University, San Antonio; Hardin Simmons University, Abilene; Lamar State College of Technology, Beaumont; Huston-Tillotson College, Austin; University of Texas, Austin; Abilene Christian College, Abilene; McMurray College, Abilene; Sam Houston State Teachers College, Huntsville; Southern Methodist University, Dallas; North Texas State College, Denton; West Texas State College, Canyon; Texas Wesleyan College, Fort Worth; Texas Christian University, Fort Worth; Austin College, Sherman; Texas Technological College, Lubbock; Texas Western College (U. of Tex.), El Paso; Texarkana College, Texarkana; University of Corpus Christi, Corpus Christi; Saint Edward's University, Austin; Texas Woman's University, Denton; University of St. Thomas, Houston; Wharton County Junior College, Wharton; Tyler Junior College, Tyler; Tarleton State College, Stephenville; Our Lady of the Lake College, San Antonio; Southwest Texas State College, San Marcos; Agricultural & Mechanical College of Texas, College Station; Incarnate Word College, San Antonio; San Angelo College, San Angelo; Texas College of Arts and Industries, Kingsville; Texas College, Tyler; Pan American College, Edinburg; Howard County Junior College, Big Spring; Sacred Heart Dominican College, Houston; East Texas State College, Commerce; Stephen F. Austin State College, Nacogdoches; South Plains College, Levelland; Blinn College, Brenham; Del Mar College, Corpus Christi; Sul Ross State College, Alpine; Wiley College, Marshall; Bishop College, Dallas; University of Dallas, Dallas; Texas Southern University, Houston; Jarvis Christian College, Hawkins; Lubbock Christian College, Lubbock; Arlington State College, Arlington.

Utah, $11,980,000: University of Utah, Salt Lake City; College of Southern Utah, Cedar City; Carbon College, Price; Snow College, Ephriam; Utah State University of Agriculture and Applied Science, Logan; Dixie College, St. George; Westminster College, Salt Lake City; Weber College, Ogden.

Vermont, $10,589,000: Norwich University, Northfield; Vermont College, Montpelier; Middlebury College, Middlebury; Trinity College, Burlington; St. Michael's College, Winooski; University of Vermont, Burlington; Windham College, Putney.

Virginia, $9,270,000: Hampton Institute, Hampton; Medical College of Virginia, Richman; Emory and Henry College, Emory; Clinch Valley College, Wise; Roanoke College, Salem; Bridgewater College, Bridgewater; Virginia Union University, Richmond; Mary Baldwin College, Staunton; Ferrum Junior College, Ferrum; Shenandoah College, Winchester; Marymount College, Arlington; Sweet Briar College, Sweet Briar.

Washington, $48,365,000: University of Washington, Seattle; University of Puget Sound, Tacoma; Seattle University, Seattle; Whitworth College, Spokane; Gonzaga University, Spokane; Seattle Pacific College, Seattle; Pacific Lutheran College, Tacoma; St. Martin's College, Olympia; Washington State University, Pullman; Western Washington College of Education, Bellingham; Central Washington College of Education, Ellensburg; Eastern Washington College of Education, Cheney.

West Virginia, $18,632,000: Davis & Elkins College, Elkins; Morris Harvey College, Charleston; Bethany College, Bethany; Potomac State College, Keyser; Concord College, Athens; West Virginia Wesleyan College, Buckhanon; Alderson Broaddus College, Phillippi; Wheeling College, Wheeling; Fairmont State College, Fairmont; West Liberty State College, West Liberty; West Virginia University, Morgantown; Shepherd College, Shepherdstown; West Virginia State College, Institute; Marshall College, Huntington; Glenville State College, Glenville; West Virginia Institute of Technology, Montgomery; Salem College, Salem.

Wisconsin, $40,603,000: Marquette University, Milwaukee; St. Norbert College, West De Pere; Carroll College, Waukesha; Viterbo College, La Crosse; University of Wisconsin, Madison; Wisconsin State Colleges Building Corp, Madison (9 campuses); Beloit College, Beloit; Ripon College, Ripon; Milton College, Milton; Lawrence College, Appleton; Carthage College, Kenosha.

Wyoming, $635,000: Casper College, Casper.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I believe it would be a serious blow to the educational strength of America if we followed the constitutional interpretation made by the distinguished legal scholar, the senior Senator from North Carolina.

I believe that we provide in the amendment all the necessary safeguards for the American taxpayers.

Then, as the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and I have said so frequently for the past 2 years, we must move as rapidly as possible toward the adoption of legislation which will provide for an early judicial review of this whole question of the meaning of the first amendment in respect to Federal aid to educational institutions of a private nature.

Here on the floor of the Senate this afternoon I wish to say that we should not cripple the pending bill by adopting an amendment which may subsequently be offered by the Senator from North Carolina, and which would put the bill at complete variance with the version of the House of Representatives, particularly when the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and I have offered to the Senate an amendment which in our judgment meets the major objective the Senator from North Carolina has in mind, with which I am in complete agreement.

We ought once again restate and reiterate, as he has so eloquently done here this afternoon, the doctrine of separation of church and state. However, the bill provides only for loans for construction of academic facilities, for use in the teaching of academic curriculums in private institutions, and at the same time it does not violate the doctrine of separation of church and state. It is completely consistent in theory with the millions of dollars in loans which have been made available in connection with such legislation as the College Housing Act and the National Defense Education Act, to mention only two great enactments.

I sincerely hope that the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Oregon will be adopted.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. ERVIN. The Senator referred to my votes on previous bills. I voted for the bill to authorize college housing on the ground that dormitories are used for sleeping purposes, rather than for instructional purposes. The Senator from Oregon may see no distinction between the two, but I do. That is the reason why I voted as I did.

I also voted for the National Defense Education Act, because in that act, insofar as the loans for scholarships were concerned, they were made to individual students, who were allowed to select the colleges they attended. In that way aid was given to the student rather than to the college.

I also voted for the National Defense Education Act, notwithstanding that it allowed the Government to buy equipment of a laboratory nature, on the ground that in my judgment that equipment could not be used for the teaching of religion, but would have to be used for secular education exclusively.

I merely wish to point out the reasons why I voted for the other bills. I do not believe there is any inconsistency between my voting for those bills and the way I intend to vote on the subject we are now considering. The Senator may disagree with me, but I appreciate his giving me this opportunity to state my views.

Mr. MORSE. By all means, I am glad to have the Senator state his views. I do not seek to emphasize any inconsistency, incidentally. I merely wish to point out that my difference with the Senator from North Carolina is that I believe the position he is taking and his interpretation of the differences between the National Defense Education Act and the College Housing Act on the one hand, and the program we are sponsoring for higher educational facilities is a difference of form, not of substance.

Let us take the matter of dormitories. Let us take the case of a private institution where these dormitories are built. In fact, it is possible to buy the land and make available to that institution the land needed by fee simple, about which the Senator spoke earlier in his remarks this afternoon.

My point is that the institution could not function without students. It could not have students unless it could have some place where it could house the students and sleep them and feed them and care for them. In my judgment, that is essential to the operation of a private institution.

For the life of me I cannot see any substantial difference between taking care of the students after bringing them to the campus, and housing them and feeding then and taking care of them, and bringing them under the rules and regulations of the private institution with respect to their conduct on the campus, and what we would provide here.

As the Senator knows, once the students come on the campus they are "wards of the institution." They are subject to all the rules and regulations as to hours, social activities, and what not.

I most respectfully say that if we provide all those facilities by way of loans, there can be no substantial difference between that and providing loans for laboratories or for any other facilities. Let us not forget that under the Defense Education Act we provide not only laboratory equipment, but also remodeling of classrooms for the teaching of modern foreign languages.

The Senator from North Carolina earlier this afternoon raised the question that we have no guarantee that the schools would not use these facilities for religious purposes.

Let us not forget that we continue to follow through to see the use to which our loan money is being put. If we found bad faith on the part of any institution—and I am not one who would even suspect that such an institution would follow bad faith—we would have the remedies in such a case.

I wish to conclude my argument by saying that so far as loans for educational institutions are concerned, it does not make any difference to what academic purpose the institution puts the loans. We are putting a guarantee in the act however that they are prohibited from putting such a loan to any use in connection with the carrying out of a religious educational purpose or function.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. Let me see if the Senator and I can reach agreement on one point. Does the Senator from Oregon concur or disagree with my opinion that under the ruling of the Supreme Court in the case of Massachusetts versus Mellon it would be impossible for any individual American citizen under the amendment proposed by the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Alabama to contest in the Federal court the question of whether an institution receiving a loan is violating that amendment?

Mr. MORSE. I would go only this far under the Massachusetts case, to say that under the facts of that case the court has made very clear that one cannot raise a constitutional question before the court. I am not ready to say to the Senator from North Carolina that I think it is impossible to test the first amendment under the National Defense Education Act. It merely has not been attempted before the Supreme Court. That would be a most fascinating case. I would like to be in on it. I said in committee, and I believe I said in debate on the floor, when that question was before us, that I do not believe the Clark-Morse bill is necessarily essential in order to get judicial review. I believe we can probably get it under tests of either the College Housing Act or the National Defense Education Act. However, the surest way to get judicial review consideration of the first amendment is through the Clark-Morse bill, S. 1482.

Mr. ERVIN. I am still trying to see if we cannot reach agreement in the legal field. I wonder whether the Senator from Oregon will agree with me in the following, that the decision of the Supreme Court in Massachusetts versus Mellon certainly did put that question in a somewhat murky condition?

Mr. MORSE. Under the operative facts of that case, but only under that case. In other words, I say most respectfully to the Senator from North Carolina, I shall not say here that I think that case pertains to any other possible set of facts than those involved in it. However, I think it is possible to bring a case under the National Defense Education Act or the college housing bill which might very well reach the Supreme Court of the United States, and I should like to see it attempted.

In order to remove any doubt about it, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and I have offered the judicial review section of the Clark-Morse bill, which is now before our committee, and which was worked out by the Attorney General of the United States, the Solicitor General of the United States, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania, and the senior Senator from Oregon. We are satisfied that under that judicial review section it will be possible to have adjudicated the whole question of how far it is possible to go under the first amendment in the whole educational field.

However, I wish to tie down the debate this afternoon to this point. I am satisfied that the provisions which are contained in the bill are constitutional; that loans under the limitations we have fixed in the bill are constitutional; and that the Hill-Morse amendment, joined with the definitive language of the House as to what an academic facility is, accomplishes, to all intents and purposes, the laudable major objective of the Senator from North Carolina, which I consider is an attempt upon his part to restate the doctrine of separation of church and State, with which I find myself in complete agreement.

Mr. President, I hope the Hill-Morse amendment will be adopted.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, first, I commend the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Alabama for offering the pending amendment, which I think buttons up tightly the fact that Congress does not intend to have any Federal money used for edifices, buildings, or classrooms which will be used for religious purposes. I think we are all clear on that point.

Secondly—and this must be a matter for disagreement between lawyers—I do not share the view of the Senator from North Carolina about the implications of the amendment; in fact, I share the view of the Senator from Oregon that the section which we jointly wrote into the act he has mentioned make it possible—indeed, probable—that this question can be adjudicated in the Supreme Court of the United States.

Third, and finally, with respect to the proposed amendment of the Senator from North Carolina, whom I honor for his disagreement—if it is legal and if it is not, we have been violating the Constitution for many years, to make loans to private institutions for dormitories, dining halls, and cafeterias—it seems to me to be very difficult, indeed, to contend that such loans cannot equally be extended for academic facilities in the nature of laboratories, libraries, classrooms, and the like, when coupled with the stringent prohibition against using any of the space thus erected with Federal loan money for religious purposes.

PARTICIPATION BY FRANK B. ELLIS IN STOCKPILE INVESTIGATION

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, last Friday President Kennedy announced that Mr. Frank B. Ellis, who, as Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, has for the past several months been in charge of the strategic stockpiling program of the U.S. Government, is resigning and that he is being nominated as a Federal judge for the eastern district of Louisiana.

In making this announcement a spokesman for the White House pointed out that Mr. Ellis had participated in the stockpile investigation which had been quietly initiated by the White House last spring and that it was this inquiry which led the President to the conclusion that a congressional investigation was needed and that the situation held a possibility of "unconscionable profits" and possible mismanagement. In pointing out Mr. Ellis' assistance in this preliminary inquiry, the White House emphasized that there was no relation between Mr. Ellis' selection for the judgeship and the stockpiling investigation.

I want to emphasize that I have no reason to think that Mr. Ellis as head of the Government stockpiling program did not do a good job, and as far as I know he is fully qualified for the Federal judgeship and will no doubt be confirmed by an overwhelming vote. I, personally, have every intention of voting for his confirmation.

However, I am going to make this suggestion, that the confirmation of Mr. Ellis for this judicial appointment be held up without prejudice until Mr. Ellis first has an opportunity to appear before the congressional committee which is being set up to investigate the stockpiling program and to give to that committee the benefit of his vast knowledge and experience concerning the operations of this program.

We cannot overlook the fact that once Mr. Ellis is confirmed as a Federal judge, under our constitutional system there would be a question as to the propriety of requiring him to testify before a congressional committee. I am not inferring that it is the intention of the administration to remove Mr. Ellis from the jurisdiction of any congressional committee, and I am confident the President would have no objection to our delaying, without prejudice, the confirmation of Mr. Ellis.

Mr. Ellis, as the recent head of the Office of Emergency Planning, was in charge of our strategic stockpiling program, and as an official he played an important part in the preliminary inquiry which was conducted at the White House suggestion into this program, which inquiry led to the President's request for a full-scale investigation. Certainly, as a result of this service, he does have a vast amount of knowledge which would be of great assistance to any congressional investigating committee. After the congressional committee has had the benefit of Mr. Ellis' testimony the Senate could then proceed with the consideration of his confirmation as a Federal judge.

It may well be that the Senate committee can develop all the information which is needed in its inquiry without the assistance of Mr. Ellis, but in the light of the importance which the President has placed upon this investigation we do not want to overlook any possibility for getting the whole story.

Once again I compliment the President upon the interest he is now displaying in curtailing the unnecessary expenditures required to purchase materials in our stockpiling program which are not needed for our national defense, and again I pledge both to the President and to the congressional committee my fullest cooperation in bringing to the attention of the American people all of the facts surrounding this program.

COMMUNITY SELF-HELP

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, we have heard much in this Chamber about programs to assist our small cities and communities in developing their economic position.

In fact, one of the most important pieces of legislation passed by the Congress in the last session was the much needed Area Redevelopment Act. This act is now providing grants and loans for technical assistance and economic development in areas of severe and persistent labor surplus. This is a program which I have long supported.

However, there is no substitute for private initiative.

As I have often pointed out in the past, no program of Federal and State assistance will be of any value unless the community itself is actively interested in helping itself. The community must seize the initiative. It must work to improve its facilities and make its attractions known to industry.

An example of such a community self-help program is found in my own State of Colorado. Last year the community and business leaders of Canon City established the Canon City Area Development Foundation, Inc.

This foundation, although little more than a year old, has already produced results. A site has been purchased for the Royal Gorge Industrial Park and already a $90,000 factor, producing airline baggage conveyors, has been constructed in the park.

I have now received a statement of the aims and accomplishments of this foundation.

The best summary of the activities of the Canon City Area Development Foundation is their motto—found in the capital letters C.C.A.D.F.—that is, Creating Concerted Action for a Definite Future.

In closing, I am sure the Senate will be interested in reading of the work of the incorporators of this organization. These men are all members of the business community of Canon City. They are Mr. Burl E. Huitt, Mr. William F. Jackson, Mr. David Marcott, Mr. Lee Peterson, Mr. George E. Smith, Mr. Ralph Tomberlin, and Mr. George S. Winters. Tribute must also be given to Mrs. Pauline L. Bryan, manager of the Canon City Area Development Foundation, Inc.

Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent that the purposes and accomplishments of the Canon City Area Development Foundation be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE AND AIMS

Promote and encourage industrial or commercial enterprises in the Canon City region by:

1. Providing suitable industrial sites through development of the Royal Gorge Industrial Park.
2. Insuring, after investigation, adequate financial assistance through local firms and/or the Small Business Administration.
3. Working for a planned development of the region with respect to present and prospective industry.

PRESENT TRACT

Twenty-eight and five-hundredths will be enlarged as additional investments are made by individuals and firms interested in planned industrial development of Canon City. Your investment or inquiries can be made to: William F. Jackson, president, or Mrs. Pauline L. Bryan, manager, C.C.A.D.F., Inc., Post Office Box 366, Canon City, Colo.

Canon City (located on U.S. 50) is served by Atchison Topeka & Santa Fe Railroad and Denver & Rio Grande Western Railroad and Rio Grande Motorway.

Fremont County Airport, certified in 1961 by CAA, is 5 miles from Canon City on U.S. 50.

Plans are being developed for a helicopter port and runway at the Royal Gorge Industrial Park.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

1. Negotiated purchase of a 28.05 acre plot through A.T. & S.F. Railway Co. from the Cherokee & Pittsburg Coal & Mining Co. as initial site for Royal Gorge Industrial Park.

2. Preliminary planning and development of the tract as follows:

a. Surveyed and constructed access roads.

b. Obtained electrical power and natural gas for the area.

c. Secured water from Cotter Corp. and city of Canon City.

3. Gave 6-plus acres of the tract to Fry & Co. as site for construction of a new $90,000 factory building—completed December 1961. This building houses the company's local expanding airline baggage conveyor and Jeep-loading manufacturing plant.

IMMEDIATE NEEDS

1. Secure funds to complete payment for installation of water line.

2. Complete master plan.

3. Complete road construction.

4. Obtain option on surrounding land for future growth.

AID FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1241) to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities and to authorize scholarships for undergraduate study in such institutions.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I do not expect to vote against the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Alabama, although I think it is totally inadequate to meet the objection I have made. At the same time, I should say it is something in the nature of a powder puff improvement upon the bill in its original form. I do not intend to vote in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, any compliment from the Senator from North Carolina concerning our amendment is appreciated.

Mr. ERVIN. I would lay the flattering unction to my soul that perhaps my amendment may have had something to do with the inspiration which led to the presentation of the amendment by the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. MORSE. I plead guilty to that charge.

Mr. ERVIN. I do not oppose the amendment. It does not interfere in any way with my amendment, because it covers other phases of the bill. So I offer no objection to its adoption.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, this matter of loans and grants was a question of concern in the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I should say that not only is it a matter of current interest and enduring significance; but during the time when the proposed legislation was before our subcommittee and later the full committee, it was a subject for considerable discussion. The proposal against grants was voted on in committee when the National Defense Education Act was before us.

Mr. President, in order that the record may be clear so far as the Senator from West Virginia is concerned, it will be recalled that during the consideration of the National Defense Education Act the subcommittee and committee were concerned on that phase of that legislation, as to the amounts of money and methods by which funds might be given in aid to institutions of higher learning. I offered an amendment which, in effect, would have prohibited any grants and would have confined the funds to loans. At the moment, there was no definitive language that we were actually considering. The record will indicate that the amendment which I offered in principle did not prevail. There was a feeling within the committee at that particular time that grants as well as loans should be provided both public and private nonprofit colleges and universities.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to testify, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Education, that the Senator from West Virginia was the leader in committee in our discussion concerning loans and grants. The Senator from West Virginia made it perfectly clear to the committee that he would oppose a bill which provided grants to private schools. The Senator will recall that he was joined in that position by the able Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK]. He was joined also by the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Alabama in our full discussion of the issue. The Senator will recall that, as chairman of the subcommittee, I told them that I share the view that we should limit the bill to loans, and that it should not provide for grants. That is why I stated a few moments ago, in my answer to the Senator from North Carolina, that I wish to stress the fact that this bill provides for loans, not for grants, to private educational institutions.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Oregon, who is in charge of this bill on the floor, is correct; he will recall that last week in the debate it was said that the House version differs from the proposal now before the Senate, in that the House measure, in dealing with the specific subject of aid to institutions of higher education, would provide grants, as well as loans, whereas the substance of the measure now before the Senate is entirely in the category of loans, and has no relationship to grants to private nonprofit institutions.

Furthermore, I should like to make the record clear as to my own position, which has been stated over and over again in both the subcommittee and the full Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. It is that of course I am opposed to public grants which would be used by private and parochial schools. Regardless of whether we are concerned with the use of Federal funds for the construction of school facilities or the giving of aid in connection with the salaries of teachers in connection with public education at either the primary or the secondary level, I have felt that no funds should be appropriated by Congress for the purpose of making grants to private or parochial or church schools, regardless of the level of education involved.

The legislation as proposed, and also as strengthened by the amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], does not violate the position which has been taken by me. This proposed legislation confines itself—very properly—to loans; and it has been my belief that this measure would not result in any violation of the constitutional provision for separation between church and state.

I can well understand the concern of the Senator from North Carolina. His belief, which is shared by many of us, is that we should not approach the edge—perhaps one could call it the ragged edge—and should not approach the brink of violating the clearly expressed principle of separation of church and state, by a provision of funds for the purpose of religious education, directly or indirectly.

At this point I should like to read from an article prepared by me in 1938, and published in the periodical Liberty, a magazine of religious freedom:

> When we speak of the separation of church and state in the United States, we do not mean simply the absence of a church supported by Federal taxes, nor do we mean simply the rights of all men, regardless of religious credo, to the privileges of citizenship. If religious freedom is to be triumphant in our Republic, its spirit must live within the constitutions of all the component States. The judge of every local court must be imbued with it. And above all, no one of us can afford to lose sight of it as being one of the pillars upon which our Republic is founded. Our belief in the freedom of conscience is the very material of that structure.

Mr. President, each of us should, I believe, exercise constant vigilance against any intrusion by the church into state affairs, or by the state—I shall say to the Senator from North Carolina—into the affairs of religion.

Since publication of the magazine article which I wrote in 1938, the Supreme Court has rendered many decisions in which it has given specific expression to the general philosophy I have voiced.

Unfortunately, I was unable to be on the floor during all of the speech delivered by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN]; therefore, I am not sure whether at that time he stated that in its opinion in the case of Everson against Board of Education, the Supreme Court declared:

> The "establishment of religion" clause of the first amendment means at least this: Neither a State nor the Federal Government can set up a church. Neither can pass laws which aid one religion, aid all religions, or prefer one religion over another. No tax in any amount, large or small, can be levied to support any religious activities or institutions, whatever they may be called, or whatever form they may adopt to teach or prac-

> tice religion. In the words of Jefferson, the clause against establishment of religion by law was intended to erect a "wall of separation between church and state."

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am glad to yield.

Mr. ERVIN. I should like to say to the senior Senator from West Virginia that in my speech earlier today I read exactly that part of the opinion of the Supreme Court in the Everson case, and I emphasized that in that opinion the Supreme Court stated that neither the Federal Government nor the States can aid any religion or all religions. I specifically cited that part of the Supreme Court's opinion, to prove that any kind of aid—whether in the form of grants, or in the form of loans, or in any other form—would contravene the establishment-of-religion clause of the first amendment of the Constitution.

I thank the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it will do no harm to have cited that Supreme Court opinion a second time for the record, inasmuch as the opinion is stated in such clear and forceful language.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I take great satisfaction in the fact that the Senator from West Virginia agrees with me that that is a great statement of the principle involved in the establishment-of-religion clause in the first amendment of the Constitution. I feel flattered that the Senator from West Virginia has selected the same part of the opinion that I did, because it is a beautiful passage, and it is also a wonderful exposition of the principle involved.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I am in complete agreement with the observation of the Senator from North Carolina.

In the Everson case there was a dissent—with the concurrence of Justice Frankfurter, Justice Jackson, and Justice Burton, and by Justice Rutledge—which perhaps is relevant today, as relevant to our thinking here on this question as was the majority opinion from which I have just quoted. Referring to the history of the first amendment and the meaning which the freedom-of-religion clause held for its framers, Justice Rutledge stated that its purpose—

> Was to create a complete and permanent separation of the spheres of religious activity and civil authority by comprehensively forbidding every form of public aid or support for religion. * * * In view of this history no further proof is needed that the amendment forbids any appropriation, large or small, from public funds to aid or support any and all religious exercises.

I said earlier that there have been attempts to breach this complete and permanent separation by offering governmental assistance to private and parochial and church-affiliated elementary and secondary schools. These efforts are often justified, according to those who advocate them, on these arguments: First, for the national defense. That is certainly a primary argument which is used. Second, the nondiscriminatory treatment of parochial and church schools. And then, of course, the third reason of the public welfare concept, on which some States have taken certain actions going to that particular point, which I shall not elucidate at this time.

I could, of course, reply that we may not allow unconstitutional practices to be smuggled in under this legislative proposal or any other legislative proposal cloaked in the guise of the what I believe to be faulty reasoning.

To speak with complete candor, the national defense, in the sense that the term is used in the cold-war context, is not involved in the measure before the Senate this afternoon. We have considered the National Defense Education Act, and the background of action within the subcommittee and the full committee has been attested to not only by the remarks which I have made, but by the pertinent comment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

I would desire to ask, before leaving this subject, whether there is in the Senate, a desire at present to advance grants to private and parochial and church-related schools for the purpose of higher education involved in the pending bill? I say no, it is not involved. Of course, I can realize very well that there is some shading of opinion. The conviction of each Senator is involved on basic principle. When we make a loan, a loan which is to be repaid, and when we make a grant, a grant which is an outright gift, there is a very real difference, in the thinking of the Senator who now speaks. I am a member of the board of trustees of Salem College, at Salem, W. Va., and I also have been a member of the board of directors of Davis and Elkins College, an institution in which I had the responsibility of teaching for 6 years. In the former instance, I was a student and was graduated from that institution. In the second instance, as indicated, I was a member of its faculty.

I say to Senators who are present in this forum that both institutions have been the recipients of loans which have come to us for dormitories and dining rooms constructed on their campuses. Both of these very splendid schools have received loans which have enabled them to construct facilities which were needed.

They were loans, I repeat, and do no violence to the principles to which I adhere.

The security and integrity of American freedoms, of course, must be preserved. I do not want to, shall I say, wave any flag here, or emphasize with undue vigor the so-called patriotic angle. I have no wish to do that. I speak on this subject quietly and, I trust, succinctly. I hope also to talk earnestly.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I am very glad the Senator is giving his support, on the floor, just as he did in committee, to loans under the bill. The universities and colleges of West Virginia have received, under existing college housing loan policies, a total of $18,632,000. In many other States, other schools in varying proportions have received this loan aid.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I thank the Senator for providing those figures at this point in the debate.

The freedoms which have been enjoyed, we would place in jeopardy if we were to make outright grants rather than loans. As the Senator from North Carolina would say again if he were speaking, the grants would certainly violate the letter and the intent of the first amendment clause which goes to the "establishment of religion." But when we provide a loan which is to be repaid, regardless of the interest rate, we are in a different category from that which exists when we make an outright grant, a contribution, a gift, to an institution of higher learning.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it the position of the Senator from West Virginia that a distinction must be made between outright grants or gifts, on the one hand, and loans, on the other hand, and that a loan does not violate the constitutional prohibition, while a grant does?

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Senator from Ohio is correct in the manner in which he states the position of the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from West Virginia has obviously given considerable thought to this subject. I would direct his attention, if I may, to title II of the bill, which deals with scholarships. Grants will be made to scholars in the sum of $1,000 a year, but in addition to those grants, title II provides that the Federal Government shall pay to the school which the applicant chooses as his school the sum of $350 a year.

The grant of $1,000 to the applicant scholar will be made. He then will choose his school. After he chooses his school, under the provisions of title II, $350 will be paid to the school, regardless of whether it is of denominational or public background.

My question is, Would that provision for the payment of $350 to the school, which might include a denominational school, violate the constitutional provision?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I say to my colleague, this phrase of the bill gives me grave concern. I cannot pass it over lightly by saying we did that in the so-called GI bill of rights, which legislation has become law. It is there. The situation the Senator has outlined does exist.

There will be offered, this afternoon or tomorrow, certain amendments which may go to the exact point of scholarships and the relationship of the contributions in reference to this question.

I appreciate the inquiry and, coupled with it, the thinking, in degree, of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. There seems to be a parallel, in that it will be not a loan but a grant. It will be a grant to the school. The Senator from West Virginia lays the groundwork that there is a distinction between the loan and a grant, that loans are permissible and grants are not. I can understand his concern. I have a grave question about the situation.

I am grateful to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. This is an issue which is well raised in connection with our deliberations on this subject.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on the point raised by the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to make it clear that under the scholarship provision of the bill the scholarship will be granted to the student. Then the student will make a decision as to what institution he wishes to attend. Let us assume he selects the University of Ohio, or selects a private institution in the State of Ohio. The bill provides that he will take with him to that institution an additional $350 to pay part, and only part, of the cost the institution will incur as the result of his selection of that institution as the place for his education.

Three hundred and fifty dollars, as the testimony and evidence taken in our committee show, will not begin to pay the real cost occasioned to the institution, which it, in turn, will have to pay in order to educate that student, but at least it will be some contribution to the institution for accepting the student, to carry on his work in that university.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Section 208 of the bill provides, in part:

> In order partially to compensate institutions of higher education for expenses, in excess of student tuition and other fees, incurred by such institutions in providing education to persons awarded scholarships and receiving payments with respect thereto under this title, the Commissioner shall, in accordance with regulations, pay each institution which such a person attends during the major portion of each academic year for which such person receives scholarship payments, the amount of $350.

The money will be paid directly to the institution of higher learning and it will be a supplement to the $1,000. That is about the best one can say for it. It will be a supplement to the $1,000 paid to the student, while allowing him to choose the college he will attend.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield further.

Mr. MORSE. What the Senator from Ohio says is perfectly true. As the Senator pointed out in his reading, it is to be a partial payment toward the encumbrance which the institution will incur in educating the student.

We took the position that if student X were to select institution A as the institution which he wished to attend to get his education, there ought to follow him to that institution a sum of $350 to be of assistance to the institution, to pay part of the extra cost which the institution will incur as a result of his matriculation.

In that sense, it is a contribution to the institution, but the institution still will have to pay more than the student will bring to the institution, both by way of the tuition, which he will pay for out of his scholarship grant, plus the $350.

I say to my friend from Ohio: we feel that money is really following the student. The money is contributed to the institution through the conduit of the student. The decision as to which institution will get the money will be left up to the voluntary judgment of the student, who will select the school at which he wishes to get his training.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Does the Senator from Oregon agree that the particular institution to which the student goes, whenever a selectee under the law goes to the school, will receive $350 more than it would receive from its private students?

Mr. MORSE. That is true.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In the minority views, it is stated:

> But, and this is the significant provision, "the college attended by the scholarship recipient receives from the Federal Government a grant of $350 per annum for each scholarship recipient in attendance during the year." Thus, the education of a student who can pay his own way without the aid of a Federal scholarship costs the college, out of its own resources, $350 a year more than does the education of a scholarship recipient who brings with him, for the institution, a direct Federal grant of $350.

Mr. MORSE. That is true.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is true.

Mr. MORSE. What we are trying to do is to save the waste of a very valuable brainpower source of this country. It is represented by those students who probably will not go to college at all if we do not have the scholarship program. We say that if we are to help these students who otherwise might not go to college—and thereby, in my judgment, cause a loss of great wealth to the country as a whole—and if we are to encourage them to go on to college, it is only fair and equitable to say to the institution which will receive them, "We are going to help you out this much. We are going to help you out in the amount of $350."

If the Senator asks me why it is $350 rather than $300 or $400, or any other figure, I shall be forced to say, "We think this is a fair and reasonable figure based upon the judgment we received from educational authorities who testified before us. We think it is a pretty equitable adjustment."

In considering whether the figure should be $350, $375, or $325, the Senator from Oregon could not justify the $350 in relation to some other close figure. We think $350 is a pretty equitable figure.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I cannot see the justification for requiring a student who is not receiving a Federal scholarship to pay $1,000 to the institution, while the one who receives the Federal scholarship will pay $1,000 and the Government will add $350, to be paid to that institution of higher learning regardless of whether it is a public institution of higher learning or a private denominational school.

Mr. MORSE. We think it is a reasonable program to obtain the cooperation we need from the educational institutions. We think it is not particularly fair to say to an educational institution, "We are going to be responsible for these students urging their admission to your institution on the basis of a scholarship and then say that you have to take care of them and we will not make any contribution at all."

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further statement?

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield first to the Senator from Ohio and then I shall yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Ohio does not agree with the Senator from Oregon that unless scholarships by way of grant are provided, highly intelligent students will not go to college on the basis of lack of money. In my judgment, if the only way we can induce students to go to college is by providing payments through scholarships, we would, by doing so, indulge in a hazard at the very beginning. In my opinion, the intellectual student, if he were provided with the power to borrow the necessary money, would avail himself of that borrowing power and attend the university of his choice.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a comment?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I understand the point of view of the Senator from Ohio. One of the problems involved in the debate is that we are urging the adoption of a program before men and women who are self-made men and women. The men and women in the Senate are men and women who have made great sacrifices in practically every instance to attain the position they have attained. But I think it is easy for us to judge others by ourselves, and so easy to take the position that my friend from Ohio has taken.

After all, we would be running a risk that young men and women would not be willing to borrow the necessary money in order to go to college, as we did, for example. But the evidence is against us. The evidence is that many thousands of high school graduates in this country are very superior. Last Friday I had printed in the RECORD an analysis of the number of high school graduates who are in the upper 30 percent of their graduating class but are not going on to college. They want to go on to college and ought to be helped to do so, not only from their own standpoint but from the standpoint of the strength and security of our country.

The sad fact is that, though we may not appreciate it, it is true that if we insist that such students encumber themselves with loans, which over a college course would total $7,000 minimum—the figures submitted at the hearings show a minimum figure of $7,000 to go through a 4-year course—the students will not do it.

The question I ask the Senate to consider is, Can we afford that potential loss of valuable brainpower resource in this country? That is why the Senate will find me, when we reach that section of the bill, opposing striking grants and substituting loans on the scholarship question, because it is in the interest of the national self-defense to see to it that we stop wasting that brainpower.

I wish I could agree with my friend from Ohio, but I think he is dead wrong if he thinks that all potentially able students will borrow money to go to college. They are not doing so. They get jobs and think of the immediate present and the future. They will get married. They are going ahead and living out their lives; and, as a result, they will not return to the Treasury of the United States the great increase in tax dollars that they otherwise would pay into the Treasury of the United States if we were willing to help them now in their formative years to go to college, to receive their degrees, and to realize a greater earning power later.

It is very easy for us in our fifties, sixties, and seventies, to speculate as to what we might do if we were 17 or 18 years old today, as contrasted with the situation which existed when we were 17 or 18 years of age. There have been great changes. We must not project ourselves into the position of the 17- and 18-year-old at the present time. But we ought to listen to the testimony of educational authorities about the problem. They say that the position taken by the Senator from Ohio does not square with what happens in practice.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD—I shall not take the time of the Senate to read them now—statements on this subject by college presidents and others.

There being no objection, the statements and materials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From p. 280 of the hearing record]

STATEMENT OF EVERETT CASE, PRESIDENT, COLGATE UNIVERSITY; ACCOMPANIED BY LOGAN WILSON, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION; AND CHARLES G. DOBBINS, STAFF ASSOCIATE, AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION, AND SECRETARY, COMMITTEE ON RELATIONSHIPS OF HIGHER EDUCATION TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Dr. CASE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

* * * * *

Proceeding now to Title II: Scholarships for college students, the council finds reason for deep gratification. We have recommended a Federal scholarship program for many years. The Federal Government, we believe, can and should provide greater assistance in removing financial barriers to higher education for qualified students. Costs to the students, according to a council survey, have risen at both public and private institutions as much in the last 4 years as in the preceding 8 years or in the 20 before that. The loan program under the NDEA has helped many families in the middle-income brackets, but qualified students at the very low income levels are finding college more and more difficult to finance.

All the studies made in recent years by the council have shown strong support in the academic world for Federal scholarships. An inquiry to our membership as late as last November asking, "Should a Federal scholarship program be added to the NDEA?" brought an affirmative vote of more than 2 to 1. It will not surprise you, I am sure, to know that in answer to the question, "For each scholarship student enrolled, should the educational institution receive a cost-of-education grant?" there was an affirmative vote of 4 to 1.

Early in 1958 the council proposed a program that in nearly all essential details, including total cost, was the program in S. 1241. We proposed then, for the first time, a cost-of-education payment to the institution chosen by the scholarship holder, a proposal which, we are pleased to note, is included in this bill. The council's current recommendations are fully in harmony also with the bill's provision for variable stipends not to exceed $1,000 for any academic year, and with the objective of seeking out and assisting students of academic promise in greatest financial need.

SUPPLEMENTARY STATEMENTS ON HIGHER EDUCATION BILLS S. 1241 AND S. 585 BY THE ASSOCIATION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

* * * * *

FEDERAL LOAN FUNDS AND SCHOLARSHIPS

We recommend continuation of the Federal student loan program on a permanent basis.

To identify students of high potentiality and, by reducing economic barriers, to encourage them to attend college, we recommend a Federal scholarship program providing a minimum of 25,000 new scholarships annually.

We recommend the elimination of the requirement of the disclaimer affidavit in the present National Defense Education Act.

* * * * *

G. KERRY SMITH,
Executive Secretary,
Association for Higher Education.

EXCERPTS FROM SOURCE MATERIALS RELATING TO COLLEGE ENROLLMENT PREPARED BY THE OFFICE OF EDUCATION

SUPERIOR HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES WHO DO NOT ENTER COLLEGE

Between 160,000 and 200,000 youth of high ability annually fail to attend college. Of these, 60,000 to 100,000 might be reached if financial assistance was made available to them.

Charles C. Cole, Jr., of Columbia University has made the most comprehensive and significant study of able high school graduates who fail to go to college. He writes: "Despite the increased interest in the bachelor of arts degree, higher education is still losing up to one-half of the top 30 percent or so of the Nation's high school seniors. Each year, apparently, between 60,000 and 100,000 highly able secondary school graduates with aptitude and interest for college fail to continue their education for financial reasons. Another group of similar size and ability lack the interest or motivation for college. This is a serious waste of intellectual resources which should not be overshadowed by the rising tide of college enrollments (Charles C. Cole, Jr, 'Encouraging Scientific Talent, 1956')."

A study [1] of the top 25 percent of the graduating classes in Wisconsin public and private high schools showed:

1. Forty-seven percent did not go on to college.
2. Between one-third and one-half of these students said lack of money was the major deterrent to going to college (J. Kenneth Little, "A Statewide Inquiry Into Decisions of Youth About Education Beyond High School, 1958").

A study [1] of the top 25 percent of the June 1957 graduating classes of 25 Utah high schools located 25 miles from a junior or 4-year college showed:

1. Eighty percent went to college.
2. Thirty percent in college indicated they anticipated financial difficulties which might force them to withdraw prior to graduation.
3. Forty-eight percent of the top quarter of those not going on to college would attend if given sufficient financial assistance.
4. If a suitable system of financial assistance were put into effect, about 93 percent of Utah's top quarter high school graduates could be induced to attend and remain in college.

A study [2] of the top 10 percent of the 1956 South Carolina high school graduates showed:

1. Of the top 10 percent of students graduating from South Carolina high schools, 30 percent did not continue their education in college.
2. Of the 1,282 who enrolled in college, 513 received some sort of financial aid, averaging $377 per white student and $200 per Negro student.
3. Although a number of superior students were offered scholarships, most of these awards were not sufficiently large to enable the student to enter college.

A study [3] of 18,000 high school seniors expecting to graduate in June 1957 from Philadelphia public, private, and Catholic diocesan schools showed:

1. Nearly half of the top 25 percent of all the high school graduates were not entering college.
2. Seventeen percent of those students stated that finances were the principal barrier to achievement of their post-high-school goals.

A study [4] based on a questionnaire received from 744 Ohio public and private high schools concerning June 1960 graduates showed:

1. Number of high school graduates, June 1960	78, 452
2. Number academically prepared to attend college	41, 383
3. Number who entered college, September 1960 (70.5 percent of item 2)	29, 185
4. Number known not to have entered college due to lack of scholarships and/or other financial resources (10.5 percent of number of qualified high school graduates, item 2)	4, 352

RISING COSTS OF ATTENDING COLLEGE

Costs of tuition and required fees have risen about 75 percent in the past decade, and promise to increase still further.

Student costs, however, must include other expenses, such as books, room rent, board, travel, and clothing.

Annual student expenses in representative institutions of higher education, 1958–59

[A—Private liberal arts college. B—Private university in large city. C—State university in small city. D—Municipal university]

	A	B	C	D
Tuition and fees	$1,000	$1,000	$300	$500
Books and supplies	100	100	100	100
Room rent	260		275	
Board	500	150	500	150
Travel	100		100	
Clothing and incidentals	300	250	250	250
Total	2, 260	1, 500	1, 525	1, 000

FAMILY INCOME IN THE UNITED STATES

Family income in the United States has risen substantially during the past decade, but more than 62 percent of families in 1957 had incomes below $6,000.

Income class	1947 percentage	1957 percentage
$2,000 or less	25	14
$2,000 to $3,999	38	23
$4,000 to $5,999	20	25
$6,000 to $7,999	9	18
$8,000 to $9,999	3	9
$10,000 or over	5	11

---

[1] Testimony presented to the House Subcommittee on Education and Labor, Salt Lake City, Utah, Nov. 1, 1957, by David R. Dixon.

[2] By the State department of education.

[3] Joint study by Temple University and the Philadelphia Board of Higher Education.

[4] Ohio Scholarship Funds Study, 1960.

A recent New York State study[5] showed that among high school graduates in 1954 with IQ's of 120 or above, about 40 percent of those from families having incomes of $4,000 or less did not plan to attend college.

[From "College Admissions—The Search for Talent, College Entrance Examination Board," published by the College Board, 1960]

WHERE THE LOSS OF TALENT OCCURS AND WHY

(By Donald S. Bridgman)

Reasons for not attending college given in State and National studies

[In percent]

	Upper 10 percent		Upper 30 percent	
	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls
Upstate New York:				
Economic	28.7	28.4	19.2	27.9
Lack of interest	8.8	31.6	12.8	34.3
Military service	40.5	1.2	45.8	1.2
Marriage		13.4	.7	11.6
Other	22.0	26.0	21.7	25.2
ETS-NSF:				
Expense			32.0	31.0
No college goal			29.0	48.0
Personal inadequacy			18.0	6.0
Family or social pressure			21.0	15.0
Indiana:				
Financial need	24.0	28.0		
Other interest	34.0	13.0		
Indifference	21.0	28.0		
Marriage	8.0	30.0		
	Valedictorians and salutatorians			
Kansas:				
Financial need	18.0		49.0	36.0
Other economic	13.0		9.0	14.0
Lack of interest	13.0		14.0	21.0
Military service	4.0		18.0	
Marriage	32.0			22.0
Other	20.0		10.0	7.0

NATIONAL MERIT SCHOLARSHIP COMPETITION, 1960[6]

"Whatever the proper standard of talent loss may be, a high percentage of the most able participants in the national merit scholarship competition do enter college. Among the participants ranking in the top one-third with respect to aptitude for college study, about 8 out of 10 enroll. Of greater significance, among the finalists (now about 9,800 annually, each of whom is considered highly qualified) more than 19 out of 20 enter college."

This means that of the approximately 1,800,000 high school graduates for 1960, the top 500,000 entered national merit competition. These students represent the general level of college ability. Of the top one-third, or 165,000 of the most able students, 20 percent, or 33,000 are unable to attend college. Further, 1 in 20 of the top one-half percent of this most capable group fail to go on to college.

[From the Washington Post, June 11, 1961]

COLLEGE COST $485 IN 1878, $3,665 NOW

(By Terry Ferrer, New York Herald Tribune News Service)

NEW YORK.—With the Cutler family of Massachusetts, Harvard is a habit.

Bradley Cutler, deceased textile manufacturer, graduated in 1878. His son Roger, a textile manufacturer, was a graduate of 1911. Bradley Cutler's grandson Eric, now assistant director of admissions and scholarships for Harvard College, was a 1940 man. And two of Bradley's great-grandchildren, Erica and Robert, are members of the class of 1963—the girl at Radcliffe and the boy at Harvard.

Tracing the actual college expenses of four generations of Cutlers at Harvard the other day, Eric Cutler (that's 1940) came up with some fantastic figures.

Bradley (that's 1878) spent around $485 for a year at the Cambridge, Mass., campus. His great-grandson Robert (that's 1963) will spend about $3,665 next year, or almost eight times as much.

While every one of the 3,790,000 boys and girls in college next fall obviously will not be spending as much as Robert Cutler—particularly at a public college or university—the true cost of a college year will be frighteningly high in 1961–62.

The 1,546,000 students in private colleges and universities will be spending an average $2,140, according to the U.S. Office of Education. The 2,244,000 in public institutions will get by with an average $1,325.

"It is not only the high cost of education that makes it so difficult for families to finance college," says Ernest V. Hollis, college financial expert in the Office of Education, "it is also the cost of high living by the student in college."

All of this might have come as a shock to Bradley Cutler, Harvard, 1878. An examination of Harvard records shows that his yearly college expenses ran something like this:

Instruction and library fees	$150
Rent and care of room in college building (with "chums")	65
Board for 38 weeks	220
Textbooks	16
2 cords of hard firewood (chums also contribute)	24
Total	485

By contrast, Bradley's son Roger (1911) spent about $589 a year; Eric (1940) the grandson, around $1,190.

Erica Cutler, Radcliffe 1963, Eric's daughter, was not even sure last week just what her expenses will be next year. She was unaware that Radcliffe, as well as Harvard, will increase its tuition $300 next fall for a total of $1,520.

Adding $1,030 for room and board, $170 for meal (her house gives only two meals a day), books, and supplies, another $100 for "special social events like skiing, weekends," Erica's budget next year will be $2,920. Many of her friends will spend more.

Erica's cousin Robert estimates his Harvard expenses next year thus:

Tuition	$1,520
Room	430
Board	590
Personal expenses (including car)	1,125
Total	3,665

A girl whom we shall call Betty will also require plenty of cash at Bennington, a private women's college in Bennington, Vt., which is the most expensive college in the United States. Bennington is also raising its comprehensive fee (tuition, room, and board) by $300 to $2,950. Two-thirds of the student body of 340 girls will pay the full amount; the rest will get financial aid through scholarships or loans or both.

Betty, who lives in Greenwich, Conn., likes to go home for Thanksgiving, Christmas, and spring vacation, and takes about 4 weekends a year away from the Vermont campus (conservative for a Bennington girl). She rides bus at $8.32 one way, and figures that $150 a year covers transportation.

To this she adds $100 for books and supplies, $75 for laundry and cleaning, and $100 for clothing (this would not include evening dresses for dates at men's college affairs). Totaling these items with the $2,950 fee, she will spend $3,375 next year.

Other girls who take every weekend away and buy more clothes could easily run the college bill up to $4,000 or $5,000 a year.

Incidentally, the average woman college student spends less than a man unless the woman comes from a high-income family. According to a 1957 study by Hollis, families and relatives provide more of a woman's college budget than of a man's. This, said Hollis, "may account for the widely held belief that it costs more to send a girl than a boy to college."

At the low end of the varying scale of college expenses are the four senior colleges at City University of New York and the 69 free public junior colleges of California—provided you live in California. (In fact, if you want to gear your family economics to college costs, move to California right now.)

Connie will be a senior at City College of City University of New York next year. She lives with her family and thus pays no room rent. Her fixed fees at the tuition-free municipal college are $28 a year. She is taking one course which carries a $7 laboratory fee.

Her books will cost her about $50 a year, her clothes another $120. For meals, carfare, and cigarettes, based on past experience, she budgets $360 a year. Total outlay: $565 in 1961–62.

Sam, who lives in San Diego, has decided that he would like to get away from home. He plans to attend one of the 14 public junior colleges in California which have dormitories.

There are no fees except for a student organization fee he figures at its lowest, $3.50 (it can run up to $10). He can get room and board in the dormitory for a minimum of $420 a year. Incidentals, including books, will run to $147 plus $100 for clothes. Sam's total: $670.50.

If Sam goes on to the University of California at Berkeley, his expenses will jump to about $1,300 a year for the junior and senior years, if he lives in a dormitory. If he lives in a fraternity house, he will need an extra $400 minimum for a total of $1,700.

(If Sam were from New York, he would also have to pay an out-of-State fee of $500 for a total of $1,800 in the dormitory and $2,200 in the fraternity.)

And so it goes. Hal, from Newark, N.J., won't have any fraternity expenses at Hiram College in Hiram, Ohio. The 675-student, coeducational, private college doesn't have either fraternities or sororities. Hal's bill next year will run about $2,200.

At Beloit, a 990-student, private, coeducational institution in Beloit, Wis., Hal would pay about $2,500, including $100 in fraternity fees.

The cost of attending college can be as high or as low as the student wants to make it. A New York girl at coeducational, private MacMurray College in Jacksonville, Ill., can spend $3,260 a year (including $500 on clothes) even though her tuition, room, and board will run to only $1,850. A Jersey boy at Amherst can get by in a squeak with $2,675, of which $2,035 will be tuition, room, and board.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one additional statement?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have on my desk a letter from the president of an institution of higher learning in Ohio, stating that the provisions of the House bill from his personal standpoint are more acceptable than those on the pending Senate bill.

The president of Miami University, John D. Millet, testified on the pending bill and stated that the grants for scholarships are not warranted at this time. I am not willing to concede the correctness of the position of the Senator from Oregon that when the Federal Government says, "We will lend you $1,000 a year if you go to college," that is not enough, but that we should say, "We will give you $1,000 if you will go to college."

---

[5] Philip A. Cowen, "Certain Factors Relative to the Continuance of Education of Graduates of Secondary Schools in New York State, 1954."

[6] National Merit Scholarship Corp. Annual Report, 1960, p. 26.

I do not believe that American boys and girls who really wish to study expect the Federal Government to give them the necessary money. All such students want is the ability to go, and if they would not go unless the money were given to them, there is not much hope that they would complete their courses.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator feel that way about the GI bill?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes; I am speaking of the GI bill, which provides a loan of $750 or $1,000 a year.

Mr. MORSE. Not the GI bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. How much does it provide?

Mr. MORSE. The GI bill is based upon grants.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The GI bill is based upon loans, with forgiveness provisions. I am talking about the National Defense Education Act.

Mr. MORSE. I am talking about the GI bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am talking about the National Defense Education Act.

Mr. MORSE. I asked the Senator if he thinks the grants of millions of dollars which were made available to the GI's, grants which have been more than repaid already by the increased taxes the recipients are paying, were a mistake? I believe they were a sound investment in the potential brainpower of America. The taxpayers have been repaid many times their investment.

Some students will take the position of the Senator from Ohio and say, "If I can get a loan, I will do so." But there are many thousands whose potential brainpower we would waste if we were to insist upon that parsimonious position.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I am not insensitive to the argument which has been made by the Senator from Ohio or the argument made by the Senator from Oregon. I think we have a burden that our thinking processes in connection with a question of the kind now before the Senate must be weighed in view of the first amendment, combining, very frankly, religious and secular aid to students. Parents and their children must think that question through very carefully.

As I said at the beginning of my remarks, the amendment I offered in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare relating to the subject of loans as against grants was defeated by a vote of 9 to 5. That was last July when we were considering a bill to extend and amend the National Defense Education Act. The proposal before us contained a provision under which grants could be made to the States for the acquisition of equipment for use in providing education in public institutions of higher education in science, mathematics, modern foreign languages, and other subjects delineated.

Contained in this same part of the bill was a provision directing the Commissioner of Education to make loans to nonprofit—other than public—institutions of higher education for the same purpose.

As stated, I offered an amendment which would have had as its effect to provide that such aid to institutions of higher education would be in the form of loans to both public and nonprofit private institutions. It was rejected by a 9-to-5 vote.

But whereas that was a question handled at that time within the committee relative to the National Defense Education Act, there is equal validity to bringing that matter to the attention of the Senate at this time when we are considering amendments to a bill providing aid to institutions of higher education.

I do not want to labor the point too much, but I feel it is pertinent to quote one of the distinguished jurists of another era, Jeremiah S. Black, who in an essay entitled "Religious Liberty" stated as follows:

> The manifest object of the men who framed the institutions of this country was to have a state without religion, and a church without politics—that is to say, they meant that one should never be used as an engine for any purpose of the other. * * * Our fathers seem to have been perfectly sincere in their belief that the members of the church would be more patriotic, and the citizens of the state more religious, by keeping their respective functions entirely separate. For that reason they built up a wall of complete and perfect partition between the two.

As we consider matters of criteria, and as we discuss the subjects to be taught within an institution of higher learning, we are admittedly treading on ground which in all instances is not watertight or foolproof.

However, I have studied this subject over and over again. Mr. President, even though I have held these very pertinent opinions and/or convictions in the matter of grants, I have come to the conclusion that in the matter of loans there is no violation of this concept of separation of church and state.

I know that the problem is complicated as we study our Constitution, because we have developed a wide and varied pattern of religious organizations and activities, and a manifold educational system in which the churches have performed an important role.

The question now is to determine the essential meaning in a multitude of situations in which the concepts vary as to where no restriction or no support of religious activities by the Federal Government is involved.

Insofar as the Senator from West Virginia is concerned, he believes that there is no violation of this concept of separation of church and state when we extend loans. If we were providing for grants under this proposal, I would be fighting against such a measure this afternoon.

In facing these multiple issues, we would do well to bear in mind the remarks of the Roman philosopher Epictetus who, when commenting on the fall of Athenian democracy as caused by educating the few, observed:

> The state says that only freemen will be educated; God says only educated men will be free.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to table was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, has the motion to reconsider the vote been made?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, the motion has been made; and the motion to table has been agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate may temporarily vacate the motion to reconsider, although eventually I shall make it again.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MORSE. It being understood, of course, that I will have the right to make it again by unanimous consent.

Mr. ERVIN. I could not hear what the Senator was saying.

Mr. MORSE. The situation is that we have been trying to make it perfectly certain that every one of our colleagues is perfectly willing to have a yea and nay vote on the amendment. We did not have a yea and nay vote because we did not feel we could delay any longer. The amendment was agreed to. Then I made a motion to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to, and that motion was laid on the table. I have agreed to vacate my motion temporarily, so that it may be possible to get in touch with some Senators. I address this parliamentary inquiry to the Chair, however: If I do that, will I later be able to make my motion? I am sure that I can do so by unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion may be subsequently renewed.

Mr. MORSE. I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my motion to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to make perfectly clear what the situation is, and therefore I address this parliamentary inquiry to the Chair, because I want the RECORD to show that we are waiting to get in touch with a Senator, and we want to be sure that he understands we did not take advantage of him in this case. After we get in touch with him I will again, later in the afternoon, make my motion to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was adopted, and that motion will then be followed by a motion to lay on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. This action does not preclude the making of a motion later.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Did I hear the Chair correctly? I want to be sure that the Senator from Oregon is in accord and in "court" on this.

Mr. MORSE. I understood the Chair to say that this does not preclude me later in the afternoon from moving to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was adopted, and for a motion to lay on the table to be made later.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, for more than 5 years I have urged Congress to encourage and stimulate the development of community colleges in this country. I have been motivated by the growing need for academic facilities in the face of a steadily increasing number of college students and a growing proportion of students interested in pursuing education beyond high school. I have been interested in this type of institution also because it seeks to provide education shaped for local needs and local interests. It meets all these needs in a most economical manner.

Let me take a minute here to describe the activities of the community college: In this country we now have approximately 400 public and 275 private junior colleges attended by more than 800,000 young men and women. This represents a tremendous growth in recent years. In fact, educational authorities and three Presidential commissions have focused attention on these colleges as the most logical way to expand higher education facilities. The hope has been expressed by one outstanding educator that junior colleges may be able to enroll 50 percent of all students entering college by 1970.

These 2-year institutions vary from community to community depending on local needs. But in general they offer all or a part of the following programs:

First. A transfer program, enabling the student to transfer to a 4-year college or university to pursue a program leading to a baccalaureate degree in the arts or sciences, or to a professional degree.

Second. A terminal program, designed to provide a specific unit of training for entrance into employment, but not intended to include transfer to a degree-granting 4-year institution.

Third. A program of general education, not intended to include transfer to a degree-granting institution.

Fourth. A program of adult education that may parallel those described above, depending on the demand, usually offered in an evening session.

Because of the advantage of this type of institution and because of the contribution it can make to the educational needs of this country at the higher levels, I was greatly pleased and gratified by the willingness of the chairman of the Subcommittee on Education, the other members of the subcommittee, and the members of the full Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to accept an amendment to title 3 of the bill, an amendment which I offered to a bill several years ago, for a community college program.

Title III of the bill will go a long way to assure every American the opportunity to continue his education up to the maximum of his ability. The expansion of existing 2-year colleges and the establishment of new ones have been recommended by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in its report on the bill. The committee looks on the 2-year institutions as providing "widespread opportunity for post-high-school education of college grade at a reasonable cost both to the student and to the supporting public. The committee regards the community college as a major new hope for the successful accommodation of increasing college enrollment."

The essence of title III is to provide Federal financial assistance to the States on a matching basis to stimulate increased State and local effort in constructing community colleges. Federal outlays of $50 a million for 5 years are a modest contribution toward the costs that are faced by the States in community college construction.

Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Abraham Ribicoff has recognized the great value of community colleges. In testimony before our committee he said:

> A community college to me is the answer to the floodgate of education in this country.
>
> I feel with the fantastic cost of education, the fantastic cost of buildings, the fantastic cost of room and board, that the answer to the large educational problem will be found in the community.
>
> Our population is changing and shifting. We are shifting away from the villages in the country, and our rural population is shifting to the city.
>
> It is expensive now to build a college and university in the country.
>
> I think with all the boys wanting to go to school, you will find a higher education basically developing in community colleges right in built-up areas in the cities, where young men and women may live at home and go to college, and this would eliminate the necessity of athletic fields and student unions and dormitories, expense for room and board, which is more expensive in many schools than the tuition; and this would be where the growth will be, Senator Case, in the community colleges, and everything should be done to encourage it.

Dr. Alan T. Waterman, Director of the National Science Foundation, testified before our committee and indicated his interest in the provisions of S. 1140, my bill for assistance to the junior colleges, which now has been adopted by the committee as title III of the pending bill. While urging support for a broad program of aid for construction of college facilities, he referred to S. 1140, in these words:

> S. 1140 raises another and quite interesting set of questions. If I interpret correctly the recent trends in higher education, the 2-year college, although already of considerable importance, is likely to become still more important in the next few years. The projected increases in college enrollments between now and 1970 will place many strains on our existing institutions. The possibility of providing Federal funds to assist in the establishment of additional community colleges is therefore worthy of careful attention.

Already, the community college program has indicated its great potential for helping young people achieve education beyond high school. Our committee was told that in the State of Washington one community college last year turned away a thousand applicants because of lack of space. In some junior colleges on the eastern seaboard the enrollment is completed 10 months ahead of the academic year.

I think that the comprehensive community college meets so many problems for so many people that its establishment is almost assured of immediate success. In the first instance it brings education close to students, making training accessible both in terms of distance and cost. It offers training for those who want to transfer to a university to prepare for a professional career or for those who are interested in a semiprofessional or technical career. And for many people it provides the stimulation to continue their education through adult programs many years after they have completed their high school training. In many of our smaller communities the community college therefore tends to become a center of education and culture, providing facilities for various age groups.

Since the 2-year institutions are relatively new in the field of education, there are those who do not yet recognize their value. But I point out that these new institutions offer facilities different from those of the 4-year university and at the same time alleviate the pressure on the 4-year schools.

Unless we help establish more of these junior colleges and expand the existing ones, there will be a growing number of young men and women of real ability who will have to miss out on college training. Last year, Dr. Arthur S. Flemming, former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, told a House committee hearing that, despite the remarkable growth of college enrollments, experts estimate that some 160,000 to 200,000 of high ability annually fail to attend college.

These youngsters are losing out on training which will enable them to reach their fullest capacity. The Nation is losing out on the fullest development of their talents and abilities. These young people should not be deprived; and the Nation cannot afford to let it happen.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that, pursuant to section 194 of title 14 of the United States Code, the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries had appointed Mr. Garmatz of Maryland, Mr. Lennon of North Carolina, and Mr. Mailliard of California, as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy, for the year 1962.

The message also informed the Senate that, pursuant to Public Law 301 of the 78th Congress, the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries had appointed Mr. ZELENKO of New York, Mr. DOWNING of Virginia, and Mr. VAN PELT of Wisconsin as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy in 1962.

GOV. NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER AND THE PROPOSED DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS—COMPLETING THE RECORD

Mr. McGEE obtained the floor.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Maine.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, on February 1, 1962, Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, of New York, addressed a partisan fundraising dinner in Des Moines, Iowa. He took that occasion to attack President Kennedy's Reorganization Plan No. 1, which would combine the Housing and Home Finance Agency and related agencies in a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. According to the Friday, February 2, issue of the New York Times:

> Governor Rockefeller of New York charged today that President Kennedy's proposal to create a Department of Urban Affairs "is being used as a smokescreen."
>
> "If President Kennedy wanted a Negro in the Cabinet, why did he have to create a new department?" the Governor added as he arrived by plane to address a Republican fundraising dinner tonight.
>
> "States can meet their own problems on urban affairs," Mr. Rockefeller contended. "The States should give leadership in this matter. I don't think a department should be set up in Washington to bypass the States."
>
> He expressed the view that such a department should be set up as part of the executive branch instead of as a Cabinet post.

This appears to be an unequivocal position on the urban affairs issue by Governor Rockefeller. But the record of his position will not be complete if it stands on the Des Moines statement.

As an addition to that record, I offer for the consideration of Senators a document dated July 2, 1957, including a covering "Memorandum for Governor Adams, Subject: Proposed Department of Urban Affairs," signed by Arthur S. Flemming as Acting Chairman, and a "Memorandum for the President, Subject: Establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs" from the President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization, and signed by Nelson A. Rockefeller, Chairman.

In the covering memorandum, Mr. Flemming states that the memorandum to the President "represents my views and Nelson Rockefeller's." The following statement is taken from conclusions in the memorandum to the President:

> It is our conclusion that a Department of Urban Affairs is already needed and that the need will rapidly become more urgent. It is our further view that the imaginative leadership taken by the administration in securing the enactment of the Housing Act of 1954 and the institution of the urban renewal program logically require that the Housing and Home Finance Agency be superseded by such an executive department.

As I have noted above, that recommendation was signed by Nelson A. Rockefeller as Chairman of the President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization. I ask unanimous consent that the complete texts of both memorandums be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield?

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the Senator from Wyoming has the floor. He will gladly yield for a comment by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Wyoming. I merely wished to inquire of the Senator from Maine whether I had not seen something in the newspapers recently to the effect that the Governor of New York appears to have changed his mind.

Mr. MUSKIE. He certainly has changed his mind since 1957. I have here another statement, to which I shall refer in just a moment, of the state of his mind last August.

Mr. CLARK. Does not the Senator from Maine agree with me that Governor Rockefeller's first conclusion was a sound one?

Mr. MUSKIE. Since he repeated it again last week, I would agree.

Mr. President, on August 28, 1961, it was my privilege to speak to the American Municipal Congress at its meeting in Seattle, Wash., and on the same day Governor Rockefeller delivered the principal address.

Commenting on the proposed Department of Urban Affairs, Governor Rockefeller had this to say:

> We hear much these days about the decline of State and local government and the concentration of power in Washington. The best way to stop this decline is for those of us who are the heads of State and local governments to have the courage to assume our full responsibilities. In New York, governments at all levels are working together in an effort to solve our own problems without constantly throwing up our hands and turning to Washington. Frankly, I think that is a pretty good objective for any State, or county, or municipality.
>
> However, this does not mean that I am opposed to the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs in the Federal Government. As a matter of better organization in Washington, it would make sense to coordinate scattered functions of the Federal Government related to urban problems. But it would be a tragedy if such a new department or agency were merely to become a handy instrument for the surrender of local responsibility, the bypassing of State government, or a substitute for courage and for making of difficult decisions back home.

Mr. President, as one who was intimately involved in the development of S. 1633, a bill to establish a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, as reported by the Committee on Government Operations, I may say that Governor Rockefeller's August 28, 1961, statement is an accurate reflection of the intent of S. 1633, and I am happy to associate myself with his comments on the importance of local and State responsibility.

But returning to the history of Governor Rockefeller's statements on the issue of a Department of Urban Affairs, I must observe that the inconsistencies in his record are obvious. They need no elaboration by me. However, the motivation behind those inconsistencies is something Governor Rockefeller may want to clarify.

EXHIBIT 1

JULY 2, 1957.

Memorandum for Governor Adams.

Subject: Proposed Department of Urban Affairs.

The attached memorandum represents my views and Nelson Rockefeller's as to a possible solution to the problems of Federal civil defense organization and organization of Federal housing activities, based on our studies to date.

Due to his recent illness, Milton Eisenhower has been unable to attend the last two or three Committee meetings and has not participated in the development of this Committee paper.

Do you believe that the idea we have outlined has sufficient potential to justify my discussing it informally with the President? If so, and if he should feel that this approach merits further consideration, our Committee feels that it should consult with heads of the agencies principally concerned (Albert Cole, Governor Hoegh, and Gordon Gray) in developing a definite proposal.

ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
Acting Chairman.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
PRESIDENT'S ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION,
Washington, D.C., July 2, 1957.

Memorandum for the President.

Subject: Establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs.

THE PROBLEM

In recent years the problems of planning, building, and conserving our cities and metropolitan areas have become increasingly acute, and demands have multiplied, in and out of Congress, for the establishment of a new executive department to take the lead in those aspects of urban affairs. At the same time, the Housing and Home Finance Agency has come to be charged with programs which go far beyond the encouragement of housing and which involve the Agency in the general physical planning and development of communities. To these trends must be added the growing belief that the reduction of urban vulnerability through community planning, zoning, shelter construction, and other measures should be given greater emphasis in our civil defense program. It has also been urged that civil defense should be focused more directly on the critical target areas, most of which are large cities, and on the use of the resources of the fire, police, public works, and other full-time personnel of local governments.

The question thus arises: Should the administration recommend the establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs to carry out the functions of the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Federal Civil Defense Administration?

FINDINGS

The Housing and Home Finance Agency was given its present status by a reorganization plan approved in 1947. Except for a modest low-rent housing program and the operation of war housing projects, the Agency was initially concerned chiefly with mortgage insurance, the promotion of savings associations, and the insurance of the deposits of savings and loan institutions. Subsequently, reorganization plans and acts of Congress (particularly the Housing Acts of

1949 and 1954) have broadened the functions of the Agency. A large-scale slum clearance activity was instituted and, during your administration, has been broadened into an imaginative, diversified urban renewal program. The responsibility for assisting local governments through advances for the planning of public works and loans for the construction of public facilities was lodged in the Housing and Home Finance Agency. Also added were such functions as making loans for college dormitories and related facilities, administering grants to assist metropolitan area and general community planning, and providing flood insurance. Although the Home Loan Bank Board has been removed from the supervision of the Agency, the Housing and Home Finance Agency's housing finance functions have grown with the greater utilization of mortgage insurance, the acquisition of secondary market responsibilities, and the initiation of a voluntary home mortgage credit program.

Consequently, the Housing and Home Finance Agency has become a serious contender for departmental status. It employs more than 10,000 persons, most of whom work in the six great bureaus of the Agency: the Federal Housing Administration, the Public Housing Administration, the Urban Renewal Administration, the Federal National Mortgage Association, the Community Facilities Administration, and the Federal Flood Indemnity Administration. The new obligational authority of the Agency for the current fiscal year exceeds $1 billion. New commitments to insure mortgages and home improvement loans are running at a rate of $5 billion per year, and the total amount of mortgage and loan insurance outstanding is now in excess of $24 billion. Nearly 400,000 units of low-rent public housing are being partially financed through annual contributions to local authorities totaling $93 million per year.

In the course of administering its existing programs, the Housing and Home Finance Agency has developed close relationships with the officials of cities, towns, and other local authorities. Its staff understands the problems of the explosive metropolitan growth now taking place in this country and is helping in the solution of those problems with the tools now available. It is, therefore, already in important respects the Federal urban affairs agency.

There is more justification for a new department than merely the present size of the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the cost of the programs which it administers. Departmental status would carry with it representation in the Cabinet, which has become increasingly important as a council for the consideration and resolution of important issues of national policy. At present agriculture, health, education, natural resources development, and other fields of Federal concern have spokesmen in the Cabinet and have the prestige of inclusion in an executive department. Such representation and status are now denied to the Agency most directly concerned with conserving and developing our cities and communities, which now include approximately two-thirds of the population of the United States.

Those civil defense functions which relate to reducing urban vulnerability to attack are closely related to the existing planning, urban renewal, mortgage insurance, and community facilities functions of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. If placed within a Department of Urban Affairs, they could be administered through the same staff and field organization, with reasonable augmentation, which would perform other community development functions of the Department. These vulnerability reduction activities, which may eventually include a shelter program, could be performed either through a delegation from a separate civil defense agency or as a direct statutory responsibility of the Department of Urban Affairs.

Civil defense activities relating to planning and organizing for postattack relief and rehabilitation could continue to be administered in a separate agency. However, experience with such an agency has not been satisfactory to date. Placing the disaster relief activities for both wartime and peacetime disasters in a major constituent of the Department of Urban Affairs would continue Cabinet representation for civil defense and would at the same time associate civil defense with important peacetime programs in an executive department. The new constituent could be called the Federal Emergency Administration.

Civil defense affects other departments and agencies such as those concerned with medical services, military operations, food supplies, maintenance of industrial production, and so on. Yet the largely urban focus of most civil defense activities may justify the exercise of Federal leadership by an urban-oriented department able to promote Federal-local cooperation because its peacetime programs require an understanding of urban government, its resources, and its methods of operation. It should be noted that only a few years ago it was the Housing and Home Finance Agency which coordinated peacetime disaster functions and directly provided much of the assistance required to restore services in affected communities.

A number of important problems will still be faced should civil defense responsibilities be lodged in the new department. The role of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization in the coordination of civil defense planning with other aspect of mobilization and nonmilitary war planning will need clarification. Fallout problems will not be limited to urban areas, but they will have to be dealt with in terms of rural home and community shelters which could logically be handled by an extension of housing functions. Evacuation and support of damaged communities will require regional measures not limited to particular metropolitan areas. The supervision and coordination by one executive department of civil defense responsibilities delegated to other departments and agencies will continue to give rise to difficulties. Adequate arrangements for the performance of early warning functions by the new department will be necessary. Finally, it must be recognized that organizational measures, however soundly conceived, cannot substitute for forceful Federal leadership in generating and executing a truly national, up-to-date civil defense plan.

In certain respects the inclusion of civil defense disaster relief functions in a Department of Urban Affairs could impede future progress in this area. First, there is the danger that such a reorganization would be interpreted as demoting this phase of civil defense to bureau status. Should such an impression be created, other Federal agencies, State and local authorities and the public might conclude that civil defense was being deemphasized and that energetic preparations to deal with enemy attack were no longer necessary. It is our feeling that the proper explanation of the role and purposes of the Department of Urban Affairs can prevent such misconceptions and that the Secretary of the new department could give enhanced status and representation to the civil defense as well as the other urban affairs activities of the Government.

ADMINISTRATION POSITION

In the last Congress a number of bills were introduced to convert the Housing and Home Finance Agency into a Department of Urbiculture or a Department of Urban Affairs, and hearings were held by the House Committee on Government Operations. This year a number of similar bills are pending. On May 27, 1957, Senator Clark of Pennsylvania and a number of cosponsors (including Senator Javits of New York and Senator Case of New Jersey), introduced S. 2159, to establish a Department of Urban Affairs. This bill is the first to include the functions of the Federal Civil Defense Administration as well as those of the Housing and Home Finance Agency in the proposed Department. Outside the Government, the demands for a Department of Urban Affairs have come from such sources as the American Municipal Association, which passed a formal resolution on this subject at its last annual congress.

The administration, in reports submitted to the Congress on the various urban affairs bills and in letters to interested persons and groups, has acknowledged that the case for a Department of Urban Affairs is a strong one meriting serious study and consideration. The specific bills have, however, been opposed on the grounds of inadequacies in approach or content. It will not be possible to maintain this stance much longer, and a decision for or against the new department on its merits will have to be taken.

CONCLUSIONS

It is our conclusion that a Department of Urban Affairs is already needed and that the need will rapidly become more urgent. It is our further view that the imaginative leadership taken by the administration in securing the enactment of the Housing Act of 1954 and the institution of the urban renewal program logically require that the Housing and Home Finance Agency be superseded by such an executive department. We also believe that the Department of Urban Affairs will have the means, the competence, the relationships and the status required to carry out a shelter program and other physical measures for reducing the vulnerability of metropolitan areas to enemy attack. It is likewise probable that civil defense disaster relief functions can be administered more successfully in the setting of a powerful executive department with active peacetime programs than in a separate agency, as is now the case, or in a new department concerned solely with civil defense and emergency relief.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that you request the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, in cooperation with this committee and in consultation with the Director of Defense Mobilization, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, and the Federal Civil Defense Administrator, to proceed with the development of a reorganization plan to create a Department of Urban Affairs to carry out the conclusions noted above. The reorganization plan should be prepared in time to permit its transmittal to the Congress early in 1958.

Nelson A. Rockefeller,
Chairman.

Mr. MILLER subsequently said: Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. McGEE. The Senator from Wyoming will be glad to yield for a question.

Mr. MILLER. I have been trying to get the Senator's attention ever since the colloquy between him and the Senator from Maine took place. I wonder if I could ask a question and make a comment, which comments could be inserted following the colloquy between the Senator from Maine and the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. McGEE. If I yielded 2 minutes to the Senator, would that be sufficient?

Mr. MILLER. I would very much appreciate that courtesy.

Mr. McGEE. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. MILLER. I ask unanimous consent that the comments appear in the Record following the colloquy between the Senator from Maine and the Senator from Wyoming, relating to the Rockefeller speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MILLER. I think it is unfortunate that the Governor of New York could not be here to defend himself in this situation. It so happened that I was in Des Moines and heard the speech. I recall the Governor of New York stated very precisely he was opposed to the reorganization plan and the proposed Department of Urban Affairs in its present form as submitted under the reorganization plan.

I hope the Senator from Maine will at the appropriate time see fit to insert in the RECORD a comparison between what the Governor of New York previously approved of, as proposed by the Eisenhower administration, and the reorganization proposal that has come from the White House now under the reorganization plan. I would hazard a guess that there would be a substantial difference between the two, and that one could well be for the first and be against the second.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article which appears in today's Washington Evening Star, entitled "Real or Fancied Need for Urban Department?" by John C. Williamson, director of the departmental relations, National Association of Real Estate Boards.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REAL OR FANCIED NEED FOR URBAN DEPARTMENT?

The Star's editorial of January 31 on the proposed Cabinet-rank Department of Urban Affairs and Housing misses the point. The issue is not to pull together under one executive head a multiplicity of functions now exercised by a variety of agencies. The agencies covered by the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962 are already under one executive head, namely, the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

The issue is much broader—whether it is in the public interest to create an executive department which will have the responsibility of coping with the problems of urban dwellers which the President states "are as complex as they are manifold."

The few functions of the Housing and Home Finance Agency directly and immediately affected by the reorganization plan don't begin to cover the complex and manifold problems of the urban dwellers. However, when we examine these problems we discover that they run the gamut of American life. Here are a few of these urban problems cited by proponents of a Cabinet-rank Department of Urban Affairs before the 1960 Democratic Convention platform committee and in testimony before Senate and House committees: Juvenile delinquency, water and air pollution, slum clearance, housing, mass transit, airports, public roads, relocation of industry, education, immigration, public health, unemployment, marketing of agricultural products, consumer protection, strikes, water, sewage and snow removal.

The issue then is whether it is practical to create a Department of Urban Affairs to devote its efforts to coping with the complex and manifold problem of the urban dweller.

The reorganization plan purports also to bring the housing functions of the Federal Government into the Cabinet department. Here, too, the plan falls woefully short of its objective. The veterans' home loan program and the Federal Home Loan Bank System together contribute to 63 percent of the Nation's residential mortgage financing. Yet, they are left out of the grand design to give the problems of urban dwellers an adequate voice in the highest councils of Government.

It has been suggested that because the Department of Agriculture looks out for the farmer, ergo, a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing would look out for the urban dweller. This analogy does not stand up even under cursory examination. The Department of Agriculture concerns itself with a major aspect of the economy, the production and marketing of food and fiber. Certainly the marketing of agricultural products is an urban interest when one reflects the havoc wrought when a teamster strike (Department of Labor) causes the hijacking (Department of Justice) of milk (Department of Agriculture) trucks using the Interstate Highway System (Department of Commerce) to bring nourishment (Department of Health, Education, and Welfare) to the schoolchildren of New York City (Department of Urban Affairs).

The most recent evidence at hand that the Department of Agriculture concerns itself with urban interests is the recent address of the Secretary of Agriculture in which he stated: "The Department of Agriculture plays an exceedingly important role in the daily life of every American—not just those who live on the farm. Yet, the impression which many urban families have is that the Department of Agriculture is concerned only with farming, and therefore, rarely touches their day-to-day activities."

Congress should therefore first direct its attention to the feasibility of bringing together the problems of the urban dweller into one executive department. Unfortunately, too much political emotion is being generated over a proposed Department of Urban Affairs (which includes only a fraction of urban affairs) and Housing (which includes only a fraction of housing).

Thus the proposal has become a symbol—a political symbol—and the public's emotion is being directed toward the symbol oblivious to its faulty identification with the problems of the urban dweller. In the final analysis these urban problems are the problems of all Americans and their voice in the highest councils of government is the President of the United States.

JOHN C. WILLIAMSON,
Director, Department of Governmental Relations, National Association of Real Estate Boards.

Mr. MILLER. I would guess that, if the Governor of New York were here and could speak for himself, he would continue to ask the question which has not been answered either by the White House or by any Member on the other side of the aisle in the Senate, which he asked pointedly the other night: That if indeed the President is so concerned about having Bob Weaver a member of the Cabinet, why has he not appointed him to the Cabinet in the first place?

Mr. McGEE. I wish to commend the Senator from Maine for his efforts to set the record straight. I think it is well we bear in mind that one of the distinguished "professors" at the Republican school of political knowledge, conducted last weekend and also this weekend in Washington, was forthright enough to say that one of the difficulties of the Republican Party is that it has been maneuvered into the position of being against, all the time. So perhaps he will agree with me that because this proposal now has come as a proposal from the President of the United States, it behooves some, in their attempts to be the opposition, to be against, even though in their freer moments they believed it to be a good idea and a sound approach to good government in the field of urban affairs.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. McGEE. I am in the midst of a colloquy with the Senator from Maine, at the moment; and then I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. MUSKIE. I thank the Senator for his remarks. I think his observation is appropriate and is supported by the record at this point.

Mr. McGEE. Yes.

Now I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have heard enough of the remarks of the Senator to understand their purport. It so happens that I am a sponsor of the Urban Department bill, and I shall stand by that position. But I say in good spirit to the Senator that I question very much the taste or the validity of naming the person whom the President may desire to put at the head of the new Department, and reading into it the implication that anyone who in good conscience is opposed to the reorganization plan or to that bill is therefore opposed to having a Negro appointed to the Cabinet.

To the extent that Governor Rockefeller made that point very strongly, I agree with him. As I have said, it is well known that I am one of the sponsors of this bill; and I intend to continue to support the proposal, whether it is in the form of a reorganization plan or in the form of a bill. But in all fairness to others who may not feel as I do about the bill, I do not think any Member should be dragooned into voting for a proposal in which he does not believe, simply because he is concerned about a possible implication that he is opposed to having a Negro serve in the Cabinet.

Personally, I would welcome the appointment of a Negro to the Cabinet; but I must agree with Governor Rockefeller that this method is not the single and only one which can be used to achieve that result, and that therefore such an argument should not be used to intimidate one not in favor this bill—although I repeat that I am in favor of it; I have been before, and I am now.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield again to me?

Mr. McGEE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MUSKIE. I believe I should make two points in regard to the comment made by the Senator from New York: First of all, the bill to create the proposed new Department was before the Senate all last year, and its merits were considered by the Committee on Government Operations and by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. During all that year, no mention was made by any of the proponents of the bill of the proposition that a Negro might be appointed to head the new Department. There was a desire on the part of the proponents to bring the bill to the floor of the Senate in August of last year. One of the reasons why that was not done was that in our judgment there were not then available sufficient votes to pass the bill. One of the reasons why there were not then available sufficient votes to pass the bill was that the opponents of the bill made no secret of their argument against the bill, to those who might otherwise have supported it, namely, that the President intended to appoint a Negro as the first Secretary of the new Department. So the race issue—if one is involved in the debate—was raised, not by the proponents, this year, but by the opponents, last year.

The second point I should like to make is that President Eisenhower was the first to use a reorganization plan in order to create a new Department. As Senators are well aware, in the creation of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, no secret was made at that time—indeed, it was disclosed by the President or by his spokesmen—that if the proposed Department were created, the first Secretary would be Mrs. Hobby. No objection was raised then to the disclosure, in advance of the implementation of the reorganization plan, of the name of the first Secretary. If it was then appropriate, I suggest that it is now appropriate. Since the opponents have made use of it, in an attempt to weaken the support of the bill, if it is fair game for the opposition to use this issue against the bill, then I suggest it is fair game for the President to disclose that there has been such speculation as to whom he will name, and to take advantage of it—if that was his intent—in support of the bill.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield again to me?

Mr. McGEE. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I should like to say that I think the Senator has referred to a very different situation. Perhaps there are some persons who are opposed to the proposed new Department for the reason the Senator has stated; but I do not think they can properly be lumped with the persons who have no such views, but who happen to be opposed to the creation of such a new Department for other reasons. Therefore, I think the idea of lumping together, in one mass, so to speak, all the opponents is very unfair, because certainly the negative of discrimination is very different from the positive of good-faith opposition to a bill.

In the second place, I wish to say that I do not quarrel in any way with the President about stating the name of the one he intends to appoint. That is his business. I only wish to make clear, so far as I can, because I am well known to favor civil rights legislation, and also to favor the enactment of this bill—that, I repeat, if my voice can be of help, I wish to help in the effort to prevent people from being tagged with the label of being opposed to having a Negro appointed to the President's Cabinet, when the record of such persons is directly to the contrary, even though in good conscience they may be opposed to this reorganization plan.

So my only purpose is the affirmative one of wishing to have this matter placed in proper focus. Citizens may judge whether a Member of the Senate had that point in mind before, or not. But I simply wish to be sure that it is not assumed that all those who oppose the creation of the proposed new Department should be considered as being in one big, amorphous mass of persons opposed to the appointment of a Negro to the President's Cabinet.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Wyoming will yield further to me, let me say that I said that issue was used last year by the opponents—although I did not say it was used by all the opponents—in an attempt to hurt the chances of enactment of the bill. I also said that the proposed reorganization plan should stand on its own merits, without regard to any race issue.

Those are the two things I wished to stress.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, on the front page of yesterday's edition of the New York Times—one of the greatest newspapers in the Nation, in my opinion—the following appeared:

> Governor Rockefeller attacked the Kennedy plan Thursday in a speech in Des Moines that was carried by closed-circuit television to a series of Republican fund-raising dinners across the Nation.

The article describes his attack, not as one confined to the particular appointee proposed to be given the job, but to the idea itself; and that was really the point which was being approached by the Senator from Maine, if I understood him correctly—namely, that it was not an attempt to becloud the issue by referring to a personality, but that Governor Rockefeller was quoted by the New York Times—an outstanding newspaper published in his own State—as suggesting that the form used by the President "might well be used 'as a subterfuge to bypass the constitutional sovereignty of the States and to gain direct political control over the Nation's big cities.' He did not state what form he thought the Department should take."

I think the Senator's point is that such judgment seems to depend upon which administration is in office, regardless of how good the proposal may be.

Certainly we should not lose sight of the merits of the proposal.

Mr. JAVITS. I am grateful to my colleague who has the floor for allowing us to separate the wheat from the chaff. I think one's attitude toward a person must stand on his own record. As I have said, I am in a unique position to speak on this matter because of my views on both subjects. I am grateful to the Senators who have helped unscramble the issues one from the other.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGEE. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I want to say, with respect to the urban renewal proposal, that, as a member of the Banking and Currency Committee which has been handling these matters for many years, we do have an Urban Renewal Department now, and Mr. Weaver is the head of it. I voted for his nomination in committee and have cooperated with him ever since he has held that position. I was the author of the Housing Act in 1954 when we changed the name from slum clearance to urban renewal. I am not opposed to an Urban Renewal Department because we have one now. What I am opposed to is setting it up with a Cabinet status and having a Secretary, because by so doing we will add more expense and more expense, and another big building with thousands of employees, which is not necessary, particularly in view of the big demands on our tax money and the huge national debt.

I am opposed to the idea, because I do not think it is necessary at this time. I think we are covering the field quite well. The Banking and Currency Committee has covered the field of housing legislation and of urban renewal legislation and of other legislation, and has covered the field quite well and sufficiently to this time.

I think we are merely being asked to add another Department and another Secretary, which will require lots of money and many more employees. I fear that once we get into the housing and slum clearance aspects, there will be other steps to be taken, and the first thing we know the cities will be dealing directly with Washington, D.C., rather than their own State governments and their own local governments.

I do not think we need what is proposed. I think the field is being thoroughly covered at the moment. I think we can do everything under existing legislation, with the present group, which, by the way, Mr. Weaver heads. I voted for the confirmation of his nomination. I have been cooperating with and working with him.

AID FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1241) to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities and to authorize scholarships for undergraduate study in such institutions.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGEE. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have conferred with the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois. I now move again that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the Hill-Morse amendment was recently adopted.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield for the purpose of my presenting a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. McGEE. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I withdraw my request.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. McGEE. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wanted to make a comment before the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] left the floor. A few moments ago he stated his views on the junior college problem. No one in the Senate has been a greater supporter and promoter of the junior colleges than has the Senator from New Jersey. I have always found it a privilege to stand shoulder to shoulder with him in the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, particularly in the subcommittee; but in view of the comments he made, I wanted the record to show the very deep regret I have that we are going to lose the Senator from New Jersey from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The Senator from New Jersey has been one of the most effective friends for strengthening the educational program of this country that we have had on the committee. The bill now pending before the Senate would not be in the strong form in which I consider it to be had it not been for the many wonderful contributions the Senator from New Jersey made to the discussions on the bill and the great assistance he was to me and to the chairman of the full committee, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], as we took up one section after another.

All I can say is, I congratulate the Senator on his new appointment. I know of his desire to serve on the committee to which he has been assigned. But I am sure I speak for all members of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare when I say it is our loss. I want him to know, however, I shall continue to call on him from time to time to come to my assistance as we in the future bring to the floor of the Senate other pieces of education legislation. But on this particular bill I express to him my sincere thanks for the assistance he was to me.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly?

Mr. McGEE. I yield.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I can only say "Thank you" to the Senator from Oregon. I appreciate deeply his kind and generous statement. I, too, was very reluctant to leave the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and one of the chief reasons is that I have found it possible, under the chairmanship of the subcommittee chairman, the Senator from Oregon, to be a little bit effective in this area, because of the way he has handled that subcommittee, and not only his relationships with all its members in committee, but, I may say, his ability to draw out what is best in a man. I regret leaving the committee. In a sense, I wanted to do that in which I was most useful. One must make a choice, and it was with great reluctance that I chose to leave the Labor and Public Welfare Committee. However, I will in no way have a lesser interest in the subjects which come under the jurisdiction of that committee, and particularly in the field of education. I most certainly hope that the chairman will feel free to call upon me when I can in any way be useful.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGEE. Does the Senator wish to speak on the point the Senator from Oregon was raising?

Mr. CAPEHART. I wanted to make a short statement.

Mr. McGEE. The Senator from Wyoming will be glad to yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am sorry there was a voice vote on the Morse amendment, because I would like to have been recorded in favor of it. I wish to say, with respect to college facilities, that, as chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency for many years, many, many years ago we in that committee made assistance available to college facilities under what was called the College Housing Act. I think it has served the colleges well and the people well, and for that reason I would have liked to support by a "yea" vote the amendment of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, if I may, I wish to change the subject now and speak on the subject for which I originally rose, about which as yet I have not had an opportunity to speak, because of yielding to my colleagues in this body on other subjects.

The subject to which I wish to address myself for a few moments is that of college education, or, indeed, all education, in this country at the present time.

It sometimes strikes me as a peculiar contradiction of principles or as working at cross-purposes that people who say again and again they believe in the power of knowledge and in the principle of education find it such a tortuous and delaying process to do anything about it. That is precisely the plight in which we find ourselves today when we talk about college education.

We found ourselves in this position last year, when we were talking about the proposed new program for elementary and secondary schools.

I think a part of the problem may stem from the fact that we have said so often that we believe in education many of us have come to take it for granted without stopping long enough to think what it really means. Education has come a long way in this country since the old cliché that it was simply a process of the wise man and the boy on opposite ends of the log exchanging experiences and ideas. For that reason I think, the time has come when not only Senators, but also all the other people of our country, must reassess and reevaluate, in a process of priority, the real power of knowledge, to determine whether we believe in the directions in which more and more enlightened education can take this country.

Despite whatever else may be said, the events of our own times have illustrated again that the pursuit of knowledge is no longer a national monopoly, nor can it be confined by legislative fiat through the enactments of some national legislative body, no matter what country is involved. Knowledge is universal. The pursuit of truth knows no man-imposed bound.

With that in mind we have a choice in our land, it seems to me. We may begin to act upon the premises in which we say we believe, the power of education included, or we may abandon this concept and retreat from the educational front. I say "retreat" because those who seek to rationalize the little that we do from year to year, on a spasmodic basis, in the realm of education do so with the seeming purpose of not allowing too much education or of being fearful of too much knowledge. In my judgment, there cannot be too much of either education or knowledge, unless we confess to a fear of truth and the logic that the pursuit of knowledge implies.

When we imposed a set of principles which we described as compulsory free education up to 14 or 15 or 16 years of age, we were subscribing to a principle of faith in knowledge which we now seem reluctant to carry forward, at times, to a logical outcome. I say that because the more we consider public education the more we find ourselves up against the real or imaginary stone wall of what lies beyond the high school diploma. We have found it necessary to disguise our educational endeavors under some names other than "education." This in itself, it seems to me, stands to the discredit of the great free people who profess that free education is the hallmark of freedom in politics and government and democracy, which our system connotes.

So, to help the colleges advance higher learning in this country we have, up until now, found it difficult if not impossible to advance a College Education Act. We disguised it as a Defense Education Act. So long as it was for defense, so long as it could assume a negative connotation, so long as it was under the garb of a handmaiden, somehow it was honorable to pursue it.

I ask my colleagues in this body, and all Americans, what has happened to free education as a dedicated article of faith among our people, that we cannot make it the epitome of that which we seek in the cause of the national interest? It is that, it seems to me, which ought to be the prime measure of our legislative endeavors in this body at the present time, for what has happened to the world in the time of all the Members assembled here has been a stepping up of the pace of revelations of great learning and the consequences of universal learning, thereby imposing great truths upon what was once an unfathomable globe made up of billions of people remotely separated from one another. In consequence, we find ourselves today sitting literally in each other's laps, trying to find space on the same globe in which we can carve out our way of life in our own fashion and still survive, short of extermination.

This is what places in focus the kind of stress and priority that, in my judgment, college education or higher education in America requires in our calculations at the present time.

The welfare of our country and the well-being of our individual citizens are two factors which are inextricably bound together. The tragedy is that on a higher educational level somehow—perhaps through indifference or perhaps through apathy—we have accepted the principle of free mandatory education, mostly through the high school, but now are fighting the old windmills all over again about how much further than that we ought to go in the realm of pursuing knowledge. That is the nub of the bill. That is the essence of the proposed legislation. We seek to enhance the opportunities for a fuller assault upon higher learning among greater masses of our young Americans as they come through the school processes of our land.

What has happened in American colleges and universities is an explosion, a mushrooming of new faces of people with new aspirations and new personalities, who seek the opportunities only a few before them had opened up to them.

One of the contradictions of our system is that a great many of these bright young minds find the doors of colleges closed to them for want of dollars. They are barred merely because they do not have the financial capability of opening up this new vista of learning into the secrets, the mysteries, and the wonders of more and still more knowledge.

According to Secretary Ribicoff of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Nation's colleges and universities must spend between now and 1966—the next 4 years—almost $18½ billion in physical undertakings.

To state the point in another way, if we are only to put a roof over the heads of the generations now knocking at the doors of our institutions of higher learning, if we are merely to keep them dry, if we are only to protect the physical circumstances under which they convene in their seminars, we shall have to build more structures on the campuses of the land than we have built altogether in the last 200 years. That is the magnitude, indeed, of the task that faces us.

Need I remind Senators that however powerful this body may be, however select this club may be regarded, that even an act of the Senate of the United States cannot bring new buildings into being overnight. New structures do not just happen. They are planned for and they are financed. Student scholarships do not arise only because they are right and just. The opportunity for scholastic aids must be legislated and that takes time. In the case of buildings and scholarships it would probably be two years before any action taken by this body today would be translated into new facilities on the campuses and new scholarships in our universities for deserving students. For that reason our discussions this week on the college education bill assume a greater sense of urgency than might ordinarily be attached to words that are spoken on the floor of this body.

A distinguished American educator, Dean Charles C. Cole, Jr., of Lafayette College in Pennsylvania, has made a most significant and comprehensive study of the available high school graduates who fail to go on to colleges and universities.

Appearing as a witness in the 1961 hearings before a special Subcommittee on Education in the House, Dean Cole said that in his own survey of the Nation's public secondary school seniors, he found among them some 60 to 100 thousand of superior ability who would not enter college for one reason—the lack of financial resources.

He found also that another group, numbering 60 to 100 thousand—about the same size—would not go on to college because they were not motivated. They did not care a great deal about going on to college. But as Dean Cole went on to say—and it is worth repeating here—

> As college applicants increase in number in the years to come, and as the costs of education rise, it will become more difficult for those who lack the financial means to secure that college education.

What Dean Cole is saying is that as tuition and cost of living for students who go away from home to school rise, the effect will be a decrease in the proportion of students that go on to college rather than an increase in those proportions. The failure of some of the best of our high school students to go on to college for financial reasons is a complete defaulting nationally upon one of the richest, almost immeasurable resources available to our Nation and to our people.

What that statement means in terms of higher income, what it means in terms of new resources taxwise for financing the necessities of a very complex society, what it means in terms of a more sophisticated public judgment of the difficult questions of the day would defy any simple measurement in absolute dollars and cents.

Yet, if, rather than merely giving lip service to education, if we believe in it, then we have only one direction to go, and that is toward supplying all the education that our resources, our ingenuity, and our vision enable us to command.

I direct the attention of Senators to tuition rates for a moment. Recently one of my sons returned to the second semester of his university. The increase in tuition rates struck a forceful blow to his "old man" in terms of the theoretical budgeting that had been projected for the spring semester on the college level. The average tuition rates have been increasing all across the land in both private and public institutions at a faster rate, not only than the cost of living, but also of personal income at the same time.

Within that identical context the scholarship allowances and the numbers of scholarships available to students who desperately need them and who are scholastically qualified to accept them have decreased in proportion to the other increases I have stated.

For example, the average institutional scholarship, during the last 4 years increased by $63, but during the same period the average increase in tuition was not $63 but $242—nearly four times as great.

Similarly, student living costs have gone up. Estimates place the average annual expense of the student living away from home at $1,500 in public institutions and about $1,000 more in private institutions.

The average scholarship, on the other hand, in public institutions is worth only $220 a year to the student, an amount equal to less than 15 percent of the estimated average expense.

But while Dean Cole has alluded to the increasing numbers of qualified scholastically inclined students who year after year cannot go on to college because they cannot afford it, he also has alluded to a second group of approximately the same size—who lack the interest, the incentive, and the motivation to go on to college.

It is easy for us to say, "Well, if a young person does not want to go to college, that is his business."

I ask the Senate very seriously today whether that question can any longer be accepted as a valid generalization. It once was the case, because we used to deal in relative terms. We were satisfied by commanding that students were required to attend school until the ages of 14, 15, or 16, or whatever age the State law decreed. But in a world that has grown progressively smaller, in a world in which the quest for knowledge has become intensively greater, the old standards of education, the old levels of educational attainment no longer assume a validity that merits our national acceptance without serious challenge. What it means is that we must raise our sights to a level at which we shall command the young minds of this country to higher and ever higher levels of learning, if we are to hold our own and surpass the bounds of competitive knowledge pursuits in other parts of the world.

It is not enough to suggest to ourselves that if we do just a little bit, it may be enough. This matter has become so critical, we dare not leave it again to the element of chance. We have discovered in the last 4 or 5 years that leaving the pursuit of knowledge to chance may mean the losing of the pace of learning that is next to impossible to recapture or recover.

The only pace to which we dare subscribe, and the only rate of learning in the pursuit of knowledge to which we dare become dedicated, is the ultimate, the maximum, the most compared with anyone, compared with all. This can be the only definition of the proper rate of change in the realm of the search for new ideas.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce in its testimony before one of our educational committees said—and I take issue with it:

> The fact is that we have always had and should continue to have large numbers of men and women of above average mentality in vocations which do not require a college degree; and conversely that there are many approaches to manpower development for vocations in the trades and in the business world other than the college campus.

This sounds like the days of William McKinley. This sounds, at the very most, like the 1920's, before the new breakthroughs in science and understanding of the human race which has occurred in our time. Who is kidding whom?

We dare not retreat to the lowest standards, to the bare minimums, envisioned in this shocking testimony from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. The fact remains that as man reaches a higher and ever higher plane on the level at which he has a right to expect to live, it imposes upon education greater and greater responsibilities for teaching him how to live at that level.

This precisely is another one of the key points at stake in this critical question. For all too long, in our concepts, once we have gotten a young man out of high school, our tendency and our inclination have been to say, "Let's get him into college, and let him specialize in some particular trade." No one ever paused long enough to say to him, "But first get an education."

So we always want to know in what field will he major. We want to know what he is going to do when he graduates. I used to be an adviser to freshmen when they entered the university. We always would say, "What is your major? What are you going to do when you get out of college?" We, in other words, panic them before they have any right to know. So they decide they will become lawyers, professors, doctors, or engineers. For decades we have been turning out generation after generation of little more than trained specialists.

This will no longer do. I say that because again the time has come when we must have a great mass, an unlimited mass, of people with a liberal education, with a philosophy for living with and understanding where they as individuals hope to go and what they hope to achieve, before the material factors of job hunting, salaries, incomes, and dollars get in their way.

It is this role, it is this task, it is this responsibility that we are increasingly imposing upon the institutions of higher learning in our land, and expecting them somehow, through miraculous gestures of their own, to meet, without any financial assistance or, in fact, without assuring them of any way of arriving at a position where they have a chance of meeting this challenge.

The great emphasis in business in this country, the great pressure in industry in the land, is automation.

Automation, new skills, and the inventive genius of our people have shortened the time in which a man has to work, in the physical sense. However, it has lengthened the time that he has for his leisure. This idea is one of the goals of our life. It is of this that all men have dreamed when they have envisioned the better way, the life of tomorrow.

But what does it avail him if he does not know what to do with his leisure time, if he does not know what to do with himself? What does it avail him, once we have scored these great breakthroughs that enable us to live with lesser energy devoted toward achieving and sustaining the kind of economical well-being for which we hope?

Thus the question is compounded. It is not only a matter of building buildings, but it is also a matter of equipping people, and a matter of educating man for living with himself, and, in living with himself, understand the complexities of living with others.

These questions seem to me to be the real core of what we face in the bill now pending before the Senate. These questions require a straightforward and courageous answer, not only by the Senate and the House, but also by all the people of our country.

Barbara Ward, the distinguished British economist and writer, said in a short article a few days ago that imagination is not limited by resources; on the contrary, resources are limited by scarce imagination.

To put it another way, what Barbara Ward is saying is that the times in which we are living are going to tax the greatest genius in the realm of ideas that we can command. We do not invent genius on Wall Street. We do not invent genius in jobs on Main Street. We invent genius in the heart and soul and belief and faith of man in men.

This, then, is the only goal. This, then, is the keystone to the arch of American faith in education. Unless and until we can raise our national sights to encompass the new level of higher learning for all people in our land, we will fall short, sadly short, of the kind of goal we have a right to expect in what we have come to call glibly, and sometimes unthinkingly, our free society.

It was President Kennedy who reminded us in February of last year, a year ago:

> Our progress as a Nation can be no swifter than our progress on education. Our requirements for world leadership, our hopes for economic growth, and the demands of citizenship itself in an era such as this all require the maximum development of every young American's capacity.
>
> The human mind is our fundamental resource. A balanced Federal program must go well beyond incentives for investment in plant and equipment.

If I may paraphrase the President, it is time indeed that this country, with no holds barred, with no reservation, with no hesitation, with no uncertainty, commit itself to an investment in the human resources of its youth that learning and knowledge inspire. It is this that really represents the essence of what we feel rides on the enactment of this college education bill this year.

These are among the reasons that will move me to support it with my vote and with the greatest personal enthusiasm.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, in his opening statement on S. 1241, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Education, the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] made a plea that no crippling amendments be offered to the bill. However, since he said he was in favor of strengthening amendments, I feel certain he would be in favor of the amendment I shall now offer.

Mr. President, I call up my amendment designated "2–2–62–E." I ask that in lieu of having the amendment read, it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 37, between lines 5 and 6, insert a new title IV, as follows, and redesignate the following title and sections of the bill accordingly:

"TITLE IV—SCHOOL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1962

"SEC. 401. This title may be cited as the 'School Assistance Act of 1962'.

"Declaration of purpose

"SEC. 402. It is the purpose of this title to authorize a two-year program of Federal grants to States to assist their local education agencies to construct urgently needed public elementary and secondary school facilities. It is the intent of Congress that with this assistance the quality of public elementary and secondary education will be substantially improved in all States and that inequalities of educational opportunities within and between States will be substantially reduced.

"Assurance against Federal interference in schools

"SEC. 403. In the administration of this title, no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the policy determination, personnel, curriculum, program of instruction, or the administration or operation of any school or school system.

"Authorization of appropriations

"SEC. 404. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, without any limitation of such appropriation or condition inconsistent with or contrary to the terms or purposes of this title, for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1962, and for the succeeding fiscal year, $325,000,000, for the purpose of making payments to State education agencies as provided in this title.

"Allotment to States

"SEC. 405. (a) The sums appropriated pursuant to section 404 shall be allotted among the States on the basis of the income per child of school age, the number of children of school age, and the effort for public school purposes of the respective States. A State allotment under this section for any fiscal year shall be available for obligation by the State, in accordance with the provisions of this title, during such year and the next fiscal year (and for those two years only). Except as provided by section 406, such allotments shall be made as follows: The Commissioner shall allot to each State for each fiscal year an amount which bears the same ratio to the sums appropriated pursuant to section 404 for such year as the product of—

"(1) the number of children of school age in the State in the preceding fiscal year, and

"(2) the State's allotment ratio (as determined under subsection (b)),

bears to the sum of corresponding products for all the States.

"(b) For purposes of this title—

"(1) The 'allotment ratio' for any State shall be 1.00 less the product of (A) .50 and (B) the quotient obtained by dividing the income per child of school age for the State by the income per child of school age for all the States (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the District of Columbia, and the Virgin Islands), except that (i) the allotment ratio shall in no case be less than .25 or more than .75 and (ii) the allotment ratio for Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands shall be .75, (iii) the allotment ratio for the District of Columbia shall be .50, and (iv) the allotment ratio of any State shall be .50 for any fiscal year if the Commissioner finds that the cost of education in such State exceeds the median of such costs in all the States by a factor of 2 or more as determined by him on the basis of an index of the average per pupil cost of constructing minimum school facilities in the States as determined for such fiscal year under section 15(6) of the Act of September 23, 1950, as amended (20 U.S.C. 645), or, in the Commissioner's discretion, on the basis of such index and such other statistics and data as the Commissioner shall deem adequate and appropriate.

"(2) The allotment ratios shall be promulgated by the Commissioners for each fiscal year, between July 1 and August 31 of such fiscal year, except that for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1962, such allotment ratios shall be promulgated as soon as possible after the enactment of this title. Allotment ratios for each fiscal year shall be computed on the basis of the average of the incomes per child of school age for the States and for all the States (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the District of Columbia, and the Virgin Islands) for the three most recent consecutive fiscal years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce. Such promulgation shall be conclusive for the purposes of this title, except that the Commissioner may estimate and subsequently revise such allotment ratios, and, as so revised and promulgated, such promulgation shall be equally conclusive.

"(3) The term 'income per child of school age' for any fiscal year for a State or for all the States means the total personal income for the State or for all the States in the calendar year ending in such fiscal year (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the District of Columbia, and the Virgin Islands), respectively, divided by the number of children of school age in the State or in all such States, respectively, in such fiscal year.

"(4) The term 'child of school age' means a member of the population between the ages of five and seventeen, both inclusive.

"Maintenance and improvement of State and local support for public school financing

"SEC. 406. (a) The sum otherwise allocable to any State under section 405 for any fiscal year after the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1962, shall be reduced if such State's effort for such fiscal year is not at least equal to such State's base effort for such year. The amount of such reduction shall be the difference between the State's public school expenditures in such year and the public school expenditures it would have made in such year had it exerted the State's base effort for such year.

"(b) The sum otherwise allocable to any State under section 405 for any fiscal year after the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1962, shall also be reduced if such State's effort for such year is not at least equal to the State's base effort for such year plus the average annual rate of increase in the national effort over the five-fiscal-year period beginning July 1, 1957, and ending June 30, 1962. The amount of the reduction under this subsection (which shall be in addition to the reduction, if any, under subsection (a)) shall bear the same relation to the sum otherwise allocable to the State under section 405, (1) as the difference between the State's effort and the national effort for such year bears to the national effort for such year, or (2), if it would result in a smaller reduction, as the difference between the State's expenditure per public school pupil and 110 per centum of the national expenditure per public school pupil for such year, bears to 110 per centum of the national expenditure per public school pupil for such year. This subsection shall not apply to any State for any year for which the State's effort equaled or exceeded the national effort for such year or the State's expenditure per public school pupil equaled or exceeded 110 per centum of the national expenditure per public school pupil for such year.

"(c) The total reductions which may be made under subsections (a) and (b) from the sum otherwise allocable to a State for any fiscal year shall not exceed one-third of such sum.

"(d) The sum of the reductions under this section for each fiscal year shall be reallotted by proportionately increasing the allotments under section 405 for such year of those remaining States (other than the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands) whose allotments for such year have not been reduced under this section.

"(e) For purposes of this section—

"(1)(A) A 'State's effort' for any State for a fiscal year is the quotient obtained by dividing (i) the State's expenditure per public school pupil by (ii) the income per such pupil for the State; except that the State's effort shall be deemed to be equal to the State's base effort and to the national effort in the case of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the District of Columbia.

"(B) A State's 'base effort' for a fiscal year means the average State effort over the three immediately preceding fiscal years.

"(C) The 'income per public school pupil' for a State or for all the States for any fiscal year means the total personal income for the State or for all the States in the calendar year ending in such fiscal year (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands), respectively, divided by the number of public school pupils in the State or in all such States, respectively, in such fiscal year.

"(2)(A) The 'national effort' for any fiscal year is the quotient obtained by dividing (i) the expenditure per public school pupil for all the States (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia) by (ii) the income per such pupil for all such States.

"(B) The average annual rate of increase in the national effort over the five fiscal year period beginning July 1, 1957, and ending June 30, 1962, shall be determined by dividing the difference between the national effort for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1957, and for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1961, by four.

"(3)(A) The 'public school expenditures' of any State in any fiscal year means the total expenditures by the State and subdivisions thereof in such year for public elementary and secondary education made from funds derived from State and local sources in the State (including payments in the nature of payments in lieu of taxes from any sources).

"(B) The 'expenditure per public school pupil' for any State for any fiscal year means the quotient obtained by dividing the State's public school expenditures in such year by the number of its public school pupils for such year.

"(C) The 'national expenditure per public school pupil' for any fiscal year means the quotient obtained by dividing (i) the public school expenditures of all the States in such year (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia) by (ii) the number of public school pupils in all such States for such year.

"(4) The Commissioner's determinations of the State effort, base effort, income, public school expenditures, and expenditure per public school pupil, for any State, and his determinations of the national effort, averaging rate of increase, and expenditure per public school pupil, shall be conclusive for purposes of this title, except that the Commissioner may estimate and subsequently revise any such determination, and as so revised, such determination shall be equally conclusive.

"Payment of allotments to States

"SEC. 407. Payments to States which have submitted and had approved their applications under this title of Federal funds allotted to them pursuant to section 405 (as adjusted by the application of the provisions of section 406 and as adjusted on account of overpayments or underpayments previously made) shall be made by the Commissioner on the basis of such estimates, in such installments, and at such times, as may be reasonably required for expenditure by the States of the funds so allotted.

"State agency administrative costs

"SEC. 408. From the sums allotted to it under section 405, as adjusted by section 406, for each fiscal year, a State education agency may use such amount as it deems necessary for any supervision, services, and other costs of administering its activities under this title in that year, except that such amount shall not be more than whichever is the lesser of (1) ten cents multiplied by the number of public school pupils in the State during the prior fiscal year, and (2) $150,000, except that if, for any State, such lesser amount is less than $25,000, such amount shall be increased to $25,000.

"State applications

"SEC. 409. (a) A State which desires to receive its allotments under this title shall submit through its State education agency an application to the Commissioner which—

"(1) provides assurance that the State education agency shall be the sole agency for administering the funds received under this title;

"(2) provides that such allotment, except for sums used in accordance with section 408, shall be used exclusively for the construction of public elementary and secondary school facilities;

"(3) sets forth criteria and procedures to insure that in allocating funds received under this title (exclusive of amounts to be used under section 408) to local education agencies priority will be given to local education agencies which, in the judgment of the State education agency, have the greatest need for additional school facilities and which are least able to finance the cost of needed school facilities;

"(4) provides assurance that every local education agency whose application for funds under this title is denied will be given an opportunity for a hearing before the State education agency;

"(5) sets forth procedures for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, funds paid to the State and by the State to the local education agencies under this title, which procedures shall include provision for repayment to the United States of any sums received by the State from its allotment for any fiscal year under this title which are not obligated by it in accordance with the provisions of this title by the end of the fiscal year following that for which such allotment was made, or which are not expended in accordance therewith by the end of the second fiscal year following that in which they were obligated (unless such sums have been deducted from subsequent payments pursuant to section 407);

"(6) provides assurance that the requirements of section 504 will be complied with on all construction projects in the State assisted under this title; and

"(7) provides for making such reports in such form and containing such information as the Commissioner may from time to time reasonably require and for access by the Commissioner, upon request, to the records upon which such information is based.

"(b) With respect to any public school operated by a public agency or institution other than a State or local education agency, and in the case of any State in which a State education agency has exclusive responsibility for financing the construction of school facilities within the entire State, within a given geographical area within the State, or with respect to particular categories of public schools, the Commissioner may modify or make inapplicable any of the provisions of subsection (a), to the extent he deems such action appropriate in the light of the special governmental or school organization of such State.

"Review of State applications

"SEC. 410. (a) (1) The Commissioner shall approve an application of a State which fulfills the conditions specified in section 409 (a), and shall not finally disapprove a State application except after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State education agency.

"(2) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State education agency, finds that such agency is not complying substantially with the provisions required to be included in its application under section 409(a), or that any funds have been diverted from the purposes for which they have been paid, the Commissioner shall forthwith notify the State education agency, and he shall thereafter withhold further payments to the State under this title until there is no longer any such failure to comply, or, if compliance is impossible, there is a repayment, or an arrangement for repayment, of Federal moneys which have been diverted or improperly expended.

"(b) (1) A State education agency dissatisfied with a final action of the Commissioner under subsection (a) of this section may appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such State or agency is located by filing a petition with such court within sixty days after such final action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Commissioner, or any officer designated by him for that purpose. The Commissioner thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code.

"(2) Upon the filing of the petition referred to in paragraph (1) of this subsection, the court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part, temporarily or permanently. The findings of the Commissioner as to the facts, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive, but the court for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall file in the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence.

"(3) The judgment of the court affirming or setting aside, in whole or in part, any action of the Commissioner shall be final, subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code.

"Definitions

"SEC. 411. For the purposes of this title—

"(1) The term 'local education agency' means a board of education or other legally constituted local school authority having administrative control and direction of public schools in a city, county, township, school district, or political subdivision.

"(2) The term 'State education agency' means the State board of education or other agency or officer primarily responsible for the State supervision of public schools.

"(3) The term 'public school pupils' means pupils in average daily attendance at public schools within a State, or within all of the States, as determined by the Commissioner in accordance with criteria developed by him to assure uniform determinations for all the States.

"(4) The term 'public schools' means schools providing free education at public expense, under public supervision and direction and without tuition charge to resident pupils, and which is provided as elementary or secondary school education—

"(a) by a State or local education agency, or

"(b) if the State application approved under this title so provides, by another State or local public agency or institution.

"(5) The term 'elementary and secondary education' shall not include any education provided below the kindergarten level or beyond grade 12.

"(6) The terms 'school facilities' and 'public school facilities' means classrooms and related facilities (including furniture, instructional materials other than textbooks, equipment, machinery, and utilities necessary or appropriate for school purposes) for public schools, and interests in land (including site, grading, and improvement) on which such facilities are constructed. Such terms shall include gymnasiums and similar facilities, except those intended primarily for exhibitions for which admission is to be charged to the general public.

"(7) The terms 'construct', 'constructing', and 'construction' include the preparation of drawings and specifications for school facilities; erecting, building, acquiring, altering, remodeling, improving, or extending school facilities; and the inspection and supervision of the construction of school facilities."

On page 41, line 16, strike the words "title III," and insert the following: "titles III or IV,".

On page 43, after line 10, strike the amendment to the title and insert in lieu thereof, the following:

"Amend the title so as to read: 'A bill to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities, to authorize scholarships for undergraduate study in such institutions, to provide financial assistance to the States for the construction of public community colleges, and to provide a two-year program of financial assistance to the States for public elementary and secondary school construction.'"

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, before discussing the amendment, I should like to have corrected a typographical error which appears in section 402, on page 2, line 3; namely, to strike out "three-year" and insert in lieu thereof "two-year". This is a technical correction.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be so modified.

Mr. McNAMARA. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, at this point I should like to refresh the memories of Senators—and the chairman, if necessary—on the origin of the higher education bill now before the Senate. The bill was considered and approved by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in the last weeks of the last session and was then placed on the Senate Calendar.

This was part of an alleged grand strategy that would provide a package of education measures—as a lure to those who seemed to be dragging their heels on the general aid to education bill.

This was the supermarket approach to education legislation, offering specials to get you into the store.

Needless to say, and as was predicted by many of us at the time, the strategy was a miserable failure.

We got neither the general aid legislation nor the higher education program.

All we got was an extension of the National Defense Education Act and an extension of the impacted areas legislation, a rather sorry showing for the grand strategists.

Now we are faced with this modest handout to higher education as the only new education program likely to be enacted by the 87th Congress.

If our aim is simply to have something with an education label on it, then this bill is just as good as any.

But if our desire is to really improve the national education system, to show that we have enough commonsense to start where the need is greatest, then we will concentrate on elementary and secondary education.

I am sure that my attempt to amend the higher education bill so as to include a school construction program comes as no surprise to most Senators.

But I wish it to be clearly understood that I do not seek this amendment to provide one more futile demonstration of my conviction that our school problem begins in the elementary and secondary grades.

The Senate has demonstrated, time and again, the most recent evidence being the passage of S. 1021 last year, that it favors a broad program of Federal assistance to the Nation's schools.

It is my further belief—and there is evidence to support it—that such a broad program of Federal assistance to education would be favored by a majority of our colleagues in the House.

Last year I offered an amendment similar to that which I offer now, when the bill to extend the federally impacted school districts program and the National Defense Education Act was before us.

I did not press that amendment to a vote because of this body's consensus of opinion; namely, that time was so short that we might jeopardize the impacted areas and the National Defense Education Act program if they were so amended.

I was told that the adoption of my amendment by the Senate would, in effect, end both of those programs.

That situation is not duplicated here. The bill before us would establish a higher education assistance program, which would not go into effect until July 1 of this year at the earliest.

We have, therefore, 5 months in which to determine whether or not the majority of Members of this Congress favors an effective school program; that is, one which will help children of all ages. I believe it does.

If my amendment is adopted, there will be sufficient time for the House to accept or reject it. We must have an honest test of the will of the elected Members of Congress, and not be stymied by parliamentary roadblocks that are contrary to the will of the people.

We are facing no deadlines of the kind that have created the pressures for empty compromises at the tail end of recent sessions.

In short, there is ample time to reach a decision on the merits of the program I propose, and I am hopeful that the Senate will join with me in seeking such a decision.

I shall not spend any lengthy period discussing the contents of this amendment. I will only say that if it be enacted, the Federal Government would embark upon a 2-year program for the assistance of construction of public elementary and secondary schools.

A total of $325 million in Federal grants would be available to the States in each of the next 2 years.

As I have said on many occasions, I favor a much broader educational effort than that contained in this amendment.

It is not enough to provide buildings if those buildings are to be staffed by undertrained and underpaid teachers.

But the realities of the conflict in the House lead me to the conclusion that a program of Federal assistance for teachers' salaries simply could not pass.

Therefore, I offer this amendment to accomplish two purposes. First, to stimulate badly needed school construction in the States; and second, to release present State construction money for the improvement of teachers' salaries and skills.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks a table containing an analysis of school construction needs, State by State, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I am hopeful that we will make this determined last effort to provide Federal assistance and leadership where it is needed most—in the Nation's school establishments.

EXHIBIT 1.—*Fall 1961 statistics on enrollment, teachers, and schoolhousing in full-time public elementary and secondary day schools*

[NOTE.—National totals, while shown to the last digit, are not in fact precise to that degree but merely represent the sum of unrounded and rounded figures furnished by the various States. Advance data from forthcoming Office of Education Circular No. 676.]

Region and State	Number of pupils enrolled			Number of classroom teachers			Number of classroom teachers with less than standard certificates			Number of pupils in excess of normal capacity		
	Total (1)	Elementary [1] (2)	Secondary [1] (3)	Total (4)	Elementary [1] (5)	Secondary [1] (6)	Total (7)	Elementary (8)	Secondary [1] (9)	Total (10)	Elementary [1] (11)	Secondary [1] (12)
United States (50 States and District of Columbia)	37,504,190	24,685,888	12,818,302	1,462,859	870,631	592,228	89,697	64,464	25,233	1,693,862	962,934	730,928
North Atlantic	8,734,239	5,313,426	3,420,813	363,563	195,919	167,644	26,358	16,176	10,182	494,540	263,408	231,132
Connecticut	498,992	349,867	149,125	20,531	12,374	8,157	1,700	1,100	600	18,722	13,382	5,340
Delaware	86,908	49,750	37,158	3,875	1,999	1,876	490	400	90	2,782	1,774	1,008
Maine [3]	207,261	156,795	50,466	8,531	5,813	2,718	356	270	86	13,515	8,339	5,176
Maryland	634,988	370,235	264,753	[4] 24,929	[4] 12,857	[4] 12,072	6,452	4,377	2,075	66,273	33,828	32,445
Massachusetts	911,840	557,499	354,341	38,108	21,004	17,104	898	410	488	36,226	16,720	19,506
New Hampshire	110,185	73,582	36,603	4,663	2,813	1,850	183	113	70	4,708	2,825	1,883
New Jersey	1,102,712	738,068	364,644	48,774	27,895	20,879	6,605	5,010	1,595	79,364	42,980	36,384
New York [3]	2,843,000	1,659,000	1,184,000	122,985	64,039	58,946	6,191	2,674	3,517	170,463	93,125	77,338
Pennsylvania	1,998,347	1,142,641	855,706	77,661	39,415	38,246	1,400	547	853	76,755	33,455	43,300
Rhode Island [3]	136,393	78,783	57,610	5,583	2,887	2,696	349	154	195	4,741	2,074	2,667
Vermont	76,345	53,473	22,872	3,394	2,155	1,239	254	151	103	5,282	3,411	1,871
District of Columbia	127,268	83,733	43,535	4,529	2,668	1,861	1,480	970	510	15,709	11,495	4,214
Great Lakes and Plains	10,495,210	7,052,983	3,442,227	424,250	264,496	159,754	24,424	20,770	3,654	376,624	222,122	154,502
Illinois	1,810,064	1,293,762	516,302	76,387	53,110	23,277	5,900	5,298	602	94,437	77,815	16,622
Indiana	1,010,290	659,463	350,827	36,763	23,999	12,764	2,700	2,250	450	10,000	6,188	3,812
Iowa	589,499	376,184	213,315	26,621	14,980	11,641	280	200	80	12,000	4,500	7,500
Kansas	474,871	357,385	117,486	22,085	13,525	8,560	--------	--------	--------	39,200	21,000	18,200
Michigan	1,726,468	1,070,410	656,058	66,159	38,372	27,787	6,957	6,540	417	51,900	30,000	21,900
Minnesota	708,894	413,748	295,146	29,381	15,157	14,224	527	425	102	28,363	15,904	12,459
Missouri [3]	838,723	634,197	204,526	30,894	21,035	9,859	136	49	87	38,004	174	37,830
Nebraska	291,229	189,581	101,648	13,920	8,598	5,322	582	459	123	19,686	11,526	8,160
North Dakota	138,729	98,853	39,876	6,857	4,425	2,432	--------	--------	--------	5,159	3,383	1,776
Ohio	2,007,117	1,323,114	684,003	75,278	45,318	29,960	5,170	3,880	1,290	47,945	34,136	13,809
South Dakota	153,077	103,842	49,235	7,959	5,239	2,720	1,172	869	303	9,217	6,097	3,120
Wisconsin [11]	746,249	532,444	213,805	31,946	20,738	11,208	1,000	800	200	20,713	11,399	9,314
Southeast	8,990,292	5,973,924	3,016,368	324,395	198,103	126,292	15,360	11,703	3,657	531,263	297,415	233,848
Alabama [6]	786,978	457,411	329,567	26,297	14,684	11,613	2,072	1,199	873	99,962	52,562	47,400
Arkansas [6]	430,309	240,512	189,797	15,453	8,557	6,896	1,948	1,559	389	20,224	10,169	10,055
Florida	1,030,353	598,349	432,004	39,724	21,737	17,987	311	296	15	77,803	38,486	39,317
Georgia [12]	957,768	652,151	305,617	33,102	21,032	12,070	592	428	164	62,852	35,603	27,249
Kentucky	625,000	447,000	178,000	23,735	15,475	8,260	2,478	2,141	337	31,860	22,786	9,074
Louisiana	725,875	560,000	165,875	27,118	16,115	11,003	1,500	1,020	480	15,500	10,000	5,500
Mississippi	553,805	357,154	196,651	19,027	10,973	8,054	795	420	375	20,364	14,380	5,984
North Carolina	1,125,834	843,886	281,948	39,013	28,045	10,968	1,354	1,148	206	62,263	42,398	19,865
South Carolina	598,558	379,470	219,088	21,273	12,289	8,984	[14] 37	[14] 11	[14] 26	31,128	13,788	17,340
Tennessee	845,000	585,000	260,000	29,593	19,520	10,073	1,075	860	215	28,487	17,520	10,967
Virginia	874,022	592,044	281,978	33,814	20,328	13,486	2,057	1,765	292	61,020	33,576	27,444
West Virginia	436,790	260,947	175,843	16,246	9,348	6,898	1,141	856	285	19,800	6,147	13,653
West and Southwest	9,284,449	6,345,555	2,938,894	350,651	212,113	138,538	23,555	15,815	7,740	291,435	179,989	111,446
Alaska	46,929	38,030	8,899	2,037	1,442	595	60	42	18	5,530	4,881	649
Arizona [3]	344,000	265,000	79,000	12,042	9,004	3,038	72	67	5	23,375	9,000	14,375
California	3,560,000	2,410,000	1,150,000	124,250	76,750	47,500	11,500	8,000	3,500	43,086	37,120	5,966
Colorado	415,282	251,496	163,786	17,763	9,666	8,097	273	214	59	25,380	14,591	10,789
Hawaii [6]	148,333	88,457	59,876	5,004	3,004	2,000	38	13	25	4,682	2,621	2,061
Idaho	163,878	90,892	72,986	6,893	3,422	3,471	1,636	1,053	583	9,295	5,281	4,014
Montana	149,706	101,309	48,397	6,961	4,810	2,151	89	84	5	6,204	2,655	3,549
Nevada	70,117	45,512	24,605	2,980	1,825	1,155	--------	--------	--------	4,926	2,013	2,913
New Mexico [6]	228,778	134,526	94,252	9,122	5,028	4,094	19	14	5	13,213	6,358	6,855
Oklahoma	550,000	335,500	214,500	21,355	12,155	9,200	--------	--------	--------	20,000	16,000	4,000
Oregon	398,841	271,611	127,230	17,736	10,858	6,878	1,136	1,086	50	7,009	4,101	2,908
Texas [3]	2,219,811	1,715,153	504,658	85,531	51,960	33,571	6,900	3,795	3,105	75,633	50,687	24,946
Utah	246,892	146,244	100,648	9,019	4,910	4,109	263	186	77	18,382	12,154	6,228
Washington	660,230	403,183	257,047	25,800	14,950	10,850	1,100	900	200	33,714	11,771	21,943
Wyoming [6]	81,652	48,642	33,010	4,158	2,329	1,829	469	361	108	1,006	756	250
Outlying parts:												
American Samoa	5,557	3,532	2,025	323	260	63	5	--------	5	270	--------	270
Canal Zone	11,943	6,860	5,083	374	201	173	2	2	--------	384	384	--------
Guam	14,148	8,919	5,229	512	296	216	57	53	4	--------	--------	--------
Puerto Rico	581,204	389,138	192,066	14,159	8,415	5,744	3,835	1,143	2,692	160,382	127,632	32,750
Virgin Islands [6]	7,349	5,011	2,338	241	132	109	--------	--------	--------	2,346	1,868	478

See footnotes at end of table.

EXHIBIT 1.—*Fall 1961 statistics on enrollment, teachers, and schoolhousing in full-time public elementary and secondary day schools*—Con.

[NOTE.—National totals, while shown to the last digit, are not in fact precise to that degree but merely represent the sum of unrounded and rounded figures furnished by the various States. Advance data from forthcoming Office of Education Circular No. 676.]

Region and State	Statewide standard used to determine normal capacity (number of pupils per instruction room)		Number of pupils on multiple or half-day sessions			Instruction rooms available, completed, and abandoned			Additional instruction rooms needed—				Instruction rooms scheduled for completion during 1961-62
	Elementary	Secondary	Total	Elementary [1]	Secondary [1]	Available, beginning 1960-61	Completed during 1960-61	Abandoned during 1960-61	Available, beginning 1961-62	Total	To accommodate excess enrollment shown in col. 10	To replace unsatisfactory facilities (exclusive of those in col. 23)	
	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)	(20)	(21)	(22)	(23)	(24)	(25)
United States (50 States and the District of Columbia)	---	---	[2] 503,108	[2] 317,539	[2] 185,569	1,331,624	72,157	18,701	1,385,080	127,165	60,169	66,996	62,737
North Atlantic	---	---	258,103	121,676	136,427	307,787	14,155	3,924	318,018	33,325	18,232	15,093	12,934
Connecticut	---	---	16,732	8,928	7,804	18,134	769	163	18,749	941	683	258	801
Delaware	30	30	98	98	---	3,369	130	6	3,493	167	93	74	86
Maine [3]	---	---	5,162	1,275	3,887	7,644	494	294	7,844	856	504	352	420
Maryland	30	25	14,446	12,611	1,835	19,307	1,292	63	20,536	2,952	2,515	437	1,240
Massachusetts	---	---	24,420	7,108	17,312	33,189	1,713	353	34,549	2,382	1,351	1,031	1,462
New Hampshire	[5] 30	[5] 25	2,674	---	2,674	4,173	321	171	4,323	245	153	92	179
New Jersey	---	---	61,151	35,882	25,269	38,507	1,947	285	40,169	3,902	2,797	1,105	2,228
New York [4]	---	---	103,716	43,280	60,436	99,950	3,970	939	102,981	13,599	6,117	7,482	4,320
Pennsylvania	30	22	23,645	10,181	13,464	71,546	3,022	1,583	72,985	6,883	3,083	3,800	1,969
Rhode Island [6]	---	---	3,746	---	3,746	4,798	234	19	5,013	297	185	112	62
Vermont	(7)	(7)	344	344	---	3,197	161	48	3,310	315	190	116	83
District of Columbia	30	25	1,969	1,969	---	3,973	102	---	4,075	786	552	234	84
Great Lakes and Plains	---	---	[2] 86,810	[2] 70,074	[2] 16,736	387,142	20,397	5,134	402,405	33,014	14,063	18,951	17,355
Illinois	---	---	39,634	37,459	2,175	64,761	4,013	964	67,810	7,409	3,669	3,740	2,396
Indiana	30	30	---	---	---	35,685	2,000	320	37,365	1,262	333	929	1,620
Iowa	30	25	---	---	---	20,148	540	91	20,597	620	470	150	500
Kansas	30	25	(8)	(8)	(8)	25,185	461	138	25,508	2,513	1,428	1,085	468
Michigan	30	25	7,600	4,125	3,475	[9] 57,479	3,616	240	60,855	7,923	1,876	6,047	3,450
Minnesota	30	32	11,655	8,606	3,049	27,518	1,583	408	28,693	2,126	1,110	1,016	992
Missouri [3]	30	[10] 28	---	---	---	30,975	1,114	396	31,693	3,601	1,439	2,162	1,043
Nebraska	(7)	(7)	2,664	964	1,700	14,001	529	378	14,152	1,600	865	735	407
North Dakota	30	30	1,017	737	280	6,737	438	459	6,716	704	172	532	310
Ohio	30	30	23,433	17,538	5,895	69,279	3,770	910	72,139	3,096	1,598	1,498	3,581
South Dakota	(7)	(7)	632	575	57	7,831	230	202	7,859	658	363	290	287
Wisconsin [11]	---	---	175	70	105	27,543	2,103	628	29,018	1,507	740	767	1,411
Southeast	---	---	93,940	79,604	14,336	308,069	15,516	5,402	319,083	40,399	17,458	22,941	13,158
Alabama [6]	---	---	14,201	12,396	1,805	25,740	1,397	632	26,505	5,166	2,982	2,184	1,530
Arkansas [6]	30	25	3,549	3,549	---	14,548	954	478	15,024	2,696	871	1,825	306
Florida	---	---	40,703	29,528	11,175	33,064	2,396	404	35,056	4,703	2,575	2,128	2,002
Georgia [12]	---	---	16,439	16,253	186	34,024	970	311	34,683	3,464	2,088	1,376	884
Kentucky	[13] 27	[13] 27	2,260	2,260	---	22,662	1,243	200	23,705	7,374	1,180	6,194	1,100
Louisiana	---	---	2,010	2,010	---	27,213	780	242	27,751	1,875	687	1,188	1,170
Mississippi	---	---	---	---	---	17,420	1,540	788	18,172	1,578	586	992	882
North Carolina	---	---	167	167	---	39,650	1,615	625	40,640	4,026	1,645	2,381	1,616
South Carolina	36	30	1,554	791	763	20,341	869	469	20,741	1,895	961	934	440
Tennessee	33	28	1,294	887	407	28,582	1,107	328	29,361	1,918	934	984	1,000
Virginia	30	25	11,629	11,629	---	29,387	2,039	557	30,869	3,943	2,302	1,641	1,899
West Virginia	30	28	134	134	---	16,338	606	368	16,576	1,761	647	1,114	329
West and Southwest	---	---	64,255	46,185	18,070	327,726	22,089	4,241	345,574	20,427	10,416	10,011	19,590
Alaska	25	25	---	---	---	1,713	180	32	1,861	361	226	135	126
Arizona [3]	30	25	19,500	10,000	9,500	10,335	800	120	11,015	1,215	875	340	720
California	---	---	---	---	---	117,000	10,000	1,000	126,000	3,000	1,500	1,500	10,000
Colorado	30	25	12,572	10,575	1,997	15,373	1,095	551	15,917	1,609	988	621	405
Hawaii [6]	32	32	1,215	1,215	---	5,101	346	64	5,383	350	149	201	253
Idaho	(7)	(7)	---	---	---	6,193	316	110	6,399	708	340	368	135
Montana	---	---	7,442	2,551	4,891	6,798	454	186	7,066	441	256	185	266
Nevada	30	25	5,929	4,752	1,177	2,522	296	91	2,727	278	173	105	256
New Mexico [6]	30	30	---	---	---	8,240	473	116	8,597	846	440	406	325
Oklahoma	---	---	---	---	---	22,824	1,026	850	23,000	3,100	800	2,300	1,000
Oregon	---	---	386	323	63	16,316	755	258	16,813	729	312	417	500
Texas [3]	32	30	2,240	2,249	---	79,288	3,752	360	82,680	4,395	2,445	[14] 1,950	3,868
Utah	30	30	13,855	13,855	---	8,141	500	122	8,519	928	614	314	541
Washington	---	---	1,107	665	442	24,376	1,855	332	25,899	2,285	1,258	1,027	1,015
Wyoming [6]	30	25	---	---	---	3,506	241	49	3,698	182	40	142	180
Outlying parts:													
American Samoa	30	30	---	---	---	251	29	---	280	186	9	177	81
Canal Zone	30	30	---	---	---	412	44	14	442	8	8	---	28
Guam	30	30	---	---	---	525	63	39	549	230	---	230	49
Puerto Rico	40	35	424,863	359,425	65,438	12,207	507	168	12,546	4,752	4,115	637	509
Virgin Islands [6]	30	25	---	---	---	197	3	1	199	107	83	24	40

---

[1] Unless otherwise noted, data for elementary and secondary schools are classified by type of organization of the school, rather than by grade group.

[2] Incomplete; total for States reporting.

[3] Data for elementary and secondary schools are reported by grade-group (kindergarten through grade 8 for elementary, and grades 9 to 12 for secondary).

[4] Includes librarians and guidance personnel.

[5] Recommended by State; not a formal "standard" or regulation.

[6] Data for elementary and secondary schools are reported by grade-group (kindergarten through grade 6 for elementary, and grades 7 to 12 for secondary).

[7] Standard based on number of square feet per pupil.

[8] Data not available.

[9] Data relate to number of teacher stations.

[10] Represents standard for junior high schools; standard for senior high schools is 25.

[11] Excludes vocational schools not operated as part of the regular public school system.

[12] Data for elementary and secondary schools are reported by grade-group (kindergarten through grade 7 for elementary and grades 8 to 12 for secondary).

[13] Standard for schools with 100 or more pupils in average daily attendance.

[14] Data for 1960-61 school year.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, with regard to the amendment offered by the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara], I wish to say that I believe his amendment has a very laudable objective, and it is one which I deeply regret I cannot support. My reasons for taking this position are that, first, the Senate already has passed Senate bill 1021, which I believe to be sounder legislation for elementary and secondary schools than this amendment, with its limited scope—sounder both from the standpoint of the money involved and from the standpoint of the breadth of the legislation contained in Senate bill 1021. So adoption of the amendment of the Senator from Michigan could be regarded, in a sense, as a retreat of vital importance.

I do not deny that we may be in a situation in which early action by the House will not be had. But in my judgment, we should not, by adopting this amendment, put ourselves in the position of making passage of the bill by the House of Representatives more difficult. We need to provide money for teachers' salaries as well as for the construction of elementary and secondary schools and for their operation and maintenance.

In my judgment, if the amendment of the Senator from Michigan were adopted or, for that matter, even if an amendment involving all of title I of Senate bill 1021 were to be adopted, there would then have to be a conference with the House of Representatives. Do we really wish to offer up, as a burnt sacrifice, aid for the colleges of this country and for the future students who would be aided by title II of Senate bill 1241, merely because we wish also to aid public elementary and secondary schools?

Mr. President, I greatly value my friendship with the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara]; and in a moment I shall have something to say about the great contributions he has made in the field of education. Certainly no Member of this body is more devoted than is he to the field of education. So I regret that here on the floor of the Senate we differ in regard to the tactics to be followed. But as the floor leader in connection with Senate bill 1241, I must oppose his amendment, and I must urge that other Senators likewise oppose it.

Mr. President, although the purpose of the amendment of the Senator from Michigan is a laudable one, I do not consider it germane to the basic purposes of this higher education bill.

In the second place, I believe that adoption of his amendment would endanger the passage of this bill by the House of Representatives, inasmuch as the House Committee on Rules has already ruled against general elementary and secondary aid proposals.

Furthermore, it is my understanding—and let me say that I hope both the majority leader and the minority leader will check on this, because they have served in the House of Representatives—that if we may assume, as a hypothetical, that the Senate would pass the higher education bill with the McNamara amendment included in it, it is conceivable that the House Rules Committee might not even give a rule to have the bill taken to conference, if they did not like to have in the higher education bill a provision which they might deem to be, in effect, a rider.

Does the Senator from Montana think that would be a possibility in the House?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think it might be a very strong possibility, with the result that no higher education legislation at all would be enacted.

Mr. MORSE. My next point is that Senate bill 1021 offers a more comprehensive approach to public school needs. I wish to say—because I see no reason why these matters should be confined to the cloakrooms—that I have talked there with many of the other members of the committee. We agree we have been ably assisted on school legislation by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara]. All of us have the same great esteem for him, and all of us feel very badly that we cannot support him in the position he has taken on this amendment. We understand the parliamentary tactics he wishes to follow. I simply have an honest difference of opinion with him as to them. I disagree with him regarding how best to serve the legislative needs of the country, both for higher education and for elementary and secondary school legislative problems.

All of us know that the Senator from Michigan has very strong feelings on this matter. He has made that very clear in utterances both on and off the floor of the Senate; and certainly he has made it very clear here this afternoon. He has stated that he is greatly disappointed because of the failure of the House of Representatives to act on elementary and secondary school legislation. I share his feeling. I, too, have been very critical because of the failure of the House to act. But, Mr. President, I think the Senate has a responsibility to carry out its obligations regarding each one of the educational subject matters which will come before it. The Senate has already acted on the secondary and elementary school education bill. The Senate has passed Senate bill 1021. So the Senate's record in regard to Senate bill 1021 is perfectly clear.

I wish to make very clear now, from the standpoint of the legislative history of the pending bill—and I shall try to make it clear as an assistance to the other members of the committee who have talked to me about the matter, and to whom I have said I would do my very best to make the record clear, so that when the Members of the House read it, they will understand our position in regard to Senate bill 1021—what I believe to be a very real danger. I speak quite noncritically about it, but I now state what I think will be a possible interpretation by Members of the House if we do not make this legislative history clear: I believe there is a real possibility that rejection of the amendment of the Senator from Michigan may be interpreted by some Members of the House—including some members of the Rules Committee who want to kill all secondary and elementary school legislation, and who therefore have been voting against giving a rule unless they can get a rule which would, in the opinion of those of us who have fought so hard for the enactment of Senate bill 1021, violate the doctrine of separation of chuch and state—unless they can get a rule that will provide for aid to the private schools on the same basis as aid to the public schools, they are likely to say, "The Senate marched up the hill and passed Senate bill 1021. But then, when the McNamara amendment came along, the Senate marched down the hill, and reversed its position."

Mr. President, I wish to make clear that as the floor leader in connection with Senate bill 1021, and as the floor leader in connection with the pending higher education bill, in voting against the McNamara amendment, this afternoon, I stand foursquare in continued support of Senate bill 1021, and I am satisfied that other Senators who will join me in voting, this afternoon, against the McNamara amendment will in no way be reversing the position they took when they voted in favor of Senate bill 1021. Although we shall vote against the McNamara amendment, we agree with the Senator from Michigan that some legislation for secondary and elementary public schools should be enacted; but we take the position that, in addition, there should be some aid for teachers' salaries; and, in addition, we believe that the broad scope of Senate bill 1021 should be reiterated.

In passing S. 1021 on May 25, 1961, we have done that job. It is now on the doorstep of the House; and the responsibility for not passing a public elementary and secondary school bill in the House rests squarely, at the present moment, with the Rules Committee of the House.

I cannot speak more emphatically or with deeper feeling than when I say that the Rules Committee has an obligation to the American people to proceed to give the House a rule so that the Members of the House can stand up and be counted on S. 1021 in the House of Representatives.

I have sincere and honest differences of opinion with the Senator from Michigan as to the parliamentary strategy that should be followed here in connection with the higher education bill. I think the effect of his amendment would be to cripple the higher education bill. I say respectfully, and we have checked it with some of our advisers in the House, that to add this amendment to the Senate bill on higher education might very well result in a resentful and negative attitude in the House which could jeopardize the possibility of passing any legislation in this session of Congress on higher education. We want to help both primary and secondary and higher education.

There are honest differences of opinion as to strategy. We do not think we ought to follow the Senator's leadership in regard to his amendment, which would have a very unfortunate parliamentary effect, by adding to this bill what is really a rider of an ungermane provision, which could result in no legislation, and at the least increase the probabilities or possibilities of no legislation at all on higher education.

If one wants to talk about the effect of passing higher education legislation in the House, I will tell the Senate what I think one of the effects may very well be. I think if the Senate does its job with respect to the elementary, secondary, and higher school systems, the parents, including those with children in grade and high schools, as well as in college, will take note of where the bottleneck is, where the bogging down has occurred, and the House will hear from them about its responsibilities with respect to both higher and primary and secondary education.

I know there can be a sincere difference of opinion as to the best parliamentary tactic. I shall vote against the McNamara amendment, because I think it is a parliamentary strategic mistake. I do not think it would be tactically wise to follow this course of action. We have other education bills. There is the NDEA amendments bill S. 2345. Are we going to add the McNamara amendment to that? We have the medical construction and the fellowships bill.

Are we going to add the McNamara amendment to them? To do so is not the best way in my judgment to carry on a parliamentary disagreement with the House of Representatives. I think the best way to put the matter to the House of Representatives is for us to complete our job in the Senate on each independent piece of education legislation. We then can say to the country, "We have done our job. Now the country has a right to ask for exercise of responsibility by the House of Representatives." I say most respectfully the people have not received what is their due because of the fact that the House of Representatives has not taken the action it has the parliamentary power to take if it has the will to do so. It could take that responsible action by making it perfectly clear to the Rules Committee that the House wants a rule from the Rules Committee on elementary and secondary public school legislation. It could also adopt alternative parliamentary procedures in the House in order to insure that the House would vote on that bill.

I close—subject to the agreed interruption by the Senator from Michigan—by saying that I know very well how he feels. I respect him for his view. Seldom have the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Michigan disagreed on these matters since we have been in the Senate together. I think I can speak most sincerely when I say it pains me no end that we find ourselves in disagreement on this question of parliamentary tactic, but I wanted the Senator from Michigan to know why I am going to vote against his amendment.

I yield now to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, at the outset, let me say that I am a little surprised that the chairman of the Subcommittee on Education takes such a strong position in opposition to something that has been approved so often by the subcommittee he represents. Moreover, his whole public record refutes the position he now takes. I have heard him stand up and speak time and time again for the schoolchildren of the country. That is exactly what my amendment does.

Furthermore, I do not want to presuppose what will happen in the House, but I call the attention of the Senator in charge of the bill, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], to the fact that under the Eisenhower administration the House passed a Federal aid to school construction program similar to this measure. Why is the Senator so sure the House will not accept this kind of amendment in the light of its once having passed a Federal aid to schools program?

Practically the same persons are Members of the House of Representatives. The only difference is that there is a new administration. What does the President say about the bill? He says he is for Federal aid to primary and secondary schools. The Senator uses the argument that my amendment does not go far enough. Of course, it does not. But that argument is an old sick horse. Everyone who is opposed to medical aid under social security, for example, says it does not go far enough. This is an old technique.

I am very much disappointed to find the chairman of the subcommittee in opposition to this amendment to the bill.

I wish to make reference to a statement I made on the floor on January 25 regarding this measure. I noted then that President Kennedy told us in his state of the Union message that he could "see no reason to weaken or withdraw" the bill passed by the Senate last year and sent to the House.

My amendment does not go that far. I see no reason to weaken or water down S. 1021. Neither does the Senator from Oregon. But at least we can take the first, feeble, necessary step and accomplish something for education while we have the schoolroom measure before us. To say it is not germane is reaching out. We have before us a bill to provide for classroom construction. This is what my amendment does. I repeat what I said a few days ago on this measure when I quoted the President's support of assistance to elementary and secondary education.

President Kennedy told us in his state of the Union message he could "see no reason to weaken or withdraw" the bill passed by the Senate last year and sent to the House.

Since he made his remarks on January 11, however, the political air between Capitol Hill and the executive department has been charged with considerable static that the administration does not really mean what it says.

These reports have it that no push will be made on general Federal aid and that the education record will be made this year with an innocuous bill to assist higher education.

This, of course, is the easy approach. It requires no great effort; it attracts no great opposition and it accomplishes very little.

I reject this approach.

When we deal with the education problems of our Nation it is necessary to establish certain priorities.

By anyone's measurement the greatest need in education is at the level which represents the foundation of our educational system, the elementary and secondary schools.

But time after time the interests of the schoolchildren have been sold out by following the easy, uncomplicated approach of bolstering higher education.

Each time a higher education bill is passed, general aid legislation is pushed back still further, postponed again while the needs and the population multiply.

In 1958 the National Defense Education Act was Congress' answer to the unmet needs of education.

This year, according to the reports, Congress and the administration are prepared to settle for the higher education bill now on the Senate Calendar as the latest sop to education needs.

I do not say these bills are worthless. NDEA was a valuable program and I was proud to support it.

I supported the current bill on the calendar—S. 1241—in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

But I supported it as a companion to the general aid bill—S. 1021—not as a substitute for it.

Under these circumstances and in view of the priority needs of education, I intend to oppose the higher education bill until general aid legislation is given the consideration that we have every right to expect.

I recognize the argument that the Senate, at least, met its responsibility by passing the general aid bill last year and sending it to the House.

That is true, but I believe that all energies in the education field, administration and congressional alike, should be directed toward freeing that bill for the President's signature and not by dissipating our strength with a relatively minor and noncritical handout to higher education.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Oregon. I appreciate his courtesy, and I ask unanimous consent that he may yield to me without losing his right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKEY in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the minority leader and myself I send to the desk a proposed unanimous-consent agreement and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proposed unanimous-consent agreement will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That, effective on Tuesday, February 6, 1962, at the conclusion of routine morning business, during the further consideration of the bill (S. 1241) to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities and to authorize scholarships for undergraduate study in such institutions, debate on any amendment (except the so-called Prouty-Keating amendment numbered 2–2–62–C, which shall be limited to 2 hours, with 1½ hours to be controlled by the proponents and one-half hour to be controlled by the opponents) motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided*, That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further*, That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided*, That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. McNAMARA. I raised a question with the Senator from Oregon, who is managing the bill, a little earlier. I should like to have his comment on the question.

Mr. MORSE. First, the Senator from Michigan talked with me in regard to whether, on the matter of parliamentary procedure, I would move to lay his amendment on the table. Although we think there is much that might be said for a motion to lay the amendment on the table, we feel, with the explanation I have already given and with the very brief explanation I shall give before we reach a vote on the question, that the Senator from Michigan is entitled to the courtesy of a yea-and-nay vote on his amendment, and I shall support his getting a yea-and-nay vote on his amendment.

Mr. McNAMARA. I shall not object, under those circumstances.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President, I should like to make it clear that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] and I have an amendment to offer to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA]. We would appreciate it if we might have the same consideration the Senator from Oregon has granted to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. MORSE. I shall certainly grant that courtesy to the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I be permitted, without the Senator from Oregon losing his right to the floor, to propound a parliamentary inquiry?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Hampshire? The Chair hears none, and the Senator will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. COTTON. If the unanimous-consent agreement is entered into at this time, since it carries within it a provision that no amendments may be offered which are not ruled by the Chair to be germane to the bill, would the amendment to be offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], on behalf of himself and me, be germane? It is germane, in my opinion, to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan, to which it is offered. If the unanimous-consent agreement were agreed to, could our amendment be ruled to be out of order, as not being germane to the original bill, even though it is germane to the amendment now under consideration, offered by the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. MORSE. I do not know what the amendment is.

Mr. COTTON. The Senator knows what it is, for it relates to the cigarette tax.

Mr. MORSE. Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair states that if the amendment were germane to the pending amendment it would be in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, has the Chair ruled on the request of the leadership?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, it is my understanding the agreement is designed to go into effect tomorrow. Consequently, the germaneness provision in the proposed unanimous-consent agreement would not apply to an amendment offered tonight.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, may we have a ruling? I should like to make a request about something else of interest.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has responded to the inquiry on the amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I mean on the proposed unanimous-consent agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may we offer the amendment before the proposed unanimous-consent agreement is agreed to, and then agree to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement? In that way we will be protected on the question of germaneness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. COTTON. May we have an exception for the amendment to be offered by the Senator from Iowa and myself, so that it may be offered subsequent to an agreement to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator wishes to send it to the desk, by all means he should do so. There is an amendment pending.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk, and I should like to have it stated.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to have a ruling on the proposed unanimous-consent agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, the proposed unanimous-consent agreement is agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is my understanding that there will be further debate on the Miller-Cotton amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA]. I express the hope, on behalf of the distinguished minority leader and myself, that we can finish debate on the McNamara amendment and the amendment thereto tonight. If that meets with the concurrence of all concerned, on behalf of the minority leader and myself, I make a further unanimous-consent request to the effect that the votes on the McNamara amendment and the amendment thereto be taken at 1:30 p.m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make some brief additional remarks in regard to the comments of my friend from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA]. He pointed out that under the Eisenhower administration the House passed a school construction bill. In effect, he has said to the Senator from Oregon, "What makes the Senator from Oregon think that the House would not do that again?"

I shall answer that argument after I yield to the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] who I understand wishes to have me yield to him for a moment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. President, notwithstanding the germaneness provision of the unanimous-consent agreement previously entered into, I ask unanimous consent that the pending McNamara amendment and the Miller-Cotton amendment to be offered, be in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, as subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That, effective on Tuesday, February 6, 1962, at the conclusion of routine morning business, during the further consideration of the bill (S. 1241) to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities and to authorize scholarships for undergraduate study in such institutions, debate on any amendment (except the so-called Prouty-Keating amendment numbered "2-2–62—C," which shall be limited to 2 hours, with 1½ hours to be controlled by the proponents and one-half hour to be controlled by the opponents, and the pending amendments—the McNamara amendment (2–2-

62—E) and the Miller amendment thereto—on which the votes will come at 1:30 p.m.), motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided*, That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further*, That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided*, That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr President I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its deliberations today it stand in adjournment to meet at 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

AID FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1241) to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities and to authorize scholarships for undergraduate study in such institutions.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, replying to my friend the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] as to what makes me think that the House of Representatives would not pass such a school construction bill again, I wish to say that I am satisfied that the House would not pass the bill in the form that the Senator from Michigan seeks to have it passed. As the floor leader of the bill, I have not been acting in a vacuum. I have been doing a great deal of work on the bill, off the floor as well as on the floor. I have been in consultation with leaders on the House side. All I can say is that I am perfectly satisfied that if the amendment to the higher education bill is agreed to, the amendment will have the result of making it very difficult to get the Senate bill even into conference with the House.

The Senator from Michigan has said that the House passed a school construction bill. It never passed a school construction bill as a rider to a higher education bill, and there is no way of changing the fact that the action will be recognized as a bit of parliamentary strategy in the Senate to seek to force on the House a secondary and elementary school rider to a higher education bill.

Furthermore, I point out that on the House side the Representatives do not have the same committee organization that we have in the Senate. For example, in the Senate my subcommittee has jurisdiction over all education bills, so a higher education bill and an elementary and secondary education bill would come to the same subcommittee. But that is not true on the House side. On the House side one subcommittee has jurisdiction over the higher education bill, and an entirely different subcommittee has jurisdiction over an elementary and secondary school bill.

I do not need to tell the Senate that on the House side these lines of jurisdiction are very highly respected and carefully guarded, and all we would do would be to create a parliamentary difficulty for ourselves by seeking to trespass on the jurisdictional boundaries on the House side.

So my reply to the Senator from Michigan is that I am satisfied that if the Senate should agree to his amendment, the effect of such action would be to defeat the probability of passing a higher education bill.

Now we come to what I believe is really the key difference between the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Oregon. I respect the Senator from Michigan for taking his point of view. I do not share it. In my judgment, the Senator from Michigan does not care whether a higher education bill is passed if he cannot get a secondary and elementary bill passed first in the House of Representatives. I think his design and strategy is to accomplish that purpose. I do not share his view in respect to such strategy. Having done our job in the Senate on an elementary school bill known as S. 1021, we now have the responsibility of going ahead with a higher education bill, then a National Defense Education Act bill, then a medical school bill, and any other education bill that may be pending before the Senate. I hope that before we are through the Yarborough GI bill will be on the calendar of the Senate for a vote. But that is a subject for the future.

I should like to state the difference which causes some of us to find ourselves not in a happy position. I would be less than honest if I did not say in the presence of the Senator from Michigan and other Senators that I am not happy about the Senator's strategy because he has me in this position. As the Senator in charge of the bill, I can say that with the assistance of the overwhelming majority in the Senate, S. 1021 was passed. It may seem to those who do not understand the parliamentary situation in the Senate that when those of us who supported S. 1021 now vote against the McNamara amendment, we shall have marched up the hill and down again, and that we shall have followed an inconsistent course of action. But we are not following an inconsistent course of action on the merits. We are following a parliamentary program in the Senate that we think will offer a better guarantee to boys and girls. The Senator from Michigan chided me by saying he had heard me many times defend the needs of boys and girls. I repeat that defense today, Mr. President. It may seem as though we were letting down those boys and girls. But, in my judgment, we shall increase the possibility of getting legislation passed through the House of Representatives, not only for elementary and secondary schools, but also higher education institutions, by voting against the McNamara amendment.

I do not reflect on the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA]. I think he is sincere. He believes his course is correct. I respect him for his courage and attitude. I am sure he will give us the benefit of the same consideration when we say that it is our honest judgment that the best way to pass proposed education legislation is to defeat the McNamara amendment. We should pass the aid to higher education bill. It is my hope that the citizens in each State will make clear to the House of Representatives that they want enacted into law legislation similar to S. 1021. I hope that parents will make it crystal clear to the Members of the House their desire that the procedures of the House should be used to overrule the House Rules Committee, or to initiate discharge action, to get the bill before the House of Representatives for a vote. That is the proper parliamentary way to go. That is the way to show respect for both Houses and the procedural rights of both Houses, rather than to agree to an amendment today which is nongermane to the higher education bill and an amendment that would be bound to give us trouble in the House of Representatives.

In conclusion, I have checked with the House of Representatives. That is my answer to the Senator from Michigan. I am satisfied that the strategy that the Senator from Michigan wants me to follow would result in the passage of no higher education bill. I am satisfied that it would not advance the cause of S. 1021, the elementary and secondary school bill, on the House side. Therefore I hope that tomorrow at 1:30, when we come to a vote, we will vote against the McNamara amendment. I shall set forth my reasons tomorrow as to why I express the hope that we shall also vote against the Miller and Cotton amendments as well.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is the Senate operating under a time limitation?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The time limitation agreed upon does not begin until tomorrow afternoon after the conclusion of morning business.

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I fully support the higher education bill before us today. As a member of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, I wish to commend the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] for the leadership they have provided.

With over 80 public and private universities, my State of Massachusetts is known throughout the world as an outstanding center of higher education. More money is spent on higher education in Massachusetts per college age youth than in any other State in the Union. When people in other parts of the country ask us why Massachusetts has seized the leadership in research, in electronics, in science, and in cultural activities, we tell them it is in large part because of the university centers located in the Commonwealth. I believe our experience should be instructive to the Nation as a whole. If America wants progress in this modern age, we must have well-educated young people. Our Nation must act on this lesson if we are to succeed in competition with the Soviets and Chinese.

S. 1241 acts on this lesson. Title I provides loan funds for a 5-year period to help institutions of higher learning build facilities and acquire equipment. Massachusetts institutions would receive $10,700,000 a year for this purpose.

Title II, which I consider of equal importance, provides scholarships for college age children. In its full operation, title II will provide 5,000 scholarships for Massachusetts students. The University of Massachusetts has completed a questionnaire on the financial resources of the parents of this year's freshman class. The results show a median income of $7,500 a year. This is $2,000 over the national average.

The University of Massachusetts is a State institution whose tuition fee is only $200 a year. If it takes $7,500 a year income to send a child to a college with tuition this low, it is obvious that millions of American families cannot afford to send their children to any college at all.

I ask unanimous consent that the report "Parents' Financial Resources, Class of 1965—University of Massachusetts" be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PARENTS' FINANCIAL RESOURCES, CLASS OF 1965, UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS

In an unusual cooperative effort, the parents of this year's freshman class of the University of Massachusetts completed, anonymously, detailed and comprehensive financial information questionnaires. Some 1,600 of the 1,800 families queried (about 90 percent) responded to questions concerning such basic matters as family income, income tax paid, numbers of children and dependents, savings, and investments. In brief, these parents presented complete sketches of their financial capabilities and plans for meeting the necessary costs of education at the University of Massachusetts.

The response of these parents will enable the university to understand and to present to the legislature, a clear and accurate picture of the financial demands being met by parents sending their sons or daughters to the university. Although the full report has not yet been completed, certain key facts and highlights are available. Among these are the following:

TOTAL FAMILY INCOME

The middle, or median, family reported a 1960 income before taxes, of $7,575; a figure which includes both mother's and father's contributions. The largest number of families (30 percent) reported incomes between $6,000 and $8,000, with more than three of every four families having total family incomes below $10,000 per year.

Two families in every ten who had sons or daughters attending the university for the first time this September had 1960 incomes of less than $5,500. At the upper income levels, only 8 of each 100 families had total incomes for 1960, of more than $14,000.

FATHER'S INCOME

The median, or middle, father had a 1960 income of $6,775. Further support for this picture of lower middle income earnings is provided by the fact that almost 60 percent of all fathers reported incomes between $4,000 and $8,000.

One in every ten fathers reported 1960 income below $4,000, with a 2 in every 10 falling below the $5,000 income level.

MOTHER'S INCOME

One of the most frequently mentioned methods of increasing family income to meet educational costs was the mother's employment. More than 40 percent of all mothers reported some income for 1960. The median income for employed mothers was $2,450.

WEEKLY INCOME

If we combined in a single weekly paycheck, the earnings for both father and mother of our middle or median, family, it would be approximately $146 per week before taxes and other deductions. The median Federal income tax reported for 1960 by parents was $768, or approximately $15 per week. Subtracting this amount plus an estimated additional $10 for retirement, dues, State tax, and hospitalization costs, the most typical weekly family paycheck would be $121.

One family paycheck of every four received would have to be set aside to pay university bills if they are to be met from regular family income.

SAVINGS AND INVESTMENTS

Few families have any sizable holdings in stocks, bonds, or other investments. Over three-quarters of the families reported no investments or amounts below $2,000.

Typical family savings (checking or savings accounts) were reported at $1,300 total, with 1 family in 10 reporting less than $170 and 5 in every 100 reporting $3,500 or more.

The median student savings account in this summer before the start of the freshman year, was $380, with 1 in every 10 reporting as much as $1,200.

FAMILY SIZE

Only one-quarter of the class of 1965 freshmen were the only dependent child in the family. The typical family, one-third of all respondents, reported two children, with another 20 percent of families reporting three dependent children.

Almost 40 percent of all families had three or more children either below the age of 18 or in some form of continuing education. In addition to these dependent children, approximately 1 family in every 10 reported one additional dependent as part of the family's continuing budget.

CAR OWNERSHIP

Parents reported clearly that they are one-car families with 85 percent of all families owning only one car. One-quarter of these cars could be classed as relatively new, having been purchased within the last 2 years. One-half of all cars owned were 4 or more years old, with over 10 percent of all cars falling in the 8-or-more-year-old category.

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, title III provides a program of matching grants for public community colleges. I have long been interested in the development of these colleges. They are the fastest growing segments of higher education in the country. They serve important needs. Last year I introduced S. 1567 to include community colleges in the National Defense Education Act. I am gratified that the committee has proposed to recognize the construction needs of community colleges in the bill before us. Massachusetts already has 4 such colleges in operation and has programed a total of 14. This title will provide the Commonwealth with $1,369,000 a year in Federal funds contingent on expenditures of double that amount by the State.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD a letter from president of the University of Massachusetts, Mr. John Lederle, a telegram from Mr. Walter Taylor, director of the Massachusetts Board of Community Colleges, and an open letter to the U.S. Congress, published by the Boston University News, largest college weekly in America.

There being no objection, the letters and telegram were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS,
Amherst, Mass., August 31, 1961.

HON. BENJAMIN A. SMITH,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR SMITH: As President of the University of Massachusetts I am writing to express our deep concern about the widely accepted belief that Congress may adjourn this year without approving either of the two major items of legislation affecting higher education. We are convinced that if this happens, at least three serious results may be expected to follow:

1. Many of our young men and women will be deprived of opportunities for college or university education which rightfully are theirs, and which are essential to the strength and continuing leadership of the United States.
2. The colleges and universities, struggling to meet demands for a higher standard of education for greater numbers of students, will have to face a responsibility for which they simply do not have the resources.
3. A world convinced that the future lies with the best educated peoples will wonder about the vision, the wisdom, and the determination of the people of the United States.

Knowing that you share our concern in this matter, I am writing to set forth the position of the American council on the two major items of legislation affecting higher education:

HIGHER EDUCATION BILL

By consensus in higher education, a program of Federal assistance in construction of academic facilities—classrooms, laboratories and libraries—should have a top priority. Even when all potential private, State, and local support is taken into account, these capital needs cannot be met by the institutions. The American council for several years has advocated optional Federal grants or loans for this purpose. We have recommended a Federal program of about $1 billion a year, based on a 1960 council survey of demand among its member institutions. While legislation now before Congress provides only $300 million annually, this amount, with required matching funds, would provide tremendous stimulus and encouragement to the institutions. Postponement of action for at least another year will mean delay at a critical time for the Nation's educational and scientific progress.

Scholarships provided by the higher education bill are also strongly supported by the council. The loss of student talent for lack of educational opportunity, by reason of financial inadequacy, can no longer be afforded by this country. With college costs rising rapidly, the loan program under the NDEA has helped many families in the middle-income brackets, but qualified students at the very low income levels are finding the financing of college more and more difficult.

Now that hearings have been concluded on this legislation we urge the Congress to give it early and favorable consideration.

BOSTON, MASS., *January 31, 1962.*

Hon. BENJAMIN A. SMITH,
Senator From Massachusetts,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SMITH: Urge passage of S. 1241 with title III intact and keeping title III intact in the House-Senate conference even if this requires separate consideration as in H.R. 8900. Development of community colleges in New England hinges on this kind of support.

WALTER M. TAYLOR,
Massachusetts Board of Regional Community Colleges.

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE U.S. CONGRESS

Tomorrow you will meet for the 2d session of the 87th Congress. Your decisions during the months that follow will shape the future of the more than 180 million Americans you represent.

More than 38 million of your constituents are students in elementary and secondary schools, colleges, and universities. They face a dim future of crowded classrooms, a shortage of qualified teachers, and rising college costs that will mean abbreviated college careers for many of them unless you respond to their urgent needs.

During this session of Congress you must pass a realistic aid to education bill.

The conflicts of today are struggles of ideas. The outcome will be determined not in the battlefield but in the classroom. The quality of education offered in our schools and colleges is the key to the preservation of our heritage and the fulfillment of our destiny.

While quality education is dependent on more than money, without it, without a great deal more money than is now spent on education, standards in our schools will crumble with the upsurge in enrollment ahead.

You know that State, community, and private resources cannot sustain the cost of education, which will more than double to $35 billion by 1970. The Federal Government can painlessly alleviate the burden but is now paying only 5 percent of the cost.

A climate for quality education in the United States can only be maintained by the fiscal powers of the Federal Government. During this session you must bring these powers to the aid of schools and colleges.

Federal aid to education need not mean Federal control of schools, as some of you have suggested. The billions of dollars in aid to foreign countries have hardly resulted in U.S. control of these countries.

There was, for instance, nothing in the several bills of the unsuccessful aid to education program last year that would have infringed on the power of States, communities, or college administrations to control schools, determine what would be taught in them, or select those who would do the teaching.

Last year's bills, which over a 3-year period would have provided $2.3 billion for aid to public schools, $577 million in scholarship aid to college students and $2.8 billion in loans for physical expansion by colleges and universities, would have been a good beginning toward alleviating many of the financial problems facing education. These bills, however, failed to become law.

Those of you who were instrumental in their defeat subverted the good of the Nation for reasons that are religious, racial, and political. Some of you supported the bills but failed to exert the influence to see them passed.

The responsibility for the failure of these bills, however, is not all yours. College students were content to remain voiceless while their future was being drawn and quartered in the House of Representatives. Teachers made a few idealistic whimpers, but only in the safety of the classroom. Administrators would not condescend to "get involved in politics" to pressure adoption of the program.

But the failure of these bills has stunned us to awareness. Students, wondering how they're going to pay next year's tuition; teachers, watching the number in their classrooms mushroom, and administrators facing shortages of classrooms, libraries, and laboratories are realizing that Federal aid to education is an acute necessity.

Our plea is a reflection of this concern. You must answer it. Early in this session you must adopt an adequate Federal aid to education program.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I have at the desk an amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire and myself to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan. I ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Strike all after line 6 on page 1 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 402. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1962, and for each fiscal year thereafter, to each State, to be used by such State for elementary and secondary educational purposes only, an amount equal to 25 per centum of the Federal tax on cigarettes (computed as provided in this Act) collected on cigarettes sold within such State during the preceding fiscal year.

(b) The Secretary of the Treasury shall, on or before October 1, 1962, and on or before October 1 of each succeeding year, pay to each State the amount authorized to be appropriated to such State pursuant to subsection (a) of this section. For the purpose of determining the amount of payments under the provisions of this section, the Secretary of the Treasury shall estimate the number of cigarettes sold in each State in each fiscal year on the basis of such statistics as may be available.

(c) For the purposes of this section the term "State" includes Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the District of Columbia, and the Virgin Islands.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I hope that my friend from Oregon will think a little about this amendment between now and tomorrow, so that by the time the Senate reassembles tomorrow he may reconsider the suggestion he made a few moments ago that he hoped not only that the McNamara amendment would be voted on, but that the amendment which has just been stated would be voted down.

I believe he can very strongly support a vote against the McNamara amendment. However, if our amendment to the McNamara amendment is adopted, I hope he will be able very strongly to support the McNamara amendment as it would then be amended. I believe it would achieve the objectives for the most part that he fought so very hard for in the past session in connection with S. 1021.

I can understand why the McNamara amendment as it now reads should be resisted by the Senator from Oregon as a matter of parliamentary procedure or parliamentary tactics. We know that the attitude in the House has been pretty well expressed in the Rules Committee. It is true that a great deal has been said about how the Rules Committee has frustrated the majority will of the House. It is also true that some Members of the House who, while publicly proclaiming the virtues of S. 1021 as passed by the Senate, have privately confided to their friends that they are very happy with the action of the Rules Committee in the House.

During the debate on S. 1021 I said on the floor of the Senate that if the Senator from Oregon would accept what was then the Cotton-Miller amendment, which is the same amendment which is now being offered to the McNamara amendment, it would achieve the objectives which the Senator from Oregon was trying to achieve by the enactment of S. 1021; further, that it would do so without the very many controversies that were inherent in S. 1021, such as segregation, religion, Federal control, and Federal bureaucracy.

This amendment would have eliminated from S. 1021 those very controversies. They were the reasons why S. 1021 was not reported from the House Rules Committee. They were also the reasons why some Members of the House who publicly proclaim the virtues of S. 1021 are privately saying to their friends that they are very happy that the Rules Committee has bottled up S. 1021.

I say also to my friend, the Senator from Oregon that if the pending amendment to the amendment had been accepted by him to S. 1021, it would have got out of the Rules Committee of the House, and many hundreds of millions of dollars for educational purposes for our young people would be appropriated and would be spent right now.

The amendment seeks to achieve the objective of enabling States to handle their primary responsibility for the education of their young children who are not today receiving the equal educational opportunities that my friend from Oregon wants so deeply to have them receive.

It does this in this fashion: First of all, it recognizes the fact that the States, much as they may wish to do so, do not have the wherewithal with which to fulfill their responsibilities for adequate education for all of their young people. We know that the States are literally strapped in raising revenue. Sales taxes have been raised in most States to the breaking point. Property taxes have gone beyond the breaking point. The same is true with respect to income taxes in some States.

The Senator from New Hampshire and I, in an effort to determine a formula for getting money back into the hands of the States on an equitable basis, reviewed the various Federal taxes as a possible avenue of returning revenue to the States.

We finally hit on the cigarette tax as being the most equitable way of doing that, because people throughout the various States of the Union smoke about the same number of cigarettes.

During the debate on the school bill last year, the then Senator from Texas, Mr. Blakley, had an income tax approach, which I supported only because I thought it was better than S. 1021 as then devised. I supported it with much less feeling of equity than I support the cigarette tax approach, because the cigarette tax approach is the only equitable approach to returning to the States and their people the tax moneys collected from them by the Federal Government. Income taxes are quite disproportionate throughout the United States because of the difference in the level of income among the States. As the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] pointed out, corporation income taxes are even more disproportionate, because while corporations earn their money in the various States, they file their income tax returns in their home States.

Therefore we have used the cigarette tax approach. In this amendment we propose to take 2 cents of the 8-cent-per-pack Federal cigarette tax and return that money to the States for educational purposes—not only for construction purposes, but for educational purposes—thus enabling the States to decide where to spend the money which has been collected from their own taxpayers. The total amount that would be raised by this amendment would be $455 million, which is considerably in excess of the $325 million for construction of facilities only, which the amendment of the Senator from Michigan would provide.

In this way, we have an approach which would furnish a substantial amount of money. It would go back to the taxpayers from whom it would be collected. The taxpayers in the States, who pay the cigarette tax, would know that from the tax on every package of cigarettes, 2 cents would be returned to their home States for education purposes. There is no possibility of Federal control, such as is inherent in the approach to S. 1021, passed at the last session, and which is one of the reasons for its being blocked in the House Committee on Rules. There is absolutely no possibility that one cent of this money would be used for Federal bureaucracies. The Senator from Oregon will remember how, the last time, I put the proponents of S. 1021 to the test concerning Federal bureaucracy. I used the estimates of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare himself in the hearings on S. 1021, when he stated that it would cost, roughly only $600,000 or $700,000 a year to administer the bill. My amendment provided that up to $1 million, but no more, could be used to administer the bill. Still, that amendment was not accepted. The fear of many of the opponents of S. 1021 was that a great new Federal bureaucracy, which would drain away many of the tax dollars which would otherwise go to the education of young people, would be established.

The approach of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] and myself would avoid that danger completely. As I have pointed out, there is no possibility for an argument, at least on the Federal level, relating to religious segregation and controversies. The people back home would know that they were getting their own tax money. I recognize that one of the objections to this approach was that it would disproportionately return tax moneys to the States and the people, whereas, in order to provide educational opportunity, we ought to return proportionate amounts of money to the States according to formulas. I recognize this objection, but I maintain that if the States had the revenue which is being taken from them by the Federal Government by way of the cigarette tax, there would not be any talk about Federal aid to education. The people then would have long since had the wherewithal to fulfill their responsibilities for education.

All that the Senator from New Hampshire and I are seeking to do by this approach is to get back into the hands of the States their own revenue, so that the States can fulfill their responsibilities for educating their young people.

If this approach were tried, and there were still a disproportion of opportunity for education among the children of the various States, then, if and when that point is reached, we might devise a formula for some type of redistribution of the tax money. However, until that point is reached, let us give the States some additional resources to fulfill their responsibilities, and see how they handle them.

There is another point that should be made. It is one of the reasons why I think S. 1021 was hung up in the House Committee on Rules. The proponents argued in favor of it on the basis of providing equality of educational opportunity. That is a noble objective. But in the same breath they said there would be no Federal controls, which meant no Federal standards. We know there cannot be equality of educational opportunity without standards. So the bill itself, while proposing a noble objective, held off the possibility for equality of educational opportunity by eliminating the possibility of Federal standards. I believe the failure to recognize that point is another of the reasons why the bill has not got out of the House Committee on Rules, and probably why it will never get out.

If this amendment were adopted, and if the amended McNamara amendment were then adopted, I do not believe the Senator from Oregon or anyone else would have to worry about the action of the conference committee in approving the bill, because this approach contains none of the elements which have caused so much dissatisfaction on the part of the House Committee on Rules and the Members of the House who support that approach.

In this one package I think we can fulfill the objectives not only of higher education, but also of primary and secondary education, without worries about parliamentary procedure and tactics.

I know what a wonderful work the Senator from Oregon did in handling S. 1021. I know how deeply he feels about the objectives of that bill. If he will accept this amendment and fight for it, so that it can be left in the bill, the objectives he fought for so hard in the last session can be achieved in this session. If those objectives are not fought for, then I am afraid we shall not have any benefits for primary and secondary education in this session of Congress.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I shall not take the time of the Senate or detain the distinguished Senator from Oregon by repeating the very cogent arguments offered by the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER]. However, I wish to make one point crystal clear.

The question of offering as an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan this proposal for returning a portion of the cigarette tax to the States for use in education has been debated on the floor of the Senate at least twice. It was my proposal 2 years ago when I first offered it. It was my proposal when I went before the Subcommittee on Education, as the Senator from Oregon will remember. Last year, together with the distinguished Senator from Iowa, I offered it on the floor of the Senate. We fought it out and had a yea-and-nay vote.

Speaking only for myself—because in what I am about to say I am not indicating, nor do I know, what the attitude of the Senator from Iowa is—I wish to make it very clear to the Senate and especially to the distinguished Senator from Oregon, the Senator in charge of the proposed legislation, that I agree with the Senator from Oregon that fundamentally the bill should have been restricted to a bill for higher education. I would not under any circumstances have tried to offer the so-called Miller-Cotton amendment to the bill if the Senator from Michigan had not opened the door and endeavored to substitute or write into the bill another rehash of S. 1021.

The Senate debated S. 1021. We tried to have our amendment adopted. We were defeated. The Senate worked its will. I did not vote for S. 1021, but it passed the Senate and has gone to the House.

So far as I am concerned, if the Senator from Michigan were to withdraw his amendment tomorrow morning, I would be in favor—and, again, I cannot speak for the Senator from Iowa—of instantly dropping this amendment. I would go along with the distinguished Senator from Oregon in the view that as the bill brought out in the hearings, it was a bill for higher institutions of learning, for college institutions, and that it is not advisable to complicate it. So I would vote against the amendment of the Senator from Michigan.

However, he has opened the door. By offering his amendment, he has endeavored to reopen the situation in regard to elementary and secondary schools. Therefore, I was most happy to associate myself, and I do associate myself, with the distinguished Senator from Iowa in offering our amendment, because if we are going back to the kind of proposal offered by the Senator from Michigan, we should have our day in court.

I simply make this statement. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] has ably recapitulated the arguments for this amendment. I believe in this amendment, and I shall continue to believe in it; and I shall take every opportunity afforded to me to fight for this proposal, because, first—as has been said—under it there will be no problem of allocation of funds; there will be no need for any complicated formulas which can never be quite satisfactory.

Second, this amendment avoids largely the problem of how this money may be used—the controversy which we have every year as to whether it shall be confined to construction, to classrooms, or whether it may be used for teachers' salaries, and so forth. Under this formula it is returned to the States. It was collected from the people within the States. It can be used in whatever way the States decide—for classrooms or for teachers' salaries—as long as it is used for education.

Third, it obviates the problem which has been such a roadblock in the way of Federal aid—the question of racial segregation and the question of aid to private and religious schools. As the Senator from Iowa has well stated, that is what is holding up the entire legislation in the House of Representatives. This effort has been made year after year, but each time we run squarely against that roadblock.

Fourth, no added Federal bureaucracy is needed to administer this bill, because the States maintain their own records in regard to retail sales of cigarettes in the States; and

Fifth, it is a complete answer to those who opposed Federal aid to education because they fear Federal control.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as part of my remarks, a preliminary estimate of annual receipts per State if 2 cents of the Federal tax on each package of cigarettes were returned to the States, as proposed by the Cotton-Miller amendment at the time when we offered it to Senate bill 1021.

There being no objection, the estimate was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Preliminary estimate of annual receipts per State if 2 cents of the Federal tax on each package of cigarettes were returned to States, as proposed by Senator Cotton's amendment to S. 1021

	Receipts in millions
Alabama	$5.60
Alaska	.50
Arizona	3.60
Arkansas	3.00
California	44.00
Colorado	4.00
Connecticut	8.00
Delaware	1.40
Florida	11.00
Georgia	8.50
Hawaii	1.10
Idaho	1.40
Illinois	35.00
Indiana	12.00
Iowa	6.20
Kansas	4.70
Kentucky	8.40
Louisiana	7.20
Maine	2.80
Maryland	8.00
Massachusetts	14.10
Michigan	19.10
Minnesota	8.30
Mississippi	4.00
Missouri	11.90
Montana	1.60
Nebraska	3.10
Nevada	1.15
New Hampshire	3.00
New Jersey	17.80
New Mexico	2.00
New York	$50.00
North Carolina	9.50
North Dakota	1.30
Ohio	26.00
Oklahoma	6.00
Oregon	4.50
Pennsylvania	23.00
Rhode Island	2.10
South Carolina	5.00
South Dakota	1.40
Tennessee	7.70
Texas	22.00
Utah	1.25
Vermont	1.10
Virginia	8.20
Washington	6.60
West Virginia	4.10
Wisconsin	9.20
Wyoming	1.00
District of Columbia	2.50
Total	455.00

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, in closing, I wish to say to the Senator from Oregon that I have made my position clear: I agree with him that this bill should be kept a college bill. I believe he is completely justified in the attitude he takes about the bill; and certainly he is not surrendering one bit of his constant fight for Senate bill 1021. But in view of the fact that this door has been opened, I believe we should have our day in court. Therefore we are offering this amendment to the McNamara amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall make a brief comment; and then I shall yield to other Senators.

I wish to say to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] that I appreciate very much his statement in regard to what his position on the pending bill would have been if the McNamara amendment had not been offered. I am grateful to him for making the record here this afternoon, when he places himself shoulder to shoulder with me on the matter of the parliamentary procedure which should be followed in the Senate in dealing with the pending bill. He was very kind; and it means a great deal to me to have him say that he thinks that from the standpoint of good legislative procedure in the Senate, we should keep the pending measure a higher education bill, and should not encumber and endanger it by adding to it amendments which deal with the subject matter of Senate bill 1021—in other words, elementary and secondary school legislation. I believe he is unanswerably correct in his statement in regard to the parliamentary procedure; but I fully appreciate the position in which he and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] find themselves—namely, that if we are to begin to digress from consideration of a higher education bill, then the door is open or the windows are open, so to speak, and certainly in that case it is then within the right of any Senator to proceed to offer any amendment he may care to offer to the bill—whether it be an amendment dealing with secondary school legislation or an amendment dealing with any other matter, I may say, subject only to the unanimous-consent agreement which has been entered into.

What the Senator from New Hampshire has said gives strong support to the position I took earlier this afternoon with most of the members of my subcommittee when I opposed the McNamara amendment. I said then, and I now repeat, that the McNamara amendment is really an amendment by way of legislative rider, and, in fact, it is not germane to the subject matter of the higher education bill. I should like to add—because I did not say this in my previous remarks—that this is not the first time in the Senate that I have opposed amendments by way of riders. Senators will remember that during the debate on Senate bill 1021, last year, other Senators sought to offer amendments which we thought really were not germane to the objectives of that bill.

Mr. President (Mr. METCALF in the Chair), the Chair will remember—because the Chair was then of great assistance to me in my opposition to the amendment I shall now mention—that at that time some Senators sought to add a civil rights amendment to Senate bill 1021. Those who proposed it had various motivations; some thought it should be added on the basis of its merits; others undoubtedly thought it would be helpful in killing the bill. I said then, and I repeat now, that I yield to no one in my record in the Senate in defense of civil rights. But I said that any legislative proposals dealing with civil rights should be offered as amendments to the existing civil rights law, and should not be added to an elementary-secondary school bill, because one of the costly effects of the latter course would be that the addition of such an amendment would be bound to jeopardize the possibility of the enactment of any such bill at all.

I repeat that I realize that I might be misunderstood by some who do not understand parliamentary procedure here in the Senate; in other words, it might be said by some that I was then voting against civil rights legislation. However, the fact is that I was voting against the addition of an amendment which I believed would have the effect of killing an elementary-secondary school bill. I said then that I thought that would be the effect of the amendment of the Senator from Michigan, if it were to prevail; and I said I hoped it would not prevail.

However, Mr. President, now that the amendment has been offered, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] certainly have a right to step through that door, so to speak. I opposed the amendment before, and I oppose it now; and I wish to say that I disagree with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER]. I do not believe that if we only agree to this amendment, we shall have no difficulty in getting the Rules Committee to adopt a rule for the bill in the House. I say that I believe that would not make any difference to the Rules Committee, insofar as opposition to Senate bill 1021, or opposition to Senate bill 1021 when amended by the Miller-Cotton amendment, is concerned, because in the Rules Committee—and let us not mince words about this matter—the issue is over aid to private schools. That is the issue there.

The reason why we cannot get a majority vote in the House Rules Committee is that a member of that committee has made it crystal clear that he would not help give a majority vote in the Rules Committee until there was a surrender to the private-school forces. In other words, until the public school bill was modified to insure that the private schools would be treated exactly as the public schools were. I said then, and I repeat now, that I favor fighting out the battle on that front. The Miller-Cotton amendment will not make any difference in connection with that fight.

But I wish to say, Mr. President, that the American people, the parents of these boys and girls—Catholics, Protestants, Jews, and non-believers, too—must make their position clear to the leaders of the private-school forces, to those who are taking the adamant position of "all or nothing," and who are saying "Either there will be an elementary-secondary school bill that provides the same treatment to private schools, or there will be no public-school bill at all." I say to all those parents that the time has come, in acting in defense of the education of their boys and girls, they should make clear to the leaders of the private-school forces that as parents and citizens they are going to make clear to their Representatives that they want the public-school bill passed in the House of Representatives, that as parents and citizens they want the bill voted on in the House as soon as possible. I also say—as I have said across America during the months following the adjournment, last fall—that in the months ahead, Americans should put this issue squarely up to the elected representatives of the people in the House of Representatives—squarely up to any Member of the House who takes the "all or none" approach to this matter.

If a Member takes the position that there will be no Federal aid to education bill unless there is support for what many consider to be a violation of the first amendment of the Constitution, his constituents should let him know their views frankly. I do not care whether he is a Democrat or Republican. I say that, in my judgment, every candidate for the House of Representatives in the 1962 election, whether he be a Democrat or Republican, who takes an all-or-none approach to Federal aid to education has a duty to, and should make clear to the voters his position so that they can decide upon whether or not he should be returned.

This whole situation of church and State relationship is basic in the Rules Committee problem, and the Cotton-Miller amendment, I believe, would not make one whit of difference.

I close by asking unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at the appropriate points in the RECORD such material as the staff of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, through me, wishes to insert in the RECORD to buttress and support the position that I have taken as floor leader of the bill. The Presiding Officer will remember that in some instances we talked about National Defense Education Act. I want to put material pertaining to that bill in the RECORD. We talked about college housing. I want to put material pertaining to that subject in the RECORD. I assure the Presiding Officer and the Senate that we will put in the RECORD only such material as is germane and coming out of the files of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There being no objection, the materials ordered to be printed in the RECORD are as follows:

CURRENT INTEREST RATE ON ACADEMIC FACILITY LOANS, TITLE I OF S. 1241

At present, the Commissioner of Education, under the bill as amended in committee, would have to charge interest on loans at an annual rate of 3⅜ percent. This is the same as the rate now charged under the college housing program and is arrived at as follows:

The bill, as amended in committee, provides that loans for academic facilities shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Commissioner of Education which shall not be less than one-fourth of 1 percentage point above the interest rate paid by the Commissioner on funds obtained from the Secretary of the Treasury (p. 4, lines 4–10). The Commissioner's borrowings from the Secretary of the Treasury shall bear interest at a rate equal to the average annual interest rate on all interest-bearing obligations of the United States forming a part of the public debt as computed at the end of the fiscal year next preceding the issuance of the notes or other obligations of the Commissioner to the Treasury, and adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of 1 percent (p. 5, lines 6–11).

The average interest rate on the public debt as of the end of the last fiscal year adjusted to the nearest one-eighth percent is 3⅛ percent. To this, the Commissioner would add one-fourth of 1 percent so that he would charge 3⅜ percent as a minimum.

FEDERAL PROGRAMS UNDER WHICH INSTITUTIONS WITH RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION RECEIVE FEDERAL FUNDS THROUGH GRANTS OR LOANS

Following is a description of Federal programs under which educational institutions with religious affiliation receive Federal funds through grants or loans. The following should be kept in mind in using this material:

1. Payments to institutions for which the United States receives a quid pro quo in a proprietary sense are outside the scope of the attached listing. However, Federal programs are so diverse that a clear line in this respect is not always possible, and many programs, not listed here because the Federal Government receives such a quid pro quo, are frequently of benefit to institutions.[1]

2. Programs to pay institutions for training Government civilian or military personnel are not included here. See, for example, 5 U.S.C. 2301 for a Government-wide employees' training program.

3. Except as noted under item 3 of the description of programs of the State Department, and in the case of payments for the education of Indian children, institutions with religious affiliation participate in all of the programs listed.[2]

25 U.S.C. 280 authorized the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent to religious organizations for lands used by them prior to Sept. 21, 1922, for mission or school purposes.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education

A. National Defense Education Act Programs

1. National defense student loan program (National Defense Education Act (Public Law 85–864), sec. 201 et seq.; 20 U.S.C. 421 et seq.):

Funds are made available by the Commissioner of Education under title II of the National Defense Education Act to enable public and private nonprofit institutions of higher education to make low-interest loans to needy students.

The Federal Government advances up to 90 percent of the capital needed for a loan fund at an institution.[3] In any fiscal year, the Federal capital contribution at any institution may not exceed $250,000. The loan to an individual student may not exceed $1,000 for a fiscal year and no student may borrow more than $5,000 for all years. Special consideration must be given in providing loans to students with superior academic backgrounds who express a desire to teach in elementary or secondary schools (not necessarily those which are public) and students with strong academic backgrounds in science, mathematics, engineering, or a modern foreign language, but other students may also receive loans. Each note must provide that up to 10 percent of the loan (plus interest) will be canceled for each year of service as a full-time teacher in a public elementary or secondary school, but not more than 50 percent of a loan can be canceled in this manner.

2. National defense fellowships (National Defense Education Act (Public Law 85–864), sec. 404; 20 U.S.C. 464):

Graduate programs in institutions of higher education are given quotas by the Commissioner of Education for the award of graduate fellowships. The Commissioner awards 1,500 fellowships per year for periods of study in such programs, not in excess of 3 academic years. The individual receiving the fellowship receives $2,000 to $2,400 per year, depending on the year of study, plus an allowance for dependents. In addition, the institution which the individual attends receives the portion of the cost attributable to such individual's study not to exceed $2,500 per fellowship holder per academic year.

3. Loans to nonprofit private schools (National Defense Education Act (Public Law 85–864), sec. 305; 20 U.S.C. 445):

Title III of National Defense Education Act is designed to strengthen science, mathematics, and modern foreign language instruction in elementary and secondary schools. The title contains provisions for grants to strengthen State supervisory services for public elementary and secondary schools and for grants to enable public elementary and secondary schools to acquire science, mathematics, and modern foreign language equipment (and at remodel space used for such equipment).

---

[1] 52 U.S.C. 1891–1893 provides that authority to contract for basic scientific research at nonprofit institutions of higher education shall be deemed authority to make grants for that purpose. Furthermore, authority to make grants or contracts for basic or applied research at such institutions provides authority to vest in the institution title to equipment purchased with grant or contract funds, without further obligation to the Government.

[2] No statute has been found where authority to deal with nonpublic institutions excludes dealing with those with religious affiliation, except 25 U.S.C. 278, 279. The law declares "the settled policy of the Government to make no appropriation whatever out of the Treasury of the United States for education of Indian children in any sectarian school." Subsistence and clothing are provided for some children in such schools.

[3] The Commissioner may make loans to institutions to help them finance their required 10 percent advance to the loan fund, where such funds cannot be secured from non-Federal sources upon terms and conditions deemed reasonable by the Commissioner. The term is up to 15 years with interest at such rate as the Commissioner determines will cover all costs to the Government, including probable losses.

Twelve percent of each appropriation for the acquisition of science, mathematics, or foreign language equipment (or minor remodeling of space for such equipment) is required to be allotted by the Commissioner of Education for loans to private, nonprofit, elementary and secondary schools. Affiliation or nonaffiliation with a religious organization is immaterial. The loans are authorized to enable the borrowing school to acquire equipment of the types referred to above (and do minor remodeling) and must bear interest at one-fourth of 1 percent above the current average yield on all outstanding marketable obligations of the United States, adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of 1 percent. Such loans must mature within 10 years.

4. Testing students in secondary schools (National Defense Education Act (Public Law 85–864), sec. 504(b); 20 U.S.C. 484(b)):

Under title V of the National Defense Education Act, grants to State educational agencies may be used, among other things, for testing students in secondary schools, public or private. The Federal participation through the State grant is one-half the cost of such testing. The section cited above provides that in any State with an approved State plan which is not authorized by law to pay for the cost of testing students in one or more secondary schools, the Commissioner of Education shall arrange for the testing of such students and pay one-half the cost thereof (for the first fiscal year of the program the payment for testing was the full cost). In carrying out this provision during the 1960–61 school year, the Commissioner arranged for testing students in private secondary schools of 40 States. (For purposes of the act the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, and Guam are treated as States.)

The provision for the Commissioner to arrange testing was inserted in the law because of the knowledge that in some States the State educational agency would not have authority to make payments toward the testing of students in nonpublic schools, particularly those with religious affiliation.

5. Institutes for training secondary school counselors and institutes for training modern foreign language teachers (National Defense Education Act (Public Law 85–864), secs. 511, 611; 20 U.S.C. 491, 521):

The Commissioner of Education is authorized to contract with institutions of higher education for summer and regular academic year training programs to improve the qualifications of counselors in secondary schools and modern foreign language teachers. The teachers from public, sectarian or any other types of private schools receive the opportunity for training without tuition costs. However, the act authorizes the Commissioner to pay a stipend for subsistence only to those who are to teach in public schools.

Although the instruction is conducted under a "contractual" arrangement pursuant to statute, it is included in this listing because the effect is very similar to that of a grant. The contract finances educational services by which the participating institutions serve a segment of people whom it would be their normal function to train.

6. Language and area centers (National Defense Education Act (Public Law 85–864), sec. 601(a); 20 U.S.C. 511(a)):

The Commissioner of Education is authorized to arrange through "contracts" with institutions of higher education for the establishment and operation by them of centers for the teaching of certain modern foreign languages and studies related to the cultures in which such languages are used. The languages are confined to those for which trained individuals are needed in business, government or education. While the statute authorizes only "contracts" for payment of one-half the cost, the program has all the earmarks of a grant situation.

7. Language fellowships (National Defense Education Act (Public Law 85–864), sec. 601(b); 20 U.S.C. 511(b)):

The Commissioner of Education is authorized to pay stipends to individuals undergoing advanced training in any modern foreign language with respect to which he determines there is a special need in business, government, or education. No payment is made to the institutions of higher education, although the stipend is so computed as to include an amount which will enable the individual to meet his tuition and subsistence needs.

8. Foreign language research (National Defense Education Act (Public Law 85–864), sec. 602; 20 U.S.C. 512):

The Commissioner of Education is authorized to contract for studies and surveys relating to the need for improved instruction in modern foreign languages and research in effective methods of improving such instruction. While the statute provides for a contractual arrangement, the program has many of the attributes of a grant situation.

9. Research and experimentation in more effective utilization of television, radio, motion pictures and related media (National Defense Education Act (Public Law 85–864), sec. 702; 20 U.S.C. 542):

In carrying out his authorization to make grants or contracts for research, experimentation, and dissemination of information in the development of methods for utilizing new media of communication for educational purposes, the Commissioner of Education has frequently paid for research, experimentation and dissemination activities of institutions of higher education without regard to religious affiliation.

B. Grants for Teaching in the Education of Mentally Retarded Children (Public Law 85–926, Sec. 1, as Amended by Public Law 86–158 at 73 Stat. 346 (20 U.S.C. 611))

The Commissioner of Education makes grants to public or other nonprofit institutions of higher education to assist them in providing training of teachers in fields related to the education of mentally retarded children. These grants may be used both in connection with the costs of instruction and for establishing and maintaining fellowships. This is a new program under which grants have been made to only 19 institutions. One of these is known to have religious affiliation.

C. Cooperative Research on Problems in Education (Public Law 531, 83d Cong., Sec. 1; 20 U.S.C. 331)

The Commissioner of Education is authorized to contract or make other jointly financed cooperative arrangements with institutions of higher education for studies and research on problems in education. In practice all arrangements have been made through contract. The program is listed here, however, because it has many of the attributes of a grant situation.

Public Health Service

A. Health Research Project Grants (PHS Act, Sec. 301(d); 42 U.S.C. 241(d) Public Law 660—84th Cong.; 33 U.S.C. 466, et seq. Public Law 159—84th Cong.; 42 U.S.C. 1857, et seq.)

Grants are authorized to defray the cost of research projects relating to the causes, prevention, treatment, or control of the physical and mental diseases and impairments of man, and also relating to the cause, control, and prevention of air and water pollution.[4]

B. Construction of Hospitals and Other Medical Facilities (PHS Act, Title VI; 42 U.S.C. 291, et seq.)

Grants are authorized to meet from one-third to two-thirds the cost of construction of general hospitals and other medical facilities. Such other facilities include hospital-related housing for nurses and nursing homes.

C. Construction of Health Research Facilities (PHS Act, Title VII; 42 U.S.C. 292, et seq.)

Grants are authorized to meet up to 50 percent of the cost of construction, remodeling or equipping of facilities for the conduct of research in the sciences related to health.

D. Categorical Training Grants and Traineeships (PHS Act, Secs. 403, 412, 422, 433(a) and 303; 42 U.S.C. 283, 287a, 288a, 289c and 242a)

Grants may be made to training institutions to meet the costs of providing specialized, technical or advanced training with respect to particular diseases of public health significance (cancer, heart disease, mental health, etc.) or with respect to air or water pollution (42 U.S.C. 1857; 33 U.S.C. 466). One example of such grants were those by the National Institute of Mental Health to schools of divinity of the three major faiths to develop on a 5-year pilot basis improved instruction in mental health. Authority is also provided for awarding traineeships to individuals, selected either by the training school or by the Public Health Service, to provide them subsistence support and expenses during their period of categorical training (42 C.F.R., pts. 63 and 64).

E. Research Fellowship Grants and Awards (PHS Act, Secs. 301(c), 433(a); 42 U.S.C. 241(c), 289c)

Authority is provided to award fellowships to individuals selected by the service, or to make grants to institutions to permit them to award fellowships, for the purpose of providing subsistence support and expenses to an individual in his conduct of research or in his acquisition of research training (42 C.F.R., pt. 61).

F. Traineeships for Professional Public Health Personnel (PHS Act, Sec. 306, 42 U.S.C. 242d)

Authority is provided for awards either directly to individuals or by means of grants to the training institution to cover the cost of the individual's tuition, fees and subsistence during his graduate or specialized training in public health for physicians, engineers, nurses and other professional health personnel.

G. Advanced Training of Professional Nurses (PHS Act. Sec. 307; 41 U.S.C. 242e)

Authority is provided for the award of traineeships by grants to training institutions to cover the cost of tuition, fee, stipends, and allowances of professional nurses being trained to teach or to serve in an administrative or supervisory capacity.

---

[4] A recent amendment (Public Law 86–798) has also authorized the use of up to 15 percent of the amounts appropriated for health research projects for grants to nonprofit universities or other institutions for the general support of their health research and research training programs. While no such grants have yet been made, present plans are to make awards without regard to the religious affiliation of the grantees.

H. Project Grants for Graduate Training in Public Health (PHS Act, Sec. 309; 42 U.S.C. 242g)

Project grants are authorized to be awarded to schools of public health, nursing or engineering to meet the costs of graduate or specialized training in public health for nurses or engineers and for the purpose of strengthening or expanding graduate public health training in such schools.

I. Indian Health—Aid in Construction of Community Hospitals (Public Law 85-151; U.S.C. 2005)

Grants are authorized to aid in the construction of community hospitals based on the proportion of construction costs attributable to the health needs of the Indians in the community.

J. Cancer Control Grants (Public Law 86-703)

Under authority of the current Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act (Public Law 86-703), grants are made to hospitals, universities, or other such institutions, for the conduct of cancer prevention, control, and eradication programs.

Office of Vocational Rehabilitation

A. Grants for Research, Demonstration and Training Projects Related to Vocational Rehabilitation (Vocational Rehabilitation act (Public Law 565, 83d Cong.), Sec. 4(a); 29 U.S.C. 34(a))

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to make grants to public and other nonprofit organizations for paying a part of the cost of projects for research and demonstrations in the field of vocational rehabilitation and training of individuals in professional fields which provide services to physically handicapped individuals. Many of the grants for research and demonstration are made to institutions of higher education, and most of the grants for training are made to such institutions. The training grants include an amount to enable the institutions to pay stipends to persons in training.

B. Vocational Rehabilitation Fellowships (Vocational Rehabilitation Act (Public Law 565, 83d Cong.), Sec. 7(a)(3); 29 U.S.C. 37(a)(3))

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to provide training in technical matters relating to vocational rehabilitation services, including the establishment and maintenance of research fellowships with stipends and allowances. Pursuant to this a limited number of research fellowships are awarded for study and research at various institutions of higher education.

Social Security Administration

A. Cooperative Research or Demonstration Projects (Sec. 1110 of the Social Security Act, as Added by Sec. 331 of Public Law 880, 84th Cong.; 42 U.S.C. 1310)

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to make grants to or contracts with public and other nonprofit organizations for paying part of the cost of research or demonstration projects relating to public welfare and social security matters. While the enabling legislation was effective for fiscal year 1957, appropriations were first available to carry out this program during the 1961 fiscal year. There has been made available $350,000 for this purpose, and it is anticipated that one-third to one-half of that amount will be for financing projects at institutions of higher education. In the approval of such projects no distinction is made because of religious affiliation of an institution.

B. Children's Bureau—Special Projects Relating to Crippled Children and Maternal and Child Health Services (Secs. 502(b) and 512(b) of the Social Security Act, as Amended by Secs. 707(b)(1)(A) and 707 (b)(2)(A) of Public Law 86-778; 42 U.S.C. 702(b) and 712(b))

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to make grants to State health agencies and nonprofit institutions of higher education for special projects in the field of services for crippled children and maternal and child health. Up to now such projects have been financed by State agencies as the result of receiving grants from the Federal Government. In the future, however, grants will be made directly from the Federal Government, and no distinction is planned with respect to sectarian institutions.

Office of Field Administration

Surplus Property Utilization Program (Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (Public Law 152, 81st Cong.), as Amended, Secs. 203(j) and 203(k); 40 U.S.C. 484 (j) and (k))

Under these provisions the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to allocate surplus personal property for transfer by the Administrator of General Services to State agencies for distribution to educational, health and civil defense organizations. Surplus real estate assigned by the General Services Administrator is transferred by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for educational and public health purposes at a public benefit discount which can be as much as 100 percent of the appraised fair value. The institutions which receive real and personal property include public and private nonprofit elementary and secondary schools and institutions of higher education.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Aid for nuclear equipment and loan of nuclear materials to colleges (Atomic Energy Act of 1946 (Public Law 585, 79th Cong.), as amended, secs. 3(a), 5(c)(2); 42 U.S.C. 2051, 2111)

The Atomic Energy Commission operates a variety of programs under which support is given for activities in institutions of higher education. For purposes of this listing these programs are grouped as follows:

1. Special fellowships for study at institutions of higher education under which payments are made to individuals to cover tuition and subsistence costs for students in nuclear science and engineering and for graduate work in the atomic energy aspects of the life sciences.

2. Grants to institutions to enable them to acquire:

(a) nuclear laboratory equipment;

(b) research reactors; and

(c) teaching aids and laboratory equipment for radioisotope technology.

3. Loans of materials for instruction in nuclear fields and for research reactors.

4. Support of research in institutions of higher education through grants or contracts in various fields involving atomic energy.

5. Summer institutes in institutions of higher education to train teachers in various fields relating to atomic energy. Instructional costs are defrayed by the Atomic Energy Commission; stipends to teachers, who may be from schools with religious affiliation are paid by the National Science Foundation. (Cf. National Defense Education Act counseling and foreign language institutes where, because of statute, stipends are paid only to public school teachers.)

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

A. Vocational rehabilitation (veterans' benefits (Public Law 85–857), ch. 31, secs. 1503, 1504; 38 U.S.C. 1503, 1504)

Training is purchased from educational institutions of all types, including those with sectarian affiliation, for the rehabilitation of war veterans with service-connected disabilities. In addition, a subsistence allowance is paid the veteran.

B. Educational benefits for World War II and Korean veterans (veterans' benefits (Public Law 85–857), ch. 33, sec. 1601 et seq.; 38 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.)

Educational benefits for veterans of World War II were included in Public Law 346, 78th Congress. Under the original arrangement, a tuition payment was made directly to the school which the veteran attended, and this could include a theological school. In addition, a subsistence payment was made to the veteran. The arrangement for payment of tuition directly to the school was changed by Public Law 550, 82d Congress, which authorized a payment to the veteran and left it to him to take care of any tuition charges. The program for World War II veterans ended in July 1956, except for a small number of persons who were entitled to training benefits beyond that date. The present program authorized by Public Law 85–857 provides for an education and training allowance directly to the veteran. Small allowances are paid to each educational institution to reimburse it for the cost of making required reports to the Veterans' Administration regarding the veterans in attendance (38 U.S.C. 1645).

C. War orphans educational assistance (veterans' benefits (Public Law 85–857), ch. 35, secs. 1701 et seq.; 38 U.S.S. 1701 et seq.)

This program provides educational opportunities for children of wartime veterans who died from a service-incurred disease or injury. The student must be pursuing an approved program of education in an institution of higher education or in a vocational school below the college level.

Payments are made directly to the student to meet in part the expense of his tuition and subsistence. The Veterans' Administrator is required to pay each educational institution $1 per month for each eligible person enrolled to assist in defraying the cost of preparing and submitting reports (38 U.S.C. 1765).

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

(National Science Foundation Act of 1950 (Public Law 507, 81st Cong.), secs. 3(a) (2), (3), (4), and (b), 11(c) and 14, as amended by Public Law 85–510, sec. 2 and Public Law 86–232, sec. 1; 42 U.S.C. 1862 (a), (2), (3), (4) and (b), 1870(c) and 1872a(b))

Pursuant to broad statutory authorizations to foster research and education in scientific fields, the National Science Foundation provides the following support for activities in institutions of higher education:

1. Fellowships for various types of graduate studies include allowance for tuition and subsistence and permit study at any accredited nonprofit institution of higher education in the United States or abroad.

2. Summer, academic year, and inservice institutes are financed at institutions of higher education through stipend and tuition payments to improve the qualifications of high school and college teachers in science and mathematics. Stipends are paid without regard to the fact that the teacher is from a school with religious affiliation. (Cf. National Defense Education Act counseling and foreign language institutes (p. 4, supra)

where, because of statute, stipends are paid only to public school teachers.)

3. Special projects in science education are financed to provide the experimental testing and development of promising new ideas for the improvement of science instruction.

4. Programs are financed to improve course content and supplementary teaching aids in science.

5. Grants are made for basic research in the sciences, including funds for the use of graduate students as research assistants.

STATE DEPARTMENT

The State Department supports educational activities to a considerable extent by a variety of programs for international exchange, improvement of cultural relationships and rendering of technical assistance to foreign countries. Basically, under the programs students from this country are permitted to attend educational institutions abroad and students from foreign countries are permitted to attend educational institutions in this country. In either case payments are made to cover the cost of instruction and subsistence. For the education of foreign students in this country, the State Department makes contractual arrangements with the Institute of International Education, a private nonprofit organization in New York City, which in turn sponsors and makes specific arrangements for educating the foreign students. Training for a profession in religion is not financed but schools with religious affiliation are used. In performing this service IEE gives financial aid to the students to cover tuition and other related student costs.

The State Department has also made direct financial arrangements with universities and charitable organizations in this country to provide student leader seminars, high school training for teenagers, and English language classes for foreign students. In addition, the State Department has a variety of exchange and other educational programs by which foreign individuals are able to study in this country with the assistance of other Government agencies and private educational organizations. Examples of programs are:

1. U.S. information and educational exchange programs. 22 U.S.C. 1991 et seq.

2. Technical cooperation with foreign countries. 22 U.S.C 1891 et seq.

Under 22 U.S.C. 1448, a program has been implemented for technical cooperation in the form of assistance to schools abroad, founded or sponsored by citizens of the United States and serving as demonstration centers for methods and practices employed in the United States in certain areas of training. A specific limitation of this program established by the State Department is that no funds may be channeled to a school operated under religious auspices.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

The Department of Defense has a number of training and research programs which finance activities at institutions of higher education. Research contracts fall under the procurement authority of each of the three branches of the Armed Forces. Thus, research is supported because of benefits to be received by the Defense Department and training is paid for because it improves the qualifications of military and civilian personnel. Such arrangements have also been made on a grant basis to institutions pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1891–1893, which specifies that the authority to contract for certain scientific research at nonprofit institutions of higher education shall be deemed to be authority to make grants.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Business management research (Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (Public Law 85–699), sec. 602(c); 15 U.S.C. 636(d))

The Small Business Administration is authorized to make grants to various organizations including colleges, universities, and schools of business for research in the field of business management and finance.

Grants have been made in prior years including those to institutions with religious affiliation. No funds are available to conduct this activity for the 1961 fiscal year.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

A. National school lunch program (National School Lunch Act (Public Law 396, 79th Cong.), as amended; 42 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.)

The purpose of this program is to improve the health and well-being of the Nation's children by providing funds and foods to States and territories for use in serving nutritious midday meals to children attending schools of high school grade and less. The Federal assistance is through payments to the educational agency of each State which then channels the aid to participating schools. However, 42 U.S.C. 1759 provides that in any State where the State educational agency is not permitted by law to disburse the funds to nonprofit schools they shall be disbursed directly to such schools for program purposes. In more than half of the States the educational agency has considered that it could not make the funds available to nonprofit private schools and as a result in those States the Secretary of Agriculture makes funds available directly to such nonprofit schools, including those with religious affiliation.

B. Special milk program (Agricultural Act of 1954 (Public Law 690, 83d Cong.), sec. 204(b); 7 U.S.C. 1446(c))

Under this program funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation are used to increase the consumption of fluid milk by children in nonprofit schools of high school grade and under, in nonprofit nursery schools, child care centers, etc., devoted to the care and training of children.

C. Forestry research (Public Law 466, 70th Cong., sec. 1; 16 U.S.C. 581)

The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to conduct research relating to reforestation and forest products through arrangements with outside organizations. A part of this program is conducted through cooperative arrangements with colleges and universities, and at least one such arrangement has been made with a university with religious affiliation.

D. Use of national forests (30 Stat. 36, 55th Cong.; 16 U.S.C. 479)

The Act of June 4, 1897, cited above, authorizes a group of persons residing in the vicinity of national forests to occupy not exceeding 2 acres of forest land for the erection of a school and not exceeding 1 acre for the erection of a church. One hundred and sixty-three schools were on forest land on June 30, 1959. Information is not available as to possible religious affiliation, but it is believed that few if any of such schools have religious affiliation. There is, however, no rule to prevent erection of a school because of such affiliation.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

University research program (National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 (Public Law 85–568), sec. 203(b)(5); 42 U.S.C. 2473 (b)(5))

Research is conducted through contract with institutions of higher education in matters within the scope of interest of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The agency has also made grants to institutions with religious affiliation pursuant to the provision of 42 U.S.C. 1891–1893, which provides that authority to contract with institutions of higher education for certain types of research shall also include the authority to make grants.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Education of Indian children

Title 25, United States Code, section 278, declares it "to be the settled policy of the Government to make no appropriation whatever out of the Treasury of the United States for education of Indian children in any sectarian school." (See *Quick Bear* v. *Leupp* (1908), 210 U.S. 50, holding that a similar prohibition did not apply to an appropriation from funds held by the United States "in trust" for a tribe.) Title 25, United States Code, section 279, authorizes the Secretary to provide Indian children in missions with the rations and clothing to which they would be entitled under treaty stipulations if living with their parents.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs arranges for the placement of Indian children in schools with religious affiliation only because of special circumstances. In such cases they make no payment toward instructional costs but do use welfare funds to pay the institution for other needs of the children.

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

College housing loan program (Housing Act of 1950 (Public Law 475, 81st Cong.), sec. 401 et seq.; 12 U.S.C. 1749)

The Housing and Home Finance Administrator is authorized to make construction loans to assist public and private nonprofit institutions offering at least a 2-year program of higher education and public and private nonprofit hospitals operating student nurse or internship programs so that they may provide new or improved housing and other related facilities (such as dining rooms, student centers, and infirmaries) for students and faculties. Under this program, loans are made only where the institution is unable to secure funds for such purposes from other sources upon equally favorable terms and conditions. The loans can cover up to the full cost of construction and have a maturity of up to 50 years, with interest one-fourth of 1 percent above the average interest rate on all outstanding Federal obligations.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. I took this time to ask the Senator from Oregon to yield because I wanted to compliment him on the very fine statement he has made about the position he has taken with respect to the pending bill, with which I completely and entirely concur. I yield only to the Senator from Oregon in my interest in education. He is the only man in America who I think has tried to do more for education than I.

It is completely consistent with the position which the Senator from Oregon and I have taken on the floor of the Senate, throughout the country, in speeches all over America, to oppose the Cotton-Miller amendment or the McNamara amendment to the bill, because they have no place either legislatively, in the order or legislative procedure, or traditionally, in this legislation.

I compliment the chairman of the subcommittee for coming here and taking this stand. I want him to know that tomorrow I shall vote with him both in opposition to the Cotton-Miller amendment and the McNamara amendment, even though the McNamara amendment seeks to achieve what we tried to do in S. 1021.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator from Montana has been very kind in his remarks, but I look to him as one of my leaders in the field of education, because his great record in the House of Representatives, plus his record here in the Senate, make him one of the leaders. As a matter of fact, the Senator is not a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, but we frequently called him into consultation last year. Time after time we call him into conferences to act in an advisory capacity, particularly because of his great leadership in the House.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I, too, wish to join in compliment of the leadership the Senator from Oregon has taken on this bill. I have not been heard from yet on the bill, but I will be tomorrow. I think the Senator knows of my fidelity to the obligations undertaken as a member of the subcommittee in seeing that we get action on as much of this legislative package as we can.

It seems to me those who do any real thinking on the higher education bill must equate it with the posture we occupy in the world. We are not living in a vacuum as to this bill.

I hope the rest of the debate will demonstrate what the Senator from Oregon has initiated—the place which the bill has in the framework of freedom, in defense of our national security, and our leadership in the free world.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I agree wholeheartedly that the so-called McNamara amendment should be defeated. This position does not mean that I would necessarily vote against the Cotton-Miller amendment, because I would rather see the McNamara amendment amended in this fashion if it should pass the Senate. I do not want to jeopardize the higher education support contained in the bill, although I may have some amendments to offer to it myself.

We have certain specified needs in this bill that we must take care of, and I personally do not want to jeopardize them in the House by adding the amendment to it. We can face that situation when we come to it. Some of us will disagree on it, as we have in the past, but we will take care of it when we come to it.

DAY CARE CENTERS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am gratified to note that the President of the United States in his message to the Congress outlining his public welfare program made certain recommendations for Federal aid to the States for local day care programs for children of working mothers. This is a welcome step in the right direction. The President recommended earmarking up to $5 million of social security funds for grants to the States in 1963 and $10 million a year thereafter. I believe, however, the provision suggested to be inadequate to the purpose.

I have been calling attention to the need for a Federal program of day care assistance for a long time, and in the 86th Congress I introduced "The Day Care Assistance Act of 1959," authorizing a Federal program of $12.5 million annually, to be allotted to the States on a matching dollar for dollar basis, and $12.5 million to be administered to "impacted" areas.

Again, in the first session of the 87th Congress, on March 7, 1961, I introduced legislation to establish a program of Federal aid to improve day care services in the same amount. That bill, S. 1209, has been endorsed by the Day Care Council of New York, Inc., a voluntary group that has pioneered in the improvement of day care services; and by the National Committee for the Day Care of Children.

I am also a cosponsor of S. 1131, which would amend the Social Security Act to establish and operate day care centers for children of migrant agricultural workers.

My bill would make available a total of $25 million a year in Federal funds for this much-needed program of day care centers—a far more realistic sum of money to meet the need. It is moreover, the kind of proposal also that incorporates Republican principles of Federal-State responsibility. I have been calling for hearings by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and I hope now that they will be given an early schedule.

REPORT OF OUTDOOR RECREATION RESOURCES REVIEW COMMISSION

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, on January 31, 1962, the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission submitted its report, and this important document should not go unnoticed. Having just concluded a study of this 246-page report, I find there are some aspects of it which warrant comment.

The Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission was established by an act of Congress in June of 1958 with a threefold mission:

First. To determine the outdoor recreation wants and needs of the American people now and what they will be in the years 1976 and 2000.

Second. To determine the recreation resources of the Nation available to satisfy those needs now and in the years 1976 and 2000.

Third. To determine what policies and programs should be recommended to insure that the needs of the present and future are adequately and efficiently met.

Created as a bipartisan commission, its members are a distinguished group drawn from Congress as well as those in private life. Under the chairmanship of Laurance S. Rockefeller, a comprehensive and well-documented report has been furnished which will have a great influence, and surely will help guide the thinking of Senate and House Members as regards this important area. Unfortunately, the size of the staff and the advisory council is too large to permit individual recognition. However, I am certain that I express the feeling of all in extending plaudits for the work which has been put into the report. Members of the Commission who have also earned our gratitude, in addition to the Chairman, are: Senator Clinton P. Anderson, Senator Henry C. Dworshak, Senator Henry M. Jackson, Senator Jack R. Miller, Representative John P. Saylor, Representative Gracie Pfost, Representative Ralph J. Rivers, Representative John Kyl, Mr. Samuel T. Dana, Mr. Bernard L. Orell, Mrs. Marian S. Dryfoos, Mr. Joseph W. Penfold, Mr. M. Frederik Smith, and Mr. Chester S. Wilson.

Recreation resources are becoming a matter of ever-increasing importance in view of the developments and changes taking place in this country. As leisure time increases, as personal income increases, it becomes imperative that recreation needs be provided for, adequately. While recognizing that the Federal Government must play a role, part of which the report suggests takes the form of a Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, within the Department of the Interior, it is significant that the States are charged with a great responsibility to protect and enhance recreation resources. Government is charged with three basic responsibilities: First, to insure access to the outdoor environment and an opportunity to benefit from such activities as enjoyment of scenery and wildlife, picnicking, and hiking; second, to recognize the importance of recreation in the management of its own lands; and third, to preserve certain outstanding resources for future generations. On the other hand, the States are described as playing the pivotal role in providing outdoor recreation opportunities for their citizens.

Stress is laid throughout upon the fact that to a large degree there has been a failure to use well what is already available in the way of resources, and that the problem is essentially one of management. There is, however, one area of real need, and that is shoreline along the Atlantic, gulf, and Pacific coasts, as well as the Great Lakes. Under the able leadership of Senator ANDERSON, we in the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee are making strides in this area. The Cape Cod bill was signed into law last session; Padre Island and Point Reyes National Seashores are under consideration, and there is a study proposed for inland shorelines as well.

The report recommends a system of classifying recreation resources into six categories, one of which, class V, is termed the "primitive areas." The suggestion was made last year as we were considering S. 174, the wilderness bill, that we might be well advised to postpone action on it, pending this very report. It is unfortunate that the suggestion was not followed. In the primitive area category, the ORRRC has the following to say:

> Areas in this class are inspirational, esthetic, scientific, and cultural assets of the

> highest value. They, and they alone, satisfy the longing to leave behind for a time all contact with civilization. Fortunately, they are a resource of which the country still has an abundant supply, and which it can afford to preserve from other uses for the benefit of future generations. At the same time, it must be recognized that there are some areas which meet the physical requirements of this class but which, for economic and social reasons, are more valuable for some other purposes.

The report goes on to recommend:

> Primitive areas (class V) should be carefully selected and should be managed for the sole and unequivocal purpose of maintaining their primitive characteristics.

At another point the recommendation regarding these areas is as follows:

> There is widespread feeling, which the Commission shares, that the Congress should take action to assure the permanent reservation of these and similar suitable areas in national forest, national parks, wildlife refuges, and other lands in Federal ownership. The objective in the management of all class V areas, irrespective of size or ownership is the same—to preserve primitive conditions. The purpose of legislation to designate outstanding areas in this class in Federal ownership as wilderness areas is to give the increased assurance of attaining this objective that action by the Congress will provide.

In passing, I might say that the Commission apparently does not share the sense of urgency which some supporters of wilderness legislation were wont to express. For the Members of the other body, presently considering this legislation, I would call attention, particularly, to that language which suggests that areas for inclusion in wilderness be chosen with care. I detect the possibility that this could better be accomplished by a congressional review of areas to be included, prior to such inclusion.

The report does a great service by crystallizing the areas of interest and need. In this and other respects, the Commission has performed a very useful service, and I commend them for it. I trust that the report will be available, as a public document, to the general public. In my own office there have already been a number of requests for copies, which as yet I have been unable to fill due to the limited quantity presently furnished to me. This is must reading by members of State and local government as well.

CIVILIAN AUTHORITY AND MILITARY SPEECHES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Senate is conducting an important investigation relating to charges that the Department of Defense is carrying out unneeded and injurious censorship of statements of our military officers.

The so-called censorship issue is before the subcommittee headed by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] and has aroused considerable interest and concern throughout the Nation.

I wish to invite to the attention of the Senate two excellent articles which appeared in a recent issue of the Minneapolis Star of Thursday, January 25. The first is an article by John Foster Dulles from his book entitled "War or Peace." A careful reading of that article will give proper perspective on the issue of civilian control over the military and the coordination of military statements and policy with the overall objectives of our foreign policy.

The second article, entitled "Military Advice" is an editorial from the Minneapolis Star which merits the most careful consideration and reading.

These articles speak for themselves. There is no need of my drawing any conclusions. I quote one paragraph which states the essence of the two articles referred to:

> The lessons of history certainly support the position taken by the administration in the present controversy—i.e., when the top civil authority has fixed upon a specific course for national policy, high-ranking military officers should not make public speeches which undermine that policy. The proper place for them to press their views is within Government councils.
>
> If despite their arguments in that forum, the Government's policy seems intolerably wrong, their proper course is to leave the service—as Gen. Edwin Walker did—and press their case as civilians, free of proper military discipline.

I ask unanimous consent that these two splendid articles be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DULLES ON MILITARY ADVICE

(By John Foster Dulles)

The military profession can produce great statesmen. General Eisenhower and General Marshall are two of our time.

But when military people function in their military capacity, they are specialists. They do not purport to be judges of economics or of world opinion. They do not attempt to take account of possibilities that reside in moral forces. They do not claim to understand the working of organizations like the United Nations, and the intangible but powerful influences that radiate from them.

It is not their business to measure the resources of diplomacy and conciliation. In the United States, at least, they assume that final decision will be made by the National Government after expert judgments on all relevant factors have been assembled and weighed.

This is what the American people have always wanted, and it has resulted in what General Eisenhower calls "the necessary and wise subordination of the military to civil power."

That "subordination" means that the American people have faith that war is not inevitable; that our policies should seek peace, and that we should take some risks for peace, just as in war we take risks for victory. It implies that the civilians in our Government who make final policy decisions must be willing to accept the responsibility of overriding at times the purely military judgment * * *.

It is imperative that our Government should get good military advice. I have no doubt that we are getting it, for American officers are the most competent and most patriotic of any in the world. But that advice should be weighed by those who believe that war is not inevitable, that we can and must have peace, and that it may be necessary to take some chances for peace.

Indeed, history suggests that only those who are willing to take some chances for peace have a good chance of winning total war.

MILITARY ADVICE

Behind the so-called censorship issue involved in the Stennis committee hearings in Washington are two basic questions of principle: (1) When the judgments of our military and civilian leaders collide, which shall prevail? and (2) What sort of advice are military men best qualified to give us?

The words of the late Secretary of State John Foster Dulles reprinted elsewhere on this page deal admirably with both questions.

The question of the subordination of the military to civil power has arisen many times in our history, and it can be counted on to arise again. Dulles' wise words, therefore, are worth remembering.

The lessons of history certainly support the position taken by the administration in the present controversy—i.e., when the top civil authority has fixed upon a specific course for national policy, high-ranking military officers should not make public speeches which undermine that policy. The proper place for them to press their views is within Government councils.

If, despite their arguments in that forum, the Government's policy seems intolerably wrong, their proper course is to leave the service—as Gen. Edwin Walker did—and press their case as civilians, free of proper military discipline.

The public needs also to make up its mind as to what sort of advice it should expect from military experts.

When such experts describe the nature of the military threat facing us and prescribe military measures to meet that threat, surely they are on their own familiar ground. But, as Dulles said, they can hardly purport to be equally expert judges of economics, world opinion, diplomacy, theories of history, etc.

A general's or admiral's very specialized and concentrated career does not allow him the time necessary to become an expert on complicated political and economic subjects. As former President Eisenhower once remarked, they are inclined to have "provincial" points of view.

Mr. Eisenhower knew from his own experience that a purely military approach to political problems can be misleading.

Speaking as a general in 1945, he declared, "I see nothing in the future that would prevent Russia and the United States from being the closest possible friends." On another occasion in the same year he said: "On two occasions now I have had the great honor of meeting officials of the Soviet Government. It is my feeling that in the basic desires of all of us they are one with us. Regardless of the methods by which we arrive at that goal, that is what we are struggling for.

Later, after General Eisenhower had the broadening experience of being President Eisenhower, he changed many of his views.

If a statesman like Dwight Eisenhower could have found purely military experience as an inadequate basis for making sound judgments on political matters, military men of the same experience but narrower interests may be doubly misled.

NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I invite to the attention of the Senate an editorial which appeared in the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of Saturday, January 27.

This editorial relates to the national school lunch program. It appropriately reminds us that this splendid program has been one of the most successful and least troublesome of any of the programs sponsored by our Government and the Department of Agriculture.

As one Senator who has actively supported the national school lunch program and urged its expansion and improvement, I am very pleased with this editorial.

I ask unanimous consent that this commendatory article of Saturday, January 27, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHILDREN'S LUNCH

The national school lunch program, started in 1946, is now reaching 14 million children, about 1 in 3 through high school. It is undoubtedly one of the least troublesome and most successful programs of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Purpose of the program, as stated in the law, is "to safeguard the health and well-being of the Nation's children and to encourage the domestic consumption of nutritious agricultural products." This school year the Federal Government is spending nearly $280 million—close to $100 million in cash reimbursements to be spent locally by school systems for food, about $70 million for food bought by the Agriculture Department for school lunch use, and more than $100 million in Government price-support and surplus-removal food supplies. About four-fifths of all the food used is purchased by the schools from local suppliers. The amount paid by the children averages about 60 percent or more of the total national cost.

President Kennedy and George S. McGovern, director for the food-for-peace program, are recommending expansion of the school lunch program, including an oversea lunch project. Managers of the food service operations in schools in this country for some time have been urging revision of the cash reimbursement formula, whereby amounts given by the Government would be determined by the number of children participating in the lunch program, rather than by total school population. This would mean a minimum Federal cash-per-lunch allowance which would remain stable for the participating schools. At present the cash received per lunch served goes down as the total number of schoolchildren in the country rises.

Besides providing a low-cost hot lunch for children who do not live near enough to their schools to go home at noon, the lunch program apparently does serve useful nutritional and educational purposes. Children get used to eating more varied foods than normally served at home, and their mothers often gain ideas for balanced menus from the school lunch lists.

The system doubtless can profit by some changes, but in its present form it works well enough so that administrators of 64,000 public and nonprofit private schools think it worthwhile to add funds and supply the personnel and equipment necessary to qualify for Federal contributions.

AID FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1241) to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities and to authorize scholarships for undergraduate study in such institutions.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it gives me great pleasure to speak today in support of the pending measure, S. 1241, the College Academic Facilities and Scholarship Act. This is a subject in which I have had a long and abiding interest, going back to the days when it was my pleasure and privilege to serve on the Labor and Public Welfare Committee.

First of all, I commend the chairman of that distinguished committee the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] the chief sponsor of this important legislation. The Senator from Alabama long ago established a reputation in this body as a great legislator and a great humanitarian. This measure before us today which he sponsors further attests to this well-earned reputation and I want to say how pleased I am to be associated with him on this issue.

I would be remiss if I did not also take this opportunity to salute the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] the chairman of the Education Subcommittee, which spent long days and weeks and months on this legislation. No Member of this body has done more than the Senator from Oregon on behalf of education.

In considering this bill, the first question that is raised is, Why is such legislation necessary? Mr. President, the facts and figures that we have before us spell out the answer to that question in no uncertain terms.

During the next 10 years, the population of college age is expected to increase at a rate almost twice that of the 1950's, and technological advances are expected to move at an unprecedented pace. Indeed, we live in such an age of innovation that we must educate young people to cope with work which does not yet exist and cannot yet be clearly defined. If the present trend of college-going continues, colleges will need to accommodate an average of 300,000 more undergraduates each year for 10 years, an annual increase of almost 10 percent of present enrollments.

The institutions themselves have sought, and continue to seek, savings and increased productivity through better utilization of faculty and facilities, better scheduling of work through the day, the week, and the year, and improved instructional methods. And yet, no matter how much success there may be in using present resources more effectively, there still must be a substantial increase of funds to provide quality education for increasing enrollments. Projections of the amounts expected from all present sources in 1970 have been made, based on the assumption that tuition charges will be increased in proportion to the rise in family incomes, that State and local governments—as a minimum—will continue to make as high a tax effort for student higher education as they have in the past, and that other funds for the purpose, both public and private, will be enlarged in amounts consistent with the growth in the national economy and with past trends. If there is no change in the basic structure of financing, the estimated income will provide only about three-fourths of that needed to finance the costs of student higher education—instructional and related costs for the enrollments expected in 1970. This means that the additional fourth will have to come from increased effort—beyond that anticipated—through existing sources or from new sources. Let us look first at the prospects for increasing the contributions from existing sources.

Increased tuition, offset by scholarship aid from private philanthropy, has been a means frequently mentioned for deriving the additional resources needed by higher education. Let us look at the facts. Since about 1954, tuition charges both in public and in private institutions have been increasing at a rate faster than that of the cost of living, and scholarship increases have lagged far behind tuition increases. While the average institutional scholarship grant increased by $63—from $277 to $340—between 1955–56 and 1959–60, the average increase in tuition was $242, or almost four times as great. Not only did a smaller proportion of the student body receive scholarship aid in 1959–60 than in 1955–56, but the average scholarship paid a smaller proportion of the student's basic educational costs. Furthermore, the fact that more than 40 percent of the scholarship and other student aid funds available are provided by transfer from the general funds of the institutions serves further to increase the tuition and other basic charges to those who can pay for them. There is no margin of tuition income to cover expansion needs, and the rising costs limit educational opportunity for many and create serious hardship for others.

Estimates place the average annual expense of a student living away from home at about $1,500 in public institutions and about $2,500 at private institutions. In 1959–60, the average scholarship in public institutions was worth only $220 to the student fortunate enough to have one, an amount equal to less than 15 percent of the estimated average expense. In the same year, the average scholarship in private institutions was $430 and would have paid only 17 percent of the estimated average expense. Furthermore, 59 percent of the scholarships were in private institutions and only 41 percent in public institutions, a proportion inverse to enrollment. Clearly, not many students can be brought into college by such scholarships, unless they or their families have considerable other resources out of which to pay the costs of attending college.

Loans assist many students in furthering their education. In 1959–60, the average loan under provisions of the National Defense Education Act amounted to $435 while loans from institution loan funds amounted to $275. While neither amount is large enough to pay a major part of the student's total expenses, the figures do reflect availability of limited funds for such purposes and the willingness of many students to go into debt for their education. I, of course, supported the National Defense Education Act and believe that the loan program is sound and desirable. I do not believe, however, that loans in themselves are the answer. There are many young people who for understandable reasons would be most hesitant and reluctant to go in debt to obtain an education even if loan funds in adequate amounts were available. Nor do I believe that our young people's ability to obtain a higher education should depend upon their willingness to mortgage future earnings.

Voluntary contributions to institutions of higher education are also a source of the needed funds. Between 1954–55 and 1958–59, according to information from the Council for Financial Aid to Education, individuals or families increased their contributions to higher education institutions by 318.1 percent, alumni by 192.9 percent, and corporations and business concerns by 149.7 percent. In the overall picture of philanthropic giving, however, their total gifts and grants in 1957–58 were the source of 7 percent of the total current-fund income of all institutions of higher education—12.7 percent of such income in private institutions and only 2.6 percent in public institutions. We must, therefore look to a further, and potentially the most extensive, source of support for higher education—the public.

Well over 40 percent of the current costs of student higher education—including instructional and related costs but excluding organized research and living accommodations—now are derived from State and local tax sources. About 60 percent of the plant funds of colleges and universities come from State and local governments. While most of these State and local funds go to public institutions, private colleges and universities are aided as well, either directly or indirectly, through student scholarship support or tax exemption.

A number of States have turned to the establishment of community junior colleges in an effort to bring education to students without the need for providing additional residential housing for them. In fact, degree-credit enrollment more than doubled in junior colleges between 1950 and 1960—108 percent increase—whereas it increased only 51.8 percent in 4-year institutions. In addition, community colleges enroll a large proportion of the students in terminal-occupational curriculums leading directly to employment in technical and semiprofessional work and a large number of adult education students seeking to upgrade their cultural and vocational qualifications. The accommodation of rapid enrollment increases in public community colleges represents a substantial outlay for new faculty and new facilities.

In their search for ways and means to meet their responsibilities to their youth, almost all States have made statewide studies of their higher education offerings and needs in order to increase productivity while they economize in the use of funds. In 1960, State tax collections reached an alltime high of $18 billion, $2 billion more than in 1959, and yet legislatures in 1961 had to press for still more revenue to meet the increasing demands for State services of many kinds. If the States increase their tax effort approximately in proportion to the numbers of students enrolled in public colleges during the coming decade, State and local expenditures for student higher education will be more than doubled by 1970, with no margin for raising the quality of education offered. Furthermore, increased State and local taxation means higher burdens on the low- and middle-income groups than would a comparable Federal taxload. Some States simply do not have resources necessary for the task. We must, therefore, find other sources of support so that the uneven abilities of the States will not deprive a substantial segment of American youth of the educational opportunities needed for national growth and world understanding.

The National Defense Education Act will inject a stimulus of about a billion dollars into our schools and colleges over a 4-year period—a healthy shot in the arm to be sure. Yet it will increase the amount we currently spend on education by less than 2 percent. It has not killed local responsibility or support for our schools. Its matching provisions and other built-in stimuli are certainly resulting in increased local and State support of education. More than anything else, the act has shown that constructive Federal assistance can be given without domination, that stimulation can be given without suffocation.

S. 1241 SERVES HIGHER EDUCATION'S NEEDS

The bill now before us will give assistance in three vital areas: academic facilities, aid for needy students with superior intellectual qualifications, and aid for the development of community colleges.

Already, our facilities are strained to capacity and approximately 11 percent of the Nation's higher education physical plant is obsolete and in urgent need of replacement. It will be a minimum of 2 years from enactment of any Federal assistance legislation before the first building can be completed with the Federal aid provided. By that time, the situation will be materially worsened. Needed physical facilities in the decade ahead are estimated to cost $18.9 billion, to provide for replacements and rehabilitation of existing facilities and for expansion to accommodate additional students. As Secretary Ribicoff pointed out last August, resources will fall short of facilities needs to the extent of $2.9 billion by 1965, $3.5 billion by 1966, and $5.2 billion by 1970.

The maximum amount of outstanding loans authorized by title I of the bill would be only $1.5 billion in the 5-year period of the bill, at the rate of $300 million per year. The requirement that at least a fourth of the development cost—construction, site acquisition, and improvement—be financed from non-Federal sources is an incentive for local effort and represents a larger downpayment than is required in most financing of private and business capital outlays.

As the world continues to grow more complex, the same forces which raised educational opportunities through the high school grades now necessitate providing similar opportunities at higher levels. The American public must find a way to provide the needed resources so that no segment of the population will lack opportunities as a result of inabilities of individuals or States to pay the cost. Even though family incomes have increased during the past 10 years, a substantial number of superior students fail to go to college because they cannot pay the costs. The average institutional scholarship—$340—may help borderline cases but it is not sufficient to bring into college a superior student who does not have considerable other resources. Add to it the maximum NDEA loan—$1,000, if the maximum is available—and the sum would not be sufficient to bring some truly needy superior students into college. Over a 5-year period, 1962–66, title II of the bill would provide an average stipend of $700 to 212,500 students, beginning with 25,000 such scholarships in 1962. To those who feel that this would swell the already overloaded enrollment, let me remaind you that the 25,000 scholarships provided for 1962 represents less than 1 percent of the total degree-credit enrollment in the fall of 1960 and less than 3 percent of the first-time degree-credit enrollment. Under the watchful eye of State scholarship commissions, this is certainly not a large enough proportion to include students of mediocre quality or those affluent enough to pay for their own education. Since the amount of the annual award must be related to factors other than the cost of education at the college selected by the student, normal prudence of the superior student recipient should result in his choice of the institution which seems to offer the best program for his needs at a price he can afford to pay.

The growing enrollment in both transfer—bachelor's degree credit—and terminal-occupational curriculums of community colleges is evidence that these institutions are meeting a real need in our increasingly urban society. Furthermore, because the major proportion of the student body at these institutions can reside at home, thereby saving room and board costs for themselves, community colleges can offer expanded higher education opportunities with greater economy than is possible through expansion of institutions whose enrollment must largely be housed in campus facilities. Title III of the bill, for emergency public community college construction, provides for Federal financial assistance to the States on a matching basis to stimulate increased State and local effort. Federal outlays of $50 million a year for 5 years are a modest contribution toward the costs that are faced by the States in community college construction.

Now, let us see what this bill means to my own State, Minnesota. In rank order of the States, according to 1957 figures, Minnesota ranks 23d in per capita personal income and 21st in State tax revenue per capita. Of its college age population in that year, 23 percent were enrolled in institutions of higher learning ranked 10th among the States and 7 out of 10 of these were in public institutions. More than half of the current income of Minnesota colleges and universities is derived from State and local governments.

To state the matter more precisely, Minnesota is above the national average both in the percent of personal income devoted to higher education and in expenditures per college age resident. In other words, Minnesota believes in higher education and is trying to do something about it.

In 1961, the Office of Education had received preliminary plans describing needed and tentatively planned new construction valued at about $120 million to be completed by Minnesota colleges and universities by the fall of 1965. This includes reports from only 19 of the State's 44 institutions and does not include costs for rehabilitation or the acquisition of land. It is in no sense a complete picture of the State's total needs for adequate facilities, but it does indicate the magnitude of the work the institutions are undertaking. If the maximum authorized by title I of the bill is in proportion to "degree credit" enrollment, Minnesota would be eligible for academic facilities loans totaling only about $6.3 million in a single year, or about $31.5 million over the 5-year period. Under the 12½-percent limitation, no State would be eligible for more than $37.5 million in a single year and, although this amount may be a powerful incentive to local effort, it still leaves much to be done by the State.

In 1959–60, the average scholarship reported by Minnesota colleges and universities was $272, the average National Defense Education Act loan was $434, and the average other institutional student loan was $306. Clearly, except for those students who live within commuting distance of a college or university, these amounts would not bring into college a single student who does not have considerable other resources, even though he may have within him the makings of a great scientist or statesman. Not including some students in terminal-occupational curriculums and adult-education courses, the total "degree credit" enrollment in Minnesota in the fall of 1960 was 75,763, and the first-time enrollment was 19,394. Title II of the bill would provide scholarships averaging $700 for only 551 students in 1962, increasing to only 4,130 in 1966 to include the total new scholarships to be made available for fiscal years 1963–66. While these may help the State conserve the human resources of the superior students to whom they are awarded they do not go nearly far enough toward assuring that no capable Minnesota student shall be denied the advantages of a higher education simply because he lacks the money to pay for it. The incentive they provide, however, will be an important factor.

The nine community colleges in Minnesota had a total "degree credit" enrollment of 2,381 in the fall of 1959 and about twice that number in terminal-occupational and adult education courses. Community college enrollment generally includes a relatively large proportion of capable students who cannot afford the cost of attending a college away from home.

Mr. President, I digress to note that only this past week visitors from my home State emphasized the importance of the development of these community colleges. I wish to underscore the importance of this as we discuss the proposed legislation relating to aid to colleges. I am convinced that the junior colleges and community colleges can do a remarkable job in the field of higher education. Whatever funds we put into them will result in helping to relieve much of the pressure for additional educational opportunity.

Additional funds are needed to expand facilities of the existing community colleges and to establish other such institutions throughout the State in order to serve the maximum number of students at a minimum of cost. Title III would provide $1,261,501 in Federal allotment, to be matched by $2,270,785 in Minnesota State funds, thus providing the incentive for emergency community college construction worth $3,532,286 during each of the 5 years in which expansion is most sorely needed.

One of the most striking failings of our affluent society seems to be its reluctance to finance to anywhere near its economic ability the most productive investment opportunity open to it: The education of its young people to the full extent of their capability. This bill is a step in the right direction, but it is only a step. It will take the full utilization of all our efforts through all sources to bring quality higher education to the quantity of students which our society must have if the Nation is to remain economically strong and intellectually mature.

Mr. President, it is essential that every young person in the United States who has the ability to go to college be afforded that opportunity. We simply cannot afford to waste any of our brainpower. It is our obligation as legislators to do all that we can to contribute toward the building of adequate college facilities and to provide the opportunity for talented young Americans to gain a college education. I am hopeful that the proposed legislation we have before us today will be passed by Congress promptly.

I am confident the proposed legislation will be a boon for the entire educational structure of the Nation. I am also confident that the differences between the bill of the House and the bill of the Senate can be resolved in a manner which will give a great stimulus to the private educational establishments as well as to the State colleges and universities.

Again I commend the Senator from Oregon and his associates for the outstanding job they have done in handling the proposed legislation. I am hopeful that tomorrow we shall be able to complete our legislative processes on the bill, send it to conference, and soon thereafter to the President, so that before the first of March we shall be able to say that the 2d session of the 87th Congress passed a vital and important bill affecting the well-being and progress of American education.

UNITED NATIONS BONDS

Mr. HART. Mr. President, all of us are conscious of the controversy over the proposal that the United States finance the United Nations, in part at least, through the purchase of bonds. This the President has recommended, specifically asking that we purchase bonds in the amount of $100 million.

Sometimes I think we miss in the discussion what is at least a key, if not the key, to it. The fact is that as of today there are members of the United Nations who refuse to put up money to pay for extraordinary actions by the United Nations—actions taken in pursuit of peace, actions which may well have spared us and the world from a major war with its devastation and incredible cost.

With bonds as the means of financing the United Nations, there will be no way for those nations to drag their feet. The United States cannot be left picking up the big end of this check any longer. There are many other reasons—meritorious reasons—which would urge us to support the proposal to finance the United Nations through the bond purchase, but I think as we consider the proposal this should be one of the things we have in mind.

In that connection I ask unanimous consent that two editorials, one from the Washington Star and the other from the Washington Post, on this subject be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star, Jan. 31, 1962]

ON BUYING U.N. BONDS

In asking Congress for authority and funds to purchase half of the $200 million in bonds to be issued by the United Nations, President Kennedy has not exaggerated the urgency of the organization's financial plight. The trouble, of course, stems mainly from the fact that all too many of the member states—notably the Soviet bloc, most Arab lands, and such Western countries as France, Belgium, and Portugal—have steadfastly declined to pay the assessments levied against them to support U.N. troops in the Congo or the Middle East.

As a result, to cope with the threat of an empty till and economic bankruptcy, the General Assembly has voted to float the bond issue, which is to be repayable at an interest rate of 2 percent over a 25-year period, with the annual repayments to be assessed against all members as part of the regular U.N. budget. This action has received the President's strong endorsement as something that promises to put the organization in a vastly improved financial position and thus enable it to carry out peace-keeping tasks of vital importance to the American people and the world at large.

Further, in urging Congress to act favorably on his request, Mr. Kennedy has asserted that failure to do so "would serve the interests of the Soviet Union, which has been particularly opposed to the operation in the Congo and which voted against this [bond] plan as part of the consistent Communist effort to undermine the United Nations and undercut its new Secretary General." With certain reservations, we think this is a persuasive line of argument, and the Senate and House will have reason to respond to it affirmatively if the World Court—which has been asked for an advisory opinion on the matter—determines that the United States and the majority of the U.N. are correct in holding that delinquent members must pay the special assessments or lose their right to vote in the General Assembly.

In any event, it seems to us that the legislation sought by the President should be conditioned on what the World Court may have to say about the obligations of the states in arrears. Beyond that, another important question of principle has to do with the purchase of the balance of the bonds if our country buys half. The congressional hearings to be held on the subject presumably will look for firm evidence that a sufficient number of other U.N. members will join Britain—which plans to invest $12 million in the project—in taking care of that balance. Certainly, without such evidence, our outlay of $100 million would be a venture of dubious wisdom.

However, if the Court rules against the delinquents and if buyers are assured for the other half of the total bond issue, favorable congressional action will be warranted. To be sure, under normal circumstances, this kind of financing would be hard to defend, but it can be justified now as a stopgap emergency undertaking to keep the U.N. from going broke and entering upon a decline that could be fatal.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Feb. 1, 1962]

Bond Sinews for U.N.

President Kennedy has left Congress no reasonable alternative to support of the United Nations bond issue. In the first place, his message makes it plain that failure on the part of the United States to buy its share of the bonds would be a vote of no confidence in the U.N. Such an outcome would cause rejoicing in Moscow, but it would be a perilous blow to the hope of maintaining a strong peace-keeping organization. No less serious than such a loss of prestige would be the denial of funds for the U.N.'s operations in the Middle East and the Congo.

The clincher in the President's argument, however, is that support of the bond issue is essential to reduce the long-run cost of U.N. operations to the United States. At present the United States is supplying nearly 50 percent of the funds for the special operations—such as those in the Congo. If the bond issue succeeds, the President said, the U.S. share of these special costs will be reduced to 32 percent.

The facts behind this conclusion are these: At present the Soviet Union and various other countries refuse to pay special assessments, thus throwing a heavy burden on the countries that want the U.N.'s police operations to succeed. But if the U.N. raises $200 million through its bond issue, it will have funds to continue present operations and possibly to finance peace-keeping activities in future emergencies. The bonds will be repaid at the rate of about $10 million annually, for interest and payment on the principal, and this $10 million will be part of the U.N.'s regular budget. All members are assessed a share of this budget, and if they do not pay it, they will lose their vote in the General Assembly.

Actually, then, the bond issue is a device for compelling the delinquents, or near delinquents, to pay their fair share of the cost of U.N. operations, if they wish to retain active membership. No country will be able to thwart a peace-keeping operation by withholding funds assessed for that specific purpose, for the U.N. will be financed by a general fund to which all active members will have to contribute. Congress could not reject a proposal so obviously desirable from the viewpoint of the U.N.'s largest contributor and foremost supporter, without incalculable damage to the basic concept of international policing.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, to give the Senate an example of an American family which has faith in the United Nations, I ask unanimous consent that a letter, dated January 28, to the Acting Secretary General of the United Nations, a copy of which was sent to me by Mr. Joseph Burgess, a constituent of mine, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FLINT, MICH., *January 28, 1962.*

MR. U THANT,
Acting Secretary General,
The United Nations, New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. THANT: Enclosed is a check for $10, which will begin a self-initiated series of periodic contributions to the United Nations. We would appreciate it if our checks were used to further peacemaking enterprises, at the discretion of the Acting Secretary General. This amount is not to be deducted from any general fund expected from the U.S. Government.

Like the American Quaker group from whom we have drawn our inspiration, we do not feel that this is in any sense a charity, but rather an obligation of world citizenship which must soon become general practice.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH BURGESS FAMILY.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the letter speaks very eloquently of the aspirations and the prayers of men and women of this country who are not heard directly in this body, and whose pleas do not reach newspaper print, but I do hope that a reading of the RECORD will emphasize this type of feeling which I believe to be widespread in this country.

U.S. FISCAL POLICY RECORD SUPERIOR TO MAJOR EUROPEAN COUNTRIES

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in recent years I have been concerned about what I consider to be overly pious and overly self-righteous statements by some of the international bankers concerning the economic and fiscal policies of the United States.

Some international bankers have told us that we should put our house in order and have freely offered their advice to us. One of the most conspicuous occurrences was at the recent International Monetary Fund meeting in Vienna when Mr. Blessing of the German Central Bank made such statements.

This was also hinted at in their speeches, notably that of the French Minister of Finance.

Most of these statements take the old "bankers" line: Our budget should be balanced whether we have high unemployment or not, interest rates should be raised, and things should be tightened up generally. These statements have been made even though our price levels have remained steady and we have suffered from excessive unemployment.

I may say also that these statements have far too often been echoed by those in high places in our own central banking system and by bankers and political conservatives here at home.

FACTS ABOUT BUDGETS

What are the facts? The facts are that the budgets of many European countries show a surplus only because they do not include capital improvements in their budgets as we do. Outlays for public improvements, public investment, the construction of buildings, dams, and so forth, are not included. In this country we do include them.

I therefore asked our Budget Bureau to provide me with information comparing our budget record in recent years with those of the major European nations.

The results are these:

Adjusted to a basis comparable to the U.S. cash statement, the study of Mr. Andrew Gantt of Harvard who has been advising the Budget Bureau shows:

West Germany, 1955–60: Deficits in 4 of the last 6 calendar years.

France, 1951–60: Deficits in every one of the last 10 calendar years.

Great Britain, 1950–60: Deficits in 9 of the last 11 calendar years.

United States, 1950–60: Surpluses in 5 years. Deficits in 6 years.

UNITED STATES HAS BEST RECORD

Thus, Mr. President, the United States has a much better record than any of these major Western European countries, some of whose central bank representatives have been overly self-righteous about our fiscal policy.

The simple answer to them is, "Physician, heal thyself."

I hope that when our Secretary of the Treasury and representatives of the Federal Reserve Board come in contact with these men, as they will, that they stress this point very strongly and no longer permit us to be put in a false position.

PHYSICIAN, HEAL THYSELF

Our balance-of-payments problem has been caused mainly by the fact that while we have a huge surplus in our physical trade, we have had a deficit because of, first, foreign aid; second, military aid and cost of troops abroad; third, expenditures by American tourists abroad; and, fourth, foreign investment.

Our European allies could help a great deal with these problems if they would bear their fair share of the cost of foreign aid, of helping to defend the West, including themselves, and in removing quotas and restrictions on some of our key products, especially coal and agricultural products like wheat, feed grains, soybeans, frozen chickens, and tobacco.

If they would do their fair share, we could then take even more effective action here at home to increase our growth rate, to reduce unemployment, and to solve the balance-of-payments problem.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement and a table provided to me by the Budget Bureau be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement and table were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE
OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., January 30, 1962.

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: The Director has asked me to send you the enclosed advance copy of his response for the record to a question raised by you during his appearance before the Joint Economic Committee last Friday.

It is our understanding that this information will become part of a more detailed study, and we will be happy to call this to your attention when it is published.

Sincerely yours,

Terrence J. McDonnell,
Staff Assistant.

The Bureau of the Budget subsequently furnished the following information for the record:

Bureau of the Budget staff was of some assistance to him, and therefore has been advised generally by Mr. Andrew H. Gantt of the preliminary results of a forthcoming study prepared by him for Harvard University. This study compares the central government budget results of England, France, and Western Germany with the United States. Adjusted to a basis comparable to the U.S. consolidated cash statement (Federal receipts from and payments to the public), the study shows that England ran deficits in 9 of the last 11 calendar years (1950 through 1960); France in every one of the last 10 calendar years (1951 through 1960); and Germany in 4 of the last 6 calendar years (1955 through 1960). In the 11 calendar years 1950 through 1960 inclusive, the United States ran surpluses in 5 years and deficits in 6.

Central government surpluses and/or deficits for recent years for 4 countries

Calendar year	England	France	Germany	United States
	Millions of current pounds	*Billions of current new francs*	*Millions of current deutsche marks*	*Billions of current dollars*
1950	611	----------	----------	0.5
1951	−55	−2.40	----------	1.2
1952	−464	−6.27	----------	−.6
1953	−628	−7.94	----------	−7.2
1954	−74	−7.56	----------	−1.1
1955	−42	−8.32	2,221	−.7
1956	150	−11.72	1,331	5.5
1957	−175	−12.21	−2,926	1.2
1958	−101	−9.36	−1,755	−7.3
1959	−282	−5.48	−3,881	−8.0
1960	−453	−3.24	−200	3.5

Notes.—The figures in this table differ from the usual "budget" deficit or surplus figures printed by these countries, which usually do not express adequately the surpluses or deficits for which their central governments are responsible. For instance, in the United States, the trust funds and other items are excluded from the "budget" figures. The figures in the table are on a basis analogous to the "Cash receipts from and payments to the public" of the United States, which encompass the entire operations of the central governments of these countries, including trust funds, government owned and sponsored enterprises, etc. It should be noted, however, that no attempt has been made to include exactly the same operations in each country. If the central government of the United Kingdom operates her radio stations and they run a deficit, this deficit is included above, even though the U.S. Government has nothing to do in an operational way with the radio stations here.

OUTDOOR RECREATION REVIEW COMMISSION REPORT GIVES STRONG ARGUMENTS FOR SAVING THE INDIANA DUNES AS A NATIONAL PARK

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I have just had an opportunity to study the report of the Outdoor Recreation Review Commission, "Outdoor Recreation for America," which was published earlier this week. I have found it to be a compelling essay in support of my proposal to establish the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore Park.

The proposed Dunes National Lakeshore Park uniquely contains the virtues and characteristics of five of the six classes of recreation areas described in the report. The 9,000 acres of the proposed park would offer the advantages of the report's high-density recreation area, general outdoor area, natural environment area, unique natural area, and historic site.

With their magnificent swimming areas and sand beaches, exciting walking paths, pleasant picnicking possibilities, botanical wonders unique to this Northern Hemisphere location, and history as a route to the early exploration and settlement of the Midwest, the dunes are an unequaled and irreplaceable site for a national park.

The Dunes Park will be the Central Park and Jones Beach of the southern Lake Michigan metropolitan area.

Now is the time for the Congress and the leaders of the great north-central metropolitan area of the country to exercise the same kind of foresight as did the founders of New York City's Central Park more than a century ago.

As the Outdoor Recreation Review Commission's report makes clear, the recreation facilities of the vast and heavily populated area running from Milwaukee to Michigan City along Lake Michigan are out of balance with existing needs and are rapidly becoming more inadequate.

The report shows that right now more than 7 million persons live in this metropolitan belt, and that the population in this area will at least double in the next 40 years. Further, the report shows that in the west-north-central region surrounding lower Lake Michigan, the population is now 15.4 million, will be 18.4 million in 1976, and by the year 2000 will reach 25.9 million. In view of the report's finding of grossly inadequate recreational facilities in the highly populated areas, the urgency of action to save the dunes becomes apparent.

But in addition to population increases recreational needs will swell even more because of increased leisure time due to shorter workweeks and because of the rapid increase in per capita disposable income. One indication of this is shown by the report that visits to national parks have more than doubled in the period 1950–59, and the total national demand for recreation is expected to at least double in the next 40 years.

A striking finding of the report which points to the need for the Dunes Park is that simple recreational pleasures are most in demand. The report shows walking for pleasure is second only to automobile driving among national recreational pastimes and it is one of the chief family recreations, and with the dunes' closeness to large numbers of people and their fine and pleasant pathways, they are exceptionally valuable in this regard.

Moreover in keeping with its finding of the high utilization of swimming and beach facilities, the report emphasizes the most important necessity of preserving for public use more of our coast and shorelines. The report shows that only 2 percent of the shoreline of the 48 contiguous States is now in public ownership for recreation.

In fact, the report states:

> Highest priority should be given to acquisition of areas located closest to major population centers and other areas that are immediately threatened. The need is critical—opportunity to place these areas in public ownership is fading each year as other uses encroach.

This is exactly what those of us who wish to save the dunes have been saying.

Finally, the report makes a very valuable contribution by pointing out that the acquiring of land for parks does not economically deprive nearby landowners and businessmen. On the contrary, the report accurately shows that leisure is now a big and rapidly growing business—with which tourists and visitors spent $30 billion in 1954 and nearly $40 billion last year. In 1957, visitors for recreation spent a billion dollars in each of the States of New York, Florida, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania; and about a half billion dollars in Illinois, Michigan, Virginia, Kentucky, Texas, and California.

Moreover, the Commission reports that parks enhance the value of adjoining lands because they make nearby properties more attractive for industrial and commercial development. In Essex County, N.J., for example, it was found that the land adjacent to parks increased in value three times as fast as in other areas.

The Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission has furnished the Congress with a systematic and convincing document in support of increased efforts to meet our national and regional recreation needs. Establishing the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore Park is an opportunity meeting the highest priorities and recommendations of the report. Hearings on this proposal will be held before the Public Lands Subcommittee of the Senate Interior Committee on February 26 and 27, and the Commission report is therefore most timely and welcome.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate now adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), the Senate, in accordance with the order previously entered, adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 6, 1962, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 5, 1962:

Diplomatic and Foreign Service

Philip J. Farley, of Virginia, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 1, a consul general, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 2 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls general of the United States of America:

Lewis E. Gleeck, Jr., of California.
Joseph Godson, of New York.
Alfred le S. Jenkins, of Georgia.
Spencer M. King, of Maine.
Elias A. McQuaid, of New Hampshire.
Charles N. Manning, of Texas.
Julian L. Nugent, Jr., of New Mexico.
Philip P. Williams, of California.

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 3 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls general of the United States of America:

Samuel Owen Lane, of California.
Everett K. Melby, of Illinois.

Norman Armour, Jr., of New York, for reappointment in the Foreign Service as a Foreign Service officer of class 3, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America, in accordance with the provisions of section 520(a) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended.

Charles H. Taquey, of the District of Columbia, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 3, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 4, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Charles C. Flowerree, of Virginia.
Colbert C. Held, of Nebraska.
Alvin T. Slemons, of Indiana.
Windsor W. Stroup, of Virginia.
Miss Dorthy E. Weihrauch, of Florida.

James F. Shea, of Maryland, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 5, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

Joseph Basile, of New Jersey, now a Foreign Service officer of class 6 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

Joseph O. Eblan, of New Hampshire, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 6, a vice consul of career, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 7, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Philip J. Adler, of Pennsylvania.
James R. Falzone, of Massachusetts.
J. Hal Lesh, of Indiana.
David Dysart Morse, of Illinois.
Peter Solmssen, of Pennsylvania.
George Peter Varros, of Connecticut.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 8, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

David L. Aaron, of California.
Miss Peggy Ann Antonides, of Illinois.
Edwin L. Barber III, of Virginia.
J. Peter Becker, of Pennsylvania.
John P. Becker, of Massachusetts.
Peter T. Beneville, of Colorado.
Robert B. Bentley, of California.
Alan D. Berlind, of Virginia.
F. James Bingley, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Stephen M. Boyd, of Missouri.
Werner W. Brandt, of New York.
Philip E. Burnham, Jr., of New Hampshire.
F. Scott Bush, of Illinois.
James A. Carney, Jr., of Virginia.
Reed Cecil, of Texas.
James Richard Cheek, of Arkansas.
Timothy W. Childs, of Connecticut.
John H. Christensen, of Iowa.
Carl John Clement, of Minnesota.
John Albert Collins, of New York.
Edwin G. Corr, of Oklahoma.
David W. Cox, of Wisconsin.
Miss Patricia A. Dawson, of New York.
Richard J. Dols, of Minnesota.
Mark M. Easton, of New York.
Lloyd H. Ellis, Jr., of Nebraska.
Edward M. Featherstone, of Pennsylvania.
William A. Feldt, of Wisconsin.
Patrick E. FitzGerald, of Montana.
Robert A. Flaten, of Minnesota.
Jerry A. Fowler, of California.
Ralph P. Gallagher, Jr., of New Jersey.
Stephen R. Gibson, of California.
Philip C. Gill, of California.
Alexander G. Gilliam, Jr., of Virginia.
Robert F. Gillin, of Pennsylvania.
Robert Coleman Gratsch, of Michigan.
Olaf Grobel, of Tennessee.
David W. Guthrie, of Ohio.
Ralph E. Hamil, of New York.
Donald D. Haught, of California.
Charles Higginson, of Massachusetts.
Miss Elinor V. Hohman, of Illinois.
George R. Hoover, of California.
Alden H. Irons, of Massachusetts.
Miss Harriet W. Isom, of Oregon.
William Harding Jackson, Jr., of Virginia.
Philip K. Johnson, Jr., of Ohio.
William P. Kelly, of Pennsylvania.
Don Roland Kienzle, of Massachusetts.
Roland Karl Kuchel, of Massachusetts.
Walter J. Landry, of Louisiana.
James O. Langland, of Iowa.
Walter C. Lenahan, of Oregon.
Donald R. Lesh, of Massachusetts.
Howard C. Loper, of Pennsylvania.
Winston Lord, of New York.
Matthew T. Lorimer, of New Hampshire.
George E. Lowe, of Illinois.
James M. Lucas, of California.
John T. McCarthy, of New York.
Mark McCormack, of Pennsylvania.
William J. McDonough, of Illinois.
Thomas J. McGee, Jr., of New York.
Carroll R. McKibbin, of Iowa.
J. Phillip McLean, of Washington.
Donald M. Maclay, of Pennsylvania.
John Linden Martin, of Oregon.
David P. Matthews, of Virginia.
Gary L. Matthews, of Missouri.
Robert Allan Mautino, of California.
William B. Milam, of California.
Robert Wesley Miller, of California.
Miss Carole A. Millikan, of Indiana.
Miss Marilyn H. Moninger, of Illinois.
Robert J. Montgomery, of Texas.
Lewis Roy Murray, Jr., of Tennessee.
William V P. Newlin, of Pennsylvania.
David G. Newton, of Massachusetts.
Thomas J. O'Donnell, of Michigan.
Bradford C. Oelman, of Ohio.
Robert H. Pelletreau, Jr., of New York.
Charles R. Pogue, of Indiana.
Henry Precht, of Virginia.
Leo J. Reddy, of Maryland.
James W. Reeves, of California.
Davis R. Robinson, of Connecticut.
Fernando E. Rondon, of California.
Richard C. Schenck, of New York.
Carl W. Schmidt, of New Jersey.
Cornelius D. Scully III, of Virginia.
John W. Sewell, of New York.
Henry Jacob Silverman, of Pennsylvania.
Samuel Sloan, of New York.
Miss Edith Smith, of Illinois.
Murray C. Smith, of Virginia.
Richard J. Smith, of Connecticut.
Gerald E. Snyder, of Ohio.
Joel S. Spiro, of Pennsylvania.
John P. Steinmetz, of California.
Miss Joan L. Steves, of Ohio.
William Morgan Stewart, of Maryland.
Richard L. Storch, of Illinois.
Garett Gordon Sweany, of Washington.
Peter Tarnoff, of New York.
Clyde Donald Taylor, of the District of Columbia.
Rush W. Taylor, Jr., of Texas.
James F. Twaddell, of Rhode Island.
Lannon Walker, of the District of Columbia.
William Graham Walker, of California.
William J. Waller, of California.
Donald J. Walsh, of the District of Columbia.
Ralph Clairborne Walsh, of Texas.
Barclay Ward, of Connecticut.
Alexander F. Watson, of Massachusetts.
Martin A. Wenick, of New Jersey.
Frank G. Wisner II, of Maryland.
Miss Joanna W. Witzel, of California.
William R. Womack, of Virginia.
Murray David Zinoman, of New York.

Harris H. Huston, of Ohio, a Foreign Service Reserve officer, to be a consul general of the United States of America.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Stuart J. Bohacek, of Nebraska.
Alessandro Cagiati, of Massachusetts.
Harold C. Champeau, of Maryland.
Nelson Chipchin, of New York.
Miss Frances E. Coughlin, of California.
William F. DeMyer, of New York.
James R. Echols, of Washington.
Robert H. Feldmann, of California.
Charles T. Foo, Jr., of Florida.
Jack B. Geaslin, of Maryland.
Edward J. Killeen, of California.
Charles M. Levy, of New York.
Hugh J. McMillan, of Washington.
Howard L. McVitty, of the District of Columbia.
John L. Maddux, of California.
Jean M. Nater, of Connecticut.
Charles C. Penney, of Massachusetts.
W. Wolf Reade, of the District of Columbia.
Howard E. Stingle, of Maryland.
Gerald Stryker, of Virginia.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be consuls and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

John W. Dixon, of Virginia.
Rodney N. Landreth, of Pennsylvania.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be vice consuls of the United States of America:

Charles L. Acree, Jr., of New Jersey.
Rexford L. Baer, of California.
Melvyn R. Brokenshire, Jr., of Georgia.
Allan W. Brown, of Virginia.
Fred A. Coffey, Jr., of Texas.
William E. Dietz, of Maryland.
Neal T. Donnelly, of New York.
Abol F. Fotouhi, of North Carolina.
David K. Grinwis, of New Jersey.
Piltti M. Heiskanen, of Maryland.
Donald C. Horan, of Maine.
Desmond L. Jackson, of Texas.
Joseph R. Johnson, of Virginia.
Louis P. Linfante, of Pennsylvania.
John F. McDonald, of Maine.
Joseph F. McManus, of Massachusetts.
Charles L. Medd, of New York.
James D. Montgomery, of Virginia.
John E. Palevich, of Pennsylvania.
Vincent Rotundo, of New Jersey.
I. L. Sablosky, of Indiana.
Chapman Stockford, of Maine.
Stanley E. Williams, of Hawaii.
Warren W. Williams, of Pennsylvania.
Douglas A. Zischke, of Wisconsin.

Charles H. Bibbings, of Virginia, a Foreign Service Reserve officer, to be a vice consul and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Thomas R. Blackshear, of California.
Alexander Bloomfield, of California.
Ernest F. Chase, of Virginia.
John P. Condon, of Oklahoma.
Thomas E. Drumm, Jr., of New Jersey.
Albert Harkness, Jr., of Rhode Island.
Peter K. Heimann, of the District of Columbia.
Arthur L. Jacobs, of the District of Columbia.
Andrew S. Kelsey, of Virginia.
Nathaniel Knowles, of Pennsylvania.
William A. Krauss, of California.
Carney G. Laslie, Jr., of the District of Columbia.
Harry T. Mahoney, of Illinois.
John W. Mowinckel, of the District of Columbia.
Lawrence E. Norrie, of Washington.
Rutherford T. Walsh, of California.

Ernest J. Colton, of Virginia, a Foreign Service staff officer to be a consul of the United States of America.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate, February 5, 1962:

Agency for International Development

William S. Gaud, of Connecticut, to be Assistant Administrator for the Near East and south Asia, Agency for International Development.

Edmond C. Hutchinson, of Maryland, to be Assistant Administrator for Africa and Europe, Agency for International Development.

Seymour J. Janow, of California, to be Assistant Administrator for the Far East, Agency for International Development.

Teodoro Moscoso, of Puerto Rico, to be Assistant Administrator for Latin America, Agency for International Development.

United Nations

Adlai E. Stevenson, of Illinois, to be a representative of the United States of America to the 16th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Francis T. P. Plimpton, of New York, to be representative of the United States of America to the 16th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Charles W. Yost, of New York, to be representative of the United States of America to the 16th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Philip M. Klutznick, of Illinois, to be representative of the United States of America to the 16th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Jonathan B. Bingham, of New York, to be representative of the United States of America to the 16th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Ambassadors

Robert McClintock, of California, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Argentina.

John M. Steeves, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Afghanistan.

C. Allan Stewart, of Arizona, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Venezuela.

U.S. Attorneys

Robert D. Smith, Jr., of Arkansas, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Arkansas.

Clinton N. Ashmore, of Florida, to be U.S. attorney for the northern district of Florida for the term of 4 years.

John M. Imel, of Oklahoma, to be U.S. attorney for the northern district of Oklahoma for the term of 4 years.

Charles M. Conway, of Arkansas, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of Arkansas for the term of 4 years.

Nathan S. Heffernan, of Wisconsin, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of Wisconsin for the term of 4 years.

U.S. Marshals

Richard J. Jarboe, of Indiana, to be U.S. marshal for the southern district of Indiana for the term of 4 years.

Joseph W. Keene, of Louisiana, to be U.S. marshal for the western district of Louisiana for the term of 4 years.

U.S. Circuit Judges

Griffin B. Bell, of Georgia, to be U.S. circuit judge, 5th circuit.

Walter Pettus Gewin, of Alabama, to be U.S. circuit judge, 5th circuit.

U.S. District Judges

Clarence W. Allgood, of Alabama, to be U.S. district judge for the northern district of Alabama.

Talbot Smith, of Michigan, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Michigan.

Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization

Raymond F. Farrell, of Rhode Island, to be Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization.

Assistant Secretary of the Treasury

James Allan Reed, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

U.S. Tariff Commission

Ben David Dorfman, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the U.S. Tariff Commission for the term expiring June 16, 1967.

Comptroller of Customs

Andrew M. Bacon, of Louisiana, to be comptroller of customs, with headquarters at New Orleans, La.

Surveyor of Customs

John A. Vaccaro, of New York, to be surveyor of customs in customs collection district No. 10, with headquarters at New York, N.Y.

Collectors of Customs

Eugene V. Atkinson, of Pennsylvania, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 12, with headquarters at Pittsburgh, Pa.

Minnie M. Zoller, of Texas, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 21, with headquarters at Port Arthur, Tex.

Sam D. W. Low, of Texas, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 22, with headquarters at Galveston, Tex.

Charles H. Kazen, of Texas, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 23, with headquarters at Larado, Tex.

William W. Knight, of Alaska, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 31, with headquarters at Juneau, Alaska.

Samuel S. Wyatt, of Tennessee, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 43, with headquarters at Memphis, Tenn.

Craig Pottinger, of Arizona, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 26, with headquarters at Nogales, Ariz.

Superintendent of the Mint

Michael H. Sura, of Pennsylvania, to be Superintendent of the Mint of the United States at Philadelphia, Pa.

Administration of General Services

Bernard L. Boutin, of New Hampshire, to be Administrator of General Services.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Dairy Outlook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, last week the administration presented its farm recommendations to the Congress. The message, of course, covered major features of the agriculture picture. Of particular interest to the State I represent, Wisconsin—the No. 1 milk-producing State, with an output of about 18 billion pounds—are these proposals relating to dairying.

In a weekend broadcast over Wisconsin radio stations, I was privileged to discuss the President's recommendations, some alternatives, and the general outlook in dairying.

I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts of my talk printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Wiley Says Outlook Dim for President's Dairy Proposals

I want to utilize this get-together with you for a discussion of problems and challenges in an industry which has helped to make Wisconsin famous; provides hundreds of millions of dollars in income; creates a livelihood for over 100,000 farm families here in Wisconsin; results in thousands of nonfarm jobs; and provides our Nation with one of its most rich and vital food resources: the dairy industry.

During this week, the President delivered a farm message to Congress. The message contained recommendations on the major features of the agricultural picture. Of particular interest to Wisconsin—the No. 1 milk producing State, with an output of about 18 billion pounds of the Nation's 125 billion pounds of milk—of course, are those proposals relating to dairying.

The dairy highlights of the President's message included the following:

1. A recommendation for continuation of the present level of price supports of $3.40 per hundredweight until December 31, 1962. To prevent further decline of dairy income—now disproportionately low in relation to the cost of operations—there is, in my judgment, a need to maintain support prices at at least the current level. To accomplish this, I will support a recommended joint resolution in Congress.

2. The adoption of a milk marketing allotment system for dairying. I believe such a program—in itself controversial—would: (a) be extremely difficult to administer; (b) provide inadequate safeguards against extreme price drops; or foreign producers taking over U.S. markets—in the event production is too greatly curtailed; (c) it is extremely doubtful whether such a program could be successful in equitably eliminating the supply-demand imbalance; and (d) the farmers, themselves, must have a determining voice in the adoption of such a program and consumers, too, have a stake in such considerations—particularly as this may affect the price of milk and other dairy foods.

The outlook for such a marketing allotment program—in my judgment, inadequate and possibly dangerous for lack of protection against "extreme price reduction" or competition from abroad—is extremely dim.

ALTERNATIVES

Now, what would be constructive alternatives?

Generally, we recognize the need for a new program to continue to provide the U.S. consumer with an adequate supply of dairy foods at reasonable prices; to provide the farmer with a fair price for his products; to reduce surplus stockpiles; and to diminish the annual cost of the price support program to the American taxpayer.

How can these steps be accomplished?

Personally, I believe by adoption of the following measures:

1. A new dairying-governmental cooperative effort to increase consumption levels.

2. Carrying forward and, as necessary, expanding, the special school milk, school lunch, food-for-the-needy, and similar programs which serve as useful outlets for the surplus dairy foods.

3. Greater utilization of dairy—as well as other food surpluses—as "strategic weapons" in our foreign policy. In a hungry world, food can be a more effective "persuader" than a gun.

4. Explore for new markets abroad and at home.

5. Expand research by the dairy industry itself to find new and more effective ways to step up consumption and utilize dairy products.

6. Enactment of the Wiley bill, S. 2414, to establish a Dairy Research Laboratory at Madison, Wis. The purpose would be to find more commercial and industrial ways to utilize dairy products.

7. Prevent public scares on milk utilizations—for example—as a source of cholesterol, creating heart problems (recent reports of activities by the Public Health Service refute such allegations).

8. Maintaining an adequate price support program, until such time as these steps promote a favorable supply-demand balance.

9. The public policy of utilizing milk too much as a "measuring stick" for radioactivity—conveying the false impression that milk—far more than other foods—carries strontium 90. This must be stopped.

10. The bad habit of folks on diets unreasonably limiting their intake of milk, too, should be discouraged. Actually, milk is unrivaled in nutritive value—being one of our best sources of minerals, calcium, and vitamins.

CONCLUSIONS

Generally, then—I believe—the adoption of these programs would better serve the American public; reduce, as possible, the cost of the price support program to the taxpayer; and brighten the outlook for the dairy industry—an important segment of our agriculture and national economy.

The House Committee on Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address:

RADIO ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE HENRY C. SCHADEBERG, FIRST DISTRICT, WISCONSIN

I would like to talk to you at this time in regard to a standing committee of the House of Representatives which has one of the most outstanding records of achievement of the many committees of the House—the Committee on Un-American Activities. In spite of its record, the tremendous work it has done on behalf of the American people to preserve our political and social, and yes—our religious way of life—and perhaps precisely because of its outstanding success—this committee and its members have been the subjects of continuing bitter and vitriolic attacks. These attacks have been leveled at the committee and its individual members with little or no basis in fact. When publicly called upon to document their criticisms, the committee's opponents either stumble and falter or at best dwell upon carping minuscule details of human error.

Probably one of the most publicized criticisms of the committee is what its opponents call "unfair treatment of witnesses." Yet, the truth is that this committee, while adamantly abiding by its constitutional responsibilities, has accomplished more for the protection of the rights of congressional witnesses than any of its predecessors or contemporary bodies.

It is significant that this committee, accused by its detractors of being unfair in its treatment of witnesses, was the first to adopt written rules of procedure. These rules of procedure were adopted in order to assure every witness equal and fair treatment while giving testimony. The rules governing the committee's work were based upon research done by the Brookings Institution. Now, the Brookings Institution is a nonprofit, nonpolitical organization devoted to economic, legal, and constitutional research. These rules of procedure, written and adopted by the House Committee on Un-American Activities, have proven to be so sound in practice that many other committees of both the House and Senate have adopted similar procedural criteria. Indeed, the House of Representatives, as a body, incorporated many of these procedures into the entire body's rule II which governs the activities of all committees of the House. It is of interest to note that the Rules of the House of Representatives are part of the law of the land and are included in the United States Code.

This committee, whose procedures are being questioned, was first to disallow the one-man subcommittee. The device of the one-man subcommittee had long been considered suspect both from the standpoint of fairness to a witness, and from a legislative standpoint. This was especially true, of course, in the case of investigatory committees. It was through the pioneering efforts of the Committee on Un-American Activities that one-man subcommittees are no longer allowed to sit. Now, when a subcommittee of the House has less than two members present, it is automatically adjourned.

Regarding the attacks on individual members of the committee, both now and in the past, it suffices to sight a few of the following facts: This committee was established 23 years ago. Over these 23 years a great number of different Members of the House of Representatives have served on the committee. Is it even slightly reasonable to believe that all of these Members, elected by U.S. citizens, have been racists, Fascists, and antisemites? Of course not. Yet the tormentors of the committee would have you believe this is the case.

The present chairman and eight other members of the committee span the entire spectrum in their political views. Past members of the committee have risen to high positions—a former Vice President of the United States, several Senators, the present chairman of the National Republican Party.

These items of facts serve to demonstrate how truly ridiculous are the baseless attacks on the committee.

The faith which the Members of the House of Representatives have in the committee was demonstrated early in the last session of the Congress when the resolution continuing the existence of the committee was adopted unanimously. When the vote was taken on the appropriation to continue the work of the committee, it was passed overwhelmingly by a vote of 412 to 6. This year there were no dissenting votes. These votes of confidence on the part of the House of Representatives should indicate that as citizens we all owe it to ourselves and our country to know all the facts on the work of this and other bodies which are engaged in the work of protecting our security.

Further, we can support the work of these bodies by practicing respect for the views of others. This means that everyone who is politically liberal is not a Communist, and by the same token everyone who is a political conservative is not a Fascist. However, we should not allow ourselves to be lulled into believing there is no threat to our Nation. It is important to realize that the constant haggle over whether our greatest threat is internal or external is missing the true picture of our enemies. There is just one threat, and that is international communism. It manifests itself in many ways, and two of these are internal and external. They are not separable. That is why this committee must continue its work. That is why it must be supported and strengthened by every American who takes the time to get the facts.

R.S.V.P. St. Louis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on February 1 Republicans gathered at dinners in 17 of this country's major cities to start the party's victory drive for 1962. I had the opportunity and honor of addressing the Republican gathering in St. Louis and I would like to share the remarks of that occasion with Republicans, and other interested citizens, throughout the country to help point the way to more meaningful discussion of the issues in 1962 and the political contentions to follow. The text of this speech which I delivered at the Republicans' start victory program dinner in St. Louis follows:

(R.S.V.P.)

(Remarks of the Honorable THOMAS B. CURTIS, at the r.s.v.p. dinner, St. Louis, Mo., February 1, 1962)

There are two basic falsehoods promulgated by the Democratic leaders about Republicans that we must challenge constantly, at all times and on all occasions by whoever repeats them until we so demonstrate their untruth to the people that they will pass from the American political scene.

Until we do this, my friends, I am afraid national debate on the crucial issues of the day will be unproductive in helping our society to reach the proper conclusions.

The first untruth is that Republicans care for money and that Democrats care for people. The truth is that all Americans by and large, including Republicans, care for people and that they recognize careful care of money is probably the most effective way to care for people, as Jesus' parable of the talents seeks to teach us. Certainly we know that a disregard for money and fiscal matters is the quickest way to bring about human misery and bring a stop to human progress.

So when we Republicans talk about balanced budgets, fair taxes at lower rates, fighting inflation and excessive Federal expenditures, we are doing so because we do care for the people, and particularly the "little" people. The issue involved in fiscal and monetary matters should never be presented to the people as the Democratic leaders have done for years, as if it were a question of who is for people and that their opponents were against people. Indeed, I charge that anyone who seeks to put national debate on this level is, by that very act, an enemy of the people. He seeks to rob and does rob the people of a clear understanding of the issues that trouble us.

No one is ever really certain that he is right in a matter. A real student seeks out debate to test his facts and his logic. But he is robbed of this necessary endeavor if his humanity, instead of his facts and logic, is made the issue.

Now, my friends of the Americans for Democratic Action have taken up the cudgel, in the name of freedom of speech and debate, to ward off attacks upon the patriotism of those who advance certain ideas and programs. When certain overenthusiastic Republicans a few years back accused Democrats, particularly the ADA brand which dominates this administration, as being soft on communism because they opposed certain programs designed by the authors to curb Communist infiltration, I took the floor of the House to rebuke my colleagues and to defend my Democratic friends, I did so in the name of freedom of speech and debate.

Is attacking one's humanity, one's religion, one's Christianity, a lesser offense to freedom of speech and debate than attacking one's patriotism? I think not.

I call for a halt on this business of attacking either the patriotism or the humanity of those who differ in public affairs. Let's get on to a discussion of the facts as both sides see them, the arguments and logic they use in each issue. There is plenty of room for honest debate.

Let's drive the matter home, Republicans. We care about people. We care about decent housing. We care about education. We care about health. We care about people having jobs. We care about low interest rates. We care about progress. We care about humanity.

It's because we do care about these things that we differ so deeply with the programs the Americans for Democratic Action, working through and with the Kennedy administration, are trying to get through the Congress.

We think these programs will produce less, not more, cheap adequate housing for our people, less and poorer education, less and poorer health, less and poorer jobs, and much less overall progress. The programs are less designed to preserve the peace and provide harmonious international relations.

And now we come to the second big lie, the Democratic leaders have been hammering home to the people about Republicans.

The Democratic leaders say the Republicans are against everything. They have no program of their own.

This is a more difficult lie to dispel, because it is certainly true that Republicans, by and large, are against the programs the Democrats advocate which rely more heavily on the Federal Government.

The Republican programs do not have the drama and oversimplification that the Democratic proposals have: let the Federal Government do it. How easy it is, particularly for a politician, to answer all problems—all questions—by saying, let the Federal Government do it. And ward off all critics who disagree or who honestly want to examine into the matter by saying:

(a) You have no heart, you aren't interested in humanity.

(b) You have no alternative proposal.

The Republican proposals rely more heavily on the private sector of our society to accomplish the desired results than do the Democrat's proposals. The Republican proposals rely more heavily upon State and local government when governmental, rather than private, action is required, than do the Democrats.

By these very facts the Republican proposals have many points and many facets. They are far from oversimplified, if anything they are complex because they rely on the individual initiative of millions of human beings, instead of the initiative of a few chosen Federal bureaucrats.

Let me illustrate by a brief discussion of how we meet the problem our older people face in obtaining and paying for their health care. The Democrats came forward with their pat, unimaginative, oversimplified solution—let the Federal Government do it—through social security. This is followed by the pattern of warding off opposition I have described as:

(a) Those who disagree have no heart, have no humanity. They don't care about the aged. They want to cast them out. This is a dastardly lie, ladies and gentlemen, and it is time all Republicans, whatever their own ideas of how to meet the problem might be, called the Democrats' hand on this.

(b) The Republicans have no program.

Let me answer the lie that the Republicans have no program. Since when is the health care program presently existing in our society, no program? It's such a fine program that its very amazing success has created the problem we are now directing out attention to. Why has health care for the aged become a problem? Because of the failure of our health care program? Not at all. It's because of its success—people are living 10 to 15 years longer than ever before. It is a blessing, not a curse.

The real issue is this: Can the program which produced the success solve the problems that the success has created? Or must we radically change this program in order to meet the new problems? This is an issue worthy of study and discussion.

I am satisfied that any objective study, and the Ways and Means Committee has conducted such a study, reveals rather conclusively that our health care system not only can meet these new problems, but that it is rapidly doing so. The studies further reveal that a switch to a heavy reliance upon the Federal Government through a compulsory hospital care program—not medical—not doctors—as is being proposed by the Democrats would radically change our program. This would result in a slowing down of further progress in medical advancement; it would lower the quality of the care we presently have, not only for the older people, but for all of us. It would only solve the problem of the aged by shortening the years of their life to finance.

Now, there are some in this audience and many around the country who would dispute my analysis. That's fine. Let's get to the debate. We're no longer talking about who is for people and who has a program. We are talking as we should. We are all for the people, and we both have programs. We are trying to figure out which program is better, the tested or the untested.

What has the debate as far as the Democratic leaders are concerned, come down to? That the doctors are against people and are uninterested in advancing further into medical care? That the hospitals are against people? That our great drug industries which have done so much for us in giving wonder drugs are against people and progress? How can sense or reason come out of such diabolic and unsubstantiated accusations?

And now I want to move to a conclusion. There is another part of the technique of the Democratic leaders opposed to national debate which I must mention. I have mentioned the two lies; that those who disagree with them have no humanity and that they have no program. The third part is also a lie. It is based upon the dangerous process of downgrading the United States, dangerous because if our enemies or the uncommitted nations believed it, it would endanger the peace and our security. It seeks to downgrade our health institutions; to make it appear that our present program is inadequate, as I have pointed out. It does the same with education—note the failure to point up the success of our educational system based as it is on local control—the greatest educational system in any society. It does the same with housing. The same with military defense. The same with our private enterprise system economy.

The President's Economic Report filed January 22, 1962, talks about the recession and lavishes great self-praise on himself, the author, for the wise, compassionate Federal program he instituted as President, which brought about recovery. Hidden in the body of the report—this part written by economic scholars—was the truth. The recession—the mildest since the end of World War II, by the way—bottomed out in February 1961. It was impossible for any Federal program or Federal action to have had any marked effect on the operation of our great dynamic American economy. President Kennedy has sought to rob our people of the success that their initiative, their ingenuity and their institutions brought about, and to lay claim to this success for himself and the massive Federal expenditure program he is advocating. It is not complacency for us to praise, as I do, our society, if our praise is justified. This accusation of complacency is the only answer my Democratic friends seem to have when they seek to rebut the arguments I have spread before you. We aren't satisfied. We have much to do, many problems to solve, many inequities to correct. Nor is it to say that the Federal Government has no part to play in meeting these problems. It has a part, but a selective part, a limited part, an ancillary part.

The Golden Age Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, over the past several years there has come into being in the Fordham section of Bronx County in New York City an active and vigorous organization known as the Golden Age Club. The purpose of this club is to take full advantage of the fine contributions that our senior citizens can make to the community wherein they reside and to the State and Nation of which they have been a part so many years. The Golden Age Club has its headquarters in the parish of Our Lady of Mercy and is in the district which I have the honor to represent. Its membership has grown steadily since its inception and it is now providing through its members a real contribution to local civic affairs.

Each year the club designates one outstanding individual to receive its Golden

Age Award. This year the award for "over 50 years of dedicated service to the community" was given to a man whom I have known for a long, long time and a man who truly deserves such an award. He is the Honorable Ernest E. L. Hammer, former justice of the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

Judge Hammer by his life and his actions truly epitomizes what is meant by the award. He has dedicated his time and his interest and his entire career to the betterment of his fellow man and the society in which he lives. He has been an outstanding lawyer and a distinguished jurist. His career at the bar of New York covers better than 55 years as he was admitted to practice in 1906.

In 1913 Judge Hammer was elected to the Assembly of the State of New York. Thereafter, he continued his public career by serving as public administrator of Bronx County for a period from 1914 to 1925. For the next 28 years from 1926 to 1954 he served as a justice of the Supreme Court of the State of New York with distinction and honor. He retired on December 31, 1954, but since that date has continued on as actively as when he was in public service. The list of his activities is too numerous to be cited. He has devoted his years in retirement to actively promoting those things that will be the greatest help to the most people. He has been honored by his church, by his fellow professional members, and by the citizens of the community in general. He has raised a fine and distinguished family of four children, the Reverend Edmond F. Hammer, Ernest Hammer, Jr., Harry F. Hammer, and a daughter, Mrs. John White.

Judge Hammer epitomizes the true citizen of the community. His life is a lesson for all of us as an example of fine devotion to public service. I am proud to have known him over the years and I am prouder still to congratulate him on this well-deserved award. I wish him many more years of continued work in what to him is a labor of love—helping his fellow man.

Effect of Oil Imports on Our Domestic Oil Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, today America faces the problems of national preservation with growing awareness of the many intricacies involved. One aspect is the maintenance and preservation of our natural resources and the allied industries therein affected.

Specifically, we must do all in our power to strengthen this Nation's ability to be self-sufficient in the production of power. Thus, the domestic oil industry must not, it cannot, be sacrificed.

We cannot afford to continue to import 26 percent of the oil which is processed for domestic and foreign consumption. Also, I believe we must maintain the 27½-percent depletion allowable on oil.

Today in my own Oklahoma the small oil companies and many allied and dependent industries are suffocating from the stranglehold of those interests which push for more importation of foreign oil.

As Mr. Harold Freeman, chairman of the Oklahoma Corporation Commission, said in a statement before a subcommittee of the Small Business Committee on November 28, 1961:

> The conditions are that Oklahoma's job-producing, tax-producing, business-producing oil and gas industry needs help. The allowables are down, the bankruptcies are up, rigs are stacked, oil workers are idle and scattered, the operators' well average is deeper, the costs are greater, money is harder to borrow, the interest rates are higher, and the excessive imports of foreign oil and petroleum products has got its foot on our necks. Excessive imports is the plague, itch, and cancer wrapped up all in one for those of us charged with the responsibility of keeping our domestic oil industry virile and responsive to national emergency.

During the Suez crises in 1956, Oklahoma's oil production shot up from 500,000 to 631,000 barrels daily. That daily increase, calculated on a yearly basis, would represent something like 40 million barrels of crude oil.

From 1957 through 1960 Oklahoma lost $6,460,200 in tax revenue primarily because of the decrease in crude oil production. In 1960 Oklahoma produced 21.7 million barrels fewer than in 1957.

The oil and natural gas producing industry faces not only the normal business hazards of trying to keep income ahead of costs; it also must carry, at its own expense, the capacity to produce far more than peacetime demand requires.

Any thinking person knows that we cannot count on Arabian oil to come surging across the sands like a knight in black armor to save us in case of war. With the blocking of the Suez, bombing of pipelines, submarine control of the Mediterranean, or by direct Soviet invasion, the Near East oil supply could be shut off in a matter of hours or days.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is absolutely essential for this Nation's security that we continue to promote incentive for the search of deposits of oil and gas by both large and small companies.

This can be done by maintaining the 27½-percent oil depletion allowable and the reduction of foreign oil imports.

The 27½-percent oil depletion allowable gives incentive to all oil companies. It must be maintained to help balance with the tremendous costs of wildcatting and exploration.

The 26-percent importation of foreign oil should be slashed to 14 percent of the domestic market. It is unrealistic to eliminate oil importation but, on the other hand, it is suicide to destroy the American oil industry.

Ladies and gentlemen, we cannot fail to heed the gasping sound of this basic industry. We cannot be so blind as to sit idly by while the oil that runs our business, agriculture, and military is shut off like water through a faucet.

The Man From Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, it was fitting that 98 years after the "Man From Illinois" made his memorable address which will live through the ages, another Illinoisan stood on the exact spot, this past November 19, and paid him a glowing tribute. His was a unique tribute in that he compared the challenges of those days to many we face today, using every highlight of that address to assure us that since that long-ago time we have faced crisis after crisis and, because we are a nation founded on liberty and equality, we have endured.

Senator DIRKSEN, in his own eloquent way, painted the beautiful word picture which follows:

ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN, U.S. SENATOR FROM ILLINOIS, AT GETTYSBURG BATTLEFIELD ON THE 98TH ANNIVERSARY OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN'S GETTYSBURG ADDRESS WHICH WAS DELIVERED ON NOVEMBER 19, 1863

> Four score and eighteen years ago this day, the man from Illinois stood in this place, the destiny of a nation upon his shoulders and the cares of conflict graven upon his face.
>
> From thousands of patriot graves, men who had fallen beneath a July sun were speaking to him. From his anguished soul he was trying to speak to and for them.
>
> He was uneasy. In ink and pencil he drafted and redrafted the remarks which he was invited to make. His mind struggled to embody in few words a message suited to the occasion, setting forth the reason for the conflict, the duty still at hand, and the hope for the future. Yet, out of deep humility, he was impelled to say that it was not the words of the living which would be noted and remembered but only the deeds of heroes who had fallen here for the Union.
>
> Consider then his words. He spoke of our forefathers—those who were here before him and brought forth a new nation. They were but one of many generations who had gone before, a part of the endless stream which flows through time and history and gives continuity to our national life.
>
> Each generation added to the inheritance which it received from those who had gone before, enriched it and transmitted it to those who were to follow. They dug the wells and planted the fields and vineyards from which those who came after were refreshed; they built the roads by which others traveled; they built the railroads by which people and things were transported; they tilled the soil from which came food and subsistence; they founded the industries where men worked; they gave the law for commerce and conduct and built the schools by which culture, classics and communication might become an open book to all. This they did — those generations who marched before—for our legacy and our trusteeship.
>
> The new nation which they wrought was conceived in liberty and dedicated to equality.
>
> How freely those words come to the tongue in all parts of the earth—liberty and equality. And what strange meanings are read into them.
>
> Men speak of liberty even as it is being extinguished before their eyes. They speak

of liberty, even as it is being transformed into a strange gospel. Men speak of liberty, even as her domain shrinks and she struggles for survival. Men speak of liberty even as such heresies as "better Red than dead" rise up to be embraced by those who have forgotten freedom's price. But the man from Illinois spoke only of that liberty which ennobles and dignifies the individual and preserves his godly image.

The man from Illinois spoke of a nation dedicated to equality. Is it a hollow word with which to beguile multitudes or does it have meaning? If it means anything, it must mean equality before the law, equality of opportunity, and equality of rights or it departs from the concept to which the new Nation was dedicated. Narrow the meaning of the word as we will, struggle against its fulfillment as we may, hedge it with conditions and exceptions to strangle its full import, it could have but one meaning to the man from Illinois who stood here 98 years ago and that is equality under a just God, equality under man's law, and equality in the enjoyment of life, the enjoyment of liberty, and freedom for each to pursue happiness in his own way.

Then came the deathless question which continues to roll down time's corridor with each generation. Can a nation so conceived and so dedicated long endure?

What strange doubts assail this timid generation of today as it beholds the challenges to both liberty and equality.

We seem beset with fear not faith, with doubt not confidence, with compromise not conviction, with dismay not dedication.

We are drenched with the literature of fear and doubt. Survival has become the main theme. The fallout shelter from which the stars of hope and courage cannot be seen has become the symbol of our fears and misgivings.

Are we to become fearful, unworthy legatees in a blessed, united land where the earth is fertile to our every need, where the skills and ingenuity of men are boundless, where the burdens are bearable, where decent living is within the reach of all, and where the genius to produce is unlimited?

Perhaps we have lost our sense of continuity? Perhaps we have forgotten that we move in that same endless stream which began with our forefathers and which will flow on and on to embrace our children and our children's children. If we have, there will have gone with it that sense of individual responsibility which is the last best hope that a nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to equality can long endure.

Comes then the reminder from the man from Illinois. Men died here and men are sleeping here who fought under a July sun that the Nation might endure, united, free, tolerant, and devoted to equality.

The task was unfinished. It is never quite finished.

Freedom is never fully won at any given time or place. From Runnymede and the Magna Carta until now is 7½ centuries. Has there been a generation in which liberty has not been challenged in one form or another?

In the day of our forefathers, the challenge was from a king and his ministers to a people.

When our Capital was burned by the British in 1814 it was an imperious sovereign against an infant land.

When the man from Illinois stood here 98 years ago, it was the challenge flowing from one of the unsolved problems in the Constitution.

Three score years ago, it was a helpless island people against a foreign tyrant.

Twice in our own time, it was the challenge of autocracy and dictatorship versus freedom and self-determination.

And, today, it is the challenge of cold war born strangely enough in the crucible of hot war. It is the challenge of a despotic, deceitful system with its own prophets, its own holy book, its own specious promises of salvation, its own image of man as a creature without dignity or the everlasting hope of another more glorious life.

But the challenge to freedom is not limited to forces from without. It embraces also those individuals and groups who are unceasing in their efforts to expand the powers and functions of the Central Government and have it intrude more deeply into the affairs of the people.

These, all these, are the continuing challenges to freedom and the task of the defenders is never finished.

Comes now the shining hope and the duty with which the man from Illinois charged his countrymen.

The hope—a new birth of freedom. But can there be a birth without labor and pain?

Dare we in this soft age believe when men shrink from pain and sacrifice that a new birth of freedom and a new sense of mission can come without pain?

And then the further hope that self-government shall not perish. He did not mean government of the few but of all. He did not say government by the few but by all. He did not say government for the few but for all.

But the key to all is government by the people for the certain way to lose the precious power of self-government is failure to use it.

So spoke the man from Illinois 98 years ago this day.

His imperishable words are as fresh today as when they were uttered.

The problem today is the same as in his day—whether in this uneasy, fevered world, this or any nation founded on liberty and equality can long endure.

The duty is the same—the duty imposed upon us as a part of that endless procession of men and women to build and ennoble this good land and carry on the unfinished work.

The bonds are the same, for the living cannot separate themselves from their obligation to the dead.

The need is the same—for a new birth of freedom as the lamps of liberty go out in many places, either by force and brutality or by default.

The challenge is the same—for this generation to come out of the gloomy shelters of defeatism and despair and assert freedom's cause under God to all the world with the same vigor and purpose which marked the course of the man from Illinois.

His name you know—Abraham Lincoln.

West Virginia Council on Children and Youth Holds Significant Conference—Justice Clark and Governor Barron Speak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it was my privilege to have been afforded opportunity to participate on January 26, 1962, in sessions of the West Virginia Council of the White House Conference on Children and Youth at Charleston.

It was my further pleasure to have had the honor of introducing the Honorable Tom C. Clark, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

The principal discussion theme during the 3-day meeting was the important subject "The Unemployed, Out-of School Youth."

As Tom Cummings of the Charleston Daily Mail staff wrote for the Friday afternoon, January 26, issue of that newspaper:

> Evidence accumulated shows that dropout from public school is a chronic educational ailment in West Virginia. Those attending a 3-day conference (of the West Virginia Council of the White House Conference on Children and Youth) to study the problem are probing for an answer. At the moment there appears to be no exact formula for a successful preventive.

But, Mr. President, the subject was appropriately and cogently discussed by Associate Justice Clark, Gov. W. W. Barron of West Virginia, and other conference speakers, including Dr. Donald M. Burke of Elkins, council president; Rev. Stacy L. Groscup of Morgantown; Phares Reeder, executive secretary of the West Virginia Education Association; Hon. Hulett C. Smith, commissioner of the West Virginia Department of Commerce; David L. Francis, president of Princess Coals, Inc., and former mayor of Huntington, W. Va.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my remarks on the occasion of introducing Justice Clark; also extracts from Justice Clark's significant address; and briefs of other speakers' contributions on the subject as reported by Mr. Cummings in the Charleston Daily Mail and by John W. Yago, staff writer for the Charleston Gazette.

There being no objection, the comments referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH, DEMOCRAT, OF WEST VIRGINIA, INTRODUCING ASSOCIATE JUSTICE TOM C. CLARK AT MEETING OF THE WEST VIRGINIA COUNCIL OF THE WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH, DANIEL BOONE HOTEL, CHARLESTON, W. VA., JANUARY 26, 1962

Governor Barron, Dr. Burke, Justice Clark, ladies and gentleman, I am grateful for the opportunity to be a participant in this conference on the subject of "The Unemployed, Out-of-School Youth." I fully realize the seriousness of the problem of the increasing number of students who fail to graduate from the schools of our State. It is most gratifying to know that a solution for the situation is being sought. Your task is challenging and the positive results will be a rewarding achievement.

Your planning committee for this meeting should be congratulated for its choice of our guest speaker. I can think of no American more devoted to the welfare of the youth of the Nation than the Honorable Tom C. Clark, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Justice Clark's efforts on behalf of the boys of America is best exemplified by his selection as "Big Brother of the Year" in 1950. Much of his work with youth is centered around the Boy Scouts. He now holds several high-ranking positions in this splendid organization, such as a member-at-large of the National Council and as a member of the committee on rural service. He was awarded the "Silver Buffalo" by the Boy Scouts of America in June of 1960 in recognition of his leadership.

Justice Clark has also helped awaken our country to the necessity of expanding juvenile opportunity. Probably his best known endeavor was his sponsorship of the "Freedom Train" which has carried the original historic documents on exhibition across the United States.

Of course, the success attained by Justice Clark is not confined to his work with young people. The accomplishments of this native Texan have been many since he first joined the U.S. Department of Justice as an attorney in 1937. He advanced within the ranks of the Department during an 8-year period, and in 1945 was appointed Attorney General of the United States by President Truman.

During his tenure as our Nation's Attorney General, this celebrated jurist was recognized for his work for civil rights and better citizenship, his support of public education against crime, and his aggressive attack against the infiltration of communism.

In 1949, President Truman nominated Justice Clark to the Supreme Court of the United States. He succeeded Justice Frank Murphy as an Associate Justice of the Court, and has been serving in that capacity with distinction in the law and devotion to public service.

It is a personal pleasure and an official privilege to present our esteemed and eminent jurist Tom C. Clark, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

EXCERPTS FROM AN ADDRESS BY HON. TOM C. CLARK, ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES BEFORE THE WEST VIRGINIA COUNCIL OF THE WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH, CHARLESTON, W. VA., JANUARY 26, 1962:

Your excellency, Governor Barron, Senator RANDOLPH, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, 8 months ago today Dr. James Bryant Conant told 500 men and women gathered in Washington from all over the country "that the problem you are here to discuss poses a serious threat to our free society * * * The existence of thousands of youths * * * who are both out of school and out of work is an explosive situation."

We gather here today under the auspices of the West Virginia Council of the White House Conference on Children and Youth to discuss the same problem—the unemployed, out-of-school boy and girl. As Dr. Conant said to the Washington group, which was brought together by the National Committee for Children and Youth, "Especially shocking * * * was the discovery that the problem of youth is literally nobody's affair." This is, as Dr. Conant said, indeed unfortunate.

I am happy to see that here in West Virginia responsible citizens such as yourselves, from the Governor on down, are making it their affair. This is particularly encouraging in view of the appraisal of Dr. Conant that the problem is social dynamite. This is a tag that he placed upon it after receiving special reports indicating that in one area of our country 59 percent of the boys between 16 and 21 years of age were both out of school and out of work, while in another area the boys and girls out of school and out of work reached 70 percent of those in the same age brackets. I note that a report of your division of vocational education indicates that there is a consistent dropout among students of some 60 percent from the 1st through the 12th grade. This is indeed distressing. What is more, the percentage of dropouts between the ninth grade and high school graduation seems to consistently run over 40 percent. Apparently these figures are on a statewide basis. In my view, until we have an accurate statistical picture about the unemployed, out-of-school boy and girl, we are not going to be able to effectively improve the situation. This, I believe, is the first task of every community, namely, to find out block by block, school by school, city by city, just what the facts are about the unemployed, out-of-school youths.

It is also most encouraging to note that your 3-day program, beginning yesterday, is an intensive one of wide coverage. It is the more impressive to me because it has attracted here the leaders of your great State. Participating in it are many public officials, religious leaders, educators, social workers, criminologists, physical education and recreation experts, and business leaders and their industrial organizations. I mention business leaders and their organizations last because they are, I believe, most important to the success of any program aimed at the transformation of unemployed, school dropouts to employed, dropin students. I congratulate you on the organization of such an impressive conference. I am honored to be a part of it and I hope that it may become the means of alleviating the distressing problem that faces West Virginia youths today.

I read and hear much about juvenile problems at the national level. Some States seem to think that it is a national problem and should therefore be handled by the Congress. The Congress has been giving some thought to the problem, as evidenced by the introduction last session of the Youth Employment Opportunities Act of 1961 and a bill by Congressman PERKINS authorizing pilot training and employment programs for youth. I am happy to see, however, that you, the people of West Virginia, are now awaiting or depending upon the passage of Federal legislation. Rather than passing the buck to Washington you have started an affirmative program of your own. Certainly the National Government has a role in the youth problems of today, but, as our Vice President said a while ago, it should be one of leadership, not of domination. As I see it, the situation is a local one varying by communities and dependent largely on the local economy. The Federal Government should and I am sure will render indirect and supplemental assistance such as the States may need in public education, employment services, and the creation of a favorable national climate for the promotion of an effective local program.

Many people suggest that we need more Federal criminal laws; others advise that we should enforce State and local laws, give police more authority, enact registration statutes, and adopt loitering and curfew ordinances. It seems to me, though, that one of the solutions is the attack that you are making on the unemployed, out-of-school youth.

As I see it, the representatives of business, labor and public education can get this job done. In addition to transforming the unemployed dropout to an employed dropin, they can build up the morale of our youth, carry on a continuous program of job training, and through a cooperative stewardship bring about a lessening of the number of youths that today face life with such a dark vision.

These are just a few random suggestions which I am sure your experts have already considered. Let me say again I do not have the answers. I do know that we must arouse the public at the local level to the necessity of action. Meetings such as you are having here today can do much to bring this about; indeed the answer to the question that you probe into today rests in your hands. If from your gathering can come a determined effort and an organized plan to go after this problem on a statewide basis, I am sure that you can solve it. In addition, I believe that your program can be organized so that it will bring home to all mothers and fathers the importance of their children mastering a trade as well as obtaining at least a high school education. In this manner your long-term target can well bring a stop not only to the unemployed dropouts but also to the juvenile delinquency problem that is increasing throughout the Nation year by year. I am sure that the National Committee for Children and Youth can render you great assistance in this regard. In addition, I am greatly gratified to know that the President has recently appointed two committees, which likewise I am sure could be of great service to you in your work. The first is the President's Committee on Youth and Employment, and the second is the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime. They are each made up of distinguished citizens who are dedicated to young people, and many of whom devote most of their time to their problems.

In closing let me say that I bid you godspeed in your work. I am sure that as you continue it there will be created among all of us a more genuine attachment to youth in their problems and a real desire to assist in their solution. Yes, I know it will take some years of hard work, but I for one believe, as do you, that our boys and girls are worth it.

GOV. W. W. BARRON DELIVERS KEYNOTE ADDRESS AT WEST VIRGINIA COUNCIL OF WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH

Governor Barron, who spoke at the first general session in his role as honorary chairman of the council, said dropouts represent one facet of West Virginia's backwardness.

"Unemployed, out-of-school youth are not just a school problem," the Governor asserted, and remarked: "These boys and girls represent a symptom of the larger problem in West Virginia—the need for modernizing and updating everything that holds progress back."

Noting that the greatest rate of school dropouts is between the 6th and 10th grades, Governor Barron said that "this is the impressionable age for most children" and he declared that youth in this age category are easily misled into believing that economic security is better than educational stature.

The Governor suggested a better educational pattern to hold the interest of the growing children and admonished that "we cannot accept the philosophy that most dropouts are people who can't do quality school work."

He pointed to statistics showing that more than half of group of dropouts studied recently were fully capable of continuing in their school work—had they been properly motivated.

Governor Barron expressed the candid opinion that "West Virginia is overproducing undereducated people," and he urged coordinated activity by government and other groups to overcome the school dropout problem. He said the fact that the State's educated people are leaving in too great numbers while those who drop out of school and swell the ranks of the unemployed threatens the future leadership and well-being of the State.

The Governor noted that West Virginia's high rate of public school dropouts is not an isolated fact and he declared: "It is simply the visible symptom of a whole social, economic, and educational complex that was never intentionally put together, in its present form, by anyone."

The dropout problem, he said, has never before been seriously considered because it posed no great problem for the State. But advancing industrial technology and automation, he added, now have eliminated a labor market for the undereducated.

"Too many of our public school products—the dropouts—are no longer salable on the labor market," Governor Barron asserted. He noted the seriousness of the problems by citing statistics showing that of the 57,825 pupils who enrolled in the first grade in 1948 only 22,107 of them graduated from high school in 1960. He said that only 14 of the State's 55 counties graduate at least half of their first graders.

"We are failing in the business of modern government," the Governor admonished, "and we are failing in modern education when our product is neither salable on the labor market nor a solid, self-sustaining member of our society."

Governor Barron then offered these suggestions:

Build eight regional vocational schools and establish mobile vocational schools for other areas; create branch colleges to bring more educational opportunities to youth at the community level; extend the influence of colleges and universities to the technical and precollege level; expand on-the-job training; establish new courses in the schools and provide more counseling services.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of February 3, 1962:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas, February 3, 1962)

The President asked Congress this week for $100 million to buy United Nations bonds. Inasmuch as I have introduced a resolution demanding that the United States withdraw from the U.N., I am in complete disagreement with any further subsidy to that organization. Any earlier hope on our part that the U.N. would keep peace in the world has long been shattered by a union of nations that seems more bent on destroying freedom and the United States as the leader of the free world, than for any other purpose. A review of recent actions of the U.N. and a simple recitation of the anti-U.S. actions over the years and the subservience to the Soviet Union is enough to prove to my satisfaction membership in and subsidy for the United Nations is not in the self-interest of our own Nation.

No amount of flippancy on the part of the President in attempting to justify authorizing Pierre Salinger, his publicity man, to meet with the Russians is going to keep the American people from remembering these important facts: (1) We have never won by talking with the Communists. They always have gained while we made concessions. Result of the Vienna Conference between President Kennedy and Khrushchev was the building of the wall in Berlin, and a further setback for the free world. (2) There is nothing in Salinger's background or experience (and he is not an official responsible to the people) which leads us to believe he can successfully deal with the Soviets. (The President did not answer this in his press conference.) (3) Secret diplomacy has always failed. I believe the people have the right to know, the press has a duty to discuss, the President's goals in following his present course of courting the Kremlin's royal family through his news secretary. While we appreciate humor, the American people find nothing funny in the many times the Communists have used such meetings as now proposed to gain respectability and further their dedicated aim of enslaving the world.

On the Dallas Federal Building: It is a mystery to me why the President, who is calling for a balanced budget, would oppose a project which will save the taxpayers $990,000 a year in present rentals. Although the President asked Congress for 70 new ways to spend money in his budget and economic messages, he seems reluctant to include a project which will save money. I will continue my efforts to get approval by the Appropriations Committee of this project which has been proven on its merits to be right.

My Committee on Ways and Means is deeply involved in writing a tax bill. Unfortunately, the end result is not going to be desirable as it should be. What is needed is complete tax reform and revision, not the hit and miss method we are now employing. Examples of where we will fall short: (1) Foreign investment. People will be forced to pay tax on money they do not have. The tax is too high and will only breed new troubles and inequities. (2) Tentative approval has been given to cut entertainment expenses an arbitrary 50 percent with no regard to legitimacy. If entertainment expenses are not legitimate, why should we allow a 50-percent deduction? If they are a legitimate business expense they should be fully deductible. A better approach to this and other tax problems, enactment of the Alger-Baker-Herlong bill for tax reform and eliminate deductions such as entertainment expense.

The House passed H.R. 8900, the college facilities bill. My opposition was based on: (1) The principle of taking Federal money to stimulate education is wrong. Our national debt is nearing $300 billion. Taxes are already too high. We are reaching the breaking point financially. (2) Public expenditure of Federal money to support colleges is killing private expenditure and will eventually replace private contributions to the detriment of higher education institutions. (3) Federal regulations must follow Federal expenditures, but are wrong when imposed in the educational field. Education of freemen must remain free and that means free of Government control. (4) The necessary separation of church and state now conflicts with the denominational schools of higher education receiving loans or grants. (5) Imposition of further Federal regulation in imposing Davis-Bacon Act provisions in building college facilities. Secretary of Labor will set wages for construction and there is no recourse in any court from his arbitrary decision. In opposing this poorly written bill I am for higher education and the right of every student who wants a college education to get it. But they must want and seek it. It cannot be a gift from the Federal Government and still give us the hope of maintaining a free society and private enterprise system.

The establishment of a new Cabinet Post for Urban Affairs as demanded by the President is not going to improve urban affairs. Our private economy operating at the local level can serve people in our cities better than any bureaucrat or combination of bureaucrats directed out of Washington can. The President's attempt to make this a political issue by injecting the race question is in poor grace and will not, I am sure, fool the people.

Is Space a Challenge to Religion?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, on Friday evening, February 2, I had the great pleasure of addressing the Fathers Club of the Ursuline School in New Rochelle, N.Y., on the subject: "Is Space a Challenge to Religion?"

The meeting was presided over by Mr. Gabriel Bundschuh, president of the Fathers Club of the school, and I was introduced by my old friend, the Honorable Peter Campbell Brown, former corporation counsel of the city of New York, and also well remembered by my colleagues for his distinguished service here in Washington as Chairman of the Subversive Activities Control Board.

I accepted this invitation because another dear friend of mine, Dr. Alexander J. Conte, wrote me that the Sisters of the Ursuline School, together with the 400 men comprising the Fathers Club, would be overjoyed to have me address them on the subject of space.

The pleasure was all mine.

Following is the text of my address:

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN VICTOR L. ANFUSO IN NEW YORK, FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 1962

Mr. Chairman and friends: I want to discuss with you today a subject which, I believe, all of you will find interesting and thought provoking. As you know, I am a member of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics and since being appointed to this committee I find the field of science extremely exciting and I keep thinking about it more and more.

I am also a deeply religious person, as are all of you. It is for this reason that I have chosen as my topic: "Is Space a Challenge to Religion?" This is not a simple subject. It is actually the old problem of "Religion and Science." Each time there is a significant advance or a major breakthrough in the scientific world, we again take up the question.

In recent years it is the exploration of outer space which has captured the imagination of people all over the world. At the same time, it has set many of them to think about religion. Some profess to see in all this a challenge to religion. Theology is not my field of specialization: my interest in this field is limited to that of the ordinary layman and devout churchgoer.

The great American poet and philosopher, Carl Sandburg tells the story how he once met with the famous physicist, Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, who played a leading role in the development of atomic energy. Sandburg asked him this question: "Tell me, when you finally shattered the atom, which is the smallest particle of matter, and it came apart, what were the pieces?"

Dr. Oppenheimer replied: "When the atom was split, it didn't come apart in pieces; it came apart in things that never existed before."

To this day we don't know all the secrets of God's universe, anymore than we know the secrets of God's ways. It is true that in recent years we have made great progress in scientific research. We have learned a great deal about outer space, we are aware of the difficulties involved, we know of the explorations being undertaken now and those planned for the future. And yet, the more I learn about all this, the more I come to the conclusion that mankind still needs to pray—and, if we are wise, we should pray very hard.

In one of his last annual Christmas messages to the world, the late Pope Pius XII, speaking of the divine grandeur and its meaning to mankind, said this:

"There is reason, indeed, for asking with fear and anxiety if modern man is still disposed to allow himself to yield to a supernatural truth so sublime, to be penetrated by the joy it has to offer; who is so sure of himself and his future, he dares all, urged by an insatiable desire to know nature's deepest secrets, to bend its forces to his own will, eager to penetrate in his own person the interplanetary spaces. In truth modern man, precisely because in possession of all that the mind and labor of man have produced, ought to recognize even more the infinite distance between what he can do and what proceeds from the limitless power of God."

This, to my mind, constitutes very sage and sound advice. Unless we recognize the infinite distance between what man can do and the unlimited powers of God, we shall digress from the belief in God and turn to the belief in some all-powerful man—a belief based more on fear than on conviction. We need not look too far afield for this possibility. The present order in Soviet Russia and Communist China, based on a godless philosophy and a way of life which is devoid of religion, are perfect examples of men living in fear instead of freedom, of men living with brutal power instead of with God's words of truth and love.

Having said all this, I do not mean to convey to you the idea that man must not continue to probe the secrets of the universe in which he lives. This is definitely desirable and should be encouraged.

Let us consider the proposal to explore the moon. The national program of exploring the moon, with manned and unmanned spacecraft, has captured the imagination of the world. Since it will also capture a sizable chunk of the Federal budget, it is being discussed, pro and con, in every city and hamlet across the land.

The question is often asked: Why go to the moon? or what can a man do on the moon that instruments can't do? If you look at a man with an engineer's eye, you will probably conclude that human beings are extremely fragile creatures to bear the strains of space flight. Certainly, they are not very reliable, compared with some machines. Considered as computers, they are both slow and inaccurate. Above all, from a moral standpoint they are not expendable; this country, at least, would never send a man into space unless it expected him to survive.

Then why should we try to put a man, and not just instruments, on the moon? The main reason is that people are unparalleled for versatility and selectivity, especially in observation, making repairs, and coping with unforeseen problems. In addition to the logical reasons for sending man into space, there are psychological factors that are not so rational. Man may not really trust his machines, and he wants to go along for the ride.

But let us assume that man himself is the best available means, you may still ask: "Why explore the moon?" Specific answers have been given at length by James E. Webb, the National Space Administrator, and others. I'll review them briefly, and then consider the values of space flight beyond the moon.

Scientists look at the moon as an object of study and a useful laboratory. They tell us that close study of the moon—which has changed relatively little through the ages, and so preserved the records of its early history—may throw much light on the origin and nature of the earth and of life itself.

The moon has economic value as a new rich source of metals and minerals, oil and gases, and other useful materials which would enrich mankind on earth.

Although this is a controversial question, there seems to be little doubt of the moon's strategic value. For instance, Professor Guy Stever of MIT, a former chief scientist of the Air Force, says that putting a man on the moon is a military necessity and whoever conquers the moon can conquer the earth. If this is true, then we don't want the Russians getting there first.

The moon could also be used for many practical applications in photography, communications, weather forecasting, medicine, navigation, and research on materials and electronic components.

Then, there are psychological reasons for going to the moon. In addition to the challenge, the voice of adventure telling us to explore the moon "because it is there," we know that the manned exploration of the moon would add immeasurably to our national influence and prestige throughout the world. We cannot overlook this factor. Look at what the Russians have done with their sputnik, the moon shot and their astronauts, all the propaganda they have gotten out of it and how they used it to build up their prestige in the world.

From the standpoint of our national space program, the moon would be very useful as a way station, a platform for the assembly and restaging of vehicles going beyond the moon to the planets. The cost and energy requirements would be much less for moon-staged flights than for direct flights from the earth to (say) Mars and Venus.

At this point in my talk, I'd like to digress for just a moment, and give you a bird's-eye view of the national space program. In the coming fiscal year, which begins on July 1, some 12 percent of the total Federal budget (of $92.5 billion) will be spent on missiles and space. That's about $11 billion. The NASA budget alone will be roughly twice as much as the year before. I think we should note, though, that NASA will spend only about $300 million for its own expenses, while letting contracts with industry of more than $3½ billion.

These are large amounts of money. You can well imagine their impact on the national economy. Since a large part will be spent for research and development. I am sure you can appreciate the stimulus that the space program will give to scientific and technological progress, and in fact to every phase of economic activity. Communities all over the country will benefit from it.

This money will pay for many different projects. You may have read their names in the newspapers. For unmanned exploration of the moon, NASA is developing the Ranger and Surveyor and also, for later use, the Prospector and Voyager.

NASA plans to launch three Rangers in 1963. The first of these will carry cameras, which will take 180 pictures of the moon from distances of 2,400 to 15 miles as they plunge to destruction on the surface. These pictures will be televised back to the earth. Equipment which (it is hoped) can survive the crashlanding will relay back additional information on (a) the moon's radioactivity, (b) the lunar surface, (c) moon quakes and (d) the impact of meteors on the moon.

The NASA budget for research and development on manned exploration of the moon will rise next year from $147 to $863 million. This program includes project Mercury (one-man craft), Gemini (two-man craft) and Apollo (three-man craft). Project Mercury has become famous through the exploits of Astronauts Shepard and Grissom (and Glenn). Now it is already phasing out. The Mercury budget reaches its peak—over $68 million—in the current fiscal year, will drop next year to some $13 million.

The next major NASA project—and one that people don't hear much about—is Mariner, for the unmanned exploration of Mars and Venus. There are also major projects for communication, weather, and navigation satellite systems, and for scientific satellites and sounding rockets.

I've already mentioned the technical and economic impact of the space program. Let me give you a few examples.

More than 700,000 people are already now employed in the various industries engaged in space technologies. Their number will grow even larger in the years to come. These industries include most of the aircraft companies and a large part of electronics, plus a number of industries that many people seldom think of in connection with space, such as plastics and ceramics. Some are virtually new industries created by the space program—one example is cryogenics (the technology of very low temperatures).

This upsurge of industry, mostly in research and development has produced a number of new materials, devices and processes. For instance, remote-control television switches enable us to turn a program on or off without moving from our chairs. These switches are an offshoot of space technology. Another example is a drug developed from a missile propellant—hydrazine—and now used to treat mental illness and tuberculosis.

In fact, many byproducts of space technology are finding applications in medicine. Incredible as it may seem, even the hazards of space flight promise in time to help us cure the ills of mankind. This possibility seems such a paradox to people who first hear it that it deserves a few minutes' consideration.

The best known hazards of space flight are radiation and weightlessness.

Below the Van Allen belts, where all manned orbital flights will probably be made, the earth's magnetic field gives good protection from radiation. Even direct passage through the Van Allen belts should not be dangerous, because it can be made so quickly, and because there are "holes" in the Van Allen belts around the earth's polar regions. But at higher altitudes, astronauts will encounter cosmic radiation and solar flares. It is on really long trips, beyond the moon, that solar flares will represent the big danger.

This country has not had much experience with weightlessness—in fact, only about 5 minutes each for the Shepard and Grissom flights. Soviet reports indicate that prolonged weightlessness causes some disorientation and nausea, as well as some irregularity of heart action, but nothing really serious. We must remember, though, that even Titov's flight lasted only about 24 hours. For flights to Mars or Venus, which will take weeks or months, the problem of weightlessness may be more serious, as indicated by the experiences of bedridden patients and the "simulated weightlessness" of subjects experimentally immersed in water. The results of "simulated weightlessness" include reduced minerals in the bones, reduced nitrogen in the muscles, and a reduced tolerance of g. forces (referring to the force of gravity).

Perhaps an astronaut's ability to withstand g. forces will have to be built up again, before he can return to the earth. A familiar parallel is the bedridden patient, who can seldom walk right after he gets out of bed, but has to regain his sense of balance and muscular control by degrees—for example, by sitting up for a few minutes every day, and taking a few steps around the room while leaning on a cane or another person. Some of our space planners have thought up a similar way of rehabilitating weightless astronauts. The idea is that an astronaut would not return directly to the earth from outer space, but would first spend some time on a space station in orbit. If the space station rotated slowly, like a top, centrifugal force would stimulate the earth's gravity—that is, it would overcome weightlessness. By controlling the rate of spin, the astronaut's tolerance to g. forces could be gradually built up until he became able again to withstand the earth's gravity.

On the plus side, it should be noted that weightlessness can prolong life by as much as one-third of the present average span because of the release of pressure on the heart. It has been calculated that man expends about one-third of his total energy production in overcoming the force of gravity. It may interest you to know that the higher up you go into space, your weight is reduced and the pressure on the heart is similarly reduced. A simple example, which might surprise you, is the knowledge that a person's weight is a trifle less in the upstairs bedroom than in his downstairs living room. Nevertheless, I would not advise you to get rid of your one-story split-level rambler home so soon.

Another interesting point for you to know is that an athlete can clear a bar on earth (and I mean a bar you jump over, and not a certain other kind of bar) at the height of about 7 feet. The world's record is 7 feet 4½ inches. On the moon, an ordinary man can clear a bar at 42 feet. Think of it, you'd be flying around up there like angels.

Someday it may be possible to send heart patients into orbit for treatment, or they may be ordered by their doctors to live on the moon or on some small planet where gravity is weaker than on the earth. In much the same way, the radiation of outer space may be used to treat diseases, just as X-rays are used today.

A principal hazard is psychological. It arises in part from the feeling that man was not made to go into space. I'd like to devote the remaining moments of my talk to this question.

Of course, it is true—again, if you look at a man with an engineer's eye—that the human frame was not designed primarily for space flight. I have no doubt that this will prove to be the limiting factor in the manned exploration of outer space. On the other hand, was the human frame designed to climb the highest mountains—where man has been—or descend to the farthest depths of the sea—where man has been?

Astronauts and highflying aviators tell us that they sometimes have a sense of isolation out there—of being cut off from the world. They also tell us about another feeling that comes to them on such occasions—a feeling of being closer to God.

For me, the ethical rightness of exploring space was settled in 1956, when His Holiness Pope Pius XII made the following pronouncement at a special audience in Castel Gondolfo:

"The Lord God, who placed in the heart of man the insatiable desire for knowledge, did not intend to limit man's efforts in the process, as he said, 'submit the earth.' It is the whole creation that he has placed at his command and that he offers to the human mind, so that he may see it through and thus may understand always more profoundly the infinite grandeur of his Creator."

In line with those inspiring words which I have just quoted, it is my firm belief that the exploration of the moon and planets will bring vast benefits, many times greater than their cost, to the Nation, the scientific community, and to all of mankind.

Which in conclusion brings me back to my original question: Is space a challenge to religion? I do not see it as such. I see the exploration of space as a furtherance of human knowledge, as the opening of new vistas for human achievement and the attainment of abundance for all. I see it as God's hand in helping man to understand the universe in which he lives.

Space exploration is not a challenge to God. It is a challenge to man. And the challenge consists not only in obtaining knowledge, but in utilizing it properly and justly, to bring real peace on earth, according to the word of God.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

John 9: 4: *I must work the works of Him that sent me, while it is day, for the night cometh when no man can work.*

O Thou who art the Creator and Supreme Ruler of the Universe, may we daily respond with faith and vigor to Thy voice of love, calling us to be workers with Thee in meeting the compelling needs of our generation.

Give us a greater sense of mission and urgency as we find ourselves challenged with the task of devising ways and means of providing for the material and spiritual welfare of humanity.

Grant that we may yield ourselves eagerly and earnestly to the promptings and persuasions of Thy Holy Spirit in order that we may rise victoriously above life's conflicts and confusions, its tensions and struggles.

In Christ's name we offer our prayer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on February 2, 1962, the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 157. An act to change the name of the Playa del Rey Inlet and Harbor, Venice, Calif., to the "Marina del Rey, Los Angeles, Calif."; and

H.R. 8847. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide that a distribution of stock made to an individual (or certain corporations) pursuant to an order enforcing the antitrust laws shall not be treated as a dividend distribution but shall be treated as a return of capital; and to provide that the amount of such a distribution made to a corporation shall be the fair market value of the distribution.

EXPANDING AND IMPROVING EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 330)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

No task before our Nation is more important than expanding and improving the educational opportunities of all our people. The concept that every American deserves the opportunity to attain the highest level of education of which he is capable is not new to this administration—it is a traditional ideal of democracy. But it is time that we moved toward the fulfillment of this ideal with more vigor and less delay.

For education is both the foundation and the unifying force of our democratic way of life—it is the mainspring of our economic and social progress—it is the highest expression of achievement in our society, ennobling and enriching human life. In short, it is at the same time the most profitable investment society can make and the richest reward it can confer.

Today, more than at any other time in our history, we need to develop our intellectual resources to the fullest. But the facts of the matter are that many thousands of our young people are not educated to their maximum capacity—and they are not, therefore, making the maximum contribution of which they are capable to themselves, their families, their communities and the Nation. Their talents lie wasted—their lives are frequently pale and blighted—and their contribution to our economy and culture are lamentably below the levels of their potential skills, knowledge, and creative ability. Educational failures breed delinquency, despair, and dependence. They increase the costs of unemployment and public welfare. They cut our potential national economic output by billions. They deny the benefits of our society to large segments of our people. They undermine our capability as a Nation to discharge world obligations. All this we cannot afford—better schools we can afford.

To be sure, Americans are still the best educated and best trained people in the world. But our educational system has failed to keep pace with the problems and needs of our complex technological society. Too many are illiterate or untrained, and thus either unemployed or underemployed. Too many receive an education diminished in quality in thousands of districts which cannot or do not support modern and adequate facilities, well-paid and well-trained teachers, or even a sufficiently long school year.

Too many—an estimated 1 million a year—leave school before completing high school—the bare minimum for a fair start in modern-day life. Too many high school graduates with talent—numbering in the hundreds of thousands—fail to go on to college; and 40 percent of those who enter college drop out before graduation. And too few, finally, are going on to the graduate studies that modern society requires in increasing number. The total number of graduates receiving doctorate degrees has increased only about one-third in 10 years; in 1960 they numbered less than 10,000, including only 3,000 in mathematics, physical sciences, and engineering.

An educational system which is inadequate today will be worse tomorrow, unless we act now to improve it. We must provide facilities for 14 million more elementary, secondary school and college students by 1970, an increase of 30 percent. College enrollments alone will nearly double, requiring approximately twice as many facilities to serve nearly 7 million students by 1970. We must find the means of financing a 75-percent increase in the total cost of education—another $20 billion a year for expansion and improvement—particularly in facilities and instruction which must be of the highest quality if our Nation is to achieve its highest goals.

THE ROLE OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The control and operation of education in America must remain the responsibility of State and local governments and private institutions. This tradition assures our educational system of the freedom, the diversity and the vitality necessary to serve our free society fully. But the Congress has long recognized the responsibility of the Nation as a whole—that additional resources, meaningful encouragement and vigorous leadership must be added to the total effort by the Federal Government if we are to meet the task before us. For education in this country is the right—the necessity—and the responsibility—of all. Its advancement is essential to national objectives and dependent on the greater financial resources available at the national level.

Let us put to rest the unfounded fears that "Federal money means Federal control." From the Northwest Ordinance of 1787, originally conceived by Thomas Jefferson, through the Morrill Act of 1862, establishing the still-important and still-independent land-grant college system, to the National Defense Education Act of 1958, the Congress has repeatedly recognized its responsibility to strengthen our educational system without weakening local responsibility. Since the end of the Korean war, Federal funds for constructing and operating schools in districts affected by Federal installations have gone directly to over 5,500 districts without any sign or complaint of interference or dictation from Washington. In the last decade, over $5 billion of Federal funds have been channeled to aid higher education without in any way undermining local administration.

While the coordination of existing Federal programs must be improved, we cannot meanwhile defer action on meeting our current pressing needs. Every year of further delay means a further loss of the opportunity for quality instruction to students who will never get that opportunity back. I therefore renew my urgent request of last year to the Congress for early action on those measures necessary to help this Nation achieve the twin goals of education: a new standard of educational excellence—and the availability of such excellence to all who are willing and able to pursue it.

I. ASSISTANCE TO ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

Elementary and secondary schools are the foundation of our educational system. There is little value in our efforts to broaden and improve our higher education, or increase our supply of such skills as science and engineering, without a greater effort for excellence at this basic level of education. With our mobile population and demanding needs, this is not a matter of local or State action alone—this is a national concern.

Since my message on education of last year, our crucial needs at this level have intensified and our deficiencies have grown more critical. We cannot afford to lose another year in mounting a national effort to eliminate the shortage of classrooms, to make teachers' salaries competitive, and to lift the quality of instruction.

CLASSROOMS

To meet current needs and accommodate increasing enrollments—increasing by nearly 1 million elementary and secondary pupils a year in the 1960's—and to provide every child with the opportunity to receive a full-day education in an adequate classroom, a total of 600,000 classrooms must be constructed during this decade. The States report an immediate shortage today of more than 127,000 classrooms and a rate of construction which, combined with heavily increasing enrollments, is not likely to fill their needs for 10 years. Already over half a million pupils are in curtailed or half-day sessions. Unless the present rate of construction is accelerated and Federal resources made available to supplement State and local resources that are already strained in many areas few families and communities in the Nation will be free from the ill effects of overcrowded or inadequate facilities in our public schools.

TEACHERS' SALARIES

Teachers' salaries, though improving, are still not high enough to attract and retain in this demanding profession all the capable teachers we need. We entrust to our teachers our most valuable possession—our children—for a very large share of their waking hours during the most formative years of their life. We make certain that those to whom we entrust our financial assets are individuals of the highest competence and character—we dare not do less for the trustees of our children's minds.

Yet in no other sector of our national economy do we find such a glaring discrepancy between the importance of one's work to society and the financial reward society offers. Can any able and industrious student, unless unusually motivated, be expected to elect a career that pays more poorly than almost any other craft, trade, or profession? Until this situation can be dramatically improved—unless the States and localities can be assisted and stimulated in bringing about salary levels which will make the teaching profession competitive with other professions which require the same length of training and ability—we cannot hope to succeed in our efforts to improve the quality of our children's instruction and to meet the need for more teachers.

These are problems of national proportion. Last year I sent to the Congress a proposal to meet the urgent needs of the Nation's elementary and secondary schools. A bill (S. 1021) embodying this proposal passed the Senate last year; and similar legislation (H.R. 7300) was favorably reported to the House by its Committee on Education and Labor. It offered the minimum amount required by our needs and—in terms of across-the-board aid—the maximum scope permitted by our Constitution. It is imperative that such a proposal carrying out these objectives be enacted this session. I again urge the Congress to enact legislation providing Federal aid for public elementary and secondary classroom construction and teachers' salaries.

As noted earlier, Federal aid for construction and operation of many public schools has been provided since 1950 to those local school districts in which enrollments are affected by Federal installations. Such burdens which may remain from the impact of Federal activities on local school districts will be eased by my proposal for assistance to all school districts for construction and teachers' salaries, thus permitting modification and continuation of this special assistance program as proposed in last year's bill.

A fundamental overhauling and modernization of our traditional vocational education programs is also increasingly needed. Pursuant to my message on education last February, a panel of consultants to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is studying national needs in this area. They have been asked to develop recommendations by the close of this year for improving and redirecting the Federal Government's role in this program.

IMPROVEMENT OF EDUCATIONAL QUALITY

Strengthening financial support for education by general Federal aid will not, however, be sufficient. Specific measures directed at selected problems are also needed to improve the quality of education. And the key to educational quality is the teaching profession. About 1 out of every 5 of the nearly 1,600,000 teachers in our elementary and secondary schools fails to meet full certification standards for teaching or has not completed 4 years of college work. Our immediate concern should be to afford them every possible opportunity to improve their professional skills and their command of the subjects they teach.

In all of the principal areas of academic instruction—English, mathematics, physical and biological sciences, foreign languages, history, geography, and the social sciences—significant advances are being made, both in pushing back the frontiers of knowledge and in the methods of transmitting that knowledge. To keep our teachers up to date on such advances, special institutes are offered in some of these areas by many colleges and universities, financed in part by the National Science Foundation and the Office of Education. Many elementary and secondary school teachers would profit from a full year of full-time study in their subject-matter fields. Very few can afford to do so. Yet the benefits of such a year could be shared by outstanding teachers with others in their schools and school systems as well as with countless students. We should begin to make such opportunities available to the elementary and secondary school teachers of this country and thereby accord to this profession the support, prestige, and recognition it deserves.

Another need is for higher standards of teacher education, course content and instructional methods. The colleges and universities that train our teachers need financial help to examine and further strengthen their programs. Increased research and demonstration efforts must be directed toward improving the learning and teaching of subject-matter and developing new and improved learning aids. Excellent but limited work in educational research and development has been undertaken by projects supported by the National Science Foundation, the Office of Education, and private groups. This must be increased—introducing and demonstrating to far more schools than at present up-to-date educational methods using the newest instructional materials and equipment, and providing the most effective inservice training and staff utilization.

Finally, in many urban as well as rural areas of the country, our school systems are confronted with unusually severe educational problems which require the development of new approaches—the problems of gifted children, deprived children, children with language problems, and children with problems that contribute to the high dropout rate, to name but a few.

To help meet all of these needs for better educational quality and development, and to provide a proper Federal role of assistance and leadership, I recommend that the Congress enact a program designed to help improve the excellence of American education by authorizing:

(1) the award each year of up to 2,500 scholarships to outstanding elementary and secondary school teachers for a year of full-time study;

(2) the establishment of institutes at colleges and universities for elementary and secondary school teachers of those subjects in which improved instruction is needed;

(3) grants to institutions of higher education to pay part of the cost of special projects designed to strengthen teacher preparation programs through better curriculums and teaching methods;

(4) amendment of the Cooperative Research Act to permit support of extensive, multipurpose educational research, development, demonstration, and evaluation projects; and

(5) grants for local public school systems to conduct demonstration or experimental projects of limited duration to improve the quality of instruction or meet special educational problems in elementary and secondary schools.

II. ASSISTANCE TO HIGHER EDUCATION

In the last 10 days, both Houses of Congress have recognized the importance of higher education to the fulfillment of our national and international responsibilities. Increasing student enrollments in this decade will place a still greater burden on our institutions of higher education than that imposed on our elementary and secondary schools where the cost of education per student is only a fraction as much. Between 1960 and 1970 it is expected that college enrollments will double, and that our total annual operating expenditures for expanding and improving higher education must increase 2½ times or by nearly $10 billion.

In order to accommodate this increase in enrollments, the Office of Education estimates that nearly $22 billion of college facilities will have to be built during the 1960's—three times the construction achieved in the last 10 years. The extension of the college housing loan program—with a $1.5 billion loan authorization for 5 years, enacted as part of the Housing Act of 1961—assures Federal support for our colleges' urgent residential needs. I am hopeful that the Congress will this month complete its action on legislation to assist in the building of the even more important and urgently needed academic facilities.

But I want to take this opportunity to stress that buildings alone are not enough. In our democracy every young person should have an equal opportunity to obtain a higher education, regardless of his station in life or financial means. Yet more than 400,000 high school seniors who graduated in the upper half of their classes last June failed to enter college this fall. In this group were 200,000 who ranked in the upper 30 percent of their class, of whom one-third to one-half failed to go on to college principally because of a lack of finances. Others lack the necessary guidance, incentive or the opportunity to attend the college of their choice. But whatever the reason, each of these 400,000 students represents an irreplaceable loss to the Nation.

Student loans have been helpful to many. But they offer neither incentive nor assistance to those students who, by reason of family or other obligations, are unable or unwilling to go deeper into debt. The average cost of higher education today—up nearly 90 percent since 1950 and still rising—is in excess of $1,750 per year per student, or $7,000 for a 4-year course. Industrious students can earn a part of this—they or their families can borrow a part of it—but one-half of all American families had incomes below $5,600 in 1960—and they cannot be expected to borrow, for example, $4,000 for each talented son or daughter that deserves to go to college. Federal scholarships providing up to $1,000 a year can fill part of this gap. It is, moreover, only prudent economic and social policy for the public to share part of the costs of the long period of higher education for those whose development is essential to our national economic and social well-being. All of us share in the benefits—all should share in the costs.

I recommend that the full 5-year assistance to higher education proposal before the Congress, including scholarships for more than 200,000 talented and needy students and cost of education payments to their colleges, be enacted without delay.

III. SPECIAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

1. MEDICAL AND DENTAL EDUCATION

The health needs of our Nation require a sharp expansion of medical and dental education in the United States. We do not have an adequate supply of physicians and dentists today—we are in fact importing many from abroad where they are urgently needed—and the shortage is growing more acute, as the demand for medical services mounts and our population grows. Even to maintain the present ratio of physicians and dentists to population we must graduate 50 percent more physicians and 90 percent more dentists per year by 1970, requiring not only the expansion of existing schools but the construction of at least 20 new medical schools and 20 new dental schools.

But here again more buildings are not enough. It is an unfortunate and disturbing fact that the high costs of the prolonged education necessary to enter these professions deprives many highly competent young people of an opportunity to serve in these capacities. Over 40 percent of all medical students now come from the 12 percent of our families with incomes of $10,000 or more a year, while only 14 percent of the students come from the 50 percent of the Nation's families with incomes under $5,000. This is unfair and unreasonable. A student's ability—not his parents' income—should determine whether he has the opportunity to enter medicine or dentistry.

I recommend that Congress enact the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act which I proposed last year to (a) authorize a 10-year program of matching grants for the construction of new medical and dental schools and (b) provide 4-year scholarships and cost-of-education grants for one-fourth of the entering students in each medical and dental school in the United States.

2. SCIENTISTS AND ENGINEERS

Our economic, scientific, and military strength increasingly requires that we have sufficient numbers of scientists and engineers to cope with the fast-changing needs of our time—and the agency with general responsibility for increasing this supply today is the National Science Foundation. At the elementary and secondary school level, I have recommended in the 1963 budget an expansion of the Science Foundation program to develop new instructional materials and laboratory apparatus for use in a larger number of secondary schools and to include additional subjects and age groups; an expansion of the experimental summer program permitting gifted high school students to work with university research scientists; and an expansion in the number of National Science Foundation-supported institutes offering special training in science and mathematics for high school teachers throughout the country. The budget increase requested for this latter program would permit approximately 36,000 high school teachers, representing about 30 percent of the secondary school teachers of science and mathematics in this country, to participate in the program.

At the higher education level, I am recommending similar budget increases for institute programs for college teachers; improvement in the content of college science, mathematics, and engineering courses; funds for laboratory demonstration apparatus; student research programs; additional top-level graduate fellowships in science, mathematics, and engineering; and $61.5 million in grants to our colleges and universities for basic research facilities.

3. REDUCTION OF ADULT ILLITERACY

Adult education must be pursued aggressively. Over 8 million American citizens aged 25 or above have attended school for less than 5 years, and more than a third of these completely lack the ability to read and write. The economic result of this lack of schooling is often chronic unemployment, dependency, or delinquency, with all the consequences this entails for these individuals, their families, their communities, and the Nation. The twin tragedies of illiteracy and dependency are often passed on from generation to generation.

There is no need for this. Many nations—including our own—have shown that this problem can be attacked and virtually wiped out. Unfortunately, our State school systems—overburdened in recent years by the increasing demands of growing populations and the increasing handicaps of insufficient revenues—have been unable to give adequate attention to this problem. I recommend the authorization of a 5-year program of grants to institutions of higher learning and to the States, to be coordinated in the development of programs which will offer every adult who is willing and able the opportunity to become literate.

4. EDUCATION OF MIGRANT WORKERS

The neglected educational needs of America's 1 million migrant agricultural workers and their families constitute one of the gravest reproaches to our Nation. The interstate and seasonal movement of migrants imposes severe burdens on those school districts which have the responsibility for providing education to those who live there temporarily. I recommend authorization of a 5-year Federal-State program to aid States and school districts in improving the educational opportunities of migrant workers and their children.

5. EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION

The use of television for educational purposes—particularly for adult education—offers great potentialities. The Federal Government has sought to further this through the reservation of 270 television channels for education by the Federal Communications Commission and through the provision of research and advisory services by the Office of Education. Unfortunately, the rate of construction of new broadcasting facilities has been discouraging. Only 80 educational TV channels have been assigned in the last decade. It is apparent that further Federal stimulus and leadership are essential if the vast educational potential of this medium is to be realized. Last year an educational television bill passed the Senate, and a similar proposal was favorably reported to the House. I urge the Congress to take prompt and final action to provide matching financial grants to the States to aid in the construction of State or other nonprofit educational television stations.

6. AID TO HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

Another longstanding national concern has been the provision of specially trained teachers to meet the educational needs of children afflicted with physical and mental disabilities. The existing program providing Federal assistance to higher education institutions and to State education agencies for training teachers and supervisory personnel for mentally retarded children was supplemented last year to provide temporarily for training teachers of the deaf. I recommend broadening the basic program to include assistance for the special training needed to help all our children afflicted with the entire range of physical and mental handicaps.

7. FEDERAL AID TO THE ARTS

Our Nation has a rich and diverse cultural heritage. We are justly proud of the vitality, the creativity and the variety of the contemporary contributions our citizens can offer to the world of the arts. If we are to be among the leaders of the world in every sense of the word, this sector of our national life cannot be neglected or treated with indifference. Yet, almost alone among the governments of the world, our Government has displayed little interest in fostering cultural development. Just as the Federal Government has not, should not, and will not undertake to control the subject matter taught in local schools, so its efforts should be confined to broad encouragement of the arts. While this area is too new for hasty action, the proper contributions that should and can be made to the advancement of the arts by the Federal Government—many of them outlined by the Secretary of Labor in his decision settling the Metropolitan Opera labor dispute—deserve thorough and sympathetic consideration. A bill (H.R. 4172) already reported out to the House would make this possible and I urge approval of such a measure establishing a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts to undertake these studies.

IV. CONCLUSION

The problems to which these proposals are addressed would require solution whether or not we were confronted with a massive threat to freedom. The existence of that threat lends urgency to their solution—to the accomplishment of those objectives which, in any case, would be necessary for the realization of our highest hopes and those of our children. "If a nation," wrote Thomas Jefferson in 1816, "expects to be ignorant and free, in a state of civilization, it expects what never was and never will be." That statement is even truer today than it was 146 years ago.

The education of our people is a national investment. It yields tangible returns in economic growth, an improved citizenry and higher standards of living. But even more importantly, free men and women value education as a personal experience and opportunity—as a basic benefit of a free and democratic civilization. It is our responsibility to do whatever needs to be done to make this opportunity available to all and to make it of the highest possible quality.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 6, 1962.*

SELECT COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Education be permitted to hold hearings during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar Day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the calendar.

MIN-SUN CHEN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 316) to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to Min-Sun Chen.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

GIUSEPPE ANIELLO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1352) for the relief of Giuseppe Aniello.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

MRS. CHOW CHUI HA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1934) for the relief of Mrs. Chow Chui Ha.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

ELWOOD BRUNKEN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 631) for the relief of Elwood Brunken.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Elwood Brunken of Tripp, South Dakota, such sum as the Secretary of Agriculture determines the said Elwood Brunken would have been entitled to receive under his crop insurance policy with the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation for crop losses sustained by him in 1959 had the croplands on which such losses were sustained not been determined (after such losses were sustained) to be noninsurable by the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation. In determining the amount the said Elwood Brunken would have been entitled to receive, the Secretary of Agriculture shall subtract an amount equal to the amount refunded to the said Elwood Brunken by the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation on account of insurance premiums paid by him for the years 1958 and 1959.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOWARD B. SCHMUTZ

The Clerk called the bill (S. 651) for the relief of Howard B. Schmutz.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Howard B. Schmutz, of Salt Lake City, Utah, the sum of $1,242.50. The payment of such sum shall be in full satisfaction of all claims of the said Howard B. Schmutz against the United States for reimbursement of one-half of the costs incurred by him in constructing two reservoirs on federally owned land in reliance upon the approval by the Agricultural Stabilization Committee of Mohave County, Arizona, of his application for Federal sharing of the costs of constructing such reservoirs under the agricultural conservation program for 1959: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. CARL F. ROMNEY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8780) for the relief of Dr. Carl F. Romney.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Doctor Carl F. Romney is hereby relieved of all liability for repayment to the United States of the sum of $2,196.80, representing overpayment of compensation he received, through administrative error, as an employee of the Department of the Air Force, Air Force Technical Applications Center, Headquarters, United States Air Force, in the period between July 13, 1958, and November 12, 1960.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Doctor Carl F. Romney, the sum of any amounts received or withheld from him on account of the overpayment referred to in the first section of this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$2,196.80" and insert "$1,866.40".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WALTER SINGLEVICH

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8781) for the relief of Walter Singlevich.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Walter Singlevich is hereby relieved of all liability for repayment to the United States of the sum of $2,196.80, representing overpayment of compensation he received, through administrative error, as an employee of the Department of the Air Force, Air Force Technical Applications Center, Headquarters United States Air Force, in the period between July 13, 1958, and November 12, 1960.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Walter Singlevich, the sum of any amounts received or withheld from him on account of the overpayment referred to in the first section of this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 4, strike out "$2,196.80" and insert "$1,866.40".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HARRY A. SEBERT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8947) for the relief of Harry A. Sebert.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Harry A. Sebert, an employee of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, be, and he is hereby, relieved of financial liability for the certification for payment by him of United States disbursing officer vouchers Numbered 66102, 19370, 1725, and 64178, in the total sum of $1,499.25, for purchase of air conditioning units for Government use in Washington, District of Columbia, in his capacity as certifying officer, Lewis Flight Propulsion Laboratory, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, the predecessor of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The Comptroller General is authorized and directed to credit the accounts of the said Harry A. Sebert, certifying officer, with the said sum of $1,499.25.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAJ. LEONARD H. POTTERBAUM, U.S. AIR FORCE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9059) for the relief of Maj. Leonard H. Potterbaum, U.S. Air Force.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

STANLEY HAYMAN & CO., INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1288) for the relief of Stanley Hayman & Co., Inc.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over, without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

FREE IMPORTATION OF STAINED GLASS FOR ST. JOSEPH'S CATHEDRAL, HARTFORD, CONN., AND FOR THE CHURCH OF ST. FRANCIS XAVIER OF PHOENIX, ARIZ.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7431) to allow the importation free of duty of certain stained glass windows for use in Saint Joseph's Cathedral, Hartford, Conn.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. This completes the call of the Private Calendar.

ADDITIONAL ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 425 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6360) to authorize an additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH] and pending that, yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 425 provides for the consideration of H.R. 6360, a bill to authorize an additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce. The resolution provides for an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

The purpose of H.R. 6360 is to authorize the appointment of an additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce to serve as the principal adviser to the Secretary on scientific and technological matters of concern to the Department of Commerce. The bill was introduced at the request of the Secretary of Commerce, who cited the need for competent direction and administration of the various scientific and technical programs of the Department.

The proposed additional Secretary would be assigned administrative responsibilities with respect to the National Bureau of Standards, the Weather Bureau, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Patent Office. In addition, he would be assigned definite staff responsibility in connection with the research and development activities carried on by the Bureau of Public Roads and the Maritime Administration.

Rapid advances in science and technology have placed additional responsibilities upon the Department of Commerce and it is felt that a specialist on these matters is sorely needed.

It is estimated that enactment of this legislation would result in the expenditure of approximately $100,000 a year.

I hope the resolution is adopted in order that the House may work its will.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 425 does provide for 1 hour of general debate under an open rule for the consideration of H.R. 6360, which will authorize, if passed, an additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

This measure was heard last year in the Rules Committee on August 22, as I remember, and I believe the rule was voted out on either a 7 to 6 vote, or a 7 to 5 vote. It now is being programed today.

Mr. Speaker, the report states that the appointment of this additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce is to serve as the principal adviser to the Secretary of Commerce on scientific and technological matters of concern to the Department of Commerce. Now, those are defined further in the report as being the National Bureau of Standards, the Weather Bureau, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Patent Office. In other words, those four separate Bureaus under the Department of Commerce will be placed under this additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

As I understand it, last year when the presentation was made before the Rules Committee there were authorized three Assistant Secretaries of Commerce.

I believe the salary at that time was $20,000 per year. Only two of those positions had been filled and there was one vacancy. Even at that time this additional fourth Assistant Secretary was asked for. I have been informed today that of the three positions, one Assistant Secretary is now filled and there are two nominations pending before the Senate.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I wonder if that is the reason why this bill has been gathering moss since last August; that is, we could not get the job filled last fall. And could that be one of the reasons why we have not been called upon to consider this bill until now?

Mr. SMITH of California. I am not the leadership and I do not schedule the program so I will say to the gentleman from Iowa that I am sorry I cannot answer that question.

The committee report states:

> We do not anticipate that creation of the new position of Assistant Secretary of Commerce (for science and technology) will involve employment of a substantial number of persons to staff the new office. We have estimated that the total annual cost for the new Assistant Secretary (at the regular salary of $20,000 per annum) and the necessary clerical help and professional assistants will approximate $100,000 to $115,000.

Mr. Speaker, I simply want to call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that since January 20 of last year the Government has expanded and expanded; a Disarmament Agency, a Peace Corps, a new agency here or there, with an addition of perhaps 100,000 employees or more. All of that has occurred since January 20 of last year. Why this big expansion has had to take place in this short period of time is something of a mystery to me.

Last year we provided an additional Secretary of Labor, which position was created more or less for a specific individual, as I understand. We have had this bill pending since August 22 of last year. The question is whether we need this additional Assistant Secretary. Allegations are made and we hear by rumor or by hearsay—I am not on the Committee on Appropriations—that requests for additional employees are being made by department after department; requests for additional travel expenses, and the like, in very large amounts, at this particular time. We will probably have to increase the limit of the national debt within the next week or two. We are spending and spending and increasing appropriations and employing more people.

I should like to suggest that it is very questionable at this particular time that we need an additional Secretary of Commerce. I think we ought to slow up a little bit and see where we are going in the matter of hiring additional employees and in the matter of the cost of operating this Government.

Perhaps we can get a little better showing so we will know more exactly what to do. We should know what this administration is planning in the matter of employment and cost of administration, without having to take up piecemeal an item for an additional Assistant Secretary, or an item for an additional new agency, as this bill provides.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I want to renew my question as to why this bill has been lying around since last August. I understand a rule was granted last August and if I remember correctly the House was in session until about October 1 last year. If this new Secretary is so important, why has this legislation been left to dry on the vine for so long? Can anybody give me a little enlightenment on that subject—on either side of the aisle?

Mr. YOUNGER. I can answer that question, I think. There are three Assistant Secretaries authorized. Only one so far has been confirmed by the Senate. There are two nominations now pending before the Senate to fill the remaining positions of the three assistants that are now authorized. So they have been this long even selecting the ones to fill the authorized jobs.

Mr. GROSS. So the gentleman is saying that without this additional Secretary proposed here, there are two appointments pending over in the other body at this time; is that correct?

Mr. YOUNGER. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. And the jobs have not been filled?

Mr. YOUNGER. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Despite the fact that apparently there was no immediate need for the two assistant secretaries. I am going to listen carefully when the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] takes some time, as I hope he will a little later on, for a further explanation.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman. Now we may get some information—further information, let me say.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman from Arkansas would be highly pleased to enlighten the gentleman in any way that he can.

First, let me say as chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, it is not my duty, responsibility or prerogative to schedule the program of the House. The gentleman from Iowa is as familiar with that fact as I am. In the second place, let me advise the gentleman that our committee reported the bill out of the committee during August—I think it was around the 10th of August, and we immediately applied for a rule. In due time in August, I was given a hearing by the Committee on Rules and then during the latter part of August, or whenever it was, the Committee on Rules did grant a rule. The gentleman is familiar with the fact that Labor Day then came along and there were a few days off and efforts to get a good many bills up were not successful. This was one of them. So I would say to the gentleman from Iowa that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has not been dilatory in its efforts to get this bill considered by the House of Representatives.

Mr. GROSS. This bill would have been even more difficult to justify last fall, would it not, when there were two or three vacancies for Secretaries? It would have been difficult to justify another one?

Mr. HARRIS. No; of course, it is going to be hard to enlighten the gentleman and anyone else who have their own minds made up on a matter of this kind.

Mr. GROSS. Well, you might be able to give me some enlightenment in the matter. I do not know that the gentleman would be able to convince me, but he might be able to give me some light on the matter.

Mr. HARRIS. I will try to give you some light on the matter, but I would not undertake to convince the gentleman, I can assure you of that. But, let me say to the gentleman, and to those who very likely are going to express reluctance about approving this proposal that this was not a proposal which was made to the Congress last year by this administration. A request was made previous to that time for an Assistant Secretary for this purpose. The committee has been giving study and thought trying to get information together during this time.

Mr. GROSS. What does the gentleman mean when he says previous to that time? Is the gentleman trying to say that some other administration wanted an Assistant Secretary of Commerce?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes, under the Eisenhower administration—it was started during the administration of Mr. Eisenhower and a request was made during his administration.

Mr. GROSS. I have no doubt about that. I think the first bill that was passed in the House in 1953, and I may be wrong about this, but certainly it was one of the first, was a bill to provide for another Assistant Secretary of State.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield me another 5 minutes?

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield that I may shed a little light on one other question?

Mr. GROSS. No, I want to give the gentleman a little light now.

Mr. HARRIS. Very well; I will take time later.

Mr. GROSS. The first bill in 1953 was a bill to provide for an Assistant Secretary of State. This was the first year of the Eisenhower administration. I opposed it; I did not think it was necessary; I thought it was piling up more expense on the taxpayers.

That Assistant Secretary, you may remember, was supposed to reorganize the Department and provide economy of operation. Do you know what happened? The new Assistant Secretary hardly got his chair warm when the State Department hired the firm of Heller Associates, a consultant firm, to do the job of reorganizing the State Department. The consulting firm was paid some $200,000 to try to effect a reorganization, but accomplished little or nothing. The Assistant Secretary accomplished nothing, for the State Department bureaucracy has grown, and grown.

Mr. HARRIS. Since the gentleman has pointed his finger at me, will he not yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am clarifying this for the gentleman.

Mr. HARRIS. But the gentleman has mentioned my name here twice and said how I voted.

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. In the first place, he knows that neither I as chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce or as a plain member would vote for the recommendation for an Assistant Secretary of State if I did not believe it was needed.

Mr. GROSS. I understand, but you are here now asking for a new Assistant Secretary, a further buildup of the bureaucracy.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman says I voted for it. I do not recall whether I did or not, but if I satisfied myself at that time that it was necessary I did; otherwise, I voted against it. I shall be glad to look up the record and see.

Now, will the gentlemen yield for one further bit of enlightenment?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. Some question has been raised—and I hope all the Members of the House will give attention to the debate in order to be informed—about the situation in the Department of Commerce. Some question was raised about the two Assistant Secretaries that have not been filled, although they were authorized last year. I think it should be noted that these matters are provided by the Congress and are, specifically, the Assistant Secretary for Transportation. That was for a specific duty and responsibility, and, therefore the Assistant Secretary for Transportation could not be filled by a man who might be a capable and qualified scientist. The fact that those two positions have not been filled and have not been utilized on the basis that they were actually needed, to me is most commendable on the part of the Secretary of Commerce. It shows a commendable economy and good business administration on his part.

But in the case of the position we are considering today, they have a man to put into that position, a man qualified to fill it. I hope the gentleman is appreciative of the fact they have saved some money.

Mr. GROSS. I am delighted to hear that this administration is filling all its jobs with men who are specially qualified for the jobs.

It is the first time in my experience in Washington when men are appointed on that basis and without any political considerations.

I am opposed to this bill to create another Assistant Secretary; to provide another member of the "Cadillac Brigade" in Washington.

Incidentally, I came across some interesting information yesterday. While driving down to work yesterday morning a big truck pulled alongside of me. On the door of the truck was painted "U.S. Treasury—Bureau of the Public Debt."

Add some more unnecessary Assistant Secretaries to the bloated bureaucracy that already exists in Washington and the streets will be full of trucks hauling the debris that represents the public debt.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6360) to authorize an additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 6360, with Mr. SHELLEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, by direction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce I present to you today for your consideration and urge your support of this bill to provide for an Assistant Secretary of Commerce to become technical adviser in scientific and technical matters for that great and sprawling Department.

This is an administrative bill. It was requested by the Honorable Luther Hodges, Secretary of Commerce, and has the support of the Bureau of the Budget. I believe during the course of the hearings a good case was made for this position.

During this debate we will show that it will be in the interest of our country, in the interest of economy, and will provide greater efficiency in the Department of Commerce if this request is granted.

I should like to make it perfectly clear that I do not favor promiscuous approval of requests for such as this just to provide somebody with a job. This is not the only request we have had referred to our committee during the last few years for positions of this kind. We try to look at the requests conscientiously and carefully and when the committee is convinced an additional position is necessary and in the interest of better government and better administration of the programs, in my opinion it is our duty to ask the House to approve.

The Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Hodges, is extremely anxious for this legislation in order that he may adequately carry out his responsibilities.

He made a personal visit to the committee and testified on this proposal to tell us why he needs this additional Assistant Secretary. We are all aware of the importance of the great advances made in science and technology in the last few years. Developments have been by leaps and bounds. Progress is staggering. We know that. Yes, they are very important to the future security of our country and our own national welfare, but they are also important to the business community. The business community needs someone in the Department of Commerce as a point of contact for information on scientific developments. Just remember that. An Assistant Secretary of Commerce with the knowledge and background of a man who will be appointed to the position can effect and will effect substantial savings in money and effort by coordinating scientific activities within the Department and making information available to businessmen, much of which has been developed with tax dollars at great expense.

Now, listen to me. We feel this legislation is necessary, therefore, in the interest of good government, and urge its adoption. It did not originate, I will say to my distinguished friend from Iowa, with this administration. And, I wish he would listen to me as I try to give him this information. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I am sorry, I did not hear the gentleman.

Mr. HARRIS. I was just calling the gentleman's attention, in order that he may be advised about the origin of this program. I would be glad to convey that information because I think it would be helpful. It did not originate with this administration. It did not originate with the Eisenhower administration. This request originated with the National Academy of Sciences, which is the scientific organization in this country that is nonpolitical and has only one purpose, and that is the purpose for which it was established, to promote the development of science. The National Academy of Sciences in March 1960 recommended that within the Department of Commerce there be established an office of an Assistant Secretary of Commerce to coordinate scientific and technical responsibilities of the Department. Now, the Eisenhower administration reviewed that recommendation and came to the conclusion that it was a very good request and should be adopted. Therefore, during the latter days of that Congress in 1960 the Department of Commerce sent up a request for this purpose. The gentleman from Kansas was a member of the committee at that time.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. AVERY. The gentleman from Arkansas knows that this gentleman from Kansas is generally greatly persuaded by the point of view of the gentleman in the well of the House.

Mr. HARRIS. And I have enjoyed a very pleasant association with the gentleman, and I am sorry he is no longer a member of the committee.

Mr. AVERY. The gentleman from Kansas views that situation with some regret, too, I may say. But, notwithstanding what happened in the past, I want to be helpful to the gentleman from Arkansas. As I understood his statement to the House a few moments ago there is at this time—and the testimony before the Committee on Rules, I think, emphasized this point last spring—there is at this time pending an authorization for an Assistant Secretaryship of Commerce that is not filled at the present time and it is not contemplated that that position will be filled; is that not correct?

Mr. HARRIS. I was going to get to that as soon as I lead up to that point. I will say that when I was before the Rules Committee, the gentleman is correct. As I explained to them, there was a position for an Assistant Secretary for Administration that was not filled.

Mr. Chairman, the Secretary or the President cannot nominate a scientist for that position. These Assistant Secretaries are authorized by the Congress for a specific work. Consequently, they could not be utilized for this purpose.

Mr. AVERY. I think the gentleman is entirely correct. In a further effort to be helpful to him, would the gentleman consider accepting an amendment abolishing that position which is not going to be used, and for which no appointment has been made, and then establishing this one in lieu thereof?

Mr. HARRIS. I could not commit myself to accept an amendment at this time, because I would not know just how that would affect the organizational setup down in the Department. I certainly would entertain a review and consideration of any of the Assistant Secretaries in this or any other agency that comes before our committee.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, I do not like to prolong this, but if there were such a proposal entertained by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, it seems very obvious to me if there is a position that is not being filled, why not abolish it? In that way I think we would overcome a lot of objection to this legislation.

Mr. HARRIS. I think I suggested that during the course of the consideration of this bill last year, and there was some comment about what it might do to the organization and the committee did not go along with it. I understand the position has since been filled.

The gentleman from California, I believe, said a moment ago that there is pending over in the Senate now two appointments for positions down there. I am not familiar with that. So I just do not know what the situation is, and I would not want to commit myself unless I did know.

Mr. AVERY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. HARRIS. I certainly will be glad to consider it, but I would not want to do it in connection with this legislation, because I am not familiar with what the facts are in relation thereto. Nevertheless, the National Academy of Sciences has recommended it, the Eisenhower administration submitted it and requested it, and in the last Congress it was resubmitted by the present Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think there are many people in this country who have any question as to the capability of Secretary Hodges, as to the business ability of Secretary Hodges, and how he feels about matters of business and the national economy. I think if there is any one person from the business community in this administration, it is the Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. Chairman, the committee held hearings on this proposal. We had some reluctance about it, I will say to the gentleman. After the first hearings we called representatives of the Department back for more detailed information to make sure that this was a position that ought to be approved by the House. We made a complete record on it, and I would refer the Members of the House to the hearings and report and ask their indulgence to read what is stated there regarding the need for the legislation, and the need for coordination. Also read the letter of the Secretary in which he supports and urges this proposal. I believe the Members of the House will be constrained that it will be in the interest of our country.

We know that if the Secretary needs to send a man with the ability and with the status of the man who will hold this position to talk to people who are his equal in other positions of Government and industry if the job is to be done. We know that. We know that if this man goes down to talk to the people in NASA, which he must do in order to coordinate his work with them, so far as that work affects Commerce, he has to have status equal to those with whom he talks. The same is true as to other agencies of the Government such as the Department of Defense.

Mr. Chairman, let me take just a minute to review what those duties are. This year in the budget there are funds—and this is purely for research and development that is charged to the Secretary of Commerce—in the Patent Office, $580,000; Coast and Geodetic Survey, $839,377; Bureau of Census, $1,107,000; National Bureau of Standards, $24,500,000; Maritime Administration, $9,013,000; Bureau of Public Roads, $4,063,000; Weather Bureau, $9 million. That is a grand total of $70,670,377 in the budget for the Department. You cannot expect one man in his position to take the time to follow through on each of these items. What we are asking here is an opportunity to coordinate this work under one head, so that the Secretary can have his finger on what is going on.

Mr. Chairman, let me say this one other thing to my colleagues in the House. There are many ways in which we have experienced great waste in Government. There is no one who deplores waste in Government more than I do. We should all be vigilant in this field. But let me say to you that there are billions of dollars being appropriated every year to the Atomic Energy Commission, to NASA, to the Department of Commerce through the Bureau of Standards, and other scientific research and development programs; and there is no program anywhere in Government subjected to waste and duplication more than in these fields.

In my judgment we would be doing a great service in the interest of economy in this Government if we approve this bill.

Mr. Chairman, the following letter from Secretary Hodges gives much information of interest in connection with this problem:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., February 1, 1962.

Hon. OREN D. HARRIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HARRIS: In connection with legislation pending in the Congress which would authorize an additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce, I feel that it would be worth while to furnish you a brief picture of the research and development effort of the Department of Commerce as it would be directed by this new Assistant Secretary.

Following is a listing of the 1962 fiscal year research and development budgets of the Bureaus of the Department engaged in this field. The amounts shown do not reflect expenditures in R. & D. plant which, for the new facilities of the National Bureau of Standards alone, will amount to approximately $100 million by 1963.

	R. & D. appropriation	R. & D. reimbursements
Patent Office	$580,000	
Coast and Geodetic Survey	839,377	
Bureau of the Census	1,107,000	$150,000
National Bureau of Standards	24,500,000	15,875,000
Maritime Administration	9,013,000	5,174,000
Bureau of Public Roads	4,063,000	
Weather Bureau	9,000,000	369,000
Total	49,102,377	21,568,000
Grand total	70,670,377	

The basic research done by the National Bureau of Standards and the Weather Bureau contributes substantially to the work of the Atomic Energy Commission, National Aeronautics and Space Agency, and the Department of Defense. Our scientific output is largely basic and fundamental. It provides foundations on which the scientific programs of these other agencies are based.

You will be interested to know, however, that, aside from the Department of Defense, the Department is perhaps the largest employer of scientists and engineers in the physical sciences in the Federal establishment.

At the present time, the management of the Department is in the hands of one Under Secretary for Transportation and three Assistant Secretaries for Domestic Affairs, Foreign Affairs, and Administration and Public Affairs. Among these four men plus, of course, myself and the Under Secretary, we distribute the management and guidance of an organization of 33,000, and 20 major bureaus and offices including our 4 bureaus that we could hope to be supervised by the new Assistant Secretary (the Patent Office, Coast and Geodetic Survey, National Bureau of Standards, and the Weather Bureau). At the moment, the Coast and Geodetic Survey and the Weather Bureau report to the Under Secretary for Transportation. The National Bureau of Standards and the Patent Office report to the Assistant Secretary for Domestic Affairs.

Please do not hesitate to call upon me for any other information you may require concerning this matter.

Sincerely yours,

LUTHER H. HODGES.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, this measure was reported out of our committee by a divided sentiment. Personally I can see no need for this additional Secretary. I want to disagree with some of the arguments of our fine chairman [Mr. HARRIS], when he says we must have a scientist as a coordinator. If that argument were followed through every university president in the United States would have to be a scientist in order to supervise and coordinate the scientific departments within that university. I say that some of the best college presidents we have in this country are not scientists. Now let me analyze this for just a minute.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNGER. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Can the gentleman point out to me one major university in this country that does not have a head directing the scientific work of that university?

Mr. YOUNGER. Yes, I can point to my own university, and the head is not a scientist.

Mr. HARRIS. I am talking about the president.

Mr. YOUNGER. That is his job.

Mr. HARRIS. No, I am talking of every president having someone in the university who heads the scientific program of that university.

Mr. YOUNGER. Now you are admitting, Mr. Chairman, exactly the point I am trying to make. You are admitting that the Weather Bureau does not have a scientist in charge of it and that the Coast Guard and the Geodetic Survey does not have a competent scientist in charge of it, nor does the Bureau of Standards. This is exactly the same point we have in a university where you have a department of chemistry or a department of physics or a department of engineering or a department of electric engineering and so on down the line. If we have competent scientists in charge of these various bureaus and posts, then what you need is a coordinator within the Department of Commerce.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNGER. If my colleague will wait for a just a moment.

Mr. MACK. I think the gentleman is quite confused.

Mr. YOUNGER. No, I am not confused at all, may I say to my colleague. We have in the Department of Commerce an Under Secretary of Commerce. That job has been filled and has been confirmed. We have one assistant for transportation. That one assistant has been confirmed. I do not know whether he is for transportation or not. We have one assistant for administration. The Assistant Secretary for Administration should be charged with the responsibility of coordinating the work within the Department, and it is not necessary for that man to be a scientist to be assigned to that duty. We have one other Assistant Secretary whose duties are not delineated by legislation according to the information I have. All three of these positions are either filled and confirmed or two of them are before the other body now and ready for confirmation. There are no new bureaus added to the Department of Commerce. There are no new officers added to the Department of Commerce. So I can see no necessity at all for another Assistant Secretary. Let me say this. Last year the Department of Commerce said that if they could only reorganize their Maritime Administration, they would be fixed. That Commission was formed and the Maritime Commission was instituted by legislation. So they ought to be well officered now by competent individuals in that field. So far as coordination is concerned, I say that good administration would hold that this Assistant Secretary for Administration, if he is a competent administrator, ought to be able to coordinate the departments within the Department of Commerce and coordinate their work with all of the other scientific departments within the Government.

As to the cost. Nobody knows what the cost of this will be. We have had this same experience right along and added and added and added to this great payroll. I remember when I came to this body in 1953, we had a Government payroll of some 2½ million and some odd thousand employees. Gradually that was whittled down until February of 1961 when it was down to 2,255,000 employees or almost a quarter of a million employees—less than 8 years previous. Already within 1 year we have added over 88,000 additional employees. How many more will be added nobody knows? Personally, I can see no necessity for this additional Assistant Secretary at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG].

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the requested creation of a new Assistant Secretary for Commerce and Technology. Basically the reason I believe it to be unnecessary is that I serve on the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Commerce and am aware of what is happening. We are presently holding hearings in this field. I have to disagree with my distinguished friend from Arkansas in this matter because I believe, looking at the Department of Commerce and what is happening not only in this agency but also in many other agencies of the Government, we are headed for a bureaucracy in this country the likes of which we have never known.

Last year the Department of Commerce asked for 1,463 new employees;

this year the request is for 2,229 new employees. To put it in just a little better perspective, the total number of permanent positions for 1962 was 22,461; in other words, the Department of Commerce is requesting an increase, in this 1 year alone, of almost 10 percent of its total employees.

Now, to refer to the request and the need for a new Assistant Secretary, we have today, as was stated by the gentleman from California, distinguished scientists heading all these agencies; and if I heard the remarks of the gentleman from Arkansas correctly, the real reason for this Assistant Secretary is to coordinate the activities of these departments so they can funnel it all together. In reading the appropriation hearings you will note that we have many coordinating committees at the present time. Take the Weather Bureau, for instance: The Weather Bureau is cooperating completely with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in the satellite program in the matter of weather; we are doing this with the National Bureau of Standards. The only reason the National Bureau of Standards exists right here is to provide contacts between agencies of the Government. To put a superstructure on this and say that the head of the National Bureau of Standards, when he wants to talk to the Defense Department, has got to go through an Assistant Secretary of Commerce is totally unnecessary. Such things as this will cost a lot more money.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield.

Mr. MACK. I am very happy the gentleman mentioned the Weather Bureau, because that brings up one problem confronting us concerning this appointment of a person who can coordinate the activities of these various agencies. I am wondering if the gentleman recognizes that we have one of the greatest weather bureaus in the Department of Commerce to be found anywhere in the world?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I think there is no question about that.

Mr. MACK. I am sure also the gentleman recognizes that the Defense Department is today spending as much money for weather information as is the Department of Commerce.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I think that may be correct.

Mr. MACK. Now you are talking about coordinating; certainly, we can coordinate activities within the Weather Bureau; certainly the Defense Department or the Department of the Army can coordinate its activities in the matter of weather. But we have a tremendous duplication of effort even in this very simple problem of dealing with the weather. Does the gentleman realize that we have five separate weather bureaus operating within 25 miles of this Capital?

The gentleman has gotten to the base of the problem here and that is that we need to eliminate some of this duplication not only in the Weather Bureau but also in all agencies of the Government.

Mr. CEDERBERG. The gentleman realizes that the gentleman from Illinois stated the point very well, as a matter of fact, the reading of the Appropriations Committee hearings will bring out this very subject. I think the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] brought it up in the hearings last year. We are very much concerned about this on the committee. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] is a member of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, and was a member of the Commerce Subcommittee, and he recognized that there were certain things in the weather field you could not possibly take away from the Air Force, and the same thing in other services. Just putting on another Assistant Secretary is not going to do the job; they are coordinating right now.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Could we not get rid of this overlapping and duplication before we add more fat to the top of the list?

Mr. CEDERBERG. May I say to the gentleman, it would be absolutely unnecessary to have this Assistant Secretary try to coordinate these various officers. They are requesting 345 new people in the Weather Bureau this year. The Bureau of Standards is requesting 290, the Patent Office wants 100 more, the Bureau of the Census 319, Coast and Geodetic Survey 199. When you add them all up you have 2,229 new employees.

Of course, as far as I am concerned, as one member of the committee, they are not going to get these new employees with my vote. I think they would be thankful if they got half of them. If you can bat .500 in a baseball game you are a star. You are adding a superstructure whereby you are going to have these assistants coordinate. I think there are coordinating committees to do this between all of these agencies and I can see no value to come out of this.

Mr. GROSS. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce says this new coordinator is not going to have anything to do with coordinating the Bureau of Public Roads and the Maritime Agency. He has read them out. He is not going to coordinate those two agencies at all.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to oppose the gentleman from Arkansas in the establishment of this new position. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG] has eloquently described what is going on in the Committee on Appropriations at the present time. We have this bill before us today. Unfortunately we are in executive session in the Committee on Appropriations and there is much that will come out in the hearings when you see the record that will amaze the members of this committee.

To establish one more Assistant Secretary in the Department of Commerce, it seems to me, is inviting an increase in the appropriation rather than a decrease. They can coordinate very easily through the Assistant Secretary for Domestic Affairs. There is also an Under Secretary to whom this Assistant Secretary for Domestic Affairs can report. Now they are building up a new title of an Assistant Secretary for Scientific Affairs. It is going to be an entirely new office.

We will have to rebuild that Commerce Department before long. We are going to have a new building, if we do not look out, because, as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG] said, they are asking for an increase of around 2,200 this year.

Let me give you just one example. In 1960 the appropriation for one department was $6 million-plus. The estimate today for that same department is $13 million, an increase since 1960. I have never seen an agency or establishment of Government grow in the last few years the way the Department of Commerce has.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the time has come when we better put a stop to this and start to look and listen and see whether we need these new Assistant Secretaries who can go in and build up new agencies under the office and find additional responsibilities to get new employees for. The only way we are ever going to give business a break is to find some way to give some type of tax reduction, and the only way we are ever going to reduce taxes is to reduce the cost of Government. We can reduce the cost of Government by putting up the stop sign to these increases in the various agencies. I think we ought to vote this bill down and take a good, hard look at it. I do not care whether it came through the Truman administration, the Eisenhower administration, or the Kennedy administration. We do not need a new Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MACK].

Mr. MACK. Mr. Chairman, this bill authorizes the appointment of an additional Secretary of Commerce, who would serve as principal adviser to the Secretary of Commerce on scientific and technological affairs. A similar bill has passed the Senate.

This proposal did not originate with this administration. A committee of the National Academy of Sciences recommended in 1960 that this new position be created. The Department of Commerce has a number of important scientific activities in the National Bureau of Standards, the Weather Bureau, the Patent Office, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, the Bureau of Roads, and the Maritime Administration, but the Secretary has no one to look to for help in coordinating the activities of these agencies.

In addition, private business needs a competent person with a scientific background to assist industry to get the results of various research activities financed by tax funds, especially through the Department of Defense.

The subcommittee was assured by Secretary Hodges that this position would be filled with a person with professional competence in science and technology with administrative experience.

The Secretary urged that the position be established to permit more effective and efficient administration of certain important functions now carried on in the departments; also to provide better representation in dealing with other departments on scientific and technical matters and promoting governmentwide coordination of scientific and technical efforts.

H.R. 6360 was introduced by the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Harris], at the request of the Secretary of Commerce.

The Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance held two hearings on this bill and went into the need for this new position very carefully.

Witnesses testified that the proposed additional Secretary would be assigned administrative responsibilities with respect to the National Bureau of Standards, the Weather Bureau, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Patent Office. In addition, the new Assistant Secretary would be assigned definite staff responsibility in connection with the research and development activities carried on by the Bureau of Public Roads and the Maritime Administration.

The National Bureau of Standards R. & D. appropriation for 1962 was $24.5 million. The Weather Bureau received an appropriation of $56 million for operations and $9 million for research in the same year. In addition, $48 million was appropriated for the new satellite program. The Patent Office appropriation for 1962 was almost $25 million of which $580,000 was for research. The 1962 appropriation for operations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey was almost $19 million of which about $850,000 was for research. For fiscal 1962, the Department of Commerce received appropriations of $304,302,000 for maritime activities. The total budget for that year for research and development was slightly in excess of $9 million. The Bureau of Public Roads, which administers the Federal-aid highway program, in 1962 had a budget for administrative expenses of more than $33 million, of which approximately $4 million was for research and development.

Rapid advances in science and technology place additional responsibilities upon the Department of Commerce. An example is the weather satellite program, which will be operated by the Department of Commerce.

The committee is aware of the vast duplication of effort in research activities in and out of Government.

Proper and effective coordination of research activities should result in important savings, not only within the Department of Commerce, but in other agencies. Savings to industry also are possible by making available to the fullest extent possible, consistent with national security, the results of research financed by various governmental agencies with tax dollars.

The committee agrees with the Secretary regarding the need for an Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Science and Technology. An Assistant Secretary with professional competence in science and technology, and with administrative experience, is needed to assist the Secretary in coordinating scientific activities of the Department, and also to serve as a point of contact with industry in the dissemination of information on science and technology. This would result in significant savings both to Government and to industry.

Under the present organization of the Department of Commerce, the Secretary has an Under Secretary. There also is an Under Secretary for Transportation. There are three Assistant Secretaries, one for Domestic Affairs, one for International Affairs and one for Administrative Affairs. At the time of the subcommittee hearing the position of Assistant Secretary for Administrative Affairs had not been filled. Since then, however, Mr. William Ruder was named Assistant Secretary for Administration and this nomination is now pending in the Senate.

Mr. Chairman, my subcommittee had the responsibility of holding hearings on the proposal which was recommended by the Secretary of Commerce and which was sent to the Congress. But, we entered into the hearings with many reservations. As a matter of fact, as the chairman indicated, we reopened the hearings to secure additional information to justify an additional Assistant Secretary. Early last year the other body passed a bill which came over to our subcommittee which would have provided for an additional Assistant Secretary. It would have established the Office of International Travel under an Assistant Secretary of Commerce. Our committee considered that proposal and eliminated the provision to establish an Assistant Secretary within the Department of Commerce.

So, as my chairman has so ably stated this afternoon, none of us has any desire to increase the number within the Department of Commerce and none of us has any desire to increase the number of Assistant Secretaries in any department of government. I do believe, however, that an excellent case has been made for the establishment of an Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Scientific and Technological Affairs. I believe that the Government would actually be saving money if we were to enact this legislation. I know that several members of the Committee on Appropriations here today talked about the number of individuals within these departments. Well, I say to them that it is their responsibility and our responsibility as Members of Congress to eliminate the additional numbers through appropriations if we have too many employees working there. I do think and I feel very strongly that we need the proper organization within our governmental agencies.

Mention has been made here today that this is a brandnew proposal of President Kennedy's. I have before me an excerpt from the President's Science Advisory Committee report of October 17, 1960, "Government Research and Development." In this statement it includes the following:

> The Hoover Commission Subcommittee on Research Activities in the Department of Defense recommended in 1955 that there be an Assistant Secretary for Research and Development in each service department.

Now, if the Hoover Commission recommended it in 1955, if the President's Science Advisory Committee recommended a similar approach in 1958, and if the National Academy of Sciences recommended it in 1960, it seems to me that there is some justification for the establishment of an additional Assistant Secretary for Science and Technology.

Mr. Chairman, I notice that the Members who have expressed opinions concerning the present assistant secretaryship have inferred that the Department has never been able to fill two of its positions. That simply is not true. I asked one Member to yield to me for the purpose of correcting him when he made that statement. As a matter of fact, we do have two acting Assistant Secretaries at the present time. We might refer to those positions as being vacant, but they are active. It is true that one of them was vacant at the time we held our hearings on this legislation last year, but the other one was filled at the time. It was filled, and it has been confirmed. The Assistant Secretary for International Affairs since that time has resigned, and in his place Mr. Jack Behrman has been recommended, and he is awaiting confirmation by the other body. So we are utilizing all of our positions of Assistant Secretaries, all three of them, at the present time.

Mr. Chairman, the other question which was raised last summer involved the appointment of an Assistant Secretary for Administration. I do not know what the other members of our committee thought about it at the time, but I think the Secretary of Commerce is to be commended for not filling that position because the man that he was using to provide that service at that time as an assistant was going to leave the Government within 6 months. Therefore the Secretary did not go through the routine of submitting his name to the Senate and having him confirmed, knowing that he was going to resign at that time.

Mr. Chairman, I have no apology to make to anyone concerning the present structure of the Department of Commerce. I think the three Assistant Secretaries which the Department of Commerce now has are all justified. There is no question in my mind but what an additional Assistant Secretary for Science and Technology can very easily be justified.

Mr. Chariman, my good friend from Michigan [Mr. Cederberg] mentioned the Weather Bureau. That is only one case of duplication. Every agency of the Government is trying to perform the complete service. At one time we did have four or five separate Weather Bureaus right here in the Washington area. One or two of them have been closed now, but just a few years ago—just 1 year ago—we had the biggest Weather Bureau in the world here in Washington, D.C., under the Department of Commerce. We had a Weather Bureau out here at the Anacostia Naval Air Station. We had another one at Bolling Field. We had another one at Andrews Field. Incidentally, for a long period of time they operated two of them—one on each side of the Anacostia Naval Air Station.

Mr. Chairman, we have tremendous duplication of activity, especially in the technological areas. I feel that it is vitally important today that we have an Assistant Secretary or that we do have an additional employee to attempt to coordinate these activities with other agencies of the Government. I think the machinery has been established for that purpose. The appointment of an Assistant Secretary of Commerce would provide the appropriate official to work with this coordinating agency.

Mr. Chairman, I have in my hand a publication just recently put out by the Interagency Committee on Oceanography of the Federal Council on Science and Technology, which is the Council that is attempting to coordinate these activities. Oceanography? Who has the responsibility for oceanography? I thought it was the Navy. But I find out later it is the Coast and Geodetic Survey. Later I found out that the Coast Guard had great activities in this area. Later I found out that even the Army and the Air Force were involved in it as well as the Navy.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is high time that we tried to eliminate some of the duplication of services even though they are in the research and development field. We hesitate to cut down appropriations for research and development, and we are criticized when we do. However, I believe that we ought to get the most for our money, and we ought to eliminate duplications of any kind.

The appointment of an additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce will make this possible. I am proud to support the bill before us today which would provide for an additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Science and Technology.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I would like somebody to tell me where and when the creation of a new Assistant Secretary, Deputy Secretary, or any other kind of secretary, within the meaning of the bill before us, has resulted in any economy in government. Will somebody please tell me where and when that has happened?

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARRIS. I know the gentleman has been on the floor listening attentively to the debate this afternoon. Let me explain this again. As we have said, there are many duplicating activities within the Department involved here. The gentleman could not expect one man—and he knows Mr. Hodges is a businessman——

Mr. GROSS. Just a minute; the gentleman spoke of Mr. Hodges.

Mr. HARRIS. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Hodges is an estimable gentleman I am sure. But let me say to the gentleman that I think Mr. Hodges would be doing a better service to the Department of Commerce and the taxpayers of this country if he would take care of the business of the Department of Commerce instead of trying to propagandize the people of this country into the oblivion of free trade. I wish he would take care of the business of his Department instead of trying to promote free trade, all over the United States.

Mr. HARRIS. I know Mr. Hodges will be glad to have the gentleman's views on that, too. It is known that unless we can do something about the duplication of these various efforts, with the tremendous cost involved, the millions and millions of dollars in the Weather Bureau, which was mentioned a moment ago, and in the other agencies and bureaus that come under the Department of Commerce—the gentleman knows you have got to have somebody who sits on it all the time if you are going to save money. But if you let them go without somebody being able to give it time and attention you will continue to have waste and duplication.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BERRY. I do not know whether the gentleman listened to the broadcast of the news over WTOP last night, the CBS news. Following the news there was a broadcast called the "Big E for Exports," telling about how many people would be employed if we only lowered our tariffs and created more exports by lowering our tariffs. And then they said that anyone who was interested in getting more propaganda on exports could do so by writing to the Department of Commerce, Post Office Box such-and-such. I thought that the broadcast was probably sponsored by the Department of Commerce. I find that WTOP did it as a public service. But somebody is writing these radio speeches, somebody is writing these acts. Maybe they do not pay the broadcast company directly, but certainly a great deal of the taxpayers' money is going into that. I wonder if the gentleman would be as much opposed to the taxpayers' money going for this purpose in the Department of Commerce as any other.

Mr. GROSS. That is the point I tried to make a moment ago.

Mr. BERRY. I was just wondering, under the circumstances, if it is the policy of the Department of Commerce to continue this, would it not be wise, and does not the gentleman believe it would be wise, to have an Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Exports?

Mr. GROSS. I do not know about that. I do know that officials of the Department of Commerce are campaigning in behalf of free trade, and I say that they ought to attend to the business of the Department. I wondered a little while ago where the demand for a new Assistant Secretary originated. Then I heard the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Harris], say that some society promoted this bill I wonder if the "Society of the Sons and Daughters of I Will Arise" comes in and wants an Assistant Secretary if we will be asked to jump through the hoop and provide one. Is that the way the payroll is to be loaded—because some society wants some "poohbah" elevated to a top job? From what source is the money to come to pay for these Cadillac-equipped new Secretaries?

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Hemphill].

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Chairman, a thought occurs to me—we have not faced up to one of the real issues here. The Department of Commerce, as conceived and as administered under the present Secretary, is the businessman's department of the executive branch of Government. To show you what has been done and what can be done, if you would go down there and see how the present Secretary has made it possible for the businessmen of this Nation to get information and to get it quickly and to get statistics and to get other material that they need, you would recognize the progress that has been made. For my part, in the 4 previous years to Mr. Hodges, the Department of Commerce exhibited a dormancy which the businessmen of this Nation suffered from.

Now, we have a Department of Commerce which is saying to the business people—you have a place to come for information and for assistance.

The Secretary of Commerce has done a great job.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I am happy to yield to my colleague.

Mr. YOUNGER. How do you reconcile that with the abolishment of the businessman's advisory council?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I think that was an act of administrative judgment. If you will go down to the Department of Commerce and see what they have established, you would come to a different conclusion about it. The advisory council was not producing; but the Department of Commerce of today is producing through the Business Information Office that they have established there, and they are doing a good job. I might say to the gentleman, in this particular field of science and technology, so far as I can see, the business community of this Nation—with the exception of those in manufacturing and producing establishments in this particular field of science and technology—does not know where to go or where to turn or how to use the free enterprise system or procure the profits that would naturally come from the use of our new discoveries in science in peaceful times for peaceful commercial purposes.

Here we are having opposition to one Assistant Secretary, the expenses of which are a mere $100,000 when we would give to any backward nation $100 million or $50 million and here we are hearing opposition to the efforts of this great Secretary of Commerce. Now he has been put in this position: He is a member of the President's Cabinet, and as I said once to one of the Cabinet members of Mr. Eisenhower in another day, "The fact that you were picked by the

President of the United States to do the job you did causes me to have great respect for your ability, and while I might oppose you in some things, I respect your judgment in the administration of your Department."

Here is a man who has the responsibility of running this Department—the responsibility to the businessmen in the State of California, Iowa and other States—and you say to him, "We are not going to help you shoulder that responsibility in this one particular area where it does not cost very much money." You are saying, "We are going to nit-pick at you and say that you should not have this Assistant Secretary when you say it is necessary for the good of the Nation."

What are we trying to do? We are tryng to substitute political judgment for the judgment of a successful businessman who has the interest of the business people of the country at heart. The reason for this legislation is the ambition of this Secretary and his determination, I am sure, to do something for the business people in this field of science and technology. When you talk about coordinating science and technology let me remind you that the average person in this Congress or the average man in business knows very little about science and technology. The budget of the average business man in America cannot afford a scientist or technologist; therefore, here is an opportunity for the businessman to get the service, to get coordination, to get the information, to get the advice. This bill provides the vehicle.

I favor this legislation and I hope it will pass.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend to the House the proposal to authorize an additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce. The Secretary of Commerce has indicated that he will be assigned to coordinate scientific activities within the Department of Commerce. I agree thoroughly with the belief that this position will enable the Department to administer its responsibilities efficiently and will encourage more effective Government-wide coordination as a result of better organization and staffing for scientific and technical responsibilities.

It is, of course, no secret that the importance of research and attention to science is a major factor in the national growth. Most businesses now have designated a vice president for research and development or at least a high responsible executive to be aware of trends affecting the future of commerce. The National Science Foundation pointed out just last year that employment of scientists and engineers in industry increased by approximately 6 percent between January 1959 and January 1960. This rate of growth is greater than that for total industrial employment. The rise in scientific and engineering employment was greater in research and development than in other activities.

As a member of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, I have been deeply aware of the continuing discussion over the proper organization of science activities within the Federal Government. Certainly there is strong need for active policy coordination throughout the various agencies. The suggestion of a Department of Science and Technology and the arguments against it must, I think, be subjected to continuing study and an appraisal of the experience of existing organizations.

However, there can be no argument against the need to provide in every instance where scientific and technological change will affect the functions of Government an office of sufficient power and authority to make use of science for better Government and public service.

I believe the proposal for an additional Assistant Secretary meets this need. I am happy to see that it has received general approval, including the warm endorsement of the late chairman of our committee, the Honorable Overton Brooks, of Louisiana. I urge the House to support this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further requests for time? If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there shall be in the Department of Commerce, in addition to the Assistant Secretaries now provided by law, one additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall receive compensation at the rate prescribed by law for Assistant Secretaries of Commerce, and shall perform such duties as the Secretary of Commerce shall prescribe.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SHELLEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill H.R. 6360, to authorize an additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce, pursuant to House Resolution 425, he reported the same back to the House without amendment.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 231, nays 169, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 12]

YEAS—231

Addabbo
Addonizio
Albert
Alexander
Alford
Andrews
Anfuso
Ashley
Aspinall
Bailey
Baring
Barrett
Bass, Tenn.
Beckworth
Bennett, Fla.
Blatnik
Blitch
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bonner
Boykin
Brademas
Breeding
Brooks
Burke, Ky.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson
Byrne, Pa.
Cannon
Carey
Casey
Celler
Chelf
Clark
Coad
Cohelan
Colmer
Cook
Cooley
Corman
Daniels
Davis, James C.
Davis, John W.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dorn
Downing
Doyle
Dulski
Edmondson
Elliott
Everett
Evins
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Finnegan
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Forrester
Fountain
Frazier
Friedel
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Giaimo
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Hansen
Harding
Hardy
Harris
Harrison, Va.
Hays
Healey
Hébert
Hechler
Hemphill
Henderson
Herlong
Holifield
Holland
Hull
Ichord, Mo.
Inouye
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Md.
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kelly
Keogh
Kilgore
King, Calif.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kitchin
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kowalski
Lane
Lankford
Lennon
Lesinski
Libonati
Loser
McDowell
McFall
McMillan
McSween
Macdonald
Mack
Madden
Magnuson
Mahon
Marshall
Matthews
Merrow
Miller, Clem
Miller, George P.
Mills
Monagan
Montoya
Moorhead, Pa.
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Moss
Multer
Murphy
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
Norrell
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen
O'Neill
Patman
Perkins
Pfost
Philbin
Pike
Poage
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Randall
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Rostenkowski
Roush
Rutherford
Ryan
St. Germain
Santangelo
Saund
Scott
Selden
Shelley
Shipley
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Miss.
Smith, Va.
Spence
Staggers
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taylor
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Toll
Trimble
Tupper
Udall, Morris K.
Vanik
Vinson
Walter
Watts
Whitener
Whitten
Wickersham
Willis
Winstead
Wright
Yates
Young
Zablocki
Zelenko

NAYS—169

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Alger
Andersen, Minn.
Anderson, Ill.
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Auchincloss
Avery
Baker
Baldwin
Bass, N.H.
Bates
Battin
Becker
Beermann
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Betts
Bolton
Bow
Bray
Bromwell
Broomfield
Brown
Broyhill
Bruce
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chenoweth
Chiperfield
Church
Clancy
Collier
Conte

Cramer
Cunningham
Curtis, Mass.
Curtis, Mo.
Dague
Derounian
Derwinski
Devine
Dole
Dominick
Dooley
Durno
Dwyer
Ellsworth
Fenton
Findley
Fino
Ford
Frelinghuysen
Fulton
Garland
Gavin
Glenn
Goodell
Goodling
Griffin
Gross
Gubser
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Harrison, Wyo.
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hiestand
Hoeven
Hoffman, Ill.
Horan
Hosmer
Jensen
Johansen
Jonas

Judd
Kearns
Keith
Kilburn
King, N.Y.
Knox
Kunkel
Kyl
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lindsay
Lipscomb
McCulloch
McDonough
McIntire
McVey
MacGregor
Mailliard
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mason
Mathias
May
Meader
Michel
Milliken
Minshall
Moeller
Moore
Moorehead, Ohio
Morse
Mosher
Nelsen
Norblad
Nygaard
O'Konski
Osmers
Ostertag
Pelly
Peterson
Pillion

Pirnie
Poff
Quie
Ray
Reifel
Rhodes, Ariz.
Riehlman
Robison
Roudebush
Rousselot
St. George
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schenck
Scherer
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scranton
Seely-Brown
Short
Shriver
Sibal
Siler
Smith, Calif.
Stafford
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Tollefson
Tuck
Utt
Van Pelt
Waggonner
Wallhauser
Weaver
Weis
Westland
Whalley
Wharton
Widnall
Wilson, Ind.
Younger

NOT VOTING—34

Ayres
Barry
Brewster
Buckley
Corbett
Curtin
Daddario
Davis, Tenn.
Dowdy
Feighan
Gallagher

Granahan
Grant
Hoffman, Mich.
Huddleston
Jarman
Jones, Mo.
Kee
Landrum
Miller, N.Y.
Moulder
Passman

Pilcher
Rains
Reece
Sheppard
Sikes
Springer
Taber
Ullman
Van Zandt
Williams
Wilson, Calif.

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Dowdy against.

Mr. Ullman for, with Mr. Van Zandt against.

Mr. Brewster for, with Mrs. Reece against.

Mrs. Granahan for, with Mr. Ayres against.

Mr. Feighan for, with Mr. Barry against.

Mr. Gallagher for, with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan against.

Mr. Sheppard for, with Mr. Taber against.

Mr. Rains for, with Mr. Miller of New York against.

Mr. Daddario for, with Mr. Wilson of California against.

Mr. Davis of Tennessee for, with Mr. Springer against.

Mr. Moulder for, with Mr. Curtin against.

Mr. Sikes for, with Mr. Corbett against.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may revise and extend their remarks on the bill H.R. 6360, just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING ADDITIONAL ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1456) to authorize an additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this bill the same as the bill that was just passed?

Mr. HARRIS. It is identical to it word for word.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there shall be in the Department of Commerce, in addition to the Assistant Secretaries now provided by law, one additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall receive compensation at the rate prescribed by law for Assistant Secretaries of Commerce, and shall perform such duties as the Secretary of Commerce shall prescribe.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill, H.R. 6360, was laid on the table.

WOODROW WILSON MEMORIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 87–364, the Chair appoints as members of the Woodrow Wilson Memorial Commission the following members on the part of the House: the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER], and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WALLHAUSER].

ELECTION TO COMMITTEES

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 539

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Agriculture: GRAHAM PURCELL, Texas.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: RAY ROBERTS, Texas.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WELFARE AND PENSION PLAN AMENDMENTS OF 1961

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 538.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8723) to amend the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act with respect to the method of enforcement and to provide certain additional sanctions, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY], and yield myself such time as I may consume.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time on this resolution and do not expect to consume any appreciable time.

This bill is an open rule providing for the consideration of amendments to the Welfare-Pension Plans Disclosure Act, with 2 hours of general debate. The bill was reported out by the committee after considerable investigation by the Department of Labor into the administration of welfare plans of industry and labor.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, and yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may need.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no objection on this side of the aisle to bringing this bill up for consideration, but I do know some questions exist in the minds of quite a few Members on this side of the aisle, and I presume on the other side also, as to certain provisions included in this bill. There is a basic question, however, as to the justification for passing the bill itself.

For example, Mr. Speaker, a number of witnesses appeared before the Rules Committee in support of this bill but they were not able to establish any tangible evidence that there was a specific need for further amendment to the Pension and Welfare Disclosure Act of 1958. We would agree that the authority and the power of the Secretary of Labor under the 1958 act is somewhat limited, but I think the burden of proof falls upon the proponents of this bill to show to the House why it is insufficient.

There was no persuasive evidence—let me say I could not say there was no evidence, but there was no persuasive evidence—as to why the Secretary of Labor would require more authority to supervise the pension and welfare plans to the extent intended by Congress than he has under the present act.

Some suggestion has been made as to intent to defraud the recipients of the assets of these funds over the years or of some mismanagement of these funds; there is a fraud statute in every one of the 50 States that would apply, providing all the necessary authority for prosecution for fraud or misuse of assets. So that does not seem to be a compelling reason.

If it is the will of Congress, if it is the will of this House particularly, to subject all of the pension and welfare funds to the careful scrutiny of the Secretary of Labor and to subject them to his supervision to the extent that at some time in the future he may have jurisdiction over the management of these funds, then, this bill should pass and it should pass without amendment.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AVERY. I would be honored to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. POWELL. There are only five States that have such laws and only two of them have laws with teeth in them. One of them is the State of Massachusetts, but the law was not strong enough and they did not appropriate money for it.

Mr. AVERY. Will the gentleman listen carefully to what I said. I did not say there exists in the 50 States complete and full jurisdiction for the surveillance of the welfare funds, but there is a statute against fraud, is there not, in all the 50 States? If there is intent to perpetrate on the fund or the recipients of the fund a fraud, certainly they would be subject to prosecution under such statute in all the States.

There are a few tangibles in this bill that, if passed, can be anticipated. We are going to add 8,500 employees to the Federal payroll over a period of years. I checked with the Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service and there are presently, I am informed, 8,000 more Federal employees than there were a year ago, which is an all-peacetime high for civilian employees. But we here propose to add 8,000 more.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AVERY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. POWELL. There will not be 8,500 additional employees. There will be only 180 additional employees. The estimated cost will be about $1,500,000 for this new group. I am willing to accept an amendment to be offered at the proper time to place a limitation of $1,500,000 for salaries paid under this act.

Mr. AVERY. I would reply to the chairman of the committee in this way: This bill is getting better all the time. It is at least 95 percent better than it was 10 minutes ago. I said it was going to cost $45 million on an extended estimate. If we are going to cut that down to $1 million, then this bill has been much improved in this colloquy.

May I add, too, that I will yield to the chairman of the committee for any further improvements to the bill as we move along.

Now, I wonder if we can look at this figure of $45 million, because the bill does have a potential cost of $45 million as presently written. I am wondering how many years it would take to save $45 million if this bill were to pass? In my judgment, I would estimate it might take 45 years to save $45 million, because there was no evidence before the Committee on Rules of any gross mismanagement of the pension and welfare fund that could not be handled under the 1958 act.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make one further point. I do not know what allusion you may have as to where the support for this bill comes from or where the opposition comes from.

I think it is reasonable to assume that some Members might have gained the impression that this bill has the full and unqualified support of organized labor; that it is opposed by forces not always in agreement with organized labor, and that a vote against this bill is an antilabor vote. I want to dispel any such illusion that you may have gained during the discourse this afternoon, because the United Mine Workers are opposed to this bill. Certainly there was no allegation of fraud in their various funds in any of the testimony that came to my attention.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AVERY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. That statement is not quite correct.

Mr. AVERY. You mean there has been a question of fraud and mismanagement on the part of the pension funds of the United Mine Workers.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Yes. There are a great many complaints on file in the committee with reference to this fund.

Mr. AVERY. Of course, I would have to accept that statement by the gentleman from California, because, as chairman of the subcommittee, I am sure he has more knowledge and familiarity with the detailed history of the United Mine Workers than the gentleman presently addressing the House. But, I would say this, I think the United Mine Workers have probably managed their affairs in as good order as any other union and, as far as I am concerned, are beyond reproach, and I take very seriously their objection to this bill as an unreasonable burden on the part of the union. Now, if this would come as any special interest to the Members, I would say it is also opposed by the Teamsters organization. I would add, further, that it is opposed by a number of small industrial unions for the reason that it would be imposing an undue burden upon the resources of those unions to comply with all of the requirements that subsequently might be made by the Secretary of Labor.

So, in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me say that the rule should be adopted. We should debate this bill, but I would admonish the Members to listen to this debate very carefully and I would admonish them further to listen carefully to the amendments that will be offered from this side of the aisle. The chairman has very generously offered to accept an amendment, as I observed awhile ago, which would drastically improve this bill and save $44 million. I think a few more amendments in that direction might be made to make the bill worthy of favorable consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8723) to amend the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act with respect to the method of enforcement and to provide certain additional sanctions, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 8723, with Mr. BONNER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, in January of last year, before the 87th Congress opened, while examining the tasks which lay before our committee, it became apparent that one of the most obvious legislative actions needed was the amendment of the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act.

Mr. Chairman, the law, as passed in 1958 over the strenuous objections of many of the members of the Committee on Education and Labor, was a misrepresentation. When former President Eisenhower signed this bill he set forth his dissatisfaction and stated he was only signing it to establish Federal responsibility in this area. The then Secretary of Labor, Mr. Mitchell, called upon the previous Congress to tighten this legislation. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] introduced a bill in the 86th Congress for that purpose. The bill before you today, H.R. 8723, which I personally introduced, drew heavily upon the Frelinghuysen recommendations and the best thinking of the present and past executive branches of our Government. I have since given the authorship of that bill to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. Chairman, I am concerned with the tremendous responsibility placed in the hands of the trustees of these pension and welfare funds which now affect the lives of over 100 million people in this country. These funds have been growing at a fantastic rate. The gentleman from California [Mr. HIESTAND], who is opposed to this amendment in a letter received this morning, indicates that within a few years the amount of plan assets will total $100 billion.

Today, annual payments into these funds exceed the budgets of the State of New York, the State of California, and a dozen other States, combined. Annual payments into these funds exceed the amounts invested by individuals in all the corporate securities of the United States combined. Fund reserves now far exceed $60 billion and are increasing at the rate of well over $5 billion a year.

This Congress must assure the millions of men and women who are the beneficiaries of these plans, and their families, that their money is well handled and their promised benefits properly safeguarded.

This is not done by the present law. The present law is toothless. The 1958 statute made the Secretary of Labor the depository for summary reports of plans and plan operations. He can do nothing to get true facts or to remedy abuses.

Our committee was not the first to recognize the need to fully disclose pertinent information about these plans. In New York State, where a more effective statute was passed, malpractices became apparent. We do not need further scandals to underscore the need for amendments to the present law. Requiring an accounting from the trustees of all types of plans will establish and imbue their operations with a code of conduct which will act as a deterrent to transgressors.

Some opponents of this legislation state that need for these amendments has not been shown because the Department of Labor has no evidence of irregularities. What these opponents have not considered is the simple fact that the Department has not—under the present law—any way in the world of finding out whether or not any fund is properly administered.

This can truly be called a bipartisan measure. Its principles were supported by former President Eisenhower and his Secretary of Labor; a distinguished member of our committee from the other side of the aisle sponsored such legislation; two out of the three Republican members of the subcommittee which considered the legislation supported the measure as it was finally reported out—the third member was not recorded in subcommittee. The subcommittee also sought suggestions, during the public hearings, from industry, labor, insurance companies, investment counselors, and welfare and pension plan administrators. All of their meritorious suggestions have been incorporated in the bill before you this afternoon.

A majority of the House voted in September in support of this measure—a vote of 245 to 161. I believe that the Members voted this way because they truly believe that it is fundamental in a democracy that the rights of the individual are secured by law—and under the present statute, the rights of millions of Americans to full disclosure of the operations of their pension and welfare funds are not so secured. We will deceive them no longer.

Your vote and support for H.R. 8723 is now solicited to close the glaring loopholes in the present law.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HIESTAND].

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Chairman, most of the bills receiving committee attention at last session of Congress and carried over to this session have three basic ingredients: increased Federal power, increased Executive power, and increased spending. H.R. 8723 has all of these, but it has much more and I object to it for the following reasons:

The need has not been shown. Indeed, it will not be shown because it cannot be shown. Long and extended hearings developed the only instances of graft or corruption occurred in excess of 5 or 6 years ago—long before the present law was made effective and most of these were of a type which would not have been corrected by the presently proposed legislation.

THE OFFENDERS WERE CONVICTED AND SENTENCED

There has been no wrongdoing shown since the enactment of the present law. The worst charge we have is that Secretary of Labor Goldberg assumes there has been wrongdoing. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe this House should legislate on assumptions or suspicion or imagination. Maybe there has been wrongdoing, but there are in every State adequate laws to punish embezzlers, grafters, and thieves. These laws apply to offenses in all kinds of transactions.

The charge has been made that thousands of plans and reports required under the present law have failed to come in on time.

Well, the hard facts are that in the very first year—and mind you, this law became effective February 1, 1959—in the very first year there were some 125,000 descriptions filed initially and the 109,000 first annual reports filed on time actually covered 118,000 of these plans.

Thus, 7,000 did not report on time. Of this 7,000, 5,000 subsequently reported or subsequently explained their failure to do so. Thereafter, 2,000 certified letters were sent to the nonreporting plans and 1,240 satisfactory plans were received.

Of the 760 who did not satisfactorily reply, 52 were carefully screened and selected as appropriate cases and forwarded to the FBI for investigation. Forty of these 52 filed as soon as they were contacted by the FBI and the remaining 12 subsequently filed after requesting time to obtain the necessary data.

How can anyone charge that this is a "massive evasion of law" or even a substantial spirit of uncooperativeness? In other words, the present law has been and is effective. Why enact so-called strengthening legislation when there are no weaknesses in the present law?

It is on this flimsy basis that we are requested to enact a law providing penalties as high as $10,000 fine or 5 years imprisonment, or both. Mr. Chairman, it is a serious thing to enact a law with these heavy penalties on so flimsy a base.

H.R. 8723 would tremendously increase the power of the Federal Government and the executive branch. This is particularly so with the Secretary of Labor, giving him not only regulatory power, but investigative power and providing criminal penalties. Here again we have another instance of a department or bureau having both legislative and executive powers.

Proponents of this bill would do indeed as they claim: put teeth into the law. And they would do it with a vengeance.

Mr. Chairman, with this added power, of course, there has to come another big enforcement staff, estimated at 8,550 and at a cost of $45 million. These estimates are based upon the cost of enforcement of present State laws of a similar character. Hence, there is a largely increased Federal expense. The expenditure of large funds of taxpayers' money could well be made if the need had been shown and if the money could be well spent. But, in my judgment, this is simply not the case with the proposal before us today.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HIESTAND. I yield to the chairman.

Mr. POWELL. I appreciate the gentleman's enlightenment that the estimated staff is 8,500 but I would like to know who made that estimate.

Mr. HIESTAND. I am happy to reply that it is in the testimony by the administrator of New York law.

Mr. POWELL. That is the New York State law?

Mr. HIESTAND. Yes, the New York State law.

Mr. POWELL. We are dealing with Federal law here and the Secretary of Labor has informed us in writing that it will be 180 employees and not 8,500.

Mr. HIESTAND. I am well aware of that. I am happy to tell the chairman that is a good estimate, if he wishes to live up to it.

Mr. POWELL. We can live up to it by putting it in the bill as an amendment.

Mr. HIESTAND. This estimate is based on a thousand such plans in New York and we contemplate the heavier supervision over 150,000 such plans.

Of course, there are other obnoxious features. Over 90 percent of the funds are managed and supervised by corporate officials. Most of the people handling funds are already under bonds and are carefully supervised by the company auditing departments. This measure would require duplicate bonds and duplicate auditing.

The present D–2 reports are, in my judgment, very complete and sufficiently detailed. The bill provides just that amount of detail. But the power to regulate would authorize the Secretary of Labor tremendously to increase all of that detail—constituting a heavy burden on a large number of the very small welfare and pension plans.

One official is quoted as saying, "this would cost us $800,000 a year and I would rather see that money put into the fund." Who is the beneficiary here—the contributor or the bureaucrat?

But, why the demand for all this increased power without justification? Could it be that certain union leaders who have publicly demanded a voice in the management of welfare and pension

funds would seek eventually to control those vast funds? Could it be that in the years ahead, when the funds are well up in the billions, these leaders would desire to direct the investment of these vast sums into the control of certain corporations, thus gaining immensely increased bargaining power? Could it be that this is simply a step in that direction?

The trend is clear. Private, well-managed control now. Government control tomorrow. Could it be certain labor leaders' control in a few years?

Like most of the setting up of other huge bureaus, we must also, of course, have an advisory council of 13 members, including 2 from management and 4 from labor and 2 from other interested groups. Need I say more?

Mr. Chairman, I consider this a very dangerous bill and urge that it be defeated.

It would give the Secretary of Labor unnecessary and broad regulatory authority, and would unduly burden the administration of pension and welfare funds; infringe upon State legislation—which is a more appropriate and effective method of handling problems involved; ignore the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code which now provide effective indirect control of abuses of pension and welfare funds; disregard the rules of conduct and standards prescribed in the Taft-Hartley Act for jointly administered welfare and pension funds; and create within the Federal Government a new bureaucracy which would increase financial and administrative burdens of the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, that bill became effective January 1, 1959. By June of 1959 the bill was introduced by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey, at the request of some of the bureaucrats down in the Labor Department. We had not at that time had a chance to see whether it was going to be effective or could be effective. It has been effective.

I oppose the bill and urge its defeat.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT], to yield as he wishes, and to manage the bill as chairman of the subcommittee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to join with the gentleman from New York, the chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor, in urging the passage of H.R. 8723, the bill to amend the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act.

The subcommittee of which I am chairman originally considered the bill and put it into the form in which the full committee reported it out. I shall accordingly describe to you some of the details respecting the background of and need for this proposed legislation and the nature of its provisions.

The Disclosure Act, enacted in August 1958 and effective as of January 1, 1959, followed studies and investigations which were undertaken in the 83d and 84th Congresses by special subcommittees, including Senator DOUGLAS' committee. These investigations revealed shocking and scandalous cases of embezzlement, overreaching, exorbitant insurance premiums, irregular insurance practices, and other forms of collusion in the operation of employee welfare benefit plans. These studies and hearings clearly demonstrated the need for full public disclosure of the facts surrounding the provisions, finances, and operations of these plans as a means of insuring that they will be honestly administered.

While nobody questions that the vast majority of these plans are being run honestly and efficiently, it became evident that disclosure legislation is imperative both as a remedy where abuses already existed and as a preventive against possible future irregularities.

During the 85th Congress a subcommittee of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, under the chairmanship of then Senator John F. Kennedy, held exhaustive hearings on a number of disclosure bills that had been introduced. The committee voted out the Douglas bill, S. 2888, which the Senate passed by a vote of 88 to 0. This vote makes it obvious that not only was there a dearth of opposition to the measure, but also that it had strong bipartisan support.

S. 2888 was a strong bill. Under it many of the abuses which had been shown to exist could have been detected and corrected. Indeed, I can say that if it had become law we would not be here today.

However, the House passed a much milder bill which in effect retained only the disclosure aspects of S. 2888. Gone were that bill's provisions which would have authorized the Secretary of Labor to administer the measure, to prescribe rules and regulations, to investigate and compel compliance. Dropped by the wayside were the provisions heavily penalizing willful violations and making embezzlements and kickbacks Federal felonies. This watered down version, under which the Labor Department is only a depository for report forms, was enacted into law. Three years' executive branch experience under the Disclosure Act amply shows its futility.

The tragedy of this act was aptly expressed by former Secretary of Labor Mitchell in his report to Congress on August 9, 1960, when he stated:

> To continue the law in its present form in the belief that it assures adequate protective safeguards is a shameful illusion. To abandon it entirely, however, would be an act of betrayal to the millions of Americans who have a right to a sense of security that the billions of dollars annually received and disbursed by these plans are being honestly and prudently managed.

Private employee welfare and pension benefit plans have become an economic factor of major importance. Approximately 100 million people, workers and their dependents, which is over one-half of the population of the United States, rely upon one form or another of the welfare and pension plans subject to the Disclosure Act. Typical welfare plans cover group medical, hospital and surgical, temporary disability, sickness, accident plans and life insurance. Pension plans operate on a group basis to provide income for the wage earner when his years of active earnings are ended. In other words, they protect the working men and women of America and their families when illness strikes or accidents befall; and they protect him against being an object of charity, public or private, when old age destroys his ability to support himself or when the day comes when he wants to enjoy his remaining years in a pleasant and well-earned retirement.

Beginning in World War II when employee benefit payments came frequently to be used as a substitute for wage increases, the growth in welfare and pension plans has been tremendous. Plan assets as of 1959 amounted to nearly $48 billion. In the intervening time assets have been increasing at a rate of $5 billion a year, so that it is safe to say they are now around $58 billion. It is also a safe estimate to say that by the early 1970's they will have reached the staggering total of $100 billion. Contributions to these plans reached a record high of over $10 billion in 1959, with more than $5 billion being paid out in benefits.

The gentleman from New York has given you in a nutshell the major ways in which the Disclosure Act is deficient. It has many other less glaring defects too, some of which I shall mention. In any event, these shortcomings would be attacked by H.R. 8723 with a broad program that breaks down into six component parts which combine together into a highly effective whole:

First. Adequate investigative power would be given the executive branch.

Second. Specific power to compel compliance and restrain violations of the law through civil judicial proceedings would be given the Government.

Third. Power to issue binding and authoritative opinions and interpretations of the law would be conferred on the Secretary of Labor.

Fourth. Bonding of persons who handle the funds and other property of these plans would be required.

Fifth. Three new sections would be added to the Federal Criminal Code prohibiting kickbacks and certain conflict of interest payments to influence actions of the giver or receiver, embezzlement, and false entries.

Sixth. Miscellaneous amendments of existing law, designed to improve operations under the act, would be made.

As you know, this statute is a disclosure law, not a regulatory one. Before I take up the provisions of H.R. 8723, I want to point out that it would add language to present section 9, stating that nothing in the law shall be construed to authorize the Secretary to regulate or interfere in the management of any plan.

Taking the above six items in order, I have no hesitancy in saying that one of the worst defects of the Disclosure Act is its failure to give the Secretary of Labor adequate investigative power. He lacks authority to investigate cases of faulty, deceptive, or defective reporting, or of complete failure to file. As a re-suit, although it is a sure thing that a large number of plans have not filed descriptions and reports, it is impossible to know how many there are and—vastly more important—it is usually impossible to identify particular plans that have not filed.

Without authority to investigate, there is little the Labor Department can do to identify delinquent plans. Of course, it is possible to identify a plan that files a description but fails to follow up with the required annual reports. However, if the plan files nothing at all there is little likelihood that its identity will come to light; the actual violation of the law turns out to be the greatest safeguard against detection.

H.R. 8723 would give the Secretary of Labor authority to conduct investigations, conditioned upon certain specific standards which he must follow in deciding whether or not to act. He would be empowered to begin his investigation whenever he has reasonable cause to believe that an investigation may disclose violations of the act. In such event investigative action may be instituted either on a complaint of violation or by the Secretary on his own initiative. Further, in cases involving possible violations of section 7(b), concerning the publication and filing of reports, the Secretary may investigate only when he has first required certification of the annual report by an independent certified or licensed public accountant. This is designed to cut down on investigative costs and burdens by dispensing with them in cases where such certifications will serve all necessary purposes. Certification will often explain or clear up a complaint of alleged violation to the satisfaction of all concerned, thereby rendering investigation unnecessary. Of course, this certification is required only in section 7(b) cases where there actually is a report. It is not required where the violation is of some other section of the act or where the offense is failure to file any report at all.

In aid of this investigatory power, the bill would make the provisions of the Federal Power Act relating to the attendance of witnesses and the production of documentary evidence applicable to the Secretary or his designee. The use of the administrative subpena is indispensable to effective investigative power under statutes like this, and it is commonly granted by such laws. A comparable provision appears in the Landrum-Griffin Act, and one was in the Douglas bill, S. 2888, when the Senate passed it in 1958.

Now, the second item; power to compel compliance through civil judicial proceedings.

A very serious shortcoming arises from the fact that the Disclosure Act relies to a large extent on self-policing by individual employees or participants to compel compliance through private litigation. This is wholly unrealistic and, as was to be expected, has proved to be wholly ineffective; apparently only one private beneficiary suit has been brought during the act's 3-year history.

I was greately impressed last year by the following statement in the report of the Commission on Money and Credit, a high-level group representing financial, business, labor, and educational organizations, and established by the Committee on Economic Development:

> The underlying premise of the Federal Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act of 1958 is that the individual participant in the pension plan is expected to detect maladministration and invoke legal remedies to protect his own interest, whereas experience has shown that employee suits alone are inadequate as enforcement remedies.

Of course employee suits alone are inadequate. Individual employees usually have neither the necessary facts, money, nor the time to prosecute their own cases.

Experience has also shown that criminal sanctions alone are not enough. Under the present law a willful refusal to file a report is a misdemeanor. But imposing the criminal penalty alone would not be the real answer in securing compliance with the law. Compliance, not punishment, is the real objective, and that would be obtained by securing a court order to compel the filing of the report. Hence the bill would specifically authorize the Government to bring civil actions in which the courts could direct compliance with the law.

The third major defect in the Disclosure Act is that no Government agency is authorized to interpret it. There are many close and doubtful questions about the meaning of various provisions of the law. Administrators of these plans want the answers. They are entitled to the answers. They ask these questions in good faith and there are countless areas in which advice to them is imperative. Yet, the Department of Labor can answer only on an informal advisory basis because the law does not empower it to issue binding interpretations or instructions.

H.R. 8723 would remedy this situation by authorizing the Secretary to issue binding opinions and interpretations which plan administrators can uniformly follow and on which they can rely. Administrators who follow such opinions and interpretations will have a good-faith defense if their actions are subsequently questioned.

The fourth area in which H.R. 8723 would improve upon existing law is bonding. Every administrator, officer, and employee who handles funds or other property of a plan would be bonded.

This, of course, does not infer that any substantial number of these persons are dishonest; the contrary is true. However, just as in the case of bank employees and others handling money, bonding is necessary to take care of the occasional case of defalcation which is bound to result whenever a large group of people is handling large sums of money.

The bill prescribes maximum and minimum amounts, $500,000 and $1,000, respectively, but the Secretary could, after notice and opportunity for hearing, prescribe an amount in excess of the maximum. This is necessary because the provision expressly permits the use of blanket or schedule bonds covering many individuals. When all the employees of some of the larger trusts are combined in one bond, such bond would have to be more than half a million dollars to afford adequate protection.

The bond's obligation would be to protect against fraud or dishonesty. It would be in a form or of a type approved by the Secretary who could approve the use of schedule or blanket forms of bonds in lieu of individual bonds. The Secretary could also exempt plan personnel from any of the bonding requirements when he believes that other bonding arrangements afford adequate protection. It would be made clear that compliance with this bonding requirement would relieve the person bonded from similar requirements under any other law insofar as the handling of the funds of the particular plan is concerned.

The fifth major addition to existing law would be made by the provisions of H.R. 8723 which would provide criminal penalties for kickbacks and certain other conflict-of-interest payments and receipts designed to influence certain actions of the giver or receiver; embezzlement; and false statements or concealment of facts in documents required to be published or kept as supporting records. The need for these three provisions is plain. The Douglas committee found that these are fertile fields for abuses. Prohibitions in these areas were included in the original Douglas bill.

The committee, at the suggestion of the Department of Justice, added to the kickback section a subsection authorizing application, with the Attorney General's approval, to the court for an order compelling witnesses in court or grand jury proceedings involving this particular section, to testify or produce evidence in return for immunity. It is clear that this will materially aid law enforcement in the conflict-of-interest field covered by this section.

I will not dwell at length on the sixth category, namely, miscellaneous improvements. The more important are:

First. Establish an advisory council to advise the Secretary respecting the act's administration. The 13-member council would be composed of 1 member from the insurance field, 1 from the corporate trust field, 2 from management, 4 from labor, 2 from other interested groups, and 3 from the general public.

Second. Plan reports would be made public information.

Third. Where plan benefits are provided through the medium of an insurance carrier, service, or other organization, the carrier or organization would be required to certify to the administrator such reasonable information as the Secretary deems necessary to enable such administrator to comply with the act.

Fourth. Every person required to file any plan description or report, or to certify any information, would be required to keep adequate supporting records and preserve them for 5 years.

Fifth. When the Secretary has determined that an investigation is necessary, under the limitations which I have described above, he would be empowered to require the filing of supporting schedules of assets and liabilities. While it is intended that this authority shall not be indiscriminately invoked, it would be valuable in certain situations.

Sixth. The present misdemeanor provision of the act would be made applicable to all sections thereof instead of being limited as at present to violations of sections 5 and 8—"Duty of Disclosure and Reporting" and "Publication," respectively.

Seventh. The Secretary would be authorized, after notice and opportunity for hearing, to prescribe regulations which would dispense with present reporting requirements covering certain information that is either duplicative, unnecessary, or impossible for practical purposes to obtain.

Eighth. As I said earlier, the new provision giving the Secretary investigatory power, subject to meeting specified standards, specifically denies him the authority to regulate plans. However, it permits him to inquire into the existence and amounts of investments, actuarial assumptions, or accounting practices, but only when it has been determined that investigation is required under the bill's standards.

Ninth. The Administrative Procedure Act would be specifically made applicable to the Disclosure Act.

Before concluding, Mr. Chairman, I wish to emphasize that the participants of the many welfare and pension plans have a right to have their investments safeguarded. The moneys which are contributed into these funds, both by the employer and employee, rightfully belong to the employees much like wages earned belong to the employee. In fact the courts, as well as labor and management in their wage negotiations, have recognized that welfare and pension plans are a form of deferred compensation for services performed. This bill is directed at protecting these investments from mismanagement by requiring full disclosure from plan administrators.

The need for extensive amendments to the 1958 Disclosure Act has been expressed by leaders of both parties. In signing the law into effect on August 29, 1958, former President Eisenhower both recognized the Federal Government's responsibility in this area and foresaw the law's basic weaknesses, urging that extensive amendments be adopted during the next session of Congress.

After 3 years' experience with the law, President Kennedy, in his message to Congress also stated:

> Since the enactment of the act in 1958 we have had an opportunity to observe its operation and effect. This has disclosed several serious deficiencies. The act is designed to prevent repetition of abuses and irregularities in the administration of employees' benefit plans. I believe these amendments are necessary to carry out that purpose.

In summary, therefore, Mr. Chairman, the committee is presenting to the House a most moderate and fair bill the need for which has been unanimously voiced and which takes into account the many special problems presented by committee witnesses in the course of its public hearings.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to my chairman, the gentleman from New York.

Mr. POWELL. The preceding speaker, also one of our colleagues from the State of California, mentioned that bureaucrats wanted this legislation. I wonder if he included in the term "bureaucrat" the former Secretary of Labor, Mr. Mitchell, and our colleague from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] and all of the Republicans who voted in favor of this bill in committee?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I would have to say to my distinguished chairman that, of course, it is the privilege of our colleague from California to refer to members of his party as bureaucrats—not an entirely complimentary designation—if he wishes to do so; but, of course, the RECORD will show that the charge did not come from this side of the aisle.

I think it would be well to point out that the matter of urgency for this measure to create more bureaucrats as referred to by my friend from California, occurred under former President Eisenhower, who recommended these provisions to Congress. I think it must be conceded that the former President has a somewhat greater stature than being a bureaucrat.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield.

Mr. HIESTAND. I cannot, of course, imply that the President of the United States knew all the details in the remarks he made.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I think all of us recognize that this is the second time this measure has been before this body. As the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from New York, remarked, this bill received an overwhelming majority last year; nevertheless, because of this rather unusual procedure I think it is important that we perhaps go over some of the background and reestablish some of the legislative history of this bill and put the picture in its proper perspective.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HIESTAND. That was before the existence of the present law.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. It was, but let me point out that the situation is no better, as far as I know, and, as a matter of fact, the Secretary of Labor and Mr. Carey, appearing before our committee, stated they believe it is worse. I am going to give you the worst part of it.

Mr. HIESTAND. But he had no evidence it was bad.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. It is bad enough if abuses happened, and President Eisenhower said the time had come when the matter should be gone into.

Mr. HIESTAND. The fact remains that the present law has done the job.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The fact remains it has not done the job, and we have no evidence it has done the job. Mr. Mitchell, under a Republican administration, and the Secretary of Labor, under a Democratic administration, both say that the job has not been done. What more does the gentleman want? I do not know.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KEITH. I think before you leave the subject which you first dealt with that I would like, as a former insurance man, to point out something which might shed a little light on the subject. I am sure that you and I both recognize, as former insurance men, that in the first year of the average life insurance policy no dividends are paid on those policies to the policyholders and similarly that the cash values in the first year of the policies are ordinarily at a minimum. I just want to set the record clear. My voting record last year would indicate support of similar legislation, but I do not think we should tell a portion of the story about the policies. In the first year they have a minimum cash value, but no dividends are paid.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. These are renewal policies, not first-year policies. Because my friend is an expert in the insurance field, could I ask him something to see if this is not the fact? Have you ever heard of the practice of trying to get a first year's commission by canceling the previous policy and rewriting it and collecting a first-year commission on that new policy?

Mr. KEITH. I have heard of that practice, but most companies have rules prohibiting it and refuse to pay any commission on policies that are sold because of surrendering other company policies. I do not know of any agent who is honorable who follows that practice. But, it had been done.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Exactly. It has been done, and if it has been done once, then we have to have a law to make sure that it is not allowed to be done again in that growing field.

Mr. KEITH. There are State laws to this effect.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. There are only five State laws to this effect, unfortunately. I wish there were a lot more.

Mr. KEITH. Prohibiting the surrender of a policy in order to get a new commission?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. There are laws against twisting, but this can be done, as you know, without twisting. Even in my State of California that is done today almost every day of the week.

Mr. KEITH. It is not done among professional people in the life insurance field.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. That is true. We are not talking about the good people; we are talking about the bad people. We are after the bad people; we are not after the good people. And, this law is not written in any way to hamper the good people. This law is trying to do something about the practice which actually exists.

May I go on and say that the House, of course, in 1958, at the conference with the Senate, yielded against a bill which was much closer to the present bill, and if the Senate bill at that time had passed, we would not have this legislation before us and the tremendous requests from both sides of the aisle to do something about its shortcomings.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, I do not know the details of the reports which are before the Congress or the committee hearings, but I should point out that there is at this time substantial regulation of a great many of these pension plans by the Internal Revenue Service. It is a long and involved process to come up with a plan that will win the Federal Government's approval. My colleagues in the Congress should know that it does not entirely escape Federal supervision at the moment.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I would hope that my friend was going to be a friend of this legislation. But I would like to read a statement on this subject because, of course, the committee went into this problem.

Mr. KEITH. I do not doubt the committee went into it, but I do feel that the entire Congress should recognize the fact that the Internal Revenue Service does have a real responsibility which they exercise in this field.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. They went to the Internal Revenue Service and asked them whether they felt they had any ability in this field. They replied in no uncertain terms that their responsibility in this field was only for income tax purposes. They said they had no way of really knowing whether or not this would be lived up to and, so far as they were concerned, there was no duplication in reporting to the Internal Revenue Service and the Department of Labor. But, on the contrary, information obtained by the Internal Revenue Service is restricted on a confidential basis whereas in our end of it, this is all public information for the benefit of the beneficiaries. This is confidential information. Even if the Internal Revenue Service found that there were certain things going on which they suspected were probably wrong, they have said to the committee that they could not do anything about it as long as the facts given to them come up to the minimum standards which they require. So they, in essence, said to us, "Look, do not give us this job; ours is an income tax collecting or a tax collecting agency and we have nothing to do with the purpose of this bill."

Mr. KEITH. They do require strict compliance with the regulations which are spelled out in some detail, and one of those regulations is that the plan in which a man or woman is a beneficiary must be conveyed and interpreted to the beneficiary in order that he knows the details of the plan. It also is not allowed to discriminate in favor of certain classes of employees—generally speaking, in plans used to supplement social security. I would be interested in knowing under what administration and under what circumstances that letter which you just read into the RECORD was obtained.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. It was before the Senate committee, and it was also before our committee.

Mr. KEITH. What was the date of the letter and who sent it?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I would have to ask the committee staff for that information, but I will be glad to put it in the RECORD for the information of the gentleman. I believe it was in 1961.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I am afraid I am using up the rather short time available to us, but I am glad to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. It might be profitable.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. CONTE. I compliment the gentleman and the members of the committee for this proposed legislation. In the State of Massachusetts I was chairman for 3 years of a commission investigating the welfare funds of the building and heavy construction unions in that State. I can say that the proposed legislation now before the House is very similar to the law that my commission wrote and which was finally passed by the Massachusetts State Legislature. Unfortunately, the Massachusetts Legislature has not appropriated the necessary funds to carry out the intent of the law. I wish to state here that my commission found many abuses. Let me give the gentleman from California one example. For the common laborers union health and welfare fund which we investigated in Massachusetts, they hired an administrator from Silver Spring, Md., a man by the name of Arthur Peisner and paid him a very handsome salary of about $40,000 a year. He came to Massachusetts and set up this fund. Then he set up a dental fund to take care of the dental work of employees in the heavy builders and heavy construction union. Through a gimmick, they paid out $412,000 in dental fees and, yet, not one person in that union ever had their teeth taken care of by a dentist in Massachusetts. This was only one small instance of many, many others. One of the trustees who happened to be a big construction employer in the State of Massachusetts and who also was an official of one of the banks, as a trustee of that particular fund in Massachusetts, took this money from the fund and deposited it in his bank interest free. This was only one of many abuses we found in the fund of the builders and heavy construction workers. There were officials both on the employers' side and on the employees' side who had their hands in the cookie jar. I think it is very commendable that we put some teeth in the laws so that such people can be brought before the bar of justice.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

I think we can all agree that this bill is nonpartisan.

There are several other things I would like to talk about, but I will reserve the balance of the time on this side for others. At this time I would simply ask permission to revise and extend my remarks and say that I will continue the debate under the 5-minute rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California has consumed 28 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise primarily to state my own position both with respect to this bill and with respect to previous legislation in this same area which I introduced back in 1959. I would like to say at the outset that I am in favor of H.R. 8723, and I hope we are successful in passing it today.

It seems to me important that we provide the kind of teeth these amendments to the act would provide. This question, of course, goes back a good many years. In the first place, the act which we now propose to amend went into effect just over 3 years ago. On looking over my own record, I found I introduced a bill, H.R. 10124, in March of 1956, proposing the registering and reporting of these pension funds. In January 1957, at the start of the 85th Congress, I introduced another bill, H.R. 2437, which would provide for the registration and reporting of welfare and pension funds. Then in 1959, on June 2, I introduced H.R. 7489. This bill is the one which has been previously referred to. It would provide amendments similar to the ones we are presently considering.

It will be recalled, I am sure, that when President Eisenhower signed the Welfare and Pension Fund Disclosure Act in August 1958 he felt extensive amendments would be necessary in order to have effective legislation. I myself agree very much with that proposition. The bill I introduced in June 1959 actually incorporates the recommendations of the then Secretary of Labor, Mr. James Mitchell, and the administration then in power. I do not think there is any partisanship in the thinking of the many people who feel something needs to be done to improve the law we passed back in August of 1958.

The basic issue is a very simple one. It has already been discussed here at some length. The question is whether the law which was passed in 1958 is in itself sufficient, or whether we need to provide additional personnel in the Labor Department to police this act. Some argue that we have already a good piece of legislation, which in effect is policing itself.

I myself do not feel that we have done enough, that there is enough protection. I feel the Secretary of Labor should be empowered to act. The amounts involved in these funds may run as high as $100 billion in the next decade or so. Since this is the case, the national interest would seem to require that we should not take it for granted that the beneficiaries of these plans can be sufficiently protected without amending the law. It is for that reason that I firmly believe we have an obligation to move. I hope we can have a decisive margin in support of this bill when the showdown vote comes.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, in expressing my opposition to the legislation contained in H.R. 8723, let me state that in its present form it is a misnomer, in that it is not an amendment of existing statutes, it is a complete rewriting of every section of the bill. I am predicating my opposition to this legislation largely on the testimony produced at the hearings before the Committee on Education and Labor on Tuesday, July 9, 1957, on which the present legislation was based. I refer to the testimony of John L. Lewis, president of the United Mine Workers of America, a trustee and chief executive officer of the welfare and retirement fund of the United Mine Workers.

Mr. Lewis said:

> We find ourselves opposed to the plan for the Congress to enact regulatory or punitive legislation affecting welfare funds as established in American industry, more or less in reprisal because dishonest men have committed dishonorable deeds as affecting certain of the welfare funds.
>
> The scandal over welfare funds is not the only sensational incident that has occurred in every social, political, and economic subdivision of our electorate. Virtue does not exist in any one segment of American society; all men are prone to weaknesses at times.

Mr. Lewis further said:

> I do not believe that the Republic, through its central powers, can regulate these voluntary associations, either in whole or in part, without of necessity expanding its powers as a central government to the point where it will become a police state, in truth and in fact.
>
> One of our proudest boasts abroad, and much money is spent in promoting this truth, is that our labor unions are free, and that our voluntary associations of citizens are free, in contradistinction to conditions existing in other states which we identify from time to time.
>
> The labor unions in this country are the first line of the Nation's defense in emergency; they are the defenders of our liberties. With their free forums, with their proven loyalty to the principles of the Republic and the defense of the Nation's free institutions, they need some liberty of action and they need to remain free as voluntary associations.

Mr. Lewis continued:

> We believe that a representative form of government and its function endure; we have proven that and demonstrated that to the world since 1776.

He continues:

> I think the Congress ought to give free enterprise in welfare funds a chance to continue. We extol free enterprise anywhere else. I am for free enterprise in welfare funds. And I recognize that the selection of wise leaders and able counselors and honorable men is just as much an obligation for a welfare fund as it is for the Congress of the United States or the lawmaking bodies of our several States. It is a constant task for the electorate to assume.

Then he added:

> To undertake to enact the legislation encompassed in those several bills pending before the committee would, I think, put an undue burden upon the welfare funds, would vastly increase the cost of administration.

I might say he expressed an estimate that it would cost the United Mine Workers welfare fund approximately $800,000 of additional outlay. He stated that they were reporting to the Internal Revenue Bureau 65,000 different items unders the present law and this would probably increase it to as many as 100,000. He thought that that money, amounting to several hundred thousand dollars, would be better used in the welfare fund to pay pensions to miners, to take care of the ill and needy members of the United Mine Workers, than to use it as an additional cost of making reports.

I call attention to one additional expression from Mr. Lewis:

> The United Mine Workers welfare fund is not an insurance company, per se. It does not solicit business. It does not compete with existing insurance organizations. It is merely an instrumentality set up by two parties, to wit, the contracting parties, for the mutual benefit of the individuals concerned in that industry.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. May I point out to the House that the gentleman is talking about testimony in 1957, and this bill was not drawn in 1957. What the gentleman may have felt at that time, we do not know what he would have felt about this bill, because he did not come before the committee. However, he did send two representatives, and I think it is important to note that in that testimony, which you will find on page 146 of the hearings, my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] asked Mr. Kaplan:

> You have no objection to the Mine Workers fund being within the scope of H.R. 8235?
>
> Mr. KAPLAN. Not at all.

All his testimony amounted to was to ask for a clarification of certain sections and to ask for certain limitations, and I think if the gentleman will read the new bill that followed that testimony, that we have pretty well acceded to what the Mine Workers requested.

Mr. BAILEY. Now, since the gentleman was kind enough to yield me time and took all of it, would he mind yielding me another minute to answer?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute, hoping he will express his views in this regard.

Mr. BAILEY. I do not intend to comment on your remarks, but I do want to take the additional time to read into the RECORD a resolution of the United Mine Workers passed on February 2, 1962:

> Whereas the United Mine Workers of America have consistently opposed legislation providing oppressive, regulatory and punitive measures affecting welfare funds; and
>
> Whereas there are sufficient laws on the statute books to accomplish the purposes set forth in pending legislation; and
>
> Whereas the United Mine Workers of America Welfare and Retirement Fund and the Anthracite Health and Welfare Fund have from their inception fully disclosed their finances and operations in annual reports, including independent annual audits as now required by law, which they give wide public distribution and through reports submitted as required by law to various agencies of the Federal Government; and
>
> Whereas the only purpose which could be accomplished by additional legislation and Federal intervention, as provided in H.R. 8723, would be to give the Secretary of Labor plenary authority which would result in a heavy financial drain on all welfare funds, and particularly the United Mine Workers of America Welfare and Retirement Fund and the Anthracite Health and Welfare Fund, thereby depriving members of this union from the benefits which would go to them instead of to defraying the cost of punitive requirements imposed by any such legislation: Now, therefore, be it
>
> *Resolved, on this 1st day of February, 1962*, That the United Mine Workers of America oppose H.R. 8723 as punitive, burdensome and financially oppressive and respectfully urge the Members of Congress to vote against its enactment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation.

I would like to point out at the outset that on August 29, 1958, President Eisenhower signed the original Welfare and Pension Disclosures Act. He indicated that he approved the act, and I quote "because it establishes a precedent for Federal responsibility in this area. It does little else. If the bill is to be effective at all, it will require extensive amendments at the next session of the Congress."

Now, it was not amended in the next session or the session after that, and it has taken up to this time to put some teeth into this law. I think it is long overdue. I share with many of my colleagues concern over placing too much power in the hands of any bureaucrat, in the hands of any public official, or administrator or whatever other term you may choose, to designate the people who will administer this act. But, I do feel that we must admit that this act needs further teeth; that we need enforcement powers here in order to do the job that was originally conceived.

Now, I would like to clarify for the RECORD several points so we will have a legislative history here that will leave no question in the minds of the administrators as to the limitations on their powers. If I may have the attention of the subcommittee chairman, I would like to ask some specific questions.

I think I know the answers, but I would like to have them clearly in the RECORD. With respect to the bonding provision provided in this act in section 13, is it the intent of the sponsors of the bill that the Secretary, in determining such standards and such bonding amounts, shall act in accordance with the provisions of the Administrative Procedures Act, particularly insofar as notice of hearing must be given to interested parties who shall have an opportunity to present their views and their recommendations to the Secretary?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I want to say to the gentleman that on page 16, section 15 of the bill, the gentleman will find the following:

Sec. 15. The provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act shall be applicable to this Act.

Therefore, my answer would clearly be "yes"; it applies to the entire act, without exception.

Mr. GOODELL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, a further question: The Senate bill regarding the bonding provision sets a floor under the amount of bond that must be put up, but no ceiling on such bonding.

Would it be the intention of the gentleman, if the gentleman from California [Mr. Roosevelt] is a conferee, to stand firm regarding a bonding ceiling in this provision?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. As I am sure the gentleman knows, I believe that the bonding ceiling as we have written it here in our committee is a very important part of that provision, because it gives directives to the Secretary of Labor. If you remove that, as we are told is proposed in the other body, obviously the Secretary then acquires such broad powers that, perhaps, he would not be properly guided by the Congress. I think we should properly guide him where we can. So, I would here on the floor of the House and in conference argue the soundness of our position because I believe in it, that is, if I were appointed to the conference. Of course, I do not know.

Mr. GOODELL. I appreciate the gentleman's comments. May I ask a final and a summary question?

The chairman of the subcommittee and I had pretty much of an exchange and colloquy on the House floor when this bill was before the House last year. I ask the gentleman if he does not agree that my questions and the gentleman's responses as legislative history to this bill are equally applicable today as they were then, and that we both endorse them as such?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. May I ask the gentleman if he would cite the pages of that colloquy in the Record?

Mr. GOODELL. I would be very happy to do so. The colloquy appears in volume 107, part 14, pages 18261–18263 of the Congressional Record.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I would say to the gentleman from New York that I had the opportunity earlier this afternoon to reread that colloquy, and I am completely in every way of the same mind as I was then. I stand behind every word of it. I would like to make it the legislative history of this session, and I would propose to the gentleman that he ask unanimous consent that it be quoted in full in order that it be a part of the legislative history at this time.

Mr. GOODELL. I will say to the gentleman from California [Mr. Roosevelt] that I shall do this when we are back in the House.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GOODELL. The reason for this somewhat involved exchange I think is fundamentally important. We have had some testimony before our committee and some indications from various individuals that they would like to start controlling the investment policies of welfare and pension plans, and that it is their intention to move in this direction, to have the Federal Government and the Secretary of Labor ultimately control the investment policies of our welfare and pension plans. It is not our intent. The gentleman from California [Mr. Roosevelt] and I made it very clear in our colloquy previously that that was not our intent and it certainly is not written into this bill. We have specifically pointed out that there shall be no powers given to anyone to control any investment policies in these pension and welfare funds. We have limited the power of the Secretary of Labor in a great many ways. The first thing that must be done is that a plan must submit a report. Under present law they might submit a summary of their investment. There were people who wanted the Secretary of Labor to have the power to make the report include all types of investments—how much stock there was in General Motors or General Electric, or any other corporation. We resisted this move. We felt that what was necessary here was a general disclosure of the broad category of investments.

Only if the Secretary of Labor found reasonable cause to believe there was a violation of this act could he proceed further. In receiving these reports, which are in summary form, listing broad categories of investments, if the Secretary feels there is reasonable cause to believe that there is a violation of this act he must then require that those reports be sworn to and certified. In other words, if he does not believe the report, his first step, his first required step is to insist that it be certified by a CPA. Then when he receives the CPA certification he must again look at it and determine whether there is still reasonable cause to believe that there is a violation here. At that stage he may investigate further and require the production of other documents to prove the contentions that are made by the administrators of the plan in the report. I think this is very important. I think it is a guarantee that the Secretary cannot exceed the authority which this Congress wishes to give him and which we feel is necessary to guarantee the sanctity of these funds.

If we insist that giving any authority to the Secretary in this respect is going too far, then we are in effect saying that these administrators of plans should make no real disclosure, that there should be no control over them whatsoever as to abuses, that there should be no power to insist upon disclosure to the beneficiaries of these funds of the broad categories of investment involved in these funds.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. AVERY. I think the gentleman has come to the very crux of this bill. I would like to ask him for my own information what further burden then is imposed upon the reporting source at this point. As I understand the gentleman, the Secretary of Labor may make this determination after certification by an accountant or other accredited examiner; and then if he is not entirely satisfied with what he has found on the basis of this examiner's report, he may determine that a further investigation is necessary. Will all of the administrative and other costs be borne by the Secretary of Labor at that point or will that impose an additional burden upon the union or upon management or whoever may be the custodian of this fund?

Mr. GOODELL. The additional burden will fall upon both parties in this respect. The Secretary of Labor, if he does at this point feel that there is reasonable cause to believe that there is a violation of this act—and I would distinguish my present words from the words of my esteemed colleague from Kansas as to the Secretary not being satisfied with what he has received; he must have reasonable cause to believe there is a violation of this act when he finally decides to go further. Then at that point, and only then, he has the power to subpena records and go in and investigate the funds to verify the accuracy of the reports that have been filed with him. The only other thing he may investigate is to see if one of the crimes listed here has been committed—embezzlement, false statement of some kind, or theft.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield for one more question: Other than the supplying of records and other data that might be required by the Secretary and furnishing other such testimony that he may require, no further burden would fall upon the management of the fund?

Mr. GOODELL. That is correct. Also I am supporting amendments which will give the Secretary discretion to make a simplified report acceptable for a number of plans where it would be unduly burdensome to require a full report. This goes along the lines of the Landrum-Griffin exemption providing that a simplified report would be satisfactory in such instances.

I might say further to the gentleman and to the chairman of the subcommittee that last year at the conclusion of my remarks I asked the gentleman from California about three amendments that had been adopted in the Senate committee, and he indicated at that time that he hoped that they would be agreed to in the conference.

I would like to go back to this point because one of those amendments was the discretionary power in the Secretary of Labor to allow simplified reports where it would be unduly burdensome to require full reports Another one was to exempt plans covering 100 or fewer participants. Finally, a third provision was to require from the Secretary of Labor full annual reports on this program. I ask the gentleman from California if his sentiments in that respect have changed since September.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I would have to say to the gentleman until I have had a chance, of course, to look at the wording of the amendments in the other body, which have not passed yet, I would hesitate to commit myself to any specific amendment. I would in principle have to say my sentiments are pretty much the same with the exception of reducing it from 25 to 100 because there is, I think, additional information I would want to look at very carefully before agreeing to that. However, the basic principle involved in the other two, I think are adequate and on the basis of information I now have, I would be inclined to think the subject of reducing that coverage to 100 employees is a subject we ought to go into very carefully.

Mr. GOODELL. I thank the gentleman. I urge my colleagues to vote for the amendments which will be offered by me and others of my colleagues to tighten up this bill even further, but in any event to vote for this legislation as being very necessary and worthy.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I want to commend the gentleman for the fine statement he has made here today. The gentleman from West Virginia referred to John L. Lewis saying this was not an insurance policy but that this was an agreement between two individuals and, therefore, there was no need for the law. Is this not the reason we need a strong law, because this is not an insurance policy or an insurance company and, therefore, it is not regulated by the State or by the Federal Government, and the law needs some teeth in it so that we can regulate these things and keep a jaundiced eye upon the administrators and trustees of the fund?

Mr. GOODELL. I agree with the gentleman that for the most part the States do not regulate these plans and that they do need regulation along the lines provided in this bill for that very reason.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. The gentleman is correct, and I think this is very clearly stated in the report. The whole record indicates that there was no intent here to have him have any say whatsoever about where these funds are invested. This is a disclosure act. It is to make sure that the investments are disclosed through the Secretary of Labor, and that is all.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield for one more question, was the action of the committee in any way indicated by advising these people who had testified of the changes made in the original bill as introduced?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. We made it known to every witness that the so-called blue sheet, describing the bill, would be available and was available. However, as far as I know, we did not send it to anybody who did not ask for it.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman. I will not impose any more on your time.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, you mentioned the question of reasonable cause. I would be glad to have you explain that if you have sufficient time. I think that is a very vital part of this bill, and I would like to have it clarified. May I proceed now?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Please.

Mr. GOODELL. Under 7(b) reports, as I understand, these are the annual reports that must be filed. Now, they may be sworn to but not necessarily certified by an accountant of some kind. It is my understanding that the Secretary of Labor, if he finds reasonable cause to believe there is something wrong with the annual report, must find that reasonable cause exists before he does anything, and he may then require the report to be certified; is that correct?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. GOODELL. He must have it certified before he takes any other action?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. If the report has not been certified, he must do that before he can make any investigation.

Mr. GOODELL. Going further, assuming that a report is filed and then the Secretary of Labor requires it be certified, if the Secretary of Labor then wants to subpena any documents, I understand, it is provided in section 9(e); he still, at that stage, must have a continuing reason, reasonable cause, to believe there is a violation; is that correct?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. That is correct, sir, and anybody would have that defense if he believed he did not so have reasonable cause.

Mr. GOODELL. On page 19 of the report, which is the text of the bill, there is the section giving the Secretary of Labor the power under sections 6 and 7 to require the filing in such form and detail as the Secretary shall by regulation prescribe. I would just like to clarify that by saying that this also requires that the Secretary make a determination that there is reasonable cause to believe there has been a violation before he makes this requirement upon the plan concerned.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The gentleman is correct; and, if the gentleman will permit—and again it is suggestion—we wrote in the specifics of what could be required in any report in order again not to allow the Secretary to ask for extraneous matter.

Mr. GOODELL. The gentleman realizes I am asking these questions to establish a bona fide unquestionable legislative history as to what the Secretary's powers are. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding. These are mostly amendments I proposed in the subcommittee.

One other question: In the bill there is a provision giving the Secretary—it is on page 21 of the report:

"The Secretary when he has determined that an investigation is necessary in accordance with section 9(d) of this act may require the filing of supporting schedules of assets and liabilities."

Once again, this power in the Secretary's hands can be exercised only upon a determination that there is reasonable cause to believe a violation has occurred.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The gentleman is correct; and we wrote it in there so there could be no misunderstanding on that point.

Mr. GOODELL. I appreciate the gentleman's responses and thank him.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. May I just say in the very few seconds I have left, that I will put into the RECORD a rather detailed description of the need. The immediate need arises largely from the New York law which covers 3,500 out of 17,000 cases and shows very clearly that there is an immediate need to protect these plans. I would refer to testimony before the subcommittee where facts show that in New York, which has a disclosure law, with the right of investigation, an examination of a welfare fund was begun on September 4, 1958. Subsequently, the fund bookkeeper was convicted on February 26, 1959, of grand larceny first degree. On March 4, 1960, she received a suspended sentence with probation. The union president and a fund trustee also were indicted on November 19, 1959, in connection with the receipt of payments and loans from the welfare fund. On November 18, 1960, he received a $500 fine or a 30-day jail sentence, and both of these persons are no longer connected with the fund.

An examination of the reports filed with the Labor Department was made, and on their face, disclosed no information which would indicate larceny, forgery, or illegal loans. It was disclosed, however, that the report was verified by the administrator only of the fund, who was an employee of the fund, whereas regulations request that each member of the board of trustees attest to the D-1 report. Not only that, but there was a discrepancy in the figures on the reporting D-2 form. At one place, employer contributions were listed as $43,775; whereas in another place, contributions were put at $33,509.12.

I emphasize to the Members, that under present law, the Department has no right to inquire into these matters.

Another case investigated by the New York authorities, disclosed withdrawal of welfare funds, for the benefit of certain trustees and union officials. The grand jury on June 29, 1959, indicted the trustees on two counts, grand larceny, first degree, and forgery in the third degree.

An investigation of filings with the Labor Department disclosed no plan descriptions or annual reports made by this fund. Subsequent investigation has revealed some question concerning coverage of the Federal law of this plan.

The basic point in all this, is that even where the right of investigation is provided, abuses of the trust relationship continue to be uncovered. Under the present Federal law, there is no right of investigation, no protection for these 80 million participants, and their interests in this $50 billion in assets in these plans.

An analogy would be the provisions in Landrum-Griffin, dealing with unlawful trusteeships in title III, but providing no investigatory right to the Secretary; or those provisions relating to union elections.

The realistic fact, of course, is, as every single Member of this House knows, filing reports with the Department, without the right to make sure that the reports are accurate and honest, is an empty protection to the participants of these plans and to the public; or as former Secretary of Labor Mitchell stated, a "shameful illusion."

I would also note that those who say the aim of the bill is to control or regulate these plans, ignore the plain facts of the record. The bill itself in section 9(h) clearly states that nothing in the law shall authorize the Secretary to regulate, or interfere in the management of, any of these plans. The committee report on page 9 reiterates this clear statement of intention. And the Secretary himself in his testimony stated on page 18 of the printed record that:

"It is not the desire or the reach of this proposal to subject these plans to Federal control. These proposals have a very simple objective and that is to make known to the beneficiaries of these plans and to the public what the contents of these plans are and to give the Secretary the necessary authority to investigate the reports that the statute calls for."

I note that under the Landrum-Griffin law, the Secretary is given authority, but I don't recall the argument that he therefore, would be able to control or regulate union internal processes and business, or that of employers or labor relations consultants.

Similarly, the contention that these amendments would require a staff of 8,550 people and $45 million, is another illustration of flagrant disregard for the facts. The Secretary plainly testified an appropriation of $2,500,000 and a total staff of 290 would be adequate. I am now advised that because of the amendments made by the committee, the actual budget would be reduced to $1,500,000 and a total staff of 171—only 86 more than the present staff.

With respect to use of departmental forms, I have here two examples of reports received by the Department, and note that on the first there is no information filled in concerning the date of the plan year ending; or when the annual report is due; what kind of plan it is; or who is the administrator.

Looking at the second form, there is no information showing how the plan is financed; how much money goes into the plan; or even how many employees are covered by the plan.

The argument, therefore, that most plans use the Department forms, becomes meaningless, unless the information requested by the form is given; and the Department has the right to make sure that the information is accurate and honest.

Further along this line, the testimony before the subcommittee showed that over 12 percent of the forms received by the Department of Labor had deficiences on their face; that is, there were omissions of such critical information as the name of the plan administrator, what type of workers were covered and information indicating when the annual report should be filed. As a matter of fact, a considerable number of reports were not even signed by the plan administrator and many others were not sworn to as required by the legislation.

In conclusion I would refer the Members to an editorial in the Washington Daily News, of May 26, 1961, dealing with the need for this legislation. It stated:

"TEETH FOR PENSION FUND LAW

"Scandalous abuses of union pension funds, as revealed by the McClellan committee, inspired passage of a sham law which provides no real protection.

"Labor Secretary Goldberg used strong but well-justified language this week in discussing this law before a committee of Congress.

"It is, he said, confusing, toothless and widely ignored. It is a betrayal of the 85 to 100 million Americans who have money estimated at nearly $50 billion in these funds.

"He considers it likely that many of the abuses discovered before passage of the law, 2 years ago, still are taking place.

"Mr. Goldberg thus backs the criticism of President Eisenhower, when he signed the act, and of his Labor Secretary, James P. Mitchell.

"The law requires pension fund administrators to file reports showing sources of the funds and their uses; but the process stops there. The Labor Department, which receives the reports, can't do anything much about them. There are no effective criminal penalties in the law for such things as embezzlement and kickbacks.

"What Mr. Goldberg wants is power to subpena witnesses and seek injunctions to compel compliance with honest standards. For embezzlement he would fix a Federal penalty of $10,000 fine and 5 years imprisonment.

"These provisions—or even stiffer—should have been in the original law. Congress should not wait to act until there are new revelations of callous theft and misuse of these funds, accumulated from the dues of union members."

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York, Mr. GOODELL, a member of the committee.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in favor of this bill. I will try to clarify some further points with reference to its provisions. I would like to point out first of all that the original Welfare Pension Plan Disclosure Act was passed in 1958. When President Eisenhower signed the bill, which was cut back considerably here in Congress, he made this statement. It was on August 29, 1958. He said he was approving the act, and I quote:

"Because it establishes a precedent for Federal responsibility in this area. It does little else. If the bill is to be at all effective, it will require extensive amendment at the next session of Congress."

It was not amended in the next session; it has gone to this time to be amended and have some teeth put into it so that the Secretary of Labor may require those who are administering the pension and welfare plans to file a report with him to make the disclosures. We wrote a provision in here that the Secretary of Labor may not use this subpena power or investigatory power without first having reasonable cause to believe there had been a violation. The violation is that they refuse to disclose in what categories their funds are invested.

We went further and wrote in a limitation in this bill that the Secretary could not explore the types of stock, the types of bonds, the kind of companies these funds are invested in except on reasonable cause to believe that the original filing was inaccurate. That means that the filing which is called for here is to inform beneficiaries of pension and welfare plans: How much money do you have invested in Government bonds? How much in corporate bonds? How much in common stocks? How much in preferred stocks? How much in real estate? The general categories are written right into the act to be sure that that is the power of the Secretary of Labor and no more. Then if the Secretary of Labor has reasonable cause to believe that that company is inaccurate in its report and has thus violated the law, then and only then may he request a filing of a full schedule of assets and liabilities in regard to the pension or welfare plan.

May I ask the gentleman from California if he will not confirm what I have said in this respect?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Not only can I confirm it but I can specify exactly where it is. It is on page 5, line 17, where it is clearly stated:

"The Secretary, when he has determined that an investigation is necessary in accordance with section 9(d) of this Act, may require the filing of supporting schedules of assets and liabilities."

Mr. GOODELL. One other point. In the early stages there was some suspicion that this was an attempt to control the investment of these funds, that maybe the Secretary of Labor or somebody else wants to tell the administrators where they can invest funds. Some union leaders appear to have such an objective, particularly one Mr. Carey, who was quoted in a newspaper as saying:

"It is our belief that the nature of the pension funds may yet require the establishment of rules by the Congress to govern the way such money is invested."

Does not the gentleman from California agree that we wrote specifically and clearly in this legislation that there is no power anywhere for anybody to tell the Administrator where he may invest these funds?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. May I read from page 8, line 19, where it is stated:

"Nothing contained in this Act shall be so construed or applied as to authorize the Secretary to regulate, or interfere in the management of, any employee welfare or pension benefit plan."

Mr. GOODELL. I have one other question. The Senate has passed a bill in this matter and its bill is generally more favorable and more liberal in this respect than the bill that is now before us. The Senate made three major additions to this bill. One, they have exempted plans covering 100 or fewer employees, except under unusual circumstances. This will eliminate the filing of a great number of plans, and it will reduce the administrative burden considerably.

Another is to give the Secretary discretion to allow simplified reports where a detailed report would be unduly burdensome. This is in the same tradition as the Landrum-Griffin Act where a similar provision was made to cut down burdensome details. Is that correct, may I ask the gentleman from California? The Senate bill also would require full annual reports by the Secretary of Labor to the Congress. Does the gentleman have any comment on these amendments?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. If the Speaker would appoint me to the conference committee, I will join with my friends in hoping we can agree to those amendments.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished author of the bill, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I want first of all to thank the chairman of the committee for permitting me to offer this bill in which I am very interested and the chairman of the subcommittee for the very good and conscientious work he has done in this area, and also the members on both sides of the committee who have been so considerate in this matter.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is a very important bill. I would like, first of all, to make a few brief remarks with respect to some statements that have been made on the floor. The statement has been made, to the effect that this bill will create an undue burden on these administrators to file new reports. There is nothing required to be filed as a result of this bill that any good administrator would not file anyway. So if anyone is going to find any additional burden, it will be someone who is not doing the job they ought to be doing today. Others are already filing this kind of report. With regard to the Internal Revenue having some provisions to control these funds, I was interested in that because I happened to have been the attorney to set up several of these funds as the result of labor-management agreements wherein they agreed to such a fund. The Internal Revenue Department does require certain requirements to be met. For example, that none of the income, or none of the corpus of the trust shall ever revert to the employer and that there shall be a determinable amount available on a periodic basis for benefits and that there must be an actuarial evaluation from time to time to show that to be a fact. However, this does not in any way cover what we are trying to cover in this bill, and the protection we are trying to get at in this bill.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. In regard to this welfare fund of the United Mine Workers, they already report to the Bureau of Internal Revenue on 65,000 items or individuals, and this would require 100,000 additional to be covered. Do you think, since they have an independent audit by certified public accountants, that it is necessary that they give this additional information?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. If they have all that, all they have to do is to take a copy of that audit down to the Department and deposit it, and it need not be any great burden.

Mr. BAILEY. They have to give more details and it would require 100,000 additional items to be covered.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. They only need file in summary—this is right in the bill.

If they have what you say they have, all they have to do is to go down to the Department and file a copy of it. That would place no great burden on them. If they do not have such information they ought to have it. That is the purpose of this bill.

I think I should point out that the Internal Revenue law does not cover all we are covering in this bill at all. All it does really is to prescribe that unless the employer meets certain conditions he cannot take off as a business expense the cost of such a plan. It does not attempt to do what we are doing in this legislation. Some have said some people want to regulate these funds. I think this is true, but I would like to read to you a little bit from a report. Let me first mention some names to show you the character of the people who issued this report. It is a report of the Commission on Money and Credit. There are Frazar B. Wilde, chairman, Connecticut General Life Insurance Co.; James B. Black, chairman of the board, Pacific Gas & Electric Co.; Marriner S. Eccles, chairman of the board, First Security Corp.; Fred T. Greene, president, Federal Home Loan Bank of Indianapolis; David Rockefeller, president, the Chase Manhattan Bank; Charles B. Shuman, president, American Farm Bureau Federation; and Jesse W. Tapp, chairman of the board, Bank of America.

The report by the commission of which they are members said:

> The underlying premise of the Federal Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act of 1958 is that the individual participant in the pension plan is expected to detect maladministration and invoke legal remedies to protect his own interest, whereas experience has shown that employee suits alone are inadequate as enforcement remedies.
>
> The Commission recommends that an appropriate regulatory body should be given added responsibilities over private corporate pension funds. These responsibilities should include the power: (1) to study and develop appropriate standards of prudence in investment of the funds; (2) to enforce such standards; (3) to assure periodic disclosure to beneficiaries of the financial statements of the fund; and (4) to bring suit against malfeasors on behalf of the plan participants and their beneficiaries.

Let me point out to you that they ask for regulation. We take a more conservative approach than that in this bill. It is true, as the gentleman from New York said, that we are not trying to regulate in this bill. We are not going as far as this Commission wanted us to go.

The question raised here is what happens to these funds. It has been said that both the employer and employee group ought to be able to take care of their own funds. I point out to you that when these funds are set aside they become trust funds and do not belong to either the employer or the union any more, but create a fund out of which the beneficiaries may expect to supplement the aid that comes to them from social security. The employees are entitled to know what is happening to or has happened to these funds, just where the funds are at the present time, what interest or return the funds are earning, what is going out of the fund, and to assure that such information is available is the purpose of this legislation. So I do not think it is too much to expect that this kind of law will be passed. Those who have nothing to hide will go ahead and file these reports, and they have been, as a matter of fact; but those who have something to hide are unwilling to file these reports. So we want to put teeth into this toothless wonder. I think it is a good law and urge its adoption.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. I wish the gentleman would comment on the cost of additional overhead in the Department of Labor that would be involved in policing these funds. How many reports is it contemplated will be filed?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. About 150,000.

Mr. JONAS. Of course, the mere filing them away down there will not accomplish anything

They will have to be examined, analyzed, and scrutinized and somebody will have to determine that some require attention and others may not. What does the committee study show with respect to cost?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. It shows that at the present time we are spending $500,000 and that amount, in fact, is being wasted, that we should either repeal the law or we should pass some amendments here to make it effective. It shows 180 employees to be added which would mean an expense of about $1½ million. We are wasting a half million dollars at present or we can by adding $1½ million and really do some good.

Mr. JONAS. The committee thinks it would take an additional 180 employees?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Yes. I might point out that in setting up an operation like this they have to have higher paid employees. That is on the management end of it. But that is already there. The reason the additional cost is so low in comparison to the number of new employees is that these will largely be clerical help and would permit the present employees to better act as management.

Mr. JONAS. I wish there were some way we could screen out the plans that are known to be properly managed and not have to encumber the record of the Department of Labor so as not to require a lot of handling of plans that are in proper order and do not need attention. I assume the subcommittee went into that and somebody would know of the plans that would not require examination because they are in good shape.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. May I say to my good friend, as the bill is written there does not have to be a completely new plan filed every year. If it is the same plan the only thing that has to be filed are any changes in the plan which have to be filed in 120 days. What it affects are reports on the status of the investment under the plan so that the information may be public. The other parts will require little additional expense.

The committee did ask, not on its own responsibility, but we asked the Secretary to tell us precisely the number of additional employees and the amount that would be asked of the Appropriations Committee. I assume that the Appropriations Committee would on that basis hold him to his statements made to our committee.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, this is a right-to-know law. The billions of dollars involved belong to employees and represent deferred income. The employer could not have deducted them as a business expense unless they were in fact deferred income—yet the evidence is that some have been milked by or through administrators. This bill is needed so employees can know whether their deferred income is being milked and to provide bonding requirements to assure that the funds will be made whole if embezzled or stolen.

I am sure that in this field, we all start from the same point of view. We all believe that employee benefit plans should be financially sound, honestly administered and adequately safeguarded so that beneficiaries will receive the benefits to which they are entitled.

We are also most anxious to prevent abuses which threaten the financial integrity of these funds. Embezzlement, larceny, bribery as well as any maladministration of these funds, not only unjustly destroys the rights and interests of beneficiaries but strikes a blow at the well-being of our economy. These beneficiaries depend upon getting the pension to be provided by these funds to supplement their social security.

We, therefore, start from the premise that disclosure of information concerning these funds is of fundamental importance. If we have effective disclosure, it will be exceedingly difficult for unscrupulous men to formulate, execute and conceal abuses. Furthermore, beneficiaries as well as the public will be able to learn more about how these funds operate and are administered. This is absolutely vital if beneficiaries and the general public are to possess intelligent and discriminating attitudes regarding these funds.

Basically, this is what Congress tried to do when it passed the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act in 1958.

Unfortunately, it passed a bill which has been universally recognized as "toothless." H.R. 8723 is the latest in a series of proposals which began almost immediately after the act was passed. It attempts to restore the machinery that was left out in 1958—machinery which will effectively carry out the disclosure concept and which will deter wrongdoing in benefit plans and put teeth into the toothless wonder that is now on the books.

I would like to briefly describe what are the important elements of this machinery.

First, H.R. 8723 expressly confers upon the Secretary of Labor the power to provide interpretations so that the people who handle these funds and are affected by this law can get precise guidance as to their obligations. There is no such provision in the law today and, as a result, unnecessary confusion regarding the scope and meaning of some of the more important provisions of the law has occurred. It is also proposed that plan administrators and others affected by the act would be permitted to place full reliance upon the opinions and report forms of the Secretary of Labor. This reliance would establish a good faith defense and would protect any plan administrator or other person affected by the act from any liability or punishment for any actions in question even though these actions are later determined not to have been in conformity with the act.

This proposal is an eminently sensible rule and is the type of proposal which could well be provided in numerous other Federal statutes which require administration by a Federal agency.

Next, the enforcement deficiencies in the act would be cured. A strictly defined investigatory power would be conferred upon the Secretary of Labor, including appropriate subpena power, as well as the authority to institute injunctions restraining violations of the act. It is virtually certain that without this sort of authority the disclosure concept cannot be made effective. Under the present law, the good administrators tend to file good reports while those with something to hide either do not file or file in a form that reveals very little or in fact hides important facts.

These powers are set up in such a way that the Secretary is precluded from regulating the operations of benefits plans. I should like to emphasize this point because there has been a great deal of loose talk about this bill being an attempt to regulate these funds and the insurance industry. I want to assure this Committee that anyone who reads these proposals will see immediately that this is not the case and that any talk about this bill attempting to regulate benefit plans is simply not true.

The bill also makes embezzlement, kickbacks, bribery, and looting from these funds Federal felonies. These were the very abuses which initiated legislative action in this field and yet, as the law stands now, none of these flagrant abuses are Federal crimes. These provisions were drafted with the aid of the Department of Justice and they reflect that Department's long experience in dealing with criminal activities. Most State authorities just do not have the resources to carry on investigations and other criminal enforcement activities which are necessary to protect beneficiaries from being victimized.

Also, I should like to point out that many State laws were not drafted to deal with the type of plans covered by the Federal law. They were based on common law concepts and experience and were not specifically geared to the new and dynamic developments that have taken place in the welfare and pension fund area.

Consistent with the idea of protecting the financial integrity of these funds, the bill provides for the bonding of administrators, officers, and employees who handle the funds or the property of the funds. You have heard this bonding provision described in great detail, and I do not intend to repeat what has been previously said. Suffice it to say, however, that this bonding provision is fair and moderate, and that it is based upon the best experience that could be mustered in this area.

These then are the principal improvements recommended by the Labor Committee and embodied in H.R. 8723. They are concrete proposals with no frills attached and are based upon specific experience under the law.

I urge passage of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK].

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I find myself in opposition to this bill for numerous reasons. In these few moments I want to pinpoint two specific areas where I think we should look a little closer. It has been referred to time and time again that the so-called Landrum-Griffin bill needs teeth. I am going to point out an area where we see the proponents of this bill moving in the opposite direction.

Section 13(a) of the bill states:

> Such bond or other security or insurance shall provide protection to the plan against loss by reason of acts of fraud or dishonesty on the part of any administrator, officer, or employee of such plan, directly or through connivance with others.

Section 13(d) of the same bill provides:

> Nothing in any other provision of law shall require any person, required to be bonded as provided in subsection (a) because he handles funds or other property of an employee welfare benefit plan or of an employee pension benefit plan, to be bonded insofar as the handling by such person of the funds or other property of such plan is concerned.

What we are saying in effect in section 13 is if you comply with the bonding provisions of this bill you will have relief from bonding provisions which otherwise might be imposed on you as administrator or employee under any other law. This is rather interesting.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I will be glad to discuss this later, but let me say at the present time the gentleman's interpretation is quite wrong. We very carefully asked committee counsel, because the gentleman debated this issue on the air the other day and he made that statement. It disturbed me very much. So I asked the General Counsel whether he would not carefully examine and see whether the gentleman is right. I think I can make the statement that the gentleman is not right and I do not think there is any question but what after he hears the statement he will not feel as he does now.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Let me proceed with what I have to say, then the gentleman can answer it if he sees fit.

Let us ask this question as a practical matter. If this were the case, as the gentleman from California points out, Why would you be relaxing the safeguards of the Landrum-Griffin Act? Why would you in section 13 of this bill provide for bonding provisions which, when satisfied, relieve a person from those which were set up in 1959?

If the gentleman from California is correct and if you do not want to upset what is under the Landrum-Griffin Act, why not say so? Here you say if you comply with 13(d) you do not have to comply with any other section. I think if you look at the two bonding provisions, you will get some indication why.

Section 502(a) of the Landrum-Griffin Act provides:

> Every officer, agent, shop steward, or other representative or employee of any labor organization (other than a labor organization whose property and annual financial receipts do not exceed $5,000 in value), or of a trust in which a labor organization is interested, who handles funds or other property thereof shall be bonded for the faithful discharge of his duties.

I think herein we see the difference. The bonding requirements of the Landrum-Griffin Act are extremely stringent compared to the bonding requirements of this act, so I think that is why we are saying in 13(d) if you comply with the bonding requirements of this act, you are relieved from the requirements of any other act. And, if the gentleman from California is correct, we should reverse it. We should say if you comply with any other act, you need not comply here, because people who might not be able to comply with the Landrum-Griffin Act would find it relatively easy to comply with section 13. Of course, it will be said that the bonding provisions of the Landrum-Griffin Act are too stringent, but everything that has been said up to now is that we need more stringent laws; that we must have these immense funds directly controlled.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. The Landrum-Griffin Act does not begin to cover all of the people we cover here under this bonding provision. What we are doing here is protecting all the funds, not one-fourth of them, so really this law is much more inclusive.

Mr. ASHBROOK. You are extending to more people less stringent provisions.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. It goes up to $500,000. What we really want to do is to protect the corpus of the fund, and wherein in this bill do we not protect the fund?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Why do we circumvent the provisions of the Landrum-Griffin Act that call for the faithful discharge of their duties?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. These requirements were very carefully worked out with people in the insurance industry and people who understand this, and they say this bill covers any possibility of embezzlement or anything like that.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I raise these points because I think they should be answered. If the gentleman from California could answer, I would gladly yield to him.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I would like to point out that as far as handling pension and welfare funds only is concerned, this act does exempt persons from the duplicate obligation to be bonded insofar as the same funds are concerned under the Landrum-Griffin Act. Thus it treats the employers and the union officials alike and does not require bonding union officials only, as is required under the Landrum-Griffin Act. Insofar as union dues and any other moneys going into union hands are concerned, this does not relieve the union officials of any of their previous obligations to be bonded as required by the Landrum-Griffin Act. In other words, no racketeers who handle union money are in any way relieved from any previous obligation, but the difference is that all persons who handle pension and welfare funds, union and management alike, are under the same obligation with respect to this act in the handling of pension and welfare funds.

Mr. ASHBROOK. The gentleman is exactly correct when he states that it would require both the employee and the employer to be bonded, but why should we relax the situation with respect to the section 502(a) requirement?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. We are only saying that insofar as the pension and welfare funds are concerned, in order to really get at the way in which they can be bonded. The insurance company people, the management people, and the labor people all said this was the only language which could be effective and could be written by the insurance companies.

The way it was written in the Landrum-Griffin Act, it would make it impossible to get the kind of a bond that would go to the purpose of the pension and welfare funds. Therefore we got a committee together and it was set up, and they came back with unanimous agreement. I think when we make sure that in no other way does it relieve anybody under the Landrum-Griffin Act specifically as to the handling of pension and welfare funds, I think the gentleman will find it does not have the horrible implications which the gentleman seems to think it has.

Mr. ASHBROOK. The gentleman said it would be impossible. Is he saying, therefore, that the provisions of the Landrum-Griffin Act are too stringent?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Not for the specific purpose for which they are written; no. We do not change that. But, it was clearly obvious, and the insurance people said that it would not be writable or effective if they were applied to pension and welfare funds. They did not go into that. Therefore, if we wanted to write an effective bonding provision for pension and welfare funds we had better set up something that could be enforced. That was the reason this language was written.

Mr. ASHBROOK. The gentleman will certainly agree that a person who might not be able to meet the requirements of section 502(a) of the Landrum-Griffin Act will be able in many cases to meet the requirements of section 13 of this act?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. No; I would not agree with that at all, because if he could not meet those other requirements and were not bondable at all he simply is not going to meet these requirements and be bondable either. He is going to be unbondable, and he would have to be denied the right to handle these funds.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I would suggest that that is the point on which I would not agree with the gentleman from California. I think the point I am making is whether section 13(d) is going to supersede the Landrum-Griffin Act. It is interesting to note that the only other provision requiring an employee to handle pension funds to be bonded is in the Landrum-Griffin Act. If this is the case, why not have it the other way around, and say if they have been covered previously it is not necessary to be covered here, rather than making it the opposite? I suggest it is done to soften the requirement of the 1959 legislation and make it easier to become bonded.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I will have to say to the gentleman that everybody that had anything to do with this, including the Department of Labor, said that they had had so much trouble with that and it became so difficult to enforce with any possible respect to pension and welfare funds, if you want to be sure everybody is covered across the board, you had better write it this way or you will not reach everybody. This committee wanted to be sure that it did not leave anybody unbonded against the various things that have been enumerated, and we wrote it this way.

Mr. Chairman, may I inquire of the gentleman on the other side [Mr. Frelinghuysen], whether he has any more requests for time?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, we have one more speaker. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis].

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I was rather shocked in listening to the colloquy between the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Keith] and the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from California [Mr. Roosevelt], when they were discussing the aspects of the internal revenue laws as they concern these particular plans. Having reviewed the committee report and finding no reference at all to the internal revenue codes as they pertain to this, and then searching through the committee hearings to find out if they thought, maybe, it might be wise to get some information from the Bureau of Internal Revenue, I find they did not do that. Then, searching still further to see if there were not some testimony on the basic aspects of these plans, which is the Internal Revenue Code, I find indeed there is some evidence which apparently the subcommittee and the committee just completely ignored.

Mr. Chairman, on page 433, and then again on page 434, running to page 438, are two letters, both of them from the American Bankers Association, calling to the subcommittee's attention the basic facts in regard to the bulk of the pension and welfare funds.

Let me read just a little bit from it. First of all, they point out the distinction between the two types of plans. One is the welfare plan, which comes under one section of the Internal Revenue Code, 401(a). The other is, the pension plan which comes under 404. Practically none of the welfare plans are qualified tax plans. The bulk of the pension plans are qualified tax plans.

The amounts of money involved are very interesting. The great bulk in number of plans lies in the welfare field, of which only a few are tax qualified. It is the 36,600 plans which have nearly $30 billion of assets and are receiving nearly $4 billion in annual contributions that are under this, and if one will study the Internal Revenue Code and read what the bankers have told the committee about this they will find that the regulations of these tax-qualified programs are very strict, go away beyond anything this bill attempts to do.

The bankers have suggested that this big area be left out of this bill. They point out, among other things, that they had previously expressed the point that these tax-approved plans have no question of violation and then they go on to say "that our reasoning was correct"—and this was after the 1958 code—"and that our recommendations are sound is confirmed by the fact that no abuses in tax-approved plans were reported up to that time nor have any of them been reported since then. All reported abuses have occurred in welfare plans which were not qualified under the Internal Revenue Code."

I wish the Committee would read this letter and find out just what are the requirements under the Internal Revenue Code. The penalties are these. If you fail to file annually and in detail you lose your tax-exempt status. And I can assure you that that is a discipline that is very important. One reason why I am particularly interested in this, is that I am a member of the Committee on Ways and Means; but I had called to my attention—and I am going to introduce a bill either tomorrow or the next day—that the pension plans do not permit putting health insurance, prepaid health insurance into those pension plans for their people when they retire. And the reason they cannot do it is that they will lose their tax-exempt status. I am anxious to see that amended so that they can do that, because immediately millions of Americans would be covered by health insurance in their retirement if we approve this little amendment.

But note why they have not done it. They lose their tax-exempt status if they do put their funds into such a very desirable program.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to urge seriously that this Committee either send the bill back to committee or at least accept an amendment that would eliminate these tax-exempt plans, because it is just going to add a lot of unnecessary cost, and the present regulations of the Bureau of Internal Revenue certainly police them away beyond anything in this bill.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS. I was going to ask the gentleman from Missouri if he would confirm the statement made by Mr. Bronston, chairman of the committee on employees trusts, which appears on page 434 which says these annual statements of these pension plans have to be filed with the Bureau of Internal Revenue in such detail that they have to show receipts and disbursements.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. And so much in detail that they have to be funded, so that they actually get into somewhat of the investment to the extent at any rate that if they are not funded in such a way as to bring in the revenues and are not actuarially sound, they stand to lose their tax-exempt status.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. But the gentleman, I do not think, would quarrel with this statement. The Internal Revenue Service merely inspects the items of the plan to satisfy itself that all funds paid to the plan are irrevocably committed to providing the specified benefits for employees. The Service does not audit these funds and, therefore, it has no information as to whether or not there is theft or whether there are other abuses with respect to the handling of the funds which have been paid in.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I do disagree with that. Who signed that? I was amazed to hear that.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Then may I read you the statement.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Who signed that letter—because here is what I am getting at.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. If the gentleman will let me say it, I will be glad to say it.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I want to point out this and then the gentleman can answer this question too. If you called that gentleman before your committee and interrogated him along the lines of what the requirements are, I think you would have clarified that. Now I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The statement is made by Mr. Harold Swartz, Director of the Tax Rulings Division of the Internal Revenue Service, and this is found on page 847 of the hearings before the Douglas committee on July 20, 1955. We then asked the Internal Revenue Service staff whether this was their same position. I do not have the name of the individual who replied, but he did reply that it was exactly the same.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Is that in the hearings?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. No; this was a part of the staff research which we asked them to do. He stated:

> I would like to emphasize that the principal function of the IRS is a collection of Federal taxes. * * * The collection of these taxes involves the processing of nearly 95 million tax returns. Obviously we can neither examine nor audit all of these returns. We must channel our limited examining power to the items which are believed to be the most productive. Accordingly, only a small portion of our time can be devoted to examining into the annual information returns filed by exempt organizations.

Then they also replied to us:

> Qualification of a plan by IRS does not insure actuarial soundness. The regulations reguire only minimum standards.
>
> The assets of the plan may have depreciated greatly through bad investments or economic conditions without being of any concern to the IRS * * *. The IRS would disqualify a plan if the minimum indicated were not put in, but this action would actually work a hardship on the employee beneficiaries.
>
> The regulation of qualified pension plans by IRS is for income tax purposes. It does not assure against abuse nor is there any disclosure to the employee beneficiaries. On the contrary, by law the IRS cannot inform the beneficiary if it finds something wrong with the management of the plan.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I simply want to say this, that first, the statement made by the people who handle most of these plans that there have been no abuses shown either before or after, is compelling.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. If my colleague will yield, may I point out that the statement to which the gentleman from Missouri refers was made by a party against the bill and not backed up by any information of any kind.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. If the gentleman will wait just a moment, I want to say these people are the ones who handle the funds.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I beg the gentleman's pardon. That statement was made by a gentleman representing the American Bankers Association.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Exactly. The members of the Bankers Association handle a great deal of these funds. That is the point. Now if the subcommittee in the interest of finding out the truth contested that, they would have called them in and, secondly, I suggest that the subcommittee would at least have the Internal Revenue Service before them to interrogate them and possibly might try to resolve the conflict in the statements that we find in your hearings beginning on page 434, the statement of the American Bankers Association and the statement that the gentleman has just read from the Internal Revenue Service. It seems to me that when you talk about the bulk of your funds here, the subcommittee might have done that amount of work.

Mr. Chairman, I think I will suggest that this bill be recommitted.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I simply want to say to the gentleman, we felt there was no conflict. It was simply a situation where one side did not want any regulation, for obvious reasons. The American Bankers Association wants to run it their own way, and I do not blame them for that. They have their right to come before the committee and say so. However, we found no evidence that the Internal Revenue Service had changed their position, and it would have been a waste of time of the committee for them to repeat what was already in the record.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. Does the record disclose any evidence of abuses in the field of pension funds that do qualify for tax exemption under the Internal Revenue law?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The record and testimony by Mr. Carey would show that he pointed the finger at a plan which was and is tax exempt. I believe I better not name it; I would have to look up the name of the case.

Mr. JONAS. Which was the only incident existing?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. That was the one instance he cited.

Mr. JONAS. Out of 30,000?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. At that time we went into matter supplied us by Senator Douglas, of Illinois, in which he pointed out other instances of misadministration of plans which obviously ought to be looked into, but neither the Senate committee nor our committee had sufficient staff to follow this through as it should have been.

Mr. JONAS. The reason I ask these questions is because I have not had an opportunity to attend the committee hearings or read the record. I have read the committee report. As the gentleman recalls, when I engaged in colloquy with the gentleman from Iowa I was concerned over the fact that there is a possibility here that extraordinary expense may be brought upon some of the people who operated in a field where there had been no complaint or no abuses uncovered. I would hope we might find some way to take care of the cases in which abuses do occur and not put the people to a lot of extraordinary expense and trouble in a field where no complaints have been received and where the plans are operating satisfactorily.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I think the gentleman's concern is a proper one. I think he will find that we have taken care of that in the bill. He will find very careful statements directed to the Secretary. There is a provision in the bill which states that the Secretary may not go into this investigative area unless he has reasonable cause to believe that there is something wrong. Wherever that does not exist there will be no additional cost to anybody concerned. On top of that you should remember the Secretary of Labor's testimony as to the amount of money needed properly to police this area where there is something wrong. That, as I have said, would be a matter for the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI].

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the subcommittee which prepared this legislation I rise in support of H.R. 8723. I think the discussion we have had in the past 2 hours, and the questions that have been raised, are most significant. I am delighted that there has been this give and take because it affords us an opportunity to establish some legislative history which will make the administration of this bill, as soon as the Congress approves it, that much easier.

I know of no piece of legislation that could be of greater importance to the House of Representatives in this session than this particular bill. This bill deals with the future of some 100 million Americans who are today relying on their health and welfare benefits, being available at the time when they will need them, in some 250,000 different health and welfare plans involving more than $50 billion.

These plans and this $50 billion fund that is now invested is growing at the rate of $4 to $5 billion a year. We are talking about the future of the older citizens of America, widows and orphans, and totally disabled workers who rely on these health, welfare, and pension plans for their future. I cannot think of anything that can be more tragic to an American than to rely on a pension fund only to discover that the money his employer has paid into the fund is no longer available and the reliance he has put in this fund has been betrayed simply because the program has been badly administered.

The Department of Labor under the present law passed in 1958 becomes a mere depository of welfare pension plans, descriptions, and annual reports. The Department possesses absolutely no rulemaking or investigative powers. I wish to emphasize this point. I wish to emphasize the testimony appearing on page 27 of the committee hearings when I asked the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Goldberg, this question:

> And then, if I understand the proposal correctly, what you are asking here is that the administrator, the Secretary of Labor, have the right to at least have a report, not necessarily review but have a report which I understand would become public on how these pension plans and pension funds are being administered and how they are being secured. Is this the purpose of this legislation?
>
> Secretary GOLDBERG. The purpose of the statute is that we get the facts of what is happening. We are not asking for any authority to direct an administrator to invest in this type of security or that type of security. There is no attempt to go that far.
>
> This is a very limited thing. All we are asking for is that we be authorized to require the administrator of the funds to tell exactly what is happening.

There has been a great deal of discussion here today as to whether or not there has been any evidence of wrongdoing. The only reason this committee has not been able to come before the House with that type of evidence is because there is no way to obtain this evidence under existing law. The Secretary of Labor has no powers to go beyond the piece of paper filed with him by an employer or an administrator of the fund. The Secretary of Labor has no right to ask any further questions. He must completely satisfy himself with the information or the report filed by administrators of pension funds and whether it is fraudulent or not he has no right to inquire. That is the guts of this bill, that is, to give the Secretary of Labor the right to pursue the matter to see how these funds are being invested. Nothing in this legislation would permit the Secretary or anyone else to interfere with the judgment of the people who administer these funds. But, certainly, the millions of Americans who rely on these funds have a right to know how their money is being invested. This is why I urge adoption of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, there was discussion as to cost. The previous speaker has spoken on this subject, claiming it would cost administrators of pension funds additional money to comply with this law. I say that the Congress had no hesitation to adopt the Landrum-Griffin bill, even though at that time there were many protestations as to additional costs for reporting. But Congress swept these protestations aside because we felt that the workers had a right to know how their union funds were being spent.

I asked the Secretary:

> For instance, do the provisions that you make here differ very greatly from the provisions in the Landrum-Griffin bill requiring disclosure of union funds?
>
> Secretary GOLDBERG. They are substantially similar.
>
> Mr. PUCINSKI. Do they differ very much from requirements of the Securities and Exchange Commission in their dealings with securities, not necessarily funds such as this but securities? They have to make full disclosure there, do they not?
>
> Secretary GOLDBERG. I think they are less onerous than the SEC requirements.
>
> Mr. PUCINSKI. Then, of course, in the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation you have some very rigid standards of disclosure.
>
> Secretary GOLDBERG. Much greater than these. In that area, mandatory audits are concerned and they audit every institution subject to the provisions of that law.
>
> Mr. PUCINSKI. I imagine you have a similar situation in the Federal Savings and Loan Corporation.
>
> Secretary GOLDBERG. That is correct; they are supervised very, very closely.

I asked another question, regarding any possible additional costs involved in conforming with this proposed legislation.

I asked the Secretary:

> Now, I have heard criticism of this plan from some of those who are involved in the administration of pension and welfare funds that this would impose a tremendous cost on the employer in trying to provide this information for you. Is there any merit to that kind of fear?
>
> Secretary GOLDBERG. Congressman, I do not believe so. Here again I want to refer to our experience under the Landrum-Griffin Act and here I want to refer to some complaints made by unions in this area. Many unions complained that, if they had to make reports under the statute, this would result in great burdens and great financial burdens. Actually, the way we have worked out the provisions in that statute, we have eased some of the burdens that they had before under prior legislation of the Congress. We provide some simplified forms. We have tried intelligently to administer the statute to prevent this. It is not the purpose of this statute or the amendments we are proposing to impose great financial burdens on anybody.
>
> The fact of the matter is that everybody who runs a welfare fund must have audits for their own protection and essentially we are not asking for any information here that is not present in a normal audit of a welfare fund.
>
> We are just asking that it be made publicly available to the participants.

The gentleman from Missouri who just preceded me suggested this legislation is not necessary for those funds which already file a report with the Internal Revenue Service to qualify for a tax exemption. I should like to remind the House that income tax returns are completely confidential and not available to anyone for scrutiny. However, it would appear to me the gentleman is contradicting himself. If these administrators of certain types of pension plans already are filing detailed reports with the Revenue Service, it should be no problem for them to file a carbon copy with the Labor Department so the public and beneficiaries of the trust fund could see how and where the money is being invested in their behalf.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, while I have the highest regard for the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY], who said the United Mine Workers oppose this bill, I wish to remind him that this bill is not directed at the UMW. I know this union now publishes a detailed report for all of its members of how the pension fund is invested. I know that many other fine unions follow a similar practice. Many employers do the same. But the legislation is not directed at them. We know how their funds are managed. This legislation is directed at those administrators of pension funds who are not so above board. I wish to remind the House that more than 25 percent of pension and welfare funds go totally unreported under the present law.

It is for these reasons that I hope this bill will be approved.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act Amendments of 1961".

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BONNER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8723) to amend the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act with respect to the method of enforcement and to provide certain additional sanctions, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

LINCOLN BOYHOOD NATIONAL MEMORIAL

Mr. ASPINALL submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 2470) to provide for the establishment of the Lincoln Boyhood National Memorial in the State of Indiana, and for other purposes.

WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, February 22, 1962, Washington's Farewell Address may be read by a Member to be designated by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the unanimous-consent request granted today, the Chair designates the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROUSH] to read Washington's Farewell Address immediately following the reading of the Journal on February 22, 1962.

PRIME MINISTER FANFANI'S BOLD MOVE A PROGRESSIVE ONE

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, while we are fostering democracy on this side of the Atlantic for all the nations of the Americas, a great champion of liberty and social justice, Prime Minister Amintore Fanfani, of Italy, is fighting for democracy in his country as an example for all of Europe to follow.

On the one hand, Italy has long been handicapped by having the largest and strongest Communist Party in all of Europe, second only to that of the Soviet Union. On the other hand, it has similarly been handicapped by the extreme rightist factions which seek to preserve or bring back antiquated feudal ways. The more they fought each other, the stronger grew Communist support because the poorer classes of the population felt that they had no other place to go and no other cause to support. The unfortunate result of this anomalous situation was that the development of a middle class, which could serve as a strong anti-Communist force, failed to materialize.

We had a similar situation in this country. In our own time, we suffered politically because we lacked a strong middle class until about the advent of Franklin D. Roosevelt and his New Deal.

Prime Minister Fanfani today represents the spirit and the ideals of Franklin D. Roosevelt in Europe perhaps more so than any other statesman on that continent. He stands for peace, for economic growth, for social development, for the expansion of education in his country, for raising the standard of living of the poor, for loyalty to the West and NATO, for vigilance against communism, and above all for democracy.

Mr. Speaker, all of us have read in the press the last few days that Prime Minister Fanfani's party, the Christian Democratic Party, has voted by a 4-to-1 majorty to form a parliamentary alliance with the Socialist Party headed by Pietro Nenni. This opens a new cycle in Italian politics.

While Fanfani's move is interpreted in some quarters as a turn to the left, it is worthwhile remembering that after many years he has succeeded in winning away from Communist ties the so-called Nenni Socialists. This will weaken the Communist influence in Italy, and as such it constitutes a gain for freedom. For the people of Italy it will constitute a step forward because it will mean greater reforms for the betterment of the nation.

Fanfani's move may also be described as a bold political gamble, and all of us sincerely hope that the gamble will succeed. It will be a remarkable achievement in itself to have the Socialist Party break completely from any Communist influence, and that democracy as we know it will be strengthened in Italy. In this spirit, we extend our greetings and best wishes to Prime Minister Fanfani and the Italian people.

There can be no question of Prime Minister Fanfani's great loyalty to Italy and of his friendship for the United States. He has demonstrated this time and time again. I have followed his career from the early days when he was secretary general of the Christian Democratic Party. DeGasperi had given vision to the party. Fanfani gave it strength by organizing it on a precinct level as we know it in this country.

I had the happy fortune to be his host the first time he came to this country in 1956 to attend the Democratic Convention in Chicago. Later, President Eisenhower was his host at the Republican Convention in San Francisco.

At the Chicago convention he met for the first time our present-day leaders, then still Senators, John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson, the then majority leader and now our great Speaker, John W. McCormack, and also Senators Estes Kefauver, Stuart Symington, and the Democratic presidential nominee at that time—Adlai Stevenson.

As a result of these meetings, a firm basis of understanding was established between the leaders of the United States and Italy which has proven beneficial for both countries.

Prime Minister Fanfani is fully aware of the risks he is taking in entering into an alliance with the Socialist Party, but he sees it as a real opportunity once and for all to break the hold of the Communists on the Italian electorate. In this effort we wish him success. Italy's gain in this respect will also be a gain for the West and for all freedom-loving nations.

REAFFIRMING U.S. POLICY IN PROTECTING ITS CITIZENS AND THEIR PROPERTY

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, there was a time in history when the image of the United States commanded respect in all parts of the world and engendered fear in the hearts of those nations and their rulers who would debase human dignity. No citizen of this land has failed to be stirred in his heart at reading history when this fledging nation challenged the powerful barbary pirates and freed the seas for our merchant ships. There was real meaning behind the inspiring words of the Marine Hymn extolling U.S. championship of its sovereignty from "the halls of Montezuma to the shores of Tripoli."

I do not believe we were universally loved in those days or since when the power of this Nation protected its citizens and their property wherever they traveled in the world. We were not concerned with having people love us, but we did command their respect, we did engender fear in the hearts of would-be dictators and bandits. The words of our great President James Monroe, "National honor is national property of the highest value," had meaning and depth and were clearly understood by all peoples of the world.

The days of American glory under President Teddy Roosevelt saw us using whatever means necessary to demand that all nations recognize the rights and privileges of American citizens everywhere. The flag of the United States, backed up by our full military resources, stood behind every citizen of this country and he felt secure in his travels.

American business, knowing that the power of the United States would protect its property everywhere in the world, invested dollars, American initiative and know-how in many far-off places, creating wealth and opportunity, not only for our own citizens but people in underdeveloped countries around the globe.

In recent years, in our eagerness to be a popular nation, we have compromised our honor. The once mighty American image has been tarnished by inaction and even pipsqueak dictators, like Fidel Castro, thumb their noses at us, imprison and murder American citizens, and steal billions of dollars in American property. The Russians shoot down our planes over international waters and American airmen are killed and the survivors imprisoned. American citizens, civilian and military, have been allowed to languish in vile prisons in Red China and have become the victims of the most medieval forms of torture. American missionaries have been murdered in the Congo, their women brutally raped, their children actually drawn and quartered. Our planes have been hijacked over our own skies. The blood of Americans has run deep in many lands. American property, amounting to untold billions, has been illegally seized and stolen in all parts of the world. Our flag has been ripped down, burned and spat upon. High officials of our Government have been humiliated and their lives endangered. Our Embassies have been wrecked and their personnel subjected to personal danger. And we have done nothing except to protest. Protest to madmen and nations which make no pretense of abiding by civilized rules of conduct.

The result of our failure to maintain our national honor as a sacred duty has been the rise of international gangsterism until no American citizen, no official of this country, no property belonging to our Government or our people is safe. Every individual travels outside the boundaries of the United States at his own risk. Every business invests in foreign lands without the protection of its government which it has a right to expect.

Mr. Speaker, I say that honor is not dead in America. We are still a powerful people, not bent on conquest, with no imperialist designs upon the world akin to the Communist conspiracy of enslavement of mankind, but determined that our Nation will command respect. The American people, I am convinced, do not want to bow to bandits and dictators. The American people are determined that "the broad stripes and bright stars" will continue "to wave o'er the land of the free and the home of the brave."

The time has come, Mr. Speaker, to reaffirm our dedication to those principles upon which our greatness has been founded. The time has come for the United States to rededicate itself to the fundamental principles of the Monroe Doctrine and to expand the spirit of that document to include the protection of the freedom and the rights of Americans and their property wherever they may be in the world. In that spirit, I have today introduced a resolution, which I hope will have the unanimous approval of this Congress, expressing the declaration of will of the American people and the purpose of their Government to reinstate the sovereignty of the United States and its people throughout the world and to guarantee the full protection of this Government for all its citizens and their property anywhere in the world.

Mr. Speaker, by approving this resolution we will strike a telling blow against the Communist conspiracy with its disregard of international law. We will warn Castro and the other bandit dictators that no longer will they be free to prey upon American citizens. Once again we will proclaim the glory which was ours at Tripoli and other historic places and times when the American image was held in respect and the American Eagle soared high in the heavens as a symbol of freedom, human dignity, and the protection of the rights of all men.

DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS AND HOUSING

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the current discussion on the establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs, I believe that a case has long been made for the establishment of such a department. I am in support of the President's proposal and hope that it can be accomplished.

It has been charged by some of the opponents of the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing that this new agency would be directing local governments in the performance of local functions. There is nothing that could be further from the truth. To make this charge is to state that past Congresses have overstepped their constitutional bounds and that this and future Congresses will behave no better. To show this to be completely false, we have to do no more than to look at the present programs which the Congress has given the Housing Agency to administer, and ask to what extent they are imposed upon localities. The answer is very simple: all of these programs are purely voluntary and any State or locality may participate or not as it so desires.

In many ways the programs of community assistance which are administered by the Housing Agency are the very essence of democratic procedure. Central to each one is the concept that these are local programs, locally planned and locally administered. The role of the Federal Government is to provide financial assistance to the locality, and in some cases technical assistance. But the locality must initiate the request and make the decisions on project matters.

There are requirements that localities meet certain standards as a prerequisite to the financial assistance being provided. These are standards which the Congress has established for the purpose of assuring that the assisted localities are willing to help themselves. In giving money to localities, we are not paying out a dole. We are saying to a locality that, "We are willing to help you deal with certain of your problems, but we want an assurance that you are willing to help yourself." Is this an unreasonable position for the Congress to take? Has there been any dictation to the locality? And locality which is unwilling to meet these reasonable criteria is perfectly free to refrain from participating in the program—and some have.

Let us look at some of these programs and ask whether they are being dictated to local communities. In particular, let us look at the urban renewal program which is beginning to revitalize the face of urban America. There are over 500 cities, large and small, carrying out urban renewal projects. Were these cities forced to undertake projects? The answer is obviously "No." Of the 20 largest cities in the United States, 16 are undertaking federally assisted projects while 4 have chosen not to do so. There is no compulsion. There is no dictation.

Before Federal assistance is provided for the planning of an urban renewal project, the local city council or other local governing body must request that assistance. Before the project may be carried out, the city council must approve the plan and request further financial assistance. At this point we do have an example of Federal standards: Congress has required that there must be a public hearing on the project after due public notice. While it could be said that this is dictation, it is to my mind a prudent requirement to assure local citizens an opportunity to voice their views about the future shape of their community.

There are, of course, other requirements to be met as a prerequisite for Federal urban renewal assistance. One such is a requirement that the city council or city planning commission find that the plan for the project is in accord with the general plan for the locality. Does this mean that the Federal Government is now dictating to localities what their plans should be? Not at all. The community itself decides on its plan. The Federal Government merely insists that there be a plan so that the Federal assistance is not diluted by uncoordinated local actions.

There are many other HHFA programs which help States and localities without dictating to them. Under the urban planning assistance program, grants are made to States, cities and metropolitan planning agencies to help them develop their own plans for what they want to do. Through the public facility loan program, smaller localities are assisted in getting loans to permit them to install much needed public utilities and facilities for their increasing population. The program of advances for public works planning permits communities to prepare their plans for public works in advance of their immediate needs. The new program of loans for mass transit will help cities meet some of their urgent transportation problems.

All of these programs are voluntary and all of them are predicated on a strong concept of local autonomy. With a record such as this, there should be no fear that the new Department of Urban Affairs and Housing will be attempting to usurp the functions of our local governments.

RADIO AND TELEVISION BROADCASTING STATION FEES

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill which would charge realistic license fees to all radio and television broadcasting stations licensed by the Federal Communications Commission.

I believe that most taxpayers would be shocked and surprised to learn that our Government now gives away absolutely free of charge the valuable right to use the people's airways. In many cases, these licensees obtain from the Government a monopoly out of which they make huge profits.

It is amazing to me that the Government has for so long seen fit to make free gifts to these television and radio outlets which in turn sell broadcasting time commercially at such rates as they can get.

The failure of the Federal Government to charge these broadcasting stations is the big giveaway of the 20th century. Can we imagine the outcry that would result if the Federal Government gave away free of charge timberland or other natural resources it might own, and then told the lucky donee to charge for these resources what the traffic will bear.

Most enterprises which are licensed by governmental bodies, whether State or municipal, pay fees for their privileges. Barbers and liquor sellers are thus charged. Public utilities such as electric companies, telephone companies, and transportation companies at least have their rates regulated. Only the broadcasting companies escape the payment of license fees and the regulation of their rates.

The point should be stressed that what I am proposing is not merely a fee for the cost of regulating broadcasting stations, although the stations now do not even pay such a fee. My proposal is to charge these outlets for a valuable asset now being handed over to them free by the Government.

This bill would require an annual license fee equal to 1 percent of the gross revenues of each licensee for the preceding year. It further provides that the Federal Communications Commission shall revoke or refuse to renew the license of any television or radio station which fails to pay the fee.

Broadcasters can be expected to oppose the bill. Naturally they want to enjoy the present pattern. However, I am sure that if, at the outset, legislation had provided for a fee for the award of a license to broadcast by the Federal Communications Commission, hopeful aspirants would be falling over themselves to obtain the licenses.

I have received letters from some broadcasting stations warning me that if this bill is passed they will discontinue public service programing. My answer to such stations is that if they do so, the Federal Communications Commission should either discontinue them, or else require a certain percentage of broadcast time to be devoted to public service programing.

In view of the revenues of these outlets, I believe our Government would obtain over $20 million each year in fees under my proposal. This legislation is long overdue.

TRADE POLICY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on January 18, 1962, I introduced H.R. 9741, a bill to provide assistance to business enterprises and individuals to facilitate adjustments made necessary by the trade policy of the U.S. Government.

This bill would establish a program for the assistance of companies and workers adversely affected by increased imports resulting from the trade policy adopted by the United States.

The distinguished chairman of the Select Committee on Small Business in the other body, Senator SPARKMAN, is to be commended for his foresight in initiating this all-out effort to provide needed relief before a situation which could do great harm to the small business communities gets worse. There have been a large number of trade adjustment proposals introduced in the Congress in recent years and as we approach the reduction of tariff barriers it becomes increasingly important that we do something for those sectors of our economy which will need it.

This proposal would give the Tariff Commission and the President the right to invoke the assistance provisions of the Trade Adjustment Act even in cases in which no serious injury or threat of serious injury is established on an industrywide basis if some companies and workers in the industry suffer injury or are threatened with injury.

The bill would offer the following relief measures: First, 25-year, 4-percent trade injury loans from the Small Business Administration; second, grants of up to $25,000 to individual companies to employ private management and industrial experts to plan for adjustment to changed trade conditions requiring conversion to new lines of production; third, extended unemployment compensation to workers unemployed because of imports; fourth, retraining and relocation allowances for such workers; fifth, retirement under social security at age 60 instead of 65 for workers unemployed because of imports; sixth, accelerated amortization of plant and equipment for companies changing lines because of imports.

One of the most important aspects of this bill is the fact that the Small Business Administration is the key agency for the administration of the business loan program as well as the planning grants. The Administrator of SBA would be made chairman of a policy-forming Interagency Committee on Trade Adjustments, on which the Tariff Commission and the Departments of State, Labor, Commerce, Interior and Agriculture would be permanently represented.

As Senator SPARKMAN said when he introduced this bill in the other body, "no injured industry can be expected to bear willingly an economic burden that more properly belongs on the broader shoulders of the national economy," a sentiment with which I heartily concur. I trust that the Congress will act on this proposal early in the present session.

COUNTDOWN ON ECONOMIC PROGRESS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HERLONG] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, it is time for some blunt talk. In the cold light of history men and governments must be judged by the consequences of their acts, not on their good intentions. It is the economic consequences of the collective acts of the Federal Government which too often are lost sight of in the planning rooms of the executive branch and in the legislative chambers of the Congress.

I do not question the patriotism or motivation of any man or woman in any branch of Government when I state that, in the total of its spending and taxing policies, the Federal Government is shortchanging the American people. This is simply to state the economic consequences of what we have wrought. What harms our Nation economically is not just a matter of lost jobs, of lower living standards, and of less human well being. It is a matter of less national strength, of lowered military security, and of diminished prestige and capacity for leadership in the world. What harms us economically aids our enemies.

For a number of years, many members of both branches of the Congress, and of our two major political parties, have been warning of the pitfalls of too much spending. I believe it is accurate to say that a great majority of the Members of both branches are deeply concerned about this trend. I further believe that the time is here when the Congress as a whole is willing and ready to take a new look, to face squarely the issue of which legislation will best serve the public welfare and national interest.

One thing which is certain is that concern about inflation does not stop the spending. I suppose the reason is that any group favoring a particular spending program is willing to take the chance of inflation, leaving it up to other groups to control their appetites for public money. I doubt if we can expect the separate groups interested in spending on particular programs to act much differently, except by a stronger demonstration of their combined interest than is provided by the inflationary threat.

Regardless of separate group interests in spending, all Americans do have the same interest in our national strength and prestige and, hence, in the rate of economic growth. Even as members of special groups, they know that high-rate economic growth is the key to the improvement of their individual positions; that a bouyant, dynamic, fast moving economy not only would insure the best progress to them individually, but will in fact eliminate or moderate conditions on which so much of the spending is based.

Thus, every citizen of whatever group must be concerned with the fact that growth in the total of Federal spending is at the expense of growth in the private economy.

For several years, my colleague on the Ways and Means Committee, Representative HOWARD H. BAKER, of Tennessee, and I have been pointing out that continuation of the spending trend prevents the reform of tax rates and methods which impede capital formation and hence limit economic growth. Our bills, H.R. 2030 and H.R. 2031, with which I am sure every Member of this body is familiar, are designed to reflect the general public interest in permitting greater growth in the private economy as against more growth in Federal spending.

We have not proposed a rollback in the total of Federal spending. Instead, our bills would preempt the revenue gain from economic growth to remove the tax brakes on greater growth. After the necessary tax reductions were effected, and the economy had responded in a continuing trend of greater growth, Federal revenues would soon move ahead of those which can be expected under the present tax structure. The price of achieving these ends, so necessary to the public welfare at home and our national strength and prestige looking abroad, is a moratorium on further spending increases.

Only by controlling its spending can the Government achieve the results which so often, but inaccurately, are said to come from increased spending. The greatest hoax of our time is the notion that greater spending in the so-called public sector is a means for increasing economic growth. The Government lives off of the private economy, and not vice versa.

In statements in support of our legislation, we have noted that while our recent growth rate has been only about 2 to 3 percent annually, the economies of other nations have been bounding ahead. In Western Europe, the rates of growth have been double to triple our rate, and Japan has been doing even better. According to CIA estimates, the Soviet economy achieved an average growth rate of 7 percent in the 1950's.

Growth comes from capital formation. The greater the capital supply, the greater will be the growth of any economy. In the less advanced economies, most new capital will go into the creation of entirely new productive capacity thus resulting in net increase in economic output. In an economy like ours, a great deal of capital formation only replaces wornout or obsolete productive facilities. Keeping these facts in mind, it is evident that a rate of new capital formation in our country will not produce as rapid a climb in total production as will comparable rates in other countries. Nevertheless, we have one of the lowest rates of gross capital formation in the world today, or approximately 15 percent of gross national product. In Western Europe, comparable rates in 1959 were: Belgium, 17 percent; France, 18 percent; Italy, 21 percent; Austria, 23 percent; and Germany, 23 percent. According to the CIA, 30 percent of Russia's gross national product goes into capital formation.

Whatever excuses there may have been for our not heeding these facts before now, we can have none hereafter. A new and authoritative study is now available which documents in quantitative data the fact that government, in the total of its spending and taxing policies, is the culprit insofar as our inadequate capital formation and economic growth is concerned. Dr. Simon Kuznets, of the National Bureau of Economic Research, is the author of this study.

The data provided by Dr. Kuznets show that, over the past century, the total of capital formation in this country has been relatively stable though tending slightly downward as a percentage of gross national product. However, the part of this capital formation required for replacement has been rising so steeply that net capital formation has been a consistently declining percentage of gross national product. From the period 1869 to 1888, to the period 1946 to 1955, the decline was from 14.6 percent to 7 percent of gross national product, measured in constant prices. Since economic growth was on a generally adequate level between 1946 and 1955, before the poor record of recent years, we may take for granted that the percentage of net growth capital is even smaller today.

Dr. Kuznets' study leaves no room for mistake about the source of our problem. It is clear from his analysis that the principal cause of too little capital formation is the combine of public spending and tax policies which takes so much capital away from the private economy.

There obviously is no escaping the conclusion that the Federal Government, in its capital-destroying tax policies, is responsible for the inadequate rate of economic growth; that the failure to control spending so as to admit of fundamental reform of the tax structure is at the expense of our domestic well-being and national security; and that contemporary spending proposals designed to relieve problems caused by inadequate growth simply compound the total of such problems.

Herein is the truth of my statement that the Federal Government is short-changing the American people out of the natural bounty and security of their free economic system.

If the Congress should this year, now, enact the legislation which the gentleman from Tennessee, Representative BAKER, and I have sponsored, what would this mean in terms of increasing well-being for the American people, and our position of economic leadership in the world?

In answering such a question, we have to decide on a timespan first, and make certain assumptions.

Because of the great emphasis on the critical decade of the 1960's, the timespan which we have used would carry us through the year 1970.

The assumptions which we have made are as follows:

First, that unions and management will have the wisdom and courage to confine wage decisions to overall productivity, so that all citizens may enjoy the maximum fruits of progress without further creeping inflation.

Second, that upon enactment of this legislation, at this time the current recovery will not be quickly dissipated in a new recession, as has happened on four occasions in the past dozen years, but will be transformed into the beginning of a new era of high-rate, long-term growth; and the economy will achieve a growth rate of 4 percent in 1963, 4½ percent in 1964, 5 percent in 1965, and 5½ percent annually thereafter.

Third, that, however, without enactment of this legislation at this time, the economy will achieve a gross national product of no more than $560 billion in 1962, as compared with the $570 billion projected by the administration's budget message and Economic Report.

From these assumptions, we find that from 1962 to 1970, gross national product will grow from $570 billion to $851 billion; that personal income will grow from $448 billion to $669 billion; that income per capita, taking account of increasing population, will grow from $2,402 to $3,163; and that the base for the individual income tax will grow from $211 billion to $382 billion.

By contrast, if through these years the economy should grow at only a 2½-percent rate annually, starting from the base of $560 billion in 1962, gross national product would grow only from $560 billion to $682 billion; personal income would grow from $440 billion to $536 billion; income per capita would grow from $2,359 to only $2,534; and the base of the individual income tax would grow only from $207 billion to $278 billion.

Now let us contrast these figures, on a total cumulative basis:

Upon enactment of our bills, these projections would indicate by 1970, additions—above what would result from 2½ percent average annual growth—of $699 billion of gross national product; of $547 billion of personal income; of $2,681 of per capita income and of $402 billion in the tax base.

The following tables show these data year by year from 1962 through 1970:

Gross national product

[In billions of dollars]

	Calendar years								
	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970
Upon enactment of H.R. 2030-2031	570	593	620	651	689	725	765	807	851
Without fundamental reform of tax rates and methods	560	574	588	603	618	633	649	665	682
Additional GNP	10	19	32	48	71	92	116	142	169
Cumulative additional GNP	10	29	61	109	180	272	388	530	699

Personal income

[In billions of dollars]

Upon enactment of H.R. 2030-2031	448	466	487	512	540	570	601	634	669
Without fundamental reform of tax rates and methods	440	451	462	474	486	498	510	523	536
Additional personal income	8	15	25	38	54	72	92	111	133
Cumulative additional personal income	8	23	48	86	140	212	303	414	547

Personal income per capita

[Dollars]

	Calendar years								
	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970
Upon enactment of H.R. 2030-2031	2,402	2,459	2,530	2,619	2,719	2,825	2,932	3,044	3,163
Without fundamental reform of tax rates and methods	2,359	2,380	2,400	2,425	2,447	2,468	2,488	2,511	2,534
Additional personal income per capita	43	79	130	194	272	357	444	533	629
Cumulative additional personal income per capita	43	122	252	446	718	1,075	1,519	2,052	2,681

Individual income tax base

[In billions of dollars]

Upon enactment of H.R. 2030-2031	211	224	239	257	278	301	326	353	382
Without fundamental reform of tax rates and methods	207	215	223	231	240	249	258	268	278
Additional individual income tax base	4	9	16	26	38	52	68	85	104
Cumulative additional individual income tax base	4	13	29	55	93	145	213	298	402

Suppose our estimates of growth upon enactment of our bills are too high; suppose despite the record of recent years, our estimate of growth with nothing more than reshuffling of the present tax structure is too low; suppose the difference would be say no more than one-half of that which we have projected?

Over recent years, and currently, the Federal Government has been exposed to a barrage of demand for Federal aid to education, and to the argument that training and education themselves are means to economic progress. Dr. Kuznets notes that the development of scientific knowledge and technological skill inevitably contributes to improvement of our economic productivity. However, he adds that "one persistent bottleneck in the use of knowledge in economic production has been the scarcity of the resources for the production of capital goods needed for the application of new knowledge."

It seems to me that Dr. Kuznets is saying that we may have been getting the cart before the horse. Training and education do not displace the need for capital; instead, they increase the need for it. We are rendering a dubious service to our youth when we use Federal moneys to increase education when the total of Federal spending and taxing in themselves deprive trained people, and in fact all members of the working force, of the best and most productive job opportunities. It may be noted that greater capital formation and economic growth would greatly improve the base for State and local, and private support, of our educational institutions. If our economy had not been bound in the past by uneconomic tax rates, we could be certain that education would be in better position today without any direct Federal aid than is now the case. Looking ahead to 1970, no reasonable man could doubt that education would be a major beneficiary of the economic growth possible under a Federal tax structure which does not unduly penalize capital accumulation and use.

We have heard a good bit about sacrifice in the last couple of years. The question posed by the facts and figures which I have cited is where the sacrifice should be made.

Should we continue with an accumulation of public policies which deprive the people of our Nation of the jobs and advance in living standards, and of the pride and independence, which would come from the kind of growth permitted by fundamental reform of the Federal tax rates and methods?

Should we sacrifice the security and strength and prestige that would accrue to our Nation in this troubled world which would come from such growth?

Should we sacrifice the inherent power of our free economic system, letting the Soviet Union move up to our heels in its bid for world economic domination?

Or, should the Government itself make the sacrifice?

Mr. Speaker, we are not laying before you a soft or easy program. No family, no business, no nation has for long prospered and endured unless it demonstrated the capacity for discipline, for prudence today in order to multiply the well-being of tomorrow.

Is the Federal Government willing to make the sacrifice, or is this administration and the Congress to continue on the path of consuming the seed corn of tomorrow's strength?

Put in this light, there is not really as much sacrifice as we have indicated. Upon enactment of H.R. 2030 and H.R. 2031, we estimate that Federal revenues would total $88.4 billion in fiscal year 1963, slowly trending out from this figure reaching nearly $92 billion in 1967; then moving rapidly to $98 billion in 1968; $105 billion in 1969; $112 billion in 1970; and $119 billion in 1971.

In the intervening years, it is true we would get more revenue under existing tax rates, admitting whatever reshuffling of tax liabilities might take place. But in fiscal year 1971, the revenues which I projected would exceed those which would come from continuation of the existing spending and taxing policies, and thereafter would race ahead.

There is the question, Mr. Speaker, will the Federal Government sacrifice today, in order to enable the private economy to save and invest, to serve the public welfare at home and to confound the enemy which has stalked us with a capital formation rate twice our own?

We believe we know your answer—that this great representative body of the people, that the Senate, and that the President of the United States, understanding these facts, will make the right decision for America.

Our legislation was introduced 3 years ago this January. It has received the support of scholars, of commentators on the public scene, of representative bodies of American citizens.

No one, no group, has contested the validity of its basic assumptions and procedures. It is, in our opinion, Mr. Speaker, time that this legislation be exposed to the full deliberative process of the Congress.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, today I had the privilege of hearing Robert E. Hansen, commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. Commander Hansen addressed the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, of which I am a member, and presented the VFW's 1962 legislative program.

I was very much impressed by his presentation and, at its conclusion, joined some of my colleagues on the committee in commending the commander for his truly outstanding testimony. I told the assemblage that it was one of the finest legislative offerings I have ever heard.

Mr. Speaker, under this permission to address the full House, I would like to convey to all of my colleagues the views I expressed at today's memorable meeting of the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

I repeat here my observation that the program offered by Commander Hansen is an excellent one. It is reasonable and fair—it is constructive and realistic. I agree with the objectives he outlined. I know that the Veterans' Affairs Committee will evaluate every detail of the VFW's recommendations and that the committee will act in what it believes to be in the best interests of the veteran and the Nation.

Commander Hansen is a leader of unique ability and dedication, and I want to compliment him on his inspiring stewardship of a great organization.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the VFW is a great organization. I know this from firsthand experiences with the VFW activities in the greatest borough of New York City and the greatest county in New York State—Queens. I am delighted to see that my native Queens is so well represented at this current VFW legislative conference.

I note with pleasure that among my friends here from Queens who are participating in the conference are: Former State commander and member of the national security committee, Edward I. Condren; former State commander, Raymond J. McDonald; county commander, Alick H. Herrmann; former county commander and chairman of the hospital committee of district 1, Allen O. Brown; past county commander and life membership chairman of the department of New York, Hollis Parker; and county legislative committee member, George Athens.

These men are among the finest I have ever known. They and the other wonderful members of the Queens organization are interested, naturally, in the advancement of the veteran's cause. But first and foremost is their dedication to a stronger, healthier America. I have seen this wonderful spirit effectively carried out in the VFW's many civic and patriotic activities, such as the community achievement program and the Voice of Democracy essay contest, which is an integral part of their excellent youth program. Incidentally, I know we are all pleased to welcome the 51 State winners of this contest to Washington.

This altruistic local activity reflects the philosophy of the National VFW and I want to commend this fine organization for its patriotism, its zeal, its strong sense of civic responsibility and its humanitarianism.

Mr. Speaker, America needs more groups like the VFW and more men like those who make up its membership. My hat is off to them.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. George P. Miller (at the request of Mr. Anfuso), for 1 hour, on tomorrow.

Mr. Herlong, for 30 minutes today, to revise and extend his remarks, and include tables.

Mr. Halpern (at the request of Mr. Derwinski), for 5 minutes today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. Lindsay, for 15 minutes, on tomorrow.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Joelson and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Harris asked and was given permission to revise and extend remarks made by him in Committee of the Whole on the bill H.R. 6360, and to include a letter.

Mr. Goodell to revise and extend his remarks made in Committee and to include pages 18261–18263 of the Congressional Record, volume 107, part 14.

Mr. Van Zandt.

Mr. Teague of Texas.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Derwinski) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Dole.

Mr. Halpern.

Mr. Baker.

Mr. Hoeven.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Albert) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Rivers of South Carolina.

Mr. Kowalski.

BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 6025. An act to confer jurisdiction on the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of George Edward Barnhart against the United States; and

H.J. Res. 612. Joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the Veterans' Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 7, 1962, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1649. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report by the Department of Defense relating to positions in grades GS–16, GS–17, and GS–18 during the calendar year 1961, and a report for the year 1961 relating to positions established in the Department of Defense to carry out research and development activities, pursuant to Public Law 85–322; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1650. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to assist in providing necessary instruction for adults unable to read and write English or with less than a sixth-grade level of education, through grants to institutions of higher learning for development of materials and methods of instruction and for training of teaching and supervisory personnel and through grants to States for pilot projects, improvement of State services, and programs of instruction"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1651. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to improve the quality of elementary and secondary education"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1652. A letter from the Administrator, Agency for International Development, Department of State, transmitting the final report on the operations and condition of the Development Loan Fund as of November 3, 1961, the date of the abolition of the fund and transfer of its responsibilities to the newly created Agency for International Development, pursuant to section 621(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1653. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the initial report to the Congress on a review of the Weather Bureau, Department of Commerce, for the fiscal years 1959, 1960, and 1961; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1654. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of the wage accounting and unemployment contribution collection activities of the Railroad Retirement Board as of July 1961; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1655. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the report of the Archivist of the United States on records proposed for disposal under the law; to the Committee on House Administration.

1656. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research, development, and operation, construction of facilities, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

1657. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated March 31, 1961, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a letter report on the St. Peters Creek, Manokin River, Md., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted June 11, 1952. No authorization by Congress is recommended as the desired improvement has been adopted for accomplishment by the Chief of Engineers under the provisions of section 107 of the 1960 River and Harbor Act; to the Committee on Public Works.

1658. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated March 31, 1961, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on Back River, Front Cove, Va., authorized by the River and Harbor Act, approved June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Public Works.

1659. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated November 6, 1961, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on the Martin Creek, Nev., authorized by the Flood Control Act, approved May 17, 1950; to the Committee on Public Works.

1660. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated November 13, 1961, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on the Eskoot Creek, Stinson Beach area, Marin County, Calif., authorized by the Flood Control Act, approved July 3, 1958; to the Committee on Public Works.

1661. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated March 31, 1961, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on St. Joseph's Cut, Calif., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted July 19, 1956; to the Committee on Public Works.

1662. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Acting Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated November 7, 1961, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of the reports on the White Oak, Cypress, and Little Cypress Creeks, Tex., requested by resolutions of the Committees on Public Works, U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, adopted August 20, 1957, June 13, 1956, and July 1, 1958, respectively; to the Committee on Public Works.

1663. A letter from the Vice Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the act of September 7, 1957, relating to aircraft loan guarantees"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 9884. A bill for the relief of certain officers of the naval service erroneously in receipt of compensation based upon an incorrect computation of service for basic pay; without amendment (Rept. No. 1298). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LIBONATI: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4188. A bill for the relief of the Clay County Hospital, Brazil, Ind.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1325). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ASPINALL: Committee of conference. H.R. 2470. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Lincoln Boyhood National Memorial in the State of Indiana, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1326). Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 67. An act for the relief of Col. Samuel Hale; without amendment (Rept. No. 1299). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 429. An act for the relief of A1c. Percy J. Trudeau; without amendment (Rept. No. 1300). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MacGREGOR: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 521. An act for the relief of Charles J. Utterback; without amendment (Rept. No. 1301). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1348. An act for the relief of the Sulzbach Construction Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1302). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1348. A bill for the relief of William Burnice Joyner; without amendment (Rept. No. 1303). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SHRIVER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1615. A bill for the relief of Francis Janis and certain other Indians; with amendment (Rept. No. 1304). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LIBONATI: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1697. A bill for the relief of Viola Borwick Warbis; with amendment (Rept. No. 1305). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2839. A bill for the relief of Mildred Love Hayley; with amendment (Rept. No. 1306). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3696. A bill for the relief of Gertrude M. Kaplan; with amendment (Rept. No. 1307). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6075. A bill for the relief of Capt. H. A. Rowe; with amendment (Rept. No. 1308). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6464. A bill for the relief of Cecil D. Rose; with amendment (Rept. No. 1309). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6740. A bill for the relief of Teofilo Estoesta; with amendment (Rept. No. 1310). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7671. A bill for the relief of Louanna L. Leis; with amendment (Rept. No. 1311). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7704. A bill for the relief of Chyung Sang Bak; without amendment (Rept. No. 1312). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7708. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Gerald Beaver; with amendment (Rept. No. 1313). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8195. A bill for the relief of Ronald L. Mutter; with amendment (Rept. No. 1314). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8368. A bill for the relief of A. Eugene Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 1315). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8482. A bill for the relief of Paul J. Pericle; without amendment (Rept. No. 1316). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8515. A bill for the relief of James R. Banks; with amendment (Rept. No. 1317). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8628. A bill for the relief of Joseph A. Tedesco; with amendment (Rept. No. 1318). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 9060. A bill for the relief of Rhea G. Burgess; without amendment (Rept. No. 1319). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 9188. A bill to relieve Theodore A. Anderson from loss of agricultural conservation program benefits; without amendment (Rept. No. 1320). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 9596. A bill for the relief of Daniel E. Moore; without amendment (Rept. No. 1321). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 9597. A bill for the relief of James N. Tull; without amendment (Rept. No. 1322). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 9830. A bill for the relief of John B. Hogan; without amendment (Rept. No. 1323). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 9831. A bill to provide relief for the heirs and devisees of Fly and Her Growth, deceased Lower Brule Indian allottees; with amendment (Rept. No. 1324). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H.R. 10091. A bill to prohibit aerial acrobatic performances without the use of safety nets; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 10092. A bill to authorize the conveyance of certain surplus Federal lands to the State of Illinois for wildlife, conservation, and recreational purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. GLENN:

H.R. 10093. A bill to reunite families in the United States by granting nonquota status to certain aliens entitled to a preference under the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10094. A bill to amend section 40 of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act with respect to the determination of monthly pay; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 10095. A bill to continue until the close of June 30, 1963, the suspension of duties for metal scrap, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of Utah:

H.R. 10096. A bill to confirm to the State of Utah title to the bed of the Great Salt Lake; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KOWALSKI:

H.R. 10097. A bill to promote the foreign policy of the United States by authorizing the purchase of United Nations bonds and the appropriation of funds therefor, and to afford an opportunity for the people of the United States to participate in the purchase of such bonds; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 10098. A bill to authorize the exchange of certain lands at Antietam National Battlefield site; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H.R. 10099. A bill to confirm title of the State of Utah to the bed of the Great Salt Lake; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER:

H.R. 10100. A bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research, development, and operation, construction of facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 10101. A bill to provide for a program of agricultural land development in the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama:

H.R. 10102. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an increased exemption from income tax in the case of annuities payable under the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROUDEBUSH:

H.R. 10103. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional income tax exemption for each dependent who is a full-time undergraduate student at a college or university; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 10104. A bill to amend the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended, with respect to space communications facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H.R. 10105. A bill to amend chapter 57 of title 39 of the United States Code to provide for adequate addresses on franked mail delivered by city carrier; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H.R. 10106. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code to increase the total mileage of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 10107. A bill to amend certain laws applicable to the District of Columbia Tax Court; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming:

H.J. Res. 621. Joint resolution permitting the Secretary of the Interior to continue to deliver water to lands in the third division, Riverton Federal reclamation project, Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H.J. Res. 622. Joint resolution declaring Communist arms and munitions contraband in the Western Hemisphere and making provisions to enforce the same; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.J. Res. 623. Joint resolution declaring that a state of conflict exists between the international Communist conspiracy and the Government and the people of the United States and making provisions to prosecute the same; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ALGER:

H. Con. Res. 410. Concurrent resolution expressing the declaration of will of the American people and purpose of their Government to reinstate the sovereignty of the United States and its people throughout the world and to guarantee the full protection of this Government for all its citizens and their property anywhere in the world; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BASS of New Hampshire:

H.R. 10108. A bill authorizing the readmittance of Walter Sowa, Jr., to the U.S. Naval Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H.R. 10109. A bill for the relief of Sister Machi Shigehisa, and Sister Tamiko Hitomi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIEHLMAN:

H.R. 10110. A bill for the relief of Rathindra N. Roychoudhury; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 10111. A bill for the relief of Marvin M. Greenlee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHARTON:

H.R. 10112. A bill for the relief of John Baltis (John Paul Petalas); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

236. Mr. CUNNINGHAM presented a petition of 160 persons in South Dakota, Nebraska, California, Wisconsin, and Illinois, asking for an end to the Red mail subsidy, which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

SENATE

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal and ever-loving Father, in this mad and sad world, with the forces of envy and hatred rending in twain Thy human family, we look away from all the contentions of earth, knowing that nothing can separate us from the love of Thee, our God, and that we cannot drift beyond the circle of Thy care. It is in that love that a sparrow's fall is noted. It is in that law that the stars keep their courses. With that certainty as our shield, we confront the day with confidence and face the future unafraid.

Make us worthy of that love divine, which transfigures all it touches. May we not fall short of the high dignity with which Thou hast endowed us.

Protect our free land from the dire evils threatened by others who blaspheme Thy law. Deliver us also from the sinful tendencies of our own wayward natures which would lure us from the path of Thy commandments.

We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 5, 1962, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of G. Joseph Minetti, of New York, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 5393. An act to amend the Bankruptcy Act; and

H.R. 8355. An act to authorize executive agencies to grant easements in, over, or upon real property of the United States under the control of such agencies, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 5393. An act to amend the Bankruptcy Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8355. An act to authorize executive agencies to grant easements in, over, or upon real property of the United States under the control of such agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection with the morning hour be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CALL OF THE CALENDAR TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, today's calendar shows that unanimous consent was granted for a call of the calendar tomorrow, beginning with Calendar No. 1077. That is an error; the request was for a calendar call beginning with Calendar No. 1142. We expect to take up the money resolutions—Calendar Nos. 1096 through 1141—tomorrow, but they will not be considered under the unanimous-consent calendar call.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader further with respect to the program for the remainder of the week, and possibly in regard to what will eventuate after the Lincoln's Birthday tour is over.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In response to the question by my distinguished friend, the minority leader, let me say we have some hopes of finishing the unfinished business, Senate bill 1241, today.

Tomorrow we shall take up the resolutions which provide for the operation of the Senate's committees; and there will be a calendar call, beginning with Calendar No. 1142; and we hope to get started on the consideration of Senate bill 2520, for enforcement of the Welfare and Pension Plans and Disclosure Act. We would like to get all these measures out of the way before the coming Friday.

It has already been agreed that there will be no votes from February 9 to February 13, inclusive.

After a discussion with the distinguished minority leader, it has been agreed—and I believe the Senate should take notice of this—that on February 19 the Senate will begin debate on the reorganization plan for a Department of Urban Affairs.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The 19th falls on a Monday, as I recall.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. So we shall begin then with debate on the so-called reorganization plan to include the creation of the proposed new Cabinet Department. Is that correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Illinois has stated the fact accurately.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

APPROPRIATIONS TO NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research, development, and operation, construction of facilities, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

REPORTS ON DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA NATIONAL GUARD ARMORY AND DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA STADIUM

A letter from the Chairman, District of Columbia Armory Board, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on the District of Columbia National Guard Armory and District of Columbia Stadium, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT ON DEVELOPMENT LOAN FUND

A letter from the Administrator, Agency for International Development, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a terminal report on the Development Loan Fund, as of November 3, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON EXAMINATION OF PRICING OF CERTAIN MISSILE TOOLING UNDER AIR FORCE CONTRACT WITH THE BOEING CO.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the examination of the pricing of certain missile tooling under Department of the Air Force negotiated contract AF 33(600)-36319 with the Boeing Co., Seattle, Wash., dated January 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF WEATHER BUREAU

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of the Weather Bureau, Department of Commerce, fiscal years 1959-61 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF SUPPLY MANAGEMENT OF PHOTOGRAPHIC SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT WITHIN DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of supply management of photographic supplies and equipment within the Department of Defense, dated January 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. DOUGLAS, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

James J. Saxon, of Illinois, to be Comptroller of the Currency.

By Mr. KEFAUVER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Harry D. Mansfield, of Tennessee, to be U.S. marshal for the eastern district of Tennessee.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. PELL:

S. 2803. A bill for the relief of Juliano Barboza Amado and Manuel Socorro Barboza Amado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 2804. A bill for the relief of Sheu Chwan Shaiou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT (for himself and Mr. GRUENING):

S. 2805. A bill to provide for a program of agricultural land development in the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. BARTLETT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KERR (for Mr. CHAVEZ) (by request):

S. 2806. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide better facilities for the enforcement of the customs and immigration laws," to increase the amounts authorized to be expended; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. KERR when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 2807. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Juliane C. Rockenfeller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 2808. A bill for the relief of Konstantinos Roumeliotis and Panagiota Roumeliotis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL (for himself and Mr. HARTKE):

S. 2809. A bill to amend section 927(d) of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, relating to individuals acquitted of offenses solely by reason of their insanity; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BENNETT (for himself and Mr. MOSS):

S. 2810. A bill to confirm in the State of Utah title to all lands lying below the high waterline of Great Salt Lake in such State; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, and Mr. BENNETT):

S. 2811. A bill amending title I of the Social Security Act so as to require that, in the administration of State programs for medical assistance for the aged established pursuant to such title, a statement of a claimant for assistance under any such program with regard to his financial status shall, if made under oath, be regarded as factually correct for purposes of determining his eligibility for assistance under such programs; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. DIRKSEN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. YARBOROUGH):

S. 2812. A bill to amend section 216 of title 38, United States Code, relating to prosthetic research in the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PROGRAM OF AGRICULTURAL LAND DEVELOPMENT IN ALASKA

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill for an act entitled "The Alaska Farmland Development Act of 1962," providing for a sound, efficient development and utilization program for Alaska's agricultural land resources. I ask that at the conclusion of my remarks the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD, as requested.

The bill (S. 2805) to provide for a program of agricultural land development in the State of Alaska, introduced by Mr. BARTLETT (for himself and Mr. GRUENING), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, much has been written about Alaska, much has been said. Some is the truth, some not, a good deal of it has been partially true. Too little is known of this vast land, but we do know that Alaska can become very productive for it is rich not only in natural resources but in human resources. The people of Alaska have enormous faith in their country and in themselves and want to play a part in their country's development. We should acknowledge that desire and advance it, for Alaska now constitutes approximately one-fifth of the land mass of the United States. Its geographic position is strategic and its strength essential to the protection of the rest of the Nation.

President Kennedy has stated again and again that we must move forward. And the country is moving forward under his leadership. We want to continue to do so. Alaskans, as much as any other group of Americans, want to move forward, but they need direction, help, and encouragement. I believe that this bill which provides for a long-term, cost-sharing program of land improvement will accomplish those very things—give direction, help, and encouragement to at least some of Alaska's people.

I do not intend to speak of what might have been. Alaska's history is what it is. We recognize this and want to proceed from it. To say that the Federal Government has great responsibilities in the development of Alaska is indisputable, but equally does it have similar responsibilities in all of the other States. The Federal Government has an obligation to promote profitable enterprises and has fulfilled that obligation in many areas. Basic to our national strength is a profitable agricultural economy and Alaska must share in a healthy farming community.

The airplane, World War II and the Korean war, the discovery of oil and gas, statehood—all have changed Alaska. In the years between 1950 and 1960 Alaska experienced a 75-percent growth in population. Anchorage alone has grown from a small railroad camp of approximately 2,500 people in the 1920's to a city of 48,000 with approximately 50,000 more living in adjacent areas.

Very little in Alaska's economy has kept pace with this growth in population, least of all its agricultural economy. Alaska's farmers presently supply slightly over 10 percent of all foodstuffs consumed there. The remainder—almost all, that is—must be imported. The Bureau of the Census in 1960 estimated that there are 367 farms in production in Alaska, including tracts as small as 10 acres. Today reliable estimates indicate that Alaska has on hand only a 3-week supply of food. Alaska can and must support more and larger farms if the people are to have some measure of protection from serious and even tragic shortages in the event that the lines of commerce are severed from the rest of the Nation.

One of the great obstacles to more rapid agricultural development is the staggering, immediate cost—cost of clearing land and placing it in production. I have been told by farmers, bankers, and others concerned with the problem that the cost of clearing 1 acre has been as high as $250. Many judge the average to be approximately $100 per acre. Alaska's settlers cannot prosper confronted with these great costs. Yet, at the present time, we are asking people to undertake these debts to open the land for all of us. Unfortunately, we cannot look to Alaska bankers to provide assistance when investment capital is as limited as it is. Estimates of the basic requirements for a farm in Alaska run from $20,000 to $60,000, depending upon the type of farming.

The Alaska agricultural revolving loan fund, a State fund providing development capital for farmers, and the agricultural conservation program service, the Federal Government agency which assists in conservation practices, have helped to some degree but, of course, neither is sufficient to provide the long-term development program essential to orderly growth. Alaska is new in many ways and underpopulated, and those there recognize that growth must come gradually, but steadily, to be of real and lasting benefit. It is my belief that this bill will provide for much of that orderly, steady advancement which is imperative.

Our Nation will be strong so long as the whole economy is strong. If Alaska is to be strong, its economy must be strong. The United States cannot afford not to have Alaska contributing to the national welfare as fully as possible, nor can we, in these days of world tension, leave the people in Alaska relying upon grossly inadequate stockpiles of food, 90 percent of which comes from other areas. Alaska cannot provide that needed strength now. It will require time, patience, energy, and perseverance. Alaska's present agricultural weakness makes it an easy conquest in the event of aggression. This, however, must not be our first consideration. We must think first of peaceful, dynamic national growth. Alaska should contribute to that growth. This bill provides a means by which it can.

The bill (S. 2805), introduced by Mr. Bartlett (for himself and Mr. Gruening), is as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Alaska Farmland Development Act of 1962".

Sec. 2. Declaration of Policy and Purpose.—In order to provide more adequately for the sound, efficient, and orderly development and utilization of agricultural land resources of the State of Alaska; to facilitate and assure the establishment of family-type farms as economic units of production and to encourage, promote, and strengthen this form of farm enterprise; to provide for Alaska's future economic growth by promoting a sound and stable agriculture, thereby insuring a more adequate and dependable food supply for the present and future population of the State; and in recognition of the strategic position of the State of Alaska in relation to national security and defense, it is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress, and the purpose of this Act shall be, to provide for a program of agricultural land development in the State of Alaska which will assist agricultural producers to develop and utilize more effectively the productive capacity of the State's land resources for agricultural purposes.

Sec. 3. The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to formulate and carry out a land development program, which subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines will best effectuate the policy and purpose expressed in section 2 of this Act, shall provide for the making of payments or grants to agricultural producers in the State of Alaska for carrying out specified farmland development or treatment measures including, but not limited to, clearing, draining, shaping and otherwise conditioning land for the production of crops or for pasture.

Sec. 4. In carrying out the provisions of this Act, the Secretary is authorized within the amounts of such appropriations as may be provided therefor to enter into agreements or other arrangements extending for a period of years with producers determined by him to have control of the farms and ranches covered thereby.

Sec. 5. The Secretary is authorized and directed to issue such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

Sec. 6. In carrying out the provisions of this Act, the Secretary may utilize the committees established pursuant to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended.

Sec. 7. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, without fiscal year limitations, such sums as may be necessary to carry out this Act: *Provided,* That the total cost of the program (excluding administrative costs) shall not exceed $1,250,000 and for any program year payments shall not exceed $125,000. The program authorized by this Act shall be in addition to, and not in substitution of, other programs in the State of Alaska authorized by any other Act.

FACILITIES FOR ENFORCEMENT OF CUSTOMS AND IMMIGRATION LAWS, TO INCREASE AMOUNTS AUTHORIZED TO BE EXPENDED

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Chavez], by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide better facilities for the enforcement of the customs and immigration laws," to increase the amounts authorized to be expended. I ask unanimous consent that a comparative print showing changes in existing law made by this proposed legislation be printed in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the comparative print will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2806) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide better facilities for the enforcement of the customs and immigration laws," to increase the amounts authorized to be expended, introduced by Mr. Kerr (for Mr. Chavez), by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The comparative print presented by Mr. Kerr is as follows:

Comparative Print Showing Changes in Existing Law Made by Proposed Bill

Changes in existing law proposed to be made by the bill are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in brackets, new matter in italic):

ACT OF JUNE 26, 1930, AS AMENDED (19 U.S.C. 68)

To aid in the enforcement of the customs and immigration laws along the Canadian and Mexican borders and to provide better facilities for such enforcement at points along such borders at which no Federal or other buildings adapted or suitably located for the purpose are available, the Secretary of the Treasury and the Attorney General are hereby authorized to expend, from the funds appropriated for the general maintenance and operation of the Customs and the Immigration and Naturalization Services, respectively, the necessary amounts for the acquisition of land and the erection of buildings, sheds, and office quarters, including living quarters for officers where none are otherwise available: *Provided,* [That the total amount which may be so expended for any one project, for the use of one department, including the cost of the site, shall not exceed $40,000, and that where quarters are so erected or facilities so provided for the joint use of the Customs and the Immigration and Naturalization Services the combined cost charged to the two appropriations concerned shall not exceed $80,000 for any one project, including the site.] *That the total amount which may be so expended for any one project, including the site, shall not exceed $100,000, and that where the project is for the joint use of the Customs Service and the Immigration and Naturalization Service, the combined cost of the project, including the site, shall be charged to the two appropriations concerned.*

MEDICAL ASSISTANCE FOR CERTAIN ELDERLY PEOPLE WITHOUT INVESTIGATION PRIOR TO CERTIFICATION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Kerr-Mills Act which would provide that older persons seeking help under State medical assistance for the aged programs would not be subject to investigation prior to certification for care.

The bill provides that a simple statement under oath as to his financial status must be presumed to be accurate in determining an older person's eligibility for care under State medical assistance for the aged programs using funds provided through the Kerr-Mills Act. Effective date for the new provision would be October 1. States not complying after that date would be ineligible for Federal grants-in-aid under the act.

Adoption of this proposal will remove a psychological barrier for lower-income people over 65 who, while otherwise independent, may need help from the State in obtaining medical care. It will tend also to accelerate the speed with which needs of these persons are met.

The persons whom the medical assistance for the aged programs are designed to help are honest and proud people. If the Nation's senior citizens cannot be trusted to accurately report their income and assets in application for help, the country as a whole is in serious trouble.

This proposal would, in essence, apply the same presumption of honesty on the part of citizens as is employed in the Veterans' Administration medical care program and the income tax.

While there is no evidence that people requesting care under the State medical assistance for the aged programs have been subject to humiliating investigation, many senior citizens fear that it might happen and resent the idea of a caseworker embarrassing them in their own neighborhoods. It is to prevent such a possibility that this proposal has been made.

Under present law, States are encouraged to develop medical assistance programs for those normally able to provide for their own needs who would be unable, however, to meet the cost of serious illness. It was the intent of Congress that these persons should be helped, as needed, without being forced onto public assistance rolls or subjected to pauperization. From 50 to 80 percent of the funds required by a State for the program are available from the Federal Government.

Most State plans provide that persons whose income and assets fall below a specific level shall be eligible for benefits. The State now may make a comprehensive and detailed investigation to determine income and assets before providing help. This would not be possible after approval of the Dirksen amendment. Instead the applicant's word would have to be accepted as presumption of his financial qualification.

The proposal would in no way alter the States right to determine the income level or other standards necessary to make a person eligible for help. Nor would it interfere with the States right to prosecute or recover funds in case of fraud.

In Illinois, individuals with annual incomes under $1,800 and couples with incomes under $2,400 are eligible for the medical assistance for the aged program if their assets do not exceed $1,800 and $2,400 respectively. Not counted as assets for this purpose are a homestead, regardless of value; personal property; an automobile; $1,000 of life insurance; or $1,000 of tools used in earning income.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be permitted to lie on the table for 2 additional days for cosponsors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Illinois.

The bill (S. 2811) amending title I of the Social Security Act so as to require that, in the administration of State programs for medical assistance for the aged established pursuant to such title, a statement of a claimant for assistance under any such program with regard to his financial staus shall, if made under oath, be regarded as factually correct for purposes of determining his eligibility for assistance under such programs, introduced by Mr. Dirksen (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

LINCOLN BOYHOOD NATIONAL MEMORIAL, IND.—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2470) to provide for the establishment of the Lincoln Boyhood National Memorial in the State of Indiana, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report, as follows:

> The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2470) to provide for the establishment of the Lincoln Boyhood National Memorial in the State of Indiana, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:
>
> That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 1.
>
> That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:
>
> In lieu of the language inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:
>
> "Sec. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act, but not more than $1,000,000, of which not more than $75,000 shall be expended for the acquisition of lands or interests in land," and the Senate agree to the same.
>
> Alan Bible,
> Clinton P. Anderson,
> Ernest Gruening,
> Henry Dworshak,
> Gordon Allott,
> *Managers on the Part of the Senate.*
>
> Wayne N. Aspinall,
> J. T. Rutherford,
> Leo W. O'Brien,
> John P. Saylor,
> J. Edgar Chenoweth,
> *Managers on the Part of the House.*

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the report is signed by each of the conferees for both the Senate and the House, and places a limitation of $75,000 on the amount of money which can be spent for the purchase of land for the national memorial. With that exception, the bill is as passed by the Senate at the close of the last session.

Mr. President, I move the adoption of the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. HARTKE subsequently said: Mr. President, I am very pleased that the Senate today accepted the conference report on H.R. 2470, the bill to provide for the establishment of the Lincoln Boyhood National Memorial in the State of Indiana.

My Hoosier colleague, Congressman Winfield Denton, and I have been working together to get this legislation passed by the Congress since early in January of 1961.

The Lincoln Boyhood National Memorial will be Indiana's first national park. It will be located in Spencer County, Ind., and will include the old Tom Lincoln farm on Pigeon Creek where Abraham Lincoln lived from the time he was 7 until he was 21 years old.

During the time that Lincoln lived in Indiana, his mother, Nancy Hanks Lincoln died. Her grave is also located on the land which will become part of this new national park.

When young Abraham Lincoln moved to southern Indiana, this area was a meeting place between North and South. As Assistant Secretary of the Interior John M. Kelley stated in a letter to Chairman ASPINALL, of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

> Had the Lincolns gone directly from Kentucky to Illinois it is probable that the boy's southern experience might have been wholly submerged, and with it his capacity, later so evident, to understand and sympathize with the southern mind and heart. These formative years in southern Indiana gave Abraham Lincoln a perspective that combined elements of both major sections of the Nation that he would one day be called upon to preserve. It is not too much to believe that only this early experience could have prepared him to meet so successfully the supreme challenge which destiny thrust upon him in 1860.

I pledged to the people of Indiana that I would work until legislation gave proper recognition to Lincoln's boyhood home. This pledge I have faithfully kept.

I wish to thank my distinguished colleagues Senator BIBLE and Senator ANDERSON and the other members of the Interior Committee for their assistance in this legislation.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. MORSE:

Address by him entitled "U.S. Role in the United Nations and Its Effect on Our Foreign Policy" before the League of Women Voters, Springfield, Oreg., October 11, 1961.

Remarks by him at the Portland State College Convocation, Portland, Oreg., November 20, 1961.

FIRST-GENERATION AMERICANS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have an interesting editorial, from a recent issue of the Daily Republican Times, of Ottawa, Ill., on "Vanishing Americans." It pays fitting tribute to first-generation Americans, and speaks eloquently of what the immigrants have meant to the Americans and what America has meant to the immigrants.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VANISHING AMERICANS

The disappearance of more and more first-generation Americans leaves a void in our Nation's life. These were the people who migrated to this country from many lands—Italy, France, Germany, Ireland, the Balkans. They brought with them an appreciation of this our land that we are sometimes apt to forget.

Many of them came from lands of oppression, poverty, and economic and social stagnation. They were plain, religious folks to whom home, family, and church meant everything. To them, America was a land of golden opportunity, not necessarily to pile up wealth, but to earn a living, to live their lives in freedom, to raise a family. America became the great melting pot.

The adjustments were not always easy. For many, poverty was a problem as long as they lived. But to them, life in America more than compensated for what we now would call hardships.

They worked in the mines and factories. They toiled long hours; they were often exploited and misled. But they built the America we know today. They thrived, and filled our cities and villages and farms. They raised sons who grew up to run the Nation's businesses and went off to war when their country called. From pushcarts they started the enterprises whose prosperity we enjoy today.

Now they are vanishing from the scene, and with them goes a little of the appreciation of America.

We second and third and fourth generation Americans take their place in shaping the affairs of our communities and States and the Nation.

We still need to match a little of the work and sacrifices, toil and sweat, laughter and tears, that the people invested in us.

LARAMIE WOOL PROCESSING & WAREHOUSING CORP.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Members of the Senate to the creation of an interesting new corporation in Laramie, Wyo. It is a wool processing plant. This is an innovation in the West. We call it a design to process wool and clean wool before it is shipped the long, 2,000-mile journey to the eastern textile markets. Until now, nearly half of the weight of wool shipped has been due to the grease and the dirt in the wool, and of course the resultant additional transportation charges have been to the detriment of the woolgrowers themselves.

With the commencement of this new operation in Laramie, we have hopes that it will open up a vast new development in connection with wool processing all through the West, and will make it possible for the wool industry and woolgrowing in general to return to their former days of prosperity.

My tribute goes to the president of this new Laramie corporation, Jim Burton, to his board of directors, and to the business groups and wool interests which have had the imagination to undertake this worthwhile experiment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a newspaper article describing the operation of this woolgrowing plant in Laramie. The article was published on February 2 in the Laramie Daily Boomerang.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WOOL MILL OFFERS ADVANTAGE IN CLEAN SHIPPING

Western sheepmen won't have to send their wools to the New England processing centers any more—a new organization has sprouted at their doorstep.

Established as a service facility, the Laramie Wool Processing & Warehousing Corp. has been in operation about 4 months.

"We're not in operation to buy large clips of wools outright," said J. V. Burton, president and executive manager of the plant. "We work on a fee basis for eastern mills and woolgrowers in this part of the country. They are the customers. We work for them as the processor."

And the potential is great, according to Burton. He noted the plant is set up now to operate on a 10-million-pound basis annually, but that 54 million pounds are available each year in the area.

"We can expect to meet that potential," Burton stated. "We have the space available and other conditions are excellent."

The plant itself was purchased from Pacific Fruit Express Co., which had used it for ice storage and servicing refrigerated rail cars for cross-country runs. It contains 100,000 square feet of usable floor space, part of which is divided into 60- by 100-foot rooms for separate storage.

There's an additional 74 acres adjacent to the structure for outside storage or industrial expansion.

But its location is the key to the entire operation. It's on the main line of the east-west transcontinental Union Pacific Railroad, offering advantageous privileges on wool shipments in either direction.

Laramie is located equally well for the collection or concentration of wools by truck from the shearing pens and area warehouses desiring further processing of their stored wools. It is bisected by east-west transcontinental highway U.S. 30 and north-south U.S. 87 which extends from Montana to Texas.

The plant also boasts a strategic nontarget location for rapid defense center distribution of goods.

These transportation advantages can be used to the great benefit of the customers, Burton pointed out.

"It's the amount of clean wool that determines value and profit," he said. "We now can offer growers the advantage of shipping scoured wool in greater bulk to the eastern mills, thus filling rail cars with baled, clean wool and getting the benefit of bulk rates. The same advantages apply for the eastern mills.

"We are also in a position, with our storage facilities, of eliminating a lot of the 'guesstimates' in estimating wool shrinkage. We can supply reliable marketing, supply, demand, and price range facts. We can eliminate unacceptable grading by the growers and the lack of classification and separation of wool types.

"The intervening 2,000 miles between western wool production and the eastern mill consumption has been a barrier that has caused many of the planned corrective efforts to fail," Burton went on to say. "We are in a position to do something about this and it looks like we are being accepted."

The Laramie plant presently can process 1,500 to 1,800 pounds of grease wool per hour. The machines open up the wools and get out loose dirt before the scouring bowls take over. Hot water with detergents added clean the wool before it goes through two rinse bowls. The clean wool then is dried and baled for shipment.

The plant is operating with one such unit but space has been set aside for four additional units which can be installed as volume increases.

Burton reported the plant can do custom scouring and blending of wools to meet specifications of eastern buyers. "We already have done some of this and undoubtedly will have an increase in such requests," he said.

"There is nothing exactly like this new plant in the West," the manager stated. "It is unique because several of the services it offers to woolgrowers are new and woolgrowers obtain the highest possible prices for their wools.

"The plant prepares wool, it scours wool, it sells wool for woolgrowers and mills both in the grease wool and the scoured wool state. It is not the policy of the plant to go out and actively buy wool for its own account.

"Each clip of wool is handled according to the specific wishes of the owner and he alone decides what we do with his product."

Advantages for the grower? Burton listed these:

The corporation can demonstrate substantial freight savings on prepared and scoured wools coming into the Laramie plant either in transit or of local origins.

Wools will be sold on their individual merits only and the better managed bands will be rewarded according to their practices.

The Laramie plant will be helping to establish a more orderly marketing system.

Smaller growers will receive the same consideration and market benefits as larger growers.

As soon as expedient the company hopes to offer at cost an efficient service for culling and grading ewe and yearling flocks for uniformity of wool and lambs. By this service defective wools, off-type wools and inefficient ewes will be eliminated from the flocks and this will increase the values of the products of the sheep enterprise.

Increased volume of scouring is not the only growth potential for the corporation, one officer said. He noted the possibility exists that expansion can be made into the other aspects of wool processing—combing and eventually the manufacturing phase.

"We're perhaps dreaming a bit here," he said, "but we can't discount the fact that the possibility exists. It would be a wonderful industry, and a very logical one, for Laramie."

TRADE WITH JAPAN

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, the Attorney General of the United States is now in Japan, on a very important mission, I believe. I hope that two articles recently published in the Washington Post—one on February 3, and the other on February 4—will be called to his attention. These articles call attention to a sentiment in Japan which is quite distressing.

The headline of the first article is "Feelings Are Hurt—Second Fiddle Trade Role Feared by Japanese."

The subheading of the article, which appears on the following page, is "Japanese Fear Desertion by United States Following Troth With Inner Six."

The article refers to the clouds that Japan sees on the horizon, including a "belief that with the passage of the new trade bill, the United States will enter into an exclusive dialogue with the Common Market countries, making restrictive deals that will leave Japan out in the cold.

The article states that Japan does feel left out, and that some in Japanese Cabinet circles feel that they have suffered a loss of face. The article states:

> America speaks to Europe, not to its second largest trading partner.

And so forth. The headline of the second article is "Japan Mystified by U.S. Policy." The article states, in part:

> Recent American actions, therefore, which seem in Japanese eyes to run counter to those principles, leave top level Japanese in business and government baffled and unhappy. They wonder if the very foundations of the relationship are being pulled down.

Finally the following is stated in the article:

> But if the United States cannot meet Japanese appeals, it could conceivably comfort official and business leaders by appearing to accord Japanese problems more concern. The Japanese are worried, and would be happier if the Americans held their hand and worried along with them.

Mr. President, the trade bill now before the Congress provides for the most-favored-nation policy. If that is adopted, it will leave us in the position of agreeing to accord to all other nations besides the Common Market Six the same reductions in tariffs or other barriers as are agreed to by them; but it does not require us to make with the Common Market an agreement which would oblige them to do the same thing.

I intend to submit, in due course, an amendment which will require that any agreement we make with the Common Market shall carry the most-favored-nation policy, along with that agreement, so as to make clear to our good friends in the Common Market Six that they, too, have a world responsibility in these days of the cold war—on the brink of a hot war—and that they, too, should take into account the economic needs of Japan, inasmuch as Japan is the only great power in the Far East; and if Japan should fall, because of economic disaster, that would be a tragedy of the first order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time available to the Senator from Connecticut, under the 3-minute limitation, has expired.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these articles be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 3, 1962]

FEELINGS ARE HURT—SECOND-FIDDLE TRADE ROLE FEARED BY JAPANESE

(By Alfred Friendly)

TOKYO.—Japan's Government officials and business leaders are suffering a bad case of nerves, hurt feelings and bewilderment about American trade policy.

Their acute unhappiness, understandable even if somewhat irrational, comes from the thought that Uncle Sam's eyes are so fixed on American relationships with the Common Market that Japan risks, as the current phrase has it, "being lost in the northwest corner of the Pacific."

On the downward swing of a massive economic readjustment imposed by the Government to cool off the nation's superheated economy—the Japanese substitute for a business cycle recession—the country's leaders would be jumpy as cats in any event. The new dimension to their nervousness comes from a series of American actions which look like a resurgence of protectionism, discrimination against Japanese goods and exclusive preoccupation with commerce in the Atlantic community.

To understand the current case of the jitters it must be remembered that Japan is as obsessed by issues of its export trade as Brooklyn used to be by the Dodgers. As the saying goes, if you want to talk in Washington, you have to talk politics; in Tokyo if you want to talk, you talk about trade. For Japan's remarkable experiment, to bring 94 million people in a country the size of Montana to a decent life by peaceful means, the only solution is a system based on the vastest exchange of goods with the world.

A third of Japan's trade is with the United States and, after Canada, Japan is the United States' largest trading partner. Accordingly, when the adverse trade balance for Japan with the United States runs, as it did in 1961, to $1 billion, and when "Big Brother" begins to take measures that look like further restrictions on Japan's exports, the word for the result is consternation.

What Japan sees as storm clouds, if not typhoons, is built of these droplets:

Tariff Commission consideration of an 8½-cents-per-pound equalization fee on cotton goods imports (to adjust for world prices as against the price at which cotton is sold in the American market).

The cessation of American purchasers by the Agency for International Development (AID) of fertilizer in Japan for economic assistance to Korea, Indian and other Asian countries ($170 million worth in 1960, about $50 million last year and presumably none this year).

A belief that with the passage of the new trade bill, the United States will enter into an exclusive dialogue with the Common Market countries, making restrictive deals that will leave Japan out in the cold.

Reports of agitation in the United States for buy-American and ship-American policies, and against Japanese goods.

It does not help much to point out that even if the 8½-cent tariff is added, Japanese imports will not be grievously hurt, inasmuch as only 6 or 7 percent of Japanese cotton goods imported to the United States are crude and unfinished, the rest consisting of finished goods or clothing where the price of the cotton content is not important.

Nor does it help to explain—as it certainly has not been adequately or widely explained until President Kennedy's message of January 25 on the Trade Expansion Act—that U.S.-Common Market negotiations will follow the most-favored-nation principle, so that tariff reductions both in America and in Europe will benefit Japan as well.

SUSPICION REMAINS

The suspicion remains and grows almost to an obsession. The Japanese feel left out; in some Cabinet circles, indeed, there is even a sense of loss of face. America speaks to Europe, not to its second largest trading partner. High hopes were left by the United States-Japanese Cabinet-level conferences here last November, but favorable developments have not materialized—indeed the trend seems to run the other way.

So far, the pocketbook injuries to Japan have not been serious, but wounds to the feelings have been. In a sense, the United States has been guilty more in bad manners than bad actions. But manners, in Japan, are important.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 4, 1962]

SPOILED BY HISTORY—JAPAN MYSTIFIED BY U.S. POLICY

(By Alfred Friendly)

TOKYO.—Since the end of the American occupation of Japan, this nation's relationship with the United States has been sustained by a pair of cardinal, basic assumptions:

1. The United States applauds, welcomes, encourages the sensational economic progress of Japan, which is moving forward at a rate probably unrivaled elsewhere in the world.

2. In all matters, especially those economic, and in defense against the Communist menace of Red China, America stood as

a partner to Japan and accepted Japan as a first-class partner.

Recent American actions, therefore, which seem in Japanese eyes to run counter to those principles, leave top-level Japanese in business and government baffled and unhappy. They wonder if the very foundations of the relationship are being pulled down.

To say that the Japanese have been spoiled since the war—that everything which should have gone wrong for them went right, that they lost the war but won the occupation—may be to aid in understanding the situation but not in alleviating it.

To explain that President Kennedy also has a political problem in seeking to gain enactment of the Trade Expansion Act, and must make some compromises with American textile and other industries challenged by Japanese imports, is to appeal to the Japanese mind, when his worry is not there but in his innards.

To explain that some American moves, such as curbing purchases of AID goods in Japan, are necessitated by America's gold drain is to evoke a reaction of wonderment; how can America with $16.8 billion of gold reserves be worried when Japan has only $1.4 billion, and that a drop from last year's figures?

To recall how good Japan's trade has been with the United States, to hold out hope of how it can be expected to grow in years to come, especially under the new trade legislation, is to encounter the reply of Vice President Alben Barkley's constituent: What have you done for me recently?

In Government circles where the reasons and explanations may be well understood there is nevertheless a grave concern which extends from the economic to the political. If Japan's current economic cutback to rectify its overexpanded, supercharged economic boom lasts too long, and if further restriction of Japanese imports to the United States holds down recovery, there could be a worrisome reaction by the voters.

The elections for the upper house come next summer. There is, to be sure, no danger of the Socialists upsetting the Tory government of the Liberal-Democratic Party, but a sharp Socialist gain could not be looked on with any complaisance. For the Socialist Party is not, in the Western sense, a loyal opposition, but rather a revolutionary one. If not Moscow or Peiping controlled, it is nevertheless Marxist to the core. A conversation with one of its leaders differs only slightly from one with an editor of the Daily Worker.

And hanging over the head of Japanese politics is the emotional yearning for China, the mother country. If trade with the United States is a bootless game, the Socialists can argue, why not turn to trade with mainland China. The economics are nonsensical, for China has no wherewithal to buy what Japan can sell, but the psychological appeal is considerable. The political consequences would be ugly.

Government officials propose, privately, a number of remedial steps for the United States to take. None, however, are very realistic, in that they disregard both political pressures in America on the trade issue and the need to correct America's gold outflow.

But if the United States cannot meet Japanese appeals, it could conceivably comfort official and business leaders by appearing to accord Japanese problems more concern. The Japanese are worried, and would be happier if the Americans held their hand and worried along with them.

HOW MANY PEOPLE HAVE EVER LIVED ON EARTH?

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the February 1962 issue of Population Bulletin, published by the Population Reference Bureau, is devoted to the subject: "How Many People Have Ever Lived on Earth?"

The article, written by Editor Robert C. Cook, is based on estimates prepared by Fletcher Wellemeyer, a consultant, and Frank Lorimer of American University.

Demography is a relatively new science. An answer to the question of total population must of course be based, in part, on assumptions and guesses. A reading of this article brings home the point that human arithmetic has moved from a relatively simple exercise in addition—and occasionally subtraction—to one of geometric progression.

Concludes Editor Cook:

> It took all of the vast reaches of time to build today's population of slightly over 3 billion. But it will take only 40 more years for population to reach 6 billion, if the present growth rates remain unchanged. The majority of the world's people still live close to the subsistence level, in poverty and squalor reminiscent of the Middle Ages. If the demographic transition to a balance betwen low birth and death rates could be hastened in the less-developed countries, this gulf might yet be bridged in time to avert a Malthusian disaster.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of this article in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW MANY PEOPLE HAVE EVER LIVED ON EARTH?

(By Robert C. Cook)

How many people have ever been born since the beginning of the human race?

What percentage does the present world population of 3 billion represent of the total number of people who have ever lived?

These questions are frequently asked the Population Reference Bureau's Information Service. Because of the perennial interest and because of the credence sometimes given to what would seem to be unrealistic appraisals, this issue presents an estimate prepared by Fletcher Wellemeyer, manpower, education, and personnel consultant, Washington, D.C., with Frank Lorimer, of American University, Washington, D.C. acting as adviser. This estimate, based on certain statistical, historic, and demographic assumptions set forth in an appendix, should be regarded as no more than a reasonable guess. It assumes that man first appeared about 600,000 years ago, a date which has been proposed for the dawn of the prehistoric era. However, this date obviously is a compromise, anthropologically speaking, between varying extremes.

Since then, it is estimated that about 77 billion babies have been born. Thus, today's population of approximately 3 billion is about 4 percent of that number.

Absolutely no information exists as to the size and distribution of prehistoric populations. Presumably they were not large, nor very widely distributed. If the 600000 B.C. date is accepted as a sound compromise, then only about 12 billion people—less than one-sixth of the total number ever born—are estimated to have lived before 6000 B.C.

Anthropologists and paleontologists differ by hundreds of thousands of years as to when man first walked this earth. Recent discoveries strongly suggest that the lifespan of the human species might date back as much as 2 million years. However, this time scale has not yet been accepted by all anthropologists.

If the "beginning" actually extended a million years prior to 600000 B.C., the estimated number of births prior to 6000 B.C. would be 32 billion, and the estimated total number, about 96 billion.

Prior to 1650, historical population data are very scanty for every part of the world. Despite this lack of knowledge, ancillary evidence exists which reveals the general pattern of human growth. Throughout the thousands of centuries which preceded the present technological age, human survival was such a touch-and-go affair that high fertility was essential to balance brutally high mortality. The human female—a relatively slow breeder, even among mammals—had to reproduce somewhere near her physiological limit in order for the family, the clan, the tribe and the nation to survive.

As human culture developed over the ages, the chances of survival tended to improve. When the invention of agriculture provided a more stable food supply, the base was laid for the maintenance of large populations and for their spread into new areas. However, high death rates continued to check population growth.

Until recently, at least a half of all babies born died before reaching maturity. Man's quest for some formula to avert death included magic, incantations and prayers, but none of these had shown any efficacy against the major killers. Then, with the advance of modern science, the mortality pattern of a million years was broken.

Jenner's dramatic discovery of vaccination for smallpox was the first of a multitude of discoveries destined to defer death, especially in infancy and childhood. This brilliant application of the scientific method to biology and medicine, together with improved agricultural technology, better transportation and the vast and complex nexus of an emerging industrial culture, set in motion forces which drastically lowered death rates and thereby greatly increased the efficiency of reproduction. In some countries, the birth rate declined also, although more slowly than the death rate. During the 19th century, the industrial countries of the West were the first to experience the transition from high to low birth and death rates. This transition took about 150 years.

These epochal changes profoundly altered the patterns of survival and population growth. In those countries of northern Europe and North America which were the first to exploit effectively the new medical discoveries, life expectancy at birth rose rapidly from 30 years to 40, then to 50, and, by 1960, to 70 years and more. Infant mortality declined drastically: now, 95 out of every 100 babies born in Western industrial countries live to reach adulthood.

Although the power to defer death is one of the greatest advances in man's long history, it has been the principal factor in the acceleration in the rate of population growth during the past century. Now, public health programs reach even the world's most remote villages, and death rates in the less developed areas are falling rapidly. But the traditionally high birth rates—so essential to offset the high death rates of even the very recent past—remain high. Thus, population growth soars.

Therefore, over the long span of history, the rate of population growth has tended to accelerate—almost imperceptibly at first; then slowly; and recently, at a rapid clip. By the beginning of the Christian era, 200–300 million people are believed to have lived on earth. That number had grown to some 500 million by 1650. Then the growth curve took a sharp upward trend. By 1850, world population was more than 1 billion. Today, it is over 3 billion.

The quickening tempo of growth is even more dramatically expressed in doubling time. It took hundreds of thousands of years for world population to reach the quarter-billion mark, at about the beginning of the Christian era. Over 16 centuries more passed before that number reached an estimated half billion. It took only 200 additional years to reach 1 billion, and only 80 more years—to about 1930—to reach 2 billion. Population growth rates are still going up. During all of the eons of time—perhaps as long as 2 million years—the human race grew to its present total of 3 billion. But it will take only 40 years to add the next 3 billion, according to United Nations estimates. In certain nations and larger areas, populations will double in 25 years or even less, if growth rates remain unchanged.

This historical review traces the proliferation of the human species through three very broad timespans: Period I extends from 600000 B.C. to 6000 B.C.; period II extends to A.D. 1650; and period III, to 1962. These time periods are chosen because the dates mark important epochs in man's cultural development.

It should be emphasized, however, that not all portions of the globe experienced simultaneously the cultural and technological advances which mark these different stages of man's history. When the first European settlement was established in Australia in 1788, the aborigines there were in the stone age. Even today, some tribes living in New Guinea and elsewhere still remain at that level.

PERIOD I: THE OLD STONE AGE

Period I extends from 600000 to 6000 B.C. It begins early in the Paleolithic or old stone age and continues to the beginning of the Neolithic or new stone age. It is estimated that during this period numbers grew to about 5 million, that man's birth rate was close to 50 per thousand, and that there was an approximate total of 12 billion births.

Little, if anything, is known about population size during this hunting and gathering stage of man's existence. The total land area of the earth is approximately 58 million square miles. It seems reasonable to assume that not more than 20 million square miles could have been used successfully by the relatively few who inhabited the earth at that time. The consensus of competent opinion indicates that, on moderately fertile soil in a temperate climate, about 2 square miles per person would be needed for a hunting and gathering economy.

It must be assumed that there were severe limitations on man's numbers during this period; and that his life cycle and average generation were much shorter than they are today. Man existed for the most part in wandering bands in order to survive. Our ancient ancestors were completely subject to all the vagaries of the weather and the ecological cycle of the game animals on which their existence depended. Food shortages were usually endemic, and the ravages of epidemics were routine, although the wide dispersal of the population tended to localize these hazards. Nevertheless, the picture that emerges is one in which births and deaths were roughly balanced, with births perhaps holding a narrow margin.

THE LONG TIMESPAN OF PREHISTORY

Anthropologists and paleontologists are gradually putting together, piece by piece, the great jigsaw puzzle that is the history of early man. Dr. T. D. Stewart, Head Curator of the Department of Anthropology, National Museum, in Washington, D.C., points out that only a few fossils of humans who lived in this period have been found. Nevertheless, man's long time-scale is known today with far greater accuracy than ever before, mainly because of the new radioactive dating techniques. According to Dr. Stewart, new discoveries demand new theories or that existing theories be adjusted.

The remains of Zinjanthropus, recently found in the Olduvai Gorge of Tanganyika by L. S. B. Leakey, curator of the Coryndon Museum, Nairobi, Kenya, which Leakey believes date back almost 2 million years, probably do not represent the beginning of the line. Zinjanthropus has been called man because he was a toolmaker in the crudest sense. Since his physical form represents a very early stage of human evolution, it is not advisable to assume so early a beginning for purposes of estimating human population growth.

However, it is generally believed that "man" had reached the point of being able to make simple tools and to talk by a half million or even a million years ago. Though he presumably emerged much earlier, Homo sapiens first appeared with great force in Europe sometime between 25,000 and 30,000 years ago. Very little is known about where he came from or about his connection with the Neanderthal people who were one of many types of man to precede him. By 20000 B.C., he had created the first great art in human history: The magnificent paintings and other artifacts found in certain caves in southern France and northern Spain. He engraved and carved bone and ivory with faithful representations of his women and of the animals he knew so well: The mammoth, the bison, and others. These were believed to have had magic significance—to bring fertility to the clan and success to the hunter.

No birth rates or death rates have ever been found on the walls of the prehistoric caves. Thus, what is the puzzle of man to the anthropologist and the paleontologist becomes the enigma of man to the demographer. A United Nations report, "The Determinants and Consequences of Population Trends," published in 1953, presents a comprehensive survey of world population through the whole of man's history. Readers are referred to it for a more complete historical survey than this limited space permits. The report states:

"That men, using tools, have been living on this planet for at least one hundred thousand years, and possibly for over a million years, is proved by various types of evidence. For example, the definitely human skeletal remains found at Choukoutien, China, in association with artificial stone and bone implements and possible indications of the use of fire, were deposited during the second interglacial period, or earlier. There is evidence, also, that several divergent types of men emerged, some of whom had specialized characteristics which place them outside the ancestral line of all living races today. The Neanderthal people, who were dominant in Europe during the last (Würm) glaciation, were apparently such a divergent race."

PERIOD II: 6000 B.C. TO A.D. 1650

Starting with the beginning of the new stone age, this period extends through the bronze and iron periods, through classical antiquity and the Dark Ages, the Renaissance, and the Reformation. It is estimated that world population increased 100-fold during the period, growing from 5 million to half a billion, and that about 42 billion births occurred.

It is believed that at the beginning of the era the earth was still very sparsely settled and population was widely dispersed. Vast areas of the globe were not inhabited, partly because the last glaciations had just receded.

It was during this period that man began to produce food instead of simply consuming what nature had laid before him. In the Near East, he had already passed the stage of the most primitive village-farming communities which grew out of the earliest agriculture with its domestication of animals. Some of these ancient communities developed into the earliest known urban settlements. The development of agriculture with its settled farming community spread to other areas of the earth during this period. Eventually, it was to change drastically man's pattern of survival and his way of life.

The earliest scene of settled village-farming communities appears to have been in the Near East. Robert J. Braidwood, professor of the Oriental Institute of Chicago, and field director of the Jarmo project, a recently studied archeological site in Iraq, says: "It is probably very difficult for us now to conceptualize fully (or to exaggerate) the consequences of the first appearance of effective food production. The whole range of human existence, from the biological (including diet, demography, disease, and so on) through the cultural (social organization, politics, religion, esthetics, and so forth) bands of the spectrum took on completely new dimensions."

Braidwood described the hilly piedmont and intermontane regions surrounding the great "fertile crescent" which starts in the valleys of the Tigris and Euphrates Rivers, sweeps around to the north to touch southern Turkey and Syria, then curves south to the shores of the Mediterranean and into Egypt. One radioactive-carbon date suggests that this development was well advanced by 4000 B.C.

Sheep, goats, pigs, cattle, and some kind of horse-like animal were used by those living in the area. Their plants were wheat and barley. Braidwood notes that some sort of hybridization or mutation, particularly in domesticated plants, must have taken place before certain species could have been moved to other areas. However, they seem to have moved into the Danube Valley by 4000 B.C., and into western Europe by 2500 B.C.

In other words, man was learning to utilize his environment more efficiently; thus it could support more people than ever before. But numbers were still regulated by the food-producing quality of the land. Population grew in times of plenty and declined when food became scarce and when disease decimated large populations, as it did in Europe during the Dark Ages.

During the bronze age, man began to use copper and bronze and to build towns, cities, and states. Kings, advanced religions, social classes, writing, and enduring monuments, such as the Nile pyramids, appeared during this period. The iron age brought iron metallurgy, the invention of the alphabet, the use of coined money, and the spread of commerce and navigation.

The early and great empires and cultures developed: those of Egypt, Rome, and Greece; of King Asoka in India; of the Han dynasty in China; and, later, the empires of the Mayas and the Incas in the New World. The Hindu, Confucian, Buddhist, Jewish, Christian, Muslim, and other great religions emerged.

THE CITY—PERIOD II

The great cities of ancient times rose in rich valleys adjacent to the Mediterranean, the Red Sea and the Persian Gulf, along the Indus and the Nile, and along the Yangtze in China. The first great urban civilization arose about 3500 B.C. in Mesopotamia, along the Tigris and Euphrates. Another grew up in Egypt before 3000 B.C. and still another in Crete. A fourth arose along the banks of the Indus in western India, but whether this grew directly out of Neolithic beginnings or was a transplant of the Sumerian culture of Mesopotamia is a matter of dispute. Urban civilizations developed in China at a later date, and still later in some areas of tropical Central America and in Peru.

The urban societies of Mesopotamia, China, and Egypt maintained complex centralized control of soil and water resources in order to provide irrigation and to control floods. These "hydraulic" civilizations supported very dense populations with highly integrated social systems. The individual peasant was allowed a small land area which produced more food than his family needed. Such civilizations have persisted in Egypt, India, China, and elsewhere to the present day, with little change in the economic basis of life but with periodic rises and declines.

The ancient Mediterranean, Asian, and American urban civilizations appear to have been isolated flowerings of human culture which culminated in "golden ages" and then declined. The archeological record abundantly reveals their wavelike nature. For additional information, readers are referred to an earlier issue of Population Bulletin, "The World's Great Cities: Evolution or Devolution?" (September 1960).

THE A.D. ERA OF PERIOD II

The United Nations study previously mentioned states that, at the beginning of the Christian era, the world's population was likely to have between 200 and 300 million people. Discussing the lack of historic demographic information, the report states:

"Various kinds of evidence indicate that man's numbers became adjusted to the food-producing capacity of the land in ancient times—increasing as it rose and declining as it fell. Unfortunately little of this evidence is of a census type, and most of the remainder does not provide a basis for estimating the number of inhabitants of an area. Large parts of the world's population were subject to some sort of census enumeration near the beginning of the Christian era, but the information available from these censuses has limited value. Roman censuses were taken for administrative purposes and were restricted to 'citizens,' an expanding category as citizenship rights were extended to outlying regions. Moreover only adult males were included in some of these censuses, while all household members except 'children' were included in others. Chinese censuses at about this time provided reports on total population but interpretation of the results involves many difficulties. Elaborate records were kept by the ancient Incas, but their meaning is obscure."

J. C. Russell, professor of history at the University of New Mexico, who has contributed much in the demographic history of the West, has traced the population changes within the Roman Empire from the second century A.D. to the year A.D. 543, a period he characterizes generally as one of imperial decline:

"However, within the general picture there are great differences in the trends. Actually most of the decrease occurred in western Mediterranean lands: Italy, Gaul, Iberia, and North Africa, together with Greece and Egypt. In Syria the population seems to have held even while in Gaul and Britain something like recovery must have occurred at the end of the period. Eastern Asia Minor and the Slavic area probably increased markedly. The German and Scandinavian spheres apparently held even in spite of emigration. The information about the central, eastern, and northern parts of Europe is so vague and uncertain that there may have been a considerable increase in population. The general rise in temperature should certainly have reduced the semiglacial conditions of the northern countries and made them attractive for grain-growing groups."

In the second and third centuries A.D., Rome suffered two devastating epidemics which have not been identified but their virulence suggests bubonic plague. According to Dr. Russell:

"The period from A.D. 543 to 950 probably marks the lowest ebb of population in Europe since the early Roman Empire. It covers the first great attack of the plague, the worst epidemic to strike the area with which we are concerned. Following it came the Mohammedan invasions from the seminomadic areas of the lands surrounding the Mediterranean. From the east in the 10th century the Hungarians scourged most of Europe and what they missed was visited by the terrible raids of the Vikings from the North. Some measure of the weakness of the European population is indicated by the feeble defense put up against these invaders by the governments of Europe."

Endemic diseases such as malaria and tuberculosis were prevalent, and the latter was particularly fatal among young people. In fact, the combination of both diseases occurred quite frequently and was highly fatal. Dr. Russell speculates that during the periods of population decline in early medieval Europe, much carefully tilled and drained acreage lapsed into breeding grounds for mosquitoes; and that a period of wet, warm weather about A.D. 800–900 greatly increased the incidence of malaria.

TABLE I.—*Area and estimates of population of the Roman Empire, A.D. 14*

	Area (thousands of square miles)	Population (thousands)	Persons per square mile
Total, Empire	1,280	54,000	41
European part	861	23,000	26
Asiatic part	257	19,500	77
African part	171	11,500	67

The span of life (extreme length of life) seems to have been around 100 years, as it is now. Those who could avoid infection were likely to live to considerable ages. According to John Durand, Assistant Director in Charge of Population, the United Nations Bureau of Social Affairs, the best basis for making mortality estimates of the Roman period is a study of tombstone inscriptions for males dying between the ages of 15 and 42. This method corrects the exaggeration of years that humans are apt to indulge in, even on tombstones, and allows for the underrepresentation of children's deaths. On this basis, Durand concludes that life expectancy at birth for the whole population of the Roman Empire was probably only about 25 or 30 years.

After the year 1000, it appears that population began to increase; and, between 1000 and 1348, that growth was phenomenal, particularly in northern Europe. The Empire of Charlemagne had already capitalized on the upward population movement, and stronger governments began to develop in Germany, Scandinavia, and even in Russia. The Crusades spread Christianity throughout the Middle East and brought contact between the Moslem and Christian worlds.

Then in 1348, the bubonic plague, which seems to have first appeared in the sixth century in Egypt, suddenly erupted in Europe in a more virulent form, taking a frightful toll of lives. Russell states that "the years 1348–50 saw a very heavy loss of life, 20 to 25 percent in most European countries. The decline continued with later epidemics until the population of about 1400 was near 60 percent of the preplague figures."

Between 1500 and 1700, far-ranging social, economic and intellectual revolutions began which formed the basis for the modern world. The era of medieval authority was first challenged in northern Italy, at the time of the Renaissance. This was followed by the age of discovery, with voyages around Africa and to the New World. At the same time, the reformation set the stage for the revival of intellectual development in northern Europe. For the first time since the Golden Age of Greece, the human intellect began to look at the world objectively. This led to the birth of the scientific method: new concepts of the nature of matter, energy and, ultimately, of life began to capture the minds of men. Out of this intellectual revolution came powerful new insights which were eventually to greatly change man's pattern of living and dying.

In Europe about the middle of the 17th century—after the end of the Thirty Years' War and the period of peace and stability which followed—agricultural methods improved, slowly at first and then rapidly. New crops were introduced and crops were rotated; manure and fertilizers were used more generally; and the soil was cultivated more extensively. Even though these more advanced methods increased food production, the margin of plenty continued to be precarious, especially for those who lived in cities. A comparable agricultural expansion seems to have occurred in China at about the same time.

Unfortunately, little is known about population growth and decline during this period for the vast continent of Asia, particularly for India and China. M. K. Bennett, director of the Food Research Institute, Stanford University, has recognized the need for a continent-by-continent or region-by-region survey. He estimates that world population in After Christ 1000, was somewhere around 275 million, or "probably less than half of the population of Europe in 1949; that there has been one century, the 14th [the century of the Black Death in Europe] in which world population did not increase at all, but declined."

TABLE II.—*Approximate population of the world and its subdivisions, 1000–1600*

[In millions]

Year	World	Europe	Asiatic Russia	Southwest Asia	India	China major [1]	Japan	Southeast Asia, Oceania	Africa	The Americas
1000	275	42	5	32	48	70	4	11	50	13
1100	306	48	6	33	50	79	6	12	55	17
1200	348	61	7	34	51	89	8	14	61	23
1300	384	73	8	33	50	99	11	15	67	28
1400	373	45	9	27	46	112	14	16	74	30
1500	446	69	11	29	54	125	16	19	82	41
1600	486	89	13	30	68	140	20	21	90	15

[1] China proper, plus Manchuria and Korea, Outer Mongolia, Sinkiang, and Formosa.

The earlier hydraulic civilizations became subject to disorders which checked and, in some cases, reversed their population growth.

The Americas had an estimated population of 16 million at the time of their discovery by Columbus. Julian Steward, research professor of anthropology, University of Illinois, has estimated the population of the different regions of the American Hemisphere in 1492 as follows:

North America:

North of Mexico	1,000,000
Mexico	4,500,000
West Indies	225,000
Central America	736,000

South America:	
Andean area	6,131,000
Remainder	2,898,000
Total	15,490,000

PERIOD III—A.D. 1650–1962

If man's existence on earth is viewed as a day, this period is less than a minute. But a fourth or more of all human beings ever born have lived during this brief span.

The period brought a sixfold increase in human numbers: from an estimated half-billion in 1950 to over 3 billion in 1962. There were approximately 23 billion births during this period—over half as many as in the preceding 76 centuries.

World population doubled between 1650 and 1850, growing beyond the 1-billion mark. It doubled again, to reach 2 billion by 1930, in only 80 years. Since that time, the rate of growth has accelerated steadily. Now over 50 million more people are added each year. If the current rate remains unchanged, today's population will double again in less than 40 years.

A steadily falling death rate, especially during the last century, is mainly responsible for the very rapid acceleration in population growth. It is estimated that during 1650–1750, population was growing at about 0.3 percent a year; during 1750–1850, at about 0.5 perecnt; 1850–1950, at 0.8 percent. Currently, the rate is somewhere between 1.6 and 1.9 percent.

This period brings man through to the modern agricultural-industrial age with its tremendous scientific and technological discoveries which have greatly speeded up the rate of social change in the Western world and which have revolutionized agriculture, industry, communication, transportation, et cetera. These developments have made possible the support of the mammoth populations in numerous areas of the world. However, many of those technological advances are only beginning to touch the less developed areas where living levels for over half of the world's people are only a little, if any, above what they were during much of the earlier history of the race.

For the world as a whole, the mid-17th century is a benchmark in the pattern of population growth. Then, the upward surge in the numbers of people began. Just why the response to the early stirrings of the modern age was so rapid is not entirely clear, though many of the major factors which stimulated the increase in human numbers can be recognized. In Europe, the frightful famines and epidemics that marked the Dark Ages seem to have decreased, although hunger and disease were still endemic. The discovery of the New World opened the way for great transatlantic migrations to the rich, sparsely settled lands of the Americas. To some extent, this relieved the growing population pressure in Europe and provided a new source of food for the Old World. It also gave impetus to the tremendous growth of populations of European origin—at home and in European colonies—which amounted to a ninefold increase during the period.

TABLE III.—*Estimates of world population by regions, 1650–1960*

Source of estimates and date	Estimated population in millions							
	World	Africa	Northern America[1]	Latin America[2]	Asia (excluding U.S.S.R.)[3]	Europe and Asiatic U.S.S.R.[3]	Oceania	Area of European settlement[4]
Willcox's estimates:								
1650	470	100	1	7	257	103	2	113
1750	694	100	1	10	437	144	2	157
1800	919	100	6	23	595	193	2	224
1850	1,091	100	26	33	656	274	2	335
1900	1,571	141	81	63	857	423	6	573
Carr-Saunders' estimates:								
1650	545	100	1	12	327	103	2	118
1750	728	95	1	11	475	144	2	158
1800	906	90	6	19	597	192	2	219
1850	1,171	95	26	33	741	274	2	335
1900	1,608	120	81	63	915	423	6	573
United Nations estimates:								
1920	1,810	140	117	91	966	487	9	704
1930	2,013	155	135	109	1,072	532	10	786
1940	2,246	172	146	131	1,212	573	11	861
1950	2,495	200	167	163	1,376	576	13	919
1960	2,972	244	200	207	1,665	641		1,064

[1] United States, Canada, Alaska, St. Pierre, and Miquelon.

[2] Central and South America and Caribbean Islands.

[3] Estimates for Asia and Europe in Willcox's and Carr-Saunders' series have been adjusted so as to include the population of the Asiatic U.S.S.R. with that of Europe.

[4] Includes northern America, Latin America, Europe, and the Asiatic U.S.S.R. and Oceania.

The development of the scientific method and the application of this new knowledge to technology stimulated the industrial and vital revolutions which so greatly changed man's way of life throughout the Western World. The industrial revolution brought the transition from agrarian to industrial societies—a transition which is beginning only now for large areas of Africa, Asia, and Latin America. The vital revolution brought the Western industrial nations through the demographic transition: from high birth and death rates to low birth and death rates.

More facts and learned estimates concerning world population are available for this period since census taking began during the 17th century. The first censuses were conducted in 1655 by the French and British in their Canadian colonies. Iceland took a count in 1703, Sweden in 1748, and Denmark in 1769. The United States took its first national census in 1790. Great Britain took its first in 1801.

The first estimate of world population ever to be compiled was published in the 17th century by a Jesuit priest named Riccioli who estimated that 1 billion people then inhabited the earth: 100 million in Europe, 500 million in Asia, 100 million in Africa, 200 million in America, and 100 million in Oceania. It appears that Riccioli reported the conjectures of others rather than his own. Other contemporary estimates of the 17th century all range below Riccioli's and one as low as 320 million.

G. King, a 17th-century English scholar, estimating population densities for the various continents, allocated 17 acres per head for Europe, 20 for Asia, 64 for Africa, and 129 for America. This yielded a total of 700 million for the world, or 600 million, rejecting a hypothetical southern continent. If correct land areas as now known are substituted, the estimate would be 874 million. It should be noted that this estimate is two-thirds higher than the estimate of approximately 500 million accepted by modern scholars.

Even though Asia's population continued to increase during the period, its proportion of world population declined from about 58 percent in 1650 to 53 percent in 1920 (excluding the Asiatic part of the U.S.S.R.). Africa's proportion also declined, from 20 to 8 percent. But the proportion for Europe, including all of the U.S.S.R., rose from 20 to 27 percent. Since 1920, the proportion for Asia and Africa has again increased, while that for Europe has declined.

Today, the combined population of the Americas is about 400 million. Their proportion of world population increased from approximately 2 percent in 1650 to 14 percent at the present time. As previously mentioned, the indigenous American populations were heavily decimated by diseases brought in by Europeans and by wars with early colonizers. Much of the subsequent increase was due to immigration and to the proliferation of the immigrant groups. More recently, the descendants of the indigenous Americans have been increasing rapidly.

THE DEMOGRAPHIC TRANSITION OF PERIOD III

Application of the scientific method to medical technology brought man the ability to defer death. In the Western industrial countries, this has changed his pattern of survival far more rapidly than any other major social development throughout his long history. Similarly, in the Western World, knowledge about the control of fertility is widespread. As the traditional pattern of high birth and death rates changed to one of low birth and death rates, man's reproductive process has become much more efficient.

In the heavily populated, less developed countries of Africa, Asia, and Latin America, the application of scientific techniques to defer death is generally accepted and quite widely practiced; but the control of fertility has not begun to be practiced extensively enough to affect birth rates. As a result, rapidly falling death rates combined with traditionally high birth rates have touched off a surge in the rate of population growth.

Modern public health methods have cut death rates by one-third or more in a single year in some countries. With the drastic decline in infant and child mortality, the proportion of the population under 15 years of age tends to increase. It is now over 40 percent in many of these countries, as compared with about 20 percent in some countries of western and northern Europe.

It is expected that the growth rate will increase even further in many areas of Africa, Asia, and Latin America, as death rates continue to decline. This will surely happen unless effective measures can be devised which will speed up the demographic transition and the rate of social change. Simply stated, acceptable measures must be found to bring birth rates into balance with modern low death rates, thereby completing the demographic transition. Unless birth rates are reduced, population growth rates will continue upward until they are checked eventually by a rise in the death rate.

Although information about the number and distribution of the world's population and vital rates is far more extensive today than at any time in history, there are still large blank spaces in the world's demographic map. Only about half of the world's births and approximately two-thirds of the deaths are formally registered.

Discussing the present rapid rate of population growth, the latest United Nations Demographic Yearbook points out that approximately one-half of the world's population lives in only four countries—China (mainland), India, the U.S.S.R. and the United States—and that the reliability of world population estimates depends largely on the accuracy of the information available about the population of these countries:

"Similarly the 1950–59 average rate of increase, estimated in the range of 1.5 to 2.0 percent per annum for the four largest populations and 1.6 to 1.9 percent per annum for the remainder of the world, can be placed, in view of possibly compensating errors, between 1.6 and 1.9 percent per annum for the world as a whole.

TABLE IV.—*Estimated population and vital rates for the world by region, 1950–75*

Continent and region (1)	Midyear population, 1959 (millions) (2)	Annual rate of increase, 1950–59 (percent) (3)	Vital rates, 1955–59		Medium projection to 1975 (millions) (6)
			Birth rate (4)	Death rate (5)	
World total	2,907	1.7	36	19	3,830
Africa	237	1.9	46	27	303
Northern Africa	78	1.9	45	26	76
Tropical and southern Africa	159	1.9	47	28	226
America	398	2.1	34	14	543
Northern America	196	1.8	25	9	240
Middle America	65	2.7	45	18	99
South America	137	2.3	42	19	204
Asia	1,622	1.8	42	23	2,210
Southwest Asia	74	2.5	46	21	116
South Central Asia	546	1.8	44	26	737
Southeast Asia	208	2.1	44	23	280
East Asia	794	1.8	39	21	1,075
Europe	423	.8	19	10	476
Northern and Western Europe	141	.7	18	11	154
Central Europe	137	.8	19	10	156
Southern Europe	145	.9	21	10	166
Oceania	16	2.4	25	9	21
U.S.S.R.	211	1.7	25	8	275

"Actually in view of declining mortality, it is virtually certain that the rate of world population growth has now surpassed 1.5 percent per annum, and quite possible that it has attained 2 percent per annum. Because of this decline in mortality, world population certainly increased in the year 1959 by at least 45 million, and possibly by as much as 55 million. Again it is evident that much of the uncertainty is caused by the lack of precise knowledge regarding the population of China (mainland). Large margins of error must also be allowed for in the estimated annual increases in India, in other parts of Asia, and in Africa."

The Chinese census of 1953 is very difficult to appraise and might introduce an error of as much as 90 million in the present world population.

WHAT IS PAST IS PROLOG

Since man first appeared on earth, human arithmetic has moved from a relatively simple exercise in addition to a complicated one of geometric progression. It took all of the vast reaches of time to build today's population of slightly over 3 billion. But it will take only 40 more years for population to reach 6 billion, if the present growth rates remain unchanged.

Life on this earth was a precarious gamble for homo sapiens for hundreds of thousands of years. Driven by his natural reluctance to endure an early death, man ultimately discovered and then perfected the power to defer death. That he has succeeded is a notable tribute to his genius and to his humanitarian and philanthropic instincts.

It is noteworthy that the desire to control fertility has never had the emotional imperatives which brought the power over death. Only modest efforts have been made thus far to discover effective methods of fertility control which would be acceptable to the people of all cultures and religions. Less than modest efforts have been made to disseminate what knowledge is now available to all of the world's people who would benefit from that knowledge. Consequently, during the past decade of rapid death-rate decline in the less developed countries, there has been no measurable reduction in high birth rates; so population growth has increased.

Rapid population growth cannot be maintained indefinitely in any part of the world. If birth rates do not decline in overcrowded lands, death rates eventually will rise to check growth.

The gulf which exists today between the peoples of the world has widened: life is better than ever before for those who live in the Western industrial countries. But the majority of the world's people still live close to the subsistence level, in poverty and squalor reminiscent of the Middle Ages. If the demographic transition to a balance between low birth and death rates could be hastened in the less developed countries, this gulf might yet be bridged in time to avert a Malthusian disaster.

APPENDIX

The statistical and general demographic assumptions used to determine the number of people who have ever been born were provided the Population Reference Bureau by J. Fletcher Wellemeyer, an independent manpower consultant, Washington, D.C., in consultation with Frank Lorimer, American University, Washington, D.C.

The estimate was made on the basis of three time periods:

Period	Number of years in period	Number of births per year at beginning of period	Number of births per year at end of period	Number of births in period (billions)
I. 600000–6000 B.C.	594,000	"1"	250,000	12
II. 6000 B.C.–A.D. 1650	7,650	250,000	25,000,000	42
III. A.D. 1650–1962	312	25,000,000	110,000,000	23
Total				77

To obtain the number of births at the beginning and end of these periods, certain assumptions were made regarding birth rates and the size of populations. It was assumed that at the beginning of the Neolithic era the population was 5 million and that the annual birth rate was 50 per thousand. The procedure assumes a smooth increase. The growth was undoubtedly irregular, but the estimates may fairly represent the net effect of the ups and downs.

By 1650, the annual number of births was estimated at 25 million, corresponding to a population of about 500 million. The 1962 world population of 3.05 billion, the number of births and birth rate of 36 per thousand are based on United Nations estimates.

The 600,000 years' duration of the Paleolithic era is based on the assumption that manlike types were then in existence but in very small numbers. Earlier dates have been given a few species by certain authorities, but some of these dates are questionable, and the earlier species may have been considerably less than manlike. The 600,000-year period seems a reasonable compromise between extreme possibilities.

Once the number of births at the dates indicated was determined, the total number of births for each period was calculated at a constant rate of increase for the period.

The estimated rates of increase differ sharply. For the long Paleolithic period, the average annual rate of increase was only 0.02 per thousand; during 6000 B.C. to A.D. 1650, it rose to 0.6; and during 1650–1962, it reached 4.35.

For the figures derived here, the following equation was used:

$$\Sigma B_t = \frac{B_o e^{rt}}{r}$$

B_o is the number of births per year at the beginning of the period; t is the number of years in the period; e is the base of natural logarithms; and r is the annual rate of increase during the period.

The value of r is obtained by solving for r the equation:

$$\frac{B_t}{B_o} = e^{rt}$$

where B_o is the number of births the first year of the period, and B_t is the number of births the final year of the period.

GREATER INDUSTRIAL USES OF FARM SURPLUSES

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, on January 31 I spoke on this floor in reference to greater industrial uses of our farm surpluses. I then pointed out that there were literally hundreds of possibilities in industry for the use of these burdensome surpluses, including two important items such as building construction and highway construction.

At that time I also discussed the possibility of alcohol from grains being used as a motor fuel.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a letter written by Milburn Petty and published in the Oil Daily of February 5, 1962.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PETTY'S OIL LETTER

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
February 3, 1962.

DEAR SIR: Some farm-State Senators just won't quit on the idea of using surplus farm crops to make alcohol, which could then be blended into gasoline as a motor fuel.

Some of these Senators, notably CAPEHART, Republican, of Indiana, and CURTIS, Republican, of Nebraska, are engaged again in their biennial effort to stimulate legislation for more research on how an alky-gas program might be set up. (A research bill, S. 2759, is on the Senate table, awaiting more sponsors.)

Five years ago, a Presidential commission made a thorough study of the possibilities along this line and concluded that "the Commission finds it impracticable to recommend an alcohol motor fuel program," and commented that this finding would probably not be changed by more studies in the future.

But, the prospects for alky-gas always appear good on paper and in theory—making for good politics in the farm belt—so no one should be surprised if another research program is set up to go over the ground again.

The idea of alky-gas is so attractive because an alcohol blend of under 10 percent would consume an enormous amount of grain—and such a program would probably wipe out the entire grain surplus.

The 1957 Presidential Commission, however, found that no blend of less than 10 percent would be practical, that this would require over 2 billion bushels of grain—more than was available in surplus then—and that plants to process such an amount would cost about $2 billion—and would probably have to be built by the Government—and that total cost to the public, in higher prices for gasoline alone, would be over $1 billion a year.

Major problem involved in making cheap alcohol from grain is to remove the protein before fermentation of starch for alcohol (or before starch is taken out for other industrial uses) in order to upgrade the protein into a human food. If this problem could be licked, the resulting alcohol would be a byproduct, with the cost then low enough to compete with oil in making gasoline.

The Presidential Commission acknowledged that a vigorous research program might find a solution to the problem and that possibly the byproduct alcohol cost might be low enough to compete with petroleum.

On the Senate floor, Senator CURTIS pushed for a new research effort on the protein extraction problem—saying (as he has many times in the past): "It has long been my hope we could use alcohol produced from grain as a part of our motor fuel."

He said that "improved methods" of upgrading the protein for humans would make protein worth many times its value as a livestock food and that the alcohol will then "become more or less a byproduct and it can be sold at a price to compete with gasoline."

CURTIS said oil companies "have no valid ground for alarm over the inauguration of such a program"—the petroleum industry should be interested in solving the farm problem (which is a big item in the Government's budget)—and farmers are oil's best customers. CURTIS also asserted that alky-gas would still be distributed by the petroleum industry and that "they (oil companies) will not lose—rather they will gain."

Very truly yours,

MILBURN PETTY.
JAMES M. COLLINS.

Mr. CURTIS. We welcome the comment and interest of these spokesmen for the petroleum industry. There is no conflict of interest between the farmers who want an outlet for their surpluses and the petroleum industry when all the facts are in.

THE CASE OF WILLIAM A. WIELAND

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I want to say for the record that I am glad the Internal Security Subcommittee is pursuing an inquiry into the State Department security risk cases identified by Reporter Sarah McClendon at the President's news conference January 24, 1962.

The case of William A. Wieland especially deserves the closest possible investigation. Here is a man, a State Department official, who has been denounced by four former U.S. Ambassadors in public testimony as untrustworthy, incompetent, a supporter of leftist elements in Latin America, and as instrumental in the fall of Cuba to communism.

I regret that the President saw fit to leap to the defense of accused security risks in such an impetuous fashion. I am sorry that he turned aside Mrs. McClendon's question in such a manner as to cause it to be interpreted as a rebuke.

As the Kilgore (Tex.) News-Herald commented:

> Press conferences are for asking questions, not sweeping them under the rug. If there are any more questions about security risks, let them be asked, even at the risk of rebukes. The Nation needs to know about such things.

I believe that the majority of Americans share my concern regarding this incident. I believe they share my concern about accused and known security risks occupying important positions in the State Department.

My mail has been heavy in quantity and 100 percent in support of Mrs. McClendon's inquiry into these State Department security cases. I have heard that White House mail has predominately supported Mrs. McClendon. I have been advised that the various press headquarters in Washington have received mail addressed to Mrs. McClendon, supporting her.

I quote the following excerpts from mail received in my office:

Long Beach, Calif.:

> Mrs. Sarah McClendon, by her courageous action, has opened the door for a long overdue probe of the State Department.

Midland, Tex.:

> Your fellow Texan, Sarah McClendon, asked President Kennedy the $64,000 question that has been a matter of concern for years to those of us who are fearful of our State Department in these perilous times.

Venice, Calif.:

> Heartiest congratulations plus to Sarah McClendon.

San Diego, Calif.:

> Sarah McClendon's questions should be the wedge to open all doors. Offer a bill to give her the DSC or DSM.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place several articles and editorials on this subject in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the articles and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Omaha World-Herald, Jan. 30, 1962]

THE WIELAND AFFAIR

One year ago this month the conservative magazine National Review charged that a man who went by the name of Arturo Guillermo Montenegro was once a terrorist in Cuba, and that with the backing of Franklin Roosevelt's Under Secretary of State, Sumner Welles, this man rose rapidly in the State Department to become head of the Caribbean desk under his real name, William Arthur Wieland.

National Review also said that two former Ambassadors to Cuba had linked Mr. Wieland to the Castro takeover. The magazine said Arthur Gardner had told the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee that William Wieland had supported leftist elements in Latin America and had contended that the Castro movement was not Communist. Earl T. Smith said Mr. Wieland was a Castro admirer.

Robert C. Hill, former Ambassador to Mexico, testified that Mr. Wieland was neither a competent officer nor a man who could be trusted. And William D. Pawley, former Ambassador to Brazil and Peru, said Mr. Wieland's activities in Rio de Janeiro were "of a nature that was displeasing to me although there was nothing specific I could put my hands on."

This was apparently the extent of published information which was derogatory to Mr. Wieland until Correspondent Sarah McClendon identified him at a Presidential press conference last week as one of two well-known security risks. The President denied the two men were security risks, and said he hoped Mrs. McClendon's question had not done harm to the men's reputations.

We surmise that those sharp words will not mark the end of the Wieland affair. The American people are entitled to know more about this man's background. If it is as clear and clean as the President says, Mr. Wieland will have nothing to lose and much to gain by a full revelation of his past.

[From the El Paso Times]

EVERYDAY EVENTS

(By W. J. Hooten)

Sarah McClendon, who has been Washington correspondent for the Times since 1947, found herself in the news again as the result of asking a question of President Kennedy at his press conference last week.

Which caused Associated Press Writer Arthur L. Edson to observe:

"Nobody—especially a President of the United States—has ever been able to ignore Sarah McClendon.

"This plump, reddish-haired correspondent for 14 newspapers from Texas to New England has always had a knack for irritating a Chief Executive."

Writing about Sarah at the Presidential press conferences, Edson said:

"In theory a President can answer or ignore anyone he wants to.

"In practice he usually recognizes the most persistent and the loudest.

"Here Sarah McClendon was in her element.

"She usually gets a seat up near the front, and leaps quickly to her feet. Possibly no reporter has asked as many questions as she has.

"Former President Dwight D. Eisenhower used to seem particularly nettled by her, and—or so it seemed to other reporters—he would play little games by pointing to those around her and acting as if he didn't see her at all.

"But, sooner or later, her persistence paid off, and he would nod her way."

It is difficult to decide whether AP Writer Edson was being complimentary to Sarah McClendon, or whether he was just doing some factual reporting the way he saw it.

GETS ENCOURAGEMENT

After Sarah's brush with President Kennedy last week she wrote me that telegrams and long-distance calls of congratulations and encouragement came from all parts of the country. She said several offers of "money if needed" were made. She wrote that a member of the New York Stock Exchange interrupted transactions "on the floor" to call to offer backing and to say, "If you need money let me know."

A group of women in Mesa, Ariz., called Sarah to offer their encouragement and added, "If you need any letters written, let us know."

A STANCH DEMOCRAT

I have known Sarah McClendon personally for 15 years. I admire her spunk, although at times I fear she is a little persistent at Presidential press conferences.

I'm wondering what her brush with President Kennedy will bring. Sarah is a stanch Democrat and she was for Kennedy even before he received the nomination.

Mrs. McClendon Versus J.F.K.

(By Holmes Alexander)

President Kennedy held his 21st Presidential news conference January 24, and it was a so-so performance.

Not even a cub reporter would write such a lead as that—a stale, listless, so-what sentence—but I have a reason. A whole lot of daily reporters praised Mr. Kennedy's last performance (James Reston of the New York Times said J.F.K. was "in his glory") so far beyond its merits that the bug of suspicion begins to bite.

What goes on here? A cult of the personality? A conspiracy of illusion about the Emperor's new clothes? Murray Marder of the Washington Post and Bill Knighton of the Baltimore Sun were among those who overpraised the handsome, articulate, popular world-famous young man who is often brilliant but who, last week (and the week before) was in a conspicuous slump.

His most publicized rejoinder to Reporter Sarah McClendon was not the icy, sharp, shrewd riposte which some front-page accounts made it appear. Mrs. McClendon got by far the better of the exchange. She mentioned "two well-known security risks" and instantly named them when the President challenged her. She was taloned and merciless for the kill. He was flustered and so much on the defensive that his grammar and sequence broke down, giving me a nostalgic sense of return to the Eisenhower era.

Moreover, for the first time in anybody's memory, the conference was abruptly terminated nearly 5 minutes ahead of the customary half hour. To the astonishment of all around me, there came an abrupt, "Thank you, Mr. President," almost as if Press Secretary Salinger had signaled from the stage for somebody to get his man out of the ring.

While the President quit early, Mrs. McClendon was quickly surrounded by a stellar group of reporters, led by Eddie Folliard, of the Washington Post, and Bob Donovan, of the New York Herald Tribune, who drafted her for an impromptu press conference of her own.

Mr. Kennedy's admirers in the press credited him with quick thinking in coming to the defense of William Arthur Wieland and J. Clayton Miller, who Mrs. McClendon named as "security risks." My opinion is that Mr. Kennedy made one of the big blunders of his White House career. J. Clayton Miller is a new man in town, but William Arthur Wieland, whatever his official security rating, is almost indefensible as a State Department public servant.

No less than four former ambassadors—Smith, Pawley, Gardiner, and Hill—have denounced Wieland by name as instrumental in the fall of Cuba to communism. Both the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations have found Wieland to be an embarrassment and have tried to hide him in the State Department's organizational maze. Wieland is an ex-newspaperman who left journalism and entered diplomacy under circumstances that the President of the United States ought not to be defending. Had Mr. Kennedy, a former member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and a former newsman, really been as informed and quick-witted as ballyhooed in the press notices, he would have known enough about Wieland to play this one some other way.

When Mr. Kennedy is good in a press conference, he is very, very good, and he is never really bad except by his own high standards. He pays the penalty extracted from all champions and artists of being under pressure to deliver a masterpiece at every attempt. Perhaps it is uncharitable to hold a top national leader up to tests that are not by any means the full measurement of his powers and performance.

But the point is that his strikeouts, ought to be reported as faithfully as his home runs—for a very special reason. It is an open secret that Mr. Kennedy plays favorites, bringing writers and publishers as guests to the White House, thereby setting up a situation for reciprocal trade of favors. Already it is routine conversation at the National Press Club to speculate whether an extreme "snow job" column of flattery by a non-Kennedy columnist, or a cozy, "inside" think piece by an influential journalist, is a bread-and-butter note.

There is no harm, and a lot of good, in the President's consorting with newspaper friends. But let's not permit sweet friendship to cloy the acid of skepticism in which every political writer's pen should be dipped.

[From the Kilgore (Tex.) News Herald, Jan. 28, 1962]

Ask a Question

Most Presidential press conferences are pretty dull stuff so far as producing anything new for the reader. Questions are anticipated and the President, who has been briefed, has a ready answer.

It's the unexpected, and sometimes critical, question that upsets a President, as President Kennedy was upset when Reporter Sarah McClendon indicated that two well-known security risks had been put on a State Department task force to help reorganize its security office. In the flareup, much was made of Kennedy rebuking the reporter, and how irked he was over the incident. In this case, the feelings of President Kennedy are of little consequence, and even any detriment to the character of the men in question is not as important as any possible detriment to the Nation's interests. The point is that if there is any possibility of security risks being on the administration's staff, such a question as posed by the reporter is pertinent. Press conferences are for asking questions, not sweeping them under the rug. If there are any more questions about security risks, let them be asked, even at the risk of rebukes. The Nation needs to know about such things.

SOLUTION TO PROBLEMS OF FREEDOM

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, recently, I had an opportunity to read some excerpts from a speech given by Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., before the California Federation of Young Democrats. As usual, I found Mr. Schlesinger's remarks profound and stimulating. In his most thoughtful address, he stresses that there are no easy answers to the challenges which face us around the world today.

Mr. President, it is indeed the time to beware of false prophets and those who promise snappy or back-of-the-book solutions for the struggle for freedom. It gives me great pleasure to ask unanimous consent that excerpts from Mr. Arthur Schlesinger, Jr.'s, brilliant address before the California Federation of Young Democrats be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

No Back-of-the-Book Solutions in Freedom

(By Arthur Schlesinger, Jr.)

I am glad to see that the theme of your convention is "The Cost of Freedom," for a pervading illusion of the 19th century was that freedom was free, a costless benefit guaranteed by history to all virtuous and respectable men. We know now that freedom is much more complicated than that.

Instead of being the natural condition of man and society, freedom is something that a few men in a few places have achieved through effort, dedication, self-discipline and social ingenuity. Freedom is the exception in history, not the rule; it is what men seek rather than what they have.

But they seek it nonetheless, and therein lies the hope for humanity. The instinct for self-fulfillment through free choice is obviously rooted deep in the human condition. It grows in vigor as education and economic growth and political responsibility liberate man from the chains into which most men are still born.

A FEARFUL BURDEN

Freedom is not only hard to get; it is hard to keep. The preservation of freedom requires the fashioning of institutions strong enough to preserve continuity, flexible enough to acknowledge change, resilient enough to transmit vitality and challenging enough to stimulate creativity. It requires, in short, a varied and subtle social discipline.

But it also requires self-discipline—because freedom emancipates man from external authority and thereby concentrates the obligation of responsibility on his own mind and his own conscience. "Liberty means responsibility," said Bernard Shaw. "That is why most men dread it."

Some men have found the strain of freedom intolerable. "Men will cry aloud at last," Dostoievsky's Grand Inquisitor warns us, "that the truth is not in freedom, for the fearful burden of free choice imposes too many cares, too many unanswerable anxieties."

To be free is to choose; and to choose is to make up one's mind; and to make up one's own mind in the whirling universe in which we live is to indulge in the most painful and hazardous of pastimes—that is, the taking of thought. This is perhaps the harshest cost of freedom.

Cogito, ergo sum, said Descartes; to think is to think for oneself and to define oneself by the thought. Those who let others do their thinking for them have ceased to be free.

But the act of thought imposes its own responsibility. To think effectively is to think honestly, soberly, carefully, intelligently. Thought is one thing, emotional self-indulgence is another. Responsible democracy requires that the two be not confused.

If I were asked to suggest the first cost of freedom, I would say that it is the renunciation of easy solutions. The mark of the dogmatist is that he is still in grade school and thinks he can find all the answers in the back of the book. He knows the truth, and everyone who rejects his truth is either a knave or a fool.

Every irritation in life, he believes, has a simple cause; every obstacle a simple explanation; every problem a simple solution. One remembers Mr. Dooley's definition of the fanatic as "a man who does what he thinks th' Lord wud do if He only knew th' facts in th' case."

THE FOOLISH FEW

As a people, we are dedicated to free choice, and we can therefore hardly complain if some of our fellow citizens choose foolishly. Throughout our history there have been those who supposed that the Republic was in some terrible danger perpetrated by a clique of sinister conspirators.

In the 1820's, honest men tried to save us from the conspiracy of the Masons. In the 1850's, the Know-Nothings tried to save us from the immigrant conspiracy. In the 1890's, the American Protective Association tried to save us from the Catholic conspiracy. In the 1920's, the Klu Klux Klan tried to save us from a conspiracy of Catholics and Jews and Negroes. In the 1930's, the American Liberty League tried to save us from the radicals. In the 1940's, the America First Committee tried to save us from the interventionists. And today the John Birch Society tries to save us from the graduated income tax, Chief Justice Warren, the fluoridation of water and the 20th century.

I would be disappointed if, in a nation of 180 million, we did not have our quota of eccentrics and extremists. This is a cost of freedom. As Ed Howe, of Kansas, said years ago, "I express many absurd opinions. But I am not the first man to do it; American freedom consists largely in talking nonsense."

But I would be disappointed, too, if many people found solace in such views. For the conspiratorial theory of history is always wrong—and it is often the first symptom of paranoia. Devotees of this theory assume that history has reached its fulfillment in the world to which they are accustomed or, preferably, in some idyllic earlier period, such as the administration of William McKinley.

They regard change beyond this as the product of someone's malevolence—as the result of the secret machinations of a wicked inner ring. But they cannot withstand the rush of history. They are all, in the end, followers of King Canute, who, according to the old legend, went down to the beach and commanded the tide not to come in.

American conservatism, from the beginning of the Republic, has enjoyed the Canute complex—and has suffered Canute's fate. It resisted the extension of the suffrage. It resisted the admission of new States to the West. It resisted the abolition of slavery. It resisted the establishment of national control over the trusts. It resisted the construction of machinery to control the cycle of boom and bust. It resisted social security and unemployment compensation and minimum wages. And today it resists Federal aid to education and health assistance to the aged and tax reform and effective action on conservation and civil rights.

If anything were predictable about this present time, it is the recrudescence of this rightwing extremism. In conservative times, the radical right is dormant and disorganized, because it is always hopeful that a conservative administration will do something it wants. But when a liberal administration is in power, the radical right becomes agitated and vociferous.

President Kennedy faces in the 1960's precisely the same situation that President Roosevelt faced in the mid-1930's and that President Truman faced in the early 1950's. Only, the radical right of today does not have leadership remotely comparable in skill or appeal to that provided by such paladins of the past as Huey Long, Father Coughlin, or Joe McCarthy. It is hard for me to believe that America is in serious danger from a movement whose leader has dedicated himself to the thesis that Dwight Eisenhower is a dedicated, conscious agent of the Communist conspiracy.

This rightwing revival is thus the conditioned reflex of extreme conservatives in a liberal age. And the fact of the cold war, by intensifying the national anxieties, has, of course, intensified the passion for quick and comfortable conclusions.

The cold war is long, slow, and agonizing. It is an ordeal of frustration. It is unbearable for those who seek simple answers and final solutions in a complex and ambiguous world. The rightwing extremism of our day is, above all, an expression of cold-war battle fatigue.

But let us not suppose that all the extremism—all the confidence in the answers at the back of the book—all the faith in simple answers and final solutions—is the property of the radical right. There are those supposedly on the liberal side who seem equally wedded to the conspiratorial theory of history, equally obsessed with primer answers to insoluble questions, equally persuaded that they are in unique and miraculous possession of the truth.

Whenever I hear talk, for example, of "the power elite," I know that I am in the presence of a mirror image of the John Birch Society. The notion that a conspiracy of bankers and generals controls our destiny is as nutty as the notion that it is controlled by Walter Reuther and the officials of the ADA.

There are some who feel that all the world's troubles would be over if we only resigned from the arms race with the Soviet Union. Their view, as I understand it, is that our economic system requires us to invent an antagonism with the U.S.S.R. in order to maintain profits in our own economy; and that if we would only stop all this nonsense about maintaining our nuclear strength, the Communist world would relax its hostilities and peace would descend on long-suffering mankind.

Let us first consider the economic arguments. From 1945 to 1946, the total Government purchases of goods and services in the United States declined, with the end of World War II, from $82.9 billion to $30.8 billion. This was a drop of over $50 billion at a time when the total gross national product was only a little over $200 billion. The decline in Government spending then was, in short, about 25 percent of the gross national product—and our economy rose to take up the slack.

An equivalent decline today would be over $130 billion—which is almost three times the size of our defense budget and half again as large as our total Federal budget. The American economy would thus in no circumstances have to meet a decline in public spending comparable to that which is survived in 1945–46.

And if all present defense spending should cease tomorrow, the American economy, which survived a decline in public spending amounting to one-quarter of the gross national product in 1946, could certainly survive a drop in public spending amounting to one-eleventh of our gross national product today. The argument that our economy requires the cold war is, in short, a phony.

Let us look now at the second half of this case—that if we would only abandon the arms race, then all problems of world tension would vanish. The premise is, of course, that the cold war is an American initiative and that Soviet policy is purely defensive. But very little in the history of the years since the end of World War II substantiates this premise.

In 1945 we began the demobilization of the greatest military force known to history. In 1946 we offered to share our atomic monopoly with the United Nations. In 1947 we invited the Soviet Union to join with us in the Marshall plan. And through these years the Soviet Union made clear its ineradicable view—a view rooted in its theory of history—that any society based on a system of mixed ownership is inherently evil and inherently a threat to the peace.

In the years since, the Soviet Union has gone even further. It has made abundantly clear that even societies based on systems of Communist ownership are unacceptable, like Yugoslavia and Albania, unless they bow to Soviet views on questions of foreign policy.

The only lasting hope for a relaxation of tensions lies in the establishment of a system of general and complete disarmament. One great issue confronting us today is how we may best negotiate an effective disarmament agreement. Those who object to our defense budget evidently assume that, if we were to permit the Soviet Union to achieve a decisive margin of military advantage, the Soviet Union would reward us by suddenly accepting a program of effective world disarmament.

As a historian, I find it hard to understand how—in view of a sequence of international actions from the Stalin-Hitler pact of 1939 to the resumption of nuclear testing in 1961—anyone can suppose that the Soviet Union is animated by anything but an aggressive conception of its own interests. There is only one way in which we can persuade the Soviet Union that it must submit to a program of international arms inspection and control—that is, by persuading the Soviet leaders that we can stay in the arms race as long as they can. If we abandon the arms race and concede the Communists' military superiority, we remove the incentive which might induce them to accept a meaningful plan of disarmament.

To persist in piling up the weapons of mass destruction is a tragic choice. But we live in a world of tragic choices, and there is no point in kidding ourselves that painful problems have painless solutions. It is an irony of our times that the arms race offers the only road to arms control and that our own resignation from the arms race is the one sure way to make certain that we will never attain the universal disarmament which must be the lasting foundation of world peace.

TRIBUTE TO JAMES V. BENNETT, DIRECTOR, U.S. BUREAU OF PRISONS

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, James V. Bennett, a fellow Rhode Islander, recently celebrated his 25th anniversary as Director of the U.S. Bureau of Prisons. Since the passage of the legislation which created the Bureau—legislation which he helped to write—he has made our Federal penal system a model for all others to follow.

His creative intelligence and his perseverance have contributed to our major advances in this field. Our Federal prisons now provide vocational training and rehabilitation services; the open prison is Mr. Bennett's innovation.

He played a large part in writing subsequent legislation in this field: the Federal Juvenile Delinquency Act of 1938 and the Federal Youth Correction Act of 1950 resulted from his wholehearted efforts. Mr. Bennett has also worked with the United Nations to improve prison standards throughout the world.

All told, James V. Bennett has provided and will continue to provide valuable services to our country. He has many plans for the future, and I am sure that they will be as successful as were those in the past. It is a pleasure for me to salute this most distinguished Rhode Islander today.

THE QUESTION OF ROBERT WELCH

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, National Review magazine, a leading exponent of and spokesman for the growing strength of political conservatism in America, has detailed and documented an airtight case in its criticism of Robert Welch, founder of the John Birch Society. The National Review editorial, to which I refer, is a courageous and responsible analysis, and I wish to associate myself with its conclusions.

I ask unanimous consent to place in the Record, following these remarks, an editorial from the February 13 edition of National Review.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE QUESTION OF ROBERT WELCH

In the past few weeks a number of conservative spokesmen whose credentials and sincerity are unassailable have made public statements about Mr. Robert Welch, founder of the John Birch Society, calling into question his qualifications to lead a national anti-Communist and antistatist movement. Russell Kirk, replying to a letter addressed to him by an executive of the John Birch Society, writes that he knows Mr. Welch to be a likable, honest, courageous, energetic man who nevertheless by silliness and injustice of utterance has become the kiss of death for any conservative enterprise. Congressman Walter Judd said in Minneapolis that he considers Mr. Welch's judgment so flawed as to disqualify him from leadership of an effective anti-Communist movement. Senator Barry Goldwater said he feels Mr. Welch should resign; and, should he refuse to do so, the society should disband and reorganize under different leadership. Fulton Lewis, Jr., at the Human Events Conference in Washington, criticized Mr. Welch's direction of the society. And, it is widely known, some members of the national council of the John Birch Society are at their wits' end, and one or two have quietly resigned. Their dilemma is, reduced to the simplest terms: How can the John Birch Society be an effective political instrument while it is led by a man whose views on current affairs are, at so many critical points, so critically different from their own, and, for that matter, so far removed from commonsense?

That dilemma weighs on conservatives throughout America. It is not a dilemma imposed by the pressure of liberal or Communist objections to Mr. Welch. If not a single criticism had been made of Mr. Welch by the liberal press, the dilemma would exist just the same, and conservatives sooner or later would have to face it. Months before the liberals even heard of Mr. Welch, many of his associates and enthusiasts were urging Mr. Welch to reshape his views, and they proceeded on the assumption that in due course he would. The underlying problem is whether conservatives can continue to acquiesce tacitly in a rendition of the causes of the decline of the Republic and the entire Western World which is false, and besides that, crucially different in practical emphasis from their own. It is unlikely that Barry Goldwater, the political leader of the conservative and anti-Communist movement in America; that Walter Judd, one of anti-communism's most eloquent and unyielding spokesman; that Fulton Lewis, Jr., among the most obdurate opponents of communism abroad and statism at home; that Russell Kirk, whose books have done more to reanimate a full-bodied conservatism than anyone else's; or indeed that National Review, whose editors are lifetime students of communism and liberalism, could be stampeded by the liberal juggernaut into unnecessary collisions with a man who is engaged in furthering conservative ends. These men have not bent under public pressure before, and are not likely to. Yet their opinion—our opinion—is that Robert Welch is damaging the cause of anticommunism.

Why?

Because he persists in distorting reality and in refusing to make the crucial moral and political distinction. And unless that distinction is reckoned with, the mind freezes, and we become consumed in empty rages. The distinction is between (1) an active pro-Communist, and (2) an ineffectually anti-Communist liberal.

It is widely known that Mr. Welch wrote a tract in which he declared that, among others, Mr. Eisenhower, his brother Milton, and the Dulles brothers were Communists. It is assumed by the overwhelming majority of the membership of the John Birch Society, who implicitly reject the accusation against Eisenhower and others (just as the council of the John Birch Society explicitly rejected the accusation when, a year ago, it was publicly brought to light), that Mr. Welch's charges were merely personal political speculation, of no bearing whatever on the John Birch Society and its activities. That is a crucial misapprehension. Although the work on Mr. Eisenhower (sometimes it is called The Politician, sometimes the Black Book) was indeed written before the John Birch Society was founded, it was circulated right up until a year ago to select members of the society as, by implication, the ultimate insight of the founder and leader of the John Birch Society. Mr. Welch has never disavowed the book, and for obvious reasons: it can be demonstrated, by quotations from his current writings, that the Black Book's central thesis (that the Government of the United States has been "under operational control of the Communist Party"—words he used publicly in the summer of 1960) continues to govern his thinking even today.

A member of the John Birch Society is entitled to observe, as so many of them, men and women of high character and purpose have done: "But I don't believe in any such nonsense—what has it all to do with the John Birch Society, of which I am a member?" It has this to do with it: the premises of the Eisenhower book are identical with the premises that underlie current statements by Mr. Welch on contemporary affairs, and continue to guide his practical leadership of the society.

For instance, a few weeks ago Mr. Welch gave an interview to the Boston Herald at which he commented on the Cuban fiasco last spring. "The Cuban invasion," said Mr. Welch, "was a plot by Fidel Castro and his friends in the U.S. Government. The invasion was planned by Castro and his friends in our Government to make Castro stronger throughout Latin America [and to] reduce U.S. prestige."

But in fact, as everyone including Mr. Welch knows, the so-called invasion of Cuba was planned by the Eisenhower administration, and endorsed by Eisenhower himself, reaffirmed by the Kennedy administration and by Kennedy himself, and executed by the Kennedy administration. What went wrong is that John Kennedy's will failed him at the crucial hour, when he gave orders to deprive the invading force of the military support which alone could have brought liberation. "The responsibility I take for myself," said Mr. Kennedy after the catastrophe. But if, as Mr. Welch alleges, the invasion was, in plan and execution, a Communist plot, how can it otherwise be deduced than that Eisenhower—and for that matter Kennedy—are pro-Communist?

Mr. Welch's annual Scoreboard, published in a summer issue of American Opinion, Mr. Welch's public journal, has for several years listed the United States as "40–60 percent" Communist-controlled. And this past summer Mr. Welch raised the figure to "50–70+". That is to say, he is reaffirming his belief that, to quote again his own words, "the Government of the United States is under operational control of the Communist Party." That was the thesis of the Black Book.

What is more, Mr. Welch brooks no disagreement on his central thesis. He does not require of his members that they expressly accept it—they would leave his society in droves if he did. But in his communications and editorials he is constantly putting forward his thesis, sometimes directly, sometimes indirectly, and always excluding disagreement with it as nonrational or treasonable. "We wrote in 1951," Mr. Welch says in the current (January) issue of American Opinion, "the truth concerning Tito. We said that he always had been, still was, and would remain, a faithful Communist agent of the Kremlin. That his break with Stalin was completely stage-managed and phony * * * And we outlined the facts and considerations which made such a conclusion inescapable to anybody who cared about the truth."

Now, there are others than Mr. Welch who care for the truth, who are very anti-Communist indeed, and who have followed Tito's career perhaps longer and more closely than Mr. Welch, but who would nevertheless reject these inflated sentences. National Review, for instance, has always believed that Tito is and remains a dedicated Communist and as such can never be a friend or ally of the West. But the relationship between Tito and Stalin, and between Tito and Khrushchev, has been very complex, and not conceivably to be reduced to the simple dependence of puppet on puppetmaster. Over the years men as stanchly anti-Communist and as diligent in the pursuit of truth in international affairs as John Foster Dulles, Senator Robert A. Taft, Prof. Gerhart Niemeyer, Frank Meyer, and James Burnham, have seen that there were schismatical strains in Titoism of a kind that we should try to exploit—and at times have succeeded in exploiting, as we did in bringing the Greek civil war to a conclusion that would not have been possible if Tito's break with Stalin had been a total fraud; that the rupture between Tito and Moscow was by no means illusory in the sense of being artificially stage-managed, but illusory only is we deceive ourselves into thinking that because of this rupture within the Communist camp Tito could be regarded as our ally.

But Mr. Welch will not tolerate such distinctions. He anathematizes all who disagree with him. "Terrific strong support [was] given to Tito, as [an alleged] defector to and friend of the West, by Life and Time; not being readers of either magazine, we did not then realize the part being so frequently played by the Luce publications in spreading the Communist line." In other words, Time and Life are not merely notoriously unreliable exegetes of a purposive anti-Communist position (on which proposition one might agree) but, by Mr. Welch's innuendo, they are compliant, if not intentional, purveyors of a pro-Communist line.

Mr. Welch continues his survey: "Practically by the time [American Opinion] began publication we pointed out that Nehru of India and Nasser of Egypt were every bit as completely Communist agents of the Kremlin as Mao Tse-tung. We supplied as many of the facts, and as much of the history of each man, as could be assembled in the space we had available, to show that any other conclusion in each case was absurd." "The notion that Nasser is an agent of the Kremlin," Russell Kirk recently wrote in his letter analyzing Mr. Welch's "erratic intuitions," is capricious. "One does not have to be a Communist to be a scoundrel. Anyone familiar with Arab nationalism will regard this allegation with contempt." Nasser has certainly exposed himself to Communist opportunism (so, on several occasions, did Dulles); it does not follow he (or Dulles) has been a Communist agent.

"In the fall of 1956," Mr. Welch continues, "we pointed out that both revolts in [Poland and Hungary] had been deliberately precipitated by the Kremlin for its own purpose." Thus, stunned, we are expected to believe that the Polish and Hungarian uprisings were not spontaneous and heroic revolts against Communist tyranny, the results of an exploding human spirit, but mere Communist theater. And this we are expected to believe, notwithstanding the self-evident facts of the situation and the abundant testimony to the contrary of survivors of these uprisings against tyranny, which embarrassed Khrushchev more than any events in modern Communist history. We are, in sum, asked to believe that Khrushchev engineered his own embarrassment.

You name him, if he disagrees strongly, he's most likely on the other side. Our CIA is pro-Communist, says Welch—and he doesn't say it only in his Black Book, but in the current issue of American Opinion, and in the issue before. "You must realize," he wrote in the December issue, "the CIA is on the [Communist] side." In the current issue he refers to "Kwame Nkrumah, Sekou Touré, our CIA, and all of the other Communist and pro-Communist troublemakers." Our State Department? "One whole year before the Communist-fomented and Communist-led revolt, supported in every practicable way by our State Department, succeeded in overthrowing Syngman Rhee in South Korea," i.e., our State Department (undoubtedly the world's most maladroit) desires (for Mr. Welch implies that the character of the insurrectionary movement was translucent) to further pro-Communist ends. (Actually, Syngman Rhee was overthrown by a military junta whose principal agent was a stanch anti-Communist.) The press? "The Communist bosses themselves obviously felt that their control of the American Government and of our media of mass communication was sufficiently complete to make even this drastic move [Castro's takeover in Cuba] safe." Control, mind you. And again, no disagreement is tolerable: "This article [written about Castro by Mr. Welch], we believe we can say with honest pride and also with accuracy, was devastating in showing the idiocy of any claim by anybody—who claimed to be informed—that Castro could possibly be anything but a 100 percent Communist."

Now, National Review in 1957 suggested Castro was probably a Communist. That is one thing: to say that anyone who disagreed was idiotic, i.e., that the businessmen, priests, journalists, politicians, scholars, students (many of whom grew up with Castro and fought side by side with him, believing him to be non-Communist), who disagreed, were Communists or pro-Communists or morally and intellectually helpless, is to make categorical condemnations which miss the whole point of the human predicament; namely, that two different people, having surveyed the same datum, can re-create differently what they saw; that two anti-Communists, evaluating the same problem, can honestly advocate different approaches toward the same solution. The United States should have struck Castro down from the very beginning, but our failure to do so was at the critical level, failure of will, a failure of perspicacity, not a failure of loyalty. But Mr. Welch disagrees; for indeed, he believes the man primarily responsible for Castro, Dwight Eisenhower, is a Communist.

NATO? "With regard to that brain child of Dean Acheson, godchild of Harry Truman, and eventual ward of Dwight Eisenhower, named NATO, we have repeatedly insisted for years that it was probably the biggest—and certainly the most expensive—hoax in all human history," i.e., NATO affects to serve an anti-Communist purpose, but in fact does not, and never was intended to. Here we have, claims Mr. Welch, a hoax on anti-Communists that deceives Europe's premier anti-Communist, Konrad Adenauer. And De Gaulle. And the entire anti-Communist community of Europe. And Fulton Lewis. And WALTER JUDD. And BARRY GOLDWATER. And the editors of National Review. And the editors of Human Events—all of whom have backed NATO. Everyone is out of step.

Bolivia is controlled by Communists, says Mr. Welch. Well, let us assume for the moment that it is. But the question is, have our leaders desired that Bolivia should be pro-Communist? Certainly, says Mr. Welch. "* * * Bolivia has been made a satellite and kept one"—by the U.S. Government. Disagree? "If you believe that there is anybody of any importance in either the last administration or the present one who has not known this fact, then there is simply no reason for your reading any more of this article." Berlin? "We have seen the artificially created and completely phony Berlin crisis used as a means of building up the prestige of that hypocritical Comsymp Willy Brandt."

"In fact, the whole canvas of this compendium was designed as a background for these final brush strokes, dealing with Washington's visible will to win this cold war—for the Soviets. Perhaps the most alarming thing about current history in the making is the way Washington [has become a part] of the whole international conspiracy of which it is now another mecca second only to Moscow." And in domestic affairs? "We have seen budgetary proposals urged by the administration which are as clearly designed to debase and destroy our currency through inflation as if they had been prepared by Karl Marx himself." Note: the allegation is not that our inflationary policies will weaken us—which they most certainly will—but that our inflationary policies, which are (unfortunately) endorsed by (a) the administration, (b) the majority of both Houses of Congress, (c) the majority of the Nation's academicians, (d) many business and banking and insurance interests—are designed to weaken us; that is, that all these people in effect desire the triumph of communism, or are totally manipulable by Communist agents.

And Mr. Welch's summation: "And we have seen on every side, in a hundred different manifestations, the unceasing efforts of our Government to carry out all programs and take all steps required to bring about the merger of the United States with Soviet Russia and all of its satellites into a one-world Socialist government." Disagree? "These are all plain facts incontrovertibly clear to anybody who will use the eyes, the intelligence, and the commonsense God gave him."

Woe unto the man who disagrees with Mr. Welch. He is (1) an idiot, or (2) a Comsymp, or (3) an outright Communist.

There are members of the John Birch Society, and they include, in our judgment, some of the most morally energetic, self-sacrificing, and dedicated anti-Communists in America, who ask: But what does it matter if we and Mr. Welch disagree on a number of things? The answer—Senator Goldwater, Mr. Judd, Russell Kirk, and other critics of Mr. Welch would agree—is in two parts. The first is political: are these disagreements on trivial or on substantive matters? It is essential, if one would endorse Mr. Welch's analysis, to believe that the Government of the United States is under the operational control of men who desire to betray this Nation and cause us to become a satellite of the Soviet Union. That is a substantive premise, from which all political analysis, strategy, and tactics are derivative. Should one, disagreeing with Mr. Welch on so central a matter, nevertheless support him because he is also against Federal aid to education and fluordinated water? Adolf Hitler was against monetary inflation: should we then have been pro-Hitler? Gerald L. K. Smith will not disagree with GOLDWATER on most domestic proposals. Should GOLDWATER then be pro-Gerald Smith? Nikita Khrushchev favors medical care for the aged. Should the Liberals be pro-Khrushchev? Robert Welch cannot be compared to these men, but the point is valid that there are bounds to the dictum: Anyone on my right is my ally, just as there are bounds (often unrecognized by the liberals) to the complementary dictum. Anyone on my left is my ally.

And secondly, there is the moral consideration: Can one endorse the efforts of a man who, in one's judgment, goes about bearing false witness? (Was Jehovah, who answered the question on Mount Sinai with the Eighth Commandment, a Comsymp?) We have no doubt Mr. Welch himself honestly believes that all those people are Communists—that mitigates his moral culpability. But those of us who disagree are not excused if, by our silence, we egg him on.

The fact of the matter is that Mr. Welch, by what Russell Kirk has called "an excess of zeal, intemperance, and imprudence," promotes a split in the conservative movement—by asking for the tacit support of men who cannot in good conscience give it, who, moreover, feel that to give it is to damage our chances of success. "Cry wolf often enough," Mr. Kirk wrote to Mr. Welch, "and everyone takes you for an imbecile or a knave, when after all there are wolves in this world." If we are to win the war against communism, we have no less a task before us than to change national policy. Nothing is clearer than that Mr. Welch is not succeeding in doing anything of the sort, precisely because, by the extravagance of his remarks, he repels, rather than attracts a great following. The John Birch Society required for effective leverage, according to Mr. Welch's own estimates, 1 million members (it might have had many millions, if properly led); it has, even after great national publicity, and largely because of Mr. Welch's "intemperance of utterance," less than one-tenth that many members, and is growing no faster than the movement to impeach Earl Warren, who remains as unimpeached today as when Mr. Welch first launched that ill-conceived campaign. Mr. Welch, for all his good intentions, threatens to divert militant conservative action to irrelevance and ineffectuality. There are, as we say, great things that need doing, the winning of a national election, the reeducation of the governing class. John Birch chapters can do much to forward those aims, but only as they dissipate the fog of confusion that issues from Mr. Welch's smoking typewriter. Mr. Welch has revived in many men the spirit of patriotism, and that same spirit calls now for rejecting, out of a love of truth and country, his false counsels.

THEN—

"For the sake of honesty, however, I want to confess here my own conviction that Eisenhower's motivation is more ideological than opportunistic. Or, to put it bluntly, I personally think that he has been sympathetic to ultimate Communist aims, realistically willing to use Communist means to help them achieve their goals, knowingly accepting and abiding by Communist orders, and consciously serving the Communist conspiracy, for all of his adult life. But my firm belief that Dwight Eisenhower is a dedicated, conscious agent of the Communist conspiracy is based on an accumulation of detailed evidence so extensive and so palpable that it seems to me to put this conviction beyond any reasonable doubt."—From The Politician, by Robert Welch, 1958

AND NOW

"The whole canvas [deals] with Washington's visible will to win this cold war—for the Soviets. Perhaps the most alarming thing about current history in the making is the way Washington [has become a part] of the whole international conspiracy of which it is now another mecca second only to Moscow. And we have seen on every side, in a hundred different manifestations, the unceasing efforts of our Government to carry out all programs and take all steps required to bring about the merger of the United States with Soviet Russia and all of its satellites into a one-world Socialist government. These are all plain facts incontrovertibly clear to anybody who will use the eyes, the intelligence, and the commonsense God gave him"—From American Opinion, by Robert Welch, January 1962.

TOASTS OF THE PRESIDENT AND CYRILLE ADOULA, PRIME MINISTER, REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO, AT WHITE HOUSE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, yesterday, a distinguished African statesman, the Prime Minister of the Republic of the Congo, Mr. Cyrille Adoula, was the guest of the President at a luncheon in the White House. In connection therewith, there was an exchange of toasts between the President and the Prime Minister.

These toasts, Mr. President, contain more than the usual pleasantries which are reserved for such occasions. They reveal a deep mutual understanding between the two leaders which augurs well for the future of the Congo and our relations with that immense new African nation. These relations appear now to be on the right track after a most difficult start. In view of the attitudes reflected by the President and the Prime Minister's words, there is reason to hope that they will stay on this track.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the exchange of toasts to which I have referred be included at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the toasts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Toasts of the President and Cyrille Adoula, Prime Minister of the Republic of the Congo (Leopoldville), at the Business Luncheon in the State Dining Room

Gentlemen, I am sure you all join me in welcoming to this country the guest of honor and the members of his Government. I don't think that any head of state of a new country has faced the difficulties and the challenges which have pressed upon him with so much force in the last few months.

The difficulties of our revolutionary experience, and the experiences of every other people coming into independence since the end of World War II, pale in comparison to the problems which the Congo has faced and which press upon the Prime Minister and his supporters.

What makes him especially welcome is the courage and the fortitude, the persistence and the judgment with which he has met these challenges—which would have overwhelmed a lesser people, a lesser country, a lesser man, a lesser government.

Prime Minister, we welcome you here for many reasons. The success of the Congo is tied up, really, we believe, with the success of the United Nations. If you fail, and the Congo should fail, it would be a serious blow for the United Nations, upon which this country has placed so many hopes for the last 17 years. And because of the intimate association between the United Nations and your Government, we are particularly glad that you are here to address them.

We are also glad to welcome you because of your own qualities, because you have set a course for your nation, of being independent, of being African, of being free, of being unalined, of governing under most adverse conditions, through parliamentary democracy, at a time when some other new nations have been forced by events to move away from democratic processes.

We welcome you because of your own extraordinary record—rising because of your own efforts to a position of preeminence, where you have won the support of people, both within and without your country—and because of your own personal qualities.

We are vitally interested in the success of the Congo because we believe the success of your country is essential to the success of a free Africa. We believe strongly in the unity of free states, able to choose their own destiny and able to decide their own fate.

So, Prime Minister, we welcome you here. Many years ago, one of our distinguished Presidents—you examined his portrait this morning in President Lincoln's bedroom—Andrew Jackson, said, "Our Federal Union, it must be preserved."

We recognize your strong conviction that the same policy should follow for your own country, that the Congo must be preserved. And as a faithful member of the United Nations, we support—through the United Nations—the implementation of that policy.

So we welcome you here, and I hope that all of you will join me in saluting the people of the Congo, the country, and to its distinguished Prime Minister.

Prime Minister Adoula (as interpreted from the French). Mr. President, I am almost embarrassed in having to reply to your magnificient speech—a speech which was so short and yet so complete, so full.

I will also speak very briefly and I will say that it is true that the Congo has gone through a period of grave difficulties. It is true also that there are people in the Congo, also of good will, who have decided to fight to surmount and overcome those difficulties.

However, I must say, Mr. President, that there is one thing which you have left out of your speech, and this is that all those efforts of the people of the Congo, all the efforts of the Government, of Parliament, of the population itself, would not have availed very much if we had been left to ourselves.

Fortunately for us, we have found in the world people of great understanding, people of great friendship. We have found countries which have helped us, and which have helped us continuously, without ulterior motivation.

This help has enabled us to try. I must tell you perhaps something, Mr. President, which appears to be a secret. In your speech you seemed to speak of a superman somewhere in the Congo, someone who had succeeded all by himself in overcoming irresistible obstacles, and in reestablishing something that has to be reestablished: Peace in the Congo.

This, Mr. President, is not true. There is no such man. There is no man who could have done that by himself. There is only a common man who wanted to serve his country, and who accepted the difficult task of forming a government, only because he knew that there were people in the world who are ready and willing to help him.

This help, Mr. President, has come primarily from you, from your Government, from your country, through the United Nations Organization. This is a help which you have given us by helping the United Nations from its very beginnings—by helping the United Nations to carry out the directives of the Security Council and of the General Assembly's directives, which you have helped to forge.

You have done that in the past, Mr. President, and I am quite certain that your administration stands ready to continue such a policy in the present—a policy of help to others—continuous, willing help with no ulterior motivation. This is what you have done for the Congo. This is the help which is necessary.

Now there was a time when people used to say about American policy that it was a naive policy, that Americans are people who believe everybody, who can get fooled easily, who sometimes behave like a bull in a china shop.

Today, Mr. President, no one can say that about American policy. This time you have scored a bull's eye, and this time you have proven that your policy is positive, that it is realistic, and I am certain that your policy is going to reach its goal and greatly increase the prestige of the United States in the world.

Another question which is mentioned is that of neutralism. Now here is nonalinement. You have to understand nonalinement to mean simply that each country wishes to remain independent and free, free and independent to defend its own principles, free and independent to be able to reconcile various interests, to reconcile and compromise its own interests with those of its friends, and not only of its friends, also all of the people in the entire world. That is what we mean by nonalinement. That is why I believe that this must be the policy not only of the Congolese Government but also of the entire Congolese people.

I must interrupt my speech because if I did not, if I let myself be carried away, I would repeat—speaking about you, Mr. President—the kind words which you have addressed to me. There is no necessity, however, to do that, because everyone knows who you are, and there is no need to repeat something which was said so well.

So all I can say at this moment, Mr. President, is that in the name of our people first of all, in the name of our Government, in the name of our Chief of State, we say thank you to the United States.

We can thank you. We say thank you for a help which has been efficacious, spontaneous, and sincere. We thank your administration for it, Mr. President, because we are quite sure, as I repeat it, that our efforts would have been to no avail if it had not been for the moral and material help which we have received from you.

We hope that this help will continue. We say it in all frankness. We say, at the same time, that our people as a people which understands reality will never forget to say thank you to the United States. It will not be like some other peoples which are willing to receive aid only to criticize later those who are helping. Thank you, Mr. President.

I ask you now to raise your glass and drink to the President of the United States, and to the prosperity of the American people.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON EDUCATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the President's message on education is an affirmation of his views on this subject as expressed to the Congress last year. He is appealing, once again, to the Congress to face up to its responsibilities as he has faced up to his in this most important and neglected segment of our national life.

The President points out once again the urgent needs of the Nation for more adequate facilities and teaching excellence at all levels of education, from primary schools on up, and in all special aspects of education, such as medicine, dentistry, and education for the handicapped. He points out, once again, the demands of justice, that educational opportunities be made more equal for all our young people, regardless of personal financial status or the peculiar conditions which may exist in the State in which a young person happens to live.

Millions of young people will pay the price if the President's appeal continues to be ignored. The Nation will pay an enormous price in the years ahead if this appeal continues to be ignored. Each day of delay represents an irretrievable loss.

The Senate has done what it can do, up to this point, in responding to the President's appeal. Led by the distinguished chairman of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee [Mr. Hill] and his able lieutenants in this matter, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara], we have passed the bills the President has sought to improve educational facilities and to equalize educational opportunities in this Nation. The Senate stands ready to move forward to the completion of this legislative task whenever the other House is prepared to join with us. I can only underscore the President's appeal, at this time, and express the hope that the moment for this advance in education which is so necessary to the Nation's well-being and to the well-being of millions of our citizens will not be long delayed.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS—DEFENSE PROCUREMENT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to a story on the front page of the New York Times. The headline is "Long Island Fights To Save Jobs at Republic."

This news illustrates two points: First, the labor-management relations which are possible of attainment in a difficult situation; and, second, the catastrophic dislocation to employment involved in the denial of defense orders and the need for new legislation in the direction of more competition in defense procurement.

On the first subject, the union meeting which was reported in the press, at which the cooperation of union members is requested in an effort to appeal to the President on defense orders for the company for which they work, is matched by a letter from the company to its employees which frankly sets forth the facts and takes the employees into the management's confidence in the problems of the company. I think this is salutary in supporting the importance of a high type of labor-management cooperation—a cooperation which should extend to alternative courses of action and lines of production in view of the serious problem being faced. I ask unanimous consent that the newspaper story of the union meeting and the company's letter be printed in the Record as a part of my remarks at this point. It emphasizes the grave threat to employment and to the economy of Long Island inherent in the denial of defense orders to Republic.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Long Island Fights To Save Jobs at Republic—Letters to Kennedy Urged as 13,000 Face Layoff

(By Roy R. Silver)

Levittown, Long Island, February 5.—Employees of the Republic Aviation Corp. were urged today to write to President Kennedy in an effort to save 13,000 threatened jobs.

The workers were told by Justin Ostro, president of Republic Lodge 1987, International Association of Machinists, to ask the President to rescind Defense Department plans to cut production on the F-105D fighter-bomber plane.

Eight thousand union members, at a meeting at Levittown Arena, heard Mr. Ostro declare that "the only area we can hope to get any help at all is the White House and the President of the United States."

Mr. Ostro, whose union represents about 9,000 of Republic's 15,569 employees, told the workers at the half-hour meeting, "You must let him [Mr. Kennedy] know you are in trouble; he promised you an expanding economy and full employment."

Mr. Ostro, along with Charles J. Brown, president of the Long Island Federation of Labor, and Nassau County Executive Eugene H. Nickerson, expect to discuss the matter at the White House tomorrow morning.

The union meeting was called by Mr. Ostro to review the potential labor crisis, in which 13,000 of Republic's employees may be laid off by December 30, 1963. A loss of 1,500 jobs is expected by March 30. Union employees at the company earn between $2.03 and $3.18 an hour.

Mr. Ostro said the economy of the entire island would be affected by the Defense Department's decision to cut production of the F-105D, by its cancellation of part of a contract for a reconnaissance version of the plane, and by the elimination of Republic from competition to build the TFX, the "plane of the future."

FORESEES ECONOMIC SHOCK

"The Long Island community will face its worst economic shock in its history through the loss of a $125 million annual payroll," Mr. Ostro predicted. "In December 1962, we will be a distressed area, with more than 6 percent unemployed."

The Defense Department plans to award a contract to the McDonnell Aircraft Corp. of St. Louis for the production of the F-110, a two-place, twin-engined fighter-bomber.

"We are not looking for a handout," Mr. Ostro said. "We wouldn't sacrifice the security of our country to keep working. Our plane is superior to the McDonnell plane. McDonnell doesn't need the contract to keep people working."

Mr. Ostro said that the separation and severance provisions of the union's contract with Republic "now become of paramount importance" and that loopholes in seniority provisions "must be plugged." The contract expires in less than 2 months.

Republic Aviation Corp.,
Long Island, N.Y., February 1, 1962.

Dear RAC Employee: By the time you receive this letter, you will probably have heard all sorts of rumors about supposed cutbacks, phasing out and even cancellation of the F-105. You also probably will have read or heard that the Department of Defense has awarded study contracts for the TFX—a follow-on successor to the F-105—to two other companies in the aircraft industry.

I am therefore writing to you directly in order to set the record straight and to give you complete information about the future of our F-105 business. Parts of this letter are not going to be pleasant. But it is important that we face facts and prepare ourselves for all possibilities.

At the same time, all of the news is not bad, and I want you to know that, also.

During the past year, many important changes in the method of planning our country's defense systems have been taking place. And foremost among these changes has been the strong desire of Defense officials to try to "package" the military forces so that, for example, all Army, Navy, and Air Forces concerned with conventional, or limited warfare, will become more unified in the uses of their equipment and their manpower. The same planning is true for strategic retaliatory forces and for continental air defense forces.

To carry this a step farther, the Secretary of Defense has proposed that, where possible, one weapon should be utilized by all services, instead of each service buying its own equipment for the performance of missions that may have some similarity.

The merit of this kind of programing is unquestioned. We all want to have as strong and efficient a defense force as possible—and as economically as possible. And we think that our company, Republic, can meet the Government's needs under this kind of planning as well as, or better than, any other company in the industry. Only one other has built as many fighter aircraft as we have and none has built better fighter aircraft than we have.

But we must face the fact that competition in the aerospace industry has been getting more severe as the dollars become scarcer. We believe that our design proposal for the TFX—a short takeoff and landing fighter for both Air Force and Navy—is one of the finest airplane designs we have ever produced. Yet we have just received word that the project will be awarded elsewhere. This means that we will not have a follow-on fighter airplane to the F-105, according to present Government planning. However, there is at least one more fighter competition scheduled for this year—the VAX, a fighter attack experimental type—and we are already vigorously at work on this proposal. I don't like to be blunt, but I feel you must know the bad news when it occurs, as well as good news when we're able to give it to you.

At the same time, the Defense Department has proposed to the Congress that, in future years, production of the F-105 be somewhat reduced and that a Navy plane, the McDonnell F4H be purchased, to share in the Air Force tactical mission with the F-105. This means that previous programing by the Air Force has been changed by DOD and we are now scheduled to build the F-105 through calendar year 1964 only. At this point I want to state that this does not automatically mean that we will not be building F-105's after 1964. It means that, in the present programing, we continue to build them through 1964. I certainly hope that we will be successful in our strong efforts to continue the F-105 business after that time. It remains the finest tactical fighter in the world, when all its mission capabilities are considered. We are designing new improvements which will increase the F-105's versatility and performance, and we hope will prolong its usefulness in our defense system.

Under any circumstances, however, it is apparent that we will have to look at our own situation carefully and honestly. Our research and development efforts are beginning to bear some fruit, but it is going to be a few years before projects now just beginning will really "pay off."

Over the next year, we are going to have to watch our employment situation week by week and month by month. As it stands today there will be layoffs in the immediate future. It is apparent that we will not be able to keep all of our people employed unless we are successful in bringing in more orders. This applies not only to our production workers but throughout the organization. In our scientific and research engineering areas we will continue at full strength, in order to develop new product possibilities to help keep our factory full.

We are a sound company. We survived even more severe blows in 1945–47 and came back strong. We have the resources and the determination to overcome this temporary setback and to move on toward new goals.

It is vitally important for you to know the facts above. It is equally important that we all keep plugging away, doing the very best job possible to keep the F–105, and all of our products, coming off the line with the same high quality and efficiency as before. In this manner, we have the opportunity to sell more of our products and keep our jobs secure.

Cordially,

MUNDY I. PEALE,
President.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, second, I think the spending of $26 billion for procurement of hard goods in defense is shown, by this situation and by many others throughout the country, to have such an enormous economic impact in the communities involved that it requires a review by the Congress in order to articulate a policy which will work more equitably than it seems to be doing at present. So I call renewed attention to my bill for enactment of legislation, which has been supported by the whole delegation from New York in the other body, as well as by the Members from the State of New York in this body, which seeks greater competition in procurement contracts, including negotiated contracts, and also consideration of the economic impact in particular areas, analogous in terms to the consideration we give small business with respect to Government contracts, in order that we may deal with catastrophic situations which may be created by the withdrawal of defense contracts in particular areas, of which this is a most striking example.

VOICE OF DEMOCRACY AWARD TO LEWIS RUSSELL NELSON

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, Senators are familiar with the contest that is sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States called the voice of democracy. This is an annual broadcast scriptwriting contest. I have noticed that several Senators have had printed in the RECORD the winning speech or statement by the young person of a State who won an award from that State.

I was most pleasantly surprised to learn that the State winner in my State of Georgia happens to be a nephew of mine, Lewis Russell Nelson, the son of Rev. and Mrs. Raymond L. Nelson, of Commerce, Ga. I am exceedingly proud to ask unanimous consent that this speech be printed in the RECORD in order that it might be considered along with other winning speeches printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT FREEDOM MEANS TO ME

(By Lewis Russell "Rusty" Nelson, State winner from Georgia)

In a time when Americans take their blessings of liberty for granted, freedom is to me, more than anything else, a challenge for every conscientious American patriot. This is a challenge to carry on the American way of life in the tradition of those who sacrificed their lives and fortunes to endow their posterity with a national heritage which is the very paragon of freedom.

This great challenge is created by the forces of evil that today, as always, threaten our sacred freedom. Today as the United States is engaged in a great war for the minds of men, the pulse of patriotism in this country is at an alltime low. The United States is backpedaling in fear of our enemies because of the lack of patriotism. In answer to the explosion of 50-megaton bombs, we build fallout shelters and that's about it. We are a nation ready to hide but not ready to fight to defend the freedom of ourselves and others. Military recruiters today cannot appeal to the patriotism of young men. The pitch has to be personal advantage, free training, civilian preparation, a choice career.

All Americans today are heirs of a freedom that was made possible by the dedication and love that our Founding Fathers had for God and country. The basic desire for this kind of freedom is still to be found but true patriots and heroes are, today, few and far between. Patrick Henry's "Give me liberty or give me death" has only a faint echo in today's "I'd rather be dead than Red." To me, that statement sounds more like a suicide note than a pledge to fight for freedom. Still, we say we would gladly give our lives for our country if necessary. But I contend that what we need to do now is not to die for the freedom of our country but to live for it. We must again resolve that those who died for our country shall not have died in vain. We must dedicate ourselves to the high ideals of our free Nation so that we may preserve and renew God's gift of freedom for our land.

It is through complete dedication to their atheistic concepts and unworthy ideals that the Communists have risen from a mere handful of men to domination of half the world in less than half a century. With our wonderful and meaningful foundations and ambitions, we could indeed turn the world upside down almost overnight, if we but had the dedication of these proponents of evil and injustice.

The challenge of freedom must be met. If a rebirth of patriotism and heroism is not realized in this country, our posterity will not know the blessings of liberty that we enjoy today.

CELEBRATION OF THE NINTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, last July 25 it was my privilege to represent the President of the United States at the ceremonies marking the ninth anniversary of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. I should like to have appear in the body of the RECORD the speech given at that time by Governor Muñoz-Marin of Puerto Rico, and also the message of greetings from President Kennedy on the occasion of this ninth anniversary of the establishment of the Commonwealth.

I am sure it is well recognized in the Senate that Governor Muñoz-Marin is a great world statesman who has done much to strengthen the cause of freedom in Latin America.

I ask unanimous consent that the message and the speech be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the message and speech were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MESSAGE OF GREETINGS FROM PRESIDENT KENNEDY TO THE PEOPLE OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO

My cordial greetings and best wishes go to Governor Muñoz-Marin and the people of Puerto Rico on this ninth anniversary of the establishment of the Commonwealth.

The great social and economic accomplishments of the Commonwealth have evoked the admiration of your fellow citizens throughout the United States, and, indeed, of freedom-loving Americans throughout the hemisphere.

In achieving the transition from a stagnant, low-income society to a dynamic, prospering commonwealth, Puerto Rico has been a source of hope and inspiration to those of us deeply concerned with charting new courses of social progress for our hemisphere.

What we seek to accomplish in our Alianza para el Progreso has already been accomplished to a remarkable measure in Puerto Rico. That the people of Puerto Rico have pioneered in translating objectives of social advancement, long-range economic planning, equitable tax structures, improved land use and vigorous investment in education, into visible realities is undeniable proof to all citizens of the Americas, of the strength and creativeness of democratic ideals.

SPEECH DELIVERED BY GOV. LUIS MUÑOZ-MARÍN ON THE OCCASION OF THE CELEBRATION OF THE NINTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO, JULY 25, 1961

Honorable representative of the President of the United States, honorable representative of the President of Venezuela, honorable representative of the Government of El Salvador, distinguished visitors, honorable presidents of the House and the Senate, honorable president of the Supreme Court, friends, and fellow citizens, in a few words on this happy and solemn occasion, I wish to express my deepest thanks to the President of the United States for his message to the people of Puerto Rico sent through such a distinguished envoy as Senator MORSE, who is with us tonight. I not only wish to express appreciation for his cordial message; I also wish to comment on some of President Kennedy's words when he so generously refers to the people of Puerto Rico as a people who have faced great difficulties with courage, decision, and patience; difficulties that they have been conquering and will finally conquer. When the President of the United States so speaks of the people of Puerto Rico, I believe that all of us, knowing the President's sincerity, should feel deeply proud of those words, from one who is at present the leader of democracy against its enemies throughout the world.

Puerto Rico, within its means and in full dedication to the cause of justice, liberty, and human freedom, will cooperate, as it has cooperated, toward the happy fulfillment throughout the American hemisphere of the Alliance for Progress which is proposed by President Kennedy, not as a paternalistic gesture of the United States, but as a call to all the peoples of America to join freely with their hearts and wills to banish poverty, injustice, from all regions of the hemisphere.

Thus, humbly but resolutely, we in Puerto Rico have been contributing our experience, with fraternal feelings toward all men in America, and now place it at the service of the Alliance for Progress as a force of hope, in the first place, and of just achievement, afterward, for all peoples in the Americas. It was, in a modest way, such a force of hope which quickly turned into tangible progress toward a good civilization in Puerto Rico.

I wish, furthermore, to thank the President of the United States for his Executive memorandum to all heads of departments and agencies of the Federal Government outlining the significance of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, of its concept of free association with the United States of America.

Allow me, at this time, to make an announcement. A few moments ago, it was announced from this very rostrum, through wires from Senator Anderson and Senator Jackson, that the appropriate committee of the U.S. Senate had approved an amendment to the relations between Puerto Rico and the United States proposed to Congress, first through resolution of the Legislature of Puerto Rico and afterward by action of the Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico in Washington. The committee recommended favorably to the Senate a resolution transferring the debt-incurring limitation of the Commonwealth from the Federal Relations Act to the Constitution whenever the voters of Puerto Rico shall so determine. I have now received the news that the Senate of the United States has approved the resolution. And I feel confident that the President of the United States will give his approval. From there on, it will be up to you, the voters of Puerto Rico, to also pass judgment on and I hope give your approval to this change, which strengthens the principle of self-government.

Let me refer again to the Executive memorandum issued today by President Kennedy, instructing all heads of the Federal Government, with regard to the relations between Puerto Rico and the United States. I am now going to read a translation of the President's memorandum:

"Because of the importance and significance of Puerto Rico in the relations of the United States with Latin America and other nations, it is essential that the executive departments and agencies be completely aware of the unique position of the Commonwealth, and that policies, actions, reports on legislation, and other activities affecting the Commonwealth should be consistent with the structure and basic principles of the Commonwealth."

And it goes on to say:

"On July 25, 1952, the Governor of Puerto Rico proclaimed the establishment of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico under its constitution. This proclamation was the culmination of a series of legislative and electoral steps which began with the passage of Public Law 600, 81st Congress, 64 Stat. 319 (1950). Public Law 600 made provision for the organization of a constitutional government by the people of Puerto Rico. In a referendum, held on June 4, 1951, the proposals of this law received the overwhelming approval of the people of Puerto Rico.

"Following approval, a Puerto Rican constitutional convention drafted a constitution, which was approved by a referendum held on March 3, 1952. The Congress in turn approved this constitution (Public Law 447, 82d Congress, 66 Stat. 327 (1952)).

"The Commonwealth structure, and its relationship to the United States which is in the nature of a compact, provide for self-government in respect of internal affairs and administration, subject only to the applicable provisions of the Federal Constitution, the Puerto Rican Federal Relations Act, and the acts of Congress authorizing and approving the constitution.

"On November 27, 1953, the General Assembly of the United Nations recognized that the people of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, exercising effectively the right of self-determination in a free and democratic way, had achieved a new constitutional status; and that, in view of this new status, it was appropriate that the United States should cease the transmission of information with regard to Puerto Rico under article 73(e) of the Charter (U.N. General Assembly Res. 748 (VIII) (1953))."

I wish to explain that the said article of the United Nations Charter provides that reports be submitted on countries retaining territorial or colonial status, and that the resolution I have just mentioned (of the United Nations in 1953), stated that the United States did not have to transmit any more information on Puerto Rico, according to the United Nations Charter, because Puerto Rico had ceased to be a territory or in any other manner a colony of the United States of America.

"All departments, agencies, and officials of the executive branch of the Government should faithfully and carefully observe and respect this arrangement in relation to all matters affecting the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. If any matters arise involving the fundamentals of this arrangement, they should be referred to the Office of the President.

"The legislative steps which have led to the achievement by Puerto Rico of Commonwealth status have made inapplicable the provisions of Executive Order No. 6726 of May 29, 1934, insofar as they pertain to or are connected with the administration of the government of Puerto Rico. This order no longer applies to Puerto Rico.

"This memorandum shall be published in the Federal Register."

In closing, I wish to express once more to President Kennedy and his very distinguished representative, the thanks of the people of Puerto Rico for strengthening the recognition of what the Commonwealth is and means. That is what Puerto Rico has overwhelmingly and repeatedly approved at the polls.

MILK CONSUMPTION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, recently I invited attention to the fact that Wisconsin was first in milk production, producing some 19 billion pounds a year. I suggested, because of the situation which has already been set forth by the Secretary of Agriculture, that since our dairy production is now in excess there are several plans which could be followed to find a solution to the problem.

One suggestion I made related to consumption.

Mr. President, for the first time in some 23 years, when I was at a luncheon at the White House yesterday, which the Vice President also attended, in addition to the usual drinks each person was served a glass of milk. To me that is what Americans should be doing throughout the land, not only in the hotels but also in homes and elsewhere, to increase the consumption of milk.

A second suggestion I made was that we should set up a laboratory and provide talent in the laboratory—we have great brains available—to make it possible to utilize the constituent parts of milk for the manufacture of industrial products. In my opinion that is one of the great outlets we have not even tapped. We have learned to make sirup out of corn. We have learned to utilize other products through chemistry, but with regard to the constituent parts of milk we have sat by and said, "We will make it into ice cream, and, yes, into powdered milk."

COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES MUST KEEP PACE WITH THE GROWING NEEDS

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, a great source of our Nation's strength is the quality of our education. We have always been proud of that quality.

We can take pride in the finest system of public schools in the world. Our colleges and universities, too, have provided outstanding higher education and training for millions of our citizens.

It is essential to the future welfare of our Nation, Mr. President, that every potential source of support for our colleges and universities be put to use, for the requirements of the future will be great.

A great upsurge of demand for admission into colleges is taking place in this decade. Even with added Federal support of our colleges and universities, it is probable that demand will exceed the ability to meet it. Indeed, in many colleges it already does.

The bill which we are now considering promises a good start in meeting the urgent needs which confront our colleges and universities and the young Americans who wish to attend them.

It would authorize loans for construction of new academic facilities for public and private institutions and would aid needy young scholars in acquiring the education they deserve. Also it would give impetus to the development of so-called community colleges, 2-year schools which provide a vital service to young students who are interested in acquiring skills but feel they do not need a major degree.

Mr. President, abundant supporting statistics already have been presented in this Chamber demonstrating the need for this pending legislative proposal. Briefly put, they show that college enrollment will nearly double in the next 10 years from a present 3.6 million to more than 6 million 10 years hence.

Meanwhile, the cost of education rises alarmingly. Tuition and fee charges have increased 86 percent in the past 10 years. A student living away from home incurs a cost of approximately $1,650 a year.

Increasing costs and increasingly crowded conditions have made it impossible for thousands of deserving young Americans to further their education. Large numbers of high school students graduating in the top one-third of their class are unable to go on to college.

Mr. President, the loss is not theirs alone. It is the Nation's.

Cold statistics do not tell the extent of the loss.

In this grim period of international anarchy, when our Nation is challenged as never before, how many potential great physicists, chemists, or engineers have been denied the education that would develop their abilities to the fullest?

How many would-be doctors, and how many fine potential teachers will never be able to fill the essential role their talents point to?

We need these young people and their abilities if our Nation is to maintain the greatness which has made it the leader of the free world and the bastion of democracy.

Our system of democracy must promise that every young American be given full opportunity to develop his abilities. Only in this way can our citizens contribute fully to their Nation.

Mr. President, I assert this is the crux of the proposal we are discussing. The statistics prove a need. It is within our capacity to meet this need.

Our obligation now, as Senators of the United States, is to do what can and must be done.

DECLARATION OF PARIS—RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE ATLANTIC CONVENTION OF NATO NATIONS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I have received a copy of the Declaration of Paris and resolutions adopted by the Atlantic Convention of NATO Nations which met in Paris, France, from January 8 through January 19, 1962.

As Senators know, Mr. President, this convention was the direct result of Public Law 86-719, enacted by Congress in 1960. Under terms of this law a U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO, composed of 20 members was appointed by the Congress of the United States. This Commission was given the job of seeking "to arrange an international convention and such other meetings and conferences as it may deem necessary" to bring about a convention with similar commissions from the other NATO countries. The purpose of the convention, as set forth in the legislation, was "to explore means by which greater cooperation and unity of purpose may be developed to the end that democratic freedom may be promoted by economic and political means."

Many Senators were sponsors of and gave their active and untiring support to the adoption of the resolutions, and the success of the convention. To name only a few, I call attention to the work of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Humphrey], the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits], who has been untiring in his efforts, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case], and many others, and call attention to the fact that the effort had the cooperation and assistance of the leadership on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. McGEE. I wish the Record to show that the Senator from Tennessee has omitted mentioning the real dynamic force that carried along so successfully the whole operation about which he has spoken. That force is his own leadership. The senior Senator from Tennessee did a great deal to bring into a real living symbol what the NATO convention can actually mean by his driving energy and his foresightedness in carrying out the principles for which the group was elected. Toward that end I salute him on this occasion.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I appreciate the words of my colleague from Wyoming. I was only one of the group. The distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson] was also very active, as were many others I could mention.

I was happy to be associated with that bipartisan group of Senators in the convention. I think the convention that has been held has been a very great success.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from New York, who has been exceedingly active in the effort.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague. I join the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee] in commending the effort of all Senators, led by Christian Herter and Will Clayton, who represented us so admirably in the effort to establish an Atlantic Community.

I also commend the Senator from Tennessee. I join the Senator from Wyoming in the statement he has made. The leadership of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee has been indispensable. It has been a great joy to work with him as a colleague in arms.

I should like to emphasize that we have a group of distinguished Americans who consider the wisdom of an Atlantic Community concerning economic and social questions to be entirely practical, and we must pay the strictest attention to their recommendations. I am grateful to my colleague for raising the subject.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am grateful to the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Pell in the chair). The time of the Senator from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am grateful to my colleague the distinguished Senator from New York for his continuous support, as well as the support of many others, for their efforts related to the building up of the strength of the Atlantic Community.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I join Senators who have spoken, particularly the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee] in an expression of gratification for the work of the Senator from Tennessee in taking the lead in the movement about which he has spoken.

I also join the Senator from Tennessee and my other colleagues in what they have said about the product of the Atlantic Convention. The leadership of Christian Herter and William Clayton has been outstanding in this regard. As one of the sponsors of the resolution and one who had high hopes for it, I may say that the results up to this time have more than justified our expectations. I am deeply grateful to the Senators who participated.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the Senator from New Jersey has been a tower of strength in this effort from the very beginning.

Mr. President, I have been working for such a convention ever since I have been a Member of the Senate. It made me very happy when Congress eventually adopted the resolution to provide the means by which this new method of bringing together uninstructed citizens and allowing them to apply their best thinking to our international problems might be tried. It makes me even happier, reading the declaration, to learn that this new experiment in international affairs has worked. The declaration and the resolutions are a distinct service to the governments involved.

I think the U.S. Commission, headed by the Honorable Christian A. Herter and William L. Clayton, is due a great deal of the credit for the success of the convention. First, they had the task of explaining the U.S. legislation to the legislative bodies in all the other NATO countries. Through the initiative of the U.S. Commission a preparatory meeting was held in London last October, at which time a scale of representation, a method of sharing the costs, and rules under which the convention would operate were agreed to. Then the other nations did, indeed, set up similar commissions and agree to participate. The fact that the convention was held was in itself an achievement.

Finally, last January 8, the delegates gathered at the International Conference Center in Paris, some 90 of them. All were uninstructed by their governments and told simply to apply their best thinking to the problems of the free world. They had been studying these problems prior to their arrival at the International Conference Center in Paris, but now they were faced with the responsibility of making decisions. Some, like Paul Van Zeeland, former Premier of Belgium and one of the fathers of the European movement, were well known and at home in international conferences. Others were new to this scene.

They came as strangers, but significantly 2 weeks later they left as friends, and they left behind a legacy of constructive recommendations for the Atlantic Community. They soon found,

that no matter where they were from in the Atlantic Community—Turks, Belgians, Italians, Icelanders, British, or American—they had a common bond in freedom. They had a common determination to make the Western World strong and united enough to endure in freedom.

Mr. President, let me read a few significant excerpts from the Declaration of Paris. It begins:

> We, the citizen delegates to the Atlantic Convention of NATO Nations, meeting in Paris, January 8-20, 1962, are convinced that our survival as freemen, and the possibility of progress for all men, demand the creation of a true Atlantic Community within the next decade.

It continues:

> A true Atlantic Community must extend to the political, military, economic, moral, and cultural fields.

The convention called upon the governments of the NATO countries to draw up plans within 2 years for the creation of an Atlantic Community suitably organized to meet the political, military, and economic challenges of this era. It proposed, as an indispensable feature of a true Atlantic community, the creation at the highest political level of a department high council, whose competence would extend to political, economic, military, and cultural matters. This council would not only prepare and concert policies on current questions, but, in defined cases, decide them by a weighted, qualified majority vote. Pending the establishment of the council, the convention recommended greater powers for the North Atlantic Council.

The convention proposed the NATO Parliamentarians Conference be developed into a consultative Atlantic Assembly, and that eventually a high court of justice be established to settle disputes between members and the organizations arising from the interpretation and application of treaties.

Mr. President, I am highlighting parts of the declaration and resolutions which appeal to me, but I think that it ought to be printed in full at this point so that the Members of this body will know it in toto. I ask unanimous consent to have printed the declaration and resolutions in full in my remarks at this point.

There being no objection, the declaration and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ATLANTIC CONVENTION OF NATO NATIONS—DECLARATION OF PARIS

We, the citizen delegates to the Atlantic Convention of NATO Nations, meeting in Paris, January 8-20, 1962, are convinced that our survival as free men, and the possibility of progress for all men, demand the creation of a true Atlantic Community within the next decade, and therefore submit this declaration of our convictions:

PREAMBLE

The Atlantic peoples are heir to a magnificent civilization whose origins include the early achievements of the Near East, the classical beauty of Greece, the juridical sagacity of Rome, the spiritual power of our religious traditions and the humanism of the Renaissance. Its latest flowering, the discoveries of modern science, allow an extraordinary mastery of the forces of nature.

While our history has too many pages of tragedy and error, it has also evolved principles transcending the vicissitudes of history, such as the supremacy of law, respect for individual rights, social justice and the duty of generosity.

Thanks to that civilization and to the common characteristics with which it stamps the development of the peoples participating in it, the nations of the West do in fact constitute a powerful cultural and moral community.

But the time has now come when the Atlantic countries must close their ranks, if they wish to guarantee their security against the Communist menace and insure that their unlimited potentialities shall develop to the advantage of all men of good will.

A true Atlantic Community must extend to the political, military, economic, moral and cultural fields. The evolution we contemplate will contribute to the diversity of achievements and aspirations which constitute the cultural splendor and intellectual wealth of our peoples.

The Atlantic Convention, keeping this ideal constantly in view, recommends the following measures which, in its opinion, would foster the necessary cohesion of the West, would bring the final objective closer and should be adopted forthwith by the governments concerned.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

1. To define the principles on which our common civilization is based and to consult about ways of insuring respect for these principles.

2. To create, as an indispensable feature of a true Atlantic Community, a permanent high council at the highest political level, to concert and plan, and in agreed cases to decide policy on matters of concern to the community as a whole. Pending the establishment of the council, the convention recommends that the North Atlantic Council be strengthened through the delegation of additional responsibilities.

3. To develop the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference into a consultative assembly which would review the work of all Atlantic institutions and make recommendations to them.

4. To establish an Atlantic High Court of Justice, to decide specified legal controversies which may arise under the treaties.

5. To harmonize political, military, and economic policy on matters affecting the community as a whole.

6. That the North Atlantic Council treat the development of an agreed NATO policy with respect to nuclear weapons as a matter of urgency.

7. That it welcomes the development, progress, and prospective expansion of the European economic institutions, and the spirit of President Kennedy's statement that a trade partnership be formed between the United States and the European Economic Community, the basis of an Atlantic Economic Community, open to other nations of the free world.

8. That the Atlantic nations, acknowledging the right of every people to freedom, independence, and pursuit of happiness, cooperate on a larger scale with the developing nations in their economic programs, through direct and multilateral action; through the acceleration of investments; and especially through measures which would increase both the volume and value of their exports, including special tariff concessions for their exports.

9. That the Atlantic Community take steps to help improve all their economies, so that the proportionate economic and social potential of all will be less unequal.

10. That the Atlantic nations, noting the destruction of the national independence and the human rights of many peoples in eastern and central Europe, reaffirm their belief that the problem of these captive nations should be resolved in accordance with the principles of both individual liberty and national self-determination.

11. To create an Atlantic Council for Youth, Education, and Culture in order to draw up Atlantic plans for exchanges of young people, students, and teachers and for the purposes of scientific and cultural collaboration.

12. That the NATO governments promptly establish a special governmental commission to draw up plans within 2 years for the creation of a true Atlantic Community, suitably organized to meet the political, military, and economic challenges of this era.

RESOLUTIONS

We, the delegates to the Atlantic Convention of NATO Nations, in meeting assembled, taking note of the recommendations of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference of November 17, 1961, that an organized Atlantic Community be created, have adopted the following documents:

"PART I—POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC QUESTIONS

"A. Special Governmental Commission To Propose Organizational Changes

"Call upon the governments of the NATO countries to draw up plans within 2 years for the creation of an Atlantic Community suitably organized to meet the political, military, and economic challenges of this era. To this end they should, within the earliest practicable period, appoint members to a Special Governmental Commission on Atlantic Unity. The Commission should study the organization of the Atlantic community, particularly in the light of the recommendations of this convention, and it should be instructed to propose such reforms and simplifications of existing institutions, and such new institutions, as may be required.

"B. Institutions

"1. Recommend, as an indispensable feature of a true Atlantic Community, the creation at the highest political level, of a permanent High Council, whose competence would extend to political, economic, military and cultural matters. Such a Council, assisted by a Secretariat, would not only prepare and concert policies on current questions and, in defined cases, decide them by a weighted, qualified majority vote, but would also undertake long-term planning and propose initiatives on matters of concern to the Community. All members of the Community would be represented on the Council.

"Whether this High Council be a new institution or a development of the North Atlantic Council should be a matter of recommendation by the special governmental commission. In any event, however, pending the establishment of the Atlantic Community, the members of the convention urgently request their governments to reinforce and develop the North Atlantic Treaty Organization as a political center. To this end, the convention recommends that the North Atlantic Council be strengthened through the delegation of additional jurisdiction. Where authority for decision is delegated to the North Atlantic Council by governments, it should employ a weighted majority vote.

"2. Propose that the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference be developed into a consultative Atlantic Assembly, to meet at stated intervals, or upon the call of its president or otherwise, to receive reports regularly transmitted to it by the Secretaries General of other Atlantic bodies; to raise questions for and to consider, debate and review the work of all Atlantic institutions, and make recommendations to other Atlantic bodies and governments on questions of concern to the Atlantic Community. A permanent Secretariat and an annual budget should be provided for the Atlantic Assembly to insure continuity. In certain defined cases, recommendations should be by weighted majority vote. Members of the Atlantic Assembly would be selected by member governments in accordance with their constitutional procedures. They need not necessarily be parliamentarians. The members thus chosen would have the power to elect a limited number of additional members of equal status.

"3. Recommend the creation of a high court of justice, reserved to the Atlantic Community, in order to settle legal differences between members and between members and the organizations arising from the interpretation and application of treaties.

"C. Policies

"The institutions of the Atlantic Community should harmonize those policies of its members affecting the interests of the Community as a whole, and contribute to the development of Community methods in planning, considering, and executing such policies.

"1. A primary objective is the continuing expression through national and international action of an overriding community of national interests in political and military policy. Closer and more effective action in this field should not await the growth of Community institutions (see par. 2, above); the development of an agreed NATO policy with respect to nuclear weapons should, among other immediate problems, be treated as a matter of urgency by the North Atlantic Council.

"2. A second cardinal policy objective is to realize the opportunities for economic progress available through the creation and development of the Atlantic Community. The expanding European Economic Community is an economic advantage not only for its members, but for North America and the free world as well. The convention welcomes the spirit of President Kennedy's recent statement that a trade partnership be formed between the United States and the European Economic Community. We hope that the negotiations envisaged by President Kennedy succeed in establishing a relationship which would constitute the nucleus of an Atlantic Economic Community, within the framework of Community institutions, and open to all other qualified countries. Such a development would be of advantage to all countries, and particularly to those which participate directly in it. Among the fruits of this expanding Community would be its stimulus to competition, investment and more rapid growth in the mass markets appropriate to the modern technological age, with progressive reductions in tariffs and other barriers to trade.

"3. Another important goal of the Atlantic nations is to cooperate with those developing nations which wish to do so in their efforts to overcome the burden of poverty, which may well be that of a falling per capita income in some countries. The convention recommends that the Atlantic Community increase its already considerable participation in development program of this kind, through direct financial and technical measures; through increased shares in United Nations programs, OECD programs, and other multilateral efforts; and above all through policies which favor commerce with and investment in the developing countries, such as the abolition of tariffs on tropical and primary products, and the reduction and, under agreed circumstances, even the eventual abolition of tariffs on their other products. The convention also recommends the development of equitable and agreed programs for the acceleration of investments, and for the protection of investors against political risks.

"4. An important goal of the Atlantic Community's economic policies should be to help raise the standard of living and the level of economic activity of the different segments of the Atlantic community, so that the proportional economic and social potential of all the members will be relatively less unequal.

"5. In view of the hundreds of millions of hungry people alive today, and the prospect that, if the present trends continue, there will be 3,000 million more people added to the population in the next generation, the Convention recommends that the Atlantic Community should address itself forthwith to the population problem.

"6. Since Soviet expansion has destroyed the effective national independence of many peoples in Eastern and Central Europe, denying to their individual members the free exercise of their religious rights and democratic liberties—with all the attendant injurious effects upon the general climate of European security and progress, the Convention affirms its recognition of the inalienable rights of all nations to assume freely the responsibilities of self-determination and self-government, and expresses its firm belief that the problem of the captive nations of Eastern and Central Europe should be resolved in accordance with the rights and principles of both individual liberty and national self-determination.

"7. As most governments of the Atlantic Community countries have accepted the obligatory clause of the Statute of the International Court of Justice at The Hague, the Convention recommends that all members of the Atlantic Community accept this obligatory clause.

"PART II—MORAL AND CULTURAL QUESTIONS

"A. The Atlantic Convention of NATO Nations declares that the basic moral and spiritual principles upon which the lives and acts of the nations forming the Atlantic Community are based are as follows:

"1. The purpose of political and economic institutions is the protection and promotion of the rights, liberties, and duties which enable every human being to fulfill his or her spiritual vocation.

"2. Liberty is inseparable from responsibility, which implies recognition of a moral law to which men, as individuals and in groups, are subject.

"3. Liberty is inseparable from the duties of men toward one another, which implies the obligation to insure that all men gradually attain physical and moral well-being.

"4. Liberty is inseparable from tolerance, which recognizes the right to free discussion of all opinions which are not in violation of the very principles of civilization.

"5. There can be no freedom without variety, the natural result of the different origins and varying achievements of different peoples in all fields. But this variety should not entail disunity. On the contrary, retaining the common factors, it should become the permanent force impelling the peoples of our Western civilization to unite.

"6. Freedom is inseparable from the spirit of objective truth, which must restore to words the exact meaning they have in the free world.

"And therefore invites member countries:

"1. To defend and promote the values and principles of civilization by means of education, publications, lectures, radio, the cinema, and television;

"2. To uphold in their conduct with all nations the ethics and values of Western civilization and by their example to impress on others that discord and disunity result when they are not observed;

"3. To defend these values and principles against intellectual and moral subversion within the Community;

"4. To try to establish an atmosphere of mutual understanding between the members of the Atlantic Community, appreciating to the full the riches of their diversity; and

"5. To demonstrate to all peoples that respect for these values and principles can alone make a technological civilization an instrument for improving the physical and moral well-being of mankind;

"Reconstruction of the Acropolis: To decide that the Acropolis shall become the symbol of our culture and the shrine of our alliance and to call upon governments to consider how this resolution might be given concrete form.

"B. The Atlantic Convention of NATO Nations—

"Considering that a major obstacle to the formation of real European and Atlantic Communities is the difference in language and therefore in mentalities and ways of thinking; and

"Considering that this language barrier is particularly prejudicial to the scientific cooperation upon which the Western potential depends—

"Invites the governments of NATO nations, and such other countries as may be inspired by the same ideal, to convene an Atlantic council consisting of Ministers of Education, Ministers for Scientific Affairs, cultural and educational authorities and representatives of universities and scientific research organizations, with a view to:

"1. Determining the comprehensive aims of an education likely to promote the ideals and purposes of the Atlantic Community, studying ways and means of implementing the principles laid down, and periodically reviewing the results achieved.

"2. Organizing—

"A bold Atlantic plan for youth and education with the aim of furthering the study of languages and the widest possible exchange of students, teachers, and youth leaders and of workers in industry and agriculture;

"A program of scientific cooperation among the scientists and the scientific institutions of the countries of the Community—

"Both of the above being financed by all participating nations.

"Within the framework of the above recommendations, the Convention draws the attention of governments to the following points:

"(a) Alongside the study and use of foreign languages, it is essential that mutual understanding be developed between men with different ways of thinking from all parts of the free world, including those of the emergent nations.

"This program should in the first place benefit university students, as many as possible of whom should be enabled to spend at least 1 year of their course in a university or other advanced training establishment where teaching is in a language other than their own.

"However, in the case of the most promising citizens of the emergent nations this program should have a special priority, since their intellectual hunger must be satisfied at all costs.

"Steps will have to be taken to insure that such periods spent at foreign universities or other establishments do not prejudice the career of the student concerned but rather confer advantages upon him in the form of either a degree valid in his own country or a new type of degree specially created for the purpose of enabling him, for instance, to exercise his profession either in his own country or in that where he has completed one or more years of study, always providing that his knowledge of the two languages is sufficient.

"(b) It is to be hoped that, in the future, those who have pursued such a course of training, which would subsequently be supplemented by exchanges of civil servants between Atlantic nations, will be given priority in selection for posts as officials required to take part in international negotiations.

"(c) It should be made possible for teachers, and particularly university teachers, research workers, and curators of museums and art galleries, either to be seconded periodically to equivalent foreign organizations, or to establish close contacts with them. Although it may not be immediately possible for all Atlantic Community countries, the introduction of the system of the sabbatical year for professors and research workers would be generally desirable.

"(d) In the field of scientific documentation and cooperation, it would be necessary to supplement existing organs by setting up a scientific documentation center responsible, among other things, for the translation and distribution of the principal articles, reports, and other publications appearing throughout the world, and which have not yet been distributed by other agencies. The committee considers this a most urgent matter.

"(e) The pairing off of universities and other advanced educational establishments of different languages within the Community should be encouraged and intensified.

"(f) The establishment and exchange of comparable statistics on education and research in the Atlantic community countries should be assured.

"C. Recommends that these proposals be studied further by the Atlantic Institute to assist in the accomplishment of these tasks in cooperation with existing agencies, such as the Council for Cultural Cooperation of the Council of Europe to avoid duplication of effort."

GENERAL RESOLUTION

"The Atlantic Convention of NATO Nations requests its president to forward the foregoing declaration and resolutions to the NATO Council and to the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference at the earliest possible date, and that the delegates to this convention report the same to their respective governments or legislative authorities at their earliest convenience."

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I think that those who participated in that Conference set the course in the right direction. I commend the report to the thoughtful consideration of Senators.

The group that assembled in Paris and gave of their time and effort over a period of several weeks are the outstanding leaders of the 15 NATO nations. There were more than 90 delegates present. I pay them high honor for the work that they did, and ask unanimous consent that the names of all the delegates, together with the countries that they represented, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE CONVENTION WITH ADDRESSES

Abdesselam, Robert (Suppléant/Alternate), Assemblée Nationale, Palais Bourbon, Paris 7e, France.

Adelmann, Count Raban, Kleinbottwar, Wurttemberg, German Federal Republic.

Agger, Donald G., 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., United States of America.

Allais, Prof. Maurise, 15 rue Gateceps, St. Cloud (Seine et Oise), France.

Andras, Kenneth B., 320 Bay Street, Toronto, Canada.

Bethouart, Général Antoine, 3, Place du Palais Bourbon, Paris 7e, France.

Billotte, Général P., 39, Boulevard du Commandant Charcot, Neuilly (Seine), France.

Blank, Dr. Martin, Am Grafenbusch 18, Oberhausen/Rhld., German Federal Republic.

Boel, Baron, 6, Square Frère Orban, Bruxelles, Belgique.

Bonaldi, Umberto, Via Vincenzo Tiberio 30, Rome, Italie.

Brandt, Prof. Dr. Leo, Leo Str. 100, Dusseldorf, German Federal Republic.

Brauer, Dr. Max, Ander Alster 65, Hamburg, German Federal Republic.

Buchan, the Honorable Alastair, the Institute for Strategic Studies, 18 Adam Street, London W.C. 2, England.

Burden, Hon. William A., 630 Fifth Avenue, New York City, United States of America.

Chamant, Jean, Assemblée Nationale, Palais Bourbon, Paris 7e, France.

de Chevigny, Pierre (Suppléant/Alternate), 23 Boulevard de Montmorency, Paris 16e, France.

Cifarelli, Michele, via Eutropio 24, Rome, Italy.

Clayton, Will C., Post Office Box 2538, Houston, Tex., United States of America.

Conte, Arthur, Président, L'Union de l'Europe Occidentale, 36 rue la Pérouse, Paris 16e.

Cooper, Edward (Alternate/Suppléant), 1600 I Street NW., Washington 6, D.C., United States of America.

Cory, Raymond, Mount Stuart House, Cardiff, United Kingdom.

Crathorne, the Right Honorable the Lord, House, of Lords, Westminster, London S.W. 1, England.

Dampierre, S. E. M. de (Suppléant/Alternate), 9 rue des Saints Peres, Paris 6e, France.

Danielou, Révérend Père, S.J., 15, rue Monsieur, Paris 7e, France.

Dundonald, the Right Honorable, the Earl of 6, St. James Place, London S.W. 1, England.

Engelhard, Charles W., 113 Astor Street, Newark, N.J., United States of America.

Ermini, Giuseppe, Camera dei Deputati, Rome, Italy.

Esmer, Prof. Ahmet Sükrü, 30 Olgunlar Sok, Ankara, Turkey.

Fandel, Romain (Suppléant/Alternate) 25, Avenue de la Gare, Esch/Alyette, Luxembourg.

Feldman, George J., 1010 Fifth Avenue, New York City, United States of America.

Fischbach, Marcel, 17, rue du Marché aux Herbes, Luxembourg.

Forgash, Morris, 711 Third Avenue, New York City, United States of America.

de Gaay Fortman, W. F., Zuidwerfplein 7, The Hague, Netherlands.

Garbo, Gunnar, Stortinget, Oslo, Norway.

Gillis, Don, RR 1, Garson, Ontario, Canada.

Gönlübol, Mehmet, Sizasal Bilgiler Fakültesi, Ankara, Turkey.

Goold-Adams, Richard, 60 Cottesmore Court, Stanford Road, London W.8, England.

de Graaff, G. J., care of Heerstelbank, Stadhouderslaan 1, The Hague, Netherlands.

Hallgrimsson, H. F., Vesturbrun 22, Reykjavik, Iceland.

Hereil, Georges, Président-Directeur Général, Sud Aviation, 37 Boulevard de Montmorency, Paris 16e, France.

Herter, The Honorable Christian A., 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C., United States of America.

Hulpiau, Raphael, Rue de la Loi 127, Bruxelles, Belgium.

Hutchins, Francis, Berea College, Berea, Kentucky, United States of America.

Huth, Dr. Eugen, Wupperthal, German Federal Republic.

Ilk, Dr. Herta, Beethovenstr. 8, Augsburg, German Federal Republic.

Johnston, Eric, 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D.C., United States of America.

Klebes, Dr. Heinrich (Alternate/Suppléant), care of BDI, Postfach 107, Köln, German Federal Republic.

Koper, Danis, Bahgelievler, 6 Sokak 37, Ankara, Turquie.

Kraft, Ole Bjorn, Kajerodvej 36, Birkerod, Denmark.

Kraft, Waldemar, Ahornweg 31, Bonn, German Federal Republic.

Lazareff, Pierre, France-Soir, 100 rue Réaumur, Paris 2e, France.

Le Bellegou, M. (Suppléant/Alternate), Hotel Terminus, St. Lazare, Paris, France.

Lombardo, Ivan Matteo, Piazza Stefano, Jacini 5, Rome, Italie.

Magnusson, Einar, Skeggjagata 11, Reyjavik, Iceland.

Mahias, M. (Suppléant/Alternate), A.F. C.A., 185 rue de la Pompe, Paris 16, France.

Markussen, Per, 11 H.C. Bordersens, Bonbrard, Copenhagen 5, Denmark.

Martins, Armando, Délégation portugaise auprès de l'OTAN, Porte Dauphine, Paris 16e, France.

Mathon, General T.E.E.H., Ruychrocklaan 124, The Hague, Netherlands.

Melander, Johan, Den Norske Creditbank, Oslo, Norway.

Mersinli, Orhan C., Mesrutiyet Cad 4/8, Yenisehir, Ankara, Turquie.

Micara, Senateur Pietro, Senato della Repubblica, Rome, Italie.

Montanari, Prof. Mario, Via Appia 23, Imola (Bologna), Italie.

Moore, Hugh, Dixie Cup Co., Easton, Pennsylvania, United States of America.

Mulley, Fred, M. P. (Alternate/Suppléant), House of Commons, London, England.

Naessens, M., Banquo de Paris et des Pays-Bas, 30–31 rue des Colonies, Bruxelles, Belgique.

Neyzi, A. (Suppléant/Alternate) (Turquie), 16 Avenue Paul Doumer, Paris 16e, France.

Nicholson, Patrick, 420 Minto Place, Rockcliffe Park, Ottawa, Canada.

Ogmore, The Rt. Hon. Lord, 34 Alexandra Court, Queens Gate, London S.W. 7, England.

Paget, John (Alternate/Suppléant), The Travellers, 25 ave. des Champs Elysées, Paris 8e, France.

Paget, R. T.; M. P., House of Commons, London, England.

Palewski, J. P. Assemblée Nationale, Palais Bourbon, Paris 7e, France.

Pallett, John, House of Commons, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.

Papi, Prof. Ugo, Rettore, Università di Roma, Roma, Italie.

Pirenne, Jacques-Henri (Suppléant/Alternate), 2 rue de la Régence, Bruxelles, Belgique.

Pittman, Ralph D., 1740 Poplar Lane NW., Washington, D.C., United States of America.

Portmann, Professeur G., leé Vice President, Le Sénat, Palais de Luxembourg, Paris 6e, France.

Regan, Ben, Hornblower and Weeks, 1 Chase Manhattan Plaza, New York City, United States of America.

Ressano, M. (Suppléant/Alternate), Délégation portugaise auprès de l'OTAN, Porte Dauphine, Paris 16e, France.

Roman, Stephen B., Roman Corporation, 4 King Street W., Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

Roper, Elmo, 111 West 50th Street, New York, N.Y., United States of America.

Rougier, Prof. Louis (Suppléant/Alternate), 354 rue St.-Honoré, Paris ler, France.

Sala, Amiral (Suppléant/Alternate), 22, rue Barbet de Jouy, Paris 7e, France.

Samkalden, Ivo, Prins Hendriklaan 22, Oegstgeest, Netherlands.

Sampson, Mrs. Edith S., 1236 Madison Park, Chicago, Ill., United States of America.

Sanness, John, Parkvn 12, Oslo, Norway.

Sarow, Friedrich, Telegraf, Bismarck Platz, Berlin/Gruenwald, German Federal Republic.

Schmidt, Adolph, 1060 Highmont Road, Pittsburgh, Pa., United States of America.

Schroeder, Prof. Oliver, Jr., Western Reserve Law School, Cleveland, Ohio, United States of America.

Sermon, Lucien (Suppléant/Alternate), 2, rue de la Régence, Bruxelles, Belgique.

Slessor, Sir John, Marshal of the Royal Air Force, Rimpton Manor, Yeovil, Somerset, England.

Stewart, Alistair, 459 McAdam Avenue, Winnipeg, Canada.

Swezey, Burr S., Lafayette, Ind., United States of America.

Tsakalotos, Général Thrasyvoulos, Dim, Soutsou 15, Place Marilli, Athens, Greece.

Tsaldaris, Mrs. Lina, Neofytou Vamva 10, Athens, Greece.

Valsecchi, Athos, Camera dei Deputati, Rome, Italie.

Vedovato, Giuseppe, Camera dei Deputati, Rome, Italie.

Vissing, Poul, 2, Fredheimsvej, Vedbaek, Denmark.

Wall, Senator William M., the Senate, Ottawa, Canada.

Walther, Dr. Gerhard, Paulsborner Strasse 8, Berlin/Halensee, German Federal Republic.

Warden, Alexander Tribune-Leader, Great Falls, Mont., United States of America.

Williamson, Sir Thomas, 17, Kingsdowne Road, Surbiton, Surrey, England.

Winter, Dr. Friedrich, Fuerth i. Bay, Koenigswarterster, 66/11, German Federal Republic.

Wynn, Douglas, 1130 Arnold Avenue, Greenville, Miss., United States of America.

Yalman, Ahmed Emin, Hür Vatan Gazetesi, Istanbul, Turquie.

Yazici, Bulent, Umum Müdür, Türkiye Is. Bankasi A.S., Ankara, Turquie.

Zaccari, Senateur Raul, Senato della Repubblica, Rome, Italie.

van Zeeland, Paul, 2, rue de la Régence, Bruxelles, Belgique.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, in closing let me say that the citizen delegates in whom we entrusted confidence acted in a statesmanlike manner. They saw clearly the goal ahead—the necessity to be united economically and politically, and to build the institutions that are necessary for such unity. They did not go as far as some would have liked—three delegates, two Italians and a Canadian withheld their votes because they thought the convention should have made more far-reaching recommendations. But I commend them for realizing that institutions grow by an evolutionary process. I think they have set the course in the right direction. I commend their report to the thoughtful consideration of governments.

Mr. CHURCH subsequently said: Madam President, earlier today a discussion took place on the floor relating to the U.S. Citizens' Commission on NATO, which recently met in Paris. I ask unanimous consent that the remarks I am about to make be printed in the RECORD immediately following that discussion.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Idaho? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CHURCH. Madam President, the U.S. Citizens' Commission on NATO, which has recently participated in the Atlantic Convention, will in due course file its report to the Congress. The results of the convention have already been published, however, in the form of a Declaration of Paris and resolutions adopted by nearly unanimous vote of the delegates from all of the NATO countries. I wish to comment briefly on the work of the U.S. Citizens' Commission at this convention.

The authorizing resolution, which I had the honor of reporting to the Senate, instructed our Citizens Commission to consult with other, similar, commissions from the NATO countries on means of strengthening the unity of the Atlantic Community. I think they deserve great credit for accomplishing this task with imagination, constructive zeal, and prudence.

Perhaps the most significant of the convention's recommendations is contained in the first resolution, which calls upon the governments of the NATO countries to draw up plans within 2 years for the creation of an Atlantic Community suitably organized to meet the political, military, and economic challenges of this era. I hope our own Government will take the lead in the implementation of this resolution, to the end that the acorn of Atlantic unity, now firmly rooted, will be nurtured to furnish a mighty shelter for Western civilization in the stormy years ahead.

IMPROVEMENT OF EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 330)

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. PELL in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, relating to the expansion and improvement of educational opportunities.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President's message on education be considered as having been read, and that the message be printed in the RECORD.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

No task before our Nation is more important than expanding and improving the educational opportunities of all our people. The concept that every American deserves the opportunity to attain the highest level of education of which he is capable is not new to this administration—it is a traditional ideal of democracy. But it is time that we moved toward the fulfillment of this ideal with more vigor and less delay.

For education is both the foundation and the unifying force of our democratic way of life—it is the mainspring of our economic and social progress—it is the highest expression of achievement in our society, ennobling and enriching human life. In short, it is at the same time the most profitable investment society can make and the richest reward it can confer.

Today, more than at any other time in our history, we need to develop our intellectual resources to the fullest. But the facts of the matter are that many thousands of our young people are not educated to their maximum capacity—and they are not, therefore, making the maximum contribution of which they are capable to themselves, their families, their communities, and the Nation. Their talents lie wasted—their lives are frequently pale and blighted—and their contribution to our economy and culture are lamentably below the levels of their potential skills, knowledge, and creative ability. Educational failures breed delinquency, despair, and dependence. They increase the costs of unemployment and public welfare. They cut our potential national economic output by billions. They deny the benefits of our society to large segments of our people. They undermine our capability as a Nation to discharge world obligations. All this we cannot afford—better schools we can afford.

To be sure, Americans are still the best educated and best trained people in the world. But our educational system has failed to keep pace with the problems and needs of our complex technological society. Too many are illiterate or untrained, and thus either unemployed or underemployed. Too many receive an education diminished in quality in thousands of districts which cannot or do not support modern and adequate facilities, well-paid and well-trained teachers, or even a sufficiently long school year.

Too many—an estimated 1 million a year—leave school before completing high school—the bare minimum for a fair start in modern-day life. Too many high school graduates with talent—numbering in the hundreds of thousands—fail to go on to college; and 40 percent of those who enter college drop out before graduation. And too few, finally, are going on to the graduate studies that modern society requires in increasing number. The total number of graduates receiving doctorate degrees has increased only about one-third in 10 years; in 1960 they numbered less than 10,000, including only 3,000 in mathematics, physical sciences, and engineering.

An educational system which is inadequate today will be worse tomorrow, unless we act now to improve it. We must provide facilities for 14 million more elementary, secondary school, and college students by 1970, an increase of 30 percent. College enrollments alone will nearly double, requiring approximately twice as many facilities to serve nearly 7 million students by 1970. We must find the means of financing a 75-percent increase in the total cost of education—another $20 billion a year for expansion and improvement—particularly in facilities and instruction which must be of the highest quality if our Nation is to achieve its highest goals.

THE ROLE OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The control and operation of education in America must remain the responsibility of State and local governments and private institutions. This tradition assures our educational system of the freedom, the diversity, and the vitality necessary to serve our free society fully. But the Congress has long recognized the responsibility of the Nation as a whole—that additional resources, meaningful encouragement, and vigorous leadership must be added to the total effort by the Federal Government if we are to meet the task before us. For education in this country is the right—the necessity—and the responsibility—of all. Its advancement is essential to national objectives and dependent on the greater financial resources available at the national level.

Let us put to rest the unfounded fears that "Federal money means Federal control." From the Northwest Ordinance of 1787, originally conceived by Thomas Jefferson, through the Morrill Act of 1862, establishing the still-important and still-independent land-grant college system, to the National Defense Education Act of 1958, the Congress has repeatedly recognized its responsibility to strengthen our educational system without weakening local responsibility. Since the end of the Korean war, Federal funds for constructing and operating schools in districts affected by Federal installations have gone directly to over 5,500 districts without any sign or complaint of interference or dictation from Washington. In the last decade, over $5 billion of Federal funds have been channeled to aid higher education without in any way undermining local administration.

While the coordination of existing Federal programs must be improved, we cannot meanwhile defer action on meeting our current pressing needs. Every year of further delay means a further loss of the opportunity for quality instruction to students who will never get that opportunity back. I therefore renew my urgent request of last year to the Congress for early action on those measures necessary to help this Nation achieve the twin goals of education: A new standard of educational excellence and the availability of such excellence to all who are willing and able to pursue it.

I. ASSISTANCE TO ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

Elementary and secondary schools are the foundation of our educational system. There is little value in our efforts to broaden and improve our higher education, or increase our supply of such skills as science and engineering, without a greater effort for excellence at this basic level of education. With our mobile population and demanding needs, this is not a matter of local or State action alone—this is a national concern.

Since my message on education of last year, our crucial needs at this level have intensified and our deficiencies have grown more critical. We cannot afford to lose another year in mounting a national effort to eliminate the shortage of classrooms, to make teachers' salaries competitive, and to lift the quality of instruction.

CLASSROOMS

To meet current needs and accommodate increasing enrollments—increasing by nearly 1 million elementary and secondary pupils a year in the 1960's—and to provide every child with the opportunity to receive a full-day education in an adequate classroom, a total of 600,000 classrooms must be constructed during this decade. The States report an immediate shortage today of more than 127,000 classrooms and a rate of construction which, combined with heavily increasing enrollments, is not likely to fill their needs for 10 years. Already over half a million pupils are in curtailed or half-day sessions. Unless the present rate of construction is accelerated and Federal resources made available to supplement State and local resources that are already strained in many areas few families and communities in the Nation will be free from the ill effects of overcrowded or inadequate facilities in our public schools.

TEACHERS' SALARIES

Teachers' salaries, though improving, are still not high enough to attract and retain in this demanding profession all the capable teachers we need. We entrust to our teachers our most valuable possession—our children—for a very large share of their waking hours during the most formative years of their life. We make certain that those to whom we entrust our financial assets are individuals of the highest competence and character—we dare not do less for the trustees of our children's minds.

Yet in no other sector of our national economy do we find such a glaring discrepancy between the importance of one's work to society and the financial reward society offers. Can any able and industrious student, unless unusually motivated, be expected to elect a career that pays more poorly than almost any other craft, trade, or profession? Until this situation can be dramatically improved—unless the States and localities can be assisted and stimulated in bringing about salary levels which will make the teaching profession competitive with other professions which require the same length of training and ability—we cannot hope to succeed in our efforts to improve the quality of our children's instruction and to meet the need for more teachers.

These are problems of national proportion. Last year I sent to the Congress a proposal to meet the urgent needs of the Nation's elementary and secondary schools. A bill (S. 1021) embodying this proposal passed the Senate last year; and similar legislation (H.R. 7300) was favorably reported to the House by its Committee on Education and Labor. It offered the minimum amount required by our needs and—in terms of across-the-board aid—the maximum scope permitted by our Constitution. It is imperative that such a proposal carrying out these objectives be enacted this session. I again urge the Congress to enact legislation providing Federal aid for public elementary and secondary classroom construction and teachers' salaries.

As noted earlier, Federal aid for construction and operation of many public schools has been provided since 1950 to those local school districts in which enrollments are affected by Federal installations. Such burdens which may remain from the impact of Federal activities on local school districts will be eased by my proposal for assistance to all school districts for construction and teachers' salaries, thus permitting modification and continuation of this special assistance program as proposed in last year's bill.

A fundamental overhauling and modernization of our traditional vocational education programs is also increasingly needed. Pursuant to my message on education last February, a panel of consultants to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is studying national needs in this area. They have been asked to develop recommendations by the close of this year for improving and redirecting the Federal Government's role in this program.

IMPROVEMENT OF EDUCATIONAL QUALITY

Strengthening financial support for education by general Federal aid will not, however, be sufficient. Specific measures directed at selected problems are also needed to improve the quality of education. And the key to educational quality is the teaching profession. About 1 of every 5 of the nearly 1,600,000 teachers in our elementary and secondary schools fails to meet full certification standards for teaching or has not completed 4 years of college work. Our immediate concern should be to afford them every possible opportunity to improve their professional skills and their command of the subjects they teach.

In all of the principal areas of academic instruction—English, mathematics, physical and biological sciences, foreign languages, history, geography, and the social sciences—significant advances are being made, both in pushing back the frontiers of knowledge and in the methods of transmitting that knowledge. To keep our teachers up to date on such advances, special institutes are offered in some of these areas by many colleges and universities, financed in part by the National Science Foundation and the Office of Education. Many elementary and secondary school teachers would profit from a full year of full-time study in their subject-matter fields. Very few can afford to do so. Yet the benefits of such a year could be shared by outstanding teachers with others in their schools and school systems as well as with countless students. We should begin to make such opportunities available to the elementary and secondary school teachers of this country and thereby accord to this profession the support, prestige, and recognition it deserves.

Another need is for higher standards of teacher education, course content, and instructional methods. The colleges and universities that train our teachers need financial help to examine and further strengthen their programs. Increased research and demonstration efforts must be directed toward improving the learning and teaching of subject matter and developing new and improved learning aids. Excellent but limited work in educational research and development has been undertaken by projects supported by the National Science Foundation, the Office of Education, and private groups. This must be increased—introducing and demonstrating to far more schools than at present up-to-date educational methods using the newest instructional materials and equipment, and providing the most effective inservice training and staff utilization.

Finally, in many urban as well as rural areas of the country, our school systems are confronted with unusually severe educational problems which require the development of new approaches—the problems of gifted children, deprived children, children with language problems, and children with problems that contribute to the high dropout rate, to name but a few.

To help meet all of these needs for better educational quality and development, and to provide a proper Federal role of assistance and leadership, I recommend that the Congress enact a program designed to help improve the excellence of American education by authorizing (1) the award each year of up to 2,500 scholarships to outstanding elementary and secondary school teachers for a year of full-time study; (2) the establishment of institutes at colleges and universities for elementary and secondary school teachers of those subjects in which improved instruction is needed; (3) grants to institutions of higher education to pay part of the cost of special projects designed to strengthen teacher preparation programs through better curriculums and teaching methods; (4) amendment of the Cooperative Research Act to permit support of extensive, multipurpose educational research, development, demonstration, and evaluation projects; and (5) grants for local public school systems to conduct demonstration or experimental projects of limited duration to improve the quality of instruction or meet special educational problems in elementary and secondary schools.

II. ASSISTANCE TO HIGHER EDUCATION

In the last 10 days, both Houses of Congress have recognized the importance of higher education to the fulfillment of our national and international responsibilities. Increasing student enrollments in this decade will place a still greater burden on our institutions of higher education than that imposed on our elementary and secondary schools where the cost of education per student is only a fraction as much. Between 1960 and 1970 it is expected that college enrollments will double, and that our total annual operating expenditures for expanding and improving higher education must increase 2½ times or by nearly $10 billion.

In order to accommodate this increase in enrollments, the Office of Education estimates that nearly $22 billion of college facilities will have to be built during the 1960's—three times the construction achieved in the last 10 years. The extension of the college housing loan program—with a $1.5 billion loan authorization for 5 years, enacted as part of the Housing Act of 1961—assures Federal support for our colleges' urgent residential needs. I am hopeful that the Congress will this month complete its action on legislation to assist in the building of the even more important and urgently needed academic facilities.

But I want to take this opportunity to stress that buildings alone are not enough. In our democracy every young person should have an equal opportunity to obtain a higher education, regardless of his station in life or financial means. Yet more than 400,000 high school seniors who graduated in the upper half of their classes last June failed to enter college this fall. In this group were 200,000 who ranked in the upper 30 percent of their class, of whom one-third to one-half failed to go on to college principally because of a lack of finances. Others lack the necessary guidance, incentive, or the opportunity to attend the college of their choice. But whatever the reason, each of these 400,000 students represents an irreplaceable loss to the Nation.

Student loans have been helpful to many. But they offer neither incentive nor assistance to those students who, by reason of family or other obligations, are unable or unwilling to go deeper into debt. The average cost of higher education today—up nearly 90 percent since 1950 and still rising—is in excess of $1,750 per year per student, or $7,000 for a 4-year course. Industrious students can earn a part of this—they or their families can borrow a part of it—but one-half of all American families had incomes below $5,600 in 1960—and they cannot be expected to borrow, for example, $4,000 for each talented son or daughter that deserves to go to college. Federal scholarships providing up to $1,000 a year can fill part of this gap. It is, moreover, only prudent economic and social policy for the public to share part of the costs of the long period of higher education for those whose development is essential to our national economic and social well-being. All of us share in the benefits—all should share in the costs.

I recommend that the full 5-year assistance to higher education proposal before the Congress, including scholarships for more than 200,000 talented and needy students and cost of education payments to their colleges be enacted without delay.

III. SPECIAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

1. MEDICAL AND DENTAL EDUCATION

The health needs of our Nation require a sharp expansion of medical and dental education in the United States. We do not have an adequate supply of physicians and dentists today—we are in fact importing many from abroad where they are urgently needed—and the shortage is growing more acute, as the demand for medical services mounts and our population grows. Even to maintain the present ratio of physicians and dentists to population we must graduate 50 percent more physicians and 90 percent more dentists per year by 1970, requiring not only the expansion of existing schools but the construction of at least 20 new medical schools and 20 new dental schools.

But here again more buildings are not enough. It is an unfortunate and disturbing fact that the high costs of the prolonged education necessary to enter these professions deprives many highly competent young people of an opportunity to serve in these capacities. Over 40 percent of all medical students now come from the 12 percent of our families with incomes of $10,000 or more a year, while only 14 percent of the students come from the 50 percent of the Nation's families with incomes under $5,000. This is unfair and unreasonable. A student's ability—not his parents' income—should determine whether he has the opportunity to enter medicine or dentistry.

I recommend that Congress enact the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act which I proposed last year to (a) authorize a 10-year program of matching grants for the construction of new medical and dental schools and (b) provide 4-year scholarships and cost-of-education grants for one-fourth of the entering students in each medical and dental school in the United States.

2. SCIENTISTS AND ENGINEERS

Our economic, scientific, and military strength increasingly requires that we have sufficient numbers of scientists and engineers to cope with the fast-changing needs of our time—and the agency with general responsibility for increasing this supply today is the National Science Foundation. At the elementary and secondary school level, I have recommended in the 1963 budget an expansion of the Science Foundation program to develop new instructional materials and laboratory apparatus for use in a larger number of secondary schools and to include additional subjects and age groups; an expansion of the experimental summer program permitting gifted high school students to work with university research scientists; and an expansion in the number of National Science Foundation supported institutes offering special training in science and mathematics for high school teachers throughout the country. The budget increase requested for this latter program would permit approximately 36,000 high school teachers, representing about 30 percent of the secondary school teachers of science and mathematics in this country, to participate in the program.

At the higher education level, I am recommending similar budget increases for institute programs for college teachers; improvement in the content of college science, mathematics and engineering courses; funds for laboratory demonstration apparatus; student research programs; additional top level graduate fellowships in science, mathematics and engineering; and $61.5 million in grants to our colleges and universities for basic research facilities.

3. REDUCTION OF ADULT ILLITERACY

Adult education must be pursued aggressively. Over 8 million American citizens aged 25 or above have attended school for less than 5 years, and more than a third of these completely lack the ability to read and write. The economic result of this lack of schooling is often chronic unemployment, dependency or delinquency, with all the consequences this entails for these individuals, their families, their communities and the Nation. The twin tragedies of illiteracy and dependency are often passed on from generation to generation.

There is no need for this. Many nations—including our own—have shown that this problem can be attacked and virtually wiped out. Unfortunately, our State school systems—overburdened in recent years by the increasing demands of growing populations and the increasing handicaps of insufficient revenues—have been unable to give adequate attention to this problem. I recommend the authorization of a 5-year program of grants to institutions of higher learning and to the States, to be coordinated in the development of programs which will offer every adult who is willing and able the opportunity to become literate.

4. EDUCATION OF MIGRANT WORKERS

The neglected educational needs of America's 1 million migrant agricultural workers and their families constitute one of the gravest reproaches to our Nation. The interstate and seasonal movement of migrants imposes severe burdens on those school districts which have the responsibility for providing education to those who live there temporarily. I recommend authorization of a 5-year Federal-State program to aid States and school districts in improving the educational opportunities of migrant workers and their children.

5. EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION

The use of television for educational purposes—particularly for adult education—offers great potentialities. The Federal Government has sought to further this through the reservation of 270 television channels for education by the Federal Communications Commission and through the provision of research and advisory services by the Office of Education. Unfortunately, the rate of construction of new broadcasting facilities has been discouraging. Only 80 educational TV channels have been assigned in the last decade. It is apparent that further Federal stimulus and leadership are essential if the vast educational potential of this medium is to be realized. Last year an educational television bill passed the Senate, and a similar proposal was favorably reported to the House. I urge the Congress to take prompt and final action to provide matching financial grants to the States to aid in the construction of State or other nonprofit educational television stations.

6. AID TO HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

Another longstanding national concern has been the provision of specially trained teachers to meet the educational needs of children afflicted with physical and mental disabilities. The existing program providing Federal assistance to higher education institutions and to State education agencies for training teachers and supervisory personnel for mentally retarded children was supplemented last year to provide temporarily for training teachers of the deaf. I recommend broadening the basic program to include assistance for the special training needed to help all our children afflicted with the entire range of physical and mental handicaps.

7. FEDERAL AID TO THE ARTS

Our Nation has a rich and diverse cultural heritage. We are justly proud of the vitality, the creativity, and the variety of the contemporary contributions our citizens can offer to the world of the arts. If we are to be among the leaders of the world in every sense of the word, this sector of our national life cannot be neglected or treated with indifference. Yet, almost alone among the governments of the world, our Government has displayed little interest in fostering cultural development. Just as the Federal Government has not, should not, and will not undertake to control the subject matter taught in local schools, so its efforts should be confined to broad encouragement of the arts. While this area is too new for hasty action, the proper contributions that should and can be made to the advancement of the arts by the Federal Government—many of them outlined by the Secretary of Labor in his decision settling the Metropolitan Opera labor dispute—deserve thorough and sympathetic consideration. A bill (H.R. 4172) already reported out to the House would make this possible and I urge approval of such a measure establishing a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts to undertake these studies.

IV. CONCLUSION

The problems to which these proposals are addressed would require solution whether or not we were confronted with a massive threat to freedom. The existence of that threat lends urgency to their solution—to the accomplishment of those objectives which, in any case, would be necessary for the realization of our highest hopes and those of our children.

> If a nation—

Wrote Thomas Jefferson in 1816—

> expects to be ignorant and free, in a state of civilization, it expects that never was and never will be.

That statement is even truer today than it was 146 years ago.

The education of our people is a national investment. It yields tangible returns in economic growth, an improved citizenry and higher standards of living. But even more importantly, free men and women value education as a personal experience and opportunity—as a basic benefit of a free and democratic civilization. It is our responsibility to do whatever needs to be done to make this opportunity available to all and to make it of the highest possible quality.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 6, 1962*.

AID FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. PASTORE obtained the floor.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President——

Mr. PASTORE. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, as we continue this afternoon to debate and vote on the issue of Federal funds for college classroom construction and higher education programs, I merely wish to state that I expect to support the committee and the bill and vote against amendments that in my opinion might delay final action on the proposed legislation. It is my hope that when the bill is finally approved in conference that it will be largely the House approved bill.

I have before me an interesting article which appeared recently in the Christian Science Monitor, which I think will serve to call our attention to the cost of Federal participation in education. The article was written by Josephine Ripley, I wish to read only a short excerpt:

> The Government is up to its ears in education programs. A recent preliminary survey showed some 40 Federal agencies spending about $2 billion a year on educational programs.

I think the article contains information that we all should have. We doubtless at times fail to realize how many programs of education the various agencies of Government are engaged in.

In order to make the article available to Senators, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDUCATION COSTS, FOR WHOM?

(By Josephine Ripley)

The Government is up to its ears in education programs. A recent preliminary survey showed some 40 Federal agencies spending about $2 billion a year on educational programs.

This fact so shocked legislators that most of the education bills now pending in the House are being held back while a thorough study is conducted to see how much overlapping is involved in these many and varied projects.

Chairman POWELL of the House Education and Labor Committee describes this multitude of educational programs throughout the government as "unbelievable."

Representative EDITH GREEN, chairman of the Subcommittee on Higher Education, has been urging a survey of these activities for the past 3 years.

Oddly, she finds more money is being spent for education by other departments of Government taken together than by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"I don't know of any single official in government, or anywhere else, who knows what the educational program really is," she has stated.

The preliminary study shows educational funds expended for agricultural extension programs, for census training, maritime administration schools, meteorological education and training, and training in the National Bureau of Standards under the Department of Commerce.

For military service academies, education for civilian and military personnel, for children of servicemen overseas; for the native population on the Pacific islands, medical education for national defense; and research assistantships under the Department of Defense.

Under the Department of the Interior, for Bureau of Mines safety program, the education of children of National Park Service employees, education in American Samoa, the Pribilof Islands, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (Carolinas, Marshalls, and Marianas), and for Indians.

Under the Department of Justice, for Bureau of Prisons general and social education, Bureau of Prisons correspondence courses; vocational training, the FBI National Academy and police training schools.

The Department of Labor has educational programs for testing, counseling, and placement services, for the foreign visitors' program, and for apprenticeship and training.

The Department of State has its educational exchange programs, country missions, and interuniversity contracts.

The Treasury has programs for Coast Guard training, education of dependent children overseas, Internal Revenue Service training for enforcement personnel.

The Atomic Energy Commission has programs of contract research, fellowships, expenditures for public schools and other training.

Under the District of Columbia there is the Capitol Page School (the pages for Members of Congress), education in public welfare institutions, and public education, since the District is a Federal city.

The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation conducts employee education programs; the Library of Congress supplies reading material for the blind; the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has training and research centers; so has the National Science Foundation.

The Office of Civil Defense, the Small Business Administration, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Veterans' Administration all have certain educational projects.

Mrs. GREEN has raised numerous questions with respect to these projects. She observes: "We keep increasing funds for agricultural extension work at a time when the census shows that the rural population is declining while the urban population increases."

Even while Congress launched upon its investigation of education costs, the House by an overwhelming majority approved a $1,500 million Federal aid program to help American colleges build classrooms. The Senate is expected to start action immediately on an even broader college-aid bill.

Pending also are: the educational television bill for purchase of educational TV equipment; Youth Employment Opportunities Act of 1961; Veterans Adjustment Assistance Act of 1961; Manpower Development and Training Act.

The administration has proposed a bill to reduce adult illiteracy, due to be introduced formally in Congress. And there is the President's controversial program for aid to public schools which has been blocked and on which no action is expected.

But even without this proposed $2,500 million for public school aid, the cost of education to the Government—the taxpayer, that is—is bound to be on the rise substantially over the next decade.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I rise to express my appreciation to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, to its chairman, Senator LISTER HILL, and to all its members, who have brought S. 1241—this bill for higher education—to its present point of perfection.

It is the nature of the Senate process, with its division of labor, that many of us, not members of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, are permitted to bide our time. We profit by the long hours of hearings, reviews, and reconciliations that produce a bill in its final form.

Then we speak our minds by means of our vote. But I feel impelled to add my voice of appreciation to my vote of approval. In this area of education, especially higher education, every one of us in the Senate is keenly aware of our needs. In comparison with and in competition with the Soviet intellectual ideology we are aware of our shortcomings. We are alive to the urgency of effective, practical, and adequate steps to combat deficiencies and to match and surpass the pace of those who would deny our ideals and destroy our destiny.

If any Senator were dilatory in recognizing the necessity for action in this field, he would certainly be alerted by responsible persons within his State. These are the responsible persons dedicated to education—persons whose whole lives are immersed in the problems to which we can give so limited a time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be given sufficient time to complete my statement, not to exceed 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, in the panorama of programs and policies which give our country character in the era for which we of the Senate bear responsibility, it is unfortunate that our legislative time has to be so rationed. But when I say "limited time" I do not mean to imply that this deliberative body has not thoroughly studied the subject and intelligently reached the conclusions embodied in this measure S. 1241.

I compliment the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] for his scholarly, statesmanlike and exhaustive presentation of last Friday, February 2. The issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that day and date is a volume to be treasured for its logic and illumination of what must be done in this field of higher education and how to do it. S. 1241 in its finished form is a masterminding of a peril that perplexes us in a country of our native riches and world responsibility.

Some of us see the problem in the simple fact that 68,000 of the top 30 percent of our high school graduates are not going to college this year. Finance and facilities are the roadblocks. This bill, I believe, removes some of these roadblocks and give us a genuine impetus along the path to more adequate higher education.

I have said that responsible leaders in education would alert us to the need for S. 1241. Senator MORSE in his Friday presentation recorded the support of college authorities in his own State of Oregon.

I would like to supplement this with support from my own State of Rhode Island, and I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Very Reverend Vincent C. Dore, O.P., president of Providence College, and a telegram from President Barnaby C. Keeney, of Brown University, be inserted in the RECORD at this point of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter and telegram were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROVIDENCE COLLEGE,
Providence, R.I., January 29, 1962.

The Honorable JOHN O. PASTORE,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PASTORE: Providence College requests your support for the passage of S. 1241 which provides matching grants at low interest rates to public and private colleges for the construction of classrooms, dormitories, libraries, and laboratories. We believe the need for such assistance is urgent to provide for ever-increasing requests for admission to our colleges and universities.

Kindest personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

VINCENT C. DORE, O.P.,
President.

PROVIDENCE, R.I., *January 29, 1962.*

Hon. JOHN O. PASTORE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Hope you will support S. 1241 establishing program of loans and grants for construction of academic facilities program is urgently needed although amount provided for Rhode Island in present bill is too small to meet needs in this State.

BARNABY C. KEENEY.

Mr. PASTORE. The president of Brown University suggests that the amount allotted to Rhode Island is too small to meet the needs in our State.

This indicates that we are not extravagant in our allocations of moneys. It also gives rise to this thought: the benefits of a State's educational opportunities are not limited to students from that State. The major part of students in our colleges come from outside the State of Rhode Island. But I also realize that many Rhode Island students profit from educational facilities outside our State.

This emphasizes the universality of American education—it is not limited by the boundaries of individual States. We are also emphasizing the universality of education in that its benefits cannot and should not be limited to the phenomenal student. There is with us the challenge of equal opportunity. This is the opportunity for each American boy and girl to make the most out of their lives and to benefit human society from the perfection of their God-given talents.

This opportunity for education is the obligation of human society and it is the source of society's strength. This is the philosophy of educational leaders who support this measure for educational aid, S. 1241.

I would like to quote briefly from one of these leaders. At the same time I would ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the complete article by Rev. Joseph L. Lennon, dean of Providence College. The article is from the Providence Bulletin of January 24, 1962.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, Father Lennon says:

> Society then is human society, erected by the free consent of human persons and having as its aim the common good of its members, the providing of the conditions of the good life through which they can most completely develop their human potentialities.
>
> "Unselfish love of the common good"—

Father Lennon quotes Thomas Aquinas—

> "makes a good citizen."
>
> This love of the citizen must, of course, like all love, be preceded by knowledge. It is here that our schools can be most helpful. The citizen has to be profoundly conscious of his dependence on society; he has to recognize himself as incomplete, as insufficient unto himself. He has to see civil society as it is, a unity of men like himself who desire to live the good life and who for the purpose of offering mutual help toward the realization of a common social and cultural well-being in which all may participate.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. PASTORE. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to proceed for 1 more minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to thank the Senator from Rhode Island for the very fine contribution he has made to the debate on the higher education bill. His premises are unanswerable, and I commend him for them. I thank him very much for the gracious comments he has made about the senior Senator from Oregon.

OUR CONGO POLICY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, for many reasons the presence in Washington of Prime Minister Cyrille Adoula of the Congo is an occasion for congratulations on the so far good results of our Congo policy. We certainly wish Prime Minister Adoula good success in his efforts to establish peace and progress in his country. The new Republic has a long way to go before it can solve its major problems, but the situation has shown a decided trend toward improvement.

United States policy toward the Congo was formulated by President Eisenhower and continued under the present administration. It calls for support of the actions taken by the United Nations in fulfilling the mandate of the General Assembly, and the success of that policy so far, notwithstanding trials and doubts, is confirmed by the clear progress that has been made. Five out of the six Provinces of the Congo are clearly under the control of the Central Government, and the process of reintegrating Katanga is proceeding under the direction of the United Nations.

An advertisement in the New York Times of Thursday, January 25, 1962, by a group of civic and educational leaders, many of whom are actively engaged in teaching and research in African affairs, commended our Government for its Congo policy, quoting President Eisenhower's statement of policy on September 22, 1960, and concluding with the following statement:

> The United Nations is in the Congo with objectives that by and large parallel our own—to help the Adoula government create a stable and unified Congo and to ward off the dangers of civil war and great-power intervention. So far, the United Nations has been remarkably successful in its efforts toward this end; had it not been available for this purpose, we should have had to invent it, or the situation would already be lost. The United Nations effort deserves our support. We have given it. We should continue to do so.
>
> The Adoula government, the only legitimate government of the Congo, is a broadly based coalition under the leadership of an outstanding non-Communist African nationalist. This government's objectives are fully consistent with ours. It, too, deserves our support and will have it.

THE AIRLINE INDUSTRY

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, there has come to my attention an article in the current issue of Aerospace, official publication of the Aerospace Industries Association, which summarizes quite well the current condition of our airline industry.

This article by Stuart G. Tipton, president of the Air Transport Association of America, shows the remarkable progress made by our airlines in the field of safety, equipment, and service. The author, at the same time, points to certain immediate problems because of the earnings record of the past few years, particularly of our domestic trunk carriers.

In calling attention to this review of the air transport industry, I should like, at the same time, to point out that the scheduled airlines' national trade and service organization, the Air Transport Association, has now completed more than a quarter-century of service to the general public. By the key role which it plays in assisting the airlines in cooperative ways, it has helped carry out the mandate of Congress expressed in the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 and reaffirmed in the Federal Aviation Act of 1958.

The association began in 1936 when it became clear that only through a thoroughly integrated national air transport system would the maximum benefits of air travel be brought to the public.

While adhering to the philosophy of regulated competition so clearly expressed in the Civil Aeronautics Act, it was also obvious that some organization such as the ATA would be required so that the airlines could draw on each other's knowledge and experience for ways and means of improving safety, for pooling ideas to increase efficiency in maintenance, flight operations and other areas of air transport. ATA is the forum for the cooperation which is so necessary to work out uniform procedures in the areas of reservations, ticketing, accounting, and luggage, mail and cargo handling, to facilitate interline transportation.

On this 26th anniversary of the ATA, I am gratified to commend to your attention the contributions which the airlines, through their association, have made. These contributions have allowed the U.S. scheduled airline system to lead the world in air transportation.

I have known Stuart G. Tipton, president of the Air Transport Association, since the midthirties, when I was a Member of the House of Representatives and was one of the sponsors of the measure which became the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938.

Mr. Tipton, at that time, was an attorney in the Treasury Department and performed a material part in perfecting this legislation. He is conscientious, knowledgeable, and fair in his application to public issues. I am certain that these attributes have contributed a vital part in the high standing which he and his association have in the aviation world today.

DEFENSE CONTRACTS IN NEW YORK STATE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I feel it my duty vigorously to protest the action of the Air Force and the Defense Department which unless halted or modified, will result in throwing from 12,000 to 14,000 employees of Republic Aviation out of work. It is the most devastating blow that has yet been struck at the economy of New York State. In the last year, defense contracts awarded in New York State have dropped from 12 percent to 8 percent.

It must not be forgotten that New York State was already getting the short end of the stick before this recent drop. New York State contributes almost 20 percent of the taxes paid to run the Federal Government. There need not necessarily be a correlation between that figure and the amount of defense work the State of New York receives, but there should be a much closer connection than is indicated in the figures I have cited.

I have already lodged a vigorous protest with the Air Force. The congressional steering committee from New York and all the Members of the New York delegation, of both parties, are greatly disturbed over this development. I sincerely trust that the Air Force will have a second look.

This action comes about through a rejection of certain planes and proposed planes developed by this company. It is not my contention that we should try to dictate to the Department of Defense exactly what planes they should purchase; but it is my belief that it does not make sense to eliminate completely from their thinking the contribution which this fine firm has made in the past to our defense strength and the overall contribution which the State of New York makes to the national economy. To deal such a sudden and devastating blow to this important area of the State of New York is not and cannot, under any possible circumstances, be in the national interest.

DEATH OF WALTER J. LYON OF THE BINGHAMTON, N.Y., SUN-BULLETIN

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to the memory of a distinguished and colorful member of the Fourth Estate in upstate New York.

Walter J. Lyon, managing editor of the Binghamton Sun-Bulletin, died of a heart attack on the morning of February 5. Although more than 80 years old, "Bud" Lyon remained an active and vigorous newspaperman to the time of his death. He was beloved not only by his fellow journalists, but also by all persons in public life in New York State who had the privilege to make his acquaintance.

With his passing, one of the last remaining links is broken with the enterprising generation of America journalists who flourished during the years preceding World War I. Walter Lyon came out of that era and kept steady pace with developments that have since occurred in the newspaper trade. He will be missed by a wide circle of friends and admirers in upstate New York.

THE PERILS OF HATE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to commend the Commandant of the U.S. Marine Corps, Gen. David M. Shoup, for his statement recently given before the Senate Special Preparedness Subcommittee.

I share the general's position that a positive, rather than a negative approach, is the best way to train our men for combat. General Shoup frowns upon the idea, expressed by some, that we should be putting ever greater emphasis on a "hate communism" campaign. Rather, he said:

> We teach them what there is in this country that is worth living for, worth fighting for, worth giving your life for.

Now we all hate communism, Mr. President, but the answer to the admitted Communist menace does not lie in seeing who can shout the loudest and the most often that he hates communism. The way to lick communism is with positive programs and positive approaches. It is not enough to be anti-Communist. No, we must do much more than that if our free society is to survive.

General Shoup in his statement shows a clear understanding of the proper role of the professional fighting man and his position in relation to the duly elected civilian leaders of the Nation. His testimony is a credit to the Marine Corps which he so proudly heads. I salute him for it.

I ask unanimous consent that a recent editorial from the Washington Post on this subject be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PERILS OF HATE

A special cheer is in order for Gen. David M. Shoup's broad measure of commonsense on the training of men for combat. One might expect General Shoup, as Commandant of the Marine Corps, to be foremost among those who are crying for a hate-communism campaign. Instead, he coolly explained to the Special Senate Preparedness Subcommittee that the marines, under his leadership, avoid hate and concentrate on ability to tangle with an enemy.

The general's thesis is that hate is a poison which is associated with fear and that fear breeds defeatism. Instead of trying to galvanize the marines with prejudices and passion, General Shoup said, "We teach them what there is in this country that is worth living for, worth fighting for, worth giving your life for." It was not hate that sustained the American fighting men who were captured in Korea, he added, but "faith and confidence, faith in the Nation and confidence in their way of life in America."

Some military men may challenge General Shoup's belief that emphasis on the positive values of our civilization is the best psychological conditioning for fighting men, but it is certainly better than hate mongering as training for citizenship. And when a nation is dependent upon citizen soldiers, it cannot afford to infect them with a hate virus that may deeply influence many of them during the remainder of their lives. For the same reason it is not a sound policy to rely primarily upon the military to inform the general public about the dangers of a potential enemy. The best interests of the country can be served if men who understand the value of freedom help soldiers and citizens alike to meet their responsibilities without resorting to the tools (hate and fear) that have made communism itself so odious and so fraught with peril.

PROPOSED DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in recent weeks there has been a great organized effort to block the establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs. From the opposition mail I have been receiving on this subject, it is clear that many well-intentioned citizens are being sadly misled as to what this proposal really is.

Walter Lippmann in a recent column described the true purpose of this Department and why it is necessary and in the best interest of the country as a whole. As Mr. Lippmann notes, the proposed Department of Urban Affairs would not take away from the cities or the States any of their present powers. It does not grant a single new power to the Federal Government. It does not create any new bureaucracy. No, all that it does is to put the various Federal programs dealing with urban affairs all under one roof, so to speak. And it would mean that for the first time there would be a spokesman for urban dwellers sitting in the Cabinet just as we have men in the Cabinet to speak on behalf of working people, the business community, and the farm community.

As I said, there has been a good deal of deliberate misinformation spread in recent weeks on this matter. Mr. Lippmann's article sets the record straight. I ask unanimous consent that his article appear at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MUCH ADO

(By Walter Lippmann)

In the political hullabaloo about the proposed Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, it is useful to remember that the Department will possess no new Federal powers and will possess no new money to spend. All the powers which are to be in the new Department have long since been voted by Congress. These powers will come from four existing agencies and all the Department will be able to spend is what Congress has authorized these agencies to spend. For this is a reorganization and not a new grant of power.

What ground, then, is there for thinking that the new Department creates anything new? Can it do anything which cannot already be done by one of the four constituent agencies? The answer is, it seems to me, that it can focus attention on the mounting problems of the cities and of the metropolitan areas. It can bring together and encourage those who know and care about these problems, and it can do much to get them a hearing.

The new Department will have no power and no money to replan the old cities and to plan the development of the new metropolitan areas. But it can promote the studies which must precede the replanning and the development. This will have to be done in order to make life decent and convenient for the three-quarters of the American people who live in urban areas. Over and above the work of the old agencies which would be grouped in the new Department, it would be essentially a department of research and education in urban affairs.

Why, it will be asked, is this a good thing to have done from Washington? The answer is that it cannot be done adequately and as a matter of fact is not being done adequately, by the States and municipalities. There are several reasons for that. One reason is that in the State legislatures the urban voters are grossly underrepresented as against the rural voters. Another reason is that the expanding metropolitan areas overlap State, county, and municipal lines, and if they are to be governed properly, development must be planned on a metropolitan scale. The planning and development cannot be done merely by the localities of the past which are now being swallowed up by the metropolis.

As for the politics which now swirl about the proposal, the fact is that there would have been little of it had the Republican leaders not made so much ado about nothing. It was wrong and it was foolish of them to gang up with a few southern Democrats in the House Rules Committee in order to refuse to let the House vote on the proposal. On what principle—constitutional, moral, or political—can it be argued that the House of Representatives should not be allowed to vote on a proposal made by the President of the United States?

This wrong was a silly one to commit because the Republican leaders seem to have forgotten that the President could force the House to have a chance to vote by doing with the Department of Urban Affairs what President Eisenhower did with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—to send it to Congress under the Reorganization Act of 1949. If there was a political trap in all this, the Republican leaders laid the trap into which they have fallen. They should not have forgotten the Reorganization Act of 1949.

I do not know what part the proposed appointment of Mr. Weaver has played in promoting the coalition of southern Democrats and Republicans. Mr. Weaver is already the head of the Housing Administration, which will be the largest component of the Department, and a refusal to promote him when he is so preeminently qualified could have been explained only as racial discrimination.

Nevertheless, he is no doubt the main reason for the opposition of the southern Democrats. But he cannot be the reason for the opposition of the Republican leaders who are making all sorts of gestures, no doubt sincerely, to prove themselves to be friends of the Negro voters.

I cannot help thinking that the Republicans did not stop to consider what they were doing, and that they acted on their reflexes, which take it for granted that any new proposal to deal with the changing world is automatically undesirable.

CENSORSHIP OF ANTI-COMMUNIST STATEMENTS OF MILITARY AND CIVILIAN LEADERS IN GOVERNMENT

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD several articles and editorials from various newspapers and magazines across the country on the subject of censorship of anti-Communist statements of military and civilian leaders in our Government. These censored items and the comments of the censors are very interesting and merit the study and attention of all Americans.

There being no objection, the article and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From U.S. News & World Report, Feb. 5, 1962]

THE WAY MILITARY SPEECHES ARE CENSORED: SOME EXAMPLES

Senate investigators found 154 instances of censorship of speeches by military officers in the last 3 years. Most of the deletions or changes of wording had been ordered by the Department of State.

In 26 of the speeches cited by the Senate investigators, the man whose words were censored was Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, the

Army's Chief of Research and Development, former head of Army Intelligence.

Testifying before the Senate investigating subcommittee on January 23, 1962, General Trudeau said some of the changes "caused me to wonder."

Following is from his testimony:

"On November 19, 1959, when I addressed the American Ordnance Association here in Washington, it was suggested by the Department of State that I not say, and I quote:

" 'The tenets of Marx and Engels and Lenin are as firm a part of the Communist doctrine as when they were announced.'

"The Department of State's comment to this suggested change was, and again I quote:

" 'They (the Communists) have jettisoned many of these tenets, unfortunately, because tenets were retarding industrial expansion.'

"Again, in the same American Ordnance Association speech, I was not permitted to say:

" 'The three Sputnik satellites lend substance to * * * (Communist) claims (of an intercontinental ballistic missile) and their lunar probes should clinch them.'

"The Department of State's comment on this mandatory change was, and I quote:

" 'Policy is to separate military from scientific achievement of U.S.S.R. It is much easier for Soviets to hit the moon than to hit the Pentagon. Such remarks tend to frighten our friends.' "

Following are some other changes cited in General Trudeau's speeches:

Statement: "Coexistence is not a choice. It is a fatal disease."

Change: Deleted. No reason given.

Statement: "On such theories socialism thrives."

Change: Deleted. State Department's comment. "Some of our best friends are Socialists."

Statement: "The eminent British historian, Arnold Toynbee, has pointed out that 19 of 21 notable world civilizations have died from within and not by conquest from without."

Change: Deletion suggested. State Department's comment: "Toynbee is a highly questionable historian—not likely to impress this audience."

Adm. Arleigh Burke, retired, testified on January 25 that some of the censorship applied to his speeches appeared to be capricious. He said: "I didn't see any pattern to the thing except that statements against communism—statements against the dangers of communism—were frequently removed."

Nikita Khrushchev was a touchy subject for military speakers.

Maj. Gen. T. C. Darcy, of the Army, in one prepared address, made a reference to Khrushchev's "smiling face and outstretched hand." This was eliminated with the comment:

"Let's stay away from Khrushchev for the time being."

Several attempts by military speakers to quote Khrushchev's statement that "We will bury you" were blocked by censors, who deleted the quotation. One censor explained his action with this comment: "He has denied that he meant this literally."

Attitudes of censors appeared to change, from time to time.

Early in 1961, references to "the Communists" were changed frequently to read "the Sino-Soviet bloc."

But later in 1961, references to the Sino-Soviet bloc were changed to read "the Communists."

Two examples were shown where the word "Christian" was deleted. In one instance, the censor changed "Christian people" to "peace-loving people." In another, the sentence, "We are a Christian nation," was cut out.

Expressions that impressed the censor as warlike were struck out repeatedly from speeches. Examples:

The word "conflict" changed to "struggle." "Massive retaliation" changed to "intercontinental nuclear capabilities." "Show of force" deleted.

In one speech, a military officer said:

"A missile firing from Alaska to China has a significant range advantage over a missile located on the west coast of the United States."

A State Department censor said: "No. This could be interpreted as aggressive intent."

Even a race horse is not safe from the censor's blue pencil. An Air Force officer referred to the X-15 plane as "the Man o' War of the stable of research aircraft."

Censor's comment: "Let's use another steed—Zev, Gallant Fox, etc., but not this one."

An Air Force general once proposed to say:

"And if it came to a mutual suicide type of fight, our Air Force figures that our highly urbanized United States would suffer many times the losses of ruralized Russia."

This was deleted by the State Department with the comment:

"State feels Khrushchev does not want general war and is unwilling to bear the losses such a war would entail, even though he could win it. This passage also discusses war in specific U.S.-U.S.S.R. terms, which we wish to avoid."

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 26, 1962]

AUTOCRATS AT THE COPY TABLE

In a long life of putting one little word after another we've had our share of horrendous experiences with capricious copyeditors. Even today we can hardly write anything and escape arguments from our colleagues about our logic, rhetoric or punctuation.

But the experiences of Lieutenant General Trudeau with the curious minds of bureaucratic copyreaders make us realize how placid our life has been. Also makes us wonder how a general ever gets a speech written that says anything at all.

Under the current rules, any general who is making a speech must submit an advance text to a whole "slew" of civilian supervisors in the Pentagon and State Department; you never can tell when a general might get confused about what the latest policy is or, what is worse, have an idea of his own. Military minds, you understand, mustn't be allowed to think.

Well, General Trudeau has been called upon to make a lot of speeches lately, for civic gatherings and all that sort of thing, and he preserved for posterity copies of his speeches as originally written and as they finally got through the labyrinthian copydesk. What was done to them would make a Madison Avenue TV writer, even accustomed as he is to the whims of advertisers, quiver in sympathy.

A good many of the blue-penciled changes are just the whimsies of small minds, and if General Trudeau should ask us, as one writing man to another we'd say that sometimes the original was better than the revised writ.

For example, the general once wrote, on the subject of courage in the face of world troubles: "We must resolutely resist those disciples of despair who crawl around the campus clubs, cocktail lounges, corner drug stores and country clubs. * * *" General Trudeau was told that he would undermine the Republic if he didn't delete the two words "campus clubs."

The official explanation for this was a derogatory remark about one segment of our society. This won't hold water because "country clubs" was left in, and we cannot believe it's official U.S. Government policy to be derogatory of country clubs either, especially since President Kennedy belongs to several of them himself. The true explanation, we're sure, is that the copy editor didn't like all this piling up of alliterations. We've suffered the same fate many a time.

But some of the deletions are hardly explainable by this holier-than-thou attitude about rhetoric. For instance, General Trudeau wanted to say:

"There can be no doubt in any of our minds today as to why we must have the best possible weapons and equipment in all of the Armed Forces—locked as we are in vital competition with the Communists."

Now none of the civilian overseers caught the awkwardness of the phrase "as to why." No; what the State Department demanded to be deleted was the phrase "locked as we are in vital competition with the Communists." Whether General Trudeau's ideological slip was to admit we are in "competition with the Communists" or whether the fault was to consider it "vital," we didn't know because the State Department never bothered to explain.

But whatever word it was that tripped the general, the impression is plainly left that the civilian brains in the State Department either do not believe that we are locked in competition with the Communist world or that the outcome of that struggle is vital to this country's future. Or at least that it's something nobody ought to say right out loud.

The expurgated and unexpurgated versions of General Trudeau's speeches are full of many more such silly examples. And if nothing else they show why this argument about "muzzling the military" is not so simple as President Kennedy would have it appear. The military mind, as it's fashionable to call it, may sometimes act in strange ways but never so strange a way as the minds of petty bureaucrats made autocrats over what ideas the people shall hear.

[From the San Diego Evening Tribune, Feb. 1, 1962]

CENSORS TOUCHY ABOUT K., CUBA

WASHINGTON.—Censors, many of them unidentified, who have blue-penciled speeches by military leaders, are under investigation by a congressional subcommittee.

Charges have been made that military men have been muzzled by the censors from making anti-Communist remarks.

The subcommittee wants to know why, if this is true, and under who's authority the muzzling is being executed.

A 2-inch-thick report, prepared for the subcommittee cites specific examples of censoring together with the explanations—or lack of explanations—from the censors.

The report said that when Vice Adm. Robert B. Pirie, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations, wanted to talk about politics in Cuba, he wrote:

"Other parts of the world are now feeling the pressure of Communist aims and are being actively wooed with enticing offers of help. What is hard for us to grasp is that many unwary nations are responding like puppets on a string—some right in our own backyard."

A State Department censor penciled out the last sentence. This censor justified the deletion with: "Cuba is not in the U.S. backyard and resents being told so."

On another occasion, Pirie attempted to tell his audience of Russian Premier Nikita Khrushchev's threat, "We will bury you." A nameless censor offered no explanation for dropping the line from the speech.

Maj. Gen. N. W. Grant also referred to Khrushchev's remark. He wrote, but never read:

"Nevertheless, in his written statements and in other talks, he has indicated that the

Soviet Union intends to bury us literally, rather than figuratively."

Public speeches recalling the Soviet leader's threat to "bury" us are "against policy," a censor scolded the general.

Maj. Gen. T. C. Darcy, Deputy Army Chief of Staff, had the same trouble with a Khrushchev reference. The paragraph he wrote but was not allowed to read was:

"That is why we have been eager to believe that Khrushchev's smiling face and outstretched hand were indications of a new attitude on the part of the Soviets. We have wanted to believe that he was coming to us in friendship and to establish peaceful relationships."

A State Department censor killed out this part of the speech and told Darcy, "Let's stay away from Khrushchev for the time being."

When Air Force Lt. Gen. Bernard A. Schriever, Chief of the Air Research and Development Command, prepared a speech to give before Purdue University Reserve Officer Training Corps cadets, he made reference to Khrushchev's shoe-banging antics at the United Nations.

A military speeches censor edited out mention of the tantrum from the text. Schriever made his point without it.

The term "world communism," has also triggered the blue pencils into action. A State Department censor wrote to Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, Chief of Army Research and Development:

"We want to discourage the term 'world communism.' It sounds very pessimistic and also, to some, pleasantly international, like the United Nations." This censor offered "Sino-Soviet communism" as a substitute term.

Trudeau had planned to tell his audience:

"They (human liberties) must be fought for and won, again and again—through continuous, dedicated struggle. They can never be taken for granted. Already one-third of the world's peoples are enslaved in the chains of world communism."

Lt. Gen. Paul L. Freeman, Jr., Deputy Commanding General for Reserve Forces, received a lesson in word usage from an anonymous censor. Freeman had written "Then came the Korean fiasco."

"Fiasco" was stricken and "war" penciled in its place. The censor added, "See Webster—fiasco—action that comes to a ridiculous end."

Army Secretary Elvis J. Stahr, Jr. was told by a State Department censor that "extended freedom" would surely be misinterpreted as "military liberation." What Stahr was banned from saying was:

"Although I am convinced of the necessity for massive retaliation if the true occasion for it should develop—and we must always be ready in every way for that unhappy possibility—I am equally certain that a capability for retaliation is only one element of the power we need to defend and extend freedom and cope with the complex perils of our time."

General Trudeau tried to name British historian Arnold Toynbee in one of his speeches. The paragraph that went out said:

"History fairly brims over with examples of proud nations which have slowly sunk into oblivion because they sowed the seeds of their own decay. Nations who will learn nothing from these examples are doomed to repeat them. The eminent British historian, Arnold Toynbee, has pointed out that 19 of 21 notable world civilizations have died from within and not by conquest from without. Ours must not be number 22."

The State Department censor commented: "Toynbee is a highly questionable historian—not likely to impress this audience."

[From the San Diego Union, Feb. 1, 1962]

OFFICER SPEECH CENSORS DELETE VARIED REMARKS

WASHINGTON, January 31.—When Russian Premier Nikita Khrushchev banged his shoe at the United Nations it was news, but a censor wants to forget it.

Someone having control over military speeches struck the words wholly from a talk Air Force Lt. Gen. Bernard A. Schriever, Chief of the Air Research and Development Command, wanted to give the Purdue University Reserve Officer Training Corps cadets.

There was no reason given to delete the reference to the Russian-style tantrum and Schriever had to make his point without it.

This and other types of censoring—some serious and some amusing—are included in a 2-inch thick volume prepared for a congressional subcommittee in session here.

The subcommittee is looking into charges that anti-Communist remarks by military leaders have been muzzled.

KHRUSHCHEV REFERENCES DELETED

In many cases the censors were from the State Department—and most of their deletions were references to Khrushchev as in the case of Maj. Gen. T. C. Darcy, Deputy Army Chief of Staff.

Darcey was told by the State Department: "Let's stay away from Khrushchev for the time being."

The paragraph he wasn't allowed to read was:

"That is why we have been eager to believe that Khrushchev's smiling face and outstretched hand were indications of a new attitude on the part of the Soviets. We have wanted to believe that he was coming to us in friendship and to establish peaceful relations."

Another general was told that speeches recalling the Soviet leader's threat to bury us are against policy.

That explanation was given by an unknown censor to Maj. Gen. N. W. Grant as a blue pencil was applied to this Khrushchev reference:

"Nevertheless, in his written statements and in other talks, he has indicated that the Soviet Union intends to bury us literally, rather than figuratively."

The paragraph never was read by Grant.

Vice Adm. Robert B. Pirie, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations, tried to use the same "We will bury you" line and lost out, also. But the censor wasn't identified and didn't explain his action this time.

"WORLD COMMUNISM" FOUND TOUCHY

Another censor found the term "world communism" touchy.

A State Department speech reviewer wrote Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, Chief of Army Research and Development:

"We want to discourage the term 'world communism.' It sounds very pessimistic and also, to some, pleasantly international, like the United Nations." They suggested substituting the term "Sino-Soviet communism."

Trudeau used it as he tried to put across the need to protect human liberties. But this reference never was heard by his audience:

"They must be fought for and won, again and again—through continuous, dedicated struggle. They can never be taken for granted. Already one-third of the world's peoples are enslaved in the chains of world communism."

Lt. Gen. Paul L. Freeman Jr., deputy commanding general for Reserve Forces, wrote a speech which used the phrase "Then came the Korean fiasco."

GENERAL TOLD TO SEE WEBSTER

"Fiasco" was stricken and "war" substituted in its place and the anonymous censor told the general: "See Webster—fiasco—action that comes to a ridiculous end."

Admiral Pirie got a so-called lesson in geography from a State Department censor when he spoke about politics in Cuba.

Pirie wanted to tell his audience:

"Other parts of the world are now feeling the pressure of Communist aims and are being actively wooed with enticing offers of help. What is hard for us to grasp is that many unwary nations are responding like puppets on a string—some right in our own backyard."

The last sentence was blue-penciled out with this explanation:

"Cuba is not in the U.S. 'backyard' and resents being told so."

Army Secretary Elvis J. Stahr, Jr., learned from a State Department censor that the phrase "extend freedom" could be misinterpreted as implying "military liberation." What Stahr could not say was:

"Although I am convinced of the necessity for massive retaliation if the true occasion for it should develop—and we must always be ready in every way for that unhappy possibility—I am equally certain that a capability for retaliation is only one element of the power we need to defend and extend freedom and to cope with the complex perils of our time."

RUSSIAN POVERTY STATEMENT HIT

Stahr also learned from the State Department that it was "inaccurate" to say Russians have a poor life. These "people are not denied necessities," said the censor. His deleted statement read:

"The Soviet Union has for years applied the major portion of its industrial capacity to the creation of military might, depriving its citizens not only of most of the comforts but many of the virtual necessities of life. We have no reason to emulate the Soviet."

Trudeau also tried to name British historian Arnold Toynbee in this light:

"History fairly brims over with examples of proud nations which have slowly sunk into oblivion because they sowed the seeds of their own decay. Nations who will learn nothing from these examples are doomed to repeat them. The eminent British historian, Arnold Toynbee, has pointed out that 19 of 21 notable world civilizations have died from within and not by conquest from without. Ours must not be number 22."

The State Department censor's comment was: "Toynbee is a highly questionable historian—not likely to impress this audience."

And out went the paragraph.

[From Newsweek, Feb. 5, 1962]

BEFORE THE BRASS MAY SOUND OFF

Exactly what is censored?

Each year, hundreds of speeches by Pentagon officials, military, and civilian alike, are carefully screened before they receive the censor's imprimateur. First, the public information office of the armed service involved checks the speech for accuracy and conformity with service policy. If necessary, the speech goes to the Department of Defense to be cleared for security. If the speech touches on foreign affairs, it is sent to the State Department, which determines if it is in accord with the official policy of the U.S. Government.

Changes may be made for a variety of reasons: Some trivial, unimportant—even capricious, some due to the censor's ineptness, some for reasons of the very highest Government policy. One of Adm. Arleigh A. Burke's speeches was toned down last year, for example, because negotiations were then underway to secure the release of the RB-47 fliers who were forced down and held captive in Russia.

Here are some examples of material, in brackets, deleted by either State or Defense

Department censors from speeches of high Pentagon brass in the past 2 years:

"A capability for retaliation is only one element of the power we need to defend [and extend] freedom." Censor's comment: "Suggest omitting since implies military liberation."

"A negative philosophy won't sustain us [in this conflict]." Censor's comment: "Use softer term."

"If the Russians can mobilize 1,000 scientists and a billion dollars to [seize] space, we must equal and surpass this effort. "Comment": It is not our policy to state that either Russia or the United States is going to seize space."

"Here is a demonstration from our tropical testing to prepare us for the kind of terrain we face in [Laos—in Central America—and in Cuba]." Changed, to: "in possible brush-fire areas of the world," without comment.

"On such theories socialism thrives." State Department comment: "Some of our best friends are Socialists."

"Their personal property is less than the clothes you have on your back [and under the rules of communism this would be all they could ever hope to acquire]." State Department comment: "They could hope for a lot more. That's why the Commies make hay."

Some censors appeared to be allergic to the words "victory" and "war," and often suggested changing "enemy" to "potential aggressor." At times, they also excised such phrases as: "The Communist conspiracy directed toward absolute domination of the world"; "Soviet infiltration menacing this Nation"; "the steady advance of communism"; "insidious ideology of world communism."

Government censors, by and large, are middle-income career employees assigned to speech reviewing; many have served as speech writers themselves. This irony was not lost on Gen. Thomas D. White, retired Air Force Chief of Staff, who observed: "I have heard there were low-level personnel who reviewed the speeches, but the truth is they were relatively low-level persons who wrote the speeches in the first place."

[From the New York Times, Jan. 30, 1962]

IF LINCOLN, LIKE KENNEDY, HAD INVITED "GUIDANCE"

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, January 29.—President Kennedy's statement at last week's news conference that even the highest civilian officials and military officers should circulate their proposed speeches through the Government for guidance, as he did his state of the Union message, has happily brought to light an anonymous paper on this subject, worthy of having been inspired by Bob Newhart's idea of how Madison Avenue would have edited the Gettysburg Address. The anonymity is attributed to the continued presence of the author in the State Department's speech-guidance group.

The work is a speculation of interdepartmental comments Lincoln could have received on the address if he and it were contemporary with present times and the guidance system. There is room here for only the subjoined few of these might-have-been guidelines, which seem less imaginative than they would have before the Stennis subcommittee assembled:

Comments by the State Department. 1. The phrase "brought forth on this continent," while technically correct, implies that the United States feels it owns the entire territory. This conflicts with our hemisphere policy and should be changed to "an area bounded on the north by 49° N. latitude," etc., etc.

2. The use of "dedicate" five times is tautological, which should be corrected by the alternate use of "apotheosize." Since "nation" is a popular term without basis in international law "member state" should be substituted. On the other hand, "our poor power" implies self-admission that the United States is not a major power, and the Secretary has directed the staff to work on a substitution. "The world will little note" invades the Department's statutory assignment to make such evaluations; substitute "There probably will be only a few people who will note," etc.

3. The requirements of international harmony call for the elimination or modification of phrases such as "conceived in liberty," "created equal," "birth of freedom," "Government of * * * for * * * and by the people," etc., because a number of our member states do not believe in liberty, freedom or equality and would properly take offense. The same objection applies to the words "under God." Also, "conceived," "brought forth" and "new birth" are open to interpretation among some of our NATO allies as offensive references to some recent irregular goings-on in their high official and motion-picture circles.

MORE GUIDANCE

Other departmental comment: 1. The Department of Defense urged the elimination of "We are now engaged in a great civil war." The passage recalls to the people the cost of our Military Establishment, particularly undesirable in this budget-making period. The words should be changed to "We have entered upon a period of civil uncertainty involving fairly high mobilization." For the same reason "brave men, living and dead," "honored dead" and so on are ill-chosen; they unnecessarily call popular attention to a byproduct of war the people don't like. And "all men are created equal" must be excised because it is highly objectionable to the Air Force.

2. The Navy Department deplored the misleading impression, created by stress on land operations, that there were no engagements at sea. It proposed mention of air-sea rescue. The Department of Commerce reported it would take years to coordinate the interests of all its units so that they could be safeguarded in the Address, but meanwhile had compiled 253 suggested editorial changes. The Department of Health, Education and Welfare (joined by State) asked that the speech be postponed until it could locate all its officials with titles conveying supreme authority.

3. The Budget Bureau proposed the Address be turned over for complete revision to a working group from State, Defense, Treasury, Post Office, Labor and Commerce, explaining the Bureau did not seek membership on the group because it could make whatever changes it chose later. Meanwhile, however, Budget counseled against figures of specific commitment such as "Fourscore and seven years ago"—advising "A number of years" instead—against "we cannot hallow this ground" as in conflict with Secretary Freeman's plan, and reminded the President that only Congress can "highly resolve"—or "resolve" at all.

If the luck of the United States is holding, the anonymous author of this paper is still in the State Department.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Nov. 22, 1961]

MUM MILITARY?—HOBGOBLIN OF "MAN ON HORSEBACK" SHOULD NOT BAR ANTI-RED BRIEFINGS BY OFFICERS

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

The controversy over how far military men should involve themselves in politics shows no signs of abating.

The case of Gen. Edwin A. Walker, who resigned from the Army after being censured for urging his own rightwing views upon his troops, was followed by a Pentagon order seemingly designed to discourage open discussion of international affairs by military officers.

The chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, has criticized the holding of seminars on communism under military auspices. Clearly this subject of the legitimate political concerns of members of the Armed Forces has a number of aspects which should be considered separately.

Practically no one would deny that American constitutional theory and practice call for civilian control of the military forces, exercised at the top level by the President and delegated by him to the Secretary of Defense, who by custom is a civilian.

By the same token an Army officer would be clearly stepping out of line if he should identify himself publicly with a political party or try to influence the votes of soldiers under his command. The United States has been happily free throughout its history of "men on horseback," of military chieftains turning themselves into dictators. And most rational Americans want to keep it that way.

KOREAN EXPERIENCE

But this does not mean that an American general or admiral should be a narrow specialist in his profession, aseptically segregated from knowledge and consideration of the world's political problems. It is, or should be, of high concern to any American officer who may have to lead men into battle to be sure that his troops know the true history of the cold war and understand the nature, methods and tactics of the Communist enemy.

Had more attention been paid to briefing GI's along these lines before the invasion of South Korea in 1950, the record of the Americans who fell into enemy hands would have been appreciably better. It is just as important for a soldier to know how to protect himself against Communist propaganda, to which he will be subjected as a prisoner, as it for him to be instructed in defending himself in the field.

Nor should the political training and education of our military leaders be neglected. It is indeed surprising that there should even be a suggestion that military science can or should be insulated from familiarity with international politics when the world's chief trouble spot, Berlin, is a most vivid example of the high price we are paying for the old idea that a war was something like a football game, that we should all go home and live happily ever after as soon as our team won.

In his "Crusade in Europe," General Eisenhower, whose decision was doubtless approved, if not dictated, by Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff in Washington, records his decision that Berlin was not the logical or the most desirable objective for the forces of the Western Allies. Noting that Winston Churchill was greatly disappointed and disturbed by the failure to make Berlin the primary objective, Eisenhower writes rather innocently:

"The Prime Minister knew, of course, that, regardless of the distance the Allies might advance to the eastward, he and the President had already agreed that the British and American occupation zones would be limited on the east by a line 200 miles west of Berlin."

BAD FAITH

What never seems to have occurred either to Marshall or to Eisenhower was that the Soviet Government had already displayed bad faith in imposing a minority unpopular Communist government on Poland and thus gave ample reason for revising the occupation lines in Germany. Had American and British troops advanced, as they were well able to do, beyond these lines Stalin might well have been told: "We will talk about the demarcation lines in Germany if and when you permit free and honest elections in Poland."

Contrast this politically innocent comment of Eisenhower with this most significant passage in the last volume of Winston Churchill's war memoirs, "Triumph and Tragedy," referring to the same period.

"The destruction of German military power had brought with it a fundamental change in the relations between Communist Russia and the Western democracies. They had lost their common enemy, which was almost their sole bond of union. Henceforward Russian imperialism and the Communist creed saw and set no bounds to their progress and ultimate dominion * * *."

Churchill then proceeds to list in sad retrospect the ideas and military-political objectives which should have governed Western policy in the critically important last weeks of the war. A new front should have been created against the Soviet onward sweep. This front should have been as far to the east as possible. "Berlin was the prime and true objective of the Anglo-American armies." American troops, not Russian, should have entered Prague and sponsored the liberation of Czechoslovakia.

WASTED OPPORTUNITIES

None but a warped fanatic would impugn the patriotism of General Eisenhower and General Marshall. It was their political innocence, an old American Army tradition that, along with the failing of Roosevelt's powers and the inevitable vacuum between Roosevelt's death and Truman's ability to grasp the whole situation, that account for the wasted opportunities at the end of the war—wasted opportunities that have come back to plague us.

Imagine how much brighter the international picture would be if all Germany, including Berlin, had evolved from an occupied enemy power into a friendly Allied power under American and British sponsorship.

We should make very certain that in the future our generals will not miss political opportunities that lie before them. This is why any proposal to suspend, curb, or curtail seminars, lectures, and other means of promoting systematic study of Communist aims and strategy by the Armed Forces should be rejected.

Americans, military and civilians alike, suffer from too little, not too much, knowledge of the international Communist conspiracy.

[From the San Diego Union, Jan. 28, 1962]

Military Experts Testify—Censors Lack Sense

(By Lyn Nofziger)

Senator Strom Thurmond, Democrat, of South Carolina, is an unobtrusive man who speaks quietly and lifts weights for exercise.

His politics are best explained by pointing out that he ran once for President on the States Rights ticket. He is a Reserve major general and former district attorney.

And he is the man largely responsible for the current Senate hearings into charges that military men are not being allowed to speak on communism to their troops or in seminars. The hearings stemmed from the controversy surrounding former Maj. Gen. Edwin Walker and his methods of indoctrinating his troops.

At present the investigation is pretty much going Strom Thurmond's way, probably because he is the man behind the men who have been digging up the facts.

A month ago Senator Thurmond assured a group of reporters that "we won't let you down. We have the proof to back up our charges."

The hearings, which began Tuesday, are just nicely underway, but already they have produced evidence that at least somewhat sustain the Senator's beliefs.

They have produced statements from some important persons who believe that review of speeches by high military men should be for security purposes only.

They have produced a statement by one outspoken general that the Communist menace is a fact and therefore statements regarding it should not be subject to policy review.

They have also produced one top official, Gen. Lyman Lemnitzer, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who says he likes things just as they now are.

And they have produced facts which Thurmond says are evidence of what he calls the State Department's "can't win" attitude toward communism.

Testimony through the first days was presented either orally or by written statement from former President Eisenhower; Adm. Arleigh Burke, former Chief of Naval Operations; from Defense Secretary Robert Lovett, who served under President Truman; Lt. Gen. Arthur Trudeau, who is head of Army Research and Development; Lemnitzer and Gen. Thomas White, ex-Air Force Chief of Staff.

All so far have agreed on two salient points: one, high military men respect and approve the principle of civilian control and, two, there has been no change in censorship policies since the change in administrations.

Lovett, a civilian who should know, calls any insinuations to the contrary regarding civilian control, false and damaging.

Mr. Eisenhower, Admiral Burke, and General Trudeau are agreed that speeches of high officers should be censored for security only and not for policy.

Mr. Eisenhower, who admittedly has changed his mind since he was President, goes so far as to suggest that top officers should not have their speeches cleared at all. All three men would rely on an officer's good judgment and hold him responsible for his mistakes on policy errors.

With the exception of General Lemnitzer, there have been complaints that subordinates without sufficient knowledge and perhaps without guidelines censor speeches. Trudeau remarked that there doesn't even seem to be a pattern to the censorship.

There is a pattern, of course, although the censors are not entirely consistent.

The pattern is one of weakening strong anti-Communist statements. It is not consistent in that words or phrases deleted one time may not be deleted another.

It is consistent, however, in that phrases attacking communism are never strengthened.

It is this censorship policy which Senator Thurmond calls the "can't win" policy.

Whether it is deliberate, whether it is a policy arising on a subordinate level, whether it is merely accidental and not true policy or whether it really doesn't exist to any particular extent has yet to be determined.

Senator John Stennis, Democrat, of Mississippi, chairman of the investigating subcommittee, appears determined to find out just what situation does exist, if it takes all session.

Meanwhile Thurmond, added to the subcommittee especially for the investigation, sits at one end of the long hearing table, with the air of a man who knows the answers, but doesn't necessarily like them.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Jan. 28, 1962]

The Exact Words in Censorship

(By Cecil Holland)

(Censorship as practiced in the Pentagon and in the State Department has come under fire. At hearings last week on charges that military leaders have been "muzzled," the Senate Armed Services Preparedness Subcommittee was told that references in speeches to communism often were toned down. Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, retired Chief of Naval Operations, testified he thought changes made in many of his speeches were "capricious." Gen. Thomas D. White, former Air Force Chief, described them as "unnecessary." Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, Chief of Army Research and Development, said some of the changes made in his speeches gave him "cause for wonder about the motivation" involved. These are some examples of the actual blue pencil of the censors at work on the speeches of the three officers as presented at the hearings:)

From drafts of Admiral Burke's speeches from January 1, 1961, to August 6, 1961:

ORIGINAL

"The Communists, however, are not going to abandon their relentless drive toward world empire—even though they dare not risk the inevitable retaliation that a nuclear war would bring."

REVISED

"Potential aggressors, however, cannot be expected to surrender their objectives without a struggle."

ORIGINAL

"Today the United States is engaged in a grim competition with an alien philosophy that has taken over whole countries—without firing a shot. That is why the only real way to increase the strength of our Nation is to strengthen what is under attack—to strengthen the individual."

REVISED

"Today, as in the past, the only real way to increase the strength of our Nation is to strengthen what is under attack—to strengthen the individual."

ORIGINAL

"Challenge of communism—Communist challenge—the Communist threat."

REVISED

"Challenge of competing ideologies—challenge—the threat."

From General White's speeches from September 21, 1960, to April 25, 1961:

ORIGINAL

"Since the Air Force's future offensive and defensive missions, as we reach farther out into aerospace."

REVISED

"Since the Air Force's future missions, as we reach farther out into aerospace."

ORIGINAL

"Approximately 90 percent of the general war striking power."

REVISED

"A very large percentage of the deterrent power."

ORIGINAL

"These same forces could also contribute substantially to a general war effort."

REVISED

"These same forces could also contribute substantially to a major aggression."

ORIGINAL

"The Soviet economic-military potential is guided by a regime which can count on the backing—however unenthusiastic—of the Russian people. In addition, the Soviets have another great intangible resource which can best be described as gall. They are showing ever increasing confidence—even arrogance—in their military and scientific strength and growth of their influence, spawned and perpetuated in brutal wars, dedicated to the mission of world revolution—their fervor for subversion and force makes them believe that Communist domination of the world is inevitable. They are further strengthened in this belief by their close partnership with Communist China."

REVISED

"Furthermore in any revolution of the Communist threat we cannot disregard the close partnership between Soviet Russia and Communist China."

ORIGINAL

"The unquestionable capacity to repel and decisively counter any attack."

REVISED

"The unquestionable capacity to decisively counter any attack."

ORIGINAL

Weapon systems have been developed to overpower either."

REVISED

"Weapon systems have been developed to overcome either."

From General Trudeau's speeches covering the period from August 1, 1961, to December 8, 1961:

ORIGINAL

"On toward the turn of the century—world communism."

REVISED

"On toward the turn of the century—Sino-Soviet communism."

ORIGINAL

"There are voices today which whisper that the vicious, dangerous and false doctrine of "peaceful coexistence" and expediency."

REVISED

"There are voices today which whisper that the vicious, dangerous and false doctrine of aggression masquerading as peaceful coexistence and expediency."

ORIGINAL

"If the Russians can mobilize 1,000 scientists and a billion dollars to (seize) space, we must equal and surpass this effort or lose space."

REVISED

"If the Russians can mobilize 1,000 scientists and a billion dollars to try to dominate space, we must equal and surpass this effort or give them a free hand."

Some passages were deleted entirely and not revised or deletion was suggested. Some examples from the speeches of the three officers follow.

ADMIRAL BURKE'S SPEECHES

One speech dealing with the destructive forces of communism at work in southeast Asia, Africa, and Cuba was censored in its entirety.

For—just this sort of free, unrestricted thinking had produced most of the remarkable accomplishments throughout out Nation's history. And—it is precisely this kind of free discussion of alternative solutions to our problems—that we must rely on for our future progress.

GENERAL WHITE'S SPEECHES

Current Communist propaganda to the world concentrates on the same central theme which it has always emphasized—the destruction of capitalism, colonialism, and imperialism. But, under this guise, they really intend the destruction of everything which does not bend to their will.

If our cold war efforts fail, armed conflict could occur * * * as has happened in the past. The Korean and Taiwan actions are examples.

Furthermore, the Soviets have demonstrated by their intensive research and development programs that they unquestionably seek a clear military advantage over the free world alliance at the earliest possible date.

GENERAL TRUDEAU'S SPEECHES

The three sputnik satellites lend substance to (Communist) claims (of an intercontinental ballistic missile) and their lunar probes should clinch them.

[From the San Diego Union, Jan. 25, 1962]

CENSORSHIP EXAMPLES—TRUDEAU SPEECH CHANGES LISTED

WASHINGTON, January 24.—Here are some of the examples of Defense and State Department censorship revealed today by Senate investigators in questioning Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, Army Chief of Research and Development.

The date of the delivered speech, its original wording by Trudeau, and revised wording or deletions are shown.

January 21, 1961: "We will be blocked and harassed by the Fabian Socialists and Communists." The phrase "Fabian Socialists" was deleted.

January 31 (to a Canadian audience): "Your country and mine are the targets of worldwide communism * * *. This is why we and our allies arm—to counter the Communist threat." Entire section was deleted.

"As we engage the Communist * * *." changed to "as we strive for a real peace."

"Yet, if our technology is to continue to accelerate—and it must to outperform the Reds * * *." Last phrase deleted.

February 1: "Locked as we are in vital competition with the Communist * * *." Delete and substitute: "In order to negotiate from a position of strength for peace."

"The Communist conspiracy directed toward absolute, universal domination of the world * * *." Deleted.

"Today, in the face of the worldwide threat of international communism * * *." Deleted.

"The vicious worldwide conflict forced upon us * * *." Delete and substitute: "Our lives and future."

February 17: "Faced as we are by the implacable mask of communism * * *." "Implacable" deleted.

"With Soviet infiltration menacing this Nation * * *." Deleted.

March 3: "Last year, in the United Nations we witnessed the growth of a new world power group—the so-called neutralist or Afro-Asian nations * * *." "Afro-Asian" deleted.

"The record in the Congo." "In the Congo" deleted.

"And beat the Communist challenge * * *." Deleted with instructions to substitute: "The threat of foreign aggressors."

April 26: "Nothing less will permit us to emerge victorious * * *." "Emerge victorious" deleted and changed to "achieve our goals."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 631. An act for the relief of Elwood Brunken;

S. 651. An act for the relief of Howard B. Schmutz; and

S. 1456. An act to authorize an additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

AID FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1241) to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities and to authorize scholarships for undergraduate study in such institutions.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. S. 1241 is the bill before the Senate. The question is on agreeing to the Miller amendment to the McNamara amendment. On this amendment there is a unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, we approach a critical vote in the Senate. Looking at it realistically, this probably is the last opportunity we will have in the 87th Congress to act on the vital question of Federal aid for elementary and secondary schools.

If my amendment is defeated, then the education record of this Congress undoubtedly will be confined to this relatively minor legislation which masquerades bravely as the higher education bill.

On the other hand, if my amendment is adopted, we will be serving notice on our colleagues in the other body and on the strategists of the administration that we recognize the major needs of education.

We have been given many arguments why my amendment should not be adopted. Some of them do not seem to me to have that sharp ring of sincerity—at least, when spoken by some of the opponents of my amendment.

Basically, we are told that the adoption of my amendment would jeopardize, if not actually kill, the higher education bill in the House. We are told that the House would not pass the bill if amended. Of course, we have no assurance at all that the House would pass even this minor higher education bill if it does go to that body unamended. It can, and may well be, stripped down even further than the shadow bill now before the Senate.

In any event, I think it is time the Senate reasserted itself and stopped making its moves in frightful anticipation of what the House might do.

I can vividly recall the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], who is in charge of the higher education bill, arguing last year in favor of my similar amendment then to the extension of the impacted areas and National Defense Education Acts.

In fact, he was very vehement about the rights of the Senate and implied very strongly that it was better to have no bill at all than to give in to the will of the House.

Mr. President, if consistency is indeed the hobgoblin of small minds, then we can be assured that the Senator from Oregon must have one of the largest minds about.

I am sorry he is not on the floor at the moment. I have looked for the floor manager of the bill, but he is not in the Chamber at this time. I can sympathize with the position in which he finds himself as manager of this legislation. However, this sympathy does not prevent my feeling that he and the administration strategists are very shortsighted in opposing my amendment.

What we need is a showdown on the question of whether the Federal Government is willing to meet its responsibilities to the States, the parents, and the schoolchildren.

Acquiescence in adopting the higher education bill without any meaningful amendment such as the one I have offered, simply postpones the day when that showdown will come. The Senator from Oregon knows that. He has used that argument himself. And the President knows that.

I call attention to the President's education message which has reached the Senate just today. In leading off his requests in the field of education legislation, the President said:

> Elementary and secondary schools are the foundation of our educational system.
>
> There is little value in our efforts to broaden and improve our higher education—or increase our supply of such skills as science and engineering—without a greater effort for excellence at this basic level of education.
>
> With our mobile population and demanding needs—this is not a matter of local or State action alone—this is a national concern.

Let me repeat one sentence of the President's message—something I have been trying to say in this body for several days. President Kennedy said:

> There is little value in our efforts to broaden and improve our higher education—or increase our supply of such skills as science and engineering—without a greater effort for excellence at this basic level of education.

If the President means that—and I certainly think that he does—then I can only assume he would vote for my amendment if he still were a Member of the Senate today.

For there is, indeed, little value in the proposed legislation we have before us unless we can reinforce the foundations of education at the elementary and secondary schools level.

But this bill of "little value"—to use the President's words—apparently is all we are destined to get in the field of education this year, if my amendment is not adopted.

And when the Senate goes hat in hand to its colleagues in the other wing of our Capitol, the chances are quite good that this bill will become of even less value.

All this leads me to the conclusion that today the Senate is involved in an exercise in futility.

The Senator from Oregon—and I am glad to see that at this time he is here on the floor of the Senate—asks me to respect his honest judgment that, the best way to pass the pending legislation is to defeat my amendment. I do respect his judgment in this regard, and I agree with him. That is the best way to pass the higher education bill. But it is not the best way to serve American education.

That is where we disagree. I maintain that enactment of this legislation will contribute little to the cause of education, and probably even less when the House gets finished with it. I maintain that enactment of this legislation will give a false front of respectability to a shabby, undernourished national education system.

I maintain that the only way we are going to move forward in this area is to force this issue once and for all. We shall not move forward if we simply pass this bill, which has been called a quarter of a loaf, but, in fact, Mr. President, is not even a crust.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. McNAMARA. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MILLER. I should like to invite the attention of the able Senator from Michigan to another portion of the President's message on education, which I, too, received this morning.

Mr. McNAMARA. Is the Senator from Iowa referring to the section on higher education?

Mr. MILLER. No; I am referring to the section on teachers' salaries; and for the sake of the record, I should like to quote from that part of the President's message as follows:

> TEACHERS' SALARIES
>
> Teachers' salaries, though improving, are still not high enough to attract and retain in this demanding profession all the capable teachers we need. We entrust to our teachers our most valuable possession—our children—for a very large share of their waking hours during the most formative years of their life. We make certain that those to whom we entrust our financial assets are individuals of the highest competence and character—we dare not do less for the trustees of our children's minds.
>
> Yet in no other sector of our national economy do we find such a glaring discrepancy between the importance of one's work to society and the financial reward society offers. Can any able and industrious student, unless unusually motivated, be expected to elect a career that pays more poorly than almost any other craft, trade, or profession? Until this situation can be dramatically improved—unless the States and localities can be assisted and stimulated in bringing about salary levels which will make the teaching profession competitive with other professions which require the same length of training and ability—we cannot hope to succeed in our efforts to improve the quality of our children's instruction and to meet the need for more teachers.

I ask the Senator from Michigan, wherein does the McNamara amendment take care of this problem, which is so well presented by the President of the United States?

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I want to compliment the Senator from Iowa for his fine quotation of the President's message. I take it he agrees with the President that there is a great need to improve the quality of our teachers.

Mr. MILLER. Indeed I do.

Mr. McNAMARA. So I would be happy to join the Senator from Iowa in trying to have such proposed legislation passed by the Senate, either now or at any other time when he may wish to take the initiative, because both of us agree with the President that this is vital.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator from Michigan can do so; all he has to do is vote for the Miller-Cotton amendment to his amendment, and then we shall have done so. Therefore, I encourage the Senator from Michigan to do it, because I suggest that the reason why the President's particular approach to this problem in the last session is lying in the House Rules Committee, dead as a doornail, is that it contains elements of controversy which relate to religion, segregation, Federal control, and Federal bureaucracy. But those elements are completely absent from the McNamara amendment if it is amended by the Miller-Cotton amendment.

Mr. McNAMARA. I agree with the Senator from Iowa. I say further that the Senate previously passed such a bill, one which did not contain controversial provisions. The Senate did that last year; and the Senate also did it the year before, when it passed Senate bill 8. We have gone through this procedure over and over again. We passed such proposed legislation, and sent it to the House, last year; and the year before last, the Senate passed such proposed legislation and sent it to the House of Representatives. Those measures did not contain such controversial provisions at all.

Mr. MILLER. But Senate bill 1021 contained those elements; and that is why it is dead, and will not get out of the House Rules Committee.

So I suggest to the Senator from Michigan—as was suggested yesterday by the Senator from Oregon—that if the Miller-Cotton amendment had been adopted by the Senate during the last session, all this money would right now be in the process of being used for the very objectives for which the President has requested funds, in his message on education which we received today.

So I would welcome—and I am sure I speak for the able Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] when I say that we would welcome having the Senator from Michigan join us in our amendment to his amendment. I believe that under those circumstances we could wholeheartedly support the McNamara amendment.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I should like to supplement briefly the words of my friend, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], who has with me, both last year, and now this year, been championing the method of aiding the States by returning to them, for use for education, a portion of the taxes on cigarettes collected in those States. In this instance, I think the money is earmarked for use for secondary and elementary school education.

Last night the very able and distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], whose grasp of these matters I greatly respect and admire, indulged in a rather dramatic speech in which he said the Miller-Cotton amendment, or a bill which carried in it that amendment and was drafted on its principles, would receive the same opposition in the Rules Committee of the other body that Senate bill 1021 would, and that the Miller-Cotton amendment or a bill similar to it would not change that situation at all.

I just want to correct the RECORD this morning, because I think the distinguished Senator was overlooking the point of the approach that the Senator from Iowa and I feel so strongly is the right approach to get real money, instead of vague hopes, for the States for their educational activities. The things that are said in the cloakroom should be said on this floor. Probably what the Senator from Oregon meant in referring to the Rules Committee of the other body was that, because S. 1021 carries no aid to private and parochial schools, a firm stand has been taken that, unless it does, nobody will get anything. That was what he said. I think that is absolutely correct.

Of course, the Supreme Court has, in interpreting the Constitution, made it quite clear that any form of Federal aid for schools must be for public schools only. The President of the United States, advised by the Department of Justice, has said repeatedly that any bill which carried aid in any way for private schools established by any religion, whatever religion it might be, would be in violation of the Constitution.

That is the reason why S. 1021 carries no possibility of aid for private and religious schools, in spite of the fact that it very unjustly—and I was one who supported the amendment to correct it—in selecting the amount to be distributed to the States, counts the children in private schools, even though no aid is given them. This militates against their benefit.

Although, of course, some limitations will be placed on the activities of the States, and some limitations have been placed upon them by the courts in terms of the Constitution, the States are able, if they have aid given them without strings attached, to do things with that money that are right, proper, and fair, and which the Federal Government cannot do, and which cannot be done with Federal money as such.

In my State long ago we established the custom of furnishing transportation, for instance, to schoolchildren attending private schools. They are taken to those schools, along with children going to public schools, in schoolbuses. We furnish that transportation. Some other States furnish textbooks. The situation as between private schools and public schools varies in the different States. A State that has a very large Catholic population, for instance, and a great many parochial schools, is in a different situation from one that has a small Catholic population and where most of the schools are public schools.

The States have faced these problems each with its own situation in mind, and consequently, in many States where it is necessary to be fair to help the children of the State to get their education—and that is what we all want—have established various customs in dealing with the problems.

The Miller-Cotton amendment if adopted, as you know, Mr. President, will simply return to each State a portion of the money collected from it to be used for secondary and elementary schools in any way that State deems proper, in any way its legislature and its school authorities determine, with no strings attached to it.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COTTON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator has just said "with no strings attached to it." It might be suggested that strings could be attached to it or Federal controls attached to it. Would the Senator think that would be a valid objection?

Mr. COTTON. I object to having Federal controls attached to it, yes.

Mr. MILLER. I know the Senator from New Hampshire objects, just as I object, to having Federal controls attached to it; but I suggest that, in view of the objections made by the Senator from Oregon last evening that this amendment would encounter the same problems that S. 1021 encountered in the Rules Committee——

Mr. COTTON. The Senator is referring to the McNamara amendment?

Mr. MILLER. I am referring to the McNamara amendment as amended by the Miller-Cotton amendment.

Mr. COTTON. Certainly.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator from Oregon said last evening that if the McNamara amendment as amended by the Miller-Cotton amendment were adopted, this bill would encounter the same problem over in the House as S. 1021 did in the last session and is now encountering in the House Rules Committee. The Senator from New Hampshire, at the beginning of his remarks, I thought made a very good point, and that is that the objection on those grounds by the Senator from Oregon is not valid.

Mr. COTTON. That is what I am about to again reemphasize. I thank the Senator from Iowa, because I intend to lead up to it. It is the point of what I am now saying.

Mr. MILLER. What I wanted to ask the Senator from New Hampshire was whether or not it can be suggested that the Miller-Cotton amendment contains a basis for Federal controls.

Mr. COTTON. No, it cannot. The Miller-Cotton amendment is the answer to those who want the amendment but without Federal controls. I want to finish my statement because the Senator from Oregon is entitled to time before we vote on the amendment.

This is what I want to set the record clear on. The States are able with their own money to deal with this problem, to deal fairly with it, and by various methods which are not artifices, but which are perfectly plain and open expedients, are able to help private and religious schools who are educating pupils in the State.

If the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Iowa and myself is adopted, in my opinion—and here is where I sharply differ with the Senator from Oregon—we send over to the other body a bill which will not have the objections in the Rules Committee that S. 1021 has, because S. 1021 provides every cent for the public schools. If our amendment to the McNamara amendment is adopted, we shall send to the House a bill which guarantees money to the States. It is not just a vague promise or fond hope. It guarantees money to every State in the Union and its territories, and that money goes back to the States from which it was received. They can use the money for teachers' salaries. They can use it in the form and manner that a particular State has found satisfactory and in accord with the opinion of the people of that State. They can use it for transportation or textbooks. They can use it for a use which in the opinion of the people of that State is justified. It is not true of S. 1021 or the McNamara amendment. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall put most of my argument in the RECORD, but I want to make this point before I make a motion to lay on the table the Miller-Cotton amendment.

The committee's hearings on S. 1021 produced a consensus that increased financial support of American public elementary and secondary education is necessary. Not all who testified, however, agreed on how this goal should be achieved.

The major areas of disagreement focused on the nature of the Federal role and the method of allocating funds among States in the Federal grant program provided in that bill.

Some, such as the Senator from New Hampshire, urged that the Federal role should be by way of Federal excise tax, remission, or relief. The proposals in this vein were advocated as a means, preferable to Federal grants, for strengthening the fiscal capacity of States and local communities for support of public education. The committee declined to adopt such an approach for three principal reasons.

The Senator from New Hampshire appeared before our committee. He testified very ably before us. He was kind enough to say to me, in effect, after the hearing that he appreciated very much the very thorough way in which the committee went into his proposals. We did so, and we rejected them. We rejected them for these three principal reasons:

First, the Federal tax credit or remission proposals do not achieve equalization as between low- and high-income States in their relative fiscal capacities for support of education. These proposals tend to aid States in direct relation to their income levels, rather than in inverse relation as S. 1021 provides. The committee believes that the Federal role should equalize educational opportunity for young people throughout the Nation by grant assistance to States designed to equalize fiscal capacity among States. Federal tax remission and credit proposals made to the committee would not achieve this objective.

Second, such proposals would not assure that there would be any increase in the level of support for public education by States and local communities corresponding with the Federal tax remissions or credits. Such resources could be used for any purpose and might not be devoted to education. Furthermore, even in States and local districts which decided to apply such resources to education, substantially more time would be required to enact at State or local community levels of government the programs of taxation and expenditure which would be necessary to apply Federal tax credit resources to public elementary and secondary schools.

Third, such proposals would necessarily entail reductions in Federal revenues. It is beyond the jurisdiction of this committee to recommend legislation providing for substitute sources of revenue to avert such reduction.

The Cotton-Miller amendment, if adopted, might cause the House of Representatives to feel that the Senate would be verging upon a trespass of the constitutional prerogative of the House in appropriations matters, since the effect of the amendment would be to bypass the appropriations process by a ministerial act on the part of the Secretary of the Treasury. Such continuing appropriation or back-door financing language might unnecessarily create opposition in the other body to the worthwhile objectives of this bill.

I close by saying again that I am not at all moved by the argument of the Senator from New Hampshire, which has been repeated many times, to the effect that there is any danger of Federal control of education under S. 1021. As I have said many times, we have had a record of Federal aid to education in this country for decades. We have had a very high program of such aid for the last 10 years, when approximately $2 billion was poured into the schools of this country under Public Law 874 and Public Law 815, without a scintilla of proof that the Federal Government has in any way interfered with the local administration of schools which have been the beneficiaries of such funds.

I repeat that the Cotton-Miller amendment cannot be justified on the ground that there is any danger of Federal interference in education under the bill which I had the privilege of conducting through the Senate. For the reasons I have set forth, it is my recommendation to the Senate that the Cotton-Miller amendment be defeated.

Mr. President, to substantiate my view that in legislation designed to assist our elementary and secondary public schools there be an equalization factor, I ask unanimous consent that a table prepared for me by the Office of Education on January 11, 1962, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Additional percent of personal income necessary to achieve national average expenditure per pupil in average daily attendance

State	Per capita personal income: 1960	Expenditure		Additional percent of personal income necessary to achieve national average expenditure per pupil in average daily attendance [2]	State ranking by percentage
		Per pupil in average daily attendance [1]	As percent of personal income [2]		
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
50 States and District of Columbia	2,223	$483.56	3.9	---	---
Alabama	1,462	269.19	4.0	3.2	4
Alaska	2,735	639.59	3.8	---	---
Arizona	2,011	542.03	5.3	---	---
Arkansas	1,341	269.20	4.2	3.3	3
California	2,741	640.46	4.7	---	---
Colorado	2,320	534.77	4.6	---	---
Connecticut	2,863	541.42	3.2	---	---
Delaware	3,013	757.48	4.1	---	---
Florida	1,968	416.54	3.6	.6	18
Georgia	1,608	296.59	3.8	2.4	9
Hawaii	2,274	368.42	3.3	1.0	14
Idaho	1,796	356.21	4.4	1.6	10
Illinois	2,613	557.83	3.2	---	---
Indiana	2,179	495.70	4.2	---	---
Iowa	2,003	435.09	4.2	.5	20
Kansas	2,068	509.91	4.6	---	---
Kentucky	1,543	281.71	3.4	2.4	8
Louisiana	1,604	477.59	5.6	.1	28
Maine	1,900	329.57	3.2	1.5	11
Maryland	2,394	530.99	3.8	---	---
Massachusetts	2,519	462.95	2.8	.1	26
Michigan	2,322	555.58	4.4	---	---
Minnesota	2,054	555.54	5.0	---	---
Mississippi	1,173	297.85	5.7	3.5	2
Missouri	2,199	$423.08	3.1	0.4	23
Montana	2,018	484.89	4.7	---	---
Nebraska	2,113	430.22	3.7	.5	21
Nevada	2,844	588.60	4.0	---	---
New Hampshire	2,074	430.03	3.3	.4	24
New Jersey	2,665	632.32	3.7	---	---
New Mexico	1,806	437.73	5.1	.5	19
New York	2,789	699.39	3.7	---	---
North Carolina	1,574	295.10	4.1	2.6	5
North Dakota	1,741	476.32	5.4	.1	27
Ohio	2,339	485.86	3.7	---	---
Oklahoma	1,848	381.70	4.3	1.1	13
Oregon	2,259	536.83	4.6	---	---
Pennsylvania	2,266	495.99	3.5	---	---
Rhode Island	2,228	448.93	2.8	.2	25
South Carolina	1,397	255.10	4.1	3.6	1
South Dakota	1,842	389.61	4.3	1.0	15
Tennessee	1,545	291.08	3.9	2.6	7
Texas	1,924	406.03	4.0	.8	17
Utah	1,910	447.07	5.7	.5	22
Vermont	1,859	400.32	3.9	.8	16
Virginia	1,848	350.61	3.6	1.4	12
Washington	2,317	550.65	4.7	---	---
West Virginia	1,674	289.59	3.9	2.6	6
Wisconsin	2,171	517.74	3.9	---	---
Wyoming	2,334	655.72	6.0	---	---
District of Columbia	3,008	486.15	2.2	---	---

[1] Total expenditures within each State for public elementary and secondary education are assumed to be the total expenditures reported for public elementary and secondary day schools. They are for current expense interest, and capital outlay including expenditures of public school building authorities. Expenditure data were obtained from preliminary statistics for 1959-60, and are from total revenue from all sources.

[2] On basis of total personal income by States for 1960, as reported by U.S. Department of Commerce, Survey of Current Business, August 1961.

Source: Col. 2, Survey of Current Business, August 1961, U.S. Department of Commerce, table 2.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the table shows, in my judgment, most graphically the magnitude of the effort which must be made if we are to achieve an equality of educational opportunity for all our boys and girls. It shows, further, I believe, the tremendous difficulties faced by many States which have low per capita personal incomes. The effort that such States are making to allocate funds for educational purposes can best be measured by the percentage of personal income from all sources in the State which, through the State taxing mechanisms, is apportioned to educational purposes at the elementary and secondary levels. For a State having a low per capita personal income to increase its educational efforts from State resources in the degree needed to bring that State up to the national average expenditure per pupil in average daily attendance is demonstrated to be so difficult by the chart as to suggest most strongly that Federal assistance without Federal control is urgently needed.

Since the pending amendment to the McNamara amendment does not, in my judgment, provide adequate equalization factors, I must regard it as being less desirable than legislation which incorporates the allocation formulas contained in S. 1021, and therefore, for this reason among others, I urge that the Senate defeat the amendment.

Mr. President, I wish to take the remaining few moments to have a little visit with my friend from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA]. As he indicated in his statement today, he is very much concerned about my consistency, or lack thereof. I always appreciate it when the Senator from Michigan takes a personal interest in my well-being, but I wish to say to my good friend from Michigan that one could be no more consistent than I have been in this whole educational fight.

My position today, my good friend from Michigan to the contrary notwithstanding, is a consistent position. It is consistent with respect to the motivating objective which moves me in all these educational debates. What is that? It is to do everything I can, within my parliamentary power in the Senate as the floor leader of these education bills, to bring a maximum benefit and aid to the boys and girls in America.

I had to reach the decision as to what was the best course of action to follow in the Senate procedurally and parliamentarily to protect the educational interests of these boys and girls for whom we have been fighting so hard. My friend from Michigan has been standing shoulder to shoulder with me in that fight in the Senate for some time. Our difference is solely a difference as to what is the best procedure parliamentarily to follow in the Senate to bring help to the boys and girls that he and I join in wishing to help. There is but an honest difference of opinion between us.

I am satisfied that to follow the approach of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara] by adding his amendment to the higher education bill would not advance by one iota the educational interests of those little boys and girls. Rather, to adopt his course would be to do additional damage to tens upon thousands of college students in America today who need the higher education bill passed.

We have a very good opportunity, if we can get a rule for a conference from the House, to have a conference on the higher education bills. It happens to be my judgment—and this is one of the places my friend seems to think I am following an inconsistent course of action—that the probabilities are very great that if we add a secondary and elementary school amendment such as the McNamara amendment to the higher education bill, we will in all probability not get even a rule for a conference on the bill from the House.

That does not mean I like the situation. I never like it when I think a wrong is being done. I shall take a realistic course of action about this, because I am satisfied that the present responsibility of the Senate is to pass a higher education bill. We should then use whatever influence we have on the House in other ways to try to get the House to measure up to its responsibilities in regard to an elementary and secondary school assistance bill.

Furthermore, I do not think my friend from Michigan has given due and adequate consideration to the procedural differences between the House and the Senate. In the Senate he and I serve on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which has jurisdiction over all education bills. Such is not the case in the House. We have a subcommittee, of which the Senator from Michigan is a member, and a very able member. It is my Subcommittee on Education. The subcommittee has jurisdiction over all education bills. On the House side, there is a subcommittee concerned with elementary and secondary school education. There is a different subcommittee for higher education legislation. There are other subcommittees for other educational subject matters.

My friend from Michigan knows that last year the able Representative from New Jersey, Mr. Thompson, was chairman of the House subcommittee dealing with elementary and secondary school education. My friend knows that Representative Thompson stood shoulder to shoulder with us in support of the major objectives of S. 1021. The chairman of the House subcommittee which deals with higher education, however, is not Representative Thompson. There is a different subcommittee which deals with higher education, and the chairman of that subcommittee is my very able colleague on the House side, Representative Edith Green, of Oregon's Third Congressional District.

I need not tell those in the Senate—I am not among them, but they have told me of their experiences—who have served in the House that there are some very strong feelings about jurisdictional lines in the House. If we add the McNamara amendment to the bill, I think the prospects are very great that we shall get into a jurisdictional difficulty with regard to the subcommittee dealing with higher education and the subcommittee dealing with elementary and secondary school education. Furthermore, I think we shall get into difficulties in gaining a rule for a conference as a result of adding, what I say most respectfully, amounts in fact, to a rider on a higher education bill. The secondary and elementary school amendment of the Senator from Michigan in my judgment, is in fact, a rider to a higher education bill.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I think that will create difficulties on the House side.

I came to the conclusion, in the interest of consistency on my part—a consistent determination to do everything I can to help the little boys and girls in the grade schools, the young men and women in the high schools, and our youth in the colleges—to follow a parliamentary course of action of getting the best bill on higher education that I can, without it being encumbered by the McNamara secondary and elementary school amendment.

I now yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. McNAMARA. I think the Senator makes a very convincing argument for accepting the bill as passed by the House and nothing else. I do not know why the Senator does not wish to do that, and to avoid all the frustration.

Mr. MORSE. It does not follow that because we cannot accept amendments relating to elementary and secondary school education that we should not add amendments on higher education to the Senate bill, for on these we can go to conference with the House. We will automatically go to the House for a conference on the higher education bill, but we might not if the McNamara amendment were to be added to it.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. I invite the attention of the Senator from Oregon to the fact that the Miller-Cotton amendment is not based upon the income of States. The Blakley amendment, which was offered to the bill passed at the previous session of Congress, was, because it was based upon income tax. Our approach is on the basis of a proposed cigarette tax, which has no relevancy to the income of the States.

Mr. MORSE. Oh, but I think the Senator is quite mistaken so far as a physical fact is concerned. The amendment does have to do with the income from the State, because the total amount of the money received from the purchase of cigarettes would depend upon the purchasing power of the population of the State. Certainly Arkansas does not have the same purchasing power as would New York when it comes to the purchase of cigarettes. The income would be from the sale of cigarettes. So very directly the income of a State, from the standpoint of the purchasing power of the consumers, would determine the amount of tax remission that would go to a given State for its educational needs. The situation varies from State to State, and some of our States with a smaller population have a much greater proportionate need for Federal aid to education than do some of our larger States. When I speak about personal income in relation to a State, that is the sense in which I talk about it.

Mr. President, I have discussed the subject with many members of my committee. I now move to table the Miller-Cotton amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Burdick in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oregon to table the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller].

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MILLER. May I inquire of the Chair what a vote on the motion would mean? Do I understand that a vote of "nay" on the Morse motion to table is a vote in favor of the Miller-Cotton amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is a motion to lay the Miller-Cotton amendment on the table.

Mr. MILLER. May I ask the Chair again if a vote of "nay" on that motion is in effect a vote for the Miller-Cotton amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will not construe the meaning of a vote.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL]. If he were present and voting he would vote "yea"; if I were at liberty to vote I would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator form Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay," and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] is necessarily absent and his pair has been previously announced by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

On this vote, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea," and the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 61, nays 28, as follows:

[No. 11 Leg.]

YEAS—61

Aiken
Anderson
Bartlett
Beall
Bible
Burdick
Bush
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Carroll
Case, N.J.
Church
Clark
Douglas
Engle
Ervin
Fong
Gore
Gruening
Hartke
Hayden
Hickey
Hill
Holland
Humphrey
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Jordan
Keating
Kefauver
Kerr
Lausche
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McNamara
Metcalf
Monroney
Morse
Moss
Muskie
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Robertson
Saltonstall
Smathers
Smith, Mass.
Sparkman
Symington
Williams, N.J.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—28

Allott
Bennett
Boggs
Butler
Capehart
Case, S. Dak.
Cotton
Curtis
Dworshak
Eastland
Goldwater
Hickenlooper
Hruska
McClellan
Miller
Morton
Mundt
Murphy
Russell
Scott
Smith, Maine
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Wiley
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—11

Chavez
Cooper
Dirksen
Dodd
Ellender
Fulbright
Hart
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Long, Hawaii
Yarborough

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now recurs on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA]. [Putting the question.]

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I voted "no" on the motion to table the Miller-Cotton amendment. My opposition to general Federal aid to education is well known; therefore I am opposed to the principle as contained in the McNamara amendment. However, I feel that if an amendment to aid elementary and secondary schools is to be incorporated in the pending legislation, the proposal contained in the Miller-Cotton amendment would have been less objectionable than that contained in the McNamara amendment.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, while Senators are on the floor and we can have their attention, assuming we finish action on the pending bill this afternoon, can the distinguished majority leader tell us whether he proposes to have this measure followed by the pension and welfare disclosure bill?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senator's assumption is correct. If the Senate completes action on the pending business this afternoon, we shall take up S. 2520, the bill for the Enforcement of the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act.

Tomorrow we shall take up the resolutions which affect the various committees of the Senate.

I hope we may complete this business by Thursday, so that when the Senate adjourns over the Lincoln Day period, the calendar, generally speaking, will be relatively clean. If that can be done, it may well mean that an extra day or so could be added to the period of recess, because no further important business calling for a vote will come before the Senate until February 20, or thereabout, at which time it is hoped to bring to a conclusion the debate and the consideration of the President's proposal to create a Department of Urban Affairs.

So if the Senate will cooperate, it is my hope that the consideration of all these measures can be concluded on Thursday, and as early on Thursday as possible for the convenience of Senators.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to inquire, further, of the Senator from Alabama, whether he anticipates a long discussion of the pension and welfare bill.

Mr. HILL. I do not think there will be. Of course, I would have no way of knowing for certain, as the Senator from Illinois realizes. However, I think there should not be too much discussion.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Now I should like to ask the Senator from Texas, who I believe intends to offer amendments, if he expects to speak at length on them.

Mr. TOWER. I have two amendments. I am willing to agree to a limitation of debate of, say, an hour on each one.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Illinois advise the Chair on whose time he is speaking?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have not the slightest idea; but I ask that the time for this discussion be taken from the time on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, did I correctly understand the distinguished majority leader to say something about the reorganization plan to create a Department of Urban Affairs?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes. It is hoped to bring that proposal to the floor for debate on February 19, a week from next Monday.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Would that be irrespective of whether the committee had been able to complete its hearings and make a report by that time?

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is my understanding that under the law if a motion of disapproval is entered—and one has been entered in this instance by the Senator from Wyoming—following a 10-day period the proposal could be brought up. I hope the Senator from Arkansas, who is chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, which will hold the hearings on the bill, will agree to that process.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am not in a position to make a commitment as to what the committee might or might not do. I do not understand why it is desired to take such early action. I do not know why there is such a rush about it. Sixty days are provided from the time the plan is submitted for the committee to study it, hold hearings, and make a report. Hearings have been scheduled to start next Tuesday, one week from today. I do not know whether it will be possible to complete them in a day or two, or whether a longer time will be necessary. I have no desire, and it is not my purpose, unduly to prolong the hearings or deliberately to delay action on the plan. But so far as I know, there is no reason, right after the resolution has been introduced, and right after the plan has been referred to the committee, to take such action with regard to discharging the committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. We are going beyond the 10 days which are allowed. It is my understanding that extensive hearings have been held on this proposal, that a bill has been reported by the committee and placed on the calendar, and that it has been approved by the policy committee for consideration. So it was with those factors in mind that I discussed the question with the distinguished minority leader. I shall be prepared to discuss it still further with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the distinguished majority leader. I think it would be quite proper to bring up the bill which has been reported by the committee and also approved for action by the policy committee. I believe that would be quite proper.

I have serious doubts about the procedure here contemplated and the precedent which it would establish. If this becomes the practice of the Senate, I doubt whether it would be advisable hereafter for the committee to whom the reorganization plans are referred to make any effort to hold hearings and develop the merits or demerits of the plans, as the case may be. I simply feel that the proposal ought to take its normal course, just as other reorganization plans have taken their course in the past. I do not recall any instance when such speed has been demanded heretofore with respect to any reorganization plan.

Bear in mind that this is an unusual legislative procedure. Safeguards were attempted to be incorporated in the law. A resolution could be introduced and the committee might not act on it; therefore, the resolution would never get before the Senate. So there had to be some procedural safeguard. However, I think it would be a mistake to take the position that after 10 days after a resolution has been introduced, and introduced the next day after the plan has been submitted, the Senate should take it up for action irrespective of having affording the committee an opportunity to hear the matter and duly process it, deliberate on it, and report its considered judgment to this body.

Mr. MANSFIELD. This is the first time that a precedent of this sort has been set, because while a bill was reported by the Committee on Government Operations and approved by the policy committee for consideration by the Senate, action was foreclosed by the procedure adopted in the other body. It is to be hoped that we might consider this proposal. I point out that if the Senate is not prepared to move—if my information is correct, and I think it is—the House is prepared to move.

Furthermore, on the same day the President's proposal was sent to the House, a motion of disapproval was entered by, I believe, three Republican Members of that body.

So one House or the other would bring it up within a short period; and I would say that in view of the fact that hearings have previously been held—in effect—on this proposal, the Senator from Arkansas would give that due consideration.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Burdick in the chair). Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I should like to say that in its procedures and deliberations the Senate should not penalize this committee because of a considered, appropriate legislative action taken by the other body. In its wisdom, it took the action it did. The action the committee of the other body took does not in itself preclude the taking of further action over there. There is a prescribed procedure whereby if that committee blocked consideration of the bill, the committee could be discharged from the further consideration of the measure, and the measure could then be brought before that body for action—for final passage or disposition.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct. But as a former Member of that body, the Senator is aware of the difficulties which that procedure would impose.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, would the Senator from Montana yield to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I do not say whether the committee which has jurisdiction of Reorganization Plan No. 1 should be discharged after 10 days from the further consideration of the plan; but I wish to say that this reorganization plan deals with proposals which for a number of years have been before the Banking and Currency Committee—proposals with which I am quite familiar. I am very much opposed to the reorganization plan; and I propose in an extended speech next Monday, when I can be recognized, to state my objections, for the record.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it the contention of the majority leader that the reorganization plan referred to is at all identical with the Senate bill which was reported by the Senate committee and was approved, for action, by the policy committee?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Not exactly, but generally so.

Mr. HOLLAND. It is my understanding that the legislative proposal went a great deal further than the reorganization plan now before the Senate; and it seems to me that consideration of the reorganization plan by no means involves duplication of the action which has been taken by the committee in passing on the legislative measure.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Florida has a point there. Again I wish to emphasize the word "generally," because both were in the same direction.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield briefly—but only briefly, because the time now being taken by us is being charged to the time available on the education bill.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, as ranking member of the Committee on Government Operations, I simply wish to associate myself with the sentiments expressed by our chairman. It seems to me the proposed procedure gives rather short shrift to the responsibility of our committee, which I do not think has been at all guilty of wasting time or at all obviously deliberate in acting. We have set the hearings for next Tuesday, in trying to find out how much concern there is.

What the Senator from Florida has said is precisely correct, namely, that the proposal we shall have to consider, whether on the 20th or at some later time, is certainly not foursquare with the legislative proposal approved earlier by our committee and approved by the policy committee. I am sure the majority leader realizes that that bill, as approved, contains provision for certain safeguards for smaller communities, rural areas, and many other desiderata, safeguards which, under the proposal, obviously could not be considered in connection with the reorganization plan received from the White House.

Therefore, under those circumstances I hope the majority leader will not ask that we take action with a shotgun pointed at our heads—unless we exhibit some tendencies for dilatory action, which we have not done yet.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to emphasize my statement that generally they are alike.

AID FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1241) to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities and to authorize scholarships for undergraduate study in such institutions.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New York [Mr. Keating] and myself, I call up my amendments identified as "2-2-62—C," and ask that they be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendments.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the amendments be dispensed with, and that they be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the amendments were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

On the first page, line 4, strike out "and Scholarship".

On page 2, line 11, beginning with "holding out", strike out all through "promise and the" in line 12 and insert in lieu thereof "giving them additional".

On page 2, beginning with line 18, strike out all through "college" in line 21 and insert in lieu thereof "through authorizing additional funds for loans to students under the provisions of title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958".

On page 18, beginning with line 14, strike out all through line 22 on page 28 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"TITLE II—ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR LOANS TO STUDENTS AND BROADENING OF CANCELLATION PROVISIONS UNDER TITLE II OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958

"Authorization amendment

"Sec. 201. Section 201 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out '$90,000,000 each for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for the two succeeding fiscal years' and inserting in lieu thereof '$90,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, $107,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, $133,750,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964'.

"Cancellation amendment

"SEC. 202. Section 205(b)(3) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended to read as follows:

"'(3) not to exceed 50 per centum of any such loan (plus interest) shall be canceled for (A) maintaining an academic standing in the top 25 per centum of the borrower's class, at the rate of 50 per centum of the amount of the loan obtained during each complete academic year in which such standing was maintained, and (B) service as a full-time teacher in an elementary or secondary school, or an institution of higher education, in a State, at the rate of 10 per centum of the total of the amount of such loan plus interest thereon which was unpaid on the first day of such service plus any amounts canceled under clause (A) above, for each complete academic year of such service;'."

On page 38, line 5, beginning after the period, strike out all through the period in line 8.

On page 40, line 12, strike out "II or".

On page 40, line 13, strike out "206(c) or".

On page 42, lines 16 and 17, strike out "to any individual or".

On page 42, line 19, strike out "or pursuant to a scholarship,".

On page 42, line 21, strike out "respect to grants or loans".

Strike out the amendment to the title and insert in lieu thereof the following:

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities, to increase the amount of funds authorized for loans to students under title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, and to provide financial assistance to the States for the construction of public community colleges."

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from Vermont yield to himself?

Mr. PROUTY. Thirty minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, each year between 160,000 and 200,000 young people with high ability fail to attend college. Of these, 60,000 to 100,000 might be reached if financial assistance were made available to them.

I have proposed, along with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], an amendment to the higher education bill which would provide additional funds for loans to needy and deserving students in colleges and universities. This amendment would not only aid superior high school graduates who are unable to obtain a higher education because of a lack of funds; it would, also, help the hard-pressed boy or girl already in college who might be forced to drop out if not given some form of financial assistance.

The proposal we present would strengthen the National Defense Education Act by making available additional funds for student loans. The amendment would raise the loan ceiling for the fiscal year 1963 from $90 million to $107.5 million, or a net jump of $17.5 million.

For the fiscal year 1963, the amendment would raise the National Defense Education Act loan fund authorization from $90 million to $133.75 million, or a net jump of $43.75 million.

Thus, over a 2-year period, the Prouty-Keating proposal would make possible nearly 120,000 additional student loans in the neighborhood of $500 each.

The junior Senator from New York and I feel that the program of student assistance should be designed to reward those who demonstrate academic excellence or enter the teaching field. This our amendment does by permitting partial cancellation of national defense student loans.

Forgiveness of 50 percent of their loans would be allowed to students who rank in the top 25 percent of their class academically. Students who decide to teach in an elementary or secondary school or institution of higher learning would be permitted loan forgiveness at the rate of 10 percent for each year they are engaged in the teaching profession.

The maximum loan cancellation possible would be 50 percent.

I believe that our amendment shows the confidence we have in the national defense student loan program. This program has produced excellent results and is carried out by the institutions of higher learning themselves.

The Prouty-Keating amendment will be of particular help to the most needy students.

A recent survey covering 86,000 student borrowers under the National Defense Education Act during the period of July 1 to November 1, 1960, reveals that 72 percent of the borrowers come from families with annual incomes of $6,000 or less, and that 45 percent come from families having two or more children. Ninety-four percent of the borrowers report personal savings of $500 or less. The combined elements of meager personal savings, relatively low family income, and number of dependents bring sharply to focus the youths most in need of assistance to pursue higher education.

According to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 83 percent of the freshman borrowers depended on the loan program to enable them to enter college, and 58 percent of other undergraduates indicated that the National Defense Education Act loan would determine their ability to remain in college. In addition, 30 percent of them had to pay their entire college expenses by means of scholarships, fellowships, and loans, and 29 percent of them had to finance three-fourths of their college expenses in this way.

These figures demonstrate beyond question that the National Defense Education Act should be strengthened because it aids the genuinely needy student.

I think all Senators ought to take note of the fact that the House-passed college aid bill has no scholarship provisions and that the chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee has announced his committee will consider the question of helping needy students only in conjunction with a review of the operation of the National Defense Education Act. This attitude was not assumed without good reason. The Advisory Group on Higher Education, which submitted a report of its findings and recommendations to the Congress, unanimously agreed that the national defense student loan program is highly successful and the group urged that it continue to be the primary vehicle of direct Federal assistance to students.

According to the American Association of Land Grant Colleges and State Universities and the State Universities Association, no Federal program of scholarships has been offered which they consider soundly conceived or practical of administration in terms of achieving its professed objectives, or as deserving at this time a priority in Federal expenditures on higher education.

These associations went on to say:

> Poorly conceived action could prove to be only a deluding of the public into thinking it had met its challenge to provide educational opportunity.

There are a number of definite advantages which the Prouty-Keating amendment has over the scholarship title in the committee bill. There are, also, countless valid objections to the scholarship title. I would like to proceed at this time to compare our amendment with the provisions of the committee bill.

First, the Prouty-Keating amendment is tied to the administrative machinery we already have on the statute books. It requires the establishment of no new agency, bureau, or commission.

The committee bill would make it necessary to have the States set up 50 brand new commissions, and the administrative costs of such an effort would run between 12 and 15 percent of the total amount of funds authorized for scholarships.

Second, our amendment would encourage academic excellence by permitting partial cancellation of student loans for those who rank in the top 25 percent of their class academically.

It would appear from a reading of the reported bill that if a student demonstrates that he can squeak by in college and is in financial need, he will be eligible for a scholarship. The bill does not require in so many words that scholarships must go to those with the highest ability, and this would give State commissions a certain flexibility which could be utilized for political purposes.

Third, our amendment would allow the colleges and universities themselves to select the recipients of student loans, as they have been doing very successfully under the National Defense Education Act.

The committee bill would place authority to aid students in the hands of 50 yet-to-be-established State commissions.

Everett Case, president of Colgate University, speaking for the American Council on Education, had this to say about the scholarship provisions in S. 1241:

> The problem is one of evaluating individual needs, and college admissions officers have far more experience in dealing with this problem than most State boards are likely to have. This can be done effectively only on a personal basis, not solely as the result of comparing the results of standardized tests and financial questionnaires—the

> only procedures available to State boards. College admissions officers do this as a routine matter.

This representative from the American Council on Education went on to say:

> The financial needs of the individual student can frequently be met by a combination of scholarship aid and loans. College campuses can plan such combined programs for individuals. State scholarship boards cannot.

The sentiment expressed by the American Council on Education was strongly supported by the American Association of Land Grant Colleges and State Universities, and the State Universities Association. President John D. Millette, Miami University, representing these associations, made this comment:

> There is substantial sentiment among educators to the effect that Federal scholarships should be awarded through educational institutions. We doubt that the evidence exists on which to base a judgment that the proposed legislation will make a substantial contribution to accomplishing its purpose.

Frederick Burkhardt, president, American Council of Learned Societies, expressed great concern about the scholarship provisions in the administration bill. I quote now from Dr. Burkhardt:

> I urge that this be put into the hands of th institutions of higher learning. They have had long experience with both scholarships and loans and can plan for the individual more effectively than can regional or State boards. The funds should be allocated essentially as they are now under the Federal Student Loan Fund provisions of the National Defense Education Act.

The National Catholic Welfare Conference, represented by Rt. Rev. Msgr. F. G. Hochwalt, stated:

> There must be kept uppermost in the minds of those who decide the problem of evaluating the individual needs, the recognition that college admissions officers have years of accumulated experience in dealing with these problems. Some of this valuable experience moreover may be lacking on the part of State or regional boards. Another basic consideration lies in the fact that the needs of the individual student can frequently be met by a combination of scholarship aid and loans. Here again the institutions and their admissions officers may be the individuals best qualified to make decisions.

Fourth, our amendment would not have any unhealthy influence on the distribution of students among the various colleges and universities.

The committee bill would tend to pack the already overcrowded so-called prestige institutions.

The American Association of Land Grant Colleges and State Universities and the State Universities Association are very much disturbed about the fact that the proposed Federal scholarship program will probably unduly influence the normal distribution of students among American colleges and universities. They feel that any program which combines selection of scholarship holders by State or national boards with freedom of winners to attend institutions of their choice inevitably will lead to the concentration of applications in relatively few of the better known institutions. These distinguished associations claim that the experience of the national merit scholarship program proves their point beyond any shadow of a doubt.

The American Association of Land Grant Colleges and State Universities and the State Universities Association strongly recommend that funds be allocated in approximately the same manner as Federal student loan funds.

It would be extremely unwise to enact legislation which encourages the packing of the big colleges and deprives of their normal student potential many of the underutilized but excellent smaller institutions.

Philip H. Coombs, program director of the education program for the Ford Foundation, recently took note of the tremendous waste in current utilization of both faculties and facilities of higher education. He quoted a survey of colleges and universities which revealed that, on the basis of a 44-hour week, classrooms were used only 46 percent of the time—25 percent when used in terms of pupil stations—and their laboratories were used at only 38 percent of capacity.

It is highly important, therefore, that we do not take any action which will crowd the overcrowded colleges and take away students from the institutions which have ample facilities and faculties to receive them.

Fifth, our amendment is designed in such a way as to help many needy students, and would injure no other students.

The committee bill would cause a college to discriminate in favor of a student who has a Federal scholarship and deny enrollment to a student who has no such aid. This is true because under the committee bill the college gets a $350 bonus for each Federal scholarshipholder it admits.

Sixth, the Prouty-Keating amendment would help not only the superior high school graduate about to go to college, it would also assist the needy and deserving already in college who may be forced to drop out because they have no money.

The committee bill advances a program which says in effect "If you have not entered college, we are willing to give you some money to go. But if you are already in college and need money, we are not going to do a thing for you."

Seventh, the Prouty-Keating amendment would encourage students to prepare to teach in all of our elementary and secondary schools and in our institutions of higher learning, as well. It would do this by providing a partial cancellation of loans up to 50 percent to those students who later engage in the teaching profession. Our amendment strengthens the foregiveness provision presently in the National Defense Education Act.

The committee-reported bill offers no incentives which will aid in erasing the teacher shortage.

Eighth, under the Prouty-Keating proposal loan funds will go into areas where they are needed most. This is true because colleges and universities themselves, knowing the loan demand, are the ones who apply for Federal funds.

The committee bill could very well bring about a bad distribution of scholarship money. According to the American Association of Land Grant Colleges and State Universities, the U.S. Office of Education does not have adequate studies of the distribution of qualified and needy students. By this I mean, there are no State-by-State studies covering the entire country of the percentage of high school graduates who attend college and of the percentage of those in various ability groupings who do attend. On the basis of the studies they do have, the land-grant colleges conclude that the percentage of high school graduates attending college varies greatly among the States and regions and raises in their mind the question as to whether or not a high percentage of the able young people who fail to go to college for financial reasons may not be fairly heavily concentrated in a few States or regions.

Our land-grant colleges argue, and I agree, that a considerably better factual basis of information needs to be available before we can make sound judgments as to the effectiveness of a Federal scholarship program and whether it would accomplish its stated objectives.

Ninth, our amendment, calling for an extension of the National Defense Education Act loan program, will reach those who are most determined to get an education and will take ample recognition of achievement through loan forgiveness for high academic standing. The money which goes to students for loans will be repaid in whole or in part and repayments will be placed in a revolving fund so that other needy pupils can be assisted as long as the National Defense Education Act is in operation.

The committee bill does not encourage industry on the part of the student and once money goes out from the Federal Government for student aid, it does not come back. The same money cannot be used over and over to aid the deserving young men and women who want a college education.

Tenth, the Prouty-Keating amendment would add additional fund authorizations to the National Defense Education Act totaling $17.5 million for fiscal 1963 and $43.75 million for fiscal 1964.

The committee-reported bill has such defective scholarship provisions that it is impossible to estimate what their costs will be. It is important to note that the limitation on authorized appropriations in the committee bill only applies to the first year of the scholarships. The second sentence of section 201 states that funds are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for each of 7 succeeding fiscal years, in such sums as are necessary to make payments to persons who have been previously awarded scholarships. If the scholarships awarded to recipients during the first year were to remain constant over a 4-year period then the maximum amount of appropriations would reach $595 million.

However, the State commissions who will be handling the scholarship money could, through simple techniques, hike the fund authorization to the multibillion-dollar category. In fact, it is theoretically possible for these commissions to hike authorizations to a figure exceeding the national debt. We can illustrate the absurdity of the language now in the bill by using a hypothetical set of circumstances.

Let us suppose that during the first 5 years of direct authorized appropriations, the several State commissions award scholarships of $100 each to 1,487,500 individuals. During each of the next 3 years, the State commissions in accordance with the provisions of section 206(a)(2)(A), upgrade these scholarships to the maximum amount of $1,000, resulting in a cost of $4,462,500,000—1,487,500 scholarships of $1,000 for 3 years. Adding the first year cost of $148,750,000 to the above figure would bring the amount to $4,463,987,500.

In addition, the education allowance of $350 granted to the institutions for each scholarship recipient in attendance per year would cost $2,082,500,000—1,487,500 scholarship recipients times $1,400—$350 for each of 4 years. Thus, under our assumed circumstances, the total cost of the scholarship program would be $6,546,587,500.

Of course, the weaknesses in the committee bill will probably not be exploited to the tune of $6 billion plus, but I do think the example I have brought out shows that the cost of the proposed scholarship program could be fantastic.

The distinguished junior Senator from New York and I feel that we have developed an approach to the problems of needy students that is both practical and realistic. It is our hope that Senators will examine the amendment we advance very carefully and will conclude that it deserves their support.

Mr. KEATING rose.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PEARSON in the chair). Twenty minutes.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 10 minutes?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished junior Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, first I wish to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his inquiry.

Mr. KEATING. Except for the pending amendment, as I understand, the Senate is operating under a time limitation of 1 hour on each amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KEATING. If an amendment is offered by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], or any other Senator, and an amendment to the amendment is offered, will any Senator offering an amendment to an amendment also have 1 hour?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Each amendment will have 1 hour, the time to be equally divided.

Mr. KEATING. An amendment to an amendment would have 1 hour?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the Presiding Officer.

Mr. President, the purpose of the pending amendment, on which I am happy to be associated with the distinguished Senator from Vermont, who has done such outstanding work in this field, is to limit the scholarship provisions contained in title II and to substitute instead, as he has explained, an expanded loan program under the National Defense Education Act.

The loan program which we are proposing has provisions for loan forgiveness up to 50 percent for two classes; students in the top quarter of their class academically, or students who enter the teaching profession.

The virtues of this approach, as opposed to the scholarship program, seem to me to be substantial. In the first place, the National Defense Education Act loan program, title II, is now in effect. It has been working well for 4 years. It has widespread support. So far it has helped some 230,000 young people to go to college who probably otherwise would not have been able to do so.

The second advantage is that a loan program can be expanded over the years at a much reduced cost when the repayments are made.

As the Senator has pointed out, it is estimated that there are from 60,000 to 100,000 high school seniors each year in the top 30 percent of their class who are prevented from going on to college because of lack of funds. To supply enough scholarships to help all those students, or a large part of them, would require astronomical sums. A loan program could help many more of these students with the same amount of money.

The third advantage of the proposal we are making is that it calls for substantial incentive provisions to encourage higher caliber students.

As I pointed out, there are provisions for forgiveness up to 50 percent of the loans for students who rank in the top 25 percent of their class and for students who enter the teaching profession. As we all know, teachers are badly needed today.

Fourth, this procedure would eliminate the creation of new and perhaps unwieldy State commissions in each of our 50 States to conduct tests and award scholarships, which is the plan under the bill before us. It would leave the program in the hands of those most directly involved—the colleges and the universities.

In setting up the proposed commissions, the administrative expenses are estimated by the House Committee on Education and Labor to be as high as 12 to 15 percent.

In the bill before us, there is no limit whatsoever, but the bill would authorize appropriations of such sums as might be necessary to meet administrative expenses.

All this money might better be spent directly on loans for needy students than on piling up another administrative structure.

Finally, the great virtue of this proposal is that it is practical and realistic. This argument has to do with the practical considerations involved in getting a bill through this Congress. There is little likelihood that the other body will accept the scholarship program in any form. If the Senate blindly goes on to pass a bill providing scholarships, the final version, if we get a bill at all, will then have to be hammered out in conference between two bills; namely, the Senate and House versions. These are as far different as night and day. As a result, the Senate will probably be asked to approve willy-nilly a compromise program that we shall never have had an opportunity to discuss adequately on the floor or to vote on directly. To my mind, that is not a desirable way to legislate. It seems to me we should take up and consider the kind of legislation we really want and not leave it to the conference committee to arrive at the final result.

For these reasons I believe that the proposed approach through the National Defense Education Act is the wisest, the most effective, the easiest to administer, and the most likely in the long run to be achieved; and I venture the prediction that if we stick to the scholarship idea, and the bill goes to a conference and we get a bill at all—if it is not tied up completely in conference—the only thing the other side will agree to is probably a loan provision. In any event, I am reliably informed that would be much more palatable to the other body than the scholarship provisions in the bill before the Senate.

Objections will be raised—and I think they are answerable—to the suggested approach. In the first place, it will be said that the bill is a higher education bill, and that we should therefore not try to bring in any provisions of another act, the National Defense Education Act, or especially that we should not here try to change the provisions of the National Defense Education Act. The National Defense Education Act benefits higher education in an effective and workable manner. Therefore, it seems to me that instead of turning our backs completely on the bill, and the machinery under it, and establishing under this bill a new form of bureaucracy to work for the very same objectives, we might better meet those objectives, since they are similar under both bills, by patterning what we do here after the National Defense Education Act.

Let me make very clear that the amendment would not affect any part of the National Defense Education Act except title II, dealing with loans; and most of title II would not be altered at all. It would be merely extended in respect to the times provided and in the sums available.

The most sizable changes are in providing forgiveness of loans, not only to those entering the teaching profession, but also to those achieving a certain academic standard. The reason why I think that should be done through the National Defense Education Act at this time, even though I realize there is another bill on the calendar dealing with the revision of the National Defense Education Act, is that it seems to me it would be a great mistake to set up 50 more State agencies, as is proposed under the bill, to handle the scholarship or any other program, when it could be handled through an existing establishment.

To my way of thinking, it is good administration to take advantage of a program now in operation so long as it is functioning well, rather than to create a new bureaucracy for that purpose. The fact that the Senate is not now considering the National Defense Education Act, and amendments to it, is in no way a legitimate argument against the amendment, it seems to me, because I believe that in studying the question of aid to higher education, the Senate should also be coordinating with the national defense education programs in that field.

In short, we should be amending that act rather than creating entirely new machinery.

Another point may be made, and probably will be made. And all these arguments have a certain amount of validity. I in no way belittle them. They are legitimate arguments in opposition to the amendment. One such argument will be the fact that the National Defense Education Act was intended to encourage the study of mathematics, sciences, and modern languages particularly, whereas Senate bill 1241 is directed at making education in any field available to those who could not otherwise afford it. I am informed—and I am rather surprised to hear it—that only between one-quarter and one-third of the national defense education agency loans are now made to those in the fields of science, mathematics, and languages.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. PROUTY. I yield an additional 5 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. There seems, therefore, to be ample scope under the National Defense Education Act program, as now drafted and executed, to assist able students in other areas of study as well. As I have said, the principal changes that we would make in the National Defense Education Act would involve the forgiveness of loans up to 50 percent for the student who remained in the top quarter of his class, and provision for an incentive so that the student would get the most out of his college year academically. At the same time, the loan feature of the program would be preserved. Students who know they must repay a loan, in part at least, are far more likely to try to benefit fully from their education than those who receive the money gratis under a Federal scholarship. Moreover, a loan program automatically singles out those who are most determined to have an education, while the forgiveness feature rewards those who are most conscientious and who take their studies most seriously. The loan feature has the virtue of providing funds and developing a sense of responsibility at the same time. The student's mind and character are strengthened. Rather than leaning on the crutch of a Government handout, the student learns to stand on his own feet.

Incidental benefits that will be derived from the fact that the Government can make these loans available to more students include the fact that it costs less, overall, to the Government, and also affects the student himself by developing his character and his dependability and his general moral fiber. That is the principal reason why I like the idea of a loan provision as opposed to an outright grant.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEATING. I will be very happy to yield to the Senator from Ohio, but I would prefer to complete my statement if that is agreeable to him.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

Mr. KEATING. The experience of private organizations, of which there is one in the city of Washington, the Strong Foundation, which are involved in this type of loan program shows that there is a very high percentage of repayment.

The other change in the National Defense Education Act is the provision for forgiveness of up to 50 percent of the loan, at the rate of 10 percent for each year in which the recipient teaches in an elementary or secondary school or in an institution of higher learning.

Under the present terms of the National Defense Education Act forgiveness is allowed to those who teach in public elementary and secondary schools. The need is equally great for teachers in private elementary and secondary schools, as well as in institutions of higher learning, both public and private. This provision would end what is a discriminatory provision in the present bill, and which has no possible relation to any kind of constitutionality; in fact, it is a change which was recommended by the committee in its amendments to the National Defense Education Act, S. 2345 is on the calendar.

There are other technical problems that may arise. For instance, the amendment would provide for a 2-year program rather than a 5-year program, because the National Defense Education Act as it now stands on the books is a 2-year program.

There may be other problems with respect to students who are now enjoying National Defense Education Act loans, in relation to the revised terms of the proposed legislation. That is something which can easily be worked out.

The incentive provisions in the amendment are virtually identical with those proposed by the advisory group on higher education, made up of members of the House Committee on Education and Labor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. PROUTY. I yield 3 additional minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. That is one reason why I state with what I believe to be accuracy that the chances of the bill in the other body are much better if we add the amendment to the bill.

Under section 4 of the report entitled "Congressional Action For Higher Education," issued by the group to which I have referred, namely, the advisory group, recommends an extension of the national defense students' loan program, with an increase in the fund. It also recommends cancellation of a portion of a student's loan for any year or years in which his academic achievement is outstanding.

The committee has expended a great deal of time and effort on the study. I am reliably informed that a provision along these lines would be more acceptable in the other body than the scholarship provisions in the present bill.

After all, those of us who are sincerely interested in improving the standard of excellence in institutions of higher learning—and this is true also, I am sure, of those who oppose the amendment—believe this is essential to our strength and security, and do not want this program to fall between the House and Senate stools.

I urge that all those who have an interest in the incentive approach to the problems of individual assistance, which has been highly successful in the framework of the National Defense Education Act, give support to the pending amendment.

I would like to comment briefly on the President's message, which came to Congress today, but perhaps I should defer doing so until a later time. I am now happy to yield to my friend from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from New York understands that I have an amendment which is substantially like that offered by the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I might say to the Senator from Ohio that I believe the intention of the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from New York, after discussing the amendment, is to withdraw it at this time and to renew the substance of it as amendments to the amendment to be offered by the distinguished Senator from Ohio. I would ask my friend from Vermont for confirmation. I understand that is what our present plan is.

Mr. PROUTY. That is true. I would like to add that, in principle, we are extremely sympathetic to the amendment which will be proposed later by the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

Mr. KEATING. We think we can improve the Senator's amendment. Perhaps we can, perhaps we cannot.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is the view of the Senator from New York and the Senator from Vermont that it will be in the better interest of the country if the scholarship fund money were loaned rather than granted as a gift. Is that correct?

Mr. KEATING. That is correct. Also, it would be better in the interest of the student and of strengthening his moral fiber.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator is of the belief that if there were made available, for example, a thousand dollars as a loan, the student receiving it, if he has moral fabric, will take the money, and in the end his character as a citizen will be improved, rather than if the money were given to him outright. Is that correct?

Mr. KEATING. That is the feeling of the Senator from New York.

Mr. LAUSCHE. My amendment contemplates increasing the amount under the National Defense Education Act. In the first year of 1962 the amount would be $90 million. In the second year, I contemplate increasing it by $35 million. In the third year it would be increased by $50 million.

Mr. KEATING. As the Senator knows—and he has discussed his amendment with us—it is not our intention to interfere with the figures in the amendment to be offered by the Senator from Ohio. We accept those figures. He is more generous in this regard than we are in our amendment. We accept those figures, if I may accept them for both of us. Our amendment refers to the forgiveness provisions of the bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. On the forgiveness provisions, under the existing law and under my amendment, a student who completes his course with the money borrowed, is granted a forgiveness of 50 percent if he enters the teaching profession. Do we agree on that?

Mr. KEATING. At present?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

Mr. KEATING. Only if he teaches in a public elementary or secondary school.

Mr. PROUTY. With this qualification, that it is only up to 10 percent a year.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes. The amendment of the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from New York contemplates granting additional forgiveness, and it is on the basis of being in the top 25 percent. What will that forgiveness be?

Mr. KEATING. Up to 50 percent. In other words, a student, if he were to get a thousand dollars, would be able to get a forgiveness of up to $500 if he remained in the top quarter of the class.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If he had a thousand dollar debt, and if he got 10 percent for 5 years, the debt would be reduced to $500. Is that correct? The 10 percent a year relates only to those going into teaching. The 50-percent forgiveness is for students then in college who remain in the top quarter of their class.

So a $1,000 debt, if the student complied fully with the provisions of the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from New York, would be reduced to $250, would it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The additional time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-one minutes have expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is my last question.

Mr. KEATING. I should like to hear the Senator's question again.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If the debt of the student is $1,000, and he complied with all the forgiveness provisions, would his debt be reduced to $250?

Mr. KEATING. It would be reduced to $500.

Mr. PROUTY. Fifty percent would be the maximum amount of a loan that could be forgiven.

Mr. KEATING. If he remained in the top quarter of his class, he could get forgiveness up to 50 percent of his loan.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What about the forgiveness under the existing law—the National Defense Education Act?

Mr. PROUTY. That applies only to teaching in public schools.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Let us consider a teacher. A teacher, then, would have two benefits: First, if he went into the teaching profession, he would get a 50-percent reduction; second, if he finished in the top 25 percent of his class, he would also get 10 percent.

Mr. KEATING. He would have had that forgiveness while he was in college. So his debt would never accumulate to more than $500 out of $1,000. But a limit of 50 percent would be put on the total allowable forgiveness.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The teacher who borrowed $1,000 could, in the maximum, if he went into the teaching profession, reduce his debt to $250.

Mr. PROUTY. The way the amendment is drafted, it would be impossible under any combination of circumstances to grant forgiveness of more than 50 percent.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Of the whole debt?

Mr. PROUTY. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator from New York and the Senator from Vermont for clearing up that point.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, how much time remains on this side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont has 45 minutes remaining.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished senior Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement I am about to make appear following the vote on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware relating to the Federal financing of the production of poultry appear following the vote on the Prouty-Keating amendment.)

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be a quorum call, with the understanding that the time for the quorum call shall not be charged to the time of either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] and I withdraw our amendment at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn.

FEDERAL FINANCING OF PRODUCTION OF POULTRY

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on many occasions during the past administration I criticized the Federal Government for pouring out the taxpayers' money to finance the construction of new poultry houses and to finance the production of broilers, layers, and turkeys, especially at a time when those agriculture products were in oversupply.

Today I want to discuss how the new administration not only has continued this absurd practice but also during the past 12 months has more than doubled the rate of these loans. Last year through six different lending agencies millions of dollars were poured out to finance the increased production of broilers, turkeys, and commercial eggs, with the result that they have brought this industry to the verge of bankruptcy.

During the past year poultry products have been selling at record low prices. The price of broilers at the farm level has ranged as low as 10 to 14 cents per pound with the price of eggs at a correspondingly low figure, and turkeys sold at the lowest price during the past 20 years, with the result that millions of dollars have been lost by the American farmers. During recent weeks broiler prices at the farm level have improved and today are at a profitable level, but the danger of renewed trouble looms unless the cause is removed.

The reason for these extremely low prices of 1961 was overproduction of turkeys, broilers, and laying hens. Normally when prices of poultry products are below the cost of production a curtailment in the output automatically follows, but this time, notwithstanding the record low prices and heavy losses being sustained, the poultry industry continued to operate at record capacity levels.

Unable to understand this failure of the law of supply and demand to function normally, studies have been made both at industrial and governmental levels. There are many in Government and some out of Government who are citing last year's plight of the poultry industry as proof that this segment of our American agriculture can no longer function under the free enterprise system but that the industry will now be forced to ask for Government supports and Government controls over its productive capacity. Several top administration officials are today gleefully referring to last year's plight of the broiler and turkey farmers as further evidence that their plan of complete Government controls over all segments of American agriculture is the only answer.

But before we abandon the free enterprise system and begin advocating further extension of Government controls I think we should first determine what was responsible for last year's plight of the industry and its failure to make its own readjustment in production. I am not overlooking the poultry industry's own responsibility when it failed to bring its production under control, but there were other contributing factors over which industry had no control.

Today I call attention to one major factor over which the farmer had no control and which accounted to a large degree for the low prices received by the American farmers for broilers, turkeys, and eggs, and that was the activities of the U.S. Government itself.

Last year while the Secretary of Agriculture was shedding his crocodile tears over the plight of the poultry farmers we find there were six different lending agencies of the U.S. Government actively soliciting loan applications from the American farmers and urging them to build new poultry houses and thereby expand their production. During 1961 representatives of these six Government agencies were scouring the country, urging the farmers to build new poultry houses and increase their production with Government money. The result was that during the first 6 months of 1961 nearly twice as much Government money was loaned for the construction of new broiler houses, new laying hen houses, and for the production of both broilers and turkeys than was loaned during any preceding year.

These same agencies are today still pouring out taxpayers' dollars to finance the expansion of this overcapacity industry at a rate of double that of any preceding year. The agencies making these loans are as follows: Federal Land Bank, Federal Intermediate Credit Banks, Production Credit Associations, Cooperative Banks, Farmers Home Administration, Federal Housing Administration under title I, and the Small Business Administration.

There are only two possible explanations of this absurd situation wherein we find the U.S. Government deliberately pouring money into an already overexpanded industry at a time when the producers are already going bankrupt as a result of low prices. One explanation could be that it represents sheer bureaucratic stupidity and the other is that this is a part of a planned program of the New Frontier bureaucrat to bankrupt the American farmers if necessary to force them into a situation where they will have to accept Government controls and allotments.

Most certainly the argument advanced by some of the bureaucrats in these agencies that they are trying to assist the little farmer over the present demoralized market situation cannot be supported by the fact; for example, the overwhelming majority of the loans that were made were in the $50,000, $100,000, and sometime million-dollar class.

First, I shall describe just a few of these loans made by one of these agencies, the Federal Intermediate Credit Banks:

In 1961 one loan of $65,000 was made for the construction of laying henhouses in New Jersey. In Missouri a $67,096 loan was made to finance the production of broilers, while in Ohio a loan of $59,095 was made to finance the construction of a new house for layers.

I cite four loans in Indiana: Loan No. 302 represents a Government loan of $1,300,000 that was made in 1960 to an individual to be used for the production of broilers, and in 1961 we find that the same individual borrowed another $800,000 from the same agency. Another so-called small farmer borrowed $304,900 in 1960, and in 1961 he came back for another $232,450, all to be used to expand his production of broilers. Several other loans ranging from $330,000 down to $60,000 were extended in the same area. Whether the 1960 loans were all paid back or whether part of the proceeds of the 1961 loans were used to make such payments is not answered in the Government's report. They are described as separate loans, but in any event they indicate the manner in which the Government has been pouring taxpayers' money out in an endeavor to encourage further expansion in this troubled industry.

A further list of some of the loans in excess of $50,000 that were made in Indiana to finance the increased broiler and layer capacity of that State are as follows:

1960:	1st half 1961 Jan. 1–July 1
$330,000	$60,000
$1,300,000	800,000
$304,000	232,450
$106,190	126,277
$128,144	99,542
$70,000	--------

Do not overlook the important point that each time new capacity for 1,000 broilers is constructed it means at least 3,000 additional birds per year for the market. Each house can produce at least three crops.

In California during the first half of 1961 alone approximately $3 million were furnished by the Federal Government through two of these lending agencies to build new poultry houses for layers and to finance production therein. The most of the loans by these two particular agencies were in excess of $50,000 each. As examples I list 10 of these loans:

1961

Loan No.:	*Amount*
----	$75,700
----	79,400
1101	56,500
1104	62,987
1105	90,620
1106	79,905
1107	56,940
1108	150,000
1109	125,865
1110	243,382

The extra eggs and broilers that were produced in these new poultry houses built with Government money certainly were a major contributing factor in the low prices for broilers, turkeys, and eggs last year.

But these were not the only States in which large loans were made. For example: There were eight loans made by this agency in Georgia during the past several months ranging between $50,000 and $150,000, all of which were for the purpose of building new broiler houses or to finance the increased production of layers. Those loans are as follows:

1960

Loan No.:	*Amount*
101	$106,993
102	50,800
103	60,000
104	92,000
105	100,000

January–July 1961

Loan No.:	*Amount*
106	$60,000
107	55,000
108	150,000

A farmer in Wisconsin borrowed $54,530 to build a new house for layers. Another farmer in Oregon borrowed $60,000, and another farmer in the State of Washington borrowed $58,000, all for the construction of new houses for layers. In Texas they list a $60,659 loan for a new broiler house, and in Arkansas during the first half of 1961 one agency made three loans, $63,000, $67,600, and $100,000 to finance increased broiler production in that area. In Alabama one farmer borrowed $70,000 in 1961, and another borrowed $419,030 in 1960 and $390,000 in 1961 to build new broiler houses and to finance expanded production.

In 1960 one farmer in Delaware borrowed $130,800, and in 1961 he borrowed another $64,000, while another farmer—loan No. 1502—borrowed $119,500 in 1960. This latter individual borrowed another $69,500 in 1961 all for production of broilers or turkeys.

In Maryland a total of $5½ million was poured out in 1960 and 1961 by two of these agencies to expand production of broilers and turkeys in that State. Maryland loans ranged from $60,000 to over a million each. To emphasize that these loans were not to finance small farmers, I cite some of these loans which were made for increasing the broiler production in Maryland:

1960

Loan No.	*Amount*
1401	$455,000
1402	960,000
1403	1,357,500
1404	164,000
1405	285,000
1406	460,500

January–July 1961

Loan No.	*Amount*
1401	$260,000
1402	540,000
1403	60,000
1404	107,400
1405	195,000
1406	208,600

Altogether this one agency, the Federal Intermediate Credit Banks, in one 18-month period made 63 loans throughout the country totaling $12,490,233. This total includes only those loans which were in excess of $50,000.

I was unable to obtain the complete statistics showing the total amount of all the millions which have been poured out by overly enthusiastic bureaucrats as they scoured the country urging the farmers to take the Government money and expand their production of broilers, turkeys, and laying hens. But the statistics which have been obtained clearly show that this loose Government money has been and is today still being poured out at double the rates of any previous year.

For instance, a sample check of loans made by another agency, the Federal land banks, shows that in the calendar year 1960, it made 361 loans totaling $1,712,472 for the construction of new broiler houses with a stated capacity of 3,968,210 broilers. In the first 6 months of 1961 this same agency made 499 loans totaling $2,290,984 for the construction of new broiler houses with an increased capacity of 4,621,222 broilers. There is no indication that loans made in the second half of 1961 were at any lower rate. This same agency, the Federal land banks, in 1960 made 129 loans totaling $915,607 for the construction of new laying hen houses with a stated capacity of 528,000. In the first 6 months of 1961 this agency made 133 loans totaling $1,195,109 for the construction of more new laying hen houses with the stated capacity of 693,210.

A special report designated "Loans Financing Poultry Houses" by the intermediate credit banks lists loans for the calendar year 1960 as follows: 901 loans totaling $4,437,157 for the purpose of constructing new broiler houses with a capacity of 8,819,300 broilers; then during the first 6 months of 1961 they made 961 loans totaling $4,129,036 likewise for the construction of new broiler houses, with a capacity of another 7,251,380.

During this same period, 1960, this same agency, the Federal intermediate credit banks, made 454 other loans totaling $3,557,306 for the construction of new laying hen houses with a capacity of 2,400,500; then during the first 6 months of 1961 they made 446 more loans totaling $3,672,478, again for the construction of new houses for layers, which further increased capacity by 2,375,300.

The Farmers Home Administration, a third Government agency working overtime to get rid of taxpayers' dollars in an area where the money is certainly not needed, has likewise been making its contribution toward bankrupting the American poultry farmers. In the calendar year 1960, this agency made 98 loans to build new poultry houses for expanded broiler production and another 56 loans to finance the production of broilers therein. These loans totaled $545,805 and $111,770, respectively. These building and production loans resulted in increased capacity of broilers by 2,071,700. Then in the first 6 months of 1961 this same agency, the Farmers Home Administration, made 92 other loans totaling $472,191 to build new poultry houses and buy equipment plus another 34 loans totaling $76,520 to produce broilers therein, with the result that by virtue of these loans the productive capacity of broilers in the first 6 months of this year was increased by 2,178,000.

This same agency, the Farmers Home Administration, was also active in helping to aggravate the already demoralized egg market. In 1960 they made 42 loans totaling $296,455 for building new laying hen houses along with 500 operating loans totaling $1,681,340, to produce layers therein. The result was that under these loans the Farmers Home Administration increased the total capacity of layers by 83,266. In 1961 this agency was still going strong pouring out Government money with another $1,149,288 being loaned to increase laying flocks by an additional 52,600 hens.

But this was not all; three other Government agencies were making similar efforts toward encouraging the American farmers to borrow Government money and increase the production of turkeys, broilers, and eggs, all of which were already in a state of oversupply.

For the most of 1961 broilers, turkeys, and eggs were all selling at prices resulting in substantial losses to the American farmers. During all this period the Secretary of Agriculture and other administration officials were shedding crocodile tears for their plight, yet we now find that it was the Government itself which was deliberately pouring out millions in an effort to accelerate the bankruptcy of this industry. This was not an accident, nor can it be charged off as sheer stupidity. It was for no other purpose than to force the industry to beg the Government to take it under its umbrella of price supports and controls.

In my opinion and in the opinion of most of the industry, price supports or Government controls over production are not the answer to the problems of the poultry industry. In fact, the greatest contribution that the Federal Government could make toward assisting the American poultry farmers today would be to stop pouring Government money into the industry to finance its overexpansion.

In my opinion, this contradictory policy of the Government is not an accident. It is part of a deliberate plan to bring the poultry farmers so near to the verge of bankruptcy that they will be forced to request and accept Government supervision.

Nor will this situation be corrected by establishing another Government agency to send its representatives into the same territory to control production and administer price supports.

Let us not forget that it was only last spring that an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture publicly boasted that by dumping surplus corn on the market the Government could force the price of corn down to levels where farmers producing corn would be forced to sign up under the Government support program.

These same power-mad bureaucrats on the New Frontier are now trying to force the American poultry farmers to seek shelter under the same Government umbrella of supports and controls, and unless they are stopped they will bankrupt a lot of farmers in the attempt.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, reports from the agencies referred to above.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., November 2, 1961.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: Since writing you on September 29 transmitting the information you requested in your letter of August 4 pertaining to poultry loans made by institutions under our supervision, we learned that one of the banks supplying information had not correctly interpreted one of the items in the request. Due to this misinterpretation, the loans of 8 borrowers who obtained loans of more than $50,000 for production purposes only (no housing construction involved) were omitted from one of the tables furnished you.

We are enclosing a revision of the table affected.

Very truly yours,
HAROLD T. MASON,
Acting Governor.

Loans in excess of $50,000 for financing poultry housing or production by production credit associations and other financing institutions rediscounting with the Federal intermediate credit banks—Year 1960, period January–July 1961

District and State	Year 1960			January-July 1961		
	Borrower No.	Amount	Purpose	Borrower No.	Amount	Purpose
2. Maryland	1401	$455,000	Broiler production	1401	$260,000	Broiler production.
	1402	960,000	do	1402	540,000	Do.
	1403	1,357,500	do	1403	60,000	Do.
	1404	164,000	do	1404	107,400	Do.
	1405	285,000	do	1405	195,000	Do.
	1406	460,500	do	1406	208,600	Do.
Delaware	1501	130,800	do	1501	64,000	Do.
	1502	119,500	do	1502	69,500	Do.
Total	8	3,932,300		8	1,504,500	
3. Georgia	101	106,993	Layer housing and production			
	102	50,800	Layer production	106	60,000	Broiler housing.
	103	60,000	Layer housing	107	55,000	Layer housing and production.
	104	92,000	Layer housing and other	108	150,000	Layer production.
	105	100,000	Layer production			
Total	5	409,793		3	265,000	
4. Ohio	201	59,095	Layer housing			
Indiana	301	330,000	Broiler and layer production	301	60,000	Broiler and layer production.
	302	1,300,000	Broiler production	302	800,000	Broiler production.
	303	304,900	do	303	232,450	Do.
	304	106,190	do			
	305	128,144	Broiler housing and production	305	126,277	Broiler housing and production.
	306	70,000	Broiler production	307	99,542	Layer housing and production.
Kentucky	401	57,847	Layer housing			
Total	8	2,356,176		5	1,318,269	

Loans in excess of $50,000 for financing poultry housing or production by production credit associations and other financing institutions rediscounting with the Federal intermediate credit banks—Year 1960, period January–July 1961—Continued

District and State	Year 1960			January-July 1961		
	Borrower No.	Amount	Purpose	Borrower No.	Amount	Purpose
5. Alabama				501	$70,000	Broiler housing and production.
	502	$419,030	Broiler production	502	390,000	Broiler production.
Total	1	419,030		2	460,000	
6. Illinois	601	85,098	Layer production			
Missouri				701	67,096	Broiler production.
Arkansas	801	100,000	Layer production	803	100,000	Do.
	802	55,500	do	804	67,600	Do.
				805	63,000	Do.
Total	3	240,598		4	297,696	
7. Wisconsin	901	54,530	Layer housing			
Total	1	54,530				
10. Texas				1001	60,659	Broiler housing.
Total				1	60,659	
11. California	1101	52,760	Layer housing and production	1101	56,500	Layer housing and production.
	1102	79,235	do	1104	62,987	Do.
	1103	55,488	do	1105	90,620	Do.
				1106	79,905	Do.
				1107	56,940	Do.
				1108	150,000	Do.
				1109	125,865	Do.
				1110	193,352	Do.
				1110	50,030	Layer housing.
Total	3	187,483		9	866,199	
12. Washington				1,201	58,000	Layer housing.
Oregon	1301	60,000	Layer housing			
Total	1	60,000		1	58,000	
Grand total	30	7,659,910		33	4,830,323	

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., September 29, 1961.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: It has taken us somewhat longer than we expected to obtain the information you requested in your letter of August 4, 1961, pertaining to poultry loans made by institutions under our supervision.

Figures shown on the enclosed tables were furnished by the 12 Federal land banks and the 12 Federal intermediate credit banks and represent the best available estimates on credit for the types of operations which you mention.

The Federal land banks made the following loans in excess of $50,000 for construction of laying houses, construction of broiler houses, or production therein:

State	Broiler houses		Laying hen houses	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
New Jersey			[1] 1	$65,000
Mississippi	[2] 1	$57,895		
California			[2] 1	56,800
Do			[1] 1	75,700
Do			[1] 1	79,400
Total			3	211,900
United States	1	57,895	4	276,900

[1] 1961.
[2] 1960.

A table showing information on similar loans in excess of $50,000 made by production credit associations is enclosed.

The Federal intermediate credit banks do not make loans directly to farmers, but the production credit associations and other financing institutions rediscount with the Federal intermediate credit banks.

On loans made in excess of $50,000, we have not shown the names of borrowers. As in the case of other lending agencies, we consider this borrower-lender relationship as confidential and do not divulge such names.

The banks for cooperatives are not included in the tables because these banks make a loan for overall operations of a cooperative and there is no way of determining how much of the loan might be used for any purpose relating to poultry. Mr. R. C. Mahone of our office talked with Mr. Ralph Peters of your office on this subject on August 25.

As we have assured you previously, each application for a loan is carefully considered by the loan committee of the local association and by the district bank involved. No loan is granted unless experienced credit people believe the applicant has a sound business proposition and will be able to repay the loan in an orderly manner. We believe that this is a sound procedure.

Sincerely yours,

R. B. TOOTELL,
Governor.

Loans financing poultry houses by Federal land banks, year 1960 and period January–July 1961

District and State	Broiler houses						Laying hen houses					
	Year 1960			January–July 1961			Year 1960			January–July 1961		
	Number	Amount	Capacity	Number	Amount	Capacity	Number	Amount	Capacity	Number	Amount	Capacity
1. Maine				1	$31,000	40,000				1	$8,300	5,200
New Hampshire												
Vermont												
Massachusetts				2	9,750	19,720	1	$4,375	4,000			
Rhode Island												
Connecticut	1	$10,000	6,000							1	4,920	2,200
New York	1	3,100	6,500	1	12,500	20,000	6	66,035	23,600	4	35,773	20,080
New Jersey										3	88,600	55,300
Total	2	13,100	12,500	4	53,250	79,720	7	70,410	27,600	9	137,593	82,780

Loans financing poultry houses by Federal land banks, year 1960 and period January–July 1961—Continued

District and State	Broiler houses						Laying hen houses					
	Year 1960			January-July 1961			Year 1960			January-July 1961		
	Number	Amount	Capacity	Number	Amount	Capacity	Number	Amount	Capacity	Number	Amount	Capacity
2. Pennsylvania	5	$44,700	60,200	5	$88,300	117,000	7	$86,300	45,200	2	$9,600	10,000
Delaware				4	24,103	32,000				1	22,573	18,000
Maryland	20	130,321	216,500	20	197,599	283,600						
Virginia	3	12,050	17,500	4	21,780	36,000	1	5,100	3,000	6	20,484	10,500
West Virginia							4	26,792	11,100			
Total	28	187,071	294,200	33	331,782	468,600	12	118,192	59,300	9	52,657	38,500
3. North Carolina	43	174,900	439,000	28	149,100	284,000	8	46,300	35,000	2	10,900	7,000
South Carolina	3	11,700	26,000	2	10,100	16,000	4	10,500	6,500	1	2,500	4,000
Georgia	80	308,000	690,000	178	547,000	1,081,200	14	48,000	37,700	13	58,100	41,000
Florida	2	17,300	27,000				8	34,600	35,000	1	5,200	3,400
Total	128	511,900	1,182,000	208	706,200	1,381,200	34	139,400	114,200	17	76,700	55,400
4. Ohio				1	7,200	2,700	3	31,000	6,500	4	35,500	7,000
Indiana	3	22,800	13,000	3	12,600	12,300	7	43,000	13,200	6	29,700	13,100
Kentucky							1	1,700	1,600			
Tennessee	3	21,000	30,000	1	6,000	10,000	1	9,000	10,000	1	5,200	3,000
Total	6	43,800	43,000	5	25,800	25,000	12	84,700	31,300	11	70,400	23,100
5. Alabama	109	330,826	954,430	134	498,903	1,155,170	11	44,685	69,260	8	27,445	57,440
Mississippi	26	290,030	873,720	25	197,357	579,600	2	13,230	5,000	7	58,100	54,740
Louisiana												
Total	135	620,856	1,828,150	159	696,260	1,734,770	13	57,915	74,260	15	85,545	112,180
6. Illinois							3	18,300	5,300			
Missouri	15	85,533	150,800	9	35,999	79,000	2	16,000	7,000	3	14,500	7,600
Arkansas	34	147,712	341,560	59	271,275	596,932	3	13,907	19,000	5	19,630	22,000
Total	49	233,245	492,360	68	307,274	675,932	8	48,207	31,300	8	34,130	29,600
7. Michigan	2	4,400	1,000	1	5,600	2,000	6	39,200	14,000	14	97,390	49,700
Wisconsin	1	10,000	4,000				2	18,700	8,500	1	8,350	7,000
Minnesota	5	55,400	81,000	3	42,823	75,000	2	10,858	3,250	2	13,000	7,600
North Dakota				1	21,000	25,000				6	66,300	24,650
Total	8	69,800	86,000	5	69,423	102,000	10	68,758	25,750	23	185,040	88,950
8. Iowa	1	20,000	6,000				1	4,100	1,000	1	7,000	4,300
South Dakota				3	32,550	36,000	1	10,400	850	3	23,550	9,000
Nebraska												
Wyoming												
Total	1	20,000	6,000	3	32,550	36,000	2	14,500	1,850	4	30,550	13,300
9. Kansas							3	9,534	5,500			
Oklahoma				2	11,500	13,000	1	2,800	2,000	1	3,000	1,800
Colorado										2	8,000	7,500
New Mexico							1	5,000	250			
Total				2	11,500	13,000	5	17,334	7,750	3	11,000	9,300
10. Texas	4	12,700	24,000	11	51,900	91,000	5	34,300	21,000	3	5,700	4,000
11. Arizona												
Utah												
Nevada												
California							18	253,400	121,200	27	482,000	209,900
Total							18	253,400	121,200	27	482,000	209,900
12. Alaska												
Montana												
Idaho				1	5,045	14,000				1	10,290	12,000
Washington							1	3,573	6,000	1	4,600	10,000
Oregon							2	4,918	6,500	2	8,904	4,200
Total				1	5,045	14,000	3	8,491	12,500	4	23,794	26,200
United States	361	1,712,472	3,968,210	499	2,290,984	4,621,222	129	915,607	528,010	133	1,195,109	693,210

Loans financing poultry houses by production credit associations and other financing institutions rediscounting with the Federal intermediate credit banks, year 1960 and period January–July 1961

District and State	Broiler houses						Laying hen houses					
	Year 1960			January-July 1961			Year 1960			January-July 1961		
	Number	Amount	Capacity	Number	Amount	Capacity	Number	Amount	Capacity	Number	Amount	Capacity
1. Maine	3	$16,915	66,500	2	$3,525	14,000				1	$5,000	5,200
New Hampshire												
Vermont												
Massachusetts												
Rhode Island												
Connecticut							1	$2,000	300			
New York										5	19,266	15,200
New Jersey							1	3,000	1,000			
Total	3	16,915	66,500	2	3,525	14,000	2	5,000	1,300	6	24,266	20,400

Loans financing poultry houses by production credit associations and other financing institutions rediscounting with the Federal intermediate credit banks, year 1960 and period January–July 1961—Continued

District and State	Broiler houses						Laying hen houses					
	Year 1960			January–July 1961			Year 1960			January–July 1961		
	Number	Amount	Capacity	Number	Amount	Capacity	Number	Amount	Capacity	Number	Amount	Capacity
2. Pennsylvania	18	$93,000	103,000	21	$106,100	12,000	28	$134,189	167,000	33	$149,314	200,700
Delaware	2	8,000	13,500	2	29,000	36,500						
Maryland	5	20,500	30,600	10	47,000	38,600						
Virginia	1	2,700	3,000	1	20,000	96,000	4	5,500	7,000	2	15,900	4,800
West Virginia							1	8,200	2,500	2	3,814	2,800
Total	26	124,200	150,100	34	202,100	291,100	33	147,889	176,500	37	169,028	208,300
3. North Carolina	295	1,045,622	1,850,000	359	690,044	950,000	27	102,545	78,200	35	116,659	110,500
South Carolina	6	27,802	42,000	6	41,647	28,000	28	87,740	56,700	16	60,096	31,700
Georgia	195	758,774	1,660,000	140	607,650	1,295,500	55	292,133	234,300	41	228,664	224,600
Florida	2	8,100	20,000	6	30,700	28,000	7	83,855	51,750	10	88,645	52,000
Total	498	1,840,298	3,572,000	511	1,370,041	2,301,500	117	566,273	420,950	102	494,064	418,800
4. Ohio	2	14,392	17,500	5	39,700	36,000	27	267,613	92,000	24	357,366	98,700
Indiana	10	59,305	76,000	14	98,879	113,000	37	255,664	147,150	54	463,320	221,924
Kentucky	3	16,701	25,500	4	41,723	40,000	14	224,423	104,980	9	81,282	59,600
Tennessee	46	299,447	215,900	34	159,467	260,500	32	181,145	74,400	31	134,081	71,600
Total	61	389,845	534,900	57	339,769	449,500	110	928,245	418,530	118	1,036,049	451,884
5. Alabama	87	384,157	851,800	138	683,779	1,378,780	29	102,351	164,040	34	200,389	267,400
Mississippi	68	454,810	930,000	88	624,409	1,245,500	30	278,241	160,495	33	246,915	164,950
Louisiana	10	107,898	197,500	12	105,882	190,000						
Total	165	946,865	1,979,300	238	1,414,070	2,814,280	59	380,592	324,535	67	447,304	432,350
6. Illinois	1	4,000	8,000				7	38,720	23,700	5	66,825	18,000
Missouri	2	10,200	52,500	5	28,301	16,000	7	33,140	30,000	14	94,472	41,300
Arkansas	89	534,735	1,398,500	87	523,200	909,000	28	233,961	260,050	37	284,354	205,150
Total	92	548,935	1,459,000	92	551,501	925,000	42	305,821	313,750	56	445,651	264,450
7. Michigan							24	306,692	77,150	6	92,100	31,000
Wisconsin	3	33,957	38,000				19	275,501	86,740			
Minnesota	11	107,855	140,500				7	65,025	28,700			
North Dakota	2	34,000	75,000				2	18,906	13,950			
Total	16	175,812	253,500				52	666,124	206,540	6	92,100	31,000
8. Iowa							3	12,500	3,800			
South Dakota												
Nebraska										1	1,200	1,000
Wyoming												
Total							3	12,500	3,800	1	1,200	1,000
9. Kansas												
Oklahoma				2	21,625	45,000	2	66,975	43,000	1	26,450	15,000
Colorado												
New Mexico										1	1,700	2,000
Total				2	21,625	45,000	2	66,975	43,000	2	28,150	17,000
10. Texas	33	297,025	624,000	22	177,405	329,000	1	2,590	62,500	4	24,030	8,750
11. Arizona												
Utah										1	11,084	6,000
Nevada												
California	7	97,262	180,000	2	45,000	74,000	32	454,297	419,096	44	831,022	490,369
Total	7	97,262	180,000	2	45,000	74,000	32	454,297	419,096	45	842,106	496,369
12. Montana												
Idaho												
Washington				1	4,000	8,000				2	68,530	25,000
Oregon							1	21,000	10,000			
Alaska												
Total				1	4,000	8,000	1	21,000	10,000	2	68,530	25,000
United States	901	4,437,157	8,819,300	961	4,129,036	7,251,380	454	3,557,306	2,400,501	446	3,672,478	2,375,303

U.S. Department of Agriculture,
Farmers Home Administration,
Washington, D.C., August 16, 1961.
Hon. John J. Williams,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Williams: We are enclosing a schedule, requested in your letter of August 4, 1961, showing the number and amount of Farmers Home Administration loans to finance commercial broiler and egg production, and the increases in number of birds resulting from these loans. Only information for 12 States is included in this schedule because our experience in other States indicated that the amount of loans for commercial poultry production was not significant. We are, however, adding Louisiana to the list of States from which we obtain periodic reports on poultry financing by our agency.

The enclosed schedule contains the information presently available in the national office. We hope that the information as presented is satisfactory. If you have additional questions, we shall be glad to be of further assistance.

Sincerely yours,

Floyd F. Higbee,
Deputy Administrator.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

Loans to finance commercial broiler and egg production, Jan. 1 through Dec. 31, 1960, and Jan. 1 through June 30, 1961

JAN. 1 THROUGH DEC. 31, 1960

State	Broiler production						Egg production						Number of borrowers involved in increases	
	Number of loans		Total funds loaned		Increase in number of birds per year		Number of loans		Total funds loaned		Increase in number of birds per year			
	Real estate loans for buildings and equipment	Operating loans	Real estate loans	Operating loans	Resulting from real estate loans	Resulting from operating loans	Real estate loans for buildings and equipment	Operating loans	Real estate loans	Operating loans	Resulting from real estate loans	Resulting from operating loans	For broiler production	For egg production
Alabama	13	11	$29,220	$16,380	245,000	0	1	12	$1,600	$19,440	0	134	21	1
Arkansas	51	1	210,110	2,500	1,491,000	40,000	2	4	9,360	5,350	2,400	1,100	34	4
California	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	26	72,865	130,470	15,700	26,200	16	14
Florida	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	5,900	5,000	1,132	0	2	1
Georgia	1	0	4,075	0	0	0	0	7	0	20,210	0	0	6	0
Maine	27	38	262,600	7 ,550	194,900	30,800	13	198	74,250	747,760	5,800	15,300	125	9
Mississippi	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
New Hampshire	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	25,970	0	0	3	0
New Jersey	0	1	0	6,000	0	0	8	182	63,070	506,940	0	5,000	137	2
New York	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	24	52,110	100,060	5,000	1,500	10	2
North Carolina	6	0	39,800	0	70,000	0	3	34	17,300	107,640	0	4,000	16	4
Pennsylvania	0	5	0	16,340	0	0	0	6	0	12,500	0	0	5	0
Total	98	56	545,805	111,770	2,000,900	70,800	42	500	296,455	1,081,340	30,032	53,234	375	37

JAN. 1 THROUGH JUNE 30, 1961

State	Broiler production						Egg production						Number of borrowers involved in increases	
	Number of loans		Total funds loaned		Increase in number of birds per year		Number of loans		Total funds loaned		Increase in number of birds per year			
	Real estate loans for buildings and equipment	Operating loans	Real estate loans	Operating loans	Resulting from real estate loans	Resulting from operating loans	Real estate loans for buildings and equipment	Operating loans	Real estate loans	Operating loans	Resulting from real estate loans	Resulting from operating loans	For broiler production	For egg production
Alabama	13	6	$41,600	$7,750	222,000	112,000	0	6	0	$7,690	0	0	12	0
Arkansas	34	3	160,856	5,680	1,227,000	34,000	5	2	$20,740	5,675	12,700	0	29	5
California	0	1	0	4,500	0	0	3	9	24,358	34,390	2,000	2,000	0	2
Florida	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	6,000	0	0	0	0
Georgia	8	0	19,860	0	36,508	0	0	2	0	9,480	0	2,000	8	1
Maine	20	20	183,500	41,950	232,000	0	20	97	115,890	390,080	14,800	0	13	5
Mississippi	8	1	31,505	3,000	90,000	0	0	1	0	2,000	0	500	7	1
New Hampshire	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	5,800	0	0	0	0
New Jersey	1	1	4,200	2,500	0	0	8	116	73,150	294,560	0	500	0	1
New York	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	42,300	34,850	6,100	4,000	0	3
North Carolina	8	2	30,670	11,140	224,000	0	5	14	36,500	44,800	4,500	3,500	5	5
Pennsylvania	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	965	0	0	0	0
Total	92	34	472,191	76,520	2,032,508	146,000	43	256	312,938	836,350	40,100	12,500	74	23

AID FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1241) to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities and to authorize scholarships for undergraduate study in such institutions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment designated "1-30-62—A." I ask that the amendment not be read, but that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The reading of the amendment will be dispensed with; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment is as follows:

On the first page, line 4, strike out "and Scholarship".

On page 2, line 11, beginning with "holding out", strike out all through "promise and the" in line 12 and insert in lieu thereof "giving them additional".

On page 2, beginning with line 18, strike out all through "college" in line 21 and insert in lieu thereof "through authorizing additional funds for loans to students under the provisions of title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958".

On page 18, beginning with line 14, strike out all through line 22 on page 28 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"TITLE II—ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR LOANS TO STUDENTS

"*Amendment to title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958*

"SEC. 201. Section 201 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out '$90,000,000 each for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for the two succeeding fiscal years' and inserting in lieu thereof '$90,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, $125,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, $140,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964'."

On page 38, line 5, beginning after the period, strike out all through the period in line 8.

On page 40, line 12, strike out "II or".

On page 40, line 13, strike out "206(c) or".

On page 42, lines 16 and 17, strike out "to any individual or".

On page 42, line 19, strike out "or pursuant to a scholarship,".

On page 42, line 21, strike out "respect to grants or loans".

Strike out the amendment to the title and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Amend the title so as to read: 'A bill to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities, to increase the amount of funds authorized for loans to students under title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, and to provide financial assistance to the States for the construction of public community colleges.' "

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from Ohio yield to himself?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Ten minutes. May I ask how much time I have on the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio has 30 minutes on his amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, my amendment relates to title II of the bill. Title II of the bill as it is now written contemplates making grants as distinguished from loans to students who wish to attend public institutions of higher learning.

My amendment is tied into the National Defense Education Act of 1958. The particular amendment which I am offering has been before the Senate and House probably on three occasions, and positively on two.

When the National Defense Education Act of 1958 was considered, it contained provisions for the making of outright grants to induce students to attend institutions of higher learning. When that matter came before the Senate, it was proposed to change the language from "grants" to "loans." On that occasion the Senate determined that it would be in the greater interest of the country and in the greater interest of the students if, instead of making outright grants, the aid were provided in the form of loans.

When the administration's bill went to the House of Representatives, it likewise contained provisions for the making of grants up to $1,000 a year, plus a payment of $350 to the educational institution chosen by the student. When that subject was considered in the House, it was moved to strike the loan provisions completely out of the bill. In the discussions had in committee and on the floor of the House, it was concluded that the grant provisions should not be adopted. One phase of the arguments made on the floor of the House was as follows: A student who refuses to attend an institution of higher learning unless he is given an outright grant, instead of a loan, in all probability does not possess the moral fabric to justify making the grant to him.

That raises a very interesting query: In our country have we reached a stage where we say, in effect, that the only way by means of which we can induce our youth to go to institutions of higher learning is by paying fully their tuition? Is that in accord with what we have known as the willingness of our youth to work their way through?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Of course the Senator from Ohio knows that under the National Defense Education Act a very sizable sum of money is being loaned each year to students, in order to enable them to get educations which are supposed to be helpful to the country, in giving it greater security and better defense; and it is proposed to continue that operation. How does the Senator feel the advocates of the pending bill can justify the setting up of another large sum of money for grants to students who would be expected to take any course they wished to take, regardless of whether it had any impact upon the security of our country, while at the same time that we granted them, free of charge, those sums of money, we would be asking those who want to defend our country to borrow money and to pay it back? How does the Senator from Ohio justify those two contrasting points of view?

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Florida has raised a very interesting and important aspect of this issue, Mr. President. We have loaned to such students, under the National Defense Education Act, $130 million. Each one of them has pledged that he will pay back the money that has been loaned to him. But now the proponents of the pending bill would say to the other group, "We will grant you the money."

I should like to know what sort of answer we will give to those who have borrowed the $130 million, when they say: "We have pledged ourselves to take a course related to the national defense, and you require that we pay back the money." But the recipients under the provisions of the pending bill are given the money as an outright grant.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield again to me?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Ohio has asked the same question that I have propounded. I judge that—as in my own case—the Senator from Ohio finds it impossible to reconcile those two approaches; namely, to lend money to be used for national defense education and to expect the repayment of the loans by the American youths who have received the loans, and at the same time with the other hand to give money freely for education to other American youths, without requiring or expecting any help to the national defense effort.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I concur fully in what the Senator from Florida has said. I repeat that if our youth have reached a stage where we cannot get them to go to college unless we fully or substantially pay their tuition, we ought to begin to wonder what is wrong with what we in the Congress have been doing and what has broken down the moral fabric of our youth, when a young fellow says: "I will not go to college and I will not study, even though I have an alert mind, unless you give me the money I need to have in order to go to college."

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield further to me?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Aside from the very great difficulty of answering the questions which the Senator from Ohio says will be asked—and very properly so—by those who have secured loans under the National Defense Education Act—questions as to why they are not treated as generously as are these others—is it not now proposed, under this pending measure, to have both systems operate at the same time?

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is exactly the case. On three occasions an attempt was made to provide help by way of gifts. On each occasion there was a repudiation by the Congress of that plan. The National Defense Education Act is in existence, and is operating; $130 million has thus far been expended.

Now it is proposed that there be a sort of adjunct under which another special type of aid would be created. I submit that there cannot be any rational support of the proposal to have loans made to one group and to have outright grants made to another group, especially when we consider the fact that the loans are related to the national defense, whereas the proposed grants or gifts would not be related to the national defense.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield further to me?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Would not such a two-headed program as has been suggested put Uncle Sam in the position of a storekeeper who points to certain goods on one counter, and says, "I will sell these commodities for such-and-such a price, on credit, provided you propose to pay. But if you do not want to pay, I have the same article over here on the next counter, and I will give it to you, without charging it to you and without expecting you to pay for it." Would not the pending proposal put our country in that precise rather ridiculous position?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Exactly so. I suggest that if the pending bill is enacted, next year we shall be asked, and in good conscience we shall be compelled, to forgive the debt of those who thus far have borrowed the $130 million. At that time, when that group comes before the country and asks for forgiveness or asks for treatment on a basis similar to that provided in the pending bill, how can the Congress possibly say, "We will not listen to you"?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator's 10 minutes have expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield myself 5 minutes more.

Mr. HOLLAND. I subscribe entirely to the philosophy of the Senator from Ohio. I think we cannot follow these two roads at the same time. We are often inconsistent in this body, but I cannot imagine our being so inconsistent as to say with one voice, "We will lend you money for education provided it has relation to our common defense," and with the other voice say, "If you would not take it on that basis, we will give it to you free." I see no possibility of reconciling those two points of view, and for that reason I strongly support the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I have taken the provisions of the National Defense Education Act and allocated for the year of 1962 $90 million, the identical sum that is in the existing law. For the year 1963, instead of allocating the $90 million as provided in the existing law, I have increased the amount to $125 million, in other words, by the amount of $35 million. For 1964 the sum is increased from $90 million to $140 million. But all of it is made available on the basis of loans, and these loans are forgivable if the recipient goes to an educational institution and studies the subject of teaching and then enters into the teaching profession.

It is my wish to liberalize the National Defense Education Act, providing, as I have said, $85 million more than is provided in the existing law.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point for one more question?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Is not the figure of the Senator on the National Defense Education Act, although $85 million more than under the present law, substantially less than the amount provided for in the National Defense Education Act pending on the calendar?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes. The bill submitted by the Senator from Oregon extends into 2 further years and provides additional money.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. If this section remains in the bill, can it be said that the young person who chooses to work and pay for his education will be taxed on his earnings, in part at least, to carry the burden of those who are the recipients of the grants set up by the dominant machine in each State that will select the grantees?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I cannot see how one can escape answering that question in any way but in the affirmative. The one who is working, and who shows the true quality of the "American kid," is trying to work his way through college. The other will be given a gift of $1,000, and the one who is working will be paying a tax on what he earns, and, in addition to that, working his own way through school.

Mr. CURTIS. If the Senator will yield further, I think sometimes in this body we lose sight of the fact that the rank and file pay substantially all the taxes. Were we to increase the tax rate so that all individuals making more than $10,000 of ordinary income were taxed at 100 percent, we would collect only about $5 billion a year—a small fraction of the national budget.

Were we to impose a tax of 100 percent on the ordinary income of individuals making over $10,000 a year, that would bring in less than $1 billion, or only enough to run the Government a matter of days. It is the rank and file of the people, because there are so many of them, that pay the great burden of the taxes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield myself 5 more minutes.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. LAUSCHE. My time is running away. I would like to raise an additional point which we ought to ponder and be alarmed about. The aircraft industry says it cannot operate without subsidies. The inland water carriers make the identical argument. The railroads state they need subsidies; otherwise they will "fold." The lead and zinc mine operators say that, unless the Government provides subsidies, they cannot operate their mines. The merchant in our country states that he cannot sell his goods throughout the world because his cost is too high. Not a week passes without the argument being heard on this floor, "My segment of business cannot survive unless the Congress pays me money."

What has produced that condition? What is wrong with our system? The student says, "I will not go to college unless you make me a gift."

I want to repeat, we had better ponder about it. If there is a difference between what is being produced in our country from what is being produced in other countries by way of scholastic attainment, the difference results from what we are doing in Congress. We are telling the young fellow, "Do not worry about working. Do not worry about the struggle. We will dig into the taxpayer's pocket and we will give you the money."

I am willing to lend money to the student, and I think the youth of the United States does not want any more than that. He would work his way through college if he could, but the hours of work and the school burdens impair him in the pursuit of his studies. All I am asking is that we lend him the money and then give him a chance to pay it back; and if he borrows money and goes into the teaching profession, we will forgive up to 50 percent of the loan.

"No; but that is not enough," the proponents of the bill say, "We will give it to you."

Well, we will keep on giving, but there will come a time when we will not be able to give, and perhaps that time is pretty close to being here now.

Two years ago there was a run on our gold. Our State Department went around the world and begged our short-term creditors not to ask for gold. The State Department was like a banker going to his depositors and saying, "Do not ask for your money. I cannot give it to you." Yet there is subsidy after subsidy. New ones are created; old ones are expanded. I think that is an error. I do not think it is in the interest of the country. I do not think it is in the interest of our youth.

That is why I ask that we convert chapter 2 of the bill from grants into loans, and increase the amount of money by $85 million. It will create a revolving fund, and the boy who gets his education now will pay back his loan, so the Government can lend it to a boy tomorrow for him to get his education, and he in turn will pay it back, and the money will be loaned again.

By that course we will build the moral character of our youth. We will contribute to the security of our country.

Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has 30 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE].

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon for yielding me this time.

Mr. President, I rise in support of title II, S. 1241, and against the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Ohio. I support the provision of the bill providing a scholarship program for needy and able students who wish to continue their education beyond high school.

I support this provision of the bill for two reasons: First, it recognizes the fundamental principle of equal opportunity for all young people to secure an education according to their ability and not according to their station in life; and, second, it recognizes the importance to a free society to invest in the training of young people to qualify for the professions, and to develop other skills of importance to our country.

As Governor of the State of Maine and as a Member of this body I have said on many occasions that I am committed to equal opportunity in education for all young people, regardless of their geographic location, economic status, race, or creed. This has been the basis of my enthusiastic and continuing support for legislation providing general Federal assistance for elementary and secondary public school education.

I regard the proposed scholarship program as an extension of that principle to advanced education. It is in line with the Morrill Land Grant College Act, which has provided public institutions of higher education. It has a precedent in the GI education bill. It is a logical extension of the loan program under the National Defense Education Act.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUSKIE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. How does the Senator reconcile the two programs he has mentioned; the National Defense Education Act, under which loans are made for the purpose of allowing youngsters to get an education which presumably will help our country to be better defended, and the program the Senator is now supporting in the instant bill, which would give grants instead of loans to other young Americans for any type of education they may choose to obtain? How can those two approaches existing at the same time be reconciled one with the other?

Mr. MUSKIE. I shall make two points in reply to the distinguished Senator from Florida.

First, I consider the educated man, whether educated in the sciences or in any other subject, to be a bulwark of strength for a free society. Second, on the question of reconciling grants and loans, this is the thrust of the remarks I have prepared. I hope the Senator's question will be answered as my remarks unfold.

In 1900 only 7 percent of those in the age group of 14 to 17 years were enrolled in high school. By 1952 20.7 percent of those in the 18- to 19-year-old group were in college; by 1960 the figure had gone up to 32.7 percent. By 1970 the opening enrollment in colleges and universities will be from 5.2 to 7 million.

This is a reflection not only of our increasing population; it is an indication of the increasing importance of advanced education to our society and to our economy.

A modern, complex, and highly industrialized society requires greater skills and more advanced training than an agricultural society. A free society, if it is to compete with a vigorous and determined totalitarian society—and this point is responsive to the remarks of the Senator from Florida—must make maximum use of its available talent.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUSKIE. I am happy to yield. I am limited in time, but I yield again.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have only one question. What is the line of demarcation made by the Senator as between the young people who would be eligible for loans only and those who would be eligible for grants?

Mr. MUSKIE. I do not think there is any such line of demarcation. When I was a young man I was one of those who was privileged—and I use the word advisedly—to work my way through college. My parents did not have the resources to send me. I was able to go and was able to finish my education, 4 years of college and 3 years of law school, partly because I worked, partly because of scholarship aid, and partly because of loans from people who were interested in my future. I benefited from loans, from scholarships, and from my own labors. I do not think there is any line of demarcation such as that suggested by the Senator.

I continue with my prepared remarks.

The fact is that we, as a nation, cannot afford to undereducate our youth. If we do not make maximum provision for their education we will be selling them short, and we will be weakening our whole society.

As the distinguished Senator from Oregon has pointed out in his remarks, the increase in population, the increase in the cost of living, and the increase in the complications of education requirements have boosted the cost of education at a far higher rate than the general cost-of-living increase. In the academic facility loan provision and the community college grant provision of this bill we recognize the impact of these costs on the institutions themselves.

The scholarship program recognizes the impact of these increased costs on the students themselves. Institutions and private groups have made a consistent effort to help alleviate these costs by increasing scholarship resources. But even the average scholarship increase in the past 4 years of $63 has fallen far behind the tuition increase of $242 in the same period, and this does not take into account the increase in the cost of room and board.

There is little value is expanding the facilities of the universities and colleges if we do not provide some assistance to able students who may be kept out of school because they do not have the funds.

The Federal scholarship program provided in this bill does not supplant the excellent and necessary private plans; it is a supplement. In Maine, for example, in 1959–60, there were 1,901 scholarships, averaging $377, granted by institutions of higher learning for a total scholarship grant of $715,825.

If enacted as presently written, the scholarship program would provide for the State of Maine, in fiscal year 1962, 141 scholarships totaling $98,700. The total for fiscal years 1963 through 1966 would be 1,058, or a total of $740,600. In addition to the payments to students, the institutions they attended would receive a grant of $350 for each scholarship awarded.

Two basic objections have been raised against the scholarship plan advocated by the committee in S. 1241. The first objection is that the National Defense Education Act loan program is as far as we should go in providing direct assistance to students. The second objection is to the $350 grant to accompany each scholarship student to the college or university of his choice.

Implicit in the argument against the scholarship grant is the assumption that a student so aided will somehow lose his sense of initiative. If this were true, then the logical conclusion would be to abolish all scholarship aid, public and private. I doubt that any of my colleagues are willing to accept that conclusion.

There can be no doubt in our minds that financial need is an effective bar to education for needy students. As the distinguished Senator from Oregon noted in his presentation yesterday, a study by the American Council on Education has revealed that approximately 60,000 to 100,000 very able high school students each year are prevented from going on to higher education by financial need.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 10 minutes yielded to the Senator from Maine have expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield the Senator 1 additional minute.

Mr. MUSKIE. I know there are those who say that the student who really wants to go on will find a way, especially through the increasing loan programs. This is a relatively easy observation for those of us who have reached a measure of financial security, and who have realized the benefits of college and university training. For us, looking back, the investment would be worth it.

Mr. President, I came from a family of modest means. I managed to get through college by working, scholarship aid, and loans. I think I would be willing to make the same sacrifices today that I made too many years ago to want to remember—but I shudder when I look at the cost of education today compared with what I had to pay when I was an undergraduate.

Scholarship aid for education does not reduce initiative, Mr. President. The GI bill certainly did not do so for many independent businessmen who are members of the chamber of commerce and who write to me to express their views on issues involving private enterprise and the Government.

The modest scholarships we are proposing would not wipe out financial problems for needy students. They would reduce the barriers to the point where students would be able to surmount them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MORSE. I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. MUSKIE. The answer to the related college grant is a simple one. Here again we do not begin to meet the whole cost. We are saying to the college, in effect, "We are sending you an able student. We recognize that his fees will not cover the entire cost of his education, and we are willing to shoulder a part of that burden." That contribution is not great enough to constitute discrimination against nonscholarship students, and it will not bar worthy students without scholarship aid.

Mr. President, this is not a grandiose program. It is a very modest means of opening the doors of educational opportunity for needy students who have the desire and the capacity to advance their education, but who, through no fault of their own, would be barred from that education because they lack the funds.

I urge that the Senate support the farsighted recommendation of the Labor and Welfare Committee for a scholarship program.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator for his speech.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I should like to ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment. May I have the cooperation of the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. MORSE. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KEATING. Would a yea and nay vote on the amendment in any way interfere with a yea and nay vote on an amendment to the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The ordering of the yeas and nays on the amendment does not preclude the ordering of the yeas and nays on an amendment to the amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, this is the first time I have been heard in this debate. I am a member of the Subcommittee on Education. I hope the Senate will pass the bill on to the other body. Perhaps I shall be a conferee on the bill. I joined in drafting the bill. I am deeply convinced that it is the right prescription for American higher education. So I rise with all respect—because I have the deepest regard for my colleagues who feel the other way—to support the scholarship provision.

I like very much what the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] stated regarding the tests. I am sorry that for the moment he is not in the Chamber. But he said, in a very moving speech, "What does the youth of the United States want?" I add to that statement, "What does the United States want?"

I think the youth of the United States want the best opportunity in life which the country can afford. I think what the United States wants is the greatest utilization of its greatest resource, to wit, its youth, especially in as critical an hour as this. As much as we do not like it, whether it is in production or in education, in foreign aid, or in any other field and much as it may irk us, the fact is that we are engaged in the greatest international competition mankind has ever known. This is essentially a competition in technology. Whether it is a competition in weapons, a competition in production, or even a competition of the social order, we are faced fundamentally by a competition of technology. We know that the whole level of our human resources must be graded up in an educational sense. We know that. We are sure of it.

I have recently been in the Soviet Union, and probably the most distinguished aspect of the whole Soviet society is its drive in the field of education. Therefore, when we legislate here, instead of getting into a frame of mind that we are in a period of normalcy, I think we must get ourselves in a frame of mind that we are in an emergency. That is what we are legislating on—an emergency. So as much as I sympathize with my colleague, the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie], that the program is a modest one—and it is a modest program—I say it is unnecessary to base the argument upon that point.

The argument in my opinion should be based upon the point: Are we legislating adequately to meet an emergency—the emergency in higher education—because of the great challenge to our fundamental institutions that we face, and because I think most of us are convinced that one of the prime answers to that challenge lies in the field of higher education.

By that standard, Mr. President, the proposal is an indispensable provision of the bill, and for a reason revealed in the very testimony which was referred to by my colleague, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty]: The testimony of President Case, of Colgate University, which is in my own State. It seemed to me that he stated precisely the evaluation of the situation that we must make in this field. He said that the college administrator must have in his hands all the tools available, including the tool of scholarship, the loan instrument, the scholarship tool of the school itself and its alumni, and any other tools he can obtain in order to facilitate the attendance at college of young people. They deserve, not in their interest alone, but what is even more important now—and I make the statement with all respect to the youth of our country—in the national interest to go to college. The most critical figure of this entire debate is the figure contained on page 9 of the committee's report, which states that each year between 60,000 and 100,000 high school graduates in the top 30 percent of their class failed to go to college because of a lack of funds, and about 60,000 college students leave college for the same reason.

For the 5 years of the program, we are talking about 300,000 plus 300,000, or 600,000 students a year, or a neat figure of 3 million in 5 years. That is the minimum figure. The maximum figure is 5 million in 5 years. We are talking about what? We are talking about 212,000 scholarships in 5 years, or the rate of roughly 40,000-plus a year.

Mr. President, that is the way in which to evaluate the program. On that basis the scholarship program is absolutely indispensable, if we are to have any balance in the bill at all. From the experience in my own State of New York, which in terms of per capita ability to maintain higher education is probably at the very top rank of our country, in terms of size——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's 5 minutes have expired.

Mr. JAVITS. May I have 1 additional minute and I shall finish.

Mr. MORSE. I yield 1 additional minute.

Mr. JAVITS. In my own State of New York, we would receive about 4,000 scholarships a year out of the program at the maximum. That figure is to be compared with the 21,381 which are awarded now. It is to be compared with the 6,000 which the State of New York itself awards today.

It seems to me that the Federal Government is certainly making a very modest contribution to the aggregate educational picture in the State of New York, as an example, and that obtains throughout the country, perhaps not as advantageously.

I conclude my statement on this proposal: We are laboring on higher education under the dread gun of a challenge to freedom second to none in the world. I think most of us are convinced that higher education represents one of the keys to answer that challenge. We are making the most modest and reasonable approach to what the Federal Government ought to do in a balanced program for higher education as demonstrated by the actual figures in my own State. So I believe the amendment should be defeated. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New York for his able speech.

Mr. President, how much time remains on my side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Approximately 6 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point the portion of the President's message of today dealing with assistance to higher education.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

II. ASSISTANCE TO HIGHER EDUCATION

In the last 10 days, both Houses of Congress have recognized the importance of higher education to the fulfillment of our national and international responsibilities. Increasing student enrollments in this decade will place a still greater burden on our institutions of higher education than that imposed on our elementary and secondary schools where the cost of education per student is only a fraction as much. Between 1960 and 1970 it is expected that college enrollments will double, and that our total annual operating expenditures for expanding and improving higher education must increase 2½ times or by nearly $10 billion.

In order to accommodate this increase in enrollments, the Office of Education estimates that nearly $22 billion of college facilities will have to be built during the 1960's—three times the construction achieved in the last 10 years. The extension of the college housing loan program—with a $1.5 billion loan authorization for 5 years, enacted as part of the Housing Act of 1961—assures Federal support for our colleges' urgent residential needs. I am hopeful that the Congress will this month complete its action on legislation to assist in the building of the even more important and urgently needed academic facilities.

But I want to take this opportunity to stress that buildings alone are not enough. In our democracy every young person should have an equal opportunity to obtain a higher education, regardless of his station in life or financial means. Yet more than 400,000 high-school seniors who graduated in the upper half of their classes last June failed to enter college this fall. In this group were 200,000 who ranked in the upper 30 percent of their class, of whom one-third to one-half failed to go on to college principally because of a lack of finances. Others lack the necessary guidance, incentive or the opportunity to attend the college of their choice. But whatever the reason, each of these 40,000 students represents an irreplaceable loss to the Nation.

Student loans have been helpful to many. But they offer neither incentive nor assistance to those students who, by reason of family or other obligations, are unable or unwilling to go deeper into debt. The average cost of higher education today—up nearly 90 percent since 1950 and still rising—is in an excess of $1,750 per year per student, or $7,000 for a 4-year course. Industrious students can earn a part of this—they or their families can borrow a part of it—but one-half of all American families had incomes below $5,600 in 1960—and they cannot be expected to borrow for example, $4,000 for each talented son or daughter that deserves to go to college. Federal scholarships providing up to $1,000 a year can fill part of this gap. It is, moreover, only prudent economic and social policy for the public to share part of the costs of the long period of higher education for those whose development is essential to our national economic and social well-being. All of us share in the benefits—all should share in the costs.

I recommend that the full 5-year assistance to higher education proposal before the Congress, including scholarships for more than 200,000 talented and needy students and cost of education payments to their colleges, be enacted without delay.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the President very much for the great strength he has added to the debate in the Senate today in what he has to say. I read now only a portion of his statement:

> I recommend that the full 5-year assistance to higher education proposal before the Congress, including scholarships for more than 200,000 talented and needy students and cost of education payments to their colleges, be enacted without delay.

Mr. President, there is an underlined plea for action on the part of Congress, in keeping with the strengthening of the whole fabric of this Republic.

I wish to make these remarks in connection with the statements made by my good friend, the Senator from Ohio. I ask unanimous consent that my prepared statement may be inserted in the Record at this time, because in the 6 minutes that I have remaining, I can only digest what I have to say.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MORSE

I respect the sincerity and conviction with which the distinguished Senator from Ohio has urged upon the Senate this afternoon his amendments with respect to title II of S. 1241. I am constrained as floor leader of the bill to oppose them since, in my judgment, they would be crippling amendments in the sense that they would delete from the pending bill a major portion of the President's educational program which was so clearly restated today in the message we have just received. The President has set forth with eloquence and conviction the need for title II, the scholarship provisions of this bill. He has provided us once again with the factual basis recommendation which is in complete accord with the committee position on the bill.

I oppose the Lausche amendments on the basis that, first, they are not in accord with the President's program; second, the effect of the amendments is such that, if adopted, many of our most able young men and women who come from low-income families could not benefit, since they could not, given their economic circumstances, afford to go on to college. Once again, I wish to restate the basic conviction of the committee that the scholars selected by State commissions under title II of the bill, if they are to achieve their degrees, will need to be in receipt of the scholarship and also loan funds and that for most of them these two income sources must be supplemented by work while attending school. The testimony before the committee, much of which has been placed in the record of this debate, clearly indicates to me that these talented young people will need assistance from all three sources if they are to achieve their goal. I would again remind the Senate that the scholarship provisions of S. 1241 are intended not only to benefit the individual but in the long range will constitute a most important accession to the Nation of a most precious and vital national resource. The cost to the Nation over the period of this program will be repaid again and again in income taxes made possible by the training these talented youngsters will receive.

I urge the defeat of the Senator's amendments.

The last Lausche amendment, insofar as it strengthens the student loan program, offers considerable promise of assisting additional numbers of able but needy students to obtain a college education. However, in terms of assisting, encouraging, and inducing additional numbers of bright students from economically deprived homes to enter college, it does not measure up. For many thousands of these talented young people, the high and increasing costs of a college education, now averaging more than $1,750 per year or about $7,000 for 4 years, is an altogether too formidable barrier and the prospects of borrowing all and most of this money is not a very compelling inducement. What is needed is a program that would provide these young people with a "leg up" on these college costs.

It is, of course, reasonable to expect such young people to do all that they can to help themselves. The provisions of the scholarship bill, providing as they do stipends averaging $700 per year to talented students from low-income families, practically insure this. Scholarship recipients would in almost every instance find it necessary to borrow additional funds and to supplement their resources by taking part-time jobs. The important and ever so crucial purpose of the Federal scholarship bill is that it would make it possible for many talented young people, many coming from families earning less than $4,000 to $5,000 per year, to turn to hope in their plans for the future. Moreover, it represents an opportunity for the Nation to develop and invest in its most precious resource, with the assurance that the investment will be returned manifold, in increasing productivity and social and economic progress.

The amendment poses great problems for the talented but needy students who simply cannot afford to investigate the possibilities for attending institutions removed from their immediate vicinities. For the reasons I have given I am constrained to oppose the amendment and I urge that the Senate defeat the proposal. Should the Senator wish to sponsor an amendment increasing loan funds under title II of the National Defense Education Act, at the time S. 2345 is on the floor, as it is now on the calendar, further consideration could then be given to the proposal.

COLLEGE COSTS

In many of the State colleges and universities "fees" have gradually entered the picture so that there are, in many of them, required charges which are equally costly whether called tuition or fees. Tuition charges, are, of course, common to private universities.

At the present time, college costs in the United States are increasing at a rapid rate. One study recently analyzed fixed (i.e., required) charges in 96 colleges and universities over a 32-year period, 1928–60. The colleges were grouped as: public—large, small; private—large, medium, for men, for women. From 1928 to 1960, tuition and fees (excluding nonresident students in public universities) had increased in public institutions around 200 percent. In private institutions, the increase was much higher, ranging from roughly 275 to 350 percent. Board and room increases were much more conservative, from 80 to 125 percent. The significant thing about these increases, however, is that roughly one-third of all the dollar increase between 1928 and 1960 occurred between 1956 and 1960, or in only 4 years of the 32 years.

One of the most important considerations in relation to financial assistance is the timing. Usually it comes too late to offer the hope which might make a difference. If it were known, perhaps even in the elementary schools, that those with a good record, good motivation, and a genuine need, would not find the door to college closed to them, more of those with high ability might make the necessary preparation.

In order to achieve this, however, the number of scholarships available would have to be increased substantially, with freedom of choice as to institutions attended and programs followed. There is some evidence that students tend to take programs in which scholarships are offered. The fact that loans are accepted by students whose family income is low also suggests the need for additional scholarships or more low-cost local institutions.

I wish to point out to the Senate that the title II scholarship provisions of this bill are complementary to the fellowship provisions of title IV of the National Defense Education Act. At the present time the Federal Government is awarding scholarships at the graduate level without requiring interest and without requiring repayment to students in training beyond the bachelor's degree level. This is a most important function and one from which the Nation will reap great benefits in the future. In title II of S. 1241 by providing scholarships we are simply seeking to insure that talented boys and girls from low income families can have the opportunity to go to college.

I am quite sympathetic to the positions expressed by the distinguished Senator from Vermont and a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I would point out to him that in my judgment, given the costs of college education today we need to have scholarships as a base, full utilization of all student loans, and in addition, if these youngsters are to achieve their goal they must be amply supplied with work opportunities while they are going to college. All three of these financial resources will have to be used in the overwhelming preponderance of the cases since by definition the youngsters selected can expect no help from family resources.

I would point out, too, that under title IV of the NDEA, the fellowship provision, that cost of education allowance to the university is included over and above the fellowship.

I include the material contained in the Senate report on S. 2345, pages 17, 18, 19, and 20, relating to the title IV fellowship program at this point in my remarks:

"TITLE IV—NATIONAL DEFENSE FELLOWSHIPS

"A. Existing law—National Defense Education Act of 1958

"Purpose: To increase the supply of well-trained college or university teachers through the award of fellowships, expansion and improvement of graduate school facilities, and wider geographical distribution of such facilities throughout the Nation.

"Provisions: Under existing law, for the first year 1,000 fellowships may be awarded by the Commissioner and during each of the 3 succeeding fiscal years, 1,500 additional fellowships. These fellowships are for periods of study not in excess of 3 academic years. Each fellow receives a stipend of $2,000 the first year, $2,200 the second year, and $2,400 the third year, together with an allowance of $400 for each dependent. An institution which enrolls the holders of fellowships may receive not more than $2,500 each academic year for the cost of its approved program which is reasonably attributable to each fellow pursuing a course of study in the approved program.

"The Commissioner awards fellowships to individuals accepted for study in graduate programs approved by him. A graduate program may be approved only upon application of the institution and only upon the Commissioner's finding: (1) that such program is a new program or an existing one which has been expanded; (2) that the new program or expansion of an existing one will substantially further the objective of increasing the facilities available in the Nation for the graduate training of college or university teachers and of promoting a wider geographical distribution of such facilities throughout the Nation; and (3) that in the acceptance of persons for study in such programs, preference will be given to persons interested in teaching at institutions of higher education.

"Appropriations now authorized: Such sums as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of the title.

"Appraisal: At the conclusion of the next academic year, 149 graduate schools will have received about $27 million in support of the graduate programs in which these fellows are studying. The following summary shows the growth of the program by years:

1959–60: 3-year fellowships in 272 graduate programs	1,000
1960–61: 3-year fellowships and 90 1- and 2-year fellowships in 204 programs approved for the 1st time and in 200 programs approved in 1959–60 but further expanded	1,410
1961–62: 3-year fellowships and 100 1- and 2-year fellowships in 204 programs approved for the 1st time and in 322 programs approved in previous years but further expanded	1,400

"In the fall of this year nearly 4,000 national defense fellows will be studying in 680 different programs at 149 institutions, in preparation for college teaching careers. Thus far, institutions in all States but Nevada and Alaska have participated in this program.

"There has been very great interest in the graduate fellowship program. In the first year, 1,040 proposals were received for new or expanded graduate programs involving over 6,000 fellowships. This compares to the 272 proposals finally approved and the 1,000 fellowships awarded. In 1960–61, 918 proposals were received for 5,370 fellowships, of which 406 programs were approved and

1,500 fellowships awarded. For the academic year 1961–62, 948 proposals were received for 5,050 fellowships, of which 526 programs were approved and 1,500 fellowships awarded.

"Title IV is having a considerable influence on the growth of graduate education in a number of States which have produced no or very few doctoral graduates in the past few years.

"The University of Idaho, for example, produced no doctorates in 1958–59, but in 1961–62 will have 44 national defense fellows studying in 9 approved programs. Similarly, the University of Mississippi produced only 7 doctorates in 1958–59, but in 1961–62 its graduate school will have 31 graduate students studying for their doctorates with national defense graduate fellowships in 3 programs. Nationally, we find that 10 States which produce the fewest doctorates have profited relatively the most from the title IV program, while 8 of the States which produce the most doctorates were among the 10 States which have profited relatively the least.

"B. National Defense Education Act Amendment of 1961

"Amendment and extension: The bill would amend the act to place the title IV program on a continuing basis. The problem which title IV is designed to meet will continue to exist in the foreseeable future and will continue to be one of major proportions. However, support for the training of teachers at the graduate level cannot indefinitely continue on the basis of the award of fellowships only in connection with new or expanded programs in graduate schools. Modifications of the title are required in order to permit qualified graduate students to take training in existing graduate programs and thus to forward the purpose of the title as stated above.

"Graduate fellowships: Accordingly, the bill would increase the number of new fellowships authorized to be awarded each year to 5,000, with up to 2,500 of such fellowships to be awarded to individuals in connection with new or expanded graduate programs as under the present act. The remainder of the awards would be made to individuals who have been accepted for graduate study in any university.

"The amendment would require that in granting fellowships under this program preference shall be given the persons who, in writing, express their intention to teach in institutions of higher education or in elementary or secondary schools, upon completion of their graduate program.

"The effect of these amendments would be to increase further the availability of fellowships, thus contributing to our national pool of highly trained teachers. The granting of 2,500 additional fellowships in existing institutions where present facilities are adequate should further be of great assistance in meeting the current college teacher shortage. Moreover, the award of fellowships to persons who need but 1 year of assistance to complete their program of study could provide an immediate reserve of capable individuals who, with this aid, could become better qualified teachers.

"Fellowship stipends: Under a committee amendment to this title, stipends, not in excess of $3,600, would be paid to the recipient of the fellowship award under regulations prescribed by the Commissioner. An additional amount of $400 would be paid to such recipient for each dependent. Recipients of the limited number of postdoctoral fellowships which it is anticipated will be granted could be paid up to $5,000 as determined by regulations of the Commissioner, and would likewise receive $400 for each dependent.

"Payments to institutions: Another amendment would provide a uniform payment to institutions of $2,500 per year for each fellowship in a new or expanded graduate program and a payment of $2,000 for each of other fellowships. The purpose of making such payments to institutions is the same as in the National Defense Education Act of 1958; namely, to reimburse the institutions for a portion of the cost of the education of the fellow who is attending the institution with Federal assistance. Testimony presented to the committee indicated that the average cost to a graduate school for the training of an individual graduate student was above the figures set in this legislation. The larger payment for new and expanded programs is intended to meet the higher costs to the graduate schools establishing new or expanding graduate facilities.

"In this connection, the committee wished to emphasize its belief that institutions of higher education, attended by a fellow selected for the program, should provide the services of their graduate schools to such fellows without charge. An amendment inserted by the committee seeks to accomplish this objective by providing that the payment to the institution (which flows to the institution by virtue of the attendance of the fellow and is conditioned upon his attendance thereat) shall be reduced by the amount of tuition charged.

"Committee comment upon fellowship programs: The committee has noted with much concern that the Office of Education has been authorizing the approval of graduate programs and the award of fellowships under this title in almost all field of academic endeavor.

"Approval has been given in a number of cases to fellowships in subject matter fields which the committee has great difficulty in reconciling with the national defense purposes of the legislation. In the committee view, programs relating to areas for which advanced degrees such as doctorates in theology are awarded, or in disciplines such as home economics, are quite unrelated to the purposes of the act.

"It is the belief of the committee that awards under this authority should reflect a concern for the Nation's most urgent needs for highly trained manpower to meet its national defense needs. The committee has therefore taken two steps designed to give clear direction to the Commissioner of Education:

"1. It has specifically excluded from eligibility fellowships for graduate study at a school or department of divinity or religion or graduate study of a religious or theological nature.

"2. It has inserted language limiting the fellowships to study in such subjects as the Commissioner finds are important to the national defense and which are consistent with the declaration of policy in section 101.

"In thus restricting the Commissioner of Education, the committee does not intend to imply that only a very narrow selection of courses is related to the strength of the Nation. On the contrary, the committee believes that the strength of the Nation rests significantly upon overall excellence in college and university faculties in the humanities and social sciences, as well as in science, mathematics, engineering, and modern foreign languages. Indeed, a well-educated scientist or linguist is in need of exposure to excellent instruction in fields other that his specialty. However, the committee believes that, in the light of the general objectives of this act, expenditures should be concentrated in those fields of study—sciences, engineering, humanities, and social sciences—which are closest to the defense needs of the Nation. The preparation of college teachers in history, economics, and government, for example, is more directly related to a strong system of undergraduate training to meet the Nation's defense manpower needs, than are graduate programs in folklore or church music.

"The title would also be amended to permit the appointment of new fellows to replace those who have resigned. This amendment would provide opportunity for maintaining the program at full strength and for aiding additional numbers of worthy individuals who have demonstrated competence in their graduate programs."

Mr. President, I call attention to these five points:

1. The committee bill is designed to assist students who are so in need of assistance that the loan fund is not enough. These students are not now in college and will not be able to enter college without scholarship assistance.

2. There is great disparity in present distribution of scholarship funds. Three percent of the colleges control 34 percent of all college scholarship aid. Four States (New York, Illinois, California, and New Jersey) grant 94 percent of all State scholarship assistance. The committee bill is designed to counteract this unequal distribution by establishing as a pilot model a Federal scholarship program in every State.

3. Colleges have already projected lending needs under the student loan program at levels above those recommended in the Lausche amendments. These loan funds are designed to provide partial assistance for students who have some support from other resources.

4. Today the average scholarship award is under $400 per year, while the average cost of education has increased to nearly $1,700 per student per year.

5. The average family income for 1960 was approximately $5,700, while the average cost of a year at college in 1961–62 is nearly $1,700. The cost of attending college has increased and will continue to increase at a rate faster than the annual increase in family income each year.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say, first of all, that we must look at this program as a package program. The Senator from Ohio, I respectfully say, is picking out an item here and an item there. We have presented a package program for support to higher education. The Senator from Ohio and some of his colleagues who are opposed to me on this issue have been talking about $1,000 scholarships. I say to the Senate that $1,000 scholarships will be as scarce as hens' teeth. The figure for scholarships will average somewhere between $400 and $700. How can we possibly get 25,000 scholarships out of the total amount authorized if we are going to give $1,000 scholarships?

That is the maximum. Most of the scholarships will not be $1,000 scholarships. They will be in the neighborhood of $400 and $700 scholarships. We are not talking about thousand-dollar scholarships.

Mr. President, we are talking about the young men and women who, we find, come from homes so poor, where the economic need is so drastic, that there is not any chance for these thousands of boys and girls to go to college.

It is all right for the Senator from Ohio to argue that if these boys and girls have the intelligence and stamina that characterized our generation, they would go to college, just as we did. The fact is that there were thousands of students in our own generation who were not able to go to college because they had economic problems to consider. The fact is, also, that today the cost of a college education has gone up by more than three times what it was when the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Oregon went to college.

We are dealing here with a group of students who will be encompassed in the bill and who will otherwise be denied a college education. If this should occur, America will suffer as well as these students because we will have wasted the precious brainpower of students that should have been developed to the maximum extent.

No one can argue with me in terms of economy. No one can argue with me in terms of putting a price tag on this whole proposition. The fact is that we are dealing here with young men and women who will be the beneficiaries of these scholarships and who otherwise would never see the inside of a college classroom.

I wish to take my next point. The money provided will not be enough in itself, to make it possible for them to go to college. It will be enough to help them make the decision as to whether or not they will have a chance of going to college. I say that, because in addition to the scholarship money, they will have to borrow money to go to college, and they will have to go to work. I was a teacher for 21 years, and I have seen some tragic cases of young men who had to work manually far beyond their physical ability in order to try to carry their schoolwork. Of course, I admire that kind of courage and that kind of character. However, I say it is wasteful. It is much better if we can keep them working in the library, if we can keep them working in the laboratory.

There has been some talk this afternoon about the fact that we are going to make loans to some students under National Defense Education Act, and that we are going to have grants. Well, we do that now. I wish to say to the Senator from Ohio that under the fellowship program of the existing law, under National Defense Education Act, we give grants up to $2,000 in first-year fellowships. There is nothing new about this proposal. We are already granting fellowships to graduate students, but not to undergraduate students. These students, as I say, will have to borrow money in addition to the money they will receive.

I wish to talk now about scholarship grants. My friend from Ohio knows that corporations of America and foundations give grants. God bless them for it. I wish they would double them or treble them. They are grants. They are not loans. The overwhelming proportion of the scholarships donated today by business are grants, not loans.

I am strongly in favor of a loan program. However, I say to my friend, the Senator from Ohio, that when we get the National Defense Education Act bill before the Senate to increase the amount of money, I want the Senator from Ohio to support us in our attempt to increase the amount of money that we have already placed in it for loans.

Let me point out what the Senator from Ohio is proposing to do. He is proposing in his amendment to increase the present amount in the law for loans. However, it is a smaller amount than the amount that this committee by a vote of 13 to 2 has recommended to the Senate we ought to adopt. That bill, S. 2345, is pending on the calendar.

What we ought to do is increase the loan provisions for National Defense Education Act over what the committee has already recommended.

I say to my colleagues in the Senate that we must look at the totality of this great educational need. We must meet it by way of loans. We must meet it by way of fellowships. We must meet it by way of grants. We must do all of these. We cannot justify the waste that we are now guilty of in regard to the brainpower of this country.

There is no greater opportunity for us to strengthen the security of this country than we have this afternoon, by voting to add some Federal scholarships to our wholly inadequate educational effort in this country.

I now would like to put my fellow Senators in my seat as I go into conference with the House. I want to talk about the practical parliamentary problems which face anyone who is chairman of a conference committee when he goes into conference in behalf of the Senate. Each one of my colleagues has been in that position.

I will be confronted in the conference with a House bill that does not have one single cent in it for scholarships. There is no scholarship aid at all in it. The House has eliminated scholarships. The President of the United States has made a very able case today for his higher education program, and he ends his plea to Congress with a request for support for the scholarship provision in the bill as it has come to the floor of the Senate.

I ask my colleagues in the Senate to come with me into the conference room. If I walk into that conference with an amendment, let us assume—God forbid—of scholarships only in the form of loans, how much of a chance do Senators really think I will have with the House in getting scholarships out of that conference at all?

I make a plea to my colleagues in the Senate to keep me in a bargaining position in support of the Senate. I make a plea that I be kept in a position where I can go into conference with at least a chance of being able to negotiate with the House. Senators have been in enough conferences to know how weakened I would be if the Senate had weakened the whole scholarship approach to the educational needs in higher education in this country.

For these reasons I urge the Senate this afternoon, in the vote which is about to take place, to defeat the Lausche amendment. In my judgment it is inadequate, because it does not go far enough, and because it represents a failure and a lack of faith on our part to invest in the brainpower in the young men and women of this country, who will be recipients of these scholarships. Let us remember that what I am really proposing is a loan when I propose a scholarship. It is only a long-term loan.

Senators ask, Who is going to pay the taxes for the scholarship program? Let me tell them who it will be. It will be the recipients of the program. There is no question about the fact that, if we give these scholarships and we get these students into college, they then can leave college and earn money far in excess of what they would have been able to obtain without a college education. They will repay to the Treasury of the United States in taxes during the next 15 or 20 years after they leave college 100 times the benefits they received under the scholarship program.

That is why I say this scholarship program is a true long-term loan program which will strengthen the security of this Republic.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. **LAUSCHE**. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Ten minutes.

Mr. **LAUSCHE**. I think the closing words uttered by the Senator from Oregon demonstrate the weakness of his position and the strength of mine. He said the scholarships will be repaid by the recipients in the future through the taxes which they will pay. I submit the repayment would be far simpler by having the students borrow the money and repay it as a debt.

The Senator from Oregon concedes that the funds ought not to be a grant, because he argues that they should be paid back not as a loan but in the form of taxes. If he concedes that the funds should be paid back, then I respectfully submit that the simplest way to do so is to pay them back in the form of discharging a loan.

Mr. **MORSE**. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for 30 seconds?

Mr. **LAUSCHE**. I have only 9 minutes remaining.

Second, when he argues that boys and girls will not attend college unless the money is provided for them as a gift, I cannot agree with him. I simply cannot believe that the citizenry of the United States has reached the stage, as I stated earlier, that unless the Federal Congress gives them the money, they will allow all of their creative ability, all of their creative mentality to go to waste. I simply cannot believe that to be the fact.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] argued that the bill will open the door for students to go to college. It will open the door; but the door will be opened for an expansion of the program next year and the following year. It is a very appealing proposal. It probably will invite votes. I suppose that when election time comes around, the program will be expanded in the quest for those votes. Certainly it will open the door.

I have been a Member of the Senate for 6 years. I have seen how the wedge is placed into the door and the door is opened a bit, and how finally the train goes through.

This is only the beginning. What the program will eventually cost, no one can foretell. The Senator from Oregon argues that this is a package deal and must be viewed in its totality. I agree that it should be viewed in its totality; but it should be reviewed in the totality of the problem of the country as a whole.

We have the finest schools in the world. We have the students for whom those schools are available. Of course, the number of schools should be expanded, and I am in favor of that portion of the bill which will help to build them. We have the students to fill the schools; but when we seek to help them, the best way to help them, in my opinion, is to make the program available on the basis of loans.

Getting back to the thought of totality, we have provided $50 billion for the national defense this year. The budget is up to $93 billion. There have been deficits in 25 of the last 31 years. The purchasing dollar has fallen from 100 cents in 1941 to 46 cents in 1962. There has been a run on our gold. The request is made for the right to borrow more money.

What is the totality of the proposition? The totality is that we had better recognize that there is a limit on how much money can be ladled out by Congress.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. MUSKIE. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator in yielding to me. I simply wish to ask him a question concerning opening the door of opportunity. Is it his statement that his program would not open the door of opportunity to young people?

Mr. LAUSCHE. If money is loaned to student A, he will pay it back. When he pays it back, that money will be available to student B. When student B pays it back, it can be loaned to student C. That is a sound basis of approach.

The argument of the Senator from Maine is: Give the money to the student. He will not have to pay it back directly, but he will pay it back in taxes because his earning capacity will be increased. I say that if he can pay it back in taxes subsequently, then, frankly, it is better to ask him to pay it back as a loan.

Mr. MUSKIE. I think it should be stated, so far as I am concerned, that I am not arguing that a student's college education should be financed totally by loans or totally by scholarships or totally by his own earnings or totally by assistance from his parents.

I recognize the merit of loans. I benefited from them myself. I found it possible to repay them. But I also benefited from grants in the form of scholarships from private sources. Perhaps I derived the greatest benefit, a benefit which the Senator described so eloquently this afternoon, from the money which I earned by my own efforts. I agree with the Senator's statement in that respect.

But I am talking about what is necessary and reasonable for the average student of average means to have as a financial program to finance his education. With the increasing cost of education, the part which scholarships have played in financing the cost of education for the poorer student has diminished. The program of the bill would simply restore the role of scholarships in financing the program of students to something approximating the part they previously played. This will not result in an overbalance on the side of scholarship aid.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement made by Dr. John D. Millett, president of Miami University, Oxford, Ohio, supporting the proposition that adequate studies have not been made to demonstrate that the Federal provision of scholarships is necessary. The testimony appears at page 298 of the hearings.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY DR. JOHN D. MILLETT, PRESIDENT, MIAMI UNIVERSITY, OXFORD, OHIO

FEDERAL SCHOLARSHIPS

Mr. Chairman, if I can best express briefly the consensus among the two associations for which I speak on the subject of general Federal scholarships it is simply that they do not have a high priority on the agenda of needed Federal action.

We believe that scholarships as such are important means of assisting worthy students in attendance at colleges and universities.

We also believe that unless funds are provided to help meet operating costs and facilities costs for colleges and universities—other than passing them on to the student and his family through tuition charges—there will be no end to the demand for more and more scholarships. We believe that if the central problem of support is attacked first, and attacked vigorously, the need for scholarships will be minimized rather than maximized, and that otherwise no conceivable scholarship program will perform the task of keeping educational opportunity open.

We realize that the stated and central objective of most proposed Federal scholarship programs, including the administration proposal now before your committee, is to make it possible for the many students of high ability but limited financial resources to attend college. This is a most laudable objective. We doubt that the evidence exists on which to base a judgment that the proposed legislation will make a substantial contribution to accomplishing its purpose. The studies which are cited as a basis for the belief that a high percentage of high ability students do not attend college for lack of funds are "national" studies based on techniques of limited sampling. But we do not have, and the U.S. Office of Education does not have, adequate studies of the distribution of these qualified and needy students. By this I mean there are no State-by-State studies covering the entire country of the percentage of high school graduates who attend college and of the percentages of those in various ability groupings who do attend. On the basis of such studies as we do have we do know that the percentage of high school graduates attending college varies greatly among the States and regions.

This at least suggests the question as to whether or not a high percentage of the able young people who fail to go to college for financial reasons may not be fairly heavily concentrated in a few States or regions. We know that some States—including some of the most prosperous States—have made the financial barriers to higher education extremely high. I respectfully suggest that a considerably better factual basis of information needs to be available, Mr. Chairman, before we can make sound judgments as to the effectiveness of a Federal scholarship program in accomplishing its stated objectives.

Having said this, I wish to add that, if we are to have a general Federal scholarship program, the proposed legislation has certain commendable features. Its intent is that scholarships go only to students who need help to go to college and not to students who are going to college but need help to go some place else to college. It thus avoids the expenditure of Federal funds to permit west coast students to go to the east coast to college, and vice versa, as some of our present non-Federal programs do. Its provision for a flat grant to the institutions of $350—rather than paying whatever fee it decides to charge—would have the effect of helping out on institutional costs without having a tendency to force up tuition charges and thus making attendance more difficult for nonscholarship students. It will reduce the tendency shown in some existing programs to encourage the concentration of the high ability students in a relatively few institutions. So great is the concern on this score, Mr. Chairman, that there is a substantial sentiment among educators to the effect that Federal scholarships should be awarded through educational institutions in order to insure that Federal action does not greatly affect the distribution of students of high ability as among the various regions of the country.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana will state it.

Mr. HARTKE. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] has indicated he wishes to offer an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio. In case the Senator from Indiana offered and amendment in the nature of a substitute, which amendment would be considered first by the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In that case the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont, if a perfecting amendment, would be considered first by the Senate.

Mr. HARTKE. Would the discussion of that amendment also precede the discussion of the amendment offered in the nature of a substitute?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A Senator having the floor could speak on either amendment he desired, but the vote on the perfecting amendment would take precedence over any substitute.

Mr. HARTKE. But it would in no way jeopardize the discussion or the vote upon the amendment offered in the nature of a substitute?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator please state his question again?

Mr. HARTKE. As I understand, the Chair has ruled that if an amendment in the nature of a substitute were offered at a later time, and the amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio were proposed, that would in no way jeopardize the consideration or the discussion of the amendment which might be offered by the Senator from Indiana, although the amendment intended to be proposed by the Senator from Vermont would take precedence so far as time and a vote are concerned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would not.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York will state it.

Mr. KEATING. The Senator from Vermont and I propose to offer two amendments to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio. The Senator from Indiana has a substitute for the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio. Do I correctly understand that the vote would first come on the amendments to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio, and that after that amendment had or had not been perfected by such amendments, the vote would then come on the amendment in the nature of a substitute?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The Senator from New York is correct.

Mr. **HARTKE**. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The Senator from Indiana will state it.

Mr. **HARTKE**. Debate on the amendments proposed by the Senator from New York and the Senator from Vermont would take precedence over debate on the amendments I have previously submitted, would it not?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. A Senator having the floor could debate either the amendments proposed by the Senator from New York or the Senator from Indiana, or both, if desired, but the vote would first come on the perfecting Keating-Prouty amendment.

Mr. **HARTKE**. Mr. President, I call up my amendments identified as "2-2-62—A," which previously have been considered as amendments to the bill. I ask that my amendments be considered en bloc, as a substitute.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments subcommitted by the Senator from Indiana will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendments.

Mr. **HARTKE**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the amendments be dispensed with.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the amendments submitted by the Senator from Indiana will be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The amendments submitted by Mr. HARTKE are as follows:

On page 2, line 21, strike out "and".

On page 2, line 24, before the period insert a comma and the following: "and through a program of loan insurance for students in higher education".

On page 37, between lines 5 and 6, insert the following:

"TITLE IV—STUDENT LOAN INSURANCE FOR STUDENTS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

"*Part I—Short title*

"Short Title

"SECTION 401. This title may be cited as the 'Student Loan Insurance Act of 1961'.

"*Part II—Loan insurance for student loans*

"Authorization

"SEC. 411. For the purpose of facilitating loans to students in institutions of higher education, such institutions shall be insured by the Commissioner against losses on loans made by them to such students in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and the succeeding fiscal year, if made upon the conditions and within the limits specified in this part. The total principal amount of new loans to students covered by insurance under this part in any fiscal year shall not exceed $100,000,000. The Commissioner may, if he finds it necessary to do so in order to assure an equitable distribution of the benefits of this part, assign, within such maximum amount, insurance quotas applicable to eligible institutions of higher education, or to States or areas, and may reassign unused portions of such quotas.

"Limitations on Individual Loans and on Insurance

"SEC. 412. No loan or loans by one or more institutions of higher education in excess of $1,000 in the aggregate to any single student in any fiscal year shall be covered by insurance under this part, nor shall the aggregate insured unpaid principal amount of loans made to any student exceed $5,000 at any time.

"Source of Funds

"SEC. 413. Loans made by institutions of higher education in accordance with this title shall be insurable whether made from the funds of the institution or from funds held by the institution in a trust or similar capacity and available for such loans.

"Eligibility of Student Borrowers and Terms of Student Loans

"SEC. 414. A loan by an institution of higher education shall be insurable under the provisions of this part only if made to a student in such institution who devotes essentially full time to educational work in accordance at such institution, as determined by such institution, and if evidenced by a note or other written agreement which (1) provides for repayment of the principal amount of such loan in installments each quarter or lesser period beginning (except in the event of default in the payment of interest, or in the payment of the cost of insurance premiums, or other default by the borrower) within one year following the date on which the student ceases to devote essentially full time to educational work in attendance at any institution of higher education, (2) is made without security and without endorsement, except that if the borrower is a minor and such note or other written agreement executed by him would not, under the applicable law, create a binding obligation, either security or endorsement may be required, (3) requires full repayment of the principal with interest within not more than ten years after the date on which the first installment of principal becomes due, (4) provides for interest on such loan at a per annum rate not exceeding 4¾ per centum on the unpaid balance and accrued interest, but payment of interest accruing prior to the date on which the first installment of principal becomes due may be postponed until after such date, (5) entitles the student borrower at his option to accelerate repayment of the whole or any part of such loan, and (6) contains such other terms and conditions consistent with the provisions of this part and with the regulations issued by the Commissioner pursuant to this title as may be agreed upon by the parties to such loan, including, at their option, a provision requiring the borrower to pay to the institution, in addition to principal and interest, amounts equal to the insurance premiums payable by the institution to the Commissioner with respect to such loan.

"Certificates of Insurance—Effective Date of Insurance—Premiums

"SEC. 415. (a) If, upon application by an institution of higher education, made upon such form, containing such information, and supported by such evidence as the Commissioner may require, and otherwise in conformity with this section, the Commissioner finds that the institution has made a loan to an eligible student which is insurable under the provisions of this part, he shall, upon tender by the institution of the first year's insurance premium payable pursuant to subsection (d), issue to such institution a certificate of insurance covering such loan and setting forth the amount and terms of such insurance.

"(b) Insurance evidenced by a certificate of insurance pursuant to subsection (a) shall become effective upon the date of issuance of such certificate, except that the Commissioner is authorized, in accordance with regulations, to issue commitments with respect to proposed loans submitted by eligible institutions, and in that event, upon compliance with subsection (a) by the institution, the certificate of insurance may be issued effective as of the date when the loan to be covered by such insurance was made. Such insurance shall cease to be effective upon thirty days' default by the institution in the payment of any installment of the premiums payable pursuant to subsection (d).

"(c) An application submitted pursuant to subsection (a) shall contain (1) an agreement by the institution of higher education to pay, in accordance with regulations, the premiums fixed by the Commissioner pursuant to subsection (d), and (2) an agreement by such institution that if the loan is covered by insurance the institution will submit such reports during the effective period of the loan agreement as the Commissioner may by regulation prescribe as necessary to carry out the provisions of this part.

"(d) The Commissioner shall, pursuant to regulations, charge for insurance on each loan under this part a premium in an amount not to exceed one-fourth of 1 per centum per annum of the unpaid balance of principal and accrued interest of such loan, payable in advance, at such time and in such manner as may be prescribed by the Commissioner. Such regulations may provide that such premium shall not be payable, or if paid shall be refundable, with respect to any period after default in the payment of principal or interest, or after the borrower has died or becomes totally and permanently disabled, if (1) notice of such default or other event has been duly given, and (2) request for payment of the loss insured against has been made or the Commissioner has made such payment on his own motion pursuant to section 416.

"(e) The rights of an institution of higher education arising under insurance evidenced by a certificate of insurance issued under this section may not be assigned or transferred by such institution, except as provided in case of default in section 416.

"(f) The consolidation of the obligations of two or more insured loans obtained by a student borrower in any fiscal year into a single obligation evidenced by a single instrument of indebtedness shall not affect the insurance by the United States. Upon surrender of the original certificates of insurance in such cases, the Commissioner may issue a new certificate of insurance in accordance with this section upon such consolidated obligation.

"Procedure on Default, Death, or Disability of Student

"SEC. 416. (a) Upon default and a reasonable effort toward collection by the institution on any loan covered by insurance pursuant to this part, or upon the death of the student borrower or a finding by the institution that the borrower has become totally and permanently disabled, determined in accordance with regulations established by the Commissioner, before the loan has been repaid in full, and prior to the commencement of suit or other enforcement proceeding upon the loan or upon any security for such loan, the institution shall promptly notify the Commissioner who shall thereupon, if requested by such institution or on his own motion, if the insurance is still in effect, pay to the institution the amount of the loss sustained upon such loan as soon as such amount has been determined.

"(b) Upon payment by the Commissioner of the amount of loss pursuant to subsection (a), the United States shall be subrogated to the rights of the institution upon the insured loan and be entitled to an assignment of the note or other evidence of the insured loan and any security therefor.

"(c) Nothing in this section or in this title shall be construed to preclude any forbearance for the benefit of the student borrower which may be agreed upon by the parties to the insured loan and approved by the Commissioner, or to preclude forbearance by the Commissioner in the enforcement of the insured obligation after payment on such insurance, or to require collection of the amount of any loan by the institution of higher education or by the Commissioner from the estate of a deceased borrower or from a borrower found by the institution to have become permanently and totally disabled.

"(d) Nothing in this section or in this title shall be construed to excuse the institution of higher education from exercising, in the making and collection of loans under the provisions of this part, the same care and diligence which would reasonably be used in making and collecting loans not insured. If the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the institution, finds that an institution of higher education has substantially failed to exercise such care and diligence, or to make the reports required under section 415(c), or to pay the required insurance premiums, he shall disqualify such institution for further insurance on loans granted pursuant to this part until he is satisfied that such failure has ceased and finds that there is reasonable assurance that the institution will in the future exercise necessary care and diligence or comply with such requirements, as the case may be.

"*Part III—Loan insurance on loans to institutions of higher education*

"Authorization

"SEC. 421. For the purpose of assisting institutions of higher education in obtaining funds to make loans insured under part II, the Commissioner, on terms and conditions prescribed by him consistent with the provisions of this part and necessary to protect the interests of the United States, may insure in whole or in part any public or private financing institution, or trustee under a trust or indenture or agreement for the benefit of the holders of any securities issued thereunder, by commitment or otherwise, against loss of principal and interest on any loan to an institution of higher education for the purpose of providing such institution with necessary funds to make loans insured under part II of this title. The total principal amount of new loans covered by insurance under this part in any fiscal year shall not exceed $100,000,000. The Commissioner may, if he finds it necessary to do so in order to assure an equitable distribution of the benefits of this part, assign, within such maximum amounts, insurance quotas applicable to eligible institutions of higher education, or to States or areas, and may reassign unused portions of such quotas.

"Limitations

"SEC. 422. No loan shall be covered by insurance under section 421 unless—

"(1) the Commissioner finds that such loan is necessary to enable the institution of higher education to provide student loans to be insured under part II;

"(2) the rate of interest to be paid on the loan is 4½ per centum or less;

"(3) the terms of such loan require repayment in twenty years or less; and

"(4) the Commissioner finds that there is reasonable assurance that the institution of higher education has the ability to repay the loan within the time fixed therefor.

"Payment on Guarantees

"SEC. 423. Payments required to be made as the result of default on any loan insured by the Commissioner under this part shall be made from the revolving insurance fund established under section 431.

"*Part IV—Administrative matters*

"Revolving Insurance Fund

"SEC. 431. (a) Premiums under part II and all other moneys derived by the Commissioner in the course of operations under this title shall be deposited in a revolving fund in the Treasury of the United States. All moneys in the revolving fund shall, upon requisition by the Commissioner, be available until expended, (1) for the payment of losses in connection with insurance undertaken pursuant to this title, and (2) for any fiscal year, in the amount provided for by an appropriation Act, for defraying the expenses of administration incurred under this title.

"(b) For the purposes of carrying out the provisions of this title, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the revolving fund provided in this section—

"(1) the sum of $500,000 for the initial establishment of the revolving fund; and

"(2) such further sums, if any, as may become necessary for the adequacy of the revolving fund.

"(c) The Commissioner shall, from the revolving fund, pay annually into the Treasury, as miscellaneous receipts, interest on any sums appropriated to the revolving fund pursuant to subsection (b) which have not been repaid into the Treasury as provided in subsection (d). The Secretary of the Treasury shall determine the interest rate annually in advance, such rate to be calculated to reimburse the Treasury for its costs in connection with such appropriated funds, taking into consideration the current average interest rate which the Treasury pays upon its marketable obligations.

"(d) Until all advances made to the revolving fund by appropriation pursuant to subsection (b) (1) and (2) have been repaid through credits as provided in this subsection, the Commissioner shall, at least annually, determine any balance in the revolving fund in excess of an amount determined by him to be necessary for the requirements of the fund, and for reasonable reserves to maintain the solvency of the fund, and such balance shall be paid into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts and the amount thereof be credited against such advances.

"(e) The Commissioner may authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to invest and reinvest such portions of the revolving fund as he may determine to be in excess of current needs in any interest-bearing securities of the United States or in any securities guaranteed as to principal and interest by the United States, and the income therefrom shall constitute a part of the revolving fund.

"Legal Powers and Responsibilities

"SEC. 432. (a) With respect to matters arising by reason of this title, and notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Commissioner may—

"(1) sue on behalf of the United States and be sued in his official capacity in any court of competent jurisdiction, State or Federal;

"(2) subject to the specific limitations in this title, consent to the modification, with respect to rate of interest, time of payment of principal and interest or any portion thereof, or security, of the provisions of any note, contract, mortgage, or other instrument evidencing or securing a loan which has been insured under this title;

"(3) enforce, pay, or compromise, any claim on, or arising because of, any such insurance; and

"(4) enforce, pay, compromise, waive, or release any right, title, claim, lien, or demand, however acquired, including any equity or any right of redemption.

"(b) The Commissioner shall, with respect to the financial operations arising by reason of this title—

"(1) prepare annually and submit a budget program as provided for wholly owned Government corporations by the Government Corporation Control Act; and

"(2) maintain an integral set of accounts, which shall be audited annually by the General Accounting Office in accordance with principles and procedures applicable to commercial corporate transactions, as provided by section 105 of the Government Corporation Control Act, except that the financial transactions of the Commissioner, including the settlement of insurance claims, and transactions related thereto and vouchers approved by the Commissioner in connection with such financial transactions, shall be final and conclusive upon all accounting and other officers of the Government.

"Treatment of Certain Trusts, Foundations, and Other Organizations as Institutions of Higher Education

"SEC. 433. The Commissioner may by regulation provide for the treatment of any nonprofit trusts, foundations, or other similar organizations, controlled by an institution of higher education or the officials thereof, as part of the institution of higher education for the purposes of this title, if he determines that such treatment would promote such purposes. Such regulations may establish such requirements for the purpose of this section as may be necessary to protect the interests of the United States.

"Administration

"SEC. 434. (a) This title shall be administered by the Commissioner, under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Commissioner shall, with the approval of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, make all regulations specifically authorized to be made under this title and such other regulations, not inconsistent with this title, as may be necessary to carry out its purposes.

"(b) At the beginning of each regular session of the Congress, the Commissioner shall make, through the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, a full report to Congress of the administration of this title, including his recommendations for needed revisions in the title.

"(c) When deemed necessary by the Commissioner for the effective administration of this title, experts or consultants may be employed as provided in section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 806, 810).

"Authority Under Act Conditional Upon Amount of Appropriation for Title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958

"SEC. 435. The authority of the Commissioner to insure any loans in any fiscal year under the provisions of this title shall be conditional upon the appropriation under the provisions of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act for such year of at least 75 per centum of the amount authorized for such year under the provisions of title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958."

On page 37, beginning with line 6, redesignate title IV as title V and redesignate the section numbers in such title accordingly.

In lieu of the amendment to the title amend the title to read as follows: "A bill to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities, to authorize scholarships for undergraduate study in such institutions, to provide financial assistance to the States for the construction of public community colleges, and to provide a program of loan insurance for students in higher education."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield for 30 seconds?

Mr. HARTKE. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say that I think the Senator from Indiana is entitled to know from me, as floor leader of the bill, what my approach to his amendments would be, because I always try to give due notice and to be perfectly fair in connection with the debate. I want the Senator from Indiana to know that after all debate on his amendments, from his standpoint and that of other Senators who support them, is completed, I shall move that the amendments be laid on the table; and when I make my reply to the Senator, I shall state my reasons for making the motion.

But I believe he realizes that I deeply appreciate the sincerity of his purpose, and that also, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Education, I deeply appreciate the many instances in which the Senator from Indiana has been of help to me. It always pains me to find myself in disagreement with the Senator from Indiana. But I am in disagreement with him in regard to these amendments; and at the appropriate time I shall move that his amendments be laid on the table.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, has the Senator from Indiana finished his presentation for the time being?

Mr. HARTKE. I yield to the distinguished Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, in due course I wish to ask the privilege of the floor for the Senator from Vermont.

At this time I suggest that the Senator from Indiana proceed with his explanation of his amendments, if he wishes to do so at this time.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the amendments I have submitted at this time are really a supplement to Senate bill 1241. They would not in any way interfere with the scholarship program or the educational facilities now provided by that bill, and they would not interfere in any way with this educational program.

Instead, Mr. President, my amendments provide, as a supplement to the provisions of S. 1241 and the National Defense Education Act, a program of loan insurance on loans to students in higher education.

This loan insurance program is modeled after the Federal Housing Administration mortgage insurance program. The Federal Government would not provide money for the loan, but it would guarantee repayment. The moneys will be provided to students by the institutions of higher education, and to colleges and universities by financial institutions.

Basically, my amendments provide:

First. Insurance on student loans of up to $1,000 a year, with an overall maximum of $5,000. Loans must be made from funds of the college or university or from funds held by such institution in a trust or similar capacity.

Second. Federal insurance on loans made by financial institutions to colleges or universities needing outside funds for student loans.

Third. Repayment of student loans to be made in installments each quarter, beginning within 1 year after the student ceases to devote essentially full time to his educational work. Full repayment must be made within 10 years after the first installment becomes due.

Fourth. The cost of student loans may be no greater than 5 percent—that is 4¾ percent for interest and one-fourth of 1 percent for insurance premium and administration.

Fifth. Repayment of loans made by colleges and universities from financial institutions must be made within 20 years. Interest on these loans may be no greater than 4½ percent. The cost of the insurance premium and administration would be an additional one-fourth of 1 percent.

Sixth. There would be a maximum yearly ceiling, on loans which the Federal Government may insure, of $100 million, for student loans; and $100 million for loans to colleges and universities.

The program of Federal scholarships provided for by S. 1241 is one which I endorse and one which I believe is very worthwhile. However, this program helps only a limited number of the capable and needy young people of our Nation. I am concerned with the great number of our young people who will not be reached by this measure.

In our complex society, there is greater and greater need for trained and well-educated people. Automation is rapidly eliminating the need for large numbers of relatively untrained and unskilled workers. For this reason, we shall be adding to our unemployment problems if we allow ambitious and able young people to enter a labor market which cannot absorb them and does not need them. We must make every reasonable effort to see to it that high school graduates of today are not the unemployed workers of tomorrow, that they are not the ones ment expense, in the future, so that they whom we shall have to train at Govern- can work and earn a living.

For over 25 years, we have had an FHA program which insured housing loans. During this period, the Federal Government has insured billions of dollars' worth of housing loans, with little or no drain on the Treasury. Losses during that time, resulting from defaults on the loans, have amounted to only eighteen one-hundredths of 1 percent, for home mortgage insurance.

If such a program can be successful for insuring loans for real estate, certainly it can be successful for insuring educational loans.

Adoption of the loan insurance program for which my amendments provide will permit the utilization of our private credit resources to encourage and enable students to continue with their studies. The program will insure loans, and it will help to insure our Nation's future.

Mr. President, I should like to call attention to a speech which I shall ask unanimous consent to have printed in its entirety in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The speech was delivered by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] on June 22, 1959, at the commencement exercises of the Bronx High School of Science, at the Paradise Theater, in New York City. In the speech the Senator from New York endorsed the principles of the program covered by my amendments, and stated fully—probably much more eloquently than could be stated by me at this time—the need for a program of this sort.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEACE PROGRAM FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

(Commencement address of Senator JAVITS at the graduation exercises of the Bronx High School of Science, June 22, 1959, at the Paradise Theater, New York City)

There are three key elements in a true "peace program for higher education" which must be launched if millions of well-trained minds are to be fully developed as our most valuable national asset in the cold war, a struggle which your generation has no choice but to inherit—

First, a Federal program for underwriting 50,000 scholarships in higher education, a minimum goal considering that an estimated 180,000 high school graduates this June—all ranked in the top 20 percent of their class scholastically—will not go on to college, a staggering loss of talent which may never develop its full potential;

Second, adoption of a Federal guarantee program for student loans, similar to the FHA guarantees for mortgages on private housing, which would stimulate an overall Federal-State $1 billion student loan program establishing a $1,000 loan maximum the first year and up to a $5,000 maximum for 5 years of study (this proposal is essential in the face of soaring college costs for students which average about $1,700 per capita each year, a leap of 33 percent from 1954 to 1958);

And third, a nationwide campaign to further increase corporate giving to higher education from the current level of $135 million to reach a national goal of $400 million by 1970 annually, with labor unions and trade organizations making contributions in recognition of their own stake in the development of skilled manpower, technicians and scientists who promote productivity and economic growth; such funds can be an invaluable aid to college construction programs trying to provide the education and living facilities required by the students a decade hence when present enrollment figures for higher education are expected to increase 100 percent.

The four-alarm warning which was sounded throughout the U.S. education system after Russia launched the first earth satellite in October 1957 has not yet been adequately answered either by Congress, our colleges and universities or by the country at large. In the wake of the orbit blazed by that first sputnik, a public awareness and enthusiasm arose which gave a tremendous boost to proposals for vitally necessary programs of Federal and private financing, particularly for higher education. Unless that support reasserts itself, a heavy penalty for our current complacency will be borne by the generation now preparing for college—in terms of sharply limited educational opportunities—and by the Nation—in terms of endangering the economic growth rate in the United States and the maintenance of U.S. peace leadership in the years ahead.

The total bill for higher education in our colleges and universities currently comes to $3,580 million a year. But if we are to do an adequate educational job for the 7 million students expected to apply to them by 1970, it will cost $9 billion, according to the Council for Financial Aid to Education. However, at the present level of financial support—public, private, and from tuition—only $7 billion will be available. The $2 billion deficit can only be made up by a coordinated program of public and private financing. And to those who see the specter of Federal control behind the prospect of increased Federal funds for higher education, let me emphasize that the proportion of the higher education bill paid for out of the Federal Treasury has been decreasing steadily for the past 15 years. As a revenue source, the Federal Government contributed $308 million in 1943–44 compared to $535 million in 1957–58, representing a 21-percent drop in its overall share of the total bill. However, during the same period, the proportionate burden shouldered by the State governments increased 10 percent, the share of private gifts rose 5 percent, and tuition's share rose 8 percent. Actually, the impact and the importance of Federal aid has been sharply reduced, and the proposals I favor for expanding its activity would carry the least likelihood of unfavorable influence—a national scholarship and loan program to individual students to help meet college costs.

If a peace program in higher education is not launched promptly, the personal loss suffered by the qualified but rejected applicants will be even more dramatically revealed as society's loss. For, a projection of current trends combined with the opinions of education authorities indicates that by 1970, the United States will be short 200,000 engineers, 100,000 research and development personnel, 56,000 nurses, and a most shocking shortage of 346,800 teachers in higher education alone, according to the National Education Association which will feature this statistic in a study to be released in the near future.

Your generation, like my own, must face the most serious intellectual challenge ever to confront this country and its constitutional institutions. Never before have we been so tested by a totalitarian ideology as we are today by Communists, but it is also my deep conviction that a superbly trained and educated generation benefiting from equal educational opportunity will not only be fully prepared to meet such a test of survival, but will have every capability for decisive success in such a competition.

The number of qualified young men and women who are deprived of a higher education today because of financial problems is about 200,000, including as many as 100,000 who are forced to stop after high school although they are considered gifted by their teachers. We cannot afford to let a higher education become a luxury item in this country. The contribution it makes to the well-being of the individual benefiting from it (the Labor Department says that a college degree is worth an additional $100,000 in earning power during a person's working life) is also clearly reflected in the growth and prosperity of the United States in recent decades.

Last year, Congress passed the National Defense Education Act but so far the loan program provided under it has proved inadequate. This statement may seem surprising in light of the fact that by May 20 of this year, $30.5 million had been appropriated out of a total authorization of $47.5 million for 1958–59. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare estimates that the funds so far made available to 1,200 institutions of higher learning in the 49 States, the District of Columbia, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico can assist some 115,000 students—however, that means the average loan would be about $300 per student, which is insufficient to even pay board for 1 year at the average college.

Nevertheless, the full subscription to this loan program by colleges and universities (which must make available $1 in loan funds for every $9 loaned by the Federal Government) has substantiated the fact that our emergency need for college-trained professionals, particularly in engineering and science, would bring student loan programs into their own with eager acceptance of a "learn now, repay later" plan.

The stage has been set for a realistically scaled loan program with a student able to receive up to a maximum of $1,000 annually, and with an average loan of $750 per student once the plan is firmly underway more than 250,000 college students could be assisted. If it is in operation by 1966, when another projection shows that 279,000—or more than half—of the 508,000 high school seniors in the top fifth of their class will not enter college, it can be the decisive factor in permitting young people from lower income families to continue their studies. Also, of equal importance, it can help in retaining 51,000 students in the same top scholastic percentile who will probably enter but not complete college.

Nevertheless, there will always be a percentage of qualified students who are unable to apply for loan assistance because of family responsibilities or because they are training for a profession where starting salaries are often too low, in their opinions, to permit them to carry the burden of student loan repayment after graduation or for other reasons. For such gifted high school graduates, a national scholarship program is indispensable. No educated man or woman believes that intelligence and income status are inevitably linked to one another. However, there is a marked correlation between a college student's family income and whether or not he receives his degree; HEW has reported that the median income of families whose children completed college was more than $1,000 higher than that of families where the student failed to finish the first registration period—and $500 higher in comparison with the families of students who dropped out later on.

The second half of the 20th century with its challenges, and its promises of greatness stretches before you. Later day historians may well describe the decades before you now as the decisive years for Western civilization which saw the dawn of a new American frontier where the heroes were pioneers in the fields of thought. To us, they will be the teacher, the scientist, the engineer, the lawyer, the researcher, the clergyman, the artist, the philosopher, and, yes, the politician, who is a practitioner of the art of a free society. What we do now in the field of higher education will determine the nature of our history for decades—it is also likely to determine the future of freedom and human dignity on this earth.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I also wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that 30 Senators joined in sponsoring a similar amendment which was submitted in September 1960, to Senate bill 2710. At that time, hearings were held on the bill, but no bill of any sort was reported from the Subcommittee on Education—although I stand ready to be corrected on that point if I am mistaken. But hearings were held on the bill introduced by the former Senator from Texas, Mr. JOHNSON, now our distinguished Vice President; and that bill was almost identical in purpose with the measure which I have placed before the Senate today. So, Mr. President, this measure has been before the committee, and it was endorsed in principle, and also by their actual signatures on the bill itself, by 30 Senators.

I say to the distinguished Senator from Oregon that if he needs something with which to bargain in dealing with the House and with the House conferees, my amendments will give him something with which he can bargain and argue, and I honestly believe that the argument which can be made in favor of the program proposed by these amendments cannot be refuted.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of the time available to me.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. HARTKE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Will the amendments of the Senator from Indiana substitute an FHA-type loan program for the scholarship program?

Mr. HARTKE. These amendments will not in any way affect the scholarship program. Instead, exactly the opposite would be the case. These amendments constitute a substitute only for those who do not have the money which they must have if they are to go to college. These amendments do not require a needs test. We have never had a needs test in the case of housing-fund programs.

Furthermore, my amendments do not provide that unusually high scholarship must be achieved. Instead, my amendments provide a program to enable children to attend college—a program similar to that under which money with which to build houses can be borrowed.

Mr. CLARK. So if the amendments of the Senator from Indiana are adopted, the scholarship provisions will remain intact, will they?

Mr. HARTKE. Yes, they will remain unharmed and intact.

My amendments provide for a program which I believe the Senate should endorse.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. HARTKE. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I commend the Senator from Indiana for making this "FHA" proposal.

I may say that in New York, loans outside of the regular program cover approximately 2,000 students, according to figures which have been placed in the RECORD.

There is, therefore, an area in which such a guarantee program could operate. As the Senator so graciously said, a few years ago I endorsed the fundamental idea. I adhere to that endorsement. I hope it will work out under this amendment.

Mr. HARTKE. I thank the distinguished Senator from New York. I made my statement because I want no claim for originality in this proposal, and no claim for being a person except that of being a loyal follower of those who I think lead wisely.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. HARTKE. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If the Senator's amendment were adopted, we would have three separate operations; first, under the National Defense Education Act, which authorizes loans; second, under the new provision contained in the bill that provides scholarships; third, the establishment of a sort of FHA that will guarantee loans by students for use in going to college.

Mr. HARTKE. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Why does the Senator feel that there ought to be a guaranteed loan program as well as a loan program set forth in the National Defense Education Act?

Mr. HARTKE. The National Defense Education Act has two main differences from the particular measure now pending. The first requires that there be a need established on the part of the student. My amendment would not require that a need be established. No need test is required for Federal housing under the Federal Housing Administration. Second, there would be no requirement that the individual be exceptionally gifted. The money would go to individuals who wanted to go to college, who graduated from high school, but, frankly, had no money, or who took the full responsibility of paying for their education and then repaying it on the basis of a loan.

Mr. LAUSCHE. As I understand, we would have one bureau administering the National Defense Education Act, another administering the gifts, and another the guaranteed loans.

Mr. HARTKE. Most of the administration under this proposal, and practically all of the administration, would be in the hands of the administrators of the colleges. They cannot use their own funds. If they want to borrow from other institutions, they are allowed one quarter of 1 percent, which is included in the loan, which would provide the cost of financing the program through the university.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If the amendment of the Senator from Indiana is adopted, it will mean my amendment has been defeated, and the gift program is fixed. Is that correct?

Mr. HARTKE. The adoption of the amendment would in effect eliminate the amendment of the Senator from Ohio. I think that is true. Whatever further amendments the Senator from Ohio wanted to propose would be in order, of course.

Mr. LAUSCHE. To go along with this amendment would be to yield on what I have been trying to do, and that I cannot do.

Mr. HARTKE. I would enjoy having the support of the Senator from Ohio on this amendment.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes, and I want to make these arguments against the amendment of the Senator from Indiana.

First, I want to say that the Senator has introduced a bill to carry out his purpose, and I assure him that his bill will have hearings before my subcommittee. The only step we have taken thus far has been to ask the departments for reports on his bill. The reports I regret to state are all adverse. The reports by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Treasury Department, go into quite some detail in opposition to the bill.

Nevertheless, we all know that adverse reports from one or more departments do not stop us from seeing that consideration is given to a bill. We frequently recommend a bill over adverse reports. However, this is not the time to consider the bill. The best way to consider the bill is, first, in full hearing before the committee, and I pledge the Senator from Indiana he will get a hearing.

The Senator made reference to hearings in 1960. Let me tell the Senate about those hearings. There were 4 days of hearings on a whole series of bills, somewhat in the same category, but not identical with the bill the Senator from Indiana is talking about, save and except one, and my recollection is that there was really only one witness on this bill who gave any testimony at any great length. As chairman of the subcommittee, I say that those bills did not receive what I am talking about now, a full consideration. They were not reported from the subcommittee. I very respectfully say this, but I should report to the Senate that after we had the last hearing that we held it was the opinion of the subcommittee that there should not be further hearings held on them. That was the decision arrived at. That was the form of action taken.

I pledge to the Senator from Indiana that hearings will be held, but I think a case should be made in support of the bill, rather than the inadequate case which was made in 1960, when really only one witness testified in substance at all. With the departments having made adverse reports, with the departments urging us not to adopt the bill, without having had any hearings before the present committee—and do not forget that the committee has been reconstituted since 1960; there have been considerable changes in the personnel of the committee—in fairness to the committee, I think we ought to insist that the bill of the Senator from Indiana be given hearings and that we get reports.

That is the history of the bill. I shall, in due course of time, but not until the Senator has had every opportunity to use all the time which he has under the rules, move to lay the amendment on the table.

Mr. HARTKE. I call the attention of the Senator to the fact that the bill has been introduced. It bears the number S. 611. Some of the reports from the departments are adverse. Some are rather sketchy. One of the reports expressed the feeling that the original proposal submitted by the President embodied all the proposals which they wanted to present at this time. The other statement was that there was no demonstration that finances could be available or that students would take advantage of this program.

I feel that if this bill was going to be considered, it should have been considered in conjunction with the bill before the Senate at this time.

I am under no illusion that if hearings are held or if action is taken adversely today on the bill, or in this Congress on the bill now before the Senate, and the bill which passed the House a few days ago, that further action in any field to provide for educational participation by the young people will pass in this Congress, or pass until there is another election and another Congress.

I would like to have this measure considered in view of the fact that 30 U.S. Senators who are still here have put their names on it and have endorsed the principles of this measure.

Mr. MORSE. I share the attitude of the Senator from Indiana that the bill should go to hearing. It will go to hearing. But the adverse report from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which is the Department which has assigned to it the primary responsibility of passing judgment upon the substantive value of the bill from the standpoint of its educational implications, certainly is an adequate report. It sets forth the Department's reasons in opposition to the bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the adverse report from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare be inserted at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Department of
Health, Education, and Welfare,
Washington, D.C., January 29, 1962.

Hon. Lister Hill,
Chairman, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: This letter is in response to your requests of January 30, and February 6, 1961, for reports on S. 611 and S. 656, bill "To provide for loan insurance on loans to students in higher education."

These bills would authorize a Federal program of loan insurance on student loans in institutions of higher education, not to exceed $100 million for each of fiscal years 1962 and 1963. The Commissioner of Education would be empowered to issue insurance certificates against a maximum of $1,000 per student for any 1 fiscal year and a gross maximum of $5,000 in unpaid principal for any one student at any given time. The insured loans could be made by any institution of higher education to any student enrolled on a full-time basis. Repayment would begin 1 year after termination of full-time study and is to be completed within 10 years. No security or endorsement would be required unless the minor's signature under applicable State law does not create a binding obligation. Interest not to exceed 4¾ percent per annum would accrue from the date of the note but could be postponed for payment until the first installment payment is due. In addition, the institution at its own option could charge an additional ¼ percent per annum to defray the cost of insurance premiums, thus bringing the potential net interest charge to the student to 5 percent per year.

These bills also would authorize a Federal program of loan insurance on loans made to colleges for student loan purposes, provided that these institutional loans carry a maximum interest rate of not more than 4½ percent per year and are repayable in 20 years; and a revolving insurance fund established at $500,000 initially to contain payment of insurance premiums and other money. This fund would defray the costs of uncollectible loans which have been insured. For each loan insurance certificate, the institution will pay a premium not to exceed one-fourth of 1 percent per year of the unpaid balance of principal and accrued interest on the student loan.

This Department is aware of the value of insurance programs for certain types of student loans, and we have followed the development of State programs with interest. However, we have reservations regarding the value of a Federal program of loan insurance to achieve certain objectives. For example, insofar as the proposed legislation is directed toward insuring existing institutional loan programs, we believe that the high rate of collection already experienced by the colleges makes loan insurance almost unnecessary. At prevailing rates of interest it is doubtful that many institutions of higher education could obtain loans from commercial sources at the 4½ percent maximum rate which can be charged on loans which could be insured under title II of the bill, the reduction, if any, resulting from the Federal insurance would probably be small. Also, all institutions would have to absorb the difference between the higher interest rate they have to pay in borrowing additional loan funds from commercial sources, and the 5 percent maximum interest rate they would be able to charge student borrowers under title I of the bill; this fact would tend to discourage additional institutional borrowing for this purpose, particularly additional borrowing by the financially weaker institutions where the difference in rates would be the greatest and where the ability to absorb such costs would be the least.

We question the value of the proposed loan insurance program as a means of providing additional aid for able but needy college students. The 5-percent interest rate, which accrues during college, places a heavier repayment burden on the student than should be the case. The fact that the bill contains no requirement that the student borrower show a need for financial assistance indicates that it is not addressed to the able but needy student.

Therefore, it appears that the primary value of the loan insurance program that would be authorized by the instant bills would be the encouragement of loans of convenience whereby any student and/or his family may elect to finance the cost of education on a credit basis rather than out of current issues and assets. We would emphasize that the function of granting loans of convenience is today being carried on by commercial banks, insurance companies, and a host of time-payment college financing programs. Within the past 5 years the numbers of these programs have increased several times over. Tuition Plan, Inc., for instance, one of the oldest installment payment programs for college, wrote $50 million in short-term loans in fiscal 1959–60. Thus the provisions of both S. 611 and S. 656 are directed toward that area of financing the costs of a college education in which there is already extensive and expanding commercial activity and, as far as we know, there is no demonstrated evidence of the need for Federal provisions in this particular area at this time.

We are advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely,

WILBUR J. COHEN,
Assistant Secretary.

Mr. MORSE. While the Bureau of the Budget and Treasury reports are brief, that is usually true——

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MORSE. All my time?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The 5 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. I yield myself 3 more minutes.

The reports of the Department of the Treasury and the Bureau of the Budget usually are rather brief. The substantive report really comes from the department which has jurisdiction over an evaluation of the legislative effects of a proposed bill. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare report is adverse to the proposal on its substantive nature.

I think the only place to make a record is in our presently constituted committee, which has never conducted hearings on the bill. I do not share my friend's view that if action is not taken on his bill by way of an amendment today there will be no opportunity for action this year.

After we pass the bill today we shall not close the door to further action on other proposed education legislation this year. In fact, several pieces of proposed education legislation will be before the Senate this year. Some of those will be coordinated with and closely related to the subject matter of higher education in this bill.

Let us consider the national defense education bill. We shall have a debate in the not too distant future on that. It is inextricably bound up with many of the subject matters of this bill.

I say to the Senator from Indiana, I do not think he should be discouraged and pessimistic, in thinking that he cannot get consideration of the bill unless the Senate takes action today.

Mr. President, I have concluded my remarks. I merely say, as chairman of the subcommittee, I consider myself duty bound to make the plea that the bill go to the committee for hearings. I think the most courteous treatment, under those circumstances, parliamentarily, that I could extend to the bill is not to have a judgment passed upon its merits but to have a judgment passed on a parliamentary question. That is why, when the Senator gets through, I shall move to lay his amendment on the table.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, does my distinguished colleague from Oregon feel that the committee would be favorably disposed toward conducting any additional hearings, in length, if we are not successful in obtaining passage of any type of education bill in this Congress?

Mr. MORSE. As I told the Senator, in behalf of the committee, I pledge to him that he will get what hearings he wishes on the bill.

Mr. HARTKE. On the basis of the pledge of the chairman, I yield back the remainder of time, and I withdraw my amendment.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President——

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. Has the Presiding Officer announced the withdrawal of the amendment?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Indiana yielded back the remainder of his time and offered to withdraw his amendment.

Mr. HARTKE. Yes; Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator offered to withdraw his amendment.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Has the Presiding Officer ruled?

Mr. HARTKE. I withdraw my amendment.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Indiana has withdrawn his amendment.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President——

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] and myself, I offer an amendment to the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, between lines 16 and 17, it is proposed to insert the following:

CANCELLATION AMENDMENT

SEC. 202. Section 205(b)(3) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended to read as follows:

"(3) not to exceed 50 per centum of any such loan (plus interest) shall be canceled for service as a full-time teacher in an elementary or secondary school, or an institution of higher education, in a State, at the rate of 10 per centum of the total of the amount of such loan plus interest thereon which was unpaid on the first day of such service for each complete academic year of such service."

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, this is a very simple amendment, insofar as an explanation is concerned, and I shall not take a great deal of time. I yield myself 10 minutes.

I wish to say initially that the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Ohio is similar to the one which is proposed by the junior Senator from New York and by me. We intend to support his amendment, but we think there are certain relatively minor changes which well might be made in order to strengthen it.

Under the National Defense Education Act at the present time those who graduate from college and become teachers in public elementary and secondary schools are forgiven up to 50 percent of their loans on the basis of 10 percent a year. The junior Senator from New York and I propose to make this forgiveness principle applicable to all teachers in all elementary and secondary schools as well as in our colleges and universities. The amendment is as simple as that.

I point out that in administering the national defense student loan program colleges and universities, in providing loans to students, must give special consideration to those students who express a desire to teach in elementary or secondary schools. The priority is given to those who hope to enter the teaching field irrespective of whether they plan to teach in private or public schools.

The National Defense Education Act also provides that up to 50 percent of the loan will be canceled in the event that a graduate of a college or university becomes a teacher in a public elementary or secondary school. A student who wishes to teach in either a public or private school after graduation is given a priority with respect to getting a loan, but only the teacher who teaches in the public school is given the loan cancellation privilege as a result of his teaching service.

We feel this is highly inconsistent and that in all equity any college graduate who receives a loan under the National Defense Education Act and who wishes to teach should be granted the right to forgiveness for up to 50 percent of his loan, regardless of whether he teaches in a public or private college or university. That seems equitable and fair.

The purpose of the act is to encourage young people who graduate from colleges and universities to enter the teaching profession. It seems to me all who enter that profession should be granted the forgiveness loan feature which now applies only to some of them.

We have a very definite shortage of teachers in this country. This is a way to rectify that shortage. All the amendment would do is to make it possible for any college graduate who intends to go into the teaching profession to be granted forgiveness of up to 50 percent of his loan at the rate of not more than 10 percent a year, regardless of whether he teaches in a public or private elementary or secondary school or in a college or university. That is the purpose of the amendment.

Mr. KEATING rose.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished junior Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, as the Senator from Vermont has pointed out, the amendment is very simple. At the present time the only persons who receive the forgiveness are those who go into teaching in an elementary or secondary public school. The amendment would extend that same privilege to those who go into teaching in a private school or to those who go into teaching in a college.

The present distinction in the National Defense Education Act really does not have much meaning or justification behind it. The need for teachers is great in private schools and in colleges. What we seek is the education of all our young people, to bring about a greater standard of excellence and scholarship. The extension of the forgiveness feature to teachers in the other schools seems to me sound and in the national interest. A good many teachers have talked to me about this problem. The discriminatory features of the National Defense Education Act are widely resented. They serve no purpose but to downgrade teachers in our private schools and in colleges and universities. I for one believe that the present limitation is wholly unwarranted.

For example, we can visualize a teacher who has received a loan and is teaching in a private school or college while a classmate who has received a loan, is teaching in a public elementary school or secondary school. The latter will have 50 percent of his or her loan forgiven; the former will not. There is no constitutional or other impediment or problem. The amendment would merely bring about equity.

As I stated in my earlier remarks, I favor the principle of loans as opposed to scholarships; and if the day has come when we must give scholarships to young people in order to get them to go to college, we have reached a pretty sorry state. In college I enjoyed a scholarship that was earned. I worked, too, and I got as much, or probably more, out of what I did in work to get my education as I did from the funds that were given to me; and what was given to me was based upon my maintaining a certain standard.

Under the proposed program a student would not have to keep up any standard of scholarship at all if he could get by. Our desire is to strengthen that scholarship provision and to do what is even more in the interest of the young people themselves than in the interest of the country. It would contribute to the building of integrity and moral fiber, and would make recipients realize the value of an education.

Today the President sent to Congress a message on education and recommended a five-point program which is designed to help improve the quality of American teaching through scholarships, institutes, special project grants, research, and administration projects in the field of education. Every bit of the language which the President has used in his message is equally applicable to teachers in all elementary and secondary schools, and not merely those who are in public schools. The President has not discussed the question specifically, but it certainly appears from his message that he recognizes the need for improved teacher training facilities for private schools as well as public schools and, indeed, for teachers in institutions of higher learning. If such is the case, it is wholly inconsistent with his position not to extend the present loan forgiveness terms for teachers under the National Defense Education Act.

The distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty] and I offer the proposal as an amendment with the feeling that it would improve the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche] and would rectify an injustice. I very much hope that the Senate will see fit to agree to the amendment.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 2 minutes?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. I wish to associate myself with the sponsors of the amendment, and particularly to express my agreement with the principle of nondiscrimination in connection with the loans which are provided. The private colleges are carrying a very large part of the burden of education in this country. In my view it is as important to stimulate the training of teachers for these great private institutions as it is to do so for the teachers of public institutions, who are also doing a great job.

I also wish to endorse the principle of the loan in contrast to the principle of the scholarship. I have had some experience in this field as a trustee for many years of one of our great universities.

For a great many years we provided loan funds for students, and it was very interesting to see the way the program developed. A student would borrow money from the loan fund while he was in college. When he had finished, he would then go to work or enter the practice of a profession. After he had begun to establish himself, his money started to return. Sometimes 20 or 30 years would be required to pay back the loans, but nevertheless the students wanted to do it and they were glad to do it. There was no pressure on them. There was no discipline. Nevertheless, they recognized that they had had the advantage of a loan which was very generous in its terms, and they were glad to recognize the responsibility to pay it back as a token of appreciation for those who had made the loan funds possible.

I do not think our students who would be taken care of under the pending amendment would object at all to the loan procedure in contrast to the scholarship procedure, and I hope that it will prevail.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes, because I want the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty] and the Senator from New York [Mr. Keating] to have the full time available. Whenever I know what our parliamentary procedure will be, I like to give notice of such procedure. After a conference we have reached the conclusion that in due course of time I shall move to lay the Prouty-Keating amendment and the Lausche amendment on the table.

My case against the amendments can be simply stated in the following way: We feel that the appropriate place for the consideration of the subject matter of the amendments is when, in the not-too-distant future, we shall have the National Defense Education Act before the Senate. We shall have a whole series of National Defense Education Act amendments. We think that the subject matter ought to be considered at that time in connection with the National Defense Education Act rather than in connection with the bill now before the Senate.

Therefore, when the proponents of the bill have exhausted all the time they wish to use, I shall move to lay the amendment on the table.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 1 minute to me?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. In my earlier remarks I dealt with the question which has been raised by the distinguished Senator from Oregon as to the timing of the amendment. The amendment of the Senator from Ohio would amend the National Defense Education Act. I see no reason why we have to wait until that bill is before the Senate when we now have the problem before us of whether we are to have scholarships or loans. Since the amendment in chief is before us, having been offered by the Senator from Ohio, it seems to me we should take every step to perfect or decline to perfect the amendment which he has offered. That is the reason we press the amendment, and feel it is appropriate to consider the amendment on its merits at this time.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Chair how much time remains on this side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighteen minutes are remaining to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I think the argument can be summarized very briefly. Consider the example of two students who go to the same college. They have both expressed a desire to engage in the teaching profession after their graduation. They are given special consideration by the college in getting a loan because of that intention. After graduation one teaches in a public elementary or secondary school. His loan would be forgiven up to 50 percent at the rate of 10 percent a year. The second teaches in a private school or a college. He would receive no forgiveness whatsoever. There certainly is a great deal of inconsistency in such an approach. I think it is unfair to those who are not allowed the forgiveness by virtue of the fact that they teach in a college, university, or private school. It seems to be in the interest of fairness to all the students under the proposed program that we extend these benefits across the board so that anyone who graduates from a college and enters the teaching profession will be entitled to receive loan forgiveness up to 50 percent at the rate of 10 percent a year.

I am ready to yield back the remainder of my time. I do ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his yielding back the remainder of his time? I wish to take a minute or two. Perhaps he may wish to speak again.

Mr. PROUTY. Very well.

Mr. MORSE. I yield myself 2 minutes.

I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the RECORD at this point the statement of our committee in its report on National Defense Education Act amendments pending on the Senate Calendar, beginning at page 6 under "Title II: Loans to Students and Institutions of Higher Education."

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TITLE II—LOANS TO STUDENTS IN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

A. Existing law—National Defense Education Act of 1958

Purpose: To increase opportunities for needy and qualified students to continue their education beyond high school by establishing loan funds at institutions of higher education.

Provisions: Undergraduate and graduate students enrolled full time, in good academic standing, and in need of financial assistance and students accepted for enrollment may borrow up to $1,000 a year over a 5-year period. In the selection of students to receive loans special consideration must be given by participating institutions to (a) students with a superior academic background who express a desire to teach in elementary or secondary schools and (b) students whose academic background indicates superior capacity for or preparation in science, mathematics, engineering, or a modern foreign language.

The repayment period begins 1 year after the student ceases to pursue full-time college studies and continues over a 10-year period at an interest rate of 3 percent a year, except that a borrower at his own option may accelerate the repayment of the whole or any part of such loan.

The liability to repay a loan is canceled upon death of borrower, or if he becomes permanently and totally disabled as determined in accordance with regulations of the Commissioner. Scheduled loan repayments need not be paid during periods when the borrower is a full-time college student or during up to 3 years of military service.

Students who become full-time teachers in a public elementary or secondary school are "forgiven" 10 percent of the balance of the loan outstanding on the first day of teaching (plus interest) for each academic year of service, up to a maximum of 50 percent of the loan.

The institution must have in its loan fund at all times at least $1 of institutional funds for each $9 of Federal capital contributions.

The Federal contribution to an institution's loan fund cannot exceed $250,000 a year.

Appropriations now authorized: Under the 1958 act appropriations for this title were authorized as follows:

Fiscal year:	
1959	$47,500,000
1960	75,000,000
1961	82,500,000
1962	90,000,000

For 4 fiscal years thereafter such sums as may be necessary to enable students who had obtained a loan for any school year ending prior to July 1, 1962, to continue or complete their education.

Appraisal: The national defense student loan program has had a significant effect on the 1,400 participating institutions of higher education, and on the lives of many thousands of deserving students in those institutions who are seeking, often against heavy odds, to obtain a college education. It is estimated that as of June 1961 over $130 million were loaned to 230,000 students, an increase of 100,000 student borrowers in 1 year's time. Five years ago, prior to enactment of the National Defense Education Act, 83,000 students throughout the country borrowed only $13.4 million. Last year 115,000 students borrowed nearly four times that amount under National Defense Education Act alone.

Colleges and universities have made remarkable use of this program. Of the 1,400 participating institutions, 630 did not have loan programs on their campuses before passage of the National Defense Education Act. Moreover, many institutions have been encouraged to bring all of their student assistance efforts—grants-in-aid, work opportunities, loans, and scholarships—to bear on the problem of meeting the particular needs of each financially needy student.

The committee is impressed with the testimony it has heard and the evidence submitted by the Office of Education indicating that the student loans are in fact accomplishing the important purposes for which they were intended. First, they are being used to encourage able students to enter college despite financial need. Of the 115,450 loans made in the fall of 1959, 11,133 were originally loan commitments to high school seniors, and of the 115,000 loans made this past fall 18,000 were committed to high school seniors in the spring of 1960.

Second, this program is helping thousands of college students to continue and complete their education. As would be expected, the facts show that 72 percent of the students come from families with an annual income of $6,000 or less. Moreover, by providing loans on terms adjusted to the student status of the borrowers, the program has contributed to a more general acceptance of the loan concept as a means of helping to meet higher education costs. This is evidenced in the dramatic increase in college and State loan programs since the start of this program.

There is also evidence that in a substantial number of cases loans are enabling needy students to devote more of their energies to academic work by eliminating or reducing the number of hours previously devoted to gainful employment.

The "forgiveness" provision for teachers is proving to be an effective instrument to encourage college students to become teachers—63 percent of all the borrowers plan to teach, of whom 31 percent are men and 32 percent are women. Of 86,000 borrowers surveyed 15 percent plan to teach in public elementary schools, 38 percent in public secondary schools, and 10 percent in college.

B. National Defense Education Act Amendment of 1961

Amendment and extension: The committee believes that there will be a continuing need for this type of financial assistance for college students and that the national interest is well served by continued and expanded Federal participation. As pointed out in testimony, college enrollments are expected to double in this decade and college education costs continue to rise. Accordingly, the bill provides for a continuing authorization for this program upon a permanent basis. Over a period of years, however, as the institutions' student loan funds are increasingly augmented through repayment to these funds, Federal and institutional contributions will begin to diminish.

Under the reported bill, the committee has extended and modified the authorizations as follows:

Fiscal year:	
1962	$100,000,000
1963	125,000,000
1964	140,000,000
1965	155,000,000
1966 and thereafter	160,000,000

The bill retains the feature of partial cancellation of loans for borrowers who teach in public elementary and secondary schools and extends this provision to present or future borrowers who after enactment of the bill teach in private nonprofit schools, in institutions of higher learning, or in an elementary or secondary school overseas of the Armed Forces of the United States. The continuing shortage of teachers extends to private nonprofit as well as to public schools and to all levels of our educational system, and this amendment would encourage college students to consider careers in college and university teaching in all types of schools and at all levels.

The committee believes that this will permit a more equitable allocation of loan funds among students in both large and small institutions of higher education.

In order to give emphasis to the fundamental importance of English in the curriculum and in consonance with the findings and declaration of policy in section 101, the act is amended to provide that preference be given, in the selection of students to receive loans, to individuals whose academic background indicates a superior capacity or preparation in English as well as to those who excel in science, mathematics, engineering, or modern foreign languages. The act is also amended to give special consideration to students who express a desire to teach in institutions of higher education as well as in elementary or secondary schools.

Summer session student loan programs: Section 205(b) of the present act reads in part as follows:

"Loans from any such fund to any student by any institution of higher education * * * shall be made only to a student who * * * (C) has been accepted for enrollment as a full-time student * * * or is in good standing and in full-time attendance there either as an undergraduate or graduate student."

Section 144.2(1) of the regulations for the national defense student loan program defines a "full time" student as one who is enrolled in a sufficient number of credit hours or their equivalent to secure the degree or certificate toward which he is working in no more than the number of semesters or terms normally taken therefor.

The Manual of General Information and Instructions (1959–60) for the student loan program further states (p. 11) that—

"A student who is gradually acquiring credits toward a degree by part-time study in regular or evening session, and/or by full-time study in summer sessions only, may not be considered a full-time student."

Thus, the statute, and regulations based thereon, effectively prevent any student from participating in the loan program who attends either part time or on a summer session only basis.

Traditionally, career teachers have been the most active participants in summer session programs. The early professional training programs for teachers, which developed during the 19th century, were based on summer sessions, since the teacher was not available as a student during the months of the school year, from September to June. This same pattern is very much in existence today, for teachers are accustomed to acquiring advanced degrees and training during the summer vacation months. No other professional group in our society continues with as much formal advanced training following career employment.

Many States and most colleges require extensive graduate work as a qualification requirement for certification and promotion. Teachers are encouraged to attain advanced degrees, especially in those areas where subject matter and techniques of instruction have changed radically in the past few years.

For many teachers continued graduate training constitutes a difficult, if not impossible, financial hardship. The level of teacher salaries in many areas requires those with families to seek part-time and summer jobs to supplement income from teaching salaries. For these persons, attendance at summer session programs is virtually out of the question since vacation time must be spent in gainful employment.

The need for financial assistance to teachers attending summer sessions is statistically documented by the following findings drawn from a recent National Education Association report:

National Education Association report on salaries, summer school attendance, and part-time job activities of public elementary and secondary school teachers

I. Average salaries, fall 1960:

A. All classroom teachers	$5,215
B. All elementary schoolteachers	5,034
C. All secondary schoolteachers	5,500
D. All men classroom teachers	5,472
E. All women classroom teachers	5,025
F. All teachers and principles and supervisors	5,389

II. Attendance at summer school, summer, 1960: A 22.2 percent of 1,526,079 or 338,790 instructional staff in public elementary and secondary schools attended summer school.

National Education Association report on salaries, summer school attendance, and part-time job activities of public elementary and secondary school teachers—Con.

III. Part-time work:

A. 27 percent of 1,526,079 or 412,041 instructional staff in public elementary and secondary schools have summer jobs.

B. 15.4 percent of 1,526,079 or 235,016 instructional staff in public elementary and secondary schools have part-time jobs during the school year.

C. 64 percent of 411,109 or 263,110 men classroom teachers have summer jobs.

D. 13.2 percent of 997,853 or 131,717 women classroom teachers have summer jobs.

IV. Academic work required by local school systems, as of 1957:

A. 43.1 percent of 1,408,962 classroom teachers or 607,263 were required by local boards of education to take college courses periodically.

B. An additional 29.8 percent indicated that additional course work was not required by their boards of education but felt considerable pressure to take them.

Extension of present loan eligibility criteria to include full-time teachers enrolled for summer session programs will accomplish these purposes:

1. It will allow for extensive upgrading of instructional personnel through increased teacher attendance in graduate programs.

2. It will enhance the professional development of persons now employed as teachers, thereby providing improved instruction during the regular school year.

3. It will allow many teachers, especially men, to resume graduate training or begin it for the first time.

It should be pointed out that the Congress has earlier recognized the unique characteristics of advanced training for teachers. During the years of the GI bill following the close of World War II only those persons employed as full-time teachers were allowed to interrupt training from one year to the next. All other veterans were required to pursue full-time college programs in consecutive semesters. There is, thus, a definite precedent for the amendment to title II of the National Defense Education Act. The committee, in view of all of these factors, amended the act to provide loan assistance to summer session students who are teachers in elementary, secondary, or higher educational institutions.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in essence what we do in this section of the report on the bill is identical in principle with what the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from New York seek to accomplish by their amendment to the aid to higher education bill.

There is this great difference, however. By seeking to add it to the higher education bill in the form in which they are submitting it, they are in effect defeating the scholarship provisions of the bill. We believe that if it is really a loan provision that they want in respect to National Defense Education Act, with the forgiveness provisions which we provide already in the bill pending on the calendar, we believe we take the proper position by saying that we should wait until the National Defense Education Act is before us for consideration. By bringing it in on this bill it has the effect of really canceling out the effectiveness of the scholarship program.

As I said earlier this afternoon, it defeats the plea of the President of the United States which he specifically made in support of the scholarship program and which I am seeking to defend on the floor of the Senate.

For this reason I believe it is appropriate to consider it in connection with the National Defense Education Act, and that is why in due course of time I will make the motion to which I previously referred.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a table prepared by my office entitled "Federal Financial Assistance to Students for Higher Education."

I will not list the total number, but there are 15 different ways in which the Federal Government at the present time is assisting students to obtain higher education. I believe it is helpful to have this information added in the RECORD during the consideration of this bill and other education bills.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO STUDENTS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

1. Total Defense Department, 1958–59, $300,877,000.

(a) Federal funds expended for education of military personnel while off duty, 1958–59, Air Force, $2,938,434.

(b) Federal funds expended for academic training of military personnel at civilian schools and service academies, 1959–60, $49,567,407. (Estimate.)

2. Atomic Energy Commission awards, total Federal funds expended for educational purposes by the Atomic Energy Commission, 1959–60, $58,451,000. (Estimate.)

3. Geographical field research in foreign areas: No information.

4. International educational exchange programs, total for exchange programs and activities, 1959–60, $29,348.051.

(a) Fulbright and Smith-Mundt programs, 1959–60, $28,902,010.

(b) Additional funds, 1959–60, $446,041.

5. Total Federal funds for National Aeronautics and Space Administration programs, 1958–59, $5,023,000.

(a) Federal funds expended for training at the National Aeronautics and Space Administration research centers, 1959–60, $119,855.

(b) Federal funds committed for National Aeronautics and Space Administration research contracts with educational institutions, 1959–60, $8,420,000.

6. National defense graduate fellowship program, 1959–60, $12,650,000.

7. National defense modern language fellowship program, 1959–60, total Federal funds expended, $499,877.

8. National defense student loan program, Federal funds obligated for the student loan program, 1959–60, $40,700,000.

9. Federal funds for research fellowships, direct traineeships, and training grants awarded by the Public Health Service, 1959–60, $87,602,000. (Estimate.)

10. National laboratories resident research associateships: No information.

11. National Science Foundation, Federal funds obligated for basic research, facilities, and education and training, 1959–60, $143 million. (Estimate.)

12. Quartermaster Corps visiting scientists research associateships: No information.

13. Federal funds expended by the Veterans' Administration for education and training, 1958–59:

(a) World War II veterans, $380,588.

(b) Korean war veterans, $565,984,930.

14. Federal funds expended for training and traineeships in vocational rehabilitation, 1959–60, $6,200,000. (Estimate.)

15. War orphans' educational assistance, 1958–59, $7,663,348.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am ready to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. PROUTY. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MORSE. I yield back the remainder of my time, and I now make the motion that the Keating-Prouty amendment be laid on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. MORSE. They have already been ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The yeas and nays have been ordered on the Prouty amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Then I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion to lay the amendment on the table.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Burdick in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the so-called Keating-Prouty amendment. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Chavez] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright] is necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Chavez] is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea," and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd] is paired with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater]. If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea," and the Senator from Arizona would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender] is paired with the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel]. If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "yea," and the Senator from California would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott]. If present and voting, the Senator from Georgia would vote "yea," and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart] would each vote "yea."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. Capehart], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater], the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper] is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Chavez]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay," and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea.'"

On this vote, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd]. If present and voting, the Senator from Arizona would vote "nay," and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel] is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender]. If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "nay," and the Senator from Louisiana would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] is paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay," and the Senator from Georgia would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 59, nays 28, as follows:

[No. 12 Leg.]

YEAS—59

Anderson
Bartlett
Beall
Bible
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carroll
Case, N.J.
Church
Clark
Douglas
Eastland
Engle
Ervin
Gore
Gruening
Hartke
Hayden
Hickey
Hill
Holland
Humphrey
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Jordan
Kefauver
Kerr
Lausche
Long, Hawaii
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McNamara
Metcalf
Monroney
Morse
Moss
Muskie
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Robertson
Smathers
Smith, Mass.
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Wiley
Williams, N.J.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—28

Aiken
Allott
Bennett
Boggs
Bush
Butler
Carlson
Case, S. Dak.
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dworshak
Fong
Hickenlooper
Hruska
Keating
Long, La.
Miller
Morton
Mundt
Murphy
Pearson
Prouty
Saltonstall
Smith, Maine
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—13

Capehart
Chavez
Cooper
Dodd
Ellender
Fulbright
Goldwater
Hart
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Russell
Scott
Yarborough

So the motion to lay on the table the amendment of Mr. Prouty and Mr. Keating to Mr. Lausche's amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche]. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Chavez] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright] is necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Chavez] is paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay," and the Senator from Georgia would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd] is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender]. If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay," and the Senator from Louisiana would vote "yea."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long] would each vote "nay."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. Capehart], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater], the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 37, nays 50, as follows:

[No. 13 Leg.]

YEAS—37

Allott
Beall
Bennett
Boggs
Bush
Butler
Byrd, Va.
Carlson
Case, S. Dak.
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dworshak
Eastland
Ervin
Hickenlooper
Holland
Hruska
Jordan
Keating
Lausche
McClellan
Miller
Morton
Mundt
Murphy
Pearson
Prouty
Robertson
Saltonstall
Smith, Maine
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—50

Aiken
Anderson
Bartlett
Bible
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carroll
Case, N.J.
Church
Clark
Douglas
Engle
Fong
Gore
Gruening
Hartke
Hayden
Hickey
Hill
Humphrey
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Kefauver
Kerr
Long, Hawaii
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McNamara
Metcalf
Monroney
Morse
Moss
Muskie
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Smathers
Smith, Mass.
Sparkman
Symington
Wiley
Williams, N.J.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—13

Capehart
Chavez
Cooper
Dodd
Ellender
Fulbright
Goldwater
Hart
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Russell
Scott
Yarborough

So Mr. LAUSCHE's amendment was rejected.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was defeated.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I call up my amendment identified as "2-2-62—D." I ask to modify my amendment by inserting between line 7 on page 1 and line 1 on page 7 the following:

On page 6, line 2, before "institution," insert "public."

On page 6, line 3, before "higher," insert "public."

I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with. I think I can make it clear.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the reading of the amendment is dispensed with.

The amendments offered by Mr. ERVIN, as modified, are as follows:

On page 2, line 17, before "institutions" insert "public".

On page 3, line 7, strike out "institutions of higher education or to" and insert in lieu thereof "public institutions of higher education or to public".

On page 3, line 12, strike out "institutions of higher education or" and insert in lieu thereof "public institutions of higher education or public".

On page 6, line 2, before "institution" insert "public".

On page 6, line 3, before "higher" insert "public".

On page 12, line 15, strike out "an institution" and insert in lieu thereof "a public institution".

On page 14, line 10, before "higher education" insert "public".

On page 14, line 1, strike out "(1)".

On page 14, line 13, before "institutions" insert "public".

On page 14, line 16, beginning with ", or (2)" strike out all to the period on page 15, line 4.

On page 38, strike out lines 18 through 20 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(c) The term 'public institution of higher education' means an institution of higher education under public supervision and control, but does not include a school or institution of any agency of the United States."

Strike out the amendment to the title and insert in lieu thereof the following: "A bill to authorize assistance to public institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities, to authorize scholarships for undergraduate study in institutions of higher education, and to provide financial assistance to the States for the construction of public community colleges."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 1 minute to me?

Mr. ERVIN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. After consultation with the various interested Members of the Senate, I am about to propound a unanimous-consent request, to which I ask the Senate to give its consideration: that debate on the Ervin amendment be limited to 20 minutes, 10 minutes to be controlled by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the author of the amendment, and 10 minutes by the Senator in charge of the bill [Mr. MORSE].

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair). Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none, and the request is agreed to.

Mr. ERVIN. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ERVIN. Madam President, the amendment is very simple. It provides that loans of Federal tax moneys authorized to be made by title I of the bill be restricted to public institutions of higher learning.

The purpose of the amendment is to make certain that no funds shall be taken from the Public Treasury for the building of academic facilities at church-owned or church-controlled schools.

I say that my amendment is necessary to make this bill comply with the establishment-of-religion clause of the first amendment.

Everybody admits the Government cannot take funds and make absolute gifts to church-owned or church-controlled institutions of higher learning. The proponents of the bill contend, however, that while the first amendment prohibits the grant of tax moneys to church-owned or church-controlled schools, it permits soft, easy, low-interest-rate loans over long periods of time, such as 50 years or 100 years or 1,000 years, to be made to church-owned or church-controlled schools.

That argument is not flattering to the intelligence of the Founding Fathers who drafted and ratified the first amendment. It places a very low estimate upon their linguistic and legal abilities. If it were valid it would show that the Founding Fathers did not do what they intended to do. We know from the testimony of Thomas Jefferson exactly what the Founding Fathers intended to do when they drafted and ratified the first amendment. Thomas Jefferson has said they intended to erect a wall of separation between church and state. They did erect a wall of separation between church and state. That wall will stand until constitutional truth is rewritten or nullified to comply with the demands of those religious groups which demand that they be given access to the Treasury of the United States and be permitted to use tax funds to finance their activities.

Madam President, there is no basis whatever under the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States for any argument that the amendment, which prohibits gifts, permits loans.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time the Senator allotted to himself has expired.

Mr. ERVIN. Have my 10 minutes expired?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It was the understanding of the Chair that the Senator had asked for 3 minutes.

Mr. ERVIN. No. I yielded to myself my entire time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may proceed.

Mr. ERVIN. Madam President, the Supreme Court of the United States declared, on page 16 of the Everson case, that neither the Federal Government nor a State government is permitted by the first amendment to aid any or all religions. Madam President, it is absurd to argue that if the Federal Government makes a long-term loan, a low rate loan, to a church-owned or a church-controlled college and that church-owned or church-controlled college, by reason of the loan, accumulates fee simple title to valuable land and valuable academic buildings that the Federal Government is not aiding the church-owned or church-controlled college.

The Supreme Court of the United States has also declared that the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States forbids government to finance religious groups. Madam President, it is absurd to assert that the Federal Government is not financing church-owned or church-controlled colleges when it loans them money out of the Federal Treasury to build buildings of any character for any purpose and collects from them payments upon the principal of those loans and payments for interest on those loans. That is certainly financing church-owned or church-controlled colleges.

The Supreme Court of the United States declared, on page 16 of the Everson case, that the first amendment forbids government from participating in the affairs of religious organizations. When the Federal Government loans money to church-owned or church-controlled colleges for the purpose of building academic facilities of any character for any purpose, and collects from those colleges interest and payments upon the principal of loans, it is certainly participating in the affairs of those religious organizations.

The Supreme Court has declared in two cases—page 314 in the Zorach case and page 212 in the McCollum case—that the first amendment prohibits the Government from participating in the blending of secular and religious education. In a dissenting opinion which is not controverted by the majority opinion on this point, Mr. Justice Rutledge, declares that the reason we have these church-owned or church-controlled colleges is so that they can teach both religion and secular courses, and that any institution which teaches both secular courses and religion is barred from the right to receive Government tax aid under the first amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Madam President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ERVIN. I have very limited time.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It is a brief question.

Mr. ERVIN. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Would the Senator's amendment have any effect upon the loans which are now being made by the Housing and Home Finance Agency for the building of dormitories?

Mr. ERVIN. No, because it is restricted to the pending bill. It is not related to anything being done under other bills.

Madam President, after I pointed out that the bill is a bald violation of the first amendment, the proponents of the bill advanced the theory that a church-owned or church-controlled college could segregate secular education from religious education and say, "This building represents a nonreligious activity of this college," and that building represents a religious activity of this college, and obtain loans for the construction of buildings of the first class.

That is precisely what Justice Rutledge said could not be done. Consequently, the Morse-Hill amendment does not harmonize the bill and the first amendment.

Madam President, if the Congress, whose Members have sworn to uphold the first amendment to the Constitution, should pass this bill in its present form; and if the President, who has repeatedly assured the American people that he believes in the separation of church and state, should sign this bill in its present form the resulting statute would mark the first major break-through for those religious groups which have been demanding that they be given access to the Federal Treasury and permitted to finance their activities with tax money.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 10 minutes of the Senator from North Carolina have expired.

Mr. ERVIN. May I have 2 minutes more?

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I will yield the Senator 2 minutes from the time on the bill.

Mr. ERVIN. Madam President, the issue raised by my amendment is very simple. No Senator should have any trouble reaching a decision as to how he should vote thereon. If a Senator favors giving religious groups access to the Treasury of the United States and permitting them to use tax moneys to finance their activities, he ought to vote against my amendment. However, if a Senator does not believe in giving religious groups access to the Federal Treasury and permitting them to finance their activities with tax moneys, he ought to vote for my amendment. This is true because my amendment makes it plain that no religious groups shall be permitted to place their hands in the Government till where tax moneys are deposited.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, I yield myself 2 minutes from the time on the bill. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from North Carolina a question.

Under the amendment, I take it the University of Chicago, which is a private university, could not get a loan.

Mr. ERVIN. That is true.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yale University, which is a private university, could not get a loan.

Mr. ERVIN. That is true.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Could Harvard obtain a loan?

Mr. ERVIN. No.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Northwestern University, which I believe has something of a denominational tag, could get no loan?

Mr. ERVIN. I do not know about it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Duke University, which is located in the State of the Senator, could receive no loan?

Mr. ERVIN. The Senator is correct. I might say to the Senator from Illinois that the universities he has mentioned are in sounder financial condition than the United States.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am also thinking of the small institutions that are spreading and need funds for academic purposes, but if they are not public institutions, but are privately endowed, no matter what their condition is, they would be excluded from the benefits of the bill.

Mr. ERVIN. The Senator is correct. The reason I have offered the amendment in that form is to make it certain that no religious institution would have access to the Treasury of the United States. I might say that under the decisions there is also some serious doubt whether Congress has authority to make provision for the support of private colleges on the theory that tax money can only be used for public purposes, and that the use of such money by a private nondenominational college is for a private purpose.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I shall reply briefly to my friend from North Carolina. I hope that the Senate will reject the amendment shortly. In my judgment, the Hill-Morse amendment, which was added yesterday to the bill, is the answer to the Senator from North Carolina. It would accomplish, in my judgment, the legitimate purpose that the Senator has in mind without doing damage to a large number of young men and women going to private colleges in this country. I point out that 40 percent of the college students in America today are going to private institutions. Sixty percent of the colleges of America today are private institutions. Yesterday we agreed to the Hill-Morse amendment, which reads as follows:

> (2) The term "academic facilities" shall not include (A) any facility intended primarily for events for which admission is to be charged to the general public, (B) any facility used or to be used for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship, or (C) any facility which (although not a facility described in the preceding clause) is used or to be used primarily in connection with any part of the program of a school or department of divinity. For the purposes of this subparagraph, the term "school or department of divinity" means an institution, or a department or branch of an institution, whose program is specifically for the education of students to prepare them to become ministers of religion or to enter upon some other religious vocation or to prepare them to teach theological subjects.

I say that that amendment gives us our protection of separation of church and state. I do not yield to any other Member of this body, including my very dear friend the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] in support of the principle of separation of church and state. We have protected that principle through the Hill-Morse amendment.

I point out that we protected the principle also in connection with other loans that we have made through Congress.

The distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] raised a point a minute or two ago. We have loaned money totaling $1,565 million-plus to the college housing program. Yesterday an attempt was made by my good friend from North Carolina to draw some line of distinction between facilities for the care of students on the campus and some other facility on the campus. I good naturedly said to him: "Of course, there cannot possibly be a university without students, and there can be no students unless we provide the facilities with which to care for them." The $1,565 million-plus involves many millions of dollars in loans to private institutions.

The Senator from North Carolina loses me in a matter of form when he tries to draw a distinction between what we have already done in college housing programs and what we propose to do in the program before us. Note also that under the bill we have the appropriation check in Congress. Under the provisions of the bill any private institution desiring to obtain a loan must come to the Federal Government, submit its plan for the loan, show what the loan will go into and what kind of building it will be spent on. We have all these safeguards. So I do not think there is any danger whatsoever in connection with the fear which the Senator has expressed here today. What I have said is in no way inconsistent with any decision that the U.S. Supreme Court has rendered.

I point out another area in which we have made millions of dollars available. Let us consider the National Defense Education Act and the amount of money that we made available under that program. Let us also consider other Federal expenditures. So long as we have safeguards and protections, we need not worry about the fears expressed on the floor of the Senate by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN].

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, has joined with us in bringing the bill to the floor of the Senate. The vote to do so was 10 to 2. He is a man whose views on the issue of the separation of church and state are well known. I am sure I can speak for him when I say that if he had the slightest idea there was any danger that the bill would violate the principle that the Senator from North Carolina has advocated here this afternoon, the Senator from Alabama would not be standing shoulder to shoulder with me in opposition to the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. RANDOLPH and Mr. PASTORE addressed the Chair.

Mr. MORSE. I yield first to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph] and then I shall yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Madam President, this question was thoroughly explored in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and in the Subcommittee on Education. The Senator who now speaks with knowledge in reference to this particular proposal, the Ervin amendment, will recall that no one more assiduously attacked this situation to find the answer which would be justifiable under the Constitution than did the Senator from West Virginia. I made a rather extended speech on this subject yesterday afternoon. I am thoroughly satisfied that, by the adoption of the Hill-Morse amendment, the protection of the principle of separation of church and state is adequate.

No one on the committee was more cognizant of the significance to our time of the fundamental principles so wisely adopted by the Founding Fathers of our Republic as they enshrined in our Constitution the protections of the first amendment. The solutions to safeguard this precious principle in the pending bill which have been adopted are to the best of my belief both real and wholesome. I had wrestled with this problem in subcommittee and in full committee, as my votes in executive session will show, in a determination that the limits in our Constitution should not be overstepped. The bill as now drafted I feel sets forth in the educational area a sound policy which flows directly from the philosophy of our founders.

With all deference to my colleague the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin], I must say that basically we are in agreement, but certainly I believe that the language of the bill as now drawn, to which I have referred, is comprehensive and leaves no loophole. I am satisfied, and shall vote with the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from West Virginia has been very helpful to me, and I very much appreciate his help.

I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. Madam President, is it fair to assume from the argument made by the senior Senator from Oregon that, insofar as Federal loans are concerned to institutions of higher learning and students who attend—let us say, Georgetown University—under the testimony there is no distinction between the room in which a student sleeps and the room in which he studies chemistry?

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct.

I have only one further point to make and then I shall close. As was brought out by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen], the Ervin amendment would also apply to the many private institutions in this country that are not denominationally sponsored. Such a provision would be most unfair and unjust in its result. My friend from North Carolina has spoken about the financial status of great institutions like Duke, Chicago, and Columbia Universities. The costs of education are ever climbing. Those universities are rendering a great service to this country by developing to the maximum extent possible the potential brainpower of their students. We ought to be partners with them, to the extent provided in the bill, to see to it that the precious brainpower resources of our country are not wasted.

Mr. MILLER. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. I should like to ask the Senator whether or not the interest provisions for the repayment of the loans in the pending bill are identical with those in the National Defense Education Act relating to the construction of dormitories.

Mr. MORSE. It has been worked out very carefully with the Treasury Department, so that we have a formula which gives us assurance that the interest is high enough to pay for the cost of the use of the money.

Mr. MILLER. I should like to ask the Senator whether or not it is the same formula that is used for the dormitory provisions in the National Defense Education Act.

Mr. MORSE. No. It provides for an interest rate as high, but this is a different formula. It was submitted by the Treasury Department with respect to this bill. It is an adjustable formula which gives assurance that the cost of the use of the money is covered, so that there is no hidden interest subsidy in the bill.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. I yield back the remainder of my time on the amendment.

Several Senators. Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. Neuberger in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin], as modified. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Chavez] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright] is necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd]. If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "yea," and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Chavez], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] would each vote "nay."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. Capehart], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater], the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater], the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 15, nays 72, as follows:

[No. 14 Leg.]

YEAS—15

Bennett
Bible
Byrd, Va.
Cannon
Eastland
Ervin
Hayden
Hickey
Jordan
McClellan
Robertson
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower

NAYS—72

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Beall
Boggs
Burdick
Bush
Butler
Byrd, W. Va.
Carlson
Carroll
Case, N.J.
Case, S. Dak.
Church
Clark
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Douglas
Dworshak
Engle
Fong
Gore
Gruening
Hartke
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Humphrey
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Keating
Kefauver
Kerr
Lausche
Long, Hawaii
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McNamara
Metcalf
Miller
Monroney
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Saltonstall
Smathers
Smith, Mass.
Smith, Maine
Sparkman
Symington
Wiley
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—13

Capehart
Chavez
Cooper
Dodd
Ellender
Fulbright
Goldwater
Hart
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Russell
Scott
Yarborough

So Mr. Ervin's amendment, as modified, was rejected.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. Madam President, it was more than two centuries ago that John Pope made the observation:

> 'Tis education forms the common mind;
> Just as the twig is bent the tree's inclined.

Both before his time and since, the need for and benefits of education have been generally conceded. Tracing the history of this country, it is patently obvious that credit for the progress we have made can, in large part, be laid to the growth and extent of education. Our modern day society offers challenges never before conceived. Our race headlong into space, with a landing on the moon at least an intermediate objective, raises technical problems of complexity surpassed in number only by the dollars required to make the space vehicle airborne. Closer to home, we have only to look at the myriad of fabrics devised to clothe us, cover our floors, wrap our foodstuffs; the appearance of computers and calculators, and a host of innovations taking place around us—to be convinced that education plays an integral part in the proper advancement of society.

S. 1241, the bill we are being asked to consider, has as its objective a three-pronged attack on the alleged needs of our college level educational system. In the first place, it proposes assistance, in the form of loans, to public and private, nonprofit, institutions of higher education; secondly, scholarship grants to high school students to assist them in securing a college education; and, finally, a formula of matching Federal-State grants to assist the construction needs of junior colleges. On those terms it is conspicuously all embracive.

Judging by the hearings held on this bill, it would appear that those associated with our colleges and universities today are in uniform agreement that Federal funds offer the only solution to the construction needs presently besetting them. The bill's provisions on that score offer loans up to $1.5 billion over a 5-year period for college academic facilities including construction, expansion, or improvement of classrooms, laboratories, libraries, and related facilities, as well as necessary equipment. Loans are parceled out on a State basis, and provisions are made for repayment to the U.S. Treasury within 50 years at a very modest rate of interest. Other provisions assure that the money will not be spent on frills, that construction will be along frugal lines, and that a condition precedent for eligibility will eliminate those institutions capable of securing private financing. The companion program for assistance to junior colleges is far less broad and consists of a $250 million fund to be spent over a 5-year period, on a matching fund basis. In my own State we could look forward to a Federal allotment of $456,597 in the event Colorado would match that sum with $913,194. Unquestionably, this could go a long way toward meeting rudimentary needs, although I am informed that in addition to construction problems, some of the institutions in Colorado, at least, also have a pressing need for assistance in the area of housing needs which are not being met.

As a coauthor of the National Defense Education Act, I am keenly aware of the fact that buildings, classrooms, and other physical equipment do not of themselves form a college or university. It is the student body which forms the basis for the need and the continuing demand for such institutions. In my judgment, the obligation of educators today, on all levels from elementary through graduate schools, is to afford our youth the opportunity to extract the maximum learning to the extent of their abilities. Implementing this obligation must be private sources, as well as State and local funds. In the event none of those channels is responsive for lack of funds, then it behooves the Federal Government to fill in the breach. But, it should be made very clear that the opportunity to secure an education—within the youngsters' abilities—is not tantamount to the guarantee of a diploma for one and all, particularly at the college and graduate level, for such is not the case. On the contrary, education's goals should afford the right to schooling based upon the product of the individual's innate ability combined with the motivating force which drives him. So long as these factors exist, opportunities to satiate the thirst must be provided if we as a nation are to produce, progress, and perform.

As the scholarship portion of the bill is written, it would permit State boards, established for that purpose, to make awards based upon two criteria: ability and need. I take exception to the latter criterion. Realizing full well the basic obstacle which is sought to be overcome, nevertheless I caution my colleagues that we may be extremely nearsighted in our approach. We would do well to consider the fact that scholarships, in general, serve two purposes, the more obvious of which is to furnish students with an opportunity to attend institutions of higher learning, who, absent this assistance, might not attend. Although, parenthetically, I might add that even private scholarships do not, uniformly, attach the need requirement. Be that as it may, the more subtle purpose is the general stimulus which scholarships prompt. Naturally, each and every school wants to capture its share of these awards, with the result that there is a built-in incentive to raise the quality of the school's products in order to meet the competition. This is an exceedingly important and healthy factor, not to be overlooked. The net effect is to upgrade the standard of educational institutions generally. My concern is with the "need" requirement; my conclusion being that it will tend to reduce the stimulus which might otherwise be present. Despite the sliding scale implicit in the bill from a maximum of $1,000 per year to the minimum of a certificate, this whole approach represents an inherent weakness which ought to be remedied. It is to lose sight of the most important objective, namely, encouraging the able; and discriminatory, in a sense, to eliminate those worthy of recognition simply because they may come from families with means. I can foresee, as all of you can, the difficulties, well-nigh insurmountable, in deciding where the need line must be drawn.

The bill, apart from defects which I have attempted to underscore, has merit, and I will give it my support. My personal observations lead me to the conclusion that education today lays too much stress upon cultivating the average, giving inadequate opportunities to those who offer evidence of brilliance. I sometimes wonder whether, in the main, education does not assume the nature of an educational tranquilizer. However, I expect to have more to say on that subject on another occasion.

Mr. GRUENING. Madam President, I offer an amendment to S. 1241 which would increase allotments in high-cost States such as Alaska. I ask that the amendment be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 30, it is proposed to insert the following:

> Strike out "and" on line 15 and insert the following on line 17 after ".75" and before the semicolon:
>
> ", and (iii) the allotment ratio of any State shall be .50 for any fiscal year if the Commissioner finds that the cost of school construction in such State exceeds the median of such costs in all the States by a factor of 2 or more as determined by him on the basis of an index of the average per pupil cost of constructing minimum school facilities in the States as determined for such fiscal year under section 15(6) of the Act of September 23, 1950, as amended (20 U.S.C. 645), or, in the Commissioner's discretion, on the basis of such index and such other statistics and data as the Commissioner shall deem adequate and appropriate."

Mr. GRUENING. Madam President, the amendment I propose would apply only to junior colleges.

It is designed to accommodate those States where the high cost of living and the soaring cost of construction impede progress. The language I suggest is identical to that which was contained in S. 1021 as it was reported by the committee and as it passed the Senate last session.

My amendment permits the Commissioner of Education to aid those States where the cost of school construction exceeds the median of such costs in all the States by a factor of two or more. The Commissioner determines the median on the basis of an index of the average per pupil cost of constructing minimum school facilities as has been determined previously under law.

During the debate on S. 1021, I stressed that we in Alaska seek no special favors. We ask only that the unique aspects of our economy be taken into account as legislation is considered.

The unbearably high costs of transportation to Alaska can increase costs by as much as 100 percent above what is charged in other areas of the United States. Decades of indifference prior to statehood have deprived Alaska of Federal funds other States received automatically. Our lack of proper highways, our dependence on water and air transportation, have increased the cost of living in Alaska.

Our schools in the 49th State are scattered throughout four time zones. The Alaska State Board of Education has stated:

> In most instances people, supplies, equipment, building materials, and fuel must rely upon airplane transportation.

Many times such transportation must be chartered, and this factor increases the cost of construction.

When a person comments that wages are high in Alaska, I agree. Then I explain that the cost of living within the State can vary from 30 percent to more than 100 percent over the average cost in most other States. We must never forget, nor neglect, to consider the extent of purchasing power.

It is common, perhaps, to bracket Alaska with wealthier States such as New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, and Illinois, but let us then recall that $500,000 spent in any of these four great States will buy a great deal more than an equal amount spent in Alaska.

The National Education Association has studied the per-pupil cost of education. I am not surprised that Alaska leads the Nation in this dubious honor. The amendment I propose will make it possible for Alaska to participate equitably and equally in the educational activities of the New Frontier.

We need the College Academic Facilities and Scholarship Act as we seek to educate our youth. We cannot expect this Nation to attain its maturity if its college facilities are substandard or, worse, nonexistent.

In his state of the Union message, President Kennedy told us that college enrollment would double in 10 years. He quoted H. G. Wells who once wrote:

> Civilization is a race between education and catastrophe.

The President has passed the educational relay stick to the Congress. Let us not drop it during this important lap.

In his introductory remarks on S. 1241 the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] expressed his belief that the mobilization of our intellectual resources in this decade can be more crucial to the Nation's future than was mobilization of physical resources in World War II. Probably no other Member of the Senate is better able to assess the true value of education than is the able chairman of the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

He approaches the Nation's need realistically, and it is on such a basis that I urge the adoption of my amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I am willing to accept the amendment and take it to conference, because the amendment is identical with the formula which we adopted in S. 1021 with respect to the recognition of extraordinarily high costs of construction in Alaska.

The amendment means that Alaska will get a $6,031 increase in matching funds, for which it will have to contribute $12,062 of its own money. The amendment merely brings the two formulas into line. It is fair and equitable. I accept the amendment and I am willing to take it to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Alaska.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1134, H.R. 8300.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (H.R. 8900) to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that all after the enacting clause of H.R. 8900 be stricken and that the text of the Senate bill, as amended, be substituted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, on the passage of the bill, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I yield 5 minutes on the bill to the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman].

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, I think it is quite relevant to the program on which we are about to vote to be reminded of the college housing program which provides for direct loans at low interest in the development of housing and related service facilities for students and faculty where such assistance is not otherwise available on equally favorable terms. The program also includes assistance to hospitals in providing housing for student nurses and interns.

The program was established under title IV of the Housing Act of 1950. The law was amended by the Housing Act of 1955 to cover loans for such revenue-producing educational facilities as cafeterias, dining halls, student centers, and infirmaries, but excluded stadiums and gymnasiums. This law also contained specific provisions to bring into the program junior colleges offering at least a 2-year program acceptable for full credit toward a baccalaureate degree. The Housing Act of 1957 extended eligibility to hospitals for housing facilities for student nurses and interns.

Program policies are directed toward assuring the soundness of all loans and thereby the full protection of the interest of the Federal Government, private lending institutions, and the borrower; and toward avoiding any interference with the applicant institution's academic policies and operations. Particular emphasis is given to the encouragement of the applicant's participation in the financing of the project, in order to minimize the required Federal investment.

INTEREST RATES

Initially, the interest rates charged on college housing loans were established by a mandatory formula specified in the Housing Act of 1950. The Housing Amendments of 1953 provided for their determination by the Administrator. The Housing Amendments of 1955 reestablished a mandatory formula under which the Administrator may establish a loan rate of 2.75 percent or the rate charged by the Treasury on program borrowings plus 0.25 percent, whichever is higher. Under the statute, the Treasury borrowing rate is fixed with reference to the average interest rate on all interest-bearing obligations of the United States. Outstanding loan commitments accordingly carry a variety of rates, dependent upon the rate in effect at the time the original undertaking was made. The current interest rate—applicable until June 30, 1962—is 3⅜ percent.

COLLEGE HOUSING LOAN FUND

The program is financed through a revolving fund which is supported by an authorization to borrow from the Treasury as a public-debt transaction. The initial enactment in 1950 provided a borrowing authorization of $300 million; this amount has been increased on several occasions to a total of $1,975 million, which amount shall be increased by $300 million on July 1 of each of the years 1962 through 1964. Within the total current program authorization, there are two specific sublimitations: First, loans for service facilities other than living accommodations, such as cafeterias, dining halls, student centers, and infirmaries, shall not exceed $205 million, which amount shall be increased by $30 million on July 1 of each of the years 1962 through 1964; and second, loans to hospitals for housing of student nurses and interns shall not exceed $130 million, which limit shall be increased by $30 million on July 1 of each of the years 1962 through 1964.

The unused balance in the college housing loan revolving funds as of December 31, 1961, is $183,314,000.

PROGRESS OF PROGRAM THROUGH DECEMBER 31, 1961

As of December 31, 1961, the college housing program had contracted for a total of $1,565 million of loans to colleges, and $37 million of loans to hospitals for student nurse and intern housing. In addition commitments have been issued to colleges and hospitals for $190 million. Under existing contracts, Federal loans will be used to build 376,811 accommodations under the college dormitory program, and 8,081 accommodations for student nurses and interns.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of my remarks tables showing, first, State totals under the college housing program cumulative since its beginning; and, second, activity under the program for calendar years 1960 and 1961 by States.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the Record, *College housing program—Cumulative totals through Dec. 31, 1961*

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

State	Colleges			Hospitals			State	Colleges			Hospitals		
	Number	Amount	Number of accommodations	Number	Amount	Number of accommodations		Number	Amount	Number of accommodations	Number	Amount	Number of accommodations
Alabama	35	$29,577	7,719	1	$372	124	Nebraska	13	$5,471	1,243	2	$1,015	292
Alaska	2	2,920	339				Nevada	1	2,042	400			
Arizona	13	15,398	4,286				New Hampshire	6	5,959	1,364			
Arkansas	33	23,555	5,493	1	500	207	New Jersey	25	28,814	6,161	4	1,905	296
California	64	106,784	26,771	2	392	29	New Mexico	13	9,828	1,721			
Colorado	39	42,227	9,799				New York	100	141,832	30,090	13	9,296	1,538
Connecticut	11	15,739	2,680				North Carolina	44	36,644	12,552	1	585	40
Delaware	5	4,404	1,375	1	250	48	North Dakota	9	6,006	1,818			
District of Columbia	12	16,204	2,988				Ohio	79	79,148	22,446	5	2,029	472
Florida	29	39,040	10,523	1	200	98	Oklahoma	19	16,317	3,919	2	725	176
Georgia	27	22,936	6,977	3	2,645	672	Oregon	20	12,014	2,621	2	940	137
Hawaii	3	1,249	220				Pennsylvania	92	82,214	20,322	8	4,395	1,187
Idaho	10	4,632	752				Puerto Rico	6	8,243	1,662			
Illinois	68	73,659	17,403	4	2,277	508	Rhode Island	11	10,863	2,042			
Indiana	41	61,405	12,377				South Carolina	20	14,520	3,609			
Iowa	26	14,656	4,200				South Dakota	23	13,189	4,130	1	480	100
Kansas	46	29,523	7,156	5	1,786	430	Tennessee	35	26,127	9,514			
Kentucky	40	38,573	9,382				Texas	100	101,610	26,298	1	356	92
Louisiana	32	47,443	9,915				Utah	14	12,150	2,574			
Maine	2	680	225				Vermont	16	10,650	2,503			
Maryland	14	12,132	3,275	2	621	185	Virginia	18	10,153	2,545	3	913	361
Massachusetts	41	50,825	8,768	1	300	60	Washington	38	51,374	10,563	1	498	20
Michigan	23	35,234	8,575	2	523	44	West Virginia	33	18,632	4,158			
Minnesota	27	27,614	6,606	2	1,035	270	Wisconsin	24	41,341	9,776	2	600	164
Mississippi	28	25,694	7,251				Wyoming	1	635	136			
Missouri	59	64,477	15,146	4	1,791	414							
Montana	17	12,800	2,493	1	776	117	Total	[1]1,507	1,565,156	376,861	[1]75	37,205	8,081

[1] Combined projects are listed separately.

College housing program—Approval comparison between 1960 and 1961

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

State	Colleges						Hospitals					
	Calendar year 1960			Calendar year 1961			Calendar year 1960			Calendar year 1961		
	Number	Amount	Number of accommodations	Number	Amount	Number of accommodations	Number	Amount	Number of accommodations	Number	Amount	Number of accommodations
Alabama	6	$6,665	1,416	14	$12,033	2,703	1	$372	124			
Alaska	1	1,750	168									
Arizona	3	6,000	1,522	1	500							
Arkansas	4	5,160	1,312	6	4,122	904						
California	6	10,955	1,377	19	28,381	5,627				1	$165	14
Colorado	3	2,602	753	8	11,329	2,323						
Connecticut	5	7,552	979	2	3,250	621						
Delaware	1	1,190	550	1	335		1	250	48			
District of Columbia				2	3,700	750						
Florida	2	1,280	438	9	12,541	2,208						
Georgia	2	877	289	11	7,910	2,558				1	1,750	500
Hawaii				1	172	56						
Idaho	3	720	142	2	2,095							
Illinois	7	12,950	2,571	11	10,420	2,387	2	1,500	364			
Indiana	2	1,855	440	11	19,760	3,802						
Iowa	1	230	72	7	4,975	1,062						
Kansas	4	1,720	512	11	6,985	1,693	1	742	156	2	500	144
Kentucky	7	5,898	1,378	9	12,433	2,463						
Louisiana	3	5,509	1,075	9	16,984	3,959						
Maine				1	350	128						
Maryland	1	345	97	4	3,290	628	1	151	60			
Massachusetts	6	6,335	714	13	23,771	3,932	1	300	60			
Michigan	2	2,190	485	7	11,200	3,544						
Minnesota	3	2,985	722	5	5,745	1,181				1	725	200
Mississippi	4	2,015	666	8	6,693	2,240						
Missouri	7	7,273	1,365	16	23,927	5,812				2	666	114
Montana	4	4,693	692	2	1,495	296	1	776	117			
Nebraska	2	1,175	214	4	1,620	342	1	500	156			
Nevada												
New Hampshire				2	1,390	316						
New Jersey	6	8,230	2,129	6	7,220	1,351	1	500	106	2	905	88
New Mexico	3	1,435	188	2	2,550	536						
New York	14	22,301	5,925	18	31,630	6,341	2	1,375	232	3	4,160	437
North Carolina	3	3,371	1,220	14	11,790	3,784				1	585	40
North Dakota	1	1,200	436	2	1,650	423						
Ohio	10	9,298	2,454	21	26,410	8,098	1	500	114	1	670	150
Oklahoma	4	1,615	335	5	5,610	1,572				1	225	56
Oregon	2	1,610	360	5	3,564	661				1	440	33
Pennsylvania	12	11,286	2,268	21	23,306	5,841				3	1,650	242
Puerto Rico	2	1,275	319									
Rhode Island	2	1,785	452	2	1,720	229						
South Carolina	4	1,015	292	3	3,394	1,367						
South Dakota	2	2,475	550	5	3,220	936						
Tennessee	4	5,950	2,075	9	7,232	2,075						
Texas	7	6,529	1,534	29	29,408	7,066						
Utah	2	975	172	1	425	120						
Vermont	3	3,575	889	3	1,675	373						
Virginia	1	670	160	6	3,931	832	2	761	255			
Washington	3	2,771	476	12	21,805	4,311				1	498	20
West Virginia	8	5,356	1,089	5	2,512	356						
Wisconsin	3	1,255	223	5	10,505	3,139	1	350	92			
Wyoming				1	635	136						
Total	185	193,901	43,495	371	437,598	101,082	16	8,077	1,884	20	12,939	2,088

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I am ready to yield back the remainder of the time available to me on the bill, if the minority leader is ready to do likewise.

Mr. LAUSCHE. First, Madam President, will the Senator from Oregon yield briefly to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Madam President, based upon the arguments I have made in support of my belief about the infirmities of title I, although I believe in titles II and III, I still cannot vote for this bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, I yield back the remainder of the time under my control.

Mr. ERVIN. Madam President, will the Senator from Oregon yield 1 minute to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from North Carolina.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from North Carolina is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. ERVIN. Madam President, believing, as I do, that title I of this measure violates the establishment-of-religion clause of the first amendment of the Constitution, I cannot vote for the bill, notwithstanding my belief in its other provisions.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I yield 1 minute to the able Senator from West Virginia.

CRIME IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. RANDOLPH. Madam President, last Friday, during the debate as recorded on page 1354 of the RECORD of February 2, a timely comment was expressed by the knowledgeable Senator from Oregon concerning juvenile delinquency and crime. The floor leader for this important pending legislation indicated that the youth in relationship to the growth of population have an aggravated record for lawbreaking. It was his belief, which I share, that a stronger educational system will mitigate against this tragic trend.

In this connection a comprehensive article has come to my attention which sets forth the disturbing facts and figures in regard to the rates of increase among the population between the ages of 10 and 17 in the United States.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article dealing with this subject. It was written by Bernard Gavzer, an Associated Press news features writer; and I ask unanimous consent that in printing the article there be included the various statistical tables in connection with it.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE LIVE IN A CRIME EXPLOSION

(By Bernard Gavzer)

WASHINGTON.—Since the end of World War II, the U.S. population has increased by 39 million, the gross national product (GNP) has reached a record $503.2 billion a year.

In this period, we shot our first rocket into space, found an answer to polio, added two States to our Union, and put a television set into practically every home.

It was also the era of the crime explosion.

What you can see and hear of it is staggering.

What you can't see is bigger.

This is what Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy and FBI Chief J. Edgar Hoover are talking about when they say crime ranks high among the Nation's major domestic problems.

FBI statistics for 1961 are not yet complete—and won't be until late February or early March—but it is already clear that it will go down as another year in which crime has continued the spiral begun in 1946.

The crime bill, says Hoover, now amounts to more than $60 million a day.

To most people, the word "crime" means violence. The murderer, the burglar, the sex offender makes a direct assault. His crime strikes close to home. The victim has a name.

But this is only one part of crime. There are two other broad areas:

Big time organized crime.

Nonviolent, white-collar crime.

All have been on the rise.

The evidence indicates that the greatest increase has been in white-collar and organized crime.

Says Hoover: "We can trace our increasing crime rates today primarily to two malignant conditions—public apathy and moral deterioration or decay of our population."

And Attorney General Kennedy comments: "The television quiz scandals of several years ago; the basketball scandals; the corruption the McClellan committee found in important parts of labor, management, and the bar; the revelations that members of the Denver Police Department were themselves operating active and lucrative burglary rings, and this after similar revelations in Chicago; the corruption of public officials—all of this must be a source of sorrow and concern to every one of us."

Hoover and Kennedy have a special vantage point. Into their offices in the Department of Justice pours the daily story of breakdown in law and order. Bit by bit it comes together into an overwhelming picture. This is what they see:

ORGANIZED CRIME

A multibillion-dollar industry. The vice lords are no longer Al Capone-type loudmouths but shrewd manipulators who keep out of the public eye, wear banker's gray, send their kids to private schools and take European jaunts. They traffic in extortion, labor racketeering, narcotics, prostitution, bootlegging, gambling, and anything else that can turn a profitable dollar. They have steadily invaded legitimate businesses.

Illegal gambling alone produces a yearly profit of $7 billion. The handle, or amount of money gambled, comes to an estimated $47 billion—or more than the 1960 U.S. defense budget.

Its power and riches outclass anything organized crime could have dreamed of in the lawless prohibition era.

Organized crime, says Kennedy, is richer, more firmly entrenched and more powerful than ever.

WHITE-COLLAR CRIME

Because of its nature, white-collar crime is the most difficult to spot. But there are ways to measure it.

The Surety Association of America represents firms which bond people in positions of trust. It estimates that $1 billion a year is stolen by persons in such positions. This loss is nearly twice the amount caused annually in all known burglaries, robberies and auto thefts put together.

The Association of Better Business Bureaus says that schemers—fast-buck operators of all sorts—take the public and business for $1.5 billion every year. It's done through such gimmicks as stock frauds, fake charities, questionable diet aids, fake cures, various mail order dodges and so on.

CRIMES AGAINST PERSONS, PROPERTY

These are the crimes that fill the Nation's police blotters.

The serious offenses are murder, forcible rape, aggravated assault, burglary, robbery, larceny over $50 and auto theft.

One serious crime is committed every 15 seconds.

Hoover points up the dimensions of the crime explosion by placing it alongside the population.

Since the end of World War II, the U.S. population increased by a little more than a third.

In 1946, there were 931,894 known serious offenses. In 1960, there were 1,861,300—an increase of nearly 100 percent.

In 1946 the crime rate (which is the number of offenses per 100,000 population) was 685.5. In 1960, the rate was 1,037.9—an increase of 56 percent.

The figures are gathered from more than 7,000 local law enforcement agencies by the FBI, which began the job in 1930.

Who causes crime?

Attorney General Kennedy says all segments of society are involved, and adds:

"No one group can point to another and say: 'There lies the fault.'

"No one section of this country can say: 'We are clean. They are corrupt.'

"No one financial or economic group can plead innocence."

Identifying the white-collar criminal is particularly difficult. He—or she—can be the secretary tapping the petty cash box for daily lunch money or the State official raiding the State's treasury for millions.

They are often the last people in the world to be suspected of wrongdoing—and usually they are the last to be discovered.

The crimes against persons and property—murder, burglary, rape, etc.—are increasingly laid to two specific groups: Negroes and juveniles.

The picture of their involvement comes from arrest figures.

They pose one of the paradoxes in crime. They have virtually no role in white collar and organized crime—the ones which produce corruption, cheat the public and eat away at the Nation's moral fiber. But they loom large in the area of crime that is quickly translated into headlines.

The role of the Negro in crime is shown in arrest figures for 1960, a year in which Negroes comprised about 10.5 percent of the total population. The figures are from 2,446 cities containing 46 percent of the Nation's population.

Crime	White	Negro
Murder	1,536	2,511
Rape	2,459	2,778
Aggravated assault	15,856	26,819
Robbery	10,994	14,155
Burglary	66,130	33,536
Larceny	129,158	65,063
Auto theft	32,271	10,601

There have been many explanations of the Negro involvement in crime. They blame pressures and conditions which restrict Negroes to the worst housing, poorest education, lowest-paying jobs, second-rate social status and the postwar population shift in which Negroes—as well as other citizens—found themselves in new environments with the added problem of trying to adjust to new ways.

The criminologist-sociologists Harry Elmer Barnes and Negley K. Teeters, in their "New Horizons in Criminology," comment:

"Any appraisal of crime among Negroes must be prefaced by the evidence, amassed through the years in innumerable studies primarily by sociologists, but also by authorities dealing with Negro-white relationships, of prejudice, discrimination, and differential treatment in law enforcement. This is true in both the North and South. Although there are many factors to be considered, there is no doubt that differential treatment of Negroes by arresting authorities, magistrates, juries and judges, plays an important part in assaying the crime rate of this vast minority group."

Arrest figures also show juveniles getting involved more and more on the wrong side of the law. These figures are based on age alone, and include those who comprise the statistics on race breakdowns. In the 1959-60 period the number of juveniles between the ages of 10 and 17 increased from 17.4 million to 25.1 million. But in the same period, Hoover says, the number of arrests in which they were involved more than doubled.

"This is an era when teenage terrorism has become so commonplace that the American public has virtually a shock resistance to vicious murders, rapes, assaults, robberies, and, in fact, the entire spectrum of atrocities committed by young people," Hoover says. "The brutality of crimes committed by teenagers certainly pales the all-inclusive pampering, palliative phrase of juvenile delinquency which is used today."

"There are many reasons why so many young people are prone to crime," say Barnes and Teeters. "Our socioeconomic structure is potent for disorganization and frustration. Old-fashioned family discipline has broken down and many parents themselves are bewildered by the changing mores. Divorce and desertion are on the increase, leaving as an aftermath many disoriented children.

"The complexity of our civilization, the increased contacts and stimulation of urban life, new concepts of education that develop a premature spirit of sophistication without a philosophy of self-discipline—all must be reckoned with."

Some of this reckoning may come in a new $30-million, 3-year program—backed by President John F. Kennedy—to combat juvenile delinquency. The money will be used to study a great variety of approaches, as well as training people, from police specialists and psychologists to probation officers and social workers.

Disturbing as the crime explosion has been, there is an even more depressing consideration:

What's known is the failures of crime—the people who get caught, the misdeeds that are discovered.

There's still the part that is unknown and unrecorded. It may be the biggest part of the crime explosion.

ARRESTS OF PERSONS UNDER 18

Percentage of change, 1955-60

	Increase
Larceny	61
Robbery	49
Burglary	44
All sex offenses	41
Aggravated assault	39
Murder	37
Auto theft	26

Age 10-17 population increase 25 percent, 1955-60.

Type	Estimated crime offenses, 1946 compared to 1960		Number of offenses per 100,000 population	
	1946	1960	1946	1960
Murder	9,814	9,136	7.0	5.1
Forcible rape	10,992	15,555	7.8	8.7
Robbery	66,002	88,970	47.1	49.6
Aggravated assault	78,148	130,230	55.8	72.6
Burglary	382,530	821,057	273.1	457.9
Larceny (over $50)	166,388	474,911	118.8	264.8
Auto theft	218,020	321,402	155.7	179.2

AID FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1241) to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities and to authorize scholarships for undergraduate study in such institutions.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Madam President, before relinquishing my time, I again express approval of the dignified and determined manner in which the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] guided this vital measure to final rollcall. Passage of the bill, which I sense will be by a substantial majority, will be an investment in higher education which will provide a dividend for an improved economy and an enlightened citizenry.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I thank the Senator from West Virginia for placing the article in the RECORD. I have read it, and I am glad to have it made available to the Senate for ready reference, because the article deals with a number of the problems with which the Senate will have to deal when it acts on the subject of juvenile delinquency.

I also wish to take this opportunity to express to the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] my deep and continuing appreciation for his wise counsel and stanch support in subcommittee, in committee, and on the floor during this debate. No one is in a better position to testify than the Senator from Oregon that upon many of the complex problems which faced us at each stage of the parliamentary process all of us paid great heed to the sage advice we received from the Senator. I wish to pay particular tribute to his steadfastness of principle in adhering to the dictates of his conscience as we explored the constitutional issues relating to church and state. The determinations were not easy ones from the political standpoint, but to the Senator from West Virginia they were easy from the moral standpoint, since he based his position squarely upon the principles which the Founding Fathers wrote into our great Constitution. I honor and respect him for the steadfastness he has shown over these many busy and trying days of hard work as this legislation was shaped on the anvil of conscionable compromise.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, most Senators, I feel, have been during the days of this debate receiving many messages from citizens and organizations in support and in opposition to the various titles of S. 1241. The senior Senator from Oregon has likewise been the recipient of such sincere statements of conviction on the part of individuals and organizations.

Although as a Senator and as floor leader of the administration's bill, I cannot share many of the diverse positions expressed to me, I wish to express my appreciation to those who have written me upon these important matters. I respect the sincerity with which they advance their views and I want them to know that I have given careful consideration to the viewpoints expressed. Because I feel that it is important for the holders of these various positions to have their statements before the Senate in connection with S. 1241, I ask unanimous consent that these statements, letters, and telegrams to which I have alluded be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 5, 1962.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Although not opposing Federal aid to private colleges we believe S. 1241 unwise and unconstitutional even with Morse-Hill amendment because it authorizes loans and supplementary scholarship grants for institutions wholly owned and controlled by religious organization. S. Ervin amendment or equivalent seems necessary unless religious organizations excluded otherwise.

GLENN L. ARCHER,
Protestants and Other Americans United for Separation of Church and State.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Will you please support House of Representatives bill for classrooms and laboratories for independent colleges.

FRANK E. MCCASLIN,
Vice Chairman, Board of Trustees, Lewis and Clark College, Portland, Oreg.

FEBRUARY 6, 1962.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I object strenuously to our Government's spending any of my hard-earned tax money for any sort of aid to any privately owned schools or colleges. When I wish to contribute I can do so personally and deduct the contributions from my income tax.

MYRA A. PAINE.

FEBRUARY 3, 1962.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

May I urge your support of House bill 8900 for matching grants and money for academic buildings for higher education when being discussed in the Senate.

DORIS BURLINGHAM.

FEBRUARY 2, 1962.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Would appreciate your supporting the House version of aid-to-education bill. Obviously, as a small college trustee, I am interested in scholarships but believe they should be discussed separately.

DAVE ABRAM,
Senior Vice President, U.S. National Bank of Portland.

FEBRUARY 2, 1962.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

As a Lewis and Clark trustee, I naturally am interested in the aid-to-education bill. Your support of the House version would be beneficial to a host of struggling independent colleges.

E. J. KOLAR,
President,
U.S. National Bank of Portland.

PORTLAND STATE COLLEGE,
Portland, Oreg., February 1, 1962.
Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Recalling your appearances at the college, and the strong leadership you have exerted in behalf of American education, I cannot pretend to a feeling that it is necessary to urge your support of legislation to provide Federal assistance to higher education, particularly when the bill in question is the Morse-Hill act. Nevertheless, I send this note to indicate that Oregon relies heavily upon your influence, and to say that we hope the Congress will take this step to help the State meet the very urgent needs facing our rapidly expanding institutions of higher learning.

Sincerely yours,
BRANFORD P. MILLAR,
President.

PORTLAND OREG., *February 1, 1962.*
Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

SIR: As a member of the board of trustees of Lewis and Clark College I am strongly in favor of the college aid bill as passed by the House of Representatives. This would furnish the colleges with the means of filling their greatest need—that of classrooms.

I do not oppose student aid where needed but classrooms are our greatest need and the bill should not be scuttled because of controversial amendments.

I am strongly opposed to the proposition that the Government should say what should be taught in the classrooms—removing this freedom of choice from our independent, private institutions of learning.

Very truly yours,
FRED H. SLATE.

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION,
New York, N.Y., February 5, 1962.
Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We note from the New York Times of February 3 that Senator ERVIN has objected on church-state separation grounds to S. 1241, a bill to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities, and to authorize scholarships for undergraduate study in such institutions.

I trust I may be forgiven for recalling to you that I testified on this bill before your subcommittee on August 21, 1961, outlining in detail the union's view that Federal aid to church-related institutions of higher education might constitutionally be provided to those which satisfy specific criteria showing them to be education rather than religion centered. Our policy statement of course appears in the printed record of your subcommittee's hearings; for your ready reference I enclose another copy.

The ACLU position turned out to be of such great interest to Senators HILL and RANDOLPH, who were present when I appeared before your subcommittee, that they allowed me considerably more time than I had expected to be given. Significantly, our position has been commented on favorably in a number of editorials, such as the one enclosed which appeared in the January 15, 1962, issue of the Des Moines Tribune.

Since the question raised by Senator ERVIN is a major one, is it too much to hope that the union's carefully thought out proposal be presented to the Senate?

Whether or not you yourself find merit in it, we should appreciate your presenting it on our behalf and having it read into the RECORD.

Yours sincerely,
PATRICK MURPHY MALIN,
Executive Director
(Signed in Mr. Malin's absence).

[From the Des Moines (Iowa) Tribune, Jan. 15, 1962]

U.S. AID TO EDUCATION

President Kennedy, in his state of the Union message, again gave his backing to the Federal school aid bill which failed to get approval at the last session. This bill proposed spending $660 million in general aid for education, including money for public school teacher salaries and buildings.

It is generally recognized that this bill is dead because of the dispute over whether aid should go to parochial schools as well as public schools.

The major administration drive at this session will be for aid for universities and colleges to improve instruction in primary and secondary schools. The proposed $100 million aid would include scholarship grants to teachers for special training at universities; money to finance short institutes at colleges for advanced study by teachers; grants to colleges for research and demonstration projects.

Similar proposals were made at the last session of Congress. However, all the major aid to education plans were lumped in one bill, in the vain hope that this strategy would result in aid for classroom teachers and school construction. The proposals will be offered separately at this session.

The new approach is wiser, because each aid program should be considered on its merits.

The position of the American Civil Liberties Union on school aid makes clear the distinction between aiding parochial elementary and secondary schools and aid to colleges and universities.

The ACLU opposed Federal aid to parochial elementary and secondary schools on constitutional grounds. It said these schools are "created for the precise purpose of communicating a body of religious teaching (and) are meant to nurture and fortify the faith of children already linked with the religious group."

The ACLU, however, found no constitutional barrier to Federal aid to church-related colleges and universities. It believes such aid is constitutional provided that: students and faculty members are not required to be members of the religious faith with which the school is linked; religious indoctrination is not a required part of the curriculum; and the curriculum is determined by those with educational, rather than religious, responsibilities.

We believe that the distinction the ACLU draws between the parochial schools and church-related colleges is a valid one.

STATEMENT OF THE AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION ON S. 1241

(By Patrick Murphy Malin)

The American Civil Liberties Union has examined S. 1241, a bill "to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities, and to authorize scholarships for undergraduate study in such institutions."

As a civil liberties organization we do not pass upon the propriety of the extension of Federal aid to either public or independent institutions of higher education. We address ourselves primarily to the question as to whether advantageous loans (which in our view are no different in principle from outright grants) for the building of academic facilities by church-related institutions of higher education, the granting of scholarships to students who attend such institutions, and the payment of an accompanying stipend to a church-related institution, are permissible under the "no establishment" clause of the first amendment.

TITLE I. LOANS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF ACADEMIC FACILITIES

We note that S. 1241 authorizes the granting of low-interest long-term loans for academic facilities including sites, which may total in the aggregate $300 million the first year and rise to $1,200 million by 1965; that not more than 12½ percent of each year's appropriation may be allotted to institutions of higher education within a single State, and that the Commissioner is left free to decide how loan funds in each State shall be allocated among public, independent, and church-related institutions of high education.

Title I as a whole constitutes an unprecedented massive Federal aid program designed to strengthen the country's colleges and universities, both public and private, and is so drafted as to give the Commissioner maximum discretion in the selection of recipient institutions.

Section 106 merely specifies that to qualify as an institution of higher education, a college or university must (1) admit as regular students only individuals who have a certificate of graduation from a secondary school, or its equivalent; (2) be authorized by the State government to provide education beyond the secondary level; (3) provide an educational program leading to a bachelor's degree; and (4) have been accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency listed by the Commissioner.[1]

S. 1241 sets down no guidelines whatsoever to aid the Commissioner in determining whether a loan may be granted to a particular church-related institution of higher education without violating the "no establishment" provision of the first amendment. The ACLU believes such guidelines are needed to distinguish between institutions whose function is palpably a religious one and those others which, though church-sponsored, offer an educational program that can be defended as such.

In function and program, it is possible to draw a line of demarcation between church-controlled elementary and secondary schools, on the one hand, and on the other, those church-related colleges and universities which are education centered. In a statement on the Federal aid to education bill, submitted on March 23 to your subcommittee, the union said in part: "Our belief that subsidization of church schools would violate the establishment clause of the first amendment rests upon the very nature, and understandable purpose, of church-controlled schools. They are created for the precise purpose of communicating a body of religious teaching. They are meant to nurture and fortify the faith of children already linked with the religious group. They have additional functions to be sure. But they exist primarily to assure that children of school age will receive religious instruction and will be shielded from competing ideologies and values."

As compared with church-controlled elementary and secondary schools, church-related colleges and universities may in some instances be sufficiently different in degree to be different in kind. Institutions of higher education may be distinguished from the typical church-controlled lower school if (a) students and faculty members are not required to be adherents of the religious group with which the institution is linked; (b) indoctrination in the tenets of a particular faith is not a required part of the curriculum; and (c) determination of the instructional program is committed to the hands of those charged with educational rather than religious responsibilities. An institution that unconditionally meets those minimal standards may properly be characterized as educational, whether or not it was founded by or is now governed or financed (in whole or in part) by a religious group.

---

[1] The last sentence of (e)(4) of sec. 106 reads: "For purposes of this paragraph the Commissioner shall publish a list of nationally recognized accrediting agencies or associations which he determines to be reliable authority as to the quality of education or training offered." On grounds of academic freedom, the ACLU believes that the Commissioner should "list those accrediting agencies which to his knowledge are regarded in educational circles as reliable authority concerning the quality of education or training offered."

It is the union's view that Federal aid to institutions of higher education which truly meet the above criteria, even though conducted by religious groups, would not be contrary to the separation mandate of the first amendment, whereas Federal aid to institutions which place the inculcation of religious doctrine over and above the demands and standards of higher education should clearly be denied such aid on constitutional grounds.

The union therefore urges your subcommittee to incorporate in title I of S. 1241 a new section setting forth the criteria which a church-related institution of higher education would be obliged to satisfy in order to qualify for Federal aid. Each such institution should be required to present evidence in proof of its having met the conditions. It would then be the duty of the Commissioner to evaluate the evidence and determine whether the institution was primarily concerned with providing a higher education administered by a faculty for the benefit of students, without regard to the church or nonchurch affiliation of either group; or alternatively, with indoctrinating the tenets of the sponsoring religious group. Such a test would automatically rule out schools of theology, schools of divinity, or religious seminaries sponsored by one or more denominations.

TITLE II. SCHOLARSHIPS FOR COLLEGE STUDENTS

With regard to the scholarship program covered in title II of S. 1241 (in the form of amendments to title II of the National Defense Education Act), the union sees no civil liberties objection to the provision in section 207 that "an individual awarded a scholarship under this part may attend any institution of higher education which admits him." Just as we have held that under the free-exercise-of-religion clause of the first amendment, students receiving funds through the GI bill of rights should be allowed to choose their institution without regard to whether it was public, independent, or church-related, we believe that on the same grounds students qualifying for either loans, scholarships, or fellowships under the National Defense Education Act should be left free to choose the institution of higher education at which they wish to study, with the sole exception of schools of theology and religious seminaries.

In S. 1241, equal treatment of applicants for Federal scholarships is insured by the provisions (secs. 221 and 226) that recipients be selected by State commissions on the basis of "objective tests and other measures of ability and achievement." This is consistent with section 108 of title I, which precludes Federal control of a beneficiary institution of higher education. Both provisions meet with our approval on civil liberties and in particular academic freedom grounds. We urge, however, on church-state separation grounds, that section 228, which provides for a $350 "cost of education allowance" to be paid annually to the institution as an accompanying stipend for each scholarship student, be revised to exclude church-related institutions of higher education which fail to meet the criteria outlined on page 3.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTION

It has been argued that large-scale, long-term, low-interest loans for the building of academic facilities by institutions of higher education, including those which are church related, is a justifiable and proper extension of the dormitory loan program authorized by the Housing Act of 1950. While the ACLU did not in 1950 challenge this section of the Housing Act, we hold that a provision which is of questionable constitutionality should not be extended indefinitely. It is the union's view that in enacting the Housing Act of 1961 the Congress should have amended title IV so as to make loans to church-related colleges for the building of dormitories and other student facilities, dependent on the same conditions which we urge for the granting of loans for academic facilities.

Whether or not your subcommittee sees fit to revise S. 1241 so as to restrict the granting of loans and accompanying stipends to those church-related institutions which satisfy specified educational criteria, the union trusts that you will at least revise the bill so as to provide for prompt judicial review of a suit filed by a taxpaying citizen. Such a provision was included in S. 1482, a bill introduced on March 20 by Senator Clark to authorize general building loans for private, nonprofit elementary, and secondary schools, on which hearings were scheduled by your subcommittee for April 18, but canceled.

We note that S. 1241 in section 105(c)(2) provides that the Commissioner may "be sued in any court of record of a State having general jurisdiction or in any district court of the United States, and such district courts shall have jurisdiction of civil actions arising under this title without regard to the amount in controversy." Our interpretation of this provision is that it would enable an institution of higher education or a college building agency which had a contract with the Commissioner to sue him, but that it would not give the same right to an aggrieved taxpayer. Without such a specific provision as was included in Senator Clark's bill, a citizen who believed either that the act was in contravention of the first amendment, or that the Commissioner had erred in his application of such educational criteria for church-related institutions as may have been included, would have no standing in court.

The union concedes that public and congressional interest has been focused on the School Assistance Act and a proposed expansion of the National Defense Education Act which would authorize special building loans to nonpublic, including parochial, schools. In our view the church-state aspects of the college bill, S. 1241, also call for your subcommittee's—and the Congress'—most earnest consideration. As recently as June 19 of this year, the Supreme Court made clear that it holds to its dictum in *Everson* (330 U.S. 1, 1947) that: "No tax in any amount, large or small, can be levied to support any religious activities or institutions, whatever they may be called, or whatever form they may adopt to teach or practice religion."

While the Torcaso case concerned not education, but a religious oath, Justice Black in his opinion went out of this way to say for an undivided Court that it has not altered its view on either its dictum in Everson or its decision in *McCollum* (333 U.S. 203, 1948) where it said:

> We are all agreed that the 1st and 14th amendments have a secular reach far more penetrating in the conduct of Government than merely to forbid an established church. We renew our conviction that we have staked the very existence of our country on the faith that complete separation between state and religion is best for the state and best for religion.

Should the Congress, ignoring the Supreme Court's reaffirmed, broad interpretation of the no-establishment clause, breach the wall of separation by authorizing aid either to church lower schools or to religion-centered institutions of higher education—and without even providing for judicial review—it would show a deplorable disregard for constitutional principles.

Mr. **MORSE**. Madam President, I yield back the remainder of the time under my control.

Mr. **DIRKSEN**. Madam President, I have done likewise.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. All remaining time on the bill has been yielded back.

The question now is, Shall House bill 8900 pass?

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. **HUMPHREY**. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Talmadge] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Chavez] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Chavez], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd]. If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay" and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell] is paired with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long]. If present and voting, the Senator from Georgia would vote "nay" and the Senator from Missouri would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Talmadge] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough]. If present and voting, the Senator from Georgia would vote "nay" and the Senator from Texas would vote "yea."

Mr. **DIRKSEN**. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. Capehart], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater], the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Capehart], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] is paired with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "yea," and the Senator from Arizona would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 69, nays 17, as follows:

[No. 15 Leg.]

YEAS—69

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Beall
Bible
Boggs
Burdick
Bush
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Carroll
Case, N.J.
Case, S. Dak.
Church
Clark
Cotton
Dirksen
Douglas
Engle
Fong
Gore
Gruening
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hickey
Hill
Humphrey
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Jordan
Keating
Kefauver
Kerr
Long, Hawaii
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
Metcalf
Miller
Monroney
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Saltonstall
Smathers
Smith, Mass.
Smith, Maine
Sparkman
Symington
Wiley
Williams, N.J.
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—17

Bennett
Butler
Byrd, Va.
Curtis
Dworshak
Eastland
Ervin
Holland
Hruska
Lausche
McClellan
McNamara
Robertson
Stennis
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.

NOT VOTING—14

Capehart
Chavez
Cooper
Dodd
Ellender
Fulbright
Goldwater
Hart
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Russell
Scott
Talmadge
Yarborough

So the bill (H.R. 8900) was passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities, to authorize scholarships for undergraduate study in such institutions, and to provide financial assistance to the States for the construction of public community colleges."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments and ask for a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MORSE, Mr. HILL, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. CLARK, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. GOLDWATER, and Mr. JAVITS conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate bill 1241 will be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. BIBLE. Madam President, I was happy to support the important legislation, which has just passed the Senate, realizing that it represents a notable step forward in meeting the ever-growing problems of our education system at the undergraduate level.

With enrollment constantly expanding far beyond the capacity to meet today's needs, our colleges desperately need the type of assistance we are providing in this measure.

In Nevada, for example, the university could borrow, in each of 5 years, a total of $368,147 for construction, improvement, and rehabilitation of academic facilities.

Under terms of title II, my State would receive 33 scholarships during the next fiscal year, amounting to $23,100, while in the next 4 years it would receive 251 scholarships worth an additional $175,700.

An important part of our higher educational system in Nevada is the southern branch of the University of Nevada, located in Las Vegas. This school would be eligible for grants of $48,596 a year for the next 5 years.

It is my considered judgment, Madam President, that we are only fulfilling our responsibilities by providing our schools with the necessary tools to keep America's educational system abreast of the times and superior to any comparable system on earth.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I wish at this time to compliment the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] who has once again demonstrated his skill and field generalship in piloting a most difficult bill through the Senate.

I think the success of what has been accomplished in this and other measures relating to education is due in large part to the knowledge and skill displayed by the Senator from Oregon. I feel I would be remiss in my duty if I did not extend to him especially, and to the rest of the committee generally, my thanks for a job well done. That takes in the membership on both sides of the committee. My commendation extends to the Members of this body on both sides of the aisle, because there was nothing in the way of a dilatory tactic, there was nothing in the way of a stalling maneuver. Everybody cooperated; the Senate did a good job, passed a good bill, and I think is to be commended.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I appreciate the kind remarks of the majority leader. I respond with no flattery, with no spirit of performing a formality; but I respond from my heart when I say that I appreciate very much the leadership and the direction that I received in connection with whatever I might have done in respect to taking this bill through the Senate yesterday and today.

I was really directed, assisted, and inspired by the majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD] and the chairman of the full committee, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], because without their assistance the present moment would never have arrived on the bill.

I also join the majority leader in expressing my appreciation to all the members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Democratic and Republican alike, because this was a bill which was the product of long hours of hearing and executive sessions in subcommittee and in the full committee, and the hammering out on the anvil of conscionable compromise on the bill that we had before us, which in no way sacrificed a single important educational principle.

I think the Presiding Officer and the Members of the Senate who are now present in the Chamber know that, after all, Senators do not do these jobs alone, and that the basic research, the foundation work, is done by loyal, dedicated staff members who serve us so well in committee and on the floor of the Senate. There are many who could be mentioned, and undoubtedly should be mentioned, but I wish to mention especially four professional staff members who were of assistance throughout the debate, and give my thanks too as chairman of the subcommittee.

I refer to Mr. Jack Forsythe, the very able and brilliant legal member of the staff of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; and Mr. Charles Lee, who is the education adviser to the committee, and who has performed distinguished service for the committee. Also I wish to express my deep appreciation to the counsel for the minority, Mr. Mike Bernstein and Mr. Raymond D. Hurley, who, as I have been heard to say in committee, and repeat on the floor of the Senate, serve the Republicans on the committee in keeping with their obligation, but who also recognize that they have an obligation to serve all members of the committee, as do Mr. Forsythe and Mr. Lee. Many times when, as a Democrat on the committee I needed assistance that I knew Mr. Bernstein in particular was qualified to give me, he has never hesitated to give me his honest judgment. I wish to thank him on the public record for the work he has done on the staff.

Next I wish to mention Mr. Stewart McClure, the staff director, and each and every one of the staff members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

I do not know how we could possibly bring together a finer group of dedicated servants to the Senate than the members of that staff.

I wish further to pay tribute to the excellent staff assistance which has been provided by Commissioner McMurrin of the Office of Education and his associates. They have given us every cooperation, at all times, in furnishing data and expert advice on the many technical aspects of the bill. To them and to Mr. Peter W. Le Roux, of the Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate, the subcommittee owes a great debt of gratitude.

Let me say in closing that I believe that every Senator who participated in the debate—those who opposed the majority on some issues as well as those who participated on the side of the majority in the debate—have demonstrated one of the most outstanding examples of a high-order debate in the Senate.

I express to them and to all my colleagues in the Senate my appreciation for their wholehearted cooperation and their understanding of my shortcomings.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns tonight, it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF WELFARE AND PENSION PLANS AND DISCLOSURE ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 891, S. 2520, the Welfare and Pension Plans and Disclosure Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2520) to amend the Welfare and Pension Plans and Disclosure Act with respect to the method of enforcement and to provide certain additional sanctions, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, after consultation with the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN], the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], and other Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle, including the chairman of the committee who will handle this measure, I should like to propound a unanimous-consent request.

I ask unanimous consent that a unanimous-consent agreement, in the usual and customary language, allowing 1 hour for each amendment, motion or appeal, the time to be equally divided between the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], who I understand has several amendments in mind, and the majority leader, and 1 hour on the bill, the time to be equally divided, be entered, effective tomorrow at the conclusion of the calendar call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none; and, without objection, the unanimous-consent agreement is agreed to.

The unanimous-consent agreement, as subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That, effective on Wednesday, February 7, 1962, at the conclusion of the calendar code, during the further consideration of the bill, S. 2520, the so-called Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act Amendments of 1961, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided*, That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further*, That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided*, That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, no action will be taken on the pending measure tonight. After the call of the calender tomorrow and consideration of the Senate resolutions which have to do with the maintenance of committees the Senate will turn to the consideration of S. 2520, and the amendments thereto. There will be no votes tonight.

Mr. TOWER. Madam President, I call up my amendment to S. 2520, numbered 1-23-62—B, and ask that it be stated. Pursuant to the previous agreement made with the majority leader, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be made the pending question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 17, it is proposed to strike out "twenty-five" and to insert in lieu thereof "one hundred".

On page 5, beginning with line 1, it is proposed to strike out through the word "by" on line 6.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. TOWER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The purpose in offering the amendment at this time, as I understand, is to make it the pending question. There will be no discussion on the amendment or the bill before the Senate until after the consideration of measures on the call of the calendar tomorrow and the consideration of the resolutions pertaining to Senate committees.

ORDER FOR REFERRAL OF S. 2650, RELATING TO SPACE COMMUNICATIONS FACILITIES, THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITES AND THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSED BILL, AND FUTURE PROPOSED LEGISLATION, TO THE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Madam President, on January 11 the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences introduced S. 2650, which concerns space communications facilities. Hearings on that bill have been announced to start before the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee on February 26.

In introducing S. 2650, the chairman of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences asked and obtained unanimous consent that the bill be referred to his committee, and in doing so, related to the Senate that he had had some discussion with me on the question of committee jurisdiction.

At first glance there would seem to be no possibility of conflict, for without question jurisdiction over launch vehicles is in the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences and jurisdiction over communications facilities is in the Committee on Commerce. Theoretically, the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee could exercise jurisdiction over those parts of a communications satellite venture pertaining to rocketry and the Commerce Committee could exercise jurisdiction over the ownership, use, and regulation of the communications satellite itself.

As a practical matter, however, the expense of placing a system of communications satellites in orbit—something not very far in the future—and thereafter operating them is not severable into segments which can be placed separately in the jurisdiction of our two committees. For that reason, I made no objection to the unanimous-consent request that S. 2650 be first referred to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences. It has been my purpose, however, at an appropriate time, to claim for the Commerce Committee that jurisdiction which is conferred by the Standing Rules of the Senate.

Now seems an appropriate time to speak on this matter, as the President will shortly send to the Congress a message setting forth his recommendations with respect to a communications satellite program and transmitting draft legislation. In the interest of orderly procedure, I think that the President's message and his suggested legislation should first go where S. 2650 was sent, to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences. However, the Committee on Commerce, and particularly its Subcommittee on Communications, in reliance on the Senate rules, has actively prepared itself to deal with legislation in this area. Under the chairmanship of the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] the subcommittee held extensive hearings last year and plans to hold more in this session.

In order that all may be advised of the respective relationships of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences and the Committee on Commerce to pending and future legislation dealing with communications satellites, I make the following unanimous-consent request: First, that the President's message on communications satellites, when received, be referred to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences; second, that when that committee has concluded its consideration of S. 2650 and the President's bill and message, they be referred to the Committee on Commerce; and, third, that henceforth any proposed legislation dealing with the employment of any part of the radio or visible spectrum for communication or the transmission of intelligence through the use of satellites or otherwise shall not be considered by the Senate until such proposed legislation has been considered by the Committee on Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

THE NATIONAL OBSERVER

Mr. MILLER. Madam President, on Sunday, the 4th of February 1962, a new national newspaper made its appearance. I refer to a paper published in Washington, D.C., entitled "The National Observer."

This paper points out that among its objectives is the publication of a weekly newspaper, except that the community of the newspaper will be the entire Nation. It points out very properly that integrity demands that all the news shall be honestly reported, and states it shall do so.

It is also pointed out, however, that in the columns of the editorial page the paper is going to speak the thoughts of the editors, and that these thoughts will be based upon an admitted prejudice that a free society and a free economy can do more for the welfare of men than any other form of society ever devised.

Madam President, I think the objectives and the standards—particularly the editorial standards—set forth in the editorial in the first issue of the newspaper are commendable. I certainly wish the newspaper the greatest of success.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled, "A Word About Ourselves," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A WORD ABOUT OURSELVES

Today the National Observer joins the family of Dow Jones & Co., publishers of the Wall Street Journal. So we think we should begin by saying a few words about ourselves and our intentions.

This is not just fond pride, although that is a natural feeling. The National Observer is not only a new publication but a new kind of publication for this country. And since there is already no shortage of publications to compete for your money and your reading time, we believe these words are due you as a reader, so that you may know what we hope to be and how we hope to serve you.

First of all, this a newspaper.

What this means is that it is designed primarily to tell you what is going on now in the whole wide world around you. We hope that we can also entertain you, and that we can offer you some things that are just plain "good reading" to either stimulate or relax the mind. But we are not in the entertainment business. A newspaper's chief reason for being is news.

This, all by itself, offers a limitless expanse. News includes the great events that shake the world, the important happenings in the Nation, the ideas men have about exploring space or their thoughts about the organization of society. But it embraces, too, everything else that interests people—the fortunes of the Green Bay Packers, the fate of the latest fashion show in Paris, books and music, and the things that happen to ordinary people every day and which, because the news of them makes us laugh or weep, give us an insight into the tragedy and joy of life.

All these things, in their infinite variety, will be grist for the National Observer.

Yet this only partially explains our intentions. For there is today no lack of some kind of news about all of these things. On the contrary, there are times when everyone feels inundated with "news." What is hard to find in the flood is understanding.

We know that nothing can surpass radio and TV in the immediacy of its news about the bare event. No national publication can replace the local newspaper in telling you about your community or your neighbors. Magazines of all kinds play their useful roles.

The problem of most readers is to find their way through the sheer bulk. And we believe that a weekly national newspaper can help those who are interested in the world around them to see it whole and to understand it better. The National Observer hopes to do this by virtue of the fact that it is a newspaper and not a magazine, a weekly and not a daily, that it is national and not local.

The newspaper format has many advantages. Its wide pages and its headlines help the harried reader to see the whole of the news in a sweep. He can learn a great deal, and quickly, from a well-written headline. He can then pause or pass on, as his interest moves him. He can skim or reread. And the newspaper press can speed the news to him before the avalanche of events relegates it to history.

In a weekly newspaper the news does not come in broken bits and pieces. What the President said about Berlin on Tuesday is not lost amid the events in Germany on Friday; the hurricane sweeping the country is not a series of isolated disasters but can be seen and measured as a unified drama in the life of the Nation.

This time to sift the news, to put it in perspective, to present it in a manageable package, has always been the great advantage of the weekly paper. It is our oldest form of journalism and it endures as a vital part of many communities. We will differ from the familiar weekly paper in that our community is the whole Nation. We will treat the news in exactly the same way for the reader in Portland, Maine, and the reader in Portland, Oreg.

Yet these advantages are not enough unless we succeed at what a distinguished American editor, almost a century ago, called this art of making a good newspaper.

The editors must have available the resources to report the news of the world in all its many aspects. So the National Observer will make use of the Associated Press, United Press International, Reuters, the resources of its own organization that already publishes the Wall Street Journal and operates the Dow Jones News Service, and a network of its own correspondents. We will use pictures, when pictures speak more clearly than words or when they illuminate the news. In distribution we can use all or any combination of seven printing plants placed strategically around the country, as the demands of our subscribers dictate.

Thus we propose to assemble all the news of the world from as many sources as are, or as may become, available to us. But if news is anything that many concern, astonish, or amuse mankind, then there is far too much of it for any newspaper to print, weekly or daily. And if it could be produced, no one would have the time to read it. No newspaper, then, can avoid the responsibility for selection.

Our standards of selection are our own, and the success of this newspaper depends on the integrity of those standards. They are the standards which we think will best serve our readers, whom we take to be all those with a ceaseless curiosity about the world around them. They may be young or old; they may be infinitely varied in learning or in their supply of information about the subjects in the news. But they would not seek out better ways of seeing the world, in any form, if they did not have an intelligent desire to satisfy their curiosity, a yearning to understand more.

We seek to match their needs. That is, we hope that our standards of selection will be those which the readers themselves would adopt if it were possible for them to drop all other pursuits and set for themselves the task of collecting and studying all the available information about what is going on in the world.

Integrity demands that all this news shall be honestly reported. That, in turn, demands that we exercise judgments; even in the Congo not all riots are of equal importance, and the editor who treats them all as of equal importance performs no service of value for his readers. Some stories we will tell here in short compass. Some we will treat in far more length than most newspapers do. We make no apologies for these judgments. We will be ashamed only if we fail in the accuracy of our facts or in the precision and clarity of writing about them.

In this particular space where we offer our observations on events, we will make judgments of a different kind. We lay no claim to infallibility or even of special wisdom. Yet it is the business of newspapermen to devote their whole time to the flow of the news in the world around them, and out of this—if they do not shirk the responsibility of thinking—there come ideas on what it all means, and whether a thing is good or bad for their neighbors or their country.

In other columns, other views. Our letters column will be open to readers who do not agree with us, and from time to time we will publish special articles by people with some special competence in a particular field even if we do not agree with their conclusions. But here, in these columns, we will speak our own thoughts, speaking from an admitted prejudice that a free society and a free economy can do more for the welfare of men than any other form of society ever devised. We make no apologies for our convictions. We will be ashamed only if we fail to express our ideas clearly and forcefully.

So, with these words, here is the National Observer. We hope it will be a success. But our first imperative is to make it interesting and rewarding. For we know that the only way to success is to put out a good newspaper.

ANALYSIS OF ELECTORAL COLLEGE PROPOSALS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Madam President, the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments held extensive hearings during the 1st session of the 87th Congress on the electoral college system of electing the President. The hearings also covered proposed amendments concerning presidential primaries and qualifications for voting, including age, residence, and poll taxes. The record of these hearings is 1,060 printed pages in length and many interested persons will not be able to take the time to analyze the evidence presented on this complex and controversial subject.

There are 14 separate pending resolutions on the subject of electoral college reform. However, they generally follow four basic approaches, direct national election, the proportional system, the district system, or perfection of the present system. Near the end of the first session, the subcommittee met and decided that it would be of great assistance to it, to the Congress and to the public if a single comprehensive and objective analysis were made of these proposals on the basis of the record made at the hearings. Although there has been much writing and discussion setting forth the provisions of various proposals and making arguments for and against each of them, too little effort has been made to analyze what the practical effects of each plan would be. There was a need for an objective study which would analyze as far as possible the operation of each plan in practice and just how it would affect the various features of the present system which produce demands for change.

The result was a study made by the staff of the subcommittee entitled "The Electoral College: Operation and Effect of Proposed Amendments to the Constitution of the United States," which was published as a Judiciary Committee print during the adjournment. I believe this to be one of the best pieces of work which has been done on this subject. We have received several compliments from political scientists concerning it. I recommend it to anyone who is interested in electoral college reform. The study was printed in considerable quantity, and there are a number of copies still available for distribution. Anyone wishing a copy should either contact the subcommittee office at room 141, Old Senate Office Building, or telephone extension 5581.

FISH PROTEIN CONCENTRATE

Mr. DOUGLAS. Madam President, the Food and Drug Administration has done excellent work in the past and I have vigorously supported it. But they make mistakes at times and they have just made a big one in disapproving the sale of a protein concentrate, made from the whole fish, within the continental limits of the United States.

WHAT IT IS

This product is a high protein concentrate made from the whole fish. It is absolutely pure. Its purity is unchallenged and no charge by any responsible authority has ever been made that, in fact, it is anything but pure.

HOW IT IS MADE

Whole fish are first washed with water; second, ground; third, washed again with water. At this point, the product is 14 to 16 percent protein; 3 to 5 percent minerals; 1 to 10 percent fat; 70 to 80 percent water. Fourth, this product is washed with five washes of boiling solvent to remove the water and fat. It is now 70 to 75 percent protein; 12 to 15 percent minerals; 1 to 3 percent fat; 7 to 10 percent water. Fifth, this product is washed with five more washes of alcohol solvent to remove the odor and the nonprotein nitrogen, the remaining oil, and more of the water. It is now 80 to 85 percent protein; 15 to 20 percent minerals; a trace of fat; 3 to 6 percent water. This is a protein-mineral concentrate made from whole fish, with bland odor and taste. One pound has the protein and minerals of 6 pounds of fish. It does not spoil, does not become rancid, and keeps indefinitely in all climates.

This fish protein concentrate has great advantages. It can be made cheaply. A product containing 80 to 85 percent protein can be made at a cost of 12 to 14 cents a pound. It can be processed in such a way as either to remove or keep the fish taste, depending on the amount of alcohol used in the process.

Fish protein concentrate is a stable product and will not become rancid in either the hottest or the coldest climate.

Adding to the diet of the undernourished people of the world either by baking it in bread or sprinkling it on rice or in soup or gravies, it can and has worked miracles.

The raw product, namely fish, is available in huge quantities to almost every underdeveloped nation. Plants equipped to process it already exist in the United States and now we have a great opportunity to help the needy people of the world. Furthermore, at relatively low cost, such processing plants can be built on small ships and the product could be made cheaply and quickly available to areas of the world where there are millions of undernourished people.

SUPPORT OF U.S. AGENCIES

Our Food for Peace Agency is anxious to use this protein concentrate as a part of its program. Numerous individuals in our foreign-aid program believe it could be most helpful. Mr. George McGovern, our Director of Food for Peace, stated:

> Viewed against the pitiful backdrop of the world's children crippled through lack of sufficient protein, a decision to accelerate production and distribution of fish flour is of prime importance.

Secretary of the Interior Udall has said:

> I foresee that this protein supplement will someday enjoy widespread acceptance and usage. Such a product, which is inexpensive, versatile in use, resistant to spoilage, and highly nutritious is, in my estimation, the basic fishery product of the future.

Thus, fish flour, or this protein mineral concentrate, can be processed cheaply, is absolutely pure, is a stable product which does not rancify in either the hottest or coldest climate, can be stored almost indefinitely, can be a boon to the fishing industry, and is badly needed to help overcome starvation and malnutrition in the world.

FDA DENIES SALE AT HOME

Before this product can be used by any Government agency, such as Food for Peace or in the aid program, it must be allowed by the Food and Drug Administration to be used here at home. But the Food and Drug Administration has denied such approval. In my personal conversations with them they have admitted that fish protein concentrate is a pure and wholesome product but they have said, in substance, that it cannot be sold within the continental limits of the United States because some consumers might view it as unesthetic. Their decision has not been made on the basis of the facts about its purity but on what they say some people might think. This is ridiculous. It prevents the use of this pure food in any of our official programs and gives the Communists the argument that those who advocate its use in underdeveloped countries are trying to push off on to the poor people of the world a food which cannot be eaten in the United States. This is true even though the Food and Drug Administration has approved its use for foreign export.

FDA STANDARDS DO NOT IMPROVE EXISTING HIGH CLEANLINESS AND PURITY OF PRODUCT

On January 25, 1962, the Food and Drug Administration ruled that before processing, fish must first have the heads, fins, tails, and inner contents removed. This is nonsense. For one thing, such removal involves handling costs which will raise the price of the product from 12 to 14 cents per pound to 60 to 85 cents per pound. This would nullify the tremendous advantage of the low cost of this high protein product. For another reason, the removal of these parts of the fish in no way improves the purity or safety qualities of the finished product. Whole fish protein concentrate is perfectly safe and pure in and of itself. The purity of whole fish protein would be the same as the purity of the product when processed according to the Food and Drug Administration's proposed standards issued on January 25. The only difference between processed whole fish protein and processed filleted fish protein is cost.

YET FDA ALLOWS SALE AT HOME OF AMAZING ITEMS OF FOOD

The Food and Drug Administration's position on this is ridiculous because it already allows food which is much less pure and much less esthetic to be sold within the United States. Clams, oysters, snails, smelts, and sardines, for example, are whole fish or whole seafood products. When we have pointed out that fish protein concentrate is purer than these products and to ask why it is that these whole fish products can be eaten and sold domestically but fish protein concentrate cannot, the only answer is that fish protein concentrate is unesthetic, and that these other products have historically been eaten.

Madam President, I have specimens in my office of other products, such as fried ants, chocolate covered ants, chocolate covered baby bees, fried grasshoppers, fried silk worms, gelatins made from horses hooves and tails, pickled pigs feet, rattlesnakes, fatbacks, and hog jowls, a few among the many products which in most cases are a good deal less pure and certainly no more esthetically acceptable than fish protein concentrate.

In fact, in my office I have a jar of whole fish, which are to be allowed to be sold in this country. It has a most filthy appearance. These whole fish are moving about in a rather villainous compound of water and sauce which offends the esthetic emotions of anyone. Yet the Food and Drug Administration admits the product.

Those of us in Washington drink water which, before it was purified, came from the polluted Potomac River.

WHY NOT A PURE PROTEIN CONCENTRATE?

Each person may pick and choose what he or she likes to eat, but so long as the food is pure and safe to eat, the choice is there. In the case of this protein concentrate the Food and Drug Administration does not even give a choice. It took upon itself to decide in terms used previously by the Millers' National Federation, that consumers would object to this product made from the whole fish and thus prevent it from being placed on the market. In this important case, the market extends across the United States and throughout the world.

Yet the Food and Drug Administration has seen fit to deny approval here at home of a product made from whole fish. While I try hard not to question the motives of the Food and Drug Administration, I am startled to find the wording of its regulation very close to the arguments against this product set forth by the Millers' National Federation.

WORDING OF FDA REGULATION FOLLOWS BIG MILLERS' POSITION

The millers fear competition from this product, and it is sad to note that it appears that they could persuade the Food and Drug Administration to keep this product from the market. Normally I support the Food and Drug Administration, and I realize the protection it renders the U.S. citizens in keeping unsafe and unhealthy foods and drugs off the store shelves. But it has made mistakes in the past, in discouraging the use of an improved bread, and they are making a big mistake now.

As I say, I try not to question the Food and Drug Administration's motives, but I find that the few mistakes made by FDA seem to result from their acceptance of the views of the big millers. In this case, as almost happened in the earlier example, the millers win and the rest of the Nation as well as the world loses. By adding 3 percent of this fish protein concentrate to bread, the bread could be made highly nutritious. By sprinkling it on rice, in soups, in gravies, and so forth, an insipid meal can be turned into a rich one with high proteins. Such meals can help solve malnutrition in a whole family at a very low cost. But this is prevented by the Food and Drug Administration's ruling, not because the product is unhealthy or impure, but because of esthetic objections only, backed up by the millers across the country.

CONCLUSION

Fish protein concentrate is important because it can help solve hunger and undernourishment in the world. People in many countries are undernourished and either cannot afford or do not have access to foods which contain sufficient proteins for their families. If we could ship fish protein concentrate to them, it could be added to their meager diets and they would thus receive the protein necessary for healthy lives.

The low cost of the product makes it an ideal item in such programs as food for peace, United Nations food programs, and other projects designed to reduce hunger in the world. It is important because it also can be used in our own country to increase the food standards of many families at a very low cost.

Under the restrictions by the Food and Drug Administration, the cost of this product would be so increased that those people who most need it could not afford it. The food is safe, it is pure, it is cheap, it is the best product we can offer to reduce hunger and increase world health.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, the Senator from Illinois has very generously and graciously made the fish protein concentrate available to me. We have enjoyed it in our family. I recognize the very great value in using it, as the Senator has said, with rice and with bread. It is a marvelous product. It will make available to starving people all over the world food of very high nutritious value at a very low cost.

I am glad that the Senator from Illinois is protesting this decision on the floor of the Senate. I hope that somehow, in some way, the Food and Drug Administration can be persuaded to reverse its decision. It seems exceedingly arbitrary, and there seems to be no justification for the decision, in view of the fact that it was found to be a food that is absolutely pure.

As the Senator from Illinois has demonstrated so wittily and well, absolutely no damage to health could possibly result, and no real case can be made on the ground of estheticism. The fact is that this product is ground up, and anyone who looks at the product can see that there is nothing offensive about it. In fact, I understand that it is available in an odorless, tasteless form also.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. As well as with a slight fish odor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Illinois has made a very real contribution this evening. I warmly and enthusiastically support him.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator. It is our intention to appeal from the decision of the Food and Drug Administration.

We will ask them to review their decision. If they refuse to do it, we will carry our appeal to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. If he refuses to reverse the decision, some of us will introduce a bill in Congress to deal with this subject.

While I like to be guarded, I may say that I have a considerable quantity of the high protein concentrate in my office, and I will be delighted to give samples to any Member of the Senate or any member of the staff. If they wish, we will have a meal in which the high protein concentrate will be an element.

Diet is important, particularly to tens of millions of people in this world who are starving. This is food that these people can use at very low cost.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, during the course of the debate on the higher education bill there were times when we did not always read all the supporting evidence that we had available on some of the premises that were laid down.

I make a general unanimous-consent request that I may have unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the appropriate places supporting evidence from our committee files and other committee material where we deem it is necessary, including insertions of certain telegrams and letters which we have received that we feel ought to be made a matter of historical record in connection with this debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT TO 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, under the previous order, I move that the Senate adjourn until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.) the Senate, under the order previously entered, adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 7, 1962, at 11 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate February 6, 1962:

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

G. Joseph Minetti, of New York, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board for the term of 6 years expiring December 31, 1967. (Reappointment)

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Dow Henry Drukker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I have been requested by the entire New Jersey delegation in the House of Representatives to make the following statement about my illustrious predecessor, Dow Henry Drukker. February 7, 1962, marks the 90th birthday of this illustrious citizen.

Dow Henry Drukker was born in Sneek, Holland, and was brought by his parents to the United States when he was but a few months old. The Drukker family settled in Grand Rapids, Mich., where young Dow attended the public schools.

At the age of 25 he came to Passaic, N.J., where his talent for community leadership was quickly noticed and his dedication to public service soon appreciated. Within a decade Dow Henry Drukker was elected to the Passaic County Board of Chosen Freeholders and served from 1906 until 1913, most of the period as its director.

On February 5, 1914, the death of Representative Robert G. Bremner created a vacancy in the Seventh—now Eighth—Congressional District of New Jersey. The people immediately looked to the popular former freeholder who since 1909 had been the president of the Union Building and Investment Co. Representative Dow Henry Drukker took his seat in the House of Representatives on April 22, 1914. He was reelected for full terms later in 1914 and in 1916. He was not a candidate in 1918 and retired on March 3, 1919.

In the almost 5 years of service within this Chamber it was a mutual pleasure and honor for Representative Drukker to serve with the late, beloved Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Honorable Sam Rayburn, of Texas; the learned Representative from Georgia, the Honorable Carl Vinson; and the distinguished Senator—then Representative—from Arizona, Carl Hayden.

Still vigorous and active, Representative Drukker is the publisher of the Passaic-Clifton Herald-News, which he acquired in 1916. He still holds the position of president of the Union Building and Investment Co. Queen Juliana of the Netherlands knighted this native son as an officer of the Order of Orange-Nassau for services rendered in the great flood of 1953.

Representative and Mrs. Drukker reside now both in Clifton, N.J., and Lake Wales, Fla.

Mr. Speaker, it is a high privilege to salute this great American.

Setting the Record Straight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD a letter which I have written to the national commander of the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc., regarding a memorandum which he circulated to Members of the House about a bill 9923, which I introduced on January 26, 1962, "by request." I think it is important that this letter be printed in the RECORD to correct the commander's erroneous belief that this bill was introduced at the request of the American Legion and also to correct his erroneous belief that a bill introduced "by request" necessarily reflects the views of its author.

My letter of February 1, 1962, follows:

FEBRUARY 1, 1962.

Mr. JOHN BASHARA, Sr.,
National Commander, Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc., Washington, D.C.

DEAR COMMANDER BASHARA: Yesterday an employee of your organization hand delivered to my office a memorandum addressed to "Congressmen" dated January 31, 1962. This memorandum referred to H.R. 9923, which I introduced on January 26, 1962, and made the following statement:

"Congressman OLIN E. TEAGUE has introduced H.R. 9923, which will amend 86–211, sections 521 and 541, title 38. He has increased income limitations in some scales and reduced the pension in other groups. It is interesting to note, that with all the propaganda by veterans' organizations like the American Legion and others regarding providing for the needy veteran, there is no increase for the veteran or widow who are in the $0 to $600 class. They are supposed to be the group placed in the most needy class but they have been overlooked."

In addition to the memorandum referred to above, news items appeared in the National Tribune which are based, apparently, on information furnished by your organization.

You seem to be under the impression that I am sponsoring H.R. 9923. Undoubtedly you fail to understand the procedure of introduction of legislation "by request." I introduced H.R. 9923 at the request of AMVETS. The American Legion had nothing to do with this bill and I am personally critical of the bill for the reasons you outline; namely, that it is devoted chiefly to raising income limits rather than helping those who need help the most.

As chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs I have introduced 36 bills for various individuals and organizations. I do not agree with many of these bills. I do follow the procedure followed by most chairmen, however, of introducing bills "by request" in order that a group or individual can have its bill printed and brought before the Congress. Your assumption that this bill is my bill and represents my views is in error and thus has led you to write a letter to Members of Congress based on these erroneous assumptions.

Very truly yours,

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman.

An Unfriendly Act of the Philippine Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, early in 1961, a group of 7 tobacco companies located in Tennessee, Kentucky, North Carolina, and Virginia sold approximately 7,000 hogsheads, worth $7 million of burley and Flue-cured tobacco to a Philippines cigarette manufacturer consigned to a Philippine importer. The tobacco was shipped from the United States during the period October-December and received in Manila prior to December 31, 1961.

This tobacco met all legal requirements of the Philippine Government in the fall of 1961 insofar as its import was concerned and the importers offered to pay the correct duty assessed on the tobacco. Importation was not permitted due to a pending injunction suit before the court of first instance in the Philippines.

Following the change of administration in the Philippine Government in January 1962, the tobacco was ruled illegally imported by the new Philippine Government. In the case before the court of first instance in Manila a decision was rendered on January 22, 1962, ordering the release of the tobacco to the Philippine importers for entry into the Philippines.

The new Philippine Government now has ordered the reexport of this tobacco which would cost the American exporters approximately $1 million in loss involving shipping charges, storage, insurance, and other expenses incident to the reexport.

The Philippine Government has stated that the American exporters had acted in good faith although they insisted that the Philippine importers had illegally imported the tobacco, despite the complete official approval of the shipment by the Philippine Government in the fall of 1961.

This appears to be a clear case of discrimination against American exporters by the Philippine Government and in view of the President's foreign trade program urging American companies to export more of their products it is a severe blow to American tobacco dealers who while acting in good faith have been caught up in what appears to be local politics.

The United States has imported in 1961 approximately 10 million pounds of Philippine tobacco and we are presently about to loan the Philippine Government a $300 million stabilization loan.

It seems amazing to me that the Philippine Government, a friendly ally, would take this method of slapping American exporters in the face, in view of the fact that they have acted in good faith, made a bona fide sale, met all legal requirements, and have followed President Kennedy's urgent directive of attempting to build greater foreign markets for American products.

This is a serious and terribly expensive blow to a group of American tobacco dealers and exporters, seeking to find foreign markets for our agricultural products. The State Department was aware of the action of the Philippine Government concerning this tobacco at the time that the loan was negotiated on January 17, 1962. I feel our own Government has indeed let down, in fact pulled the rug from under, Americans seeking to carry out the very policy enunciated by President Kennedy in seeking foreign trade.

In view of these facts, I urgently demand that the State Department reconsider its present program of assistance to the Philippine Government until assurance can be received that the tobacco shipment in question will be allowed to be received by the bona fide importers and Philippine manufacturers. An additional assurance in the form of a written agreement to set up long-term yearly quotas for importation of U.S. leaf tobacco for blending purposes should be forthcoming from the Philippine Government.

Then this matter can be cleared from the record in a manner satisfactory to those Americans who trusted in the good faith of the Philippine Government in making this sale.

The Wit and Wisdom of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a copy of

"The Wit and Wisdom of Congress," edited by Edward Boykin.

This is a treasury of anecdotes and epigrams, quips and puns, nuggets of historic debate and gems of eloquence—all handpicked from the annals of the Congress, from 1789 to the present.

Mr. Boykin, a longtime student of congressional history, has watched the Congress in action for a quarter century.

His research into the records of Congress is probably unsurpassed by that of any other American historian today.

The work of compiling and editing the lively, the humorous, and the eloquent words and activities of the Congress is his unique achievement; no similar treatment of the congressional annals has ever been published.

While I have not yet finished my copy, I have found it thus far to be highly entertaining and informative, and I certainly would offer it as recommended reading for Members of the Congress. And, I might add, our Hon. Vice President Johnson, and Senator Kenneth B. Keating also offer their recommendations of the publication.

U.S. Role in the United Nations and its Effect on Our Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Congressional Record a speech I made at Springfield, Oreg., before the League of Women Voters, on the "U.S. Role in the United Nations and Its Effect on Our Foreign Policy."

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. Role in the United Nations and its Effect on Our Foreign Policy

(Speech of Senator Wayne Morse, of Oregon, to the League of Women Voters, Springfield, Oreg., October 11, 1961)

Taken as a whole, and relative to other nations in the world, the role of the United States in the United Nations has been one of very active participation in this world organization. Reserving for a moment the question of whether we could or should channel more of our foreign policy through the U.N., the fact remains that our record of performance at the United Nations is a good one.

Certainly the United States provides the major financial support for the United Nations and its various operations, and without this support, the U.N. would probably collapse. Last fall when Senator Aiken of Vermont and I served as U.S. delegates, Senator Aiken was assigned to the budget committee of the General Assembly, the fifth committee. In our report, we pointed out that the United States pays about one-third of the regular annual U.N. budget of $63 million, which excludes the various police force activities, and as much as 72 percent of certain relief activities. Of course, assessments are handed out to member nations on an ability to pay basis, which means that we are assessed somewhat more than a third of most U.N. budget. But beyond this, it was the Rockefeller family which made possible the present U.N. headquarters in New York City and an interest-free American loan further helped to get the organization established in these new quarters.

The question of moving the headquarters out of New York—to Moscow, or Geneva, or Berlin—has usually foundered on the simple financial consideration that the United States has provided generous quarters for the organization and no other nation has backed up its offers or recommendations for a new site with the financing of comparable quarters.

One of the worst failings of some member nations—and happily it is one we are not as yet guilty of—is their refusal to contribute to U.N. activities to which they are opposed. The most obvious offender in this respect is the Soviet Union. Neither Russia nor any of its satellite countries has contributed 1 red penny, if you will pardon the phrase, to the very expensive U.N. operation in the Congo. This operation was possible only because the United States has financed about half of it. The Communist governments make it a regular practice to withhold funds from any U.N. program with which they disagree, and this practice has greatly weakened the U.N.

But the Communist countries are not the only ones which do this. The Arab countries refuse to support the U.N. police force in the Gaza strip because they refuse to recognize Israel as a country at all, and oppose the U.N. peace mission there. The annual cost of this U.N. Emergency Force is about $19 million. France, another country with a rather large assessment, also refuses to pay its share of activities it opposes, and has contributed nothing to the Congo operation.

Then there are a few countries in Latin America and Africa which plead poverty, as does Nationalist China, and have fallen rather far behind in their obligations. However, neither this group nor the Communist countries have fallen so far behind as to bring into action article 19 which states that the right to vote in the General Assembly shall be forfeited if they fall as much as 2 years behind in their dues.

The result has been that the United States bears an unduly large burden in the financing of the U.N. This is bad for us, and bad for the other members. It is bad for the United States because it tends to accentuate the feeling that if the body takes any action or position we do not like, we should withhold financial support. It deepens the feeling that because we pay so much to the piper, we ought to call the tune.

Most Members of Congress, including myself, receive occasional mail calling upon this country to withhold contributions to U.N. technical assistance programs in which Cuba is a participant. We receive even more mail calling for an end to all American financial support to any international body of which Communist China is a member. In fact, a provision to this effect was put into the foreign aid bill in the Senate this year, but was quietly dropped in conference with the House of Representatives.

I think we have been wise in rejecting that policy. In the first 15 years of the United Nations, the United States has never been on the losing side of a really important vote. We have never had to cast a veto in the Security Council. Yet, we cannot always expect to have our own way. It would do us more harm than good to let the threat go out that unless another government is rejected for representation, we will pick up our marbles, and for all practical purposes, quit the United Nations.

But, neither should the United States be expected to pay the cost of an organization whose nonpaying members may decide its policies and then bill the United States for the cost of those policies. This problem of collecting assessments is one that the organization is going to have to come to grips with. If it does not, then it must expect the feeling to grow in the United States that this country, too, should follow the policy of supporting only those U.N. activities we favor.

Even this, of course, would be quite different from withdrawing from an organization because another government is admitted. It would be hard to imagine a more ignorant and shortsighted action, yet the cry is being heard more frequently that we should withdraw if Red China is seated in the United Nations.

Those who raise it have never, in my opinion, understood what the cold war is about, understood the role of the United Nations in the world, nor appreciated the possibilities of the United Nations as a part of American foreign policy. For many of them, the Red China issue is really just an excuse for something they have long favored and that is American withdrawal from the U.N. and a return to unilateral power politics.

Nonetheless, the very question forces a reexamination of what role the United Nations can and should play in American foreign policy. I think it raises first the question of what is at stake in the contest with the Communist world.

One of the least understood facets of it is the role of the so-called neutral or nonalined nations. The recent Belgrade Conference, where the unalined powers met almost in the light and heat of Russian nuclear tests, was a great disappointment to Americans, including myself, because it failed to apply to the Communist world the same standards it applies to the Western World. As a result, there has been a somewhat increased opinion in the United States that we should stop worrying about what these countries think of us, stop considering what their reaction to a given American move might be, and go about protecting our own interests as best we can.

That leads to the question of what our interests are. Most of the critics of these neutral nations might well have said, 3 years ago: "Why worry about what Cuba thinks? What difference does it make to us what kind of government the Cubans have? It's Russia that counts."

Or they might have said: "Who cares about Laos, or South Vietnam? Let's stop worrying about what those people think, and concentrate on Red China."

Yet, today we find ourselves very much worried about what kind of government the people of Cuba will support, and whether or not the people of Laos and South Vietnam are willing to support non-Communist governments.

That is, after all, what the cold war really is. It is a struggle between the West and communism not over Russia and Red China on the one hand and the NATO countries on the other, but over all the world in between. The hot war may not develop between the two behemoths, but the cold war for control of what now lies on neither side will continue.

That is why we must be concerned about what the unalined countries want and think. One might say today that we should forget about the neutrals; but tomorrow that same person will charge that we had no business letting the Communists take over another nation.

The sad fact is that too many Americans really do not care much about the rest of the world until a given country does show signs of going Communist. Latin America is a particularly bad example of this. The former British colony of Guiana was about as unknown to Americans, including Members of Congress, as any part of the world until the recent election there and the establishment of a largely independent government brought into charge of its affairs a man who is reputed in some quarters to be a Communist sympathizer. Now, we suddenly find a great interest in Congress in British Guiana.

Much the same is true in Africa. We pretty much ignored several of the new countries of Africa until they turned to the Communist world for support.

So I think we really do care what the other nations of the world think of us, and what kind of governments they have. If we do not, then we are in effect saying to the Communists that as far as we are concerned they are welcome to do whatever they wish in Latin America, Africa, the Middle East, and Asia, and that we will not interfere so long as they do not set foot on American shores.

Yet that policy would be a disaster. We simply have no choice but to seek to influence the countries outside the Communist bloc.

Probably the most important single way and place where we can try to exert some influence with them is in the United Nations. This is the one arena in which the dozens of small nations of the world have a chance to be heard, to take their equal place with the rich and powerful giants of the East and West.

Now, these small countries know, too, that the United Nations is where they are important. That is why they have supported such U.N. activities as the Congo operation. It is why they supported Dag Hammarskjold against the Communist tirade for his resignation.

It is why I think they will continue to support a strong and active United Nations against Communist efforts to cripple it with further extensions of the veto power.

It has not been any accident that in recent days, and especially since President Kennedy's magnificent address to the General Assembly, the Soviet Union has considerably modified its demand for a three-headed Secretariat.

Let us remember that these unalined powers are also the target of Soviet intentions, and that Russian policy has bent before the winds of neutralist objections before at the United Nations.

Even in the case of the Belgrade conference, I think Russian policy was carefully calculated to influence the conference. Many Americans have said that the resumption of nuclear testing by Russia on the eve of that conference was a deliberate insult to the neutrals, calculated to show Russian contempt for them and for their opinions. I do not think that was the case at all. I think it was only a difference between what this country would have done and what was a typical Russian Communist power play. Instead of appealing to the oft-expressed objections of the neutrals to nuclear testing, the Russians simply terrorized them. The Russian display may well have been calculated to frighten those nations into the position that anything would be better than a nuclear war, and that any price should be paid by the West to avoid it. If that was in fact the Russian intention, it came uncomfortably close to succeeding. The neutrals have demonstrated that they can be frightened into the abandonment of principle and abandonment of the very elements of self-determination which they demand for themselves.

Perhaps the result will be a more realistic attitude toward them by the United States. It certainly should not be an attitude of disinterest, of writing them off to communism. But it should take into account the limitations of these countries, the narrowness of their interests, and their own type of power politics which has been described as the tyranny of the weak.

Least of all should we quit the one place where we have a chance of exerting an influence—the United Nations. It is unthinkable, to me, that we should so easily be driven from the field where we have long dominated the play. Our ability to fight the cold war will depend in large part upon our ability to distinguish between what is fatal to our interests and what is not.

We should learn a lesson from a mistake the Russians made once and never repeated, and that was to walk out of the Security Council in the early stages of the Korean invasion. The result was that the rest of the U.N. acted against Soviet wishes and the Russians promptly walked back in again.

Walking out of the U.N. is the surest way to lose many times the influence we lose when another government walks in.

This is not to say that I think Red China is about to be seated, because I think its efforts will be defeated. But I do reject the suggestion that this country should inform the U.N. that whenever it admits Red China we will leave. The rest of the world knows we cannot afford to leave the United Nations, any more than Russia can, unless we are prepared to admit defeat in the cold war.

Because I believe the United Nations will continue to be the major forum of American policy in spite of the many dangers which confront the U.N., I also believe we should take more foreign policy problems to the United Nations.

The record of the U.N. in supporting American desires has been pretty good. The organization has been frustrated by the Soviet use of the veto. But when we have taken a firm position in support of principle, we have largely won the support of the organization.

Why not do that with such issues as Berlin? Why not do it with the troublesome question of Quemoy, Matsu, and the future of Taiwan? I would like to see the United States be the first to propose a U.N. settlement in Berlin, one that perhaps would put the entire city of Berlin under U.N. jurisdiction and move some U.N. activities to that city. I know that most editorial reaction to this proposal is highly negative. Strangely enough, it is usually opposed on the ground that the Russians would never agree to it. But the Russians agree to little of what the West stands for, and I think it is time we asked ourselves not: "what are the Communists for," but "what is the United States for."

Too much of American policy is based simply on opposing something the Soviet Union is advocating, or vice versa. Today we are standing firm in Berlin because the Communists want us out. If we are not careful, we are going to find ourselves standing before the United Nations trying to beat down a Russian proposal for United Nations action that would force us out of Berlin.

We have an opportunity now to present our own solution, one that would call upon the Communists to make their sector a part of a single city once again. After all, the same agreement which put the Western Powers in Berlin put the Communists in Berlin too. Their rights in East Berlin have exactly the same legal basis as our rights in West Berlin. Any change in one part of the city should be extended to the entire city.

But unless we start now to make this point we are going to see the discussion revolve around West Berlin alone.

Another advantage we would gain would be to broaden the world interest in access into Berlin. Today, we have only the rights of three conquering powers on which to stand. We would be in a much stronger position if we were suggesting that all members of the United Nations have the same access into Berlin which we have.

Conceivably, we could fail to obtain such a solution. Conceivably, it would be opposed and even defeated by the Soviet Union by one means or another. But it is vital to American interests in Europe that we stop talking about what concessions the United States should make in the name of peace and start talking about some concessions the Soviet Union should make, or that both parties should make.

We know perfectly well that an aggressive action by the Communists against our access in and out of the city will bring on war. Not limited or conventional war, but nuclear war because that is the kind that both sides are ready for in Europe. Should such an aggression occur, we have our answer ready. But what we are not ready for are arguments and proposals pressed by the Soviet Union that require the West to abandon Berlin in whole or part in the name of avoiding nuclear war. It is in this realm that we remain entirely on the defensive.

World opinion is a nebulous indefinite, intangible, and much-maligned force. But it cannot be ignored and it is not ignored either by us or the Communists, because it is the prize both of us are seeking short of war. It has its base in the United Nations. To the extent that we wish to oppose communism short of war, we will do that primarily in the United Nations. We have numerous mutual defense treaties with which to deal with direct aggression, but the weapon of propaganda, internal discontent and internal revolution cannot be defended against with such treaties. This is why we must be concerned with what the people of these countries think and what kind of government they will support.

For these reasons, I expect the United Nations to remain a focal point of American foreign policy. The extent to which we make it such a focal point may well determine the success of American foreign policy for the foreseeable future.

A Significant Anniversary: The 100th Year of Banking by Mail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, a significant anniversary, of interest to the U.S. Post Office Department, the Nation's banking community, and the American people, will occur on April 9 this year.

On that day, banking by mail in the United States will have reached its 100th anniversary. This fact in itself is worthy of commemoration but the circumstances surrounding the beginnings of this now taken-for-granted enterprise should be of interest to all our citizens.

Banking by mail has been an important factor in developing greater habits of thrift among our people. It has simplified the making of deposits for hundreds of thousands of persons for whom it is difficult to make periodic visits to savings institutions; it has contributed to the growth of the savings bank idea; in short, the privilege of banking by mail provides people with a convenient means of saving regularly for life's emergencies.

However, 100 years ago the law prohibited such practices by specifying that deposits in savings institutions had to be made in person by the man or woman under whose name the account was held.

On April 9, a trustee of the Bank for Savings, the oldest mutual savings institution in New York State and one of the oldest in the country, succeeded in having introduced and passed in the New York State Legislature a bill which provided for the following change in the banking laws:

> *Resolved*, That the requirement that the depositor shall be present and subscribe to the regulations of the bank shall be dispensed with in the case of persons in the naval and military service of the United States, whether regular or volunteers from the respective States.

This bill, designed for the convenience of men in the service during the Civil War, continued in use after the war ended, and eventually was applied to all depositors—thereby becoming the forerunner of present-day banking by mail.

I wish to call this important anniversary to the attention of my colleagues in this House and to the American public and focus attention on its historical significance. Since the facts which inspire this presentation are of patriotic interest to all Americans and of historic value to the Post Office Department, I am calling upon the Government to authorize the issuance of a special commemorative stamp, marking the 100th anniversary of banking by mail and honoring its invaluable contribution to the American way of life.

Dedication of New Post Office at Newry, Blair County, Pa., February 3, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on February 3, 1962, a new post office was dedicated at Newry, Pa., in my congressional district, at which time I was pleased to deliver the following address which, under leave granted, I include in the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

It is pleasing to participate in this dedication program, since it is a memorable occasion in the history of the Borough of Newry.

The post office we are dedicating today is evidence of the progress of a postal modernization program inaugurated in 1953 that promises to revolutionize the operations of this indispensable American institution.

At that time it was found that 12,000 of the Nation's 36,000 post offices indicated the need for modernization or replacement because of lack of space or outmoded quarters and equipment.

Since Newry was among the communities in need of modern postal facilities, it was pleasing to me to be able to announce on April 29, 1960, that a new post office had been authorized for this community, in keeping with the postal modernization program.

This modern post office building was constructed under the Post Office Department's commercial leasing program, which means its owner will pay county, borough, and school taxes on it the same as other Newry taxpayers.

This modern post office provides the residents of Newry with the latest in modern postal improvements, assuring patrons more convenient mail service, as well as providing adequate facilities and improved working conditions for Postmaster E. J. Miller and those who assist him.

On this occasion it is appropriate to recall that Williamsburg is the only town in Blair County older than Newry.

Founded in 1795 by Patrick Cassidy, a native of Newry, Ireland, this community, which was incorporated as a borough in 1876, has nurtured generations of God-fearing men and women whose spiritual roots were imbedded in various religious faiths.

Their intense love of country is recorded in the history of the community as evidenced by the patriotic service of Newry's manhood and womanhood in every national emergency.

This display of patriotism by every generation recalls to mind the stirring example set by Newry's founder, Patrick Cassidy, who fought on the side of the colonists in the American Revolution and thus aided in securing for posterity our cherished ideals of liberty and freedom.

In dwelling briefly on the history of the postal service in Blair County, we are reminded that in 1846, when Blair County was formed from parts of Huntingdon and Bedford Counties, there were 13 post offices, including Newry, within its borders.

From 1846 to 1917, 44 additional post offices were established, bringing the total to 57 offices.

In 1962 or 116 years after the founding of Blair County, due to the establishment of rural delivery service and the consolidation or abolishment of post offices, the number of offices has been reduced to 15.

It is significant to state that in 1846 the original 13 post offices in Blair County served an estimated population of about 16,000.

Today, after 116 years of its existence, Blair County has a total population of 137,270.

Despite the amazing growth of the postal service, coupled with the expansion of its facilities which has brought increased demand for postal service, the 15 post offices provide efficient daily service for the entire population of the county.

Speaking of the increased demand for modern postal facilities, it is realized that exciting things are happening in the field of communications.

In the not too distant future instantaneous transmission of messages and pictures will be possible on an international scale.

Postal research is discovering new ways to apply recent technological breakthroughs in the field of space communications to our postal operations to make its service more useful and efficient.

Postal improvement has been a continuing process since the establishment of the American postal service.

The quality and extent of postal operations in the United States has grown—as our country has increased in size, population, and wealth.

Our postal system, which began with only 75 post offices and less than 2,000 miles of post roads to serve an area of some 868,000 square miles, has become a large and complex operation.

The U.S. postal service now handles over 63 billion pieces of mail and is the largest single communications system in the world.

The area served now extends beyond the boundaries of the North American Continent to include the Hawaiian and other islands in the Pacific.

The number of people who depend on this great service for the majority of their written communications has grown from a mere 4 million in 1790 to 185 million.

Throughout our history the post office has been the mainstay of our system of communications despite the introduction of a number of other media such as the telephone, the telegraph, the radio, and the television.

It has been able to retain this position by continually improving its modes of transport and expanding its operations to keep abreast of the increases in demand for its services.

We have now entered a new era in transportation and communications.

To meet the challenge of the space age our postal service is currently engaged in a research and modernization program that will have far-reaching effects on mail service in the next decade.

By 1970 our postal system will probably be using two completely new concepts of mail transmission.

Experimental use of both of these has proven they are technically practicable, but refinements are needed to make them economically feasible.

One of these involves the use of guided missiles to transport mail to areas not now readily accessible by conventional modes of transportation and communication.

The first successful mail delivery based on rockets and missiles was made in June 1959, with a Regulus missile launched from a submarine, a hundred miles off the coast of Florida.

The other recent major technological breakthrough in mail transmission is based on the use of space satellites.

A worldwide communications network linked by space satellites orbiting thousands of miles above the earth will make revolutionary changes in many forms of communications, including the postal system, possible within the next 5 or 10 years.

These satellites will act as microwave relay stations to serve as channels for teletype, telephone, radio, and television.

Mail transmission that utilizes this same principle is currently under study at the Post Office Department Laboratory.

The system developed to date involves converting written messages into electronic impulses, scrambling them for privacy, and relaying them by microwave to another post office.

When the satellite communications network is put into space this system of instantaneous electronic transmission will make it possible to send written messages across oceans and continents within minutes instead of days.

Truly the new post office structure we are dedicating today is an excellent symbol of the postal progress that is still underway.

This new building stands as a tribute to the constant process of postal advancement and to our country's scientific and economic achievements that make it possible.

Therefore, I wish to congratulate Postmaster E. J. Miller and those who assist him, as well as borough officials and businessmen, on this admirable addition to the area's postal facilities.

I wish to congratulate Mr. Kenneth Claar, of East Freedom, who was successful in obtaining the contract to construct and lease this new and modern post office building.

In addition I warmly commend the Newry Lions Club for sponsoring this dedication program and the businessmen and residents who aided the sponsors.

As a Member of of Congress interested in providing adequate postal service through modern facilities, I am pleased to have been invited to join with you in dedicating your new and modern post office.

The Borough of Newry has gained a valuable and attractive asset and one that reflects credit on this community.

Blueprint for Regimentation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, the Kennedy administration's blueprint for the regimentation of American agriculture has now been introduced in the House of Representatives as H.R. 10010—a 106-page document which spells out in horrifying detail a program of harsh production controls, coupled with fines and jail sentences for farmers who run afoul of its provisions.

The measure tells farmers flatly that the alternative to this Federal straitjacket is no Federal price support assistance at all.

Apparently this administration has decided farmers are becoming an increasingly smaller minority in the United States. If farmers do not accept the production and marketing controls set forth in the new farm bill they would be denied future assistance under Federal price support programs, while, if farmers bow to this pressure and accept the program, they run the risk of fines or imprisonment for violating its many technical provisions.

The wheat section of the bill would, for example, subject farmers to four specific penalties ranging from liability under civil action to "a fine of not more than $10,000 or imprisonment of not more than ten years, or both." Under the bill, wheatgrowers and dairy producers would be singled out for much harsher fines and penalties than could be assessed against producers of other commodities.

The bill specifies "the Secretary of Agriculture shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this—wheat—subtitle including, but not limited to, regulations governing the acquisition, disposition, or handling of marketing certificates". It further provides that any person who violates "any regulation governing the acquisition, disposition or handling of marketing certificates shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be subject to a fine of not more than $5,000 for each violation."

In other words, if a farmer should inadvertently violate a secretarial regulation relating to marketing certificates published in the Federal Register, he could be subjected to a fine of not more than $5,000 for each offense.

Never before has the Federal Government sought to impose such penalties upon American farmers.

The wheat program which would be submitted to farmers for their approval in a referendum is outlined in the bill but it leaves much to be answered. Although the producer would receive from 75 to 90 percent of parity for wheat consumed as food in the domestic market, wheat moving into export and other uses would be supported at 0 to 90 percent of parity. A national wheat allotment would be set and it would be perhaps 20 percent below the present allotment of 55 million acres. If growers turned down this entire package in a referendum, all price supports on wheat would be terminated and, to make the price situation even more chaotic, the Government would be empowered to dump 200 million bushels of wheat into the marketplace each year.

For producers of grain sorghums and other feed grains, the alternative choice is equally disastrous. If growers refused to approve a program calling for mandatory controls on all feed grains, price supports would cease and the Government could dump up to 10 million tons of feed grain into the marketplace each year.

American farmers deserve a farm program which offers them a better choice than complete regimentation or disaster in the marketplace.

Apparently this administration is determined to impose its solution upon farmers. The Kennedy-Freeman farm bill contemplates a so-called land use adjustment program which would have the effect of drastically reducing the number of farms and farmers over a period of years. Should Congress enact this legislative monstrosity, the liquidation of millions of small-family farm people would undoubtedly be achieved in even less time than the administration contemplates.

The United States and the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Congressional Record remarks I delivered on the United States and the United Nations, before the Portland State College Convocation, Portland, Oreg., November 20, 1961.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE UNITED STATES AND THE UNITED NATIONS

(Remarks of Senator Wayne Morse, of Oregon, before the Portland State College Convocation, Portland, Oreg., November 20, 1961)

Faculty, students, and friends of Portland State College, there is no greater pleasure for me than to return to the stimulating atmosphere of an Oregon campus, and this visit to Portland State is no exception.

The growth of this institution is one of the encouraging signs that higher education will not be allowed to lag behind population growth. As chairman of the Senate Education Subcommittee, it has often seemed to me that we have been bound to a somewhat stagnant concept of making big schools bigger instead of creating new 4-year universities that will take their place beside the traditional ones.

We do not hesitate to build new homes or highways for a bigger population. Why should we hesitate to build new universities? I feel that Portland State is proving that this is indeed the appropriate way to keep up with our needs in the field of higher education.

To this audience, however, I want to devote my principal remarks to foreign policy problems. Never in our history has there been more interest and concern with international affairs among Americans than today. This is true because we are the most powerful nation in the world and also because we are self-governing. Where decisions are made for a people by an imposed set of rulers, they may not need to know the why and wherefore of the decision; but where a government is elected in a free election, there is no substitute at all for an informed public.

Probably the one new and basic fact which has changed American thinking about international affairs more in the 15 years since the end of World War II has been the advance in Communist technology and production which now enables the Soviet Union to deliver upon the territory of the United States by long-range missile the frightful destruction of nuclear weapons.

This is a relatively new factor for Americans to consider. Prior to World War I, and prior to World War II, we were bystanding witnesses to the military might which swept over Europe and over Asia. We watched it; we debated whether it would eventually threaten our own territory. We considered at what point we should enter the fray ourselves so that the battle with Germany and Japan might be won before it ever reached the United States proper.

Today, it is the United States itself which is a central target of armed might, and it is an armed might that carries more destruction than any in history. We have an even more overwhelming nuclear force at our command. But I think it is safe to say there is no chance at all that either the United States or the Soviet Union can strike the other without being struck in return, no matter who unleashes the first blow.

That Americans are beginning to understand this basic change in our position is evident from the hot and heavy debate over civil defense, a subject we have scarcely even considered before.

Those of us who serve on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee recognize that military technology and civil defense are part of the raw material from which foreign policy is made. The old tradition that war is just one more means of pursuing a national policy is, however, rendered pretty invalid by modern warfare. Our use of war has been for defense. War today, however, and I mean a nuclear war with the Soviet Union, will not defend what we want preserved. If we can destroy the enemy by means of war, the war itself will destroy, too, what we like to call the American way of life.

The dismal alternatives and the preoccupation with them by so many people has given rise to what I think is a highly falsified debate over whether it is better to be red than dead, or vice versa.

This preoccupation has also given rise to an old familiar refrain about stopping Communist advances by investigating the American State Department. For many people, it is unthinkable that anything can happen anywhere in the world unless it is willed by the United States, and every change that appears to them as a threat to their sense of permanent American superiority is assumed to have occurred only because of connivance by Americans.

The plain truth is that both Russia and China are very large nations, with populations that greatly exceed our own. Once industrial technology and mass education was applied to these vast numbers of people and to their extensive natural resources, the result was a rise in their industrial and military power. We could investigate every person who works for the Department of State until the cows come home, but it would have no impact on Communist advances. We got on that merry-go-round about 10 years ago, and the only result it produced was to make the United States a laughing stock among people who did not see why they should be impressed with American foreign policy when the American people did not trust their own State Department.

This is no time for us to emulate the Communist folly of devouring its own. Actually, the free world has benefited from that Communist practice. The campaign to eradicate Stalin from history and even change the name of Stalingrad to Volgagrad probably has some unknown roots in the twists and turns of Communist doctrine. But the result has been a revelation of how ridiculous communism can get. It has also given rise to new questioning of present Communist policy. The party line is going to have to be buttressed with more logic and information than in the past, because the party faithful in many countries are already asking why they should believe in the present Soviet leaders any more than they should believe in Stalin. We should take every advantage of this confusion in Communist ranks instead of creating our own counterpart.

We help the Communist world by firing on our own State Department from the rear while the Communist fire on it from the front.

I have never been among those who believe that a democracy can find scapegoats. Many prefer to find scapegoats than to think. Many find it easier to argue with loyal Americans than with Russian Communists. But disunity, witch hunting, and suspicion at home will never improve our standing abroad.

Instead of this neurotic insistence on investigating individuals, what we really need is a national investigation and debate by all the American people of the policies our State Department should pursue, because the men and women who happen to work there are not separate from the American people.

We do need more public investigation of foreign policy issues and problems. We need some hard thinking about alternative to the choice between "red or dead." We need to learn more and debate more what policies and devices are open to us that will really save what we want saved of American life. This is a job that the whole American people must do.

One of the alternatives which I do not think has been fully appreciated and used is the United Nations. I have been critical of the State Department policy myself in this respect. But we need to have a realistic picture of the United Nations, of what it does, what it could do, and what it cannot do.

First of all, too many people who are critics of the United Nations and too many who ardently believe in it seem to regard the U.N. as representing chiefly the neutral or unalined nations. Too often, when we speak of the United Nations, we have in mind a so-called third force of countries who are party to the cold war. Many individuals think these nations, being militarily weak, should be ignored and therefore the United Nations should be ignored.

On the other hand, some Americans tend to ascribe to this bloc of nations some special pure and lofty motives, untarnished by self-interest, unsullied by the taint of ownership of nuclear weapons. This romantic misconception of the so-called neutral bloc also leads to some serious mistakes in our thinking about the United Nations.

Neither of these attitudes is sound. The fact is that the cold war between the Communist world and the free world is over the future of these presently unalined countries. If they lack military power, they still contain a huge proportion of the world's population and natural resources. What American who today says we should ignore the neutrals, would ignore any one of them which is taken over by a Communist form of government? Let that happen, as it did in Cuba, and the howls for American action will go up.

But neither are these nations any different from the United States or the Soviet Union in the pursuit of what they think is their national interest. Let us never forget that among the new nations of Asia and Africa, and in Latin America, too, nationalism is probably the strongest single driving force. Their nationalism is no less rampant than the nationalism of the Soviet Union nor of the United States.

If they are critical of the two great powers for failing to settle their differences, the small countries have not settled their differences, either, and they have not used the United Nations for peaceful settlement of them any more than we have.

That the United Nations remains as the center of world politics in spite of the nationalism of great and small powers is testimony to the universal need by all these powers to have a single agency which will tend to moderate conflicting nationalisms. It also points up the one common need of every nation—the avoidance of nuclear war. Nuclear war is the enemy of every country's national aspirations.

In this respect, the United Nations is as important to us as the so-called neutral countries. This is why we have supported it financially, and in fact, the United States has been by far the largest single source of U.N. financing. Since assessments are levied on the basis of ability to pay, however, we are contributing no more than our share.

But the Communist bloc, and some of the colonial powers, refuse to support any U.N. function of which they disapprove. This policy has been weakening to the organization. It has been restrained by the provision of the charter which deprives a nation of the right to vote in the General Assembly if it falls 2 years behind in its regular assessment. Unfortunately, such expensive operations as that in the Congo are not considered as part of the regular budget and so Russia and its satellites and France have simply refused to pay their share. This is one of the most serious problems the organization faces.

A second major problem of the United Nations is the veto power. When it was written into the charter in 1945, it was at our insistence as well as that of the Soviet Union. But it has hamstrung effective United Nations action in many areas. It has resulted in the withering of the Security Council as an operating body, and caused the U.N. to use the General Assembly for the making of policy which the Security Council was supposed to make. It has also forced the Secretary General to assume supervision over police actions authorized by the Assembly which were intended to be authorized and supervised by the Security Council.

As one who opposed the veto power in 1945, I continue to believe it should be eliminated, and that this country should constantly seek its elimination,

Above all, it should not be extended to the office of the Secretary General, and the fact that it was not is due to the outstanding diplomacy of Ambassador Stevenson, plus the conviction among the small nations that the secretariat must not be reduced to the impotency of the Security Council. Yet this battle was won only temporarily, because U Thant of Burma will only fill the unexpired term of Mr. Hammarskjold. In April of 1963, the battle against the "troika" will begin anew.

It is evident from a discussion of these two major problems facing the United Nations that they arise from the efforts of the Soviet Union to prevent effective United Nations action which tends to block their own objectives. A third manifestation of Russian dissatisfaction with the U.N. is its effort to move it out of New York City to Moscow, or some other place where Communist riots and demonstrations may more easily be organized as a means of influencing and intimidating U.N. delegates. Those ill-informed Americans who call for getting the U.N. out of the United States fail to understand how much we have to gain by having its headquarters in the United States, and how much advantage the Soviet Union would gain throughout the world if it were moved to Moscow.

The point of what I am saying is that because we do not want to compel other nations to be like us, but only want them to be independent, we share with them a common interest in the United Nations. It is the focus of common interest that has yet to be developed in American foreign policy. The unalined nations, being weak, are susceptible to Communist terrorism, as we saw when the Russian resumption of nuclear testing achieved much of its purpose at the Belgrade conference. It is an old American belief that in unity there is strength. We must see to it that the United Nations is an instrument that will reflect this commonly held desire for peace, and opportunity for national growth.

We can best do that by taking to the U.N. the big international issues that threaten the peace. We should not let these nations remain in the role of passive bystanders to the East-West struggle, where they are most likely to feel that since it does not involve them, they should merely bring pressure on whichever side is most reasonable to give in to the side which is more implacable. This tendency is all too evident among the neutrals.

Because we say, and believe, that in defending the freedom of West Berlin we are defending freedom for all nations, we should put these nations into Berlin with us. This is why I have often urged that we try to put the whole city of Berlin under the jurisdiction of the United Nations. It is why I have consistently urged that before we send American troops to one trouble spot or another which is outside the requirements of our immediate self-defense, that we first try to get the United Nations to act.

The right of self-defense is fully recognized by the U.N. Charter and will always remain our right and obligation. But the advances of communism elsewhere in the world must be met by something else. That something else must be a sense of unity against aggression, including subversion, and the strength to back it up. We have the strength, but when we use it unilaterally in matters outside our territorial defense, we fail completely to get others to see that they, too, have a stake in the outcome.

A hot war, in other words, which ends in mutual destruction has no victor. A cold war can be won or lost. It cannot be won, however, by the United States alone but only by the community of nations, and the community of nations today is the United Nations.

United Nations Peace Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK KOWALSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill to promote the foreign policy of the United States and to afford an opportunity for the people of the United States to participate in the purchase of United Nations bonds, to amend the United Nations Participation Act of 1945.

The President has recommended enactment by Congress of a bill to authorize and appropriate up to $100 million for the purchase of United Nations 25-year, 2-percent bonds to finance special operations in the Middle East and in the Congo.

This method of financing was approved by the General Assembly and has been formally offered by Acting Secretary General U Thant.

The need for this means of financing the United Nations expeditionary force and the United Nations operation in the Congo arises both from the refusal of some member states, and the inability of others, to pay their special assessments.

The United Nations bond issue will enable the United Nations to continue these special operations for which the General Assembly has granted authority. It will obligate every nonpaying or delinquent member state to pay its accumulated debt. It will reduce the U.S. contribution for these operations from approximately 47½ percent to a more equitable 32 percent. It is hoped that this remedial financing will encourage a greater sense of financial responsibility among member states.

I support the President's recommendation to Congress in the belief that the United Nations, however imperfect, is today an essential instrument of our national security and of our national policy, and in the hope that it may be made more perfect in the days ahead as mankind's best hope of finding an alternative to war.

I support our Government's participation in the bond issue, knowing that the United Nations is proving a powerful weapon against Communist imperialism and confident that in those instances where we have suffered reversals we can, through patience, wisdom, and courage, make them yield new victories for the cause of peace.

The refusal of Russia and its satellites to pay their assessments for U.N. operations in the Congo and in the Middle East is a crude confession of the effectiveness of U.N. actions.

It is argued that the United Nations bonds are a bad risk, and who would deny it. But I cannot think of a better diversified investment. We are risking $52 billion in a Military Establishment that, should war come, would not prevent massive destruction to America. We are risking $700 million in a civil defense program that may prove ineffectual in saving the 50 million Americans it is designed to accommodate.

Let us look at the far graver risks our failure to support the bond issue would entail. U.N. operations would be halted in the Middle East and in the Congo and new operations could not be launched to meet new crises. A war between Israel and the Arab States, direct U.S. intervention in the Congo or writing it off to chaos or to communism—these alternatives are perilous too.

It is debatable whether the United Nations could survive our lack of confidence or loss of hope. If not, what are the chances of mankind surviving?

Has anyone estimated the cost to us if the U.N. operations fail? How much more will we have to appropriate for our staggering new defense budget to allow for the greater risk of global war?

What thought has gone into an alternative policy should these special operations end or the United Nations collapse?

Or how might we strengthen the United Nations?

It is time the Congress gave these matters some thought.

United Nations bonds buy that time to think.

The United Nations bond issue offers the United States a priceless opportunity to build a better United Nations by reinforcing our collective responsibility through individual participation in its support, and in so doing to set an example for other member states.

With this purpose, I introduce a bill that would, following approval of the President's request, authorize the Treasury to issue for sale to the general public United Nations peace bonds in denominations of $25, $50, and $100 and bearing 2-percent interest compounded semiannually, which would offer to the American people an opportunity to underwrite any portion of the $100 million appropriated to the Treasury. The Treasury would thus have available a large sum that could be appropriated for other worthwhile programs.

I believe these peace bonds would give the people of America, as individuals, a long-sought, tangible, and potent means to share in the tasks and the objectives of the United Nations.

The ever-present threat of thermonuclear annihilation haunts the everyday thoughts of our men and women and children. In the face of this threat, it has been suggested that private citizens or the Government construct fallout shelters.

Serious questions have arisen in the minds of many people about the effectiveness, the strategy, the morality, and the humanity of such a defense. Whatever the validity of these questions, the fact is virtually no shelters have been constructed.

The constant menace of a nuclear catastrophe, coupled with a vision of the remoteness of the Government and the United Nations, instills a growing sense of helplessness or of outrage among our people, who want to take an active role in their own defense short of burrowing into the ground. Unless these energies are tapped, our Nation's strength and resolve will be seriously impaired.

United Nations peace bonds would allow the average American a concrete means of coping with this threat, of participating more closely with the Government's support of the United Nations, a way of making a personal investment in the task of positively and constructively building a shelter of peace through the United Nations.

It should further be considered that the man on the street could thus demonstrate convincingly to the world the overwhelming support of Americans for the United Nations. Such a clear, popular demonstration might encourage other member states to offer similar bonds to their citizens and thus not only make it easier for less prosperous nations to participate in the United Nations bond issue through public subvention, but also greatly enhance the possibilities for peace throughout the world community.

Making United Nations peace bonds available to the public would, moreover, obviate any possible suspicion that the Government's purchase is a "profitmaking venture by capital exporting nations, who will purchase the largest share of the bonds."

Finally, it would exert the strongest moral pressures on recalcitrant member states to pay their accumulated debt. I believe that if the American workingman and the American housewife and the American schoolboy buy United Nations peace bonds, their Russian counterparts will take a new look at America, and at themselves and their own delinquent government.

I am not in sympathy with those who argue against new proposals because of their novelty or who expect all things to be accomplished effortlessly, forgetting there are rewards that are most satisfying if they are commensurate with our efforts.

I am in sympathy with those who will offer better approaches to the problems and possibilities I have suggested.

In sum, I am convinced the issue of the United Nations peace bonds will strengthen the average American's personal commitment to the United Nations and set an example to the governments and peoples of the world. I ask your support for the bill I am introducing:

H.R. 10097

A bill to promote the foreign policy of the United States by authorizing the purchase of United Nations bonds and the appropriation of funds therefor, and to afford an opportunity for the people of the United States to participate in the purchase of such bonds.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President, without fiscal-year limitation, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, $100,000,000 for the purchase of United Nations bonds. Amounts appropriated pursuant to the preceding sentence shall be used for such purchases at any time that the President determines it necessary. This determination shall not be contingent upon the sale of peace bonds nor any proceeds to be derived therefrom.

SEC. 2. Amounts received from the annual repayment of principal and payment of interest due on United Nations bonds shall be deposited into the Treasury of the United

States in a special fund which shall be available for redemption of peace bonds. Amounts not needed for such redemptions shall be deposited into miscellaneous receipts.

Sec. 3. The United Nations Participation Act of 1945 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"UNITED NATIONS PEACE BONDS

"Sec. 9. (a) For the purpose of providing an opportunity for the public to provide support for the activities of the United Nations, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to issue special obligations of the United States, designated as 'peace bonds,' in accordance with the provisions of law applicable to United States savings bonds except that peace bonds shall mature not more than twenty-five years from the date as of which issued, and shall be issued on a discount basis such as to afford an investment yield not in excess of 2 per centum per annum, compounded semiannually when held to maturity.

"(b) Peace bonds shall have a face value of $25, $50, and $100 when held to maturity, and may be issued in such other denominations as the Secretary of the Treasury may from time to time determine.

"(c) Amounts realized by the Secretary of the Treasury from the sale of peace bonds shall be deposited in a special fund in the Treasury, and shall be available for use in the purchase of United Nations bonds."

The Lighter Side of Life in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, in these days of frustration and uncertainty, it is always pleasant to look on the brighter side of things. Hence, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I enclose herewith an article which appeared in the U.S. News & World Report of February 12, 1962:

BARRY GOLDWATER "ACCEPTS"—THE LIGHTER SIDE OF LIFE IN WASHINGTON

(Senator Barry Goldwater, of Arizona, a leader of Republican conservatives turned up as a political satirist and humorist at a meeting of Washington's Alfalfa Club.

(The club, a social group that includes many of the Capital City's most prominent citizens, annually holds a mock "national convention" to nominate the "Alfalfa" candidate for President. This year's nominee was the Arizona Republican.

(Text of an address before the Alfalfa Club in Washington, D.S., on January 20, 1962:)

Mr. President, fellow members of this convention, guests: Thank you, Mr. Graham [Philip L. Graham, president of the Washington Post and Times Herald]. Believe me, it is an honor to be nominated by a man of your distinction, and I am very grateful to Herblock [Post and Times Herald cartoonist] for giving you the evening off to perform this vital task. While seated at the table I turned to my friend and able colleague from Kentucky, Thruston Morton, and remarked that there are a lot of Republicans here tonight and he quickly commented that Republicans cannot afford $100 dinners and settled for this $25 one.

This is the most exicting thing that has happened to me since [Walter] Reuther made me an honorary Auto Worker. Frankly, I feel that I am long overdue for this nomination. But in my modesty I can't believe that there are not others better qualified. Personally, I think Nelson Rockefeller would make a wonderful President. Although I don't know how the White House would look with those gas pumps out in front.

I notice that Mr. Kennedy and his chief scout aren't here tonight and if someone can carry the word to the President, tell him he would have been in no danger appearing with me tonight—we're not on television. I understand the President and Vice President are out raising money to pay off the campaign debt. They could each give up 1 week's allowance and take care of that.

Now, gentlemen, if my voice trembles a little at this historic moment, I'm sure you will understand. Emotion chokes me when I think that you have chosen a barefoot boy from the Arizona "valley of fear" to lead this underprivileged, undernourished, underhoused, underclothed, and over-Kennedied Nation of under 190 million underlings back to the old frontier of McKinley's day. The undertaking, naturally, overwhelms me. It takes my breath away even though I feel the White House is ready for me since Jacqueline remodeled it in an 18th-century decor, and I feel this is a double honor since I've never even been to Harvard.

But this has been a genuine draft—not just the kind felt by reservists—and I have yielded to it in the sincere belief that no man with a drop of patriotism in his veins could turn down such a golden opportunity to advance his family. Of course, the Goldwater clan is not as large as the Kennedy clan. And my brother Bob doesn't want to be in Government—he promised dad he'd go straight. Besides, somebody has got to mind the store. Which reminds me, I must have the books audited.

But I have a lot of uncles and cousins and in-laws whom I wouldn't mind shifting to the Government payroll. Anything at all—Peace Corps, Justice Department, Senator from Massachusetts—just anything so long as it isn't one of those dollar-a-year jobs. And don't forget I have a sister named Carolyn and a granddaughter named Carolyn, which I figure puts me two up in that department.

Since the Attorney General's famous parachute jump from the dome of the Capitol, we now have a three-party system—Republican, Democrat, and Teamsters. This opens a whole new vista for elections. Before, the Democrats had to carry away their own ballot boxes. Now the Teamsters can do the job, whether they dump them in the Illinois River or the Rio Grande.

Which reminds me, I have a grandson who's too young to vote but too old to be Attorney General. This may be an asset.

Now right at the beginning let me scotch one bit of campaign slander the opposition has come up with. It is perfectly true that, during the heat of the preconvention maneuvering, I said that, if nominated, I would not accept and, if elected, I would not serve. But that statement was lifted out of context and deliberately distorted.

In the first place, when I said it things didn't look so good. But do they tell you that? Of course not. They claim that I meant it. What I really said was that Sherman had said it first, Eisenhower had said it in 1948, Adlai had said it in 1952—and wishes to God he'd stuck to it—and Nixon is saying it now. It beats me how they can take a clear-cut sentence like that and distort it. Why, even Pravda garbled it in translation and they usually get things right.

I will not deny that I've thought about the Presidency. Somebody ought to think about it. And I'm not afraid of the Presidency. They say it's the loneliest job in the world. But those who say it have never been a Republican in this Senate. Besides there are many risks to being President—I saw that President Kennedy was Time magazine's "Man of the Year." Did you see his picture on the cover? I didn't even know that Everett Dirksen could paint.

I would not be truthful if I said that I was fully qualified for the office. I do not play the piano. I seldom play golf, and I never play touch football. I hope you will find it in your hearts to accept a President who just sits behind a desk and works.

Now, I must take note of the fact that my opponents call me a conservative. If I understand the word correctly, it means to "conserve." Well, then, I'm just trying to live up to my name and conserve two things that most need conserving in this country—gold and water.

I don't apologize for being a conservative. I can remember when "conservative" and "mother" were clean words.

Now let me turn to my campaign platform: As you all know, I have argued for some time that we should do away with the cumbersome and lengthy, unmeaningful and platitudinous promises that the platforms of both parties have become. We need bold, brief statements that all Americans can understand.

With this in mind and hoping to avoid any floor fight over the platform, I called the two gentlemen who wrote the 1960 Republican platform and asked the hopeful next Governor of California to have a midnight meeting with the current and next Governor of New York.

These things are no good, apparently, unless they are done at the witching hour of midnight.

Well, that was 2 weeks ago, and they're still arguing. They have a tentative draft that runs over 1 million words. You see, Dick has just written a book, which he thinks would make a good platform, that runs 500,000 words right there. And, of course, Nelson wants equal time.

And I gathered that they were both thinking of 1968, so I said, "The hell with that" and sat down and wrote a platform with only three planks. I've eliminated all the usual gobbledygook and tried to make it concise and concrete so that everybody will know just where I stand.

The first plank fits neatly on one page, but I think it's basically sound and honest. It will mean the same thing to you whether you live in the North or the South, whether you're a farmer in Maine or an industrial worker in California. It says, and I ask you to pay close attention: Elect Goldwater.

That's it. No nonsense, no shilly-shallying, no hairsplitting—just elect Goldwater. It's got a nice ring to it that I sorta like and is there anyone, from the highest to the lowest, from the ordinary schoolchild to the lowliest Harvard professor, who can possibly mistake this meaning? I'll go even further. Is there anyone in this room who doesn't understand it?

The other two planks deal with labor, education, foreign policy, and the farm problem. Here's plank No. 2: Elect Goldwater. Now you may notice a certain similarity between the first plank and the second, and I want you to know that that was deliberate. It has been my experience that the public is confused if you offer too many issues. The thing to do is to get hold of one good one and stick to it. Hammer it home. Repetition is the way Madison Avenue sells toothpaste and soap and it's the way the New Frontier stays in the limelight. But when repetition occurs at the White House—and it has since 1932—it's not a sales pitch, it's a giveaway. You don't even have to guess the price.

And now for the final plank—plank No. 3. This is the bellringer and it's even shorter. It just says ditto.

There you have a campaign platform in five words—elect Goldwater, elect Goldwater, ditto.

Just to keep things symmetrical, I think I'll hold the budget to five figures. Jayne Mansfield's for openers and I'll accept nominations for the other four.

Now, no campaign could get rolling without some slogans—words to quicken the patriotic pulses of the people and get them steamed up to go out and elect GOLDWATER.

You'll notice that they are set with the compass bearing of the New Frontier wagon train and some of them may even strike terror in the heart of Mr. Khrushchev.

The first one I borrowed from my friend L.B.J. It reads: "Forget the Alamo."

Others that are equally inspiring are: "Surrender, hell, I have not yet begun to negotiate." Or "Millions for defense, but not 1 cent for victory." And "54-40 or a reasonable compromise."

One more, "Damn the torpedoes—we're unilaterally disarmed."

Now, my inaugural address will establish precedent by the same kind of brevity. When I'm sworn in by Earl Warren—who will no doubt regard this act as a violation of his oath of office—all I intend to do is raise my hand and say, "I do."

That's all I said when I was married and it's all I've been able to say around the house ever since. But it's worked out rather well.

Now, I think you're entitled to know something about the caliber of men I will have in my Cabinet. In presenting the list, I'd like it understood that it is confidential. Also, all the men on this list have already leaked the information to the press and I have promised to respect the priority of their leaks.

For Secretary of the Treasury, I think I can do no better than to keep Mr. Dillon. Primarily because he has demonstrated that he possesses the one quality so badly needed in these days when we are being pulled one way by the extremists of the left and the other way by extremists of the right. Mr. Dillon is flexible. In fact, you might call him an extreme middle-of-the-roader.

My hat is off to any man who can argue under Eisenhower that we must beware of the inflationary tug of the mounting national debt and then make a rebuttal under Kennedy by saying a mere $7 billion added to the debt won't hurt us a bit. I believe that Secretary Dillon belongs in Government—I don't think private industry could afford him.

For Secretary of Defense, I'm sure you'll agree I couldn't do better than Linus Pauling. I figure if we give him 3 weeks on the job he'll give us a defense without going to the expense of nuclear weapons or bomb shelters, or anything else. That would save us about $60 billion right there and it ain't to be sneezed at.

Also I rather like his notion of replacing General Walker with Cyrus Eaton. If we're going to indoctrinate the troops, let's do it right.

Postmaster General is up for grabs. Adlai Stevenson is mad at the Post Office. He couldn't get back the Christmas card he sent to Nehru. It couldn't be delivered anyway because Nehru was at a peace conference—that's where he spends his time between invasions.

For Secretary of the Interior I certainly would be loyal to a fellow Arizonian and ask Stew Udall to stay on—I'll need that oil money anyway. But only if he promises to stay off Mount Fuji and other people's private property. If he does a good job, we might even build a statue for him.

I haven't picked a Secretary of Agriculture yet. I'm waiting to see what Governors are unemployed.

As for the State Department, I've been going over their records and have come to the conclusion we ought to abolish the whole damn thing.

I don't claim to have all the answers, but, since this administration took over, I don't even understand the questions.

And another thing: How is it that our Government did better against General Electric than they did against Cuba?

I don't want to seem critical. But our first ambassador in space was a chimp. And so far he's the only one in the State Department who hasn't made a mistake.

If I do have a State Department I guess I could keep Chester Bowles. He's the mystery guest in the Cabinet; in fact, he's going on "What's My Line?" as soon as he finds out what his line is. Of course, if the State Department doesn't work out I can always close it and keep the store open nights.

I think it's only fair to tell you I intend to be the President of the whole people and can promise you a nonpartisan administration made up of the best men obtainable. If there are some good scouts in the New Frontier—and I have my doubts—I'll ask them to stay even if they have to be approved by Walter Lippmann.

For example, I have some definite plan for Professor Galbraith, Ed Murrow, and Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. I can't reveal these plans, because if there's a leak they might get out of the country before I'm inaugurated.

I have some other notions that I shall reserve for my first state of the Union message. For example, I'm going to propose a constitutional amendment that any decision of the Supreme Court must make sense. I know it will be controversial, but I think it deserves an airing.

Further, I will state to the people, "Ask not what your country can do for you but rather what you can do for your country." I think I've heard that somewhere. Then I'll ask for a new Government agency to study and make recommendations on new things the Government can do for the people. This may take considerable research.

I think it's time to dust off that old shibboleth, "The people are too damned dumb," and really apply ourselves to the task of taking their property, spending their money, and living their lives for them. It's time they face up to the realties of life and start making some sacrifices.

The Kennedy administration has only scratched the surface in this field. Actually, as we mark the first anniversary of the New Frontier, I must say it's been a wonderful year. I wish we could afford it. Now I know why they call it the New Frontier—we're having a harder time crossing it than "Wagon Train."

Now, I suppose no acceptance speech would be complete without a reference to the candidate's background. Very simply, I think I'm in the American tradition. I was born in a log cabin, which I had moved to Phoenix, and, except for some air conditioning, a swimming pool, a bowling alley, a bar, a shooting range and a golf course, it remains the simple log cabin it always was.

I have nothing against millionaire Presidents. I'd just like to see the day return when people other than Presidents can be millionaires, too.

I've never hesitated with an answer. When anyone asks me how I stand on integration, I've only got one answer: Where are you from?

Now, gentlemen, I have told you the story. The rest is up to you. Go out and work from now to election day and fulfill our campaign pledge—elect GOLDWATER. Find more of those districts such as the one the New Frontier turned up in Cook County—the one that had 22 residents but came up with 77 votes. That's the sort of stuff I mean.

Gentlemen, I'm flattered that you thought first of my name. I have every confidence that, with all of you behind me, I could be another Alf Landon.

Do your share, and, I pledge you, I will do mine.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 1962

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the Honorable LEE METCALF, a Senator from the State of Montana.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

God of our fathers, facing tasks that tower above our power to achieve, with a sense of our utter inadequacy when left to our own devices, we bow for the strengthening benediction of our morning prayer.

In all the tangled tragedy of our ailing world we ask for power to keep our goals clear, our hearts pure, and our spirits courageous.

May we hear Thy call in the thunder of these tumultuous times. When the hammers of Thy purpose are beating out new shapes on the anvil of the world, may this dear land of ours be fashioned into an instrument through which Thy will may be done on the earth in such desperate need of Thy guidance.

In the spirit of the Master we ask it. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

> U.S. SENATE,
> PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
> *Washington, D.C., February 7, 1962.*
>
> *To the Senate:*
>
> Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. LEE METCALF, a Senator from the State of Montana, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.
>
> CARL HAYDEN,
> *President pro tempore.*

Mr. METCALF thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, February 6, 1962, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 8780. An act for the relief of Dr. Carl F. Romney;

H.R. 8781. An act for the relief of Walter Singlevich; and

H.R. 8947. An act for the relief of Harry A. Sebert.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

S. 631. An act for the relief of Elwood Brunken;

S. 651. An act for the relief of Howard B. Schmutz; and

S. 1456. An act to authorize an additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

H.R. 8780. An act for the relief of Dr. Carl F. Romney;

H.R. 8781. An act for the relief of Walter Singlevich; and

H.R. 8947. An act for the relief of Harry A. Sebert.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements during the morning hour be limited to 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Harrison L. Winter, of Maryland, to be U.S. district judge for the district of Maryland;

Frederick A. Daugherty, of Oklahoma, to be U.S. district judge for the northern, eastern, and western districts of Oklahoma;

J. Robert Elliott, of Georgia, to be U.S. district judge for the middle district of Georgia; and

Daniel T. Donovan, of Washington, to be U.S. marshal for the eastern district of Washington.

By Mr. KEFAUVER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Charles G. Neese, of Tennessee, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Tennessee; and

Frank Gray, Jr., of Tennessee, to be U.S. district judge for the middle district of Tennessee.

By Mr. ERVIN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

L. Richardson Preyer, of North Carolina, to be U.S. district judge for the middle district of North Carolina.

By Mr. HART, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Almeric L. Christian, of the Virgin Islands, to be U.S. attorney for the Virgin Islands.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of James J. Saxon, of Illinois, to be Comptroller of the Currency.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

U.S. MARSHAL

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Harry D. Mansfield, of Tennessee, to be U.S. marshal for the eastern district of Tennessee for a term of 4 years.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

COMMUNICATION SATELLITE ACT OF 1962

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the establishment, ownership, operation, and regulation of a commercial communications satellite system, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

REPORT OF SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report, for fiscal year 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AIRCRAFT LOAN GUARANTEES

A letter from the Vice Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of September 7, 1957, relating to aircraft loan guarantees (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT ON BACKLOG OF PENDING APPLICATIONS AND HEARING CASES IN FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in that Commission, as of December 31, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF SELECTED ACTIVITIES OF DEPARTMENT OF LICENSES AND INSPECTIONS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of selected activities of Department of Licenses and Inspections, District of Columbia Government, dated February 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

TEOFILO CAOILE SERVITO

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Teofilo Caoile Servito (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADULT LITERACY ACT OF 1962

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to assist in providing necessary instruction for adults unable to read and write English or with less than a sixth grade level of education, through grants to institutions of higher learning for development of materials and methods of instruction and for training of teaching and supervisory personnel and through grants to States for pilot projects, improvement of State services, and programs of instruction (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

IMPROVEMENT OF EDUCATIONAL QUALITY ACT OF 1962

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to improve the quality of elementary and secondary education (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT ON POSITIONS IN GRADES GS-16, 17, AND 18 IN DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on positions in that Department allocated or placed in grades GS-16, 17, and 18, during the calendar year 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

JOINT RESOLUTION OF VIRGINIA LEGISLATURE

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD Senate Joint Resolution 5, expressing the sense of the General Assembly of Virginia in opposition to Federal legislation establishing minimum unemployment benefit standards.

This joint resolution was sponsored in the Virginia General Assembly by Senator Garland Gray and Senator Landon R. Wyatt.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 5

Joint resolution expressing the sense of the general assembly in opposition to Federal legislation establishing minimum unemployment benefit standards

Whereas previous efforts have been made in the Congress of the United States to establish minimum standards on the amount of unemployment benefit payments in the various States; and

Whereas there is presently pending before the Congress legislation which would establish minimum Federal benefit standards; and

Whereas such legislation, if enacted, would have a coercive effect upon this body, since it imposes drastic penalties on the taxpaying employers of those States which fail to conform to such minimum standards; and

Whereas this legislative body, consistent with the belief that matters relating to the amount and duration of unemployment compensation payments reside properly in the discretion of the general assembly, has periodically increased the maximum benefit amount and maximum duration in order to meet the needs of Virginia's unemployed citizens, which needs have been precipitated by changing economic conditions: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of delegates concurring), That the General Assembly of Virginia is opposed to any legislation which would establish and impose minimum Federal standards on the amount or duration of unemployment benefits paid by the States;

Resolved further, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each member of Virginia's delegation in the Congress of the United States.

Agreed to by the senate, January 22, 1962.

Agreed to by the house of delegates, January 31, 1962.

BEN D. LACY.
Clerk of the Senate.

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF WESTCHESTER COUNTY, N.Y.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, with new welfare legislation soon to come before the Congress, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a comprehensive and important resolution on this subject recently adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Westchester County, N.Y.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Honorable Board of Supervisors, County of Westchester, N.Y.:

Your committee on budget and appropriations has seriously considered a communication dated September 5, 1961, from the commissioner of public welfare recommending the adopting of a resolution aimed toward the simplification of the administration of public welfare.

During our study of this problem, we have been informed by the commissioner of public welfare that the Federal Government, in providing grants-in-aid to States and localities for public welfare assistance, has promulgated certain laws, rules, and regulations which adversely affect the reasonable administration of public welfare by the States and localities.

After full consideration of the matter, your committee agrees that it is of paramount importance that every effort be made to eliminate certain obstacles and reduce redtape so that localities may be able to administer public welfare in an efficient and effective manner.

Your committee therefore recommends the adoption of the attached resolution.

Dated, January 22, 1962.

Francis X. O'Rourke, Gordon Miller, Leonard Berman, Patrick V. Ryan, Edmund F. Ward, Anthony J. Posillipo, Manlio S. Severino, Arthur W. Richardson, George D. Burchell, Edward N. Vetrano, Joseph A. Martin.

RESOLUTION 33–1962

Whereas, public welfare assistance in the State of New York is a locally administered, State supervised governmental activity; and

Whereas the Federal Government in providing grants-in-aid to States and localities for public welfare assistance has promulgated certain laws, rules, and regulations which adversely affect the reasonable administration of public welfare assistance by the States and localities: therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Supervisors of the County of Westchester urge that the State of New York exert all influence possible to encourage the Federal Government to change, alter, and amend said Federal laws, rules, and regulations in order to (among others):

1. Give States freedom of choice in determining whether or not federally aided public welfare assistance is to be administered within their jurisdiction as a single program or as combined programs, instead of stipulating five separate categorical programs as now required by Federal law;
2. Establish a single formula for Federal financial participation applicable to all categories of assistance and to all assistance expenditures whether administered as separate or as combined categories;
3. Eliminate the Federal requirement of accumulating individual case counts in certain categories in order to compute Federal grants-in-aid and, instead, distribute grants-in-aid on a flat percentage basis similar to the new medical-assistance-for-the-aged category;
4. Eliminate the Federal requirement that State policies on eligibility and standards for assistance and other services to welfare recipients must apply equally in all localities as a prerequisite to receipt of Federal grants-in-aid regardless of varying local conditions;
5. Eliminate the Federal requirement prohibiting the use of Federal grants-in-aid for work relief;
6. Eliminate the Federal requirement that, without exception, all money payments to public welfare assistance recipients must be made with no restrictions imposed by the local welfare department on the use of funds by the recipient;
7. Provide a method by which a State may test in court its rights to receive grants-in-aid before the Federal department can cut off funds from a State; and be it further

Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be sent to Hon. John F. Kennedy, President of the United States; Hon. Abraham Ribicoff, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare of the United States; Hon. Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York; Chairman, Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, Washington, D.C.; Commissioner Raymond W. Houston, New York State Commissioner of Social Welfare; Senator Jacob Javits; Senator Kenneth Keating; Congressmen Edwin B. Dooley and Robert R. Barry; and the boards of supervisors and mayors of all New York counties.

ELMER J. MALONEY,
Clerk, Board of Supervisors.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 1564. A bill for the relief of Evangelos J. Marthakis (Rept. No. 1198);

S. 1638. A bill for the relief of Felix Ledina Mendoza (Rept. No. 1199);

S. 1874. A bill for the relief of Roland Fernando Mishutani (Rept. No. 1200);

S. 1881. A bill for the relief of Maria La Bella (Rept. No. 1201);

S. 2101. A bill for the relief of Aida Mary Sorino Boccalery (Rept. No. 1202); and

H.R. 8625. An act for the relief of Dennis H. O'Grady (Rept. No. 1195).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 1841. A bill for the relief of Maria Zambetoulla (Rept. No. 1203); and

H.R. 2990. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to determine the claim against the United States of Amis Construction Co. and San Ore Construction Co. (Rept. No. 1196).

By Mr. KEATING, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H.R. 74. An act to reimburse the city of New York for expenditure of funds to rehabilitate slip 7 in the city of New York for use by the U.S. Army (Rept. No. 1197).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McCLELLAN (for himself, Mr. EASTLAND, and Mr. ERVIN):

S. 2813. A bill to prohibit wiretapping by persons other than duly authorized law enforcement officers engaged in the investigation or prevention of specified categories of criminal offenses, and for other purposes, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. McCLELLAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KERR (for himself and Mr. MAGNUSON):

S. 2814. A bill to provide for the establishment, ownership, operation and regulation of a commercial communications satellite system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

(See the remarks of Mr. KERR when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 2815. A bill to amend the act of September 7, 1957, relating to aircraft loan guarantees; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and Mr. McCARTHY):

S. 2816. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an accelerated amortization deduction for industrial or commercial plants and facilities which will provide new employment opportunities in economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 2817. A bill to establish an Office of Public Works Coordination and Acceleration; to authorize the preparation of a plan for acceleration of public works when necessary to avoid serious nationwide unemployment levels; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CLARK (for himself and Mr. HUMPHREY):

S. 2818. A bill to promote the foreign policy of the United States by authorizing the purchase of United Nations bonds and the appropriation of funds therefor, and to afford an opportunity for the people of the United States to participate in the purchase of such bonds; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. CLARK when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 2819. A bill to provide for the imposition of countervailing duties upon iron ore in order to offset bounties or grants to foreign producers; and

S. 2820. A bill to maintain a fair ratio with domestic consumption of iron ore between iron ore produced in the United States and iron ore imported from foreign countries; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. McCarthy when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 2821. A bill to amend the National School Lunch Act in order to extend the provisions of such act to nonprofit summer camps for children; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. Javits when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HICKENLOOPER (for himself and Mr. Bennett):

S. 2822. A bill to establish a cropland retirement program; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. Hickenlooper when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HICKENLOOPER (for himself, Mr. Miller, Mr. Bennett, and Mr. Cooper):

S. 2823. A bill to extend and amend the conservation reserve program; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. Hickenlooper when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN (by request):

S. 2824. A bill to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act to authorize the United States to participate in loans to the International Monetary Fund to strengthen the international monetary system; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Sparkman when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION

JOHN R. DEVEREUX—REFERENCE OF BILL TO COURT OF CLAIMS

Mr. BEALL submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 294), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 2735) entitled "A bill for the relief of John R. Devereux" now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the Court of Claims; and the court shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28 of the United States Code and report to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand, as a claim, legal or equitable, against the United States and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITE ACT OF 1962

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], I introduce a bill which has to do with space communications satellites. This is the administration's bill. I have prepared a brief statement setting forth the similarity between this bill and the one previously introduced.

In accordance with the agreement between me and the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], the chairman of the Commerce Committee, I ask that the bill be referred to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, and also that my remarks on the measure be printed at this point in the Record.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and referred, as requested by the Senator from Oklahoma; and, without objection, the remarks will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2814) to provide for the establishment, ownership, operation, and regulation of a commercial communications satellite system, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Kerr (for himself and Mr. Magnuson), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

The statement presented by Mr. Kerr is as follows:

The most important and promising peaceful program resulting thus far from our Nation's extensive space program is the communications satellite system which is now developed to the point where it can become operational in a relatively short time. It is essential that this be done without delay and on the soundest possible organizational base.

In my judgment, the most effective means of insuring that the program is put into operation at the earliest possible time and operated successfully is by creating a corporation, operated for profit, within our private enterprise system—for traditionally our Nation's communications systems which have served our country so well have been privately owned companies. Accordingly, at the beginning of this session I introduced a bill which would authorize private ownership of the U.S. portion of a worldwide communications satellite system.

The President has today sent to the Congress his own proposal for a privately owned corporation. Although the proposed bill transmitted by the President provides for a corporate structure different from that contemplated in the bill I introduced, both strive for the same goal; namely, a privately owned corporation in which the existing American companies engaged in the international communications business would be able to invest, with their investments treated the same as the acquisition of new equipment and thus includible in their rate bases. This important feature permitting the rate of return for all communications services to be spread over a broad base should insure lower charges for communications satellite services. The principal new feature of the administration bill is a provision for two classes of stock, one to be nonvoting, and to receive no dividends but, as described earlier, includible in the rate bases of the investing communications carriers; the other, open to the public, would be voting stock upon which dividends would be paid.

The administration bill authorizes the corporation to issue 1 million shares of class A stock at a price of not less than $1,000 for each share. Class A stock, which is eligible for dividends, may be purchased by any type of investor subject to the limitation that no single investor (including any group of affiliated companies) may own more than 15 percent of the authorized class A stock or more than 25 percent of the outstanding class A stock. Voting rights are confined to class A stock.

The class B stock would be nonvoting and nondividend bearing. It could be owned only by communications common carriers approved by the FCC, and the bill provides that their investment in class B stock may be included in the rate bases of the investing carriers to the extent allowed by the FCC.

The bill also provides for the exchange by communications common carriers of class A stock for class B and vice versa subject to the approval of the FCC, and it authorizes the FCC to compel a carrier to sell either class A or class B stock to another carrier. Noncarrier shareowners, however, could not be compelled to sell stock.

The limitations on foreign ownership of stock in communications carriers contained in the Federal Communications Act of 1934 are made applicable to ownership of shares of stock in the proposed corporation.

I believe that the administration's proposal merits careful consideration, and accordingly the senior Senator from Washington, chairman of the Commerce Committee and I have agreed to introduce the administration bill for appropriate reference. As has been previously announced, the chairman of the Commerce Committee and I have discussed this particular subject and agreed that the bill should be referred first to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences and subsequently to the Commerce Committee for consideration if that should prove necessary or desirable.

The enactment of legislation to create a corporation which would make it possible for this Nation to translate its leadership in this phase of space technology into an actual program benefiting the people of this country as well as those of the other countries of the world should be achieved promptly. I can give assurance that insofar as the Space Committee is concerned this item has a high priority and will be taken up at an early date.

AIRCRAFT LOAN GUARANTEES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the act of September 7, 1957, relating to aircraft loan guarantees. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the letter of the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, requesting the proposed legislation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2815) to amend the act of September 7, 1957, relating to aircraft loan guarantees, introduced by Mr. Magnuson, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. Magnuson is as follows:

Civil Aeronautics Board,
Washington, D.C., February 6, 1962.

Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson,
President of the Senate,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: The Civil Aeronautics Board recommends to the Congress for its consideration the enclosed draft of a proposed bill "to amend the act of September 7, 1957, relating to aircraft loan guarantees."

The Bureau of the Budget states that it is unable, at present, to advise as to the relationship of the proposed bill to the administration's objectives.

Sincerely yours,

________,
Chairman.

Statement of Purpose and Need for Proposed Legislation—A Bill To Amend the Act of September 7, 1957, Relating to Aircraft Loan Guarantees

The act of September 7, 1957, authorizes Government guarantee of private loans to certain air carriers for purchase of aircraft. By the terms of the act this authority expires 5 years from the date of enactment.

The act authorizes the Board to guarantee loans made to local service and certain other air carriers for the purchase of aircraft to improve their service and efficiency, with the purpose of enabling these carriers to borrow the necessary funds on reasonable terms. Experience with the act has amply demonstrated that lenders, in order to obtain a guarantee, are generally willing to give more favorable terms than they would without a guarantee. A significant portion of the equipment modernization by eligible carriers, achieved during the life of the act, has been financed by guaranteed loans. As of December 31, 1961, a total of $30,349,503 had been borrowed on such loans, with $23,379,152 still outstanding at that date. These funds have been used to purchase (1) 33 twin turbine engine F–27 aircraft, (2) 12 twin-engine (piston type) Convair 340/440 aircraft, which can be converted to turbine power, (3) 3 twin-engine (piston type) Martin 404 aircraft, (4) 5 single-engine (piston type) Vertol 44B helicopters, and (5) 1 twin turbine engine helicopter. Applications have been approved for one jet aircraft and three additional twin turbine helicopters, the delivery of which will take place in the near future. Applications are now pending for the guarantee of loans for the purchase of eight twin turbine helicopters, four CV–240's and two DC–6's.

Although much use has been made of the act, not all of the eligible carriers have reequipped, and, in many cases, these carriers must acquire modern equipment if in the long run their subsidy needs are to be reduced. In the coming years it is anticipated that suitable new equipment will be offered for sale by manufacturers, and that many of the trunk carriers will be disposing of excellent equipment at reasonable prices. The development of air transportation would be delayed if the smaller carriers could not obtain loan guarantees when they cannot otherwise borrow funds to purchase this more efficient equipment on reasonable terms.

It thus appears that there will be need for loan guarantees during the foreseeable future; accordingly, the draft legislation in effect provides that the authority contained in section 3 of the act is extended for another 5 years from the present expiration date of September 7, 1962.

PUBLIC WORKS COORDINATION AND ACCELERATION ACT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish an Office of Public Works Coordination and Acceleration. A companion measure is being offered today in the House by Representative John Blatnik, of Minnesota.

The basic purpose of this act is to give the President authority to move promptly and effectively to combat recessions or persistently high levels of unemployment.

Mr. President, this proposed legislation which we are offering today seeks to deal in a realistic and practical manner with a problem of ever-growing importance. Namely, that while the economic level of our country has been rising throughout the years in terms of production, the gross national product, and total employment, we nevertheless find ourselves with more and more unemployed workers—both in terms of numbers and percentage.

The figures speak for themselves. In 1953 we had an unemployment rate of 2.9 percent. The following year we had a recession, and by 1956 when we had recovered, the unemployment level stood at 4.2 percent. In 1957, we entered another recession and when it ended in 1959 we had an unemployment rate of 5.5 percent. During this period from 1953 to 1959, the number of jobless workers increased by 100 percent.

Even today, despite a tremendous upsurge in the economy during the past year, we still have an unemployment figure of 5.8 percent.

In considering the unemployment problem, we must also face up to the fact that the number of Americans seeking to enter the work force is steadily increasing. It is estimated that 1.3 million Americans will be annually entering the labor market in the next few years as compared to 800,000 a year averaged over the past 10 years. Also, there are hundreds of thousands of workers who each year are being displaced by technological changes, including automation. We must consider too the many marginal farmers and farmworkers who are being squeezed off the land.

So, it is quite evident that we have our work cut out for us in keeping the economy going at a sufficient rate to absorb the new jobseekers and those who have lost their jobs.

The administration through its sound policies is stimulating the economic growth of our country. The jobless rate has been decreasing over this past year. However, the Congress has not provided the President of the United States with sufficient tools to act promptly to stem recessions and to reduce excessive unemployment.

The purpose of the bill which we are introducing today is to give to the President such tools so that he can act promptly and effectively. The purpose of this act is spelled out in section 2 and I quote:

> It is the purpose of this act to provide the necessary machinery to keep the President and the Congress informed on the status of public works construction and planning and to enable the President to take quick and effective action to stimulate the economy by inaugurating a program of needed capital improvements when unemployment indicators reveal persistently high levels of unemployment or indicate the beginning of a recessional pattern in the economy. In the furtherance of this purpose, the act provides the President in such periods with standby authority (1) to increase immediately expenditures for direct Federal programs of capital improvements previously authorized by the Congress, and (2) to furnish incentives through Federal financial assistance to State and local governmental bodies to accelerate their capital improvement programs through the initiation of projects which can be begun promptly and completed over a reasonably short period of time. It is the intent of Congress that departments and agencies of the Federal, State, and local governments should make necessary advance plans for capital improvement projects in order to enable them to act promptly whenever the President initiates the program authorized by the act.

Our bill provides for the establishment of an Office of Public Works Coordination and Acceleration. This Office would be directed to prepare and keep current a shelf of public works projects which could be put into effect in times of recession and rising unemployment. The public works plans envisioned would include Federal public works projects as authorized by Congress, and public works projects of States and local governments for which Federal financial assistance is authorized under existing legislation.

When the President declares this act to be in effect, the Director of the Office of Public Works Coordination and Acceleration would be authorized to allocate an amount not to exceed $2 billion to the heads of departments and agencies of the Federal Government responsible for the construction of Federal public works projects and responsible for the administration of laws authorizing Federal financial assistance for public works projects of State and local governments. The specific amounts to be allocated to the various departments and agencies would be determined by the Director with priority being given to those public works projects which, first, can be commenced within 60 days of the date of enactment of the plan; second, will meet essential public need; and, third, contribute significantly to the reduction of unemployment.

I wish to emphasize, Mr. President, that this bill does not institute any new Federal public works programs or any new Federal assistance programs to State and local governments for public works projects. The programs to which the Director would be authorized to allocate funds would have to have been approved by the Congress through prior legislation. What the bill would do is to provide that an additional $2 billion could be used to accelerate such programs so as to alleviate unemployment and to stem the tide of recessions.

Mr. President, this type of legislation is something we have needed for a long time. It would permit the Federal Government—working with the States and the local communities—to get on with the job whenever the economy should falter. A shelf of public works programs already planned, approved and ready to go, could be put into action with a minimum of delay. Under this plan, within a matter of days, work could begin on public works programs which could put men to work and give the economy a lift.

These public works programs would not only provide gainful employment and give a boost to the economy, but they would be a meaningful and lasting contribution to a better America. These programs would not be make-work schemes. The work which would be done—I repeat—would be programs which the Federal Government, the States, and the local communities have already approved. It would include work on our roads, construction of hospitals, urban renewal programs, community facility programs including the laying of sewer lines, construction of water pollution treatment plants, streets, sidewalks, parks, and playgrounds.

I know the argument will be made that we are advocating a great expenditure here. It is true that this does involve a lot of money. But I would remind the critics of such a program that just in money terms alone we lose much more than the money provided in this bill when people are jobless and without money to keep the economy going. Recessions mean a loss of tens of billions of dollars. But, of course, the overall consideration, the prime consideration is the people themselves. In a country as rich and as powerful as ours, it is inexcusable that there are millions of able bodied men and women who want to work but cannot find gainful employment. We have a duty to exert every effort to see to it that there is full employment in this country.

Mr. President, I hope that this proposed legislation which Senator McCarthy and I and Representative Blatnik offer today will be given careful consideration. I was pleased to note that President Kennedy in his state of the Union message asked for standby authority to accelerate federally aided capital improvement programs in times of rising unemployment. I agree 100 percent with the President in the need for such authority. That is what the bill we introduce today seeks to do.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill and a summary of its provisions be printed in the Record.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and summary will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2817) to establish an Office of Public Works Coordination and Acceleration; to authorize the preparation of a plan for acceleration of public works when necesary to avoid serious nationwide unemployment levels; and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Humphrey (for himself and Mr. McCarthy), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Public Works Coordination and Acceleration Act".

Sec. 2. (a) The Congress finds that there have been periodic declines in business activity causing severe unemployment and resulting in persistently high unemployment levels, loss of production and loss of purchasing power, and that repetition of these periodic recessions can be avoided, or their impact lessened, by prompt remedial action by the Federal Government as authorized in this Act. The promotion of maximum employment, production, and purchasing power is the continuing policy and responsibility of the Federal Government. The Congress also finds that virtually every community in the Nation has a backlog of needed capital improvement projects, and that a quick and effective means of increasing employment and expenditures is by accelerating the construction of such projects. Thus, in addition to being a useful economic means of increasing employment and stabilizing the economy, public works construction will also meet longstanding public needs, improve community services, and enhance the health and welfare of the citizens of the Nation.

(b) It is the purpose of this Act to provide the necessary machinery to keep the President and the Congress informed on the status of public works construction and planning and to enable the President to take quick and effective action to stimulate the economy by inaugurating a program of needed capital improvements when unemployment indicators reveal persistently high levels of unemployment or indicate the beginning of a recessional pattern in the economy. In the furtherance of this purpose, the Act provides the President in such periods with standby authority (1) to increase immediately expenditures for direct Federal programs of capital improvements previously authorized by the Congress, and (2) to furnish incentives through Federal financial assistance to State and local governmental bodies to accelerate their capital improvement programs through the initiation of projects which can be begun promptly and completed over a reasonably short period of time. It is the intent of Congress that departments and agencies of the Federal, State, and local governments should make necessary advance plans for capital improvement projects in order to enable them to act promptly whenever the President initiates the program authorized by this Act.

Sec. 3. There is hereby established the Office of Public Works Coordination and Acceleration (hereinafter referred to as the "Office"). The Office shall be administered by a Director of Public Works Coordination and Acceleration (hereinafter referred to as the "Director"). There shall be a Deputy Director. The Director and the Deputy Director, shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Director shall receive compensation at the rate of $20,000 per annum, the Deputy Director at the rate of $18,500 per annum.

Sec. 4. The Director shall encourage the coordination of planning policies for the construction of public works in the United States, and for this purpose shall—

(1) collect all necessary information from the head of each department, instrumentality, and agency of the Federal Government, and of State and local governments, having authority to construct public works.

(2) review such information and determine—

(A) what public works projects have been or are in the process of being planned for construction,

(B) what public works projects are required to meet national, regional, and community growth and economic development,

(C) what are the present policies of the various departments, agencies, and instrumentalities with respect to planning public works, and

(D) the extent to which the policies of each such department, agency, and instrumentality should be coordinated with an overall policy with respect to public works planning and construction, and methods for such coordination.

(3) report from time to time as he deems necessary but not less often than once each year to the President and Congress—

(A) all public works which are in the process of being constructed, those which have been or are being planned, and those which should be planned,

(B) any other recommendations with respect to planning and coordination of public works.

Sec. 5. The Director shall, to the fullest extent possible, cooperate with all departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of State and local governments to insure the greatest possible planning and coordination of public works projects at all levels of government.

Sec. 6. The Director is authorized to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

Sec. 7. (a) The Director is authorized to establish such advisory committees and to consult with such persons and organizations as he may deem necessary to carry out this Act.

(b) The Director shall, in carrying out this Act, utilize to the fullest extent possible the services, facilities, and information of all departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of government as well as private agencies in order to avoid duplication of effort and expense, and all the departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government shall provide the Director with such services, facilities, and information as he may determine necessary to accomplish the objectives of this Act on a nonreimbursable basis.

Sec. 8. (a) The Director is authorized and directed to prepare and to keep current at all times a public works plan which shall have as its basic purpose the acceleration of the construction of public works necessary to increase employment and to stabilize the economy when required to offset declines in economic activity.

(b) The public works plan authorized by subsection (a) of this section—

(1) shall provide for the acceleration of those Federal public works projects which have been authorized by Congress through the allocation of funds under this Act.

(2) shall provide for the acceleration of those public works projects of States and local governments for which Federal financial assistance is authorized under other provisions of law through the allocation of funds under this Act.

(3) shall give priority to those public works projects which can—

(A) be commenced within 60 days of the date the plan takes effect;

(B) meet essential public need;

(C) contribute significantly to the reduction of unemployment.

(c) All grants-in-aid made from allocations made by the Director under this Act shall be made by the head of the Department, Agency, or instrumentality of the Federal Government administering the law authorizing such grants in accordance with all of the provisions of such law, except (1) provisions requiring allocation of funds among the States, and (2) limitations upon the total amount of such grants for any period.

(d) Not more than 12½ per centum of all amounts allocated by the Director under this Act shall be made available to projects within any one State.

Sec. 9. (a) The plan which the Director is required to establish under section 8 of this Act shall go into effect, and the Director shall have authority to carry out the provisions of such plan, only during those periods when the President shall declare the plan to be in effect except that no such declaration shall be made unless:

(1) Data compiled and published by the Secretary of Labor shows (A) that the national unemployment rate, adjusted for seasonal variations, has risen in three of the four most recent consecutive months for which data is available, and (B) that the national unemployment rate, adjusted for seasonal variations, has risen by not less than 0.5 per centum during such period, or

(2) Data compiled and published by the Secretary of Labor shows that the national unemployment rate, adjusted for seasonal variations, has exceeded 5 per centum during four of the six most recent consecutive months for which such data is available.

(b) Whenever the President declares the plan authorized by section 8 of this Act to be in effect, such plan shall remain in effect until terminated by the President, or until the end of the twelfth full month which begins after the date such period begins, whichever first occurs.

Sec. 10. (a) During any period when the President has declared the public works plan authorized by subsection (a) of section 8 of this Act to be in effect, the Director is authorized to allocate—

(1) to the heads of the departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government responsible for the construction of Federal public works projects, such

amounts as he determines necessary for the acceleration of the construction of such projects, and

(2) to the heads of the departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government responsible for the administration of laws authorizing Federal financial assistance to public works projects of States and local governments, such amounts as he determines necessary for the acceleration of the construction of such projects through such Federal financial assistance.

(b) The total of all allocations made by the Director under paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of this section shall not exceed $500,000,000, and the total of all allocations made under paragraph (2) of subsection (a) of this section shall not exceed $1,500,000,000.

(c) Any allocation made under this section may be obligated immediately by the head of the department, agency, or instrumentality to whom it is made and shall continue to be available for obligation until the termination of the period during which the plan is in effect.

(d) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to liquidate obligations incurred under authority of subsection (c) of this section, and to otherwise carry out this Act.

SEC. 11. No part of any allocation made by the Director under subsection (a) of section 10 of this Act shall be made available to any State or local government for any public works project unless such project results in a net increase in the current annual level of expenditures of such government for capital improvement projects. The head of each department, agency, and instrumentality of the Federal Government administering any program for financial assistance which receives an allocation under subsection (a) of section 10 of this Act shall promulgate such rules and regulations governing the review of expenditures for capital improvement projects of applicants for assistance from such allocation as may be necessary to carry out this section.

SEC. 12. Section 202 of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(2) During any period when the President has declared the public works plan authorized by section 8 of the Public Works Coordination and Acceleration Act to be in effect, the Administrator is authorized to make a grant-in-aid from any allocation made for such purpose under such Coordination and Acceleration Act to any public entity described in clause (1) or (2) of subsection (a) of this section of not to exceed 50 percent of the cost of construction of any project for public works or facilities, if such project would be eligible (without regard to the restrictions and limitations of subsections (b) and (c) and the proviso of subsection (d) of this section) for financial assistance under subsection (a) of this section."

SEC. 13. Section 702 of the Housing Act of 1954 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(g) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, no advance made under this section for the planning of any public works project shall be required to be repaid if—

"(1) construction of such project is begun within two years of the date of completion of the plan as determined by the Administrator, or

"(2) construction of such project is begun (during a period when the President has declared the public works plan authorized by section 8 of the Public Works Coordination and Acceleration Act to be in effect) as a result of a grant-in-aid made from an allocation made under such Coordination and Acceleration Act."

The summary presented by Mr. HUMPHREY is as follows:

SUMMARY: PUBLIC WORKS COORDINATION AND ACCELERATION ACT

I. ESTABLISHES AN "OFFICE OF PUBLIC WORKS COORDINATION AND ACCELERATION"

A. This creates the necessary machinery for:

1. Keeping the President and the Congress advised on the status of public works construction, planning, and those public works needed to meet our national, regional, and community growth and economic development.

2. Encouraging and suggesting methods by which the public works planning policies of the various instrumentalities of the Federal Government, and the instrumentalities of State and local governments can be coordinated to insure maximum effectiveness and efficiency in public works construction.

3. Keeping in readiness a public works acceleration plan should a public works acceleration period be proclaimed by the President.

4. An independent office, responsible to the President, whose function would be to allocate the funds provided for under this act to the respective departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government for use in accelerating programs under their jurisdiction when the acceleration plan is in effect.

II. CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT ACCELERATION PERIODS

A. Gives the President authority to declare the public works acceleration plan in effect after the following criteria have been met:

1. The unemployment rate has risen in 3 of the 4 most recent consecutive months and increased by 0.5 percent in that period.

2. The unemployment rate has exceeded 5 percent during 4 of the 6 most recent consecutive months for which such data is available.

B. The plan shall remain in effect until terminated by the President, or is automatically terminated after 12 months.

III. PROGRAMS AUTHORIZED DURING ACCELERATION PERIODS

A. Increased expenditures for initiation and acceleration of projects under direct Federal programs ($500 million) authorized to be distributed by the Director among the departments and agencies administering such existing programs in accordance with the acceleration plan proclaimed by the President.

B. Increased expenditures for initiation and acceleration of programs under existing Federal grant-in-aid programs.

C. Authorizes grants-in-aid of up to 50 percent of the cost of construction during a capital improvement acceleration program for any project eligible for financial assistance under subsection (A) Sec. 202 of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (community facilities program). The population restrictions on the communities eligible under this program are removed.

D. $1.5 billion is authorized to be distributed by the Director among the departments and agencies administering programs under B and C (above) in accordance with the acceleration plan.

E. Limitations and restrictions:

1. Grants are not subject to any limitation in existing programs with respect to the apportionment of funds among the States.

2. All grants-in-aid made from allocations by the Director shall be made in accordance with all the provisions of the law authorizing such grants (excepting apportionment of funds among the States).

3. Not more than 12½ percent of grant funds may go to one State.

4. Priority should be given to public works projects which (1) can be commenced within 60 days, (2) meet essential public need, and (3) contribute significantly to the reduction of unemployment.

5. Administering agencies must assure that funds provided to assist State and local governmental bodies are provided only for projects and programs which increase net annual capital improvement expenditures.

IV. SOURCE OF FUNDS

A. The administering agencies are authorized to obligate the moneys allocated to them by the Director. Appropriations are authorized.

V. ADVANCES FOR PUBLIC WORKS PLANNING

A. Planning advances shall not be required to be repaid if construction of the project is begun within 2 years of the date of the completion of the plan as determined by the administrator.

B. Planning advances shall not be required to be repaid if construction of such project is begun during a period when the President has declared the capital improvement acceleration program to be in effect.

PURCHASE OF UNITED NATIONS BONDS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the people of the United States to purchase from the Treasury special peace bonds to help finance the purchase of United Nations bonds by the Federal Government.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may lie on the desk until the end of business on February 20, in order that other Senators who may desire to join in the cosponsorship of the bill may do so.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill may be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will remain on the desk as requested, and it will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2818) to promote the foreign policy of the United States by authorizing the purchase of United Nations bonds and the appropriation of funds therefor, and to afford an opportunity for the people of the United States to participate in the purchase of such bonds, introduced by Mr. CLARK (for himself and Mr. HUMPHREY), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President, without fiscal-year limitation, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, $100,000,000 for the purchase of United Nations bonds. Amounts appropriated pursuant to the preceding sentence shall be used for such purchases at any time that the President determines it necessary. This determination shall not be contingent upon the sale of peace bonds nor any proceeds to be derived therefrom.

SEC. 2. Amounts received from the annual repayment of principal and payment of interest due on United Nations bonds shall be deposited into the Treasury of the United States in a special fund which shall be available for redemption of peace bonds. Amounts not needed for such redemptions shall be deposited into miscellaneous receipts.

Sec. 3. The United Nations Participation Act of 1945 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"UNITED NATIONS PEACE BONDS

"Sec. 9. (a) For the purpose of providing an opportunity for the public to provide support for the activities of the United Nations, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to issue special obligations of the United States, designated as 'peace bonds', in accordance with the provisions of law applicable to United States savings bonds except that peace bonds shall mature not more than twenty-five years from the date as of which issued, and shall be issued on a discount basis such as to afford an investment yield not in excess of 2 per centum per annum, compounded semiannually when held to maturity.

"(b) Peace bonds shall have a face value of $25, $50, $100, $500 and $1,000 when held to maturity, and may be issued in such other denominations as the Secretary of the Treasury may from time to time determine. No person or business entity may purchase or hold peace bonds with a face value in excess of $10,000.

"(c) Amounts realized by the Secretary of the Treasury from the sale of peace bonds shall be deposited in a special fund in the Treasury, and shall be available for use in the purchase of United Nations bonds."

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a practically identical bill was introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative Kowalski, of Connecticut. The bill would authorize the Treasury to issue for sale to the general public "peace bonds" in denominations of $25, $50, $100, $500, and $1,000, bearing 2 percent interest compounded semiannually, to underwrite a part or all of the $100 million U.N. bond issue for which the administration is asking Congress authority to purchase. Purchases would be limited to $10,000 per individual or business entity.

I am going to do my best, as I am sure the Senator from Minnesota will do his best, to obtain administration backing for this peace bond issue.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. This whole subject of the use of peace bonds is interesting to me, because for the last several years I have been urging the Treasury Department to sell $25 billion worth as a way to deal with the long-term debt of the United States.

I wish to compliment the Senator from Pennsylvania and his colleague for utilizing this type of bond approach to the problem. I am unhappy about the fact that the bonds would be used for a very desirable but rather limited purpose, because what we are doing now is a terrific description of what could greatly excite and get a lot of support from the American people.

I congratulate the Senator. For a long time Senator Williams and I and the Treasury Department have had a go-round on the question of calling our savings bonds peace bonds.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am very happy to be associated with the Senator from Pennsylvania on this proposal. I believe it will have considerable public support. I am sure the Senator from Pennsylvania and other Senators have had letters, as I have, from constituents indicating a desire for such a proposal as the issuance of peace bonds in aiding the financial stability of the United Nations. I will do what I can to get administration support, and I hope we can get action on the proposal.

EXTENSION OF NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT TO COVER NONPROFIT SUMMER CAMPS FOR CHILDREN

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to extend the benefits of the National School Lunch Act to nonprofit summer camps for children. It would take up the vacation period slack in the program as far as many thousands of children are concerned. Just the day before yesterday Senator Humphrey inserted in the Record an editorial praising the school lunch program, which has indeed been an excellent one, and noting that there may be some proposals soon to expand it. The bill now being introduced would expand it so that many of the same children who benefit from it during the school year would be able to continue to do so during the summer months while they attend nonprofit summer camps.

This gap in the present program was brought to my attention by the Community Council of Greater New York, which points out that camps operated by New York City agencies alone provide for vacations for more than 100,000 children, the majority of whom come from families in the low income groups. The bill would, of course, apply throughout the Nation, wherever the school lunch program is being used.

Certain surplus foods are now available to nonprofit camps, but the range of such foods is much narrower than that available under the school lunch program and depends upon the size of the surplus. In some recent years, for example, distribution of dairy products, butter and cheese had to be restricted to schools. The bill would correct this discrepancy and would also make available foods, such as frozen meats and poultry and canned fruit and vegetables, which are purchased with funds appropriated for the national school lunch program and cannot be made available from any other outlet.

I urge that the bill be given prompt consideration so that the nonprofit summer camps may have the benefit of these foods during the coming summer.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the Record.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2821) to amend the National School Lunch Act in order to extend the provisions of such act to nonprofit summer camps for children, introduced by Mr. Javits, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the seventh sentence of section 4 of the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1753) is amended to read as follows: "For the purposes of this Act the term 'school' means any public or nonprofit private school of high school grade or under and any nonprofit summer camp for children; and, with respect to Puerto Rico, such term shall also include nonprofit child-care centers certified as such by the Governor of Puerto Rico."

CROPLAND RETIREMENT ACT OF 1962

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett] I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish a cropland retirement program. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the Record, and held at the desk until the close of business on next Wednesday for any additional cosponsors who wish to add their names to it.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record and will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Iowa.

The bill (S. 2822) to establish a cropland retirement program, introduced by Mr. Hickenlooper (for himself and Mr. Bennett), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Cropland Retirement Act of 1962".

Declaration of policy

Sec. 2. The Congress finds that the production of excessive supplies of wheat and other grains depresses prices and the income of farm families, constitutes improper land use, and is wasteful of our natural resources. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress and the purpose of this Cropland Retirement Act of 1962 to bring the supplies of wheat and other grains into line with current demand so that (a) farm prices and per family farm income can be increased; (b) the surplus of these commodities can be reduced; and (c) the public cost of farm programs can be decreased. To effectuate the policy of Congress and the purpose of this Act, programs are herein established to assist farmers to divert a portion of their cropland from the production of excessive supplies of wheat and other grains, and to carry out a voluntary program of soil, forest and wildlife conservation.

TITLE I—LAND RETIREMENT AND SOIL CONSERVATION

Annual determination—voluntary land retirement—eligibility for price support—rental payments in cash or kind

Sec. 101. Beginning with the 1963 crop year the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to establish and carry out a cropland retirement program. In formulating and administering such program—

(a) The Secretary shall not later than February 1 of each year make and announce an annual determination of—

(1) the total estimated cropland available for the production of crops in the United States in that year;

(2) the total acreage of wheat, corn, oats, rye, barley, grain sorghum, soybeans, and flaxseed necessary to bring the total estimated annual production plus the anticipated release from the Commodity Credit Corporation stocks into balance with the estimated annual disappearance of such commodities; and

(3) the total acreage of farm cropland necessary to be retired and devoted to soil-conserving uses in order to achieve this balance.

(b) The Secretary is authorized to enter into contracts for periods of three or more years with producers determined by him to have control for the contract period of the farms covered by the contracts if such producers agree to retire and devote to soil-conserving uses any or all farm cropland. The Secretary shall determine and announce the period within which such contracts will be entered into. This period shall be of sufficient duration to provide an opportunity for maximum producer participation. The Secretary shall encourage the retirement and conservation of whole farms and shall provide full opportunity for producers of all commodities to voluntarily participate in the cropland retirement program: *Provided,* That the Secretary shall place a maximum limitation on the percentage of total cropland which may be retired and devoted to soil-conserving uses in any State or county if he finds that such action is necessary to prevent the cropland retirement program from having an unduly disruptive effect on the economies of counties and local communities.

(c) Each year upon the expiration of the period within which contracts may be entered into pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, the Secretary shall determine whether the acreage of cropland retired and devoted to soil-conserving uses pursuant to subsection (b) of this section is sufficient to obtain the balance specified in subsection (a) (2) of this section.

In any year that the Secretary finds that sufficient cropland has not been retired and conserved under subsection (b) of this section to obtain the balance specified in subsection (a) (2) of this section, he shall—

(1) Determine and announce the percentage of the total cropland in the United States necessary to be retired and devoted to soil-conserving uses to obtain such balance;

(2) Be authorized to enter into annual cropland retirement contracts with producers determined by him to have control for the contract period of the farms covered by the contract if such producers agree to retire and devote to soil-conserving uses that percentage of their cropland required to be retired and devoted to soil-conserving uses in order for such producers to be eligible for price support on wheat, corn, oats, rye, barley, grain sorghum, soybeans, and flaxseed.

(3) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, make available through loans and purchase agreements, price support on wheat, corn, oats, rye, barley, grain sorghum, soybeans, and flaxseed to only those producers who comply with the cropland retirement program and retire and devote to soil-conserving uses at least that percentage of their farm cropland determined by the Secretary pursuant to subsection (c) (1) of this section. Any cropland retired pursuant to subtitle B of the Soil Bank Act, as amended (70 Stat. 188; 7 U.S.C. 1801 and the following), or pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, shall be deemed to be retired and devoted to soil-conserving uses for the purpose of establishing eligibility for price support on wheat, corn, oats, rye, barley, grain sorghum, soybeans, and flaxseed. Any cropland retired and devoted to soil-conserving uses under the cropland retirement program established pursuant to this title shall be deemed in subsequent years to have been planted cropland for the purpose of establishing cropland history and to be cropland for the purpose of determining eligibility for price support on wheat, corn, oats, rye, barley, grain sorghum, soybeans, and flaxseed.

(d) The Secretary shall make an annual rental payment either in cash or in kind to producers who (1) retire and devote cropland to soil-conserving uses with proper management pursuant to subsections (b) and (c) of this section, and (2) otherwise comply with the cropland retirement program as set forth in this title.

The Secretary shall determine the rate of rental payments that will provide producers with a fair and reasonable annual return on the land retired and devoted to soil-conserving uses after taking into consideration (1) the incentive necessary to achieve voluntary participation in the program, (2) the loss of crop production on the retired acres, (3) any savings in cost which result from not planting crops, (4) the estimated profit margin of crop production on the designated acres, (5) continuing farm overhead expenses, (6) the cost of establishing a conservation practice on the retired acres, (1) the value of the land for production of commodities customarily grown on such kind of land in the county or area, (8) the prevailing rates for cash rentals for similar land in the county or area, (9) drought, flood, or other abnormal conditions, and (10) other relevant factors. The rate on lands determined in accordance with the preceding paragraph shall be adjusted on a State, county, and individual farm basis in such a manner as the Secretary determines will facilitate the practical administration of the program. The lands to be covered by contracts under subsection (b) of this section for three or more years shall be determined by a competitive bid procedure in which a producer wishing to obtain a contract shall specify the percentage of the rental rate applicable to his farm the producer is willing to accept.

The rates applicable to land placed under contracts on an annual basis under subsection (c) of this section shall be based on the average of the rates accepted by the Secretary for the retirement and conserving of comparable land for three or more years under subsection (b) of this section under the bid procedure as specified in the preceding paragraph.

On annual contracts the Secretary shall provide for such additional incentive as he deems necessary to encourage producers to retire and to devote to soil-conserving uses for more than 1 year, the identical cropland which was originally retired and devoted to soil-conserving uses in the previous year or years as a requirement for eligibility for price supports.

(e) The Secretary shall compensate producers for participating in the cropland retirement program—

(1) Through the issuance of negotiable certificates which the Commodity Credit Corporation shall redeem in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary in cash upon presentation by the producer or by any holder in due course; or

(2) If option is exercised by the producer 30 days before compensation is tendered, through the issuance of negotiable certificates which the Commodity Credit Corporation shall redeem in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary in wheat, corn, oats, rye, barley, or grain sorghum upon presentation by the producer or by any holder in due course. The Secretary shall limit the distribution of the certificates redeemable in kind if he finds the issuance of such certificates will have an adverse effect on wheat, corn, oats, rye, barley, or grain sorghum market prices or upon livestock marketing or livestock market prices, and in no case shall a certificate be redeemable at less than 115 per centum of the current support price for any such commodity.

In order to assist producers in the establishment of soil-conserving uses on cropland retired under the cropland retirement program, the Secretary shall coordinate such program with the agricultural conservation program established pursuant to the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended (49 Stat. 163, 16 U.S.C. 590 and the following).

Terms and conditions of contracts with producers

Sec. 102. (a) Under any cropland retirement contract the producer shall agree—

(1) to establish and maintain with proper management for the contract period protective vegetative cover (including but not limited to grass and trees), water storage facilities or other soil-, water-, wildlife-, or forest-conserving uses on an acreage of land which is specifically designated at the time the contract is entered into and which has been regularly used in the production of crops (including crops such as tame hay, alfalfa, and clovers, which do not require annual tillage);

(2) to allow to remain fallow and idle, throughout the contract period, an acreage of the remaining land on the farm which is not less than the acreage normally allowed to remain fallow and idle on such remaining acreage;

(3) not to harvest any crop from the acreage established in protective vegetative cover, excepting timber (in accordance with sound forestry management) and wildlife or other natural products of such acreage which do not increase supplies of feed for domestic animals;

(4) not to graze any acreage established in protective vegetative cover;

(5) not to adopt any practice, or divert lands on the farm from conservation, woods, grazing, or other noncropland use, to any use specified by the Secretary in the contract as a practice or use which would tend to defeat the purposes of the contract;

(6) to abide by regulations prescribed by the Secretary with respect to the planting of crops during the contract period for later harvest or use; and

(7) to such additional provisions as the Secretary determines are desirable and includes in the contract to effectuate the purposes of this title and to facilitate the practical administration of the cropland retirement program, including provisions relating to control of noxious and other objectionable weeds.

(b) In the event that the Secretary determines that there has been a violation of the contract (including the prohibition of grazing on retired acreage) at any stage during the time such producer has control of the farm and that such violation is of such a substantial nature as to warrant termination of the contract, the producer shall forfeit all rights to payments or grants under the contract, and to refund to the United States all payments and grants received by him thereunder, and forfeit eligibility for price suport on wheat, corn, oats, rye, barley, grain sorghum, soybeans, and flaxseed. In the event that the Secretary determines that there has been a violation of the contract but that such violation is of such a nature as not to warrant termination of the contract, to accept such payment adjustments, forfeit such benefits, and make such refunds to the United States of payments and benefits received by him, under the contract, as the Secretary may determine to be appropriate.

Sec. 103. The Soil Bank Act, as amended (70 Stat. 188; 7 U.S.C. 1801 and the following), is amended as follows:

Administrative and judicial remedy

(1) The first sentence of section 107(d) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1831(d)) is amended by adding after the words "paragraph (6) of subsection (a)" the phrase "or under section 102(b) of the Cropland Retirement Act of 1962".

Effect on other programs

(2) Section 112 of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1836) is amended by adding after the words "under this subtitle" each time it appears therein the phrase "or under title I of the Cropland Retirement Act of 1962".

Geographic applicability

(3) Section 113 of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1837) is amended by adding after the words "subtitle B" the phrase "and title I of the Cropland Retirement Act of 1962".

Reapportionment prohibited

(4) Section 115 of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1803) is amended by adding after the words "conservation reserve programs" the phrase "or the cropland retirement program established pursuant to title I of the Cropland Retirement Act of 1962".

Utilization of local and State committees

(5) Section 117 of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1805) is amended by adding after the words "this title" the phrase "or title I of the Cropland Retirement Act of 1962".

Utilization of other agencies

(6) Section 118 of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1806) is amended by adding after the words "this title" the phrase "or title I of the Cropland Retirement Act of 1962".

Utilization of land use capability data

(7) Section 119 of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1807) is amended by adding after the words "this title" the phrase "or title I of the Cropland Retirement Act of 1962".

Finality of determinations

(8) Section 121 of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1809) is amended by adding after the words "this title" the phrase "or under title I of the Cropland Retirement Act of 1962".

Protection of tenants and sharecroppers

(9) Section 122 of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1810) is amended by adding after the words "this title" the phrase "Or under title I of the Cropland Retirement Act of 1962".

Penalty for grazing or harvesting

(10) Section 123 of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1811) is amended by adding after the words "section 103 or 107" the phrase "or under title I of the Cropland Retirement Act of 1962".

Pooling of cropland retirement land

(11) Section 126 of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1814) is amended by adding after the words "conservation reserve program" the phrase "or in the cropland retirement program established pursuant to title I of the Cropland Retirement Act of 1962".

Incorrect information furnished by the Government—marriage of producers

(12) Section 128 of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1816) is amended by adding after the words "conservation reserve program" the phrase "or the cropland retirement program established pursuant to title I of the Cropland Retirement Act of 1962".

Authorized period of contract and expenditure—appropriations

Sec. 104. (a) The Secretary is authorized to formulate and announce programs under this title and to enter into contracts thereunder with producers during the four-year period 1963–1966 to be carried out during the period ending not later than December 31, 1973, except that contracts for establishment of tree cover may continue until December 31, 1978.

(b) The period covered by any contract shall not exceed ten years except that contracts for the establishment of tree cover may extend for fifteen years.

(c) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title, including such amounts as may be required to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for its actual costs incurred under the payment-in-kind program established by this title.

Termination and modification of contracts

Sec. 105. The Secretary may terminate any contract with a producer by mutual agreement with the producer if the Secretary determines that such termination would be in the public interest. The Secretary may agree to such modification of contracts previously entered into as he may determine to be desirable to carry out the purposes of this title and to facilitate the practical administration of the cropland retirement program.

Regulations

Sec. 106. The Secretary shall prescribe such regulations as he determines necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

TITLE II—REPEAL OF ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS AND MARKETING QUOTAS ON WHEAT—PRICE SUPPORTS ON WHEAT, CORN, OATS, RYE, BARLEY, AND GRAIN SORGHUM

Repeal of acreage allotments and marketing quotas on wheat

Sec. 201. The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (52 Stat. 31; 7 U.S.C. 1281 and the following), is amended by adding the following new section after section 338:

"Sec. 339. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, acreage allotments and marketing quotas shall not be established for the 1963 and subsequent crops of wheat."

Price support on oats, rye, barley, and grain sorghum

Sec. 202. Subsection (b) of section 105 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1441 note), is hereby repealed.

Price support on wheat, oats, rye, barley, and grain sorghum

Sec. 203. Title I of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 107. Notwithstanding sections 101 and 301 of this Act, the level of price support for the 1963 and subsequent crops of wheat, oats, rye, barley, and grain sorghum shall be based on the support level for corn for the same crop year, with reasonable adjustments, as determined by the Secretary, for the differences in weight, nutritive value, and buyer preference, with the objective of restoring the pricing of such commodities to market conditions as rapidly as possible: *Provided*, That the support price for wheat of the 1963 crop shall not be less than 120 per centum of the support price for corn of the 1963 crop; and *Provided further*, That proper premiums shall be established in the support price of wheat of milling and baking quality."

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Federal irrigation, drainage, and flood control projects

Sec. 301. Section 211 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1860) is amended (1) by striking "three years" each time it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "eleven years," and (2) by adding after the words "soil-bank provisions of this Act" in subsection (b) the phrase "and under Title I of the Cropland Retirement Act of 1962."

Restrictions on sales by the Commodity Credit Corporation

Sec. 302. Section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1427), is amended by adding at the end of the fourth sentence the following: "*Provided*, That effective July 1, 1962, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall not make any net sales of wheat, corn, oats, rye, barley, grain sorghum, soybeans, or flaxseed for domestic use at less than 115 per centum of the current support price for any such commodity, plus reasonable carrying charges."

EXTENSION AND AMENDMENT OF CONSERVATION RESERVE PROGRAM

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and Senators Miller, Bennett, and Cooper, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to extend and amend the conservation reserve program. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the Record and that it lie on the desk until the close of business on next Wednesday for any additional cosponsors who may wish to add their names to it.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record, and will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Iowa.

The bill (S. 2823) to extend and amend the conservation reserve program, introduced by Mr. Hickenlooper (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Soil Bank Act, as amended (70 Stat. 188; 7 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.), is amended as follows:

(1) by adding to the end of Section 107 (b) (2) (U.S.C. 1831(b)) the following: "Before extending contracts with producers as provided in Section 109(a) of this Act, the Secretary shall review the rate of annual payment provided by such contracts. The rate of payment to be offered under any extended contract shall be determined in accordance with the considerations established in this section."

(2) Subsection (a) of Section 109 (7 U.S.C. 1833(a)) is amended by adding to the end thereof the following: "The Secretary is authorized further during the five-year period 1962–66 to extend contracts, other than contracts for the establishment of tree cover, entered into under the authority of this subsection for periods ending not less than three nor more than ten years after the original termination dates of such contracts."

(3) Subsection (b) of Section 109 (7 U.S.C. 1833(b)) is amended by inserting after the first comma the following: "except as extended as provided in subsection (a) and".

(4) Paragraph (7) of subsection (a) of Section 107 (7 U.S.C. 1831(a)) is amended by striking the last word and inserting in lieu thereof: "and other objectionable weeds."

AMENDMENT OF BRETTON WOODS AGREEMENTS ACT

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, by request I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act to permit the United States to participate in a special loan arrangement worked out within the International Monetary Fund in order to strengthen the international monetary system. The proposed legislation would give effect to the message to Congress from the President of the United States urging prompt action to authorize participation by this country in the plan to increase the potential borrowing resources of the Fund.

This special arrangement among the 10 principal industrial member countries in the fund was proposed early in 1961 by Managing Director Per Jacobsson and approved last December after intensive study and consultation. It responds to changing world monetary conditions in which currencies other than the dollar have become stronger and more freely used, with the consequences of larger capital movements and wider swings in balances of payments. The Fund has available resources to cope with the balance-of-payments problems of most members. However, it requires additional assurances that adequate currencies of the principal industrial countries would be available to finance the large drawings which might be needed to deal with unusual pressures on the dollar, or on sterling at a time of relative dollar weakness.

It has been recommended that up to $6 billion be added to the callable resources of the Fund, with two-thirds of the sum being provided by the United Kingdom, Canada, Japan, Sweden and the members of the European Common Market. The proposed legislation would authorize the United States to cover the remaining one-third. However, in view of the current balance-of-payments situation it is not anticipated that any call would be made upon this country's share in the projected lending operation. No transfer of gold would be involved in any case. Despite the likely absence of any actual transfer of U.S. funds in the near future, approval of the legislation is required to implement the overall proposal at an early date.

This International Monetary Fund plan appears designed to be of primary benefit to the United States. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD, together with the message from the President of the United States to the Congress.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and message from the President will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2824) to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act to authorize the United States to participate in loans to the International Monetary Fund to strengthen the international monetary system, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, as amended (22 U.S.C. 286-286k-1), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

"SEC. 17. (a) In order to carry out the purposes of the decision of January 5, 1962, of the Executive Directors of the International Monetary Fund, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to make loans, not to exceed $2,000,000,000 outstanding at any one time, to the Fund under article VII, section 2(i) of the Articles of Agreement of the Fund. Any loan under the authority granted in this subsection shall be made with due regard to the present and prospective balance of payments and reserve position of the United States.

"(b) For the purpose of making loans to the International Monetary Fund pursuant to this section, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public debt transaction not to exceed $2,000,000,000 outstanding at any one time of the proceeds of any securities hereafter issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under that Act are extended to include such purposes. Payments to the Fund under this section and repayments thereof shall be treated as public debt transactions of the United States. Payments of interest and charges to the United States on account of any such loan shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

"SEC. 18. Any purchases of currencies or gold by the Secretary of the Treasury from the International Monetary Fund may be transferred to and administered by the fund established by section 10 of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934, as amended (31 U.S.C. 822a), for use in accordance with the provisions of that section. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to utilize the resources of that fund for the purpose of any repayments in connection with such transactions."

SEC. 2. The last sentence of section 7(c) of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act (22 U.S.C. 286e) is amended to read as follows:

"The face amount of special notes issued to the Fund under the authority of this subsection and outstanding at any one time shall not exceed in the aggregate the amount of the subscription of the United States actually paid to the Fund and the dollar equivalent of currencies and gold which the United States shall have purchased from the Fund in accordance with the Articles of Agreement, and the face amount of such notes issued to the Bank and outstanding at any one time shall not exceed in the aggregate the amount of the subscription of the United States actually paid to the Bank under article II, section 7(i), of the Articles of Agreement of the Bank."

The message from the President, presented by Mr. SPARKMAN, is as follows:

FEBRUARY 2, 1962.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Transmitted herewith for the consideration of the Congress is legislation which would implement the recommendations of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems relating to "special borrowing arrangements of the International Monetary Fund." A copy of the report of the Council is attached.

The legislation takes the form of an amendment to the Bretton Woods Agreements Act and authorizes the United States to participate in loans to the International Monetary Fund in order to strengthen the international monetary system.

The International Monetary Fund has been a vital force for economic stability in the free world ever since it was formed in 1946. Its transactions have supported the currencies of free-world nations which encountered balance-of-payments or other monetary difficulties, and it helped maintain confidence in the currencies of its members. The leadership of the United States in the establishment and support of the Fund has been a source of pride and satisfaction.

In my message of last February 6, I discussed the imbalance in our international payments and called for a series of related measures to correct it. A number of these measures have been adopted. But the problem is stubborn and complex and will require additional action over a number of years.

Meanwhile, we can strengthen the monetary system in general and the position of the United States in that system by augmenting the resources and flexibility of the International Monetary Fund to permit the Fund to be utilized more effectively in supporting a healthy and growing world economy.

To accomplish this purpose, intensive negotiations have gone forward, with the active participation of the Fund, among the major industrial nations of the free world. These negotiations culminated in the proposals described and recommended in the National Advisory Council's report calling for the addition of $6 billion to the resources of the Fund. This addition would strongly reinforce the international monetary system of the free world.

It would, in particular, greatly enhance the ability of the Fund to assist the United States in coping with its international payments problems. Today, the Fund has on hand only $1.6 billion of the currencies of other major industrial countries—exclusive of the United Kingdom, which has itself made a large drawing from the Fund—to meet a possible need for a drawing by the United States. The new arrangements would permit an additional $3 billion increase in available resources of these other major currencies, and would thus assure the Fund the assets needed to meet a request for a drawing by the United States should such a request ever be necessary. At a time when the confidence in the dollar is of utmost importance to the free world, the $6 billion addition to the Fund will be especially significant. It will greatly enhance our own financial resources and greatly reduce any possibility of a serious drain upon dollar balances. The very existence of the new standby credits will be an assurance of stability of major currencies.

The new borrowing arrangements would require amendment of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act by authorizing the United States to lend up to $2 billion to the Fund. The other nine participants in the arrangement would commit themselves to provide up to $4 billion. The commitment of nearly $2.5 billion by members of the European Common Market—Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, and the Netherlands—would represent an amount about equal to the present aggregate of their Fund quotas. By contrast the United States and the United Kingdom would provide amounts equal to only about half their present quotas. The United States would not be expected to lend to the Fund in the absence of a substantial improvement in its balance-of-payments position.

The new proposals would strengthen the position of the dollar as the world's major reserve currency. They would also provide new armament for the defense of the currencies of the free world and for reinforcing the entire international monetary system.

I urge, therefore, that the Congress promptly consider this legislation. Participation by the United States in the proposed arrangements is in the national interest.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

AID TO HIGHER EDUCATION—PRINTING OF BILL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that H.R. 8900, the higher education bill, as amended by the Senate substitute, be printed as passed by the Senate last evening.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

MINOR CORRECTIONS IN CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS PROVIDING FOR STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there are on the Senate Calendar eight resolutions providing for studies and investigations of certain matters within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary, which have been favorably reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration.

There are certain slight, inconsequential changes in form of a clerical nature that should be made, and I ask unanimous consent that they may be corrected by the Secretary and not considered as amendments. They in no wise change the substance of the resolutions.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, may I inquire the nature of the changes?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The changes concern numbering, commas, and so forth. They are minor technical changes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF SHIPPING ACT, 1916—INDEFINITE POSTPONEMENT OF BILL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on September 8, 1961, the Senator from California [Mr. Engle] introduced, for himself and his distinguished colleagues, the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Butler], Senate bill 2524. The purpose of the bill was to extend through March 31, 1962, the then-existing interim dual rate law—Public Law 85-626, as amended by Public Law 86-547 and Public Law 87-75. Subsequently, this purpose was accomplished by an amendment to H.R. 3156 which, on September 16, 1961, became Public Law 87-252. On October 3, 1961, the need for an interim dual rate law ceased because of the enactment of Public Law 87-346. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have S. 2524 indefinitely postponed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ESTABLISHMENT OF CANYONLANDS NATIONAL PARK, UTAH—AMENDMENTS

Mr. MOSS submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 2387) to provide for establishment of the Canyonlands National Park in the State of Utah, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

WELFARE AND PENSION PLANS DISCLOSURE ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1962—AMENDMENT

Mr. GOLDWATER submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 2520) to amend the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act with respect to the method of enforcement and to provide certain additional sanctions, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON FARM BILL

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to announce that earlier today the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry met and decided to hold hearings on the administration farm bill, S. 2786, beginning Monday, February 19. I express the hope that those who desire to testify will let their wish be known to the committee clerks. I announce further that the committee has decided that once hearings are started, it is our purpose to go through with them until they are completed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2470) to provide for the establishment of the Lincoln Boyhood National Memorial in the State of Indiana, and for other purposes.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. CAPEHART:

Address delivered by Senator Goldwater before the Notre Dame University student body in South Bend, Ind., on February 26, 1962, on the subject of the struggle against Communist domination.

MUZZLING OF MILITARY OFFICERS—STATEMENT BY ROBERT E. HANSEN

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, the January 17, 1962, statement of Robert E. Hansen, commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States submitted to the Special Preparedness Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee, is one of the most perceptive, intelligent, and thorough statements I have ever seen.

Commander Hansen and the Veterans of Foreign Wars deserve the highest commendation for this excellent document, which is truly a profound public service to their country.

I am particularly impressed with pages 13, 14, 18, 19, and 22 of the statement. I am most impressed with pages 26 and 27 because of the excellent to-the-point recommendations in which I find myself in hearty agreement with the sole exception of recommendation No. 5.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR RUSSELL

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, that distinguished and brilliant commentator, Tristram P. Coffin, recently made a broadcast that captured a delightful insight of the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell] that has never been captured before to my knowledge. It is this type of interpretative reporting which sets Tris Coffin apart from his journalistic colleagues.

Because of its excellence and because of the great interest that Members of the Senate have in the senior Senator from Georgia, I would like to read excerpts from this broadcast of Tris Coffin:

> Senator Russell of Georgia is the kind of gentleman any young lady would love to have as an uncle. He possesses an old-fashioned courtesy that is charming. He is worldly wise and tolerant of human frailties. He has a vast amiability that smooths over troubled moments.
>
> All of these admirable qualities were on display a few days ago in the small Senate Armed Services Committee room, which has the air of a well-run antique shop: two sparkling cutglass chandeliers, a long table covered with green felt, pitchers of ice water. None of the confused modern contraptions of microphones that don't work and boom out squeaks and assorted noises into loudspeakers. None of the blasted glare of floodlights for television cameras. A quiet, contented, gracious air.
>
> Senator Russell was presiding at the hearing on the confirmation of John McCone as Director of Central Intelligence. * * * Senator Russell was in good humor at the hearing. During the interrogation of the new Navy Secretary, an earnest Senator Case of South Dakota worried about the Secretary's position on beef for the boys. Senator Russell said amiably, "Do you have any strong feelings on oleo?"
>
> Another appointee admitted to being a Harvard professor. Senator Russell inquired solicitously. "How are the new professors getting along up there? Have they had time to find their way about the campus yet?"
>
> Then, abstractedly, he asked, "I wonder when they are going to discover the oldest State university in the country?" "They" meant President Kennedy and "the oldest State university" is the beloved University of Georgia at Athens, Ga., where Greek literature is read in the original.
>
> A nonmember of the committee, Senator Eugene McCarthy, came to the table, at the chairman's invitation, and began to read a statement hardly complimentary to McCone. Senator Russell took this philosophically, with the professionally calm air of an indulgent uncle. * * * Senator Russell said soothingly in his pleasant Georgia voice, "Mr. McCone will have wide scope in replying."
>
> * * * * *
>
> Once, Senator Russell leaned over and whispered an aside to Senator Saltonstall. That gentleman's face broke into a smile of pure joy, and all around the table other Senators sat up with glowing and amused looks. John McCone's blue eyes showed the hint of a glint. The press table boys grinned as if they had heard a delicious secret. Of course, none of us, except Senator Saltonstall, had any idea what Senator Russell said.
>
> It just shows the power of the man's personality. Maybe, come to think of it, the administration ought to investigate the products of the oldest State university.
>
> This is Tris Coffin in Washington.

THE BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, February 7 through 13 is Boy Scout Week. I was reminded of the occasion a few days ago because a young Cub Scout from Arlington, Va., Alan Walker, visited me in my office and did me the favor of calling the fact to my attention by presenting me with a lapel pin to wear during the week-long observance.

Today we mark the 52d birthday of the Boy Scouts of America. This company of young gentlemen was chartered by Congress in 1916 and has nourished more than 38 million Americans to maturity and manhood, teaching them not only to "be prepared," but, in addition, to "do justly and love mercy and walk humbly with thy God." Therefore, it is fitting that Senators should note this occasion with particular pride and enthusiasm, for the Boy Scouts are not only the beneficiaries of our free country; they are its protectors as well, endeavoring to prepare themselves today for the benefits and burdens of tomorrow.

I am particularly pleased at this time to commend the Boy Scouts of my own State, North Carolina, for their activity and growth through the years. North Carolina has one of the most aggressive and productive scouting programs in the Nation and the Scouts and their leaders have the esteem of our State, and, indeed, the Nation. They are laboring with speed and vitality, and with success, toward their goal, which also is our Nation's goal: to keep "physically strong, mentally awake, and morally straight."

A legion of great leaders in North Carolina over the past half century has come from the ranks of the Boy Scouts. Their early training was a prolog to a better future, and this day in North Carolina is brighter because of Scouting.

Yet it is not sufficient only to commend the boys themselves. Great credit is theirs, to be sure, for without their exuberance and devotion, the enterprise would not be viable. But, by the same token, we must lay much tribute at the feet of the adult members of the scouting movement. Without their planning and vision, without their programing and aspirations, this birthday would not be celebrated. I commend them. As we celebrate their excellence here today, I recall 2 days last fall when I attended dinners in Siler City, N.C., and Durham, N.C., sponsored by adult Scouters. I was impressed not only with the fact of their devotion to our youth but also with the fact that these two groups were representative of similar groups in virtually every community of our State. They illustrate so well to me the worthiness of a great combination, responsible adult guidance and trustworthy national youth. Our youth will have its day, but because of the devotion of adult leaders, the day will be altogether different and, I think, better.

It is indeed a particular pleasure for me to say happy birthday to the Boy Scouts of America and to wish them and those working with them success in the years ahead.

CENSORSHIP OF ANTI-COMMUNIST STATEMENTS OF MILITARY AND CIVILIAN LEADERS IN GOVERNMENT

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on Tuesday, February 6, 1962, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD several articles and editorials from various newspapers and magazines across the country on the subject of censoring anti-Communist statements from addresses prepared for delivery by top military and civilian leaders. This material appears on pages 1780–1785. In view of the importance of this subject I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD some additional articles and editorials.

There being no objection, the articles and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Jan. 25, 1962]

WHEN A CENSOR SEES RED, HERE'S WHAT COMES OUT

WASHINGTON.—Here are some of the examples of Defense and State Department censorship revealed Wednesday by Senate investigators in questioning Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, Army Chief of Research and Development.

The date of the delivered speech, its original wording by General Trudeau, and revised wording or deletions are shown.

January 21, 1961: "We will be blocked and harassed by the Fabian Socialists and Communists." "Fabian Socialists" was deleted.

January 31 (to a Canadian audience): "Your country and mine are the targets of worldwide communism. This is why we and our allies arm—to counter the Communist threat." Entire section deleted.

"As we engage the Communist," changed to, "as we strive for a real peace."

"Yet, if our technology is to continue to accelerate, and it must to outperform the Reds"; last phrase deleted.

February 1: "Locked as we are in vital competition with the Communist"; delete and substitute: "in order to negotiate from a position of strength for peace."

"The Communist conspiracy directed toward absolute, universal domination of the world," deleted.

"These totalitarians, in thought and action, have clearly stated again and again that their simple, sole, and stark objective is to bury us," deleted.

"Khrushchev created a new kind of war," deleted.

"Our ability to meet the challenges of Soviet imperialism will determine whether our way of life will continue," deleted.

"Today, in the face of the worldwide threat of international communism," all deleted.

"We must field new and improved weapons systems more rapidly if we are to retain a military advantage over the Soviets." "Military" deleted.

February 17: "Faced as we are by the implacable mask of communism." "Implacable" deleted.

"With Soviet infiltration menacing this nation," deleted.

March 3: "Last year, in the United Nations we witnessed the growth of a new world power group—the so-called neutralist or Afro-Asian nations." "Afro-Asian" deleted.

"The record in the Congo." "In the Congo" deleted.

"Diplomatic dealing without powerful cards is a bluff at best." Deleted with this comment: "State Department feels diplomacy should not be compared to a card game."

"And beat the Communist challenge" deleted with instructions to substitute "The threat of foreign aggressors."

April 26: "Nothing less will permit us to emerge victorious." "Emerge victorious" deleted and changed to "achieve our goals."

"Coexistence is not a choice. It is a fatal disease." Deleted.

June 1: "We must win this struggle or we lose the world." Last phrase deleted.

Some anti-Communist phrases by General Trudeau were also censored when the Eisenhower administration was in power, the record disclosed. These were few in number but revealed deletions of such phrases as:

"I do not believe that the Soviets have relented in the slightest in their determination to dominate the world and to destroy our way of life."

In July 1960 General Trudeau spoke of the "Growing Communist drive in Latin America in open violation of our Monroe Doctrine." The phrase beginning "in open violation" was deleted.

On February 1, 1960, he mentioned "Khrushchev's challenge." "Khrushchev" was deleted and "Communist" substituted.

[From the Washington Star, Jan. 24, 1962]

STATE DEPARTMENT PLAYS MAJOR "MUZZLING" ROLE

(By Cecil Holland)

A major role has been played by the State Department in censoring the speeches and statements of military leaders and top civilian officials of the Defense Department, according to the findings of Senate investigators.

In a study by the Senate subcommittee investigating charges of "muzzling" of military leaders in speeches about the menace of communism, instances of censorship were found in 168 speeches or statements.

In at least 70 cases, according to the study, the State Department suggested or ordered mandatory changes. In some instances, several of the changes involved one speech.

Most of the speeches occurred during 1961 but some ranged back to 1959.

NOTATIONS CITED

The Senate investigators said one speech by Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, retired Chief of Naval Operations "was censored in its entirety in that Admiral Burke was prohibited from delivering it." This was a speech the admiral, who testified as the first witness at the subcommittee's opening hearing yesterday, proposed to give before the National Business Publications Association here last January 29.

The role of the State Department in instances of censoring was revealed on notations of the speeches which the subcommittee obtained from Defense Department files and other sources. Changes or deletions were suggested or directed not only in the speeches of the military leaders but also in those of many top civilian officials.

Secretary of the Air Force Zuckert, Secretary of the Army Stahr, and other civilians experienced the heavy hand of the censor on numerous occasions.

The censors revealed themselves, according to the study, as critics and grammarians as well as reviewers of policy.

QUESTIONABLE HISTORIAN

In one speech early last year Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, Army Research and Development Chief, undertook to say that "history fairly brims over with examples of proud nations which have slowly sunk into oblivion because they sowed the seeds of their own decay." He pointed out that Arnold Toynbee, the British historian, had said that 19 of 21 notable world civilizations have died from within and not by conquest from without and added that "ours must not be number 20."

A note on the front of the speech referred to "State Department's recommendation," and the censor's comment was: "Toynbee is a highly questionable historian—not likely to impress this audience."

Nearly a year ago Gen. George H. Decker, Army Chief of Staff, wrote in a speech: "It appears better to some—by their false rationale—to accede to totalitarianism than to risk the destruction of millions of human beings and large segments of the fruits of civilization—they would rather be Red than dead." The censors suggested deleting "they would rather be Red than dead."

General Trudeau, who had changes or deletions made in 26 speeches over a period of 2 years, said in a speech that his phrase "emerge victorious" had been changed to read "achieve our goals."

A comment in one speech was deleted as "too flip for the occasion." In another the phrase "world war III is already underway" was stricken with the censor's comment: "State says will affect foreign relations due to tone of speech."

WORDS QUALIFIED

Numerous speakers, including General Trudeau, were prevented from identifying the Communists as the enemy. Such qualifying words as "potential" enemy or "aggressor" were inserted instead.

The censors wielded the pencil on such terms as "world communism" and "international communism." One speech bore a notation that one such change was a "State change." A censor struck out the word "world" from a Trudeau speech and made it read "Sino-Soviet communism" with the comment:

"We want to discourage the term 'world communism.' It sounds very pessimistic and also, to some, pleasantly international, like the U.N."

At least two speakers found that the censors struck out the word "Christian." A speech by an Army officer was changed from "Christian" to "peaceloving people" and a sentence in a speech by Maj. Gen. A. M. Kuhfeld, Air Force Judge Advocate General, last November 11 was crossed out. The sentence read: "We are a Christian nation."

In the early part of 1961, the subcommittee study shows, references in a number of speeches to "Communists" were changed to read the "Soviet-Sino bloc."

Later on in the year the way of the censor became more tortured and references to the Soviet-Sino bloc were changed to read "the Communists."

Early in the year, in a speech prepared for delivery February 14, before the Los Angeles World Affairs Council (the name of the speaker was not listed), the following changes were made:

The word "war" to "contest," "battles" to "challenges," "real war" to "a vital struggle" and "war" to "struggle."

In a May speech, Maj. Gen. T. C. Darcy of the Army referred to Soviet Premier Khrushchev in several unflattering comments. The references were crossed out and the censor's note said: "Let's stay away from Khrushchev for the time being." The margin bore the note "Department of State," the study said.

In another speech cited in the study, Vice Adm. Robert B. Price was asked to delete a sentence: "Khrushchev said: 'We will bury you.'" Similar references in other speeches, the study showed, were deleted. When Lt. Gen. B. A. Schriever of the Air Force referred to the Khrushchev statement in a May 17, 1961, speech, the censor commented: "He has denied that he meant this literally."

LE MAY SPEECH

Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, now Air Force Chief of Staff, had a sentence in a speech last April saying : "SAC has the capability to destroy the warmaking capacity of any aggressor and to achieve victory." The phrase "and to achieve victory" was stricken, the study said.

A speech by another Air Force officer, Lt. Gen. George W. Mundy, last spring, contained this sentence: "In fact, the big question of our day is simply this: Will the future world, that is, the emerging world, be in our image, or will it be in the image of world communism?" The censor's comment: "No, we want people to have the right and freedom to choose own destiny."

Soon after he became Chief of Naval Operations last August succeeding Admiral Burke, Adm. George W. Anderson, Jr., submitted a speech containing a sentence which said: "Their actions clearly demonstrate that the leaders of the Sino-Soviet bloc do not choose to compete with us on an honorable basis." The censors changed it to read "their actions too often belie their words."

CENSORED ENTIRELY

In addition to a speech that was censored entirely, the subcommittee study found that another one of Admiral Burke's speeches—this one before the National Military, Industrial, and Educational Conference in Chicago last April—was objected to by the Defense Department.

However, the subcommittee said that "at Admiral Burke's insistence, the Department of Defense reversed its position" and allowed him to make the speech.

The first seven and a half pages of a speech by Rear Adm. Charles Martell last January was "deleted by the State Department," the Senate report said.

A speech by General Decker last January 30 to Army chaplains was returned, the subcommittee said, with this notation: "This general comment is offered: Portions of the speech do not conform to the tone and spirit of the inaugural address and particularly the following thought: 'Let both sides explore what problems unite us instead of belaboring those problems which divide us.'"

[From the Washington Report of the American Security Council, Feb. 5, 1962]

THE MILITARY AND COLD WAR EDUCATION

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Lt. Gen. Edward M. Almond, U.S. Army (retired), guest editor for this issue, was commander of the 10th Corps in the Korean war. Prior to that he was Chief of Staff to General MacArthur in Japan and dealt directly with the Russian mission there. These portions of his distinguished military career make him particularly well qualified to comment on the need for cold war education. This Washington report is a short version of a statement prepared by General Almond at the request of Senator JOHN STENNIS, chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Muzzling the Military. General Almond is a member of the American Security Council's national strategy committee.)

(By Lt. Gen. Edward M. Almond, U.S. Army, retired)

THE NEED FOR COLD WAR EDUCATION

Every American, be he soldier or civilian, is entitled to the best information available concerning the dangers to our Nation. Every true American responds to the call of duty when he understands why the call is made. But the need for sacrifice has to be understood. Our people must be informed.

The threat today is not primarily one of imminent armed attack on our country either by land, sea, or air. It is mainly the threat of deterioration of our individual and our national integrity and resolution, our willingness to sacrifice, and especially the weakening of our moral fiber. The danger is that we shall lose by default through abandonment of the will to win.

The Communist threat to both our national and our individual existence is no matter of partisan politics. It is a matter of survival for us all. It is both internal and external. Those Americans who would use the full power of the United States to combat Communist aggression abroad find themselves opposed by their fellow citizens who would compromise with the enemy. A portion of this compromising segment openly adopts the slogan, "Better Red than dead."

Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, who has repeatedly warned us of the internal threat, declared as recently as December 7, 1961, that:

"We are at war with the Communists and the sooner every red-blooded American realizes this, the safer we will be. We must continue to stiffen our national backbone in dealing with the Communists, their dupes, sympathizers, and apologists. If we relax our guard for one moment, we court national disaster."

A survey published in the Saturday Evening Post of December 30, 1961, testifies to the continuing decay of our moral fiber. This survey found the typical American youth—ages 14 to 22—"to be a pampered house pet," "will settle for low success rather than risk high failure," "has little spirit of adventure," "is a reluctant patriot who expects a nuclear war and would rather compromise than risk an all-out war," and "he likes himself the way he is and the things the way they are."

My long experience as a soldier has convinced me that this weakening of our national moral fiber has seriously affected the stamina of the average American fighting man. The debilitating influences to which the average American is subjected prior to his induction into military service have progressively increased the effort required on the part of the military leader—from the squad to the Army commander—to bring him up to the moral and physical standards required for victory. The experience of the Korean war proved that many American soldiers had little or no understanding of why they were fighting. Consequently, they lacked both knowledge and courage to withstand brainwashing by their Communist captors.

In view of past experience, it is particularly astounding to read the statement of Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, that "fundamentally, it is believed that the American people have little, if any, need to be alerted to the menace of the cold war."

Alarming, also, is the rise in influence of a group which seems to have induced our President to wage a campaign against the anti-Communist thinking of our citizens. At the same time, they seem determined to cause him to overlook the fruitless record of negotiation with the Soviets over the past 25 years. These people denounce the concept of victory over communism as extremism. In their eagerness to negotiate a settlement with the Communists, they ignore the fact that the long-range Soviet goal is still world domination. They forget that to the Soviets any negotiation or "agreement" is merely a tactic in pursuit of that goal.

HOW THE MILITARY CAN ASSIST IN COLD WAR EDUCATION

The military sponsored seminars launched in 1958 by a directive of President Eisenhower, after endorsement of the move by our National Security Council, have done much to alert our citizens throughout the country. I have personal knowledge of the result of one such seminar which generated sufficient concern to cause a civilian group (comprised of bankers, insurance executives, and civic leaders) in a period of 6 months to establish and operate a speakers bureau on the dangers of communism which reached 63,000 persons in 18 counties in the northern portion of the State of Alabama.

While such local seminars may be possible without benefit of military facilities, the inspiration which generated the above result came from a military seminar held at Fort Benning, Ga., in October 1959. There are many Americans of sound judgment, both civilian and military, who believe that the military segment of our Nation is one of the most knowledgeable of the anti-Communist forces.

Unfortunately, the campaign to discourage strong anticommunism has centered on the military. I am not aware of a single cold war seminar having been sponsored by the military since September 1, 1961.

Despite declarations by the Department of Defense that it does not prohibit military personnel from speaking out against communism, freedom of discussion of the Communist threat by military personnel is simply not taking place. A review of hundreds of Department of Defense censored speeches prepared by military officers has shown the elimination of such expressions as "the Communist challenge," "Communist conspiracy directed toward absolute domination of the world," "Soviet infiltration menacing this Nation and extending throughout the far corners of the globe," "Soviets have not relented in the slightest in their determination to dominate the world and our way of life," "the steady advance of communism," and the words "victory" and "war."

Such censorship blurs the nature of the Communist threat and promotes the policies of those who would comprise our principles. Failure to call a spade a spade helps those who seek to further appease the Communists.

The military commander is directed and urged by our Department of Defense to establish the best possible relationship with the civic leaders and local officials in his region. There can be no legitimate objection to cooperation with the civil entities if they request the military to help further their fight against communism by exposing Communist concepts, Communist methods of infiltration and subversion, and Communist ideologies.

Where the military individual is guilty of improper procedure or misrepresentation of condition or is nonfactual or libelous or where he makes false accusations, he personally is to blame and appropriate punitive action should be taken by the proper authorities. No officer or man in any branch of the military service will violate the proper code of conduct once he knows that he is personally liable for such action. The military services have adequate precepts, traditions and ethical standards, some written and some unwritten, which provide all the safeguards necessary against partisan or political action except where the individual is guilty of poor judgment or irresponsible preparation of his subject matter.

WHAT MUST BE DONE

All true Americans should urge the utilization of every means available to inform, on a nonpartisan basis, our servicemen, in particular, and our people throughout the country in general of the insidious and very real Communist threat to our country.

To do this we need a spirit as well as a program; we need the leadership at the top of our political system to encourage patriotic and self-sacrificing efforts by our people in every walk of life; we need less of the "red pencil" of our censors and more of the spirit of our forefathers whose courage and intrepidity made this Nation possible.

From the rank of captain of Infantry through that of lieutenant general commanding an Army corps of more than 100,000 troops, I have been in many difficult battle spots. My "shield and buckler" has always been encompassed by the thoughts: "This is my country." "This is for those who would act as I am acting if they were here." God forbid that the time shall ever come when the American fighter should think, when the chips are down: "Why should I risk my life for those who would rather be 'Red than dead'?" If this be labeled "superpatriotism" by the apologists for America, let them make the most of it.

The chips are down and this is a struggle for survival. Our age-old concept of life and liberty demands that no one dare to apologize for our beliefs or to excuse the foreign aims of tyrants who would deprive us of both life and liberty.

[From the Nashville Banner, Jan. 25, 1962]

State Department Editing Bewilders General Trudeau

Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau is puzzled. Throughout his testimony before the Senate Armed Services Subcommittee he expressed bewilderment over deletions of terms and changes of phraseology made in his speeches by State Department security officials.

The Army Research Chief laid out in chapter and verse ample evidence justifying his claims that censorship of portions of his speeches—particularly those referring to the Communist threat—had left him mystified.

To his surprise he learned that it was verboten to allude to "the vicious challenge of world communism." The State Department's objections to using the phrase, "world communism," are, to say the least, ambiguous. The Department said:

"We want to discourage the term 'world communism.' It sound very pessimistic and also, to some, pleasantly international, like the U.N."

Thus, the phrase is deleted and "Sino-Soviet" is substituted when communism manifests itself militantly, as if there are certain forms of Marxism which are more benign than others.

And here is a sentence from one of the general's addresses which was blue-penciled in its entirety: "I believe that if we surrender certain of our rights today, then inevitably and soon we shall lose what rights remain."

It was called an invasion of the realm of foreign policy. What is foreign about freedom? It is American. The General's view is as old as the Declaration of Independence. It is one of the great truths of all time.

General Trudeau, who also has served as Army Chief of Intelligence, made an observation yesterday that might prove to be one of the serious indictments emanating from this hearing.

In referring to the many changes made in his texts, he said often the source was unidentified "which gave my staff and me equal cause for wonder about the motivation involved."

Unless the State Department can come up with an answer to this, there will remain a rather large "why" in these proceedings, the deduction of which will devolve on subcommittee members.

It should be stressed that the General had not prior to his appearance before the probing unit filed an official protest regarding these changes and deletions. He said he believed "a soldier does not question the policies and decisions of higher Government authority." He is still on active duty, holding an important military position. He has not resigned in favor of the speaking circuit.

But in a pointed observation, he stated that he knew of no directive prohibiting military men from "speaking out clearly and forthrightly against communism or challenging our people to stand fast on those great principles that are the keystones in the arch of American policy and freedom of men everywhere."

It's no surprise that General Trudeau is puzzled, bewildered and mystified. So is the Nation.

[From the Nashville Banner, Feb. 1, 1962]

New Censorship Danger—Executive Seeks To Hide Behind Pentagon "Fifth"

Last week following the testimony of Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau before Senate Armed Services Subcommittee investigating charges "muzzling" military officers, the Banner said:

"General Trudeau, who also has served as Army Chief of Intelligence, made an observation yesterday that might prove to be one of the serious indictments emanating from this hearing.

"In referring to the many changes made in his (speech) texts, he said often the source was unidentified 'which gave my staff and me equal cause for wonder about the motivation involved.'"

Since that time both the State and Defense Departments have issued directives stating that their officials testifying before the committee would not reveal the identities of individual security officers who had "edited" the intended remarks of General Trudeau and other high-ranking officers.

This order was bound to cause difficulty. Yesterday Willis D. Lawrence, assistant director for policy and procedures in the Pentagon security review office, refused to name the person or persons who "censored" General Trudeau's remarks from testimony he gave before the House Science and Astronautics Committee last February.

It can be said that Mr. Lawrence is merely carrying out orders from his superior, Defense Secretary McNamara, but Senator Strom Thurmond has brought up a valid point.

The South Carolina Senator points to the "motivation" issue which the Banner had questioned. He said, "It is essential to identify the individual who reviewed particular speeches for this committee to perform its functions."

At the time General Trudeau framed his "motivation" remark. The Banner also said that unless a satisfactory answer was forthcoming, "there will remain a rather large why in these proceedings."

Worse still, the McNamara dodge amounts to an effort by the executive branch of the Government to hide behind a Pentagon-directed "fifth amendment."

And that is the most dangerous type of censorship that could threaten the country.

[From the Washington Star, Jan. 25, 1962]

Censors at Work

The difficulties, not to mention the absurdities, which arise once the peacetime censor has been set to work are clearly reflected in some of the illustrations culled from material put before the Stennis subcommittee.

The subcommittee, which is studying charges that military men have been muzzled, learned that a censor had stricken from one speech a reference to a military plane as a "Man of War." Penciling this out, the censor said: "Let's use another steed—Zev, Gallant Fox, etc., but not this one." The policy, it seems, is against using such words as "war" or "victory."

Another censor objected to a speech quoting Arnold Toynbee on the reasons for the decline of once proud nations. "Toynbee," the censor said, "is a highly questionable historian." An Army officer's speech was blue-penciled to delete a reference to Khrushchev's remark that "we will bury you." The censor explained "he has denied that he meant this literally." An Air Force officer wanted to say: "In fact, the big question of our day is simply this: Will the future world, that is, the emerging world, be in our image, or will it be in the image of world communism?" But the censor put his foot down. "We want people to have the right and freedom to choose their own destiny," he explained.

These, perhaps, are extreme examples. But there are many more in the record, and they are hardly less noteworthy for their asininity. The main trouble, granting that some censorship is needed, comes from attempting to censor speeches for policy as distinguished from security reasons. And the trouble is compounded when some faceless censor, often with no qualifications for his job, tries to function under policy directives which, to say the least, are vague and uncertain. The censor invariably will play it safe, and the safer he plays it the sillier he will get.

Defense Secretary McNamara, refusing to identify individual censors, says he assumes full responsibility for what they have done. Perhaps this is the right position for him to take since, after all, he is responsible. But it is a position which also leaves him at the mercy of his censors, and he might be well advised to try to find some new and more sensible ones.

[From the Omaha World-Herald, Jan. 30, 1962]

THE TRUTH

According to a report in the Sunday World-Herald, Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau was considered for the job of Deputy Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, but lost out because of his testimony before the Senate subcommittee which is looking into charges that military leaders have been muzzled.

The general assertedly "got into the area of political definitions" and displayed signs of what "Schlesinger calls a dogmatist."

To common, everyday Americans that may seem to be a vague offense. But disagreement with Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., or the incurring of his displeasure apparently can be devastating to a career in the Kennedy administration.

Professor Schlesinger laid down an official definition of "dogmatism" in a speech which the President hailed as the finest given by any member of his administration. In it the White House adviser said:

"The mark of the dogmatist is that he is still in grade school, and thinks he can find all the answers in the back of the book. He knows the truth, and every one who rejects his truth is either a knave or a fool."

Note Mr. Schlesinger's words, "the truth" and "his truth."' Observe also the implication that truth is unknowable and that all who contend otherwise are childish and ignorant.

By the Schlesinger definition Thomas Jefferson clearly would have to be tagged a dogmatist. In a memorable document, he held certain basic truths to be self-evident. He held that all men are created equal and endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights. He did not regard those statements as mere working hypotheses, or as only his idea of the truth. He regarded them as the truth.

The Founding Fathers built a whole structure of government on what they believed to be absolute, unquestionable truths about the source of man's rights and the nature of them. According to their wisdom, those rights came from Almighty God, not from the state, and the governments were instituted among men to insure these rights. Through a whole catalog of didactic, dogmatic statements, they never admitted doubt concerning basic truths.

Were Jefferson and his colleagues in the age of enlightenment naive and primitive men?

Were the words of the Declaration, the Constitution and the Bill of Rights mere value judgments subject to revision or discard by self-proclaimed wiser, more urbane minds of the 20th century?

Was Thomas Jefferson figuratively still in grade school when he poured his heart and soul into the self-evident truths of the Declaration of Independence?

Millions of patriotic Americans refuse to disown the truths on which their Nation was founded. They believe, just as firmly as did Jefferson, Madison, Jay, Adams, and the rest that some verities are eternal, and that our country's star should be hitched to them and directed thereby.

To paraphrase another Founding Father, if this be dogmatism, make the most of it.

[From the New York Daily News, Jan. 29, 1962]

WHAT GOES ON HERE, ANYWAY?

"I believe that if we surrender certain of our rights today, then inevitably, and soon, we shall lose what rights remain."

Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, Army Research and Development Chief, wanted to include the above statement in a speech he delivered October 10, 1961.

Unnamed persons in the Defense and State Departments ordered the sentence cut out of the speech when they cleared it for delivery. It was in conflict, they said, with Public Affairs Directive No. 18 on foreign policy.

This directive apparently seeks to repeal a principle proved true throughout recorded human history.

The censoring of Trudeau's speech became public last week, as the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee's investigation of the muzzling of military men got underway.

Numerous other incidents of such censorship were bared by the subcommittee—chairman, Senator JOHN STENNIS, Democrat, of Mississippi—at the same time. Trudeau is a vigorous anti-Communist who believes in denouncing communism at every opportunity and in the plainest English, and therefore is hated by professional liberals and anti-anti-Communists.

On another occasion (January 31, 1961), General Trudeau wanted to say in a speech:

"Beyond a shadow of a doubt, your country and mine are the prime targets of a worldwide, all-out offensive of world communism. This offensive has forced nations that glory in free institutions to join in defending these priceless values. This is why—and the simple, sole and irrefutable reason—we and our allies arm—to counter the Communist threat. Since the days of the bloody Red revolution, the Soviets have ceaselessly increased their weapon capabilities against the day when in Khrushchev's words, they 'will bury us.'"

ANTI-RED GAGGED BY BUREAUCRATS

This entire passage—a statement of a truth known to everybody who knows what goes on in the world, and a truth every American should know—was cut out of Trudeau's speech on order of the State Department, without explanation.

For delivery February 17, 1961, General Trudeau prepared a speech containing this sentence:

"We must make sure that our military strength is geared to cope with the Sino-Soviet bloc threat today and in the future."

It would seem that there is at least one pipsqueak in the State Department who doesn't know that our current major enemies are Soviet Russia and Red China. Anyway, the State Department gutted the sentence by ordering out the phrase "Sino-Soviet bloc"—again without explanation.

The remark "On such theories socialism thrives" was eased out of a Trudeau speech delivered March 9, 1961, with a State Department comment that "some of our best friends are Socialists."

General Trudeau was guardedly polite in his testimony about all this before the Stennis subcommittee. We imagine he had Gens. Billy Mitchell, Douglas MacArthur, and Edwin A. Walker rather painfully in mind while testifying.

But there is no necessity for civilians or newspapers to be polite on this subject of the muzzling of the military by appeasers or worse in the State and Defense Departments.

TRAITORS—OR DUMB CLUCKS?

What is going on, obviously, is that our military men—the men who know the enemy best and may have to fight him some day—are being forbidden to sound the alarm to their fellow Americans in vigorous and convincing ways.

They are being forced to tone down and mushmouth the truths that are in their minds and hearts.

This disclosure by the Stennis subcommittee raises some very grave questions, among which are:

Is the State Department, as so often alleged, still infested with second- and third-echelon traitors who mold much of our foreign policy and are determined to sell the United States down the river to communism?

Or are both the State and the Defense Department loaded with simple-minded, mole-eyed twerps who don't know that there is a war on?

It is to be hoped that the Stennis subcommittee will put plenty of time and effort into getting the correct answers to such questions, and will let the people have those answers uncensored by anybody in any particular.

[From the San Diego Union, Jan. 25, 1962]

HEARINGS START WELL—MUZZLING ISSUE CLEARLY DRAWN

Hearings into the muzzling of military leaders opened in Washington, D.C., on just the right note.

The testimony was informative, not emotional. And a clear battle line was drawn over the central issue.

The issue is, Should officers be permitted to speak out against communism without invading the field of purely partisan politics.

The answer most eloquently was "Yes."

Former President Eisenhower, a man with considerable experience in the fields of military command and partisan politics, put it this way:

"We are smothering the concept of personal responsibility under the practice of heavyhanded and unjustified staff supervision. I say let the military speak, always under properly established policies and the general—not petty—supervision of their superiors."

Mr. Eisenhower's written testimony was supported by the words of another great American, Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, former Chief of Naval Operations.

Admiral Burke, whose own remarks have been censored in the past, remarked on the disturbing tendency of an underling to pass judgment on statements of an officer who knows much more.

He also pointed out how censorship can dry up the channels of military command:

"Important mistakes can go undetected and unremedied and gradually become compounded until a serious crisis develops and then it is too late."

Mr. Eisenhower, Admiral Burke, and the third witness, Robert Lovett, former Defense Secretary, were firm in stating that the military should steer clear of purely partisan politics.

Their testimony pointed up the basic pity of the entire muzzling issue—the quarrel between the armed services and the Kennedy administration civilians over who can best indoctrinate against communism.

Rather than argument, this is one area where we need absolute agreement. Communism is an enemy whose cancerous techniques should be exposed to every American.

The need for anti-Communist education in the armed services was demonstrated in Korea. It still exists. Civilian and military agencies must work together. As Mr. Eisenhower said:

"With the education for troops and the public, each supplements and supports the other—defense personnel takes the lead in the first, civilian agencies do so in the second."

That is the goal. We fervently hope that the subcommittee hearings can show us the way.

[From the Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle, Jan. 29, 1962]

CENSORSHIP WITHOUT CAUSE

When Senator STROM THURMOND called last August for the military "muzzling" probe now underway, he charged that the Fulbright memorandum had brought about "censorship of statements of military leaders far beyond any requirement of security classifications or compliance with civilian made policy."

His charge is well substantiated in a 71-page book just released by the Senate subcommittee conducting the "muzzling" investigation. The book documents samples of censored statements by 85 officers. In case after case, deletions and changes were made that obviously have nothing to do with national security or compliance with basic policies of our Government. To cite only a few examples:

Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, former Chief of Naval Operations, submitted a speech for delivery last June 4 in which this sentence appeared:

"Today the United States is engaged in a grim competition with an alien philosophy that has taken over whole countries—without firing a shot. That is why the only real way to increase the strength of our Nation is to strengthen what is under attack—to strengthen the individual."

This was changed to "today, as in the past, the only real way to increase the strength of our Nation is to strengthen what is under attack—to strengthen the individual." This was a mandatory change by the State Department after review by the State Department, Army, Navy, Air Force and Directorate of Security Review. No reason was given for the change.

Gen. Thomas D. White, former Air Force Chief of Staff, included this statement in a speech for delivery January 31, 1961:

"Current Communist propaganda to the world concentrates on the central theme which it has always emphasized—the destruction of capitalism, colonialism, and imperialism. But, under this guise, they really intend the destruction of everything which does not bend to their will. Theirs is the language of total war. They have a consistency and a singlemindedness about promoting world revolution which is unique in the history of dictatorship. The only sensible view of Communist intentions is that they seek to destroy us by any means which they can use."

The office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs ordered a mandatory deletion of this entire section. Again, no reason was given.

The original draft of a speech to be made by Lt. Gen. Bernard A. Schriever, commanding officer of the Air Space Systems Command, contained this comment:

"He may use the threat of nuclear rockets, or he may use the prestige of space probes. He has even been known to take off a shoe and bang it on the table."

The second sentence was deleted. No source or reason was given.

Secretary of the Air Force Eugene M. Zuckert included these sentences in a speech for delivery last August, shortly after THURMOND made his charge:

"Khrushchev's boastful threats are not aimed at the scoreboard. They are aimed at our jugular."

This segment was deleted by a censor in the State Department. No reason was offered.

These examples and many others follow a definite pattern—a pattern of softening or deleting altogether, statements that call attention to Khrushchev's crimes or to the nature and goals of communism. They point forcefully to the need for review and revision of our entire system of military censorship.

The matter at issue as far as we are concerned, is not whether speeches by military officers are subject to civilian review. Most of the officers themselves, including Admiral Burke and General White, agree on the need for security and policy clearance. But the kind of censorship involved in most of the cases cited is neither needed nor justified. Therein lies the danger of the Fulbright memorandum and the far-reaching effect it has produced.

[From the St. Louis Globe Democrat, Jan. 25, 1962]

THE SENATE INVESTIGATES CENSORS

Why can't any American, in or out of uniform, point out that international communism is our mortal enemy and will "bury us," if it can?

This is the real issue in the current Senate investigation of the censorship which the Defense Department and State Department exercise over top Federal officials—civilian as well as military.

Former President Eisenhower got the investigation started on the right foot in a letter he sent to the Senate subcommittee. In it, he said:

"I question the desirability of requiring the topmost Government officials, whether military or civilian, to submit their proposed public statements for what amounts to censorship of content—as distinguished from security matters—prior to their utterance."

This is what the special Senate Armed Forces subcommittee is investigating—censorship.

It is misleading to call the probe the Walker hearings. This suggests the sole object is to investigate the removal of Gen. Edwin A. Walker for alleged rightwing statements.

Senator STROM THURMOND, South Carolina Democrat, brought this censorship issue to a head by a series of forthright attacks on the floor of the Senate. He smoked out the now famous memo Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT sent to Defense Secretary McNamara. It warned against getting the American people too worked up over the cold war.

"Fundamentally," Senator FULBRIGHT wrote, "it is believed that the American people have little, if any, need to be alerted to the menace of the cold war."

On the contrary, he stated, "in the long run, it is quite possible that the principal problem of leadership will be, if it is not already, to restrain the desire of the people to hit the Communists with everything we've got, particularly if there are more Cubas and Laos."

In effect, this is an argument for lulling the American people to sleep. The Senate is now investigating if that is what Washington is doing.

Adm. Arleigh A. Burke testified on the first day of the investigation. He told the Senators he felt military officers had the proper and moral right to speak out against communism, as long as they avoid partisan politics.

Who doesn't agree?

The American Communist Party doesn't. It has attacked Admiral Burke by name, in the Worker, for his expressed anti-Communist views.

But who else wouldn't?

STOCKPILING INQUIRY—NOMINATION OF FRANK B. ELLIS TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, there is before this body, for confirmation as U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Louisiana, the nomination of Frank B. Ellis.

Until shortly before his nomination, he was Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, in the Executive Office of the President, an agency formerly known as the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.

This Office has within its purview and under its jurisdiction the stockpiling of strategic war materials. He resigned as Director thereof, to accept the nomination for the judgeship.

Last week the President in his news conference called for an inquiry regarding stockpiling of strategic war materials. He declared he was astonished at the $7.7 billion total which it embraced. He referred to it as a questionable burden on public funds and a potential source of excessive and unconscionable profit. The situation was so bad that he had taken steps to halt any new acquisitions, except in three items; he became convinced that a thorough investigation should be ordered; he decried the cloak of secrecy surrounding the program; and he called for complete exploration of the entire activities.

All of this was a result of a detailed check which had been ordered last spring.

Against the background of this entire subject, we find the name and the official acivities of Mr. Frank B. Ellis. His testimony will be very desirable, and in fact will be quite pivotal, inasmuch as he had been in active charge and responsible for the reports of his Office upon which, presumably, the President made many of his conclusions in regard to stockpiling.

Mr. Ellis enjoys a reputation as an attorney of character and competence. He has engaged in many extra-professional activities in his community and State. Insofar as the record shows, there would seem to be no reason why he should not be considered qualified to assume the judgeship to which he is nominated.

It will be desirable for the Judiciary Committee to hold early hearings and report on the nomination, so that the Senate can act promptly to fill the vacancy now existing on the bench.

However, before this is done, it would be very much in order that the congressional investigating committees which will undertake inquiry into stockpiling should bring Mr. Ellis before them at an early time.

It goes without saying that after he is sworn in as judge, he will not be able to testify without some reluctance, because of his newly assumed functions. He should be given timely opportunity to testify and furnish such facts as the investigating committees might need in order to clarify the situation.

At present there is no such impediment, or any other. Certainly with the President's deploring the cloak of secrecy which has surrounded this program and his statement that this is no longer justified, since secrecy now is only an invitation to mismanagement, the assertion of executive privilege is moot.

Thus, Mr. Ellis can testify freely, openly, without reservation, and with full approval of the President as to all facets and all details of the program which he once directed.

If this were not done, the only remaining opportunity to interrogate Mr. Ellis in detail on this subject would be at the Judiciary Committee hearing on his nomination.

This would be unfortunate, since the Judiciary Committee does not have the background and direct knowledge to enable it to undertake an inquiry of maximum detail and significance, such as the occasion plainly requires, in view of the President's expressed concern.

Time is of the essence. It is my hope that we shall receive early assurances that Mr. Ellis will be called and will testify soon before investigating committees.

AID TO ALBANIA

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, in the New York Herald Tribune for January 31, 1962, included under "Letters to the Editor," was a letter from Hugh G. Grant, former U.S. Minister to Albania, under the heading "Don't Back Albanian Reds."

I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DON'T BACK ALBANIAN REDS

To the NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE:

As the last U.S. Minister accredited to Albania, from 1935 until 1939, I have been following closely the recent events in Albania, arising from the controversy between Khruschev and the Albania Communist Dictator Enver Hoxha.

In your editorial, "The Red Rift Widens," it is asserted that "Albanian boss, Hoxha, is no hero," and that "he rules brutally over a people whose own civilization is not far removed from barbarism, and whose product he is."

I agree fully that Hoxha is no hero and that he rules brutally in Albania, but I cannot agree that the civilization of the Albanian people is not far removed from barbarism, or that Communist Boss Hoxha is a product of Albania.

The fact is that the Albanians, descendants of the ancient Illyrians, represent the oldest race in southeastern Europe. Despite great poverty, the result of foreign invasions and conquests over a period of many hundreds of years, these sturdy people have maintained their own language, their traditions and cultural standards and furthermore they have many fine traits of character, such as the creed of hospitality, and they observe strict codes of honor, all of which is wholly foreign to barbarism. Members of the three great religious orders, Moslem, Orthodox and Catholic, the Albanians are noted for their religious tolerance, a striking indication of a civilized people.

Hoxha, the Communist boss in Albania, is not a product of his country. The political philosophy of Hoxha, an ardent disciple of Stalin, is completely foreign to the philosophy of the individualistic freedom-loving people of Albania. The execution of more than 10,000 Albanians and imprisonment of approximately double this number since the seizure of the country by the Communists at the end of World War II is mute evidence of this fact.

As indicated in your editorial of January 16, 1962, it appears that Hoxha, in his break with Khrushchev, may be putting out feelers for material cooperation by the West, such as has been extended to Communist dictator Tito, of Yugoslavia, by the United States.

In my judgment, it would be a fatal error for the West to swallow this Communist bait. At the same time ,it would appear that the time is ripe for a strong declaration by the Western powers, reasserting the right of the Albanian people to reestablish their complete political independence and territorial integrity, as proclaimed by the Albanians on November 28, 1912, at the end of the Balkan Wars, and maintained until the Italian Fascist conquest in April 1939.

HUGH G. GRANT,
Former U.S. Minister to Albania.
AUGUSTA, GA.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY IN HOMEOWNERSHIP

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, since the first demand for the abolition of slavery, the people of Massachusetts have always led the way in an effort to insure equal opportunities for all Americans. This effort has taken different forms at different times in our history. Today, perhaps the greatest challenge is to insure equal opportunity in homeownership.

A number of citizen groups in Greater Boston are asking their neighbors to join them in meeting this challenge. In Lexington the education division of the Lexington Civil Rights Committee, headed by Mrs. Harry Blum and Mrs. Hiller Zobel, are circulating, this month, a "good neighbor pledge."

The citizens of this town, where Americans first made their stand for equal rights, are being asked to make the following pledge:

"I will accept families and individuals into my neighborhood without discrimination because of religion, color, or national origin."

This pledge follows in the historic tradition of our Commonwealth and I hope it will find widespread support.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the agreement previously entered into, I move that the Senate proceed with the call of the legislative calendar, beginning with Calendar No. 1142.

The motion was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The legislative calendar, beginning with order of business No. 1142, will now be called.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will now proceed to call the legislative calendar, beginning with Calendar No. 1142.

THOMAS O. TATE, JR.

The bill (S. 160) for the relief of Thomas O. Tate, Jr., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Thomas O. Tate, Junior, chief warrant officer, United States Navy, retired, of Rogue River, Oregon, is hereby relieved of all liability to repay to the United States the sum of $1,062.92, representing salary paid him during the period from January 4, 1960, through April 1, 1960, while he was an employee of the Veterans' Administration, in violation of the Act of July 31, 1894 (28 Stat. 162), as amended, the said Thomas O. Tate, Junior, having been erroneously advised by the Veterans' Administration prior to his employment that such Act was not applicable to him.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Thomas O. Tate, Junior, the sum of any amounts received or withheld from him on account of the salary payments referred to in the first section of this Act.

JONG DAE KIM

The bill (S. 1273) for the relief of Jong Dae Kim was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Jong Dae Kim, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Sergeant Leon R. Tonini, a citizen of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of the said Jong Dae Kim shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

WILLIAM JOHN CAMPBELL McCAUGHEY

The bill (S. 1499) for the relief of William John Campbell McCaughey was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That William John Campbell McCaughey may be naturalized upon compliance with all of the requirements of title III of the Immigration and Nationality Act, except that no period of physical presence within the United States shall be required in addition to his physical presence within the United States since November 27, 1956.

MARY ELIZABETH SIDOR POLKOWSKA

The bill (S. 1520) for the relief of Mary Elizabeth Sidor Polkowska was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 203(a)(3) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Mary Elizabeth Sidor Polkowska shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mrs. Therese Polkowska, a lawful permanent resident of the United States.

MERLE K. LOESSIN

The bill (S. 1684) for the relief of Merle K. Loessin was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Merle

K. Loessin of Summit, South Dakota, is hereby relieved of all liability for charges entered against him as a result of the theft of $1,000 of public funds in his charge, such theft having been committed by a person or persons unknown on May 19, 1953, while the said Merle K. Loessin, then a first lieutenant in the United States Marine Corps, was serving as deputy disbursing officer with the First Marine Division in the Republic of Korea.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Merle K. Loessin an amount equal to the total of any amounts which have been paid to the United States on account of such theft.

PASCO, WASH.

The bill (S. 1756) for the relief of the city of Pasco, Wash., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the city of Pasco, Washington, is hereby relieved of all liability to pay to the United States the sum of $3,000, representing the value of approximately 60,000 cubic yards of sand and gravel removed and sold by such city in connection with the development of a portion of a reservoir area (formed by the McNary Dam project) licensed to such city by the United States under the provisions of section 4 of the Act of December 22, 1944, as amended (58 Stat. 889), such city having utilized the total proceeds realized from the disposition of such sand and gravel for the construction of a public recreational facility.

ROBERT B. KASPAREK AND OTHERS

The bill (S. 2018) for the relief of Robert B. Kasparek and others was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to (1) Robert B. Kasparek, the sum of $147.84; (2) Robert M. Kearny, the sum of $692.55; (3) Richard A. Stokes, the sum of $510; (4) J. R. Whitehouse, Junior, the sum of $885; and (5) Herbert A. Wolff, Junior, the sum of $325; all employees of the National Park Service at Everglades National Park, Florida. The payment of such sums shall be in full satisfaction of all their claims against the United States for compensation for personal property damages sustained by them when the Government quarters assigned to them were inundated on September 10, 1960, as a result of a hurricane: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

STEPHEN PATRICK HOUSE AND OTHERS

The bill (S. 2155) for the relief of Stephen Patrick House and others was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Stephen Patrick House, Ellen Myra Rachel House, Thomas Stephen Rendall House, and Jane Ellen House, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of July 31, 1956.

MATE IVAN JURASIC

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1397) for the relief of Mate Ivan Jurasic, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mate Ivan Jurasic (also known as Mike Jurasic) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall reduce by one number the number of refugees who may be paroled into the United States pursuant to sections 1 and 2(a) of the Act of July 14, 1960 (74 Stat. 504), during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

EDWARD YIN LIANG

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1578) for the relief of Edward Yin Liang which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, in the administration of the Act of September 26, 1961 (75 Stat. 650), Edward Yin Liang shall be deemed to be within the purview of section 25(a) of that Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

JEAN L. DUNLOP

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2165) for the relief of Jean L. Dunlop, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, on page 1, line 5, after the word "of", where it appears the second time, to strike out "$1,804.20" and insert "$1,275", and in line 8, after the word "through", to strike out "September 30," and insert "May 31,"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Jean L. Dunlop of Arlington, Virginia, is hereby relieved of all liability for repayment to the United States of the sum of $1,275, representing the amount of erroneous payments of a class Q allotment made to her by the Department of the Army for the period from August 1, 1951, through May 31, 1952, as a result of administrative error.

, Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Jean L. Dunlop, the sum of any amounts received or withheld from her on account of the overpayments referred to in the first section of this Act.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

KENNETH STULTZ

The bill (H.R. 2147) for the relief of Kenneth Stultz was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ANTHONY ROBERT LOWRY

The bill (H.R. 2973) for the relief of Anthony Robert Lowry was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

GILES L. MATTHEWS

The bill (H.R. 3710) for the relief of Giles L. Matthews was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

MRS. ANN W. EDWARDS

The bill (H.R. 4194) for the relief of Mrs. Ann W. Edwards was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ALESSANDRO BOTTERO

The bill (H.R. 4211) for the relief of Alessandro Bottero was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

DIMITRI ELIAS SARTAN

The bill (H.R. 4280) for the relief of Dimitri Elias Sartan was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

WALTER H. HANSON

The bill (H.R. 4381) for the relief of Walter H. Hanson was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

MARY C. ATKINSON

The bill (H.R. 4876) for the relief of Mary C. Atkinson was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF PRIVATE LAW 85-699

The bill (H.R. 5181) to amend Private Law 85-699 was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

DR. SERAFIN T. ORTIZ

The bill (H.R. 5324) for the relief of Dr. Serafin T. Ortiz was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

HOUSTON BELT & TERMINAL RAILWAY CO.

The bill (H.R. 6013) for the relief of the Houston Belt & Terminal Railway Co. was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

FRANCIS AINSWORTH

The bill (H.R. 6120) for the relief of Francis Ainsworth was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ARLIN DAVID ENGLISH

The bill (H.R. 6226) for the relief of Arlin David English was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

AUTHORIZING GUAM TO ENTER INTO CERTAIN INTERSTATE COMPACTS

The bill (H.R. 6243) extending to Guam the power to enter into certain interstate compacts relating to the enforcement of the criminal laws and policies of the States was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

JULIUS BENIKOSKY

The bill (H.R. 6644) for the relief of Julius Benikosky was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

DR. ROBERT E. HILLER

The bill (H.R. 6938) for the relief of Dr. Robert E. Hiller was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ALBERT R. SERPA

The bill (H.R. 7473) for the relief of Albert R. Serpa was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read for the third time, and passed.

MRS. SHARON LEE HARDEN

The bill (H.R. 7740) for the relief of Mrs. Sharon Lee Harden was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

HARRISON THOMAS HARPER

The bill (H.R. 8325) for the relief of Harrison Thomas Harper was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

GEORGE B. OLMSTEAD

The bill (H.R. 8779) for the relief of George B. Olmstead was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, does that conclude the call of the calendar?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That concludes the call of the calendar.

INVESTIGATION OF AERONAUTICAL AND SPACE ACTIVITIES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1096, Senate Resolution 234.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 234) authorizing the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences to investigate matters pertaining to aeronautical and space activities of Federal departments and agencies.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

WINNING ESSAY OF MISS JANICE WOELFLE IN 15TH ANNUAL VOICE OF DEMOCRACY CONTEST

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, each year, the Veterans of Foreign Wars hold a Washington conference of national officers and department managers. Last evening they concluded the 1962 meeting with a banquet at the Sheraton-Park Hotel. Announcement was made there of the winners of the 15th annual voice of democracy contest which this patriotic organization sponsors in cooperation with the National Association of Broadcasters.

The Nebraska congressional delegation attended that banquet in company with other Members of the Senate and House. We were all thrilled to listen to the announcement that Miss Janice Woelfle was the winner of the first prize, which entitled her to a $1,500 scholarship to a school of her own choice.

The following were winners of the second, third, and fourth prizes in the respective amounts of $1,000, $750, and $500: Miss Maja Swetschin, Crookston, Minn.; Miss Jill Mackler, East Rockaway, N.Y.; and Mr. Eric D. Alpert, New Bedford, Mass.

Miss Janice is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Henry Woelfle of 4502 Greenwood, Lincoln, Nebr. She is a senior in Northeast High School.

There participated in the contest some 120,000 high school students in the 50 States and the District of Columbia. Winners from each of these areas came to Washington to enjoy a 3-day tour of its points of interest and to attend the banquet.

It can be said for a certainty that this program sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars has inspired countless thousands of young men and young women, together with their high school faculties, their parents and others, toward a more meaningful and dedicated patriotism.

The VFW and the National Association of Broadcasters are to be highly commended and congratulated.

Mr. Merton Olson, of Hartington, Nebr., department commander for the State of Nebraska was on hand in Washington together with his delegation from that State to witness the achievement of Miss Janice.

The plaque and the prize were awarded to her and to the other contestants by commander in chief of the VFW, Robert E. Hansen, of South St. Paul, Minn.

It was a great occasion. The essay itself, as well as the fine fashion in which it was delivered by Miss Janice, is outstanding.

My colleague, Senator CURTIS and I have already received many congratulations from our colleagues here in the Senate. We accept them all on behalf of Miss Janice, her very fine parents, and the faculty and student body of Northeast High School in Lincoln.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Miss Woelfle's essay entitled "What Freedom Means to Me," be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT FREEDOM MEANS TO ME

(By Janice Woelfle, of Lincoln, Nebr., first place national winner, 15th annual voice of democracy contest, 1961–62)

Three Americans were out sightseeing in a Soviet city 2 years ago. One was Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, the second was a U.S. Army officer, and the third a Russian-speaking official of the U.S. Embassy. It was a unique day for them. In their tour of the U.S.S.R., they'd managed for once to shake off their Kremlin-appointed guide.[1]

As they walked down the street, a young man suddenly accosted them. He was about 30 years old, quite well-dressed for a Russian, with the look of a professional person.

"Are you Englishmen?" the young man said in Russian.

The Embassy man replied. "No, we're Americans."

"Americans. That's even better," the young man said excitedly. "I've wanted so long to talk to an American."

"Why?" the Embassy man asked.

"Because you Americans are such lucky people. You can read what you want, hear what you want, say what you want. We can't."

The young man peered nervously over his shoulder to see if anyone were listening. He knew he was risking his life to speak like that. "Always remember," he went on, "they aren't fooling us about you Americans. We want this to be your kind of world." Then he walked away. Fast.

This incident, experienced and related by Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, is typical of the effect democracy has on the people of the world; and it is so true. We are lucky.

Because of democracy, we can go to a public library and select any book from the "Iliad" or the "Odyssey" to "Alice in Wonderland." We can listen to the "Classical Hour," the "Top 50 Tunes," "Back to the Bible Broadcast," or political panels on our radios without fear of being found and punished. We, young and old alike, have the unequaled privilege of casting our vote for class officers, school cheerleaders, or the President of the United States.

I am 17 years old and a senior in high school. Next year, I plan to go on to college and eventually I hope to become a teacher. I have been free to make my vocational and college choice. My family attends church together each Sunday, and we are free to choose our own church. Every year we take a vacation and are free to enjoy the tumbled splendor of the Rockies, the wild coast of Maine, or the warm, sunny beaches of California without having to apply for a passport or ask for permission.

---

[1] "The Man in the Street." An experience of Senator JACKSON'S as written in the book, "The Day I Was Proudest To Be an American," edited by Donald Robinson.

My father is president of his local electrical union where they are free to bargain for higher wages or improved working conditions. I can choose between a movie or a football game; my family can purchase all types of clothes from Bermuda shorts to the most beautiful of formals.

Freedom of press, freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom of choice, the right to vote—all freedoms are made possible only through democracy.

Yes, democracy is voting in November, going to the church of our choice, speaking for what we feel is right, and being able to decide what we will read, see, hear, and do. But it is more than this. It is also the shout of a crowd as their team makes the final touchdown; it's the glow in the eyes of a little girl as she sits on Santa's knee; it's the joy on a 3-year-old's face as he pretends that he's a boat in a mud puddle. It is the tender look on a mother's face as she gazes at her new-born child. She knows his future is insured because he was born in a free democratic country.

Countless times throughout our history we have defended our rights and the rights of other people to be free, but the job is far from done. To further protect and insure the future of every baby, now and yet to come, we must continuously speak for democracy. Yes, we must act for democracy. For only through our democratic processes come the guarantees of rights, liberty, and freedom. Our freedom is a give-and-take process, a mutual agreement among Americans to pursue happiness as long as it doesn't infringe on the rights of others.

Yes, our country is a great country and it presents a great hope to the Communist-held world.

"Always remember," the young Russian continued, "They aren't fooling us about you Americans. We want to be your kind of world."

Freedom is our heritage. Freedom is our opportunity. Freedom is our job.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON EDUCATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to make some comments on the President's education message of yesterday, as I am a member of the Subcommittee on Education of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

It seems to me that it should be made clear where this problem really rests, and I do not think that merely sending a message to the Congress excuses the situation in which we find ourselves. The reason why we do not have Federal aid to public primary and secondary schools and for teachers' salaries, which the President says is an urgent national need, is that the overwhelming majority in the other body will not give it to us. That is what the situation is, very simply and bluntly.

It has been possible here in this body to have Federal aid to education legislation, and under the leadership of the majority leader, we passed a bill yesterday which I consider to be a splendid bill. We have had a bill for primary and secondary school assistance on the part of the Federal Government. It has bogged down in the other body, and I do not think one can disguise the fact that it has bogged down because the Democratic majority does not deliver on it.

There is such a thing as outstanding Presidential leadership that has been shown. It has to be shown now, and a message is not enough. I say that in all honesty and candor. I am not known in this Chamber for partisan attacks. I think this is one situation where the responsibility cannot be left out of consideration because there are Republicans on the Rules Committee or some other place in the other body who may not be sympathetic to or do not like the legislation.

The point is that if the President is going to write messages telling us how urgent this need is, I think he must also exercise effective leadership in his party, which has the overwhelming majority in the other body, to bring about such legislation. Merely sending messages is not enough.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD with my remarks the editorial entitled "School Aid: New Perspective," which appeared in the New York Times, February 7, 1962.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

SCHOOL AID: NEW PERSPECTIVE

President Kennedy has put the needs of American education in their proper perspective. In his message to Congress he has cut through the confusion created by a succession of smokescreens with which special interests have obscured the picture. The heart of the matter, and of the President's message, is that elementary and secondary schools are the foundation of our educational system.

It therefore follows that there is little value in our efforts to broaden and improve our higher education, or increase our supply of such skills as science and engineering, without a greater effort for excellence at this basic level of education.

No expediency of political tactics in the past was ever able to persuade us that this essential priority should or could be denied. Now the President, in an eloquent description of the entire educational panorama, has underlined his own conviction that the priority is too urgent to permit postponement or compromise. While adding that there may well be need for better coordination between existing Federal programs, he has given warning to some of his lukewarm managers in Congress that such reforms cannot be permitted to defer action on meeting our current needs.

President Kennedy makes it clear that Federal aid to education is not a question of convenient "either-or" legislation. He draws a portrait of a cohesive structure—from elementary school through graduate school and adult learning—in which the foundation must be made stronger while, at the same time, the peaks of excellence must be raised. He permits no choice between the need for adequate facilities and the need for better-educated teachers, paid in accordance with the importance of their tasks to the future of American society.

None of this detracts, as Mr. Kennedy stressed, from the urgency of aid to the colleges and universities if they are to cope with the expected doubling of enrollments by 1970. Nor can there be any doubt that Federal scholarships are also needed to keep open the path to higher education.

Those of the President's lieutenants who have tried to create the impression that the White House would bow to expediency and let sleeping education-aid rest should take note of this new outline of national need and legislative priorities. Speaking of the public school bill that Congress failed to enact last year, the President said: "It is imperative that such a proposal carrying out these objectives be enacted in this session." It is now up to him to confound the prophets and follow through with all his vigor on the political battle he is inviting. We hope to see the continued leadership in this field we have long been looking for.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, what does the Senator suggest that the President do?

Mr. JAVITS. If my colleague will allow me, I will tell him what.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does he suggest force or coercion or maybe the use of a big stick?

Mr. JAVITS. No. I suggest the President call in the key Members of the other body and lay before them with the greatest urgency that he considers it indispensable to the success of his administration to have this legislation considered in the other body. Many Presidents have done that with considerable success in the past. I am not sure this President would not be as successful. I only suggest that sending us a message, telling us how urgent such legislation is, is not enough.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not know what happened since early last month, but it is my understanding that the President does meet with the leaders of our party from both the Senate and House of Representatives. I am sure that the matters of which the Senator speaks have been discussed. Does the Senator expect the President to do anything further?

Mr. JAVITS. I do not know what the President has discussed with the leaders. I do not know of the intensity of the conviction he has expressed. I saw him be very effective in this Chamber when he was one of us. I think he can be with the Members of the other body.

Let me say that I do not think there is any lack of good faith on the part of the President, but I think it is the duty of those of us who have convictions in such issues, as I do in this, to stimulate, urge, and push things forward. That is what I am trying to do this morning. But that is not done merely by sending messages.

There is an enormous opportunity, which is not referred to in the message, and which I hoped the President would refer to, and discuss, and that is getting the business community to increase its gifts to colleges and education generally. The business community has great potential in that regard. It represents a great effort if the potential is utilized. Here is one of the most important areas where it can help education, especially higher education.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Does the Senator want the President to crack the whip over the Congress and business, too?

Mr. JAVITS. I did not say any such thing, Mr. President.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is the implication.

Mr. JAVITS. No, that is not my implication, either.

I merely point out that this is an area in which very considerable additional help may be obtained for education. I direct attention to it. It is always the wonderful thing when a President will give voice to what could be another national resource. I do not say that at all in the same spirit I use with respect to the President's leadership of his own majority in the Congress.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would say that the President has been quite vigorous in his views on education and on other matters, such as urban affairs and the like, in expressing what he wishes to have the Democratic majority do. May I ask my friend from New York, what was the attitude of the Republicans on the House Rules Committee relative to education and measures affecting that field?

Mr. JAVITS. I anticipated my colleague. Perhaps he did not listen very closely when I said that certainly there were Republicans on the Rules Committee in the other body, and many other Republicans in the other body, who are vigorously opposed to Federal aid to education. I was only pointing out that an administration is composed not only of the President but also, if it has it, of its majorities in the Congress. Therefore it is not enough—and I repeat—to send messages. There is also a question, in terms of evaluating the success of an administration, as to what its majorities in the Congress do and how they perform.

I am not recommending the cracking of a whip over anybody on any subject. I am only questioning the responsibility. As I think has already been indicated so far in this debate, it is very easy to throw the responsibility on the opposition party, which is the Republicans in this case.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is exactly what the Republicans are doing to us.

Mr. JAVITS. I know, but the Democrats are deserving of it. The Democrats won the election for President.

Mr. MANSFIELD. But we cannot get the Republican votes on the Rules Committee.

Mr. JAVITS. The Democrats have great majorities in the Congress. They have 10 to 5, on the Rules Committee in the other body.

Therefore, if the majority party or the administration is divided, let the country know it. Let the country not be confused and led astray by the fact that the President, with fine ideas, is merely sending a strong message to the Congress that he wants something done.

FEDERAL AID TO THE ARTS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I note with great interest the recommendation by the President for Federal aid to the arts. I thoroughly agree with it. Indeed, I am a cosponsor of the bill for a Federal advisory council on the arts.

I wish to point out, however—and I hope this will have really serious attention from all of our colleagues—that culture is no longer a matter for parlor discussion and parlor interest. Culture is now a critical element in the evaluation of a country in the world and in the cold war. Therefore, the times have passed by what is a very mild proposal for a Federal advisory council on the arts, which is the beginning that we should have taken 5 years ago.

In my opinion, we now have to do something far more practical and far more affirmative than that in order to marshal our cultural resources. So, Mr. President, I urge very much that there be hearings held by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, of which I am a member, which is charged with this responsibility. I urge that hearings be held upon the whole group of bills on this subject.

We in the Senate at least should not be content with an advisory council, which will take us to where we should have been 5 years ago, but we should seek to do something very affirmative, whether it be with respect to my bill for a U.S. Arts Foundation, or the bill introduced by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], or any other one of a number of other bills. We must do something affirmative to marshal the cultural resources of the country both in terms of meeting domestic needs, for which present efforts are far under par, and very particularly in terms of our international posture in this field.

WIRETAPPING

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the Attorney General on February 1 sent a letter to the President of the Senate wherein he pointed out the problems confronting law enforcement officials due to the present conflicts between State and Federal law in the area of wiretapping.

The Attorney General further suggested the need to prevent indiscriminate wiretapping, which seriously threatens individual privacy, and the need to establish a controlled use of wiretapping by all law enforcement officials.

By request, Mr. President, for myself, the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill in conformity with the views expressed by the Attorney General, which would prohibit wiretapping by persons other than duly authorized law enforcement officials engaged in the investigation or prevention of certain specified criminal offenses.

Mr. President, I may say, for myself and on behalf of the cosponsors with me on the measure, that our sponsorship of the bill does not necessarily imply that we agree with or that we shall finally support all of the provisions contained in the bill. I am in agreement with the general objectives of the proposed legislation, and I feel that the bill will serve as the basis for a continued study, and I hope constructive and effective action in the field of wiretapping, by the appropriate Senate committee.

Accordingly, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the aforementioned letter from the Attorney General to the President of the Senate, along with a section-by-section analysis of the proposed bill, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and analysis were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., February 1, 1962.

The VICE PRESIDENT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: There is attached for your consideration and appropriate action a legislative proposal to prohibit wiretapping by persons other than duly authorized law-enforcement officers engaged in the investigation or prevention of specified categories of criminal offenses, and for other purposes.

For many years the problems presented by wiretapping have been matters of concern to the public, the Congress, the judicial and executive branches of Government, State legislatures and law-enforcement officials, and the bar. Existing law has proved ineffective, both to prevent indiscriminate wiretapping which seriously threatens individual privacy, and to afford a clear-cut basis for the legitimate and controlled use of wiretapping by law-enforcement officials. The public has been concerned and apprehensive because of the increasing and widespread use of wiretapping by private individuals for personal gain.

The present situation is unsatisfactory. This is highlighted by the fact that State and local prosecutors are now faced with the dilemma that the exercise of wiretapping authority conferred by State law may violate Federal law. The courts have indicated it would be a violation of section 605 of the Federal Communications Act to divulge wiretap evidence in a State court, even if the wiretap was authorized by State law. Nevertheless, Federal courts have refused to restrain the introduction of wiretap evidence in a State court or to reverse a conviction based on such evidence.

Moreover, the inadmissibility of wiretap evidence in Federal courts under current law has prejudiced the enforcement of Federal statutes designed to protect the national security. Every Attorney General for the past 25 years has authorized wiretapping by Federal agencies in particular cases involving the national security.

Use of wiretapping by law enforcement officials under specified controls would serve also to implement the renewed Federal effort to combat organized crime. As recognized by Congress during the past session, the unrestricted utilization of interstate facilities such as the telephone by large-scale criminals presents a problem of paramount national concern. Investigation has documented the ease with which leading racketeers can insulate themselves from their illegal operations and rely on this Nation's elaborate communications system to direct such activities. To deny law enforcement officers the right to monitor telephone communications is to permit our Nation's vast communications network to be used as an irreplaceable tool of the underworld.

The Congress has had numerous wiretapping proposals before it in recent years, including a number of bills introduced in the present Congress on which extensive hearings have been held. In preparing the present bill we have given most careful consideration to these bills and to the hearings and other published discussions on them.

The attached legislative proposal outlaws all private wiretapping and all wiretapping by law enforcement officials which does not conform to the limited authority which the bill grants. Violators would be subject to fine of not more than $10,000 or 2 years imprisonment or both. At present the interception and divulgence of a wire communication is prohibited by Federal law. This proposal would prohibit the interception of a wire communication or the disclosure or the use of the intercepted information. The proposal would also make certain that neither the information obtained from an unauthorized interception, nor any evidence derived therefrom would be admissible in evidence in any judicial, administrative or legislative proceeding of the Federal Government or the States.

The bill would authorize Federal law enforcement agencies to tap wires to obtain evidence of the commission of certain specified major offenses. Such authorization would be obtained by court order. In addition to the court order method, the Attorney General could authorize wiretapping in certain cases involving treason, espionage, sabotage, subversion, and unauthorized disclosure of classified atomic energy information. In following this procedure the Attorney General would be required to find that a serious threat to the security of the United States existed and that resort to the court order procedure would be prejudicial to the national interest.

Wiretaps by State law enforcement officers would be permitted only in States which adopt a statute authorizing the court order procedure as set forth in this bill. If a State does have an appropriate statute, then the attorney general of that State or the principal prosecuting attorney for any political subdivision may apply for permission to wiretap in the investigation of the crimes of murder, kidnaping, extortion, bribery, or narcotics.

Responsibility under the bill is centralized. Each application to a Federal court must be authorized by the Attorney General or an Assistant Attorney General. An application to a State court must be made by the State attorney general or the chief prosecutor of a county, city, or other political subdivision of the State. All Federal and State applications and orders must be reported to the Attorney General and the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, and an annual report must be made to the Congress.

The bill limits the disclosure and use of the information received by reason of a lawful interception. Procedural safeguards are specified for the application for a wiretap and the findings which must be made by the judge prior to granting leave to wiretap, and time limits are placed on wiretap orders. Provision is made for motions in Federal courts to suppress evidence obtained or derived from a wiretap which was not lawfully authorized or carried out.

In summary, the present law with respect to wiretapping is chaotic; the right of privacy is not being protected and law enforcement agencies are being hampered unduly. Therefore, to clarify the law, protect the privacy of our citizens, and give law enforcement agencies another tool—with strong safeguards—to combat subversive activities and organized crime, I urge the early introduction and enactment of this legislative proposal.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that this proposal is consistent with the program of the President.

Sincerely,

Robert F. Kennedy,
Attorney General.

Section-by-Section Analysis of Department of Justice Wiretapping Proposal Submitted in the 2d Session of the 87th Congress

Section 2 contains legislative findings.

Section 3 provides that it shall be a felony, punishable by a fine of not more than $10,000 or imprisonment for not more than 2 years or both, for a person willfully to intercept, disclose or use the contents of any wire communication except as specifically authorized by the act. However, it shall not be unlawful for a switchboard operator, or any telephone company employee, to intercept, disclose, or use a wire communication in the normal course of his employment while engaged in any activity which is a necessary incident of the rendition of service.

Section 4 provides that no part of the contents of an unlawfully intercepted wire communication and no evidence derived therefrom may be received in evidence in any judicial, administrative, legislative, or other proceeding of the United States, or of any State or any political subdivision thereof.

Section 5 establishes procedures by which certain interceptions by law enforcement officers may be authorized.

For cases involving certain felonies affecting the national security—espionage, sabotage, treason, sedition, subversive activities, and unauthorized disclosure of atomic energy information—alternative procedures are provided. The Attorney General or an Assistant Attorney General may authorize an application to a Federal judge of competent jurisdiction for leave to permit the Federal Bureau of Investigation to tap wires. Alternatively, the Attorney General may authorize such wiretapping himself if he finds that the commission of the offense presents a serious threat to the security of the United States and that resort to the court order procedure would be prejudicial to the national interest.

Wiretapping may be authorized for certain other Federal crimes by court order upon application authorized by the Attorney General or an Assistant Attorney General. The Federal crimes for which such wiretapping is authorized are: murder, kidnaping, or extortion under title 18 of the United States Code; any offense under 18 U.S.C. 201, 202 (bribery). 18 U.S.C. 1084 (transmission of gambling information), 18 U.S.C. 1952 (travel or transportation in aid of racketeering enterprises); any offense involving violations of the Federal narcotic law; and any conspiracy to commit any of those offenses.

The attorney general of any State or the principal prosecuting attorney for any political subdivision thereof, if authorized to do so by State statute, may petition a State judge for leave to wiretap for the crimes of murder, kidnaping, extortion, bribery, or dealing in narcotic drugs or marihuana or any conspiracy involving those offenses.

Section 6 authorizes persons, who have lawfully received information concerning a wire communication which was lawfully intercepted in accordance with the act, to make limited disclosure and use of such information. Any Federal or State investigative or law enforcement officer may disclose such information to another Federal or State investigative or law enforcement officer if such disclosure is appropriate to the proper performance of the official duties of both the officer disclosing and the one receiving such information. An investigative or law enforcement officer may use such information for the proper discharge of his official duties. Any person may disclose such information while testifying in a Federal or State criminal trial or grand jury proceeding.

Section 7 contains the penalty provision.

Section 8 provides procedures for applications for, and issuance of, court orders on both the Federal and State levels. Each application for a court order must contain a complete statement of the facts relied on to show probable cause; the location and nature of the telephone facilities involved; and information concerning all previous wiretapping applications involving the same telephone or the same suspected criminal. The judge may require additional evidence in support of the application. The judge may issue an ex parte order to tap a telephone within the territorial jurisdiction of his court if he finds probable cause for belief that an offense for which an application to wiretap is authorized, has been, is being, or is about to be committed; facts concerning such offense may be obtained by the proposed interception; no other means are readily available for obtaining such information; the facilities to be tapped are used in the commission of the offense for which tapping is authorized, or are leased to, listed in the name of, or commonly used by a person suspected of that offense. The order must specify the nature and location of the facilities to be tapped; the crime as to which information is sought; the identity of the law enforcement agency authorized to tap; and the period of time for which such tap is authorized. No order may authorize a tap for any period exceeding 45 days; extensions of not more than 20 days each may be granted upon the findings referred to above.

Before the contents of an intercepted communication may be introduced in evidence in a Federal criminal trial the defendant must be served with a copy of the court order or other authorization for the wiretap. A defendant in a Federal criminal trial may move to suppress wiretap evidence on the grounds that: the communication was unlawfully intercepted; the order or other authorization was invalid; in the case of court order, there was no probable cause for issuance of the order; or the interception was not made in conformity with the order or other authorization. All applications made to a Federal or State court and all orders granted by such courts must be sealed and may only be made public by order of the court or as provided for in the act.

Section 9 requires copies of all of the applications made and orders issued under this act to be transmitted to the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts and to the Department of Justice. The Administrative Office is instructed to report annually to the Congress.

Section 10 contains the definitions.

Section 11 amends section 605 of the Communications Act of 1934, 48 Stat. 1103; 47 U.S.C. 605 to delete the second and fourth clauses of section 605 (dealing with interception and divulgence), and to exempt from section 605 the procedures authorized by this act.

Section 12 contains a separability clause.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that the measure may lie on the desk for today and tomorrow so that any other Senators who may desire to do so will have the opportunity to have their names entered as cosponsors of the measure.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk as requested.

The bill (S. 2813) to prohibit wiretapping by persons other than duly authorized law enforcement officers engaged in the investigation or prevention of specified categories of criminal offenses, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McClellan (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. I wish to invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that last year there were public hearings on a wiretapping bill, somewhat narrower in scope than the bill to which the Senator refers, which he is introducing. I wish to ask the Senator from Arkansas whether it is contemplated there will be public hearings on the bill which he is introducing, or whether it will be considered that the hearings held last year are sufficient, or whether an attempt will be made to have the hearings previously held serve as the basis for reporting the presently introduced bill without further public hearings?

Mr. McCLELLAN. It is not within my province to say whether there shall be hearings on a bill which I am presently introducing, or whether there shall not be. My own personal view is that the hearings already held, together with any additional hearings the committee to which the bill is referred may determine to be desirable, will be a part of the record for the information and consideration of this body if and when a bill comes to the Senate for debate and passage.

Mr. HRUSKA. The bill introduced today is of much wider scope than the previous bill. The Senator from Nebraska feels that public hearings would be very desirable because of that fact. Sometimes we like to be assured that the introducer of a bill would be in sympathy with hearings on a bill, because of that fact.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I say to my distinguished colleague, who is also a member of the Committee on the Judiciary with me, that I shall join him in seeking hearings on the bill. I do not think I have ever introduced a bill as to which I was not willing to have, or did not in most instances seek, hearings.

I should think that any hearings which have been held on this subject on any particular bill by the committee at any time, certainly within the recent past, may well be considered as a part of the record on any bill the committee finally may report, if it reports a bill.

Mr. HRUSKA. To that I would fully subscribe. However, the hearings held in the first session of this Congress pertained to a bill which would have extended authority to and enabled State legislatures to legislate in this field subject to certain Federal law requirements. Therefore, the bill was much narrower in scope, and hence the necessity for additional public hearings.

Mr. McCLELLAN. My friend from Nebraska will have my support. If he is asking me to join with him to request hearings on the bill, I will join with him. I cannot determine in advance what the Judiciary Committee may do. I would think there would be no objections to hearings on the bill.

I may say further that in introducing the bill I made reservations. There might be provisions in the measure that I would not support or that I would want to see modified or changed. But I want the Record to show that, without any reservation or equivocation, I favor some legislation in this field because the criminal elements in our country today are getting by with crime after crime after crime. It is apparently impossible to reach those who are committing such crimes without a stronger process of law in order to get the evidence against them that is necessary.

If we talk about the principle of wiretapping, I take the view that we have a proper search and seizure law which enables a search and seizure in the premises of citizens of this country. I do not see that wiretapping would do any more violence to individual liberty and freedom than the law permitting a proper search and seizure, if the wiretapping procedure is conducted under equally careful judicial supervision. I support the general principle.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KEATING. I want to say first that the Senator from Arkansas has been of great assistance in the effort to report out of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights a very limited wiretapping bill to permit wire tapping by the States with strict safeguards. The district attorneys of many New York counties and district attorneys throughout the country are grateful to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas for lending his assistance in this way.

The thing that somewhat worries me about the administration's 11th hour wiretapping bill is that it may interfere with the very limited measure (S. 1086) which I introduced and which has been reported favorably by the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee and is now on the agenda of the full Judiciary Committee.

This bill would not have any effect on States that do not now permit wiretapping. As the Senator from Nebraska has so ably said, it is designed merely to provide that in those States which permit wiretapping, and under stringent Federal restrictions specified in this bill, they may continue to do so.

The situation which the public faces in New York State is a really serious one. The district attorney of New York County recently had to ask that a large group of defendants charged with the most vicious narcotics crimes be discharged because some of the evidence against them was obtained by wiretapping. A large gambling prosecution in upstate New York had to be dismissed for the same reason.

As the Senator from Arkansas has said, there is no more reason that a telephone should be a privileged instrument for criminals than a home or a man's pants pocket, all of which can be searched under the proper conditions.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If the Senator will forgive me for interrupting, a telephone conversation should be no more sacred than a man's cabin or his home.

Mr. KEATING. The Senator is correct.

There is one really serious defect in the Attorney General's proposed wiretapping bill, with regard to State wiretapping. I refer to the omission of a crime which I am sure the Senator would agree is of great importance. It is one of the principal ones in which hoodlums and the organized mobs engage; namely, gambling. All of the evidence before us was that illegal gambling, narcotics, prostitution, and bootlegging are the crimes in which organized syndicates are most active and where it is most essential, as conveyed to us by prosecuting attorneys, that some provision be made to get needed evidence by wiretapping.

Mr. President, I want to stress that many States are opposed to wiretapping. This limited bill (S. 1088) would in no way affect them. I am glad that the Senator from Arkansas has stated that in his opinion hearings should be held, because certainly our hearings to date have not covered many of the points that are involved in this rather comprehensive legislation which he has just offered.

This bill, originally suggested by the Attorney General, has much good in it. But I do hope the introduction of this new bill will not interfere with the progress of the more limited bill which has already been reported by the subcommittee.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator from Arkansas has no intention of saying that the bill introduced is the only bill, or to agree with all of its provisions. The bill undertakes, as I interpret it, and as I think it is intended, to leave the States free. They do not have to have any wiretapping law at all. But if States do have such a law, then such law must in general conform with the Federal law. In other words, Federal Government action in this field could be interpreted by the courts as preempting any authority of the States to so act, unless some dispensation is given to the States, as is provided in the bill, and as I am sure is contained in the Senator's bill to which he referred.

RESIDUAL OIL IMPORT CONTROLS ARE NOT CREATING ELECTRIC POWER SHORTAGE; AMPLE FUELS AVAILABLE

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the campaign by certain groups to bring an end to controls on imports of residual fuel oil continues unabated. It is regrettable that those who want the Federal Government to do away with all residual oil import restrictions—and permit an unlimited flow of this foreign produced fuel into ports of entry along the east coast—have now resorted to pressure tactics in an effort to induce the President to rescind the quota system limiting oil imports.

The matter of import controls on residual oil is much too important and far-reaching to be decided on the basis of scare headlines. Involved here are the security of the vital eastern region of the United States and the economic health and vigor of the domestic fuels industries. Whatever decision is made should be made upon the basis of a calm, careful and deliberate study by responsible Federal officials who have access to all pertinent data, including that relating to the effect upon national security of a growing dependence by a large sector of the vital east coast industrial complex upon an imported fuel.

The Fuel Oil Marketeers of America, Inc., seem to be taking the lead in the current propaganda campaign against residual fuel oil import controls. I am told that this group, Mr. President, is composed of distributors and retailers of imported oil along the east coast. Obviously, they have a vested interest in the destruction of import controls because the more foreign residual oil that is available the more they can sell in east coast industrial markets to the detriment of domestic fuels. Unlike responsible Government officials, who now have this entire matter under review, these distributors of imported residual oil do not have to concern themselves with all the implications of excessive imports. An immediate and expanded market for their imported product may be a legitimate objective for a group such as the oil marketeers but to officials concerned with defense mobilization planning the question goes much deeper and must take into account an assured and adequate fuels supply and a healthy domestic fuels industry as the base upon which to plan for future emergencies.

The latest example of scare tactics being used by the oil marketeers to get their story across is a report that one New York utility soon will exhaust its supply of residual oil. The inference is that unless something is done immediately to increase the residual oil supply, electric service could come to an end in a populous metropolitan area.

This is a most serious statement, Mr. President. If the New York metropolitan area should be threatened with a shutdown of a significant part of its electric power generation there would be created a problem of national importance. But if this threat does not exist in the degree implied, I believe this fact should be made clear. It would be most unfair to permit this alleged condition to go unchallenged, if it is not based on fact, because it creates for the many residential and industrial consumers of electric power the constant worry that at any moment and without warning they will suddenly find themselves without electric service.

I state that I cannot find substantiated evidence that there is any real threat of an interruption of service by a Metropolitan New York electric utility because of a shortage of residual fuel oil. There is ample fuel in the area or available to the area to keep all of the electric generating plants in the vast New York metropolitan complex operating at full capacity. The residential and industrial consumers of electricity in the New York area can be reassured on this score.

I base this statement upon several facts:

First. When the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] included a statement about a possible interruption of electric utility service in New York in a speech he made in the Senate on January 31, the Long Island Press, published in Jamaica, N.Y., quoted an official of the Long Island Lighting Co. as saying:

> It might be us (referred to in the speech). As of the moment our residual oil will be used up by mid-February but there is no possibility that service to our customers will be affected.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. That is precisely what the junior Senator from New York said, namely, that the utility in question would run out of residual oil in mid-February. This was substantiated by an official of the company the Senator has mentioned, although the junior Senator from New York did not actually mention the name of the company involved.

I definitely did not say they would stop producing electricity. Obviously, they would do probably what the Senator from West Virginia would like, namely, use coal for the generation of electricity. We all know that coal is considerably more expensive than oil.

Who would get it in the neck? The consumers would be the ones that would pay.

I repeat: There was nothing in the statement I made to the effect that this utility was going to shut off power. I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am very glad for the explanation. I submit that this statement attributed to the official of the company answers effectively the question about the interruption of service to electric utility consumers. "There is," he said, "no possibility that service to our customers will be affected." I think that should be made a part of the RECORD.

Second. The article in the Long Island Press also quoted the Long Island Lighting Co. official as having said:

> We are prepared to change over to coal to operate each of the stations producing electricity. We can, without question, keep operating until the oil supply is replenished under the quota. The only objection to the use of coal is that it is more costly.

Mr. President, I believe Senators are entitled to know that the Long Island Lighting Co. obtains its imported residual fuel oil from a distributor under a contract which guarantees that if the price of coal is reduced, the supplier has the option of lowering residual oil prices accordingly, to insure that his imported oil will undersell coal.

Obviously, under any such coal parity clause imported residual oil will always undersell coal. There is absolutely no way in the world for the domestic coal industry to compete with this type of predatory pricing. As long as the imported fuel oil distributors enjoy such great flexibility in their pricing policy, they can undersell coal. And they will undersell coal in an effort to take over this important east coast market. If import controls are removed, or if they are further weakened, it will not be long before imported residual oil will become the sole fuel for important utility plants. This raises the question, Mr. President, of what the New York metropolitan area would do for electric power should this foreign supply of residual oil be cut off? If coal is pushed entirely out of the fuel markets along the east coast and if coal production and transportation facilities are allowed to deteriorate, how could these utilities keep their boilers burning?

This is a serious national problem. It is one that transcends in importance the efforts of distributors of imported residual oil to gain a larger market.

Third. Mr. Cordell Moore, the administrator of the oil import program, seemed to question the validity of these unsubstantiated reports of an impending residual oil shortage by declaring at the weekend that stocks appear to be ample.

He added that residual stocks along the east coast appear to be considerably higher than they were a year ago.

Mr. President, I wonder if it might be that what is happening could be that the distributor serving the Long Island Lighting Co. possibly wishes to attempt to use this alleged shortage of residual oil and a consequent threatened shutdown of electric generation as a pressure tactic to use to force the Government to grant him a larger import quota of foreign residual oil. Some well-informed observers tell me that this particular distributor seems to be following a pattern that has developed in recent months. Allegedly, a long-term contract, calling for delivery of more residual oil than is available to the distributor, is offered to a utility at considerably less than posted prices. When all of the oil called for under the contract is not available, then the distributor can claim the existence of a shortage and predict innumerable dire results unless larger imports are granted or the control program is ended.

In the interest of bringing to light some of the important facts involved in these events under discussion, I believe it should be stated that the President of the Fuel Oil Marketeers of America, the group which allegedly is developing the facts upon which a series of speeches and newspaper articles are based, is also the head of the distributing company which has an exclusive contract to supply the Long Island Lighting Co. with imported residual fuel oil.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I repeat that there is much more involved in the question of residual oil imports than a battle for markets between coal and residual oil. At stake is the future existence of the entire domestic fuels industry as a strong, vital segment of the economy, with the vigor to expand production when needed to meet future domestic and emergency needs. I submit that continued excessive residual oil imports will undermine our domestic fuels economy and could cause vital areas of this Nation to have to rely entirely upon foreign sources for a major part of their fuels needs. The Nation must deliberate long and carefully before it embarks upon a course that, in the final analysis, will mean dependence upon foreign sources for a commodity as vital and essential as fuel.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the news article which was published in the Long Island Press of February 1, 1962, to which I referred earlier.

There being no objection, the article was ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OIL SUPPLY IS RUNNING OUT—LILCO MIGHT HAVE TO BURN COAL

FEBRUARY 1, 1962.

The Long Island Lighting Co. will soon run out of residual oil which it used to make electricity and have to use coal instead.

Senator KENNETH B. KEATING made the dramatic announcement yesterday in a speech before the Senate.

"Unless some relief is offered," he said, "I am informed that a major New York utility supplying power to millions of metropolitan residents will be completely out of oil by mid-February." Keating did not name the utility, but a spokesman for the Long Island Lighting Co. told the Press KEATING may be referring to Lilco.

"It might be us," the spokesman said. "As of the moment, our residual oil will be used up by mid-February."

KEATING'S speech raised speculation that thousands of homes and industries might soon be without electricity. But the Lilco spokesman said, "There is no possibility that service to our customers would be affected."

"We are prepared to change over to coal to operate each of the stations producing electricity. We can, without question, keep operating until the oil supply is replenished under the quota." The only objection to the use of coal, the spokesman said, is that it is more costly.

KEATING urged President Kennedy to remove import restrictions on the oil. The Office of Emergency Planning has been conducting a year-long study on whether to recommend that Kennedy lift the import quotas. Several weeks ago a reliable source reported the OEP had decided to recommend Kennedy remove the quotas but had not formally submitted the recommendation to him.

The New York and New England congressional delegations have been waging a continuous battle to get the quotas removed.

They were first imposed by President Eisenhower.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, does the Senator from West Virginia intend to place in the RECORD, or there is included in the material which he sent to the desk, the complete statement made by the official of the Long Island Lighting Co.?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am placing in the RECORD the article from the newspaper to which I have made reference. It was my purpose to quote the essential statements; but if the Senator from New York feels that it would be helpful to place the entire statement in the RECORD, I should like to have him do so.

Mr. KEATING. I think it would be helpful. I do not have it available now, but at a later time I may wish to place it in the RECORD.

Mr. President, the consumers on the east coast are hard hit by this restrictive quota system. They pay out of their pockets, every month and every year, the extra dollars and cents which are necessary to support the market for residual fuel oil which has been knocked out of whack by these quotas.

Every time the housewife pushes down the lever of her toaster or starts her electric stove, she bears the burden imposed by this quota system.

I know that the coal industry is desirous to force concerns like the Long Island Lighting Co., which apparently can convert to coal rather easily, to convert to that fuel. But many power companies cannot do so. That is one answer. Many of them cannot do what Long Island Lighting Co. can do.

But, if they do, as the Senator from West Virginia has very candidly pointed out, it will mean that the few extra pennies consumers now pay every month will amount to more pennies and even dollars extra every month.

The coal industry is looking for a whipping boy, and it has settled on the consuming public of the northeastern part of the United States as the prime victim.

I respect the judgment and ability of the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia and other Senators who share his position, but I do not think they have a good case. They are asking us—not the American economy, but us, the consumers, the toasters of the northeastern part of the country—to bail out the coal industry. In my judgment, the way to support a great industry is not by imposing such a burden on the consumers of the northeast.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I reply to the astute and able Senator from New York by declaring emphatically that the coal industry is not interested in making a whipping boy out of any segment of the economy of the east coast or any other section of the United States. Of course, the coal industry is interested, where it can maintain old markets and properly secure new ones, to have an opportunity to provide coal in those markets.

I feel very strongly, as indicated, that there is real reason to look beyond the immediate period. I have concern for the consumers, as does the Senator from New York; but I have concern also to look beyond the current condition and to realize that there is a need in the United States for a strong domestic fuels industry; and basic to that industry is to have a coal industry which will not be allowed to deteriorate, but will serve us well in times of peace and in times of crisis. There is a threat of possible conflict. We must be realistic in our approach to world problems under which sources of supply from abroad could be summarily closed to importation into the United States in the case of actual war with weapons. There is a definite national security aspect inherent in this problem and it is to be hoped the consumers of the east coast will bear in mind that it is dangerous to rely solely on foreign sources for their fuel needs. We cannot escape viewing with some alarm the fact that there is a communistic country, Cuba, situated on the shipping lanes between the two Americas of the Western Hemisphere. This may pose a greater danger than we are willing to accept as a possibility.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, in recent weeks attacks upon the residual fuel oil import control program have increased in intensity. By painting a somewhat questionable picture of dangerous shortages which threaten to bring important industrial activity to a halt and to increase prices which penalize an entire region, opponents of import controls are obviously hoping to force the President to end the present control program.

The administrator of the oil import program has assured the people of the east coast that there are ample stocks of residual fuel oil on hand to meet normal demands. Another clear indication that supplies are adequate is that actual imports under the program were some 6 million barrels below import allocations for the first 10 months of 1961—the latest period for which figures are available. Obviously, if residual fuel oil was in critically short supply on the east coast, every barrel of oil available under the allocation program would be brought into the country to fill this great need.

As to all of the talk about prices, Mr. President, I would like to point out one thing which the opponents of control consistently and deliberately ignore. They compare prices today with those existing in 1959. Yet, they fail to point out that in that year an unprecedented amount of residual oil was dumped along the east coast, leading not only to a cut-rate price level but also to the imposition of mandatory import controls by the Federal Government. The glut of oil sent prices down to abnormally low levels.

In connection with the price of residual oil, I would like to say, Mr. President, that men who intimately know the east coast fuels market tell me that imported residual is now being sold in New York at as much as 40 cents a barrel below the posted prices. So any attempt to use these posted prices to show a large and consistent increase in price simply cannot be accepted without question.

The mandatory controls were imposed, I wish to remind the Members of the Senate, because the Government concluded, on the basis of a study at the highest level of government, that imports of crude oil and residual fuel oil had increased to the extent that they threatened to impair the national security.

I urge the Senate to keep this one fact in mind. Import controls are a national security matter. If imports in 1959 were running at a level too high to be consistent with security, then does it not stand to reason that the intent of the control program was to bring imports more into line with national security considerations? If imports are too high from a security standpoint, obviously they cannot be permitted to enter the country in such quantities that it can fill the entire market demand for cut-rate oil? Should controls be removed, the cheap imported oil would literally flood the east coast and the domestic fuels industries could be irreparably damaged.

Dwelling further on the national security aspects of the oil import program, let us consider coal's position. The coal industry has never concealed its concern that residual oil has been manipulated to wrest industrial and commercial fuel markets from coal. Neither has the industry failed to recognize the relationship of a balanced fuel economy to our Nation's total capacity to respond during periods of national crisis.

When one considers that the bituminous coal industry is in a seriously depressed condition, currently operating at 75 percent or less of capacity, then he can readily understand the distress of the industry over peacetime competition and its ability to respond to a national defense emergency.

Many utilities and industrial plants on the east coast possess multiple-use burning equipment, allowing them to switch back and forth from coal to residual oil—with price alone determining the fuel they use. Coal prices are established in accordance with production of a specific commodity for the marketplace. Since foreign residual oil is a throwaway byproduct of the refining process, any price beyond transportation cost represents profit.

The low rate of operating capacity has a direct bearing on the ability of the coal industry to mobilize for a national emergency. Mining facilities are being allowed to deteriorate; many have been abandoned. Mines which are closed because of unfair competition from residual oil cannot be reopened overnight. In many cases they will not be reopened at all because it would require spending more money than the coal is worth.

What about the railroads? They are also in a depressed state. It is extremely doubtful that they would have sufficient coal-hauling equipment available for a sudden increase in demand. The time required for the railroads to gear their resources to full capacity could adversely affect national productive mobilization. Thus, we see that the requirements of the railroads also must be considered in evaluating the total problem.

I would like to point out, Mr. President, that the tears which are being shed over the alleged shortage of residual fuel oil are of the crocodile variety. Even under the control program, those categories of imports under control are now running at a rate of 462,000 barrels per day for the 1961–62 quota year, as compared to 344,000 barrels daily for the first period when quotas were established in 1959. Certainly an increase of this magnitude is more than sufficient to take care of any growth in demand for residual oil as a result of an increase in fuel and energy consumption. Yet, opponents of controls are not satisfied with this increase. They want all controls removed and unlimited access to domestic fuels markets.

They say that the national security implication of oil import controls is a phony issue, that controls on residual were slipped into the Presidential proclamation, and that the President never really intended for them to be included.

I say, Mr. President, that the record does not bear this out. Residual fuel oil was intentionally included in the control program by the President upon advice of a Cabinet committee and the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, now the Office of Emergency Planning. Before the national security aspects of the program are dismissed so lightly, I think we should at least wait until the President has had an opportunity to complete a review of the oil import program now in progress. We should not accept as the final authority on defense mobilization planning the recommendation of importing groups which have a direct financial stake in the ending of the program.

It is obvious, I believe, that there is a grave danger inherent in relying upon foreign sources for the Nation's fuel and energy supply. The oil would have to be moved over water and in time of emergency we know from bitter experience the havoc that enemy submarines can cause. Our present potential enemy has a submarine fleet far more powerful and flexible, we are told, than anything the Germans could muster. The question that has to be considered, before we base our industrial complex and security upon foreign oil, is whether we can reasonably expect to get the oil we must have through the submarine blockade that would be imposed.

One other argument which has been used consistently against the oil import program was revived by my good friend, the senior Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] last week. The Senator declared in a speech to the Senate that the import control program is causing serious economic harm to our friends overseas, particularly in Venezuela.

I wish to state, Mr. President, that my good friend is in error when he attributes any economic difficulties Venezuela might be experiencing to the oil import program. The facts do not bear him out.

The Bureau of Mines reports that exports of residual oil from Venezuela, including that produced in the Netherlands West Indies from Venezuelan crude, increased from 170 million barrels in 1958—the year immediately preceding the institution of controls—to 194 million barrels in 1959 and to 208 million barrels in 1960—the last year for which reports are available. During the same period, exports of crude oil from Venezuela to the United States increased from 192 to 200 million barrels.

Reports of the Department of Commerce show that during this same period purchases of all goods from the United States by Venezuela declined from $809 million to $550 million. At the same time, purchases by the United States from Venezuela increased by almost $100 million a year.

Obviously, if Venezuela is encountering any economic difficulties, the oil import program clearly is not at fault.

In closing, Mr. President, I wish to remind my colleagues once more that in the oil import program we have a matter of vital concern to national security. Excessive oil imports will damage the domestic fuels complex to a point where it cannot provide the fuel and energy the Nation must have, not only to meet normal expanding economic requirements, but to fulfill defense requirements in time of emergency. A sound, stable domestic fuels industry is essential to our security and economic growth. We cannot maintain such a domestic industry in the face of excessive oil imports. That is why, Mr. President, the continuation of the program is essential.

INVESTIGATION OF AERONAUTICAL AND SPACE ACTIVITIES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 234) authorizing the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences to investigate matters pertaining to aeronautical and space activities of Federal departments and agencies.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the pending business is Senate Resolution 234, Calendar No. 1096?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Montana is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the appropriate point in the Record a statement contained in the report of the committee and also a letter addressed by the chairman of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences to the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

There being no objection, the statement and letter were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

This resolution would authorize the expenditure of not to exceed $90,000 by the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, from February 1, 1962, through January 31, 1963, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of—"any and all matters pertaining to the aeronautical and space activities of departments and agencies of the United States, including such activities peculiar to or primarily associated with the development of weapons systems or military operations."

The purposes of the resolution are more fully detailed in a letter to Senator Mike Mansfield, chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, from Senator Robert S. Kerr, chairman of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, which letter (with accompanying financial statement for 1961 and budget for 1962) is as follows:

U.S. Senate,
Committee on Aeronautical
and Space Sciences,
January 11, 1962.

Hon. Mike Mansfield,
Chairman, Rules and Administration Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: The Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee, without objection, reported out Senate Resolution 234 on January 10, 1962, which has been referred to your committee.

This resolution would authorize an expenditure not to exceed $90,000 by the committee for the period beginning February 1, 1962, through January 31, 1963. This resolution, which substantially conforms to the suggested draft for resolutions of this nature, would permit the committee to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the aeronautical and space activities of departments and agencies of the United States, including such activities which are peculiar to or primarily associated with the development of weapons systems or military operations.

In compliance with Senate Resolution 77 of the 79th Congress, there is also enclosed in triplicate a budget breakdown with respect to the use of these funds.

The amounts set forth in the budget breakdown are based in part on last year's activities by the committee, since that was the only year which the committee can use for a reference. During this past year the committee has, under Senate Resolution 45, done a considerable volume of work. It has, for example, published, or is in the process of printing, four reports encompassing a broad spectrum in the space field. These reports involve studies concerning communication satellites, meteorological satellites, space activities of the U.S.S.R., as well as a study and report on the international organization for outer space.

While the amount that was expended during the past year was not large, in comparison with what was authorized, we felt that since this was the first year of our operation under a year-to-year resolution, we should make more of a general survey to create a foundation from which to pinpoint our activities for 1962. It will be recalled in this connection that I assured your committee last year that "as chairman of the Space Committee the amounts of money expended pursuant to the provisions of this resolution will be carefully supervised." As the attached report of expenditures indicates, nearly $98,000 of the $135,000 authorized under Senate Resolution 45 will be returned unexpended on January 31, 1962.

You will note that the amount set forth in the budget breakdown is less by $45,000 than that authorized last year. This has been accomplished by a reduction in the number of staff employees, by reducing the amount for reimbursement to other agencies, and the amount for consultant expenses. Also such items as communications, witness fees, and hearing expenses have been reduced. As we did last year, we would like to point out that the activities of this committee involve matters that are technical in nature, requiring the use of expert scientific and professional consultants in order that the committee can be properly informed to carry out its duties under its legislative jurisdiction. Because of the highly knowledgeable and competent employees required in this area we are requesting this year the same salary ceilings as last year in order to attract and retain this caliber of employee.

In view of our experience during this first year, we believe that there is a great deal more that should be done in order to acquaint committee members and the public with our overall space and aeronautical problems. Having in mind the rapidly expanding efforts of this Nation and others, there is a constant and continuing requirement that we keep abreast of activities enumerated in the resolution. We believe that the enclosed budget reflects a realistic approach to accomplish this undertaking.

Should the Rules and Administration Committee feel that it needs additional information in connection with their consideration of this resolution, I would be pleased to personally appear before the committee in order to answer any questions which the members might have.

With warm personal regards, I am,

Sincerely,

ROBERT S. KERR,
Chairman, Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee.

Actual and estimated expenditures under S. Res. 45

	Authorized	Actually expended through Dec. 31, 1961	Contracted expenses through Jan. 31, 1962	Estimated additional expenses through Jan. 31, 1962
Salaries	$70,337.88	$10,972.57		$2,100
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382)	420.00	67.06		8
Contributions to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries paid)	4,550.00	101.34		51
Contribution to employees group life insurance (27 cents per month per $1,000)	250.00	34.73		5
Reimbursable payments to agencies	25,000.00	2,017.96	$16,837.80	
Travel (inclusive of field investigations)[1]	3,000.00	[1] 4,458.51		300
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)	3,000.00			
Witness fees, expenses	4,000.00			
Consultant expenses	20,000.00			
Stationery, office supplies (includes postage)	1,000.00	406.23		200
Communications (telephone, telegraph)	2,500.00			
Newspapers, magazines, documents	500.00	224.65		30
Contingent fund	442.12			
Total	135,000.00	18,283.05	16,837.80	2,694

[1] $1,000 of this amount is in revolving fund and will be returned before Jan. 31, 1962.

Budget

Position	Number	Base salary per annum	Gross salary per annum	Monthly gross	Total for period of budget (gross)
Staff:					
Member	1	$8,000	$16,102.90	$1,341.91	$16,102.90
Do	1	7,380	15,013.27	1,251.11	15,013.27
Clerks	4	2,640	6,052.11	504.34	24,208.44
Total	6				55,324.61
ADMINISTRATIVE					
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382, effective July 1, 1960)					486.72
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries paid)					3,596.11
Contribution to employees Federal employees group life insurance (27 cents per month per $1,000 coverage)					197.64
Reimbursable payments to agencies					10,000.00
Travel (inclusive of field investigations)					3,000.00
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)					2,000.00
Witness fees, expenses					2,000.00
Stationery, office supplies					1,000.00
Communications (telephone, telegraph)					1,500.00
Newspapers, magazines, documents					500.00
Contingent fund					394.92
Consultant expenses					10,000.00
Total					34,675.39
Grand total					90,000.00

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, last year this committee received $135,000. Very little of that money was spent; most of it was returned.

This year, $90,000—or $45,000 less—is being requested.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Louisiana wish to speak on the resolution?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. President, over the past years I have served, more or less, as a watchdog in regard to the expenditures made for various committee investigations. As I have often said, our Government is growing topheavy—so much so, that some day it may crush us. It strikes me that the Senate should strive to set a good example for other Government agencies in practicing economy.

Mr. President, as I look around Capitol Hill, I well remember that some 11 years ago efforts were begun to construct a new Senate office building. I opposed construction of the building because I felt that sufficient space was available in the Old Senate Office Building for all real consideration of the Senate's business. I further advocated that since there was also a move to extend the east wing of the Capitol, we could provide sufficient space there to take care of the needs of Senators. But, Mr. President, in the last few years we have not only constructed the New Senate Office Building; we also have extended the east wing of the Capitol. In addition, we have utilized all space available in the Old Senate Office Building, to provide more space for these special investigating subcommittees and, as well, for other uses on Capitol Hill.

Mr. President, I do not know where this trend will lead us. But as I have said, I was very hopeful that we in the Senate would set a good example of economy for other agencies of the Government.

When these subcommittees are created, they seem to be renewed from year to year, indefinitely. I have seen very few of them die. Some of these committees have been requesting further funds of Congress each year for the past 15 or 20 years—in fact, ever since the reorganization bill was enacted.

Mr. President, the resolutions today before the Senate for consideration call for aggregate appropriations of $3,977,000. The appropriations made last year for these identical subcommittees amounted to $3,986,000—or a savings of only $9,000. In other words, we have reduced requests only $9,000 out of a $4 million item. In my judgment this is far too little, too late.

Mr. President, as we proceed with the consideration of these resolutions, I should like to question the chairmen of the various subcommittees, in some instances, as to what has been done since the enactment of the resolutions which created their subcommittees.

For instance, among other resolutions, I notice the resolution which calls for the expenditure of an additional $170,000—if I correctly recall the figure—for a further study of juvenile delinquency. Up to now we have spent in that field, as I recall the amount, in excess of $1 million, although when the investigation was begun, its total cost was not to exceed $150,000 to $175,000.

Mr. President, I think it is shameful for the Senate to permit many of these committees to continue, and in that way have on Capitol Hill a large army of unnecessary workers. I realize that some of these committees are necessary; but I repeat that once they are created, they seem never to die.

I notice that the Judiciary Committee—which, of course, is the biggest offender—this year is asking for $1,675,000 in order to pay for various investigations which have been going on almost from time immemorial. The amount requested this year is only a few thousand dollars less than the amount appropriated for this purpose last year. I understand that is due to the fact that the request for funds for the juvenile delinquency investigation has been decreased by approximately $30,000.

Mr. President, I wish to ask whatever Senator is in charge of the pending resolution to state what has been done by this subcommittee that could not have been done by the employees of the regular committee. In other words, I wish to point out that—as Senators know—the Senate has 16 standing committees, I believe, and each of them is allowed $145,000—if I correctly recall the amount—in order to pay for experts and for all clerical assistance.

The Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences is a new one. It is fairly well staffed. I wonder what this subcommittee did that the regularly employed staff could not have done.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in response to the question asked by the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana, I state that this is a new committee; and I repeat that last year it asked for—and was granted—$135,000; but it spent only approximately $40,000. This year it is asking for $90,000.

Furthermore, I am informed that at the present time six reports are in the process of being compiled, and that of the approximately $40,000 which was spent by the committee last year, about $17,000 was spent with the Library of Congress. This is a very important committee, as are all committees. It is a committee in an entirely new field. The $90,000 is being asked for by the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences and any subcommittee thereof for the purpose of investigating or making inquiry of Federal departments and agencies.

I am sorry I do not have more information at my disposal, but in view of the importance of the committee and its relative newness, I hope no question will be raised about the amount asked for this year.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, but before the Senator from Nevada answers, let me say this is not a special committee; it is a standing committee of the Senate.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is why I made the point, if the Senator will allow me to reply. Here we have a standing committee which reports very little legislation. I do not know of any bills it has reported to the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Oh, yes; it reported some last year.

Mr. ELLENDER. A few.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is a new committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. There are four professional staff members on that committee. I am just wondering what the subcommittee did which the parent committee could not have done.

Mr. MANSFIELD. For the purpose of answering that inquiry, I will yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. CANNON. I thank the Senator for yielding. I would simply like to point out, as the majority leader has so well stated, that this is a new committee. It is a committee in a very rapidly expanding area; a committee before which, I recall, a few years ago, when Dr. Glennan appeared before the committee, he made an observation which shocked many of us, that before too long the NASA budget would exceed $1 billion. Now, in view of this rapidly expanding area, we are informed that the NASA budget, in the not too distant future, will exceed $4 billion.

This is an area in which the United States is concentrating a very great amount of its economic resources and its talent in order that we may engage in the so-called space race.

As the Senator from Montana has pointed out, a considerable amount of money last year was turned back as unused. However, it is obvious that in an area as greatly and as rapidly expanding as this, there is going to be a considerable overlapping of activities in the various Federal departments and agencies; and I think it behooves the committee and is the responsibility of the committee to investigate for duplication and overlapping in this very rapidly expanding area, and try to eliminate, as much as we can, unnecessary cost to the American taxpayer.

I think the authorization of the money for the purpose of permitting investigations in this field will pay very ample dividends in the results that will be accomplished in the saving to taxpayers in the overall NASA budget. I think it is a small investment for the overall savings to be achieved.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why could not the members of the regular committee staff do that work? When these committees are created, they have, under the law, four professional staff members. Each committee also has eight clerical staff members, which includes the clerks. It strikes me that if these people do their work and their duty, there is no need for additional personnel.

The appropriation for this whole work is not done by the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences; it is done by the Appropriations Committee of the Senate. As the Senator knows, we have charge of that.

Even though this is a new committee, with very little legislation presented to the Senate, I do not see why its staff could not do the work being done by this subcommittee.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be read.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 1, line 12, to strike out (a); on page 2, line 5, after the word "consultants" to strike out the comma, insert a colon and the following language: "*Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment for each ten or final fraction thereof selected by the majority, and the person or persons so selected by the minority shall be appointed and the basic compensation of at least one such person shall be fixed at such rate not in excess of $8,040 per annum as may be specified by the minority;".

And on page 2 to strike out lines 10 to 15, inclusive.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, a few years ago the Senate, by approving amendments offered on the floor of the Senate, made it mandatory that, with respect to the special staffs set up from funds coming from the contingent fund, provision be made for a minimum of one minority staff member. Some committees have gone beyond that, voluntarily.

The purpose of the amendment is to strike out the language in the resolution and insert new language that extends the principle a little further in two particulars.

It provides that for every 10 employees paid for from the contingent fund—I am not talking about statutory employees—or final fraction thereof, it will be permissive to obtain an employment of 1.

In other words, if there is a committee operating with, let us say, eight or nine employees, the minority ought to be entitled to one. It is entitled to that now. However, should a committee undertake a gigantic task, such as has happened in the past, and have 45 staff members, or even 65, it is evident that 1 minority staff member cannot keep the minority members informed or cope with the investigative or research work that is going on, in order that the minority may discharge its duty to the public. If the committee expanded its staff to 65, let us say, under this proposal the minority would have 7 members of the staff.

These investigative committees reach almost every branch of our country. We are not concerned about partisan disputes, but there are differing viewpoints that are entitled to be considered. For example, there is before us a resolution providing funds to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences. It is so related to national defense that the junior Senator from Nebraska would be the last person to say that it is a Democratic problem or a Republican problem. It is an American problem. In arriving at answers for the soundest American issues we find there are scientists of one school and also of another. There are staff members who may disagree on economic philosophy. They may disagree on what part shall be done by Government and what part shall be done by non-Government enterprise. The public is entitled to have those two viewpoints at work in trying to find a final solution.

Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. ELLENDER, and Mr. MANSFIELD addressed the Chair.

Mr. CURTIS. After one more word of explanation I shall be happy to yield.

The amendment, in addition to providing more for the minority, when the number of staff members exceeds 10, also provides in nearly every instance—except for one, which I shall mention later—for the maximum pay. In reference to the resolution before the Senate it would mean that on the staff setup, to be paid from contingent funds, the minority would have a right to name one person whose pay would equal the top pay of the majority staffman of the highest rank. Again I refer to the staff provided under the contingent fund.

I now yield to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. As the Senator from Nebraska knows, I am a member of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences. I regret that the Senator from Oklahoma is not on the floor at this moment.

Does the Senator from Nebraska have a feeling that the minority members of the committee have not been consulted as to the staff?

Mr. CURTIS. No, not at all.

Mr. ANDERSON. I cannot speak for what happens now, but I know the able Senator who was ranking minority member previously, the late Senator Bridges, was consulted frequently on the question and was completely satisfied.

Mr. CURTIS. Yes. This is permissive language.

Mr. ANDERSON. No. This is mandatory language. It is not permissive.

Mr. CURTIS. Yes; it is. I think it is permissive.

Mr. ANDERSON. It is mandatory. If the language of the Senator's amendment is the same as that provided to me, it is: "*Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment for each ten or final fraction thereof selected by the majority, and the person or persons so selected by the minority shall be appointed and the basic compensation of at least one such person shall be fixed at such rate not in excess of $8,040 per annum as may be specified by the minority:".

That takes completely out of the hands of the chairman of the committee the ability to name the employees. I wonder if the members of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences have not been satisfied previously.

Mr. CURTIS. No.

Mr. ANDERSON. Then what is the purpose of the amendment?

Mr. CURTIS. The amendment, which is being offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] and myself, is the result of discussions with the minority leader and is motivated on our own part by the basic belief that the Senate ought to accept this principle.

It is permissive in this regard: If the minority members are satisfied with what is now being done, they are not compelled to avail themselves of this language.

Mr. ANDERSON. Would the Senator point out the language in the amendment which provides that?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. It says that the minority will select.

Mr. CURTIS. It says the minority is authorized to select. It does not say the minority shall select, but that the minority is authorized to select.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I am happy to yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. How would the Senator apply the amendment to the resolution now pending before the Senate, with respect to its present staff?

Mr. CURTIS. At the present time the minority would get only one staff member.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is provided under the rules now, is it not?

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. In other words, of the six employees permitted under the resolution, the minority has one?

Mr. CURTIS. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Should the amendment which the Senator is offering be agreed to, how would it affect the pending resolution?

Mr. CURTIS. It would change the pending resolution only in this regard: The minority could, if they so chose, insist that their appointee receive the maximum salary which the highest paid man paid from the contingent fund is being paid.

Mr. ELLENDER. In other words, the Democrat would get the same as the Republican. Is that it?

Mr. CURTIS. That is correct. We did not single out the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences. We expect to offer the amendment to nearly every resolution which comes before the Senate. It is a matter of principle. I hope the majority will see fit to accept it. We are at their mercy, if they do not. We anticipate asking for a yea-and-nay vote, if we can get it, at least on this first attempt. I am not going to punish the Senate by asking for a yea-and-nay vote on every resolution.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President—

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I state frankly I am perturbed about the proposal being made by the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from New York. I am perturbed because of the fact that a situation might well be created which could bring about dissention within committees in which no dissention exists today. For example, insofar as a committee of which I am a member is concerned, the Committee on Rules and Administration, we have four staff members, three are considered appointees of the majority and one an appointee of the minority.

In my other committee, the Committee on Foreign Relations, a total of 11 staff members are employed.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS. I do not expect to offer the amendment to the resolution relating to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I appreciate that, because I was disturbed about the possible effects on a very harmonious situation which has existed in that committee under both Republican and Democratic chairmen. I know the committee would not like to see that disturbed.

This is something which has been discussed, I believe, in the hearings before the Committee on Rules and Administration, by the chairmen of the various committees who came before the committee seeking funds. The question was raised, I believe almost always, as to whether there was a minority employee or allowance made for one. The answer was invariably "Yes." I know of no committee which has not, in response to a question of this nature, indicated that the minority was being given consideration as to appointments.

I would hope that the Senate would also look at the resolution under discussion, line 10 on page 2, and note the language:

> The minority is authorized to select one person for appointment as an assistant or consultant, and the person so selected shall be appointed.

It seems to me that this procedure is the proper one. It is in effect in accord with what the distinguished Senator from Nebraska has advocated, except for the fact that the Senator wishes to make it on the basis of 1 for every 10 or fraction of 10.

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I hope we will have some debate on the question and that the Senate will make its wishes known. If there is a vote, Senators can act accordingly.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I am ready to vote.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, since the yeas and nays have been requested and ordered on the amendment, I express the hope that the proposal of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] and the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] will be rejected.

For many years Senators have operated on a very cooperative basis. There has been a feeling of mutual trust in the committees between Republicans and Democrats. When the Republicans have been in the minority, they have been taken care of; I think that when the Democrats have been in the minority, they have been taken care of, too.

I do not like the idea of a staff member as such to be appointed and to be given a salary equal to that of the chief clerk or the chief of staff of a committee. I think there is a certain amount of responsibility to be considered. I hope that all those factors will be taken into consideration by Members of this body. A very satisfactory relationship exists at the present time, and if the amendment to the resolution were agreed to, it would mean at the very most, in effect, the addition of approximately 5 additional minority members, if we were to include 1 additional member on the Committee on Foreign Relations, on which committee the number in toto is 11 at the present time.

So I plead with the Senate that we adhere to the present rule. If there is any need for a reform of this nature, I suggest that it be taken up in the Rules Committee, as it has been in some degree, but in more detail.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator will recall that a discussion was had on this subject in the Rules Committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS. To review the record, I think it is also proper to say that when language was inserted in the proposed resolutions some years ago, it had to be done on the floor of the Senate. The amendment providing for one minority member was adopted in the Rules Committee. The Parliamentarian ruled that the Rules Committee could not amend a resolution coming from another committee to that extent. That action resulted in the language adopted by reason of an amendment offered from the floor by the junior Senator from Nebraska.

The amendment was discussed in the Rules Committee. I gave an indication of the type of language that I would seek, and I immediately thereafter notified the chairman of the very committee or subcommittee seeking funds from the contingent fund of my intention to offer the amendment. I want the RECORD to show that I am not attempting to take the Senate by surprise.

Mr. MANSFIELD. No. Every word that the Senator from Nebraska has said is true. He has stated the facts. He has kept the committee informed. He has kept the chairmen of the committees informed. He has certainly publicized what he intended to do on the basis of his action today. So I think the Senator has been very open and aboveboard in what his intentions were.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CANNON. In view of the fact that the amendment is directed to the resolution relating to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences (S. Res. 234), I would merely like to be certain that the RECORD is clear. Presently there are 13 people employed on the standing Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences. Of those 13, 3 of the members are serving on that committee and a subcommittee staffed by virtue of appointments from the minority side.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I understand that the amendment does not apply to W.A.E. employees who may be employed for a week or for a very short time, but as I understand the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska, it applies only to regular employees.

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator is correct. If the W.A.E. employment were in reality permanent, that would be a different thing.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes; I understand.

Mr. CURTIS. It is not my intention to count employees who are employed for less than a month.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the Senator.

I wonder if I may ask the majority leader and the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration if it would not be possible to have an understanding about a rule in the Rules Committee along the line that is being considered here.

Mr. MANSFIELD. This subject could be discussed in the Committee on Rules and Administration. We could arrive at a recommendation which we could present to the Senate, and that might be the best way to handle the situation. I make that statement to my friend from Nebraska, the ranking member of the Committee on Rules and Administration, and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE] is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay," and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is paired with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Georgia would vote "nay," and the Senator from Illinois would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] is paired with the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "nay," and the Senator from Hawaii would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is paired with the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay," and the Senator from California would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas would vote "nay," and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. LONG] would each vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea," and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is paired with the

Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois would vote "yea," and the Senator from Georgia would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH]. If present and voting, the Senator from Hawaii would vote "yea," and the Senator from Texas would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is paired with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea," and the Senator from Arkansas would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 55, as follows:

[No. 16 Leg.]

YEAS—30

Aiken
Allott
Beall
Bennett
Boggs
Bush
Butler
Capehart
Carlson
Case, N.J.
Case, S. Dak.
Cotton
Curtis
Dworshak
Goldwater
Hickenlooper
Hruska
Javits
Keating
Miller
Morton
Mundt
Murphy
Pearson
Prouty
Saltonstall
Smith, Maine
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—55

Anderson
Bartlett
Bible
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carroll
Church
Clark
Douglas
Eastland
Ellender
Engle
Ervin
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hickey
Hill
Holland
Humphrey
Jackson
Johnston
Jordan
Kefauver
Kerr
Lausche
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McNamara
Metcalf
Monroney
Morse
Moss
Muskie
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Robertson
Smathers
Smith, Mass.
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Williams, N.J.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—15

Chavez
Cooper
Dirksen
Dodd
Fong
Fulbright
Hayden
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Long, Hawaii
McGee
Russell
Scott
Wiley
Yarborough

So Mr. CURTIS' amendment was rejected.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, it was my intention to offer this amendment to every resolution on the calendar, with the exception of the resolutions pertaining to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and the Committee on Foreign Relations; but I accept the verdict of the Senate. I shall not offer my amendment to the remaining resolutions on the calendar.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I express my appreciation for the courtesy and consideration shown by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska. I assure him that we are all truly appreciative of his courteous action in this instance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution is open to amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 234) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the aeronautical and space activities of departments and agencies of the United States, including such activities peculiar to or primarily associated with the development of weapons systems or military operations.

SEC. 2. (a) For the purposes of this resolution the committee is authorized, from February 1, 1962, through January 31, 1963, inclusive, to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable, (2) employ upon a temporary basis and fix the compensation of technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants, and (3) with the prior consent of the head of the department or agency of the Government concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any department or agency of the Government.

(b) The minority is authorized to select one person for appointment as an assistant or consultant, and the person so selected shall be appointed. No assistant or consultant may receive compensation at an annual gross rate which exceeds by more than $1,400 the annual gross rate of compensation of any person so selected by the minority.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1963.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $90,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

AUTHORIZING INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1098, Senate Resolution 242.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 242) authorizing the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to investigate certain matters within its jurisdiction and authorizing certain expenditures therefor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 242) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to Indian affairs; irrigation and reclamation; minerals, materials, and fuels; public lands; and territories and insular affairs.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1962, to January 31, 1963, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $100,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1129), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND
INSULAR AFFAIRS,
January 16, 1962.

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pending before the Rules Committee is Senate Resolution 242, which would authorize the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to obtain additional staff personnel and to make expenditures in the amount of $100,000 for this and other purposes related to committee business. Submitted herewith is a budget in accordance with which expenditures will be made by the committee under the resolution from February 1, 1962, through January 31, 1963.

This is the same amount of funds requested for the committee during the 1st session of the 87th Congress. It now appears that by the close of business on January 31, 1962, the committee will have a surplus of about $16,000 to be turned back. I see no reason why our expenditures during the coming year should exceed the budgeted amounts. If this objective can be accomplished, $100,000 will be adequate to supply our needs.

I shall be pleased to appear before your committee on behalf of Senate Resolution 242 at your convenience.

Sincerely yours,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman.

Budget

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
STAFF					
Legal and investigative:					
Special counsel	1	$7,980	$16,067.74	$1,338.97	$16,067.74
Assistant chief counsel	1	5,940	12,482.52	1,040.21	12,482.52
Investigator	1	6,240	13,009.76	1,084.14	13,009.73
Do	1	5,820	12,271.64	1,022.63	12,271.64
Administrative and clerical:					
Assistant clerk	1	2,760	6,295.16	524.59	6,295.16
Do	1	2,400	5,566.05	463.83	5,566.05
Do	1	2,340	5,444.53	453.71	5,444.53
Total	7				71,137.37
ADMINISTRATIVE					
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382, effective July 1, 1960)					229.92
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries paid)					3,041.88
Contribution to employees Federal employees group life insurance (27 cents per month per $1,000 coverage)					227.52
Travel (inclusive of field investigations)					15,000.00
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)					8,000.00
Stationery, office supplies					500.00
Communications (telephone, telegraph)					500.00
Contingent fund					1,363.31
Total					28,862.60
Grand total					100,000.00

NATIONAL FUELS AND ENERGY STUDY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1122.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 269) authorizing the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to conduct a national fuels and energy study.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported by the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments, on page 2, line 22, after the word "committee," to insert "from February 1, 1962, to January 31, 1963, inclusive,"; in line 23, after the word "authorized", to strike out "through January 31, 1963,", and on page 3, line 10, after the word "resolution", to strike out "from the date of its agreement"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified in rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to—

(a) make a full and complete investigation and study (including the holding of public hearings in appropriate parts of the Nation) of the current and prospective fuel and energy resources of the United States and the present and probable future rates of consumption thereof; and

(b) make a full and complete investigation and study of the existing and prospective governmental policies and laws affecting the fuels and energy industries with the view of determining what, if any, changes and implementation of these policies and laws may be advisable in order to coordinate and provide an effective national fuels policy to assure the availability of fuels and energy adequate for an expanding economy and for the security of the United States, taking into account the investment by private enterprise for the maintenance of efficient and adequate fuels and necessary related industries and the necessity for the maintenance of an adequate force of skilled workers.

SEC. 2. The President of the Senate, at the request of the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, shall appoint three Senators, none of whom shall be members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to participate in the study authorized herein and the Senators so appointed shall serve with the committee in an ex officio capacity.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution the committee from February 1, 1962, to January 31, 1963, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 4. The committee shall report its finding, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date.

SEC. 5. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, through January 31, 1963, shall not exceed $25,000 and shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 269), as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1153), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR
AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
January 22, 1962.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On January 18 I introduced Senate Resolution 269 which is now pending before your committee. This resolution provides for the extension of the fuels and energy study which this committee was authorized to conduct pursuant to Senate Resolution 105, 87th Congress, 1st session.

While Senate Resolution 105 provided $25,000 for the purposes of this study, I can report to you that none of these funds have been expended to date. We have made considerable progress with the study, but, as I advised you last year, it is necessary to extend the authorization as I anticipate we will need at least the balance of this year to finish our work. I am hopeful that a preliminary report can be made to the Senate within the next 2 months. Only the completion of that report will enable us to gage the need for additional study on narrower issues of the problem area as well as determine the exact need for public hearings. I am again requesting the allocation of $25,000 to this study for the coming year.

You will recall that Senate Resolution 105 provided for the appointment of three Senators, not members of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, to serve in an ex officio capacity with the committee for the purposes of this particular study. I urge your committee to approve that feature of Senate Resolution 269 which would continue this authorization in order that we may have the benefit of the services of the three Members I shall ask the President of the Senate to assign to the fuels and energy investigation.

I am most hopeful that Senate Resolution 269 can be considered at an early date by the Committee on Rules of Administration, and I shall be glad to appear before you at your convenience in support of the resolution.

Sincerely yours,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman.

ADDITIONAL EMPLOYEE FOR COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1135, Senate Resolution 235.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 235) authorizing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to employ an additional clerical assistant.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 235) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is authorized, from February 1, 1962, through January 31, 1963, to employ one additional clerical assistant to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 4, Eightieth Congress, approved February 19, 1947, as amended.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1156), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT

A statement of justification for the additional employee, from the report of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to accompany Senate Resolution 235 (S. Rept. 1125, 87th Cong., 2d sess.), is as follows:

"Under the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, each standing committee is permitted to employ not in excess of four professional staff members and six clerical assistants.

"During the 82d Congress, the 83d Congress, the 84th Congress, the 85th Congress, the 86th Congress, and the 1st session of the 87th Congress, the six clerical assistants assigned were not sufficient to carry on the work of the committee and it was necessary to employ one additional clerical assistant. The committee has determined that it is necessary to continue the employment of this assistant."

INVESTIGATION OF POSTAL SERVICE AND CIVIL SERVICE SYSTEMS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1136, Senate Resolution 236.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 236) authorizing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to investigate the postal service and civil service systems.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 236) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to examine, investigate, and conduct such studies as may be deemed necessary with respect to any and all aspects of—

(1) the postal service, including but not limited to (a) postal rates, (b) modernization of facilities, (c) research and development programs, (d) public services, (e) operations, and (f) procedures; and

(2) the civil service system, including but not limited to (a) steps necessary to improve the merit system, (b) the shifting of positions from the merit system to a policymaking category, (c) the granting of civil service status to employees by Executive order or administrative action, (d) procedures for classifying positions and adjusting pay schedules, (e) administration of the health and life insurance programs, and (f) operation of the retirement program.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1962, to January 31, 1963, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable; to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1963.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $75,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1157), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE
AND CIVIL SERVICE,
January 23, 1962.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I submit herewith a statement of justification and a proposed budget to continue or undertake the following studies or investigations.

1. The postal service, including (a) postal rates with respect to all classes of mail, (b) modernization of facilities to promote efficiency and economy, (c) research and development programs designed to improve the postal service, (d) public services to ascertain ways of better meeting the needs of the public, (e) operations with the view to eliminating costly and inefficient practices, and (f) procedures in order to provide maximum efficiency with a minimum of expense; and

2. The civil service system, including (a) steps that may be necessary to strengthen and improve the civil service merit system, (b) the shifting of positions from the merit system to a policymaking category and the transfer of positions from the policymaking category to the merit system, (c) the granting of civil service status to employees by Executive order or administrative action, and (d) the administration of a variety of employee benefit programs.

The mounting cost of the postal service continues to be of real concern to the committee. Studies underway or to be undertaken will be directed toward bringing the postal budget to a more nearly balanced basis by means of rate adjustments, the adoption of more efficient methods and equipment, and the elimination of costly practices to the maximum extent consistent with the public interest.

The problem of a strengthened and improved civil service system is of a continuing nature. There is a need for appraisal on a broad front lest we allow the public service to become stale and inefficient. The committee intends to act with reason to see that this does not occur.

The committee was authorized $75,000 under Senate Resolution 61 with which to conduct studies and investigations during the 1st session of the 87th Congress. Of this amount, approximately $20,000 will remain unspent on January 31, 1962, and will be returned.

With kind regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,
OLIN D. JOHNSTON.

STATEMENT OF JUSTIFICATION

Senate Resolution 236 provides $75,000 to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service for the 12-month period beginning February 1, 1962, to continue or initiate investigations or studies on the following subjects:

(1) The postal service, particularly with respect to (a) adjustments in the highly complex rate structure taking into account the value of service furnished to each mail class and category within each such class, (b) modernization of facilities, equipment, procedures, and operations to reduce costs and raise efficiency, and (c) steps necessary to improve employee morale and productivity.

(2) The civil service system with the view to (a) determining ways of making it more effective and efficient in the execution of our national programs and worldwide responsibilities, (b) critically examining the shifting of positions to and from the merit system and the exempt categories, and (c) the administration of the Federal employee retirement, life insurance, and health insurance programs.

The committee's study of the postal service necessarily has been of a continuing nature since the 83d Congress. Maximum benefit of these studies should be realized during the present session although it seems likely that there will be need for further study into the foreseeable future. During the present session, attention will be directed toward postal rate adjustments and ways of improving the postal service.

The administration of the Federal employee retirement program and the life insurance and health benefits programs are of concern to the committee. Each of these programs involves sums of public and private funds running into the billions of dollars. This alone justifies constant attention on the part of the appropriate committee of Congress. On the other hand, world affairs require that the Government continue to attract and retain the quality of personnel required to carry out its farflung, broad and challenging missions with efficiency and effectiveness. To this end, its employee fringe benefit programs must be kept in tune with those of private industry. This alone requires constant study and frequent change in legislation.

COMMITTEE WORKLOAD

During the 1st session of the 87th Congress, the committee gave consideration to 107 Senate bills, 3 Senate resolutions, 1 Senate joint resolution, and 23 House bills. The committee held 17 days of public hearings on 15 different measures. An additional 7 days were devoted to public hearings on 11 Executive nominations. Measures considered by the committee resulted in the enactment of 12 public laws.

The committee received 856 postmaster nominations from the new administration, of which 703 were confirmed after appropriate study, 2 were withdrawn by the President, and 151 were still pending at the conclusion of the session. The committee has received 271 nominations since the start of the second session. These are now being processed by the staff for early consideration by the committee.

In the future, just as in the past, the expenditure of funds under this authorization will be carefully watched. During recent years, the committee has turned back in excess of 30 percent of funds authorized. The past year $75,000 was authorized, of which approximately $20,000 is being turned back.

Budget

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
STAFF					
Legal and investigative:					
Special counsel	1	$8,040	$16,173	$1,347	$16,173
Investigator	1	6,600	13,642	1,137	13,642
Do	1	4,380	9,576	798	9,576
Editorial and research: Research assistant	1	3,900	8,603	717	8,604
Administrative and clerical:					
Stenographer	1	2,220	5,201	433	5,201
Typist	1	1,920	4,715	395	4,715
Total	6	27,060	57,910	4,827	57,911
ADMINISTRATIVE					
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382, effective July 1, 1960)					
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries paid)					3,764
Contribution to employees Federal employees group life insurance (27 cents per month per $1,000 coverage)					187
Travel (inclusive of field investigations)					3,000
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)					1,200
Witness fees, expenses					400
Stationery, office supplies					938
Communications (telephone, telegraph)					1,100
Contingent fund					6,500
Total					17,089
Grand total					75,000

STUDY AND EXAMINATION OF FEDERAL JUDICIAL SYSTEM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1112, Senate Resolution 262.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 262) to study and examine the Federal judicial system.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 262) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to conduct a study and examination of the administration, practice, and procedures of the Federal judicial system with a view to determining the legislation, if any, which may be necessary or desirable in order to increase the efficiency of the Federal courts in the just and expeditious adjudication of the cases, controversies, and other matters which may be brought before them.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1962, to January 31, 1963, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis professional, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of departments and agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1963.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $90,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1143), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
January 18, 1962.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Committee on the Judiciary today ordered reported an original resolution, Senate Resolution 262, authorizing funds for the operation of the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, which is conducting a study of the Federal judicial system. This resolution proposes that the amount of $90,000 be allocated for the conduct of business for the budget period 1962–63.

A needed, worthwhile study of the various phases of judicial administration, with special reference to practice and procedures of the Federal courts, is in progress by the staff of this subcommittee. The Committee on the Judiciary is in agreement with Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON, chairman of the subcommittee, that this work should proceed without interruption or delay. Senator JOHNSTON'S letter to me outlining the proposed areas of study for this session is enclosed for your information.

I am also enclosing for your information and study copies of Senate Resolution 262 and the proposed budget request for 1962–63. It is sincerely hoped that these requests will meet with the approval of you and your committee.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely,

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMPROVEMENTS IN
JUDICIAL MACHINERY,
January 12, 1962.

Hon. JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Standing Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary presents herewith the attached budget and the proposed resolution approving the sum of $90,000 for the study and examination of the administration, practice, and procedures of the Federal judicial system to determine the legislation, if any, which may be necessary or desirable in order to increase the efficiency of the Federal courts in the just and expeditious adjudication of the cases, controversies, and other matters which may be brought before them.

The subcommittee during 1961 had 24 legislative bills referred to it dealing with the various phases of judicial administration and procedure of the Federal courts. Ten of the bills were favorably considered and reported; 14 are presently pending before the subcommittee.

Summaries of the activities of the subcommittee have been presented in a separate report from the Committee on the Judiciary. Another will be filed this year in accordance with provisions of last year's authorization resolution.

An earnest desire to carry through to completion the goals of the subcommittee is underway. Field trips to Federal districts and attendance at various conferences have been initiated by the staff. Numerous informal meetings and interviews were held with outstanding judges, justices, and chairmen of judicial committees. It is also our proposal to give careful deliberate consideration to all proposed legislation which would in any constructive manner aid in the more efficient and expeditious operation of our Federal judicial system. The response from bench, bar, and the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts to our offers of assistance has been heartening, and I believe, with proper organization and adequate funds for operation this subcommittee will be able to present remedial suggestions that will relieve the acute situation in many of our Federal courts, and promise for the future administration of justice that can and will keep pace with the times in which we live.

Since adequate judgepower has been obtained in the last session by the passage of the omnibus judgeship bill, preliminary information reflects the need for a concentrated study of the operation and administration of court supporting personnel, especially in areas such as pretrial techniques, heretofore solely a judicial function. It has been indicated that presently many functions are being performed by already overburdened judges which could be delegated to others, such as hearing examiners, commissioners, or special masters.

By reason of careful handling of funds, certain unanticipated savings in staff expenses, and vacancies, the subcommittee has not expended the full amount appropriated during the first session, and the sum of approximately $60,000 will, at the expiration of the resolution on January 31, 1962, be returned to the contingent fund of the Senate.

Therefore, I hope the Committee on the Judiciary will act favorably on our budget request of $90,000 for 1962–63.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely,

OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
Chairman, Subcommittee.

Budget—Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for budget period (gross)
STAFF					
Legal and investigative:					
Chief counsel	1	$8,040	$16,173.19	$1,347.76	$16,173.19
Minority counsel	1	7,260	14,802.38	1,233.53	14,802.38
Counsel	1	7,260	14,802.38	1,233.53	14,802.38
Assistant counsel	1	4,140	9,009.01	757.50	9,009.01
Administrative and clerical:					
Clerk	1	3,420	7,631.82	635.98	7,631.82
Stenographer	2	2,280	5,323.02	443.58	10,646.04
Total	7				73,064.82
ADMINISTRATIVE					
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-383)					504.00
Contribution to civil service retirement fund					4,749.22
Contribution to employees Federal employees group life insurance					243.15
Travel (inclusive of field investigations)					8,600.00
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)					1,200.00
Witness fees, expenses					300.00
Stationery, office supplies					600.00
Communications					600.00
Contingent fund					138.81
Total					16,935.18
Grand total					90,000.00

REVIEW OF ADMINISTRATION OF TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1140, Senate Resolution 268.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 268) authorizing a study of matters pertaining to a review of the administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 268) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to conduct a further examination and review of the administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, and the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, and consider proposed legislation affecting said Acts.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1962, to January 31, 1963, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1963.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $45,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The title was amended so as to read:

Resolution authorizing an examination and review of the Trading With the Enemy Act.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1161), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
January 18, 1962.

Re Senate Resolution 268.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Committee on the Judiciary today ordered reported an original resolution providing additional funds for a continuation of the study, examination, and review of the administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act and the War Claims Act of 1948.

This work has been carried on by the Subcommittee on Trading With the Enemy Act, which was first authorized by Senate Resolution 245 of the 2d session of the 82d Congress. Senate resolutions have successfully authorized the continuation of the functions of the subcommittee. Under the provisions of Senate Resolution 60, agreed to February 13, 1961, the authority for the study will expire on January 31, 1962. The new resolution proposes a budget of $45,000 for the period ending January 31, 1963. This is the same budget approved under last year's resolution.

This subcommittee deals with several complex problems which must be resolved by the Congress. One of the most urgent is the matter of the payment of war damage claims to American citizens who suffered losses during World War II. The subcommittee has approved a measure which was considered to be the logical first step in a war claims program. This bill was reported by the Committee on the Judiciary and is now on the Senate Calendar. However, much work is yet to be performed in connection with this program. It is essential that the subcommittee be continued until we have legislation in behalf of these citizens.

Enclosed for your information is the proposed budget for the subcommittee and a statement from the chairman of the subcommittee outlining his plans for this session.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES O. EASTLAND, *Chairman.*

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON TRADING
WITH THE ENEMY ACT,
January 15, 1962.

Hon. JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR EASTLAND: The examinations and reviews assigned to be performed by the Subcommittee on Trading With the Enemy Act have been successively continued from the 2d session of the 82d Congress until January 31, 1962. For the period covered by Senate Resolution 60, which expires January 31, 1962, a total of $45,000 was authorized. A new resolution proposing the continuing of this work until January 31, 1963, would authorize the expenditure of the same amount, $45,000.

Of the $45,000 authorized under Senate Resolution 60, an estimated $6,000 will be returned as unexpended balance.

There were 13 bills under consideration by the subcommittee during the 1st session of the 87th Congress. The subcommittee approved for full committee consideration two bills, one an original bill (S. 2618) and one a bill (S. 495) amended to incorporate the provisions of two bills (S. 495 and S. 291). The Committee on the Judiciary reported these two bills to the Senate and both are now on the Senate Calendar.

The American war damage claims program as contemplated by S. 2618 is necessary and long overdue. The subcommittee feels that its work should be continued until we have fulfilled our obligations to our American citizens who suffered damage or loss during World War II. Considerable work yet remains on this measure since the Senate has yet to act and no action has been taken on the House side.

There are several meritorious bills before the subcommittee which should be given consideration.

The subcommittee agreed in the last days of the first session to hold hearings on the question of the necessity or advisability of amending section 9(a) of the Trading With the Enemy Act to permit the sale of a vested asset while such asset is in litigation. These hearings will require considerable time and work by the subcommittee.

In conducting its work, the subcommittee seeks the assistance of a counsel, a minority counsel, and a clerk.

Sincerely yours,

OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
Chairman.

Budget—Review of the administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
STAFF					
Legal and investigative:					
General counsel or staff director	1	$8,040.00	$16,173.91	$1,347.76	$16,173.19
Special counsel (minority)	1	7,260.00	14,802.38	1,233.53	14,802.38
Administrative and clerical: Chief clerk	1	3,420.00	7,631.82	635.98	7,631.82
Total	3				38,607.39
ADMINISTRATIVE					
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382, effective July 1, 1960)					140.00
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries paid)					2,509.48
Contribution to employees Federal employees group life insurance (27 cents per month per $1,000 coverage)					129.60
Travel (inclusive of field investigations)					500.00
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)					500.00
Witness fees, expenses					100.00
Stationery, office supplies					400.00
Communications (telephone, telegraph)					200.00
Newspapers, magazines, documents					50.00
Contingent fund					1,863.53
Total					6,392.61
Grand total					45,000.00

EXTENDING TIME FOR FILING COMMITTEE REPORT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1097, Senate Resolution 238.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 238) extending the time for filing a report by the Special Committee on Aging.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 238) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the time for filing a final report by the Special Committee on Aging, established by S. Res. 33, Eighty-seventh Congress, agreed to February 13, 1961, as amended and supplemented, is hereby extended to January 31, 1963.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of enabling the special committee to complete its work and prepare such final report, it is hereby authorized to exercise, until such date, all of the duties, functions, and powers conferred upon it by S. Res. 33, Eighty-seventh Congress, as amended and supplemented.

SEC. 3. The expenses of the special committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $185,000 from February 1, 1962, through January 31, 1963, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the special committee.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared on Senate Resolution 238 be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MCNAMARA

Senate Resolution 238 would simply extend the life of the Special Committee on Aging through January 31, 1963.

It makes no change in the committee's composition, functions, or responsibilities.

The budget approved by the Rules Committee is the same as that approved by the Senate for 1961 and from which we expect to turn back more than $15,000. In that budget we provide, as I was happy to assure Senator CURTIS, for representation by the minority.

The reasons why we believe the life of the committee should be extended are set forth in detail in my letter of January 10, 1962, to Senator MANSFIELD. That letter and its attachments appear in full in Senate Report No. 1128.

During the congressional recess, our subcommittees held hearings in no less than 29 cities in all parts of the country.

Those hearings were both productive and provocative. The job of editing the hearings is almost completed, and we expect to have them at the printer's within the week. As soon as they are available, our subcommittees will take on the task of analyzing them and reporting on their findings.

I believe the members of the committee have done an outstanding job this past year and will continue to do so if the resolution is approved.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1128), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING,
January 10, 1962.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Senate Resolution 238 extends to January 31, 1963, the time within which the annual report of the Special Committee on Aging is to be filed and, in effect, extends until that date the life of the committee as presently constituted, with no change in its functions or responsibilities, and on the same budgetary basis as approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration and the Senate for 1961.

During this past year, our staff and members of the Committee on Aging have been diligent in the discharge of our responsibilities. By January 31, 1962, we will have issued 8 studies and reports (a list of which appears below as "Attachment III") in addition to some 30 volumes of testimony taken at hearings in Washington and in the field.

I am happy to report that many of our colleagues, members of the administration, State legislators, and students of the problems of aging have been kind enough to tell us that they have found those reports and studies of considerable value to them in their consideration of legislative proposals.

Recognizing the fact that the overwhelming majority of America's more than 17 million older people do not have resources sufficient either to enable them to come to Washington or to send skilled lobbyists in their behalf, the committee decided that it would go to them.

This resolution was buttressed by our desire to consult with the State and local officials immediately involved, concerning the various ways in which common national problems take on different aspects and different values in different parts of the country and perhaps necessitate greater flexibility in Federal legislation designed to cope with such common problems.

A third factor in our decision lay in our desire to give special attention during this period to the special problems of older people living in rural areas. More than 5.3 million aged, almost one-third of all our senior citizens, live on farms or in small towns with less than 2,500 population.

Moreover, in many rural areas, we are witnessing a sharp upturn in the proportion of the aged in the population structure resulting from a migration to the cities of young people in search of employment and a backflow of the elderly to rural areas when they lose or give up employment in industry.

This phenomenon takes on added significance when we realize that a higher than average proportion of the aged in rural areas is not eligible for social security payments and is dependent—sometimes an alarmingly high percentage of all the aged in a rural community—on the old-age assistance program.

As a result of these considerations, ad hoc subcommittees of the Special Committee on Aging held hearings in no less than 29 communities throughout the land between October 15 and December 15, 1961.

During the course of this extremely demanding and arduous schedule, which resulted in the most comprehensive congressional study of the problems of aging ever attempted at the grassroots level, more than 900 persons vitally concerned with the problems of aging in the United States actively participated. More than 440 of these were expert witnesses who presented testimony on the four technical subjects investigated during the morning sessions of the hearings: nursing homes, retirement income, housing for the elderly, and the extent, quality, and relationship of Federal and State activities in the field of aging.

The more than 450 other witnesses were what we consider the real experts—the older people who actively participated in the town meetings of senior citizens conducted by each subcommittee. Their testimony was supplemented by hundreds of letters sent the committee at its request by other senior citizens who were physically unable to attend the hearings or were too diffident to speak out in public.

Our last hearing was held on December 15. Since then the committee's staff, which has been working almost literally around the clock and with but 1 day off since October 15, has almost completed the editing of the hearing transcripts and has begun its analysis of their contents. Obviously neither our subcommittees nor the full committee will have opportunity to review the hearings, to analyze the many provocative suggestions made thereat, to follow up the many new leads furnished by the witnesses, and to carefully consider and formulate its recommendations to the Senate by January 31.

Because the results of our field hearings, which are necessarily held after the adjournment of a session, can be translated into carefully considered recommendations only after the beginning of the next session, and because we know the Senate and our older people will benefit if this committee is given opportunity to inquire further into questions which repeatedly came to the fore in the course of our hearings, which we propose to study further and some of which I am setting forth in attachment II herewith, we urge the passage of this resolution.

As I have said, the resolution would continue the committee on the same basis as it is now operating and with the same financing approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration for 1961. In connection with the proposed budget which appears as attachment I, I am pleased to advise you that our insistence on operating as economically as possible will enable us to turn back some $15,000 of last year's funds on January 31.

I do hope that prompt and favorable action on this resolution will serve to advise our people that the Senate's concern with the situations that confront our many millions of elderly people is a real and a continuing one.

With all good wishes.

Sincerely,

PAT MCNAMARA.

Budget—Special Committee on Aging

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
STAFF					
Legal and investigative:					
General counsel or staff director	1	$8,340	$16,700.42	$1,391.70	$16,700.42
Assistant staff director (minority)	1	7,500	15,224.17	1,268.68	15,224.17
Editorial and research:					
Editorial director	1	6,900	14,169.70	1,180.80	14,169.70
Research director	1	8,000	16,102.90	1,341.90	16,102.90
Research assistant	2	3,360	7,510.31	625.85	15,020.62
Staff member (professional)	1	8,000	16,102.90	1,341.90	16,102.90
Administrative and clerical:					
Chief clerk	1	3,360	7,510.31	625.85	7,510.31
Assistant clerk (secretary to director)	1	3,120	7,024.25	585.35	7,024.25
Assistant clerk (record)	1	2,280	5,323.02	443.58	5,323.02
Assistant clerk (hearing)	1	2,280	5,323.02	443.58	5,323.02
Stenographer	2	2,040	4,836.96	403.08	9,673.92
Total	13				128,175.23
ADMINISTRATIVE					
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382, effective July 1, 1960)					1,000.00
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries paid)					9,375.00
Contribution to employees Federal employees group life insurance (27 cents per month per $1,000 coverage)					500.00
Reimbursable payments to agencies					2,500.00
Travel (inclusive of field investigations)					10,000.00
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)					12,000.00
Witness fees, expenses					5,000.00
Stationery, office supplies					2,400.00
Communications (telephone, telegraph)					3,600.00
Newspapers, magazines, documents					600.00
Contingent fund					1,849.77
Consultants					8,000.00
Total					56,824.77
Grand total					185,000.00

ATTACHMENT II

QUESTIONS CURRENTLY UNDER REVIEW BY THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

Private pension plans

The present limitations of private pension plans and how to increase their significance as a more universal source of retirement income (how they can be spread to more occupations and industries).

An examination of where Federal legislation falls short in protecting the interests of pension participants and beneficiaries.

The growing need to provide greater economic security for the survivors of retired workers (especially aged widows). The extent to which private pension plans now provide such survivor benefits and the prospects of adding such a feature to private pension plans.

Evaluating the means by which age discrimination in employment can be reduced and the progress of current efforts to do so.

To study the impact of long-term unemployment on the economic security of the older worker as well as upon his future as an economically independent retiree. Associated with this problem is the especially severe plight of the unskilled older worker in an age of increasing automation.

The prospects for the successful retraining of older workers and the special problems such retraining programs are likely to encounter in economically depressed areas.

Surplus foods

Increasing the availability of surplus foods to the elderly by removing the distribution barrier that now stands between the warehouse and the potential consumer.

The possibility of broadening the use of surplus foods by the elderly through agencies that could be eligible under the existing program, through the sharing of information about certification methods, use of voluntary agencies in distributing foods, etc.

The desirability of qualifying other than existing channels for the use of surplus food, for example: "Meals on Wheels," and the changes in the Federal law that would be involved.

Public assistance

Developing more definitive information on the provisions in the Federal old-age assistance law and the administrative interpretations of this law which hamper the efforts of the States to return mental patients to more normal community life by declaring them ineligible for old-age assistance. What are the justifications for the Federal provisions? What devices are now being used by the States to circumvent these provisions and what dangers are inherent in such devices?

Developing recommendations for changes in the Federal law and in the administrative interpretations thereof which are in step with modern thinking and which recognize and encourage the various efforts of the States in tackling this problem.

Miscellaneous

Exploring and proposing methods for developing meaningful and creative activities for older persons, for their own good and the good of society, including methods of stimulating volunteer services through the payment of work-connected expenses and establishing community projects to provide employment opportunities for older workers on a primarily part-time and noncompetitive basis.

Developing proposals for a focal point within the Federal Government for actively and effectively carrying forward the Federal responsibility for providing information, guidance, and support in the development of programs, governmental and voluntary, to serve the needs of older people.

Assessing the need for an expansion in previously identified Federal responsibilities through the establishment of Federal staff positions to serve as a community-based stimulator of programs for the elderly, as a central source of general information about the great variety and complex of Federal programs and activities, and as a referral agent to specific programs.

Whether the capital gains tax on the sale of homes by older people might not be considered as contrary to public policy insofar as it represents a tax on a socially desirable form of saving for retirement—apparently the only form of such saving available to large numbers of low- and middle-income people.

The great disparity in State laws and administrative approaches with respect to standards in the nursing home field; the degree to which majority occupancy of such homes by recipients of old-age assistance renders this a matter of Federal concern; the failure of the Federal Government to set and maintain acceptable standards for nursing homes in the District of Columbia.

The extent to which the "medical assistance for the aged" program is reaching or can be expected to reach the objectives sought by the Congress in its enactment; the degree to which it has been and is being used to transfer State responsibilities to the Federal Government; the size of the current and potential burden it represents for local taxpayers.

Housing

The apparently significant gap in housing for the lower middle income group of the elderly.

The reasons for the conspicuous lack of provisions for the elderly in the reuse of urban renewal areas and possibilities of developing effective incentives to localities for including such developments in their plans.

The critical problems of the elderly urban population created by the increase in housing values and costs through urban rehabilitation programs, and the development of proposals for preventing the wholesale displacement of the elderly by such programs.

ATTACHMENT III

PUBLICATIONS OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING, 1961

(In addition to hearings)

"New Population Facts on Older Americans."

"State Action To Implement Medical Programs for the Aged."

"Comparison of Health Insurance Proposals for Older Persons, 1961."

"Fact sheet, 'Some Current Facts About the Nation's Older People.'"

"Mental Illness Among Older Americans."

"Basic Facts on the Health and Economic Status of Older Americans."

"Health and Economic Conditions of the American Aged."

"A Constant Purchasing Power Bond: A Proposal for Protecting Retirement Income."

STUDY BY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1099, Senate Resolution 243.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 243) authorizing the Committee on Public Works to make a study of certain matters within its jurisdiction.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 243) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Works, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to flood control, navigation, rivers and harbors, roads and highways, water pollution, public buildings, and all features of water resource development.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1962, to January 31, 1963, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1963.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $125,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1130), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS,
January 17, 1962.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: From the Committee on Public Works, on January 17, 1962, there was reported Senate Resolution 243, providing additional funds for the use of the committee during the period February 1, 1962, to January 31, 1963. It is requested that your committee consider the resolution at an early date, and I respectfully urge that the committee report favorably thereon.

The need for these funds arises from the heavy and increasing workload of the committee, relative to legislation under its jurisdiction. The Federal Aid Highway Acts of the past few years have authorized a $40 billion program for improvement of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways. In addition, authorizations have been made for a progressively increasing program for the construction and improvements of the primary, secondary, and urban highways.

There will be legislation during 1962 which will authorize a continuation of the primary, secondary, and urban highway program, as well as forest highways, forest roads and trails, park roads and parkways, Indian reservation roads, and public lands roads.

It is necessary that there be a continuous study of the status and progress for financing and expediting completion of the huge highway program. These studies will require an annual review of the programs and reports by the agencies, inspection of certain areas, investigations of irregularities, conferences with highway officials and residents, studies relating to reimbursement of cost of toll roads, safety studies, studies relating to effect of highway construction on tenants and property owners and other matters relating to the highway program.

The Flood Control and Rivers and Harbors Act of 1960 included authorization for 132 projects having an estimated cost of $1.446 billion. It is expected that additional authorizations will be sought during 1962. The laws already enacted and those anticipated will result in a large backlog of projects and the committee must be in a position to insure that the development of flood control and rivers and harbors projects will be orderly and will contribute to the Nation's economy and growth.

Legislation has been proposed which would call for the establishment of policies and procedures for the evaluation and development of water resources projects. The committee must give careful consideration to the purposes and effect of such legislation, and proposes to conduct hearings in certain areas and hold conferences with local citizens and organizations interested in various features of water resources development.

Public Law 1018, 84th Congress, amended the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act to broaden its provisions in order that more complete utilization could be made of structures proposed. Approval of plans for certain projects are the responsibility of the Committee on Public Works, and extensive studies and investigations are necessary at times.

The Water Pollution Control Amendments of 1961 authorized an expanded program of Federal grants for construction of necessary treatment works for sewage or other wastes discharging into the waters of our Nation. It authorized an expanded program of research to determine practicable means of improving the design of sewage treatment plants and operating methods to remove the maximum amounts of pollutants from our waters. It authorized the inclusion of capacity in reservoirs, to be constructed by Federal agencies, for water quality control. It also authorized expanded enforcement measures to combat the ever-increasing pollution problem. With this vastly expanded program and entry of the Federal Government into a broader field of responsibility, it is necessary that the committee carefully assess the manner in which the program is being carried forward.

The Public Buildings Act of 1959 vests authority and responsibility in the Administrator of General Services for acquiring, constructing, altering, repairing, remodeling, improving, or extending public buildings and acquiring the necessary sites or additions to sites in connection therewith. Construction or acquisition of any building involving an expenditure in excess of $100,000 or alteration of an existing building which costs in excess of $200,000, must be approved by the committee. A great number of buildings have been approved and many more requests for approval are anticipated. Close supervision of this program will be necessary, and inspections and meetings will be called for.

The committee has long been interested in the manner in which projects under its jurisdiction have been constructed, the extent to which new and improved construction materials and methods have been employed, and the extent to which research has been carried forward in making better use of known and new construction materials. Because of this interest, the committee has determined that an investigation and report should be made concerning the use of new materials and new uses of known materials in flood control and river and harbor, highway, and public building projects. This will involve a considerable amount of investigations, discussions, and hearings.

Many other matters will be considered by the Committee on Public Works requiring special studies relative to water resources development policy, navigation bridge clearances, timber and recreation access roads, acquisition of lands in reservoir areas, evaluation of recreational benefits from Federal reservoirs, cost sharing on flood control projects, and buildings and grounds in the District of Columbia.

A division of the funds requested is as follows:

Salaries	$70,376.81
Contribution to employees' health benefit program	525.00
Contribution to civil service retirement fund	4,574.49
Contribution to group life insurance	190.01
Reimbursable payments to agencies	3,000.00
Travel	28,000.00
Hearings	12,000.00
Stationery	2,000.00
Communications	2,500.00
Newspapers, magazines, and documents	1,833.69
Total	125,000.00

Your early consideration of Senate Resolution 243 will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Public Works.

Budget—Committee on Public Works

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
STAFF					
Legal and investigative:					
Chief investigator	1	$8,040	$16,173.19	$1,347.76	$16,173.19
Investigator	1	7,260	14,802.38	1,233.53	14,802.38
Editorial and research:					
Staff member	1	4,980	10,756.25	896.35	10,756.25
Administrative and clerical:					
Assistant chief clerk	1	5,760	12,166.19	1,013.85	12,166.19
Assistant clerk (hearing)	1	3,720	8,239.40	686.62	8,239.40
Stenographer	1	3,720	8,239.40	686.62	8,239.40
Total	6				70,376.81
ADMINISTRATIVE					
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382, effective July 1, 1960)					525.00
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries paid)					4,574.49
Contribution to employees Federal employees group life insurance (27 cents per month per $1,000 coverage)					190.01
Reimbursable payments to agencies					3,000.00
Travel (inclusive of field investigations)					28,000.00
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)					12,000.00
Stationery, office supplies					2,000.00
Communications (telephone, telegraph)					2,500.00
Newspapers, magazines, documents					1,833.69
Total					54,623.19
Grand total					125,000.00

INVESTIGATION RELATING TO PUBLIC AND PRIVATE HOUSING

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1100, Senate Resolution 244.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 244) authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to investigate matters relating to public and private housing.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 244) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to public and private housing.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1962, to January 1, 1963, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1963.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $107,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1131), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON BANKING
AND CURRENCY,
January 19, 1962.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: There is pending before your committee Senate Resolution 244, which was reported favorably from the Committee on Banking and Currency on January 18, 1962.

The funds requested by this resolution are for the continuing study, review, and investigation of matters relating to public and private housing by the Banking and Currency Committee through its Subcommittee on Housing. The subcommittee proposes to employ, upon a temporary basis, such assistance as it deems advisable in connection with the scope of activity to be carried out.

As you and other members of the Rules Committee know, I do not agree with, nor do I support, all of the programs which have been enacted by the Congress in the field of housing. However, I do earnestly endorse and support Senate Resolution 244, and I hope your committee will give favorable consideration to this resolution.

Under existing laws, the Federal Government has commitments toward housing ranging from grant, loan, and underwriting programs—such as urban renewal, VA home loans, and FHA insurance—to the insurance of deposits and shares of private lending institutions holding residential loans. These direct and indirect commitments total well over $150 billion. Because of this involvement on the part of the Federal Government, I believe that we on the Banking and Currency Committee, as well as the Senate itself, would be remiss if we did not maintain constant study, review, and investigation of Federal housing programs in order to protect the interest of the Federal Government as well as the interest of the public at large.

Sincerely yours,
A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Chairman.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON
BANKING AND CURRENCY,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING,
January 19, 1962.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: On January 18, 1962, there was referred to your committee for consideration Senate Resolution 244, which was reported favorably from the Committee on Banking and Currency on January 18, 1962.

This resolution requests authorization for the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee, to expend funds in an amount not to exceed $107,000. These funds will be used by the Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency to continue its study and investigation of matters relating to public and private housing. These functions are authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, pursuant to the committee's jurisdiction under rule XXV 1(d)4 of the Standing Rules of the Senate. The subcommittee proposes to employ upon a temporary basis such assistance as it deems advisable in connection with the scope of activity to be carried out.

During the 1st session of the 87th Congress, pursuant to Senate Resolution 25, the subcommittee's activities included studies and investigations, both in Washington and in the field, of all phases of housing. During the session, the subcommittee held hearings and prepared for the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency an omnibus housing bill (the Housing Act of 1961). By many experts, this bill is considered the most comprehensive housing act ever enacted by the Congress. The 1961 act dealt with all phases of housing; it added such new programs as (1) middle-income housing, (2) home repair and rehabilitation, (3) experimental housing, (4) open-space land, and (5) mass transportation, and extended, either by date or by increased authorizations, the majority of previously enacted housing, urban renewal, and community facility programs.

The Federal Government's commitments and contingent liability in housing have grown to an amount which now approximates $100 billion. The Housing Subcommittee is charged with studying, investigating, and preparing legislation in all Federal housing programs. The scope of subcommittee activities include the Federal Housing Administration system of mortgage financing, which presently encompasses some $42 billion of residential mortgage financing; a $4 billion authority for slum clearance and urban renewal which now covers some 930 projects in 520 communities; a low-rent housing program encompassing some 700,000 dwelling units; the secondary market and special assistance operations of the Federal National Mortgage Association with a total authorization of some $7 billion; a college housing program of $2.9 billion; a public facility loan program of $600 million; a veterans' direct loan program of $2.7 billion; and several other specialized programs such as housing for the elderly, farm housing, nursing homes, home improvement loans, and the voluntary home mortgage credit program.

The Housing Act of 1961 created new programs which fall within the subcommittee's scope of activities. The programs are: A moderate income mortgage insurance program; an experimental housing mortgage insurance program; a new repair and rehabilitation mortgage insurance program; a mass transportation program providing loans and grants of $75 million to States, municipalities, and other public bodies to finance the acquisition and improvements of facilities and equipment for use in urban mass transportation service; and an open-space land program providing grants of $50 million to help States and local public bodies finance the acquisition of land to be held as permanent open spaces.

Many features of the new moderate income housing program, as well as the experimental housing and home repair and rehabilitation programs, are entirely new within the FHA mortgage insurance program. It is imperative that these programs be carefully studied and reviewed to determine whether they serve the purpose contemplated by the Congress. In addition, the mass transportation and open-space land programs are new to the field of housing. These programs must be carefully studied during the early years of operation to determine whether they are being administered and operated within the intent for which they were enacted.

During the past year the subcommittee continued its study of mortgage-credit problems. Reports from four Federal agencies were submitted to the subcommittee in accordance with recommendations made by the subcommittee in its report on the subject of mortgage credit to the Banking and Currency Committee. These agency reports and recommendations were studied by the subcommittee and a report was printed thereon.

During the last session of the Congress the subcommittee was assigned the task of investigating the adequacy of and the enforcement of local housing codes and ordinances as prerequisites for continued Federal aid. The subcommittee presently contemplates making a report on this subject.

In fulfilling this assignment the staff worked closely with the General Accounting Office in carrying out an investigation on the effectiveness of local housing codes as a prerequisite for urban renewal activities. Studies were conducted in 11 cities. The results of this investigation and other material developed by the subcommittee staff will be prepared in a report for the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Among the special studies the subcommittee anticipates making are such subjects as vacancy rates in housing, disposal of FHA Commissioner-held properties, and housing for the elderly.

The subcommittee and its staff also will be responsible for work associated with consideration of legislation pertaining to housing and related matters during this session of the Congress. At present there are pending before the subcommittee bills relating to housing for migratory farmworkers, the establishment of an international home loan bank, and technical amendments to the Housing Act of 1949. In addition, it is anticipated that the subcommittee will consider legislation in such fields as international housing, housing for the elderly, college housing, and civil defense community shelters, as well as technical and perfecting amendments to the Housing Act of 1961.

The subcommittee serves as a channel of communication between Members of the Senate, Government agencies, the housing industry, and the public generally. It has accumulated experience and knowledge which are utilized every day by Members having an interest in legislation, both existing and proposed, and in administrative problems affecting housing.

The Housing Subcommittee plays an important role in keeping the members of the Committee on Banking and Currency, as well as the Senate as a whole, informed and advised on all Federal housing and related programs.

It is our sincere belief that the $107,000 authorization requested is completely justified by the size and complexity of the many problems of our Federal housing program and is, in fact, necessary if the Senate is to keep itself informed on these vital matters. We hope that your committee will give favorable consideration to Senate Resolution 244.

In accordance with the request contained in your letter of December 15, 1961, to the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, there is attached an itemized budget indicating the manner in which the funds requested by this resolution are proposed to be used. In addition, there is attached a copy of Senate Report 1123, which accompanied Senate Resolution 244.

Sincerely,

JOHN SPARKMAN.
HOMER E. CAPEHART.

Budget—Study of Federal housing programs

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
STAFF					
Legal and investigative:					
Staff director	1	$8,000	$16,102.90	$1,341.90	$16,102.90
Chief counsel	1	8,000	16,102.90	1,341.90	16,102.90
Investigator	1	3,660	8,117.89	676.49	8,117.89
Editorial and research:					
Research director	1	4,440	9,697.59	808.13	9,697.59
Staff assistant	1	6,540	13,537.00	1,128.00	13,537.00
Professional staff member	1	8,000	16,102.90	1,341.90	16,102.90
Administrative and clerical:					
Assistant clerk (secretary to director)	1	3,060	6,902.74	575.22	6,902.74
Assistant clerk	1	2,940	6,659.70	554.97	6,659.70
Total	8				93,223.62
ADMINISTRATIVE					
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382, effective July 1, 1960)					648.96
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries paid)					6,059.54
Contribution to employees Federal employees group life insurance (27 cents per month per $1,000 coverage)					317.52
Travel (inclusive of field investigations)					2,000.00
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)					3,000.00
Witness fees, expenses					1,000.00
Stationery, office supplies					200.00
Communications (telephone, telegraph)					200.00
Newspapers, magazines, documents					200.00
Contingent fund					150.36
Total					13,776.38
Grand total					107,000.00

AUTHORITY FOR CONTINUING STUDY OF U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1101, Senate Resolution 246.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 246) to authorize a continuing study of U.S. foreign policy.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 246) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make complete studies of any and all matters pertaining to the foreign policies of the United States and their administration.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1962, to January 31, 1963, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; (3) to hold such hearings, to take such testimony, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, and to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents; and (4) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government, as the committee deems advisable.

SEC. 3. In the conduct of its studies the committee may use the experience, knowledge, and advice of private organizations, school institutions, and individuals in its discretion, and it is authorized to divide the work of the studies among such individuals, groups, and institutions as it may deem appropriate and may enter into contracts for this purpose.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $160,000 for the period ending January 31, 1963, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1132), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U. S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am writing to call your attention to Senate Resolution 246, to authorize a continuing study of U.S. foreign policy by the Committee on Foreign Relations. This resolution was reported from this committee on January 15, and was referred the same day to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Briefly, the resolution authorizes the expenditure of $160,000 by the Committee on Foreign Relations during the next year to continue inquiries now being conducted into the foreign policies of the United States. These inquiries have particular reference to Latin America and to other geographical areas of the world where this Nation has special interests, and also cover aspects of world armament control. The resolution is similar in text and purposes to Senate Resolution 41, agreed to January 31, 1961, which authorized the expenditure of $160,000 by this committee last year.

The committee's activities for the past year, and its plans for undertakings under this resolution are described in Senate Report No. 1118, which is enclosed. The report also contains the committee's proposed budget for the requested $160,000.

I hope the Committee on Rules and Administration will give this resolution favorable consideration at an early meeting in order that it might come before the Senate at an early date.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman.

Budget

Position	Basic salary per annum	Gross salary per annum	Gross monthly salary	Total
STAFF				
Staff member	$8,040	$16,173.19	$1,347.76	$16,173.19
Do	5,400	11,533.51	961.12	11,533.51
Do	3,660	8,117.89	676.49	8,117.89
Staff assistant	5,040	10,872.25	906.02	10,872.25
Do	3,660	8,117.89	676.49	8,117.89
Assistant clerk	3,120	7,024.25	585.35	7,024.25
Do	2,760	6,295.16	524.59	6,295.16
Do	2,640	6,052.11	504.34	6,052.11
Do	2,640	6,052.11	504.34	6,052.11
Do	2,220	5,201.49	433.45	5,201.49
Do	2,220	5,201.49	433.45	5,201.49
Do	1,200	3,303.10	275.25	3,303.10
Do	1,200	3,303.10	275.25	3,303.10
Consultant	60	953.95	79.49	953.95
Total				98,201.49
ADMINISTRATIVE				
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382)				405.00
Contribution to civil service retirement fund				6,383.09
Contribution to employees group life insurance				349.92
Reimbursable payments to agencies (and/or contracts)				10,000.00
Travel				3,500.00
Hearings, reporting				28,500.00
Witness fees, expenses				2,800.00
Stationery, office supplies				4,600.00
Communications				900.00
Newspapers, magazines, documents				1,900.00
Contingent fund				2,459.90
Total				61,798.51
Grand total				100,000.00

ASSISTANCE TO MEMBERS OF THE SENATE IN CONNECTION WITH INTERPARLIAMENTARY ACTIVITIES AND RECEPTION OF FOREIGN OFFICIALS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1102, Senate Resolution 247.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 247) to provide assistance to Members of the Senate in connection with interparliamentary activities and reception of foreign officials.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 247) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That in order to assist the Senate properly to discharge and coordinate its activities and responsibilities in connection with participation in various interparliamentary institutions and to facilitate the interchange and reception in the United States of members of foreign legislative bodies and prominent officials of foreign governments, the Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized effective February 1, 1962, and until otherwise provided by law, to employ one additional professional staff member to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with the provisions of section 202(e) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to pay the actual and necessary expenses incurred in connection with activities authorized by this resolution and approved in advance by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, which shall not exceed $5,000 each fiscal year, effective February 1, 1962, and until otherwise provided by law, from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers certified by the Senator incurring such expenses and approved by the chairman.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1133), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
January 22, 1962.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: There has been referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration Senate Resolution 247, to provide assistance to Members of the Senate in connection with interparliamentary activities and the reception of foreign officials. This resolution, which was reported to the Senate by the Committee on Foreign Relations on January 15, 1962, is similar to Senate Resolution 40, agreed to by the Senate on January 31, 1961, except in one detail.

It was the unanimous conclusion of the committee that the annual practice of authorizing $5,000 and employing one additional staff member for the reception of foreign dignitaries by the Senate might now be placed on a permanent basis by resolution until otherwise provided by law.

Reception of foreign visitors since 1958 under this practice has been a rewarding and successful operation, valuable to Senate Members and to the conduct of our relations with representatives arriving from friendly and allied governments. Concurrently, the work in the committee preparing for international conferences, and the compilation of reports which necessarily devolve by law upon the committee afterward, has increased markedly over the last few years.

The committee agrees that these established procedures, as outlined, have had sufficiently successful results that they should not hereafter require yearly renewal. This resolution, therefore, provides that change. At the same time, the committee is not asking for an increase in the working fund of $5,000. Such amount should cover all its costs each fiscal year for the foreseeable future. Of the same amount approved last year, it is estimated the total cost for receptions of notable visitors came to $3,500, or $1,500 less than was authorized.

A copy of the committee report on the resolution is enclosed. I very much hope you will be able favorably to consider the resolution at your next meeting in order that the Senate can thereafter give it early consideration.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1103, Senate Resolution 249.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 249) to provide additional funds for the Committee on Small Business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 249) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Select Committee on Small Business, in carrying out the duties imposed upon it by S. Res. 58, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to February 20, 1950, and S. Res. 272, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to May 26, 1950, is authorized to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of the problems of American small and independent business and to make recommendations concerning those problems to the appropriate legislative committees of the Senate.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1962, to January 31, 1963, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1963.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $125,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1134), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS,
January 15, 1962.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Since the authority of the Select Committee on Small Business to make use of funds under Senate Resolution 62, 87th Congress, expires on January 31, I have today introduced a new resolution for the same amount of additional funds ($125,000) for the committee's use during the present session of Congress.

The committee's members consider it noteworthy that, despite increased costs and the expanded scope of its activities in behalf of the problems of the small-business segment of the national economy, the committee continues effectively to operate within the same appropriation allowance of the past two sessions.

I intend to send you a copy of our 12th annual report as soon as it is printed. It summarizes the substantial activities of the committee during 1961 in many troublesome small-business problem areas.

For example, our Subcommittee on Monopoly held extensive hearings on certain anticompetitive aspects of the Government's space communications satellite program, as well as on the effect of the patent policies of some Federal agencies on small business. The evils, from the small retailer's point of view, of dual distribution, that is, the direct competition of manufacturers with their own franchised dealers at the retail level, continued to occupy the attention of the committee. One result of this interest was the introduction of S. 2640 and S. 2641 by a committee member. To stimulate the interest of small businessmen in exporting, the committee issued a report entitled "Small Business Exports and the World Market."

Our concern about the impact of shopping centers on small retailers arbitrarily excluded from such centers resulted in hearings being held on the feasibility of a plan to guarantee small business leases. I feel that study of this problem by the committee should continue.

As in past years, considerable time and effort were spent by the committee's members and staff in studying, investigating, and holding hearings on the programs of the Small Business Administration and the procurement policies and programs of the Government agencies, both civilian and military.

I shall appreciate an opportunity, when the Rules Committee meets to consider our resolution, to present further information to justify the request for funds.

With kind personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JOHN SPARKMAN,
Chairman.

Budget—Study of problems of small and independent business

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
STAFF					
Legal and investigative:					
Special counsel	2	$7,140	$14,592	$1,216	$29,184
Assistant counsel	2	6,180	12,904	1,075	25,808
Chief investigator	1	4,920	10,640	887	10,640
Investigator	1	2,340	5,445	454	5,445
Editorial and research: Research director	1	6,180	12,904	1,075	12,904
Administrative and clerical:					
Assistant clerk (file)	1	1,140	3,200	266	3,200
Stenographer	3	1,740	4,229	352	12,687
Total	11				99,868
ADMINISTRATIVE					
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382, effective July 1, 1960)					892
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries paid)					6,491
Contribution to employees Federal employees group life insurance (27 cents per month per $1,000 coverage)					340
Travel (inclusive of field investigations)					7,000
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)					2,000
Witness fees, expenses					1,000
Stationery, office supplies					1,500
Communications (telephone, telegraph)					2,000
Newspapers, magazines, documents					1,000
Contingent fund					2,909
Total					25,132
Grand total					125,000

AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS TO MAKE CERTAIN STUDIES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1104, Senate Resolution 250.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 250) authorizing the Committee on Government Operations to make certain studies.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 250) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Government Operations, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from February 1, 1962, through January 31, 1963, to make investigations into the efficiency and economy of operations of all branches of the Government, including the possible existence of fraud, misfeasance, malfeasance, collusion, mismanagement, incompetence, corrupt or unethical practices, waste, extravagance, conflicts of interest, and the improper expenditure of Government funds in transactions, contracts, and activities of the Government or of Government officials and employees and any and all such improper practices between Government personnel and corporations, individuals, companies, or persons affiliated therewith, doing business with the Government; and the compliance or noncompliance of such corporations, companies, or individuals or other entities with the rules, regulations, and laws governing the various governmental agencies and its relationships with the public: *Provided*, That in carrying out the duties herein set forth, the inquiries of this committee shall not be deemed limited to the records, functions, and operations of the particular branch of the Government under inquiry, and may extend to the records and activities of persons, corporations, or other entities dealing with or affecting that particular branch of the Government.

SEC. 2. The Committee on Government Operations or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is further authorized from February 1, 1962, to January 31, 1963, inclusive, to conduct an investigation and study of the extent to which criminal or other improper practices or activities are, or have been, engaged in in the field of labor-management relations or in groups or organizations of employees or employers, to the detriment of interests of the public, employers, or employees, and to determine whether any changes are required in the laws of the United States in order to protect such interests against the occurrence of such practices or activities. Nothing contained in this resolution shall affect or impair the exercise by the Committee on Labor and

Public Welfare of any power, or the discharge by such committee of any duty, conferred or imposed upon it by the Standing Rules of the Senate or by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

SEC. 3. The Committee on Government Operations or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is further authorized and directed from February 1, 1962, to January 31, 1963, inclusive, to make a full and complete study and investigation of syndicated or organized crime which may operate in or otherwise utilize the facilities of interstate or international commerce in furtherance of any transactions which are in violation of the law of the United States or of the State in which the transactions occur, and, if so, the manner and extent to which, and the identity of the persons, firms, or corporations, or other entities by whom such utilization is being made, what facilities, devices, methods, techniques, and technicalities are being used or employed, and whether or not organized crime utilizes such interstate facilities or otherwise operates in interstate commerce for the development of corrupting influences in violation of the law of the United States or the laws of any State, and further, to study and investigate the manner in which and the extent to which persons engaged in organized criminal activities have infiltrated into lawful business enterprise; and to study the adequacy of Federal laws to prevent the operations of organized crime in interstate or international commerce; and to determine whether any changes are required in the laws of the United States in order to protect the public against the occurrences of such practices or activities. Nothing contained in this resolution shall affect or impair the exercise by the Committee on the Judiciary or by the Committee on Commerce of any power, or the discharge by such committee of any duty, conferred or imposed upon it by the Standing Rules of the Senate or by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

SEC. 4. The Committee on Government Operations or any of its duly authorized subcommittees shall report to the Senate by January 31, 1963, and shall, if deemed appropriate, include in its report specific legislative recommendations.

SEC. 5. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1962, to January 31, 1963, inclusive, is authorized, as it deems necessary and appropriate, to (1) make such expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate; (2) hold such hearings; (3) sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjournment periods of the Senate; (4) require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents; (5) administer such oaths; (6) take such testimony, either orally or by deposition; (7) employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (8) with the prior consent of the executive department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, employ on a reimbursable basis such executive branch personnel as it deems advisable; and, further, with the consent of other committees or subcommittees to work in conjunction with and utilize their staffs, as it shall be deemed necessary and appropriate in the judgment of the chairman of the committee: *Provided further*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment and the person selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee.

SEC. 6. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $400,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate on vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1135), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE, COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS, PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS,
January 16, 1962.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: This letter supplements and comments on Senate Resolution 250, 87th Congress, 2d session, which was introduced in the Senate on January 16, 1962. This resolution seeks authority and funds for the continued operation of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations for the period from February 1, 1962, through January 31, 1963. Prior to the resolution's being submitted to the Senate, it was considered and unanimously approved by the Senate Committee on Government Operations.

In discharging the responsibilities given to this subcommittee by the Senate in January 1 year ago by Senate Resolution 69, this subcommittee has conducted and has in prospect inquiries under the three major areas of the subcommittee's jurisdiction, (a) efficiency and economy in Government, (b) improper activities in the labor or management field, and (c) organized crime. Numerous hearings have been held and others are in the stage of preparation. The authority and powers granted by the Senate to the subcommittee for the past year were adequate and, if continued, will meet our requirements for the coming year. Therefore, the resolution before you is basically identical with that which you approved last year.

Attached to this letter is a proposed budget for the operation of this subcommittee. In assessing our requirements for another year, we have drawn on the accumulated experience of the past and studied the projected program and prospective work to be done for this year. We anticipate that $400,000 will be required to operate this subcommittee effectively. This is a minimum requirement and in asking for this amount we must necessarily anticipate your indulgence in the event unforeseen developments arise requiring greater expenditures than are now contemplated. The subcommittee was able to effect certain economies out of the appropriations currently available ($390,000) so that we expect to be able to return to the operating funds of the Senate in excess of $30,000. It is impossible to predict whether it might be feasible to operate with the same economy during the coming year. We shall try, and we will be diligent in our efforts to operate at the lowest cost possible consistent with effective results.

In support of and to emphasize the necessity for continuing this subcommittee with the same authority and responsibility it has now, we here report briefly on the work of the subcommittee during the past year.

We shall cover only the major inquiries undertaken by the subcommittee, that is, those concerning which hearings have been held and reports either filed with the Senate or that are now in the process of compilation. During the course of assembling these reports, the subcommittee staff interviewed thousands of people, the subcommittee members took testimony from 191 witnesses and conducted 32 days of hearings.

GOVERNMENT INQUIRIES

This subcommittee was originally formed for the purpose of monitoring the activities of agencies of the executive branch of the Government. This area continues to be a major field of interest and it received close scrutiny during the past year.

Military Sea Transportation Service (MSTS)

Last year when the chairman of the subcommittee spoke before the Senate Rules Committee, he mentioned a pending investigation into the Military Sea Transportation Service. Since then the investigation has been completed and a report concerning it has been filed with the Senate.

Originally it was reported to this subcommittee that the nature of the relationship existing between certain private ship repair contractors and some of the employees of the Military Sea Transportation Service was certainly in violation of ethical standards of conduct if not, in fact, actually in violation of law. It was alleged that contractors maintained the practice of granting gratuities in the form of gifts and entertainment to such an extent that the Government employee recipients were compromised in the performance of their supervisory duties. It was alleged in addition that actual bribery in the form of cash payments were more or less routine practice in this field.

In general, the subcommittee learned that these allegations were in fact true. We learned that in foreign nations it was common and approved practice for the commander of a vessel to receive a percentage of the amount of the repairs. It appears that this practice has spilled over into the American ship repair industry.

It was apparent from the testimony elicited by this subcommittee that ethical and moral standards were honored more in the breach than in the observance in the repairing of Military Sea Transportation Service vessels in the Brooklyn, N.Y., establishment.

This subcommittee held 8 days of hearing on the Military Sea Transportation Service and heard 36 witnesses, 4 of whom invoked the fifth amendment. Among the fifth amendment witnesses was Mr. George Cross, the top-ranking civilian and a Government employee of many years' service whose duties included approval of ship repair contracts. Cross sought refuge behind the fifth amendment when asked about the source of almost $100,000 income outside and above his salary over a 5-year period.

The subcommittee learned that it was common practice for private contractors to give and for MSTS employees to accept excessive gifts, free services, and even money. The effect on the efficiency and economy of the Government service is apparent.

The subcommittee also learned that the Navy has destroyed valuable records to the extent that it was impossible to retrace the steps involved in the completion of ship repair contracts. This practice has been stopped.

During the course of this inquiry the subcommittee received spurious records in response to a subpena; fortunately, we were able to demonstrate that the records were false.

Also during the course of the inquiry the subcommittee encountered strong indication that an agent of the Internal Revenue Service had accepted a bribe from the representative of a ship repair contractor. All the witnesses who testified concerning this incident invoked the fifth amendment.

Some of the beneficial results flowing from this and other inquiries by this subcommittee will be set forth in a single section of this letter.

Civil Rights Commission

In the late spring of 1960 it was alleged to this subcommittee that the functioning of the Civil Rights Commission was adversely affected by the incompetence of its staff director, Mr. Gordon Tiffany. This subcommittee pursued this subject matter by virtue of its obligation to report to the Senate concerning the efficient and economical operation of governmental agencies.

At the time we received this complaint, the Senate was considering controversial legislation concerning civil rights. Accordingly, the subcommittee proceeded with great care so as not to confuse these deliberations with this unrelated subject matter.

The subcommittee held 3 days of hearings in executive session and heard the testimony of pertinent witnesses including Mr. Tiffany. The report of this matter, with individual views of some of the committee members, was filed long after the discussion of civil rights legislation was finished in the Senate. In that report the subcommittee concluded that Mr. Tiffany had demonstrated clearly his incompetence in (1) causing Commission documents to be destroyed in contravention of law, (2) failing to comply with civil service regulations in handling Commission personnel, (3) failing to maintain adequate financial records, and (4) failing to extend to this subcommittee even a minimum of cooperation.

Agriculture Department

During the early part of the summer of 1961 it was alleged to the subcommittee that certain officials of the Agriculture Department had made threats to persons who were prospective witnesses before congressional agricultural committees in order to influence their testimony concerning the administration's farm legislation. It was alleged that pressure was applied to representatives of the cotton, cattle, poultry, and other industries to secure their favorable testimony on the farm bill which was then pending.

This alleged pressure took the form of the withholding of subsidies or the downward revision of tariff on competing foreign products. Executive sessions were held concerning this matter and a report was filed with the Senate.

It is difficult to arrive at an uncontestable conclusion on the basis of testimony heard by the subcommittee. However, it could be concluded fairly from the testimony that the Agriculture Department tried to convince representative persons in the affected industries that the administration's bill was desirable. It could also be concluded fairly that the persons so addressed might have felt (and did in at least one instance) that they were being coerced.

LABOR INQUIRIES

Chronologically the second area of interest of this subcommittee is that of impropriety in the labor or management field. The wisdom of continuing this activity under this subcommittee has been underscored by subsequent events. Hardly a day passes without representatives of the executive agencies of the Government referring to our files. We learned that certain unsavory elements still persisting in labor were delaying execution of their schemes until the Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field ceased to exist. The action of the Rules Committee and of the Senate in continuing the authority under this subcommittee has had a salutary effect.

James R. Hoffa and continued underworld control of New York Teamster Local 239

The subcommittee's investigation of James R. Hoffa and Teamster Local 239, and the activities of a powerful New York underworld figure Anthony (Tony Ducks) Corallo in connection with these and other locals serves to emphasize the necessity for continuing this authority in the subcommittee.

The continued control of local 239 by Corallo after his ostensible resignation in 1958 and Hoffa's knowledge and acquiescence of this control was the subject of hearings before this subcommittee early last year.

The committee's report in this matter is ready for filing. However, the Department of Justice has requested that its filing be temporarily held in abeyance. Corallo was indicted in the Federal courts in New York along with a justice of the New York State Supreme Court and a former assistant U.S. attorney. They are presently awaiting trial on a matter which is not germane to the committee's hearing. However, the Justice Department has advised that the publication of the report and its probable attendant publicity might delay and hamper the prompt prosecution and trial of this case. Therefore, it is my intention to seek the consent of the Senate to extend the time for filing this report.

Labor stoppages at missile bases

The central fact of our existence today is that there is in being an aggressive and organized force with the avowed and announced purpose of world domination. The principal impediment to its accomplishment of this purpose is a vigilant, purposeful, and capable sanctuary of freedom. The United States is the only such sanctuary. As the minutemen of 1775 recognized their personal civic and national responsibility, so should we in this day of peril accept our personal responsibility. Paramount among the means of retaining our national character and independence is the rapid and successful development of missiles capable of excelling, or at least equaling, the performance of those of Communist Russia. The facts are so self-apparent that most schoolchildren should and do realize them.

Within this framework it was with considerable surprise and grave concern for this subcommittee to hear reports that our missile program was being halted by a series of slowdowns and strikes called for inconsequential reasons.

It was alleged that workers on these missile bases would stop work for jurisdictional and other minor reasons and would resume their jobs only under the most unreasonable conditions, usually including an even higher rate of pay for the workers.

The subcommittee conducted 8 days of hearings on this subject during which time it heard 38 witnesses. In brief, the subcommittee learned that work stoppages and slowdowns were commonplace at missile sites. It was evident that many of the wildcat strikes, work stoppages, and slowdowns were deliberately planned for the purpose of generating overtime pay at double and even triple rates to make up for the time lost by reason of these work stoppages. Obviously, this is a matter affecting the efficient and economical operation of this Government program, particularly since the central point of many of these strikes was to gain more overtime pay for the workmen.

In terms of money these strikes and the concessions which resolved them were costly; in terms of time lost they could have been and may yet be catastrophic. Maj. Gen. William Thurman, Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff, Materiel, Air Force, testified that there were 327 work stoppages and wildcat strikes which resulted in the loss of 162,872 man-days in the missile program from the inception of the construction of the sites for the ICBM missiles to March 1961, with a manifestly tremendous impact on the time schedule for missile operations and resultant danger to the safety of the Nation. It was also responsible for enormous financial losses incurred attempting to make up for the time lost.

The subcommittee concluded that greediness and irresponsibility on the part of both labor and management and vacillation and lack of personal responsibility on the part of both military and civilian Government personnel severely delayed and compromised our missile program.

The subcommittee learned that excessive pay was routine. Of 42 plumbers employed by one contractor at Cape Canaveral, the average weekly pay ranged from a low of $402 to a high of $733. Of 48 electricians who worked for the same contractor the weekly pay ranged from a low of $413 to a high of $670. These inflated salaries resulted from unwarranted overtime rates. These rates, in turn, were imposed by means of slowdowns and strikes on the part of labor and agreed to by management and Government.

Once at Cape Canaveral the cement finishers went on strike because the painters were using trowels to fill up cracks and holes in the walls they were painting. The cement finishers claimed that since trowels were used they should do the work.

The subcommittee heard some almost unbelievable stories of low productivity of construction workers far beneath the minimum standard for average construction work. We heard witnesses testify that military supervisors were concerned only with keeping men on the job regardless of what concessions it might require.

Management, insulated by cost-plus contracts, had little incentive to produce economically.

Apparently the only "solution" reached with reference to jurisdictional disputes in many cases was the practice of featherbedding. The subcommittee heard testimony that an electronics device was delivered to one of the missile bases fully assembled, but the electricians on the base declined to install the equipment since they felt the assembly of this device was within their jurisdiction. The solution to this quandary was to permit the workmen on the base to sit idly doing nothing for the period of time it was estimated would be required to disassemble this device and reassemble it. Having spent this time doing nothing, they would place a mark indicating their approval for it to be installed.

ORGANIZED CRIME

In Senate Resolution 69 passed last year the jurisdiction of this subcommittee was expanded so as to include an inquiry into the field of organized crime. Following the passage of this resolution this subcommittee began to inform itself concerning this field of activity. We were told that gambling is not only a form of organized crime, but that, in addition, it supports and finances other forms of organized crime. The question arises, therefore, whether some additional Federal legislation on the subject might be in order. Accordingly, our first series of hearings on the broader field of organized crime related to certain aspects of gambling.

Legal betting at the racetracks in 1960 amounted to $3½ billion. This relates solely to horseracing, which, it is estimated, comprises about 42 percent of the total money bet. Off-the-track betting is widespread, but is done legally only in the State of Nevada. The subcommittee heard authoritative estimates to the effect that off-the-track betting is at least 10 times the volume of the betting at the track. The amount of money involved obviously is very large. In fact it approximates and may exceed the total amount appropriated by the Congress for national defense during the same year.

The subcommittee learned that a bookmaker is dependent upon speedy and accurate information concerning the outcome of the races. One of the benefits of this type of service to the bookmaker is that it permits the winner of a race immediately to bet on another one. Until a few months ago, a substantial business enterprise had been built up solely to provide this speedy and accurate information to the bookmakers.

Most racetracks and some State laws prohibit the transmission of up-to-the-minute information concerning the outcome of races. Accordingly, in order to supply speedy and accurate information, these wire services who provide it must smuggle the information out by some means. The subcommittee learned about some ingenious methods of accomplishing this. Each method involves an observer inside the track and someone outside the track to receive his signals. This can be done by hand signals, electronic devices, and other means of signaling. We learned that one reason speed is paramount to the bookie is that it is his only real protection against having someone with advance information place a bet on a horse which has already won the race.

This wire service has been set up to service groups of bookmakers and in some instances they trade information. The information is transmitted mostly by telephone. In some cases only the results are transmitted, but in others the narrative of the race is broadcast to the horse rooms where the bookmakers have their business establishments. The hearings demonstrated that the only business of the wire services is to transmit the information and to sell it to the bookmakers.

Shortly after our hearings were held, Congress enacted several antiracketeering laws and made it a violation of Federal law to operate such a business in conjunction with betting.

Incidentally, most of the witnesses involved in these businesses invoked the fifth amendment. There was an attempt to intimidate witnesses. Witnesses received threatening telephone calls from anonymous callers promising retaliation if they testified before our subcommittee. We know of only these instances of intimidation. We have no way of knowing how many other witnesses received a similar approach and as a result invoked the fifth amendment. We have reason to believe that it in fact did happen to other witnesses who took the fifth amendment.

Another area explored by the subcommittee was that of betting on other sporting events, principally baseball, basketball, and football, which like horse betting is illegal in almost every State of the Union. Briefly, the subcommittee learned that there are a few professional handicappers who distribute in advance of each sporting event the likely winning team and in the case of football and basketball the probable margin of victory. In this business also rapid communication is important so that the bet takers can be kept currently informed of current odds. These predictions by the handicappers are subject to change and are influenced by such factors as the volume of betting on one side or the other, physical injury to a key athlete, the weather, and other variable factors.

A little-known fact was disclosed by the subcommittee hearings that shortly after the opening line (or early odds) the handicappers then consulted with well-known layoff betters who then would indicate what the odds line should be. In other words, the layoff bettors were setting the odds and not the handicappers so that bettors were deceived on the true probabilities of the results.

One result of unconcealed businesses of this type is corruption which almost inevitably accompanies illegal gambling. It is apparent that in many areas local authorities lack either the ability or the desire to stop illegal gambling. This corruption may also extend and has on occasion extended to attempting to influence the outcome of a sporting event. The subcommittee heard a young athlete from the University of Oregon, Michael Bruce, describe an approach made to him by Larry Rosenthal, a professional gambler, in which Rosenthal asked Bruce, in return for a payment of $5,000, to influence the result of a football game between the University of Oregon and the University of Michigan. Rosenthal invoked the fifth amendment. Michael Bruce was a young man of good character and so the bribe was not accepted. There is no way of knowing to what degree similar approaches have been made to young men of lesser moral character who succumbed to the temptation.

Another area in the field of gambling which the subcommittee explored was that of crooked gambling devices. The subcommittee was somewhat surprised to learn not only of some of the ingenious methods of fleecing innocent adventurers, but also to learn that the sale of these devices is not undercover, but out in the open; several companies actually put out brochures describing the various crooked dice, marked cards, and the like. One witness estimated that crooked dice were used in 1 crap game out of 20. Since in most cases gambling itself is illegal, the victim of a crooked gambling game, even if he knows he has been fleeced, is not likely to complain to authorities concerning it. Legislation has been introduced which would prohibit the interstate transportation of crooked gambling equipment.

CORRECTIVE ACTION

It is not always possible to point to any piece of legislation or even any administrative action resulting from the work of this subcommittee. However, during the past year certain changes have taken place which have resulted from the work of this subcommittee.

Government inquiries

The U.S. Navy has corrected the misunderstanding through which valuable contract files were destroyed in the past. These files are now being retained for any future recheck.

The U.S. Navy is also maintaining a closer scrutiny on its contracts and on the people who deal with the contracts, both Government employees and private contractors.

Several employees were permitted by the Navy to resign or retire, one employee was dismissed and numerous employees were reprimanded because of the nature of their relationship with private contractors.

The U.S. Navy has barred certain unethical contractors from participation in Navy contracts.

Two agents of the Internal Revenue Service who audited and approved the books of the ship repair contractors resigned while under investigation.

A certified public accountant, who took the fifth amendment concerning whether or not he bribed an agent of the Internal Revenue Service, resigned his enrollment to practice before the Treasury Department.

The Internal Revenue Service is investigating the income tax returns of several witnesses who appeared before this subcommittee because of indications of income tax violations.

Labor inquiries

In May 1961 after the subcommittee's missile hearings, there were 36 man-days lost compared to 11,614 man-days lost in May 1960. In June 1961 the man-days lost were 326 compared to 31,769 man-days lost in June 1960, or approximately 1 percent of the man-days lost during the same months of 1960 before our hearings. Thus the salutary effect of our hearings is clearly demonstrated both in the tremendous savings in prevention of loss of time in the urgent need to get our missiles into operation and the financial savings resulting from a cutdown of work stoppages representing millions of dollars.

As an outgrowth of the disclosures of this subcommittee, the President formed the Missile Sites Labor Commission with the Secretary of Labor as its Chairman. This Commission seeks to secure agreements short of labor stoppages at missile installations. We hope this corrects the deplorable situation which existed. The Commission must, however, depend on voluntary compliance by all the parties. These hearings have caused the chairman of the subcommittee to be somewhat skeptical of the wisdom of relying solely on voluntary compliance in this area and so he has introduced a bill which, if enacted into law, will prohibit strikes at vital defense installations.

The continuing problems of unions in the transportation industry and the alarming tendency for them to join forces constitute a threat to our whole economy. In an effort to cope with this situation the chairman of the subcommittee has also introduced a bill, which, if enacted into law, will bring unions in the transportation industry under existing antitrust legislation.

In addition to this the chairman has introduced an amendment to the Landrum-Griffin Act adding certain violations of law to those already in the act, the violation of which would render a person ineligible for union office for 5 years. We believe that would further help to remove unsavory elements from influential union office.

The subcommittee's hearings on the missile program revealed that the lack of defined criteria as to what is, or is not, construction, under the Davis-Bacon Act was a major contributory factor to jurisdictional disputes between construction- and industrial-type unions which resulted in serious work stoppages.

After the commencement of the subcommittee's inquiry into this matter, the Secretary of Labor established a Missile Site Public Contracts Advisory Committee. This Committee under date of August 25, 1961, recommended certain standards for the application of the Davis-Bacon Act to missile sites construction. These recommendations are now being considered by the Secretary of Labor for final action. Several work stoppages have occurred on missile sites since this Committee was appointed as a result of jurisdictional disputes between construction and industrial unions. This is a matter of great importance and will be followed closely by the subcommittee.

Flowing from evidence developed by the subcommittee during hearings on James R. Hoffa and New York Local 239, an official of local 239 has been indicted under the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act. Evidence suggesting violations of other Federal criminal statutes has been turned over to the Department of Justice and is presently being studied.

Organized crime

Certain legislation was passed by Congress and signed by the President on subjects relating to the hearings before this subcommittee:

(a) Chapter 50, title 18 of the United States Code was amended by adding a prohibition against the interstate transportation of wagering information. Since this became law, most of the wire services which existed solely for the purpose of transmitting racing information have gone out of business. However, some, in the belief that they have found a loophole in the law, are continuing operations. Further study is needed to determine whether these loopholes can be closed.

(b) Chapter 95, title 18 of the United States Code was amended so as to add a prohibition against the interstate transportation of wagering paraphernalia. This prohibition does not apply to any such material which can be used legally under the laws of the State to which it is consigned. Here again further consideration need be given to whether this act needs tightening and the subcommittee chairman has introduced a bill which would prohibit the interstate transportation of crooked gambling equipment. We hope the Congress will act favorably on this bill during the current session.

(c) Chapter 95, title 18 of the United States Code was further amended so as to include a prohibition against the interstate and foreign travel or transportation in aid of racketeering enterprises.

FUTURE ACTION

With reference to the plans of the subcommittee for the coming year, it may be said in general terms that we plan to continue the surveillance of Government agencies as we have in the past.

There is an urgent need for continuous scrutiny of improper activities in the labor or management field. The subcommittee is maintaining a continuing study of the missile labor and production problems and is exploring reports of grossly excessive profits being made by contracting firms in the missile field. The subcommittee also plans to inquire into certain improprieties which have been reported to us of certain unions in the entertainment field.

The subcommittee also plans to inquire more deeply into the field of organized crime and the subcommittee staff is making preliminary studies on this general subject with particular emphasis on the problems growing out of addiction to narcotics and international criminal syndicate operations of worldwide narcotics rings which are the means of furnishing addicts with a continuing supply of drugs.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman.

SENATE PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Financial statement of authority of S. Res. 69

Authorization under S. Res. 69, 1st sess., 87th Cong	$390,000.00
Expenditures:	
Salaries	269,535.70
Contract (accounting)	3,739.46
Per diem (investigators)	8,176.00
Travel (investigators)	13,775.91
Recording proceedings	2,111.21
Witness fees	5,949.00
Witness travel	14,147.24
Office supplies	762.91
Telephone and telegraph	8,337.23
Postage	123.35
Documents	579.40
Miscellaneous	247.94
Subtotal	327,485.35
Estimated expense and unpaid bills for December not yet received	32,200.00
Total	359,685.35
Unexpended balance	30,314.65
Total	390,000.00

Budget

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
PROFESSIONAL STAFF					
General counsel	1	$8,760	$17,438.57	$1,453.21	$17,438.57
Acting chief counsel	1	8,400	16,805.88	1,400.49	16,805.88
Chief counsel to minority	1	8,040	16,173.19	1,347.76	16,173.19
Assistant counsel	7	8,040	16,173.19	1,347.76	16,173.19
		8,000	16,102.90	1,341.90	16,102.90
		7,680	15,540.51	1,295.04	15,540.51
		7,200	14,696.93	1,225.66	14,696.93
		7,080	14,486.03	1,207.16	14,486.03
		7,080	14,486.03	1,207.16	14,486.03
		6,300	8,615.22	717.93	8,615.22
Investigators	5	8,000	16,102.90	1,341.90	16,102.90
		7,200	14,696.93	1,225.66	14,696.93
		7,080	14,486.03	1,207.16	14,486.03
		6,960	14,275.15	1,189.59	14,275.15
		6,120	12,798.87	1,066.57	12,798.87
Subtotal					222,878.33
CLERICAL STAFF					
Chief clerk	1	4,740	10,292.28	857.69	10,292.28
File clerk	1	3,840	8,482.43	706.86	8,482.43
Staff editor	1	3,360	7,510.31	625.85	7,510.31
Assistant clerk	1	3,120	7,024.25	585.35	7,024.25
Stenographers	5	3,120	7,024.25	585.35	7,024.25
		3,060	6,902.74	575.22	6,902.74
		3,060	6,902.74	575.22	6,902.74
		3,000	6,781.22	565.10	6,781.22
		2,820	6,416.65	534.72	6,416.65
Clerk-typist	1	2,400	5,566.05	463.83	5,566.05
Research assistant	1	3,120	7,024.25	585.35	7,024.25
Subtotal	26				79,927.17
Total					302,805.50
ADMINISTRATIVE					
Contribution to civil service retirement fund					18,511.68
Contribution to Government insurance					875.44
Contribution to health insurance					1,307.38
Travel and per diem, investigators					25,000.00
Accounting firm					12,000.00
Recording proceedings					2,800.00
Witness fees and travel					25,000.00
Office supplies and postage					1,100.00
Telephone and telegraph					9,600.00
Documents and miscellaneous					1,000.00
Total					97,194.50
Total budget					400,000.00

ADDITIONAL TEMPORARY STAFF FOR COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1105, Senate Resolution 252.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 252) authorizing the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to employ temporarily an additional assistant chief clerk and additional staff personnel.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 252) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is authorized from February 1, 1962, through January 31, 1963, to employ one additional assistant chief clerk, six additional professional staff members, and eight additional clerical assistants to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with section 202(e), as amended, of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and the provisions of Public Law 4, Eightieth Congress, approved February 19, 1947, as amended.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1136), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND
PUBLIC WELFARE,
January 19, 1962.

Re: Senate Resolution 252 (87th Cong., 2d sess.).

To: Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD, chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration.

From: Hon. LISTER HILL, chairman, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

On January 18, 1962, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare unanimously ordered reported a resolution extending for 1 year the authority of the committee to employ certain temporary professional staff members and clerical assistants in addition to those authorized under the Legislative Reorganization Act. This resolution, Senate Resolution 252, has been referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Under the terms of this resolution, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare would receive renewed authority—

(1) To continue the employment of four additional clerical assistants whose positions were first approved by your committee and by the Senate 9 years ago, by Senate Resolution 37, 1st session of the 83d Congress, and subsequently by Senate Resolution 186 of the 2d session of the 83d Congress, by Senate Resolution 34 of the 1st session of the 84th Congress, by Senate Resolution 194 of the 2d session of the 84th Congress, by Senate Resolution 75 of the 1st session of the 85th Congress, by Senate Resolution 254 of the 2d session of the 85th Congress, by Senate Resolution 49 of the 1st session of the 86th Congress, by Senate Resolution 265 of the 2d Session of the 86th Congress, and by Senate Resolution 70 of the 1st session of the 87th Congress.

Thus, these positions have been authorized on nine occasions during the last 9 years.

In addition, the pending resolution continues one other clerical position, which was originally authorized under Senate Resolution 49 of the 1st session of the 86th Congress, continued by Senate Resolution 265 of the 2d session of the 86th Congress, and by Senate Resolution 70 of the present Congress.

(2) To continue the employment of four temporary professional staff members, and of two clerical assistants, whose positions were first authorized by Senate Resolution 101 of the 1st session of the 85th Congress, and continued under Senate Resolution 253 of the 2d session of the 85th Congress, by Senate Resolution 44 and Senate Res-

olution 265 of the 1st and 2d sessions, respectively, of the 86th Congress, and by Senate Resolution 70 of the 1st session of the 87th Congress.

(3) To continue the employment of one additional assistant chief clerk, two additional professional staff members, and one additional clerical assistant, all of whose positions originally were authorized in the 2d session of the 86th Congress by Senate Resolution 265, and continued during the 1st session of the present Congress under Senate Resolution 70.

Thus, the pending resolution, Senate Resolution 252, would merely continue the authority hitherto granted the committee by the Senate to continue the following additional staff positions: One assistant chief clerk, six professional staff members, and eight clerical assistants.

In previous memorandums submitted to the Committee on Rules and Administration in support of Senate Resolutions 49 and 265 of the 1st and 2d sessions of the 86th Congress, respectively, and of the 1st session of the present Congress, there has been set forth the justification for all these positions. The committee's need for continuing this authority is as great as at any time in past years. The facts set forth below strongly suggest the need may be greater than ever before.

As my memorandum of February 8, 1960, concerning Senate Resolution 265, and my last year's memorandum, concerning Senate Resolution 70, indicated, two of the additional professional staff members will continue to have as their primary responsibility the exercise of legislative oversight functions in connection with the administration of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 (Public Law 86-257, approved Sept. 14, 1959), and the other four professional staff positions authorized will be filled, as needed, with staff members charged with legislative duties in the fields of labor, education, veterans' affairs, manpower, and railroad retirement.

As earlier memorandums have repeatedly pointed out, it is the policy of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to fill authorized positions only as the workload of the committee requires it, and to engage personnel only for those periods of time that they are actually needed. In the past session, as in previous sessions, several of the professional and clerical positions authorized by special resolutions were vacant for various periods of time. Because of its considerable experience operating under this type of resolution, the committee is convinced that it is more economically and efficiently served by having authority to employ a number of temporary staff members above the statutory limitation instead of seeking a dollar amount to be used for general purposes.

If Senate Resolution 252 is approved, the committee intends to employ professional staff members at a basic annual rate not in excess of $8,000, and clerical assistants at a base annual rate not to exceed $3,720.

I am enclosing herewith a letter addressed to you by the Honorable BARRY GOLDWATER, ranking minority member of this committee, expressing his endorsement of the pending resolution.

On behalf of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, may I express the hope that your committee will give early and favorable consideration to Senate Resolution 252.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON LABOR
AND PUBLIC WELFARE,
January 18, 1962.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MIKE: I have read the memorandum sent to you by Senator LISTER HILL expressing the hope that your committee will give early and favorable consideration to Senate Resolution 252 providing for temporary employment by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of certain professional staff members and clerical assistants.

I fully support the resolution and join Senator HILL in his request.

Sincerely,

BARRY GOLDWATER.

STUDY OF ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1106.

The motion was agreed to; and the resolution (S. Res. 256) to study administrative practice and procedure was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to make a full and complete study and investigation of administrative practice and procedure within the departments and agencies of the United States in the exercise of their rulemaking, licensing, and adjudicatory functions, including a study of the effectiveness of the Administrative Procedure Act, with a view to determining whether additional legislation is required to provide for the fair, impartial, and effective performance of such functions.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1962, to January 31, 1963, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1963.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $115,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1137), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

Mr. ELLENDER. In each case I wish to have the proposed budget also printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
January 22, 1962.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am enclosing the budget which was approved by the Committee on the Judiciary, at its meeting on January 18, 1962, for the work of the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure.

The committee authorized the reporting to the Senate of an original resolution, Senate Resolution 256, to provide the amount of $115,000 for the work of the subcommittee from February 1, 1962, through January 31, 1963.

The program of the subcommittee is fully set forth in a letter to me from Hon. JOHN A. CARROLL, chairman of the subcommittee. I am forwarding this letter to you herewith with the proposed budget for the information of the Committee on Rules and Administration for consideration at its forthcoming meeting.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely,

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman.

U.S. SENATE, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, SUBCOMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE,
January 15, 1962.

Hon. JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Standing Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary presents herewith the attached budget, and the proposed resolution approving the sum of $115,000 for a continuing study and investigation of the laws of the United States, governing Federal administrative practice and procedure, and their application.

The subcommittee was originally formed pursuant to action taken by the Committee on the Judiciary at its organizational meeting of January 26, 1959, when it approved an original resolution appropriating the sum of $115,000 for the Standing Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure, of which I was designated chairman. This resolution was agreed to by the Senate, as Senate Resolution 61, on February 2, 1959. The subcommittee was continued pursuant to Senate Resolution 234, which was agreed to by the Senate on February 8, 1960, and Senate Resolution 51, agreed to by the Senate on January 31, 1961. These resolutions provided that the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, make a full and complete study and investigation of administrative practice and procedure within the departments and agencies of the United States in the exercise of their rulemaking, licensing, and adjudicatory functions, including a study of the effectiveness of the Administrative Procedure Act, with a view to determining whether additional legislation is required to provide for the fair, impartial, and effective performance of such functions.

It has long been the position of outstanding leaders in the fields of Government and law that there should be a standing subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary having authority over Federal agency practice and procedure of common application among the various departments and agencies of Government. The Committee on the Judiciary is aware that almost 16 years have elapsed since the enactment of the Administrative Procedure Act by the Congress on June 11, 1946 (60 Stat. 234, title 5, United States Code, secs. 1001-1111). The Judiciary Committee has recognized that there has been a growing need for thorough study and revision of that act and an intelligent determination as to what legislative proposals may best be considered by the Congress to bring that act up to date. Ten years of Senate consideration preceded the passage of the Administrative Procedure Act in 1946.

The subcommittee, with the aid of the staff, has been conducting studies and hearings which have resulted in certain legislative recommendations as a foundation for its continued operation. We have had outstanding witnesses present their views on the problems of the administrative process and many valuable suggestions have been made as to possible solutions. Pending in the subcommittee are several bills, some of which were the product of subcommittee hearings and recommendations. The Standing Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure continues to have the duty of conducting comprehensive factfinding and comparative hearings directed toward an examination of the basic fairness and efficiency of administrative agency proceedings.

Real progress has been made in collecting and evaluating essential information; but, in so large a field, this is but a substantial beginning to the solution of the major and complex problems in administrative practice and procedure facing the Federal Government.

The overall study and revision of the Administrative Procedure Act will necessitate the continued services of an adequate, competent technical staff to aid the subcommittee in carrying out its assigned duties.

In view of the magnitude of the task ahead, I urge the approval of the attached proposed budget for the subcommittee. The budget proposes only such amounts as will be necessary to provide the Congress with the information and ideas necessary for adequate legislation in this technical field.

Sincerely,

JOHN A. CARROLL,
Subcommittee Chairman.

Proposed budget, 1962—Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure

Position	Number	Annual salary (gross)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
STAFF				
Legal and investigative:				
Counsel and staff director	1	$16,102.90	$1,341.90	$16,102.90
Assistant counsel	2	32,205.80	2,683.80	32,205.80
Minority counsel	1	14,907.83	1,242.31	14,907.83
Administrative and clerical:				
Economist	1	14,907.83	1,242.31	14,907.83
Secretary	1	6,659.70	554.97	6,659 70
Stenographer	2	12,347.28	1,028.94	12,347.28
Total	8			97,131.34
ADMINISTRATIVE				
Contributions to civil service retirement fund, employees health benefit programs, group life insurance for Federal employees				6,313.54
Travel (inclusive of field investigations)				3,000.00
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)				4,200.00
Witness fees and expenses				2,250.00
Stationery and office supplies				750.00
Communications (telephone and telegraph)				750.00
Publications and documents				300.00
Contingent				305.12
Total				17,868.66
Grand total				115,000.00

STUDY OF REVISION AND CODIFICATION OF U.S. STATUTES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider Calendar No. 1107.

The motion was agreed to; and the resolution (S. Res. 257) to study revision and codification of the statutes of the United States, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to revision and codification of the statutes of the United States.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee from February 1, 1962, to January 31, 1963, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That if more than one counsel is employed, the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1963.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $26,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1138), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
January 18, 1962.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am enclosing the budget approved by the Committee on the Judiciary for work of the Standing Subcommittee on Revision and Codification for the period February 1, 1962, to January 31, 1963. The committee authorized reporting of an original resolution, Senate Resolution 257, to provide the amount of $26,000 for the work of the subcommittee during the period February 1, 1962, through January 31, 1963. This is the same amount of money agreed to by the Senate for the subcommittee last year.

Also enclosed for the information of the Committee on Rules and Administration in considering the resolution is a letter to me from the subcommittee chairman summarizing the proposed program, for the subcommittee.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely,

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman.

U.S. SENATE, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, SUBCOMMITTEE ON REVISION AND CODIFICATION,
January 16, 1962.

Hon. JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The members of the Standing Subcommittee on Revision and Codification have approved the following program and budget for the subcommittee's activities during the 2d session of the 87th Congress. Therefore, as subcommittee chairman, I should like to submit these plans for the draft resolution for the favorable consideration of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The new resolution which we are submitting proposes a budget of $26,000, the identical sum which was authorized last year, to cover legal and administrative expenses anticipated by the subcommittee during the period February 1, 1962, through January 31, 1963.

During the 1st session of the 87th Congress, the matters referred to the subcommittee were not as demanding as had been anticipated and as a result a full-time staff was not required. The entire expenditure by the subcommittee during the first session amounted to less than $6,000 and, accordingly, the remainder of the appropriation is being returned to the contingent fund of the Senate.

As you are aware, various titles of the United States Code have been codified in previous Congresses, and an examination of the titles in the code will reveal the great importance of such codification. The titles of the code thus far codified have been titles 1, 3, 4, 6, 9, 14, 17, 18, 28, 35, 10, 32, and 39. Such titles as "Civil and Criminal Code" and the laws relating to the armed services are included in this compilation.

As a general rule, codification bills originate in the House of Representatives, where the Subcommittee on Revision of the Laws of the Committee on the Judiciary and its staff process these pieces of legislation. They, in connection with publishing companies, bring the laws into the right categories and prepare the bill that is eventually to be the subject matter of the Congress. This work is so detailed that it oftentimes takes 3 or 4 years to codify a particular title. It can readily be seen that a project of this magnitude must carry a cutoff date for the laws which are to be codified, and that subsequent laws must then be taken care of by a so-called cleanup bill. The element of time then enters into the picture for the reason that when the bill has received approval of the House and has been sent to the Senate it almost of necessity must be passed in that Congress or the entire work on that legislation is for naught and must be commenced again in the next succeeding Congress. This causes a great deal of waste in the matter of time and expense. It also means that a great amount of work must be taken on faith because without a staff the Committee on the Judiciary does not have the facilities to recheck 4 or 5 years of work within a single session. When this is realized, it becomes apparent why a staff for this most important legislative function be provided for this subcommittee.

The subcommittee anticipates that during this session of the Congress codifications of the several titles of the code will be passed by the House of Representatives. Accordingly, it is expected that the subcommittee will take action on the following:

Title 37—Pay allowances of the Army, Navy, Air Force, etc.;

A bill to revise and codify the Canal Zone Code;

A "cleanup bill" to correct errors and other inaccuracies to titles 10 and 32 relating to the Armed Forces and National Guard; and

A further "cleanup bill" to title 39, relating to the postal service.

In view of the probability of increased activity by the subcommittee relating to the aforesaid, the subcommittee feels that its budgetary request is a modest one.

With all kind wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

Sam J. Ervin, Jr.,
Chairman.

Budget—Subcommittee on Revision and Codification of Statutes of the United States

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
STAFF					
Legal and investigative: Chief counsel	1	$8,000	$16,102.90	$1,341.91	$16,102.90
Administrative and clerical: Stenographer	1	3,000	6,781.22	565.10	6,781.22
Total	2				22,884.12
ADMINISTRATIVE					
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382, effective July 1, 1960)					162.00
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries paid)					1,487.47
Contribution to employees Federal employees group life insurance (27 cents per month per $1,000 coverage)					77.76
Travel (inclusive of field investigations)					840.69
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)					840.69
Witness fees, expenses					150.00
Stationery, office supplies					100.00
Communications (telephone, telegraph)					100.00
Newspapers, magazines, documents					50.00
Contingent fund					147.96
Total					3,115.88
Grand total					26,000.00

INVESTIGATE ANTITRUST AND MONOPOLY LAWS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider Calendar No. 1108.

The motion was agreed to; and the resolution (S. Res. 258) to investigate antitrust and monopoly laws of the United States was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to make a complete, comprehensive, and continuing study and investigation of unlawful restraints and monopolies, and of the antitrust and monopoly laws of the United States, their administration, interpretation, operation, enforcement, and effect, and to determine and from time to time redetermine the nature and extent of any legislation which may be necessary or desirable for—

(1) clarification of existing law to eliminate conflicts and uncertainties where necessary;

(2) improvement of the administration and enforcement of existing laws; and

(3) supplementation of existing law to provide any additional substantive, procedural, or organizational legislation which may be needed for the attainment of the fundamental objects of the laws and the efficient administration and enforcement thereof.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1962, to January 31, 1963, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1963.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $450,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 1139), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. Senate,
Committee on the Judiciary,
January 19, 1962.

Re: Senate Resolution 258.

Hon. Mike Mansfield,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: Submitted herewith is the budget approved by the Committee on the Judiciary on January 18, 1962, to cover the activities of the Standing Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly for the period February 1, 1962, to January 31, 1963, inclusive.

An original resolution (S. Res. 258) was reported favorably to the Senate January 18, 1962, providing the sum of $450,000 for the work of this subcommittee during the coming year. This budget is the same that the subcommittee operated under during the past year.

The subcommittee has been engaged in a continuing study and investigation of the application of the antitrust laws of the United States. In pursuance of this objective, the subcommittee's plans for the coming year are broad and comprehensive in scope and represent its planned effort to find an answer to the fundamental problems now confronted in the antitrust and monopoly field. The subcommittee will attempt to conclude its study of administered prices. It will continue its consideration of whether clarification and supplementation of existing antitrust laws are necessary in order to cope with the problem of high prices flowing from monopoly and lack of price competition.

The Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly has been diligent in carrying out its responsibilities in the field of antitrust law. In order that its work may be continued, I deem it most important that the resolution (S. Res. 258) to provide funds for the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly be approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

I am enclosing for the information of your committee a letter addressed to me from Senator Estes Kefauver, chairman of the Antitrust Subcommittee, which outlines in detail the proposed studies of that subcommittee.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

James O. Eastland,
Chairman.

U.S. Senate, Committee on the
Judiciary, Subcommittee on
Antitrust and Monopoly,
January 17, 1962.

Hon. James O. Eastland,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: The Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary today approved the following program, attached budget, and proposed resolution approving the sum of $450,000 for a continuing study and investigation of unlawful restraints and monopolies and of the antitrust and monopoly laws of the United States.

This subcommittee is vested with the responsibility for making continuing studies and investigations concerning the adequacy of our existing antitrust laws, the effectiveness of their enforcement, and the need, if any, for additional antitrust legislation. This is, indeed, a serious responsibility, for it relates directly to the protection and preservation of one of the basic aspects of our American philosophy of freedom—the free enterprise economic system. The benefits of competition in the marketplace are well proven. Competition gives the American citizenry a chance to buy at the lowest possible price commensurate with a fair return to the sellers; it gives a freedom to choose among products and services based on quality, experience, and appearance; it provides a yardstick for judging improvement, and, most important, an incentive for innovation and research for better things at lower cost.

In its dedication to this basic principle of competition in a free enterprise system, Congress has continued to support and promote the antitrust laws and the Federal Trade Commission Act as the basic means for safeguarding this system from undue restraints and monopolistic practices. To a very large extent these safeguards have worked well to eliminate the more predatory abuses. However, as the subcommittee's studies and investigations now show, there are new threats to competition and business freedom on the American scene, which, lacking the conventional cloak of conspiracy or monopolistic intent, are nevertheless equal to the old abuses in economic impact. We have found a continuing and persistent increase in the concentration of power in many basic industries during the past 10 years despite the strengthening of the Clayton Act, and the efforts of the Antitrust Division and the Federal Trade Commission to avert such a trend. We have observed evidences of monopoly power, both potential and exercised, in the hands of some of the giant companies which the enforcement agencies have apparently found difficult to attack in the light of the present law. We have demonstrated that in certain industries where concentration is high, prices have tended to be "administered." Manufacturers have held to uniform prices over a period of time rather than quote competitive prices which reflect constant changes in supply and demand. Competitors have tended to follow the leader in establishing price stability and uniformity. And, even in times of slackening demand or oversupply, little effort has been made by competitors to depart individually from the administratively maintained price.

In pointing up these serious problems which are affecting, and will continue to affect, our traditional system of free competition, we have fulfilled our informing function which, indeed, is an indispensable adjunct to the legislative process. Perhaps in no field has this function been more keenly felt and more effective in keeping the American people alerted to the possible threats to their freedom as businessmen and consumers and to keep the Congress apprised of the trends in restraint and monopoly.

This subcommittee will continue to concentrate on legislation designed to supplement and strengthen the antitrust laws, and to cope with the problems of enforcement which, according to representatives from the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission, are becoming increasingly complex.

An important adjunct to the legislative effort—and flowing out of it—is the function of informing the Congress and the public of the serious problems which are affecting our traditional system of free competition. Perhaps in no field has this function been more keenly felt than in keeping the American people alerted to the possible threats to their freedom as businessmen and consumers and in keeping the Congress apprised of the trends in restraint and monopoly.

During the year 1961 the activities of the subcommittee were many, varied, and significant. Among these were:

It completed its intensive investigative hearings into the causes of the basic lack of price competition among the larger drug manufacturers and of the high prices of so many widely used prescription drugs. It almost completed its legislative hearings on S. 1552, the Drug Industry Antitrust Act, a bill designed to correct some of the undesirable practices demonstrated by the earlier drug investigation.

It held hearings on and approved S. 167, legislation authorizing the Attorney General to compel production of documentary evidence in civil antitrust investigations by the Department of Justice. This bill, as amended, passed the Senate on September 21, 1961.

It considered and reported legislation dealing with certain antitrust aspects of organized team sports. H.R. 9096, which was almost identical with one bill before the subcommittee, was enacted into law.

It resumed extensive hearings into the electrical manufacturing industry which were begun in 1959, but which were recessed pending the outcome of the so-called Philadelphia cases. Of prime importance was the issue as to what additional legislation should be considered to prevent a recurrence of such broad-scale criminality and to place a greater duty for compliance with the law on those executives and managers ultimately responsible for the sales policies of their company. Separate hearings were held on several bills designed to accomplish these purposes. Also, a short hearing was held on electric motors, a branch of the electrical manufacturing industry which was not included in the Philadelphia cases.

It commenced (under the direction of Senator HART) an investigation into packaging and labeling practices.

It completed its second major insurance study: "Rates, Rating Organizations and State Rate Regulation," dealing primarily with fire and allied lines of insurance.

It completed its hearings on S. 1474, a bill designed to give the Attorney General the power to prevent the monopolization of professional boxing by racketeers. The bill is pending before the Judiciary Committee and it is hoped that consideration will be given to it, as well as to the solution suggested by Senator WILEY, in the near future. Meanwhile, the subcommittee is gratified to note some corrections in the situation have been made both by voluntary actions and by criminal convictions of some of the worst offenders.

In the course of the year the staff of the subcommittee has spent considerable time advising Senators and their constituents on a multitude of antitrust problems which arose.

It assisted a number of Senators in preparing material pointing up the necessity of holding the price line in steel and, at the same time, holding any increase of wages in the steel industry to that warranted by an increase in productivity. The subcommittee was gratified that no steel price increase took place in 1961.

PROGRAM FOR 1962

The subcommittee's plans for this year are again wide in scope and represent its planned effort to find an answer to the fundamental problems confronting our Nation's free enterprise economy.

(1) Foremost among these is the problem of administered prices, and the related problem of price leadership and "price fellowship." The subcommittee has considered in detail the pricing practices existing in the steel, automobile, asphalt roofing, bread, drug, and electrical machinery industries. Although the subcommittee has held three volumes of hearings on alternative public policies relating to this problem, it is felt that a new overall evaluation of the administered price and related phenomena should be made. In the very near future, the subcommittee hopes to hear a number of legal and economic experts who will have had a chance to study the testimony brought out in the previous industry-by-industry pricing hearings.

(2) In addition to these hearings which will be directed to the problem of public policy toward administered prices in industries which are highly concentrated, there is the additional problem of preventing further increases in concentration. The ability of the Clayton Act to accomplish its intended purpose of preventing monopoly before consummation has been seriously impaired by procedural difficulties which have arisen in the enforcement of that act. Thus the effectiveness of the 1950 Celler-Kefauver amendment to section 7 has been weakened by the extended delays in litigation, during which time the assets of the acquired company are scrambled and effective divestiture is made impossible. Delays of 5 years and more between the issuance of the complaint by the Federal Trade Commission and its decision have become commonplace. The record in cases brought by the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice is similar to that of the FTC. During the interval the plants of the acquired company may be torn down or greatly altered; its workers let go; its salesmen dismissed; its trade name and prestige disappear; and the prospects of reconstituting it in anything like the form which it resembled prior to acquisition may completely vanish. It is timely that the subcommittee give attention to further amendments to section 7 of the Clayton Act in order to prevent this continued frustration of congressional intent.

(3) A somewhat similar problem arises in the enforcement of section 2 of the Clayton Act directed at price discriminations that destroy competition. The hearings of this subcommittee, of the House Antitrust Subcommittee, and of the Senate and House Small Business Committees are replete with complaints by small businessmen of the delays involved in securing relief from unlawful price discriminations. They state that by the time the FTC can conduct its investigations, hold its hearings and frame an enforcible order, so much time has elapsed that the discrimination of which they complained has already done its damage and they have either been forced out of business or suffered irreparable economic damage. Some have testified that the time problem has become so serious that they no longer bother to complain to the FTC even if the price discrimination directed against them is of an extreme and clearly unlawful form. If Congress intends that small business be protected from unlawful price discriminations which are found to destroy competition, it should see to it that relief is provided in time to be of value to those whom it intends to protect.

Accordingly, part of the subcommittee's hearings will be directed toward the problems of the scrambling of the assets during the trial of section 7 cases and the destruction of small businesses through price discrimination during the trial of section 2 cases. It is hoped that out of these hearings there will be developed equitable and workable ways and means of giving to these important sections of the Clayton Act the force and effect originally intended by Congress.

(4) The subcommittee will also begin an examination of the problem to which still another part of the Clayton Act, section 8, is directed. This section provides that no person may at the same time be a director in two or more competing corporations engaged in interstate commerce, if any one of the two companies has capital, surplus, and undivided profits aggregating more than $1 million. The FTC in a comprehensive report, "Interlocking Directorates," issued in 1952, called attention to several loopholes and shortcomings of the act which have seriously impaired its effectiveness. Speaking of the rule of law applicable under the section, the Commission states: "The rule * * * leaves unchallenged interlocking directorates between corporations, both large and small, that have not been competitors in the past but might become so in the future; between corporations that are related to each other as seller and buyer; and between industrial and commercial corporations and financial institutions or common carriers. The reduction of competition that exists or has existed between relatively large interlocked corporations is the only danger that the rule seeks to avert.

"Moreover, this rule applies only to corporate interlocks that are brought about through common directors. It does not attempt or prevent directors of one corporation from being officers or large stockholders in another" (p. 10).

In 1951 the FTC proposed sweeping revisions to section 8 designed to broaden its scope and increase its effectiveness. In view of the increasing concentration of the economy, it is urgent that we reexamine section 8 to see if it is adequate in the present setting of a more complex and vastly expanded economy to achieve the original congressional objective in 1914. The subcommittee anticipates holding hearings on section 8, during which attention will be directed to the 1951 legislative recommendations of the FTC and to other proposals which may be advanced by the antitrust agencies and others.

(5) Another practice which might appropriately be the subject of a new and additional section of the Clayton Act is the abuse of power by large firms engaged in a variety of different and unrelated industries, i.e., the so-called conglomerate corporations. These corporations are frequently in the position of being able to finance onslaughts against their smaller single-line producers in competitive industries with monopoly profits made from highly concentrated industries in which they are also engaged. It is recognized to be one of the contributing causes of concentration, and it is one to which the Congress has never specifically directed its attention and for which no general rule of law has ever been established. In view of the growth of conglomerate corporations in recent years from mergers and other means, and also in view of new information on this subject now in the subcommittee's possession, it is hoped that the subcommittee will be able to hold hearings on the problem of the conglomerate corporation and its potential for the destruction of competition.

(6) In a joint undertaking with the Bureau of the Census, the subcommittee will issue a report on economic concentration based upon the 1958 Census of Manufactures. Although similar to a 1957 report based on the 1954 census data, the new report will contain a number of new and useful tabulations.

(7) It is expected that hearings on S. 1552, the proposed Drug Industry Antitrust Act, will be completed early in 1962, and action will be taken on the legislation without delay.

(8) The subcommittee will conduct studies and possibly hold hearings in two areas involving antitrust and foreign trade. One is a project which was authorized and begun in 1961 and which involves the declining U.S. share of foreign markets for certain products.

The second investigation concerns the European Common Market. The establishment of this economic unit may well be the most significant economic event in recent history and will have a direct bearing on the antitrust laws of our country. As part of their policy of trade liberalization, the member countries are now seeking to adopt and implement antitrust policies designed to insure that private restraints and abuses do not replace the tariffs and quotas soon to be abolished. Because the Common Market is America's single largest export market and foreign investment area, and because we have so many interests in common with the member countries, these emerging policies affect our most vital public and private interests. It is important for the subcommittee to study the antitrust law, policies, and practice in the Common Market in order to assess their possible effect upon the ability of American corporations to compete in the Common Market and other areas of the world. It will also study the general relationship between our antitrust laws and the liberalization of foreign trade.

Two of the most significant investigations of the subcommittee will be directed by Senators HART and DODD.

(9) The subcommittee, under Senator HART, will continue to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of the nature and extent of trade and commercial practices affecting consumers in a manner which tends or may tend to restrain competition in interstate and foreign commerce, with particular reference to deceptive, misleading, fraudulent or unfair practices in the production, processing, packaging, labeling, branding, advertising, statement of prices and other conditions of sale, marketing and furnishing of goods and services to consumers.

(10) Senator DODD has accepted the responsibility of carrying forward the investigation of the insurance industry which was carried on for several years by Senator O'Mahoney. The next area of investigation will be surplus line insurance which presents a number of serious problems. For example, is the American insurance industry noncompetitive with British firms in excess coverage and if so, why? This, and other questions, will be considered at hearings in 1962. If time permits, the subcommittee may begin a study of the mail-order insurance business and its regulation under the McCarran Act.

(11) The subcommittee is nearing completion on hearings on five bills (S. 996, S. 2252, S. 2253, S. 2254, and S. 2255) designed to strengthen penalties for and provide other deterrents against antitrust violations. These bills were drafted and introduced as a result of the shocking situation which was revealed in the electrical manufacturing industry. It is anticipated that the subcommittee will take action on these bills early in 1962.

(12) As a part of the program for 1961, a staff study was made of the hearing aid industry. This study grew out of a large number of complaints received by the subcommittee with respect to lack of competition and unduly high prices in this industry. There is every likelihood that the subcommittee will hold a brief hearing on this industry at an early date.

(13) The subcommittee continues to receive an unusual number of complaints concerning practices in certain industries, including the basic metals industries, the electrical machinery industry, the transportation industry, the poultry industry, the meatpacking industry, and others. The subcommittee will continue to keep a close watch on developments in these industries.

In addition to the hearings held on legislation heretofore referred to, it is possible that the President will send to the Congress legislative proposals within the purview of the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee. It is also most likely that Members of the Senate will introduce such legislation. In the event of either of these occurrences, the subcommittee may schedule hearings for consideration of such measures.

It is contemplated that the subcommittee staff will be called upon to submit monographs and studies on various subjects of importance in the field of antitrust and monopoly.

The proposed budget, which is attached for the information of the Committee on the Judiciary, is the same budget upon which the subcommittee is presently operating. Accordingly, the program, attached budget, and proposed resolution are submitted with the recommendation that they be approved.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely,

ESTES KEFAUVER,
Chairman.

Budget—Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee

Position	Number	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
STAFF				
Legal and investigative:				
Staff director	1	$16,173.19	$1,347.76	$16,173.19
Counsel	2	16,102.90	1,341.90	32,205.80
Minority counsel	1	16,102.90	1,341.90	16,102.90
	1	14,275.15	1,189.59	14,275.15
	1	13,537.00	1,128.08	13,537.00
Assistant counsel	1	15,435.06	1,286.25	15,435.06
	1	13,009.76	1,084.14	13,009.76
	1	12,904.32	1,075.36	12,904.32
	1	12,587.99	1,048.99	12,587.99
	2	11,428.05	952.33	22,856.10
	1	10,756.25	896.35	10,756.25
	1	10,640.27	886.68	10,640.27
	1	9,090.01	757.50	9,090.01
Attorney	1	12,271.64	1,022.63	12,271.64
Chief economist	1	16,102.90	1,341.90	16,102.90
Economist	1	15,118.71	1,259.89	15,118.71
	1	14,802.38	1,233.53	14,802.38
Editorial and research:				
Editorial director	1	12,693.43	1,022.63	12,693.43
Assistant editorial director	1	11,638.94	969.91	11,638.94
Administrative and clerical:				
Clerk	1	7,996.37	666.36	7,996.37
Special assistant to staff director	1	7,996.37	666.36	7,996.37
Records clerk	1	6,920.74	575.22	6,902.74
Stenographers	2	6,781.22	565.10	13,562.44
	1	6,295.16	524.59	6,295.16
Stenographer (minority)	1	6,052.11	504.34	6,052.11
Stenographer	3	5,930.60	494.21	17,791.80
	1	5,566.05	463.83	5,566.05
	2	5,097.97	423.33	10,194.94
Telephone operator	1	4,593.92	382.82	4,593.92
Messenger	1	3,303.10	275.25	3,303.10
Temporary, when actually employed	3			7,500.00
Total	39			379,956.77
ADMINISTRATIVE				
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382, effective July 1, 1960)				2,500.00
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries paid)				24,697.19
Contribution to employees Federal employees group life insurance (27 cents per month per $1,000 coverage)				1,500.00
Reimbursable payments to agencies				1,000.00
Travel (inclusive of field investigations)				23,000.00
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)				2,000.00
Witness fees, expenses				6,500.00
Stationery, office supplies				2,500.00
Communications (telephone, telegraph)				3,500.00
Newspapers, magazines, documents				1,500.00
Contingent fund				1,346.04
Total				70,043.23
Grand total				450,000.00

STUDY OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider Calendar No. 1109.

The motion was agreed to; and the resolution (S. Res. 259) authorizing a study of matters pertaining to constitutional amendments was considered and agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF WELFARE AND PENSION PLANS AND DISCLOSURE ACT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The hour of 1 o'clock has arrived, and the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 2520) to amend the Welfare and Pension Plans and Disclosure Act with respect to the method of enforcement and to provide certain additional sanctions, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business and also the unanimous-consent agreement be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed with consideration of the so-called money resolutions.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

STUDY OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. No business is pending at this time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I believe the Senate was considering Calendar No. 1109, Senate Resolution 259.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That resolution has been agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, before it was agreed to, I was on my feet, addressing the Chair, and seeking recognition. I object to the resolution.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which Senate Resolution 259 was agreed to be reconsidered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is on agreeing to Senate Resolution 259.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I notice that the amount requested reflects an increase of $16,500 over last year's appropriation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I understand that the reason for that amount is to allow for the employment of a minority counsel.

Mr. ELLENDER. So in this instance it is proposed that $16,500 be spent to accommodate the minority. What has the subcommittee done in the last 12 months with the money it had, and why is it necessary to provide $16,500 in order to employ a minority counsel? Does not the subcommittee already have sufficient staff?

Mr. MANSFIELD. This subcommittee has been an extremely busy one. It has to handle constitutional questions of all kinds, and it already has reported favorably on various proposals having to do with residence requirements for voting in presidential elections, as well as other measures.

Other subjects being studied by the staff, and which should be considered during the second session of this Congress, include Presidential inability, State taxation of nonresidents' income, equal rights for women, and apportionment of representation in State legislatures, among others.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that the subcommittee deals with constitutional amendments only. In other words, under the resolution that is all the subcommittee is supposed to consider.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct; but perhaps the work of the subcommittee has been spread out a little.

Mr. ELLENDER. But the purpose of providing $16,500 is merely to put another lawyer on the committee staff, to satisfy the minority. That is the only purpose, and I think it is shameful.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to Senate Resolution 259.

The resolution was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to constitutional amendments.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1962, to January 31, 1963, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1963.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $48,500, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 1140), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. Senate,
Committee on the Judiciary,
January 19, 1962.

Re Senate Resolution 259.
Hon. Mike Mansfield,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: I am enclosing the budget which was approved today by the Committee on the Judiciary for the activities of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments for the period from February 1, 1962, to January 31, 1963. The committee authorized the report to the Senate of an original resolution, Senate Resolution 259, to provide $48,500 for the work of the subcommittee during this period.

I am also enclosing a letter to me from the Honorable Estes Kefauver, chairman of the subcommittee, setting forth its program and activities and the justification for the proposed budget.

Sincerely yours,
James O. Eastland,
Chairman.

U.S. Senate, Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments,
January 19, 1962.

Hon. James O. Eastland,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: Enclosed is a draft Senate resolution and budget to continue the operation of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments and its staff until January 31, 1963.

This subcommittee has been quite active thus far during the 87th Congress. Forty-three Senate joint resolutions proposing amendments to the Constitution have been referred to it. A comprehensive series of hearings was held on 25 resolutions concerning our Federal elections system. These involve qualifications for voting and the method of nominating and electing the President and Vice President. The printed record of these hearings reached 5 volumes of 952 pages.

The subcommittee has already reported favorably a proposed amendment concerning residence requirements for voting in presidential elections. Proposals concerning presidential primaries, the electoral college, 18-year-old voting and poll taxes are still pending before the subcommittee and I expect it to act on them early in the second session. The subcommittee staff prepared a detailed analysis of the operation and effects of proposed amendments on the electoral college. It was published as a Judiciary Committee print and is extremely helpful in the evaluation and study of the principal proposals in this area.

The subcommittee also reported favorably an amendment which would authorize State Governors to make temporary appointments of Members of the House of Representatives whenever one-third of the House seats are vacant.

The past year also witnessed the successful climax of previous activities of the subcommittee. On March 29, 1961, ratification of the 23d amendment to the Constitution was completed, thus giving the District of Columbia a vote in presidential elections.

Other subjects which are being studied by the staff and which should be considered during the second session include presidential inability, State taxation of nonresidents' income, equal rights for women, and apportionment of representation in State legislatures.

The budget request is the same as that for last year except for the addition of funds for a minority counsel. The minority's request for representation on the staff seems reasonable. The subcommittee's work increasingly involves subjects concerning election procedures, voting qualifications, governmental functions, and other matters of considerable importance to each political party. Otherwise, we plan to continue the present staff arrangement of a chief counsel and a chief clerk. It will probably be necessary again to employ additional temporary secretarial and technical help from time to time, and provision for this is again made.

In my view, the budget is very modest considering the important legislation which is assigned to the subcommittee.

Sincerely yours,

ESTES KEFAUVER,
Chairman.

Budget—Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
STAFF					
Legal and investigative:					
Chief counsel	1	$8,040	$16,173.19	$1,347.76	$16,173.19
Minority counsel	1	7,260	14,802.38	1,233.53	14,802.38
Administrative and clerical: Chief clerk	1	3,240	7,267.26	605.60	7,267.26
Total	3				38,242.83
ADMINISTRATIVE					
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382, effective July 1, 1960)					150.00
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries paid)					2,485.78
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)					1,400.00
Witness fees, expenses					300.00
Stationery, office supplies					200.00
Communications (telephone, telegraph)					300.00
Newspapers, magazines, documents					150.00
Contingent fund					771.39
Temporary clerical and technical assistance					4,500.00
Total					10,257.17
Grand total					48,500.00

INVESTIGATION OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1110.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 260) to investigate matters pertaining to constitutional rights.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let me ask what work has been done by this subcommittee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think we shall hear on this matter from the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I should like to state, first of all, that the subcommittee is returning unspent approximately $23,000 of its appropriation for last year. The subcommittee was able to do this simply because each year the Smith-Richardson Foundation sends to Washington two law school graduates with very brilliant records to work with Congress; and during the past year the subcommittee had the good fortune to have both of the recipients of the foundation's awards assigned to our subcommittee, to work with us on constitutional problems.

This subcommittee has done a tremendous amount of work. It has had a number of bills and resolutions referred to it, and has reported some of them to the parent committee. It has investigated some of the most troublesome angles of constitutional law. Among the bills and resolutions reported by it to the full committee is proposed legislation dealing with the field of wiretapping. It has also conducted extensive investigations into the constitutional rights of the mentally ill and of the American Indians. These investigations covered some 16 days of public hearings, and built up very fine records in these fields of constitutional law, and have culminated in the drafting of proposed legislation relating to the constitutional rights of the mentally ill. We are now entering an inquiry into the constitutional rights of persons subject to military jurisdiction.

The subcommittee has had referred to it virtually all of the civil rights bills introduced in the Senate; and we expect to hold, very shortly, extensive hearings on the bill introduced by the distinguished majority leader, which relates to literacy tests for voters, and also on other bills on the same subject introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and cosponsored by his colleague [Mr. KEATING]. In fact, I do not know of any subcommittee that works harder than does this subcommittee.

In addition to these things the subcommittee is called on from time to time during the course of the year to make studies in the field of constitutional rights for the benefit of Members of the Senate, and to answer numerous letters from private individuals who ask questions about constitutional rights.

Mr. ELLENDER. But I ask, Of what avail is all that work? Is the subcommittee some kind of a court?

Mr. ERVIN. This work is of importance because it is the subcommittee, authorized by the Senate to hold investigations, to determine whether further legislation is necessary in order to protect the existing constitutional rights of Americans.

Mr. ELLENDER. How much legislation of that sort has been passed by Congress since the subcommittee has been established?

Mr. ERVIN. I cannot undertake to inform the Senate about that, because I have been chairman of the subcommittee only a short time. I became chairman of the subcommittee last February, and had to spend some weeks to reorganize the subcommittee. Since that time the subcommittee has considered some of the most troublesome problems in the constitutional field, wiretapping, for example. Not only has the committee passed on bills which relate to constitutional rights in connection with wiretapping, but by the consent of the parent committee the subcommittee has been dealing with this subject generally, and has studied bills of a general nature in this area. One of them has been reported from the subcommittee to the full committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. When the subcommittee holds its hearings, does the parent committee also hold hearings on the same subject?

Mr. ERVIN. No.

I may add that we were requested by the members of the bar of the District of Columbia to conduct investigations into the constitutional validity of the statute which provides for the mandatory commitment of persons adjudged in the courts of the District of Columbia not guilty because of insanity. Pursuant to that request we have conducted investigations in that field, and have in preparation proposed legislation to deal with that problem.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to Senate Resolution 260.

The resolution was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to constitutional rights.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1962, to January 31, 1963, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1963.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $140,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1141), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I join in the request; I wish to have an excerpt from the committee report printed in the RECORD, in further answer to the inquiry made by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
January 19, 1962.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am enclosing the budget approved by the Committee on the Judiciary for work of the standing Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights for the period February 1, 1962 to January 31, 1963. The committee authorized reporting of an original resolution, Senate Resolution 260, to provide the amount of $140,000 for the work of the subcommittee during the period February 1, 1962 through January 31, 1963. This is the same amount of money agreed to by the Senate for the subcommittee last year.

Also enclosed for the information of the Committee on Rules and Administration in considering the resolution is a letter to me from the subcommittee chairman summarizing the proposed program for the subcommittee.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely,

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON
CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS,
January 16, 1962.

Hon. JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Members of the standing Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights have approved the following program and budget for the subcommittee's activities in the 2d session of the 87th Congress. As subcommittee chairman, I should, therefore, like to submit these plans, with a draft resolution, for the favorable consideration of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The new resolution which we are submitting proposes a sum of $140,000, the same amount authorized last year, to cover legal, investigative, and administrative expenses anticipated by the subcommittee in its study of matters pertaining to constitutional rights during the period from February 1, 1962, through January 31, 1963.

It is my belief that this amount is amply justified in the light of the subcommittee's activities during the past year, as described in our annual report, and in view of our proposed agenda for this session.

In the past year, the subcommittee has conducted 16 days of public hearings to consider: the rights of the mentally ill in civil and criminal cases; wiretapping and eavesdropping legislation; executive nominations for membership on the Civil Rights Commission; and the constitutional rights of the American Indian. Nineteen bills and three executive nominations were received by the subcommittee for consideration. In addition, we have, through investigation and research, examined problems involving the constitutional rights of persons subject to military jurisdiction; legal aid to indigent defendants; the right to petition Congress and secrecy in Government; and constitutional rights in criminal procedure and the administration of criminal justice. Through field trips in furtherance of these various studies, representatives of the subcommittee have attended and reported on several informative conferences and meetings. The subcommittee has also rendered assistance when requested to numerous congressional offices on matters which posed constitutional rights problems.

The proposed agenda for this session provides for a study of significant areas of constitutional law which stand in vital need of examination by the Congress. At the present rate of expenses, the proposed budget should permit the subcommittee, in addition to dealing with legislation referred to it, to continue its work on the following subjects:

(1) "The constitutional rights of the American Indian": This is a long-neglected area of law in which the subcommittee feels it has made, and can continue to make, a very real contribution. The study would continue to encompass a review of Federal laws and regulations affecting Indian citizens; the administration of law and order for Indians by Federal, State, and tribal governments; the status of constitutional rights under the tribal court system; and the extent to which the wardship status of Indians might conflict with citizenship rights under the Constitution.

(2) "The constitutional rights of persons subject to military jurisdiction": Hundreds of complaints have been received and analyzed, and considerable preliminary research and consultation carried out in the initial phase of this study. It will focus on the extent to which due process of law is being observed in the Armed Forces, and will place special emphasis on the administration of the Uniform Code of Military Justice, and on complaints that administrative discharges and other procedures are being used to bypass congressional intent in enacting the code, and to deprive servicemen of basic rights.

(3) "Constitutional rights and the administration of criminal justice": In this study, the subcommittee is attempting to determine how effectively constitutional rights are protected in Federal criminal trials. The study will concentrate on the operation of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, and deal with such problems as venue, excessive bail, arrest, and interrogation, double jeopardy, right to counsel, and discovery procedures. Fourth amendment problems involving search and seizure will also be examined.

(4) "Citizenship": The rights, privileges, and duties of American citizenship is another significant area of the law which the subcommittee plans to continue to examine. Emphasis will be placed on constitutional rights issues arising through loss of citizenship and of citizenship rights.

(5) "Rights of the mentally ill": The subcommittee will also continue its study of problems relating to the rights of the mentally ill in civil and criminal cases. We hope to consider the feasibility of remedial legislation designed to deal with some of the problems highlighted by the subcommittee's hearings in this field during the last session.

In all of these areas, it is the intent of the subcommittee to determine whether there is a need for remedial legislation and to recommend it where measures appear necessary for the further safeguarding of rights arising under the Constitution. In view of the importance to every citizen of the subcommittee's work on these problems, I request, on behalf of the subcommittee, that our program and budget for 1962 be approved.

With all kind wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

SAM J. ERVIN, Jr.,
Chairman.

Budget—Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
STAFF					
Legal and investigative:					
Chief counsel and staff director	1	$8,040	$16,173.19	$1,347.76	$16,173.19
Minority counsel	1	6,720	13,853.35	1,154.44	13,853.35
Counsel	1	5,700	12,060.74	1,005.06	12,060.74
Assistant counsel	2	3,600	7,996.37	666.36	15,992.74
Editorial and research:					
Research assistant	1	2,640	6,052.11	504.34	6,052.11
Professional staff members	3	3,720	8,239.40	686.61	24,718.20
Administrative and clerical:					
Chief clerk	1	3,720	8,239.40	686.61	8,239.40
Assistant clerk (secretary to director)	1	3,420	7,631.82	635.98	7,631.82
Stenographer	2	2,580	5,930.00	494.21	11,861.20
Total	13				116,582.75
ADMINISTRATIVE					
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382, effective July 1, 1960)					1,053.00
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries paid)					7,577.88
Contribution to employees Federal employees group life insurance (27 cents per month per $1,000 coverage)					398.52
Travel (inclusive of field investigations)					6,000.00
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)					4,300.00
Witness fees, expenses					2,000.00
Stationery, office supplies					600.00
Communications (telephone, telegraph)					800.00
Newspapers, magazines, documents					500.00
Contingent fund					187.85
Total					24,417.25
Grand total					140,000.00

GOVERNMENT CHARTERS, HOLIDAYS, AND CELEBRATIONS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider Calendar No. 1111.

The motion was agreed to; and the resolution (S. Res. 261) to consider matters pertaining to Government charters, holidays, and celebrations was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to consider all matters pertaining to Federal charters, holidays, and celebrations.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1962, to January 31, 1963, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $7,500, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 1142), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. Senate,
Committee on the Judiciary,
January 18, 1962.

Re Senate Resolution 261.
Hon. Mike Mansfield,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: I am enclosing a copy of an original resolution for the standing Subcommittee on Federal Charters, Holidays, and Celebrations, which has been approved by the Committee on the Judiciary.

The number of legislative proposals referred to this standing subcommittee has become increasingly greater year after year to the extent that the activities of this subcommittee require the services of a clerical assistant for the subcommittee. The committee, therefore, has approved the sum of $7,500 in order to afford one clerical assistant for this subcommittee.

I believe it most appropriate that this resolution to provide modest funds for the Subcommittee on Federal Charters, Holidays, and Celebrations should be approved by the Senate at an early date.

With kindest regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,
James O. Eastland,
Chairman.

U.S. Senate,
Committee on the Judiciary,
January 18, 1962.

Hon. James O. Eastland,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: During the 1st session of the 87th Congress, Senate Resolution 75, agreed to February 13, 1961, appropriated the sum of $7,500 for the operation of the standing Subcommittee on Federal Charters, Holidays, and Celebrations.

Upon the basis of the subcommittee's activities of the past year, I urge favorable consideration of an original resolution appropriating $7,500 for the Subcommittee on Federal Charters, Holidays, and Celebrations for the 2d session of the 87th Congress.

I deem it most appropriate that this resolution be speedily approved.

With kindest regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,
Evérett McKinley Dirksen,
Subcommittee Chairman.

Budget—Federal charters, holidays, and celebrations

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
STAFF					
Clerk	1	$2,700	$6,173.64	$514.47	$6,173.64
Total	1				6,173.64
ADMINISTRATIVE					
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382, effective July 1, 1960)					47.28
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries paid)					411.28
Contribution to employees Federal employees group life insurance (27 cents per month per $1,000 coverage)					22.80
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)					845.00
Total					1,326.36
Grand total					7,500.00

STUDY OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1113, Senate Resolution 263.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A resolution (S. Res. 263) to study matters pertaining to immigration and naturalization.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to immigration and naturalization.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1962, to January 31, 1963, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1963.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $125,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 1144), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. Senate,
Committee on the Judiciary,
January 19, 1962.

Re Senate Resolution 263.
Hon. Mike Mansfield,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: May I respectfully call to your attention an original resolution (S. Res. 263) which was approved by the Committee on the Judiciary on January 18, 1962, and which is now pending before the Committee on Rules and Administration. This resolution provides funds to the committee to the extent of $125,000 for the period beginning February 1, 1962, and ending January 31, 1963, which funds are needed primarily to maintain the Standing Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization. I am submitting herewith a copy of the resolution, as reported, and a proposed budget in connection with the resolution.

The expenditure of funds contemplated under this resolution is made necessary by the continuing heavy workload of the subcommittee which may be attributed to the large number of private immigration bills and adjustment-of-status cases which are referred to the subcommittee; the numerous general immigration and nationality bills referred to the subcommittee for action; the large number of cases referred to the subcommittee in which the Attorney General has exercised his discretionary authority to waive certain provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act which are required to be submitted to the Congress; the many cases referred to the subcommittee in which the Attorney General has exercised his special authority to parole into the United States certain refugee-escapees and in connection with which he must submit a detailed report in each case to the Congress; and the innumerable routine items relating to immigration problems.

The standing Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization has been maintained exclusively by funds provided by special resolutions since the 2d session of the 81st Congress and is presently maintained from funds made available pursuant to Senate Resolution 58 of the 1st session of the 87th Congress. That resolution provided $125,000 for the period beginning February 1, 1961, and ending January 31, 1962.

To assist you in your consideration of this resolution and proposed budget, the workload of the standing Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization is hereafter described briefly, under separate headings, for your convenience.

I. PRIVATE IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION BILLS

The number of private immigration and naturalization bills referred by the Senate to the subcommittee continues to be large. During the 1st session of the 87th Congress, there were referred to the subcommittee 775 such bills. Of the 775 private immigration and naturalization bills received by the subcommittee during the 1st session of the 87th Congress, 399 were disposed of, 301 of which were reported favorably to the Senate by the full Judiciary Committee, and 98 were indefinitely postponed. The remaining 376 were not acted on prior to the time of the adjournment of the 1st session of the 87th Congress. The majority of the 376 private bills which were not acted on were those referred to the subcommittee late in the 1st session of the 87th Congress and on which the necessary departmental reports or supporting information from the sponsor were not received prior to the time of the close of the 1st session of the 87th Congress.

Many private bills are indefinitely postponed because the committee has a general policy of disapproving private bills in cases in which an administrative remedy appears to be available. In this type of case, the staff assists the Senator's office in working out the administrative remedy for the alien involved.

II. GENERAL IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION BILLS

There were referred to the subcommittee 17 general immigration and naturalization bills during the 1st session of the 87th Congress. Of the bills received, 1 was reported favorably to the Senate by the full Judiciary Committee, 2 were indefinitely postponed, and there were 14 bills pending before the subcommittee at the time of the adjournment of the 1st session of the 87th Congress.

In addition to a consideration of the new general immigration and naturalization bills referred to the subcommittee in each session of the Congress, the staff of the subcommittee continually observes the operation of the Immigration and Nationality Act (Public Law 414, 82d Cong.) which became effective on December 24, 1952, and the amendatory laws thereto, in order to assure fair and effective interpretation and administration of that act. Considerable work hours of the staff have been and will continue to be utilized in conference with the administrative and enforcement officials of the executive branch, in research, and in the study of rules and regulations and administrative interpretations.

It is necessary for the subcommittee staff to maintain continuous liaison with the various branches of the executive departments concerned with the administration of the immigration and nationality laws, and it is expected that numerous informal sessions and conferences will be held, as in the past, between members of the staff and officials of the Visa Office and the Passport Office of the Department of State, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and the Board of Immigration Appeals concerning administrative problems in the enforcement of the Immigration and Nationality Act and other immigration and nationality laws. Members of the staff of the subcommittee consult daily with other senatorial staff members in connection with problems arising under the act.

The workload of the subcommittee was increased considerably during the 1st session of the 87th Congress because of the continuing widespread interest in the administration and operation of the Immigration and Nationality Act and the many bills to revise it. The subcommittee staff was required to devote substantial amounts of time in conferences and consultations with U.S. Senators, their assistants, personnel in the executive departments, representatives of nongovernmental voluntary agencies engaged in immigration and naturalization activities, bar associations, officers of commercial and industrial enterprises affected by provisions of the act and its implementing regulations, and interested members of the general public.

Public hearings were conducted on July 20, 1961, on the bills S. 2212 and H.R. 187, to provide for the judicial review of orders of deportation. Eight witnesses were heard and, in addition, numerous statements filed for the record in lieu of personal appearances were received.

In view of the current widespread interest in immigration problems and the anticipated legislative proposals to be referred to the subcommittee, the subcommittee will be called upon to hold further hearings on general immigration matters during this session of the Congress.

III. REFERRAL CASES INVOLVING DISCRETIONARY ACTION OF ATTORNEY GENERAL

There are numerous instances under the immigration laws where the Attorney General is granted discretionary authority to waive certain provisions of the law, but in such cases he is required to submit detailed reports to the Congress of his action.

Under section 212(d)(6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, he is required to report to the Congress certain cases in which he authorizes the temporary admission of aliens who are otherwise subject to exclusion. Section 212(a)(28)(I) of the Immigration and Nationality Act authorizes the Attorney General to admit certain aliens to the United States for permanent residence who are otherwise subject to exclusion because of their former membership in the Communist Party or other subversive organization if it is established to his satisfaction that they are bona fide defectors. The Attorney General must submit a detailed report to the Congress in each such case.

During the 1st session of the 87th Congress, there were submitted 5,388 cases under the above provisions of law. All reports of the orders issued by the Attorney General are referred to the subcommittee, where they are carefully checked to see that the discretionary action is being exercised in conformity with the intent of the Congress.

IV. REFERRAL ITEMS AND CORRESPONDENCE

The subcommittee has an extensive workload of referral items from Senators' offices and correspondence which cannot be statistically appraised but which necessitates considerable hours of work by the staff.

V. ADJUSTMENT-OF-STATUS CASES

Under the immigration laws, the Attorney General is empowered to adjust the status of certain deportable aliens to that of aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence through the procedure of suspension of deportation, but such adjustment of status is subject to affirmative congressional approval in certain categories of cases.

In addition, under the provisions of the Displaced Persons Act, a number of persons who had gained admission into the United States on a temporary basis were eligible to have their status adjusted to permanent residence. Each of these cases is subject to affirmative congressional approval by action similar to the action taken in certain of the suspension of deportation cases. A similar provision was contained in the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, for the adjustment of status of an additional 5,000 persons in a refugee status.

Also, under the provisions of section 13 of the act of September 11, 1957 (Public Law 85-316), the Attorney General is authorized to adjust the immigration status of certain aliens who entered the United States in a diplomatic or semidiplomatic status as officers or employees of a foreign government or certain international organizations and who have failed to maintain their official status. The number of aliens who may be granted the status of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence under the provision is limited to 50 in any fiscal year.

While the cases involving suspension of deportation by the Attorney General or adjustments of status under section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended, or section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended, or section 13 of the act of September 11, 1957, are submitted to the Congress for approval in groups, each individual case is the equivalent of a private bill. Each such case requires separate investigation in the subcommittee, an appraisal of the facts involved, and a determination on the merits regarding the grant of suspension of deportation or adjustment of status. In those cases where affirmative approval or disapproval is required, written reports are filed with the full committee.

At the beginning of the 1st session of the 87th Congress, there were pending in the subcommittee 67 cases involving the adjustment of the status of deportable aliens under the suspension of deportation procedure. To that number of pending cases were added 51 additional cases submitted during the 1st session of the 87th Congress, making a total of 118 cases. Of the total number of cases pending before the subcommittee during the 1st session of the 87th Congress, 86 were approved, 1 was withdrawn by the Attorney General, and 2 cases were not approved, leaving 29 cases in process at the time of the close of the 1st session of the 87th Congress.

At the beginning of the 1st session of the 87th Congress, there were submitted to the subcommittee four cases involving applications for adjustment of status under the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended. Three of the cases were approved and one was held for further information and was pending at the close of the 1st session of the 87th Congress.

At the beginning of the 1st session of the 87th Congress, there were pending in the subcommittee two cases of adjustment of status under section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended. To that number were added 16 additional cases, making a total of 18 cases submitted. Of the total number of cases, referred, 14 were approved, 1 was held for further information, and 2 were not approved, leaving 1 case "in process" at the time of the close of the 1st session of the 87th Congress.

At the beginning of the 1st session of the 87th Congress there were pending in the subcommittee 16 cases of adjustment of status under section 13 of the act of September 11, 1957. To that number were added 43 additional cases, making a total of 59 cases. Of the total number of cases referred, 16 were approved, leaving 43 "in process" at the time of the close of the 1st session of the 87th Congress.

VI. PAROLED REFUGEES AND ESCAPEES

Under the provisions of the act of July 14, 1960 (Public Law 86-648), the Attorney General, under the terms of the discretionary parole authority granted to him by section 212(d)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, is authorized to parole into the United States certain alien refugee-escapees. He may parole prior to July 1, 1962, such refugee-escapees who are under the mandate of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees in a number not to exceed 25 percent of the total number of any such similar refugees resettled during stated periods of time in countries other than the United States. The Attorney General is required to submit to the Congress on or before January 15 and June 15 of each year a complete and detailed statement of facts in the case of such alien paroled into the United States. There were referred to the subcommittee in the 1st session of the 87th Congress, 7,264 cases in which the Attorney General paroled refugee-escapees into the United States.

VII. STAFF

The present subcommittee staff consists of seven staff members and three stenographers. As previously pointed out, the proposed resolution provides for a sum of $125,000 to operate the subcommittee during the current 12-month period which is the same amount that was requested for the 1st session of the 87th Congress. This request for funds to operate the subcommittee during the current period is based upon the staff requirements under the present workload.

In view of the fact that the funds provided to the committee pursuant to Senate Resolution 58 of the 1st session of the 87th Congress will be exhausted on the 31st day of this month, it is of the utmost urgency that this resolution be given the earliest possible consideration by the Committee on Rules and Administration, and your cooperation in procuring early approval of the resolution will be deeply appreciated.

If there is any further information which you may need in the consideration of this matter, I shall be pleased to supply it to you promptly.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

James O. Eastland,
Chairman.

Budget—Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization of the Committee on the Judiciary

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
STAFF					
Legal and investigative:					
Staff director	1	$8,040	$16,173.19	$1,347.76	$16,173.19
Assistant staff director	1	8,040	16,173.19	1,347.76	16,173.19
Minority staff member	1	7,320	14,907.83	1,242.31	14,907.83
Investigator	1	4,200	9,211.53	767.62	9,211.53
Editorial and research:					
Research director	1	6,480	13,431.56	1,119.29	13,431.56
Research assistant	1	5,820	12,271.64	1,022.63	12,271.64
Do	1	4,200	9,211.53	767.62	9,211.53
Administrative and clerical:					
Assistant clerk (secretary to director)	1	3,240	7,267.26	605.60	7,267.26
Assistant clerk (file)	1	3,240	7,267.26	605.60	7,267.26
Stenographer	1	2,340	5,444.53	453.71	5,444.53
Do	1	1,620	4,005.31	333.78	4,005.31
Total	11				115,364.83
ADMINISTRATIVE					
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382, effective July 1, 1960)					600.00
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries paid)					5,500.00
Contribution to employees Federal employees group life insurance (27 cents per month per $1,000 coverage)					350.00
Travel (inclusive of field investigations)					2,000.00
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)					600.00
Stationery, office supplies					200.00
Communications (telephone, telegraph)					200.00
Contingent fund					185.17
Total					9,635.17
Grand total					125,000.00

INVESTIGATION OF ADMINISTRATION, OPERATION, AND ENFORCEMENT OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1114, Senate Resolution 264.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A resolution (S. Res. 264) to investigate the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Internal Security Act.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, insofar as they relate to the authority of the committee hereunder, to make a complete and continuing study and investigation of (1) the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Internal Security Act of 1950, as amended; (2) the administration, operation, and enforcement of other laws relating to espionage, sabotage, and the protection of the internal security of the United States; and (3) the extent, nature, and effect of subversive activities in the United States, its territories and possessions, including, but not limited to, espionage, sabotage, and infiltration by persons who are or may be under the domination of the foreign government or organizations controlling the world Communist movement or any other movement seeking to overthrow the Government of the United States by force and violence.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1962, to January 31, 1963, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $325,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 1145), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. Senate,
Committee on the Judiciary,
January 18, 1962.

Hon. Mike Mansfield,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: The Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary submits the attached budget for the period ending January 31, 1963, pursuant to your request of December 15, 1961.

A list of the subcommittee's publications for 1961 is enclosed. In addition to the public hearings which are there listed, the subcommittee took thousands of pages of testimony in 58 executive hearings. I know you are aware of how the subcommittee operates, so I won't go into detail on the time consumed on research, interviews, and correspondence prior to hearings, and on editing, indexing, and printing the publication.

The subcommittee had programed a substantial schedule of hearings for the period between adjournment of Congress and the end of the year. This contemplated program included several days of hearings in the field on "Communist threat to the United States through the Caribbean," further hearings on the many chapters of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee in major cities of the country, and a very important series of hearings with respect to the administration of the internal security laws.

In contemplation of those hearings, the subcommittee asked for and received a supplemental appropriation of $20,000 under Senate Resolution 201, approved September 7, 1961. Since the subcommittee found it necessary to postpone those hearings until 1962, this entire amount is being turned back, along with approximately $20,000 from our initial allocation.

The subcommittee's budget now submitted, for the period ending January 31, 1963, includes this additional $20,000, since the subcommittee plans to go ahead with those hearings during 1962, in addition to a heavy schedule of hearings previously planned for the year. There is provision made also for a small contingent fund, which the subcommittee will administer as strictly an emergency fund, not to be used unless absolutely necessary. It should be stressed that this small item (under $5,000) represents the only increase requested over the amount of funds actually granted to the subcommittee for the year just ended. You may rest assured that the subcommittee will continue its practice of careful economy.

I'd like to point out that funds are included again in this year's budget for contract services and consultants—when actually employed—subject, of course, to prior approval of the Rules Committee. The subcommittee has found this to be a financially sound practice, since it enables us to secure the best technical assistance available on special projects at the lowest possible cost.

Your aid in securing favorable action on the budget before the end of this month will be greatly appreciated.

Best personal regards.

Sincerely,

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman.

INTERNAL SECURITY SUBCOMMITTEE PUBLICATIONS, 1ST SESSION, 87TH CONGRESS

"Analysis of the Khrushchev Speech of January 6, 1961." Testimony of Dr. Stefan Possony, June 16, 1961. (Released July 17, 1961.)

"Bang-Jensen Case." Committee print. September 14, 1961. (Released October 10, 1961.)

"Communist Appeal to Youth Aided by New Organizations." Testimony of Romerstein and Markman, April 25, 1961. (Released July 24, 1961.)

"Communist Infiltration in the Nuclear Test Ban Movement." Part 2—August 31; September 1–2; October 10, 1960. (Released March 19, 1961.)

"Communist Party Line, The." J. Edgar Hoover. Reprint, Senate Document No. 59. (Released September 21, 1961.)

"Communist Plot Against the Free World Police, A." An exposé of crown-handling methods. June 13, 1961. (Released September 28, 1961.)

"Communist Political Propaganda and Use of U.S. Mails." Part 2—Irving Fishman, April 3, 1961. (Released June 28, 1961.)

"Communist Threat to the U.S. Through the Caribbean:"

Part 11—Joe Louis and Wm. Rowe, June 5, 1961. (Released August 28, 1961.)

Part 12—Ambassador Hill, June 12, 1961. (Released September 19, 1961.)

"Communist and Workers Parties Manifesto Adopted, November–December 1960." Interpretation and Analysis (Jay Lovestone, January 26; February 2, 1961). (Released April 7, 1961.)

"Cuban Aftermath—Red Seeds Blow South." Implications for the United States of the Latin American Conference for National Sovereignty and Economic Emancipation and Peace, March 16, 1961. Father Joseph F. Thorning. (Released December 13, 1961.)

"Export of Ball Bearing Machines to Russia":

Part 1. (Released October 24, 1961.)

Part 2, including index. (Released October 24, 1961.)

"Communist Forgeries." Testimony of Helms, CIA, June 2, 1961. (Released June 18, 1961.)

"Fair Play for Cuba Committee":

Part 1. April 29; May 5; October 10, 1960, and January 10, 1961. (Released April 3, 1961.)

Part 2. April 25, 1961; May 16, 1961. (Released August 3, 1961.)

Part 3. Detroit, June 15, 1961. (Released August 23, 1961.)

Part 4. Cleveland, June 12; June 13, 1961; Kirsch, Levey, Tekla, Tussey, and Ungvary. (Released October 23, 1961.)

"Guide to Communist Tactics Among the Unemployed." (Released September 28, 1961.)

"New Drive Against the Anti-Communist Program." Ed Hunter, July 11, 1961. (Released August 27, 1961.)

"Proposed Shipment of Ball Bearing Machines to the U.S.S.R." Report—Committee print, February 28, 1961.

"Pugwash Conferences, The." Committee print. (Released May 28, 1961.)

"Real Productivity of Soviet Russia." Critical analysis by Colin Clark. Committee print.

"Safeguard Communications Facilities." Hearings on S. 1990, June 7, 1961.

"Soviet Oil in the Cold War." Committee print—Study by Library of Congress. (Released May 11, 1961.)

"Testimony of Dr. Linus Pauling." Part 2, October 11, 1960. Report—Committee print. (Released March 17, 1961.)

"Wordmanship—Semantics as a Communist Weapon." Committee print.

"Yugoslav Communism, a Critical Study." Dr. Zalar, October 18, 1961. (Released November 12, 1961.)

NOT YET RELEASED

"Export of Strategic Materials to U.S.S.R."

"Relationship Between Teamsters and Mine-Mill Union."

Budget—Internal Security Subcommittee

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
STAFF					
Legal and investigative:					
Chief counsel	1	$8,820	$17,525.00	$1,460.41	$17,525.00
Special counsel (associate)	1	8,040	16,173.19	1,347.76	16,173.19
Assistant to chief counsel	1	5,400	11,533.51	961.12	11,533.51
Assistant counsel	1	5,640	11,955.29	996.27	11,955.29
Chief investigator	1	7,440	15,118.71	1,259.89	15,118.71
Investigator	2	4,140	9,090.01	757.50	18,180.02
Editorial and research:					
Editorial director	1	5,640	11,955.29	996.27	11,955.29
Assistant director	1	5,640	11,955.29	996.27	11,955.29
Research director	1	7,620	15,435.06	1,286.25	15,435.06
Research assistant	1	3,300	7,388.79	615.73	7,388.79
Investigations analyst	2	7,080	14,486.03	1,207.16	28,972.06
Administrative and clerical:					
Chief clerk—Records manager	1	5,100	10,988.24	757.50	10,988.24
Assistant clerk (secretary to director)	1	3,720	8,239.40	686.61	8,239.40
Assistant clerk	1	3,600	7,996.37	666.36	7,996.37
Do	1	1,980	4,715.45	392.95	4,715.45
Stenographer	3	3,000	6,781.22	565.10	20,343.66
Do	1	2,640	6,052.11	504.34	6,052.11
Secretary	2	2,580	5,930.60	494.21	11,861.20
Do	1	2,280	5,323.02	443.58	5,323.02
Do	1	1,860	4,472.40	372.70	4,472.40
Total	25				246,184.06
ADMINISTRATIVE					
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382, effective July 1, 1960)					1,325.28
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries paid)					16,001.96
Contribution to employees Federal employees group life insurance (27 cents per month per $1,000 coverage)					796.44
Travel (inclusive of field investigations)					17,000.00
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)					12,500.00
Witness fees, expenses					12,500.00
Stationery, office supplies					2,000.00
Communications (telephone, telegraph)					5,500.00
Newspapers, magazines, documents					1,000.00
Contingent fund					4,692.26
Consultants, when actually employed basis ($2,500); contract services ($3,000)					5,500.00
Total					78,815.94
Grand total					325,000.00

INVESTIGATION OF NATIONAL PENITENTIARIES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I would like to skip the next one on the calendar, Calendar No. 1115, Senate Resolution 265, and move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1116, Senate Resolution 266.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 266) to investigate national penitentiaries.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and inspect national penitentiaries.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1962, to January 31, 1963, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1963.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $5,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 1147), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. Senate,
Committee on the Judiciary,
January 18, 1962.

Hon. Mike Mansfield,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Mansfield: I am enclosing a copy of an original resolution and a budget for the standing Subcommittee on National Penitentiaries, which has been approved by the committee.

The standing Subcommittee on National Penitentiaries has been in existence since the 80th Congress. While its needs have always been modest, as is shown by the fact that appropriations for it have ranged between $5,000 and $8,600 during its existence, its effectiveness in building morale among inmates and administrative personnel in our Federal penal institutions has been considerable. The subcommittee affords the personnel of our Federal penal institutions an opportunity to bring their problems in regard to discipline, food, health, and recreation for inmates directly to the attention of the Senate. It further provides Members of the Senate an opportunity to speak directly to inmates and to hear any grievances which the inmates may feel they have. The subcommittee believes that this has been a factor in deterring riots, attempted escapes, and the like, as it provides a real opportunity for inmates to tell their stories to an outside observer. It is gratifying to the subcommittee that since its establishment no serious riot has occurred at any Federal penal institution.

The subcommittee has incurred no expenditures for staff personnel during the past session, and the proposed budget which is submitted for the present session does not anticipate any expenditures for staff. The modest appropriation which has been recommended by the committee is designed to provide only for travel, hearings, including reporters' fees, witnesses' fees, and incidental expenses.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

James O. Eastland,
Chairman.

Budget—the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on National Penitentiaries

Staff expenses	None
Administrative:	
Travel	$3,500
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)	1,000
Witnesses' fees, expenses, communications, supplies, incidental expenses	500
Total expenses	5,000

EXAMINATION AND REVIEW OF ADMINISTRATION OF PATENT OFFICE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1117, Senate Resolution 267.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A resolution (S. Res. 267) to examine and review the administration of the Patent Office.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to conduct a full and complete examination and review of the administration of the Patent Office and a complete examination and review of the statutes relating to patents, trademarks, and copyrights.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee from February 1, 1962, to January 31, 1963, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditure as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1963.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $120,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 1148), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. Senate,
Committee on the Judiciary,
January 19, 1962.

Hon. Mike Mansfield,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: I am enclosing the budget which was approved by the Committee on the Judiciary at its meeting on Thursday, January 18, 1962, for the work of the standing Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights.

The committee authorized the reporting to the Senate of an original resolution (S. Res. 267) to provide the amount of $120,000 for the work of the subcommittee for the period from February 1, 1962, through January 31, 1963.

The program of the subcommittee is fully set forth in a letter to me from Hon. John L. McClellan, chairman of the subcommittee. I am forwarding this letter to you, herewith, with the proposal budget, for the information of the Committee on Rules and Administration for consideration at its forthcoming meeting.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely,

James O. Eastland,
Chairman.

U.S. Senate, Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights,
January 12, 1962.

Hon. James O. Eastland,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: During the 1st session of the 87th Congress, Senate Resolution 55, agreed to January 31, 1961, appropriated the sum of $135,000 for the operation of the Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights for the examination and review of the Patent Office and the laws relating to patents, trademarks, and copyrights. Upon the basis of the work of the subcommittee in 1961, I urge the appropriation of $120,000 to continue the subcommittee during the 2d session of the 87th Congress.

The subcommittee is presently considering legislation to establish a uniform Government patent policy. As an outgrowth of 15 reports prepared by the staff on the patent policies of the various Government departments and agencies, the subcommittee held 7 days of hearings on this subject during the first session. Over 70 witnesses presented the views of Government, industry, inventors, and the legal profession. The hearings disclosed a general consensus of opinion that it was desirable for Congress to enact legislation in this area. The members of the subcommittee were convinced that the proclamation of a Government patent policy is one of the most complex questions before the Congress and one that does not lend itself to doctrinaire solution. Despite the difficulties of finding a formula that will both protect the public interest and be equitable to Government contractors, the subcommittee hopes to report legislation.

The subcommittee views with concern the critical situation confronting the operations of the Patent Office. Over the past few years the Patent Office budget has more than doubled, yet the backlog of pending patent applications has decreased only slightly. In its reports the subcommittee has pointed out serious deficiencies in the operation of the Patent Office and has made remedial recommendations. A direct result of these deficiencies in the Office's examination procedure is the high mortality rate of patents when litigated.

While the budget for the Patent Office has drastically increased in the past decade, the amount received by the Treasury as Patent Office fees covers a proportionally smaller percentage of operating costs. The basic fees of the Patent Office have not changed since 1932 and the average cost of processing a patent application is over three times as great as the fees collected. There is now pending before the subcommittee a bill which was introduced at the request of the Department of Commerce which will increase fees and for the first time institute a system of renewal or maintenance fees. It is anticipated that hearings will be held on the measure during the second session.

The subcommittee during 1961 continued its interest in the general revision of the copyright laws. A comprehensive report containing the tentative recommendations of the Copyright Office for revision of the law has been submitted to the Congress for its consideration. There is wide agreement on the need for a general revision. However, extensive hearings will be needed to determine the scope and content of such a general revision.

Extensive hearings have been held on a bill to provide for the protection of ornamental designs of useful articles. The subcommittee is hopeful of reporting legislation during this session. In addition to the matters I have already mentioned, there are other patent, trademark, and copyright bills pending before this subcommittee, on some of which hearings have been held, and others are awaiting hearings and action.

The subcommittee is also engaged in investigating the practical effects of the patent contracting practices of the various Government departments and agencies and whether inventions and technical information arising out of Government-financed research are being reported. This work is of great significance in view of the fact that congressional appropriations for research and development exceed $10 billion a year.

By reason of careful handling of funds, certain unanticipated savings in staff expenses, and vacancies, the subcommittee has not expended the full amount appropriated during the first session, and the sum of approximately $50,000 will, at the expiration of the resolution on January 31, 1962, be returned to the contingent fund of the Senate. Accompanying this letter is a report of the expenditures of the subcommittee for the period February 1, 1961, through January 31, 1962.

A copy of the annual report of the subcommittee will be made available to anyone who is interested in a more detailed account of the subcommittee's work during the past year. On behalf of the subcommittee I urge approval of the attached budget.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

John L. McClellan,
Subcommittee Chairman.

Budget—Examination of the administration of the Patent Office and review of statutes relating to patents

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
STAFF					
Legal and investigative:					
Chief counsel	1	$8,040	$16,173.19	$1,347.76	$16,173.19
Special counsel	1	8,040	16,173.19	1,347.76	16,173.19
Assistant counsel	1	6,900	14,169.70	1,180.80	14,169.70
Assistant counsel	1	5,880	12,377.07	1,031.42	12,377.07
Assistant counsel	1	3,360	7,510.31	625.85	7,510.31
Administrative and clerical:					
Chief clerk	1	5,880	12,377.07	1,031.42	12,377.07
Assistant clerk	1	3,360	7,510.31	625.85	7,510.31
Assistant clerk (secretary to director)	1	3,240	7,267.26	605.60	7,267.26
Secretary	1	3,120	7,024.25	585.35	7,024.25
Total	9				100,582.35
ADMINISTRATIVE					
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382, effective July 1, 1960)					730.08
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries paid)					6,537.84
Contribution to employees Federal employees group life insurance (27 cents per month per $1,000 coverage)					346.68
Reimbursable payments to agencies					1,500.00
Travel (inclusive of field investigations)					2,500.00
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)					4,500.00
Witness fees, expenses					1,500.00
Stationery, office supplies					500.00
Communications (telephone, telegraph)					200.00
Newspapers, magazines, documents					300.00
Contingent fund					803.05
Total					19,417.65
Grand total					120,000.00

INVESTIGATION OF VARIOUS AREAS OF NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1118, Senate Resolution 270.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A resolution (S. Res. 270) to authorize a study by the Committee on Armed Services of various areas of national defense.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Armed Services, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) common defense generally;

(2) the War Department and the Military Establishment generally;

(3) the Navy Department and the Naval Establishment generally;

(4) soldiers' and sailors' homes;

(5) pay, promotion, retirement, and other benefits and privileges of members of the Armed Forces;

(6) selective service;

(7) size and composition of the Army and Navy;

(8) forts, arsenals, military reservations, and navy yards;

(9) ammunition depots;

(10) maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal, including the administration, sanitation, and government of the Canal Zone;

(11) conservation, development, and use of naval petroleum and oil shale reserves;

(12) strategic and critical materials necessary for the common defense;

(13) aeronautical and space activities peculiar to or primarily associated with the development of weapons systems or military operations.

Sec. 2. For the purpose of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1962, to January 31, 1963, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $220,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 1149), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. Senate,
Committee on Armed Services,
January 12, 1962.

Hon. Mike Mansfield,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: It will be appreciated if the Committee on Rules and Administration will give prompt consideration to the approval of Senate Resolution 270 which was adopted by unanimous consent by the Senate Committee on Armed Services. This resolution would provide spending authority to the committee or any authorized subcommittee for the period of February 1, 1962, to January 31, 1963. The resolution is similar to those adopted for the past six sessions of Congress. The total authorization requested is $220,000.

These funds are requested for the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee. However, a considerable portion of the funds will be required for the operation of the Special Preparedness Subcommittee, appointed pursuant to a resolution adopted by the committee on September 20, 1961. The Special Preparedness Subcommittee was thereby authorized and directed to study and appraise the use of military personnel and facilities to arouse the public to the menace of the cold war and to inform and educate armed services personnel on the nature and menace of the cold war.

This investigation has necessitated a temporary enlargement of the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee staff and a significant increase in virtually every part of the subcommittee budget. These additional requirements will continue for several months.

The functions of the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, as you know, include the responsibility of helping to promote the common defense by maintaining surveillance of the policies, operations, and expenditures of the Department of Defense as well as other matters within the jurisdiction of the committee.

The subcommittee last year conducted investigations, studies, and inquiries into a number of vital defense matters. Three major series of hearings culminated in reports and recommendations which proved invaluable to the committee. In addition, the subcommittee rendered a special report to the Committee on Appropriations and to the President of the United States. The committee feels that matters under investigation and programed for review by the subcommittee fully justify its continuance.

Sincerely,

Richard B. Russell,
Chairman.

Budget

Position	Number	Base salary	Gross salary	Monthly salary	Total
Chief staff counsel	1	$8,000	$16,102.90	$1,341.90	$16,102.90
Professional staff member	4	6,000	12,587.99	1,048.99	50,351.96
Do	1	5,580	11,849.85	987.48	11,849.85
Do	1	5,400	11,533.51	961.12	11,533.51
Do	1	5,100	10,988.24	915.68	10,988.24
Clerical assistant	1	2,700	6,173.64	514.47	6,173.64
Do	1	2,640	6,052.11	504.34	6,052.11
Do	2	2,340	5,444.53	453.71	10,889.06
Do	1	2,280	5,323.02	443.58	5,323.02
Stenographer [1]	3	2,040	4,836.96	403.08	3,627.72
Total	16				132,892.01
ADMINISTRATIVE					
Contribution to health benefit programs					3,810.00
Contribution to civil service retirement					1,773.96
Contribution to group life insurance					8,402.18
Reimbursable payments to agencies					12,908.75
Travel (inclusive of field investigations)					13,100.00
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)					6,811.47
Witness fees, expenses					4,254.65
Stationery, office supplies					729.38
Communications					317.60
Contingent fund					8,500.00
Consultants and staff advisers					26,500.00
Total					220,000.00

[1] Temporary—90 days.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1119, Senate Resolution 245.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 245) to print additional copies of hearings entitled "Relationship Between Teamsters Union and Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary five thousand copies of a hearing entitled "Relationship Between Teamsters Union and Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers", held by its Internal Security Subcommittee during the Eighty-seventh Congress, first session.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE DOCUMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1120, Senate Resolution 248.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 248) to print additional copies of Senate Document No. 59 of the 87th Congress, on "The Communist Party Line."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary twenty thousand additional copies of the Senate Document 59 of the Eighty-Seventh Congress, first session, entitled "The Communist Party Line" (prepared by J. Edgar Hoover for the Internal Security Subcommittee).

INVESTIGATION AND CERTAIN EXPENDITURES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1121.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 233) to investigate and make expenditures in connection with certain matters within its jurisdiction.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) banking and currency generally;

(2) financial aid to commerce and industry;

(3) deposit insurance;

(4) the Federal Reserve System, including monetary and credit policies;

(5) economic stabilization, production, and mobilization;

(6) valuation and revaluation of the dollar;

(7) prices of commodities, rents, and services;

(8) securities and exchange regulation;

(9) credit problems of small business; and

(10) international finance through agencies within the legislative jurisdiction of the committee.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee from February 1, 1962, to January 31, 1963, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $80,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Amend the title so as to read: "Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to investigate, and make expenditures in connection with, certain matters within its jurisdiction."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1152), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON BANKING
AND CURRENCY,
January 18, 1962.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On Thursday, January 18, the Committee on Banking and Currency unanimously agreed to report Senate Resolution 233, introduced January 11 by myself and Senator CAPEHART. The resolution was reported on January 18.

This resolution authorizes this committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, to employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistance as may be necessary to carry out studies and investigations within the jurisdiction of the committee.

You undoubtedly will recall that for a number of years resolutions similar to this one have been approved for this committee on an annual basis. We have introduced and reported this resolution, in the amount of $80,000, because of our need to retain additional personnel as we have done for the past several years to supplement the permanent staff and to cover other expenses incident to our committee responsibilities. Due to the extremely complex nature of the matters within our jurisdiction, we have found it necessary, from time to time, to bring in experts in the various fields of our jurisdiction.

The workload of the committee is extremely heavy under normal circumstances: that is, in dealing with legislative matters which recur year after year. Experience has shown that we must anticipate during each session some special study or legislation which makes it necessary to employ additional staff and to incur additional expenses.

It is difficult at this time to predict, with any degree of precision, the legislative activities of the committee. However, there are areas within our jurisdiction which can be expected to receive even greater attention than normally. For example, the issues raised by the report of the Commission on Money and Credit have received, and I expect will continue to receive, extensive consideration and be the subject of legislative proposals.

Other areas which may well require additional study include the securities business now under active study by the Securities and Exchange Commission under Public Law 87-169, the savings and loan situation, and problems relating to silver and the Silver Purchase Act.

In addition to its legislative responsibilities, the committee can expect in the course of the next session to receive many requests from Senators, either formally or informally, to make special studies of various problems in the economic field. While these studies may never reach the stage of formal hearings or investigations, they do require a great deal of staff work. Increased attention which problems of monetary policy are receiving creates an additional burden on the staff.

Of the $80,000 authorized for the last 12-month period under Senate Resolution 44, expenditures through January 31, 1962, are approximately $76,647.70, leaving a balance of $3,352.30.

Enclosed is a copy of Senate Resolution 233. It is in the form prescribed by the sample resolution enclosed with your letter of December 15, 1961, except that section 3 of your sample form (requiring that findings and recommendations be reported not later than January 31, 1963) is omitted.

Also enclosed is the completed standardized budget form, as prescribed by your committee. The budget calls for no staff personnel in addition to those presently employed by the committee.

Sincerely yours,

A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Chairman.

Budget—Study of banking and currency matters

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
STAFF					
Legal and investigative:					
Assistant counsel	1	$5,460	$11,638.94	$969.91	$11,638.94
Do.	1	4,980	10,756.25	896.35	10,756.25
Editorial and research:					
Staff member	1	8,000	16,102.90	1,341.90	16,102.90
Economist	1	7,980	16,067.74	1,338.97	16,067.74
Administrative and clerical:					
Assistant clerk (record)	1	4,680	10,176.30	848.02	10,176.30
Assistant clerk (hearing)	1	2,580	5,930.60	494.21	5,930.60
Total	6				70,672.73
ADMINISTRATIVE					
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382, effective July 1, 1960)					486.72
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries paid)					4,593.73
Contribution to employees Federal employees group life insurance (27 cents per month per $1,000 coverage)					246.24
Travel (inclusive of field investigations)					1,700.00
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)					1,100.00
Witness fees, expenses					300.00
Stationery, office supplies					125.00
Communications (telephone, telegraph)					200.00
Newspapers, magazines, documents					175.00
Contingent fund					400.58
Total					9,327.27
Grand total					80,000.00

EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1123, Senate Resolution 286.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 286) authorizing the Committee on Rules and Administration to make expenditures and to employ temporary personnel.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules and Administration, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) the election of the President, Vice President, or Members of Congress;

(2) corrupt practices;

(3) contested elections;

(4) credentials and qualifications;

(5) Federal elections generally; and

(6) Presidential succession.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1962, to January 31, 1963, inclusive is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1963.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $150,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1154), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE, COMMITTEE ON RULES
AND ADMINISTRATION, SUBCOMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS,
January 9, 1962.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections of the Committee on Rules and Administration has prepared an original resolution and a budget for a new appropriation for the fiscal year beginning February 1, 1962, and ending on January 31, 1963.

During 1962 approximately one-third of the Members of the U.S. Senate will be seeking reelection and, as in prior election years, it must be anticipated that some complaints and petitions for investigations will be referred to the subcommittee for attention.

Notwithstanding the fact that no formal contests were received by the Senate during 1960, staff investigators conducted inquiries in many States following the receipt of letters and affidavits charging violations of Federal election laws. Since the bulk of the subcommittee's investigative activities concerning elections occurs after the adjournment of the Senate, it would not be possible to request an additional appropriation at that time and the subcommittee must estimate, on the basis of past experience, what its expenses may total in the event of one or more election contests. Thus, in 1956 and 1958 the Senate granted appropriations of $150,000 and in 1960 the sum of $160,000 was approved.

During the 2d session of the 87th Congress the subcommittee will continue to study legislation which has been already referred to it proposing various modifications in Federal election laws, and the report of the President's Commission on Campaign Costs, which will fall due on or before April 30, 1962, may result in new recommendations which will require study and probable hearings by the subcommittee.

Additionally, the subcommittee intends to publish, as Senate documents, three pamphlets or books which will have been completed early in 1962. One contains the Corrupt Practices Act, as amended, and miscellaneous acts; a second contains pertinent provisions of Federal and State laws governing elections (the Election Law Guidebook); and the third contains a complete compilation of Senate election, expulsion, and censure cases from 1789 through 1960.

The subcommittee will make every effort, as it has during prior years, to conserve its appropriation, but believes that the sum of $150,000 is reasonable in consideration of the scope of its 1962 program and the election contests which might arise during the course of the year.

The original resolution and budget are submitted herewith for your consideration, and the subcommittee respectfully requests the approval of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Sincerely yours,

HOWARD W. CANNON,
Chairman.

Budget

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
STAFF					
Legal and investigative:					
Chief counsel	1	$8,040	$16,173.19	$1,347.76	$16,173.19
Assistant counsel	1	6,600	13,642.45	1,136.87	13,642.45
Chief investigator	1	4,620	10,060.30	838.35	10,060.30
Investigator	2	3,840	8,482.43	706.86	16,964.86
Minority counsel	1	6,840	14,064.24	1,172.02	14,064.24
Editorial and research:					
Research director	1	4,620	10,060.30	838.35	10,060.30
Research assistant	1	3,900	8,603.95	716.99	8,603.95
Administrative and clerical:					
Assistant clerk (secretary to director)	1	3,000	6,781.22	565.10	6,781.22
Assistant clerk (file)	1	1,800	4,350.91	362.57	4,350.91
Assistant clerk (hearing)	1	2,400	5,566.05	463.83	5,566.05
Stenographer	3	2,040	4,836.96	403.08	14,510.88
Accountant	1	4,620	10,060.30	838.35	10,060.30
Total	15				130,838.65
ADMINISTRATIVE					
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382, effective July 1, 1960)					2,359.80
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries paid)					8,504.51
Contribution to employees Federal employees group life insurance (27 cents per month per $1,000 coverage)					450.36
Reimbursable payments to agencies					1,500.00
Travel (inclusive of field investigations)					1,500.00
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)					1,000.00
Witness fees, expenses					1,000.00
Stationery, office supplies					1,000.00
Communications (telephone, telegraph)					1,000.00
Newspapers, magazines, documents					500.00
Contingent fund					346.68
Total					19,161.35
Grand total					150,000.00

PAYMENT OF GRATUITY TO ISOM HENDERSON AND PRUDENCE HENDERSON

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1124, Senate Resolution 285.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 285) to pay a gratuity to Isom Henderson and Prudence Henderson.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Isom Henderson, father, and Prudence Henderson, mother of William W. Henderson, an employee of the Architect of the Capitol assigned to duty in the Senate Office Buildings at the time of his death, a sum to each equal to three months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

PAYMENT OF GRATUITY TO GERTRUDE S. FAUCETTE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1125, Senate Resolution 284.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res 284) to pay a gratuity to Gertrude S. Faucette.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Gertrude S. Faucette, widow of Andrew McC. Faucette, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to one year's compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

PAYMENT OF GRATUITY TO ELIZABETH J. HEFNER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1126, Senate Resolution 283.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 283) to pay a gratuity to Elizabeth J. Hefner.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Elizabeth J. Hefner, widow of Wilson C. Hefner, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to one year's compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

PAYMENT OF GRATUITY TO THOMAS R. MASSEY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1127, Senate Resolution 282.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 282) to pay a gratuity to Thomas R. Massey.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Thomas R. Massey, brother of James T. Massey, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to one year's compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

PAYMENT OF DEATH GRATUITY TO ALSON J. SMITH

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1128, Senate Resolution 281.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 281) to pay a death gratuity to Alson J. Smith.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Alson J. Smith, widower of Mattie M. Smith, an employee of the Senate at the time of her death, a sum equal to nine and one-half months' compensation at the rate she was receiving by law at the time of her death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

PAYMENT OF GRATUITY TO EDNA V. McLEOD

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1129, Senate Resolution 280.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 280) to pay a gratuity to Edna V. McLeod.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to

Edna V. McLeod, widow of Scott McLeod, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to one year's compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

PAYMENT OF GRATUITY TO ELMO W. KEEL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1130, Senate Resolution 279.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A resolution (S. Res. 279) to pay a gratuity to Elmo W. Keel.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Elmo W. Keel, widower of Jessie L. Keel, an employee of the Senate at the time of her death, a sum equal to eight and one-half months' compensation at the rate she was receiving by law at the time of her death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

PAYMENT OF GRATUITY TO VONDA P. BERGMAN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1131, Senate Resolution 278.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A resolution (S. Res. 278) to pay a gratuity to Vonda P. Bergman.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Vonda P. Bergman, widow of Harold Bergman, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to nine and one-half months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

PAYMENT OF GRATUITY TO HAZEL T. CLEM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1132, Senate Resolution 277.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A resolution (S. Res. 277) to pay a gratuity to Hazel T. Clem.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Hazel T. Clem, widow of T. Briley Clem, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to eight months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1137, Senate Resolution 251.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A resolution (S. Res. 251) authorizing the Committee on Commerce to investigate certain matters within its jurisdiction, and providing funds therefor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment, on page 3, line 8, after the word "exceed", to insert "$315,000", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) interstate commerce generally;

(2) foreign commerce generally;

(3) maritime matters;

(4) interoceanic canals;

(5) transportation policy;

(6) domestic surface transportation, including pipelines;

(7) communications, including a complete review of national and international telecommunications and the use of communications satellites:

(8) Federal power matters;

(9) civil aeronautics;

(10) fisheries and wildlife;

(11) marine sciences; and

(12) Weather Bureau operations and planning, including the use of weather satellites.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1962, to January 31, 1963, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1963.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $315,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment, the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 1137), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. Senate,
Committee on Commerce,
January 24, 1962.

Hon. Mike Mansfield,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Chairman Mansfield: Senate Resolution 251 is now before your committee for consideration and action. This resolution would authorize the Committee on Commerce to expend not more than $315,000 between February 1, 1962, and January 31, 1963, upon studies and investigations of any and all matters within its jurisdiction. This is identical to the amount granted the committee during the 1st session of the 87th Congress (S. Res. 74).

During the last session of the 86th Congress, this committee was authorized by the Senate to expend the amount of $620,000 (S. Res. 243, S. Res. 244, and S. Res. 305). In addition to our regular work, we were at that time completing our special studies on transportation and foreign commerce.

Of the $315,000 authorized for 1961, we are returning approximately $65,000. This is not because we overstated our needs last year, but rather because we were unable to start some of our programed projects.

During the first session of this Congress, the Committee on Commerce approved 72 of the 236 bills submitted to it, and the Senate passed 68 of them. Of these measures, 44 were signed into law by the President, 22 are still pending in the House, 4 are on the Senate Calendar and 2 were Senate resolutions.

The committee received, reported favorably, and the Senate confirmed 1,081 routine nominations in the Coast Guard and the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Of the 44 major nominations submitted to us, 6 were withdrawn by the President, 32 were reported to and confirmed by the Senate, and the remaining 6 were received too late in the session to be acted upon.

In the month of January 1962, we have already received 9 major and 408 minor nominations.

The committee held 64 days of public hearings, and our subcommittees held 77, a total of 141 during 1961. This year we anticipate a heavy public hearing schedule, already started on the textile problem, and to open next month on transportation.

Under the Standing Rules of the Senate, this committee has jurisdiction over all legislation and matters relating to—

1. Interstate and foreign commerce generally;

2. Regulation of interstate railroads, buses, trucks, and pipelines;

3. Communication by telephone, telegraph, radio, and television;

4. Civil aeronautics, except aeronautical and space activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration;

5. Merchant marine generally;

6. Registering and licensing of vessels and small boats;

7. Navigation and the laws relating thereto, including pilotage;

8. Rules and international arrangements to prevent collisions at sea;

9. Merchant marine officers and seamen;

10. Measures relating to regulation of common carriers by water and to the inspection of merchant marine vessels, lights, and signals, lifesaving equipment, and fire protection on such vessels;

11. Coast and Geodetic Survey;

12. The Coast Guard, including lifesaving service, lighthouses, lightships, and ocean derelicts;

13. The U.S. Coast Guard and Merchant Marine Academies;

14. The Weather Bureau;

15. Except as provided in paragraph (c) the Panama Canal and interoceanic canals generally—paragraph (c) gives the Senate Armed Services Committee jurisdiction over "maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal including the administration, sanitation, and Government of the Canal Zone";

16. Inland waterways;

17. Fisheries and wildlife, including research, restoration, refuges, and conservation; and

18. Bureau of Standards, including standardization of weights and measures and the metric system.

This committee anticipates a heavy program for 1962. The agencies for which we have responsibility have budget requirements totaling approximately $2,275 million. Further, we share responsibility for military air transportation and military sea transportation, and these would double this foregoing budget figure. I think we can safely say our committee must oversee agencies spending almost $4.5 billion each year.

As your committee knows, we operate through standing and special subcommittees. For 1962, we hope our program will be as follows:

THE STANDING SUBCOMMITTEES

Merchant Marine and Fisheries

Maritime industry problems to which the committee must give attention during this session are many and urgent. Every segment of shipping under the U.S. flag is at dangerously low ebb. In the foreign trade ways must be found to assist our shipping, both subsidized and unsubsidized, in securing a more adequate share of this Nation's booming export and import trades. Operators of the liner services serving essential trade routes are engaged in a costly vessel replacement program. To survive they must be helped to secure the cargoes required.

Special problems attach to Great Lakes shipping, and to the lines engaged in the coastal, intercoastal, and offshore trades. Canadian vessels, newly subsidized, and growing fleets of modern European vessels, are threatening to take over completely in the St. Lawrence Seaway, while the domestic and offshore trades are beset with problems that, unless resolved, could have a devastating effect upon certain west coast industries, and upon the economics of Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico.

In the administration of the cargo preference statute more equitable apportionment of higher rate cargoes to U.S.-flag shipping must be found, while liability of shipowners and of vessels in collisions are but two of the many legislative proposals to be considered and resolved.

We know that your committee understands these problems are not new. Rather they are continuing ones, and watchfulness is necessary if we are to do the job the Senate has assigned to us.

We plan hearings to review our maritime program generally, looking toward a program to increase the use of our ships by our citizen shippers, a formula to spread ship construction over all our coastlines, and to improve our merchant marine so that it may regain its proper place in the world.

Sports fishing and hunting continue to grow in popularity and millions of American families take advantage of these outdoor recreational pastimes—50 million Americans over 12 years of age went hunting or fishing or both in 1960. They spent over $4 billion and our businessmen and manufacturers are devoting a greater amount of effort to satisfy family needs in this recreational field. We will consider legislation to promote effectual planning, development, maintenance, and coordination of this natural resource.

Our commercial fishery has problems. There are legislative proposals to step up fisheries research, to encourage the development of new fish products, to study the depredations of destructive predators and to do what we can, in a legislative way, to aid and assist our State officials in conservation practices.

In 1959 alien fleets moved into waters adjacent to Alaska. We must determine how we are to cope with this international threat to a common resource. For the committee's consideration are bills to improve and modernize our fishing fleets in order to meet our foreign competition. We must not permit the depletion of our natural resources.

The protection of marine mammals, research and studies on the effects of insecticides upon our wildlife, the preservation of bird species, and many and varied problems relating to game animals, wild fowl, and bird life demand our attention.

Communications

New technical and economic developments and changing needs in the communications field require a thorough examination of both short-range and long-range plans and policies in order to assure a sound and vigorous growth in the telecommunications field, both domestically and internationally. The whole area of communications will be tremendously influenced by the use of space communications satellites. A uniform policy for all communications, including space communications, must be established. This requires a review of the present status of our policies as well as a complete evaluation of the allocation of frequencies so as to assure the most effective and efficient use of this valuable resource.

Many agencies of the Government are involved, such as the Weather Bureau, which will use space satellites for the gathering of weather information. We held preliminary hearings in the first session of the Congress and recessed these hearings in order to permit the formulation of certain policies within the various Government agencies that are involved. Legislation has been proposed. Extensive hearings and work will be done in this area in 1962.

Specifically, we want to be sure that the United States has formulated specific policies and plans which could be used for guidance in reconciling the conflicting interests and needs of Government and private users of the spectrum space. We must determine whether or not the United States has developed a national policy and position for dealing with other nations in seeking international telecommunications agreements in view of the rapid changes taking place in this field. A close watch must be kept to make sure that the United States is fully prepared for the 1963 Geneva Conference in which allocation of frequencies for space communications is to be made.

In the last Congress, section 315 of the Communications Act, the so-called equal-time provision with respect to political broadcasting, was temporarily suspended in order to permit the candidates for the offices of President and Vice President of the United States to engage in the so-called debates. All the reports, particularly the extensive analysis prepared by the FCC, indicated that the temporary suspension during the 1960 campaign was a huge success. There is now considerable support for legislation that would make such an exemption permanent. There is presently pending before our committee a number of bills to accomplish this end, as well as to expand the exemptions to include other political candidates such as U.S. Senators, Congressmen, and gubernatorial candidates. Hearings on this subject are to be scheduled.

We must continually watch how Government-licensed media is used for the dissemination of political opinions, news and advertising, the presentation of candidates, and the discussion of controversial issues, and we must oversee the Commission's processing of the numerous complaints that arose from the 1960 campaign.

Television channel allocation is a continuing problem and we continue to urge the FCC to act. We want to provide for a nationwide competitive television service. To date, the more than 70 UHF channels that are available for commercial and educational television are very little used. Recently the Commission concluded that a competitive nationwide television service with adequate provisions for local outlets and educational stations is not possible within the framework of the 12 VHF channels and that greater use must be made of the 70 UHF channels. In line with this program they have recently instituted a number of so-called deintermixture proceedings aimed as a remedy to this problem. The Commission has also recommended legislation that would authorize it to require that television receivers shipped in interstate commerce be all-channel receivers capable of satisfactorily receiving UHF signals. This is an extremely vital subject and hearings will be held.

The committee has held extensive hearings with regard to network practices in the past and as a result special funds were appropriated to the FCC for a network study. The study was made and the Commission has now recommended specific legislation on this complicated problem of regulating networks. Wide interest has been expressed in this legislation (S. 2400), and it will require lengthy hearings.

The question of advertising hard liquor on radio and television has been the subject of numerous hearings by this committee. A number of years ago representatives of the liquor industry and the broadcast industry urged that no action be taken with regard to legislation in this field because the industry was capable of handling the problem on a self-regulated basis. During the last year reports indicate that certain broadcasters were attempting to break down this hard-liquor barrier and we brought this to the attention of the National Association of Broadcasters and other interested parties. If the self-regulation approach does not prove to be satisfactory, we may be required to move in with legislation and hold hearings on this very sensitive problem.

For the third straight Congress the committee has reported out my educational television bill which would accelerate the use of television facilities in our schools and colleges. The bill is now pending in the House. The FCC, at our recommendation, has established a special office to assist in the development of educational television. We are working closely with all interested parties in order to encourage and expedite a fuller use of the more than 200 TV assignments which are presently reserved for educational purposes.

Extensive hearings were held in the last Congress with reference to community antenna and booster problems. The FCC has recommended specific legislation on this subject, which is quite controversial, and will probably require additional hearings before final action is determined.

A matter which still requires further attention by this committee is the mandate which Congress has issued requiring Western Union to divest itself of its international operations. The complexity of the many problems involved has unduly prolonged these negotiations which have been underway with the prospective purchasers for some time. It is hoped this problem will soon be brought to a final conclusion.

Aviation

An unusual number of legislative items of considerable importance to the aviation community are currently pending before our committee.

Participation percentagewise by U.S. carriers in the field of international air transportation has been declining at a substantial rate over the past several years. As a result, we have commenced a study to ascertain the reasons for this trend, what problems confront our carriers, and whether a favorable solution, consistent with foreign policy considerations, can be found. Among other matters the committee will conduct a hearing on legislation proposed by the Civil Aeronautics Board which would broaden and more clearly delineate its powers to effectively regulate foreign air carrier activities in this country.

As a result of a combination of factors, including but not limited to, overcapacity, mounting costs, and declining load factors, the airline industry, financially, last year suffered one of the most severe years in its history. We expect to conduct hearings on the subject of airlines' finances with the view of determining the nature and extent of the problem and whether legislative action is necessary.

During the last session, the Senate passed S. 1969, a bill that would authorize the Civil Aeronautics Board, under specified criteria, to grant limited certificates of public convenience and necessity to supplemental air carriers. However, because of certain tragic events occurring subsequent to its passage, a great deal of confusion and misunderstanding has clouded the issues involved in determining the proper role of the supplemental air carrier industry in the aviation community. We will devote our energies to putting the issues in proper focus and to resolve such differences as exist between the House- and Senate-passed versions of the legislation so as to insure maximum air safety and sound economic policy.

We also plan hearings on the subject of air safety with primary emphasis on the problems involved in air traffic control. Particular attention will be devoted to the recommendations set forth in the Project Beacon report and plans for implementation thereof.

The authority of the Civil Aeronautics Board to guarantee loans made to local service carriers for the acquisition of modern aircraft will expire on September 7 of this year. We must conduct hearings to determine if there is a need for extending the Board's authority beyond the September 7 expiration date.

The committee hopes to conduct early hearings on a bill, S. 2599, which would amend the Federal Aviation Act to provide for the establishment of a Federal Aviation Service for air traffic control.

In addition, a number of bills, mostly of a routine nature, proposed by the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Federal Aviation Agency are pending before us. The committee expects to conduct such hearings as may be necessary and to take such action as these bills may merit during the current session.

Surface transportation

During the 1st session of the 87th Congress, 42 bills and resolutions were referred to the Surface Transportation Subcommittee. Of these, seven measures were favorably reported to the floor, six were passed by the Senate, and three were signed by the President into public law.

The subcommittee held 20 public hearings on specific legislation and, in addition, conducted 13 public hearings on 5 separate studies and investigations relating to major transportation problems. In this latter category, heavy emphasis was placed on first determining the extent of the decline of common carriage—by all modes—in the national transportation system, then developing and evaluating remedial steps to halt this decline.

As a result of the material developed, initial consideration in the second session will be given to S. 2560, a measure designed to strengthen the authorized transportation companies by curtailing unlawful and illegal carriers, particularly on the highways. Moreover, the subcommittee's workload is expected to sharply increase when the President transmits to the Congress a special transportation message, including specific legislative recommendations. It is anticipated that this will cover the broad range of transportation problems, from tax relief to bankruptcies to agricultural exemptions, and will require therefore, extensive consideration by the subcommittee.

Another important measure to be taken up will be S. 2413, which would help stabilize the Alaskan transportation companies by placing the Alaska Railroad under the regulatory authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEES AND STUDIES

Textile industry study

We have, through public hearings in Washington, D.C., and in the field, been actively probing into the problems of this very important segment of our economy since 1958. Two reports have been issued, and a third is under preparation, following our hearings last week.

We made several recommendations to the executive branch of our Government; however, very little was accomplished until President Kennedy, on May 2, 1961, issued a seven-point program to aid this industry. We are trying to aid the implementation of this program and to oversee the actions of the various departments of Government that are involved. We firmly believe that this industry, second only to steel in times of national emergency, should not be allowed to decline any further.

Marine sciences

Oceanography has, and will continue to take a great deal of our time and energy. Two of our members attended the first session of the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission held in Paris last October. Thirty-nine nations participated. We must carefully watch the expanding oceanographic programs of other nations. We must maintain close contact with the National Academy of Sciences Committee on Oceanography, the Coordinating Committee on Oceanography, comprised of the ranking professional oceanographers of all Government agencies, with institutions and laboratories engaged in oceanographic or Great Lakes research, and with industries which recently have established laboratories for sophisticated marine studies, encouraged by the deep interest manifest by our committee and the Congress.

The emergence of Soviet Russia as the most active of all nations in worldwide deep-water studies; the numerous resolutions adopted by the IOC at Paris relating to international ocean surveys, expeditions, communications, and weather observations, the recommendations of U.S. scientific bodies, including NASCO, and of Government departments and agencies, all present important problems within the province of this committee, many of which may require constructive legislation as well as constant vigilance.

Foreign commerce

This committee has recently issued a report entitled, "The United States and World Trade: Challenges and Opportunities." We believe that the nontariff problems of our foreign commerce must be met head on if we are to maintain our place in world trade.

We must develop a good bold program under which our domestic economy can continue to prosper and to keep pace with the dynamic growth of our European friends. The emergence of the Common Market as a major trading bloc should be welcomed as a further buttressing of the free world. The United States must make every effort to assure that its present dominant position in world trade is strengthened, rather than jeopardized, by the new economical and political alinements so rapidly developing around the globe.

During the first session, there were four Senate bills, two Senate joint resolutions, and one Senate concurrent resolution concerning foreign trade referred to the Committee on Commerce. After public hearings, three bills were favorably reported and passed by the Senate, two of which were later enacted into law. We anticipate that during this session there will be further hearings dealing specifically with measures to be taken to improve our balance-of-payments position through the promotion of foreign exports, in support of the President's program. The International Travel Act of 1961 (Public Law 87–63, S. 610) passed last year is expected to be of material benefit in this direction.

Packaging and labeling

As you know, our committee has jurisdiction in this field, so important to our citizens as a protection to their health, as well as against fraud. We are responsible, as an example, for such acts as the Wood Products Labeling Act, the Fur Products Labeling Act, and the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act. The latest two statutes in this field are the Federal Hazardous Substances Labeling Act and Public Law 87–354 that requires certain identifying marks on articles made of gold or silver.

We have watched with great interest the hearings on the deceptive and misleading labeling and packaging practices now prevalent in the packaged products field, and have informed the hearing committee that we stand ready to proceed swiftly if packaging and labeling legislation is the answer to the problem.

The workload of the Commerce Committee is determined by our plans as highlighted above, together with whatever additional legislation is referred to us by the Senate. In view of our wide jurisdiction and the volume of work it covers, we believe you will agree with the views of our committee that this request is reasonable.

Sincerely yours,

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman.

Budget

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
STAFF					
Professional staff members in following general fields:					
Aviation, communications, marine sciences, general transportation, merchant marine and Coast Guard, fisheries and wildlife, auto-marketing practices, foreign commerce, and regulatory agencies	5	$8,000	$16,102.90	$1,341.90	$68,437.32
	1	7,320	14,907.83	1,242.31	3,726.96
	1	7,080	14,486.03	1,207.16	3,621.51
	1	6,180	12,904.32	1,075.36	12,904.32
	[1]4	6,000	12,587.99	1,048.99	50,351.96
	1	5,520	11,744.39	978.69	11,744.39
	1	5,280	11,322.60	943.55	11,322.60
	1	4,980	10,756.25	896.35	10,756.25
	1	4,680	10,176.30	848.02	10,176.30
	1	4,560	9,940.62	828.38	9,940.62
	1	4,200	9,211.53	767.62	9,211.53
	1	4,080	8,968.51	747.37	2,242.13
Clerical staff:					
Clerical assistants and stenographers	1	4,200	9,211.53	767.62	9,211.53
	2	2,940	6,659.70	554.97	13,319.40
	2	2,640	6,052.11	504.34	3,026.06
	1	2,580	5,930.60	494.21	5,930.60
	1	2,520	5,809.07	484.08	5,809.07
	2	2,460	5,687.56	473.96	11,375.12
	2	2,220	5,201.49	433.45	10,402.98
Total	30				263,510.65
ADMINISTRATIVE					
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries)					17,128.19
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382)					2,433.60
Contribution to employees group life insurance (27 cents per month per $1,000)					1,065.96
Travel (inclusive of field investigations)					20,000.00
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)					4,500.00
Stationery, office supplies					1,300.00
Communications (telephone, telegraph, postage)					3,000.00
Newspapers, magazines, documents					200.00
Contingent fund					1,861.60
Total, administrative expense					51,489.35
Grand total					315,000.00

---

[1] Includes part-time consultants, 1 man-year.

Funds requested, Senate Resolution 251, $315,000.

FUNDS FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON MIGRATORY LABOR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1138, Senate Resolution 273.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 273) to provide additional funds for the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to migratory labor including, but not limited to, such problems as (a) the wages of migratory workers, their working conditions, transportation facilities, housing, health, and educational opportunities for migrants and their children, (b) the nature of and the relationships between the programs of the Federal Government and the programs of State and local governments and the activities of private organizations dealing with the problems of migratory workers, and (c) the degree of additional Federal action necessary in this area.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1962, to January 31, 1963, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1963.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1138), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON LABOR
AND PUBLIC WELFARE,
January 29, 1962.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On behalf of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I am transmitting herewith a memorandum and budget concerning Senate Resolution 273, 2d session, 87th Congress, which would authorize this committee to continue its comprehensive study of the problems of migratory labor. The memorandum has been prepared by the chairman of the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, the Honorable HARRISON WILLIAMS, JR.

Senate Resolution 273 has today been unanimously approved by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

May I express my hope that your committee will take favorable action on Senate Resolution 273 at an early date.

With kindest personal regards and best wishes.

Very sincerely,
LISTER HILL,
Chairman.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON LABOR
AND PUBLIC WELFARE,
January 30, 1962.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MIKE: I have read the letter sent to you by Senator LISTER HILL expressing the hope that your committee will take favorable action on Senate Resolution 273 authorizing the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to continue its study of the problems of migratory labor.

I fully support the resolution and join Senator HILL in his request.

Sincerely,
BARRY GOLDWATER.

U.S. SENATE, SUBCOMMITTEE ON
MIGRATORY LABOR OF THE COM-
MITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC
WELFARE,
January 29, 1962.

Memorandum to: The Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD, chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration.

From: Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., chairman, Subcommittee on Migratory Labor.

Re Senate Resolution 273 (87th Cong., 2d sess.) authorizing a comprehensive study of migratory labor.

The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has unanimously approved Senate Resolution 273, authorizing a comprehensive study of migratory labor, which has been referred to your committee for consideration and action. The resolution merely continues for another year the authority of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to conduct studies of the migratory farm labor problem.

During the 1st session of the 87th Congress, the Senate in approving Senate Resolution 86 on March 13, 1961, authorized the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, "to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to migratory labor." The resolution also authorized the committee to expend a sum not in excess of $50,000 for this purpose. The committee, in turn, authorized the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor to conduct the study called for by Senate Resolution 86 (87th Cong., 1st sess.).

The Subcommittee on Migratory Labor was in existence prior to the adoption of this resolution. It was created by the full committee on August 5, 1959, under my chairmanship, having as its majority members, Senators RANDOLPH and MURRAY, and as its minority members, Senators GOLDWATER and JAVITS. The subcommittee remains under my chairmanship, but its original membership has been altered. The majority is now represented by Senators BURDICK, of North Dakota, and SMITH of Massachusetts, and the minority by Senators TOWER, of Texas, and JAVITS, of New York.

Since its establishment, the subcommittee has held numerous hearings for the purpose of obtaining the views of interested parties on specific legislation and on the general subject of the migratory farm labor problem. In toto, the subcommittee has obtained testimony on the general problem and examined the living and working conditions of migratory farmworkers in eight States, ranging from New York to Florida, and from the upper Middle West to California.

The testimony presented at these hearings has been printed in two parts, and a subcommittee print entitled, "The Migrant Farm Worker in America," which is a basic background document, has enjoyed wide distribution and stimulated great interest. In addition, the subcommittee prepared and submitted to the Senate an interim report in which the subcommittee's findings and recommendations concerning migratory farmworker problems are given detailed explanations.

In accordance with the provisions of its resolutions (S. Res. 267 and S. Res. 86), subcommittee studies have been conducted in the areas of wages, working conditions, transportation facilities, housing, health, and educational opportunities for both children and adults. The subcommittee has also examined the nature of and relationship between the programs of the Federal Government and the programs of State and local governments and the activities of private organizations dealing with the problems of migratory farmworkers. As a result of the work of the subcommittee, certain determinations have been made respecting the degree of Federal action necessary in the area of migratory farmworker problems.

In consequence, in February 1961, a comprehensive legislative program for the amelioration of many of the most serious migratory farmworker problems was introduced in the Senate. This program comprises S. 1122, agricultural minimum wage; S. 1123, prohibitions against harmful child labor; S. 1124, child education; S. 1125, adult education; S. 1126, Federal registration of crew leaders; S. 1127, migrant housing; S. 1128, collective bargaining rights for farmworkers; S. 1129, domestic farmworkers stabilization; S. 1130, health; S. 1131, day care facilities; and S. 1132, National Advisory Council on Migratory Labor.

During the 1st session of the 87th Congress, hearings were held on several of these bills. The hearing testimony on the child labor, child and adult education, crew leader, health, and National Advisory Council bills have been printed and widely distributed. In August and early September 1961 these five bills were passed by the Senate and now await action by the House of Representatives.

The bill, S. 1129, domestic farmworker stabilization, was also the subject of hearings. At the close of the last session, this bill was pending before the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor.

The migrant housing bill, S. 1127, was the subject of hearings conducted by the Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency during the last session. The bill is pending before the Subcommittee on Housing and is expected to be considered during this session.

During this session also, it is anticipated that the Committee on Finance will consider S. 1131, the day care facilities bill. The remaining migratory labor bills to be considered during this session are pending before the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor (S. 1122, minimum wage; S. 1128, collective bargaining; and S. 1129, domestic farmworker stabilization).

The activities relating to the pending migratory labor legislation will require the subcommittee to conduct public hearings, research, and other activities during the second session of this Congress. Such activities will necessarily include assistance and consultative services affecting migratory labor bills referred to other committees. In addition, the subcommittee expects to continue research and study in cooperation with relevant Federal and State agencies and other interested organizations, in those problem areas such as workmen's compensation and residence requirements, which have not yet been covered by specific legislative proposals.

The subcommittee has carefully studied the State laws affecting migrant labor. In States having such laws, generally conscientious and serious enforcement efforts have been observed. Nonetheless, these State laws have made little, if any, significant impact on the lives of migratory farmworkers and their families. Clearly, most of the critical migratory farmworker problems result from their predominantly interstate character which renders them beyond the reach of State action. The subcommittee is, therefore, convinced that it must continue its study of the interstate character of this problem to define fully the role of the Federal Government.

It is noteworthy that the administration has evidenced its strong support of the subcommittee's work respecting the general problem of migratory farm labor. The administration has expressed favorable views on the five migratory labor bills passed by the Senate during the first session of this Congress. More recently, on January 17, 1962, the administration expressed its continued support through a statement of policy, recommendations, and directives of the President's Committee on Migratory Labor. I am including as part of this memorandum the statement of policy, recommendations, and directives, together with the minutes of the President's Committee meeting and related correspondence between the Secretary of Labor and the President of the United States.

Subcommittee savings in the form of unexpended budget funds in the amount of approximately $5,000 will be returned to the contingent fund of the Senate. Such savings were possible because the services of Mr. Frederick R. Blackwell, counsel to the subcommittee, were retained without charge to the subcommittee.

The diversified activities of the subcommittee which will be required during the coming session, as well as the greater need for the use of expert consultants and technical advice and assistance, will require a budget equal to that authorized last year. It is of interest to note, however, that despite contemplated diversification and increased scope of the general workload, the number of staff personnel requested in the pending resolution will be no greater than that approved by the Senate last year. In accordance with procedures established by the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, the proposed resolution makes provision for the appointment of a minority staff member.

The subcommittee requests the approval of the pending resolution by your committee, and submits the attached budget.

HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

Budget

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
STAFF					
Editorial and research:					
Research director	1	$4,380	$9,576.07	$798.00	$9,576.07
Research assistant	2	6,360	13,220.66	1,101.72	13,220.66
Administrative and clerical: Stenographer	3	6,840	15,969.05	1,330.75	15,969.05
Total	6				38,765.78
ADMINISTRATIVE					
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382, effective July 1, 1960)					200.00
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries paid)					2,519.77
Contribution to employees Federal employees group life insurance (27 cents per month per $1,000 coverage)					150.00
Reimbursable payments to agencies					500.00
Travel (inclusive of field investigations)					3,500.00
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)					1,500.00
Witness fees, expenses					500.00
Stationery, office supplies					500.00
Communications (telephone, telegraph)					1,000.00
Newspapers, magazines, documents					500.00
Contingent fund					364.45
Total					11,234.22
Grand total					50,000.00

Also submitted to the committee by Senator WILLIAMS as pertinent to the proposed inquiry is the following statement of the President's Committee on Migratory Labor:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., January 17, 1962.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We are pleased to submit the first formal statement of policy, recommendations, and directives of your Committee on Migratory Labor. This report was approved at a meeting of the full committee today.

Approximately 1 million men, women, and children are involved in the Nation's migratory farm labor system. Excluded from most of the great social and economic legislation which protects the vast majority of the Nation's wage earners, forced to compete with hundreds of thousands of foreign workers, bereft of training and education in anything other than agriculture, migratory farmworkers are truly the Nation's excluded Americans. Each spring brings fresh reports of highway accidents resulting in the death and injury of migrants in transit, stranded migrants without adequate food or shelter, and the retardation of migrant children because of inadequate educational opportunities.

Together, domestic migrant farmworkers comprise a "depressed class" of agricultural wage earners—a group which for many years has remained outside the broad scope of public concern or policy. Most are members of minority groups—Negro, Mexican-American, Puerto Rican, and American Indian. Many are former sharecroppers, tenant, and marginal farmers, and regularly hired laborers who have been replaced either by machines or foreign labor. They migrate because there are not enough jobs in their home communities to sustain them, or because local wages are too low to provide for the necessities of life.

The chief purpose of today's meeting of the President's Committee on Migratory Labor has been to establish a united Committee policy directed toward improvement of the economic and social condition of migrant farmworkers and their families. Our immediate goal is to secure passage by the House of the five bills, introduced by Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS of New Jersey and passed by the Senate during the last session of Congress. These bills deal primarily with the national registration of farm labor contractors and crew leaders, the extension of the child labor provision of the Fair Labor Standards Act to the children of migrants, the extension of health services to migrants, grants-in-aid on a matching basis to States for the education of migrant children and adults, and the establishment of a National Advisory Council on Migratory Labor. The Committee has also urged passage of the National Farm Labor Stabilization Act—a bill which would make it possible for many more underemployed rural workers to accept jobs in agriculture.

We have also advocated strict enforcement of Federal and State laws and regulations which now apply to migrants and their families, and the tightening of regulations governing the importation of foreign labor for work on U.S. farms.

In addition, the Committee has advocated "support in principle" for the extension of appropriate minimum wage and labor-management legislation to agriculture. The Committee has asked the PCML secretariat to review legislative proposals in these fields.

The Committee has also directed its secretariat to study provisions of the Area Redevelopment Act and rural development and special food programs to determine how the benefits of these programs can be extended to migrants and their families.

In conclusion, Mr. President, we believe that public support for reform in this field is at the highest point ever reached. It is your Committee's opinion that effective followthrough by both legislative and administrative forces will produce tangible solutions to the longstanding problems of migrants and their families.

Respectfully,

ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG,
Secretary of Labor, Chairman, President's Committee on Migratory Labor.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, January 17, 1962.

Hon. ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG,
Secretary of Labor, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have read the statement of policy, recommendations and directives of the President's Committee on Migratory Labor which you sent to me today. I wholeheartedly endorse the Committee's view that a united policy is necessary if improvements are to be made in this important field.

Having been long acquainted with the problems faced by migratory farmworkers and their families, I believe the Committee has outlined in its recommendations and directives the major areas of concern. A followthrough on the Committee's recommendations will, in my opinion, result in better conditions for the Nation's migrants—one of the most underprivileged groups in the American labor force. The five migrant bills introduced by Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS of New Jersey and passed by the Senate during the last session of Congress offer the opportunity to make real progress in this important area consonant with the Committee's recommendations. I hope these bills will receive favorable action by the House this year.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

MEETING OF COMMITTEE

The President's Committee on Migratory Labor met on January 17, 1962. Present at the meeting were Secretary of Labor, Arthur J. Goldberg, Chairman; Secretary of Agriculture, Orville L. Freeman; Secretary of the Interior, Stewart L. Udall; Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Abraham A. Ribicoff; and the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, Robert C. Weaver. Special guests were the Honorable Harrison A. Williams, Jr., Senator from New Jersey, chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor; and the Honorable Herbert Zelenko, Congressman from New York, chairman of the House Select Subcommittee on Labor.

Also present were the alternate Committee members, the Committee's Executive Director, John Walsh, and departmental aids.

In opening the meeting Chairman Goldberg expressed the hope that the Committee would establish a united policy directed toward improving the social and economic conditions of migrants and their families. He hoped also that all major issues would be considered at the meeting, and that the Committee would formulate a program to eliminate the persistent problem of migrancy from the American scene.

In welcoming the distinguished guests, the Chairman touched briefly upon past legislative efforts to improve migrant conditions, but said none has succeeded in achieving what Senator Williams had accomplished during the last session of the Congress—the passage by the Senate of five bills pertaining specifically to migratory labor.

Chairman Goldberg also paid tribute to the efforts of Representative Zelenko in working for action in the House on migratory labor bills introduced by himself and other Representatives. "I am sure that I am speaking on behalf of all members of the Committee," the Chairman said, "when I congratulate the Senator and the Congressman for taking on a tough job for no reason other than that it was the right thing to do."

Senator WILLIAMS and Congressman ZELENKO made appropriate responses and both expressed their warm appreciation of the Chairman's remarks concerning the stated purpose of the meeting. Both guests gave an interesting résumé of campaign actions on behalf of migrant legislation, and each confirmed the increase in public awareness of migrants and concern for their welfare. The Senator indicated that he expected to hold hearings this year on some if not all of his remaining five bills, while the Congressman said he would concentrate on passage of the five measures passed by the Senate in the first session of the Congress.

The Committee's Executive Director, John Walsh, gave a résumé of migratory labor conditions, of governmental attempts to resolve the many problems involved, and of public policy motivating those actions.

On the request of the Chairman a proposed statement of Committee policy, recommendations, and directives, developed by the secretariat with the aid of constituent departments, was then read once, and opened for discussion and consideration. All members of the Committee separately expressed their endorsement of the document, and with a few minor changes it was formally and unanimously adopted.

The Committee's statement of policy, recommendations, and directives was submitted to the President. Appended hereto is a copy of the Chairman's letter of transmittal, and a copy of the President's letter of response.

STATEMENT OF POLICY, RECOMMENDATIONS AND DIRECTIVES OF THE PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON MIGRATORY LABOR

Statement of policy

Migratory agricultural workers have been given many names—"excluded Americans," "forgotten Americans," and the "Nation's derelicts," among many others. Regardless of what they are called, migrants perform an extremely important service to farming communities throughout the Nation during certain seasons of peak agricultural activity. Their appearance in an area may mean the difference between economic success and economic disaster. Between seasons, they retire to shack and shanty towns well off the main roads in their home base areas—out of sight and out of mind.

Domestic migrants are displaced people, usually lacking in education and bereft of training in anything other than agriculture. Most are members of minority groups—Negro, Mexican-American, Puerto Rican, and American Indian. Many are former sharecroppers, tenant and marginal farmers, and regularly hired laborers who have been replaced either by machines or foreign labor. They migrate because there are not enough jobs in their local communities to sustain them, or because local wages are too low to provide for the necessities of life.

Together, they comprise a depressed class of agricultural wage earners; a group which for many years has remained outside the broad scope of public concern and policy. They are among the lowest paid of any group in the American labor force, able to find employment on only half the days of each year. They are excluded from most of the great social and economic legislation which protects the vast majority of American wage earners. Because they are constantly on the move, their children are denied the opportunity to receive an adequate education, and restrictive residence requirements deny them public health and welfare services. In many cases this restriction extends even to that most basic of American rights—the right to vote.

In their everlasting search for work, domestic migrants are forced to compete with hundreds of thousands of foreign workers for the few jobs that are available to them. Yet to many growers across the country, these workers are indispensable to harvesting, their importance far exceeding their numbers during crucial periods of the agricultural cycle.

The President's Committee on Migratory Labor recognizes the many earnest efforts made on behalf of the Nation's migrant workers by church, civic, farm, and labor groups in a great number of communities throughout the country. The Committee believes that as long as migrancy continues, the need for community services will also continue, and urges that there be no relaxation of these commendable programs.

The Committee also recognizes the valuable services of its working group, the members of which often contribute their own time in planning and programing interdepartmental services for migrants. The many National and State committees and organizations concerned with the problem of migratory labor have accomplished a great deal in publicizing the need for sound remedial action, and working for its realization. For over 2 years Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, of New Jersey, aided in the House by Congressman HERBERT ZELENKO, of New York, has worked strenuously on a migrant legislative program. Senator WILLIAMS with the help of Congressman ZELENKO has done much to focus public and official attention on the migratory labor problem and has helped bring the extension of protective legislation to migrants closer to actuality than ever before in history.

The chief purpose of the first meeting of the President's Committee on Migratory Labor under the Kennedy administration is to establish a united Committee policy directed toward improving the economic and social condition of migrant farmworkers and their families. It is the Committee's hope that all public policy will be directed toward the creation of a stable and structured labor force in American agriculture, rather than toward the perpetuation of the present anachronistic labor system based on unemployment, underemployment, and poverty, both at home and abroad. The Committee supports a sound farm program which will assure prosperity for all American farmers, but insists that such prosperity be shared by all segments of the agricultural community, including both migratory and permanent hired labor.

It is, therefore, the policy of the President's Committee on Migratory Labor to accomplish in agriculture what we, as a nation, have already accomplished in most other sectors of our economy—the restoration of respect and dignity, based on good wages, good working conditions, steady employment, educational opportunities, and the extension of public health and welfare services to the men, women, and children who labor for hire in American agriculture.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND DIRECTIVES

I. Federal legislation

A. Legislation passed by the Senate: The President's Committee on Migratory Labor recommends prompt and favorable action by the House of Representatives on five migrant labor measures passed by the Senate during the first session of the Congress. The Committee believes that passage of these bills would mark a historic turning point in public policy toward farm migrants and their families. Briefly, the five measures are as follows:

1. Registration of farm labor contractors: Require registration of crew leaders and labor contractors in an effort to protect migrants against exploitation.

2. Child labor: To extend the protection of the child labor provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act to the children of migratory farmworkers.

3. Health services: Grants to States to extend public health services to migrants and their families.

4. Education: Grants-in-aid on a matching basis to States and local communities to help provide educational opportunities to both migrant children and adults.

5. National Advisory Council on Migratory Labor: Composed of representatives of migrants, farm employers and experts in the field of migrant health, welfare, education and employment, to advise the President and the Congress on matters pertaining to migratory labor.

B. Other migrant legislation: The President's Committee on Migratory Labor, in seeking to remedy other areas of longstanding distress from which migratory and other farmworkers suffer, recommended that the Congress give serious consideration to the following proposals, each within its own context:

1. Domestic worker stabilization: The President's Committee on Migratory Labor recommends prompt consideration and passage by the Congress of the measures introduced as the National Farm Labor Stabilization Act. The Committee believes the provisions of this bill would make it economically possible for many additional underemployed rural workers to accept employment in agriculture. This would work to the advantage of farm employers as well as employees.

2. Minimum wage: The President's Committee on Migratory Labor supports in principle the appropriate extension of minimum wage legislation to agriculture. The Committee believes that there is rising public support for an agricultural minimum wage. This support comes not only from groups and individuals usually associated with reform in the farm labor field, but from many growers and their organizations as well. It is becoming increasingly apparent that growers who reside in States where farm labor wage rates are relatively high are at a competitive disadvantage with growers in low-wage States. The Committee directs the secretariat to review legislative proposals in this field, and in so doing to take into account the problems faced by farm operators whose difficulties are fully appreciated by the Committee.

3. Day care: The President's Committee on Migratory Labor supports legislation which would provide grants-in-aid to the States on a matching basis to provide day-care centers for the children of migratory agricultural workers. Under present conditions, the children of migrants who are too young to work are left at the home camp during the workday without sufficient care, or are taken to the fields where dangerous conditions prevail.

4. Housing: The President's Committee on Migratory Labor supports in principle legislation which would aid farmers and farm wage earners in improving on-farm and home-base housing. The Housing Act of 1961 will be of help in this regard, but it is possible that additional legislation may be necessary. The Committee recommends, therefore, that Congress give serious consideration to bills, introduced by Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS and others, which would provide direct loans to associations of farmers and other nonprofit organizations for improvement of off-farm housing. The President's Committee on Migratory Labor recommends also that the secretariat give further study to adjustments in the Housing Act of 1961 which would make it easier to provide adequate housing for farmworkers.

5. Labor-management relations: The President's Committee on Migratory Labor supports in principle the appropriate extension of collective bargaining rights to agricultural workers. The Committee recognizes, however, that the unstructured and diversified character of both agriculture and agricultural labor must be properly considered before the type and scope of enabling legislation can be determined. The Committee's secretariat is accordingly directed to initiate a study of this problem and forward recommendations to the chairman of the Committee as soon as possible.

6. Unemployment insurance: The President's Committee on Migratory Labor supports in principle the extension of unemployment insurance legislation to agriculture. Specific recommendations in this field will be made following completion of studies now underway by the U.S. Department of Labor in cooperation with several State employment agencies.

7. Residence requirements: The great majority of States have residence requirements which exclude financially needy migrant workers and their families from public assistance. The President's Committee on Migratory Labor recommends that serious study be given to this problem by Federal and State authorities, with a view to eliminating or reducing the hardships these requirements impose on domestic migratory workers.

II. Administration of legislation passed during the 1st session of the 87th Congress and other programs which relate to agricultural labor

A. Public Law 78 (Mexican farm labor program) and other foreign worker legislation: The President's Committee on Migratory Labor believes that the amendments to Public Law 78 passed during the 1st session of the 87th Congress will be of help to the Secretary of Labor in preventing adverse effect to domestic farmworkers. The Committee would like to point out that in a statement accompanying H.R. 2010 (extension of Public Law 78 as amended), President Kennedy said the following: "The adverse effect of the Mexican farm labor program as it has operated in recent years on the wage and employment conditions of domestic workers is clear and cumulative in its impact. We cannot afford to disregard it. We do not condone it. Therefore I sign this bill with the assurance that the Secretary of Labor will, by every means at his disposal, use the authority vested in him under the law to prescribe the standards and to make the determinations essential for the protection of the wages and working conditions of domestic agricultural workers." The President's Committee on Migratory Labor welcomes this forthright statement of policy by the President and the initiative taken by the Secretary of Labor to fulfill this Presidential mandate, and the intent of the Congress. The Committee urges that affiliated State agencies, growers who use foreign labor, and other interested individuals and organizations offer their full cooperation to the Secretary of Labor. In line with this, the Committee recommends that growers who use foreign labor begin now to seek ways and means of recruiting and training available domestic labor, thereby reducing their dependence on foreign labor. The Committee recommends also that present farm placement activities be expanded to help achieve full utilization of unemployed and underemployed rural workers. Finally the Committee asserts that the temporary admission of aliens for work in agriculture under the Immigration and Nationality Act, Public Law 414, can be no substitute for the kind of bilateral agreement that exists between the United States and Mexico for the temporary admission of Mexican nationals for work in agriculture under Public Law 78.

B. Area redevelopment and rural area development programs: The President's Committee on Migratory Labor directs the secretariat to study provisions of the Area Redevelopment Act and rural area development programs to determine how the benefits of these programs can be extended to migrants and their families—especially to migrants who make their home base in designated redevelopment areas. Recommendations from the secretariat to the Committee members should be made within 90 days of the date of this meeting.

C. Housing Act of 1961: The President's Committee on Migratory Labor directs the secretariat, in cooperation with HHFA and FHA, to initiate an informational campaign to inform farmers and farm wage earners of the provisions of the Housing Act of 1961 which apply to the improvement and construction of home-base and on-farm housing.

D. Special food programs: The President's Committee on Migratory Labor recommends additional special efforts to enable more migratory workers and their families to receive the benefits of the national school lunch and special milk programs, and the program under which federally owned foods are made available to the States for distribution to schools, nonprofit institutions, and needy families. The Committee, therefore, directs the secretariat to explore immediate areas of additional action, including the need to work with State migratory labor committees in order to achieve greater use of these programs in assisting migratory farmworkers and their families.

E. State programs: The President's Committee on Migratory Labor directs the secretariat to work closely with State migratory labor committees in the formation of programs to aid migrants. State committees and agencies are urged to call upon the secretariat for any help they may need in developing and carrying out programs, and are also urged to offer advice and recommendations concerning future actions of the President's Committee on Migratory Labor.

III. Enforcement of existing legislation and regulations

A. Federal legislation and regulations: The President's Committee on Migratory Labor urges all Federal and cooperating State agencies which administer laws and regulations pertaining to agricultural labor to improve related enforcement and compliance programs. If additional appropriations are necessary, the Committee recommends that the agencies request additional funds from the Congress, and that the Congress give serious consideration to these requests.

B. State legislation and regulations: The President's Committee on Migratory Labor urges those States which have laws and regulations applying to agricultural labor to step up their enforcement and compliance programs. State action of this kind is especially needed in the fields of health, housing, or labor camp regulations, and safety regulations governing the transportation of farmworkers. The Committee also urges those States which do not have legislation and regulations pertaining to agricultural labor to act in this area as soon as possible. State action in the field of workmen's compensation is especially needed.

PRINTING OF SENATE DOCUMENT ON ELECTION, EXPULSION, AND CENSURE CASES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1139, Senate Resolution 289.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The resolution will be stated by title.

The **Legislative Clerk.** A resolution (S. Res. 289) authorizing the printing as a Senate document of a compilation entitled "Senate Election, Expulsion, and Censure Cases From 1879 to 1960."

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the compilation entitled "Senate Election, Expulsion, and Censure Cases From 1789 to 1960", compiled by Richard D. Hupman, Senate Librarian, under the direction of Felton M. Johnston, Secretary of the Senate, be printed as a Senate document, and that there be printed five thousand additional copies of such document for the use of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

STUDY OF INTERAGENCY COORDINATION, ECONOMY, AND EFFICIENCY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1141, Senate Resolution 276.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The resolution will be stated by title.

The **Legislative Clerk.** A resolution (S. Res. 276) to provide additional funds for the study of matters pertaining to interagency coordination, economy, and efficiency.

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to say a few words with regard to Senate Resolution 276, as reported in Senate Report No. 1162 by the Committee on Rules.

The purpose of this resolution is to provide additional funds for the Committee on Government Operations to study matters pertaining to "interagency coordination, economy and efficiency."

It has been my privilege to serve as chairman of the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations, which has conducted the previous study of the "Inter-Agency Coordination, Economy, and Efficiency."

A. THREE REASONS FOR THE RESOLUTION

The reasons for the present resolution are as follows:

First. Important savings for the American taxpayer have already been achieved under the past study.

Second. Several significant studies are underway. Additional time is necessary to complete them.

Third. Under its regular jurisdiction, the Committee on Government Operations has a heavy workload. It cannot adequately fulfill its responsibilities for "interagency coordination" under Rule 25, Standing Rules of the Senate, unless it has additional staff, such as is provided under this resolution.

It will be recalled that Senate Rule 25 provides that this committee shall be responsible for the study of "budgeting, accounting, economy and efficiency."

B. PROPOSED AUTHORITY AND FUNDS IDENTICAL

The authority and funds proposed under Senate Resolution 276, 87th Congress, 2d session, are identical to the authority and the total of funds—$75,000, plus $15,000—under Senate Resolution 26 and Senate Resolution 205, 87th Congress, 1st session, for the study of "Inter-Agency Coordination, Economy, and Efficiency."

Of the $90,000 previously authorized, we are returning some $8,000.

C. RESOLUTION, AS REPORTED, HAS ONLY MINOR PROCEDURAL AMENDMENT

The single amendment, as reported by the Committee on Rules, is purely procedural—that is, to set at $1,400, rather than $1,200, the maximum difference which may be allowed as between the gross rate paid the highest minority employee and the rate paid the highest majority employee.

D. THE THREE TOPICS HANDLED BY SUBCOMMITTEE IN 1961

During the first session, the subcommittee concentrated on three important subjects:

First. Improved management of Federal scientific information—involving efficiency in over $10 billion of research, development, testing, and evaluation in the 1962 fiscal year.

Second. Improved budgeting for Federal research and development.

Third. Strengthened interagency coordination in oversea technical assistance—involving over $180 million in Federal funds.

A number of other subjects also received our attention: First, interagency coordination in international health; and second, interagency coordination in support of inventions.

E. ACCOMPLISHMENTS IN ALL THREE AREAS

As a result of each of the three principal studies, important achievements, including savings to the taxpayers have resulted.

First. Cutting waste through better information. Because of our efforts, there has been considerable improvement in Federal management of scientific and technical information.

Nonetheless, we estimate that one-tenth of all Federal research and development efforts may involve unintentional and wasteful duplication of efforts. In electronic research and development, this may involve $200 million or more in waste of taxpayers' resources.

In at least one instance, Congress has now been given clearer and better administrative information—on over $1 billion of medical and health-related research. Congress control of the purse strings has thereby been advanced.

Second. Strengthening budgeting for research and development. The Bureau of the Budget is considering certain steps which we have recommended for improved budget presentations to the Congress on research funds. These funds will consume one out of every eight U.S. budget dollars in the 1963 fiscal year.

Third. Securing better coordination in oversea assistance. As the direct result of our study of coordination of oversea technical assistance, an amendment to the Mutual Security Act of 1961 was developed by the subcommittee, introduced and enacted. It requires the Agency for International Development to make greater use of domestic-oriented Federal agencies (which have the principal competence in such fields as education, health, agriculture, housing, etc.)

In the past, there has been a tendency to build up within the Foreign Aid Agency a duplicate Public Health Service, a duplicate Housing Agency, a duplicate Office of Education, as well as other small-scale replicas of domestic agencies.

F. EXHIBIT OF MESSAGES PRAISING SUBCOMMITTEE STUDY OF INTERNATIONAL HEALTH

I have previously reported to the Senate as regards the very important study of international health activities which the subcommittee has conducted and on which we continued efforts in 1961.

I have mentioned that hundreds of enthusiastic messages have been received as regards our efforts from the medical profession at home and abroad.

Praise-filled descriptions, such as "wonderful," "extraordinarily fine," "monumental," have been applied to our reports by leading authorities.

I ask unanimous consent that, at the conclusion of my remarks, there be reproduced—as exhibit "A"—quotations from a few of these many messages of commendation received within the past few months.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

G. AGENCIES IMPROVING COORDINATION IN OVERSEAS TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Mr. HUMPHREY. At this very moment, at our instance, the Agency for International Development is conducting a series of discussions with domestic-oriented departments and agencies. Their purpose is to develop more effective ways in which the domestic agencies can contribute to American technical assistance programs abroad.

It is clear that the previous memoranda of agreement between the foreign aid agency—ICA, now AID—and the domestic agencies will have to be greatly revised if the technical expertness of the domestic agencies is to be capitalized upon to the fullest.

It must be recalled that the United States is competing with the Soviet Union in technical assistance activities throughout the developing nations. The U.S. Government must strengthen its technical assistance programs in Latin America and elsewhere throughout the world.

We must find ways of strengthening the caliber of personnel whom we send abroad to teach and train in education, housing, agriculture, health, and other pursuits.

We have had many fine, dedicated workers, serving our technical assistance programs in the past; but there is still vast room for improvement.

Here is a problem of interagency coordination which is especially appropriate to the further efforts of the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations.

EXHIBIT A

COMMENDATIONS OF THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE'S STUDY OF INTERNATIONAL MEDICAL RESEARCH AND INTERNATIONAL MEDICAL ASSISTANCE

Hiden T. Cox, executive director, American Institute of Biological Sciences, Washington, D.C.: "We have received your Report No. 142 on the 'Coordination of Federal Agencies' Programs in Biomedical Research and in Other Scientific Areas.' In our opinion, this is a monumental report which is invaluable for general reference purposes. In particular, did we find valuable the thoughtful staff recommendations and some of the criticisms of govermental budgeting and planning policies which seem to be very well founded.

"We are considering establishing a study on the impact of Federal funds on biological research in this country. Your report should be exceedingly valuable to such a group and I may be calling upon you later for additional copies."

Robert S. Morison, M.D., director, the Rockefeller Foundation, medical and natural sciences, New York, N.Y.: "Thank you very much for your courtesy in sending us the documents related to the international health hearing of your subcommittee. We are very glad to have these valuable reference works for our library. May I add my congratulations on an excellent job."

Frank B. Berry, M.D., senior medical adviser, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Washington, D.C.: "We recently received the report for which you are responsible: Report No. 142, 'Coordination of Federal Agencies' Programs in Biomedical Research and in Other Scientific Areas.' I have read it through with the greatest of interest and wish to congratulate you and through you the committee on this extraordinarily fine report."

W. Clarke Wescoe, chancellor, the University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kans.: "I appreciate very much receiving from you and your office the reports on 'Federal Expenditures for Health, Including Research.'

"These are valuable documents and beautifully presented. This is the first time I have ever seen such a comprehensive report on these matters."

Henry W. Brosin, M.D., director and chairman, Department of Psychiatry, University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine, Western Psychiatric Institute and Clinic, Pittsburgh, Pa.: "I want to thank you for sending this report to me in view of the interesting information about the manifold activities in the field of biomedical research. It is only upon reviewing a report with the comprehensive coverage of this one that one begins to gain an idea about the tremendous scope of Federal activity in the field of health. You and your staff are to be congratulated upon the excellence of this overall review which will be an invaluable reference work to those who have the responsibility in Government and to many of us outside of Government who are interested in the development of health activities and the research connected with it."

C. F. Code, M.D., Mayo Clinic, Rochester, Minn.: "I am impressed by the tremendous amount of material which you and your subcommittee were able to accumulate and to digest. It was a big task; it does lay however a fine groundwork for future operations."

Marcus D. Kogel, M.D., dean, Albert Einstein College of Medicine, Yeshiva University, New York, N.Y.: "I want to express my admiration for the work done by your Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations as exemplified by the report of the committee.

"I feel certain that your wise and dynamic leadership played a significant part in bringing out facts which will lead to constructive action.

"Your comments on the best use of the health dollar are certainly to the point. Your committee has provided Congress and all interested citizens with a document of great value."

Herbert Volk, M.D., assistant professor, cancer coordinator, Albert Einstein College of Medicine, Yeshiva University, New York, N.Y.: "I read with keen interest the memorandum describing the work of your Senate subcommittee in the fight against cancer. I would like to express my appreciation for your fine efforts and commend you for your accomplishments. Your contributions are indeed significant."

William C. Moloney, M.D., director of hematology laboratory, professor of clinical medicine, Boston City Hospital, Boston, Mass.: "I am very much impressed with the work of your subcommittee on the fight against cancer. This is an international problem, and it is especially important that increased methods of communication and exchange visits of fellows and other research workers should be encouraged.

"I have been working in this field for many years and know personally how much the work of your subcommittee will stimulate and encourage research in this field."

John V. Blady, M.D., Philadelphia, Pa.: "I wish to commend your committee and subcommittees under your committee, for their very fine efforts to promote a better coordinated and more fully expanded and comprehensive program of cancer research and treatment of the cancer problem as encountered to date."

George E. Armstrong, M.D., director, New York University Medical Center, New York, N.Y: "I want you to know how much I appreciate your thoughtfulness in sending me this wonderful report and at the same time should like to congratulate you and your colleagues for the splendid job you are doing for our country."

Kenneth Williamson, associate director, American Hospital Association, Washington Service Bureau, Washington, D.C.: "We are greatly impressed with the manner in which your subcommittee has assembled a vast amount of information dealing with various phases of international health, and which up to now has not been available in the readily accessible and concise manner as is presented in your excellent report.

"We are indebted to you and cannot commend too highly the efforts of your committee in promoting greater interest on the part of the U.S. Government in international health and medical research and a higher degree of coordination between various organizations, both governmental and semigovernmental in these fields.

"We continue to believe that health is one of the most promising fields for better understanding in international relations. The position of the United States throughout the world can be greatly enhanced if we use the international health field as a medium of exchange.

"We would hope that in any legislative action that might result from your endeavors, hospitals will be included as part of the total health picture. Our association will gladly cooperate with any international program designed to share with the free world the experience and achievements of American hospitals."

Chauncey D. Leake, retiring president, American Association for the Advancement of Science, professor of pharmacology, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio: "Congratulations to you and your colleagues on the very important scientific research study which you have carried forward so splendidly. The reports that you have reported are indeed of great value, and they clearly indicate the scope of the activities of your group.

"I am glad that you are helping to bring about coordination of the various health professions. It is essential that the professions of medicine, dentistry, pharmacy, veterinary medicine, nursing and public health, together with the members of the health sciences and health services, cooperate together with the overall purpose of improving the health of our people. Anything that we can do to promote this interprofessional cooperation will be greatly to our good."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment, on page 2, line 5, after the word "than", to strike out "$1,200" and insert "$1,400", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Government Operations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to interagency coordination, economy, and efficiency.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1962, through January 31, 1963, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized at its discretion to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings upon the study and investigation authorized by this resolution, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1963.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $90,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 276) was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1162), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE, COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS, SUBCOMMITTEE ON REORGANIZATION AND INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS,
January 26, 1962.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Chairman, Committee on Rules,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On January 16, the Committee on Government Operations approved unanimously the attached resolution. It would enable this committee to continue a study of interagency coordination, economy, and efficiency.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations, which has carried out the study, I am pleased to submit a background memorandum. It sets forth what we have achieved and why it is necessary to continue the study.

The memorandum has been kept comparatively brief. I could, however, have included excerpts from literally hundreds of messages which we have received commending our work.

I will quote at this point only from a single letter, received just yesterday, from one of the scientists in charge of one of the highest priority military projects in the Nation, a ballistic missile weapon system. Writing on one of our reports as regards weaknesses in Federal science information programs, he said:

"Let me congratulate everyone responsible for this report. It is informative, well written, and really drives the points home. In fact, I was so impressed that I held a group meeting and read key passages to my personnel and requested that everyone read the findings."

I know that the Committee on Rules will give its earnest consideration to the resolution.

Kindest wishes.

Sincerely,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Subcommittee Chairman.

MEMORANDUM FROM SENATOR HUBERT HUMPHREY, CHAIRMAN, SUBCOMMITTEE ON REORGANIZATION AND INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION, RE CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY AND FUNDS FOR STUDY OF INTERAGENCY COORDINATION

Recommendation: A resolution is proposed which would authorize the Committee on Government Operations to continue its study of interagency coordination, economy, and efficiency.

By direction of the chairman of the committee, the study has been conducted to date by the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations.

Identical authority: The authority in the proposed resolution would be identical to that approved under Senate Resolution 26, 87th Congress, 1st session, February 13, 1961.

Same total of funds: Funds proposed for the study would be $90,000—identical to the total granted to the committee in the 1st session of the 87th Congress ($75,000 under S. Res. 26, followed by $15,000 under S. Res. 205, 87th Cong.).

Funds to be returned: We anticipate that, as of January 31, 1962, a sum approximating $8,000 will be returned, unused.

Reason for extended authority and funds: A great deal of work in interagency coordination remains to be done.

The Committee on Government Operations already has a broad jurisdiction; much legislation comes regularly for its review. Over and above such legislation, under rule XXV, Standing Rules of the Senate, the committee is responsible for Government-wide review, among other problems, of budgeting and accounting, economy and efficiency.

The regular staff is too heavily committed to undertake assignments on the latter subjects. Additional staff is, therefore, necessary.

Moreover, the complex nature of the interagency activities which have been examined requires an extended review, if best results are to be achieved for the American taxpayer.

Past achievements: The previous study of interagency coordination, economy, and efficiency has, it is felt, repaid, in effect, to the American taxpayer the funds which the Senate has previously granted.

The study has received commendations from executive agencies and from nongovernmental quarters for its helpfulness in serving the interests of the Nation.

Specific legislation has resulted, e.g., an amendment enacted in Public Law 87-295, as described below.

In addition, many administrative improvements, suggested by the subcommittee, have been put into effect by Federal agencies. These improvements cover many phases of better Federal budgeting and accounting and strengthened economy and efficiency in each of the areas listed below.

Three major topics reviewed: Under Senate Resolution 26, 87th Congress, three major subjects have been examined:

1. Interagency coordination in scientific and technical information (a study of how Federal agencies are today spending $100 million in taxpayers' funds);

2. Interagency coordination in Federal budgeting for research and development (or how the Bureau of the Budget and other agencies budget $10 billion in taxpayers' funds in the 1962 fiscal year);

3. Interagency coordination in oversea technical assistance (an analysis of Federal expenditures of over $180 million in taxpayers' funds).

Focus different from that of other committees: In all of these reviews, the focus has been on interagency activities. That is, we have studied matters of a board scope involving several departments or agencies (in addition, often intergovernmental organizations), rather than a single department, such as any other committee of the Senate would review within its specialized jurisdiction.

As the title of the full committee indicates, our concern is with Government-wide operations—problems so broad that they cut across the lines of many agencies. These are the type of problems which concern the Executive Office of the President, including the Office of the Special Assistant for Science and Technology and the U.S. Bureau of the Budget.

House Appropriations Committee quoted our findings: In order to avoid any possible overlapping with the work of any other committee, the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations carefully notifies other Senate and House committees before, during, and after its studies.

Thus, we brought our findings on interagency lack of coordination on science and technical information to the attention of the Committees on Appropriations of both the Senate and House.

In this instance, the House Appropriations Committee noted (H. Rept. No. 574, 87th Cong.) in its report on Department of Defense appropriation bill for the 1962 fiscal year:

"There has been recent criticism by another committee of the management of scientific information. It was stated that unknowing duplication and 'tragic and intolerable waste of men, money, and material' has resulted from poor management of these programs and it was recommended that a Science Information Exchange for the registration of all current research projects of the Government be established. This committee requests that the Department of Defense give this matter close attention."

No overlap with investigations subcommittee: The Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations does not review any problems requiring investigation, as such; that is the sole responsibility of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

Three studies under previous resolution: A summary now follows on the three studies conducted under Senate Resolution 26, 87th Congress.

1. COORDINATION IN SCIENCE INFORMATION

A. Purpose of study: To strengthen Federal control of masses of scientific and technical information being generated within Federal, contractor, and grantee laboratories and facilities.

B. Fiscal and other significance: In the 1962 fiscal year, Federal agencies are spending over $10 billion for research, development, testing, and evaluation. Evidence indicates an alarming condition in which literally hundreds of millions of dollars of this tax-supported research goes into needless, unintentional, wasteful duplication of effort.

Countless investigators apply for, and Federal administrators authorize, new research without possessing necessary information on: (1) What related study is already underway elsewhere on the same subject, or (2) what work has already been completed (and has yielded either positive or negative results).

The results of thousands of research projects are not sufficiently reviewed and correlated either by administrators or scientists.

Hundreds of millions of dollars in contracts and subcontracts which are canceled before completion go to waste because the data which they generated before termination gets buried.

Meanwhile, spending for information services is mounting. U.S. agencies are spending slightly under $100 million for scientific and technical information (publishing, bibliographic, reference, research services, etc.); this total only includes direct outlay. Much vaster sums are spent for indirect types of information support. The latter includes travel support and payment of scientists' and engineers' salaries while they are attending hundreds of scientific meetings which take place each year.

C. Reports completed: Two reports have been completed:

1. "Coordination of Information on Current Scientific Research and Development Supported by the U.S. Government," Senate Report No. 263, 87th Congress, 1st session, May 18, 1961. This report demonstrated that the Federal Government possesses no central index over 160,000 projects which it currently supports, or even a partial series of comprehensive indexes.

2. "Coordination of Information on Current Federal Research and Development Projects in the Field of Electronics," 87th Congress, 1st session, September 20, 1961.

This report showed that perhaps $200 million out of current Federal outlay of $2 billion for electronic research, development, testing, and evaluation may be wasted in unplanned and needless duplication of effort.

Both reports contained specific recommendations for improvements in the executive branch.

D. Comments on reports by Admiral Rickover: Among the many comments which have been noted on our reports are the following remarks by Adm. H. G. Rickover. Testifying before the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights on June 2, 1961, he stated:

"It is immensely important that what has already been invented be known so that there will be no needless duplication of effort. Scientists and engineers must have easy and prompt access to such information. Most of them work in narrow fields and cannot possibly be familiar with all pertinent developments affecting their work unless positive steps are taken to bring these to their notice. Last April the staff of a Senate Subcommittee on Government Operations found our efforts to coordinate and make available information on research quite inadequate. Of course, the job is terrific. There are now more than 160,000 tasks being performed in the physical sciences alone, in about [illegible],000 research installations.

The staff report states that today there exists not even a complete inventory of the Government's own research and development program, still less, of course, of total national research. On the other hand, the Russians have an excellent system of collecting, translating, tabulating, and distributing technical information from all over the world. All of this goes automatically to all scientists who might find this information helpful in their own researches."

E. Report in process: To be printed shortly at the Government Printing Office is a staff report on "The Crisis and Opportunity in Scientific and Technical Information and Communication."

This report analyzes the whole pattern of interagency and agency shortcomings in handling information on billions of dollars worth of research and development. The report proposes a Bureau of Information on Technology and Science (BITS) which would coordinate the now widely scattered functions of the Office of Technical Services (Department of Commerce), Science Information Exchange (Smithsonian Institution), and other interagency services.

F. Results of study: As direct results of the committee's efforts to date: (a) The President's Science Advisory Committee has been giving new, intensive study to problems of better information control as has, (b) the Federal Council for Science and Technology; (c) a number of Federal publications and systems which the subcommittee study revealed as being relatively weak, have been discontinued by agencies; (d) numerous improvements have been made in agency information systems, e.g., coverage of the Science Information Exchange has been broadened and made more prompt, etc.

2. COORDINATION IN FEDERAL BUDGETING FOR R. & D.

A. Purpose of study: To strengthen practices and procedures in interagency budgeting for Federal research and development.

B. Significance: Federal spending for research and development has grown from eight-tenths of 1 percent of the budget in 1940 to over 10 percent in 1961.

Congress cannot fulfill its constitutional responsibility for effective control of Federal research appropriations unless the executive branch makes available a clearer and more candid budget. Such improvements would identify what is being asked of the legislative branch on an interagency basis both in the next fiscal year, and, in effect, in years to come.

In many respects, the Bureau of the Budget has not provided in the annual budget volume the type of analysis which is needed, nor in the way in which it is needed, for the Congress to scrutinize effectively the interrelated research and development requests.

Only rarely, in an interagency program such as oceanography, has the Bureau given the Congress the necessary facts on the relationships between funds which a variety of agencies request for research and development programs in the same general area.

In fields such as meteorology, materials science, communications, the Congress has only been given part of the facts and on a piecemeal basis.

One illustration of obsolescence in the budget is that, in its analysis, the Bureau of the Budget has heretofore lumped under one catchall heading, "Commerce, Housing, and Space Technology" these three totally separate programs. Yet, space technology alone may reach an annual $5 billion expenditure in the 1964 fiscal year. In addition, space technology involves long-range, 10-year budget commitments affecting not merely NASA but a whole group of agencies.

Literally hundreds of millions of dollars in research and development funds are being transferred back and forth between agencies by administrative decision.

C. Our interest in interagency practices: As we have stated in our previous reports to the Committee on Rules, and as we reiterate now, the interest of the Committee on Government Operations is not in NASA's individual budget, nor in that of any other individual agency; such budgets are the concern of other committees, notably the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences and the Committee on Appropriations.

Our interest, by contrast, is in Government-wide budgeting and in interagency coordination, under Bureau of the Budget or other auspices.

D. Hearing exhibit volumes: Two hearing exhibit volumes have been published—"Federal Budgeting for Research and Development," parts I and II. Many of the exhibits in these volumes contain information never before compiled by a congressional committee, e.g., on Government-wide budgeting for basic research and on other areas.

E. Status: We are now rounding out our review of Federal budgeting for research and development, preparatory to submitting recommendations to the Senate.

F. Results of study: 1. Many of our recommendations have been adopted for improved and more uniform research accounting. In our Senate Report 142, 87th Congress, 1st session, "Coordination of Federal Agencies' Programs in Biomedical Research and in Other Scientific Areas," we had pointed out (as the House Committee on Government Operations also noted subsequently) that the Congress was unfortunately not being given accurate or consistent estimates of almost three-quarters of a billion dollars in biomedical research expenditures.

2. We have reason to believe that we have helped induce reevaluation of certain other practices in research budgeting on the part of the Bureau of the Budget.

3. COORDINATION IN TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

A. Purpose of study: To strengthen coordination in programs of international technical assistance.

B. Significance: The U.S. Government is expending in the order of $180 million (in American currency only—not to mention additional outlay in foreign currencies) for technical assistance in developing countries.

A chronic problem of lack of coordination has tended to exist between: (1) the U.S. foreign aid agency (heretofore known as the International Cooperation Administration, and now entitled "Agency for International Development"), and (2) the domestic agencies, which are technically qualified in particular fields, such as the Department of Agriculture, Department of Labor, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, etc.

Critical interagency problems persist in recruitment of American technical personnel to serve abroad and in training of foreign specialists in the United States.

In addition, despite some progress, serious problems of coordination have persisted among other sources engaged in technical assistance abroad:

1. Agencies of foreign governments, e.g., United Kingdom, France, Canada, etc.;

2. Worldwide intergovernmental organizations, e.g., the United Nations with its Special Fund and its Expanded Program of Technical Assistance, and the specialized agencies—World Health Organization, Food and Agriculture Organization, United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organizations, etc.;

3. Regional intergovernmental organizations and programs, e.g., Colombo plan, alliance for progress, etc.;

4. Nongovernmental sources, e.g., Advisory Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service, National Health Council agencies, private foundations, etc.

C. Helping relieve U.S. Government of burdens: Our staff has endeavored to find ways and means of stimulating the greatest possible technical effort overseas on the part of non-Federal sources so as to help relieve Federal burdens. It believes Federal agencies have not done a fraction of what might be done and should be done to: (1) encourage foreign governments in the northern tier of developed nations to fulfill expanded technical assistance responsibilities, in addition to (2) serving as a catalyst for enlarged private efforts by American and foreign voluntary groups. Instead, there is a tendency to overrely on the U.S. Government. Meanwhile within the Government, the foreign aid agency has in the past tended to build up little duplicate technical aid agencies of its own in education, health, agriculture, etc.

D. Subcommittee result: Statutory amendment. As a direct result of an amendment drafted by the subcommittee staff, there was incorporated as section 621A of the Act for International Development of 1961, Public Law 87-195, signed September 4, 1961, an amendment requiring that:

"In providing technical assistance under this Act in the field of education, health, housing, or agriculture, or in other fields, the head of any such agency or such officer shall utilize, to the fullest extent practicable, the facilities and resources of the Federal agency or agencies with primary responsibilities for domestic programs in such fields."

E. Status of study: The above amendment has yet to be implemented by AID. Our staff is now following up on the subject.

4. CONCLUSION

The authority and funds which are requested will, we believe, help assure further real savings for the American taxpayer by helping to increase the efficiency of the executive branch.

Budget

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
STAFF					
Legal and investigative:					
General counsel or staff director	1	$8,000	$16,102.90	$1,341.90	$16,102.90
Minority counsel	1	8,040	16,173.19	1,347.76	16,173.19
Editorial and research:					
Editor	1	4,380	9,576.07	798.00	9,576.07
Assistant editor	1	3,120	7,024.25	585.35	7,024.25
Administrative and clerical:					
Chief clerk	1	3,900	8,603.95	716.99	8,603.95
Assistant clerk	1	3,120	7,024.25	585.35	7,024.25
	1	3,000	6,781.22	565.10	6,781.22
	1	2,520	5,809.07	484.08	5,809.07
Total	8				77,094.90
ADMINISTRATIVE					
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382, effective July 1, 1960)					648.96
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries paid)					5,013.75
Contribution to employees Federal employees group life insurance (27 cents per month per $1,000 coverage)					279.44
Reimbursable payments to agencies					3,000.00
Travel (inclusive of field investigations)					500.00
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)					1,000.00
Witness fees, expenses					200.00
Stationery, office supplies					400.00
Communications (telephone, telegraph)					150.00
Newspapers, magazines, documents					150.00
Contingent fund					1,562.95
Total					12,905.10
Grand total					90,000.00

INVESTIGATION OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1115, Senate Resolution 265.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 265) to investigate juvenile delinquency.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I would like to know who is conducting the hearings of this subcommittee. Who is the chairman of the subcommittee?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] is chairman of the subcommittee, and he is unavoidably absent today. He has asked me, as a member of the committee, to present a report as to the activities of the committee and the plans for the coming year and to attempt to answer any questions in connection therewith.

Mr. ELLENDER. Has any legislation been submitted by the subcommittee?

Mr. KEFAUVER. During 1961 four substantial and important bills, on which hearings were held, were passed by the Senate. Some of them passed the Senate, but not the House.

The first involved a hearing on S. 802, which was a bill to provide Federal assistance for the prevention, control, and treatment of juvenile delinquency, at which hearing many persons interested in juvenile problems in counties, cities, and States appeared. It was an effort to provide control over juvenile delinquency. The bill passed the Senate and the House and has become Public Law 87-274.

Another bill has become Public Law 87-336. It was Senate bill 1953. The legislation was introduced by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD].

The third bill, S. 1954, has passed the Senate and is now in the House. It was designed to fill an existing gap in the law pertaining to individuals by providing criminal penalties for juveniles who escaped or attempted to escape while in custody. The committee had considerable hearings on it, and it passed the Senate.

The fourth bill, introduced by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], is S. 1691, a bill to provide that any juvenile who has been determined to be a delinquent by a district court of the United States may be committed by the court to the custody of the Attorney General for observation and study. Such a presentence investigation is presently available to those from 18 to 21 under the Youth Correction Act.

The bill has passed the Senate and is now pending in the House of Representatives.

There are five or six other bills which are before the subcommittee, on which some hearings have been held, and others must be held.

The amount the committee is asking is $20,000 less than it got last year. I think approximately $15,000 is being turned back.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a statement by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], as well as a letter written by the Senator to the chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

There being no objection, the statement and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DODD ON JUVENILE DELINQUENCY SUBCOMMITTEE RESOLUTION

I respectfully ask that my distinguished colleagues consider favorably the resolution to continue the Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency.

Last year when I was appointed chairman of the subcommittee, the problem was comparatively new to me. I called in expert jurists and crime control specialists to help us outline a program of activities and formulate proposals for legislation. The committee had been in operation for several years and, although we did not want to lose continuity with the past, we knew that some changes in approach, in policy, and in purpose were in order. In view of what had gone on before, it was my intention to determine what the subcommittee should do to reach its goals without unnecessary repetition and without waste of effort.

Early in March we conducted a hearing to determine the responsibility the several branches of the Federal Government should have with respect to this problem of delinquency. We found there is a real need for Federal leadership. State and city leaders urged the Congress and the executive branch to provide some funds and a lot of know-how to their efforts in this area. They urged the passage of a bill (S. 802), which I introduced with several members of the delinquency subcommittee as cosponsors. The subcommittee had fought for this legislation for 6 years.

I feel the subcommittee shared the victory that was won when the President signed the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961. The law makes $10 million of Federal moneys available to States and nonprofit organizations for each of 3 years to train personnel, to test delinquency control methods, and to devise new approaches. This act was a limited version of S. 802.

Another bill referred to our subcommittee and later signed into law was Public Law 87-336. This legislation was introduced by me as chairman of the subcommittee and was a companion to similar House legislation. It permits a Federal youth offender on probation to have his conviction set aside upon discharge from probation, thereby according him the same treatment given a youth offender released from an institution. This was a major step forward toward a more successful handling of youth offenders.

A third bill that I introduced, S. 1954, was designed to fill an existing gap in the law pertaining to juveniles by providing criminal penalties for juvenile offenders who escape or attempt to escape from custody. It was passed by the Senate, and it is now pending before the House of Representatives. I hope that it will be passed in this session.

A fourth bill acted upon by the subcommittee, introduced by Senator ROMAN L. HRUSKA (S. 1691), proposed to amend the Federal Juvenile Delinquency Act by permitting U.S. district court to commit juveniles under 18 years of age for presentence investigation. This arrangement is presently available only to youths from 18 to 21 under the Federal Youth Corrections Act. This bill was also passed by the Senate and is pending before the House.

Today the subcommittee is in the midst of several investigations that we hope will lead to significant legislative proposals in 1962.

We need legislation in several areas to curb delinquency and that is what we are going to have. We drafted new bills during the year and we plan to introduce these proposals in 1962.

This legislation will be somewhat broader in nature, as directed by the findings obtained through our investigations.

First, it is of the most vital importance that we find a much more effective means of stopping the flow of drugs across our borders, not only narcotics but also the illegal distribution of the new dangers, the amphetamines and barbiturate drugs. Our investigators have spent many weeks in those areas of the country where large quantities of drugs have been coming in in a veritable flood. We have hearings scheduled that will result in new approaches to this vexing problem.

Secondly, we must plug the holes in our laws regarding sale and transportation of firearms to minors. The subcommittee staff has spent time and effort investigating the importers and distributors of guns that have been getting into the hands of juveniles, criminals, and mental defectives. The gun industry has cooperated with the subcommittee and has worked with us to develop remedial legislation.

Thirdly, perhaps one of the most important legislative actions is needed with regard to television programing. I myself and I know other subcommittee members were shocked to learn of the threatening power the three networks hold over the industry. We learned that it is not the Government that threatens free speech, but rather the networks themselves that are restricting originality and expression of talent by directing producers to create shows according to a formula of crime and violence which has proven to be successful and moneymaking.

In the interest of the public, we must insure that the airwaves are used for its benefit and not exclusively for profit at the expense of our children's social health and emotional stability.

We have found irregularities and we must now find the means to cope with them.

We must pull together the information accumulated during 1961 and previous years and find solutions for many problems. In addition to those I have described already, we must deal with such delinquency generating factors as excessive school dropouts, youth unemployment, lack of Federal, State, and local detention and correctional institutions. And finally, we must look into such new areas as increasing delinquency among girls for whom there are practically no facilities, as most institutions have traditionally been set up for male delinquents. Delinquency among the middle class or white collar families is a new phenomenon and defies all previous theories of delinquency. I have a feeling the mass media has a lot to do with twisting the values of these previously law-abiding children. This year we plan to call together social scientists, the clergy, and correctional administrators to inquire what new and broader Federal laws are needed.

In view of the unsolved problems, in view of the requests for legislative leadership and guidance from Federal and State agencies, and in view of the proven ability of the committee to operate as a unique crime-fighting force in the Nation, I urge that its request for $178,000 be approved for activities during this coming year.

I am confident that for many of the needs and problems in this field heretofore unmet, we can find legislative solutions. Therefore, I request that Congress continue the life of this subcommittee as evidence of its concern and determination to solve the problem and as a bulwark against the destructive forces of crime and delinquency which have attacked the youth of America and which continue to sap the strength of our Nation.

U.S. SENATE, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE JUVENILE DELINQUENCY,

January 17, 1962.

The Honorable JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR EASTLAND: As chairman of the Judiciary's Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, I am writing this letter to outline the program of the subcommittee for 1962. Since assuming this chairmanship, I have been made all too aware of the magnitude of the youth crime problem facing this Nation. We are rapidly approaching the time when one in every four young males will have a juvenile court record. While all attempts to halt this 12-year trend have failed thus far, this past year saw a beginning effort by the Federal and State Governments to develop a realistic program of delinquency prevention. As you know, a bill was passed which provides $30 million to the States for training personnel and experimental programs. This legislation originated in this subcommittee on January 26, 1955, under the then chairman, Senator ESTES KEFAUVER. It was introduced by members of this committee every session of Congress since then and I was gratified that Congress passed a somewhat limited version of this legislation during the last session.

The administration's new delinquency unit in the Attorney General's office has requested that the subcommittee coordinate its legislative efforts with that organization during the coming year. They are interested in seeing subcommittee legislation passed in the areas of mail-order guns, narcotics, dangerous drugs, and legislation covering the Federal handling of juvenile delinquents and youthful offenders. I introduced two pieces of legislation this past year that were part of the Attorney General's program, S. 1953 and S. 1954. They relate to the handling of Federal youth offenders and Federal juvenile delinquents. In addition, we are working closely with the Labor Department on its youth employment program.

The subcommittee began hearings in March 1961, which were nationwide in scope wherein we heard experts from all parts of the country who supported the provisions of the legislation that was subsequently passed.

During these hearings, the experts expressed great alarm over the deluge of crime, violence, and sadism on television and its effect on children and youth. The subcommittee then started an investigation of television programing that developed some startling information on one of the most powerful influences in the lives of our young people. We found that networks ordered producers and writers to inject elements of prurient sex, violence, sadism, crime, and brutality into television shows to attract audiences, including millions of children and young people. The investigation spread from the networks in New York to the writers and producers in Hollywood and to the advertisers in Chicago and elsewhere. While the investigation developed on a much larger scale than I had anticipated, I feel strongly that its importance merited the attention given it by the subcommittee. We are now in the final stage of the television investigation and I hope that significant legislation will result from it.

We have conducted a study of mail-order firearms which reach the hands of juveniles and young people and have been working closely with local police officers and the Nation's gun manufacturers on amendments to the Federal National Firearms Act to control the indiscriminate sale of handguns across State lines.

As you know, the subcommittee under the chairmanship of Senator Thomas C. Hennings, Jr., began a study of the narcotic traffic in the United States. At the time of his death, we had just begun to develop interest and momentum at the Federal and State levels. Because of the loss of Senator Hennings, the narcotic investigation was temporarily suspended. I ordered this investigation resumed and subcommittee staff members have been continuing our work in this area. Our investigators report the traffic across the border is as great or greater than before and that Federal activity is needed more than ever if we are to successfully combat this frustrating nemesis.

The major reports I referred to in my last appropriation letter have been completed and will be distributed to subcommittee members for approval. They include: (1) a national juvenile court study, (2) a report on juvenile violence, (3) a report on the effectiveness of the Narcotic Control Act of 1956, (4) a survey of antisocial gangs in the United States.

The information, recommendations, and legislative proposals in these reports will, I feel, prove of great benefit to the efforts of those fighting delinquency in this country.

When I became chairman of the subcommittee, reports of delinquency cases before the courts appeared to be leveling off in 1959. However, I have just had figures submitted to me which indicate another substantial increase in our delinquency rates for 1960, the last year for which we have comprehensive data. In 1960, there was a 6-percent increase in cases coming before the courts, totaling 820,000 appearances by juveniles for all categories of offenses. Not only have the recently noted trends continued, that is, more delinquency among girls, among upper income groups, and in rural areas, but big-city delinquency, thought to have been leveling off, again surged higher.

My experiences during the past year, the fact that we have been inadequate in our efforts at all levels of society in halting the delinquency plague, prompts me to ask for a continuation by the Judiciary Committee of the Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency. The requests we have had from many Federal and State agencies for leadership, guidance, use of subcommittee documents and files, is an indication to me of the importance of the unique ability of the subcommittee to develop legislation, conduct studies, and gather information that is nationwide in perspective. I would like to continue the cooperative efforts the subcommittee has established with the Attorney General's office, the Labor Department, the Federal Bureau of Prisons, and other agencies in a combined attack on this problem. In addition, I would like to continue investigations in the following areas in 1962:

1. Effects of crime, violence, and brutality on television and its effect on young people: Testimony taken during the past year has convinced me of the harm that has been done by the saturation of television with objectionable shows. Millions of children watch a steady diet of crime every night and in the words of the outstanding researcher in this field, the amount of violence on television is too dangerous to go on. We have one final hearing on this subject planned and the staff is working on legislation that would help the Federal Communications Commission in its efforts to insure programing in the public interest.

2. Youth employment and delinquency: According to information gathered by the subcommittee, the consensus of opinion of the experts in delinquency is that lack of job opportunity is a prime factor in antisocial behavior. I plan to hold hearings on this subject and to work closely with the administration which has committed itself to a great extent to the proposition that a sound youth employment program will diminish our delinquency problem to a great degree.

3. Narcotic addiction and the narcotic traffic: From information developed during the year, I am convinced that our approach to cleaning up the narcotic traffic in the United States needs to be reevaluated. In spite of increasingly stricter penalties, the drug traffic continues to flourish. There is a river of narcotics coming across our borders, principally from Mexico in the Southwest. For example, in California more than one-third of the arrests of adults in 1960 were for addiction or use. Furthermore, the majority of these people began their careers as delinquents and began their drug use at age 18 or 19. I plan to seek action through the Departments of State and Treasury in order to realistically reach a solution to this problem that continues to plague our country.

4. Mail-order weapons: Hearings are planned on the widespread sale of pistols and revolvers to juveniles, felons, drug addicts, and mental cases who use the anonymity of Railway Express to obtain these weapons with no check made as to the legitimacy of the purchaser. The recent death of a 14-year-old boy in the District of Columbia who was shot with a .38-caliber revolver purchased by a 16-year old from a mail-order house is a dramatic case in point. The mail-order firm involved at the time was under investigation by the subcommittee as one that has a record of indiscriminate gun sales throughout the Nation. We hope to amend the Federal Firearms Act to insure greater control over the interstate shipment of these weapons.

5. In addition to the above, the subcommittee program includes the preparation of reports on legislation referred to it in the several areas of delinquency, including Federal laws relating to Federal juvenile delinquents, the Youthful Offender Act, and interstate adoption legislation.

Throughout the year, the subcommittee has utilized on a consultant basis some of the most competent available specialists in the field of delinquency. We have also acquired a staff trained in the related fields of criminology, law, sociology, psychology, police investigation, and social work. The value of the subcommittee as a unit in this country's delinquency-fighting setup has been proven. I feel that our contribution more than justifies our request for $178,000 to continue our activities during the coming year.

We have just broken the ice during the past year in our 12-year fight against youth crime. We now have the "seed money" and the momentum to get the job done. The coming year will be a critical one for we must use our available funds and personnel wisely if our efforts are to be of any value. The Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency can play a prominent role in helping to see to it that the right steps are taken.

With an annual toll rapidly approaching 1 million children coming before our courts, it is imperative that this Nation generate as much effort as possible to contain and ultimately reverse this rampaging sickness. The continued operation of this subcommittee is evidence of the concern of Congress over this problem and its determination to do something about it. I urge that the program and budget of the subcommittee for 1962 be approved. A copy of the proposed budget has been included with this letter.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

Thomas J. Dodd,
Chairman.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to juvenile delinquency in the United States, including (a) the extent and character of juvenile delinquency in the United States and its causes and contributing factors; (b) the adequacy of existing provisions of law, including chapters 402 and 403 of title 18 of the United States Code, in dealing with youthful offenders of Federal laws; (c) sentences imposed on, or other correctional action taken with respect to, youthful offenders by Federal courts; and (d) the extent to which juveniles are violating Federal laws relating to the sale or use of narcotics.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee from February 1, 1962, to January 31, 1963, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation, as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1963.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $178,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report—No. 1146—explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. Senate,
Committee on the Judiciary,
January 19, 1962.

Re Senate Resolution 265.
Hon. Mike Mansfield,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: I am enclosing a copy of the budget which was approved by the Committee on the Judiciary at its meeting on January 18, 1962, to carry on the work of the Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency for the period from February 1, 1962, to January 31, 1963.

The committee has authorized the introduction of a resolution in the Senate for continuing the subcommittee and providing $178,000 for this purpose.

A copy of the letter setting forth in detail the program of the subcommittee from the chairman, the Honorable Thomas J. Dodd, is enclosed for the information of the Committee on Rules and Administration and for consideration at its forthcoming meeting.

Sincerely,

James O. Eastland,
Chairman.

U.S. Senate, Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency,
January 17, 1962.

Hon. James O. Eastland,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Eastland: As chairman of the Judiciary's Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, I am writing this letter to outline the program of the subcommittee for 1962. Since assuming this chairmanship, I have been made all too aware of the magnitude of the youth crime problem facing this Nation. We are rapidly approaching the time when one in every four young males will have a juvenile court record. While all attempts to halt this 12-year trend have failed thus far, this past year saw a beginning effort by the Federal and State Governments to develop a realistic program of delinquency prevention. As you know, a bill was passed which provides $30 million to the States for training personnel and experimental programs. This legislation originated in this subcommittee on January 26, 1955, under the then chairman, Senator Estes Kefauver. It was introduced by members of this committee every session of Congress since then and I was gratified that Congress passed a somewhat limited version of this legislation during the last session.

The administration's new delinquency unit in the Attorney General's Office has requested that the subcommittee coordinate its legislative efforts with that organization during the coming year. They are interested in seeing subcommittee legislation passed in the areas of mail-order guns, narcotics, dangerous drugs, and legislation covering the Federal handling of juvenile delinquents and youthful offenders. I introduced two pieces of legislation this past year that were part of the Attorney General's program, S. 1953 and S. 1954. They relate to the handling of Federal youth offenders and Federal juvenile delinquents. In addition, we are working closely with the Labor Department on its youth employment program.

The subcommittee began hearings in March 1961, which were nationwide in scope wherein we heard experts from all parts of the country who supported the provisions of the legislation that was subsequently passed.

During these hearings, the experts expressed great alarm over the deluge of crime violence, and sadism on television and its effect on children and youth. The subcommittee then started an investigation of television programing that developed some startling information on one of the most powerful influences in the lives of our young people. We found that networks ordered producers and writers to inject elements of prurient sex, violence, sadism, crime, and brutality into television shows to attract audiences, including millions of children and young people. The investigation spread from the networks in New York to the writers and producers in Hollywood and to the advertisers in Chicago and elsewhere. While the investigation developed on a much larger scale than I had anticipated, I feel strongly that its importance merited the attention given it by the subcommittee. We are now in the final stage of the television investigation, and I hope that significant legislation will result from it.

We have conducted a study of mail-order firearms which reach the hands of juveniles and young people and have been working closely with local police officers and the Nation's gun manufacturers on amendments to the Federal National Firearms Act to control the indiscriminate sale of handguns across State lines.

As you know, the subcommittee, under the chairmanship of Senator Thomas C. Hennings, Jr., began a study of the narcotic

traffic in the United States. At the time of his death, we had just begun to develop interest and momentum at the Federal and State level. Because of the loss of Senator Hennings, the narcotic investigation was temporarily suspended. I ordered this investigation resumed and subcommittee staff members have been continuing our work in this area. Our investigators report that traffic across the border is as great or greater than before and that Federal activity is needed more than ever if we are to successfully combat this frustrating nemesis.

The major reports I referred to in my last appropriation letter have been completed and will be distributed to subcommittee members for approval. They include: (1) a national juvenile court study, (2) a report on juvenile violence, (3) a report on the effectiveness of the Narcotic Control Act of 1956, (4) a survey of antisocial gangs in the United States.

The information, recommendations, and legislative proposals in these reports will, I feel, prove of great benefit to the efforts of those fighting delinquency in this country.

When I became chairman of the subcommittee, reports of delinquency cases before the courts appeared to be leveling off in 1959. However, I have just had figures submitted to me which indicate another substantial increase in our delinquency rates for 1960, the last year for which we have comprehensive data. In 1960, there was a 6-percent increase in cases coming before the courts totaling 820,000 appearances by juveniles for all categories of offenses. Not only have the recently noted trends continued, that is, more delinquency among girls, among upper income groups, and in rural areas, but big-city delinquency, thought to have been leveling off, again surged higher.

My experiences during the past year, the fact that we have been inadequate in our efforts at all levels of society in halting the delinquency plague, prompts me to ask for a continuation by the Judiciary Committee of the Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency. The requests we have had from many Federal and State agencies for leadership, guidance, use of subcommittee documents and files, is an indication to me of the importance of the unique ability of the subcommittee to develop legislation, conduct studies, and gather information that is nationwide in perspective. I would like to continue the cooperative efforts the subcommittee has established with the Attorney General's office, the Labor Department, the Federal Bureau of Prisons, and other agencies in a combined attack on this problem. In addition, I would like to continue investigations in the following areas in 1962:

1. Effects of crime, violence, and brutality on television and its effect on young people: Testimony taken during the past year has convinced me of the harm that has been done by the saturation of television with objectionable shows. Millions of children watch a steady diet of crime every night and in the words of the outstanding researcher in this field, the amount of violence on television is too dangerous to go on. We have one final hearing on this subject planned and the staff is working on legislation that would help the Federal Communications Commission in its efforts to insure programing in the public interest.

2. Youth employment and delinquency: According to information gathered by the subcommittee, the consensus of opinion of the experts in delinquency is that lack of job opportunity is a prime factor in antisocial behavior. I plan to hold hearings on this subject and to work closely with the administration which has committed itself to a great extent to the proposition that a sound youth employment program will diminish our delinquency problem to a great degree.

3. Narcotic addiction and the narcotic traffic: From information developed during the year, I am convinced that our approach to cleaning up the narcotic traffic in the United States needs to be reevaluated. In spite of increasingly stricter penalties, the drug traffic continues to flourish. There is a river of narcotics coming across our borders, principally from Mexico in the Southwest. For example, in California more than one-third of the arrests of adults in 1960 were for addiction or use. Furthermore, the majority of these people began their careers as delinquents and began their drug use at age 18 or 19. I plan to seek action through the Departments of State and Treasury in order to realistically reach a solution to this problem that continues to plague our country.

4. Mail-order weapons.—Hearings are planned on the widespread sale of pistols and revolvers to juveniles, felons, drug addicts, and mental cases who use the anonymity of Railway Express to obtain these weapons with no check made as to the legitimacy of the purchaser. The recent death of a 14-year-old boy in the District of Columbia who was shot with a .38-caliber revolver purchased by a 16-year-old from a mail-order house is a dramatic case in point. The mail-order firm involved at the time was under investigation by the subcommittee as one that has a record of indiscriminate gun sales throughout the Nation. We hope to amend the Federal Firearms Act to insure greater control over the interstate shipment of these weapons.

5. In addition to the above the subcommittee program includes the preparation of reports on legislation referred to it in the several areas of delinquency, including Federal laws relating to Federal juvenile delinquents, the Youthful Offender Act, and interstate adoption legislation.

Throughout the year, the subcommittee has utilized on a consultant basis some of the most competent available specialists in the field of delinquency. We have also acquired a staff trained in the related fields of criminology, law, sociology, psychology, police investigation, and social work. The value of the subcommittee as a unit in this country's delinquency-fighting setup has been proven. I feel that our contribution more than justifies our request for $178,000 to continue our activities during the coming year.

We have just broken the ice during the past year in our 12-year fight against youth crime. We now have the "seed money" and the momentum to get the job done. The coming year will be a critical one for we must use our available funds and personnel wisely if our efforts are to be of any value. The Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency can play a prominent role in helping to see to it that the right steps are taken.

With an annual toll rapidly approaching 1 million children coming before our courts, it is imperative that this Nation generate as much effort as possible to contain and ultimately reverse this rampaging sickness. The continued operation of this subcommittee is evidence of the concern of Congress over this problem and its determination to do something about it. I urge that the program and budget of the subcommittee for 1962 be approved. A copy of the proposed budget has been included with this letter.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS J. DODD,
Chairman.

Budget—Investigation of juvenile delinquency

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
STAFF					
Legal and investigative:					
Staff director	1	$7,380	$15,013.27	$1,251.10	$15,013.27
Chief counsel	1	5,700	12,060.74	1,005.06	12,060.74
Professional staff member	1	6,240	13,009.76	1,084.14	13,009.76
Chief investigator	1	3,240	7,267.26	605.60	7,267.26
Investigator	1	3,120	7,024.25	585.35	7,024.25
Staff assistant	1	2,880	6,538.19	544.84	6,538.19
Editorial and research:					
Editorial director	1	6,840	14,064.24	1,172.02	14,064.24
Research director	1	3,840	8,482.43	706.86	8,482.43
Staff member	2	4,140	18,180.02	1,515.00	18,180.02
Administrative and clerical:					
Chief clerk	1	4,140	9,090.01	757.50	9,090.01
Secretary	2	2,940	13,319.40	1,109.94	13,319.40
Do	1	3,180	7,145.77	595.48	7,145.77
Assistant clerk (file)	1	2,160	5,079.97	423.33	5,079.97
Assistant clerk	1	1,140	3,197.39	266.44	3,197.39
Stenographer	1	2,340	5,444.53	453.71	5,444.53
Total	17				144,917.23
ADMINISTRATIVE					
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382, effective July 1, 1960)					1,205.00
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries paid)					9,419.62
Contribution to employees Federal employees group life insurance (27 cents per month per $1,000 coverage)					511.92
Travel (inclusive of field investigations)					14,000.00
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)					3,000.00
Witness fees, expenses					1,000.00
Stationery, office supplies					1,000.00
Communications (telephone, telegraph)					2,000.00
Newspapers, magazines, documents					746.23
Contingent fund					200.00
Total					33,082.77
Grand total					178,000.00

AMENDMENT OF WELFARE AND PENSION PLANS AND DISCLOSURE ACT

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of the unfinished business, Calendar No. 891, S. 2520.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2520) to amend the Welfare and Pension

Plans and Disclosure Act with respect to the method of enforcement and to provide certain additional sanctions, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Florida.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time is now under control, in accordance with the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] is the author of two amendments which will be considered under limited time, I think it advisable to have a quorum call before the chairman of the subcommittee makes his statement.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I wish to make the usual request concerning staff members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all members of the staff of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be authorized the privilege of the floor of the Senate during Senate consideration of the bill, S. 2520.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Michigan? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. SMATHERS. And, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time necessary for the call of the roll not be charged to either side.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Florida? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which handled S. 2520, I desire to offer amendments relating to a number of technical changes in the bill as reported.

Two of these changes relate to dates, and are required by the fact that almost 5 months have passed since the bill was reported.

The other changes are of a perfecting nature.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Since there is an amendment pending, does the Senator ask unanimous consent?

Mr. McNAMARA. Yes.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment may be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate may proceed to the consideration of the amendments to be offered by the Senator from Michigan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Florida? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The amendments will be stated for the information of the Senate.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I have a very short statement explaining the amendments.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, have the amendments been stated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No. The amendments will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 4, it is proposed to strike out "1961" and insert "1962".

On page 3, line 14, after the word "any" insert "plan administered by a".

On page 4, line 24, strike out "the effective date of such change" and insert "the change has been effectuated".

On page 7, line 9, strike out "policy year" and insert "calendar, policy, or other fiscal year, as the case may be".

On page 12, lines 14 and 15, strike out "any administrator, officer, or employee of such plan" and insert "such administrator, officer, or employee".

On page 22, line 8, strike out "January 1, 1961" and insert "ninety days after the date of enactment of this Act".

On page 22, lines 9 and 10, strike out "July 1, 1962" and insert "one hundred eighty days after such date of enactment".

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, the first modification is self-explanatory. It appears on page 1, line 4, where it proposes to substitute the year 1962 for the year 1961.

A second modification is proposed on page 3, line 14. This modification is one of language alone and does not change the meaning or substance of the new provision.

On page 4, line 24, we propose to substitute for the words "after the effective date of such change", the words "after the change has been effectuated".

The purpose of this provision is to allow the plan administrator 60 days in which to file information covering modifications of the plan.

The bill proposes that the cutoff date on which the 60 days begins to run should be the effective date of the change.

In many cases, however, the effective date of the change may precede by several months the final assembling of all of the details which are necessary to the report.

A better cutoff date is the point at which the change has been finally concluded in all of its details or finalized, and it is with this thought that we suggest this modification.

The same kind of modification is proposed for a similar matter on page 7, line 9. Here, under the bill, the cutoff date for the filing of certain information for insurance companies is the "policy year."

However, it appears that a number of different policies may be issued under a single plan with the result that there may be several different policy years under one plan.

It would be burdensome to require the insurance company to file this information on the anniversary date of each of these policy years all under one plan.

Therefore, we propose to substitute for the cutoff date "policy year" the words "calendar, policy, or other fiscal year, as the case may be."

This provides the needed flexibility.

On page 12, line 14, we offer another purely technical change.

The provision as it is now written is too broad since it refers to employees who might not be subject to the bonding provision.

The proposed change will tighten this provision.

At page 22, line 8, we offer a modification covering the effective date of the act, required by the passage of time.

The amendment proposes that the act shall take effect within 90 days after the date of enactment, except that the bonding provision of the act shall not take effect until 180 days after the enactment date.

Each of these changes is of a technical or a perfecting nature, and I ask that the amendments be adopted.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments may be agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Florida?

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas will state it.

Mr. TOWER. The amendments of the Senator from Michigan are technical amendments only?

Mr. McNAMARA. The Senator is correct. They do not change the substance in any way.

Mr. TOWER. They do not change the substance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Florida? The Chair hears none; and, without objection, the amendments are agreed to.

The question recurs on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I have a short statement explaining the bill, if the Senator from Florida will yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, the bill we now debate, containing vital amendments to the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act, is no stranger to most of us.

These amendments represent the same objectives as were contained in the bill which passed the Senate in 1958 by a vote of 88 to 0.

They are designed to provide adequate protection for the billions of dollars owed to American workers by virtue of their pension and welfare programs.

Unfortunately, the protective sections of the 1958 bill, duplicated in the bill before us, were stripped from it after it left the Senate.

From a program that would provide adequate safeguards, the 1958 bill was transformed into an almost empty measure which was all form and no substance.

The need for pension and welfare plan protection has been demonstrated to this Congress time and again.

Beginning with the 83d and 84th Congresses, under the leadership of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and former Senator Irving Ives, continuing through the 85th and 86th under then Senator John Kennedy, Senate studies revealed the corruption and theft which marked the administration of many funds.

When knowledge of this malfeasance is added to the fact that these funds will grow to an estimated $100 billion by 1970, it is certain that some means must be provided to protect such a vast amount of money.

Roughly one-half of the American people—employees and their dependents—depend in some measure on these plans for their future health and standard of living.

These funds represent deferred income to employees; they are not moneys floating in space under the control of some anonymous trustees.

Furthermore, these funds are now, and will continue to be, the largest single source of equity capital in the Nation.

The national interest in insuring that these plans are honestly administered should be obvious.

Under our present law, all that is required of plan administrators is that they file a report of their operations each year.

The Secretary of Labor is merely a depository for these annual reports. He may not, in any manner, question their honesty, accuracy, or completeness.

Indeed, he does not even possess the power to specify what data is to be included in the report. The administrators of the plans are free to accept or to reject the report form he has suggested.

When former President Eisenhower signed the 1958 bill into law, he said he was doing so only "because it establishes a precedent of Federal responsibility in this area."

He stated that it did little else and would "require extensive amendment at the next session of Congress."

Former Secretary of Labor Mitchell, noting that the 1958 bill was reputed to provide adequate safeguards, described the law as a "shameful illusion."

Both President Kennedy and Secretary Goldberg have been equally critical of the present law.

The President, in submitting the present bill to the Congress, said it was necessary if the original intent of the law was to be implemented "to prevent repetition of abuses and irregularities in the administration of employee benefit plans."

This continuing and bipartisan executive concern about the act is only one source of evidence that the act should be reformed.

In the hearings on the present bill, for which I served as chairman, the balance of testimony was strongly in favor of legislation similar to that before us.

There was some outright opposition to any reform, mostly from groups who traditionally oppose any Government regulation of activities affected with the public interest.

Needless to say, some union officials whose plans were called into question during Senate hearings are opposed to the present bill.

But the vast majority of people who participate in or are concerned about the management or establishment of health and welfare plans favor the proposed legislation.

There were several constructive suggestions on revisions, virtually all of which have been accepted by the committee.

Senate Report No. 908, which Senators will find on their desks, contains a complete description of the substance of the bill.

I should like to mention only those provisions I consider to be the most important, and comment on them briefly.

First, the Secretary of Labor would be given the essential power to require specific data in the annual report.

To ease the administrative burden on small plans the Secretary can provide a so-called short form in place of the more extensive report required of large plans.

In addition, those small plans covering between 25 and 100 employees are exempted from the annual report unless the Secretary believes such an exemption for an individual plan would not serve the purposes of the act.

If we are to provide sound guarantees against abuses and irregularities, power to look behind the raw data of the annual report must be given to the Secretary.

This bill gives him that power, but only after he has received a certification of the report by an independent certified or licensed public accountant, and only after he satisfies normal judicial standards for investigation.

If, after receiving such a certification, the Secretary has reasonable cause to investigate further, he may do so.

My colleagues who are lawyers are aware that the phrase "reasonable cause" is a legal term of art, the exact meaning of which cannot be precisely explained.

The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in its report on this bill states the belief that this phrase is neither too discretionary nor too restrictive.

It certainly prevents the Secretary from embarking on a "fishing expedition," that perennial horror of private lawyers.

But it does not mean that the Secretary must have in hand before his investigation, the evidence he seeks to find by his investigation.

It will be sufficient for him to find, on a reasonable basis, that an investigation may reveal a violation of the act.

Thus he will not be required to possess the powers of prophecy, only the sense of justice that our courts have required of those who guard the public interest.

Finally, in the enforcement area, the power of subpena is given to the Secretary under the traditional restraint of judicial review.

Another important amendment deals with the bonding of those individuals who handle the assets of pension and welfare funds.

This provision will insure that any future corruption will not dissipate the financial assets of the plans by providing restoration of stolen money through bonds.

No amount of regulation and enforcement can undo the hardship which is created by such thefts, but these insurance provisions can.

The last important set of amendments establish Federal criminal sanctions for violations of trust.

Under these sections embezzlements, kickbacks, false statements, bribe solicitations and acceptances, and other forms of corruption would become violations of Federal law and subject to criminal penalties.

Because of the complex, interstate operation of many of these plans, existing State laws have been inadequate to deter the looting of fund money.

And while all States do have legislation that would cover solely intrastate embezzlement only a few States have laws dealing with kickbacks.

Coupled with these criminal sanctions is an immunity provision to assist the Government in gathering evidence.

The testimony which would be compelled under this immunity section could not be used in any State or Federal prosecution.

I am aware that some fear this legislation not because of its present contents but because they fear it is a first step in total governmental regulation of pension and welfare funds.

This is not the intent of the administration, it is not the intent of the committee, and I am sure it is not the intent of the Senate.

To make this absolutely clear we have written into the bill a prohibition against any such attempted regulation by the Secretary, an addition in which the Secretary of Labor wholeheartedly concurs.

These, then, are the major elements of the bill before us; and together, their enactment can do justice in this field.

What we deal with here is more than technical and goes beyond those considerations which are termed as "fiduciary" and the like.

This involves the hopes and expectations of the majority of our people.

A trust fund depleted by connivance and corruption can shatter the lives of all too many people.

It is money that is almost irreplaceable.

For the man who cannot pay his doctor and hospital because of someone's malfeasance, relief is difficult.

He needs the money then, and his future earning capacity is of little consequence.

And the retired person whose annuities have disappeared into the pockets of the thief has no possible escape from misery for his earning days are past.

I trust we will provide the means to wipe out such individual tragedy by the enactment of this bill.

I thank the acting majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, how much time is available on the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has 30 minutes on the amendment.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

I have offered an amendment that would change the size of the plans covered or comprehended by the act from those covering 25 employees or less to 100 employees or less. Actually I think the amendment is worth while because it would reduce substantially the number of plans administered by the Department of Labor, but it would change the number of people by only 5 percent. In other words, the amendment would reduce the number of plans covered by the act by about 75,000, and yet only 5 percent of the employees now covered by pension welfare programs would be affected by changing the number from 25 to 100.

I think the amendment is desirable because it would prevent harassment of the small businessman, who already must do a great deal of work for the Government. The small businessman must collect withholding taxes. He has to collect sales taxes for the State. He is already burdened with enough Federal paperwork. He cannot afford to hire a vast number of competent and technically skilled employees to do all the required Government paperwork. So I believe that in the best interests of small business the number should be changed from 25 employees to 100 employees.

I believe that strong arguments have already been made in committee testimony for the change. I therefore urge adoption of my amendment, which would exclude all plans covering 100 employees or less from the provisions of the act.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, will the acting majority leader yield to me a little time?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield to the Senator from Michigan whatever time he may desire.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, the amendment proposed here to exempt from coverage all plans having less than 100 participants would deny protection to workers most in need of it.

Our objective in seeking this legislation is to insure the future health, welfare, and standard of living of American workers.

To do this, we have to create weapons that can destroy the kinds of corruption and outright thievery that were disclosed by congressional hearings.

There is not a person in this Chamber who believes that the pension plans which are operated by some of our major industrial concerns were subject to this corruption and theft.

It was primarily in the smaller, loosely organized, poorly supervised welfare and pension plans that opportunities existed for malfeasance.

And yet the workers who are covered by these smaller plans have as much at stake, as do the workers who are covered by the plans formulated by our industrial giants and their employee organizations.

There is nothing that distinguishes the needs and hopes of the small company employee from those of the large company employee, except the size of the company for which he works.

Both face the same medical problems.

Both have similar requirements for food, clothing, and housing at retirement.

The existing Disclosure Act makes no distinction between them.

It is obvious, therefore, that we should provide the workers covered by these plans with the same protection we provide other workers.

Yet the amendment would do away with all protection for this group.

It would cut loose approximately 50 percent of the plans now covered by the law.

It would remove protection from approximately 2 million employees whose interests are now protected.

I want to point out that we have taken into account the administrative problems which confront such small plan administration.

For this reason the bill proposes to exempt such plans from the annual reporting requirements while at the same time it maintains coverage in all other respects for them.

As a result of the amendment which we adopted in committee, the smaller plans covering less than 100 participants need not file an annual report unless the Secretary of Labor, after investigation, finds that publication of the report in the particular case is necessary in order to serve the purposes of the act.

Given this exemption, the only question we still face relating to these small plans is, Must they be honestly administered?

This is a simple question: Shall they continue to be subject to the bonding provisions and the criminal sanctions in the act after their annual filing burdens have been removed?

I cannot believe that the Senate would jeopardize the future of workers whose benefits will be paid from such smaller plans. I urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes. I believe that 100 is certainly a reasonable cutoff figure.

My principal reason for wishing to exempt smaller plans is because I do not want to disturb the progress which has been and is being made by smaller employers in instituting welfare and pension programs for their employees. Large employee groups have substantial pension and welfare plans negotiated through the collective bargaining process. This is not so with respect to the smaller employers who generally establish pension plans out of a genuine concern for the welfare of their employees or in the interest of enlightened personnel administration. Nevertheless the number of small plans being adopted is steadily increasing. The proposed bill would inject into the situation new and additional burdens and problems to be met by the small employer, and, in my opinion, such additional burdens might well dissuade the small employers from initiating such a program. I feel that the failure to accept my amendment will adversely affect the expansion of these plans. Indeed it may well reverse the growing trend on the part of small employers to voluntarily offer needed protection to their employees.

It is true, of course, that in the case of plans covering a number of employees between 25 and 100 employees would only be required to file descriptions of the plans, and would not be required by the act itself to file an annual report. The fact is that discretionary power is reposed in the Secretary of Labor. At his own discretion he could require small businesses to file annual reports.

Again I say that such action is an unwarranted burden on small business. I think ultimately it must be considered a burden on the workers themselves. It would raise the overhead cost to small businessmen. It would mean that less money could be distributed in the way of profits and less money could be paid in the way of wage increases. I see no reason for imposing an additional burden on the small businessman, particularly in light of the fact that at the previous session Congress passed legislation designed to protect, help, and nurture small business. Now we are urged to pass a bill which, if not amended, would, I think, ultimately result in additional overhead for small business and possible harassment of the small businessman by a gigantic Federal bureaucracy.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, in reply to the Senator from Texas, let me say that the subject was discussed at some length in the committee, and the Senator from Texas entered into the debate. But the conclusion was reached. Under the proposed legislation there was a demand that the Secretary have reasonable cause for going into these plans and all other plans. He would not go in willy-nilly on them. He must have some grounds for going in. The grounds are somewhat spelled out and they are rather complicated, but he would be held accountable to the committees of Congress if he did go in without proper reason for doing so or having charges that something was wrong.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McNAMARA. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. What criteria, if any, are spelled out in the bill for the Secretary to use in determining whether or not these plans should be investigated?

Mr. McNAMARA. In general either there must be a charge by interested parties that there is something wrong in a specific plan, or he must have sufficient ground for suspicion to warrant his entering the case.

Mr. TOWER. Does the bill spell out the specific grounds that must exist?

Mr. McNAMARA. No; the bill does not spell them out.

Mr. TOWER. In other words, one dissident employee who might be angry at his boss could charge the boss with playing fast and loose with a pension or welfare fund, and that would be adequate ground for investigation by the Secretary of Labor. Is that correct?

Mr. McNAMARA. One might do that. But the Secretary would have the option of either going in or not going in. He would not be compelled to go in merely because one dissident employee had made a charge.

Mr. TOWER. But actually the grounds are not spelled out in the bill; therefore a great deal is left to the discretionary power of the Secretary of Labor.

Mr. McNAMARA. Those things are not specifically spelled out in the bill.

Mr. TOWER. Then I submit that the small businessman would be at the mercy of the Secretary of a great Federal department who had a great deal of power.

Mr. McNAMARA. The staff of the committee and the committee itself wrestled with this problem for a long time, particularly with the precise language that should be used in connection with the exemption feature to which the Senator has addressed himself.

It was difficult to lay down precise guidelines for the Secretary to follow in deciding whether to withdraw this exemption from any individual plan.

There was little information available from our hearing record to guide us in this, since the precise question had not been raised during the hearings.

For that reason we decided that the Secretary after notice and a canvass of all views could determine the best procedures for withdrawal of the exemption prior to the issuance of his rules and regulations to carry out this provision.

Let me discuss for a moment a hypothetical problem.

A plan with less than 100 participants qualifies for this exemption, but substantial evidence is presented to the Secretary that the administrators of the plan have embezzled some of its funds.

It is the committee's intention that given such evidence, the Secretary should be able to require a report from the fund so that he might assure himself that it is being administered in a proper manner.

It is the committee's intention that such a fund would then be subject to the same procedures as the larger plans.

The Secretary could require certification of the report, and if he had reasonable cause to believe that a violation of the act had occurred, he could conduct an investigation.

We believe that this process would eliminate the administrative burden on such small plans while maintaining adequate protection for those participating in the fund.

Mr. TOWER. Actually I do not recall that there was any great hue and cry to make the act apply to the smaller plans, covering in excess of 25 employees. There was testimony to the effect that 100 employees should be the cutoff figure.

If automatic reporting were required by the Secretary of Labor, which he could require at his discretion, it would be a great burden on the small businessmen.

The number of employees covered, as comprehended by this amendment, would amount to only 5 percent of the total number of employees. That is a very small number of employees. However, it represents a large number of plans. The administrative cost per year could be tremendous. We talk about 75,000 plans; and the administration has estimated that it would cost from $10 to $12 a plan to administer it. Actually the figure would be greater, because all the States in their experience with these plans have shown that the cost has been substantially greater. The cost would be tremendous. There has been talk about adding 12,000 employees to the Department to handle this activity. If we consider the FBI, with its 14,000 employees, we get a pretty good idea of the scope of the bureaucratic operation that would be involved.

So I say again that we would be putting the small businessman at the mercy of a powerful Federal bureaucracy. At present the small businessman feels that he is being smothered in a pall of Federal bureaucracy. I do not believe we should impose this additional burden on him.

Mr. McNAMARA. In response, let me say that we have eliminated from the registration section the employer in the category of between 25 and 100 employees. Beyond that, the legislation merely requires that the employer be as honest as the rest of the people involved. I do not believe it is an undue burden so far as the amount of money that is involved is concerned. This money has been spent already, generally speaking, because the plans are registered. It would be necessary to spend money for future plans. The policing of plans would not require the amount of money the Senator indicates.

Mr. TOWER. How many businessmen have been shown to be in the category of smaller plans since the original passage of the act in 1958?

Mr. McNAMARA. Nobody has had the authority to investigate that subject. No one would have the authority unless we were to pass this kind of legislation to permit someone to go into the plans and file records. This is one reason for the need for enactment of the pending legislation.

Mr. TOWER. Would it not be wise for us to go back to committee and conduct an investigation to determine whether or not any abuses have been proven to exist? There has been no evidence revealed by the committee which would indicate that there has been any extensive abuse in connection with the small plans.

Mr. McNAMARA. We have had considerable testimony in which committees of Congress have been drawn into this field by one or more witnesses, but I repeat that no agency would have authority to get the facts unless the proposed legislation were enacted.

Mr. TOWER. A congressional committee can get the facts in these matters. So far, that has not been done.

Mr. McNAMARA. They have generally followed the route of public hearing. I believe some checking has been done in specific instances in the Chicago area, but there was a lack of authority for anyone to do it.

Mr. TOWER. A real need has not been proved.

Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time, if the Senator from Michigan is prepared to do likewise.

Mr. McNAMARA. I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. PROUTY. I merely wish to point out that, as I understand the situation—and I would like to be corrected if I am wrong—under the bill as now drafted, the small plans do not have to be reported. The employer must explain the plan initially, and that is all there is to it. He does not have to make a report unless the Secretary has reason to believe that it should be done.

Mr. McNAMARA. As a result of the amendment by the Senator this action was taken.

Mr. PROUTY. That is correct.

Mr. TOWER. That is absolutely true. This is something which was brought out awhile ago. However, the fact remains that the Secretary of Labor does possess power at his arbitrary will and discretion to require annual reports on the small plans.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do both sides yield back the remainder of their time?

Mr. McNAMARA. I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. TOWER. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on the pending amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Texas. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina would vote "yea," and the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] would each vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], and the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 57, as follows:

[No. 17 Leg.]

YEAS—25

Allott
Bennett
Butler
Byrd, Va.
Capehart
Carlson
Case, S. Dak.
Cotton
Curtis
Dworshak
Eastland
Ellender
Goldwater
Hickenlooper
Hruska
Miller
Morton
Murphy
Pearson
Robertson
Saltonstall
Smith, Maine
Tower
Wiley
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—57

Aiken
Anderson
Bartlett
Beall
Bible
Boggs
Burdick
Bush
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carroll
Case, N.J.
Church
Clark
Douglas
Engle
Ervin
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hickey
Hill
Holland
Humphrey
Jackson
Javits
Jordan
Keating
Kefauver
Lausche
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McNamara
Metcalf
Monroney
Morse
Moss
Mundt
Muskie
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Smathers
Smith, Mass.
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—18

Chavez
Cooper
Dirksen
Dodd
Fong
Fulbright
Hayden
Johnston
Kerr
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Long, Hawaii
Long, La.
McGee
Russell
Scott
Thurmond
Yarborough

So Mr. TOWER's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I have an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed on page 14, line 5, to strike out the word "an" and insert the word "the".

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, notwithstanding that we are operating under a unanimous-consent agreement, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider a nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask that the Senate consider the nomination of Harrison L. Winter, of Maryland, to be a U.S. district judge for the district of Maryland, which nomination was reported today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will be stated.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Harrison L. Winter, of Maryland, to be a U.S. district judge for the district of Maryland.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is agreed to.

Without objection, the President will be notified of the nomination.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

By unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

AMENDMENT OF WELFARE AND PENSION PLANS AND DISCLOSURE ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2520) to amend the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act with respect to the method of enforcement and to provide certain additional sanctions, and for other purposes.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I yield 20 minutes to myself on the amendment.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. Does the Senator expect to ask for a yea-and-nay vote?

Mr. PROUTY. That is not my present intention.

Mr. SMATHERS. After that, the Senator from Texas has an amendment on which he is going to ask for the yeas and nays. Is that correct?

Mr. TOWER. That is correct.

Mr. PROUTY. I may explain to the distinguished Senator from Florida that my amendment will probably be withdrawn.

Mr. President, the Welfare and Pension Plan Disclosure Act is designed to prevent abuses and irregularities in the administration of employee benefit plans. The act was passed in 1958 after a series of congressional investigations had clearly shown that legislation was needed to protect all those who have an interest in the honest management of the billions of dollars invested in private welfare and pension plans in America.

The Senate, in 1958, adopted a broad welfare and pension plan reporting bill, S. 2888, 85th Congress. This measure would have authorized the Secretary of Labor to issue regulations, to make investigations, and to bring injunctions to enforce the bill's provisions. Intentional violations carried a heavy penalty. Kickbacks, embezzlements, and false statements in and destruction of records and books would have been made felonies.

However, the House of Representatives passed a much milder bill, and this was essentially what was agreed to in conference.

As finally enacted, virtually all effective penalties and administrative and enforcement powers had been deleted.

It is significant to note that the present act, in order to be effective, relies upon suits by individual employees. Commonsense tells us that employees are subject to possible intimidation if they attempt to file a suit and this situation discourages action.

When President Eisenhower signed the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act, he spotlighted its shortcomings and said that he was approving it only "because it establishes a precedent of Federal responsibility in this area" but "does little else" and will require "extensive amendment at the next session of Congress."

The Eisenhower administration sent up to the Congress bills to correct the defects in the disclosure statute but these measures designed to protect the interests of employees and beneficiaries were given short shrift by the 86th Congress.

Secretary of Labor, James Mitchell, in a report to Congress on August 9, 1960, called for revision of the 1958 law to make it more than a shameful illusion.

He reported that the law had no teeth, is honored more in the breach than otherwise, and concluded:

> The net effect, to date, raises grave doubt as to the wisdom of retaining so weak a law on the statute books. To continue the law in its present form in the belief that it assures adequate protective safeguards is a shameful illusion. To abandon it entirely, however, would be an act of betrayal to the millions of Americans who have a right to a sense of security that the billions of dollars annually received and disbursed by these plans are being honestly and prudently managed.
>
> The only recourse, therefore, is the prompt amendment of the act.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Was the remedial or supplemental legislation which was recommended by President Eisenhower and Secretary Mitchell substantially similar to S. 2520, which is now before the Senate?

Mr. PROUTY. As I recall, in principle it would accomplish the same purpose. It might have been a little stronger than the bill presently before the Senate.

Mr. KEATING. Did it apply to both union-managed and employer-managed pension plans?

Mr. PROUTY. Yes; to all plans.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the Senator. The Senator is making an illuminating statement for the benefit of those of us who do not serve on the committee.

Several employer groups have contacted me urging that this bill be amended to exclude employer-managed pension plans. It is difficult for me to see the justification for making a distinction along these lines. Either we strengthen the 1958 act, about which President Eisenhower and Secretary Mitchell expressed such grave reservations, or we let it stand as a simple means for gathering statistics with no proper means to followup on abuses which are uncovered.

I share the concern of the many who have written to me that the role of the Government in our society must be kept within reasonable bounds. But this is not a new bill or a new program. It merely corrects faults and weaknesses in an existing program enacted by the Congress in 1958.

This act will not and should not mean an increase in the amount of statistical materials required to be filed. It will have no effect whatsoever on honest, well-meaning, properly administered pension plans. It will, however, protect the individual who may be under a plan which is fraudulently and improperly managed. This seems to me important.

Mr. PROUTY. I thank the Senator for his compliment. It is easy to see why Secretary Mitchell was concerned about the defects in the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act and the failure of Congress to do anything about those defects.

Plans reporting to the U.S. Department of Labor under this statute had assets of nearly $48 billion in 1959. More than $10 billion in contributions were made to these plans during that particular year and benefits amounting to more than $5.5 billion were paid.

The welfare plans cover well over 25 million employees and the pension plans cover about 17 million employees. The total participation in the plans by employees and other persons is estimated to be about 80 million people.

The assets of these plans are not only fantastic now, but also they are increasing in value at the rate of $4½ billion a year. It is estimated that in the 1970's it is very possible that assets of all plans will approximate $100 billion.

And yet, despite the evident need of adequate safeguards for these funds, millions of Americans who depend upon these plans were ignored when the last Congress shunted aside the recommendations of President Eisenhower.

Although the present occupant of the White House scheduled no action on legislation to strengthen the Welfare and Pension Plan statute when he was chairman of the Senate Labor Subcommittee, he has discovered since he went to 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue that the Government has an obligation to the millions of men and women who are participants in benefit plans and that the obligation remains unfulfilled.

President Kennedy had this to say:

> Since the enactment of the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act of 1958 we have had an opportunity to study its operation and effect. This has disclosed several serious deficiencies. I am transmitting herewith for appropriate consideration by the Congress a draft bill designed to correct these deficiencies.

Mr. President, sad to say, the draft bill sent up by the administration was an undisguised grasp for power. It would have authorized the Secretary of Labor to go on fishing expeditions any time he had an inclination to do so.

When I say fishing expeditions I am not just joking. The original administration bill would give the Secretary of Labor authority to make investigations wherever he deems it "necessary or appropriate to determine whether any person has violated any part of the statute" or whenever he feels investigation would "aid in the enforcement of this act."

This greed for blanket authority was correctly characterized by one witness as follows:

> The proposed language would authorize the Secretary of Labor to examine, in wholesale fashion, the records of any company and disclose them. Only his own consideration of whether such investigation is "necessary or appropriate" limits its scope. The proposed amendments fail even to establish reasonableness as a guidepost in undertaking investigations. Certainly, the language used goes far beyond that conferred on such agencies as the Federal Trade Commission or the Securities and Exchange Commission.

The House Education and Labor Committee and the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee took a dim view of the proposed investigatory powers.

To their everlasting credit, these committees limited the authority of the Secretary of Labor to legitimate goals. The reported bill contains a realistic provision which authorizes the Secretary to investigate only "upon complaint of violation or on his own motion when he finds reasonable cause to believe investigation may disclose violation of the act."

As might be expected, the changes made by Congress are not altogether to the liking of the Secretary of Labor. He said:

> I have strong objection to the one dealing with investigative power, which would change the language of S. 1944 to provide that the Secretary may investigate only "upon complaint of violation, or when he finds reasonable cause to believe investigation may disclose violations of this act."

Of course, Mr. President, the same bill that does not go far enough to suit the Secretary of Labor goes much too far in the eyes of those who will be regulated by it.

This leads me to believe that the Labor and Public Welfare Committee is getting pretty close to what I would call the area of reasonable compromise.

One major change in the administration bill, which was made at my suggestion, exempts from the annual report requirement plans covering less than 100 participants. The administrators of these small plans will no longer be required automatically to publish and file annual reports unless the Secretary of Labor determines after investigation the pubication of such a report is necessary to serve the purposes of the act.

I believe this action by the committee will streamline the basic statute and increase its effectiveness in the long run.

Plans covering fewer than 100 lives constitute approximately 50 percent of all plans but cover only 5 percent of all employees. Thus we are taking from the shoulders of the truly smaller plans a substantial burden which will in no way lessen the protection of the individuals who may expect to benefit from these plans.

When there is a small group of employees who have constant personal contact with their employer, the opportunities for abuse are very limited. In addition, if some irregularities do occur in connection with the administration of a small plan, the Secretary of Labor can quickly revoke the exemption from the annual reporting requirement.

Since both the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations have contended that there are basic weaknesses in the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act, it might be well to discuss for a moment some of these weaknesses:

First, under the present law the Secretary of Labor can do nothing to insure effective reporting or uncover abuses. His Department merely acts as a receptacle in which the papers and material filed by plan administrators are put.

Second, neither the Secretary of Labor nor his Department has any authority to issue interpretations under the act, nor does either have authority to investigate cases of faulty or deceptive reporting or failure to report.

Third, existing law requires the administrator of a welfare or pension benefit plan to file only a summary statement of assets, liabilities, receipts and disbursements. All types of abuses can be concealed by the making of sketchy or summary reports.

Fourth, as things stand now, the Secretary of Labor has no authority to bring enforcement litigation. The failure of the basic statute to furnish him with any such authority leaves him powerless to uncover abuses in connection with reports called for by the statute. Reliance on individual employees to bring suits has proved to be an unsuccessful device.

Finally, the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act carries no penalties for embezzlements, kickbacks or bribes which take place in connection with the operation of an employee benefit plan.

To remedy these defects in existing law, the committee-reported bill, S. 2520, would make a number of changes in existing law. Here are some of the major ones:

The bill would give the Secretary of Labor the authority to prescribe the form and the detail of the plan descriptions and of the annual report.

The annual reports would have to contain an adequate financial statement with relatively full disclosure rather than the summary statement now required.

The Secretary would no longer be left powerless to uncover abuses. He could make investigations upon complaint of violation or when he has reasonable cause to believe an investigation may disclose a violation of the act.

The committee bill would authorize the Secretary to enforce the provisions of the statute through injunction action in the Federal district courts.

In addition, the pending legislation would require bonding of administrators, officials, and employees handling plan funds or other plan property.

Finally, the bill amends the Criminal Code to establish criminal liability for (a) accepting bribes in connection with the administration of a welfare or pension plan covered by the act; (b) for theft or embezzlement from employee benefit plans; (c) for false statements and concealments of facts in relation to documents which are subject to the provisions of the act. The penalties for these crimes are set at fines of not more than $10,000 or imprisonment for substantial terms.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I should like to say that the members of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee tried to do everything possible to protect the equity which millions of American workers have in welfare and pension plans. We feel that present law is far too weak and that we have given the Senate a measure which will impart to the Secretary of Labor all the power he needs to prevent the repetition of abuses and irregularities. If the committee bill is adopted, we will have what we do not have now, a meaningful statute which will help safeguard the funds upon which many workers depend or will depend for their well-being.

Mr. President, I withdraw my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKEY in the chair). The amendment is withdrawn.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I call up my amendments designated "1–23–62—A" and ask that they be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, it is proposed to strike out lines 19 and 20, and insert the following:

(12) The term "Commission" means the Securities and Exchange Commission.

On page 3, line 23, strike out "Secretary" and insert in lieu thereof "Commission".

On page 4, line 1, strike out "Secretary's" and insert in lieu thereof "Commission's".

On page 4, line 6, strike out "Secretary" and insert in lieu thereof "Commission".

On page 4, line 16, strike out "Secretary" and insert in lieu thereof "Commission".

On page 4, line 18, strike out "he" and insert in lieu thereof "it".

On page 4, line 23, strike out "Secretary" and insert in lieu thereof "Commission".

On page 5, line 3, strike out "Secretary" and insert in lieu thereof "Commission".

On page 5, line 22, strike out "Secretary" and "he" and insert in lieu thereof "Commission" and "it", respectively.

On page 6, line 3, strike out "Secretary" and "he" and insert in lieu thereof "Commission" and "it", respectively.

On page 6, line 6, strike out "by the Department of Labor".

On page 7, line 10, strike out "Secretary" and insert in lieu thereof "Commission".

On page 7, line 13, strike out "Secretary" and insert in lieu thereof "Commission".

On page 7, line 14, strike out "he" and insert in lieu thereof "it".

On page 7, line 16, strike out "Secretary" and insert in lieu thereof "Commission".

On page 8, line 4, strike out "Secretary" and insert in lieu thereof "Commission".

On page 8, line 6, strike out "his" and insert in lieu thereof "its".

On page 8, line 7, strike out "he" and insert in lieu thereof "it".

On page 8, line 9, strike out "he" and insert in lieu thereof "it".

On page 8, line 10, strike out "him" and insert in lieu thereof "it".

On page 8, line 19, strike out "Secretary" and "him" and insert in lieu thereof "Commission" and "it", respectively.

On page 8, line 20, strike out "Secretary" and insert in lieu thereof "Commission".

On page 8, line 22, strike out "he" and "his" and insert in lieu thereof "it" and "its", respectively.

On page 9, line 8, strike out "Secretary" and insert in lieu thereof "Commission".

On page 9, line 10, strike out "Secretary" and insert in lieu thereof "Commission".

On page 9, line 21, strike out "Secretary" and insert in lieu thereof "Commission".

On page 9, line 22, strike out "Secretary" and insert in lieu thereof "Commission".

On page 9, line 23, strike out "he" and insert in lieu thereof "it".

On page 9, line 24, strike out "Secretary" and insert in lieu thereof "Commission".

On page 10, line 3, strike out "he" and insert in lieu thereof "it".

On page 10, line 25, strike out "Secretary" and insert in lieu thereof "Commission".

On page 11, line 4, strike out "Secretary" and insert in lieu thereof "Commission".

On page 11, line 5, strike out "Secretary" and insert in lieu thereof "Commission".

On page 11, line 23, strike out "Secretary" and insert in lieu thereof "Commission".

On page 12, line 8, strike out "Secretary" and insert in lieu thereof "Commission".

On page 12, lines 20 and 21, strike out "Secretary" and insert in lieu thereof "Commission".

On page 13, line 20, strike out "Secretary" and insert in lieu thereof "Commission".

On page 13, line 23, strike out "he" and insert in lieu thereof "it".

On page 13, line 24, strike out "his" and insert in lieu thereof "its".

On page 14, line 1, strike out "Secretary" and insert in lieu thereof "Commission".

On page 14, line 11, strike out "Secretary" and insert in lieu thereof "Chairman of the Commission".

On page 14, line 14, strike out "Secretary" and insert in lieu thereof "Chairman of the Commission".

On page 14, line 16, strike out "Secretary" and "his" and insert in lieu thereof "Commission" and "its", respectively.

On page 14, line 17, strike out "Secretary" and insert in lieu thereof "Commission".

On page 14, line 19, strike out "Secretary" and insert in lieu thereof "Commission".

On page 14, line 21, strike out "Secretary" and insert in lieu thereof "Commission".

On page 14, line 22, strike out "he" and insert in lieu therof "it".

On page 14, line 24, strike out "his" and insert in lieu thereof "its".

On page 15, line 2, strike out "he" and insert in lieu thereof "it".

On page 15, line 4, strike out "he" and insert in lieu thereof "it".

On page 15, line 7, strike out "Secretary" and insert in lieu thereof "Commission".

On page 15, line 10, strike out "Secretary" and insert in lieu thereof "Commission".

On page 22, line 4, strike out "Secretary" and insert in lieu thereof "Commission".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from Texas yield to himself?

Mr. TOWER. I yield myself 10 minutes.

The Secretary of Labor is regarded as labor's representative in the Cabinet and his Department is committed to the welfare of the workingman. The problems involved in connection with the administration of this act do not basically relate to labor relations. Rather, they relate to disclosure and fiduciary standards which govern financial transactions and to honest administration and sound accounting. The administration of the act is remote from the Secretary's and the Labor Department's principal functions. Moreover, the Labor Department has few competent personnel, apart from the Bureau of Labor Statistics, to administer a statute involving intricate financial transactions.

On the other hand, the SEC is readymade for the job. It has had a long and invaluable experience with disclosure and fiduciary matters. The Commission's staff has developed an expertness in financial transactions of all kinds and with the details entailed with disclosure of financial information. The Commission is accustomed to prescribing forms of accounts and inspecting financial statements. The staff of the SEC could easily and quickly adjust to the tasks, could produce better forms and, in general, would have a better grasp of the significance of the information disclosed and the problem involved.

Giving the administration of the act to the SEC, which is better insulated against partisan and political pressures, would bring about public confidence in the act and would underline the basic idea behind the statute that these funds will be protected and their operation closely scrutinized.

This amendment would place the administration and operation of the act in the Securities and Exchange Commission. This bill is designed to give the Secretary of Labor broad investigative and enforcement powers which he does not presently possess. If the act is a mere disclosure statute there would appear to be no objection to having the act administered by the Labor Department. But in view of this grant of broad investigative and enforcement powers, I regard it as mandatory that the administration and operation of the law be placed in the hands of a governmental agency equipped by background and experience to properly handle the job. Such an agency is the Securities and Exchange Commission, which has had a long period of successful administration of disclosure statutes, and, in fact, has some familiarity with welfare and pension plans. I feel that this Commission with its trained personnel has the tested administrative machinery to administer the statute and to make factfindings, and detect frauds and irregularities in complicated financial operations.

I would like to mention that the final report of the Subcommittee on Welfare and Pension Funds in the 84th Congress, headed by the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] recommended to the Senate that the administration of a welfare pension and disclosure act be placed in the Securities and Exchange Commission. I am in agreement with this recommendation and urge that my amendment be adopted.

It is interesting to note that my position, that the SEC rather than the Department of Labor should administer this statute, is also the view expressed by the present Solicitor General of the United States, Mr. Archibald Cox.

In a statement submitted in May 1957, to the then Senator John F. Kennedy, chairman of the Senate Labor Subcommittee on Welfare and Pension Plans Legislation, Mr. Cox said:

> Should the statute be administered by the Secretary of Labor (as proposed by the Ives bill) or by the Securities and Exchange Commission (as proposed by the Douglas bill)?
>
> I am convinced that any plan for registration and disclosure (or even more detailed regulation) should be administered by the Securities and Exchange Commission. My reasons are as follows:
>
> (a) The Labor Department has little competent personnel apart from Bureau of Labor Statistics. It has been the weakest department in the Government for some years, in my opinion, and there is little reason to foresee improvement because the nature of its work is not as attractive to able young men as the work of other agencies.
>
> (b) There is more expertise in this field in the SEC. The SEC is already accustomed to prescribed forms of accounts and inspecting financial statements. Consequently, it would prepare itself for the task more easily than the Department of Labor and could be expected to produce better forms and better administrative regulations. Its staff is also likely to have a better grasp of the significance of the information disclosed. The last factor has some significance today, but it would become even more important if experience under a disclosure statute should reveal the need for additional legislation regulating fiscal policies with respect to premiums, reserves, etc.
>
> (c) Giving the responsibility to the SEC would arouse more public confidence. Furthermore, if employer plans are included, as I think they should be, there would be somewhat plausible objections to registering with a department committed to the welfare of employees. I do not mean to imply that I share the objections, but only that it has enough plausibility to be taken into account.
>
> (d) The problems of honest administration and sound accounting are not problems of labor relations which the Labor Department might legitimately claim fall within its sphere of responsibility. These problems relate to fiscal practice. The justification for a statute is the need for subjecting to the public scrutiny the activities of any person who controls large amounts of other peoples money. It is for this reason that we regulate commercial and savings banks, insurance companies, investment trusts, etc. This is also the reason for regulating the fiscal and fiduciary aspects of welfare and pension plans.

Mr. Cox's statement has great significance.

He has outlined, I believe, almost ironclad arguments for the inclusion in the act of a provision to the effect that the Securities and Exchange Commission should administer the act. Mr. Cox was speaking not in the abstract or as a highly respected Harvard law professor and recognized expert in the field of labor. He spoke from experience he gained as a former Associate Solicitor of the Labor Department. Considering Professor Cox' position and experience as Solicitor General, I think his views should be given very considerable weight.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 10 minutes on the bill?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I am a member of the committee which reported the bill, and I am very much in favor of it. However, I should like to raise a number of questions about the bill with the Senator in charge of the bill, because I think such questioning might be very useful in respect of the purpose of the bill.

One of the very important points in connection with the bill which has not yet been discussed is the proposed grant to witnesses, in that section of the bill which deals with kickbacks and bribery, of immunity from prosecution.

It is a proposed amendment to the racketeering chapter of our Penal Code.

Mr. President, to key Senators to the bill itself, the section appears at page 20, beginning at line 24, and extends over to page 21, line 23.

The power proposed is a very important one since it suspends the constitutional privilege against self-incrimination by granting immunity from prosecution in order to produce evidence. While I am satisfied that the questions of kickbacks and bribery in labor-management situations are so dangerous to the public interest that we must find a way of obtaining evidence, the proposal is certainly a very high price to pay. I have repeatedly noted that we must be aware of and alert to the consequences whenever we deprive citizens of this very fundamental constitutional privilege. For this reason I want to be sure that the ultimate decision to invoke the immunity provision will not rest with a local U.S. attorney alone, but that, as a matter of policy, the decision will be referred to the Attorney General himself, the authority being reposed either in him or in a top-ranking assistant in the Attorney General's Washington office. So I have asked the Senator from Michigan, who is in charge of the bill, to ascertain the answer to that question from the Attorney General. I now propound that inquiry to him.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, the question has been taken up with the Attorney General, and he informs us that he has the necessary authority, and that it is not delegated out to the field. He has the authority here in Washington.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, therefore, we may make a part of the legislative record the statement that the Attorney General would himself exercise the authority which would be granted by that provision, rather than delegating or allowing it to be exercised, as the language of the bill itself would permit, by the individual local U.S. attorney.

Mr. McNAMARA. The Senator is correct. It would be the same as under the Narcotics Act.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HRUSKA. On that score, it is the recollection of the Senator from Nebraska that under a reorganization plan the Attorney General is expressly authorized to delegate the performance of any of his functions to his officers and employees, with a few exceptions. My inquiry of the Senator from Michigan is, Notwithstanding that provision expressly empowering the Attorney General to transfer functions, would it still be the thought and policy of the Attorney General not to delegate this responsibility to district attorneys or anyone else?

Mr. McNAMARA. We have his reply in answer to that direct question, to the effect that he would not delegate.

Mr. JAVITS. I point out to the Senator from Nebraska, and also to the Senator from Colorado, who is on his feet, that the bill we are passing vests authority in "a U.S. attorney," obviously a local official. Therefore this legislative record is critically important on so important a matter as this, because we are demonstrating the intent of Congress that the decision shall not be made by anyone but by the Attorney General himself, notwithstanding the words in the law.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. My inquiry of the Senator from Michigan is, then, In what form was the assurance given? Was it oral or in writing?

Mr. McNAMARA. It was oral. However, we will definitely include it in the conference report.

Mr. JAVITS. By establishing the point so affirmatively, in advance of the time when amendments will be foreclosed, I am satisfied that this will make the policy for the Attorney General, inasmuch as the Senator in charge of the bill on the floor concurs in that understanding.

Mr. HRUSKA. That is satisfactory to me. I thought that if the assurance were available in letter form, it could be introduced in the RECORD at this time.

Mr. McNAMARA. I shall have it in letter form.

Mr. JAVITS. I join the Senator from Nebraska in the hope that the Senator from Michigan will get such a letter and include it in the record.

Mr. McNAMARA. The staff has been instructed to do that.

Mr. JAVITS. I would not wish to see the bill passed without this assurance set out in this record, whether we get it in writing or not.

Mr. McNAMARA. We agree on this point, I am sure.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I am interested in one point which the Senator has made, and that is that the legislation before us, as written, refers to "a U.S. attorney."

I am not sure, but from my reading of the newspaper accounts of a similar situation which arose in connection with the quiz situation in New York, the results were rather damaging so far as the public was concerned, particularly when we realize that people can get away with hundreds of thousands of dollars and not be punished with more than a light tap on the wrist.

As I read those reports—I did not examine the record—there was an indication that this happened under the general provision of law granting immunity to some of the witnesses involved.

This is a very damaging situation, because it puts into the hands of a district attorney—and most of us who are lawyers have served as district attorneys—the power to select which defendants he will ultimately prosecute. Therefore he can pick the ones that he does not want to prosecute and urge them to become witnesses, and grant them immunity under the general statute for that purpose. This is a very dangerous subject for Congress to legislate on. Did I understand the Senator to say that all amendments are foreclosed at this time?

Mr. JAVITS. No; I did not say that. The bill is open to amendment. All I said was that if we are to establish legislative history, we must do it while the bill remains open to amendment.

Mr. ALLOTT. I misunderstood the Senator. I believe the legislative history now is very clear. I would like to suggest that the best way to legislate is not necessarily by legislative history but by actually expressing the intent of the Senate in the bill.

Mr. JAVITS. If the Senator were to offer such an amendment I would join him in it. I would point out, however, that the language of the statute at page 21, line 5 reads: "Upon the approval of the Attorney General shall make application," and so forth.

In other words, whatever may be the concatenation of words with respect to the Attorney General exercising his authority so as to divest himself of the decision, we want the decision, in cases like these, of giving immunity, made only by the Attorney General. That is the legislative history that we are making.

Mr. ALLOTT. I understood the Senator who is in charge of the bill on the floor, the Senator from Michigan, to say that he is wholeheartedly in agreement.

Mr. JAVITS. That is correct. I made the point in view of the Senator's feeling that we should amend the words. We are tying it down by this legislative history.

Mr. ALLOTT. We want to make it absolutely clear.

Mr. JAVITS. Yes. I have one other point, Mr. President. I have had a great many letters from businessmen in New York complaining about the bill. As I analyze the letters, they boil down to the question as to whether or not the pending bill should extend to a plan which is unilaterally management managed or union managed as well as a plan that is jointly managed by labor and management.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. May I have 2 additional minutes?

Mr. McNAMARA. I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from New York on the bill.

Mr. JAVITS. In order to have a plan which is completely fair and nondiscriminatory, and in view of the fact that the great number of plans are so-called unilateral plans, whether they are fixed plans or not—which is a word of art, relating to making sure of the integrity of the fund—it is necessary to have coverage under this bill all inclusive. However, I believe that any doubt on that point is resolved by the testimony given before the House Committee on Labor on this very matter on June 1, 1961, by James M. Higgins, chief, examination section, welfare fund bureau, New York Insurance Department.

In his testimony Mr. Higgins affirmed the point that in order to have a complete system which assures the integrity of the plan it is necessary to include in coverage the unilateral plan. He added that the New York law does not include it, and he therefore feels that this is a deficiency in the New York law which should be corrected.

I ask unanimous consent that the testimony of Mr. Higgins on this point in the hearings before the committee in the House may be made a part of my remarks, as answering this point, which I believe is a perfectly valid point which has troubled many businessmen. They do not want regulation if it is not needed. Therefore the proper test is whether it is needed. Here is a very experienced voice in the field from my own State which says it is needed. So I ask unanimous consent that his testimony on this point may be included in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> Mr. HIGGINS. We were of the opinion that the jointly administered funds, that the conditions which dictated supervision over jointly administered funds, would apply equally to unilateral funds. We suggested to our legislature on at least two occasions, that these other funds be included under the scope of our law. That has not been done up to this time.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I move to strike on page 1, line 10, the word "Commission".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An amendment is pending. Therefore the motion of the Senator is out of order at this time.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. McNAMARA. I yield 3 additional minutes to the Senator from New York on the bill.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Should not the test be, not whether the fund is administered by management or by labor or by a mixture of the two, but whether or not the custodians of the fund stand in a fiduciary capacity?

Let me illustrate. If an employer makes a promise to pay, is not that in the same category as any other pledge or evidence of debt? It is not at all a situation where money is set aside in a fund, and the necessary machinery is sought to police the fiduciary. Would the Senator from New York comment on that?

Mr. JAVITS. It seems to me that there is a fiduciary relationship imposed on anyone who is charged with the administration of a fund, whether it is technically a fiduciary, like a bank or a trust company, or not; and that, therefore, if we were merely going to depend on the criminal statutes and other statutes of accountability which relate to a fiduciary, we would not have this bill at all.

The point is that we feel there must be in the Federal law greater sanctions than are inherent in the usual laws relating to fiduciaries, which are essentially State administered; hence the reason for the bill.

It seems to me that once it is felt that there is a basis for the bill—that is, a need for legislation—the only argument I make for coming to this conclusion, and upon which the bill is postulated, is that it is necessary to go all the way. Otherwise, it is not possible to have a good bill, much as I understand the concern of businessmen who do not want to be regulated, if they do not have to be, in this way. In this context of a need for greater sanctions, I do not see how it is possible to justify a cutoff of, or exclusion from, coverage simply because a part of the plan is managed jointly by management and labor.

If the Senator from Nebraska feels in good conscience that the laws with respect to fiduciaries are presently adequate for all purposes, the Senator from Nebraska will then vote against the bill. I do not feel that way. Therefore, I must direct my attention to the other argument, which is: Assuming that more adequate protection is needed, how broad shall be its coverage?

Mr. CURTIS. If the employer is not administering a fund which is set aside, but has merely contracted to pay, is it not true that all the assets of the employing company are liable for the performance of that promise?

Mr. JAVITS. That is true. That does not mean the assets will be adequate for the purpose; but it is true that the employer will be liable for the performance of that promise. That is a rather unusual situation.

Mr. President, I move to amend the amendment of the Senator from Texas by striking out the word "Commission" in line 3, page 1.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator from New York that his motion will not be in order until the time for the debate on the amendment has been consumed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from New York 15 minutes on the bill.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I was not trying to complicate our procedure; but apparently it will take a little more time than we have; hence my effort to get it. I am grateful to the Senator from Montana.

It seems to me that the point which we should get very clear is that there are plans of all different kinds, and the question is whether we shall include any of them. I believe the testimony which I have introduced in the Record from the New York Insurance Department spokesman goes directly to the merits of trying to draw some distinction as between the various plans.

In response to the query of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis], it seems to me that if one has a plan which is nothing but a promise by the company, then it would be a very simple legal proposition to have that plan excluded, in practical effect, from the bill, because it is not a plan at all; it is nothing but a contractual obligation of the company to its employees, which could be taken out of ambit by the broader legal contractual relations provided in the bill. The bill relates to situations in which there is a residual asset, which is the backing for a plan. That is its essential purpose. I believe that those who face a situation where there are no assets to back a plan except contractual responsibility could design their legal relationship so as not to be subject to the bill.

Therefore, much as I sympathize deeply with the problems of businessmen who feel that they need not file reports if it is unnecessary, the case is made out for the need to provide whatever may be the distinctions, and that the scheme of the legislation is directed, therefore, toward a proper legislative purpose.

I express appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Montana. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, of the time remaining on the bill, I shall take a minute to reply to the distinguished Senator from New York.

As the Senator from New York knows, the purpose of the bill is to protect the future health and standard of living of millions of American workers. It is really unimportant whether the source of future funds to pay for that protection be in the form of a jointly administered or a unilateral plan. No matter in which form the funds are held in trust they represent an obligation to the employee. They are, in every sense, deferred wages owed the employee. It is precisely these deferred wages we seek to protect.

For that reason, the proposal to exempt unilateral plans from the coverage of this act was rejected in 1958.

For the same reason the Labor and Public Welfare rejected—and still rejects—such an exemption now.

Mr. President, in reply to the Senator from Texas, the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator would transfer the administration of the Welfare and Pensions Plan Disclosure Act from the Labor Department to the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Mr. President, perhaps I should ask for some definite amount of time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Pearson in the chair). How much time does the Senator from Michigan yield himself?

Mr. McNAMARA. The time is under the control of the majority leader.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, how much time remains on the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirty minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Michigan whatever time the Senator wishes to use within the 30 minutes.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, the amendment proposed by the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] would transfer the administration of the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act from the Labor Department to the Securities and Exchange Commission.

I assume that the amendment is based on the belief that the regulation of pension and welfare plans involves primarily a question of investment practices and that the SEC is the agency best qualified to supervise matters of this kind.

This line of reasoning has surface appeal, but I think it ignores the basic issue.

We do not seek by the bill to regulate investment policies.

Indeed, we have written into the bill a specific prohibition against Federal regulation of the management of the investments of welfare and pension plans.

What we seek is protection for what we consider to be the unqualified rights and interests of more than 25 million American workers.

In every pension and welfare program there is a contractual obligation between employer and employee.

Whether or not such plans have evolved through collective bargaining or through unilateral efforts of the employer, the benefits derived from them represent an obligation on the part of the employer to the employee. They are really a part of the compensation for an employee's work; they represent deferred income, as I have previously said. Because this deferred income is the essence of such plans, it is a vital element in labor-management relations.

Given this overriding labor-management factor, it seemed obvious to the committee that the governmental administration should be entrusted to that agency which had experience in and understanding of labor-management relations.

Furthermore, the Labor Department has a particular experience in the field of welfare and pension plan regulation as a result of the 1958 act.

While this act made the Department no more than a depository of information, it did give them a broad experience in what information was important and what actions should be taken if they were given authority to take them.

The Department has a going operation in this field; it has a staff already as expert as the present law permits.

More importantly, it is now charged with the responsibility for administering the reporting and disclosure provisions of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959.

The reporting provisions of the two laws have a common policy; they prescribe parallel procedures; and they complement each other very closely.

The problems in these fields arise out of the labor-management field and are a vital part of the entire fabric of labor-management relations.

A single agency, expert in the field of labor relations, should handle the reporting and disclosure provisions of both laws.

In addition to the Labor Department's ability and desire to administer an expanded act, the views of the Securities and Exchange Commission must be given great weight.

The SEC is totally opposed to the transfer to itself of administration of the Welfare and Pension Act.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a statement from the Chairman of the SEC, an attached memorandum outlining the Commission's views, and a letter from Secretary of Labor Goldberg, setting forth his opposition to such a transfer. These documents are self-explanatory, and I think they make the defeat of this amendment overwhelmingly desirable.

I urge a "no" vote on the question of agreeing to this amendment.

There being no objection, the statement, the memorandum, and the letter were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Securities and Exchange Commission,
Washington D.C., January 23, 1962.

Re proposed amendment to S. 2520.

Hon. Pat McNamara,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Labor, Labor and Public Welfare Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator McNamara: The Commission has been informed that under a proposed amendment to S. 2520 the function of administering the Welfare and Pension Plan Disclosure Act of 1958 would be transferred from the Department of Labor to this Commission. Proposals which would have charged this Commission with the duty of administering welfare and pension plan legislation were considered in the 85th Congress, and at that time the Commission expressed serious doubt whether it should be the agency to administer such legislation. The Commission has reconsidered that position in the light of the proposed amendment to S. 2520 and is of the opinion that the duty of administering the Welfare and Pension Plan Disclosure Act should not be transferred to this Commission.

The reasons underlying the Commission's position are, in essence, that this agency does not possess expertise in the area of labor-management relations, and that the Commission is heavily committed to its present work, including a special study of the securities markets authorized by Congress in September 1961.

I am enclosing six copies of a memorandum of comment on the proposed amendment stating the Commission's position in more detail. The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of the memorandum from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

William L. Cary,
Chairman.

Memorandum of the Securities and Exchange Commission on a Proposed Amendment to S. 2520, 87th Congress

S. 2520 would amend the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act ("the act") with respect to the method of enforcement of the provisions of that act. The bill would also provide for certain additional sanctions apparently designed to facilitate the administration of the act. The bill was reported by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to the U.S. Senate on September 8, 1961. As reported the bill would not affect the operations of this Commission.

A proposed amendment to S. 2520 would, however, transfer from the Department of Labor to this Commission the function of administering the provisions of the act. In this regard the proposed amendment would accomplish the same result that would have been accomplished by certain bills that were introduced in the 85th Congress and considered in connection with the welfare and pension legislation that was enacted during the 85th Congress. Proposals to charge this Commission with the duty of administering welfare and pension plan legislation, which were embodied in S. 1122, S. 1813, and S. 2137, 85th Congress, 1st session, were rejected in favor of proposals to charge such duty to the Department of Labor.

In testimony on welfare and pension plan legislation in the 85th Congress, representatives of the Commission testified orally that they did not believe it would be appropriate for the Commission to undertake administration of welfare and pension plan legislation.[1] In addition, in a memorandum submitted in response to questions raised at the hearings at which representatives of the Commission testified, the Commission expressed serious doubt whether it should be the agency named to administer welfare and pension plan legislation.[2] The same reasons which then impelled the Commission to question such a proposal now impel the Commission to express the view that the duty of administering the provisions of the act should not be transferred to this agency.

It is true that the Commission and its staff have developed an expertise in the areas of financial analysis of corporate securities and full disclosure of financial information. However, this expertness has been developed in the context of statutes having as their broad purposes the prevention of fraud in the securities markets, the regulation of brokers and dealers and the stock exchanges and the publication by issuers of significant information concerning their management, operations and securities without reference to the special problems in the labor-management field. An agency which has a closer contact with the needs and problems in the labor-management field and a more intimate knowledge of related statutes should be in a better position to determine the appropriate criteria for the administration of welfare and pension plan legislation. The plans which are involved are the fruits of collective bargaining and, accordingly, are inseparably intertwined with labor-management relations. Abuses in this area would have their main effect in an economic area in which this Commission does not possess expertise. In addition, the task that would be imposed under the proposed amendment to the bill could tend to overshadow the Commission's present work. This would be especially serious at the present time when the Commission is conducting a study of the securities markets and is faced with serious and ever-increasing problems which demand the Commission's full attention.

If the Congress should determine that, nothwithstanding the considerations mentioned above, it would be appropriate for the Commission to administer the provisions of the act, the Commission would, of course, undertake to perform such duties in accordance with purposes of the act. However, it should be emphasized that the performance of such duties would require additional personnel and entail substantial additional expense.

U.S. Department of Labor,
Office of the Secretary,
Washington, D.C., January 26, 1962.

Hon. Pat McNamara,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Labor, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator McNamara: It is my understanding that during floor consideration of S. 2520, the bill to amend the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act, an amendment may be offered which would transfer the administration of the act from the Department of Labor to the Securities and Exchange Commission.

I would like to take this opportunity to present to you several important reasons why such a change would in my opinion be unwise and unsound.

May I say, at the outset, that the Department of Labor has acquired over 3 years of experience in the administration of the Disclosure Act, and I believe that the Congress should take full advantage of this considerable experience. Moreover, and equally important, not only do we have the benefit of this background, but we also have acquired extensive experience under the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959.

As you know, the Disclosure Act, particularly as S. 2520 would amend it, and the Landrum-Griffin Act are similar. They are both disclosure laws, one applying to the organization and financial affairs of unions and the other applying to the same aspects of employee welfare and pension benefit plans. They are designed to bring comparable protections to much the same persons, the working men and women of America.

Many of the procedures under the amended Disclosure Act would be closely akin to those under Landrum-Griffin. Each calls for the administration of a program of public disclosure through the reporting of organizational and financial information. Plainly both programs would be similar and should operate in substantially the same fashion.

There are other marked similarities between the two measures. For example, both have a bonding provision. The Department of Labor has acquired a knowledge of this area under the Landrum-Griffin Act. Indeed, the bonding provision of that law applies not only to labor organizations but also to trusts in which a labor organization is interested. Some of these trusts are also subject to the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act.

In my opinion, therefore, it would be greatly in the interest of wisdom and good Government administration to vest the responsibilities imposed by these two statutes in the same agency. Inconsistency between the operation of the two programs would not serve the public interest and could be highly confusing, an undesirable result that would be almost inevitable with dual administrators.

Yours sincerely,

Arthur J. Goldberg,
Secretary of Labor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield briefly to me at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Pearson in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. McNAMARA. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MORSE. Because I am required to attend a meeting at this time, I should like to make clear, for the Record, by means of this colloquy with the Senator from Michigan, that the intent of this act is that in formulating and administering the regulations the Secretary shall follow the procedures of the Administrative Procedure Act. I also wish to make that clear with respect to the notice of hearings to interested parties. In that case, also, the intent is that the Secretary shall follow the procedures of the Administrative Procedure Act.

Will the Senator from Michigan state whether that is his intent, as sponsor of the bill, and whether that is also the intent of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare?

Mr. McNAMARA. Yes, it is; that is entirely correct. We intend that the Secretary shall give such notice to interested parties, prior to the issuance of the regulations. That is set forth clearly—namely, that prior to issuance of the regulations, the Secretary shall give notice of the hearings.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Michigan very much.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I am aware that the SEC does not want to have jurisdiction of this Act. I think it is to be commended for that, because it is about the only agency of the Government that is not engaged in empire building. Nevertheless, I think the view of the SEC in that respect should not be considered by us to be controlling in this case.

---

[1] Hearings before the Subcommittee on Welfare and Pension Plans Legislation of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, U.S. Senate, 85th Cong., 1st sess., pp. 108, 110–111.

[2] Id. at 119.

In my opinion, there is some significance to the view of the Secretary of Labor that labor-relations matters should be administered by the Department of Labor. However, the problem with which we are dealing in this case is not a problem of labor relations. Instead, it involves the disclosure of the fiduciary standards which govern these financial transactions. These pension and welfare funds are invested in multifarious types of securities, bonds, insurance, and whatnot; and it seems to me that the Securities and Exchange Commission by its very nature would be much more competent to evaluate the reports that will be required from the management of these funds, in order to determine whether there has been abuse. It seems to me the act would be more effective if we placed its administration in the hands of an organization that is accustomed to dealing with financial and accounting and investment matters.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, at this point will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. TOWER. I yield.

Mr. McNAMARA. This bill does not authorize any governmental agency to investigate or inquire as to where these funds are invested.

Mr. TOWER. But is it not true that if the Secretary of Labor decides that the reports have been inaccurate or misleading or that they contain anything false or fraudulent——

Mr. McNAMARA. Oh, yes; as to the reports——

Mr. TOWER. In other words, that in such cases he can investigate?

Mr. McNAMARA. Yes.

Mr. TOWER. And the reports will cover not only the nature of these funds, but also the management and investment of the funds. Again it would appear that persons with the background of the members of the Securities and Exchange Commission could best determine as to these matters.

Mr. McNAMARA. It is not the purpose under this measure to have inquiry made into the question of where the money is invested. In connection with this measure, we are trying to get out of that. Let those in charge of the funds invest them as they will.

Mr. TOWER. But can the question of how the money is being invested and what is being done with it be completely divorced from the making of the required reports? If the Secretary of Labor believes there is something wrong in the reports, he can conduct an investigation and can seek an injunction to compel compliance with the law. I do not see how the two can be divorced.

Mr. McNAMARA. But this is the only authority he has, and I think the law is well drawn in that regard.

I certainly disagree with the Senator from Texas when he says this is not a labor-management of labor-relations matters, because generally speaking it involves deferred wages.

Mr. TOWER. Yes, this may have been arrived at by collective bargaining.

Mr. McNAMARA. Or it may not have been. But it still involves deferred wages; in either event it involves compensation to the employees, and is deferred wages.

Mr. TOWER. Then does the Senator from Michigan think we should create within the Department of Labor a legal department to enforce all of the criminal statutes which pertain to labor, rather than to have the Attorney General do that?

Mr. McNAMARA. No; and I do not think they propose to enforce anything except the authority granted them under this legislation.

Mr. TOWER. But something which may pertain to labor may not pertain to labor-management relations.

Mr. McNAMARA. Then the Department of Labor attorneys would not enforce that; it would be turned over to the Attorney General.

Mr. TOWER. That is exactly the point I am making.

But in this case, just because this matter affects labor, some Senators desire to have it administered by the Department of Labor. If so, why not have the Department of Labor handle all criminal laws which pertain to labor? That is the point I am making.

This measure relates to the establishment of pension funds.

Mr. McNAMARA. It pertains to labor, as the Senator has stated.

Mr. TOWER. Yes, it pertains to labor, and there are many other things that pertain to labor. But this question is not fundamentally a labor question.

Mr. McNAMARA. But sometimes these funds are created by negotiations between management and labor.

Mr. TOWER. And sometimes they are voluntary and are unilaterally created.

Mr. McNAMARA. Yes. But in either event they are considered, generally speaking, as deferred wages; and therefore the law in connection with them should be administered by the Department of Labor.

Mr. TOWER. But basically they relate to the investment and management of money, not to labor relations. The law which gives labor the power to bargain collectively and to arrive at these arrangements does deal with labor relations. But this act is not of that sort. It seems to me that the long experience the Commission has had with the disclosure of fiduciary matters should be invaluable in connection with the administration of a matter of this kind. Furthermore, I should like to point out that the Securities and Exchange Commission is much better insulated against partisan and political pressures than are the Department of Labor and the Secretary of Labor.

Mr. McNAMARA. I do not agree as to that. Nevertheless, that is not part of the question which is before us.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. TOWER. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. I should like to ask a question about the Senator's amendment. It is my recollection that the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], who was chairman of the committee when I had the honor to serve on it in 1955 and 1956, at one time advocated that the administration of this act be placed under the Securities and Exchange Commission.

I wish to state that it seems to me that what is sought to be accomplished in this case relates more to the soundness and integrity of the administration of the funds than to labor or employee-management relationships. For that reason, I shall support the amendment of the Senator from Texas, just as I have always supported this proposal, because it seems to me that the emphasis in this case is one having sound, honestly managed, and well managed funds, rather than to have the emphasis placed on a matter of employee-management relationships. If the latter were the basic question, the administration should be by the Department of Labor. But that is not the question. Instead, the question is as to the soundness of the funds.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, how much time remains available to the proponents, and how much to the opponents?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixteen minutes remain available to the proponents of the amendment; 23 minutes remain available to the opponents of the amendment, and under the control of the majority leader.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I may say that in the committee, I voted for the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Texas, for it seemed to have some appeal at the time.

But since then, I have learned that the Securities and Exchange Commission very definitely does not want to have this responsibility and does not feel equipped to handle it.

I believe the Senator from Michigan has already inserted this in the RECORD, but I wish to quote from a memorandum submitted by the SEC to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on May 29, 1957:

> 1. The magnitude of the task imposed by this legislation would tend to overshadow the Commission's present work. The Commission is reluctant to assume a job of such potential size that would tend to submerge the Commission's main mission.

The second point, which I think is more important, is:

> Many of the plans involved in this legislation are the fruits of collective bargaining. Accordingly, these plans are inseparably intertwined with labor-management relations. Abuses in this area then have their main effect upon an economic area in which the Commission does not possess expertise.

The Commission continues at some length to reinforce its opinion. That memorandum expresses the conviction of the SEC. It seems sound and logical to me. So I shall be compelled to vote against the amendment.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back my time, if the other side is willing to do so.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I should like to say a word. I think it requires some objective judgment to determine which agency is best qualified to administer this act. It is my understanding that there was a time when the SEC felt a matter of this type should come within the preview of the responsibilities of the SEC. In recent months it has changed its mind.

However, this still is not a matter of labor-management relations. These funds can be set up as a result of collective bargaining, but the procedure involves the disclosure of fiduciary practices, investment of money, and management practices. It is, therefore, I think, not a labor-management matter.

If the SEC does not want to do it, certainly it will raise arguments against being given this responsibility; but it is my experience that the Congress has always either assigned duties to agencies or created agencies, when it saw fit, that it felt could do the best job in the administration of any given act, rather than base its action on whether various agencies or Government officials did or did not want to perform a certain task.

I do not see how we could arrive at the conclusion that an agency of the Government that has long been involved in the business of supervising fiduciary relationships, supervising the sale and exchange of securities, supervising financial matters, would be less competent to deal with a matter of this kind than the Labor Department, which has not had this experience.

According to testimony by Archibald Cox, Solicitor General of the United States, only the Bureau of Labor Statistics has anything remotely resembling competent experience in this field.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOWER. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. What is the purpose of the legislation, in the first place?

Mr. TOWER. As I understand, the purpose of the legislation, is to afford some oversight over pension and welfare funds, to prevent possible abuse and mismanagement of those funds.

Mr. CAPEHART. How can an agency that has absolutely no experience in money or fiscal matters possibly do a good job, without setting up a new department, in discovering errors in the management of such funds?

Mr. TOWER. In my judgment, it could not do so. The Senator has asked the question, How can they do that without setting up an additional operation or additional personnel? Actually, it would require over 8,000 additional personnel for the Labor Department to do it.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is the SEC so constituted and qualified as to examine a pension plan and discover errors and discrepancies in it?

Mr. TOWER. I think it would be logical to assume that no other agency has better competence to scrutinize and understand such matters; and if the SEC is not competent to do it, I should say the SEC is not competent to supervise laws with respect to great financial transactions of our Republic.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, the testimony before the committee was that it would require less than 200 additional persons, and not 8,000. This argument was made in the committee, and the committee nevertheless recommended that the bill as it is now before the Senate be passed.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield back his time?

Mr. TOWER. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield back the time of the majority.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time has been yielded back.

Mr. HUMPHREY. May we have the yeas and nays?

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum has been suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the yeas and nays ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum call is in process.

Mr. HUMPHREY. No Senator has answered.

I ask unanimous consent to set aside the order for the quorum call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the yeas and nays be ordered on the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. ALLOTT. What was the request?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That the yeas and nays be ordered on the pending amendment. The majority leader assured the Senator from Texas it would be done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request? Without objection, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendments proposed by the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER]. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina would vote "yea," and the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 57, as follows:

[No. 18 Leg.]

YEAS—25

Allott
Bennett
Butler
Byrd, Va.
Capehart
Carlson
Case. S. Dak.
Cotton
Curtis
Dworshak
Eastland
Goldwater
Hickenlooper
Hruska
Jordan
Lausche
McClellan
Miller
Murphy
Pell
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Stennis
Tower

NAYS—57

Aiken
Anderson
Bartlett
Beall
Bible
Boggs
Burdick
Bush
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case, N.J.
Church
Clark
Douglas
Ellender
Engle
Ervin
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hickey
Hill
Holland
Humphrey
Jackson
Javits
Keating
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McNamara
Metcalf
Monroney
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Muskie
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Smathers
Smith, Mass.
Smith, Maine
Sparkman
Symington
Talmadge
Wiley
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—18

Carroll
Chavez
Cooper
Dirksen
Dodd
Fong
Fulbright
Johnston
Kefauver
Kerr
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Long, Hawaii
Long, La.
McGee
Scott
Thurmond
Yarborough

So Mr. TOWER's amendments were rejected.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes on the bill to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, this is the bill with respect to which I had intended to offer the amendment with respect to literacy as a qualification for voting. I had intended to offer an amendment to provide that a sixth-grade education should be conclusive evidence of literacy for purposes of voting for Federal officers throughout the United States.

I am not offering that amendment, and I shall not offer it, because I believe that the cause for which the amendment would be offered would be best served if in the most authoritative way legislation can be brought to the Senate and passed at this session to effectuate this very essential safeguard to the voting right.

Mr. President, the majority leader and the minority leader, joining together, have already started in that direction, and they have given us assurances on the floor that the Senate will, within a 60- to 90-day limitation period, be given an opportunity to vote on this question. In reliance upon that assurance I am not offering the amendment at this time.

I wish to say, in justice to the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin], that on behalf of his subcommittee he has already issued a statement of the program under which these bills to which I now refer are listed for hearing shortly after the middle of March.

I emphasize again that whatever may be the intermediate steps, whether by committee hearing or committee report, the situation is such that the Senate—and I have every confidence in the representations made here with respect to the administration bill—will have the opportunity to express its will upon this question within a 60- to 90-day period, which means during April.

I also wish to express to the Senator from North Carolina my appreciation of his having noted the fact that my own bill, which is to the same effect as the administration's bill, has been pending before the subcommittee since January 1961, and will also be included in the hearings which the subcommittee will hold.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR ROBERTSON

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman].

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, a few nights ago there was held in Washington a very fine and interesting meeting. There was a dinner honoring a very distinguished Member of our body, the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, my friend, my chairman, my desk mate, Senator Robertson, of Virginia.

The Vice President of the United States made some brief preliminary remarks, and I ask the indulgence of the Senate to read these remarks, because I think they express our own feelings.

The Vice President said:

> All of Willis Robertson's friends are delighted that you are having this party for him.
>
> His Senate colleagues know him as an outstanding constitutional lawyer; a man who is Jeffersonian by the hour; a man steeped in the history of his home State and eager to preserve its principles; and, as a man who is prudent, not only with your money, but with his own.
>
> In his work as chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, on the Appropriations Committee, and on the Joint Committee on Defense Production, where he also holds the chair, he repeatedly has shown those qualities which I have cited and which I value so highly in him as I value his friendship. I know you feel the same. He's a real Virginia gentleman.

The principal address of the evening was made by Mr. Homer J. Livingston, chairman of the board of the First National Bank of Chicago. I ask unanimous consent that, as a part of my remarks, the speech by Mr. Livingston may be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Introduction of the Honorable A. Willis Robertson, U.S. Senator From Virginia, by Homer J. Livingston, Chairman of the Board, the First National Bank of Chicago

It is more than fitting that a banker should be given the privilege of introducing Willis Robertson. It is eminently just. What business or profession is more in debt to the distinguished chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee than mine? This debt has been created by his fairness, vision, and creative stewardship and not by his partiality. In Willis Robertson banking has found a friend who is more interested in the welfare and functioning of the banking system than in soothing and be beguiling so-called influential bankers.

And surely it is the very measure of this man's service that a banker now thanks him for his impartiality—a virtue that could goad when it interfered with an overzealous legislative push on the part of bankers or could upset a group of perplexed financiers prophesying an imminent doomsday if this or that measure wasn't immediately adopted.

Our honored guest tonight, who chairs the important Senate Banking and Currency Committee, prepared for it for a long, long time. First, he brought to this significant responsibility many years of invaluable experience. Before becoming a Senator in 1946, Willis Robertson served 14 years in the House of Representatives, 10 of them on the Ways and Means Committee. This enriching and informative experience added greatly to his intimate knowledge of the complex, ever-present problems of taxes, tariffs, and trade. While his expertise in these areas is widely known, evidences of it is specifically suggested by important tax legislation that bears his name.

But perhaps even more significant is a still different kind of preparation. How does one develop integrity and devotion to the common welfare? What forces act to shape a man's character and implant in his soul gentle righteousness and a love of justice? The personal history of the man we seek to honor tonight will help us to understand these things more surely, and in a more satisfying way, than theorizing at great length. Is it, for example, just an accident that Willis Robertson comes from Virginia—the State of Woodrow Wilson and Carter Glass and the giant national figures of our Revolution two centuries ago—the historic cradle of the country's liberty and social aspirations? What part of this great country defines the Nation's estimate of a gentleman? Not the North or West or East, but a southern gentleman, if you please. Senator A. Willis Robertson is the epitome of this subtle, enviable distinction. He was named after a grandfather who could boast of 19 brothers, 10 of whom served in the Civil War, and 5 of whom died in that conflict. His family can easily trace its descent to colonial times, including Dr. John Woodson, who arrived in Jamestown in 1619, and the first Benjamin Harrison, who came to the Jamestown area not many years later. Because of his father's pastoral duties, the future Senator of Virginia was born in West Virginia but quickly made things right by moving with his four brothers and sisters to the Old Dominion for his early schooling in Lynchburg and Rocky Mount. A history major in Richmond College, the young Willis Robertson showed an early appreciation for the romance of the study of those forces that shape a nation's destiny and make it great, and he began to prepare himself, almost by instinct, for his own role in public life.

A less obvious preparation, but no less important, was also taking place on the Richmond College athletic field where a stalwart tackle played every minute of every game for 2 years and set a record that still stands in the hammer throw. This athletic activity helped to toughen him and to illustrate the benefit and needs of teamwork—a lesson that stood him in good stead in the U.S. Senate when he helped support the southern forces in certain celebrated protracted debates.

Because of his great devotion to Woodrow Wilson he was a delegate to the State Democratic convention in 1912 that eventually voted to support the Governor of New Jersey at the forthcoming national convention. This was his entry into the political wars and confirmed in him his intention to make public affairs his lifework. Willis Robertson was elected State senator in 1915 to represent a district composed of the city of Buena Vista and the counties of Rockbridge and Bedford. This election marked the formal opening of a political career that has never experienced defeat in its contests for public office.

The youthful State senator, prophetically, was assigned to the Finance Committee and in his 6-year term—interrupted by his World War I service as a major of infantry—amassed an enviable legislative record. After service as commonwealth attorney for the county of Rockbridge he was appointed in 1926, by the new Governor Harry F. Byrd, to the chairmanship of the Commission on Game and Inland Fisheries and was able to turn his deep love of nature and wildlife to the lasting profit of Virginia's forests and streams. This active interest continued after Willis Robertson was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1932. As chairman of the Select Committee on Wildlife, he sponsored the duck stamp bill to provide funds for acquisition of nesting areas for migratory waterfowl; the Pittman-Robertson Act to develop upland game resources; and the Coordination Act of 1956 relating to the protection of wildlife in and around all water impoundments of the Federal Government.

Hunting and fishing continue to be his principal hobbies and his major outdoor recreational activities.

His courage and wisdom were immediately demonstrated by his championship in the House of the reciprocal trade agreements legislation of the late Cordell Hull which was eventually enacted. In 1937 he became the first Virginian on the House Ways and Means Committee in 34 years and continued to give his expert attention to tax matters. In 1943 the Robertson-Forand bill was passed and our income taxes went on a pay-as-you-go basis—a development that is still very much with us. On the basis of the splendid work he did in taxation, foreign trade, banking, currency, and allied economic problems, not to mention the field of soil and wildlife conservation, our honored guest in 1946 was nominated by acclamation by the Virginia State Democratic Convention and was subsequently elected to fill out the unexpired term of the late Senator Glass.

This was a great honor to WILLIS ROBERTSON. He had long admired the father of the Federal Reserve Act and Secretary of the Treasury under Wilson. Seemingly to confirm the fitness of this succession, the new Senator was given the late Senator's committee appointments, Appropriations and Banking and Currency—an unusual honor for a freshman in the Senate and an undeniable indication of the reputation he had built for himself in these fields in the House. Reelected in 1948, for his first full term, the State of Virginia emphatically returned him to the Senate in 1954 and again in 1960.

Before assuming the chairmanship of the august Committee on Banking and Currency the Senator was asked in 1956 to study the Federal laws governing financial institutions with the end of enacting a piece of legislation that would codify and unify all laws in the Federal code affecting financial institutions and that would eliminate those that had become obsolete, plus giving recognition to modern business practices.

Out of this study and labor came the financial institutions bill of 1957, which unhappily died in the House. This work of Senator ROBERTSON was described by the then president of the American Bankers Association as "a monumental achievement" and caused Banking magazine to write in March 1959, "Were it not for the singular situation in the House last year, Senator ROBERTSON would today be known as the author of the greatest single piece of banking legislation since the Federal Reserve Act."

Despite this development many of the provisions of the Robertson bill have been enacted and have influenced much subsequent legislation. In 1958, for example, the Small Business Investment Act was amended as proposed in the financial institutions bill and, later, laws dealing with savings and loan associations, bank holding companies, credit unions and reserve requirements of the Federal Reserve member banks were revised along lines recommended by his bill.

Naturally I cannot indulge my temptation to list all or most of the legislation in which this distinguished American has had a significant part since his appearance in the Congress 30 years ago. I can only hope to suggest in these few minutes the influence he has wielded and the good he has done in his areas of legislative interest. This man, with his eloquence and statesmanship, with his persuasive array of facts and sentiments and with an administrative ability unexcelled in the Congress, has left an indelible mark on the institutions that govern this Nation's economic life—a mark that stands for the sound, sure and steady evolution of institutions and laws to assure the economic well-being of the American people.

His background—but briefly outlined in these all too incomplete remarks—helps us to understand how this man has earned the position of responsibility he holds today. His ancestry and schooling mixed happily to prepare him for a long and fruitful service in public life, and his models—Wilson, Carter Glass, and Hull—are all present in the man today. Like them he reflects the deliberative, reflective, just and human nature of a great southerner—a truly public-spirited man.

I am delighted and honored to present to this assemblage the Honorable A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, of Virginia.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It was a very fine and memorable occasion, and it could not have happened to a finer man.

AMENDMENT OF WELFARE AND PENSION PLANS AND DISCLOSURE ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2520) to amend the Welfare and Pension Plans and Disclosure Act with respect to the method of enforcement and to provide certain additional sanctions, and for other purposes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the pending measure is of especial interest to me because of the fact that in 1955 and 1956 I served as chairman of the subcommittee which conducted the investigation into welfare and pension funds, and, with the help of other members of the committee and the staff headed by Paul Cotter, drafted a bill on this very subject, which the Senate passed in 1958 by a vote of 86 to 0.

The bill provided, first, for the full disclosure of the essential features of the welfare and pension funds, and that the disclosure should be made to the Department of Labor. Second, it gave to the Secretary of Labor the power to ask for additional data to carry out further investigations under proper rules and procedures, and to institute civil as well as criminal suits.

Third, it outlawed, subject to criminal penalties, kickbacks, bribes, embezzlements, and knowingly false statements made by officials of welfare and pension funds.

This bill was passed by the Senate after an amendment to exclude employer-managed plans had been defeated. It was passed, as I have said, by a vote of 86 to 0.

If the Senate bill had been passed in that form by the House of Representatives, there would be no need today for the present bill. This point was made yesterday on the floor of the House by the manager of the bill in that body. Unfortunately, in the House Labor Committee and in the House itself the Senate bill was badly eviscerated in the following respects:

First, all punishment or mention of embezzlements, kickbacks, willful false statements, and so forth, were eliminated from the bill.

Second, the power of the Secretary of Labor to investigate initial reports and to provide for full reporting, rather than summary reporting, was also eliminated. Other restrictions were placed in the bill, which have destroyed most of the effectiveness of the act.

We reluctantly accepted those amendments because this was the only way we could get a bill at all. We not only felt it was inadequate, but knew it was inadequate. This was also stated by President Eisenhower and Secretary Mitchell.

What we are doing today, and what we hope the House is doing at the same time, is restoring to the act the provisions in the Senate bill which the House eliminated in 1958. When the final vote comes, therefore—and I hope it will be a very large vote—we shall be passing again what we passed in 1958. The whole experience gives one added confidence in the final triumph of sound principles. When I first developed the idea of disclosure in 1955 the opposition seemed so great that it seemed as though the bill could never pass. When the bill in 1958 was gutted in the House, I was despondent. But slowly the idea of an effective measure took root. Former opponents not only ceased to oppose the measure but began to fancy that they were its original sponsors. And now it will shortly become law, and I predict it will have a good effect. For sunlight is a great disinfectant. Investors and beneficiaries are entitled to the truth.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes on the bill.

I urge the defeat of the pending measure for several reasons. The bill is imperfectly drawn. It contains many provisions that I believe would be a hardship to small business. I do not believe it provides for administration by the appropriate agency. Moreover, I do not believe any genuine need has been shown for this legislation.

No significant cases of abuse were brought to the committee's attention which occurred at any time subsequent to 1958, the date of the original passage of the Pension and Welfare Disclosure Act.

Therefore, there does not seem to be any real need to "beef up" the provisions of the present act.

In addition, it seems to me that this measure is somewhat redundant, because already there are adequate legal and judicial means for protecting the beneficiaries of the various pension and welfare funds throughout the country. For example, under section 302 of the Taft-Hartley Act, welfare and pension plans in which any union participates are subject to the specially designed requirement that a trusteeship must manage them.

This section requires annual audits, and creates a Federal-State dichotomy which regards the statutory violation a crime and leaves negligence or maladministration to State action. Every trustee is controlled by the local common law in addition to Federal and State statutes under section 302. The purpose of this requirement is to impose an obligation upon the managers of a fiduciary and to require these funds to be operated for the sole interest of employees and their families. This is the strictest standard of conduct that has been developed under the law.

The Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act of 1958 gives a statutory mandate which is the normal obligation of every trustee to disclose to beneficiaries the various operational details. The Landrum-Griffin Act of 1959 requires handling for certain trustees "for the faithful discharge of his duties." Unions, acting as representatives of employees, are themselves fiduciaries which must act properly and for the benefit of the members.

In addition, many State laws impose sanctions to protect against dishonesty and neglect. Indeed, laws are already in existence in every State of the Union designed to protect against embezzlement, fraud, mismanagement of other people's money generally, and other crimes. I believe machinery exists in all States to prosecute those who violate these laws. I submit that such machinery provides adequate safeguards for the beneficiaries of the pension and welfare funds against possible mismanagement and abuse. Therefore, I urge the defeat of the measure.

Mr. President, I wish to read into the RECORD a portion of a statement submitted to the committee by Mr. John C. Gibbons on behalf of the American Bankers' Association. It brings out a very pertinent point:

> The administration of the plan and the fund is governed by a variety of other regulations of the Internal Revenue Service. We call your attention to three of them as follows:
>
> (a) Treasury Department Release P.S. 49 as modified by Revenue Ruling 57-163 requires submission of data in connection with the purchase of any securities of the employer company. In such a case, the Commissioner's regulations require that full disclosure be made to the Internal Revenue Service of the reasons for such investment, and this must be done even if the trustee does not seek an advance determination letter. A procedure is established whereby the District Directors of Internal Revenue will issue advance determination letters as to the effect on qualification of the plan when the trust invests in securities of the employer, and in the usual case such advance determinations are requested. In support of the request, financial statements of the employer must be furnished and favorable rulings usually depend upon a showing that the investment will provide a fair return commensurate with the prevailing rate. that sufficient liquidity will be maintained by the trust so as to permit distributions in accordance with the stated purposes of the plan and that the safeguards that a prudent investor would look to must exist. These requirements are supplemented by section 503 of the Internal Revenue Code which specifically sets forth as prohibited transactions such items as loans to the employer without adequate collateral or at insufficient interest rates or, in fact, almost every other conceivable arrangement whereby an employer could obtain a selfish advantage. The penalty for a violation is disqualification for tax purposes, a very heavy penalty as shown later.

Mr. President, it seems to me that with the oversight and supervision provided under the Taft-Hartley Act, under the Landrum-Griffin Act, by the Internal Revenue Service, and by State and local governments, the bill which it is proposed to pass today is totally unnecessary and redundant; it will simply require additional paperwork; and will make the managers of the pension and welfare funds the administrators for the Federal Government. Therefore, the bill should be defeated.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement by me concerning the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD. It gives concrete evidence of the abuses which have occurred and the need to guard against them. It is taken from the evidence I presented before the House and Senate committees.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> This legislation has a long history. By a Senate resolution in 1954, an investigation of employee welfare and pension funds was started under the chairmanship of then Senator Ives. In the 84th Congress I was appointed chairman and through our hearings and investigations we developed disclosure legislation. This legislation was finally passed by the Senate and covered employer-administered plans, union-administered plans, and welfare and pension plans which were administered by both unions and employers.
>
> In addition, our bill provided for relatively full disclosure and gave to the Secretary of Labor rulemaking power and the power to initiate investigations and criminal proceedings where that was necessary. The basic purpose of the legislation was to deter and to prevent wrongful acts, and to give employees adequate knowledge of the plans on which their future in part depended. Our investigations turned up enough abuses so that we felt it was absolutely essential that when the bill became law the administering agency could take over the investigating function which Congress properly exercised in the process of seeing what legislation was necessary, but which Congress could not and properly should not do on a continuing basis. Hence, these functions were properly delegated in our bill to the administering agency.
>
> In the Senate and I believe in the House as well, the key issue was whether or not the employer-administered plans were to come under the legislation. Various attempts were made to delete this provision and numerous excuses and arguments were used to say that it was unnecessary. However, our investigations had shown that the abuses found in the administration of these plans were by no means limited to any one group or party but they involved unions, management, and insurance companies as well.
>
> In the Senate we were successful in defeating amendments to narrow the scope of the bill and to exclude employer-administered plans which, at that time, composed approximately 90 percent of all plans. This was the key issue.
>
> When the bill came to the House, efforts were first made to exclude employer-administered plans. These efforts were not successful but by so diluting the powers of the administrator of the law, the effect was, in fact, to accomplish this and to give us a weak and puny law.
>
> Instead of full disclosure only summary disclosure was provided. Instead of authorizing the Secretary of Labor to require that certain information be produced, he was given authority only to provide forms which could be used at the discretion of the administrators of the individual plans and which were not mandatory. The result, of course, has been that the amount of information which has been disclosed has been hopelessly inadequate for the protection of the employee, or to provide the Secretary with the detailed facts which are necessary if employees and those who are to benefit from the funds are to be protected.
>
> Instead of giving the Secretary the power to investigate and initiate proceedings, this power was denied and it was left to the individual employee to initiate on his own any remedial action without adequate information.
>
> Thus, while the final legislation did not limit the coverage of the act, which was the true purpose of its opponents, the same effect was gained by knocking out of the bill virtually all of the teeth which were needed to make disclosure effective.
>
> This bill finally was passed in this form by the House near the end of the session in 1958 and we were presented with a take-it-or-leave-it situation. Rightly or wrongly, the legislation was passed with its teeth pulled and in its weakened form.
>
> Now I understand that the opponents of the bill, which would restore to the Secretary the right to get adequate information about these funds and, in those few cases where necessary, to initiate investigations and court proceedings, are arguing that there is no need to amend the act. They say that since no abuses have been disclosed nothing needs to be done. So after having passed a law with its teeth pulled and under which very little was disclosed and few powers to take action were given, it is now argued that since no action has been taken, there is no need to take action.
>
> I want to state that the investigations which we held disclosed all kinds of evidence of abuses. Three individuals were convicted, not as a result of this puny law, but as a result of our investigations. And, we found abuses which convinced us that it was necessary for the law not only to give the protection of disclosure but also the continuing power of some agency to investigate and initiate action. In other words, if the law is to have a deterrent effect, which is its purpose, both the disclosure power and the power to investigate and initiate action must be in the law. Congress cannot carry on this continuing function. But it is necessary that this function be carried on and the administering agency must have this power.
>
> From the facts and evidence which have been presented to your committee, there are now about 200,000 welfare and pension plans in existence. The welfare plans cover about 25 million employees and the pension plans cover about 17 million employees. The total participation in the plans by employees and others is estimated to be about 80 million people.
>
> Of the plan, about 91 percent are now administered by employers. The unions administer about 2½ percent of them, and 6½ percent are jointly administered. The assets of these plans are staggering in their amount. I am told that they now amount to nearly $60 billion. Under the present law plans have been filed with the Department of Labor which cover $29.1 billion in assets. Of these, the bulk, namely $27.4 billion, are in pension plans and the remaining $1.7 billion in welfare plans. The assets of these plans are increasing in value at the rate of $4½ billion a year. In 1959, contributions amounted to about $9.4 billion and the benefits which were paid out to approximately $5 billion. It is estimated that within another decade it is very possible that the assets of all plans will approximate $100 billion.
>
> Unless the law provides adequate safeguards for these funds, millions of Americans who depend upon these plans and who have contributed at least in part to these plans will be betrayed. A situation in which the administrators of this law are unable to obtain the full facts and lack both investigative and enforcement powers, provides no proper deterrent to wrongdoing on the part of the few who will take advantage of their responsibility in administering these funds on behalf of the beneficiaries.
>
> #### ABUSES UNCOVERED BY INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE
>
> Now let me turn to some of the specific things which we found in our investigations.
>
> We found that the characteristics of these plans and their extremely fast rate of growth and development made them susceptible to weaknesses, waste, abuses, and unnecessary losses to the beneficiaries. Their bigness, the grouping together for coverage of large

numbers of people, the pooling of vast sums of money, the size of insurance premiums, third party or management control of the plans, accompanied by vagueness about employee rights and an attitude in certain quarters that the employees have no right to know how the finances of the plans are managed, have made them vulnerable to a host of infirmities and have thrown temptation in the path of the unscrupulous.

We found, of course, that the great majority of the plans are honestly administered but, at the same time, we found numerous abuses and enough to convince us that there must be more than merely pro forma disclosure if the employees are to be protected.

While our investigation originally included only the union-administered plans, and was indeed so limited by the original resolution, we soon found even upon cursory examination that the abuses involved employers, unions, and the insurance carriers. Perhaps the worst abuses involved certain insurance practices. These included exorbitantly high commissions and administrative charges; fictitious fees; retention by some insurance companies of unduly large shares of the premiums; unequal treatment of policyholders; placing the interest of the policyholder before that of the beneficiaries; switching carriers to obtain high first-year commissions; premium embezzlements by insurance brokers and agents; failure to report embezzlements to the insured and Government authorities; and collusion between insurance representatives, union officials, and management.

Let me cite a few cases.

1. Excessive commissions

In the laundry workers' national welfare plan the Security Mutual Insurance Co. paid a 10 percent flat commission to the broker, Louis B. Saperstein amounting to $262,500 on premiums of $2,364,709.57. He embezzled approximately $900,000 or more. In addition, the insurance company paid $85,000 in promotional fees to a union official. This case also involved switching of policies to another carrier with continued high commissions, and an indication of collusion between certain union and management trustees of the fund, officials of insurance companies, and the broker.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that a more detailed explanation of this case from pages 29 and 30 of the final report of our investigation of these matters be printed in the record (exhibit 1).

Let me give further examples. In the Continental Assurance Co. case the carrier paid its agent, C. J. Simons Corp., whose group business amounted to between $2 million and $3 million in premiums yearly and included both jointly and employer-administered plans, 23 percent first-year graded commissions, 6 percent yearly graded renewal commissions, 4 percent yearly administration and claims handling fees, plus an additional 6 percent on some cases. Also, a 2 percent to 10 percent yearly contingent commission or bonus was paid if the claims experience of the cases was favorable. This reprehensible practice alone amounted to $208,000 in insurance company payments to Simons, earned on premiums billed between 1950 and 1955, and paid without the knowledge of the policyholders. In addition, one of the principal officers of the Simons Corp. embezzled $164,000 in premiums, and when this was disclosed the carrier settled the matter, allowing full credit for commissions, fees, contingent bonuses, etc., on the stolen premiums without notifying the authorities and without discontinuing business with the firm.

(See exhibit 2.)

Another example is that of the Washington National Insurance Co. which paid the brokerage firm of Dash & Love, Philadelphia, Pa., excessively high commissions, contingent bonuses or commissions and service fees on a large volume of business involving both jointly administered and employer-administered plans. This broker also engaged in switching policies to obtain higher commissions.

I ask unanimous consent that a more detailed explanation appearing on pages 30 through 37 of our report of the practices of giving contingent commissions, excessive service and administrative fees of policyholder and third party fees, and of switching practices, dealing with this and other companies be printed in the record at this point (exhibit 3).

Other detailed information concerning the practices of the Washington National Insurance Co. and the brokerage firm of Dash & Love appears on pages 242 through 257 of our report, and I ask unanimous consent that that information be printed at this point in the record (exhibit 4).

In yet a further case, the Eastern Casualty Co. of New York paid to the Cardinal Agency, Inc., and to the Alcor Agency, Inc., combined commissions and service fees of from 18 to 22.5 percent. I ask unanimous consent that a more detailed review of the practices of this company and these agencies appearing on pages 263 to 271 of our report be printed in the record at this point (exhibit 5).

Another example of excessive commissions, fees, and so forth, is in the case of the Mutual Benefit Health & Accident Association and the Companion Life Insurance Co. (its New York affiliate) who filed with State insurance agencies and paid group commission scales providing as much as 30 percent graded commissions for the first year and 15 percent graded for renewals, and had a scale of service fees which increased in subsequent years as the commissions decreased.

(See exhibit 6.)

There was also a case in which an insurance company wrote its field agent to the effect that the favorable experience under a particular policy was such as to entitle the employer to a dividend or experience rating refund, but that the company was hesitating to pay it because "several other steel groups of a similar size indicated that they did not wish to receive any refund as the insurance had been purchased under an agreement with the union and the employer was obligated to pay a certain specific amount for insurance. If any refund was obtained, it would only be turned over to the union and the employer would not derive any savings from his cost" (report, p. 228, hearings, p. 1358).

In another case the insurance company, apparently at the request of the broker, canceled the group policy and reissued it, paying first-year commissions for the second time on the ground that it had to do it to keep the business (report, p. 37).

Another abuse was brought out in the January 1955 interim report. Computing commissions on separate coverages or types of benefits within the same plan has long been a widespread practice throughout the insurance industry. By applying the decremental scale to each type of benefit in a plan, a much larger commission is generated. For example, the Aetna Life Insurance Co., second largest group insurance carrier in the country, in reporting information requested by a previous subcommittee, stated:

"Commissions on group policies in general: Group life, group accidental death and dismemberment, group disability, group hospitalization (including group surgical, etc.), and group major medical coverages, whether issued through a separate policy or through a rider to a policy, will each be considered as a separate policy for commission purposes."

(See exhibit 7.)

2. High retentions

Another abuse was that of high retentions. In the final analysis, the level of benefits available from a given premium dollar depends on the proportion of that dollar which the insurance carrier retains for itself. That is, after having paid and made provision for incurred claims, the remainder is divided in two parts in accordance with the company's dividend or retention formula. One part, the retention, is retained by the company to cover commissions, service fees, and other acquisition costs; taxes; risk charges; home office and field office administration expenses; other costs; reserves; and, in the case of stock companies, profits. The other part is passed on to the policyholder as a dividend or experience rating refund.

Our investigation disclosed that the average retention reported by 35 insurance carriers, who issued 10 or more group policies or had billed premiums of more than $100,000 in 1952, on over 1,500 group insurance policies, was 12.5 percent of the billed premiums. For individual companies the average retentions were as high as 45 percent of billed premiums. (S. Rept. No. 1734, pp. 317–318.) It was disclosed that 15 companies had average retentions of 15 percent or more; and 7 of 20 percent or more of billed premiums. On individual policies, of course, the retentions ran much higher. In other words, certain companies made it a practice to absorb all the traffic would stand out of the premium dollar. Our studies showed that high retentions were not an uncommon practice and prevailed in the case of employer-administered plans as well as in other types. (Hearing record, Welfare and Pension Plan Investigation, pt. 3, p. 1253; S. Rept. No. 1734, pp. 317–318.) (Exhibit 8.)

3. Discriminatory treatment

Another major abuse which we found was the discriminatory treatment of policyholders. Our investigation disclosed that companies do not treat all policyholders alike. Since the intricacies of group insurance are presumed to be beyond the scope or comprehension of anyone except the highly trained insurance specialist, this is not surprising. The result has been that only alert and knowledgeable buyers of insurance, or those who can afford to employ competent consultants, are in a position to make certain that their plans provide the highest level of benefits possible for the premium dollar expended. An insurance company official appearing before the investigating subcommittee testified on this point. He stated:

"Everyone is not treated alike. That is another fallacy of this bonus or dividend system under which we operate * * * there are many other companies that handled it in the same way" (report, p. 38).

The official of another insurance company, when questioned as to whether similar types of policies, with similar experience, received different treatment, stated:

"I think that is probably true of most every company, frankly, and I think that is something you no doubt wish to consider carefully. The squeaking wheel gets the oil (hearings, p. 1366).

When the insurance company official was asked whether this practice prevailed when the policyholder was a single employer as well as when it was a trust fund, he stated:

"I would say so, due to several reasons. One could be a far more able representative of theirs. A man trained in group insurance very often, I think, forces the hand of the insurers on that point" (ibid.).

4. Case of General Motors

Now let me turn to other abuses. I wish now to refer in some greater detail to specific abuses which we brought out. Let me speak first about the General Motors case. This was a typical level of benefits plan where the employees contributed a set amount and the company promised specific benefits and supplied the balance of the costs. It was developed that prior to 1950. the hourly employees paid 43 percent of the costs of the General Motors plan, insured through the Metropolitan Life Insurance Corp. The salaried employees paid 35 percent, and the corporation 22 percent.

By 1950 there were $8.7 million of extended life insurance and rate reduction reserves in this group policy, and on the basis of the proportionate hourly contributions, over $3.5 million of this was for the credit of the hourly employees. Yet when a separate contract was negotiated with the hourly employees in 1950, this $3.5 million was taken away from them and left with the salaried employees, which, of course, overfunded the reserve with respect to their coverage and permitted General Motors later to receive a dividend in excess of $3 million. The employees knew nothing about this because it was a so-called employer-administered level-of-benefits plan and the facts were not disclosed. It was legal, but was it equitable?

Would the hourly employees have stood for it had they known about it? Should they not have known? This is the type of plan which management held should not be disclosed to the employees.

Later, new reserves were built up by employee contributions with the company paying the balance, between 1950 and 1954. During this period the hourly employees contributed 56.9 percent of the insurance costs of the plan, and by December 1954, $15 million in old age extended insurance and rate reduction reserves had been accumulated.

By the terms of the General Motors-Metropolitan policy, which the employees knew nothing about, a large part of these reserves would be returned to General Motors if the policy provisions included for the additional protection of the older employees and other arrangements were to be canceled. In such an eventuality, regardless of how remote, is there any great difference between an employee's being deprived of benefits he was depending upon because it was all legal, rather than for him to find that the money was not there as a result of looting, or some other abuse? This is precisely why summary disclosure is inadequate and more detailed disclosure, as your bills provide, is needed.

Why should not the employees know these things? Why does it have to be a secret of management? It is the employee whose security is at stake. An employee most certainly is entitled to more information than he gets in these lovely little brochures supplied by the companies, which in a great many cases imply that the employee has no future worries, and that for a small payment, they will give him coverage all the way to heaven.

Other findings in this study revealed that policyholders are not treated alike. As a matter of fact, General Motors received very favored treatment as compared with other policyholders in the manner in which reserves were handled, in the manner in which interest was paid on reserves, etc.

(See exhibit 9.)

5. *Case of Angelo Inciso*

A very noteworthy case turned up by our committee was that involving one Angelo Inciso and what was formerly the UAW–AFL Amalgamated Local 286, of which Mr. Inciso was president. Mr. Inciso prevailed upon 30-odd employers to make their insurance contributions to a welfare plan as union dues in circumvention of the Taft-Hartley Act provisions. He commingled the insurance moneys with union funds and spent these as he pleased. He obtained control of a small insurance company, switched the group policy to that company, and managed the affairs of this company without regard to laws, regulations, or sound insurance practices. He used the commingled funds for gifts, luxury trips abroad, etc., and drew large sums of money without making proper accounting.

As a result of our investigation, a 22-count indictment was returned against Mr. Inciso on October 23, 1956, charging him with having caused his local to receive and accept approximately $420,000 in illegal insurance payments from 22 different firms whose employees were represented by local 286. He was found guilty on all 22 counts in May of 1960 and he was sentenced to 10 years' imprisonment and a $22,000 fine. The evidence we obtained led to his conviction. He is now in prison.

6. *Laundry Workers' case*

I have already put in the record some of the details of the Laundry Workers' case and their insurance agent, Louis Saperstein, who handled the union's relations with the Security Mutual Life Insurance Co. in which union resolution provided that all premiums should be paid to Saperstein for transmittal to the insurance company. The record indicated that the union had paid $3.26 million in premiums but that the insurance company only received $2.35 million, or $912,000 less than it should have. The embezzlement was traced to Saperstein who was obviously in collusion with at least one union official, Eugene C. James, who was secretary-treasurer of the international. This case was fully documented in our hearings and, in addition to outright embezzlement, there were a host of other abuses and irregularities.

As a result of our hearings and work, Eugene James was indicted on September 30,, 1957, for conspiracy to embezzle union welfare funds. In September of 1960, James pleaded guilty and in November was sentenced to 1 to 2 years in the New Jersey State Prison.

7. *The case of James Gallagher*

Another case in which an indictment and conviction was secured was that of James Gallagher who was the head of the Pointers, Cleaners & Caulkers Local 52 in Chicago. In this case there was no written collective bargaining agreement, no trust agreement setting up the welfare plan, and the welfare fund was entirely controlled and managed by Mr. Gallagher. The testimony we took showed that management had made efforts to secure such a trust agreement and had failed because of lack of cooperation on the part of union officers. As the contributions flowed in they were siphoned off and used for miscellaneous purposes, including unaccounted-for large cash withdrawals. The plan was self-insured but no benefits were specified and those paid consisted of handouts at Gallagher's discretion without any adequate accounting.

Mr. Gallagher pleaded "no defense" at his trial, was convicted, and given a suspended sentence.

8. *Distillery Workers' case*

A further case is that of the jointly administered (union-employer) national social security fund of the Distillery, Rectifying Wine & Allied Workers Union of America, AFL. The fund was financed entirely by contributions from 550 employing firms and had an annual income of approximately $3 million. Welfare benefits were first insured under conditions which resulted in excessively high commissions and service fees, kickbacks of over a half a million dollars to well-known gangsters, and other depletions of the funds. Later, the fund became self-insured, at which time the salaries of fund officials were doubled, liberal expense accounts were permitted, and nepotism was engaged in freely.

ANALYSIS OF PLANS AND OTHER INVESTIGATIONS

1. *Twenty-seven plans*

In 1955 the interim report of our committee gave the results of a cross-section analysis of 26 joint union-employer administered plans. I mention this analysis because it shows that when proper investigatory work is performed, numerous abuses are found. The idea that there are no abuses because none have been reported under the law indicates how poor the law is rather than that there are no abuses. In its interim report the subcommittee characterized 7 of these plans as well managed, 6 as grossly mismanaged, and 13 as marked by a questionable practice. The instances of mismanagement and questionable practices included outright diversion of the funds, high administration costs, commingling of funds, ignoring the terms of the trust agreement, failure to keep records and inadequate recordkeeping, placing insurance through favored brokers, permitting the switching of policies, high insurance company retentions, indifference on the part of certain of the union and management trustees, ineptness, employer delinquencies in making contributions, and partiality shown to certain employers in the collection of contributions (interim report, Jan. 10, 1955, pp. 10–19; exhibit 10).

2. *Philadelphia fund*

A Philadelphia fund was reviewed by the investigation staff of our committee and the record showed that more than 100, or over 20 percent, of the contributing employers were delinquent, and there were indications that business agents of the union may have made off-the-record settlements with the delinquent employers (S. Rept. 1734, p. 25).

3. *McClellan committee example*

The Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor and Management Field disclosed that in the West Coast Teamsters case there were excessive broker commissions paid on a large volume of business; that the broker and a high official of the union were partners in a horseracing enterprise and that, while the broker appeared to be financing the project, the union official was deriving most of the benefits (hearing record, Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor and Management Fund, pt. 7, pp. 2320–2338).

Other examples have also come to light.

4. *Meany testimony*

George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, in his testimony before our subcommittee, cited the case of a large west coast company, which instituted and administered a group life insurance plan covering its employees. He stated that the cost was to be borne principally by the employees, the employer withholding from their wages contributions at the rate of 73 cents per month for each $1,000 of life insurance; that the company originally claimed it was paying part of the premium cost, but later when the union proposed that the plan be transferred to another carrier at a rate of 60 cents per month, the company officials acknowledged that the actual cost of the plan, based on actual experience, was only 43 cents per $1,000; and that during the period involved, according to the union's best estimates, the company collected $600,000 from the employees above the cost of the insurance (hearing record, p. 195).

Mr. Meany cited another case in which there was a collectively bargained welfare and pension plan with a company that later went into bankruptcy. Afterward it was ascertained that the company had failed to convey to the insurance company approximately $3,000 withheld from the employees' wages for payment of insurance premiums and had not transmitted approximately $2,500 which it had agreed to contribute for the insurance, with the result that the insurance policy had lapsed. He testified that during the interim, $9,600 in claims arose which were not paid because of the termination of the policy. With respect to the pension plan arrangement, he said that as of the date of the bankruptcy the company had failed to forward to the insurance company $64,500 for the funding of the plan in accordance with the agreement and the insurance contract, and that there were 15 employees who had reached retirement age and would have been entitled to receive monthly benefits under the plan if the employer had made the required payments (ibid., pp. 195–196).

5. *Internal Revenue cases*

An interesting case reflecting abuses in employer-financed tax-qualified employee-pension trust is that of the *H.S.D. Company v. Karanagh, an Internal Revenue Collector* (88 Fed. Supp. 64 and 191 Fed. 2d 831). In this case the pension plan was set up by means of trust agreements, one for the employees and one for the executives. Very little was paid into the employees' trust, and over the period involved it realized only $745 in income. During the same period, through the use of leasebacks and other manipulations, the executive trust realized a profit of over $31,000 for the benefit of two company officials. The Internal Revenue Service considered both trusts as one plan and disqualified the plan.

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue, in reporting by letter of July 11, 1957, to me as chairman of the subcommittee, at my request, concerning tax-exempt pension plans, pointed out:

"If the operation of the plan by the employer or trustee violates the applicable requirements of the code, the result of Internal Revenue Service enforcement would be taxation of the trust and denial of deduction to the employer or taxation of the employees. The result might well be a tax penalty on the victims rather than on the perpetrators of the violation. For example, an employer or trustee who diverted funds might not be solvent, and the penalty might be assessment of a tax liability against the fund as well as a denial of tax deferment and capital gains treatment of the beneficiaries." (Hearing record, p. 494.)

Inquiry at the Internal Revenue Service confirmed the fact that there had been actual situations of this nature where the IRS had taken such action against the employees, although the violations bringing about the disqualification of the plan had been perpetrated by the employers. Documentation cannot be made of such cases as they are administrative actions of the IRS that are not reported publicly.

This situation takes on rather grim significance in the face of the statistical compilation which the subcommittee caused the Internal Revenue Service to make and which reflected that in the months of September, October, and part of November 1957, out of 99 terminations of tax-qualified plans reported from the field, 53 had been terminated because of financial difficulties and dissolution of the corporation or sale of the company and liquidation of the plan. (Letter of November 27, 1957, from Commissioner of Internal Revenue with attachment.) Under present law, further facts on these cases could not be obtained unless the subcommittee obtained special authorization from the President to examine the confidential material of the Internal Revenue Service.

6. *Company investment in own assets*

One of the abuses which our investigation revealed and which appears in some detail on pages 359–365 of our report is that of the investment of pension and welfare fund moneys in the assets of the company with which the fund is connected.

One can see what a dangerous practice this is, for the individual employee runs at least two risks. He first runs the risk that he may lose his job from the company by which he is employed if the company fails, goes bankrupt, or goes out of business. Secondly, if such a company fails and the funds which he has contributed have been invested in the assets of this same company then he more likely than not will lose whatever rights he may have had to a pension or welfare payment from such a fund.

In our hearings and report we gathered a good deal of information about this practice and I ask unanimous consent that this information, appearing on pages 359 through 365 of Senate Report No. 1734, be placed in the record at this point (exhibit 11).

This is exactly the kind of information which should be disclosed and which could properly be disclosed under the proposed legislation.

CONCLUSION

I have gone into lengthy detail on the abuses which our investigation brought out to indicate that the absence of information under the act is due not to any lack of abuses but to the totally inadequate nature of the law which is now on the books.

It is vital that this law be changed so as to provide full disclosure rather than summary statements. It must be broadened to require that insurance carriers and other organizations giving information to the administrators of these plans that they need to comply with full disclosure.

We must give power to the Secretary to investigate and to gather information and to give him subpena power and the authority to bring a proper action to enjoin violations of the act.

It should also contain penalties for kickbacks, gifts, excessive commissions, and other things of value for the purpose of influencing the actions or decisions with respect to the improper handling of these plans.

The administrators of these plans, union, management, trustees, and the carriers, have a great responsibility to the millions of people who depend upon them for their welfare and for their old age. That they should have virtually no protection against the myriad of abuses which our investigation brought out and which involve many hundreds of thousands of dollars is a ridiculous circumstance The Congress could serve the public interest in no better way than by rectifying this situation promptly.

EXHIBIT 1

SETTING UP SPECIAL COMMISSION SCHEDULES

Certain insurance carriers set up special commission schedules to accommodate various brokers. Examples of this are the special commission arrangements entered into between the Security Mutual Life Insurance Co. and Louis B. Saperstein; the Washington National Insurance Co. and the firm of Dash & Love and the broker Harry D. Epstein; the Continental Assurance Co. and the firm of C. J. Simons Corp.; and the commission scales of the Mutual Benefit Health & Accident Association of Omaha.

It may be pointed out that, in the aggregate, commissions paid on 1,596 cases in force in 1952 reported by 70 carriers amounted to 3.4 percent of billed premiums.

In 1950, Louis B. Saperstein approached the Security Mutual Life Insurance Co. to underwrite a group insurance plan for the Laundry Workers International Union welfare fund if it would pay him his "regular" commission. He had life contracts with this company to receive a flat 10-percent first-year renewal commission on all group business produced. The record shows that from April 1, 1950, to September 30, 1953, this broker received flat annual commissions of 10 percent on this case, or a total of some $262,500, on total premiums of $2,364,709.57, or approximately $700,000 annually. Under a typical decremental scale he would have received approximately $8,500 the first year and renewal commissions of about $3,850, or a total of approximately $18,125 for the 3-year period. In the case of this broker, the company established a commission scale acceptable to him in order to get his business. In 1953, when the company, after conferring with the New York State Insurance Department, informed Saperstein that it would have to reduce the commission, the insurance was shifted to another insurance company. Saperstein, as broker of record, received a commission of 6 percent plus an overriding commission of 2.5 percent, as general agent of the new company. With respect to Saperstein's arrangements with Security Mutual, it should be noted that his contract within that company was primarily H. B. Wickes, vice president in charge of group operations. The subcommittee in its interim report of July 20, 1955, described the activities of Wickes in this case as subject to serious question, and stated that he unquestionably utilized his position with Security Mutual and his knowledge of the LWIU case to his own personal advantage.

EXHIBIT 2

9. THE C. J. SIMONS CORP.

C. J. Simons Corp., of Newark, N.J., general agent for Continental Assurance Co., has been one of the largest single producers of group business for that company during the past 10 years. From 1951 to 1955, the C. J. Simons Corp. wrote group insurance involving a gross premium of between $2 and $3 million per year. Most of this business was written by William H. Croland, treasurer of the corporation and owner of 50 percent of its stock.

For this business, Continental Assurance Co. paid to the C. J. Simons Corp. commissions of 23 percent graded on new business, 6 percent graded on renewals, 4 percent for administration and claims handling, and 2- to 10-percent contingency bonus arrangement based on claims experience. The graded commissions, as is the practice with the Continental Assurance Co., were applied separately to life insurance and each of the other three coverages.

According to Mr. C. J. Simons, practically all of the group business was included in his 4-percent administration fee arrangement. In many cases the company paid another administration fee to the policyholder, usually in the amount of 6 percent, through the Simons Corp. The Continental Assurance Co., therefore, was paying, on several cases, 10 percent of premium for so-called administration and claims-handling services. Paul Rinker, testifying on December 1, 1955, explained that the payment of an administration fee to the trustees of a fund was actually offset by a reduction of the experience rating refund which might be due to that particular fund, and that it made little difference whether this 6 percent of premium was paid as an administration fee to the trustees or included as part of the refund. These administration fees are always paid on instructions from the trustees (the policyholders). It is difficult to understand the policyholder's motive in requesting that refunds be handled in this fashion.

About 75 percent of the group business produced by C. J. Simons Corp. came under the contingency bonus arrangement with Continental Assurance. Under this arrangement, the lower the loss ratio, the higher contingency bonus was paid to the agency. As a practical matter, the amount actually paid in extra commissions was 2 to 6 percent of premiums. When these facts are applied against the regular pattern of kickback payments made by the Simons Corp., which are discussed below, it would appear that the contingency commissions were used in part for that purpose.

Many practices of a rather irregular nature to which Simons and the Continental Assurance Co. were parties were explained by Mr. Rinker as resulting from the pressure of competition. For example, in one case, that company wrote the same policy twice within a 2-year period, each time paying high first-year commissions.[1] There were many instances of unequal treatment of policyholders by adjusting retention and experience rating refunds to fit the circumstances of each case. In one case, the first year's experience rating report showed a deficit of $1,100 and in order to develop a refund, C. J. Simons Corp. agreed to surrender their administration allowance and contingency bonus which produced a refund of $7,700 when the experience report was revised.[2] In another case, Continental authorized C. J. Simons Corp. to make a retroactive refund of 2 percent of premium in order to prevent the case from going to a competitor.[3] There are other such examples including one case where Continental Assurance Co. reduced the amount of experience rating refund which had been developed because, after discussing the matter with C. J. Simons Corp., it was decided that the refund was too large and the insurance company then retained an additional $1,900.[4] In still another case, the experience report was revised and the refund reduced in order to pay a 6-percent administration fee to the trustees of the welfare funds.[5]

For several years, it was the company's practice to permit the C. J. Simons Corp. to take credit for their policyholders' refunds against premiums due and allowing the corporation to send in a Simons check for the balance. The insurance company had no dealings or contact with the policyholders. The Simons Corp. paid claims out of a special account established by the insurance company in a Newark bank. Checks payable to the insurance company were often deposited in this account by the Simons Corp.

This practice made it possible for William H. Croland, of the C. J. Simons Corp. to withhold from the insurance company portions of premiums in 13 cases. Croland admitted to having withheld a total of $164,000 in this manner.

He maintained that he did not retain any of the funds withheld for his own personal use but paid all of it, and more, in the form of "administrative fee," wherever necessary to obtain or keep the business. These payments were made by check of the corporation signed by both William H. Croland and Charles J. Simons. Croland testified that this money was paid out to individuals and in amounts dictated by persons who controlled the placing of the business. In many instances, large amounts of money were paid to persons who had no connection whatever with the writing of the insurance policies. Some of these persons were not licensed insurance brokers or agents. Others, though licensed, pursued other callings. One of them was a plumber, another a union official. Although only a small part of the records of C. J. Simons Corp. were available for inspection, the staff was able to trace $150,000 in payments of this nature. These ranged from $6,000 to over $40,000 and were obviously "kickbacks" to various individuals. Croland thought it was an acceptable practice to pay administration fees because in so many cases the Continental Assurance Co. authorized payment of such fees to policyholders in order to obtain the business. He also found justification in the fact that in 1946 a group of cases was handed to him by the eastern department manager of the Continental Casualty Co. In connection with these cases, he claims to have received specific instructions from the manager to pay about $1,100 each quarter to a local union in New York for rent and stenographic services, and 2.5 percent of premium to the employer trustees and to the union trustee. He has done so ever since.

The Continental Assurance Co. first learned of this withholding of premium by the C. J. Simons Corp. in January 1954 when Croland volunteered the information that he had withheld about $32,000 in premiums in one case. In August 1954 Croland again volunteered information on the withholding of premiums in the total amount of $132,000 in 12 other cases. A settlement was reached between the insurance company and the C. J. Simons Corp. whereby the Simons Corp. was given credit for all commissions, fees, and contingency bonus developing on these cases against the premiums due to the insurance company. The company did not report Croland's activities to any law enforcement agency nor did it notify their policyholders that the agent had withheld part of their premium payments. The insurance company's aim was that of recovery of the amount of premium due and of saving the reputation of its very productive general agent. The company sent to audit letters to all of this agency's group policyholders, although it did not inform them of discrepancies in the agency's accounts.

William H. Croland resigned as an officer of the C. J. Simons Corp. on January 1, 1955, upon the insistence of Continental Assurance Co., but he did not resign as an employee of the corporation until October 10, 1955, 3 days after the subcommittee staff had completed its investigation of the insurance company in Chicago. There was testimony at the hearings of the subcommittee that Croland still retained a 50-percent interest in the corporation after his resignation. Croland now operates an insurance brokerage business from his home. As late as November 1955, subcommittee staff was informed that he had the use of a desk in the offices of the corporation. He may still be placing business with the Continental Assurance Co. through the corporation.

The chief counsel of the welfare fund inquiry of the New York Department of Insurance, in a letter dated August 10, 1955, notified the Department of Banking and Insurance of the State of New Jersey of the activities of William H. Croland and the C. J. Simons Corp. To date this subcommittee has learned of no action taken by the New Jersey Department of Banking and Insurance against William H. Croland or the C. J. Simons Corp.

EXHIBIT 3

CONTINGENT COMMISSIONS

In addition to regular commissions, special arrangements were entered into by the Washington National Insurance Co. and the Continental Assurance Co. to pay extra commissions to certain brokers which were not contingent upon the claims experience of the policies these brokers handled. In these cases, the lower the claims, the greater the extra commission. This practice certainly does not serve the best interests of the policyholders and beneficiaries. It is a built-in incentive to hold down claims which can result in denying just benefits to the beneficiaries in whose behalf the insurance has been issued. It is especially difficult to condone when, as in these cases, the policyholders were not aware of its existence.

The Washington National Insurance Co. paid the extra commissions, which it deducted from the policyholders' dividends to two brokers, Dash & Love and Harry D. Epstein. This contingent commission amounted to 10 percent of earned premiums on each of the group policies on which they were listed as broker of record and which developed a favorable claims experience. According to company figures, payments made to Dash & Love since 1952, and to Harry D. Epstein since 1951, are as follows:

Item	Dash & Love		Harry D. Epstein	
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
Premiums	$481,201	100.0	$510,505	100.0
Total commission	65,098	13.5	61,151	12.0
Regular commission	42,560	8.8	48,414	9.5
Contingent commission	22,448	4.7	13,737	2.5

With respect to Harry D. Epstein, the company had an additional arrangement to assure him adequate compensation for his work in the handling of claims. It set up a special claims account of $4,200 per year against which he could draw $350 monthly. If the 10 percent contingency commissions should fail to yield $4,200 in any one year, the company would make up the difference.

The effect of the contingency commission arrangement is to reduce the experience rating refunds payable to the policyholders. This is strikingly illustrated in the case of the Boot & Shoe Workers Union group insurance plans where the extra commissions paid to Dash & Love during the 3 policy years ending in 1952, 1953, and 1954 were several times the dividends paid the policyholders. The dividends in each of 3 policy years were divided as follows:

Policy year	Total	To Dash & Love	To policyholder
Dec. 1, 1951–Nov. 30, 1952	$15,649	$6,322	$9,329
Dec. 1, 1952–Nov. 30, 1953	8,021	6,982	1,632
Dec. 1, 1953–Nov. 30, 1954	6,202	5,000	1,207

The experience on certain other policies was such that Dash & Love received extra commissions, while the policyholders received no dividends.

The extra commissions were payable on all policies, whether issued to a welfare fund, a union, or to an individual employer. In the case of Amalgamated Local 195 of the Meat Cutters & Butcher Workmen's Union, three policies were issued to the union and five to individual employers.

The testimony with respect to these two brokers makes it clear that neither the union nor the policyholders knew of these arrangements. One of these employers stated that he never heard of Dash & Love; that to his knowledge there was no broker on the case; and that all his dealings had been with the insurance company's field representative. Another stated that he had never seen either Dash or Love. Similar assertions regarding commissions were made by union officials and employers in the Boot & Shoe Welfare plans, where the policies were issued jointly to the union and the individual employers.

In another case involving the plan of the Torsion Balance Co., Clifton, N.J., a company official indicated that he had no knowledge of the fact that extra commissions were paid to Harry D. Epstein and deducted from the dividend that his company would otherwise receive.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 1356.

[2] Trucking employees of Passaic and Bergen Counties. Letters between agent and company, dated May 5, 1954, and July 30, 1954.

[3] Memorandum from Russell P. Inskeep, dated Oct. 2, 1950, in re retail shoe health commission.

[4] Insurance welfare fund of the Brotherhood of Painters of Queens County. Letters between agent and company, dated Oct. 11 and Dec. 6, 1949.

[5] Retail furniture employees' welfare fund. Letters between company and agent, dated Jan. 31 and Mar. 7, 1950.

The Continental Assurance Co. entered into an arrangement with the C. J. Simons Corp., of Newark, N.J., its general agent, whereby the company agreed to pay the corporation an annual contingency bonus or extra commission of from 2 to 10 percent of billed premiums depending on the claims experience on its entire business. The premium volume ranged between $2 and $3 million per year. During the period 1951–55, the C. J. Simons Corp.'s contingency bonus alone totaled $208,000. Again, this applied to any policy whether issued to a union, a welfare fund, or an employer policyholder.

There are numerous instances involving high commission arrangements which clearly gouge welfare-plan beneficiaries. It is seriously questionable whether such arrangements are necessary. Group insurance is bought and not sold in many cases. Too often it was found that most, if not all, of the administrative work connected with the insurance phase of welfare plans was performed by salaried personnel of the carrier while the producer (agent or broker) reaped the benefit of excess commissions and fees simply for having obtained the business.

SERVICE AND ADMINISTRATION FEES

The nature of group insurance makes it practical, where a reasonably large group is involved, for the insurance carrier to delegate certain administrative functions to the policyholder. These generally include issuance of certificates to the employees, accounting of monthly premiums due the carrier, determination of eligibility for coverage and even payment of claims. Generally, a policyholder is given a premium discount (typically, of 1 to 3 percent) or additional dividend for performing these functions. The subcommittee's studies show that with respect to policies in force in 1952, 27 of 43 companies with a substantial volume of business paid service fees. Eleven companies paid fees of 2 percent or more of billed premiums.

However, many instances were found in which liberal service fees were paid not only to agents and policyholders but also to other persons who performed little or no service. In effect, these fees when paid to an agent are additional commissions. When paid to a third party, they verge on kickbacks, rebates, or commissions to an unlicensed agent.

Testimony before the subcommittee revealed many instances in which agents received unduly high service fees under circumstances that raise grave doubts as to the extent to which they were earned. For example, Eastern Casualty Co. paid the Cardinal Agency 7.5 percent until 1953 when the amount was reduced to 3 percent. This was in addition to 15 percent flat commissions on first year and renewal premiums. It paid the Alcor Agency 5 percent in addition to flat commissions of 12.5 percent. An official of the company testified that the fees were paid as compensation for administrative functions such as billing and claims processing.

The Mutual Benefit Health & Accident Association (Mutual of Omaha) combined various decremental commission schedules with incremental service fees which in effect resulted in a flat rather than a graded yield to the agents or brokers. As its volume of business increased, it gradually adjusted its commission and fee agreements with its agents. At present the company pays the standard graded 20 percent first year and 5 percent renewal commissions on new business. Service fees are at a level 3 or 4 percent. An example of how the earlier incremental service fee schedule worked is illustrated in the joint welfare fund of the International Union of Operating Engineers, Locals 14 and 15. In this case, according to an administration contract entered into April 30, 1952, between Mutual and the agent, Alphonse C. Corcillo, no first year fee was paid on the first $20,000 of premium, but the fee then ranged from 5 percent on the next $10,000 of premiums up to 14.9 percent on all in excess of $500,000. Renewal fees rose from 10 percent on the first $10,000 of premium to 14.9 percent on all in excess of $500,000. The use of an incremental scale for computing commissions and fees is contrary to general practice. Under this arrangement, Corcillo received combined commissions and service fees of 16.2 percent and 15.7 percent during policy years 1952–53 and 1953–54, respectively, on gross premiums totaling about $187,000 in 1952–53, and about $185,000 in 1953–54.

As of April 1, 1954, Mutual initiated a policy of reducing service fee payments to a flat 4 percent with the result that, in this particular case, combined commissions and service fees amounted to only 6.4 percent of gross premium of a little over $303,000.

In another case, Local 445 of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters welfare fund, Victor D. Levitt, Jr., the broker for Mutual Benefit Health & Accident Association, was paid in addition to the regular and overriding commission, first year service fees of 10 percent on the first $1,000, graded down to 5 percent on all in excess of $50,000, and on renewals 5 percent on the first $1,000 graded up to 9 percent on all in excess of $50,000. Companion Life, which carried the life insurance, paid the regular commissions plus a flat service fee of 6.5 percent for first year and renewal. Thus, this broker received combined renewal fees and commissions amounting to a flat 10 percent.

Many other instances were found where fees, as distinguished from commissions, were paid to agents. Among them were the administration fees of 4 percent paid by the Continental Assurance Co. to the C. J. Simons Corp. This, in spite of the fact that the agency was receiving a contingency bonus in addition to its regular commissions.

A novel arrangement was entered into by Dash & Love, the broker in the case, and Michael Tesoro, eastern representative of the Boot and Shoe Workers Union, in the welfare plans of that union carried by Washington National. In this situation, Dash & Love agreed to handle the union's insurance details in return for one-half of the dividends received by the union. In this case, the agents were already receiving extra commissions which were deducted from the policyholders' dividends. Thus they received, in addition, one-half of the dividends remaining payable to the policyholders.

The subcommittee is firmly convinced that such practices are wholly unreasonable and unwarranted. They represent an unnecessarily high charge against the beneficiaries, increase the net cost of insurance and reduce the amount of money available for benefits to employees. There is no logical reason or justification for thus increasing the size of the payments to agents and brokers.

Policyholders and third party fees: Even more questionable is the payment of administration fees to certain policyholders or to other third parties who are in a position to swing the business but whose part in the administration of the plans is difficult to define. The most glaring example involves the Laundry Workers International Union welfare fund policy with the Security Mutual Life Insurance Co. Testimony showed that the company paid $85,000 to E. C. James, an acting secretary-treasurer of the union, from September 1951 to October 1953, at the rate of $2,500 monthly, allegedly for expenses incurred by the union in promoting its welfare plan. In addition, the company had agreed, in October 1950, to allow a 5 percent premium deduction to the fund to take care of administrative costs in processing and screening the claims.

The 5 percent was allowed, allegedly because the company did not have the field staff necessary to service this nationwide fund. The trustees of the fund agreed that welfare deputies be appointed in each section of the country where the plan operated. Thus, by March 1955, 33 such deputies were appointed. They were paid 5 percent of the premiums paid on behalf of the members of the locals for which they were deputies. For example, James, as welfare deputy for local 46 (Chicago) received almost $78,000 from October 1, 1950, through September 30, 1954. Appearing before the subcommittee on March 29, 1955, James refused to tell how he handled this money on the ground that his answer might incriminate him. An interesting fact, in this connection, is that one of the welfare deputies, Sidney Brennan, was not a member of the Laundry Workers International Union but was a vice president of the Brotherhood of Teamsters. He received almost $12,000 from 1952 through 1954.

The overloading of such costs to the premium is illustrative of both the insurance company's and the union and management trustees' disregard of the interest of the employees.

An unusual arrangement was uncovered by the subcommittee in which Mutual of Omaha insured some 3,600 members of 4 locals of the Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers Union employed by the Anaconda Copper Co. In this case, the company sought to reduce the commission of the regular agents in the case because it had agreed to pay a service fee to the union's insurance consultant, Paul Pinsky of San Francisco. From the facts available on this case, it is entirely possible that the service fees were nothing more than an inducement to retain the business.

In the cases in which Harry D. Epstein was broker, a pattern of 5 percent administration fees paid to union officials was developed. Washington National loaded the insurance premiums by 5 percent to produce these fees. An insurance company official testified that these individuals contacted union members to explain the insurance program to them. The company also took the position that it had no legal obligations to verify whether these individuals actually rendered any service. In view of the fact that Epstein was already receiving liberal commissions plus an extra contingency commission, was this not indeed a "loading" of the premium? It was testified that while Epstein denied that these fees represented a return for favors rendered, he readily admitted that the "administrators" were union officials through whom he originally obtained the business.

In one welfare fund case involving Local 262 of the Bakery, Confectionery, and Cannery Workers Union, Newark, N.J., Washington National paid over $10,300 during a 4-year period of two coadministrators who were also officials of the local. Evidence shows that during the first 3 years the company's checks were endorsed by the two coadministrators of the fund. These individuals, in addition, received small salaries and expense allowances from the fund plus, of course, their salaries as union officials.

Another case handled by Epstein concerns the Torsion Balance Co., of Clifton, N.J. This firm was the holder of a policy issued in 1953. In the 2 following years, it paid premiums totaling almost $12,800. Washington National paid administration fees of 5 percent, first to James Grafagnino, a former official of the International Jewelry Workers Union, and then to his father-in-law, Dominic Tripode, an official of the local. Since the plan was a unilateral employer administered plan, neither of these persons had taken any part in its administration. Company officials had never even heard of the first individual.

Testimony with respect to the Continental Assurance Co. is full of instances in which the company paid fees running as high as 6 percent to trustees of welfare funds who, in fact, performed no administrative functions. In some of these, the brokers or agents were already receiving administration fees. In one case, an insurance company employee questioned the administrative fee arrangements made by the branch office since the home office performed all administrative functions. In still other cases, allowances for administrative fees were being made in order to retain the business, although no administrative functions were performed.

Testifying before the subcommittee, officials of Continental Assurance Co. had difficulty in defining the administrative functions of these individuals. Upon further questioning, the company's vice president testified that 1 to 3 percent was an adequate administration fee. With respect to administrative allowances made to trust funds, these officials testified that they saw no reason why a trustee, as a policyholder, who chose to have his experience rating refund divided into two parts—one labeled "administration allowance," and the other, "refund," should not be accommodated. It was the policyholder's money, they said, and he could get it any way he saw fit.

In too many cases, the use of administrative fees by individual trustees, borders on a racket. In the C. J. Simon case, this agent of Continental was obviously paying administration fees out of his commissions and fees to various individuals in a position to swing business to him.

The practices described above are vicious. In the Simons case, the testimony tells the sad story of a broker who had to pay so-called administration fees to various and sundry individuals in order to obtain and keep a gross yearly business of between $2 and $3 million. Apparently, these were paid out of moneys received from the insurance company as commissions and fees. This agent's commitments were such that this source of funds eventually became insufficient and he began to withhold premiums from the insurance carrier.

SWITCHING

Switching is the practice of transferring insurance from one carrier to another without disclosing the costs involved to the policyholder. Control of cases by agents and brokers is a common group insurance phenomenon. Switching involves the payment of high first-year commissions all over again. A switch means that installation costs and contingency and other risk-sharing reserves accumulated by one insurance company must be reaccumulated by the new carrier.

Based on reports from insurance carriers, the subcommittee's statistical analysis of group insurance transactions in cases where the union had some voice in the selection of the carrier shows that out of the 2,073 policies reported in force at the end of 1953, 10 percent had been shifted from one carrier to another. Of course, there are cases in which a carrier wants to "get off the risk" and advises the policyholder that his policy will not be renewed. In such cases, the latter seeks out a company that will take his risk and usually finds one. There are also cases in which the policyholder is not satisfied with the treatment he gets from the carrier and transfers his insurance to another. The record, however, shows cases, such as the LWIU-Saperstein case, where carriers were switched because the one would no longer continue the commission and fee arrangements. In this case, both Saperstein and certain of the fund trustees went to great lengths to make the switch.

Another example of switching is found in an insurance plan involving local 195, Meat Cutters & Butcher Workmen of North America, Philadelphia. This plan was originally underwritten by the Continental Casualty Co., of Chicago, Ill., on January 1, 1952, through a broker, Dash & Love. A year later, it was switched to the Washington National Insurance Co. under commission arrangements which were more favorable to the broker. Some employers who were contributing to the program first learned of the change after it had been made.

This same broker handled an insurance plan involving the Boot & Shoe Workers Union, Philadelphia, which also was insured by Continental from August 1950 to December 1951, when it was likewise switched to Washington National.

In the Torsion Balance case, already cited, the insurance coverage had originally been carried by the State Mutual Life Insurance Co. and the Security Mutual Life Insurance Co. The agreement between this employer and the union (Playthings, Jewelry, and Novelty Workers International Union, CIO, Local 306) called for a specified program of benefits. In November 1952, a new agreement was entered into providing for contributions of 3¾ cents per hour, or $6.49 monthly per employee, into a fund to be used for the purchase of insurance. At that time, the union requested the company, in writing, to cancel the outstanding policies and to place the insurance with the Washington National Insurance Co. through Harry D. Epstein, broker. This was done. The employer was the policyholder and administered the plan. The commission and fee arrangements which Epstein enjoyed have already been cited.

During the subcommittee's hearings, an official of the Continental Assurance Co. testified on a case in which the C. J. Simons Corp. was the agent, and in which the policy was canceled and reissued and, therefore, first-year commissions were paid twice. This official said, "I certainly expect that the producer or someone must have decided that there was going to be a first-year commission paid on that case anyway, if not with us, it could be placed with some other carrier." When asked whether it seemed worth doing—paying a new commission again in order to keep the business, he answered, "in our judgment we found that is what we had to do; yes."

Exhibit 4

Field Inquiries

In an effort to determine at the plan level the effect of such practices as paying extra commissions to brokers out of dividends, paying administrative fees to union officials, and having special arrangements with seemingly favored insurance brokers, the subcommittee conducted field inquiries in Newark, N.J., of the business controlled by Harry D. Epstein, and in Philadelphia, Pa., with respect to the business of Dash & Love.

(A) PHILADELPHIA INVESTIGATION

(1) *Amalgamated Local 195, Meat Cutters & Butcher Workers of North America*

This union has some 7,000 members employed in various segments of the meat industry in the Philadelphia area; i.e., hotel and restaurant supply houses, beef boners, packing and slaughter houses, poultry houses and retailers. The numerous employers in the industry are, for the most part, members of employer associations. Collective bargaining by local 195 is carried on with four such employer groups. The local's welfare program consists of: (1) A medical center which provides medical care to all covered employees; and (2) life insurance, accident and sickness coverage, hospitalization, etc., for employee-members through group insurance contracts with various insurance carriers. These are noncontributory programs and are bargained on a benefit basis with respect to the insurance and on a fixed contribution by the employers with respect to the medical center. With the exception of three groups under this arrangement, the employers reportedly select their own carriers and hold the insurance policies.

According to Vincent LoCasale, secretary-treasurer of local 195, 5,800 to 5,900 members of this union are covered by group insurance plans underwritten by several commercial carriers. Some 800 members are covered by three policies issued to local 195 by the Washington National Insurance Co. and five separate policies issued to employers. The broker on each of these eight policies is the firm of Dash & Love. In interviews with subcommittee staff members LoCasale said he was a lifelong friend of J. Warren Dash, a partner of this firm, that the firm was utilized as this union's insurance consultant, and that it had placed fire and auto insurance for the union itself.

In 1948 or 1949, according to LoCasale, local 195 first obtained insurance programs for its members through negotiations with employers. These were to be contributory plans, the employers paying two-thirds of the cost and the employees one-third. The union obtained informal bids from about 15 insurance carriers and selected the Continental Casualty Co., Chicago, Ill., on the basis of lowest net costs. Continental's bid had been submitted by Dash & Love, who subsequently became broker on the policy.

In 1950, the plan was made noncontributory; at which time the employers insisted upon choosing their own carriers. A clause to this effect was inserted in the collective-bargaining agreement, and many employers insured their programs through a number of different underwriters. However, the 800 or so members referred to above continued to be covered by Continental.

The multiple policies in effect for members of the same union was a consequence of the Pennsylvania insurance regulation prescribing group policies for groups of less than 25 workers. Employees of small companies engaged in similar activities were banded together so as to qualify for group protection under Pennsylvania insurance regulations. Since the union was the only centralized administrative factor, it became the policyholder on three different policies. J. Warren Dash told subcommittee investigators in October 1954 that local 195's insurance was handled by Continental Casualty Co. under a "franchise" contract rather than the usual group insurance contract and that three separate groups covering members of the same union had been formed along the lines followed in collective bargaining, that three different employer associations were involved, and that each group had different coverages. Dash further stated that separate policies were issued to employers as soon as they had more than the required 25 employees but that his firm did not get first-year commissions when employers were split out from one of the Amalgamated groups.

Both LoCasale and Dash advised that since experience proved adverse in this case, Continental demanded a premium rate increase. This took place at the end of the third insurance year, according to Dash. As a result, all these groups were taken from Continental and insured with Washington National, which offered to take the cases at lower rates.

Information of record does not support the foregoing statements. In questionnaires received from Continental Casualty and Washington National, the following data was submitted concerning local 195:

(a) Continental Casualty Co.: Continental issued a group policy to local 195 January 1, 1952, providing accidental death and dismemberment and temporary disability cash benefits (accident and health insurance) at a monthly premium of $2.60. Forty-nine contributing employers were listed. The S. Z. Goodstein Corp., Drexel Building, Philadelphia, a general agent for Continental, listed as agent on the case, was paid 20-percent flat first year and renewal commissions and a 5-percent fee. This case was canceled January 1, 1953, exactly a year after it began.[6] The following experience was shown:

Premium: $44,603.

Commissions: $8,920.60 (20 percent).

Fees: $2,230.15 (5 percent).

Incurred claims: $32,314.35 (72.4 percent).

Dividends: None.

Retention: $12,288.65 (27.5 percent).

Inquiry disclosed that Dash & Love was the broker in this case and received commissions directly from Goodstein. The Goodstein firm is presently attempting to determine from its files the circumstances surrounding the cancellation of the case and other related details. It can be seen, however, that (1) the case did not run 2 or 3 years under Continental and develop adverse experience; (2) there was no indication that adverse experience caused Continental to demand a rate increase; and (3) the case was canceled by the contracting party—not Continental.

(b) The Washington National Insurance Co.: The questionnaires returned by Washington National, together with material obtained from files of the carrier, provide the following information:

Of the original 49 contributing employers listed in the Continental group policy, 17 are presently insured under three separate group policies issued to the union by Washington National. These are designated by the carrier as units 1, 2, and 3. In addition, 4 of the original 49 employers are now carried under separate policies issued by Washington National. Still another separate policy was issued by Washington National to an employer not included in the original 49. Dash & Love is the broker in each of these cases. Thus, eight separate policies now exist in place of the single policy formerly carried by Continental. Commissions are paid separately on each of these policies, obviously increasing the commission factor considerably. (It should be noted that 12 new employers not included in the original 49 have been added to the three groups for which the union holds policies.)

Of these eight policies, three were issued on the same day that the Continental policy was canceled. The remaining five were issued shortly before or soon after that time. Washington National insured local 195, unit 1, on December 1, 1952, unit 2 on January 1, 1953, and unit 3 on May 1, 1953. Two of the five employer policies were issued November 1, 1952, two on January 1, 1953, and the fifth on November 1, 1953. Records indicate that local 195, units 1 and 2 of the five employer groups, were insured for a period of time under both Continental and Washington National.

The benefits and premium rates were different under each of these policies as shown below.

1. Unit 1, local 195 (carried by Continental from January 1, 1952, to January 1, 1953; by Washington National from December 1, 1952, to date). Coverages and premium rates of inception under Washington National:

[Effective date Dec. 1, 1952]

Coverage	Monthly premium	Annual premium
Life insurance	$2.04	$24.48
Accidental death and disability	.20	2.40
Accident and health	1.99	23.88
Total	4.23	50.76

2. Unit 2, local 195 (carried by Continental from January 1, 1952, to January 1, 1953; by Washington National from January 1, 1953, to date). Coverages and premium rates in inception under Washington National:

[Effective date Jan. 1, 1953]

Coverage	Monthly premium	Annual premium
Life insurance	$0.99	$11.88
Accident and health	2.60	31.20
Total	3.50	43.08

3. Unit 3, local 195 (carried by Continental from January 1, 1952, to January 1, 1953; by Washington National from May 1, 1953, to date). Coverages and premiums rates at inception under Washington National:

[Effective date May 1, 1953]

Coverage	Monthly premium	Annual premium
Life insurance	$1.01	$12.12
Accidental death and disability	.18	2.16
Accident and health	1.99	23.88
Hospitalization (employees)	1.17	14.04
Hospitalization (dependents)	3.41	40.92
Surgical (employees)	.50	6.00
Surgical (dependents)	1.82	21.84
Total	10.08	120.96

According to Washington National's questionnaire, the union's executive board was included under this unit. According to the carrier's files on this case, dependent coverage at the outset was written only on the union's executive board. As of November 1, 1954, according to these same files, hospitalization and surgical benefits were increased for members of the executive board and their dependents only. The file states: "Employers pay entire cost of program."[7]

The separate policies issued to the five employers also provide different coverages and premium rates.

According to a letter from Goodstein, the general agent (set forth in detail later in this section), Dash & Love, on the local 195 case, received a commission of 17.5 percent flat on first year and renewal premiums, and Goodstein, as general agent, received an additional 7.5 percent. The subcommittee's questionnaire from Continental shows that the total retention for the 1 year the policy was in effect amounted to 27.5 percent of premium. With 25 percent of this representing commissions and fees, the carrier's net retention was only 2.5 percent of total premium. These commissions and service fee arrangements are unusually high.

Dash & Love's commission arrangements with Washington National are especially significant. This broker received commissions based separately on each policy issued by Washington National to the various units and employers whose programs covered local 195 members. The commissions were computed separately, using the decremental scale, on each group and on separate coverages within each group. Had the premium for all groups been combined for commission purposes, the result would have been to reduce substantially the amount of commissions paid. Even more important was the contingency commission arrangement previously described by which Dash & Love received 10 percent the gross premium on each case where the experience was sufficiently favorable to produce a dividend. This 10 percent was deducted from whatever dividend became payable and returned to Dash & Love in addition to their regular commissions. The effect of the arrangement was to reduce any dividend earned by the various groups as a result of favorable claims experience by an amount equaling 10 percent of gross premium. If the dividend was insufficient to equal that amount, as it was in some instances, then a lesser percentage was paid to Dash & Love with no dividend being paid to the group. The remainder of the dividend, if any, after the 10 percent additional commission had been deducted, was then paid to the insured group.

In 1954, following the first insurance year of units 1, 2, and 3 under Washington National, dividends were paid to one of the units and additional commissions were paid to Dash & Love under the contingency arrangement as follows:[8]

	Dividend paid	Extra commission paid
Unit 1	None	$183.79
Unit 2	None	297.30
Unit 3	$202.77	772.66

The following data, compiled from questionnaires submitted by Washington National and from their files, reflect the first year experience on five of the eight policies, including the three union groups. The tabulation includes the contingent commissions paid to Dash & Love. The percentages express the relation of the individual item to billed premiums:

Policy	Premium	Fees	Commissions	Contingent commission	Claims	Dividends	Gross retention	Net retention
		Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
A	$7,726	0	20	10.0	28.5	2.6	69	39.0
B	3,528	2.5	20	8.5	28.0	0	72	41.3
C	2,708	2.5	20	6.8	19.5	0	80	51.4
D	3,378	2.5	20	----------	27.0	0	73	50.5
E	1,905	2.5	20	----------	30.0	0	69	46.7

It can be seen that the return to the beneficiaries on each dollar of premium (in claims and dividends) in these cases was 31 cents, 22 cents, 19 cents, 27 cents, and 30 cents, respectively, the remainder in each case being consumed by commissions, fees, and insurance company retention. It cannot be said that the welfare of these beneficiaries was improved by the switch from Continental to Washington National. The change appears to have been more advantageous to the broker through his special arrangements with the latter carrier.

Neither LoCasale, of local No. 195, nor three of the five employer policyholders insured through Washington National knew of the extra commission arrangements between the broker and the carrier. They were likewise unaware of the broker's regular commission arrangements or the amount of insurance company retention on their policies. They had never seen a statement of the experience on the policies despite the fact that Washington National annually transmits such statements to Dash & Love. An official of one of the five employer policyholders who is comptroller of his firm said he had never heard of Dash & Love, that to his knowledge there was no broker presently involved on the case, and that all his company's dealings were with Washington National's local group insurance supervisor, a Mr. Edward Butcher. An official of another of these companies told staff members the local No. 195 insurance program arose out of association bargaining and was presented to his company as a "package" with Dash & Love as broker and Continental as the carrier. His first and only knowledge of the change in carriers came when Mr. Butcher called at his office to obtain personnel information for Washington National's records. This individual stated he had never seen either Dash or Love. A third employer said he bargained independently with local No. 195 and that his insurance program had been insured with Washington National at the suggestion of the union, with Dash & Love as the broker. He further stated that Dash & Love had occasionally called at his office to check specific claims information.

---

[6] Questionnaire from Continental Casualty Co. re Meat Cutters & Butchers Workmen of North America, Amalgamated Local 185.

[7] Washington National's installation summary effective date, May 1, 1953, Amalgamated Meat Cutters Local 195, Hotel and Restaurant Division, Unit 3.

[8] Washington National letter to Dash & Love, dated Sept. 17, 1954.

Investigation determined that claims in all these cases are processed and paid through Mr. Butcher's office rather than through that of the broker.

(2) *Boot & Shoe Workers Union Local No. 141*

This union has insurance programs with some 35 individual employers in the eastern Pennsylvania area which have been negotiated on a benefit basis with the employers agreeing to provide specified coverages set out in the bargaining agreement through insurance companies of their own choice. About half of the 35 employers have insured their programs through various well-known commercial carriers; 17 employers provide benefits through Washington National on policies issued to the union which also carry the names of the individual employing firms, allegedly for identification purposes only. Dash & Love is the broker on this program. There is no welfare fund involved. Employers pay the insurance premiums direct to the carrier which then provides the benefits as established in collective bargaining. The plan is entirely financed by the employers.

The Continental Casualty Co., from August 1, 1950, to December 31, 1951, insured this same plan under a franchise agreement, rather than a group-insurance policy. Again due to inaccessibility of records pertaining to the case, this carrier has been unable to furnish data requested by the subcommittee; however, it has been established that Dash & Love was also the broker of record with Continental but all commissions were paid by the carrier to its general agent in Philadelphia, S. Z. Goodstein. Commissions to Goodstein were 40 percent of the first year premium and 35 percent of renewal premium. Adverse experience, according to Continental, caused a reduction in renewal commissions to 25 percent on August 1, 1951, to which the agent objected. Subsequently, negotiations were entered into looking toward reinstating original commissions contingent on good future experience but the case was terminated before any arrangements could be made.[9] J. Warren Dash informed staff members that his firm's commissions as broker in this case were originally 17½ percent flat and that they were adjusted through subsequent negotiations to 22½ percent flat.

(There is inserted below a self-explanatory letter received from S. Z. Goodstein & Co., general agents from the Continental Casualty Co., in Philadelphia, Pa. This letter was submitted in response to the staff's request for information this agency's file with respect to the Boot & Shoe Workers Union and the Meat Cutters & Butcher Workmen Union Local 195, together with the background of these cases. While the information is sparse, it has some bearing on the statements made by J. Warren Dash, the broker.)

CONTINENTAL CASUALTY CO.,
S. Z. GOODSTEIN & CO., INC.,
GENERAL AGENTS,
Philadelphia, Pa.

Mr. BLAKE TURNER,
Staff Member, U.S. Senate, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Subcommittee on Welfare and Pension Funds, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TURNER: This is in reply to your letter of December 8, 1955, with reference to the above-captioned cases for the period of January 1, 1952, to January 1, 1953.

BOOT & SHOE WORKERS UNION

1. The commission paid to Dash & Love as brokers, was 17½ percent of the premium collected. It would be extremely difficult, if not impossible to give an answer as to total moneys involved because our records for this period do not appear to be complete.

2. The commissions paid on all coverages was the same.

3. Commissions were not renegotiated.

4. Our agency received commission of 7½ percent of the premium collected. My comment in item No. 1, as to the availability of a dollar-and-cents figure applies here as well.

5. As brokers, Dash & Love:

(a) Assisted in rate calculation.

(b) Prepared proposals for the groups concerned, based on information and rates supplied by our office.

(c) Aided in collecting delinquent premiums. Contacted the employers upon notification from our office that our efforts to make collection had not been successful.

(d) Arranged installation and designed and instituted all necessary procedures for use of employers.

(e) Aided in service and claims negotiations upon request.

(f) Maintained regular contact with clients and our office to assist in efficient administrative functioning.

(g) No additional fees or commissions were paid for these services.

AMALGAMATED MEATCUTTERS & BUTCHERS UNION

The same information as supplied above.

We have no information relative to the circumstances surrounding the original placements of these cases. We were merely requested by the brokers to supply rates for proposed coverage and were later informed that the cases were written.

It is our recollection that the cases were terminated after notification of pending rate increase upon renewal was discussed. The brokers did not feel that the employers would accept the rate increase.

We have no figures showing the experience on these cases but using the figures supplied in your letter, it appears that Continental was left with only eight-tenths of 1 percent. The figures which you quoted showed gross collections of $44,603, commissions and fees of $11,150.75, claims of $32,214.35. Hence against collections of $44,603, there were payments aggregating $43,365.10 representing 97.2 percent of the premium. From the remaining 2.8 percent, Continental paid 2 percent Pennsylvania premium tax, leaving them with only eighttenths of 1 percent. Obviously, this explains the need for an increase in premium rate.

We can find no listing of employees covered.

In our original conversation, you had asked if any of the individual groups had remained on the books after the termination of the case per se. I have checked into the matter and find that none did.

I hope this information is to your satisfaction.

Very truly yours,
S. Z. GOODSTEIN & CO., INC.,
MARVIN N. DEMCHICK,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Questionnaires of Washington National disclose that 12 of the present 17 employers they insure were issued policies effective January 1, 1952, the day following that on which Continental ceased to be the carrier. The remaining five were added later, two in 1952, two in 1953, and one in 1954. The coverage, premium rates, and benefits differ in each of these 17 programs; however, all beneficiaries are members of the same union.

Again, as in the local 195 instance, Washington National pays Dash & Love separate commissions on each of these 17 individual units and, according to questionnaires submitted by the company, also pays separate commissions on each individual coverage within each of the employer units. The effect of this is illustrated in a letter from the insurance company to Dash & Love dated February 27, 1954, which contains the statement:

"Had we lumped together the premiums paid on each case and graded the commissions accordingly, then commissions paid would have been greatly reduced during the first year."

According to a tabulation of the carrier's questionnaires on the policies issued in 1952 only, the first year premium totaled $59,691.25 and commissions reportedly paid were $11,506.11 (19.3 percent of premium).

Mr. Knoblock testified in this connection that:

"At the time we took that group (Boot & Shoe Union) over for Dash & Love, they indicated that in order for us to be considered by them they would want us to pay commissions separately on each particular shoe company. We agreed to it, and the only reason we agreed to it was the fact that we were advised that each of these shoe companies was in effect going to be written separately and in fact at different intervals. Now I can't tell you at what intervals they were written, but I should say the effect was that we could under the circumstances consider each one as a separate group, and for that reason we agreed in that instance to pay separate commissions on the coverage written for each of these shoe companies."[10]

Mr. Knoblock pointed out elsewhere in his testimony that:

"Sometimes a particular broker or agent in controlling a group is going to be the one who is going to designate which insurance company is going to get that risk, and the fact that a person does exercise such close control over a particular group may warrant the payment of some amount in addition to the regular standard commission."[11]

Senator ALLOTT asked whether the carrier had to pay the broker greater commissions, in other words, to obtain the business in some instances. Mr. Knoblock replied: "In the case of this Boot & Shoe Union that is what was done."[12]

Dash & Love also have a contingent commission arrangement in effect with Washington National in this case similar to that of local 195, under which they receive up to 10 percent of earned premiums as additional commission over and above the broker's regular commission if experience warrants it.

According to Washington National's file, dividends were paid in the Boot & Shoe Union cases for each of the first 3 insurance years, from which extra commissions were deducted and paid to Dash & Love as follows:

---

[9] Letter from Continental Casualty Co. to subcommittee dated Nov. 21, 1955.

[10] Ibid., p. 1255.

[11] Ibid., p. 1259.

[12] Idem.

Policy year[1]	Total dividend	Deducted and paid Dash & Love as extra commission	Paid to policyholder
Dec. 1, 1951, to Dec. 1, 1952	$15,649.37	$6,322.16	$9,327.21
Dec. 1, 1952, to Dec. 1, 1953	8,021.83	6,982.30	1,039.53
Dec. 1, 1953, to Dec. 1, 1954	6,202.67	5,000.00	1,202.67
Total	29,873.87	18,304.46	11,589.41

[1] Policy year according to Washington National's files.

Thus, the broker received in extra commissions 61.2 percent of the sum which would otherwise have been payable to the policyholder as dividends had the arrangement not been in effect. Neither the union nor the employers involved in these programs knew of these commission arrangements. Washington National officials informed staff members that they received "verbal assurances," from Dash & Love at the time this arrangement was originally made that the insured groups were aware of and had approved it. In testifying before the subcommittee, Mr. Knoblock said:

"I think that, in accepting verbal assurances from both Dash & Love and Harry Epstein that the unions knew of the commission arrangement which we made, we were very probably being naive in not getting something in writing."[13]

An even more unusual arrangement is that which Dash & Love had with the Boot & Shoe Workers Union through Michael Tesoro, eastern representative. J. Warren Dash testified that some time after Washington National became the insurance carrier but prior to the end of the first policy year, Dash & Love agreed "at Tesoro's request" to assume responsibility for all administration and servicing of the policy. Mr. Dash suggested that his firm receive half of any dividend which might develop in the case. Tesoro agreed to this. This, of course, was in addition to the broker's regular and extra commissions paid direct from the carrier. Asked if he had informed Tesoro of his contingent commission arrangement, Mr. Dash testified he had not.

Mr. Tesoro produced checks made payable to Dash & Love drawn on a special account which he maintains in his own name as eastern representative of the Boot & Shoe Workers Union. An examination of these reflected the following:

Check dated	Amount	Dividend to union
Jan. 28, 1953	$4,663.60	$9,327.21
Apr. 26, 1954	519.76	1,039.53
Mar. 15, 1955	601.33	[1] 1,202.67
Total		11,569.41

[1] For further explanation of this last "dividend," see p. 250.

The arrangement which Dash & Love had with Tesoro was not known to Washington National. Mr. Knoblock testified that:

"The Washington National Insurance Co. had absolutely no knowledge of that agreement between Dash & Love and whoever the individual was."

He added:

"I think also that this 50 percent of the dividend certainly is a lesson to us and shows that these things have got to be checked very carefully in the future before any contracts of this kind are entered into."[14]

Thus an amazing situation existed in which a broker was able to get unusually favorable basic commission arrangements with the carrier, plus 50 percent of the remaining dividend paid the union.

There is no formal agreement between the individual employers and the union in this case as to the disposition of insurance dividends. It would seem logical that dividends would either be shared equally by the employers and the union or at least utilized in furtherance of the program by joint agreement. Actually, all dividends, less contingent commissions to the broker, were paid by Washington National directly to the union. Correspondence in the carrier's files indicates that there was a deliberate attempt to hide from the employers the fact that dividends were paid.

An exchange of correspondence between Edward Butcher, Washington National's group supervisor in Philadelphia, and Mr. C. D. Smith, the company's agency supervisor in Evanston, is pertinent. Mr. Smith sent Butcher a letter dated January 23, 1953, enclosing an experience statement on this case for the first policy year. A portion of the letter stated:

"For your personal information, there is a total bonus (this company's term for dividend return to policyholder) due of $15,649.37. However, in accordance with our agreement with Dash & Love, we are issuing a separate check in the amount of $6,322.16 to Dash & Love for additional commission for their handling of the group. You will recall that Dash & Love receive 10 percent of the earned premiums as extra commission, said 10 percent being deducted from the bonus payable.[15] We have issued two separate checks, one for $9,327.21 payable to the Boot & Shoe Union, and the other, as above payable to Dash & Love."

Mr. Butcher acknowledged receipt of the above with a memorandum dated January 26, 1953, which stated:

"I delivered the two checks on the above group to Dash & Love, and they will see that the union receives their check by today or tomorrow. The money that the union receives is kept by the the Boot & Shoe Union in a special fund that they have set up. It is also important that no announcement of this dividend be made to any of the insured companies."[16]

Mr. Butcher informed staff members that this warning to his home offices resulted from instructions to that effect which he had received from Dash & Love.

Mr. Tesoro frankly admitted he had never advised the employers of the dividends paid, and that they had never asked about them. He said the dividend money (excluding his 50-percent payments to Dash & Love) is used for union organization expense. At one time or another, five different business agents have been paid in varying amounts from this account.

In its questionnaires, Washington National listed dividends as having been paid in many of these 17 separate employer units (each case or unit is treated separately for experience-rating purposes, dividends, commissions, etc.). Staff members interviewed individuals at two of these companies where the questionnaires indicated dividends had been paid. In neither case were the employers aware that dividends had been paid nor had they received them, of course. They did not know what the commission arrangements were on the case or that extra commissions were paid. They had no idea what the insurance company retention was and had never seen an experience statement on their programs. It was further apparent that such questions had never occurred to them and that they were not too concerned about it. As one of these two employers put it, he "pays the premium and forgets about it." He stated that as long as the rates are fair, the program adequate, claims handled satisfactorily, and the union and his employers are happy, why question anything. He said he had never asked for an experience statement from Washington National.

When employers abdicate their responsibilities to this extent, it is not all surprising that the broker, the union, and the insurance carrier can operate without restraint.

In early 1955, following the third complete insurance year on this case, Mr. Smith wrote Mr. Butcher at Philadelphia advising that this case had developed a bonus of $6,202.67. He pointed out, however, that due to the 10-percent extra commission arrangement with the broker, this entire amount would be due Dash & Love. He asked whether it would be necessary to prepare a bonus statement breaking down the $6,202.67 percentagewise in accordance with premium received from the various companies. His letter continued:

"This is necessary where a return is being made to the companies; however, because Dash & Love will receive the entire amount it does not seem feasible to go through all the extra motion unless Dash & Love are going to return $6,202.67 to the group."[17]

By letter dated March 2, 1955, Smith wrote Dash & Love as follows:

"Enclosed is the bonus statement on the above group (Boot & Shoe Union) together with dividend checks as requested in your telephone conversation, one check to the Boot & Shoe Union for $1,202.67 and one check to you for $5,000." It is particularly significant that the enclosed bonus statement showed a total bonus (dividend) payable of $6,202.67. Had the statement been delivered to the union it would have become aware of the contingency commission arrangement between Washington National and Dash & Love. Had it been delivered to the employing companies, they, too, would have discovered, of course, that dividends were being paid in this case. It hardly need be added that the statement was not so delivered. Furthermore, of the $1,202.67 which the broker saw fit to let the union receive, he recovered $601.33, or half, under his arrangement with the union about which the carrier allegedly knew nothing. When questioned by staff members on this, Mr. Dash said the $1,202.67 given to the union was "probably a psychological procedure," and added that, "We wouldn't have had to do it." When asked why he did not obtain the same 50-percent agreement with the Meatcutters Union, Mr. Dash said, "It didn't occur to us; we missed the boat." Later, in testifying at the subcommittee's hearings, he claimed he had made this remark facetiously and that there was a vast difference in the two situations.

Mr. Dash told staff members his firm does not deliver Washington National's bonus statements, that they feel no obligation to do so and that the groups have expressed no interest in them. (When asked whether he was surprised to learn that the company's bonus statements were not being distributed to policyholders, Mr. Knoblock stated he had learned this about a month prior to the subcommittee's hearings, at which time he was surprised. He said the letter transmitting the statement usually contains a request that it be delivered to the proper individual.) Dash also readily admitted that these groups are not aware of either his basic or his contingency commission arrangements with Washington National. Under these circumstances, it is little wonder that such outrageous practices continue and flourish without detection.

---

[13] Hearings, pt. 3, p. 1260.

[14] Hearings, pt. 3, p. 1260.

[15] Earned premiums for the year totaled $63,221.60.

[16] Memorandum from Edward J. Butcher to Washington National, dated Jan. 26, 1953.

[17] Washington National letter to Edward J. Butcher dated Feb. 28, 1955.

As a final indication of the favored position this broker enjoys with Washington National, reference is made to the following: The carrier insures a group known as the Delicatessen & Cafeteria Workers Union, Local 232, at 920 Walnut Street, Philadelphia. This case was effective April 1, 1952. The carrier's files reflect that effective July 1, 1953, the casualty premiums on this group were increased by 11 percent. This increase was not due to loss ratios (poor claims experience) nor was it to be retained by the company. The entire increase, less taxes, was to be returned to Dash & Love as a service fee. This raised the basic monthly premium from $4.47 to $4.96.[18] Unfortunately, lack of time prevented the staff from determining what representations were made to this group as to the cause of the increase; however, Mr. Dash, when questioned about it, insisted the raise was due to adverse experience, a contention that is not borne out by the facts.

The extra commissions to Dash & Love, which in the carrier's records are often referred to as "administrative fees," were justified by Washington National officials and the broker on the basis of extra servicing which Dash & Love perform on all their cases. Investigation disclosed that all claims in Dash & Love's cases are processed and paid through Washington National's Philadelphia group office by Mr. Butcher, a salaried employee of the carrier. It was further developed in contacts with officials of both the employing concerns and unions involved that Dash & Love seemingly do very little, if anything, in the way of extra servicing which would entitle them to extra commission. For example, Tesoro stated he used the broker chiefly to intercede with Washington National when he could not get satisfaction from Butcher on claims, but that he deals mainly with Butcher on insurance matters. He said he sometimes consulted the broker often, sometimes not at all for long stretches, and that he had not used them at all in the past 6 months. LoCasale told staff members that Dash & Love "sells the insurance—period." Later at the hearings he amended this, saying:

"When I received this summons to appear, I wanted to make sure I had all the facts straight. I checked with the girl who handles health and welfare and I asked, 'What procedure do you go through when there is a claim that comes to the office from one of the members?' She said, 'Well, we contact Dash & Love and get the claim forms and we get the forms filled out by the individual member and then forward those to the Washington National for processing.' "[19]

He affirmed that Butcher handled the claims processing. As pointed out previously, the employers with but one exception stated that they had seen no evidence that Dash & Love performed any service whatsoever in connection with these cases. The one excepted employer reported that the broker occasionally calls at his company to obtain specific claims information. Mrs. Ruth Katz, office secretary in Washington National's Philadelphia group office who processes claims in all the cases of this company in that area, stated that, to her knowledge, Dash & Love perform no fieldwork, administration or any other service in connection with any of their cases. She advised that this office does all the administrative and claims work, including billing and collection of premiums, postings, and maintenance of all administrative records necessary to the servicing of these cases.

Mr. Butcher, despite his capacity as Washington National's top supervisory official in the Philadelphia area, said he was not aware that Dash & Love had not distributed the carrier's bonus statements to policyholders although he knew that his company intended that they be delivered. He was likewise unaware, he said, of the broker's arrangement with Tesoro, whereby Dash & Love recovered half the dividends paid to the boot and shoe union.

(B) NEWARK INVESTIGATION

At Washington National's home office in Evanston, Ill., staff members reviewed some 15 files dealing with group-insurance policies issued by this company to various companies and union groups in the Newark, N.J., area, in all of which Harry D. Epstein, 29 Elizabeth Avenue, Newark, N.J., is the broker. Epstein was, until 1951, associated in a partnership with Louis B. Saperstein in an insurance brokerage firm known as the Harlew Agency, Inc., Newark. Saperstein is fully identified elsewhere in this report. Washington National has also insured several groups in the Newark area on which Harlew Agency, Inc., was broker of record.

Epstein has an arrangement with Washington National similar to that of Dash & Love, whereby he receives extra commissions amounting to 10 percent of earned premiums over and above regular commissions, deducted from dividends otherwise payable to the insured groups. His regular commission payments are based on Washington National's standard decremental scale except that in renewal years on all his cases he receives a flat 5 percent instead of the usual graded 5 percent, a departure from the carrier's standard contract. Epstein actually does process and pay claims, and, according to his statement, handles all other administrative functions in his cases despite the fact that Washington National also maintains a group office in Newark similar to the one in Philadelphia.

In each Epstein case reviewed by the staff at Washington National's home office, files reflected payment of an administrative fee amounting to 5 percent of earned premium to individuals identified as union officials. This administrative fee is provided by loading the insurance premium; i.e., the actual cost of insurance is increased by 5 percent in order to produce the fee. Washington National officials stated these administrators perform actual service such as contacting union members to sign up new applicants for insurance, to explain the insurance program, to assist in filling out claim forms, and to police delinquent employer contributors. They further stated that these fees are paid to individuals designated by Epstein. Mr. Smith testified on November 30, 1955, that the carrier had discontinued the practice of loading the premium for administration fee purposes. Washington National officials earlier informed staff members in Evanston that they now require a letter of authorization from trustees or other responsible officials of a welfare fund or insurance plan before the carrier will pay administration fees to anyone.

Mr. Epstein was interviewed by staff members on November 3, 1955, at his office. He was informed that hearings were contemplated by the subcommittee later that month, at which time this matter would probably be reviewed. Mr. Epstein was served with a subpena on November 30, 1955 (after several earlier unsuccessful efforts by representatives of the U.S. marshal's office), ordering him to appear before the subcommittee; however, a telegram was received from him in which he stated he was in ill health and, in his physician's opinion, such an appearance would definitely endanger and be detrimental to his health.

In the November 3, 1955, interview with staff members, Epstein explained in detail the service he performs in all his cases in return for the special commission arrangements he has with Washington National. He stated that he maintains complete administrative records on all his cases to such an extent that he can handle any insurance problems which arise within his groups without reference to the company's home offices. His administrative functions include finding, selling, installing, premium billing and collection, claims processing and paying, auditing in some instances, and contacts with unions and trustees of plans with which he is connected as broker.

Since this description appeared to leave very little, if anything, for union administrators to do in return for 5 percent of premium in all his cases, Epstein was asked what function they perform. He stated they perform important functions by visiting employee beneficiaries in plants where the insurance program is in effect, explaining the insurance plan, answering inquiries, policing delinquent employer contributors, and enrolling new applicants in these plans. Epstein admitted that, generally speaking, these administrators were union officials through whom he originally obtained the business, either by introduction or recommendation. He denied, however, that the fees paid to them in any sense represented a return of favor.

Like Dash & Love, Epstein does not make a practice of distributing the annual bonus statement which Washington National sends him for delivery to the policyholder, though he conceded that it was the intent of the carrier that they be delivered. He said his insured groups had expressed no interest in these experience statements. Epstein also admitted that only one of his insured groups was aware that he had supplementary commission arrangements on his cases with Washington National. This group is the United Bakery, Confectionery, Cannery, Packing & Food Service Workers Union, Local 262, Newark, headed by Anthony Auriema and George Braverman, president and general organizer, respectively. This union, Epstein said, knew of his extra compensation but was not aware of how it was paid or the fact it was deducted from dividends.

Over a 4-year period, more than $18,000 was paid to 10 administrators in union insurance or welfare fund cases involving Epstein as broker and Washington National as carrier. Some of these cases are small and the amount of the fee proportionately small; however, the practice is open to serious question. This is apparently realized by Washington National officials who have discontinued such payments unless all interested parties are fully aware of the circumstances and have authorized them.

EXHIBIT 5

D. EASTERN CASUALTY CO.

Examination of questionnaires submitted by this company reflected abnormally high commissions, fees, and insurance company retention in most of its policies. These were issued to unions or welfare fund trustees. High commissions and fees were found present in all groups regardless of the premium volume. Nearly all policies were written through two brokers who, according to the data reported, were paid flat commissions of 12.5 to 15 percent in both the first and renewal years, plus service fees ranging from 2.5 to 7.5 percent per year.

However, the New York State Department of Insurance had conducted investigations into certain phases of this company's operations, particularly with respect to two brokers: Cardinal Agency, Inc., and Alcor Agency, Inc., both of New York City. The department's publication, Whose Welfare, refers to portions of this investigation and officials of the department informed the subcommittee that additional material bearing on Eastern Casualty would be brought out in future reports and hearings. For this reason, the subcommittee conducted no extensive inquiry into this matter; however, staff members did confer with officers of the Eastern Casualty Co. in November 1955, and briefly reviewed a number of the company's files pertaining to welfare fund programs.

---

[18] Office memorandum dated Oct. 27, 1953, from C. D. Smith to Grace Michaels re Delicatessen & Cafeteria Workers Union, Local 232.

[19] Hearings, pt. 3, p. 1263.

David Schultz, vice president of Eastern Casualty, testified before the subcommittee during its November 30, 1955, hearing at which time the general background, activities, and practices of this company were reviewed. Following is a summary of his testimony.

1. VOLUME OF PREMIUMS

The Eastern Casualty Co. was organized in 1949 by Samuel Kosman, presently an officer of the Union Casualty & Life Insurance Co., Mount Vernon, N.Y. Eastern Casualty began operations in 1950 with the majority of its business consisting of group cases involving union welfare plans. In 1954, this business reached a total premium of approximately $1 million.

Eastern Casualty, as a new company, lacked facilities and personnel to administer its risks and its general policy was to have the broker perform this work for a service fee in addition to his regular commission.

2. BROKERS AND COMMISSIONS

The bulk of Eastern Casualty's business emanated from the two brokers: Cardinal Agency, Inc., and Alcor Agency, Inc.; it paid a flat 15-percent commission to Cardinal on first-year and renewal-year premiums in all cases. The service fee to this broker varied over the years from 7.5 percent originally to 3 percent beginning in 1953. Thus, the combined commissions and service fees to this broker on all cases ranged from 18 percent to 22.5 percent. Schultz stated that the service fees were paid only as long as the agency continued to perform services on the case. "In many cases, the allowances were withdrawn and in some cases the services stopped. There was no agreement that they were to be continuous and flat in the sense that the commissions were." [20]

Eastern Casualty paid a 12.5-percent flat commission to the Alcor Agency, Inc., which applied in the first policy year and each renewal year. In addition, this broker received 2.5 percent plus another 2.5 percent for servicing and administration, or a total of 17.5 percent in commissions and fees.

Mr. Schultz testified that in return for their service fees these brokers handled almost all the administrative details of their cases, including claims processing and premium billing. The commissions, he said, were paid "for bringing the business to the company."

Chairman Douglas asked Mr. Schultz whether he did not think these commissions were rather high, particularly since they were not based on decremental scales but were paid at flat rates not only in the initial year but in succeeding years. Mr. Schultz replied that the commission scales were established before the business was produced, rather than on an "each case basis," and that his company could not anticipate the premium volume for each particular case. In effect Eastern Casualty agreed to pay these commissions year after year on all the business which these two brokers produced.

Schultz said when these commission scales were established for the Cardinal and Alcor agencies, his company had no other business from other sources. Eastern's entire commission schedule was changed in 1953 with respect to other agents, but the original arrangement with these two agencies was left unchanged. At present, these brokers account for only about 15 to 20 percent of Eastern's total business because the business written by them has decreased.

Mr. Schultz said that from his experience, an overall study of group insurance since 1950 would probably disclose that much higher commissions were paid than an individual company's scale might indicate. He attributed this to frequent changes in insurance carriers after the first year, which meant that the lower renewal year commissions had no chance to obtain.

3. LOSS OF BUSINESS

Schultz said Eastern has lost almost half a million dollars of business in terms of annual group casualty insurance premiums in 1955. "Most of this business of its own nature, so to speak, has gone away from us." He did not attribute this loss to switching of this business by brokers to companies paying higher commission rates. "On almost all of this business we lose it by our own actions, either directly by cancellations, indirectly by requesting a premium increase, which in the market as it is today is tantamount to losing the group, or by indicating to the group in certain situations that we were not particularly interested in renewing." [21] He added that this type of business was not sufficiently profitable for his company and, as a result, it has been sidetracked completely in the interest of other types of insurance.

Eastern Casualty recognizes favorable experience by reducing the premium in the ensuing renewal year, Schultz said, or by making cash returns on the previous policy year premiums. The company's practice has varied from year to year in this respect. Schultz testified that the majority of Eastern's group policyholders have not received cash returns and that "some of them for experience purposes did not warrant any credit. The losses developed for support of a credit, and for certain of the groups in lieu of a cash return we reduced the premium rate in the next year." [22]

4. HIGH RETENTIONS

The chief counsel discussed with Schultz the insurance experience of a case involving the Restaurant, Luncheonette, and Soft Drink Employees Union, Local 1115, 323 Fourth Avenue, New York City. According to Eastern's questionnaire, this policy was issued in March 1952 with the Cardinal Agency as broker. Referring to the data furnished by the insurance company, it was pointed out that in the first policy year of this case, premiums totaled $28,638; commissions amounted to $4,296, or 15 percent; fees to $2,148, or 7.5 percent; and claims totaled $11,966, or 41.8 percent of premium. This produced a gross insurance retention of 58.2 percent of premium, 22.5 percent of which represented commissions and fees. There was no refund or dividend paid.

Mr. Schultz explained that the figures reported by his company in all its questionnaires had been on a cash basis and, therefore, would not necessarily reflect all incurred claims, particularly in the first policy year. He stated that "in the company's retention which you have developed from [these figures] are the reserves chargeable to the experience on this group, which is just as real as claims payments except that they are paid out in a future policy year. So that is in no sense retention by the company. That is to the credit of the policyholder." [23] He also testified that in this case a substantial rate decrease was allowed in the second policy year in lieu of a cash return.

The experience on this case in 1953 and 1954, as obtained from the company's files and verified by Schultz, reflect the following data:

	1953		1954	
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
Premiums	$29,497.51	100.0	$30,092.24	100.0
Commissions	4,424.63	15.0	4,513.81	15.0
Fees and allowances	2,212.31	7.5	1,577.47	5.2
Claims paid	13,983.72	47.4	16,773.44	55.7
Dividends	0	------	0	------
Gross retention	15,513.79	52.6	13,318.80	44.3

(This case was terminated on March 31, 1955, according to the company's files.)

Thus, it can be seen that in the 3-year history of this group, according to the company's figures, 51.7 cents of every premium dollar was retained by the insurance company, over 17 cents of which was paid out in commissions and service fees. Clearly, this is a grossly exorbitant insurance charge and an example of how a group of beneficiaries suffered at the hands of this carrier. The most liberal allowances for reserves would still leave insurance costs markedly high. It is significant that premium decreases of 15 to 20 percent were given this group on the basis of favorable experience. It is obvious that the cost of insurance was still high, however.

Counsel then reviewed a case involving the welfare fund of Local 816, International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 364 West 34th Street, New York City. A group policy was issued by Eastern Casualty to the trustees of this fund on December 1, 1950, with the Cardinal Agency, Inc., as broker. The insurance company files reflected the following experience.

	1951		1952	
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
Premiums	$24,930.00	100.0	$56,901.69	100.0
Commissions	3,116.25	12.5	8,535.25	15.0
Fees	1,661.63	6.6	4,276.73	7.5
Claims paid	14,324.32	57.2	37,088.85	65.2
Dividends	1,029.23	4.1	0	0
Gross retention	9,576.56	38.7	18,812.84	34.8

	1953		1954	
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
Premiums	$90,202.45	100.0	$106,570.44	100.0
Commissions	5,443.59	6.0	0	0
Fees	2,226.45	2.5	0	0
Claims paid	67,468.30	74.8	87,613.49	82.2
Dividends	0	0	0	0
Gross retention	22,734.15	25.2	18,956.95	17.8

Mr. Schultz pointed out the steadily climbing loss ratio (claims paid as percent of premium) on this case and said in the fifth insurance year, 1955, it is running at about 95 percent. He testified that Cardinal had been replaced as broker by action of the trustees and that he did not know the reason for it. He stated that Andre Burnett, an independent broker, replaced Cardinal, and Burnett is being paid only a 5-percent commission. "That was a negotiated commission, in view of the extremely high loss ratios that are developing on the case," he said.[24]

---

[20] Hearings, pt. 3, p. 1180.

[21] Ibid., p. 1184.

[22] Ibid., p. 1185.

[23] Ibid., p. 1187.

[24] Ibid., p. 1190.

The Cardinal Agency, Inc., is or was a general agent of Eastern Casualty Co. In his testimony, Schultz identified the principals of the agency as John DeFeo and William H. Martoccia. Another of its principals is Samuel Kosman, who, according to Schultz, organized Eastern Casualty. Approximately one-third of Cardinal's income from 1951 to 1954 consisted of commissions and fees received from Eastern Casualty on union welfare fund insurance premiums. As Eastern's general agent, the Cardinal Agency collected and remitted premiums in all its cases to Eastern, after deducting commissions and service fees.

The Cardinal Agency, Inc., has been under investigation by both the New York district attorney's office and the New York State Insurance Department; the former began its inquiry in late 1953. In response to questioning, Schultz said that he had no "direct knowledge" that the Cardinal Agency was under investigation by the New York State Insurance Department, though he was aware of the fact that the agency was being looked into by the district attorney.

With respect to the Teamsters local 816 cases, Eastern Casualty's files reflect that Andre Burnett who "replaced" Cardinal Agency as broker on this group is himself a former employee of Cardinal. The local 816 case file reveals that the trustees asked Eastern for an analysis of its charges for all years, including retentions, and requested a "dividend projection" for future policy years. The company did not reply to this request, according to this file, but by letter of November 1, 1955, notified the trustees that it was discontinuing this policy.

5. BROKER CONTROL

In discussing the payment of high flat commissions to brokers such as Cardinal and Alcor, Schultz testified that such payments were established solely for the purpose of competing with existing scales in the group insurance market. The company did not feel that it could obtain business otherwise and that commissions of 12.5 percent to 15 percent "would put us in a position of competing for this business with the agents and brokers." He added "* * * the situation was then much as it is today, that the broker does control the placing of the business on behalf of the trustees,"[25] and he agreed that creating attractive scales to obtain the business of these brokers was the practice of the group insurance industry.

Schultz said the New York State Insurance Department has never instructed his company to reduce its rates and commissions.

Senator ALLOTT cited statistics from the subcommittee's interim report of January 1955, wherein 79 insurance companies reporting group insurance business paid out about 87.5 percent of their premium income in claims and dividends, leaving a retention of some 12.5 percent. Schultz said a comparable figure for Eastern Casualty might run about 70 to 75 percent expended in claims.

6. CASES DISCUSSED

Seven other cases were discussed with Schultz, at the hearing and subsequent thereto. These risks had been selected at random from among the 36 questionnaires originally submitted to the subcommittee by this company. The figures set out below were verified by Schultz. Gross retention is shown in parentheses. Supplementary data obtained by the staff from the company's individual case files is also included where pertinent, together with comments by Schultz at the hearings:

1. Trustees of local 318 health and welfare trust fund (International Brotherhood of Pulp, Sulphite & Paper Mill Workers), 225 Lafayette Street, New York City; broker: The Cardinal Agency, Inc.; policy effective November 1, 1951:

	1952		1953	
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
Premiums	$32,546.46	100.0	$41,364.71	100.0
Commissions	4,881.97	15.0	6,204.71	15.0
Fees, administrative	2,440.98	7.5	2,913.66	7.0
Claims paid	11,204.90	34.4	19,238.35	46.5
Dividends	0	------	0	------
Gross retention	(21,341.56)	65.6	(22,126.36)	53.5

Schultz testified that at least one premium decrease of 20 percent was granted in this case, according to his recollection.

The company's file on the case reflected that on September 10, 1954, an attorney representing the trustees of the welfare fund requested the Cardinal Agency for a "dividend account" on this policy for all years in force. It was pointed out that such a statement had never been supplied and the trustees felt perhaps a dividend had been overlooked. Cardinal referred the inquiry to Eastern Casualty and on September 23, 1954, Schultz wrote the trustees advising that no retroactive experience credits were payable for the first policy year at November 1, 1952; however, at the end of the second policy year on November 1, 1953, a rate reduction of approximately 15 percent was applied on the renewal in view of the previous year's experience.

On March 26, 1954, the trustees notified Eastern that they were terminating this insurance contract effective March 31, 1954.

2. Trustees of Local 107, AFL Labor-Management Trust Fund, 799 Broadway, New York City (the Paper Bag, Novelty, Mounting, Finishing, and Display Workers, Local 107); broker: the Cardinal Agency, Inc.; policy effective June 1, 1951:

	1952		1953	
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
Premiums	$100,308.65	100.0	$165,634.47	100.0
Commissions	15,046.30	15.0	24,345.17	15.0
Fees and allowances	7,523.15	7.5	12,422.58	7.5
Claims paid	44,888.31	44.8	90,898.57	54.9
Dividends	0	------	0	------
Gross retention	55,420.24	55.2	74,735.90	45.1

	1954	
	Amount	Percent
Premiums	$184,138.71	100.0
Commissions	23,938.03	13.0
Fees and allowances	0	------
Claims paid	112,019.24	60.8
Dividends	0	------
Gross retention	72,119.47	39.2

With respect to this case, Schultz testified, "I believe (premium) decreases totaling about 25 percent have been put in."[26]

The carrier's files reflected that at the policy renewal year commencing June 1, 1954, the benefits and premiums were increased on this policy. The group was also allowed a premium credit of $2,000 per month against payment of subsequent premiums, or a total rate reduction of $24,000. There is no other indication of a premium decrease, and there were no cash returns. Since the 1954 premium totaled $184,138.71, this amounted to a 13 percent decrease or premium credit.

On March 1, 1955, an official of this welfare fund wrote Eastern Casualty pointing out that an analysis of this case from its start reflected the following:

Premiums	$446,364.60
Claims paid	247,806.12
Dividends apportioned	24,000.00
Claims reserves	35,255.92
New York State assessment charges	1,167.94
Retained by Eastern Casualty (30.02 percent)	134,134.62

This official asked Eastern Casualty for a breakdown of this retention figure together with explanations, plus a 10-year projection in the case.

The files do not reflect that this inquiry was ever answered. On June 30, 1955, the trustees terminated this insurance contract with Eastern.

3. Welfare fund of Master Truckmen of America, Inc. (Local 816, International Brotherhood of Teamsters); broker: The Cardinal Agency; policy effective September 1, 1950:

	1951		1952	
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
Premiums	$42,857.89	100.0	$40,170.10	100.0
Commissions	5,332.24	12.5	6,025.52	15.0
Fees and allowances	3,199.34	7.5	3,012.76	7.5
Claims paid	20,467.75	48.0	22,037.85	54.9
Dividends	0	------	0	------
Gross retention	22,190.14	52.0	18,132.25	45.1

	1953		1954	
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
Premiums	$53,687.10	100.0	$71,554.60	100.0
Commissions	8,053.16	15.0	0	------
Fees and allowances	4,026.58	7.5	0	------
Claims paid	32,994.89	61.5	67,542.72	94.4
Dividends	0	------	0	------
Gross retention	20,692.21	38.5	4,011.88	5.6

The company's file in this case reflected no information as to why commissions and fees were discontinued.

4. Trustees of the Bronx Bartenders Welfare and Insurance Fund; broker: Alcor Agency, Inc. (January 1 to July 1, 1952); Harlew Agency, Inc. (July 1, 1952, to July 1, 1953); Jannine Agency (July 1 to October 1, 1953); policy effective January 1, 1952:

	1952		1953	
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
Premiums	$61,521.50	100.0	$41,491.71	100.0
Commissions	7,690.19	12.5	5,186.46	12.5
Fees and allowances	1,954.42	3.2	1,369.84	3.3
Claims paid	32,738.03	53.2	31,323.30	75.5
Dividends	0	------	0	------
Gross retention	28,783.47	46.8	10,168.41	24.5

According to the company's files, Eastern Casualty canceled this group as of October 1, 1953. From January 1 to June 30, 1952, Eastern paid commissions of 12.5 percent to Alcor plus 2.5 percent to Alphonse Corcillo, the principal of the agency, as an "underwriting servicing override." On June 20, 1952, the welfare fund trustees notified Eastern that Harlew Agency would henceforth be broker of record. Beginning July 1, 1952, Harlew received 10-percent commissions and Corcillo a 5-percent override. Harlew assigned its commissions to the Jannine Agency which, from July 1, 1953, to date of cancellation, was paid 10 percent while Corcillo continued to receive his 5-percent override.

---

[25] Idem.

[26] Ibid., p. 1195.

Significantly, Eastern files reflect that claims service was handled by the company itself throughout this entire case.

5. Operating Engineers, Locals 137, 137A, and 137B; broker: Alcor Agency, Inc.; policy effective August 1, 1950.

	1951		1952	
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
Premiums	$3,952.56	100.0	$11,530.66	100.0
Commissions	494.07	12.5	1,441.33	12.5
Fees and allowances	197.63	5.0	576.53	5.0
Claims paid	772.07	19.5	3,011.02	26.1
Dividends	855.68	21.6	3,468.88	30.1
Gross retention	2,324.81	58.9	5,050.76	43.8

	1953		1954	
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
Premiums	$12,900.00	100.0	$12,600.00	100.0
Commissions	1,612.50	12.5	1,575.00	12.5
Fees and allowances	645.00	5.0	630.00	5.0
Claims paid	2,543.13	19.7	3,994.27	31.7
Dividends	2,699.72	20.9	3,154.63	25.0
Gross retention	7,657.15	59.4	5,451.10	43.3

6. Joint welfare fund of the International Union of Operating Engineers, Locals 14, 14B, 15, 15A, and 15C; broker: Alcor Agency, Inc.; policy effective July 1, 1950:

	1951		1952	
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
Premiums	$46,560.00	100.0	$71,729.80	100.0
Commissions	5,820.00	12.5	8,966.23	12.5
Fees and allowances	690.00	1.5	3,586.49	5.0
Claims paid	35,144.43	75.5	43,659.43	60.9
Dividends	0	------	0	------
Gross retention	11,415.57	24.5	28,070.37	39.1

This case was terminated by the trustees on March 12, 1952, according to carrier's files. It is noteworthy that Sidney E. Liewant became an insurance consultant to this welfare fund. One Sidney E. Liewant in 1950 was secretary and general manager of Eastern Casualty Co.

7. Pavers and Roadbuilders District Council welfare fund; broker; Alcor Agency, Inc.; policy effective April 1, 1951:

	1951		1952	
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
Premiums	$21,600.00	100.0	$29,849.93	100.0
Commissions	2,700.00	12.5	3,731.24	12.5
Fees and allowances	1,080.00	5.0	1,492.50	5.0
Claims paid	5,623.06	26.0	9,476.51	31.7
Loss reserve [1]	2,236.56	10.4	653.74	2.2
Dividends	3,243.83	15.1	4,847.23	16.2
Gross retention	12,733.11	58.9	15,526.19	52.1

	1953		1954	
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
Premiums	$34,570.02	100.0	$56,296.62	100.0
Commissions	4,321.25	12.5	7,037.08	12.5
Fees and allowances	1,728.50	5.0	2,814.83	5.0
Claims paid	14,526.74	42.0	21,057.49	37.4
Loss reserve [1]	2,097.39	6.1	6,256.89	11.1
Dividends	7,208.50	20.9	9,108.60	16.2
Gross retention	12,834.78	37.1	26,130.53	46.4

[1] Included in gross retention, these figures were extracted from information in the company's files and are an indication of the reserves to which Mr. Schultz referred which are returned to the insured group in subsequent years through claims payments.

Prior to preparation of this report the above experience figures on these nine cases were submitted to Mr. David Schultz of Eastern Casualty for verification. Under date of January 4, 1956, he wrote the subcommittee as follows:

"In accordance with your letter of December 27, I am returning the exhibit on nine of our welfare-fund groups. Except for a small error for local 107, these figures are correct.

"The point I tried to make at the hearing was that these figures were strictly cash basis, rather than the earned premium-incurred loss basis which is used to compute retroactive credits, and the cash-basis figures may develop unrealistic percentages, particularly when short periods (1 or 2 years) are involved. If possible, we should like your published record to note that these figures are not on the accrual basis.

"Thank you for your courtesy and this opportunity to review and comment on this exhibit."

7. OBSERVATIONS

The nine cases described above represent only a fourth of those reported on the company's questionnaires. On virtually all cases, however, the carrier's net retention, after payment of claims, dividends, commissions and fees, was equally high. By and large the only return realized by the welfare plan policyholders insured with this company was through actual claims paid. This is partially explainable, of course, by the fact that Eastern's business was largely produced by the two brokers, Cardinal Agency, Inc., and Alcor Agency, Inc., both of which received high flat commissions and service fees regardless of premium volume of a particular case. Since these items are a part of retention it naturally follows that any case involving either of these brokers was burdened with heavy surcharges of 17.5 to 22.5 percent, thus driving up the cost of insurance. Mr. Schultz stressed that the figures reported were on a cash rather than an accrual basis and that the company's retention, developed from these figures, did not take into account the reserves set up in each case which are returnable to the policyholder via claims paid out in ensuing or renewal years. He further emphasized that sizable rate reductions, rather than cash dividends, were given in many cases where the experience warranted. In spite of this contention, however, a review of these cases on a 2-, 3-, or 4-year basis, reflects but little reduction.

EXHIBIT 6

MUTUAL BENEFIT HEALTH & ACCIDENT ASSOCIATION AND COMPANION LIFE INSURANCE CO.

1. THE COMPANY

Mutual Benefit Health & Accident Association, commonly referred to as Mutual of Omaha, is a health and accident company organized under the laws of the State of Nebraska. It commenced business on January 10, 1910; and in 1950 first entered the group accident and health field.

Mutual's wholly owned subsidiary, Companion Life Insurance Co., was licensed in New York on July 1, 1949, as a life company. Companion began writing group life insurance in 1950.

According to testimony at the subcommittee's hearing on November 30, 1955,[27] Mutual and Companion both bid for group business (the former with respect to accident and health coverages and the latter only on life), sometimes separately and sometime jointly. Generally, if the coverage desired includes both life and casualty, Mutual handles the casualty, and Companion the life. Occasionally when both types of coverage are included they submit joint bids.

Mutual's volume of business rose sharply from its entry into the group field in 1950 to 1954. Earned premiums in 1950 were a little over $2 million and $13.6 million in 1954, as the following table shows:

	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954
Premiums earned	$2,026,685	$2,490,521	$5,532,709	$9,836,727	$13,643,485
Claims incurred	1,424,371	2,058,492	5,037,985	9,265,951	12,030,206
Expense excluding Federal income and real-estate taxes	331,755	445,405	591,504	876,931	832,375
Commissions and brokerage	307,857	257,865	391,431	452,035	421,504
Loss from underwriting	37,298	281,241	488,211	758,190	640,600
Percentage of commissions and brokerage to premiums earned	15.2	10.4	7.1	4.6	3.1

As indicated above, Mutual has not yet experienced a profitable year in the group business. Officials of the company informed the subcommittee, however, that a substantial increase in writing in 1955, coupled with a standardization of commissions and fees, would probably result in a profit for that year.

Of significance, perhaps, in explaining both Mutual's rise in the group field and its failure to operate profitably are high commissions and service fees paid agents and brokers. Initially the company paid level combination service fees and commissions as high as 30 percent for first-year business, and 15 percent for renewal business. Until 1954, Mutual had at least 12 different commission schedules ranging from a level 1 percent for first year and renewal business to a graded 30 percent first year, 7 percent renewal, including an incremental fee schedule under which the larger the premium the greater was the allowance for servicing. This had the effect of establishing a flat rather than a graded yield to the broker when combined with the decremental commission scale. In effect, it was a commission disguised as a service fee, though Randall argued that it was not hidden as Mutual paid it and declared it.

Under a gradual reorganization of its practices, Mutual is now on a standard 20-percent graded commission on all new cases, with renewals graded downward from 5 percent. Likewise, in almost all cases, service fee scales are at a level 3 or 4 percent.

2. DETAILS OF INDIVIDUAL PROGRAMS

The effect and extent of the commission and service fee arrangements of Mutual of Omaha can be demonstrated by considering four cases which subcommittee staff members examined in the company's files and concerning which testimony was received at public hearings.

(A) Local 445 International Brotherhood of Teamsters Welfare Fund

This is a joint-trusteed noncontributory fund in Westchester County, N.Y., financed by contributions from approximately 50 trucking firms. It covers about 600 employees. Both life and casualty coverages began January 1, 1951. The combined experience of Mutual and Companion Life for this group from January 1, 1951, to November 1, 1955, is shown on table 11.

---

[27] Hearings, pt. 3, pp. 1200–1228.

The agent of record, and administrator, in this case is Victor D. Levitt, Jr., 20 Archer Avenue, Mount Vernon, N.Y. As table 11 indicates, the combined commissions and service fees actually paid Levitt on this case ranged from 25.5 percent of premium in the policy year 1951 to 10.2 percent in the policy year 1954, or an average of 14.1 percent for the 5-year period. Mr. Levitt was too ill to appear at the subcommittee's hearings. However, table 12 was provided, setting forth the commission and fee scales applicable to this case. It will be observed that the percentage payable to Mr. Levitt by Mutual under the fee scale in renewal years rises as the amount of premium increases; the commission scale, on the other hand, decreases as the premium rises.

TABLE 11.—*Summary of premiums, commissions, and fees paid, Jan. 1, 1951, to Dec. 31, 1955, Local No. 445, International Brotherhood of Teamsters welfare fund*

	Premiums	Commissions	Fees	Total, commissions plus fees	Percent of premium
1951:					
Companion Life, GL No. 3	$11,616.00	$2,051.00	$787.21	$2,838.21	24.4
Mutual, GMB 1006	13,002.64	2,850.53	650.13	3,500.66	26.9
Mutual, GMB 1007	22,918.84	4,647.51	1,145.95	5,793.46	25.3
Total	47,537.48			12,132.33	25.5
1952:					
Companion Life	12,394.20	619.71	805.62	1,425.33	11.5
Mutual, No. 1006	14,666.51	331.00	1,075.66	1,406.66	10.0
Mutual, No. 1007	28,884.95	1,510.25	2,413.78	3,924.03	13.6
Total	55,345.66			6,756.02	12.3
1953:					
Companion Life	16,454.82	822.75	1,069.57	1,892.32	11.5
Mutual, No. 1006	20,916.72	1,576.88	1,487.67	3,064.55	14.6
Mutual, No. 1007	40,823.70	2,168.47	3,474.37	5,642.84	13.8
Total	78,195.24			10,599.71	13.6
1954:					
Companion Life	$15,235.29	$761.76	$990.30	$1,752.06	11.5
Mutual, No. 1006	22,772.75	460.79	1,811.12	2,271.91	10.0
Mutual, No. 1007	43,391.95	763.36	3,525.70	4,289.06	9.9
Total	81,399.99			8,313.03	10.2
1955:					
Companion Life	15,984.00	799.21	1,038.96	1,838.17	11.5
Mutual, No. 1006	16,526.99	451.31	1,757.42	2,208.73	13.4
Mutual, No. 1007	33,428.12	792.20	3,689.11	4,481.31	13.4
Total	65,939.11			8,528.21	12.9
Total Jan. 1, 1951, to Dec. 31, 1955	328,417.48			46,329.30	14.11

TABLE 12.—*Commission and fee scales applicable to Local No. 446, International Brotherhood of Teamsters welfare fund, Victor D. Levitt, Jr., agent*

Amount of premium	A. Mutual of Omaha						B. Companion Life			
	Commission scale (No. 3)				Fee scale (S-3)		Commission scale		Fee scale	
	1st year		Renewal		1st year	Renewals	1st year	Renewals	1st year	Renewals
	Agent	Overwrite	Agent	Overwrite						
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
0 to $1,000	20.0	2.5	5.0	2	10.0	5.0	20.0	5	6.5	6.5
$1,000 to $5,000	20.0	1.5	3.0	2	10.0	7.0	20.0	5	6.5	6.5
$5,000 to $10,000	15.0	.75	2.0	1	10.0	8.0	15.0	5	6.5	6.5
$10,000 to $20,000	12.5	.75	1.5	1	7.5	8.5	12.5	5	6.5	6.5
$20,000 to $30,000	10.0	.75	1.5	1	7.5	8.5	10.0	5	6.5	6.5
$30,000 to $50,000	5.0	.75	1.5	.50	7.0	8.5	5.0	5	6.5	6.5
$50,000 plus	2.5	.50	1.0	.50	5.0	9.0	2.5	5	6.5	6.5

Mr. Albert W. Randall, manager, group department, Mutual of Omaha, testified before the subcommittee that:

"The reason * * * why they have incremental scales and decremental scales is more from the standpoint of convenience in handling the various entries insofar as service fees go and commissions go in breaking them down on your annual statement. But for all practical purposes they would be on a level scale."

He further expressed the opinion that those in Mutual responsible for such payments "thought they were justified because of the duties being performed." [28]

According to Mr. Randall, Levitt "collects the premiums, issues the certificates, handles all changes in the policy, pays the claims, and handles the entire administration of the case." [29] He further brought out that Mutual's operating costs at that time were about 25 percent of premium; that this approximated what Levitt received; and that the fee paid Levitt during renewal years for servicing the policy likewise compared favorably with the company's operating costs.

Regardless of Mr. Randall's contentions, the subcommittee feels that the combined commissions and service fees paid Levitt on this case were too high for the services actually rendered and that other factors must have dictated these payments. In support of this feeling, attention is called to an incident concerning the local 445 welfare fund and the Anchor Motor Freight Corp. fund about which testimony was adduced at the subcommittee's hearings.

Levitt was administrator of both these funds and was included as a beneficiary under the policies issued in each case. In 1954 he submitted personal disability claims under both policies, approved them, and issued drafts in payment thereof to himself. The claims were in identical amounts, $1,180 each, or a total of $2,360, and covered the same period of disability. Mutual, at first, rejected the claims on the theory that Levitt as an employee of the funds could not be included in the coverage issued either. Subsequently, however, the company did pay both claims. According to Mr. Randall's testimony, Mutual paid because an official of Anchor Motor Freight advised that they had been paying premiums on Levitt since 1953 and considered him included in their coverage.

Testimony showed, however, that Mutual honored these claims after it received a memorandum, dated August 23, 1955, from John Cook of Companion Life, informing Mutual that "Levitt tells me * * * unless he receives a satisfactory letter concerning his eligibility as a fully covered individual under Mutual of Omaha's policy he is going to make immediate arrangements to transfer this business to another carrier." [30]

(B) *New York City District Council of Carpenters' welfare fund*

This policy became operative on January 1, 1951, for life coverage with Companion, and May 1, 1951, for accident and health coverages with Mutual.

John G. DeFeo, of the Cardinal Agency, Inc., is the agent of record and receives from Mutual a 25-percent graded commission on first-year business and 7 percent graded on renewal business. In addition, he received an administrative allowance on the accident and health coverages which amounted to a level 11.5 percent from May 1951 to October 1952, when it was reduced to its present 3 percent.

The accident and health experience on this risk, as reported by Mutual on a questionnaire returned to the subcommittee and as amended by letter of January 5, 1956, reflects high commissions, service fees, and retentions for a case of this size.

Year	Premiums earned	Commissions and fees	Claims incurred	Refunds	Retentions	Percent of retentions to premiums earned	Percent of commissions and service fees to premiums earned
1952	$469,713	$63,733	$231,278	$132,740	$105,685	22.5	13.6
1953	987,151	132,499	781,421	0	205,729	20.8	13.4
1954	1,030,540	84,882	804,904	23,156	202,480	19.6	8.2

---

[28] Ibid., p. 1210.

[29] Ibid., p. 1211.

[30] Ibid., pp. 1220-1221.

Companion Life, during the same policy years, paid DeFeo the following commissions and administrative allowances in this case:

Year	Commission	Administrative allowance
1952	$10,331.79	$8,128.44
1953	16,448.90	10,823.17
1954	12,614.52	12,269.52

Walter F. Martineau, executive vice president, Companion Life Insurance Co., testified that his company had "started off originally by paying (DeFeo of the Cardinal Agency) a 24-percent graduated commission, graded down from $5,000. That was the first-year commission. The second-year renewals are graded down to 3 percent. The commissions at the present time average around 3 percent." [31]

These figures indicate that DeFeo has been amply compensated in commissions and service fees for whatever services he has rendered in this case.

(C) *Joint welfare fund, International Union of Operating Engineers, Locals 14 and 15*

Accident and health experience under this policy from April 1, 1952, to March 1, 1955, was as follows:

Year	Gross premium	Service fees and commissions	Service fees and commissions as percent of gross premium	Claims
Apr. 1, 1952, to Apr. 1, 1953	$187,104.34	$30,281.69	16.2	$133,793.68
Apr. 1, 1953, to Apr. 1, 1954	185,573.44	29,063.89	15.7	175,827.04
Apr. 1, 1954, to Mar. 1, 1955	303,095.36	19,328.27	6.4	255,730.37

On April 30, 1952, the company entered into a group-insurance administration contract with Alphonse C. Corcillo, agent of record, under which Mutual agreed to pay the following service fees:

	1st year	Renewal
	Percent	*Percent*
On the 1st $1,000 of adjusted premium	0	10.0
On that part in excess of $1,000 but not exceeding $5,000	0	12.0
On that part in excess of $5,000 but not exceeding $10,000	0	13.0
On that part in excess of $10,000 but not exceeding $20,000	0	13.5
On that part in excess of $20,000 but not exceeding $30,000	5	13.5
On that part in excess of $30,000 but not exceeding $50,000	10	13.5
On that part in excess of $50,000 but not exceeding $100,000	12.5	14.0
On that part in excess of $100,000 but not exceeding $250,000	14.0	14.5
On that part in excess of $250,000 but not exceeding $500,000	14.75	14.9
On that part in excess of $500,000	14.9	14.9

Correspondence in the files of Mutual indicated that around March of 1954, Mutual was going to change Corcillo's contract from the incremental scale to a level 4-percent service fee. In a revealing letter dated March 9, 1954, to Gale E. Davis, vice president of Mutual, Walter F. Martineau, executive vice president of Companion Life, stated:

"I don't know what your thinking is behind this drastic move, but it seems to me that you are jumping the gun and throwing away some $550,000 in premiums, written through the A. C. Corcillo Agency, alone.

"It is my thinking, and, mind you, I am not trying to substitute it for yours, that until the legislature enacts legislation, or the insurance department promulgates a regulation setting the maximum that can be paid for a 'service fee,' that your company continue on these risks, provided, of course, that they are profitable, or can be made profitable.

"It is entirely possible that the insurance department's thinking may resolve itself into a 'no service fee' agreement, and if such is the case, all companies will have to do the work it is now delegating and, of course, all brokers and agents will have to abide by that regulation or legislation.

"Why give your competitor a chance to get on a risk now, with the possibility that you will be unable to dislodge him later.

"There is going to be legislation or regulation, make no mistake about that. However, the thinking of the department's position has not as yet been solidified.

"What 'service fee' you are paying and how it is being paid is not illegal. Up until now there is nothing in the law to regulate it and, naturally, there can be no violation of a nonexisting law or regulation." [32]

The change to a level 4-percent service fee was made effective April 1, 1954, despite the representations of Mr. Martineau. Mr. Corcillo, the agent of record, has not switched the business to another carrier. However, Mr. Randall, of Mutual, testified that his company is still paying Corcillo service fees on the incremental scale in one case.

When Mr. Martineau appeared at our public hearings, the above letter was not in the subcommittee's possession, and he was unable to recall ever having written such a letter. However, it was later produced from Mutual's files and is incorporated as exhibit 98 [33] in the subcommittee's hearings. By letter of January 18, 1956, Mr. Martineau explained that his previous letter "was simply a suggestion on my part to Mutual Benefit that they not reduce their administration or service fee to the extent that it would be economically unsound for an administrator to agree to do the work."

The subcommittee feels that some of the thoughts expressed in this letter not only supply an insight into the policy followed by Mutual, and its affiliate, Companion Life, with respect to commissions and service fees but, more importantly, indicate a line of reasoning which it is believed is one of the basic causes of some of the problems and abuses in welfare and pension programs today.

Since Mr. Martineau's letter indicated that he was obviously of the opinion that the proposed cut in the service fee being paid Corcillo by Mutual would result in that company, and possibly Companion, losing the business written by him, perhaps it was necessary to agree to pay such high fees to get the business in the first instance. The question which then comes to mind is whether the fees were being paid for services rendered by the agent or because he could take the business away from, or give it to, whatever company he chose.

The philosophy expressed by Mr. Martineau in his letter—that the payment of service fees is entirely proper because it is not yet illegal—is one with which this subcommitte cannot by any means agree. It is very disquieting that it came from one who is now a high executive of a reputable company and formerly was an official of the New York State Department of Insurance. Such thinking is not only fallacious but reacts usually to the detriment of the beneficiaries for whom these programs were created. It is felt further that this type of thinking has insidiously crept into this field to such an extent that it is now one of the major reasons why it is necessary to make the operation of these programs subject to a law capable of fully protecting the beneficiaries.

(D) *The Anaconda group*

Mutual insures a number of small risks, representing the A. F. of L. craft union members employed by Anaconda Copper Mining Co. In addition, Mutual of Omaha insures four major groups, Anaconda Smeltermen, Butte Engineers, Butte Miners, and East Helena Smeltermen, under a single master policy. In June 1955, approximately 3,600 employees were covered under this program.

The claims ratio on this case has been high. In the policy year ending April 1, 1954, earned premiums were $424,232.45 and incurred claims $524,897.70.

Commissions and fees charged against this risk have been at standard rates. In addition, however, a fee of one-half of 1 percent of premium has been paid to one Paul G. Pinsky of San Francisco under a contract dated April 5, 1955, retroactive to November 1, 1954.

Testimony showed that Mr. Pinsky is an insurance consultant for the Mine, Mill, & Smelter Workers Union and that when this case was renewed in 1954 he was able to effect increased participation in the plan through his contacts with the union. Mr. Randall testified that Pinsky's fee is paid from Mutual's "portion of the retention, on the assumption that he was performing duties that would normally be performed by us, and he is doing it. He travels from San Francisco to Butte, Mont., four times a year." [34]

A letter introduced into the record revealed that Randall, as manager of Mutual's group department, wrote the company's general agent at Great Falls, Mont., on December 6, 1954.

"As you probably know, it was necessary to agree to pay a service fee to Paul Pinsky who is the union insurance representative to help in the control of claims. This is normally a function of the agent or agents of record on the case. In view of the fact that the present agents of record on this case are not performing this particular function, this was necessary. At the present time we are paying a full agent of record commission and the full manager's overwrite as well as all expenses of the group administration in Butte, Mont. In view of the fact that we did not plan on this expense when bidding our retention factor and that it was necessary to allow a fee in order to retain the business for you, we know you will feel an adjustment in the commission presently being paid is in order." [35]

The amount of the fee paid Pinsky and whether he effected additional participation in the plan and the control of claims, as alleged, are of only incidental interest. Testimony showed that the policies in this case are in the name of the union which decides where insurance will be placed. The subcommittee therefore seriously questions the practice of paying a fee to a union consultant, located in San Francisco, to render services in Butte, Mont., when that consultant has some say "on the final determination of the case." Though Randall went on to say "that had nothing whatsoever to do with our paying him one-half of 1 percent," the possibility that Mutual obtained this renewal because of this fee and/or paid it with that objective in mind is certainly not without support on the record. Moreover, the subcommittee believes that Pinsky's receiving compensation from the insurance company while acting as insurance consultant to the union presents a clear case of conflict of interest.

---

[31] Ibid., p. 1216.

[32] Ibid., p. 1215.

[33] Ibid., pp. 1214–1215.

[34] Ibid., p. 1226.

[35] Idem.

The subcommittee's inquiries at both Mutual of Omaha and Companion Life were limited in time and number of cases reviewed. Therefore the situations examined represent only a minor portion of the business of these firms which undoubtedly is on the whole capably administered. But, regardless of how minor the portion of ailments affected, the practices discussed are part and parcel of the ailments currently plaguing group welfare and pension programs to the detriment of the beneficiaries, which should be corrected. It is the subcommittee's earnest hope that this limited inquiry and disclosure will have a salutary effect on the group operations of both companies.

EXHIBIT 7

QUESTIONABLE COMMISSION PRACTICES

The preceding paragraphs have shown how most group writing companies pay agents and brokers. Unfortunately, the decremental scale can be abused. An unscrupulous producer can induce welfare-fund trustees to cancel a policy with one insurance company and switch to another carrier.[38] Once the switch has been completed, the producer receives "first year" commissions a second time—from the new carrier. And, in several cases examined, three or four carriers were on the risk in as many years.

The decremental scale also produces higher commission charges (and lower benefits and dividends) when applied separately to each insurance coverage. One welfare fund examined by the staff provided life insurance, accidental death and dismemberment coverage, weekly wage loss coverage, plus hospital and surgical care benefits for both employees and their dependents. A decremental commission scale was applied separately to all four coverages. Thus, by a four-time application of the scale, a premium of 25,000 can be made to produce first-year commissions of $4,719 (18.9 percent) and renewal commissions of $791 (3.2 percent) instead of $3,500 (14 percent) first-year commissions and $470 (1.9 percent) in renewals which the producer would receive under a packaging arrangement.

Many agents oppose packaged commissions. To them, packaging represents a device to reduce legitimate commission income, particularly when a welfare fund bought life coverage at one time, wage-loss benefits at another time, and, subsequently, hospital and medical coverages. Carrier practice on packaging varies widely. Standard practice for many companies, especially on larger policies, is to "issue all coverages under a single package policy which * * * automatically combines premiums for * * * dividends and commissions." However, this practice is not always "standard" when the policyholder requests a separation of coverages for dividend purposes. Then commissions are paid separately on each policy starting at the beginning of the commission scale. The subcommittee believes that packaging is in the best interest of welfare fund beneficiaries and urges group-writing carriers to extend the practice.

Although abuses are possible under the decremental scale, far greater abuses have occurred when, to get or keep business, insurance companies have abandoned their decremental scales completely and paid high-level flat commissions to favored agents or brokers who control welfare fund business. The committee examined five welfare funds where carriers paid flat commissions of 10 percent or more; three international unions, three agents or brokers, and three insurance carriers were involved. In one case, the agent received over $350,000 in commissions in 4 years.

The number of unscrupulous insurance companies and predatory producers indulging in such practices appears, fortunately, to be small. But small as the number may be, two of the three carriers referred to in the preceding paragraph reported union group premiums during the 1952-53 policy year amounting to $8,400,000. The effect of such commission payments was to reduce the dollars available for benefits and deprive employee-beneficiaries of protection rightfully theirs. Table 6 contrasts the breakdown of the 1952 group insurance premium dollar in one high-commission company with the premium-dollar breakdown for all companies writing union group business.

TABLE 6.—*Distribution of the premium dollar, 79 insurance companies and carrier D, policy year 1952-53*

	79 companies	Carrier D
	Percent	*Percent*
Premiums	100.0	100.0
Claims	79.5	63.4
Dividends	8.0	8.8
Retention	12.5	27.8
(Commissions)	(3.4)	(10.4)
(Fees)	(.9)	(2.5)

All the insurance companies reporting to the subcommittee paid out about 87.5 percent of their premium income in claims or dividends and rate credits to policyholders. Carrier D, on the other hand, returned only 72 percent of premiums in claims and dividends. Nearly 13 percent of this carrier's excessively high retention (the amount kept by the company to pay taxes, home office expense and commissions, and to provide reserves) went for commissions and fees.

---

[38] On two occasions an agent boasted to staff investigators that he could switch carriers "almost at will." During 1953-54 this agent had been a key figure in at least two switches.

EXHIBIT 8

TABLE 18.—*Transactions of carriers with 10 or more policies, or with billed premiums of $100,000 or more, by insurance carriers: Policies issued or renewed in 1952 by 70 carriers*

Code	Carrier name	Number of policies	Billed premiums		Claims incurred	Dividends	Percent of billed premiums—Retentions			Remainder
			Amount	Average			Total	Commissions	Fees	
	All carriers	1,596	$127,475,757	$79,872	79.5	8.0	12.5	3.4	0.9	8.2
	Subtotal	1,518	126,621,056	83,413	79.5	8.0	12.5	3.4	.9	8.2
	Carriers with 10 or more policies or billed premiums of $100,000 or more:									
88	Washington National Insurance Co	37	421,970	14,404	60.5	5.4	34.1	8.7	2.4	23.0
85	United Benefit Life Insurance Co	15	238,993	15,933	87.9	--------	12.1	10.4	.3	1.4
78	State Mutual Life Insurance Co	35	621,216	17,749	74.4	4.5	21.1	9.4	2.1	9.6
29	Continental Casualty Co	135	2,982,024	22,089	63.2	16.5	20.3	4.5	1.1	14.7
28	Farm Bureau Mutual Automobile Insurance Co	9	235,340	26,149	69.4	13.1	17.5	6.1	--------	11.4
25	Eastern Casualty Co	24	658,197	27,425	52.7	2.2	45.1	13.6	5.2	26.3
38	Home Life Insurance Co	7	207,118	29,588	87.6	3.3	9.1	1.9	--------	7.2
34	Great West Life Insurance Co	10	324,722	32,472	81.5	2.9	15.6	6.7	2.2	6.7
43	Liberty Mutual Insurance Co	16	526,462	32,904	79.3	8.1	12.6	--------	--------	12.6
31	General Accident Fire & Assurance Corp., Ltd	3	117,498	39,166	79.5	8.4	12.1	3.4	--------	8.7
12	Benefit Association of Railroad Employees	23	964,608	41,939	78.0	6.6	15.4	4.6	1.9	8.9
45	Lumbermen's Mutual Casualty Co	18	763,917	42,440	95.7	.6	3.7	2.7	--------	1.0
11	Bankers Life Co	32	1,437,447	44,920	82.5	4.8	12.7	2.3	1.6	8.8
18	Columbian National Life Insurance Co	12	544,117	45,343	69.1	6.0	24.9	4.0	1.9	19.6
87	United States Life Insurance Co	48	2,239,666	46,333	69.4	11.3	19.3	4.1	.8	14.4
88	Union Labor Life Insurance Co	164	7,633,440	46,545	78.4	7.3	14.3	4.4	1.1	8.8
04	American Casualty Company of Reading	25	1,214,153	48,566	87.1	2.5	10.5	5.2	.4	4.9
47	Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Co	18	1,114,920	61,940	91.4	4.3	4.2	5.8	--------	1.6
20	Connecticut General Life Insurance Co	78	5,132,621	65,803	77.1	10.5	12.4	4.3	(1)	1.6
21	Continental Assurance Co	63	4,151,319	65,894	76.7	7.7	15.6	3.9	2.5	9.2
44	Lincoln National Life Insurance Co	28	2,033,062	72,609	81.2	6.7	12.1	3.8	.1	8.2
80	Travelers Insurance Co	50	3,793,343	75,869	70.0	15.5	14.5	3.1	.2	14.2
1	Aetna Life Insurance Co	84	6,715,981	79,952	76.3	13.4	10.3	2.5	--------	7.8
65	Paul Revere Life Insurance Co	3	247,091	82,364	73.7	6.2	20.1	2.8	1.7	18.6
63	Pacific Mutual Life Insurance Co	58	4,792,522	82,630	87.0	5.0	8.0	5.3	1.6	1.1
32	General American Life Insurance Co	9	805,867	89,541	70.9	14.5	14.6	3.3	--------	11.3
09	Associated Indemnity Corp	4	360,283	90,070	65.2	15.1	19.7	1.3	--------	18.4

(1) Negligible.

Table 18.—*Transactions of carriers with 10 or more policies, or with billed premiums of $100,000 or more, by insurance carriers: Policies issued or renewed in 1952 by 70 carriers*—Continued

Code	Carrier name	Number of policies	Billed premiums		Claims incurred	Dividends	Percent of billed premiums—Retentions			Remainder
			Amount	Average			Total	Commissions	Fees	
	Carriers with 10 or more policies or billed premiums of $100,000 or more—Continued									
69	Provident Life & Accident Insurance Co.	46	4,687,840	101,910	89.2	3.1	7.7	1.5	.1	6.1
56	New York Life Insurance Co.	24	2,506,528	104,438	78.2	11.5	10.3	3.4	------	6.9
8	American Progressive Health Insurance Co. of New York	1	112,209	112,209	84.6	7.0	8.4	15.0	------	−6.6
89	West Coast Life Insurance Co.	5	578,407	115,681	60.6	24.5	14.9	1.0	1.3	12.6
30	Founders' Insurance Co.	2	241,960	120,980	74.6	8.6	16.8	4.0	------	12.8
61	Occidental Life Insurance Co. of California	175	21,294,189	125,281	82.2	4.3	13.5	3.1	1.6	8.8
27	Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States	47	5,999,121	127,641	83.3	6.1	10.6	2.3	------	8.3
70	Prudential Insurance Co. of America	64	9,150,338	142,974	78.4	11.8	9.8	2.1	.2	7.5
75	Security Mutual Life Insurance Co.	29	4,181,148	144,178	63.4	8.8	27.8	10.4	2.5	14.9
61	Mutual Benefit Health & Accident Association	19	2,929,751	154,197	88.3	.3	11.4	2.5	6.6	2.3
41	John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Co.	52	8,412,824	161,785	83.9	7.6	8.5	1.9	.2	6.4
81	Union Casualty & Life Insurance Co.	26	4,223,315	162,436	84.9	.9	14.2	6.1	.4	7.7
15	California Western States Life Insurance Co.	8	1,671,094	208,886	86.9	9.6	3.5	1.1	.1	2.3
49	Metropolitan Life Insurance Co.	4	1,308,121	327,031	78.5	9.8	11.7	1.6	------	10.1
86	United Pacific Insurance Co.	1	547,522	547,522	81.5	------	18.5	3.0	------	15.5
3	Amalgamated Life Insurance Co.	7	8,498,782	1,214,111	79.2	14.7	6.1	------	------	6.1
	All other carriers	78	854,701	10,958	79.2	6.0	14.8	7.5	.3	7.9

Exhibit 9

The General Motors Welfare Program

While a number of unilaterally administered level-of-benefits plans were studied, time permitted a detailed examination of only one, namely, that of the General Motors Corp. Since this plan is set forth in detail in section VI, A of this report, only the handling of reserves and the lack of disclosure of the details of the financial operation will be dealt with here.

Estimates made by the subcommittee staff based on data supplied by General Motors indicate that prior to 1950, the General Motors hourly rate employees paid 43 percent of the cost of the GM-Metropolitan Life group insurance plan, the salaried employees paid 35 percent and the corporation paid 22 percent. Application of a 42.7 percent factor (the proportion of total net cost represented by hourly rate contributions) to the $8.7 million in extended life insurance and rate reduction reserves in effect on August 31, 1950, produces an amount of $3,665,000. However, in 1950, when the hourly rate employees went under a collectively bargained plan, these as well as other reserves accumulated under the General Motors policy for salaried and hourly rate employees were left with the salaried group.

General Motors justifies this action on the basis that, since the employees were paying a specified amount toward benefits and the corporation was paying the balance of the cost, any reserves accumulated came from General Motors' share and should be treated as General Motors funds. However, General Motors deducted from taxable income the entire cost of its share of the program as part of its employees' compensation under section 162(a)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code.

It was testified at the subcommittee's hearings that, by amendment to the General Motors-Metropolitan policy, reserves left with the salaried group could be used by the hourly group if needed. The facts reveal, however, that there was never any need for such use. Significantly, in 1952, a cash dividend in excess of $3 million was paid to the corporation on the salaried portion of the risk, over $2 million of which came from reductions in the old age extended insurance and rate reduction reserves which had become disproportionately large for the salaried group as a result of the hourly reserves being left with that group.

In 1950, new reserves were started for the hourly rate group and by December 1954 $10 million in old age extended insurance and $5 million in rate reduction reserves had been accumulated. Between 1950 and 1954, the division of total costs, percentagewise, for this plan, including reserves, was as follows:

	Percent
Hourly:	
General Motors' share	43.1
Employees' share	56.9
Salaried:	
General Motors' share	23.0
Employees' share	77.0

As of December 1954, the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. held $33 million in reserves which had been accumulated from premiums jointly contributed by both employees and management. A large part of these reserves would be released by the Metropolitan and returned to General Motors if the policy provisions included for the additional protection of the older employees or other arrangements were to be canceled. The employees have no right to these reserves. These facts were unknown to the employees of General Motors until they came out at the subcommittee's public hearing on November 29, 1955.

Under present law and court decisions the subcommittee concludes that General Motors' contributions to this program are in the nature of compensation to its employees and therefore their interest in these funds (both their direct contributions and those of the corporation) dictates their right to know what the insurance costs are, how the policy is managed and what reserves are behind the policy. The subcommittee believes that General Motors' withholding of the details on the financing of the insurance plan from its employees is a serious defect in an otherwise good program.

Exhibit 10

Case Studies

Summary comments on 26 of the 29 plans examined are set out below:

WELL-MANAGED PLANS

Welfare plan No. 1: This plan exemplifies the way in which a trusteed welfare fund may be operated in the best interests of the beneficiaries by careful and intelligent planning and administration. Its salient features include:

1. Coverage of both members and their dependents with a wide range of benefits.

2. Active and intelligent participation in planning and operation by both employer and union trustees.

3. Selection of a qualified firm of insurance consultants to draft bid specifications for insurance coverage and to analyze for the trustees the bids submitted by a number of insurance companies.

4. Independent audit by certified public accountants, including field examination of employer payroll and contribution accounts.

5. Reasonable administrative expenses (7 percent of contributions during the first year of operation).

The trustees have been conservative—probably overconservative—in providing benefits. Benefit payments did not commence until the trust fund had assets of over $600,000.

Welfare plan No. 2: This large regional fund appears to be honestly and efficiently run. About 5,000 employers contribute at the rate of $0.075 per hour. During the year contributions are made for about 40,000 employees.

1. The insurance carriers were selected through competitive bidding.

2. The trustees have been cautious—even conservative—about liberalizing eligibility rules and benefits.

3. The trustees have not stinted in securing reputable legal and insurance counsel. They hired a professional administrator to handle the day-by-day operations of the fund.

4. The trustees have made vigorous efforts to keep employers, local unions, and employees informed of fund operations. Annual financial statements are mailed to each contributing employer. Local unions receive monthly a report on benefits paid to their members. An annual report goes to each member-beneficiary.

5. This fund began paying benefits from the date it was created, before any employer contributions had been received. This was unwise; during the first months of operation the trustees were forced to borrow to meet operating expenses.

Welfare plan No. 3: Set up in 1950, this fund involves approximately 600 employees. Employers contribute at the rate of $2 per week per employee. It appears to be well operated.

1. This is a "dry" fund—one in which all employer contribution are paid out in insurance premiums.

2. Due to adverse claims experience, it was necessary to pool the insurance policy with

policies involving other members of the local. The pooling arrangement will, it is expected, iron out severe claims fluctuation and reduce overall insurance company retention charges.

3. Controls over eligibility and employer contributions are well handled.

Welfare plan No. 4: A criticism that reasonably may be made of this plan's operation is ultraconservatism governing investments. On the whole the plan appears to be managed in an efficient and proper manner.

1. In 1950 it was originally planned to use contributions from employers to construct a medical center to service the health and medical care needs of some 5,000 employees.

2. In 1955 employer contributions were segregated, one-half being applied to purchase Blue Shield hospital service, with the remainder going into a fund for the construction of the medical center.

3. As of August 31, 1954, fund reserves amounted to over $1 million. These were on deposit in checking accounts, drawing no interest.

4. Administrative expenses are fairly high (12 percent of contributions), but this figure includes payment to a medical director of $17,500 a year for full-time service in connection with the proposed medical center.

Welfare plan No. 5: This small plan appears to be run for the best interests of the beneficiaries. It was established in 1952.

1. It provides a wide range of benefits, including fairly complete medical care.

2. The trustees meet regularly. All actively participate in fund administration. Minutes are well kept.

3. Surplus funds were fully invested.

4. Although the volume of insurance is small, the trustees secured bids before placing the coverage.

Welfare plan No. 6: This plan appears to be well operated; however, there is a possible conflict-of-interest problem.

1. The attorney for the employer association assists in the administration of the fund and also acts as insurance broker on the case. There is a possible conflict-of-interest element in this situation.

2. The commission scale was applied separately to each of the insured coverages rather than being packaged. Payment of commissions on this basis imposed an added cost burden on the fund.

3. Both union and employer trustees have participated actively in fund operation.

4. Internal controls on eligibility and employer contributions are well handled.

5. Monthly reports are made to members.

Welfare plan No. 7: This local building trades fund was set up in 1950. Employers contribute 10 cents per hour for about 1,400 employees. On December 31, 1953, the fund had assets exceeding $500,000. It appears to be well and honestly administered.

1. The fund maintains an unusually complete set of controls on employer contributions. All contributions are matched against weekly employee-submitted work reports. Each contributing employer furnishes a wage bond of $1,000. The trustees are authorized to examine all employer payroll records.

2. The trustees have faced major problems in securing insurance coverage. Over 25 percent of the union members were over 60 years of age, and about 100 had retired. Of four insurance companies approached, only one was willing to take the risk. During the policy year 1951–52 claims exceeded premiums.

GROSSLY MISMANAGED PLANS

Welfare plan No. 8: The importance of providing and maintaining strict and effective controls over the operation of employee welfare plans to safeguard the funds against waste and dissipation is strikingly emphasized in this case.

1. The plan involves 2 separate funds—a welfare fund and a so-called defense fund—allegedly established to provide benefits for some 500 participating members of a local labor organization.

2. Employers contribute 7½ cents per hour to the welfare fund; the defense fund is financed by a 5-cent-an-hour checkoff from each participating member's hourly wage.

3. Both funds are under the exclusive control of the local union's president, who is accountable to no one. Employers are not represented in the administration of the welfare fund. There are no trust agreements; no schedule of benefits is available, nor is there any evidence of financial audits or reports.

4. Staff investigators have been denied access to the books, records, and accounts of both funds.

5. Separate bank accounts are maintained for each fund. An examination of bank records disclosed that checks drawn on the welfare fund require the signature of the union president only; those drawn on the defense fund require the signatures of both the president and the secretary-treasurer of the union.

6. During a 3-year period (1952–54), $85,000 was transferred from the welfare fund to the defense fund, and $120,000 went to the account of the union.

7. In the period 1949–54 checks in even amounts ranging from $500 to $10,000 and totaling $136,300 were drawn on the defense fund by the president and secretary-treasurer of the union. Many, if not all, were payable to cash.

8. Both funds now are practically exhausted. As of November 30, 1954, the combined balance was just under $17,000.

Welfare plan No. 9: This case illustrates what happens when an employer association deliberately refuses to participate in the planning and administration of a welfare trust fund.

1. The association, at its own request, had nothing to do with the administration of the plan. It agreed to pay for the insurance as a means of avoiding payment of a wage increase.

2. No trust agreement was entered into by the association and the union.

3. No employer trustees were appointed by the association.

4. The association made no effort to analyze insurance costs or to participate in the selection of a carrier.

5. It failed to request any financial reports on fund operations.

6. One of the results was that trust funds were mishandled. A dividend check for $9,000 has never been accounted for. A balance of $17,000, which should have been transferred to another trust fund, likewise remains unaccounted for.

Welfare plan No. 10: The administration of this plan is replete with unsound policies and highly questionable practices.

1. Union officers completely control benefit payments. Employer trustees have no adequate control over fund disbursements.

2. Employer trustees are paid no salaries, but the two union trustees are paid $3,000 per annum each under the plan. In addition, the fund is spending $9,000 per year to purchase annuities for them. One of the union trustees reportedly spends most of his time in Florida and the nature of the services he performs could not be determined.

3. The plan pays the union a rental of $7,500 per year for office space.

4. Fund disbursements may be made by checks with the signature of any two of the four trustees whether union trustees or employer trustees. In practice, the union trustees sign most of the checks.

5. Thirty-one percent of contributions and 61 percent of all benefits paid have been expended on so-called vacations which, in fact, constitute a share-the-work scheme financed by payments from the benefit fund. Members are required to take "vacations" ranging from 3 to 5 weeks during which time the fund pays each vacationer at the rate of $115 a week.

6. A 1953 actuarial analysis of the plan showed that past service pension liability for employed members exceeded $3,750,000. The fund's liability for death benefits exceeded $500,000. At that time, the fund had assets of $650,000.

Welfare plan No. 11: There is no employer participation in the administration of this plan. Local union trustees completely control the plan, in absolute secrecy, and with no accounting either to the beneficiaries or to the contributing employers.

1. The plan was established in 1952 and is financed by the employers.

2. There is no trust agreement, no formal meetings of the trustees are held, and no minutes are maintained.

3. The trustees of the fund include the local union president and two other local officers appointed as trustees by the local president.

4. No report on the financial operations of the fund has ever been made to contributing employers or to employee beneficiaries. Some of the latter have complained that they have been unable to obtain any information concerning the financial operation of the fund.

5. The insurance on the case was placed by the union through a favored broker, who switched the business to another carrier after 2 years of operation. The switch in carriers enabled this broker to again receive a first-year commission of $7,000. The same broker later attempted to switch the business to a third carrier but was prevented from doing so through the intervention of the international union.

Welfare plan No. 12: Employers and employer trustees so completely abdicated their rights and responsibilities that control of the plan was left entirely in the hands of the union trustee, thus making a farce of the principle of joint administration.

1. Under the terms of the collective-bargaining agreement the employers agreed to pay the cost of insurance to cover plan benefits, but the union was given the right to select the carrier.

2. No meetings of the board of trustees have been held since the inception of the plan in 1951.

3. Until 1954 there had never been an audit of the fund, nor were any financial reports published.

4. The employers have the right to name two trustees but when one of those originally nominated resigned, a successor trustee was never appointed.

5. The remaining employer trustee had never seen the trust agreement and admitted approving fund disbursements without question because the sums involved were only "nominal."

6. The requirements of the trust agreement have been largely ignored.

Welfare plan No. 13: This plan is characterized by inefficiency, waste, questionable insurance practices, and one-man control.

1. Employers do not participate in the administration of the plan. It is controlled completely by the union business agent.

2. Welfare contributions are collected from the employers by the union business agent and commingled with union funds.

3. No report has ever been prepared showing welfare receipts and disbursements, nor has an audit ever been made of the financial operation of the welfare plan.

4. The local business agent uses a portion of welfare contributions to purchase group insurance. The remaining funds are used to pay his salary and expenses.

5. The business agent has never met the present insurance broker on the case. Yet during a 6-year period the claims paid by the insurance carrier have averaged only 13 percent of premiums paid. No dividends

have been paid. As a result, the insurance company has retained 87 cents out of each premium dollar paid.

PLANS MARKED BY QUESTIONABLE PRACTICES[27]

Welfare plan No. 14: This plan provides both welfare and pension benefits. The union insisted upon the right to select the insurance carrier which was to underwrite the welfare benefits. Methods used by the trustees in establishing the pension fund circumvented the provisions of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947.

1. The trust agreement specifically provides that in providing welfare benefits "the union shall have the ultimate right to designate the source of such insurance, and the kind and amount of benefits under such insurance." A 6-week strike preceded the establishment of the welfare fund.

2. The pension fund was established in 1951 under an agreement designating employer contributions to the fund as "wages." Each employee covered by the pension fund must provide his employer with a written assignment of the so-called wage increase under which the employer pays the agreed-upon sum over to the union officers acting as pension fund trustees. Each covered employee must also provide these trustees with a power of attorney, in writing, authorizing the trustees to cash and deposit the wage increases to the account of the pension fund.

Welfare plan No. 15: If employer contributions, in this case, had been made to a well-managed, jointly administered trust fund, it should have been possible to provide the same level of benefits at a considerably lower cost or, conversely, to have provided a higher level of benefits at the same cost.

1. The local union bargains for welfare benefits with each employer.

2. One insurance company underwrites all benefits. The business agent accompanied the broker on the latter's selling trips to employers.

3. Insurance company retentions covering 14 cases over a 2-year period average 39 percent of premiums and ranged as high as 91 percent.

Welfare plan No. 16: Because of inefficient plan operation, delinquent employer contributions have reached alarming proportions in this fund.

1. The fund was established in 1952. It is completely financed by employers who have an equal voice with the union in the administration of the fund.

2. As of August 1954, delinquent employer contributions amounted to more than $16,000. Cash on hand amounted to only $3,500; 75 percent of the fund's receivables are more than 2 months delinquent.

3. After 2 years of operation the original insurance carrier was terminated by the trustees upon the advice of the broker. There is every indication that the interest of the broker in additional commissions was the motivating factor for the switch.

Welfare plan No. 17: This plan was established in 1949. Employer contributions are made on behalf of about 1,400 employees at the rate of 17 cents per hour per employee. The plan is fairly well managed.

1. Union and employer trustees meet regularly and have shown an active interest in the plan. Detailed records of trustee meetings are maintained.

2. Administrative costs are not unreasonable, but there is some duplication of administrative services which increases administrative costs.

3. Annual audits of the fund have not been made, and some members of the union have complained that they have been unable to secure full information about the operation of the plan.

4. The plan has reciprocity agreements with the welfare plans of other locals in the area. Under these agreements members of the craft employed outside the area can maintain eligibility for benefits from the instant plan.

5. A pension plan established several years ago was terminated after 18 months of operation because of disagreements concerning coverage, benefits, and plan costs. No pension benefits were ever paid. The younger members of the local voted to receive the employer contributions as a wage increase and that was done following the abandonment of the pension plan.

Welfare plan No. 18: This fund has had a stormy history. Approximately 12,500 employees are covered. The collective bargaining agreement called for contributions of $5.60 per month per employee from a large number of small employers. The fund appears to be honestly but inefficiently administered.

1. This fund had the poorest claims experience of any fund examined by the staff. Over a 3-year period three insurance companies paid out in claims $215,000 more than they received in premiums.

2. The trustees allocated all the fund's income for benefits and administration. Annual claims exceeded premiums and carriers asked for rate increases. As a result, the trustees were forced to shop around for other carriers.

3. Some trustees took little interest in the fund. Until alternate trustees were designated, meetings often lacked a quorum.

4. Employer delinquencies in contributions were common.

5. Eligibility rules were loosely interpreted.

6. The fund was plagued by unreasonable medical charges. High fees for services to beneficiaries were charged by doctors because the patient was covered by the fund. One medical partnership is said to have received fees of over $60,000 in 14 months.

Welfare plan No. 19: This plan is fairly well administered. It is burdened in terms of cost, however, by a questionable approach to the purchase of insurance.

1. The plan provides insurance benefits to employees and dependents in two ways: (a) Employers provide certain welfare benefits through the purchase of group insurance; (b) welfare funds have been established to which employers contribute for the purchase of medical care.

2. Technically the welfare funds are jointly administered but, in practice, all fund administration is handed by the union and the only function of the employer trustees is to countersign checks. The funds have never been audited.

3. Employers with fewer than 25 employees are covered by group insurance policies issued to the local union. This is a desirable practice in this case because the employees of the smaller firms could not otherwise secure coverage. However, it was noted that as soon as an employer acquired as many as 25 employees, a separate policy was issued.

4. The parties at interest are to be strongly criticized for their approach to other group insurance matters.

(a) Nearly all the participating employers purchased their insurance from one favored carrier.

(b) The insurance carrier has paid no dividends.

(c) The decremental commission scale was applied separately to each insurance coverage.

(d) Reports on 1953 experience showed that the company paid out only 27 percent of premiums in benefits. Rigid claims handling by a company representative was responsible for part of this showing.

Welfare plan No. 20: This regional fund involved about 800 employers and 7,500 employees. Most contributions were at the rate of 5 cents per hour. The fund appeared to be honestly run, but management was somewhat lax.

1. During the fiscal year 1953–54 the fund spent about 10 percent of its $700,000 income on administration.

2. Eleven days before the end of the 1953–54 policy year the fund changed insurance brokers. The new broker received retroactive commissions of over $14,000. He was uninformed about the fund's insurance problems and provided little in the way of service.

3. Delinquent employer contributions approximated 4 percent of annual contributions. One firm (in which an employer trustee was an officer) owed over $8,000.

Welfare plan No. 21: Internal union dissension and almost continuous strife with the employers have burdened this fund from its inception.

1. This self-insured plan was established in 1948. It is jointly administered by trustees appointed by the union and the employers.

2. The present fund is a successor to three other welfare funds. The establishment of these various funds grew out of the almost continuous strife within the union and between the union and employers. The situation has burdened the fund with heavy costs in terms of fees to umpires, arbitrators, attorneys, and a succession of administrators.

3. Internal operating controls are adequate but are not being enforced, with the result that a considerable number of employers have not contributed to the welfare fund for long periods of time. There is some evidence that the individuals in charge of the local union have ignored the situation in return for personal considerations.

4. As of mid-1954 the balance in the fund was approximately $1 million. For many months no efforts were made to invest surplus funds. This is being corrected.

5. There is some basis in fact for complaints by employee beneficiaries that they can obtain no information concerning the financial operations of the fund.

Welfare plan No. 22: There is no real joint administration by union and management in this fund. Operating practices have been both inefficient and wasteful.

1. Trustee meetings have been informal and for the principal purpose of allowing the employer trustee to sign checks against the welfare fund account. No minutes of such meetings are maintained.

2. The fund is administered at the union offices. Certain union expenses have been charged to the welfare fund, including rental and insurance costs for three automobiles used by the business agents to collect union dues, as well as welfare contributions.

3. During the first year of operation, of each welfare dollar contributed, only 29 cents was paid out in benefits.

Welfare plan No. 23: The individuals who operate this plan have stated that the beneficiaries are not employed in interstate commerce, and claim that the provisions of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 do not affect its operation.

1. The administration of this fund is completely in the hands of four local union officers appointed by the business agent. There is no trust agreement; trustee meetings are irregular, and no minutes are maintained.

2. Employers finance the fund but have been unable to obtain any information from the trustees concerning its financial operations.

3. The insurance has been switched twice in 3 years, with the result that the fund bore unnecessary but burdensome acquisition costs. The switches served the best interests of the broker but drained the fund of money which could otherwise have been used to purchase benefits.

---

[27] The subcommittee found that these plans were, in the usual case, honestly but improperly or badly managed. Two otherwise well-managed plans were placed in this category because the trustees attempted to circumvent the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947.

Welfare plan No. 24: The administration of this plan suffers because the trust agreement prevents employer participation by specifically limiting the authority of the employer trustee to making eligibility determinations.

1. The plan is administered in the union offices by a union member.

2. A benefit fund committee composed solely of union members approves claims.

3. Benefits are restricted to union members only.

4. The administrative authority of the employer trustee is limited to making determinations that benefit payments are made only to persons on whose behalf contributions to the fund were made.

5. The fund has never been audited and, as in most cases, there has been no compliance with Federal tax requirements.

Welfare plan No. 25: This fund covers about 1,450 employees and their dependents. It was established in 1950. Employer contributions total 11.5 cents per hour.

1. Eligibility requirements were loosely drawn and loosely administered. Since, for most benefits, no minimum work requirement was established, a certification by the union served to establish benefit eligibility. Included among the eligible members were 22 municipal employees (in whose behalf the city made no contributions) and other individuals who had left the trade.

2. Controls to assure the payment of all employer contributions were deficient in practice. In one instance an employer contribution was made directly to a union official who then turned over the money to the fund.

3. For the fiscal year ending in 1954 fund administrative expenses were less than 3 percent of a total income of $250,000. Controls over eligibility and contributions could be tightened by the expenditure of additional funds from the trust.

4. Examination of this fund was complicated by union jurisdictional rivalries, factionalism within the local union, and a switch in insurance carriers.

Welfare plan No. 26: The collective agreements in force provide for a base wage of $3.05 per hour plus $0.325 in benefits. Of this latter amount $0.125 is allocated to a pooled vacation fund, $0.10 goes into a health and welfare fund, $0.075 goes into a pension fund, and $0.025 goes to a joint industry board set up late in 1954. The funds were negotiated by one building trades local. They cover about 1,200 men. The funds appear to be well administered.

1. Insurance was purchased on the basis of competitive bidding.

2. During the fiscal year ending in 1954 administrative expenses for the health and welfare fund approximated 8 percent of an annual income of $222,000.

3. The joint board is composed of members representing the union and the employers. The board administers all the benefit funds. Despite the prescriptions of section 302(c) (5) of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 relating to specified purposes for which employee trust funds may be used, the board uses trust funds to police collective bargaining contracts, deal with grievances, and secure changes in State and local building codes. This avoidance of compliance with the Federal act suggests the need for improving and clarifying the statutory language of section 302 to make clear its applicability to cases of this kind.

4. Section 302(g) of the Labor-Management Relations Act does not authorize pooled vacation funds unless they were in being prior to January 1, 1947. Since the vacation fund was set up effective July 1, 1953, its legality under section 302 is questionable.

Welfare plan No. 27: The subcommittee examined this welfare plan providing benefits for approximately 50,000 workers on a national basis. The results of the subcommittee's examination of this plan will be contained in a separate report to be issued at a later date.

EXHIBIT 11

ANALYSIS OF RETURNS FROM 65 BANKS AS TO PENSION PLANS FOR WHICH THEY ARE CORPORATE TRUSTEE

In hearings before the subcommittee in July 1955, Mr. C. C. Balderston, Vice Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, stated that 65 banks in the country held pension or other trusts, including personal trusts, in aggregate amounts in excess of $100 million each. Thirty-eight of these banks were State bank members of the Federal Reserve System and held pension and other employee benefit funds in 2,800 accounts with aggregate assets of almost $6 billion. Twenty of the banks were national banks acting as trustees for 2,069 pension and employee benefit trusts with assets of $2,040 million. The list of 65 banks cited by Mr. Balderston included 7 State-chartered nonmember banks which were trustees for 400 pension and other employee trust accounts with $216 million in assets.

These 65 banks had a total of 5,269 pension and other employee trust accounts with $8,256 million in assets. All except a very small proportion of these employee trust assets are those of pension plans. The great majority of the assets of all pension and employee benefit trusts administered by banks are in the 65 banks referred to above.

In November 1955, the subcommittee staff addressed a letter to each of these 65 banks requesting essentially the following information:

A. A list of all pension and profit-sharing plans with pension features for which the bank is corporate trustee, this list to show separately (1) employer-administered pension plans; (2) pension plans jointly administered by representatives of the employer or the employer and a union; and (3) profit-sharing plans with pension features.

B. (1) A list of pension plans the trust agreement of which permits the purchase of securities, obligations, leasebacks, or other property of the employing company or its subsidiaries or affiliates; (2) a designation of those plans in which the bank had sole discretion with respect to investments; (3) a designation of those plans the trust fund of which contained any investment in assets, obligations, securities, and so forth, of the employing company, and an itemization of these holdings and the percentage of such holdings to the total assets of the trust.

C. A list of any common or voting stocks, any portion of which is held in a pension trust and wherein the bank holds in a fiduciary or other voting capacity, including holds in personal trusts, an aggregate of such stock amounting to 5 percent or more of the issue outstanding.

D. The requirements, if any, of the bank relating to actuarial soundness of the plans for which it serves as trustee.

Replies were received from 64 banks. All told, the banks were acting as trustees for a total of 5,053 plans, of which 3,515 were pension plans and 1,538 were profit-sharing plans with retirement features. Of the 3,515 pension plans, 3,389 were employer administered and 126 were jointly (employer-union) administered or wholly union administered plans.

Most of the trusts were administered by banks in six States: California (440), Illinois (517), Massachusetts (222), New York (1,681), Ohio (317), and Pennsylvania (610). Banks in other States administered 1,266 plans.

Sixty-four percent of all plans were administered by 19 banks, each of which administered more than 100 pension trusts.

Specific prohibitions in the trust instruments as to investment in employers' assets or obligations were found in 650 funds; 967 trusts specifically permitted such investments; in 324 insured plans, there were no funds to invest; in the remaining 1,574 plans, the trust instrument was silent on this point.

There was a minimum of 914 plans in which the bank had sole discretion as to the investment of the funds. This figure may, however, be an understatement. It appears from the material that there are many cases in which the bank has virtually no investment authority whatsoever, where all investments are decided upon by the employer, or a committee representing him, and in effect the bank merely serves as a custodian of the securities or assets held.

Approximately 6 percent of the total of 3,191 noninsured pension plans (195) held employers' assets or obligations in the trust fund. The distribution of these plans, according to the percentage of the total trust invested in the employers' assets, is as follows:

Percentage of employers' assets to total assets of trust fund:	*Number of pension plans*
0 to 2.9	44
3.0 to 9.9	86
10.0 to 24.9	34
25.0 to 49.9	17
50.0 to 74.9	9
75.0 to 100.0	5

In 65 plans, assets or obligations of the employer amounted to more than 10 percent of the total trust assets. Appendix I lists these plans.

One thousand five hundred and thirty-eight profit-sharing plans with pension features were reported by the banks. Of these the trust agreements in 431 cases specifically permitted investment in the employers' assets or obligations and in 140 cases specifically prohibited such investments. The trust agreements of the remaining 967 plans were silent on this point.

In at least 362 plans of this character the bank had sole discretion as to investment.

Of the 1,538 profit-sharing plans with pension features, 198 plans reported an investment in the assets of obligations of the employer.

The distribution of these 195 profit-sharing funds in accordance with the proportion of the trust assets which were invested in the employers' assets or obligations is as follows:

Percentage of employers' assets to total assets of trust fund:	*Number of pension plans*
0 to 2.9	31
3 to 99	52
10 to 24.9	34
25 to 49.9	38
50 to 74.9	15
75 to 100	25

In 112 of these 195 plans more than 10 percent of the trust fund was invested in the employers' obligations or securities (see appendix 11).

There were two banks which held in a pension or profit-sharing trust a common stock or other security with voting rights which added to other holdings of the issue by the bank represented in excess of 5 percent of the issue in question. All together, these banks held exactly 100 securities of this description. In many cases, the security in question represents the ownership of a particular piece of real estate. In many instances, the corporations involved are quite small. There are nevertheless, a number of instances in which a bank holds a sizable percentage of the common stock of a large corporation and where a question as to possible bank control of the corporation might arise.

The replies of the banks indicated that to all intents and purposes the banks have no responsibilities with respect to the actuarial soundness of the plans for which they are trustees and that they have established no requirements along these lines. A number of banks indicated that they will not accept the trusteeship for a plan unless they know that the plan has an actuary, but there is no indication that they receive or request a copy of the annual evaluation report of the actuary. In general, it is apparent that the banks simply do not concern themselves with this side of the operation of pension plans.

APPENDIX I

PENSION TRUSTS IN WHICH MORE THAN 10 PERCENT OF THE TRUST IS INVESTED IN SECURITIES, LEASEBACKS, OR OTHER OBLIGATIONS OF THE EMPLOYING COMPANY OR AFFILIATES

Employer company and description of securities held	*Percent of trust*
Company A—common stock	26.0
Company B—common stock	25.8
Company C—preferred stock of affiliate	13.9
Company D—3-percent demand note	10.1
Company E—common stock	50.6
Company F—6-point notes	44.9
Company G—common stock; 4-percent notes and capital stock of holding corporation	72.7
Company H—leaseback	18.5
Company I—6-percent promissory notes	79.6
Company J—common stock, cumulative convertible preferred stock	11.1
Company K—capital stock of affiliate	100.0
Company L—4-percent debentures	34.1
Company M—stock of subsidiary	16.5
Company N—4½-percent debentures	62.2
Company O—common and cumulative preferred stock	18.1
Company P—commingled investment fund	39.3
Company Q—cumulative preferred stock	10.2
Company R—common and cumulative preferred stock	14.7
Company S—note	29.0
Company T—promissory note	70.0
Company U—promissory note	42.0
Company V—promissory note	62.0
Company W—common and cumulative preferred stock	12.6
Company X—common stock	14.3
Company Y—cumulative convertible preferred stock	17.0
Company Z—leaseback	15.3
Company AA—common stock and leaseback	18.8
Company BB—preferred stock of affiliate	47.0
Company CC—common stock	52.0
Company DD—real estate lease	78.2
Company EE—first and refunding mortgage bonds	100.0
Company FF—leases on equipment	37.8
Company GG—2-percent promissory note	12.0
Company HH—bonds and preferred stock	11.7
Company II—common stock	20.7
Company JJ—common stock	10.8
Company KK—oil production payment	25.2
Company LL—convertible 4½-percent debentures and preferred stock	14.4
Company MM—common and preferred stock, 3-percent debentures	16.9
Company NN—class A cumulative preferred stock	32.9
Company OO—common and preferred stock	16.2
Company PP—common and preferred stock; equipment leased	64.9
Company QQ—cumulative preferred stock	18.2
Company RR—capital stock and leaseback of affiliate	15.4
Company SS—preferred stock	38.0
Company TT—common stock and real estate leasebacks	66.3
Company UU—common stock of company and affiliate	44.5
Company VV—3-percent promissory note and cumulative preferred stock	20.0
Company VV (salaried employees)—3-percent promissory note, common and cumulative preferred stock	14.0
Company WW—common stock	16.8
Company XX—registered 4½-percent debentures of affiliate	97.1
Company YY—debentures and common stock	54.1
Company ZZ—common stock	13.6
Company A3—common stock	13.3
Company B3—first mortgage real estate notes (4½ percent)	13.2
Company C3—convertible 3½-percent debentures, common and cumulative preferred stock	36.7
Company D3—preferred stock	18.5
Company E3—shares of affiliate	25.5
Company F3—notes receivable and 4½-percent demand notes of affiliate; real estate	18.9
Company G3—common and second cumulative preferred stock, subordinated convertible debentures, leaseback	11.4
Company H3—class A and B common and cumulative preferred stock	28.3
Company I3—common stock	40.1
Company J3—common and cumulative preferred stock	12.4
Company K3—mortgage notes	20.6

APPENDIX II

PROFIT-SHARING PLANS WITH PENSION FEATURES IN WHICH MORE THAN 10 PERCENT OF THE TRUST IS INVESTED IN SECURITIES, LEASEBACKS, OR OTHER OBLIGATIONS OF THE EMPLOYING COMPANY OR AFFILIATES

The majority of profit-sharing plans are not tied to pension plans. The employee generally receives his share of the plan in a lump sum upon leaving the company's employ, or upon retirement at 65, or his estate receives it upon his death.

In listing this material the subcommittee wishes to point out that it may be a characteristic of profit-sharing plans to invest in their own securities or properties. However, it feels that where the plan incorporates pension features the details should be made known to the employees.

Employer company and description of securities held	*Percent of trust*
Company A—loan	18.5
Company B—preferred stock	20.0
Company C—capital stock	45.9
Company D—trust and debenture loan	23.0
Company E—leaseback	46.0
Company F—leaseback	97.0
Company G—shares of affiliate	40.4
Company H—common stock	27.0
Company I—purchase contracts	57.0
Company J—cumulative preferred stock	12.0
Company K—chattel mortgage installment notes	15.0
Company L—trust and debenture loan	44.0
Company M—leaseback and secured loan to affiliate	92.0
Company N—shares of company	17.0
Company O—shares of company	33.3
Company P—preferred shares of affiliate	99.0
Company Q—5¼-percent promissory note	74.6
Company R—6-percent demand notes	46.0
Company S—shares of company	100.0
Company T—5-percent secured note	46.0
Company U—common stock	96.6
Company V—capital stock	50.1
Company W—cumulative preferred stock	26.6
Company X—5-percent note	83.9
Company Y—common stock	40.5
Company Z—shares of company	100.0
Company AA—common and cumulative convertible 2d preferred stock	100.0
Company BB—capital stock	100.0
Company CC—6-percent debentures	25.0
Company DD—common stock	10.1
Company EE—cumulative preferred stock	48.9
Company FF—6-percent promissory note and 6-percent debenture	21.0
Company GG—capital stock, leaseback valued	94.2
Company HH—common and cumulative convertible preferred stock	39.7
Company II—shares of affiliate	27.4
Company JJ—common stock	71.4
Company KK—bond and mortgage	16.5
Company LL—common stock	44.9
Company MM—shares of company	100.0
Company NN—common stock	94.0
Company OO—common stock	29.4
Company PP—common and cumulative preferred stock; leaseback to affiliate	39.9
Company QQ—common stock	29.6
Company RR—common stock	79.1
Company SS—common stock	21.9
Company TT—common stock	98.0
Company UU—real estate leaseback	14.9
Company VV—preferred stock	10.4
Company WW—common stock and real estate leaseback	29.6
Company XX—common stock	15.1
Company YY—common stock	25.9
Company ZZ—preferred stock	24.8
Company A3—6-percent debentures	100.0
Company B3—preferred stock	21.4
Company C3—common and preferred stock	22.5
Company D3—convertible preferred stock; overriding royalty in real estate leases	15.0
Company E3—common stock	11.1
Company F3—common stock	65.7
Company G3—common stock	48.6
Company H3—common stock	71.9
Company I3—common stock	29.6
Company J3—equipment	23.3
Company K3—common stock	92.3
Company L3—3-percent debentures, capital stock, common stock, real estate	70.9
Company M3—common stock	14.4
Company N3—secured and promissory notes	72.0
Company O3—preferred stock	24.6
Company P3—common stock	14.4
Company Q3—common stock	10.0
Company R3—common and preferred stock	37.1
Company S3—common stock	10.0
Company T3—capital stock	68.7
Company U3—shares of company	73.7
Company V3—capital stock	48.1
Company W3—shares of company	49.9
Company X3—common stock	49.9
Company Y3—shares of company	49.8
Company Z3—common stock	49.6
Company A4—shares of company	43.8
Company B4—common stock	28.2
Company C4—4½-percent demand loan, rental lease	95.0
Company D4—mortgage	36.0
Company E4—class A convertible debentures	20.0
Company F4—common stock	50.0
Company G4—shares of affiliate	19.6
Company H4—5-percent convertible debentures	13.0
Company I4—5-percent unsecured bonds	14.1

Employer company and description of securities held—Continued

	Percent of trust
Company J4—shares of company, leasebacks	21.2
Company K4—leasebacks	45.7
Company L4—class B, 5-percent noncumulative participating stock	11.9
Company M4—5-percent note on real estate loan	63.4
Company N4—class B stock	52.1
Company O4—5-percent note; real estate loan	13.4
Company P4—common stock	18.7
Company Q4—4½-percent note secured by 1st mortgage	19.5
Company R4—common stock	10.3
Company S4—4½-percent debentures	97.3
Company T4—cumulative preferred stock	40.9
Company U4—noncumulative preferred stock	49.1
Company V4—5½-percent collateral note	74.4
Company W4—preferred stock (employees' profit-sharing)	40.8
Company X4—cumulative preferred stock	79.6
Company X4—(profit-sharing trust) cumulative preferred stock	99.0
Company Y4—capital stock	100.0
Company Z4—common and preferred stock	46.0
Company A5—2d cumulative preferred stock	84.9
Company B5—class A and B common stock	27.8
Company C5—class B common and cumulative preferred stock; 4-percent debenture trust note	81.3
Company D5—preferred stock; note of subsidiary	70.0
Company E5—common stock	78.7

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I offer an amendment and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 9, at the beginning of line 20, to strike out through the word "Act", in line 24, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 10. The contents of the descriptions and regular annual reports filed with the Secretary pursuant to this Act shall be public information, and the Secretary may publish such information and data.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, there is a point of legislative history which I wish to clear up. It relates particularly to some of the bonding provisions. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an excerpt from the report beginning with the last paragraph on page 9, and ending with the first paragraph on page 10.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Beyond the express floor established for the bond, the Secretary has the authority to establish by general regulation the standards determinative of the dollar range of the bond as well as the form or type to be used. The section expressly contemplates the use of a commercial blanket-type bond, covering all employees handling funds or property of any given plan subject to the act. In this sense the bonding provision follows general commercial practices.

Furthermore, bonding would be required only in those cases in which funds or other property of the plan subject to the act are handled. It is contemplated that the funds or other property to which the section refers are those which are clearly identifiable as funds or property of the plan, as distinguished from the general assets of a union or of an employer.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, for the purpose of establishing the legislative history, I wish to direct some questions to the distinguished Senator from Michigan, who is in charge of the bill. From my reading of the language—and this is what I wish to make certain—it is clear that bonding will be used and will apply only in those areas where the corpus of a fund is affected.

Mr. McNAMARA. That is the intent. The Senator from Colorado is correct.

Mr. ALLOTT. As distinguished from any general obligation of the company toward its employees, whether by contract or otherwise, such as an obligation to pay out of its funds, or general funds, for a week's illness or 2 weeks' illness—something like that. The bonding provisions of the bill would not apply to those unfunded situations.

Mr. McNAMARA. The Senator is absolutely correct. The bonding provisions would not apply.

Mr. ALLOTT. I appreciate the Senator's making that clear, because if any other interpretation is placed upon that language, I believe it could actually affect many hundreds of thousands of employers, and it is not contemplated that that be done.

Mr. McNAMARA. The committee has no objection to the Senator's amendment. We will accept it and ask that it be agreed to at this point.

Mr. ALLOTT. I appreciate that statement. The amendment is a simple one. It is merely designed to define and make clear what will be public information and how it will be disclosed to the public.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment be agreed to. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back. That question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask for the third reading of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. This bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is all remaining time on the bill, on both sides, yielded back?

Mr. McNAMARA. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on both sides is yielded back.

The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (S. 2520) was passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 2470) to provide for the establishment of the Lincoln Boyhood National Memorial in the State of Indiana, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Acting President pro tempore.

AMENDMENT OF ACT ESTABLISHING CODE OF LAW FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 496, House bill 5143, and that it be made the pending business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 5143) to amend section 801 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations which have been reported today from the Committee on the Judiciary.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). The nominations referred to will be stated.

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGES

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Frederick A. Daugherty, of Oklahoma, to be U.S. district judge for the northern, eastern, and western districts of Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of J. Robert Elliott, of Georgia, to be U.S. district judge for the middle district of Georgia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Charles G. Neese, of Tennessee, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Frank Gray, Jr., of Tennessee, to be U.S. district judge for the middle district of Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of L. Richardson Preyer, of North Carolina, to be U.S. district judge for the middle district of North Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

U.S. ATTORNEY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Almeric L. Christian, of the Virgin Islands, to be U.S. attorney for the Virgin Islands for a term of 4 years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

U.S. MARSHAL

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Daniel T. Donovan, of Washington, to be U.S. marshal for the eastern district of Washington for a term of 4 years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of all these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ADMINISTRATION CANYON LANDS, NATIONAL PARK BILL—EMPIRE BUILDING AT UTAH'S EXPENSE

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, on February 1, the Secretary of the Interior, Stewart L. Udall, sent to Congress a report calling for the establishment of a 332,292-acre national park in the canyon lands of southeastern Utah. There are two good things about the report: First, it recognizes that a portion of the spectacular country along the Green and Colorado Rivers fully deserves national park status.

Since it was my privilege to persuade the former Secretary of Interior, Fred A. Seaton, to study, in 1959 and 1960, the park and recreational potential of the area, I am particularly pleased that the new administration has given the area similar recognition. Those studies were the basis for my bill, S. 1239, introduced on March 7, 1961, to create a 72,000-acre Needles National Recreation Area, to be administered on a multiple-use basis. This bill was followed by another, S. 2616, which I introduced, to create a national park complex containing the unique scenic portions of the Grand View, Needles, and Upheaval Dome areas, all in the canyon lands country.

NEW BILL PLANNED

At the present time, I am working closely with Gov. George D. Clyde and a special committee which he has appointed to prepare a revision of my bill, S. 2616, which I shall introduce. It will probably add a portion of the Land of Standing Rocks and will expand the Needles acreage. Other changes also may be made. The bill probably will be ready before congressional hearings are held.

ACCESS ROAD BATTLE WON

The second good aspect of the report is its reversal of the earlier position of the Department of Interior by including a section calling for access roads to the park. This is a rejection of the view stoutly maintained by my three congressional colleagues from Utah, who did not include access roads in their canyon lands bills. Thus, the Department has now refused to go along with a wilderness concept for the area. This represents a successful climax to my long campaign for access roads as the key to full development of the canyon lands country. The opposition was stiff, but that makes the victory more sweet.

UDALL PROPOSALS IGNORE THE WELFARE OF THE PEOPLE OF UTAH

Unfortunately, the good aspects of the Udall report are so far outweighed by the bad that the people of Utah and the Nation would suffer irreparable damage if the Department bill were to be passed by Congress. I have repeatedly called Secretary Udall's attention to the immense economic potential of the area he now wants to lock up forever. Probably as a result of my efforts and those of Governor Clyde, Secretary Udall announced ceremoniously and with great fanfare, on August 4, 1961, the award to the University of Utah of a contract for a special economic study.

Against this background of purported concern displayed by the Department, it was with shock and surprise that I learned today that Secretary Udall had not reviewed the university's initial study, before sending his report to Congress. In a telegram of February 1, in which he refused to give Governor Clyde a copy of the university's initial economic study, Secretary Udall said that he did not feel at liberty to divulge its contents "until the National Park Service and I have reviewed it. I do not know when this review will be completed." Yet the report has been in Mr. Udall's hands since January 2, 1962.

UNNECESSARILY LARGE EMPIRE

Secretary Udall wants to grab far more land than is needed to develop and protect the unique scenic features of the canyon lands area. Perhaps we in Utah should be happy that he asked for only 332,000 acres, since he first wanted 1 million acres. Of course, this may be just his first big bite, for his stated goal is the addition of 6 million acres to the national park system in the Southwest. The Secretary has said that his further goal is to take into the national park system more land than did his hero, Harold Ickes. This acreage target is at least 20 million acres. Strangely enough, I have yet to see any proposals to lock up huge chunks of his native State, Arizona.

When compared to the staggering amount of land Secretary Udall wants to add to his empire, 332,000 acres may not seem to be very much. However, there are already two national parks, eight national monuments, and one national historic site in the State of Utah. When the acreages in all 11 of these areas are added together, the total is less by almost 14,000 acres than Mr. Udall's single canyon lands gargantuan park. In addition, there are two major national recreation areas in Utah, but these are under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management.

A BETTER PARK PLAN

Governor Clyde and the Utah State Park and Recreation Commission concluded after intensive study that the truly unique scenic wonders, which are small in area and are widely separated, can be developed and protected by making them parts of a national park with appropriate buffer zones and connecting roads. The less scenic areas, which are inferior to or duplicate those set aside, would then be available for commercial development, and would not forever be embalmed in a single-use national park. That is the approach taken in my bill.

NO MULTIPLE USE

The size of the proposed park is of particular importance, because the vast tract Secretary Udall wants to lock up forever is one of the most mineral rich in the United States.

Dr. W. P. Hewitt, director of Utah's geological survey, and professor of economic geology at the University of Utah, said just last week that the proposed 332,000-acre Canyon Lands National Park "includes potentially the most valuable mineral lands in the State." He called attention to the fact that the State's richest oil and uranium producing areas border on the proposed park, and that the northeast quarter is underlaid with potassium, magnesium, and related deposits of immense potential value. He described the area as extremely promising for valuable oil and uranium production. I ask unanimous consent that the newspaper account of Dr. Hewitt's comments appear in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

UDALL'S OWN BUREAU CITES MINERAL RICHES

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the Secretary's own Bureau of Land Management expert stated:

> The area proposed in the bill * * * contains valuable minerals. The proposed park area of southeastern Utah, within the Paradox Basin, contains valuable deposits of oil and gas, potash, salt, and uranium. Much of the area is covered by oil and gas lease applications, potash permits and mining claims. Interest is greatest in oil and potash, and exploration activities are proceeding at a rapid pace. Uranium exploration, once very active, is nearly idle.
>
> Oil exploration is greatest in the northern and northeastern parts. Of a total of 33 wells in the area, two wells are commercial oil producers located in the Big Flat unit. Oil potential is considered good throughout the whole Paradox Basin.
>
> A large potash mining facility, only 3 miles northeast of the area involved, is now under construction. Valuable potash reserves underlie much of the northeastern and eastern part of the proposed area. The potash deposits are associated with large and potentially valuable salt deposits. These salt deposits have no present use value, but represent a great reserve.
>
> Uranium is present along the eastern edge as limited deposits in the Chinle formation. Except for three relatively large mines on the proposed park boundary, none of these deposits are being mined today.

I ask unanimous consent that this entire report, which is dated September 14, 1961, and is in the form of a memorandum from the Director of the Bureau of Land Management to the Legislative Counsel, Office of the Solicitor, be included in the RECORD at the end of my speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, it is clear from the Bureau of Land Management report that the area has immense mineral potential. Apparently Secretary Udall either refused to review this report, too, or else ignored it completely.

Section 4 of the proposed Department bill does pretend to deal with this problem, but it is virtually meaningless. The section provides that any valid rights under the mining laws or mineral leasing laws existing before this act takes effect shall be recognized. It is unlikely that any very substantial activity under the mining or mineral leasing laws will take place in the near future in that great canyon lands area, now largely inaccessible. The Secretary would probably turn down any lease applications, which he may do at his discretion, under the law. Obviously, the Secretary and his congressional allies hope to rush through this year, the park bill, which would effectively preclude any real development under section 4. The great potash deposits, as well as the oil and gas and uranium potential, would be utterly wasted. Yet, within the last month, a new commercial potash find was made by the Superior Oil Co. in Lisbon Valley near the proposed park.

It is particularly significant that a staff study, dated January 10, 1962, entitled "National Fuels and Energy Study," prepared for the Senate Interior Committee, contains between pages 40 and 41 a map showing that the entire area covered by the proposed park is favorable to oil and gas development. It is specifically designated as "an area in which most future oil and gas discoveries will be made."

WHAT IF PARK GRAB MADE 10 YEARS AGO?

If the Udall park grab had been made just 10 years ago, in keeping with the grandiose dreams of empire of his idol, Harold Ickes, it would have been even more disastrous than the present effort. It would have locked up vast additional acreage fanning out in a broad band along both the Colorado and Green Rivers clear up to the city of Green River, and south beyond the Arizona border. If this had been done, the key dam in the Colorado River storage project, Glen Canyon, would have been rejected, just as was Echo Park. The whole project would probably have been defeated, including the central Utah and Emery County projects, which are largely dependent on power revenues from the Glen Canyon Dam, and there would be no rich oil and gas industry in the area, which has made San Juan County wealthy; there would be no uranium industry; there would be no $30 million potash plant at Cane Creek. In short, there would be nothing but economic stagnation.

I refer to these developments for two reasons: First, to show the immense potential wealth of the area; and, second, to prevent a hasty, impetuous action to lock up the area, a step that the people of Utah and the Nation would regret for centuries. Neither partisanship, empire building, nor misguided idealism can justify such a calamity.

UDALL PROMISED MULTIPLE USE AND THEN BACKED OUT

Outside of grazing provisions, the bill makes no provision whatever for any meaningful uses, other than gazing at the scenery. This is particularly surprising, since Secretary Udall, during at least two of his four trips to Utah in 1961, said that he fully supported multiple use in the Canyon Lands National Park. To this he added, on several occasions, the statement that we need a new national park concept permitting such uses.

Typical of these statements are the following:

From the Salt Lake Tribune of July 7, 1961:

> Mr. Udall said it was his task to harmonize the interests of grazing, mineral resources and national parks development throughout the Nation. He expressed his belief that his was the national point of view in development of the parks system. Vision, he said, is needed in resources development.
>
> Mr. Udall said: "Many people locally fear that this will not be a rounded program but will exclude such uses as grazing and mineral development. I do not think this is an 'either, or' choice. If we have wise conservation statesmanship we can work with these other uses."

From the Deseret News of July 6, 1961:

> Senator Moss noted Wednesday that the legislation for the proposed national park would undoubtedly provide for a given period of exploration of natural resources in the area.
>
> Secretary Udall emphasized that such exploration would follow sound conservation principles.
>
> Both agreed careful exploration of other possible uses of the area must be made. "We are seeking a program by which there will be maximum assurance that other uses are not precluded," Secretary Udall said.
>
> Of the possibility of an exploratory period, Secretary Udall noted that "we have to make some adjustments which are different than the classic concepts of our national program."

From the Deseret News of August 5, 1961:

> He [Udall] hinted at possible multiple use in the park area, saying such a study "should include the possibility of mineral exploration in the park areas under certain specified conditions."

From the Ogden Standard Examiner of August 6, 1961:

> "My firsthand inspection of this area last month convinced me that a thorough study of the magnificent scenic resources of this rugged canyon country and their economic potential deserved the highest priority," Secretary Udall said. "I also came away from my trip with the impression that a study such as the one contemplated should include the possibility of mineral exploration in the park areas under certain specified conditions."

In addition to these, Assistant Secretary of Interior John Carver and members of the Utah delegation gave similar assurances that multiple uses would be permitted. This was reported on as follows:

From the Ogden Standard Examiner of October 8, 1961:

> All three (Assistant Secretary Carver, Senator FRANK E. MOSS, and Representative DAVID S. KING) * * * told a press conference the multiple-use concept, important to the mineral, grazing and oil industries will be maintained. Exactly what multiple use of the land will be involved will have to be decided when Congress is asked finally to act on a bill creating a national park.

From the Provo Daily-Herald of July 12, 1961:

> He [Representative M. BLAINE PETERSON] said the key to success of the proposed new Utah park would be in approval by the Kennedy administration and the Congress of limited multiple use. The First District Congressman said he had Secretary Udall's personal assurance that mineral development would be allowed in the Utah area.

The people of Utah thought these promises could be relied upon. However, when certain national conservationist leaders confronted Secretary Udall with the statements, he immediately retreated and ran for cover. He explained them away by claiming he really did not mean them.

He explains away one such multiple-use promise as follows:

> "With wise conservation and statesmanship we can have both" was directed at the total southeastern Utah area. I do not favor multiple use, as it is usually interpreted, in the national parks.

This neat dodge deserves the attention of Congress; so I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the National Wildlands News article be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the National Wildlands News, November 1961]

SECRETARY UDALL SAYS HE WANTS NO MULTIPLE USE NATIONAL PARKS

In reply to an editorial "Does Udall Want Multiple Use National Parks?" on page 2 of National Wildlands News for October, Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall wrote the editors, "My statement, 'With wise conservation and statesmanship, we can have both,' was directed at the total southeastern Utah area. I do not favor multiple use, as it is usually interpreted, in the national parks."

Writing further, the Secretary told the editors, "There will be times, of course, when certain nonconforming uses will be permitted to continue, for a period of time, such as has been done with grazing and valid patented mining claims in some of the parks and monuments. But these are unique exceptions to the principles on which our national park system is founded."

The Secretary pointed out that Senator FRANK E. MOSS and Representatives BLAINE M. PETERSON and DAVID S. KING, of Utah, had introduced bills in Congress to establish a Canyon Lands National Park (see National Wildlands News for October, p. 1), and that, to overcome the objection of Gov. George Clyde, of Utah, and others that the proposed area (see map, October, p. 1) is too large, their bills include a minimum of acreage—map on page 3—consistent with preserving the best scenic features of the region.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the people of Utah now realize that they were sold a bill of goods by the Secretary during his vast park expansion huckstering in Utah. They now know that my warnings at the time were correct and valid. Even if Mr. Udall had kept his promises, those of us here in Congress know that it is very difficult to obtain legislative approval for multiple use in national parks and monuments. Thus, an amendment which I offered to the Dinosaur Monument boundary revision bill, in behalf of the cattlemen who would be damaged by it, was deleted on the floor of the House. It was said that the amendment violated the sanctity of the national park system.

SAD EXPERIENCE WITH ECHO PARK DAM

Even when pledges for multiple use are written into legislation or are included in Executive orders, as in the case of the 1938 Dinosaur National Monument order, there is no assurance whatever that these promises will be kept. The people of Utah know this full well after our experience with the proposed Echo Park Dam, which would have been built in Dinosaur. President Roosevelt solemnly declared, in his Executive order setting aside this 209,000-acre area, that water and power development would be permitted within its borders. However, certain park-purist lobbyists, who did not think the United States Government should keep its promises, succeeded in killing the Echo Park Dam, even though it was vitally needed.

I suspect that some of my colleagues in the Utah congressional delegation will argue that some modest amendments can be offered to the Udall bill, so as to permit certain other uses of the resources in the proposed park. However, the history of Echo Park should be a red flag to those who think that amendments to bills will, in fact, offer protection after the bills are passed. Thus far, my colleagues have shown no interest in permitting activity under the Mineral Leasing Act, which of course means that development of oil, gas, potash, and uranium, which hold such great promise in the area, would forever be barred. The people of Utah must beware of flocking up vast tracts of land in the belief that somehow they will be able to develop them later on.

UTAH SCHOOLCHILDREN ARE LOSERS UNDER THE UDALL PROPOSAL

Under the enabling act by which Utah was admitted to the Union in 1896, the State of Utah was given four sections of Federal land in each township, to be transferred when the land was surveyed. These lands and the revenues derived therefrom were earmarked for the Utah school fund. The State lost the right to many of these sections because the land was put to other use before a survey was made. However, the State is now permitted to acquire other Federal lands, in lieu of those lost. It was my privilege to help get a bill through Congress, so that the State would receive mineral lands in exchange for mineral lands which had been lost.

The result of the enabling act and the legislation which I have described is that the State of Utah may now select about 600,000 acres of Federal lands, for the benefit of Utah's schools. Much of this land can be mineral in character. However, Secretary Udall proposes to withdraw one of the few remaining major tracts of mineral land, probably the richest in Utah, thus denying Utah's schools the revenues which would result from commercial development. This is not a minor matter, as may be illustrated by a recent school-land acquisition of a rich tract of potash lands in the middle of the $30 million Cane Creek operations of the Texas Gulf Sulphur Co. This plant is right on the edge of the proposed park, less than 3 miles away. In fact, the potash bed runs under the park.

The State of Utah already owns more than 14,000 acres in the proposed park area. There are another 11,872 acres that the State did not get title to because of withdrawals prior to the cadastral survey. The bill promises that the State can exchange the 14,000 acres for other Federal lands of equal value; but the problem is, Where can they get lands of equal mineral value? It is probably the most valuable mineral land remaining in the State. Moreover, the State is already having difficulty in obtaining desirable mineral lands, and this problem is compounded by the great delay in getting approval of State applications and agreeing on value with the Bureau of Land Management. This problem would be further compounded by the Udall bill.

The Utah State Land Board has pointed out that it would be difficult to determine whether State lands taken had mineral deposits, because of restraints on mineral entry. This would interfere with the State's selection of mineral lands in exchange for mineral lands taken. The combined result, the land board notes, would be "more confusion, more delay, and likely loss to the State in a process of selection already snarled by legal technicalities."

Utah schools stand to lose millions of dollars if the proposed park bill sponsored by my three colleagues and Secretary Udall is passed by Congress.

NO HUNTING

During the past weeks, I have received from Utah sportsmen many letters expressing alarm and concern that Secretary Udall and his Utah congressional allies would lock up 332,000 acres, much of which is choice hunting land. Although my bill for a parks complex in the area provides that hunting would continue, the bills of my Utah colleagues and Secretary Udall in effect post "no hunting" signs all over the area. As the Bureau of Land Management report which I have previously cited notes, mule deer are found in large numbers over the entire area, especially during the winter months. It is already difficult to keep the wildlife in balance with the forage production. For these and other reasons, the Utah State Fish and Game Commission and the Utah Wildlife Federation with its many local area organizations have gone on record against the no hunting provisions of the other bills.

It is obvious to me that carefully controlled big game hunting can be carried out under State law with appropriate regulations formulated by the Department of the Interior.

RECLAMATION AND POWER BARRED IN THE UDALL PARK

I was startled to read in the January 31 report prepared by the Bureau of the Budget that the sponsors of this mammoth park bill did not ask their committees to refer the bills to the Federal Power Commission for comment. Fortunately, the Bureau of the Budget did, and the FPC made reference to the water and power potential of the area. I understand that the committees have now asked for a report from the FPC. This again shows the absence of careful thought and study, and dramatizes the precipitate action of Secretary Udall in sending to Congress a report without the necessary study and documentation. Anticipating this problem, I wrote the Bureau of Reclamation several months ago, and received a reply which set forth several power withdrawals in the area to be embraced in the Udall park. Furthermore, this letter indicated that at least one of the possible projects might prove feasible and needed as the Colorado River storage project progresses. The Bureau refers to the potential Junction Power Dam on the Colorado River immediately below its confluence with the Green River. I ask unanimous consent that this letter appear in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I am sure that I speak for virtually all Utahans in stating my fervent belief that we can set aside, protect, and develop the unique scenic features of the majestic red rock and canyon country in southeastern Utah without, at the same time, selling our birthright of natural resources for a mess of political pottage brewed by the Department of Interior and some Members of Congress. It should be obvious to any fair observer that their proposal is hasty, ill-conceived, and does not adequately consider or deal with the many problems and implications which arise from it.

A typical evidence of the widespread concern about the unwise action proposed by Secretary Udall and my three congressional colleagues is a resolution adopted by the Utah State Association of County Officials, in convention assembled on January 19, 1962. The county officials request Secretary Udall and the Utah congressional delegation to seriously consider the multiple-use concept, with an eye to reduction of the land area. I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION REGARDING CANYON LANDS NATIONAL PARK

Whereas Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall has promised a favorable administration report on the Canyon Lands National Park; and

Whereas the people of Utah are elated at the prospect of deserved recognition of the picturesque beauty and wonders of this portion of our fabulous State, and the economic benefits that should occur; but

Whereas said proposed new Utah national park of approximately 330,000 acres would contain 519 square miles which represents six-tenths of 1 percent of the total area of the Beehive State; and

Whereas the 519 square miles proposed for said park is part of an area rich in mineral, petroleum and range land natural resources of a public land State, and

Whereas, the National Park policy is that of single purpose preservation of natural beauty and phenomena; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Utah State Association of County Officials in convention assembled this 19th day of January 1962, That the Honorable Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall and the Utah congressional delegation be requested to seriously consider the multiple use concept of the area involved with the eye to a reduction in the land area to be encompassed by the proposed Utah National Park or preferably, to consider in its place the creation of a Canyon Lands Recreation Area which would permit multipurpose use.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I intend to do everything I can to persuade Congress that it should pass a sensible bill creating a national park system in southeastern Utah. Unfortunately, the Udall bill does not meet this criterion, and must be drastically amended if Utah's schoolchildren, hunters, and the State's economic future are to be protected.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my statement, a memorandum on the acreages of national parks, monuments, and historical sites in Utah.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Acreages of national parks, monuments, and historic sites in Utah

Arches National Monument:	
Federal	33,689.94
Private	320.00
Total	34,009.94
Bryce Canyon National Park:	
Federal	36,010.38
Total	36,010.38
Capitol Reef National Monument:	
Federal	36,115.65
Private	3,056.98
Total	39,172.63
Cedar Breaks National Monument:	
Federal	6,154.60
Total	6,154.60
Dinosaur National Monument:	
Federal	47,498.58
Private	5,478.73
Total	52,977.31
Golden Spike Historical Site (agreement with railroad):	
Private	7.00
Total	7.00
Hovenweep National Monument:	
Federal	160.00
Total	160.00
Natural Bridges National Monument:	
Federal	2,649.70
Total	2,649.70
Rainbow Bridge National Monument:	
Federal	160.00
Total	160.00
Timpanogos Cave National Monument:	
Federal	250.00
Total	250.00
Zion National Park:	
Federal	132,470.32
Private	14,564.65
Total	147,034.97
Total Federal and non-Federal land	318,586.53
Federal land	295,159.17
Non-Federal land	23,427.36

EXHIBIT 1

CANYON LANDS TERMED "MINERAL RICH"—PROPOSED UTAH PARK AREA SEEN AS GREAT POTENTIAL

(By Clarence S. Barker, Deseret News staff writer)

The proposed 330,000-acre Canyon Lands National Park in southeastern Utah includes potentially the most valuable mineral lands in the State, a geological authority declared Wednesday.

Dr. W. P. Hewitt, professor of economic geology at the University of Utah, and director of the State's geological survey, made this comment to Gov. George D. Clyde's advisory committee on the proposed park.

The State's richest oil and uranium producing areas border on the proposed park area and U.S. Geological Survey reports show that the northeast quarter is underlaid with potassium, magnesium, and related deposits of immense potential value, he said.

Vanadium and copper also are important byproducts of uranium mining operations, and are known to exist in large quantities in the area, he added.

PROMISING AREA

Structures and strata existing in the proposed park area make it extremely promising for valuable oil and uranium production, Dr. Hewitt added.

Asked if he would recommend multiple use of the area to permit mining and other uses of resources if it were designated as a national park, he replied strongly, "Yes."

Dr. Hewitt said he knew of no other area in the State which had greater potential for mineral production.

The professor said he saw no reason why the mineral and oil deposits could not be developed without destroying scenic values.

"I am at a loss to see any conflict in such development," he said.

BOTH ALLOWED

Both uses are allowed in Death Valley National Monument. Mining of borate has been carried on in that area both before and after it was designated as a national monument, the professor said.

(Multiple use is permitted in national monuments, but not national parks.)

Dr. Hewitt said the U.S. Geological Survey has drilling logs and other information concerning mineral values within the proposed park area, which is confidential information not available to the public at present.

EXHIBIT 2

MEMORANDUM, SEPTEMBER 14, 1961

To: Legislative Counsel, Office of the Solicitor.
Attention of Mr. Decker.
Through: Assistant Secretary Carver's Office.
From: Director, Bureau of Land Management.
Subject: S. 2387, H.R. 8573, H.R. 8574.

S. 2387 is a bill to provide for the establishment of the Canyon Lands National Park in the State of Utah. H.R. 8573 and H.R. 8574 are identical bills to S. 2387. The area described in the bill involves lands presently under administration by the Bureau of Land Management and is within the exterior boundaries of grazing districts established pursuant to the provisions of the Taylor Grazing Act, as amended. The proposed area approximates 300,000 acres of Federal land. The area involved in S. 1239 (Needles Recreational Area) is also included in the subject proposal.

We recommend the establishment of the park but we favor boundaries which would embrace all the lands that the National Park Service has called the optimum area.

All of the land within the proposed bills are included in grazing permits and are administered by the Price and Monticello districts, Bureau of Land Management.

The lands west and north of the Green and Colorado Rivers are in the Price district. The terrain is extremely rough consisting of rims, ledges, slick rocks, and narrow deep canyons. It is isolated by rimrock from other grazing areas of the district. This area has only limited grazing value. It can only be grazed in the winter when snow is available for water. The area has not been grazed since 1956–57 because of drought conditions.

The lands in the Monticello district can be broken down into three major areas with regard to their value for grazing. Between the Green and Colorado Rivers, the high plateau bench area is excellent grazing land used by cattle and sheep.

The area between the rivers below the plateau known as the White Rim consists of a beach of varying width and has a limited value for grazing. Access to this area is by an unimproved road and a trail. This area is grazed by two bands of sheep during the winter when snow for water is available.

The area south of the river is broken by numerous rocky canyons and rock outcrops interspersed by small sagebrush, grass parks, and woodland areas. The sagebrush and grass parks, although making up much less than one-half of the total area, are valuable for grazing. Water for livestock is limited and they must travel long distances between the forage and water. Because of this water situation, grazing is during the periods when snow for water is available.

Mule deer, especially during the winter months, are found in large numbers over the entire area. Rough terrain and lack of access preclude adequate hunting to keep the wildlife in balance with the forage production.

The expenditure for range improvements are limited to small earth reservoirs or water catchments, and none of the lands have been reseeded or fenced.

The optimum area would include lands in the Price and Monticello districts. Although the arid climate and shallow soil with rock outcrops limit forage production in this area, the forage produced is highly nutritive and is considered valuable for grazing.

The area is generally accessible for grazing even though the terrain is rough and broken. Grazing permits are in demand and are valued at about $10 per AUM. The Bureau of Land Management, in cooperation with grazing permittees, has constructed a large number of range improvements to secure better distribution of livestock and increase forage production. These improvements consist of reseeding, fencing, roads, and water developments. Expenditures for these improvements amount to about $200,000.

The area proposed in the bill, as well as the optimum area, contains valuable minerals. The proposed park area of southeastern Utah, within the Paradox Basin, contains valuable deposits of oil and gas, potash, salt, and uranium. Much of the area is covered by oil and gas lease applications, potash permits and mining claims. Interest is greatest in oil and potash, and exploration activities are proceeding at a rapid pace. Uranium exploration, once very active, is nearly idle.

Oil exploration is greatest in the northern and northeastern parts. Of a total of 33 wells in the area, two wells are commercial oil producers located in the Big Flat unit. Oil potential is considered good throughout the whole Paradox Basin.

A large potash mining facility, only 3 miles northeast of the area involved, is now under construction. Valuable potash reserves underlie much of the northeastern and eastern part of the proposed area. The potash deposits are associated with large and potentially valuable salt deposits. These salt deposits have no present use value, but represent a great reserve.

Uranium is present along the eastern edge as limited deposits in the Chinle formation. Except for three relatively large mines on the proposed park boundary, none of these deposits are being mined today.

We have no objections to sections 1 through 4 inclusive but recommend that section 1 be revised to include the optimum area.

Section 5 deals with the utilization of the mineral resources and we recommend keeping the lands open to mineral leasing and mining location under safeguards suitable to harmonize as much as possible the mineral utilization and park values. This will, by the nature of mineral utilization, be a phasing-out process. Further, it is recommended that dispositions under the Materials Act also be authorized in order to assure full utilization of the mineral resources where necessary.

In order to provide for complete mineral utilization and development under appropriate law, it is recommended that section 5 be completely revised as follows:

"SEC. 5. Notwithstanding the specific exclusions of national parks from the operation of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 20, 1920 (41 Stat. 437; 30 U.S.C. 181), as amended, and the Materials Act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681; 30 U.S.C. 601), as amended, all mineral deposits, within the exterior boundaries of the Canyon Lands National Park or as it may be hereafter extended, of the classes and kinds subject to location, entry, and patent under the mining laws, subject to leasing under the said Mineral Leasing Act and subject to disposition under the said Materials Act, shall be, exclusive of the land containing them, subject to disposal under such laws, with right of occupation and use of so much of the surface of the land as may be required for all purposes reasonably incident to the mining or removal of the minerals and under such general regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior."

JAMES F. DOYLE,
Assistant Director.

EXHIBIT 3

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION,
Washington, D.C., September 29, 1961.

Hon. WALLACE F. BENNETT,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BENNETT: In our letter of August 30 we responded in part to your request for information on the effect that creation of Canyon Lands National Park, as proposed in H.R. 8573, would have upon the program of the Bureau of Reclamation. We promised additional information following receipt of a report from our Regional Director at Salt Lake City.

The southwestern corner of the proposed Canyon Lands National Park would be situated in the vicinity of the headwaters of Lake Powell above Glen Canyon Dam. The Bureau of Reclamation has no definite plans for any developments within the proposed national parks on either the Colorado River or the Green River. However, the following Reclamation withdrawals for Glen Canyon are within the proposed Canyon Lands National Park:

1. T. 31S., R. 16E., Secs. 12, 13, 14.
2. T. 301/2S., R. 17E., Secs. 21–28 and 33–36.
3. T. 31S., R. 17E., entire township except Secs. 5 and 6.
4. T. 32S., R. 17E., all or parts of Secs. 1–5 and 8–24.
5. T. 30S., R. 18E., Secs. 1–3, 10–15, and 19–36.
6. T. 301/2S., R. 18E., Secs. 19–36.
7. T. 31S., R. 18E., Secs. 3–10 and 15–18.
8. T. 291/2S., R. 19E., Secs. 31–36.
9. T. 30S., R. 19E., Secs. 1–21 and 28–33.

The above descriptions are oriented to the Salt Lake Base and Meridian.

The only possible future reclamation development within the proposed national park is the potential Junction Power Dam on the Colorado River immediately below its confluence with the Green River. This power dam, if constructed, would raise water to a maximum elevation of about 3,960 feet mean sea level, and would back up both the Green and Colorado Rivers beyond the north boundary of the proposed park. However, the reservoir created would be confined to the bottom of the deep and narrow canyon gorges of these two streams. At the present time, construction of the Junction Power Dam does not appear feasible. With increased regulation of streamflows made possible by other features of the Colorado River storage project, however, construction of the Junction development may prove feasible at some time in the future.

If we can be of any further assistance regarding this matter, please advise.

Sincerely yours,

——— ———,
Acting Commissioner.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader whether there is some indication as to the program for tomorrow and the days following.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in reply to the question asked by the distinguished acting minority leader, I wish to state that no further votes will be taken today.

On tomorrow the Senate will meet, for the purpose of conducting routine business; but there will be no votes at that time. The Senate may have under consideration a conference report which I understand will cause no discussion.

From tomorrow, Thursday, the Senate will go over until the following Monday, February 12. During that session there will be no voting in the Senate.

From Monday, February 12, the Senate will go over to Thursday, February 15. At that session there will be no voting.

From Thursday, February 15, the Senate will go over to Monday, February 19. It is the intention of the leadership to bring to the floor of the Senate, for consideration, on February 19, the President's proposal to organize a Department of Urban Affairs.

In summary, there will be no further votes today; and there will be no votes in the Senate on tomorrow, or on Monday, February 12, or on Thursday, February 15.

Mr. HRUSKA. I thank the Senator from Montana.

IRON ORE IMPORTS AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE POLICIES

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, since the end of World War II imports of iron ore into the United States have greatly increased. In 1946 imports amounted to 2,754,000 long tons. In 1959 total imports were in excess of 35,613,000 long tons.

We are faced with some rather vital questions in the area of free international trade. I have long been one who supported liberalization of international trade policies on the ground that free trade, when it is based on truly economic considerations, is good for all the countries that are involved.

With regard to the importation of iron ore, however, there are a number of factors which bear upon the competition which cannot truly be described as economic factors. Concessions in the way of tax considerations have a most important bearing on such competition.

There are also questions of direct subsidy and, in some cases, of indirect subsidies through special Government grants and special loans, part of which are subsidized by the Government.

One of the reasons for the decline in domestic mining in the United States is, I believe, unfair competition from foreign ores, and one of the causes of the unfair advantage is the special tax considerations which are given to U.S. steel companies and mining companies which are doing business in other countries.

I cite particularly a quotation from the report of the Royal Commission on Canada's Economic Prospects, November 1957, at page 388:

> Canadian tax laws which give each new mine a 3-year period of exemption from taxation and in addition provide generous depreciation and depletion allowances, have helped encourage American (and other) investment in the mining industry. The absence of a capital gains tax in Canada has been a factor of great importance. Still another, but one that is less important, is the fact that Canadian corporation income tax rates have been lower than those prevailing in the United States, especially during the Korean war when there was an excess profits tax in the United States. Canadian succession duties have also been a factor and a number of family owned companies have been sold to foreign concerns in order to obtain the funds with which to pay such levies.

I submit that if we are truly going to urge the cause of free trade, we must be concerned, particularly in our relations with our allies, about the policies of those nations that are bearing, or should be bearing, their fair share of the burden of sustaining and furthering international peace. The economic facts and relations between one country and another, particularly when it touches on vital industries, should be of concern to the administration and to Congress as we approach the whole question of dealing with international trade policies in 1962.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. GORE. As the able Senator from Minnesota knows, the junior Senator from Tennessee has long been an advocate of the reciprocal trade program. I have firmly believed that the best interests of the free world would be promoted by the greatest possible equality of the flow of trade and commerce.

I ask the able Senator, in view of the remarks he has just made, if there can be an even flow of trade and commerce when the United States persists in keeping tax policies that give preferential treatment to the profits earned abroad by U.S. corporations?

Mr. McCARTHY. The answer to the Senator would have to be that we cannot have genuine free trade and international exchange under those conditions, any more than we can if we say that foreign competition is genuine economic competition when it is either directly or indirectly subsidized through tax policies, or special interest rates, or through direct grants in aid.

Mr. GORE. Then, as I understand the position of the distinguished and able junior Senator from Minnesota, he feels that, in consideration of international trade, we must also consider the inequity and favoritism of tax policies as they affect that trade.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator is quite correct, particularly since this favoritism and these advantages have become increasingly important and have greater and greater bearing upon the competitive position of foreign-produced goods in the American market or, for that matter, in the world market.

Mr. GORE. I say to the able Senator that it will be my purpose to make a series of three or four addresses within the next few days dealing in considerable detail with this problem which I consider to be growing very rapidly.

Mr. McCARTHY. I look forward to hearing or, if not hearing, reading the statements of the Senator from Tennessee.

I note that at least one major U.S. steel company has finished construction and is about to go into the operation of a large ore-producing and ore-processing plant in Canada. Several others are in the process of building. More recently, another announcement was made of plans to construct another plant in Canada by an American steel company.

So far as I can determine, the principal advantage, or at least the immediate motivation, is the tax advantage given to these companies by the Canadian Government; I refer to the provision that they shall pay no taxes for 3 years and that, following that 3-year period, they be given very quick write-off authority, so that in addition to paying no taxes for 3 years there is the possibility of perhaps paying no taxes for 4, 5, 6, or 7 years after the plants go into operation.

Mr. GORE. As soon as the junior Senator from Tennessee is able to obtain the floor he intends to speak upon a project, the final contract of which is scheduled to be signed tomorrow, which provides a 10-year period of complete tax exemption.

Mr. McCARTHY. I have prepared a bill, which I intend to introduce today. It provides for the imposition of countervailing duties to offset the effects of special tax considerations or other noneconomic advantages which may be given to ore produced in foreign countries and brought into the American market.

A second consideration which I think is of some significance is, and the record shows quite generally that, as steel production has dropped within recent years there has been a very marked decline in the production of domestic ore. However, the importation of foreign ores has continued not only at the same level but, in fact, has even increased in some of the years in which the steel industry was in a state of depression or at least relative recession.

In the years 1951 through 1955 the average production of iron ore in the United States was a little more than 102 million tons. In 1956 it was 97 million tons. In 1957 it was 106 million tons. In 1958 it went down to 67 million tons, and in 1959 it went down to 60 million tons.

With respect to the imports of foreign ore, in 1956 the total imports were 30 million tons. In that year the domestic production was 97 million tons.

In 1957 the domestic ore production was 106 million tons and imports were 33 million tons.

In 1958, when domestic production went down to 67 million tons, the imports of foreign ore were 27 million tons. In other words, with a decline of not quite 40 percent in the production of domestic ore, the imports of foreign ore declined approximately 18 percent.

In the year 1959 domestic production was down to 60 million tons, yet foreign imports went up from 27 million tons in 1958 to over 35 million tons in 1959.

My second bill attempts to establish a ratio which would prevent this development and would more or less require that the steel companies which import iron ore, or use iron ore, maintain a reasonable ratio of domestic ore to ore which is produced in foreign countries and imported into the United States for use in our steel mills and steel producing facilities.

Mr. President, I introduce the two bills, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent that the text of the bills may be printed in the RECORD, in addition to certain tables relating to iron ore.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills and tables will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills, introduced by Mr. McCARTHY, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

S. 2819. A bill to provide for the imposition of countervailing duties upon iron ore in order to offset bounties or grants to foreign producers.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That whenever the United States, or any other country, dependency, colony, province, or other political subdivision of government, person, partnership, association, cartel or corporation shall pay or bestow, directly or indirectly, any tax concession, bounty, grant, subsidy or other benefit, not paid or bestowed upon producers of iron ore in the United States, upon the production or export of iron ore produced in such other country, dependency, colony, province, or other political subdivision of government, then upon the importation of any such iron ore into the United States, whether the same shall be imported directly from the country of production or otherwise, and whether such iron ore is imported in the same condition as when exported from the country of production or has been changed in condition by remanufacture or otherwise, there shall be levied and paid, in all such cases, a duty equal to the net amount of such tax concession, bounty, grant, subsidy or other benefit however the same be paid or bestowed. The Secretary of the Treasury shall from time to time ascertain and determine, or estimate, the net amount of each such tax concession, bounty, grant, subsidy or other benefit, and shall declare the net amount so determined or estimated. The Secretary of the Treasury shall make all regulations he may deem necessary for the identification of such articles and merchandise and for the assessment and collection of such duties.

SEC. 2. The duties imposed pursuant to this Act shall be treated for administrative purposes as duties imposed by section 303 of the Tariff Act of 1930.

S. 2820. A bill to maintain a fair ratio with domestic consumption of iron ore between iron ore produced in the United States and iron ore imported from foreign countries

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That paragraph 1700 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C., sec. 1201, par. 1700) is amended by inserting "(a)" after "1700." and by adding the following subparagraph:

"(b) (1) The total quantity of iron ore, including manganiferous iron ore, provided for in subparagraph (a), entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption during any calendar year, shall not exceed an amount which bears the same ratio to the estimated domestic consumption of iron ore for such year as the amount of imports of iron ore during the calendar year 1954 bore to the domestic consumption of iron ore during such year. The quantity of iron ore entitled to enter under this subparagraph during the unexpired portion of the calendar year 1962 shall be the annual quota quantity less one-twelfth thereof for each full calendar month that has expired in such year.

"(2) For the purposes of this subparagraph the Secretary of the Interior shall estimate the quantity of iron ore necessary to meet consumption requirements in the United States during any calendar year and shall notify the Secretary of the Treasury of such estimate. The notification of the Secretary of the Interior shall be published in the Federal Register."

The tables presented by Mr. McCARTHY are as follows:

Import and consumption of iron ore in the United States

[Thousands of long tons]

	Consumption	Imports	Percentage of imports to consumption
1946	72, 175	2, 754	3. 8
1947	96, 116	4, 896	5. 1
1948	100, 499	6, 092	6. 1
1949	89, 218	7, 391	8. 3
1950	106, 610	8, 281	7. 7
1951	114, 837	10, 145	8. 8

Import and consumption of iron ore in the United States—Continued

[Thousands of long tons]

	Consumption	Imports	Percentage of imports to consumption
1952	100,641	9,761	9.7
1953	122,125	11,074	9.1
1954	94,229	15,792	16.7
1955	125,028	23,472	18.7
1956	125,171	30,411	24.3
1957	129,375	33,651	26.0
1958	91,900	27,544	29.9
1959	93,662	35,613	38.0
1960 [1]	113,000	35,000	30.9

[1] Preliminary.

NOTE.—Information is not available on total drawdown or buildup of ore pile inventories for either domestic or imported ores.

Source: Derived from: U.S. Bureau of Mines, Minerals Yearbook, 1959, "Vol. 1: Iron Ore," by Horace T. Reno and Helen E. Lewis, p. 539; "Iron Ore in 1960—Preliminary," Mineral Market Reports, No. 3166.

Ratio of iron ore imports to United States [1]

[Percent]

Year or period	Production	Consumption
Average, 1937-39	4.6	3.0
Annual:		
1943	.4	.4
1946	3.9	3.7
1947	5.3	5.0
1948	6.0	5.9
1949	8.7	8.1
1950	8.5	7.5
1951	8.7	8.4
1952	10.0	9.3
1953	9.4	8.7
1954	20.2	16.2
1955	22.8	18.4
1956	31.1	24.6
1957	31.7	26.1
1958	40.7	29.5
1959	59.1	37.1
1960	39.0	32.8
January-March 1961	44.3	21.0

[1] Tariff Commission report on "Escape Clause Investigation No. 7-92," with additional data for 1960-61.

TABLE 1.—*Iron ore, including manganiferous iron ore containing not more than 10 percent of metallic manganese: U.S. imports for consumption, total and by principal sources, 1960 and January–November 1961* [1]

Country	1960		January-November 1961	
	Quantity	Foreign value	Quantity	Foreign value
	Thousand long tons	*Thousand dollars*	*Thousand long tons*	*Thousand dollars*
Canada	10,601	104,728	9,356	95,487
Venezuela	14,552	132,820	9,579	90,554
Peru	2,758	26,829	1,101	10,859
Chile	3,942	30,684	2,175	18,325
Brazil	1,461	15,518	757	8,130
Liberia	907	8,034	658	6,167
Sweden	94	1,543	78	1,156
British West Africa	46	315		
Mexico	150	513	113	386
All other	70	637	26	360
Total	34,581	321,621	23,843	231,424

[1] Data are preliminary.

Source: Compiled from official statistics of the U.S. Department of Commerce.

PROPOSED DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, on Monday I placed in the RECORD certain statements made by Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, of New York, relating to the proposal to create a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. I did not undertake to elaborate upon the inconsistency which they reveal. I did suggest that the Governor might want to clarify the motivation behind the inconsistency.

Later in the day, the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] made the following statement with reference to my remarks:

> I hope the Senator from Maine will at the appropriate time see fit to insert in the RECORD a comparison between what the Governor of New York previously approved of, as proposed by the Eisenhower administration, and the reorganization proposal that has come from the White House now under the reorganization plan. I would hazard a guess that there would be a substantial difference between the two, and that one could well be for the first and be against the second.

I am happy to offer a comparison, based upon such information as is available to me, between what Governor Rockefeller previously approved of on July 2, 1957 and August 28, 1961, and the reorganization plan of the President which the Governor criticized last week.

I think it should first be noted, however, that Governor Rockefeller's opposition of last week, according to the New York Times report of his remarks, appeared to be unqualified. I repeat the following:

> States can meet their own problems on urban affairs.
>
> The States should give leadership in this matter. I don't think a Department should be set up in Washington to bypass the States.

If his opposition of last week was based upon a difference between the President's plan and the proposals which the Governor had in mind in 1957 and 1961, he did not indicate it, and did not disclose the difference.

If the Governor intended to convey the idea that he would support the creation of such a Department, if the proposal were to be modified in some respect, he effectively concealed such intention and the modifications which he had in mind.

Consequently, the printed reports which I have seen of the Governor's comments of last week are devoid of information which would be useful in making the comparison requested by the junior Senator from Iowa. The Senator has said he heard the speech. If it contained any qualifications which would suggest that the Governor would still support a proposal to create such a Department, if it were in different form, I am sure he will make them a part of the RECORD.

Let us turn to the Governor's statement of August 28, 1961. I quoted that statement at length on Monday. On the subject of the proposed Department, he said:

> As a matter of better organization in Washington, it would make sense to coordinate scattered functions of the Federal Government related to urban problems.

The Governor did not make reference to any specific plan or bill. S. 1633, which, at that point, had been reported by the Committee on Government Operations, met the only test which the Governor's statement suggested. It would not add a single new function to those now performed by the Federal Government in the fields of housing and urban affairs. It undertakes simply to coordinate scattered functions of the Federal Government related to urban problems. The President's Reorganization Plan No. 1 is based upon S. 1633.

S. 1633 had the support of President Kennedy. That fact did not seem to trouble Governor Rockefeller last August. Last August it was also widely rumored that Mr. Weaver would be the first Secretary of the new Department. As a matter of fact, there was considerable speculation to that effect, in the press. If the Governor was aware of the rumors and speculation, he was not concerned about them last August.

Still seeking information upon which to base a reply to the junior Senator from Iowa, let me turn to the memorandum, dated July 2, 1957, addressed to President Eisenhower and signed by Nelson A. Rockefeller, which I placed in the RECORD on Monday.

This is the longest and most detailed statement on the subject by Mr. Rockefeller which I have seen. However, it is not of much help in connection with the request of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER].

It is quite eloquent in describing urban problems and the need for the proposed new Department. It does not, however, spell out a plan. It refers to pending bills on the subject without endorsing anyone.

Mr. Rockefeller's suggestion seemed more concerned with achieving the objective of creating a new Department than it was with a detailed plan. It does, however, make two suggestions which are worthy of note:

First. That the new Department be created by elevating the Housing and Home Finance Agency to department status. This is what S. 1633 would do. This is what the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1 would do.

Second. That civil defense functions be placed within such a department. This recommendation was clearly not made a condition to the creation of the new Department. As a matter of fact the memorandum conceded that, to include civil defense functions in the new Department could impede future progress in this area by appearing to have the effect of demoting it to bureau status.

Governor Rockefeller's reasons in 1957 for supporting a Cabinet Department of Urban Affairs are remarkably parallel to those of President Kennedy in 1961.

1. MAGNITUDE OF URBAN AFFAIRS PROBLEMS

The Rockefeller report said:

> In recent years the problems of planning, building, and conserving our cities and metropolitan areas have become increasingly acute, and demands have multiplied, in and out of Congress, for the establishment of a new executive department to take the lead in those aspects of urban affairs.

President Kennedy said:

> In a few short decades we have passed from a rural to an urban way of life; in a few short decades more, we shall be a Nation of vastly expanded population, living in expanded urban areas in housing that do not now exist, served by community facilities that do not now exist, moving about by means of systems of urban transportation that do not now exist. * * * The need for such a department has been increasingly recognized in recent years. * * * The time is here to take the next needed step.

2. SIZE OF FEDERAL FUNCTIONS INVOLVED

Governor Rockefeller said:

> Consequently, the Housing and Home Finance Agency has become a serious contender for departmental status. The new obligation authority for the Agency for the current fiscal year exceeds $1 billion. New commitments to insure mortgages and home improvement loans are running at a rate of $5 billion per year, and the total amount of mortgages and loan insurance outstanding is now in excess of $24 billion.

President Kennedy said:

> The various programs with which the new department would be charged involve Federal investments of billions of dollars, and contingent liabilities of billions more.

3. NEED FOR CABINET STATUS

Governor Rockefeller said:

> There is more justification for a new Department than merely the present size of the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the cost of the programs which it administers. Departmental status would carry with it representation in the Cabinet * * *

President Kennedy said:

> Our cities and the people who live in and near them need and deserve an adequate voice in the highest councils of government.

Governor Rockefeller said:

> At present, agriculture, health, education, natural resources development, and other fields of Federal concern have spokesmen in the cabinet and have the prestige of inclusion in an executive department. Such representation and status are now denied to the Agency most directly concerned with conserving and developing our cities and communities, which now include approximately two-thirds of the population of the United States.

Having reviewed the record, which is available to me, as carefully as possible, I am left without any suggestion of the kind of difference which the Senator from Iowa had in mind when he addressed his request to me. I do not know whether there exists the kind of documentation which would support his suggestion.

I am left with the conclusion that Governor Rockefeller gave unequivocal approval to the basic proposal contained in Reorganization Plan No. 1 in 1957 and 1961, and that he withdrew his approval to the same basic proposal last week for reasons which he has not stated and which we can only guess.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUSKIE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not know whether my statement would be any encouragement to the Senator from Maine, but there seems to be a stretchout in the attitude of the action of Mr. Rockefeller in terms of changing his position. In this case, he waited from August until the next February to reverse himself, whereas last fall, when we were considering the question of long-term financing of foreign aid, I think he changed his position within a period of 2 weeks.

Mr. MUSKIE. I agree with the Senator from Minnesota that even on the question of timing and using that as a standard for evaluating his position, we are left without a reliable guide.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I am not here to speak for the Governor of New York. I will let him take care of the question on his own time and in his own forum. He might have changed his position on the question of how to finance the debt of the United Nations after reading my very intelligent suggestion in that field.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW—ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT FROM TOMORROW UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MUSKIE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business tomorrow, it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FREE TRADE FOR A FREE WORLD

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, America and the West are at a crossroads. They must decide how to relate their economies and trading institutions, how to preserve their extraordinary economic strength, how to maintain the strength of their currencies—this in the climate of freedom, under the challenge of a totalitarian society.

If we are to choose as we must, we must have the opinions and judgments of the ablest men among us. We require not only the will to move ahead in cooperation with our European friends, but the kind of analysis that will make that cooperation effective.

Recently Mr. Charles Engelhard, of Newark, N.J., honored me with a copy of his extensive paper on "Free Trade for a Free World." I recognize that the paper is somewhat longer than is ordinarily printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Nevertheless, it is so cogent and so searching an analysis of the alternatives open to the United States and Western Europe that I think it should be given the widest circulation. Therefore I ask that the paper be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the paper was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREE TRADE FOR A FREE WORLD

(By Charles W. Engelhard)

FOREWORD

"Free Trade for a Free World" is an analysis of the consequences to the free world of regionalism and other economic developments since World War II, and an exploration of proposed and existing international economic structures.

The times demand such an examination. In the past 15 years the world economy has undergone radical changes. The rapid growth of regionalism in Europe, the emergence of the new nations, whose future development as members of the free world must be enhanced, and the economic offensive of the Soviet Union command us to study anew our international economic structures.

An analysis of current economic history and an exploration of alternatives for the future cannot be properly made in the abstract. Such studies must relate to our objectives. We seek a world which presents within reach of all men opportunities for economic, intellectual and spiritual growth, growth in all the areas which enable a man to live in dignity and peace with himself and his fellows. The framework of any economic policy must be designed for these objectives or it serves no lasting purpose.

Last summer I asked Dr. Padraic Frucht, an economic consultant, to prepare a report with these purposes in mind. I wish to thank Dr. Frucht for his work as well as the following persons who gave invaluable assistance at various stages in the formation of this report: Prof. Henry B. Arthur, Moffet professor of agriculture and business, Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University; Mr. Sterie T. Beza, formerly of Princeton University, presently at the International Monetary Fund; Mr. William F. Butler, vice president, Chase Manhattan Bank; Mr. G. Griffith Johnson, vice president, Motion Picture Association of America, Inc.; Prof. Edward S. Mason, Lamont University professor, Harvard University; Dr. Alfred C. Neal, president, Committee for Economic Development; Mr. Courtlandt Nicoll, a New York attorney; Prof. Gardner Patterson, director of the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, Princeton University; Mr. Lester G. Shapiro, a New Jersey writer; Mr. David J. Steinberg, an economics consultant; Prof. Philip Taft, professor of economics, Brown University; Mr. William A. Waldron, a Massachusetts attorney.

This report is not be considered, however, as an expression of the individual views of these men or of the various institutions with which several of them are associated.

CHARLES W. ENGELHARD.

PREFACE

"Free Trade for a Free World" is a study of recent foreign economic history and an analysis of proposals for economic growth and unity in the free world. This preface is a brief summary of its contents.

From 1945 to 1958 the United States exercised leadership in rebuilding the economies of Western Europe and Japan, and in expanding trade on a multilateral foundation. The United States supported the creation of international institutions designed to complement these aims and carried a substantial part of the burden of rebuilding and liberalizing the world economy. During this period the United States permitted other countries to discriminate in trade against her while at the same time reducing her own tariff barriers. The unquestioned position of the dollar enabled the United States to occupy itself with foreign economic problems without too much concern for the internal ramifications of foreign economic policy.

The economic positions of the United States and the rest of the world, particularly Western Europe, had shifted by 1958. The imbalance in the U.S. external payments position, which had persisted for several years, now grew and was accentuated by a substantial outflow of gold. At the same time, the movement toward European economic integration, which we had been supporting in various forms since the end of World War II, was given its most meaningful and hopeful form in the European Economic Community (EEC).

The consequence of the external payments imbalance was that the United States began to turn its thoughts inward. Unfortunately, this came at a time when the development of the EEC threatened to reverse the recent advances made toward multilateral free trade.

Britain's application for admission, in 1961, to the EEC less than 2 years after it had formed a rival bloc, demonstrates the enormous attraction of the EEC and the swift pace of current economic events. We can expect that within the next 5 years most of the nations of Western Europe and their dependencies will be members of the EEC, and that the trade liberalizing phase of European economic integration will be largely completed.

We will be beset by two kinds of pressures. In the first place, the lowering of trade restrictions within the EEC will make it more difficult for us to meet the competition of producers in that market. Secondly, the economic difficulties encountered by free world countries not in the Common Market will, to some degree, be laid at our door for solution.

There are three general courses which the United States can take in response to the developing changes in foreign economic patterns—a drive to increase protectionism, a policy of drift, or a drive to free trade for the free nations of the world.

Protectionism will elicit retaliation from foreign countries and mean a lower standard of living and slower rate of domestic economic growth. A policy of moderation or of drift would, in all likelihood, lead toward protectionism in view of the pressures in this direction in the United States today.

The solution suggested by this paper is free trade for the free nations of the world. An approach to free trade on a firm timetable for the elimination of tariffs and quotas will afford the developing nations an opportunity to concentrate their efforts in those areas of their economy to which their national production capacity gives them the greatest efficiency. Their "infant" industries can develop provided the timetable adopted affords them temporary protection.

Of importance to free world unity and the cold war is the interdependence which such a program will develop among the nations of the free world. Protectionism builds self-sufficiency and a host of nations thus isolated will be susceptible to Soviet penetration. But nations with economic links among them can grow along lines of mutual advantage and present a united front in the cold war.

For the U.S. domestic economy, free trade will bring favorable results. Our standard of living and our rate of economic expansion should improve. Consumers will have an even wider variety of products than at present from which to choose. Producers will be alert to match their most technologically advanced foreign competitors, with the expected improvement in efficiency.

The consequences on U.S. unemployment and on those industries which cannot compete in a free trade framework are not as severe as often imagined. They are by no means more serious than those which result from other forces in our free economy, or beyond effective solution through government assistance programs.

The burdens and frustrations, while by no means unimportant, are far outweighed by the prospect of a more prosperous United States and a unified free world.

THE CHALLENGE

The radical changes and swift pace of current developments in the free-world economy pose the most serious challenge American international leadership has faced since World War II.

The challenge springs from two sources: the developing divisiveness among the nations of the free world and the mounting aggressiveness of a Soviet economic and psychological offensive designed to exploit this divisiveness to the utmost.

These developments bring a new and unprecedented urgency to the prosecution of the longstanding U.S. goal of free-world progress. What has appeared desirable in the past has now become essential. U.S. leadership must succeed in developing a burgeoning economy at home and such economic and social benefits in the rest of the free world as will preclude defection to Soviet inducements. The alternative will be a search by the weaker members for economic help wherever they can find it, even at the risk of the political pressures that may follow in its wake. While the Soviets can marshal their forces to strike at the areas of greatest vulnerability, we must minimize such vulnerability across the board—we must see to it that the weakest link in the free-world chain of unity is too strong to succumb to lures of Soviet offers, or to the pressures of internal subversion. It is essential, of course, that the means adopted to generate and maintain free-world unity be designed to strengthen all its economies, including that of the United States.

The purpose of this report is to assess the appropriateness and adequacy of present U.S. foreign economic policies, and to evaluate alternatives for the future in the light of our basic international goals and domestic interests.

I. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENTS 1945–58

General considerations

Since World War II, the course of free-world economic developments and the exercise of U.S. international leadership can be roughly divided into two phases, with 1958 as the benchmark.

In the earlier phase, the dominant international developments were the rebuilding of the war-torn economies of Western Europe and Japan and the rehabilitation and expansion of world trade on a multilateral foundation. The period was marked by U.S. leadership that was imaginative, vigorous, and generally successful.

Even before World War II ended, the United States had played a leading role in laying the groundwork for a sound postwar economy and in the establishment of the International Monetary Fund (OMF) and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (World Bank). The IMF was designed to assure an orderly international payments system by mobilizing international reserves and establishing rules to govern member countries in setting policies used in protecting their payments positions. The World Bank was set up to provide development loans capable of meeting strict financial criteria.

At the same time, the United States took progressive steps to liberalize its commercial policies on a most-favored-nation basis. The United States willingly took less than it gave in many cases as a major contribution to the rebuilding efforts in Europe and Japan. In 1948, with U.S. support, the major trading nations of the free world joined in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), which is dedicated to the reduction of tariffs on a generalized multilateral most-favored-nation basis and the elimination of discriminatory provisions in trade.

The postwar period had scarcely begun when it became apparent that these institutions could not cope with the immediate situation. Only the massive injection of U.S. resources could provide the requisites of economic reconstruction in a Europe torn by grievous economic problems, social strife and political instability.

This lesson was driven home by the subversion of Czechoslovakia and the imminence of Greek and Turkish collapse into the Soviet orbit. Starting with economic and military aid to Greece and Turkey in 1947, the United States went on to develop a massive program of foreign aid (signaled by the Marshall plan) to insure a healthy Europe and Japan.

To enable the recipients to maximize the effectiveness of these contributions of foreign aid and their limited export earnings, the United States did not object to discrimination by these nations against the dollar. It seemed reasonable that countries into which the United States was pouring billions of dollars worth of foodstuffs, raw materials and capital goods for reconstruction should be permitted to control and limit the spending of precious dollars on such things as American movies and other consumer luxuries. As the years passed, however, the exchange controls and quantitative restrictions imposed by Western Europe and Japan became more and more instruments of protection.

The principal concern during these years was with the industrial nations who were in a position to contain the Soviet and Chinese military and political offenses. The generally high prices received in this period by the primary producing nations (largely the less developed countries) made this emphasis tenable.

There is no doubt but that the size and scope of the foreign commitments of the United States, its willingness to liberalize, and the strength and vigor of its international leadership during the pre-1958 period were strongly bolstered by the international strength of the dollar. This made domestic support of foreign policy easier to obtain and gave the United States a commanding position in free world councils.

As the period drew to a close, the achievements of U.S. leadership came into sharp focus. Western Europe and Japan had recovered dramatically and were in the process of moving into new dimensions of domestic economic growth, trade expansion and economic stability. Their payments balances attained soundness and inflation disappeared as a threat. They began to reduce their discrimination against the dollar although at a cautious pace.

While Western Europe was moving so impressively on the economic front, it made little progress in achieving a common military posture toward Iron Curtain pressures. NATO was a promising beginning to a collective defense, but further developments stalled, as was evidenced by the failure of the European Defense Community concept. Resistant to a German military buildup outside common control, but unable to achieve an effective basis for collective defense which would establish such control, Western European attention shifted in the direction of political integration.

But suspicious and jealous of sovereignty, they were unable to make a frontal assault on political union. Economic integration then became a vehicle for eventually evolving the political cooperation essential to effective defense.

Development of EEC

In 1957 a major step toward unity was taken by 6 European countries—France, West Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Belgium, and Luxembourg. The Treaty of Rome which established the European Economic Community (EEC) was signed in March of that year and became effective on January 1, 1958. The formation of this Common Market is a development of major economic and political significance to the United States and the entire free world.

U.S. policy must be sufficiently flexible to cope effectively with the new and dynamic forces that have begun to reshape the economic and political face of the earth. The nature of this new European development, therefore, demands our most careful attention and understanding.

Customs duties on trade among members of the EEC have been reduced by 30 percent to date and a further cut to bring the total reduction to 40 percent (or possibly 50 percent) by December 31, 1961, is under consideration.

All quotas on industrial imports within the EEC are to be eliminated by December 31, 1961. The first move toward the common external tariff (originally the arithmetical average of the tariffs of France, Germany, Italy, and the Benelux Union, since reduced by 20 percent) took effect on December 31, 1960. On that date member countries raised or lowered their customs duties on imports from outsiders by 30 percent of the difference between their individual tariffs and the proposed common external tariff.

While the multiple factors responsible for the ratification of the Rome Treaty cannot be extensively discussed in this paper, several of the fundamental impulses should be noted. The problem of a common posture vis-a-vis the East was a stimulus. The urgency of the desire to bind West Germany to Western Europe grew as the cold war stalemate continued its intractable course

It is evident also that the French, Germans, and Italians had begun to feel too small individually to exert much initiative in a world dominated by the United States, the U.S.S.R., and the British Commonwealth. Together they could hope to mobilize sufficient power to play a major role in world affairs. To these prospects, men of ideals and men motivated by practical considerations were drawn.

But the expected benefits of discrimination implicit in economic integration colored all attitudes and overcame all resistance; in union each member of the EEC saw net economic advantages unique to its own economy.

Integration foreshadows expanded markets and increased specialization in production. It means sharper competition which reduces waste while stimulating technological change and innovation in distribution. Such a development implies a growing cost consciousness within the markets of the union. This means that smaller price differentials affect the direction of purchases, increasing the impact on trade of any given tariff preference in favor of insiders. In addition, for some products, the larger market within the union affords increasing returns to scale which will augment the effect of the external tariff.

Discrimination means trade dislocation for nonmembers, the substitution of higher cost production for lower, and thus is a departure from the international division of labor implicit in a free trade arrangement. More specifically, discrimination means an increase in self-sufficiency for nonmembers. It does not follow, however, that this must necessarily diminish the volume of trade with nonmembers.

It is even possible that integration within EEC may result in an increase in the trade of members with nonmembers through the increase in income of the members.

This discrimination is a direct consequence of economic liberalization within the market in conjunction with a common external tariff. Whereas, prior to economic integration, however high the tariffs of one country might be, with most-favored-nation principles all outsiders compete in markets on an identical tariff basis. Following the first steps to integration of EEC, outsiders face tariffs higher than members in the same market. Thus, only those products of outsiders that are relatively unique or substantially cheaper than those produced within the union would be able to compete effectively in the market.

Increased competition in a number of industries changes the competitive climate for all industries, shaking the economy by the roots, setting in motion new drives for profits, opening doors to new ideas and techniques.

The prospects of expanded markets increase the flow of capital investment for new capacity in all firms which feel capable of competing in sheltered but growing markets. Since new capacity is typically more productive than old, the competitive position of such firms will improve, inducing, if only in self-defense, acquisition by other firms of new productive facilities.

Gains from economic integration, then, consist pretty much of those which flow from an improvement in competition and a more favorable climate for the distribution of investment. There is little doubt that the formation of the Common Market will unleash strong impulses for economic efficiency and growth in Western Europe.

Although it is perhaps premature at this time to evaluate the influence of EEC on the increases in the flow of capital investment and on the extraordinarily high growth rate within the market, the following tables may well be illustrative. Although the first tariff cut (10 percent) occurred as recently as January 1, 1959, the treaty was signed in March 1957, and at the time the broad course of future events could be anticipated.

(See tables 1, 2, 3.)

Significance of EEC to outsiders

It is particularly significant that the economic growth in the Common Market has meant an increase in its trade with the rest of the world at no greater pace than occurred prior to integration, despite the substantial elimination of direct exchange controls which restricted the imports from outsiders. The total imports of EEC countries from all sources including one another have risen rapidly, but the rise has been more rapid from member countries than from outside the EEC.

(See table 4.)

While the development of the Common Market has meant dislocations in product areas of concern to the United States and other nonmembers, some American exports of manufactures to EEC have suffered, particularly in those areas in which price rather than product uniqueness has been important. The most significant adverse effects of the Common Market appear likely in the long run to rest on the developing nations outside the preference system of the market.

It is an unfortunate fact that the development of regional economic integration strikes at the bonds that tie together the free world as a whole while it is cementing the bonds among certain of its members. Through discriminations, both existing and prospective, the Common Market reduces its own members' relative dependence upon trade with outsiders, curtailing access by outsiders to its markets. The dislocations increase over time as discrimination generates investments which would not be viable without the prospect of preference.

Such developments breed new and possibly even more powerful vested interests against liberalization toward the outside world than previously existed. The industries most anxious for protection today are declining and outside the main stream of industrial development. While their voices may be powerful, their interests are often not vital to their nation's prosperity in the long pull. But, where integration results in the building of massive new capital installations whose viability depends on continued discrimination the case is somewhat different. Economic regionalism, therefore, is dangerous for a world in which a general strengthening of economic ties among nations is regarded as vital.

The apparent success of the European Common Market from the point of view of its members undoubtedly offers a powerful lesson to U.S. policymakers interested in generating closer bonds of unity in the free world. These countries searching for a means of creating strong bonds of mutual interest had failed, even in the face of a much feared enemy, to come to terms with each other through ordinary political and diplomatic means. Through economic integration, however, they have managed to lay the foundation of an association that is almost universally considered durable and likely to grow in closeness.

II. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENTS SINCE 1958

U.S. monetary crisis

As the movement toward European integration gathered force in 1958, it became apparent that the economic position of the United States relative to the rest of the world was shifting.

"Dollar shortage," at a peak of intensity in 1957 due to Suez, was transformed into "dollar crisis" in 1958. This focused attention on the deterioration in the deficits in the U.S. balance of payments that had been occurring for several years. The United States has had balance-of-payments troubles ever since. (See table 5.) This development largely reflected the growing economic strength and competitiveness of the Western European nations. They had become strong enough to build up their official gold and dollar reserves. (See table 6.)

This growth in reserves initially had U.S. support because it strengthened the holders against balance of payments difficulties, and thus contributed to an easing of restrictions against imports by those countries. But, as dollar holdings mounted, and the earnings on dollars became less important to those increasingly affluent economies, the temptation grew to take a growing share of additional dollar earnings in the form of gold.

These developments place the United States in a dilemma. It appears that the expansion of world trade requires some, perhaps a roughly proportionate, expansion in international liquid reserves. But with free world trade expanding at roughly 5 percent per year, this would require a manifold increase in gold production for monetary reserves or a drastic appreciation in the value of gold. The first possibility being hopeless, and the second unappealing for many reasons, the United States in effect has been providing a flow of dollars for reserves by running current deficits in its balance of payments.

But as foreign dollar claims piled up, the ratio of these claims to U.S. monetary gold stocks climbed steadily. The reserve backing of the dollar thus became increasingly vulnerable, encouraging repeated attacks on the U.S. gold stock (see table 7).

If the United States should call a halt to deficits, the growth in international reserves might be slowed considerably with adverse consequences for the expansion of free world trade. It has often been suggested that an increase in the trade balance—purchased by domestic deflation or at least a rigorous holding of the line on prices—would solve the dollar problem. This is obvious. What is not obvious is how the adverse effects of a U.S. balance-of-payments surplus, or a reduced deficit, on world trade expansion can be offset. In the absence of such a remedy, we must continue to choose between supporting an expansion of trade and protecting our stock of gold, barring the success of collective solutions such as those proposed by Professor Triffin or Dr. Bernstein which would revise and expand the functions of the International Monetary Fund.

It is possible that we can run deficits without losing gold if we are also willing to inhibit our economic development by resorting to very high domestic interest rates, thus attracting private foreign short-term dollar balances. This is a price that the United Kingdom has been paying for years and which we have begun to pay. It is a heavy price because it then becomes more difficult to sustain an adequate rate of growth at home.

U.S. departure from world trade liberalization

The emergence of U.S. payments problems in 1958 coincided with a decline in U.S. aggressiveness in the campaign for world trade liberalization. The steam went out of the drive; the Reciprocal Trade Act was renewed in 1958, but only with tighter peril point and escape-clause provisions, supplemented by new and potentially significant exceptions for defense essentiality. At the same time, the United States moved substantially away from liberalization by placing import quotas upon several key minerals—lead, zinc, and oil.

While moving sideways on trade policy, the United States in supporting the EEC in effect turned from its traditional multilateralism. By 1960 we find a split developing in Europe as the European Free Trade Association (EFTA) was organized.

To the rest of the world, these developments could hardly have failed to be disturbing. The two unions comprise about half the industrial market of the free world, and both unions hold out discriminatory preferences to raw materials producers associated with them.

Since 1958 U.S. foreign economic policy has lost most of its former vigor and initiative. While the United States has stepped up its aid to the underdeveloped nations, this shift from Western Europe has been accompanied by a corresponding shift from an emphasis on economic aid to military assistance. And, the total value of annual aid expenditures has been falling, although they represent a large multiple of Soviet aid resources.

In the meantime the shift in Soviet tactics toward economic penetration has been picking up momentum with a policy of concentrating aid where it carries the greatest political weight. By allowing the steam to go out of its drive toward multilateralism, the United States has unwittingly aided the Soviets. While they can effectively mobilize for aid—or at least as effectively as we can—they would be at an increasing disadvantage in counteracting the benefits that significant free world trade liberalization would bring.

United Kingdom applies for EEC membership

The force of developments discussed above is dramatically heightened by the prospect of entry by the United Kingdom, with at least Norway and Denmark, into the European Common Market, which is under discussion in the fall of 1961.

The hope of the United Kingdom that EFTA would bring sharp improvements in trade for the member countries was not borne out. (See table 8.)

Furthermore, afflicted with the lowest rate of economic growth of any major industrial nation for a number of years the United Kingdom considered that a massive effort to increase this rate was essential. In addition the United Kingdom's balance of payments position deteriorated rapidly in 1960 and 1961. In 1960 its adverse condition was masked by heavy inflows of short-term capital which brought about a substantial increase in gold and foreign exchange holdings. But Britain's external position continued to deteriorate in 1961, and despite the help received from other European countries which accumulated large pound holdings under the Basle agreement, she eventually turned to the International Monetary Fund for assistance.

It was concluded in the light of these developments that the opportunities were better within the EEC than in the narrow confines of EFTA.

III. EFFECTS OF AN EXPANDED EEC

General considerations

Expansion of the EEC by the addition of the United Kingdom, Denmark and Norway will undoubtedly mean a heightening of discriminatory effects upon outsiders. It will mean that more than half the industrial markets of the free world will be inside the shelter of a common external tariff (the imports of the EEC, the United Kingdom, Denmark, and Norway totaled nearly $46 billion in 1960, while imports of these countries, the United States, Canada, Japan, and Australia aggregated $72 billion in that year.) An EEC expanded by these three countries will confront the United States and other nonmembers with increased discrimination in a major part of the market in which they sell.

Structure of world imports, 1960

[In millions of dollars]

World	119,000
Industrialized nations:	
Western Europe	57,350
United States	16,051
Canada	6,124
Japan	4,491
Total	84,016
European Common Market:	
Benelux	8,488
France	6,281
West Germany	10,107
Italy	4,721
Total	29,597
United Kingdom	12,765
Denmark	1,803
Norway	1,461
Total expanded	45,616

Percentage shares of imports, 1960

Present EEC in world imports	24.9
Present United States in world imports	13.5
Present EEC in imports of industrialized nations	34.7
Present United States in imports of industrialized nations	19.1
Expanded EEC in world imports	38.3
Expanded EEC in imports of industrialized nations	54.3

Source: International Financial Statistics, November 1961, International Monetary Fund.

A major difficulty in analyzing the external effects of EEC expansion is that a number of key aspects of the merger will be decided in the negotiations with the United Kingdom. A major problem confronting the negotiators involves the status of oversea members of the British Commonwealth. It is probable that members whose outputs fall into the category of tropical raw materials will be given preferential status analogous to that of the oversea associates of France.

The cases of India and Pakistan, however, will present serious difficulties in view of their export potentials in cotton textiles. Hong Kong textiles and other light manufactures also will pose serious problems. Canada and Australia with agricultural exports and manufactures that compete directly with Europe will pose further problems.

Another issue of great significance will be the effect of United Kingdom entry upon the level of the EEC common external tariff. It appears that United Kingdom tariffs are generally higher than the average levels of present EEC tariffs. Thus, if British tariffs are permitted to influence the EEC levels, the entry of the United Kingdom into EEC will increase its effective protectionism and the discrimination implicit in an expanded Common Market.

Its entry into EEC means a surrender by the United Kingdom of virtually all its power to execute unilateral initiative in external commercial policies, a weakening of Commonwealth ties, and a possible abandonment of sterling key currency responsibilities. These shifts in Britain's foreign economic role will lessen her ability to protect the economic status of outsiders. They mean still greater burdens upon U.S. leadership at the same time that pressures upon its own trading position and balance of payments are likely to be sharply increased.

On the underdeveloped nations

Expansion of the EEC will affect both the exports of primary products and light manufactures from the underdeveloped nations.

The oversea associates of EEC, principally former French colonies, which are given preferential treatment in its markets can be expected to gain enormously. The United Kingdom may bring with it some of the tropical members of the Commonwealth on an associated basis. Their established exports will be more readily marketable and their prospects will improve as this rapidly expanding market grows.

Over the longer pull, however, the export and growth prospects of oversea affiliates of the EEC will be even more strongly boosted in product areas which do not figure significantly at present in their production or exports.

The affiliated nations in west and central Africa possess the material resource endowments to supply the EEC with many of the raw materials it now imports wholly or partly from other primary producers. These potentialities are already beginning to influence the economic development of the overseas affiliates, and will find accelerating realization through aid from the European member nations and with increasing flows of private investment spurred and attracted by the EEC's market shelter. By the same token, present nonaffiliated EEC raw materials suppliers face the somber prospect of a diminishing share of the market and a possible decline in total exports to EEC.

These potentialities apply mainly to tropical zone products. However, non-EEC producers of temperate zone products face a continuation and heightening of already heavy discrimination in favor of agricultural production in north Africa and Europe.

It has been argued that, since the overseas associates of France and the United Kingdom have been accorded even more preferential treatment in the past than is contemplated by the EEC, the effect of EEC preferences on their trade and development will not be profound. However, these new nations are dominated as never before by internal pressures and demands for economic development.

In addition, this magnified desire for growth is given greater force by the expansion of their preferential markets from those of the "mother" country to the entire EEC market. Thus, internal pressures for rapid exploitation of export potentials create conditions under which EEC preferences can become significant.

While affording its affiliates and associates preferential treatment in its own markets, the EEC also permits these countries to protect their own infant industries from the competition of EEC producers. Presumably a large share of such newly established industries will be in the light manufacturing category, and directly competitive with those of Japan and the newly industrializing areas, such as Hong Kong, Pakistan, and India.

The potentialities of the EEC for moving toward self-sufficiency in raw materials and light manufactures will obviously be raised by its expanded scope. This will redound to the betterment of the underdeveloped affiliates. But it also means that, increasingly, nonmember primary producers and underdeveloped economies will have to find other export outlets. It means, therefore, greater pressure upon non-EEC industrialized nations to import from these countries and implies that these primary producers will be forced into greater economic diversification than otherwise would be justified.

Such diversification means lessened economic specialization and lessened interdependence among the nonmember industrialized and nonindustrialized.

Satisfying the export needs of less developed and newly industrializing nations outside EEC will pose several important problems for U.S. leadership. Liberalization in their behalf by the United States would either give them preferences as against EEC members and associates, violating multilateralism and the GATT directly, creating, in effect, a U.S. centered trading bloc, or else it would require the extension of similar concessions to the EEC group.

On the industrializing economies

While the impact of an expanded EEC upon the underdeveloped outside nations bears primarily upon their trading prospects, its effects upon many of the industrializing economies outside should be felt immediately.

It seems apparent that Canada and Australasia, with exports of both raw and semiprocessed materials, and manufactures which do compete directly with continental European producers, will be excluded from the expanded EEC. This will mean not only a loss of the present preferences in the United Kingdom, but a shift into active discrimination against their products.

Australasia will feel this more keenly than Canada, which has become closely geared to the U.S. market. Both, however, will be strongly affected and will be anxious to develop stronger trading ties with other large traders.

Such an exclusion will pose the problems mentioned in the following paragraph. Of still greater concern to the United States, however, would be an attempt by the United Kingdom to seek an associated status for Canada and Australasia at the expense of restrictions on U.S. exports to the expanded Common Market area.

In this picture, the trading prospects of Japan may be much enhanced. Japan would be capable of absorbing a substantial part of the excess exports of Canada and Australasia, provided, of course, they increased their purchases from Japan. For this reason, the Japanese and the Australians are already giving thought to the potentialities of economic union. Such a move, however, would reduce U.S. exports to these countries without correspondingly reducing its own imports from them. If such a union should develop, and if it should expand to include such nations as India, Pakistan, and other Asian members of the Commonwealth, it would mean the rise of another major and potentially self-sufficient bloc. The consequences of such a development for the U.S. economy, for Latin America, and for the other remaining underdeveloped nations of the free world would be serious.

On the European economy

It is not easy on purely economic grounds to explain the apparent receptivity of the Six to the prospective entry of the United Kingdom. British competition will impose a number of heavy economic adjustments on the Six. In textiles, automobiles, chemicals and machinery, Britain should increase its share of the continental market substantially. British textiles, in particular, should compete very favorably on the Continent and challenge the position of French producers.

British entry into EEC undoubtedly will mean an intensification of competition throughout the Common Market, leading to an increase in capital investment in the Six as well as in Britain, and to an accelerated rate of productivity increase. This factor may partly explain the attitude of the Six, but remains a less than adequate explanation since such benefits would be still further augmented by a move toward full-scale trade liberalization throughout the free world.

The addition of Britain to the Six, however, does give promise of bringing the EEC to an economic size comparable to that of the United States. This would unite a trading area where total imports are almost three times the size of U.S. imports. Although the total gross national product (GNP) of the expanded group ran at only about $260 billion in 1960 in comparison with a U.S. GNP of $504 billion, the much faster economic growth of the EEC countries will speedily eat into the U.S. lead, unless a greater dynamism develops in the U.S. economy. If we, for instance, assume that the expanded EEC can grow, as in the recent past at approximately twice the rate of the United States, both economies will be at the same level in 15 to 20 years.

It is likely that the economic vigor and entrenched EEC leadership position of France and Germany, to be supplemented undoubtedly by conditions laid upon United Kingdom in the merger negotiations, will insure that the United Kingdom will for some time to come play a subordinate policymaking role in the EEC to the Franco-German alliance. Indeed, as Britain turns to meet the challenges of both export opportunity and import pressure, it is likely that she will for a while become preoccupied with these matters at the expense of her traditionally wider concerns. In the course of time, however, British administrative skills and experience, the best available in Western Europe, will increasingly be brought to bear within the EEC.

Entry of the United Kingdom into EEC thus promises to augment sizably the status and influence in the free world of the Franco-German entente. It will also strengthen the bonds of European economic unity by widening the scope and intensifying the degree of economic interdependence. As the scope of the union broadens, geographic economic specialization also tends to increase. This increases the stake of each member economy in continued association.

When the need for unity became evident, the turn was to expanded economic liberalization as the most dependable tie that binds. This lesson must not be lost to American statesmanship and public opinion as we mobilize our own resources of will and imagination for the far greater task of binding together the more numerous and infinitely more heterogeneous aggregate of free world nations into an enduring community.

On sterling liabilities

Although a matter of great consequence at this juncture, little can be said as to the impact of the merger on the international payments system. The pound has been one of the two key currencies—along with the dollar—which have been held in the postwar period as foreign exchange reserves. It is significant, of course, that total sterling liabilities have been held within the level set in 1954. Thus, excepting the additions of newly mined gold in the foreign exchange reserves of the free world, the entire burden of meeting the liquidity needs of an expanding world economy has fallen upon the United States. A move by the United Kingdom to extinguish these foreign obligations would add significantly to U.S. responsibilities in this area.

It is, of course, quite possible that the six might decide to take over in some fashion the key currency role of the United Kingdom by the development of a common reserve currency—such as deposits in a group clearinghouse which would be freely convertible into member currencies. This would call for a general shift by the member nations into a current deficit position against the outside world. An alternative approach would be for West Germany to take over this key role. Certainly this nation is, by its economic circumstances and the disciplines which created them, admirably suited to the task.

There is little basis, however, for predicting a move in the near future by these countries toward a key currency status. To date their policies have been oppositely directed; they have bent their efforts toward building gold and foreign exchange reserves and minimizing their current foreign liabilities.

It is obvious that a major reason for the British move toward the EEC is the desire to break the United Kingdom out of its rut of economic semistagnation. This indicates a British retreat from its key currency status and heavily militates against such an assumption by the Six. These nations are not likely to slow their progress and reduce their mounting economic influence on the rest of the world by donning key currency responsibilities. Thus the United States could be left to carry this burden alone until a satisfactory collective solution to the problems of creating adequate international liquidity could be developed.

On the cold war

It is obvious that the creation of a single market embracing most of Western Europe is too momentous a development not to affect the strategy and conduct of the cold war. It is not, however, easy to assess the repercussions. Such an analysis is beyond the scope of this paper and will not be attempted. But some areas in which repercussions may be expected will be noted, as our foreign economic policymaking must reflect a concern with possible cold war exigencies.

Western European economic integration means that, so far as its members are concerned, Soviet pressure must be exerted on the group rather than on a divide-and-conquer basis. This enormously complicates the Soviet problem of generating effective pressure on these nations since union increases their economic strength while it reduces their fear of Soviet military pressures or political subversion. It may well be, for instance, that the intensification of Soviet belligerency regarding Berlin and the recent Soviet nuclear tests are a reflection of this fact. We can anticipate a succession of Soviet attempts to bring about a neutralization of the EEC in the cold war. In such a context, the strengthening of NATO will be essential.

We can look forward to greater Soviet economic pressures upon the Western European nations outside EEC. Lacking the strength that comes from union and adversely affected by the EEC, some of these nations may become relatively easy marks for Soviet influence. The Soviet invitation to Finland in November 1961, for mutual defense conversations is indicative.

It is illuminating to remember that Marxist thought lays great stress upon capitalist imperialism and analyzes it as an international version of the class struggle. Its classic prediction is that in areas dominated by capitalistic economic organization, the rich get richer and the poor get poorer. But the failure of Marxist subversion to make headway within the industrialized nations of the West reflects the fact that free enterprise operating in a context of free markets yields rising real incomes per capita and steadily reduces income differentials.

The record is not so clear when we turn to the underdeveloped nations. In recent years their growth rates have slowed and their prospects have dimmed. Anticolonialism is a mighty force among the new nations. In this context, any intensification of discrimination against them in major industrial markets presents a danger. It is apparent that free world unity cannot be expected to survive developments in the organization of free world trade in which gains for industrialized nations can be construed as being at the expense of the underdeveloped.

In essence, our problem in seeking to bind the industrialized and nonindustrialized nations of the free world together is to create and to maintain a free world economic structure which will as effectively nullify the Marxist class struggle thesis when applied to all the free world economy as it does within the leading industrial nations. Otherwise, the attractions of the quick totalitarian solution to the problem of getting a takeoff in growth will be reinforced by bitterness against the affluent West.

It would be a strange paradox, if, in seeking to bind the free world and to promote its overall economic progress, we fail to use our greatest cold war asset—the free market. To talk economic freedom to those who doubt its merits and then to act against its dictates is a questionable way to document our case and demonstrate our sincerity.

On the formation of other trading blocs

If we assume that the United States takes no significant steps to conteract these adverse effects, we may see the consolidation of the free world into a group of trading blocs. One may well be developed by former members of the British Commonwealth. Two have recently been organized—the Latin American Free Trade Association and the Central American Common Market. Others have been formally or informally proposed in North Africa, in middle Africa, the Near East, and south Asia. These would disturb the trading positions of the nations left outside—possibly Japan, Hong Kong, Israel, South Africa, Finland. It would stimulate increasing government controls over trade and payments and the subordination of market processes to the dictates of political pressures. It would present the Soviets with an opportunity to play one bloc against another.

Under these circumstances, the problem of maintaining free world unity would be magnified.

On the United States

An expanded EEC will adversely affect the U.S. balance of trade with Western Europe, barring further changes. It will mean greater discrimination against U.S. products in the United Kingdom and continental Six because in each market they will compete less advantageously against the products of the other market than before the merger. On the other hand, sharper competition and its fruits in productivity advances within the larger Common Market will favor increased imports to the United States from the EEC.

To be sure, the rise in real incomes to be expected in the EEC will militate in favor of increased EEC imports—certainly for raw materials, machinery and equipment, and consumer goods. But the increased raw materials imports will be only slightly in favor of U.S. products, many of which are competitive with continental products. In the two latter categories in which the United States has been in the lead, as natural barriers fall and those against us remain comparatively constant, we can expect a rapid increase in European competition.

Augmenting these forces is the present expansion of European capacity in these categories. The extraordinary growth in European real incomes and the rising importance of the middle income classes in these countries is sparking an unprecedented buildup of European industries devoted to satisfying the consumer demands of this increasingly large and affluent group.

There is little doubt but that the expansion of EEC will be highly adverse to our long term private capital export balance. The sheltered market, which will be larger by far, will bring a rise in U.S. direct capital exports and in U.S. portfolio investments in EEC securities markets. In addition, the merger will enable the European branches of U.S. firms to serve a larger market with a broader choice of alternatives in production sites. Where proportions of the input factors vary significantly among the stages of production, the wider market opens greater possibilities of cutting costs via geographical diversification of production stages than previously existed. These factors all make direct U.S. private investment in Europe more attractive after the merger than before.

In third markets, the U.S. position will be weakened by expansion in the EEC. The EEC will, by virtue of its greater internal competitiveness and invigorated business climate, compete even more favorably in these markets than it has in the recent past.

The foregoing considerations suggest that the U.S. balance of payments will be under still heavier pressure with an expanded European Common Market. A continued buildup of current dollar liabilities held by EEC countries may develop, and in that event the vulnerability of the U.S. monetary gold stock would increase.

The prospect of an increasingly more powerful EEC indicates that the United States has much to gain from a substantial mutual liberalization of United States and EEC tariffs. Apart from enabling both the United States and the Europeans to make better use of their resources, this would eliminate the attraction of a sheltered market in Europe for American producers, and would spark a dynamism in the U.S. economy similar to that resulting in the Six from its economic integration. American domestic investment would be stepped up and EEC producers would undoubtedly augment their long term investments in the United States.

Expansion of EEC will thus mean major changes in the trading structure and perhaps even in the political organization of the free world. It will significantly affect the United States in its trade, its domestic economy, and its future role in world affairs; it will have heavy impacts upon the underdeveloped nations and possibly jeopardize their relations with the industrialized nations; it will pose serious problems for the industrializing nations such as Canada, Japan, and Australasia; it will significantly affect the cold war balance of power, and will produce new strains and potentialities for the Soviets to exploit.

IV. THE DANGERS IN DRIFT

The United States is entering a stage of crisis in its international economic position and leadership. Events have reached a stage at which further temporizing may place in jeopardy both its own interests and the integrity of the free world. Indeed, it is difficult to see how, in the absence of a vigorous drive toward general free world trade liberalization, the United States can avoid moving toward economic isolation.

The voices of protectionism are already heard. Pressures by industry for tariff and quota relief under peril point, escape clause and defense essentiality provisions are increasing. In some cases the administration has resorted to formal and informal quota agreements.

U.S. protectionism cannot be expected to improve the U.S. foreign or domestic position. Such defenses are easily countered by foreign countries. Domestically, this means increasing costs, reduced competition, and slower economic growth. To choose this route is to weaken and economically isolate America, to turn our backs on our international responsibilities and abet the Soviet economic offensive.

A logic of sustained retreat runs through this chain of events. A process that begins with failure to appreciate the extent of our international responsibilities may well end in the need to abandon them. What begins as Government intrusion into the marketplace to protect complaining industries against import competition may result in even greater Government intrusion into the economy to protect the Nation from the errors of its ways. The short-term economic gains which complaining industries may have won, and the temporary political respite won by the Government that yielded to their pleas are bought at a very high price.

In view of the pressing need to preserve and develop our business stake in Western Europe and our stake in the cohesiveness of the free world community, we must run fast even to stay in the same place. Our approach must be unprecedently liberal. It is not enough for the United States merely to seek amelioration. Moderate liberalization is a singularly inappropriate goal for a nation in an adverse position in trade and payments, and with its effective leadership on the wane.

For those who caution moderation, who minimize the forces of change in the U.S. international economic and leadership position, the example of Britain carries a lesson. Few observers could have believed, as the EFTA was established in 1959, that by mid-1961 the British would have applied for membership in EEC. It is apparent that international economic developments are moving with almost unprecedented speed.

V. TOWARD WORLDWIDE FREE TRADE

General considerations

It is apparent that, acting unilaterally, the United States cannot itself save the free world. Indeed, not even a collective drive by all the major industrialized nations can offer assurance that free world unity will survive. We can act on the view that because nothing is certain we should do whatever is easiest at the moment, taking credit for favorable developments and blaming unfavorable ones on intractable realities. This is the easy approach. Conversely, we can take the view that history is broadly affected by underlying forces, by structural conditions which can be altered by rational men acting rationally so as to condition the development of events along favorable lines.

When the underlying structure and processes of international economic behavior are stable and sound, it is possible to deal with particular problems on an ad hoc basis. Potentially adverse effects of opportunism can then be swamped by the stronger pull of more fundamental forces. But when the structure is unsound and in the process of radical change, opportunism is particularly dangerous. At such times, effective policymaking must be attuned to the requirements of basic developments.

It is impossible to avoid the conclusion that the most important condition of free world unity and progress is a successful drive to full-scale free multilateral trade among all nations. This is also vital for the United States, not only because it will improve our balance-of-payments and prospects for price stability, but more fundamentally because it will improve the efficiency of our economic system and promote our economic growth.

In reviewing potential weapons for unifying the free world, free trade is the obvious choice. It is the one method that is both sanctified by our traditions and unavailable to the Soviets. It is an approach calculated to reduce anticolonialist fears and sensitivities in underdeveloped nations. It makes their imports and exports a function of terms and prices established in an impersonal world market by the interaction of multitudes of buyers and sellers.

When a primary producer deals with the Soviet bloc countries, every step of purchase and sale is subject to negotiation. Such trade can be manipulated easily in the interests of the powerful state trader and against those of the weaker country. To do business on this basis over a long period is to risk independence by providing the state trader with the opportunity to shape economic development.

The appeal of Soviet trade and aid proposals will grow in attractiveness with a shift of the free world market toward restrictionism. Americans might have been less shocked by Nehru's antiwesternism on Berlin at the Belgrade Conference in the fall of 1961 had they given greater thought to his request a few days earlier for greater export opportunities in the EEC market.

Free trade and developing countries

It is not enough to offer a moderately expanding market to certain products of less developed countries such as India, Pakistan, or Brazil. These countries are in the process of attempting to increase their productive activities dramatically. They view their trading prospects as more significant than their present export situation. If they are to emphasize investment in export industries, they need to be assured of rapidly expanding markets for such products. Otherwise, they will plow their investment funds into industries which provide substitutes for imports and thus conserve foreign exchange.

Evidence shows that it is typically far easier for underdeveloped nations to expand their production of exports than to force production of import substitutes. Their exports tend to utilize their human and natural resources far better than do import substitutes. Export industries follow the lines of international comparative advantage while the production of import substitutes fostered by government policy runs against natural advantages.

In most underdeveloped economies, the internal market for new producers is typically difficult to exploit because it is usually too small to permit an efficient scale of operations and the organization of distribution is often inadequate. For domestic producers to be attracted to such markets, high levels of protection against imports are usually necessary, often supplemented by outright subsidies.

Creating tariff and subsidy conditions necessary to stimulate private investment in import competitive industries will often prove too great a task for inexperienced and sometimes unstable governments. Moreover, internal political and social tensions may well make it impractical to implement policies which, in effect, guarantee large profits for private firms. For these reasons, underdeveloped nations which aim toward greater self-sufficiency usually stress government ownership and control.

The situation is very different when economic development is directed toward satisfying an expanding world market. The world market, though risky, is more competitive and far better organized than most internal markets. Where these world markets are expanding, exports of primary products and light manufactures face no serious problem in distribution.

Not only is the world market more accessible to such producers, but when unrestricted it is also more profitable. Gains from trade are large when the productive factor combinations between countries are most dissimilar. Trade between underdeveloped and industrialized nations runs between economies rich in labor relative to capital and rich in capital relative to labor. In each case, the country pays in its own goods a much smaller price for imports than they would cost to produce in its own economy. In a free market, the large gains implicit in such trades are maximized and shared by all.

These propositions are well documented by economic history. The resurgent economic development of Western Europe during the Renaissance is testimony to the vital role of trade.

And it was the revival of commerce that nurtured the rise of modern Europe. The rapid development of the U.S. economy was based on the broad and unrestricted scope of its territorial base for trade. Modern Germany was the result of the extension of free trade to the many small German states. In the dramatic expansion of trade and income in the EEC, we find present day confirmation of the contribution of trading freedom to economic development.

Americans, who have become greatly concerned about the failure of foreign aid to raise income levels as anticipated in the underdeveloped nations, have signally failed to relate this aid failure to developments in world trade. Yet logic and evidence indicate that the effectiveness of foreign aid is strongly influenced by the actual and prospective export earnings of underdeveloped nations.

Foreign trade subject to restrictionism and discrimination is no way out of this foreign aid dilemma. Trade in Western markets under such conditions need not be an obvious improvement over trade with the Soviets. Aid and trade controlled by the state rather than impersonal market forces favor planned economies. To compete with the Russians and Chinese on this basis is to deny our inheritance and fight with unfamiliar weapons against an adversary schooled in them.

The answer to these problems and reactions is a trading system in which political control over access to markets for the underdeveloped nations is minimized. We must make it apparent that the markets of the West will become and remain open to them on a competitive basis for any and all products they may produce, or we shall be charged with trying to keep them in a subordinate status. To put the matter another way, the price of tying the economies of the underdeveloped and uncommitted nations more closely to those of the industrialized West is to increase the interdependence of the industrialized countries with all other free economies. To believe that the trading opportunities we can offer the underdeveloped nations would be adequate while we still maintain an uneconomic diversification in our production base through protection is to fly from reality.

There is, of course, the danger that some underdeveloped nations may use their increased export earnings to insulate their economies from the outside world—to move toward greater self-sufficiency, which is often equated with national independence. This arms supporters of self-sufficiency with an emotional appeal that obscures the economic and political justifications for interdependence. These forces will, at least initially, be strong.

But it is difficult to believe that ambitious nations will, in the long run, starve the growth of industries which produce solid and growing export earnings. As these nations reach and exceed the development takeoff stage, the cost of uneconomic allocations of investment capital will become increasingly apparent.

At present the economic development of most underdeveloped countries stands in sharp contrast to the prospects we have been discussing. The difference lies partly in the circumstances of trade. The rewards for developing export industries in accordance with their existing comparative advantages and potentials are limited in a world with trade restrictions in force. It is not surprising that the flow of private investment from the industrialized nations has been far less than desired.

Under a free trade regimen, a program for stabilizing the export earnings of nonindustrialized primary producers may be essential. Stabilization would lessen fears that a greater involvement in trade would create unmanageable shifts in balances of payments. Designing such a system so that the countries involved benefit equitably without, at the same time, stimulating and compounding waste involves a number of complexities.

It is not within the purview of this paper to analyze the various proposals currently suggested, or to develop new ones. To illustrate, however, it might be desirable to undertake buffer stock arrangements for primary commodities. With financial resources contributed by countries interested in a particular commodity, its world price could be stabilized. The buffer stock authorities would sell from their holdings when the world price rose above a certain level, and would buy for stockpiling purposes when the price fell below a certain level.

As the free world economy becomes more closely knit, and increased export earnings lead to development of more export industries, export earnings as a whole will become more stable. But the assurance of an effective backstop of stabilization measures in the early years would contribute to that end.

Effect of free trade on the United States

The previous discussion regarding the significance of a move to full-scale trade liberalization has centered about its potential for unifying the free world and stimulating economic growth in less developed nations. It is now appropriate to consider the probable consequences of such a policy for the U.S. economy. Should it appear that the international fruits of liberalization would come at the expense of our domestic economic health and progress, the United States would be in a dilemma.

Fortunately, however, this is not the case: free trade would be a boon to the U.S. economy.

As has been the case recently in Western Europe and throughout history, the opening of our market will expose our economy to competitive forces which cannot but revitalize its internal processes and lead both to increased investment in new plant and equipment and to greater stability in prices.

Exposure to free trade would greatly increase productivity, for two major reasons: (i) the more rapid rate of capital investment will both add to the total stock of capital and develop more efficient technologies, (ii) the resulting joint growth of our imports and exports means a general relocation of labor from the low wage-low productivity industries to the high wage-high productivity industries. Our most efficient industries would expand, our least efficient would contract.

A move to free trade between the United States and the expanded Common Market can be expected to improve the U.S. balance of payments. The American market is less sheltered than the present EEC and United Kingdom markets—and much less protected than the expanded EEC will be when it has achieved a common external tariff and eliminated its internal tariffs. Thus, free trade on their part implies a greater increase in effective accessibility to foreign exports than it does for the United States. And, elimination of discriminations and tariffs will improve U.S. payments by removing a major cause of direct long term U.S. capital investment in Europe.

While the trade balance with an expanded EEC can be expected to become increasingly favorable as free trade conditions are approached, this involves only about one-third of U.S. trade. The remainder comprises our commerce with third countries.

It is apparent that we would find our imports from all these countries increasing with free trade, but it is highly probable that the increase in their exports to the EEC nations would exceed the increase to the United States for two reasons: (i) the larger effective liberalization by the EEC, (ii) the fact that most of the larger exporters of manufactures—Scandinavia and the major Commonwealth nations—are strongly oriented toward British and continental European markets. There is little doubt also that Japan would increase its presently almost trivial exports to Western Europe far faster than to the United States.

Our imports from the less developed nations would increase substantially, but mainly in primary products. While their exports to us of light manufactures would increase very rapidly, the small base from which they would grow would keep them small in relation to our total imports for many years to come.

It is important to realize, however, that if the United States were to do no better than hold its present trading position in third markets, this would insure that its overall trade balance would be substantially increased. Taking these nations as a whole we are confronted with a group which has and will have for many decades to come a trade deficit. For most of these economies are underdeveloped or industrializing; they are capital importing nations rather than capital exporting ones. With an improved trade balance with Western Europe, the United States would have to suffer a major cut in its share of third markets for its overall trade balance to worsen—a highly improbable event.

Although free trade would improve the U.S. long-term private capital export balance with the industrialized nations, it is likely that this trend would be more than offset by heavy net outflows to the less developed and industrializing nations. The opportunities for private enterprises in these countries to sell in wholly unrestricted industrial markets could not fail to attract a mounting tide of U.S. business investments. Other things being equal, this would offset at least a good part of the payments gains in the trade balance.

But from every possible point of view, this would be a desirable development. We want American business capital to pour into these countries because with it goes American business know-how and initiative; its direct contributions to the growth of these countries will be magnified by demonstration effects and the development of new labor skills and administrative experience. Such a trend would significantly reinforce the impulses of these nations toward the closer free world bonds developed by the opening of industrial markets. It would add weight and momentum to the cause of free enterprise in these countries—a cause already invigorated by free trade.

Foreign aid

It appears then that the major contribution we can make to a more effective utilization of foreign aid is to lead the way toward complete freedom of access by the underdeveloped countries to the industrial markets of the West. Our great mistake has been to construe foreign aid as a substitute for rather than as a complement to a vigorous program of trade liberalization. When a breakthrough to free trade is achieved, we will be able to count on the pulling power of export earnings potentials in a competitive world market to guide and discipline the use of aid. Reinforcing vectors of trade and aid are required if the barriers against economic growth in underdeveloped areas are to be overcome and the climate for private investment is to be brightened. Meanwhile the imperatives of aid remain. We must drastically improve the economic payoff of our aid and induce increased aid contributions from our major industrialized allies.

VI. DOMESTIC ASPECTS OF FREE TRADE

General considerations

If free trade can contribute so monumentally to the unity of the free world and the economic health of our productive system, why then does the United States hesitate to take this vital step?

Until very recently the pros and cons of free trade have been argued almost exclusively in a context of extremism. The debate has placed the interests of the Nation as a whole against those of adversely affected groups on an all-or-nothing basis.

In the long history of this debate we find various intellectual transformations. Statesmen in previous strongholds of free trade coincidence with the rapid shift of textiles to the South, suddenly found flaws in the sentiment in the South have, in remarkable logic of the free-trade position. The industrial North, whose protectionism was a root cause of the Civil War, now—with increasingly modern capital intensive rather than labor intensive plant—find wisdom in the free-trade principles of Adam Smith. On this issue, as on so many others, the realities of specific group interests dominate the debate. But there are times, and this is one of them, when the clash of immediate interests must yield precedence to the imperatives of national interest.

To make a more decisive impact on international developments we must embrace economic change. This means a hard look at domestic antigrowth policies as well as international economic policies.

Tariff barriers and unemployment

Although a liberal commercial policy improves the allocation of resources in the long run, it may have transitional economic effects that are extremely painful. Thus, it is important to make an assessment, albeit a rough one, of the effects of reduction in tariff barriers on employment. Specifically, we shall ask what the impact on employment would be if the United States unilaterally reduced her tariff barriers to zero over the next 10 years. It is obvious that the increase in unemployment would be smaller, or perhaps nonexistent, if other countries reduced their tariff barriers by roughly comparable amounts at the same time. But for the sake of illustration, let us assume that there are no such reductions in any degree by other countries.

Of the $15 billion of U.S. imports in 1960 less than one-half or approximately $7 billion, was subject to tariffs. Assume the elimination of tariff barriers would lead eventually to an increase in these imports from $7 billion to $17 billion per annum, an increase of $10 billion. (For an increase of this magnitude to take place both American demand and foreign supply would have to be highly responsive to change in price, but at this stage it is better to overestimate rather than underestimate the influx of foreign goods in response to the lowering of U.S. tariff barriers.) Suppose, further, that this increaes of imports of $10 billion takes place over a 10-year period, or at the rate of $1 billion per annum. What is a plausible figure for the amount of unemployment created each year by the $1 billion rise in imports? With national income per person employed running at about $6,500 per year, an increase of $1 billion in imports would displace annually about 150,000 workers in import-competing industries, if product per person employed were as high in these industries as the national average. If the workers in the import-competing industries produce, per head, only half as much as the national average, then the unemployment created by displacement would rise to 300,000. A detailed exposition would attach many qualifications to the figures presented above, but most of the qualifications would be by way of showing that our rough calculations exaggerate the unemployment problem.

In any event, it is clear that the numbers involved are not large, particularly when it is realized that each month our economy successfully reabsorbs a comparable number of displaced workers. In any given year the number of workers affected would be less than one-half of 1 percent of the labor force. Some may argue, however, that over the course of the 10-year liberalization somewhere between 1 and 2 million workers will have been displaced by imports. But the aggregate figure is of little relevance. The problem of unemployment is the problem of what happens in the short run, and in judging the effects of a 10-year import liberalization program it would be folly to count in 1961 the unemployment expected from liberalization in 1965 or 1970, and it would be equally misleading to count in 1970 the unemployment that had been created 9 years earlier in 1961.

In each year the Government will be dealing with the residual unemployment created by imports as well as other economic factors remaining after the new job opportunities created by the natural resources of the economy have been filled.

Of course, the unemployment figures presented refer only to the direct impact of increased imports on unemployment. They do not measure the total unemployment that would develop if the primary increases in unemployment were not offset, which we assume would be the case. That is, in the absence of Government policies designed to offset primary unemployment, the reduced spending by the unemployed would lead to further unemployment.

The unemployment figures in the preceding paragraphs are the maximum which would follow directly from the elimination of U.S. tariff barriers. As such they are illustrative, but inapplicable to any concrete situation. The purport of this paper is that any substantial tariff reductions by the United States will be met by comparable reductions abroad which in turn will develop and increase U.S. exports together with the concomitant employment. It is highly unlikely and not the recommendation of this paper that the United States embark on a program of unilateral tariff reduction. The net employment figure thus resulting from an increase in export industries and a decrease in import competing industries may well be even or a net gain.

We conclude that, even when changes in commercial policy have the immediate effect of causing unemployment, most of this unemployment will be of limited duration.

Adjustment assistance

To the extent that a prosperous economy fails to eliminate unemployment the Federal Government can and should provide adjustment assistance. It should help business to develop new product bases through, for example, accelerated amortization of obsolescent machinery and credits for modernization. It should lay the necessary groundwork of labor market information, job retraining opportunities, and financial assistance in relocation to reduce the human costs of employment dislocation to a minimum. Indeed, with a national system of employment information coupled with a census of labor skills and qualifications, labor retraining facilities and relocation assistance, we can dramatically reduce frictional unemployment and disguised unemployment—where labor capable of higher productivity is used in employments of lower productivity.

With such a program we can reduce the social costs of progress and at the same time give progress new impetus.

Adjustment assistance is not a new idea. It is established in the EEC and has played a major role in reducing business and labor opposition to the unleashing of import competition manifested in the drive toward regional economic integration.

It means that as society reaps the benefits of trade liberalization it also bears collectively a major part of the costs of such progress, which otherwise would fall on a few. To argue, as some may tend to, that government should not be so closely involved in private economic processes is to ignore the nature of tariffs and quotas which are also direct interference by Government in private markets.

Unless one is willing to argue for an all-out free trade program with no succor to the injured, the choice lies fundamentally between two lines of governmental intervention. One, trade restrictionism, is not a reasonable approach for the United States today. It means the erosion of the international basis of our security, a shirking of our international leadership responsibilities, and a relative stagnation in our domestic economy. The other, adjustment assistance, would promote our security, strengthen and justify our international leadership, and freshen the springs of our domestic economic growth.

A beginning has been made in the last year by the Federal Government. The Area Redevelopment Act of 1961 is a long-range program for area economic redevelopment. The skills and experience developed in the administration of this act in the field of employee reorientation and industrial redevelopment will be invaluable to such adjustment assistance as may be required by free trade.

Current trade restrictions

To make a more decisive impact on international developments we must embrace economic change. This means a hard look at domestic antigrowth policies as well as international economic policies. It means that the peril point, escape clause, defense essentiality rationalizations must go. Their whole thrust is to preserve the status quo. Moreover since they cripple our progress they fail in the end to achieve their narrow goal—domestic prosperity.

The status quo defenses built into our present trade legislation are more dangerous to international economic progress than might be imagined because they promise or threaten the imposition of heightened trade barriers even where such barriers are presently of no consequence. It is bad enough for foreign exporters to face U.S. trade barriers of known levels; to live in the knowledge that they may rise to whatever level is required to dam the flow of imports is to stifle hope that in new exports, in a more diversified production of exports, lies the answer to their export problems. If the answer for these countries does not lie in export specialization, nor in a diversified export base, the thrust to development must be toward self-sufficiency—away from, not toward, private enterprise.

The protectionists realize that even a partial maintenance of the status quo requires increasingly rigorous measures. At present they are shifting from tariffs to quotas and international market sharing agreements as their answer to import pressures. This is a natural development, but a painful threat to our domestic and international interests. Tariffs are designed to distort markets, but in altering the terms of exchange they still leave the market free to accommodate itself to the altered conditions. Precisely for this reason, the contemporary protections aim for the approaches that will throttle economic freedom in the international market and eliminate the market forces entirely at our borders.

The defense essentiality provision of the Tariff Act operates as a cloak for the narrowest protectionist pressures. This cloak is potentially a most useful one, for the public is not ready to ask many questions of a step alleged to be in the interests of national security. Since its introduction into the 1955 extension of our trade legislation, the clause has seen little use—mainly because of zealous Presidential scrutiny of requests under its provisions.

Barring a firm Presidential hand, it offers the argument of national security to those seeking protection from competition. We need to discipline applications of the device so as to restrict it to cases which do involve our security importantly. Such a way exists: It is to replace the tariff or subsidy—paid by consumers directly—with a cash subsidy paid from the defense budget. Where important security needs are involved, the Defense Department would support such expenditures and Congress presumably would be ready to levy the taxes required. But where the plea is not based on real security needs, it would be difficult to secure the support of either group. It would be extremely difficult to imagine a more grievous assault on fiscal integrity than legislative subsidies hidden from those who pay them.

VII. PROBLEMS IN IMPLEMENTING FREE TRADE

Simply to conclude that we must and will move toward ever-increasing trade freedom leaves unanswered a number of broad and narrow questions of principle, of strategy, of timing, and of organization.

Timetable to free trade

The first question is, How far should we go toward the pole of free trade? The answer is that we must go all the way. There is no stopping place short of free trade. We can be reasonably certain that full-scale free trade will help our economic growth and balance of payments, and contribute powerfully toward free world progress and unity. These potential benefits will be diminished as our goal falls short of full trade liberalization.

It does not follow, however, that full trade freedom must be achieved at one swoop. Practical considerations as well as logic and the compelling evidence of EEC experience suggest that if the free trade goal is unequivocal and the steps to this goal are prescribed in an orderly and unequivocal sequence under law, the flows of investment and trade will swiftly move to anticipate the patterns expected to obtain when the final goal is reached.

The time needed to attain free trade should be short enough to galvanize into action producers who are currently or potentially exporters but long enough to bring the adjustment problem down to proportions easily manageable in a strong and prosperous economy. No single time span would please everyone. If 1 year is too long for the zealous free trader, 50 years is too short for the embattled protectionist. It is suggested that the legitimate needs and aspirations of all parties involved, domestic and foreign, could be adequately met with a program which reduces our tariffs by 10 percent of their initial level in each subsequent year. This program could be established, as in the EEC, subject to the provision that no time extensions could be granted, but with opportunity for a speedup if desired. Speedup latitude is useful because with the handwriting on the wall, the necessary adjustments would be made very swiftly and with relative ease in all but a minority of cases. Thus, it is only in the hard core cases that more than a few years for adjustment is useful or necessary. If tariff reductions are on an across-the-board basis, as advocated in the next session, the acceleration of general tariff reduction will cause no serious strains and facilitate greater action in the residual problem areas. The EEC has found this to be the case.

Across-the-board liberalization

There are compelling reasons for abandoning our present commodity-by-commodity procedures in tariff determinations and negotiations.

In the first place, the more narrowly defined the product area covered by a tariff rate, the more concentrated are the losses and the smaller the net social gain from any particular reduction. This approach maximizes the discrepancies between the income effects of any given change in the tariff level upon the average citizen and upon those connected with the particular industry. It thus enhances the ability of protectionists to exploit the principle that it is the squeaking wheel that gets the oil. But as the tariff bargaining area is widened the income losses from tariff increases, or the income gains from tariff decreases affect a greater number of people and cumulate for those involved, thus making more persons ready to exert themselves to advance their interests.

Secondly, narrowly defined tariff bargaining forces each contracting country to submit to a procedure in which to gain a benefit for one of its export industries it must in effect allow the other nation to dictate the product area to be liberalized. If a country takes the initiative in offering concessions, it loses some of its initiative in the selection of the area to be liberalized abroad in return. With all the imponderables inherent in any prediction of the effects of the initial bargain as a result of its generalization to all most-favored-nation countries, it is not surprising that even minor tariff adjustments are a formidable undertaking.

If, however, we switch to a broad product range for tariff cutting—so that the total range of dutiable products is collected into, say, 10 groups, the situation can be much improved. If, for instance, a general 10 percent cut is made in each category, the right could be given each country to achieve this cut (based on a weighted average of the rates on products included) by whatever pattern of individual product rate cuts it desires in each category—so long, of course, as the percentage cuts in each successive year are based on the initial year rates and weights. This would give each nation far more freedom than it now possesses in distributing reductions among its list of protected products. It would thus enable each nation to concentrate the bulk of its cuts in product areas whose rapid progress toward adjustment reduces or minimizes consequent burdens from rising imports. Thus, each nation could retard in the first few years the pace of liberalization for industries with particularly heavy adjustment difficulties.

Such autonomy in distributing tariff cuts would create a significant additional benefit. Once a nation gears itself for adjustment and begins to make significant progress toward it, the economy begins to produce more and more examples of success in adjustment. Rising expectations are generated by the multiplying evidence of the export growth opportunities created by the liberalizations carried on abroad in return. This will reduce the fears and insecurities which figure so prominently among the factors responsible for resistance to adjustment in hard core areas, setting the stage there for more rapid progress than might otherwise be anticipated.

Finally, there is a most compelling practical reason for the change to a broad-based tariff bargaining system. The members of EEC have established this approach for handling their internal liberalization and they insist that future bargaining with the United States and other outsiders must be on this basis. We cannot succeed in upholding on grounds of principle our narrowly based system and we cannot afford to take the consequences of a failure to induce major tariff concessions from them.

Alternative U.S. strategies for liberating trade

Although susceptible to countless variations in details and approach, the basic routes through which the United States might move toward effective free trade for the free world can be reduced essentially to three:

1. The United States might join a major regional bloc of industrialized nations and work from within to tie the rest of the free world in bonds of increasing mutual interdependence to such a union. This approach—such as entry into the EEC, formation of an Atlantic community of the OECD countries, a union of NATO countries—would involve as a first step moving toward internal free trade among the members.

2. The United States might initially form a regional bloc with non-European nations, perhaps a Pan American Economic Union, in which it would function as the industrial heart.

3. The United States might stay outside regional blocs and work directly for generalized free trade.

The U.S. entry into some version of an Atlantic Community has considerable appeal. It appears to provide an acceptable answer to our pressing international economic problems and would extinguish the threat of narrow isolationism. Its adherents say such a union would unite in ever-tighter bonds the centers of western civilization and culture, whose preservation they argue is a central goal of our foreign policy.

Such a union, however, is a dubious solution to the problem of binding the free world. Western Europe is not ready to contemplate yielding on its discriminatory treatment of outsiders to accept the United States or any other country with a guarantee that membership, on a regular or associated basis, will be open to all the countries of the free world. The achievement of discrimination, after all, is an important element in the development of the EEC. We cannot expect the Community to accept readily the enormous pressures incident upon U.S. entry into its union and in addition abandon its discriminations against the rest of the world. Such a move would be to Europe's advantage in the long run by expanding its opportunities, but this overlooks the fact that (relevant in the short run only) unexploited opportunities of this sort exist now. Entry of the United Kingdom and possibly other EFTA members will offer new opportunities with the concomitant need for adjustment.

While still wider markets in the United States and elsewhere would be of some interest to the EEC, it seems unlikely that these advantages would compensate this group for the immediate pressures from increased imports.

Should the United States enter the EEC without insuring that the rest of the free world would be included and on generous terms, there are strong reasons for believing that free world unity would be jeopardized. This would exacerbate already inflamed fears and anti-Western sentiments among the less developed nations. Anti-imperialism would be reinforced.

Nations of the non-Western World gain a measure of security regarding their trading future in European markets from the fact that presently they make common cause with the United States. They and the United States are interested in greater access to European markets, and—given its policy of multilateralism—U.S. gains are also gains for them. Under present circumstances, they have cause to feel that in dealing with the EEC American self-interest works in favor of their own interests. Should the United States enter an Atlantic economic union, however, this correspondence of interests would be weakened.

An Atlantic union which offered the rest of the world less than it offered its members would inevitably appear as a combination of affluent, capitalist nations against the rest of the world. World opinion would find unseemly a union for mutual aggrandizement by the wealthy few on a basis which slights the lot of the impoverished many. This could not help but make Soviet overtures more attractive, relatively, even with the attendant risks. Unless we are ready to abandon the non-Western free world, the Atlantic union approach is not realistic.

If upon our entry into an Atlantic union we were able to secure terms of admission for the rest of the world regarded as generous by all nations concerned, then the approach would really partake of the multilateral free trade offered by the third alternative.

Entry by the United States into a non-European regional bloc would be inadvisable. Even if such a union were as successful as its limited scope allows, it would be against our interest. It would tend quickly to estrange Western Europe politically as well as economically. It would put our mutual defenses in jeopardy. The many non-European nations excluded would be embittered because of this discrimination by the United States.

In this approach, as in the previous alternative considered, the dynamics of ensuing developments would run against any hopes of eventual reversal of the exclusionary trends set in motion. As time passes, the initial forces which militated against general multilateralism become stronger and increase in number as well. Regionalism breeds internal changes in the pattern of investment and production which are inconsistent with liberalized multilateral trade. Discrimination produces increasingly powerful vested interests against external liberalization which reinforce the initial pressures that generate systematic discrimination. To outside nations, therefore, there are valid reasons to dismiss as pious, hypocrisy any pledges that after an adjustment period, regionalism will be abandoned for general liberalization.

The only reasonable approach to the urgent problems confronting our foreign economic policymakers is for the United States to go all out for free trade across the free world, although to assert this, even waiving the domestic political problems involved, is to raise a number of difficult questions.

It is obvious that an invitation by the United States to the rest of the world to move in a prescribed timetable to free trade would not be enthusiastically received in every quarter.

As already noted, there are many reasons to doubt that the EEC would relish entering into any programs that would reduce its economic exclusiveness. Such a step would certainly enhance Western Europe's real income potentials and bind Europe to the United States and the rest of the world in ever stronger economic ties. But this would also reduce the relative position of Europe in the free world. A united Europe in a divided free world is stronger than a Europe integrated with the rest of the free world. It is unreasonable to expect a resurgent Europe to look upon such a development with equanimity.

Despite these drawbacks, the long-range benefits to Europe of joining the free world in free trade are formidable. Greater access to U.S. markets and those of other industrial countries, the increase in productivity through greater specialization and competition—in short, gains from free trade—would raise the standard of living in Europe in the same manner, but to a greater degree, as in EEC itself. Vigorous leadership by the United States—its position reinforced by a firm commitment to a free trade policy—could be persuasive.

Our problem in choosing the right strategy for liberating world trade is nevertheless a most difficult one. There is no easy answer, save to drift on while the free world disintegrates around us. If we do drift we shall very likely find ourselves with no other alternative than to turn to the EEC. Acceptance into the EEC with reasonable safeguards for our interests may then be difficult.

An offer of free trade from the United States should embrace terms binding on all participants. In particular, these terms should include the following:

1. Every signatory nation, with the exception noted in paragraph 5 below, would agree to follow a stated timetable for trade liberalization.

2. Tariff liberalization would be on an across-the-board basis, with annual reductions of 10 percent of the weighted average of the rates obtaining at the time the U.S. offer is made; thus in 10 years all tariffs would be eliminated.

3. All import quotas would be automatically increased by 20 percent each year, with the additional provision that at the close of the 10-year period, no quota restrictions would remain.

4. Each signatory country must agree to abstain from other measures that would offset the effect of lowered trade restrictions—e.g. discriminatory excise taxes.

5. Underdeveloped countries would be permitted to restrict imports of certain products for a specified period to provide time for adjustment. A longer restriction of tariffs is also justified in these countries in view of the importance of customs revenue to their fiscal systems.

6. Relations between the signatory nations and outsiders would be governed by GATT procedures.

7. Nations applying for membership after the process of liberalization has gotten underway would be required to match the liberalization already made by member nations. This would tend to discourage delay in entering the signatory group.

The system envisaged here is not perfect, but it would promote generalized trade liberalization throughout the free world. It utilizes the classical system of rewards and penalties. Thus, to nations most interested in expanding markets for exports, the liberalization program offers a most attractive reward. For nations more concerned with import pressures than with the need for expanding exports, the potential loss of existing exports through exclusion from the new free-trade area would be a disturbing contingency. The program would continuously raise the cost of nonparticipation.

In a world of perfectly rational nations such penalties would perhaps be unnecessary. This classical system of rewards and penalties is, however, indigenous to a free-market system and is particularly appropriate to a domestic free enterprise society striving to establish conditions for freedom and individual opportunity in the world.

We stand at a turning point in history: We must go forward toward free world economic unity or set aside our hopes for dynamic growth at home and abroad.

This paper has been written in the firm belief that Americans can and will rise to the imperatives of the times once they understand the issues. Clarification of these issues is a crucial function of the public debate now in progress. It is hoped that this paper will contribute to that purpose.

TABLE 1.—*Industrial production in the European Economic Community, 1953–60*

	1953	1958	1959	1960
General industrial production	100	148	158	178
Manufacturing industries	100	151	163	184

Source: European Economic Community, Bulletin Général de Statistiques, 1961, No. 2, p. 77.

TABLE 2.—*Net flow of U.S. direct investment into the European Economic Community and other areas, 1957–60*

[Dollar amounts in millions]

	1957		1958		1959		1960 [1]	
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
To all areas	$2,482	100.0	$1,181	100.0	$1,372	100.0	$1,694	100.0
To the EEC	96	3.9	106	9.0	180	13.1	282	16.6
To the rest of Europe	191	7.7	84	7.1	304	22.2	[2] 680	40.1
To Canada	718	28.9	421	35.6	417	30.4	471	27.8
To Latin America	1,163	46.9	299	25.3	218	15.9	95	5.6

[1] Preliminary.

[2] Ford stock investment of $368,000,000 in Britain occurred in this year.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Survey of Current Business, August 1961, p. 22; U.S. Business Investments in Foreign Countries (1960), pp. 136–137.

TABLE 3.—*Industrial investment in the European Economic Community, 1954–60*

[Volume indexes, 1954=100]

	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960 [1]
Total EEC	100	115	126	132	130	134	151
France	100	112	125	141	147	149	162
West Germany	100	122	125	124	124	132	155
Italy	100	111	120	132	126	135	158
Netherlands	100	118	124	134	120	135	149
Belgium	100	105	124	114	105	104	118

[1] Provisional.

NOTE.—Because of various statistical qualifications, these indexes do not possess strict comparability.

Source: European Economic Community, Statistiques Industrielles, 1961, No. 1, p. 53.

TABLE 4.—*Trade of EEC countries with themselves and with outside world, 1953–60*

[In millions of dollars]

	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960
Total imports	14,918	16,630	19,269	22,353	24,816	22,895	[1] 24,313	[1] 2[illegible],558
Imports from EEC	3,954	4,571	5,564	6,336	7,032	6,786	7,968	10,140
Imports from outside EEC	10,964	12,059	13,705	16,016	17,784	16,109	16,164	19,416
Total exports	14,095	15,788	18,355	20,077	22,440	22,775	25,227	29,729
Exports to EEC	4,035	4,666	5,647	6,436	7,154	6,864	8,176	10,246
Exports outside EEC	10,061	11,122	12,708	13,641	15,286	15,911	17,051	19,483

[1] These totals are approximate, not exact, sums of the component parts shown.

Source: European Economic Community, Commerce Exterieur par Pays 1953–58 (1960), pp. 4–5. Import data for 1959 and 1960 are from U.S. Department of Commerce, Foreign Commerce Weekly, July 31, 1961, p. 5. Export data for 1958 through 1960 are from European Economic Community, Commerce Exterieur, 1961, No. 6, p. 22.

TABLE 5.—*The U.S. international payments balance and its disposition, 1946–60*

[Million dollars]

Year	Balance [1]	Change in U.S. gold reserves [1]	Change in foreign holdings of U.S. short-term liabilities (private and Government) [2]	Change in foreign holdings of U.S. Government long-term securities
1946	933	+623	−310	
1947	4,862	+2,850	−2,012	
1948	1,006	+1,530	+524	
1949	211	+164	−47	
1950	−3,602	−1,743	+918	+941
1951	−343	+53	+1,055	−659
1952	−1,092	+379	+1,169	+302
1953	−2,102	−1,161	+1,023	−82
1954	−1,516	−298	+1,210	+8
1955	−1,149	−41	+579	+529
1956	−968	+306	+1,409	−135
1957	−468	+798	+382	−52
1958	−3,477	−2,275	+1,171	+31
1959	−3,826	−731	+2,426	+669
1960	−3,836	−1,702	+2,100	

[1] Excluding subscriptions to International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and International Monetary Fund.

[2] Mostly payable in dollars.

NOTE.—Plus sign signifies increase; minus sign signifies decline. In balance-of-payments accounting, the reverse signs are used in the recording of gold changes. Thus, in this table, the combination of signs will not add to the sign of the total payments balance for that year.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce data, as presented in U.S. Senate Commerce Committee staff report, "United States and World Trade (1961)," table 1 opposite p. 4; modified by data in U.S. Department of Commerce, "Survey of Current Business," March 1961, table 4, p. 8.

TABLE 6.—*Official gold and foreign exchange positions of the United States and selected areas, 1951–61*

[In millions, end of period]

Country or area	1951	1952	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	June 1961
All countries:											
Gold	$33,935	$33,920	$34,360	$34,970	$35,445	$36,095	$37,360	$38,075	$37,870	$38,050	$38,385
Foreign exchange	15,095	15,615	17,145	18,245	18,780	19,745	18,925	19,215	19,175	21,690	22,345
Total	49,030	49,535	51,505	53,215	54,225	55,840	56,285	57,290	57,045	59,740	60,730
United States:											
Gold	22,873	23,252	22,091	21,793	21,753	22,058	22,857	20,582	19,507	17,804	17,603
Foreign exchange											186
Total	22,873	23,252	22,091	21,793	21,753	22,058	22,857	20,582	19,507	17,804	17,789
Rest of free world:											
Gold	11,062	10,668	12,269	13,177	13,692	14,037	14,503	17,493	18,363	20,246	20,782
Foreign exchange	15,095	15,615	17,145	18,245	18,780	19,745	18,925	19,215	19,175	21,690	22,159
Total	26,157	26,283	29,414	31,422	32,472	33,782	33,428	36,708	37,538	41,936	42,941
Canada:											
Gold	842	885	986	1,073	1,134	1,103	1,100	1,078	960	885	906
Foreign exchange	984	979	841	882	776	841	736	870	917	951	1,087
Total	1,826	1,864	1,827	1,955	1,910	1,944	1,836	1,948	1,877	1,836	1,993

TABLE 6.—*Official gold and foreign exchange positions of the United States and selected areas, 1951–61*—Continued

[In millions, end of period]

Country or area	1951	1952	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	June 1961
Latin America:											
Gold	1,955	1,830	1,920	1,835	1,855	1,870	1,890	1,735	1,640	1,360	1,425
Foreign exchange	1,035	1,180	1,380	1,300	1,340	1,810	1,930	1,380	1,380	1,595	1,360
Total	2,990	3,010	3,300	3,135	3,195	3,680	3,820	3,115	3,020	2,955	2,785
Continental Europe:											
Gold	4,365	4,775	5,430	6,055	6,930	7,540	8,215	10,050	11,335	13,230	14,090
Foreign exchange	3,050	3,440	4,530	5,515	6,190	5,995	5,930	7,175	6,120	8,170	8,635
Total	7,415	8,215	9,960	11,570	13,120	13,535	14,145	17,225	17,455	21,400	22,725
United Kingdom, estimated:											
Gold	2,200	1,500	2,300	2,550	2,050	1,800	1,600	2,850	2,500	2,800	2,400
Foreign exchange	174	458	246	248	106	476	774	255	250	439	378
Total	2,374	1,958	2,546	2,798	2,156	2,276	2,374	3,105	2,750	3,239	2,778

NOTE.—Data do not include positions of these countries or areas in the International Monetary Fund. Because of various statistical qualifications, the data should be used as indicating only orders of magnitude.

Source: International Monetary Fund, International Financial Statistics, November 1961, pp. 23–25.

TABLE 7.—*U.S. short-term liabilities, payable in dollars, on foreign account, and U.S. gold reserves, 1956–61*

End of period	Grand total	Total to banks and official institutions	Total to other holders	Gold reserves (excluding position in IMF)
1956	14,890	12,860	2,030	22,058
1957	15,099	12,847	2,252	22,857
1958	16,099	13,669	2,430	20,582
1959	19,311	16,913	3,398	19,507
1960	21,213	18,986	2,227	17,804
May 1961 (preliminary)	20,936	18,759	2,177	[1] 17,603
To Europe	8,593	7,871	722	
To Canada	2,612	2,362	250	
To Latin America	2,289	1,241	1,048	
To Asia	3,174	3,048	126	
To other areas	349	317	32	
To international institutions	3,920	3,920		

[1] June.

Source: Federal Reserve Board, Federal Reserve Bulletin, September 1961, table 2, pp. 1116–1117, except for gold figures which are from table 6.

TABLE 8.—*Foreign trade patterns of the European Free Trade Association, 1959 and 1960*

[In millions]

	1959	1960	Increase in 1960
Imports by EFTA members (cost, insurance, and freight):			
From all sources	$20,016	$23,081	+$3,065
From one another	3,242	3,731	+489
From EEC	5,614	6,567	+953
From outside Western Europe	10,262	11,673	+1,411
Exports by EFTA members (free on board):			
To all countries	17,002	18,533	+1,531
To one another	3,042	3,501	+459
To EEC	3,944	4,425	+481
To outside Western Europe	9,110	9,578	+468

Source: European Free Trade Association, "EFTA's Foreign Trade in 1960 (1961)," pp. 42–43.

THE VOLTA RIVER PROJECT IN GHANA

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, on December 16, 1961, the President of the United States announced his decision to commit U.S. funds to assist in financing the construction of the Volta River project in Ghana. I have previously publicly expressed my view that this decision was unwise. Today I shall undertake to explain in some detail why I consider U.S. participation in this project to be contrary to our own best interests and, in the long run, contrary to the principles of freedom and perhaps not in the best interests of the Ghanaian people. I shall also indicate why I think the President would be well advised to reconsider the question.

Our overall national objective in our foreign aid programs to insure national security in a world at peace, a world in which human beings everywhere may enjoy individual freedom and an opportunity to participate in the increasing benefits of a free and productive society. We have long since recognized that we cannot expect to retain in perpetuity for ourselves alone the benefits of a free society. A go-it-alone policy simply will not work in today's world.

In our own self-interest, then, we aid those who are allied with us in the cold war struggle. We do this by providing direct military aid. Moreover, we provide economic aid to shore up the economies of some of our allies so as to enable them to support the military establishments which our military aid helps to build. In this way, we seek to maintain overall military superiority for the West vis-a-vis the Soviet bloc. Let me make it plain that I endorse these principles, that I have been a constant supporter of collective action by free nations and a consistent supporter of mutual security programs.

The second major aspect of our aid program involves the assistance we extend to those nations which are not now, and cannot in the foreseeable future become, significant military powers. These are so-called underdeveloped nations. Here we are motivated in part by our basic humanitarian desire to assist others to achieve the things we now enjoy. But here, too, our own self-interest is heavily involved.

Simply stated, we desire freedom for others, both for their sake and to preserve freedom for ourselves. Political freedom cannot long exist without economic freedom.

Thus, the Mutual Security Act attempts "to strengthen friendly foreign countries and to assist, on a basis of self-help and mutual cooperation, the efforts of free peoples to develop their economic resources and free economic institutions." I support these objectives, let me repeat.

The Volta project fails the test set forth in the quoted policy declarations of the act. Moreover, it violates the principles that ought to guide our foreign aid program, particularly in Africa where the need for aid is so great. In the first place, the Volta project is the wrong kind of aid. In the second place, it is given under the wrong kind of conditions and is in the wrong place.

On tomorrow the final signature is scheduled to be affixed to the Volta River project contract.

Let us first examine briefly conditions in Ghana. From many points we see danger signals flashing. Even in today's news there is an Associated Press dispatch from Ghana which reads as follows:

> GHANA ARRESTS 80, ACCRA HEARS
>
> ACCRA, GHANA, February 7.—Reliable sources said yesterday 80 persons have been arrested by the Ghana Government since last Thursday. An opposition member of Parliament, Daniel Apedoh, was said to be among those detained.
>
> The reports could not be officially confirmed.
>
> The arrests were said to have been made in the Volta region's chief town of Ho, 103 miles east of Accra, and in the Keta district and Bawku in Northern Ghana.
>
> Mr. Apedoh was elected to Parliament after the detention of another opposition member, Modesto Apaloo. The opposition now has 8 seats in the 114-member Parliament.

Mr. President, while in Ghana last fall, Senators NEUBERGER and HART and I sat in the gallery of the Ghana Parliament and heard debated a bill which appeared to me to have no democratic earmarks; quite to the contrary, it appeared to me to be exclusively an instrument of dictatorship. Indeed, one of the members who spoke against the passage of the bill made the statement that when that bill became law freedom will have vanished from Ghana. Some of the members of Parliament whom we heard opposing the bill quickly were forced, for their own protection, to flee Ghana.

Mr. President, no former colony in Africa has been granted independence with prospects for success so bright as were those that prevailed in Ghana. The British, over the years of enlightened colonial rule, had firmly planted the seeds of democratic institutions. The Ghanaian people had been encouraged to participate in their Government and a competent civil service corps had been trained. A substantial surplus existed in the treasury. The transition from colonial status to independence was smooth and carefully coordinated.

Within the short span of 5 years the light of freedom that once gave promise of burning so brightly in Ghana has been all but snuffed out. Democratic institutions, where they still exist, exist in name only. The one-party political system is deliberately suppressing all opposition and systematically obliterating individual freedom. Supreme political power has been gathered into the grasping hands of one individual. Freedom is being systematically crushed. Ridiculous attempts to deify himself in the eyes of the Ghanaian people while fanning the flames of racism in the name of nationalism raise additional qualms and questions.

The fact that Nkrumah has, in recent years, displayed increasing affinity for Communist causes and has consistently alined his Government with the Communist bloc in international politics does not, in and of itself, disqualify the Ghanaian people for appropriate assistance. I observe, however, that such a condition ought not to be dismissed without consideration.

What is more fundamental than political alinement in international politics is the fact that the present Government of Ghana does not adhere to basic principles of rule of law. It denies fundamental human rights to its opposition. It has embarked upon a calculated program to suppress freedom of expression. It has legalized imprisonment and even death of citizens for any act which Nkrumah may, by whim or otherwise, decide is a crime, upon sentence by special judges appointed by him and from whose judgment there is no appeal. It was the bill for that purpose which I read and heard debated, and which gave me a deep shock.

Nkrumah seeks to wield, and is wielding, dictatorial power. He seeks, through mass communications media which he controls, to abrogate unto himself power over the people that extends not only from the cradle to the grave, but even beyond as well.

Mr. President, on the day we arrived in Ghana, I acquired a copy of the Evening News, the masthead of which carries the statement that it was founded by Kwame Nkrumah, and bears the slogan, "The Party Is Supreme."

The lead article of that edition of the newspaper—dated Saturday, October 14, 1961—carries on page 1 the bold headline: "Nkrumah Is Our Messiah." I wish to read one paragraph from that article:

> From time to time, individuals have caught glimpses of the Christ or the true idea of God, good. Long before Jesus, were men like Moses, Joshua, Elisha, etc., who demonstrated the true idea of sonship. This demonstration by no means ended with Jesus. Why. Karl Marx demonstrated the Christ, and so did Lenin of U.S.S.R., Ghandi of India, Mao of China, and in our midst is Kwame Nkrumah.

Editorial opinion in prominent U.S. newspapers has taken note of Nkrumah's leftist tendencies and dictatorial acts; yet it is said that we should not forsake the Ghanaian people merely because their Government is dictatorial and alines itself with Moscow. Rather, it is argued, we should provide assistance to improve the lot of the people, to remove the causes of hunger, illness, and illiteracy that breed communism, to wean them away from their ill-guided ways, in their own interest, which will ultimately prove to be in our own interest as well.

There is much to be said for this theory, Mr. President. But assuming its validity—and there are situations in which it can validly be applied—it does not fit the Ghanaian situation or apply to the Volta River project. The Volta River project simply will not implement this philosophy. It will not do so because this project will provide little aid to the Ghanaian people. In large measure, it may serve further to entrench the present dictatorial regime. The Volta project is a prestige showpiece for Nkrumah and his political clique.

The first stage of the Volta Dam project is designed to produce about 512,000 kilowatts of electricity. Ultimately, it is planned that 1-million-kilowatt capacity will be installed. That is an enormous flow of electricity. Is it needed in Ghana? At the present time, only about 40,000 kilowatts is used in the entire country and there is no prospect for local industrial development that could absorb anything like a major fraction of the output of the proposed dam.

The Volta Dam project undertakes to answer a need that does not exist. It supplies power for a demand that is not there. If there were a prospect of developing local industry to use this vast quantity of power, if industrial development were merely awaiting the availability of power to be unleashed, if this project would indeed provide for the dire needs of the people of Ghana, there might be justification for the project; but these conditions are not satisfied, and there is no prospect in the foreseeable future that the people of Ghana, who now use 40,000 kilowatts of electricity, can use economically 1 million kilowatts of electricity. How is it proposed, then, to justify this project?

The only way a need for power can be demonstrated is by extending many more millions in loan aid to a created subsidiary of Kaiser Aluminum Corp. and Reynolds Aluminum Co. to construct an aluminum smelter to process alumina shipped from the United States, with the finished aluminum to be marketed either in the United States or in Europe.

Thus, it is proposed that we use the foreign aid program to assist two big U.S. corporations to create a demand for power to justify the need for foreign aid to build a dam in a country whose leaders flout and successfully suppress the principles of political and economic freedom which are enunciated in the declaration of policy contained in the Mutual Security Act. I ask the President to reconsider all the circumstances before the final signatures are affixed.

The executive branch of the Government has had many months in which to consider this project. Its approval was announced only recently. But even though the announcement has been made, the terms of the agreement, and the basis upon which it was negotiated, are such that any deterioration of the situation in Ghana, economic or otherwise, would be a sufficient basis for termination of the agreement. I submit that the situation in Ghana, both economic and political, has been steadily deteriorating.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the legislative branch of the Government is entitled to consider a commitment to a project which, so I am advised, ultimately will cost in the order of $500 million, before that commitment is finally made, and particularly so since there is a serious question as to whether a project of this kind—and especially this particular project—will meet the requirements of the Mutual Security Act of 1961.

Moreover, as I shall later indicate, I have serious doubts that the conditions the President fixed as requirements for final approval have adequately been met.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask the President to withhold the final act of approval, scheduled for tomorrow, until the legislative branch of the Government can have an opportunity to give the matter careful and full consideration.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. Do I correctly understand that the Senator from Tennessee also has an objection which relates to the possible avoidance, let us say, of a suggestion written into the foreign aid bill at the last session—namely, that in administering this program, the political orientation of the proposed recipient nation be taken into account. I believe that was known as the Keating amendment. Let me ask whether that provides a possible basis for the Senator's concern over having this particular project constructed in Ghana.

Mr. GORE. I had not intended to refer specifically to that provision of the act. I am sure that consideration has been given to the political orientation of Mr. Nkrumah and his Government. I say in all candor that I would not deny approval to the project solely on those grounds. If the project were one which related definitely to the needs of the people there, then I would not have it defeated only because of Nkrumah's political orientation.

I am raising what I consider more fundamental and more serious objections. However, I recognize that the point the Senator from Iowa makes is a valid one and is one from which Congress might well wish to consider; and I realize also that the other Members may not feel as I do in this regard.

Mr. MILLER. If the President would withhold finalizing this agreement, that would give Congress an opportunity to consider this feature, and also the feature the Senator from Tennessee has been so ably presenting to the Senate in the last several minutes, would it not?

Mr. GORE. It would, indeed.

I should like to add that the President cannot lead very far in this foreign aid program where the people and the Congress will not follow. This project is an enormous one. It has been estimated to me by one, who is very knowledgeable in regard to the project, as ultimately costing $500 million. I should like to suggest to the Senator from Iowa that this is a project of such magnitude that the legislative branch of the Government should have an opportunity to consider it on all of its merits or demerits—an opportunity to consider all points in connection with it, including the one the able Senator from Iowa has raised.

Mr. MILLER. But at the same time, as a result of the action taken by Congress at the last session, the President does not have to acquiesce in the suggestion or the request made by the Senator from Tennessee; the administration has the power to proceed to finalize this agreement and to ignore the suggestions which have been made here this afternoon, does it not?

Mr. GORE. I do not really raise a question as to the President's power to make this commitment, although I have quoted from the objectives of the Mutual Security Act and I have raised questions as to whether this project will satisfy those conditions and those objectives. However, I do not here argue that the President is without power to approve this project.

Mr. MILLER. If the President exercises this power, notwithstanding the arguments the Senator from Tennessee has made, will some control still remain with the Appropriations Committees, for annual review of the project?

Mr. GORE. Well, no money can be expended until it is appropriated. So it would be necessary for Congress to appropriate the funds for the project, before funds could be expended on the project.

Mr. MILLER. Have enough funds been appropriated, so that the project can get underway?

Mr. GORE. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. In other words, enough funds to get the project underway have already been appropriated, and thus the project can be gotten underway without regard to the arguments which have been made here—in other words, without regard to the reactions of the Members of Congress?

Mr. GORE. I believe that is a correct statement.

Mr. MILLER. But when it comes to completion of the project, after it has been begun, control remains in the Congress, does it not?

Mr. GORE. Undoubtedly so. If Congress were to refuse to appropriate the money for the project, it could not be completed; and if Congress were to refuse to approve the lending of money to this subsidiary of the Kaiser Aluminum Co., that could not be done, either. This project can be completed only with the ultimate approval of Congress; and since it is a project of great magnitude and since it raises such serious questions of policy, of advisability, and of strict compliance with the requirements of the statute, I am venturing to suggest to the President that in my humble opinion he would be well advised to allow the legislative branch of the Government to have an opportunity to give it full consideration.

Mr. MILLER. Let me say that I join the Senator from Tennessee in expressing that opinion and in taking that position, and I compliment him on his forceful presentation of this situation.

Mr. GORE. I thank my able friend. Since he has been so kind as to listen to my remarks and to show his interest in this matter, I wish to suggest that this project does not have the political connotations which were present in connection with the Aswan Dam project. There are three big differences.

First, the Aswan Dam was designed to provide irrigation water for the very life of the Egyptian people. However, the Volta Dam project does not have any irrigation feature.

Second, in Egypt there is a great need for electricity. I have already indicated that in Ghana there is no demand for the large block of electric power to be produced by this project, if it is constructed.

Third, I would question whether the Soviets would rush in to build this project to provide electricity that is not needed, to supply a demand that is not in existence, to spend enormous amounts of money on a project which does not go to the needs of the people, but which could be utilized only by some vast industrial user of electricity. I would seriously question whether the Soviets would be tempted to move in if the United States were to decline to act in this situation, even though Russia did move in, as we know, in connection with the Aswan Dam project.

The only way a need for power can be demonstrated, as I have said, is by the construction of a huge industrial plant. In this case it is proposed to lend to the subsidiary of Kaiser Aluminum and Reynolds Metal Co. many millions of dollars to build an aluminum smelter. I think Kaiser Aluminum will own 90 percent of the consortium and Reynolds will own 10 percent.

Mr. President, if our aid program in Africa and in other underdeveloped nations is to succeed, we must orient it so as to improve the lot of the people rather than merely to entrench the political regime which happens to be in power. The overwhelming needs of the people in Ghana, as elsewhere in the new nations of Africa, are elemental—education, health, food and water. The Volta Dam and its power will not supply these needs. It will create but few jobs for the Ghanaian people. It is not even planned, at least initially, to develop the low-grade bauxite deposits in Ghana. Under the agreement between the Kaiser consortium and Nkrumah, Kaiser will be the sole judge as to whether and to what extent Ghanaian labor will be employed in the smelter which is to be constructed.

Nowhere is it seriously suggested that there is any need in Ghana for any significant portion of the aluminum that will be smelted. It is contemplated that shipment of aluminum to Europe and the United States will generate foreign exchange for Ghana, but there is no indication as to for what or where this foreign exchange will be used.

On the basis of presently available evidence, I must conclude that the principal beneficiaries of this project will be the huge U.S. corporations which have sponsored it and Mr. Nkrumah and his political group.

It is argued that failure to proceed with the project might have created bitter anti-American feeling in Ghana where Nkrumah could be expected to have ignited violent anti-American propaganda through his controlled communications media. He has been doing so constantly and, therefore, could be expected to do so again.

In country after country, during the month I spent in Africa, I found anti-American and anti-Western propaganda that had emanated from Ghana. So we should not be surprised if it occurs again.

But there is another side to the coin. By proceeding with the project, we have, to say the least, discouraged and raised doubts about the future of those who are sincerely dedicated to the promotion of individual liberty and democratic self-government, not only in Ghana but elsewhere in Africa.

If Volta is to serve as a guideline, no longer will progress toward democracy and freedom be considered the pathway toward United States assistance. Indeed, some may justifiably regard Volta as demonstrating that dictatorial methods, with a strong leftist slant, pave the way to Fort Knox. It surely will not go unnoticed by other political leaders in Africa that the amount of aid from U.S. sources—$201 million as now specified—which has been earmarked for this one project, is approximately equivalent to one-half of the total amount of aid it is expected to provide to all of Africa during the current fiscal year.

Mr. President, we must remember that it is the taxpayers' money which will be committed tomorrow by final signature to the contract, if that signature is fixed. I realize that the stakes for which we play in this rapidly changing world, particularly in Africa, are high. I am prepared, and I believe most patriotic Americans are prepared, to make whatever sacrifices are necessary, provided the expenditure promotes achievement of our national objectives.

I do not believe the Volta project will promote those objectives. Indeed, it may well hinder the achievement of those objectives.

Moreover, this project will produce adverse economic tax and balance-of-payments results which give promise of being unusually serious. Under the contemplated plan of operation, the Kaiser consortium will ship bauxite from Jamaica to the United States, where it will be processed into alumina. The alumina will then be shipped to Ghana, where it will be smelted into aluminum. The aluminum will then be marketed either in Europe or in the United States. There is no demand in Ghana for aluminum to come from this size production facility.

The Kaiser consortium will pay to its Ghana subsidiary a service charge or "tolling" fee to compensate it for the smelting process. Thus, American corporations will be paying out dollars for foreign exchange for the performance of production processes on American produce for which our capacity here in the United States is not only fully adequate, but which even now provides a surplus.

Our balance-of-payments problem will be adversely affected, then, not only by the investment capital associated with the construction of the dam and smelter, but by the operation of the project as well. The Ghana subsidiary may have a decided competitive advantage over U.S. producers of aluminum. It will pay to the Government of Ghana about 2.65 mills per kilowatt-hour for Volta electricity. Comparable amounts of power obtainable in the United States under currently negotiated contracts would be at rates of approximately 4 mills per kilowatt-hour.

Ghana is a member of the British Commonwealth. As such it will likely have access to the Common Market on terms much more favorable than will firms based in the United States. Thus, the Kaiser consortium, by operating through its Ghana subsidiary, may have a decided advantage over U.S. producers of aluminum in gaining access to the European Common Market. This European market is expected to provide a major portion of the increase in the demand for aluminum in the next decade. Under such circumstances, the operation of this aluminum smelter in Ghana, made possible by U.S. money, is tantamount to the export of American jobs.

The principal beneficiaries, other than Nkrumah, are, as I have said, the U.S. corporations which promote it. They stand to gain tax-free profits, and there is almost no way in which they could lose. Up to 90 percent of any funds actually invested by the consortium and up to 90 percent of any unrepatriated profits will be guaranteed against both political and business risks by the U.S. Government. The consortium has obtained an agreement from Nkrumah under which its subsidiary will enjoy complete tax exemption, at least for the first 10 years. For that period, the smelter will be a 100-percent tax haven operation. Moreover, the U.S. Treasury has agreed in advance not to question, as a tax avoidance device, an arrangement whereby the major portion of the money actually invested by the consortium could be withdrawn out of operating profits of their subsidiary without U.S. tax liability.

Mr. President, when one considers the advantages accruing to the Kaiser consortium from this project, it is not difficult to understand why representatives of the Kaiser company did so much to promote it. Kaiser conducted an engineering survey and developed the current concept for the project. Incidentally, one-half of Kaiser's fee for this service was paid by the American taxpayers out of foreign aid funds. Representatives of the Kaiser company have established themselves as advisers to Nkrumah. During my visit to Ghana last fall I was somewhat surprised to learn that representatives of the Kaiser Co. had much readier access to Nkrumah and other political leaders than the U.S. Ambassador. This is not to say that this is "dollar diplomacy," but it is to illustrate the intense interest of a private interest and the close working relations between that private interest and the Ghana dictator.

I have no objection, Mr. President, to legitimate activities by American companies to develop proposals for economic development in other areas. I believe, however, that projects actively promoted by U.S. companies which have a financial interest in their construction should be considered solely on the merits of the project itself and with the understanding that it is just barely possible that the interests of the private U.S. company is not always identical with that of the United States.

If this project is constructed as planned and operated as planned, I can foresee complication rather than simplification of future United States-Ghana relations. Undoubtedly, the Ghanaian people will take great pride in this project, at least initially, but after passage of a few years it is possible, if not probable, that they will view the situation merely as an operation under which a U.S. corporation is the principal beneficiary of Volta power. We have heard cries of dollar imperialism before and we will likely hear them again. An example of this can be found today in Guinea.

Mr. President, I wish to acknowledge that our entire foreign aid program has an important bearing upon the serious problem of the balance of payments. I would not stop our foreign aid program because of the particular difficulties which it raises. I think, however, we must distinguish between foreign aid—both economic and military aid—directed to meet the needs of people of the recipient countries and a huge industrial project, of which the principal beneficiary is a subsidiary of a U.S. corporation, which will operate for at least 10 years in a complete tax haven and compete unfairly with respect to U.S. concerns.

Mr. President, I realize that the decision to participate in this project has already been made and publicly announced by the President of the United States. However, I repeat that, by the terms of the agreement, any deterioration of the situation in Ghana would be a sufficient basis for termination, and I again point out that the situation there has been deteriorating. Wise men sometimes change their minds. I invite the President to reconsider in order to permit the legislative branch of the Government, whose support and cooperation is necessary to continue the foreign aid program, to give careful consideration to this project of such great magnitude.

My views were made known to the executive department before this decision was made, and I am sure they were given thoughtful consideration. Undoubtedly, the President gave consideration, among other things, to the long period over which negotiations had been conducted on this project, including those conducted by the previous administration. I believe, despite these considerations, the decision was a mistake, and I think this mistake should be corrected, if possible, even at this late hour.

I have serious doubts, as I earlier indicated, that the requirements and safeguards specified by the President with respect to this project have been met. I am not at liberty to discuss these requirements, though I am entirely familiar with them, but I do question the adequacy of compliance.

Under the proposed agreement, funds are to be made available under written terms which imposes contractual obligations upon the Government of the United States. It also imposes contractual obligations upon the Government of Ghana.

I bring this matter to the attention of the Senate, Mr. President, in order that my concern about this particular project be made clearly a matter of record, in order that the Senate may give it even brief attention today before the ceremonies for final commitment.

More importantly, however, it is my hope that public discussion and debate about the Volta project will contribute to the development of a national policy decision which will preclude any idea that the Volta project has established a pattern to be followed in our aid program for Africa. The needs of the people are too great and too dire to permit the United States to spend all its available funds on a few huge projects, such as the Volta Dam project.

The problems of Africa are staggering. Per capita income is less than $100. The only way the problem can be attacked successfully in my opinion is to undertake programs that are simple and which provide assistance directly to the people rather than merely shoring up a regime which is in power, or providing money making deals for big private interests. We ought not to send bulldozers when handtools are needed and we ought not to build gigantic hydroelectric power projects until the economy of the area involved is ready for them.

Mr. President, I appreciate the attention of the Senate and I yield the floor.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, let me say again that I agree with the Senator from Tennessee that this question ought to be reviewed by the Congress. I point out that I became concerned over this particular project following my reading about it in the newspapers. The news accounts reported that this proposal was personally taken up with the President and reviewed, and that "on balance" a favorable decision was reached thereon. On the basis of that information I wrote to the State Department to find out exactly what the facts were on the basis of which the balance was struck.

The information I received to support the striking of this balance consisted of a statement that—

> The loan should not be construed as an endorsement of all the policies of the Government of Ghana.

The further statement was made—

> That it is a long-term investment in the welfare of the Ghanaian people, and that our participation in the project is concrete evidence to the people of Africa that the United States genuinely desires to assist developing African nations in achieving economic stability and political freedom.

I am afraid that that statement is not enough justification to satisfy me. When I ask for details of a project, on the basis of which I would hope a rather intensive review was made, and as a result of which a mere balance was struck in favor of the project, I require more reasons, and I think other Members of Congress would like to have more reasons than that.

The able Senator from Tennessee I believe has provided some very good reasons as to why the balance should not have been struck.

I hope the President will heed the request of the Senator from Tennessee and have this matter reviewed by the Congress.

THE KENNEDY-FREEMAN FARM PLAN

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the proposed Kennedy-Freeman farm plan has finally revealed that this administration's professed concern for the farmers was no deeper than their potential votes. To suggest that they be given a choice between loss of their freedom on the one hand or loss of all protection from economic adversity on the other hand is not much of a choice. This is particularly true when other segments of the economy are not being required to make such a choice. The vast surpluses of feed grains which have been built up under wartime agricultural programs which have been continued on the books by democratically controlled Congresses are being used today to scare farmers into so-called voluntary participation in a program which cost a half billion dollars a year more than the old outdated program—just for the year 1961, without noticeable improvement in the net income of most farmers. At the same time, the President said the other day at his press conference that in connection with excessive stockpiling of strategic materials, "we will take no action which will disrupt commodity prices." Why this double standard between farmers and people engaged in producing other commodities, Mr. President?

I ask unanimous consent that editorials from the February 1 issues of the Cedar Rapids Gazette, the Waterloo Courier, and the Chicago Daily News, and the February 2 issue of the Chicago Sun Times on this proposed new farm program be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Cedar Rapids Gazette, Feb. 1, 1962]

THERE'LL BE SOME CHANGES

American agriculture got the word with the bark on it from President Kennedy Wednesday. In his special farm message to Congress the President offered only two choices to farmers—submit to the strictest controls and the most massive regimentation ever seriously proposed or lose Government price supports and other economic aids.

The forthcoming battle over the Kennedy farm proposals in Congress undoubtedly will make last year's fight on the omnibus farm bill appear like a minor engagement.. With an election coming up in the fall, Congressmen will be reluctant to take Government benefits away from farm voters.

It is extremely doubtful, too, that the necessary two-thirds majority of farmers would approve the compulsory control features of the Kennedy program, even under threat of losing price supports and having the vast Government surpluses dumped on the market. Practically all farmers treasure their independence and a great many of them strongly oppose Government intervention in their business on the scale proposed in the Kennedy message.

Nor is it likely that the program would immediately improve farm income. A cut of 20 percent in production would require an increase of 25 percent in the support level to hold gross income at the same level. Net income would be less, for fixed costs would be spread over fewer units of production.

In the course of time when surplus stocks have been reduced and agriculture has become adjusted to the lower level of production after several years of the new program, farm income might show improvement.

That improvement is not likely to reach the "parity of income" that President Kennedy promised farmers in his campaign speeches. The administration is as fully committed to holding down food prices for city voters as it is to raising the incomes of farm people.

In the long run, better incomes for farmers are most likely to result from the continued decline in farm numbers, with the total national farm income divided among fewer farmers operating larger and more efficient farming units. The most serious criticism of the administration's proposed farm program is that it will tend to freeze agriculture into today's pattern and delay the adjustments in farm size and numbers that eventually must be made.

What President Kennedy's proposed program will do for or to farmers is more or less an academic question. The program will be quite different when Congress gets through with it.

[From the Waterloo Courier, Feb. 1, 1962]

ALTERNATIVES TOO HARSH IN KENNEDY FARM PLAN

President Kennedy has presented to Congress a farm program which would confront farmers with this choice: Accept compulsory controls on production or lose Government price supports.

Under the administration proposal, farmers involved in production of wheat, feed grains, and milk would be given a choice at a referendum of accepting compulsory acreage allotments and marketing quotas under a system of high price supports or the drastic reduction or elimination of price supports.

If producers of feed grains, for example, failed to give the necessary two-thirds approval, price supports would be withdrawn but Government payments would still be made for land withdrawn from production. However, the Government would be given the right to dump 350 million bushels of surplus feed grains on the market.

If dairy farmers voted for marketing allotments by a two-thirds margin, the Government would spend up to $300 million a year (about half the current rate) to support prices at 90 percent of parity. If the marketing allotments were rejected, the $300 million would be spent in general price support operations at a lower parity level but nothing more would be available after the $300 million is spent.

It has long been apparent that farmers could not continue to receive Government guarantees without also facing Government controls. The voluntary participation system has failed to bring about the overall reduction in production which is necessary to justify the Government expenditures. As we have said, if we are going to spend the money, let's spend it to buy what we want—a reduction in production. And that means compulsory controls.

But the program as presented by the administration hasn't any chance at all of being approved by Congress in its present form. The alternatives are too harsh and unfair. The requested power to dump surpluses on the open market, for example, is a Government gun at the back of each farmer almost compelling him to vote "yes" in the referendum, whether he approves or not. And it would hardly seem fair to impose on the 66 percent of farmers who might vote "yes" on the referendum the sudden withdrawal of supports when only 34 percent—or slightly more than one-third—voted "no."

Congressional reaction to the plan has not yet been crystallized; but it is safe to say that, if the choice between compulsory controls or lower supports is given, the alternatives will not be so harsh. Perhaps a gradually declining level of price supports should be offered as the alternative to high supports with controls. And, since the surpluses were not accumulated under a free market system, it is not fair to permit the dumping of these surpluses as a penalty on farmer preference for that system.

On the political side, the administration has obviously given the Republican opposition a fine campaign issue. The President proposes a drastic cut of $5 billion over a 4-year period in farm aid at a time when he is proposing a rapid increase in spending for almost every other purpose, including foreign aid.

[From the Chicago Daily News, Feb. 1, 1962]

FARMERS GET HELP—OR ELSE

During his campaign, President Kennedy predicted that his farm program would reduce the cost of farm subsidies by $1 billion a year. The results were that costs arose by $1 billion.

It is difficult, therefore, to share either Mr. Kennedy's pride in the record or the enthusiasm with which, in his farm message yesterday, he predicts new and greater accomplishments.

The notable feature of the "new" farm program is the warning that the inevitable day has come when the halter is slipped on as the price of the free oats. There will be acreage allotments and marketing quotas to which growers must conform before they qualify for Treasury checks. The decision to accept these controls will, of course, be reached "democratically" by a two-thirds majority in a referendum. This year has shown that means are available, in price-depressing market maneuvers, to punish a stubborn minority that won't join the club.

One way this was done was by selling corn from surplus stocks in sufficient quantity to drive the free market price down to 90 cents a bushel. Farmers who cooperated could sell their crop to the Government at the support price of $1.20.

The direction of the Kennedy program is probably one of the most deeply significant moves of his administration. The Government has been tinkering with the "farm problem" for 30 years. But improvement in farm technology has outpaced the brakes on production, until, as Mr. Kennedy noted, by 1980, in spite of a 65 million increase in population, we will produce all we need with 50 million fewer acres then of cropland than are in use today.

What is significant is the turn toward stern regimentation rather than in the direction of free markets as long urged by conservative farm organizations.

Congress, the farmers and the public have been conditioned to accept this program and some of the benefits are visible. The President noted that 85,000 more schools and child-care centers are getting free milk, 700,000 more children enjoy a hot lunch, food stamps have added to the amount and variety of food available to 6 million people.

We suspect that the popular reaction will be that if this is the result of socialized regimentation, give us more of it. And Mr. Kennedy does, too.

The Farm Home Administration is to make loans to farmers for recreation enterprises and build sewage systems and other facilities so the communities may attract industry. Another agency will make loans and grants for "rural renewal" which means "developing new uses for land and water, creating forest industry parks, assist small farmers in farm consolidation and enlargement, develop needed public facilities, including outdoor recreation."

Even after the customary discount or political bombast, this is pretty lavish generosity. There is no mention of who is to pay for it but most of us know by now.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Feb. 2, 1962]

Regimenting Farmers

President Kennedy's new farm proposals have run into violent reaction in some quarters in Congress, but the criticisms are nothing to the explosion that would be touched off if almost total regimentation of American industry were to be proposed. The sad fact is the Nation has grown used to, and accepts, a managed agricultural economy.

The only questions now raised are over the degree of management—how heavily the hand of the bureaucrat in Washington will rest on the farmer's shoulder. Under the terms of the President's farm message, the farmer would henceforth feel the Government's grip as he never has before.

Mr. Kennedy proposed a far-reaching reorganization of farm production, including the tightest controls in history, retirement of many farms, and a shift of a great number of farmers to other occupations.

This much can be said for the program: It is designed to bring about, at last, a reduction in the Nation's costly farm surpluses. It aims to cut the cost of support prices almost in half by 1967. It seeks to eliminate thousands of the estimated 1,600,000 inefficient American farms, and proposes loans to finance training of rural youths and their elders for nonagricultural employment.

There can be little quarrel with these goals. But alarming doubts arise over the means by which the Government planners would achieve their stated objectives, and correct the failures of present and past agriculture policies.

The new program, for example, would require farmers to exchange voluntary controls for firmly regulated production and marketing curbs. If they refused, the Government would simply walk away from agriculture and leave it in chaos.

For such crops as wheat and corn, growers would be given a choice between increased Government limitations over both production and marketing, or no Federal price supports. Moreover, if the farmers voted against the control in a referendum, the Government would be empowered to dump millions of tons of feed grains and wheat on the market, a move which must depress prices. Also, for the first time, marketing quotas would be set on dairy products, which have begun to pile up in Government surplus warehouses again after raises in the price supports by this administration. If the dairymen refuse to accept quotas, their price supports would be drastically reduced.

"Naked coercion," was the term used by Charles B. Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, to describe these provisions under which farmers would vote on whether to accept Federal dictation over their individual operations.

Further, acceptance would mean that farmers would become almost totally dependent on Government decisionmaking. They would march in step to a tune piped in Washington. And there could not fail to be a vast increase in Federal enforcement machinery.

This is a heavy burden of regimentation to suggest imposing on one segment of the U.S. economy to solve problems which have not been of its making.

The latest proposal would probably reduce surpluses, if adopted, but gains for taxpayers are questionable at best. The cost of subsidies, land diversion programs, and distribution of stored commodities to the needy at home and abroad are bound to go up.

Every serious student of the farm problem knows there are better ways of reaching the desirable ends which this program envisions. But there is only one way to do it without compulsion. Agriculture must return to a freer market. This cannot be done overnight or without severe, temporary adjustments. As painful as these may be, the fact remains—and Congress should understand—the longer they are delayed, the worse they will inevitably become.

RECIPROCAL TRADE PROGRAM AND THE COMMON MARKET

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the principal hurdle to be overcome in working out a new reciprocal trade program with the Common Market will be the issue of whether the volume of agricultural exports from the United States is going to continue or is going to decline.

In the January 14 issue of the Washington Post, an article reports that a joint agricultural policy was finally agreed upon by the Common Market nations. As pointed out in the lead editorial in the Post on January 16, the resolution of the issue of uniform prices among member countries and the timing of such uniformity will profoundly affect U.S. farm exports. A high tariff-high price system, if allowed to encourage uneconomic production, would reduce the share of American farmers in the European market. On January 28, an article in the Post reports that the most influential Minister of Agriculture in the Common Market group of nations, M. Edgard Pisani of France, had dashed cold water on American hopes of getting any firm assurance of its export of farm produce to this group of nations.

In the February 4 issue of the New York Times, there appeared an excellent article by Mr. J. H. Carmical on this entire subject, pointing out that the new agricultural policy of the EEC envisions the exclusion of food exporting nations from the Common Market. In the same issue of the Times, another article by Edwin L. Dale, Jr., entitled "Technology Changes Europe's Pattern of Agriculture," describes how European farmers are following a somewhat similar path to that of American farmers in improving their efficiency and productivity.

Notwithstanding these developments, the fact remains, Mr. President, that European countries cannot economically produce feed grains on land costing as much as $1,000 per acre—certainly not in competition with the United States. If Europe wishes to increase its meat and poultry production, all to the good. But let them continue to import feed grains from the United States in order to support this increased production.

Let me make it very clear, Mr. President, that I for one do not propose to expand the President's powers to negotiate new reciprocal trade agreements with the Common Market or the Common Market nations unless I have satisfactory assurance that this is to be a truly quid pro quo arrangement—a two-way street, if you please, which will assure continuance of our agricultural exports. If, indeed, the prospect of a loss of part or all of this market is what contributed to the unfortunate proposal of the President and his Secretary of Agriculture for a controlled agricultural program, then let me say that we had better get this aspect of the President's proposed reciprocal trade agreements program out into the open. In the President's message of January 24, he calls attention to the fact that nearly $2 billion in agricultural products are exported to the Common Market nations, and one is led to believe that enactment of his program will insure that this will be continued, if not increased. Such being the case, let us be sure, Mr. President, that appropriate safeguards are written into the reciprocal trade agreement program which will see to it that these assumptions are met so that our farmers will not find themselves forced into a controlled agricultural economy because of loss of their markets in the Common Market.

I ask unanimous consent that the various articles and editorial to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 14, 1962]

Accord on Crucial Farm Issue Ends Inner Six Talk

(By Robert Mauthner)

BRUSSELS, January 14.—The six Common Market nations agreed on a joint agricultural policy early today after a marathon 175-hour bargaining session.

The agreement announcement followed soon after an earlier statement that the six nations in the low-tariff union had agreed to set up a common agricultural fund.

The fund will support farm prices in the face of more freedom of movement for farm goods established under the common agricultural policy.

West Germany, especially, had expressed fears that its highly protected farm economy might suffer from the free flow of farm goods among the six.

Italian delegates had set today as a deadline for reaching agreement on the formation of a common agricultural policy so they could return home to prepare for an important congress of the Christian Democratic Party.

Agreement on a common agricultural policy will enable the six to pass into the second stage of the Common Market, with more tariff cuts and integration of the low-tariff group's administration.

The second stage was due to come into effect January 1, but was blocked by the squabble over a common farm policy.

Meanwhile, a British spokesman was asked about a report that talks scheduled for Thursday on the British application for Market membership had been postponed. He said no decision on a postponement would be made before Monday.

The financing of the common farm policy was the key problem among several which faced the Common Market nations.

Others, apparently also settled, include escape clauses for fruit and vegetable imports, the length of the transitional period for applying the common agricultural policy and the question of grain prices.

The ministers began their current round of negotiations December 18, broke off for the Christmas holidays and met again December 28 and 30 without reaching agreement. January 1 was the old deadline for starting the Market's second stage. Talks resumed January 4. The extension of the deadline was an effort of the ministers to avoid admitting failure—an admission which might have hampered extension of the Market to include other nation applicants.

The agricultural issue has pitted countries like France, desperate to export huge farm surpluses, against others like West Germany, equally intent on protecting its own farmers against cheap food imports.

France and West Germany stood opposed over contributions to the fund for financing farm policy.

France backed a Belgian proposal which would mean Germany would pay 31 percent of the contributions at the end of the first 3-year transitional period while France would pay 24 percent. The Belgian proposal would lead to the progressive financing of the fund by levies on imports from third countries.

The West Germans wanted fund contributions made on the basis of the budgetary scale laid down in the Market-founding Treaty of Rome.

This would mean France and West Germany would each contribute 28 percent.

West Germany, biggest agricultural importer in the Market, did not want to bear the burden of financing French farm exports or of footing the bill for structural reforms in France which would only boost the already big surplus of French produce.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 16, 1962]

COMMON MARKET STAGE II

The nations of the Common Market may take great satisfaction in having reached the second stage of their great enterprise. The momentum of European integration has been accelerated. The prospect for European political and economic unity has moved closer. The counterpoise to Soviet power in Europe is gaining weight. For the United Kingdom, this increases the importance of making common cause with the Common Market. For the United States, it makes more compelling the case for broader tariff bargaining powers.

In celebrating the achievement, it nevertheless would be a mistake to suppose that congratulations exclusively are in order. Some fairly sizable differences seem to have been swept under the rug. The sticking point of the negotiations was farm policy. Because in the second stage no single country retains a veto, Germany, like others, will have to accept majority decisions in the sensitive farm area. But Germany is reluctant to expose its high cost agriculture to severe competition. Hence Germany insisted on, and obtained, an escape clause that amounts to a backdoor veto on this subject.

The principal issue in the farm field results from the need to arrive at uniform prices among the member countries. From the statements made so far there is no evidence that this issue has been resolved. Today, farm prices in Germany are high, though not for all products, and prices in France and some of the other countries are low. These differences will be maintained, in the immediate future, despite the removal of quantitative restrictions on trade. Sliding scale tariffs will be employed, among the member countries and toward the outside, to keep price levels apart. But in order to achieve a true common market, the internal tariffs eventually will have to be removed and the external equalized. This involves a decision whether the price level for farm products is to be high, as in Germany, or low, as in France and some other countries. A low outside tariff, by producing a low price level, would discourage uneconomic farm production and hurt German farmers. A high tariff would do the reverse, and would thereby raise living costs in the Common Market and reduce its international competitiveness.

The resolution of this issue will profoundly affect U.S. farm exports. A high tariff-high price system, if allowed to encourage uneconomic production, would reduce the share of American farmers in the European market. A lower tariff with lower European production would offer much better prospects. The administration had hoped that this issue would be clarified before the discussion of reciprocal tariff reductions with the Common Market now approaching their climax in Brussels are concluded. The United States could then have sought assurances that U.S. farm products would continue to have their fair share of the European market. But if, as seems to be the case, this issue has not been settled, very specific commitments probably are not available.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 28, 1962]

PARIS DASHES U.S. FARM TRADE HOPES

PARIS, January 27.—The most influential Minister of Agriculture in the six-nation European Common Market, Edgard Pisani of France, dashed cold water here this week on American hopes of getting any firm assurance for its export of farm produce to the Six.

He said the common agricultural policy just worked out by the Common Market was designed primarily for the benefit of its own farmers and that their interests would come first when imports are being considered.

"When Mr. Freeman (Orville F. Freeman, U.S. Secretary of Agriculture) comes asking me for import guarantees, he is asking for something which I cannot even promise my own farmers," Pisani said.

The French Minister said in his opinion the only solution to world farm surpluses was a worldwide organization of the various commodity markets. He said France had made detailed proposals to this end in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade in Geneva and would continue to advocate them.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 4, 1962]

FOOD EXPORTING LANDS STUDY COMMON MARKET FARM PLAN—IMPACT ON UNITED STATES SEEN IN PLAN TO EXCLUDE OUTSIDE GOODS

(By J. H. Carmical)

The food-exporting nations are greatly concerned over the new agricultural policy recently adopted by the European Economic Community. And they should be, for a study of the plan shows that it envisions their exclusion from the world's largest single market.

Coming at a period when the United States, the biggest exporter of agricultural products, is in what has been described as "a crisis of abundance" in food supplies, the plan of the European trading bloc, usually referred to as the Common Market, threatens to result in a further curtailment of American agriculture.

This bold and imaginative plan, which was adopted only after the most deliberate considerations by the six member nations in the bloc, eventually may include all Western Europe into a single trading unit. Already most of the other countries in Western Europe, largely in self-defense, have signified an interest in becoming members.

TREMENDOUS POTENTIAL

Should the outsiders be admitted, the largest single trading bloc in history would result. Encompassing an estimated population of 250 million, its potential would be tremendous and its impact on world trade in food, raw materials and manufactured goods would be felt by every nation.

According to those who have closely watched the development of the Common Market, the adoption of the agricultural policy has removed the last major obstacle in the economic integration and possibly the political unification of the Western Continent.

The farm pact, considered the most significant development since the bloc was formed 4 years ago, has the specific objective of making member countries collectively self-sufficient in food production.

The expansion of farm production, which will involve new tractors and other farming equipment, would be a major spur to the industrial development of these six countries—Western Germany, France, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg.

The new farm policy necessarily will mean a great shift in the world trade routes and it looks as if the United States ultimately will lose a large part of its biggest export cash market for farm products. This will be a serious blow because of the present heavy excess production of these items and the huge surpluses already built up.

In an effort to alleviate the burdensome surpluses, of which storage costs alone amount to nearly $1 billion a year, the Kennedy administration is advocating an entirely new farm program that includes a drastic restriction of production over a long period as well as the gradual disposal of a portion of the inventories, mostly held by the U.S. Government.

To what extent the new Common Market policy on agriculture influenced the President's message to Congress last week is not known, but the prospect of losing a part of the European market must have contributed to some extent at least to the proposals to drastically limit farming operations here.

The essentials of the Common Market agreement are these:

The gradual elimination of all tariffs against each other over the next 7½ years, starting from July 1.

The establishment of identical price supports in each member country.

The imposition of tariffs on farm products imported from outside sources at rates equal to the difference between the world price and the Common Market support price.

PRICE SETUP UNKNOWN

The question that remains unresolved is at what level the new Common Market prices for agricultural products are to be set. It has been tentatively agreed, however, that eventually they would be established somewhere between the present French and German levels.

Western Germany has higher price supports than the other members. The support price on wheat, for instance, is $3 a bushel, against $2.20 in France. This would indicate that the price support on wheat would be about $2.60 a bushel should the tentative agreement be carried out. Price supports on other major crops probably would be on the same relative basis.

Support prices at such levels would stimulate agricultural operations in most sections of the Common Market. Since it would apply for a long period, it would enable the farmers to mechanize with the most modern tools, and this should result in an increase in the yield an acre.

Farming would become more efficient and the farmers using outdated methods would be "frozen out" in somewhat the same way they have been here in the last 15 years. Many had to leave the farms in this period because of the technological revolution in farming.

RISE IN EFFICIENCY

This would result in a more efficient European agriculture and would make available to industry there those persons who have been pushed off the farms. Substitution of tractors for animal power, which is still largely used on many European farms, would release grain for the production of meat and other foods for human consumption.

Generally, what is envisiaged by the Common Market countries in agriculture is not unlike what has taken place in the United States in the last 10 years. During that period, farming in this country has gone through a technological revolution and has been almost completely mechanized.

Through the development of higher yielding seed, the use of more fertilizer and the adoption of better cultivating methods, including the use of chemicals to kill weeds and grass, the yields to an acre here have risen sharply.

Better methods of feeding livestock, including the use of antibiotics, also have resulted in a greater utilization of the larger amount of grain produced on an acre. Now it takes only about one-half as much grain to produce a pound of meat as it did 10 or 15 years ago.

SELF-SUFFICIENCY GOAL

There is not much doubt that the Common Market countries, by following reasonably closely the methods used here, soon can become self-sufficient in food production. In fact, within a few years, it is quite likely that Europe may become an exporter of food rather than an importer.

The present support prices, which are high enough to encourage production in most countries, will be continued at least until next year's harvest. Although some may be adjusted downward a bit in certain areas, the knowledge that support prices will be continued and that a market will be guaranteed for products raised will stimulate activity even before the plan is put into effect.

Under the plan, an agricultural fund is to be created that would be used to aid farmers unable to finance needed equipment, to bolster markets if they should drop below the support level, and to subsidize the exports of any agricultural product that develops an excessive supply.

The money for this common fund would be raised through the variable import levies on farm products from outside the Common Market. These imports now amount to some $3,500 million a year, of which West Germany receives roughly $1,500 million.

World prices for agricultural products now are generally below the lowest support prices of any in the Common Market countries so, at the start, the fund may grow rapidly. As the bloc approaches self-sufficiency the accumulations will drop, but at that time its needs will not be so great.

By agreeing to the agricultural policy, the Common Market countries are described as having passed the point of no return on their road to unity. This was the last occasion when the development of the project could be stopped by the vote of a single member country. Unless all members agree to stop it, which seems most unlikely, the terms of the Treaty of Rome, which was signed by the six members in 1957, provide that it continue in effect until the economic unification of the six nations is complete.

Now that the Common Market is more or less permanently established, the question naturally arises as to how many more of the European nations may join in the near future. Britain has made a bid to join, and Denmark and Norway are expected to seek membership. At first, some of the other nations may just seek associate memberships.

Regardless of how many, if any, of the other nations in Europe obtain membership, the Common Market is bound to bring about a sharp decline in imports of farm products to the six member countries. Because of the variable tariff duties, the United States would be able to sell those countries only those items they could not produce. This would be only cotton.

In 1960, the United States sold farm products amounting to $1,100 million to the Common Market countries, or nearly one-fourth of the total agricultural exports of $4,824,187,000. A large portion of these exports was part of foreign-aid programs and payments were not received in dollars for nearly $1,500 million of them. Deducting these foreign shipments, the Common Market accounted for about one-third of this country's agricultural exports in dollars actually received.

U.S. exports of farm products to all of Europe in 1960 amounted to some $2 billion all of which was paid for in dollars. If Britain and other European countries should become members of the Common Market, much of these exports would be in jeopardy.

Cotton and soybeans appear to be the only two major farm products grown here that would be permitted free importation into Common Market under the present plan. Since soybeans could be produced in the area, it probably would be only a short time before one of the countries in the group would decide to grow them, and an import levy by all then would follow.

Eventually grain exports from the United States to the Common Market would virtually cease. In 1960, feed-grain exports to these countries amounted to 181 million bushels, or 41 percent of the total of 439 million bushels exported.

Although this country's sales of food products to the Common Market may drop to a very low level, prospects are that there may be some increase in sales of cotton. With the standard of living expected to increase further, the use of cotton by the bloc should rise and this may partly offset the decline in shipments of food items from this country.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 4, 1962]

TECHNOLOGY CHANGES EUROPE'S PATTERN OF AGRICULTURE

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

PARIS, February 3.—The technological revolution in agriculture is sweeping Western Europe, but life "down on the farm" is still anything but easy for millions of farmers.

With one major exception—the absence of huge farms with thousands of acres—European agriculture is following the course laid out in the United States. And like the United States, the world of agriculture is made up of two broad categories:

Farms of sufficient size, mechanization and efficiency to produce a fairly good income for the owner and a reasonable standard of life.

Farms that are too small, or on poor soil, or with insufficient capital input, to produce a decent income.

In Denmark one can have tea in the luxurious house of a "big" farmer, surrounded by carefully tended gardens, and then travel for 15 minutes to the tiny house of a farmer with only 10 acres of land and a living that is hard from one year to the next.

PICTURE IN FRANCE

In France, though there are no exact statistics, it is probable that a good majority of the farmhouses do not have a toilet or even hot water. But there are farmers in the rich grain country who live on the scale of the lower and middle salaried classes in the cities.

The striking fact about agriculture in every country in Europe is the twofold revolution that has already swept America: The reduction in the number of farms and farmers and the enormous increase in expenditure on modern methods on the farms that remain.

A combined report from the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe and the Food and Agriculture Organization said recently: "Farming is becoming, in many respects, more and more like a manufacturing industry. It is becoming a business, and quite highly capitalized business."

These are some "signpost" figures, covering the countries of northern and western Europe (that is, excluding the Mediterranean countries):

Expenses for fertilizers and pesticides rose in the last decade from $885 million to $1,400 million.

Tractors in the six Common Market countries rose from 300,000 in 1950 to 1,580,000 in 1959.

Milking machines in Britain rose in the same period from 69,000 to 293,000.

In the 12 countries of northern and western Europe, total investment in agriculture was $17 billion in the last decade, and the amount was rising year after year.

Most important of all, the man-years devoted to agriculture fell by 20 percent in the decade. For hired labor alone the fall was 26 percent. In a few countries, such as Sweden and West Germany, the active population engaged in farming dropped by a third.

The huge investment in better methods has brought the expected increase in farm productivity—about 50 percent in the past decade. With some rise in total output and a big fall in the number of people sharing the income, average income for farm owners—always hard to measure exactly—apparently rose by almost 40 percent in the past decade, much of which was plowed back into more equipment and land and other investment.

But this evident "success story" still leaves the problem of the small farmer, a heritage from a very long history. In West Germany, for example, out of a total of 1,720,000 farms in 1959, 950,000 were less than 12 acres in size. Of the 9 million farms in the Common Market, more than half have less than 12 acres.

Not every small farm is poor, of course. In the Netherlands, for example, poultry breeding—using mainly cheap imported feed—has become a major industry, with the chicken population doubling between 1952 and 1960. A man does not always need a big farm to make money on hogs or poultry.

But the basic problem of European agriculture, in almost all countries, remains that of the farmer who sticks to his land without any real hope of an efficient operation. Governments have passed a variety of laws to encourage consolidation of farms into larger size, including a bewildering array of new credit facilities to help with the financing.

As a result, the average size of farms is almost everywhere increasing, but slowly.

Meanwhile, given the excessive numbers of small farms, agricultural income continues to lag on the average behind that in industry and services.

A West German study, for example, showed that farm incomes as a whole 2 years ago were a fourth less than "parity" with industrial and other urban incomes, despite the highest price support levels in the world.

If this sounds familiar, it should. For in agriculture, as in industry, Western Europe is following a path already familiar in the "New World" across the Atlantic.

THE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS PROBLEMS

Mr. **MILLER**. Mr. President, in his state of the Union message, President Kennedy, for some strange reason, resorted to a comparison of 11-month periods in attempting to reach the conclusions that only one-third of the balance of payments deficit problem remains; that speculative fever is ending; and that confidence in the dollar has been restored.

I ask unanimous consent that two excellent articles by Maurice Stans, former Director of the Federal Budget Bureau, appearing in the January 22 and January 29 issues of the Washington Post on this subject be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. **MILLER**. Mr. President, these articles by Mr. Stans point out that, contrary to the inference that was intended by the President's statement, the balance of payments deficit problem has not been reduced to one-third and that it is more serious to the position of our country than the present military threats. Moreover, Mr. Stans repeats what I have been calling on this administration to do ever since it began flooding the Congress with all types of so-called urgent requests for increased Federal Government spending—namely, to establish priorities in its spending programs, to curtail Government spending and the inflationary pressures of deficit financing.

EXHIBIT 1

GOLD OUTFLOW, NOT BERLIN OR CONGO, IS NATION'S GREATEST THREAT

(By Maurice Stans)

The greatest threat to our Nation today is not Berlin. Nor is it Vietnam or the Congo or Laos. It is the precarious situation of our balance of international payments and with it the potential erosion of world confidence in the dollar. President Kennedy's state of the Union message, by its emphasis on foreign trade, made this evident.

The balance-of-payments problem is not a complex matter to understand, as many people seem to believe. It is in fact quite elementary. Americans and the American Government spend a lot of money overseas every year to import goods, travel, investments, maintain troops and give aid. We have not been able to induce the other countries to spend all of those dollars back with us. Instead, they hold the unspent difference in bank accounts and in claims against us that will have to be settled some day with goods or gold.

In the 3 years, 1958 to 1960, our oversea spending and investing exceeded the inflow of our dollars at the average rate of $3.7 billion a year. Right now the net debt we owe to other countries on short-term demand is $18 billion. To pay this we have a little less than $17 billion in gold, but we already have pledged $12 billion of that to back up our money in circulation here at home. We could not pay all our current foreign debts if they were all demanded at once.

Khrushchev's pronouncements have regularly claimed that our capitalist system would go down under its own weaknesses. The most grave and chronic risk we now face is that we will not be able to extricate ourselves from our present predicament, which is of our own making. But the causes are easier to see than the cure.

The Kennedy administration is exerting strong efforts to fight a winning battle, as did Eisenhower. In this, it deserves support. But the unfavorable conditions are cumulative, and only titanic and unceasing work will reverse the trend and save us from a major setback.

Eisenhower fully recognized the seriousness of the problem. Treasury Secretary Anderson repeatedly urged that the strong nations of Europe should be required to contribute a larger share to their own and the free world's military defense, so as to permit a reduction in our foreign aid and our oversea costs. This plea was dramatized by the trip Anderson and Dillon made to Germany late in 1960, but the effort had been going on long before that behind the scenes

In 1959 Commerce Department Secretary Mueller initiated a major program to increase American exports and to encourage foreign travel in the United States, but he was frustrated by the unwillingness of the Congress to appropriate the funds needed. The Defense Department laid down rules to reduce the number of dependents going to military posts abroad. Treasury proposed reducing the duty-free exemption to returning tourists from $500 to $100 and made other proposals to stem the outflow of gold. Above all, Eisenhower recognized that the security of our position depended on maintaining confidence in our money, and he fought hard to keep the budget in balance and to demonstrate good fiscal housekeeping to our oversea creditors.

These efforts temporarily stopped the flow of gold, but they did not halt the growth of the unfavorable balance.

Since last January 20, President Kennedy and Secretary Dillion have carried on and enlarged the campaigns to encourage exports overseas and foreign travel in the United States. The Congress enacted the reduction in duty-free customs allowance to returning tourists. A new insurance plan has been announced by the Export-Import Bank to reduce the risks of loss on foreign export credit. West Germany and several other countries came through with $650 million of advance payments that Secretary Anderson had urged them to make on their postwar assistance loans.

The first 6 months of 1961 went well. Exports were up, imports decreased as a result of our slight recession, and the advance debt payments to the Treasury were enough to show almost an equilibrium for the period. But it is now apparent that this was only temporary improvement. The fundamental causes of imbalance had not been removed, and the actions to date were inadequate. Reducing the duty exemptions was more psychological than real, for example, as it helps to the extent of only $100 million or so a year.

Also, not all the administration's actions in the first 6 months of 1961 were toward tightening. The Defense Department withdrew the limitations on oversea dependents almost immediately to placate the military. Kennedy's proposals to increase the dollars paid out on foreign programs were defeated in the Congress, but heavy future commitments are involved in the Peace Corps and the mushrooming Alliance for Progress in Latin America. Since June imports have increased to record peaks. The deficit in the balance of payments for the second half of 1961 was again at the rate of $3 billion a year, and for all of 1961 would have been close to $2.5 billion except for the nonrecurring German debt payment. There are no present reasons to expect that 1962 will be better. The claims against our gold will grow.

In all of 1961 we lost $800 million in gold, and our reserve is at the lowest point since 1939. The claims against it are at the highest in history.

Secretary Dillon's job is to see that our oversea creditors increase their spending of dollars here. If he fails in this, he must persuade them to leave their money here, not to demand payment in gold. Decisive measures and continuing actions are required and can be expected. Some of them will be outlined in a later article.

President Kennedy's place in history will suffer badly if his administration doesn't solve this crisis of chronic imbalance. To miss or to default is to invite ruinous inflation and subsequent devaluation and their humiliating consequences. Khrushchev's experts are surely watching the outcome with eager anticipation. Everything depends on finding the answer while there is yet confidence in the future of the dollar. In the meantime, under this pressure, we are certain to see the decline of the early 1961 gospels of economic growthmanship and unlimited Federal spending, and that is all to the good.

PAYMENTS SOLUTION REQUIRES RESTRAINT

(By Maurice H. Stans)

The place of the United States as a leader of the free world is endangered by economic pressures more serious than the present military threats. The chronic imbalance in our international payments transactions raises worried doubts at home and abroad as to how long and to what extent international claims on our dwindling gold reserves can be allowed to increase.

In an earlier article, I summarized our precarious situation in which we find $12 billion of our $17 billion gold reserve "frozen" as backing to our currency. The remainder is what is available to meet $18 billion in net short-term foreign claims. The Eisenhower administration began and the Kennedy administration continues a strong fight to maintain confidence in the dollar by decisive measures to prevent further outflow of gold.

The only sound solutions can come from increased exports, insistence on a larger contribution by prosperous European countries to the free world's military strength and security and more suitable price, wage, and budget policies at home. The answer is not to be found in reducing imports, for this would almost surely cause a reciprocal reduction in our exports. Nor is it to be found in reducing investments overseas. These now return large dividends and in time will bring in more. Preventing the export of our capital would slow up the development of other countries and would merely make future years more difficult by cutting down investment returns.

CONVERSION TO FRUGALITY

It is these conditions that lie behind President Kennedy's determination to seek authority from the Congress to reduce tariff barriers on imports, in the hope of inducing increases in purchases of our goods overseas. It also accounts heavily for his sudden October 1961 conversion to frugality, in recognition of the importance of avoiding budget deficits and the resulting inflationary forces that would weaken international confidence in our money. It explains his announced determination to insist on restraint in future wage increases in our economy and the Federal Reserve Bank's recent increase in interest rates on bank savings. It would be no surprise if the Defense Department were to reverse itself again and reduce the number of military dependents being supported overseas. It should.

To look further for solutions, we need again to search for causes. Why are we in this predicament, and why have we allowed it to worsen year after year?

One major cause of our present dilemma is the rapid postwar advance in wages in this country. This advance has exceeded gains in our productivity and has forced our prices higher on world markets. Normally, our increasing expenditures overseas would have induced an equivalent increase in spending here. Instead, our export prices, pushed to a competitive disadvantage by high costs, are not attractive enough to encourage an adequate return flow of our money.

Another unfavorable factor for us has been the advancing technology in other countries. For years we have rested confidently on our technological advantages and our new research to level out our wage disadvantages with other countries. But we are finding that our machines can be copied, that our improvements can be matched and that one lower paid Japanese can operate a machine tool or an automated plant as readily as one American.

WAGES ADVANCE ABROAD

Wages in other countries are advancing rapidly, it is true, but even at the present trend a long time will elapse before much of our American production can compete in world markets. We cannot wait hopefully for uncertain worsening conditions abroad to solve our problems at home. We need instead to put our own house in order.

To do this, we must curtail Government spending and the inflationary pressures of deficit financing. We must curb unwarranted wage increases and subsidies for not producing. We must end the cost burdens of inefficient management and make-work featherbedding so that our Americtn producers, capable of competing in world markets, may do so.

Rich as this Nation is, it cannot take on every worthwhile international program. To make the attempt will only bring failure to the free world and bankrupt our country in the process. We need to develop a more restrained set of priorities by which we evaluate the international commitments we can and should assume.

All these objectives must be achieved if we are to retain our position before the world. President Kennedy realizes this. But they can be attained only if some pet domestic and foreign welfare schemes before the Congress are abandoned.

U.S. balance of payments

[In billions of dollars]

	1960	1961 (estimated)
Payments for—		
Imports	14.7	14.6
Services	6.4	6.4
Private investment overseas	3.9	3.8
Military expenditures	3.0	3.0
Government grants and loans	3.4	3.6
Other (net)	.6	.6
Total	32.0	32.0
Receipts from—		
Exports	19.4	20.0
Services	4.7	4.5
Foreign investments in the United States	.2	.9
Repayments on Government loans	.6	1.2
Income on investments abroad	3.2	3.4
Total	28.1	30.0
Total deficit	3.9	2.0
Met by—		
Sales of gold and convertible currencies	1.7	.8
Increase in foreign-owned liquid liabilities	2.2	1.2

Source: Derived from Department of Commerce data.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1962

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, justification being advanced in the hearings on the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962 to establish a new Department of Urban Affairs seems to be reducing itself to a difference between the "recognition" that such a Department would give to problems of people living in urban areas over what these problems are now receiving from the Housing and Home Finance Agency, according to the latest newspaper stories. As one witness is reported to have put it: "It's easier to get a decision from a colonel than from a general."

Mr. President, I think it depends a great deal on who the colonel is and who the general is, and even more so on the job each has to do. Inasmuch as the plan merely embraces the functions of the Housing and Home Finance Administrator and the Public Housing Administrator, there will be no change in the decisionmaking responsibility or authority. If functions of other departments and agencies were transferred to the new Department, that would be another thing, but they are not.

Moreover, Mr. President, it is becoming increasingly evident from the statements of witnesses supporting this plan and from the President's statement in support of the plan that the scope of interest of the proposed new Department goes beyond cities—it also includes small towns and communities, which hardly come within the understanding of the word "urban." I have been saying for some time that if, indeed, there is need for the kind of a department the proponents are talking about, it ought to be called a Department of Community Development; and its establishment should be meaningful and not consist of the mere transfer of the present functions of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

In the January 31 issue of the Wall Street Journal there appeared a timely lead editorial, entitled "Why an Urban Affairs Department?" which asks some realistic questions that ought to be answered before this Reorganization Plan No. 1 is swallowed by the general public and Congress in particular. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY AN URBAN AFFAIRS DEPARTMENT?

A lot more heat than light is being generated around the administration's efforts to create a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. The President, now that the House Rules Committee has pigeonholed a bill to create the new agency, is trying to win his point by setting up the department by Executive decree. So it is a good time to review just what this program involves and to see what its implications are.

The proposal provides for transferring to a new Cabinet-level department the functions of many existing Federal housing agencies. The secretary would be charged with studying the Nation's housing problems and development of urban communities, advising the President, and providing leadership, technical assistance and information to State and local governments.

Proponents of the plan themselves have advanced unintentionally, persuasive reasons why it is neither desirable nor necessary. For they have said again and again that the plan would create no new Federal programs nor would it alter substantially existing laws on Federal housing and urban development. If that is so, as the National Association of Manufacturers and others have observed, there surely is no crying need for a whole new Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

But a much more likely prospect is that the proposed department would actually be a device by which the Federal Government could extend and consolidate control over its farflung housing and urban redevelopment projects, at the expense of urban areas. Since the plan defines an "urban area" as a city or township of any size, whether incorporated or unincorporated, it would cover a pretty broad territory.

The President himself hinted at the possible extent of this Department invasion of localities when, commenting on the Rules Committee action, he referred to the administration's "concern for some effective management and responsibility of the problems of two-thirds of our population who live in cities."

The Government might well be concerned. For just such massive intrusions into municipal affairs as a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing would be empowered to make have helped to contribute to the urban mismanagement and irresponsibility with which many cities are well acquainted. Too often political machines have become involved with millions of dollars of construction contracts with scandalous results. Nor is the profligate example of the Government itself one that suggests prudent management to municipal governments.

What the cities need far more urgently than Federal concern for their failings is a hard look by their own administrators and citizens at what Federal housing programs already are doing to them. What is happening as the result of paper plans imposed upon them from Washington whether relevant to local problems and conditions or not? What has been the effect of municipal rubber-stamping of Federal standards and specifications, imposed under the threat of withdrawal of Federal funds? What has been the effect on cities of swallowing projects which in the absence of local control had been better not begun at all?

That sort of realistic appraisal is the last thing the localities can expect from the Federal Government. And it surely would not come from a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. What would inevitably come are still more and more elaborate paper plans, more Federal standards and specifications, more Federal say-so about where, how and for what the taxpayers' dollars are used. The only logical end to all this is complete abdication of municipal control over urban development.

It may be vain to expect that the Federal housing and urban "improvement" juggernaut as it now exists can be rolled back. But its further invasion, under the banner of a new Cabinet-rank Department, can be checked. Now that the President, in a message yesterday, has notified Congress he is setting up the Department, the House or Senate has 60 days in which to reject it. On its merits alone, rejection is what it deserves.

PUBLIC SERVANTS AND PARTISAN POLITICS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, there has long been the established policy of our Federal Government that its career public servants not become involved in partisan politics; also that the hiring,

retention, and promotion of our faithful, career public employees not hang on the slender thread of participation in matters which could be construed as partisan political activity, but, rather, rest on the meritorious basis of performance of the duties to which they are assigned.

A recent directive from the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission contains language which tends to violate this policy; namely, that:

> The career official may explain the position of the administration in regard to * * * proposed legislation before interested public groups.

Where the duties of a career employee are directly concerned with administration of laws already passed by the Congress, I have no difficulty with suggestions that the employee speak and act in support of the laws he is supposed to help administer. However, it is another proposition when merely proposed legislation is involved. To say that a career official "may" trespass in this area before public groups paves the way for discrimination against the official who does not do so. It opens the door to having a supervisor "suggest" to a career employee that he take some positive action in support of proposed legislation which he personally may not subscribe to. His resistance to such a suggestion could cause him to be passed over for promotion in favor of another who has followed the suggestion. All of us know there is enough discretionary power at the supervisory level to make it impossible to prove such discrimination. I sincerely hope, Mr. President, that the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission will issue a supplementary directive stating that, to insure the morale of our career public servants and to insure confidence of the public in the integrity of this group of employees, it is suggested that they not engage in presenting positions in favor of or in opposition to proposed legislation before public groups. I ask unanimous consent that the recent directive be printed in the RECORD.

The policy of the administration to weaken the independence and impartiality of our career civil service has been broadened to cover the employees of the U.S. Agricultural Extension Service. In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial appearing in the January 24 issue of the Sioux City Journal, entitled "Politics and the Extension Service," and another one appearing in the January 29 issue of the Christian Science Monitor, entitled "Overextending the Extension Service."

There being no objection, the directive and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROLE OF THE CAREER OFFICIAL IN SUPPORT OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS

The extent to which Federal career officials should publicly support current and discuss proposed programs of their departments and agencies requires thoughtful judgment by all concerned. The role of the career official is still evolving within our system of Government with the consequence that the precedent of longstanding tradition is not available. It is understandable, therefore, that uncertainty exists regarding the role the career official should play in program advocacy. This uncertainty has prompted requests from career officials, particularly in the field service, and from department and agency heads for guidance.

No definitive standard can be enunciated to define this role. Discretion and judgment must be applied by both Presidential appointees and career officials within the context of each problem as it arises. With this in mind it may be helpful, nevertheless, to consider the following guidelines:

1. PROGRAMS ALREADY AUTHORIZED BY LAW OR EXECUTIVE ORDER

When a Federal program is based on law or Executive order, every career official has a positive obligation to make it function as efficiently and economically as possible and to support it as long as it is a part of recognized public policy. This means that a career official may properly make speeches explaining and interpreting a current program, identifying its public purposes, citing its achievements, defending it against uninformed or unjust criticisms, pointing out need for possible corrective action or soliciting views for improving it. The fact that the program was the subject of partisan controversy during the stages of enactment or development would in no sense lessen this obligation although the career official should exercise care in divorcing his remarks from a strictly political context.

2. PENDING LEGISLATION

A more difficult decision is faced when new or changed programs are pending before Congress in the form of proposed legislation. Definitive statutory language prohibits the use of appropriated funds for "publicity or propaganda designed to support or defeat legislation pending before Congress." Such language clearly limits the career official's position of possible support of or opposition to new or amendatory legislation. Aware of these implications, however, the career official may explain the position of the administration in the proposed legislation before interested public groups.

Frequently, career officials are requested to testify on pending legislative proposals before congressional committees. Presidential appointees should recognize potential political involvement in assigning responsibility for legislative testimony to career officials. In most instances, the career officials should be used to present factual or technical testimony with policy advocacy reserved for presentation by the Presidential appointee.

A special circumstance arises when congressional committees request the technical services of career officials to assist in drafting bills or reports. Even in politically controversial areas such an assignment is appropriate if it is understood that the career official is serving as a technical expert to assist in committee work under the direction of committee leadership.

JOHN W. MACY, Jr.,
Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission.
JANUARY 10, 1962.

[From the Sioux City Journal, Jan. 24, 1962]

POLITICS AND THE EXTENSION SERVICE

Secretary of Agriculture Freeman's suggestion that the Extension Service get into the political arena is likely to meet considerable resistance here in the Midwest. For what the Secretary of Agriculture seeks is to change the role of the Service from an unbiased "explainer" of farm methods and problems to an "advocator" of policy. This would be bound to lead to controversy and confusion. And it would be far afield from the original purpose of the Extension Service—to help teach farmers and their wives how to become better farmers and homemakers.

By law and by Presidential budget reports, the Service is designed as a partnership between the U.S. Department of Agriculture and each of the State land-grant colleges or universities, involving the cooperation of local governments—usually counties—and local people. The Federal Government contributes roughly one-third of the cost, the States one-third, and the local governments one-third.

There is little doubt that such a change as suggested by Mr. Freeman would reduce the effectiveness of the Extension Service. In its present role of the unbiased observer, the Service through its personnel can, and indeed does, help explain farm programs. Under the Eisenhower administration, for example, the Service participated in meetings explaining the land retirement program. Under the Kennedy administration it was involved in similar meetings explaining the feed grain program. But in both instances, it simply explained and did not advocate.

Such a course enables the Service personnel to deal more effectively with all of the farm organizations that do take political positions on farm programs.

It should be remembered, too, that the Extension Service is a part of the land-grant college system. In the case of Iowa, this is Iowa State University at Ames. The colleges are nonpolitical. And if the Extension Service were to get into the political game, as Mr. Freeman advocates, the situation could be embarrassing.

It appears to us that the Extension Service would be far more effective as it presently is operating. Once it got into the riled political waters, its ability to function would be seriously impaired.

The idea advanced by Secretary of Agriculture Freeman has been tried before, with a notable lack of success. And there is no reason to believe it would be any more successful at this time.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Jan. 29, 1962]

OVEREXTENDING THE EXTENSION SERVICE

For years the U.S. Agricultural Extension Service has been one of the best liked of all Government activities. With cooperation of the States and counties, its people helped farmers to grow better crops and their families to make more attractive homes.

Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman now believes it must do something more. At an annual conference in Washington he declared that the problems of agriculture cannot be met by continued emphasis on productivity but that the service should enter "the area of public policy" concerning agricultural economics.

Now it cannot be denied that the problems of American farming are as much economic as technical, nor that county agents have been helpful in the mechanics of soil bank and other programs. But if Mr. Freeman means that people on the public payroll should be used to advocate the particular solutions a given administration in Washington favors, that is another and more questionable matter.

An example of the risks comes from faraway Alma-Ata in the Kazakh Republic of the Soviet Union. There the head of a college department of agricultural economics has had to admit publicly that he "committed a serious error" in approving a dissertation by a candidate for a degree, the head of the feed section of an experiment station, which was not in line with the current exhortations of Premier Khrushchev on agriculture.

Since the Soviet Government is much in need of greater grain production the official line is to urge growing of corn, sugarbeets, and legumes instead of hay in a crop rotation. The hapless experimenter advocated a mixture of alfalfa grass and corn, but this was still too much grass.

Under the arid conditions of much of the central portion of the Soviet Union the agricultural policies of Premier Khrushchev may prove as much of a mistake as the plowing of grasslands which led to the Dust Bowl of the 1930's in the Western United States. But with a lid on objective scholarship, the exploration of alternatives is forbidden.

MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in the February 5 issue of the Washington Post there is a timely article by Maurice H. Stans, former Director of the Bureau of the Budget, entitled "Emotionalism Fogs Medical Care Issue." A careful reading of this article will, I believe, persuade the impartial reader that the President's medicare program, which is embodied in the King-Anderson Bill, providing benefits to anyone on social security whether he or she needs them or not is unfair and shortsighted. We have many young people who are visited with a catastrophic disease or illness who ought to be covered by such a program rather than people over 65 years of age who have ample insurance and personal resources to meet their needs. I note that recently the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare suggested that a compromise might be worked out to have the program cover hospital and nursing home care only. I trust that this indicates a realization on the part of the administration that instead of trying to power something through the Congress on an emotional or political basis, it would be better for our country for all truly concerned about the problems of health of our citizens to keep an open minded attitude and to evaluate solutions to these problems on a basis that is fair to all—regardless of age—who are in need. I ask unanimous consent that the article by Mr. Stans be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EMOTIONALISM FOGS MEDICAL CARE ISSUE

(By Maurice H. Stans)

President Kennedy has repeated his request to the Congress to write a new law putting medical care for the aged under social security. It is likely to be one of the hottest and least understood issues in the current session.

Ever since medical care for the aged became a political issue early in 1960, it has generated an atomic lot of heat and a minimum of reality. Even today many people wrongly seem to believe the issue is medical care or no medical care. This is the result of another case of undue emotionalism in Washington—a surge of sympathy misdirected toward an excess of government.

There are no facts or figures, of course, as to how many people there are over 65 who need and want medical or hospital care and don't get it. Whatever their number, no one in this enlightened country wants anyone to suffer from that lack. The problem has been, and is, how to find the most sensible way to see that they don't.

We do know some facts. There are nearly 17 million people over 65. A large proportion of them are not medically indigent. Those over 65 account for 9 percent of our total population, and, despite the retirement majority, they still receive 8 percent of all personal incomes.

More than half of those over 65 have coverage under some form of health insurance, and the number is increasing rapidly. Millions more are safeguarded by their own wealth, the resources of their families and service of local welfare and church agencies. Other millions are assured of present or future benefits by their rights and privileges under veterans' benefit programs. The number without adequate health protection is proportionately small. It will grow even smaller as those now under 65 and holding an even greater degree of coverage of their medical needs move into the over-65 bracket with retirement protection.

KERR-MILLS BILL

Under these conditions, the White House and Secretary Flemming in 1960 developed a plan that would fill the medical gap, whatever it might turn out to be. Under it, the provision of medical and hospital services to all those in need of assistance would be left to the local communities. The State would advance the cost, and Washington would pick up 50 to 80 percent of the bill, variable according to the wealth of the States.

Depending on the scope of the benefits covered and the estimates of numbers of beneficiaries, the Federal Government's share would be something over $200 million in the first year of the program and about $400 to $500 million in later years. And it was accepted that under a widespread program like this, these costs would include a fairly substantial amount which would not represent new protection but merely a transfer of responsibility from existing sources to the State and Federal governments.

With some changes, the Flemming plan was enacted as the Kerr-Mills bill in the 1960 session of the Congress. It is now in operation in 26 States and a dozen others are moving toward it. Unfortunately, the continued agitation for a more expansive plan under social security has slowed up action in some States. But there is no evidence that the present program is inadequate.

NO TEST OF NEED APPLIED

The Social Security proposal is entirely different in a fundamental way. It applies no test of need and gives everyone over 65, regardless of wealth, income or other means, the vested right to submit medical and hospital bills to Washington to be paid. The cost would be paid by another increase in social security taxes, already scheduled to rise to 9¼ percent by 1968, to be shared equally by working people of all ages and their employers. The total annual cost of this plan has been estimated to be from $1.5 to $2.5 billion at the start and rising in later years to $5 billion or more.

I have never been able to understand why the social security way would make sense, or why any working man would support it. It would multiply the tax collections and payments for medical care eightfold or tenfold, only to provide added funds to give to those who didn't need them.

It would, in other words, set up a program that benefited 8 or 10 people for every one that needed help. To cite an extreme, it would cover payments to the Fords, Rockefellers, Morgans, Harrimans and other wealthy individuals over 65. It would mean that working men and women would dig up taxes to cover such expenses for Maurice Stans when he reaches 65 and for millions of others who ought to meet their own bills. It would double the social security bureaucracy, which now has 32,000 employees and a vast forest of electronic machines.

THREE MILLION UNPROTECTED

Despite this, it would fail to protect three or four million people over 65 who are not eligible for social security. And the program, I feel sure, would not stop at age 65. Let's not deceive ourselves. Within a year or so after it were operative, the drive would begin to lower the age qualification, especially since the taxes would be paid by younger employed, and the pressure could continue until everyone was covered. And certainly the administrators of the funds would have to fix limits and standards on the kind of medical care and hospital services that would qualify.

By degrees we would move into a socialization of medical and hospital practices. I can understand why the medical profession does not want this, and, with the ever-increasing cost experience of Britain and other countries as evidence, we should beware of it here.

Putting medical care for the aged under a mandatory social security program would be the beginning of the largest single step we could take toward government paternalism and the centralized state. If we want to preserve our personal pride, our sense of character and responsibility, our freedom of choice and decentralized government, we ought to oppose this to the fullest. And no one will suffer, because the machinery already in law will take care of everyone who needs help at a lot less cost to the taxpayer.

ATMOSPHERIC ATOMIC TESTS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, on February 5 the Washington Post published an article entitled "United States May Put Off Aerial Testing for New Treaty Effort," written by Rowland Evans, Jr. Mr. Evans says:

> A powerful opinion within the administration now holds that before proceeding with a series of atmospheric tests, the United States should propose a simple treaty to Russia banning all tests in the air.

One reason advanced for the proposal is that unlike underground testing, explosions in the atmosphere are self-policing and always detectable.

Inasmuch as we know that the administration includes a number of members of the extremist Americans for Democratic Action, the current platform of which opposes U.S. resumption of nuclear tests, one should not be surprised that such an opinion as described by Mr. Evans exists within the administration. The shocking thing is that the opinion is a powerful one.

The idea behind this position apparently is that the leaders in the Kremlin would honor a treaty more than they did the test-ban moratorium—especially if their breaking of the treaty would be readily detectable.

Mr. President, I do not know how anyone could seriously advance such an argument. The Communists have no honor—except to communism. They believe that the end justifies the means; that anything goes—lying included—if it will advance communism. They are quite ready and willing to break moratoriums, treaties, agreements, promises, human souls, the backs of small nations, the necks of large nations—anything—if it suits their purpose; and they are not a bit bashful about doing so before the eyes of the world.

Mr. President, my position all along has been that if nuclear testing—underground or in the atmosphere—is deemed necessary by those experts who are charged with the defense of our country, we should not hesitate to conduct it; that if testing in the amosphere is indicated, this should be done through the us of "clean" bombs so that there will be no danger of nuclear fallout. The case for nuclear testing was well presented in an address delivered by the Governor of New York last October in Miami, Fla., before the annual national convention of Sigma Delta Chi, honorary journalism fraternity, entitled "Power To Save Freedom." I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POWER TO SAVE FREEDOM

(An address by Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller)

I would like to speak to you today of the supreme issue before us all—the strength of our Nation in the cause of human freedom in the world.

Basic, of course, to our strength is our faith:

The same faith as stirred our Founding Fathers to create this bastion of freedom; the faith for which we have fought two world wars in a generation, the faith that man is a creature of God, made and meant to be free.

This faith underlies the strength we bring, as a nation, to the cause of the freedom we cherish, and to the peace we hope for. In the realm of political decision, this issue stands as far as one can get from partisanship. There is no such thing as a Republican or a Democratic struggle for freedom and peace in the world. There is, and there can be, only an American struggle—a total national commitment to the future of freedom, and to all the historic decisions and sacrifices that this struggle will demand of us.

We all know well that we live in a time of continuing conflict. We know its current signs and places: Cuba, Berlin, Laos, Vietnam. And we recognize these crises-of-the-day as familiar marks of the total and constant and implacable Communist plan and purpose—to dominate and to impose their fixed design on all the world.

Just as most crises that imperil the peace of the world reflect this single Communist design, so, too, our meeting of this conflict depends decisively upon one question: Have we the will to develop and to deploy the power that is essential to enable freedom to survive against this relentless Communist threat?

I do not suggest that sheer, simple power can, alone and of itself, assure the future of freedom. The great aspirations of mankind cannot be met—the hungry and the needy millions, throughout the world, cannot be fed or comforted—by power alone. The problem of creating international structures of free nations to foster the growth of freedom is a challenge not only to our power but also to our political creativity and our moral convictions.

Yet the fact stands that America—without the power to be both the shield and the sword of freedom—would no longer have the chance to help build a world safe for free men and free nations.

What is the nature of this freedom-guarding, hope-giving power?

The vital component is nuclear power—the decisive power in a nuclear age. If the balance of this power in the world turns against us, it could end freedom overnight.

For more than 15 years now, since World War II, this power, the power of nuclear weapons has stood between freedom in the world and those who would destroy it.

This power—disciplined with the moral purpose and tempered with the faith of a free society—is the basic military source of our strength.

But now I must say to you that in terms of this nuclear military power—in both its technical aspects and in our psychological attitude toward it—we, as a nation, stand today in danger.

The facts that measure the danger before us are few, and simple, and serious.

The Soviet Union—with massive disdain for world opinion—is finishing, in these days, a series of more than 20 nuclear tests in the atmosphere. The series has already included the greatest blast of destructive power the world has ever witnessed. And upon the completion of their tests, we must be prepared for the Soviet Union to turn its face from the scene of the blast, with an air of virtue and innocence, and say to us: Now, shouldn't we all stop testing these awful weapons?

We can prepare ourselves for the stern answer to that question by looking at a few hard facts.

Let me summarize them briefly.

First. While honest and expert judgments on relative Soviet and American nuclear strength have varied considerably, there is one fact on which all responsible sources agree. It is the fact that since the voluntary moratorium on nuclear testing in 1958, we have stood relatively still for the past 3 years in the development and improvement of nuclear weapons.

Second. We know from the very nature of the recent Soviet tests that the period of the so-called moratorium after 1958 must have been used by Soviet science for intensive and major research in nuclear weapons development. There is also every technical possibility and likelihood that the Soviets engaged in underground testing not subject to detection by the outside world. The hidden preparations for the current Soviet atmospheric tests must have extended over a period of many months, perhaps a full year. And all this was done while the Soviet negotiators, conveniently dragging their feet, were ostensibly seeking agreement on a test-ban treaty.

Third. We simply do not know the extent of the technical advances scored by the Soviet Union throughout the moratorium and in their current tests in the atmosphere. We thus confront, today, a Soviet nuclear power whose exact extent, nature, and ingenuity lie beyond our power to measure.

Fourth. The people who most obviously do know these facts—the Soviet leaders themselves—have plainly shown the value and importance they have attached to these tests. For the very undertaking of these tests defied not only world opinion but also all the years of Soviet propaganda invested in the pretense of seeking a ban on nuclear testing. So defiant a stroke must have been well worth it—in terms of raw military power.

These few facts tersely measure the peril that growing Soviet nuclear power now thrusts before us.

Our response to this peril is a most urgent and important issue before the American people today.

For what is at stake is nothing less than our having the power that is essential to serve the cause of freedom to which we stand committed:

Power to defend ourselves against all-out enemy nuclear attack; power to survive an all-out nuclear attack and strike back with a decisive counterattack; power to defend freedom in any corner of the globe in which it is challenged.

This essential power critically depends upon our nuclear weapons of defense and retaliation. And to assure the sufficiency of our weapons, in the face of the recent Soviet tests, we are now clearly compelled to conduct our own nuclear tests.

Let me again be specific:

1. We must reduce the weight of nuclear warheads.

We must press forward tests that can enable us to reduce greatly the weight of our nuclear warheads while retaining their full explosive power. Such a development of lighter weapons promises the mobility of our missiles so vital to the survival of our retaliatory power after a first strike by any aggressor. Weapons light enough, for example, to be moved about on trucks and small, swift submarines (and under control by improved safety devices) could virtually assure our decisive deterrent power.

2. We must develop antimissile defenses.

The development of antimissile missiles to defend us against nuclear attack is critically dependent upon further nuclear testing. Some of these tests must be performed in the atmosphere—and it is a scientific fact that such tests can be performed without releasing a dangerous amount of radioactivity. This testing is doubly necessary to determine the degree of vulnerability of our own missiles to any Soviet antimissile missiles. Soviet technology may already have scored great success in this sphere of antimissile missiles. We must face the fact that if the Soviets achieve a reliable antimissile defense before we do, our retaliatory power could cease to be the shield for freedom.

3. We must improve our tactical weapons.

Only further nuclear testing can perfect the tactical nuclear weapons so needed for local and limited military action. In most areas of the world, only a clear American superiority in such weapons can compensate for the Communist superiority in numbers—as we confront the overwhelming size of the Soviet, the east European satellite, and the Chinese Communist armies, capable of swift strikes anywhere along the vast periphery of the Communist empire.

At home, we are at last beginning serious action to protect our civilian population against nuclear attack. And we are, in these very days, sending thousands more of our young men overseas. It is unthinkable that the men we dispatch to guard the farthest frontiers of freedom should go forth across all the globe without their having, as need may warrant, the most advanced, clean, and precise nuclear weapons against overwhelming enemy numbers.

4. We must develop new weapons.

As we confront (without being able to measure) the Soviet progress in all categories of nuclear weapons, we are compelled to speed our own testing of new weapons of greater precision and flexibility. With regard to such weapons, it would seem significant that all scientific journals in the Soviet Union suddenly stopped publicly discussing experimentation with neutrons more than 2 years ago. This suggests serious Soviet work on a neutron bomb. We know that if the Soviets had enjoyed a monopoly of the hydrogen bomb, it is doubtful that we would still be in existence as a free society. We can view with no more complacency the chance of their winning so stunning a strategic advantage with a neutron bomb.

5. We must improve methods of controlling nuclear weapons and detecting nuclear tests.

We urgently need the knowledge and skills available only through further nuclear testing to make possible the kind of control and discipline over nuclear power that all free peoples desire.

This involves two crucial objectives:

We need to perfect safety devices to eliminate any chance of error in our control over widely dispersed nuclear weapons. We can through nuclear testing develop technical means by which the danger of accidental explosions could be reduced.

We need to accelerate the development of far more sensitive and truly secure devices for detection of secret nuclear tests. Without them—today—no ban, no pact, can be foolproof or deceitproof. Only when such devices are perfected can the international control of testing and production become truly practical and consistent with our national security.

6. We must build for peace with nuclear energy.

All the stress and peril of the world conflict must not obscure, in our vision of the future, the wondrous resources of nuclear power. Whether the task be building new harbors, or extracting mineral riches from deep within the earth, or building an open, water-level channel across Central America to supplement the Panama Canal, the key to such fabulous achievement lies ahead in nuclear energy.

The aspirations of all humanity for a fuller life have surged to new heights—precisely in this age when we are discovering the power and the means to fulfill these aspirations.

This is the creative—the heartening—the exciting—part of facing the facts of life in a nuclear age.

All the dangers of our time are matched in size and greatness by the opportunities.

For every grave peril, there is a great hope—if we but have the courage and the vision befitting freemen.

Therefore the issue before us, I believe, is clear.

There is only one way for a great and free nation to live in this age, and this is to lead.

We cannot shy from the responsibilities of power.

Today this concretely means that we must proceed with nuclear testing because we cannot leave undone those things we can and must achieve by such testing.

We dare not commit the folly of assuming that the most recent Soviet scientific achievements have been slight or trivial.

It defies commonsense to imagine that Soviet policy elected to ignore world opinion to score any puny technical gains.

It defies commonsense, too, to discount or dismiss even relatively small technological advantages. Such advantages do not have to be massive in order to be decisive.

In this age, the margin between victory and defeat—survival and disaster—can be a thin one.

We cannot tolerate the surrender of such a margin to an enemy bent upon the destruction of freedom itself.

We must prevent any such disaster—even though the decisions and actions required of us may not be acclaimed by world opinion of the moment or by plaudits of so-called neutralist nations. We can, and we do, seek the respect and the understanding of all such nations. We cannot, however, confer upon them or their sentiments of the moment an effective sovereignty over our own vital national decisions. It is one thing for America to be conscientiously concerned with the views of neutralist nations. It would be a quite different and wholly preposterous thing for America to start behaving like one. Our basic responsibility—to ourselves, to all free peoples, and to future generations—is to do, confidently and firmly, not what is popular but what is right.

For we are, as I said at the outset, committed to our faith in freedom, and in the readiness of freemen to fight, if need be, to stay free—forever.

This is the heart of the matter.

The question is not whether we like nuclear power or its weapons.

The question is: do we love freedom?

Let us be clear and resolved in our answer to this question—and all other questions find their proper place.

The only way to avoid nuclear disaster is to command nuclear power.

There is no other course we can rationally and honorably choose.

To attempt any other would be to confess, in fact, that freedom, and our will to defend it, became obsolete with the discovery of nuclear weapons.

If we were to tremble and stumble toward any such confession, we would then no longer be masters of the weapons we ourselves devised. They would have mastered us.

I am confident what our decision will be.

It will be to face the future, not in new fear, but with renewed faith.

It will be our firm national resolve to have the power, to match the will, to be free—and to help save freedom in all the world.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, only by maintaining the power and the will to use it can we hope to deter the Communists from use of military means to advance their imperialism. If we persevere in this position, we may hope that eventually their leaders will recognize that it is to their advantage to enter into a disarmament program, backed up by effective inspection and controls.

Meanwhile, I think it well to invite attention to an article which was published in the February 5 issue of the Washington Post written by Preston Grover, quoting from a recent speech by one of the leaders in the Kremlin which makes it clear that there can be no such thing as peaceful coexistence or the status quo with an aggressive philosophy such as communism. I ask unanimous consent that this article and also the article by Mr. Evans, previously referred to, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

United States May Put Off Aerial Testing for New Treaty Effort

(By Rowland Evans, Jr.)

Contrary to some published reports, it is now doubtful that the United States will resume nuclear tests in the atmosphere until one new approach to the Soviet Union—a dramatic one—is attempted.

This may be stated on excellent authority as the big question of the day—to test or not to test—is debated at the highest levels.

A powerful opinion within the administration now holds that before proceeding with a series of atmospheric tests, the United States should propose a simple treaty to Russia banning all tests in the air. Unlike underground testing, explosions in the atmosphere are self-policing and always detectable.

This opinion, which has not yet hardened into decision, is based on the following assumptions:

Assumption No. 1 is that the United States still holds a significant lead over Russia in basic nuclear technology. Who leads whom in the vastly complicated business of nuclear weapons depends on the often conflicting judgment of the experts. Experts disagree. There is no pat formula, no slide rule against which the question of atomic superiority can be accurately measured.

SOVIET STILL LAGS

Nevertheless, a powerful case is now being made within the expert scientific community that despite its long series of atmospheric tests last fall, the Soviet Union still lags behind the United States. This is not to say it lags in every department. Russia has already exploded nuclear weapons of three and four times the magnitude of the largest that the United States have exploded.

But on balance, the United States may still be measurably ahead of Russia.

The second assumption grows out of the first. If the experts decide that the United States is indeed ahead, then any agreement banning atmospheric tests would seem to be in our advantage. It would protect the American lead.

Assumption number three is a matter of public relations on the grand scale. Could the Soviet Union afford to turn down such a treaty, a simple piece of paper with no ifs, ands, or buts, no inspection teams, no three-headed troika system of control with which the Russians torpedoed the Geneva talks?

WOULD CONCENTRATE ON AIR

The treaty would avoid all these inconveniences for the simple reason that it wouldn't apply to underground tests. Our own underground tests are teaching us two things: That they are less useful—and easier to detect—than we had thought. Therefore, let each side do as it wishes underground. Concentrate on the transcendant issue of testing in the air.

But let's assume (the argument goes) that we propose a treaty and the Soviet Union refuses to sign. We lose nothing. But we should gain quite a lot. We would be on the side of the angels. The Russians would look as black as satan. We could then shed a bitter tear at the Soviet refusal and proceed to our tests.

But now assume that they went along with us and signed a treaty. They broke a moratorium last August and it didn't seem to hurt them much. But breaking a simple moratorium is quite different from breaking a formal treaty, with all the world watching. It could hurt.

Nevertheless, Russians are Russians, and they might easily sign, then break the treaty. This is one of the rubs. The Russians, for example, could sign the treaty and secretly prepare for atmospheric tests. At the right moment (for them) they could find a pretext to break the treaty and start testing at once.

The United States, for obvious reasons, could not follow without a timelag that might last for several months. We can't leash our free-enterprise scientists and technicians to the atomic-test post indefinitely. If the precise timing of the tests rested on a totally unpredictable decision by Russia to break the treaty, we would have a possibly serious delay before we could follow suit.

A MAJOR GAMBLE

But the Soviet Union would be taking a major gamble if it gained a test-ban treaty and then tore it up in front of the whole world.

The President is refusing to yield to the political clamor for a renewal of testing in the atmosphere until every avenue is explored. He is willing to risk the incredibly dangerous spiral of a nuclear test race, with all that it means in poisonous atomic fallout and larger explosive yields, only if he is certain that there is no acceptable alternative.

The offer of an automatically inspectable test-ban treaty could be such an alternative.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 5, 1962]

Ideological Coexistence Impossible, Red Says

(By Preston Grover)

Moscow, February 4.—Soviet communism today sharpened its battle of ideas with the West.

Pravda published a long speech by Mikhail Suslov, top party theoretician, declaring that in the realm of ideology peaceful coexistence with the West is impossible.

The speech was made January 30 before directors and professors of social science institutions. It opened a drive to lead the country to more active acceptance of doctrines outlined at last October 22d party congress.

Nikita Khrushchev himself, while a professed advocate of peaceful coexistence on the practical plane, has often pressed the idea that war on the ideological side must continue.

The Suslov speech appeared to be a direct answer to President Kennedy's suggestion in his Izvestia interview last year that trouble in the world is caused by the active preaching and pressure of the advance of communism.

"Can we consider that peaceful coexistence exists in the sphere of ideology?" Suslov

> asked. "Of course not. Among some people in the U.S.S.R. there still exist remnants of capitalism They sponge, steal, bribe, conduct hooliganism, bureaucratism, promote religious ideology.
>
> "Is the peaceful coexistence of our socialist ideology with such phenomena possible?
>
> "Impossible. Impossible without betrayal of the interests of communism.
>
> "What does the bourgeois ideology consist of?
>
> "Is it vicious anti-communism, a propaganda of hatred toward communism, shameless slander of socialism, propaganda of military aggression, ideological defense of a system of hired slavery and colonialist enslavement?
>
> "Is some sort of conciliation possible, at least temporarily, with that ideology?
>
> "It is impossible and unthinkable. This would amount to ideological disarmament for Communists * * *.
>
> "Peaceful coexistence means giving up war, the solution of outstanding questions between states through negotiations * * *. Finally peaceful coexistence is the economic competition of states."
>
> With bourgeois ideology, Suslov went on, "we must conduct a resolute struggle."

PROPOSED DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS AND HOUSING

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MILLER in the chair). The Chair recognizes the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, first let me express my gratification and thanks to the very able Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] for his willingness to bear with me for a few minutes while I place in the record some remarks concerning the proposed Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. I greatly appreciate his consideration.

For the past half hour, it has been my privilege to preside over a Chamber empty except for the presence of the distinguished Senator from Iowa, and to listen to him speak with conviction and ability on a wide variety of subjects. I do not think that in the course of that half hour he said anything with which I agreed. Nevertheless, I would go even further than Voltaire: I would defend to the death the Senator's right to say everything he said; and I listened to him with pleasure, which is something I do not think Voltaire would have done.

It is now the unhappy fate of the Senator from Iowa to preside, again, over a completely empty Chamber—and I note only about 10 individuals in the gallery—while I speak on a subject on which my views are diametrically opposed to his. I am sure the Senator from Iowa will preside with the same silence as I did; although, as I understand, under the rules of our body, particularly so late in the evening as this, he could, from the chair, ask me to yield, if he desired to do so. I suspect, however, that he is as desirous of getting home as I am. Therefore, I shall proceed.

Mr. President, few issues before the Senate in recent years have given rise to so much misinformation and misunderstanding as the proposal of President Kennedy to create a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

The proposal before the Congress is so utterly simple that it is hard to see how it could be misunderstood. All the President proposes is to change the name of the Housing and Home Finance Agency and to elevate it to Cabinet status.

The question we have to decide is only this: Are the responsibilities of the HHFA of sufficient importance to justify Cabinet rank. That is the only issue. Yet out of this simple question the opponents have managed to conjure up some alarming bogeymen.

The magazine published by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, for example, recently published an article entitled "Washington Reaches for Your City Hall," with the subtitle "Proposed New Agency Would End Home Rule." A newsletter distributed by the same organization begins with this sentence, partly in capital letters, underlined:

> A drive is on to reduce your community to a Federal province.

Mr. President, it is hard to believe one's eyes. How could changing the name of an agency do these things?

It could not, of course. And it is hard to believe that the paid propagandists of this scare campaign do not know that it could not.

So much misinformation has been distributed on this issue that it is probably impossible, at this date, to correct it. But for a few moments this afternoon I shall like to do the best I can. I want to correct three of the most common of the allegations against President Kennedy's proposal which have no foundation in fact. I will try to lay to rest the three most terrifying of the bogeymen.

1. THE BOGEYMAN OF BIG SPENDING

The proposed Department of Urban Affairs and Housing has been attacked as being a huge spending measure, as creating a new and giant bureaucracy, as leading us toward big government.

None of these charges has the slightest foundation.

Anybody who has read the Reorganization Act of 1949, under which this plan is presented to Congress, knows that under that act the President cannot create new functions or programs. All he can do is to reorganize functions and programs which have been created by previous acts of Congress.

In this plan, the President has not even redistributed any functions. He has placed in the new Department only the present functions of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. He has transferred no activities from any existing department or any other agency to the new Department.

This is precisely the procedure that President Eisenhower followed when he changed the name of the Federal Security Agency and elevated it to Cabinet status as the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. He simply decided, and the Congress agreed, that the functions of the FSA were of such importance as to warrant Cabinet rank. That is the same question, and the sole question, we have to decide now regarding the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Of course, questions of new functions and new programs are sure to arise in connection with the new Department. But these arise every year, in connection with all departments. They arise now, in connection with the HHFA.

Last year, for example, the Congress authorized two important new activities in the field of urban affairs. One was a program of assistance to State and local governments in the preservation of open space for public purposes. The other was a program of loans to improve mass transportation in metropolitan areas.

These two programs, though they have nothing to do with housing or home finance, were assigned to the Housing and Home Finance Agency. Why? Because that Agency has been recognized for a long time, by both the executive branch and the legislative branch, as the agency of Government concerned with urban affairs in general. Federal programs relating to communities, unless they fall clearly within the jurisdiction of another department, have been assigned to the HHFA. Thus that Agency could, right now, more properly be called the Urban Affairs and Housing Agency.

But whether we authorize new programs or spend more on existing programs will be decided in the future, as they are decided now, on a case by case basis, year by year The Congress will decide each case on its merits as we do now. What the opponents of this measure seem to be saying—in arguing that the new Department will mean more spending—is that the Congress is able to say "No" to a request by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator but will be constrained to say "yes" to the same request by the same gentleman if he bears the title of Secretary of Urban Affairs and Housing.

I acknowledge that more public attention will be paid to a member of the Cabinet than to a subordinate official. That is one reason I am an advocate of the new Department: so that urban problems can receive more nearly the public attention they deserve. But to suggest that the Members of Congress will roll over and play dead when the case for urban programs is presented by a member of the Cabinet is nothing short of ridiculous.

To summarize, this reorganization plan authorizes no new programs whatever, no additional expenditures whatever, no increase whatever in the size of Government.

2. THE BOGEYMAN OF STATES RIGHTS

A second line of attack on the new Department is that it would bypass the States and thus, in the words of the minority of the Committee on Government Operations, "violate the principles of the Federal system," "usurp authority vested in State governments," and "build even higher the stronghold of Central Government."

The answer to these rather florid accusations is much the same as the answer to those I discussed earlier. Just as the President's reorganization plan creates no new programs or functions, so it creates no new relationships between the Federal Government and either the States or the cities and towns of America.

Each time the Congress establishes a program, it decides what the relationship with other units of Government will be. Sometimes we decide that a program of Federal aid is best administered through the States; sometimes we decide otherwise.

For example, when we created the Hill-Burton program of aid to hospitals, we decided to work through the States. When we set up a program of aid for building sewage treatment plants, we made the same decision. The highway program operates exclusively through the States. So do our welfare programs.

On the other hand, when we established the urban renewal program, direct relationships were authorized between the cities and the Urban Renewal Administration. Housing programs in general do not operate through the States. In general, housing programs work directly through the cities, or directly to private individuals or corporations, and have done so ever since they were instituted.

The reasons for this divergence are easy to find. Every State has strong health, highway, and welfare departments. They had such departments before Federal aid was enacted. So it was appropriate and natural to work through the States.

But no State, except perhaps New York, had a housing program of any kind when our Federal programs were first enacted. Not more than half a dozen States are, even now, doing anything at all in the field of housing; and those few are not doing much. So it has never been seriously proposed or seriously considered that housing and urban renewal programs be channeled through the States. In the absence of State administrative machinery, such a requirement could not help; but it might hinder.

It should be emphasized, of course, that the States have to assent to this arrangement or to any other arrangement which bypasses them. They must enact enabling legislation before their cities can participate in Federal programs. In such enabling legislation, they can establish whatever supervisory arrangements they may consider appropriate. So the States are in the channel to whatever extent they desire.

It is obvious nonsense, then, to say, in the words of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce magazine, that "proposed new agency would end home rule." Only the States can give powers to municipalities; only the States can take powers away. Federal legislation can do neither. If home rule is ever ended—but it will not be—it can be ended only by the States.

To summarize, changing the name of the HHFA has no effect whatever on States rights. It has no effect whatever on our Federal system. It takes no authority whatever away from the States. It establishes no new relationships between the Federal Government and the cities, and alters no existing relationships.

Perhaps the most striking testimony to the fact that the States are not injured in any way by this proposed Department lies in the support given the proposal by the Governors of the States, who would be the first to rise to the defense of State prerogatives. Of Governors who have taken a stand on this issue, a substantial majority favor creation of the new Department.

I ask unanimous consent that a list of the 23 Governors who have endorsed this Department up to the present time be printed at this point in the RECORD. I note that those 23 are the Governors of the States which have a large majority of the population of the United States.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNORS IN SUPPORT OF DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS AND HOUSING

John Patterson, Alabama.
William A. Egan, Alaska.
Edmund G. Brown, California.
Steve McNichols, Colorado.
John Dempsey, Connecticut.
Elbert N. Carvel, Delaware.
Otto Kerner, Illinois.
Matthew E. Welsh, Indiana.
Bert Combs, Kentucky.
J. Millard Tawes, Maryland.
John A. Volpe, Massachusetts.
John B. Swainson, Michigan.
Grant Sawyer, Nevada.
Richard Hughes, New Jersey.
William Guy, North Dakota.
Michael V. DiSalle, Ohio.
J. Howard Edmondson, Oklahoma.
David L. Lawrence, Pennsylvania.
John A. Notte, Jr., Rhode Island.
Buford Ellington, Tennessee.
Albert D. Rosellini, Washington.
William W. Barron, West Virginia.
Gaylord A. Nelson, Wisconsin.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a portion of a letter to the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], from the Governor of Alaska, the Honorable William A. Egan.

There being no objection, the portion of the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF ALASKA,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Juneau, Alaska, April 5, 1961.

Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Committee on Government Operations, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: Recently I received from the Governors' Conference a communication expressing opposition to bills now in your committee which would create a Cabinet-level Department of Urban Affairs.

Since I cannot agree with the opinions expressed by the majority of Governors' Conference executive committee members, I am writing you to endorse S. 289, S. 375, and S. 609 and to set forth some of the reasons for this endorsement.

The argument has been raised that establishment of a department of this type would tend to weaken existing relationships between the States and their political subdivisions.

I think this assumption is incorrect. The establishment of this Department would not create innovations in Federal assistance programs. Such functions as housing, home finance, urban renewal, slum clearance, pollution control, airport and highway construction, metropolitan planning, and civil defense mobilization have already been assumed by the Federal Government, and I think wisely so.

Because of the fact that State legislatures tend to include more representatives from rural areas than urban areas and therefore tend in varying degrees to be anticity, legislatures in many States have ignored problems of urban areas until they could no longer be ignored.

Many metropolitan areas, spurned by their own State legislatures, have turned to the Federal Government for assistance. Creation of a Cabinet-level agency, with available financial assistance, will encourage State legislatures to look more favorably upon the needs of urban areas within their States. This attention would tend to increase cooperation between metropolitan and State governments and decrease the already substantial dependence of local governments on the Federal Government.

It is also argued that the proposed department could preclude unified administration of many programs, such as highway construction, air pollution, and civil defense which also exist outside urban areas.

While it is true that urban areas exist in certain locations which may benefit from the proposed program to the exclusion of locations which are not urban, I do not believe this is a valid argument against establishment of such a department. If this thinking is to be accepted, how can one justify having a Department of Agriculture, which deals solely with problems of agricultural areas, or Federal agencies dealing exclusively with national parks, oil reserves, rivers and harbors, or schools?

WILLIAM A. EGAN.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, in view of the speech made by the able Governor of New York, which my friend, the Senator from Iowa, introduced a few moments ago into the RECORD—a speech in opposition to the proposed new Department of Urban Affairs—I think he will be interested to recall that the able Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] placed in the RECORD, a few days ago, the text of a memorandum, prepared for President Eisenhower by that same gentleman who now is the Governor of New York, strongly recommending the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks, six sentences from that recommendation by Governor Rockefeller to President Eisenhower, for the creation of the Department of Urban Affairs. The report by Governor Rockefeller was submitted to President Eisenhower in 1957.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ESTABLISHMENT OF A DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS, NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER, CHAIRMAN, PRESIDENT'S ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION

There is more justification for a new department than merely the present size of the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the cost of the programs which it administers. Departmental status would carry with its representation in the Cabinet, which has become increasingly important as a council for the consideration and resolution of important issues of national policy. At present agriculture, health, education, natural resources development and other fields of Federal concern have spokesmen in the Cabinet and have the prestige of inclusion in an executive department. Such representation and status are now denied to the

> agency most directly concerned with conserving and developing our cities and communities, which now include approximately two-thirds of the population of the United States.
>
> * * * * *
>
> It is our conclusion that a Department of Urban Affairs is already needed and that the need will rapidly become more urgent. It is our further view that the imaginative leadership taken by the administration in securing the enactment of the Housing Act of 1954 and the institution of the urban renewal program logically require that the Housing and Home Finance Agency be superseded by such an executive department.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, in a recent speech to a political gathering, Mr. Rockefeller indicated he had changed his mind. I assume that is the speech the Senator from Iowa obtained consent, a few minutes ago, to have printed in the RECORD. But perhaps, in addition to the 23 Governors as listed, we are entitled to add a half vote for the nonpolitical side of Governor Rockefeller, as distinguished from his political side. That would bring us to 23½, which is substantially more than the number of Governors who have expressed themselves on the other side.

3. THE BOGEYMAN OF BIG-CITY BIAS

A third line of attack on the new Department is that it would exist primarily to assist big cities, and that they should be able to look out for themselves.

I have always protested the notion, expressed frequently in this Chamber, that the problems of big cities should not be the concern of the Federal Government because the cities are supposedly rich and opulent. Having been mayor of a large city, a few years ago, I know that simply is not true. It is true that big cities have more rich people—although the suburbs probably have the most; but big cities have also most of the very poor. It can be demonstrated that big cities do not have left untapped great tax sources which, if utilized, would enable them to solve their problems. Most of the Federal tax revenues come from urban residents; and, insofar as these revenues are used to deal with domestic problems, big cities and small cities alike have a claim on their fair share.

But however one feels about big cities, the fact is that the new Department would deal with problems of urbanism wherever they arise—in cities, in towns, in villages, and in suburbs. I call the attention of the Senator from Iowa to the fact that the definition of urban area which is used by the U.S. Census Bureau is any community with a population of 2,500 or more.

Whether a given program would assist larger cities more than smaller ones, or vice versa, depends upon decisions of the Congress.

Just as I have pointed out in regard to the so-called spending issue and the so-called States rights issue, the question of how Federal funds are distributed in various Federal-aid programs is determined by the law in each case.

As for the treatment of big cities, I can think of no program which discriminates in favor of them. But I can think of quite a few that discriminate against them and in favor of smaller communities.

The Hill-Burton hospital program gives priority to rural areas. Yet I state without fear of successful contradiction that in many a great city—including my own city of Philadelphia—the need for Federal aid to assist in replacing old hospitals and in building new ones to take care of citizens who are without sufficient income and who need this care is as great as that of any rural area.

The water pollution control program is limited in the amount of assistance it can give any one project, and consequently provides a larger share of help to smaller communities. The community facilities program is limited to communities below a specified size. Urban planning assistance is likewise restricted to smaller communities. The proportion of Federal aid under urban renewal is three-fourths for cities under 50,000 population, two-thirds for larger cities.

Thus the Congress has often decided, in establishing programs of Federal aid, to favor smaller communities. I have no doubt that, whether a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing exists or not, it will continue to do so. Changing the name of the HHFA will not affect these decisions one way or the other.

Let me cite some of the ways in which smaller communities now benefit from programs which would be administered by the new Department.

Of the 1,800 communities assisted under the urban planning assistance program, 92 percent have populations of less than 25,000.

About half of the 504 local governments engaged in urban renewal have populations of less than 25,000.

Almost 80 percent of the 1,200 communities with low-rent housing programs are under 25,000 population.

Under the public facilities loans program, communities under 10,000 population are given a priority for loans for water and sewage systems. Over 90 percent of the 350 loans actually made are to communities with populations of less than 5,000.

Of 2,350 loans for public works planning, totaling $63 million, 55 percent went to communities under 10,000.

Over 30 percent of the colleges participating in the college housing loan program are in communities of less than 10,000 population, and nearly 67 percent are in communities of less than 50,000 people.

To summarize, the Housing and Home Finance Agency now gives extensive help to small cities, towns, and suburbs. Converting the HHFA to a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing will have no effect whatever on the formulas used in distributing Federal funds.

THE NEED FOR THE NEW DEPARTMENT

I hope that I have disposed of the three most terrifying bogeymen that the opponents of President Kennedy's reorganization plan have created. I have not tried to deal with all of the many minor ghosts, smaller specters, and less fearsome phantoms that accompany the larger three.

The question may well be asked, if the new Department is as harmless as that—if it creates no programs, authorizes no expenditures, builds no bureaucracy, establishes no direct relationships between the Federal Government and the cities, diverts no Federal funds in the direction of the big cities, all of which is the case—then what good is it? Why bother with it?

I acknowledge that some of the advocates of this proposal have been responsible for some of the misunderstanding about it. In their enthusiasm, some of them have claimed for the new Department more power than it will have. Some have said that the new Department would bring together all of the functions of the Federal Government having to do with urban affairs. This, of course, is not true.

But a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing would do four important things.

First, it would raise the status of a cluster of governmental programs which, taken together, have a tremendous impact on the development of communities of all sizes. As Mr. Norman Mason, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator in the Eisenhower administration, told the Housing Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate on May 9, 1960—

> Functions of the Housing Agency now have a tremendous impact on the entire national economy. They closely affect the daily lives of many millions of our citizens; they play a vital part in the livability and the economic stability of towns, cities, and metropolitan areas throughout the Nation; and they are closely related to the programs of many major departments of the Government. Finally, as your committee knows, our functions are necessarily very complex because they are addressed to so many difficult and closely interrelated problems affecting our urban communities.

Mr. CLARK. Governor Rockefeller, in his 1957 memorandum, which I have already quoted, pointed out that the HHFA then employed more than 10,000 persons, included 6 great bureaus, had obligational authority for that year of over $1 billion, was making commitments to insure mortgages and loans at a rate of $5 billion a year, and had insurance outstanding in excess of $24 billion. Citing its nonhousing functions, he said the HHFA was "already in important respects the Federal Urban Affairs Agency."

In Government, as elsewhere, status is important. The man charged with responsibilities of such magnitude deserves a rank equal to that of other officials with equal or lesser responsibility. The Federal Urban Affairs Agency deserves to be represented at the Cabinet table.

In short, we should not ask a major, or perhaps a colonel, to do a major general's job. But that is what we have been doing.

Second, the plan would bring greater attention to the problems of urban America.

In his message transmitting the plan, President Kennedy said:

> Our cities and the people who live in and near them need and deserve an adequate voice in the highest councils of Government. The executive branch and the Congress need

an adequate instrument to assist them in the formulation and execution of policy concerning urban affairs and housing. States and local governing bodies urgently need an agency at the departmental level to assist them in formulating and carrying out their local programs for dealing with these problems. All these needs can best be met through the establishment of the Department provided for in this reorganization plan.

It is true that the Housing and Home Finance Administrator now has a general concern for all of the problems arising from the explosive growth of urban and metropolitan areas, and he can propose legislative or executive action at any time. But a Secretary of Urban Affairs and Housing will be better able to make himself heard, partly because of his higher status, which I have already discussed, and partly because his new title will make clear to State and local officials, to the Members of the Congress, to the press and the public and all concerned that his interests are not limited to housing and home finance, but extend to urban affairs in general. Since, as Governor Rockefeller said in 1957, HHFA is already "the Federal urban affairs agency," this reorganization will fit the title to the fact.

Third, the reorganization would improve the coordination of Federal functions affecting communities. The Secretary would have no authority to direct the activities of other departments, but he would be responsible for initiating corrective action if, for example, highway programs conflict with urban renewal, or the Defense Department disrupts local planning. Governors, mayors, and county officials would have a central point of contact to straighten out conflicting or confused Federal policies.

The Housing and Home Finance Administrator, in his present subordinate status, is in no position to take the initiative for better coordination that is required. A Cabinet officer would have the rank and status that is necessary.

Fourth, the new Department would be in a better position to provide information and technical assistance to State and local governments on problems arising from urban growth. While any such activities would depend on congressional appropriations, the new Department, with its broader title, would presumably require more initiative than has HHFA in sponsoring research, and compiling and disseminating information on urban problems in general.

The Federal Government carries on extensive research on the causes and cures of potato blight, but not of urban blight. It knows much of farmland use, little of urban land use; much of the economics of transporting hogs, but little of the economics of mass commutation of people. The new Department would not conduct much research, but it would provide leadership, and a clearinghouse of information.

Mr. President, apparently Governor Rockefeller and Mr. Mason, as well as President Kennedy, the Government Operations Committees of both Houses, a majority of Governors, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the American Municipal Associations, and most other organizations of local officials, support this simple change.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Mason's testimony before the Housing Subcommittee on this question in 1960 may appear in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement of Norman P. Mason, Housing and Home Finance Administrator, Before the Subcommittee on Housing of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, on Pending Housing Legislation, May 9, 1960, Relating to S. 3292, To Create a Department of Housing and Metropolitan Affairs

S. 3292, which was introduced by Senator Clark, for himself and other Senators, would establish a Department of Housing and Metropolitan Affairs. All functions of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, including its constituent agencies, would be transferred to the new Department. The transfer would be effective 2 full calendar months after the month in which the bill is enacted.

The bill also provides that the "President shall from time to time exercise his authority under the Reorganization Act of 1949 with a view to further consolidating within the Department such functions and agencies of the Government as will further the purposes of this act." By January 3, 1961, the President would be required to submit a report to the Congress setting forth what action had been taken or is proposed to be taken with respect to the new Department's organization, and the reasons therefor.

I have made available to your committee a rather detailed report giving my views on the bill, and also discussing its technical provisions as well as major background considerations which I believe to be relevant to the question of whether Housing Agency functions should be given departmental status. It may be helpful if I were now briefly to summarize the conclusions stated in that report.

I do not recommend the enactment of legislation along the lines of S. 3292 at this time. This position in no way arises from disagreement with many of the broad policy arguments which have often been made by proponents of departmental status for our agency's functions. On the contrary, I believe that the time is near when the principal responsibilities of the Federal Government in the field of urban housing and community development ought to be organized into a new executive department. This is so, in my opinion, because a basic force is operating to give constantly increasing national significance to urban and metropolitan problems. This force is the rapid growth of our population, accompanied by an even more rapid shift between rural and urban living. In 1900, 24.1 million people lived in metropolitan areas. By 1959, this figure had increased more than fourfold to 100 million. Our total population had meanwhile increased by less than 1⅓.

As our urban communities have rapidly spread across municipal, county, and State lines, new problems have arisen and new Federal programs have been devised to help in their solution. Functions of the Housing Agency now have a tremendous impact on the entire national economy. They closely affect the daily lives of many millions of our citizens; they play a vital part in the livability and the economic stability of towns, cities, and metropolitan areas throughout the Nation; and they are closely related to the programs of many major departments of the Government. Finally, as your committee knows, our functions are necessarily very complex because they are addressed to so many difficult and closely interrelated problems affecting our urban communities.

Accordingly, the objections which I see in S. 3292, except for some technical deficiencies referred to in my report, relate to its timing and to the method of approach. In the case of many of our program operations, there is a need for quickly gearing them to rapidly changing conditions in the economy or in the home building or financing industries. However, I believe it is fair to say that the relative advantages of continuing housing and community development functions in a major independent agency or of vesting them in a new department is not a matter which demands action at a particular point in time.

With this in mind, I would not want us to foreclose the alternative of accomplishing the desired result through a reorganization plan submitted by the President. The Reorganization Act has in recent history vested in the President important powers to make the arrangements he feels necessary for the discharge of his constitutional responsibilities. Since the creation of an executive department is certainly a major exercise of such power, it would seem that the possible use of this legal method of bringing about the desired result ought to have very thoughtful consideration.

As your committee knows, the Reorganization Act of 1949 expired last year, and only last week the President has again urged its extension.

I am sure that my comments will not be misunderstood as in any way suggesting that the Congress is not free to legislate in this field as it chooses and when it chooses. Rather, the question that I do wish to raise relates to whether there is more to be gained from legislating at this time or from making possible recourse to the alternative approach if the President chooses. In this connection, I would like to call the attention of your committee to the fact that section 3(b) of the bill actually contemplates future action by the President in the form of reorganizations of functions and in the form of a progress report to the Congress to be made by January 3, 1961. I believe that nothing substantial would be gained under the bill, including these provisions for future actions and reports, which might not be better accomplished under a possible future proposal by the executive branch.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I offer for the Record, also, two articles which shed further light on the case for the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. Both appeared in the Philadelphia Bulletin of February 4, one by the noted columnist Eric Sevareid, and one by the chief of the Bulletin's Washington Bureau, Robert Roth. I ask unanimous consent that they be inserted in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Nation of Cities—Big-Government Planning Vital To Direct Rapid Urban Expansion

(By Eric Sevareid)

Far more columns of correspondence have described the President's shrewd political play with his proposed new Cabinet-rank Department of Urban Affairs than the structure and power of the post and its relationship to existing agencies dealing with these problems now. It can be argued in this case, as in the case of his request for radically new tariff-cutting powers, that the people have not been educated in advance, that he is acting first and explaining later.

Whether, in terms of administrative efficiency, this new Department is justified or not, I do not know, and those who fear the growth of Federal Government cannot be lightly dismissed, but the education of all of us in this matter ought to begin with an overall grasp of what is happening to our country and our life together.

America is not a city-State in the Greek sense, but it is rapidly becoming a State of cities. Two-thirds of us now are essentially city dwellers, whether we reside in the suburbs or the "loop." Through the vast coastal sprawl from Boston to Washington, D.C., the highways are not roads in the old sense, but super side streets to move the traffic through a 400-mile urban area.

The number of farmers declines in absolute figures as well as proportionately; the small towns become satellites of the nearest big town, and the big town of the nearest metropolis.

Our national pattern of governing ourselves was founded not only on political principles concerning distributed and balanced power but on the existence of distance and diversity. Along with distance, diversity is vanishing. Nearly everywhere the problems tend to be identical.

Living this close together produces the opposite of "togetherness"; it accelerates the rate of human alienation, man from man. The difference between urban and rural Americans, in their sense of comfort and security, their needs and their fears, their chance to be self-reliant, is now a chasm producing two separate classes of human beings more importantly different than the rich and the poor.

PROBLEMS NOT LOCAL

When we talk of the youth problem we are mostly talking of an urban problem. It is the same when we talk of the housing, medical, social security, school and, to a large degree, the civil rights and racial problems.

It is becoming increasingly difficult, as this new pattern of American life fastens upon our soil, to think in terms of local answers for problems that are not really local. Our communities are producing more social history than they can consume locally.

Political conservatism of the old school becomes increasingly identified with the old, smalltown pattern of American life, an ever narrowing field in spatial and numerical terms. This brand of politics narrows also, therefore in terms of commonsense.

Big government in our country is perhaps less to be feared than to be deplored for its inevitable inefficiency and waste, but these faults in the innumerable conflicting and obsolescent parochial units of government are not inconsiderable when viewed in their totality; and in the last generation, at least, the corruptibility of State and local officialdom has been notoriously worse than that of Federal officialdom.

ADVANCE PLANNING VITAL

To continue to think of social planning as "un-American," per se, is to be blind to the nature of America. From planning itself there is no escape, and we have learned the bitter way that an ounce of preventive planning is worth a pound of curative planning.

The lack of controlled plans turned our cities into traffic nightmares, which must now be straightened out by rigorous governmental control. The lack of planning stripped away the trees and topsoil for the new suburbias of crackerbox houses and let new industries build and operate where and as they wished.

New Draconian measures of planning and enforcement—"Government interference"—are required to slow the drop in the water levels and freshen our polluted rivers.

These and many other powerful trends of this last generation were foreseeable and, indeed, foreseen. Not by any underground railroad did millions of southern Negroes move to a few centers of concentration such as New York's Harlem, South Chicago, Philadelphia, Detroit, and Los Angeles. They followed their friends and relatives, as have the Puerto Ricans who now throng uptown Manhattan.

Tragedies and terrible tensions have been the inevitable result of these concentrations.

FLOW CAN BE DIRECTED

Yet it was never beyond the abilities of Federal, State, and urban authorities, working and planning together, to redirect much of this human flow on a voluntary basis to other areas, with housing, employment, and educational arrangements made in advance.

Under the terms by which modern industrial society must exist, it may be laid down as a ruling principle that for virtually any massive change in the pattern of life—none of which come as a surprise save to the blind and the deaf—there must be a measure of "Government interference," i.e., planning and controls, at the start of the process, or there will be an immeasurable degree of it later on.

We ought to be as much concerned with the timing of Government action as with the size of Government structure. In a rapidly expanding society, no one can know objectively at precisely what point government grows too big; it is far easier to know when it moves too slowly. To be concerned that it may move too rapidly is to worry about the exception that illustrates the rule.

GOP IGNORING THE CITIES?—ONLY ROCKEFELLER, AMONG FUNDRAISERS, MENTIONS CRUCIAL URBAN AREAS

(By Robert Roth)

WASHINGTON.—Political observers are becoming increasingly convinced that if the Republicans want to make a fight for the 1962 congressional election—not to mention the 1964 Presidential election—they will have to look elsewhere than to Washington for leadership.

The men who speak for the party in Congress—and they are the actual if not the nominal custodians of party fortunes between elections—have failed to give either impetus or direction to a drive for votes where the GOP needs them most, in the big centers of population.

Senate Republican Leader EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, of Illinois, and his House counterpart, CHARLES HALLECK, of Indiana, seem determined to ignore the lessons of history and test once more the theory that elections can be won by a policy of negativism.

MILLER OVERRULED

They have overruled the party chairman, Representative WILLIAM E. MILLER, of New York, who wanted the Republicans to put out a "state of the Union message" of their own, stating what they are for and will support. DIRKSEN and HALLECK have committed their party to a policy of waiting to see what the President does, and then fighting it.

As a result, Republicans find themselves in ever closer collaboration with the Southern extremist right wing of the Democratic Party and on the unpopular side of two key issues—medical care for the aged and creation of a new urban affairs department.

How much the Republicans need and lack a spur was demonstrated at a cross-country series of fundraising dinners last Thursday night. The dinners probably achieved their fiscal goal but they broke no new political ground and they provided no new political ammunition.

With one outstanding exception, no speaker came to grips with the problem of dwindling Republican strength in the cities and none gave recognition to the fact the Nation's population base has shifted from farm to city and that the GOP is losing out not only in the big cities but in the small towns and suburbs as well.

PROBLEM OF CITIES

There was a great deal of emphasis on the need for standing fast by the old-fashioned Republican virtues of self-reliance and thrift, and considerable emphasis on the need for improving party organization.

If it is true, as many believe, that the new concentrations of mass population have created new problems which cannot be solved by the citation of old-fashioned maxims, scant recognition was given to this in the speeches that came to the diners from party bigwigs over closed-circuit television.

Former President Eisenhower said that the answer to Republican election losses "can be found only in faulty sales tactics, not in political doctrines and practices."

Former Vice President Nixon warned Republicans that they must be alert to forestall election fraud "by having every precinct manned before and on election day."

The task of Republicans, said Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona, is to "emphasize over and over again the vast difference which exists between our approach and that of the welfare State Democrats."

Alone among the speakers, Governor Rockefeller, of New York, furnished the kind of talk which gladdens the hearts of ward and precinct leaders, a fighting talk capable of stirring the troops to action.

ACCUSES PRESIDENT

He chose to meet the Kennedy administration on its own ground—the urban affairs proposal. He accused the President of deliberately sabotaging the creation of an Urban Affairs Department by linking it in advance with the appointment of a Negro Cabinet member to head it.

Why, asked Rockefeller, if the President wanted a Negro in his Cabinet, didn't he name one in the first place? What the President sought to do, Rockefeller said, was to shift to Republicans responsibility for Democratic inability to cope with the problems of the cities.

But even Rockefeller, though he has demonstrated his ability to win urban as well as rural voters, was trapped into a defensive position and found himself trying to explain why he was against something which he would much rather have been for.

TELLING ARGUMENT

There may be some substance to the charges Rockefeller has leveled at the President. This does not alter the hard political fact that opposition to creation of a Department of Urban Affairs is opposition to a proposal which most city dwellers are likely to regard as in their own best interest.

Nor will charges of political chicanery abate the resentment of Negro voters against those who stand in the way of one of their number achieving a Cabinet post for the first time in history.

On the evidence available to date, the Republicans have no program tailored to the needs and desires of city dwellers. If they want the city votes that eluded them in 1960, they had better start developing one.

It will not be enough for them to say, as GOP leaders here are so fond of doing, that local problems should be solved at the local level. It has been demonstrated too often that they cannot be solved that way.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I am about to conclude, and I do so with renewed thanks to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] for his patience in listening to this talk, with most of which, I assume, he disagrees.

Let me say, in conclusion, that, knowing him for the able lawyer and student of government that he is, knowing him from my association with him when we served in the Air Force together, knowing of his keen interest in these questions, I ask him to take another look at this proposal to see whether or not it would do more good than harm for the small towns, and the medium-sized cities, and the one or two larger cities of Iowa.

Also consider that for 100 years the farmers of America, who now constitute less than 25 percent of the population of our Nation, have had a seat at the President's Cabinet table and a representative with Cabinet status, with all the influence that position implies.

Is it not right and just and fair that now, when 75 percent of the population are living in suburbs, metropolitan areas, small and large cities and towns, those three-quarters of our population should be given the same status, the same access, and the same right to be heard through a measure which authorizes no expenditure, creates no new functions, does not permit the Department to take any new steps or expand its activities without the consent of the Congress of the United States?

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, February 7, 1962, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 631. An act for the relief of Elwood Brunken;

S. 651. An act for the relief of Howard B. Schmutz; and

S. 1456. An act to authorize an additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, pursuant to the order previously entered, I now move that the Senate stand adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.), under the order previously entered, the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 8, 1962, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 7, 1962:

IN THE AIR FORCE

Maj. Gen. Harold W. Grant, 487A, Regular Air Force, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President in the rank of lieutenant general, under the provisions of section 8066, title 10 of the United States Code.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force under the appropriate provisions of chapter 835, title 10, United States Code, as amended. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

LINE OF THE AIR FORCE

First lieutenant to captain

Aamodt, Clark E., 29553A.
Abell, John B., 49624A.
Abhalter, Robert J., 60654A.
Abrahamson, James A., 54254A.
Adams, Francis J., 27155A.
Adams, Richard J., 57169A.
Adams, Robert N., 60436A.
Adcock, Billy D., 57179A.
Ahlefelder, Henry J., 60804A.
Aicher, Thomas E., 57378A.
Albers, Robert J., 57230A.
Alberts, John R., 60593A.
Albright, Theodore L., 56898A.
Aldrich, William B., 31802A.
Alewine, Martin A., Jr., 60502A.
Alexander, David M., 31681A.
Alfred, Loren R., 27156A.
Allbritton, James W., 50885A.
Alleman, George T., Jr., 53903A.
Allen, Bennie R., 53998A.
Allen, Benny J., 57083A.
Allen, David H., 31719A.
Allison, George B., 57233A.
Allison, Lee R., 51292A.
Allman, Fred D., 57129A.
Alvarez, Ariel, 31626A.
Alvey, Robert E., 53988A.
Amend, Dale N., 54039A.
Amsler, Gordon M., 48185A.
Anders, William A., 27158A.
Anderson, Bruce E., 57219A.
Anderson, Carl A., 53993A.
Anderson, Donnie L., 60819A.
Anderson, Edwin M., Jr., 27159A.
Anderson, Glenwood J., 51310A.
Anderson, Milton W., 31742A.
Anderson, Mylus G., 53974A.
Anderson, Richard E., 31901A.
Anderson, Theodore G., 60378A.
Anderson, Warren L., 60882A.
Anderson, Wayne C., Jr., 57084A.
Anderson, William G., 31839A.
Anderson, William L., 27161A.
Apple, Nick P., 54220A.
Arata, Harold J., 56805A.
Arata, Paul F., 3d, 31694A.
Arcari, Paul W., 56821A.
Archer, Norma A., 50830W.
Arens, Thomas J., 31840A.
Armstrong, Frank A., 3d, 60559A.
Armstrong, James B., 57345A.
Ashley, Daniel L., Jr., 60544A.
Athanas, Athas J., Jr., 60775A.
Atkinson, Donald M., 56995A.
Atkinson, Gary D., 28077A.
Atkinson, Rowland R., Jr., 31746A.
Aukerman, Donald T., 29542A.
Aulbach, George F., Jr., 60880A.
Austin, George A., 53901A.
Austin, Harold D., 57303A.
Avila, George C., Jr., 48112A.
Aycock, James W., Jr., 54017A.
Babbitt, Frank K., Jr., 56961A.
Babcock, Leon W., Jr., 54265A.
Baber, Ralph K., 49621A.
Bachelor, James T., 60821A.
Backues, Billy G., 54248A.
Bailey, Benjamin N., 56823A.
Bailey, Charles S., 54169A.
Bailey, John C., Jr., 51314A.
Bain, Donald W., Jr., 60771A.
Baird, Robert V., 47807A.
Baker, Marlin R., 27163A.
Baker, Ward J., 47934A.
Ballard, Arthur T., Jr., 31816A.
Balma, Ronald J., 57400A.
Balzen, Earl W., 53850A.
Banks, James E., 47928A.
Bara, Raymond M., 57265A.
Bargery, Basil L., 57070A.
Barinowski, Robert E., Jr., 60340A.
Barker, Raoul S., 31770A.
Barlow, Wesley J., 31701A.
Barlow, William J., 27164A.
Barnaby, Richard E., 60897A.
Barnard, Austin A., Jr., 54219A.
Barnes, Edward G., 31668A.
Barnes, Walter E., 3d, 57205A.
Barras, Gregory I., 27165A.
Barrett, William R., 54245A.
Bartholemew, David B., 31741A.
Bartholomew, Richard A., 57376A.
Bartleson, Fred D., Jr., 60575A.
Bartlett, Dean D., 54104A.
Bartlett, Reid, Jr., 31878A.
Bartlett, Robert O., 27166A.
Bartlett, Stanley D., 54211A.
Bartman, Gilbert, 31887A.
Barton, Gerard S., 31814A.
Basquez, Joseph G., 3d, 47775A.
Bassett, Cecil A., Jr., 60719A.
Batchelor, Charles C., 53990A.
Bates, Albert R., 54012A.
Batson, Louis R., Jr., 56803A.
Battaglia, Joseph H., 60457A.
Battle, Ed L., 53902A.
Bauer, Richard F., 60627A.
Bauman, Edward J., 48101A.
Baumgardner, Max E., 60740A.
Baumgartner, William P., 54152A.
Baxter, William W., 54301A.
Bayless, Thomas H., 31702A.
Bayly, Philip A., 27168A.
Bayus, Richard M., 55902A.
Beale, Robert S., 57324A.
Beaman, Paul C., 60471A.
Beard, Harry R., 60415A.
Beard, James P., 60542A.
Beardsley, Clarence J., 48062A.
Beck, Donald P., 57386A.
Becker, Stanley H., 60887A.
Becker, Thomas C., Jr., 60543A.
Beckman, Rodney B., 48152A.
Bedke, Ernest A., 48086A.
Bedsworth, Bobby D., 54249A.
Behunin, Otto E., 60545A.
Belcher, John T., 31695A.
Bell, Douglas C., 57282A.
Bellinger, Richard A., 47843A.
Bender, Leo H., 54031A.
Bendrick, Frank E., 27170A.
Benge, Bobby J., 60681A.
Bennett, Clyde E., 60904A.
Bennett, Robert E., 47995A.
Benoit, Donald F., 56832A.
Benson, Douglas W., 53885A.
Bent, Peter D., 54181A.
Benton, Charles R., 27171A.
Bentz, Richard, 47994A.
Beoddy, John J., 27172A.
Beran, John F., 50791A.
Beresik, Eugene P., 53849A.
Berg, Waldo G., 60385A.
Bergstrom, James W., 29693A.
Berkley, Dale W., 60567A.
Bernasconi, Louis H., 60513A.
Berry, Robert F., 49591A.
Berryhill, James V., 57344A.
Bertelsen, James P., 60473A.
Berthold, David F., Jr., 60900A.
Bethke, George E., 53862A.
Beuke, Theodore R., 57285A.
Beveridge, Roy D., 60598A.
Bewley, Danforth E., 53829A.
Beyer, William R., 53935A.
Bianckino, Richard A., 27174A.
Bickley, Earnest J., 57039A.
Biersack, Elmer R., 31689A.
Biggar, Kaye H., 53981A.
Biggs, Robert L., 56923A.
Bill, Charles G., 48174A.
Billion, William E., 31662A.
Bingham, William A., 60388A.
Binish, Robert H., 27175A.
Bird, Devaughn, 31720A.
Birkett, Robert C., 54210A.
Birkner, Harry, 60621A.
Birmingham, Daniel J., Jr., 54175A.
Birmingham, John M., 31679A.
Birr, Thomas G., 57224A.
Bishop, Alexander Y., 57203A.
Bixby, Marvin D., 60580A.
Bjerstedt, William R., 51270A.
Blackman, Gordon N., 47914A.
Blahauvietz, Kay G., 54276A.
Blair, James A., 60440A.
Blair, William D., 28083A.
Blake, Daniel, Jr., 53899A.
Blake, Thomas C., Jr., 47976A.
Blanchard, Wesley K., 54142A.
Bland, William J., 49612A.
Blank, Emanuel T., 60535A.
Blanton, Harvey B., Jr., 28080A.
Blanton, John W., 60899A.
Bleacher, Ralph D., 60853A.
Blinn, Robert H., Jr., 53827A.
Blitch, George R., 27176A.
Blunck, Kurt G., 60414A.
Boddie, James T., Jr., 56806A.
Boden, Warren W., 31633A.
Bodenhamer, Kenneth D., 56916A.
Boehler, Ernest A., Jr., 31858A.
Boinest, James W., 54143A.
Bolduc, Roger J., 54289A.
Bolin, John W., Jr., 31841A.
Bolls, Dillard D., 60382A.

Bonanni, Peter A., 53873A.
Bond, Gerald E., 60673A.
Bond, Wayne C., 54302A.
Bonner, Otis L., Jr., 60420A.
Booker, Hillard C., 47809A.
Boone, Earle M., 53969A.
Booth, William K., 57276A.
Borland, Jack G., 31830A.
Boseman, Paul M., 31827A.
Bossert, Carl J., 27177A.
Bottoms, William H., Jr., 27178A.
Bouchard, Phillippe O., 27179A.
Boulware, Robert H., 31639A.
Bourn, Daten O., 50810A.
Bouton, Lloyd M., 57269A.
Bowden, Charles K., 56859A.
Bowen, John E., 59729A.
Bowen, Kenneth R., 31699A.
Bowen, Richard A., 29557A.
Bowersock, Dave E., 57081A.
Bowles, Frederick M., 27180A.
Bowman, Billy J., 53824A.
Bowyer, Neal F., 48072A.
Boyer, Gary L., 48192A.
Braden, Robert H., 53951A.
Bradley, Charles W., 57131A.
Bradshaw, John B., 60701A.
Brakebill, Dale L., 57167A.
Bramwell, Stanley K., 53819A.
Branco, Anthony J., 53812A.
Brander, Albert, 48019A.
Brandon, Francis E., Jr., 48169A.
Branton, Charles E., 53933A.
Brasuell, Rollo W., 60707A.
Brattain, Thomas L., 54177A.
Braunstein, Eugene D., 31789A.
Breaux, Ellis J., Jr., 60586A.
Breckner, William J., Jr., 54059A.
Brehm, Lawrence R., 54114A.
Brennan, Lowell S., 54238A.
Brennan, William F., 31838A.
Bridewell, Joseph A., 60727A.
Briggs, Joseph N., 54121A.
Briggs, Ronald A., 60776A.
Brinson, Alfred C., 59993A.
Brinson, Kenneth G., 56795A.
Brister, Eric J., 50911A.
Brittain, Douglas B., 57237A.
Broadway, Cary L., 54259A.
Brock, Eugene B., 50831A.
Broderick, George T., 60450A.
Broker, John A., Jr., 60724A.
Brooks, Wesley J., 54055A.
Broschat, Donald F., Sr., 57011A.
Brotherston, Joseph H., 53855A.
Brotnov, Harmon M., 57250A.
Broun, Leroy A., 4th, 54079A.
Brower, Richard H., 27181A.
Brown, Charles D., 57135A.
Brown, David L., 53825A.
Brown, Donald D., 56940A.
Brown, Floyd W., Jr., 57148A.
Brown, Francis J., 60470A.
Brown, Gerald C., 27182A.
Brown, Harris S., 31807A.
Brown, Joseph O., 54195A.
Brown, Paul, 53994A.
Brown, Robert M., 57123A.
Brownfield, Bird R., 54022A.
Bruce, Clarence K., 57142A.
Bruce, Richard A., 53937A.
Bruckner, Charles S., 31803A.
Brundrett, Wallace M., Jr., 60587A.
Bruno, John B., 56792A.
Buchanan, Herbert, 53831A.
Buchter, Richard F., 49656A.
Buck, John T., 54242A.
Buckley, Sims A., 48012A.
Buie, Al, 27183A.
Buikema, Kenneth E., 54081A.
Bunde, Merle O., 57118A.
Bunge, Carl C., 54194A.
Buran, Emil L., 54246A.
Burbey, Ralph D., 54036A.
Burcham, Rollie K., 57347A.
Burgess, Elvin A., Jr., 57170A.
Burggrabe, Donald E., 57115A.
Burke, David J., 57214A.
Burke, Thomas F., 59727A.
Burkett, Walter M., 31869A.
Burleson, Donald R., 53868A.
Burns, John R., 53843A.
Burns, Lindo L., 31864A.
Burns, Robert J., 54050A.
Burpee, Richard A., 31704A.
Burris, Marvin E., 28072A.
Burroughs, William D., 27184A.
Burt, David N., 31678A.
Burton, Robert W., 27185A.
Burwell, Edward M., 57387A.
Busch, Warren L., 57306A.
Bush, Gaston O., 56928A.
Bush, George H., 31684A.
Bush, Robert E., 56994A.
Bushong, Eugene M., 50866A.
Butler, Samuel L., 56838A.
Butt, Lucious C., 57026A.
Butts, Ray F., 57161A.
Buzard, Lyman E., 60359A.
Bylinski, Joseph J., 57356A.
Byspiel, Allen, 28867A.
Cahill, Harley R., 47919A.
Cain, Keith M., 50893A.
Caine, Philip D., 28118A.
Caldwell, Bruce T., 57381A.
Caldwell, James G., 60876A.
Caldwell, Troy L., 31757A.
Calhoun, James N., 60770A.
Callahan, Stephen C., 50852A.
Calvit, Thomas O., 51316A.
Camacho, Raymond, 31591A.
Cameron, Paul A., Jr., 53578A.
Campbell, Gerald E., 60606A.
Campbell, Thomas J., 60523A.
Canfield, Paul C., 47924A.
Cannon, James A., 60331A.
Cannon, Jerald D., 47892A.
Cannon, Mervyn M., 31866A.
Canon, William R., 60725A.
Capaldo, Roy P., 47922A.
Capper, Dennis L., 31772A.
Card, Merritt C., 54061A.
Cardosi, John C., 27187A.
Carey, Kenneth V., 56851A.
Carlson, Fredric J., 31788A.
Carlson, James W., 53978A.
Carlson, Kenneth D., 60376A.
Carnes, Hugh B., Jr., 54058A.
Carpenter, Joe V., 60538A.
Carpenter, Kenneth B., 57299A.
Carrier, Stephen C., 31905A.
Carriere, Joseph A., 57258A.
Carrington, William M., 27188A.
Carroll, William R., Jr., 60444A.
Carrothers, William S., Jr., 57049A.
Carruthers, William M., 27189A.
Carson, David L., 56971A.
Cartee, Dale E., 57293A.
Carter, John L., 57220A.
Carter, William E., 60435A.
Case, Benjamin L., 53952A.
Casey, Thomas A., 60346A.
Cassells, Cyrus C., Jr., 27190A.
Cathey, Carl H., Jr., 27191A.
Caven, Charles A., 53995A.
Chafey, Frank D., 60400A.
Chambers, Everett A., 53811A.
Chambers, William A., 53897A.
Champlin, James L., 31739A.
Chancey, John W., 31783A.
Chapel, Kieran O., 31627A.
Chapman, Edwin K., 27192A.
Chappell, Richard G., 31632A.
Charpentier, Donald J., 53989A.
Chase, Robert S., 57132A.
Chastain, Robert L., 56932A.
Chastaine, Laverne A., 27193A.
Cheatham, Richard D., Jr., 53923A.
Cherrington, John R., Jr., 57234A.
Chiota, Anthony J., 27194A.
Chipman, Jerry L., 50901A.
Chivers, Edgar P., 53898A.
Christensen, Donald J., 57200A.
Christian, Richard E., 56807A.
Christiansen, Evan C., 60680A.
Christiansen, Roger H., 60903A.
Christiansen, Von R., 54149A.
Christianson, Howard L., 60482A.
Chura, Francis R., 27195A.
Claiborn, Edward L., 48058A.
Clark, Charles H., 56910A.
Clark, James R., 48175A.
Clark, James R., 50879A.
Clark, Ralph L., 60811A.
Clark, Robert M., 60817A.
Clark, Robert S., 60515A.
Clarke, James E., 31721A.
Clarke, John A., 49610A.
Clarkson, Joseph E., 27196A.
Clary, James C., 60830A.
Claunch, George E., 54225A.
Clayburn, Grant B., 60832A.
Clayton, John F., 60642A.
Clegg, David H., 57225A.
Clegg, Maurice V., 51789A.
Clemens, Donny D., 54015A.
Clements, Gerald H., 54153A.
Cleveland, Frederick H., 31904A.
Clifford, Robert V., 60566A.
Cline, Joseph P., 28101A.
Cloutier, Leo C., 48161A.
Coates, Harry J., Jr., 53946A.
Cobb, Kenny D., 31703A.
Cohen, Edward D., 57295A.
Cole, Earle R., 57267A.
Cole, Victor P., 60697A.
Coleman, Marvin L., 60364A.
Colleran, Joseph A., Jr., 60467A.
Collier, James L., 54004A.
Collins, David, 57069A.
Colson, Harold G., 57030A.
Colwick, Harold D., 57065A.
Comfort, Earle H., 31767A.
Conduff, Lloyd E., 57163A.
Conlin, Robert A., 60715A.
Conner, Arlie R., 50853A.
Connolly, Joseph H., 57005A.
Connolly, Vincent J., 48094A.
Conroy, Joseph M., 54164A.
Conway, Richard P., 47873A.
Conway, William R., 27200A.
Conwell, Leslie C., 51261A.
Cook, Donald E., 57089A.
Cook, Frank E., 60752A.
Cooke, Walter D., 50922A.
Cooley, Carroll R., 47782A.
Cooney, Charles T., Jr., 31649A.
Cooper, Charles D., 47778A.
Cooper, James W., 60620A.
Cooper, Marvin E., 53887A.
Cope, Edward A., 51260A.
Copp, Arthur J., 53834A.
Cordner, Floyd B., 60408A.
Cornelius, John T., 50898A.
Cornwell, William T., Jr., 48071A.
Corrigan, Clayton H., 60551A.
Cory, Gerald A., Jr., 57289A.
Cosgrove, Raymond E., 57023A.
Cost, Dennis E., 57401A.
Coulter, Herschel E., Jr., 31690A.
Coulter, Robert K., 27202A.
Countryman, William E., 56880A.
Coupland, William R., 31874A.
Courtright, John F., 60844A.
Covert, Willis D., 57388A.
Cowan, John C., 50876A.
Cowern, Richard T., 57264A.
Cowger, George H., Jr., 54173A.
Cox, Gene A., 31667A.
Cox, Glenn T., 54197A.
Coyle, Francis S., 3d, 31897A.
Coyner, Richard L., 54207A.
Cozine, John E., Jr., 48186A.
Cracraft, Jack E., 53830A.
Craig, David E., 53893A.
Crampton, Henry E., 3d, 50877A.
Crandall, Donald C., 57133A.
Craven, William E., 48039A.
Craver, Jesse C., Jr., 31793A.
Crawford, Charles E., 49622A.
Crawford, Cyril J., 60863A.
Crawford, Gary D., 50880A.
Crawford, James C., 60699A.
Crenwelge, Joe E., 57040A.
Crock, Lee, 56782A.
Crook, Marcus F., 57229A.
Crow, Myron W., 49638A.
Crowther, Walter E., 60474A.
Crumbaker, David M., 60539A.
Cruzan, Donald E., 57121A.
Cuellar, Andres N., 56828A.
Cummings, Jack C., 56855A.
Cunningham, Charles J., Jr., 31879A.

Cunningham, John T., 3d, 27206A.
Cupfender, Norman M., 56788A.
Currie, Julian M., 60500A.
Curtin, Donald R., 60423A.
Curtis, Herbert B., 56794A.
Curtis, John W., 56964A.
Curtis, Lewis G., 31896A.
Cushing, Stanley R., 48116A.
Cushwa, Phillip C., 60531A.
Custer, Jack E., 60417A.
Dahl, Gordon I., 50920A.
Dahlberg, Irvin W., 54088A.
Dahlquist, Lamont R., 31819A.
Dahmen, Gerald K., 56989A.
Dailey, Keith G., 60611A.
Dair, Donald G., 56976A.
Daley, Robert J., 56889A.
Dame, Jan G., 57330A.
Damon, Edward R., 31645A.
Daniel, Henry L., Jr., 60815A.
Daniel, James E., 60865A.
Daniel, James O., 57102A.
Daniels, Louis E., Jr., 56993A.
Daniels, Richard E., 57100A.
Dantzler, Gerald T., 27209A.
Danz, Raymond A., 48095A.
Darling, Frederick R., 56948A.
Darlington, Norman W., 57144A.
Darsey, Wilbur A., 57064A.
Daugherty, James M., 57045A.
Daugherty, Tim T., 60581A.
Daugherty, William L., 50860A.
Daughtry, John F., 60685A.
Davidson, George R., 56952A.
Davis, Clifford B., 60495A.
Davis, David H., Jr., 60562A.
Davis, Dempsie A., Jr., 27210A.
Davis, Fred M., 56826A.
Davis, Harry A., 3d., 56911A.
Davis, James W., 31854A.
Davis, Jerry G., 31696A.
Davis, Joseph H., Jr., 27211A.
Davis, Milford E., 53833A.
Davis, Ray D., 60730A.
Davis, Reginald R., 27212A.
Davis, Richard, 47977A.
Davis, Walter R., 28081A.
Davis, Wayne E., 56885A.
Day, Bobby G., 47949A.
Day, Charles B., 53928A.
Dean, Ernest S., Jr., 47959A.
Decarlo, Anthony J., 31884A.
Dedinas, Joseph V., 54008A.
Deghuee, John F., 60558A.
Delk, Derrill R., 54151A.
Dellamorte, John O., 50814A.
Deloache, Kelly L., 47920A.
Delong, Robert E., 57051A.
Delong, Robert I., 56871A.
Demarco, Patrick, 60651A.
Demarino, Rocco A., 57215A.
Deming, Wilford E., 3d, 49643A.
Denice, John J. 50943A.
Denney, Floyd C., 56881A.
Dennis, Robert C., 48125A.
Denny, Jack E., 57082A.
Depriest, Van A., 57274A.
Desilets, Martin G., 54020A.
Desmond, William R., 31860A.
Detar, Dean E., 53950A.
Detering, Victor D., 48133A.
Devens, Allyn M., 47862A.
Dewerd, Thomas G., 53965A.
Dewitt, John S., 54006A.
Dibartolo, Eugene N., 31787A.
Dible, Harry D., 60765A.
Dickens, Freddie D., 29554A.
Dickey, Gerald D., 27214A.
Dickinson, James H., 27215A.
Dickman, Henry J., Jr., 50857A.
Dickson, Marshall W., Jr., 27216A.
Dickson, Paul W., Jr., 47888A.
Dickson, Thomas P., 51289A.
Didamo, Francis A., 57268A.
Diehl, William P., Jr., 54066A.
Dietze, Robert J., 53874A.
Diggs, James H., 56882A.
Dillard, James R., 31652A.
Dille, Roy B., Jr., 57032A.
Dillon, Larry A., 60641A.
Dimski, Jack C., 56987A.
Ditz, James P., 47908A.
Diven, William L., 60843A.
Dockery, George E., 60838A.
Dodds, William G., Jr., 53860A.
Doggette, James C., Jr., 57273A.
Doherty, Charles J., 47900A.
Dollahon, William J., 57077A.
Dommer, Wayne R., 57232A.
Donald, Frank L., Jr., 27217A.
Donaldson, Robert D., 51279A.
Donaldson, Robert J., 57270A.
Donlon, James M., Jr., 31834A.
Doole, William H. E., 50821A.
Doren, Anthony J., 54074A.
Dormann, James E., 51269A.
Dorwart, Jason D., 53909A.
Doscher, Stanley, 50832A.
Dosky, Raymond C., 48103A.
Downes, Larry B., 57207A.
Doyle, Billy C., 54098A.
Doyle, William L., Jr., 57098A.
Dozier, Gilbert L., 57056A.
Drablos, Donald S., 57139A.
Drawbaugh, Robert E., 31629A.
Dreibelbies, George A., 60828A.
Driscoll, Dennis R., 57140A.
Drislan, John J., 57216A.
Drobot, John J., 60682A.
Dryden, Gary L., 49584A.
Dubois, James W., 60769A.
Duckworth, Richard D., 47937A.
Duell, Frederick K., 60786A.
Duet, Daniel S., 60624A.
Duff, Howard J., 48020A.
Duffy, Daniel H., 57116A.
Duffy, John J., Jr., 50798A.
Dugard, George A., 60868A.
Duke, Thomas A., 54240.
Dunagan, Eddie D., 60463A.
Dunbar, James R., 27222A.
Dunham, Robert L., 54091A.
Dunlap, Francis E., 51303A.
Dupont, Holbrook B., 50782A.
Durdin, Thomas N., 60748A.
Durkee, Hugh H., 56979A.
Dutcher, William W., 29545A.
Dutnell, Richard C., 27223A.
Dutton, Brock W., 57231A.
Dutton, Richard K., 31888A.
Duval, Ronald C., 54239A.
Dyer, Pintard M., 3d., 27224A.
Dyer, Richard E., 29558A.
Dyer, Thomas J., 3d., 31813A.
Dyes, Lynn S., 60822A.
Easom, Charles H., 60735A.
Eassa, Edward J., 27225A.
Eddy, David H., 51306A.
Edgar, Norman R., 50881A.
Edgren, Robert D., 31842A.
Edson, Donald G., 49648A.
Edwards, Alan M., 27227A.
Edwards, Harry N., 31881A.
Edwards, Lloyd, 57072A.
Edwards, Ronald L., 53878A.
Egan, John R., 49604A.
Egbert, James F., 57162A.
Egbertson, Charles B., 31712A.
Eggleston, John D., 318[illegible]0[illegible]
Ehmke, Charles A., 48054[illegible]
Eisenberg, Alvin B., 54045A.
Elliott, Albert M., 57003A.
Elliott, Donald E., 50833A.
Elliott, Joseph, 48011A.
Elliott, Richard D., 57171A.
Elliott, Robert L., 56875A.
Ellis, Donald E., 54000A.
Ellstrom, James W., 27228A.
Elmer, Dean A., 31835A.
Elwood, Niles T., 57136A.
Ely, Richard K., 57196A.
Emig, Charles W., 60645A.
Enbysk, Howard R., 60825A.
Enevoldson, Einar K., 60862A.
English, Edwin E., Jr., 49628A.
Enty, Arthur D., 50886A.
Eppinger, Dale L., 57371A.
Equi, Dino P., 48135A.
Erickson, Edwin D., 54043A.
Erickson, Paul E., 60869A.
Ericson, David M., Jr., 31831A.
Ermel, Eldon C., 50784A.
Ermel, Fred W., Jr., 51300A.
Erwin, Ralph D., 56984A.
Esterlin, Francis E., 2d, 56819A.
Estes, James F., 60492A.
Eubanks, Robert E., 60782A.
Evancho, Michael E., Jr., 60893A.
Evankovich, Carl E., 53987A.
Evans, David W., 48068A.
Evans, Harold R., 47811A.
Evans, Robert E., 60709A.
Everett, James D., 27229A.
Everson, David, 56893A.
Evert, Jack K., 60883A.
Ewing, Charles V., 27230A.
Ewing, Don R., 57062A.
Ewing, Stanley E., 47992A.
Ewing, Wilbur E., Jr., 49588A.
Ewing, William V., 60428A.
Fagan, Daniel M., 57261A.
Fagan, Willis F., 47943A.
Falck, Louis K., Jr., 60674A.
Falconieri, Louis, 60664A.
Fallows, Thomas E., 47883A.
Falls, Clyde L., Jr., 48170A.
Farha, Jimmie L., 60372A.
Farmer, Grover C., 47863A.
Farnham, Neil J., 48168A.
Farnsworth, William W., 27232A.
Faulkner, Fredrick H., 31821A.
Faulkner, Jackie L., 57281A.
Faurer, Judson C., 27233A.
Fawcett, Horace K., Jr., 49572A.
Feather, George K., 57046A.
Feiler, David C., 60504A.
Felciano, Franklyn M., 60626A.
Felmley, Jerry J., 56981A.
Fendrick, William A., 51294A.
Fennewald, Joseph A., 60736A.
Ferguson, Arthur E., 48102A.
Ferguson, Charles L., 60431A.
Ferguson, Harold B., 57262A.
Ferrell, Paul S., 57172A.
Ferrell, Robert O., 57253A.
Ferzacca, Albert L., 57066A.
Field, Robert L., 53997A.
Fikes, Charles O., 60762A.
Fincher, Thomas H., 56986A.
Fine, Boris A., 60448A.
Fink, Richard B., 48179A.
Finley, Robert A., 54103A.
Finn, Gerald, 56815A.
Finn, Robert J., 51293A.
Finn, William V., 57074A.
Finnegan, Neil F., 49564A.
Fisher, Charles W., 54193A.
Fisher, Richard L., 54080A.
Fisher, Robert H., 53940A.
Fisher, Samuel L., 53883A.
Fisher, Theodore A., 49606A.
Fisher, William E., 49618A.
Fitton, Crosley J., Jr., 47853A.
Fitts, Richard E., 47929A.
Fitzgerald, James C., 56827A.
Flanders, Edward D., 60546A.
Fleener, Delbert W., 53927A.
Fleet, Ronald P., 51320A.
Fleming, Peter M., 60866A.
Fleshman, Roger F., 48013A.
Fletcher, Carl C., Jr., 31705A.
Flood, James L., 50951A.
Florman, George L., 56963A.
Flowers, Jack L., 54105A.
Floyd, Leland D., 27236A.
Flynn, Charles L., 27237A.
Flynn, John J., Jr., 60484A.
Foley, Daniel J., Jr., 50952A.
Foley, Paul K., 50912A.
Follmer, William J., 56791A.
Folsom, Carl M., 53958A.
Font, William I., 47749A.
Forster, David C., 57332A.
Forstner, George C., 50887A.
Foster, Gerrit D., Jr., 49633A.
Founds, Boyd E., 47988A.
Fournier, Joseph D. L., 48021A.
Fowle, Edward E., 27238A.
Fox, Thomas E., 60785A.
Foxe, George E., Jr., 47859A.
Foy, Robert J., 57307A.
France, Warren G., 54154A.
Francis, George F., 27239A.

Francis, Philip B., 57037A.
Franklin, John M., 53853A.
Franklin, Reilous A., 57254A.
Franklin, Sidney B., 56965A.
Franks, Tullos L., Jr., 54092A.
Franscini, Lucien S., 3d, 28097A.
Frazier, Allison A., 60552A.
Frazier, Therman E., 51311A.
Freedman, Bernard, 48022A.
Freeman, Roy B., Jr., 27240A.
Freund, Richard M., 54108A.
Frey, Roger A., 56869A.
Frisbie, Erwin C., Jr., 31791A.
Frisch, Jerome A., 49649A.
Frise, Paul L., 53857A.
Frizzell, Donaldson D., 56969A.
Fry, Clifford F., 28115A.
Fry, Lyle M., 60678A.
Frye, Vernon L., 57158A.
Frymire, Randolph W., 60582A.
Fulgham, George S., 56897A.
Fulghum, Gary G., Jr., 53955A.
Fulk, James W., 54113A.
Fullam, Wayne E., 47819A.
Fuller, Benjamin R., 3d, 31883A.
Fuller, Robert R., 57314A.
Fullmer, Wayne M., 50872A.
Fults, Jim, 60553A.
Funai, Donald K., 31475A.
Funderburk, Elmer, Jr., 50823A.
Furlow, James D., 56852A.
Furtner, Ralph W., 60852A.
Gabby, Harold H., 48045A.
Gabriel, Arnald D., 56790A.
Gafney, James M., 57075A.
Gagen, Neil A., 60419A.
Gaiser, William L., 60333A.
Galerneau, Harold H., 54051A.
Gallanger, Clifford L., 54208A.
Gamble, John T., 27242A.
Gammage, Frank T., Jr., 57397A.
Ganneway, Jay T., 54019A.
Garcia, Rudy M., 56974A.
Gardecki, Anthony, 56990A.
Gardner, Melvin S., 31625A.
Gardner, Richard A., 60635A.
Garner, William D., 60870A.
Garove, Eugene, 29546A.
Garrick, Howard T., 60781A.
Gatt, John M., 57275A.
Gatz, Richard M., 60650A.
Gauldin, John E., 3d, 27243A.
Gee, John P., 57279A.
Geer, Richard L., 48150A.
Gehrig, George T., 56868A.
Gehring, Philip F., Jr., 27244A.
Geib, Philip G., 56888A.
Gemienhardt, Lloyd L., 54038A.
Genereaux, Robert J., 57402A.
Geran, Daniel B., 27245A.
Gerbing, Frederick B., 56943A.
Gerdon, Gerald A., 27246A.
Germscheid, Thomas C., 57271A.
Gesund, Ludwig, 57284A.
Gholson, Gerald E., 60702A.
Giannangeli, Anthony R., 53826A.
Gibbs, Charles A., 56921A.
Gibson, Billy R., 53975A.
Gibson, John F., 60743A.
Gibson, William L., 51296A.
Gilbert, Ernest G., 50834A.
Gilbert, John E., 57372A.
Gilbert, Kenneth L., 53930A.
Gilbert, Richard L., 56953A.
Gillen, Thomas E., 57113A.
Gillespie, Claude M., 47882A.
Gilligan, Ray G., 57204A.
Gilliland, Jack E., Jr., 31697A.
Gillis, Malcolm E., Jr., 57034A.
Gilmore, Wiley C., 60731A.
Gilpin, Jerry M., 27247A.
Giordano, Robert L., 60636A.
Girard, Robert M., 31850A.
Girling, Wallace D., 50789A.
Givens, Richard E., 60425A.
Gladney, Horace M., 56983A.
Glen, Dwight P., 31637A.
Glenn, Bobby W., 54203A.
Glenn, James M., 57173A.
Glidden, Norb B., 27250A.
Godfrey, Harold T., Jr., 56801A.
Goebel, Jerome R., 56873A.
Goeltz, Francis S., 49650A.
Goetz, Muriel A., 48023W.
Goetze, Earl E., 57320A.
Goforth, Charles T., Jr., 51305A.
Golden, Maurice F., Jr., 53818A.
Goldstein, Donald M., 54029A.
Gomas, Roger A., 60854A.
Gonzales, Carlos, 60355A.
Goode, Howard, Jr., 54155A.
Goodenough, Jerry C., 53904A.
Goodman, Donald W., 54052A.
Goodreau, Richard J., 49567A.
Goodrich, Ivor K., 57251A.
Goodwin, George W., 3d, 57355A.
Goodwin, James A., 27251A.
Goodwin, William J., Jr., 27252A.
Gordon, Archibald E., 60658A.
Gore, Robert R., 60721A.
Gore, Samuel T., 57036A.
Gorman, Rodney J., 60669A.
Gorski, Eugene S., 56786A.
Goss, Gerald, 60657A.
Gough, Thomas H., 60490A.
Gowing, Donald R., 31786A.
Grabler, Ronald V., 57366A.
Graetch, Joseph E., 57370A.
Grafton, Edward S., 60460A.
Graham, Gary G., 31655A.
Graham, William W., 60808A.
Grainger, Wayne F., 60758A.
Grange, John T., 31707A.
Grant, Joseph S., Jr., 57063A.
Grassan, George D., 53967A.
Graue, Robert W., 27253A.
Graves, William F., 56814A.
Gravette, James A., 50801A.
Gray, Eugene T., 31794A.
Gray, Harold D., 50934A.
Gray, Michael, 28119A.
Green, Billy L., 31815A.
Green, Henry W., Jr., 57193A.
Green, Jimmy R., 60464A.
Green, Phillip R., 60572A.
Green, Roy L., 53932A.
Green, Wade L., 31740A.
Green, Warren G., 31670A.
Greenberg, Lester, 60706A.
Greenblatt, Owen L., 31773A.
Greene, Douglas R., 54215A.
Greene, Taylor H., 47940A.
Greenwood, Edward E., 54290A.
Greenwood, Edwin L., 50890A.
Greer, James M., 51277A.
Greever, Robert S., 57197A.
Gregg, Lucius P., Jr., 27256A.
Gregory, Carl R., 48092A.
Grewell, Dean R., Jr., 31882A.
Griffin, Francis L., 57319A.
Griffin, William C., 48173A.
Griffith, Joe T., 57085A.
Griffith, Tedd N., 47901A.
Griggs, Phillip D., 28087A.
Grigsby, Bert E., 57327A.
Grimes, Jerry S., 57094A.
Grimm, Don A., 54096A.
Gross, Thomas L., 54291A.
Grotte, Roland M., 57263A.
Groves, Fergus C., 2d, 48141A.
Groves, Harold L., 50868A.
Gruer, Allan L., 57341A.
Grumbach, Delbert T., 60644A.
Gruver, Neill R., 54262A.
Grzebiniak, Valentine J., 57389A.
Gubler, Brian T., 57184A.
Guerney, Walter S., 60885A.
Guinn, Gregory S., 31862A.
Gulley, Coleman H., 54127A.
Gunnell, Earl L., 60411A.
Guptill, Murray T., 57150A.
Gustafson, Charles J., 31877A.
Guyton, Sam M., Jr., 60529A.
Gylov, Palle R., 56864A.
Haase, Ronald L., 56834A.
Haber, Joseph M., 60905A.
Hackett, Michael H., 60421A.
Hackman, Victor L., 56863A.
Haffner, Richard W., 31868A.
Hagenbrock, Harry H., 57380A.
Hagloch, Elmer I., 47795A.
Hahn, Ernest R., 60834A.
Hahn, Jack, 28107A.
Hahn, Robert A., 53842A.
Hail, William W., 60441A.
Haile, Allen C., 31731A.
Hairston, Victor E., 60753A.
Halbert, John T., 56808A.
Hale, Ira D., Jr., 60607A.
Hale, Jay G., 51309A.
Hale, John W., 50895A.
Hale, William E., 54047A.
Hales, Glen H., 54170A.
Hall, Bud T., 27258A.
Hall, Donald J., 47965A.
Hall, Gene F., 31859A.
Hall, George F., 48154A.
Hall, Jack R., 48160A.
Hall, Jimmie R., 50862A.
Hallidy, Hugh D., 50807A.
Halpern, Paul F., 56784A.
Ham, Charles D., 50856A.
Ham, Ronald L., 47944A.
Hamel, Raymond F., 49603A.
Hamilton, John T., 27259A.
Hamley, Gordon B., 27261A.
Hammett, David M., 27262A.
Hammond, Constance, 48024W.
Hammond, Robert A., 27263A.
Hancock, David L., 49586A.
Hand, John W., 56941A.
Haney, William F., Jr., 47941A.
Haning, James R., 31713A.
Hanna, John J., 60493A.
Hanna, Robert K., 49592A.
Hansell, Haywood S., 3d, 27264A.
Hansen, Darrel C., 57221A.
Hansen, Wynn D., 57328A.
Hanson, Stanley C., 48015A.
Harbour, Elbert E., 60341A.
Hardaway, Charles E., 57334A.
Hardee, John H., 60816A.
Hardin, Marion S., 56835A.
Harding, James R., 50937A.
Hardy, John S., 27266A.
Hargraves, William F., 2d, 60686A.
Hargreaves, John J., 31635A.
Harman, Jack D., 57390A.
Harmon, John F., 47889A.
Harnly, Myron D., 27267A.
Harper, Jackson D., 50844A.
Harpster, Milton H., 31657A.
Harrell, Charles E., 60601A.
Harrington, Basil V., 50845A.
Harrington, Charles F., Jr., 60332A.
Harrington, Harry G., 53875A.
Harris, Frank E., 60814A.
Harris, Gerald A., 56962A.
Harris, James T., 60453A.
Harris, Jerry D., 54292A.
Harris, Marshall E., 56991A.
Harris, Peter W., 49615A.
Harris, Virgil W., 53959A.
Harris, William G., Jr., 49561A.
Harrison, Gerald D., 31717A.
Harrison, John W., 48063A.
Harrison, William L., 27269A.
Harsh, Eugene S., 60693A.
Hart, Richard L., 47820A.
Hartsfield, Henry W., Jr., 57000A.
Hartung, William E., 56837A.
Harvey, John B., 60501A.
Harvill, Preston S., Jr., 27270A.
Harz, Donald K., 31688A.
Haskins, Gale L., 28073A.
Hastings, Loyal D., 57185A.
Hatch, John E., 60630A.
Hatch, Monroe W., Jr., 27271A.
Hathcock, Robert G., 57255A.
Haug, John M., 56798A.
Hause, Richard G., 28108A.
Hawkins, Clifton J., 57050A.
Hawkins, Jerome D., 27272A.
Hawkins, Jerry P., 48145A.
Haydel, Albert E., Jr., 51276A.
Hayes, Richard J., 53980A.
Hayes, Robert E., 53809A.
Haynie, John M., 48147A.
Hays, Leo P., 49577A.
Headley, Lanny J., 28100A.
Heap, Donald E., 60368A.
Heckel, Gayle D., 54102A.
Heckrotte, Robert P., 60358A.

Hector, Perry G., 47871A.
Hegwer, Frank A., 31843A.
Heidrich, Robert A., 60430A.
Heisel, Donald F., 50813A.
Heller, John J., 60456A.
Hellman, Alfred, 57016A.
Helms, Sanda B., Jr., 27273A.
Hemm, Valentine F., 60518A.
Hemming, Alfred O., 53863A.
Henderson, Hubert M., 47948A.
Hendrick, Alton J., 47909A.
Hendrix, James E., 60741A.
Hendry, Lynwood B., 31804A.
Hennigar, Harry J., Jr., 57333A.
Henning, Bobby L., 50882A.
Henning, Robert G., 60609A.
Henrie, Gordon C., 47825A.
Henriquez, David R., 48096A.
Henry, Richard L. W., 57021A.
Hensley, Russell D., Jr., 27274A.
Herbert, John D., 56700A.
Herman, Milton J., Jr., 27276A.
Hermann, Daniel A., 53880A.
Herod, Samuel P., 51283A.
Herrington, Don L., 60596A.
Herty, Frank B., Jr., 57093A.
Hess, Robert C., 31895A.
Hesseltine, William H., Jr., 31792A.
Hettinger, Edward J., 47781A.
Hewston, Robert A., 50802A.
Heye, James F., 27277A.
Hickman, Elmer J., 47986A.
Hicks, Robert E., Jr., 56947A.
Higgins, Bennie E., Jr., 57346A.
Higgs, Robert J., 27278A.
Hilbun, William H., 3d, 31751A.
Hilbreth, Richard L., 47860A.
Hilkemeier, Donald, 57198A.
Hill, Benjamin F., Jr., 50835A.
Hill, Ernest C., Jr., 31628A.
Hill, George T., 60849A.
Hill, James J., 60407A.
Hill, James R., 47938A.
Hilland, Richard W., 27279A.
Hillegas, Dale H., 60683A.
Hilton, Richard D., 47821A.
Hime, James L., 28977A.
Himebaugh, Rodric J., 57025A.
Hinely, Raymond F., 57058A.
Hines, Charles C., 49595A.
Hines, Rondal O., 56934A.
Hinkley, Waynard J. C., 56960A.
Hinote, Martin A., 31801A.
Hinton, Jerald L., 56973A.
Hintzen, Robert L., 53949A.
Hirsh, Leon S., Jr., 31761A.
Hivner, James O., 50815A.
Hlawek, Robert A., 27280A.
Ho, Walter T. M., 57125A.
Hobgood, William A., 50894A.
Hock, William J., 3d, 27281A.
Hodges, Russell B., 27282A.
Hodgson, Newton H., Jr., 50792A.
Hoelzer, Ronald N., 56946A.
Hofmann, Frederick L., 57898A.
Hogeman, Carroll G., 31798A.
Hogue, Herbert R., 31889A.
Holden, Kenneth L., 27283A.
Holland, Darrell T., 47864A.
Holland, John T., 60600A.
Holland, Leslie R., Jr., 27284A.
Holley, Edward M., 57105A.
Hollis, Grant W., Jr., 54234A.
Holly, Ronald D., 32114A.
Holmes, Douglas J., 54167A.
Holt, Ralph L., 53867A.
Holt, Roland R., 54156A.
Holt, William B., Jr., 60563A.
Holter, Paul C., 57127A.
Holubec, Melton G., 57004A.
Holubeck, August A., 47779A.
Honingford, Richard H., 53841A.
Hooker, Thomas M., 57190A.
Hoover, Richard L., 31700A.
Hopkins, Thomas C., 48124A.
Horinek, Ramon A., 49644A.
Horky, Frederick P., 56872A.
Horn, Brice W., 49616A.
Horn, William D., 57181A.
Horton, Joseph R., 51297A.
Hoskinson, Thomas M., 57259A.
Hosman, Stuart B., 31663A.
Houde, Frank L., 47935A.
Howard, James E., 27288A.
Howard, Joe A., 51307A.
Howe, Bruce H., 57362A.
Howe, Dan O., 60387A.
Howe, James O., Jr., 57145A.
Howley, John J., Jr., 60466A.
Hoyda, John A., 60496A.
Hoye, Dennis E., 57278A.
Hoyt, Harold M., 53828A.
Hudel, Perry A., 57106A.
Hudson, Charles L., 49585A.
Huey, Peter D., 60594A.
Huffman, Charles E., 54044A.
Hughes, Eynon, 47905A.
Hughes, Frank A., 60668A.
Hughes, James C., 60485A.
Hughes, Jerome E., 48085A.
Hughes, Louis N., 51280A.
Hughes, Vincent C., Jr., 47834A.
Hull, Robert W., 56822A.
Hummel, Ronald L., 60708A.
Hunder, Richard A., 57316A.
Hundley, Franklin D., 56996A.
Hunsicker, Robert, Jr., 56789A.
Hunsuck, John D., 48036A.
Hunsucker, Coley A., 47893A.
Hunt, David A., 50925A.
Hunter, George F., 27290A.
Hurley, James J., 60427A.
Hurtado, John V., 53957A.
Huskin, Frank P., Jr., 47954A.
Huyett, Melvin A., 60663A.
Igelman, David D., 50903A.
Inge, Walter H., Jr., 57384A.
Ingraham, Gale A., 60888A.
Ingram, Ralph W., 31722A.
Isler, James R., 60692A.
Iverson, Alan R., 60875A.
Iverson, William L., 60754A.
Jacko, Edward J., 57297A.
Jackson, Franklin M., 56843A.
Jackson, Glen A., 60615A.
Jackson, Kaye D., 57246A.
Jackson, Keith W., 60416A.
Jackson, Lee R., Jr., 57146A.
Jackson, Robert L., 57391A.
Jacobs, Delbert H., 27291A.
Jacobs, Joseph H., 57331A.
James, Charles L., Jr., 48006A.
James, Raymond F. X., Jr., 50799A.
Jamesen, Roy W., 47865A.
Jameson, George W., 31844A.
Jameson, Harold L., 47810A.
Jameson, Randolph C., 60655A.
Jandt, Robert A., 31863A.
Jatras, George, 49655A.
Jeanes, Cecil B., Jr., 56830A.
Jeffries, William R., 3d, 31823A.
Jeffs, Roger D., 54137A.
Jelarcic, Roland J., 60555A.
Jenkins, Ivan R., 60445A.
Jernigan, Leon S., 53910A.
Jessen, Chris, 60432A.
Jewett, Douglas A., 57256A.
Jines, James J., Jr., 56901A.
Jochen, Clarence H., 60859A.
Joern, John G., 48187A.
Johnson, Arlan D., 60367A.
Johnson, Benny F., 60848A.
Johnson, Charles M., 60520A.
Johnson, Charles R., 57304A.
Johnson, Daniel M., 60603A.
Johnson, Deward, 57143A.
Johnson, Edward S., 49626A.
Johnson, Edward V., Jr., 47844A.
Johnson, Edwin W., 49569A.
Johnson, Gilbert E., 51290A.
Johnson, James D., 57042A.
Johnson, Jerry, 57315A.
Johnson, Jerry E., 54293A.
Johnson, Kenneth O., 57111A.
Johnson, Richard H., 54244A.
Johnson, Robert E., 50944A.
Johnson, William D., 31648A.
Johnston, Bruce J., 48025A.
Johnston, Richard L., 47830A.
Johnston, Robert L., 48060A.
Joiner, Jackie L., 56935A.
Jokela, Allan M., 57097A.
Jones, Charles L., 54035A.
Jones, Charles W., 54138A.
Jones, David G., 57354A.
Jones, George E., 3d, 47785A.
Jones, Harold D., 47826A.
Jones, Jack D. V., 57395A.
Jones, James B., Jr., 56841A.
Jones, John G., 48040A.
Jones, Owen R., 60468A.
Jones, Raymond L., 57349A.
Jones, Richard C., 56846A.
Jones, Robert D., Jr., 28085A.
Jones, Robert E., 60519A.
Jones, Robert F., 60550A.
Jones, Russell W., 57086A.
Jones, Simon R., Jr., 50863A.
Joos, Leroy A., 50846A.
Jordan, Edward P., 60787A.
Jordan, James E., 56809A.
Jordan, Ralph M., Jr., 48136A.
Jordan, Wayne E., 47870A.
Jordan, Donald L., 60766A.
Julian, Robert E., 47903A.
Jung, Kineson, 57245A.
Junker, Joseph F., 54184A.
Justeson, George R., 31631A.
Kabrisky, Mathew, 54212A.
Kaley, Robert R., 53894A.
Kan, Robert S., 53984A.
Kanauka, Algirdas V., 49654A
Kaneshige, Thomas M., 60390A.
Kangas, Walter W., 51262A.
Kannawin, William I., Jr., 60449A.
Kapka, Dale V., 50836A.
Karam, Raymond A. 27295A.
Karczewski, Charles G., 60505A.
Karnes, John H., 27296A.
Karolczyk, Edward, 47790A.
Karth, James M., 50913A.
Kastella, Kenneth G., 47850A.
Kastilahn, Donald M., 57367A.
Kaufmann, Donald R., 56812A.
Kaul, Fred R., 60424A.
Kauppila, Calvin R., 57012A.
Kaus, Norbert R., 27297A.
Kavanaugh, Robert Z., 54090A.
Kay, Wayne G., 57309A.
Keddington, Neil H., 54150A.
Keeler, Walter D., 57321A.
Keenan, Thomas P., Jr., 59510A.
Keene, Gordon E., 56883A.
Kehoe, Peter P., 57187A.
Kehoe, Robert J., 54218A.
Keith, Alton P., 57043A.
Keith, Patrick, 31890A.
Kelley, Gerald V., 60349A.
Kelley, Richard E., 56968A.
Kelley, William J., 57211A.
Kelly, James A., 56874A.
Kelly, James S., 31753A.
Kelly, Joseph M., 60345A.
Kelly, Vernon B., Jr., 31669A.
Kelsey, Loyal L., 57383A.
Kennebeck, George R., Jr., 27299A.
Kennedy, Andrew, 54294A.
Kenney, Charles E., 27300A.
Kent, Richard B., 56998A.
Kepley, J. H. Allen, 60656A.
Keranen, Edmund H., 27301A.
Kern, George W., 57186A.
Kerr, Kenneth L., 50914A.
Kersting, Ronald A., 60442A.
Ketchum, Lowell D., 60568A.
Kiefer, Richard J., 27302A.
Kindel, James C., 60592A.
King, Andrew J., 57199A.
King, Cliff A., Jr., 31906A.
King, George W., 54134A.
King, Hubert G., Jr., 60871A.
King, J. Robert, 31775A.
King, Robert R., 31875A.
King, Thomas T., 57107A.
Kingsley, Rubert H., Jr., 31865A.
Kinkel, Charles H., 31658A.
Kirchner, Lewis G., 49570A.
Kirk, Charles N., 49613A.
Kirkpatrick, Kenneth A., 51263A.
Kishline, Samuel J., 48065A.
Kittler, Richard M., 27304A.
Klaerner, William H., Jr., 47345A.
Klonoski, Frank J., 3d, 54062A.
Klung, Henry A., Jr., 27305A.
Knaus, Ronald R., 49641A.
Knauss, Russell N., 48176A.

Knight, Guy D., 62061A.
Koch, William C., Jr., 48110A.
Koehly, Paul V., 53877A.
Koepke, Frederick R., 49634A.
Koho, Robert B., 60576A.
Konneker, Peter A., 50824A.
Koon, David P., 48191A.
Korzep, David A., 27308A.
Kosel, Howard E., 60379A.
Koski, Francis H., 31774A.
Kovacich, Vincent J., 47835A.
Kovar, Timothy J., Jr., 57126A.
Kowalczyk, Michael R., 54109A.
Kowalski, Gean G., 53964A.
Krecklow, Charles W., 60330A.
Kressin, Wolfgang K., 47956A.
Krim, John W., 48016A.
Kroese, Coe J., Jr., 48066A.
Krueger, Earl L., 57272A.
Krueger, James H., 48151A.
Krueger, Kenneth J., 60744A.
Krueger, Richard W., 47858A.
Kruse, Dean, 54122A.
Krutsinger, Edwin H., 48127A.
Kujawa, Walter A., 48132A.
Kukowski, Theodore T., 53936A.
Kunkel, James F., 51291A.
Kunz, Richard E., 28089A.
Kuprenas, Algimantas J., 51272A.
Kuske, Elwood C., 60837A.
Kustelski, Thomas A., 31646A.
Kuwamoto, Melvin M., 48109A.
Kvetensky, Warren S., 49573A.
Labadie, Edwin J., 50933A.
Laber, Roger C., 49653A.
Labranche, William E., 50808A.
Labrie, Norman G., 60347A.
Lackey, Henry F., 56833A.
Lafave, Kenneth E., 60712A.
LaFleur, Ray C., 60639A.
LaFond, Roger A., 47877A.
Lamb, George H., 48059A.
Lamb, Henry A., 47915A.
Lamb, Leroy A., Jr., 27309A.
Lamb, Robert W., 49659A.
Lamb, Walter A., 57217A.
Lambert, Thomas D., 50858A.
Lampe, Donald K., 56849A.
Lanan, Kenneth F., 48164A.
Landon, Kenneth S., 60475A.
Lang, Henry S., Jr., 60647A.
Langford, John W., 53845A.
Langford, Walter M., Jr., 47973A.
Langley, Duane D., 60826A.
Lanning, Robert G., 47923A.
Lanphear, Wayne A., 51301A.
Lantier, Ward J., 57014A.
Lantz, Richard M., 49651A.
Lapham, John S., 27310A.
Larimore, William H., 57134A.
Larkin, Arthur R., 49590A.
Larrabee, Edward R., 48177A.
Larsen, Richard N., 47894A.
Larsen, Robert D., 50935A.
Larson, Gerald D., 60560A.
Latta, James P., 48048A.
Laughlin, Ronald L., 50923A.
Law, Donald K., 27311A.
Lawhon, Gerald L., 50878A.
Lawrence, Gerald C., 60695A.
Lawter, Owen R., 57377A.
Lawyer, Richard E., 53986A.
Lay, Billy G., 54041A.
Lea, Randall J., 60365A.
Leal, Richard E., 48113A.
Leaphart, John L., 48064A.
Leaverton, Charles W., 56783A.
Leavitt, Alfred G., 48026A.
Lecates, Walter F., Jr., 27312A.
Ledbetter, Melvin N., 28075A.
Lee, Bennon, 53934A.
Lee, Donald V. H., 48055A.
Lee, James D., 47812A.
Lee, James L., Jr., 57157A.
Lee, John P., 56937A.
Lee, Thomas H., 48165A.
Leeka, Richard B., 56845A.
Leffler, Donald D., 50793A.
Leggett, Carl L., 51298A.
Lehman, Wiliam B., 51282A.
Lehr, Harry J., Jr., 56857A.
Leiby, Richard G., 47890A.
Leigh, Gerald G., 48144A.
Lein, Larry L., 31638A.
Lennon, William E., Jr., 31723A.
Lenz, Howard T., 51284A.
Leombruno, Salvatore J., Jr., 60429A.
Leonard, Dan W., 47875A.
Leonard, Rupert A., Jr., 60710A.
LePage, Francis W., 60737A.
Lerner, Vance, 56938A.
Leroy, Ronald S., 57374A.
Lescher, Charles O., Jr., 57038A.
Lesster, William C., Jr., 48120A.
Letnes, Douglas R., 47793A.
Letto, Augustine R., 48069A.
Leutwyler, Cooke H., 53996A.
Leventis, John K., 27313A.
Levy, Stuart W., 54082A.
Lewis, Duane L., 57359A.
Lewis, Edwin R., 56847A.
Lewis, John C., 48091A.
Lewis, Robert F., 49660A.
Light, Willford D., Jr., 57247A.
Lind, Robert C., 50788A.
Lindeke, Robert L., 54159A.
Lindenmeyer, Edgar J., 47974A.
Linebarger, John H., 27317A.
Linseisen, Frank J., 57044A.
Linton, John D., Jr., 31718A.
Lipsey, Victor H., 57408A.
Lipsky, Joseph R., Jr., 56950A.
Lisle, Alan G., Jr., 60836A.
Little, John D., 54232A.
Littman, Mayer, 57257A.
Lively, Lawrence L., 56853A.
Lively, William L., 31762A.
Livingston, Reginald S., 54060A.
Locht, John A., 57156A.
Lodge, William G. S., 29560A.
Lofton, Theo G., 47950A.
London, Richard J., 60588A.
Long, Francis J., 51286A.
Long, Joseph T., Jr., 60726A.
Long, Thomas M., 60840A.
Longman, Edwin R., 47800A.
Loosley, Donald J., 27318A.
Loosley, James H., 53970A.
Lorch, John H. V., 48018A.
Loukota, Robert D., 49631A.
Low, Edward, 27320A.
Lowe, Joe E., 57052A.
Lowery, Fred L., 57290A.
Lowry, Burlin, 54010A.
Lucero, Antonio H., 53865A.
Lucke, Daren L., 60784A.
Luckenbill, Clive D., 56905A.
Luecke, Conrad J., 54267A.
Luhks, Ronald A., 53871A.
Lukens, Kenneth W., 57248A.
Lukens, Leland K., 50816A.
Lund, John M., 57343A.
Lund, William W., 31832A.
Lundin, Perry J., 56899A.
Lundin, Robert L., 57001A.
Lung, David Y. F., 57403A.
Lunnen Ray J., Jr., 27321A
Luther, James N., 60521A.
Luttrell, Alfred N., 60585A.
Lyden, Raymond G., 27322A.
Lynch, John S., 54266A.
Lynn, Roy H., Jr., 27323A.
Maas, Edwin R., Jr., 53905A.
MacDonald, Roy, 56820A.
MacGregor, John E., Jr., 57228A.
Mackin, Paul C., 47991A.
Mackrell, Roy J., 60573A.
Macomber, Edward M., 47866A.
MacPike, Kenneth A., 53738A.
MacQueen, George F., 47945A.
Maddox, John W., 60443A.
Maddox, William L., Jr., 60477A.
Madson, Raymond A., 56957A.
Magtutu, Paul W., 60652A.
Mahew, James H., 60608A.
Mahoney, George F., 31644A.
Maier, Lothar T., 56933A.
Makinson, Jimmie L., 57174A.
Makowski, Henry A., Jr., 60426A.
Malickson, David L., 56824A.
Manigault, Elwood, 56920A.
Manion, Adelbert J., 60703A.
Manion, Martin F., 54042A.
Mann, Dalton L., 57027A.
Mann, Wayne A., 60889A.
Manns, Ralph E., Jr., 28116A.
Mansperger, Carl A., Jr., 50924A.
Manthei, Donald F., 31758A.
Maratos, Stanley G., 47961A.
Marcellino, Michael R., 57137A.
Marchon, Donald F., 60800A.
Marcotte, Wayne W., 57175A.
Marcum, Ronald P., 60497A.
Maricle, Ronnie G., 57168A.
Markey, Ronald L., 50796A.
Markowitz, Harold, Jr., 60895A.
Marlin, James W., Jr., 60879A.
Marquez, Leo, 60483A.
Marriott, Joseph R., 60704A.
Marrs, Stanley L., 56793A.
Marsh, Gary E., 60480A.
Marshall, James C., 60757A.
Marshall, Jerry E., 57236A.
Marshall, Richard C., 57410A.
Marshall, William F., Jr., 60788A.
Marshall, William L., 60909A.
Martel, Richard N., 57283A.
Martin, Charles H., Jr., 27324A.
Martin, Charles H., Jr., 60728A.
Martin, George D., 60570A.
Martin, James D., 54283A.
Martin, Jerry R., 56884A.
Martin, Jimmy G., 47829A.
Martin, Paul L., Jr., 27325A.
Martin, William C., 27326A.
Martino, Salvatore F., 56954A.
Marz, David E., 56966A.
Mason, Andrew F., Jr., 47804A.
Mason, Kenneth J., 57194A.
Masoner, Thayer E., 28082A.
Massengale, Wendell H., 50904A.
Masson, Richard W., 27327A.
Mathis, Glenn M., Jr., 47776A.
Mathis, James R., 53920A.
Mathis, Paul C., 60722A.
Matthew, Robert E., 50809A.
Mattson, Wayne O., 27329A.
Mauger, Harold A., Jr., 47789A.
Maxson, Edwin R., 57166A.
Maxwell, Samuel C., 49645A.
May, Donald M., 27330A.
Mayfield, William E., 60906A.
Mays, Robert C., 60713A.
McAllister, William D., 56844A.
McBride, Roger T., 48123A.
McCarley, Martin L., Jr., 60666A.
McCartney, Robert R., 31676A.
McClelland, Lester C., 60537A.
McClure, Samuel L., 27332A.
McCoid, James H., 60738A.
McCollam, George W., 31680A.
McConathy, Jack, Jr., 47967A.
McConnell, Anderson G., 57352A.
McCormack, Eugene L., Jr., 31779A.
McCormick, Carl O., 60399A.
McCormick, Everett C., 60532A.
McCoy, Lelian D., 28090A.
McCracken, James D., 57243A.
McCright, Gerald D., 31724A.
McCrillis, Walter C., 27334A.
McCulloch, Samuel D., Jr., 57087A.
McCullough, Walter J., 56858A.
McCurdy, Thomas P., 47822A.
McDonald, James G., 47792A.
McDonald, John S., 27336A.
McDonald, William M., 56787A.
McDowell, Gerald A., 60653A.
McFarlane, Raymond E., 60877A.
McGee, Edward V., 57404A.
McGee, John F., Jr., 56862A.
McGee, Joseph W., 47910A.
McGinn, John R., 57188A.
McGinnis, James G., 60344A.
McGraw, Joseph F., 54295A.
McGroarty, Robert P., 51271A.
McGuire, Charles A., 57018A.
McGuire, Richard L., 31692A.
McHugh, Joseph A., 31891A.
McIlvaine, Francis J., 47985A.
McIntyre, James S., 54021A.
McJoynt, Albert D., 27337A.
McKay, Peter R., 60823A.
McKay, Robert R., Jr., 54205A.

McKelvey, Robert D., 27338A.
McKenna, James L., 57010A.
McKenna, John J., 54025A.
McKenzie, Robert M., 60700A.
McKone, John R., 62063A.
McLamb, Estel W., 53936A.
McLaughlin, Robert C., 56914A.
McLean, Michael A., 53979A.
McLendon, Charles L., 53816A.
McMahon, John F., Jr., 47783A.
McManus, Richard L., 57017A.
McMichael, William S., Jr., 57152A.
McMonigle, Joseph P., 57266A.
McMullen, Jack L., 51266A.
McNally, Ray F., 47823A.
McNamara, Donald P., 48087A.
McNeil, Dale E., 31687A.
McPherson, James K., 27341A.
McVay, Julian C., Jr., 57002A.
McWilliams, William D., 3d, 27343A.
Meedeiros, Raymond R., 27344A.
Meiners, Herman P., Jr., 54094A.
Meiners, Paul A., 48035A.
Meinig, Helmut P. M., 31768A.
Meisenheimer, Robert A., 27345A.
Melancon, Jose L., Jr., 60829A.
Mellerski, Robert A., 47897A.
Mellott, Lester R., Jr., 31725A.
Melone, Sabato J., 49605A.
Melroy, Dana L., 50908A.
Melton, James H., 60451A.
Melvin, James A., 3d, 57153A.
Merkle, Edward P., 50805A.
Merrell, Alfred L., 57398A.
Merrill, Charles D., 47833A.
Metcalf, James R., 50905A.
Metcalfe, Frank W., 60613A.
Metzger, James C., 60878A.
Meyer, Donald H., 60884A.
Meyer, Richard L., 57195A.
Meyers, Ronald J., 47058A.
Michalove, Lawrence G., 27346A.
Michaud, Carroll R., 60729A.
Mickelson, Russell C., 54030A.
Mier, Colbert L., 57288A.
Milam, Earl E., 47911A.
Milburn, Richard A., 48073A.
Miles, Percy W., Jr., 56877A.
Millard, Robert G., 27347A.
Millard, Robert J., 54284A.
Millay, Albert K., 27348A.
Miller, Eric E., 60661A.
Miller, Gene A., 60756A.
Miller, Gerald S., 48046A.
Miller, Harlan S., Jr., 47939A.
Miller, James I., Jr., 48032A.
Miller, John B., Jr., 54014A.
Miller, John R., 57130A.
Miller, Ralf M., 31851A.
Miller, Richard M., 54111A.
Miller, Robert D., 50916A.
Miller, Robert J., Jr., 60574A.
Miller, Thomas H., 27349A.
Millhaem, Robert N., 48044A.
Milliken, Gordon J., 48007A.
Mills, Edgar C., Jr., 60512A.
Mills, Michael M., 60533A.
Milton, Hugh M., 3d, 54064A.
Minihan, Donald J., 56977A.
Mirich, Guy S., 53945A.
Mitchell, Andrew D., 50938A.
Mitchell, James D., 60446A.
Mitchell, Jimmie R., 27350A.
Mitchell, John F., 53891A.
Mitchell, Paul L., 57099A.
Mitchell, Wallace E., 54032A.
Mittelman, Leonard, 60845A.
Mitts, John E., 56879A.
Mobley, John O., Jr., 60687A.
Mock, Robert P., 60402A.
Mohler, Thomas F., 31872A.
Monahan, George L., Jr., 27351A.
Monahan, John W., 31760A.
Monroe, Paul L., 57073A.
Monsees, James M., 60803A.
Montgomery, Russell N., 57392A.
Moon, Frank A., 60362A.
Moore, Burton T., 53911A.
Moore, Charles F., 50929A.
Moore, Jim A., 60881A.
Moore, John F., 56895A.
Moore, Leon M., 57365A.
Moore, Michael K., 57399A.
Moore, Ray E., 60589A.
Moore, Richard E., 56860A.
Moore, Thomas D., Jr., 27353A.
Moore, Thomas L., 31805A.
Morales, John J., 60348A.
Moran, Richard A., 27354A.
Morgan, Boyd A., 56907A.
Morgan, Charles E., Jr., 50907A.
Morgan, Joseph P., 57312A.
Moring, Eugene E., Jr., 47813A.
Morlock, Leroy E., 57059A.
Morris, Dan, 60690A.
Morris, Frank J., 57379A.
Morris, Jack K., 48075A.
Morris, Lloyd V., 57308A.
Morrison, Robert G., 54076A.
Moser, John T., 57375A.
Moses, Kenneth H., 27355A.
Mosteller, Melvin R., 57252A.
Motal, Delbert R., 50869A.
Motley, Albert E., Jr., 60676A.
Motsinger, Harold V., 56813A.
Mounce, Jimmy R., 60660A.
Moure, Reinardo P., 48159A.
Mower, Roland D., 57191A.
Mowry, Byron M., 54053A.
Mrak, Steve V., 56958A.
Mudzo, Michael G., 27356A.
Mulch, Leroy R., 31714A.
Mulholland, James W. A., 27357A.
Mulkey, Charles W., 57108A.
Mullenger, Robert W., 48099A.
Mullennex, John T., 31903A.
Muller, Albert F., 50826A.
Munna, Joseph V., 31825A.
Munson, Lloyd M., 60717A.
Murchison, Benjamin F., Jr., 57019A.
Murff, John D., 48008A.
Murphy, Edmund P., 60370A.
Murphy, Edward J., 53854A.
Murphy, Luther G., 60677A.
Murphy, Stuart T., 31677A.
Murray, James D., Jr., 29547A.
Murray, James R., 47906A.
Murray, Richard S., 51281A.
Murray, Ronald S., 27358A.
Muskat, Michael S., 28071A.
Mussman, Arthur C., 47996A.
Myers, Dewitt H., 57138A.
Myers, Franklin W., 31795A.
Myers, Gene O., 57090A.
Myers, James E., 49661A.
Myers, Jerry L., 57322A.
Naegle, Thell S., 50790A.
Nagy, Charles S., Jr., 60328A.
Nanning, Ronald L., 53822A.
Nash, Howard G., 53823A.
Nash, Monte E., 54158A.
Nasypany, Raymond, 31674A.
Nay, Gerald L., Jr., 27359A.
Neal, Billy C., 54054A.
Neely, Joseph A., 60761A.
Neilson, Herbert E., 57335A.
Nelson, Conover A., Jr., 49596A.
Nelson, Elton M., 60556A.
Nelson, Merle A., 31810A.
Nelson, Oscar W. Jr., 48076A.
Nelson, Val G., 54024A.
Neubeck, Francis G., 27361A.
Nevins, Joseph K., 54119A.
Newcomer, Robert W., 50849A.
Newell, Jack L., 31856A.
Newsom, Ronald A., 54189A.
Newsome, Richard S., 56886A.
Newsome, Winfred T., 60394A.
Newton, Frank A., 47955A.
Newton, Tyree H., 56992A.
Niblack, Billey P., 57310A.
Nicholas, Michael C., 60595A.
Nichols, David L., 31880A.
Nichols, Donald C., 60747A.
Nichols, James C., 60472A.
Nicholson, Charles E., 60342A.
Nielson, Roland A., 56811A.
Nine, Robert E., 57227A.
Nishimoto, Hiroshi, 60391A.
Nixon, George S., 56978A.
Noble, Richard J., 60759A.
Nordlie, Roland L., 27363A.
Norman, Bobby L., 49574A.
Norman, Warren E., 47837A.
Nottingham, William H., 60809A.
Nou, Juri V., 31892A.
Nowakowski, Anthony J., 56985A.
Nowland, Benoni, 4th, 51317A.
Noyd, Dale E., 28084A.
Nuckolls, Norman L., 60459A.
Nunenkamp, Max T., 48038A.
Nunley, Billy F., 53963A.
Nunley, Bobby J., 48156A.
O'Banion, Glenn A., 31747A.
O'Brien, Alva B., 50910A.
O'Brien, James, 54178A.
O'Brien, Thomas E., 27364A.
O'Brien, Thomas H., 31818A.
Obzut, Nicholas P., 48114A.
O'Connor, Patrick J., 27365A.
Odgers, Peter W., 27366A.
Odland, Robert B., 31691A.
Oehme, Chester G., Jr., 31809A.
Oeser, Paul R., 50797A.
Oetting, George D., 54034A.
Offen, Curt R., 48030A.
O'Halloran, Leo D., Jr., 57406A.
O'Hara, Thomas A., Jr., 54166A.
O'Keefe, Cornelius J., 54078A.
Oldroyd, David A., 54009A.
Oliphant, John E., 53835A.
Olive, Lewis C., Jr., 27369A.
Oliver, Alan F., Jr., 54296A.
Oliver, John F., 54089A.
Oliver, Robert L., 54013A.
Olson, Arthur W., 2d, 48004A.
Olson, Vernon R., 54183A.
O'Neal, Bob H., 48083A.
O'Neill, John T., 50917A.
Oppel, Albert F., 27370A.
Orenstein, Stephen M., 29540A.
Ormand, Lowell W., 60723A.
Orme, Gordon R., 60801A.
O'Rourke, Andrew P., 53813A.
Orr, Charles L., 57339A.
Orr, Gary W., 60797A.
Ortega, Lorenzo T., 54005A.
Osaki, Ted M., 54297A.
Osborne, William R., 60856A.
Ostrominski, John, 47932A.
O'Toole, Patrick J., 48157A.
Ott, Franklin D., 49606A.
Otteson, David E., 60841A.
Overacker, William E., 50942A.
Overall, Douglas, 60772A.
Oveson, Richard M., 57178A.
Owen, James M., 60902A.
Owen, Wilbert P., Jr., 54226A.
Owens, Wayne E., 54235A.
Oyler, Duane E., 60486A.
Paige, Frederick D., 31752A.
Palcowski, Richard V., 54285A.
Palko, Edmund P., 54110A.
Palladino, Norman K., 27372A.
Pankey, Harold E., 20552A.
Pannell, William P., 51693A.
Paquette, Eugene F., 50926A.
Park, Richard N., 50927A.
Parker, Benjamin F., 60807A.
Parker, Norman M., 47832A.
Parkhurst, Kenneth M., 57067A.
Parr, John S., 53962A.
Parrish, John A., Jr., 47852A.
Parsons, Marvin A., 53772A.
Parsons, William P., 60465A.
Partridge, James D., 60540A.
Paschal, Richard B., 31902A.
Passi, Henry R., 48134A.
Patrick, John R., 47814A.
Patrick, Thomas J., 54261A.
Patterson, Billy R., 49566A.
Patton, Billy D., 54099A.
Paul, Donald G., 57031A.
Pawlik, Harry, 50803A.
Pawson, Leslie R., 49563A.
Paxson, Norman T., 31654A.
Payne, Marvin L., 60377A.
Payne, William M., 60806A.
Pearson, Leroy M., 56836A.
Pearson, Morris W., 60494A.
Peck, Victor H., 54187A.
Pecuch, Albert C., 49608A.
Peek, Kenneth L., Jr., 49593A.
Pelofsky, Arnold H., 57202A.

Pennington, David J., 54040A.
Perdue, Jacque M., 48027A.
Perdue, Raymond G., Jr., 60891A.
Perino, Michael B., 53376A.
Perkins, Charles M., 57235A.
Perkins, John E., 56915A.
Perkins, John H., 60698A.
Perkins, John R., 27374A.
Perkins, Thomas E., 3d, 60746A.
Perren, Gerald J., 31726A.
Perrin, David L., 57035A.
Perrin, Leroy J., 60637A.
Perroots, Leonard H., 60665A.
Perry, Elza, Jr., 60405A.
Perry, Johnny L., 60659A.
Perry, Joseph J., 60629A.
Peschel, Franklin D., 54095A.
Peter, Robert A., 57340A.
Peterman, Gerald W., 57393A.
Peters, Harold W., 57311A.
Peters, Leroy R., 60901A.
Petersen, Nohl D., 60864A.
Peterson, Arthur A., 47916A.
Peterson, Carl B., 27375A.
Peterson, Donald C., 47971A.
Peterson, Donald H., 27376A.
Peterson, John F., 56866A.
Peterson, Kenneth L., 31729A.
Peterson, Leonard R., 54247A.
Peterson, Milton R., 31824A.
Peterson, Roald E., 54018A.
Peterson, Thomas C., 60412A.
Peterson, Vernon C., 53859A.
Peterson, Wilbur D., 27377A.
Petrak, Herbert G., 49578A.
Petrie, Russell G., 61220A.
Petteway, Clark H., 60783A.
Pettyjohn, Jimmy C., 31743A.
Pew, Robert M., 60618A.
Peyser, Daniel B., 59994A.
Pfeffer, Clarence F., 56922A.
Pfeiffer, Larry C., 50902A.
Pfister, Kenneth L., 60403A.
Phares, Norman R., 57305A.
Pharr, William H., 57047A.
Pheiff, Robert F., 27378A.
Phelan, Thomas J., Jr., 57238A.
Phelps, Peter B., 54268A.
Philbrick, Gene E., 56982A.
Phillips, Fred B., 27379A.
Phillips, John, 60438A.
Phillips, John B., 31849A.
Phillips, John L., 53814A.
Phillips, Orlan T., 50888A.
Phillips, Thomas J., 2d, 27380A.
Pickitt, John L., 27381A.
Pierce, Ralph A., 53929A.
Pierce, Richard E., 57405A.
Pinette, Ronald E., 57119A.
Piotrowski, John L., 49636A.
Piper, Robert B., 60476A.
Pirkey, Frederick E., 27382A.
Pitstick, William F., 29543A.
Pitt, Robert W., 54188A.
Pittenger, Eugene W., 57008A.
Plaisance, Newton C., Jr., 31797A.
Plowman, Charles E., 48093A.
Plumb, Randall L., 48034A.
Plumb, Richard E., 31806A.
Plummer, Orel L., 56867A.
Plutt, Phillip E., 47907A.
Poe, Joe E., 60604A.
Poindexter, Luther R., 57176A.
Poirier, John T., 27383A.
Pokrant, Edmund R., 60648A.
Polk, Adrian V., 57353A.
Pollard, Ben M., 53879A.
Poncar, Jerry V., 54241A.
Ponti, Robert J., 27384A.
Ponton, James O., 57061A.
Poor, William B., 48005A.
Poore, James W., 48084A.
Poore, Walter H., 47802A.
Pope, Dallas H., 54106A.
Popovich, Michael T., 28975A.
Poppe, Robert T., 27385A.
Porter, David L., 50786A.
Porter, James W., 53886A.
Porter, William E., 53815A.
Postas, John R., 60361A.
Poteet, Bobby S., 60584A.
Poteete, John D., Jr., 60842A.
Potter, Ernest J., 47880A.
Potter, Frederick R., 60422A.
Potter, Merwin E., Jr., 53947A.
Potts, George S., 60847A.
Poukish, Philip E., 57020A.
Powell, Jack H., 60605A.
Powell, William Y., 60794A.
Powers, John, 48182A.
Pralle, James R., 60711A.
Prassel, Victor, Jr., 54272A.
Prater, Richard H., 27387A.
Pratt, John C., 48188A.
Pratt, William E., Jr., 60812A.
Pretlow, James P., Jr., 57360A.
Prewitt, George P., 48171A.
Price, John H., Jr., 60742A.
Price, Norris E., 48117A.
Prince, Robert E., 31817A.
Pritchett, Larry W., 57409A.
Propst, Robert W., 31642A.
Pruden, Albert L., Jr., 54107A.
Pruitt, Leslie D., 27388A.
Puckett, William E., 31812A.
Pyatt, Robert C., 31671A.
Pyke, James A., Jr., 53960A.
Pyne, Wallace R., 60610A.
Quinlan, Edward M., 53852A.
Quinlan, John P., 60802A.
Quinlan, William F., 54298A.
Quinn, Lawerance H., 31822A.
Radder, Paul E., Jr., 60675A.
Rader, Paul L., 60633A.
Ragland, Samuel F., Jr., 60511A.
Raisor, Harry E., 47453A.
Ramey, Albert A., 50867A.
Randolph, Bernard P., 57318A.
Ransom, Charles E., 60734A.
Rapuano, Joseph M., 60628A.
Raschke, Rupert T., Jr., 53941A.
Rasmussen, Robert A., 54172A.
Raspberry, Everett T., 53972A.
Raudenbush, Paul E., 47786A.
Rausch, Russell R., 56909A.
Rawie, Carl W., 49646A.
Ray, James, S., 27391A.
Ray. Walter L., 56900A.
Rea, Chalmers F., 48080A.
Reade, Harold C., 60619A.
Rebsch, Willis J., 53906A.
Recicar, Steve A., 27392A.
Reding, John J., 48178A.
Redmond, Robert, 57287A.
Reed, Edward S., 50837A.
Reed, Guy A., Jr., 31734A.
Reed, Jack N., 60384A.
Reed, John W., 60689A.
Reed, Lester W., Jr., 31666A.
Reed, Norman E., 50941A.
Reeder, Lloyd, 50827A.
Reeder, Martin G., 53896A.
Reese, Clyde H., 48042A.
Reese, Jerry W., 31778A.
Reichelderfer, John W., 60896A.
Reid, Robert, Jr., 53821A.
Reilly, James J., 60760A.
Reilly, Walter A., Jr., 54221A.
Rendahl, Neil J., 48082A.
Rentz, Charles A., 60569A.
Rentz, William D., 53992A.
Reynolds, William R., 48172A.
Rhoads, Donald G., 57057A.
Rhodes, Harold B., 47993A.
Rhodes, Robert N., 47962A.
Rice, George E., 47798A.
Rice, Tommy E., 56876A.
Richard, Kenneth R., 57114A.
Richards, Charles M., 53864A.
Richards, Donald C., 47895A.
Richards, Frank D., 48183A.
Ridlinghafer, Billy R., 47946A.
Riedel, Emil G., Jr., 27394A.
Riegle, Robert M., 54144A.
Rigby, William G., 47851A.
Riggs, Leland S., Jr., 27395A.
Riley, Mitchell B., 60578A.
Rissi, Donald L., 27397A.
Rist, Monroe D., 60534A.
Ritchey, John W., 53943A.
Ritenour, John D., 50819A.
Roades, Charles W., 27398A.
Robb, Wesley E., 49663A.
Robbins, Clyde R., 51318A.
Roberds, Donald W., 60851A.
Roberson, Merle L., 60507A.
Roberts, Albert J., Jr., 48077A.
Roberts, Clifford K., 50804A.
Roberts, David L., 54135A.
Roberts, Linwood, 48163A.
Roberts, Lionel W., 48009A.
Robertson, Gilbert A., 50939A.
Robertson, Jimmie R., 49589A.
Robertson, O. D., 47972A.
Robertson, Orbie G., 53900A.
Robertson, Valden L., 60547A.
Robidoux, Joseph E., 48010A.
Robinett, Eugene D., 51278A.
Robinette, Jerry O., 60354A.
Robinson, Wilbur L., 50838A.
Robson, Donald E., 31716A.
Robst, Paul K., 60413A.
Rodenhizer, Donald, 54275A.
Roell, Roger V., 48028A.
Rogers, Albert G., 29548A.
Rogers, Charles J., Jr., 54069A.
Rogers, Frank M., 54028A.
Rogers, James K., 53869A.
Rogers, John A., 57329A.
Rogers, John C., Jr., 60597A.
Rogers, Philip C., 50930A.
Rogers, Robert I., 60867A.
Rohr, Donald F., 27401A.
Rollman, Leo F., 57015A.
Roosa, Stuart A., 50873A.
Roque, Bernard A., 53908A.
Rosenlof, Kenneth D., 28112A.
Ross, Alfred P., Jr., 60527A.
Ross, James S., 56980A.
Rossmeisl, Robert D., 56927A.
Roth, William E., 27402A.
Rothlisberger, William O., 50883A.
Rough, Floyd D., 51273A.
Rousseau, Robert G., 31661A.
Ruana, Raymond M., 54217A.
Rubenstein, Morton J., 27403A.
Ruberg, Arthur J., 27404A.
Ruby, Norman A., 56817A.
Rufty, Franklin G., Jr., 47801A.
Rule, Ronald E., 27405A.
Rumsey, Edwin F., 27406A.
Runkle, Robert H., 60350A.
Rupp, Alexander K., 27407A.
Russ, Robert D., 57180A.
Russell, Charles H., Jr., 57024A.
Russell, Charles R., 60846A.
Russell, Howland S., 56785A.
Russell, Jerry W., 47827A.
Russell, Robert L., 27408A.
Russell, Robert S., 29551A.
Ruth, Alfred E., Jr., 31776A.
Ruth, John C., 27409A.
Ryan, Arthur R., 56939A.
Ryan, Eddie W., 56904A.
Ryan, Jack B., 60617A.
Ryan, Kenneth E., 60503A.
Sachs, Robert L., 60557A.
Sackschewsky, Donald M., 28109A.
Safer, Melvyn I., 57385A.
Sager, Bonaventure F., 54274A.
Sager, Ralph F., 53832A.
Sager, Robert E., 31790A.
Sahlman, Armas F., 3d, 54046A.
Saindoux, Edward L., 60536A.
Salisbury, Earnest E., 54145A.
Salter, James E., 60755A.
Salyer, John A., 54002A.
Samos, Gerald J., 27411A.
Samuelson, Reid R., 53847A.
Sanborn, Morgan W., 53961A.
Sanborn, Walter R., 49658A.
Sanders, Lawrence N., 56825A.
Sanders, Robert G., Jr., 60516A.
Sanders Robert W., 47981A.
Sanders, William H., 51319A.
Sandifer, Jerry K., 56975A.
Sandstrom, Jack H., 49627A.
Santagati, Ronald S., 60452A.
Sargent, Arthur, Jr., 50854A.
Sargologos, Nicholas, Jr., 31715A.
Saunders, William W., 31736A.
Saurs, Robert R., 60614A.
Sawyer, Dallas D., Jr., 60499A.

Saylor, John C., Jr., 60488A.
Sayre, George M., Jr., 60554A.
Scanlan, Tracy A., 57007A.
Schade, David U., 27412A.
Schadel, Harold A., 53931A.
Schaefer, Ronald T., 48142A.
Schaefer, William E., 60873A.
Schaff, Robert M., 56949A.
Schaub, Theodore J., 47805A.
Scheid, Donald J., 57325A.
Scheu, Arnold W., 49597A.
Schick, Donald E., Jr., 54288A.
Schirmer, Gerald C., 50884A.
Schlenker, Richard A., 57096A.
Schlicht, Harold C., 27413A.
Schlichter, Robert N., 29690A.
Schlier, Frank G., 60510A.
Schluter, Henry A., 54213A.
Schneider, Darrell A., 57286A.
Schneiders, Thomas H., 60684A.
Schoeplein, Charles W., 53907A.
Schoolfield, Scott M., 31650A.
Schorsch, Rudolf H., 31898A.
Schroer, John E., 56908A.
Schroter, Dodsley A., 60360A.
Schuehler, James K., 54199A.
Schulman, Herbert L., 31755A.
Schurig, Robert M., 49579A.
Schutes, John G., 57300A.
Schwabacher, Michael F., 56919A.
Schwankl, Gerald C., 56967A.
Schwartz, Harold, 31693A.
Schwartz, James W., 60767A.
Schwartz, Roger M., 53884A.
Schwenk, Larry D., 60780A.
Schwieren, Richard D., 57280A.
Schwietz, Thomas E., 49582A.
Scott, Glyndon V., 57242A.
Scott, Martin R., 50864A.
Scott, Ronald W., 60791A.
Scott, Thomas D., 60839A.
Scriven, Gilbert A., Jr., 60329A.
Scully, David J., 57361A.
Seamens, Howard R., 54180A.
Seay, James E., 27414A.
Seback, Albert J., 60612A.
Seborg, Earnest H., 27415A.
Secanti, Richard M., 31735A.
Secord, Richard V., 27417A.
Seddon, John J., Jr., 60894A.
Sedlak, George, Jr., 54125A.
Seig, Louis, 47360A.
Senn, Charles H., 27418A.
Serex, Henry M., 27419A.
Sessa, Patrick C., 60672A.
Setliff, Jasper A., 56800A.
Shacklock, John D., 50874A.
Shaeffer, John E., 31640A.
Shanahan, Wayne K., 27420A.
Shaner, Carl W., 60646A.
Sharkey, Byron L., 60833A.
Sharp, Hubert W., 31784A.
Sharpe, Hardy R., Jr., 60716A.
Shaw, David H., 48148A.
Shaw, Donald E., 54057A.
Shaw, John R., 60481A.
Shaw, Ward C., 56878A.
Shaw, William H., 56956A.
Sheffield, John M., Jr., 57348A.
Sheldon, Alfred E., Jr., 27421A.
Sheldon, Lyndon L., 49630A.
Sheppard, Jack W., 56892A.
Sheringo, William, 29691A.
Sherrier, Richard J., 31748A.
Shields, Bertrand E., Jr., 57241A.
Shields, Don R., 47942A.
Shields, Richard A., 48131A.
Shinkle, Albert D., 54201A.
Shircliff, Thomas A., 47926A.
Shively, Stanley F., Jr., 47867A.
Shiver, Robert A., 31907A.
Shook, Tom M., 31885A.
Shookman, Loyd A., 59509A.
Short, Donald L., 31659A.
Shrum, Claude R., 57350A.
Shular, Robert D., 60509A.
Shumway, Allen L., Jr., 56810A.
Shuppert, Ben A., 56930A.
Siegmund, Frederick R., Jr., 31847A.
Siemers, Eric T., 56988A.
Sigler, John E., 54182A.
Silva, Robert M., 48115A.
Silverstein, Jack, 48001A.
Smitjis, Thomas G., 60667A.
Simm, Robert K., 56912A.
Simmons, Thomas N., 57009A.
Simon, Paul J., 47964A.
Simpson, Manford E., 60623A.
Singer, Earl V., Jr., 27424A.
Singleton, Elmer R., 47968A.
Sither, Robert D., 54033A.
Sizemore, Tad E., 27425A.
Skipton, Charles P., 56856A.
Skorepa, Ronald J., 49611A.
Slaten, Elmer, Jr., 57351A.
Slates, Donald H., 60418A.
Slaton, Frank T., 60616A.
Slaughter, Dale M., 51268A.
Sleater, Joseph K., Jr., 60777A.
Slider, Joseph H., 31886A.
Sloth, Sven E., 29544A.
Small, Irvin M., 27426A.
Small, John W., 57323A.
Small, Leland F., 60631A.
Smart, Edmund P., 48031A.
Smetana, Duane W., 27427A.
Smiley, Richard M., 60763A.
Smink, Carl R., 60561A.
Smith, Adam C., 53999A.
Smith, Bealus A., Jr., 54112A.
Smith, Bruce A., 60526A.
Smith, Carl R., 28105A.
Smith, Charles J., Jr., 54011A.
Smith, David W., 60478A.
Smith, Donald F., 53872A.
Smith, Donald W., 53919A.
Smith, Douglass W., 47869A.
Smith, Frederick E., 54067A.
Smith, Gordon W., Jr., 50828A.
Smith, James A., 47963A.
Smith, James L., Jr., 53977A.
Smith, James R., 54128A.
Smith, Jimmie L., 54001A.
Smith, John E., 60688A.
Smith, John K., 3d, 60338A.
Smith, John R., 54227A.
Smith, Kenneth L., 60336A.
Smith, Lee E., 50909A.
Smith, Lester S., 47998A.
Smith, Melvin R., 31660A.
Smith, Merlin C., Jr., 54071A.
Smith, Murray L., 48088A.
Smith, Needham V., 60795A.
Smith, Raymond F., 60908A.
Smith, Richard P., 31780A.
Smith, Robert A., 31686A.
Smith, Robert A., 60907A.
Smith, Robert N., 31826A.
Smith, Roger M., 31672A.
Smith, Thomas D., 3d, 31709A.
Smith, Thomas H., 31785A.
Smith, Warren P., Jr., 31766A.
Smith, William T., 60739A.
Smuck, Barre E., 48029A.
Snell, Jerry D., 54228A.
Snell, Richard T., 57210A.
Snider, John W., 50847A.
Snowden, Richard M., 57396A.
Snyder, Benjamin C., 47982A.
Snyder, Earl P., Jr., 57120A.
Snyder, Omar G., 53912A.
Soherr, Paul E., 47989A.
Solomon, Harry, 50855A.
Solomon, Howard N., 57301A.
Solomon, Robert C., 56925A.
Somerder, Herbert E., 47854A.
Somers, Richard L., 31833A.
Sotrines, Frank A., 57291A.
Souvignier, Douglas R., 54179A.
Sowders, John H., 53953A.
Sowers, Richard S., 56999A.
Spallina, Marvin G., 50787A.
Spangler, Wilson H., Jr., 27430A.
Sparks, David C., 54101A.
Spaulding, Keith H., 53603A.
Speed, Marvin E., 50829A.
Speer, Jon G., 50899A.
Spegal, Donn A., 47884A.
Spicka, Charles F., 60437A.
Spivey, Delmar B., 51313A.
Spoerl, Todd A., 56942A.
Sprague, Russell K., 50817A.
Spratt, Victor M., Jr., 60640A.
Springer, James A., 54222A.
Springer, Richard M., 50820A.
Springston, Theodore, Jr., 31727A.
Spurrier, Donald L., 57022A.
Staehli, Alfred M., 47847A.
Staffen, Verne G., 27431A.
Stagg, Jerome A., 54097A.
Stahl, William A., 54171A.
Stalcup, Gordon E., 56902A.
Staller, Kenneth W., 60591A.
Standring, John A., 49635A.
Stanfill, Grant C., 56931A.
Standford, Jesse E., 31685A.
Stanford, Nolen B., 49637A.
Stanley, Frederick W., 60404A.
Stanonis, Benedict A., 60396A.
Stanton, Joseph S., 56870A.
Staples, Henry M., Jr., 54200A.
Starling, Laramie D., 60590A.
Starrett, Charles O., Jr., 60857A.
Steel, Tommy R., 56850A.
Steele, Gail F., 48189A.
Steele, Ralph D., 60583A.
Steen, Joe R., 31710A.
Steen, John A., 57201A.
Steinbrunner, Donald T., 60353A.
Steinke, David G., 48050A.
Stephen, John G., 48070A.
Stephens, Jerry D., 27434A.
Stevens, Eldon L., 60401A.
Stevens, Jack D., 53840A.
Stewart, Frederick N., 60410A.
Stewart, George F., 50825A.
Stewart, Lowell A., 56955A.
Stewart, Sam P., 53922A.
St. George, Edward F., Jr., 27410A.
Stickney, Henry E., 49580A.
Stiffer, Robert M., 60632A.
Stilwel, Kenneth R., 56918A.
Stinson, James E., 51287A.
Stirk, John J., 55903A.
Stitt, Howard D., 60750A.
St. Jean, Frederick J., 47816A.
Stocker, John R., 60638A.
Stoddard, George J., 49576A.
Stoeckel, Charles G., 27436A.
Stoeckle, Edward R., 60679A.
Stokes, Elbert R., 60720A.
Stoll, Harry J., 31728A.
Stone, Don W., 60798A.
Stone, Reed L., 27437A.
Stone, Roland J., 50848A.
Story, Alfred F., 50948A.
Story, Conrad L., 47874A.
Stout, Jerry D., 56796A.
Stout, Thomas A., 57013A.
Strain, Robert B., 31730A.
Starit, Ernest D., 47953A.
Straub, Edward C., 27439A.
Strebeck, George E., 50850A.
Streett, Donald P., 56797A.
Stricker, Werner, 56896A.
Strickland, Robert K., 27441A.
Strickland, Theodore R., 27442A.
Strittmatter, Leonard E., 60733A.
Strohecker, Harry F., 50794A.
Strong, Jeridan, 60366A.
Stuart, Robert B., 27443A.
Stuart, Theodore W. A., Jr., 54073A.
Stumpf, Lawrence, 57296A.
Sturk, Robert L., 56839A.
Sturtevant, Richard C., 54282A.
Sullins, Dee G., Jr., 57091A.
Sullivan, Farrell J., 57177A.
Sullivan, John J., 60357A.
Sullivan, John R., 27444A.
Sullivan, Richard L., Jr., 57222A.
Sullivan, Robert L., 60799A.
Sullivan, Robert M., Jr., 53921A.
Summers, Clarence S., Jr., 27445A.
Sund, William A., Jr., 54116A.
Supercynski, Florian A., 49587A.
Sutton, Stephen L., 51315A.
Sutton, Thomas E., 49620A.
Suver, James D., 29538A.
Sverdrup, Lawrence H., 31759A.
Swafford, John E., Jr., 50840A.
Swalm, Thomas S., 56842A.
Swanson, Harold W., 54204A.
Swanson, James O., 31711A.

Swearengen, John F., 53924A.
Sweetwood, Robert D., 53991A.
Swett, Ben H., 48047A.
Swift, Charles F., Jr., 57206A.
Tabb, Howard C., 53889A.
Taddiken, Gerard A., 54216A.
Tadlock, Carl E., Jr., 47999A.
Talley, Dorsey J., 50949A.
Talley, William H., 54120A.
Tarbet, Thomas M., 54133A.
Tardif, Charles H., 47855A.
Tate, George R., 54250A.
Tauzel, William R., Jr., 49607A.
Taylor, Billie J., 47824A.
Taylor, Billy G., 60813A.
Taylor, Claret D., 56970A.
Taylor, Donald M., 60831A.
Taylor, Franklin D., 57213A.
Taylor, James P., 60371A.
Taylor, John F., 54191A.
Taylor, Ralph C., 50811A.
Taylor, Robert H., 56936A.
Taylor, William K., 54063A.
Tebben, Gerald D., 27447A.
Tefft, James R., 56913A.
Terhune, Burke C., 56649A.
Terpening, Andrew L., 54264A.
Terreau, Gerald E., 53917A.
Terrell, Everett K., 60890A.
Thedford, Jack L., 60373A.
Theunissen, Gerald J., 53926A.
Thomas, Charles D., Jr., 31675A.
Thomas, David W., 50870A.
Thomas, Floyd L., 57048A.
Thomas, George E., 47868A.
Thomas, Kenneth E., 56917A.
Thomas, Lloyd H., 47896A.
Thomas, Marshall W., 60374A.
Thomas, Oscar L., 60805A.
Thomas, Timothy L., 48041A.
Thomas, Virgil D., 29549A.
Thomas, Wayne H., 29559A.
Thompson, George B., 53861A.
Thompson, Jack E., 50892A.
Thompson, James E., 48014A.
Thompson, James L., Jr., 27448A.
Thompson, Leland L., Jr., 47818A.
Thompson, Lucien T., 49623A.
Thompson, Ray G., 50865A.
Thompson, Raymond E., 50785A.
Thompson, Robert I., Jr., 57240A.
Thompson, Robert L., 48053A.
Thompson, Thurston A., 50841A.
Thompson, Vern E., 60861A.
Thompson, Warren N., 57639A.
Thompson, William C., 50861A.
Thompson, William D., 31698A.
Thomson, Alan H., 57244A.
Thomson, Alexander W., 49657A.
Thornhill, William J., 31808A.
Thornquist, Robert 27449A.
Thornton, Leonard F., 47817A.
Thornton, Richard W., 47921A.
Thornton, William L., 31664A.
Thorp, James V., 50953A.
Thorpe, Roscoe P., 60363A.
Thouvenelle, Norman J., 60351A.
Threatt, Thomas V., 47917A.
Thurston, Robert F., 57357A.
Tibbetts, Therice E., 60855A.
Tidwell, Marion F., 31665A.
Tietbohl, Frederick J., 3d, 53837A.
Tiggeman, Ralph D., 60469A.
Till, John F., 3d 48146A.
Tilley, Tommy A., 31749A.
Tillotson, James A., Jr., 50940A.
Timpko, Charles M., Jr., 31732A.
Tindall, Ira F., 48181A.
Tindall, Richard D., 47840A.
Tingley, Ronald D., 48143A.
Tissot, Raymond E., 54075A.
Titus, John W., 53913A.
Titus, Terrence R., 60602A.
Toft, Donald L., 47887A.
Tokar, Donald E., 56924A.
Tolbert, William T., 47913A.
Tolliver, Thomas J., 51302A.
Tomaskovic, Thomas M., 47846A.
Tomlinson, John R., 50950A.
Toney, Robert L., 54132A.
Tortorilla, Harold O., 53820A.
Totman, James M., 57154A.
Tourangeau, Clifton E., 48153A.
Traband, George P., Jr., 48121A.
Trabun, Samuel J., 56651A.
Tracy, Bryce L., 60337A.
Trahan, Whitney J., Jr., 60356A.
Trapp, Charles E., Jr., 57249A.
Trapp, Theodore J., 51275A.
Trask, John R., 54237A.
Travis, Marvin T., 50906A.
Treacy, William O., 62485A.
Treen, Harlin P., 54299A.
Trevor, Bruce B., 47796A.
Trexler, Charles C., Jr., 60599A.
Trickey, Ronald E., 51299A.
Tripp, Harold D., 48061A.
Trivitt, Philip K., 49639A.
Trolinger, Donald C., 48081A.
Tronolone, Andrew, Jr., 60835A.
Tropio, Thomas A., 56890A.
Trout, Myron B., 60779A.
Trout, Richard G., 55849A.
Trudell, Alfred A., 31893A.
Trudell, Ronald D., 31643A.
Trzcinski, Robert J., 57239A.
Tsuda, James M., 50928A.
Tubb, Donald J., 50946A.
Tucker, Gordon L., 28076A.
Tucker, Sidney L., 47957A.
Tucker, Thaddeus W., 2d, 54084A.
Tucker, William L., 53942A.
Turnbull, Thomas J., 51288A.
Turner, Hugh A., 50919A.
Turner, Richard D., 48106A.
Turner, Thomas A., 27454A.
Tussey, Frank D., 53982A.
Tuthill, Daniel A., 47815A.
Tuttle, George G., 48017A.
Tuttle, Robert R., 47979A.
Tuttle, William C., 47969A.
Tyler, William L., 48184A.
Tyndall, Edward F., 50812A.
Uhef, Edward L., 56818A.
Ulshafer, Paul M., 27455A.
Underhill, George, Jr., 60792A.
Underwood, David B., 48089A.
Underwood, Harold W., 47857A.
Underwood, John D., 49571A.
Unser, Oscar E., 49642A.
Upp, James R., 54236A.
Ursini, Samuel M., 60790A.
Usher, William R., 54072A.
Utley, Russel K., 48078A.
Utman, Howard W., 60818A.
Vacin, Frank L., 56959A.
Vadeboncoeur, James L., 47803A.
Valentine, Edward J., 49565A.
Valentine, Harold J., 54139A.
Valle, Manuel D. J., 31873A.
Valley, Joseph H., Jr., 50875A.
Vance, David R., 48180A.
Vancura, Lawrence A., 54198A.
Vandriel, Charles E., 54083A.
Vanheusen, George C., 49640A.
Vanhorn, Arthur E., 57302A.
Vannier, Vern F., 60751A.
Vanree, Harold G., 49647A.
Vanspeybroeck, Donald J., 60564A.
Varnum, John W., 31836A.
Vatis, Martin D., 56951A.
Vaughan, Daniel G., 47808A.
Velde, Lee D., 47927A.
Verch, Kenneth W., 47936A.
Vermeys, Carlton P., 60718A.
Vestal, Perry M., 53866A.
Vetters, William E., Jr., 49598A.
Vick, Dewain C., 51304A.
Vickers, Douglas B., 60455A.
Vickery, John D., 57342A.
Villaume, Louis G., 47787A.
Vincent, Herman G., 49562A.
Vitori, Theodore E., 27456A.
Vlach, William R., 60352A.
Voelker, Robert G., 31706A.
Vogel, Richard D., 49594A.
Vogler, Charles C., 53888A.
Vogler, Frederick J., 48052A.
Volgenau, Ernst, 27457A.
Volkstadt, Wilfred G., 27458A.
Vongohren, Edward V., 28113A.
Vonkleist, Robert V., 47872A.
Vonwolffradt, Gustav S., 48079A.
Waddill, Roger G., 47902A.
Waddle, Bobby G., 57112A.
Wade, Austin R., 31796A.
Wadman, John F., Jr., 60409A.
Wagner, Arthur L., 57110A.
Wagner, Eugene P., 57212A.
Wagner, Paul E., 48090A.
Wagoner, Paul D., 60898A.
Waiss, Terrill E., 56903A.
Waite, Lawrence A., Jr., 60489A.
Waits, Kenneth D., 60462A.
Wakafuji, James I., 56848A.
Walbridge, James S., 31861A.
Walden, Charles E., 56894A.
Waldman, James H., 28078A.
Walker, Andrew D., 51308A.
Walker, Fernie J., 60789A.
Walker, Joseph E., 60810A.
Walker, Leland G., 57277A.
Walker, Norman B., 47912A.
Walker, Rees D., 48097A.
Walker, Stuart D., 31737A.
Walker, Whitney C., 60796A.
Wall, Jerry D., 60334A.
Wall, Robert P., 60530A.
Wallace, Jarrell R., 60820A.
Wallace, Robert E., Jr., 50954A.
Waller, Larry D., 57117A.
Walsh, Venice L., 60506A.
Walters, Rives M., 57060A.
Waltman, Donald G., 53895A.
Walton, Robert G., 60541A.
Waltz, Burton L., 57337A.
Ward, Brien D., 27459A.
Ward, Ronald J., 60774A.
Ward, William E., 54072A.
Ware, Walter E., Jr., 27460A.
Wareham, William A., 31870A.
Wargowsky, Richard G., 27461A.
Waring, George B., 31781A.
Warloe, Roger O., 51267A.
Warner, Morris T., Jr., 27462A.
Warwick, Daniel P., 53839A.
Wathen, John A., 31782A.
Watkins, Donald L., 60487A.
Watson, Gerald S., 51259A.
Watson, James R., 49599A.
Watson, John T., 51264A.
Waxstein, Bernard A., Jr., 59728A.
Weaver, Burl J., 54273A.
Weaver, James A., Jr., 31853A.
Weaver, Thomas G., 27463A.
Webb, Clarence L., 60874A.
Webb, Gerald M., 60860A.
Webb, Leonard W., 48000A.
Webber, Peter J., 56804A.
Weber, Alban L., 47990A.
Weber, Daniel R., 56906A.
Webre, Eugene J., 47848A.
Webster, Donald N., 53851A.
Wedgeworth, Roy M., Jr., 60398A.
Weeks, Jack W., 54086A.
Weems, Joe F., 60393A.
Wege, William F., 60892A.
Weiner, Arthur C., 31811A.
Weisbeck, Edward M., 47881A.
Weisiger, Donald H., 47379A.
Weiss, James E., 54233A.
Weissenborn, Ronald E., 27464A.
Welch, John F., 31651A.
Welch, Larry D., 54026A.
Welch, William W., 27465A.
Wendland, James L., 54258A.
Wenker, William J., 54270A.
Wentworth, Dougles F., 54161A.
Werner, Reuel T., Jr., 56831A.
West, Charles B., 57028A.
West, David A., 53890A.
West, Jerry G., 56926A.
Westcott, Russel G., Jr., 57182A.
Weston, Oscar B., Jr., 53956A.
Wetzel, Richard W., 57326A.
Wetzl, Thomas G., 56865A.
Whalen, Donald L., 60696A.
Wharton, Browning C., Jr., 54148A.
Wheeler, Elmer G., 54100A.
Wheeler, Karl A., 57068A.
Wheeler, Terrence G., 48056A.
Wheeler, William H., 60858A.
Whistler, Joseph Y., 60565A.

White, George A., 48104A.
White, Lawrence A., 54190A.
White, Leslie W., 28092A.
Whitehouse, Larry V., 31738A.
Whiteside, Jack H., 31867A.
Whitmore, Joe I., Jr., 60491A.
Whitt, Joe B., 54118A.
Whitten, William E., 54252A.
Whitwell, Franklin C., 54123A.
Wichy, Bismarck, 56854A.
Wicker, Thomas J., 56802A.
Wiederspan, Jon W., 31848A.
Wiese, Richard B., 60579A.
Wiesner, James F., 27466A.
Wiggins, Larry D., 47856A.
Wilde, James B., 28079A.
Wilde, Thomas A., 57078A.
Wiles, Donald A., 29556A.
Wilhelm, John A., 60389A.
Wilkinson, Thomas C., 27468A.
Will, Jimmy D., 60622A.
Will, Kenneth J., 28086A.
Williams, Bill C., 60343A.
Williams, Donald C., 50851A.
Williams, Earle D., Jr., 47933A.
Williams, James A., 57358A.
Williams, James R., 53976A.
Williams, Jimmy R., 56816A.
Williams, Joseph B., 57183A.
Williams, Lee E., 57104A.
Williams, Pete C., 57006A.
Williams, Robert W., 57080A.
Williams, Rodney P., 60662A.
Williams, Sherman F., 28110A.
Williamson, John W., 54263A.
Williamson, Thomas C., Jr., 57079A.
Willis, Franklin E., 57159A.
Willis, William S., 57029A.
Wilmer, Joseph A., 48057A.
Wilson, Albert H., 57055A.
Wilson, Dick E., 47838A.
Wilson, Donald D., 49601A.
Wilson, Glen H., 31641A.
Wilson, Glenn H., 54287A.
Wilson, Harold D., 57226A.
Wilson, Harold L., Jr., 60514A.
Wilson, Kenneth V., 27469A.
Wilson, Melvin C., 47952A.
Wilson, Robert R., 53858A.
Wimbley, Charles O., 60714A.
Wimer, Jack W., 56944A.
Winkler, John L., Sr., 50871A.
Winston, Donald K., 50842A.
Winter, Donald H., 60625A.
Winters, Albert C., Jr., 27471A.
Winters, Don F., 50818A.
Winters, Edgar J., 31634A.
Winters, Richard A., 31609A.
Wirth, Peter C., 28091A.
Wirth, William R., 56972A.
Wise, Boyd E., 47836A.
Wise, Lee B., 57313A.
Wiseman, William R., 51285A.
Witherspoon, Robert W., 53944A.
Withrow, Bobby L., 57164A.
Witzig, Herman R., 49632A.
Wolf, Donald K., 57338A.
Wolf, Ramond E., 60381A.
Wolf, Richard H., 57260A.
Wolfe, Lloyd T., 27472A.
Wolfkeil, Wayne B., 49652A.
Wolford, Leland, 29541A.
Wollaston, Dean E., 53915A.
Wolniewicz, Peter F., 57292A.
Womack, Clarence E., 57128A.
Womack, Willis G., 31845A.
Wood, Barry O., 54070A.
Wood, Carl E., 60392A.
Wood, Don C., 54163A.
Wood, Ernest M., 60369A.
Wood, Floyd D., 47918A.
Wood, James T., 57394A.
Woods, Billy, Jr., 47970A.
Woodworth, Samuel A., 31777A.
Wooton, Wayne F., 31673A.
Worden, Alfred M., 27474A.
Worden, Dwight C., 57071A.
Workmon, Edward E., 48137A.
Wortham, Ronald E., 50859A.
Worthy, William E., 57223A.
Wray, Robert O., 27475A.
Wright, Charles W., 53876A.
Wright, Chris D., 57147A.
Wright, Clifton D., Jr., 31764A.
Wright, James R., 47886A.
Wright, Sidney J., 60764A.
Wundermann, Charles R., 60397A.
Wyatt, Thomas C., 3d, 49600A.
Wyman, Myron L., 50843A.
Yager, Donald E., 31771A.
Yancy, Raymond C., 31894A.
Yanuzzi, Nicholas. 60498A.
Yates, Donald R., 57109A.
Yates, Douglas B., 60479A.
Yeabower, John A., 49581A.-
Yeager, Jerry L., 50822A.
Yearsley, William R., 60694A.
Yoder, Robert D., 53983A.
Yoshida, Yoshitaka, 47975A.
Yost, Daniel C., 54102A.
Young, Brewer H., Jr., 27477A.
Young, Wayne C., 60327A.
Youngblood, Russell W., 56887A.
Yount, Charles F., 60634A.
Zachary, John D., 56840A.
Zaike, Donald A., 56861A.
Zarr, Robert D., 31846A.
Zeeck, Richard C., 47951A.
Zerbe, Frederick R., 57076A.
Zeybel, Henry L., 60372A.
Zieg, James E., 60461A.
Ziehe, Gerald D., 60383A.
Zienert, Clarence E., 56997A.
Ziliak, Wayne C., 63971A.
Zink, Donald L., 48002A.
Zink, Duane L., 56945A.
Zuckerman, Donald L., 27479A.
Zuker, Alan L., 28103A.
Zvetina, Edmund J., 60380A.

MEDICAL CORPS

Arens, James F., 59480A.
Barber, Dennis D., 62920A.
Bauermeister, Milton L., 59597A.
Bentlage, Charles H., 59714A.
Brandt, Robert J., 61147A.
Brown, Horace J., 59599A.
Bullock, William R., Jr., 62919A.
Chapman, Calvin C., 59594A.
Coursey, John W., 59593A.
Deacon, James D., 59553A.
Derby, Dennis R., 59952A.
Dunn, Jared M., 59595A.
Dyer, James W., 59598A.
English, Thomas O., Jr., 59555A.
Fitzrandolph, Raymond H., 62816A.
Govi, Joseph R., 61149A.
Igelman, Jon M., 59596A.
Jones, David R., 62817A.
Key, Frederick M., 61146A.
Laubach, John B., 59482A.
Major, Francis J., Jr., 59601A.
McCarthy, William H., 59713A.
McKee, William F., Jr., 59483A.
Metheny, Dale C., 59556A.
Randall, George E., 62819A.
Roberts, Perry T., 62818A.
Schanen, Giles M., 59481A.
Story, William R., 59953A.
Thurston, Charles S., 62815A.
Weg, John G., 59600A.
White, Robert S., 59557A.
Zimmerman, Frank W., Jr., 59554A.

DENTAL CORPS

Cappetta, Charles J., 59494A.
Hargrove, Rufus C., Jr., 56400A.
Lovern, Kenneth W., 56557A.
Shaw, Fred A., Jr., 59960A.
Simon, Edward F., Jr., 62823A.
Svensson, Ernest D., 62824A.
Swanson, Ben Z., 59723A.
Taylor, Carroll G., 61157A.
Wettlaufer, Robert K., 59722A.

MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS

Golson, Mary F., 56403W.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Aaron, Robert V., 32501A.
Bluhm, John L., 56461A.
Choisser, Donald C., 56456A.
Cravey, Robert H., 49105A.
Cravotta, Charles A., Jr., 55360A.
Demuth, William J., Jr., 56457A.
Destefano, Peter, 32503A.
Gibson, Charles H., 49092A.
Gildner, John L., 56459A.
Hammer, Stanley G., 49106A.
Hancock, James A., Jr., 49104A.
Hankins, John W., 32498A.
Harn, Thomas J., 56460A.
Higgins, Donald D., 32497A.
Holtzman, Charles F., 49093A.
Kingsley, Willard E., 49094A.
Lindsley, Adolph A., 56458A.
Lyon, Byrd K., 49100A.
Mansfield, William P., Jr., 49103A.
McCambridge, John J., 28095A.
Monk, Joseph C., 56462A.
Mugford, Frank M., 32502A.
Noe, Edward R., 49107A.
O'Connor, James P., 49097A.
Parrish, Dale W., 49095A.
Pizzuto, Joseph S., 55364A.
Podkin, Marvin, 56452A.
Pridgen, Aubrey W., 55740A.
Rawlinson, Neil C., 47828A.
Rosenthal, Harry, 32499A.
Sadanaga, John Y., 55361A.
Scolaro, Dominic C., 50967A.
Slagel, Ronald V., Jr., 32500A.
Smith, Billy S., 49096A.
Straughn, Herbert E., 56453A.
Tuck, Charles W., 55363A.
Wells, Darius L., 49098A.

VETERINARY CORPS

Casey, Harold W., 56489A.
Ewing, Dean E., 56487A.
Page, Norbert P., 61206A.
Temple, Harold G., 61209A.
Wise, David, 61208A.
Wisecup, William G., 61207A.

NURSE CORPS

Andrews, Jane E., 59733W.
Badgett, Gladys R., 56568W.
Burgess, Jacqueline A., 59736W.
Calvert, Dorothy C., 55225W.
Carter, Blanche, 54962W.
Carter, Phyllis J., 59564W.
Casey, Eunice R., 51390W.
Cyrus, Ona M., 56057W.
Davenport, Lorraine M., 56566W.
Deffner, Mary R., 51392W.
Deptula, Geraldine B., 54966W.
DeYoung, Kay F., 56570W.
Duval, Lorraine M., 51594W.
Evans, Joanne M., 56569W.
Fellin, Elizabeth T., 56173W.
Flitsch, Erma, 558578W.
Foley, Eileen H., 51391W.
Gagnon, Kathleen E., 49731W.
Gifford, Dorothy A., 51386W.
Greene, Mary B., 62930W.
Hale, Beatrice J., 56399W.
Hamilton, Frances A., 56404W.
Haskins, Helene R., 59611W.
Hatton, Freda A., 54963W.
Hernandez, Rosa, 59973W.
Hunte, Dorothy A., 56565W.
Johnson, Betty L., 59971W.
King, Norda M., 56058W.
Kipste, Margaret A. Q., 54967W.
Lane, Ruth M., 51388W.
Leftenant, Mary E., 55390W.
Lewis, Rita L., 51393W.
McMichael, Nina, 62929W.
McMurdo, Ruth A., 56401W.
Novotny, Dorothy R., 51387W.
Park, Elizabeth L., 56405W.
Phillips, Charlotte J., 55392W.
Pounds, Myrtle Y., 59501W.
Ray, Barbara J., 59972W.
Ready, Frances M., 55879W.
Richmond, Rose A., 56059W.
Smith, Joanne P., 59734W.
Sorrell, Ethel E., 55389W.
Sturm, Reva I., 55393W.
Thomas, Peggy J. T., 51389W.
Thornburg, Colleen, 49732W.
Wagner, Carolyn M., 56402W.
Whitaker, Joyce E., 59735W.
Young, Clara E., 56567W.

CHAPLAIN

Abernethy, Alfred J., 56426A.
Auer, Robert F., 60003A.
Flinn, James E., 56431A.
Gibson, Vancil V., 56430A.
Grimmett, Philip E., Jr., 60004A.
Hall, Darrell E., 60009A.
Hunt, Asa E., 3d, 60007A.
Kilpatrick, August C., 60006A.
McGrory, John R., Jr., 60002A.
Rasberry, John E., 60008A.
Shoupe, Edward E., 56427A.
Smith, Rufus G., 56428A.
Tabb, Robert W., 60005A.
Taylor, James R., 56429A.

(Note.—Dates of rank of all officers nominated for promotion will be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.)

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 7, 1962:

Comptroller of the Currency

James J. Saxon, of Illinois, to be Comptroller of the Currency.

U.S. Marshals

Harry D. Mansfield, of Tennessee, to be U.S. marshal for the eastern district of Tennessee for the term of 4 years.

Daniel T. Donovan, of Washington, to be U.S. marshal for the eastern district of Washington for the term of 4 years, vice Darrell O. Holmes, term expired.

U.S. Attorney

Almeric L. Christian, of the Virgin Islands, to be U.S. attorney for the Virgin Islands for the term of 4 years, vice Leon P. Miller.

U.S. District Judges

Charles G. Neese, of Tennessee, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Tennessee.

Frank Gray, Jr., of Tennessee, to be U.S. district judge for the middle district of Tennessee.

Frederick A. Daugherty, of Oklahoma, to be U.S. district judge for the northern, eastern, and western districts of Oklahoma.

J. Robert Elliott, of Georgia, to be U.S. district judge for the middle district of Georgia, vice T. Hoyt Davis, retired.

L. Richardson Preyer, of North Carolina, to be U.S. district judge for the middle district of North Carolina.

Harrison L. Winter, of Maryland, to be U.S. district judge for the district of Maryland.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Jude 25: *To the only wise God, our Saviour, be glory and majesty, dominion and power, both now and ever.*

O Thou eternal God, source of light and of love, in this moment of prayer, may we experience the fellowship and blessedness of Thy presence, Thy peace, and Thy power.

We humbly acknowledge that in seeking the right answer to our many perplexing problems we are becoming increasingly aware of our own failings and limitation and that we need Thy guidance.

Grant that we may understand more clearly that our own spiritual life, in its simplest motive and highest manifestation must be a life of sanctity and of service.

May the social order which we are longing and laboring to establish upon this earth have in it the spirit of reverence for Thee, of good will toward all mankind, and of mutual trust and helpfulness.

We offer our prayer in the name of Him who is our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments, in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 8900. An act to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. Morse, Mr. Hill, Mr. McNamara, Mr. Yarborough, Mr. Clark, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Prouty, Mr. Goldwater, and Mr. Javits to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2470) entitled "An act to provide for the establishment of the Lincoln Boyhood National Memorial in the State of Indiana, and for other purposes."

HON. AL ULLMAN

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, it is with great personal pleasure that I note the presence on the floor today of a colleague whom we all have missed, the distinguished and beloved gentleman from Oregon, Al Ullman.

I know I speak for us all in expressing gratification that he is able to rejoin us today.

Let us hope it will be only a short time until his recovery is complete and he is able again to resume his place here on a full-time basis.

LINCOLN BOYHOOD NATIONAL MEMORIAL, IND.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2470) to provide for the establishment of the Lincoln Boyhood National Memorial in the State of Indiana, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

Conference Report (H. Rept. No. 1326)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2470) to provide for the establishment of the Lincoln Boyhood National Memorial in the State of Indiana, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 1.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the language inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"Sec. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act, but not more than $1,000,000, of which not more than $75,000 shall be expended for the acquisition of lands or interests in land."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Wayne N. Aspinall,
J. T. Rutherford,
Leo W. O'Brien,
John P. Saylor,
J. Edgar Chenoweth,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Alan Bible,
Clinton P. Anderson,
Ernest Gruening,
Henry Dworshak,
Gordon Allott,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

Statement

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2470) to provide for the establishment of the Lincoln Boyhood National Memorial in the State of Indiana, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to the amendments to the text of the bill:

Two amendments to the bill as it passed the House were added in the Senate. In substance they deleted the authority for the purchase of lands which the bill contained when it passed the House and added a limitation of $1,000,000 on the amount authorized to be appropriated for development of the area.

The members of the committee of conference have agreed to recommend that the Senate recede from the first of these two amendments and that the House accept the second with a further amendment. The effect of the latter action will be to limit the amount authorized to be appropriated for development and land acquisition combined to $1,000,000, of which not more than $75,000 (the same figure that was in the bill as it passed the House) will be available for land acquisition.

Wayne N. Aspinall,
J. T. Rutherford,
Leo W. O'Brien,
John P. Saylor,
J. Edgar Chenoweth,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from California [Mr. HIESTAND] renew his point of order?

Mr. HIESTAND. I do, Mr. Speaker; I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 13]

Arends
Boykin
Bruce
Buckley
Byrnes, Wis.
Celler
Coad
Corbett
Curtin
Curtis, Mass.
Dowdy
Goodling
Granahan
Grant
Green, Pa.
Halleck
Harrison, Va.
Hoffman, Mich.
Holifield
Huddleston
Johansen
Kee
Landrum
Moulder
Passman
Pilcher
Reece
St. Germain
Sikes
Springer
Stratton
Williams
Wilson, Ind.

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and ninety-nine Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

WELFARE AND PENSION PLAN AMENDMENTS OF 1961

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 8723) to amend the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act with respect to the method of enforcement and to provide certain additional sanctions, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 8723, with Mr. BONNER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, the Clerk had read through section 1 ending on line 4, page 1, of the bill.

If there are no amendments to this section, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. The first line of section 3 of the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act is amended by striking out "(a)".

SEC. 3. Paragraph (1) of section 3 of such Act is amended by striking out the word "to" after the word "communicated".

SEC. 4. Paragraph (9) of section 3 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(9) The term 'State' includes any State of the United States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Guam, Wake Island, the Canal Zone, and Outer Continental Shelf lands defined in the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331–1343)."

SEC. 5. Section 3 of such Act is further amended by striking out paragraph (11) and adding the following new paragraphs (11), (12), and (13):

"(11) The term 'industry or activity affecting commerce' means any activity, business, or industry in commerce or in which a labor dispute would hinder or obstruct commerce or the free flow of commerce and includes any activity or industry 'affecting commerce' within the meaning of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, as amended, or the Railway Labor Act, as amended.

"(12) The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Labor.

"(13) The term 'party in interest' means any administrator, officer, trustee, custodian, counsel, or employee of any employee welfare benefit plan or employee pension benefit plan, or a person providing benefit plan services to any such plan, or an employer any of whose employees are covered by such a plan or officer or employee or agent of such employer, or an officer or agent or employee of an employee organization having members covered by such plan."

SEC. 6. Paragraphs (3) and (4) of subsection (b) of section 4 of such Act are amended to read as follows:

"(3) such plan is administered by an organization which is exempt from taxation under the provisions of section 501(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and is administered as a corollary to membership in a fraternal benefit society described in section 501(c)(8) of such Code or by organizations described in sections 501(c)(3) and 501(c)(4) of such Code: *Provided*, That the provisions of this paragraph shall not exempt any fraternal benefit society or organization which represents its members for purposes of collective bargaining; or

"(4) such plan covers not more than twenty-five participants."

SEC. 7. Subsection (a) of section 5 of such Act is amended by striking out the last sentence thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Such description and such report shall contain the information required by sections 6 and 7 of this Act in such form and detail as the Secretary shall by regulations prescribe and copies thereof shall be executed, published, and filed in accordance with the provisions of this Act and the Secretary's regulations thereunder. No regulation shall be issued under the preceding sentence which relieves any administrator of the obligation to include in such description or report any information relative to his plan which is required by section 6 or 7. Notwithstanding the foregoing, if the Secretary finds, on the record after giving interested persons an opportunity to be heard, that specific information on plans of certain kinds or on any class or classes of benefits described in section 3(a) (1) and (2) which are provided by such plans cannot, in the normal method of operation of such plans, be practicably ascertained or made available for publication in the manner or for the period prescribed in any provision of this Act, or that the information if published in such manner or for such period would be duplicative or uninformative, the Secretary may by regulations prescribe such other manner or such other period for the publication of such information as he may determine to be necessary and appropriate to carry out the purposes of this Act."

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment. I have been trying to follow the reading of the bill but I think the Clerk has read past the point to which my amendment applies. I ask unanimous consent to offer this amendment at page 3, line 9.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I shall not in this instance, but I suggest that we all pay attention to the reading. Otherwise, things could get very complicated.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CURTIS of Missouri: Delete the language on page 3, lines 9 through 12, and insert in lieu thereof of the following: *"Provided,"*.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment which in effect eliminates from the bill the tax-exempt pension plans. This was the tenor of my discussion last night during the debate calling attention to the fact that the pension plans that are tax exempt are presently under very rigid restrictions under the Internal Revenue Code, and calling attention to the fact that the committee's own testimony, in fact the only testimony on the subject—and this is uncontroverted—reveals that there never has been any abuse in the area of the tax-exempt pension plans. Incidentally, these tax-exempt pension plans, over which we require this very strict supervision on the part of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, must be qualified, which is a difficult thing; and then much detail is called for in the annual statements which are required to be filed, the penalty for failure to comply with the statutes, of course, is to lose the tax-exempt privileges of the plan. This in itself is a sufficient deterrent.

As I understand this matter, the extension of this bill to include these plans simply places an added onus on the people who are really the beneficiaries, because these are nonprofit plans and wholly set up for the benefit of the employees. Any added cost we place on the plans will have to be borne by the beneficiaries and this will impose an undue and unnecessary burden. It seems to me that this should have been eliminated in the beginning.

I might add also that this takes care of about $30 billion of the plans that are set up. It is only the pension plans, I might state, not the welfare plans.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I should like to indicate my support of what I believe to be the intent of this amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri. I am in favor of the basic purpose of this bill. However, the bill as it stands is too broad and all encompassing. Amendments were offered in the committee in an effort to limit the scope of this bill to those situations where this legislation is needed. Unfortunately, those amendments were rejected by the majority. Accordingly, those of us who believe there is a real need for limited legislation are confronted with a very difficult choice by the presentation of this bill.

As drafted, the bill covers the waterfront. Although I am not expert in the application of the Internal Revenue Code, I believe the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri deserves very serious consideration and support if it does not go too far.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I thank the gentleman.

I do want to point out again that the penalties under the Internal Revenue Code are considerably more drastic than any penalties under this bill, because the loss of the tax-exempt feature is a sufficient deterrent; and I might say further every one of these plans and annual reports are prepared by certified public accountants. They have to be. This is a very effective way and the reason that there has never been even the rumor of a complaint against these pension funds that have qualified and are existing under our Internal Revenue Code.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis].

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment for the very obvious reason it would exempt practically all of the pension plans now in existence because they are tax exempt, and I would draw the attention of the Committee to the very plain fact that simply because a plan is tax exempt there are no guarantees that there will not be the abuses which this bill hopes to correct.

This bill is to insure that not only does it require disclosure of necessary data but there is proper protection to the beneficiary. The Internal Revenue Service has no power to require bonding of those persons who handle these funds. It is true a plan may be filed for tax-exempt purposes, but if you do not require a bond and the Internal Revenue Service cannot require it, you have lost one of the most effective efforts of this measure.

The argument that we are dealing with an area in which there is not a rumor or suspicion of wrongdoing is plainly not supported by the facts, either before the Committee on this side of the Capitol or in the other body.

The penalties referred to by the gentleman will be directed wholly against an employer. There would be no penalties of any kind against an administrator, against the people who would be perpetrating the things that we know are possible. Therefore, I must ask for the defeat of this amendment.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis].

It was shown in the discussion yesterday that there has been no abuse shown in 98 percent of the total funds, as indicated, the pension funds. Those have been well administered with proper safeguards; and, as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] has remarked, the Internal Revenue Code provides a very severe penalty for funds that are not properly managed. This penalty of removing tax exemption is an important one, and these funds are very jealously guarded. This is about 90 percent of the total funds. If we are to legislate against the vast majority instead of the few who could possibly show abuses, we are not legislating very soundly.

It was mentioned yesterday that the inclusion of all of these perfectly managed and honestly managed funds might be a good reason to recommit the whole bill.

I suggest to the House that the bill as it is written is much too broad. It is a shotgun approach. It simply wants to build up the Secretary of Labor's power, especially to go into all kinds of funds, whether needed or not.

I support the amendment and feel it should be adopted.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have previously received permission to include certain extraneous matter in the Committee of the Whole because I knew the Members of this Committee who wanted to kill this legislation would utilize this amendment, which I am sure was offered in good faith by our distinguished colleague from Missouri.

I would like to include in the Record, first, just a part of the correspondence that has reached our committee since we started consideration a year ago, and I am including only that part of the correspondence that comes mainly from widows of former members of the United Mine Workers, whose husbands were killed in the mines, complaining about the fact that they would not be receiving their just pensions that they were entitled to, some of them going back for many years.

WILKES-BARRE TOWNSHIP, PA.,
March 2, 1961.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN POWELL: I am a widow with three children; my husband had worked in the coal mines when he was hurt and died as a result of a rock fall in December 1959.

I am writing this letter in hopes you will send investigators here to look into the Union Welfare Fund of the coal region here in Wyoming Valley. A few years ago the widows were to receive $1,000, then the officials said the funds were low so it was reduced to $500 death benefit. Now we don't know if we will receive that as they tell us there are no funds available now.

The union thought nothing of assessing the workers or raising the union dues when they thought they needed funds for one thing or another, depriving the worker and his family of a few extra dollars. When the worker is no longer able to provide for his family, the union says they have no funds.

I would like to know where all the money is going. If there are no funds where does all the money come from to be able to pay the officers of the union. If the funds are so low why don't the officers wages be cut to be able to pay the widows and the pensions the retired workers are to receive.

I am not the only one who is waiting. My deceased husband's mother whose husband had died of miners asthma about 7 years ago hasn't received one penny of the welfare fund.

Will you please have some investigators sent to the coal region here in Luzerne County? To see what can be done about receiving the death benefit from the welfare fund.

Yours truly,
MRS. FLORENCE ZARUTA.

LARKSVILLE, PA.,
March 8, 1961.

DEAR SIR: Although we do not know each other, I am appealing to you for help.

I read in the paper recently where you are going to try to investigate the pension and death benefit funds. Good for you. I wish you all success in your endeavor.

I'm the widow of a miner who spent 45 of his 65 years in the mines.

He passed on 5 years ago and since that time I have been trying to collect his death benefit.

I've asked local officials. I've written to the president of the locals here, Mr. Lippi, and I've contacted the Hazelton office.

The results have been nil. Can you help me? I would greatly appreciate any consideration at all.

Thank you.
Most humbly,
MRS. CHARLES KONAISHI.

PLAINS, PA.,
March 7, 1961.

Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE POWELL: It has been brought to my attention that you are now working on the matter of the moneys due to individuals regarding the death benefit.

My husband had worked for the Lehigh Valley Coal Co., for a good number of years. At his death in August 1956, I was informed that there was no money available at that time to pay that which was due me. Since that time I have made inquiries and have been given the same answer.

Since it is now almost 5 years, I believe some money should be due to us. I would appreciate greatly in hearing from you regarding this matter. Any information relative will be thankfully received.

Thanking you for your interest in this matter, I am,
Sincerely,
MRS. MARY BENISH.

PLYMOUTH, PA., *February 27, 1961.*

Hon. Congressman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL:

I am a UMW member. I belong in the union for over 52 years. I would like to call your attention to those that are mistreated by the UMW leaders—widows of former mineworkers that should collect $500 are unable to collect. The same goes for us old men that are on pension. They claim there is no money in the welfare pension fund. During the 12 months ending September 30, 1960, anthracite producers paid assessments of $10,329,000 to the anthracite health and welfare fund, bringing the ascertainable direct regional benefits to $87,463,000 during the 12 months. Anthracite producers channeled more than $87,500,000 directly into the region's economy according to the current bulletin to the Anthracite Institute and our leaders claim there is no money in the treasury. Here is an estimate production to date, August 31, 1960, total tons coal mined 11,670,029. The amount of money collected for that tonnage at 75 cents a ton would come to $34,090,986 toward the fund that is death benefits and old-age pension and yet they say there is no money. Some widows are waiting 6 years—and the contract made and signed by the coal companies and the union to pay this money. That's why I am writing to you for help. I would like for you to start an investigation of our union welfare and pension fund. Some of our leaders were caught swindling and were taken to court. Here is some of the figures for salary and expenses: For 4 months annual salary for 21 men is $282,779. Expense for 4 months is $21,404.92 in 1 year. The total comes to $91,288.47. Some of those men are not needed. They got their jobs because they are sons and relatives of Mr. Lippi and Mr. Kennedy, our presidents. If you are in the clique, you are in to stay because they have too much on one another and the members can't say anything because if they do they lose their jobs. So please do all you can for us.

Thank you,

MAX DYNASKI.

LUZERNE, PA.,
February 27, 1961.

Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL.

HONORABLE SIR: I had seen in the Wilkes-Barre Independent that you are starting an investigation of union and welfare funds. As a United Mine Workers widow (my husband died September 7, 1956), time and again I had asked the secretary of his local why I'm not being paid the $500 that is due me. He told me 2 years ago I was the 11th on the list.

But no results—I had asked an attorney, a friend of the family. He said: "Mrs. Slapor, you could sue but you'll never get anything as they don't have any money." So I don't bother as they tell me I'll never get anything from them. My husband was a faithful union man from 1912 to 1956. Why when he retired in 1948, did they take dues? Please, honorable sir, if you are really starting an investigation, would you please help us poor widows—it's not only myself—it's a number of widows in my locality.

Trusting and thanking you, I remain,

Respectfully yours,

MRS. JOHN SLAPOR.

WILKES-BARRE, PA., *March 4, 1961.*

DEAR SIR: I am writing to you concerning the United Mine Workers death benefit claim which as yet was not paid. My husband died January 27, 1958. Their reason—for the payment due me—is because of working conditions and that is their reason for the delay. Any help or advice given me on this matter will be deeply appreciated.

Yours truly,

MRS. JOSEPHINE ZATZIK.

WILKES-BARRE, PA., *March 3, 1961.*

Congressman POWELL.

DEAR SIR: I'm writing to you about my widow's pension.

As to date I have not received my $500 that I was to get after the death of my husband, John Kazanecki, who died on April 4, 1959. When I did inquire about it they told me to wait.

I would be very thankful to you if you could look into this matter, so that I should get my widow's pension.

Thank you.

I remain,

MRS. JULIA KAZANECKI.

NANTICOKE, PA.,
Alden Station, March 2, 1961.

Congressman POWELL.

DEAR SIR: I am a widow now for 4 years. My husband was a member of the United Mine Workers Union for 48 years. I haven't received any money from the union due to me. I was visited shortly after my husband's death by one of the local union representatives. He told me then that when my name came up on the list I'd receive the widow's payment of $500.

Four years have gone by. I haven't been contacted so far, or received the payment. Thank you for your interest in this matter.

Most sincerely,

MRS. JAMES SWANBERRY.

WILKES-BARRE, PA., *March 2, 1961.*

DEAR SIR: My husband died March 2, 1956, and I haven't received the $500 from the United Mine Workers pension fund. I wish someone would investigate this and find out what is the cause of this—my husband has always paid his union dues.

Yours truly,

MRS. SAMUEL WANSAW.

DUPONT, PA., *March 3, 1961.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN POWELL: I am a widow. It was 3 years November 14, 1960, my husband died with a heart attack.

Now what I want to know: If you could help me get my $500 from the United Mine Workers welfare fund. There are other widows like myself just waiting. Just how long does a widow have to wait? The first year I asked a fellow who works in their office for my money. He told me to wait. The second I asked again, the answer was: There are other widows ahead of you. The third I wrote a few letters to Hazelton. The answers were my payments were approved—but because the coal production is very low. Now who are they kidding? We had a good cold winter. Why are they just not paying me? My husband paid his union dues no matter if he had a big pay or a few days pay. The coal mines are not getting better of what is left of them. Even when the coal mines were good, they had the widows waiting. I told them why don't they lay off some office workers? I even wrote to our Congressman DANIEL FLOOD. It makes me sick to think I have money coming to me which I need it badly. Because I owe for some bills. And I wrote to who I thought could help me. So now I am enclosing a clipping from a newspaper that is why I am writing this letter to you; maybe you could do something.

I thank you.

MRS. MARY E. GAMBINO.

NANTICOKE, PA., *March 9, 1961.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE POWELL: I am writing you in regard to the United Mine Workers' pension and widow's death benefits.

I have been a widow since early 1960. I am 72 years old. My husband worked in the mines for over 25 years. He was sick for 11 years—and died from the effects of the mines. I never got any benefit after his death. My husband paid into the union regularly—for me to get the benefits after his death. I, plus many other widows are still waiting for the benefits which are due us. Some widows are waiting for as long as 10 years. We would all like to know where the money is that hundreds, maybe thousands, of miners paid into the union. It must be somewhere. I, and many others, have often asked an official about the benefits. And we are told, "you may as well forget about it." Why? We really would like to know.

I would appreciate your looking into the matter to find out for me, and many other waiting widows, just how these unions work, and where all the money is that the poor, hardworking miners put into the union. In the event of their death that money would benefit their widows. Unions are supposed to be for the people. The way it is now this union has completely forgotten the people and especially forgotten the poor men who are dead, to whom they owe the obligation of paying off their debts.

I want to thank you for your time, and really hope that you will check into the matter and try and help us widows.

Thank you again.

Sincerely,

MRS. MARY TWARDOWSKI.

PLYMOUTH, PA., *February 27, 1961.*

MR. POWELL: Dear Sir, I read in the paper about you starting an investigation of union welfare and pension funds. I am a widow. My husband died September 28, 1959, and I applied for the $500 pension but never got any word about it. I certainly could use the money. I only get $80 a month security. My rent, coal, food, light, a little insurance, clothing, in fact everything comes out of that $80, so if you can do anything to help us widows God would bless you and yours.

Sincerely,

MRS. ELIZABETH MARKS.

P.S.—You use this letter any way you please.

KINGSTON, PA.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN POWELL: This article from the paper is self-explanatory. I am an unfortunate widow that hasn't received what belongs to my children and me. My husband has left us over 3 years now, and I can't get results. I hope you will find time to read the article and help us also. I'm not much of a letterwriter, especially to a superior. Hope you understand.

Thanking you very much,

Sincerely,

MRS. ANTONETTE KASPER.

NOW IS THE TIME

EDITOR, SUNDAY INDEPENDENT: I hope there will be more UMW members interested in the mine workers' pension and the widows' death benefits which is supposed to be $500.

Now that we have a friend who is willing to start investigating union welfare and pensions, I, for one, am in favor of having an investigation in our union. Believe me, we need someone to straighten out the mess in our union and the leaders.

Widows who are waiting for more than 10 years haven't collected a cent. When they contact a union official, he tells them they might as well forget about the $500.

If Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, of New York is so right about the welfare and pension fund, which he claims is $40 million, then it's high hime for the widows and pensioned miners to write to Congressman POWELL in Washington to have our union investigated and our leaders should not object.

Now let's get to the convention that Lippi called. What he called it for I don't know, but now is the time for our delegates to bring up the question about the widow benefits and the old-men pensions and along with that, find out where all that money is gone from the locals where the mines are shut down. It will run into hundreds of thousands of dollars.

The money belongs to the locals where the mines are shut down, not to the district or international. Believe me, you better act fast or you will lose all. They will take the charter and you will be out.

To be prepared, all these locals should call a meeting first and have a vote on what to do and have your delegates vote the same as all locals voted for and at the same time all concerned should write to Congressman POWELL, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

We all should write to Congressman FLOOD and Congressman SCRANTON. Let's make a good job of it.

I am sure there is enough money in the treasury to pay widows and pensioned miners. It's up to our delegates to fight for our rights and don't let them put you out of order when you get up to present your case, and fight.

Mr. Kennedy, let us know where the money is going and why we are not getting paid. The money that is in those locals that are closed would be almost enough money to pay the widows.

So it is up to our delegates to demand that money be paid to the widows.

The widows who are interested should write to Congressman POWELL, Washington; also to Congressman FLOOD and Congressman SCRANTON, same address.

MAX DYNOSKI.

PLYMOUTH.

Wilkes-Barre, Pa., *March 3, 1961.*

Hon. Adam Clayton Powell,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Powell: In reference to a letter written to the editor of the Sunday Independent newspaper, Wilkes-Barre, Pa., I wish to advise you that I am one of the many widows who have been unable to collect the $500 due from the United Mine Workers pension fund. My husband, Thomas Skodzinski, died on January 4, 1956 (5 years ago).

I congratulate you, and sincerely appreciate your interest in resolving, through investigations, union welfare and pension funds. I do hope that your investigators will cover the coal regions of Pennsylvania—not only for my sake but for the many, many other widows in the same predicament.

Thank you,

Jadwiga Skodzinski.

Sheatown, Nanticoke, Pa.

Hon. Adam Clayton Powell,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Mr. Powell: As a widow of a coal miner who was a member of the United Mine Workers Union, I am entitled to a widow's death benefit which I have not received as yet.

There is a fund for that purpose but when I inquired about it, they told me to forget about it.

I wish you would take this letter into consideration, and please help me and the many unfortunate widows by investigating the union.

I thank you.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. Anna Wrobel.

Sheatown, Nanticoke, Pa.,
March 16, 1961.

Hon. Adam Clayton Powell,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Mr. Powell: As a widow of a coal miner who was a member of the United Mine Workers Union I am entitled to a widow's benefit which I have not received as yet.

There is a fund for that purpose but when I inquire about it, they tell me to forget about it.

Please take this letter into consideration and have the union investigated.

I thank you.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. A. Luckiewicz.

Nanticoke, Pa., *March 10, 1961.*

Dear Sir Congressman Powell: I hope I will not take up too much of your time. I would like to know if there is anything you could do to help me get a little more help as I am a widow and I am getting $63. I cannot live on that and pay my way. Also could you do something for me about my widow's death benefit? It has been 4 years now, and I need help. I think it is coming to me as my husband worked in the mines all his life and paid dues. Can't something be done about it?

Hoping to hear from you soon. I am 67 years of age and cannot go out to work.

Yours truly,

Mrs. Leroy Angle.

P.S.—That $63 is social security.

Pittston, Pa.

Dear Mr. Powell: I am writing you this letter concerning a part in the paper about the widows and pensions and death benefits. You might have read it in the papers. I do hope you can help me out in some way. I'm a widow with four children. My husband worked in different mines for 33 years, and the last place he worked was for the Knox Coal Co. in Port Griffith. It was leased out from Pennsylvania Coal Co. at Port Griffith, main office in Dunmore-Scranton, Pa. He started there in 1954 and worked up until he got trapped. He worked on Saturdays but was paid only straight time when he should have got time and a half for Saturdays. But there was a lot of crooked work at this mine. But my husband and the rest of the men had to keep their mouths shut in order to work and keep his job, and he didn't know any other work but the mines. But in January 22, 1959, the Susquehanna River broke in, flooding the mines. Many men got out but 12 men were trapped and drowned. It is hard to write this letter, I just cry, because he was the best man a woman could ever have; my children long for him, and God only knows I do too. My home isn't what it should be, and I'm under a doctor's care ever since he left me. It's not the same when the loved one isn't there, and it's very hard to be a mother and father. I get social security and a compensation, but it's not what he used to bring me pays. The company didn't help me out or no one came to give me their sympathy. My husband paid $4.25 a month union dues; and when I wrote to Washington about his death benefit, they sent the letter to Hazelton, and I received a letter telling me they had no record of my husband's death, and that was 9 months later. So I got in touch with the union president, Charles Piasetski, and he sent a man to fill out the papers. The union is local 8005, and the man said if it was turned in sooner I would have gotten it but now he didn't know when, but he said he will rush it being it was an emergency case I'd get it soon, but so far it's only excuses. The funds are low. If and when money is in, I'd get it, and I keep trying but I hear we may never get it because the mines aren't working, and money isn't coming in. I think it's a shame paying into a union, and can't get nothing out of it. I was to get back wages but I was denied them. Only eight men got it because they discussed it with the committeeman, and how do they know my husband didn't complain. They asked 85 questions but they didn't ask any of me, but as they say a dead man can't talk so I didn't get it. It's about not getting paid right for travel time and per start they didn't go according to the contract and then there is back wages for working on Saturdays. But the Wage and Hour Co. is working on it and so far the case hasn't come up yet. I also wanted his body out but they said it would take millions to clear the mines in order to find them. So if it costs so much, why don't they settle with the widows—give them so much and leave the bodies down in the mines, but they just get away from everything. Of course the 12 widows are all suing the company and the cases didn't come up as yet. What results I will get I don't know. But I hear my compensation checks will be cut off and I will have to return what I received. There was a lot of crooked work done at the mines. The mines paid kickbacks to the union to keep quiet: the union knew they worked on Saturdays but did nothing about it. But it all came out after the river broke in and they went out further, then the red stop line and it was too thin, so the river broke in. They had a case and still have but they are getting free and paying the lawyers to get away with everything. I wonder where is all the money coming from when the widows can't get paid. Kennedy and Lewis get $50,000 a year and we can't get $500 death benefits. It should be $1,000, but it was cut down, and with the mines not working they still have all the men in office where they should fire some. August J. Lippi, president, is one who took a lot of money and still he was elected president for what: to rob the coal company again. Believe me, it's very hard to be a mother and father, and run a home. I can't say it's home because it's a wreck since he left me. No love or happiness. I just can't go on, because I'm under a doctor's care ever since he was trapped. I was told I'd get help when I need it but so far nothing. My coal bin is empty. I can't buy coal, I just try to keep the place warm with wood. God only knows the way I suffer since he left me. I'm behind on my bills, the children can't get what they used to when their dad worked. I sometimes wonder does it pay to live a life like I'm living. I loved my husband very much, and he was good to me, and handed every cent, and never said a word where I spent it. He was a home man, never went out but stayed at home and helped me out. So I do hope you look into the coal field because it is a wreck the way they operate the mines. A Mr. Robert Dougherty, 322 Monument Avenue, Wyoming, Pa., was owner then; a Mr. Louis Fabrizio, 10 Stout Street, Yatesville, Pittston, Pa., took over along with Mrs. Josephine Sciandra and son Joseph, 507 Cedar Avenue, Exeter, Pa., and August Lippi, 7 Bennet Street, Fox Hill Place, Pittston, Pa., and a few others.

Dougherty is running the Avon and Pelly Mines in Plymouth, Pa. His men have back wages coming, also.

Thank you.

Yours truly,

Mrs. Caroline Baloga.

Hopes Probe Made Here of Union Welfare Fund

Editor, Sunday Independent: As a longtime reader of the Sunday Independent I hope you can call the attention of those who have been mistreated by the United Mine Workers pension fund and that which is supposed to pay $500 to the widows of former mine workers, to a chance they have to get just treatment.

Representative Adam Clayton Powell, of New York, has announced that he has started an investigation of union welfare and pension funds which he said now total $40 billion. He said he had hired investigators and many of us hope some of these will come into the coal regions.

To make sure, I think all those who have suffered pension losses and all widows who have been unable to collect their payments, or if they have been able to get only part of them, should write to Congressman Powell at the House of Representatives in Washington.

He said he already had uncovered exorbitant fees paid to trustees of the funds, which I guess they paid to themselves; kickbacks and splits between trustees and lawyers; interest-free loans to pals and other signs of favoritism.

A great many of us would like to see what his investigators could uncover in the coal regions.

Former Mine Worker.

Atlantic Beach, N.Y., *March 1, 1961.*

Mr. Adam Clayton Powell,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: I am writing this letter for my mother, who lives in Pennsylvania, and was widowed in July 5, 1956, and to this day has not received any payment from the United Mine Workers pension fund. She has had a few people write to the union but no answer was received explaining the delay or her status concerning the claim.

My mother was a victim of a stroke in August of 1953 when my father still lived. Being disabled and unable to support herself, she is supported by my brother and myself. She is not able to collect any social security because she is only 60 and does not have enough time under the plan to collect.

So as you can see, anything that you can do about my mother's claim to her pension will be appreciated by her. I will wait for your answer before I write once again to the union to see if anything can be done.

Thank you kindly.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT A. SOKOL.

P.S.—You may reply to me or my mother herself, whose address is: Mrs. Nell Sokol, 1408 North Washington Street, Wilkes-Barre, Pa.

PLYMOUTH, PA., *March 11, 1961.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN POWELL: My husband died February 24, 1959, and since then I have been trying to get the $500 that the widow is supposed to get after the husband's death. They say they have no money, but according to an investigation I understand they do have money.

I am under the doctor's care and being a widow I could sure use the money. I know you understand this and would appreciate any information you can give me on this.

Thanking you very kindly, I am,

MRS. MARY KRYSTOFIK.

GREENWOOD TV–RADIO,
Scranton, Pa., March 9, 1961.

Congressman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I was wondering if you can give us some information in regard to social security benefits due to my mother under my late father's account. I am writing this note for my mother, Mrs. Mary Panuski, 113 McLean Street, Dupont, Pa., and would appreciate your directing any information available directly to her.

My father had worked in and around the coal mines in this region for a period of 25 years, the last 5 of which were under the social security program. Due to failing physical health, he was compelled to leave and then became employed as a truckdriver for the Pennsylvania State Highway Department for a period of 9 years. No social security tax was paid by him during this 9 years. Subsequently, he passed away in 1950.

Can you send my mother any information as to what benefits she might be entitled to such as are stated in the attached newspaper clipping?

Your cooperation in this matter will certainly be appreciated by us.

Sincerely yours,

J. R. PANUSKI, *Manager.*

HOPES PROBE MADE HERE OF UNION WELFARE FUND

EDITOR, SUNDAY INDEPENDENT: As a long-time reader of the Sunday Independent, I hope you can call the attention of those who have been mistreated by the United Mine Workers pension fund and that which is supposed to pay $500 to the widows of former mineworkers, to a chance they have to get just treatment.

Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, of New York, has announced that he has started an investigation of union welfare and pension funds which he said now total $40 billion. He said he had hired investigators and many of us hope some of these will come into the coal regions.

To make sure, I think all those who have suffered pension losses and all widows who have been unable to collect their payments, or if they have been able to get only part of them, should write to Congressman POWELL at the House of Representatives in Washington.

He said he already had uncovered exorbitant fees paid to trustees of the funds, which I guess they paid to themselves; kickbacks and splits between trustees and lawyers; interest-free loans to pals and other signs of favoritism.

A great many of us would like to see what his investigators could uncover in the coal regions.

FORMER MINEWORKER.

MARTINS FERRY, OHIO,
February 25, 1961.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE POWELL: I am reading my newspaper this morning. It says you are going to investigate scandal in welfare fund, so that is why I am taking the liberty and honor to write you a letter. I am an old coal miner, born 1904, went to work in the mine in 1919 in the State of Ohio. At that time there was 46,000 miners in this State; today there is less than 4,000 miners. October 20, 1960, I was laid off. It is impossible for me to get a job. After 1 year I will be cut off from welfare. Do you think, after I put all my life in the coal mines, is it right for John L. Lewis to cut us coal miners off the hospital fund.

Yours sincerely,

LOUIS BANYAS.

WEST NANTICOKE, PA.,
March 12, 1961.

Congressman POWELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: According to the paper I have found out that you are investigating unions.

My husband died April 26, 1957. Up to this time I have not received the $500 allotted according to their contract. He belonged to the United Mine Workers, of which he belonged since 1917 or earlier. We were told "just wait, there would be more money coming through." There have been quite a few men belonging who have died before and since who have not received their's either. Yet, at the same time these officials can increase their own salaries out of the same fund. Anything you can do would surely be appreciated as the majority of us could sure use it. Hoping you have success.

I remain,

MRS. S. S. REAMS.

Mr. POWELL and Mr. A. RIBICOFF:

Can we poor widows and pensioners ask you for help? We ask you to look into the UMW Union. They cut our pension from $100 to $50, raised our dues $1.25 a month; they send us our check when they please; they also raised the official salary to $1,700 a year. Will someone help us?

PENSIONER'S WIFE.

P.S.—District is having the convention in Wilkes-Barre, March 13, 14, 15.

PLYMOUTH, PA., *February 27, 1961.*

Mr. POWELL.

DEAR SIR: I read in the paper about you starting an investigation about the Miners' Pension and Welfare Fund. I am a widow since May 26, 1959. I applied for the $500 but so far have not heard anything about it. I am on the miners asthma pension. I get $82 a month. My rent, coal, light, food, clothing, and everything comes out of that, and it won't last too much longer, and I am not old enough yet for social security. So if you can help us widows we would be very thankful and I pray God will bless you and yours very much.

Sincerely,

MRS. LYDIA DAVISON.

P.S.—You can use this letter any way you want to.

WOODBRIDGE, N.J., *March 9, 1961.*

Congressman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I saw an article in the Wilkes-Barre Sunday Independent in regard to the United Mine Workers Fund. I am just one of the many people that have been unable to claim my father's payments.

I am enclosing the letters I have received from the United Mine Workers of America where they claim they have no money in their fund. If you can use these letters in any way to help our cause, please feel free to use them.

Enclosed is a self-addressed, stamped envelope for their return, when they have served their purpose.

May I please hear from you in regard to this matter?

Respectfully yours,

MRS. MARY S. SHAFER.

HOPES PROBE MADE HERE OF UNION WELFARE FUND

EDITOR, SUNDAY INDEPENDENT: As a long-time reader of the Sunday Independent I hope you can call the attention of those who have been mistreated by the United Mine Workers pension fund and that which is supposed to pay $500 to the widows of former mineworkers, to a chance they have to get just treatment.

Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL of New York has announced that he has started an investigation of union welfare and pension funds which he said now total $40 billion. He said he had hired investigators and many of us hope some of these will come into the coal regions.

To make sure, I think all those who have suffered pension losses and all widows who have been unable to collect their payments, or if they have been able to get only part of them, should write to Congressman POWELL at the House of Representatives in Washington.

He said he already had uncovered exorbitant fees paid to trustees of the funds, which I guess they paid to themselves; kickbacks and splits between trustees and lawyers; interest-free loans to pals and other signs of favoritism.

A great many of us would like to see what his investigators could uncover in the coal regions.

FORMER MINEWORKER.

UNITED MINEWORKERS OF AMERICA,
Pittston, Pa., September 18, 1958.

Mrs MARY SHAFER,
Cranford, N.J.

DEAR MRS. SHAFER: In regard to your letter of September 12, 1958, I wish to inform you that because of a backset in funds your check, as yet, has not come through. May I remind you that your claim and notarized death certificate are on file at the UMW offices in Hagleton, Pa., and will be paid as soon as money is available. Please be patient for such matters take time.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM DOMBROSKI,
Recording Secretary.

ANTHRACITE HEALTH & WELFARE FUND,
Hazleton, Pa., November 20, 1958.

Mrs. MARY SHAFER,
Cranford, N.J.

DEAR MRS. SHAFER: Reference is made to the death benefit application you submitted as a survivor of your late father, Frank Smykowski, Local Union No. 7519, district 1, United Mine Workers of America.

Please be advised that this application has been processed and approved for payment.

The Anthracite Health & Welfare Fund is financed, solely, by revenue received from the tonnage of anthracite coal produced for use and sale. A reduction of royalty payments to the fund, due to poor working time in the industry over the past several years, has caused a delay in making the death benefit payments.

Everything possible is being done to pay the accumulated claims, and you may feel sure that just as soon as finances permit, payment will be made to you, consistent with the rules and regulations of the Anthracite Health & Welfare Fund.

Very truly yours,

L. SINCAVAGE,
Supervisor, Death Benefit Fund.

CRANFORD, N.J., *May 13, 1959.*

ANTHRACITE HEALTH & WELFARE FUND,
Hazleton, Pa.
(Attention of Mr. L. Sincavage.)

DEAR SIR: On March 23, 1958, my father died from asthma in the Pittston, Pa., hospital. Five days later I submitted the death certificate and funeral expense to your office.

September 12, 1958, I wrote to you asking that I be paid the policy benefits on my father's insurance. After submitting the necessary papers, you advised me on November 20, 1958, that this application had been processed and approved for payment.

Almost 6 months, have passed, and as of this date (May 13, 1959) I have not heard from you, and received no check.

Since the Anthracite Health & Welfare Fund has a very good reputation, I feel I should have this payment without further delay.

Please let me know exactly when I can expect this check.

Yours truly,

MRS. MARY SHAFER.

ANTHRACITE HEALTH & WELFARE FUND,
Hazleton, Pa., May 15, 1959.

MRS. MARY SHAFER,
Cranford, N.J.

DEAR MRS. SHAFER: I am in receipt of your letter of May 13, in which you make further inquiry regarding the death benefit application that you submitted as a survivor of your late father, Frank Smykowski, Local Union No. 7519, District No. 1, United Mine Workers of America.

As we advised in a letter to you on November 20, 1958, your application has been processed and approved for payment, and payments of all benefits under the program of the Fund are dependent upon Anthracite coal production. Due to the decline in coal production, the delay in paying the death benefit claims, still exists.

Since it is impossible to determine what future coal production will be, or what revenue we will receive, I am, therefore, unable to advise you as to just when you will receive your check. However, you may feel sure that just as soon as it is possible for us to do so, payment will be made to you, consistent with the rules and regulations of the Anthracite Health & Welfare Fund.

Very truly yours,

L. SINCAVAGE,
Supervisor, Death Benefit Fund.

UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA,
Wilkes-Barre, Pa., May 18, 1959.

MRS. MARY SHAFER,
Cranford, N.J.

DEAR MRS. SHAFER: I am acknowledging receipt of your letter of May 13, together with enclosure, concerning the death benefit application that was filed with the Anthracite Health & Welfare Fund as a result of the death of your father, Mr. Frank Smykowski, 1232 Main Street, Port Griffith, Pa.

This afternoon I discussed this matter with Mr. Mart F. Brennan, executive secretary of the Anthracite Health & Welfare Fund, and I was informed that the fund has not paid any death claims since February 1958.

As you already know, payments of benefits from the Anthracite Health & Welfare Fund are matters under the direction of the trustees of the fund. Because of the sharp decline in anthracite production, the fund has not been able to meet its death claim obligations due to insufficient funds.

As soon as the fund is in a position to make death benefit payments, I will take up your case with Mr. Brennan once again and you may rest assured that every effort will be made to get this claim paid.

I regret that I cannot be more helpful to you in this matter.

Very truly yours,

AUGUST J. LIPPI.

ANTHRACITE HEALTH & WELFARE FUND,
Hazelton, Pa., January 28, 1960.

MRS. MARY SHAFER,
Avenel, N.J.

DEAR MRS. SHAFER: Your letter of January 22, addressed to Mr. Thomas Kennedy, president, United Mine Workers of America, with regards to the application you filed for death benefit payment as a survivor of your father, the late Mr. Frank Smykowski, Local Union No. 7519, District No. 1, United Mine Workers of America, has been referred to this office for my reply.

In corresponding with you previously, we advised that your claim is approved for payment.

As is indicated in your letter of January 22, you seem to be of the opinion that the death benefit payment is some type of insurance program whereby your late father, and other mineworkers, pay premiums or union dues. This is not so, inasmuch as the fund is financed by royalty payments received from the tonnage of anthracite coal produced and sold.

Because of low coal production, the delay in paying the death benefit claims still exists. However, you may rest assured that just as soon as finances of the fund will permit, payment will be made to you, consistent with the rules and regulations of the Anthracite Health & Welfare Fund.

Very truly yours,

MART F. BRENNAN,
Executive Secretary.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Would the gentleman now speaking tell the committee whether the subcommittee investigated the charges contained in the letters, or do the letters contain unsupported charges of mismanagement against people who have not had an opportunity to have their day in court to explain?

Mr. POWELL. Frankly, that is what this legislation is planning to do, to set up their day in court.

Mr. JONAS. I am asking whether the subcommittee made an investigation to determine whether the charges contained in the letters are supported.

Mr. POWELL. I would categorically say yes, that I did, and I have in my hand in this correspondence replies from the pension, health, and welfare fund of the United Mine Workers in Pennsylvania and other areas of this country showing that those claims were justified, from the mineworkers themselves.

Mr. JONAS. What I mean is, Did the committee after receiving these charges and complaints give to those against whom the complaints were lodged an opportunity to respond to the complaints?

Mr. POWELL. This committee was not set up as a complaint evaluating body. This committee was set up to handle these complaints which we do not have now, that is, the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. JONAS. If letters that have not been verified are placed in the RECORD and if those letters contain charges of mismanagement against individuals or people in charge of these funds, I would question the advisability of using them. These people ought to have an opportunity to respond if their integrity is brought into question by unsupported statements contained in letters.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. May I respond to that by simply saying that the committee did inform the United Mine Workers of these charges, and we invited their presence. They sent gentlemen by the names of Robert Kaplan, Val J. Mitch, and T. G. Dudley, and we asked them specifically whether they had any comment on this, and they said they were not prepared to do so and could not do anything else.

Mr. POWELL. In this morning's Philadelphia Inquirer we find this. Looking for scandal? I said one was imminent. Here it is:

> Five coal companies withheld almost $1.5 million from a pension fund for retired miners for up to 6 years before fund trustees took legal action, court records disclosed here Tuesday.

This is datelined Wilkes-Barre, Pa.

> Another 6 years after the suits were filed, action is still pending on claims against three companies for $603,800.
>
> Court records do not reflect any collection efforts on this indebtedness by United Mine Workers of America lawyers since 1955.

I shall not read all of the article, but later on it states:

> The No. 9 Coal Co., of Hughestown, $717,847 for royalties in the period between December 1948 and September 1954.
>
> The Mammoth Coal Co., of West Pittston, $293,952, between March 1949 and September 1954.
>
> Indian Head Coal Co., West Pittston, $308,556, between December 1948 and September 1954.
>
> The Joliett Coal Co., West Pittston, $1,290, for the months of May and June 1951.
>
> The Hydrotated Anthracite Fuel Co., Inc., of West Pittston, $148,140, between December 1948 and September 1954.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. Gladly. There is your scandal. You have been looking for it.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. You are talking about, I believe, welfare funds, are you not?

Mr. POWELL. I am talking about amendments to the pension and welfare funds.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Under this bill there are two entirely different kinds of funds.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, there are two separate different kinds of funds which this bill seeks to affect under two different sections of the Internal Revenue Code. One is the pension funds. The pension funds are by far the least in number. They get a tax exemption which is different from that under which the welfare funds are operated.

Mr. Chairman, the testimony before the committee in the hearings—and I again refer to page 435—reveals that very few of the welfare funds avail themselves of the tax exemption privilege, because it does not make too much difference to them since they do not have income in the funds themselves. But the bulk of the pension plans do.

The evidence also reveals that the great bulk of the complaints, in fact, practically all of them, are directed against these ones that are not tax exempt. In the tax exempt area—and that is what I am talking about, and what I am talking is in the tax code—I do not believe the gentleman's list which he was reading off applies to any of these tax exempt pension plans. There are practically no welfare plans that are tax exempt. They do not avail themselves of that right.

Mr. POWELL. May I address myself to the gentleman's amendment by asking a question?

Does the Internal Revenue Service police these plans?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. It depends on one's definition of the word "police". They effectively regulate them, yes, because, No. 1, in order to qualify the plan itself must undergo very close scrutiny, and that is done on an individual basis. Then the plan requires that it have an annual report in considerable detail. Some of that detail is spelled out on pages 435, 436, and 437 of the committee hearings. If any one of these funds fails to comply with the law—that restriction—they suffer loss of the tax exemption. That is a tremendous power, and that is why I think the statement has been made, and accurately, that there has been no breath of scandal against this kind of tax exempt pension plans.

Mr. POWELL. The gentleman's point would be well taken if the gentleman could show proof here, which he knows is impossible, that the Internal Revenue Service does not audit these reports.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. They do audit certain ones, but it is done, as the Bureau of Internal Revenue does, on a spot-check basis. But let me say this to the gentleman: This is an area in which there is considerable scrutiny and this spot checking that goes on over a period of time serves to be a pretty effective policing. Mind you, there is another thing. One of these annual reports has a certified public accountant's certification on it. Let me say this: The committee did not even go into this field. I had to find this one thing on the subject myself.

Mr. POWELL. That is not correct, sir.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Well, it is not in the hearings.

Mr. POWELL. That is not correct. It might not be in the hearings, but we did go into it. I can authoritatively say here that the Attorney General of the United States, Mr. Robert Kennedy, personally told me three times that this was mandatory legislation for the Department of Justice, which includes the Internal Revenue Service, in order to proceed to correct some of these abuses. That is the testimony of the Attorney General.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. POWELL. Certainly.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The point is this: The House of Representatives is dependent upon the committee performing the study and covering the subject in its printed hearings, and the report. When you go outside that data, of course, we cannot consider it. That is why I stated that it looked as if the committee did not provide the necessary information. I have heard other things outside of the report. Yesterday the Congressman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT], read a statement from the Bureau of Internal Revenue Service back in 1955, but there was not any interrogation or development of this point. So I think the point is well taken that the subcommittee did not go into this aspect in the hearings. Therefore, the House and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House cannot follow with intelligence this matter. I think a lot of homework needs to be done here.

Mr. POWELL. We did a tremendous amount of homework. It has been going on during the Republican administration under President Eisenhower and Mr. Mitchell, and by the Democratic administration, as well as by our committee.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, yesterday I read to the committee from the Senate report with reference to the Internal Revenue Service.

They were:

> Qualification of a plan by IRS does not insure actuarial soundness. The regulations require only minimum standards.
>
> The assets of the plan may have depreciated greatly through bad investments or economic conditions without being of any concern to the IRS * * *. The IRS would disqualify a plan if the minimum indicated were not put in, but this action would actually work a hardship on the employee beneficiaries.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] has expired.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield further to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Continuing this quotation—

> On the contrary, by law the IRS cannot inform the beneficiary if it finds something wrong with the management of the plan.

So I wrote yesterday to Mr. Swartz, the Assistant Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service, quoted him that, and this is what he answered:

> You also asked whether certain statements quoted from page 15, Senate Report 1440, on S. 2888, 85th Congress, 2d session, are grounded in fact.
>
> It is my belief that the quoted statements will hold true in all material respects.

I think that should settle the argument.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield to the gentleman so he may ask a question of the gentleman from California.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. My point is this. This is the kind of material I suggest the subcommittee should have been getting. I should like to interrogate, for example, Mr. Swartz. I should think someone on the committee would want to interrogate him about the procedures that are followed. The testimony as shown in the hearings is that of the American Bankers Association which set out their procedures.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. May I say to the gentleman that we asked four times for that gentleman to come down before the committee. He refused to come down and all he did was to submit this letter. I do not know how far a committee of Congress can go in demanding that people come before them.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I am simply pointing out that the statement made as shown here requires considerable investigation.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. It has been investigated and already answered, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The gentleman is missing the point. If this is the way the committee conducts an investigation I can easily understand why we get nowhere so far as obtaining information is concerned. What I am anxious to find out is the accuracy of this statement in contrast to those who are required to comply with the Internal Revenue Service requirements.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask for the defeat of this amendment on the ground that the Internal Revenue Service does not police these funds, does not audit these funds; and there are no criminal penalties against kickbacks and no criminal penalties against administrators of these funds if the gentleman's amendment is adopted.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, regretfully I must oppose the amendment of my esteemed colleague from Missouri. I am fearful that his amendment would in effect exempt virtually every plan we are seeking to include under this bill. I think without question it would exempt from this act all union plans that are normally tax-exempt.

I sympathize with the gentleman's frustration over not having more information, but I do not feel the Internal Revenue Service is the proper agency to police these plans. I think it would be ill advised for us to exempt all of the plans that come under Internal Revenue surveillance from this particular act.

I ask that the amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Curtis of Missouri), there were—ayes 38, noes 50.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 8. Subsection (b) of section 6 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Any change in the information required by this subsection shall be reported to the Secretary within sixty days after the effective date of such change."

Sec. 9. (a) Section 7(a) of such Act is amended by striking out "twenty" and inserting in lieu thereof "fifty".

(b) Section 7(b) of such Act is amended by striking out the first sentence of the second paragraph and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "The amount contributed by each employer; the amount contributed by the employees; the amount of benefits paid or otherwise furnished; the number of employees covered; a statement of assets specifying the total amount in each of the following types of assets: cash, Government bonds, non-Government bonds, and debentures, common stocks, preferred stocks, common trust funds, real estate loans and mortgages, operated real estate, other real estate, and other assets; a statement of liabilities, receipts, and disbursements of the plan; a detailed statement of the salaries and fees and commissions charged to the plan, to whom paid, in what amount, and for what purposes. The Secretary, when he has determined that an investigation is necessary in accordance with section 9(d) of this Act, may require the filing of supporting schedules of assets and liabilities."

(c) Section 7(b) is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "In the case of reports sworn to, but not certified, the Secretary, when he determines that it may be necessary to investigate the plan in accordance with section 9(d) of this Act, shall, prior to investigation by the Department of Labor, require certification of the report by an independent certified or licensed public accountant."

Sec. 10. Subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1) of subsection (f) of section 7 of such Act is amended by striking out "summary" and by striking out "broken down by types, such as cash investments in governmental obligations, investments in nongovernmental bonds, and investments in corporate stocks" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "as required by section 7(b)".

Sec. 11. Subparagraph (C) of paragraph (1) of subsection (f) of section 7 of such Act is amended by striking out "total fund" and inserting "total funds", by striking out "by reason of being an officer, trustee, or employee of such fund", and by striking out "listed at their aggregate cost or present value, whichever is lower" and inserting in lieu thereof "valued as provided in subparagraph (B)".

Sec. 12. Subparagraph (D) of paragraph (1) of subsection (f) of section 7 of such Act is amended by striking out the words "by reason of being an officer, trustee, or employee of such fund".

Sec. 13. Section 7 of such Act is amended by adding thereto the following new subsection (g):

"(g) If some or all of the benefits under the plan are provided by an insurance carrier or service or other organization, such carrier or organization shall certify to the administrator of such plan, within one hundred and twenty days after the end of each policy year, such reasonable information determined by the Secretary to be necessary to enable such administrator to comply with the requirements of this Act."

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Goodell: Page 6, line 24, strike the colon following "(g)" and add the following: "and (h):".

Page 7, after line 7, add the following:

"(h) The Secretary shall prescribe by general rule simplified reports for plans which he finds that by virtue of their size a detailed report would be unduly burdensome, but the Secretary may revoke such provisions for simplified forms for any plan if the purposes of the Act would be served thereby."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. Goodell].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. May I say to the gentleman that we, on this side, are prepared to accept his amendment.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would permit the Secretary to accept simplified reports under certain circumstances, in his discretion.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Goodell].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 14. Section 8(a)(2) of such Act is amended by striking out "a summary" and inserting in lieu thereof "an adequate summary".

Sec. 15. (a) Section 9(a) of such Act is amended by striking out "of sections 5 or 8".

(b) Section 9 of such Act is amended by striking out subsections (d) and (e) and inserting in lieu thereof the following new subsections:

"(d) The Secretary may, after first requiring certification in accordance with section 7(b), upon complaint of violation not satisfied by such certification, or on his own motion, when he continues to have reasonable cause to believe investigation may disclose violations of this Act, make such investigations as he deems necessary, and may require or permit any person to file with him a statement in writing, under oath or otherwise, as to all the facts and circumstances concerning the matter to be investigated.

"(e) For the purposes of any investigation provided for in this Act, the provisions of section 307 (relating to the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, records, and documents) of the Federal Power Act of June 10, 1920, as amended (16 U.S.C. 825f), are hereby made applicable to the jurisdiction, powers, and duties of the Secretary or any officers designated by him.

"(f) Whenever it shall appear to the Secretary that any person is engaged in any violation of the provisions of this Act, he may in discretion bring an action in the proper district court of the United States or United States court of any place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, to enjoin such acts or practices, and upon a proper showing a permanent or temporary injunction or restraining order shall be granted.

"(g) The United States district courts and the United States courts of any place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States shall have jurisdiction, for cause shown, to restrain violations of this Act.

"(h) Nothing contained in this Act shall be so construed or applied as to authorize the Secretary to regulate, or interfere in the management of, any employee welfare or pension benefit plan, except that the Secretary may inquire into the existence and amount of investments, actuarial assumptions, or accounting practices only when it has been determined that investigation is required in accordance with section 9(d) of this Act."

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Ashbrook: Page 7, strike out line 25 through line 6, page 8, and insert the following:

"(e) For the purposes of any investigation provided for in this Act, the provisions of sections 9 and 10 (relating to the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers and documents) of the Federal Trade Commission Act of September 16, 1914, as amended (15 U.S.C. 49, 50), are hereby made applicable to the jurisdiction, powers, and duties of the Secretary or any officers designated by him."

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, all this amendment seeks to change is the investigative power granted to the Secretary of Labor. To sum up very briefly:

The provision of the subpena powers under the Federal Power Act which are to be duplicated in the proposed bill are much broader than the provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act which are incorporated in the Landrum-Griffin Act. For instance, under the FTC provisions the power of access shall be only at reasonable times and against any corporation being investigated or proceeded against. This could be interpreted to mean that the subpena powers would be valid only if there was a valid basis for investigation as provided in the bill.

The Federal Power Act provisions state the Commission may investigate any facts, conditions, practices, or matters which it may find necessary or proper in order to determine whether any person has violated or is about to violate any provision of this chapter or any rule, regulation, or order thereunder or to aid in the enforcement of the provisions of this chapter, or in prescribing rules or regulations thereunder, or in obtaining information to serve as a basis for recommending further legislation.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that this legislation very easily lends itself to any type of fishing expedition that the Secretary of Labor might wish to make. Much has been made of the word "reasonable" by the proponents of this bill. Let them try to define "reasonable" and I feel they will be forced to admit that as far as Washington bureaucracy is concerned, "reasonable" is synonymous to anything and everything.

I believe we should give power to the Secretary of Labor that would be more restrictive than that contained in the bill. That is one of the reasons we offer this amendment, to substitute investigative powers that are in the Federal Trade Commission Act for those contained in the Federal Power Act. I believe if we do not do this we may create the possibility under this bill of fishing expeditions to be undertaken by the Secretary when he thinks a violation is about to occur.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I merely wish to state to the Committee that I strongly support this amendment. I think it will improve the bill tremendously. It will preclude certain types of actions and situations which would occur under the Federal Power Commission powers provided under this bill. The authority in the Federal Power Commission Act, which is a strong regulatory act, is excessive for the type of regulation we provide in this bill. I believe the Federal Trade Commission powers are much more desirable, and I hope this will be accepted on the other side.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. I would like to say to my good friends on the other side that, speaking individually, I have no very strong objections to this amendment. I think it should be pointed out, however, that section 9(e) of H.R. 8723 incorporates the provisions of the Federal Power Act of June 10, 1920, as amended (16 U.S.C. 825f). The Federal Power Act requires that a claim of the fifth amendment be made prior to the attachment of immunity; and, thus, the Department of Justice prefers such a requirement to that contained in the Federal Trade Commission Act of September 16, 1914, as amended (15 U.S.C. 49), which is the "immunity bath" type of statute in that the mere production of books and records would cause immunity to attach. Immunity may be inadvertently bestowed under the Federal Trade Commission Act and thus limit the Department of Justice in future actions.

The provisions of the Federal Power Act in this respect are not unique. Other regulatory statutes such as the Federal Communications Act (47 U.S.C. 409(1)) contain similar provisions to the Federal Power Act.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 2, strike out the quotation mark, and after line 2, insert:

"(1) The Secretary shall immediately forward to the Attorney General or his representative any information coming to his attention in the course of the administration of this Act which may warrant consideration for criminal prosecution under the provisions of this Act or other Federal law."

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to the gentleman's amendment unless he would like to explain it.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I should like to explain the amendment briefly for the information of the Members. It would require the Secretary of Labor to forward to the Attorney General immediately any information that comes to his attention that may warrant consideration for a criminal prosecution under this act. This would be a safeguard, to be sure, that there could never be a coverup of any nature by any future Secretary of Labor. It would guarantee that this material obtained under the act would be evaluated by those who are experienced in criminal prosecutions, and if there is sufficient information to justify a criminal prosecution, the Attorney General will be enabled to proceed and get the information from the Secretary of Labor.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 16. (a) Such Act is further amended by renumbering sections 10, 11, and 12 as sections 16, 17, and 18, respectively, and by adding the following new sections to the Act:

"REPORTS MADE PUBLIC INFORMATION

"SEC. 10. The contents of the descriptions and reports filed with the Secretary pursuant to this Act shall be public information, and the Secretary may publish any information and data which he obtains pursuant to the provisions of this Act. The Secretary may use the information and data for statistical and research purposes, and compile and publish such studies, analyses, reports, and surveys based thereon as he may deem appropriate.

"RETENTION OF RECORDS

"SEC. 11. Every person required to file any description or report or to certify any information therefor under this Act shall maintain records on the matters of which disclosure is required which will provide in sufficient detail the necessary basic information and data from which the documents thus required may be verified, explained, or clarified, and checked for accuracy and completeness, and shall include vouchers, worksheets, receipts, and applicable resolutions, and shall keep such records available for examination for a period of not less than five years after the filing of the documents based on the information which they contain.

"RELIANCE ON ADMINISTRATIVE INTERPRETATIONS AND FORMS

"SEC. 12. In any action or proceeding based on any act or omission in alleged violation of this Act, no person shall be subject to any liability or punishment for or on account of the failure of such person to (1) comply with any provision of this Act if he pleads and proves that the act or omission complained of was in good faith, in conformity with, and in reliance on any written interpretation or opinion of the Secretary, or (2) publish and file any information required by any provision of this Act if he pleads and proves that he published and filed such information in good faith, on the description and annual report forms prepared by the Secretary and in conformity with the instructions of the Secretary issued under this Act regarding the filing of such forms. Such a defense, if established, shall be a bar to the action or proceeding, notwithstanding that (A) after such act or omission, such interpretation or opinion is modified or rescinded or is determined by judicial authority to be invalid or of no legal effect, or (B) after publishing or filing the description and annual reports, such publication or filing is determined by judicial authority not to be in conformity with the requirements of this Act.

"BONDING

"SEC. 13. (a) Every administrator, officer, and employee of any employee welfare benefit plan of or any employee pension benefit plan subject to this Act who handles funds or other property of such plan shall be bonded as herein provided; except that where such funds or property are not segregated for the purposes of such plan, the Secretary in his discretion may accept the filing of other security or certificate of insurance in lieu of the bonding requirements set out herein. The amount of such bond shall be fixed at the beginning of each calendar, policy, or other fiscal year, as the case may be, which constitutes the reporting year of such plan. Such amount shall be not less than 10 per centum of the amount of funds handled, determined as herein provided, except that any such bond shall be in at least the amount of $1,000 and no such bond shall be required in an amount in excess of $500,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary, after due notice and opportunity for hearing to all interested parties, and after consideration of the record, may prescribe an amount in excess of $500,000. For purposes of fixing the amount of such bond, the amount of funds handled shall be determined by the funds handled by such administrator, officer, or employee and their predecessor or predecessors, if any, during the preceding reporting year, or if the plan has no preceding reporting year, the amount of funds to be handled during the current reporting year by such administrator, officer, or employee, estimated as provided in regulations of the Secretary. Such bond or other security or insurance shall provide protection to the plan against loss by reason of acts of fraud or dishonesty on the part of any administrator, officer, or employee of such plan, directly or through connivance with others. Any bond shall have as surety thereon a corporate surety company which is an acceptable surety on Federal bonds of like amount under authority granted by the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to the Act of July 30, 1947 (6 U.S.C. 6–13). Any bond, other security, or insurance shall be in a form or of a type approved by the Secretary. The Secretary may, in lieu of individual bonds, approve the use of schedule or blanket forms of bonds to cover individuals required to be bonded as herein provided.

"(b) It shall be unlawful for any administrator, officer, or employee to whom subsection (a) applies, to receive, handle, disburse, or otherwise exercise custody or control of any of the funds or other property of any employee welfare benefit plan or employee pension benefit plan, without being bonded as required by subsection (a), or without the Secretary having accepted other security or insurance under the provisions of subsection (a), and it shall be unlawful for any administrator, officer, and employee of such plan, or any other individual having authority to direct the performance of such functions, to permit such functions, or any of them, to be performed by any such individual, with respect to whom the requirements of subsection (a) have not been met.

"(c) It shall be unlawful for any person to procure any bond, other security, or insurance, required by subsection (a) for the protection of funds and property of any employee welfare benefit plan or of any employee pension benefit plan, from any surety, insurance, or other company or through any agent or broker in whose business operations such plan or any party in interest in such plan has any significant control or financial interest, direct or indirect.

"(d) Nothing in any other provision of law shall require any person, required to be bonded as provided in subsection (a) because he handles funds or other property of an employee welfare benefit plan or of an employee pension benefit plan, to be bonded insofar as the handling by such person of the funds or other property of such plan is concerned.

"(e) The Secretary shall from time to time issue such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section. When in the opinion of the Secretary other bonding arrangements covering the Administrator, officers, and employees of a plan are adequate for the protection of the beneficiaries and participants, he may, in his discretion, exempt such Administrator, officers, and employees from the bonding requirements of this section.

"ADVISORY COUNCIL

"SEC. 14 (a) There is hereby established an Advisory Council on Employee Welfare and Pension Benefit Plans (hereinafter referred to as the 'Council') which shall consist of thirteen members to be appointed in the following manner: One from the insurance field, one from the corporate trust field, two from management, four from labor, and two from other interested groups, all appointed by the Secretary from among persons recommended by organizations in the respective groups; and three representatives of the general public appointed by the Secretary.

"(b) It shall be the duty of the Council to advise the Secretary with respect to the carrying out of his functions under this Act, and to submit to the Secretary recommendations with respect thereto. The Council shall meet at least twice each year and at such other times as the Secretary requests. At the beginning of each regular session of the Congress, the Secretary shall transmit to the Senate and House of Representatives each recommendation which he has received from the Council during the preceding calendar year.

"(c) The Secretary shall furnish to the Advisory Council an executive secretary and such secretarial, clerical, and other services as are deemed necessary to the conduct of its business. The Secretary may call upon other agencies of the Government for statistical data, reports, and other information which will assist the Council in the performance of its duties.

"(d) Appointed members of the Council shall be paid compensation at the rate of $50 per diem when engaged in the work of the Council, including travel time, and shall be allowed travel expenses and per diem in lieu of subsistence as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 73b-2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently and receiving compensation on a per diem, when actually employed, basis.

"(e)(1) Any member of the Council is hereby exempted, with respect to such appointment, from the operation of sections 281, 283, and 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, and section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 99), except as otherwise specified in paragraph (2) of this subsection.

"(2) The exemption granted by paragraph (1) of this subsection shall not extend—

"(A) to the receipt or payment of salary in connection with the appointee's Government service from any source other than the private employer of the appointee at the time of his appointment, or

"(B) during the period of such appointment, to the prosecution or participation in the prosecution, by any person so appointed, of any claim against the Government involving any matter with which such person, during such period, is or was directly connected by reason of such appointment.

"ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT

"SEC. 15. The provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act shall be applicable to this Act."

(b) Subsection (b) of the section renumbered as section 16 by this Act, is amended by inserting after "of this section" the following: "and section 13".

(c) The table of contents of the first section of such Act is amended by striking out the last three lines and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 10. Reports made public information.
"Sec. 11. Retention of records.
"Sec. 12. Reliance on administrative interpretations and forms.
"Sec. 13. Bonding.
"Sec. 14. Advisory Council.
"Sec. 15. Administrative Procedure Act.
"Sec. 16. Effect of other laws.
"Sec. 17. Separability of provisions.
"Sec. 18. Effective date."

Mr. ROOSEVELT (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, in the interest of time, because I think everybody has pretty well read the bill, I ask unanimous consent that the rest of this section be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

The **CHAIRMAN**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GOODELL: On page 9, line 8, after "and" insert "annual"; and in line 10, after "Secretary" insert ", where to do so would protect the interests of participants or beneficiaries of a plan".

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. It is our opinion that this really does not change substantively this section or paragraph, and we have no objection to the insertion of what the gentleman wants to do here.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, may I assert for the legislative history at this time that the great problem which occurs here in resisting this kind of a bill is the fear that there will be unwarranted investigations and that somehow or other investigators or swarms of Federal employees will descend upon the administrators of these plans, will obtain information from the plans, go back to Washington, and then ultimately publicize the information that they have obtained. This is not our intent. We want to make it clear, I believe, on both sides that it is our intention that a minimum of information be pubilcized and disclosed with reference to the details of these plans, subject only to the requirement of protecting the interests of the beneficiaries of the plans. I believe my amendment will clarify this to a degree and make it clear that the Secretary may disclose and publicize the annual reports that are submitted, the supplemental material to those reports, if such reports were originally inadequate, but that he may not publicize that information that he receives in the course of the investigation pursuing further the possibility of abuses in these funds.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Will the gentleman explain to the committee what purpose would be served by the Secretary publicizing this information? This is not of general interest to the public; it is of interest only to the beneficiaries of the plan. What good purpose would be served by disseminating this information around the country for the edification of people who are not concerned?

Mr. GOODELL. The whole philosophy of the Disclosure Act is that the best protection is the disclosure of the details of the plans openly and that those beneficiaries of the plans and others affected by the plans will then know what is being done with their money. That is the basic philosophy of this act. It is my purpose to have the Secretary publicize only what is necessary to protect the interests of these beneficiaries and to prevent the Secretary from going into extraneous matters that might hurt the administrators of these plans.

Mr. JONAS. I thought the basic purpose was to make this information available to the Secretary of Labor to the end that he might take the necessary steps to see that any abuses are corrected and the necessary steps taken to see that any embezzlers are prosecuted. But, a publication of the contents of these reports might cause mischief in some cases. I do not believe publication of these confidential reports will be necessary for the Secretary to discharge his policing powers under the act.

Mr. GOODELL. May I say to the gentleman that you are distinguishing between disclosure and publication. It is our intention here that all of the facts be made known in a general way to those who are affected. We do not want, and we have presented a good many amendments to clarify this, the publication of the disclosure of the details of stock investments.

This is done where it is absolutely necessary to do so in order to protect the interest of the beneficiary. But the present act does require disclosure, and I believe the distinction between disclosure and publication will be small in terms of the possible injury to which you refer. The main people who would be concerned, and who would unjustly benefit from knowing the terms of a plan of which they are not a beneficiary, will know it if there is disclosure, regardless of whether there is publication.

Mr. JONAS. That is right, and that is the reason I asked why it is necessary to publish it.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The Chair will count.

One hundred Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GRIFFIN: On page 11, line 13, after the word "herein" insert the following: "*Provided, however*, That this section shall not apply with respect to any employee welfare benefit plan financed in whole or in part by any employer who is required under such plan to provide a fixed or predetermined level of benefits."

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, as I said before, I am in favor of the basic purpose of this legislation. I believe that adequate protection should be provided for funds contributed by employees toward welfare benefits or toward pension plans.

When employees have their dues checked off, or otherwise make contributions toward a retirement program, and they have a right in 15 or 20 years to retire and draw benefits, I believe they should be entitled to reasonable assurance that the funds will be protected and available for the purposes for which they were contributed.

Mr. Chairman, this bill will add to the law, which was passed in 1958, a bonding provision. In those circumstances where there is some reason to believe that employee funds set aside for such a purpose could be diverted or used for another purpose, then the bonding provision is desirable. As everyone knows, bonds cost money. There is no point in applying this bonding provision across the board in situations where there is no reason for it.

This act applies not only to pension plans but also to welfare benefit programs such as Blue Cross, sickness and health benefit plans, and other programs that involve everyday benefits and fringe benefits of employees.

Under the present act a report must be filed to cover almost every welfare and pension plan of any kind and description. This may be all right to the extent that this broad legislation makes available some statistics. However, in the case of welfare benefit plans, there are many plans under which the employer is required to provide a fixed or predetermined level of benefits. In other words, he must provide so many days of sick pay or so many days of hospitalization. When the employer contributes in whole or in part to the financing of such level-of-benefits programs, there is built-in protection against abuse or having those funds diverted; if funds are diverted the employer would have to pay that much more. If the employer allows this to happen he would only be hurting himself and not the employee.

Accordingly, insofar as level-of-benefit welfare plans are concerned, the bonding provision in this bill is not necessary. It would be unnecessarily expensive to require all employees of a company who are authorized to sign payroll checks, for example, to be bonded merely because the employer agrees to provide employees with Blue Cross insurance as a fringe benefit.

Mr. Chairman, I offer this as an amendment for the serious consideration of the committee. It seems to me that this amendment makes sense. If we are not going to exempt completely level-of-benefits plans from the act, which was attempted earlier, then I believe we should at least exempt those plans from the bonding provision.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that the amendment be accepted.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment and would like to point out to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] that from the discussion I believe this amendment would actually eliminate almost everybody that would have been eliminated under the Curtis amendment. The reason I say that is this: to get one of these plans approved by the Internal Revenue Service, if it is a pension plan, one requirement at least is that it must provide a fixed and determined amount. It may be that you have an actuarial valuation that finds that the amount per hour to be contributed is 10 cents—but the level of benefits must have been determined before it can qualify as a tax deductible plan. This amendment as I heard it read would seem to eliminate almost every kind of a pension plan that came under the provision of the Internal Revenue Code.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for purposes of clarification?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Of course, the gentleman does not have a copy of my amendment before him. The amendment is specifically limited to employee welfare benefit plans and does not apply to pension plans. I want to make that clear. It does not exempt bonding with respect to pension plans, but only with respect to the level-of-benefits welfare plans. So there is an important difference and, as I indicated, I think Congress should go to greater lengths to protect employee pension benefits.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. What the gentleman is saying is that as to welfare benefits, if they are stolen or embezzled they should not be covered by a bond, but if it is a pension plan, they should?

Mr. GRIFFIN. No, if the gentleman will permit. Generally, welfare benefits are a current expense. We are talking generally about Blue Cross, sick benefits, and so forth. These fringe benefits are almost like a payroll, paying wages, so far as the employer is concerned. If the employer is obligated to make such payments, and he finances them either in whole or in part, he has every incentive to make sure that funds available for that purpose are not diverted.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I point out that a large group of benefit plans would not come within the purview of the gentleman's amendment. I refer especially to the building trades industry where they contribute 10 or 15 or 20 cents an hour to a welfare plan, or it may be to a vacation plan. They get permission from the Internal Revenue Service to deduct this as a business expense. So it does come under the Internal Revenue Code. But there is a large fund in the hands of the administrator and the administrator pays out the benefits.

Mr. GRIFFIN. My amendment would not exempt such a plan.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I do not see how you can help that, because these are welfare benefits and the fund is in the hands of an administrator. If the administrator is not covered by a bond, then the benefits will not be available.

Mr. GRIFFIN. It applies only to an employee welfare benefit plan financed in full or in part by an employer who is obligated to pay a fixed or predetermined level of benefits.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. In these cases it is financed in whole, as a matter of fact.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Or in part by the employer who is required to pay a fixed level of benefits.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I also would point out in these cases that many times the employer is a transient employer. He comes in and has a contract and contributes for 2 or 3 months into the fund. Then he is gone. If the time comes to pay out these benefits and he is no longer around, there is no longer any jurisdiction over him. So in fact, if the administrator was not bonded, there is no way of getting back to the employer to make him pay the benefits. I have had a personal experience in a case of that kind, where a man came to Iowa to work on some pipelines. He went back to Kansas City and never would pay the benefits. So you would exempt him also under this proposal.

Mr. GRIFFIN. If the gentleman will permit me to say so, the same problem applies where it is provided in part and you can always run into that possibility. I think the argument is very correct with respect to a pension program where the benefits are not to be realized until 15 or 20 years hence.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I think, if you look at this carefully, this amendment exempts a lot of people that we really want covered and there would be a considerable loophole in the law.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I must say, I agree with the gentleman from Iowa. I do have some sympathy with the argument of the gentleman from Michigan, if he had limited it to those funds which were part of the general funds of a corporation or of the unions, and the funds had not been contributed as a sort of trust fund. But even in the welfare field, these funds are actually trust funds, and it seems to me that is a different case which the gentleman's amendment would not meet. Therefore, we would be running a risk, and I do not think it is a proper risk to run. An individual would find his money had been misappropriated and because of the lack of bonding, he would have no recourse to get his contribution back and his contribution should have been put aside in a trust fund.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I would say it would not be difficult to get people exempted later, if we would find out it should be done.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in support of the amendment.

I think the objections raised are answered by the simple fact that where you have a level-of-benefits program, the employer guarantees that he will meet a certain level of benefits. He may deduct some money from his employees along the line. He may decide that he wants to deduct enough to pay 50 or 60 percent of all the benefits he has negotiated to pay under contract with his employees. He may decide that he wants to overfund.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. However, if he does take 50 or 60 percent from the employee, does he not occupy a fiduciary capacity in that instance with respect to the employee?

Mr. GOODELL. Yes, I think he does, but then suppose the employer does misuse this 50 or 60 percent. He still has his contractual obligation to pay the employee and, basically, that is what they have to fall back on anyway. He has guaranteed a level of benefits to them. If he goes out of business, they are stuck anyway.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. If he has misappropriated the fund, however, and this company is not in a good financial position—in that instance an employee could get his money back through the bonding company even though the employer-company went bankrupt. There are cases like that in the record. Then an employee would have recourse, otherwise he would have no recourse because the company was bankrupt.

Mr. GOODELL. Unfortunately, what you are doing is penalizing this plan that guarantees a level of benefits paid from the general assets of a company. I think that is going a little too far, perhaps.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Would not the gentleman agree, however, that it is a very small penalty. It is the premium on the bond which would probably only be on the administrator, and undoubtedly he is going to be the administrator of the pension plan, he probably is going to have to be bonded for that anyhow. So why should he not be bonded for both of them?

Mr. GOODELL. The penalty is small if there is one person who is bonded, but in many instances with large companies, they have payroll clerks who would have to be bonded under this particular provision that is in the bill now. Such a payroll clerk, for example, may have authority to pay sickness benefits to workers himself without going back to the main office. He is able to go ahead and pay an employee who is sick from the general assets of the company.

I do not think that a man who pays money out of general assets should have to be bonded.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. It is a difference of opinion. I am not going to argue with the gentleman. I just feel I want to be on the safe side and make sure that the beneficiaries are protected.

Mr. GOODELL. I want to be on the safe side, too, but I do not want to go to the extreme here of putting unnecessary burdens on the administrators of the plans.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Griffin].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Griffin) there were ayes 26, noes 48.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask a question of the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking minority member. The bill requires that every administrator, officer, and employee shall be bonded. What if a trust company with $100 million of free assets should be the administrator of one of these funds? Could he take care of this requirement by buying a bond from an insurance company with substantially less assets than the administrator itself?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Will the gentleman rephrase his question.

Mr. JONAS. Assume a trust company with, say, $100 million in assets is the administrator of a fund. This bill requires him to give a bond. He has to go to a bonding company and buy the bond. Now, suppose he buys one from a company that is less financially responsible than himself, are you not imposing an unreasonable burden on the administrator?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. No. If you will read this part of it, it must be by bonding companies approved by the United States.

Mr. JONAS. I understand that. They can be approved, but they should in every instance be as financially responsible as the administrator himself. If an insurance company or a trust company happens to be the administrator of a trust fund, is it the purpose of this section to require that a bond be given by every individual working for that administrator who handles any part of the fund?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I think the answer to the gentleman is in line 5:

> Every administrator, officer, and employee of any employee welfare benefit plan—

And so forth.

That is the answer. The answer to the second part is found in line 11 where it says:

> The Secretary in his discretion may accept the filing of other security or certificate of insurance in lieu of the bonding requirements set out herein.

If a case of this kind came up the Secretary would demand such alternate.

If you will go down further, you will see where it says the bond shall be 10 percent of the amount of funds handled, it shall not be less than $1,000 or in excess of $500,000, except, again, in specific instances where the amounts that had to be handled would indicate it should be in excess of the $500,000.

Mr. JONAS. In cases where the administrator is financially responsible, his own obligation might be more protection than a bond issued by a bonding company.

Would it not be advisable to give the Secretary some discretion to protect these funds in ways other than bonds? I can visualize situations in which complete protection can be provided otherwise than by giving a bond.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I would have to say no to the gentleman, because I think the gentleman well knows that in the case of a bank or a trust company, its assets would be unreachable in many of these instances for this kind of a security, and that is why in nearly every State—and you will find it in the case of a Federal depository, a bank or trust company—it is required that the officers and employees be bonded for just exactly that reason, and that is the difficulty of getting at its assets.

Mr. JONAS. Under this section would the trust company or insurance company be permitted to give one bond to cover all of these employees instead of having to give one for each officer and employee?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The answer is yes to the gentleman. We provide for a scheduled bond.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. If I understand your point correctly, you would like to have the Secretary of Labor have more discretion in the case in which he feels there would be complete safety without a bond.

Mr. JONAS. Yes.

Mr. GOODELL. I wonder if we could not eliminate the word "bonding" in line 2, page 14, so it then would read:

> When in the opinion of the Secretary other arrangements covering the administrator, officers, and employees of a plan are adequate for the protection of the beneficiaries and participants—

And so on.

This would give more discretion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I take this time in order to reply to the gentleman from New York. I do not think that there would be any serious objection if anybody wants to offer that amendment, although I think it is better to leave it this way. But, if you all feel strongly enough about it, perhaps we can consider it.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Chairman, I renew my point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Ninety-six Members are present, not a quorum.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 14]

Arends
Buckley
Byrnes, Wis.
Celler
Corbett
Curtin
Dowdy
Goodling
Granahan
Grant
Green, Pa.
Halleck
Hoffman, Mich.
Holifield
Huddleston
Johansen
Kearns
Kee
Landrum
Lankford
Mason
Moeller
Moulder
Passman
Pilcher
Rains
Reece
Rivers, S.C.
Sikes
Smith, Va.
Spence
Springer
Stratton
Vinson
Williams
Wilson, Calif.
Wilson, Ind.
Young

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Bonner, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 8723, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 391 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ASHBROOK: Page 16, strike out line 10 and insert the following: "Administration".

Page 16, line 11, after "Sec. 15." insert "(a)".

Page 16, after line 12, insert the following: "(b) No employee of the Department of Labor whose duties involve the administration or enforcement of this Act shall be a member of an employee organization if such organization admits to membership, or is affiliated directly or indirectly with an organization which admits to membership, employees other than employees of the Federal Government."

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, in view of the President's Executive order which was issued on January 17, 1962, and which established a Federal policy of encouraging Federal employees to join unions and to designate such unions as their collective bargaining representatives, I firmly believe that a possible conflict of interests has been created.

Under the Pension and Welfare Disclosure Act, certain employees of the Department of Labor are commissioned to investigate and prosecute any employer or union which violates the provisions of the act. However, these same employees may be members of the very union that they are investigating. For example, it has been announced that the first Government employee union local in the country to get formal recognition under President Kennedy's new Government labor-management Executive order is Labor Department Lodge 12, American Federation of Government Employees—AFL-CIO. Let me quote from last Saturday's Washington Star:

> Formal recognition: The first Government employee union local in the country to get formal recognition under President Kennedy's new Government labor-management Executive order is Labor Department Lodge 12, American Federation of Government Employees.

As you know, under the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act, it is provided:

> No labor organization shall be certified as the representative of employees in a bargaining unit of guards if such organization admits to membership, or is affiliated directly or indirectly with an organization which admits to membership, employees other than guards.

Certainly, this is a wise provision and one which has borne the test of time. There well could be a conflict of loyalties if the guards whose duty it is to enforce plant rules had to enforce these rules against a fellow union member.

Without question, this same conflict of loyalties would exist if the Labor Department employee was called upon to investigate or prosecute a union of which he is a member. I think this conflict would be far more serious than the conflict that a guard might have. For here we are talking about the enforcement of a very important law and the possible imprisonment of violators.

One other aspect of this conflict of interests should also be examined. Under the usual union constitution a member can be fined for acts of disloyalty to the union. Fines of this type are often imposed and once they are imposed a union can then go into court and obtain a judgment for the member in the amount of the fine. The courts have held that as part of the contract of membership a member may be obligated to pay a fine which has been levied against him even though he has subsequently resigned from the union.

It is not beyond the realm of reason to envision a set of circumstances wherein an official of a union violates the provisions of this act and the Department of Labor is called upon to investigate the allegation of violation. Lo and behold the investigator who investigates the charge is a member of that very same union. Now is it unreasonable to assume that the charged labor union official might well feel that an investigation which would lead to his imprisonment was an act of disloyalty on the part of the investigator?

Certainly no employee of the United States should even be confronted with such a dilemma. A dilemma which, if he does his duty as a Federal employee, could mean his expulsion from the union and the payment of a large fine.

Certainly at the very least this bill must be amended so that Federal employees who administer it will not be permitted to be a member of a union which admits employees other than Federal employees to membership.

There is an old saying among the farm people I know which applies to business, labor, or government—that "The crow should not be called upon to guard the corn." Absent this amendment, this bill should not be permitted to be enacted into law. I am confident a majority of the Members of the House share this belief.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot emphasize too strongly what a very bad amendment this would be. In the first place, most Members of the Congress, I am sure, know that Federal employees since 1912 have been allowed to join unions, and since 1912, if there was any conflict of interest along this line, certainly it would have been rectified by now. So, we are not dealing with anything very extraordinary.

The President's Executive order merely, in essence, says that now there may be bargaining units within the Federal establishment. But, the gentleman has not, I think, told you the full story, and I would like to quote very briefly from a letter from the Secretary of Labor to Chairman POWELL concerning this Executive order. He says:

> First, section 3(a) of Executive Order No. 10988 provides that "no recognition shall be accorded to any employee organization which the head of the agency considers to be so subject to corrupt influences or influences opposed to basic democratic principles that recognition would be inconsistent with the objectives of this order."

That clearly takes care of a certain type of union.

This prohibition will be reinforced by the standards of conduct and codes of fair practice which the Temporary Committee for Supplementation of the Policy shall develop pursuant to the order.

Now, second, the Secretary says:

> The order does not override existing laws or policies which prohibit Federal employees from entering or maintaining relationships which would create a conflict of interest that might prevent their performance of official duties in the public interest. Moreover, the order precludes the establishment of a unit for exclusive recognition which includes "any managerial executive" (sec. 6(b)), and forbids representation or participation in the management of an employee organization "where such participation or activity would result in a conflict of interest or otherwise be incompatible with law or with the official duties of an employee." (Sec. 1(b).)

And he refers to section 1(b) of the order:

> Third. Employee organizations cannot under the order use fines, threat of expulsion, or any other disciplinary measures provided in their constitutions to influence an employee in the performance of his duties. The policy on employee-management cooperation in the Federal service stresses:
>
> The task force wishes to state its emphatic opinion that the union shop and the closed shop are contrary to the civil service concept upon which Federal employment is based, and are completely inappropriate in the Federal service.

In other words, the very thing that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] fears, which is that the union itself through its policy of a fine or expulsion, specifically the order, as it is being carried out, says that that becomes inoperative in reference to the Federal service. So, I think when we go back to the fact that the individual has been able to join or to be a member of a union since 1912, I am afraid we will find that the gentleman's fears are completely unfounded.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Is the gentleman able to give to the members of the committee any guarantee, then, that such a conflict of interest would not occur in this situation?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I am able to give the guarantee of the Secretary of Labor, which I have just read, in which he says the employee organizations cannot under this order use fines, threat of expulsion, or any other disciplinary measures provided in their constitutions to influence an employee in the performance of his duties. I do not see how the guarantee could be flatter or more clearly stated than that.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I am happy to yield further to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ASHBROOK. That is the point I brought up in my amendment, and which I feel is very germane. I think the Members of the committee should look realistically at the idea of placing it permanently into law, rather than leaving it up to administrative procedure or administrative statements on the part of the Secretary. We might have another Secretary who might not feel that way.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. If I read the gentleman's amendment correctly, it would go far beyond that. It would specifically prohibit any member of the Department of Labor who joined a union or who became a part of a union from participating in the enforcement of this act. It does not make any exception. It would be completely binding.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. It would go so far as to completely hamstring the Department of Labor in its ability to enforce this act.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I will yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I thank the gentleman from California. I should like to read from section 16 of the President's Executive order pertaining to the Federal employee unions.

> This order shall not apply to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Central Intelligence Agency, or any other agency, or to any office, bureau or entity within an agency, primarily performing intelligence, investigative, or security functions.

Notice the application to investigative functions. It seems to me the very language of that particular section recognizes that those in the Government who are performing an investigative function should not be put in a situation where there might be a conflict of interest. It seems to me the order itself recognizes there could be a conflict of interest. I wonder if the gentleman might have any comment on that?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I would have to say to the gentleman that I think the order is very properly drawn, because what it says is that in any matters of national security or intelligence that have to do with national security in and of itself that that shall be above and beyond any even joining of a union, and I feel that that is correct. In that particular case because it deals not with the kind of thing we are dealing with, but with national security, we are in an entirely different field. I believe the President was correct in his exemption of the specific agency of the FBI.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield.

Mr. GRIFFIN. The particular provisions which the gentleman quoted to the effect that a union could not fine or discipline its members, was that in an official order by the President or was it just in a letter from the Secretary of Labor?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Perhaps I should read the language again. It is in the letter of the Secretary of Labor.

Mr. GRIFFIN. It is in a letter from the Secretary of Labor.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. In which the Secretary says:

> Third, employee organizations cannot under the order—

So it is included in the order. It is not just the opinion of the Secretary of Labor.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Is this the order of the President or the order of the Secretary of Labor?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. This is the order of the President, Executive Order No. 10988.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I ask for the defeat of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. THOMPSON of Texas). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HIESTAND) there were—ayes 66, noes 55.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. ASHBROOK and Mr. ROOSEVELT.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 105, noes 79.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, mistakes are often made in high places. We are all human and this is an imperfect world. Nonetheless, I have asked for this time to speak out of order because I feel I have something which deserves the attention of all my colleagues.

I think all of us, as Americans, have a right to demand that those making high policy share with us our fundamental objectives as a free people. Socialism is alien to the free enterprise system of America. I cannot trust personally the advice of anyone who sincerely believes that socialism must save capitalism. Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., a top adviser to the President, wrote in the Partisan Review of 1947 an article entitled "The Future of Socialism: III—The Perspective Now." I call your attention to it because I think you should all know what Mr. Schlesinger wrote in that article in 1947. I will quote at random for the discomfiture of a few of my colleagues. I quote Mr. Schlesinger in 1947:

> If socialism (i.e., the ownership by the state of all significant means of production) is to preserve democracy, it must be brought about step by step in a way which will not disrupt the fabric of custom, law, and mutual confidence upon which personal rights depend. That is, the transition must be piecemeal; it must be parliamentary; it must respect civil liberties and due process of law. Socialism by such means used to seem fantastic to the hard-eyed melodramatists of the Leninist persuasion; but even Stalin is reported to have told Harold Laski recently that it might be possible. * * * There is no sign * * * that the capitalists are putting up a really determined fight. * * * There seems no inherent obstacle to the gradual advance of socialism in the United States through a series of New Deals. * * * But the New Deal greatly enlarged the reserves of trained personnel; the mobilization of industry during the war provided more experience; and the next depression will certainly mean a vast expansion in Government ownership and control. The private owners will not only acquiesce in this. In characteristic capitalist panic, they will demand it. * * * The process of backing into socialism in the contemporary world is not so simple as it sounds. Too many forces are working, some wittingly, some not, to obstruct that process.

I do not believe the American people want to back into socialism. I do not believe the American people want a man writing our President's speeches, guiding our foreign policy with reference to Cuba or the Conference at Punta del Este, who believes what Mr. Schlesinger apparently believes. To my knowledge, Mr. Schlesinger has never repudiated nor modified the position he took in this article. I ask President Kennedy to take cognizance of this article and to give serious consideration to replacing Mr. Schlesinger in his inner circle of advisers.

In any event, the American people have a right to know the direction in which Mr. Schlesinger would like President Kennedy to steer our Ship of State.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad the Ashbrook amendment was adopted, and I should like to point out now that it is very important now to retain it in the bill. The principle underlying the Ashbrook amendment is basic and would also have application to the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959, the so-called Landrum-Griffin Act, under which the Bureau of Labor Management is charged with the responsibility of investigating labor organizations. Under an Executive order issued by the President and further implemented by the Secretary of Labor, employees of the Labor Department—this very Bureau—can and presumably will join and affiliate with a union and can be put in the position of having to investigate their own union or the international union with which they are affiliated.

The gentleman from California indicated that the Secretary of Labor in a letter interpreted the Executive order as giving assurances that a union could not fine or expel its members for carrying out their duties as Federal employees. However, there is a serious question in my mind. I question whether a letter from the Secretary—or the Executive order itself—could change the bylaws or constitution of a union. I think that the President by an Executive order may be able to determine whether or not a union will be recognized, whether or not a Department of the Government will negotiate and to some extent, within the limits of the law, what they will negotiate about.

But I doubt that the internal operations of a union as established by its constitution and bylaws are within the reach of even an Executive order issued by the President. I believe that a law of Congress would be required to make invalid a particular provision in the constitution or bylaws of a union.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. If I understand the gentleman's logic correctly, would it not then follow that the gentleman is saying that no member of the Labor Department, no employee of the Department of Labor, whether he is employed in the section having to do with enforcement of the Landrum-Griffin Act, or whether he has to do with enforcement of fair labor standards or any other department which polices union activity can belong to a union?

Mr. GRIFFIN. No. I would not go that far. I would say in those agencies of the Department of Labor which have the responsibility of investigating and enforcing particular provisions involving unions. In those particular areas, certainly Federal employees should not belong to a union that is affiliated with the AFL–CIO, the United Mineworkers, or other international union which they might be called upon to investigate.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Would the gentleman carry this same logic, we will say, to other agencies of Government such as the Pure Food and Drug Administration whose scientists check on the content of drugs or foods. Is the gentleman saying these scientists should not join professional organizations because they are investigating violations of federally administered standards? Where do we want to draw the line? Where is the end?

Mr. GRIFFIN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] referred to guards of a company under the Taft-Hartley Act. They can belong to their own union, but they may not belong to a union affiliated with a union to which the regular employees of the company belong. Since plant guards have policing responsibilities with respect to regular employees, they are not allowed to belong to the same union because there could be a conflict of interest. If they belong to a union, it should be an independent union, to say the very least.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I then gather anyone who would vote for the Ashbrook amendment would in effect be saying he does not believe any Federal employee engaged in the performance of any investigative work may belong to a union in that particular field?

Mr. GRIFFIN. No. I would say he should not belong to a union unless it is an independent, unaffiliated union. That would be, I think, a good sound principle.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Then we are in agreement, if you support the Ashbrook amendment you are saying to the Federal employees that they cannot belong to a union other than an unaffiliated union?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Those Federal employees charged with the responsibility of investigating labor unions. The principle would be limited to those employees. If those employees do belong to a union it should be an unaffiliated union.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. GOODELL: Page 11, line 9, after the semicolon, strike all the words beginning with "except" to the word "The" in line 13, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "except that, where such plan is a completely unfunded plan under which the only assets from which benefits are paid are the general assets of a union or of an employer, the administrator, officers, and employees of such plan shall be exempt from the bonding requirements of this section."

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would go along with the amendment that was presented previously to exempt level of benefit plans. In many instances an employer or a union makes a commitment based upon his own general assets, his own credit, that he will provide a welfare plan or a pension plan himself. This actually would permit him an exemption from the bonding provisions. In this kind of situation, all the union or employer has done is to commit the general assets of his company or of the union to pay these benefits. There is no fund set aside with money to pay the benefits. Therefore, it seems to me completely unfair to require this employer or this union to bond every individual who handles their general assets and makes payments to the employees under the welfare or pension plan. I feel the amendment would not injure this bill in any way but would clarify it and relieve an unnecessary burden upon those plans which are completely unfunded. I urge the enactment of this amendment.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I will be delighted to.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. If I understood the amendment correctly as it was read, what the gentleman is saying is if the assets were wholly within the general assets of either the company or the union and were not segregated in any way.

Mr. GOODELL. That is correct. If there is any segregation of assets at all in a plan or fund, then this amendment would not apply and would not exempt that plan.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. We have no objection to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. GOODELL: Page 15, line 2, strike the period after the word, "year" and add the following: "and a report covering his activities under the Act for such preceding calendar year, including full information as to the number of plans and their size, the results of any studies he may have made of such plans and the Act's operation and such other information and data as he may deem desirable in connection with employee welfare and pension benefit plans."

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment. I would merely like to point out that this requires the Secretary of Labor to make an annual report in detail to the Congress, which I feel would be indicated, so that we can reassess this program as we go along.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I will be happy to accept the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. GOODELL: Page 16, strike out line 10 and insert the following: "Administration".
>
> Page 16, line 11, after "Sec. 15" insert "(a)".
>
> Page 16, after line 12, insert the following:
>
> "(b) No more than two hundred and sixty employees shall be employed by the Department of Labor to administer or enforce this Act.
>
> "(c) Not more than $2,200,000 per year is authorized to be appropriated for the administration and enforcement of this Act."

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, once again this is the estimated cost and total number of employees that are supposedly going to be involved in the enforcement of this act. It includes the present employees and the cost of the present program. In other words, the total number of employees would be 260 employees and the total amount of cost would be $2.2 million. It places a ceiling at this level in both categories. I want, as indicated, to be sure that this proposal does not get out of hand completely in terms of total number of employees and administrative expense.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. It is my recollection that the chairman of our full committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL], agreed in essence to this amendment yesterday. I would like to ask the gentleman, though, because I think our committee has tried to stay away from interfering in the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations, whether or not it would not be wise to add, in essence, that this ceiling be applicable for the first 2 years. After 2 years, certainly, it seems to me that we will want to leave to the Committee on Appropriations the question as to whether this ceiling should be increased slightly or increased in any amount. I would like to ask the gentleman if he would object if I sent up an amendment to this effect.

Mr. GOODELL. Well, I would have no serious objection. If the gentleman feels that it would be indicated, I would accept it. My objective is clearly to set a ceiling on costs in this bill today.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. ROOSEVELT to the amendment offered by Mr. GOODELL: On page 16, after the word "Act" strike the quotation marks and add the following: "for the first two years after the enactment of these amendments."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONAS: On page 14, line 1, strike out "other" and all of lines 2 through 6—and insert the following: "the administrator of a plan furnishes adequate evidence of financial responsibility so that the protection of the beneficiaries and participants is assured, he may exempt such administrator, officers and employees from the bonding requirements of this section."

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment pertains to the colloquy a little while ago between the present speaker and the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from California. This amendment will give the Secretary discretionary power to accept other evidence of financial responsibility instead of requiring a bond in every instance.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, in view of the gentleman's explanation of his amendment, we have no objection to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that the Ashbrook amendment and my last amendment on page 16 should be conformed to the bill.

May we ask unanimous consent that they be conformed in their reading and identification as to number?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, we are approaching the end of this debate. We have improved the bill with some amendments, and a number of others have been rejected. My judgment is still that it is a very bad bill. We have no assurance that the bill if passed will come out of conference in the shape that we send it over.

Mr. Chairman, I object to the bill largely because the need has not been shown, and cannot be shown; that it would give the Secretary of Labor unnecessary and broad regulatory authority, and would unduly burden the administration of pension and welfare funds. It would infringe upon State legislation, which is a more appropriate and effective method of handling the problems involved. It would ignore the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code which now provide effective indirect control of abuses of pension and welfare funds, as was shown in the debate. It would disregard the rules of conduct and standards prescribed in the Taft-Hartley Act for jointly administered welfare and pension funds, and it would create within the Federal Government a new bureaucracy which would increase financial and administrative burdens of the Federal Government. It would increase the power of the Executive, increase the size of Government, and increase expense.

Mr. Chairman, I object to the bill. I think it is still a very bad bill, and should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CRIMES

SEC. 17. (a) Chapter 11 of title 18, United States Code, as amended, is amended by adding a new section captioned and reading as follows:

"§ 224. Offer, acceptance, or solicitation to influence operations of employee benefit plan

"Whoever, being an administrator, officer, trustee, custodian, counsel, or employee of any employee welfare benefit plan or employee pension benefit plan, or a person providing benefit plan services to any such plan, or an employer any of whose employees are covered by such a plan, or officer or employee or agent of such employee, or an officer or agent or employee of an employee organization having members covered by such a plan, receives or agrees to receive any money or thing of value because of, or with intent to be influenced with respect to, any of his actions, decisions, or other duties relating to any question or matter concerning such plan, or any person who directly or indirectly gives or offers, or promises to give or offer, any payment or delivery of money or other thing of value prohibited by this section, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than three years, or both: *Provided*, That this section shall not prohibit the payment to or acceptance by any person of bona fide salary, compensation, or other payments made for goods or facilities actually furnished or for services actually performed in the regular course of his duties as such administrator, officer, trustee, custodian, counsel, agent, or employee of such plan, employer, or employee organization, or person providing benefit plan services to such plan.

"As used in this section, the term 'any employee welfare benefit plan or employee pension benefit plan' means any such plan subject to the provisions of the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act.

"(b) Whenever in the judgment of a United States attorney the testimony of any witness, or the production of books, papers, or other evidence by any witness, in any case or proceeding before any grand jury or court of the United States involving any violation of this section, or any conspiracy to violate such section, is necessary to the public interest, he, upon the approval of the Attorney General, shall make application to the court that the witness shall be instructed to testify or produce evidence subject to the provisions of this subsection, and upon order of the court such witness shall not be excused from testifying or from producing books, papers, or other evidence on the ground that the testimony or evidence required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture. But no such witness shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he is compelled, after having claimed his privilege against self-incrimination, to testify or produce evidence, nor shall testimony so compelled be used as evidence in any criminal proceeding (except prosecution described in the next sentence) against him in any court. No witness shall be exempt under this subsection from prosecution for perjury or contempt committed while giving testimony or producing evidence under compulsion as provided in this subsection."

(b) The analysis of chapter 11, title 18, United States Code, immediately preceding section 201 thereof, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"224. Offer, acceptance, or solicitation to influence operations of employee benefit plan."

(c) Chapter 31 of title 18, United States Code, as amended, is amended by adding a new section captioned and reading as follows:

"§ 664. Theft or embezzlement from employee benefit plan

"Any person who embezzles, steals, or unlawfully and willfully abstracts or converts to his own use or to the use of another, any of the moneys, funds, securities, premiums, credits, property, or other assets of any employee welfare benefit plan or employee pension benefit plan, or of any fund connected therewith, shall be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

"As used in this section, the term 'any employee welfare benefit plan or employee pension benefit plan' means any such plan subject to the provisions of the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act."

(d) The analysis of chapter 31, title 18, United States Code, immediately preceding section 641 thereof, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"664. Theft or embezzlement from employee benefit plan."

(e) Chapter 47 of title 18, United States Code, as amended, is amended by adding a new section captioned and reading as follows:

"§ 1027. False statements and concealment of facts in relation to documents required by the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act

"Whoever, in any document required by the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act (as amended from time to time) to be published, or kept as part of the records of any employee welfare benefit plan or employee pension benefit plan, or certified to the administrator of any such plan, makes any false statement or representation of fact, knowing it to be false, or knowingly conceals, covers up, or fails to disclose any fact the disclosure of which is required by such Act or is necessary to vertify, explain, clarify or check for accuracy and completeness any report required by such Act to be published or any information required by such Act to be certified, shall be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned not more than five years, or both."

(f) The analysis of chapter 47, title 18, United States Code, immediately preceding section 1001, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"1027. False statements and concealment of facts in relation to documents required by the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act."

SEC. 18. The Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act is further amended by substituting the term "Secretary" for the term "Secretary of Labor" wherever the latter term appears in such Act.

SEC. 19. The amendments made by this Act shall take effect January 1, 1962, except that section 13 of the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act shall take effect July 1, 1962.

Mr. ROOSEVELT (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read at this point, and open to amendment on this section, and any further sections.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I offer three conforming amendments, and ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. ROOSEVELT: Page 1, line 4, strike out "1961" and insert in lieu thereof "1962".

Page 21, line 15, strike out "1962" and insert in lieu thereof "1963".

Page 21, line 17, strike out "1962" and insert in lieu thereof "1963".

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, as I have previously noted when H.R. 8723 was before this House under suspension of the rules, I am reluctant to see additional powers placed in the hands of the Secretary of Labor. It is unfortunate but true that we have asked the Secretary of Labor, whether he is a Republican or a Democrat, to carry an impossible burden. First of all, he is labor's spokesman and advocate within the administration and this is as it should be. But then we have placed in the Department of Labor and under the supervision of the Secretary of Labor the administration of certain laws which call for impartiality and equal treatment, as well as vigorous enforcement, in cases which involve employers as well as labor unions. I am now referring to the Wage and Hour Law, the Bacon-Davis Act, the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959—better known as the Landrum-Griffin Act—and, of course, the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act which we are today considering.

And so it is with great sincerity that I suggest and urge that in the very near future careful consideration be given to a plan of reorganization which would take the administration of these very important laws away from the Labor Department and place them in an agency which could administer them in a wholly unbiased and nonpartisan manner. If this was done, then whenever amendments to these laws come before this House we would not be required to deal, as now, with what should be purely an extraneous matter—the partiality of the Labor Department and its inherent inability to administer the law in an unbiased manner—but rather we could devote our time to a careful consideration of the substantive provisions of the proposed legislation.

Of course, we cannot at this time place the administration of the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act under an independent agency. So, in the drafting of the proposed amendments, we have done the next best thing. We have carefully limited the powers of the Secretary. For example, section 9(d) limits the Secretary of Labor's investigatory powers to those situations where there has been a complaint of violation or he has reasonable cause to believe investigation may disclose violations of the act. This means that the Secretary of Labor is prohibited from conducting fishing-type investigations or investigations which are not supported by a valid complaint or a reasonable belief that a violation has occurred. Moreover, it is also my understanding that the investigations conducted by the Department of Labor will be only in the nature of preliminary inquiries; and, in the event there is any evidence of a violation of the criminal offenses or a willful violation of the reporting or publication provisions, the case will be forwarded to the FBI for final investigation.

Next, section 15(h) provides that nothing in this act shall authorize the Secretary of Labor to regulate or interfere in the management of any plan. It is not the intent of this bill that the Secretary of Labor be given supervisory powers with respect to welfare and pension plans, and this provision specifically states this fact.

Finally, an amendment must be adopted which would prohibit the Labor Department employees who administer this act from belonging to unions which also represent employees other than Federal Government employees.

Unless this amendment is adopted there exists a very real possibility that the Labor Department employees could be faced with a dangerous conflict of interest. For only recently President Kennedy issued an Executive order which by its provisions is framed to encourage Government employees to join unions which would in turn act in the capacity of their bargaining representative. Significantly, the first Government employee union local in the country to get formal recognition under the Executive order was Labor Department Lodge 12, American Federation of Government Employees, AFL-CIO.

It should be noted that under the Taft-Hartley Act it is specifically provided that—

> No labor organization shall be certified as the representative of employees in a bargaining unit of guards if such organization admits to membership, or is affiliated directly or indirectly with an organization which admits to membership, employees other than guards.

Certainly if Congress was concerned over a possible conflict of interest with respect to guards, it makes even more sense that there should be concern over a possible conflict of interest when a Government employee may be called upon to investigate and prosecute a union and its officers when he is the member of that same union.

On this point, I feel so strongly that if this amendment is not adopted, I will withdraw my support from this bill and urge that it be defeated.

On the other hand, if this amendment is adopted, I will support the bill's passage even though it does have certain shortcomings. I feel that in its present carefully drafted form, this bill does add needed criminal penalties while at the same time the Secretary's investigative powers have been effectively limited.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment just offered by my colleague from Michigan. I think the exemption of level-of-benefit plans from the bonding provisions of the act is an entirely justifiable move. It is wasteful and unnecessary to apply the bonding provisions to these welfare benefit plans to which the employer must contribute and under which he is required to provide a set level of benefits. As has been explained to you, this operates as a built-in protection against misapplication of the funds in these plans. These plans are already under close and careful scrutiny and I see no need to saddle them with this extra and unnecessary expense.

I urge adoption of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BONNER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8723) to amend the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act with respect to the method of enforcement and to provide certain additional sanctions, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 538, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 15]

Arends
Boykin
Buckley
Byrnes, Wis.
Celler
Chiperfield
Corbett
Curtin
Daddario
Dawson
Dowdy
Goodling
Granahan
Grant
Green, Pa.
Halleck
Harrison, Va.
Hays
Hoffman, Mich.
Huddleston
Jensen
Johansen
Kee
Kluczynski
Landrum
MacGregor
Mason
Moulder
Passman
Pilcher
Rains
Reece
Sikes
Springer
Stratton
Ullman
Vinson
Williams
Wilson, Calif.
Wilson, Ind.

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 392 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

WELFARE AND PENSION PLAN AMENDMENTS OF 1961

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. HIESTAND. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. HIESTAND moves that the bill H.R. 8723 be recommitted to the Education and Labor Committee.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HIESTAND) there were—ayes 80, noes 174.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KEARNS) there were—ayes 191, noes 85.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, it is very interesting that we could not get sufficient Members——

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that that is not a parliamentary inquiry.

So the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill H.R. 8723 the Clerk be authorized to make the necessary clerical corrections in section and subsection numbers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THIS WEEK

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time to inquire of the distinguished majority leader concerning the program for the balance of the week and, if he can give it to us, for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, this completes the legislative program for this week. No other matters will be brought up except such as may be brought up under unanimous consent for the balance of the week. The program for next week will be announced tomorrow.

Mr. HOEVEN. I thank the gentleman.

RESPONSIBILITY OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD IN CRASH OF IMPERIAL AIRLINES PLANE AT RICHMOND, VA.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all of my colleagues were as profoundly shocked as I was reading in this morning's paper the Civil Aeronautics Board's report on the tragic crash of the Imperial Airlines' plane at Richmond, Va., which cost the lives of 74 Army recruits, including 29 of my constituents.

So now that the CAB has submitted its report on that crash, permit me, Mr. Speaker, to submit my report on the CAB and the extent of that agency's responsibility for this appalling air tragedy.

This company was in existence solely because the CAB authorized it to be. Here is the sad history of how that came to pass:

This is the story of the management of Imperial Airlines, and particularly of one of the key figures, one E. J. Averman.

These remarks are based entirely on proceedings before the CAB. Every member of the Civil Aeronautics Board has had all of this information continuously at his disposal.

PARTICIPATION IN THE "SAFEWAY" COMBINE OF NONSKEDS

One of the principal nonsked combines of recent years was one known as Safeway, which was put togeher at the start of the 1950's.

The purpose of such nonsked combines is to provide regular, frequent service, in the manner of a fully certificated airline, by pooling the flights which each nonsked in the combine is individually permitted by the CAB. For instance, if each is permitted 10 round trips per month on a route, 3 can provide a daily service by pooling their operations. Typically, they advertise to the public as though the operations are all those of one business entity. These combines and their operations are completely illegal.

The nonsheduled carriers which were the nucleus of the Safeway combine were Peninsular Air Transport and Aero Finance Corp. Peninsular originally operated by itself. The combined operations were set up in the following way.

E. J. Averman, Jr., a pilot for Peninsular, allegedly bought 49 percent of the voting stock of Aero Finance on or about June 16, 1950,[1] and became secretary of the company. At that time Aero Finance was a dormant corporation but held authority from the CAB to operate as a nonscheduled air carrier.[2] Averman acquired the stock from one C. N. Shelton. Although Shelton retained the rest of the stock for a time, it seems that he did not conduct or manage the later operations of the company inasmuch as Averman himself represented that, as secretary-treasurer, he was the chief operating executive of the company,[3] and the Board and the examiners recognized this as a fact.[4] The status thus assumed by Averman should be contrasted with a CAB order of April 6, 1950.[5]

That order, issued only 2½ months before Averman's acquisition of 49 percent of the stock, had approved transfer of the nonsked operating authority from Shelton, who held it personally, to the corporation known as Aero Finance, which he wholly owned. It was approved upon his representation that he had not used the authority, that he now wished to, and that he accordingly wanted to do so as a corporation, instead of personally, in order to facilitate financing and because of the limited liability available through corporate status. The Board conditioned its approval on Shelton keeping ownership and control of over 50 percent of the stock, and remaining "in active control of the air transportation conducted by" the corporation.

Subsequent CAB proceedings, moreover, brought out significant evidence that Averman was acting, not for himself, but for the principals behind Peninsular Air Transport. The Aero-Peninsular Compliance case sets forth the resulting control and interlocking relationships between Peninsular and Aero in some 45 fact-filled pages.[6] The Board called Aero a "mere shell," with "direction of Aero's policy" resting in Peninsular.

The evidence of control by Peninsular included the fact that the books of Peninsular showed what purported to be a loan to Averman (still unrepaid nearly a year later) in the amount of 'and made on or about the time of the initial payment for the stock of Aero Finance.[7] When Averman sold his stock in February 1953, title was transferred to Wallace F. Peterson, a pilot for Aero and Peninsular.[8] In February 1954, Peterson transferred it to Paul Satterfield, a pilot for the same two companies.[9] In July 1955, Satterfield transferred the stock and the purported presidency to one Ray W. Frantz, who had joined Aero finance only the previous month.[10]

Such activities, it may be noted, are not unique, isolated events among nonscheduled carriers. Currey Air Transport, another nonsked, came into the Great Lakes combine in the same way and at about the same time. "Currey was inactive when the Board granted it an exemption to operate as an irregular transport carrier on March 16, 1951, it having disposed of its aircraft during the illness of Mr. Currey in 1949."[11] The Board found, on the basis of Currey's application, that it had indicated its intention to resume operations. It also provided that the authority should "terminate whenever joint or several control of Currey passes from Mr. Arthur Currey and/or his wife, Mary E. Currey," and was specifically conditioned on the company not collaborating with other carriers with respect to holding out or conducting of regular service.[12]

Soon thereafter Currey transferred 49 percent of the stock in the company to one Robert M. Smith, who had become operations manager of Great Lakes in 1949, and who became executive vice president of Currey in January 1952.[13] Mr. Currey withdrew all the assets from the company, so that what Smith had acquired was the operating authority.[14] The evidence indicated that Currey did not remain in control and management of the company's operations, and that Smith took over.[15] The evidence also strongly suggested that although Smith asserted that he borrowed the purchase money from one Malcolm Robertson, a personal friend, the purchase money "deposited to Mr. Smith's account was given him by Great Lakes. * * * No explanation of these transactions was given by either the Hermans [i.e., the Great Lakes principals] or Mr. Smith even though they are the only parties having knowledge of the facts. It is inconceivable that Mr. Smith could not remember the source of the funds involved in the largest and perhaps most important deposit made in his personal account during a period of more than 2 years. * * * It is concluded that their conduct with respect to these matters was tantamount to a refusal to testify." [16]

---

[1] I.D., D. 5132, Jan. 10, 1957, p. 116. 24 CAB 469

[2] I.D., D. 5132, Jan. 10, 1957, p. 110, 116.

[3] Order E–16060, Jan. 25, 1952, p. 2.

[4] 17 CAB 869, 870; 24 CAB 469, 478 (note 19).

[5] E–4044.

[6] 24 CAB 469.

[7] I.D., D. 5132, Jan. 10, 1957, p. 116.

[8] Ibid.

[9] Ibid.

[10] Ibid., and 117.

[11] I.D., D. 5132, Mar. 29, 1955, p. 310.

[12] Order E–5202.

[13] I.D., D. 5132, Mar. 29, 1955, p. 310.

To return to Mr. Averman, subsequent to the sale of 49 percent of the stock to Averman, Shelton went further and sold all the rest of it back to Aero, the corporation, which retained it as company stock, so that the only issued and outstanding stock was the original 49 percent sold to Averman.[17] In other words, this gave Averman 100 percent ownership of all outstanding stock. This clearly violated the Board's order of April 6, 1950.

This sale of the balance of the stock by Shelton occurred in October 1951,[18] while applications of July 20, 1951, by Shelton and Averman for modification of the Board's requirement of April 6, 1960, that Shelton retain over half the stock and remain in active control were pending. On January 25, 1952, the Board issued an order denying these applications.[19] If the Board has been made aware by that time that the balance of the stock had already been transferred, there is no indication of that in its order of January, 1952. And it was not until October 10, 1952, that the Bureau of Enforcement of the CAB, alleging sale of the balance of the stock, instituted proceedings requesting revocation of Aero's operating authority.[20]

One corollary of this was that in hearings in the Large Irregular Air Carrier Investigation, to quote the Board:

"Aero called as its witness its secretary-treasurer and director, E. J. Averman, Jr., who sponsored its exhibits. On cross-examination, Averman was interrogated as to the current stock ownership in Aero. He refused to answer, claiming privilege against self-incrimination." [21]

One element of proof which the Federal Aviation Act requires for an exemption, such as Aero sought, is that the applicant be a citizen of the United States, which in the case of a corporation means that the president and two-thirds of the board of directors and other managing officers must be citizens and 75 percent of the voting stock must be held by citizens. Because of Averman's refusal to answer on this point, the examiners struck his direct testimony and, giving consideration "to the fact that Aero has refused to present current evidence with respect to its present ownership and control, that Aero's principal witness, Mr. Averman, who is the chief operating officer of the company, refused to stand cross-examination on matters material and relevant to the issues of the applicant's case, and within the scope of his direct examination, and that Aero's other witness, sponsoring the exhibits, * * * was unable to answer questions on cross-examination on such exhibits because of her unfamiliarity and lack of knowledge with the subject matter contained herein, and * * * is not a competent witness to testify with respect to such matters."

Recommended that the Board dismiss Aero's application.

What did the Board do even in the face of such considerations as these? It said:

"Since Aero has failed to prove an essential element of its case, dismissal of its applications at this time would be fully warranted. However, as in the Argonaut case, the dismissal of Aero's applications would result in the termination of the carrier's authority to engage in irregular air transportation. We are reluctant to impose so severe a sanction." [22]

And the Board remanded the case to the examiners for further hearing on Aero's application.

The Safeway combine flourished until the mid-1950's, concentrating to a great extent on the New York-Miami and Chicago-Miami markets. The Board finally ended it by revoking the operating authority of Peninsular and Aero January 31, 1957, roughly 6½ years after Averman's entrance into the Aero operation had helped make the combine possible. In its revocation decision the Board said:

"The record in this case discloses the clearest kind of knowing and willful violations—violations of major scope, extending over a long period of time.

* * * * *

"The combination, however, stands as final proof of respondents' complete disregard of the entire concept embodied in the regulations governing the role of irregular carriers and of their subordination of public to private objectives. The violation is compounded by the concealment of the true character of their operations through the failure to file working arrangements that would have revealed the nature of the combination. Since respondents' very existence as a business is bottomed on illegal arrangements illegally concealed, for them to comply in the future, as hoped by the examiner, would require a complete change in the character of their business and a renunciation of all that has guided them through their existence to date. Under such circumstances we cannot accept, as a reasonable basis for favorable action, the mere hope that respondents might see fit to comply in the future. There is nothing in the hearing record to suggest that respondents will comply. Even on brief and argument following the examiner's initial decision the respondents have not intimated that they are willing to comply and have made no representation that they will do so." [23]

As to the company of which Averman purportedly was the head, the Board added:

"The record makes clear that Aero, as the cohort, if not the tool, of Peninsular, could no more be expected to comply in the future than could Peninsular. Its operations were spawned by illegal arrangements which have prevailed until the present. There is no basis, therefore, for trust in its good faith." [24]

In a case [25] against the ticket agencies which represented the Safeway combine, the Board said the following about their business practices:

"An air transport examiner of the Board, testified that 105 complaints had been received by the Office of Compliance from May 1, 1955, through June 22, 1956, from members of the traveling public * * * witnesses complained of postponed departures, hours of delay in takeoff, late arrival of planes, and misrepresentations of total trip time; of flights represented as nonstop to destination when in fact intermediate stops were made; of representations made orally and through advertising that flights would be made on four-engine planes when in fact two-engine planes were used; of confirmed return reservations which in fact were not provided; and of representations made orally or through false and misleading advertising that the respondents were air carriers when in fact they were ticket agents, all of which caused the witnesses to suffer great inconvenience, distress, and financial loss.

"It was the practice to honor refund claims only at the office where the ticket was purchased, and then only if the office had sufficient cash from daily receipts to pay the claims, which was not always the case. If there was not sufficient cash, the person was told to come back later. This practice resulted in confusion, delay, and inconvenience to persons entitled to refunds. Witnesses waited weeks and months for refunds. * * * Claimants were given one excuse after another for failure of the respondents to honor refund claims. When witnesses wrote concerning their refund claims, their letters were not answered. One witness testified that he received a check for his refund but the check was returned uncollectible.

"Mr. Shuman testified that while he was general manager there were a 'lot of refunds' which were not paid. Mr. Robertson said that when he opened the Detroit Southeast Agency office in the Industrial Building, Detroit, Mich., the office 'swarmed' with people demanding refunds in connection with the Southeast Airlines Agency in the Tuller Hotel." [26]

ACQUISITION OF REGINA CARGO AIRLINES, LATER CALLED IMPERIAL

Meanwhile Averman had developed other interests.

According to the initial decision of March 29, 1955, in the large irregular air carrier investigation, Averman, in August 1951, had acquired 98 percent of the common stock and 75 percent of the preferred of another nonsked, Regina Air Cargo, "while he was operating manager and, according to his own testimony, owner of 49 percent of Aero's stock. The stock was purchased in the name of Lora Grell, Mr. Averman's mother-in-law, who transferred it to him on February 1, 1953, which was the date on which he sold his stock in, and severed his connection with, Aero." Acquisition of a carrier by an owner of a different carrier normally requires Board approval.

At the time he acquired Regina it, like Aero Finance before it, was a dormant carrier. Its air carrier operating certificate had been suspended by the CAA on May 29, 1950, following a crash 2 days earlier.[27] Its CAB letter of registration was also in suspension at the time of acquisition by Averman. Averman testified that at the time he did not consider Board approval necessary because he believed Regina not to be an air carrier due to the loss of its operating certificate and letter. A natural question, if in fact he thought this eliminated the need for approval, was why the stock was bought in his mother-in-law's name.

The only thing the examiners said about this in the initial decision of 1955 was that "there is no clear showing here of a knowing and willful violation of the act such as would preclude issuance of operating authority to Regina, and we will not here pass upon the question of whether Mr. Averman violated the act by acquiring the Regina stock while he operated and had apparent control of Aero."

The Board, in its decision in the Large Irregular case in January 1959,[28] said that "we may add that if there was a violation, it appears to have been voluntarily terminated on February 1, 1953, when Mr. Averman severed his connections with Aero."

---

[14] Ibid.

[15] Ibid.

[16] Ibid., p. 317.

[17] I.D., D. 4132, Jan. 10, 1957, p. 116.

[18] I.D., D. 5132, Jan. 10, 1957, p. 116.

[19] Order E–6060.

[20] 17 CAB 870.

[21] 17 CAB 870.

[22] 17 CAB 869 (1953).

[23] 24 CAB 481–2.

[24] 24 CAB 482–3.

[25] Southeast Airlines Agency, Inc., et al., Compliance Proceeding, 24 CAB 89.

[26] 25 CAB 105–6.

[27] I.D., D. 5132, Mar. 29, 1955, p. 296.

[28] Order E–13436, D. 5132.

Thus the Board did not deal with the basic "fitness" issue, which was not whether a violation had been terminated, but whether one had in fact been committed.

In effect, Averman appears to have held control of both companies from August 1951 to February 1953—a full year and a half—until Regina's operating certificate was about to be reinstated (which occurred on February 4, 1953, 3 days after his mother-in-law transferred the Regina stock from her name into Averman's). At that time, seemingly having no further need for Aero, he disposed of his stock in that company. This apparently resolved the fitness question at least to the satisfaction of the Board members who formed the majority in the 1959 3-to-2 split decision in the Large Irregular case.

This was akin to the many issues which, in that case, were decided pursuant to the doctrine the CAB enunciated therein of resolving doubts in favor of the carrier.

To continue according to the summary by trial examiners in that case, in February 1953, after his mother-in-law had transferred the Regina stock to him Averman transferred half of it to E. S. Turner who became secretary-treasurer, with Averman as president. These two bought a DC-3 and leased it to Regina at $3,000 per month. A second DC-3 was leased from Mr. Averman's father, E. J. Averman, Sr., for $2,000 per month. Inasmuch as these lease terms were far above those under which nonskeds leased such planes from the Air Force after the war—in some instances reportedly for only a few hundred dollars a month—it is possible that these were higher than the going rate for such rentals at this date. It would appear that Regina could have raised capital and bought aircraft itself, or leased them from disinterested parties under arm's length bargaining.

Investigations by the CAB of other combines have indicated that high-cost leases under which interested parties have leased planes to the operating companies have drained funds out of the corporations holding the nonsked operating authority and into the hands of the principals behind the combine and, secondly, have placed the operating equipment out of the reach of creditors of the corporation.

Regina recommenced services February 22, 1953, primarily as a passenger carrier. It had a crash at Vail, Wash., September 1, 1953, in fog and rainy weather. The Board found the probable cause of the accident to be the pilot's flying under visual rules during instrument flight weather.[29]

Despite this history, and despite the fact that they carefully pointed out that no studies had been submitted as to Regina's capital requirements or in support of the company's forecast of profitable operations, the examiners in the large irregular air carrier investigation in 1955 said Regina was "found to be a suitable carrier." The Board in its decision in the same case in January 1959 [30] certificated the company as a supplemental carrier, not only ignoring the question as to the legality of Averman's acquisition of Regina, but going on to say that "there is no evidence of combine operations as between Regina and Aero or any other carrier." The Board completely ignored Averman's earlier personal involvement with the Safeway combine and its own harsh words about that group.

In the Aero-Peninsular Compliance case (Jan. 31, 1957),[31] based in large part on operations by Aero during Averman's tenure with that company, the Board found Aero to have been willfully guilty of excessive flight frequency; violation of ticketing regulations of the CAB; failure to file intercompany working agreements as required by the Board, which would have revealed the nature of the combined operation; agreements with Southeast Airlines Agency (ticket agents in the Safeway combine) without CAB approval, and in violation of Board regulations.

Early in January 1962, 5 years after that decision and almost 12 years after Averman took title to the initial 49 percent of Aero stock, the Chairman of the CAB testified to Representative HARDY's Armed Services Subcommittee that a recent investigation of Imperial, to which Regina changed its name 2 years ago, had revealed that once again a carrier run by Mr. Averman had been engaging in ticketing irregularities, and was also guilty of tariff violations, and filing misleading financial data and false statements with the Board.

Not only has the Board majority over a long period manifested indifference to these evidences of lack of fitness and willingness to comply with the law, but the Chairman of the Board testified before the Hardy subcommittee that the inspection subsequent to the Richmond crash was the first that the Board has made of this company although the company has been in business since 1949.[32] He admitted also that the Board has never made "any periodic examinations (i.e., of nonscheduled carriers generally) to determine whether there have been violations other than those which were brought to their attention by some obvious violation, some specific complaint." [33]

There are three grounds for judging Mr. Averman and the CAB's treatment of him—fitness, financial capacity, and quality of flight operations.

There has for a long time been ample basis for questioning the fitness of this man and his management to do business in air transportation. This is based on years of evidence of a disposition not to comply with the law. In view of the Federal Aviation Act, fitness is an appropriate and in my opinion necessary test to be met.

The Chairman of the CAB testified that in his judgment the crash at Richmond was connected with the financial condition of the company.

Finally, the Board's own report on the cause of the crash at Richmond is all we need to know about the quality of the company's operations.

It does not appear too much to say that if the Board had blocked Averman's acquisition of dormant certificates, or had faced up to the issue of the legality of his acquisition of Regina, or had conducted thorough inspections of this company's books and its technical competence, the Richmond accident probably never would have taken place. That is a very, very serious indictment.

With the Board having done such a bad job of evaluating this carrier, there is no reasonable basis for relying on any assurance given by the CAB at this time about any supplemental carrier or about the Board's ability to control these carriers in the future.

The refusal of the Board over the years to acknowledge the marginal nature of most of the nonscheduled carriers, its inability to police them and to inspect their operations, but most of all its obstinate determination in face of all the facts to resolve doubts in favor of the carriers and thus put protection of these three- and four-man enterprises ahead of the public interest, are the reasons that the Board cannot in the future be given power to grant any broad authority to these carriers.

The pending legislation therefore should provide for charter authority only. There must be no individually ticketed authority of any sort. This is an absolute must, whether in civilian business, which gives rise to illegal combines, or in carriage of military personnel as in the Imperial crash at Richmond which resulted in the Secretary of Defense promptly and wisely prohibiting use by the military of any individually ticketed services of supplemental carriers.

No matter how individually ticketed authority has been defined and limited in the past, there have always been nonscheduled carriers that have devised ways to evade the limitations. This will always be the case. This is why individually ticketed operations have consistently attracted the irresponsible operators in the nonscheduled industry. To grant any such authority is simply to ask for trouble, to saddle the taxpayers with the high costs of enforcement proceedings, and to close one's eyes to the fact that a management that will not obey the law cannot be relied on to show proper concern for safe operations. And the issue here is what the Government can rely on, not what it can naively hope for.

The number of these carriers should also be cut down by fitness tests in the proceedings for interim authority immediately following enactment of the pending legislation. Their number must promptly be reduced to the point where the managements of doubtful character and ability and the companies of marginal financial strength have been eliminated, and those who remain are few enough in number both to make effective surveillance possible and to eliminate the cutthroat competition that produces the financial weakness that imperils safety.

With this kind of a program, Congress would at last be putting the interest of the public first. I am going to do everything in my power to see that these objectives are achieved.

HOW GOOD IS THE GOVERNMENT'S WORD?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, with the fantastic growth of Government over the recent years and the consequent need for more people to have dealings with it comes the question, "How good is the Government's word?" A relatively recent Supreme Court decision may supply one answer. I would like to tell the Members of the House about it.

There is an age-old maxim in law which holds that you cannot do indirectly what the law says you cannot do directly. But the courts and Government agencies move in mysterious ways their wonders to perform and the old maxim begins to fade away.

A case in point arises from the 1954 Bureau of Census Act which authorizes the Bureau to require detailed data from manufacturers and business concerns. Under penalty of fine and imprisonment businessmen are required to fill out a lengthy and complicated form supplying such detailed information about their affairs as the Bureau might require.

---

[29] CAB Accident Investigation Report SA-282, File No. 1-0071, Jan. 20, 1954.

[30] Order E-13436, D. 5132.

[31] 24 CAB 469.

[32] Tr. 419 f.

[33] Tr. 421.

To allay the fears of businessmen over revealing business data and secrets to their competitors or agencies of Government—besides the Census Bureau—the 1954 act provides that neither the Bureau nor any of its employees may reveal the contents of the business census report to anyone, including agencies of Government. To further reassure businessmen, the form to be filled out by them carries the statement:

> Your report is confidential and only sworn Census employees will have access to it. It cannot be used for purposes of taxation, investigation, or regulation.

The clinching assurance was provided by the President of the United States himself who proclaimed:

> No person can be harmed in any way by furnishing the information required.

All these assurances, no doubt, were related to a constitutional provision which says in effect that no person may be compelled to testify against himself in a criminal proceeding. An agency like the Federal Trade Commission is a quasi-judicial body, and refusal to comply with its orders may be punished by fine and imprisonment.

There is another old saying. It goes like this:

> There is more than one way to skin a cat.

The FTC has found another way.

Under the provisions of the 1954 Census Act the Bureau of Census is prohibited from giving to the Federal Trade Commission any of the data contained in the business census reports filed with the Bureau. But Government bureaucracy must not be daunted, despite the assurances of the President, the Bureau of Census, or the understanding of Congress. Under a recent Supreme Court decision—St. Regis Paper Co. against United States—all that the Federal Trade Commission has to do is subpena a copy of the census report, not from the Census which cannot legally supply it, but from the individual businessman himself. Once in the hands of the FTC it becomes a matter of public record and its contents soon are available to all. Thus, what the FTC could not do directly, it did do indirectly.

So the assurances of Government become as sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal—made so by a Supreme Court decision. Its word is certainly not reliable. The people's faith in the integrity of Government is once more shaken.

As another old saying has it, the law is what the Supreme Court says it is. It is not necessarily what the Congress intended nor what the words of the law itself indicated. Nor is it what the President or the executive agencies assure the people it is.

PROPOSED NEW FOREIGN TRADE POLICY

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, when President Kennedy delivered his message to Congress on his proposed new foreign trade policy, he said:

> At rare moments in the life of this Nation an opportunity comes along to fashion out of confusion of current events a clear and bold action to show the world what it is we stand for.

Certainly, I take no issue with the President's laudable observation, but it remains to be seen whether in the new foreign trade policy we will actually take "bold action to show the world what it is we stand for." I submit that what these United States and the vast majority of the people believe are bound to deal with the economy of Communist nations in a firm competitive manner. To assist a Communist economy regardless of what small return it may provide to certain American interests will not improve our stand as the bastion of freemen in today's distraught world.

For this reason I believe it is the responsibility of Congress in renewing the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act to place embargoes upon Communist nations. To do anything less is contrary to our moral standards so essential to winning the cold war.

The Constitution of the United States specifically prescribes that Congress shall establish duties and tariffs on imports. If, however, the majority of the Members of Congress are willing to transfer their constitutional responsibility to the executive branch of Government, it seems to me that the least that we can do is to provide limitations which we feel are in the best interest of this Nation and the people we represent.

In the shrunken world in which we live, it is no longer feasible to wrap our economy in prohibitive tariffs. To believe we could do this in the face of the world situation is ostrichlike. But neither can we go completely in the other direction in establishing trade policies which are going to sap the strength of American labor and industry simply to provide a transfusion of it to our foreign friends. Our first responsibility as representatives of the collective people of this Nation is to preserve our own economic strength through consideration of jobs and industrial revenues.

The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, which will expire on June 30 of this year, demands a new policy and the establishment of that policy is properly the responsibility of the Congress as constitutionally prescribed.

Any legislation reported, it would seem to me, should not be considered under a gag rule. We all know that the pitched battle over American trade policy in the future is going to demand expanded trade subsidies of one kind or another. Can we afford to subsidize any part of the cost of American goods exported to Communist nations whether they are part of the Soviet bloc or not? Communism at any level represents a challenge to freemen and free nations. It must be so recognized at every level and wherever it exists in the world.

It is a rather sad state of affairs when Members of Congress elected by the people to represent their interest in Government are refused the identity of American firms shipping materials and commodities to Communist governments, including the Russian-Sino bloc and its satellites. The cloaking in secrecy of such information by the Department of Commerce is untenable.

Does it not seem entirely obvious to any Member of this House that when a Communist country buys any material or commodities from the United States it does so because it is strategically needed and in many cases cannot be secured from any other source. Certainly winning the cold war is admittedly as economic, if not more so, than diplomatic and military. To assume any lesser position in evaluating our trade policy with Communist nations would indeed be foolish.

Ironically, a young Yugoslavian refugee, Anthony Hosticka, who escaped from Titoland by climbing through the mountains into Austria in an ice storm, made this statement upon his arrival at O'Hare Field in my district:

> The people of Yugoslavia laugh when the United States gives money to Tito, for everyone knows he takes his share first so he can live high and travel widely. When the people in Yugoslavia learned that the Americans were sending jets, the Communists made more fun of Americans because they know how their system works—they drain you of everything they can and then they use it against you. This is what will happen to the United States.

Incidentally, this young man escaped during the Communist May Day celebration, which he attended after leaving a road construction gang where he earned an equivalent of $32.50 a month in a country where a suit of clothes costs twice that sum.

For the information of the House I submit the following figures showing the number of export licenses issued in 1961 by the U.S. Department of Commerce covering shipments of materials and commodities to Communist countries: Soviet Union, 647; Rumania, 252; Czechoslovakia, 438; Poland, 140; Hungary, 304; and Yugoslavia, 551.

EXTENSION OF AIRCRAFT LOAN GUARANTEE ACT

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with a request made to you by the Civil Aeronautics Board, in a letter dated February 6, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I have today introduced a bill providing for a 5-year extension of the act of September 7, 1957, authorizing the Government guarantees of private loans to certain air carriers to purchase aircraft.

It will be recalled that this legislation was enacted in 1957 to help the local service airlines and certain other air carriers to buy modern equipment.

In requesting that this legislation be introduced, the Civil Aeronautics Board submitted the following statement:

> The act of September 7, 1957, authorizes Government guarantee of private loans to certain air carriers for purchase of aircraft. By the terms of the act this authority expires 5 years from the date of enactment.
>
> The act authorizes the Board to guarantee loans made to local service and certain other air carriers for the purchase of aircraft to improve their service and efficiency, with the purpose of enabling these carriers to borrow the necessary funds on reasonable terms. Experience with the act has amply demonstrated that lenders, in order to obtain a guarantee, are generally willing to give more favorable terms than they would without a guarantee. A significant portion of the equipment modernization by eligible carriers, achieved during the life of the act, has been financed by guaranteed loans. As of December 31, 1961, a total of $30,349,503 had been borrowed on such loans, with $23,379,152 still outstanding at that date. These funds have been used to purchase (1) 33 twin-turbine engine F-27 aircraft; (2) 12 twin-engine (piston-type) Convair 340/440 aircraft, which can be converted to turbine power; (3) 3 twin-engine (piston-type) Martin 404 aircraft; (4) 5 single-engine (piston-type) Vertol 44-B helicopters; and (5) 1 twin-turbine engine helicopter. Applications have been approved for one jet aircraft and three additional twin turbine helicopters, the delivery of which will take place in the near future. Applications are now pending for the guarantee of loans for the purchase of eight twin-turbine helicopters, four CV-240's, and two DC-6's.
>
> Although much use has been made of the act, not all of the eligible carriers have reequipped, and, in many cases, these carriers must acquire modern equipment if in the long run their subsidy needs are to be reduced. In the coming years it is anticipated that suitable new equipment will be offered for sale by manufacturers, and that many of the trunk carriers will be disposing of excellent equipment at reasonable prices. The development of air transportation would be delayed if the smaller carriers could not obtain loan guarantees when they cannot otherwise borrow funds to purchase this more efficient equipment on reasonable terms.
>
> It thus appears that there will be need for loan guarantees during the foreseeable future; accordingly, the draft legislation in effect provides that the authority contained in section 3 of the act is extended for another 5 years from the present expiration date of September 7, 1962.

GENERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. **FRELINGHUYSEN**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. **FRELINGHUYSEN**. Mr. Speaker, two items have just appeared on the news ticker which I believe deserve to be called promptly to the attention of the House. First of all, it is reported that the National Education Association, which has lobbied so aggressively for school-aid legislation, is about to launch what they describe as another substantial campaign for President Kennedy's general aid to education recommendations. The executive secretary of the NEA, William G. Carr, is said to believe chances are much better than even that Congress will pass Mr. Kennedy's general aid bill at this session.

Contrast this with another statement, this one just made by Francis Cardinal Spellman. In what is described as his most outspoken criticism yet, Cardinal Spellman predicts that passage of the Kennedy recommendations would mean the "eventual end" of the Catholic school system in this country.

Which one of these distinguished citizens is correct? Or are they both correct? Perhaps the bill will be passed and if this occurs perhaps the Catholic school system is doomed. It may even be that both predictions are incorrect. At any rate, these differing viewpoints indicate that the administration's bill is in deep trouble.

Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I cannot understand why the President continues to insist that Congress consider his proposal to subsidize the Nation's teachers and to help build schools. That approach, it seems apparent, is inevitably going to run into a dead end. It has many critics, as exemplified by this reiteration of Cardinal Spellman's position. Furthermore, I do not believe the American people want Washington to subsidize the teachers of their children. If such a proposal, by some unlikely circumstance, should come to a vote, I believe it would be decisively defeated.

What is needed, Mr. Speaker, is an end to this flogging of a dead horse. Unless a new approach can be developed, quite different from that advocated by the administration, I believe we shall continue simply to talk about education instead of developing a sound program of action.

AWARDS UNDER PHILIPPINE REHABILITATION ACT

Mr. **CURTIS** of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. **CURTIS** of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 8617, to appropriate $73 million in payment of balances of awards under the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of April 30, 1946, was scheduled for consideration by the House today, but I understand it will come up later.

But I desire to bring certain facts about this bill before the House now so that Members and others may have them available when the bill is reached.

This bill provides for very large payments to private individuals and there are certain facts about that which deserve attention.

I hope Members will read the minority report printed in the House report on the bill, No. 1042.

Mr. Speaker, of course, the United States must treat the Philippines fairly and generously and must live up to its promises. But the facts before us do not justify the authorization of a further appropriation of $73 million to give further compensation for private war damage suffered in the Philippines during World War II.

The facts, in brief, are that the Congress in 1946 decided to give aid for the rehabilitation of the Philippine economy, which was at a low ebb due to the war-torn condition of the country. It decided that the best way to stimulate the Philippine economy was to pay compensation to private persons who had suffered war damage. It was to be paid on condition that the money should be used to replace or repair the lost or damaged property. This would, in effect, pump money quickly into the stream of the Philippine economy.

In 1946 the Congress appropriated $400 million for this purpose, Public Law 370 of the 79th Congress. The act appears on page 17 of the committee report. At the same time the Congress appropriated an additional $120 million for compensation for war damage to public property. The act established the method of payment of compensation for private property—first, full payment of all damage under $500; and second, to use the rest of the money for pro rata payment of 75 percent of remaining damages. It set up a Philippine War Damage Commission to pass on claims of damage. The $500 claims have been paid in full. Fifty-two percent of the remaining claims have been paid, and it will require about $73 million more to pay the remaining claims up to 75 percent. The present bill provides that amount for that purpose.

It should be emphasized that the payments which have been made were gifts in aid of rehabilitation. They were not payments of legal war damage claims such as arise when our Army found it necessary to seize property and was obligated later to give compensation. Those types of claims have been handled separately from this legislation.

The proponents recognize that fact, but contend that the United States is under moral obligation to pay the balance of the claims up to the 75 percent.

The facts before us do not justify the further payment of $73 million for compensation for private damage at the present time, for the following reasons:

First. The main purpose of the 1946 act was to rehabilitate the war-torn economy of the Philippines. Quotations from the Record in support of this statement will be found below. Further payment now of these private claims which are about 15 years old is impractical and will not accomplish that purpose. The much-respected Bell mission to the Philippines of 1950 looked into this question and reached the following conclusion, which is quoted on page 29 of the House report:

> That further war damage payments to individuals would not contribute materially to economic development in the Philippines, and that continuing assistance by the United States should be for development projects in agriculture and industry related to the specific needs of the Philippine economy

rather than as additional war damage payments to individuals.

When Mr. Douglas Dillon was Acting Secretary of State, he wrote to the Speaker of the House on March 3, 1960, about a bill then pending similar to the present bill, and said:

> The executive branch believes that rebuilding, replacement, or repair of war-damaged private property in the Philippines is no longer practicable. Moreover, in view of the time which has elapsed since the original claims were approved, and since the U.S. Philippine War Damage Commission went out of existence on March 31, 1951, it is not considered practicable for the U.S. Government to assume any responsibility for the payment of the balance of approved individual private property claims.

Further payments at this time cannot accomplish the legislative purpose of rehabilitating the war-torn economy of the Philippines. It is too late for that. And while the 1946 act required that payment should be applied to replacement or repair of damaged property, that provision does not appear in the present bill, except in case of payments made outside the Philippines. The provision of the 1946 act, as appearing on page 20 of the House report, was as follows:

> (c) All of the provisions of this title shall be subject to the requirement that, to the fullest extent practicable, the Commission shall require that the lost or damaged property be rebuilt, replaced, or repaired before payments of money are actually made to claimants under this title.

The nature of the payments which would be made under the present bill give an indication that these payments would not accomplish the legislative purpose of rehabilitating the war-torn economy of the Philippines, but would in many cases result in windfalls to large private claimants. The committee report on pages 11 to 14 lists the names of the parties who will receive the additional payments if this bill is enacted, together with the amounts which they will receive. Some of them are listed as follows:

[In pesos]

Claimant:	*Amount*
The Procter & Gamble Trading Co	257,421.41
Philippine Refining Co., Inc	1,298,443.35
Heald Lumber Co	498,555.33
Singer Sewing Machine Co	288,948.14
Standard Vacuum Oil Co	488,598.88
Philippine Racing Club, Inc	186,439.30
RCA Communications, Inc	133,456.08
Manila Jockey Club, Inc	59,809.02
Army & Navy Club, Inc	75,489.08
Manila Lodge No. 761, BPOE	75,894.58

These are large amounts, and it is not surprising that there is great interest in the present bill. A table on page 7 of the committee report indicates that about one-half of the proposed $73 million appropriation will go to the payment of a few hundred large claims, while the other half will go to the payment of some 80-odd thousand of smaller claims.

Second. If the 1946 act implied any obligation to give further sums in aid of the rehabilitation of the Philippines in addition to the $400 million provided by that act, that obligation has been fully met.

The 1950 report of the Bell mission to the Philippines which is quoted above urged that any further assistance to the Philippines should be for development projects in agriculture and industry rather than as additional war damage payments to individuals. That is exactly what the United States has been doing since the 1946 act. Obligation and commitments for foreign economic aid to the Philippines from 1946 through 1960 amounted to over $1 billion, of which about three-quarters were grants. This appears in the ICA report on U.S. foreign assistance, of March 31, 1961.

Third. The 1946 act did not imply any obligation to give further sums in aid of the rehabilitation of the Philippines in addition to the $400 million provided by that act.

Some persons claim that the main intent of the act was payment of claims up to 75 percent. Others claim that the main intent of the act was to set up a procedure and method of disbursing the $400 million provided by the act. They claim that the attitude of the committees of the Congress was, "We'll pump $400 million into the stream of the economy of the Philippines and then we'll see how far it goes in payment of claims up to the limits which we have set, and we will decide whether we want to provide further moneys for further war-damage payments to individuals or whether we will appropriate funds to rehabilitate the Philippines in other ways."

A reading of the record of the committee hearings and the debates in the House and Senate indicate that a majority of the members of the committees favored the second rather than the first of these views.

If the members of the committees in the House and Senate, who favorably reported the 1946 act, placed their emphasis on the need for payment to individuals up to the full 75-percent limit rather than on merely providing a measure for the disbursement of the $400 million made available, it is extraordinary that those members did not make further efforts to appropriate additional sums to pay the claimants up to the full 75 percent when it became evident that the $400 million appropriated would not support payments up to that limit. The War Damage Commission completed its work and disbursed the $400 million pro rata in less than the 5 years prescribed in the 1946 act.

During the 1960 hearings on a bill having much the same purpose as the present bill, Mr. Frank A. Waring, former Chairman of the U.S. Philippine War Damage Commission was asked whether it was the purpose and intent of the Congress in the 1946 act to provide for payment up to the full 75 percent. His answer, at page 14 of the hearings was:

> I think the wording of the act itself leaves some doubt as to that. The act did say "up to a maximum of 75 percent." But it did say, "maximum," and it did provide for the pro rata distribution of the funds authorized.
>
> I think the feeling, certainly my feeling, and I believe that of the other members of the Commission and the staff, was that our Philippine friends hoped for payment up to the 75 percent and perhaps even anticipated it.
>
> I think it fair to say that in our public utterances there was no action on our part that would have enforced such hopes.

Fourth. Payments of further compensation now for war damage which occurred 15 years ago is impractical and unsound.

Secretary of the Treasury Robert B. Anderson commented on this, with reference to the 1960 bill, in his letter of June 14, 1960, quoted on page 30 of the committee report, as follows:

> Almost 10 years have elapsed since the Philippine War Damage Commission went out of existence, and undoubtedly there will be great difficulties involved in locating claimants and determining the appropriate heirs, next of kin, or successors in interest of original award recipients who have since died or gone out of existence. The administration bill has the great advantage that it would turn over funds to the Philippine Government in full satisfaction and final settlement of all of these awards, leaving to the Philippine Government the detailed administration of the payment of the balance of awards.

Fifth. The following quotations from the 1946 record support the statement made above that the main purpose of that act was to rehabilitate the war-torn economy of the Philippines, which, it is argued, would not now be accomplished by the present bill.

Senator Tydings, of Maryland, in introducing the debate in the Senate on page 11466 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 5, 1945, said:

> The purpose of the bill, briefly, is to rehabilitate the Philippine Islands in the least costly way we can provide. We have, furthermore, provided that the money so appropriated shall be used to reconstruct the industries and the buildings which have been damaged, rather than to pay in cash, the whole philosophy being to start the wheels of industry turning again so that employment will follow in their wake.

In the 1946 hearings before the Committee on Insular Affairs, Chairman Jasper Bell, of Missouri, said:

> My view is that this is purely a bill to rehabilitate the economic situation in the Philippines. And I have consistently refused to support any of the amendments that have been proposed which look to the rehabilitation of individuals except where their rehabilitation was purely incident to the rehabilitation of the economy of the islands.

The record is replete with evidence that the intention of the Congress in 1946 was rehabilitation of the Philippine economy and that payments of compensation to individuals were a means to that end.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that these facts will receive the attention of the Members.

PUBLIC WORKS COORDINATION AND ACCELERATION

Mr. BURKE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, our Nation is just emerging from its third serious recession in less than a decade. The economic prognosticators are now optimistically telling us that the forces of boom are gaining strength, and that we can expect a significant reduction in the number of unemployed by the end of 1962. We are also told again that this year the economy will reach a new, alltime high in national product. As in the past, however, predictions of sustained, future prosperity may soon be forgotten through indignation over the hardship caused by economic decline. Predictions, in addition, provide little solace for those workers and industries still bearing the adversity of the most recent recession; and even should their burdens soon be lifted, most of those currently unemployed will live with the haunting specter of another recession—one possibly more severe and longer in duration should the pattern of this decade's recessions persist.

The time is past due for the Congress to take a close look at the effectiveness and sufficiency of the tools available to fight economic declines. We must reassess our endeavors to comply with the policy directive of the Employment Act of 1946 which commits the Federal Government to use of the measures required to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power. The economic contingencies of the future should be prepared for now—in a period of growth and recovery. Involuntary unemployment, with its demoralizing effects, is both an affront to human dignity and an economic waste. To be derelict in our charge to promote an environment which provides employment opportunities for those able, willing, and seeking work would be a breach of faith on the part of the Congress and a blot on the public conscience of this country.

The duration of the recessions in the past decade has become more prolonged, their severity in terms of the rate of unemployment has become more acute, and the unemployment levels succeeding each have become progressively higher. The experience of this past decade strongly indicates that our present monetary and fiscal tools for combating recessionary downswings have not been adequate in the task of economic stabilization.

I have long felt that more discretionary stabilization tools should be made available to the President to be used to augment those currently available. With this purpose in mind, I have in recent sessions of the Congress advocated legislation providing for the acceleration of public works construction to stem the forces of recession—a program easily accomplished through Federal financial assistance in the construction of needed, worthy public works. No support for this badly needed antirecessionary program was provided by the prior administration—the serious implications of this attitude were clearly demonstrated by the extreme severity and prolonged duration of the 1960–61 recession. Had we acted quickly in the application of this kind of economic stabilizer—one generally recognized to be highly effective when put to timely use—I am confident that a national unemployment rate of better than 6 percent for 16 months could have been avoided, and the duration of this recession considerably lessened. It is our unavoidable obligation to assure that adequate measures will be available in the future to provide a greater stimulus to the economy, and alleviate the hardship and distress generated by severe unemployment.

It was with great satisfaction that I listened to the state of the Union message this year—a gratification prompted by President Kennedy's request for standby authority to accelerate public works construction during periods of economic decline. Executive acceptance of public works acceleration as a necessary implementation to existing stabilization measures, long overdue, had become a reality.

Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation providing for a standby public works acceleration program to be used—after certain economic criteria have been met—to stimulate the employment, production, and purchasing power necessary to turn economic declines and regenerate the forces of growth. We can expect recessionary dips in the future, and so it is necessary that there be a public works coordinator to prepare a shelf of planned projects, the construction which could be immediately started upon proclamation by the President of a public works acceleration program. This legislation also authorizes $2 billion to be allocated among the various levels of government to accelerate and construct projects from the shelf of those planned, mainly in grants for local public works projects. This is not a "boondoggle" or WPA kind of program, but acceleration of programs already authorized by existing operational agencies.

Such a program would not necessarily contribute to a deficit during a recession, but rather would encourage prudent use of Federal, State, and local funds in the construction of badly needed public projects, reducing the amounts of money flowing into nonproductive expenditures, such as unemployment compensation and State and county welfare and relief costs which are currently at an alltime high.

Public works acceleration is a sound, needed, and justified discretionary economic stabilizer in light of the insufficiency of our automatic stabilizers, especially during the two most recent recessions. Other nations, for example Sweden and the Netherlands, have had a great deal of success with public works acceleration in countering declines in employment. If standby authority to accelerate public works construction had been available during the last three recessions, 1953–54, 1957–58, and 1960–61, the time duration of the recessionary period could have been considerably reduced, and, more important, the postrecessionary unemployment levels could have been considerably reduced. The postrecessionary unemployment levels could have been returned to what is considered full employment—an economic state which has not been achieved since the beginning of the 1957 recession.

From the pattern which has emerged from the last three recessions, it is amply clear that we must take more forceful measures at the beginning of a recession if we are to return to full employment and production levels. The employment record in this period of recovery, particularly, is very alarming. Nine months after the low point in the 1949–50 recession, unemployment had dropped by 30.6 percent; after the 1954–55 bottom the unemployment figure had dropped 26.1 percent within 9 months; in 1958–59, by 20 percent; but the same 9-month period in 1961 produced a cut of only 7.3 percent. The progression is clear. The charge is equally as clear—more aggressive measures must be taken from now on.

The duration of unemployment and the rates of unemployment during the past four recessions also clearly corroborate my contention that the duration and severity of our economic declines are progressively worsening. Unemployment in the construction industry during recessions is particularly severe, and this is an occupation where public works acceleration would be particularly helpful in providing employment. The following table should clearly illustrate these points:

Number unemployed 15 weeks or more and rates of unemployment (selected occupations) during past 4 recessions

Recessionary periods		Number unemployed [1]	National unemployment rates [2]	
			Manufacturing	Construction
			Percent	*Percent*
(1)	1949	683,000	5.2	11.9
	1950	782,000	5.6	10.7
(2)	1953	211,000	2.5	6.1
	1954	812,000	6.1	10.5
(3)	1957	560,000	5.0	9.9
	1958	1,451,000	9.2	13.7
(4)	1960	956,000	6.2	12.2
	1961	1,532,000	7.7	14.1

[1] 15 weeks or more, annual averages.

[2] Annual averages.

Source: Department of Labor.

Another disturbing feature of our recent economic history is that recovery from each of the past several recessions took place at successively higher levels of unemployment. The upswings after each of the three past recessions were shorter and weaker. The rate at the cyclical peak in July of 1953 was 2.7 percent, in July of 1957 the peak rate was 4.2 percent, and in May of 1960 the rate at the peak had increased to 5.1 percent. The intervals between the recessionary periods has been steadily shrinking, too. After the 1949 recession, the economic upswing lasted a full 45 months. After the 1954 recession expansion continued for 35 months. The period of climb after the 1958 recession lasted only 25 months before the country started into the recession of 1960. These facts carry serious implications for the whole economy. They certainly are not a signal for the Congress to stand idly by with a wait-and-see attitude.

Mr. Speaker, the compelling merit of this legislation lies in the fact that two urgent national needs can be met through this one program. Though essentially designed as a quick and effective means of increasing employment through the acceleration of capital expenditure programs, these bills in addition will provide funds to meet longstanding public needs, now reaching alarming proportions because of prolonged neglect and expanding population.

The State and local governments have made commendable efforts to keep apace of their growing needs, but even with assistance from a variety of Federal programs they have been unable to narrow the gap between existing facilities and actual requirements. The prolonged neglect by the Federal Government has resulted in a serious accumulation of deficiencies in education, airports, urban redevelopment, community facilities, energy supply, transit systems, stream and air pollution, institutional care for dependent and aged persons, and other vital social services. The evidence is strong that the lag in the development of the public sector has also retarded progress in the private sector.

The problem facing us in the area of community facilities expansion is twofold. First, we must try to eliminate our accumulated deficiencies, and second, we must strive to expand public facilities to meet future needs of more than 200 million people. Estimates as to our requirements vary according to how complex a solution is sought and rapid a remedy is contemplated. Regardless of the calculation, need for a staggering outlay is always indicated. Alvin H. Hansen, a reputable economist in this area, estimates that we need to allocate one-fourth of gross national product, or roughly $125 billion a year to the public sector. A lower estimate made by Gen. John S. Bragdon, a special assistant to President Eisenhower, indicated that an investment of $160 billion over the next 10-year period would be required just to take care of the backlog of needs and replacement of existing facilities.

Contrast these estimates with the average nonmilitary public investment of just over $9 billion a year during the period from 1956 to 1959. Even if compared to more conservative estimates of our needs, we have fallen far short of our actual requirements. It is clear that acceleration of public works would be of great assistance in meeting our mushrooming needs in public works, as well as providing significant amounts of employment during a recessionary downswing.

The time, Mr. Speaker, has arrived when we must make stronger efforts to stabilize the economy at the inception of a recession, and to return it to full employment and production levels after the economic downswing. In my district alone the annual average insured unemployment rate in all three of our labor market areas has remained higher than 10 percent since 1958, mainly because the economy has never fully regained its momentum since the 1957-58 recession. The human and economic waste is incalculable. We must act expeditiously before the chain reaction of events returns us to the misery and acute hardship of the thirties. This possibility, I am sure all will agree, justifies making the necessary preparations to prevent its repetition. The Public Works Coordination and Acceleration Act legislation which I am introducing, I firmly believe, will prevent a return to anything as serious as the depression, and will contribute significantly in ameliorating of future recessions, as well as helping meet the heavy backlog of needed public facilities.

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC WORKS COORDINATION AND ACCELERATION ACT

1. Establishes an Office of Public Works Coordination and Acceleration:

A. This creates the necessary machinery for—

(1) Keeping the President and the Congress advised on the status of public works construction, planning, and those public works needed to meet our national, regional, and community growth and economic development.

(2) Encouraging and suggesting methods by which the public works planning policies of the various instrumentalities of the Federal Government, and the instrumentalities of State and local governments can be coordinated to insure maximum effectiveness and efficiency in public works construction.

(3) Keeping in readiness a public works acceleration plan should a public works acceleration period be proclaimed by the President.

(4) An independent office, responsible to the President, whose function would be to allocate the funds provided for under this act to the respective departments, agencies and instrumentalities of the Federal Government for use in accelerating programs under their jurisdiction in accordance with the public works acceleration plan proclaimed by the President.

2. Capital improvement acceleration periods:

A. Gives the President authority to declare the public works acceleration plan in effect after the following criteria have been met:

(1) The unemployment rate has risen in three of the four most consecutive months and increased by 0.5 percent in that period.

(2) The unemployment rate has exceeded 5 percent during four of the six most recent consecutive months for which such data is available.

B. The plan shall remain in effect until terminated by the President, or is automatically terminated after 12 months.

3. Programs authorized during acceleration periods:

A. Increased expenditures for initiation and acceleration of projects under direct Federal programs ($500 million authorized to be distributed by the Director among the departments and agencies administering such existing programs in accordance with the acceleration plan proclaimed by the President).

B. Increased expenditures for initiation and acceleration of programs under existing Federal grant-in-aid programs.

C. Authorizes grants-in-aid of up to 50 percent of the cost of construction during a capital improvement acceleration program for any project eligible for financial assistance under subsection (A), section 202 of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (community facilities program). The population restrictions on the communities eligible under this program are removed.

D. One and one-half billion dollars is authorized to be distributed by the Director among the departments and agencies administering programs under B and C (above) in accordance with the acceleration plan.

E. Limitations and restrictions:

(1) Grants are not subject to any limitation in existing programs with respect to the apportionment of funds among the States.

(2) All grants-in-aid made from allocations by the Director shall be made in accordance with all the provisions of the law authorizing such grants (excepting apportionment of funds among the States).

(3) Not more than 12½ percent of grant funds may go to one State.

(4) Priority should be given to public works projects which (1) can be commenced within 60 days, (2) meet essential public need, and (3) contribute significantly to the reduction of unemployment.

(5) Administering agencies must assure that funds provided to assist State and local governmental bodies are provided only for projects and programs which increase current net annual capital improvement expenditures.

4. Source of funds:

A. The administering agencies are authorized to obligate the moneys allocated to them by the Director. Appropriations are authorized.

5. Advances for public works planning:

A. Planning advances shall not be required to be repaid if construction of the project is begun within 2 years of the date of the completion of the plan as determined by the administrator.

B. Planning advances shall not be required to be repaid if construction of such project is begun during a period when the President has declared the capital improvement acceleration program to be in effect.

DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS AND HOUSING—REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1962

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, a lot of false fears and farfetched speculations have been generated about the President's plan to establish a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

One of these is that this would centralize local authority in Washington by creating a Federal superpower to usurp the rights of local governments, to decide and dictate how they should be run, and to reduce our cities to puppet principalities and our States to dependent colonies.

This, of course, is completely false. It could not be done. It would not be done. And no one I know of, in or out of this administration, would let it be done.

Such tales remind me of a story by the late Bob Burns about a man who refused to tell a young stranger on a train what time it was. He explained that if he did so, he would start a conversation that would lead to an acquaintance, and that the young stranger would then meet his beautiful daughter, fall in love with her, and want to marry her.

"And," said the man, "I don't want a son-in-law that can't buy his own watch."

Just as absurd, but less amusing, are these scareheads that a department to administer the existing Federal housing and urban programs would be a monster that would swallow up local and State authority.

The fact is that the Department would have the opposite effect. Let us get a few things straight.

There are certain things a reorganization plan cannot do. It cannot scrap, or amend, the Constitution. It cannot change the laws enacted by the Congress, or in any way increase the authority of the Federal Government.

The powers and authorities in housing and urban affairs under a department would be exactly the same as those now exercised by the agencies that make up the Housing and Home Finance Agency, no more, no less. Only the Congress can add to the present powers under present law, and then only within constitutional limits. This is true, whether or not these functions are administered through a department or, as at present, through a grouping of agencies.

The Congress, moreover, has been careful to limit the Federal authority in the housing and urban programs it has enacted. No program may become operative except on the request and initiative of the State, the local body, or the individual who seeks to use it. They must first ask for it. Local governments, moreover, must first obtain authority from the States to obtain Federal aid in housing or urban renewal, and the Federal Government requires full compliance with State and local laws as a condition for its assistance. Some States, indeed, and quite a number of localities have not chosen to make use of certain programs, and the Federal Government does not—and cannot—seek to force these programs upon them.

Where a State or local government does avail itself of Federal help, as most of them have, it must, of course, comply with the requirements necessary to assure that the aid will be used for the purposes set forth in the law. This relationship would be no different under a department that it is now. Such a department would have no more authority in such matters than is now held by the several agencies linked together under the HHFA.

On the other hand, placement of these housing and urban functions in a department, under the authority of a Secretary, would result in a consolidation and simplification of their administration under the policies established by the Congress.

More clearly defined responsibility and accountability would better enable the agency itself, as well as the President and the Congress, to see that these programs are administered within the proper limits of Federal authority.

State and local governments would deal on policy matters through one policy command instead of through diffused and separate lines of policy direction, such as now exist. They would be better able to maintain and develop coordinated direction and control over their own complex operations affecting community and State welfare and growth.

A department would establish a single point of responsibility and accountability for all these programs at the Federal level. It would enable the President and the Congress more readily to maintain surveillance and control over their direction and development and see that they are administered in the manner that the Congress intended.

The placement of these functions under secretarial direction at the Cabinet level would permit closer coordination with other Federal responsibilities involving local and State relations already established in existing departments.

The consolidation and simplification in the administration of these programs through a department would, in short, make them more efficient, more consistent, and better coordinated, and it would provide the means through which accountability and control of policy and the exercise of power could be clearly established for the Congress and the President.

The Congress has already laid down the basic policy governing these housing and urban programs. This policy would be as binding upon a new department as it is upon the present agencies represented in the HHFA.

That policy was enunciated in the Housing Act of 1949. It clearly states that these programs must be administered to encourage and assist private enterprise to meet as large a part of the need as it can, and, secondly, that appropriate local bodies should be encouraged and assisted to carry out programs of community assistance and renewal. It specifically states that Federal aid shall be extended only to communities that estimate their needs and demonstrate that they cannot be adequately met without such help.

President Kennedy, in his housing message and on other occasions, has cited this statement of policy in the 1949 Housing Act as furnishing the basis for his program in the housing and urban field. The Housing Administrator, Dr. Weaver, and his associated constituent heads, have not only emphasized these principles in their administration of these programs, but in their public utterances during the past year, they have urged State and local governments to assume more responsibility in carrying out these programs and place less reliance on the Federal Government.

The record is clear that the plan to place these programs under departmental direction is not a move to enhance the power of the Federal Government, but, on the contrary, to make these programs more responsive and more responsible to local and State needs and desires.

This is not a plan to centralize greater power in the Federal Government. It is a plan to centralize responsibility for the administration of the housing and urban programs that already exist. It is a method of assuring that they will be administered within the framework of the policies laid down by the Congress.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I was absent from the floor on the occasion of quorum call No. 7 and rollcall No. 8. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 8 on the bill H.R. 8900.

AWARDS RECENTLY RECEIVED BY THE PERSONNEL OF THE PAWTUCKET, R.I., POST OFFICE, FEBRUARY 6, 1962

Mr. ST. GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST. GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I am more than pleased to call the attention of the House to the fact that two important awards have recently been received by the personnel of the Pawtucket, R.I., Post Office.

The drivers of the post office have received the National Safety Council's first-place safety award in the Government truck division for fleets of comparable size throughout the country. These drivers covered about 250,000 miles with only one accident, or at a rate of 0.4 accident per 100,000 miles. This splendid record was compiled in the fiscal year July 1, 1960, to last June 30. It is particularly interesting to note that this is the first time that any post office in the country has received this particular award.

Also, the Pawtucket, R.I., Post Office has received a certificate of commendation for its fire protection program during the past year, awarded by the National Fire Protection Association covering the United States and Canada. This recognition was received for a posted evacuation plan and instructions as to each employee's duties in case of fire.

Sincere congratulations are due to Acting Postmaster John D. McCarthy, Mr. Willard V. Horan, who is in charge of safety for this post office, the drivers, and the entire force of the Pawtucket, R.I., Post Office. Theirs is a truly outstanding achievement for which they deserve a great deal of credit.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means have until midnight February 15, 1962, to file the report, along with minority or supplemental views, on the bill H.R. 10050.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

THE TRADE AGREEMENTS PROGRAM

The **SPEAKER.** Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, a great deal has been made of the support extended by the AFL–CIO to the so-called reciprocal trade agreements program.

Let me say that this support, although expressed in a resolution passed at the last biennial convention of the AFL–CIO held in December 1961 in Bal Harbour or Miami Beach, Fla., was not unqualified. Indeed the need for safeguards and remedies was clearly stated and recognized.

I think it will help to bring this matter into better perspective to read into the RECORD excerpts that express the view of a number of the national unions on further tariff reductions, low-wage import competition, and the retraining and relocation of workers.

Please note the replies of President George Meany and Mr. George Harrison, chairman of the resolutions committee, as they explained the meaning of the resolution.

The excerpts from the third day of the proceedings follow:

EXCERPTS FROM AFL–CIO DEBATE ON FOREIGN TRADE RELATIONS, DECEMBER 11, 1962, BIENNIAL CONVENTION AT MIAMI BEACH, FLA.

(Proceedings, pp. 51–67, third day)

Mr. E. L. Wheatley, president, International Brotherhood of Operative Potters:

"We are not anti to any foreign nation. We are anti to having the rights of Congress turned over to the State Department.

"You can talk of giving money to help distressed people and train them to come into new industries. * * * We do not think that program will get there in time to do any good in the way of offering relief for our people.

* * * * *

"But you people remember how long it takes the American labor movement to even raise the minimum rate here, and that is too long * * * to assume that the pottery workers and the other thousands and millions of workers who are being deprived of their job opportunities are going to sit and wait on the relief lines while some labor organization in these other nations brings up a decent minimum."

Mr. George Baldanzi, president, United Textile Workers:

"We are not for isolation. We believe in reciprocal trade. But our definition of reciprocity is that we will supply nations with products that they do not have, and we will buy from them products which we need and we do not have.

"We do not interpret reciprocal trade to be a concept under which we will permit low-wage areas or no-wage areas to destroy the economy of entire industries in this country, merely for the purpose of having friends.

* * * * *

"With due respect to President Kennedy, who I firmly believe has a feeling and a grasp of the problems of the world, I do not believe in the principle that we should give to any President the right as an individual to wipe out any kind of tariff or controls as an individual administrative act, because who may be President today may be one type of personality. Who may be President tomorrow or 5 years from now may be a completely different personality.

* * * * *

"When there are corporate interests * * * investing millions of dollars in the Common Market of Europe, that are establishing plants that are more modern than ours today, unless we get some safeguard against wholesale importation into this country, there is no guarantee that 5 years from now these same automated factories that are being built in many parts of the world * * * will not curtail operations in this country and dump all the cheap goods right back here in the United States."

Mr. Enoch Rust, vice president, United Glass & Ceramic Workers:

"Well, I went to Washington and I didn't have to stay long until I found that we did not have a trade program based on the law as written, the reciprocal trade program of 1934 and amended several times thereafter.

* * * * *

"Why are we excited? There was enough window glass imported in 1959 and 1960 to furnish over 4 million 6-room dwellings. * * * In that period of time (1959 and 1960) over a million automobiles were imported into this country carrying 30 million square feet of glass and carrying 5 million rubber tires replacing thousands of rubber workers, thousands of glassworkers, thousands of textile workers and thousands of automobile workers.

* * * * *

"We were told by Khrushchev that he was going to bury us economically. What did we do to help him do it? We gave him a spade to dig the hole with and to throw the dirt in our face."

Mr. George Burdon, president, United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum & Plastic Workers:

"In the rubber industry we are experiencing a serious challenge from the growing imports of rubber footwear. * * * Imports totaled 50 million pairs in 1959 and doubled to 100 million pairs in 1960.

* * * * *

"We have an average of $2.50 an hour versus an average in some other countries of 23 cents an hour. We cannot compete with that kind of competition."

Mr. George Fecteau, president, United Shoe Workers of America:

"In 1949 we imported 3 million pairs of shoes. * * * We exported 6 million pairs.

"Last year, 1960, we imported 30 million pairs * * * and our exports had dropped to 3 million pairs to all countries, so that the balance we have been speaking about certainly is not in favor of the shoe industry.

"Many of our companies in the shoe industry—the large companies, those who can afford to move—have moved to Japan. They have moved to Italy. They have moved to other foreign countries. Many of them have closed shoe factories here in the United States. * * * These companies are moving for profit reasons.

* * * * *

"We have estimated that unless some protection * * * comes about * * * the shoe industry here will become extinct as the dodo bird within 8 years.

* * * * *

"It is suggested that the people employed in those industries can go to other industries. As one who has been in the field and has seen factory after factory close down, and has seen the efforts of our union and these workers to place themselves in industry, I know that such talk is a lot of damned foolishness. It is not practical or just."

Mr. William Pollock, president, Textile Workers of America:

"Since 1934 we have been for reciprocal trade; but we feel as an industry and as representatives of the workers in that industry that we should not be offered up as a sacrifice on the altar of international trade.

"You know, it is all very well to be for international trade, but we represent workers * * * and they are told that in the interest of international trade we must accept the imports from other nations, and 'To protect you we will retrain you and prepare you to go into some other industry.' Well, I think this fine, it is as it should be.

"But when you get an individual that has spent 20 or 30 years learning a skill * * * only to find his job shipped to some other nation and he is to be trained to go, maybe to the electronics industry, where they are barely paying a minimum wage, it is pretty hard to convince him that this is a sacrifice he must make in the interest of world peace.

* * * * *

"I know that in 1962 when we have to elect a full Congress, if the representatives of our unions go to a Congressman in that congressional district and find that he is going to vote for a liberal trade program that will export their job to Europe, that he cannot count on their votes to send him back to Washington."

Mr. George Meany, president, AFL–CIO:

"If you read this resolution carefully, you will see that we are setting forth stipulations that we feel should go in this legislation.

* * * * *

"We call for retention of the escape clause provision in the new legislation, and then I would like to point to section 4 of the proposed resolution, that 'the new legislation should direct the President to take whatever action is necessary to mitigate problems of market disruption.'

"To all these organizations, I can say to you that when the legislation comes up * * * that our legislative department, our reseach department, our economists and everybody concerned will cooperate with these organizations and try to get in the legislative safeguard to protect them to the maximum extent that is possible.

"But we cannot * * * depart from the idea of a reciprocal trade pact with the other nations of the world."

Mr. George Harrison, chairman of the resolutions committee:

"This resolution goes further than any other trade policy resolution adopted by this federation, in the direction of protecting our industries against undue hardship because of reciprocal trade agreements.

* * * * *

"If you will look at paragraph 6 you will find that it says 'In all phases of tariff and trade policy, the U.S. Government should seek to safeguard the absolute historic levels of production of significant industries.'

"Now that means only one thing. Certainly imports shall not be permitted to the point where it causes serious injury to any of our historic industries."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I shall be pleased to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. Is it not a fact that this reciprocal trade program is one of the worst menaces to America that there is and that if we adopt proposals now being advocated we are in for some unpleasant surprises?

Mr. BAILEY. I would like to say to the gentleman from New York that my purpose here is to enlighten the Members of Congress to the serious situation that confronts us in drafting a new trade policy and insisting that we get proper safeguards for American workers.

Mr. TABER. I think the gentleman is doing a real service.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman from New York for his comments.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DENT. I have read the message that the gentleman has before him and I note there is not much difference between the position of labor today, as it is stated by the AFL–CIO at their convention, than it has been over the years. If you will read carefully, you will see Mr. Meany stated the position of labor to be that they have historically been for reciprocal trade, that they are going to insist, as they have always insisted, that safeguards be placed in the legislation or kept in the legislation that will protect the industrial capacity of this country which in turn will protect job opportunities.

I believe that all of us are for reciprocity. The fight we are trying to make is one that would put reciprocity in reciprocal trade which seems to have been forgotten by those who have been negotiating the trade agreements.

Mr. BAILEY. I may say in reply to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that I, too, am concerned, as the author of the present escape clause in the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act. I fail to see a provision for an escape clause. I find that the Tariff Commission is being stripped considerably of its powers, and I am concerned as to whether or not we will have a check.

Mr. DENT. I have carefully examined the legislation as introduced and have tried to relate it to the message of the President. I find that the President's message, in which he said that the escape clause provisions and protection would be carried on in the legislation is not carried in the body of the legislation as it is now written.

Mr. BAILEY. I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania it is essential that those who are not inclined to support the new trade policy should be united in opposition to the granting of a closed rule to bring this legislation on the floor.

Mr. DENT. I think it would be disastrous.

DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS AND HOUSING—REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1962

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Philbin). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. George P. Miller] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, let me call attention to what we are really dealing with when we consider whether the Federal Government's responsibilities toward housing and urban problems should be given an equitable role in the Government's concern for our national welfare, or whether they should continue to be relegated to a secondary and subordinate place in our national affairs.

That, in essence, is what we will determine in our action on the President's reorganization plan to establish these functions as a department of the Federal Government.

These programs involve more than just houses or urban renewal projects, which are merely the physical evidence of the living, or decaying, community. To some degree they affect the lives of all Americans, and in a very direct way they affect the lives, the opportunities, and the incomes of three-fourths of our population living in our cities and smaller towns.

The programs of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, which the President proposes to give equal status with our major concerns in the Federal Government, today are intimately related to the personal welfare and fortunes of the vast majority of our people. For three out of every four Americans, these activities can help, or hurt, them where it counts—in their homes, in their daily community life, their job opportunities, and in their pocketbooks.

Let us take a look at what I am talking about—the people that housing and urban programs are designed for.

To express it in dollars, these housing and urban programs as of now involve close to $50 billion in housing and community investment. Ninety percent of that is privately financed housing. The remainder represents repayable loans and Federal grants for housing and community improvement. And this does not include more than $4½ billion of local investment in public housing which is made possible by an annual Federal subsidy that currently runs less than $200 million a year.

Put another way, these programs involve some 7 million homes and apartments—93 percent of them privately owned and financed—which are aided by Federal financial guarantees or assistance. In addition, HHFA programs in the urban field of community improvement and facilities currently involve close to 300,000 families, three-fourths of whom are being rescued from slum and substandard housing and given decent housing to live in. These same programs encompass the renewal and improvement of urban areas which, in the aggregate, would be the equivalent of one of our medium-size cities.

These urban and housing activities reach more than 1,500 communities, ranging from some of the smallest towns to the largest cities, in every State of the Union. And they will become larger and more extensive under existing programs—irrespective of whether these programs are consolidated at the top policy level or left to function as a loosely harnessed team without strong command and direction.

It seems to be inescapable that the impact of these housing and urban activities on the lives and welfare of the vast majority of people, both today and in the future, is necessarily tremendous, and that the growth of our towns and cities will be determined to an important degree by the kind of direction and purpose that underlies all of these programs. How then can we say that the measures we are taking to restore our cities to urban health are not important enough for the attention of the President and his Cabinet advisers?

It is an elementary fact that the prosperity of a community and its ability to increase and improve its housing and community facilities are so closely related that, as a rule, when one goes up or down, the other responds in the same fashion. A lag in housing and urban improvement will be accompanied, usually, by increased unemployment—and increased construction and public activity helps to restore job opportunities. The ability of the urban family to work, to get a paycheck, to produce, and consume is affected by these programs.

Furthermore, the ability of the community to provide the services and improvement that the people and its businesses need is seriously hampered by its inability to get rid of the tax-devouring areas of blight and slums which keep local budgets more and more out of balance. One midwestern city, hard pressed to find the revenues to provide essential services to its expanding suburbs, found that the renewal of one deteriorated area in the central city would release sufficient firetrucks to serve the larger suburban growth without additional cost to the taxpayers. It would be a good thing if everyone's tax bill could show how large a proportion of his tax money has to go into lost areas and unproductive sections that no longer pay their way. The news would come as a shock to many people.

Finally, more than 6 million families, most of them homeowners, are today financially secure in their homes because of the insurance that the FHA provides behind their personal credit. An increasing number of families facing special problems—the low and moderate income and the elderly, for example—are finding good housing made possible for them because of the programs of support that the Congress has enacted and that the HHFA administers.

The businessmen of the community—both in small towns and larger cities—are among the most vigorous exponents of what urban renewal is now doing to rescue the inner city from decay and to restore business growth to the core of the city.

Millions of Americans who have left the city for the suburbs to seek uncongested, wholesome community living have found that the forces of blight, through lack of planning and control, have moved right on their heels, and brought the same growing problems to the suburbs. Here the Federal programs to assist small towns and growing metropolitan areas to plan their growth and to preserve necessary areas for public use are providing a vital answer.

These represent the people and some of the modern-day problems that have come with our tremendous urban growth in recent years, and which the Congress has agreed, through its legislation, need and require Federal support and aid in the interests of the people's welfare.

These are the things that the President is now saying are so vital, so personal, so basic to our national welfare that they should no longer be carried on in a loose-jointed fashion, remote from the top policy concern of the Federal Government. He is saying that these particular problems of more than 70 percent of our people are so imperative to them and to the country that they should be represented by a single voice instead of an echo in the President's councils.

It is hard to see how a stronger case could be made, in the people's interests, for the creation of a new Department.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. I very happily yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from California for taking this time to discuss this very important subject.

Mr. Speaker, when President Kennedy answered a press conference question on January 24 with the statement that he would—if given the authority—appoint Dr. Robert Weaver to be Secretary of the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, he stated his reasons for his choice.

The President said Dr. Weaver was chosen to head the Housing and Home Finance Agency because of his long experience. He said that Dr. Weaver had done an outstanding job as head of the Agency whose programs are being transferred to the new Department.

At a later press conference on the same question, the President pointed out that it had been well rumored that Dr. Weaver would be appointed to the Cabinet, and that in fact, it may have played some part in some decisions in regard to the matter. He went on to say, and I quote:

> Obviously, if the legislation had been passed, Mr. Weaver would have been appointed. It is well known on the Hill. The American people might as well know it.

It has been said that the announcement of a Cabinet selection before the post is created is without precedent. This is not true. One only has to go back to the last Cabinet department which was established—the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in the year 1953. And it was a Republican President who set that precedent.

The timing of the release of the information was the same as in the case before us now. It was on the same day President Eisenhower sent Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953 to the Congress that the White House let it be known that Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, then Federal Security Administrator, would be named the first Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. In its news story of March 13, 1953, concerning President Eisenhower's submission of that plan, the New York Times reported, and I quote:

> The head of the new Department would be a Secretary of Cabinet rank and the White House has indicated that Mrs. Hobby, the first Chief of the Women's Army Corps and former executive vice president and publisher of the Houston, Tex. Post, will get the position.

There was no question of this during the hearings on that reorganization plan. In speaking to Mrs. Hobby during the course of those hearings, Senator Smith of Maine said at one point, and I quote:

> As Director of the Federal Security Agency and the next Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, we are pleased to have you here.

On this point, let me read to you again from the hearings on that earlier plan. Budget Director Joseph M. Dodge was testifying. In referring to Mrs. Hobby, he said, and I quote:

> Of course the possibility of having the plan depended in a large degree on the selection of an appropriate and outstanding individual to head the agency. Thus, if you act favorably on this proposal, you can be assured the new status of the Secretary will be carried on with leadership, ability, distinction, and grace.

As President Kennedy has said, the reason for announcing his choice is to be sure that it is well understood in this case also that the Cabinet post under consideration will be held by a man whose experience and qualifications leave no doubt of his ability to do the job with distinction.

Dr. Weaver has turned in an outstanding performance as Housing and Home Finance Administrator during the past year. He has been congratulated frequently by members of congressional committees before which he was testified on the breadth and depth of his understanding of the many complex programs for which his agency is responsible.

As a fellow New Yorker, I personally attest that Dr. Weaver's experience has equipped him well for the position he would hold as a Cabinet officer. His concern with housing and urban development goes back 25 years. None can deny he is performing outstanding service in his present post.

Just before his appointment as Housing and Home Finance Administrator, Dr. Weaver—he holds a Ph.D. from Harvard University—had been serving as vice chairman of the housing and redevelopment board of the city of New York, a three-man body responsible for the direction and administration of New York's urban renewal and middle-income housing program, involving more than a quarter of a billion dollars in projects. Before that he served with distinction as administrator of the New York State Housing Rent Commission, and earlier as deputy commissioner of housing.

His Federal service dates back to 1933, and includes service with the earliest housing programs of the Government in the Housing Division of the Public Works Administration and the U.S. Housing Authority.

I congratulate President Kennedy on his selection of such an outstanding man as Cabinet Secretary of the proposed Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. If, as some say, the selection was politically motivated, I say this is political motivation of a quality we can applaud.

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. I am very happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I first would like to congratulate the gentleman on the excellent statement he has made on this very important subject, and also to commend him for taking the leadership in bringing this to the attention of the Members of the House and to the attention of the entire country.

Mr. Speaker, certainly, in my congressional district in the city of Pittsburgh we are aware of how necessary this Department of Urban Affairs and Housing will be. We have found that our problems in our city go much further than merely housing and home finance. We believe that the people of our city, like the people of cities and small towns across the Nation, should have representation at Cabinet level so that their problems can be presented at the highest level.

Yesterday morning the House Committee on Government Operations, under the able chairmanship of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON], began hearings on a matter of great importance to the over 125 million persons living in urban areas in the United States of America.

I refer to Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962 which would establish a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

I know the problems which cities and city dwellers face in the middle of the 20th century in the United States of America.

My congressional district lies in the heart of the city of Pittsburgh, which has a remarkably successful record of dealing with urban problems.

We have had problems of flood control, air pollution, urban blight, slums, water pollution, juvenile delinquency, recreation, health, traffic congestion, and mass transportation.

In short, Mr. Speaker, the problems of Pittsburgh and of other cities are far broader than housing and home finance. Yet the only Federal agency which has overall concern with the unique problems of cities and city dwellers is designated the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

The fact that the jurisdiction of this agency includes the mass transportation and open space programs demonstrates how much we are out of date and how necessary it is to have a reorganization.

Merely changing the name of HHFA would not be sufficient. The 69.9 percent of our people living in urban areas deserve representation at Cabinet meetings. If the Secretary of the Interior should raise a question about national parks, there should be a Secretary of Urban Affairs to stress, as did the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, the importance of having parks near large centers of population. If questions of health, education or welfare be raised, the unique problems of cities in these fields should be presented.

The proper development of our metropolitan areas will require consideration of problems of economics, transportation, highways, recreation, education, welfare, health, and housing. These problems transcend city, county, and even State boundaries. Action by many departments of the Federal Government may be involved. Cooperation at all levels of government is essential. Such cooperation can best be achieved by the President's proposed Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

There are those who appear to oppose Reorganization Plan No. 1 who seem to feel that housing would not receive sufficient attention from the proposed Department.

I say that nothing could be further from the truth.

President Kennedy has pointed out with respect to the proposed Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, and I quote:

> Because of its magnitude in our economy and the immediacy of its impact on our people, housing has been and will continue to be the heart of this complex of related programs. In recognition of this fact, the plan provides for the transfer of the Federal Housing Administration as an entity to the new Department. Provision is also made for the continuance of the existing office of Federal Housing Commissioner, appointed by the

President with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Commissioner would continue to head the Federal Housing Administration under the supervision and direction of the Secretary as head of the Department.

In addition to preserving the status of housing in governmental activities, a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing would reflect recognition of the range of urban activities that are related to housing. The other urban affairs functions that would be encompassed in the proposed Department are concerned with improving the environment in which housing must be located. The programs dealing with urban growth problems would facilitate homebuilding and enhance the livability of the housing for the occupants.

Federal urban planning assistance that is provided under one of the HHFA programs is vital to the development of urban areas in which housing will be located. Housing is the single greatest user of land in urban areas—and will continue to be. In order to produce marketable housing, however, our localities must plan for the provision of sewer and water and other community facilities in the areas where new housing will be located. Planning the location of commercial facilities and of industrial areas that will provide employment and economic support for housing helps create the environment in which housing can be financed and sold. It is also necessary that our urban areas begin to develop more efficient systems of transportation, which will make more land available for housing.

Public facilities and transportation necessary to service housing must also be financed. In the Housing and Home Finance Agency there are programs for loans to local governments and public agencies to help them finance community improvements and mass transit facilities. The livability of our urban areas also requires the planned provision of open space for recreational and conservation purposes and to create buffers to protect housing from air pollution. The provision of open space can help shape the growth pattern of an entire urban area. For this reason, it is essential that open space acquired by localities with financial aids of the Housing Agency should be an integral part of the comprehensive planning for housing and other land uses in an area.

Besides its concern for new housing, the urban affairs functions in the new Department would also help conserve existing residential property values and thus lend stability to all housing activities. The urban renewal program is aimed at the renewal and conservation of neighborhoods, to prevent the spread of blight and slums. In this manner we can avoid the deterioration of existing residential property values and help stabilize real estate values, a necessary prerequisite for a healthy housing market and a high level of new homebuilding.

The urban renewal program must be closely coordinated with the FHA mortgage insurance programs which help finance the rehabilitation of existing homes as well as new housing in urban renewal areas, and housing for people displaced from urban renewal areas. The urban renewal and public housing programs must also be closely coordinated since low-income families displaced from urban renewal areas have a priority in occupancy of available public housing units. This coordination, which enhances the role of housing, can best be achieved in a unified Department.

Thus, all of the functions that would be carried on in the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing are necessary to support the growth of the housing segment of our economy. They would not downgrade the role of housing. To the extent that the urban affairs activities related to housing would have greater support through representation in the President's Cabinet, it would also be helpful to housing. As the President has indicated, housing would continue to be the heart of the complex of programs administered by the new Department.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. I am very happy to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I desire also to compliment my distinguished colleague on his presentation. Through the years this Congress has responded to the changing requirements of our people. When the problems of agriculture reached the point at which Presidential and Cabinet level attention became necessary, the Congress responded and created the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, when the problems of the workingman reached the point where they required consideration at the highest levels of Government, the Congress responded and created the Department of Labor. So it has been down through the years. The phenomenon of growth of the American city and urban community is one of the most significant in the history of our country. Now some 70 percent of our people live in our exploding urban areas. The multiplicity of problems which confront them require the attention of the President of the United States and his Cabinet. The President has recognized this in sending up a reorganization bill creating a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. This plan should have the approval of the Congress.

I commend the gentleman upon his fine statement.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. I am very happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. CORMAN].

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I certainly share the views of my colleague from California, and I would like to say that so far as the 22d District of California is concerned, one of the most constructive steps taken by this administration to carefully delineate responsibility and to meet that responsibility with prudence and efficiency is the creation of a Secretary of Urban Affairs.

A look at the implication of such a move and the opportunity for substantial tax savings by people in metropolitan areas, gives a welcome promise for the future to the residents of the 22d District who find that although their local taxes continue to mount, they are faced with a number of complex problems which look many years and many millions of dollars away from solution. The same can be said for any American citizen who makes his home in a large city.

The implication is that the Federal Government has raised its concern for the complex problems facing urban dwellers to that level it accorded the farmer a century ago, a Secretary sitting in the President's Cabinet, an advocate for the proper interests of the city dweller.

Before reviewing the opportunities for tax saving, we should make some realistic observations. Any time the Government does anything at any level, it costs money—taxpayers' money. A reasonable rule to follow is that any governmental action is best done by the lowest level of government which is to be solely benefited and which has the jurisdiction and the tax base necessary to perform. Certainly this leaves a broad range of governmental activities in the hands of city councils and county boards of supervisors. The creation of a new Federal department will have no effect on these activities.

But the movement of masses of people into congested urban areas has given rise to a broad scope of yet unsolved problems. They fall generally into two categories: physical and financial. Some of the major physical problems are air pollution, water pollution, the hazard of moving large numbers of people into and out of large metropolitan areas by air, or surface transportation, the disposal of astronomical quantities of rubbish and sewage, the social problem of juvenile delinquency, the complexities of land use and regional planning. These problems are not the unique bane of any one metropolitan area, they are a day-to-day challenge to every city in the Nation. Solution to most, and perhaps all of them, will necessarily come from costly scientific and sociological research. The fruits of that research will fall, not to one, but to all. Thus, the cost should be borne by all through utilizing the Federal tax base. It is not the obligation of the Los Angeles County taxpayer to spend the millions of dollars necessary for research to eliminate air pollution—it is the obligation of all the taxpayers who will benefit from the solution of that problem.

The second category of problems is financial. A relatively minor, but important, problem facing cities is the loss of tax base because of Federal activity, normally defense activity. For instance, the Los Angeles City School District alone loses $7 million a year in school taxes because of the ownership of Federal property within that district. The problem and a solution to it are worthy of consideration by a Cabinet officer. A broader financial dilemma for cities is that they face some problems which they do not have the credit and tax base to solve alone. Two principal ones are mass rapid transit and slum abatement. Local government cannot and does not expect to ignore these problems and leave them to Washington. They can and do expect to use the Federal Government and its broad tax base, to which they contribute about 75 percent of the total income, to create the tools to solve their own problems. For instance, the Los Angeles Metropolitan Transit Authority has requested Federal guarantee of its revenue bonds so it may undertake construction of a mass rapid transit system without that system becoming an imposition on the real property taxpayers in Los Angeles. A possible solution to many of the needs of cities to raise funds may lie in a Federal insurance program similar to the Federal Housing Authority. This program, which has operated for more than a quarter of a century without cost of one Federal tax dollar, has put millions of American families in their own homes. It has avoided both the slums and tenements of two generations ago, and the massive public housing which would have been a solution inconsistent with the American free enterprise system.

All of these problems deserve eventual scrutiny by a Cabinet officer. It is within the vital interest of the Federal taxpaying, city dweller, that they be fairly resolved.

In passing, we should dispose of the hackneyed old argument that the Federal Government is "seizing power" or "globbling up home rule." The Federal Government is controlled by elected officials, just as responsive to the voters as are city councilmen, county supervisors, or State legislators. And far from gobbling up home rule Federal programs are gaged to putting into the hands of locally elected officials the tools with which to solve their own problems. It is for this reason that the U.S. Conference of Mayors and the American Municipal Association, composed of mayors and city councilmen who are most familiar with these complexities and their relation of different levels of government, have both long and vigorously supported creation of this Cabinet post. It is for this reason that the Los Angeles Board of Supervisors, a nonpartisan local government serving 7 million people, endorses the proposal.

As stated in the preamble, the first purpose of those who authored the U.S. Constitution was to form a more perfect union. If the new Secretary of Urban Affairs successfully advocates Federal programs gaged to making it safer, more economical, more convenient to move from one large metropolitan area to another, if he can be instrumental in providing these cities with clean air and water in abundance, if he can give the mayors and city councilmen tools to solve their complex social and economic problems, if he can give the city dweller the tools to own a decent home, then he will have fulfilled his obligation to that first mandate. We who support him will, to that extent, have fulfilled ours.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, in answer to some of the questions raised by my colleagues, may I point out to you that in this rapidly expanding country of ours we may expect to see a city extending from Washington to Boston in the not too distant future. This is already on the way. In the metropolitan San Francisco Bay area in California, the Department of Commerce at the request of the Army Engineers some years ago made an estimate of the population 60 years hence; that is, 2020. That seems a long way in the future, but when we remember that World War II started over 20 years ago it does not seem so far away. Twenty years is one-third of that time to target. In an area now containing 3,700,000 people it is anticipated there will be 14,400,000 people. And this is not peculiar just to that section of the country. Go into any metropolitan area; for instance, the area of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] where special joint State groups had to be set up to meet important problems because the problems of New York became the problems of New Jersey, and vice versa. The situation is repeated in many places in our country.

Certainly the time has come when the 70 percent of the people who live in the cities of this country should have representation at the highest level of our Government. I am happy to see President Kennedy recognize this problem and offer his reorganization plan to bring it about.

DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS AND HOUSING—REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1962

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the economic activities related to the functions that are presently vested in the Housing and Home Finance Agency have a strategic influence upon the course of our entire economy. This is readily illustrated by tracing the trend of housing production and general economic activity over the past 15 years.

In the development of every economic recession that we have had since World War II—1948 to 1949, 1953 to 1954, 1957 to 1958, and 1960 to 1961, a decline in homebuilding came before and contributed to a recession. To take the most recent sequence of events, between December 1959 and December 1960, there was a decline of more than 40 percent in the seasonally adjusted annual rate of private nonfarm housing starts. During the course of this decline in housing activity, in the third quarter of 1960, we encountered a general economic recession. During the first quarter of 1961, while we were still in the trough of the general economic recession, homebuilding began to rise and led the upturn in general business activity, as it had on previous similar occasions since World War II.

This effect of homebuilding upon the economy stems from the multiplied impact which homebuilding has upon income and spending. The decreases or increases in income which are directly related to ups and downs in residential construction and building materials production have a multiplier effect in the economy because they lead to decreases or increases in the demands for consumer goods. There are also related changes in demands for house furnishings and appliances when new home sales rise or fall.

Thus, housing activity significantly affects the general economy but housing activity, in turn, is affected by the changes in general monetary policies. Housing demand is heavily dependent upon the availability of funds for mortgage loans. In recent years, there has been a net increase of $12 to $15 billion a year in outstanding residential mortgage debt to finance the current levels of home construction. Since home buyers, particularly those of moderate income who finance their home purchases with Government-insured loans, cannot compete with business borrowers, they are squeezed out of the money market when the credit supply tightens and interest rates rise. Thus, the fluctuations in housing activity are influenced significantly by general monetary and economic policies and the housing viewpoint should be represented at the highest level of policy formation. This could be accomplished through a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing in the Cabinet of the President.

The Housing and Home Finance Agency also has a major impact on the economy through its urban affairs programs. These programs influence the economic growth of our urban areas in which almost three-fourths of our people reside.

Slums and blight erode the city's tax base. In order to help cities regain their financial health, the Congress has authorized a total of $4 billion in urban renewal grants. Under the urban renewal program communities are assisted in the comprehensive and planned renewal of their physically deteriorated areas so that the economic vitality of the cities can be restored. Under this program every attempt is now being made to conserve existing real property values through rehabilitation, so that valuable homes and neighborhoods can be saved. At the beginning of this year, urban renewal programs were under way in 520 localities. For these local programs, a total of $2.3 billion in grant reservations had been made to assist in carrying out 944 urban renewal projects.

The urban planning assistance program of the Housing Agency helps urban areas in planning their long-range development. With the rapid growth of our metropolitan suburbs, there have arisen great demands for capital improvements to provide public services for the increasing and widespread urban population. Hundreds of billions of dollars of local funds will be required during the next several decades for additional sewer and water facilities, streets, public buildings, new firehouses, and other public improvements. The Federal funds for planning assistance and the technical assistance which the Housing Agency and its constituents can provide for urban localities, counties, and

States will assure greater efficiency in the installation and operation of the local public improvements. Communities of moderate size that cannot obtain financing from private sources on reasonable terms for the construction of necessary public facilities can obtain public facility loans from the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

The Housing Agency was also given the responsibility under the Housing Act of 1961 to assist in the solution of the most pressing current problem in our metropolitan areas, namely, that of mass transportation. In response to this problem the HHFA has been authorized to make long-term loans to public agencies for mass transportation facilities and equipment, and to make grants for mass transportation demonstration projects to assist in carrying out urban transportation plans and research. The success of these new programs could mean tremendous savings of time and money in moving people and goods in cities.

Our cities and suburbs are bound to grow at a rapid rate in the years ahead. And with this expansion, private investors and local governments will have to invest large sums in urban improvements and housing. These outlays provide services that are essential to the American standard of living—and they also contribute to our economic growth. If these investments are to provide the greatest possible return to the communities and to the Nation, the related Federal aid programs should be coordinated with each other and with general economic policies in the most effective manner possible, through a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS AND HOUSING — REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1962

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. Sullivan] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, it is essential that the Federal Government continue to bring its resources to bear on important problems of housing and urban development. In view of the tremendous stake the Nation has in its urban areas it is clearly in the national interest and proper for it to do so, as in fact it has been doing for over 25 years under congressional mandate.

With the passage of the Housing Act of 1961, some important additional tools were added to those previously made available to State and local governments. The new grant programs for mass transportation, open space, the new mortgage insurance program for the rehabilitation of our older housing supply, and the experimental middle-income housing program will, I am sure, prove of great value to all areas of the country, but particularly to the major cities. As a member of the Housing Subcommittee which drafted these proposals, I am most anxious that they be given every opportunity to succeed.

That means that they should have the continual attention of the highest level of our Government.

Effective Federal leadership in promoting intergovernmental cooperation and in assisting local governments and States meet urban problems is dependent on Presidential interest, backing, and participation and the assignment of adequate Executive authority to implement policy. Creating a Department of Cabinet status will provide stronger leadership for, and better representation of, urban interests in administering a comprehensive and coherent national urban policy, particularly in the field of urban housing.

A department could also help the President and the Congress in their task of formulating urban policy, and could serve as a focal point for housing and urban affairs in the executive branch.

Remember, too, that a department could work closely with the States in strengthening existing programs of aid to local government and in encouraging the establishment of such new programs as seem warranted at the State level. I think we all recognize that the States constitute indispensable elements in developing the effective governmental partnership essential to the solution of our increasingly complex urban problems.

The opposition to the creation of the new Department seems to me to be based on considerations having nothing to do with the basic issue.

Mr. Speaker, some of the opponents of the proposal for establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs have professed to see in this proposal the possibility of improper and undesirable interference by the Federal Government with the strictly local political decisions of our city governments. I think the best answer to that position can be found in an official statement of policy adopted by the Board of Aldermen of the City of St. Louis which I have the honor to represent.

Mr. Speaker, I include as part of my remarks a resolution adopted by the St. Louis Board of Aldermen, as follows:

Resolution No. 59

Whereas the First Census of the United States of America compiled in 1790 revealed a national population of but 4 million while that of 1960 reflects 180 million; and

Whereas the pattern of life in our country has steadily changed from agrarian to urban so that now 70 percent of our population or about 126 million people dwell in the 1,800 cities containing 10,000 or more inhabitants; and

Whereas there long has existed in the executive branch of our Government a Department of Agriculture under the President which Department has been so successful in advising, encouraging, and assisting rural areas that problems of such areas now involve overproduction and commodity surpluses while the cities are burdened with budgetary deficits, mass transportation and school insufficiencies, inadequate housing, slum eradication, crime, stream or river pollutions, and other problems difficult of solution, if at all: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this board of aldermen favors the establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs within the Cabinet of the President of the United States for the purpose of advising and assisting urban centers in their problems; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to Senators Edward V. Long and Stuart Symington and to the honorables Frank M. Karsten, Thomas B. Curtis, and Leonor Sullivan, the latter three being the Representatives in Congress from the First, Second, and Third Congressional Districts of Missouri, respectively, which include all of the territory of the city of St. Louis, it being the hope of this board that the aforesaid congressional delegation will see fit to move that this resolution be included in an edition of the Congressional Record.

Approved February 2, 1962.

FREEWHEELING FOREIGN MISSIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Philbin). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Lindsay] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, on February 5, 1962, I wrote the Secretary of State the following letter:

February 5, 1962.

Hon. Dean Rusk,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Secretary: I note with the greatest possible concern that Attorney General Robert Kennedy has left on a world tour and, from all reports, on a foreign policy mission that will take him to sensitive parts of the world, accompanied by a staff and photographers. He will be away from the Department of Justice, it is reported, for at least a month.

I have noted also that Mr. Edward Kennedy leaves for Poland, Israel, Greece, and possibly Berlin. Both go with the imprimatur of the President's high office and his name.

This is not the first time those of us who have the responsibility of attempting to formulate a bipartisan approach to foreign policy have been led to wonder where the channels of policy lie. We question whether it is necessary for you and your office to be either burdened or embarrassed by freewheeling foreign missions on the part of highly placed amateurs who do not have the background, training, language ability, or capacity to carry on the enormous burden of diplomacy in the context of today's long struggle.

The Attorney General is untrained and without background in the business of diplomacy, and his nomination as Attorney General was not confirmed by the U.S. Senate for this purpose. Far better that the man who holds the highest legal office in the country spend time familiarizing himself with the meaning of the rule of law and how the rule of law can be advanced at home and abroad.

I think the Congress has a right to know the purpose of this tour and its genesis, including all of the facts surrounding the proposed trip to the Soviet Union, plus any plans for the future along these lines.

It has become common knowledge in Washington that some embassies of other countries, with the knowledge that the Attorney General is available for this kind of extra curricular invitation, are indulging in a kind of scramble to "get the ear" of the Attorney General under the notion that this means direct access to the President. I am sure you would agree that this can lead to all kinds of special pleading. Even worse, it can make a shambles of diplomacy which can be embarrassing to your Office and to the trained Assistant Secretaries and diplomats under your authority.

In the past the President has made mention of the dangers of personal diplomacy as a poor substitute for solid policy. But in some respects this seems to be the plain drift of the conduct of foreign policy.

I must respectfully ask that I be supplied with the answers to the questions I have raised and the additional question of whether we may expect a continuation of this kind of activity in the years to come.

With kindest personal regards.

Sincerely,

JOHN V. LINDSAY,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I think the Congress has a right to know all of the facts relating to these forays into the area of foreign relations on the part of the Attorney General. We should know, particularly, the circumstances surrounding the proposed trip to the Soviet Union, which was later canceled. Who proposed it and who canceled it? Does the Secretary of State endorse this kind of arrangement or is he a silent sufferer?

Meanwhile, Mr. Speaker, there is unfinished business in the Department of Justice. As one who spent some time in the Department in former years, I can assure you that the job requires full-time leadership. If the Attorney General wishes to educate himself on the subject of foreign policy, I would recommend that he acquaint himself with the meaning of the rule of law, a subject about which the No. 1 legal officer in the country should have some knowledge. Time spent on this and on the Department's legislative program, civil rights for example, would be time better spent than meddling in the area of foreign policy, hamburger fries in the great halls of the U.S. Department of Justice, and the other superficial publicity gimmicks to which the public has been treated.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINDSAY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I feel that the gentleman is raising a most pertinent point. I certainly hope a reply to the gentleman from the Secretary of State will be forthcoming. If the gentleman's analysis is correct, it strikes me that the Attorney General is, in effect, taking a major role in the conduct of foreign affairs and we might expect to receive a reorganization plan combining the Justice Department and the State Department since the Attorney General seems to be filling both positions. Perhaps, the Secretary of State might enlighten the gentleman from New York on that possibility.

Mr. LINDSAY. I look forward to a prompt reply from the Secretary of State, a man for whom I have the highest regard. I think it is regrettable that the Secretary of State should have to put up with this kind of meddling on the part of highly placed amateurs who have not been confirmed for the purpose of engaging in the business of other executive departments. In the sensitive area of foreign affairs, which calls for a high degree of bipartisanship on Capitol Hill, this is especially true. We are running a risk here and it is important that someone point it out.

In today's struggle, with danger confronting us, and with world tensions getting greater, it is essential that the channels of diplomacy remain clear and that we know where policy begins and where it ends; that those who through training and experience have had responsibility placed on their shoulders, be the ones chargeable for the conduct of foreign policy under the supervision of the President.

THE BERLIN CRISIS

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I was profoundly impressed by an analysis of the Berlin crisis which recently appeared in the Reporter magazine. I found it articulate, reasonable, and brilliantly written—none of which surprised me, since its author is the distinguished senior Senator from my State of New York, the Honorable JACOB K. JAVITS.

The Senator's article demonstrates his complete grasp of the issues involved and his perceptive insight into all the ramifications of the situation.

Senator JAVITS is a superb legislator, combining a vast knowledge of our domestic affairs with a statesman's approach to international problems. We in New York are singularly honored to have such a dynamic and enlighted man serving our Empire State in the U.S. Senate. All America is most fortunate to have the benefit of his wisdom, perceptiveness, and counsel in international deliberations. His devotion to the public good is boundless; his determination to exert every possible effort toward the achievement of our national and international goals is endless.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this article to my colleagues and to the American public. It is a thoughtful presentation of the problem facing us in Berlin and suggests solutions to this matter which will act in the best interests of our Nation and the free world.

The article follows:

A PROPOSAL FOR TAKING THE INITIATIVE IN BERLIN

(By Senator JACOB K. JAVITS)

Of course we must stand firm in Berlin. For it is there that the Kremlin is attempting to consolidate its iron grip on Eastern Europe and to push its influence forward into Western Europe. But it is also in Berlin that we ourselves can best demonstrate our own determination to help defend the freedom of Western Europe and to hold out the hope of freedom to the peoples of Eastern Europe. And in order to do that, standing firm may not be enough. We must also be prepared to take risks.

I do not believe that the Soviet rulers want war Memories of the destruction of whole cities and regions are still fresh in the minds of the Soviet people, and even Communist leaders must take into account the possible consequences of recklessness in the age of nuclear warfare. Yet their behavior in Berlin has come uncomfortably close to cornering us and leaving us no honorable way out. In the interests of the millions of people who live on both sides of the wall that runs through Berlin and all across the heart of Europe, we should not and we cannot refuse to negotiate. But at the same time I see no reason to rush into negotiations on Berlin and the rest of Germany unless there is some promise of an acceptable result. We cannot, in short, be bound to consider only those problems the Russian leaders would put up for negotiation. After all, they have left very little, and on their terms we would begin to negotiate right down at the rock bottom of what must be preserved at all costs. The Communists must clearly give some evidence of a greater willingness to make concessions. And for our part we must not expect Khrushchev to like our proposals any more than we have to like his on Berlin.

WHY WE ARE THERE

We must seize the diplomatic initiative from the Soviet Union. This must be done so that at the appropriate moment we can in obvious good faith propose clear and compelling terms that will command the respect of everyone—even of the people inside the Soviet Union. We have been on the defensive in Berlin for 3 years. For too long we have been reacting to each successive Communist violation of the four-power agreement covering the occupation of Berlin with nothing stronger than purely defensive actions and words of protest. While the Communists have proceeded with their concerted campaign to bludgeon Berlin into surrender—culminating last August 13 in the erection of a prison wall—we have seemed to be in constant retreat.

The wartime agreements among the four powers looked forward to the eventual unification of Germany on the basis of self-determination by free elections. They provided for the occupation status of Greater Berlin and the rights of access to the city from West Germany over the 110-mile corridor across East German territory. The Soviet leaders have never denied the lawful right of the Western Powers to deploy their own troops in Berlin; they have sought to justify their own numerous violations of the wartime agreements—such as the presence of East German troops in Berlin, the interruption of communications between West Germany and West Berlin and between East and West Berlin, and now the wall that physically divides the city—on the ground that changes which have occurred since the agreements were signed have rendered them invalid. In other words, the changes the Communists themselves have made have been used as the justification for further changes—on the ground that the situation has changed.

Well, if conditions have changed, as the Communists say they have, the goals of the occupation have not. Indeed, the allied occupation of Berlin is more necessary than ever today if Germany is not to become once more the cause of a world war.

The NATO allies clearly have right on their side in Berlin, and fortunately the Russians cannot ignore their might. The mission of Western troops in Berlin is to carry out the allied commitments on the joint administration of the whole city, east and west alike, until such time as the unification of Germany is finally accomplished. This is still our stand, and the fact that the Communists have done everything they could to perpetuate the division of Germany in no way gives them a right to claim that reunification is a dead issue.

There most certainly are some facts to be faced about the situation in Berlin. But they are not the facts the Soviet Union wants us to accept. As I see it, the Western Allies must insist emphatically on three fundamental principles in any negotiations over the Berlin question:

1. West Berlin is part of the West, and its freedom cannot under any circumstances be traded away.

2. We cannot recognize the validity of any steps taken or attempted by the Soviet Union to alter the original four-power agreement on Berlin, including above all our right of access both to and within Greater Berlin.

3. We must seek peaceful means by which the security of Europe may be guaranteed. In such negotiations it may be desirable to have representatives of both the German Federal Republic and the East German regime present, as they were at the Geneva talks of 1959. But the presence of East German representatives must not be taken as a recognition on our part of the Ulbricht regime. For it must be clearly understood that as one of the principal guarantees of the security of Europe we shall continue to work for the eventual reunification of Germany on the basis of self-determination through free elections. In short, we are working for an integrated Europe of which a reunified Germany can be a peace-maintaining element.

Only if the three Western Powers are firmly united on these basic principles can the willingness of the Soviet Union to conduct meaningful negotiations be tested. The Western Powers must, as they have already made clear, be prepared to use force to maintain these principles if force is used against them. Our own willingness to try to reach a reasonable solution was abundantly demonstrated in 1958 when the Soviet Union demanded drastic changes in the status of Berlin as a climax to a decade of agitation. Extensive negotiations were carried on among the Four Powers for many months and resulted in the convening of a Foreign Ministers Conference at Geneva in the spring of 1959. A number of earnest proposals were put forward there by Secretary of State Christian Herter, but as we now know they came to nothing. The lessons of those dark days have not been forgotten. Now it is up to the Kremlin to demonstrate its own desire for serious negotiation.

We cannot forget, however, that for some time the reunification of Germany along the lines laid down at Potsdam has been the last thing the Soviet Union wants. The counterproposals for a free city in Berlin would have the effect of perpetuating the division of Germany. Indeed, the Russians seem to want not merely two Germanys but three. Chairman Khrushchev has now repeated these demands and demonstrated how far he is determined to go in putting this policy into effect by cutting off communications between West and East Berlin.

Chairman Khrushchev has sought to justify this drastic action by invoking in Europe the terrible memories of the holocaust wrought by Germany under Hitler. I, too, believe it is vital for all of us to remember vividly the horrors of aggressive German militarism. That consideration must inevitably influence our own German policy. But Chairman Khrushchev must not be allowed to provide a reborn German militarism with a new chauvinistic cause, and the permanent division of Germany would do just that.

Of course, Chairman Khrushchev would be glad to reunify Germany in a flash—but as a Communist satellite all of whose resources he would then be able to employ to force communism's way further into Europe. But even if we should be tricked or frightened into letting Khrushchev have all of Germany, this course would lead sooner or later to the imminence of war. It would present a greater danger to the security of Europe than anything since the Ribbentrop-Molotov pact of 1939. This is the basic reason why it is our policy on Germany, not Chairman Khrushchev's, that is the policy of peace, based, as it is, on full knowledge of history. As President Kennedy said in his interview with Khrushchev's son-in-law, Aleksei Adzhubei, the editor of Izvestia, our policy would prevent Germany from taking any unilateral acts of aggression, since it would irrevocably consolidate the position of Germany as an integral part of Western Europe as a whole, dependent on European unity for its own security. It is the Kremlin's policy that would make for a repetition of the fatal errors that preceded the Second World War.

A STEP FORWARD

There is no reason for us to ask for new legal rights in Berlin. In fact, our basic demand is that the old rights be respected, and we certainly must insist on the restoration of communication between the eastern and western parts of the city. We should, however, move forward—legally and fully within the spirit of the occupation agreements—to implement our insistence on the reunification of Germany.

I am therefore also making the following proposal for consideration and study as a step to be taken toward the ultimate reunification of Germany while negotiations with the Soviet Union are being prepared: Without abandoning any of their rights and agreements as occupation powers, the United States, France, and the United Kingdom could concur in the incorporation of West Berlin into the Federal Republic of Germany. This could be done legally and with the full consent of the people of West Berlin.

Under the Bonn constitution, as well as the Berlin constitution, the entire city was declared to be a "Land," or state, of West Germany. Reservations made by the allied military governors on May 4, 1949, and reaffirmed in 1955, when West Germany joined NATO, restricted German sovereignty so as not to compromise the special status of the city. But now that that status has been drastically undermined by the Communists, West Berlin cannot be left dangling as a kind of third Germany. The city's loose and informal association with West Germany is indeed something that can be considered a fact, one that is far more genuine and meaningful than the East German regime. And as long as West Berlin remains isolated and exposed, more than a hundred miles from the nearest friendly territory, Western troops must be there to protect the city's freedom. The size of these troop units may make the allied military presence in Berlin seem merely symbolic. Yet it is an armed symbol, and the determination with which is it maintained can provide a very effective guarantee of security to the nations of the West and of hope to the peoples of the East. And as long as the Russians refuse to live up to their agreements on the reunification of Germany, they must be required to respect our rights of access to Berlin.

Accordingly, the restrictions placed on West German sovereignty in Berlin could now be formally withdrawn. Berlin, though still occupied by allied military forces, could formally pass into the governmental jurisdiction of the Federal German Republic, and the West Berlin representatives in the Bundestag and Bundecrat, who now sit as nonvoting members, could be given full legal status. This would be a logical sequel to the use of a common currency, close economic ties, and many laws in common between West Berlin and the Federal German Republic.

It would not be necessary to amend the basic law of West Germany or the Berlin constitution. Incorporation could be accomplished by holding a plebiscite to determine the will of the people and by a joint declaration of the United States, France, and the United Kingdom. By thus legally integrating West Berlin into the German Federal Republic, close ties could be maintained between the city and West Germany while at the same time our guarantees not to let West Berlin fall to the Communists would be preserved.

So long as this step is regarded as a basic move in the fulfillment of the allied obligation to reunify Germany, the Soviet Union could not object on valid legal grounds. And yet the Russians would be confronted with an accomplished fact that would certainly have to be taken into account in any negotiations over the future of Berlin. Heretofore, it has been the Russians who have presented us with accomplished facts—the main difference being that they have effected changes by illegal means of military force, whereas the change we would make would be based on a perfectly legal agreement between the people of West Berlin and the people of West Germany.

It has recently been reported that West Germany and West Berlin have been encouraged—perhaps by the President of the United States—to work out a new contractual basis for their relationships. It is not yet clear what all this might involve, but it would seem that the creation of new legal bonds between two sections of West Germany might add a number of new difficulties to an already difficult situation. The Russians, too, might want to have a voice in the matter. No such difficulties would be presented by the integration of West Berlin into the German Federal Republic, since the step would involve only the formal ratification of old and fully established economic, political, and spiritual bonds.

In the past our policy on Germany has been criticized as a weak one because we have apparently sought only to maintain the status quo. It has been repeatedly said that the status quo should be improved. What I am suggesting is that the status quo be improved in the interest not only of Berlin but of the West.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR PEOPLE ON THE LAND

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include therein a speech.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, at the recent Conference on Land and People in Washington on January 15, John Baker, Director of Agricultural Credit for the U.S. Department of Agriculture, addressed the Conference on "Opportunities for the People on the Land." In this excellent presentation, Mr. Baker discussed rural poverty, both farm and nonfarm, and outlined positive steps which the administration and the Department of Agriculture have taken and propose to initiate to alleviate the blight of rural poverty. I am especially glad to see the Department working cooperatively with other Federal agencies to pool their programs along area lines and to stimulate State and local interests in rural areas for more rapid economic development. I recommend Mr. Baker's speech as highly worthwhile reading and include it in the RECORD at this point:

OPPORTUNITIES FOR PEOPLE ON THE LAND

(Remarks of J. A. Baker, Director of Agricultural Credit to the Land and People Conference, Washington, D.C., January 15, 1962)

Economic development of rural America consists of many interrelated phases. It can be viewed from any one of a hundred aspects.

I shall focus attention on people. People are the starting point for and the end of institutional and resource adjustments to up-date American agriculture. The motivating force must be the legitimate aspirations and felt needs of the people who live on the land in this country—the mothers and fathers—the children and their children's children—and grandpa and grandma, too.

Efforts of rural folks to attain their aspirations must, of course, take into account their impacts on the rest of the economy and upon natural resource conservation goals. But let us not lose sight of the fact that people are why we are concerned. Someone has truly said, "A human being is an individual of infinite worth."

RURAL POPULATION

There are 54 million people living in the countryside and villages of rural America. Probably 20 million more people live in small cities which economically are an integral part of rural America. Together they are about two-fifths of the Nation's people. (A tabulation of the makeup by location, age, sex and color groups of the rural population is attached.) In rural areas alone there are 17.4 million families and 2.5 million other households. This is more than half as many households as in urban areas.

I emphasize these figures to bring out a key consideration of this conference. When we are discussing human people phases of rural area adjustments to up-date American agriculture we are not talking about just a minimal segment of the national population and one that is about to disappear. We're talking about one-third of America. I'm not sure that all of us know this and recognize its implications.

RURAL POVERTY

An even more startling fact is that over half of the poverty in America is rural poverty. The number of rural families with inadequate incomes (less than $2,500) exceeds the number in urban areas—not only percentagewise, but by actual count. There are 4.1 million inadequately low-income rural families and 3.9 million such urban families. Over 15 million rural people live under conditions of dire poverty measured by American standards. I deeply doubt that many of them prefer this poverty as a way of life. I'm sure they, just as you and I, would rather participate a little more in the affluent society.

Almost half of the 3.8 million farm families (1.7 million) have total money incomes from all sources of less than the equivalent of $208 per month, which certainly does not exceed what might be considered to be a base minimum of adequacy in modern-day America. Nearly one-fifth (2.4 million out of 13.6 million) of rural nonfarm families have similarly low incomes. Nearly two-thirds of the unrelated individuals on farms and almost half of the rural nonfarm unrelated individuals have incomes of less than $1,000 per year—less than $100 per month.

About one-tenth of the rural population is nonwhite, with the consequent unique added disparities of opportunities piled on top the usual run of disparities of rural opportunity.

To summarize, over 4 million rural families have money incomes from all sources of less than about $208 per month. A million and a quarter detached individuals in rural areas have incomes of less than $100 per month. To alleviate this rural poverty and to eradicate its causes is a high and worthy public purpose.

There are about 22 million youth in rural America under 20 years of age and over a million are born there each year. More than a fifth of them are in poverty-ridden families. Equality of opportunity for these children of rural America is a worthy national goal, an essential element, if you please, of the promise of America—equal opportunity for all. In our affluent society there is no reason why conditions should not be such that any child born in rural America should have before him the same opportunities for health, education, and avenues to advance to the limits of his personal capabilities as the best afforded in our society anywhere.

GOVERNMENT'S RESPONSE

Democratic government is responsive, not compulsive. As we discuss needed institutional and resource adjustments for promoting greater prosperity and economic growth to up-date American agriculture, let us keep that fact uppermost. The key question is, What do rural people want their Government to do? not, What Government should do to rural people."

The difference in sequence is important and often critical. It behooves us to keep it straight.

Evidence abounds that rural people want broader opportunity. It shines through the strivings for farm price and income parity. It shows up in the backlogs of loan applications piled up in every Farmers Home Administration county office, in the growing volume of applications for industrial enterprise and community facility loans and grants under the Area Redevelopment Act. It is dramatically demonstrated by the success rural people have made through their own cooperatives in the rural electrification program, in the enthusiasm for agricultural conservation cost-sharing and long-range farm soil and water conservation planning, in the multiplying number of watershed protection projects.

But these are things, let's get back to people—to the people of rural America. These people, like people everywhere, want and deserve to be able to obtain an equal economic opportunity to obtain a modern, full, and satisfying life for themselves and their children.

LOW INCOME RURAL NONFARM POPULATION

There are two segments of rural poverty: farm and nonfarm.

Almost 2½ million families and nearly 1 million detached individuals, with inadequate incomes live in rural areas but not on farms. Currently we know very little about this low income rural nonfarm group except how many there are in the various States. Perhaps we should find out more about their needs, about their living conditions and their employment opportunities. Certainly these rural nonfarm families' problems are as worthy of our attention as those of the farmworkers, operators, and those of low income and unemployed families in urban areas.

Economic Research Service, Farmers Home Administration and the Office of Rural Areas Development are currently exploring the situation and troubles of this sizable segment of the national population. What lines of action can most surely alleviate this rural nonfarm poverty and eradicate its causes? We welcome your suggestions, information or insights.

Certainly some of the troubles of this group can be corrected with broad areawide economic development. How much? What other specialized phases of activity are needed?

HIRED FARMWORKERS

Not all those who work on farms for wages are poverty stricken. But a large proportion are. Our statistics on this are not any too good. In total, we figure there are about 200,000 families, migratory and nonmigratory hired farmworkers counted in the farm population, and probably there are some 500,000 to 800,000 nonfarm rural families and detached individuals whose main or only source of income is farm wagework. Probably three-fourths of these have total annual incomes below nationally accepted standards of adequacy.

In addition to the about 400,000 imported foreign migratory workers employed each year on U.S. farms, there are somewhere in the neighborhood of 350,000 domestic migratory farmworkers who obtain their major income from farmwork.

Most farm wageworkers are employed in rich land areas of the Nation with the great bulk working on some 50,000 factory-type agricultural production units. In 1959, less than 2 percent of all commerical farm operators had wage bills larger than $10,000.

In many cases, wages are low. Often working conditions are less than fully adequate. The plight of the families of underemployed migratory workers is of deep concern to the Nation as a whole.

The resource and institutional adjustments needed to eliminate the causes for low income of migratory workers must of necessity take place in rich land rural areas of otherwise high family and per person income—not in the rural areas most likely to be designated for attention under the Area Redevelopment Act.

This is indeed a delicate, yet pertinent problem. I don't have the answers. The Secretary of Agriculture is working in close cooperation with the Secretary of Labor and other Federal officials, through the President's Commission on Migratory Labor, to see if we can find some answers. Your continued advice and counsel in this area as in others is most welcomed.

POVERTY ON FARMS

Another large segment of rural poverty is composed of some 1,350,000 part- and full-time farm operator families.

It is always a shock to me, personally, to realize that almost half of what the Census Bureau classifies as farm operating families falls into the inadequate income category. As a matter of fact, on only 780,000 family farms and about 50,000 industrialized factory-type agricultural production units do the operator and his family have an income from farm sources alone of more than $208 per month for an average family of 3.6 persons. Some one-and-a-half-million others are able to obtain minimum adequate income by augmenting farm income with income from off-farm sources.

LOW INCOME AGED

The heads of more than 450,000 of the inadequately low income farm operator families are 65 years of age or older. On nonfarm residences in rural areas there are upwards of 1 million more low income aged family heads and detached individuals.

Economic Research Service, Office of Rural Areas Development and Farmers Home Administration are now jointly engaged in research and exploration of the special needs, if any, of this large group of extremely low income senior citizens. Certainly our affluent Nation can afford to do whatever is proper and right for poverty-stricken retired people. We must not lose sight of the fact that this group of citizens is growing larger and that they deserve to be heard and answered. We solicit your consideration of this phase of the land and people topic and will utilize your advice and suggestions.

LOW-INCOME FAMILIES ON PART-TIME AND FULL-TIME FARMS

A great deal has been made of the fact that, increasingly, farm operator families have been supplementing their low farm incomes with earnings from nonfarm work. And indeed many have, fortunately, been able to do so. Of the families on the 885,000 farms that the Census reports as part-time, only about 200,000 had incomes from all sources of less than $208 per month.

And on part-time commercial farms as well, off-farm income has been used increasingly to supplement meager income from farm operations. We do not know at this time, with any exactness, the extent to which off-farm earnings have relieved underemployment of families on low income farms.

But we do have some indications. The ones we have, indicate there are, among farm operator families when the operator is less than 65 years of age, more than 900,000 families with inadequate incomes from all sources on the part- and full-time family farms of the Nation with farm gross incomes of less than $10,000, while some 1,400,000 families on such farms have $208 or more money income per month when farm sources are augmented by nonfarm income.

I have cited a lot of statistics and I am more than a little embarrassed to have burdened you with so many. But, if we are seriously to consider the people's phases of rural adjustments, we have to know what kind of people we are talking about; we have to know their problems.

NEXT GENERATIONS

So far, I have discussed broad measures of existing rural poverty. But, what of the future generations in the rural areas. What is their lot to be?

Rural poverty now, I think we all agree, is bad enough. We need to do, and we are doing, something to alleviate it. Still, as bad as poverty is today, it would be inexcusable if we allowed it to continue and to expand its shameful tentacles on and on from one generation to another generation. Rural poverty of tomorrow must be stopped, today.

In the next 10 years over 10 million rural youths will reach working age. They will seek desirable economic opportunities. Over 1 million of these new workers will be nonwhite. Almost 2 million will come from families with inadequate incomes.

What can and should we do as citizens, as local, State and Federal employees, as private businessmen and farmers, to make certain that these young rural workers of the next decade have something constructive, something challenging, something rewarding, to work at when they reach the working age?

Almost 6 million of these future workers from the rural areas are males, and they will make up almost one-fourth of the entire expected increase over the next 10 years in the U.S. labor force. What are we going to do to provide jobs for these youths? That's one of our problems.

And let's not forget the feminine side of the picture, either. She may have the hands that rock the cradle, but she also has the hands which, in many instances, hold the families' purse strings. There are probably some 1 million rural women who, during the next 10 years, will be looking for employment, if the opportunity is there.

Where are we going to find 7 million economic opportunities for these young people? Only 2½ million of them will be able to find jobs replacing current workers who will retire in the next 10 years.

NEEDED NEW ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITIES

To summarize, here are the categories:

1. We need some 4½ million additional economic opportunities for rural youth and women, seeking to join the labor force.

2. We need the equivalent of at least 250,000 new jobs to overcome the seasonal unemployment among domestic farm wage workers.

3. We need the equivalent of nearly a million new jobs to overcome underemployment among the working age low-income, rural, nonfarm families.

4. We need to provide appropriate needed services for 5 million rural people 65 and over, especially the 1.5 million needy aged among them.

5. We need to be concerned about the unemployed and low income among the 5 million rural males between ages 45 and 64. To what extent and in what manner can, or should we give special attention to providing new and expanded opportunities for this group? We are told that many employers cannot afford to hire new workers who are over 45 years old. How can we encourage employers to hire older workers in new occupations? If we cannot, what then? Relief is surely not the answer. We need your counsel for this over-45-under-65 group. How can we expand their opportunity horizon?

6. And we need to concern ourselves with what to do to expand economic opportunity for over 1 million inadequately low-income families on full and part-time family farms where the operator is below retirement age.

In all, if we are to come anywhere near providing full employment for everyone in rural America, these figures add up to well over 7 million needed new or improved opportunities for currently inadequately low income rural people over the next 10 years.

In addition, of course, is the continuous job we all have to provide conditions of expanding economic opportunity in a growing national economy for the million and a half farm families and 11 million rural nonfarm families who now have relatively adequate incomes.

THE JOB AHEAD

As crude and approximate as these calculations are, they certainly point up the huge job we face if we are to provide reasonably desirable opportunities on the land for people. It means we must generate approximately half again as many new or improved economic opportunities as there are now full-time jobs in rural areas.

Some have urged more rapid rural-urban migration as the major solution. Maybe it is. But, on the other hand, migration may not be the best total answer. We would like your ideas.

With the complexities and special problems of urban living, with the huge public and social costs of overcoming the problems of large scale urban population growth, and then put on top of these the implications of nuclear, chemical and biological war, there can be found no sensible reason why national policy should be directed to depopulation of rural areas.

In fact, new urgency would seem to be needed to the stream of thought popularized by Thomas Jefferson that rural America might be a good place sociologically for a sizeable share of our population to live and work.

As one Nebraska banker said, while commenting on the migration of low farm income families: "Every time we lose 10 to 12 farms from our community, we lose the people who would spend the income to sustain one average size small town business. Ten fewer farm families means 35 fewer people to buy shoes and groceries and overalls and shirts. This hurts a community."

Let's ponder the problem some and ask ourselves a few questions. Do we want this rural-urban migration to continue and add to the burdens of the already crowded cities? What shall we do, as leaders, to provide adequate opportunities for those who remain in rural areas? What do we need to do to better prepare rural youth and adults for the move to city, if they want to move? That's our problem too.

Ladies and gentlemen, we need your ideas, your wisdom, your judgment. We don't expect to solve these problems overnight, but we don't intend to ignore them either, hoping they'll go away.

We are well aware that there is a crying need for more jobs so that people may remain in the rural areas. We have noted with appreciation and interest the recent Washington Post editorials, urging this point of view.

As we well know, the Department of Agriculture has not been idle over the years in its attention to these problems. A lot has been done. But obviously not enough. Otherwise, there would not still be so much rural poverty.

We in the Department of Agriculture are currently engaged in a determined effort, of which this conference is a part, to improve, step up and sharpen our services in this regard. Secretary Freeman early directed all agencies of the Department to review their services and give top priority to this effort.

Our aim is to eradicate the blight of rural poverty from our land with this generation.

PUBLIC RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

As previous speakers have already pointed out, a more nearly adequate level of public resource management, conservation and use will directly add employment opportunities for people on the land. Even more in numbers of new jobs would result because better public resource management will set up the basis for additional industrial and commercial opportunities. I will give some specific examples later.

PUBLIC SECTOR INVESTMENT

We are giving increased attention to the decisionmaking process by which location of new Federal and State installations and of public supply contracts are determined. We would appreciate any help you can give us in how we can get a higher proportion of new contracts and new installations placed in the rural areas.

RURAL INDUSTRIALIZATION AND COMMERCIAL ENTERPRISE

Sometimes in speaking of the rural areas development program, I have said our purpose is to start a chain reaction of increased purchasing power—to start the cash registers on Main Street to ringing more often and more merrily.

We aren't promising miracles, by any means, but we do expect some miracles to happen in this program. What we aim to do is to help the local folks identify their opportunities, and to help them to take advantage of their opportunities.

We have assigned the specific job of stimulating the development of rural industrial and commercial enterprise to the Rural Electrification Administration.

It is fortunate that we have the successful rural electric experience to rely upon—that we have the experienced rural electric and telephone cooperatives and other cooperating local groups to rely upon. From nearly 30 years of operating farm programs of various kinds these 1,800 electric and telephone borrowers and thousands of other local committees and governing boards have developed a lot of know-how in building locally owned and locally controlled businesses and other enterprises.

During the past year, the Rural Electrification Administration made many important contributions to expanding industrial and commercial enterprise in rural America. The program authorized by section 5 of the REA Act has been put to work to finance with REA loans, through electric borrowers only, the purchase and installation of electrical machinery and equipment for industrial, commercial and agricultural purposes.

Through these section 5 loans new job opportunities were opened up in North Dakota, Minnesota, and Illinois. The first loan of $25,000 was to a rural electric co-op in North Dakota which in turn made a loan to a building supply firm for the purchase of electrically operated gravel-crushing machinery. This gravel operation will employ 10 people, in addition to helping other businesses in the community.

A second REA loan of $280,000 went to a Minnesota electric co-op which in turn lent $250,000 to the operator of a millwork plant to finance electrical equipment. This plant employs 160 persons, and expects to expand to where it will employ 225 persons full time. Besides this, during the winter, it uses the services of 172 farmers, to cut trees and bring them to the plant. This provides extra income for these farmers, whose farm income isn't sufficient. The electric co-op also lent

$30,000 to a company for grading and processing seed potatoes.

REA's greatest contribution to setting the foundation for expansion of rural industry and commercial enterprise in rural areas is its regular electrification and telephone loan programs. In 1961, the agency's 1,000 electric borrowers, ranging from Alaska to Puerto Rico, connected an additional 148,000 rural consumers, including an estimated 12,000 new business firms, processing plants and industries. New opportunities for countless rural people.

More than 186,000 telephone subscribers were connected, many of them receiving telephone service for the first time, and all of them receiving their first rural dial service. Automatic dial telephone service, is, of course, practically a requisite for developing new local enterprise in the country today.

REA borrowers also were serving and helping to plan vital community facilities, such as schools, hospitals, water systems, fire departments, churches, airports, libraries. These facilities not only were enhancing rural community life for residents, but increasingly, they were determining whether or not a new rural industry would build in a particular area.

Of the $259 million in electric loans approved by REA during 1961, more than $145 million was approved for generation and transmission purposes. This amount includes the largest single loan ever made by REA—for more than $60 million to finance a southern Indiana generating plant.

These REA loans, by assuring rural consumers of lower cost, more adequate and more secure power, encourage the development of new homegrown industry, since the electricity is the lifeblood of the modern factory.

REA also administers important phases of the industrial and commercial enterprise loan program under the recently enacted Area Redevelopment Act. Operating through a new established Rural Areas Development Staff, REA aims to help new and expanding rural industrial and commercial enterprises to obtain from all appropriate sources the package of credit and technical services they need to get into operation.

Direct and important contribution to the rural industrialization efforts is made by all the other agencies of the department.

Forest Service has stepped up it activities in the rural areas to provide more job opportunities. Up in Minnesota, for example, the Forest Service increased their appropriations by $843,000 in the Minnesota national forests. This money will provide from 12,500 to 15,000 more man-days of employment in that area. That may seem like a small thing, but we must realize that the gigantic pyramids of Egypt are made up of many small stones, and this program of providing employment has a way of pyramiding itself.

Down in Mississippi rural areas development activities of Forest Service have resulted in the building of a new charcoal briquetting plant, which is providing a market outlet for a number of kilns in that State. After working with the Forest Products Laboratory, the new plant was successful in obtaining nationwide outlet contracts through a big chain of supermarkets. Consequently, it is now providing employment to from 35 to 60 employees at the plant, and has indirectly created additional jobs at a number of other charcoal kilns throughout the State.

The Department's small watershed program, under Soil Conservation Service, has done and is doing much to provide new opportunities in rural America. I wish you could go down to Culpeper, Va., or Six Mile Creek watershed in Arkansas and see for yourselves. A small watershed project often acts as the catalyst to a whole rural development program. Family farm improvement, soil and water conservation, water resources control, industrial development, commercial expansion, improvement of community facilities and recreation—they all fit together, like a well-planned, well-made building.

Let me give you an example of how all the elements of area development, farmland, water resources, manpower, industry, have a way of fitting together.

A few years ago, a big plant opened in a rural southern Ohio county with a majority of small, low-production farms. Many of the farmers found work helping build the plant, and permanent work in the plant upon its completion.

This development offered an opportunity for some of the full-time farmers to buy or rent land from their neighbors, not only to make up economic units but, just as important, to maintain conservation practices on what had been idle, often neglected land.

There are many other Department programs which can help to expand rural industrial and commercial enterprise—ARS utilization research, AMS services and research, the statistical and research work of ERS and SRS.

Many services are also available outside of the Department of Agriculture, which are helping in our program of total development for all rural America. For example, where a rural applicant can meet the modest minimum criteria, Small Business Administration is in a position to make an industrial loan. These are over and above the role Area Redevelopment Administration plays in the 467 designated rural counties.

The following is a good example of how the various sources of credit can be pulled together to provide a processing plant for local products, thus providing higher income for the farmer, and employment for rural people:

Let's say a dairy-products processing plant is needed to provide a milk outlet for farmers residing in and around an Indian reservation. A plan is developed to secure the financing for the project. The Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of Interior, provides the Indian tribe with part of the funds, enough to finance the building. An REA-financed electric cooperative proposes to finance 80 percent of the electrical equipment. The local people raise part of the funds, and finally the operating company provides the working capital. That is coordination of sources of financing, so often needed for rural development. Greater industrialization has long been a dream of many rural areas. Can we bring it to pass? That is a prime question.

COMMERCIAL ENTERPRISE IN OUTDOOR RECREATION

Probably the most promising potential for building greater economic opportunities in many rural areas is in connection with expanding outdoor recreation of a growing population.

In 1960 over 93 million persons visited our national forests and recreational sites. And, it is estimated that this number exceeded 100 million last year. Now, think for a moment what it means to the economy of the area of one of these parks, if each visitor spent only $10, and I'm sure from my own experience that they spend much more than that. But, for comparison's sake let's say they spent only $10 per person. That comes out to over $1 billion spent for recreational purposes. That's quite a tidy sum in anyone's book of economies. And you can multiply that sum many times over and over again.

Each visitor probably spent extra money for clothes for his trip. There were transportation, lodging, and meal expenses. There probably was money spent on film, personal services, etc. There's hardly any way of telling how many more jobs were created by people just visiting national parks.

Besides providing additional income to people in rural areas, recreational facilities can permit the diversion of some cropland to higher beneficial public uses. There are many things we can propose to promote this type of program. For instance, there could be a Federal cost-sharing credit, and technical assistance program, which incidentally, is already working to some degree, to provide local organizations with funds for development of recreational capacity in selected watershed reservoirs.

REA, through its section 5 loan provisions recently approved a $30,000 loan to a northern Illinois electric co-op, which in turn lent the money to a ski resort, which opens the area to recreational purposes, providing direct employment for the ski resort people, and indirect employment to the people of the community.

This recreational center, started by two energetic men, was having difficulty getting off to a good start due, principally, to a lack of proper snowmaking equipment which would protect it against the variable weather conditions and insure a steady income from the operation of the ski lift and a restaurant. The short winter days will also be lengthened by outdoor lights which will make the resort a nighttime attraction, too.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES

In many rural areas, the lack of modern and improved community facilities such as water and sewerage systems, rapid convenient transportation, and cultural opportunities has been a deterrent factor not only to general community improvement but also to more rapid industrialization.

You may be interested in knowing that of the 27 projects which Agriculture has recommended to Area Redevelopment Administration, as of January 4, nearly one-half of them were related to water and/or sewage-disposal projects.

To make certain that no gap exists in Federal services required to meet the need for rural community facilities, Farmers Home Administration and the Office of Rural Areas Development are engaged in a broad exploratory survey, in cooperation with the Community Facilities Administration of Housing and Home Finance, to determine what programs other than the existing watershed and water facilities loan programs, and other Federal activities in the field, are needed. Farmers Home Administration currently makes loans to public bodies in connection with Soil Conservation Service watershed projects, makes loans to establish water systems for farmers and small towns, and carries out the Department's delegated functions with respect to the community facility loan and grant program under the Area Redevelopment Act. Housing and Home Finance Agency, through its community facilities program, can make long-term low-interest-rate loans for water, sewage disposal, and other community facilities.

Although not strictly a community facility activity in a strict sense, the rural housing loan, grant and research program of the Department should be mentioned in this regard. Better housing makes rural communities more attractive to industry, commerce and recreational development. Building houses in itself provides expanded payrolls. And the total need for improved rural housing is far from met.

FAMILY FARM DEVELOPMENT

Let us not forget that the basic source of economic prosperity in rural America and a basic bulwark of democracy in the Nation is farm production and farm income on family farms.

There is a place in America for both full and part-time family farms; the goal is to make certain that the families who live on them shall have adequate incomes and economic opportunity. We need to make certain that appropriate services are available to enable these families to develop both their non-farm and their farm employment and income opportunities so that they can operate as a family on an adequate basis. Such rough estimates as we have been able to make indicate that over the next 20 years, appropriate institutional and resource adjustments can be made in American agriculture and elsewhere in rural areas to provide ample economic opportunity and services for at least 3.5 million families on full and part-time family farm operating and retirement units.

You are familiar with the services of the Department that will help both full and part-time family farmers to make the needed institutional and resource adjustments for more rewarding farm operations. I shall not burden you with a detailed inventory.

However, I do want to say that we are working toward a closer coordination and more concentrated approach in meshing together, on a farm-by-farm basis, the educational services of Extension Service, the technical services of Soil Conservation Service, the cost-sharing conservation program of ASCS and the loan programs of Farmers Home Administration, Farm Credit Administration, rural credit unions and other elements of the farm credit system.

In this our special emphasis will be on providing effective services to enable families on inadequate units to become operators of fully adequate full- or part-time family farms. Our progress to date has been gratifying. We earnestly request your ideas for further improvement and for means to speed up the process.

Speaking of Farmers Home Administration programs, Secretary Freeman recently said: "Without such help many efficient farmers would have been forced out of agriculture, thus adding to the already serious hard-core unemployment in the Nation."

We are trying to work out effective and realistic ways in which we can make certain that full credit resources can be concentrated along with SCS technical assistance on long-range soil and water use planning and ACP cost-sharing to be made available, in a coordinated way, to each of these families who are seeking to develop an inadequate farm unit into an adequate one, either full- or part-time size.

I need not, before this audience, expand upon the value, in building adequate family farms, of the education work of the Extension Service.

The long-range soil and water use planning and implementation available from Soil Conservation Service plays a major role in family farm development. This service backed up with ACP cost-sharing and appropriate credit from Farmers Home Administration, the cooperative institutions of the Farm Credit Administration and other sources has a crucial importance to a family that is trying to develop an inadequate farm unit into an adequate family farm.

Last year, Farmers Home Administration advanced a record $490 million in loans to rural families to finance needed farm adjustments, better rural housing, development of water systems and soil conservation. This was a 46-percent increase over the amount loaned in 1960. About 183,000 rural families used credit facilities of the agency during the past year. Careful estimates indicate that the great bulk of these loans were obtained by families in the low income category who are now moving into a more nearly adequate family farm operation. The loans administered by FHA were greatly improved in potential effectiveness by Congress last year.

Farmers Home Administration is pursuing a vigorous policy of trying to meet the needs of family farmers in need of credit to meet the rising costs of farming.

FARM INCOME

Steps have already been taken by Congress and by the Executive Branch to improve farm family income through a better balance of the abundance of America's family farms and greater emphasis on natural resource conservation. Improvements in important commodity programs have added a billion or more dollars to farm family income in 1961, and prospects are that the 1961 level will at least be maintained in 1962. At the same time the cost of such programs to the Federal Government has been reduced by half a billion dollars per year. We are proud of this achievement.

Expansion and improvement of the Department's production disaster programs also have a major contribution to make to improved security of people on the land.

We need to continue to improve the Federal Crop Insurance program until it is soundly available to all farmers in all counties.

Even if we are successful with all of the efforts and programs I have so far discussed, an adequate basis for farm income can be obtained for the foreseeable future only by the adoption of workable farm income and price stabilization programs for the commodities that are produced by family farmers.

I understand the President intends to send a special message to the Congress on this subject and I will not dwell on it here.

In addition, at this point, it would be well to mention the significance of social security, old-age and survivors insurance, and similar programs and our current search for additional ways, if they are required, to meet the needs of low-income aged in rural areas.

Expansion and improvement of these programs have an important bearing on bringing a parity of prosperity to rural America.

BETTER GENERAL AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IN RURAL AREAS

The need for and justification of better schools and vocational training facilities in rural areas is so well known that I shall not discuss it in detail. The Office of Rural Areas Development in cooperation with Farmers Home Administration and Extension Service are exploring the needs and possible avenues of additional action in this field with the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare. They are also cooperating closely with these other Departments on the expansion and operation of the retraining program now in operation under the Area Redevelopment Act.

Projects for training of tractor drivers are in the works, almost ready for implementation; and projects for training workers for electrical appliance repair work are in the exploratory stage. Several retraining projects involving rural underemployed as well as urban unemployed are already in operation in West Virginia and elsewhere.

We will benefit from your advice and suggestions on these matters. Better educational and training facilities for both youth and adults are needed; we hope to expand and buttress this work.

VOCATIONAL COUNSELING AND GUIDANCE

Working in consultation with the Department of Labor, the Farmers Home Administration and Office of Rural Areas Development are studying the need for Farmers Home Administration and the employment services to close whatever gap may exist in rural areas in the existing services of youth and adult career counseling, vocational guidance and labor recruitment and placement. Again we will welcome any information, suggestions, and advice you can give us on this phase of providing more opportunities for people on the land.

AREA CONCEPT

In this discussion of Federal services and resources available for rural economic development, I am sure that the recital sounds as if this were a cafeteria operation. As you go down the line with your plate the attendant would help you to close a loan from Small Business Administration and combine it with an REA section 5 loan and a private bank loan and an ARA loan for a new industry. Further down the line you pick up a community facility, some rural housing, some outdoor recreation, and some newly developed adequate family farms.

And in a real sense the Federal services available to further rural area development is a long inventory list, each item of which we are trying to improve in effectiveness. And you could think of each separate program as being strung out down a cafeteria line.

Actually, we know the cafeteria system has not been fully effective. Therefore, the Secretary of Agriculture directed that arrangements be made to package these services on an area-by-area basis. What one individual or one business or one county might not be able to do alone, all of the people of a trade or labor market area might be able to do in a concerted and coordinated way.

Each agency of the Department, and, under the Area Redevelopment Act, each Department of the Executive Branch, have been directed and encouraged to pool and package their programs along area lines to bring maximum support to local and private efforts in rural areas for more rapid economic development.

In the Department of Agriculture we have geared our full machinery of resources to a new and concentrated program of revitalizing opportunities for people in rural America. If it is to run on all cylinders, it requires the will and the help of the local people. They turn the switch. They supply the spark and the fuel. We, in Government, provide supporting services. But the local people drive the machine that will bring new horizons of prosperity to their local communities.

The process of government alone cannot and should not shoulder all the humanitarian responsibility for the economic problems of people on the land. Citizen responsibility is called for and it can be either in the inadequate and undesirable terms of welfare and charity or it may be expressed in the businesslike and productive terms of positive development of the resources of the area.

We believe that rural people want to take the latter course. That's the aim of our rural areas development program—to backstop local initiative with all the tools available—financial and technical. Through this approach we search out and try to develop what the Kellogg Foundation calls "pockets of opportunity" in full cooperation with local leaders and existing agencies.

LOCAL INITIATIVE—ESSENTIAL INGREDIENT

The initiative and the effort for successful programs of growth and progress must come from local people working with interested State and local government officials.

We in Washington know, just as you know, that Washington cannot take the main responsibility for developing new jobs in rural America. Nobody in Washington can or should substitute for local private enterprise. The spark and the momentum—yes, and the wisdom and judgment, too—can only be supplied by the enlightened, effective, and determined efforts of rural people themselves.

We have been gratified at the response of State extension services to the request by Federal extension that they assume leadership responsibility for helping organize local initiative and efforts for area planning and development.

Right now, in just about every State, local rural areas development committees are being organized. These groups, made up of people interested in the progress of their communities, are already at work. They are planning areawide improvement and growth; finding out what resources they have, what potentials; and learning about sources of help to assist in the campaign to build prosperity at home.

And in just about every State, rural areas development committees are being formed to help the counties and areas promote such programs. The State agencies and organizations represented have a wealth of services and talents to help localities get started, and support them after their programs are underway. We have strongly urged the local folks to make their committee membership as broadly representative of all interests in the area as their meeting hall will permit. To be responsive and to be responsible, these committees must be representative—not just of an elite but all the different sorts of people and economic groups the attainment of whose legitimate aspirations are involved in rural areas development. If anyone has not been invited I hope he will elbow his way in. Rural areas development is as broad as the Nation—and its membership should reflect the entire population in each area.

Federal Government workers are not members of this committee. Instead they take part in State and local programs as members of what we call technical panels. They are ready to help when called upon.

Rural America often has unique problems in operating economic development programs. One of these may be total lack of machinery for economic planning and administration. City officials with their big staffs of hired experts have this machinery. But too often it does not exist in rural areas. Rural areas development is based on volunteer service. We expect the volunteer State, area, and county development committees to provide the planning and implementation machinery that would otherwise be missing.

Rural leaders are rededicating themselves to this task. Citizen groups, farm organizations, church groups, labor unions, business organizations, and local governments are moving ahead in area development committees composed of people of all religions, all colors, all walks of life. Only local people and their organizations and their local governments on a broadly representative basis can develop the drive that will get the job done.

We in Washington have been challenged and spurred on by the widespread enthusiasm in rural America for development. We are responding to their initiative. We are gratified by their impatience.

The speed with which rural areas designated under the Area Redevelopment Act have gotten organized and have formulated overall economic development programs and processed industrial and community facility project applications indicates they have both the will and the drive. We know that the local leaders will guide the whole block of available services, private, State, local, and Federal, toward a positive solution of the troubles of the local areas.

When the opportunities are located, specialized aid of the best type procurable will be used to seek economic and social progress. We like to think that our rural areas program is evolving a vigorous and aggressive local action program to develop the latent resources of each rural area, in creating new hope, while routing despair and the feeling that every avenue is a dead end.

In closing, let me repeat we do not believe that updating American agriculture along sensible lines will require the depopulation of rural America. On the contrary, we feel that great national purposes and goals justify and require that attractive opportunities be made available that will enable the next generation to stay in dignity and with an adequate standard of living near the birthplaces of their grandfathers, if that is what they want to do.

Our purpose is to provide all rural people, including the low income and disadvantaged, with attractive and workable alternatives so they can come and go in America with freedom and equality of opportunity without sacrificing either their dignity or their security. We hope also to eradicate in our lifetimes the causes of rural poverty so that the next generation of rural babies, regardless of race or region or economic status of their forefathers, can start life with a true realizable equality of opportunity.

Our aim is security and prosperity for people on the land in rural America. Your discussions here today and your continuing advice will help us to improve our services such that we can be of maximum effectiveness to support the drive of people in rural areas to attain their legitimate aspirations in their own way.

BILL WOULD INCREASE DUTY-FREE GOODS

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill to permit Americans traveling abroad to bring back with them duty free up to **$500** in goods instead of the temporary $100 limitation presently imposed. This plan would also provide another means of releasing unobligated counterpart funds currently retained by our embassies and consulates.

The bill would amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to eliminate the present temporary reductions in the exemption from duty of articles brought back by Americans from overseas in cases where the articles brought in were obtained with foreign currencies purchased from the United States for dollars.

Analysis J of the Budget of the United States for fiscal 1963, shows the following foreign currencies available in fiscal 1963:

Country:	*Dollar equivalent*
Burma	$11,000,000
Canada	1,000,000
France	11,000,000
Germany	22,000,000
India	403,000,000
Indonesia	31,000,000
Israel	60,000,000
Italy	16,000,000
Japan	21,000,000
Pakistan	153,000,000
Philippines	9,000,000
Poland	469,000,000
Syria	8,000,000
UAR (Egypt)	60,000,000
United Kingdom	16,000,000
Yugoslavia	70,000,000
Other countries	329,000,000
Total	2,968,000,000

The major source of these foreign currencies is our sale to these particular countries of surplus agricultural products under the provisions of Public Law 83–480, the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954. Some of these funds are obligated for other sources, for example, utilization under the Fulbright program for the financing of international educational exchange programs. This still leaves large amounts of foreign currencies in some of these countries that are effectively blocked. It is my feeling that an excellent way to convert these funds into U.S. dollars is to permit their purchase by Americans for dollars; the foreign funds thus obtained by traveling Americans would be spent in the country which they are visiting, increasing thereby the consumption by American tourists of that country's products.

The main purpose and goal of the bill, however, is to convert these foreign currencies into U.S. dollars, thus reducing the foreign claims against our gold reserves.

It is my hope that Congress will see the advantages to be gained in such a program and that hearings will be set on this bill early in the session.

STOCKPILING OF CRITICAL MATERIALS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Burke] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy is to be commended for his courageous action of last week in ordering the Government to cease stockpiling critical materials after finding that the United States had hoarded twice the quantity of its wartime needs in most of these strategic metals. The President said that "the cloak of secrecy surrounding this program may have been justified originally to conceal our shortages, but this is no longer the case and secrecy now is only an invitation to mismanagement."

PAST EFFORTS OF CONGRESSMEN KIRWAN, BOLAND, FOGARTY

Members of this House have had an opportunity to become aware of the overstockpiling of these critical materials, thanks to the leadership of our colleagues the gentleman from Ohio, Mike Kirwan, with the able assistance of the gentleman from Massachusetts, Eddie Boland, and the gentleman from Rhode Island, John Fogarty, all distinguished members of the Appropriations Committee. As a new Member of this House, I was proud to support them in August 1959 on amendments to H.R. 8609, extending authorities I and II of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, which at least assisted in giving some semblance of commonsense to the national stockpile program.

Mr. Speaker, 1 year earlier, on August 21, 1958, Congressmen Kirwan, Boland, and Fogarty were successful in their fight to kill the domestic minerals stabilization bill, by a vote of 159 yeas to 182 nays. This bill was designed to stabilize production of copper, lead, zinc, acid-grade fluorspar, and tungsten from domestic mines by providing further subsidies.

Let me read to you from a story in the Youngstown, Ohio, Vindicator, Sunday, February 4, 1962, edition, by Sam

Hanna of the Vindicator Washington bureau:

> Washington, February 3.—The excess stockpiling of unwanted minerals attacked by President Kennedy last week received its first serious punch 4 years ago from Representative Michael J. Kirwan, of Youngstown.
>
> Kirwan's vehement attack on the program in the House of Representatives in 1958 forced a sharp cutback in Government buying of tungsten, lead, zinc, and similar metals.
>
> It also blocked passage of a bill that would have cost—by this time—several additional billions in outright subsidies to U.S. mineral companies.

Mr. Speaker, the Vindicator story goes on to say:

> Kirwan's 1958 attack on the program was the first well-documented description of the way in which the stockpiling program had ceased to be a defense measure and had turned into an expensive price support system for a relatively small number of mining companies.

Another newspaper, the Springfield, Mass., Daily News, commented last Thursday, February 1, about the gentleman from Massachusetts, Congressman Boland's efforts, as follows:

> The stockpile is now loaded. All of this critical and strategic material is running out of our ears. I think we ought to stop it.

This quote might have been used yesterday by President Kennedy when he announced at his press conference that the whole national stockpiling program was to be investigated.

However, it was not said yesterday. It was said on August 19, 1959, by a hard-pressed U.S. Representative, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Edward P. Boland, who, as a member of the House of Representatives Appropriations Committee, was trying to slow down, if possible, huge appropriations being made for the program.

The gentleman from Massachusetts, Representative Boland, took to the floor of the House of Representatives to assert that the national stockpile has reached its objective and is way beyond its maximum objective as concerns practically every strategic material with the exception of asbestos. "I repeat," said the gentleman from Massachusetts, Representative Boland, more than 2 years ago, "that the stockpile totals some $8 billion and that is $4 billion in excess of the needs."

Mr. Speaker, I feel we owe a debt of gratitude to these Congressmen for their foresight in bringing this overstockpiling of critical materials to our attention a few years ago, and I include Mr. Hanna's story, which appeared in the Youngstown Vindicator, in its entirety with my remarks:

Kirwan Leads Attack on Stockpiling

(By Sam Hanna)

> Washington, February 3.—The excess stockpiling of unwanted minerals attacked by President Kennedy last week received its first serious punch 4 years ago from Representative Michael J. Kirwan, of Youngstown.
>
> Kirwan's vehement attack on the program in the House of Representatives in 1958 forced a sharp cutback in Government buying of tungsten, lead, zinc, and similar metals.
>
> It also blocked passage of a bill that would have cost—by this time—several additional billions in outright subsidies to U.S. mineral companies.
>
> President Kennedy told a news conference that some $7,700 million in strategic minerals was gathering dust in Government storage and that in most cases the supplies far exceeded any reasonable requirements in case of war.
>
> #### PROBES DUE
>
> The program was also a potential source of "unconscionable profits," Mr. Kennedy told the newsmen.
>
> Three Senators immediately announced plans to investigate the stockpile—part of which has never been displayed publicly because of a tight cloak of security around the inventory.
>
> This same security cloak for many years prevented any real public understanding of the size of the minerals stockpile—which exceeds in size the well-publicized hoard of farm surpluses the Government also owns.
>
> Kirwan's 1958 attack on the program was the first well-documented description of the way in which the stockpiling program had ceased to be a defense measure and had turned into an expensive price support system for a relatively small number of mining companies.
>
> #### TWO-PART PROGRAM
>
> Actually the stockpiling program consists of two parts. One program began in 1939. Since then, the Government has purchased about $5,800 million worth of materials, most of them purchased abroad and not obtainable in large quantities in this country. People who have studied the stockpiling system generally agree this phase of the program has been well handled.
>
> At the outbreak of the Korean conflict, however, Congress authorized another program. The Defense Production Act revolving fund, which launched a program for buying minerals produced in the United States.
>
> Kirwan, chairman of the House Interior Appropriations Subcommittee and ranking member of the Supplemental Appropriations Subcommittee, grew increasingly disturbed over the size of this second program as it continued past the Korean conflict.
>
> #### BACK-DOOR APPROVAL
>
> But there was nothing the Appropriations Committee could do about the program at that time. The domestic mineral purchases were carried out under a system that enabled Government agencies to borrow money from the U.S. Treasury without coming to Congress for annual appropriations. This is the technique usually called backdoor financing. Its most famous use is done by the Commodity Credit Corporation to buy farm surpluses.
>
> In 1956, the quiet warnings of men like Kirwan and others began to reach the ears of those in charge of the program and it became obvious the program was getting out of hand. About $7,500 million worth of purchase contracts were outstanding. So far, only $2,200 million worth of minerals have been bought under this program, but some of the contracts are still in effect.
>
> #### IKE VETOED EXTENSION
>
> In any case President Eisenhower vetoed an extension of the revolving fund program but failed to dampen the determination of the minerals area legislators who promptly pushed through a bill authorizing purchases of $91 million worth of tungsten and a few other materials over a 30-month period.
>
> This program required an appropriation for the Interior Department. Kirwan, as chairman of the subcommittee, flatly refused to offer a dime. He held out through some stormy committee sessions and in the end succeeded in stopping the program through Congress' traditional power over the purse strings.
>
> The mineral interests exerted powerful new pressures, however. In 1958 Interior Secretary Fred A. Seaton sent to Congress a bill that promptly was denounced as a Brannan plan for metals, named for the agricultural support system first advanced by Agriculture Secretary Charles F. Brannan.
>
> Under this plan, the Government would set a fixed fair-return price for each metal. Mining companies would sell their minerals in the open market for any price they chose and the Government would make up any losses.
>
> #### SAW DANGERS
>
> Kirwan analyzed the bill and saw that it would commit the Government to high expenditures which the Appropriations Committee would be powerless to prevent. After the bill passed the Senate he decided to block it—if he could—on the floor of the House.
>
> Kirwan went into the fight with a handful of supporters. He told the House what most of its veteran members already knew—that he seldom spoke on the floor "except when I think I know a little about a bill."
>
> The Youngstown Congressman then laid out before the House the figures he had been patiently collecting many months. He pointed out that the Government had already bought over 3 times its maximum requirement of fluorspar, 4 times its maximum requirement of lead, and 8½ times the maximum needs for zinc.
>
> He said the U.S. stockpile has four times as much tungsten as it will ever need and half again as much copper. The unneeded amounts cost $1,200 million alone.
>
> He noted that the bill was being justified on grounds that metal miners were being thrown out of work. He said the statistics showed some minor drops in this type of employment, but that employment in anthracite coal mines—where Kirwan had worked as a boy—had been cut almost half in 3 years—and anthracite would receive no aid under the bill.
>
> #### ATTACKED CLAIM
>
> Kirwan attacked the claim that the bill was needed because the United States was being flooded with cheap imported metals. He charged that most of the U.S. companies complaining about the imports—in order to get the bill through—owned foreign subsidiaries which were producing much of the imported ores and refined metals.
>
> In the case of copper, he said, 95 percent of all U.S. reserves were held by six companies, most of which heavily invested in foreign plants.
>
> In the case of tungsten, he said, producers were selling the metals to the Government at prices up to $63 a unit when the going price was $36 a unit.
>
> Kirwan also claimed that the estimated price tag for the program—about $650 million—would only be the start and would have to be increased as metal fair-price levels were adjusted upward.
>
> Kirwan's first attack was directed against the "rule"—in effect, he was attempting to prevent House consideration of the bill under standard House procedures. His move lost by a vote of 198 to 165.
>
> #### PRODUCES FACTS
>
> Kirwan again moved to the attack during the actual debate on the bill. He pointed out that unemployment in steel industry far exceeded the layoffs in the metals mining industry—yet the steel companies were not crying for subsidies. He produced financial statements of several large minerals companies showing they were suffering from no serious financial reverses.
>
> This time Kirwan and his supporters carried the day. They rejected the bill by a narrow 182-to-159 vote. It has not been seen since.
>
> Kirwan's move did not entirely halt all stockpiling—minor amounts have continued under the program authorizing the United

States to trade farm surpluses for metals. But the end of the wholesale purchasing was in sight.

BILL WOULD PROTECT RIGHT TO VOTE IN FEDERAL ELECTIONS

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced in the House the bill which the distinguished majority leader of the other body, the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], introduced in the Senate on January 30. This bill is to protect the right to vote in Federal elections of those individuals who have at least a sixth-grade education.

This is legislation that has been needed for many, many years. There are a large number of American citizens, for example, who do not come from an English-speaking background and who, therefore, have been excluded from the voting booths. There are other Americans who have been excluded because of the color of their skin on the pretext that they are not literate. This bill would set an excellent standard and will, I trust, result in the enfranchisement of a large number of persons. I have been informed that if this legislation is passed 200,000 Americans of Puerto Rican descent will be eligible to vote in my own State of New York.

I cannot think of any more worthy piece of legislation presently before the Congress than this one. I hope that we will have an opportunity to act on it in the very near future.

HEALTH CARE THROUGH PENSION PROGRAMS

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important issues before this body at the present time is that of seeking out the best ways in which to provide for the health care of the people of this country, especially those of retirement age and on retirement incomes. It is the goal of all Members of this House on both sides of the aisle to attain for Americans of all ages and in all parts of the country the very best of medical care and the benefits of the rapid, the astonishingly rapid, progress that has been evidenced in the health sciences.

Progress in the health sciences is costly; indeed, progress anywhere in our society exacts its cost burdens from the members of the society which profits from it. It is important that we realize the costs which are involved and that we understand they must be borne and plan how best they may be borne.

The costs which are involved in the progress we have experienced in the health care field are particularly heavy for those in the over-65 age bracket. This is especially true for those who are in the over-65 age group at present. It has been shown that in this period of retirement age and income an individual can expect to face his heaviest health care expenses, although it must be kept in mind that at the same time the individual's other expenses will be significantly lower. For many in this age group, medical expenses are a severe strain on both the budget and accumulated assets.

The reason for the special burden on our aged at this time is that they grew old before the techniques of financing illness through health insurance had developed sufficiently to meet their needs. The longevity of Americans is a tribute to our medical system, a triumph of the health sciences. Again, this is a matter of progress and the means for paying the cost of this progress by spreading it through the society has only recently come to maturity in our health insurance system. This system is now mature, and indeed is reaching out to cover those who grew old before its unique advantages—catastrophic illness coverage, prepayment, guaranteed noncancellable policies—were available.

Even with this rapid increase in coverage and scope of health insurance, a very real problem exists in the area of financing health care for those people now in the over-65 age range. It must be realized that this problem is a temporary one. As other Americans reach the age of 65 they will have the opportunity of having and having had the benefits of the new ideas of financing health care which are embodied in the health insurance system.

It is important that we look at the problems of the aged in meeting their health care costs in this context. There is a further facet of this and it deals with the formulation of Government policy to bring about further progress in the health sciences and in the field of financing health care costs.

Several important legislative steps have been taken in this area. Let me cite among them the amendment to the Housing Act which provides FHA financing for qualified nursing home construction. This helps make available at reasonable costs the important services of nursing homes, a type of facility greatly needed and well adapted to the care of the aged. I might also cite the Federal assistance for training health care personnel. In particular, I should like to make mention of the recently passed amendment to title II of the Vocational Education Act of 1946 extending Federal aid to the training of practical nurses. There is also aid for the construction of other important health care facilities and the Kerr-Mills act, now swinging into operation in 28 of our 50 States. This last provision, the Kerr-Mills act, is especially significant because it acts to give the assistance which is needed within the context of the problem which exists—it is given in those cases where need is shown, not indigence but a threat of indigence arising from the burden of this one large item, health care costs, in the budget of the aged person. Because it is a program based on need, the Kerr-Mills act as it has been and is being put into operation in the States takes into account the transitory nature of the problem and the increasing effectiveness of the health insurance system to meet the needs of our society. In addition, 10 more States have taken advantage of the liberalized provisions for care of those on public assistance which the Kerr-Mills act offers.

I have today introduced a bill which I believe will stand with these other important measures in helping our society realize its goal of providing the best in health care benefits for all Americans. It is an amendment to section 401 of the Internal Revenue Code and allows pensions operating under this section of the Code to include provision for the health needs of the beneficiaries.

The significance of this proposal is this: When the Code first allowed the deduction of amounts paid into pension funds as current business expenses to the companies establishing these pension plans, only those meeting statutory standards provided deductions. No provision was included for deducting contributions to reserves for meeting retired employees' health needs. In fact, adding this element to the pension plan took away the deduction for any part of amount set aside for these plans.

My bill would make contributions for the purpose of meeting these health costs of the retired employees under pension plans deductible when these benefits are made a subordinate part of pension plans meeting the other requirements of the Code. Because of the severe tax penalty involved, companies have consciously avoided adding this element to their benefit plans. Removing this obstacle will, I feel sure, open the way immediately to coverage of millions of employees by health benefit plans, financed either through prepaid health insurance or, in the alternative, by the accumulation of reserves within the sponsoring company and payment of health costs directly by the company.

Passage of this bill would provide another meaningful step in finding effective ways to provide for the health needs of Americans. It involves some of the most advanced techniques of health insurance, including that of prepayment allowing the individual to provide for financing his future health needs by payment, through fringe benefits, on health insurance during his working years. I should like to comment at this point that this is the only strong arguing point in favor of the King-Anderson bill, now under consideration in the Ways and Means Committee, which would place the program of health care for the aged under social security. This one feature, however, cannot serve to redeem an idea which is basically unsound. It ignores the question of need and extends its benefits in a manner which places the Federal Government in a position of control over the operations of health care. Its benefits are limited and do not extend to the catastrophic illness and its cost estimates are open to serious question. It is based upon the most regressive form of taxation in our society—a flat-rate tax levied against the first dollars of income from wages. The very wise concept of prepayment cannot redeem these flaws.

In this situation we find another example of the Federal Government impeding progress by its actions. In this case it is an unrealistic exercise of its powers of taxation. A similar example of progress in the private sector stymied by Federal Government policies exists in the field of retraining where Federal tax legislation penalizes those who seek to obtain a new skill rather than encouraging them. I urge those of my colleagues who share with me a desire to make meaningful progress in this important area of national policy to join me in support of this bill. I believe it offers one of the best opportunities we have to promote the cause of adequate health care for all Americans.

The text of the bill is set out below:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 401 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to qualified pension, profit-sharing, and stock bonus plans) is amended by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d) and by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

"(c) MEDICAL, AND SO FORTH, BENEFITS FOR RETIRED EMPLOYEES AND THEIR FAMILIES.—A pension may provide for the payment of benefits for sickness, accident, hospitalization, and medical expenses of retired employees and members of their families, if such benefits are subordinate to the retirement benefits provided by the plan."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. GRANAHAN (at the request of Mr. NIX), for the balance of the week, on account of illness.

Mrs. KEE (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today and the balance of the week, on account of illness.

Mr. PELLY, February 12 through February 19, 1962, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. CORMAN, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. DERWINSKI), for 10 minutes today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. NATCHER.

Mr. POWELL to revise and extend his remarks made in Committee of the Whole today and to include extraneous material.

Mr. PHILBIN in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CORMAN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ALFORD.

Mr. ANFUSO in two instances.

Mrs. KELLY.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2470. An act to provide for the establishment of the Lincoln Boyhood National Memorial in the State of Indiana, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 631. An act for the relief of Elwood Brunken;

S. 651. An act for the relief of Howard B. Schmutz; and

S. 1456. An act to authorize an additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 8, 1962, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1664. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed new obligational authority in the amount of $418,530,000 for various agencies and $701,847 for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year 1962. In addition, other proposals not increasing new obligational authority are made for an appropriation of $25 million to liquidate obligations incurred under previously granted contract authority and for increases in limitations amounting to $18,374,000 for various agencies and $130,000 for the District of Columbia (H. Doc. No. 333); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1665. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an amendment to the budget for the fiscal year 1963 in the amount of $2,579,000 for the Department of the Interior (H. Doc. No. 334); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1666. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an amendment to the budget for the fiscal year 1963 involving an increase in the amount of $800,000 for the Patent Office, Department of Commerce (H. Doc. No. 335); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1667. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for the establishment, ownership, operation and regulation of a commercial communications satellite system, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1668. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill "A bill to authorize certain retired personnel of the U.S. Government to accept and wear decorations, presents, and other things tendered them by certain foreign countries"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1669. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of selected activities of the Department of Licenses and Inspections, District of Columbia government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1670. A letter from the Deputy Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting the Veterans' Administration's report on its activities in the disposal of foreign excess property for the period January 1 through December 31, 1961, pursuant to Public Law 152, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1671. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, relative to making public by January 1 of each year the approved program of airport development intended to be undertaken during the fiscal year next ensuing, pursuant to Public Law 87-255; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1672. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill for the relief of Teofilo Caolle Servito"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1327. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 10113. A bill to establish an Office of Public Works Coordination and Acceleration; to authorize the preparation of a plan for acceleration of public works when necessary to avoid serious nationwide unemployment levels; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BRAY:

H.R. 10114. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that widows of war veterans who marry certain other war veterans shall be eligible for pension upon the death of their husbands without regard to the length of the marriage; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 10115. A bill to provide for the establishment, ownership, operation, and regulation of a commercial communications satellite system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 10116. A bill to require the expenditure of 75 percent of the funds expended for the conversion, alteration, and repair of naval vessels to be expended at Government shipyards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H.R. 10117. A bill to amend section 401 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that plans which provide certain medical and other benefits for retired employees and their families may be qualified pension plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 10118. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Antidumping Act, 1921, to provide for greater certainty, speed, and efficiency in the enforcement thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEVINE:

H.R. 10119. A bill to prohibit trade with Communist nations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 10120. A bill to protect civil rights through improvement in the quality of police forces; providing criminal and civil remedies for unlawful official violence; authorizing suits by the Attorney General to prevent exclusion of members of minority groups from jury service; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EVINS:

H.R. 10121. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, with respect to the hours of operation of certain broadcasting stations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 10122. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Federal Advisory Council of the Arts to assist in the growth and development of the fine arts in the Nation's Capital and elsewhere in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 10123. A bill to extend and improve the special education and rehabilitation services provided by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 10124. A bill to provide civil remedies to persons damaged by unfair commercial activities in or affecting commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10125. A bill to encourage the expansion and improvement of State programs of special education and related services for exceptional children through Federal financial participation in the cost of development and implementation of such programs and in the cost of colleges and universities in providing special courses of instruction and scholarships for persons preparing for professional participation in such programs, and for establishing research grants and special projects and by establishing and providing for consultation with a National Training and Research Council and technical advisory committees on education of exceptional children in the administration of this act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HALEY:

H.R. 10126. A bill to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act to create an Indian Claims Commission, to provide for the powers, duties, and functions thereof, and for other purposes", approved August 13, 1946; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. HANSEN:

H.R. 10127. A bill to amend sections 2 and 5 of the act entitled "An act to regulate the height, exterior design, and construction of private and semipublic buildings in the Georgetown area of the National Capital", approved September 22, 1950 (64 Stat. 903); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 10128. A bill to preserve as a part of the park system of the Nation's Capital the historic waterfront of Georgetown, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire lands therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 10129. A bill to amend the act of September 7, 1957, relating to aircraft loan guarantees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARVEY of Indiana:

H.R. 10130. A bill to establish a cropland retirement program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H.R. 10131. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I at the monthly rate of $100; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 10132. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to permit payments thereunder to be made to dependent children, within the temporary program of aid to dependent children of unemployed parents, even though such parents are required to perform services in a work relief program as a condition of such aid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 10133. A bill to make it a crime to move or travel in interstate or foreign commerce to avoid compliance with certain support orders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.R. 10134. A bill to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey certain land in Prince Georges County, Md., to the American National Red Cross; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H.R. 10135. A bill to extend and amend the conservation reserve program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 10136. A bill to amend titles 10 and 32, United States Code, to provide Federal support for defense forces established under section 109(c) of title 32; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MACGREGOR:

H.R. 10137. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to lease a portion of Twin Cities Arsenal, Minnesota, to Independent School District No. 16, Minnesota; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER:

H.R. 10138. A bill to provide for the establishment, ownership, operation and regulation of a commercial communications satellite system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 10139. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H.R. 10140. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a child may continue to receive child's insurance benefits until he attains age 21 if he is a full-time student, and to increase the amount which the widowed mother of such a child may earn without deductions from her benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 10141. A bill to protect the right to vote in Federal elections free from arbitrary discrimination by literacy tests or other means; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10142. A bill to amend paragraph 1798(c)(2) of the Tariff Act of 1930 to eliminate the present temporary reductions in the exemption from duty enjoyed by returning residents in cases where the articles involved were obtained with foreign currencies purchased from the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 10143. A bill to assist in providing necessary instruction for adults unable to read and write English or with less than a sixth grade level of education, through grants to institutions of higher learning for development of materials and methods of instruction and for training of teaching and supervisory personnel and through grants to States for pilot projects, improvement of State services, and programs of instruction; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 10144. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment in certain cases because of race, religion, color, national origin, ancestry, or age; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 10145. A bill to improve the quality of elementary and secondary education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT (by request):

H.R. 10146. A bill to amend section 3964 of title 10, United States Code, to provide for the advancement on the Army retired list of certain persons who held warrant officer grade during World War II; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.J. Res. 624. Joint resolution designating the 5-day period beginning September 10, 1962, as "Licensed Practical Nurse Week," and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.J. Res. 625. Joint resolution designating the first Sunday in June of each year as "Shut-In's Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H. Con. Res. 411. Concurrent resolution relative to condemnation of Communist oppression of the Catholic faith in Lithuania; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. Con. Res. 412. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Report No. 1282, parts 1 and 2, 87th Congress, 1st session; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Con. Res. 413. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of "Supplement to Cumulative Index to Publications of the Committee on Un-American Activities, 1955 through 1960 (84th, 85th, and 86th Congs.) " 87th Congress, 1st session; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Con. Res. 414. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of "Hearings Relating to H.R. 4700, to amend section 11 of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, as amended (The Fund for Social Analysis)," 87th Congress, 1st session; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Con. Res. 415. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the publication entitled "Cumulative Index to Publications of the Committee on Un-American Activities, 1938–1954," 84th Congress, 1st session; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Con. Res. 416. Concurrent resolution to print as a House document the publication "Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications," and to provide for the printing of additional copies; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Con. Res. 417. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Report No. 1278, parts 1 and 2, 87th Congress, 1st session; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H. Res. 540. Resolution providing for the reading of the Declaration of Independence in the House of Representatives each year in celebration of the Fourth of July; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. Res. 541. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of "Hearings Relating to Revision of H.R. 9120 and H.R. 5751 To Amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950," 87th Congress, 1st session; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 542. Resolution providing for additional copies of House Document No. 118, 86th Congress, 1st session, entitled "The House Committee on Un-American Activities, What It Is—What It Does"; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr DULSKI (by request):

H.R. 10147. A bill for the relief of Liboria Annibale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 10148. A bill for the relief of Stephen Lee (also known as Lee Fung Yew); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 10149. A bill for the relief of Mrs. An Fu Wang Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 10150. A bill for the relief of Halina Larysz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 10151. A bill for the relief of Anthony Magliulo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H.R. 10152. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to cause the vessel *Eugenie II*, owned by J. C. Strout of Milbridge, Maine, to be documented as a vessel of the United States with full coastwise privileges; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER:

H.R. 10153. A bill for the relief of Marion J. Harron; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H.R. 10154. A bill for the relief of Loreto Mario Vincenzo Angeloni, Emilia Nella Angeloni, and Enzo Angeloni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 10155. A bill for the relief of Marcelo Canlas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10156. A bill for the relief of Josephine Trumbach; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10157. A bill for the relief of Louise Dominiecki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10158. A bill for the relief of Nicole Henriette Lestienne; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 10159. A bill for the relief of Esther Lin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10160. A bill for the relief of Mrs. A. R. Lendian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 10161. A bill for the relief of Clemente C. Tiampo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Honesty Is Still Our Best Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday, while attending mass at my community church in Brooklyn, St. Joseph Patron Roman Catholic Church, I learned of an interesting incident which may prove to be a most effective method of promoting good will and better understanding between the people of our country and those of other countries.

The incident is merely a simple act of honesty, but by this act of honesty my fellow parishioner and church usher had won many friends for us in Mexico. His name is Mr. Patty Mangiaracina, whom I have known for many years and who has demonstrated honesty all his life. Briefly, the story is as follows:

Several months ago, the wife of a high Mexican official, the Honorable Hugo B. Margain, Under Secretary of Industry and Commerce, lost a bag in New York during a visit there. She was not sure whether she had lost it at the hotel, at Pennsylvania Station, or in a taxi. She wrote to the hotel management and to station officials, but the bag had not been found. In the meantime, Mr. Mangiaracina had found the bag and turned it over to the New York Police Department. Early in January, Mrs. Margain in Mexico received a letter from the New York Police Department stating that a bag had been turned in which could be hers and would she identify it. The bag was identified and subsequently returned to Mrs Margain in Mexico.

Last week Mr. Mangiaracina received a letter of thanks from the Mexican Under Secretary of Industry and Commerce in which he expresses "deepest gratitude for your wonderful sense of honesty" and also his appreciation for "all the trouble you and the police department took in order to recover the bag." Mr. Margain forwarded through the New York office of the Banco Nacional de Mexico a Mexican gold coin as a souvenir from his wife to Mrs. Mangiaracina.

Mr. Speaker, courtesies and acts of this kind are very often more meaningful and beneficial than aid programs and similar efforts. I have not only extended my personal best wishes and congratulations to Mr. Mangiaracina, but I am also writing to Police Commissioner Michael J. Murphy, of New York, to congratulate him and the fine men of his police department for a job well done. A little incident like this is worth tons of speeches.

It is of paramount importance for the good will and prestige of our country that we impress upon Americans traveling abroad how urgent it is for them to be on their best behavior. It is similarly important that we extend the best treatment and friendliness to foreigners visiting our country. This could go a long way toward strengthening the ties of the United States with those of other nations in cementing lasting friendship with them and strong support for us in our endeavors to attain security of the free world.

Speaker Sam Rayburn—Philosopher King

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, about a year ago, over a nationwide television program, I listened to the very interesting and well-considered views of our late and beloved and most esteemed Speaker, Sam Rayburn, as they were presented in response to a series of questions on the panel "Washington Conversation."

I was so deeply impressed with the views of our beloved Speaker at the time that I immediately wrote him a brief letter commenting on the excellence of his presentation and the splendid manner in which he had commented on many burning public issues.

I thought no more of the matter until about 2 weeks afterward, when our dear friend, the then Speaker, came to me on the floor of the House and thanked me very warmly for the letter I had sent him.

He said it was "one of the finest letters he had ever received," and he thought so well of it that he was arranging to have it placed in the Rayburn Library at his beautiful hometown, Bonham, Tex.

The letter had been written from New York, where by mere chance I had seen the excellent program, and I had no copy of it. Most desirous of seeing its contents, I made appropriate inquiries at the Speaker's office and have just received a copy of the letter from Bonham. It reads as follows:

HOTEL ASTOR,
New York, N.Y., Saturday.

The Honorable SAM RAYBURN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Your talk on "Washington Conversation" which I have just heard over TV was one of the finest ever. It ended too soon.

But it was replete with accurate, sound commentary on many political figures and matters, past and contemporary, and infused with noble philosophy. The country will be very deeply impressed, and I wish it could be carried into every hamlet, not only to inform and inspire, but to clarify many popular misconceptions.

It reminded me so much of Plato, his image of the democratic city, state and the philosopher king. You are indeed cast in that mold—great in ability, in experience, and in justice, rich in all those things and attributes that make for lofty service to the people. Do it again soon.

Warm and admiring congratulations.

God love and keep you.

Proudly,

PHILIP J. PHILBIN.

Mr. Speaker, as I reread the letter, I was very happy indeed to realize that I had written to our beloved and great former Speaker while he was with us some of the very things that were said of him after he had passed from the scene and left an irreplaceable void in our midst.

In this sense, I felt no inconsiderable satisfaction that I had conveyed to him in person, even if but very briefly, some of the thoughts that were in my mind and heart concerning his memorable service and everlasting inspiration.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. Patrick F. O'Dwyer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, 2 days ago in addressing this House I had occasion to comment on the fact that the San Fernando Valley in California is a community of a million people, populated and built almost entirely since the end of World War II. This rapid influx of population and growth has been a challenge to every segment of our community. Today I would like to pay my respects to one of the handful of men who has met the challenge of growth in the need for places of worship and religious education, the Right Reverend Monsignor Patrick F. O'Dwyer.

Monsignor O'Dwyer was born in County Tipperary, Ireland. A graduate of St. Patrick's College in Thurles, Ireland, he was ordained in 1924, and came to California. Shortly after the end of World War II when it became apparent that the San Fernando Valley was to undergo rapid expansion, the then Father O'Dwyer was appointed pastor of St. Elizabeth's parish. At the time, the parish covered the bulk of the heart of the San Fernando Valley. Today, this same geographic area is served by 10 pastors in 10 parishes. With the kindness and wit typical of his national origin, and with a realistic sense of the need for growth, Patrick O'Dwyer set about building a beautiful church and the attendant educational facilities. He was charter chaplain of the Knights of Columbus of West Valley, then the only Knights of Columbus council in the San Fernando Valley. In addition to serving those of his own parish, he made a substantial contribution to the community in his efforts as an original member of the Bethlehem Star Parade Committee. Originated in the late forties, this project has developed into a religious parade participated in by every Christian church in the San Fernando Valley. It is a religious pageant staged during the Christmas season, and is truly an inspiration to the million people who live in the valley, and the millions of others who share it with them on television annually. It is pleasing, though not surprising, to his thousands of friends, both those in his parish and those of us who know him as a kindly friend and a devout fellow Christian, that His Holiness Pope John XXIII, has recently elevated Patrick F. O'Dwyer to the position of domestic prelate, as announced recently by James Francis Cardinal McIntyre. It is a privilege and pleasure to join Monsignor O'Dwyer's multitude of friends in extending my sincere best wishes.

Congress and CIA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, since 1953 I have during each Congress introduced a resolution to create a Joint Congressional Committee on Intelligence Matters. All of the arguments which I have advanced in the past retain their validity.

In this morning's New York Times there was printed an editorial entitled "Congress and CIA," which read as follows:

CONGRESS AND CIA

The Central Intelligence Agency, under its new Director, John A. McCone, is opening a fresh chapter. Though without prior experience in the intelligence community, Mr. McCone is an able administrator. He has already made changes in personnel and methods which are hopeful, and others are impending.

But the Central Intelligence Agency cannot live by itself. It is not a policy-formulating agency. It must provide many of the facts upon which policy is built. Its secret operations can influence policy; and it requires, as do all executive agencies, the close supervision of Congress.

For a variety of reasons the CIA has not had that supervision in the past. The system of division of powers upon which our Constitution was founded must not be eliminated, or minimized, in the name of secrecy. And secrecy does not preclude effective congressional control.

Today the CIA is monitored by four subcommittees of the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees of House and Senate. Cuba alone would appear to offer ample evidence that these divided committees do not exercise adequate supervision. What is clearly needed, as we have said many times, is establishment of a Joint Congressional Committee on Intelligence, a "watchdog" committee similar to the one on atomic energy. Such a committee, continuously functioning, thoroughly informed, scrupulously discreet, could be the CIA's "conscience," its legislative monitor.

If war is too important in the atomic age to be left to the generals, secret intelligence is certainly too important to be left entirely to its own devices.

Mr. Speaker, over the years the Times has supported this legislation and I am, of course, delighted that they continue to do so. Early last year after a similar editorial appeared, I had occasion to write the following letter to the Times:

APRIL 26, 1961.

Mr. CHARLES MERZ,
The New York Times,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. MERZ: I read with interest the editorial in this morning's New York Times entitled "Reappraising the CIA." In it, the writer clearly creates the impression that my distinguished colleague, Senator MANSFIELD, was the sponsor and original author of the resolution which would establish a Joint Congressional Committee on Intelligence Matters. Humbly I submit the true historical background on this resolution.

Late in 1950, while serving on the committee which was responsible for the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951 (Battle Act), I came to realize the tremendous lack of knowledge, on the part of the Congress, of intelligence matters. After 2 years of periodic consultations with Members of the House of Representatives and legal counsel, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 168 in the 83d Congress (July 23, 1953). This resolution provided for the establishment of a Joint Congressional Committee on Intelligence Matters. While I endeavored to convince many other Members of the House to cosponsor my resolution, my success was limited to my colleagues, Mr. ZABLOCKI (H. Con. Res. 169, 83d Cong.) and Mr. JUDD (H. Con. Res. 170, 83d Cong.).

In 1955, Senator MANSFIELD introduced a similar resolution in the other body (S. Con. Res. 2, 84th Cong.). During the 2d session of the 84th Congress, this resolution was reported in the Senate but did not pass because of certain weaknesses in that version of my resolution.

I endeavored, along with Mr. ZABLOCKI, to have this resolution reported from the House Rules Committee in the 84th, 85th, 86th and 87th Congresses. In March of this year, I appeared before the Committee on Rules and gave testimony in support of my resolution. Members of the House Committee on Armed Services appeared in opposition and testified that a subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services was and had been reviewing CIA activities. The committee did not report my resolution but, recognizing the importance of the matter, did not table the resolution. The matter is still before the committee and considerable sentiment for favorable action has developed. A report of the proceedings before the Committee on Rules by C. P. Trussell appeared in the New York Times on March 5, 1961, at page 56.

Although I have never been a person who seeks excessive publicity, I believe that credit should be given where credit is due. I enclose herewith copies of House Concurrent Resolution 168, 83d Congress; a letter which I addressed to the Speaker of the House on January 20, 1954; Mr. Trussell's article of March 5, 1961; and a copy of Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, 84th Congress.

Sincerely yours,

——— ———.

Character Counts With the Boy Scouts of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, from February 7 through 13, the Boy Scouts of

America will celebrate their 52d anniversary. Last week I had the honor of being presented with a Scout badge by Johnny Blaine, a Cub Scout belonging to the Ryland Methodist Church Pack of Washington, D.C. I am proud to wear the Scout badge during Boy Scout Week as I know of no other organization which has done more over the years for the physical and spiritual well-being of the youth of our country than the Boy Scouts of America.

I have met and known many boys like Johnny in the Second Congressional District of Kentucky, which I have the honor to represent, and these boys, from Cubs to Explorers, deserve our wholehearted support, encouragement, and respect. From the very beginning of the scouting movement, the purpose of this organization has been to promote the ability of boys to do things for themselves and others, to train them in scoutcraft and to teach them patriotism, courage, and self-reliance, and to emphasize the need for character development, citizen responsibility, and physical fitness. It is my belief that these high ideals and purposes have been fully met, and the success of this organization can be measured not only in terms of its phenomenal growth but in the achievements of the individual boy. Scout training and adherence to the principles of the Boy Scouts of America have a profound effect on the development of our future citizens, and it is absolutely imperative that we use every resource at our command to develop men who will have the moral fiber to meet the challenges of the space age. Our Nation's strength lies in the character of its people, and the work being done by the Boy Scouts of America in preparing our youth to meet the ever-increasing demands of world leadership cannot be overestimated.

Boys from so-called less-chance areas where juvenile delinquency is high have responded enthusiastically to the scouting program. A police inspector in Philadelphia has said:

> For the first time in many years crime and delinquency in "the Jungle" show a decrease. * * * This can be directly attributed to the amount of personal and community responsibility demonstrated and practiced by the increased numbers of people and institutions working hand in hand with scouting.

Good citizens have replaced future criminals.

While the beneficial results of scouting are perhaps more dramatically illustrated in overcrowded cities, an active program of rural scouting in our farm areas of equal importance. Scouting's basic appeal is as a "school of the woods," the only national organization for boys that places its major emphasis on camping, hiking, fishing, nature study and physical fitness, and it is in our rural communities that the greatest opportunity exists to explore all the wonders of nature.

The impressive growth and accomplishments of scouting would not be possible without the services of thousands of men and women who give unstintingly of their time and effort to make this program work. The high caliber of the men who dedicate themselves to the scouting movement is noteworthy—these men are exceedingly well equipped both mentally and morally to be entrusted with the training of our youth and we owe them a debt of gratitude for the outstanding work they are doing.

Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to salute the Boy Scouts of America on their 52d anniversary, and to wish them well in all their future endeavors. These boys and their leaders know that in order to "strengthen America—character counts."

Medical Schools Need Help

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mr. **PHILBIN**. Mr. Speaker, one of the most salutary effects of H.R. 4999, a bill to provide matching grants to medical schools for the construction of teaching facilities and scholarship support for medical students, recently passed by the House, is that it seeks to relieve a long-felt need in medical education.

It should be clear even to the casual observer that the Nation must augment its number of trained doctors. In order to achieve this end, it will be necessary to modernize and expand existing programs of medical education and to develop new programs and provide operating support for medical schools and scholarship assistance for medical students.

Obviously, it is most desirable and necessary to continue to expand the present program of research support. To my mind, these measures must be taken promptly and cannot be delayed, if we are to maintain even the existing ratio of doctors to population, not to speak of those required to meet the needs of growth in population.

As many of you know, Massachusetts has some outstanding schools of medicine which are making most significant contributions to medical education, improvement of the public health, and research in many fields vital to the well-being of the American people. The cost of a medical education is bounding upward at an alarming rate and lack of adequate capital is seriously checking required extension of educational facilities in this field.

It would be most desirable: First, for medical schools throughout the country to increase their first-year enrollments; second, also increase the number of transfer students they can accept into the third year from the growing number of 2-year medical schools already in operation; third, increase the number of qualified doctors that medical schools can train and send into the service of the people.

It must be recognized by everyone concerned that new medical schools and larger medical schools will require more faculty members. Federal programs have been helpful and fruitful in supporting valuable research in medicine and in medical science. This, in turn, has greatly served to improve the Nation's health and strengthen our medical schools—a long-sought goal.

It should be pointed out that Federal participation in the support of these activities has not brought Federal control. It is believed that this will continue to be true for a program of matching grants for teaching facilities, and grants for scholarship support. The importance to the country of research in medical and biological science has been recognized for many years in and out of the Congress.

It is now appropriate that Congress should recognize that adequate and proper education in medicine underlies both research and patient care.

We should take note of the fact that medical education is a long and costly process both for the student and for the school. Scholarship funds such as the ones provided in the bill would place medical education within the reach of many who cannot now contemplate such a career because of economic circumstances.

The above views are entertained very strongly by high officials of Harvard, Tufts University, and Boston University Medical Schools. If scholarship grants are made, Congress will have taken another step in insuring a more adequate supply of talented, well-trained physicians and scholars for the future.

The early implementation of this measure will be a great boon to medical education and I urge expeditious action in this regard.

New York Journal-American's Crusade Against Dope Addiction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mr. **ANFUSO**. Mr. Speaker, the New York Journal-American has been carrying on a crusade in recent weeks against dope peddling with the primary purpose of saving our youth from drug addiction. This is a matter of great concern to many of us in New York City, particularly those of us who are parents and fear that our children may fall prey to evil influences.

The New York Journal-American deserves to be congratulated for undertaking this crusade, which should have the support of all citizens. In fact, the public is taking cognizance of this effort to stamp out addiction among our youth. Only a few days ago, the Journal-American reported that a citizens committee of 500 against teenage dope addiction has been organized under the leadership of Kings County Judge Hyman Barshay and Assemblyman Stanley Steingut.

I am today writing to Judge Barshay and to Assemblyman Steingut offering my support and at the same time asking them to support my bill, H.R. 616, to provide grants-in-aid to the States for the treatment of narcotic addicts in closed institutions.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of an editorial from the New York Journal-American of February 5, 1962, entitled "Public Aroused," and also the text of my letter to Judge Barshay and Assemblyman Steingut:

PUBLIC AROUSED

The Journal-American's crusade to save our teenagers from the dangers of narcotics addiction is really getting through to the people.

This was demonstrated again today with the announcement of the formation of a Citizens Committee of 500 Against Teenage Dope Addiction.

Kings County Judge Hyman Barshay and Assemblyman Stanley Steingut head this massive effort to stamp out the dope traffic. They have enlisted an impressive array of public officials, lawyers, medical men, and clergy of all faiths in a drive for a double objective:

A statewide medical program aimed at the cure and rehabilitation of addicts.

Stiffer penalties for dope pushers, especially the evil men who supply narcotics to minors illegally.

It is gratifying indeed to have such distinguished citizens solidly lining up behind a program that parallels the recommendations of our own blueprint for action.

It also is gratifying to have Judge Barshay give the Journal-American's crusade full credit for "providing the impetus for this project." It was to arouse good citizens to the need for action against the dope traffic that we embarked on this crusade a month ago.

We commend Judge Barshay and Assemblyman Steingut for their plan to enlist the aid of the medical societies and legal and civic groups in obtaining a maximum security narcotics hospital for New York City and a program of aftercare for addicts.

We are glad to see that the committee's program for aftercare centers around a key recommendation in our blueprint. This is a system of health camps, where youthful dope users after treatment in a hospital could be quarantined away from the influences that led to their addiction and receive vocational training and guidance.

If you would like to enlist in this crusade, write to Assemblyman Stanley Steingut, State Assembly, Albany 1, N.Y., or Judge Hyman Barshay, Criminal Courts Building, 120 Schermerhorn Street, Brooklyn 1, N.Y.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 7, 1962.

Hon. HYMAN BARSHAY,
County Court Judge,
Brooklyn, N.Y.

DEAR "HY": I want to congratulate you for following up, by concrete action, the graphic exposé of drug addiction and its effects on our society initiated recently by the New York Journal-American. I am very pleased to offer you my assistance in Congress in every way possible.

Dope peddling and drug addiction is as much a Federal problem as it is a New York State and city problem. Were it not for the evil peddlers of dope, many of our young people today would be healthy and productive citizens and New York would not have the dubious honor of having the largest number of addicts in the country.

I have been aware of this situation for a number of years and have done all in my power to try to stamp out this evil. It is for this very reason, and with the support of Commissioner Harry J. Anslinger, Chief of the U.S. Bureau of Narcotics, that I introduced my bill, H.R. 616, to provide grants-in-aid to the States for the treatment of narcotic addicts in closed institutions. This bill is now pending before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

The purpose of my bill is to pay half of the cost per bed patient for the treatment of addicts in institutions maintained by the States. With financial assistance from the Federal Government, States having a difficult narcotic problem will be able to provide for a drug treatment program under which the addict is committed through a State civil action to remain under treatment until released by competent medical authority.

This is compulsory confinement in a drug-free atmosphere, but it is the only logical way to deal with this situation and it is supported by the Bureau of Narcotics and many organizations. We must recognize that the drug addict is a sick person and we must treat him as such. Under the circumstances, I would, therefore, like to propose three things for your Committee of 500:

1. For as many people as possible to write letters to Chairman OREN HARRIS, Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, House of Representatives, Washington 25, D.C., as well as to all members of that committee, urging that my bill, H.R. 616, be reported out favorably as soon as possible.

2. To have a resolution passed by the New York State Legislature memorializing Congress to take immediate action on my bill.

3. Write a letter to every Member of Congress from New York State requesting that they give their support to the bill.

You may be assured of my personal efforts in all your endeavors.

Sincerely yours,
VICTOR L. ANFUSO,
Member of Congress.

Pills, Politics, and Patriotism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DALE ALFORD

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, on the night of January 31, it was my high honor and great privilege to address the annual meeting of the Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, Inc., meeting in the Mayflower Hotel in Washington. This is a very dedicated group of patriots who are working for the good of their country. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a copy of my address entitled "Pills, Politics, and Patriotism":

PILLS, POLITICS, AND PATRIOTISM

(Address of DALE ALFORD, M.D., Member of Congress, Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, Inc.)

"Pills, politics, and patriotism" may seem a bit unusual as a topic for such a distinguished group of patriots; however, when it is broken down into its separate components, I believe you will agree with me that the implications are not quite as sophomorish as a first impression might bring. Or—at the expense of alliteration—I might say pills, politics, and conservatism. The three words of the title indicate a metamorphosis of my own life in the past few years.

Pills has an obvious allusion to the fact that by profession I am a physician and surgeon. For several years I served on the committee on public relations of my State medical society and for 6 years served as chairman of this committee. During the latter period I attended numerous meetings, many local, and some on a national level, dealing with trends in legislation and specifically with Government regulation of my own profession. Through this experience I developed a profound interest in politics and, in addition to being a student of medicine, became a student of political science. Therein lies the reason for the second word in the title of my remarks, "politics." As a physician and businessman I found that I had suffered a true confrontation with a relatively new philosophy of forgetting what you are and want to be and merging yourself with the masses. Get yourself some kind of protective law—irrespective of your talents or capacities or workmanship or diligence—and hide yourself under it and cover yourself with it. Yes, the trend would seem to be too much the idea that the main thing is to be protected. Be secure. Be certain. Let the Government, let Washington, let the Congress, let the law take care of us. It is my contention that this is not the kind of philosophy that made this country great. Thomas Jefferson said the American Republic was to be a great experiment which would determine for all time whether or not "men may be trusted to govern themselves without a master." He predicted future happiness for Americans "if we can prevent the Government from wasting the labors of the people under the pretense of taking care of them." This country was not built by spineless Socialists. America achieved greatness by the pioneering spirit of rugged individualists who blazed new trails, shaped their own destiny without Government planning—were self-reliant and free.

It has almost come to the point where the race in which we are engaged is not between a slave economy and a free economy, but between a slave economy and a half-free economy. We know that we have already lost many of our freedoms through usurpation and legislative processes. When one is sincere and conscientious and makes a study of the nature of government and its political philosophy, an intelligent and fairminded individual immediately recognizes that our young Nation became the wealthiest, healthiest, and most powerful nation in the world in less than 200 years through a private enterprise economy guaranteed to us under the Constitution. Whether the field is Federal obstruction for the businessman, whether it is telling the physician what he may or may not do with respect to his patients, or whether it is telling the merchant how to run his store, or the farmer what he can plant, or destroying patent rights on American lifesaving drugs, or destroying the incentive of business through taxation, the long arm of Government is out of place when it impinges on private enterprise. Government's place is to maintain the outer fences of economy in repair. Government's place is not to step inside the sphere of direction and assume either the authority or responsibility. That belongs to the people. It belongs to private initiative. And this is what the Government did do under the Constitution for a long time. But alas. When one examines the philosophy of some of our more prominent officials, a student of political science will have to admit that the philosophy falls under the classic definition of "international socialism." It is internationalism on one side and freedom on the other.

The time has come to reinvoke the principles of our Founding Fathers, which brings us to the third word in the title of my remarks, "patriotism."

Each of you here knows that there are forces at work in the United States today, trying to weaken and undermine our people. And it is only when we understand that they are trying to destroy us that we can work together to prevent them from reducing us to a common denominator that would bring about our destruction. If you advocate patriotism today you automatically become a "radical reactionary" to the leftwingers. They'll tell you that you belong to a bygone era, that this is the 20th century and that we "must conform" to our time—in other words, that we must conform to their particular brand of socialism, Keynesian, Fabian, or Marxian—or to the internationalism of the Council on Foreign Relations. They will tell you, in the words of a prominent official, that "the American people have little, if any, need to be alerted to the menace of the cold war." They will advocate negotiation with the Communists "in secret"—and tell us that we face the risk of nuclear destruction if we do not do so; international blackmail. Negotiation, to the Communists, means, of course, that this country and its allies will make concessions. When you ask them if freedom is not better than a straitjacket, they will reply "a straitjacket is more orderly and besides a straitjacket is democratic if everyone wears it." That is what I mean by reducing us to a common denominator. They would lead us into a one-world government—and tell us it is different from communism. Khrushchev apparently thinks differently. In his address to the Russian Communist Party Congress he expressed hope that the present socialism which exists in Russia would soon become total communism and he seemed confident when he stated that "by 1980 the world would be a Communist utopia."

Socialism has been defined as governmental ownership or control of the means of production. And communism, as any political scientist knows, is socialism. Karl Marx labeled himself a Socialist. After the Communist revolution, Russia was named the "Union of Soviet Socialist Republics." The invasion of socialism and/or communism into the United States, penetrating every facet of our lives, brings us to the inevitable conclusion that America is in dire need of a new breath of patriotism. We need to reawaken ourselves and all citizens at every level of our economy to the fundamental principles underlying our Nation's greatness, and to the influences that are working to undermine the very foundations of our inherent God-given rights.

I am for economy in Government at every level: city, county, State, and National. I am for fiscal responsibility. I am for a sound dollar.

Fiscal divisions may seriously affect individual rights and freedoms. For example, taxes may cancel the right of the individual to spend part of his money the way he wants to, and the higher the taxes, the less personal discretion for spending.

Although a heavy tax burden is probably inevitable in these times, it is the duty of Congress to insure that the citizen is not deprived of his rights to spend his own money except to the degree essential to meet proper and reasonable Government costs. Since individual liberty is fundamental in American sovereignty, every fiscal and economic division should also be carefully weighed in terms of its effects on individual rights and freedoms.

Our taxes have increased in the last 25 years from $30 per capita in 1935 to $650 per capita in 1961. The Bureau of the Budget has estimated that for every $1,000 paid by you, the average taxpayer, you will pay another $820 in other types of Federal taxes, either directly or indirectly. So when you figure your income tax, add another 82 percent for all the other Federal taxes you have paid through sundry sources, and this would more accurately be your Federal tax burden. All of this is over and above and in addition to the social security tax.

Your elected Representatives and Senators should be your lobby as a taxpayer, but they cannot be successful if there continues to be powerful pressure groups pushing for political projects. There is a proposal now before the Congress to grant the power to our executive branch of Government to raise or lower income taxes at the discretion of the Executive and without the specific consent of Congress. I maintain that this is taxation without representation and that if this is accepted this country will have regressed 200 years to the days when taxpayers in righteous indignation rebelled at the assumption of similar dictatorial power and dramatized their protest with the Boston Tea Party. Individual liberties, the freedom of choice, and the right of private property will continue to disappear unless the taxpayers of this country rise up in protest to this usurpation of power.

Our Federal debt reached a peak of $27 billion at the end of August 1919. On Monday of this week, January 29, 1962, the Treasury Department reported that the national debt had jumped to a record $297 billion. The Treasury can still borrow $542 million before hitting the temporary debt ceiling of $298 billion because not all of the total debt comes under the legal limit. The servicing of a large debt is now a sizable part of the total tax burden. The interest amounts to about $9 billion. And now the Congress is being asked to raise the temporary debt limit by $10 billion—to a new high of $308 billion. This should give us some idea about the size of the budget deficits now to be encountered when the temporary expenses overcome the income tax established in the World War I era as temporary and the corporate income tax levied as temporary in the Korean war and the temporary taxes on telephones and transportation established in World War II. In fact, everything we have today will be purely temporary if the present trend continues.

A large part of these hard-earned dollars is going down the drain in the form of foreign aid. Under the banner of mutual assistance, we are undergirding foreign economies that are operating this very day in open competition with American business. Scrapping our present reciprocal trade policy and exchanging it for the proposed "common market" policy will be simply an economic surrender on the part of American business and American labor to the internationalists. When Americans arrive at the point in our economic life that we cannot survive or defend this private enterprise economy under the Constitution without the permission or consent of foreign powers or international agencies, then Americans will have lost the national sovereignty and independence for which our forefathers fought so valiantly and so successfully. How, in the name of commonsense, can we continue to increase the national debt, literally pouring billions of dollars into spurious projects around the world, all in the name of or guise of preventing communism when all we need to do is look at Laos, Cuba, Vietnam, and others where our foreign aid was used and we are now hated and these countries have fallen behind the Iron Curtain? We are giving our hard-earned tax dollars to countries whose philosophies are alien to ours and in many instances undergirding governments alien to our economy and American way of life. There are many examples that can be cited. One recent illustration is that of the Prime Minister of British Guiana when he stated on "Meet the Press" October 15, 1961: "In the economic field I do not believe in capitalism. I do not believe that free enterprise which may have been wonderful for, say, the United States of America, will, in present day circumstances, develop either in my country or an underdeveloped country in the world generally." This foreign official who was seeking our tax money in the form of economic aid evaded an answer to the question of whether or not his administration was pro-Communist. I think that we, as patriotic Americans, are entitled to know whether our economic aid to such an administration would receive proper credit to the United States of America in the eyes of his own people. Continuing our study of the global cold war, let us review the statement of President Tshombe of Katanga issued January 7 of this year, bearing in mind that President Tshombe is a Christian leader dedicated to fighting the Communists. Here is a quote from his statement: "With unexpected ferocity, incredible in an international force whose mission is to serve peace, the armies of the United Nations attacked Katanga with astonishing violence. They used the most murderous of weapons. They did not spare the civilian population, which became the great victim of this cataclysm for which the Government of the United States of America should perhaps be held even more responsible than the United Nations Organization. In truth, the Katangan people cannot forget that it was American planes that brought reinforcements of arms and material to the United Nations forces, and made possible the bombardment of Katanga's capital, now partly destroyed and become a city in a stupor."

In my opinion, as American citizens we are entitled to know why American planes carried supplies aiding a pro-Communist movement opposed to a dedicated anti-Communist administration in a sovereign state. Who is responsible for this paradoxical situation? Shall we blame the State Department or shall we blame the real bosses of our foreign policy in both Democratic and Republican administrations; that invisible government known as "the Council on Foreign Relations"? And yet officials on the Washington scene state in such a superior sophisticated manner that "the American people have little, if any, need to be alerted to the menace of the cold war." Are American citizens to be relegated to the position of serfs or peasants bowing in surrendering silence to the feudalistic egotistical whims of the CFR? Are all our rights as a sovereign nation to be destroyed?

The foreign policy of both the Democratic and Republican administrations apparently is dominated by the Council on Foreign Relations and, in my opinion, seems to hinge on a strategy not to destroy communism, but in the words of Dean Manion to preserve communism "as a convenient means for the destruction of American independence": a strategy not to destroy the United Nations but to use it as a convenient world government, using words instead of bullets, to socialize the world; and apparently in the meantime to create regional world government in the form of Fabian socialism and then hand it to the rest of the world as a better substitute for the Russian-type socialism. From the actions of our foreign policy experts this is what we are to know as peaceful coexistence, the existence of two kinds of socialism. In an objective study of this two-headed socialistic monster one is directed to such a conclusion by just such remarks as one prominent opinion-maker when he was quoted as saying that: "The social objectives and tendencies of communism are, by and large, in the same direction of those of Western liberal industrialism."

Shortly before his visit to the United States, Nikita Khrushchev said: "We cannot expect the Americans to jump from capitalism to communism, but we can assist their elected leaders in giving Americans small doses of socialism, until they suddenly awake to find they have communism."

And now with this background of a confused and tortuous bipartisan foreign policy we are now called upon in Congress to take up one-half or $100 million of a $200 million bond issue by the United Nations in order that the U.N. can bail itself out of an irresponsible policy that resulted in the deficit through aggression against Katanga and questionable policies with respect to Goa and Angola. Why is the United Nations in financial trouble at this time? Simply because Russia refuses to pay anything for police operations. France and some of the Arab States also have balked at paying. Many other nations lag far behind in their obligations to the United Nations. Out of 104 nations, at least 82 are in arrears.

At the same time, the United States paid $22.3 million into the U.N. for the 1961 operating budget. Since its start, the United States already has paid more than $1.5 billion into the United Nations. And this figure does not include the staggering cost of the Korean conflict, which was supported almost entirely by the United States.

How far in the red is the United Nations? Right now the deficit stands at $107 million. Working capital of the Organization is down to zero.

The United Nations was designed to preserve peace in the world, but the follies, foibles, and frauds of the U.N. cause me to conclude that the United Nations is totally ineffective in its world mission of peace and justice and that the U.N. bond issue should be decisively rejected by the Congress of a sovereign people.

It is indeed ironic that our Nation should be preparing for a hot war while appeasing the enemy in the cold war. It is difficult, I am sure, for many Americans who have been called to active duty recently to rationalize that they are at the frontline of defense while we permit Communists to be trained at our own installation in the continental United States of America. More ironic, perhaps, is that our servicemen are ordered to defend the peace of their fellow citizens abroad, but even within our own borders they are not allowed to speak out against the threat of international communism. Such phrases as "the Communist challenge," or "the steady advance of communism," or "on such theories socialism thrives," or "insidious ideology of world communism" have been stricken from proposed speeches by military leaders. What on earth goes on here in the land of the free and the home of the brave when an American is ordered headlong into the cannon's mouth in defense of his country but cannot utter words against the enemy? As a Member of Congress, I sincerely believe it is my patriotic duty to speak out against the pragmatic prating of the political puppets directed to censor such words of our military leaders.

From what we read in the press as to statements being issued relative to patriots and superpatriots it becomes immediately obvious that many persons in high political offices are not properly informed as to the nature of the real enemy.

Despite the economic, political, and psychological battles in which we are engaged, some of our political leaders still contend, either because of their lack of knowledge about international communism, or what is infinitely worse, because they are completely duped by the psychological warfare methods employed by our Socialist enemy, that there is no cause for alarm. From the Lenin School of Political Warfare, Georgia Dimitrov stated: "We must always remember that one sympathizer is generally worth more than a dozen militant Communists." So one sympathizer in any American community can effectively do the work of 12 Communists.

What more effective way can we combat international communism than through a properly informed military not afraid to inform other members of the military of the true nature of the enemy.

Our bureaucrats apparently have all kinds of rights of freedom of speech while denying the same right to other branches of Government service. A classic example is the recent statement by a Government official that "a welfare state is our best defense against communism." Now if that is supposed to be positive progressive 20th century liberal philosophy, then I am, indeed, a negative, old-fashioned conservative American patriot.

In spite of the maze of political commentary we read and hear today there are only two distinct sides to the issue when all the frost and foam is blown away. There are those who wish to maintain our liberties and freedoms under the Constitution and there are those who accept or welcome Federal usurpation which aims at overthrowing the Constitution and establishing a centralized international government.

One does not have to be a mental giant to understand that communism is a total threat; that it is a military threat; an economic threat; a political threat; an infiltration threat; and a propaganda threat. Why should we not use every possible means available to us to fight communism when our freedoms are at stake? Why do some leaders speak of a program for survival but never of a program to totally defeat communism? Does their idea of survival mean the surrender of the Stars and Stripes to an international flag? As patriotic Americans we should never entertain the thought that Old Glory must be subservient to the United Nations flag, the NATO flag or any other flag on earth.

We achieved our position of prominence in the world through rigorous attention to our domestic affairs and by preservation of the principles of private enterprise through individual initiative. We did not do it by letting international planners and daydreamers siphon off our freedoms—and we will not now let them take it away from us. But we must again do what our forefathers did. That is, we must release the energies of the people to achieve, to advance, to master, to expand by leaps and bounds.

Not since the days of the Founding Fathers has this country been in such desperate need of patriotism and conservative thinking. The time has come to call a halt to the feeding of the monster that would swallow us up. The time has come to rid ourselves of the internationalists and return to nationalism. It is not too late—and our people are becoming aroused and informed. Your very presence here is strong indication of that. Everywhere alert Americans, like yourselves, are taking action to safeguard the preservation of our traditional way of life. I am persuaded that everywhere there are loyal, patriotic, courageous Americans who are ready to take up this battle and save our great country. With your efforts will come other Americans to meet the challenge.

I have stated repeatedly that we are standing between two great mountain peaks of eternity—on the left we have an atheistic, socialistic, communistic superstate and on the right we have our American Republic held together by the greatest of all legal instruments, the American Constitution, dedicated to the cause of freedom and of Almighty God.

Yes, it may be a cliche, but it is good for us to understand that America is at the crossroads—the crossroads between bigger government and a form of state socialism on one side and a private enterprise system of constitutional government on the other. The burning question today is, "How far down the road into socialism and the welfare state do we go before we lose all our freedoms?" Senator BYRD of Virginia said: "The welfare state—is that state of twilight in which the flow of democratic freedom is fading beyond the horizon, leaving us to be swallowed in the blackness of socialism, or worse."

We, as a people, must not be hoodwinked or duped by the malicious meanderings of a leftist press, leading us into socialism and world government through the hypocritical cry of peace, peace. Peace can only be maintained in a materialistic world by a show of firmness and courage—and most important of all in the eyes of the Communist world—the power to destroy. There is not time for inaction and appeasement. There is no time for retreat and compromise. This is a time that calls for a worldwide offensive on the part of a Christian nation that will stand resolute against the powers of darkness.

Let us make America strong first. I say charity begins at home. Let us not dissipate our resources: let us not disperse our manpower around the world while training Communists within our own interior. Let us leave our children a legacy of patriotism and not be a party to discrediting patriots through an anti-anti-Communist campaign. Let us not forget first of all that everything we have we owe to Almighty God. This is one belief the Communists cannot imitate in their atheistic ideology, for when they do assert this fundamental belief in God, the victory will have been won. No, we cannot win by imitating the atheistic Socialists of the world; we cannot win by destroying the sovereignty of our Nation in the name of an international government.

It may be late, but it is not too late to save our Republic.

We can win if the American eagle is free to fly with only loyal Americans on board.

The Struggle Against Communist Domination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of a speech by Senator BARRY GOLDWATER before the Notre Dame University student body in South Bend, Ind., on February 6, 1962.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF A SPEECH BY SENATOR BARRY GOLDWATER, OF ARIZONA, BEFORE NOTRE DAME UNIVERSITY STUDENT BODY, SOUTH BEND, IND., FEBRUARY 6, 1962

In our struggle against Communist domination, what do we Americans really champion?

What do we really believe?

What do we really stand for?

Is the rest of the world getting a true picture of our national character?

I don't think there is a single person here today who doubts that there is a serious misunderstanding throughout the world regarding the fundamental aims—the fundamental philosophy—of the American people.

Is it enough to tell the world that we can build a better lawnmower? Now a good, cheap lawnmower has its place. We can all agree on that.

Is it enough to tell the world we can build a more efficient tractor? All of us know that more efficient tractors are important. We can all agree on that.

But is a cheaper lawnmower, or a more efficient tractor the symbol that expresses the essence of America?

Distinguished foreign observers, like Dr. Charles Malik of Lebanon, have said that all too often our American publicity men have represented this Nation in the wrong light. They have too often pictured us as a nation primarily interested in only material gain.

On the contrary the story of America and her accomplishments is the story of men with deep spiritual motivations—men who sought freedom to pursue their own ideals and their own aims as the children of God. Some historians, blinded by materialistic considerations, have written about my own State of Arizona and the whole West as though this vast area was opened only as a result of men driven by a desire for gain. Fascinated by stories of the gold rush, land hunger, and buffalo hunting, they ignore the real story—the story of pioneers with the spiritual fiber to overcome impossible material obstacles to carve a civilization out of the wilderness. I think of the Mormons whose spiritual strength brought a whole desert into bloom.

The same sort of materialist vision which distorts the true meaning of the opening of the West, is presenting a picture of America to the world which interprets the ideals of America in purely economic terms.

We have seen a worldwide publicity campaign which offers a mail-order catalog as the quintessence of the American dream—a sort of materialist substitute for the Bible.

Somehow the idea has gotten abroad that the way to share the American ideal is to become bigger, fatter, and more luxurious. People are beginning to believe that to be American is simply to have more food and more complicated gadgets.

It is no wonder that, presented with these claims, many people in the Moslem world or the Buddhist lands or even Europe ask themselves, "What, after all, is the difference between the Communists and the Americans? They both tell us that life is for material prosperity and for military superiority; and they use almost identical phrases."

I suggest we Americans have been our own worst apologists.

Are we really nothing better than materialists? Do we genuinely believe that the test of a nation's virtue and greatness is its gross national product or its modern military gadgets? Are wall-to-wall carpets and space capsules the be-all and end-all of American civilization? Do we, in short, truly believe in anything beyond the material aims of the Communists?

If not, why do we oppose the Communists? If material progress is our only aim, why not join them?

It is true that we still are richer and stronger than the Soviets—though their standard of living has increased somewhat, and their military power has increased greatly. Well suppose then, 10 years from now, the Communists achieve a standard of living higher than ours, and an army and an air force and a navy better than ours. (I do not expect them to; but suppose this for the sake of argument.)

Should we, in such circumstances, admit their superiority and yield to them? If prosperity and material power are the prime summits of human striving, it follows that we might just as well throw in our lot with the Communists. In fact, there are so-called liberals in America today who have come to this conclusion. They say they would rather be Red than dead.

But I cannot agree that material prosperity and armed might are the indexes of personal and national greatness. I do not believe that any mere standard of living, in itself, is worth dying for. I deny that goodness and truth are determined by the magnitude and number of hydrogen bombs. I suggest that we Americans, and our Christian and Western civilization, stand for truths nobler and more enduring than these material satisfactions.

I suggest that if you must choose, it is better to be poor and free than to be snug and a slave.

I suggest that if you must choose, it is better to live in peril, but with justice, than to live on a summit of material power, but unjustly.

I suggest that if you must choose, it is better to stand up as a suffering man than to lie down as a satisfied animal.

Now to compete in bragging with the Communists is lost endeavor; at that game the most practiced liar always wins. And to adopt Communist standards for such a bragging match is folly. To cite tables of figures about our low prices and our high wages converts no Communists, and impresses few neutrals, and does not convince even ourselves: indeed, this may rouse envy throughout the world, without creating friendship. To demonstrate that our Globemasters can fly in enough Gurkhas and guns to discourage the Katanga gendarmes and smash the Katanga hospitals is no proof, either to Africans or ourselves, that we have any cause worth fighting for. And I believe it is time for us to tell our allies, and our adversaries, and ourselves, just what we Americans really are ready to sacrifice for—and, if need be, to die for.

This Nation does not live for the sake of butter, nor for the sake of guns. The United States of America, on the contrary, has for its moral object the high dignity of man; and for its political aim, ordered freedom—liberty under God and under the law—with justice for all. I think it is impossible to maintain freedom and order and justice without religious and moral sanctions. And surely it is not possible for man to enjoy true dignity without a model that is more than human and a hope that is more than earthly. Man is made for eternity; he does not perish like the flies of a summer; therefore he enjoys dignity. Every human being is a person, made in the image of God; therefore every man enjoys certain natural rights.

Are we ashamed nowadays to confess this?

Ought we to conceal our moral and cultural heritage, Jewish and Christian and classical, as something old fangled and impractical and irrational? To judge by the propaganda of certain gentlemen in our information services, one would so assume. Muttering vaguely about the wall of separation between church and state—which idea they carry far beyond any possible constitutional interpretation—these publicists discard as so much rubbish the moral and theoretical foundation of the American cause. And having nothing else left, such propaganda experts offer to the world a mess of pottage compounded of production statistics and firepower. And so do the Soviet propagandists.

In what way do we differ fundamentally from the Communists? Cardinal Manning said once that all differences of opinion are theological at bottom. True when he said it, this statement has grown even truer in our century. The great gulf fixed between the American Republic and the Soviet Union is a theological Grand Canyon. The Communist says that man is a thing, who exists to have his belly filled; and who may be manipulated and altered and, if need be, liquidated for the sake of efficiency. Such a creature does not need freedom; he wants only creature-comforts. "Freedom?" Lenin mocked. "Freedom? What for? What for?"

But to the American who has faith in his national traditions and the wisdom of our ancestors, who believes that our civilization is not morally and intellectually bankrupt, man is a being quite different. Man was made to know God, and enjoy Him forever. Man is not a thing, but an immortal essence. And freedom, ordered liberty, is man's birthright; for without true freedom, man could not choose between good and evil; he could not become fully human; he would remain, at best, childish. There exists a natural order for man, with natural rights. Worldly powers and dominations are not morally entitled to treat man as a pawn in a social chess game: the masters of the state have no right to deal with human beings as if they were animals—no right to manipulate and alter and liquidate human persons.

Here, I suggest, is the stone wall of demarcation between the Communists and Americans; we have hearts and consciences. If, by new inventions or slave labor or territorial conquests, the Soviets should grow richer and stronger than ourselves, and if we then should be asked, "Why not unite with them? Theirs are the kingdoms of the earth."

If we are men, still we will stand firm. If it comes to the test, we ought to die rather than to submit to a collectivistic anthill, no matter how glistening, or filled with up-to-date comforts.

For the object of the Communists is to reduce human nature to the material elements alone. And the object of thinking Americans and their allies is to preserve and strengthen the spiritual elements of human nature. The material conception of man and the spiritual conception of man cannot be reconciled. For this reason I have said that only through victory will we secure ourselves. More than a century ago, Abraham Lincoln declared that this Nation cannot endure half free and half slave. Today that solemn fact is true of the world.

Between Communists and men who believe in a transcendent order there can be no enduring compromise; for Communists will not tolerate religious belief, unless they find it so weakened and tamed that it seems harmless; and men who discern natural rights will never be able to live under communism. This eternal hostility was expressed far better than I can put it by a brilliant and God-fearing American for whom I have great personal admiration, a man who lies buried here in the chapel at Notre Dame, Orestes Brownson. Only a few months after the "Communist Manifesto" was published, Brownson—who had been a radical in his youth—denounced as heresy the philosophy of Marx and the sociologist ideology in general.

Brownson saw at the outset that Marxism was a political substitute for religion, caricaturing Christian doctrine. And Brownson knew that the terrible power of this ideology could be resisted only by true religious understanding—and by willingness to sacrifice for the enduring things. With a gift almost prophetic, Orestes Brownson declared that the struggle of the future would be between socialism and Christianity. In 1962, the fate of humankind is in the balance, and this contest seems to draw toward judgment.

The competition between the Communists and what we call the free world is clearly not being decided by living standards or even by the big battalions. The issue will be determined by power of conviction: the conviction of men who fear and love God, or the conviction of materialists who detest anything higher than themselves. And if our faith and our culture are to prevail, we must take our stand forthrightly on certain moral truths and ancient ways.

First, we must stand for the real brotherhood of man, which is possible only under the fatherhood of God.

Second, we must stand for personal freedom, which in essence is the right and duty of moral choice.

Third, we must stand for the Judaeo-Christian and classical principle of justice: to each man the things that are his own by nature.

Fourth, we must stand for charity: the toleration, the mercy, and the giving which are the products of love.

Fifth, we must stand for the wisdom of our ancestors, sound authority and experience, what Edmund Burke called "the bank and capital of the ages."

Sixth, we must stand for variety; for diversity, which includes the right of men and nations to differ, and, as Chesterton put it, of "every potty little man to be his own potty little self."

And finally, we must stand for honor and the dignity of man.

This brief catalog of mine does not exhaust the roster of our duties and our first principles; but it may suggest that there are irreconcilable differences between the Communists and ourselves. It is for this reason that we can speak only of victory, never of any fundamental compromise.

As you may have expected, I am commending to you a conservative position in this crisis of our fate—what I believe to be a healthy and imaginative conservatism. I am commending to you the courageous and responsible conservative principles for which Orestes Brownson spoke. I am asking you to think of liberty as Brownson described it, in his long essay on the origin and constitution of government:

"By freedom, regarded as the end of government," Brownson wrote, "we understand the ability of every man to discharge, without other let or hindrance than his own moral delinquency, his special functions as a human being. All men have the equal right to be men, and each man has the equal right to be the man his Maker designed him to be."

This is not the conservatism of suspicion, or of selfishness, or of smugness. Rather, it is the noble conservatism of Edmund Burke and of George Washington. It is founded upon belief in a God who has given us our nature, our rights, and our duties; upon belief in a freedom which is moral in origin, and which is intended for our full development as human persons, each man and woman after his bent. And this is a world apart from the dreary slave-equality of Marx and of Lenin.

The real line of division in the modern world is not between liberals on the one hand and totalitarians on the other. Instead, it is between all those on the one hand who believe in a transcendent order of things and an enduring human nature; and on the other hand all those who would treat man as a mere creature of appetite, self-created or chance-created, to be dealt with as advanced social planners wish. It is between people who know themselves to be part of the great continuity and essence, and, on the other hand, people who live in the nightmare realm of an existence with no meaning but material appetites and power over bodies and minds.

What do we stand for? If we are true to our civilized heritage and to ourselves, we stand for order and freedom and justice, founded upon religious understanding. Our prosperous economy, our technological achievements, our leisure and pleasures, our military defenses—all these are byproducts, at bottom, of religious belief and of knowing the dignity of man. If we fail to stand by these deep enduring principles, then the Communists will bury us—and we will deserve to be buried.

No, the first principles of our moral and social order cannot be reconciled or blended with those of communism. Communists deny the divine origin of man; for the Communist, there is no more logical reason why a man should be dignified than there is why a pig should be dignified.

If we are strong in our faith and correspondingly strong in our preparations, the Communists will not bury us. For the Communist respects just one thing: power. And power of spirit is a greater force than the power of weapons. The Communist will not press for a final showdown with men whose spiritual power renders them invulnerable. For Communists, this life on earth is everything: death in a great war would mean the end of existence for them, for all time. In that sense, the Communists are at a disadvantage by the side of the religious man, who believes that death is no evil in itself: everything depends on how you die, for none of us live forever.

And if we are strong and resolute, demanding freedom from the Communist rather than yielding ground timidly before their bullying, we can triumph without any terrible devastation—without a final holocaust. For the nature of things is on our side. I mean that the Communists are operating upon false principles: upon illusions concerning the nature of man and the nature of the good society. Sooner or later, anyone who lives by false premises betrays himself. Men and women are not the mere animals and puppets that Communists would have them be. Human nature reasserts itself, given a little time, under even the most merciless tyranny. Behind the Iron Curtain, discontent will increase. If we Americans stand prepared and resolute, we can help the oppressed back toward a decent civil social order.

Within the core of the Communist structure—within Russia and China—the more energetic and talented and generous natures cannot be suppressed forever; and if we have prevented the commissars from establishing a world domination, those better natures in the rising generation ultimately will work their way to order and freedom and justice—given some help and encouragement—even in Moscow and Peiping. So the present question is not whether we want a devastating war, but rather whether we Americans have the intelligence and the fortitude to stand by ideas and institutions that were not born yesterday. Communism, a political religion, denies the providential order of existence; and so providence, sooner or later, will make an end of communism, if you and I do our part.

Perhaps you are thinking, "What can I do?" There are many tasks that can be yours—and many sacrifices you must make, of time and money and comfort, if we are to win our ultimate victory over the powers that would dehumanize man. But the first thing to do—and this is the especial province of university students—is to grasp clearly and firmly the grand principles of the moral order and the social order.

Our conservative task of saving mankind from a collective degradation will not make you rich; probably it will not make you powerful; and possibly it may mean that you will live harder and less long than if you were content to be a slave or a coward. But this task has one high reward: the consciousness of being fully human, in the cause of truth and justice and of man as God meant him to be.

You have the talent and the training for the duty that is yours. I am confident you will not fail to stand up for the things which make life worth living.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Hebrews 13: 6: *We may boldly say, the Lord is my helper, and I will not fear what man shall do unto me.*

Almighty God, who art our help and hope in each new day, grant that all that we think or say and do may be touched with the strength and beauty of Thy truth and love.

May we daily grow in nobler ways of living and thereby witness to the power of Thy divine spirit to change us from what we are to what we ought to be.

Give us a vivid sense of the spiritual resources which Thou hast placed at our disposal and may we have a finer perception of the moral laws by which we must govern our character and our conduct.

Inspire us with a vision of the dawning of that better time when weary and heavy-laden humanity, however divided and distempered, shall enter into possession of the radiant and more abundant life.

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord in whom Thy will was incarnated and revealed. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 2147. An act for the relief of Kenneth Stultz;

H.R. 2973. An act for the relief of Anthony Robert Lowry (Antonio Piantadosi);

H.R. 3710. An act for the relief of Giles L. Matthews;

H.R. 4194. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ann W. Edwards;

H.R. 4211. An act for the relief of Alessandro Bottero;

H.R. 4280. An act for the relief of Dimitri Elias Sartan;

H.R. 4381. An act for the relief of Walter H. Hanson;

H.R. 4876. An act for the relief of Mary C. Atkinson;

H.R. 5181. An act to amend Private Law 85-699;

H.R. 5324. An act for the relief of Dr. Serafin T. Ortiz;

H.R. 6013. An act for the relief of the Houston Belt & Terminal Railway Co.;

H.R. 6120. An act for the relief of Francis Ainsworth;

H.R. 6226. An act for the relief of Arlin David English;

H.R. 6243. An act extending to Guam the power to enter into certain interstate compacts relating to the enforcement of the criminal laws and policies of the States;

H.R. 6644. An act for the relief of Julius Benikosky;

H.R. 6938. An act for the relief of Dr. Robert E. Hiller;

H.R. 7473. An act for the relief of Albert R. Serpa;

H.R. 7740. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sharon Lee Harden;

H.R. 8325. An act for the relief of Harrison Thomas Harper; and

H.R. 8779. An act for the relief of George B. Olmstead.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 160. An act for the relief of Thomas O. Tate, Jr.;

S. 1273. An act for the relief of Jong Dae Kim;

S. 1397. An act for the relief of Mate Ivan Jurasic (also known as Mike Jurasic);

S. 1499. An act for the relief of William John Campbell McCaughey;

S. 1520. An act for the relief of Mary Elizabeth Sidor Polkowska;

S. 1578. An act for the relief of Edward Yin Liang;

S. 1684. An act for the relief of Merle K. Loessin;

S. 1756. An act for the relief of the city of Pasco, Wash.;

S. 2018. An act for the relief of Robert B. Kasparek, Robert M. Kearny, Richard A. Stokes, J. R. Whitehouse, Jr., and Herbert A. Wolff, Jr.;

S. 2155. An act for the relief of Stephen Patrick House, Ellen Myra Rachel House, Thomas Stephen Rendall House, and Jane Ellen House;

S. 2165. An act for the relief of Jean L. Dunlop; and

S. 2520. An act to amend the Welfare and Pensions Plans Disclosure Act with respect to the method of enforcement and to provide certain additional sanctions, and for other purposes.

COLLEGE ACADEMIC FACILITIES ACT

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H.R. 8900, to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities, with the Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I object.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA, INC., ON THE OCCASION OF ITS 52D ANNIVERSARY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct privilege to offer my personal congratulations to the Boy Scouts of America on the occasion of another important anniversary—its 52d. The building of future citizens and service to the Nation have been hallmarks of the Scouting program since its inception in the United States on February 8, 1910.

When Scouting came into existence in this country it could have taken as a basic principle the following quotation which appears on our National Archives Building in Washington, D.C.:

> The heritage of the past is the seed that brings forth the harvest of the future.

For the past 52 years the professional staff, the great group of volunteers, and the boys themselves have assisted boys of varied backgrounds and interests in preparing for their future service to community, State, and country. Boys are indeed seeds that will assist in bringing forth the harvest of the future.

On this occasion we honor a record of 33 million boys and countless volunteers in practically every community in our 50 States. Each year it is with pride and joy that the Congress of the United States receives the annual report of the Boy Scouts of America. It is good to recall that by act of Congress a Federal charter was granted to Scouting in 1916. This gives special protection to the name, insignia, and limits the membership to American citizens.

The program of the Boy Scouts of America is one that safeguards our freedom, the Constitution, and our future way of life. The self-reliance and resourcefulness that Scouts are gaining each day proves to be of great value to America's role in this dramatic era of world history. For we need now to invest in the harvest of the future.

I congratulate the Boy Scouts of America as an organization. I congratulate the boys, their leaders, their families, and their communities and wish for them a high degree of continued success.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday, February 12; that when it adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet on Thursday, February 15; and that when it adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet on Monday, February 19.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I make this reservation simply to say to the Speaker, to the majority leader, and the membership that this matter has been under consideration for some time. On this side we all understand, and I am sure our friends on the other side do too, it is traditional practice for us to get back to our districts in celebration of Lincoln's Birthday, and sometimes engage in an effort to rebuild our fortunes on the home front.

I just want to say thanks to the leadership on the Democratic side for having it worked out so that we can, I think, without any impairment of the process of the legislative program of the House of Representatives, have the opportunity that will be afforded by this unanimous-consent request, and I trust that there will be no objection to it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, all I was able to assimilate on short notice was a series of dates announced by the majority leader. When is it proposed that the House reconvene for business?

Mr. ALBERT. On February 19.

Mr. GROSS. And that would be a week from Monday or Tuesday?

Mr. ALBERT. A week from Monday.

Mr. GROSS. A week from Monday?

Mr. ALBERT. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. Well, then, when is it proposed that the House get down to business and do some work? When will the next recess or vacation take place?

Mr. ALBERT. Answering the first question, I think the House has passed several bills this session already, and we propose to schedule others just as fast as we can.

Mr. GROSS. Then it is proposed to get down to work week after next; is that correct?

Mr. ALBERT. It is proposed to have legislative business week after next.

Mr. GROSS. And the gentleman has no idea when the next vacation will come along. Will there be one for the Democrats later?

Mr. ALBERT. Well, the gentleman from Oklahoma is making no comment upon a matter that is not under consideration at this time.

Mr. GROSS. I am trying to get something under consideration at this time if I can. So, there is no week to be set aside later on that the gentleman knows of now?

Mr. ALBERT. Not that I know of, I will advise the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. In other words, what the gentleman from Iowa is saying is that he hopes in this session of the Congress we will not come down to the wire in September or October passing bills in the dead of night, under forced draft, with language written into them in conference for which nobody seems to be responsible. Not even all of the conferees knew of an important provision that was planted in one bill last year. What the gentleman from Iowa is saying is that he would like to see this session of the Congress get down to work and do what is necessary to be done, do it deliberately, and in the interests of the people of this country, and then adjourn. I hope that that will be the program, and I will not like to see many more weeks of vacation take place at this time of the year when we ought to be at work.

Mr. ALBERT. I am sure the gentleman has expressed also the hope of the leadership and our desire to have the usual cooperation of the gentleman in trying to expedite matters.

Mr. GROSS. You will have my cooperation on the basis that I have set forth and only on that basis.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SALES TAX ACT

Mr. McMILLAN (at the request of Mr. EDMONDSON) submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 258) amending the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act.

OKLAHOMA FAMILY HONORED IN BOY SCOUT WEEK

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago our beloved Chaplain gave a prayer to which I am sure all of us subscribe, that we may be changed "from what we are to what we ought to be."

Mr. Speaker, this week the Nation observes all over the country a celebration honoring an organization which probably does more than any other in the country to change people from what they are to what they ought to be. I speak of the Boy Scouts of America, an organization to which many of us have belonged in past years, some of us a great deal longer ago than we would care to admit, and an organization to which many of our sons belong today.

This is Boy Scout Week to more than 5 million Scouts and Scouters and their families and friends. It has been celebrated annually since 1919. Mr. Speaker, I doubt if there is any piece of legislation which this Congress has ever passed which has done more for the youth of America than the act which chartered the Boy Scouts of America as a national organization which was enacted by the 64th Congress. This congressional charter has been honored by designation of Charter Day for special scouting purposes. This legislation recognized 130,000 local Scout groups and is celebrated by large meetings in more than 500 cities. Here in Washington on June 14 a national commemorative dinner will be held under the auspices of the Boy Scouts of America and the several hundred national organizations who share in the local sponsorship of Cub packs, Boy Scout troops and Explorer posts.

Mr. Speaker, I hope and trust that this dinner will have the wholehearted support of the Members of Congress and of our citizens all over the United States.

Mr. Speaker, it is a happy fact that two Members of the 64th Congress which chartered the Boy Scouts are still with us in the 87th. I refer to the senior Senator from Arizona [CARL HAYDEN], and our much admired colleague, the gentleman from Georgia, Representative CARL VINSON. Both of these distinguished legislators have an honored place in the hearts of the present members of the Boy Scouts of America and the millions more who have enjoyed this program during the past 52 years.

This morning several Members of the Congress and national Scouters, including President Ellsworth Augustus and Chief Scout Executive Joseph A. Brunton, Jr., had breakfast with an all-Scout family from Bartlesville—Mr. and Mrs. Harry G. Fair and their family of 4 children. This family during Boy Scout Week represents all families of Scouts and was selected to come to Washington to meet the President of the United States in the White House in what is traditionally called the Scouts, report to the Nation. Oklahomans are more than pleased that this family should be selected from our State, but they also share the Nation's pride in Scouting which serves both parents and children so completely.

Mr. Fair was a Scout and Scouter for 8 years. He is a busy official of the Phillips Petroleum Co., but finds time to be chairman of a Boy Scout district. Jane Fair, his lovely wife, is a den mother and Girl Scout leader. Grant, 19, was a Cub Scout and Eagle Scout and is now an Explorer adviser. William, 12, is a first-class Scout in McKinley School PTA Troop 10; and Robert, 9, a Wolf Cub Scout in its pack 2. Martha, 17, has been a Girl Scout for 4 years.

During Boy Scout Week, the family will participate in various observances in Washington and New York and at the headquarters of the National Council, Boy Scouts of America, in New Brunswick, N.J. Everywhere they exemplify the 1962 slogan for Boy Scout Week, "Strengthen America, Character Counts."

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may have until midnight tonight to file a report on H.R. 9300.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

LOUP RIVER BILL

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation to authorize construction of the integrated Loup River division as part of the Missouri River Basin project. I have taken this step only after a series of lengthy discussions with the Commissioner of Reclamation and the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

I would like to point out that the Bureau reports on the various features of this project are not yet completed. They are still in the works.

The Loup River division, if constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation as outlined in this bill, would become an important contribution to the welfare not only of Nebraska but to the overall usefulness and fiscal soundness of the Missouri Basin project itself.

The bill embraces two major features. One unit, the North Loup, would provide irrigation water for some 52,000 acres of land in the Loup Valley. This major contribution to our national farm economy will be coming into its full usefulness at just about that point in our national history when our population explosion, combined with industrial growth, will make it mandatory for us to use all available land and all available skills for production. This estimate is based on the facts and figures provided the Congress a few years back by some of the country's most outstanding economists and farm experts.

The second feature of the project is the lower Loup unit, consisting of a dam and reservoir and other facilities at or near, Fullerton, Nebr. This reservoir would act as a stabilizing influence on the Loup River and would provide an even, adequate streamflow in the lower Platte Valley throughout the year. Thus it would guarantee to the homeowners, farmers, municipalities, and industries in the lower valley a constant and even recharge of the ground water supplies upon which they must depend for their existence.

Mr. Speaker, there is a growing population and a growing industrial community in the Platte Valley. This growth depends entirely on two factors—the availability of an ample water supply and the availability of adequate power supplies. The bill which I introduced today will help solve, in part, both of these problems.

We in Nebraska have been blessed with a fine underground water supply. This supply has proved adequate up to now to provide domestic, municipal, and industrial needs as well as to provide pumping irrigation for farmlands in the Platte Valley. However, this supply by itself is not inexhaustible. It must be recharged by surface waters seeping down through the sandy bed of the Platte River.

Many of our important eastern Nebraska cities, including Fremont and Lincoln, depend entirely upon this underground water for their municipal needs. In the very near future the city of Omaha, too, is contemplating drilling wells in the Platte Valley for additional water supplies.

As the demand climbs, the underground water table is very likely—in fact, most likely—going to get lower and lower. The only assurance we have that it will remain stable and steady is through seepage from the Platte on a year-round basis.

While there is growing demand for a stable and consistent underground water supply in the lower Platte Valley, there is an increasing demand for irrigation water upstream and in the major streams contributing to the Platte, including the Loup. This growing irrigation activity is good for our State and our Nation, and so long as it is economically sound and is being developed in an orderly manner, I favor this type of project. However, we in Nebraska must face the facts based on overwhelming evidence that this additional irrigation will do two things unless corrective measures are undertaken jointly with irrigation projects. First, the streamflow of the Loup River will be so sharply cut that power generating facilities will not be able to operate at full capacity during summer months. Secondly, this lowered streamflow will not provide the kind of recharge water needed in the Platte Valley during late summer and early fall months.

Mr. Speaker, I have stood on the banks of the Platte River during the spring flood season and I have seen the mighty flow of turbulent, muddy water rushing toward the Missouri and on to the gulf. I have realized the great and sometimes near catastrophic damage this untamed water has already done—and have visualized the damage it could contribute downstream in the Missouri and the Mississippi in its inevitable rush to the Gulf of Mexico.

In late summer of the same year I have stood on the banks of the Platte and have seen a tiny trickle of water—hardly worth the name river—with vast expanses of sand and mud banks where water once coursed.

And on both occasions I have thought to myself that every drop of water which leaves Nebraska without first having served a useful purpose within the State is an economic waste. It does us no good and in the spring floods it does us great harm.

Now, in this bill I have tried to accomplish two things. First, I would provide adequate water for economically sound irrigation. Second, at the Fullerton site there would be a reservoir capable of containing the flood and freshet waters of the Loup River. This water would be released gradually throughout the dry months of the year to maintain a steady and adequate streamflow in the Loup and the Platte.

This steadying influence on the Loup would be of great economic benefit to the lower valley. It would provide the needed recharge water throughout the year. It would also provide a stable supply of water to maintain hydrogenerating capacity at Columbus.

This latter feature would actually be of benefit not only to Nebraska but to the entire Missouri Basin as well. Under existing procedures, the Secretary of the Interior must enter into contracts with the Loup River Public Power District to repay that generating agency for the electricity lost due to lowered Loup River streamflows. These contracts cover a 26-year period and involve hundreds of millions of kilowatt-hours of power.

This is an economic waste in itself. Instead of being able to furnish additional power—and I would like to emphasize that word "additional"—to attract new industry to the area, the Missouri Basin pool would simply be furnishing replacement power to the Loup River district.

With the Fullerton Reservoir in operation, no such contracts would be needed. Loup River Power District would be guaranteed an adequate water supply to meet its needs throughout the year.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I would like to state once again that every drop of water which leaves Nebraska, without first having served a useful purpose within our State, is an economic waste to our State and, in fact, to the entire Midwest. I want to see an end to such waste and I maintain that the legislation I have introduced today would accomplish that purpose.

TAX CUT

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I have again introduced a bill to increase from $600 to $700 the personal income tax exemptions of the American taxpayers.

In urging this tax relief for the hard-pressed taxpayers of this country, I want to say and remind the House that the heavy and unfair tax burden levied against the American taxpayers to meet the rising cost of government is bound to create a tax rebellion. Never before have the taxpayers been called upon to shoulder such a tremendous peacetime tax responsibility. It is a serious and disturbing situation when we find that the average taxpayer spends 12 hours of his 40-hour workweek to get the money to pay his Federal, State, and local government taxes.

Tax collections this fiscal year ending June 30 will reach an alltime high of about $82 billion with an estimated $93 billion for fiscal year ending June 30, 1963. Yet, the cost of government keeps on going higher and higher without any tax relief for the average little fellow.

While an increase in personal exemptions under my bill would cut about $3 billion off Federal revenues, our own previous experience indicates that tax cuts are always followed by increased consumer spending, greater production, more employment, and large revenues to our Government.

The current trend toward rising taxes and higher government spending has become a matter of grave concern to the American taxpayers and they have reached the point of revolt against ever-increasing government costs. This bill to increase the personal income tax exemptions will be a step in the right direction toward granting partial tax relief to Mr. and Mrs. American Taxpayer.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill, H.R. 10162, to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to make loans to the International Monetary Fund, and thus to permit U.S. participation in special borrowing arrangements of the International Monetary Fund. The proposed legislation would make it possible to augment the resources of the International Monetary Fund in order to strengthen the international monetary system and the position of the United States in that system.

The new borrowing arrangements provide that 10 major industrial countries, including the United States, would stand ready to lend their currencies to the Fund if needed to forestall or cope with an impairment of the international monetary system. The liberalization of trade and capital movements, and the emergence of strong convertible currencies other than the dollar in recent years, have made possible wider swings in the balance of payments of the major countries. Consequently, the principal currencies which are used in world trade and in which monetary reserves are held have from time to time come under severe, though temporary, pressures. It is in the interest of the free world to prevent these pressures from impairing the stability of the international monetary system.

The International Monetary Fund does not at the present time have resources in the form of the currencies of the main industrial countries adequate to deal with various contingencies which might arise. In the event of unusual pressures on the dollar, in particular, the Fund would require additional resources in order to be able to come to the assistance of the United States in an effective manner. The additional resources now proposed would total $6 billion, of which $4 billion would represent lending commitments of countries other than the United States—the European Common Market countries, the United Kingdom, Canada, Japan, and Sweden.

It is not expected that the United States would be called upon to lend any portion of its share in the supplemental Fund resources in the absence of a substantial improvement in our balance-of-payments position. Approval of the proposed legislation is needed, however, in order to permit U.S. adherence to the International Monetary Fund arrangements. The arrangements cannot enter into force without such U.S. adherence.

The new borrowing arrangements would primarily benefit the United States.

Under unanimous consent, I include the bill at this point in the Record, together with the message from the President urging prompt consideration of this legislation.

H.R. 10162

A bill to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act to authorize the United States to participate in loans to the International Monetary Fund to strengthen the international monetary system

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, as amended (22 U.S.C. 286–286k–1), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

"Sec. 17. (a) In order to carry out the purposes of the decision of January 5, 1962, of the Executive Directors of the International Monetary Fund, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to make loans, not to exceed $2,000,000,000 outstanding at any one time, to the Fund under article VII, section 2(i), of the Articles of Agreement of the Fund. Any loan under the authority granted in this subsection shall be made with due regard to the present and prospective balance of payments and reserve position of the United States.

"(b) For the purpose of making loans to the International Monetary Fund pursuant to this section, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated $2,000,000,000, to remain available until expended to meet calls by the International Monetary Fund. Any payments made to the United States by the International Monetary Fund as a repayment on account of the principal of a loan made under this section shall continue to be available for loans to the International Monetary Fund.

"(c) Payments of interest and charges to the United States on account of any loan to the International Monetary Fund shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. In addition to the amount authorized in subsection (b), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary for the payment of charges in connection with any purchases of currencies or gold by the United States from the International Monetary Fund.

"Sec. 18. Any purchases of currencies or gold by the United States from the International Monetary Fund may be transferred to and administered by the fund established by section 10 of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934, as amended (31 U.S.C. 822a), for use in accordance with the provisions of that section. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to utilize the resources of that fund for the purpose of any repayments in connection with such transactions."

Sec. 2. The last sentence of section 7(c) of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act (22 U.S.C. 286e) is amended to read as follows: "The face amount of special notes issued to the Fund under the authority of this subsection and outstanding at any one time shall not exceed in the aggregate the amount of the subscription of the United States actually paid to the Fund and the dollar equivalent of currencies and gold which the United States shall have purchased from the Fund in accordance with the Articles of Agreement, and the face amount of such notes issued to the Bank and outstanding at any one time shall not exceed in the aggregate the amount of the subscription of the United States actually paid to the Bank under article II, section 7(1), of the Articles of Agreement of the Bank."

The White House,
Washington, D.C., February 2, 1962.

Hon. John W. McCormack,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Speaker: Transmitted herewith for the consideration of the Congress is legislation which would implement the recommendations of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems relating to special borrowing arrangements of the International Monetary Fund. A copy of the report of the Council is attached.

The legislation takes the form of an amendment to the Bretton Woods Agreements Act and authorizes the United States to participate in loans to the International Monetary Fund in order to strengthen the international monetary system.

The International Monetary Fund has been a vital force for economic stability in the free world ever since it was formed in 1946. Its transactions have supported the currencies of free world nations which encountered balance of payments or other monetary difficulties, and it helped maintain confidence in the currencies of its members. The leadership of the United States in the establishment and support of the Fund has been a source of pride and satisfaction.

In my message of last February 6, I discussed the imbalance in our international payments and called for a series of related measures to correct it. A number of these measures have been adopted. But the problem is stubborn and complex and will require additional action over a number of years.

Meanwhile, we can strengthen the monetary system in general and the position of the United States in that system by augmenting the resources and flexibility of the International Monetary Fund to permit the Fund to be utilized more effectively in supporting a healthy and growing world economy.

To accomplish this purpose, intensive negotiations have gone forward, with the active participation of the Fund, among the major industrial nations of the free world. These negotiations culminated in the proposals described and recommended in the National Advisory Council's report calling for the addition of $6 billion to the resources of the Fund. This addition would strongly reinforce the international monetary system of the free world.

It would, in particular, greatly enhance the ability of the Fund to assist the United States in coping with its international payments problems. Today, the Fund has on hand only $1.6 billion of the currencies of other major industrial countries—exclusive of the United Kingdom, which has itself made a large drawing from the Fund—to meet a possible need for a drawing by the United States. The new arrangements would permit an additional $3 billion increase in available resources of these other major currencies, and would thus assure the Fund the assets needed to meet a request for a drawing by the United States should such a request ever be necessary. At a time when the confidence in the dollar is of utmost importance to the free world, the $6 billion addition to the Fund will be especially significant. It will greatly enhance our own financial resources and greatly reduce any possibility of a serious drain upon dollar balances. The very existence of the new standby credits will be an assurance of stability of major currencies.

The new borrowing arrangements would require amendment of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act by authorizing the United States to lend up to $2 billion to the Fund. The other nine participants in the arrangement would commit themselves to provide up to $4 billion. The commitment of nearly $2.5 billion by members of the European Common Market—Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, and the Netherlands—would represent an amount about equal to the present aggregate of their Fund quotas. By contrast the United States and the United Kingdom would provide amounts equal to only about half their present quotas. The United States would not be expected to lend to the Fund in the absence of a substantial improvement in its balance-of-payments position.

The new proposals would strengthen the position of the dollar as the world's major reserve currency. They would also provide new armament for the defense of the currencies of the free world and for reinforcing the entire international monetary system.

I urge, therefore, that the Congress promptly consider this legislation. Participation by the United States in the proposed arrangements is in the national interest.

Sincerely,

John F. Kennedy.

SUGAR

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, the farm message has been received. I have studied it very carefully. I have searched all of the small print. And now, at the risk of sounding like a broken record, I must ask one question. Where was the administration's recommendation relative to the welfare of this Nation's sugar producers?

It is a question I have been asking for a good long time. I have said many times in the past that the Department of Agriculture should come forth with a proposal on sugar legislation. It certainly comes as news to no one that the Sugar Act expires on June 30 of this year. We have reminded the Secretary often enough. I was alarmed last session that time was slipping away and that the Congress would be faced with last-minute, hurry-up legislation if action was not taken early. Now, the time element is critical.

I cannot understand why a recommendation on sugar has not been made. We know that the respective people in the sugar industry have expressed their concern and desire for early action. But the Agriculture Department and the Agriculture Committee remain conspicuously silent.

Indeed, the Agriculture Committee is now starting hearings on the general farm bill while time continues to run out on the domestic sugar producer's hope for fair treatment.

It is inconceivable to me that the Congress should be expected to talk about either farm problems or reciprocal trade policies without prior agreement on long-term sugar legislation.

A glaring failure of the last session of this Congress was the lack of action on sugar legislation. The very least that should have been expected was early consideration this session. But we now find the session a month old and neither the Department of Agriculture nor the Agriculture Committee has come up with a single proposal. This sin by omission against American agriculture is a crippling blow.

PROTECTION FOR DOMESTIC LEAD-ZINC MINING INDUSTRY

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Hall] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill providing for import tariffs to provide protection for the domestic lead-zinc mining industry. In so doing, I have joined a large number of Congressmen from 20 lead-zinc producing States.

Only 10 years ago, the domestic mines produced lead and zinc valued at $300 million annually, but excessive imports, much of which has found its way into our supplemental and strategic stockpile, has resulted in an average domestic production during the past 4 years of only one-half this amount.

This decline in production has had a detrimental effect on the mining industry in southwest Missouri, with serious consequences for employees, their families, and communities.

The lead-zinc industry has a long record of effort to correct this situation. The Tariff Commission has twice determined that the mines are injured by excessive imports, but as recently as only last July, the executive department has continued to recommend stockpiling by increased imports from Canada and Australia.

The bill I have introduced would increase the basic permanent tariff rates and provide an additional removable tax that will be applied only when excessive imports adversely affect our domestic price. This is a plan to revitalize our domestic mines, provide a good metal supply to the consumer, and provide a fair share of our markets to the importer at reasonable prices.

The subsidy bill passed last year did not begin to get at the real roots of the problem in the lead-zinc industry. I believe the bill I have introduced today will begin to meet the problem and I urge its consideration by the Congress.

ADULT LITERACY ACT OF 1962

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I offer for the RECORD a letter signed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare addressed to the Speaker, and a bill known as the Adult Literacy Act of 1962, and other extraneous matter:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, February 6, 1962.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I am enclosing for the consideration of the Congress a draft bill—the Adult Literacy Act of 1962—to assist the States and local communities in establishing programs of instruction for adults who are unable to read and write English or who have not achieved a sixth-grade level of education, and to assist in the preparation of special instructional materials and specially qualified teachers. This legislative proposal would carry out the President's recommendations with respect to adult literacy contained in his education message of February 6, 1962.

We are in a technological revolution, with automation rapidly developing in many industries. Further, 1960 census reports indicate that approximately 8 million adults or 8 percent of our population aged 25 or over are defined as functionally illiterate—that is, have achieved less than a fifth-grade education. Moreover, nearly 20 million Americans cannot adequately read an English language newspaper. The economic and personal welfare of all these people who cannot read and write the English language—and, consequently, of the entire Nation—urgently requires that they be enabled to do so.

The draft bill would provide for specialized preparation of teachers and teaching materials; for aid to public school systems for literacy classes and courses; and for grants to State departments of education to assist in developing and supervising literacy courses in the school districts of the State.

1. The specialized teacher preparation would be accomplished through grants to colleges and universities. Such grants would also be made for development of suitable teaching materials for adult literacy programs.

2. The draft bill would also authorize an appropriation of $5 million in fiscal year 1963 and $10 million in each of the next 4 years for grants to the States for:

(a) Pilot projects for demonstrating effective methods and courses for teaching adult literacy and for stimulating local programs.

(b) Support and expansion of local programs of instruction in adult literacy.

(c) Support of the State educational agency in providing technical assistance and supervision of local adult literacy programs.

To be eligible for grants, the bill requires a State to submit a plan providing, in addition to various administrative provisions, for a program designed to raise substantially the level of adult literacy in a reasonable period of time and among all segments of the population. The appropriations would be allotted among the States on the basis of the relative number of adults who are unable to read and write English or who have not achieved a sixth-grade level of education.

Progress in upgrading manpower skills, in reducing dependency and welfare costs, in combating poverty, in promoting general economic growth, and in encouraging maximum personal development and the fullest contribution of free citizens in a democracy can be made only if all our citizens possess the basic skills of learning necessary for acquisition of knowledge.

Passage of this draft bill will do much, in the next 5 years, to achieve these vital goals.

I would appreciate it if you would be good enough to refer the enclosed draft bill to the appropriate committee for consideration.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that enactment of this proposed legislation would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely,

ABE RIBICOFF,
Secretary.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education—cost estimates, Adult Literacy Act of 1962

	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967
Authorization:					
Grants to States	$5,000,000	$10,000,000	$10,000,000	$10,000,000	$10,000,000
Grants to institutions of higher learning [1]	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
Total	5,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
Appropriation requirements:					
Grants to States	5,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
Grants to institutions of higher learning	250,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Administration	150,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
Total	5,400,000	11,200,000	11,200,000	11,200,000	11,200,000
Expenditures:					
Grants to States	2,700,000	12,300,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
Grants to institutions of higher learning	175,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Administration	125,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
Total	3,000,000	13,500,000	11,200,000	11,200,000	11,200,000
Man-years of employment	15	22	24	24	24

[1] Such sums as may be necessary.

H.R. 10143

A bill to assist in providing necessary instruction for adults unable to read and write English or with less than a sixth grade level of education, through grants to institutions of higher learning for development of materials and methods of instructions and for training of teaching and supervisory personnel and through grants to States for pilot projects, improvement of State services, and programs of instruction

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Adult Literacy Act of 1962".

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. It is the purpose of this Act to initiate a program of furnishing instruction to adults who are unable to read and write English, as determined in accordance with regulations of the Commissioner, and adults who have not completed the sixth grade of school or achieved an equivalent level of education, as so determined, so as to help eliminate such inability and raise the level of education of such adults with a view to making them less likely to become dependent on others, increasing their opportunities for more productive and profitable employment, and making them better able to meet their adult responsibilities.

TRAINING OF TEACHERS AND DEVELOPMENT OF INSTRUCTIONAL METHODS AND MATERIALS

SEC. 3. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and each of the four succeeding fiscal years such sums as may be necessary for (1) grants to public or nonprofit private institutions of higher learning to assist them in the development of methods of, and materials for use in, instructing adults described in section 2, and (2) grants to such institutions of higher learning to assist them in providing specialized training for teachers of such adults and for supervisors of such teachers, including the establishment and maintenance of traineeships with such stipends and allowances as may be determined by the Commissioner.

(b) Payments of grants made under subsection (a) may be made by the Commissioner from time to time, in advance or by way of reimbursement, as he may determine.

GRANTS TO STATES FOR ADULT LITERACY PROGRAMS

SEC. 4. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, the sum of $5,000,000, and for each of the four succeeding fiscal years the sum of $10,000,000, for grants to States which have State plans approved by the Commissioner under this section.

(b) Grants under subsection (a) may be used, in accordance with regulations of the Commissioner, to—

(1) assist in establishment of pilot projects by local educational agencies, relating to instruction in public schools of adults described in section 2, to (A) demonstrate, test, or develop modifications, or adaptations in the light of local needs, of special materials or methods for instruction of such adults, (B) stimulate the development of local educational agency programs for instruction of such adults in the public

schools, and (C) to acquire additional information concerning the materials or methods needed for an effective adult literacy program;

(2) assist in meeting the cost of local educational agency programs for instruction of such adults in the public schools; and

(3) assist in development or improvement of technical or supervisory services by the State educational agency relating to adult literacy programs.

(c) The Commissioner shall approve for purposes of this section the plan of a State which—

(1) provides for administration thereof by the State educational agency;

(2) provides that such agency will make such reports to the Commissioner, in such form and containing such information, as may reasonably be necessary to enable the Commissioner to perform his duties under this Act;

(3) provides such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the State under this section;

(4) provides for cooperative arrangements between the State educational agency and the State health authority looking toward provision of such health information and services for adults described in section 2 as may be available from such agencies and as may reasonably be necessary to enable them to benefit from the instruction provided under programs conducted pursuant to grants under this section; and

(5) sets forth a program for use, in accordance with subsection (b), of grants under this section which affords assurance of substantial progress, within a reasonable period and with respect to all segments of the population and all areas of the State, toward elimination of the inability of adults to read and write English and toward substantially raising the level of education of adults with less than a sixth grade education.

The Commissioner shall not finally disapprove any State plan submitted under this section, or any modification thereof, without first affording the State educational agency reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

(d) (1) From the sums appropriated under subsection (a) for a fiscal year the Commissioner shall reserve such amount, but not in excess of 1.6 per centum thereof, as he may determine to be necessary for allotment to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Canal Zone, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands, according to their respective needs; and shall allot the remainder of such sums on the basis of the relative number of adults described in section 2 in each State, as determined by the Commissioner on the basis of the best and most recent information available to him, including any relevant data furnished to him by the Department of Commerce.

(2) The amount of any State's allotment under paragraph (1) for a fiscal year which the Commissioner determines will not be required, for the period such allotment is available, for carrying out the State plan (if any) approved under this section shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates during such period as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under paragraphs (1) for such year, but with such adjustments as may be necessary to prevent reallotment to any State of any sum in excess of the amount which the Commissioner estimates it needs and will be able to use for such period for carrying out such State's plan approved under subsection (c). Any amount reallotted to a State under this paragraph during a year shall be deemed part of its allotment under paragraph (1) for such year.

(e) The allotment of any State under subsection (d) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, shall except to the extent reallotted under paragraph (2) thereof, remain available until June 30, 1964, for obligation by such State for carrying out its State plan approved under subsection (c).

(f) The Commissioner shall from time to time estimate the amount to be paid to a State for carrying out its State plan approved under subsection (c); and shall pay, from the allotment available therefor, the amount so estimated in such installments as he may determine, after making appropriate adjustments to take account of previously unadjusted overpayments or underpayments previously made.

(g) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State educational agency administering a State plan approved under subsection (c), finds that—

(1) the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of subsection (c), or

(2) in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision, the Commissioner shall notify such State agency that no further payments will be made to the State under this section (or, in his discretion, further payments to the State will be limited to programs under or portions of the State plan not affected by such failure), until he is satisfied that there will no longer be any failure to comply. Until he is so satisfied, the Commissioner shall make no further payments to such State under this section (or shall limit payments to programs under or portions of the State plan not affected by such failure).

(h) A State educational agency dissatisfied with a final action of the Commissioner under subsection (c) or (g) may appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which the State is located, by filing a petition with such court within sixty days after such final action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Commissioner, or any officer designated by him for that purpose. The Commissioner thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code. Upon the filing of such petition, the court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part, temporarily or permanently. The findings of the Commissioner as to the facts, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive, but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall file in the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence. The judgment of the court affirming or setting aside, in whole or in part, any action of the Commissioner shall be final, subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code.

FEDERAL CONTROL OF EDUCATION PROHIBITED

SEC. 5. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution or school system.

MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 6. (a) The Commissioner may delegate to any officer or employee of the Office of Education any of his powers or duties under this Act.

(b) For purposes of this Act—

(1) the term "adult" means any individual who has attained the age of 18;

(2) the term "State" includes, except for purposes of section 4(d)(1), the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, the Canal Zone, and American Samoa;

(3) the term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of Education;

(4) the term "State educational agency" means the State board of education or other agency or officer primarily responsible for the State supervision of public elementary and secondary schools, or, if there is no such officer or agency, an officer or agency designated by the Governor or by State law;

(5) the term "local educational agency" means a board of education or other legally constituted local school authority having administrative control and direction of public elementary or secondary schools in a city, county, township, school district, or political subdivision in a State.

(c) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall submit to the President, for transmission to the Congress, prior to January 1, 1967, the Commissioner's report on the administration of this Act, together with the Secretary's recommendations on the continuation of this Act and the extent to which it should be modified in order better to accomplish its purposes or otherwise raise the educational level of adults.

LONG-RANGE SUGAR LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, among the important subjects which the Congress must consider early in this session is the subject of long-range sugar legislation. The present Sugar Act expires June 30 of this year. For the last year and a half the domestic sugar industry and, indeed, also the foreign suppliers to our market, have labored under the handicap of short-term extensions to the act.

We have been repeatedly told that two things were essential for the Congress to begin consideration of a long-range sugar law: First, an agreement by the various segments of the domestic sugar industry on what proposals to recommend for our consideration; and, second, a recommendation on long-range sugar legislation by the executive branch of the Government.

I am pleased to report to the Members of this House that the first point now is accomplished fact. All the segments of the entire domestic sugar producing and refining industry have reconciled their different points of view and have agreed on a carefully worked-out program, which they propose to present for the consideration of the Congress as soon as they are given the opportunity to do so.

It is my understanding that this program has been discussed with various Members of the Congress and with various responsible persons in the executive branch of the Government.

I do not propose to discuss the program at this time. I do wish, however, to commend the representatives of the segments of the domestic sugar producing and refining industry for coming forth with this joint program and therefore assisting the Congress materially in moving rapidly toward full and early consideration of a long-range sugar law, first in the House Committee on Agriculture, and then here on the floor of the House.

This industry agreement was not arrived at easily. That is plain when you see that it has the support of widely divergent groups: The American sugarbeet industry, the mainland sugarcane industry, the U.S. cane sugar refining industry, the Hawaiian sugar industry, and the Puerto Rican sugar industry.

It is obvious that these groups have widely varying points of view, and that in order to achieve unanimity, many compromises were necessary. I am sure that no single group finds that every provision in the proposal is to its entire satisfaction. But in order to cooperate with the Congress in getting a long-range law, every group has reduced its individual ambitions and tempered its desires. For this, every group is to be highly commended.

The next step is for the administration to present its views. I express the fervent hope, Mr. Speaker, that those views will be forthcoming without further delay.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. Sikes (at the request of Mr. Albert), for today, on account of illness.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Diggs (at the request of Mr. O'Hara of Illinois).

Mr. Loser.

Mr. Anfuso, notwithstanding it will exceed two pages of the Record and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $297.

Mr. Smith of Iowa.

Mr. Van Zandt.

Mr. Rodino.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. Albert) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. Kelly.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 160. An act for the relief of Thomas O. Tate, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judicary.

S. 1273. An act for the relief of Jong Dae Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1397. An act for the relief of Mate Ivan Jurasic (also known as Mike Jurasic); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1499. An act for the relief of William John Campbell McGaughey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1520. An act for the relief of Mary Elizabeth Sidor Polkowska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1578. An act for the relief of Edward Yin Liang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1684. An act for the relief of Merle K. Loessin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1756. An act for the relief of the city of Pasco, Wash.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2018. An act for the relief of Robert B. Kasparek, Robert M. Kearny, Richard A. Stokes, J. R. Whitehouse, Jr., and Herbert A. Wolff, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2155. An act for the relief of Stephen Patrick House, Ellen Myra Rachel House, Thomas Stephen Rendall House, and Jane Ellen House; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2165. An act for the relief of Jean L. Dunlop; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2147. An act for the relief of Kenneth Stultz;

H.R. 2973. An act for the relief of Anthony Robert Lowry (Antonio Piantadosi);

H.R. 3710. An act for the relief of Giles L. Matthews;

H.R. 4194. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ann W. Edwards;

H.R. 4211. An act for the relief of Alessandroi Bottero;

H.R. 4280 An act for the relief of Dimitri Elias Sartan;

H.R. 4381. An act for the relief of Walter H. Hanson;

H.R. 6120. An act for the relief of Francis Ainsworth;

H.R. 6226. An act for the relief of Arlin David English;

H.R. 6243. An act extending to Guam the power to enter into certain interstate compacts relating to the enforcement of the criminal laws and policies of the States;

H.R. 6644. An act for the relief of Julius Benikosky;

H.R. 6938. An act for the relief of Dr. Robert E. Hiller;

H.R. 7740. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sharon Lee Harden; and

H.R. 8779. An act for the relief of George B. Olmstead.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 12, 1962, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1673. A letter from the Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report on title I, Public Law 480, 83d Congress, as amended, on agreements concluded during December 1961, pursuant to Public Law 85–128; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1674. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the custodianship functions of the Office of the Treasurer of the United States, Treasury Department, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1675. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of utilization of excess R3350–26WA aircraft engines as a source for spare parts by the Department of the Navy, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1676. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the 49th Annual Report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 604; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1677. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of December 31, 1961, pursuant to section 5(e) of the Communications Act, as amended July 16, 1952, by Public Law 554; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1678. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases of certain aliens who have been found admissible to the United States pursuant to section 212(a) (28) (I) (ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee of conference. H.R. 258. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act so as to increase the rate of tax imposed on gross receipts from certain sales, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1328). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 9300. A bill to provide that the House of Representatives shall be composed of 439 Members beginning with the 88th Congress; with amendment (Rept. No. 1329). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SPENCE:

H.R. 10162. A bill to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act to authorize the United States to participate in loans to the International Monetary Fund to strengthen the international monetary system; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 10163. A bill to amend the law relating to pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 10164. A bill to increase the opportunities for training of physicians, dentists, and professional public health personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DAGUE:

H.R. 10165. A bill to establish a cropland retirement program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DOLE:

H.R. 10166. A bill to extend and amend the conservation reserve program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. EVINS:

H.R. 10167. A bill to amend section 31 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, relating to registration fees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 10168. A bill to amend chapter 34 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to documentary stamp taxes); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 10169. A bill to increase from $600 to $700 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 10170. A bill relating to the tax treatment of transfers of rights to copyrights and literary, musical and artistic compositions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 10171. A bill to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 10172. A bill to provide for the reentitlement of certain surviving widows to annuities under the Civil Service Retirement Act upon termination of their subsequent remarriages by reason of death of husband, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 10173. A bill to require certain uniform lighting of taxicabs for hire in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 10174. A bill to amend the Internal Security Act of 1950; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

H.R. 10175. A bill to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 to provide for a security program with respect to defense contractors and their employees; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H.R. 10176. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the integrated Loup River division, Nebraska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 10177. A bill to establish in the District of Columbia government the Council for the Preservation of Historic Landmarks and for Cultural Development; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.J. Res. 626. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting representation in the electoral college to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kansas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to establish a modern grain research center on or near the campus of Kansas State University of Agriculture and Applied Sciences at Manhattan, Kans., which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. RYAN introduced a bill (H.R. 10178) for the relief of Katherina Raffaelli, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

Thursday, February 8, 1962

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Honorable J. J. Hickey, a Senator from the State of Wyoming.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

God of all grace, trusting only in Thy mercy would we seek Thy presence. Keep us, we beseech Thee, from the folly of attempting to deceive Thee, unto whom all hearts are open, all desires known. As those whose powers are dedicated to the Nation's welfare, make Thy servants here in the ministry of public affairs faithful to each challenging duty, loyal to every high claim, responsive to the human needs of this suffering earth.

In a confused day, keep our minds clear, fair, and uncluttered by partisan prejudice. In a darkened day, when so many lights have gone out, give us the sight and the insight of the pure in heart, that we may see God and the godlike everywhere as we toil in these fields of time in the sense of the eternal. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The Chief Clerk read the following letter:

U.S. Senate,
President pro tempore,
Washington, D.C., February 8, 1962.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. J. J. Hickey, a Senator from the State of Wyoming, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

Carl Hayden,
President pro tempore.

Mr. HICKEY thereupon took the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, February 7, 1962, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Lt. Gen. Paul D. Harkins, U.S. Army, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the rank of general, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 8723) to amend the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act with respect to the method of enforcement and to provide certain additional sanctions, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

H.R. 2147. An act for the relief of Kenneth Stultz;

H.R. 2973. An act for the relief of Anthony Robert Lowry (Antonio Piantadosi);

H.R. 3710. An act for the relief of Giles L. Matthews;

H.R. 4194. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ann W. Edwards;

H.R. 4211. An act for the relief of Alessandroi Bottero;

H.R. 4280. An act for the relief of Dimitri Elias Sartan;

H.R. 4381. An act for the relief of Walter H. Hanson;

H.R. 6120. An act for the relief of Francis Ainsworth;

H.R. 6226. An act for the relief of Arlin David English;

H.R. 6243. An act extending to Guam the power to enter into certain interstate compacts relating to the enforcement of the criminal laws and policies of the States;

H.R. 6644. An act for the relief of Julius Benikosky;

H.R. 6938. An act for the relief of Dr. Robert E. Hiller;

H.R. 7740. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sharon Lee Harden; and

H.R. 8779. An act for the relief of George B. Olmstead.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection with the morning hour be limited to 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Foreign Relations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Report on Agreements Under Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954

A letter from the Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on agreements concluded during December 1961, under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Report of Secretary of Commerce

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

Acceptance by Certain Retired Personnel of the U.S. Government of Decorations Tendered by Foreign Countries

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize certain retired personnel of the U.S. Government to accept and wear decorations, presents, and other things tendered them by certain foreign countries (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Audit Report of Custodianship Functions of Office of Treasurer of the United States

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the custodianship functions, Office of the Treasurer of the United States, Treasury Department, fiscal year 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Admission Into the United States of Certain Defector Aliens

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting admission into the United States of certain defector aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the Colville Indian Association, of the State of Washington, relating to a redress of grievances; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

RESOLUTIONS ON PROBLEMS OF THE GLOVE INDUSTRY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the enactment of new trade legislation raises many tough problems. All conscientious Members of Congress must be mindful of the effects of trade legislation both at home and abroad. One of the most hard hit communities in New York State, as far as trade is concerned, is the city of Gloversville, a well-known center for the manufacture of leather gloves. Leather gloves require a great deal of hand labor, and therefore are more inexpensively manufactured overseas than in many areas of the United States.

I have taken a deep interest in the problems of the glove industry and have sought to do everything I could to help the workers involved as well as the community in which they live. I would like to take this opportunity today to call to the attention of the Senate resolutions adopted by the Common Council of the City of Gloversville and by the United Glove Workers of America indicating their views on new trade legislation. I ask unanimous consent that these resolutions be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolution by United Glove Workers of America

Whereas Congress will be asked to reconsider the U.S. tariff policy at its next session; and

Whereas it appears that the administration will recommend to the Congress that it effectively and substantially reduce the present tariff structure; and

Whereas it appears that the objective of the administration policy is the free interchange of goods with all the nations of the world with the hope that such interchange will build peaceful relationships and reduce the economic barriers that contribute to international friction and unrest; and

Whereas the United Glove Workers of America is a labor organization organized to protect and further the interest of glove workers in the United States, and particularly in the Fulton County, New York State area; and

Whereas the members of the United Glove Workers of America have within recent years been adversely affected by the vast increase of foreign gloves imported into the United States; and

Whereas the glove workers represented by the union have consistently taken the position, before the Tariff Commission, before State and Federal agencies and elsewhere, that their right to employment as American workers of skill and ability in their craft must be recognized as at least equal with the national policy of supporting the economy of foreign lands; and

Whereas the glove workers of our country have and are suffering a disproportionate reduction in their work opportunity as a result of a vast influx of gloves streaming into this country under very favorable tariff rates; and

Whereas the members have considered this matter based upon extensive tariff experience in this industry and its relation to world trade, and in the interest of protecting the American worker as well as furthering the security of his foreign counterpart; and

Whereas all the glove workers are mindful of their responsibility to their families, their country, and to the world community: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the President of the United States and the Congress are urged to adopt a firm and resolute policy concerning the glove industry which policy shall clearly by a system of quota, balance and regulate glove imports into the United States in accordance with a predetermined ratio and proportion of imports to domestic production; and be it further

Resolved, That such quota or proportion system be fair and equitable so that foreign trade is encouraged and American jobs may be protected, always thereby assuring employment for glove workers of our land and other lands while safeguarding the American glove industry; and be it further

Resolved, That in the safeguarding of the American glove industry there will always be the ready reservoir of workers and factories that will stand ready, in the event of national emergency, to produce handwear for soldier and civilian alike.

Resolution 73

Resolution protesting reduction of protective tariff

Whereas President John F. Kennedy's new trade program of increasing exports must of necessity bring about an increase in imports; and

Whereas such program will mean, as has been stated by President Kennedy, the necessity of lowering trade barriers; and

Whereas President Kennedy states that greater consumer benefits, healthier competition and a check on inflation will be brought about by his new program; and

Whereas the city of Gloversville has a population of 21,744 people; and

Whereas the glove industry accounts for approximately 70 percent of the manufacturing employment in the city of Gloversville; and

Whereas the city of Gloversville has had the distinction of being the glove manufacturing center of the world; and

Whereas approximately 95 percent of the domestic glove manufacturing is done in Fulton County; and

Whereas by reason of the lack of more effective trade barriers in the form of tariffs or quotas on glove imports Gloversville is rated by the U.S. Bureau of Employment in group F; that is, "job seekers substantially in excess of job opportunities—rate of unemployment 12 percent or over"; and

Whereas the only market available to the domestic glove manufacturers is the domestic market; and

Whereas the entire glove industry is a small industry and its monetary impact on world trade is minute and when divided among all of the foreign countries is of no real benefit to any; and

Whereas the domestic glove industry is a necessary industry to the United States in that the glove manufacturers in Fulton County supplied to the U.S. Armed Forces 180 million pairs of gloves during World War II; and

Whereas the city of Gloversville has done much and hopes to do more in its own program of recovery and its policy of self-help; and

Whereas the city of Gloversville is about to embark on a long-range program of urban redevelopment for the improvement of its industrial, commercial, residential and community facilities; and

Whereas the sponsors of this resolution cannot believe that the people of the city of Gloversville have been forgotten; that they do not want to believe that they have been or will be sacrificed to world trade; that they want to believe that there is a future for themselves and their children in the city of Gloversville: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Common Council of the City of Gloversville go on record for the reasons hereinbefore set forth as being opposed to the program of President John F. Kennedy or his administration as it relates to trade barriers in the form of lowering or reducing the protective tariff insofar as it affects the glove industry; and let if further be

Resolved, That the Common Council of the City of Gloversville go on record requesting that relief be given to the glove industry in the form of placing quotas on glove imports to the United States and any such other Federal Government financial assistance as may be deemed necessary; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, Senators Jacob Javits and Kenneth Keating, Representatives Samuel Stratton and Carleton King, Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, State Assemblyman Joseph Younglove and State Senator Walter Van Wiggern, and to each and every other person or group of persons that should have notice of this resolution; and be it further

Resolved, That Mayor Grover ask all of the people of our city to write letters to the aforesaid President and Representatives protesting any interference with trade barriers as they now exist.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. **EASTLAND**, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, without amendment:

H. R. 1375. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the former owner thereof (Rept. No. 1204); and

H.R. 4934. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to modify certain leases entered into for the provision of recreation facilities in reservoir areas (Rept. No. 1205).

By Mr. **ELLENDER**, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, without amendment:

S. 875. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey to the State of Wyoming for agricultural purposes certain real property in Sweetwater County, Wyo. (Rept. No. 1206); and

H.R. 9013. An act to provide for the transfer of rice acreage history where producer withdraws from the production of rice (Rept. No. 1207).

By Mr. **ELLENDER**, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with amendments:

S. 2533. A bill to amend subsection (d) of section 16 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended (Rept. No. 1208).

By Mr. **YOUNG** of North Dakota, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry without amendment:

H.R. 8842. An act to amend subsection (h) of section 124 of the Agricultural Enabling Amendments Act of 1961 (Rept. No. 1209).

NATIONAL STOCKPILE INVESTIGATION—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. **SYMINGTON**. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services I report an original resolution, approved unanimously this morning, that would authorize expenditures of not to exceed $30,000 by the committee or its Subcommittee on the National Stockpile for the purpose of conducting an investigation of the acquisition, storage, and disposal of strategic and critical materials for the national defense.

The investigation that would be financed by this resolution was requested by the President in his press conference last week. I have had discussions with my colleagues on the subcommittee, the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] and the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. We propose to conduct this investigation in a thorough but objective and nonpolitical manner. The staff assistance that must be had immediately is not large. Considering the magnitude of the programs that are the subject of this investigation, I believe the amount requested in this resolution is modest.

I earnestly hope that this resolution may be favorably considered by the Committee on Rules and Administration and later by the entire Senate at an early date, so as to permit our study to proceed with dispatch.

The resolution (S. Res. 295) to authorize a study by the Committee on Armed Services on strategic and critical stockpiling, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Armed Services, or its Subcommittee on the National Stockpile and Naval Petroleum Reserves, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the acquisition, storage, and disposal of strategic and critical materials necessary for the common defense.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1962, to January 31, 1963, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $30,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. **MAGNUSON**, from the Committee on Commerce:

Rear Adm. Edwin J. Roland, to be Assistant Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard, with the rank of vice admiral;

John S. Patterson, of Maryland; Ashton Barrett, of Mississippi; Thomas E. Stakem, of Virginia, and John Harllee, of the District of Columbia, to be Federal Maritime Commissioners;

James V. Day, of Maine, to be a Federal Maritime Commissioner;

Capt. William D. Shields, Capt. Richard D. Schmidtman, and Capt. Willard J. Smith, for promotion to the permanent rank of rear admiral in the U.S. Coast Guard; and

Donald Glen Popejoy, and sundry other persons, for permanent appointment in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

By Mr. **MORTON**, from the Committee on Commerce:

Kenneth H. Tuggle, of Kentucky, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. **GOLDWATER**. Mr. President, as in executive session, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably the nominations of one rear admiral and four vice admirals in the Navy, and one general in the Army. I ask that these names be placed on the Executive Calendar.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The report will be received and the nominations will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

The nominations are as follows:

Lt. Gen. Earle Gilmore Wheeler, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the rank of general;

Rear Adm. Peter Corradi, Civil Engineer Corps, U.S. Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks;

Rear Adm. Carl F. Espe, U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list; and

Vice Adm. William A. Schoech, Vice Adm. Roy L. Johnson, and Vice Adm. Rufus E. Rose, U.S. Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

Mr. **GOLDWATER**. I also report favorably 756 nominations for appointment and promotion in the Army in the grade of captain and below. All of these names have already appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In order to save the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Secretary's desk, for the information of any Senator.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The report will be received and the nominations will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Arizona.

The nominations are as follows:

Frank M. Alley, Jr., and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States; and

John W. Baker II, and sundry other distinguished military students, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. **BENNETT**:

S. 2825. A bill to impose a statutory prohibition upon the importation of certain furs which are the products of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or of Communist China; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. BENNETT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. **MORSE**:

S. 2826. A bill to improve the quality of elementary and secondary education; and

S. 2827. A bill to assist in providing necessary instruction for adults unable to read and write English or with less than a sixth grade level of education, through grants to institutions of higher learning for development of materials and methods of instruction and for training of teaching and supervisory personnel and through grants to States for pilot projects, improvement of State services, and programs of instruction; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. **MAGNUSON** (for himself and Mr. JACKSON):

S. 2828. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to confer insured status for disability insurance benefits thereunder upon disabled individuals who are not presently insured for such benefits but who were insured for such benefits at the time of the injury, or the inception of the disease or condition, which gave rise to their subsequent disabled condition; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 2829. A bill to amend title 12 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to remove certain limitations with respect to war risk insurance issued under the provisions of such title; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. BIBLE, and Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts):

S. 2830. A bill to amend the act providing financial assistance for local educational agencies in areas affected by Federal activities in order to provide assistance under the provisions of such act to the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HART:

S. 2831. A bill to eliminate the population limitation which makes certain communities in redevelopment areas ineligible for assistance under the public facility loan program; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

RESOLUTION

INVESTIGATION OF STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL STOCKPILING

Mr. SYMINGTON, from the Committee on Armed Services, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 295) to authorize a study by the Committee on Armed Services on strategic and critical stockpiling, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. SYMINGTON, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

CONTINUANCE OF EMBARGO ON FUR IMPORTS FROM RUSSIA AND COMMUNIST CHINA

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to place a statutory embargo on imports of mink and other select furs from Russia and Red China. At present there is a Presidential proclamation in effect which places an embargo on the following furs from these countries: ermine, fox, kolinsky, marten, mink, muskrat, and weasel. Of these, mink is the most important and probably makes up 90 percent of the imports of all of these furs.

The present embargo was put into effect pursuant to the Trade Agreements Act of 1951. Section 11 of that act directed the President to take such measures as were necessary to prohibit the importation of these furs from Russia and Communist China. Pursuant to that section, President Truman proclaimed the embargo in 1951, and it has been in effect ever since.

However, the tariff and trade bill which the Kennedy administration has submitted to Congress, H.R. 990, specifically repeals the 1951 act in section 248(c). Therefore, should H.R. 9900 become law it would remove the statutory basis for the embargo and the U.S.S.R. could deluge the United States with furs. Section 5 of the 1951 Trade Agreements Act, which also relates to imports from Russia and other Communist countries, is likewise specifically repealed by H.R. 9900, but there is a saving clause in the new bill which leaves in effect all action taken under section 5. But there is evidently no saving clause in H.R. 9900 to preserve the embargo on furs. The purpose of my bill is to clarify the situation and give statutory authority to continue this embargo irrespective of the outcome of H.R. 9900.

I would be prepared to incorporate my bill into H.R. 9900 when it comes over from the House if that appears to be the best approach. However, for now I desire to make sure that this embargo does continue, and thus I am introducing my bill.

Specifically, my bill would as a matter of technicality repeal section 11 of the 1951 Trade Agreements Act. But then it would impose a statutory embargo irrespective of that act, or of H.R. 9900. The embargo applies to the same list as in the current embargo: ermine, fox, kolinsky, marten, mink, muskrat, and weasel.

I am primarily concerned about mink. Between 40 and 50 percent of our mink consumption is from imports, primarily from the Scandinavian countries and Canada.

I ask consent to insert a table showing domestic production and total imports of mink skins over the decade 1951 through 1960. It also shows the ratio of imports to domestic production. It should be noted that the U.S. mink fur industry is of relatively recent origin. Prior to World War II most of our mink production was from wild animals. Mink farms are a postwar phenomenon.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE I.—*Domestic production and total imports of mink skins, 1951–60*

[Total skins in thousands]

	Domestic production	Total imports	Ratio of Imports to domestic production
1951	2,219	865	39.0
1952	2,483	1,164	46.9
1953	2,612	1,269	48.6
1954	2,912	1,422	48.9
1955	3,364	1,657	49.3
1956	4,417	1,870	42.3
1957	4,515	2,763	61.2
1958	5,078	2,591	51.0
1959	5,703	2,775	48.7
1960	6,445	2,846	44.2

Source: U.S. Tariff Commission.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the State of Utah ranks fifth in the Nation in mink production. Utah mink farmers produced 383,000 skins in 1960, representing 6 percent of total domestic production. It is my understanding that every State in the Nation, except possibly Hawaii, has some mink farming. The States which outrank Utah are Wisconsin, Minnesota, Washington, and Illinois. Other States making up the top 10 list are Oregon, Michigan, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and New York. Together, these 10 States accounted for 81 percent of 1960 U.S. mink production.

The embargo on Russian and Chinese mink pelts which went into effect in 1951 took place at a time when Russia was just beginning its breeding stock. Its mink industry is likewise of postwar vintage. No one knows the extent of Russia's stock today, but it is vastly greater than in the early postwar years.

I ask consent to insert in the RECORD a table showing total imports of mink for 1939 and 1946 through 1950, and the Russian and Chinese imports over those same years. These were the years before the embargo went into effect. Note that the Chinese figures are erratic, but the Russian figures generally show an increasing trend. The bulk of the imports are from the Scandinavian countries and from Canada.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE II.—*Domestic production, total imports, and imports from Russia and China of mink skins*

[Thousands of skins]

	Domestic production	Total imports	Imports from:	
			Russia	China
1939	[1] 450	1,000	14	15
1946	1,196	724	18	133
1947	1,526	1,028	40	14
1948	1,940	994	30	7
1949	1,871	1,665	33	[2]
1950	1,967	1,597	59	21

[1] Most of which were wild.

[2] Less than 500.

Source: U.S. Tariff Commission.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, if we were to open up our markets to Russian and Chinese pelts today, the relatively small figures of the late 1940's would become giant figures today because of Russia's progress in mink farming in the last decade. Our domestic market would collapse if Russia were permitted to flood the United States with furs. This must not happen or our fur industry will be driven out of business. The mink producers must even now sell much of their production below actual cost. The embargo must be continued if they are to survive. There is no justification for enriching the Communists at our expense.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2825) to impose a statutory prohibition upon the importation of certain furs which are the products of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or of Communist China, introduced by Mr. BENNETT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

PROVISION OF CERTAIN WAR RISK INSURANCE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, provides that the Secretary of Commerce, with the approval of the President, may provide insurance and reinsurance against loss or damage by war risk, whenever he finds that such insurance adequate for the needs of the waterborne commerce of the United States cannot be obtained on reasonable terms and conditions from companies authorized to carry on an insurance business in a State of the United States.

The war-risk insurance thus authorized may cover American vessels—including those under construction—foreign-flag vessels owned by citizens of the United States, or serving the commerce of the United States, and so forth; their cargoes, personal effects of officers, crews, passengers, and so forth.

However, the owner of a vessel built with construction subsidy is limited, by the first and third provisos of section 1209(a)2 of the act, as to the amount for which he can insure his vessel. Unlike the owner of a vessel not built with construction subsidy, the subsidized steamship vessel owner cannot, through prudent insurance, protect his investment for either its full replacement or market value, a limitation which places an unnecessary burden upon the contract operator. Since war risk insurance rates are calculated ex post facto, upon the actual loss experience, there would be no financial burden on the Government in permitting the operator to insure his vessel up to its full value.

I am introducing, by request, a bill to remove the limitations which now apply with reference to such insurance of vessels built with construction subsidy, and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2829) to amend title 12 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to remove certain limitations with respect to war risk insurance issued under the provisions of such title, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

IRON ORE IMPORTS AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE POLICIES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILLS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on the next printing of Senate bill 2819 and Senate bill 2820, relating to iron ore, introduced yesterday by the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the name of the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] be added as a cosponsor of the bills.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ENCOURAGEMENT OF DISCOVERY, DEVELOPMENT, AND PRODUCTION OF GOLD—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, there was a time when gold touched directly the lives of nearly every westerner. Thousands of our people were actively engaged in searching for it, or in actual mining operations. Many thousands more had financial interests in gold properties or in prospecting ventures. The rest of us, in former days, followed avidly the accounts of new strikes, saw gold in daily use as a medium of exchange, and carried gold coins—sometimes handed to us with great ceremony by our grandfathers—in our pockets.

There was also a time, Mr. President, when gold was one thing our country seemed to have enough of. We were bankers to the world, and the legendary hoard at Fort Knox seemed inexhaustible.

Now the western gold mines, with few exceptions, are closed. Our gold reserves have been drawn down to the danger point. And gold, itself, the precious metal extracted from the earth, is seen by most of us only in our wedding rings.

Mr. President, there is a plain and simple reason why gold is in short supply. The price of gold has been fixed, by Government order, at $35 an ounce, while everything required to find and produce it—from the prospector's time to the flotation cell—has doubled or tripled in cost.

Just as the cause for the scarcity of gold is plain, so also is the remedy; let the price of gold rise in a free market to reflect its real worth.

But we are told that this cannot be allowed to happen, because it would mean devaluation of the dollar. Now it would seem to me that it is gold, not the dollar, which is being devalued. Keeping the price of gold at $35 an ounce has not insured that $35 will buy the same suit of clothes, or the same month's supply of groceries, or even the same week's stay in a hospital that it would have brought in the thirties. Yet concern for the dollar seems destined to keep the price of gold fixed, and forces us to seek an alternate method for breaking the stalemate. And there is an alternative. We can restore production, and bolster our sagging reserves by paying an incentive for newly mined gold.

This is precisely what Senate Joint Resolution 44, which was introduced in the Senate last year by the junior Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], would authorize. Under the terms of this resolution, the monetary value of gold would remain unchanged at $35 an ounce, but the Secretary of the Interior would make incentive payments, up to an additional $35 an ounce for new production. The modest sums required for the incentive payments would come from general tax revenues. A part of this investment would be returned to the Treasury through the increased taxes paid by the rejuvenated gold mining industry; for the rest, the taxpayer would own his share of steadily increasing gold reserves in the Treasury, and the whole country would benefit from an easing of our balance of payments difficulties, and the consequent strengthening of our position in international trade and finance.

Mr. President, Senate Joint Resolution 44, which is pending in the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the Senate, deserves attention and favorable action. I ask unanimous consent that my name may be added to those of the junior Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], as a sponsor of this joint resolution.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEDICAL ASSISTANCE FOR CERTAIN ELDERLY PEOPLE WITHOUT INVESTIGATION PRIOR TO CERTIFICATION — ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of February 6, 1962, the name of Mr. BUSH was added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 2811) amending title I of the Social Security Act so as to require that, in the administration of State programs for medical assistance for the aged established pursuant to such title, a statement of a claimant for assistance under any such program with regard to his financial status shall, if made under oath, be regarded as factually correct for purposes of determining his eligibility for assistance under such programs, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself and other Senators) on February 6, 1962.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON S. 1677 AND S. 2148, BILLS TO AMEND THE MILLER ACT OF AUGUST 24, 1935, RELATING TO MECHANIC'S OR MATERIALMAN'S LIENS

Mr. HART. Mr. President, on behalf of a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Friday, February 23, 1962, at 10:30 a.m. in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on S. 1677 and the related bill, S. 2148, to amend the Miller Act of August 24, 1935, to provide that persons entitled to protection under State laws relating to mechanic's or materialman's liens who have furnished labor or materials for public works shall have a right to receive payment out of payment bonds furnished by the prime contractor on such public works.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in this legislation may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], and myself, chairman.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

Remarks made by Senator DOUGLAS at the appreciation dinner honoring Henry H. Bolz at Decatur, Ill., on January 10, 1962.

By Mr. ENGLE:

Letter dated January 25, 1962, from Representative HARRY R. SHEPPARD, of California, to Robert S. McNamara, Secretary of Defense, and the reply thereto, dated February 2, 1962, on the subject of the awarding of contracts for defense purposes.

COMMENDATION OF SENATORS FOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS AT THIS SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate passed Senate bill 2520, to amend the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act. At this time I wish to express my apprecation to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], for the skill and generalship he displayed in bringing that bill to passage. I also wish to commend the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] for the forbearance, the understanding, and the patience he showed in connection with the consideration of his amendments; and I am delighted to commend all Senators on both sides of the aisle for bringing this bill, which is of great importance, to a successful conclusion so quickly.

At this time I also wish to commend the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] for the excellent job he did in managing, as chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, the Du Pont bill, the first major piece of legislation passed at this session. I also commend the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] for their activity in connection with that measure, and also the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] for his patience, consideration, and understanding during the consideration of that bill.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I wish to state my thanks to the entire Senate for the fine attitude all Senators have displayed in connection with the measures I have mentioned. I hope this attitude will be apparent during the remainder of the session.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. As long as the bouquets are going around, I should like to commend the distinguished majority leader, the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], for making possible the passage of the measures he has mentioned. His forbearance, and at the same time the push he quietly gives all our business, should be praised. Inasmuch as he has been passing out compliments, I know that all other Members of the Senate join me in extending this compliment to him for his handling of these affairs.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senator from Connecticut is very kind; but I would call his attention to the fact that the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the majority leader, the Senator from Montana, are the servants of the Senate.

LATIN AMERICAN AND UNITED STATES POLICIES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a report on Latin American and United States policies, which I completed on January 13 last, and released on February 4, last Sunday. The report was made to a committee headed, as chairman, by the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], and to which were assigned, in addition to the Senator from Montana, as an ex officio member of the Foreign Relations Committee, the distinguished acting minority leader, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], and the distinguished senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH]. It was a pleasure and a privilege to serve under Senator McCLELLAN and with my colleagues, all of whom made outstanding contributions to the success of the trip. I have never served with a finer group of Senators. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LATIN AMERICA AND UNITED STATES POLICIES

(Report of Senator MIKE MANSFIELD on a study mission to Latin America, January 13, 1962)

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

JANUARY 13, 1962.

Hon. JOHN L. McCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on State, Justice, and the Judiciary and Related Agencies, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Submitted herewith is the report which we agreed that I should make at the conclusion of the study in Latin America of the Subcommittee on State, Justice, and the Judiciary and Related Agencies, of the Appropriations Committee. I would suggest that release of this report be deferred until the conclusion of the Punta del Este Conference which is scheduled to convene in Uruguay on January 22. The views expressed in this report are those of one Senator and are intended to contribute to the consideration of certain foreign policy questions by the Senate. The views expressed by the U.S. delegation at Punta del Este will be those of the President and, hence, the official position of the U.S. Government. There should be no confusion on that score.

There is not treated in detail in this report the operations of the various U.S. agencies in the nations which we visited, since that subject is being considered by the subcommittee as a whole. What I have sought to do here is to suggest major aspects of the Latin American situation of which we need to be aware, both in weighing issues of foreign policy and in legislating on related matters, notably aid programs and the staffing of agencies of the executive branch which operate abroad. Also included are individual conclusions and recommendations respecting our interests and our foreign policies which grow out of these observations and other studies over the years. The appendix contains reprints of reports which I have made on Latin America in preceding years to the Committee on Foreign Relations and other observations.

This report is submitted in my capacity as an ex officio member of your subcommittee, from the Committee on Foreign Relations. May I take this occasion, Mr. Chairman, to express my deep admiration for the manner in which you conducted the subcommittee's proceedings. It was a privilege to serve under your outstanding leadership and with the other able members of the subcommittee, Senators SMITH (Maine), DWORSHAK, BIBLE, and HRUSKA. I am confident that the subcommittee's work will be of benefit to our relations with the Latin American nations.

I should also like to express my thanks to the staff personnel from the Senate and the Air Force as well as to the personnel of the U.S. offices abroad. Their assistance and cooperation were most beneficial to the purposes of the study.

Sincerely yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

1. INTRODUCTORY

In Latin America, as elsewhere in the world, the maintenance of the most effective possible relations is dependent on our part on three principal factors: (1) An accurate comprehension of the situation as it exists and as it is evolving; (2) an accurate comprehension of our interests and a sense of proportion as to the importance of specific interests to the Nation as a whole; (3) the development of effective policies and their administration in a fashion which permits a realistic adjustment of our interests to the evolving situation.

If our understanding of the situation in Latin America is inaccurate, our relations will be correspondingly less effective. If we do not adequately comprehend our various national interests and the interplay between them, our relations will be correspondingly less effective. If our policies and their administration persist in the ingrained paths of the past out of inertia or if they change simply for the sake of change, if they presume to do more than it is practicable to do or less than they can potentially do, our relations will be correspondingly less effective.

In all three factors—in comprehension of the situation, in evaluation of our interests and in adjustments of the two through practical policies and alert administration—there have been deficiencies for many years. Significantly, there is recognition of that fact in this Nation. When we speak in general terms of our difficulties with or our neglect of Latin America we are referring, in specifics, to deficiencies in one or more of these three factors.

The Alliance for Progress represents a profound effort of leadership which could hasten the end of many of these deficiencies. In concept, it recognizes that Latin America is in an era of far-reaching change. In concept, it recognizes that we have a special concern in hemispheric affairs and that certain of our interests have deepened sharply or otherwise altered in recent years. In concept, it recognizes that we must modify old approaches and find new approaches, as necessary, in order to safeguard our interests in the light of the changing situation.

The Alliance for Progress, however, is a prescription for action; it is not, of itself, action. It is a promise of substantial benefit to the people of this hemisphere, our own included. The fulfillment of the promise depends on action, on the actions of many, not on those of the President alone or of the United States alone. The fulfillment depends on wise political and other leadership not only here but throughout the Americas. It depends on the adaptability and dedication of the bureaucracies of this Nation, of the other American republics, and the agencies of inter-American and international cooperation. It depends upon a high degree of mutual understanding among the peoples of the Americas so that there can be an accurate identification of common needs and reasonable expectations. Failure to meet these requirements will compel modifications in the Alliance for Progress. A significant abdication of these responsibilities may render the concept largely irrelevant to the future of the hemisphere.

2. THE CURRENT SITUATION IN LATIN AMERICA

The situation in Latin America is not one of unrelieved social stagnation, technical backwardness, and human misery. Conditions which may be so characterized exist in many parts of the region but it is inaccurate and misleading to view the entirety in that light.

Similarly, there is a degree of Communist influence in the Latin American countries and there is a high level of political instability in many of them. But, again, it is inaccurate and misleading to view the whole as seething with unrest and on the verge of collapse into communism.

Yet these overdramatized simplifications have come to dominate much of our thinking with respect to Latin America. Their inaccuracy or more properly, their one-sidedness represents a significant danger to the United States and to the hemisphere. The concepts have become deeply involved in the design and administration of our policies with respect to Latin America. To the extent that these policies represent a response to an incomplete interpretation of the situation, they can bring about inappropriate action. At best, the policies are likely to prove as ineffective as they are costly. At worst, they may act inadvertently against our interests and to enhance the role which communism and other totalitarian forms play in Latin America.

Therefore, in considering policies for Latin America, it is essential to bear in mind that what is involved is not a flat surface painted in the twin tones of misery and communism. Rather, it is a faceted situation in which there is a great deal of glitter along with the gloom and a whole spectrum of political forms and possibilities.

To be sure, we are considering an area of high illiteracy rates, an area in which there are millions of people who do not even speak Spanish or Portuguese, let alone read or write these principal national languages. We are considering an area in which millions of people obtain few, if any, of the public services and the material conveniences which we associate with modern life. We are considering an area in which millions of people have little, if any, modern medical care, an area in which high rates of death at birth and other factors shorten average life expectancies. We are considering an area in which millions of people eke out a bare subsistence under antiquated systems of tenure and inefficient techniques of agriculture. We are considering an area in which millions of the dispossessed from the countryside flow into and around the cities and live in appalling conditions of squalor.

All these conditions are to be found in Latin America. But this picture of backwardness is incomplete if it is taken as the whole. We are also considering an area in which tens of millions of people do read and write, an area which contains nations with high literacy rates. We are considering an area which includes several of the great cities of the globe, cities of extraordinary design and dynamism, cities whose services and concentrations of modern amenities and cultural achievements rival those found elsewhere in the world. We are dealing with nations which contain a substantial supply of modern medical and other scientific and technical skills. We are dealing with nations which have great resources of natural wealth in proportion to population.

We are dealing, finally, with nations which are in the midst of an expanding industrialization. If this process is stimulating inflationary pressures and other difficulties for millions, it is also producing new wealth, new benefits, and new opportunities and it is expanding the reservoir of skills for further development.

The brighter facets of the situation do not reflect evenly within the nations of Latin America. On the contrary, there is, generally, a widening contrast as between city and countryside in each nation. Nor is the reflection even as among the nations. A dynamic of progress, for example, is very much in evidence in Mexico. It is less evident, but it is not absent, elsewhere.

The important point, however, is that positive economic and social factors are to be found in the situation in Latin America. An appreciation of them is essential to an accurate understanding of the area. Any approach to policy which ignores or underestimates these factors by an obsessive fixation on the misery and backwardness which are also present, begins on an erroneous premise. Inevitably, the error will multiply in the actions which unfold under the policy.

In a similar fashion, it is essential to keep a sense of balance with respect to political developments in Latin America. As already noted, there is a Communist factor, spectacular in Cuba and less evident but nevertheless present in greater or lesser degree throughout Latin America. There is a high level of political instability in some nations which is related not only to communism but to more traditional political deficiencies. Jefeism, for example, military dictation of politics, oligarchic control, mob violence, and other such practices are by no means gone from the scene.

Again, however, the positive factors should not be overlooked. The forms of popularly responsible government exist in most of the nations of Latin America. Furthermore, an extension in the practice of such government seems still to be the dominant trend.

In this connection, it would be well to bear in mind the experience of our close neighbor, the Republic of Mexico. After a century of government by coup, a far-reaching revolution took place which caused great anxiety at the time. However, out of that revolution evolved the responsible Government which exists today and with which excellent relations are maintained. That Government has operated in a pattern of freedom for many years and through several recent transitions of the Presidency which have been brought about by peaceful elections. Under that Government there have already been striking economic and social advances and there is well-based hope for the continuance of this progress.

In a situation as varied as that which prevails in Latin America, few generalizations are valid. There is one, however, which approaches a universality of application. An enormous pressure for change exists in Latin America. It is operating on many levels and in different ways. At base, however, this pressure is not much different from that which affects other parts of the world. In a sentence, there is a growing determination on the part of ordinary people to live their lives with a greater sense of personal worth, with a fuller participation in national life and with more ample and more equitable access to the human benefits which are the promise of modern science and technology. This determination may take the form of a simple desire for piped water in a village in the Andean highlands. It may be a desire for automobile transportation in the cities or some other such amenity. It may be a demand for more schools. It may take an abstract form such as the deep questioning of existing social structures and that intense examination of philosophies and ideologies which is generally characteristic of university life in Latin America. Whatever the form, the determination exists throughout Latin America and is already producing significant changes in the area.

The principal question, then, with respect to the situation in Latin America is not whether the region will change but whether or not the change will be rapid enough and can go deeply enough by processes that are peaceful and evolutionary.

The requirements for evolutionary change are clear. In the first place, there must be a modernization and a great and continuing expansion of the facilities for the production of goods and services. In the second place, there must be or there must come into being, promptly, institutions which are capable of bringing about a wide diffusion of the benefits of expansion and modernization, institutions which act to increase popular participation in national life, institutions which serve to insure increasing respect for the intrinsic dignity of all people.

These requisites have very specific implications in Latin America. They mean bringing into production millions of acres of unused or underused land through resettlement, through irrigation and reclamation and an expanded use of the whole range of scientific agricultural techniques. They mean a great development of communications and transportation. They mean a rapid growth in industrial production. They mean a spread of social services in the countryside no less than in the cities. They mean an end to illiteracy and also the fostering of technical training and scientific inquiry. They mean tax reform. They mean dedicated civil servants. They mean a decline in exploitative and demagogic government. They mean an extension of responsible government.

In some Latin American nations, there appear to be reasonably good prospects for meeting these requirements. Elsewhere the prospects for evolutionary change are not encouraging. Where change does not come about by such means, however, the alternative is not likely to be an indefinite tolerance of the existing situation. Rather, it is likely to be militant efforts to produce change by revolutionary means, in traditional or newly imported patterns.

3. U.S. INTERESTS

It is against this background of both backwardness and progress and, above all, of widespread change, in process or incipient, evolutionary or revolutionary, that the 3 major U.S. interests with respect to Latin America must be viewed if they are to be safeguarded effectively. The first and paramount of these interests is the maintenance of friendly political ties within the hemisphere. These ties which date from the dissolution of the colonial relations with Europe in the 18th and 19th centuries, have had a checkered history. There has been great respect and admiration for this Nation in Latin America—for its concepts of freedom and for its achievements. And, on our part, there has been a continuing thread of warm sympathy with Latin America growing out of the common revolutionary experience with respect to Europe and the difficulties which have been encountered by its peoples under exploitative government.

There have also been very serious difficulties with various Latin American nations at various times. The present conflict with Cuba, for example, has many antecedents. Nevertheless, inter-American ties have held in essentials and, in essentials, every effort must be made to see that they continue to hold and grow stronger. They are immensely desirable now and will become even more desirable in the future. They are vital in situations of world crisis.

These political ties with Latin America are intimately associated with the security and peace of this Nation and, hence, have an important bearing on requirements for defense. One can only speculate on what the cost of defense, already in excess of $50 billion annually would be, if there were a huge expanse of hostility to the south, rather than the essentially friendly neighbors which we now have.

These ties of inter-American friendship also undergird the other two principal U.S. interests—trade and investment. Inter-American trade may involve directly the well-being of a relatively small percentage of our population but indirectly it involves us all. Latin American products form an integral part of the consumer habits of our citizens and are woven into our industry and commerce. Our exports to Latin America of agricultural and manufactured products and services are linked with the livelihood of many of our citizens.

The present importance of inter-American trade and its potential are indicated by a growing volume. In 1940 our exports to Latin America totaled $1 billion and our imports from Latin America were $900 million. In 1960 exports were $5.2 billion and imports were $4.7 billion. We might well contemplate the importance of the returns, wages and other benefits which are involved for our own people and the Latin Americans in a trade of $10 billion annually.

Trade can and does take place, of course, without the maintenance of close political ties. But the relationship of such ties to trade is indicated in the extreme case of Cuba. In 1957, Cuban-United States trade amounted to over $1 billion. That trade, today, is down to an annual rate of under $50 million.

In a similar fashion, the third principal U.S. interest with respect to Latin America—investment—is closely associated with these ties. U.S. investments in that area have grown from $2.8 billion in 1940 to a total of $8.4 billion in 1960. In a reverse fashion, again, to cite the extreme case of Cuba, the total of U.S. private investment in Cuba stood at $850 million in 1957 but this investment has been completely overwhelmed by the hostility which now characterizes Cuban-United States relations.

It should be stressed that these interests are not one sided. If they mean much to us, they mean a great deal to the Latin American nations. If friendly political ties with Latin America act to reduce the cost of defense to us and increase our security, these ties do the same for Latin America. If inter-American trade means jobs, profits, and other benefits to this Nation, it has a similar effect in Latin America. If investment in Latin America brings opportunities and returns to U.S. citizens, it brings greater productivity, development, and other benefits to Latin America.

In short, the interests which we have with respect to Latin America are mutual interests. Because they are, however, we cannot assume the automatic preservation and extension of these interests. Our cultural and political ties with the nations to the south are under intense and continuous propagandistic attack, not only from Communist nations outside the hemisphere and from Cuba but from various sources within the Latin American nations.

Inter-American trade is beset with serious problems which involve primary commodities such as copper, lead, and zinc and for which durable solutions that meet the need of our own producers and consumers and the Latin American producers have yet to be found. Competition for international trade is growing rapidly. From Europe—especially Western Europe—and Asia there is heightened competition with our typical exports to Latin America. From Africa and other areas, there is heightened competition with typical Latin American exports to this Nation.

There is room for great trade channels, not only north and south within the Americas but east and west to the other continents. Nevertheless, the impact of regional trade groupings on inter-American trade is as yet an uncertain one. In the short run at least, these groupings could be damaging unless there is a common understanding of the interest of the Americas in hemispheric trade and common action if necessary to safeguard these interests.

With respect to U.S. investment, the fact that the enterprises which it sponsors in Latin America may be efficiently managed, pay high wages and make important contributions to development does not, of itself, safeguard this interest from erosion. On the contrary, U.S. investments are often the subject of popular suspicion, political attack, and damaging legislation.

The degree of difficulty which U.S. investment experiences varies from place to place and from time to time. Generally speaking, where there is intense political stimulation of nationalist sentiment for whatever reason, there is likely to be a high degree of opposition to foreign business and U.S. business in particular. Generally speaking, where U.S. business operates on a very large scale and is concentrated in extractive or plantation-type operations or in public utilities it is more likely to be a target of hostility than where it is spread in many units into many industries; emotions are more easily aroused over a foreign-owned petroleum or utility company than over a foreign-owned shoe factory. Where U.S.- or foreign-owned business in general constitutes the major source of economic activity in any given country, investment is also highly susceptible to attack. That is the case, particularly, where locally owned enterprises of a modern type are just coming into being and are unsure of their competitive capacities or where the taxing of foreign enterprises may seem to offer a politically palatable alternate to internal fiscal reform.

Measures to neutralize the opposition to U.S. investment have had some effective results. The Department of State has pushed hard for treaties, agreements, and other corrective action. The information program conducts general public relations programs on the virtues of our system. U.S. enterprises have made themselves acceptable in certain localities by better selection and training of personnel for service in Latin America. Some have "self-nationalized," in the sense of incorporating ever larger numbers of Latin Americans in management, by buying locally wherever possible, by encouraging local capital to join with U.S. capital in corporations of mixed ownership, by participating in a broad range of community activities, and by similar means.

It is doubtful, however, that such measures in themselves will suffice to end the basic difficulties of U.S. investment in present circumstances. The experiences of U.S. mineral producers are revealing in this connection. In one country, these producers have sought to pursue most of the constructive measures noted above. Further, wage payments to local workers and liberal benefits which are provided raise real earnings far above the average in the country of operation and to a level which is comparable to that of similar workers in this Nation. The profits from these operations are nominal by U.S. standards and far below returns which are common in Latin America. Nevertheless, these operations are under constant political pressure and are jeopardized by tax squeezes, with the threat of further measures always in the background.

The difficulties which U.S. investment experiences in Latin America are not unique to that area. Generally speaking, these difficulties are endemic in developing nations. In all honesty, we should not overlook the fact that examples of opposition to foreign-owned business are not alien to our own earlier history of economic development. In time, the growth and expansion of locally financed and managed enterprise should tend to reduce the difficulties because foreign-owned enterprises become "lost," so to speak, in a setting of substantial economic development. But so long as private U.S. investment constitutes a very conspicuous part of the total economy of any Latin American nation, so long as a large percentage of this investment is concentrated in the ownership of what might be termed the "emotional industries"—that is, those involving the direct exploitation of natural resources—the problems of safeguarding this interest are not likely to be solved. And, unsolved, the problems exacerbate all the difficulties of maintaining effective relations.

A less evident but nonetheless real danger to all our interests respecting Latin America is the difficulty of adjusting national attitudes both on our part and on the part of the Latin Americans to a situation of great transition. As noted, in Latin America, these attitudes contain a high degree of respect and even affection for this Nation. But there is among Latin Americans also a hangover from an earlier day when we were widely characterized as the "Colossus of the North." And there is a hangover in this Nation of militant sentiments of omnipotent responsibility for whatever occurs in Latin America, particularly in the Caribbean area. These feelings can be aroused on both sides. In Latin America, they can be aroused by the words of political and other leaders. The experience with Cuba in the early days of the Castro regime is revealing in this connection. There is little doubt that feelings of mass hostility were readily stimulated and channeled against this Nation by the Cuban revolutionary leaders at that time.

Unfortunately such feelings cannot be so readily abated on our part. They cannot be abated by words alone, no matter how much may be said by the information program and how well it may be said. The principal reason is nationalism. Misguided or otherwise, it is already by far the more powerful factor in any Latin American situation in which we may be encountering serious difficulties.

Sober information programs have value in correcting distortions and in affirming our policies. But words and propaganda, per se, also have a point of diminishing returns. An excess of words, apart from cost, tends to intensify adverse reactions because it suggests that we do protest too much. And if the excess becomes so great as to suggest tilting with windmills it can tend to the ludicrous.

In short, there is no verbal panacea which will eliminate quickly certain negative attitudes which have long lain beneath the surface of our friendly relations with the nations of Latin America. These attitudes can be softened but they will persist for some time to come and occasionally will break forth in angry statements or unfriendly acts. Presidential visits, interparliamentary meetings, exchanges of persons, cultural interchange, sensible information programs, and other devices for promoting understanding are very helpful. But the deeper solution lies in a long and constructive experience in Latin America, with the flowering of a sound national consciousness, with the strengthening of national stability, with the development of broader contacts with the rest of the world, and with the growing mutual benefits of inter-Americanism.

The distorted attitudes of the past, among other factors, must be borne in mind as we move into an era of more intense attention to Latin American affairs. There is cause for neither apology nor arrogance in the history of our relations with Latin America and neither apology nor arrogance will serve our contemporary interests. There is cause in this history for a most determined effort to understand the situation as it is today and to deal with it with restraint.

4. U.S. POLICIES AND ADMINISTRATION

This effort is especially necessary in view of the changing situation in Latin America. It is important to bear in mind that we are dealing less and less with a region containing preponderantly inert populations, governed and otherwise controlled by a relative handful of people. In these circumstances, it is increasingly insufficient merely to maintain good relations with Latin American governments unless those governments, in turn, are in good standing with their own peoples. It is not enough for our representatives to enjoy a close association with a small group of officials and others at the top especially if that group, in turn, does not enjoy a close association with its own people. It will not serve our interests to be admired by those who are little admired by their own people. If the term "our friends in Latin America" is to have meaning in the sense of policy, it must relate to those who are regarded as friends by their own people.

An approach of policy which is heavily and indiscriminately dependent on incumbent wielders of power and little concerned with the sources of power or the changing nature of power in Latin America is one that is full of pitfalls for the interests of this Nation. It will become increasingly inadequate as the beachhead societies so characteristic of the past in Latin America continue to give way to more rounded national societies.

If older approaches are inadequate, there is also considerable doubt that the newer approach which has permeated policy in recent years—the approach associated with foreign aid—offers any greater assurance for the maintenance of effective relations and the safeguarding of our interests. This approach has been carried over from the successful experience with the Marshall plan in Western Europe. It has relevance to the situation in Latin America, but only if it is adjusted to what is a far different situation. In a sentence, Western Europe required a substantial but marginal assist to restore itself after the war, whereas Latin America requires, not restoration but thoroughgoing inner change at the outset and a marginal assist in bringing about that change.

Unless this difference is fully appreciated, any significant flow of aid to that region will involve grave dangers to the long-range interests of this Nation. Apart from the prospects of an unending drain on public resources, such a flow also promises to lead us into a position of ambiguous responsibility for the support of existing situations which are intolerable to the people who live in them but in which the resistance to change cannot be overcome by evolutionary means. Aid in these situations may delay revolutions but unless we are prepared for an ever-deepening involvement aid is not likely to prevent revolution in the end. On the contrary, the effect of aid could be to help insure that communism or some other extreme revolutionary form will be seen increasingly by millions as the only way out of an intolerable situation. And, if such revolution does occur, our aid will have placed this Nation in the position of being one of its principal targets. In short, we have got to face bluntly the fact that misguided assistance can prove at least as damaging to our interests as a failure to aid at all.

It is delusive to believe that any practical level of U.S. aid alone can be the principal factor in maintaining internal stability in Latin America, except in isolated instances and for limited periods of time. Similarly, it is delusive to believe that the principal missing ingredient to satisfactory development in Latin America is such aid as may be supplied by the United States.

Latin America is an area of over 200 million people with an enormous complex of difficulties as well as a great indigenous supply of natural resources and labor and substantial modern skills. There is a great pressure for change and there is also a great resistance to change. We should not underestimate the potential of outside aid in that kind of setting, but even more important we should not overestimate it. Most important, we must recognize that outside aid is a catalyst which will act with significant effectiveness in promoting internal stability and development only as it is combined with an indigenous leadership, able and willing to guide indigenous resources and skills into channels of benefit for a whole society. Without such leadership, there is little prospect of accommodating the reasonable expectations of the people of Latin America by evolutionary means, with or without U.S. aid.

The responsibilities for what transpires in the Latin American countries are, in order, national and hemispheric (and ours only as a part of the hemisphere). An approach which presumes to reverse the order or which views the hemispheric responsibility as exclusively a U.S. responsibility will be as damaging to our long-range interests as it will be to the interests of the people of Latin America.

As indicated at the outset, the Alliance for Progress promises a way around both the inadequacies of the outmoded approaches of the past and the pitfalls in the more recent approach of policy which tends to overemphasize the factor of aid. The phrase "Alianza para el Progreso" has circulated throughout Latin America and has met with warm approval even as it has aroused warm expectations. In all frankness, however, it must be stated that the full implications of the concept do not yet appear to be widely grasped either by the Latin Americans or, indeed, even by our own bureaucracy abroad. On the part of the Latin Americans, there is still reluctance to face the realities of national sacrifice which are entailed in the concept, as well as the limits of U.S. responsibility as one nation of the hemisphere. Indeed, some of our own representatives in the field may be contributing to this misunderstanding both by an overanxiety to help and to publicize our willingness to help.

It is true that it takes time for a concept such as the alliance to filter through the massive machinery of the bureaucracy. Nevertheless, we must face the fact that tangible changes in the approach to Latin America have yet to take place. We must face the fact, too, that expectations have been kindled which, if they are not met promptly and vigorously when it is reasonable to meet them or disavowed promptly and firmly when it is not, may tend to make this Nation a target for a wave of hostility and ridicule in Latin America.

5. CONCLUDING COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Latin America is in the midst of a dynamic social transition. For the most part, this transition is proceeding along evolutionary paths. There is no assurance, however, that it will not veer into channels of revolution of greater or lesser magnitude in some Latin American countries.

It is in our national interests that essential change take place in Latin America by peaceful and evolutionary means. It is also in the interests of the people of Latin America. This community of interest is the basis for the Alliance for Progress.

It must be emphasized, however, that the concept assumes the existence of the essential ingredients for such change in Latin America. It assumes, for example, dedicated indigenous leadership. It assumes a willingness on the part of those who are able to do so, to make moderate sacrifices now for the long-range benefit of their countries. It assumes the absence of insurmountable resistance to evolutionary change.

The Alliance assumes, too, that not only this Nation but the other American Republics and, perhaps, other nations will cooperate in adding such external ingredients as loans, skills, and investment as may be necessary to evolutionary change in Latin America.

Where the indigenous ingredients are not present, the Alliance for Progress will not be able to supply them, except in minor isolated instances. And, as already noted, an overeagerness to apply outside help may act not to stimulate necessary change but rather serve to prolong an unsatisfactory status quo.

To delineate and to tread a delicate line between effective aid to evolutionary change in Latin America and inadvertent aid to the maintenance of an unsatisfactory status quo is the fundamental challenge in our contemporary relations with the southern republics. The undertaking is extremely difficult and will require great perception and great restraint. The President will need and should have the responsiveness of the bureaucracy and the broad support of the Congress in this effort. For, on finding the line and hewing to it, rests the future of our interests in this hemisphere. If we do not aid the transition in Latin America, our interests will suffer. If we aid in a misguided or inept way, we shall waste public funds and our interests are likely to suffer at least as much in the end.

This approach will not find favor with those who would have the United States carry the principal financial burden of maintaining an unsatisfactory status quo in Latin America, nor with those who would prefer change by extreme revolution rather than evolution. There will be criticism in some quarters if this approach is followed, and, perhaps, even temporary reprisals against our existing interests. Unless we are prepared, however, to remain firm in the insistence that we will aid only where there is a reasonable opportunity for the ordinary people of Latin America to obtain tangible benefit from the help, we will face, sooner or later, greater difficulties than criticism and temporary reprisals.

The Alliance for Progress must be clearly understood now and pursued solely as a vigorous effort to assist in necessary change in Latin America, for the benefit of the people of that region. This understanding of the alliance must be established promptly in inter-American circles. Without it, the alliance will tend merely to prolong the old aid program under a new name and with an increased and endless drain on public funds.

This understanding must also be established within our own bureaucracy, particularly with respect to the military and nonmilitary aid programs. Both of these programs have so far been little affected in practice in Latin America by the Alliance for Progress. They continue to operate on the old basis of a broad commitment of this Nation to ambiguous responsibilities concerned largely with maintaining internal stability in the Latin American countries. The commitment is both presumptuous and impractical in terms of policy, as well as costly. Most seriously, the continued pursuit of this commitment can act against the intent of the Alliance for Progress by buttressing resistance to change. And if it acts against the intent of the alliance, it acts against both our long-range national interests and the interests of the people of Latin America.

As a first step, then, in bringing our policies in Latin America into line with the Alliance for Progress, it would appear essential to divest the existing military and nonmilitary aid programs of the negative objectives associated with promoting internal stability in Latin America. This action would leave military aid with more appropriate functions largely in connection with hemispheric defense against actual military aggression.

It is very difficult, of course, to draw a line between military aid which serves hemispheric defense and military aid which serves to buttress internal stability. It would be helpful, however, if the latter term were dropped from the lexicon of the aid programs. It would be helpful, too, in this connection if the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense were to review, jointly, strategic concepts for defense of this hemisphere and try to arrive at a clear understanding of a practical role which specific Latin American nations may reasonably be expected to play in these concepts. It would also be helpful to bear in mind that any government which must rely heavily on outside assistance merely to maintain internal stability is likely to have very little to contribute to hemispheric defense at a time of military crisis.

As for the nonmilitary aid programs, they should be divested not only of such unlimited objectives as helping to maintain internal stability but they should also be divested of vague objectives concerning the promotion of development in other nations. After these steps have been taken the slate will have been prepared for a redefinition of specific and practical objectives which will serve the purpose of the Alliance for Progress.

This redefinition can take place, however, only if the negotiations with the Latin American nations under the alliance establish the specific dimensions of our aid commitment with respect to each nation or regional situation. The Latin American nations should have reasonable long-range plans of national or regional development. Under these plans, we should seek as far as possible to define our own commitment in terms of very specific projects rather than commit ourselves to an underwriting across the board, of a percentage of the cost of these plans. Without some such arrangement, there is little prospect of establishing public responsibility for performance. Without some such arrangement, it will be impossible to make clear at home or abroad what we are committed to do and, equally what we are not committed to do.

Further, our specific commitments under the alliance should be conditional on the commitments of the Latin American governments themselves and to some extent on those of other participants in any situation. The conditions should be known in this country and in Latin America. We should be prepared to stay clear of or to withdraw from situations where these conditions are not being met. Once these circumstances of effective and responsible action have been established, however, we should be prepared to act generously, with a minimum of redtape and with great vigor in terms of our own commitment.

The present bureaucratic structure under which military and nonmilitary aid are administered continues to be attuned to aid in the old pattern in Latin America. This structure requires substantial change if it is to provide effective support to the Alliance for Progress. Under ambiguous objectives of promoting internal stability and economic development, the administrative structure of the aid programs has tended to spread in almost identical patterns into nation after nation. This extension of the bureaucratic process overseas tends to generate its own pressure for ever-increasing commitments which are then incorporated into policy and act to impel it to flow in certain channels. In short, the instruments of policy tend to become the determinants of policy and the tail wags the dog.

It is entirely possible that a thorough study of the strategic realities of hemispheric defense will indicate that many of the military missions in Latin America have tended to come into being by the process of bureaucratic extension. If so, there should be no hesitancy in curtailing this process and withdrawing these missions wherever possible. Residual functions could be shifted to the military attachés of the embassies or transferred back to this country. Not only would public funds and dollar exchange be saved by this course, but at the same time the purposes of the Alliance for Progress might well be facilitated.

In a similar fashion, nonmilitary AID missions of the type which now function in Latin America will clearly require change if the vague objectives of promoting internal stability and development are redefined in terms of specific responsibilities for specific projects under the alliance. Moreover, the creation of the Peace Corps and the food for peace programs, the establishment of the Inter-American Bank, the availability of other inter-American and international agencies, and the potential of a significant contribution of skills and other resources from some Latin American nations to their neighbors, as well as the flow of aid and investment from nations outside this hemisphere, all suggest the desirability of a drastic redesign of the present AID missions in Latin America.

We must face up to the enormous duplication of sources of help for Latin America which already exist. These are not yet used in any integrated pattern. We can ill afford to waste either the funds or the talents that are involved in this duplication. Moreover, it is likely that more sources of aid will continue to be piled on top of existing sources and, beyond great cost, there will be such cumbersomeness, confusion, rivalry, and redtape that effective followthrough under the Alliance for Progress will become next to impossible.

A shakedown of agencies and reordering of functions is clearly needed. It is entirely possible that the best approach will be to limit the permanent oversea aid establishment in Latin America to a single development agent of the highest caliber in each embassy. A single agent, under the direct supervision of the Ambassador, without attachment to any operating agency, would be in a most effective position to advise the Ambassador and, hence, the Secretary of State and the President on what sources of assistance are needed in any given situation and how these sources might be most efficiently blended in the discharge of our specific responsibilities under the Alliance.

An arrangement of this kind might result in a better use of our own bureaucracy. It might also help in mobilizing the participation of the many inter-American and international agencies which can be encouraged to play a much larger role in Latin America than is now the case. It might help, further, to insure a maximum flow of skills which are in surplus in some Latin American nations into areas of need in the region and to encourage an input of capital and aid from Western Europe and elsewhere.

Apart from bringing the aid programs and their administration into line with the Alliance for Progress, other actions pertaining to inter-American relations suggest themselves, actions which might strengthen and advance our interests in this hemisphere. Some steps have already been taken, for example, to clarify the lines of authority in Washington with respect to Latin American policies. The influence of the Ambassadors has been strengthened and new Ambassadors of broad background have been assigned to Latin America. There has also been a marked improvement in the language capacities and other skills of younger Foreign Service officers as a result of better training programs which have been made possible by past congressional actions. The Embassies, however, still tend to operate largely on the basis of the inertia of past policies and on inadequate firsthand contact with whole situations. Associations of Embassy officials are largely confined to the cities, to other U.S. nationals, and to a relatively small group of Latin Americans. Certainly, it would appear desirable to encourage considerable on-the-ground travel, particularly by younger Foreign Service officers at the outset of an assignment. In this and in other ways the acuteness of observation and the accuracy of interpretation might be increased.

Every reasonable support, including adequate funds, should be given by the Senate to improvements of this kind in the Foreign Service. For it is largely on the depth of understanding and perception of the younger officers of the Embassies that our policies will depend in Latin America during the years head. In the end, their performance will have much to do with determining whether we understand the situation thoroughly and whether or not we follow the best course to safeguard the interests of this Nation.

The virtue of any massive propaganda campaign in Latin America must be questioned. As already noted there is a point of diminishing returns in words, whether over the airwaves or in printed form.

To be sure, there is a need for carefully conceived information programs which explain and publicize the policies and purposes of this Nation, which tell the truth without undignified embellishments, which make clear not only what we are doing but what we are not doing and have no intention of doing. But words endlessly propagated, in the end, will not determine the course of Latin America's future, whether the words come from us or the Russians. In the end, that course will be determined by the Latin American people on the basis of what is of enduring value to them.

Exchanges of persons which are sometimes linked to information programs are, in reality, in a different category. These are concerned with deepening understanding both ways in the hemisphere, over the long range. The Fulbright and similar programs are of great value in inter-American relations and efforts should be made to strengthen them and to diversify them. One variant which seems to be worthy of encouragement is the expansion of the sister-university concept, as between our universities and universities in Latin America.

There are also substantial opportunities for an expansion of medical and other scientific and technical exchange among the American Republics on a highly selective basis and in both directions. Our own professions would have much to gain from this expansion as would those of the Latin American nations and, again, every practicable encouragement should be given to such exchanges.

With respect to inter-American trade, it is of the utmost importance that this interest not be neglected in connection with the impending trade legislation and our interest in the European Common Market and other trade groupings, two of which, incidentally, are developing in Latin America. We should study, deeply, in concert with Latin America and, it would seem desirable, with Canada as well, the implications of these trading trends. This subject would be worthy of consideration by the impending meetings of both the Mexican-United States and the Canadian-United States Parliamentary Groups. As a matter of official policy, moreover, this Government would be well advised to consult with the Latin American nations in advance of major decisions in connection with the European trade groupings which may affect their interests. Indeed, the possibilities and perhaps even the necessity of developing an inter-American approach to the European Common Market and other trade groupings should not be overlooked.

With regard to such key commodities as copper, lead, zinc, cotton, and others which encounter perennial difficulties in the world market, a common hemispheric approach might be explored in an effort to evolve more effective international agreements. There is a great need to provide a measure of stability for producers and workers with, of course, safeguards for consumers. It is becoming apparent that without effective international agreements there is little prospect of alleviating the hardships of those engaged in the production of these commodities, either in Latin America or in the United States.

Some of our most immediate difficulties in Latin America are associated with our interest in investment in that region. Every reasonable protection should be given to U.S. industries which are seeking fair conditions under which to operate in that region. Every appropriate help should be given to these industries which are trying to increase their acceptability in Latin America through "self-nationalization."

However, in the light of the continuing opposition to U.S. investment, in the light of the decline in our dollar exchange reserves, it is doubtful that special inducements should be offered to capital to flow to Latin America at this time.

In some countries, local ownership and U.S. enterprise appear to have developed highly effective and mutually satisfactory working arrangements on the basis of stable conditions of management over a period of years with adequate recompense for the risks taken. It might be to the general advantage of our interests in Latin America if difficulties with particular investments could be reduced through mutual accommodations of this kind.

An opportunity may exist for a major advance in hemispheric cooperation in connection with a most important humanitarian endeavor. For some time now, the Defense Department has been developing and expanding techniques for air and sea rescue work throughout the Americas. On a less-organized basis, this Nation has participated through the aid programs from time to time in relief work in connection with disasters, such as those which have struck Chile and Peru in recent times.

It would be desirable to explore the possibilities of consolidating these and related functions in a permanent hemispheric rescue and relief unit under the Organization of the American States. Such an organization could stockpile food and other emergency supplies at strategic points and otherwise plan and prepare in advance for cooperative and immediate action whenever and wherever disaster strikes in the Western Hemisphere. An organization of this kind would not only have the highest practical utility but would be a symbol of the humanistic potential of hemispheric cooperation.

In the realm of political relations, there may be need for a reassessment of the role of the Organization of the American States. Unilateral intervention by one country in the affairs of another in this hemisphere was discarded in the era of the good neighbor policy, an era which marked a major advance in inter-American relations.

Nevertheless, we must face the fact that situations arise in particular states which are adverse to the security of others or are so flagrant in their trampling of human decency as to outrage the conscience of the hemisphere. Such a situation existed in the Dominican Republic. Such a situation prevails in Cuba.

In these or in any similar situation which may arise in the Americas, we cannot expect identical evaluations from each American nation. But regardless of differences of views, the important point is that these situations cannot be ignored as a hemispheric responsibility. The OAS must be prepared to face them, to debate fully and frankly the issues that are involved in them and then set a course on the basis of collective wisdom and carry it through on the basis of collective action. Unless the organization has this kind of vitality, the American nations will tend to act individually and ineffectively in matters that are properly of hemispheric concern and, eventually, the functions of the OAS are likely to be assumed elsewhere.

We are at a decisive point in inter-American relations. The benefits which are derived from these relations can be expanded through the Alliance for Progress and other means. But if the problems of inter-American relations are allowed to drift or if they are treated with ineffective remedies, there is a danger of the steady erosion of these relations. Much depends on what this Nation does under the Alliance for Progress. But the answers to these problems will not be found in the alliance alone. Nor will they be found in our policies alone, no matter how enlightened they may be. In the last analysis, the future of inter-American relations will depend on a full appreciation by the people of the Americas, of the mutual benefits which these relations bring to the hemisphere and on the sense of responsibility, restraint, and dedication with which all the American nations act to sustain and strengthen these relations.

THE EUROPEAN COMMON MARKET AND THE U.S. "PERIL POINT" CLAUSE

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, in this morning's New York Times there appears a news article under the byline of Edwin L. Dale, Jr., with a Paris dateline, under the headline "Trade Bloc Cites U.S. Tariff Laws: Common Market Warns on Peril Point Clause."

Mr. Dale reports that the European Common Market has warned the United States that it will be unable to negotiate trade concessions "unless present U.S. legal procedures are drastically changed." He cites the peril point and escape clause as existing procedures which the Common Market wants to have abolished.

Mr. President, in President Kennedy's trade message to the Congress, he gave assurance that safeguards to American industry would be retained, although in modified form. The President made this statement:

> Ample safeguards against injury to American industry and agriculture will be retained. Escape-clause relief will continue to be available with more up-to-date definitions. Temporary tariff relief will be granted where essential. The power to impose duties or suspend concessions to protect the national security will be retained. Articles will be reserved from negotiations whenever such action is deemed to be in the best interest of the Nation and the economy. And the four basic stages of the traditional peril point procedures and safeguards will be retained and improved.

Now, Mr. Dale reports, the Common Market's Council of Ministers has issued a statement as a formal reaction to the President's trade message. In effect, to use Mr. Dale's words, the statement constitutes "a veiled warning to the United States that it will be unable to negotiate a major tariff-cutting bargain, as desired by President Kennedy, unless present U.S. legal procedures are drastically changed."

Mr. President, this development raises disturbing questions:

Is the Common Market attempting to dictate to the President and the Congress of the United States the details of domestic legislation?

Are we witnessing the birth of a "new isolationism" in Europe arising from the Common Market?

Do the Common Market nations believe they can "go it alone" in the present world situation, and stand aloof from the United States in the struggle against Communist imperialism?

This development, Mr. President, reinforces my conviction that the administration has chosen the wrong method of achieving closer unity among allied free nations by concentrating its attention upon the limited field of trade relations with the Common Market.

I believe the administration should broaden its vision and should press at once for broadly based discussions of major barriers to free world unity, such as can be conducted in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development—OECD—or under the provisions of article 2 of the NATO Treaty.

Major questions for such a conference—in the words of the NATO Treaty—"to eliminate conflict in international economic policies"—of the United States and the Common Market countries include first, policy toward trade with the Sino-Soviet bloc; second, a more equitable sharing of the burdens of the common defense; and third, the role of Japan and other non-Atlantic nations in the struggle against Communist imperialism.

In such a conference, it would be appropriate to remind the nations of Western Europe that we contributed billions of dollars in Marshall plan aid to rebuild their industrial plants, following World War II, and gave trade concessions for which we received an inadequate quid pro quo.

At the present time, when the United States has a persistent and dangerous deficit in its international balance of payments, it would be appropriate in such a forum to remind Western Europe that it owes us some unilateral trade concessions and has an obligation to assume a fairer share of the free world's burdens.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have referred be printed in the Record following these remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 8, 1962]

Trade Bloc Cites U.S. Tariff Laws—Common Market Warns on "Peril Point" Clause

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

Paris, February 7.—The European Economic Community has issued a veiled warning to the United States that it will be unable to negotiate a major tariff-cutting bargain, as desired by President Kennedy, unless present U.S. legal procedures are drastically changed.

These procedures go mainly under the heading of peril point or escape clause. They limit the President's authority to reduce tariffs, and permit raising tariffs that have once been reduced, if there is actual or potential injury to domestic producers.

The peril point is the lowest level of tariff concessions considered safe to the domestic economy. The escape clause provides for the withdrawal or the amendment of a tariff concession when imports of a commodity increase to the extent that they threaten serious injury to the domestic economy.

The warning from the Common Market came in the form of a statement issued yesterday by the Council of Ministers as a formal reaction to the President's tariff message to Congress last month. Officials explained today the purpose and meaning of the statement.

After expressing the hope that new progress will be made in reducing tariffs with the aim of contributing to the development

> of world trade, the statement's key and concluding sentence said:
>
> "The Council expresses the firm conviction that, in the light of past experience, the indispensable condition for guaranteeing in the future the efficacy of any new multilateral effort in the tariff field is that all interested parties dispose of equivalent legal powers."
>
> #### NEGOTIATORS CIRCUMSCRIBED
>
> Under present U.S. law, American tariff negotiators are virtually barred from offering tariff cuts in areas where the Tariff Commission has found there might be injury to domestic producers. In addition, the United States can offer no guarantee that a tariff, once reduced, will not be raised again if an industry applies for relief under the escape clause.
>
> The Common Market, although made up of France, West Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Belgium, and Luxembourg, negotiates as a single group through its International Executive Commission. As a practical matter, it has and can have no tariff commission, no peril point, no escape clause.
>
> The Common Market has gained its first negotiating experience on tariff matters in the long bargaining with the United States that has just been concluded, leading to a 20-percent reduction of tariffs on a wide variety of items—more reductions by the Common Market than by the United States. The detailed terms of this bargain have still to be announced.
>
> As a result of that experience, officials close to the negotiations said today, the Common Market nations have concluded that they cannot bargain on equal terms with the United States as U.S. law now stands. This was the reason for yesterday's statement.
>
> #### POSSIBLE RELUCTANCE CITED
>
> Its clear implication was that the more restrictions Congress imposes on the President's tariff-cutting authority the less likely there is to be serious bargaining. According to some officials, the Common Market will be reluctant to enter into negotiations unless the cards are equal.
>
> Apart from today's statement which was aimed at the peril point and escape clause, one key aspect of the Kennedy program has aroused a cautious reaction in Europe.
>
> This is the proposal for outright elimination by both sides of tariffs on those categories of products in which the United States and the Common Market together provide 80 percent of world exports.
>
> Although officials of varying viewpoints are unanimous in saying that it is too early to give a definite reaction to this proposal, some argue that it may go too far.
>
> This line of thought stems, in great part, from one of the fundamental principles of the Common Market. According to this principle, written into the Common Market Treaty, free trade alone is not enough. It must be accompanied by various measures of harmonization of national economies.
>
> The caution on this point, expressed in some influential circles, does not mean the Common Market will resist a sizable mutual tariff reduction. However, it may balk at eliminating tariffs altogether on a sweeping range of products.

EXECUTIVE PRIVILEGE AND SENATE COMMITTEE STAFF ACTIVITIES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think it is well known in the Senate that every Senate committee is the agent of the Senate and is subect to the direction and the control of the Senate. That is a matter of procedure in the Senate that I wish to say should always be complied with, and the Senate should see to it that it is always complied with.

I am sure that many Members of the Senate have been disturbed by newspaper articles, published in the last 2 days, bearing upon criticism of the head of the Marine Corps in respect to alleged interrogations conducted, according to the newspapers, by aids of the Senate.

I read only a paragraph of an article published this morning in the Washington Post:

> These developments came as it was revealed that Senate investigators secretly questioned Marine and Air Force enlisted men and officers in the Washington area about communism during the past week.
>
> The interrogations were conducted at the Marine barracks in Henderson Hall at Arlington and in Air Force barracks at Bolling and Andrews fields without the knowledge of the subcommittee staff or of Chairman John Stennis, Democrat, of Mississippi.
>
> Stennis was considerably upset when he found out about the interrogations. He immediately ordered a complete investigation of them.

Those of us who know the Senator from Mississippi would expect him to follow just that course of action.

I merely wish to say on the floor of the Senate this noon that we are entitled to have this investigation, and we are entitled to a full report in regard to what the investigation will show.

If the newspaper reports are correct, in my judgment any such interrogation conducted by any aid of the Senate, in violation of the separation of powers doctrine of the Constitution, was uncalled for and unjustified, and we ought to make sure that we take the necessary action to see that that kind of conduct is not indulged in by any member of the committee or any member of the staff of the committee.

I say this as one who in all my years in the Senate has recognized the privilege of Executive powers as part of our separation-of-powers doctrine, on which this constitutional system of government is based.

I am glad to see the vigor with which the Senator from Mississippi is reported to have defended the doctrine of separation of powers, and the powers that inherently rests in the executive department of Government.

The head of the Marine Corps is entitled to have the Senate proceed to investigate the charges he has made in the press to the end of seeing that this kind of Gestapo procedure, if it is being conducted, is stopped forthwith.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I have used my 3 minutes.

ARROGANT ACTION OF SENATE AIDS SHOULD BE REPUDIATED

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] has very forthrightly brought to the attention of the country a matter of concern to all of us, a matter of embarrassment to the Senate, an act of arrogance on the part of two employees of the Senate in utter disregard of the separation of powers principle provided by the Constitution of our country. I also wish to advert briefly to this same subject, because I know this outrageous action of two Senate aids should be repudiated.

The Washington Post and Times Herald today revealed that two Senate staff members during the past week secretly questioned Marine and Air Force enlisted men and officers in the Washington, D.C., area about communism.

These men were seeking to play God with other people's patriotism. The conduct of these two men was fantastic—reminiscent of Hitler's Gestapo. It was not only inexcusable and uncalled for, but was an impertinent disregard of the division of powers set forth in the Constitution of our country.

The Department of Defense is an important part of the executive branch of our Government. For Senate staff employees to subject officers and men of our Armed Forces to an inquisition was to flout the Constitution of the United States. Either that, or they are ignorant of the division of powers as set forth in the Constitution.

Such vigilante conduct must be repudiated immediately, else it would work to the discredit of the Senate. These men are employees of the Senate. In a way they act for all Senators.

Incidentally, Mr. President, too often members of Senators' staffs and committee staffs strut around in the Senate Chamber and elsewhere in a "porky" manner, as we say in Ohio, evidently trying to impress spectators in the galleries and others with their simulated importance. Many of us have observed in the past an attitude of self-importance and of superciliousness on the part of some employees of the Senate as though at times they are trying to give the impression that they are running the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask that a portion of a news item relating to this latest abuse that appeared in today's issue of the Washington Post be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> #### CENSOR QUIZ BAN BACKED BY KENNEDY
>
> It was revealed that Senate investigators secretly questioned Marine and Air Force enlisted men and officers in the Washington area about communism during the past week.
>
> The interrogations were conducted at the Marine barracks in Henderson Hall at Arlington and in Air Force barracks at Bolling and Andrews fields without the knowledge of the subcommittee staff or of Chairman John Stennis, Democrat, of Mississippi.
>
> Here are some of the questions that were asked:
>
> "Who was Marx? Lenin?"
>
> "Who is Gus Hall? Castro? Koslov?"
>
> "What is the John Birch Society?"
>
> "Describe and define dialectical materialism."
>
> "Name a pacifist organization. A civil rights one."
>
> "What is the difference between right-wing and conservative organizations and Fascist groups?"
>
> "Do you have information to prepare you for the next country you will fight in? What will that country be?"
>
> "List three groups on the Attorney General's list of subversive activities."
>
> "What is the population of the United States? The Soviet Union? China? France? Cuba?"

"Who is Ming Tse-tung?" (This was a deliberate misspelling of Mao Tse-tung's name to try to trip up the servicemen.)

"Do you hate, respect or fear Russian soldiers?"

(Marine Commandant Gen. David M. Shoup said last night the questionnaire was a "needless waste of time" and a detriment to morale, United Press International reported.

(Secretary McNamara forwarded Shoup's written report to the Stennis subcommittee. Appended was a report by Marine Lt. Col. Hazel E. Benn, education officer, who told how she had objected to having individual Marines requested to sign their names and give rank, serial number and date of birth at the end of the questionnaire. She was told, her report said, that the names would be used only where leftist responses were given and then only to alert commanding officers.

(Shoup said of the questionnaire:

("I am quick to admit that I am personally unable to fully answer all the questions. Yet as a man who has spent his adult life in the military service of his country and who believes he is a loyal and patriotic American willing to fight and die for his country should the need again arise, I do not believe my ability or that of any well-trained marine to answer that questionnaire has any particular bearing on the effectiveness of the corps in its assigned mission.

("Therefore I consider the questionnaire a needless waste of time.")

Persons familiar with the results of the testing reported that only 1 out of 26 servicemen questioned at one Washington military installation knew what the Attorney General's list is.

In another instance no one in a group of about 30 servicemen could identify Gus Hall. He is general secretary of the American Communist Party.

It was also reported that some of the servicemen said in answering the questions, "I don't know enough (about communism) and I wish I knew more."

The questions—about 20 of them—were printed on 2 sheets of paper. Written answers were required. Charles Byrnes and Benjamin Kaplan, the two aids, administered the tests, which were arranged through Marine and Air Force legislative liaison and public information officers.

Stennis said that the subcommittee had considered conducting surveys among servicemen about their reaction to troop education and information programs but that no surveys had been specifically ordered by the subcommittee. He immediately called for a full report on the questioning.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I am happy that not only has the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] repudiated the action of those men, but also that the distinguished junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the chairman of this subcommittee, when he first learned of the action, immediately expressed his distress, repudiated it, and ordered an investigation.

I also compliment the Commandant of the Marine Corps, Gen. David M. Shoup, for ridiculing the action of the two inquisitors and denouncing the questionnaire submitted by them. He said that he would have difficulty answering some of the questions himself. I do not know who drew up the questions, but they are offensive and silly questions, such as—

Describe and define dialetical materialism.

That would have been enough, but then they also asked—

Do you have information to prepare you for the next war you will fight in?

This question could lead one to assume that ours is an aggressor Nation and that we are surely going to fight some other country.

I do not wish to continue further on this subject, but it is too important a situation for us to give it the charity of our silence. I am very happy that the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon brought it to the attention of the country.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Ohio very much.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, my appearance here on this subject is in response to interest manifested by members of the Special Preparedness Subcommittee that is investigating the review policies of the so-called censoring, sometimes called muzzling, of the military, and also the indoctrination program of troops and public with reference to the menace of the cold war.

A question has arisen, and the facts have not been fully developed yet, with reference to the interrogation of some of the members of the Marine Corps by a gentleman on the subcommittee staff. These members of the Marine Corps were enlisted men who were questioned by some members of the staff concerning their knowledge with reference to the Communist threat and related matters.

Since this matter came to my personal attention, Mr. President, I have made a brief survey of the situation. We have not completed a full investigation of the facts. The press called me many times yesterday, when I was engaged in other urgent matters, asking for a statement about it. There was no disposition to evade a statement or put them off, but I felt that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] wanted to talk about it first, and he was away yesterday and last night.

I have in my hand a copy of the questionnaire that was conceived and written up by a member of the staff. It is the questionnaire that was used in interrogating some of the enlisted men in the Marine Corps.

I ask unanimous consent that it be placed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the questionnaire was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INFORMATION QUESTIONNAIRE—DEFINE THE TERM "COMMUNIST THREAT"

Is the international Communist conspiracy a menace to all free people?

Do Communists operate against armed services? If so, how?

What is the Attorney General's list (EO-10450)?

Name three designated subversive organizations.

What is a front organization?

Name three front organizations, and describe one.

Is there a difference between a pacifist organization and subversive organization?

Is there any difference between a civil rights organization and a subversive organization? Describe.

Name one pacifist organization and one civil rights organization.

Is there any difference between a conservative organization and a Communist front group? Describe.

Name your two State Senators, your Representative, the President, Vice President, Secretary of State, and Secretary of Defense.

How many individuals are in the U.S. Senate?

What is the President's term of office? The Vice President's? Representatives?

Approximately how many people live in the United States? In Russia? Communist China? Cuba? France?

Do you agree with the saying—From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs? If not, why not?

Describe the code of conduct.

How many hours of instruction were devoted to the code? What type of instruction do you receive?

Do you have a copy of the code of conduct with you?

If you were to be called upon to fight overseas, whom do you think we would fight?

Do you think you have sufficient knowledge of enemy named in previous question?

Describe the American Nazi Party.

Who is George L. Rockwell?

Name any books, articles or movies, official or unofficial, which describe some aspect of communism, in which you have personal knowledge.

How many nations have fallen to communism since 1936?

Identify the following individuals and terms: Fidel Castro, Patrice Lumumba, Moise Tshombe, Gus Hall, Karl Marx, VI Lenin, Frol Koslov, Das Kapital, Min-Setung, Chinese Commune, presidium, brainwashing, the Worker, a publication, dialectical materialism.

How many hours of instruction do you receive concerning communism?

If you had more complete knowledge of enemy named above, do you think this would be an additional motivating factor for patriotic and devoted service?

How many hours of indoctrination (information and education) do you estimate are required of the Russian soldier?

If you had intimate knowledge of the Russian soldier, as your opponent in the battlefield, would you hate, respect or fear him? (Choose one.)

Name ______________________________
(Print)
Rank ____________, serial number _________
Duty assignment__________________________
Years in service__________________________
Date and place of birth ____________________
____
Additional comments:
Signature __________________________

Mr. STENNIS. I have here in my hand also a communication from the Secretary of the Navy which is a memorandum for the Secretary of Defense, dated February 7, 1962, including a memorandum signed by General Shoup. This document purports to state the facts as understood by General Shoup and other officers as to what occurred.

For the information of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it be placed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM FOR THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, D.C., February 7, 1962.

Subject: Stennis subcommittee staff members visit to headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps, on February 1 and 2, 1962.

(Enclosures: (1) Detailed chronology of events; (2) coordinating officer's report; (3) sample questionnaire.)

The attached memorandum from the Commandant of the Marine Corps is forwarded for your information and such action as you may deem appropriate.

FRED KORTH.

FEBRUARY 7, 1962.

Memorandum for the Secretary of the Navy.

Subject: Stennis subcommittee staff members' visit to headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps, on February 1 and 2, 1962.

(Enclosures: (1) Detailed chronology of events; (2) coordinating officer's report; (3) sample questionnaire.)

1. The purpose of this memorandum is to acquaint you with certain events concerning the subject matter and to express my strong disapproval of the action of certain Stennis subcommittee staff members involved.

2. In brief, a Mr. Byrne of the Stennis subcommittee staff called this headquarters on January 31 and asked that arrangements be made for him and a Mr. Kaplan to interview five or six randomly selected marines on cold war information programs. On February 1, Mr. Byrne and Mr. Kaplan came to this headquarters, but instead of interviewing as they had requested, proceeded first to subject the education officer, who was the assigned coordinator, to a lengthy interview which they recorded. Subsequently, they requested the coordinating officer to assemble a group of 25 to 30 marines for the purpose of filling in a questionnaire the staff members provided. The questionnaire was to be signed by the marines with name, rank, serial number and date of birth. The investigators were insistent that the coordinator leave the room while the questionnaires were being filled in and also initially insisted that the papers be signed. However, an officer from the office of my legislative assistant finally prevailed on the investigators to announce to the group that they need not sign the questionnaire if they had objections to so doing. After administering the questionnaire the investigators secured for that day but Mr. Byrne returned on February 2 and conducted an interview with another officer on my staff. At the completion of this interview it was indicated that this series of interviews was concluded unless "other points of interest arise." On this date, Mr. Byrne was requested to provide the Marine Corps a copy of the questionnaire used the day before, but he refused.

3. A more detailed chronology of the pertinent occurrences in this matter is attached as enclosure 1.

4. A copy of the coordinating officer's report on her interview is attached as enclosure 2.

5. One of the marines who filled in the questionnaire has, to the best of his memory, listed the questions contained therein. See enclosure 3.

6. There are essentially three main points I wish to emphasize:

(a) Time: Since the inception of the Stennis subcommittee's inquiries into the troop information program, members of that staff have visited Headquarters, Marine Corps, on other occasions. In one case, they utilized the time and efforts of one general officer and several colonels plus several officers of lesser ranks for 1 full day and were given a thorough briefing on the Marine Corps position and programs in all the areas in which the subcommittee is ostensibly interested. On another occasion they visited the Marine Corps Recruit Depot, San Diego, and the 1st Marine Division at Camp Pendleton, Calif., for a period of a little more than a day and a half. While at San Diego, they orally questioned some 50 men covering in detail the training program.

In all instances, even the one presently at issue, the Marine Corps has been completely cooperative and much time and effort on the part of many personnel has been spent in preparation of these visits in order to be sure of being helpful and informative.

These visits are time consuming and costly in terms of personnel utilization and I seriously doubt that they serve any further truly useful purpose. I can assure you they do not for the Marine Corps. I believe in the area in question, our goals are clear and our course properly charted.

As Commandant of the Marine Corps I have also made my position perfectly clear in this matter during my testimony before the Stennis subcommittee on January 30.

(b) Value of the questionnaire: I have perused the list of questions that were given to my men (enclosure 3). I am quick to admit that I am personally unable to fully answer all the questions. Yet as a man who has spent his adult life in the military service of his country and who believes he is a loyal and patriotic American willing to fight and die for his country should the need again arise, I do not believe my ability, or that of any well-trained Marine to answer that questionnaire has any particular bearing on the effectiveness of the Corps in its assigned mission. Therefore, I consider the questionnaire a needless waste of time.

(c) Ethics and morale: Such actions as described herein can but cause wonderment among our marines. I consider the manner in which this transpired to be detrimental to the morale of those whose morale I am responsible for.

7. This report is forwarded for your information and such action as you may deem appropriate.

DAVID M. SHOUP,
General, U.S. Marine Corps,
Commandant of the Marine Corps.

Detailed Chronology of Events, February 1 and 2, 1962

1. Mr. Byrne called and requested arrangements be made for him and Mr. Kaplan to interview a "random selection of five or six marines" on cold war information programs.

2. Mr. Byrne later notified of arrangements for interviews at 1000, February 1, in building 3, Henderson Hall.

3. Mr. Byrne and Mr. Kaplan arrived on schedule but instead of interviewing the selected marines, they first subjected Lieutenant Colonel Benn to a rather lengthy interview which they recorded.

4. Subsequent to interviewing Lieutenant Colonel Benn the investigators requested her to assemble a larger group of marines (instead of the five or six requested) to fill in a questionnaire. They had indicated a larger group might be wanted.

5. Lieutenant Colonel Benn did as requested by the investigators and assembled a group of 30 marines. The investigators indicated that the questionnaire was to be signed with name, rank, serial number, and date of birth.

6. Lieutenant Colonel Benn notified the Office of the Legislative Assistant of this latter development after the group started filling in the questionnaires. Upon being notified, an officer of that Office immediately went to the interview area and insisted upon the investigators announcing to the assembled group that they need not sign the paper if they had objections to so doing. After some discussion, Mr. Kaplan did announce that signatures would not be required.

7. At completion of Thursday's work, the interviewers indicated they wanted to talk to G–2 and G–3 representatives on operations and intelligence matters relative to the same general subject of cold war information. Lieutenant Colonel Benn arranged for them to talk to Colonels Berkeley and Cereghino.

8. At 0930 on Friday, February 2, Mr. Byrne arrived alone at headquarters to be conducted to Colonel Cereghino's office. Mr. Kaplan was not with him. Mr. Byrne was asked to provide a copy of the questionnaire so that the Chief of Staff and the Commandant might be aware of its content. He refused to do so. This was 0945 on February 2. The matter was discussed further with our pointing out our cooperation as well as our belief that we had a right and a responsibility to be aware of what our marines were being subjected to. He nevertheless refused to provide a copy on his own responsibility but indicated he would check with the subcommittee staff.

9. Comdr. R. J. Gerhardt, investigations branch, Navy OLA, was contacted after Mr. Byrne left this office and the entire matter was discussed with him. He indicated that:

(a) Mr. Byrne had contacted him prior to calling headquarters on the original request for interview and had indicated the same request to him, i.e., interview five or six marines, etc.

(b) Mr. Byrne's and Mr. Kaplan's actions in the matter thus far were certainly contrary to previous actions by members of that staff on such visits, in that, heretofore they had always stayed within the boundaries of their stated requests.

(c) Since these people work under the supervision of Lieutenant Colonel Hartel, he was going to contact him and discuss it. He was to make it clear we weren't concerned other than on procedures, etc., and that the issue of the questionnaire was not to be enlarged.

(d) Lieutenant Colonel Hartel talked to Mr. Kendall, then called Commander Gerhardt back and informed him that as a matter of legislative privilege they would not furnish the marines a copy of the questionnaire.

(e) He asked Lieutenant Colonel Hartel if they intended to call some of the marines questioned as witnesses and Hartel's answer was, "Not as a result of this questionnaire."

(f) At approximately 1330 on Friday, Mr. Byrne checked back by this office after having interviewed Colonel Cereghino and Colonel Berkeley he indicated this was the end of this particular series of interviews "unless other points of interest arise."

Questioning on February 1, 1962, by Staff of Stennis Subcommittee; Information Concerning (a) OLA (Lieutenant Colonel Anglin) Foncon of January 31, 1962, With Lieutenant Colonel Benn

(Enclosure: (1) Summary of questions and answers of Stennis staff interview with Lieutenant Colonel Benn of February 1, 1962.)

1. In accordance with reference (a), the undersigned met with Messrs. Kaplan and Byrne, members of the staff of the Stennis subcommittee on February 1. Six enlisted men had been selected for questioning as requested.

2. Developments were as follows:

(a) The committee staff wanted first to interview me prior to questioning the men. This lasted at least 2 hours with a tape recorder in action most of the time; the staff affirmed and reaffirmed that tapes would be transcribed and returned to the undersigned for editing. I will then be asked to sign the statement. Typical questions asked are listed in enclosure 1. I attempted to avoid insofar as possible encroaching into the areas of other staff agencies. In some cases, however, personal opinions were requested. (My reluctance will not be apparent in the transcription because the tape recorder was not operating all the time.) The Stennis staff members then stated a desire to talk to Colonels Cereghino of G–3 and Berkeley of G–2.

(b) Mr. Kaplan indicated that they would like 30 marines rather than just 6 and they would like them to fill out questionnaires and sign them. I got in touch with the executive officer of headquarters battalion and made arrangements for 30 enlisted marines and 2 officers (1 woman) to take the test. Actually 31 enlisted (including 1 woman staff sergeant) and 2 officers came. As I indicated to you, I objected strongly to having personnel being required to sign questionnaires. My concern was manifold including the possibility of the marines finding themselves being required to be witnesses before a Senate committee, thus my call to you. I was assured that they would use names only where leftist responses appeared and then it would be to alert the commanding officer.

I was not allowed to stay in the room while the questionnaire was being filled out by the group.

3. After the questionnaires were turned in, they told me that they had some of their most interesting responses from this marine group. Only one man didn't sign the questionnaire. I was allowed to see a blank questionnaire form briefly. Their reaction seemed to be much the same as that of the other Stennis group (Lieutenant Colonel Hartel and Mr. Roche): they like what the Marine Corps is doing but they seem to feel that more instruction on the dangers of communism should improve a marine's combat effectiveness.

Summary of Questions and Answers of Stennis Staff Interview of February 1, 1962 with Lieutenant Colonel Benn

1. Will you state in your words what you feel General Shoup's philosophy is on information and education?

Answer. I stated as nearly as possible the same information in the CMC's statement and in the policy letter.

2. Why does the Marine Corps feel that individual commanders are qualified to determine how much each marine needs in the area of democracy and communism?

Answer. I stated essentially that commanders are professional marines who have spent their lives preparing to accept positions of responsibility and leadership in the art of warfare, gave the pitch "I believe or I relieve."

3. Does the Marine Corps feel that more or less instruction in Americanism, communism, and the capabilities of Communist weapons would make marines better qualified?

Answer. I deferred to G–3 but referred to CMC statements on the first two items. I mentioned that the man needs to know his place in his fire team and his own weapons first and then there are limitations of some in age, experience, and mental ability to absorb details of philosophy of communism, facts on Government and weapons of an enemy.

4. What is the difference in levels of instruction on Americanism and communism, i.e., basic school or service school?

Answer. I deferred to G–3 and stated that the instruction would vary the same as any beginning or advanced work in an area.

5. How do you fit into the I. & E. picture and how does the section in which you work?

Answer. I explained my position, my instruction on Americanism and communism; A.F.I. & E. materials within HQMC, and as to distribution of materials.

6. How does HQMC screen information materials?

Answer. It was included in answer above.

7. What kinds of information materials does HQMC refuse?

Answer. We select those which we feel will support training. We refuse those that we feel are factually incorrect, or which overlap other materials, or which concern areas where marines aren't located.

8. Does the Marine Corps distribute materials in the area of national policy that is not cleared with the State Department?

Answer. We get all materials in this area from DOD; they now have a State Department man assigned to DOD.

9. Will you describe code of conduct training?

Answer. That is G–3's responsibility and Colonel Cereghino will.

10. Who teaches men slated for embassy duty?

Answer. This is G–3's responsibility. I believe they have some instructors from State Department but this would have to be confirmed.

11. What responsibility do you have in the area of domestic infiltration?

Answer. This, to me, is a G–2 responsibility.

12. Who alerts Pvt. Joe Blow to a local youth activity which is subversive?

Answer. To me, this would be a G–2 responsibility and the CO's.

13. Doesn't G–2 cut you in on this type of material?

Answer. No.

14. Wouldn't it help to have better coordination?

Answer. It's none of my business.

15. Why doesn't the Marine Corps like the film, "Operation Abolition"? Did your G–2 review it?

Answer. I explained that I reviewed it first and I personally didn't like it. I was the only marine present as I remembered.

16. What didn't you like?

Answer. It depicted to me that our highest legislative body was unable to control hoodlums. In fact this so upset me that I almost completely missed the point the producers intended to make. I refused repeatedly to state any "Marine Corps" policy.

17. Did the Marine Corps refuse this film prior to its controversial publicity?

Answer. After I had expressed distaste for the film, DOD never offered it again to the Marine Corps.

18. What would the Marine Corps suggest to get across the message of the menace of communism?

Answer. The Marine Corps approach is positive. I suggested "Force in Readiness" and, on the other side "question 7."

19. Who determines which information films are accepted for the Marine Corps?

Answer. The Commandant of the Marine Corps.

20. Does HQMC require training aids libraries to keep a record of the utilization of films?

Answer. G–3 has this responsibility. I was under the impression that they might be able to tell how many times a film is drawn from a library but not how many persons saw it.

Later:

21. What is the Bendetson Committee?

Answer. If you have seen the papers you know as much about the charter as I do.

22. What is your position with regard to the Bendetson Committee?

Answer. I merely act as the liaison for HQMC, I obtain materials which the committee desires.

SOME OF THE QUESTIONS (IN SUBSTANCE)

1. How much training do you get on Communist matters?

2. How much training do you think the Russian soldier gets?

3. Do you think you'd be better able to fight the Russians if you knew more about the Russian ideology?

4. What is the menace of communism to the free world?

5. Do you think that the Communists are trying to influence the armed services?

6. Is there any difference between a pacifist organization and a subversive organization?

7. What is the Attorney General's list?

8. Name three organizations listed as subversive.

9. Is there any difference between a Communist front organization and a civil rights organization? If so, describe.

10. Name a pacifist organization and a civil rights organization.

11. What is a Communist front organization?

12. Identify or describe the following: (a) Karl Marx, (b) Gus Hall, (c) the Worker, (d) Frol Koslov, (e) Ming Tse-Tsung, (f) Patrice Lumumbo, (g) Moise Tshombe, (h) Das Kapital, (i) dialectic materialism, (j) brainwashing, (k) Fidel Castro.

13. Give the names of some books or periodicals that describe communism.

14. How many nations do you think have become Communist since 1936?

15. What are the populations of Russia, China, Cuba, France, the United States?

16. What is the code of conduct?

17. Name your Congressman, Senator, President of the United States, Secretary of State, Secretary of Defense.

18. What is the American Nazi Party? Who is George Lincoln Rockwell?

Mr. STENNIS. I have in my hand also a memorandum dated February 7, 1962, addressed to Mr. James T. Kendall, who is chief attorney and acting chief of staff of the Special Preparedness Subcommittee.

This memorandum is from Mr. Charles A. Byrne, who is one of the additional staff members working with the special committee on this investigation. When I say, "additional staff members," it means that he and a few others are in addition to the regular staff of the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee.

Mr. Byrne is a very fine man. He is now really employed by the General Accounting Office, but, at my request, he is with us temporarily on what is called a reimbursable basis. He is an investigator. We merely pay his salary while he is with us.

The memorandum states:

> Re the information questionnaire and visits February 1 and 2, 1962, to Headquarters, Marine Corps, for review of information and education program.

Shortly I shall ask unanimous consent to place the memorandum in the RECORD, unless I decide to read a major portion of it, in which case I shall read it all.

Mr. Byrne is the gentleman who went out and interrogated the enlisted men. He was accompanied by a Mr. Kaplan. Mr. Kaplan is not a member of the subcommittee staff. He is temporarily a member, as I understand, of the staff of the Senator from South Carolina. Mr. Kaplan went with Mr. Byrne at the request either of Mr. Byrne or of another one of the additional staff members.

I have not had an opportunity to talk to Mr. Kaplan or to Mr. Byrne. Anyway, they were the ones who did the interrogation.

Mr. President, there is a difference in the statement of facts by Mr. Byrne with reference to what happened and the statement by members of the Marine Corps. The subcommittee has had neither the opportunity nor time to go into the question to try to resolve any difference as to the facts. We are bringing this out now for the Senate and the public.

It is the idea of the Senator from Mississippi that as soon as we can we shall go into the matter, and that we shall not put it off in any way. As soon as the subcommittee can develop the facts and reach some decisions it will do so. In the meantime, we have the questionnaires, some of which were signed, in the bosom of the committee. They are open to inspection by any member of the subcommittee or by any Member of the Senate, so far as that is concerned. They will be held until it is decided what are the facts and what should be done in this matter.

Another point is that we have had to work together the best we could, the subcommittee staff, with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] and the members of his staff. We have added additional staff members, assigned to this case alone. The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] has cooperated in every way. We have made the best of a pretty difficult situation, with all the personnel being overworked, and we have tried to cover the vast volume of facts which pertain to the investigation.

Mr. President, we ran into the fact that the so-called censors in the Department of Defense in round numbers had to pass on 12,000 different articles a year, counting all the newspaper releases they had to review, statements to committees of the Congress, speeches by the generals and civilian employees. The formal speeches they have had to pass on, those made by civilian and military personnel for the Washington area, have been running at the rate of 1,500 speeches a year. Last year that jumped to more than 2,000 speeches, a 33⅓-percent increase.

That covers the major part of the investigation we have been working on so far. It shows the tremendous volume of work that has been done.

The questionnaire is something I had not seen. Mr. Kendall, the chief counsel, acting director of the staff, had not seen it. It was through him I issued general directions that all major matters would have to be cleared, and perhaps the main reason why he had not seen the document or had an opportunity to go over it was simply that he has been very busy, doing a lot of questioning and work preparing for the presentation of the hearing. He has been working day and night, and simply was not available as much as he ordinarily would have been to the other staff members.

I am going to be brief about this, but I assure the Senate we are not covering up. We are not holding back. Everything we have done is going to be explained to the Senate the best we can.

I appeal to the Senate, or to anyone else who is interested, to withhold judgment on this question, not to reach any conclusion or to prejudge it, until the facts are all in.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Oregon. I think the Senator's remarks in bringing up the subject this morning are a very great service to the Senate. I do not object to that at all.

Mr. MORSE. I only wish to make it clear that I brought the subject up because it is a matter of public knowledge in the press.

Mr. STENNIS. I know.

Mr. MORSE. I wished to find out from the Senator from Mississippi what the situation was.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. I simply asked the Senator what were the facts.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Mississippi fully understands, and thinks the Senator from Oregon has rendered a service.

As a matter of fact, the Senator from Mississippi would have brought the subject up yesterday himself, but for the conditions he has already described. We were making preparations for witnesses coming before the committee this morning, and the very important question of executive privilege was at stake, was expected to be pleaded, and, frankly, was pleaded. It has been ruled on. Special preparations had to be made.

We are getting into the problem.

I wish to say, for the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], we may have some differences of opinion on some facts, but certainly the Senator has cooperated, and we have made the best of the situation so far, at least, as it has confronted us. I think each of us gives the other credit for acting in good faith about these matters.

Any mistakes which have been made in the handling of the matters by the staff are my responsibility. I am going to review the entire question with the subcommittee, and then we shall take such action as we think we should, as the Senate representatives, and shall give the Senate a report.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is not usually my intention to make any comments relative to the activities of a committee looking into a particular situation. However, as a former marine, as one who was a private, first class, a Pfc., in the Marine Corps, I have a great deal of pride in the Marines and a great deal of confidence in the Commandant, General Shoup.

To say that I was shocked and surprised to find that the kind of questioning which has been discussed has taken place is to state my position mildly.

I am heartened and encouraged by the statement made by the chairman of the committee, who now holds the floor. I am sure that, on the basis of his advice to keep our feelings in control until the question is settled, justice will be done.

However, it should be brought out that if the newspaper stories are correct the Commandant of the Marine Corps has requested a list of these questions and has been refused. So long as the men under his command were questioned, and so long as the questions are available to any Senator, I believe that the Commandant likewise should have access to the questions. Furthermore, I think he should have been consulted before such an action was undertaken.

I note in the Baltimore Sun a news story on this subject. I knew nothing about it until yesterday afternoon. The title of the story, which is dated for the 8th of February, today, is, "Marine Calls His Uniform Best Anti-Red Motivation."

The story continues:

> A veteran member of the Marine Corps said today he told Senate investigators "The fact that I'm an American citizen plus the uniform I wear"—rather than any knowledge of communism—are enough to make him a better marine.

I do not know what further proof one wants of one being a good, patriotic American citizen. I believe that the Marine Corps is the greatest outfit in the world, and is not subject to questioning in this respect.

I am disturbed. I hope that the investigation now underway, under the chairmanship of the able and distinguished Senator from Mississippi, will insure that the wheels will be kept on the track.

I would raise a question as to the educational ability of the 100 Members of the Senate to answer those questions accurately, as I have understood the questions as reported in the press. They cannot even spell Mao Tse-tung's name correctly. I wonder how many people know who Gus Hall is, or can describe the term "dialectic materialism," or "identify Frol Koslov and Gus Hall," or "name three organizations listed as subversive," and other questions.

I think the Marines are entitled to upgrading and not downgrading. I think our country is extremely fortunate that, as Commandant of the U.S. Marine Corps, we have a man of the caliber of Gen. David Shoup, who holds the Congressional Medal of Honor, who knows what he is doing, who teaches his men to do their duty, to be fighting men first and foremost, and to be prepared to go anywhere at any time and under any circumstances. There is behind him a 180-year history of proud achievements on the part of the Marine Corps.

So, as a former enlisted man in the Marine Corps, I express the hope that under the able chairmanship of the Senator from Mississippi the inquiry will be kept on the track.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Montana.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. First, I thank the Senator from Mississippi for his characteristically judicious statement. I am sure that we will all withhold final judgment until the facts, as he develops them, are brought out. I think, however, that it might be worth while to say something about the background of General Shoup, a subject which was touched upon briefly by the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Illinois can speak from personal experience, having served with the General in the Marine Corps during the Second World War.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator. General Shoup was the operations officer of the 2d Marine Division and drew the combat plans for Tarawa. On the eve of the landing, the officer who was to lead the landing forces in the attack was taken ill, and General Shoup asked for the privilege of leading the forces in person. I think it is one of the few occasions in military history in which the man who drew the plans took the risks of carrying them out. General Shoup led the attack forces and went in on one of the first waves. His command post was in water up to his waist. He was under heavy enemy fire for hours, and showed great bravery and presence of mind. For this he was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor. Usually one must die to receive a Congressional Medal of Honor, but the award was properly made in this instance.

Those of us who had the privilege of serving in the Marine Corps are sometimes accused of being excessively conceited and laudatory of our corps. That may be true. I merely say that the corps takes some pride in its record. I know of no instance in which it has turned tail in the face of combat. We point with some pride to the combat record of our corps and submit that our casualty lists show that we have never shirked danger. On the contrary, we have sought assignments which were dangerous and disagreeable if they needed to be performed. We have every desire to continue to serve this country in the future as we have done in the past and we are ready to let the American people judge whether we serve our Nation with our full strength.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator for his remarks.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 30 seconds?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I ask the Senator to yield now only because what I have to say should be said while he is present in the Chamber. I appreciate very much the report he has given to the Senate. Being the first Senator to comment on the subject today, I owe it to the Senator from Mississippi to express the fact that I deplored what I read in the newspapers on this question. I have made the point that each committee of the Senate is an agent of the Senate and is responsible to the Senate. We have an obligation to see to it that committees follow a responsible course of action. I only sought to ask the Senator from Mississippi to make clear to the Senate what the facts are.

Unquestionably I do not like what I read.

I know, as the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] have pointed out, that we can always count on the judicial attitude of the Senator from Mississippi in carrying out his duty.

But I raise again the point I previously raised. We are responsible for the procedures that are followed by our committees. It is disturbing to me to read in the newspapers that, if true—and from what the Senator from Mississippi himself has said only a few minutes ago, it is true—the chairman of the committee was not aware that the procedure was going to be followed. The record will speak for itself.

I think the committees must be held responsible for the conduct of their aids and that we must see that the aids of our committees do not exercise arbitrary and discretionary power in conducting our committee work.

Our aides must be notified, as the Senator has announced he had attempted to do in connection with his committee, that there must be approval—in this instance through his counsel and through the committee.

I also raised a question that to me is very fundamental to the protection of the American people. We should always have vigilant compliance with our doctrine of separation of powers and the privileges of the Executive. I will fight equally vigorously for the privileges of the legislature.

But what bothers me about a situation such as the one before the Senate is that if a congressional committee, without getting any clearance from the executive branch of the Government, can walk into an office of the Armed Forces of this country and take away for 1 minute—if one can do it for 1 minute he can do it for a long period of time—the personnel of that particular branch of the armed services and put them, for that period of time, under the command of the Senate, we shall have clearly violated the doctrine of separation of powers; we shall have clearly invaded the prerogatives of the Commander in Chief, the President of the United States.

I shall reserve further judgment, depending on the final report of the chairman of the committee. But on the basis of the newspaper account I again raise the question, as I did earlier today, as to the power of the Committee on Armed Services, or a subcommittee thereof, or staff members thereof, on their own, to proceed to set themselves up for 1 second as the commanders of any group of Marines or Air Force personnel. I think it is perfectly clear that the commander, General Shoup, should have been given the opportunity to refuse or grant permission for the use of the questionnaire.

Otherwise, we are invading the Executive power of the Government under the separation-of-powers doctrine. That is the point I raise.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator. I fully understand his motives. I know that no Senator would impugn the motives of the committee in trying to develop the facts. I hope no one will impugn the motives of the staff members who were trying to work at the task. I certainly wish it clearly understood in our Marine centers, as well as other places, that the action in no way impugns the motives or questions the loyalty of the Marine Corps, or any member thereof. The very opposite is true.

One of the best statements and most effective bits of testimony the committee has had was that given by General Shoup.

I may say to the Senate that the law provides that the term of the Commandant of the Marine Corps shall be 4 years. When the appointment of General Shoup came to the committee, it was for only 2 years. The Senator from Mississippi was the one who raised the point in committee that it had to be for a 4-year term, to be a valid appointment. The appointment was sent back to the Pentagon, and the White House returned the appointment calling for a 4-year term. It is incidental that I am the one who raised the point about the 4-year tenure, instead of the 2-year tenure.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I mention that point incidentally. I am a great admirer of the man and his fine record. I am glad now to yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I know that what the distinguished chairman of the committee has just said is true. The facts of the tenure of the present Commandant of the Marine Corps have borne out the trust and faith and good judgment of the Senator from Mississippi.

Also speaking incidentally, my distinguished colleague the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and I, when I was a Member of the House of Representatives, together were able to get a bill passed in Congress, unanimously, I believe, which, among all the services, set for the Marine Corps alone a floor, and thereby guaranteed to the Marine Corps a size amounting to three combat size divisions and three combat size wings.

We did this only because at that time there were other interests in the military which were seeking, in effect, to reduce the Marine Corps to a guard unit.

We are very glad that we sponsored that legislation, that the Marine Corps is the organization that it is today, and that its Commandant is of the caliber of General Shoup.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Montana has made a very fine statement on the great work he sponsored with the able Senator from Illinois.

I wish now to read a factual statement prepared by Mr. Byrne, who was the man who interrogated these gentlemen:

MEMORANDUM OF FEBRUARY 7, 1962

To: James T. Kendall.
From: Charles A. Byrne.
Re the information questionnaire and visits February 1 and 2, 1962, to Headquarters, Marine Corps, for review of information and education program.

On January 30, 1962, we arranged with Lt. Col. E. O. Anglin, Office of Legislative Liaison, Marine Corps Headquarters, for a review of the crops information and education program at Henderson Barracks, Va., and, generally, as provided for the Marine Corps. We indicated that we would desire direct information from a number of the personnel selected at random. This was agreed upon and it was arranged that on February 1, 1962, we contacted Lt. Col. Hazel Benn, Marine Corps, personnel and member of Bendesten Committee, who is most knowledgeable in the overall Marine Corps information and education program.

The subcommittee staff on January 31, 1962, prepared an information questionnaire on communism and American institutions for the purpose of testing the knowledge of the participants in these subjects. We proposed to use the questionnaire in an effort to enlarge our coverage by using groups, rather than individually. Also, we could obtain better sample rather than relying on possibly handpicked selections. We had previously used a different type of questionnaire, but as a result of not retaining a tight control over its distribution, it was compromised to the point that much of its value was dissipated for loss of the surprise element.

A review of the questionnaire we think reveals a straightforward series and depth of questions, the responses to which will indicate the degree of insight into the subjects of communism, cold war subjects, and our institutions, the sources of this information, the stress placed on these subjects and to a less degree the impact as well as an opportunity to comment. We felt that it was desirable to have the participant sign the questionnaire, which is not legal paper, to identify the individuals, their assignments, years of service, etc., for possible future inquiry by the subcommittee. We failed to ask for educational experience, which we think is also very important.

We met with Lieutenant Colonel Benn, as arranged, and she described the sources of information and educational data which is made available through military channels or is devised by the Marine Corps and how selection is made of material to be disseminated to the lower commands. She related the procedures to the policies of the Marine Corps and described how responsibility for this activity is a command function at each echelon down to the smallest unit.

If I may interpose at this point, I should like to say that regardless of how I would have selected a questionnaire, how detailed or how learned it would have been, nevertheless, trying to examine, through some of these men at the lower echelon, and to learn just how this plan is operating, was a practical way of trying to get the information.

I continue to read:

She said that 10 men had been selected at random for our inquiry; we asked if we could have 30. This was agreed to and arranged immediately following chow, which had just been completed. We met in a classroom in the gymnasium and were introduced by Lieutenant Colonel Benn. We then oriented those assembled to the effect that we wished that they would complete the questionnaire. We did not touch on the matter of signing of the questionnaire, until just after our orientation was completed and the work was begun, when we conferred with Lt. Col. E. O. Anglin and a major on the Marine Corps Legislative Liaison Staff as to the question of signature.

We interrupted the group and pointed out to them that the form of the questionnaire indicated that they might like to sign it; if not, they were not required to do it. No further comment was made from the group and Lieutenant Colonel Anglin and his associate seemed satisfied. Lieutenant Colonel Benn also left the group following our initial orientation.

On the next morning, February 2, 1962, I went to the Marine Corps Office of Legislative Liaison to make further inquiries concerning the G-3 activities in training and education in cold war subjects of Marine Corps recruits and regulars. About midmorning when I returned to the Legislative Liaison Office I was informed that the corps would like to have a copy of the questionnaire to review. I felt I could not properly comply and said so. I pointed out that the group (including two officers and two females) had used it and that two legislative liaison officers and Colonel Benn had looked it over and no questions had been raised because it was as represented for the purpose we had in mind. Also, I said that we preferred not to release it because we had experience previously with an earlier questionnaire for solely subcommittee use, which was compromised in its usefulness by publicity and that we personally did not favor its release otherwise. I was then informed that the Commandant desired it, and I forthwith contacted the subcommittee staff which directed that it not be released except on a formal request.

The specific information you requested in your memorandum dated February 7, 1962, is as follows:

1. Subcommittee staff member, G. E. Hartel, instructed me to make this visit.

Mr. G. E. Hartel is one of the additional members of the subcommittee staff. He is a retired Army colonel. He retired at the end of 20 years, sometime during the early part of the year 1961. He had spent a great number of years in the service, working in the troop information and education program. He was familiar with the subject, and he applied. I continue to read:

2. Mr. Kaplan accompanied me on this visit at the direction of Mr. Hartel, because of the importance of the Marine Corps information and education program in the overall inquiry by this subcommittee and the fact that a previous incident had occurred at headquarters, Marine Corps, and he wanted no recurrence of such an incident. No other staff member was available to accompany me.

Those are matters which perhaps are simply little brushes that happened along the way in making the investigation. I am not personally familiar with them; I do not know what happened. But anyone who has been engaged in this work knows that these little brushes and differences of opinion do occur. I do not know how serious this matter is. I am not trying to judge it. I think we ought to withhold judgment on it.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say, most respectfully, that I believe a very serious basic question of policy is involved in this whole subject. The explanation by Mr. Byrne, which the Senator from Mississippi has just read, is completely unsatisfactory to me. His saying that he went through channels does not mean that he went through channels. Let us see what kind of channels he thinks meet the requirements of a subcommittee to go through channels.

In the first place, so far as I know, he did not go through the committee.

The question as to whether or not the cross-examination of marines on the part of the committee staff aids should be conducted as a matter of policy never was cleared with the committee. I am willing to take judicial notice of the fact that had it been taken to the committee, it would never have got beyond that point, because I cannot imagine that a majority of the committee would have approved what, when they got to the bottom of the question, would be established to be a clear violation of separation of powers.

What are the channels he is talking about? He is talking about the legislative counsel of the Marine Corps, a subordinate, and, so far as rank is concerned, very much of a subordinate in the Marine Corps. He did not go to one who would determine the policy of the Marine Corps or the policy of the Armed Establishment of the country. When a question such as one of policy was raised, it ought to have gone through channels first. He ought to have gone to the Commandant of the Marine Corps, or the Secretary of Defense, or, if necessary, to the White House.

In my judgment, this is an invasion in particular of the powers given to the President of the United States as Commander in Chief under the Constitution. I do not believe this counsel or any other committee aid had any right to conduct this questionnaire simply because he received clearance from a legislative assistant and a colonel who apparently has charge of some education program of the Marine Corps.

This was a basic question as to whether the Senate would intervene in the Marine Corps and establish a policy of exercising or claiming a right to cross examine members of the military personnel of the Marine Establishment. If that can be done, then where do we draw the line?

If that can be done, what other invasion of the right of the Military Establishment can a Senate committee make or staff member make, until we get policy clearance at the top?

I say most respectfully to the Senator from Mississippi that I do not think this aide went through channels at all. Those are not the channels this body has the right to expect the employee of any committee, on a basic question of policy, which involves a constitutional question, to follow.

So far as I am concerned, if that is his defense, he is guilty of following a course of action which cannot be reconciled with the proper service that he ought to render to a Senate committee.

Mr. STENNIS. These men who go out over the country visit various places. I do not know how many; not any great number, but many; and the investigators go out for other purposes. They frequently check with someone in charge or in authority. Sometimes a call will be made to the Pentagon to inquire what to do. Frequently the Pentagon will call Mr. Kendall, chief counsel, who is in charge of the staff, and talk with him about a question; but in this case, no such call came. After all, it is rather reasonable for a staff member to go to the Marine barracks, or whatever the location was in this instance, after having called the legislative liaison in the Pentagon and arranged for the meeting a day or two in advance. When he showed up there, he was met by a lieutenant colonel, who the legislative liaison said would meet him and arrange the meeting. The lieutenant colonel sits with the investigator and accompanies him. As a practical matter, that is getting pretty close to home, to restate the mode of operation.

Technically, the request did not go through General Shoup; of course, all matters cannot go through him. Of course there could have been higher clearance than General Shoup. That is possible. But these matters have a practical side. Certainly there is no purpose of the subcommittee to invade executive privilege. I am sure the Senator from Oregon understands that. That question has been raised before the committee today. The right of executive privilege was sustained.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have already paid a compliment to the Senator from Mississippi for the position he took on that point. However, this action by some aids of the committee—not the committee—did invade an executive prerogative.

Mr. STENNIS. We shall inquire into that very point. I mention that again for the benefit of Senators who were not here earlier and did not hear this comment.

I continue to read:

> 3. Mr. Hartel said that he prepared the questionnaire.
>
> 4. The visit was announced and arranged for in detail through Marine Corps legislative liaison, Lieutenant Colonel Anglin; and all arrangements were made, including the selection of 10 marines for questioning by us.
>
> 5. See above. Also, 33 marines completed the questionnaire, ranging in rank from private to major.
>
> 6. Mr. Kaplan accompanied me on only this one visit and then only on February 1, 1962, when we used the questionnaire.

The simple explanation is that he wanted someone to go along with him. I think it is customary for investigators to travel in pairs.

> 7. Since we had no secretary available for our interview with Lt. Col. Hazel Benn, we took a tape recorder with us at Mr. Hartel's suggestion. The reason for this was that in a previous interview at headquarters, Marine Corps, information had been procured which was subsequently denied by the Commandant of the Corps in his official testimony. Lieutenant Colonel Benn raised no objection when we said that we would like a permanent record of our discussion.
>
> You probably are aware of the fact that we used the identical questionnaire at Andrews Air Force Base with 22 airmen (second class or lower) in the group and no objection was made then.

There is one further point. When General Shoup called for a copy of the questionnaire, I think he was entitled to it. But it was not given to him then. The reason for not giving it to him was that Mr. Kendall, to whom I have already referred, the chief counsel, the man preparing the hearings, was approached by a staff member who had the questionnaire in his hand. Mr. Kendall did not know its contents, and had never seen it. The staff member said to him, in effect, "General Shoup wants this."

Mr. Kendall asked, "Is that a part of your working papers?"

The aide replied, "Yes."

Mr. Kendall then said, "Well, you cannot let him have it," and walked into another room, busy about something else in connection with the hearings.

Certainly General Shoup was entitled to the questionnaire. I wish that fact had been brought out more clearly.

Mr. Kendall said, "Whatever they want, let them make a formal request for it." That word was supposed to have been transmitted back.

Mr. President, those are all the facts that I know. My inquiry has led that far; and we are going to thrash out this thing and get at the full truth.

I wish to repeat that although I do not look upon this matter as a small one, yet I do not believe it is an overwhelming one. I believe it can be adjusted when everyone is understood, and I believe we are not as far apart as might appear on the surface. I think this investigation is an important one, and I hope it will be permitted to proceed on its merits, and will be confined as closely to that as humanly possible, for I believe that is the purpose of all the members of the subcommittee.

I desire to thank the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] for yielding to me. I wonder whether he will be willing to yield also to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND].

Mr. MORSE. Of course. I shall be delighted to yield to both Senators.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I think the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] has made a thorough explanation of just what occurred.

There is an effort on the part of some to make a mountain out of a molehill. Possibly some of the reasons for that may come out. I have from certain members of the press information that the current stories have been put out by Mr. Arthur Sylvester, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs. I understand that his office has put out word that Gestapo tactics were used when the investigators went to the Marine headquarters. I understand that he said secret tests were given, and that the men were forced to sign the tests; and the newspapers were informed, from the statement which came from Mr. Sylvester's office, that the investigators were from my office.

I simply wish to say that the man who made the investigation is with the General Accounting Office, and I never met him until today. He was assigned to the committee staff last fall—the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] was able to arrange for him to be assigned there—and he has proved to be a dedicated and capable investigator and public servant. His name is Charles A. Byrne.

I think his statement in regard to just what happened is as clear as can be. The distinguished Senator from Mississippi read the statement. In the statement Mr. Byrne states—and I call attention to this statement:

> On January 30, 1962, we arranged with Lt. Col. E. O. Anglin, Office of Legislative Liaison, Marine Corps Headquarters, for a review of the corps information and education program at Henderson Barracks, Va.

Mr. President, is not that the proper way to go about it? The staff—of which Mr. Kendall is the chief counsel—of the Preparedness Subcommittee would normally proceed in that way. I am not a permanent member of the subcommittee, but I was assigned to it for the purposes of this investigation. The staff would hardly call General Shoup. In fact, when Senators have matters to take up with the Army, the Navy, or the Air Force, we take them up through the legislative liaison office. That is the proper channel through which to proceed, and that is the way the services want it done; and that is the way it is done, and that is the way it was done in this particular case.

In his statement Mr. Byrne further says:

> On February 1, 1962, we contacted Lt. Col. Hazel Benn, Marine Corps Personnel, and member of Bendetsen Committee, who is most knowledgeable in the overall Marine Corps information and education program.

So, Mr. President, no steps were taken, so far as I have learned, by the staff except through the normal routine. Mr. Byrne came from the General Accounting Office, and he has been with the Government for many, many years. As I have said, I met him for the first time today. In his report he sets out clearly, I think, the steps which were taken on that occasion. Certainly there has been nothing improper; and there is no desire on the part of any subcommittee member, so far as I know, to do anything improper; and there is no desire on the part of any member of the staff, so far as I know, or on the part of the chief counsel, Mr. Kendall, or on the part of any other member of the subcommittee or its staff, to do anything improper. They are simply trying to fulfill their responsibilities under the resolution adopted by the Senate Armed Services Committee.

I should like to remind the Senate of the two purposes stated in the resolution. The first is "to study and appraise the use of military personnel and facilities to arouse the public to the menace of the cold war." The second is "to inform and educate armed services personnel on the nature and menace of the cold war."

Mr. President, it is the duty of this subcommittee to determine whether that is being done. We were charged with making a study and investigation into determining whether the armed services personnel are being informed and educated on the nature and menace of the cold war.

I may say that the Navy—and the Marines are under the Navy—issued a guidance on this matter. It is identified as: "OP-NAV Instruction 3410.8—From Chief of Naval Operations—To All Ships and Stations." It is dated November 14, 1958.

The purpose of this guidance is set forth as follows:

> (a) To increase alertness to opportunities for the Navy to make a greater contribution toward the achievement of U.S. cold war objectives.
>
> (b) To solicit ideas which the Navy could use in its day-by-day operations to further U.S. cold war efforts.

Then the guidance goes into the background.

The third paragraph reads as follows:

> 3. DISCUSSION
>
> (a) Cold war is the competition between the free world and the Sino-Soviet bloc to enhance their power and influence relative to each other by political, economic, psychological, and other means. The cold war confronts the United States with a continuous threat to national security which may well be more serious than that of direct military conflict.
>
> (b) The primary functions of the military in the cold war are to (1) remain prepared to deter and conduct limited or general war; (2) provide a position of strength to validate and reinforce other-than-military cold war measures; and (3) use the resources of the armed services to further the objectives of political, economic, and psychological programs in the cold war arena.

Mr. President, that guidance was issued by the Navy; and I presume that the Marine Corps was trying to comply with it. Under the resolution the Senate passed, a study was being made—and the making of the study will continue—as to whether the armed services are informed and educated in regard to the nature and menace of the cold war; and this questionnaire is one method of determining that.

No Gestapo tactics were used. No person was required to sign the blank. The blank has been submitted for printing in the RECORD, and Senators can see it there. As the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] has said, some of the questions may be a little difficult. Perhaps they are. I myself had nothing to do with preparing the blank. It was prepared by a member of the subcommittee staff, and perhaps some of the questions included could have been omitted. But there are other questions which certainly are very pertinent.

For instance, the first question here is:

> Define the term "Communist threat."

The second question is:

> Is the international Communist conspiracy a menace to all free people?

The third question is:

> Do Communists operate against armed services? If so, how?

And on down the list.

There may be some questions that could have been left out, and perhaps some could have been added; but, taking the questionnaire from the first to the last, it is a questionnaire that would give a reasonable evaluation in depth to this matter, and the staff evidently thought it was a fair and reasonable questionnaire.

I think this whole effort has been brought about by Mr. Sylvester informing the press that my staff arranged this whole matter and my staff conducted this evaluation and my staff was responsible for all of it to try to take the heat off them.

Today they have pleaded executive privilege. They have refused to let an employee of the Department of Defense answer who censored one of Lieutenant General Trudeau's speeches or statements that he proposed to make to the House Aeronautical and Space Committee. That person, who was Chief of the Army Section of the Defense Directorate of Security Review at that time and who knew the censor and could have given us the name of the censor, was not allowed to do so. In fact, the Secretary of Defense himself came down and had a letter from the President of the United States and pleaded executive privilege.

If the President wanted to follow that course, that is a matter for him; but, Mr. President, the heat is on. The heat is going to stay on. We are not going to be deterred in this investigation by, as one press man said, these neat public relations tricks. We are not going to let Mr. Sylvester deter us in our effort to perform our duties under the resolution of the Armed Services Committee.

We expect to go forward and we expect to bring out information; and if I do not bring it out in the subcommittee, I am going to bring it out on the floor of the Senate, because we have valuable information that the people of this Nation ought to know, and they will know before the work of the subcommittee is over.

I read from an article published in the Baltimore Sun of today, February 8, 1962:

> NEW STIR CREATED
>
> Meanwhile, a new stir was created this morning by a Pentagon announcement that more than 30 marines stationed at Marine Corps headquarters here had been subjected to a questionnaire as to their knowledge of communism—

Mr. President, why not find out what they know about communism? One of the purposes of this investigation is to see what the armed services know about communism. Is any Senator on this floor going to object to this committee's performing its function of ascertaining whether or not troops are receiving adequate information about communism, the aims and designs of communism, the insidious dangers of communism, the purposes of communism?

The article continues:

> presumably by persons connected with the muzzling investigation.

The article continues:

> The Pentagon made the announcement after Gen. David Shoup, Commandant of the corps, had reported the questioning of his men to the Secretary of Defense, through his immediate superior, the Secretary of the Navy.

I want Senators to hear this:

> The first report said that General Shoup protested the questioning. This was later denied by a Marine Corps spokesman.
>
> Chairman STENNIS and Senator THURMOND both gave explanations of the affair to newsmen this afternoon.
>
> THURMOND said that the marines were given the questionnaire by a member of the staff of the subcommittee named Charles Byrne, on loan from the Government Accounting Office, and an unnamed member of THURMOND's staff.

On that point, I want to tell the Senate exactly who the member was. His name is Ben Kaplan, a professionally trained man, a man who could be of assistance in this matter, and who was willing to assist in doing this.

There was another reason, as I shall explain in a few minutes, why Mr. Hartel, a member of the staff, suggested Mr. Kaplan go along with Mr. Byrne, because something happened over there on the previous trip to the Marine headquarters that would be of interest to the Senate. The article states further:

> The South Carolina Senator hinted that the marines didn't score too well in their knowledge of what communism amounts to and why it is dangerous.
>
> Mr. Harry Dent, administrative assistant to THURMOND, said later that the Marine Corps was notified well in advance of the plan to question some marines, that Marine Corps information officers were shown a copy of the questionnaire in advance, and that the marines themselves picked the men to be tested.

These investigators did not choose the Marines. Full cooperation was given. The Marines themselves chose the persons who were to receive this evaluation.

I continue with the article:

> The men, in turn, according to Dent, were told they need not sign their names to the questionnaires if they did not care to. Some of them signed their names, anyway, he added.
>
> NO DETAILED RESULTS
>
> Dent disclosed that similar groups in all the other services have submitted to similar questionnaires. The team of Government Accounting Office investigators who administered the questionnaires has visited between 25 and 50 military installations, he said.

How are we going to ascertain how well the troops are being trained about communism and the aims and dangers of communism? How are we going to determine the quality of it? How is the subcommittee going to perform its function to get the information, if the official investigators on the subcommittee do not have the right to evaluate the quality of the training they have been receiving?

The article states that a similar group of Air Force officers and men took the same test.

The article continues:

> And only 1 of 22 in the Air Force group could answer the question: "What is 'the Attorney General's list'?"
>
> In the case of the Marine Corps, Dent asserted, the questioning was done under the most amicable circumstances, and the testing team had lunch with the Marine information officers afterward.

Mr. President, there is no strained relationship. It is all cooperation. There is thorough accord. There is no discord. Arrangements went through proper channels that are gone through for matters of this kind, as anyone knows who is familiar with the services or as anyone should know who has been around the Capitol here for a number of years.

Let me repeat:

> In the case of the Marine Corps, Dent asserted, the questioning was done under the most amicable circumstances, and the testing team had lunch with the Marine information officers afterward.
>
> The Marines tonight verified this version of what happened.

Mr. President, the Marines themselves verified that.

I continue with the article:

> They insisted that General Shoup did not protest—

These are the Marines talking now:

> They insisted that General Shoup "did not protest," that he merely filed the usual routine "information" memo with the Secretary of the Navy.
>
> A Marine Corps spokesman said that when the committee called it asked, at first, for only five or six marines to take the test.
>
> But when the investigators arrived, they indicated they wanted more. So the Marine officers on duty at the information office rounded up 20 or 25 more men who were not on duty at the moment, making it clear to them that the questionnaire was voluntary.

Mr. President, again I say there was nothing compulsory about this. They were not using any Gestapo methods. They were not using any compulsory methods. It was purely a voluntary evaluation matter.

> One Marine major was among the volunteers who took the test.
>
> The Marine Corps spokesman emphasized that "it is not true that all this went on behind locked doors."

Mr. President, this is what the Marine Corps man said. The word which got out from the Pentagon was that it was behind locked doors and that the men were forced to sign the statements. They went to the newspapers, and it has come out in the newspapers that my staff did it, that the staff of the Senator from South Carolina did it, when a man from my staff went along to assist, as I stated a few moments ago.

> Everything was done in the open and in a friendly manner, he said.

This is the Marine Corps spokesman now talking. I repeat:

> Everything was done in the open and in a friendly manner, he said.
>
> He added that the Marine Corps is mystified over the origin of the report that General Shoup had protested the questioning of his men.

How did this get out? It got out as I stated, Mr. President. It got out from the office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Arthur Sylvester, who was putting out false reports to try to protect certain people in the Defense Department and in this Government. He is trying to smear me, the Senator from South Carolina, who has led the movement for this investigation and who will continue to fight to lead the movement and will continue to bring information on this matter to the subcommittee and to the American people despite Mr. Sylvester's efforts to deter him.

I read further, Mr. President:

> Stennis acknowledged that the questioning of the Marines was to an extent an action of the subcommittee, in that a staff member of the subcommittee did the questioning under the general instructions issued by Stennis for the gathering of information on troop indoctrination.

I might say, Mr. President, that this investigation will go into three fields. The first is censorship. That is the field in which we are engaged in hearings now. While we are in this field the investigators are collecting information on the troop information and education program. They have been doing that for some time. That will be the second phase, and will begin when the censorship phase has ended.

> But the chairman said he didn't know anything about this specific incident until the Pentagon told him about it.

Mr. President, I did not know anything about it, either, until after it was done. The investigators have been performing their function as they should, and I heartily endorse what they have done. They have done it in a proper manner. They have done it in a legal manner. They have not used any Gestapo methods. There has not been any secret test.

Mr. President, I think that is enough of the article from the Baltimore Sun to bring out the facts about where this thing originated, about where this whole thing began.

It originated, I repeat, in the office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Mr. Arthur Sylvester, who is trying to save his own hide. His son, Tony Sylvester, who is connected with a radio station or a TV station here, has given a distorted view of this thing to the public over that news media.

Mr. President, why did Mr. Hartel wish to have someone go along with Mr. Byrne when he went over for this evaluation of these marines? In the first place, Mr. Kaplan, a professionally trained man, has had many years in the Counter Intelligence Corps, and that would be very helpful to him. In the second place, Mr. Hartel did not want to have another incident such as the one which happened over there with him on November 28, 1961. I shall now tell the Senate what that incident was.

Mr. Hartel and one other investigator went to the Marine Corps Headquarters, and while they were interviewing people there—they were later to see General Shoup, and they did—when one of them turned his head, somebody there opened his briefcase and removed a paper from it, a copy of which I hold in my hand.

Mr. President, in order for this entire matter of the incident to be on record I ask unanimous consent that a letter to me from P. A. Terry, dated January 24, 1962, be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

San Diego, Calif.,
January 24, 1962.

The Honorable J. Strom Thurmond,
Senator From South Carolina,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Thurmond: Under date of October 26, 1961, your legislative assistant, Mr. J. Fred Buzhardt, wrote me asking for my assistance in providing information to support your investigation of the so-called "gagging" of the military in informing the American people relative to the dangers of communism.

In good faith, and in what I considered my obligation as a citizen of the United States, I addressed a letter to Mr. Buzhardt under date of November 24, 1961, expressing my personal opinions considered to be helpful to your investigations.

The Commandant of the U.S. Marine Corps, Gen. David M. Shoup, now advises me that he has a copy of my personal letter addressed to Mr. Buzhardt. This, of course, is most embarrassing to me in that my personally expressed opinions in the letter might be considered to be those of the Copley newspapers, the stationery of which I used as an employee in the organization's department of education.

My letter to Mr. Buzhardt was personal in content and should not have been written on the stationery of the Copley newspapers or with any relationship that might be implied to my employment as director of the department of education of the Copley newspapers.

The use of Copley newspapers stationery in this matter was improper and is regretted. The Copley newspapers do not deal in inferences and are not a source of information for any other purpose than reporting the news.

The references to Vice Adm. Clarence E. Ekstrom, U.S. Navy, Rear Adm. Murr E. Arnold, U.S. Navy, and Maj. Gen. Victor H. Krulak, U.S. Marine Corps, and the inferences that these distinguished members of the Armed Forces might be sources of information for an investigation by a congressional committee expressed my personal opinion. The officers mentioned are men of unquestionable integrity and I am sure that they can speak for themselves without inferences or suggestions from any source.

I also want to make it clear that at no time have I ever discussed with Admirals Ekstrom and Arnold or General Krulak any part of the matter contained in my personal letter to Mr. Buzhardt.

Furthermore, I have never received any communications relative to the content of my letter addressed to Mr. Buzhardt from any of the officers mentioned, or from any member of their respective commands.

Very truly yours,
P. A. Terry.

Mr. THURMOND. I ask unanimous consent that a letter to General Shoup from James S. Copley, dated January 25, 1962, be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

January 25, 1962.

Gen. David M. Shoup,
Commandant of the Marine Corps,
Department of the Navy,
Washington, D.C.

Dear General Shoup: This will acknowledge your memorandum, enclosed in an envelope postmarked at Arlington, Va., January 20, 1962, to which were attached a copy of a letter dated November 24, 1961, signed by Mr. Paul A. Terry, director of education of the Copley newspapers, addressed to Mr. J. Fred Buzhardt, legislative assistant to Senator J. Strom Thurmond, and a copy of your letter addressed to your generals dated March 6, 1961.

I also have received a copy of a letter, dated January 24, 1962, written by Mr. Terry to Senator Thurmond, showing you as an information addressee.

You will be interested to know that I fully subscribe to the statements of Mr. Terry as contained in his letter to Senator Thurmond under date of January 24, 1962.

Very sincerely yours,
James S. Copley.

Mr. THURMOND. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of a letter to Mr. J. Fred Buzhardt, legislative assistant to Senator Strom Thurmond, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C., from P. A. Terry, dated November 24, with an attachment from Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps, dated November 24, 1961, and with a note to Mr. Terry from David M. Shoup dated January 20, 1962, be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the letter and attachments were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

January 20, 1962.

My Dear Terry: Somehow, I wonder whether the combination of Terry to Buzhardt to Hartel will be as effective as Tinker to Evers to Chance?

David M. Shoup.

P.S.—With copy of my personal letter enclosed, perhaps you need not embarrass Major General Krulak.

Copley Newspapers,
San Diego Calif., November 24, 1961.

Mr. J. Fred Buzhardt,
Legislative Assistant to Senator Strom Thurmond, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Buzhardt: I hope you will forgive me for the delay in answering your letter of October 26, but there just have not been enough hours in the day to do all that needs to be done.

As you know, we do not publish a newspaper in Seattle; and I have not had an opportunity to look into the lead of Lieutenant Huffaker or Lieutenant Colonel Holbein.

The books "Masters of Deceit" and "The Naked Communist," and other similar books, are not available in the naval exchanges or post exchanges in the area. By contrast, Lieutenant Commander Matlin (retired) purchased "The Un-Americans" in the branch naval exchange located in the district commandant's headquarters (Rear Adm. M. E. Arnold, U.S. Navy).

Among those who were directed to stop anticommunism talks in this area were the following: Lt. Comdr. Fred L. Nelson, U.S. Navy; Comdr. Thomas H. Hardy, U.S. Navy; Lt. Comdr. Edward J. Matlin, U.S. Navy; John Wirges, AMIC, U.S. Navy (relieved of duty and transferred); Chief Petty Officer Spooner, U.S. Navy; Lt. Mike McKee, U.S. Navy (see enclosure A); Lt. Col. W. G. Reid, U.S. Marine Corps (ordered transferred; elected to retire).

Your attention is invited to enclosure B which apparently is the original inquiry from the Chief of Naval Information as to military involvement in anticommunism talks.

I point to the followup inquiry by the commandant, 11th Naval District, which appears to have been broadened by him. It is my thought that if Rear Adm. M. E. Arnold were called before the committee and directed to produce his records, they would reveal that he did a good "hatchet job" even above that required of him by official directives.

You will note enclosure "C" which is a press release of a film ban on the part of Brig. Gen. Raymond L. Murray, U.S. Marine Corps, base commander at Camp Pendleton. Brigadier General Murray is alleged to have said: "Fifty-one percent of the people have voted for communism and if that is what our people want, I will give it to them."

Lt. Col. W. G. Reid, U.S. Marine Corps, was ordered by Colonel Sanders to stop anticommunism talks at Camp Pendleton. Reid refused and was ordered to duty in the desert at Twentynine Palms. He elected to retire rather than accept the transfer. Marine Corps photographers followed Lt. Col. Reid off the base and photographed him in church and at service club meetings in offduty hours. Colonel Sanders is now on duty in Washington as one of General Shoup's associates. A talk with either of these gentlemen should be rather revealing.

It has been learned from reliable sources that Vice Adm. Clarence E. Ekstrom, U.S. Navy, was ordered by the Chief of Information in the Navy Department to appear at a function in Phoenix, Ariz. He received a letter of censure from the Defense Department for being on the same platform as Senator GOLDWATER. The admiral was not a speaker.

None of the films you mentioned in your letter are available in local military film libraries. Local films such as the two weak, new films are available to civilian groups in the military. Military personnel in the area are so scared that they discuss communism only with their closest friends in the privacy of their own homes.

Under separate cover I am sending you some ship and station newspapers from this area for your evaluation.

There is one command in the area that has a good leadership program. That is the Marine Corps Recruit Depot, under the command of Maj. Gen. V. H. Krulak, U.S. Marine Corps. I am of the opinion that he would talk freely about the Shoup personal letter to his generals and other directives.

I have purposely stayed off of military reservations due to my retired status and the information furnished was developed as a newspaperman.

With kindest personal regards.

Most sincerely,

P. A. TERRY.

HEADQUARTERS U.S. MARINE CORPS,
OFFICE OF THE COMMANDANT,
Washington, D.C., March 6, 1961.

Probably you have read reports in the press of the President's views on the public speeches of senior officers. In a recent press interview, the President said: "If a high official makes a speech, people have a right to believe that the speech represents Government policy."

In another interview a few days later, the President renewed his insistence that military leaders and other officials who make speeches in fields of national security should coordinate with the State Department and the White House so that there would be no conflict with current national policy.

At a press conference at the Pentagon not long ago, the Secretary of Defense expressed similar thoughts on this subject.

In view of the administration's understandable concern about this matter, I desire you to bring it to the attention of your senior officers so that they can exercise discretion in any public speeches they may have occasion to make.

This headquarters sends proposed speeches by marines in the Washington area (and any which are submitted by marines in the field) to the Department of Defense for review. Such review requires a minimum of 5 working days and four copies of the proposed speech.

Obviously, the time element frequently precludes Department of Defense review of proposed speeches by senior officers stationed at a distance from Washington. For these officers, it is especially important that good judgment be exercised. If there is any doubt as to the appropriateness, security, or policy matter of a proposed public speech, the speech should be referred to your next senior commander or to the Commandant of the Marine Corps (code AG), as appropriate.

I might add that during the past calendar year, I made some 50 speeches in various parts of the country. In no case did I find it necessary to make disparaging remarks about the other services or to comment on matters that are properly the concern of the State Department, nor did I once use the word Communist or communism.

With best regards, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

DAVID M. SHOUP.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, what occurred was that while Mr. Hartel, one of the official investigators—and this is something which has not come out before—of the Subcommittee went to the Marine Corps Headquarters, he had his briefcase with his papers, including this paper which came to Mr. Buzhardt, of my office, who is my legislative assistant.

I might say that the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] requested that I appoint someone in my office to coordinate with the staff of the subcommittee. I did. I appointed J. Fred Buzhardt, Jr., my legislative assistant, and he has assisted as best he could the chief counsel and the members of the staff during the investigation.

This letter was sent to him by Mr. Terry from California. Mr. Hartel had this letter in his briefcase with his official papers. While he was at the Marine Corps Headquarters, General Shoup's headquarters, this letter directed to Mr. Buzhardt, in care of me, was taken from his briefcase and given to General Shoup. Later, when they talked to General Shoup, he had information. I do not know whether he revealed that he had that or not, but at any rate General Shoup held that information and did not tell me anything about it until later, when I got a letter Mr. Terry wrote to me, which is dated January 24, 1962, which I have put in the RECORD concerning this matter.

I called General Shoup about it, and I said, "General, who in the world took this paper that is addressed to my legislative assistant in care of my office out of the briefcase of the official investigator, Mr. Hartel, when he was over in the Pentagon on November 28, 1961?"

General Shoup said, "I cannot reveal that information. The Secretary of the Navy has directed me not to furnish that information."

He did not furnish it, and he has not furnished it to this day.

I should like to know who took from the investigator's briefcase on that occasion a letter directed to my legislative assistant, in care of my office.

After Mr. Hartel had had that experience in General Shoup's headquarters, he advised Mr. Byrne to take along someone with him. As I stated, he took Mr. Ben Kaplan along with him. Mr. Kaplan could also be of assistance to him in the work that he was to do over there.

I believe that is the entire story on this subject. If Senators wish to ask any questions, I shall be delighted to try to reply to them.

There is no question about the right of the subcommittee to do what it did. There is no question about the manner in which the staff of the subcommittee proceeded. The subcommittee staff has done only what it was charged with doing under the resolution of the Senate Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. President, no man is infallible. I hold General Shoup in high respect. He holds the Congressional Medal of Honor. I admire any man who is as great a soldier as General Shoup is. He has a fine record, of which he can be justly proud. I would say nothing that would disparage his good name, his patriotism, or his loyalty to our country. But no man is infallible. Even General Shoup is not infallible. When the investigators talked with General Shoup here, he told them that he did not use the code of conduct card in training the Marines. However, when he came from the committee to testify, he stated that the code of conduct card was used. When the investigators made the second trip they took a recording machine with them, so that there would be no question about what various individuals said when they talked to the investigators.

Later General Shoup stated that he had made a mistake. I hold in my hand the letter signed by him directed to the Honorable JOHN STENNIS, dated February 2, 1962. The letter reads as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
HEADQUARTERS, U.S. MARINE CORPS,
Washington, D.C., February 2, 1962.

Hon. JOHN STENNIS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR STENNIS: In reviewing my testimony of January 30, 1962, before your subcommittee, I have discovered that I made two incorrect statements. So that your record may be absolutely accurate, I would appreciate the opportunity of supplying you with the correct information on these two points.

During the hearing, Mr. Kendall asked me the following question (p. 412):

"Does the Marine Corps use the code-of-conduct wallet cards?"

I answered "yes" to that question. Upon looking into this matter, however, I discovered that I was confusing the Geneva Convention card which marines do use with the code-of-conduct card. The Marine Corps has not issued wallet-sized code-of-conduct cards for the use of individual marines. As I pointed out in my testimony, we do teach the code of conduct in all commands. The fact that the Marine Corps does not issue these cards should not be interpreted to mean that I have any reservations about the value of the code of conduct other than I stated before your subcommittee.

In discussing prisoners of war in Korea, I stated, in answer to a question of Senator BARTLETT (p. 402) that Colonel Schwable's case was the only record of a Marine prisoner cracking up. Actually, one Marine officer in addition to Colonel Schwable was coerced into signing a false confession of having participated in bacteriological warfare. He was the colonel's copilot, and was subjected to the same insidious treatment as was the colonel. Many other officers and enlisted personnel successfully resisted similar treatment.

I hope this information will help to clarify the record on these two points.

Sincerely,

DAVID M. SHOUP,
General, U.S. Marine Corps, Commandant of the Marine Corps.

Mr. President, the subcommittee that was created by the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate is endeavoring to do a worthwhile job. It is endeavoring to render the country a service in the function which it was charged to perform. It is necessary that the investigators visit various military commands, at various echelons and various services, in order to obtain the information necessary to discharge their duties. There has been no instance of which I know, relative to the places the investigators have visited, in which there has been ground for any just complaint. I have heard of none. There is no complaint, as I understand. Mr. Sylvester's office gave out the complaint about General Shoup; and, according to the Baltimore Sun, General Shoup merely passed the memorandum on to others, and he himself did not protest.

The first report was to the effect that General Shoup protested the questioning. That statement was later denied by a Marine Corps spokesman.

Again I submit that what we have heard is an effort to smear the Senator from South Carolina and to cause the public to remove its eyes from the main issue in the investigation. We shall forge forward with the investigation. We shall be fair. We shall be factual. But we shall be unrelenting.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief comment in regard to the subject under discussion. As the Senator who first raised the issue today, after listening to the Senator from Mississippi and the Senator from South Carolina, I think I should state my tentative conclusions.

I am very glad to have the assurance of the Senator from Mississippi and the Senator from South Carolina that in due course a full report will be made to the Senate in regard to the particular incident Senators have been discussing. It now being a matter of public discussion, having been commented upon in the newspapers, it has become also the business of the Senate as well as the business of the subcommittee.

As I said earlier today, each committee is an agent of the Senate, and the Senate has an overall obligation to see to it always that its committees follow a course of procedural action that is in keeping with the best interests of the Senate itself.

After listening to the discussion today, my tentative conclusions are as follows:

First, in my judgment it is perfectly clear that the staff aids involved never did obtain clearance from the committee for the course of action they followed. In my judgment it is a matter of required good procedure on the part of any committee—I care not what committee—to have it understood at all times by staff members that they have only such prerogatives are as given to them by the committee, and that they owe it to a committee, when any policy question involving investigation procedure is concerned, first to clear it with the committee. I am satisfied that the policy question involved in the questionnaire approach that the staff then followed was such an important policy question that they owed it to the committee to obtain committee clearance. I do not think they conducted themselves in a proper manner, as aids of a Senate committee—and I speak as a Member of the Senate—by not obtaining clearance in regard to policy.

That is the first channel that they should have gone through. They did not do so. I do not share the point of view expressed here this afternoon that they followed a perfectly proper procedural policy. I do not believe so, when we are considering a policy as basic as to whether or not the Senate, through a committee, will intervene in the operation of the Defense Establishment of this country. That function belongs under the Constitution to the President of the United States as Commander in Chief, and that a committee should not think it has cleared through channels when it merely has discussed the matter with a legislative liaison officer of a branch of the Defense Establishment.

The top policymakers in the Pentagon have the right to the courtesy from a Senate committee of a discussion of that policy at the top level. I think that they certainly should have gone to the Commandant of the Marine Corps or the Secretary of Defense and, if they had any question, to the White House itself.

So, I merely wish to say that on the basis of Mr. Byrne's memorandum itself, which was read on the floor of the Senate, he followed a course of action which in my judgment cannot be justified, and the committee cannot alibi a justification of it, should it attempt to do so. I say most respectfully we are dealing here with a basic question of policy which involves the separation of powers.

Some of my colleagues in the Senate remember the time when General Bradley was a witness in one of the most critical hearings that has ever been held by a Senate committee during my service here. He refused to answer a question. He took the position that he did not have to answer the question. Oh, there was a great deal of talk in the Senate about charging him with contempt. The trouble was that those who were making the charge did not understand the doctrine of separation of powers. They did not understand the doctrine of executive privilege. They did not understand that under the Constitution the President of the United States is protected in his prerogative to carry out his Executive functions, one of which happens to be to operate and administer the armed services as Commander in Chief.

Therefore, I say most respectfully that the Pentagon was owed the courtesy, not of going through the channel of a legislative liaison officer, a lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps, but of first raising the question of policy with the policymakers in the Pentagon, which in this instance would have been the head of the Marine Corps or the Secretary of Defense.

That is all I wish to say about the subject at this time. This is a matter that needed to be raised. I am glad it was raised. I thank the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] for the position he took in support of the inquiry that I raised this afternoon. I shall await with a great deal of interest the final report of the committee.

I hope that at least this discussion this afternoon will be helpful to some staff aids on other committees of the Senate. I suspect that this is not the only place where some of the staff aids have arrogated unto themselves pretty broad powers without seeing to it that there is, first, policy clearance with the committee.

Time is not so precious, so far as our staff aids are concerned, that they can justify not following that checking course before they start on a program that can raise such a serious question of policy which can involve the whole Senate in the amount of discussion that has taken place, and undoubtedly will take place on this matter before it is put to rest.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HART. I apologize for not having been on the floor to hear the discussion of this subject when it was first raised, and I regret that I did not hear the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG]. I heard only briefly the concluding comments of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND].

At the grave risk of saying something that will be played back to me in a rather disastrous fashion some day, I should like to suggest that if in fact the leadership of the Marine Corps has taken the training time sufficient to permit its membership to define "dialectical materialism," the Committee on Armed Services profitably could explore the necessity of establishing another corps so that we may have some fighting men standing by ready to fight.

I was embarrassed, because some of my children gave me that examination to which reference has been made. I am not sure about Gus Hall, but I "blew" on "dialectical materialism" completely.

SUPPORT FOR TRADE VETO

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I have on several occasions urged that the Congress be given a voice in formulating our Nation's trade policies in future years. I have specifically recommended that by a two-thirds vote the Congress be given the power to veto trade agreements and modifications of trade agreements negotiated by the executive branch under the extension of the Trade Agreements Act which the Congress will be called upon to enact before June 30 of this year.

I am delighted that this proposal has received support from a number of newspapers and a number of groups interested in trade legislation. I should like to call attention today to an editorial in the Dallas, Tex., News which has recently come to my attention and which endorses giving the Congress trade veto authority. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial appear in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TARIFF POWER

President Kennedy should be given broader authority to reduce tariffs, but subject to veto by Congress of individual trade agreements, thinks Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, Republican of New York. This proposal seems to be a fair balance between congressional and Presidential power and, at the same time, a safeguard for the national interest.

Probably no public issue is so full of angles of self-interest by individuals and industries as the fixing of tariff rates. For this reason, it is the cause of logrolling and playing of politics in Congress, if left entirely to Congress. It puts a great responsibility on the President with a strong temptation to play politics if decisions are left entirely to him.

Tariff policy confronts us with a serious problem that must be solved. Behind tariff walls we pursue an isolationist policy, while being held up to the world as a Nation leading in a movement for world harmony and peace.

Today, because of the growing success of the European Market and the danger to our gold reserves, our tariff problem is becoming critical. A division of responsibility for meeting it—as between President and Congress—should solve some of the problems if Congress adopts a sounder, more flexible policy.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on the point of the veto power?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. I think the Senator has a very important proposal. Has the Senator given any thought to making the veto power a majority vote rather than a two-thirds vote, inasmuch as all tariff legislation is passed by a majority vote?

Mr. KEATING. I have given thought to it. I prefer the two-thirds vote, which has a precedent in the trade act now, and has another precedent in the Reorganization Act; but I would be happy to talk to the distinguished Senator, who is something of an expert on that subject in this field, because I think we must fashion a method whereby the Congress retains its constitutional authority in trade matters. However, I recognize and support the principle of an orderly recognition of the fact that the Common Market raises new problems, and that we must be ready to face them and must have an orderly expansion of our foreign trade.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator for yielding to me. I look forward to discussing that issue with him.

Mr. KEATING. I would like to discuss it with the Senator.

FISH PROTEIN: BUREAUCRATIC SQUEAMISHNESS IMPEDES THE FIGHT AGAINST COMMUNISM

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, on January 25, 1962, the Food and Drug Administration published a proposed standard of identity for fish protein concentrate which, unless rescinded, will greatly impede the efforts of the United States in its struggle against the threats of Communist world domination. One of the greatest weapons in the arsenal of the United States against these threats is food.

Food enriched with fish protein concentrate could be used to convince the hungry hordes of the uncommitted nations of the world that the United States is genuinely and concretely interested in their welfare.

We have an abundance of fish from which this whole fish protein concentrate can be manufactured cheaply. If the unnecessarily elaborate procedures which the Food and Drug Administration seeks to impose are followed, the end product will be tripled in cost. The use of fish protein additive on an international scale will be precluded.

Time is running out in our deadly struggle against world communism. We cannot be deterred in our efforts because the use of whole fish in making this fish protein additive offends the esthetic sensibilities of some official of the Food and Drug Administration. This is especially true when such squeamishness of that same official is not applied to the domestic sale of oysters or clams or chocolate coated ants and bees.

Russian factory ships are already plying the high seas. We can be certain that they will not be deterred by esthetic considerations from the manufacture and distribution of fish protein additive to the starving multitudes in the uncommitted nations. The Communist potential to use fish protein concentrate as a weapon against us already exists.

How long will we tie our own hands in the fight against communism because of bureaucratic esthetics and squeamishness?

I have already written to the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare protesting this proposed standard and requesting an objective hearing before a hearing examiner having no connection with that Department.

I ask unanimous consent that my letter to the Secretary be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hon. ABRAHAM RIBICOFF,
Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I want to register a vigorous protest against the Food and Drug Commissioner's definition and standard of identity for fish protein concentrates as published in the Federal Register of January 25, 1962.

After having received some 1,800 comments on the fish protein concentrate proposed standards, contained in the Register for September 15, 1961, the Commissioner decided against the use of whole fish protein even though more than one-half the opinions given were favorable to such whole fish protein.

The arguments pro and con are simple enough: the Commissioner contends that the inclusion of the whole fish—viscera, head, fins and all—brings the product under the forbidden category of "filthy" or "putrid" or "otherwise unfit for food." Whereas the whole fish proponents argue that there is no trace in the processed concentrate of anything filthy or putrid, that no scientist is able to isolate even a particle that was once viscera or fin, etc., the solvent baths having effectively eliminated all objectionable matter.

Were the world in all of its parts as well fed as America I might be reluctant to challenge the Commissioner's opinion, but that is patently not the case. As President Kennedy himself told the recent Fish and Nutrition Conference, two-thirds of this planet's people suffer from protein malnutrition. No other protein food can be produced nearly as cheaply as whole fish protein, no other food is easier to ship and store.

The Honorable George McGovern, Director of the President's food-for-peace program, has wholeheartedly endorsed the idea of whole fish protein. He would gladly use it in his food shipments abroad as a ready protein supplement but for the propaganda capital the Communists might make of it. While the Food and Drug Commissioner prevents the sale of whole fish protein in this country, the executive branch of the Government cannot very well send such flour abroad without the Russians saying to the recipients: "If this is not good enough for the Americans why does Uncle Sam think it's good enough for you?" Hence the food program is effectively precluded from rendering this cheap but invaluable protein assistance to the world's hungry. There is ample evidence that whole fish protein concentrate gives growing children the food values they need, and in many, many cases would not otherwise receive.

I am aware of the fact that economically my suggested change in the proposed standard would be of great benefit to the fishing enterprises not only of Alaska and the other coastal States as well but also those of the Great Lakes States. Nonetheless, there is no reason not to look objectively at the good results of the reversal, in spite of the happy consequence to the fishing industries of these States. If there is no chemical or biological or bacteriological trace of the so-called filthy substances in the finished product, I can see no substantive objection to its sale to Americans, when you consider that the fish protein concentrate, like no other known food, would ameliorate the world's protein deficiencies. Balancing the crying need for a cheap but effective protein against the squeamishness of a handful of people not aware of the greater problem involved leaves little choice, in my opinion, but to decide in favor of whole fish protein. To the extent that we are selfish, to the extent that we are not willing to do for our country, to that extent communism will enjoy success around the world. Americans who do not like the idea of while fish protein certainly would not have to eat it. But that is no reason for denying its use to every citizen, thereby effectively denying its employment as well in our food for peace program.

It seems most peculiar that the Food and Drug Administration should ban the use of "heads, fins, tails, viscera and intestinal content" in the preparation of fish protein concentrate while not banning the use of fish scales or the sale as a wholesome food of whole oysters, clams and crabs which would be open to the same objections.

I hope, therefore, that you will see to it that the effective date of the proposed standard will be suspended and that the matter will be set down for a full, objective public hearing before a hearing examiner having no connection with your Department.

With all best wishes, I am,

Cordially yours,

ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senator.

THE PATENT SYSTEM

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, of which the Senator from Nebraska is a member, has for the past several months been considering a drug bill which, among other things, would cut down the historic patent period of 17 years to 3 years with compulsory licensing to competing firms.

A most impressive warning against the results of piecemeal tinkering with the patent system was sounded by Dr. Vannevar Bush, one of America's most gifted scientists who has combined his brilliant career with one of service to his country.

Dr. Bush makes the straightforward statement that if S. 1552 were to become law, America would no longer lead the world in the development of new and useful drugs. He warned our subcommittee:

> In S. 1552, you gentlemen have a blunt instrument in your hands. If you use it you will do great harm.

Dr. Bush's distinguished service to the academic world, which includes the deanship of the school of engineering at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and the presidency of the Carnegie Institution, has often been interrupted by a return to Government service. During World War I he was engaged in submarine detection research for the Navy. Before our entry into World War II he was Chairman of the National Defense Research Committee and later was head of the Research and Development Board of the Defense Establishment.

Because of this outstanding background, Vannevar Bush speaks with an articulate, authoritative voice—a voice that commands immense respect. Not the least of his accomplishments are the 20 or 30 inventions on which he himself holds patents. Dr. Bush modestly acknowledges that he has never counted the number. But because he is himself an inventor and because he has a long and distinguished record of contributions to his Government, his views on the American patent system are of great importance.

This is particularly true now that there are proposals for weakening the patent system which has been a part of American law since the establishment of our Government and which has its basis in the Constitution.

Accordingly, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD the statement made by Dr. Bush when he appeared before the Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly on December 7, 1961.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF DR. VANNEVAR BUSH BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON ANTITRUST AND MONOPOLY OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, U.S. SENATE, CONCERNING S. 1552, DECEMBER 7, 1961

My name is Vannevar Bush. Some of you gentlemen know me, for this is not the first time I have appeared before a congressional committee. I appear today principally to discuss the patent aspects of the bill you have before you. I should therefore state the ways in which I have had experience with the patent system.

Sometimes I make inventions. My first patent issued in 1913; my latest, but I trust not my last, a few weeks ago.

I have had responsibility for the patent affairs of industrial companies. For example, I was one of the founders of Raytheon, Inc., and in its early days had charge of its research and its patenting. It would not be alive today if it had not been for the patent system. I am now chairman of the board of Merck & Co., Inc., and am especially interested in its research program and its results. Since I have heard remarks about the profits of pharmaceutical companies, I might add that I did not join Merck in order to make money; I attended to that aspect of my affairs adequately when I was young. I joined because I wanted to participate in the exciting venture of creating new drugs to cure men's ills, and I have been amply rewarded by seeing some of my friends made well by drugs that were unknown 10 years ago.

I have had experience with the relations of nonprofit institutions to the patent system. When I was vice president of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, I drew up their patent policy. I did the same when president of the Carnegie Institution of Washington.

Not many men have worked with the system in industry, academic institutions, and government. During the war, when I was Director of the Office of Scientific Research and Development, I had in my organization a patent department. It had much to do as modern radar, proximity fuses, etc., were developed under our programs. It was also involved with the atomic bomb development. OSRD had a Committee on Medical Research, which early realized that penicillin would be of value in fighting the war, and shepherded it into production for that purpose. There were important patent relationships in that connection.

I was Chairman of the President's Science Advisory Board appointed in 1943 to study the patent system, and I was a member of a similar Patent Survey Committee created in 1945.

I am one of few recently to propose a program of far-reaching changes in the patent system to bring it in line with modern conditions. This appeared as Study No. 1, conducted by your sister Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights, entitled "Proposals for Improving the Patent System" and published in 1956. I am still learning things, and I would not today attempt to support every proposal I then made.

I continue to be convinced, however, (1) that the patent system is an essential part of our free enterprise system; (2) that it has been responsible for a significant part of the great technical and industrial advance of this country; that in particular it has made possible the salutary advent of many small independent individual companies; (3) that the system is not perfect, and that revisions could be made which would bring it into step more fully with modern conditions; (4) that when such a revision is made it must be done on an overall basis, by a group that fully understands the system, and also understands modern research and development, and that any attempt to do it piecemeal would inevitably result in damage to the system and to our national progress.

If I were to attempt to analyze the system in all its aspects, I would be here for a week. I will therefore speak only of aspects affected by the present bill.

As far as patents are concerned, the central feature of the present bill is that it would require the licensing of all drug patents to all comers after a 3-year interval, and at royalties with a stated maximum.

The simple fact is that, if this were the law of the land, we would soon no longer lead the world in the development of new and useful drugs. Our industrial research programs on drug development would be severely cut back. How great a catastrophe this would be is not hard to visualize. We look back on the days when medical men used to bleed patients as a sort of cure-all, and we regard such medical practice as crude and fortunately obsolete. Twenty years from now those of us then living will look back on the drugs of today as crude and inefficient. Certainly some of them today are marvelous in their effects, compared to the sulfur and molasses of our grandmothers. But we have just started to comprehend the chemical complexities of life, and to learn to modify them to prevent and overcome physical disease, and mental disease as well. We do not yet understand the basic life processes, as we understood the physics of the atom as the last war started, and were hence in a position to plunge forward with a great program on atomic fission. Someday we will understand the biochemistry of the cell, and be prepared to move forward similarly on a broad front to conquer the diseases which still baffle us. Even cancer will be overcome when we have the fundamental knowledge of its cause and action, if we are then prepared to exploit our understanding by a vigorous program of applied chemistry. We are embarked on a great adventure, to make life more healthy and sane. Our progress must not be slowed down now.

Furthermore, compulsory licenses for all comers are bound to prevent the very kind of healthy competition in discovering new products that now characterizes the industry. When Merck developed Diuril and patented the product, our competitors could not sit back and wait for compulsory licenses in 3 years, nor could they start infringing (as they might well do if S. 1552 should pass) with the assurance that the 3 years would expire before we could obtain a judgment. Instead, our competitors had to get busy and try to discover improvements of their own. This is just what they did. In a few short years several competitors had introduced important modifications and acquired a substantial share of the market. There are many similar illustrations. Under a system of automatic compulsory licenses after 3 years, none of us would have the incentive to exert these efforts.

But someone will immediately remark that, if this bill were passed, companies could still pay for their research by collecting royalties on licenses. Perhaps they could, if the number of licenses could be limited so as to produce desired development of the market, and if the royalties were high enough. But when everybody and his brother can obtain a license, neither the patent holder nor any licensee can afford to spend the money necessary for years of clinical tests, for prosecuting the new drug application, and for familiarizing doctors with the drug. Patentable inventions do not result automatically in a market invention, with the inventor and manufacturer merely sitting back and collecting royalties.

Let me give an example from my own experience. I have not counted the number of patents issued to me, I suppose it is 20 or 30. Two or three of them have been of some importance, the others have not. I still have hope for one or two more. I think my batting average is good. I understand that less than 1 of 20 issued patents ever comes into real use. For the pharmaceutical industry, the ratio is about 1 out 10. When a pharmaceutical company is conducting research on drugs, it is fortunate if 1 in 6 of its programs results in even one salable product. The successful one has to pay for all the others that result in patents never used, and for the greater number of ventures that never even get to the patent stage. Royalties under licenses issued to all comers just will not do it, since none of the many licensees can hope to earn enough to afford to develop the market. The successful venture must yield a large profit, measured in terms of its cost of production and distribution, not only to pay for the cost of its development, but also to pay for a lot of development on other products which never arrived. This is particularly true today when the vigorous competition in the industry renders brief the life of many a new product before its equivalent is found in some other field of chemistry, or it is made obsolete by something better.

Let me add a word about the role of patients in encouraging the disclosure of new discoveries. This is a vital function of the system, and if we debase patents to the point where they are not worth obtaining, we will lose the benefit of today's open system of industrial and scientific knowledge. As I have said, perhaps one patent in 10 will ever amount to anything commercially. But all 10 add to the sum of knowledge, and it may be one of the commercial failures that leads someone else to an important leap forward. This universal publication of scientific findings permitted and indeed required by the patent system, is one of the keys to modern drug research. It is only through the publication of patent specifications that pharmaceutical discoveries are disclosed to others working in the field. Due to the protection implicit in an application for patent, the scientists in most of the pharmaceutical companies customarily publish their inventions in the technical journals as soon as a patent application for the invention has been filed. This greatly accelerates the availability of scientific invention to others working in the pharmaceutical field.

Modern research requires teams of top grade scientists from many disciplines, working together in a stimulating and satisfying environment in the pursuit of a worthwhile goal. These men are not industrial hacks, but dedicated professional specialists. They would feel they were debasing their common dedication to knowledge if they could not publish the results of their work, and direct their own efforts to expanding the sum of knowledge already discovered and published by others. They are not interested in discovering what they must keep secret, or in discovering a second time what someone else has already discovered and kept to himself. Secrecy would destroy this teamwork, and deprive us of its highly productive results. Destroy the incentive of patent rights as S. 1552 proposes, and you will encourage a return to secrecy for such little research as the pharmaceutical industry would then be willing to conduct.

There is another point I would like to emphasize in regard to this matter of compulsory licensing, and it has to do with the morale and spirit of the scientists and engineers in the laboratories. I have had some experience in conducting research, and I know that nothing really worthwhile ever comes out of an industrial laboratory unless the team that develops takes pride in its accomplishment. There are, in the pharmaceutical laboratories in this country some of the most able and versatile scientists I know of. Do they work just because they draw good salaries? If they did we would never have the array of powerful drugs that has already conquered some diseases and will conquer more. A scientist works hard, and he needs to if he is to excel in rapidly evolving science, because he values the respect and admiration of his fellows, and because he takes satisfaction in seeing his efforts produce results. In basic science these results may be just increased knowledge; in applied research they are devices or products which add to men's pleasure or comfort or well-being. Especially in pharmaceutical laboratories there is the satisfaction of seeing products come into use which save lives, ease pain, and restore to health. The team which produces an important drug takes pride in being associated with a company which accomplishes worthwhile things, and they get a lift every time some friend remarks that one of their products has cured one of his ills. If, every time a new drug appeared, everyone could make and sell it, we would lose something of great value, namely, some of the keenness of competition between teams in laboratories, a competition which is just as important as that industrial competition which is the basis of our free enterprise system.

Now do not gather from this that I think our whole system of providing drugs for the public is perfect. I do not. I believe it can be improved. In particular I believe the cost of drugs to the user can be reduced. But the way to do this is not to knock out the source of new and better ones. The reason for the high cost of drugs does not lie in undue profits realized by the pharmaceutical industry. If an individual goes into a drug store and pays a dollar for a prescription, 4 or 5 cents of that dollar represents profit to the concern which made it. If we knocked out all the manufacturer's profit we would not reduce the cost much, and soon we would have an industry in distress. Personally, I never want to buy a drug made by a company that is losing money and is therefore tempted to cut corners. We need a healthy industry if we aspire to a fully healthy population.

Now it will be claimed in some quarters that, if the pharmaceutical industry ceases to be the source of new important drugs, an allwise and effective Government will produce them in its own laboratories, and at no cost whatever, except of course the cost to the taxpayer which we occasionally overlook. I know something about Government research. For one thing, I was once Chairman of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, with its great laboratories which performed essential service developing the science of aeronautics. There are very important things that Government laboratories can do well, and some things they must do if they are to be done at all. But inventing, developing, promoting new products for public use through industrial channels is just not one of them. We know this if we examine the record.

There is one final point I would emphasize. We hope to avoid a nuclear war, and I believe, if we keep our courage and vigor, that we can do so. But no man will deny that we live in hazardous times, and that a great war might be started, perhaps by accident or irresponsibility. If it came it would be far more terrible than any war in history. This time, in addition to hydrogen bombs, with their burns and radiation, we might meet also a still more appalling weapon in the hands of men with no conscience: biological warfare. This is no time to weaken our medical system, or the pharmaceutical industry which supports it.

The patent system is one of the important factors in the great growth and prosperity which this country has enjoyed. It needs to be strengthened for its intended purpose. It can be modified to fit better than it does now into the modern scene. But this requires a delicate operation on a complex organism. In S. 1552, you gentlemen have a blunt instrument in your hands. If you use it you will do great harm.

VANNEVAR BUSH—BIOGRAPHICAL NOTES

Born March 11, 1890. Married 1916, two sons.

B.S. and M.S. degrees from Tufts College.

Doctorates in engineering from Harvard and Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

During World War I, Dr. Bush was engaged in submarine detection research for the Navy, returned to MIT as associate professor and later professor of electric power transmission. Became vice president of MIT and dean of the school of engineering in 1932. Elected president of the Carnegie Institution in 1938, serving until 1955.

Appointed Chairman of National Defense Research Committee in 1940 and in 1941. Director of the Office of Scientific Research and Development, in charge of defense research mobilization in all fields. In 1946 he chaired the Joint Research and Development Board of the War and Navy Departments, was later first Chairman of the Research and Development Board of the Defense Establishment. In 1953–55, he was a member of the National Science Foundation Advisory Committee on Government-University Relationships.

He is a noted inventor in the fields of electronics and physics and holds numerous patents. Served as chairman of the Advisory Committee on the Application of Machines to Patent Office Operations in 1954.

Author of many texts, articles, and reports, he has received over a score of medals and awards from scientific and governmental agencies here and abroad, holds honorary degrees from over 20 colleges and universities, and is a member of many honorary and professional organizations and fraternities.

THE STOCKPILING PROGRAM

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, my remarks will be directed to the subject of the investigation which is to be conducted in regard to stockpiling of strategic minerals.

On May 20, 1957, before the Senate there was a question as to what we should do about an additional appropriation for the acquisition of strategic minerals—$30 million was requested. At that time I addressed the Senate and made this statement:

> Mr. President, this subject has been discussed at some length in the Senate. There exists at present an impasse between the House and the Senate concerning the item as it was written by the Senate into the urgent deficiency bill.
>
> About 3 days ago there came to my office an official of one of the tungsten companies. He told me that this program of the Senate, subsidizing the manufacturers of tungsten when we already have at least a 5-year supply available, would bring profit to his company. However, he stated to me that, as an American citizen, he did not want that profit, knowing that the program was wrong.

I further stated:

> Every bit of testimony offered on this subject indicates that we have more tungsten than we need. We are talking about reducing the budget. I know of no better place to begin than in connection with a subject with respect to which the testimony proves

that we are merely continuing a program to purchase supposedly strategic materials, of which we already have an overabundance. Mr. Flemming testified on the subject, and his testimony was quoted by the Senator from Delaware. He said that the tungsten on hand exceeds both the minimum and long-term stockpile objectives, and the inventory plus orders is larger than the total 5-year wartime requirements.

I concluded:

> I simply cannot understand how, in the face of the huge tax burden, the huge budget, and the huge national debt, we can justify investments of this type.

Five years have passed since that statement was made. In those 5 years this identical question was before the Senate a half dozen times, at least. On each occasion I argued against the proposal to increase the pile of strategic materials. I regret to say that on each occasion I was on the losing side of the issue.

Five years later it is suddenly announced that there is a grave wrong in what has been done. I should like for the people of Ohio to know that on the floor of the Senate more than a half dozen times I have stressed this obvious extravagance in the spending of the taxpayers' money.

I do not know what the investigation will disclose, but I think it is long past due. Stockpiling in most instances should have been stopped 5 years ago; in some categories even before, but for some reason it has gone on and on and on.

I am glad the investigation is being made. I have fought the excessive stockpiling up and down the line and will continue to do so.

WELFARE AND PENSION PLAN AMENDMENTS OF 1961

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I understand that there is a little procedural entanglement to be untangled today in connection with the bill passed in the Senate yesterday relating to welfare and pension plans. I shall now submit a unanimous consent request, which will clarify the situation and will receive the support of Senators on both sides of the aisle, because it involves a procedural question.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 8723, a bill to amend the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act with respect to the method of enforcement and to provide certain additional sanctions, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 8723) to amend the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act with respect to the method of enforcement and to provide certain additional sanctions, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move to strike out all after the enacting clause and substitute the language of S. 2520 as it passed the Senate on February 7.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oregon.

The motion was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H.R. 8723) was passed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment and ask for a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oregon.

The motion was agreed to; and the Acting President pro tempore appointed Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. MORSE, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts, Mr. PELL, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. PROUTY, and Mr. TOWER conferees on the part of the Senate.

COMMITTEE STAFF MEMBERS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I rise for two purposes. First, I wish to extend my thanks to the distinguished majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD] for his courtesy and graciousness in the consideration of the amendment I offered yesterday to one of the so-called money resolutions. I intended also to offer the amendment to practically all such resolutions.

In addition, I rise for the purpose of expressing the hope that the majority party will accept the principle which we have sought to establish. I realize that on most committees the majority have been very cooperative in seeing that the minority had adequate staff members. On the other hand, rather extensive investigations have been undertaken by Senate committees. Such investigations have reached many aspects of our American economy. The rights of American people are involved. Sometimes the work has been carried on by a rather large staff. I know of one instance in which a committee had 65 members of a staff which conducted an investigation. In that case the minority representation was confined to one.

I believe it is for the protection of the Senate itself, as well as in fairness to the public, that that situation be corrected. As a minimum, it was my thought and the thought of the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], that the ratio ought to be at least 10 to 1, which in the case I refer to would have given the minority a staff of 7. I am making no complaint about that, because it is something that is past.

I make this statement in the hope that the majority and its leadership and the Policy Committee and the committee chairmen will take it into account, to the end that when their resolutions are presented a year from now I dare express the hope that perhaps they will include this principle in their resolutions when they come from the committees.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I appreciate the Senator's graciousness and patience in this matter. I assure him now that the suggestions he has made will be taken up by the appropriate committees. I personally will see to it that they will be given every possible consideration.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the majority leader.

COMMENDATION OF THE PEACE CORPS

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, any new approach to international helpfulness can expect to be subjected to criticism. That is a proper democratic process. It was the experience of the Peace Corps.

I borrow the words of an observant newspaperman who defined the Corps in these terms:

> Its expressed purpose is to recruit young Americans with a sense of mission to help underdeveloped countries solve their problems in a manner in which those countries want them solved. Engineers, teachers, archeologists, dirt farmers, carpenters, electricians are being sent abroad to work for foreign governments on jobs designated by those governments and at pay prescribed by them. The purpose is to let the idea of Americanism rub off on their people by means of this simple, direct relationship.

Constructive criticism as to principles and personnel, manpower and methods, is a healthy sign of genuine and deep interest in the Peace Corps and, I am sure, is accepted in the cooperative spirit in which it may be offered.

By the same token, it is refreshing to have voluntary, favorable and competent praise of the Peace Corps come to our desks.

When I recently received such a letter couched in the careful and understanding language of a college professor with firsthand knowledge of international exchange of assistance and possessing immediate experience with the Peace Corps, I felt that its paragraphs of analysis and praise deserved circulation beyond the correspondence between a Senator and a constituent. I asked and received permission of the writer to give the letter that circulation.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that my letter from Dwight B. Heath, an associate professor at Brown University, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BROWN UNIVERSITY,
Providence, R.I., January 12, 1962.

Concerning Peace Corps.

Hon. JOHN O. PASTORE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: During the last month I have enjoyed the opportunity of serving the Peace Corps, in the capacity of consultant, several times. On the basis of my familiarity with

Bolivia, I have been able to advise them concerning the feasibility of requests for specific projects, the development of a training program for volunteers, possible problems in implementing activities in that country, and so forth.

In the course of my work with members of that organization, I have developed a tremendous respect for its potential, and would like to share with you the reasons for my hopeful attitude. Because of my considerable experience with other economic and technical assistance programs throughout much of Latin America, I frankly had misgivings at first. It is gratifying, however, to find that this agency has avoided many of the major pitfalls of other foreign aid programs:

1. Peace Corps responds to needs as felt by the people: Requests for Peace Corps volunteers are submitted by the host government, for specific kinds of skilled workers, to help in specific projects which the local people feel are important. This is far better than the usual pattern of doing what North American administrators want done, with no regard for the realistic wants and needs, or existing resources, of nationals.

2. Peace Corps volunteers are prepared for oversea service: Volunteers undergo an intensive training program, including language study as well as an introduction to the history, economics, politics, sociology, culture, and other aspects of life in the country to which they will be sent. This affords them some idea of what they may expect, as well as an appreciation of the several classes of factors which are important in understanding the behavior of nationals in the host country. This contrasts markedly with the arrogant ignorance and ethnocentrism of most point 4 representatives who do not know even the language (much less the culture) of the country in which they work.

3. Peace Corps volunteers are integrated with nationals: They work on similar jobs, live under similar conditions, and meet in informal social activities as well as on the job. Again we see a dramatic improvement over the aloof isolation of most other foreign aid personnel who avoid contact with the people whom they are supposedly trying to help.

4. Peace Corps volunteers are administered by the host government: These people work in the employ of the national government, with national colleagues, on projects which are of importance to the local people. In this way there is developing a true sense of cooperation rather than an attitude of resignation ("Let's sit back and let the Americans do it"), or of ridicule ("American aid programs are all administration and no work").

5. Peace Corps is an efficient organization: Every effort has been spent to keep the administration at a minimum, to avoid top-heavy bureaucracy. This has created an immense amount of work for a few people, but allows decisions to be made and work to be accomplished with a minimum of redtape. Again, the contrast with other aid programs is obvious.

6. Members of the Peace Corps are concerned about their work: They share an enthusiastic esprit de corps which stems from their emotional as well as their intellectual dedication to their work. This refreshing attitude is reflected not only in what they say but also in what they do—such a small staff can achieve so much only because they work hard, with no regard for normal office hours, and often put in 7 days a week, of 10 to 16 hours each. The opposite is true in most Government offices with which I have had contact.

Furthermore, I have been gratified to find that many of the volunteers for oversea service are mature people with valuable skills. Contrary to my expectations (and continuing public opinion) this is not just a group of romantic young adventurers who want an opportunity to travel in exotic areas.

In sum, the Peace Corps is a well organized group of conscientious and dedicated people who are aware of the problems of human relations as well as international politics. I have sincere hopes that they will get the support which might enable them to achieve—with fewer people and far less expense—the dual role of helping people around the world and fostering better understanding of our Nation, where organizations ancestral to the Agency for International Development have failed.

Sincerely yours,

DWIGHT B. HEATH,
Assistant Professor of Anthropology.

HEALTH CARE FOR THE AGED

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, Mr. Maurice Stans, the Budget Director of the previous administration, although a full-time California banker, now writes a syndicated column on economics. On Monday, Mr. Stans had some comments on the present administration's proposal to provide health care for the aged through the social security system. It should come as no surprise to the advocates of this approach that Mr. Stans opposes the proposal.

I would like to indicate some of the facts which Mr. Stans chose to ignore in his column. His omission of these facts only points out why he can declare that the health care issue may be one of the least understood issues of this session of Congress—at least in some quarters.

The organized opposition to the administration's proposal long ago decided that it would not, even if it could, build its case on facts, but would detour the debate down the road of "sloganeering." Mr. Stans seems willing to take that road.

Dr. Aims C. McGuinness, executive secretary of the New York Academy of Medicine, recently characterized this approach by observing that the financing of medical care promises to be increasingly difficult, and will not be eradicated by being swept under the rug with cliches.

The Stans' column indicates that the aged, for the most part, have sufficient income to meet their medical expenses. But no matter what study is cited or how it treats income, almost invariably it will show that the aged have very low incomes. New data from the U.S. Census Bureau for 1960 show that the medium income for two-person families where the head of the family is aged 65 or over is $2,530 a year, and for an aged person living alone or with nonrelatives it is about $1,050 a year. Many aged persons live in the home of a younger relative, for example, the widowed mother with her daughter and son-in-law. The aged in this situation are in the main not financially independent, and usually have lower income than those maintaining their own households alone or with a spouse.

Mr. Stans writes glowingly of the job private health insurance is doing to protect the aged. In truth, this is the situation, as reported by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the Department may be carried at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The national health survey, a comprehensive survey sponsored by the Public Health Service, found that in the latter half of 1959, 46 percent of those 65 and over had some form of health insurance. As for the retired aged—those who did not usually work in the survey year—only 42 percent had any kind of health insurance.

In many instances, the survey showed, the protection against hospitalization was inadequate. Where insurance paid part of the hospital bill, it covered less than half the total hospital bill in 18 percent of those cases, between one-half and three-quarters of the bill in 23 percent of the cases, and three-fourths or more in 59 percent of the cases. Only about a third of the aged have some protection against surgical costs, while only about 1 out of 10 have insurance against other physicians' services. The extraordinary drug costs the aged incur—two or three times those of younger people—are practically never covered outside the hospital.

Like the young, the aged have become educated, largely through the efforts of voluntary and private insurance groups, to the value of health insurance. The problem has been that the aged do not seem able to protect themselves adequately through health insurance.

Many Americans have, of course, concluded that the task of providing health insurance for the aged cannot be done by private effort alone. The reasons for this conclusion are a matter of economics. People over 65 have health costs that are twice as high as those of younger people while their incomes are only half as high on the average. The median annual income of an aged couple is less than $2,500 while the aged widow has less than half that amount to live on. Furthermore, the retired aged are generally not in groups that can be insured, but are insured instead on an individual basis. This form of coverage is, of course, quite expensive—sometimes costing twice as much as group coverage offering the same protection.

Not only is coverage now inadequate but it tends to be concentrated, as you might expect, in the higher income group and among the better risks. The national health survey found that the percent who had protection declined as income declined, so that only one-third of the aged people whose family income fell below $2,000 a year—45 percent of the whole—had hospitalization insurance. The same survey found that aged persons in relatively poorer health are less likely to have hospital insurance. Of those reporting themselves unable to carry on their major activity, only 30 percent had hospital insurance.

In considering the rate of future expansion in health insurance, one should note that any significant extension of adequate health insurance protection in the older age groups will necessarily involve those aged people with the lower incomes, those in the higher age brackets, those who are no longer working, those in ill health—in short, the very people who represent the poorest risks from a health insurance standpoint and who are least able to pay for protection.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, Mr. Stans claimed that the Kerr-Mills program had been effective. He contends that the effort to enact a health care program under social security is delaying action by the States to establish programs through Kerr-Mills. This contention simply does not hold water. First, many States lack the funds needed to set up medical assistance for the aged programs. Second, if the social security system is operating as the base for 14 million people past 65, then Kerr-Mills can be made truly effective. The two approaches are not in conflict.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has strongly supported the Kerr-Mills legislation and is encouraging all the States to establish programs of medical assistance for the aged. About 22 States have plans in effect, but as of November 1961, three States—New York, Massachusetts, and Michigan — were spending 92 percent of all expenditures under medical assistance for the aged programs and much of the spending by these States was for persons transferred from the old-age assistance rolls. Among the States which have established medical assistance for the aged programs, there are wide variations in the type and amount of medical care provided. For example, Kentucky provides a maximum of only 6 days of hospital care and then only for acute, emergency, or life-endangering conditions.

One of the major problems in establishing adequate programs is that many States already have heavy financial obligations and find it difficult to raise the considerable sums needed for adequate programs. With the enactment of a health insurance program for the aged covering the basic health needs of the great majority of aged people, the States would be financially able to undertake more adequate and meaningful medical programs to meet the special needs not met by the insurance program, through the mechanism of the Kerr-Mills law.

Many aged persons, especially those who have always been financially independent, will choose to forgo medical care rather than apply for assistance under a procedure requiring investigation of their financial means.

The problems of meeting heavy medical expenses and avoiding dependency is a problem faced by practically all the aged people. It is well established public policy that the role played by public assistance programs in reducing dependency among the aged should, to the extent possible, be reduced and emphasis be placed on programs like old-age, survivors, and disability insurance, which help to prevent dependency.

Mr. Stans states that under the social security proposals, rich and poor alike would get benefits. Health insurance benefits, like old-age survivors, and disability insurance benefits, would be provided to qualify beneficiaries without application of a means test, and undoubtedly there would be some persons receiving protection who could meet their own health care costs. One of the principles of the social insurance program, however, is that benefits are provided as an earned right by persons during their working years. Benefits are paid to all qualified persons without regard to their wealth or lack of wealth. An individual's assets and his income from investments, savings, insurance, and the like have no effect on the amount of benefits he receives under the program. But let us look further.

Mr. Stans states that the health-care program would be made to the Fords, Rockefellers, Morgans, Harrimans, and other wealthy individuals over 65. Now it may be that some of the members of these distinguished families are covered by social security or railroad retirement—certainly the Harrimans have had some connection with the railroads of this country—but let us take a look at the facts:

Since millionaires are in the high income tax brackets, their medical deductions on tax returns result in a reduction of taxes equal to most—as high as 91 percent—of their medical costs. Thus, whether or not wealthy persons are included under OASDI health insurance, their costs, particularly for those 65 years of age and older, will, in a real sense, be borne by public funds.

In addition the costs of paying medical benefits to the wealthy persons are not significant. Aged persons with annual income of $50,000 or more represent only three-tenths of 1 percent of total OASDI eligibles, those with $10,000 or more represent only 3 percent of eligibles.

Mr. Stans also says that the program under the King-Anderson bill would fail to protect 3 or 4 million people over 65 who are not eligible for social security. Again I think it would be helpful to take a realistic look at the situation.

More than 4 out of 5 people who will be 65 or over at the beginning of 1964—14¾ million out of the 18 million total—will be eligible under the OASI and railroad retirement programs and would thus have health insurance protection under the administration's proposal.

Practically all of those not covered under the administration's proposal would be eligible for benefits or assistance under other public programs. For example, some would be eligible for the health insurance benefits that are provided under Federal employee retirement programs; others would be able to get comprehensive health care under the veterans' program; still others will be in public institutions such as TB or mental hospitals and receive complete medical care at public expense. Furthermore, a substantial number of the people aged 65 or over who would not be protected under any of these public programs could get some assistance with their medical care needs under either the old-age assistance programs or the new programs for medical assistance for the aged.

An overwhelming proportion of the aged would thus be eligible for benefits under some public program—the vast majority under OASI—at the time the proposal would go into effect. Since, as time goes on, more and more of the people who reach retirement age will have protection under social security, practically all of the aged would have protection under the administration's health insurance plan in the long run.

The Stans' article flatly states that the health care proposal, if enacted, would double the social security bureaucracy. What are the facts?

An estimated 4,000 to 4,500 additional employees would be needed to administer the program proposed in this bill during the first full year of normal operations. A relatively small number of professional employees will need to be added to the Public Health Service and the State agencies to perform the activities related to the health aspects of the program.

Most of the employees would be performing administrative and clerical jobs in BOASI in connection with the certification of beneficiary eligibility and the payment of bills. This estimate does take into account the administrative and professional manpower requirements of the Department as well as the States in carrying out their administrative functions under the bill.

Mr. Stans also states that the cost of this plan in the first year of operation could range up to $2.5 billion. Actually, veteran actuaries estimate the first year cost of benefits and administration at $1,600 million. Mr. Stans just has his figures wrong.

It is difficult to tell from Mr. Stans' column whether he is dissatisfied with the social security proposal because it would benefit so many aged persons, or whether he is disappointed that it would not cover all of them.

Mr. Stans declares that the social security proposal is just an entering wedge to very broad Government health insurance. In reality, the proposal is considered an essentially complete one. It is designed to meet the problem that the aged do not have the financial resources to purchase adequate protection against their above-average health bills. Thus, in the case of the aged, social insurance provides a workable mechanism through which they can prepay the full cost of health insurance coverage during their working years.

Younger people can purchase current health insurance protection from current income. While there are people in the younger age groups who do not have adequate health insurance protection, the potential for providing it exists so that the need of the aged for social insurance does not occur among the young.

It is true also that only a portion of the health costs of the aged would be covered under the current proposal. However, this portion is one often involved in the case of expensive illness where the need is greatest, and we expect that once basic protection is provided, the beneficiaries will buy supplementary protection—against the cost of physicians' and dentists' services and drugs—just as they have in the case of OASI benefits. If there is basic social insurance and if private supplementary protection expands, as can be expected, there will be no need to go further than the present proposal.

This is a step toward socialized medicine, says Mr. Stans. Surely he must know that under socialized medicine doctors would work as employees of the Government, and the Government would own the medical facilities.

The proposed program would not provide a single medical service but would only help people finance the costs of their health care. There are specific guarantees that the Government would in no way control, regulate, or interfere with the practice of medicine. The proposed legislation also specifically provides that no supervision or control would be exercised over the administration or operation of participating institutions or agencies.

The proposed program is no more socialized medicine than are Blue Cross and other similar existing programs and that means it is nothing like socialized medicine in any way, shape, or form.

Mr. President, Mr. Stans states that millions of the aged are safeguarded by their own wealth, the resources of their families and services of local welfare, and church agencies. I just wonder whether these millions can feel any real safeguard, as Mr. Stans phrases it, in depending for assistance on families who have other financial burdens, or on welfare, or the charity of church agencies. Certainly we all know that local welfare agencies and the churches have heavy demands placed upon them for help. What Mr. Stans is advocating is charity for millions of the elderly. How does this square with his closing argument that we must preserve our personal pride and our sense of character? It is an outright contradiction.

It is interesting to read that Mr. Stans is now enthusiastic about the medical-care plan developed in 1960 by the then Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Arthur S. Flemming. My understanding is that Mr. Stans was anything but enthusiastic about the Flemming plan at that time. As I understand it, the Flemming plan, through its income limits, would have embraced most of the aged. He has abetted the efforts to keep the health-care issue a misunderstood issue.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that an article appearing in the New York Times of February 5 be printed at this point in my remarks. It relates that the American Medical Association has urged doctors to lower their fees to aged patients of modest means. I have two comments on this action by the AMA. First, it is further evidence that the elderly do, in a great many cases, have a problem in meeting their medical bills. Second, the action, while welcome, is but another effort to head off the enactment of the administration's social security approach to financing some of the health care expenses of the aged.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 5, 1962]

AMA URGES CUT IN BILLS TO AGED—ASKS DOCTORS TO TRIM FEES CHARGED TO ELDERLY OF MODEST MEANS—DEPLORES COMPULSION—MOVE SEEN AS NEW ATTEMPTS TO BLOCK ADMINISTRATION'S MEDICAL PROPOSALS

(By Donald Janson)

CHICAGO, February 5.—The American Medical Association called on doctors today to lower their fees to aged patients of modest means whether or not the patients carried health insurance.

The suggestion was made in a statement by the association's board of trustees, which met here Saturday and Sunday.

It followed by less than 3 weeks the association's announcement of support for a new nationwide Blue Shield program of uniform surgical and medical benefits for persons 65 years of age or over. That program, to cost about $3 a month per person, will provide full coverage for couples whose income is $4,000 a year or less.

Today's statement urged all physicians to gear fees for the aged of modest means to such programs.

The board urged doctors to "consider such special compensation for services rendered to persons in the group whether they have health insurance coverage, a prepayment-type policy, or pay directly for such expenses out of pocket."

The action was interpreted as another move by the American Medical Association to head off the pending King-Anderson bill. The bill, which has the support of the Kennedy administration, would finance some hospital and nursing home costs for the aged through increased social security taxes.

The association regards the bill as a step toward socialized medicine.

The AMA board called the development of voluntary health insurance programs in recent years phenomenal, especially among the aged. It said this demonstrated the preference "of Americans for voluntary selection of financing mechanisms rather than for any compulsory Government scheme."

About 9 million persons over 65—some 53 percent of that age group—are covered by voluntary health insurance plans.

The AMA board praised employers "who are in increasing numbers covering their retired employees and making arrangements for some kind of prepayment or health insurance plan for those about to retire."

The Blue Shield program of low doctor's fees for aged persons who can meet the means test is expected to be ready next summer. The AMA is supporting the program.

The administration has served notice that its proposals for care of the aged would not be changed.

Abraham A. Ribicoff, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, said the principal problem was hospital care, which would not be affected by the Blue Shield plan. He said the administration would continue to fight for the King-Anderson bill, which would help the aged to meet hospital costs without requiring a means test.

SOVIET IMPERIALISM IN LITHUANIA

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, February 16, which is a week from tomorrow, will mark the 44th anniversary of the restoration of the independence of Lithuania—after its liberation from czarist imperialism in 1918. The people of Lithuania loved their freedom. But this freedom did not last. In 1940 a new type of Russian imperialism—communism—deprived the Lithuanians of their freedom. I am certain that many of my colleagues in the Senate would want to make certain that they are here on the floor on Friday next. Many of us would use that opportunity to pay tribute to the struggle for freedom of the Lithuanian people. A Lithuanian monsignor—Rt. Rev. Michael Kemezis—will say the invocation on that day.

On this occasion I would like to have printed in the RECORD immediately following my comments a letter from the Lithuanian American Information Center expressing the feelings of the people of Lithuania on this anniversary day.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 6, 1962.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senator From Wisconsin,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: We are again asking the friends of Lithuania in the Senate to remember her a week from Friday—February 16—the 44th anniversary of the restoration of her independence. As you know, Lithuania is not a new state in Europe, her history is as old as that of any state in Europe.

We hope you can be in the Senate that day, Senator WILEY, to pay tribute to her. A Lithuanian monsignor—Rt. Rev. Michael Kemezis, of New Jersey—will say the invocation.

You know that Lithuania overcame insurmountable obstacles in throwing off the yoke of some 120 years of Russian misrule. The new reborn Lithuanian State made remarkable progress in all fields of endeavor. She was an honored member of the family of free nations.

After the Soviet occupation in 1940, the Soviets propagandized that Lithuania voluntarily joined the Soviet Union, but the United States has never recognized the Soviet incorporation.

If anything, conditions have worsened in Lithuania since last year. The youth is still being exploited by being sent for "volunteer" labor to far parts of the Soviet empire; the religious are continually persecuted; and russification is being strengthened.

In remembering Lithuania, Senator WILEY, we are remembering a gallant little nation silenced temporarily. But just as she shook off the previous long Russian rule, so shall she shake off the present Soviet one.

Thank you for your many kind considerations in the past.

Very sincerely yours,
MARY M. KIZIS,
Director.

SEVENTIETH BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, this week marks the 70th birthday of one of the leading figures of the Catholic world, Joszef Cardinal Mindszenty.

In the American Legation where he has had sanctuary since the Hungarian revolution 5 years ago, the cardinal represents the spirit of freedom in Hungary today. Despite hints that he could leave the country if he wished, the cardinal will not desert his people to the Communists; the same Communists who imprisoned him for 7 years after a mock trial.

I think we should all pay our respects to the courage of this man who has defied all forms of totalitarianism in his nation, both Fascist and Communist. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the following article from the Boston Globe of February 5.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRISONER REDS CAN'T SUBDUE—CARDINAL MINDSZENTY IS 70 YEARS OLD

(By Seymour Freidin)

When the first dull rays of winter light peep beneath a shuttered window on the little plaza called Liberty Square in Budapest this morning, an aging man will intone his customary prayers.

The grayish light will filter through the few inches between the window sill and the shutters. Its flickering illumination should show the supplicant, black cassock draped around his shoulders and a red cap on a grizzled head.

Three floors down cold marble stairs of a late-model baroque building only the guards will check doors and make their regular night report. This is the American Legation, which will start working after a weekend that isn't relaxing or fun finding for Americans. The Communist regime in Hungary takes perverse pleasure goading official Americans. That goes for their time off, too.

Upstairs, off the third floor landing, the occupant of an austere chamber meant to be a functional office will temporarily pay no heed to the temporal conflicts clashing outside. On this day, significant to the outside world, Joszef Cardinal Mindszenty is 70 years of age.

He is celebrating, if that is the proper word, his birthday in a twilight world. Cardinal Mindszenty is half-prisoner, half-free. If he leaves the Legation, where he sought sanctuary after the Russians crushed the Hungarian revolt 5 years ago, the cardinal is probably doomed.

As a shut-in, he has his room, his prayers, the memoirs on which he works—and a brief walk in the postage-stamp sized courtyard of the Legation once a day.

Life and living have been harder on Cardinal Mindszenty even than on his unfortunate countrymen. He is the Prince Primate of Hungary, which also endows him with great political influence over his country whenever he cares to exercise it.

In times of crises, Cardinal Mindszenty spoke out. He openly defied established political regimes. Once it was the Nazis. Then it was the Communists.

He also spent 7 years in Communist prison and detainment. In between there was a rigged Communist trial so the regime could present a brainwashed church dignitary to the world.

WILL NOT BOW

Today, the Government in Budapest, run by Janos Kadar, is making noises about a Mindszenty solution. It is offering the cardinal, so one of the regime ministers suggested, a choice: Either leave Budapest with a guarantee of unhindered passage to Rome, or swear allegiance to the Government and go about the strictly religious tasks of the church.

Nobody expects the cardinal to accept either alternative. He will not forswear his native land, and the Vatican supports him in this determination.

Neither will he pledge fealty to a regime headed by Kadar, whose name in Eastern Europe is synonymous with Vidkun Quisling's during World War II.

Cardinal Mindszenty never had a chance to try his hand and skill at any substantive type of coexistence with the Communists—the kind, for instance, that prevails in its strange, indeterminate way in Poland. There, the cardinal (Sztepan Wyszinski) and the comrade (Wladyslaw Gomulka), practice on-again, off-again coexistence.

Why wasn't Cardinal Mindszenty able to try the same approach? Poland is practically 100 percent Catholic. Hungary is about 60 percent to two-thirds. Gomulka and Cardinal Wyszinski were put in jail about the same time.

The ferment that almost blew Poland apart just before the Hungarian revolution was diverted by the simultaneous release of both the cardinal and the comrade.

The church and state have ever since lived in an uneasy state of coexistence. Gomulka has often relied on the influence of the cardinal to maintain discipline in Poland. Otherwise, as he has openly said, Poland might be wiped off the map of Europe.

It is not hard to guess who would erase the country geographically.

In Hungary there was no Communist of even any nostalgic following who might have been able to make such a coexistence feasible.

While Kadar had been in a Communist prison himself, he betrayed the Hungarian revolution, the one he hailed as so genuine and spontaneous.

But his regime feels it necessary to keep Cardinal Mindszenty's name rolling off Hungarian lips today. The country, as in most of Eastern Europe, is riddled with new ferment, fresh uneasiness.

Therefore, the regime needs recognition by someone with a name and with influence to copper-rivet its position.

Cardinal Mindszenty is more than a name and influence in Hungary. He is a living symbol—the cardinal prisoner, so as to speak—of life in Hungary. Moreover, he spans three generations of history so important in making the country what it is today.

When he would not yield to Communist pressures, ranging from withdrawal of subsidies to war-shattered churches and church schools to organizing proregime "peace priests," Rakosi went after the cardinal.

In the years from 145 to a few months before the arrest, Cardinal Mindszenty impatiently brushed off discussion of possible arrest.

I brought the subject up half a dozen times. He would reply: "That isn't important." Then, he would plunge again into the problems besetting his country.

The Rakosi regime would not let up the pressure on him. A plan had even been drafted to arrest Cardinal Mindszenty on Christmas Day, 1948. There would be too much of an outcry, some of the party higher-ups cautioned.

A compromise was made: the regime arrested the cardinal day after Christmas. Cardinal Mindszenty told his captors he must pray before going to jail. He also left behind a note prepared long before, that any confession by him to the regime would not be authentic.

Taking his leave, Cardinal Mindszenty kissed his aged mother goodby.

"No need to worry," he comforted the sobbing old lady. "Everything will be all right. We all need to pray."

FINANCING OF UNITED NATIONS

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, Tuesday's edition of the Boston Herald contained an outstanding editorial favoring purchase by the United States of United Nations bonds.

I wish the many people in this country who are being misled on this issue would take time to read this editorial. It comes from a distinguished newspaper of Republican persuasion, which has always supported a vigorous foreign policy for the United Sates.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial "United Nations Loan" be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED NATIONS LOAN

Now that the U.N. has decided to meet part of its financial needs by floating a bond issue the United States is honor bound to support it.

Many Americans still question whether borrowing is the best way. But the commitment has been made, and it would be a disaster if the bonds were not subscribed now.

Actually the bonds are but one part of a more comprehensive and sensible program.

The problem is the special assessment for the emergency force in the Gaza strip and the operation in the Congo. The Soviet Union and certain other nations have refused to pay their share on the ground that they oppose the peacekeeping actions. Some smaller nations have been unable to pay. The result has been a growing deficit and a disproportionate burdening of those who have kept up their payments.

The Assembly has attempted to meet the situation in three ways: First, by approving new appropriations to carry the emergency operations through the present fiscal year and assessing the cost against all members as in the past; second, by asking the International Court of Justice to rule that special assessments, like regular assessments, are expenses of the organization and legally binding on all members under the charter; third, by issuing bonds to pay off current obligations.

The second step is obviously the most important. If the Court rules that special assessments must be paid and the members all agree, the U.N. problems will be over. If the Court acts and the members don't pay up, holdouts may lose their voting rights in the Assembly, which is a heavy sanction.

The bond issue would also help to squeeze money out of the delinquents because repayments would be made at the rate of $10 million a year out of regular U.N. assessments, which all members pay. The United States, for example, is now getting up nearly 50 percent of the U.N.'s special operation costs, but for that part covered by the bond issue it would pay only 32 percent (its regular assessment share).

U.N. finances are beginning to look up. We can and should support the loan.

WATERSHED AND FOREST MANAGEMENT RESEARCH AT PARSONS, W. VA.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, last year during the course of hearings before the Senate Appropriations Committee, of which I am a member, attention was given to the need for the construction of a Watershed and Forest Management Research Laboratory at Parsons, W. Va. Dr. V. L. Harper, of the Forest Service, testified regarding the need for such a laboratory to provide badly needed facilities for watershed management work—very little of which is being done at present, including hydrology facilities. Also needed are: a soil physics laboratory, three physiology and silvicultural laboratories, a greenhouse, office space, a garage, and storage space. It was estimated that $200,000 would be required to meet these needs.

Following the hearings, I offered an amendment to the appropriation bill to provide the $200,000, but the committee did not accept the proposal. Consequently, on August 4, 1961, I wrote to the Honorable David E. Bell, Director, Bureau of the Budget, and urged that the funds be included in the budget estimate submitted to the Congress for fiscal year 1963. I am disappointed to find that the moneys were not recommended in the fiscal 1963 budget submitted to the Congress a few days ago. I shall, therefore, attempt again to amend the bill when it is again before the Senate Appropriations Committee this year to include moneys for this very worthy purpose. I am now informed that an overall figure of $150,000 will be sufficient.

The watershed management problems prevailing in the central Appalachian Mountain region involve the management and harvesting of the hardwood forest to prevent destructive flood runoff and keep soil erosion to a minimum and, at the same time, improve the quantity and quality of the water coming from forest lands. The money which I am going to request for construction of the facility at Parsons, W. Va., is needed to facilitate research in the management of these watershed lands for soil stability and beneficial streamflow.

The Appalachian Mountain region occupies the headwaters of several major river systems in Eastern United States. There are many industries located along these rivers which are dependent upon a reliable streamflow for their water supply. Demand for industrial water continues to increase. Furthermore, the Appalachian region is fast becoming popular for outdoor recreation. High quality water improves fishing, boating, swimming, and other outdoor recreational activities. There are many cities and towns that depend on the water from the Appalachian Mountains for their municipal supplies. Water for drinking must be pure—no more than 10 parts per million of solid material—and these watersheds could yield water which can be consumed without treatment. Unfortunately, many are not yielding water free of contamination. Poor logging and forestry practices have resulted in some instances in 56,000 or more parts of sediment per million parts of water, mainly from soil erosion and debris in the streams.

Mr. President, I have had able assistance from the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, Senator STENNIS, one of the senior members of the Senate Appropriations Committee, and I have only yesterday discussed the matter with him. I congratulate him upon his interest in forestry research even when that research is being conducted in States other than his own State of Mississippi. He has been a pioneer in the field of forestry research, and I am very grateful for the help that he has given me. I shall hope that my committee will this year favorably consider my amendment in order that needed research may be done at Parsons, W. Va., on land owned by the Government and within a short distance of the Fernow Experimental Forest. This makes possible an ideal arrangement of both indoor and outdoor laboratory facilities so necessary in studying the complex watershed problems of this forest area.

AMENDMENT OF ACT ESTABLISHING CODE OF LAW FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the unfinished business, H.R. 5143.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5143) to amend section 801 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

POSTAL RATES AND COMMUNIST PUBLICATIONS

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I am supporting President Kennedy's request for postal rate increases. The postal deficit runs some $774 million. Without increases the deficit this coming year will run even higher.

The postal rate bill passed last week by the House of Representatives provides that third-class mail—advertising, circulars, and so-called junk mail—would have its rates increased by $161.9 million annually. This is a substantial increase. First-class mail rates would be increased from 4 to 5 cents for letters and airmail from 7 to 8 cents.

But there is a serious defect in the bill passed by the House of Representatives in the amendment dealing with mail classified as Communist propaganda. I am pleased to note that the largest newspaper of my State, the Oregonian, in an editorial stated "This is an example of legislation through emotion rather than reason."

Foreign mail travels pursuant to reciprocal international agreements, and the United States is a member of the Universal Postal Union. Under terms of the convention, mail is delivered to the addressee by the country of destination without payment of any part of the postage to that country. This is a reciprocal arrangement of mutual advantage.

According to the facts, 96 million pounds of printed matter were sent from the United States and approximately 76 million pounds of printed matter were received in the United States during fiscal year 1961. Thus the U.S. Post Office actually gains under this mutual arrangement.

I was pleased by the strong position taken by the President of the United States in his press conference of January 24, dealing with Communist mail.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD an editorial from the Portland Oregonian of February 1, 1962, entitled "What We Don't Know," together with the statement by the President of the United States at his January 24, 1962, press conference.

There being no objection, the editorial and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT WE DON'T KNOW

House amendment of the postal rates bill to include a provision prohibiting the post office from handling mail classified by the Attorney General as Communist propaganda is an example of legislation through emotion rather than reason.

We don't ask any sympathy for Soviet propagandizers. But think a minute: Do the American people really want to cut themselves off from the enemy's wavelength? Is a Khrushchev speech Soviet propaganda? Of course. Do we not, therefore, want to know what Khrushchev is saying, or, for that matter, what his paid propagandists are saying? Are we so scared that we cannot tell the right from the wrong, the good from the bad, that we don't even want to meet our opponents in open debate? Is the American cause really as weak as all that? Is the patriotism of Americans so suspect?

Such questions, in themselves, point up the ridiculous consequences of legislation passed by the House in a moment of false patriotism.

It should be added, too, that the United States has been sending behind the Iron Curtain seven times as much mail (16 million pounds per year as compared with 2.3 million pounds) as has been coming to us from Russia and its satellites. We could expect retaliation; and the ludicrous point would be that the initial step of blind restriction had been taken by us, not by the Communists, with whose system it would be more compatible.

The Senate should take a long look at this one and should get its backbone in shape for a stand on the principles of freedom.

COMMUNIST MAIL

Question. Mr. President, what is your view of the House amendment to the postal rate bill which would prohibit the post office from distributing mail labeled as "Communist propaganda"?

Answer. Well, I think it does not give the Attorney General—I have just read the language here—it does not give the Attorney General very clear guidance as to what he is supposed to label Communist and political propaganda. Is he supposed to label newspapers that may be received or speeches, or whatever they may be, so that the language is somewhat vague? In addition, I think that we want to realize that this is a reciprocal matter, and I think in the last 12 months ending March 31, 1961, we sent a total of 16 million pounds of mail of all types sent to the Iron Curtain countries, and a lot of it went to friends and relatives in Iron Curtain countries, and food packages and all of the rest, and we were only receiving 2.3 million pounds.

Now, there has been a drop in the amount of mail coming in from Communist countries in the last few months, really since last spring. If there is also an effort made by the Communists to deny us ability to send mail, it is going to present serious problems for a good many Americans who have been carrying on correspondence with friends and relatives. Now, I know that is not the purpose. I think that the Senate should examine the language very clearly and make sure that it is effective and is responsive to our national needs, and determine whether the rather generalized instructions to the Attorney General fall within the necessity of legal precision.

I think the American people are used to hearing all sides, and I don't think that they are particularly impressed by a good deal of what I have seen of propaganda. We send a good deal of mail out and I want to be sure that our rights to send our mail and our views and our correspondence to all parts of the world are not interfered with.

I think that the Senate should look at it carefully.

IMPROVEMENT OF EDUCATIONAL QUALITY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senate Tuesday completed floor action upon one of the major programs of President Kennedy in the field of education when it sent to conference the higher education segment of the President's program. Last May 25 the first segment of his program was accomplished by the Senate when it passed and sent to the House of Representatives S. 1021, to provide Federal financial assistance to the States for elementary and secondary public education.

This morning I have the great honor and privilege of sending to the desk two bills which represent the administration's efforts in two additional sectors of education.

I am confident that the excellent cooperation I have received from the members of the Subcommittee on Education and from the members of the full committee on both sides of the aisle will permit early committee action on these measures. The first bill I send to the desk is entitled the "Improvement of Educational Quality Act of 1962." President Kennedy in his state of the Union address indicated his desire that the Congress authorize programs designed to improve the preparation of our elementary and secondary school teachers; to offer outstanding teachers an opportunity for further study in the subject matter courses taught by them; and to encourage widespread use of improved practices and methods in elementary and secondary school teaching. That far-seeing program was further emphasized in the message from the President of the United States of February 6. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the section from the February 6 message relating to improvement of educational quality which may be found on pages 4–6 of House Document No. 330 be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Improvement of Educational Quality

Strengthening financial support for education by general Federal aid will not, however, be sufficient. Specific measures directed at selected problems are also needed to improve the quality of education. And the key to educational quality is the teaching profession. About 1 out of every 5 of the nearly 1,600,000 teachers in our elementary and secondary schools fails to meet full certification standards for teaching or has not completed 4 years of college work. Our immediate concern should be to afford them every possible opportunity to improve their professional skills and their command of the subjects they teach.

In all of the principal areas of academic instruction—English, mathematics, physical and biological sciences, foreign languages, history, geography, and the social sciences—significant advances are being made, both in pushing back the frontiers of knowledge and in the methods of transmitting that knowledge. To keep our teachers up to date on such advances, special institutes are offered in some of these areas by many colleges and universities, financed in part by the National Science Foundation and the Office of Education. Many elementary and secondary school teachers would profit from a full year of full-time study in their subject-matter fields. Very few can afford to do so. Yet the benefits of such a year could be shared by outstanding teachers with others in their schools and school systems as well as with countless students. We should begin to make such opportunities available to the elementary and secondary school teachers of this country and thereby accord to this profession the support, prestige, and recognition it deserves.

Another need is for higher standards of teacher education, course content, and instructional methods. The colleges and universities that train our teachers need financial help to examine and further strengthen their programs. Increased research and demonstration efforts must be directed toward improving the learning and teaching of subject matter and developing new and improved learning aids. Excellent but limited work in educational research and development has been undertaken by projects supported by the National Science Foundation, the Office of Education, and private groups. This must be increased—introducing and demonstrating to far more schools than at present up-to-date educational methods using the newest instructional materials and equipment, and providing the most effective inservice training and staff utilization.

Finally, in many urban as well as rural areas of the country, our school systems are confronted with unusually severe educational problems which require the development of new approaches—the problems of gifted children, deprived children, children with language problems, and children with problems that contribute to the high dropout rate, to name but a few.

To help meet all of these needs for better educational quality and development, and to provide a proper Federal role of assistance and leadership, I recommend that the Congress enact a program designed to help improve the excellence of American education by authorizing—

(1) The award each year of up to 2,500 scholarships to outstanding elementary and secondary school teachers for a year of full-time study:

(2) The establishment of institutes at colleges and universities for elementary and secondary school teachers of those subjects in which improved instruction is needed;

(3) Grants to institutions of higher education to pay part of the cost of special projects designed to strengthen teacher preparation programs through better curriculums and teaching methods;

(4) Amendment of the Cooperative Research Act to permit support of extensive, multipurpose educational researcn, development, demonstration, and evaluation projects; and

(5) Grants for local public school systems to conduct demonstration or experimental projects of limited duration to improve the quality of instruction or meet special educational problems in elementary and secondary schools.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in the provision of this training and instruction it is the intent of the proposed legislation that the resources of our colleges and universities be utilized through institutes at which the proposed advanced study would be conducted.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Ribicoff's letter of February 6, 1962, addressed to the President of the Senate, which discusses in detail the proposed legislation, together with its attachments, be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter and enclosures were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Department of Health,
Education, and Welfare,
February 6, 1962.

The President,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: I am enclosing for your consideration a proposed bill, entitled the "Improvement of Educational Quality Act of 1962," to assist institutions of higher learning, individual teachers, and State and local school systems to improve the quality of elementary and secondary education. It would authorize closely related programs designed to improve the preparation of elementary and secondary school teachers, to offer outstanding teachers an opportunity for further study in the subjects taught by them, and to encourage widespread use of improved practices in elementary and secondary school instruction. With the exception of the amendments to the Cooperative Research Act, these programs would be authorized for a period of 5 years.

This proposed legislation would carry out the President's recommendations for improving the quality of elementary and secondary education, contained in his special message on education of February 6, 1962.

The programs that would be authorized by the bill are briefly outlined and described in the following paragraphs.

A. Improvement of quality of teaching (title I): Among our approximately 1.6 million elementary and secondary teachers there exist wide variations in professional preparation, knowledge of subjects taught, experience, and opportunity for professional improvement and advancement. Much can be done to provide opportunities for teachers to improve their knowledge of subject matter and their command of the most advanced techniques of instruction. At the same time, attention needs to be focused on the initial preparation of teachers, because any inadequacy in this respect is difficult to overcome at a later stage. Of all the professions, teaching most requires the breadth of knowledge associated with a sound, liberal education. The programs herein proposed are aimed at bringing about improvements along these lines.

1. Arrangements with colleges and universities for the operation of institutes for advanced study by elementary and secondary school teachers and supervisors in subject-matter areas in which the Commissioner of Education finds there is widespread need for improved quality of instruction (sec. 101):

This authority would provide, in other basic curriculum areas, the opportunity for improvement that has been provided in mathematics, science, and modern foreign languages through institute programs administered by the National Science Foundation and the Office of Education. The existing programs have been so successful in improving instruction that the relative neglect of these subjects has been dramatically reversed in a few years.

There are other subjects in the school curriculum, however, in which better instruction is required in order to attain high educational standards. In such fields as reading and English composition, for example, we believe that short term and regular session teacher institutes could bring about the same revitalization of instruction as has occurred in modern foreign languages. Moreover, these skills are absolutely essential to a student's progress in all fields of learning, including the physical sciences.

In arranging, through grants or contracts, for the institutes the Commissioner of Education—in addition to making a finding that improved instruction in the subject matter is needed and is not being met through institute programs already authorized—would give preference to those subjects which are generally accepted as meeting college entrance requirements. Teachers attending such institutes would receive a stipend of $75 per week, plus $15 per week for each dependent, during the period of attendance.

2. Authorization of 2,500 annual scholarship grants to outstanding elementary and secondary teachers for 1 year of full-time study in a college or university of their choice (sec. 102):

The number of grants authorized each year by Congress would be allocated among the States (and the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands) on the basis of the number of full-time certified elementary and secondary school teachers in each State, with not less than 10 to any State. Teachers would be selected for these grants by a representative State commission appointed by the Governor. Each teacher selected would receive an amount equivalent to his or her annual salary as a teacher, but not more than $5,000, for a year of study in the subject-matter field in which they teach or are expected to teach. While the number of such grants is relatively small, the returns would be very great. The teachers selected would be those who have demonstrated special ability as scholars and aptitude for teaching, and who show promise of being able to make significant contributions to improvements in the quality of elementary and secondary education. A year of full-time study has many advantages over the "piecemeal" approach of a few summer-session courses spread over a period of years. Most teachers, however, are not able financially to devote a full year to study. The existence of these grants would serve to emphasize the high value the Nation places upon excellent teachers and to encourage similar State and private programs for teachers.

In addition to the grant to the teacher, the draft bill provides for a $500 cost of education allowance to the college or university the grant recipient attends.

3. Authorization for grants to colleges and universities for projects to improve the quality of teacher education (sec. 103):

Any comprehensive effort to improve the quality of elementary and secondary education must include a concerted effort to raise the standards of teacher preparation programs and the standards for the selection of teaching candidates and their continuation in such programs. This proposal would make grants available to higher education institutions having programs for the preparation of individuals to teach in elementary and secondary schools, to pay part of the cost of projects to strengthen these programs through improvement of course content and curriculum, improvement of student teaching activities, and improvement of selection, continuation, and graduation standards in such programs. The institutions themselves would, of course, design the projects and submit them for consideration. In reviewing applications, the Commissioner would obtain the advice and recommendations of persons competent to evaluate the merits of the projects.

We believe that there is a direct relationship between the quality and intellectual content of teacher education and the quality of student attracted to a career in teaching. There is evidence that teaching as a profession is not attracting a proportionate share of our most able college students, and that many able and dedicated teachers suffer from inadequate academic preparation. While we recognize that inadequate salaries for teachers is a major factor in this situation, we believe that improvements in teacher education can significantly improve the status of the profession. This proposal would encourage and help colleges and universities to make desired improvements.

B. Broader Application of Improved Instructional Practices (title II): The quality of our schools could be increased significantly if all that were known concerning the most effective instructional practices were put into practice on a wide scale. Moreover, a good start could be made in averting the dangerous social and economic consequences of failure to meet the educational needs of large numbers of culturally deprived and disadvantaged children. The provisions of this bill would provide the means of accelerating desirable changes in elementary and secondary education. Educational research alone is not sufficient—we must encourage the wide implementation of research findings, while giving new vigor and dimension to the continued search for better methods of instruction in our schools.

1. Grants to States for local educational agency projects to improve the quality and effectiveness of public elementary and secondary education (sec. 201):

The purpose of this program is to help achieve one of the greatest needs in education—to translate research and experimental findings into actual practice in the schools. The knowledge is available in many aspects of school organization, instructional methods, and curriculums to bring about dramatic improvements in education. But the use of new techniques has been limited almost entirely to special "laboratory" schools and to a few schools selected for experimental projects. Not only do innovations cost money, but parents, teachers, school administrators, and students generally must experience them in practice before they are accepted and used.

Most of the grant funds would be used to pay one-half the cost of pilot, demonstration, and experimental projects submitted to the State education agency by local public school districts and approved by the State agency under criteria and procedures set forth in the State's plan. Section 201(c) of the draft bills sets forth seven types of projects as illustrations of programs in which Federal funds might be used to improve the quality and effectiveness of public elementary and secondary education. These are: programs and curriculum adaptations for exceptionally gifted children, for children having language difficulties, and for deprived and disadvantaged children; improving the effectiveness of teachers through preservice, internship, and inservice programs; the more effective utilization of new or improved instructional materials and equipment and the development of improvements in school building design; the development of new types of instruction or programing in elementary and secondary schools; and coordination of school programs and planning in deteriorated or depressed communities with planning and programs of other organizations working to improve conditions in the area. Each project would include the acquisition of library and other material and equipment needed for the educational program involved.

Up to 10 percent of a State's allotment could be used by the State education agency to expand and improve State services in developing, evaluating, and promoting the broader application of improved instructional practices in elementary and secondary schools.

All of these activities place the emphasis upon raising the standards of excellence in our schools, and upon making this excellence available to all the children attending these schools. The bill would authorize the appropriation of $50 million annually for this program, allotted among the States on the basis of their relative populations. This is the most practical and direct investment the Nation could make in an effort to improve the quality of education. Used with intelligence and imagination, this investment would be as vital to our fundamental national interest as any we could make. The necessary know-how to improve our schools is, in large measure, at hand—and this program affords the means to apply that knowledge.

2. Amendment of the Cooperative Research Act so as to provide the means to develop, evaluate, and demonstrate new instructional practices and materials in elementary and secondary schools (sec. 202):

The purpose of the proposed amendment to Public Law 531 (83d Cong.) is to give a much-needed new dimension to the program of cooperative research in education. The act now authorizes educational research, demonstrations, and surveys to be carried out by colleges and universities and State education agencies on a contract or cooperatively financed basis. The effect of the amendment would be to authorize grants for these purposes as well as contracts, to facilitate the participation of educational research and professional training organizations as well as colleges and universities and of local as well as State educational agencies, and to specifically authorize grants to universities and colleges and other research organizations to assist them in establishing and operating, whenever appropriate in cooperation with State and local educational agencies, centers for educational research and development and for the evaluation and demonstration of experimental programs in actual school settings. A few such programs are now being conducted with very excellent results, but financial support and organizational leadership has not been sufficient to do the job on a sufficient scale or to spread the benefits widely among the schools.

This strengthening of the cooperative research program would have a direct relation to the utilization of State project grants outlined in B–1 above, in that the practices developed and tested could be used by the States on a widespread basis.

C. Miscellaneous Provisions (title III): This title of the draft bill contains pertinent definitions and administrative provisions, including a specific prohibition against Federal control of education.

In conclusion, I wholeheartedly commend to you the provisions contained in the enclosed draft bill. Every program that would be authorized in the draft bill is designed to meet a basic requirement in the effort to raise standards in education and to do so in such a way that the Federal Government does not intrude upon the fundamental responsibilities of States, local school districts, and institutions of higher learning. Each program would be related and complementary to the others so as together to provide a comprehensive approach to the encouragement of quality in elementary and secondary education. The purpose to be accomplished is truly national and is basic to the security and well-being of our Nation.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that enactment of this legislation would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely,

ABE RIBICOFF,
Secretary.

(Enclosures.)

Improvement of Educational Quality Act of 1962

[In thousands of dollars]

	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967
APPROPRIATION REQUIREMENTS					
Title I—Improvement of teacher education:					
Institutes for advanced training for teachers	$23,850	$40,000	$40,000	$40,000	$40,000
Scholarship grants for outstanding teachers	13,750	13,750	13,750	13,750	13,750
State commissions	500	500	500	500	500
Project grants to strengthen teacher education	15,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000
Title II—Broader application of improved instructional practices:					
Grants to States to strengthen instruction—supervision and administration	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000
Grants to States for special projects	45,000	45,000	45,000	45,000	5,000
Grants to universities and colleges, State education agencies, and local school districts—cooperative research demonstrations	16,000	20,000	25,000	30,000	30,000
Administration	900	1,300	1,500	1,500	1,500
Total	120,000	150,550	155,750	160,750	160,750
Man-years of employment	72	117	124	124	124

	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967
EXPENDITURES					
Title I—Improvement of teacher education:					
Institutes for advanced training for teachers	$6,000	$34,000	$40,000	$40,000	$40,000
Study awards for outstanding teachers		13,750	13,750	13,750	13,750
State commissions	500	500	500	500	500
Project grants to strengthen teacher education	6,200	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000
Title II—Broader application of improved instructional practices:					
Grants to States to strengthen instruction, supervision and administration	3,000	3,500	4,000	4,500	5,000
Grants to States for special projects	16,000	25,000	35,000	45,000	45,000
Grants to colleges, universities, State education agencies and local school districts, cooperative research and demonstrations	7,500	20,000	25,000	30,000	30,000
Administration	800	1,300	1,400	1,500	1,500
Total, expenditures	40,000	123,050	144,650	160,250	160,750

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to pay a very deserved tribute to Secretary Ribicoff for his great educational statesmanship in connection with all these education bills. In connection with the two bills I am introducing today for the administration, Secretary Ribicoff has been of great service to our committee, and, equally of course, of great service to the President, through conducting much of the research necessary for us to give consideration to the form which the proposed legislation should take at the time of its submission to the Senate.

Mr. President, I wish to commend the great service of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in the field of education—and the same is true of his work in all the other fields falling within the jurisdiction of his Department especially since the Secretary certainly is one of the great leaders of our time in the field of health legislation in our country. However, I wish particularly to commend him for the notable work he has been doing in the past several months in the field of adult education, for that is what the Secretary really has been doing. He has gone from coast to coast, from State to State, to discuss with the parents of America the serious educational crisis which confronts the country in these very troublous times.

I have followed with great interest and high approval the program of adult education which Secretary Ribicoff has carried on. He is now, I understand, giving a series of lectures dealing with various phases of this problem. The bills I am introducing today in behalf of the administration are bills which have been prepared very carefully with Secretary Ribicoff and represent his sound, wise, farseeing educational statesmanship.

Mr. President, the second bill which I propose to introduce this morning on behalf of the administration is entitled "The Adult Literacy Act of 1962," which is designed to assist the States and local communities in establishing programs of instruction for adults who are unable to read and write English or who have not achieved a sixth-grade level of education. It is shocking to realize that approximately 8 million adults in the United States, 8 percent of our population 25 years of age or over, must unfortunately be defined as functionally illiterate. It is a shocking thing that almost 20 million adult Americans cannot adequately read an English-language newspaper. The bill which I shall introduce is designed to meet and overcome this blot upon the Nation's record of educational achievement. The bill would provide for specialized preparation of teachers and provision for appropriate teaching materials in this difficult field of adult education. It further would provide for aid to the public school systems of the several States for literacy classes and courses and for grants to State departments of education to assist in developing and supervising literacy courses in the school districts of the States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the portion of the President's message of February 6 which may be found on page 8 of House Document No. 330 be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the document (H. Doc. No. 330) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

3. REDUCTION OF ADULT ILLITERACY

Adult education must be pursued aggressively. Over 8 million American citizens aged 25 or above have attended school for less than 5 years, and more than a third of these completely lack the ability to read and write. The economic result of this lack of schooling is often chronic unemployment, dependency, or delinquency, with all the consequences this entails for these individuals, their families, their communities, and the Nation. The twin tragedies of illiteracy and dependency are often passed on from generation to generation.

There is no need for this. Many nations—including our own—have shown that this problem can be attacked and virtually wiped out. Unfortunately, our State school systems—overburdened in recent years by the increasing demands of growing populations and the increasing handicaps of insufficient revenues—have been unable to give adequate attention to this problem. I recommend the authorization of a 5-year program of grants to institutions of higher learning and to the States, to be coordinated in the development of programs which will offer every adult who is willing and able the opportunity to become literate.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks, the letter, dated February 6, from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Honorable Abraham Ribicoff, in which he discusses in detail the "Adult Literacy Act of 1962." I also ask to have printed at this point in the RECORD the cost estimates which accompany that letter.

There being no objection, the letter and attachments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
February 6, 1962.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am enclosing for the consideration of the Congress a draft bill—the Adult Literacy Act of 1962—to assist the States and local communities in establishing programs of instruction for adults who are unable to read and write English or who have not achieved a sixth-grade level of education, and to assist in the preparation of special instructional materials and specially qualified teachers. This legislative proposal would carry out the President's recommendations with respect to adult literacy contained in his education message of February 6, 1962.

We are in a technological revolution, with automation rapidly developing in many industries. Further, 1960 census reports indicate that approximately 8 million adults, or 8 percent of our population aged 25 or over, are defined as functionally illiterate—that is, have achieved less than a fifth-grade education. Moreover, nearly 20 million Americans cannot adequately read an English language newspaper. The economic and personal welfare of all these people who cannot read and write the English language—and, consequently, of the entire Nation—urgently requires that they be enabled to do so.

The draft bill would provide for specialized preparation of teachers and teaching materials; for aid to public school systems for literacy classes and courses; and for grants to State departments of education to assist in developing and supervising literacy courses in the school districts of the State.

1. The specialized teacher preparation would be accomplished through grants to colleges and universities. Such grants would also be made for development of suitable teaching materials for adult literacy programs.

2. The draft bill would also authorize an appropriation of $5 million in fiscal year 1963 and $10 million in each of the next 4 years for grants to the States for:

(a) Pilot projects for demonstrating effective methods and courses for teaching adult literacy and for stimulating local programs.

(b) Support and expansion of local programs of instruction in adult literacy.

(c) Support of the State educational agency in providing technical assistance and supervision of local adult literacy programs.

To be eligible for grants, the bill requires a State to submit a plan providing, in addition to various administrative provisions, for a program designed to raise substantially the level of adult literacy in a reasonable period of time and among all segments of the population. The appropriations would be allotted among the States on the basis of the relative number of adults who are unable to read and write English or who have not achieved a sixth-grade level of education.

Progress in upgrading manpower skills, in reducing dependency and welfare costs, in combating poverty, in promoting general economic growth, and in encouraging maximum personal development and the fullest contribution of free citizens in a democracy can be made only if all our citizens possess the basic skills of learning necessary for acquisition of knowledge.

Passage of this draft bill will do much, in the next 5 years, to achieve these vital goals.

I would appreciate it if you would be good enough to refer the enclosed draft bill to the appropriate committee for consideration.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that enactment of this proposed legislation would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely,

ABE RIBICOFF,
Secretary.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education—Cost estimates, Adult Literacy Act of 1962

	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967
Authorization:					
Grants to States	$5,000,000	$10,000,000	$10,000,000	$10,000,000	$10,000,000
Grants to institutions of higher learning [1]					
Total	5,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
Appropriation requirements:					
Grants to States	5,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
Grants to institutions of higher learning	250,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Administration	150,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
Total	5,400,000	11,200,000	11,200,000	11,200,000	11,200,000
Expenditures:					
Grants to States	2,700,000	12,300,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
Grants to institutions of higher learning	175,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Administration	125,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
Total	3,000,000	13,500,000	11,200,000	11,200,000	11,200,000
Man-years of employment	15	22	24	24	24

[1] Such sums as may be necessary.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I now introduce and send to the desk, for appropriate reference, the two bills to which I have alluded. I ask unanimous consent that the text of each of these measures be printed at this point in the RECORD, following my remarks.

The bills, introduced by Mr. MORSE, were received, read twice by their titles, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2826. A bill to improve the quality of elementary and secondary education.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Improvement of Educational Quality Act of 1962".

TITLE I—IMPROVEMENT OF QUALITY OF TEACHING IN ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Institutes for advanced study for teachers

SEC. 101. The Commissioner is authorized to arrange, through grants or contracts, with colleges and universities for the operation by them of short-term or regular session institutes for advanced study, including study in the use of new teaching methods and instructional materials, for individuals who are engaged in teaching, or in supervising teachers, in elementary and secondary schools, in subject-matter areas in which he finds that there is a widespread need for improvement in the quality of instruction. In determining the subject-matter areas in which such advanced studies will be provided, the Commissioner shall give preference to subjects which are generally accepted as meeting college entrance requirements, and shall take into consideration the activities, in the area of advanced studies for elementary or secondary school teachers, being supported by the Office of Education, the National Science Foundation, or other agencies or departments under other Federal laws. Each individual (engaged in teaching or in supervising teachers in elementary or secondary schools) who attends an institute operated under the provisions of this section shall be eligible (after application therefor) to receive a stipend at the rate of $75 per week for the period of his attendance at such institute, and each such individual with one or more dependents shall receive an additional stipend at the rate of $15 per week for each such dependent for the period of such attendance.

Scholarship grants for outstanding teachers in elementary and secondary schools

SEC. 102. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to make scholarship grants for one year of full-time study at colleges or universities to individuals engaged in teaching in elementary or secondary schools who have demonstrated special scholarship ability and aptitude for teaching, and who show promise of being able, through such study, to make significant contributions to improvement in the quality of instruction in elementary and secondary schools. The number of such grants to be made from the sums appropriated under this section for any fiscal year shall be the number, not to exceed 2,500, specified in the Act appropriating such sums, and the number so specified shall be allocated by the Commissioner among the States, in accordance with his regulations, on the basis of the relative numbers of persons engaged as full-time certified elementary and secondary school teachers in each State in the most recent year for which satisfactory data are available to him, except that the number so allocated to each State for any fiscal year shall be at least ten. Recipients of the grants so allocated to each State shall be selected by a State commission broadly representative of elementary and secondary education, higher education, and the public, and established or designated for the purpose by the Governor of the State; each such commission shall make its selection in accordance with criteria and procedures, consistent with this section, which are developed by it and approved by the Commissioner. Teachers awarded scholarship grants under this section shall pursue full-time courses of study primarily in the subject matter or content areas in which the recipient teaches or expects to teach. Each such teacher shall receive a stipend, as provided in regulations of the Commissioner, equal to his or her most recent annual salary as an elementary or secondary school teacher, but not to exceed $5,000, and the college or university which such individual attends shall receive a cost of education allowance of $500.

Project grants to strengthen teacher preparation programs

SEC. 103. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to make grants to colleges and universities which have programs for the preparation of individuals to teach in elementary and secondary schools, to pay part of the cost of special projects designed to strengthen such programs through improvement of course content and curricula (including improvements in library resources needed for such programs), improvement of student teaching activities, and improvement of standards for selection of candidates for such programs and standards for continuation in and graduation from such programs. Any grant for any such project made from an appropriation under this section for any fiscal year may include such amounts as the Commissioner determines to be necessary for succeeding fiscal years for completion of the Federal participation in the project as approved by the Commissioner.

(b) No grant shall be made under this section for any project until the Commissioner has obtained the advice and recommendations of persons who are competent to evaluate the project as to its feasibility and its pertinence to the purposes of this section, and as to the adequacy of the resources available to carry out the project.

Authorization of appropriations

SEC. 104. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title, including sums determined by the Commissioner to be necessary for administrative expenses of scholarship commissions under section 102.

TITLE II—BROADER APPLICATION OF IMPROVED INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICES

Grants to States

SEC. 201. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated $50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for each of the 4 succeeding years, for making grants to State educational agencies under this section to assist in the conduct of pilot, demonstration, or experimental projects of local educational agencies designed to improve the quality of instruction in public elementary and secondary schools, and to assist in the expansion and improvement of State educational agency activities in developing, evaluating, and promoting the broader application of improved instructional practices in such schools.

(b)(1) From the sums appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) for any fiscal year, the Commissioner shall reserve such amount, but not in excess of 1.6 per centum thereof, as he may determine for allotment among the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Canal Zone, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands, according to their respective needs. From the remainder of such sums the Commissioner shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount of such remainder as the population of such State bears to the total of the populations of all the States. The populations of the several States shall be determined by the Commissioner for the most recent year for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce.

(2) A State's allotment under subsection (a) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, shall, to the extent not reallotted pursuant to this subsection, remain available for payment pursuant to subsection (d) for projects or activities in such State until June 30, 1964.

(3) The amount of any State's allotment under this subsection for any fiscal year which the Commissioner determines will not be required during the period for which such allotment is available for carrying out the State plan (if any) approved under this section shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates during such period as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under this subsection, but with such adjustments as may be necessary to prevent reallotment to any State of any sum in excess of the amount which the Commissioner estimates it needs and will be able to use for such period for carrying out the State plan. Any amount reallotted to a State under this paragraph during a year shall be deemed part of its allotment under this subsection for such year.

(c)(1) Any State which desires to receive payments under this section shall submit to the Commissioner, through its State educational agency, a State plan which—

(A) provides that the State educational agency will be the sole agency for administering the plan;

(B) sets forth a program under which all funds paid to the State from its allotment under subsection (b), except funds paid pursuant to clause (D) of this paragraph, will be expended solely for pilot, demonstration, or experimental projects of limited duration, submitted by local educational agencies or by other agencies or institutions operating a public elementary or secondary school, and approved by the State educational agency, which are designed to improve the quality and effectiveness of public elementary and secondary education, including but not limited to the following types of programs (and including the acquisition of library and other materials and equipment needed for such programs):

(i) Programs to encourage and stimulate educational excellence, including course content and curriculum adaptations and special accelerated programs for exceptionally gifted children;

(ii) Projects to improve the effectiveness of public elementary and secondary school teachers through preservice, internship, and inservice programs;

(iii) Programs for the improvement of instruction through the more effective utilization of new or improved instructional materials and equipment or through the development of improvements in the design of school facilities;

(iv) Programs for developing new types of elementary or secondary instruction or programing;

(v) Remedial or special instructional programs or services for pupils having language or other special educational problems;

(vi) Programs or services for adapting curricula to the needs of deprived or disadvantaged pupils;

(vii) Programs for coordinating the school system planning and programs in the area served by the local education agency, with the planning and programs of other public or private nonprofit agencies dealing with problems related to the alleviation of deteriorated or depressed communities which include such area and of the families and children residing therein.

(C) sets forth the criteria and procedures, consistent with the purposes of this section, on the basic of which projects submitted by local educational agencies or other agencies or institutions under this section will be approved by the State educational agency;

(D) sets forth a program for expansion or improvement of State educational agency supervisory or related activities, including research, development, evaluation, and promotion of improved instructional practices in public elementary and secondary schools and including administration of the State plan, except that not to exceed 10 per centum of a State's allotment under this section for any fiscal year may be expended for such activities;

(E) provides that the State educational agency will make such reports to the Commissioner, in such form and containing such information, as may be reasonably necessary to enable the Commissioner to perform his duties under this section; and

(F) provides for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the State, and by the State to local educational agencies or other agencies or institutions under this section.

(2) The Commissioner shall approve any State plan and any modification thereof which complies with the provisions of paragraph (1). The Commissioner shall not finally disapprove any State plan submitted under this section, or any modification thereof, without first affording the State educational agency reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

(3) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State educational agency administering a State plan approved under this section, finds that—

(A) the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of this section, or

(B) in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provisions, the Commissioner shall notify such State agency that no further payments will be made to the State under this section (or, in his discretion, further payments to the State will be limited to projects under or portions of the State plan not affected by such failure), until he is satisfied that there will no longer be any failure to comply. Until he is so satisfied, the Commissioner shall make no further payments to such State under this section (or shall limit payments to projects under or portions of the State plan not affected by such failure).

(4) A State educational agency dissatisfied with a final action of the Commissioner under paragraph (2) or (3) of this subsection may appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which the State is located, by filing a petition with such court within sixty days after such final action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Commissioner, or any officer designated by him for that purpose. The Commissioner thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code. Upon the filing of such petition, the court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part, temporarily or permanently. The findings of the Commissioner as to the facts, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive, but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall file in the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence. The judgment of the court affirming or setting aside, in whole or in part, any action of the Commissioner shall be final, subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code.

(d) From a State's allotment for a fiscal year under subsection (b), the Commissioner shall from time to time pay to such State an amount equal to one-half of the expenditures for projects described in subsection (c)(1)(B) and for State educational agency activities described in subsection (c)(1)(D) which are carried out under its approved State plan, except that from a State's allotment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, he shall pay with respect to expenditures for State educational agency activities described in subsection (c)(1)(D) an amount equal to such expenditures.

Amendments to Cooperative Research Act

Sec. 202. The first section of the Act of July 26, 1954, entitled "An Act to authorize cooperative research in education" (68 Stat. 533, 20 U.S.C. 331) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) in order to enable the Office of Education more effectively to accomplish the purposes and to perform the duties for which it was originally established, the Commissioner of Education is authorized to enter into contracts or jointly financed cooperative arrangements with, or make grants to, public or nonprofit private universities, colleges, and other organizations with research or professional training facilities, State educational agencies, and, with the concurrence of the appropriate State educational agency, local educational agencies, for the conduct of research, surveys, and demonstrations in the field of education, including grants to public or nonprofit private universities, colleges, and other organizations with educational research facilities to pay part of the costs of the establishment and operation, when appropriate in cooperation with State and local educational agencies, of centers for the conduct of programs of research, development, evaluation, and demonstration of improved instructional practices and materials in elementary and secondary schools."

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Definitions

Sec. 301. As used in this Act—

(a) The term "State" means a State, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Canal Zone, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands, except that as used in section 201(b)(1) such term does not include the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Canal Zone, Guam, American Samoa, or the Virgin Islands.

(b) The term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of Education.

(c) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(d) The term "State educational agency" means the State board of education or other agency or officer primarily responsible for the State supervision of public elementary and secondary schools, or, if there is no such officer or agency, an officer or agency designated by the Governor or by State law.

(e) The term "elementary school" means a school which provides elementary education, as determined under State law.

(f) The term "secondary school" means a school which provides secondary education, as determined under State law, except that it does not include any education provided beyond grade 12.

(g) The term "local educational agency" means a board of education or other legally constituted local school authority having administrative control and direction of public elementary or secondary schools in a city, county, township, school district, or political subdivision in a State.

Payments

Sec. 302. Payments under this Act to any individual, to a State educational agency, State commission, institution of higher education, or any other organization, pursuant to a grant or contract, may be made in advance or by way of reimbursement, in such installments and at such times as may reasonably be required for expenditure by the recipients thereof, and, in the case of grants, with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments.

Delegation of authority

Sec. 303. The Commissioner is authorized to delegate any of his functions under this Act, except the making of regulations, to any officer or employee of the Office of Education.

Federal control of education prohibited

Sec. 304. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution or school system.

S. 2827. A bill to assist in providing necessary instruction for adults unable to read and write English or with less than a sixth grade level of education, through grants to institutions of higher learning for development of materials and methods of instruction and for training of teaching and supervisory personnel and through grants to States for pilot projects, improvement of State services, and programs of instruction.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Adult Literacy Act of 1962".

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

Sec. 2. It is the purpose of this Act to initiate a program of furnishing instruction to adults who are unable to read and write English, as determined in accordance with regulations of the Commissioner, and adults who have not completed the sixth grade of school or achieved an equivalent level of education, as so determined, so as to help eliminate such inability and raise the level of education of such adults with a view to making them less likely to become dependent on others, increasing their opportunities for more productive and profitable employment, and making them better able to meet their adult responsibilities.

TRAINING OF TEACHERS AND DEVELOPMENT OF INSTRUCTIONAL METHODS AND MATERIALS

Sec. 3. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and each of the four succeeding fiscal years such sums as may be necessary for (1) grants to public or nonprofit private institutions of higher learning to assist them in the development of methods of, and materials for use in, instructing adults described in section 2, and (2) grants to such institutions of higher learning to assist them in providing specialized training for teachers of such adults and for supervisors of such teachers, including the establishment and maintenance of traineeships with such stipends and allowances as may be determined by the Commissioner.

(b) Payments of grants made under subsection (a) may be made by the Commissioner from time to time, in advance or by way of reimbursement, as he may determine.

GRANTS TO STATES FOR ADULT LITERACY PROGRAMS

Sec. 4. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, the sum of $5,000,000, and for each of the four succeeding fiscal years the sum of $10,000,000, for grants to States which have State plans approved by the Commissioner under this section.

(b) Grants under subsection (a) may be used, in accordance with regulations of the Commissioner, to—

(1) assist in establishment of pilot projects by local educational agencies, relating to instruction in public schools of adults described in section 2, to (A) demonstrate, test, or develop modifications, or adaptations in the light of local needs, of special materials or methods for instruction of such adults, (B) stimulate the development of local educational agency programs for instruction of such adults in the public schools, and (C) to acquire additional information concerning the materials or methods needed for an effective adult literacy program;

(2) assist in meeting the cost of local educational agency programs for instruction of such adults in the public schools; and

(3) assist in development or improvement of technical or supervisory services by the State educational agency relating to adult literacy programs.

(c) The Commissioner shall approve for purposes of this section the plan of a State which—

(1) provides for administration thereof by the State educational agency;

(2) provides that such agency will make such reports to the Commissioner, in such form and containing such information, as may reasonably be necessary to enable the Commissioner to perform his duties under this Act;

(3) provides such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the State under this section;

(4) provides for cooperative arrangements between the State educational agency and the State health authority looking toward provision of such health information and services for adults described in section 2 as may be available from such agencies and as may reasonably be necessary to enable them to benefit from the instruction provided under programs conducted pursuant to grants under this section; and

(5) sets forth a program for use, in accordance with subsection (b), of grants under this section which affords assurance of substantial progress, within a reasonable period and with respect to all segments of the population and all areas of the State, toward elimination of the inability of adults to read and write English and toward substantially raising the level of education of adults with less than a sixth grade education.

The Commissioner shall not finally disapprove any State plan submitted under this section, or any modification thereof, without first affording the State educational agency reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

(d) (1) From the sums appropriated under subsection (a) for a fiscal year the Commissioner shall reserve such amount, but not in excess of 1.6 per centum thereof, as he may determine to be necessary for allotment to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Canal Zone, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands, according to their respective needs; and shall allot the remainder of such sums on the basis of the relative number of adults described in section 2 in each State, as determined by the Commissioner on the basis of the best and most recent information available to him, including any relevant data furnished to him by the Department of Commerce.

(2) The amount of any State's allotment under paragraph (1) for a fiscal year which the Commissioner determines will not be required, for the period such allotment is available, for carrying out the State plan (if any) approved under this section shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates during such period as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under paragraph (1) for such year, but with such adjustments as may be necessary to prevent reallotment to any State of any sum in excess of the amount which the Commissioner estimates it needs and will be able to use for such period for carrying out such State's plan approved under subsection (c). Any amount reallotted to a State under this paragraph during a year shall be deemed part of this allotment under paragraph (1) for such year.

(e) The allotment of any State under subsection (d) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, shall, except to the extent reallotted under paragraph (2) thereof, remain available until June 30, 1964, for obligation by such State for carrying out its State plan approved under subsection (c).

(f) The Commissioner shall from time to time estimate the amount to be paid to a State for carrying out its State plan approved under subsection (c); and shall pay, from the allotment available therefor, the amount so estimated in such installments as he may determine, after making appropriate adjustments to take account of previously unadjusted overpayments or underpayments previously made.

(g) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State educational agency administering a State plan approved under subsection (c), finds that—

(1) the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of subsection (c), or

(2) in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision,

the Commissioner shall notify such State agency that no further payments will be made to the State under this section (or, in his discretion, further payments to the State will be limited to programs under or portions of the State plan not affected by such failure), until he is satisfied that there will no longer be any failure to comply. Until he is so satisfied, the Commissioner shall make no further payments to such State under this section (or shall limit payments to programs under or portions of the State plan not affected by such failure).

(h) A State educational agency dissatisfied with a final action of the Commissioner under subsection (c) or (g) may appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which the State is located, by filing a petition with such court within sixty days after such final action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Commissioner, or any officer designated by him for that purpose. The Commissioner thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code. Upon the filing of such petition, the court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part, temporarily or permanently.

The findings of the Commissioner as to the facts, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive, but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall file in the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence. The judgment of the court affirming or setting aside, in whole or in part, any action of the Commissioner shall be final, subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code.

FEDERAL CONTROL OF EDUCATION PROHIBITED

Sec. 5. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution or school system.

MISCELLANEOUS

Sec. 6. (a) The Commissioner may delegate to any officer or employee of the Office of Education any of his powers or duties under this Act.

(b) For purposes of this Act—

(1) the term "adult" means any individual who has attained the age of 18;

(2) the term "State" includes, except for purposes of section 4(d)(1), the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, the Canal Zone, and American Samoa;

(3) the term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of Education;

(4) the term "State educational agency" means the State board of education or other agency or officer primarily responsible for the State supervision of public elementary and secondary schools, or, if there is no such officer or agency, an officer or agency designated by the Governor or by State law;

(5) the term "local education agency" means a board of education or other legally constituted local school authority having administrative control and direction of public elementary or secondary schools in a city, county, township, school district, or political subdivision in a State.

(c) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall submit to the President, for transmission to the Congress, prior to January 1, 1967, the Commissioner's report on the administration of this Act, together with the Secretary's recommendations on the continuation of this Act and the extent to which it should be modified in order better to accomplish its purposes or otherwise raise the educational level of adults.

POLICIES OF THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an editorial critical of the senior Senator from Oregon. The editorial, which was published under the title "Rangerider Morse," appeared in the Oregonian for Wednesday, December 6.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Rangerider Morse

Senator Morse's explanation to the Associated Press of why he intervened in the administration of Oregon grazing lands by the Bureau of Land Management is not specific.

He said his action was justified by his investigation of eastern Oregon grazing problems (i.e., complaints of stockmen), and that BLM policies need to be reviewed by Congress.

Senator Morse's intervention was revealed by L. C. Binford, Portland conservationist, and criticized as political interference with the administration of public land laws in a resolution adopted by the Oregon division, Izaak Walton League of America. The following telegram sent to the Portland BLM office and relayed to field officials was signed by Karl Landstrom, BLM Director, an Oregon man who knows Oregon range problems:

"At request of Senator Morse, please temporarily suspend until January 1, 1962, any action in State of Oregon to reduce numbers livestock in licenses or permits under provisions of 43 CFR (F). Copy of letter to Senator Morse follows. No publicity need be given."

In other words, even though a public range is being overgrazed, the BLM is prevented from reducing livestock numbers because Senator Morse says so. Is the range to be protected by administration agencies, or is it to be administered by Senator Morse in an election campaign? One doubts that Karl Landstrom is a willing participant in this political game. Could the order have come from the Secretary of Interior, Mr. Udall, who knows and plays politics, he has said publicly, to the hilt?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record, as a part of my remarks immediately following the editorial to which I have referred, a letter to the editor of the Oregonian. The letter, which also is critical of the senior Senator from Oregon, was written by Mr. L. C. (Jack) Binford, executive board of directors, Izaak Walton League of America.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

More Grass for All

To the Editor:

Clippings from the Oregonian referring to my statement to the Izaak Walton League as to the management of BLM rangelands, have been forwarded to me in this land of "manana."

It would be easy to personalize the answer as my critics have done in letters to the editor, but such would not serve the cause of conservation.

There can be no controversy over the fact that each year Oregon's public domain grasslands have been producing less and less pounds of beef, lamb, and wool. It's a situation that must be corrected.

Members of the Izaak Walton League have been years in learning that scientific game management does a better job than the oldtimer. For proof, observe that getting big game harvested in sufficient numbers is a problem of the Oregon Game Commission.

We in IWLA are convinced that the scientifically trained rangeman can. If given a chance, rehabilitate the rangelands of Oregon. We have no thought of reducing the total use by livestock grazing, but rather that it be increased.

We invite the "permittees" of the public-owned rangelands to join with us in supporting scientific range rehabilitation and management to the end that there may be greater utilization by all users.

This writer has not learned of the condition of the rangelands by driving the roadways in a car or jeep, but by the slow, intimate study of weeks on horseback off the beaten trails.

L. C. (Jack) Binford.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I received a letter, under date of December 22, 1961, from a very distinguished lawyer in my State, Forrest E. Cooper, of Lakeview, Oreg. Throughout his many years of practice, Mr. Cooper has had much to do with range law, with our public lands, with the Taylor Grazing Act, and with our conservation problems. In fact, I consider Forrest Cooper, of Oregon, to be one of the best informed men in Oregon and in the entire country in regard to the many legal problems involved in the administration of the public lands; and, let me say, I also consider him to be a sound conservationist. He recognizes that a sound conservation program does not require a Bureau of Land Management policy which would result in bankrupting a large number of family-owned small cattle ranches in Oregon and in other States of the West. Mr. Cooper's letter to me reads as follows:

Lakeview, Oreg., *December 22, 1961.*

Hon. Wayne L. Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Wayne: I have enclosed herewith a copy of a letter I have mailed today to the editor of the Oregonian.

Sincerely yours,

Forrest E. Cooper.

Mr. President, let me state that Mr. Cooper is a very active Republican in my State. Would that he were a member of my party; but Mr. Cooper is a very active Republican. However, as all of us should do, he follows where the facts lead; and he recognizes that the editorial published in the Oregonian and the letter written by a Republican colleague of his, Mr. Binford, deserve to be answered, because they cannot withstand factual analysis.

So, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Cooper's letter of December 21, 1961, to the editor of the Oregonian be printed at this point in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Smith of Massachusetts in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The letter is as follows:

December 21, 1961.

Editor, the Oregonian,
Portland, Oreg.

Dear Sir: I am sorry you published your editorial of December 6, entitled "Rangerider Morse." You have put your prejudice toward the Senator to working against the best interests of our State.

It is usually an awkward move for a Member of the legislative branch to quickly obtain an administrative injunction lest an injustice be done or to correct a mistake. Over the past 35 years I have seen several Members of the Congress whom the editorial page of your newspaper has admired, blow the whistle on one bureau or another under like circumstances without a murmur of protest from your newspaper.

Senator Morse is one of the sponsors of a bill introduced early this year which would grant our BLM grazing licensees a judicial review right here in Oregon. I assume he wants to maintain the status quo of all existing licenses until the Congress can act one way or another on this measure, and since he has been out riding the range, as the title of your editorial indicates, I would assume that he also wants time in which to see if the current avalanche of range cuts can be substituted with a grass-growing program. I believe the Senator is on the right track and deserves the support of everyone in this endeavor.

If the man who owns the radio station across the street should receive a decision from the FCC which he believes to be erroneous, he can, like most other Federal licensees, obtain a Federal judicial review no farther away than Portland and possibly as near as Klamath Falls or Medford. But the BLM grazing licensee who finds himself in a similar situation has to seek his judicial review in the Federal court back in Washington, a remedy which is of no value because of the high cost thereof. Such a situation has created a constant temptation to give the citizen a rough time, especially if he is disliked, and to pass out favors to those who are liked.

Since 1934 the BLM has administered the public domain of eastern Oregon which constitutes 1 acre in 4 on this side of the Cascades. Each year it claims it is growing less forage than the year before and proceeds to use the ax on grazing permits in one or more areas. This downhill course is pure nonsense but your newspaper never complains.

The young men from this county go down to Oregon State where they are taught to raise most everything in the place of sagebrush. Some of their classmates gravitate into Federal service and spend the rest of their lives raising nothing but sagebrush. The time has come to call a halt. As for your buddy, Mr. Binford, he shouts with glee when range cuts are ordered because he believes the wildlife is somehow gaining an advantage. Lake County used to have many thousands of antelope and our game commission peddled permits to Californians and Oregonians at a dollar a permit with no limit on the number. Today we have small bands grazing on private pasture between Lakeview and Plush, plus three bands that graze the year around on the private land here in the Goose Lake Valley. If you Portlanders could drive them out onto the public domain and keep them there they could then be managed out of existence.

It would seem that when the BLM makes as high as a 45-percent allocation of the forage on a grazing allotment for wildlife that we license buyers ought to provide that percent of the cost of range rehabilitation. Freddie Freeloader shudders at the thought. In Florida and West Virginia the license buyer pays an extra State fee to hunt or fish on national forest acreage and this money is plowed back into the premises. Since Uncle Sam has such a reputation as manager of his rural real estate, east or west, it should be obvious that someone has got to put something in the pot before values can come out. At a recent range conference held here in Lakeview it was agreed by those present, including the BLM, that if the present trend is not reversed it will take more than 1,000 years to regrass the 12½ million acres of Taylor land in eastern Oregon.

Since the war, Oregon has climbed to fourth place amongst the 11 Western States in cattle numbers and the ever-growing California market continues to be most attractive. The BLM does not claim any credit for this growth. Further range cuts are planned for 1962. The increased carrying capacity of our private lands deserves the credit. If the public domain could carry its share of the wildlife and livestock, Oregon could slip into third place behind California and Montana. Lake often leads all of the counties in this State in the per capita payment of a State income tax. Increased State revenues from this section to build such much needed public improvements as an expanded Portland State College will have to depend upon what is done with the 4 acres out of 5 in this county that are owned by Uncle Sam.

Two years ago the writer attended an adjudication session where some permit holders of marginal size were cut close to 50 percent. Since the other half of the permit was valueless they asked for nonuse permits and a chance to match their money and labor with Uncle Sam in an effort to reclaim the Federal range. The request was denied. Secretary Udall has also been out riding the range. He is currently taking procedural steps that will require such applications to be granted. Since much of the success of our western reclamation projects has revolved around the energy, know-how, and capital of the man on the land, it may be that the current crisis may result in the enlistment of permittee cooperation to a degree not now in existence. Your newspaper leases its business premises. The present lease will still be in effect long after your press staff of 500 employees has retired. Contrast your lease with that of the grazing permittee who is kept on a year-to-year tenure. The rug can be jerked out from under him in whole or in part on short notice and often is.

The writer will make the flat statement that no citizen of Oregon can longer afford to have our public domain acres locked in the existing icebox whether his or her first love is wildlife or livestock. All such critters have to eat. It is encouraging to see, for the first time, men at the head of our Government go out and get the facts first hand. They need such facts in order to help us out of our present dilemma because the administrative rule book is written back in Washington.

Yours very truly,

Forrest E. Cooper.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, under date of January 10, I wrote to Mr. Cooper, as follows:

January 10, 1962.

Mr. Forrest E. Cooper,
Attorney at Law,
Lakeview, Oreg.

Dear Forrest: I want you to know that I am very grateful for the wonderful letter that you wrote to the Oregonian in defense of the position that I have taken in the controversy with the Bureau of Land Management.

I realized full well before I drew that issue that there would be those who would try to stir up the conservationists. Apparently they worked on the assumption that because there are more conservationists than there are cattlemen that I wouldn't come to the defense of the cattlemen. They couldn't be more wrong. I am convinced that once the conservationists come to know the history in this situation, they will realize that I have taken a fair and responsible course and many of them will rally to my support.

With best wishes to you and your wife for everything good in the new year.

Cordially,

Wayne Morse.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record another letter which I received from Mr. Cooper. In this letter he called my attention to the fact that the Oregonian simply did not print the letter he wrote in my defense to the editor of that newspaper. Of course, that is not a new experience for me, because very often I am subjected by the press, generally, in my State to the old journalistic technique known as the thunders of silence, when anything good about a liberal is involved. However, whenever it is at all possible to find anything that would reflect on a liberal—no matter how unfair or untruthful it may be—one may be sure the Oregonian will play it up under headlines in a prominent place in that newspaper.

So, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a letter Mr. Cooper wrote to me, in which he stated that the Oregonian had never seen fit to publish his letter in defense of me, in spite of the fact that Mr. Cooper is recognized in Oregon as one of the most outstanding and best qualified witnesses in regard to rangeland problems.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Lakeview, Oreg., *January 12, 1962.*

Hon. Wayne L. Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Wayne: A short time ago I sent you a copy of a letter that I mailed to the editor of the editorial page of the Morning Oregonian wherein I took issue with his editorial of December 6 wherein he attempted to criticize you and exalt his crony, Mr. Binford. The editorial criticized you because of your current interest in eastern Oregon Taylor grazing permits and the maintenance of their status quo.

The editor refused to print my letter. This is a frequent practice of his except where he thinks he has a snappy comeback. Since the gentleman is totally ignorant about eastern Oregon's range he could not make answer and therefore did the next best thing.

The editorial page of the Oregonian dated January 5 printed a letter from Mr. Binford who, according to the letter, is relaxing these winter months under a palm tree on the lower coast of Mexico. The letter creates the impression that Editor Lundy had forwarded to him several critical letters such as mine and Mr. Binford went on to answer one and all by saying he and his cohorts love everyone in eastern Oregon and he feels certain that if the BLM is left to its own thinking that it will muddle through somehow.

Sincerely yours,

Forrest E. Cooper,
Attorney at Law.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I could not have been more correct in my reference to my expectation in regard to what would be the position of the conservationists, once they came to understand the facts, for many a member of the Izaak Walton League and many a member of other conservation groups have written to me and have assured me that they do not share the point of view expressed by the Oregonian and by Mr. Binford.

I am informed that the issue of the national magazine of the Izaak Walton League which came off the press in recent days contains an article critical of me because of the position I have taken in regard to the exercise of capricious attitude by the Bureau of Land Management. I have not yet seen the article; but, Mr. President, I wish to state today, from the floor of the Senate, that I shall be very happy to have submitted to any meeting of the Izaak Walton League, anywhere in this country, at any time, the facts which will be developed at the hearings which we shall hold in regard of the Bureau of Land Management and its grazing permit policy. Although Mr. Binford is a lawyer, apparently he has temporarily overlooked or suffered a lapse of good legal recollection in regard to this fact—that our Government is a government of separation of powers and the Bureau of Land Management simply administers congressional power delegated to the Bureau of Land Management in respect to the public lands; but under our Constitution the authority over the public lands of the United States is vested in the Congress and in that sense the Bureau of Land Management is an agent of the Congress; and as the elected representatives of the people of the United States, it is the constitutional duty and trust of the Members of Congress to exercise whatever surveillance is necessary over any agency of the Congress whenever it resorts to the use of arbitrary power.

All that I am supposed to have done, the heinous crime that I am supposed to have committed, in the eyes of some conservationists—and they have labeled it "political interference"—is to ask that the Bureau of Land Management come forward and justify before the appropriate committee of the Senate the policies which the Bureau of Land Management has announced it is going to put into effect. These policies, I respectfully submit, will never be able to withstand public disclosure and analysis; and I shall be perfectly willing to assume the burden of proof in those hearings, in demonstrating that those policies must be changed in the interest of justice, in the interest of the landowners involved, in the interest of the economy of the communities involved, and in the interest of the best conservation policies for the public lands. These public lands do not belong to the Bureau of Land Management, they do not belong to the members of the Izaak Walton League—but they do belong to all the taxpayers of the United States, including all the members of the Izaak Walton League and including every other group within our citizenry.

Mr. President, I make this comment today because this is only the first of many speeches I shall make on this subject in the months immediately ahead, because I have investigated this matter enough to satisfy myself that this wrong has to be righted. I have been in the Senate enough years to know that a Senator does not right a wrong by making only one speech, and does not set in motion remedial procedures essential to righting a wrong by making only one speech. Instead, one must carry through; and I intend to carry through on this issue, because I am satisfied the facts are so overwhelmingly against the Bureau of Land Management in respect to this matter that they have got to be brought out, in speech after speech, case after case, rancher problem by rancher problem, until this Congress takes whatever steps may be necessary to right these wrongs. I am satisfied, as I have made clear to the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Udall, that the administrative power exists in the Department of the Interior to see to it that the injustices about which I shall complain specifically can be alleviated by administrative order and regulation.

But even if they are not, I serve notice on the Secretary of the Interior and the head of the Bureau of Land Management here today that I shall proceed with the introduction of whatever legislation is necessary in order to protect the taxpayers of this country from what I consider to be the inexcusable, arbitrary, capricious action of which the Bureau of Land Management is guilty in its announcement of certain range cuts.

Mr. President, I know of the handicaps of which I speak, because there has developed a sort of emotional setting in respect to the matter of conservation. If one raises any question as to any policy that is announced by the Bureau of Land Management, or, for that matter, by the Forest Service in the Department of Agriculture, the presumption is raised at once that the question is wrong and the Bureau is right.

Mr. President, those of us who have been engaged in the art of Government for many years know that one of the most important functions we have to perform each year in protecting the interests of the American people is to watchdog and check arbitrary, bureaucratic action by men who have never run for office; by men who very often show very little appreciation of the responsibilities that Members of Congress, under our democratic processes, owe to the voters of the country; by bureaucrats who sometimes seem to think that, because they are put in charge of some department of Government, they have been given unchecked power and jurisdiction over the subject matter of that department.

So this lesson of the check-and-balance system, the lesson of the responsibility that an administrative agency of the Congress owes the Congress, has to be retaught and reemphasized many times a year. I say, in regard to this problem, it needs to be retaught and reemphasized for the benefit of the Department of the Interior, and particularly for the Bureau of Land Management.

Let there be no doubt about it, I speak not alone on this subject here today, for, as this controversy develops, it will soon become clear that there are other Senators—many of them from Western States—who have come to me and made perfectly plain that they intend to stand shoulder to shoulder with me to see to it that there is full public disclosure of the policies of the Bureau of Land Management in respect to the administration of public lands falling within its jurisdiction. My complaint is also theirs, and my experience is also theirs. They, too, in their States, have had policy announcements by the Bureau of Land Management which is going to do great injustice in the administration of public lands in their States.

So these remarks are a forerunner of a detailed discussion of the whole matter of the administration of public lands. In this specific instance I deal with the matter of grazing cuts which the Bureau of Land Management has ordered in respect of some of the smaller ranches of my State and other States—cuts of 40 to 82 percent on little family cattle farms, where the total headage is 75 to 300 head of cattle. Mr. President, try to support a family on a ranch with 75 to 300 head of cattle. They receive their total economic income from those little ranches.

If one quarrels with that cut, an attempt will be made to put him in a position of being against rehabilitating the range. The record will also speak for itself on this subject, for there is not a man in this body in recent years who has fought harder for the rehabilitation of the western range than has the senior Senator from Oregon, with the assistance of such colleagues as the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the chairman of the Appropriations Committee [Mr. HAYDEN], the chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], my own colleague [Mrs. NEUBERGER] and my colleagues from Washington and California.

When disastrous fires have rampaged across the western plains and over our range lands, who is it that, on the floor of the Senate and before the committees, have asked for extraordinary and special appropriations of several millions of dollars for a quick rehabilitation of the burned-over areas? It has been such Senators, including the present speaker, to whom I have just referred, and others.

Those who oppose me on this issue will look in vain for a single instance in which the senior Senator from Oregon has not joined in any rehabilitation or appropriation program that seeks to develop the western range. And I shall continue to do so.

But the range has to be administered in the interest of rehabilitation, too. You know, Mr. President, one of the common myths is that if it is desired to rehabilitate the rangeland, one must merely stop grazing it. People who do not know anything about grasses and people who do not know anything about rangeland are likewise unaware of the fact that nonuse of the range will deteriorate it.

It is a matter of controlled, proven experiment, and that is why I have been heard to say to some of the men in the Interior Department, "You ought to go out to the Squaw Butte Experiment Station and spend a few days there and see what their own scientific findings will show you in regard to range experimentation."

I happen to be one who gets his facts before he speaks, who gets his facts before he draws an issue.

I have spent time at Squaw Butte. There is acreage there on which there has not been a single set of teeth clipping a blade of grass since 1936. Across the fence I have seen rangeland that has been scientifically grazed, wisely grazed; and there is no question about the fact that the range that has been grazed, and properly grazed, is preferable by far to the range that has not had a hoof or a set of teeth on it since 1936.

There are a lot of false assumptions which appear in our periodicals about our ranges. Of course, one of the great western myths is that in the country we are talking about, the sagebrush country, there was a time when for miles and miles the cowboys rode across those plains with the grass stirrup high. That is fiction. Those stories give the impression that was typical of grass by hundreds of square miles. It never was and never will be in the intermountain

States, no matter what kind of a range rehabilitation we follow. There are gullies. There are areas in which there is a closer water supply to the surface of the land, so that it is not semiarid, in which one may find some high grasses, but one finds them still while there is grazing.

Mr. President, in November and December I was on thousands and thousands of acres of rangeland in eastern Oregon where the cheat grass was higher than my knees. I suspect it is that kind of acreage the old novelists had in mind when they wrote their stories about the western range, although the interesting thing is that the Bureau of Land Management does not wish to give any credit for cheat grass. They think it is not any good. I good-naturedly said to them, "Why do you not get a cattleman or two on your staff?"

I was talking with one of the old weatherbeaten cattlemen of eastern Oregon, after he made an inspection tour of the rangeland in the area of his holdings. One of the Bureau of Land Management book experts, as this salty old rancher referred to him, said, "Well, cheat grass is not any good." The cattleman said, "Look at my cattle." I saw them, too. They were fat enough to go off the cheat grass into the stockyards.

He said, "If this cheat grass isn't any good, you know what I think I'll do? I think I'll round the cattle up and take them down to the stockpens, in which there is no grass at all, and finish them off, because, judging from your obvious lack of knowledge of cattle raising, you would, I suppose, conclude I could finish them off better in a barren stockyard than in cheat grass knee high."

The fact about cheat grass is that there are times when it is not reliable, depending upon weather conditions. That is why it is so necessary to reseed into Russian crested wheat, or other provable grasses of recent origin, the large acreages of the western public lands. I am all for it, and have been urging appropriations of money for it.

The chairman of the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee which deals with a good many of these items is in the Chamber. He knows whereof I speak. I refer to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. He knows the record the western Senators have made before him and other members of the Appropriations Committee in respect to the need for appropriations for rehabilitating areas of public lands which need rehabilitation with Russian crested wheat seed or other grasses.

Mr. President, there will always be thousands upon thousands, tens of thousands upon tens of thousands of acres of cheat grass, of bunch grass, and other so-called native grasses of the western range lands, because in many parts of that range land one cannot reseed effectively. The terrain is too rough. The gullies are too deep. Weather conditions are too problematical.

What we have to do is to protect the native grasses. We must protect the native grasses and go ahead with an orderly, scientific reseeding program.

I say most respectfully, the Department of Interior had better do first things first. Instead of saying to the small family-owned cattle ranches, "We are going to cut your permits," first they ought to take a look to see where they can put the cattle while they do the reseeding.

We must not forget the value of the base ranches dependent upon the availability of the public domain to the cattle which use the base ranch as their shelter quarters.

Let me give a hypothetical as to what I mean. Let us assume there is a base ranch of 2,000 acres of arid, semiarid, barren sagebrush land with a permit to graze some 300 head of cattle on the public domain adjoining or surrounding it, and that the permit is cut 82 percent, as I can show has been done in some instances by the Bureau of Land Management. What is the result, Mr. President? Not only is there a depleting of the herd of cattle, not only is there a denying to that rancher of a source of income, but also the base ranch is made unsalable. The man could not give it away. It loses value, because the value of the base ranch is related directly to the accessibility of public domain land on which he runs his cattle during those grazing months.

Something else results, Mr. President. I can take Senators into Jordan Valley, into Westfall, into Pendleton, into Athena, into any of the towns of the cattle country of my State—and this would be true of the towns of the cattle country of Nevada, of New Mexico, of Arizona, of Wyoming, and of all the other Western States, including Idaho and Washington.

Such action not only would do economic injury to that family rancher, but also would close the store fronts of store after store in the little western towns, for the economy of those towns is dependent upon the economy of the ranches.

Let us take the pertinent question. Is the Senator from Oregon taking the position that cattle ought to be kept on ranges in numbers which result in overgrazing the ranges? Let there be no doubt about what the record should show. The answer is an unequivocal "No."

To the contrary, if someone can show me that a range is in fact overgrazed, my answer is, "We must take the steps necessary to stop the overgrazing." If it ends up that the only step which can possibly be taken, after everything else has been tried, is to cut the grazing permits, then the senior Senator from Oregon will say, as he has said to the cattle meetings in the State of Oregon, "You have to take the cuts." But that is another one of the great myths. The American reading public has been fed a great deal of propaganda about the condition of the western range. The result is that many people who do not know anything about range grass problems jump to the conclusion that the ranchers must be overgrazing the range.

I shall not take the time today to go further into the subject, because the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] wishes to proceed with consideration of a conference report. But when we get on with the hearings, I am satisfied that the Bureau of Land Management will not be able to show the overgrazing that it claims would justify the cuts that it has ordered.

Let us move to the next premise. Let us assume that in some areas there has been some overgrazing and reseeding is necessary. Let it be perfectly clear that the senior Senator from Oregon wants us to proceed with that reseeding. But the Bureau of Land Management has a few preliminary steps that it ought to take for good rehabilitation of a range program.

PROPER PROCEDURE FOR BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

The first thing that the Bureau should do is to sit down with the ranchers to see what can be done to develop a program of transferring their cattle from their present grazing areas to other areas where there is a surplus of grass and in which areas it would be in the interest of sound range policy to put some cattle. The Bureau of Land Management has not yet done it, and the information given to me is that it has not even offered to do it and has not even been willing to sit down with the so-called range advisory committees, which have become pretty much nominal things, which never was intended when the Taylor Grazing Act was enacted.

These ranchers are perfectly willing to develop such a program with the Bureau of Land Management.

Before we get through with the hearings, we shall have shown the need for certain changes in some Forest Service policies, too, but to the everlasting credit of the Forest Service let me say that in many instances they have tried to work out some temporary exchange grazing land for ranchers until such time as a reseeding program could be established.

I very well remember Mr. and Mrs. Miller down in Jordan Valley. I stayed overnight at their ranch in November and inspected the ranch. They are a couple typical of the pioneering spirit of the West, a couple who have scratched out of that sagebrush area over the past 30 years a great monument to an agricultural free enterprise system in this country. All one need do is look at the hands of those two hardworking ranch people of my State, for Mrs. Miller has worked shoulder to shoulder with her husband over the 30-year period as they have developed their small cattle ranch of a little less than 300 head of cattle. They told me of their problem and of how last year they worked out with the Forest Service an exchange whereby they took their cattle 25 miles into a game refuge under the jurisdiction of the Forest Service in which there was a great surplus of grass, and kept their cattle there for the grazing season. But no such cooperation and accommodation came from the Bureau of Land Management.

So today I say from the floor of the Senate to the Bureau of Land Management that the Bureau has some first steps it should take. I wish to enumerate them.

FENCING SHOULD BE PROVIDED

First, there is the problem of fencing. Fencing should come before reseeding. Reseeding does no good unless livestock can be kept off the reseeded areas; and seeding a successful stand of Russian crested wheat grass takes from 3 to 5 years.

So when one of the family ranches is cut from 40 percent to 82 percent, they are put out of business, because the wherewithal has been taken away from them for a minimum of 3 years, and, depending upon weather conditions, frequently 5 years.

What needs to be done is to proceed first with a fencing program, so that the area to be reseeded can be fenced off, leaving other areas for grazing.

WATER SUPPLY NEEDED

The next thing ought to be to develop a water supply. A ranch is no good without a water supply. Tens of thousands of acres of reseeded land are worthless, so far as grazing use is concerned, unless water supplies are built in at distances where cattle can travel to and from the waterhole, and keep in a growing, fattening condition.

Almost uniformity of complaint comes from the western ranchers that in the administration of the public lands there is a failure on the part of the Bureau of Land Management to proceed with first things first.

SAGEBRUSH PROBLEM

Third, let me say to the Bureau of Land Management that getting rid of sagebrush is more important than reseeding, and the eradication of sagebrush puts Mother Nature in a position so that, with the sagebrush off the land, we are surprised to see what Mother Nature does. Again, I suggest to the Bureau of Land Management that representatives should go out to the Squaw Butte Experiment Station and see what happens to land on which sagebrush has been taken off, on which no reseeding is done and nature is permitted to go to work on a nonsagebrush area. The sagebrush can be taken off in three ways. The sagebrush can be taken off by controlled burning. In fact, I became pretty much an arsonist in my inspection of the rangeland in regard to controlled burning, because one of the most effective techniques is to burn off the sagebrush by controlled fire. It does not do irreparable damage. In fact, the scientific evidence is pretty clear that such burning is good for the land. One uses the kind of fire that can be controlled, which gets rid of the sagebrush, and he can return the following year and see the surprising growth of native grasses out of the bosom of nature herself.

Sagebrush can be controlled by spraying. The work that has been done with spraying is remarkable. I have urged here appropriations for spraying. Spraying is a successful technique. Through that method sagebrush could be eliminated upon tens of thousands of public land acres.

The last sagebrush control procedure I should mention today is insect control. Biological control of sagebrush is a remarkable thing. It is remarkable what scientists have developed with regard to an insect that attacks only sagebrush and nothing else. Quantities of such insects are transported to sagebrush areas, and the insects go to work. Within a year or two sagebrush so treated has died. That method does not require water. With such water that is available—and these are semiarid areas—the land becomes available to the native grasses.

Those things should be done before the Bureau starts cutting the permits.

I am satisfied that the evidence will show that there is no justification for the cutting of permits on the basis of land that is available for controlled grazing at the present time.

DECLINE IN RANGE USE

This is the argument today, and it is only an introduction to the arguments that will follow.

I wish to make comment on what has happened to the use of ranges by animals that graze. What is left in the State of Oregon from the standpoint of sheep population? I was told over and over again that there were only 4 bands of sheep left in all of eastern Oregon, where only a few years ago there were 20 to 50 bands of sheep.

Thousands upon thousands upon thousands of heads of sheep in my State alone have disappeared from the range because the sheep industry has practically collapsed economically in this country.

So there has been that great saving. But not a whisper from the Bureau of Land Management in regard to that saving in any analysis of its alleged justification for the permit cuts.

In one area in the last 5 years 6,000 wild horses have been eradicated from the area. That means the equivalent of fodder use of 12,000 head of cattle, because a horse eats twice as much range grass as a bovine "critter." That is only one range area in my State. I have seen a report that the total number of wild horses that have been eliminated from the range involve many thousands more than the 6,000 in this one allotment area.

It is a false assumption that the cattle population has increased. What has increased is the wildlife population.

I am all for the wildlife population. I say to conservationists and sportsmen that I do not yield to any of them in their desire to do what must be done to help develop an adequate supply of wildlife for the benefit of the conservationists and sportsmen of the country. It will have to be regulated intelligently and managed so far as our hunting policies are concerned. However, I also want to say to these sportsmen and wildlife enthusiasts, "What do you think would happen to the wildlife if it were not for the alfalfa fields and alfalfa haystacks of the cattle ranchers?"

I can take anyone into many areas of my State at certain times in the winter and show him from 200 to 700 or more deer in the alfalfa fields in the base properties, where they live off the ranchers. The ranchers must barricade their stacks. They cannot put up wire fences around the stacks, because a fence means nothing to a deer or elk. They must be boarded up, so that these animals cannot possibly get to them. That is done at great expense.

Therefore we have in this controversy over this issue little consideration given to the ranchers in respect to the great contribution that they are making in the development and the feeding and the preservation of the wildlife for the sportsmen of America.

This controversy can be amicably settled and fairly negotiated and worked out to the satisfaction of all concerned and to the protection of the public interest which is paramount and controlling so far as the senior Senator from Oregon is concerned, if the Department of the Interior, through its Bureau of Land Management, the Director thereof, and the Secretary of the Interior, have the desire to do it.

I close by saying: Mr. Secretary, it is up to you. However, so far as the senior Senator from Oregon is concerned, I intend to carry out my trust. I care not about the political threats and all the charges of political cost. I intend to see to it that justice is done, first, to the public lands of my State in the interest of future generations; second, I intend to see to it that justice is done to the small businessmen and ranchers of my State, who, if they are subjected to the present arbitrary, discretionary, and unjustified grazing cuts ordered by the Bureau of Land Management, will be done irreparable injury. I do not intend to let the Bureau of Land Management get by with it if I can stop it. I will not be alone, Mr. Secretary. I will not be alone, Mr. Director of the Bureau of Land Management. I already have the assurance of colleagues in the Senate that the hearings for which I have asked will be held and that they, too, will appear as witnesses in support of my position in regard to these policies of the Bureau of Land Management.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, first, I wish to commend the senior Senator from Oregon for the very able presentation he has made on a problem that confronts all of us in the western public-domain States. We in Nevada, likewise, have a problem very similar to the one the senior Senator from Oregon has so forcefully outlined. We have the problem of suggested cuts in allotments. We have the additional problem of a threatened increase in grazing fees at a time when, at least in my State, we are suffering the worst drought that we have had in the history of our State.

The problem the Senator from Oregon has outlined is one that runs throughout the western tier of States. I might say to my good friend the Senator from Oregon that as chairman of the Public Lands Subcommittee of the Committee on the Interior I intend to investigate the present policies of the Bureau of Land Management. I know that in the Senator from Oregon we will have a really strong right arm and an adversary to clear up some of the arbitrary abuses that exist today.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Nevada very much for this public statement. I am sure he will not object to my saying that he has given me the same assurances in our private conversations. As he knows, I raised this matter at the first Democratic conference. The majority leader is here. He was chairman of that meeting. I raised this matter at that conference. There was a consensus of opinion among many of our colleagues that I was right about it. I took the position that this is a Democratic administration. These policies are now being imposed by a Democratic administration. The fact that it is a carryover from a Republican administration does not make one whit bit of difference as far as my party's responsibility is concerned.

This is a Democratic Party responsibility so far as the administrative policy is concerned. I intend to do what I can, as a Democrat, to see to it that my party administratively supports a program which will protect the public interest, and which will see to it that the injustices that are about to be brought about by the Bureau of Land Management do not come to pass.

Mr. BIBLE. I thank the Senator. I certainly again assure him that so far as I am concerned, as chairman of the Public Lands Subcommittee, there will be full and ample hearings for exploring these abuses and this arbitrariness, particularly the interminable redtape that we have been trying to cut through in connection with some of these bureaucratic rulings.

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SALES TAX ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 258) to amend the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act to increase the rate of tax imposed on certain gross receipts, to amend the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Parking Facility Act of 1942 to transfer certain parking fees and other moneys to the highway fund, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of February 19, 1962.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HRUSKA in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the conference report now before the Senate for consideration is one on which the conferees on the part of the Senate—and I am sure it is equally true of the conferees on the part of the House—have labored long, hard, and diligently. I feel that we have finally produced an end product which can be accepted by the Senate and the House of Representatives.

It is a piece of revenue legislation which, in the very nature of a tax bill, is never popular. It is the first tax increase which has been voted for the District of Columbia since 1956—almost 6 years ago.

In view of the rising costs of the District government, of the new services which are required, and, I may say, particularly the pay increases which have been voted to follow the Federal pattern, the problem of raising revenue for the District of Columbia has become increasingly difficult.

I pay particular tribute to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Fiscal Affairs of the Committee on the District of Columbia, the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SMITH], for his diligence and the long hours of hard work he has spent on the bill. Likewise, I compliment the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Fiscal Affairs and the ranking minority member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, as well, for his participation. Also, I desire to compliment the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who has labored so long in the vineyard for the principles in which he believes so firmly and positively, and who headed the Senate conferees at the close of the last session of Congress, when it was impossible to come to a final agreement. The Senator from Oregon has been most helpful in attempting to solve this troublesome problem.

The conference report which is now before the Senate will provide an anticipated $2,085,000 in new revenue from now until the end of June, which is the end of the present fiscal year. It will raise $13,925,000 for the fiscal year 1963, and $11,925,000 for subsequent years. The difference of $2 million is contained in title 2, which eliminates the installment payments of the corporate and noncorporate franchise taxes. The bill will provide the District in fiscal year 1963 with an additional $2 million, but it is a nonrecurring item. So this item of the bill, other than for the fiscal year 1963, will result in revenue of $11,925,000.

Briefly, the bill will accomplish the following:

It will increase the general sales tax from 2 to 3 percent. This increase will raise in the neighborhood of $1,585,000 for the rest of this fiscal year, the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and $9 million for subsequent fiscal years.

Title II is a nonrecurring item relating to the elimination of installment payments of the corporate and nonincorporated income and franchise taxes.

Title III establishes for the first time a real estate deed recordation tax in the amount of one-half of 1 percent. It is estimated that the revenue to be received by title III will amount to $250,000 for the present fiscal year, the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and will produce in later full fiscal years in the neighborhood of $1,500,000 annually.

Under title IV, the increases in the tax on alcohol and spirits from $1.25 to $1.50 per gallon will, it is anticipated, produce $200,000 additional revenue for the remainder of this fiscal year and $1,100,000 in subsequent full fiscal years.

Title V permits the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to increase water and sewer charges by 25 percent. This could raise $4,300,000, but this item is not reflected in the general fund, because it is an earmarked tax, and the revenue is used for the maintenance and operation of the water and sewer system. This item simply is permissive authority for the District Commissioners to make this increase as the needs of the water and sewer system require it.

Title VI amends the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Parking Facility Act by establishing a motor vehicle parking fund to permit the use of motor vehicle parking meter receipts to help to maintain the streets and highways of the District of Columbia. In addition, it preserves the purposes of the Motor Vehicle Parking Agency by allowing that Agency, within congressional appropriation, to continue to function in acquiring and constructing public parking facilities.

I overlooked mentioning that under title I of the bill there will be an increase in the transient lodging tax from 3 to 4 percent. This will provide an additional $50,000 for the remainder of the present fiscal year and $325,000 annually for subsequent fiscal years.

Mr. President, the conference report is the result of extensive hard work. All of the items which the Senate sought were not completely agreed upon in conference. Nevertheless, we believe the report represents a fair solution of the revenue problems of the District of Columbia. Therefore, I recommend and urge the Senate to adopt the report.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I wish to join the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia in congratulating the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SMITH], chairman of the Subcommittee on Fiscal Affairs, for the splendid work which he did on the bill. Also, I desire to compliment the chairman of the committee, Senator BIBLE, and the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who have always worked so zealously on the committee on behalf of the citizens of the District of Columbia.

In this conference we sought to reach an agreement among the Members of both bodies.

The Senate did not get all it wanted, all we hoped to get; but I believe we secured an increase over the amount in the House bill of almost $5 million. I ask the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts if that is not correct.

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. That is correct.

Mr. BEALL. We would have liked to see some of the other features of the bill maintained; but in order to accomplish the most important thing; namely, to provide a tax bill for the District of Columbia, it was necessary for the Senate conferees to yield on some of the items in the bill which the Senate had passed. Therefore, this conference report which is before us today represents a reasonable compromise. It is not a total answer to the financial needs of the District of Columbia, but it does represent substantial progress.

The record clearly shows that every effort was made by the Senate and its conferees to provide the $20 million required to prevent a deficit operation by the District government. On two occasions, during the closing days of the first session of this Congress, the Senate conferees remained firm on proposals which would have provided additional funds for the operation of District schools. On both of these occasions the conference report was not approved by the House largely because of the impacted areas amendment.

Yes, I think it is abundantly clear that the Senate and Senate conferees have tried to meet the District's needs and that they have done a fine job in providing $14 million for fiscal 1963 and over $2 million for the remainder of fiscal 1962.

So I feel that while we did not secure everything which the Senate wanted, everything the Senate instructed its conferees to obtain, nevertheless the chairman of the Subcommittee on Fiscal Affairs performed in an outstanding manner in securing the conference agreement which is before the Senate today. I am happy to join with the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] in congratulating the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts upon his splendid work.

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Maryland and the distinguished Senator from Nevada for their very kind remarks. It has been a pleasure to work with them in conference.

In my capacity as chairman of the Subcommittee on Fiscal Affairs of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I believe this revenue bill will benefit the District of Columbia greatly without imposing unfair burdens on the residents of the District. I believe that the committee has acted wisely and well, in the interest of having additional tax moneys come in.

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will adopt this conference report, and thereby help end the 3-year stalemate in connection with this local tax problem in the Nation's Capital.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is with sadness that I speak this afternoon in opposition to the conference report which is being presented by my very good friend, the most able chairman of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, the very hardworking and conscientious Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE]. I know how long he has worked on this vital revenue bill for the District of Columbia; and I want him to know that I sympathize deeply with him because of the difficulties he has faced in his efforts to perfect a bill dealing with this always troublesome area of fiscal aid for the Capital of the Nation. I also want him to know that although I am constrained by conscience to oppose many of the provisions of the conference report, there is no reflection on his efforts or on those of the other Senate members of the conference committee. I want to commend very highly not only the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], but also the chairman of the subcommittee, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SMITH], who had the responsibility of doing so much in connection with this proposed legislation in a difficult conference.

I also wish to commend a very close personal friend of mine for many years here in the Senate, with whom I have worked on the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia for more years than I wish to take the time to count up now. I refer to the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL]. I know the problems which confronted those three Senators as they sought to work out with a very adamant and difficult House group a conference report on the fiscal problems of the District of Columbia.

I say most respectfully, and the RECORD should show it, that the responsibility for this report's being as unsatisfactory as I think it is, in many of its parts, rests squarely upon the House of Representatives Committee on the District of Columbia. In fact, I wish to say that I am very much disturbed about the attitude taken by some Members of the House of Representatives Committee on the District of Columbia in respect to many District of Columbia problems.

I never pass judgment on the motivations of people, but I cannot ignore the consequences of their policies.

I have served on the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia for many years, as the present Presiding Officer of the Senate knows, I was "kicked" onto it, and I refuse to be "kicked" off of it. I serve there now at my own request, because as an old teacher of municipal law, it has been a great education to me to note the marked difference between municipal law as it is on the statute books and municipal law as it is practiced.

In fact, as I once said to some of my former students, at a bar association meeting in my State, "If, as, and when I return to the practice of law among you, I shall do two things immediately: First, send each of you an apology for the courses on municipal law I taught you; and, second, try to give you a refresher course in regard to how municipal law is practiced in the Congress."

Mr. President, although of course, I said that somewhat facetiously, yet there is a considerable amount of truth in what I say in regard to this matter this afternoon, because we have been confronted with a fixed, adamant attitude in regard to the District of Columbia's problems by a number of the Members of the House of Representatives who serve on the Committee on the District of Columbia. The attitude is unyielding to the extent, that in my view, we have been stymied from taking the legislative course that the citizens of the District of Columbia are entitled to receive from Congress. In the course of my remarks, I hope to bring out the above mentioned fact, which I state now only as a general allegation.

Mr. President, as I speak at this very moment, here on the floor of the Senate, hundreds of little boys and girls in the District of Columbia are being sent to school in buildings which, in my judgment, are not safe enough to be used as school buildings. In my opinion, we are justified in calling them firetraps. Yet when we try to get from the Congress a fair, equitable, and just appropriation, by means of an increase in the Federal payment to the District of Columbia, in keeping with what the Congress intended when it set up the District of Columbia in its present form, we are met, on the House side, by the "price-tag boys," who, in respect to our school problem, apparently are perfectly willing to put paltry dollars above the safety of the schoolchildren. I have often protested that attitude before. To do so did not win me any popularity contest in the House; but I have not received any successful answers from those House Members. In fact, Mr. President, I wish to say that the adamant position which has been taken in the House of Representatives concerning appropriations for the District of Columbia simply cannot be justified from the standpoint of the facts or from the standpoint of the history of the United States, either, for all one has to do is consider the situation which existed at the time when the District of Columbia was reorganized. At that time the Congress contemplated a 50-percent contribution by the Federal Government to the support of the District of Columbia. That was not too much, and it would not be too much now. But it is a far cry from the contribution presently being made, which for a long time has been approximately 11 percent, has it not?

Mr. BIBLE. That is approximately correct—between 11 and 12 percent.

Mr. MORSE. Congress is now contributing to the support of the Capital City of the Nation only some 11 or 12 percent. Mr. President, we have been trying to get Congress to contribute $32 million annually, but we are in trouble over that year after year. The other evening I said, in a speech delivered here in the District of Columbia—and I repeat the statement now—that the Congress should be contributing a minimum of $40 million to the support of the District of Columbia. Of course some of that would be used for schools; of course some of it would be used to keep faith with the spiritual obligation which all of us have, as free men and women, in connection with implementation of the teaching that we are our brother's keeper. Mr. President, if anyone thinks there is not a great need to implement to a greater degree that spiritual teaching, let him accompany me at any time in a visit to a number of parts of the District of Columbia. It is the Capital of the Nation, and supposedly the capital of the free world but there are areas in this Capital which are a disgrace to the American people. There are areas where one finds human suffering, misery, deprivation, areas which contain sick children who are suffering from malnutrition, and shocking areas blighted with social, economic, and health conditions for hundreds of our fellow citizens here in the District of Columbia.

Yet we in the Congress sit here encloaked with all of our power and refuse, year after year, to appropriate a fair allotment for the people of the District of Columbia.

More than that, Mr. President, there are no votes for us here in the District of Columbia, and the politicians know it very well. I hope I shall not be charged with being unkind or being just a cantankerous fellow when I express publicly my suspicion that if there were some votes here, the legislative action of the Congress toward the District of Columbia might be quite different, politicians being what they are.

The great Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] and I, and others of our colleagues, have fought on the floor of the Senate for some years for first-class citizenship rights for all the citizens of the District of Columbia, white and black. We have put through the Senate now, four or five times, I think——

Mr. BIBLE. Five times.

Mr. MORSE. Either the Neely-Morse home rule bill, or the Morse home rule bill, the Clark bill, or the Bible-Morse home rule bill, which would give to the people of the District of Columbia what I say is their constitutional due.

I cannot reconcile a denial of the right of self-government to the people of the District of Columbia with what we prate around the world as our great defense of our constitutional system based upon the right of self-government. The right of self-government does not exist for tens of thousands upon tens of thousands of people in the District of Columbia, and it is a blot on the history of the country.

(At this point Senator MORSE yielded to Senator STENNIS and other Senators who addressed the Senate on another subject.)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. MORSE. My recollection is—although it was some hours ago that it happened—I was making the point, when I yielded to other Senators, that the fact that the people of the District of Columbia do not enjoy first-class citizenship, which they can only enjoy if they have the precious right of self-government in this country, is due controllingly to the fact that the House of Representatives has adamantly blocked one home rule bill after another after it was passed in the Senate.

We must take a look at the personnel of the House District of Columbia Committee. There is a great adamancy there on the part of some members of the committee on the home rule question.

I was making the point also that if we could get an adequate appropriation, which the District of Columbia has due to it from the Congress, if we are going to continue to insist upon our function of being the aldermen of the District of Columbia—and that is what Congress is—we ought to appropriate an adequate amount of money so that the District of Columbia, the Capital City of the Nation, can be a source of pride to this country rather than to continue to be a source of great shame in regard to many of its inadequacies.

An adequate appropriation is needed, and I believe the minimum should be $40 million. That much money is needed so that we can continue with the construction of various public works programs, with the modernization of our schools, and to finance the health program, and the welfare programs, which are being grossly neglected in this Capital City. We need at least $40 million for those purposes, to say nothing of costs involved in the speedup of the urban renewal program. One of the reasons for our difficulty in obtaining an adequate Federal payment for the District, I repeat, is that we have not been able to convince our brethren in the other House that they ought to change their outlook about the District of Columbia.

So I rise, not in any way even indirectly to seem to criticize our colleagues on the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia for the fact that they have brought forward a conference report this afternoon which I, in good conscience, cannot possibly vote for, for the reasons that I shall set forth shortly.

There is one other problem in the District of Columbia that I wish to mention at this point. As a lawyer, as one who has worked for years in the field of criminal law administration in this country, I think it is just too bad that we have a juvenile court situation in the District such as we have. We have but one juvenile judge, who has a backlog of hundreds of cases which, as is well known throughout the District of Columbia, he cannot possibly get action upon for months and months. I need not tell the Senate that certainty of justice is one of the best deterrents in the administration of criminal law. These juvenile cases will be so long delayed that by the time the judge gets to them much of the evidence will have gone. The witnesses will have disappeared. Of course, the effectiveness of the juvenile law will have been dissipated.

What have we been trying to do? The chairman of the committee, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], has struggled, to my knowledge, for the past 2 years in an effort to work out a compromise in the House of Representatives. He has tried to make it possible for us to increase the juvenile court by two judges. We ought, I feel, to increase it so that it is a court with a minimum of five judges, to do the job which needs to be done.

I am very much disturbed about the oft-repeated reason, which is frequently publicly announced as to why, perhaps, we are having trouble in this field, that it might result in a very able colored lawyer being appointed to the juvenile court bench. Why not? After all, the juvenile problem in the District of Columbia involves a great many colored juveniles. There ought to be some colored juvenile judges engaged in the administration of justice, in order to carry out a system of government by law. We ought to be shocked if there is the slightest basis in fact for the claim made by some, that a part of our difficulty in juvenile court reform in the District of Columbia is due to the fact that enactment of the Senate bill might end up with the selection of an able colored lawyer for elevation to the bench. Selection of judges should be based on merit, not color nor any other nongermane factor.

I simply say, with a fervent plea on my lips, Mr. President: Let us find some way to break this deadlock. I would much rather keep our court on a juvenile court organizational basis. As the Senator from Nevada knows, every law enforcement organization in this country—so far as I know, without exception—which has ever been asked to pass a value judgment on the juvenile court problem in the District of Columbia, has recommended that the number of juvenile court judges be increased, and has recommended also, that the organizational arrangement to be kept in the form of a juvenile court system instead of being merged into the municipal court system.

As I have told the Senator from Nevada, every possible means should be considered to provide this much needed service. It will be for the benefit of the poor, unfortunate juveniles, who for some reason, because of some quirk, because of some inherent defect, because of some environmental conditioning, because of some blood chemistry—who knows what the causal factors are in producing a juvenile delinquent?—and it will benefit the community. By so doing, we shall be affording needed protection to many innocent persons who may be victimized by juvenile delinquents in the next hour, or tonight, or tomorrow, or next month, or the year ahead. If this entails a compromise with the House concerning some municipal court reorganization plan and the giving of some jurisdiction to some department over the juvenile court, I favor getting on with that business, too.

I will help my chairman. He knows I do not like this situation. He knows I would like to see juveniles dealt with within the framework of a court organizational setup which, so far as I know, all the experts recommend. But he and I, as lawyers, are realists. We know that, encumbered as it might make the municipal court, if we could get additional judges in some department of the municipal court, or if it could be understood that there would be some new division of work in the municipal court, whereby that court could take jurisdiction of some of the juvenile delinquency cases, I am openminded as to that. I will work toward achieving a compromise. I wish such a compromise could have been reached in this conference report. But on this subject, the Senator from Nevada and I can work together to reach a compromise.

In the conference report on revenue, however, through no fault of his, he has lost me, so far as voting for the report this afternoon is concerned. Nevertheless, as I said the other night, it is necessary to have some solution of the revenue problem of the District of Columbia; and at an appropriate time new legislation will be introduced at this session of Congress which will seek to do greater financial justice to the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, I feel it is my duty to point out as strongly as I can my disappointment that the conference committee has been unable to accept as part of the revenue bill a proposal which is justified by every criterion of equity. I refer to the failure to include within the purview of Public Law 874 one of the most federally impacted areas in these United States—Washington, D.C.

Mr. President, let me review the operation of Public Law 874.

Fiscal year 1961 marked the beginning of the second decade of operation of Public Law 874 which authorizes financial assistance to local educational agencies in federally affected areas for current operating expenses.

MAJOR PROGRAM TRENDS

For the 11th consecutive year the number of school districts and the total amount of their entitlement increased. Applications for Federal financial assistance for current school operating expenditures under this act were filed by 4,080 local educational agencies in 50 States, Guam, and the Virgin Islands in the 1961 fiscal year. It is all right for Guam and the Virgin Islands, which are under Federal jurisdiction, as is the District of Columbia; but it is all wrong for the District of Columbia, according to the House.

Of 4,080 local educational agencies in 50 States, plus Guam and the Virgin Islands, 3,965 were determined to be eligible for a total net entitlement of $203 million. The number of applicants in 1960 was 3,794 and their net entitlement was $177,556,580.

The 1961 fiscal year entitlement was based on an average daily attendance of 1,621,560 federally connected children, which constituted approximately 15 percent of the total average daily attendance in the eligible school districts.

Mr. President, keep the 15-percent figure in mind, because it is very relevant to an argument I shall make shortly.

Under the provisions of the act the Federal payments received by eligible applicant districts become a part of the funds available for current operating expenses for all pupils in these school districts. Thus, these payments helped to meet the cost of educational services for almost 11 million pupils, or about one-third of all the Nation's children in attendance at public elementary and secondary schools in the 1960–61 school year. As in prior years, the Federal payments to eligible school districts continued during the 1961 fiscal year to approximate 5 percent of the total current operating expense budgets of the eligible districts, although in a number of individual cases the Federal funds constituted from 25 to 75 percent of the current operating expense budgets. A total of $11.5 million was required during the year under the authorization of Public Law 874 for financing the operating costs of schools for some 34,235 dependent children of military and civilian personnel residing on 61 Federal intallations in the United States, Puerto Rico, and Wake Island. Most of these federally operated school programs were for children living on military installations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that certain tables relating to Public Law 874 be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish further to document my statement by asking unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks a memorandum dated February 1, 1962, addressed to the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia by Mr. Schuyler Lowe, Director of Administration, entitled "Estimate of Federal impact assistance that would be available to the District of Columbia if the act is amended to cover the District of Columbia."

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL ADMINISTRATION,

February 1, 1962.

Memorandum to the Board of Commissioners.

Subject: Estimate of Federal impact assistance that would be available to the District of Columbia if the act is amended to cover the District of Columbia.

A carefully designed sample survey of District of Columbia schoolchildren was carried out in order to have a reasonably reliable estimate of the number of pupils who would be eligible under the act if amended to cover the District of Columbia. A very brief description of the technical aspects of the survey design is included as an attachment.

The preliminary results of this survey show that approximately 30 percent of all District of Columbia pupils would be eligible under the present act. This estimate does not include any pupils who have a parent or guardian working on District of Columbia-owned property or on Federal property containing District of Columbia Government activities. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has not ruled on which of these District of Columbia properties would be eligible under the act. Since most District of Columbia activities serve a primarily local benefit or service and hence would be ineligible, we presume that an HEW ruling would probably add only about 1 percentage point or so to the above estimate.

The following table shows the calculated funds that would have been available for fiscal year 1962 if the District were included in the Federal impact area program. The present calculation is based on a special survey and the latest additional information from the Board of Education, and is compared with figures given to Senator MORSE by HEW several months ago.

	Present calculations for 1962	Earlier information submitted by HEW to Senator MORSE for 1962
1. Estimated average daily attendance	115,500	113,500
2. Average cost per pupil in average daily attendance in 2d preceding year (fiscal 1960)	$417.53	$416
3. Per pupil Federal grant for type B cases (for simplicity, all cases are considered type B; the number of type A cases is negligible)	$104.38	$104
4. Estimated proportion of eligible pupils (percent)	30	42
5. Estimated number of eligible pupils (line 4 × line 1)	34,650	47,670
6. Estimated Federal grant for eligible pupils (line 5 × line 3)	$3,616,767	$4,957,680

Not all of the funds could have been actually available in the current fiscal year. Anywhere from 1 to 25 percent of the funds, under present HEW procedures, applicable to the present fiscal year, would be actually paid in the next fiscal year.

If the survey results and methods are applied to 1963, the estimated amount of Federal funds comparable to the $3,616,767 in the above table would be $4,031,756. This increase is attributable to the estimated increase in enrollment.

SCHUYLER LOWE,
Director of General Administration.

ATTACHMENT A: BRIEF SUMMARY OF SURVEY DESIGN

A. STRATIFICATION

1. Depressed and nondepressed areas: The schools were divided into two general groups—those which tended to be in or near economically depressed areas, and all the rest. The first group contained about a third of all pupils, but the sample was equally divided between the two groups.

2. Grades: Each grade was sampled separately.

3. Other stratification: The following categories were also sampled separately—each vocational high school; the special education classes; certain other high schools.

B. CLUSTERING

1. Schools: Within a stratum each school was considered a cluster. A sample of schools was drawn.

2. Classes: Within each selected school every class in the appropriate grade was considered a cluster. A sample of classes was drawn.

C. SAMPLING

Within each stratum, the sample schools were selected by use of a random number table. All schools had the same chance of entering the sample. However, in general once a school was selected for a grade, it was not allowed into the sample for a different grade. Thus for the most part one grade only was sampled in each selected school. Within the sample school, all classes within that grade had the same chance of entering the sample. One class was selected by use of a random number table. All pupils in this class received the questionnaire. A systematic random subsample of two-thirds of the returned questionnaires in each class constituted the final sample that was actually edited and coded. The final coded sample consisted of 1,937 questionnaires in 99 classes in 89 schools.

D. ESTIMATES

1. The sample data were first inflated to an estimate for the selected classroom in such a way that the inflated totals equaled the true number of pupils in that class.

2. The classroom estimates were then successively inflated in an unbiased manner to the selected school, then to all schools in the stratum. The strata estimates were then added together.

3. The global estimates were then adjusted so that their total was equal to the true total number of pupils in the entire school system (except for those in schools outside the universe of the survey).

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the memorandum shows clearly that, excluding all children of District employees, there is still a Federal impaction—by which I mean children of parents who live or work on Federal property—of 30 percent. That is to say, 30 percent of the children who go to school in the District of Columbia are clearly federally impacted children within the meaning of Public Law 874. Yet those Members of the House of Representatives—as will be shown in a moment—after turning down the Senate's proposal, which the Senate passed twice, continue to claim that this should not be a federally impacted area within the meaning of Public Law 874. Thirty out of one hundred children in the District schools are children of parents who live or who work on federally owned property. There are some 34,650 of these boys and girls in the school population of 115,500 pupils in the elementary and secondary schools of Washington, D.C.

Mr. President, as shown in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 107, part 16, pages 21427-21435, certain Members of the House of Representatives in colloquy upon the floor of the House had unkind words to say of the proposal of the senior Senator from Oregon to make the District of Columbia eligible for Public Law 874 benefits. I think it is quite appropriate at this time to give scrutiny to the benefits received by the congressional districts these gentlemen represent. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks, a compilation and covering memorandum—prepared at my request by the Office of Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—which sets forth for each congressional district represented by the gentlemen who participated in that colloquy of September 22 and September 26, 1961, the Federal money received in their home districts in 1960 and 1961 under Public Law 874.

There being no objection, the memorandum and table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 8, 1962.

To: Senator MORSE.
From: B. Alden Lillywhite, Associate Director for Federally Affected Areas, Office of Education.
Subject: Entitlements under Public Law 874 for selected congressional districts.

In accordance with your telephone request this morning there is enclosed a tabulation showing the amount of Federal entitlement under Public Law 874 for the 1960 and 1961 fiscal years to school districts in 12 congressional districts for which you requested the data. The tabulation also shows by congressional district the percent that the federally connected children counted for Federal entitlement are of total public schoolchildren in the districts eligible for assistance. The pupil data are in terms of average daily attendance.

Data for the 1960 fiscal year were taken from the tabulation prepared last year for all congressional districts in the Nation. Data for the 1961 fiscal year are taken from tabulations used for preparation of the 11th annual report on the administration of Public Laws 815 and 874. These tabulations show the status of Federal entitlement and federally connected children as of September 1, 1961. Entitlement and number of federally connected children for some of the school districts are estimates and may change slightly when all field survey reports have been received and the project processed for final payment.

Federal entitlements under Public Law 874 for specified congressional districts for fiscal years 1960 and 1961 and the percentage federally connected children are of total children in the eligible districts in 1961

Congressional district	State	Federal entitlement		Number of districts eligible for assistance [1]	Number of federally connected children [1]	Total children in eligible districts [1]	Percent federally connected [1]
		1960	1961 [1]				
26th	California						
7th	Florida						
9th	Indiana	$53,439	$98,825	25	1,000	16,723	6.0
6th	Maryland	2,697,202	2,925,044	4	30,926	121,547	25.4
4th	Michigan						
5th	do						
2d	Nebraska	910,362	1,401,511	15	6,806	63,571	10.7
1st	North Carolina	118,136	118,647	8	1,331	16,112	8.3
6th	South Carolina	113,036	137,190	1	1,078	16,547	6.5
4th	Virginia	437,882	510,145	7	4,890	32,055	15.3
10th	do	5,458,698	5,903,743	4	47,831	95,410	50.1
15th	Illinois	234,908	310,991	18	1,231	19,052	6.5

[1] Data are for 1961 and show the status as of Sept. 1, 1961.

NOTE.—All pupil data are in terms of average daily attendance.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is very interesting to note what politicians are prone to say when there is any possibility that funds for impacted-area schools in their own districts will be touched. How well we know what they say under those circumstances. How well we know the very interesting debate which occurred in the Senate and in the House, last year, when it was suggested that those funds might be extended for only 1 year—as recommended by the President—instead of 2 years. Why, Mr. President, I thought the eagle in the ceiling of this Chamber would actually fly away under that oratorical bombardment. Members were so eager to defend the interests of their constituents. Mr. President, you and I know what happened: Those Members were being deluged by scores and scores of telegrams and telephone calls and letters from the folks back home, who were saying, "Get us the money." And a lot of those Members did not want to go home without that "bacon."

Those protests were being received from voters, and those Members were interested in getting the money for the benefit of their voting districts. What a difference one observes, when reading the colloquy which occurred in the House, between their attitude when voters are involved and their attitude when a voteless population is involved. The poor taxpayers of the District of Columbia cannot vote against them. I wish they could. If they could, I am satisfied that a little better protection for the taxpayers of the District of Columbia and its boys and girls would be obtained from the politicians in Congress. I do not use disparagingly the word "politician." I think politics is a great profession. But some live up to its responsibilities better than others.

In this particular case, I say for some time past the Congress has not lived up too well to its responsibilities to these voteless people—not as well as the Members of Congress have lived up to their responsibilities to the voters back home. Certainly that was a very interesting colloquy.

Mr. President, I think the chart which I have now placed in the RECORD is most interesting in one respect. The percentage of Federal impaction which results in payment to the school districts in almost every case, with but one exception, is less than the impact percentage of federally connected children in the District of Columbia. In other words, of all those Members of the House who, within the rules of the House, just as I am proceeding this afternoon within the Senate rules, paid their disrespects to me because I suggested that we should give protection to the taxpayers of the District of Columbia by recognizing the undeniable fact that this is a federally impacted area, to the extent of 30 percent of the schoolchildren, all but one of them come from districts in which the percentage of impact is less than the 30 percent impact in the District of Columbia. In other words, the situation in the District of Columbia is much, much more serious than the situation in their home districts. Yet, as my friend, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] knows, they were able to wield enough power and influence to prevent our reaching agreement in conference, last fall; and we ended up with no conference report.

I wish to say, to the credit of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SMITH], that they never have wavered on this. They have stood foursquare on it. In fact, when I finish my remarks this afternoon, I shall introduce—once again—a bill giving the Congress an opportunity to carry out a clear obligation, namely, a bill which proposes to bring the District of Columbia under Public Law 874.

I shall always be appreciative of the fact that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] came to me, when he heard I was going to introduce this bill, and volunteered to join in sponsoring it. Of course I told him that it would be a great honor and privilege to have him join me in sponsoring it this afternoon. The bill will be introduced, before I finish these remarks, with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the chairman of the committee, as a cosponsor of the bill on this subject. I want him to know and I also want the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SMITH] to know that I understand and realize the position in which they found themselves in conference. An emergency fiscal problem confronts us in this case. The Senate conferees felt that the best thing they could do under the circumstances was to yield in this instance; and they yielded. I am not critical of them, and I want them to know that. I am sorry they were in a position in which it became necessary for them to yield. All I wish to do this afternoon is fix the responsibility for that situation. The responsibility has to be fixed, I believe, on what is an unfortunate attitude on the part of too many Members of the House of Representatives in regard to doing justice to the District of Columbia.

In my judgment, the threadbare and moth-eaten arguments advanced against including the District of Columbia under Public Law 874 are without merit. It was alleged in the House of Representatives that the Federal payment to the District of Columbia includes sufficient funds to more than offset a Federal payment for our schoolchildren. Yet, what is the actual situation? Some 3 or 4 years ago, testimony before the Senate District of Columbia Committee showed the need for replacing dangerous and obsolete structures that house far too many of the District of Columbia schoolchildren. Yet, unless I am vastly mistaken, the worst example of congressional neglect of the District of Columbia stands not too many blocks from the Capitol—I am speaking of Hines Junior High School. Why is it not razed; why is it not torn down? Why was it not replaced in 1924, when it was obsolete for the most part? Solely because the Congress has failed to appropriate money with which to modernize the delapidated District of Columbia school system as fast as it should have. Other communities, many of them in the district represented by Mr. BROYHILL, of Virginia, have built school after school from funds from Public Law 815, and have hired teachers and bought supplies under the operation and maintenance clauses of Public Law 874. That has happened just across the Potomac River, in his district. Congress is liberal when it comes to spending the people's money in Virginia. But Congress is niggardly when it comes to increasing the authorization for the District of Columbia under the Federal payment to take care of the needs of the District of Columbia schoolchildren.

The Senator from Nevada will remember that not so many years ago, after I had completed, on behalf of the subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia, with the very able assistance of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the so-called hungry children investigation in the District of Columbia, in which we brought forth the fact that deplorable malnutrition problems were being suffered by a very, very large number of schoolchildren in the District of Columbia, I warned that Hines Junior High School was a firetrap. I warned then that we were just gambling with the fate of the boys and girls who go to that school.

It will be recalled—and thank God there were no fatalities—that sometime after that, Hines School had to be evacuated because a fire did break out in the school, and it was only because of the previous fire drill discipline in which those students had been trained, and the courage of the dedicated teachers, that we did not read headlines of fatalities from that fire. I am not so sure that, after the children went out of the school, it would not have been a good thing if the school had burned to the ground, because I believe it to be, if not unsafe, certainly unsatisfactory. Hines still stands there a potential firetrap monument to the failure of the Congress of the United States to live up to its moral obligations to the people of the District of Columbia. It is not the only one. There are other schools which are also shocking monuments to malservice on the part of the Congress of the United States toward the District of Columbia.

Representative McMILLAN, chairman of the House District of Columbia Committee, knows there is a State 5 cents a pack tax on cigarettes in his native State, but he objects on behalf of the South Carolina farmers when the proposal is made to increase the District of Columbia cigarette tax from 2 to 3 cents. It would seem to me only equitable that the conference committee should have included within its package a cigarette proposal which would have raised $3,900,000, such as I proposed last year. Yet, neither of these gentlemen seem to be able to convince their colleagues in the House that the District should be treated as any other American city is now treated under Public Law 874, and thus become eligible for some $3,600,000 of impact aid for operation and maintenance of our federally impacted school system.

I may say to my good friend from Nevada that I am speaking under great restraint when I get to speaking on this cigarette matter. I am not going to impose upon him or the Senate what might be considered a bias or prejudice on the part of the Senator from Oregon. It is a bias and a prejudice, however, that has a factual foundation. If anyone wants to question the factual foundation, I ask him to come with me to Bethesda, to the National Health Institutes. I invite him to go with me through the Cancer Research Center of the National Institutes of Health. He would become almost a cigarette prohibitionist. I was taken through it, and there came face to face with the reality of the scourge of cancer in this country. The doctor who took me through said, "Senator, I hope you notice that not a single member of the staff, to say nothing of the patients, and not a single doctor, is to be seen smoking a cigarette." He said, "If you spent any time here, you wouldn't."

Some of my colleagues read in the papers in the last 30 days, I think it was, a statement by one of the great doctors, a courageous doctor, who dared to point out again that many medical research men are satisfied, on the basis of their experimentations, diagnoses, and analyses, that there is a direct cause-to-effect relationship between excessive cigarette smoking and certain types of cancer.

Whenever such medical findings are publicly reported, we are always treated to some stories which come out very soon thereafter seeking to raise questions as to whether or not we can be too sure about the relationship of tobacco and cancer. The interesting thing is that those who write these stories are finding it more and more difficult, in their advertisements of rebuttal on the cancer issue, to find reputable doctors who will deny there is any cause-to-effect relationship. Read these rebuttals. They are carefully worded, weasel-worded bits of semantic misdirection which seek to implant the idea that there will not be any cancer resulting from tobacco use. But the fact is, I am satisfied, that medical science knows today that there is a direct cause-to-effect relationship.

Mr. President, I am for the farmers. Do you know what I would be willing to support? I would rather favor a great subsidy program to help the tobacco farmers grow something else. I think it would be good for the economy of the country, and I have not any doubt it would be good for the health of the country.

May I say to the Senator from Nevada that it is pretty considerate of me to limit myself to this little time on the subject, but I think I have made my point. I only wish to say I was not convinced by the Representative from South Carolina. I do not think he can justify not supporting a cigarette tax in the District of Columbia at least equal to the cigarette tax in his own State of South Carolina. Had he done so, it might have helped us to avoid what I think is the most unfair tax of all—the sales tax.

The situation is compounded by the fact that the conferees in the interest of getting a bill passed in the House of Representatives also had to drop the provision which would have increased the authorization for the Federal payment to $36 million. The gentlemen of the House seem to wish to have it both ways for purposes of debate, because at one time they claim that they are already making the payment for the schools, and therefore Public Law 874 aid under another name is included within the Federal contribution to the District of Columbia. Yet, on the other hand, they resist strongly every effort to increase the Federal authorization despite the ever-mounting and increasing cost of municipal government in the District of Columbia—costs over which the District has no control—costs which are forced upon the District by Federal legislation increasing the salaries of employees and Federal legislation which destroys through condemnation the tax resources of the District. Not only do we have a federally impacted children figure of 30 percent, we currently have the Federal Government as a tax freeloader owning, using, and occupying 42.9 percent of the total area of the District of Columbia. The Congress was far more liberal with the District before 1920, when it picked up the tab of 50 percent of the cost of the operation of the Nation's Capital. Today, the $32 million authorization, which has never been fully appropriated, represents less than 12.8 percent of the general fund.

I think the exact figures will show it is nearer 11 percent of the total budget.

I point out, Mr. President, that not only is the District, in my judgment, impacted with children with federally connected parents, it is further impacted by loss of tax-producing properties occupied by the Federal Government.

Having denied to the District $3,600,000 of Public Law 874 money, the House of Representatives is forcing instead the shabby expedient of increasing by 50 percent a tax on the daily necessities of life. Soap, shoes, and clothes will now cost more to those least able to pay more. I cannot in good conscience, Mr. President, accept the iniquitous philosophy of this regressive tax. I also note with sadness that among the sales taxes which could be increased, the one which in my judgment could be justified, and I speak here frankly of the tax on liquor, has been given only the powder-puff treatment.

Before I discuss that, I wish to make a few comments about my general attitude toward the sales tax. We have beaten a sales tax in Oregon five times by referendum.

I come from a State in which democracy really prevails. I come from a State which operates under what is known in political science literature as the "Oregon system" of referendum, initiative, and recall. In my State we had State legislators on various occasions subjected to various influences, which resulted in the passage of a sales tax, but thank God for the referendum system. The people repudiated the action of their legislature. The people vetoed their legislators. The people five times took the issue to referendum and five times reversed the legislature. Today we still have no sales tax in my State.

I have played an active part in some of those historic referendum battles. I have no intention of sitting in the Senate of the United States and ever voting to impose or increase a regressive sales tax on the voteless people of the District of Columbia. I could not do so when I have fought so hard against the imposition of such a tax on the voting people of the State of Oregon. They, exercising their referendum power, have by their votes supported the position some of us have taken as we, time and time again, have fought the iniquitous, regressive sales tax principle.

So no one should be surprised that the senior Senator from Oregon is not going to vote for the conference report.

I come now to the matter of the sales tax on liquor. I said it has received the powder-puff treatment. The conferees have decided that the most the market can bear is an increase of 5 cents a fifth; 5 cents on $5. Under the proposal of the conference committee, a pair of $12 shoes will carry a tax of 36 cents. Two bottles of Scotch, or other "booze," will pay a tax of 10 cents. An interesting commentary on our social values, I must say, Mr. President, and one which reflects no great credit in my judgment upon the Congress of the United States.

I said in the last debate on this subject, but it is still apropos, it is a case of "booze" in preference to boots. I only wish the go-easy-on-liquor-sales boys would go down to some of the very-low-rate or moderate-price clothing stores in the slum areas of Washington, D.C. They would see, in those relatively few instances in which the parents have any money for booties, the parents come in to buy shoes for their children and on their purchase have to pay a sales tax higher in proportion to cost than the sales tax which is charged to liquor "guzzlers" in Washington, D.C. Residents of the District consume more liquor per capita, I understand, than is consumed in any other city of its size in the Nation, to the everlasting discredit of the Capital.

Am I unkind or unfair when I deplore that inequity and iniquity? I think not. I simply say on the floor of the Senate this afternoon that the liquor interests should be required to pay more so that those who buy shoes for their children can pay less. To me it is a matter of comparative values.

Now let us turn to beer. That is supposed to be the poor man's drink. I mention this intoxicating beverage, Mr. President, because I note a strange silence in this taxing area in the revenue bill, H.R. 258. The great State of Virginia realizes $4 on the sale of each barrel of 31 gallons of beer. The District of Columbia realizes only $1.50. If I were representing the State of Virginia, as is Mr. Broyhill, it would seem to me to be in the interest of my constituents to insist upon a taxing parity with respect to this commodity. The revenue from a $2.50 per barrel increase for 31 gallons of beer, which could have been used to meet a portion of the expenses of the District, would have been in the neighborhood of $1,275,000.

I think that would be fair. I think it would be reasonable. I think it ought to have been done to bring the District in line with Virginia.

Mr. President, in my judgment the floor statement which I made at the time of Senate passage of H.R. 258 in respect of many of these taxes is still most pertinent. I therefore ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from the Record of August 25, 1961, be placed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> Mr. Morse. I merely want the majority leader and the chairman of the committee to know that in the back of my mind is the intention I have stated.
>
> Before I proceed to expressing my opposition to portions of the bill, I first want to say that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Bible] is deserving of the commendation of the Senate for the wonderful leadership he has rendered in this field as chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia. I have served on that committee for many years. I have been an alderman for the District of Columbia ever since I have been in the Senate. I mean no flattery when I say to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Bible] that every citizen of the District of Columbia is greatly indebted to him for the wonderful leadership he has given to the District as chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia.
>
> I find it regrettable that I cannot agree with him as to some parts of the bill. I am going to let the record speak for itself. I hope, before I finish, I may be able to work out some compromises in respect to the bill which are, in my opinion, sorely needed.
>
> As the Senator from Nevada knows, I cannot in good conscience, acquiesce in a proposal to increase a sales tax. I would greatly prefer to be in a position to assist the committee in passing a measure designed to repeal existing sales taxes. As the Senator is aware, I submitted a statement against the sales tax feature of the pending bill, before the Fiscal Affairs Subcommittee, and I voted against it in our full committee session.
>
> I oppose the measure on the following grounds:
>
> First. H.R. 258 increases a tax which is regressive, inequitable, and a nuisance to the business community, which, perforce, must act as tax collectors for the District of Columbia.
>
> Second. The sales tax already adds its burden to many items which in this day and age are necessities, even though it does exempt food from its increase in levy. It taxes, I repeat, necessities which are already subject, in many instances, to Federal excise taxes.
>
> I am against excise taxes, although I am going to propose increases in excise taxes, but not on necessities. Such excise taxes are going to be based on ability to pay, but excises generally are not based on that principle.
>
> Excise taxes, as I am sure the Senator is aware, are but disguised sales taxes. H.R. 258 thus increases the cost of living to the consumer, which is already high.
>
> Mr. President, I say in all seriousness that we can, and should, find alternative sources of revenue to operate the government of the District of Columbia.
>
> I do not think, simply because the Congress has not appropriated sufficient money, that we, as Senators, can justify imposing upon the people of the District of Columbia what I think is a very unfair tax.
>
> My view is that we have to make a stronger drive than we have made in some years past for a much larger appropriation from the Congress to pay what I think is a greater share of the costs of the District—a share which Congress owes to the District and owes to the country.
>
> The status of the District as the Federal City imposes unique financial burdens which should be borne by the people of the United States as a whole, rather than by residents of the District of Columbia alone. As we all know, it is expensive to maintain an entire city as a national monument. When public structures are required to harmonize with a master plan, costs go up. This factor, for example, will increase the cost of the new Theodore Roosevelt Bridge by one-third. The National Park Service receives more than $3½ million a year from the District of Columbia for the maintenance of federally owned and operated parks which are far more extensive—and, indeed, more beautiful—than those maintained by most other major cities. This year the cost to the District for the support of the federally operated National Zoological Park alone is $1.3 million. Congress has required the District to share a substantial part of the cost of hospital construction within the city; yet 40 percent of the patients treated at these hospitals are not residents of the District of Columbia.
>
> Mr. Bible. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?
>
> Mr. Morse. I yield.
>
> Mr. Bible. I thought it might be well to state this for the record. The Senator has mentioned that the zoo costs the District of Columbia $1.3 million a year. This is a problem that has always somewhat troubled me, because the zoo is under the control of the Smithsonian Institution. Yet the District of Columbia pays the price tag on a zoo which I think may well be of national significance.
>
> Mr. Morse. I agree.
>
> Mr. Bible. We have received donations of tigers and various other animals from all over the world. If the point that the Senator from Oregon is attempting to make is that this should be a Federal responsibility, rather than a city responsibility, I certainly wholeheartedly join with him. Perhaps we could devise legislation, as long as the zoo is controlled by the Smithsonian Institution, whereby the U.S. Government would pick up the price tag.

Mr. MORSE. I agree. What I am trying to do in this part of my speech is point out to the Congress and the country what the fiscal situation is and how unfair we are, as a Congress, to the District of Columbia; and the responsibility and fault rest squarely on the Congress.

That is why, for the years I have been in the Senate I have been trying to get the Congress to give up its control over the District of Columbia, and stop preventing the citizens of the District of Columbia from becoming first-class citizens, and let them run their own city, as do the citizens of the capitals of States all over this country. Those capital cities are run by the citizens of those cities, and not by the States.

I know the Senator from Nevada and I agree on this principle. I am not in dispute with him. I am in dispute with him only over the fact that he is willing to increase the sales tax, rather than go on with a deficit. Perhaps that is what has to be done in order to awaken the Congress to its responsibility.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I know the Senator from Nevada has many contributions that he can make to the debate, but I do not wish to yield until I complete my statement. I have a lengthy statement to make.

Mr. BIBLE. This would not take over 30 seconds.

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to yield to him for that short time.

Mr. BIBLE. When I find myself in agreement with the Senator from Oregon, I like to rise to state it——

Mr. MORSE. We are in agreement 99 percent of the time.

Mr. BIBLE. On the question of home rule for the District of Columbia, I am in 100-percent accord with the Senator from Oregon. He has led the good fight year after year. We have a bill before the committee on that question. I hope, prayerfully, it may be enacted into legislation.

Mr. MORSE. Why does the Senator want to raise the sales tax?

Mr. BIBLE. Because some of the teachers and policemen may go without pay.

Mr. MORSE. I am for paying them. I take care of them in my amendments.

Mr. President, Congress has required the District to share a substantial part of the cost of hospital construction within the city; yet 40 percent of the patients treated at these hospitals are not residents of the District of Columbia.

At the present time, the District's unpaid liability in this program alone is almost $18 million.

I think it should be pointed out that the District attracts many tax-exempt activities; for example, patriotic organizations, foreign agencies, and others, because it is the Nation's Capital. According to the District Commissioners, property with an assessed value of $275.3 million is exempt.

Property with an assessed value of $81 million has been taken off the tax rolls of the District of Columbia in the last 3 years. We continue to increase the amount of property that is tax exempt in the District of Columbia.

It should also be remembered that Federal legislation imposes building height limitations to prevent any commercial structure from overshadowing Federal structures, and this holds realty values and tax revenues down.

There are many other similar factors which tend to increase the District's cost, and at the same time decrease its revenues. Most important, however, is the fact that the tax-exempt status of the Federal Government, which is the city's primary industry, deprives the District of major sources of tax revenue such as is paid by principal employers and land users in other cities. If the Congress were contributing to the District what the average corporate employer pays in State and local taxes—an average of $1 for every $20 spent in salaries—the annual Federal payment would be approximately $62.5 million. The committee recognized some of these factors in recommending that the authorized annual Federal payment be increased to $36 million. I think $36 million is a minimum figure. A very strong case can easily be made for a much larger annual Federal payment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point two editorials from Oregon newspapers bearing upon this subject.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"[From the Sunday Oregonian, Feb. 19, 1961]

"TAX-PINCHED CAPITAL

"Members of Congress, whose second home is in the Nation's Capital, should not need an annual reminder from their home-State newspapers that they have been neglecting a financial obligation to the city of Washington, D.C. But the fact is that the Federal appropriation for city government, in lieu of taxes on the more than 50 percent of the real property area occupied by the Federal Government, has been on a declining scale since 1921—i.e., from 50 percent to 12 percent.

"At the same time, there has been a flight of residents to the suburbs beyond Washington's fixed city limits, requiring annual tax increases on those remaining. Municipal taxes are comparable to city, State, and county taxes in other cities and have increased more than $30 million in the past 4 years. District officials are asking for a $14.1 million increase in 1962.

"The District Commissioners are asking Congress to contribute $36 million for fiscal 1962, compared with $32 million authorized, and only $25 million actually delivered in fiscal 1961. The equity of this Federal support to the National Capital is undisputed. We suggest that our Members of Congress look into the matter."

"[From the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard, Mar. 5, 1961]

"CAPITAL (AND) FUNDS

"It seems strange that there should be any public money shortages in Washington, D.C. But there are.

"The city of Washington operates on a budget in part supported by congressional appropriations. These are intended to offset the Federal Government's occupancy, tax-free, of about one-half of all the land area of the city.

"Sadly, for residents of the National Capital, Congress has been getting stingier and stingier about these payments in recent years. At the same time, most of the city's high-income families have been moving out to the suburbs.

"These matters affect not only those remaining to pay taxes in Washington. They are matters of national concern. If the city's budget isn't fattened up, the Capital of this most affluent of capitalist nations is headed toward serious deterioration. Streets will go unswept, perhaps. Pavements will go unmended. And Washington will no longer be the showplace city every American—and foreigner—expects it to be.

"How much is being asked of Congress by the city of Washington this year? Thirty-six million dollars. That would be about 14 percent of the city's overall budget needs.

"Back in 1921–24 Congress was willing to pay 40 percent of Washington's municipal operating expenses. In recent years the percentage of Federal participation has slipped as low as 8.5 percent.

"We can't help wondering if Washington's inability to convince Congress of its critical needs has anything to do with the fact that residents of the Capital City are voteless."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as I stated earlier in my remarks, my principal objection to the pending bill is that it would increase the sales tax. I am certain that if the people of the District of Columbia had any voice in the matter—and there is no sound reason in the world why they should not—they would make the same decision as the people of my State have made on at least five different occasions in rejecting a sales tax.

The proponents of this measure assert that the sales tax is the least felt of all forms of taxation. This is not true at all. The truth is that the sales tax is felt most heavily by low income families. The illusion that they do not feel a sales tax is fostered by the fact that as a group they tend to be less articulate than the more moneyed families who would be affected by, and complain about, an increase, for instance, in the income tax.

It is true that the income tax in the District of Columbia is lower, in many brackets, than the income tax in Maryland and in Virginia. What we ought to be proposing is an increase in the income tax, based upon the progressive principle of the ability to pay.

Unlike an income tax, which tends to lessen inequalities in income, the sales tax tends to defeat this objective. It reduces consumption by the poor who spend all their income on the necessities of life.

The virtue of the income tax is that it allows an exemption of amounts considered necessary for subsistence and exempts that which is saved.

The proponents of the increase in the District sales tax recognize this inherent evil, and the best they can do is make a plea of confession and avoidance. "Our tax on food is only 1 percent," they say, "it is only other purchases which will be taxed at the rate of 3 percent." But man does not live on bread alone. What they do not say is that those other purchases include soap and shoes and all the other things which are necessary. The poor must, of necessity, spend a larger part of their income on these things than the wealthy. Whether they complain or not, they feel it, and it is most unfair to increase this burden upon them when there are so many ways it can be avoided.

Mr. President, I am of the opinion that other taxes imposed directly upon the shoulders of people in accordance with their ability to pay ought to be imposed rather than to take these people less able to pay and impose what I consider to be an unconscionable, regressive tax. I think it is an example of people in a strong economic position of power taking advantage of taxpayers that are not in a strong position of power.

I am rather shocked on moral grounds, by the imposing of sales taxes on the necessities of life. I believe that people who are not able to pay taxes on necessities should be relieved of them; and there are many, many of them here in the District of Columbia from whom these taxes are being extorted, who, I believe, should be relieved of such taxes on the basis of moral grounds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded by the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield myself an additional 5 minutes.

It is estimated that the proposed increase in the sales tax will bring a corresponding increase of $9 million in the District's revenue. What I recommend, however, is a five-point package embracing increases in two existing taxes, the addition of two new taxes which will fall only on those who can afford to pay them, and the repeal of the sales tax on groceries, to replace the increase in the general sales tax and at the same time replace the $9 million which the District sorely needs.

I have added to my package, I say for the benefit of the press representatives, another amendment which would bring the District of Columbia under coverage of the federally impacted area legislation, Public Law 874. This would entitle the District of Columbia to receive approximately an additional $5 million annually. Is there any sound reason why Bethesda, Md., and Arlington, Va., should be under Public Law 874, and not the District of Columbia?

I shall go into that amendment a little later, but I serve notice now that I am ready to debate the federally impacted areas issue today. Let the minority leader take note. I am ready today to proceed, on this bill, to pass the federally impacted areas legislation by adding the District of Columbia. This is the time to really draw the issue, by applying it to the District of Columbia for the benefit of the people in the District of Columbia, who ought to be eligible under the federally impacted areas legislation.

Why in the world should schools in Bethesda and Arlington receive the benefit of Public Law 874, but not those in the District of Columbia? Why should not the District of Columbia be treated as a State with respect to federally impacted areas legislation, exactly the same as Maryland and Virginia and other States?

The committee has recommended an increase in the tax on spirits and alcohol from $1.25 to $1.50 a gallon. This is expected to raise $1,100,000 annually. I would raise the tax on spirits and alcohol to $2 a gallon.

If there were ever an excise tax which could be considered based upon ability to pay, this is it. The District of Columbia has a shocking record of consuming more alcoholic beverages per capita than any city of its size in the country. It is a disgraceful consumption record for the District of Columbia. We ought to increase the tax on hard liquor in the District of Columbia. Thus I propose to increase it to $2 a gallon. I do not know of a more sound social recommendation that anyone could make.

After all, let us face up to the fact that hard liquor is one of the greatest social menaces facing this country. It is a shame that we are asked to impose an increased sales tax on shoes for the poor in the District of Columbia and not to increase the tax on liquor to at least $2 a gallon. That is how we can raise additional revenue—a tax on "booze" rather than a tax on boots. That is the source from which we should raise the money.

The experts tell me that such a tax would increase the revenues by an additional $2.5 million above the committee recommendation. This figure would indicate that the committee's estimate is a little low. The important factor, however, is that the tax increase would fall not upon those who have a difficult enough time buying their foods and their clothing, the necessities of life, but rather upon those who are well able to afford the luxury of a drink now and then. Oh, there may be some who point out that the District's poor buy more than their share of the spirits sold here. Even if this is true, if a choice must be made, I would rather make it more difficult for the poor man to purchase a drink that he does not need than to make it more difficult for him to buy a pair of shoes which his little girl does need.

When anyone talks to me about the amount of hard liquor the poor buy, I say we should take a look at the psychological escape mechanism involved. Perhaps if we give the people in the District of Columbia a little better standard of living and make it a bit easier to buy shoes for the little children, they would not take the psychological escape into consuming hard liquor.

Mr. President, I would make it more difficult for the people to buy booze but I would make it easier for them to buy boots.

I suggest that if one of the side effects of such a tax be the decrease in the consumption of hard liquor in the District of Columbia, that this will be to its credit and might, just possibly cut down on some of the social costs which can be attributed to the consumption of intoxicants.

The amended bill increases the tax on cigarettes from 2 to 4 cents a package. This will furnish an estimated increase of $2.6 million a year. I would increase the tax to 5 cents a package and add an additional $1.3 million a year to the amount the committee has recommended. This would still leave the District's tax lower than Maryland's 6 cents a package.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point a table dealing with comparisons on cigarette taxes in this country, which points out the differences with respect to Maryland and other places.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Cigarette tax rates per pack of 20, District of Columbia and States

Tax rate and number of States:
- None (3 States):
  - Colorado
  - North Carolina
  - Oregon
- 2 cents (2 States):
  - Arizona [1]
  - District of Columbia
- 2.5 cents (1 State): Kentucky
- 3 cents (5 States):
  - California
  - Delaware
  - Indiana
  - New Hampshire
  - Virginia
- 4 cents (8 States):
  - Hawaii [1,2]
  - Illinois
  - Iowa
  - Kansas
  - Nebraska
  - Utah
  - Wyoming
  - Missouri
- 5 cents (10 States):
  - Connecticut
  - Florida
  - Georgia [1]
  - Michigan
  - New York
  - Ohio
  - South Carolina
  - South Dakota
  - Tennessee [1]
  - Wisconsin
- 6 cents (11 States):
  - Alabama [1]
  - Arkansas
  - Idaho
  - Maine
  - Maryland
  - Massachusetts
  - Mississippi [1]
  - North Dakota [1]
  - Pennsylvania
  - Rhode Island
  - West Virginia
- 7 cents (6 States):
  - Minnesota [1]
  - Nevada
  - New Jersey
  - Washington [1]
  - Oklahoma [1]
  - Vermont [1]
- 8 cents (5 States):
  - Alaska
  - Louisiana [1]
  - Montana
  - New Mexico
  - Texas [1]

[1] These States impose a tax on other tobacco products.

[2] Actual rate is 20 percent of wholesale sales price.

Source: Commerce Clearing House—State Tax Guide.

Mr. Morse. Mr. President, 4 cents is not enough.

In spite of my tobacco friends in the Senate I think this would also have a great social benefit. They may say, "Oh, that would result in a decrease in consumption of cigarettes." I would say "Good; that will be fine for the health of the young people of the country, if that is the result."

I would rather increase the tax on cigarettes than to increase the tax on the necessities of life, needed for the children of the poor families in the District of Columbia.

I do not wish to get into an argument at this point, although I shall be glad to on some other occasion, in respect to what the scientists tell us. I should like to have my colleagues go to the Cancer Research Institute at Bethesda, and go through the Institute and talk to the doctors there about this subject.

The Presiding Officer. The time of the Senator from Oregon has again expired.

Mr. Morse. Mr. President, I yield myself another 5 minutes.

I should like to talk with the doctors and hear what they have to say about the cause and effect relationship as between cigarettes and cancer. In my judgment, enough evidence exists not only to establish a prima facie case, but a strong presumption in regard to the cause and effect between cigarette smoking and certain types of cancer. Therefore I offer no apology for suggesting an increase in the cigarette tax to 5 cents a package.

The third part of the package I recommend is a 10-percent tax on parking fees. One of the significant costs of the District government is highway maintenance. I see no valid reason why parking lot owners should not pay a greater share of the tax burden. Of course the yield on such a tax is somewhat difficult to estimate. But I have received one estimate that in the central business district alone, that is in the area bounded by 2d and 23d Streets and Constitution and Massachusetts Avenues, a 10-percent tax on the fees paid for commercial spaces would yield about $1.2 million a year.

The final tax I would recommend is a tax on commercial rents that would be paid by individuals and organizations engaged in activities in the District but not effectively subject to the District of Columbia corporate tax—the tax on unincorporated business or the individual income tax. Although it would fall on nonprofit as well as profitmaking organizations, it would not be paid by any organization or person whose real property would be exempt from taxation under existing law if the property rented is used for purposes which would qualify it for exemption if owned rather than rented.

Among the organizations and individuals on whom the tax would fall are the following:

First. Lawyers, doctors, and members of other unincorporated trades or professions exempt from the income tax on unincorporated businesses who reside outside the District but conduct their affairs here.

Second. Trade and labor associations.

Third. Washington offices of business enterprises and other groups.

Fourth. A variety of organizations, mostly of a nonprofit character, which find it desirable to be located in Washington.

It is estimated that such a tax would raise $5 million a year. But in addition to raising substantial amounts of revenue, a tax of this kind will do a great deal toward eliminating some of the inequities in existing tax laws. For example, a printing shop, even though its operator may reside in the suburbs, pays a substantial property and income tax. Next door there may be a lawyer, a trade association or the Washington office of a defense contractor paying no income tax. They make just as much use of the city's services, and a 10-percent tax on the amounts they pay as rent would be an effective way of requiring them to share the cost.

Summarizing the increases which can be expected from the first four points of the five-point program, we find that the increase to $2 a gallon on spirits and alcohol will yield $2.5 million; the increase to 5 cents a pack on cigarettes will yield $1.3 million; the 10-percent tax on parking fees, $1.2 million; and the tax on commercial rents, $5 million. In all, these proposals would yield $10 million a year, $1 million more than the proposed increase in the general sales tax would yield.

The last point of my five-point program is the repeal of the present 1-percent sales tax on food purchased for home consumption in the District. I introduced S. 1744, a bill to repeal the sales tax on groceries, in this session of Congress. The amendment I propose is identical to S. 1744. As much as I am opposed to the sales tax principle, I am even more opposed to a sales tax on food. The price of the tax is too high in terms of human values to be tolerated for one moment longer than it takes to repeal it. The District of Columbia Finance Office informs me that it collects approximately $2,250,000 annually from the sales tax on food.

The secret of successful taxation is to impose taxes on those to whom it will be least burdensome. Each of the taxes I propose seems to me to meet that test. The increased general sales tax they would replace most certainly does not.

I now come to the additional amendment which I drafted this morning.

The District of Columbia differs from the surrounding metropolitan area, so far as school revenues are concerned, in that the Virginia and Maryland counties immediately adjacent receive Federal funds under Public Law 874.

These payments are made because of the number of children who are federally connected, that is to say children whose parents either live or work on Federal property or both.

Certainly if there is any geographical area in the United States which is impacted with federally connected children, it is the Capital of our country. The Federal Government is by far the largest single employer in the District of Columbia. If my memory is correct over one-third of all gainfully employed individuals in the District of Columbia are employed by Uncle Sam.

Equity alone would seem to cry out that Washington, D.C., should be given the very same Federal benefits as are available to every other major or minor city or town in the Nation which can qualify under the provisions of Public Law 874.

It may be objected that to include the District of Columbia under Public Law 874 would be a meaningless gesture since the Federal payment to the District now made under existing laws would have to be deducted from payments made under Public Law 874. This would be a very sound argument if its premise were true. However, I am advised by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare that the opinion of the Department is that the Federal payment to the District is not of the category which would have to be offset. Let me quote a pertinent paragraph from a memorandum I received on this point:

"Public Law 874 requires there be deducted from gross entitlement computed for a school district any Federal payment made to the district with respect to Federal property and available for school purposes during that year. The Federal payment made to the District of Columbia each year is based on a number of considerations, but is not allocated to specific functions or purposes. A review of the legislative history of the annual Federal payment to the District of Columbia leads to the conclusion that any amount of this Federal payment that may be allocated to current operating expenses of schools, on any proportionate basis or otherwise, would not be deductible from the gross entitlement computed for the District of Columbia under terms of the act as currently in effect. Consequently, it appears that there would be no deduction from the estimated gross entitlement."

How much would be received by the District if my amendment were to be adopted? An estimate of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has been prepared and it indicates that approximately $5 million annually could become available. This amount, in my judgment, would go far to offset the regressive tax proposals contained in the committee reported bill. I therefore strongly recommend to my good friend and chairman of the District Committee that he accept my amendment in lieu of the sales tax provisions of the committee bill. In order to document further my case, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in my remarks materials which are to be found on pages 1318 through 1320 of part 2 of the hearings before the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare entitled "Public School Assistance Act of 1961." The material consists of a statement regarding financing of school programs in Arlington County, Va., and includes a table entitled "Information Regarding Number of Federally Connected Children in and Federal Payments Under Public Law 874 to Arlington County, Va."

Mr. President, I further request unanimous consent to insert other testimony excerpted from the same hearings record given by witnesses testifying on behalf of an extension of Public Law 874.

There being no objection, the materials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"STATEMENT RE TESTIMONY OF ROBERT B. WALKER AND DOROTHY S. McDIARMID, OF FAIRFAX COUNTY, VA.

"The facts presented in the testimony of Robert B. Walker, assistant superintendent of schools and Dorothy S. McDiarmid, member of the General Assembly of Virginia, regarding the expansion of school population in Fairfax County since 1950 and concerning the crucial importance of the Federal financial assistance provided under Public Law 874 and Public Law 815 in meeting the educational problems in the county occasioned by this expansion are not challenged. Fairfax County, Va., has been one of the fastest growing counties in the United States. Much of this growth may be attributed to its location adjacent to the Nation's Capital.

"It can hardly be said, however, that Fairfax County is typical of the 3,861 school districts which received assistance under Public Law 874 in 1959-60. Fairfax County has, according to the testimony, some 51 percent of its school attendance federally connected and 14 percent of its current operating expense budget from Federal payments. This compares with the average for all applicant school districts in the Nation of 15 percent of their children federally connected and 5 percent of their current operating expenditures derived from Federal payments. Attached hereto is a study of the distribution of applicant school districts in 1959 by percentage of their current expenditures derived from Public Law 874 payments. This study indicates that for 2,365, or 62.9 percent of the 3,761 school districts eligible in that year, the Federal payment under Public Law 874 was less than 5 percent of their current operating expense budgets. In only 383, or 10.2 percent of the school districts, did the Federal payments constitute as large a proportion of the current operating expenditures as in the case of Fairfax County, Va.

"The 1960 application of Fairfax County under Public Law 874 shows the following data:

"Two hundred and sixty-two children in average daily attendance in the 'A' category; 4,720 children in the 'B' category; total federally connected 25,500 or 50.3 percent of the total average daily attendance in a county of 50,751. The payments to the county were based on $246.94 as the local contribution rate times the 'A' category children plus one-half of the 'B' category children or $3,187,008. The school district revenues of $16,592,728 consisted of $4,208,199 or 25.4 percent from State sources, $9,197,521 or 55.4 percent from local sources and $3,187,008 or 19.2 percent from Federal sources. The expenditure per pupil in average daily attendance from State sources was $82.92 and from local sources was $181.22.

"These data would indicate that payment at the rate of 50 percent of the local contribution rate for the 'B' category children resulted in an amount per pupil of $123.47 which is 68 percent of the county expenditure per pupil from local revenue sources. Had the rate been that proposed in S. 1021, title II, in that year, or $61.73 per pupil for 'B' category pupils, it would have constituted 34 percent of the county's expenditure per pupil from local revenue sources.

"We note in the testimony an estimate made by the county department of assessments that Federal property within the county would yield $5,872,500 per year at current assessed valuations and at current county tax rates. We understand that this estimate is as of January 1, 1960. Since 64 percent of the county budget is devoted to support of public schools, the school portion of the $5,872,500 estimated yield would be $3,758,400. It may be noted that in 1960 the county's entitlement under Public Law 874 was $3,187,008, and under Public Law 815 was $2,319,456, or a total of $5,506,464."

"TABLE 125.—*Number and percent of eligible applicants in fiscal year 1959 by proportion of Federal payments (Public Law 874) to total current expenditures of the applicant district*

"Percent Federal payments (Public Law 874) of total current expenditures	Number of districts	Percent of districts
Total	3,761	100
Less than 5 percent	2,365	62.9
5 to 9 percent	734	19.5
10 to 14 percent	279	7.4
15 to 19 percent	140	3.7
20 to 24 percent	58	1.5
25 to 29 percent	55	1.5
30 to 39 percent	58	1.5
40 to 49 percent	28	.75
50 to 59 percent	19	.5
60 to 69 percent	13	.4
70 to 79 percent	6	.2
80 to 89 percent	2	.05
90 to 100 percent	4	.1

"STATEMENT REGARDING FINANCING OF SCHOOL PROGRAMS IN ARLINGTON COUNTY, VA.

"The purpose of this statement is to present factual information regarding the portion of the Arlington County operating budget each year that comes from Public Law 874. This information in the attached table presents actual data by year from the 1956 through the 1960 fiscal years and estimated data for the 1961 fiscal year. It will be seen from this table that more than half of all schoolchildren attending Arlington County public schools each year are federally connected for the purposes of Public Law 874. This proportion ranges from a low of 53 percent to a high of 57 percent federally connected during the 5 years. This table also shows that the per pupil cost in Arlington County public schools has risen gradually from $389 per child in 1956 to an estimated $506 in 1961. State funds have provided from

16 to 18 percent of the total operating costs each year, and local funds have provided between 67 and 68 percent. Federal funds have provided between 14 and 16 percent of the budget each year ranging from a high of 16.1 percent in 1958 down to 14.4 percent in 1961.

"The table shows one other significant fact. The local contribution rate paid under Public Law 874 for 'A' category children has increased from $207 in 1956 to $265 in 1961. During the same period, local funds have provided $265 per child in 1956 increasing up to $340 per child in 1961.

"TABLE 126.—*Information regarding number of federally connected children in and Federal payments under Public Law 874 to Arlington County, Va.*

Item	Fiscal year				
	1956-57	1957-58	1958-59	1959-60	1960-61 (estimated)
Average daily attendance:					
Total	20,918	21,330	21,646	22,030	23,624
Federally connected children [1]	12,047	12,103	12,049	11,996	12,596
Percent Federal ADA of total	57.6	56.7	55.7	54.5	53.3
Current operating expenses:					
Total	$8,137,179	$8,690,781	$9,529,685	$10,595,910	$11,956,521
State funds	1,332,762	1,432,281	1,702,874	1,929,876	2,209,335
Federal funds [2]	1,250,298	1,400,257	1,432,115	1,523,028	1,700,000
Local funds	5,554,119	5,867,243	6,394,696	7,143,006	8,047,186
Percent of total expenses	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
State funds	16.4	16.5	17.9	18.2	18.5
Federal funds [2]	15.4	16.1	15.0	14.4	14.2
Local funds	68.2	67.4	67.1	67.4	67.3
Cost per child:					
Total	$389.00	$407.87	$440.25	$480.98	$506.12
State funds	63.71	67.15	78.67	87.60	93.52
Local funds	265.52	275.07	295.42	324.24	340.64
Rate per child paid under Public Law 874 for 3(a) category [3]	207.57	231.39	234.85	250.21	265.98
½ paid for 3(b) category	103.79	115.70	117.43	125.11	132.99

"[1] Less than 2 percent of these are 'A' category children in any year.

"[2] Paid under Public Law 874.

"[3] Local contribution rate paid per child in average daily attendance for children residing on Federal property with a parent employed on Federal property (sec. 3(a) category). ½ this local contribution rate paid per child in average daily attendance for those either residing on, or residing with parent employed on, Federal property (sec. 3(b) category)."

I point out that 900,000 children in New York City are receiving the benefit of payments under the Federal program of aid to impacted areas. Under Public Law 874, the Federal aid to impacted areas for a part of the cost of operation and maintenance of public schools in one school district of New York City covers 900,000 children in average daily attendance. Yet we are not willing to grant similar assistance to the children in the Capital City of the Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that the testimony on pages 717-720 of the hearings alluded to earlier, which bear out my amendment, be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"STATEMENT OF FREDERICK SHORE, ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT, EAST MEADOW PUBLIC SCHOOLS, NASSAU COUNTY, LONG ISLAND, N.Y.

"Mr. SHORE. May I read it, please?

"Senator GOLDWATER. Certainly.

"Mr. SHORE. Senator, I am Frederick Shore, administrative assistant to the superintendent of schools of the East Meadow School District, Nassau County, Long Island, N.Y. I am also representing the federally impacted school districts of New York State.

"I greatly appreciate this opportunity to present our views to this committee and to urge the extension of the present provisions of Public Law 874, 81st Congress.

"There are many of my colleagues here, as you heard, who will be presenting other aspects of this matter tomorrow.

"TABLE 66.—*Summary of effects of Public Law 874, New York State, 1960*

Federally impacted school districts		Total New York State school districts	Percent
161 districts eligible for Public Law 874 entitlements		924 districts operating schools, including New York City.	17.4
Sec. 3a ADA	2,809	Approximate total ADA 2,500,000	1.1
Sec. 3b ADA	25,242	(Including almost 900,000 ADA for New York City) (about 1,600,000 excluding New York City).	(1.8)
Federal ADA	28,051		
Sec. 3a entitlement	$752,807		
Sec. 3b entitlement	3,780,833		
Total	4,533,640		
Add additional net	[1] 256,339		
Total net entitlement	4,789,979		
Total current expenses $230,031,060 (net entitlement represents 2.1 percent of aggregate current expenses in these districts).		Total current expenses approximate $1,349,000,000.	17.1
		(Including $446,000,000 for New York City) (about $903,000,000 excluding New York City).	(25.5)

"[1] Consists of entitlement of $301,432 for 874 'sec. 4a' pupils, $2,496 for sec. 2 net entitlement, less deductible funds under sec. 3.

"Last year, 161 New York school districts had an aggregate entitlement under Public Law 874 of approximately $4,800,000. Most of the payments were for the education of 25,242 children who were federally connected by reason of employment of parents on Federal tax-exempt properties—the section 3b children. The entitlement for such purposes was $3,781,000. New York school districts also provided publicly supported education for 2,809 section 3a children, those with residence and parental employment on Federal tax-exempt property.

"The following is a summary of the effect of Public Law 874 provisions in New York State for fiscal 1960.

"This summary shows there are 161 districts eligible for Public Law 874 entitlements out of 24 districts in the State that operate schools, including the city of New York. That is about 17 percent.

"The Federal impact ADA under section 3 is 28,000-plus, and that represents approximately 1.1 percent of the 2.5 million children in ADA. However, it is interesting to note that almost 900,000 of that ADA is in New York City alone in one school district.

"Therefore, it is a shade under 2 percent when we take into account that 1,600,000 are in the so-called upstate districts of our State.

"The total entitlement was a little under 4,800,000, and that represented in those districts that are federally affected 2 percent of their current expenses of $230 million, and that is 17 percent of the total current expenses in the State of $1,349 million, including almost one-half billion dollars for the city of New York.

"Senator GOLDWATER. So that this can be kept in proper order, we will print your table in your remarks.

"Mr. SHORE. Thank you, Senator.

"When one looks at these aggregate figures, it is noted that the overall impact is not too large. However, the picture changes when individual districts are examined. In some, districts, the federally connected children represent a little more than 3 percent of the total.

"In many, the percentage is much more substantial.

"In some districts the Public Law 874 payments represents a small tax rate equivalent, while in others the receipt of these moneys prevented a considerable tax rate increase.

"My school district, East Meadow, is one of the latter. It is a residential community of 60,000 persons situated on Long Island, adjacent to the Mitchel Airbase and about 12 miles from the New York City line.

"East Meadow is one of the rapid-growth districts that appeared on Long Island in the post-World War II period and which faced a tremendous increase during the Korean war with the consequent expansion of Federal defense activities in the 1950's.

"We grew from a two-school system educating about 1,000 elementary pupils to the largest district on Long Island and the eighth largest in New York State with a pupil enrollment of over 18,000 in 12 elementary and secondary schools.

"For fiscal 1960, East Meadow's entitlement under Public Law 874 was $186,687 consisting of $119,591 for attendance of 475 section 3a children and $67,096 for 533 section 3b youngsters.

"Our 3a children resided on 3 Federal housing projects containing 909 dwelling units:

"Mitchel Manor, a 628-unit Wherry housing garden apartment project for Armed Forces personnel; Santini housing, consisting of 203 units, including a guesthouse and transient quarters on the Mitchel Airbase; a trailer village with 78 trailer sites on base property.

"Their parents were stationed at 17 military installations in the general metropolitan area as well as being on active duty at a number of oversea bases or on board naval vessels.

"The 3b youngsters had parents employed on 38 federally owned, tax-exempt properties in New York. In the past 10 years we have noted employment or military assignment on 83 different Federal properties or installations, all tax exempt.

"This Public Law 874 entitlement represents a tax-rate equivalent of almost 23 cents per $100 of assessed valuation and was equavalent to 2.5 percent of our current expenditures of $7,480,000, for the last school year.

"Our tax rate is presently 4.07 per $100 for school purposes alone on an assessed valuation of $82.3 million. Last year, real property was determined to be assessed at 38 percent of true value in our town.

"As previously indicated, the major portion of Federal payment was for the attendance of residents on Federal tax-exempt property in our district. Thus, the United States made direct payments for the education of these children which were, in effect, payments in lieu of taxes.

"The remaining moneys were for the education of children who were federally connected by reasons of parental employment. These payments recognized the Federal responsibility involved in the education of children whose parents are employed on Federal tax-exempt property.

"While it is true that in the latter case property taxes are derived from the residences of these families, the valuation per child is insfficient to meet their proper share of educational costs. Thus there must be an increase in the local tax rate to produce more dollars on a shrinking base.

"Furthermore, as additional siblings in these residences reach school age, no additional taxable valuation can be anticipated which leads to a further tax rate increase.

"What has occurred in our school district and many others is that we are bedroom communities for large numbers of federally connected personnel.

"The Federal Government has affected or impacted these school districts and should continue to bear its share of the financing costs of maintenance and operation of schools when this occurs.

"The Congress, for the past decade, has declared it to be the policy of the United States to recognize its responsibility * * * 'to provide financial assistance for those local educational agencies upon which the United States has placed financial burdens by reason of the fact that * * * that such agencies provide education for children residing on Federal property; or such agencies provide education for children whose parents are employed on Federal property; or there has been a sudden and substantial increase in school attendance as the result of Federal activities.'

"We respectfully urge this committee to continue this policy and to provide the same provisions of law as now exist for these purposes.

"We also request that sufficient appropriations be made available to meet the full entitlements of the federally affected school districts.

"Without these Federal payments, constantly rising school taxes would have risen even higher and the real estate tax burden on the small homeowner, which is very great now, would have been even heavier.

"This is no time to reduce the funds available to these school districts. Proposals for changes in the provisions of Public Law 874 payments for section 3b children would result in a decrease of about $2 million for New York State school districts. East Meadow's loss would be about $35,000; something we cannot afford to lose.

"Neither is this a time to make eligibility requirements more stringent. For many years now, the determination of eligibility has provided for an equitable level of initial eligibility.

"Congress has also given recognition to the problems brought about by changes in the impact problem and has provided for a taper in the payments when changes took place and eligibility could no longer be established at the 3-percent level. Proposed changes would eliminate a great many districts from eligibility. Yet, the children are still federally connected and they are still in school.

"Your support and favorable action is sought in order that we may continue to provide the proper educational program which our children need and deserve, and without having our local property taxpayers assume the additional costs which are a Federal responsibility. Thank you, sir.

"Senator Goldwater. Thank you very much, Mr. Shore, and I want to add my apologies to those of the chairman for having kept you here so long.

"Mr. Shore. That is all right.

"Senator Goldwater. But you find, when Senators testify, they utilize the privilege of speech just as they do on the floor.

"Mr. Shore. I appreciate this a great deal."

Mr. Morse. Mr. President, I now read from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare memorandum I quoted earlier, the basis used to determine the estimated amount of Federal entitlement for the District of Columbia in the 1962 fiscal year if brought under the provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874.

Public Law 874 authorizes any applicant school district to count for Federal entitlement those children who live on Federal property with a parent employed on Federal property, and those children who either live on Federal property or live with a parent employed on Federal property, but not both. Since the District of Columbia has not been included in the provisions of Public Law 874 or 815, there is no recent data available to the Office to indicate the percentage of children in the District's public elementary and secondary schools who meet either of the two conditions described in the previous sentence. In six jurisdictions in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area, 42 percent of all public school children were classed as federally connected children in 1960. In the four northern Virginia school districts, 50 percent were federally connected, and the proportion in Prince Georges and Montgomery Counties was 37 percent. It is believed that the same ratio would hold true for the District of Columbia as for the entire metropolitan area.

Subsection (d) of section 3, Public Law 874, specifies the method for computing the "local contribution rate" for applicant school districts in each State, which is the amount paid per child for "A" category children. One-half the local contribution rate is paid for "B" category children. The basic method of computing the local contribution rate is the expenditure per child from local revenue sources in comparable communities in the same State in the second preceding year. However, no school district has to take a lower contribution rate than one-half of the State average cost per child, or one-half of the national average cost per child, both in the second preceding year.

This subsection further specifies that the Commissioner determine the local contribution rate in any State in which there is one local educational agency, which is the case in the District of Columbia, in accordance with policies and principles which will, in his judgment, best effectuate the purposes of this act and most nearly approximate the policies and principles provided herein for determining local contribution rates in other States.

In view of the circumstances in the District of Columbia and the fact that there are no comparable local educational agencies to the District, it is extremely difficult in the time available to determine the basis on which the Commissioner would determine the rate of payment per child in the District. However, it appears that in view of all the circumstances, the rate that would be established for the District of Columbia to best effectuate the policies and principle of the statute would be one-half of the State cost per child in the second preceding year. This alternative minimum is higher than one-half the national average cost per child, which is the other alternative minimum.

DETAILS OF THE ESTIMATE

In fiscal year 1960, the year on which the local contribution rate is determined for payments for the 1962 fiscal year, there were 105,801 children in average daily attendance in the District of Columbia public schools, and the total current operating expense budget was $44,102,211. This gives a per capita cost of $416.84. One-half of this per capita cost is $208.42, which would be the rate of payment for "A" category children if one-half the State average were used as the local contribution rate. Although there are a small number of "A" category children in the District of Columbia, for the purpose of this estimate, entitlement has been computed at the "B" category rate for all eligible children, which would be one-half of the local contribution rate, or $104.21 per child.

The estimated average daily attendance for the 1962 fiscal year in the District of Columbia public schools, as reported to the Office of Education, is estimated to be 113,500. This number, multiplied by the estimate of 42 percent federally connected children, gives an estimate of 47,670 federally connected children for the purpose of computing Federal entitlement. The estimated number of federally connected children multiplied by the rate of $104.21 per child equals $4,967,690 entitlement rounded to $5 million for the purpose of this estimate.

Public Law 874 requires there be deducted from gross entitlement computed for a school district any Federal payment made to district with respect to Federal property and available for school purposes during that year. The Federal payment made to the District of Columbia each year is based on a number of considerations, but is not allocated to specific functions or purposes. A review of the legislative history of the annual Federal payment to the District of Columbia leads to the conclusion that any amount of this Federal payment that may be allocated to current operating expenses of schools, on any proportionate basis or otherwise, would not be deductible from the gross entitlement computed for the District of Columbia under terms of the act as currently in effect. Consequently, it appears that there would be no deduction from the estimated gross entitlement:

"Estimated entitlement for the District of Columbia for the 1962 fiscal year if brought under the provisions of Public Law 874: $5 million."

PUBLIC LAW 815

It appears that the District of Columbia could not qualify for assistance under Public Law 815 in fiscal year 1962 because there would not be sufficient increase in the number of federally connected children to equal the required percentages.

Mr. President, to document further the basis of the payment of benefits under Public Law 874, I turn to pages 565 through 569, of the Public School Assistance Act of 1961 to a letter and attachments I received under date of March 20, 1961 from that great and dedicated friend of education legislation, the distinguished Senator from Montana, Mr. Metcalf.

I ask unanimous consent that the correspondence be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR
AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
March 20, 1961.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Education, Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Following is the statement I promised to furnish following Senator DIRKSEN's and my colloquy before the subcommittee on Monday, March 16.

In support of my contention that Federal impact funds are not in lieu of taxes but are based on the needs of students in affected school districts, I cite first this statement which appears in the introduction (p. 1) to the Sixth Annual Report of the Commissioner of Education on Administration of Public Laws 874 and 815:

"Instead of a straight payment in lieu of taxes on the property itself in the jurisdiction where it is situated, the payment under Public Law 874 is calculated on the basis of that part of the local share of the cost of educational services normally borne by a property tax on places of residence or places of employment. Under Public Law 815, the payment is in terms of a grant to the school district of the Federal share of the cost of providing school facilities for children residing on or with parents employed on tax-exempt Federal property. This Federal share is computed in relation to the State average per pupil cost of construction school facilities."

I promised to cite specific examples, in conection with the Glasgow Air Force Base and Northern Cheyenne Indian Reservation in Montana, which show the relationship of the payment to educational needs rather than taxes replaced.

The Glasgow Airbase in Valley County contains 4,520 acres. Of these 3,917 acres were obtained from State lands and 603 acres were purchased from private owners. These 603 acres paid $87.85 taxes in the year 1957–58. Valley County school officials advise me the payment would be at the same rate were the lands still privately owned.

These formerly private lands are comparable in value to the former State lands which form the remainder of the airbase. Had the entire 4,520 acres been taxed at the rate which applied and still applies for the 603 acres, the taxes received annually would be $658.87.

Total school enrollment in Valley County in May of 1957 was 1,333 students. There were 54 teachers. As of March 14, 1961, there were 2,676 students, 120 teachers, plus an enlarged administrative staff. Thus the school operations (and costs) have more than doubled. The county superintendent of schools, Mrs. Ruth Putz, says "with very little exception the airbase has caused this change."

Mr. William C. Greer, superintendent of schools, district No. 1, Glasgow, reports that percentagewise, in the period from the 1957 school year to the 1960–61 school year, pupil increase has been 200 percent, operational increase 202.7 percent, operational increase as represented in teacher salary 56 percent.

However, he states the loss in taxable value represented by those 603 acres has been 0.01 percent.

A total of $1,553,643 under Public Law 815 and $720,808 under Public Law 874 has gone into Valley County. Most of this Federal payment stems from the Glasgow Airbase, whose lands when taxed, I repeat, brought the county $87.85 a year.

In fiscal 1959, Valley County schools included 85 children whose parents or parent lived and worked on the base and 294 children of airbase personnel who lived off base.

In fiscal 1960, the number of children rose respectively to 281 children in category A and 370 children in category B.

In fiscal 1960, more than $250,000 went into Valley County schools under Public Law 874. Well over half that amount relates to the Glasgow Airbase. But if only half the annual payment were related to the airbase, that $125,000 would be more than 1,400 times greater than the taxes previously paid on lands now part of the base.

Or, to put it another way, each year the Federal Government grants that $87.85, formerly raised by taxes, several times over, for each of several hundred children.

I hope the details I have cited on this particular question make clear to all that Public Laws 815 and 874 relate to the cost of educating children, that they are not in-lieu payments.

On the Northern Cheyenne Reservation, 89 percent of the land is in trust status, and subsequently no taxes are paid on it. Much of the land in this area, as on many Indian reservations, is poor and unproductive, worth less than that in Valley County. Under Public Law 815, $629,178 in Federal money has been spent in the Lame Deer and Ashland School Districts in this area. Under Public Law 874, the Federal Government contributed $36,446 to these two school districts in 1959, and $50,709 in 1960.

On March 17, 1961, Valley County Superintendent of Schools Ruth Putz wrote me a letter describing the history and criteria of Federal impact appropriations in that area. I ask that it be printed as part of my presentation, and I commend to all this enlightening letter from a fine teacher and administrator.

Sincerely yours,

LEE METCALF.

VALLEY COUNTY,
Glasgow, Mont., March 17, 1961.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
Old Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: A day message sent you on Tuesday, March 14, 1961, gave you statistical information regarding school district No. 1, Valley County, Glasgow, Mont.

Are these payments under Public Law 874 "in lieu of taxes?" Does "in lieu of" mean that certain lands were once privately owned and taxed, and then taken by the Federal Government to public use, and now the Federal Government under Public Law 874 is compensating for this loss? Or does "in lieu of taxes" mean that there was, or is, any existing tax base to lose and because public education depends upon such a base for taxes, Public Law 874 is given to the district "in lieu of" any property upon which to base a tax to support education for children, in other words "impact."

Five of Valley County's 13 operating school districts receive Federal aid for maintenance and operation of public schools under the provisions of Public Law 874, and likewise all 5 have or are now receiving construction aid under Public Law 815. Let me sketch for you a brief narrative of three of these districts which will review the history and philosophy of Federal Government in giving aid for public education.

(a) Frazer—Fort Peck Indian Reservation.
(b) Fort Peck—Project Missouri River at Fort Peck (Fort Peck Dam).
(c) Glasgow—Glasgow Air Force Base.

FRAZER—FORT PECK INDIAN RESERVATION

Frazer School District No. 2 is presently receiving aid under Public Law 874 after transferring from Johnson-O'Malley 3 years ago.

History shows us that the first President of the United States recognized the need for education of the Indian children and made this an obligation of the Federal Government by treaties. Such treaties were made with all Indian tribes and when Montana became a State, we accepted this obligation for education of native Americans in our enabling act. From 1934 until 1958, Indian education was financed under the provisions of the Johnson-O'Malley Act. We are now under Public Law 874 in district No. 2, Frazer.

Was this "money in lieu of taxes" under definition 1 or 2?

"Lands which are occupied by a tribe or tribes of Indians have always been regarded as not within the jurisdiction of the State for purposes of State property taxation." The tribes have been regarded as distinct political communities. Therefore we never lost any land from taxation (definition 1 cannot apply), but we need funds for education of children for which according to our philosophy, we have a civil, as well as a moral obligation.

FORT PECK DISTRICT NO. 21, VALLEY COUNTY—MISSOURI RIVER AT FORT PECK

The Fort Peck Dam started construction in 1933. The townsite of Fort Peck lies in school district No. 21, Valley County, but the powerhouse lies across the Missouri River and in fact in another county (McCone).

The project[1] consists of 610,036 acres associated with it. Of this 422,069 acres were public domain, and 20,263 acres in riverbed and flow, and only 167,704 acres were purchased. Of the lands purchased only 36,217.26 acres lay in Valley County, the remainder in Garfield, McCone, Phillips, Petroleum, and Fergus Counties. Specifically, school district No. 21 lost 8,880 acres or 86 percent of its land. It was operating a one-room rural school with an enrollment in 1932 of 12, 1933 of 7, 1934 of 30, 1935 of 332 aside from a Federal Government school which had an enrollment of 258. (See exhibit A, col. A.) Likewise, the impact of elementary school children had overflowed into the adjoining districts Nos. 6 and 20. (See cols. B and C of exhibit A and for location of same see map exhibit B.) Remember this was 1932 to 1937 and while everyone was happy to have a job, the schools had a terrific pupil-teacher load and no means of finance. (I was a "dam" teacher, you know.) There was no Federal aid and no taxable property to support education.

Finally in 1946, Wesley D'Ewart, Republican, introduced a bill in the House which became Public Law 586 which made an appropriation to the Corps of Engineers at Fort Peck to be used for education of the public schoolchildren whose parents were employed on the Fort Peck project and who resided at Fort Peck. No mention was made to "in lieu of." It was a recognition of a responsibility for education due to a Government-directed order.

Then in about 1952, after the Federal Government had built more dams, projects, etc., a general policy for any school district federally impacted was adopted and Federal funds for impacted areas was established and administered through the Office of Education under provisions of Public Law 874. Today, Fort Peck School District No. 21 receives financial aid under Public Law 874.

If this was money in lieu of tax property lost, then the other counties of McCone, Garfield, etc., should likewise be compensated by the Federal Government.

GLASGOW SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 1, VALLEY COUNTY, MONT.

As stated in our other correspondence the present Glasgow Air Force Base contains 4,520 acres. Three thousand nine hundred and seventeen acres was State land (not subject to tax). The loss in acres to school district No. 1, is 603 acres or 0.019095 percent. However, the impact of students is immense:

---

[1] Information courtesy of Don Beckman, Corps of Engineers, Fort Peck.

	1957 (May)	1961	Percent increase
Enrollment	1,333	2,626	200
Teachers	54	[1] 120	56
Operational costs			202

[1] Plus administrative staff.

Payment in lieu of taxes on property lost (0.019095 percent) could never compensate for the impact of enrollment of 200 gain.

Do we need Federal aid to replace money lost by seizure of property by Federal Government, or do we need Federal aid to compensate for the increased burden of education placed upon a district by reason of a Federal installation?

The criteria set forth for entitlement under Public Law 874 takes into account (a) local effort and (b) eligible pupils in terms of residence and employment.

If Federal reimbursement is to be made on "in lieu of" the basis of actual acres lost to taxation because of a Federal installation—

(1) Frazer School District No. 2 would have no entitlement since no acres were lost.

(2) Fort Peck School District No. 21 should receive 86 percent of what the land would earn in taxation to support a school population of 99.4 percent 3a pupils.

(3) Glasgow School District No. 1 should receive 0.019095 percent.

The loss of acreage is not the important aspect. The increase in school population with its allied increase in maintenance, operational, and construction costs is of prime importance.

Respectfully submitted.

Ruth Putz
Mrs. Wayne Putz, Sr.
County Superintendent, Valley County Schools.

U.S. Senate,
Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
March 24, 1961.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Education,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Please make the attached March 19 letter and enclosures from Harry H. Cloke part of my response to your and Senator Dirksen's request, when I testified on Monday, March 13, for documentation of the statement that Public Laws 815 and 874 are directly related to the costs of education, rather than local taxes.

I previously sent you my letter and a supporting letter from Superintendent Ruth Putz.

Sincerely,

Lee Metcalf.

Lame Deer Public School,
Lame Deer, Mont., March 19, 1961.

Senator Lee Metcalf,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Metcalf: As a school administrator for many years in federally affected areas I can most emphatically assure you that Public Law 815 and Public Law 874 funds are most directly related to the cost of education and not a mere means of payment in lieu of taxes. It is most imperative to state that these funds are honorably intended to educate children, not to reduce taxes.

It is lamentably shortsighted for anyone to consider the vital funds of Public Law 815 and Public Law 874 as a mere meeting of a moral obligation by the Federal Government. The enclosures give most irrefutable proof of my thesis that Federal funds are solely directed to the educating of children and not to the mere reduction of taxes. (It seems essential to emphasize this.)

Columns 7 and 8 of exhibits A and B show the local contribution rate and the per capita cost of five school districts comparable in this instance to Lame Deer. It is noted that our local contribution rate is $216.61 while our per capita cost is $473.05. Our Public Law 874 money is used in its entirety for a percentage portion of the cost of operating and maintaining our public school whose students are 95 percent northern Cheyenne Indians.

Sincerely,

Harry H. Cloke,
Principal, Lame Deer Public Schools.

Exhibit A

Table 6.—*Comparable district data for school districts individually selected as comparable to applicant district*

(To be completed in full by sec. 3 and sec. 4 applicants unless: (1) State has group rates or (2) application is made under subsec. 3(c)(1) only and applicant elects to have local contribution rate based on minimum rate, requested in table 4, item 1)

Montana-60-E-506 LAME DEER NO. 6, ROSEBUD COUNTY

Names of 5 comparable school districts and county in which located	ADA	Revenue receipts for current expense purposes		Current expenses paid from local sources only (exclusive of debt service and capital outlay expenditures excluded by Public Law 874)	Total current expenses (exclusive of debt service and capital outlay expenditures excluded by Public Law 874)	Local contribution rate (col. 5 divided by col. 2)	Per capita cost (col. 6 divided by col. 2)
		From local sources only	From all sources				
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
1. Total for all districts in State	124,051	$33,803,202	$49,861,901	$33,801,383	$49,861,901	$272.48	$401.95
2. Names of comparable school districts (data for 1956-57):							
Roosevelt County, Bainville, No. 64	148.2	52,582	72,180	48,014	65,908	323.98	444.72
Bonner, No. 14, Missoula County	225.0	71,658	99,641	75,658	105,198	336.26	467.55
Swan Valley, No. 33, Missoula County	34.7	12,918	22,044	13,154	22,447	379.08	646.89
Froid, No. 65, Roosevelt County	135.7	55,795	70,439	54,945	69,367	404.70	511.18
Greenfield, No. 75, Teton County	109.0	31,350	47,899	33,134	50,625	303.98	464.45
3. Comparable districts: Aggregate for cols. 2-6; quotient for cols. 7 and 8, Lame	652.6	224,303	312,203	224,905	313,545	344.63	480.50
4. Applicant district (1956-57), Lame Deer, No. 6	180.4	30,097	65,722	39,077	85,339	216.61	473.50

Harry H. Cloke,
Principal, Authorized Representative.
K. F. Bergan,
State Director of Public Law 874.

Table 7.—*Information relating to school districts entered in table 6 for fiscal year 1957–58*

(To be completed in full by sec. 3 and sec. 4 applicants unless: (1) State has group rates or (2) application is made under subsec. 3(c)(1) only and applicant elects to have local contribution rate based on minimum rate, requested in table 4, item 1)

Montana-60-E-506 LAME DEER NO. 6, ROSEBUD COUNTY ELEMENTARY

School districts	Legal classification	Type of community (urban, suburban, or rural)	Grade levels maintained	Percent of pupils transported	Pupil-teacher ratio	Assessed taxable valuation		School tax rate for current expenses only (mills per $1)	Total tax rate for all school purposes (mills per $1)
						Total for school purposes	Percent of true value		
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
1. Bainville, No. 64, Roosevelt County	3d	Rural	1 to 8	49.38	23 to 1	$1,177,556	30.7	38.82	38.82
2. Bonner, No. 14, Missoula County	2d	do	do	None	20 to 1	1,445,020	30.2	53.44	66.82
3. Swan Valley, No. 33, Missoula County	3d	do	do	100.00	13 to 1	163,396	27.9	63.22	65.85
4. Froid, No. 65, Roosevelt County	2d	do	do	46.58	19 to 1	775,640	26.5	53.35	53.35
5. Greenfield, No. 75, Teton County	3d	do	do	91.73	22 to 1	312,423	24.6	45.76	50.04
6. Applicant:									
Lame Deer a, 1957–58	do	do	do	11.16	20 to 1	77,444	24.6	26.57	26.57
Lame Deer b, 1959–60	do	do	do	11.16	20 to 1	98,014	28.3	30.00	30.00

EXHIBIT B

TABLE 6.—*Comparable district data for school districts individually selected as comparable to applicant district*

(To be completed in full by sec. 3 and sec. 4 applicants unless: (1) State has group rates or (2) application is made under subsec. 3(c)(1) only and applicant elects to have local contribution rate based on minimum rate, requested in table 4, item 1)

BABB NO. 8 ELEMENTARY, GLACIER COUNTY

No. 102-874 (1960-61)

Names of 5 comparable school districts and county in which located (1)	ADA (2)	Revenue receipts for current expense purposes: From local sources only (3)	Revenue receipts for current expense purposes: From all sources (4)	Current expenses paid from local sources only (exclusive of debt service and capital outlay expenditures excluded by Public Law 874) (5)	Total current expenses (exclusive of debt service and capital outlay expenditures excluded by Public Law 874) (6)	Local contribution rate (col. 5 divided by col. 2) (7)	Per capita cost (col. 6 divided by col. 2) (8)
1. Total for all districts in the State	128,785	$35,530,164	$53,287,708	$34,116,039	$51,148,485	$264.91	$397.16
2. Names of comparable school districts (data for 1958-59):							
Boyd No. 28, Carbon County	35.7	11,708	16,870	10,415	15,007	291.74	420.36
Winkler No. 28, Glacier County	27.8	16,580	21,610	15,070	19,643	542.09	706.58
Hellgate No. 4, Missoula County	63.5	17,463	26,123	15,432	23,085	243.02	363.54
Heron No. 3, Sanders County	45.7	16,261	22,930	16,909	23,846	370.00	521.79
Logan No. 1, Gallatin County	42.9	11,972	18,467	10,807	16,679	251.91	388.79
3. Comparable districts: Aggregate, cols. 2-6; quotient, cols. 7 and 8	215.6	73,984	106,000	68,633	98,260	318.33	455.75
4. Applicant district (1958-59): Babb No. 8, Glacier	47.7	14,934	26,552	16,970	30,174	355.77	632.57

TABLE 7.—*Information relating to school districts entered in table 6 for fiscal year 1958-59*

(To be completed in full by sec. 3 and sec. 4 applicants unless: (1) State has group rates or (2) application is made under subsec. 3(c)(1) only and applicant elects to have local contribution rate based on minimum rate, requested in table 4, item 1)

BABB NO. 8 ELEMENTARY, GLACIER COUNTY

No. 102-874 (1960-61)

School districts (1)	Legal classification (2)	Type of community (urban, suburban, or rural) (3)	Grade levels maintained (4)	Percent of pupils transported (5)	Pupil-teacher ratio (6)	Assessed taxable valuation: Total for school purposes (7)	Assessed taxable valuation: Percent of true value (8)	School tax rate for current expenses only (mills per $1) (9)	Total tax rate for all school purposes (mills per $1) (10)
Boyd	3	Rural	1 to 8		13 to 1	$230,861	28.82	33.00	33.00
Winkler	do	do	do		10 to 1	709,194	46.06	20.20	33.52
Hellgate	do	do	do		19 to 1	1,353,174	29.32	21.87	25.40
Heron	do	do	do		15 to 1	258,457	31.06	44.59	52.81
Logan	do	do	do		16 to 1	727,095	36.41	23.05	23.05
Applicant:									
Babb a. 1958-59	do	do	do		17 to 1	338,969	27.55	31.22	35.78
Babb b. 1960-61	do	do	do		do				

EXHIBIT C

TABLE 6.—*Comparable district data for school districts individually selected as comparable to applicant district*

(To be completed in full by sec. 3 and sec. 4 applicants unless: (1) State has group rates or (2) application is made under subsec. 3(c)(1) only and applicant elects to have local contribution rate based on minimum rate, requested in table 4, item 1)

Names of 5 comparable school districts and county in which located (1)	ADA (2)	Revenue receipts for current expense purposes: From local sources only (3)	Revenue receipts for current expense purposes: From all sources (4)	Current expenses paid from local sources only (exclusive of debt service and capital outlay expenditures excluded by Public Law 874) (5)	Total current expenses (exclusive of debt service and capital outlay expenditures excluded by Public Law 874) (6)	Local contribution rate (col. 5 divided by col. 2) (7)	Per capita cost (col. 6 divided by col. 2) (8)
1. Total for all districts in State	128,785	$35,530,164	$53,287,708	$32,116,039	$51,148,485	$264.91	$397.16
2. Names of comparable school districts (data for 1958-59):							
Logan No. 1, Gallatin County	42.9	11,972	18,467	10,807	16,679	251.91	388.79
Swan Valley No. 33, Missoula County	41.6	10,520	25,520	9,567	23,221	229.98	558.20
Herris No. 3, Sanders County	45.7	16,261	22,930	16,909	23,846	370.00	521.79
Lonepine No. 12, Sanders County	44.3	16,587	26,565	13,972	22,377	315.40	505.12
Frazer No. 2, Valley County	124	30,215	55,994	30,405	56,347	245.20	454.41
3. Comparable districts: Aggregate, cols. 2-6; quotient, cols. 7 and 8	298.5	85,555	148,458	81,660	142,470	273.57	477.29
4. Applicant district (1958-59)	65.5	17,566	25,789	25,278	37,119	385.92	566.70

TABLE 7.—*Information relating to school districts entered in table 6 for fiscal years 1958–59*

(To be completed in full by sec. 3 and sec. 4 applicants unless: (1) State has group rates or (2) application is made under subsec. 3(c)(1) only and applicant elects to have local contribution rate based on minimum rate, requested in table 4, item 1)

School districts (1)	Legal classification (2)	Type of community (urban, suburban, or rural) (3)	Grade levels maintained (4)	Pupil-teacher ratio (6)	Assessed valuation: Total for school purposes (7)	Assessed valuation: Percent of true value (8)	School tax rate for current expenses only (mills per $1) (9)	Total tax rate for all school purposes (mills per $1) (10)
1. Logan No. 1, Gallatin	3	Rural	L-1-8	16-1	$727,095	36.41	23.05	23.05
2. Swan Valley, Missoula	3	do	1-8	20-1	169,881	25.03	52.31	62.94
3. Heron, Sanders County	3	do	1-8	17-1	258,457	31.06	44.59	52.81
4. Lonepine No. 2, Sanders	3	do	1-8	6-1	207,625	27.34	53.16	53.16
5. Frazer No. 2, Valley	3	do	1-8	21-1	483,998	25.29	46.37	46.37
6. East Glacier No. 50 [1]	3	do	1-8	21-1	656,538	33.16	37.88	37.88
East Glacier No. 50 [2]	3	do	1-8	21-1			27.60	27.60

[1] 1958-59. [2] 1960-61.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, how much time have I left?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator has not any.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is speaking on time yielded by the minority leader.

Mr. MORSE. We have an hour and a half available.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But I have control of the time.

Mr. MORSE. I ask the Senator from Illinois how much time he has remaining.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will ask the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada has 11 minutes remaining. The Senator from Illinois has 18 minutes remaining.

Mr. MORSE. I beg the Senator from Illinois to yield to the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. PROXMIRE. I should like to reserve some time to explain my amendments.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I shall be most charitable.

I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I enthusiastically support the statement of the Senator from Oregon. I support his amendments. I hope the Senate will agree to them.

I wish to discuss the sales tax increase which has been recommended by the District Committee. I recognize that substantial additional revenues are needed in the District of Columbia.

I think the Senator from Oregon has offered alternative methods of securing the revenues. In fact, his amendments would raise more revenue than the sales tax would raise.

As I believe was brought out in my colloquy with the distinguished Senator from Nevada, Mr. BIBLE, who is chairman of the committee, the present taxes in the District of Columbia, including all taxes, income, real property, personal property, sales, auto tax, and so forth, are roughly proportionate to income in middle income brackets. If income ranges between $5,000 and $15,000, according to a table introduced by District of Columbia Commissioner Tobriner in the record on page 22 of the hearings, District of Columbia taxes are 5.8 percent of income for a man making $5,000 a year and about 5.8 percent for a man making $15,000 a year. However, it seems to me that the concept that should be grasped in imposing taxation is that people with a small income use a very large proportion of that income to buy the bare necessities of life.

A man with a $5,000 income must spend perhaps $4,000 to provide a bare minimum of food, shelter, clothing, and all the other essentials for his family and himself in the District. This means that he has only about $1,000 left for recreation and everything else that he wants to spend money on. I believe that this is a fair and proper and realistic concept. If the proposed tax measure is adopted it will mean that a man with a $5,000 income must pay 23 percent of the money he has available above the bare essentials of life; with a $7,500, it would be 12 percent; with a $10,000 income, about 9 percent; with a $15,000 income, about 8 percent. In other words, applying this concept the District of Columbia tax is highly regressive.

Of course, a man with an income of less than $5,000 is hit cruelly by this kind of tax system, because it means that if he has an income of $2,500 or $3,000—and many families in the District have that low an income—he will simply not be able to buy the bare necessities of life, and will very possibly be pushed over the edge onto relief.

The fact is that virtually all taxes are taxes on income. However, a sales tax is a tax on income which is spent. It is not a tax on income which is saved. It is a tax on income which is spent within the taxing area.

I submit that a man with a small income who cannot travel and certainly cannot save much will have to pay a far higher proportion of his income in sales taxes than a man who can save a part of his income. That is why a sales tax is regressive.

The District of Columbia, by increasing its sales tax, encourages Maryland and Virginia to increase their sales taxes. As the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia has admitted in the colloquy with me, the fact is Virginia has no sales tax. Maryland has a 3-percent sales tax. However, that Maryland sales tax exempts food. The District of Columbia puts a 1-percent tax on food. This will mean that the sales tax in the District will be more burdensome and more regressive than the sales tax in the surrounding areas.

It seems to me that the real argument here should be that the alternative obviously beckoning to the District Committee is to increase the income tax. The income tax in the District of Columbia is a maximum of 5 percent. But that rate is not reached until income goes up to $25,000, so that the overwhelming majority of high-income people pay a lower rate tax. It does not go higher. In Virginia the income tax is 5 percent on all income over $5,000. In Wisconsin it goes up to 10 percent. In Oregon it is about 10 percent. Many other States are trying to have a progressive tax system. Yet in the Capital of the Nation we find a regressive tax system, with a maximum income tax at $25,000 of 5 percent. It puts the surrounding States in the position where they are forced to adopt the same kind of regressivity because of the competition of business and so forth.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I have only a few minutes but I will yield quickly to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does not the Senator think that the imposition of a sales tax will allow the millions of people who visit here each year as tourists from other parts of the country to make a contribution to the expense of the government in the District of Columbia which they could not do in any other way?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am delighted that the Senator has asked me that question. The people who visit the District of Columbia are taxpayers who contribute to the District of Columbia in the Federal payment that is made to the District. It seems to me that to impose additional taxes upon these people, who bring their children to visit the District of Columbia—and they should be encouraged to do so—is a very serious mistake. I oppose it on that ground, too.

I wish to conclude by saying that the disparity in income in the District of Columbia is obvious to anyone with eyes to see. One cannot drive around the city without finding area after area in which people have to live in the most dilapidated and dirty conditions. Slums here are among the worst anywhere.

Housing is very poor. Obviously the income of a very high proportion of the residents of the District of Columbia who are colored is very low. These are the people who will have to pay more in taxes because of the sales tax. On the other hand, statistics show that the per capita income in the District of Columbia is higher than in any other State except Delaware. This means that we should certainly, if we have any regard for progressivity, insist on an income tax which is at least comparable to that in most of the other States.

The President of the United States has called for an alliance of progress, which is a fine name for our South American aid program. The great weakness in many South American countries is that they do in those countries what is being done in the District of Columbia; namely, that the burden of the taxes is imposed upon those who are least able to pay. If any area of the country should set an example for these countries, it is the District of Columbia, the Capital of the Nation.

The money is needed. The District should have it. I feel very strongly that Washington, D.C., should be the model for the country and the model for the world.

When the District of Columbia recommends a series of tax increases, every one of which is regressive, and does not touch the District income tax, which is far lower than in other areas of the country, being only 5 percent, it seems to me that the District is not living up to the ideals of the administration or the progressive ideals of our Nation.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 36, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following:

"TITLE IX—AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC LAW 874, EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS, TO INCLUDE THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

"SEC. 901. Section 9(8) of the Act of September 30, 1950 (20 U.S.C. 244(8) is amended by inserting 'the District of Columbia,' after 'Guam,'.

"On page 36, line 21 and following, redesignate title IX as title X and redesignate the sections in such title accordingly.

"On page 37, line 14, before the period insert a comma and 'other than title IX'".

Mr. Morse. The amendment provides that the District of Columbia shall come under Public Law 874. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has assured us that the law can apply to the District of Columbia if we adopt an amendment.

The amendment contains technical provisions however to make certain that the District authorities will not determine what is covered. I ask the chairman if he will agree to take the amendment to conference. It is a sound amendment.

Mr. Bible. What the Senator from Oregon has said during his very able discussion of the revenue problem of the District of Columbia is very impressive, and has impressed me a great deal today.

There is a question here about the impacted areas bill not having included the District of Columbia. I am frank to say that this was not completely discussed by our committee. It seems to me, however, if it is good for Bethesda, as the Senator has pointed out, and good for New York City—and I know it is good for the State of Nevada—perhaps it is good also for the District of Columbia.

I do not know all the ramifications. The only thing that concerned me was that it might possibly mean that this amount will be taken off the Federal payment. The Senator from Oregon seems to think and made the statement in his preliminary remarks that this would not happen.

Mr. Morse. I have read into the Record a memorandum which indicates that that would not happen.

Mr. Bible. I am perfectly willing to take the amendment to conference. It has considerable merit. I am happy to accept the amendment.

The Presiding Officer. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. Morse. Mr. President, I send the next amendment to the desk. It is an amendment to increase the tax on hard liquor from $1.50 to $2 a gallon. As the chairman knows, the committee felt there was a great deal of merit to the amendment. There is a chance here to impose a tax on the basis of ability to pay.

The Presiding Officer. The amendment will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 10, line 14, strike out "$1.50" and insert "$2.00". On page 10, line 16, strike out "$1.50" and insert "$2.00".

Mr. Morse. It would be better to have a tax on booze than on boots.

Mr. Bible. Mr. President, in this area the Senator from Oregon makes a rather impressive case. By way of comparison, the State of Maryland imposes a tax of $2.50 per gallon on alcohol and $1.50 per gallon on spirits. The figure proposed by the committee was the best judgment of the committee. We arrived at a figure of $1.50 per gallon for both alcohol and spirits. However, I am not adverse to accepting the figure of $2 a gallon on spirits and alcohol. I am perfectly willing to take the amendment to conference and attempt to hold it in conference.

Mr. Morse. I appreciate the Senator's statement. I am ready to vote.

The Presiding Officer. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. Morse. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to increase the tax on each package of cigarettes to 5 cents. I think it would be in the public interest as well as in the interest of increasing the tax revenues of the District of Columbia on the basis of ability to pay rather than to tax the necessities of life.

As the Senator from Nevada knows, the State of Maryland imposes a higher tax on cigarettes. I think a tax of 5 cents a package is a reasonable compromise. I beseech and urge the chairman of my committee to accept the amendment.

Mr. Lausche. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. Morse. I yield.

Mr. Lausche. If we keep increasing these taxes, will we not ultimately be producing an amount far more than is requested? Does the Senator from Oregon propose a reduction of the tax on some items?

Mr. Morse. My last amendment will propose some reduction in the amount of revenue to be raised.

The Presiding Officer. The amendment of the Senator from Oregon will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 7, line 13, it is proposed to strike out "4 cents" and insert in lieu thereof "5 cents."

Mr. Bible. Mr. President, this question was discussed at length in the full committee. There was some feeling that the tax should be 4 cents, some feeling that it should be 5 cents, and some feeling that it should be 6 cents a package. The tax in Maryland is 6 cents a package; in the Commonwealth of Virginia it is 3 cents a package. This proposal, again, involves a question of judgment. The committee was fairly well divided as to whether the tax should be 4 cents or 5 cents. I am willing to accept the amendment and take it to conference.

The Presiding Officer. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. Morse. Mr. President, I offer the next amendment which I send to the desk. I have not been so persuasive with the chairman with respect to increasing the tax on parking facilities. I think the operators of such facilities are getting away with a tax that is too low.

The Presiding Officer. Does the Senator from Oregon desire to have his amendment read?

Mr. Morse. Not in its entirety; just the title. I ask that the amendment be printed in the Record.

The Presiding Officer. The amendment will be printed.

The amendment is as follows:

"On page 36, after line 20, insert the following new title:

"TITLE IX—TAX ON AMOUNTS PAID FOR PARKING OF MOTOR VEHICLES

"'SEC. 901. TAX ON PARKING FEES.

"'(a) IMPOSITION OF TAX.—There is hereby imposed on amounts paid for parking any motor vehicle in any commercial parking facility in the District of Columbia a tax equal to 10 percent of the amounts so paid.

"'(b) FRACTIONAL PARTS OF CENTS.—If the amount of tax imposed under subsection (a) includes a fractional part of a cent—

"'(1) such fractional part shall be disregarded if it is less than ½ cent, and

"'(2) the tax imposed shall be increased to the next higher whole cent if such fractional part is ½ cent or more.

"'(c) BY WHOM PAID.—The tax imposed by subsection (a) shall be returned and paid by the person receiving the amount paid for parking.

"'SEC. 902. DEFINITIONS.

"'For purposes of this title—

"'(1) COMMERCIAL PARKING FACILITY.—The term "commercial parking facility" means any premises used for the parking of motor vehicles if a charge is made, directly or indirectly, for the parking of any motor vehicle thereon, except that such term does not include—

"'(A) any such facility which has a maximum capacity for parking less than five motor vehicles of average size, or

"'(B) any such facility if the maximum charge for parking a motor vehicle thereon does not exceed a rate of 25 cents per day.

"'(2) COMMISSIONERS.—The term "Commissioners" means the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

"'SEC. 903. EXCEPTIONS.

"'(a) TRUCKS AND BUSES.—The tax imposed by section 901 shall not apply to amounts paid for parking—

"'(1) any truck or truck trailer or semitrailer, or

"'(2) any motor vehicle which has a passenger seating capacity of ten or more adult passengers, including the driver

"'(b) GOVERNMENT-OWNED MOTOR VEHICLES.—The tax imposed by section 901 shall not apply to amounts paid for parking any motor vehicle owned by the United States, the District of Columbia, or any State, or any agency or instrumentality of any of the foregoing, if—

"'(1) such motor vehicle may be used only in the official business of the Government which owns such motor vehicle, or

"'(2) an occupant of such motor vehicle is engaged in official business during the time that such motor vehicle is parked.

"'(c) PARKING METERS.—The tax imposed by section 901 shall not apply to any amount paid for parking if the amount paid is deposited in a parking meter maintained by the District of Columbia.

"'SEC. 904. AMOUNTS PAID WHICH INCLUDE AMOUNTS PAID FOR PARKING.

"'(a) PARKING PRIVILEGES INCLUDED AT NO ADDITIONAL CHARGE.—In any case in which a lease of property (other than property used by the lessee as his personal residence) confers on the lessee a privilege to park one or more motor vehicles in a commercial parking facility without additional charge, the amounts paid under such leases shall be considered to include an amount paid for parking such motor vehicle or vehicles within the meaning of section 901. The amount so considered to be paid shall be an amount, determined under regulations prescribed by the Commissioners, equal to the amount by which the payments for the property leased exceed payments for the lease of comparable property which does not confer any parking privileges on the lessee.

"'(b) PARKING PRIVILEGES INCLUDED UPON PAYMENT OF HIGHER RENTAL.—In any case in which a lease of property (other than property used by the lessee as his personal residence) confers on the lessee a privilege to park one or more motor vehicles in a commercial parking facility for a stipulated additional rental, the amount so stipulated shall be considered an amount paid for parking such motor vehicle or vehicles within the meaning of section 901.

"'SEC. 905. ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.

"'The provisions of section 126 and of sections 129 through 152 of the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act, as amended (63 Stat. 115, 117–124; D.C. Code § 47-2603 and § 47-2606–§ 47-2629), shall under regulations prescribed by the Commissioners, apply with respect to the tax imposed by section 901.

"'SEC. 906. SHORT TITLE.

"'This title may be cited as the "District of Columbia Tax Act."

"'SEC. 907. EFFECTIVE DATE.

"'The tax imposed by section 901 shall apply only with respect to amounts paid on or after the first day of the first month which begins more than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act for the parking of motor vehicles on or after such first day.

" 'Renumber title IX, and sections 901, 902, 903, and 904, to be title X, and sections 1001, 1002, 1003, and 1004, respectively.' "

Mr. Bible. Mr. President, I must resist this amendment. It has not had the full consideration of the committee. It concerns a new area of taxation and requires further study. It may have merit but I hope the Senator from Oregon will not press the amendment, but will give the Subcommittees on Fiscal Affairs of both the Senate and the House an opportunity to explore it further.

Mr. Morse. I think it is a fair tax. The need for it is so obvious that hearings are not needed. The operators of parking facilities are not paying enough taxes. They have the ability to pay.

Mr. President, I ask for a voice vote.

The Presiding Officer. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. Morse. Mr. President, I offer the next amendment which I send to the desk.

The Presiding Officer. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. Bible. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The Presiding Officer. The Senator from Nevada has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. Bible. I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. Morse. The Senator from Nevada is gracious.

The Presiding Officer. The amendment will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 36, after line 20, insert a new title 9, as follows:

"TITLE IX—TAX ON AMOUNTS PAID AS RENTS FOR NONRESIDENTIAL PROPERTY

"Sec. 901. Tax on Rents for Real Property.

"(a) Imposition of Tax.—There is hereby imposed on amounts paid as rent for any real property situated in the District of Columbia a tax equal to 10 percent of the amounts so paid.

"(b) Tax Applicable Only to Amounts Paid for Right of Occupancy.—If any lease of real property confers on the lessee any rights or privileges in addition to the right to occupy the real property leased and to services or facilities furnished in connection therewith, the tax imposed by subsection (a) shall apply only to that portion of the amounts paid as rent under such lease as is attributable to the right to occupy the real property leased and to such services or facilities. The portion of the amounts paid so attributable shall be determined under regulations prescribed by the Commissioners.

"(c) Subleases.—If the amount paid as rent is paid by a lessee who has subleased the rented property to a sublessee, or is paid by any subsequent sublessor of such property, the tax imposed by subsection (a) shall apply only to that portion (if any) of the amount paid as exceeds the amount paid as rent for such property by his sublessee.

"(d) By Whom Paid.—The tax imposed by subsection (a) shall be returned and paid by the person paying the rent.

"(e) Definition.—For purposes of this title, the term 'Commissioner' means the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

"Sec. 902. Exceptions.

"(a) Personal Residences.—The tax imposed by section 901 shall not apply to amounts paid as rent for any real property used solely as a personal residence. In any case in which real property is used both as a personal residence and for any other purpose or purposes, the tax imposed by section 901 shall apply only to that portion of the amounts paid as rent as is attributable to such other purpose or purposes. The amount so attributable shall be determined under regulations prescribed by the Commissioners.

"(b) Unimproved Property.—The tax imposed by section 901 shall not apply to amounts paid as rent for unimproved real property.

"(c) Rents Paid by the United States, the District of Columbia, and so Forth.—The tax imposed by section 901 shall not apply to amounts paid as rent by the United States or the District of Columbia, or by any government, organization, or person specified in section 1 of the Act entitled 'An Act to define real property exempt from taxation in the District of Columbia', approved December 24, 1942, as amended (56 Stat. 1089; D.C. code § 47–801a), if the property rented is used for purposes which would entitle such property to be exempt from taxation under such section if it were owned by such government, organization, or person.

"Sec. 903. Credits for Tax Paid.

"(a) Corporations.—Title VII of the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947, as amended (61 Stat. 345; D.C. Code § 47–1571—§ 47–1571a), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

" 'Sec. 3. Credit for Tax Paid on Rent.—There shall be allowed as a credit against the tax imposed by section 2 of this title for any taxable year an amount equal to the amount of tax paid or accrued by the taxpayer during such taxable year under section 901 of the District of Columbia Rent Tax Act. The amount of tax paid or accrued under such section shall not be taken into account in computing the taxable income (as defined in section 1 of this title) of the taxpayer.'

"(b) Unincorporated Businesses.—Title VIII of the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947, as amended (D.C. Code § 47–1574—§ 47–1574e), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section.

"Sec. 7. Credit for Tax Paid on Rent.—There shall be allowed as a credit against the tax imposed by section 3 of this title for any taxable year an amount equal to the amount of tax paid or accrued by the taxpayer during such taxable year under section 901 of the District of Columbia Rent Tax Act. The amount of tax paid or accrued under such section shall not be taken into account in computing the taxable income (as defined in section 2 of this title) of the taxpayer."

"Sec. 904. Collection; Administrative Provisions.

"(a) Returns and Payments.—Returns of the tax imposed by section 901 shall be made at such times, but not more often than once during each calendar quarter, as may be required by regulations prescribed by the Commissioners. The tax shall be paid at the time of making the return.

"(b) Information by Lessors.—Every person owning real property situated in the District of Columbia which is leased to any other person, and every person leasing or subleasing real property situated in the District of Columbia who subleases such property to any other person, shall furnish at such times and in such manner as may be required by regulations prescribed by the Commissioners—

"(1) the name of the person or persons to whom such property is leased or subleased;

"(2) the amount of rents payable under the lease or sublease; and

"(3) such other relevant information as may be required by regulations prescribed by the Commissioners.

The provisions of this subsection shall not apply with respect to property used solely as a personal residence or to unimproved property.

"(c) Administration Provisions.—Except to the extent inconsistent with the provisions of this title, the provisions of sections 217, 220, 221, and 223 of the District of Columbia Use Tax Act, as amended (63 Stat. 127–128; D.C. Code sections 47–2707, 47–2710, 47–2711, and 47–2713), including the provisions of the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act made applicable by such sections, shall, under regulations prescribed by the Commissioners, apply with respect to the tax imposed by section 901.

"Sec. 905. Short Title.—This title may be cited as the 'District of Columbia Rent Tax Act'.

"Sec. 906. Effective Date.—The tax imposed by section 901 shall apply only with respect to amounts paid on or after the date of the enactment of this act for rents becoming due and payable on or after the first day of the first month which begins more than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this act.

"Renumber title IX, and sections 901, 902, 903, and 904, to be title X, and sections 1001, 1002, 1003, and 1004, respectively."

Mr. Morse. Mr. President, the only purpose of the amendment is to tax the fellow who makes his money in the District of Columbia but lives outside the District. It imposes a tax on commercial rents that would be paid by individuals and organizations engaged in activities in the District but not effectively subject to the District of Columbia corporate tax—the tax on unincorporated businesses, or, the individual income tax. He ought to be required to pay such a tax. If he makes his living here, he ought to be required to pay a tax. I urge that the amendment be agreed to.

Mr. Bible. Mr. President, the amendment was considered by the committee. It has some appeal, but it raises some problems. I hope it will be possible for the committee to consider it in another year. I am opposed to this particular amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. Morse. Mr. President, I ask for a voice vote.

The Presiding Officer. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. Morse. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senator from New York to my next proposal, to my plea for the elimination of the sales tax on groceries. It is offered as an amendment to the bill. I simply do not think a 1-percent tax can be justified on the food which poor people have to take into their mouths in order to live in the District of Columbia. I think the tax ought to be repealed. My amendment proposes to repeal it.

The Presiding Officer. The amendment will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. At the appropriate place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 114(a)(1) of the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act (D.C. Code, sec. 47–2601) is amended to read as follows:

" '(1) The sale for consumption of any meals, food, drink, or other tangible personal property for a consideration at any restaurant, hotel, drugstore, club, resort, or other place at which meals, food, drink, or other tangible personal property are sold.'

"Sec. 2. The proviso in section 125 of the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act (D.C. Code, sec. 47–2602) is amended by striking out 'the rate of tax with respect to sales of food for human consumption off the premises where such food is sold shall be 1 per centum of the gross receipts from such sales, and that'.

"SEC. 3. Section 127 of the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act (D.C. Code, sec. 47-2604) is amended—

"(a) by striking out, in subsection (a), the following: 'other than sales of food for human consumption off the premises where such food is sold, and';

"(b) by striking out subsection (b); and

"(c) by redesignating subsection (c) as (b).

"SEC. 4. Section 128(d) of the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act (D.C. Code, sec. 47-2605) is amended by inserting before paragraph (2) thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"'(1) Sales of food for human consumption off the premises where such food is sold.

"SEC. 5. Paragraph (5) of section 201(a) of the District of Columbia Use Tax Act (D.C. Cod, sec. 47-2701) is repealed.

"SEC. 6. Section 212 of the District of Columbia Use Tax Act (D.C. Code, sec. 47-2702) is amended by striking out ', except that the rate of tax with respect to sales of food for human consumption off the premises where such food is sold shall be 1 per centum of the sales price of such sales'.

"SEC. 7. This Act shall take effect on July 1, 1961."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. When I was a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I espoused this amendment. I am glad the Senator from Oregon has offered it. It is the general practice in communities which impose a sales tax to exempt food because a tax on food is regressive. I sincerely hope the chairman of the committee may see fit to accept the amendment and take it to conference, as he has done with respect to a number of other amendments which, with his usual distinction and force, the Senator from Oregon has offered.

Mr. MORSE. This was the bill of the Senator from New York in the 86th Congress. I cosponsored it with him then.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the tax still be applicable on food which is consumed in a public merchandising place—that is, restaurants?

Mr. MORSE. Unfortunately, yes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I enthusiastically support the amendment. While it will cause the loss of $2.4 million of revenue, more than twice as much will be gained by the impacted areas amendment, accepted by the chairman of the committee. If this amendment is adopted, there will still be more revenue than was provided in the bill to begin with.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Wisconsin is correct.

Mr. President, I am ready to vote.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I am opposed to the amendment. It is a difficult amendment to resist. Twenty-four of the 35 States impose a tax higher than is imposed in the District of Columbia. Thirty-five States of the Union have this type of tax.

Believe me, the District of Columbia needs revenue, even if the impacted areas amendment is successful, because we are premising the total amount of revenue on a $36 million Federal payment. The House has allowed, to date, $30 million. There is a $6 million differential. I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on this amendment I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I offer my last amendment, which simply strikes out the sales tax provision.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Beginning on page 5, line 12, it is proposed to strike out all matter through line 5 of page 7.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this amendment strikes out the increase in the sales tax.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, again, regrettably, I must oppose this amendment. The amendment simply brings the District of Columbia tax into accord with that of the State of Maryland. I oppose the amendment and ask that the question be put.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on this amendment, I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 2 tary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. How much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has 3 minutes remaining; the Senator from Nevada has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, on page 48 of the hearings it is shown that the problem of the District of Columbia is mainly the result of the action of Congress in granting salary increases last year. I look back with a bit of comfort in remembering that I opposed a part of those salary increases. I think if we had been called upon to impose new taxes a year ago, when the salary increase bill was passed, we would not have been so liberal.

I should like to point out that the District of Columbia has 34 employees for every thousand population; Pittsburgh has 10 per thousand; Cincinnati has 12 per thousand; Cleveland has 12 per thousand.

It is quite bewildering, even recognizing that there are so many public services, to find that the District of Columbia has 34 employees per thousand. I venture to say—without having made a study of the matter—that that number is in excess of the needs.

Moreover, I should like to point out that the expenditure for personal services in the District of Columbia is $127 million; in Cleveland, $71 million; in Cincinnati, $44 million; in Buffalo, $49 million. Cities with larger populations have service expenditures 50 percent less than those in the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the Senator from Ohio has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I am happy to yield 1 minute to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. First, Mr. President, I wish to thank the chairman of the committee, Mr. BIBLE, for his cooperation in connection with this measure. It is typical of his leadership of the committee.

I hope the amendments which have been agreed to will be approved in the conference.

I cannot vote for the bill, because by the levying of a sales tax it imposes on the poor people of the District of Columbia. Nevertheless, I appreciate the help of the chairman of the committee in connection with the adoption of my amendments.

I wish to say that, in my judgment, the salary increase last year in the District of Columbia should have been larger. The trouble lies with Congress. Congress has not done its job; the Members of Congress have not served as good aldermen for the city of Washington.

What Congress should do is transfer to the free citizens of the District of Columbia their citizenship rights, and let them run the District of Columbia. Then Congress would not have to spend its time in dealing with what amount to city-council matters for the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, I shall not vote for the bill, because it is not good enough.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the first remarks of the distinguished Senator from Oregon—who is a most helpful member of our committee—in reciting again that there should be self-government in the District of Columbia.

If the Senator from Ohio, Mr. LAUSCHE, will examine the record of the Appropriations Committee in connection with this matter, I believe he will find that very little waste or extravagance exists in the various District of Columbia departments, in connection with the performance of the various responsibilities with which the District of Columbia is charged. This is not an ordinary American city; it is more in the nature of a combination city and State—the Nation's Capital. Certainly it has unusual problems. Under the able leadership, on this side of the Hill, of the distinguished junior Senator from West Virginia, Mr. BYRD, I believe every effort is being made to remove the waste and the fat from the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

Of course, it costs money to run the government of the Nation's great Capital City, and it will continue to cost money. Those who provide the necessary services in the District of Columbia—for instance, the services provided by the Police Department—are repeatedly lost to Federal agencies which are able to pay higher salaries. One of the very large problems in connection with the District of Columbia is in connection with recruiting sufficient personnel for an adequate police force. That is most difficult, because it is impossible for the District of Columbia to pay high enough salaries to command the best possible police force members, whereas the District of Columbia should have the best police force both in the Nation and in the entire world.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. BIBLE. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I believe the Senator from Nevada and I are talking along the same line. The Federal Government has established the salary schedule; and the District of Columbia loses its employees to the Federal Government agencies, because of the higher salaries paid by those agencies. The Federal Congress has fixed the salary schedule, and that is the source of the problem.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the schedules appearing in the hearings on page 11. under exhibits 1 and 2, and on page 12, under exhibit 3, showing the number of employees and the expenditures for personal services, as compared with those for other cities.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows.

"EXHIBIT NO. 1

City	Population, 1950	Population, 1960	Percent change in population	Number of city government employees per thousand population, 1950	Number of city government employees per thousand population, 1960	Number change
Milwaukee	637, 392	734, 788	+15. 3	10. 3	12. 4	+2. 1
Baltimore	949, 708	921, 363	−2. 9	27. 0	27. 0	----------
Pittsburgh	676, 806	600, 327	−11. 3	9. 6	10. 9	−1. 3
Boston	801, 344	677, 626	−15. 4	17. 4	30. 9	+2. 5
Cincinnati	503, 998	505, 000	+. 19	11. 25	13. 56	+2. 31
Cleveland	914, 808	869, 867	−4. 9	12. 59	12. 39	−. 2
Buffalo	580, 132	528, 387	−8. 9	15. 56	17. 34	+1. 78
San Francisco	775, 357	715, 609	−7. 7	25. 54	29. 93	+4. 39
Houston	596, 163	932, 680	+56. 4	6. 3	9. 1	+2. 8
St. Louis	856, 796	754, 134	−11. 9	9. 3	12. 5	+3. 2
Minneapolis	521, 718	482, 872	−8. 0	16. 7	19. 1	+2. 4
New Orleans	570, 445	627, 525	+10. 0	11. 3	11. 7	+. 4
Washington	802, 178	746, 958	−6. 9	24. 9	34. 5	+9. 6

"EXHIBIT NO. 2

"Changes in District of Columbia government personnel, by grade classifications, June 30, 1952, through June 30, 1960

Grade	Number of employees, June 30, 1952	Number of employees, June 30, 1960	Percent of change
1	421	44	−89. 5
2	365	755	+106. 8
3	982	1, 312	+33. 5
4	733	1, 448	+97. 5
5	1, 092	1, 122	+2. 7
6	270	1, 086	+302. 2
7	522	1, 207	+131. 2
8	68	270	+297. 0
9	268	622	+132. 1
10	39	102	+179. 4
11	161	351	+118. 0
12	107	280	+161. 7
13	70	188	+108. 5
14	29	101	+248. 2
15	19	54	+184. 2
16	4	19	+375. 0
17	3	6	+100. 0
18	0	2	----------

"Source: District of Columbia personnel office.

"EXHIBIT NO. 3

"[In thousands of dollars]

City	Expenditure for personal services, fiscal 1951	Expenditure for personal services, fiscal 1959	Increase
Milwaukee	28, 097	49, 964	21, 867
Baltimore	58, 322	113, 759	55, 437
Pittsburgh	23, 758	35, 131	11, 373
Boston	75, 131	106, 787	31, 656
Cincinnati	22, 843	44, 126	21, 283
Cleveland	55, 012	71, 740	16, 728
Buffalo	31, 649	49, 821	18, 172
San Francisco	51, 811	85, 818	34, 007
Houston	13, 531	33, 537	20, 006
St. Louis	33, 968	54, 717	20, 749
Minneapolis	21, 048	29, 204	8, 156
New Orleans	18, 997	34, 671	15, 674
District of Columbia	65, 387	127, 725	62, 338

"Source: 'Compendium of City Government Finances' (1951 and 1959 eds.), Bureau of Census, U.S. Department of Commerce.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I recognize the problem, Mr. President; and 2 years ago I opposed the salary increase at that time, in part because I knew it would result in this burden.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as an earnest of my intent to seek to obtain justice for the District of Columbia, I now send to the desk and ask appropriate reference of a bill to amend Public Law 874 to include the District of Columbia.

I introduce the bill in behalf of myself and, unless he has changed his mind since my speech started, also in behalf of my good friend from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE].

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I am happy to be a cosponsor with my distinguished friend from Oregon.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2830) to amend the act providing financial assistance for local educational agencies in areas affected by Federal activities in order to provide assistance under the provisions of such act to the District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in concluding my statement in opposition to the conference report, for which I cannot in good conscience vote, I should like to voice one plea to my colleagues on the committee. The inadequate revenues of the District, in the light of ever increasing costs must, perforce, bring before us in the next session or so, yet an additional revenue bill.

As we then consider further ways and means of meeting the financial obligation which is owed to the District by the Congress, I hope further attention will be directed to utilization of Public Law 874 money for the District.

I would hope, too, that we may have a more imaginative approach in seeking additional sources of revenue for the District. One such approach occurred to me as I was working on my statement this morning. I have not had time to explore it to the extent I should like, but I offer it to my colleagues on the committee in order that constructive work may be done in the interim.

I wish to say to my friend from Nevada that I intend to put one of his committee staff members to work on this plan. It has a great deal of merit. It will produce a great deal of money, and it will have some ancillary effects, too. I wish the Senate particularly to take note of the potentialities of the ancillary effects of my proposal.

First Senators ought to take refuge in a soundproof reception room so that they will not receive the full impact of the blast that I expect from some directions, but I think the proposal is sound. I believe that we should consider a very fruitful revenue field which might be developed for municipal purposes if a tax of, say, $1 a minute were to be placed on TV and radio commercials emanating from stations whose headquarters are in Washington, D.C.

I wish to say at the outset, that if the argument were made that such a tax would reduce the amount of advertising on the TV and radio, it would be the greatest argument for my proposal. If anything could encourage taking off the air some of the blatant commercials that are really an insult to one's intelligence, I would be in favor of using the tax device to do so.

Over and over again it has been held that use of the power of taxation is proper in the exercise of the police power of the State. I believe that the use of the police power through taxation is a technique that we have overlooked to date in connection with cleaning up TV and radio commercials. So I shall propose such a tax, and all Senators who wish to cosponsor that idea can form a line on the right. I add, in only half-joking manner, that it might be in the public interest to impose a steeply graduated tax upon each repetition of the same commercial. In all seriousness however, here we have an industry which uses the publicly owned spectrum of radio, and TV waves under license, for commercial gain. It seems to me that the cities of our country, and Washington, D.C., in particular, might be overlooking a good tax source. It would not, in my judgment, infringe upon the freedom of the press since the tax could be levied uniformly and without favor. It would be an easy tax to assess from the records already kept and its cost would bear not too heavily upon any individual or corporation.

One final point: Can the chairman tell us if he expects that additional borrowing authority will be sought this session for our urgent school and other capital construction needs?

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the borrowing authority now granted to the District of Columbia Commissioners under the 1958 Public Works law is a $75 million loan authority. I am advised that all but about $18 million to $19 million of that authority has been used. In projecting their figures for the next fiscal year, the District Commissioners plan to use the remainder of that loan authority. They have advised me informally that they will seek authorization for an additional $75 million of loan authority, and when that bill is brought forward, it will come to the legislative committee and I am sure prompt hearings will follow.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, let me say to the chairman of the committee of which I am a member that although I have left him on this particular subject, I want him to know that at the next meeting of the Committee on the District of Columbia I shall be back working shoulder to shoulder with him, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SMITH] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL]. I am always happier when we are working together, trying to accomplish something good for the District of Columbia.

I am sorry I have taken so much of the time of the Senate, but I think Senators will agree with me that it was necessary for me to make this record this afternoon so that there will be no misunderstanding of my position. It is early in the session. We need money now. I never fight hopeless causes. My parliamentary floor activity might be quite different if this were the last week of the session. But I am a realist, and therefore I shall not even insist on a yea-and-nay vote. I do not know that a quorum could be obtained if we called for one anyway. But I wish the Senator from Nevada to know that I shall always be grateful to him for his patience and his understanding in connection with this very difficult problem, and I am always hopeful, as we present the facts through the minority, as I have done today, that at some time in the future, in some future conference, the record will be of benefit to us.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

SUMMARY

By comparison with statistics for fiscal year 1951, when the maintenance and operation program was initiated, data for 1960–61 show striking increases in: (1) number of local educational agencies eligible for payment; (2) ADA of federally connected pupils; (3) total ADA in eligible school districts; (4) total current expenditures of eligible districts; and (5) net entitlement. (See statistical highlights in table C.) This significant growth is attributable to expanded Federal activity, broadened interest in the program by State and local school officials, increases in school population and costs, and liberalizing amendments to the basic legislation. Public Law 874 payments are available for current operating expenditures attributable to all pupils in the eligible school districts. In fiscal 1961 the ADA in such districts was about one-third of the Nation's public school attendance, compared with about one-eighth in 1951.

While the trend has been generally upward in these major phases of activity over the 11-year period of program operation, relatively stable relationships have been maintained, nonetheless, in other fundamental aspects. For example, the proportion of federally connected ADA in the total ADA of eligible districts has changed only 2 percent, ranging from 17 in 1951 to 15 in 1961. Although net entitlements have multiplied almost six times, they bear approximately the same ratio to total current expenditures of the participating school districts as the Federal payments did in 1951. (See table A.)

TABLE A.—*Public Law 874: Number of eligible applicants, total current expenditures, and percent financed by Public Law 874, fiscal years 1951 through 1961*

Fiscal year	Number of eligible applicants	Net entitlement for secs. 2, 3, and 4 of applicant districts	Total current expenditures of applicant districts	Percent of total current expenditures financed by Public Law 874 funds
1951	1,172	[1]$29,611,018	$520,370,000	5.7
1952	1,763	45,026,148	825,926,541	5.5
1953	2,212	54,600,902	1,040,424,071	5.2
1954	2,524	69,071,132	1,284,960,000	5.4
1955	2,683	[2]71,606,560	1,450,700,000	4.9
1956	2,860	80,874,345	1,754,530,000	4.6
1957	3,320	106,051,520	2,156,450,000	4.9
1958	3,340	116,641,127	2,578,486,000	4.5
1959	3,757	149,650,517	3,083,668,609	4.9
1960	3,794	175,785,876	3,534,582,784	4.9
1961	3,965	202,964,825	3,999,469,697	5.1

[1] Payments prorated at 96 percent for fiscal year 1951.
[2] Payments prorated at 99.5 percent for fiscal year 1955.

As in all former years, the major portion of total entitlements was paid to those local educational agencies claiming assistance under section 3 of the act. (See table B.)

TABLE 3.—*State summary of eligible applicants and entitlements, secs. 2, 3, and 4, respectively, Public Law 874, as amended, and eligible average daily attendance, secs. 3 and 4 (entitlements to financial assistance, as of Sept. 1, 1961, for current-expenditure purposes for fiscal year 1961)*

State	Number of eligible applicants	Sec. 2, net entitlement	Sec. 3										Sec. 4		Total net entitlement [1]
			Number of pupils in ADA			Entitlement						Average local contribution rate for 3(c)(1) (3(a)+½ 3(b))	Number of pupils in ADA 4(a) 1st-year assistance	Net entitlement	
			3(a)	3(b)	3(c)(4)	3(a)	3(b)	3(c)(4)	Total	Deductible funds	Net entitlement				
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)
Alabama	50		3,550	48,356		$602,755	$4,105,212		$4,707,967	$39,202	$4,668,765	$169.79			$4,668,765
Alaska	24		10,987	11,047		5,809,958	1,734,629		7,544,587	41,954	7,502,633	456.96			7,502,633
Arizona	111		12,894	15,138	2,324	2,663,144	1,911,093	$154,413	4,787,610	66,895	4,720,715	223.54			4,720,715
Arkansas	51	$11,331	2,006	7,610		340,598	646,051		986,649	12,439	974,210	169.79			985,541
California	513	152,354	36,246	244,550		8,100,307	27,984,695		36,085,002	549,088	35,535,914	227.64			35,688,268
Colorado	73		4,360	33,421		1,388,023	4,655,098		6,043,121	81,668	5,961,453	286.80			5,961,453
Connecticut	47		648	12,700		212,375	1,799,562		2,011,937	8,419	2,003,518	287.50	45	$14,669	2,018,187
Delaware	9		9	2,368		2,002	263,369		265,371	4	265,367	222.44			265,367
Florida	18	24,359	4,734	50,204		803,788	4,262,067		5,107,114	2,719	5,104,395	169.79	1,562	394,655	5,523,409
Georgia	76		3,109	53,082		527,877	4,506,681		5,069,805	15,010	5,054,795	169.79			5,054,795
Hawaii	1		13,200	26,100		2,241,228	2,215,760		4,456,988	800	4,456,188	169.79			4,456,188
Idaho	37		2,477	9,764		588,962	1,009,207		1,598,169	25,783	1,572,386	217.17			1,572,386
Illinois	95	128,569	5,212	11,618		1,682,294	1,699,397		3,398,860	32,132	3,366,728	306.84			3,495,297
Indiana	106	54,103	1,650	6,956		427,045	647,004		1,074,049	35	1,074,014	209.45			1,128,117
Iowa	25		288	3,854		92,517	627,778		720,295	7,904	712,391	325.19			712,391
Kansas	182	32,351	5,752	28,492		1,432,118	3,701,355		5,133,473	58,134	5,075,339	256.70			5,107,690
Kentucky	53	40,791	199	13,918		34,465	1,240,429		1,274,894	29,905	1,244,989	178.11			1,285,780
Louisiana	9		1,420	6,382		244,282	548,949		793,231	5,944	787,287	172.03			787,287
Maine	74		3,740	8,909		937,479	973,970		1,919,927	2,076	1,917,851	233.26			1,917,851
Maryland	15		5,766	77,341		1,067,000	7,155,975		8,222,975	16,576	8,206,399	185.05			8,206,399
Massachusetts	162		4,363	32,799		1,412,001	4,950,649		6,362,650	94,434	6,268,216	306.45			6,268,216
Michigan	58		2,413	9,849		465,090	933,790		1,428,607	4,704	1,423,903	190.65			1,423,903
Minnesota	26		1,644	1,388		327,583	139,121		466,704	20,848	445,856	199.62			445,856
Mississippi	25		1,604	14,154		272,344	1,201,604		1,473,948	8,564	1,465,384	169.79			1,465,384
Missouri	107	33,323	3,462	14,480		664,657	1,622,623		2,292,713	4,599	2,288,114	213.72	364	115,060	2,436,497
Montana	73		4,727	5,375		1,254,056	626,846		1,880,902	219,441	1,661,461	253.68			1,661,461
Nebraska	50	5,602	2,480	9,887		720,366	1,429,911		2,150,277	5,791	2,144,486	289.66	970	300,950	2,451,038
Nevada	11		4,001	6,760		761,590	643,384		1,404,974	32,006	1,372,968	190.35			1,372,968
New Hampshire	37		1,348	5,116		465,377	748,251		1,213,628	12	1,213,616	310.71			1,213,616
New Jersey	139	2,592	4,846	20,085		1,255,395	2,854,042		4,109,437	50,615	4,058,822	276.01	376	91,680	4,153,094
New Mexico	50		12,537	29,962		2,275,340	2,718,902		4,994,242	188,539	4,805,703	181.49			4,805,703
New York	175		5,108	27,476		1,418,592	4,185,237		5,603,829	49,952	5,553,877	297.35			5,553,877
North Carolina	29		3,654	20,692		620,513	1,756,894		2,377,407	2,611	2,374,796	169.79			2,374,796
North Dakota	28	1,176	1,758	1,424		416,701	168,764		585,465	1,743	583,722	237.03			584,898
Ohio	137	51,189	2,112	38,263		377,197	4,318,370		4,695,567	133,668	4,561,899	221.04			4,613,088
Oklahoma	333	33,334	9,133	42,918		1,996,949	5,033,714		7,030,663	26,867	7,003,796	229.82			7,037,130
Oregon	78		1,006	6,524		286,324	912,715		1,199,039	132,442	1,066,597	280.94			1,066,597
Pennsylvania	151	197,803	752	35,411		158,696	4,377,932		4,536,628	12,413	4,524,215	245.79			4,722,018
Rhode Island	22		1,695	8,123		567,618	1,280,429		1,848,047	2,181	1,845,866	321.04			1,845,866
South Carolina	33	7,152	3,740	31,016		636,552	2,712,561		3,349,113	13	3,349,100	169.79			3,356,252
South Dakota	63	11,100	3,385	6,051	925	1,011,305	895,397	25,115	2,005,465	7,082	1,998,383	297.43	108	33,664	2,043,147
Tennessee	44	5,686	1,103	23,772		187,279	2,020,849		2,208,128	79,665	2,128,463	169.79			2,134,149
Texas	242	4,350	15,381	106,320	559	2,998,830	9,028,144	20,549	12,047,523	104,626	11,942,897	175.47	261	31,962	11,979,209
Utah	12		1,574	19,531		267,250	1,658,084		1,925,334	17,269	1,908,065	169.79			1,908,065
Vermont	9		15	469		5,878	70,304		76,182	25,708	50,474	305.34			50,474
Virginia	46		6,189	115,748		1,244,093	12,829,859		14,073,952	6,305	14,067,647	219.69			14,067,647
Washington	200		12,247	68,263		2,300,026	6,395,966		8,695,992	99,665	8,596,327	187.50			8,596,327
West Virginia	5		37	1,284		6,282	109,005		115,287	1	115,286	169.79			115,286
Wisconsin	33		950	2,741		274,234	400,166		674,400	2,919	671,481	290.63			671,481
Wyoming	16		1,167	3,629		427,966	382,500		810,466	102,347	708,119	271.83			708,119
Guam	1		2,467	3,570		418,872	303,075		721,947	474	721,473	169.79			721,473
Virgin Islands	1		125	500		21,224	42,447		63,671	5,000	58,671	169.79			58,671
Total	3,965	797,165	235,270	1,386,290	3,808	54,714,406	148,439,816	200,077	[2]203,624,211	2,439,191	201,185,020	218.82	3,692	982,640	202,964,825

[1] Net entitlement figures from table 1; may be changed on basis of additional information.

[2] Includes $269,912 for subsec. 3(f) applicants.

TABLE B.—*Public Law 874: Summary of estimated net entitlement, by section, and pertinent related data, 1961*

Section	Number of eligible claimants	Average daily attendance	Basis of eligibility	Net entitlement	Percent of total net entitlement
Total	4,088	1,663,295		$214,498,630	100.00
2	71		Removal of land from local tax rolls by Federal acquisition. Financial burden, need for funds shown.	797,165	.37
3(a)	3,940	235,270	Pupil residing on Federal property with parent employed on Federal property.	201,185,020	93.79
3(b)		1,386,290	Pupil residing on Federal property or with a parent employed on Federal property.		
3(c)(4)		3,808	50 percent of pupils in average daily attendance residing on Federal property. Reasonable tax effort, need for funds shown.		
4	8	3,692	Increase in average daily attendance due to increase in Federal activities. Increase in sec. 3 pupils over the prior year may be included if applicant so elects. Financial burden, reasonable tax effort, need for funds shown.	982,640	.46
6	56	34,235	Pupils residing on Federal property, no State or local taxes expendable for their education, or no agency can provide suitable free public education.	11,406,026	5.32
8(a)	13		Reimbursement to other Federal agencies for certain educational services provided for children residing on Federal property.	127,779	.06

TABLE C.—*Public Law 874: Statistical highlights, fiscal years 1951 and 1961*

Items about sec. 2, 3, and 4 claimants	Fiscal year		Percent of increase
	1951	1961	
Number of districts eligible	1,172	3,965	238
Average daily attendance in eligible districts	2,943,740	10,968,202	273
Federally connected pupils	512,050	1,663,295	225
Federally connected pupils as percent of total average daily attendance	17	15	
Net entitlements	$29,611,018	$202,964,825	585
Operating expenditures:			
Total	$520,300,000	$3,999,469,697	669
Percent financed by Public Law 874	5.7	5.1	

TABLE 5.—*Appropriations for and net entitlement, all sections of Public Law 874, as amended, and number of eligible and ineligible applicants, secs. 2, 3, and 4 (for current-expenditure purposes, as of Sept. 1, 1961—by fiscal year, 1951 through 1961*)

Fiscal year	Appropriation	Net entitlement, all sections	Number of applicants under secs. 2, 3, and 4	
			Eligible	Ineligible
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1951	[1] $29,080,788	[2] $29,686,018	1,172	126
1952	51,570,000	47,814,282	1,763	128
1953	60,500,000	57,696,592	2,212	149
1954	72,350,000	71,860,087	2,524	149
1955	75,000,000	[3] 75,276,843	2,683	149
1956	90,000,000	85,671,844	2,860	158
1957	113,050,000	111,319,914	3,320	208
1958	127,000,000	122,323,791	3,340	178
1959	157,362,000	156,903,506	3,757	206
1960	186,300,000	184,979,171	3,794	169
1961	217,300,000	[4] 214,498,630	3,965	115

[1] Includes $380,788 made available from other Federal agencies for fiscal year 1951.

[2] Payments prorated at 96 percent for fiscal year 1951.

[3] Payments prorated at 99.5 percent for fiscal year 1955.

[4] May be changed on basis of additional information.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I appreciate the attitude of the Senator from Oregon. He recognizes that the revenue bill involved some problems along its legislative path. It has been 3 years moving as far as it has. I am very happy that this is early in the session, because I recognize that there are certain parliamentary devices that would be available to anyone in good voice—and I have always found the Senator from Oregon in excellent voice.

I believe that the Senator from Oregon will have in the bill he has just introduced for reference to his own committee—and I think it will be referred to his subcommittee—an excellent vehicle to provide some additional revenue for the District of Columbia. I am in wholehearted agreement with his impacted school area philosophy. It seems to me that if the program is good for Virginia, Maryland, Nevada, and Oregon, it is equally good for the District of Columbia. I made that statement when the suggestion was first offered on the floor by the able Senator from Oregon.

One of the weaknesses that we encountered in considering this particular type of revenue measure for the District of Columbia was that we did not have the benefit of full hearings upon it. Now that it is in the subcommittee of which the Senator from Oregon is chairman, I hope he will make it a prime order of business so that we may have the benefit of hearings and make some headway in that field.

I have one additional thought. I think in fairness it should be stated that the conferees on the House side, in respect to the problem of the impacted area bill, agreed with the conferees on the Senate side on two different occasions and took the amendment back to the House for a yea-and-nay vote. They were unsuccessful in obtaining the necessary majority, but in both instances the conferees themselves voted for the impacted area bill when a yea-and-nay vote was called for on the House side. I think they recognized that the program should apply in the District of Columbia. The impacted area program is a source that could well bring in approximately $3½ million to $4 million of additional funds to the District of Columbia, and I commend the Senator from Oregon for his efforts in that direction. I hope there will be an early hearing. I will join with him, to the best of my ability, in seeing that the bill moves along quickly.

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BIBLE. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Fiscal Affairs.

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. With the permission of the Senator from Oregon, the junior Senator from Massachusetts would like to have his name added as a sponsor of the bill introduced, as he feels very strongly about the impacted areas bill for the District of Columbia. He feels that the boys and girls of the District of Columbia are entitled to the same privileges provided for every other impacted area in the United States.

Mr. MORSE. I am greatly honored to have the Senator from Massachusetts add his name as a cosponsor.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I have only one more observation to make, and then I shall move the adoption of the conference report. In the field of Federal payment, the authorization today is $32 million. The amount appropriated is $30 million. I believe the authorization should be higher. I shall certainly join in moving independent legislation in that direction. I believe that the bill now pending before the Committee on the District of Columbia, to give full self-government to the District of Columbia, contains a title which is a fine framework for adopting a formula for once and for all attempting to indicate what the Federal payment should be. The formula does very much what the Senator from Oregon has indicated on the floor of the Senate. It would bring in, I am told, in the neighborhood of $40 million by way of Federal payment, more or less in lieu of taxes.

I believe this is worthwhile legislation. Even if the complete self-government bill does not provide it, I hope at least we can make some progress in this direction at this particular session of Congress.

Mr. President, if there is no further discussion of the conference report, on which we started at 5 minutes after 1 o'clock, I now move that the Senate agree to the conference report.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

The motion was agreed to.

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS AND HOUSING—REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1962

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, 1 week from next Monday, on February 19, the Senate will take up Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962, establishing a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

I do not need to remind my colleagues that this recommendation by the President has occasioned some controversy. In response to various public criticisms of the proposal, letters I have received from constituents, and questions raised on the merits and details of the reorganization plan, I have had prepared two documents which provide an objective analysis of the plan, its intent, and its implications.

I hope these direct and dispassionate examinations will restore a sense of balance and perspective to the debate on the plan, in place of the partisan fireworks which have obscured the real issues, this week.

With this objective, Mr. President, I offer two exhibits for the consideration of my colleagues. The first is a series of 18 questions and answers on criticisms which have been leveled at the proposed reorganization of the Housing and Home Finance Agency and related agencies into a Cabinet-level department. The second exhibit is an analysis of the question which has been raised as to the application of this plan to problems in small communities. Some fear has been expressed as to the possible smothering of small-town interests under a big-city-oriented department. I hope this paper will answer the questions and allay the fears of those who, with me, want to preserve the integrity of our communities, large and small.

I ask unanimous consent that the two exhibits be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT 1

1. Question. What is the purpose of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962?

Answer. It is the purpose of this plan to raise to departmental status the functions of the Housing and Home Finance Agency so that Federal functions relating to urban affairs and housing can have a voice in the Cabinet and be given the proper weight and position in the overall administration of the executive branch. The plan also has the purpose of providing in the Department better internal machinery for coordinating and otherwise administering these functions, in order to serve better our States, our cities and towns, the Congress, and the people whom all of the programs are designed to ultimately serve.

2. Question. Briefly, just what would the reorganization plan do and not do?

Answer. Basically and in legal effect, the reorganization plan would do one thing and one thing only: It would create a new department in the executive branch and transfer to it the existing functions of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, providing for their administration in accordance with sound principles already approved by the Congress for other executive departments. This includes the placing of authority in the Secretary of the Department to supervise and direct all functions of the department—a normal, logical, and consistent method of operation, as distinguished from some of the scattered authorities in the existing Housing Agency.

The reorganization plan would do the following:

(a) It would not authorize any new function or program whatsoever.

(b) It would not provide any additional funds.

(c) It would not commit or obligate the Congress in any way to authorize any new program or function.

(d) It would not remove any authority or control of the Congress over the executive branch.

(e) It would not extend in the slightest any power or control of the Federal Government.

(f) It would not impinge on, or in any way affect, the authority of any State, city, or other local body.

(g) It would not transfer any function from any Federal agency or department except the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

3. Question. Why should a new department be established by reorganization plan, instead of by an act of Congress?

Answer. The recent action of the Rules Committee on H.R. 8429 effectively prevents the Congress from debating and acting on a bill for this purpose on its merits. The administration originally preferred to have Congress act affirmatively on the question, and recommended legislation for this purpose.

The executive department most recently established—the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—was proposed through reorganization plan of the President. In submitting Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953, President Eisenhower said that his action was demanded "* * * by the importance and magnitude of these functions, which affect the well-being of millions of our citizens."

Under the American system of government, the Cabinet bears a close and even personal relationship to the Chief Executive. It is appropriate that the creation of a new Cabinet department should be effected by an exercise of Executive powers with the review and assent of the Congress as provided in the Reorganization Act.

4. Question. How does this reorganization plan differ from the legislation reported by House and Senate committees at the last session of the Congress and acted on by the House Rules Committee?

Answer. This reorganization plan is essentially the same as that legislation, except as to a few minor provisions which legally cannot be included in a reorganization plan.

5. Question. Wouldn't the functions of the new department be small in scope and importance compared with those of existing departments?

Answer. No. The gross expenditures under operations to be included in the proposed department are greater than those of six of the present departments. Almost two-thirds of the financial assistance being provided by all Federal credit operations is being provided under programs of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. These programs now involve close to $50 billion in Government and private investment. Under one or more of these programs financial assistance has been provided to more than 2,000 communities.

Already 70 percent of our population lives in urban areas, and the massive shift of population to these areas continues. One of the greatest of all domestic problems results from the magnitude and complexity of providing adequate and properly planned commuting and other public facilities, especially in urban areas extending across municipal and even State boundaries. Administering the Federal measures designed to assist in meeting these urban problems is proportionately important in operating the executive branch of the Government.

The national economy is particularly sensitive to fluctuating conditions of the housing industry and to related Government aids, and interrelated Government policies regarding them are among the most important of all Government domestic policies.

Of great significance is the unavoidable complexity of these housing and urban development programs which present a continuing stream of extremely difficult problems. They play a major role in the whole relationship of the Federal Government to its States and localities.

6. Question. Wouldn't the establishment of the new Department for city dwellers be inconsistent with the past practice of establishing departments on the basis of their basic purpose?

Answer. The plan would certainly not deal with all of the activities that happen in cities or cover all of the functions of the Federal Government relating to people living in cities. The vast growth in the population of urban areas is indicative of the importance and magnitude of the urban problems which the new Department would handle, but this is not intended to indicate that all the Federal functions relating to these people would be handled by the new Department, any more than all the functions of people living in rural areas are handled by the Department of Agriculture.

Rather, the Department would be established for the basic purpose of dealing with those functions which are particularly urban in nature. They are the functions now being performed by the Housing and Home Finance Agency. Educational and health activities in cities would continue to be aided by HEW; transportation by air and interstate highway and rail would continue to be aided by commerce; labor matters would continue to be handled by the Labor Department, etc.

The new Department would have as its basic purpose assistance to the improvement and development of urban areas. Thus, grants under the existing program to aid urban planning could enable a city to plan its own growth and placement of its residential, commercial, industrial, and recreational areas. This would enable the city itself to determine where an airport or a highway aided by an existing department should be located.

7. Question. What could the new Department do that is not now being done? Isn't the proposed reorganization plan merely to change symbols?

Answer. It is true that the plan would provide no additional functions. However, the raising of existing functions to Cabinet level and the proposed new machinery for their administration would accomplish the purposes indicated above, which are extremely important to the welfare of the people in our urban areas and to the Nation as a whole. To the extent the Federal Government's machinery is improved, the States and localities should also benefit, and to the extent the Federal Government can provide better leadership in this field, it will assist the States and localities to strengthen their own machinery for the same purpose.

8. Question. Would the new Department have a unified purpose?

Answer. Yes; because the urban development functions are closely intertwined with the urban housing functions. The urban planning, urban renewal, and community facilities functions relate to the urban housing functions because all of them have a single unified objective—to provide homes in good neighborhoods in well-planned communities adequately served by related public facilities. Indeed, as a category, the functions of the new Department would be much more unified and interrelated than the functions of several existing Federal Departments which require far less coordination of the day-to-day activities of their several bureaus or offices.

9. Question. Wouldn't the mere reorganization of the Housing and Home Finance Agency accomplish the desired purposes without the creation of a new Department?

Answer. The mere reorganization of the Housing and Home Finance Agency would fail to accomplish the principal objective of the plan—giving the proper weight and position to urban affairs and housing matters in the overall administration of the executive branch of the Federal Government.

10. Question. Wouldn't the purpose of the reorganization plan be better served by merely establishing a coordinating commission or other body?

Answer. No. Such a proposal only superficially touches on the problem. It fails to recognize the importance and scope of the increasing problems of our urban areas with their vast influxes of population and the increasing difficulties of providing transportation and facilities of all kinds across municipal and State boundaries, affecting tax structures and presenting a myriad of local coordinating difficulties.

11. Question. Why doesn't the reorganization plan transfer to the new Department the functions of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and the functions of the Veterans' Administration related to housing?

Answer. The problems of coordinating the VA guaranty program with the FHA mortgage insurance program have long since been worked out and the programs are working smoothly. By its very nature, the VA housing program is a temporary one and eventually will be discontinued and liquidated. Any advantage of transferring it to the new Department at this time would be much more than offset by the disruption of the Washington and field offices which would necessarily occur if the transfer were made.

As to the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, the Congress has already acted on this matter when it separated the Board from the Housing and Home Finance Agency in 1955. This was done by the Congress on its own initiative and was not recommended by the executive branch. There is no reason to assume that the position of the Congress is different at this time, nor is the executive branch contemplating any change.

12. Question. Won't the establishment of a new Department lead to a vast new bureaucracy with increased Federal spending?

Answer. The creation of the Department would have no significant bearing on either extension of functions or increasing expenditures. It creates no new functions and provides no additional money. Nor is there any basis for assuming that the creation of a Department carries any implied commitment or encouragement to increased expenditures. There is every reason to believe that the Congress will look at each program on its own merits.

Some agencies which are not Departments, such as the Housing and Home Finance Agency, have greater annual expenditures than many of the Departments.

It is a mistake to assume that Government agencies always continue to grow and spend increasing amounts. The Housing and Home Finance Agency expenditures for the last fiscal year were 40 percent of its expenditures for a peak fiscal year during World War II when the Congress considered increased activities of the Agency to be warranted. Functions of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare have continued to grow, but there is no basis for concluding that the establishment of the Department was the reason for any increase. Rather, it was because the Congress decided that the functions added to the Department were desirable functions. They would have been authorized if the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare had not been created.

Actually, the establishment of the new Department should save Federal funds and save funds of local communities in vast amounts. The only increased cost which can be expected as a result of the reorganization plan amounts to $50,000 annually for the salaries of several important new officers, The savings in interest costs alone, through more expeditious handling of urban renewal projects, for example, could run into millions of dollars annually.

13. Question. Doesn't the reorganization plan centralize more power in Washington?

Answer. No. The reorganization plan deals only with the organization of existing Federal functions, and increases no authority or power. It in no way commits the Congress or the President to do so. In any event, this reorganization plan is not dealing with any subject matter involving Federal versus State power. All of the programs of the new Department are voluntary programs of aid to cities, States, or individuals who request it. Insofar as cities or other public bodies participate in any of the programs, such participation must be authorized by the State legislature or some specific constitutional provision, or both. In practice, the States control this participation in great detail. At all times, the State would be free to withdraw or change a city's rights to future participation in the programs. The State itself could participate in the aid programs for public bodies.

The States and localities are bound to benefit from improved administration under the plan. In every field where States are interested in themselves making a contribution to local urban development, the new Department would provide the most effective possible source of Federal encouragement to such State endeavors It may be pointed out that the program of grants for the planning of urban communities, which would be transferred to the Department, is already administered almost entirely through States themselves, as distinguished from direct financial aid to cities.

14. Question. Wouldn't the reorganization plan impinge on States rights and reduce the status of States and cities?

Answer. No. The reorganization plan has no relationship to the constitutional or legal status of the States and their subdivisions whatsoever. The status of the States remains entirely unchanged. Their functions in this field would be encouraged and strengthened as a result of the plan.

15. Question. Won't the housing functions of the Federal Government be downgraded in the new Department?

Answer. No. Actually, this would be impossible because housing will always constitute the core of the new Department's activities and will be closely related to each one. About three-fourths of all the privately owned structures of our urban areas are residential. All of the public facilities provided by municipalities have a direct relationship to housing. This is true in matters of planning, financing, and development. Even as to commuter transportation, there is an increasing need for closer coordination in planning transportation in relation to the planning of housing developments. In recognition of the importance of housing in the new Department, the reorganization plan has retained the structure of the Federal Housing Administration without change.

16. Question. Wouldn't the creation of the new Department emphasize aid to big cities, to the detriment of smaller communities?

Answer. Experience under the programs of the Housing and Home Finance Agency has proved that this would not be true. Emphasis has been given to aid for smaller communities because they frequently have the greater need. The record in this regard is included in the attachment, "HHFA Programs for Smaller Communities."

17. Question. Wouldn't the creation of the Department tend to emphasize central city areas at the expense of suburbs?

Answer. No. Our suburbs would be the major beneficiaries of the improved administration of the programs of the Department relating to the future growth of our communities. This includes programs relating to the planning of the physical development of growing areas, whether residential, commercial or industrial. It includes the planning of streets, roads, utilities, and the location of schools as well as housing. The permanent benefits of proper planning of suburban areas are not limited to esthetic considerations but include the savings to residents of their time as commuters, and their money as taxpayers.

Suburbs would also be the major beneficiaries of improvements in the administration of Federal programs of financial aid for new housing construction and for the provision of related public facilities, such as transportation, in the right place at the right time and at financial costs which are not unreasonably burdensome.

18. Question. Shouldn't creation of the Department await further study?

Answer. The entire subject has been studied so long and so thoroughly in both the executive and legislative branches, that no purpose would be served by undertaking a further study. As far back as 1937, the report of the National Resources Committee to the President suggested that the Federal Government give attention to the common problems of urban dwellers, as it had to farmers through the Department of Agriculture. In 1955 the Kestnbaum Commission thoroughly studied the problems of Federal, State, and local government relations in the areas of housing and urban affairs, and pointed to the need for greater coordination of the Federal programs in these areas. A similar study and report was made in 1961 by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

The Congress itself has studied the problem exhaustively. Committees of both Houses have held hearings and have taken volumes of testimony on this specific problem. A subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations held hearings on bills to create such a Department in 1955, in 1959, and in 1961. A subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Government Operations held hearings on the same subject in 1959 and 1961. In 1960, the Housing Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency held similar hearings. All three of these committees reported bills to create a similar new Department.

EXHIBIT 2

HHFA PROGRAMS FOR SMALL COMMUNITIES

The proposal for a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing has been referred to as a measure for the big cities. There have been congressional demands for a similar department for small towns and at least one bill, introduced in the House by Congressman CUNNINGHAM, of Nebraska, would establish such a department.

While the big cities are, of course, vitally interested in the proposal for a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, the smaller communities are equally interested.

In his message transmitting Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962, President Kennedy said:

"It should not be assumed that these are matters of concern only to our larger cities. Hundreds of smaller cities and towns are located on or near the fringes of rapidly growing urban areas. The problems of the cities affect them today, and will be theirs tomorrow. Hundreds of other smaller towns and cities not now affected will be so situated a few short years hence. Thus, the smaller towns and cities have a stake in this proposal as vital as, and only a little less immediate than, that of our large urban centers. This plan is addressed to their needs as well as to those of the major cities."

Mayor Daley, of Chicago, and Mayor West, of Nashville, both emphasized this point in their testimony on the bills last year.

Mayor Daley said: "I would like to give particular emphasis to the far-reaching benefits that this bill would give to our urban and suburban communities. This is not a bill for the big cities."

And Mayor West, speaking on behalf of the U.S. Conference of Mayors and the American Municipal Association before both the House and Senate subcommittees, said: "When we speak of a Department of Urban Affairs we do not mean a department of big city affairs or small-town affairs. This Department would be charged with looking after the programs of vital interest to the big city and the small town."

Ed E. Reid, executive director of the Alabama League of Municipalities, also speaking for the American Municipal Association, made the same point in the statement filed with the House and Senate subcommittees. He said:

"There is one point which I cannot emphasize too strongly. Some people unfortunately seem to identify a Department of Urban Affairs only with large cities. This impression is completely mistaken. To be sure our large cities have some special problems, as do small communities. However, cities of every size have many problems and aspirations in common. I feel confident that a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing would not be administered simply to benefit the larger metropolitan areas."

"The Alabama League * * * represents all Alabama communities, regardless of size. These communities range from very small towns up to the metropolitan area of Birmingham with a total population of over 600,000, but most of them are small, by big-city standards. I would not be testifying in support of this measure, if I did not believe that all of these communities would benefit."

Some of the programs which would be transferred to the new Department are particularly designed to help small cities. These include the program of advances for public works planning and the public facility loans program, both administered by the Community Facilities Administration, and the urban planning assistance program administered by the Urban Renewal Administration. In each of these programs, the major portion of the assistance is given to communities of under 50,000 population.

Other HHFA programs also contribute to the welfare of the Nation's smaller cities. For example, over 585,000 FHA mortgages were insured in counties outside of standard metropolitan areas during the period of 1935–52. About $300 million in capital grants has been made available to communities under 50,000 persons through URA's slum clearance and urban renewal programs. And over 40 percent of the communities with low-rent public housing projects in preconstruction, construction or management were cities of less than 5,000.

A program outline of significant HHFA assistance to the small cities follows:

COMMUNITY FACILITIES ADMINISTRATION

Advances for public works planning

Interest-free advances are made for the planning of essential public works. The advances are repayable when and if construction is undertaken.

Communities under 5,000 population have provided 1356 of the 3518 applications received as of December 31, 1961, and 2,778 applications have come from cities under 50,000 persons. Communities of 50,000 or less have submitted 78.5 percent of the applications under this program.

Public facility loans

The program of public facility loans is especially beneficial to the smaller communities. Loans for essential public facilities are made to non-Federal public bodies unable to obtain funds from other sources at reasonable interest rates. Loans are limited to 40 years. Current interest rates for loans are 3⅝ percent, or 3⅜ percent for communities situated in redevelopment areas designated under the Area Redevelopment Act, Public Law 87–27.

The Housing Act of 1961 established a population limit of less than 50,000 for applicant communities or, less than 150,000 for communities situated in redevelopment areas.

By the end of December 1961, there had been 393 net approved loans for over $115 million made under this program.

URBAN RENEWAL ADMINISTRATION

Urban planning assistance

Under the urban planning assistance program, two-thirds grants are made to State planning agencies for aid to municipalities, counties, and communities with less than 50,000 population. Three-fourths grants are made for urban planning for municipalities and counties in designated redevelopment areas. Although grants are also made for State, interstate, metropolitan area, and regional planning, the bulk of the program is geared to communities of less than 50,000 population.

Financial assistance for the preparation of community plans has been made available to 2,001 localities of under 50,000 population. These represent over 85 percent of the total number of communities assisted under the program;

Urban renewal

HHFA also provides financial assistance to localities for planning and carrying out urban renewal projects. For communities of up to 50,000 (150,000 in redevelopment areas). the Federal share is three-fourths of cost instead of two-thirds.

Of the 470 localities participating in the urban renewal program, 100 of them are under 10,000. Localities of under 50,000 population total 291.

A total of 349, or 43 percent, of the 813 urban renewal projects being planned or undertaken in June 1961 were in cities of under 50,000 population. Of the nearly $2 billion capital grant reservations made in the program, 293 million or 16 percent have gone to communities of under 50,000 population with $47 million alone reserved to cities of under 10,000.

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

The latest statistics on FHA-insured home mortgages by location of property cover the period of 1935–52. Some 19 percent of the FHA-insured mortgages in this period were in counties outside of standard metropolitan areas and in which the largest city had less than 50,000 population.

The dollar amount for the 585,000 FHA-insured home mortgages in counties outside of standard metropolitan areas in this period was a little over $3 billion.

PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

Out of a total of 1,517 communities with PHA low-rent housing in preconstruction, construction, or management on September 30, 1961, 1,177 were outside urbanized areas; 853 of these were communities of less than 10,000 population and 650 had population of less than 5,000 according to the 1960 census.

Small cities in the South have especially benefited under this program. The Atlanta and Fort Worth regions have almost 74 percent of the communities under 10,000 which have public housing low-rent projects in preconstruction, construction, or management.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on February 16, 1918, the Lithuanian nation reestablished its independence after over a century of Russian domination followed by German occupation during World War I. During its two decades of independence, Lithuania made great economic and social progress as a democratic state with a constitution guaranteeing the basic freedoms of speech, assembly, religion, and communication.

With the outbreak of World War II, Lithuania became one of the first countries to experience the aggressions of both Hitler and the Soviet Union, and she was eventually subjugated once again by Russian tyranny. The United States has never recognized the forceful incorporation of Lithuania and her neighbors by the U.S.S.R. This principle of nonrecognition, affirmed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt in his administration, was reaffirmed by the Congress in 1959 when it passed the Captive Nations Week resolution, and by the Senate when it approved the Douglas resolution of 1954.

On the occasion of the 44th anniversary of the restoration of Lithuanian independence, it is right that we should pay tribute to the Lithuanian people, who, through their enduring faith in freedom, have kept alive the fight to secure human rights and democratic government. Americans of Lithuanian descent are among our own best citizens and they have made fine contributions to our country. Let us hope and work that the day will soon come when freedom and democracy will be restored once more to Lithuania.

CUBAN REFUGEES

Mr. HART. Mr. President, according to an official report which I received this morning from the Immigration and Naturalization Service, the Cuban refugee influx into this country continues unabated at approximately 1,200 persons weekly. Most of these people, as my colleagues know, concentrate in Dade County, Fla.

The hearings held last December by the Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees clearly indicates that in terms of the growing dimensions of the refugee situation, the Federal program of assistance is without question deficient. The committee is now considering recommendations to remedy this situation, and for the benefit of the Congress and the American people will soon issue a report of its findings and recommendations. It is imperative that we as a people give vitality to our tradition through deeds as well as words.

Much of the impetus to resolve the refugee problem will necessarily come from the Federal Government. But it is heartening to know that the voluntary agencies are also applying their experience and knowledge in great measure. As it is true of refugee programs elsewhere, it is the voluntary agencies and their dedicated representatives on the scene, who are the essential links between the programs and the human in need.

The resourcefulness of the voluntary agencies working among Cuban refugees is seen in the newly organized refugee resettlement program called flights in freedom. The program was sparked by James MacCracken of Church World Service, and also includes as participants the National Catholic Welfare Conference, United HIAS Service, and the International Rescue Committee. I pay tribute to the dedication of these fine organizations for the new venture they have undertaken.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter to me from Mr. MacCracken, and an accompanying description of the flights in freedom, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 7, 1962.

Hon. PHILIP A. HART,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SENATOR: I had the privilege of presenting testimony before your Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees last December on Cuban refugees. At that time I outlined very briefly a project which would call for Cuban refugee charter flights to be mounted on an interfaith basis drawing widely upon the valuable civic resources and the normal humanitarian concern of our American urban communities. I am forwarding for your information a presentation of this idea in a brief pamphlet which we have entitled "Flights in Freedom."

I know you will be interested, Mr. Senator, to learn that a civic Cuban Refugee Resettlement Committee has been formed in Cleveland, Ohio, for the express purpose of receiving the first charter flight on February 27, 1962. In addition to prominent civic leaders, I am pleased to report the enthusiastic participation by executives of the Catholic, Jewish and Protestant religious communities. I am pleased also to note the role of leadership which has been assumed by the executive director of the International Institute of Cleveland.

We are presently engaged in conversations with community leaders in an additional half-dozen cities.

If the response from the American private community is as great as I anticipate it will be, the projected charter flight plan could have meaningful results.

I would like to take this opportunity to express again my appreciation for the hearings you conducted on Cuban refugees, which attracted needed national attention to the plight of our neighbors who find themselves in the Florida community.

Sincerely,

JAMES MACCRACKEN,
Director, Immigration Services.

FLIGHTS IN FREEDOM—A CUBAN REFUGEE RESETTLEMENT PROGRAM

THE CUBAN REFUGEE PROBLEM

Over 100,000 of our Cuban neighbors have fled from their home island only 90 miles from Florida into the Miami area. The President of the United States has extended a warm hand of friendship and welcome to the Cuban people. By his direction, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has established a Cuban Refugee Center in Miami which, in cooperation with the State of Florida, provides registration, material support, medical, educational, and resettlement facilities to Cuban refugees.

Since the Miami area cannot absorb all of these Cuban neighbors, interstate resettlement is essential. Working in closest cooperation with our governmental authorities, Church World Service, the National Catholic Welfare Conference, the United Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society, and the International Rescue Committee are seeking resettlement opportunities across the country for Cuban refugees.

Despite the best energies of the voluntary agencies in resettling 500 Cuban refugees per week, the influx of more than 1,500 per week continues. Three refugees enter Florida each week for every one resettled.

A DRAMATIC APPEAL

Your city can play a significant role in meeting the interstate resettlement challenge. If 1,000 American cities and towns would accept responsibility for 1,000 special charter flights of Cuban refugees, the resettlement job could be accomplished. Each city would be asked to receive one charter flight of about 25 refugee families.

All of these refugees, officially registered at the Federal refugee center in Miami, will have received medical health clearance and will be entitled to undertake residence and employment in your community.

A dramatic series of special Cuban refugee charter flights can solve the Cuban refugee problem. There is an unparalleled opportunity for an American community to extend a hand of friendship to desperate refugees who have sought sanctuary on our shores.

The Cuban refugee is a distinguished neighbor of education, sensitivity, accomplishment, and potential. Understandably, there is shyness and reserve about accepting the challenges of interstate resettlement. The charter flight provides the possibility for friends and interrelated families to move together and to avoid the fear of loneliness.

HOW DOES THE CHARTER SYSTEM WORK?

The most important step in the Cuban refugee charter flight system is the formation of a civic Cuban refugee resettlement committee. The committee, hopefully securing the cooperation of the mayor as chairman or honorary chairman, should include representatives from the major religious faiths, civic welfare agencies, and private citizens.

Such a committee could be formed in close cooperation with an international institute, service club, religious agency, or other public-spirited organization. This committee would be responsible for planning the reception of the charter flight and securing individual sponsors for the refugees.

SPONSORSHIP RESPONSIBILITIES

These responsibilities are best met if the individual sponsor secures the cosponsorship of a church, synagogue, or local agency.

1. Housing: It will probably be necessary for each family to live in some sort of temporary quarters for a short time. After meeting the family, the sponsor should help to obtain suitable permanent housing. It may be necessary for the sponsor to pay some rent until the wage earner in the Cuban family receives the first paycheck. Sponsors should help in furnishing the apartment, making rent arrangements clear, etc.

2. Employment: All possible contacts should be utilized to help the Cuban man and/or woman obtain a job. While Cuban refugees, in their eagerness to become self-sufficient, will accept virtually any type of employment, the sponsor should undertake special care to place the wage earner in employment commensurate with his training and abilities.

3. Language training: Cuban refugees will feel at home sooner if they learn English rapidly. The sponsor should offer guidance in enrolling for English classes. Also, help with English phrases used in shopping and transportation is a small matter which can be very important.

4. Special care: There may be times when the sponsor can offer outstanding service in directing their Cuban friends to medical or spiritual aid at a time of need. The greatest value of the individual sponsor is the friendship and interest he invests in the Cuban refugee's successful future.

The sponsor should not hesitate to avail himself of the energy and resources available to him through the local Cuban refugee resettlement committee.

OUR CHALLENGE TO YOU

You are the link. You can be the one to take the initiative in your city in forming a civic Cuban refugee resettlement committee. You can be the catalyst in bringing together all the necessary and interested individuals and groups to make possible a Cuban refugee charter flight. This would be good for the Cubans and for your city.

The success of this project depends on the cooperation of individuals, families, churches, synagogues, welfare, and social service organizations, various civic interest groups, national agencies working with refugees and immigrants, and the Federal Government. American energies and resources are unlimited.

There are those who are highly skilled in working with refugees, whose services would be available on an advisory basis. There are also people in your local community who are experienced in working with people in need. They would be willing to cooperate at any time they are needed after the plane arrives in your city.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I also invite the attention of Senators to a warm, interesting article on Cuban refugees in Washington's Sunday Star of February 4, 1962. Although devoted primarily to the Cuban community in Washington, the article gives expression to the industrious temperament and sturdy spirit of Cuban refugees throughout the United States. I ask unanimous consent that this excellent article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CUBANS START NEW LIVES IN WASHINGTON

(By Dan Gottlieb)

They leave Cuba with a maximum of 5 pesos (about 50 cents) in their pockets and virtually all their property confiscated, even down to a baby's earring—but they consider themselves blessed.

These are the refugees from Castro's Cuba, an estimated 700 to 1,000 of whom are now living in Washington. During the past 3 years, according to the best figures available, they have about doubled the size of the Cuban-born and Cuban alien community here. More than 300, at least, came in the past 12 months. They are still coming here at an estimated rate of 10 families a week.

The Cuban refugees who came to Washington (or merely stayed on here after resigning) immediately after Castro's rise to power were chiefly those closely connected with the Batista regime.

The second wave of refugee immigrants began around the start of 1960. Many of these were originally Castro supporters. They turned against Fidel, they said, when the Communist takeover of the revolutionary government became apparent. Like many in America, they were fooled by Castro's early assertions that he was not a Communist and that the Government was not Communist.

The refugees are chiefly professional people, businessmen and white-collar workers. Here, in their own words (in some cases freely translated from Spanish), is why they came to the United States:

A former diplomat who works as a receptionist at an art gallery—"I felt like I had a stone crushing my chest. I couldn't breathe. I was picked up twice and interrogated by police. They accused me of burning some cars in a place I had never been."

HOLDS A JOB AS BUSBOY

A former Government officeworker, now a busboy—"I worked in the Batista government, but I also worked for the Government before Batista.

"I lost my job in a reorganization. I could not get work— not even swinging a pickax. The Government forbade anyone from hiring anybody who had anything to do with the Batista government."

A former university professor—"With the books of Marx and Lenin, I was still able to teach democracy using their very words and the speeches of Fidel. I was accused of using counterrevolutionary materials, but my students defended me. If I had been found guilty I could have been jailed, shot, insulted, or tortured, as some of my colleagues were."

Washington is ahead of many other large cities in the country, including Philadelphia, as a settling place for Cuban refugees, a spokesman for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's Cuban refugee program said. Factors contributing to the influx here, as outlined by the spokesman and Cubans themselves, are:

1. The overcrowding of refugees in the Miami-Dade County area of Florida, the chief entry point for Cubans, just 1 hour's flight from Havana. Almost all who stay in Miami draw on special Federal relief (up to $100 per month maximum for a family in direct cash assistance).

ONLY MINIMAL NEEDS MET

2. The fading prospects for an early overthrow of Castro. The failure of the Bay of Pigs invasion last April was the pin which pricked the dream of an immediate return to the homeland. Being next door to Havana, therefore, does not have the attraction that it did.

3. Federal assistance in Miami meets only the minimal needs (one refugee here said it cost $75 a month in the Miami area to rent just an efficiency apartment).

HEW is encouraging voluntary resettlement. As of late last November, HEW has had a policy of cutting off aid to refugees in Miami who refuse a bona fide offer of resettlement. This includes a promise of a job, transportation expenses to the place of resettlement, and the assistance of one of four voluntary agencies cooperating with HEW in the resettlement program.

4. The existence here of a substantial Latin American, Spanish-speaking community, and a large hotel-restaurant industry, various international organizations, such as the International Monetary Fund, Pan American Union (Organization of American States), and Inter-American Development Bank, and the Federal Government, all of which have found the skills and knowledge of Cubans useful.

Early last year, only 1 out of 3 Cuban refugees in Florida, when offered a chance of resettlement, took it. Now more accept than decline, the HEW spokesman said.

Although the Senate subcommittee on refugees and escapees heard testimony last December that idleness, juvenile delinquency and racial friction have accompanied the large Cuban refugee influx in Florida, the Cubans here seem to be taking up their new life here quietly and independently.

Capt. Albert B. Clark commands the 10th police precinct, which covers the area between the 1800 block of Columbia Road and Mount Pleasant, where the Cuban and Puerto Rican and other Spanish-speaking people of the District are concentrated. He has found no particular police problem with the Cubans. Merchants in the area say they have noticed the influx of Cubans but report no trouble due to them.

Msgr. Leo J. Coady, director of Catholic Charities of Washington, which has helped many Cubans establish themselves here, said:

"It is not beneath a majority of them to take any kind of job. The problem is to get them to accept help when they need it."

CUBANS LEARNING ENGLISH

Miss Jeanne MacDaniels, Washington representative of the International Rescue Committee, a nonsectarian organization also cooperating with HEW in the resettlement program, said:

"These people are hearty. Once they get a job, they are on their way. They get along all by themselves."

Principal James T. Gallahorn of the District's Americanization School, which teaches English and citizenship to aliens, said about 82 Cubans, mostly adults, are enrolled. "They seem very earnest to learn," he said.

Only one Cuban family resettled here under HEW auspices has applied for welfare, according to a spokesman at the District Welfare Department. If granted, this aid will be reimbursed 100 percent by the Federal Government. Cubans who come here on their own must wait the customary year to fulfill the residence requirement before applying for relief. None have done so to the knowledge of Donald Gray, program director at the Department.

CALLED RELIABLE WORKERS

Employers here describe Cubans as good, hard, reliable workers. Some of the more distinguished refugees have key posts in Government and international organizations. The majority, however, have taken what work they can find. Doctors have worked as waiters; rich businessmen as salesmen; architects as draftsmen.

"It is difficult to start life again," said a man of 40 who left his wife and children behind, "but it is preferable (to staying)." He hopes to bring his family here eventually.

All the refugees with whom the Star talked requested that their names or identifying factors in their stories be omitted in order to protect relatives in Cuba. One, an officeworker in Cuba, who has lived here with his wife and three children more than a year, summed up his feelings about life here this way (freely translated from the Spanish):

"In Cuba I earned $58 a month. Here I have to work from 10 in the morning to 10 or 11 at night (as a busboy), but I earn $70 a week. I listen on my job and try to pick up enough English to become a waiter. If I could afford to go to school, I would. I have an 'American' baby now (born since his arrival here) and whether Castro falls or not, I want to die here."

Although most Cubans express the desire to return to their homeland, they seem, here in Washington, at least, to be putting down roots. Antonio Aranda, owner of El Sombrero Cordobes, 3166 Mount Pleasant Street NW., where many of the refugees eat and socialize, said the refugees realize that as time passes, even if Castro is overthrown, there will be no work, no property for them back in Cuba.

The prospects for future growth of the refugee community here hinge on two factors: Whether Castro continues to allow Cubans to leave their homeland and the impetus for resettlement of refugees from the Miami area.

At present, HEW estimates, there are about 1,600 refugees a week arriving in the United States. More than 500 a week are being resettled under HEW auspices.

One Cuban recently arrived from Miami said he expects many more to come north after the winter. "They are afraid of the cold and loss of their welfare payment," he said.

WILL CASTRO STOP FLIGHTS?

State Department officials said yesterday they had no indication the Castro regime plans to cut off or further limit the flow of refugees out of Cuba because of action cutting off trade with Cuba. They pointed out that passengers are required to pay for their tickets in dollars so the air traffic provides a source of scarce foreign exchange.

At present the Castro government limits the outflow to 17 flights a week to Miami and one to New Orleans, the HEW spokesman said. Except when the cargo runs heavy, practically all seats on the flights are taken, the spokesman said.

All the refugees with whom this reporter spoke said they have relatives or friends who want to get out. Not all can.

Resigning one's job with the government is enough of a pretext to be jailed, they say, and in order to get permission to leave one must resign.

At least two anti-Castro groups are active in Washington, but their activities are limited to picketing and social meetings, according to informed Cubans. Metropolitan Police Inspector John L. Sullivan says there has not been any increase in picketing or other political activity by anti-Castro forces since the recent influx of refugees. Except for the throwing of eggs filled with red paint at four Latin American embassies before the Punta del Este Conference of Inter-American foreign ministers, there have been no violent actions attributed to anti-Castro forces here, he said.

Informed Cubans say there have been some "Fidelistas" (pro-Castroites) who have come to Washington posing as refugees but that their identities are "fairly well known" to law enforcement agencies.

Even though admitted on a visa-waiver as a "parolee," the technical term for a refugee, Cubans can stay in this country as long as they like, a spokesman at the Immigration Service said, providing they do not violate certain regulations.

HEW has announced its plans to step up its resettlement effort. The Senate subcommittee studying the Cuban refugee problem has urged even more concentrated efforts in this direction to relieve the burden on the Miami-Dade County area.

Thus, all signs at present point to a continued, even increased, flow of refugees to Washington if Castro does not erect his own version of the Berlin wall.

ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SOKOL

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, 100 years ago on February 16, 1862, an organization came into being that was to have a lasting effect on history. It is the Sokol Gymnastic, Educational and Physical Culture Society founded in Prague, Czechoslovakia, by a group of patriots to whom liberty and democracy were a cherished ideal. Among them were philosophers, businessmen, authors, journalists, professional men, scientists, and public officials.

They wanted freedom and liberty for their people. Led by men well versed in the history and philosophy of the past they knew that a nation can hope to achieve independence and, what is more important, retain it, only if it is willing to prepare for it and maintain it by constant vigilance.

One of the cofounders, Dr. Miroslav Tyrs, a professor at Charles University in Prague, used the golden age of ancient Greece as his model. The physical perfection of that period and the great attainments made in almost all fields of life convinced him of the inseparable connection between physical exercise and mental and moral development. To this he added the humanitarianism of the 19 centuries of the Christian era, the thinking of Jan Amos Comenius, Rousseau, Pestalozzi, the German School of Democratic Leaders that culminated in Frederick Jahn and others.

All of these great teachers realized, stressed and fought for the simultaneous development of the entire individual, physical, mental, moral, and spiritual. Dr. Tyrs also created a terminology for calisthenics, apparatus exercises, and games that is so precise that units thousands of miles apart can practice the assigned drills, then meet at the great Sokol exhibitions and after only one general rehearsal, perform as if they had trained together for months. He believed that the entire nation—men, women and children—should consistently exercise from early childhood past their maturity.

All of this for neither profit nor glory. All of this as a dedication to their nation, an enlightened member of the family of nations, conscious of their rights and their duties and obligations. Dr. Tyrs knew that the battle is won or lost long before the battlefield is reached. His thinking, his training of his nation provided the legions for Thomas G. Masaryk in World War I.

Three years after the original Sokol unit was founded in Prague, his ideals came to America. The first Sokol unit came to life in St. Louis, Mo., on February 14, 1865. Within a few years there were units in Chicago, New York, Milwaukee, Cleveland, and Detroit. Today units reach from coast to coast, from Canada to Mexico. There are Sokol units throughout the world, all of them dedicated to freedom and liberty. Their loyalty and ability to serve are proverbial. In every war in which this country was involved our Sokol gymnasiums were forsaken by their men's and junior classes in favor of military service. The record of rejection for physical infirmities is less than one-sixteenth of 1 percent.

For 97 consecutive years the American Sokol Educational and Physical Culture Organization has been consistently active in all-round physical development. They build and support their own gymnasiums, community centers, and children's camps. They have trained and given outstanding coaches and leaders to colleges, high schools, and playgrounds by the hundreds. Mrs. Hruska and I and our three children all received Sokol training.

Within the past few years, units have built new or expanded their old gymnasiums in Baltimore, Md.; Cleveland, Ohio; Dallas, Tex.; and Los Angeles, Calif. Many more are planning new improved facilities in dozens of localities. The Sokols are respected in every land that is free.

In captive nations they were the first organizations to be dissolved by the Nazi and Communists wherever they usurped the power. The Sokol leaders were among the first to be imprisoned and liquidated. The Second World War saw 90 percent of the Sokol leaders, down to the unit level liquidated in Czechoslovakia, Poland, Austria, Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria.

The few that were left have found a similar fate at the hands of the Communists, but the great mass of the former powerful Sokol organizations in Europe are far from being exterminated. We know from reliable sources that the great spirit of freedom, liberty, and human justice instilled in them by dauntless men and women for almost a century is very much alive and transferred to each new group of children. We know that those who have once known freedom and liberty as we know it will never forget it.

These Sokol trained people have faith in the inexorable destiny of mankind. The Sokols in America have produced their own great leaders and thinkers. Men and women in all walks of life have felt that their greatest contribution to this great land would be to devotedly serve in the Sokol ranks, to constantly train the young in that physical, mental, moral, and spiritual strength that is the bulwark of a nation.

It is with pride that I claim membership and activity in the American Sokol organization since boyhood. Mrs. Hruska and all our children have likewise profited by the activities and benefits available through participation. All of us are grateful for Sokol.

And all Sokols everywhere proudly view its sound and meaningful record of achievement as they join in celebrating the 100th anniversary of this splendid organization.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, in accordance with the order previously entered I now move that the Senate stand in adjournment until Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until Monday, February 12, 1962, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 8, 1962:

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in rank as follows: Lt. Gen. Paul D. Harkins, O17625, U.S. Army, in the rank of general.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Annuity Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1962

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, basic inequities in many laws exist. It is, I feel, the duty of every Member of Congress to attempt to remedy them when such situations are brought to light.

I have recently learned that under the provisions of section 10 of the Civil Service Retirement Act a widow of a Government employee loses all annuity rights upon her remarriage. As a result, should her second husband die, she is not reentitled to the annuity regardless of her financial circumstances. This, of course, would be true if, by a quirk of fate, the second husband dies 1 day after the marriage.

To remedy this situation I have today introduced H.R. 10172, which would provide the widow with a reentitlement to the annuity should the second husband die. The bill also prevents a widow from receiving more than one annuity in the event she had any entitlement as a result of her second marriage.

I invite and request those of my colleagues who so desire to act as cosponsors of this legislation or to introduce similar bills.

Remarks Made by Senator Douglas, of Illinois, at the Appreciation Dinner Honoring Henry H. Bolz

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 8, 1962

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement which I made at the appreciation dinner honoring Henry H. Bolz be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I may say that Mr. Bolz is secretary of the Association of Commerce of Decatur, Ill. Not only was he honored by the association, but the unions of Decatur also honored him at a dinner. It is a somewhat unusual occurrence for the unions of a city to honor the secretary of the Association of Commerce. It is an indication of the high esteem in which Mr. Bolz has been held.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PAUL H. DOUGLAS, OF ILLINOIS, AT THE APPRECIATION DINNER HONORING HENRY H. BOLZ, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 10, 1962, DECATUR, ILL.

Henry Bolz is a most unusual and valuable citizen—one of the very best that Decatur has ever had. For years he has worked with all his heart, brains, and soul for Decatur. He has tried to bring new industries to Decatur and has been largely successful. He has done this because such growth means increased payrolls and this brings greater prosperity and income to all.

But Henry has worked for many other civic purposes as well. As a reporter years ago, he was one of those who promoted the building of Lake Decatur which not only has saved Decatur economically, but has been a great recreational resource. For years he has been promoting the idea of a second lake to provide sedimentation, water supply, and added recreational features. I know he will continue to work for this and I am doing my best to help you and him.

Henry has also worked for industrial peace and greater understanding among groups in Decatur. Unlike the executive of some chambers of commerce, he has never engaged in any union-busting activities, but has tried to develop mutual cooperation between labor and management. As a result there has been less industrial warfare in Decatur in the last quarter of a century than in most cities.

Henry has also worked for honest, efficient, and humane government and has done so without throwing his weight around.

Henry has done all this because he is a truly good man, broadly tolerant, honorable, and kindly. He has devoted his energies to working with people for people.

God bless you, Henry, and may you keep on to the very end in the path you have hewn out for yourself. We are grateful for what you are and we will all be your friends from the heart, forever.

Ukrainian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 8, 1962

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the people of the 13th Congressional District of Michigan, may I underscore the expressions which have been made by so many of my distinguished colleagues in this Hall with reference to the 44th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Ukrainian National Republic. All have spoken of the unity and common purpose which we in this land share with the more than 40 million people of the Ukraine who have been shut off since 1920 behind the Iron Curtain of Soviet communism.

As we in America face the gravest crisis of the centuries, as we watch the parallels of the Ukrainian struggle around the world, the monumental impact of what it has cost the Ukrainian people, mentally, physically, and spiritually, to maintain the ideals and maintain the struggle for the dignity of freedom must strike us to the roots.

For 2 fleeting years between 1918 and 1920, surrounded by hostile forces, they struggled to secure and maintain the liberty, the high prize of self-determination and self-government which is an unquenchable striving within man. But the powers against them were too great and in the 40 and more years of enslavement since that time, generations of Ukrainian people have died without knowing the fulfillment of that which they desired. Remembering this, I recall the words of Scripture of the Apostle Paul: "These all died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and embraced them." They died in the faith that others would unceasingly continue the struggle for freedom and one day achieve it lastingly, and the evidence is that their faith continues to be justified. We hear of uprisings from time to time, even though we have not details of them and we know that the hope of freedom remains unabated, strongly persistent, and vibrant.

We whose lives are also staked in the tenets of liberty and individual freedom must and do support this struggle of the Ukrainian people. We are grateful for this continuing valiant resistance to the rule and force of Communist tyranny. It is an inseparable part of our fight that men everywhere who wish to be free shall be free and to the hard pursuit of this objective our Nation is pledged.

Mr. Speaker, this is not just a week's observance, this anniversary we share with the people of the Ukraine. We would want Ukrainians everywhere to know our Nation is intensely and urgently aware of their aspirations and these aspirations are before us as we day by day proceed with the task of making secure in the world the right to freedom.

Short Explanation of H.R. 10078

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NEAL SMITH
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 8, 1962

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, on last Monday I introduced a bill to provide student loans and require a study and report as to the extent to which our present inadequate and fragmented approach could be replaced and should be supplemented by such a loan program.

This bill is intended to provide loans for better than average students who are unable to attend college without a loan. Under the proposal, repayment of the loan would begin the second year after the student completes full-time study, and the loan would be repaid at the rate of 5 percent of the individual's net taxable income per year.

The bill would allot loan funds to colleges, which in turn would make the loans. The cost to the Federal Government for 200,000 interest-free loans to be repaid from future earnings would be about the same amount as the 40,000 scholarships proposed by the administration and included in the higher education bill as recently passed in the Senate.

This would be a much better approach, for more students would participate, it would not interfere with existing scholarships and would assure continued competition for private scholarships, and it would permit some students below the genius level to develop their talents also.

We do not want a situation where only those who can memorize best go to college—we also want to develop those students who question, think, and analyze, but who tend to get B's rather than A's. Thomas Edison and Albert Einstein were both in this category, and, like them, some students bloom late but with a more solid and better balanced foundation.

It is my belief that the greatest advantage our educational system has had over the Soviet system is that we usually have given students the freedom of choice in what course they will take; however, since shortages have appeared in several professions and skills, the tendency has been to have Federal scholarships in specific areas which will divert students from the courses of study they prefer, and next we find shortages in some area from which students were diverted.

There are some 34 different programs dealing with parts of the problem on a piecemeal basis. I believe the total cost of this increasingly splintering approach is more than the cost of having a broad loan program under which there would be enough graduates taking the courses they choose to fill all the needs. I believe the total cost of an interest-free loan repayable out of future earnings is only about one-fifth as much as the cost of scholarships and thus five times as many students can be given loans with the same cost to the Government.

If we had more going to college who are now looking for unskilled jobs that do not exist, we would not need to try to guide students into courses of study they do not prefer. We are graduating about 800,000 students per year and about 200,000 more of college ability are unable to attend college due to needing an average of $700.

On the average, the young people could secure the balance of the money needed and would gladly repay from future earnings. These young men and women have been adding to the unemployment rolls or replacing unskilled workers at the very time when there is a shortage of some professions and skills, especially in the electronics field.

The bill also provides for a study to determine the extent to which Federal grant and assistance programs designed to induce students into particular courses of study have diverted students from other courses of study which they preferred and for which other Federal grant or assistance programs have been enacted. It will also determine the extent to which the provisions of this act can reasonably replace various other Federal grants or assistance programs designed to overcome the financial barrier to students attending an institution of higher education.

College graduates will not be as efficient and productive if they are in a line of work or a profession that they did not really want anyway. I think freedom of choice should be given greater weight and that it is time we reappraise the direction we have been going and expand the whole base of higher education under a less expensive approach rather than trying to induce students into course of study they do not prefer.

The Boy Scouts' Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 8, 1962

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, 52 years ago today one of the great organizations of our time was born. For on February 8, 1910, under the original leadership of a dedicated Chicago publisher, Mr. William D. Boyce, the Boy Scouts of America came into being. Like our very Nation, the Boy Scouts had their roots in English soil, and it was there that Mr. Boyce met and was inspired by Sir Robert Baden Powell, founder of the Scouting movement.

On this occasion of joy and satisfaction to Scouts everywhere, I am delighted to join in the salute to this truly magnificent organization. I know that each of you shares my pride in the outstanding work that Scouting does for the youth of America. More than 30 million boys have received the great and lasting benefits that come from belonging to the Scouts since it was founded here in our Nation's Capital this half century ago.

I am sure that none of us is unaware of the great service this organization continues to perform every day. More than 5 million Scouts and leaders are actively building the character and physical fitness of our leaders of tomorrow. And, as with many other fine organizations who perform dedicated work, they accomplish this without asking or receiving any money from our Federal Treasury.

Political Influence in Awarding of Contracts for Defense Purposes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 8, 1962

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, on January 25, 1962, the chairman of the California congressional delegation sent a letter to Secretary McNamara, calling attention to the fact that political groups will attempt to influence the U.S. military services in the awarding of contracts for defense purposes. The Secretary of Defense, on February 2, 1962, answered Congressman Sheppard's letter and stated unequivocally that "capability of performance, quality, and price are primary factors in our determinations."

We in California are glad to hear this because we believe that these defense contracts should be awarded on the basis of which firm can produce the best product at the lowest price and in the earliest possible time. The State of California which, this year, will become the first State, populationwise, in the United States, with 38 Congressmen, intends to compete for defense business on the merits. We challenge our critics to sharpen their pencils if they want to compete with us and we propose, although we have great political power, to resist politics in the awarding of defense contracts. I assert again that we are willing, in every instance, to compete on the merits with those who claim California gets too much of the defense business of this Nation.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the Record the letter of January 25, 1962, written by Congressman Sheppard, and the answer of Secretary of Defense McNamara to which I have already referred.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., January 25, 1962.
The Honorable Robert S. McNamara,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Secretary: Once again there is evidence that political groups will attempt to influence the U.S. military services to award contracts based on geographic, distressed area, or other considerations instead of quality and cost. In our opinion, the importance of resisting such pressures cannot be overstated.

Last month, a New York Times article stated the New York congressional delegation's steering committee protested to you about a decline in New York's defense business, and went on to quote that committee as stating such decline "is truly shocking when read in relation to the statistics reflecting the increasingly dominant role of California in such procurements." What would truly be shocking, Mr. Secretary, is if military procurement officials allowed themselves to be swayed by this type of appeal.

We also noticed in Washington newspapers the action of the Governor of Maryland and a committee including Maryland Congressmen seeking defense work in their State because one of their defense companies was laying off some 2,500 workers. (It was interesting to note the same company at the same time had added 3,000 employees at its plant locations in Colorado and Florida.) This action imitates similar actions by other States in the past year or two, and most of the criticism is leveled at the State of California.

Historically, our military services have led the world in their military might and it is obvious that the welfare of our Nation depends on its ability to continue that leadership. During this history of leadership, the services have consistently bought from the private firms producing the best and most advanced articles at the lowest cost. Thus, quality and price have been the two important considerations in the minds of military procurement officials, and this basis for procurement has helped greatly in achieving our Nation's outstanding record of military success.

To buy on any other basis invites second-rate products at excessive costs during a time when neither the world situation nor the economy of our Nation will allow us such a luxury.

The fact that so many of our Nation's top defense manufacturing firms are located in California is due to many good and understandable reasons, including the benefits from the close availability of an experienced and very skilled pool of workers and technicians. For similar reasons, other industries have concentrated in other sections of our country, such as textile firms in the Northeast and South, automotive firms in Michigan, electronic firms in Northeastern and Middle Atlantic States, steel and other metal products in the East and Midwest. But the California congressional delegation never has complained of concentration of Government purchases of such items in those geographic areas. The same principle holds true here: it is to the advantage of our Nation to make Government purchases on the basis of merit—and not on the basis of support for a geographical area.

Our experience with California defense products manufacturers indicates that they are unanimous in their willingness, and eagerness, to compete for Government business on a strictly merit basis—without seeking geographic or any other type of special favor. Indeed, they are concerned that geographic favor for other sections of the Nation may make it difficult or them to compete on merit alone.

The State of California and its congressional delegation, of which I am chairman, shares this concern in behalf of our thousands of skilled workers and our many fine manufacturers in California. We hope you may be able to assure us we have no cause for such concern.

We are sending copies of this letter to your three service Secretaries, and another to Mr. James Webb, as we believe it would be as great a mistake for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration as for the Department of Defense to downgrade their procurement efforts.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter, and we would be very interested to have your comments in reply.

Yours very truly,
Harry R. Sheppard,
Chairman, California Congressional Delegation.

The Secretary of Defense,
Washington, February 2, 1962.

Dear Mr. Sheppard: I appreciate your letter of January 25, stating your views on the subject of defense procurement policies.

It is, indeed, the policy of this Department to award defense contracts with full recognition to the priorities involving considerations of merit. Capability of performance, quality, and price are primary factors in our determinations. We are currently engaged in intensive efforts to strengthen incentives for outstanding performance.

As I stated before the Armed Services Committee, we recognize that changes in military programs create very difficult problems for the businesses, communities, and individuals affected. Therefore, we have taken such reasonable measures as lie within the capabilities of the Government to alleviate hardships. Within the Defense Department itself we have established a special office to deal with problems stemming from such dislocations. We shall continue these efforts in the future but we cannot compromise the basic principle that the defense programs must be guided primarily by national security requirements.

We appreciate your support for this basic policy of the Department of Defense.

Sincerely,
Robert S. McNamara.

The House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee Will Be Asked To Conduct an Investigation Study of the Adequacy of the Regulation of Nonscheduled Airlines in the Light of the Imperial Airlines Crash at Richmond, Va., November 8, 1961, Killing 74 Army Recruits and 3 Crewmembers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1962

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on February 8, I refrained from signing the report of the special subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee to investigate the Imperial Airlines plane crash near Richmond, Va., November 8, 1961, at which time 74 Army recruits and 3 crewmembers lost their lives.

In refraining from signing the subcommittee report the following statement reveals my additional views which I filed with the subcommittee chairman. Following the statement is a copy of the House resolution I intend to introduce on Monday, February 12, 1962, which would authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to conduct an investigation and study of the adequacy of the regulation of nonscheduled airlines in the light of the Imperial Airlines crash near Richmond, Va., November 8, 1961:

Additional Views by Representative James E. Van Zandt, of Pennsylvania, Member of a Special Subcommittee of the House Committee on Armed Services To Investigate Crash of Imperial Airlines, Inc., Airplane at Richmond, Va., November 8, 1961

While I am in accord generally with the views expressed by my colleagues, Mr. HARDY and Mr. BREWSTER, it is my opinion that the committee report and recommendations do not deal adequately with the situation resulting from the air tragedy on November 8, 1961, that took the lives of 74 Army recruits and 3 crewmembers.

On page 3018 of the special subcommittee hearings, Administrator Alan Boyd, of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, had this to say:

"The nature of the violations were in the economic area: (1) the submission of misleading financial data; (2) ticketing irregularities; (3) tariff violations; (4) filing false statements with the Board."

On page 3073 of the hearings Najeeb Halaby, Federal Aviation Agency Administrator, said:

"A special inspection conducted in August, September, and November 1961 indicated the following discrepancies: (1) use of uncertificated airmen on a revenue flight; (2) noncompliance with airplane flight manual; (3) failure to file a flight plan prior to a particular flight; (4) unauthorized appearance on an aircraft flight deck; (5) a failure to list all mechanical discrepancies; (6) ferrying aircraft without ferry flight authorization; (7) absence of fuel records for the month of October 1961."

On page 3077 of the hearings I asked Administrator Halaby the question as to whether or not "there was confusion in the cockpit as the result of a conversation between the pilot and copilot, as to who would pilot the ship. Does this cockpit confusion stem from lack of management?" Administrator Halaby replied:

"I would say it represents both."

In the CAB's accident report released on February 6, 1962, on page 24 the following is stated:

"From a study of all information available to the Board it is concluded that this flight crew was not capable of performing the function or assuming the responsibility for the job they presumed to do. The Board further concludes that the management personnel of Imperial Airlines should have been aware of the manner in which company operations were being accomplished. It is believed that the substandard maintenance practices of Imperial's employees were condoned by management. The manner in which maintenance personnel records were kept by the company confirms this conclusion."

The above statements by the Administrators of the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Federal Aviation Agency, as well as the CAB report of February 6, 1962, show evidence of criminal neglect on the part of the management and employees of Imperial Airlines, resulting in the death of 74 Army recruits and 3 crewmembers.

In view of the allegations which border on criminal negligence, it is my opinion that the U.S. Government has the following responsibility:

1. Insist that the findings of both investigations be referred to the Department of Justice and that the Attorney General proceed immediately to determine the legality of bringing criminal charges against Imperial Airlines.

2. It is my intention to introduce the proper resolution in the House of Representatives authorizing a full-scale congressional investigation of the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Federal Aviation Agency in relation to the manner in which they administered laws regarding the supplemental airlines, commonly referred to as nonskeds. This investigation should include the Imperial Airlines tragedy November 8, 1961, to the end that such a tragedy should not happen again.

From the February 7, 1962, issue of the Washington Daily News, I quote the following telling statement:

"The callous neglect, all around, which resulted in the Richmond tragedy is unforgivable."

For the reasons cited above I refused to sign the subcommittee report.

H. RES.—

Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to conduct an investigation and study of the adequacy of the regulation of nonscheduled airlines

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study at the earliest practicable time of the adequacy of the regulation of supplemental air carriers (commonly referred to as "nonscheduled airlines"), with particular emphasis upon Imperial Airlines, by the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Federal Aviation Agency insofar as concerns requirements of safe equipment, competent and trained personnel, sufficient inspections and other safety measures, adequate maintenance, adequate records of maintenance and servicing, and compliance with operating standards, instructions, and manuals. Such investigation and study shall be conducted in the light of the crash of an aircraft of the Imperial Airlines on November 8, 1961, at Richmond, Virginia, killing 74 Armed Forces recruits and 3 members of the crew, in order to determine the extent to which this tragedy was the result of inadequate regulations or inadequate enforcement of existing regulations, as well as neglect on the part of management and employees of that airline, with a view to recommending such measures as the Congress may adopt to prevent a recurrence of the factors leading to this tragedy.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, including any Commonwealth or possession thereof, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

The committee shall report to the House as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Any such report which is made when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

Radio Clear Channels: A Defense Resource

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. CARLTON LOSER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1962

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, Congress has before it bills to preserve existing radio clear channels. I am the author of one. Recently a new defense use of these channels came to light. It adds another compelling reason for approval of the legislation.

Testifying for the Defense Department, February 2, 1962, Maj. Gen. John B. Bestic, Director of Telecommunications for the U.S. Air Force, said:

> With respect to the technical aspects we have been asked to comment on, we favor increased power and clear channel operation to aid in survivable communications.

The threat to clear channels stems from the Federal Communications Commission. It has unfortunately voted to destroy one-half of them. The House Commerce Committee asked the Commission by letter last September to delay the action until the committee could study it. The Commission replied to the letter but refused to heed the request.

A clear channel is one upon which only one radio station operates at night. These channels were allocated originally to make possible round-the-clock radio listening to farflung remote rural regions. They serve the same purpose today. While the Nation has urbanized, nearly 60 percent of the Nation's land area still depends completely and solely upon clear channels as its only source of nighttime radio service. Over 25 million people, plus travelers in that area, get no other acceptable radio signals between sunset and sunrise. Other millions depend on them for a choice of programs. The engineering basis for this is the same today as it was when the channels were originally established.

Currently 25 of the 107 standard broadcast channels are U.S. I–A clear channels. The other 82 channels are used by regional, local, and other stations.

Originally there were 40 such channels. Urban pressures over the years led the FCC to destroy 15 of them. Now it proposes to destroy 13 more, leaving only 12. In fact, it says it may eventually also destroy all clear channels. Thus, it perpetuates its practice of bringing more and better service to urban areas while failing to meet its obligation for more and better service to remote and rural regions. Yet, these are the very people who rely on radio more in their business and daily lives than most others. These are the people who likewise have poorer television service.

These were the facts that led me to introduce H.R. 8274. My bill freezes the 25 clear channels as clear channels. I feel, furthermore, that no more stations should be added to the I-B channels. I only wish it were possible to restore several of them to I-A channels.

Now the defense use of these channels enters into the picture.

In appearing before the Subcommittee on Power and Communications of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, General Bestic said:

> USAF war exercises and operational analyses have proved that an enemy using nuclear weapons could cause wide damage to military circuits. Further, data exist which show that nuclear bursts can knock out high frequency communications for several hours. Considering this, we must exploit every means of communicating which may survive.
>
> A resource for communications survivability lies in the radio and television broadcast stations. The feasibility of using the station frequency for communicating at the same time the regular program is on the air was proved by a series of tests directed by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The technical ability to operate simultaneously is necessary because it would not be in the public interest to withdraw a broadcast station from its normal function in peacetime.
>
> We are installing a circuit using the above technique. The circuit will be physically separated and completely independent from any other communication system. Initially, we shall test the circuit to determine operating effectiveness and to identify problems. If the circuit confirms our thinking and proves acceptable, we will automate it as rapidly as procurement and engineering procedures will allow.
>
> Although every broadcast station would undoubtedly cooperate, the stations represented by the Clear Channel Broadcasting Service (CCBS) are major contributors to our circuit because of the technical advantages they offer. Specifically, their geographic coverage is wider than other stations propagating over the desired paths; their degree of reliability is superior because they broadcast on discrete frequencies and are therefore less susceptible to interference.

Mr. Speaker, in the light of this testimony and a preponderance of other evidence, the FCC's September 1961 decision must be set aside by the Congress. It is the Congress, in the ultimate, that must bear the responsibility for serving and protecting the "public interest, convenience and necessity" in the use of radio channels.

Perhaps the FCC did not know of the full defense potential of clear channels when it made its decision. That is understandable. Several of the channels that it plans to destroy are key links in the Defense Department's system.

The Congress must recognize that the groundwave signals now used and referred to by General Bestic are of an extremely low order and that higher power is needed to extend and increase the reliability of the system. And who is able to predict the future use of these channels in defense and foreign relations?

The use of higher power, such as Mexico and numerous other countries have used for a long time, on clear channels is the only technical way to improve inadequate nighttime radio signals to over 25 million people. Bills now before the Congress also authorize the use of higher power.

The Commission cannot deny that when a I-A clear channel is destroyed by the addition of another station thereto that additional duplications follow inevitably, thus reducing to practically zero the original clear channels' ability to fulfill its intended function.

The reason is simple. At night radio signals that move skyward are reflected back to earth when they hit the ionosphere. This does not happen to a significant degree in the daytime. At night these reflected signals interfere with and distort all signals on the specific channel involved for hundreds and sometimes thousands of miles. There is no way to prevent this.

This is why only one station may operate on a clear channel at night if that station is to serve distant points. It is why local and regional stations find their coverage vastly reduced after sunset. It is why their more distant nighttime signals are garbled as they collide with the reflected skywave signals of other stations operating on their channel.

These reflected or skywave signals furthermore form the basis for the arguments against the daytime stations operating additional hours without creating radio chaos.

Mr. Speaker, it is the engineering basis which makes clear channels necessary if millions of Americans are going to get any acceptable nighttime radio service. The FCC's proposal does violence to this accepted engineering fact. It places in jeopardy the Defense Department's fullest use of these channels. It does practically nothing to improve inadequate nighttime rural radio service. In fact it will bar forever the only known way of improving that service on the channels it plans to destroy, the route of power in excess of 50 kilowatts, an outmoded power ceiling that we have been anchored to by the Commission since the early thirties.

The Commission's answer to better rural radio service after sunset, according to testimony, would bring better radio service to some 250,000 rural Americans out of a total of 25 million in need of improved service. If the addition of stations were an answer to the problem it would have been solved long ago. The Commission has permitted the number of radio stations to operate at night during the past 15 years to double. But the addition of nearly 1,000 of these stations making a total of nearly 2,000 such stations operating today has left over 25 million rural and small-town Americans without nighttime radio service save for the clear channel signals. Yet, the Commission proposes to solve the problem of inadequate rural radio service by adding a dozen or so more stations.

It would be desirable, of course, if there was an AM local full-time radio station every few miles throughout our thousands of thinly populated square miles. Each could supplement local nighttime service to that of the clear channel stations. Unfortunately, this is technically and economically impossible. Most of these areas simply cannot financially support a radio station. I know of no qualified person who takes exception to this.

The matter of the best use of AM radio clear channels was raised for the third time on February 20, 1945, when the FCC upon its own motion set into operation an investigation (docket 6741) as to how, among other things, radio service to remote rural regions could be improved. Only one FCC Commissioner on the Commission today sat through those hearings.

After 16 years the Commission would now resolve the issue by destroying one-half of the clear channels bringing better rural radio service to some 250,000 people while leaving 25 million still without adequate nighttime service and by placing in jeopardy a defense communications system.

By its proposed action, furthermore, the Commission would materially handicap the only possible way of bringing better nighttime radio service to rural America, namely, the use of higher power on I-A clear channels.

This is progress in reverse; action that the Congress should not let stand. Congressional action must come quickly also since the Commission's date for starting the I-A clear channel breakdown has passed. Otherwise, vital national resources will have been forever lost.

Italian Board of Guardians Honor Congressman Victor L. Anfuso

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1962

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, on October 29, 1961, I was privileged to be honored by the Italian Board of Guardians at a testimonial dinner at the Hotel Astor in New York on the occasion of the organization's 25th anniversary of its founding. The reason why I was chosen for this signal honor was because I was the founder of the organization.

The Italian Board of Guardians was established for the purpose of combatting juvenile delinquency and helping children from broken homes. In the course of the years it became affiliated with the Catholic Charities of Brooklyn and its record of achievements is widely recognized.

Some 1,500 persons attended the dinner which turned out to be an event of personal tribute and affection for me and my family. Heading the list of distinguished guests were the Vice President and Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson, Mayor Robert F. Wagner of New York, and many national, State, and New York City leaders in government, religion, civic affairs, industry, and labor.

In addition to the real tributes that evening, I was also the recipient of two awards. One, was the Founder's Award in the form of a bronze plaque presented to me by the Italian Board of Guardians "in grateful recognition of 25 years of dedicated service as benefactor of our youth." The other, was an award from the State of Israel in the form of a beautifully embossed Bible, personally inscribed by His Excellency Avraham Harman, the Israel Ambassador to the United States, and presented to me by Ambassador Michael Comay, the Israel representative to the United Nations.

It would be impossible, due to limitations of space, to insert into the RECORD all the addresses and the many congratulatory messages received from dignataries of all walks of life. I shall, therefore, limit it to the following:

The address by Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson; the congratulatory message from President Kennedy; the message from our distinguished Speaker, the Honorable John W. McCormack, then still the majority leader of the House; also from the Honorable John B. Connally, Secretary of the Navy; the Honorable Herbert H. Lehman, our beloved former Governor of New York and former U.S. Senator; and the Honorable Angier Biddle Duke, Chief of Protocol of the United States. My son, Victor L. Anfuso, Jr., presented a bouquet of roses to his mother and paid a very wonderful tribute to her, which I am glad to include here. Then there is the wording of the Founder's Award and the introduction by the toastmaster and my good friend, the Honorable Edward D. Re, Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States.

Others who paid tribute were: Representatives John Rooney, of New York, and Torbert Macdonald, of Massachusetts; Jacob Potofsky, president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America; Hon. Joseph T. Sharkey, majority leader of the New York City Council; Hon. Louis J. Lefkowitz, New York State attorney general; Hon. Lawrence E. Gerosa, comptroller of the city of New York; the Right Reverend Robert J. Testagrossa, pastor of St. Joseph's Patron Church; Rev. Anthony F. LoGatto, director of Catholic Charities in Queens; Hon. Joseph F. Carolino, speaker of the State assembly; Hon. Anthony J. Travia, minority leader of the State assembly; Hon. Bart Turecamo, president of the Italian Board of Guardians; Justice Anthony J. DiGiovanna, New York State Supreme Court; Justice Juvenal Marchisio, New York City Domestic Relations Court; Justice Leonard E. Ruisi, New York City Domestic Relations Court; State Senator Frank J. Pino; State Assemblyman Joseph R. Corso; Dr. Mario F. Tagliagambe, chairman of the IBG testimonial dinner committee; Hon. James V. Mangano, administrative director and general clerk, New York State Supreme Court; and the well-known labor leaders, Luigi Antonini, August Bellanca, and Howard Mollisani.

At the conclusion, I responded to all these tributes with an address which I am pleased to insert into the RECORD:

SPEECH BY VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON AT 25TH ANNIVERSARY DINNER OF THE ITALIAN BOARD OF GUARDIANS, HOTEL ASTOR, OCTOBER 29, 1961, IN HONOR OF ITS FOUNDER, CONGRESSMAN VICTOR L. ANFUSO

My dear friend, "VIC" ANFUSO, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, just to think that you live in a country where a boy born in a foreign land 56 years ago, coming here at the age of 9 years, could sit in the highest councils of the Congress and enjoy the respect and the devotion of the President of the United States, the colleagues with whom he serves and the members of the judiciary who are here this evening, is something that makes us all proud, not only of America, but of Americans.

I have met many members of the judicial branch of the Government this evening. I am aware of the great reverence and respect that the members of the bar have helped to bring about for that separate, independent branch of the Government known as the judiciary.

I have served with great pleasure with the Members of the Congress from the great State of New York and particularly the Members from Brooklyn. Some of them are here this evening. The State of Massachusetts honors us with the presence of Congressman MACDONALD.

I have served with five Presidents of this country during the 30 years that I have spent in Washington. In all those years I have never known a period when our courts, our Congress, and our Chief Executive were confronted with more serious problems or more trying times than face us tonight.

I am privileged to sit in the councils with the great leader of this country—the President of the United States—John F. Kennedy. I see that able judge of men and women spend every daylight hour and many hours in the evening, attempting to resolve the critical questions that come to him for decision and which cannot be passed on to anyone else.

From the experience of the last few months, I have drawn many lessons. One of the most important is this:

One thousand eight hundred million people in the world—almost 2 billion of the 3 billion total—have an income of less than $9 per month. In our part of the world we have an income of more than $8 per day. All 3 billion people are confronted with two philosophies, the Communist philosophy and the philosophy represented by the United States of America—a free country with three separate, independent branches of government, the executive, the legislative, and the judicial. If I could have my wish tonight, I would wish that the Congress in these times and the executive in these times could enjoy the same reverence and the same respect that are accorded to the judiciary.

The enemies of freedom-loving people know that they can never destroy America militarily. They know that they can never destroy America economically. So what would you do if you were looking at it from their viewpoint? You would do exactly what they wish to do and that is to try to destroy us from within. You would rally class against class, race against race, religion against religion, brother against brother, to the point that we would engage in a bitter struggle and weaken our country and believe every claim of Mr. Khrushchev and his minions.

These challenges confront our beloved President tonight. He has been the President for only a few months. He is the only President that this country has and is going to have for the next 4 years. He is the leader of the free world.

We can either help him by closing ranks and forgetting petty differences; by relegating our quarrels to yesterday; by marching forward together in unity; or we can divide, engage in class warfare, and bring our Nation to destruction.

I know what the answer is. I know the people of this country are not going to allow themselves to be so embroiled in bitter internecine warfare that the enemy can take over.

We have the military resources and we intend to use them. We will not be provocative; we will not be aggressors; but we are prepared to stand on our rights and preserve our integrity and our way of life.

It is most inspiring to me to come here this evening to join with honored citizens to honor this great man for his contributions to humanity and for his interest in bettering the role of his fellow men. VIC ANFUSO has proven the theory "Give to the world the best you have and the best will come back to you." As I leave the platform tonight to go across the Nation I feel better in having had the chance to be here and tell you how proud I am to be a citizen of and a resident of a nation that offers opportunity, equal opportunity, to all who reside in our boundaries.

NOVEMBER 1, 1961.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ANFUSO: I want to express my congratulations on the silver jubilee anniversary of your founding of the Italian Board of Guardians. I know the Guardians have played a most effective role in coping with juvenile delinquency and helping young people to build constructive and satisfying careers.

I regret that I was not able to attend the dinner held in observance of the founding of the organization but am glad that the Vice President was able to participate in the anniversary celebration.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

MESSAGE FROM CONGRESSMAN JOHN W. McCORMACK, OF MASSACHUSETTS, HOUSE MAJORITY LEADER

I regret very much my inability to attend this evening's testimonial dinner to my close and valued friend, Congressman VICTOR ANFUSO on the occasion of the 25th anniversary of the founding by Congressman ANFUSO of his splendid organization, the Italian Board of Guardians. Your organization has done outstanding constructive work during the past 25 years in the rehabilitation of character and good life in the cases of countless youth. There is no finer work that any group of men or women, or organization can be dedicated to than this. In honoring Congressman ANFUSO you honor yourself for he is truly one of God's noblemen, as well as a great American and an outstanding legislator in the Halls of Congress. My regard for Congressman ANFUSO is profound. My friendship for him is very deep. I admire him very much. He richly deserves the honor that you and those present are extending to him tonight. I extend to Congressman and Mrs. Anfuso and their loved ones my congratulations and my kindest regards, and to you and all others present my very best wishes.

MESSAGE FROM JOHN B. CONNALLY, SECRETARY OF THE NAVY

A new generation is not born with traits of responsibility, a sense of patriotism, selflessness and dedication to principle is gained by learning from others.

Your fine organization, knowing that youth is the future, has devoted a quarter century to providing guidance which leads to the development of the strong and responsible citizen.

The tragic consequences of juvenile delinquency are manifold not only to the individual, his family, and his faith, but also to our United States which relies so heavily on its most important human resources—the moral fiber of its youth.

To the members of the Italian Board of Guardians, past and present, and all who assist in carrying on your vital work, I extend the Navy's congratulations and best wishes on this 25th anniversary. We express special gratitude to Congressman VICTOR L. ANFUSO whose foresight, inspiration, and dedicated leadership has meant so much to your organization and to the defense and success of our Navy and our country.

Message From Gov. Herbert H. Lehman

Dear Victor: I left New York shortly after primary day and your recent letter reached me only a few days ago. Hence the delay in acknowledging it. I have taken note, however, that you were leaving for Rome shortly after your invitation was sent to me and I assume that you have not returned even now.

I greatly appreciate your very kind invitation to attend and speak at the dinner of the Italian Board of Guardians on October 29 which is honoring you on its 25th anniversary as its founder. As you know, I took a very active part in the primaries and am returning to New York within the next 2 or 3 days to participate in the mayoralty campaign. Unfortunately, I have a number of engagements both during the day and on the evening of October 29, some of very long standing. I have tried to rearrange my schedule so as to make it possible for me to participate in this well deserved tribute to you. Unfortunately, however, I have found it impossible to do so. Were it possible for me to accept your invitation I would consider it a privilege to join with your many other friends in this tribute to you and to the very fine organization for whose creation I understand you are largely responsible.

I am sure that the dinner will be a most impressive and enjoyable affair.

May I send my heartiest congratulations and warmest good wishes to you and wish for the Italian Board of Guardians many years of continued fine service to the community which it has served so long and so faithfully.

With kindest personal regards and warmest good wishes.

Yours very sincerely,

Herbert H. Lehman.

Washington, D.C., *October 27, 1961.*

Mario F. Tagliagambe, M.D.,
Italian Board of Guardians,
Brooklyn, N.Y.:

On the occasion of your dinner on Sunday evening at the Hotel Astor for Congressman Victor Anfuso let me express my regret to you and "Vic" at not being able to attend. I send you my congratulations for recognizing through the medium of your silver jubilee Congressman Anfuso's leadership and deep personal interest in the glorious cause of youth.

Angier Biddle Duke,
Chief of Protocol of the United States.

Presentation of Roses to Mrs. Victor L. Anfuso by Victor L. Anfuso, Jr., at Testimonial to Victor L. Anfuso Tendered by the Italian Board of Guardians on October 29, 1961

Mr. Toastmaster, we gather here tonight to celebrate an anniversary, to preserve a spirit of charity, and to honor a man of ideas. But this night belongs also to another person among us.

Your guest of honor was never one to be content with a work-a-day world, and, from the beginning, he chose instead to climb a steep mountain, complete with crags and crevices, stress, and conflict. But that journey was not made alone. (Nor perhaps is the mountain fully climbed yet.)

And as the guest of honor thinks back, how could he describe the companion of those years. Would he say that she is the mother of his children—Diana, Marianina, Frank, and Joe? Would he describe her as a simple person, who prefers to remain out of the limelight, who would be as content in a farmhouse as in a palace of kings? Would he think of her as an humble person who devotes one-half hour each night to prayer before her head hits the pillow? Would he say that she is a thoughtful person who thinks first of her five children—or as she sometimes likes to say, her six children—before thoughts of herself?

I am sure he would say that she is something more, that she possesses an indefinable power: to bolster confidence with a soft unnoticed word; to put you back on the right path when an instinct tells you to fight back; to comfort in an hour of defeat.

Theirs is a union of two natures, primarily different, which burns the brighter because of the contrast. It is like the effect left on an audience by a great composer who resolves a crescendo of discordant sounds by a balanced pianissimo.

I hold in my hands fresh and blooming roses. My father had a sister named Rose, but the true rose of his life, still freshly blooming, is his wife, Mrs. Frances Anfuso.

Testimonial Bronze Plaque Presented to the Honorable Victor L. Anfuso

FOUNDER'S AWARD TO CONGRESSMAN VICTOR L. ANFUSO, K.C.H.S.

Great in the public life of the Nation yet ministering to the poor, the humble, the distressed, in grateful recognition of 25 years of dedicated service to I.B.G. as benefactor of our youth with fervent prayers that God will continue to bless and prosper this noble son of the church.

Presented by the Italian Board of Guardians, October 29, 1961.

Remarks of Hon. Edward D. Re, Chairman, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States in Introduction and Honor of Congressman Victor L. Anfuso

Ladies and gentlemen, distinguished guests, members of the Italian Board of Guardians, representatives of the press, and fellow Americans, the function of a toastmaster, at a gathering such as this, is quite as important as it is simple. Essentially, it involves the introduction of the guest of honor to the audience. Responsibility is enhanced when the guest is eminent and the audience distinguished.

Since the introduction is designed to acquaint the audience with the guest and his qualifications, both custom and good sense require that the toastmaster state briefly and accurately the accomplishments and achievements of the one to be honored.

If I were to do this with relation to our guest tonight, I would have to tell you that Victor L. Anfuso was born in 1905, at Gagliano, Castelferrato, Sicily; that his brilliant career began as a student in elementary and commercial high school in Brooklyn; that he attended Columbia University in New York, and graduated from St. Lawrence University Law School (new Brooklyn Law School). I would also have to tell you that he was awarded the LL.B. degree in 1927 and admitted to the New York bar in 1928.

When a person of national prominence, holding truly high office is presented, however, protocol and tradition require that the master of ceremonies simply identify the speaker by the title of his office. The dignity and prestige of the office give a status that does not require a biographical statement of achievements or offices previously held. Accomplishments are properly presumed, and all prior attainments are merged in the high office presently held.

Although Congressman Anfuso falls within this latter category, ladies and gentlemen, it is my intimate personal friendship of long standing with him that allows me to disregard protocol in order to acquaint all of you with his many outstanding accomplishments that are often minimized by our guest's natural modesty.

And so, I hope that it will not be regarded as presumptuousness on my part to acquaint you with the highlights of our guest's career and his achievements. Rather, permit me to do so as a proud friend.

After his admission to the New York bar in 1928, Victor L. Anfuso engaged in the practice of law in New York City. The humanitarian spirit of our honored guest throughout his extremely active life was early manifest by his great strides as a civic leader and organizer. During and after the great depression, he organized Citizens Welfare Association in Brooklyn. You will recall that this association was instrumental in aiding those who were hardest hit by the depression.

During World War II, Victor L. Anfuso served in the Office of Strategic Services in the Mediterranean theater, another milestone in a long and honorable career dedicated to the service of God and country. For this service he was later awarded the Certificate of Merit by the Regular Veterans Association. In 1946 he was knighted by Pope Pius XII as a Commander of the Knights of the Holy Sepulchre, for his "humanitarian work on behalf of youth."

Upon his return to the United States, he was appointed special assistant to the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization. Congressman Anfuso played an important role in the extensive surveys and research into the immigration laws as pertaining to southern Europe which were made at this time.

It is a matter of common knowledge that our guest has been a stanch and continuing foe of communism in this country and abroad. In 1948, for instance, he undertook a gigantic task—that of informing hundreds of thousands of Italian citizens abroad to defend themselves against the Communist threat by voting against the leftwing candidates in the Italian elections of 1948. Italian officials admitted that this effort resulted in the victory of the democratic De Gasperi government, and the New York Times described Anfuso as a "one-man crusader."

He has been the recipient of many awards, among which may be included honors from the Post Office Employees, the American Legion, the Jewish War Veterans, the Liberty Award of the Democratic Nationalities Division, the "Humanity Award" from the Order Brith Abraham, the Polish Migration Committee, Polish-American Youths, the Commander of the Order of Merit from the Italian Government, and many others.

Victor L. Anfuso's continuing struggle and sacrifice on behalf of our American ideals did not long go unrecognized. On November 7, 1950, he was elected by the people of his community to the 82d Congress of the United States. When he first came to Congress, he was assigned to the least desired committee, the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. But Congressman Anfuso found himself at home on this committee—because it concerned actual people, and no special interest projects. Although still a freshman in Congress, he became one of the most valued members of the committee and the champion of better postal service and better working conditions for postal employees. Congressman Anfuso began by visiting every post office in the city, coming back to Washington to sponsor immediate legislation. In 1952, he led the fight for the first real pay increase the postal employees had ever enjoyed. It is small wonder, then, that so many postal employees throughout the State and Nation remember him for his services and are represented at this testimonial.

After 2 years in office, he was forced to retire from Congress when his home districts were reapportioned. But this distinguished public servant was far too valuable to the interests of the city and the Nation to be permitted to return to private life. Mayor Robert F. Wagner, whose cause he sponsored in 1953, tendered Victor L. Anfuso the first available judicial appointment upon his taking office in 1954.

Our guest, therefore, continued to serve the public interest on the bench. But the call to a more active life in our country's Congress came again and again from the people he had served so well in the past, and our guest of honor was not one to let the responsibilities of high public office remain unchallenged. With the recommendation of our Democratic county leader, Joseph Sharkey, he ran again, and was overwhelmingly elected to the 84th Congress in 1954. Since then, he has been reelected to the 85th, 86th, and 87th Congresses.

Back in Congress, the administration, cognizant of his previous magnificent record on the Post Office Committee, wanted him to serve as a member of the Agricultural Committee. It is important that no city Member had ever been appointed to this committee before, and people at first wondered what a man devoted to the cause of urban people and issues was doing on a "farm" committee. Once again, however, Congressman ANFUSO realized the opportunity to serve not only the farmers, but the people from the city—as consumers. In one of his oft-quoted speeches, he told the Congress:

"I don't have a farm in Brooklyn. The nearest I can come to being a farmer is that I have a flowerpot on my window sill which gets watered every day. But remember, I represent more people from the cities than those of you from the farm areas. You want better prices for your products. We want better wages, better working conditions, better housing and fair prices for our consumers. Remember also, that this is not a one-way street. Farmers and city people must work together for a more abundant and a stronger America."

Through his own personality, wisdom, and fairness, Congressman ANFUSO won many friends from both sides of the congressional aisle which separated Democrats from Republicans. Soon he became chairman of the Consumer Committee, which he had helped to create; for the first time in congressional history, the consumers of America were assured of adequate representation.

Then dawned the age of space. To meet the many challenges this new era of human history presented to our Nation, a new committee was created by the Congress. Congressman ANFUSO was selected as a ranking member. He serves today as chairman of the Subcommittee on International Cooperation and Security, and as a congressional adviser to the United Nations. In addition, his past record as legislator has virtually assured him a key role on the full Committee on Science and Astronautics.

On this committee, Congressman ANFUSO, following the objectives of President Kennedy in keeping this country the strongest in the world, has been instrumental in the great forward strides this committee has taken since its inception. To inspire our scientists, for instance, Congressman ANFUSO sponsored a law granting, to those making contributions and breakthroughs in science, a Presidential Medal of Honor as well as a cash award. This law passed unanimously. Congressman ANFUSO has also proposed a Science Academy which will rank with our other three great Academies. He has also made the observation that if this Academy is added to our Army, Navy, and Air Academies, we will have created a fourth pillar of defense—the initials of the four spelling SANA—which, in Latin, means sound and strong.

Such constructive ideas are typical of the activity of our guest. At a recent convention in Washington, D.C., of the International Federation of Scientists and Astronauts, for instance, VICTOR L. ANFUSO proposed that, in the forthcoming flight to the moon, we send a Russian, an American, and a neutral. He added, significantly, that:

"Such a team, trained together, welded into a single operating unit and experiencing the glories and hardships of a flight to the moon, would dramatically symbolize the brotherhood of man."

Of VICTOR L. ANFUSO's many other activities and contributions in our Congress I need make no mention. We are all acquainted with his unparalleled accomplishments on our behalf in this branch of the Government; we are familiar with his far-reaching and constructive proposals in other areas—law, culture, and science; we are aware of his place on the front line of the ideological conflict in which we are now engaged. Congressman ANFUSO's record—in all these undertakings—speaks for itself. It is a record of which each and every one of us—as fellow Americans, as constituents, as friends, as New Yorkers—can be justifiably proud.

In retrospect, I find I have omitted a very important item—the exemplary family life which this devoted public servant has led since his marriage in 1930 to the former Frances Stallone of Brooklyn. The Anfusos have been blessed with five children—Victor, Jr. (who is already following in his father's footsteps, recently graduating from St. John's Law School and being admitted to the bar); Diana, Marianina, and twin sons Francis and Joseph.

On this memorable occasion, however, I have saved the most appropriate, and perhaps one of the most important, contributions of Congressman ANFUSO until the last.

It is by the success and permanence of our institutions that we can most properly appreciate the men who founded them. To us gathered here tonight, this silver anniversary testimonial banquet is an event of great significance. It is a tribute, first of all, to the permanence and vitality of a great organization—the Italian Board of Guardians. To those of us present who have witnessed the noble work of the board throughout the years in aiding children from broken homes—this, indeed, is a happy occasion, and one which will be long remembered.

But this wonderful event has an added significance. For in honoring the Italian Board of Guardians, we pay lasting tribute to the man whose wisdom, foresight, and exceptional judgment and sacrifice did much to make its founding possible. It is a tribute to this man and his work that we are assembled here tonight.

It has been said that it is a sacred duty of every American to perpetuate our civil institutions and to avert the dangers which may threaten them. By these standards, VICTOR L. ANFUSO has truly earned our lasting tribute, as well as this testimonial in his honor. Through the board that he founded and nurtured, through all the many activities of a dedicated career, he has helped us all achieve the ideals to which we as a nation are steadfastly committed. In devoted and patriotic service to God, country, and fellow man; in a brilliant, long and honorable career as a public servant, lawyer, judge, and Congressman, no one is more deserving of our highest praise and emulation than our honored guest on this silver anniversary, Congressman VICTOR L. ANFUSO.

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN VICTOR L. ANFUSO

Ladies and gentlemen, I recognize that this is a signal honor—an honor which 25 years ago I did not even foresee. But the child called the Italian Board of Guardians has grown into benign maturity with such wonderful proportions that today it is able to guide the destinies of thousands who otherwise might have strayed into a life of crime. I alone did not bring this child into being. Many who are here contributed to its formation, and most of you have brought it to its present status.

I shall remember and forever cherish the award presented to me this evening by Ambassador Michael Comay, the Israel representative to the United Nations, in behalf of the Government of Israel. This is indeed a token of great esteem and high honor. May I assure the Ambassador—and I shall be pleased if he would convey this to his Government—that I am not only fortified in my sincere friendship and esteem for the people of Israel, but that I stand ready at all times to do all in my power and to lend my assistance in every way possible to help bring peace and security to Israel.

As I look back, it was not a pretty picture which I observed 25 years ago, as a practicing attorney of only a few years. The calendars of our criminal courts were filled with Italian names of young men waiting to be tried for crimes of violence, including murder. But what disturbed me the most was our children courts' calendars, replete with names ending in a vowel. Here were our future rapists, thieves and murderers. I was sure that environment alone was not the cause of these children's delinquencies. I had been brought up in the same environment and fought my way through the jungle of poverty and despair. But I had someone to guide me—someone who understood me; who spoke the same language I did. This guidance came from my mother and older brothers and sisters who came with me to this glorious country in 1914. I was only 9 then, but I had already been to school in Italy and had worked with my father as an apprentice in his business for 3 years until his death. I never stopped working when I came to these shores and continued my education, first during the day and then at night.

Having grown with delinquents in a real tough neighborhood in those days, receiving a broken nose and other forms of injury because I refused to join their gangs, I learned a good deal of the causes of their delinquencies. I also learned to fight with my fists and in time won their respect so that they left me alone. There were times when I would be invited to their homes and learned that children and parents lived in two separate worlds. There was no family spirit at all. There was complete estrangement. The children spoke the English they had learned in school and some of the gutter language they picked up on the streets of New York. The parents spoke no English at all and left the house only to go to work with some paisano. They were hard working, these foreigners from Italy, as were my brothers and sisters and my mother, who took in work at home. The difference between my home and theirs was that we spoke the same language at our home and gathered together for dinner every night, whereas the parents of these other children spoke no English and the children no Italian. Parents and children were never together at dinner and there was absolutely no means of communication between them. They lived in a house without a home. When a child got into trouble and a truant officer or policeman would call at the home, the mother or the father could give no information that would be helpful to restore the child to a useful life. Such little information as they had about the child's doings they would withhold from the court officer with the result that the child was invariably sent to a correction institution for a minor offense. From there he was graduated to bigger institutions and sometimes wound up in the electric chair. He never had a chance. You know it's difficult to be a man. It's difficult to be a woman. Neither a skirt nor a pair of pants makes either one. It takes character. What I regret is that some kids never have a chance to build character.

This was the situation which I and others aimed to correct 25 years ago. How to do it was another thing again. We had no social workers of Italian extraction, no society with a knowledge and ability to solve the problem. We were still newcomers to this great land of many peoples.

I had heard of the Jewish Board of Guardians and how it had solved the problems of delinquency and crime among youths of the Jewish faith. I spoke to its president and my good friend—here tonight—Mr. Philip Heimlick, and I received the most wonderful cooperation enabling me to form a charter based on the model given to me by the Jewish Board of Guardians.

Soon we had our own court officers and truant officers who could understand the Italian language, win the confidence of the parents, and with proper knowledge of the family situation finally win the confidence of the delinquent boy himself. Thus, we were able to present a true picture to the judge or to the school authorities, making it possible for the boy to be placed in our care instead of an institutional home or prison.

The results, as I have said, have been almost miraculous. The calendars of our criminal and children's courts are no longer congested with names ending in a vowel. Indeed, the Italo-Americans have come into their own. The fear of future Costellos or Lucky Lucianos no longer exists.

But more than helping Italo-Americans, the Italian Board of Guardians has contributed to a better America, as did the Irish, the Poles, the Germans and the people of the Jewish faith before them. To unite the country further and to make an invincible America, we must with equal fairness and justice deal with our fellow citizens from Puerto Rico and the Negroes. In furtherance of this, I was happy to lend a copy of the charter of the Italian Board of Guardians to some of my Puerto Rican friends some years ago, and today there is in existence a Puerto Rican Board of Guardians. I predict that in a very short time the Puerto Ricans will make an even more valuable contribution to the welfare of our city, State, and Nation.

The Negro situation looms now foremost on the American horizon. It cannot be handled superficially. We must recognize once and for all that anywhere in these United States they are entitled to the same pursuit of life, liberty, and happiness, and the equal protection of our laws.

I can never forget Richard Wright's book about the colored boy in the slums who, looking up at the airplane in the sky, muttered: "Fly that plane, white boy, fly that plane." He knew it was a white boy flying that plane and he knew too that it could never be him, no matter how much he wanted it. That is the trouble today. The Negro feels trapped and feels that he has to fight back—fight everybody.

But I can assure you that they cannot and will not be held down much longer. Negro education and Negro culture have soared. The educated and the cultured are beginning to take care of their own and soon the colored people will assume their proper responsibilities and further enrich the society in which we live.

Nations, just like people, have found it difficult to live together. In the last 2,000 years the world has gained much knowledge, but when we observe the direction in which mankind is headed I am sorry to say that it has gained very little wisdom. Our tremendous progress in the field of science has brought the world to a situation where we are faced with the choice of total destruction or a world of peace and abundance for all.

We cannot lose this struggle if we recognize that the real strength of America lies in its many national and racial strains. These blended together have made the United States, the youngest of Western nations, the strongest country in the world. Further understanding will make it invincible in the future.

Regardless of all the dire prognostications about mankind and its survival in the future, I am optimistic concerning man's ability to extricate himself from the present dilemma in the world and to face a glorious future of peace and abundance for all. We need but to look to our faith in God for encouragement and hope. We can find different messages of hope expressed differently by each of our major faiths or by the prophets of these faiths, but in essence all these messages stem from the one God that is the Creator and Father of all humanity.

In Isaiah (ch. LIV, verse 17), for example, we find this very encouraging prophecy for the future of mankind:

"No weapon that is formed against thee shall prosper * * *."

In St. Matthew (ch. XVI, verse 18), we find this prophecy:

"And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."

And from a modern-day Protestant religious leader, D. L. Moody, I quote this observation:

"I think it would take the wrinkles out of your brow if you would just look into the future, instead of into the past. There are two kinds of people—some that live on the past, and some that live on the future. You never saw a person living upon the past all the time, and always talking about the past, that did not have a great many wrinkles on his brow."

I am confident that these messages from God and the interpretations of the words of God will someday bring out the best in men and women everywhere and cause peoples all over the world to unite for the betterment and the glory of all mankind, no matter what their religious beliefs. God's message of peace on earth will eventually reach all peoples and will unite this world of ours as it has never been united before.

Thus, united, mankind can conquer space, settle other planets, and eventually bring back to earth presently unimaginable resources to create a world of abundance—making war in the future unthinkable and unnecessary.

My friends, will you please rise with me and together let us toast the future. May we, with the help of God, pass through these days of turmoil, which hold the threat of atomic bombs and missiles over our heads and give us neither peace nor rest. May we be privileged to live and to see some of the wonders that a united world can bring to all mankind.

SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 1962

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father who art in heaven, and in the earth, and in the hearts of men, hallowed be Thy name. In this opening moment of a new week's council concerning the future of the Nation and of the world, may those here chosen to speak for the Republic, with such responsibilities committed to their hands, draw near unto Thee in humility and sincerity. Reveal unto them, we pray, the means Thou wouldst have them use to establish justice and peace among men in all the earth.

May those who here serve the people be wise interpreters of the signs of the times and brave spokesmen of Thy will and of Thy truth which sets men free from ancient wrongs. Out of the chaos of our time, may there come the kingdom of which Thy prophets have dreamed in every age.

Enable each of us in the places where we stand to live greatly in a world so grave, as we are granted light enough for the next step.

In the Redeemer's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 8, 1962, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86-42, the Speaker had appointed Mr. DULSKI, of New York, Mr. PHILBIN, of Massachusetts, Mr. MURPHY, of Illinois, Mr. DONOHUE, of Massachusetts, Mr. GIAIMO, of Connecticut, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, of Nebraska, Mr. TUPPER, of Maine, and Mr. ROBISON, of New York as additional members of the U.S. delegation of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group for the meeting to be held in Ottawa, Canada, from February 28 to March 4, 1962, on the part of the House.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H.R. 4876. An act for the relief of Mary C. Atkinson;

H.R. 5181 An act to amend Private Law 85-699;

H.R. 5324. An act for the relief of Doctor Serafin T. Ortiz;

H.R. 6013. An act for the relief of the Houston Belt & Terminal Railway Co.;

H.R. 7473. An act for the relief of Albert R. Serpa; and

H.R. 8325 An act for the relief of Harrison Thomas Harper.

CALL OF THE CALENDAR DISPENSED WITH

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the call of the legislative calendar was dispensed with.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection with the morning hour be limited to 3 minutes.

The **VICE PRESIDENT.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The **VICE PRESIDENT** laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for Mr. EASTLAND), from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Alexander Greenfeld, of Delaware, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Delaware; and

Harry M. Miller, of Kentucky, to be U.S. marshal for the western district of Kentucky.

The **VICE PRESIDENT.** If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSIONER

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Kenneth H. Tuggle, of Kentucky, to be Interstate Commerce Commissioner for a term of 7 years expiring December 31, 1968.

The **VICE PRESIDENT.** Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The **VICE PRESIDENT.** Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

U.S. COAST GUARD

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Coast Guard.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The **VICE PRESIDENT.** Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Federal Maritime Commission.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The **VICE PRESIDENT.** Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

U.S. ARMY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Lt. Gen. Earle Gilmore Wheeler, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army) to be general.

The **VICE PRESIDENT.** Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

BUREAU OF YARDS AND DOCKS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Rear Adm. Peter Corradi, Civil Engineer Corps, U.S. Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks in the Department of the Navy for a term of 4 years.

The **VICE PRESIDENT.** Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

U.S. NAVY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The **VICE PRESIDENT.** Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

U.S. ARMY—NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Army which had been received by the Senate and placed on the Secretary's desk, and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on January 25, 1962.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The **VICE PRESIDENT.** Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of all these nominations.

The **VICE PRESIDENT.** Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The **VICE PRESIDENT** laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ACT OF 1950, RELATING TO CONSTRUCTION OR MODIFICATION OF APPROVED PUBLIC SHELTER SPACE

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to further amend section 201 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, to authorize payment toward the construction or modification of approved public shelter space, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON PROVISION OF WAR RISK INSURANCE AND CERTAIN MARINE AND LIABILITY INSURANCE FOR THE AMERICAN PUBLIC

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the provision of war risk insurance and certain marine and liability insurance for the American public, as of December 31, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF SUPPLY MANAGEMENT OF SHIP REPAIR PARTS BY SHIPS PARTS CONTROL CENTER, MECHANICSBURG, PA.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of the supply management of ship repair parts by the Ships Parts Control Center, Mechanicsburg, Pa., Department of the Navy, dated February 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

CHANGE OF NAME OF PETERSBURG NATIONAL MILITARY PARK

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to change the name of the Petersburg National Military Park, to provide for acquisition of a portion of the Five Forks Battlefield, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Kansas; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 22

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States in regard to legislation pertaining to the agricultural conservation program

"Whereas the ever-increasing demands for effective soil and water conservation impose a major responsibility on Kansas farmers; and

"Whereas watershed development in the State of Kansas involves accelerated conservation work; and

"Whereas the farmers of Kansas have demonstrated a willingness to spend more of their own time and money for conservation of soil and water in the public interest; and

"Whereas, for the past 14 years, the Federal appropriation for agricultural conservation work on a cost-sharing basis has remained at $250 million; and

"Whereas before the end of the year 1961 more than 60 counties in the State of Kansas were using advance allocations of funds appropriated for the year 1962; and

"Whereas in the State of Kansas these funds have consistently been used for fundamental and permanent conservation activities such as terraces, waterways, restoration of native grasses and other projects and practices of enduring value; and

"Whereas some States do not use their full allocation of the Federal funds, commonly known as agricultural conservation program money: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Kansas (the Senate concurring therein)*, That we respectfully urge and request the Congress of the United States to maintain the appropriation of agricultural conservation program funds at no less than $250 million per annum; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That we respectfully urge and request the Congress of the United States to amend the basic agricultural conservation program law so as to permit unused funds in any State to be reallocated to States which demonstrate a need for additional funds for permanent conservation work; and be it further

"*Resolved* That the secretary of state be instructed to transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, the chairmen of the committees on appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, and to each member of the Kansas delegation in the Congress of the United States.

"Adopted by the house February 1, 1962.

"ALLEN L. MITCHELL,
"*Speaker of the House.*
"A. E. ANDERSON,
"*Chief Clerk of the House.*

"Adopted by the senate February 5, 1962.

"HAROLD H. CHASE,
"*President of the Senate.*
"RALPH E. ZARKER,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*"

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 1

"Joint memorial requesting the President and the Congress of the United States to authorize the Director of the U.S. Mint to issue a commemorative half dollar coin commemorating the State of Arizona's 50th year of statehood

"*To the President and the Congress of the United States of America:*

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"On February 14, 1962, the people of the State of Arizona will celebrate the anniversary of 50 years of statehood for Arizona. This semicentennial celebration of Arizona's statehood will continue throughout the year 1962 and the anniversary will undoubtedly be recognized not only within the State but throughout the United States.

"In view of this important and significant semicentennial anniversary of Arizona statehood, the members of the Arizona Legislature believe it appropriate and proper that the President and the Congress of the United States signify its recognition of this important event by authorizing the Director of the Mint to issue a commemorative half-dollar coin so that the whole Nation may join in recognizing Arizona's 50th year of statehood.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the Legislature of the State of Arizona, prays:

"That the President and the Congress of the United States of America authorize the Director of the Mint to issue a commemorative half-dollar coin in honor of Arizona's 50th year of statehood and so that the people of the whole Nation may join hands in honoring this significant event."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Kansas; to the Committee on Finance:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 12

"Concurrent resolution relating to Federal income taxation of the interest derived from public bonds

"Whereas the State of Kansas and the political subdivisions thereof have in the past and are now currently engaged in financing, through the issuance of bonds, needed public improvements such as the building of schools, highways, water and sewer distribution systems, and other projects for the promotion of the health, safety, and welfare of the people; and

"Whereas the interest income which the owner derives from such bonds has in the past and is now currently exempt from the imposition of any Federal income tax; and

"Whereas the Federal taxation of the interest of such bonds, as income, would result in the curtailment of construction of needed public improvements, and would result in either an increase of taxes imposed by the State of Kansas and any political subdivision thereof in order to pay higher interest costs, or the assumption by the Federal Government of the responsibility of financing such improvements; and

"Whereas, there is currently a national movement to permit the imposition of the Federal income tax on the interest income from the bonds issued or to be issued by the several States and their political subdivisions: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Kansas (the Senate concurring therein)*, That the Legislature of the State of Kansas respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to oppose any amendment of the Constitution of the United States, or any other action by the Congress of the United States, or the executive branch thereof, which would have the effect of subjecting the income from State and local bonds to a Federal tax or to cause the tax to be increased because of such bondholdings by a taxpayer whether or not the increase is in fact titled a tax; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from Kansas in the Congress of the United States.

"Adopted by the house January 25, 1962.

"ALLEN L. MITCHELL,
"*Speaker of the House.*
"A. E. ANDERSON,
"*Chief Clerk of the House.*

"Adopted by the senate February 5, 1962.

"HAROLD H. CHASE,
"*President of the Senate.*
"RALPH E. ZARKER,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*"

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Finance:

"RESOLUTION 26

"Resolution memorializing the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States with respect to Federal income taxation of the interest derive from public bonds

"Whereas the State of Rhode Island and the political subdivisions thereof, have in the past, and are now currently engaged in financing, through the issuance of bonds, needed public improvements such as the building of schools, highways, water and sewer distribution systems, and other projects for the promotion of the health, safety, and welfare of the people; and

"Whereas the interest income which the owner derives from such bonds has in the past and is now currently exempt from the imposition of any Federal income tax; and

"Whereas the Federal taxation of the interest of such bonds, as income, would result in the curtailment of construction of needed public improvements, and would result in either an increase of taxes imposed by the State of Rhode Island and any political subdivision thereof in order to pay higher interest costs, or the assumption by the Federal Government of the responsibility of financing such improvements; and

"Whereas there is currently a national movement to permit the imposition of the Federal income tax on the interest income from the bonds issued or to be issued by the several States and their political subdivisions: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to oppose any amendment of the Constitution of the United States, or any other action by the Congress of the United States, or the executive branch thereof, which would have the effect of subjecting the income from State and local bonds to a Federal tax or to cause the tax to be increased because of such bondholdings by a taxpayer whether or not the increase is in fact titled a tax; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welware:

"The military forces and public health agencies of our Nation have a vital and continuous need for medical services. Difficulty has long been experienced in obtaining a sufficient number of medical men to administer proper care to military personnel and their dependents, and to efficiently carry on essential public health services.

"It is therefore deemed highly desirable that a Federal service school to be established in the field of medicine patterned after West Point in the field of Army training, Annapolis in the field of naval training, and the Air Force Academy in the field of aviation, which school would supply a steady flow of trained medical personnel for all of the branches of the service and for conducting our important public health service.

"It is also deemed desirable that such a school be established in a conveniently located medical and hospital center. No better location could possibly be found than Pittsburgh, Pa., which in recent years has become one of the leading medical centers of the United States, and which has a readily accessible central location; Therefore be it

"*Resolved (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania memoralize the Congress of the United States to establish a Federal medical school in the city of Pittsburgh, Pa.: and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of each House of the Congress of the United States and to each Senator and Representative from Pennsylvania in the Congress of the United States.

"JOHN MORGAN DAVIS,
"*President of the Senate.*
"PAUL C. MOOMAW,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*
"JOSEPH OMINSKY,
"*Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.*"

A resolution adopted by the district board of the middle district of Pennsylvania of the

Church of the Brethren, at Bellwood, Pa., protesting against nuclear testing; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the Miami Shores, Fla., Rotary Club, favoring an investigation of the State Department; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Democratic State Central Committee of Michigan, Lansing, Mich., endorsing the program of the President of the United States, in his state of the Union message of January 10, 1962; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MONRONEY:

S. 2832. A bill to provide for the erection and maintenance on the island of Wake of a memorial to the members of the American Armed Forces who were killed in the defense of Wake Island during World War II; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Monroney when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 2833. A bill to confer on the Federal Maritime Board the authority to determine postal rates for ocean mail transportation; and

S. 2834. A bill to provide for the regulation of schedules and certain practices of foreign air carriers in foreign air transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DODD:

S. 2835. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Yang Yin (Yang Chee Hung) nee Tsai Sieu Yoeh;

S. 2836. A bill for the relief of Carmelo Rafala; and

S. 2837. A bill for the relief of Konstantinos P. Theodoropoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FONG:

S. 2838. A bill to modify the project for protection against tidal waves and excessive high tides at Hilo Harbor, Hawaii; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. Fong when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ALLOTT (for himself and Mr. Carroll):

S. 2839. A bill to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey certain lands in the State of Colorado to the city of Denver, Colo.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

WAKE—THE ISLAND THAT MUST NOT BE FORGOTTEN

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the erection and maintenance on the island of Wake of a memorial to the members of the American Armed Forces who were killed in the defense of Wake Island during World War II.

Mr. President, such marking of a hallowed site is long overdue. In the 16 days after Pearl Harbor, a tiny force of Americans in the Marines, the Navy, and the Army held that small V, which is really three islands, against unbelievable attacks. There were only 1,731 Americans on Wake, but the Japanese lost—by their own admission—11 ships, 29 airplanes, and 5,700 men before forcing surrender after a massive landing. We lost 96 brave men and a dozen planes. And how do we mark the place where we gained 16 irreplaceable days? I was there a few years ago and saw the pitiful attempt that has been made. The prop and engine cowling off an F-4F on a pile of coral signals the spot. Two fading wooden signs and a corroding bronze placque tell part of the story. Certainly the epic chapter of U.S. military history written at Wake deserves a more permanent monument.

Recently the story of Wake and its pitiful monument was told by Jim Downing, of the Tulsa Tribune, in his paper and in a story for the Newspaper Enterprise Association. I ask unanimous consent for his story's inclusion following my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the news article will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2832) to provide for the erection and maintenance on the island of Wake of a memorial to the members of the American Armed Forces who were killed in the defense of Wake Island during World War II, introduced by Mr. Monroney, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The article presented by Mr. Monroney is as follows:

Wake—The Island That We've Forgotten

(By Jim Downing)

Wake Island.—With the rising sun beginning to shed its glow on some unlikely spots in the Far East and incidents sending seismic tremors across the Pacific, the U.S. Navy, early in 1941, decided Wake Island would be a fine place to fix up an airbase.

The Marines, Seabees, and civilian construction crews came in to scrape at the coral, put up some buildings and erect the airbase. The job was half done when, on Monday morning, December 8, 1941, at breakfast, word came that the Japanese had attacked Pearl Harbor, 2,000 miles east across the international dateline where it still was December 7. The 1,731 Americans on Wake knew they had had it.

They had, in fact, until 11:58 a.m. to load up what guns they had, gas up and deploy the dozen fighter planes, dig trenches and generally batten down the hatches.

The Japanese bombers came in low and plastered the place in a personal salute from the Emperor. Sure, they took Wake, finally. But the price paid was fantastic, considering what they got.

For 16 days, the Japanese threw everything they could muster against Maj. James P. S. Devereux' 378 marines, Maj. Paul A. Putman's 60-man marine squadron, Cmdr. W. S. Cunningham's 72 Navy men, Capt. Henry Wilson's handful of Army communications men and Dan Teters' construction gang of 1,146.

In those 16 days, the Japanese lost—by their own admission—11 ships, 29 airplanes, and an incredible 5,700 men, either drowned or shot down or killed in combat.

When Devereux surrendered after a massive landing, our losses were a dozen planes and 96 men.

If you're like me, 20 years later, you get off your trans-Pacific airplane and you feel the goose pimples, a lump in the throat, a sting in the eye. Wake Island—"the enemy has landed and the situation is in doubt." That was Cunningham.

Is there a monument marking, for the thousands upon thousands of trans-Pacific tourists, the fact that this indeed is hallowed ground?

Going through the air terminal, turning right past the cluster of terminal and service buildings and walking a few hundred feet to the fork in the road will reveal a monument.

A pitiful pile of coral surmounted by the prop and, engine cowling off an F-4, flanked by a pair of wooden signboards and partly overgrown by the mesquite-type island brush. A tiny bronze plaque is corroded and slightly askew.

Someone has tried. Someone with the proper respect, if somewhat lacking in education. The plaque was donated by a Tacoma foundry, the sign reveals.

The fading signs hail the defenders and note that the prop and speedring are from Capt. Henry T. Elrod's last Marine fighter plane, crash-landed after attacking a Japanese destroyer. His bones are somewhere hereabouts possibly, because he died in hand-to-hand combat the day before the surrender.

Hank Elrod, his last plane lying in wreckage, crouching in a slit trench somewhere here on the night of December 21 with a rifle in his hand, almost certainly would have laughed at the thought of a monument as he looked at the stars for the last time.

Today, even with a modicum of modern conveniences, plenty of food and water, movies every night and cold beer at the Drifters Reef, Wake is a lousy place to live and work.

Wake is a 3-square-mile conglomerate of three islands, roughly V-shaped.

Wreckage strews the south shore, especially in the area where the rusting hull of a Japanese supply ship *Suwa Maru* lies beached—what is left of it after the typhoon of 1952 that swept the island almost clean of man's handiwork.

The sun beats down and sudden rains slash across. For the 1,500 permanent inhabitants—military, civilian and Federal Aviation Agency personnel—it is a life of deadly monotony, to be endured while the bonus pay bankroll builds up to make it partly worthwhile.

Wake's 8,500 concrete airlines runway still feels the pounding tires of some 900 aircraft a month, but its doom is easy to foresee. Today, it is mostly the piston-engined craft of poor, old make-do MATS and snooty Pan American which slant in over the lagoon and settle down on Capt. Sam Wake's island to refuel. The jets, replacing the old craft, need no stepping stones, no refueling havens.

So someday, this island may fade into obscurity without even leaving a decent monument to remember the dead in its ironic wake.

REGULATION OF SCHEDULES AND CERTAIN PRACTICES OF FOREIGN AIR CARRIERS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, at the request of the Air Transport Association, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the regulation of schedules and certain practices of foreign air carriers in foreign air transportation. I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the President of the Air Transport Association, requesting the proposed legislation, together with a section-by-section analysis of the bill, be printed in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and section-by-section analysis will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2834) to provide for the regulations of schedules and certain practices of foreign air carriers in foreign air transportation, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter and analysis presented by Mr. MAGNUSON are as follows:

AIR TRANSPORT ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., February 8, 1962.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Commerce, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As you know, section 402 of the Federal Aviation Act provides that a foreign air carrier must possess a permit issued by the Civil Aeronautics Board before such air carrier may operate air transport services to the United States. Although the Board is authorized to establish terms and conditions in connection with the issuance of foreign air carrier permits, the power of the Board to require the filing and approval of foreign air carrier schedules—as a means of determining public interest requirements and of insuring conformity and compliance with existing bilateral air transport agreements—has been subject to considerable question.

Almost all bilateral agreements in force between the United States and other countries retain as their primary objective the provisions of capacity adequate to the traffic demands between the country of which the designated air carrier is a national and the countries of ultimate destination. Existing bilateral agreements were originally designed to provide a framework of liberal but fair bilateral regulation of international air transportation. Their terms must necessarily be adhered to if this objective is to be achieved. These bilateral agreement principles, particularly with regard to the primary capacity objective, are, however, being rendered meaningless in those instances where foreign air carriers interpret agreements in accordance with their own self-interest.

The air carriers of several foreign countries are, with the consent or knowledge of their governments, operating capacity—the amount and kind of air transportation operated by the carriers of two signatory countries—to and from the United States far in excess of that provided for in the bilateral agreements. Although such agreements provide the United States with the opportunity to consult with a foreign government or governments about capacity questions and disagreements, consultations with regard to excess capacity which may be detrimental to U.S. interests have proven to be generally useless.

Under the terms of existing bilateral agreements, the U.S. Government does not quarrel with the right of any given foreign air carrier to operate maximum capacity between its country and the United States so long as such capacity is based on the carriage of primary traffic. In our opinion, however, the U.S. Government should object and should take action when foreign air carriers operate capacity in violation of the agreement, capacity which is, in fact, geared primarily to the carriage of traffic between the United States and third countries.

Excess capacity substantially increases airline operating costs and these costs must ultimately be borne by the general public. Excess capacity has a most adverse effect upon the economic health of the industry. This is particularly so in the case of our own U.S.-flag international airlines whose share of the international market is declining at an alarming rate and who now face serious economic difficulties. This decline is to a large measure the result of the excess capacity operated by several foreign air carriers.

Because the consultations provided for in the bilateral agreements have proven unsuccessful with regard to excess capacity, the U.S. Government has found itself powerless to take effective measures to ensure that the provisions of the applicable air agreements are adhered to. The lack of specific statutory authority to require the filing and approval of foreign air carrier schedules in this respect has been a contributing factor.

In the absence of clear legislative authority, we recommend the consideration and enactment of legislation authorizing the board to require the filing of foreign air carrier schedules for approval. A draft bill in this connection, as well as an analysis of the proposed legislation, is enclosed for your consideration and we respectfully request its early introduction.

The proposed legislation would leave to the Government's discretion whether a foreign air carrier's schedules or proposed schedules are in the public interest and in consonance with the applicable bilateral agreement. The proposed legislation does not envisage a unique or unusual authority in the field of international air transportation. Other governments have had, or are having, similar excess capacity problems. They have solved, or are solving such problems by requiring foreign air carriers to file their schedules for approval.

Our Government should be similarly equipped to deal immediately with increasingly urgent excess capacity problems. Furthermore, the very fact that we would possess the power provided for in the proposed legislation would, to a large extent, eliminate another kind of capacity problem confronting the United States, the imposition of arbitrary restrictions upon U.S.-flag airlines by foreign governments.

We hope you will agree to introduce the proposed legislation and that hearings may be scheduled as soon as possible.

Cordially,

S. G. TIPTON.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 402 of the Federal Aviation Act provides that a foreign air carrier must have a permit issued by the Civil Aeronautics Board before such air carrier may operate air transport services to the United States. Section 402 of the act also contains provisions dealing with the application for, issuance, and terms and conditions of such permits but does not specifically mention the filing and approval of flight schedules. The Board's authority in this respect has been subject to question. The proposed bill would effectively resolve this issue by adding a new subsection to section 402 of the act. New subsection (h) would specifically authorize the Board to require foreign air carriers to file with the Board for approval copies of schedules currently operated, as well as proposed, between any point in the United States and any point outside the United States. This subsection would further provide that current or proposed schedules cannot be continued or inaugurated unless approved by the Civil Aeronautics Board, after consultation with the Secretary of State, and that such approval shall take into consideration the public interest requirements of the United States as well as any applicable U.S. law, treaty, convention, or agreement.

CASH CONTRIBUTION FOR HILO HARBOR BREAKWATER PROJECT

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the elimination of a cash contribution requirement of 28.2 percent imposed by the Corps of Engineers on the seismic sea wave or tsunami protection portion of the Hilo Harbor breakwater project.

On May 31, 1960, Congress responded to my plea on behalf of the people of Hilo, Hawaii, who, a week earlier had experienced a devastating tidal wave. Sixty people perished and property damages from the series of great waves amounted to over $25 million. Only 14 years before 159 people were killed in a similar seismic sea wave.

The thriving city and busy harbor of Hilo suffered extensive damage from these waves. The Corps of Engineers estimated that practically all of the damage to Hilo in 1960 could have been prevented if an adequate protective barrier had been in existence.

In 1960, Congress authorized a $26 million project to protect the people and the city of Hilo, Hawaii. Studies have been made by the Corps of Engineers on this proposed breakwater, and in its report the recommendations follow the same standards set in public works projects dealing with excessive high tides and flooding caused by hurricanes.

The Corps of Engineers has therefore reported that a 28.2 percent cash contribution will be required of the local interests.

The seismic sea waves which have hit Hawaii cannot be likened to hurricanes and excessive high tides. The short wavelength of storms and hurricanes cannot be compared in damage potential to the long wavelength of a seismic sea wave. No other State in the Union has experienced the full force of a seismic sea wave.

An underwater tremor off Alaska or the coast of South America or an earthquake in Japan may touch off a seismic sea wave. The force of this wave increases as it travels thousands of miles across the ocean. Hawaii, because of its location, almost invariably will be in the path of these waves.

The tsunami travels thousands of miles within a very short time. Hurricanes, on the other hand, move very slowly. Warning against hurricanes are possible several days in advance and their courses are predictable.

It is possible to ascertain, with a reasonable degree of accuracy, the severity of a hurricane. This is not so in the case of a seismic sea wave. Furthermore, it is often not possible to detect a seismic sea wave on the high seas. The size of the wave also escapes prediction. For these reasons, adequate warning cannot be given of seismic sea waves.

Hurricanes and excessive high tides are seasonal occurrences. The areas where these high winds and tides occur expect them during certain periods of the year. These localities have therefore through the years prepared themselves for these local phenomena.

A seismic sea wave on the other hand has no season. No one knows when a tsunami will occur. The constant fear that it will occur, but not knowing when, is cause for national concern. The damage potential, the unpredictability, the tremendous force and the threat to individual lives takes a tsunami out of the category of a local misfortune. The protection needed against a seismic sea wave is a national project.

Hilo Harbor is an excellent harbor but the topography of the ocean floor rising to Hilo Bay acts as a funnel for the waves. The full force of these waves are directed into Hilo Bay and onto the shore areas of the city.

The damages suffered at Hilo from seismic sea waves have always been severe and recovery expensive. Because of the severe and particular circumstances associated with the tsunami and the Hilo Harbor breakwater project, I feel there is no precedent that can be followed.

For the foregoing reasons, I believe that the people of Hawaii should not be required to make a cash contribution amounting to 28.2 percent of the cost. Hilo has made spectacular recovery in spite of the ruin it experienced only 2 years ago. The devastation has rendered Hawaii County financially incapable of putting up the $5½ million required. The State of Hawaii is likewise incapable of assuming this additional burden. I have received many letters from individuals and leaders in the county of Hawaii and the State expressing deep concern over this requirement.

The dangers of another seismic sea wave disaster and the accompanying fears continue to plague every resident of Hillo. I therefore ask the members of the Senate Public Works Committee and the Senate as a whole to act quickly and favorably on my proposal to eliminate the cash contribution requirement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2838) to modify the project for protection against tidal waves and excessive high tides at Hilo Harbor, Hawaii, introduced by Mr. FONG, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

WELFARE AND PENSION PLANS DISCLOSURE ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1962—PRINTING OF BILL AS PASSED BY SENATE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that House bill 8723, the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act Amendments of 1962, passed by the Senate on Wednesday last, be printed showing the Senate amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments, to which was referred for examination and recommendation two lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States, dated January 22, 1962, and January 30, 1962, respectively, that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon, pursuant to law.

THE CONGRESSIONAL FRANKING PRIVILEGE—AMENDMENT

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the February 5, 1962, issue of the New York Herald Tribune entitled "Let Congressmen Pay for Their Propaganda."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET CONGRESSMEN PAY FOR THEIR PROPAGANDA

Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS has one wheel on the right track in his effort to bar use of the congressional franking privilege for junk-type mailings to city dwellers.

In the windup of last year's session, the House passed a measure authorizing such use. It permits Congressmen to send unaddressed mail on city postal routes, which has to be delivered, postage free, to all households. (Boxholder mail was already being accepted free on rural routes.)

Previously the Senate had blocked such a move; this time the House slyly included it in a catchup supplementary appropriations bill which was sent to the Senate on a take-it-or-leave-it basis.

The privilege, of course, is useful principally for blanketing a Congressman's district with glowing accounts of how splendidly he is looking out for its interests.

In Senator WILLIAMS' words, "This constitutes an unconscionable abuse of the franking privilege which is so necessary to the proper conduct of a congressional office, because it allows Members of Congress to use a free mailing service to do things which ordinary citizens and businesses cannot do even if they pay for it."

He has offered an amendment to the postal rate bill barring delivery of franked mail in cities unless addressed to a specific street number.

All of which is fine. But why not get the rural wheel on the same track?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in this editorial they approve of the amendment but point out that it does not cover the whole problem since under the amendment unaddressed mail or junk mail could still be sent under frank by Members of Congress to rural boxholders.

The editor is correct. This was an oversight on my part and I appreciate having it called to my attention. I am today introducing a corrected amendment which will do the job.

This revised amendment will stop all franking privileges for unaddressed mail in any area—cities or rural—by Members of Congress.

I send the corrected amendment to the desk and ask for its referral to the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee for consideration when acting on H.R. 7927.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REGULATION OF RATES AND PRACTICES OF AIR CARRIERS AND FOREIGN AIR CARRIERS—AMENDMENT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, last session, at the request of the Civil Aeronautics Board, I introduced a bill (S. 958) which would amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide for the regulation of rates and practices of air carriers and foreign air carriers in foreign air transportation, and for other puposes.

I now submit, at the request of the Air Transport Association, an amendment to that proposed legislation. I do this so that the ideas of both the industry and the regulating agency may be before the committee when hearings are held.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Air Transport Association, requesting the proposed amendment, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Commerce; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

AIR TRANSPORT ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., February 8, 1962.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Commerce,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Civil Aeronautics Board has contended that it has no summary power to stop any carrier in foreign air transportation from placing into effect any rate, fare, or practice it elects, excluding that which may be of a discriminatory nature. The Board, therefore, has long sought legislation which would extend its interstate rate authority, the authority to fix and prescribe rates, to foreign air transportation. The Board's current proposal in this regard is set forth in S. 958 now pending before your committee.

Since the Board contends it lacks sufficient statutory authority to correct and/or prevent rate problems in foreign air transportation, it is our belief that some specific authority should be provided. We recommend enactment of legislation authorizing the Board to suspend rates in foreign air transportation. A draft bill in this connection, as well as an analysis of the proposed legislation, is enclosed for your consideration and we respectfully request its early introduction.

With regard to oversea air transportation, our proposed legislation is much the same as S. 958 with respect to providing the Board the same authority to prescribe rates and practices in oversea air transportation as the Board now possesses with respect to interstate transportation. Unlike S. 958, however, our proposed legislation recognizes the need to distinguish between interstate and oversea air transportation on the one hand and foreign air transportation on the other. This distinction is necessary because:

1. Rates and tariffs in foreign air transportation involve to a major extent multilateral considerations which need not be taken into account in interstate and oversea air transportation. Rates and practices developed through the time-proven IATA conference system take into account multilateral considerations and are subject to the approval of the respective governments, thus ensuring that such rates are in the public interest; and

2. Virtually all U.S. bilateral air agreements provide that if the Board were to have the authority to prescribe rates in foreign air transportation and such rates were unacceptable to a foreign government, the disagreement would be referred to an independent body for an advisory report. Thus,

the net effect of the rate authority proposed in S. 958 would be to subject the Board's rate decisions to a third party arbitration.

Our proposed legislation would empower the Board either upon complaint or upon its own initiative to suspend a proposed or an existing tariff related to foreign air transportation for a period not exceeding 365 days in the aggregate when such tariff appears inconsistent with the public interest. If and when the Board were to suspend a proposed tariff, the tariff in effect immediately prior to the filing of the new tariff shall be maintained. In the case of suspension of an existing tariff, the lowest or most advantageous tariff or tariffs currently in effect and applicable to services provided by other air carriers engaged in the foreign air transportation may be used.

It is our belief that the enclosed draft bill would provide the Board with the specific statutory authority to carry out the declared policy of Congress with regard to "the promotion of adequate, economical, and efficient service by air carriers at reasonable charges, without * * * unfair or destructive competitive practices." For reasons previously cited, our legislative proposal accomplishes this objective in a more effective manner than that provided for in S. 958.

We hope you will agree to introduce our proposed legislation and that hearings may be scheduled as soon as possible.

Cordially,

S. G. TIPTON.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 1002 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 authorizes the Civil Aeronautics Board to prescribe rates and practices, and to suspend rates in certain cases, of air carriers engaged in interstate and oversea air transportation. No rate authority has been given the Board in the case of carriers engaged in foreign air transportation. The purpose of the proposed bill is to empower the Board to suspend rates relating to foreign air transportation when such rates appear to be unjust and unreasonable.

1. Subsection (d) of section 1002 of the act authorizes the Board to prescribe rates and practices of air carriers in interstate and oversea transportation, with a proviso that as to oversea air transportation the Board shall prescribe only a "just and reasonable maximum or minimum, or maximum and minimum rate, fare, or charge." Section 1 of the proposed bill would strike out the proviso with regard to oversea air transportation in order to give the Board the same authority to prescribe rates and practices of air carriers in oversea transportation as the Board now possesses with respect to interstate transportation. This change is necessary to standardize the Board's interstate and oversea rate authority and to necessarily distinguish between interstate and oversea transportation on the one hand and foreign air transportation on the other. This distinction is further necessary in view of the rate suspension authority with regard to foreign air transportation given the Board under section 4 of the proposed bill.

2. Section 2 of the proposed bill would change the heading of subsection (e) of section 1002 of the act to read: "Rule of Rate Making—Interstate and Overseas Air Transportation" in order to make clear that the Board's authority to prescribe rates applies to interstate and oversea transportation.

3. Section 3 of the proposed bill would change the heading of subsection (g) of section 1002 of the act to read: "Suspension of Rates—Interstate and Overseas Air Transportation" in order to make clear that the Board's authority to suspend rates under this subsection applies to interstate and oversea air transportation.

4. Section 4 of the proposed bill adds a new subsection (j) to section 1002 of the act. The new subsection would empower the Board either upon a complaint or upon its own initiative to suspend in the public interest a proposed or an existing tariff relating to foreign air transportation for a period not exceeding 365 days in the aggregate. If and when the Board should suspend a proposed tariff, the rate, fare, or charge in effect immediately prior to the filing of the new tariff shall be maintained. In the case of an existing tariff, this section would empower the Board either upon a complaint or upon its own initiative to suspend any existing tariff of a foreign air carrier which is not consistent with the public interest. Any such suspension would be for a period not exceeding 365 days in the aggregate. If and when the Board should suspend an existing tariff, the foreign air carrier concerned may use the lowest or most advantageous tariff or tariffs currently in effect and applicable to services provided by other air carriers engaged in providing the same foreign air transportation.

5. Section 5 of the proposed bill would add a new subsection (k) to section 1002 of the act. New subsection (k) sets forth some of the factors or criteria which the Board shall take into account in exercising and performing its powers and duties under proposed subsection (j). These include:

(i) The requirements of section 1102 of the act which relate to international agreements. This would insure that all actions, taken by the Board under proposed subsection (j) would be fully consistent "* * * with any obligation assumed by the United States and any foreign country or agreement that may be in force between the United States and any foreign country or foreign countries, and shall take into consideration any applicable laws and requirements of foreign countries."

(ii) That all relevant factors, such as cost of operation, reasonable profit, the characteristics of each service, and the rates charged by other carriers and foreign air carriers shall be taken into consideration by the Board in order to properly ascertain just and reasonable levels of rates.

(iii) That the public interest requires adequate, efficient, and dependable transportation by U.S. and foreign air carriers at the lowest cost consistent with furnishing such transportation and that a need for sufficient revenue exists to enable air carriers to provide adequate, efficient and dependable service under honest, economic, and efficient management.

PURCHASE BY THE UNITED STATES OF UNITED NATIONS BONDS—AMENDMENT

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the Foreign Relations Committee has been holding hearings on S. 2768, the administration's bill to authorize purchase by the United States of bonds to be issued by the United Nations to finance its current peace keeping activities. The bond issue is in pursuance of a three-point plan, approved by the General Assembly, to meet the current financial crisis in the United Nations. It is proposed to levy a special assessment for operations in the Congo and the Near East, to obtain an advisory opinion from the World Court as to the binding nature of these assessments on all U.N. members, and to issue emergency bonds, repayable with interest over a period of 25 years, to keep these U.N. operations from collapsing.

In my judgment, testimony so far received in the Foreign Relations Committee indicates that the bond issue is the best way available for solving the financial emergency now facing United Nations. The President's bill, S. 2768, would authorize purchase by the United States of $100 million of the proposed United Nations bond issue. I believe, however, that this proposed legislation, if approved, should contain a provision insuring that any such bond purchase by the United States will be a businesslike loan and not become a grant in disguise. I believe it is in the best interests of the United Nations itself that this be done, since the organization cannot emerge strengthened from its present difficulties unless the proposed bonds are fully and faithfully redeemed. Because the United States is being asked to put up half of the bond money, we are entitled to definite assurance that it will, in fact, be repaid.

Section 2 of the bill now provides:

> Amounts received from the annual repayment of interest due on such bonds shall be deposited into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

I propose an amendment which would substitute the following for section 2 of the bill:

> The President is authorized to deduct from the annual payment of the assessed share of the United States of the budget of the United Nations an amount equal to the corresponding annual installment of principal and interest due to the United States on account of bonds purchased pursuant to section 1.

The implementation of this amendment would guarantee to the United States full repayment of principal and interest on the U.N. bonds we purchase. No door will have been left open for future delay or default.

Mr. President, since the current financial crisis confronting the U.N. results from the failure of other member nations to pay their share of the special assessments levied upon them, the United States is entitled to have the protection of this amendment, as security for the repayment of the money we are being asked to loan the United Nations to save it from a bankruptcy for which we are in no way responsible. Thus, the amendment is right for the United States, even as it is right for the United Nations. I send it to the desk, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed and appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed, and will be appropriately referred.

The amendment was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator may have stated this, but I do not recall hearing it. Has the Senator discussed his proposal with representatives of the State Department?

Mr. CHURCH. I have taken the amendment up with the State Department, and the State Department has responded.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The language which the Senator includes in his amendment is essentially the same language which the State Department has indicated it might be able to live under?

Mr. CHURCH. We have come to an agreement on the language, and the State Department has indicated that it will interpose no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thought that was correct, but I wished to be sure the RECORD so showed.

Mr. CHURCH. I am very pleased the Senator has brought that to the attention of the Senate. The amendment in its present form, if it does not have the endorsement of the State Department, at least will not be objected to by the State Department as an amendment to the bill.

U.S. COMMISSION ON AGING—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on further printings of Senate bill 2779, to establish a U.S. Commission on Aging, the names of the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] and the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SMITH] be entered as cosponsors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ENCOURAGEMENT OF DISCOVERY, DEVELOPMENT, AND PRODUCTION OF GOLD—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF JOINT RESOLUTION

On request by Mr. GRUENING, and by unanimous consent, his name was added as an additional cosponsor of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 44) to encourage the discovery, development, and production of domestic gold.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. GORE:

Address by Senator KEFAUVER delivered before the League of Women Voters, Nashville, Tenn., January 19, 1962.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

Excerpts from remarks by him to the Antitrust Symposium of the New York State Bar Association, January 25, 1962.

MONTANA RADIO STATION WINS NATIONAL AWARD

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the State of Montana is the fourth largest State in the Union; it is sparsely populated, and it is composed of many small cities and towns. Despite its rural characteristics and the distances from metropolitan areas, Montanans do very well in almost every competitive enterprise. Montana has done it again: Radio station KGVO, an affiliate of the Western Broadcasting Co., has been named the winner of a national radio news award.

KGVO was selected for its excellence in public-affairs editorial programs, and competed with approximately 5,000 other stations. I think it is important to point out that this station is competing with radio stations in cities such as New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles. Missoula can be justly proud of KGVO, and I wish to add my words of congratulation and encouragement to all who helped to present these stimulating public-affairs programs to western Montana.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter I have received from Dale G. Moore, president of the Western Broadcasting Co., and a résumé of the subject covered on one of the public-affairs programs carried nightly on KGVO.

There being no objection, the letter and the résumé were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WESTERN BROADCASTING CO.,
Missoula, Mont., February 6, 1962.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MIKE: Once in a while every business has something of which it is especially proud. The once-in-a-while occurred again for us last month when Western Broadcasting Co.'s affiliate in Missoula, KGVO radio, was named the winner of its fourth national radio news award. KGVO was picked as the 1 radio station out of almost 5,000 in the United States for its excellence in public affairs editorial programs. We are justly proud of this award, especially when one considers that we were being compared with stations in New York City, Los Angeles, and all across the country.

We feel our stations have achieved an enviable position of responsibility and respect in Montana and in the Nation. However, what we now are represents to us merely a start on reaching the higher goals we hope to achieve in the future.

I have attached to this letter a résumé of the subjects covered on just one of our public affairs programs—"Editor's Desk," aired nightly. I felt you might be interested in knowing who was interviewed and what subjects were discussed on our stations during the past year. The listing showing on the attached by no means represents the total number. However, it will give you a good sampling. I know of no other news organization of any kind in the State of Montana that has had as complete a service or has gone into the reporting in depth that has occurred on our stations in the past year.

This letter is going out to community, business, professional and public servant leaders in our State and Nation. We welcome your comments and suggestions and earnestly solicit your cooperation and help in the coming year. Please be assured we will continue to do everything possible to better serve Montana.

Sincerely,

DALE G. MOORE, *President.*

The four stations of Western Broadcasting Co. (KGVO in Missoula, KBMN in Bozeman, KCAP in Helena, and KURL in Billings) submit a partial list of the public affairs programs that have been aired on these stations in the past year. The attached list by no means encompasses the total number of programs that have been aired over the past 3 years. We respectfully submit the following partial list to further inform you of what these stations are doing to fulfill their obligation of operating in the public interest, convenience, and necessity.

The news coverage as set forth on attached pages is specifically designed to ask the question "Why", and also to attempt to serve community purpose and direction. Many of these public affairs programs are designed to background and fill in the gaps always left in a radio newscast limited to 5, 10, or 15 minutes.

Reporting of community problems by radio is more than saying that a problem or issue exists. It is more than quoting fiery statements. On all of their newscasts, KGVO, KBMN, KCAP, and KURL attempt to probe deeper than the sensational. But, even then, something more is needed. Most programs are interviews. Some are scripted background reports or commentary. Some are editorials.

The term "reporting in depth" is very much in vogue. But our stations believe that what passes on most radio (and television and newspapers) as "depth" reporting is pretty shallow. Too often one source of information provides the material. With the programs, as listed on the following pages, our stations of KGVO, KBMN, KCAP, and KURL provide the background, the depth, the meaning—to the individuals in our communities—of things that are happening, have happened, or will happen, that will directly affect their lives. This type of reporting cannot be done in a newscast alone, limited by time and usual variety of news stories. Our news and information programs break through some of the mental blocks of broadcasting. They are a "special" but are scheduled regularly. Our public affairs programs may run 5 minutes, usually run 15 minutes; on occasion, they are expanded to a full hour.

We deal with unusual subjects, such as a discussion of religion or philosophy, but with fairness, good taste, and without sensationalism. The programs are produced, written, and usually handled on the air by News Director Don Westor or management. This includes some commentary. However, on editorials giving position of the station on public issues, the opinions are voiced by the station owner and manager.

The editorials are prepared as a result of research, primarily by the news staff, although the station manager often joins in the research. The subject of an editorial, or series, can be initiated by the news department or the management. Very often subjects are brought up with a divergence of opinion, followed by months of discussion and argument before a position is agreed upon. Often research is started on a subject on which there are several opposing views by members of the staff as to what stand should be taken. This type of give-and-take arguing and research can often develop some of the best editorials.

Some of the editorials on immediate problems, we feel, have had immediate results. Particularly, we feel, the subject matter handled in the interviews, many of them in a series, has had the effect of raising interest in the subject, causing awareness of the problem and the beginning of the process of community action which might not jell for years.

It should be pointed out that our communities have had a lack of newspaper aggressiveness. With the accent to news, public affairs and public service made by our stations we are most happy to have the other media beginning now to show an interest in the affairs of our communities.

In addition to the programs listed on attached sheets, community problems are also reported every day throughout the year on regular newscasts. Subject matter for the programs are planned and developed. More often than not, several different persons are interviewed on succeeding programs on the same subjects. And often a series of interviews may be done with one person to allow time to explore fully the subject at hand.

An example of this would be the four interviews done on the State's economic status with Dr. Edward Chambers, who was director of the Bureau of Business and Economic Research at Montana State University.

One series on the Montana State Prison, troubled by two bloody riots in 3 years, included interviews on successive nights with Warden Fred Dixon of California's San Quentin Prison (Mr. Dixon was in the State on inspection of the Montana prison); Warden Floyd Powell of the Montana prison; Randall Swanberg, chairman of the Montana Citizens' Council on Corrections; and Dr. Gordon Browder, chairman of the Sociology Department of Montana State University.

Other such series included interviews with all candidates for major State and local offices in the 1960 general election. The election interviews were tied together by interviews, scheduled periodically through the campaign, with Dr. Thomas Payne, chairman of the Political Science Department of Montana State University.

While faculty members at Montana State University and Montana State College are interviewed frequently by our stations, it should be noted they are interviewed in connection with local or national issues, and the interviews are often tied in with a series of interviews which has included nonacademic persons. The State university and State college offer a wonderful background of information and interpretation which is used on many programs effectively to mesh this talent into the everyday life of the community and the region. Use of these faculty members to background and voice opinions on public issues, it would seem, is a service that would be lost to the general (taxpaying) public in our areas if it were not for KGVO, KBMN, KCAP, and KURL.

But as the day-by-day schedule of interviews and programs will demonstrate, the colleges provide only a small segment of the subjects covered. Another such segment is the U.S. Forest Service. Usually, Forest Service interviews deal with fires and fire prevention. Some interviews have dealt with fires, but the majority of programs on our stations have dealt with other phases. For example, insects cause more economic loss to the timbered areas, by far, than do fires. A number of interviews with forestry people have dealt with research and methods of attacking this problem.

During the 1961 legislative session at Helena, Don Weston moved the program to the State capitol building. Interviews were made with key legislators each day throughout the session. The coverage of the legislature is only one part of the travel involved in obtaining the interviews and special reports. One such special report was a special program expanded to half-hour length, recorded with the people in the small community of Superior, 50 miles west of Missoula. This special report was edited from the comments on the problems facing this community whose thriving tourist business ended abruptly when the new interstate highway was opened and the town was completely bypassed. The interstate highway program will have a great impact on each of our stations' coverage areas.

Following is a representative listing of public affairs programs aired on KGVO, KBMN, KCAP, and KURL during the period of August 1960 through July of 1961:

IN 1960

August 2: Dr. Eunice Roberts, associate dean of students, Indiana University, nationally recognized expert in vocational guidance for women, concerning frustration of highly trained women who become housewives and mothers.

August 4: Bill Johnson, assistant supervisor, Lolo National Forest, concerning fighting a major forest fire, recorded on scene at fire control headquarters.

August 16: Special feature anniversary of Yellowstone Park earthquake with recorded highlights of news coverage KGVO made on the scene 1 year ago.

August 22: William Bush, president, Western Montana Fish and Game Association, on effects of river pollution in Montana on fishing.

August 30: Wesley Castle, associate justice of Montana State Supreme Court, about backlog of cases of efforts of court to get "current," and how long it usually takes for case on appeal to get decision and why.

September 5–8: Four-part series. Dr. Edward Chambers, director of Bureau of Business and Economic Research at Montana State University, going over all phases of Montana economy with resultant conclusion that recession is quite serious and that State has economic problems. Quotes from this series were picked up by wire services and became key part of State political campaign issues in fall. Republican candidate for Governor requested tapes to listen to and to make studies from. Each night of the series of interviews dealt with a different phase of economy.

September 12: Ed Whiteman, president of Affiliated Indian Tribes of Northwest, on proposed legislation to terminate Federal supervision of Indians and why he favors a go very slow policy. Also concerning economic plight of Indians in Montana and neighboring States.

September 15–16: Two-part series. Dr. Fred Honkala, chairman of geology department, Montana State University, on results of his summer of field trips in earthquake area and what has happened and is happening.

September 20–22: Three-part series. Warden Fred Dixon of California's San Quentin Prison on his opinions after touring Montana's State Prison; with Warden Floyd Powell of Montana's State Prison on operations, rehabilitation work, and what needs to be done; Randall Swanberg, chairman, Montana Citizens' Council on Corrections, concerning paroles, pardon procedure with his group's recommended changes.

Septemer 30: Dr. Frank Dumond, professor of English at Harvard, visiting lecturer, discussing literature today—where it seems to be going.

October 5: Jack Barrows, director, Northern Fire Research Laboratory of U.S. Forest Service, Missoula, concerning scientific research planned at new million-dollar unit; particularly Project Skyfire, to study and possibly control lightning storms, the major cause of forest fires in the West.

October 7: Dr. Thomas Payne, chairman of Montana State University Political Science Department, in another interview analyzing 1960 campaign, discussing Nixon-Kennedy debates, value of fairness, etc. (He did not believe it was a good idea to have scattergun questions.)

October 10: Lee Metcalf, Democratic nominee for U.S. Senate. Interview.

October 11: Orvin Fjare, Republican nominee for U.S. Senate. Interview.

October 13: Alfred Klingler, executive director, Montana Municipal League, concerning problems, particularly financial, of cities.

October 17: Donald Nutter, Republican nominee for Governor. (Democratic nominee refused to be interviewed.)

November 10: Dr. Thomas Payne, chairman, political science department, Montana State University, first of two-part interview concerning election results.

November 15: Dr. Erling Dorf, paleobotanist, Princeton University (visiting lecturer) concerning his research in climatic changes, indicating what's happening to the world's weather and what might be expected in years ahead. (He expected general warming trend for hundreds of years.)

November 16–18: Three-part series. Dr. Harry K. Newburn, president of Montana State University, dealing with (1) physical plant growth problems of university; (2) educational standards of universities in light of challenges of space and atomic age; (3) operations policies (what they are trying to teach, what they expect to accomplish) at Montana State University.

November 24: Thanksgiving Day feature, interview with local Salvation Army volunteer workers.

November 30: Dr. John Borchert, chairman, geography department, University of Minnesota (visiting lecturer) on future growth patterns of urban areas, particularly along lines of strip growth on city outskirts and shopping centers disrupting city business districts.

December 5: Don King, superintendent of Rocky Mountain division of the Northern Pacific Railroad, concerning proposed merger of Northern Pacific with Great Northern, Northern Pacific, Burlington, and Spokane-Portland-Seattle, dealing with effect it would have on Montana economy.

December 12–13: Two-part series. Vic Reinemer, executive secretary of retiring U.S. Senator James E. Murray, dealing with recollections, sidelights of his work with the Senator.

December 20–22: Three-part series on juvenile delinquency with (1) Dr. Gordon Browder, chairman of sociology department, MSU; (2) D. W. Hutchinson, probation officer, fourth judicial district, Montana; (3) Mrs. Maxine Scott, member, Montana Citizens Council on Corrections.

December 28: Expanded into hour-long year-end summary of local-State news, with recorded highlights of 1960 news events.

IN 1961

January 2: Retiring Gov. J. Hugo Aronson, concerning his future plans, reflections on his two 4-year terms.

January 4: Recorded comments of five Republicans and five Democrats in legislature, brief interviews on their reactions, comments to Governor's state of the State address earlier that day.

January 13: Representative James Haughey (Republican), Yellowstone County, concerning his bill to revise unemployment compensation system in State (one of major pieces of legislation).

January 22: Gov. Donald Nutter, concerning his legislative proposals and why he thinks they should be enacted.

February 3: Senator William F. Cashmore, Republican, Lewis and Clark County, concerning his bill which would require labor unions to hold secret strike ballots.

February 8: Editorial on lobbyists.

February 12: Gov. Donald Nutter, concerning the status of his program in legislature, admitting he probably gave legislature too much for one session.

February 17: Senator Leland Schoonover, Democrat, Lake County, concerning proposed changes in State school foundation program.

February 28: Representative Clyde Hawks, Republican, Big Horn County, speaker of the house, on possibility of going overtime and operations and appointments of joint conference committees.

March 7: Senator William A. Groff, Democrat, Ravalli County, chairman, senate finance and claims committee, concerning deadlock on university system appropriation, forcing overtime session of legislature.

March 13: Representative Elmer Schye, Republican, Meagher County, concerning reapportionment bill and compromise settlement.

March 17: Representative Ted Schwinden, Democrat, Roosevelt County, minority whip in house, concerning his comments and opinions on work of 37th legislative assembly.

March 20-21: Two-part series. Governor Nutter, concerning his comments and opinions on accomplishments and lack of accomplishments of legislative session.

March 24: Keith Thompson, executive secretary, Montana Taxpayers Association, concerning school taxation and costs.

April 7: Joseph Musselman, director of State music festival, concerning 3,000-student event opening on university campus.

April 10: Dr. Alan Watts, San Francisco, nationally recognized philosopher (visiting lecturer), concerning religion and philosophies of Far East compared with those in the West.

April 13: Dr. Milton Schwank, newly appointed director of athletics at MSU concerning future of athletics at MSU in view of breakup of skyline conference.

April 25-26: Two-part series. Phil Johnson, chief of the Northern Inter-Mountain Entomology Experiment Station, dealing with insect damage to forests and steps being taken to combat infestations.

April 27-28: Two-part series. Franklin Roby, executive director of Yellowstone Boys' Ranch, concerning operation of ranch home for boys near Billings.

May 1: Roy Loman, president of Upper Columbia Development Council, concerning proposals to build either smaller privately constructed hydroelectric dams on Clark Fork River or large Federal multipurpose project. (UCDC favors private power).

May 2: Paul Harlow, chairman of committee for Paradise Dam, concerning construction of dams. (This group favors public power.)

May 8: B. J. Rose, public information officer, State fish and game department, concerning regulations, etc., on opening of Montana general fishing season.

May 17 and 19: Dr. Charles Hertler, chairman of Montana State Interscholastic Meet, on preparations for annual event and problems of housing 2,000 contestants, etc., and interviews on the field with youths competing in the interscholastic meet.

May 23-24: Two-part series. Robert Oswald, professor of physical education, concerning swimming and water safety.

June 2: Fred Heinrich, U.S. Forest Service regional safety officer, concerning safety practices public should follow in campgrounds and while hiking, etc.

June 7-8: Two-part series. Alex Stephenson, supervisor, Montana State Highway Patrol, dealing with causes of sharp increase in State's highway fatalities, and installation of new speed zones.

June 13: Arthur Lamey, Billings lawyer, who was American Bar Association observer to United Nations General Assembly, concerning his opinions of U.N.

June 19: Maj. Robert Keyes, State director of civil defense, concerning overall civil defense, defense operations in Montana.

June 30: Edward Hummell, superintendent of Glacier National Park, concerning park travel, and status of Mission 66 program to revitalize all national park facilities by 1966.

July 3: Capt. William Cahill, chief of local division of State highway patrol, concerning highway safety and the 4th of July.

July 5: Mrs. S. R. Logan, Montana national Democratic committeewoman, concerning primarily public power issues.

July 6: Bernard Eismann, CBS news correspondent, concerning his tour through the drought area of the Dakotas.

July 10-14: Series of five editorials on Montana Power Co. application to State public service commission for a natural gas rate increase.

July 17: Expanded program dealing with problems of small western Montana community, whose tourist business ended abruptly when interstate highway opened, bypassing the town.

We believe that the scope and quality of our news and public affairs broadcasting in small market radio proves that responsible radio can succeed. The bread and butter news is that day-in-day-out checking of the regular news sources. It is seldom the spectacular, but it is the regular on-foot person-to-person calls, the attendance by our radio stations' reporters at meetings of the city council and county commissioners, and contact every day with major news sources in our communities, that provides the service and builds the foundation of respect and authority in the communities.

We believe that what has been called quality radio and serving in the public interest is not limited to those radio stations in large metropolitan markets.

THE UNITED STATES AND THE EUROPEAN COMMON MARKET

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, last week the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] spoke at some length about the extremely successful Atlantic Convention in Paris which he, together with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] had supported so vigorously in the Senate. The membership of the U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO, representing the United States at the convention, was drawn in great part from the eastern seaboard—which is quite fitting, in view of the historic relationship between our Atlantic States and Europe. As a Montanan and westerner, however, I took particular pride in the presence of my friend, Alex Warden, on the Commission.

Alex Warden is publisher of the Great Falls Tribune-Leader, one of the most enlightened newspapers in the West. On his return to Montana he addressed the Great Falls Rotary Club on the issues explored by the convention and on the necessity of America's close relationship with the Common Market. He told the members of the club that an increase in U.S. exports to Europe is essential, and that "this can only be effected by giving the President authority to make trade agreements at arm's length. This is not a partisan matter," he said, "but a matter of national welfare."

The press and people of this country would benefit from a hundred men like Alex Warden, Mr. President—men who can comprehend the issues of ultimate significance to the free world, and who can translate their concern into readily understandable terms.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a news story on Mr. Warden's address be printed at this point in the RECORD, together with an editorial, from the Great Falls Tribune, entitled "Kennedy's Giant Stride Toward New Foreign Policy."

There being no objection, the article and the editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune, Feb. 1, 1962]

DEADLY COLD WAR WILL GO ON, SAYS NATO COMMISSION SPEAKER

"Even though no crisis is likely to trigger a shooting nuclear war, the present deadly cold war will continue unabated so long as we live."

This was the expressed opinion of Alexander Warden, publisher of the Tribune and Leader, at the Rotary Club's luncheon meeting Wednesday noon in Hotel Rainbow.

"If you are sleeping well, you might, in your prayers, give a slight vote of thanks to NATO, which is largely responsible for the fact we are not in the middle of a shooting war," Warden suggested.

He discussed the Atlantic Convention of North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) nations, which he attended in Paris in mid-January as a member of the U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO.

Warden told of NATO member nations' concern regarding the Communist threat, expressed his views of the Common Market and reviewed a short visit in West Berlin.

In introducing the speaker, R. F. Kitchingman, executive vice president of the chamber of commerce, termed Warden's appointment to the Commission as "a great honor that has come to Montana." He noted the publisher now is the Commission's only member from a State west of the Mississippi.

"We're getting into a type of world very new to us," Warden said, "a world which will necessitate new and aggressive measures."

He said that of the world's 3 billion people, 1 billion are under Communist domination, one-half billion in the free world and a billion and a half uncommitted, whose choice will gravely affect the fate of the world.

"People with hungry bellies don't care anything about ideologies," he said. "If 2 of the 3 billion become Communist, we're just about dead," he warned.

Regarding the Atlantic Convention, Warden reported, "We did make progress toward necessary cohesion of the free world to combat an effective Communist program that is going on."

"We didn't go there to make any moon shot," he said, explaining a compromise was required.

Some conferees felt an Atlantic Union government, complete with a constitution and necessitating countries giving up their national sovereignty, should be formed at once. Warden explained, while others recommended moving more slowly to a goal of that nature.

The Declaration of Paris, prepared by the 98 convention participants representing 15 nations' NATO commissions, included a determination to work for a true Atlantic community during the next 10 years, with a pattern of action to be prepared within the next 2 years, he reported.

Many resolutions concerned aid to developing nations, he said, adding the convention "went for" free trade, establishment of a scientific documentation center and for more joint action by NATO nations.

Warden described the Common Market, established in 1957 by France, Italy, West Germany, Belgium, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands, as similar to the program of the United States after the Revolutionary War.

Regarding the United States' joining the Common Market, he noted the Common Market countries "couldn't care less, but are willing to talk about it." He said the Common Market can get along fine without the United States.

The U.S. trade balance, $5 billion now, is not as good as it sounds, he said, noting the Nation is faced with a mounting deficit.

"The United States is not self-sufficient, and it is not going to be," Warden suggested. "For every job in American labor dependent on exports, 10 are dependent on imports, which will have a bearing on labor's attitude on what we do in international trade," he said.

"An increase in U.S. exports is the only answer," Warden advised, "and this can be effected only by giving the President authority to make trade agreements at arm's length. This is not a partisan matter, but a matter of national welfare."

Noting tariff reductions are an economic necessity, Warden suggested, "If we don't get into the ball game, we're likely to suffer slow strangulation."

He explained such a transition would require "painful adjustment" and suggested Federal subsidies to assist certain industries over the bridge might be needed.

Warden described "the wall," which he viewed during his Berlin visit, as "a disturbing sight" and as "a monument to the fact that communism on the other side is a failure."

He praised Gen. Lauris Norstad, supreme allied commander, who conducted a briefing session for convention participants, describing him as "simply great."

Christian A. Herter, Secretary of State in President Eisenhower's administration, and William L. Clayton, who was Under Secretary of State under President Truman, are co-Chairmen of the U.S. NATO Commission.

It was announced during the meeting that the nomination of Col. Harry E. Goldsworthy, a Rotarian, for advancement to the rank of brigadier general has been approved by the Senate. Goldsworthy is commander of the Site Activation Task Force in charge of the Minuteman project in this area.

Kennedy's Giant Stride Toward New Foreign Policy

There's been a crackling drumfire of impatient criticism, both at home and from abroad, because of the lack of any clearly defined foreign policy since World War II.

Now the President has moved to spell out in clarity a new foreign policy—national in scope for the first time in our history—for the handling of tariffs toward freer world trade.

Gone, fortunately, are the 150 years when U.S. tariffs were built or broken on the shifting sands of sectional pressures and logrolling. Slated for exit, too, is the now quite inadequate Reciprocal Trade Act of 1934 with its barnacles of checkmating restrictions and quantity controls.

There's a new world. The President sees this clearly. So does a mounting segment of the American people, perhaps more than some Congressmen who feel dutybound to woo their constituencies in all their waking hours. Inevitably they must bow to a compelling national interest.

For we must be able, day by day, to negotiate trade agreements we need on a global basis. We have to stand in trading clothes fit for dealing at arm's length with the advancing and enlarging Common Market, with the nations of Latin America, with Japan, with the developing nations of southeast Asia and Africa.

Isolation is dead as a dodo, and we have the knotty problem of holding our own in the highly competitive arena of free international trade. We must also have a free hand to join with the rest of the free world in fighting the formidable monolithic juggernaut of Communist aggression so bent on world domination.

The necessary temporary adjustments in our domestic economy pale into insignificance when measured against the so much larger problem of economic survival and the growth of the Nation in the years now rolling.

To preserve our Western heritage, to hold our rightful place among the family of nations, it is time to set our house in order. With admirable foresight, the President has acted. We think the Congress should approve this new foreign policy as a matter of the greatest urgency.

DEAN RUSK, SECRETARY OF STATE

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, Courtney Sheldon, writing in the Christian Science Monitor of February 7, 1962, has given us a perceptive evaluation of the Secretary of State, Mr. Dean Rusk. In a sentence, it adds up to a portrait of an American more concerned with making accurate decisions than with making headlines. It is a thoughtful article which pays tribute to the Secretary's outstanding diplomatic achievement at Punta del Este and his patient, steady progress in directing the foreign policy of the Nation in accord with the policies of the President.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

From a Correspondent's Notebook

(By Courtney Sheldon)

After his press conferences Secretary of State Rusk usually reads only part way through the stenographic transcript before turning the chore over to subordinates. What changes he makes are usually stylistic.

Last week he read his press conference on the Punta del Este meeting in full before authorizing the release of the text.

The tireless diligence and diplomatic skill of Mr. Rusk at Punta del Este could go far toward raising Mr. Rusk's stature as a Cabinet official.

Most of Mr. Rusk's negotiations with the Soviet Union and with Western allies over Berlin policy have been behind a diplomatic curtain. His negotiating ability has been hard to judge. The Punta del Este negotiations, by contrast, were very much out in the open, squabbles and all.

The usual Rusk press conferences, held about as infrequently as the President's, are models in some ways. They may not be as productive in a news way as correspondents wish.

But the mechanics are far better than the larger and more uncontrolled Presidential press conferences.

Originally Mr. Rusk held his press conferences in the same large State Department auditorium as the President. Lately, he has preferred the international conference room.

The conference room is a far more informal setting. Mr. Rusk remains seated and appears in a more communicative mood there, though never expansively so.

There is none of the shouting for attention that characterizes the Presidential conference. The President seems to follow no particular order in selecting correspondents.

Getting the President's attention is sometimes the result of having a voice which carries, spring in your legs, and willingness to risk impolitely interrupting the President in the middle of a statement.

On numerous occasions it has been possible to watch the President's attention diverted step by step across the auditorium in the direction of a persistent correspondent with a penetrating voice.

Mr. Kennedy does not single anyone out when he sees they have been patiently waiting, Mr. Rusk does.

He first attends to the regular State Department correspondents who surround him in front. Then he deliberately looks over their heads for other questioners.

Mr. Rusk's press conferences have not been the drawing cards that former Secretary of State Dulles' were. There was a feeling at first among many correspondents he was too cautious, too moderate, lacking in color and dynamism.

Within the last few months some of the veteran correspondents have sensed a change in Mr. Rusk. It is felt it is traceable to the reshuffling of the high command in the State Department. Mr. Rusk appears, from the outside, more the boss.

If anyone expects Mr. Rusk suddenly to step out of character and turn into a bombastic, headline-grabbing Secretary of State, he hasn't seen much of Mr. Rusk in action.

He is a thoroughgoing team man, one who isn't concerned whether he himself gets the personal credit, though he would be a very unusual person if he didn't object, way behind the scenes, to being blamed for failures which might be more attributable to others than him.

What strikes an observer about Mr. Rusk is his almost uncommon patience. The fact that he did not obtain his job because of political influence, came up the ladder the hard way, and doesn't throw his weight around in public, are not necessarily assets by Washington's standards.

But they make Mr. Rusk very attractive as an individual. Those who take the time to read his public comments and speeches thoroughly find he is an exceptionally thoughtful and balanced individual.

Those who make too quick an assessment of him on the basis of what appears on the surface may well change their opinions as time goes on.

THE LATE SENATOR ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL—RESOLUTION

Mr. **SPARKMAN**. Mr. President, I send to the desk a copy of a resolution on the death of our late colleague, Senator Andrew F. Schoeppel, which was adopted by the Small Business Committee at its executive session on Thursday, February 1, 1962.

The members of the committee have requested me to have this resolution printed in the body of the RECORD; consequently I ask unanimous consent that this may be done at this point.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the members of the Senate Small Business Committee were saddened to learn of the death of our friend and associate, Andrew Frank Schoeppel; and

Whereas his advice and counsel in the decisions of the committee could be unfailingly relied upon; and

Whereas each one of us must personally feel a deep sense of loss by being deprived of his friendly presence: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the members of our committee do at this time express our sorrow that he is no longer among us, and direct that the clerk of the committee send a copy of this resolution to the family of our departed colleague.

IT IS TIME TO SUBSIDIZE THE NATION'S GOLD MINES IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST

Mr. **GRUENING**. Mr. President, how effective have been our national measures to stop the outflow of gold?

In his state of the Union message earlier this year, President Kennedy told us the problem is not yet solved. One has only to look at the state of our declining gold supply to find the reason.

Little more than a year ago our gold supply was considerably larger than it is today. That figure on February 3, 1961, was nearly $17.5 billion. That figure as of February 5, 1962, was not quite $16.8 billion.

Let me cite the specific amounts for 1960, 1961, and 1962, as they were given to me by the U.S. Treasury Department's Office of Domestic Gold and Silver Operations:

Date:	*Gold bullion on deposit*
Jan. 31, 1960	$19,143,560,721.00
Feb. 3, 1961	17,436,295,334.22
Feb. 5, 1962	16,790,080,826.75

In his state of the Union message on January 11, 1962, President Kennedy discussed our balance of payments. As he outlined U.S. efforts to safeguard the dollar, the President expressed his belief that—

> Confidence in the dollar has been restored. We did not—and could not—achieve these gains through import restrictions, troop withdrawals, exchange controls, dollar devaluation, or choking off domestic recovery. We acted not in panic but in perspective. But the problem is not yet solved.

Mr. President, I agree that the problem is not yet solved, and I wish to call attention to the President's welcome and most encouraging words which assured those of us from mining States that the administration has no intention of "choking off domestic recovery." These four words strike "paydirt."

Since 1934, the price of gold has remained at $35 per troy ounce. This constancy prompted Mr. Alvin Kaufman, mineral economist of the Bureau of Mines, to express the following opinion in the December 1961 issue of Mining Engineering:

> The decline in gold output resulted from a lack of incentive to produce because of rising costs and the fixed price of $35 per ounce, as well as from a decline in reserves.

Elsewhere in the same issue of the magazine, I read:

> High costs, limited transportation facilities, lack of skilled labor, and limited local investment capital plague the development of a mineral industry in Alaska.

And:

> Unless its price is boosted substantially, gold output will contract severely in the next few years.

Economists may well observe that our country is facing a very serious situation. But so are the Nation's gold miners. What can be done to help correct these dilemmas?

Pending before the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee is Senate Joint Resolution 44. It has the simple and realistic aim of encouraging the discovery, development, and production of domestic gold.

It considers the complexities of the existing situation so far as gold is concerned, and proposes that incentive payments be made to miners who produce new gold within the United States, its territorial possessions, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. Such incentive payments would not exceed $35 per ounce of new gold. Such payments for new gold would cease when the gold reserves of the U.S. Government equal or exceed $23 million.

As my able colleague the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] observed recently on the floor of the Senate:

> Under the terms of this resolution, the monetary value of gold would remain unchanged at $35 an ounce, but the Secretary of the Interior would make incentive payments, up to an additional $35 an ounce for new production.

This proposal first was offered February 2, 1961, by Senator ENGLE, for himself and for Senator CASE of South Dakota and Senator KUCHEL.

Nearly 30 years have gone by since our Government took a realistic look at the costs involved in gold mining. The expense in some instances is many times that of 1934, when the price of gold last was adjusted.

Mining officials in Alaska agree that an increase in the price of gold would greatly stimulate State economy.

Less than 1 year ago the Governors of the Western States urged incentive or bonus payments to assure domestic gold producers a fair economic return.

No one—certainly not the miners themselves—would ask that the gold miners of this Nation receive undue advantage over the workers in other industries. But it is my contention that the miners of gold have been neglected. This Government manages to look out for most of its special-problem areas. But it has failed to see the storm signals in the gold mining industry.

When we look at the uses of gold today we see that gold is an active part of the space age, as well as the backbone of our economic well-being. Let me describe briefly two atomic-age uses of this metal which are noted in the 1960 Minerals Yearbook:

First. Gold is used for gold coatings in steering jets for space vehicles, to reflect cosmic radiation. It helps safeguard our astronauts.

Second. Gold was used to plate the pressure-seal jacks used in constructing large valves for a nuclear power station, for protection against acid corrosion under high pressure at elevated temperature. Thus, this metal of all ages assumes a new role on the New Frontier.

How would Senate Joint Resolution 44 affect Alaska? Commissioner Phil R. Holdsworth, of the department of natural resources of my State, suggests that the proposed subsidy would ignite a surge in prospecting which he believes could result in new discoveries of base metal ore bodies, as well as in the discovery of more gold deposits.

During the calendar years 1959 and 1960, the mining industry in Alaska produced approximately 180,000 ounces of gold each year. The estimated production for calendar year 1961 is 113,000 ounces, according to Commissioner Holdsworth. This rather large drop in production has come about as the result of curtailed operations on the part of the U.S. Smelting, Refining & Mining Co. at both Fairbanks and Nome. A further cutback is anticipated if existing practices and prices continue.

However, the subsidy proposed in Senate Joint Resolution 44 would probably result in a doubling of the 1961 gold production in Alaska, and would assure continuation at that level in future years.

Is there a need to boost production? Indeed there is. I am more than a little concerned by world production figures appearing in the 1960 Minerals Yearbook, which show the United States producing 1,679,000 ounces in 1960, as opposed to U.S.S.R. figures of 11 million estimated ounces. All of us should be concerned about this.

Mr. President, Senate Joint Resolution 44 merits immediate attention and favorable action, for it will go far to reverse the trend of a dwindling gold reserve. It should be noted that this legislation in no way changes the price of gold on the world market—with whatever consequences such a change would bring about.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "A Realistic Appraisal of the Gold Situation," which appeared in the Fairbanks, Alaska, News-Miner of November 25, 1960, and an editorial entitled "There's Still Gold in Them There Hills," which appeared in the Anchorage News of January 25, 1960, be printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks. I also request that the world production figures of gold, appearing on pages 519 and 520 in the 1960 Minerals Yearbook, be printed in the RECORD following the aforementioned editorials. This information covers the years 1951 through 1960.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that my name be added to those of the junior Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], and the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], as a cosponsor of this joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Fairbanks (Alaska) News-Miner, Nov. 25, 1960]

A REALISTIC APPRAISAL OF THE GOLD SITUATION

Most sought after of all the metals throughout the ages has been gold, and its history has been most turbulent.

It has featured in the creation and crumbling of empires, as men fought and died for its possession. It has been the foundation of personal and national wealth and it has never been equaled, either as a standard of monetary value or medium of exchange.

Although the gold standard disappeared nearly 30 years ago and national currencies are no longer backed by this precious metal, individuals, even nations retain their long-lived confidence in it. A universal criterion of worth is "as good as gold."

There have been thousands upon thousands of words written in recent weeks by news analysts and financial experts about the current gold situation in the United States: why the U.S. gold reserve is being so rapidly depleted, who is at fault, and the reasons for the ominous gold buying by foreign sources.

The only realistic answer, which in our opinion, is to get more new gold into the Treasury, is never mentioned by the experts. Do that and the gold crisis will be over.

In our opinion, one way to keep from disturbing the world market, would be to subsidize the miners who produce the gold—guarantee a subsidy for a certain period of time so that the mining industry can invest in efficient machinery, put the lagging industry on its feet, and the United States back on an even keel. Then the crisis would no longer exist.

It's an issue that must be faced, and the sooner the better. The time for theorizing is past.

[From the Anchorage (Alaska) News, Jan. 25, 1960]

THERE'S STILL GOLD IN THEM THERE HILLS

Perennially, the then Delegate in Congress introduced bills in Congress to increase the price of raw gold or to permit U.S. mined gold to be sold on the world market. Again this year as a U.S. Senator Mr. BARTLETT is seeking a remedy to the Alaska gold mining industry through congressional action.

We have backed this philosophy continuously. It is obvious the price of gold must go up if mining is to survive. Recently the Fairbanks News-Miner again pointed up the reasons why Alaska needs a higher gold price. It is well put here:

"A boost in the price of gold would have a healthy, stimulating effect on an Alaskan industry which seems about ready to give up the ghost.

"Virtually every cost which mining industry must contend with has continued to rise over the years while the price of gold, held down under an artificial ceiling has remained stationary—and low.

"The cost of labor, equipment and prospecting all have moved skyward—so high in fact that these costs are slowly stifling Alaska's mining industry. A boost in the gold price would bring an immediate change for the better in this unsatisfactory situation.

"Capital would begin to pour into mining once again. Small operators would again take to the field. Abandoned claims would come to life again. All of Alaska would feel this resurgence of vitality—so long lacking in an industry which was once so vigorous and healthy.

"Mining men with special skills and know-how would return to Alaska. Operations which were unprofitable with gold at $35 an ounce would be reopened when the price is jumped to $60 or more as has been proposed. Hundreds of new jobs would be created not only in mining but in the industries which supply it.

"The supply of gold which our Nation needs for its reserves—a supply being steadily drained away by unfavorable trade balances—certainly is not going to increase significantly until something is done about this all-important price boost."

[From the Minerals Yearbook, 1960]

TABLE 14.—*World production of gold, by countries* [1] [2]

[Troy ounces]

Country [1]	1951–55 (average)	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960
North America:						
Canada	4,365,720	4,383,863	4,433,894	4,571,347	4,483,416	4,602,762
Central America and West Indies:						
Costa Rica [3]	--------	535	705	310	--------	--------
Cuba [3]	1,120	1,008	915	804	615	348
Dominican Republic	153	290	286	780	513	[3] 308
Guatemala [4]	182	360	360	370	--------	--------
Honduras	26,390	1,611	2,025	1,714	[3] 2,798	[3] 2,172
Nicaragua	247,464	217,140	203,636	214,882	218,302	210,082
Panama	579	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------
Salvador	16,771	2,983	2,508	2,372	2,474	1,121
Mexico	421,323	350,250	346,328	332,246	313,663	300,256
United States [5]	1,905,511	1,865,200	1,800,000	1,759,000	1,635,000	1,679,800
Total	6,985,000	6,823,000	6,790,000	6,884,000	6,657,000	6,797,000
South America:						
Argentina	6,469	11,381	7,732	3,054	[3] 1,782	[3] 201
Bolivia	19,403	35,549	27,685	[6] 19,115	[6] 35,246	[6] 45,457
Brazil [4]	161,000	162,000	150,000	186,000	125,000	120,000
British Guiana	21,478	15,815	16,490	17,500	3,448	2,364
Chile	146,917	94,459	103,590	110,952	76,294	[4] 60,000
Colombia	409,708	438,349	325,114	371,715	397,929	433,947
Ecuador	20,073	15,076	16,247	19,685	18,450	15,159
French Guiana	6,620	5,832	8,954	20,000	16,100	18,940
Peru	147,015	159,074	161,831	159,127	150,299	143,766
Surinam	6,617	6,736	6,516	4,258	5,826	4,932
Venezuela	30,435	69,826	89,654	76,009	53,766	46,868
Total [4]	976,000	1,014,000	914,000	987,000	884,000	892,000
Europe:						
Finland	18,622	18,229	22,377	22,152	23,374	20,351
France	49,556	30,608	35,173	35,559	48,226	41,796
Germany, West	3,682	4,369	3,681	[4] 4,000	[4] 4,000	[4] 4,000
Greece	[7] 5,441	3,504	7,877	5,787	4,340	4,823
Italy	10,627	5,726	6,334	4,802	3,261	3,400
Portugal	19,708	22,120	23,777	17,747	20,769	19,500
Spain	10,022	11,510	11,901	14,211	15,239	[4] 15,000
Sweden	86,730	95,745	97,063	127,574	103,000	[4] 110,000
U.S.S.R. [4] [8]	9,200,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	11,000,000
Yugoslavia	36,137	47,808	51,988	55,364	59,640	67,517
Total [1] [4]	9,600,000	10,400,000	10,400,000	10,400,000	10,400,000	11,400,000
Asia:						
Burma	231	179	104	190	212	[6] 304
Cambodia	--------	482	1,608	322	4,823	4,180
India	230,610	209,251	179,182	170,090	165,383	160,593
Japan	218,118	241,422	252,563	260,630	261,547	262,350
Korea:						
North [9]	131,000	130,000	130,000	130,000	130,000	130,000
Republic of	28,432	49,903	66,578	72,071	65,690	65,812
Malaya	19,780	20,253	11,157	22,484	26,739	20,745
Philippines	435,760	406,163	379,982	422,833	402,615	410,618
Sarawak	642	599	883	864	2,450	3,326
Saudi Arabia	51,672	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------
Taiwan	28,794	33,131	20,548	21,345	13,497	15,699
Total [1] [4] [8]	1,330,000	1,350,000	1,300,000	1,460,000	1,430,000	1,430,000
Africa:						
Angola	43	34	--------	26	42	42
Bechuanaland	925	590	190	215	198	203
Cameroun, Republic of	2,058	463	10,899	2,009	971	415
Central Africa, Republic of	[7] 630	338	614	932	495	291
Congo, Republic of the (formerly Belgian)	361,083	370,505	371,020	352,276	347,967	[4] 256,000
Congo, Republic of	[7] 11,298	7,289	7,404	6,048	3,665	2,628
Eritrea	876	3,215	4,501	6,430	16,718	5,144
Ethiopia	28,575	25,700	[4] 25,000	36,369	41,439	40,915
Gabon, Republic of	[7] 36,750	33,086	22,727	15,921	16,172	17,096
Ghana	719,065	637,755	790,381	852,834	913,200	878,800
Kenya	11,143	13,843	7,388	7,753	9,145	8,646
Liberia	2,685	[10] 500	[10] 381	[4] 400	1,401	1,036
Malagasy Republic	1,562	903	862	797	434	96
Morocco: Southern zone	3,298	265	--------	--------	--------	104
Mozambique	1,200	1,247	1,080	695	295	[4] 300
Nigeria	1,003	439	389	646	950	994
Rhodesia and Nyasaland, Federation of:						
Northern Rhodesia	2,274	3,367	3,270	3,746	4,704	5,667
Southern Rhodesia	509,050	536,392	536,849	554,838	566,883	562,703
Ruanda-Urundi	4,417	3,343	3,215	3,858	3,119	1,566
Sierra Leone	2,017	6,452	--------	--------	--------	--------
Sudan	1,659	3,100	1,158	1,571	2,300	2,605
Swaziland	65	252	7	--------	--------	806
Tanganyika [11]	69,349	69,699	63,485	68,250	95,794	106,954
Uganda (exports)	391	297	212	329	334	642
Union of South Africa	12,643,027	15,896,693	17,030,737	17,656,447	20,065,515	21,383,019
United Arab Republic (Egypt region)	14,335	7,697	3,026	1,812	2,486	[4] 2,500
West Africa (formerly French)	2,012	431	331	3,247	[4] 8,000	[4] 8,000
Total	14,430,000	17,620,000	18,890,000	19,580,000	22,100,000	23,290,000
Oceania:						
Australia	1,023,590	1,029,821	1,083,941	1,103,980	1,085,104	1,082,784
Fiji	78,237	67,475	75,150	86,794	72,565	72,203
New Guinea	99,452	79,085	68,564	43,254	46,663	45,019
New Zealand	48,216	26,063	30,195	24,981	36,758	[4] 37,000
Papua	346	391	466	558	156	132
Total	1,249,841	1,202,835	1,258,316	1,259,567	1,241,246	1,237,138
World total (estimate) [1]	34,600,000	38,400,000	39,600,000	40,600,000	42,700,000	45,000,000

---

[1] In addition to countries listed, gold is also produced in Austria, Bulgaria, China, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Hungary, Indonesia, Rumania, and Thailand, but production data are not available; estimates for these countries are included in the total. For some countries accurate figures are not possible to obtain owing to clandestine trade in gold (as, for example, in former French West Africa).

[2] This table incorporates some revisions. Data do not add exactly to totals shown because of rounding where estimated figures are included in the detail.

[3] Imports into the United States.

[4] Estimate.

[5] Refinery production.

[6] Exports.

[7] Average for 1953–55.

[8] Output from U.S.S.R. in Asia included with U.S.S.R. in Europe.

[9] Estimate according to Minerais et Metaux (France), except 1960.

[10] Purchases. Production may be greater.

[11] Including gold in lead concentrates exported amounting to the following: 3,314 ounces in 1951–55 (average); 11,871 ounces in 1956; 9,192 ounces in 1957; 11,951 ounces in 1958; 10,391 ounces in 1959; and 8,930 ounces in 1960.

Source: Compiled by Augusta W. Jann, Division of Foreign Activities.

WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ADVISORY BOARD MEETS IN MONTANA

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I have just examined the report to Secretary Ribicoff by Robert C. Ayers, executive secretary of the Water Pollution Control Advisory Board. This report summarizes the discussion at the Board's September meeting. I believe many readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will be interested in portions of this report and, in some cases, excerpts from the 241 pages of transcript taken at the meeting. Let me preface these remarks by reading first the beginning paragraphs of the report to Secretary Ribicoff:

The Water Pollution Control Advisory Board met September 20–22, 1961, in the Montana cities of Missoula and Butte, at the invitation of U.S. Senators MANSFIELD and METCALF of that State.

This was the first of the Board's regional meetings to be held in the northwestern part of the United States and also the first meeting of the Board held open to the general public. Participating in the meeting were members of the Montana State Water Pollution Council, the Columbia Basin Interagency Committee, the Pacific Northwest Water Pollution Control Council, the Wyoming Stream Pollution Control Council, and representatives of various other groups, both government and nongovernment, having an interest in water pollution control. The combined attendance at the Missoula and Butte meetings totaled 562. Forty-nine persons requested and were granted program time to present statements.

Presiding at the meetings were Dr. Luther L. Terry, Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service, on the afternoon of September 20 in Missoula; and Dr. Robert J. Anderson, Assistant Surgeon General, on the mornings of September 20 in Missoula and September 22 in Butte. Both Drs. Terry and Anderson accompanied the tour group on September 21, as hereinafter recorded:

Board members present included: Messrs. John A. Biggs, Charles H. Callison, John Charles Daly, Tom McCann (present September 20–21), and John S. Samson; and Drs. Clair S. Boruff and Maurice K. Goddard. Being newly appointed to the Board by President Kennedy, this was the first meeting for Mr. Biggs and Dr. Goddard. A third new member, Mr. Ed E. Reid, and Board Member Dr. Russell E. Teague sent messages regretting their inability to attend. This was the 15th meeting of the Board since its establishment under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1956, and the 4th of 1961.

Nearly all the witnesses shared a concern over clean water and demonstrated an understanding that each level of government has a responsibility which must be met if our children and our grandchildren are to have the water they will need to live. Among the outstanding statements was the following by Dr. R. R. Renne, president of Montana State College, chairman of the Water Resources Committee of the American Association of Land-Grant Colleges & State Universities, consultant to Secretary of the Interior Udall, and a member of President Truman's Water Resources Policy Commission.

DR. RENNE'S STATEMENT

Friends, I represent the American Association of Land-Grant Colleges & State Universities; as chairman of the water resources committee I have that association as well as being president of Montana State College at Bozeman. The association has 70 member institutions. This year it is celebrating the 100th anniversary of the founding of the land-grant colleges and universities. This fiscal year is the centennial celebration. There has been a growth in these institutions with the passage of other Federal legislation followed with State legislation. As you know, these institutions have under their jurisdiction, in addition to resident instruction, the agricultural experiment station, engineering experiment stations and experiment services. I mentioned this because this association, the American Association of Land-Grant Colleges & State Universities, is concerned with the problems associated with our water resources. As chairman of the water resources committee of this association, I'm happy to be here today and have an opportunity to say briefly two or three things that may be of interest to all of us. I will confine my remarks to two major aspects, one, a statement of the problem and two, possible solutions.

It is very difficult for us who live in Montana with our large, sparsely populated land areas, and our many relatively clean streams, especially in the western part of the State, to comprehend what is happening to the water supply of our country as a whole. Unless an individual has personally experienced water deterioration or water scarcity, or both, he finds it hard to think in terms of quality and quantity of water relative to the continually growing needs of the Nation and the serious situations that are developing in water quality within our own State and region.

Four natural elements—earth, air, water, and fire—are man's inseparable companions. One of these four, namely, water which is one of the most plentiful substances, remains as a strategic and determining factor in man's progress. Water—its use and misuse—is a major national issue.

Our rapidly increasing population (now some 180 million and predicted to total around 330 million by the year 2000) in our technologically advanced economy with growing needs and with rising standards of national demand, is taxing to the limit our essentially fixed water resources. Our needs for water have climbed to astronomical figures. It is estimated that the per capita need for water for all purposes exceeds 1,200 gallons per day. This figure covers domestic requirements for water as well as those that go into production of the things we eat and wear and use. In some sections of our country and region water is in short supply, while in many sections far too much water is made useless by uncontrolled pollution. The result is that water pollution control today is a major instrument in effective water resource conservation.

Looking first at the quantity of water available for our use and bypassing for the time being the quality aspects, total use of water estimated for the year 2000 for the Nation as a whole will approximate one and a half times the flow of all streams (streams where streamflow is available 50 percent of the time). This assumes that all streams would be regulated to the maximum degree to get the greatest possible amount of water from them. The fact that total needs for water in the year 2000 exceed the total streamflow indicates that there must be some regions or areas in the country which will be acutely short of water supplies, since some other areas have an overabundance of water. Much greater reuse of water and conversion of salt water from the sea may help meet the increased needs.

Taking the 17 Western States (roughly the area west of the 100th meridian) with a current population of nearly 44 million, the estimated population of this region by 1980 will be approximately 66 million and in the year 2000, 97 million. The estimated increase in population of the Western States for the next four decades is some 124 percent compared with only 83 percent for the United States as a whole. Obviously, this more than average estimated increase in population for the 17 Western States will mean excessively heavy demands upon the water resources of the area.

It is estimated that only 2 of the 9 water resource regions of the 17 Western States will have a surplus of water over projected needs for both 1980 and the year 2000. For example, the Pacific Northwest will have nearly five times as much water as will be needed in 1980 and almost four times as much in the year 2000. The Central Pacific will have about one and a half times more supply than demand in these years. The remaining seven of the nine water resource regions in the Western States will be deficient in supplies relative to demands either in 1980 or by the year 2000. In the case of the western gulf and upper Arkansas-Red Rivers, supplies will be more than adequate through 1980, but by the year 2000 will be only 90 percent adequate. In the Great Basin supplies will be only 80 percent adequate by 1980 and only 70 percent adequate in the year 2000. In the upper Missouri River in which we Montanans are most interested, water supplies will be 80 percent adequate in 1980 but only 70 percent adequate in the year 2000. In the Colorado River region, supplies will be only 50 percent adequate by 1980 and through the year 2000. In the upper Rio Grande-Pecos Rivers area, water supplies will be only 0.14 of those needed by 1980, and only a 10th of the water demands can be met by the year 2000. The south Pacific area is the most deficient water resource region in the country. In 1980 it is estimated that this area will have 0.03 of the quantity of water available that will be needed and for the year 2000 only 0.02.[1]

It can be seen from the above data that the Nation as a whole and many regions of the country will be desperately short of water in the next three or four decades. However, in addition to a very acute problem of short supply we are faced with an increasingly serious problem of water pollution resulting from poisons, chlorides, detergents, fertilizers, insecticides, weedicides, fungicides, and many other poisonous substances that will be discharged into our streams. For example, in 1960 some 500 million pounds of economic poisons were produced for use as insecticides, fungicides, weedicides, and chemical fertilizers. It is estimated that if treatment were to double current levels the waste load would still rise twofold. One writer refers to it as "a tidal wave toward a technological utopia resulting in a setting replete with contradictions, frustrations, conflicts, and competitions."[2]

Under such conditions it will become increasingly difficult to maintain some sense of balance in our physical environment. From an evolutionary point of view there are only two major types of species—one that maintains itself in equilibrium with other living things about it and another that destroys its environment for the sake of its own immediate perpetuation. Many would have to conclude that man has been behaving like the second type. It is generally agreed by thoughtful students and observers in many fields that man is doomed to extinction if he cannot be persuaded to live in equilibrium with his environment. He is dependent upon a very complex life process and must learn to respect and protect this process at every step for his own self-preservation. Obviously, universities and colleges with their educational and research staffs should play a strategic role in preparing our young people to understand this interdependence of man and his physical environment in this complex life process. Modern man with an arrogant supposition that nature can be manipulated or ordered to meet his whims has all but abandoned this interdependence concept. Obviously, compared with spectacular and dramatic events like races to the moon, conservation of natural resources and water pollution control have little glamor. A tremendous job of education as well as research is needed badly in the conservation of our water resources and their qualifying control.

---

[1] "Water Resources Activities in the United States: Water Supply and Demand," Select Committee on National Water Resources, U.S. Senate, Committee Print No. 32, Washington, D.C. Government Printing Office, August 1960, 131 pages.

[2] Mark D. Hollis, "Water Resources and Needs for Pollution Control," Water Pollution Control Federation Journal, vol. 32, No. 3, pt. I, March 1960, p. 226.

In analyzing our present situation and the things which have been occurring in recent years, it would be safe to assume rather general agreement on at least four major predictions for the coming two to four decades: (1) our explosive population growth will result in gigantic metropolitan-industrial complexes and at rapidly increasing rates of growth; (2) a continuing avalanche of technological change at an ever increasing tempo which will outmode our traditional methods of measuring and equating impacts on water resources, both quantitatively and qualitatively; (3) somewhere on our growth curve the predictable microbiological pollution together with the less predictable contaminates from exotic chemical substances will produce composite effects with sobering potentials;[3] and (4) our current waste treatment technology is not equal to the trends of the times and at best can with considerable cost, reduce only to some degree traditional organic pollution, but is in no sense adequate to meet effectively the anticipated buildup in pollution resulting from wastes associated with new substances.

It is estimated that by the year 1980 only 50 percent of our population will be served by water adequate in quantity and quality, and by the year 2000 only 47 percent. Another 43 percent in the year 1980 will be served with water adequate in quantity but low in quality and this proportion will reach 44 percent in the year 2000. By 1980, 7 percent of the population will find its water supply inadequate both in quantity and quality and in the year 2000, 9 percent.[4]

Our present methods of determining the extent of pollution in streams were developed in the very early stages of modern sanitary engineering, and were reasonably satisfactory yardsticks prior to World War II for the pollution situation which existed then. Of course, they are still important in terms of control of pollution by dilution and to the measurement of self-purification phenomena of streams, but they are grossly inadequate as effective measurements when the reuse of water supplies becomes a dominant factor in many regions and as the character of pollution changes. These pollution changes involve wastes from industrial sewers but more particularly the changing character of metropolitan waste and the buildup of chemical pollutants in runoff waters from agricultural, forestry, and land use practices.

A few decades ago attention was directed by public health agencies to water supply and sewage disposal in terms of the problem of controlling germ diseases, largely enteric infections. The great progress made by American medical science and public health agencies does not need further mention here. However, these great successes contributed to the development of modern urban congestion, and in themselves have created new types of problems. Of course, the danger of waterborne germ diseases will continue, may even be multiplied in the years ahead; but in general we know what to do and how to do it to control these particular types of problems. But we must also note the unresolved difficulty of how to control the known distribution of virus infections to places many miles from their origin through the contamination of underground water.

Medical science is now concerned with broader health problems which stem from new types of water pollutants. That is, pollutants that have their origin in exotic substances, primarily new chemicals. Workers in the public health field simply do not yet know the behavior of most of these substances in streams and in water treatment and sewage treatment methods. Medical people say that even less understood are the health effect potentials, particularly from long-term exposure to lower concentrations; and treatment of atomic energy wastes is still a problem of great hazards.

It is likely that the chronic effects from these types of substances will be subtle and much less obvious and definitive than were the germ diseases, which means they will be much more difficult to pinpoint and will be involved in many complex interrelationships. In addition to all this complexity is the stepped-up pace of change associated with our rapidly advancing technology and scientific applications.

What are the solutions of the water pollution problem? Abraham Lincoln is quoted as having said "You can't escape the responsibility of tomorrow by evading it today."

Most scientists believe that the answers to the complex pollution problems growing out of our highly concentrated metropolitan and industrial areas and the increasing discovery and use of exotic chemicals can be found; but perhaps a more important aspect is whether there is time to find such answers before serious damages result to public health and whether there is a willingness on the part of taxpayers and the public to devote adequate funds to achieve effective and adequate answers. Many are afraid that with the rapid pace of our technological advancement serious economic problems will be experienced before there is adequate determination of the chronic health impairments. This thought should make all of us, but specifically those of us in public service, and especially those of us in our educational and research agencies and institutions, dedicate ourselves anew to the solution of the scientific, technological, economic and political problems associated with present-day water pollution.

Some specific programs that could be followed which would help to bring water pollution under reasonable control are the following:

(1) A stepped-up rate of building municipal waste treatment plants. Currently the rate is around $400 million per year, but many medical people and sanitary engineers believe that a per annum construction rate above $500 million is needed. It should be kept in mind that present construction represents for the most part only partial and primary treatment.

(2) There exists widespread lack of adequate data on actual stream quality. There has been only limited coverage of major streams for a short time but even so the data makes very sober reading. Total stream monitoring must be put on a more scientific basis, in place of present methods and programs which have been spotty and sporadic.

(3) Perhaps our greatest need is more adequate research to develop completely new methods of waste treatment. A comprehensive program of pollution control to meet present and prospective pollution problems associated with our advancing technology and increased use of exotic chemicals cannot be found by relying upon concepts developed in and passed on from radically different times. It is said that no basic scientific breakthroughs in the field of waste treatment have occurred for 40 years. It is becoming more and more apparent that what is needed primarily is an economically good process for removing soluble molecules or ions from waste materials. Scientific research may also result in producing economically valuable salvage in contrast to the current situation where salvage is mostly in the talk stage.

Who should control pollution and who should pay the bill are two very important questions uppermost in the minds of many who are concerned with our water pollution problems. Montana and many other States have excellent water pollution acts on their statute books, which, if properly administered and adequately carried out, would greatly improve the quality of our streams and water supplies. Our Federal Government has passed legislation which, with 1961 amendments referred to as the pure water bill, established new enforcement procedures, provided for substantially increased financial aid to State and interstate water pollution control agencies, and to municipalities through program and construction grants. Obviously, the legal mechanics by which local communities, municipalities, State agencies, and the Federal Government can cooperate effectively to solve water pollution problems which exist. If an informed and aroused public really wants effective pollution control the public can have it.

However, there is widespread lack of understanding and general apathy toward the seriousness of present-day water pollution. The average individual does not see clearly how his own individual health or that of his immediate family is directly involved or affected by the soluble molecules and ions of exotic chemicals hidden in industrial and agricultural wastes or by the viruses that survive ordinary treatment in sewage disposal plants. However, the average American does have a very high regard for scientific knowledge, which means that there must be a strong and continuing research and educational program if citizens in local communities and at the State and Federal levels are to insist upon and give adequate support to an effective water pollution control program. Our public higher educational institutions have a major responsibility in this field. In Montana we should be acutely aware of this and prepare to meet the problem before our clean streams and underground waters become polluted and present us with the difficulties that so many other States are now trying to meet. Our citizens have a right to adequate supplies of potable water. Thank you.

Dr. Renne was followed by Mrs. M. Y. Foster, president of the Montana League of Women Voters. Her statement follows:

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS STATEMENT

Dr. Anderson, members of the Board, ladies and gentlemen, you gentlemen are not alone in your concern about water and water pollution. We women also are concerned with our vital supply of water and what happens to it. I would like to tell you briefly some of the activities of women throughout the United States who have for a number of years been interested in water resource development.

I am president of the League of Women Voters of Montana. I wish to tell you how pleased the league is that you are holding your fall meeting of the Board here in Missoula, and to thank you for giving us the opportunity of expressing ourselves here today.

The League of Women Voters of Montana has been interested in water pollution abatement since 1954 when Missoula league members made a streamside examination of the Clark Fork River to see for themselves the pollution invading the river.

---

[3] See Hollis, ibid.

[4] See Hollis, ibid.

The failure of the city of Missoula in years past to construct a sewage system and treatment plant and to provide for the pollution abatement of the Clark Fork River has been of special concern to league members in Missoula. A constant study program and continued public education resulted in the adoption of a bond issue early this year by a sizable majority of the voters authorizing the construction of sewage lines and a sewage treatment plant. Missoula league members recognize this problem as being similar to problems of other cities and are eager to add their voice to the growing chorus in support of better water resource development and control of pollution.

Local league members joined others in the State of Montana in the study of the problems of pollution of the Clark Fork River; became interested in the study of the Columbia River Basin; assisted in the preparation and editing of the Great River of the West, a publication produced by the leagues of Oregon, Washington, Montana, and Idaho; studied congressional and agency material; and made statements at Senate hearings.

Montana league members made a study of the Montana code and found that pollution is termed therein as alteration of the physical, chemical or biological properties of water which renders them harmful or detrimental for their most beneficial use.

Following an examination of the Montana codes and a compilation of reports from local members, the League of Women Voters of Montana was convinced that enforcement of existing legislation would do much to clean up the streams and that members must embark upon a legislative program at State and national level to provide as soon as possible for a stream pollution abatement program. The difficulties encountered by supporters of such legislation is well known throughout the State and the presence here today of a representative of the League of Women Voters may be construed as an indication of unrelenting determination to see that legislation is enacted and carried out which adequately provides for stream pollution abatement in the State of Montana and elsewhere in the Nation. For health reasons, the Montana league sees no alternative to Federal cooperation to insure compliance with pollution control legislation.

The League of Women Voters of Montana has watched with interest the case of St. Joseph, Mo., the only city to date to be taken into court under the enforcement provisions of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. It is encouraging to note that for a thousand miles along this great river cities are planning, building, or operating sewage treatment plants. The change will not be immediate, but it is hoped that this attitude of cooperation will before long bring under control the Missouri River pollution situation, and lead the way for other areas to do the same.

Because league members in their own communities all over the United States have become so interested and active in working toward pollution control, the League of Women Voters of the United States has been able to express volubly and forcefully its support of Federal legislation in behalf of better water pollution abatement. It is the work at the local level of government which has made the league such a strong supporter of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, signed into law by President Kennedy on July 20.

This also explains why league members will continue to watch and support local, State and national programs which promote better pollution abatement. They hope that the States and local communities will take full advantage of the help now available through the Federal program and that the Federal Government will push the program with vigor.

League members know that the natural flow of water is no respecter of State lines, that water pollution is no respector of State lines, and that local, State, and Federal governments must work together to control and eliminate pollution.

The league recognizes that voluntary compliance with pollution control programs is highly desirable to all citizens, local, State, and National. For health reasons alone, it is imperative that pollution abatement programs be undertaken throughout the State of Montana and the other 49 States as a cooperative project with the Federal Government.

The League of Women Voters of Montana firmly believes that pollution control is one of the major parts of the problem of water resource development. We believe it is a national problem and one which must have Federal support to assist States and local governmental units to embark on adequate pollution abatement programs.

League members in Montana appreciate the opportunity of speaking before this hearing today and we hope that we can work to encourage our State to carry its share of the task of cleaning up and keeping clean the rivers of Montana and the Northwest. Thank you.

In his own words, Dr. G. D. Carlyle Thompson, executive officer of the Montana State Board of Health, "filled in a few of the gaps" in previous testimony. His statement was as follows:

Dr. Thompson's Statement

Dr. Anderson, Mayor Waldbillig, Governor Nutter, ladies, and gentlemen. As you will see from my remarks today I'm going to fill in a few of the gaps which the Governor obviously could not include in his excellent summary.

The Montana State Board of Health has been concerned with stream pollution in one phase or another since the original law was passed in 1907. This was not a comprehensive law but it did give the State board of health authority to correct stream pollution problems when there was evidence existing that the waste was polluting water used for drinking.

The 1907 laws were amended in 1911, 1917, 1921, and 1945. With these various amendments, the coverage became broader—yet the pollution had to be related to health before action could be taken. In 1953 there were 105 communities disposing of waste in streams. Only 20 had adequate sewage treatment plants serving 125,000 people. There were 48 other communities serving 60,000 people with inadequate or partial treatment, and there were 37 communities with 151,000 people discharging raw sewage into the streams. Today only nine of these communities still lack treatment and only one is still without plans or a committed date for completion of a sewage treatment facility.

In order to improve the situation as found in 1952, the Montana State Board of Health that year adopted a policy requiring all municipalities to adequately treat their sewage before discharging to a watercourse. The policy was flexible, recognizing the many problems involved and the importance of correcting the most serious problems first. Therefore, the early effort was directed at communities who were discharging raw sewage, it being the plan to upgrade, at a later date, the sewage treatment of those communities having partial treatment. A few exceptions were made where the partial treatment was particularly serious, and in one instance exception was made regarding the immediacy of pressing for treatment of raw sewage.

The policy in general provided a maximum of 5 years for municipalities to prepare plans for sewage treatment and 2 additional years for completion of the plant. By 1959 all cities were to have sewage treatment plants. It did not work out quite that way, since as always, some did meet this objective, but others did not for various reasons, usually financial. As a result, in place of 20 communities in 1953, there are now 91 with adequate treatment serving approximately 322,000 persons. There remain 35 communities, having a total population of about 78,000, in various stages of working on the problem. Of these 35, 5 have new plants under construction, 5 have voted their bonds and have the money available, and 6 are in the preliminary planning stage or have their plans already prepared. There is but one community of about 600 persons that has done nothing toward treatment. There remain 18 communities with the inadequate treatment. These 18 communities serve 13,000 persons.

In summary then, Montana's municipal wastes picture from 1953 to 1961 has changed as follows:

From 20 adequate treatment plants in 1953 to 91 in 1961;

From 48 inadequate treatment plants in 1953 to 26 in 1961;

From 37 raw sewage discharging communities in 1953 to 9 in 1961; 3 of these have treatment plants under construction, 3 have their financing and engineering plans, 2 are working on their plans and finances, and only 1 has not shown progress.

This makes a total of 105 municipalities discharging sewage in 1953 and 126 in 1961—an added 21 sewered communities using the streams in this 8-year period.

Thus, the first and major problem of raw sewage discharge is just about corrected, and we are not changing the emphasis of our work to the remaining 26 communities that must improve their present inadequate treatment plants.

In order to develop and carry on a program that would permit us to move from 20 adequate plants in 1953 to 91 in August of this year, we were assisted by several developments. These developments included education efforts, the use of sewage lagoons, more comprehensive legislation, and Federal pollution control and construction grants. The lagoon method of sewage treatment is relatively inexpensive as compared with the mechanical sewage treatment plant and gives an excellent effluent or none at all. Our first lagoon in Montana was placed in operation in 1953 at Plentywood. We now have 63 lagoons in operation in Montana.

In 1955 the Montana Legislature passed a comprehensive water pollution control law establishing a council to cover all phases of water usage. Mr. Palmer, chairman of that council, will tell you about this group and their activities.

In 1956, the Congress made available grants to assist the communities in the construction of sewage treatment facilities. Montana's total grant amounts to a little over $500,000 each year. This has been allocated to the municipalities to cover 30 percent or $250,000 of the cost of sewage plant construction, whichever was the smaller. This money was allocated on priorities which were based upon need for treatment and need for assistance. Since 1953, $11 million has been expended in Montana for sewage treatment works which are either completed or are now in process. Two and one-half million dollars was Federal and eight and one-half million dollars was local funds. In the 4 years prior to 1956, the first year of the Federal construction grants, slightly under $1 million local funds was expended in Montana, the balance, or $7½ million have been expended since 1956. Since 1956, 4 projects used only local funds while 48 involved Federal funds. Projects involving only local funds, both prior to and following the availability of Federal construction grants, were small, the largest such project being for a community of about 2,500 people. It is apparent that the use of Federal funds gave the greatest impetus to sewage treatment construction works of the larger communities. It is also apparent that while Federal funds assisted with the improvement in Montana's stream pollution, that the bulk of the financial responsibility was carried in Montana.

These factors, together with a national understanding of the need to protect streams and our own educational programs in Montana made possible a favorable vote by the citizens in the various communities in Montana. The usual majority was more than 2 to 1 voting in favor of sewage treatment. In one instance, a majority of 144 voted for sewage treatment to 1 against. I believe this shows the people really believe in sewage treatment. We did have two communities that voted against sewage treatment on the first ballot, but later reversed themselves, and now have sewage treatment installed. It has been necessary to prod some communities into action and in one case the city council who failed to take action after the voters approved the bond issue. This prodding took the form of four formal orders that were issued by the board during these years. It proved unnecessary to take any of the orders to court and the city council and the voters subsequently took the needed action which brought about support for sewage treatment. It must be recognized, however, that such an order of the board had once been carried through the Montana Supreme Court on appeal by one of our cities. The court ruled in favor of the board in this case. In all communities where bond issues were needed, the State board of health furnished, on request, the services of its staff, particularly the engineers and health educators, convening with community groups to discuss the problem.

Concurrent with the effort to improve municipal waste disposal, work with industry progressed to improve industrial waste disposal. Most industries were practicing some degree of waste control before 1953, but since then most of the industries of the State have worked diligently to reduce the strength of their waste and some have practically eliminated their wastes from the streams. One of these streams the advisory board will view tomorrow when it visits the Anaconda operations in the Clark Fork River.

The Yellowstone River has produced tastes and odors in drinking water of downstream communities for many years at irregular times but periodic and sometimes seasonal intervals. Extensive studies of the Yellowstone River have been made to attempt to identify the cause of the tastes and odors. Further study is still necessary. This may yet require extensive monitoring of the river on a continuing basis to identify possibly waste outlets which cause in themselves or in conjunction with other factors, the tastes and odors in the river. But, nevertheless, the extensive expenditure involved in the practical elimination of untreated municipal waste and the extensive expenditures for the control or elimination of industrial wastes on this river may solve the problem of taste and odors before the full causal relationship is determined. But because of difficulty in always identifying certain industrial wastes, some degree of continual monitoring may be necessary in order to identify sources of illegal pollution.

It has always been recognized that there were also individual polluters with raw sewage but that the initial effort should be made with the problem that contributed the largest volume and affected the most people. Recently the program has been directed to individual polluters with emphasis in the beginning of this activity on the Flathead Lake. It is anticipated that the bulk of the individual pollution problem will be corrected through educational efforts and direct identification of the polluters.

While our population has increased and more communities are using the streams for waste disposal, Montana's streams have greatly improved. While we do have problems in some areas which have not been completely solved, we have recovered many miles of streams. Instead of some gray streams that were quite turbid, most of our streams in the State are now sparkling clear and an invitation to fishermen and others to enjoy our streams. Reduction of wastes has assisted in making better water available for drinking to many of our communities that depend upon streams for their drinking water, and it has reduced costs or made more suitable the water used for industry and agriculture.

An interesting sidelight is that approximately one-half of the lagoons built in the State to serve municipalities do not have an overflow. The liquid from these ponds is removed by seepage and evaporation. Elimination of raw sewage, even the effluent in some cases from our streams, has greatly improved the quality of the water in our rivers and lakes. Most Federal installations in Montana have gone along with this program. There are only two installations where improvements are needed. We believe these will be corrected in the not too distant future.

A problem that could be serious has come to the forefront this year with the heavy grasshopper population. This is the use of insecticides for the control of insects both for agricultural purposes as well as for forest protection. For the past several years, the use of insecticides and weedicides has been increasing. We know that the insecticides have been the cause of fish-kills on the Yellowstone River. There have been no reported illnesses in humans traced back to these materials. I believe this is a problem which should be further evaluated in an effort to determine whether or not these materials affect humans. If there is a human effect, what is the maximum concentration that can be permitted in the stream before it is unfit for humans to drink?

The other question before us: Will small quantities in the drinking water that are ingested by humans accumulate in the body and eventually cause illnesses?

The weedicides and insecticides get into the water by direct spraying from airplanes, and being washed by the surface runoff and irrigation waste water into the streams. We would like to recommend that research be encouraged to determine the total problem which is facing us in this respect.

Another problem which I will not describe in detail relates to the matter of the increasing use of detergents and their disposal through municipal wastes. In Montana, we have no practical experience with this problem as it relates to public water supplies but mention is made of it here because of its potential in the future, especially as it affects the operation of today's sewage treatment plants. As with insecticides and weedicides, this matter needs more research.

What we have done in Montana has not been done rapidly and it has not been due to just one factor. Through the efforts of many working together, we believe there will be proper sewage treatment as well as proper industrial waste disposal throughout the entire State in the not too distant future. Thank you very much.

A few minutes ago, I said "nearly all" the witnesses appearing before the Board believed that each level of government has a responsibility for clean water which must be met if our children and grandchildren are to have the water they will need to live. The exceptions at the Montana hearings were our former Governor and his commissioner of agriculture, Mr. E. C. Wren. Both were killed in a tragic airplane crash on January 25, 1962. Governor Nutter's opening statement was as follows:

Governor Nutter's Statement

Thank you kindly. Dr. Anderson, Mayor Waldbillig, members of the Federal Water Pollution Advisory Board, as Governor of the State of Montana, I welcome the President's Water Pollution Advisory Council to this wonderful State. You, in your work, have the job of asking the people of this Nation to meet and solve the many problems of water pollution. I sincerely believe you will be proud, as we are in Montana, of the accomplishments of our Montana Water Pollution Council operating within the framework of our State antipollution laws and the previous Federal Water Pollution Control Act. It was most gratifying to read in the last report of Water Pollution in the Missouri River Drainage in Montana that 87 percent of the population of the Missouri River Basin in Montana is served by adequate sewage treatment facilities or will be served by such facilities by 1961. This has been a task supported to some extent by Federal assistance; however, the major burden has fallen on the people of this State and their response in voting bond issues for community projects is more than amazing. Also, our industries have strongly supported antiwater pollution programs to the extent that I believe we may well have cleaner, clearer water than any other State in the Nation.

Briefly, I will indicate our present position in Montana regarding water pollution. As of January 1953, we had 37.4 percent of our population with adequate sewage treatment, 17.7 percent with inadequate treatment, and 44.9 percent with no treatment. As of August 1961, we find 80.5 percent of the population with adequate treatment, 7.8 percent with inadequate treatment and 11.7 percent with no treatment. In addition, there are currently five sewage treatment plants under construction, five plants ready for construction, six plants in preliminary planning stages. In Montana, at the present time, there is only one town which has taken no action, and this, some 60 miles from the nearest use of the same water.

During the 1961 session of our State legislature, we passed two acts relating to water. One was the Water Well Drillers' Licensing Act, and the other, the Underground Water Code. While these are new acts, we feel they will have a beneficial effect on Montana's maintaining the purity of our water.

We note the 1961 amendments to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act includes the broadening and strengthening of Federal enforcement powers. This act also increases the amount of Federal grants. In the light of our current international situation, perhaps we should be more interested in less Federal control and fewer ways for the Federal Government to spend money. It is time that individual States become responsible in this area, and that any appeals for assistance from the Federal Government should be based solely on need.

We in Montana long ago recognized the need for pure water. I am proud of the efforts of Montana's people in solving the problems of stream pollution. We have been a State of action and we are getting a little tired of some other States sitting on the dime, doing nothing, expecting Uncle Sam to provide Federal aid, to do it for them.

Under the previous Federal Water Pollution Control Act, in which the Federal Government provided $50 million a year, our people bonded themselves to provide pure water. They recognized the need and they acted.

In our State, we know we have additional water pollution problems but I feel certain when you look at the State of Montana, you, too, will feel my sense of pride in the efforts of the people of this State to assure pure water for themselves and future generations. Thank you.

As the Governor pointed out, Montanans take pride in our programs toward clean water—progress accelerated by the Water Pollution Control Act of 1956. Since that act was passed, 51 Montana communities have asked for, and received, this Federal aid. Projects built serve 274,602 Montanans, more than 1 out of every 3 of our people. And, as of the most recent report I have, 11 more projects are pending.

Witnessess following Governor Nutter pointed out that Montana's State water pollution control budget amounts to $36,750 a year, a fraction of the Federal grant to our State for that purpose. This prompted questions from Board Members Charles H. Callison of New York, assistant to the president of the National Audubon Society, and John Charles Daly, NBC news commentator.

According to the transcript, Mr. Callison asked if Montana's $36,750 a year "is adequate." In reply, Governor Nutter asked Mr. Callison a question—and the following ensued:

NUTTER-CALLISON COLOQUY

Governor NUTTER. I have a question, Mr. Chairman, directed to Mr. Callison. Mr. Callison, is it your thought we measure this in the expenditure of dollars only?

Mr. CALLISON. I realize completely, Governor, one man drawing a given salary may accomplish a great deal more than another man drawing the same salary. There are many factors involved in this but I think there is a direct relationship between the size of a staff, the quality of personnel you might employ and the amount of money you are spending in your State.

Governor NUTTER. You use the term something like "Montana only spent $36,000," yet the percentage is set forth by myself in my talk and that of Dr. Thompson to spell out accomplishment in percentage. This is a realization, particularly to me, and I was wondering if you were adopting the position taken by many Federal people, you think you measure everything in the amount of dollars you get rid of.

Mr. CALLISON. In the first place I'm not one of the Federal people and in the second place I'm not taking a position today. I'm here to learn and listen to you and the other members of the board. I'm quite interested in studying what I will have an opportunity to see in Montana.

Governor NUTTER. I'm not critical. I'm glad you take the position I do. I'm pointing out a lot of people in Federal Government—I'm sure you're aware of this—seem to measure accomplishments in the amount of dollars. We think we have been gaining ground in Montana, we were gaining this ground on the previous amount which the Government provided $50 million a year. Now, the Federal Government deemed it wise to spend twice as much money. I can say this: We might be able to expedite our accomplishment, get our objectives obtained earlier by pouring in more money; I don't think this is what we desire in Montana. We are carrying out a very sound program under the old law and the thing I'm vitally concerned about is when you talked with increased grants-in-aid. Right with it you're married to it in increased Federal control; Federal enforcement mentioned specifically in the amendments and this concerns me.

At that point, Mr. Daly took over. I quote again from the transcript:

DALY-NUTTER COLLOQUY

Mr. DALY. Governor, I was particularly interested in the presentation of your health office which indicated in the period 1956 to August of this year Montana had contributed out of its own purse $7½ million to the improvement of the pollution control problems of the State; whereas in the period, 1953 to 1956, $1 million was expended. I believe he stated without qualification, that is the cooperation of Federal grants, had certainly stimulated activity in the State; if this is true do you not feel that taking the entire Nation as a whole, Montana has tended to prove that the increase in grants which this Board sought and approved may well expedite the solution to your problems on a national basis, a very worthy goal and it may, as you said yourself, expedite the solution of your problems in Montana itself? In the issue of Federal enforcement which concerns you so much, I believe that the rights of the States in intrastate affairs are very well protected and that you as Governor, for instance, would have to give written permission for the involvement of the Federal Government on any matter which did not concern your neighboring States. That does not seem to be an unreasonable position.

Governor NUTTER. Not at all; and that could be written out as it's written in.

Mr. DALY. There is a question if I may say so.

Governor NUTTER. This may reflect the attitude of this Board.

Mr. DALY. As far as this attitude is concerned I would like the record to show we believe completely we will never reach the goals we have set in the solution of the water control problem, except that the community and State activity solves the problems for us, we would never wish to intrude upon the rights of the State. We do feel, however, that for instance in this interstate relationship the day may well come when you sitting in your chair would be glad to have Federal help to make a neighboring State polluting your waters clean up those waters. I feel our position has always been that the issue of the State sovereignty is one we will fight for just as hard as you.

Governor NUTTER. I'm glad to hear you say that.

That the opposition of the Montana State administration is directed at the program across the boards is made abundantly clear by the following exchange, involving Montana Agriculture Commissioner Wren and Board Member John S. Samson, attorney at law, of Omaha, Nebr.:

COMMISSIONER WREN COMMENTS

Mr. WREN. Mr. Chairman, I don't know if I will be here all day. I would like to make a comment and add a few points. I'm the commissioner of agriculture, State of Montana. The public debt was brought up briefly, what I was concerned about mainly is a statement which was made by our President at the time he ran for election. That's something to the effect that it's not what your country can do for you but what you can do for your country. So since then there have been at least 30 issues that have been introduced for additional spending in the United States, some defeated in Congress, some passed, but what disturbs me and many officials in the State of Montana, How is the taxpayer who is already burdened with 30 percent of his income, how is he going to pay for such a project as this? I realize the importance of the projects under the Pollution Act, but I see no reason why Montana for one State should be subjected to the additional amendments. Now I would like to state one other thing under this amendment: that it calls for later, at some later date, the construction of some six or seven labs in the United States to study this situation and to me that is an additional burden, an additional expense, to the taxpayers of the United States. I feel this money could well be placed possibly toward something of the international aspects where we are in serious trouble and the past events of course do not have to be related at this time but I wanted to express my feelings that the State of Montana certainly does not need the amendments to the Pollution Act.

Dr. ANDERSON. Other comments.

Mr. SAMPSON. Doctor, I would like to direct a question. What provisions of the act were you referring to, Commissioner, in your inquiry?

Mr. WREN. There are several provisions.

Mr. SAMPSON. The broadening of Federal jurisdiction?

Mr. WREN. That's right. The interference is what worries me. Throughout the State of Montana and in my travels here is what the people asked me. They said, "When is the Federal Government going to stop the usurpation of State rights?" That's one of the questions people ask me today. There is a limit. Of course, I realize, too, the United States has certain responsibilities but how far can we go? It has interfered with every phase of our living today that I can think of.

Dr. ANDERSON. I'm sorry you weren't here when the legislation was discussed, Commissioner, this morning.

Mr. WREN. I read briefly the legislation.

Mr. CALLISON. May I direct a question to Commissioner Wren? I have been interested, Commissioner, in questions of concern that you have heard today about the growing use of chemical insecticides and other pesticides and the problems that we see as a result of that. Now, in view of your point of view about the reason of the Federal Government in certain areas, I wonder if in your work as Commissioner of Agriculture you have been rejecting or turning back any Federal assistance you may have received in plant test control work.

Commissioner WREN. Well, with the grasshopper situation I certainly would take it, I'll tell you that. No, I haven't; but a lot of the individual farmers and ranchers have. Under the Federal participation grasshopper spray situation, they pay one-third and the owner two-thirds, that's on the pasture land. But, I find in working with our plant pest control man, the USDA representative, that many of the farmers and ranchers were reluctant because it took so long to get anything done. The redtape and so forth. I have not been opposed to the use of chemicals. I have been ranching for 13 years but it brings me in mind of the cranberry situation. A cow would have to eat 5 acres of grass to become infected with the so-called insecticide and she probably would have to eat that 5 acres in about a week and I don't know if a cow could do it. I don't know if that answers the question.

Mr. CALLISON. I do appreciate your concern about the use of insecticides and pesticides. I wonder if your concern went so far as to be acceptable of some of the programs going on?

Commissioner WREN. They have restrictions also; if they spray you can't run a cow for a certain length of time on that grass; you're aware of that.

Mr. CALLISON. Are you able to keep the deer off the same grass, or the antelope?

Commissioner WREN. No, but I don't want a deer myself. I eat beef.

Dr. ANDERSON. Over here.

Voice. I was just wondering if I might direct a question to the board and again at the Commissioner. I understood that this problem is a nationwide problem, vital to the life, welfare of the entire Nation. I didn't come here today in my small part with the notion that we weren't concerned with everybody and we are only concerned with the so-called major individuals of the United States. I would like to ask you, Mr. Commissioner, Are we or are we not here today to decide what is the best line of water pollution prevention for the citizens of the United States or the ranchers of Montana, please?

Commissioner **Wren.** That's fairly easy to answer, but I might have to bring up one other issue. They tell us a lot of things are good for all the people of the United States; perhaps Federal aid to education is good for all the people of the United States, but what hapepned to it in Congress? I'm getting back to States rights. Montana, the flow out of Montana produces something like 70 percent of the Columbia River flow. We want to preserve that water for the Montana rancher and farmer. I agree with you. I'm not opposed to the State itself taking care of the pollution problem. Certainly we have in Montana, nor am I opposed to having the border States take care of their problem. I would rather see them take care of themselves.

Mr. **Daly.** I think that's a fair observation on the part of all of us; I think the issue here is that while you say you would believe and feel that Montana should take care of this tremendous outpouring of headwaters that goes into the Columbia, equally you would agree that the self-interest of the entire northwestern community is met if there is a process by which this can be assured should the responsibility not be met here. In other words, as long as Montana's actions grievously hurt the neighbor States there should be recourse to those States to get Montana to clear the waters out. It's a happy fact Montana meets its responsibilities; in intrastate affairs there is no possibility of Federal interference without the Governor's written permission—the Federal Government can't interfere with it.

Voice. I agree with you partially.

Mr. **Goddard.** As an example, in Pennsylvania we spent $185 million on the Delaware River alone to clean up the pollution. Now suppose the city of Trenton and New Jersey would not spend a nickel to clean up its pollution load. Isn't it reasonable to assume that some interstate agency or the Federal Government should require the city of Trenton to clean up its pollution? This is all we are asking.

NEWSPAPER COMMENT

Since it is conflict which makes news, the press picked up the Governor's line. "Nutter Blasts Encroachment at Pollution Control Hearings," read the headline in the Missoulian for September 21. The account of the September 20 meeting is as follows:

Blasts at the Federal Government for moving in on State rights; a difference of opinion over whether Montana has an adequate water pollution law, and the growing danger of pollution from atomic waste, insecticides and pesticides, and other chemicals; with a left-handed intrusion of the private versus public power issue marked a Federal hearing in Hotel Florence Wednesday. It was conducted by the Water Pollution Control Advisory Board of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Thursday, the Board and others representing various governmental and private agencies will inspect the $12 million process developed by the Anaconda Co. in the past decade to handle mine and smelter wastes from its Butte and Anaconda installations. They will be guests of the Anaconda Co. at a barbecue lunch and then go to Butte where the hearing will be resumed at 10 a.m. Friday. Mayor Vern Griffith will give a welcome and 16 others have indicated they wish to make statements, which will be limited to 10 minutes each. Question periods will be interspersed.

Gov. Donald G. Nutter struck hard at Federal encroachment into State sovereignty and lambasted other States in this area for waiting for the Federal Government to supply the money for pollution control.

The State's chief executive pointed out that 1961 amendments to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act include broadening and strengthening of Federal enforcement powers, and increases in the amount available for Federal grants.

Subsequently in a question period, Governor Nutter expressed fear that doubling the $50-million-a-year Federal fund as has been done will result in loss of State control. He declared that every time a State or community receives more Federal money, increased Federal control is "married" to it.

The State head admitted that Montana could have expedited its pollution cleanup program with more money but emphasized he believes the dangers in Federal aid far outweigh the advantages.

Early in his brief talk, Governor Nutter quoted figures showing that Montana can be proud of its advancement in sewage treatment facilities from 1953 to 1961. Although this has been supported to some extent by Federal assistance, he explained, the major burden has fallen on the people of the State and their response in voting bond issues for community projects has been more than amazing. Also, he stated, Montana industries have strongly supported antiwater pollution programs to the extent that he believes the Treasure State may well have cleaner, clearer water than any other State in the Union.

TWO ACTS PASSED

In addition, according to the official, the last session of the legislature passed two acts that will have a beneficial effect on maintaining the purity of Montana water, the Underground Water Code and the Water Well Drillers Licensing Act.

Later in the day Edward C. Wren, Montana agriculture commissioner, after asserting that Montana could have done the job without broadening of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act as was done in 1961, inquired, "When is the United States going to stop usurpation of State rights?"

DALY HAS ANSWER

This brought an interjection from John Charles Daly, board member, news commentator and moderator of "What's My Line?" TV show, that the best solution would be for the States to care for the problem themselves. At a question period earlier he had assured Governor Nutter that board members will fight for State sovereignty. The board is composed of five Eisenhower appointees and four Kennedy appointees, with Dr. Luther L. Terry, U.S. Surgeon General, another Kennedy appointee, as chairman.

Governor Nutter was supported in his assertion that Montana has a good water pollution control law and gradually is achieving solution of its problems by F. F. Palmer, of Forsyth, chairman of the Montana Water Pollution Control Council, and Dr. G. D. Carlyle Thompson, of Helena, council member and executive officer of the Montana State Board of Health.

DR. STEWART DIFFERS

Opposition to that claim came largely from representatives of wildlife organizations. After listing many types of pollution as still in existence along the Clark Fork River, Dr. John M. Stewart, a Montana State University chemistry professor, emphasized that individually the types aren't impressive but referred to the total as staggering.

Dr. Stewart asserted that Montana pollution laws are woefully inadequate and almost impossible to enforce. Prime responsibility for enforcement of most of its provisions rests with the State board of health. This agency has not in the past done a good job of carrying out its responsibility to the public in the matter of water pollution. Towns like Missoula continue to pass untreated sewage into the stream, paying little heed to supposed deadlines set by the board. Other types of pollution caused by industries, communities, and individuals are most commonly ignored unless pressure for action is brought on them by a local group.

TYPES OF POLLUTION

The types of pollution he listed follow: (1) raw sewage spouts into the streams and rivers, Missoula being the most flagrant example in this region; (2) on every stream bank are many places where garbage, trash, auto bodies, etc., spill into the river; (3) silt from mining and mill operations, and poor land use practices on farms and ranches increases erosion; (4) lumber-mill wastes always have been a problem near Missoula; (5) agricultural sprays undoubtedly find their way to the water.

UP TO RESIDENTS

After these statements, Dr. Stewart asserted that Montana citizens should assume the responsibility at once of effecting a change in the present State pollutions. He revealed that the Western Montana Fish & Game Association, for which he was acting as a spokesman, is making definite plans to spearhead a drive aimed at promoting the passage of a new pollution law at the next session of the legislature. In closing he said that if Montana people don't face up to the responsibility of getting a new law, attention should be focused on getting Federal aid to protect and preserve for the future the purity of the State's water.

Dr. George F. Weisel, another MSU professor, representing the same group; Dr. Richard A. Ormsbee and Dr. William H. Hoyer, U.S. Public Health Service employees at Hamilton, both representing the Ravalli County Fish & Wildlife Association, spoke in similar vein; and W. Leslie Pengelly of the Montana Wildlife Cooperative Research Unit, representing the WMFGA, showed slides and spoke along the same lines.

DR. RENNE SPEAKS

Dr. R. R. Renne, president of Montana State College and chairman of the Water Resources Committee of the American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities, quoted statistics showing that the Nation as a whole and many regions of the country will be desperately short of water in the next three or four decades. However, in addition, he said, the Nation is faced with an increasingly serious problem of water pollution resulting from poisons, chlorides, detergents, fertilizers, insecticides, weedicides, fungicides, and many other poisonous substances that will be discharged into the streams.

Many scientists, he stated, believe answers can be found to the complex pollution problems growing out of highly concentrated metropolitan and industrial areas and the increased discovery and use of exotic chemicals can be found. But, he asked if there is time to find answers before serious damage is done to public health and whether there is time to convince the public of the need.

SOLUTIONS OFFERED

The president suggested the following solutions: (1) stepping up building of treatment plants; (2) investigation of stream quality; and (3) research to learn new ways of treating waste.

A veiled reference to the private versus public power issue became evident in questions asked concerning land acquisition and high and low water levels by Mrs. Frances Logan of Charlo.

Mrs. M. Y. Foster, speaking as president of the Montana League of Women Voters, stated the league has an unrelenting determination to see that legislation is enacted and carried out which adequately provides for stream pollution abatement in Montana and elsewhere in the Nation. For health reasons, she said, the State league sees no alternative to Federal cooperation to insure compliance with pollution control legislation.

A. J. Erskine, president of the Izaak Walton League of America, emphasized a need to get more people to dedicate themselves to working for clean water; H. A. Swenson, Washington, D.C., representative of the U.S. Geological Survey, said that agency believes water quality rather than quantity will be the controlling factor; Dr. Wilson Clark, representing the Montana Conservation Council, declared that pollution problems can be solved with concerted effort; Mayor Carl Clavadetscher, of Billings, said clear water will result if people will play by the same rules all over the country.

WARNING FROM SCHOONOVER

"There must be no more 'Eat, drink and be merry' " attitude toward the water of the Northwest, Leland Schoonover of Polson told the board.

Schoonover, president of the Pacific Northwest Conservation Council, said the present plenty is not perpetual and urged that the present large supply of good water in the Northwest be protected.

He said his organization advocates public education, strict standards for pollution control and Federal legislation to protect interstate waters.

Schoonover said the "inadequacy of enforcement" of present pollution laws is "disturbing" and cited specifically pollution of Pacific coastal waters by oil, detergents and insecticides.

Speaking of Montana's industrial pollution control program, Schhonover said it might be expanded but commented that the State is getting its money's worth.

RECREATION STRESSED

Donald Aldrich of Missoula, also representing the PNCC, said that in many areas the recreational quality of the water has been "eliminated." Like other speakers, he referred to recreation as the Northwest's greatest industrial potential.

He noted that some industries tell prospective workers of the recreational benefits of the area and then contribute to pollution of the streams which are a part of the recreational resource.

Prof. Arnold Bolle of the Montana State University Forestry School, vice president of the Montana Conservation Council, told the board that the cost of using water is increased if it is polluted. He said the State can have industrial development and clean water both. "It's not an 'either-or' situation," he said.

EDUCATION NEEDED

Robert Sykes of Kalispel, president of the Montana Wildlife Federation, cited the importance of water as a recreational resource in Montana and urged further action on conservation. He mentioned specifically the need for appropriations for conservation education and the fact that recreation is not a legel use of water in Montana and that there is no minimum water level law in the State.

Harold W. Bloomer of Lakeside, president of Flathead Lakers, Inc., said his area would lose "a good portion" of the lucrative tourist and vacation industry if the lake becomes polluted, "as it already is in spots."

Bloomer said the recreation industry in the area now brings in about $16 million annually directly and produces another $45 million in secondary business.

ANDERSON, TERRY PRESIDE

Dr. Robert J. Anderson, U.S. Assistant Attorney General, presided at the morning session and explained that the function of the Board is to make recommendations to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare after studying the pollution problem. Dr. Terry presided at the afternoon session. Murray A. Stein, enforcement branch chief, Water Supply and Pollution Control Division of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, outlined features of new Federal legislation.

Messages were received from Senators Mike Mansfield and Lee Metcalf and Representative Arnold Olsen saying they regretted being unable to attend because Congress remains in session. They stated they expect that the Montana meetings will contribute to solution of the problems and the opportunities available under the 1961 act.

Outside as well as inside the hearing there was disagreement with the Governor's stand. Under the headline "Demo Flays Nutter for Belligerence," the Billings Gazette carried the following story on September 22:

Muddy Water—Demo Flays Nutter for Belligerence

Missoula.—Mrs. Frances Logan of Charlo, Democratic National Committee woman, Thursday chided Gov. Donald G. Nutter for what she said was Nutter's "unprovoked belligerence" toward the Federal Water Pollution Control Advisory Board.

Nutter Wednesday attacked the Board at its meeting in Missoula as Federal interference in State's affairs and an invasion in States' rights.

"Governor Nutter actually did not secede from the United States yesterday in his appearance before the Board but his belligerent attitude and assertion of lack of confidence that the Congress had acted in good faith in protecting States rights over intrastate waters strongly suggested he might have done so * * *," she said.

Mrs. Logan also criticized the Governor for his assertions Montana was handling capably its own water pollution problems.

"The rosy picture of Montana independent accomplishments painted by Governor Nutter was not borne out by better informed witnesses," she said.

Mrs. Logan said figures of the State board of health proved pollution control lagged in Montana until Federal grants made it feasible to undertake more pollution control projects.

"The attitude of other witnesses who recognized problems of pollution control must be undertaken cooperatively by all levels of government was in marked contrast to the Governor's unprovoked belligerence," she said.

The following day, the Montana Standard, published in Butte, Mont., reported—under the headline "Mayor Doesn't Agree With Nutter's Stand"—as follows:

Mayor Doesn't Agree With Nutter's Stand

Mayor Vern Griffith Friday said he strongly disagreed with Gov. Donald G. Nutter's position that Federal Government is encroaching on States' rights by increased offers of assistance in water pollution control.

Griffith made the statement before a meeting of the Federal Water Pollution Control Board in Butte.

"It is my belief that since all tax moneys originate on the local level we should see some of this money coming back when we need it," Griffith said.

Governor Nutter at a hearing of the Board in Missoula Tuesday had criticized neighboring States for " 'sitting on the dime,' doing nothing, and expecting Uncle Sam to provide Federal aid to do it for them."

The Governor said it is time for individual States to assume responsibility in the area of pollution and "appeals for Federal assistance should be based solely on need." Nutter said he was troubled with the possibility that doubling the $50 million Federal aid fund, recently accomplished, will result in increased infringement on States' rights.

At the Friday board meeting in Butte W. J. Leary, city manager of Helena, said the municipality has been able to take advantage of Federal aid to provide a sewage treatment plant. He said the city would be in serious trouble without this assistance and would like to see it continued.

"From requests to the State, we * * * formations and allowed pollution of fresh water tables," Jack Toole, a director of the Montana Cattlemen's Association, stated. Toole said he represented the association and its 1,100 members. He said the test holes and the explosions entailed sometimes allow lower strata levels of brackish water or sulfur water to mingle with fresh water tables.

The cattlemen urged the board to consider the problem, noting that proper precautionary measures in seismographic operations could prevent this pollution.

"I don't believe test operations have contributed to water pollution in northwestern Montana," said I. J. Staid, director of the Rocky Mountain Oil & Gas Association, Billings.

He said his company first learned of this purported cause of pollution a few days ago but immediate survey results indicated that pollution of fresh water tables by brackish water from another table was due to fault zones in the earth's strata and migration of pollutants through these zones.

WOULD RECTIFY SITUATION

Staid said if sufficient evidence is found to the contrary his company will gladly rectify the situation.

A Kalispell man, Michael J. Behrens, told the Board that residents on Flathead Lake are endangered because raw sewage from communities on or near the lake is contaminating the water. He called for State and Federal legislation "with teeth in it" to prevent such pollution.

E. F. Garbe, town clerk of Culbertson, Mont., said this community, which is dependent upon the Missouri River for its water supply had in the past been endangered by water shortage. He said during one period the town had no water for a period of 2 weeks, a condition brought about because the water released from the Fort Peck Reservoir was insufficient to cut a fresh water channel in the Missouri River.

Anderson noted that recent Federal water-regulation legislation provided that any Federal agency intending to impound water should first consult with the Department of Public Health in local communities to ascertain local needs.

OTHERS GIVE STATEMENTS

Others giving statements before the Board Friday included: J. Kolokotones, mayor of Three Forks; Dr. William L. Jellesen, Hamilton; Arnold Rieder, State senator from Jefferson County; Thomas H. Deckert, Yellowstone County commissioner; Lloyd T. Jensen, member of National Technical Task Force on Industrial Pollution, Denver; George Weber, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Billings; Basil Coplas, Billings; Ralph Kelly, Flint Creek Valley stock raiser.

Anderson concluded the meeting by noting that the Board was well pleased with attendance at the sessions. He said this showed that people were interested in the problem but that more than just interest was required if the threat of pollution were to be eradicated from the American scene.

The meeting in Butte was the concluding session of the Board in Montana. It had met Tuesday in Missoula to receive statements and conduct a question-and-answer period.

Thursday the members and interested parties made an inspection tour of waste disposal facilities at the Anaconda Reduction Works in Anaconda.

Reference was made to the excellent facilities of the disposal system at the Friday meeting. Board Member Maurice K. Goddard, secretary of the Pennsylvania Department of Public Works, asked if the Anaconda Co. charged Anaconda or Butte for this service and if any other companies in the State were providing such facilities to cities.

Edward D. Tierney, assistant vice president of the company, said no charges were made to the cities. He did not know if other companies offered such a service.

The Anaconda Co. operates a waste treatment process for its mine and smelter wastes at Anaconda and Butte and furnishes treatment of municipal and industrial wastes from the two cities without costs to the local government.

It was left for a Helena weekly newspaper, the People's Voice, to do a thorough job on the conference. That account follows:

PROGRESS MADE, MUCH YET TO DO TO CURB WATER POLLUTION IN MONTANA

(By Gretchen G. Billings)

Two things are necessary for man to exist. One is land and the other is water. In a growing and complex 20th century grave concern is being felt over the quality and quantity of our water supply. Sitting at the headwaters of all of our source of water, facing only pollution of our creation, Montana's problems are insignificant compared with those of the rest of the Nation. That we are not without problems, however, was evident last week when the Advisory Board on Water Pollution to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare held a conference in Missoula, Anaconda, and Butte to listen to people interested in the waters of this area.

The sources and amounts of water available to this Nation are basically the same as when Columbus landed. Increasing demands of population growth (200 million by 1980) will make the pollution image broaden and likely it will darken. Water needs will spiral upward.

A suggested national credo recommended by the National Conference on Water Pollution in December of 1960 included three points:

1. Users of water do not have an inherent right to pollute.
2. Users of public waters have a responsibility for returning them as nearly clean as is technically possible.
3. Prevention is just as important as control of pollution.

Every citizen of this Nation is involved in the problem of pollution and its control. Every citizen is a polluter and every citizen is a user.

Pollution abatement is a problem with roots in rural land use and agronomy, as well as in urban congestion and industrial growth.

The 2½-day conference included all day sessions in Missoula on Wednesday, September 20, with a banquet that evening. On Thursday, the Anaconda Co. took participants on a field trip through their stream cleanup plant and hosted a barbecue at the company's Mount Haggen ranch in the afternoon. On Friday the conference resumed in Butte for the half-day final session.

CONFERENCE HAS BLUSTERY START

Montana's Governor Nutter started the conference off with his highly publicized blast at Federal spenders in tones of pompous virtue and words of doubtful dignity, by saying "We are tired of other States sitting on their dimes and doing nothing and the Federal Government has to come along and help them out." He said he was sure the advisory board would be proud of Montana's work operating under the previous Water Control Act, which provided for Federal participation with the States. He stated Montana has used Federal assistance.

In a rather meaningless accumulation of words the Governor contributed little to the traditional hospitality of Montana or to the solution of water pollution problems.

He said for instance: "It is time any assistance from the Federal Government should be based solely on need."

Statistics he could not deny, proved Montana had done little or nothing toward cleaning up her sewage problems until the Federal Government offered financial assistance. Flying in the face of facts he unblushingly complimented the people of Montana on use of States rights raising money by bond issues on the local level.

However the effects of the "Yankee, go home" rantings of our Chief Executive were softened by the friendly attitude of other Montanans present who carried on after the Governor marched out of the meeting, and during the following 2 days of the session.

The warm appreciation for the work the advisory board was trying to do, from political figures such as former Gov. John Bonner and 1960 Gubernatorial Candidate Jack Toole, of Shelby, helped cushion some of the shock.

Telegrams of welcome from Senators MANSFIELD and METCALF and First District Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN were read to the advisory board and visiting delegates from 17 States.

Bonner said he thought the presence of the board in Montana would serve to awaken our interest in our greatest asset, water.

CONCERN OVER POLLUTION OF UNDERGROUND WATER

Toole said he was concerned with the pollution of underground fresh water, which is a secret process that is only discovered when its pollution has reached most serious proportions. "The possibility of radioactive fallout makes the importance of keeping this vast supply of underground sweet water uncontaminated * * * of major importance," he said.

During the question period Wednesday morning Nutter asked the advisory board if they measured accomplishments in dollars only.

Dr. G. D. Carlyle Thompson, State board of health, stated that too much money could be as disastrous as too little in what he termed his "going between the horns" statement. He said a lot more money would not have made Montana's situation improve appreciably and might even have been a hindrance to orderly development, but enough more money to add an extra staff member or two might have helped more than anything. More money might have expedited pollution control in Montana but an expedited program would have lacked understanding of the citizens, he said.

Nutter leveled another volley in his Castro-like revolution with Uncle Sam by saying: "We spent only $37,000. This is realistic. The position of you Federal people is to judge by how many dollars you can get rid of."

A member of the board patiently restated what had earlier been pointed out, that they were not Federal people, but interested citizens seeking information.

The Governor was not to be mollified and reiterated his complaint that increased funds meant you marry Federal control and Federal enforcement worried him.

John Charles Daly, exerting his well-known charm, pointed out that Montana could be proud of what it has accomplished, but Daly said it was evident from figures presented by Dr. Thompson that it wasn't until Congress passed the original Pollution Control Act in 1956 which made Federal grants available that Montana had started to move ahead.

From 1953 to 1956 he pointed out Montana had only spent $1 million on pollution control whereas from 1956 to 1961 $7½ million had been spent.

Daly asked the Governor if he did not feel, taking the population as a whole, the increase in Federal grants may well expedite worthy goals and even expedite pollution control in Montana itself.

He also asked if the Governor did not realize the law provided he would have to give written permission for the Federal Government to enter an intrastate situation. This provision against intruding on State sovereignty, Daly said, he would fight to maintain.

Nutter insisted the permission could be written out the same as it was written in, whereupon the Governor dismounted his trusty dinosaur and marched off to a federally subsidized airport to fly to Billings.

WITHOUT A TIME MACHINE, YET

Good old "dinny" was to be used later in the day by an emotionally distraught Nutter appointee, Commissioner of Agriculture Edward C. Wren, who thought this money could well be placed to the international aspects; that the State of Montana certainly does not need the amendments to the Pollution Act; and when is the Federal Government going to stop usurpation of States rights?

Advisory board member, Charles H. Callison, of New York, asked Wren if, in his official position as commissioner of agriculture he had refused or turned back Federal grants, to which Wren admitted original sin by saying he had not * * * adding, "but many individual farmers are refusing Federal help on grasshopper control."

The haunting fact Mr. Wren avoided is whether the major reason for individuals refusing Federal help in the grasshopper control situation could be that it is not sufficient. The two-thirds of the cost individuals have to pay is a financial burden hard-pressed Montana farmers are in no position to assume. Wren might have told the advisory board that the 1961 State legislature refused to participate in the Federal-State-individual program. He might have added that the State took no sovereign responsibility which leaves Montana farmers completely free of Federal usurpation and their land embedded with grasshopper eggs.

Wren also opposed the setting up of research labs to study mounting pollution problems as an additional bureau and an additional expense.

Advisory board assurances that they agreed with him most heartily that all the States should shoulder the responsibility for clean water left Wren only partially agreeable as the steam he generated ran out. He had no concern for the efforts of agricultural sprays on such as deer because, he said, "I do not eat deer * * * they are not worth eating."

Reaction to the attitude of the Governor and his stand-in, Wren, was perhaps summed up best by one observer who stated the political administration in Montana, if left to their own devices, would leave their grandchildren a bucket of dollars to drink.

CITY OFFICIALS APPROVE OF PROGRAM

City officials defended the Federal Government's responsibility in water pollution control.

Carl Clavadetscher, mayor of Billings; Vern Griffith, mayor of Butte, and W. J. Leary, city manager of Helena, all spoke of the necessity and value of Federal participation in the program. Clavadetscher said he "accepts Federal regulation of water pollution," and "we are looking for the Federal Government to set up a uniform code."

The Helena city manager didn't mince words when he spoke of the experience of the cities before the State legislature. He said, "Helena has been able to take advantage of Federal aid for a sewage disposal plant and we would like to see that program continued. A lot of cities would be up against it if they did not receive some Federal help. We appeared before the legislature with our problems and they gave us everything but money."

Mayor Griffith of Butte said, "after all, all money is raised at the local level" and he "did not see why municipalities should not get some of it." The cities of Butte and Anaconda have had no financial problems with their sewage disposal. The Anaconda Co. is taking care of these along with the pollution control program attendant to their mining and smelting operations, in Silver Bow Creek.

FEDERAL FUNDS PROVIDED IMPETUS

Dr. Thompson of the State board of health outlined the sizable accomplishments in the State of Montana in the past 5 years stating:

"It is apparent the use of Federal funds gave great impetus to the work of the larger communities."

Defending the State board of health, Dr. Thompson pointed out the difficult task they face in educating and prodding the citizens of this State to get to work on their pollution problems, and outlined some of the community problems still existing. He said the first and major problems here are about corrected, that the goal is near.

He recognized the need for research to determine the total problem as to the effects of modern day detergents, sprays, insecticides, and other chemicals on human health.

Wildlife and fish and game representatives tended to be critical of the State board of health and what they seemed to consider slow progress in some places and overlooking many problems in others.

Of great concern to everyone is the effect of what was termed "exotic chemicals" on human life over a period of time.

NEVER MISS THE WATER TILL THE WELL GOES DRY

Robert Sykes, Kalispell, president of the Montana Wildlife Federation, enthusiastically endorsed the Federal Pollution Control Act and said his organization was pleased with the work that has been done since 1953, but compared progress with a ball game in that we have scored a run in the first inning but there are eight innings yet to go.

In the innings ahead, Sykes said, we need State appropriations to include education on these problems in the schools; Montana needs a minimum low-level water law; stronger enforcement provisions in the law which are presently woefully inadequate; larger appropriations for the State board of health.

"Before there is any use of insecticides," Sykes said, "there should be a study," because using them to kill insects results in also killing fish, and even game animals are unsafe to eat.

"If all the money for the State board of health were used on Flathead Lake," he said, "it would take 5 years to accomplish their objective."

MORE AGGRESSIVE ACTION NEEDED

Flathead Lake was presented as a pollution problem by several spokesmen including State Senator Leland Schoonover of Lake County, speaking as president of the Pacific Northwest Conservation Council, who referred to the glowing reports by the Governor and said while recognizing the progressive steps already taken, "from where we sit we do not think things are going fast enough," and "more aggressive action on the national level must be instituted."

Schoonover said pollution control lags behind other forms of development and the lack of good State legislation is alarming.

Asking for stronger enforcement power for the laws we have, the Senator said: "We do not necessarily recommend a crash program but a program that will give us real answers on how to keep water clean so all people can enjoy its use."

He said domestic pollution is not our only problem and that our industrial waste problems are in the future. Pollution is one of the gravest problems we face, according to Schoonover, and we will get just about what we spend to correct it.

Other speakers specifically interested in methods to prevent further pollution of the recreational and tourist attraction in western Montana were Harold W. Bloomer, of the Flathead Lakers, and Michael J. Behrens, Flathead County sanitarian.

WATER NO RESPECTER OF STATE LINES

Mrs. M. Y. Foster delighted the packed hearing room with her firm and knowledgeful presentation as spokesman for the League of Women Voters in behalf of Federal participation in pollution control. Mrs. Foster said the "Federal Government will push the program with vigor." She said water is no respecter of State lines and women are concerned with the vital supply of water and what happens to it.

"For health reasons alone," she said, "this national problem must have Federal support to embark on adequate abatement programs."

Dr. R. R. Renne, president of Montana State College and chairman of the Water Resources Committee of the American Association of Land-Grant Colleges & Universities, saw the most acute problem as primarily one of research because of new pollutants in most areas of the country.

"Students of the problem will agree we simply do not have the answer at this time on how to handle the new problems that are growing out of the health hazards of the exotic chemicals," he said.

Renne expressed the hope that Montana State College and the American Association of Land-Grant Colleges might be able to help play a part in the research and public understanding that will be necessary to meet the growing problem.

FEDERAL FUNDS HELPED CLEAN UP BOULDER RIVER

State Senator Arnold Reider supported the Federal help Montana has received and cited the case of the Boulder River where raw sewage was sent to the land of adjacent farmers and ranchers until Federal funds made it possible for the State institution involved to correct it. "I will continue to support the National Congress in helping us with the pollution problem," he said.

E. F. Garbe, Culbertson, stressed the need for a minimum-flow law in Montana, which would require any water storage facility built on any of our streams to allow a normal flow below the dam and the board of health be given authority to demand release of the water if the health and welfare of any community is at stake. Culbertson this summer had to go to their U.S. Senators to get release of water when the health and welfare of that community was threatened.

CONGRESS RECOGNIZING PROBLEMS

Congress is recognizing this problem of providing water for periods when flow in streams is normally down, according to Dr. Robert Anderson, of the Public Health Service. He said recent legislation endorsed a specific provision that any agency impounding water should consult with the Public Health Service for recommendations on guarantees that should be put in to maintain streamflow when flow is low. This would be taken into consideration in original planning, Dr. Anderson said.

Asked what the situation is in regard to existing water impoundments and those already planned, the advisory board did not know, but assured the group, that would be one question that would be taken back to Washington.

The answer seems to rest in a reallocation of water use to take care of the low-flow periods.

SPORTSMEN MAKE DRAMATIC APPEAL

Sportsmen and wildlife conservation groups put up the most dramatic appeal for preservation of the clean, clear, sparkling water in Montana. Presenting this State as a mecca for an increasingly outdoor-hungry, recreation-seeking Nation, their demands for the quality of water were the most specific. Their statements on present domestic and industrial waste disposal were the most critical. Their standards for Montana tended toward preserving the pristine purity of the native wilderness wherever possible.

Industrialization merely for the income or payroll without consideration of the effects on our resources, they regarded as dangerous. One university professor suggested "sooner or later we will all die at a banquet of consequences."

The social cost of uncontrolled pollution could make the national debt look small in comparison, they claimed.

These people were unanimous in their concern over what major highway construction is doing to Montana streams. "Highways," they said, "are being built at the expense of the streams."

Another fish and wildlife association spokesman, Dr. John Stewart, who even likes venison, said it was "mighty fine to be proud of Montana's progress in stream pollution," but "raw sewage is only one type of pollution," and called attention to the city of Missoula where, while the money is available to take care of the city sewage, there is still a vast stream pollution problem to be licked.

"From whence comes man's weird idea that dumping into the river will take care of our waste * * * the solubility of an automobile body is highly improbable," Dr. Stewart said.

The charge was made that the State board of health has the prime responsibility in these matters and they have not done a good job in taking care of this responsibility. The question was raised as to whether "the law or guts" was to blame. Regardless of which it is, there will be a new law presented at the next session of the legislature, sportsmen said.

ACM COMPLIMENTED

The Anaconda Co. was commended on the job it has done, but it was pointed out that a single slip can undo all that has been accomplished. The Waldorf Paper Co. ponds are full so where do we go from here, was one of the questions raised.

Of the Clarks Fork River through Missoula one spokesman said, "Frankly, it stinks" and another said "all Montana waters are not clear and sparkling as some would lead you to believe."

"The mere presence of people does not bring prosperity," said Dr. Pengally, as he showed slides of the Ganges in India, and added that the care a nation takes of its resources is the true indication of its culture.

Showing how fish die in polluted water that is being used downstream by human beings, he said "fish are fussier than people."

CRITICISM LEVELED AT BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS

Advisory board member John A. Biggs of the Department of Game and Fish, of the

State of Washington, expressed the hope that this board would do something immediately about "an official expression" to the Bureau of Public Roads that a greater consideration be given as to the effect interstate highway construction has on impairment of stream values.

"This board might very usefully point out to public officials the concern of people as to the lack of good planning in this field," he said.

"Sedimentation, whether from highways or other sources, according to W. J. Everin, director of the State fish and game department, is one of the most important and the most ignored problems which contributes to the downgrading of streams. It covers the bottoms and insects cannot spawn. Streams in such condition are expensive to reclaim," he said.

FEDERAL LEADERSHIP NECESSARY

Speaking on the matter of pollution from the viewpoint of management, James Gill, manager of the Ethyl Corp., Pittsburg, Calif., said the cause of clean water in the United States can best be furthered by the Federal Government exercising its role in research and its weight in getting the States to shoulder their responsibility in meaningful control. He said pollutants must be eliminated at their source which is a matter of local concern and control.

"State and local governments must not only recognize these responsibilities but must appropriate necessary funds to establish and maintain adequate staff, labs and control agencies," he said, adding "Too often these groups have not received sufficient share of State revenues to shoulder their responsibilities."

The industry spokesman who felt he had received a "battering" from earlier speakers, said industry has received an undue share of the burden for the condition of our streams, but "even after today, I do not know who has done most to foul up our waterways."

"The waterways cannot be maintained for any one group," he said. "All groups should have equal rights to the same water."

SUGGESTS SOME WATERWAYS FOR WASTE ONLY

He suggested that some waterways may have to be left for waste and some left for recreation. He said conservationists who contend there should be no gradation of water are wrong. "To believe you are going to set the same standards for a lake in the high Sierras and San Francisco Bay is simply unrealistic," Gill contended. "It may well be we cannot afford to have every cubic foot of water in California the quality of Lake Tahoe * * * to those who think you can you must reevaluate your standards," he said.

Gill would have regional authorities to establish standards and make determination on the use and purity of different waterways. "It is not sufficient to say water must be clean and not polluted," he said, "it cannot be hit or miss, but it must be based against the philosophy of free enterprise and not the emotional, unreasonable demands of any group."

"Our goals must not be unrealistic, they must be based on study and analysis to meet the needs of changing society," and this requires advancement in knowledge in all phases of wtaer use and control, he said.

"Any program should not be idealistic, but practical, not only desirable but required," he concluded.

FEATURES OF 1961 LAW REVIEWED

The existing features of the 1961 law as passed by Congress were outlined by Murray Stein, legal adviser to the Advisory Board, who said any Federal assistance must be requested by the Governor of a State getting the aid on an intrastate problem, however the new law strengthens enforcement procedures on all Federal water abatement where procedures in on State are endangering some other State.

This situation was dramatized by Advisory Board Member Maurice Goddard of Harrisburg, Pa., who pointed to situations existing in his area where a community had spent some $185 million cleaning up its waste and sewage only to have an upstream community in another State continue to send its polluted water downstream. "Shouldn't somebody require they clean up their pollution? That is all we are asking," he said.

Stein pointed out the drive for the 1961 law was "inexorable" and was a milestone in the field of preserving and cleaning up the valuable life-giving resource of water.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION HAS ALLOWED UTILITIES TO CHARGE CONSUMERS FOR MORE TAXES THAN THE COMPANIES ACTUALLY PAY

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, ever since Congress passed the 1954 Internal Revenue Act, many public utilities have been reaping a bonanza at the expense of utility customers. A number of regulatory jurisdictions, the most prominent being the Federal Power Commission, under prior administration have permitted utilities to charge rates based upon income-tax allowances which far exceeded their actual tax liability to the Treasury. These regulatory commissions have held that in computing the Federal income tax amount to be allowed in fixing utility rates, the higher deductions for depreciation made available under the rapid depreciation option provided by section 167 of the Internal Revenue Act could be ignored, even though such deductions were taken in the tax returns filed by the utilities with the Internal Revenue Service.

The excuse given by the Federal Power Commission in 1956 for permitting this amazing extraction from the pocketbooks of utility customers is that the Commission was only carrying out the intent of Congress in enacting section 167 of the Internal Revenue Act. This specious ground was swept away in 1961 by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth and Fifth Circuits. The Commission then simply retreated to claiming that the imposition of such burden upon consumers was a matter of its own discretion.

I have had a study made by competent experts of the price which gas customers are now paying because of the failure of the Federal Power Commission during the past 6 years to carry out the intent and purpose of the Natural Gas Act. It appears that in the year 1960 alone, 15 of the major natural gas pipeline companies subject to the rate jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission obtained more than $100 million from the pocketbooks of gas customers through the device of charging customers for income taxes not paid to the Treasury. This investigation showed the companies and the amounts by which their costs of furnishing service were inflated by phantom charges for taxes not paid, and the related income taxes thereon are as follows. These figures are based upon the sworn reports filed by these companies with the FPC:

American Louisiana Pipe Line Co	$2,843,933
Colorado Interstate Gas Co	1,593,747
El Paso Natural Gas Co	40,369,448
Michigan Wisconsin Pipe Line Co	6,039,574
Natural Gas Pipe Line Co. of America	5,035,409
Northern Natural Gas Co	7,739,363
Ohio Fuel Gas Co	2,979,164
Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line Co	1,496,456
Southern Natural Gas Co	3,939,577
Tennessee Gas Transmission Co	11,163,524
Texas Eastern Transmission Corp	5,718,324
Texas Gas Transmission Co	3,154,422
Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Co	8,625,476
Trunkline Gas Co	2,214,076
United Fuel Gas Co	1,615,385
Total	104,527,878

An additional $5,400,000 of inflated costs pertains to 17 smaller pipeline companies. These unjustified exactions from gas consumers which are used for capital improvements are growing rapidly year by year. The amount for 1960 represents an increase of approximately $28.5 million over the year 1959.

May I also point out that the tax bill now before the House Ways and Means Committee includes an investment credit for utilities of 4 percent. Before such a provision is finally approved, if it is, we should make it very clear in the bill that such reductions in taxes to the utilities should also be deducted from their costs when the FPC or State commissions come to determine what proper costs may be passed on to consumers.

A recent article in News for Electric Consumers published by the Electric Consumers Information Committee of Washington, D.C., exposes by chapter and verse the justifications given by the Commission for its actions and its shift of position in 1961 from one of following congressional intent, to one of pure discretion. This article also points out that the new Federal Power Commission has a golden opportunity to put an end to these injustices which are being imposed on gas and electric consumers.

I ask unanimous consent that the item from the News for Electric Consumers of December 15, 1961, may be printed as part of the RECORD in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the news article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FPC CAN ACT TO END "PHANTOM TAX" SUBSIDIES

The new leadership at the Federal Power Commission has a golden opportunity to put an end to an injustice imposed on gas and electric consumers by Commissioners who served in the previous administration.

The issue: subsidies enjoyed by power and gas companies as a result of FPC interpretation of rapid depreciation provisions in the tax law. ECIC has spotlighted the issue often in the past. Quite simply, FPC has permitted utilities to charge consumers for more taxes than they, the companies, actually pay to the Government. The utilities retain these "phantom taxes," enjoy subsidies in the form of interest-free loans, and in some instances, actually give stockholders windfalls in the form of tax-free cash dividend payments.

In its Amere case decision in 1956, the FPC said a consumer could be charged for more taxes than a gas company actually paid, under section 167 of the tax law. But the FPC wasn't quite happy about its decision. It voiced regrets and put the blame on Congress, saying the FPC was simply following the intent of Congress. Said the FPC:

"We cannot strike down an act of Congress, if we think it unwise, or unnecessary to a particular industry, and enforce it only if it is in accord with our economic and regulatory philosophy.

"The extraordinary ability and willingness of natural gas companies * * * to attract capital and construct new facilities causes us to question whether the incentive provided by section 167 of the Internal Revenue Code is necessary or desirable for this industry."

In cases which followed, the FPC reiterated its Amere decision and permitted utilities to levy rates based on inflated Federal tax allowances. The FPC continued to say, in effect, that its hands were tied, that it was simply applying the law as Congress wrote it.

But then came a Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals decision. While the court did not upset the FPC's decision on "phantom taxes," it did note that the intent of Congress was not really involved, that this was an FPC matter. Said the court in a gas case appeal brought before it by the California commission:

"We think, in short, that there is no statutory authority for the Commission (FPC) to treat actual savings in taxes to which natural gas companies are entitled any differently than savings in any other cost of service."

When several Kentucky cities appealed another FPC gas rate decision to the Fourth Circuit Court, that court also indicated that the treatment of tax deductions was up to the FPC's discretion. On rehearing that case, the FPC tried to answer charges that it had used its own discretion instead of following the intent of Congress. Said the FPC:

"We think these arguments are misconceived. We are not using our discretion, but following the intention of Congress in determining that the utility is privileged to retain initially the benefits of all three tax incentives—liberalized depreciation, percentage depletion and the intangibles."

But when the California case mentioned earlier was taken to the U.S. Supreme Court by the State commission, what did the FPC say? In its brief urging the High Court not to review the case, the FPC declared early in 1961:

"The issue is not a basic question affecting the law of utility regulation, but a relatively narrow, though recurring, accounting problem within the discretionary province of the Federal Power Commission." The FPC added:

"No general issue of law is involved, only a discretionary choice among competing accounting systems. Such a choice is not one which warrants review by this Court. * * * the choice is one which can be changed by the Commission should it become convinced that the other method is preferable."

This FPC brief, incidentally, was signed by the Kennedy administration's Solicitor General.

To sum up: The FPC under the previous administration first said it had no choice but to follow the intent of Congress and permit utilities to charge consumers for "phantom taxes." It repeated this 1956 contention until early 1961, when it reversed itself and argued that the issue was one for the FPC's discretion, not a matter of law. The Solicitor General agreed. Lower courts had already made the same point.

It would seem, therefore, that the new FPC members have it within their discretion to take a good hard look at the "phantom tax" issue and to serve the public interest by ending "phantom tax" subsidies to gas and electric companies. Utility consumers would be delighted, to say the least, to no longer have to pay power and gas bills which include more money for taxes than the utilities relay to the Government.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Is it correct to conclude, from the remarks of the able Senator from Illinois, that while one Government agency gives to certain utilities a tax reduction, another Government agency permits them to charge the public utility rates as if the taxes had been paid, when in fact they were not paid, and were not even owed?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Tennessee has put his finger exactly on the point.

Mr. GORE. Does the Senator know whether that has continued under the present administration?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not believe a ruling has been made on it yet, but they are about to decide.

Mr. GORE. I am glad the Senator has called attention to this fact. Let us hope the present administration will make a decision in the interest of the people.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I hope that very much; and in the new tax bill which we hope will come to the Senate, if an investment credit should be granted—and I am not at all clear that it should be, but if it is granted—we should have a saving clause in the bill to safeguard the future.

Mr. GORE. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

Without objection, the Senator is yielded an additional 3 minutes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Presiding Officer.

Mr. GORE. The tax credit, as I understand, is advocated on the basis that U.S. business needs this additional tax reduction in order to compete in international trade. I wonder what international competition is engaged in by American utilities.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Tennessee really provides the answer to his own question—they produce only for the domestic market.

Mr. GORE. They do not produce at all for the foreign markets.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. GORE. I wonder in what international trade competition an automobile sales agency in Nashville, Tenn., or Peoria, Ill., engages?

Mr. DOUGLAS. They engage in domestic commerce or trade, of course.

Mr. GORE. Yet, as I understand the draft of the bill as it is presently standing, a tax credit would be given to that kind of service agency.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think it should be said, in justice to the Treasury Department, that it was opposed to an investment tax credit for utilities and if the utilities were included under such a provision, as I believe the House Ways and Means Committee has tentatively decided, it would be by legislative action, and not by administrative pressure.

Mr. GORE. Well, as so often happens, once we start out upon a course that is in the wrong direction, we are apt to be propelled further in that direction than we intended to go.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is true. I hope the warning which I have tried to serve this morning may have some influence both on the Federal Power Commission and on the Congress of the United States.

Mr. GORE. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. GORE. As an economist, as the able distinguished Senator from Illinois, is, I would like to know if added depreciation allowances show up on the books of a taxpayer as additional profit or whether, in fact, they do not show up in a greater set-aside reserve for depreciation, real or unreal, and that in fact the books may show less profit, while the dividends may be greater and the cash flow may be greater?

Mr. DOUGLAS. As I understand the situation, the Senator from Tennessee is correct. I think in practice in these cases the deductions were taken on the tax return, but the economies were not passed on at the rate structure level.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Is there further morning business?

ARMY TIMES CITES PROBLEM OF SCREENING IN CALLUP OF RESERVISTS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on January 27, 1962, the Army Times carried a most informative article by Mr. Randall Shoemaker, which indicated that a considerable number of Ready Reserve fillers have been called to active duty by mistake. The article points out that this group are not those who were victims of earlier administrative errors, but young men who fell within a "gray" area in which policy has only recently been clarified.

I know of one case in which a young man served 5½ years and was called back to duty in the recent callup. When this was brought to the attention of the military forces they admitted it was a mistake and promptly released him. There are other such cases.

Because the article deals objectively and fairly with subject matter which easily lends itself to sensationalism, I shall ask unanimous consent that the article appear in the RECORD.

Mr. President, the imposition of military duty—even when validity and accurately imposed—causes considerable sacrifices in time and loss of earning potential, interruptions in educational plans, separation from home and family, to say nothing of the more basic sacrifice of personal liberty. The impositions resulting from an erroneous call to military duty cannot be justified and there should exist some means by which these young men might obtain reasonable recompense. If no means exist, however, it would seem incumbent upon us to provide a method to redress the impositions to which these young men and their families have been subjected.

This article from the Army Times, for which the associate editor is Larry Carney, points out that there can be quite a large number of people who have been erroneously recalled to service, after long years of service, in the emergency call-up.

I ask unanimous consent that the Army Times article of January 27, 1962, under the title "More Fillers Due Release" be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORE FILLERS DUE RELEASE

(By Randall Shoemaker)

WASHINGTON.—The Army has discovered another group of several hundred—or possibly several thousand—Ready Reserve fillers who were called to active duty by mistake, it was learned this week.

The affected reservists are not those who were victims of administrative foulups which came to light earlier in the Berlin crisis buildup. The new group wound up on active duty because their service obligations fell within a "gray" area in which policy only recently has been clarified.

Active Army commanders several weeks ago began checking records of the 40,000 Reserve fillers in their units to identify those eligible for release. Following the policy established when previous mistakes were discovered, the individual is given the opportunity to stay on active duty if he wishes.

Those eligible for release are fillers who completed at least 5 years of combined active duty and Reserve service before October 1, 1961, and did not sign an agreement to stay in the Ready Reserve beyond that date.

In addition to the screening of recalled fillers, the action also calls for corps headquarters to transfer many thousands of Ready Reserve reinforcement pool members to Standby Reserve status. These personnel were not recalled but are otherwise similar to those being released from active duty.

Most of the individuals affected are expected to be men who originally enlisted or were inducted before August 10, 1955, the date the Reserve Forces Act became effective. All men entering the active Army or a Reserve component before RFA acquired an 8-year obligation.

Eight-year obligors, under current law, may qualify for transfer to Standby by serving a combination of active duty and satisfactory participation in an accredited training program of the Ready Reserve for a total of at least 5 years. Otherwise, they normally must serve out the 8 years in Ready status.

A key factor in the current screening action was a recent Army legal decision regarding the definition of satisfactory service. Before RFA, there were no enforcement provisions to put teeth into the Reserve training obligations and consequently there was no effective mandatory training program. Some individuals volunteered to attend regular drills, but the majority of reservists did nothing because they were not directly ordered to do anything.

Reexamining this situation, the Army's legal experts reportedly decided these individuals could not be held in Ready status until the end of their 8-year terms.

Another decision by the legal experts added a complication. Some 8-year obligors who originally enlisted in the National Guard or USAR were never on active duty before the call-up. For this purpose, active duty for training is not counted as active duty. However, even 1 day of active duty, it was decided, would be sufficient to bring a man under the rule of transfer eligibility after 5 years' combined service.

One group which would benefit from this loophole are former Guardsmen who served on active duty in 1957 during the Little Rock school integration controversy and later went into the USAR filler pool. If they were recalled, and had not volunteered for Reserve service beyond October 1, 1961, they would be eligible for release from active duty.

REPORT OF RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE OF SOUTHERN WEIGHTS & MEASURES ASSOCIATION

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, it is with great pleasure that I offer for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a resolution of the Southern Weights & Measures Association adopted at their conference October 23–26, 1961.

The association represents 17 Southern States and the District of Columbia and has done yeoman work in assisting and protecting the consumers of the South. Incidentally, its new president, Matt Jennings is from my own State of Tennessee where he serves as director, division of marketing, State department of agriculture.

The resolution praises Senator PHILIP A. HART for the great progress he has made in the investigation of misleading and deceptive packaging and pledges him and his associates the support and cooperation of the Southern Weights & Measures Association in this endeavor.

The investigation of packaging and labeling practices has, of course, been carried on as a project of the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee and has already resulted in many worthwhile packaging and labeling changes benefiting the American consumer.

When I designated Senator HART to head that phase of the subcommittee's activities dealing with trade and commercial practices directly affecting consumers, I was confident that he would do the kind of job that would reflect favorably on the work of the subcommittee. Now that his inquiry into such practices has become an integral part of our program, I am proud that we have received the commendation and support of so distinguished and important a group as the Southern Weights & Measures Association.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT OF RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE OF THE SOUTHERN WEIGHTS & MEASURES ASSOCIATION, IN CONFERENCE, OCTOBER 23–26, 1961

Whereas Senator HART, of the U.S. Congress, is making great progress in his investigation of misleading and deceptive packages; and

Whereas his activities are fully in accord with our thinking: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Southern Weights & Measures Association (in conference at Atlanta, Ga., October 23–26, 1961), That we commend him and his associates for their investigations into the purported practice of putting into the channels of trade packages which are deceptive in form, or fill, or weight, or which are so labeled as to mislead or deceive a prospective purchaser as to quality or quantity of contents; and further, do pledge our support and cooperation in his endeavor: Be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Senator HART and a copy be spread on the minutes of this association.

C. D. BAUCON,
Chairman.
H. K. SHARP.
L. T. WILLIS.

TRIBUTE TO JAMES V. BENNETT

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I wish to express my best wishes to Mr. James V. Bennett upon the completion of his first 25 years as Director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons. The Nation will indeed be fortunate if the record of this agency during the next quarter century is as successful as it has been under his direction during the last.

Jim Bennett's achievements and contributions in the field of penology have ranged far beyond those of an excellent administrator. Because of his accomplishments in the Federal prison system, he has been called upon by our armed services, several foreign governments, many States including my own, and numerous cities, including those in Tennessee. He has helped them work out problems of constructing and staffing their prisons, rehabilitating prisoners, and improving their laws governing the commitment and custody of lawbreakers.

As a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, I remember particularly an occasion in 1958 when Mr. Bennett enlisted my support of a bill which later became Public Law 85–752, and I was happy to give it. This law was designed to remove inequities in sentences for Federal crimes, and time and experience have more than proved its worth.

Skill and knowledge have, of course, contributed to Jim Bennett's success. But just as important a factor, I believe, has been his humanitarianism—a concern for his fellow man that best reveals itself in the Bureau's policy of beginning the rehabilitation of an inmate on his first day in prison.

Jim Bennett is one of our most dedicated public servants. He deserves every salute that a grateful Nation can accord him.

FORESTRY RESEARCH PROGRAM AT ALEXANDRIA, LA.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the forestry research program at Alexandria, La., would be greatly benefited and made much more efficient through the construction of a $900,000 laboratory which has been proposed. The project involves construction of a modern laboratory and remodeling of a structure recently obtained as a Federal surplus building. Together these facilities would house five important lines of research: direct seeding and timber culture research, range management, fire research, insect control studies, and forest products utilization.

Mr. President, it was my privilege to visit this entire area last summer. Louisiana is becoming green again. Many acres of land which were nothing but charred stumps now are filling up

with young trees. It is my hope that some research can be conducted to the end that all these trees, as well as a lot of hardwood located within the State of Louisiana, can be utilized in some way.

Forest products utilization is one of the most important fields of research that needs to be intensified. The program at Alexandria would be developed in close coordination with the work at the Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, Wis. The new laboratory would house forest products investigations of particular concern to the southern pine and hardwood industry. It would emphasize research on the most pressing current problems and would bring to the South the much needed technical applications of the latest new developments in this field.

Several years ago, the very inadequate offices and laboratory housing the forestry research program in Alexandria burned to the ground. Since that time, the scientists located there have had virtually no modern facilities for their research. The proposed $900,000 laboratory would not only provide for these workers but also would enable other research scientists at scattered locations and without modern facilities to be brought to this location. Their work would be greatly benefited by this modern laboratory.

I express the hope that work on this facility will be started soon.

HHFA: AN ADMINISTRATIVE MONSTROSITY

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, as a longtime and strong supporter of the proposal to establish a new Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, I have heard many arguments advanced both for and against such a Department. But all of us who have spoken on this subject have been, so to speak, on the outside looking in. I think it is time for us to hear the views of a man who should know, Dr. Robert Weaver, who presides over what he has aptly described as the "administrative monstrosity" we call the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

I ask unanimous consent that a speech by Dr. Weaver on the subject of the new Department, delivered at Rutgers University in my own State of New Jersey on January 31, be included in the Record at this point:

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ADDRESS BY ROBERT C. WEAVER, ADMINISTRATOR, HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY, TO THE URBAN STUDIES CENTER, RUTGERS UNIVERSITY, NEW BRUNSWICK, N.J., JANUARY 31, 1962

Your director, John Bebout, was remarkably farsighted when he was planning this lecture series last August. For he arranged the opening lecture in a week of great significance in the development of our national policies in urban affairs.

It was just 1 week ago today that President Kennedy announced he would send to the Congress a reorganization plan creating a Cabinet-level Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. And yesterday that plan went before Congress and before the Nation.

One of the topics it was suggested I could talk about tonight was the role of the Government in urban affairs.

The action of the President yesterday is a vital step in the development of that role. At the risk of being somewhat less academic than you might have expected, I would like to talk about it. And perhaps in the course of the discussion you will still learn something about the philosophy and the dynamics of urban affairs.

Your Urban Studies Center is now in the midst of its first year. As a consultant to the Ford Foundation I was interested in the grant which made the center possible. And now, as a Government official, I am interested in the work being carried on here.

When a grant for the Urban Studies Center was proposed to the Ford Foundation many of the same questions were raised that are now being raised about the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

Why, it was asked, was such a center needed? Academic disciplines are well defined and jealously protected. Were not the traditional disciplines carrying out all the research that was needed, and training all the specialists that were needed? Why create a center with a subject cutting across these disciplines, and confusing them?

Our answers to these questions came ultimately from history: Urban studies had become so vital to our knowledge of current problems that they needed a focus—a center where the resources of all the traditional disciplines could be concentrated, and the benefits they had to offer coordinated.

This was not a simple concept to grasp, or an easy one to convey to other people. But we persuaded enough people of its validity, the center was established, and now it is proving itself.

In helping to establish the center we were responding on the academic level to many of the same demands that now can be felt on Government. And we were reaching toward solutions at the academic level that we are now reaching toward in Government.

In his state of the Union message, just a few days ago, the President said "both equity and commonsense require that our Nation's urban areas—containing three-fourths of our population—sit as equals at the Cabinet table. I urge a new Department of Urban Affairs and Housing."

Proposals for the creation of such a Department have been before the Congress many years. They have been thoroughly investigated and considered by the committees of Congress. And the Government Operations Committees in both the Senate and the House have approved bills that would establish such a Department.

The reasons given by these committees for establishing a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing are these:

To improve the administration of Federal programs in these fields.

To provide leadership in the executive branch of our Government for the coordination of Federal activities in these fields.

To encourage State, county, local, and private efforts to solve the numerous problems resulting from the rapid growth of our urban areas.

To insure that the needs and interests of those who live in those urban areas are adequately represented in the executive branch of the Government.

Those who oppose the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing often fear creation of a new Federal bureaucracy and a mushrooming of Federal expenditures. They sometimes cite the growth in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as an example.

This is a fear which confuses cause and effect. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was created because, as President Eisenhower said: "Such action is demanded by the importance and magnitude of these functions, which affect the well-being of millions of our citizens."

The importance and magnitude of those functions did not stop growing because the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was created. They continued to grow as Congress added to them. And Congress would have added to them whether or not the Department had been established.

The Department of Urban Affairs and Housing under the reorganization plan does not, and could not, create any new governmental function. Instead it establishes a more efficient administrative structure for the performance of the functions already authorized by Congress and assigned to the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

The additional cost of the new Department would be $51,400—the compensation of the seven senior officials of that Department less the salaries now being paid for positions in the Housing and Home Finance Agency which would be abolished or become unnecessary.

The management efficiencies made possible by the new Department would offset that cost several times over.

To understand the need for the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing one really needs to understand the Housing and Home Finance Agency—and there are not many people who do.

I once made some of my associates unhappy by describing the HHFA as an "administrative monstrosity." That may not have been proper bureaucratic language. But it was a pretty accurate description. And it is about time something was done about it.

The Housing and Home Finance Agency came into being in 1947, under a reorganization plan of President Truman's. Its purpose was to bring order into the housing activities of the Federal Government as this Nation rushed to meet housing needs pent up during 15 years of depression and war.

At first the activities of the HHFA were primarily concerned with housing—the low-rent housing programs of the Public Housing Administration and the insurance of home mortgages by the Federal Housing Administration.

But over the years Congress has steadily expanded the responsibilities of the Agency in the area of urban affairs. In 1949 the slum clearance and urban renewal programs were authorized. In 1950 the Federal National Mortgage Association became part of the Agency. In 1954 the Urban Renewal Administration and the Community Facilities Administration were established within the HHFA.

Today the Housing and Home Finance Agency is no longer an agency concerned primarily with housing and home finance. Whether we call it an agency or a department, it is the arm of the Federal Government which administers its program of urban affairs and housing. And these are programs which Congress has been steadily increasing and elaborating.

We should not continue indefinitely creating new programs, expanding old ones, and turning everything over to the same creaking bureaucracy. Sooner or later a point is reached when the administrative structure must be changed, or it can no longer do what is demanded of it.

We are now far past the point with the Housing and Home Finance Agency. By every test of efficiency, of intelligent management, and of good government there must be a consolidation and reorganization of functions within this Agency if duplication, conflicts, and waste are to be eliminated. And this is one purpose of the reorganization plan proposed by the President.

Whenever we succeed in demonstrating that establishing a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing will not of itself enlarge the functions of Government, increase Government spending, or create a new bureaucracy, we arouse other misgivings.

Then it is argued that the new Department will not do anything beyond what is now being done—so why bother?

In reply we have to recall again the criteria in establishing other departments: the importance and the magnitude of the functions involved, and the number of persons whose well-being is affected.

The function of the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing would be to assist States, communities, and private interests in the preparation of comprehensive plans for community development and redevelopment; the elimination of slums and blight through clearance and rehabilitation; the planning and construction of redevelopments to provide better homes for Americans, better locations for the offices and shops where they work, and better commercial facilities to serve them; the preservation of open space in urban areas for recreation and conservation; the preservation and development of urban transportation systems; the planning and construction of community facilities; the financing of residential construction and rehabilitation; the financing of home ownership; the financing of home improvements; and the maintenance of a stable market for Government-insured mortgages.

All of these are matters of major public importance, for which policies should be set at the Cabinet level.

The provision of good housing for lower-income families has to be coordinated with the efforts of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to meet other needs of those families.

The provision of good housing for those who live on our Indian reservations has to be coordinated with the Department of the Interior.

The relationship between programs for urban, suburban and rural housing has to be coordinated with the Department of Agriculture.

Programs for the provision of housing at or near military bases must be coordinated with the plans of the Department of Defense.

Operations in the home mortgage market must be carefully coordinated with the Department of the Treasury.

Assistance to communities for the preservation of open space for recreation and conservation must be coordinated with the Department of the Interior.

Assistance to communities for the development of adequate systems of mass transportation must be coordinated with the Department of Commerce, which is responsible for our Federal highway program.

President Kennedy has not waited for the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing to begin his efforts to achieve this coordination. He began it as soon as he took office and has worked at it ever since.

His proposal for the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing is an essential next step in this continuing endeavor.

The magnitude of the functions which would be brought under the new Department of Urban Affairs and Housing is one of the strongest arguments for its creation. For it does not make sense that Government activities of such magnitude should be carried on outside the highest council of Government.

The Director of the Bureau of the Budget, David E. Bell, pointed out in his testimony on the President's proposal that only 3 of the 10 departments now in the Cabinet have larger gross expenditures than the Housing and Home Finance Agency. Those expenditures in fiscal year 1960, he told the Congress, were $4.6 billion—more than all departments save Defense, Treasury, and Agriculture.

One of the major activities of the Housing and Home Finance Agency is the provision of credit assistance to private and public borrowers and grants to local public agencies. For fiscal year 1961 the Agency's new commitments, overall, to insure private loans and make direct loans and mortgage purchases amounted to an estimated $12 billion—or almost two-thirds of the financing assistance provided by all Federal credit programs.

The Federal Housing Administration—which would continue as an entity within the proposed Department—last year insured the mortgages on about one out of every five of the new housing units built in the country. The total amount of FHA insurance which has been written is over $72 billion—making the FHA one of the largest insurance operations in the world.

The Federal National Mortgage Association—which would also remain an entity within the proposed Department—last year bought and sold over a billion dollars worth of mortgages, and increased its total holdings to over $6 billion.

Major increases in the programs of the Housing and Home Finance Agency were authorized by the Housing Act of 1961 and are provided for in the budget the President has just submitted for fiscal 1963.

These budget proposals anticipate $2.5 billion in urban renewal activity and special housing financing—more than a third greater than the program levels in the current fiscal year. FHA mortgage commitments are expected to increase 13 percent over the current fiscal year; the number of units of public housing contracts are expected to increase 17 percent.

What budget levels the Congress will determine remains to be seen, of course. But it is obvious that the magnitude of Federal activity in this field will continue to increase—whether or not the new Department is created.

The number of persons affected by its programs is another strong argument for establishing a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

The shift in population from rural to urban areas is perhaps the single most dramatic development of our time. It is a worldwide phenomenon, going on in both under-developed and highly developed countries regardless of their political or economic systems or the level of their culture.

In this country it has transformed a predominantly rural and agricultural country to one that is predominantly urban and industrial. Yet our institutional forms—of which our Government is only one—have not kept pace with this transformation. The President's proposed Department of Urban Affairs and Housing is one attempt to adapt our Government to this reality.

In 1789, when our Constitution went into effect, there were only 24 communities in the country with a population of 2,500 or more. The combined population of those urban areas was 202,000, or 5 percent of the total population of 3.9 million persons.

A century later, when the Department of Agriculture was raised to Cabinet status, 80 percent of our population lived in rural areas and only 20 percent was urban.

Today, however, 130 of the 184 million Americans live in urban areas. Two-thirds of our population increase in the last decade was in metropolitan areas. Virtually all of our future population growth—estimated at 90 million in the next 20 years—will take place in those areas.

In his message to Congress yesterday, transmitting the reorganization plan for the new Department, President Kennedy said:

"The times we live in urgently call for this action. In a few short decades we have passed from a rural to an urban way of life; in a few short decades more, we shall be a Nation of vastly expanded population, living in expanded urban areas in housing that does not now exist, served by community facilities that do not now exist, moving about by means of systems of urban transportation that do not now exist. The challenge is great and the time is short.

"Our cities and the people who live in and near them need and deserve an adequate voice in the high council of Government. The executive branch and the Congress need an adequate instrument to assist them in the formulation and execution of policy concerning urban affairs and housing. States and local governing bodies urgently need an agency at the department level to assist them in formulating and carrying out their local programs for dealing with these problems. All these needs can best be met through the establishment of the Department provided for in this reorganization plan."

Thank you for inviting me to open this series of lectures marking the centennial of the act creating our land grant colleges—a centennial coinciding with the establishment of the Department of Agriculture.

It is significant, I think, that this centennial should come at a time when our country is preparing to take another important step in Federal aid to education, and also to establish another important department of Government.

Those who profess to fear the consequences of Federal aid to education should give some thought to the history of the land grant colleges, such as Rutgers. For it was Federal aid to education in the form of land grants that made possible the great contributions made by those colleges to the growth and prosperity of our Nation.

In considering the establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing we should give thought to the precedent to be found in the establishment of the Department of Agriculture.

In his first annual message to Congress, President Lincoln said:

"Agriculture, confessedly the largest interest of the Nation, has not a department nor a bureau, but a clerkship only, assigned to it in the Government. While it is fortunate that this great interest is so independent in its nature as to not have demanded and extorted more from the Government, I respectfully ask Congress to consider whether something more cannot be given voluntarily with general advantage."

A century has passed since Lincoln penned those words. The largest interest of our Nation today is in its urban areas. We know that those areas are inadequately represented at many levels of government. And it is time, some of us believe, to "respectfully ask Congress whether something more cannot be given voluntarily with general advantage."

Here at the Urban Studies Center you are pioneering on the urban frontier. A necessary prerequisite of intelligent Government policy is knowledge—knowledge based both on political judgments and on research.

If we are to cope with the myriad problems resulting from the era of intensive urban growth into which we now have entered we will need men who have been trained to understand and assess those problems; men with the imagination to find solutions, the diligence to research them, and the judgment to implement them.

It was my hope, as a consultant to the Ford Foundation when the Urban Studies Center was first proposed, that it could be the vehicle not only for the performance of this research, but also for the training of men who will be needed to apply the results of that research.

You have made an excellent beginning in the first year of the institute. I look forward eagerly to watching your progress in the future. And I hope that as a result of your progress other colleges and universities—in addition to those which have already done so—will establish similar centers.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL THURSDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its deliberations today it stand in adjournment to meet at 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I yield to my colleague from Delaware for a unanimous-consent request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Delaware have a statement to make?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Delaware, without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the Senator from Virginia is very courteous. I shall be glad to wait.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator need 10 minutes?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not think it will take over 10 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the Senator from Virginia yielding for not to exceed 10 minutes to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. ROBERTSON. How much time did the Senator ask?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Ten minutes. Is there objection to the Senator from Virginia yielding 10 minutes to the Senator from Delaware? The Chair hears none, and without objection the Senator from Delaware is recognized.

FANCY BOOKKEEPING ON THE NEW FRONTIER

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the Kennedy administration is boasting a $1½ billion reduction in its inventories of surplus agriculture commodities.

Today I wish to discuss how this is merely a phantom $1½ billion reduction in the Government's investment in its inventories of surplus agriculture commodities, and I will show how this imaginary claim of $1½ billion reduction is in reality merely the result of some "fancy" bookkeeping on the New Frontier.

On January 12, 1962, the Department of Agriculture issued a report stating that as of November 30, 1961, the total investment of the Commodity Credit Corporation in price support loans and inventories amounted to $7,647,236,000 and called attention to the fact that on December 31, 1960, the investment of the Commodity Credit Corporation in surplus agriculture commodities had been $9,228,604,000. Thus they showed a reduction of agriculture commodities during the first 11 months on the New Frontier of approximately $1½ billion.

The President, in his farm message as sent to the Congress under date of January 30, 1962, called attention to the fact that the Government stocks of farm products have been reduced for the first time in 9 years and when his administration had taken over early last year the inventories had amounted to over $9 billion. I quote from his message:

> By the beginning of 1961—when the emergency legislation was introduced to reduce inventories—the Commodity Credit Corporation had over $9 billion in loans and inventories.

In his press conference of February 1, when commenting upon the excess inventories in our strategic stockpiling program he referred to the value of our surplus farm products now in storage as being less than $7.7 billion.

Last year the New Frontier administration under its feed grains program spent nearly $700 million, paying the American farmers to reduce their acreage of feed grains—corn, sorghums, et cetera—but this program was a dismal failure as evidence by the fact that instead of getting a reduction of 20 million acres of corn—based upon their own report—the 1961 corn acreage was reduced by only 15.4 million acres.

Thus, in 1961 the Secretary of Agriculture paid over $150 million for the removal from production of 4½ million phantom acres, acreage which never would have been put in feed grains anyway.

To cover up this multimillion-dollar failure the Kennedy administration has merely changed its bookkeeping system, and after juggling a few figures they now come up with the fantastic claim of a $1½ billion reduction during the first 11 months under the New Frontier administration in the Government's investment in inventories of surplus agriculture commodities.

I will now show that this claim of a $1½ billion reduction in the Government's investment in inventories of surplus agriculture commodities is just as unrealistic as was Mr. Kennedy's campaign dream about a missile shortage.

In fact, instead of a $1½ billion reduction there have actually been increases in the Government's stockpile of practically all commodities except cotton.

This is how the books were juggled to create this false impression:

CORN

On December 31, 1960, the Commodity Credit Corporation's books showed 1,471,276,965 bushels of corn in inventory which were carried at a value of $2,444,716,557.76. On November 30, 1961, this administration, after having paid nearly $700 million to farmers not to grow grain, ended up with an inventory of corn totaling 1,472,845,459 bushels, or an actual increase in corn inventories of 1,568,494 bushels. Now comes the fancy New Frontier style of bookkeeping. To show a reduction in the overall inventories they merely reduced the valuation of this larger inventory of corn from $2,444,716,557.76 to a lower valuation of $1,878,186,125.28. This gave them an imaginary reduction of $566,530,432.48 in the Government's investment in its inventory of corn. This reduction in inventory was claimed notwithstanding the fact that in reality they actually had over 1½ million more bushels of corn on hand.

WHEAT

The Frontiersmen followed the same procedure in juggling the values of their inventories of wheat. For instance, on December 31, 1960, the Commodity Credit Corporation reported a wheat inventory of 1,132,960,901 bushels with a total valuation as of that date of $2,948,309,682.55. Their inventory as of November 30, 1961, was 1,145,343,252 bushels upon which they placed a valuation of only $2,269,493,531.22. Thus, they showed a reduction in this category of $678,816,151.33, although wheat inventories had actually been increased by 12,382,351 bushels.

GRAIN SORGHUMS

On December 31, 1960, the Commodity Credit Corporation books show an inventory of 311,965,117 hundredweight of grain sorghums upon which they placed a valuation of $858,355,475.58. During the succeeding 11 months the Government's inventory of grain sorghums was increased by 38,407,575 hundredweight to a total of 350,372,692 hundredweight, but again in an effort to deceive the American people into thinking that under this administration's agriculture program progress was being made toward a reduction in agriculture inventories they reduced the valuation of this higher inventory to $670,700,139.92, or a reduction of $187,655,335.66. On grain sorghum during 1961 there was actually an increase of over 38 million hundredweight in inventories but the New Frontier claimed a reduction of over $187 million.

These three discrepancies alone account for $1,433,001,919.47 of the President's imaginary progress toward reducing agriculture commodity inventories.

COTTON

It is true that the Department did reduce the inventories on cotton during this first 11-month period of 1961. Cotton inventories were reduced from 4,969,016 bales on December 31, 1960, to 1,448,750 bales on November 30, 1961, with a corresponding reduction in the valuation of such inventories of around $590 million, but this reduction was many times offset by the over $1½ billion increases in inventories of corn, wheat, grain sorghums, butter, cheese, and dried milk. For instance:

BUTTER

There has been a $80 million increase in the Government's inventory of butter during the first 11 months of the Kennedy administration. One of their first actions was to raise the price supports on dairy products. This step was taken over the opposition of many farm leaders and many of us in Congress who warned that while the immediate benefits of this action might be pleasant to the farmers the long-range results would be disastrous. The result of the Government's action last year was that inventories of butter jumped from 66,295,284 pounds on December 31, 1960, valued at $39,603,695, to 199,610,965 pounds valued at $120,544,151.13 on November 30, 1961, or an increase in inventories of 133,315,681 pounds and a dollar increase of $80,940,456.13.

DRIED MILK

During the same 11-month period inventories of dried milk skyrocketed. They jumped from 279,836,322 pounds valued at $39,520,452.94 on December 31, 1960, to 355,429,573 pounds valued at $56,564,349.63 at the end of November 30, 1961. This was an increase in dried milk inventories of 75,593,251 pounds or a dollar increase in inventories of $17,043,896.69.

CHEESE

Under the Kennedy administration the Government's inventories of cheese jumped from zero on December 30, 1960, to 57,627,324 pounds valued at $21,894,770.98 at the end of November 1961.

This represents a total increase in inventories of dairy products—butter, dried milk, and cheese—of around $120 million during the first 11 months of the Kennedy administration.

The actual figures prove that there can be no possible justification for the fictitious claim that under the New Frontier they have reduced the inventories of wheat, corn, and grain sorghums by around $1.4 billion during the first 11 months of their administration. The fine print in their own books shows actual increases in inventories of all three commodities.

This fictitious claim of a $1½ billion reduction in inventories of surplus agriculture commodities was for no other reason than to cover up the fact that the Kennedy administration's feed grains program of 1961 was a complete fizzle and to kid the American taxpayers and in particular to fool the American farmers into believing that they are actually making progress under the New Frontier's agricultural program.

At a time of the year when the Federal Government is expecting all American taxpayers to render a proper accounting of their 1961 earnings the least the administration could do is to be equally as honest in reporting to the people on its own operations.

STOCKPILING

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an article entitled, "Kennedy Impaled on Own Stockpiling Petard?" This article appeared in a recent issue of the New York Herald Tribune.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KENNEDY IMPALED ON OWN STOCKPILING PETARD?

(By Donald I. Rogers)

There can be no doubt that the stockpiling proclivities of the U.S. Government are—and always have been—something to merit not only constant supervision but frequent investigation. It is an amusing part of the legend that until a few years back the Army maintained a fairly substantial stockpile of cavalry saddles along with its unused hoards of canned hamburgers and tinned willie-beef.

Unless there is a big scandal brewing, however, as Washington correspondents have been hinting, President Kennedy displayed unusual irresponsibility in his purely gratuitous and unsubstantiated statement that there had been "unconscionable profits" in the stockpiling program.

If Mr. Kennedy wants an investigation of stockpiling, he should have asked for it.

If, however, he wanted to make an indictment of the business community (whose support he has been wooing), that is exactly what he did.

With his ill-advised indictment of the businessman, though, he also indicted his own administration, for he clearly pointed up the fact that the Government, which he wants to have supervise economics for everyone everywhere, can't even handle its own economic and business affairs properly.

For the stockpiling is done by Government, not by business. The Government does the buying; business, the selling.

Government buying of strategic materials has been based on two basic ideas: (1) To stockpile things that must be shipped to this country from foreign ports and thus might be in doubtful supply during a war; and (2) to stockpile things mined or produced domestically that, normally, were not mined or produced in sufficient capacity to enable the country to fight a war.

In the case of the former, the profits involved were turned over to the foreign producers. In the case of the latter (domestic producers), prices paid by the Government were usually destitute prices, paid to keep an operation in business or to increase capacity.

This was not particularly true in aluminum (as it was in silver and other metals), but since the President singled out aluminum, it might be well to give that area some consideration.

At the outset of World War II aluminum was in desperately short supply. As a result, the Government created several multibillion-dollar aluminum producing plants.

It built up the producing capacity of the American aluminum industry and even went so far as to create plants in other parts of the world nearer the source of supply (Ghana, for instance).

At war's end, anxious to get out of business, the Government sold its aluminum plants to Reynolds, Kaiser, and others at less than cost, and obliged them to go into business against an established giant like Alcoa.

Betimes the stockpiling of aluminum continued—at the behest of Government, at prices fixed by Government.

But what is the biggest problem besetting the aluminum industry today? It is overcapacity.

Overcapacity is the problem in uranium, too, though it was only a few years back that the Government couldn't buy enough of it.

It wasn't until Uncle Sam had urged prospectors to go into all parts of the globe seeking uranium ores that it was discovered that the one thing the old world seems to be loaded with is uranium. We didn't need so much. Stockpiling ended.

This is only to point out that stockpiling requirements change from week to week, month to month. Only a short time ago, the Government couldn't buy enough lithium because it was regarded as the best of the high energy fuels for missiles. Later, scientists changed their minds. The stockpiling ceased.

Some armchair strategists say we should stockpile for a 3- to 5-year war. Others say we needn't bother because any war of the future may be ended in a few days.

Yet commonsense indicates that it isn't war we're concerned with so much as source of supply. Take tin. The principal supply comes from Latin America where, anyone must admit, the possibility exists that the United States could become persona non grata. The second, and to all practical purposes, the only other source of supply of tin is from the Congo. This is an area where the source could be shut off at any time.

Under these conditions, who's to measure the length of time a stockpile should serve us?

The important thing is that most of this strategic stockpile has a market value. If we have overbought in any ore, metal, or product, most of them can be sold at current market prices, and that should mean, in most cases, that they can be sold at a profit.

So what's so bad about all this?

PEOPLE-TO-PEOPLE SENATOR — A TRIBUTE TO SENATOR HARRY BYRD

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, there appeared in the February 7 issue of the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, an excellent article written by Mr. Holmes Alexander entitled "People-to-People Senator."

In this article a well-deserved tribute is paid to one of the ablest Members of the U.S. Senate—Senator HARRY F. BYRD.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEOPLE-TO-PEOPLE SENATOR

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON.—The U.S. Senate, like life itself, is full of pleasant surprises. Senator HARRY BYRD, one of the best-liked yet least accurately portrayed southerners of the clubby upper Chamber, went to the grassroots during the last recess, and had a perfectly wonderful time in ways that do not at all fit his public image.

Senator BYRD, the Virginia apple farmer and patriarch, flew 35,000 miles around the world, with a side trip or two, accompanied by a 20-language linguist so that he could talk with the folks far from the diplomatic centers in Japan, India, Nepal, Thailand, South Vietnam, Hong Kong, Italy, and way stops.

PAID OWN FARE

Although Senator BYRD was traveling primarily to equip himself with knowledge on measures that will come before the Finance and Armed Services Committees, he paid his own way. This is characteristic of the Senate's finest gentleman and legislative scholar, but almost exotic by modern political standards. I asked him why he went into his own pocket, and he said as casually as if he were imparting the time of day:

"If a man's able to pay his own way, he ought to do it. Besides, I wanted to do things, like mountain climbing, that were not strictly chargeable to committee work."

AVOIDED THE TOUR

Traveling unofficially, he dined with only two ambassadors and avoided anything like a guided tour. The Finance chairman, who will preside over the President's trade proposal Senate hearings, saw Japanese girls working at 28 cents an hour with American-bestowed machinery. Legalized abortion has halted runaway population in Japan, he reported, where the increase in the annual birth rate is only 1.5 percent. India's is 3 percent.

As ranking Democrat on Armed Services, where the President's new worldwide military policies are under review, Senator BYRD stood at the electrified wire fence between

British Hong Kong and Red China, flew in a single-engine plane around the lower ranges of Mt. Everest in the Himalayas, which stand partly in Nepal and partly in Tibet, and discussed guerrilla warfare and Red infiltration tactics with on-the-spot observers.

SKEPTICAL ABOUT ASIA

No true Virginian is ever a defeatist, and Senator BYRD does not believe in abandoning any people to communism—but he came away from southeast Asia feeling very skeptical about what the United States can do with arms and money.

The Senator has discussed his trip with the President, and does not plan the usual Senate floor travelog with which colleagues often regale the club. In a way, it's too bad because his private descriptions of the Taj Mahal, of snow-capped Fujiyama, of fuming Vesuvius and fog-bound Etna are classics. The results of Senator BYRD's journey will become manifest in the questions he puts to committee witnesses and the advice he gives on final passage of legislation. That's why he comes to Washington for the congressional sessions, and that's what he does.

A MOUNTAIN MAN

These realities about Senator BYRD don't fit the orthodox public portrayal of somebody more interested in budgets than people, a naysayer on nearly everything concerning foreign policy. But the Senator, born and raised in the Shenandoah Valley in the azure shadow of the Blue Ridge Mountains, has been in love with mountains ever since he began the Shenandoah National Park during his Virginia governorship three decades ago.

He personally sold President Roosevelt on the magnificient Skyline Drive across the southern highlands of Virginia, North Carolina, and Tennessee.

While he didn't start traveling abroad until a mission at the end of World War II took him to Europe to consult with General Eisenhower, he has been quietly on the go ever since.

A TRIBUTE TO BOYCE HOUSE, FAMED TEXAS STORYTELLER

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Boyce House, one of the best known Texans of our times, has passed from the land of the living. Best known as a humorist, his works were quoted by Bennett Cerf. Carl Sandburg said his writing was of "that peculiar brand of valor and swagger which is Texas," and John Gunther said, "It's impossible to describe Texas without borrowing some of House's stories."

Boyce House's writings and compilations of Texas tall stories brought delight to the hearts of legions of readers over the years. More copies of his books have been sold than of any other Texas writer. Over 130,000 copies were sold of one of his books.

Mr. House was a talented and beloved humorist, storyteller, lecturer, after-dinner speaker, and poet whose brilliance will be missed on the American and Texas scene.

While Boyce House is best known as a writer and humorist, he was also a student of oratory and political reforms, a crusader of the agrarian populist type, who adored William Jennings Bryan, dedicated one of his books to Mr. Highsaw, his debate coach at Memphis (Tenn.) High School, and could quote Ingersoll, Bryan, and other orators by the hour. Boyce House's contribution to the political life of Texas was considerable, and all for the better.

He covered political campaigns in Texas as a news reporter, then served successfully as publicity director, campaign manager, and candidate himself, in statewide political campaigns. Twice he was a candidate for Lieutenant Governor of Texas, the second time he made the runoff Democratic primary and ran a very strong race, sweeping many counties.

Boyce House was my friend. He aided me with his counsel in my own political races, and in one of my early races, served as statewide director of publicity. We spent weeks on the road together, traveling by automobile. Of all the people I have ever worked with in my political campaigns, Boyce House had the most fertile brain, vivid imagination, and came up with more original ideas.

Following his father's profession as a newspaperman, he began his training as a cub reporter on the Memphis Commercial Appeal. Ever after he paid ready and affectionate tribute to Editor C. P. J. Mooney as one of the great editors of America.

Later Boyce House was an outstanding Texas reporter on the Fort Worth Star-Telegram.

While some will say Boyce House's greatest fame will come as a humorist, or writer, or poet (his poetry was published in poetry magazines in both England and the United States), to me, he stands greatest as a friend. No economic pressure, no threats of reprisal, could dissuade him from standing with a friend in time of stress and need. As we say in Texas, "He will do to ride the river with." Out across the Great Divide, Boyce House's soul will be riding with similar trusty spirits.

Though Boyce House was best known as a writer of books on humor, his serious articles on history have been printed in a number of regional historical magazines and quarterlies.

At the time of his death, House was at work on two unpublished manuscripts—a life of William Jennings Bryan, and an account of his own political experiences in Texas.

Shortly before his death, he confided to a friend: "My book on Texas politics will be my best book. Who else has had the background for such a book as I have had? Who else has had successive experiences as a reporter covering statewide campaigns, then publicity director for statewide candidates, campaign manager for statewide candidates, speech writer and platform builder, then twice myself a candidate for statewide office; who else in Texas who can write has had such experiences?"

The stillness of destiny cut short his best manuscript.

The published works of Mr. House include: "As I Was Saying"; "City of Flaming Adventure: The Chronicle of San Antonio"; "Cowtown Columnist"; "Cub Reporter"; "Friendly Feudin', Alaska versus Texas"; "How I Took Hollywood By Storm"; "I Give You Texas"; "Laugh Parade of States, Star-Spangled Wit and Humor"; "Oil Boom, the Story of Spindletop, Burkburnett, Mexia, Smachover, Desdemona and Ranger"; "Oil Field Fury"; "Roaring Ranger, The World's Biggest Boom"; "Roundup of Texas Humor"; "Tall Talk from Texas"; "Texas Laughs and The Amazing Truth About Texas"; "Texas Proud and Loud"; "Texas Rhythm and Other Poems"; "Texas Treasure Chest"; "Were You in Ranger?"; and "You Can Always Tell a Texan (But You Can't Tell Him Very Much)."

It was Mr. House who delighted the Nation in 1928 as a newswriter with his stories about "Old Rip," the now-legendary horned frog from Eastland County, Tex.

In view of the place of honor that Boyce House holds in the hearts of Americans, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD the following newspaper articles:

"Writer-Humorist Boyce House Dies," Dallas Times Herald, Sunday, December 31, 1961,

"Boyce House, Texan," Dallas Times Herald, January 2, 1962,

"Footnotes to Texas Life Died With Boyce House," Fort Worth Star-Telegram, January 1, 1962,

"Braggingest Texan, Boyce House, Dies," Forth Worth Star-Telegram, December 31, 1961.

"Boyce House Made 'Old Rip' Famous," the Abilene Reporter-News, December 31, 1961,

"Boyce House," the Abilene Reporter-News, January 2, 1962,

"Boyce House Rites Set Wednesday," Dallas Times Herald, January 1, 1962,

"This Is West Texas," Fort Worth Star-Telegram, January 5, 1962,

"House Praised in Resolution," Fort Worth Star-Telegram, January 5, 1962,

"Town Plans Memorial," Fort Worth Star-Telegram, January 5, 1962,

"Lions Boost Show, Pay House Tribute," Fort Worth Star-Telegram, January 4, 1962,

"Funeral Services Held for Humorist," Fort Worth Star-Telegram, January 4, 1962.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Dallas Times Herald, Dec. 31, 1961]

WRITER-HUMORIST BOYCE HOUSE DIES

FORT WORTH.—Boyce House, known as the braggingest Texan of them all, was found dead in his bed at his hotel here today.

The 64-year-old author and humorist, whose books of Texas tales have sold hundreds of thousands of copies, apparently died of a heart attack.

He had picked up his morning newspaper and gone back to bed to read it. A maid became concerned when he failed to rise and discovered him dead shortly before noon.

House suffered a heart attack last September and had been in ill health in recent months.

Although he had written on various topics, it was House's compilations of tall Texas tales that brought him renown. Most of the stories were familiar ones, but House maintained that people would rather hear stories they've already heard than new ones.

House started writing in 1935, but it was the publication of "I Give You Texas" in 1943 that gave him his first big boost. The book sold 130,000 copies, many of them to Texans overseas fighting the war.

Then came "Tall Talk From Texas" and "Texas Proud and Loud." Many others followed.

His only books not devoted to Texas were "Cub Reporter," about his newspaper days on the Memphis Commercial Appeal, and "Laugh Parade of States," a collection of funny stories from all over the United States.

VALOR, SWAGGER

House never went to college, but he didn't let that handicap him.

Carl Sandburg has described House's writing as "that peculiar blend of valor and swagger which is Texas."

House was born in Piggott, Ark., where his father was a printer and editor of a weekly newspaper. He spent his early boyhood in Texas, grew up in Memphis and returned to Texas in 1920.

He became editor of Eastland's daily newspaper in 1921, and it was there in 1928 that he broke the story of "Old Rip."

Old Rip was a horned frog which had been placed in the cornerstone of the Eastland County Courthouse 31 years before. The building was being torn down, and the man who had entombed the toad—then County Clerk Ernest Wood—believed it would be found alive.

RIP'S FAME

House, although dubious, saw the possibilities of the story and set it before his readers. A crowd of thousands gathered to view the opening of the cornerstone—and the horned frog was found alive.

They named it Old Rip and took it on a national tour which even reached the White House. President Coolidge was kept waiting 10 minutes for a chance to see the toad.

Old Rip died of pneumonia after a year of glory. His body now rests in a satin-lined casket in a glass case in the lobby of the Eastland County Courthouse.

In 1942 and 1946 House was a candidate for the Democratic nomination for Lieutenant Governor. He failed to make the runoff in 1942 but in 1946 he ran Allan Shivers a close second.

[From the Dallas Times Herald, Jan. 2, 1962]

BOYCE HOUSE, TEXAN

Texas brags about many things, sometimes with good reason.

And none ever bragged about his adopted State more than did Boyce House, writer, newsman, and folklorist, who made a career of telling other people about Texas. Among his better known books was one called "Texas Brags."

He began his newspaper career at Memphis, Tenn., and came to Texas in 1921, working as editor of newspapers at Ranger and Eastland during the oil boom there. Later he moved to Fort Worth and worked for the Star-Telegram, wrote national magazine articles and helped write a motion picture, "Boomtown."

In 1946 he made his fling at politics, being defeated by Allan Shivers in the race for Lieutenant Governor. Later he was in the public relations business and maintained a Dallas office. He wrote a newspaper column for Texas papers, "I Give You Texas."

Boyce House died Saturday at his home in Fort Worth. News of his death will cause many Texans to start reminiscing. Nothing, probably, would please him more than to have his thousands of friends recall the yarns he loved to spin. Boyce House was for "Texas Proud and Loud."

[From the Fort Worth Star-Telegram, Jan. 1, 1962]

FOOTNOTES TO TEXAS LIFE DIED WITH BOYCE HOUSE

There were those who thought Boyce House had the faculty of total recall—that he remembered everything he had ever heard, seen or read. He didn't and that, more than anything else, is what made him such a prolific writer. That and his love for Texas, its people and the minutiae of its history.

Boyce House—you seldom heard his name uttered except in this conjoint fashion—traveled a great deal over Texas as a newspaper reporter and free lance writer, and he heard and observed a prodigious lot. His mind soaked up Texas lore and Texas talk like a sponge. But because there is a limit even to what a sponge can retain, he committed as much of it as he could to paper. He wrote like he talked—in a bluestreak, putting down thousands upon thousands of words at a single sitting.

It was the off beat, the humorous, that chiefly interested him, especially as it reflected the character of the greats in Texas history and politics or cast a sidelight on the larger issues of past or present. And because these bits interested him, he believed they would interest others. They did, as the sales of his 15 books and his popularity as a speaker before luncheon clubs and other organizations attested. It is probable that he did as much as anyone else, or more, to build the reputation of the Texan as a teller of tall tales. Certainly he did as much as anyone to prove that these tales often are based more on fact than on fiction.

There are few who have the vacuum-sweeper facility for gathering up humorous stories and odd bits of information that Boyce House had, and fewer still who realize they are worth preserving and have the diligence to do it. More's the pity, for at his death last week Boyce House's mind and notebooks were far from empty, and much of this sort of material was still unwritten. This means that a great many footnotes to Texas life and history—illuminating as well as entertaining—died with him.

[From the Fort Worth Star-Telegram, Dec. 31, 1961]

BRAGGINGEST TEXAN, BOYCE HOUSE, DIES

(By Norman Lunger)

Boyce House, known as the braggingest Texan of them all, was found dead in his bed here Saturday.

The 65-year-old author and humorist, whose books of Texas tales have sold hundreds of thousands of copies, apparently died of a heart attack about 6 a.m.

He had picked up his morning newspaper and gone back to bed to read it. A maid became concerned when he failed to rise and discovered him dead shortly before noon.

TALL TALE TELLER

He resided in the Coates Hotel Apartments, 611 West Fourth.

House suffered a heart attack last September and had been in ill health in recent months.

He was active as executive vice president of the Association Consumer Finance Companies of Texas until his heart attack. He had been with the Dallas-based firm 8 years.

Although he had written on various topics, it was House's compilations of tall Texas tales that brought him renown. Most of the stories were familiar ones, but House maintained that people would rather hear stories they've already heard than new ones.

"Texans at heart are really modest," he said, "but when we tell the plain, unadorned, unretouched truth about our incomparable State, we are accused of exaggerating."

BIG BOOST

House started writing in 1935, but it was the publication of "I Give You Texas" in 1943 that gave him his first big boost. The book sold 130,000 copies, many of them to Texans overseas fighting the war.

Then came "Tall Talk From Texas" and "Texas Proud and Loud." Many others followed.

His only books not devoted to Texas were "Cub Reporter," about his newspaper days on the Memphis Commercial-Appeal, and "Laugh Parade of States," a collection of funny stories from all over the United States.

House never went to college, but he didn't let that handicap him.

Carl Sandburg has described House's writing as "that peculiar blend of valor and swagger which is Texas."

John Gunther has said, "It's impossible to describe Texas without borrowing some of House's stories."

"OLD RIP" STORY

House was born in Piggott, Ark., where his father was a printer and editor of a weekly newspaper. He spent his early boyhood in Texas, grew up in Memphis and returned to Texas in 1920.

He became editor of Eastland's daily newspaper in 1921, and it was there in 1928 that he broke the story of "Old Rip."

Old Rip was a horned frog which had been placed in the cornerstone of the Eastland County courthouse 31 years before. The building was being torn down, and the man who had entombed the toad—then County Clerk Ernest Wood—believed it would be found alive.

House, although dubious, saw the possibilities of the story and set it before his readers. A crowd of thousands gathered to view the opening of the cornerstone—and the horned frog was found alive.

They named it Old Rip and took it on a national tour which even reached the White House. President Coolidge was kept waiting 10 minutes for a chance to see the toad.

MANY TALENTS

Old Rip died of pneumonia after a year of glory. His body now rests in a satinlined casket in a glass case in the lobby of the Eastland County courthouse.

House also edited newspapers at Ranger, Cisco, Olney and Brady and was on the staff of the Star-Telegram for 5 years in the mid-1930's. For many years he wrote a column for weekly newspapers and conducted a radio program.

In 1942 and 1946 House was a candidate for the Democratic nomination for lieutenant governor. He failed to make the runoff in 1942 but in 1946 he ran Allan Shivers a close second.

House served as publicity manager for the Frontier Fiesta here in 1937 and for the Southwestern Exposition and Fat Stock Show for several years.

His poem, "Cities," was used in the Casa Manana program of 1936 and was probably the most widely quoted poem of Texas' centennial year.

WROTE POEMS

Most of his poems were in free verse, unrhymed and irregular but rhythmic.

Many of them were written in the reading room of the old Carnegie Library here. He dashed most of them off in longhand in less than half an hour.

House served as technical adviser and writing consultant for the MGM film "Boom Town," based on the Burkburnett oil boom.

He also made numerous appearances as a speaker in Texas and other parts of the United States. He maintained a full schedule of engagements until late last summer.

Surviving are two sisters, including Miss Vivian House of Washington, D.C.

Harveson & Cole will announce funeral arrangements.

[From the Abilene Reporter-News, Dec. 31, 1961]

EASTLAND COUNTY DAYS—BOYCE HOUSE MADE "OLD RIP" FAMOUS

West Texans—particularly those who live in Eastland County—will remember Boyce House, 65-year-old humorist who died Saturday in Fort Worth, as the newspaper editor who turned a horned frog into a world-famous legend of the Lone Star State.

House, an Arkansan by birth, migrated to Ranger in July of 1921 and remained there 10 years. He edited papers at Ranger, Eastland and Cisco during the period.

While editing the Eastland paper in 1928, he learned one day that a live horned frog had been placed in the courthouse cornerstone in 1897, and he sent out a news dispatch.

Then some weeks afterward, the old building was torn down and the cornerstone was opened, revealing Old Rip the horned frog; and it was House who told the world about it.

Travelers approaching Eastland today can still see signs advertising that the Eastland County seat is the home of the famed horned toad. Old Rip's remains—the frog died of pneumonia about a year after he was discovered—rest in a miniature casket on a marble pedestal in the courthouse lobby.

House also reported the famous Santa Claus Bank Robbery at Cisco on December 23, 1927, which left two officers shot fatally and three robbers dead of gunshot, execution and lynching.

The journalist recalled to another newsman several years ago that he followed the chase of the bandits throughout the county, admitting that "I tried not to get too close."

But he nearly got shot anyway when an eager lawman pulled a riot gun out of the car too fast. The shot peppered the oak leaves of a tree over House's head.

He is credited with some unusual firsts, including promoting the first night football game at Eastland in the 1920's with electric lights strung across the football field—a hazard for punters, but a pleasure to the viewers, it was reported.

The first of his more than a dozen books was "Were You in Ranger?" published in 1935. It told of experiences during the Ranger oil boom days, a boom which had faded before House came to Ranger. He followed that book with another in 1951—"Roaring Ranger, the World's Biggest Boom."

House also was chief drum beater for Cisco's Big Dam Loboot when that team and the Abilene Eagles were rivals.

Long after he left Eastland County to live in Fort Worth, House returned to central west Texas on many occasions as a banquet speaker.

[From the Abilene Reporter-News, Jan. 2, 1962]

BOYCE HOUSE

Boyce House, the Texas funny man, is gone.

His colorful career was ended by a fatal heart attack Saturday in the Fort Worth hotel where he lived.

Boyce House went to Eastland in 1921 and pursued a newspaper career there and at Ranger while the oil boom was still alive.

Also, he encountered Old Rip, the horned frog.

House applied his bountiful ability and unmatched humor to the extravagances of the oil boomtowns in which it was his fortune to live, and made Ranger, Eastland, and Old Rip famous from that time on.

He was a storyteller without peer, a talent which made him a favorite character on the banquet circuit, and which produced a number of successful books dealing with the tall tales of Texas.

Boyce House brought good clean humor to leaven the toils of life.

He will be missed, but long remembered.

[From the Dallas Times Herald, Jan. 1, 1962]

BOYCE HOUSE RITES SET WEDNESDAY

FORT WORTH.—They tell tall tales about Texas the world over and Boyce House probably told the tallest tales of them all.

His books and newspaper articles earned him titles such as "Mister Texas" and "Cowtown Columnist" and fame as the world's foremost collector, author, and teller of big lies about Texas.

"He writes with that peculiar blend of valor and swagger which is Texas," Carl Sandburg, poet-author, once said.

Funeral services for House are scheduled at 4 p.m. Wednesday at a Fort Worth funeral home. He died Saturday, apparently of a heart attack. He was 65.

He was home recuperating from a heart attack he suffered September 4. Survivors include two sisters, Miss Vivian House of Washington, D.C., and Mrs. Marian Faulk, of Jacksonville, Fla.

House, a native of Brinkley, Ark., began his career working for the Memphis, Tenn., Commercial Appeal. He moved to Texas in 1921, worked as editor of papers at Ranger and Eastland, then moved to Fort Worth to work for the Star Telegram.

He turned out 15 books. They were collections of tall Texas tales under such titles as "Texas Brags," "Texas Proud and Loud," and "I Give You Texas."

[From the Fort Worth Star-Telegram, Jan. 5, 1962]

THIS IS WEST TEXAS

(By George Dolan)

The day they buried Boyce House was gray and drab. There was a chill in the air and some rain fell.

The funeral oration, though, was warm and affectionate, just the kind of farewell message Boyce House would have liked.

The minister, Rev. Hayden Edwards, described his first meeting with House, a quarter century ago, and their friendship since.

He even recalled that House used to refer to him as a man who had traveled extensively over five counties.

There were Texas yellow roses on the casket and one of the organ numbers was "Texas, Our Texas."

It was an appropriate goodby motif to the humorist who did so much to publicize the State of his choice. A national magazine once described him as Texas No. 1 booster.

MUTUAL BENEFIT

The relationship between House and his State, though, was mutually beneficial.

If House hadn't come to Texas in 1920 and grown so fond of the place, he might have lived out his years as an obscure country newspaper editor in Arkansas.

And, if it hadn't been for ill health, he may not have come to Texas at all.

As it was, he was rundown physically and decided to spend the winter in a family-style hotel at Cotulla.

That's where he became acquainted with Texas jokes.

The traveling men who stopped there began plying him with tall Texas tales as soon as they learned he was from out of State.

One was the one-ranger, one-mob story. Another was the Admiral Byrd comment when he reached the pole: "Boy, I'll bet it's cold at Amarillo."

House was a serious young man then, though bent on writing a book about the romance of the oilfields.

So, after regaining his health, he went to work on Eastland County newspapers and gathered material for his book, "Were You in Ranger?"

One reviewer treated the book kindly but suggested that the one-ranger, one-mob anecdote, which House had used, be put to pasture.

Some years later, though, House was chatting with three Texans in the lobby of an Austin hotel. He told the old one-ranger, one-mob story and got a big laugh.

ACTIVE MEMORY

He learned that two of the men never had heard it before. The third hadn't heard it in years.

So House, whose memory was as active as his tongue and pen, began jotting down all the Texas stories he had heard through the years. He turned them into "I Give You Texas," which sold more than 100,000 copies in its first 2 years.

"It didn't take long to write," he explained later, "but I was a long time in gathering the stories—from the winter of 1920 to 1940."

He wrote other books and magazine articles and delivered countless speeches—some, for pay, at dinners; others, for free, at bull sessions with friends.

At his funeral, one friend said: "It's a shame to be saying goodby to such a bright guy on such a drab day."

"No," argued another friend. "I think it's appropriate. With Boyce gone, Texas can't help but be a drabber place."

[From the Fort Worth Star-Telegram, Jan. 5, 1962]

HOUSE PRAISED IN RESOLUTION

AUSTIN, January 4.—The senate adopted a resolution Thursday reciting that "the great Southwest lost a great son" in the death of Boyce House in Fort Worth, December 30.

The resolution said the longtime newspaperman and author of tall tales about Texas will live in the hearts and minds of men and women as long as the friendly flag of the Lone Star waves over our free land.

Senator Doyle Willis of Fort Worth sponsored the resolution, which was cosigned by Senators Dorsey Hardeman, of San Angelo, and Tom Creighton, of Mineral Wells.

[From the Fort Worth Star-Telegram, Jan. 5, 1962]

BOYCE HOUSE—TOWN PLANS MEMORIAL

EASTLAND, January 4.—The Eastland Chamber of Commerce announced plans Thursday to establish a permanent memorial to Boyce House, Texas author and humorist who died Saturday in Fort Worth.

Chamber Manager Lee Ellis said he had written to Governor Daniel asking for suggestions and aid in the project. The chamber has not decided what form the memorial will take.

House came here in 1921 as editor of the Oil Belt News, a daily newspaper in the oil boomtown. In 1928 he centered nationwide attention on Eastland with the story of "Old Rip," a horned frog that reportedly lived for 31 years in the cornerstone of the old Eastland County courthouse.

The frog was taken on a national tour which included a stop at the White House, then occupied by Calvin Coolidge.

Several of House's books concerned the oil boom days in Eastland County.

[From the Fort Worth Star-Telegram, Jan. 4, 1962]

FORT WORTH LIONS BOOST SHOW, PAY HOUSE TRIBUTE

(By Bob Bain)

WALNUT SPRINGS, January 3.—In the tradition that Boyce House would appreciate—the show must go on—a bus load of Lions Club members traveled south of Fort Worth Wednesday to boom the Southwestern Exposition and Fat Stock Show.

At 4 p.m., however, somewhere between here and Meridian, the boosters' bus was stopped along the highway and silent tribute was paid to House, one of the show's greatest boosters.

House was a former publicity director for the stock show. He died Saturday of a heart attack.

His funeral services were held in Fort Worth at 4 p.m., Wednesday, and that's when the bus paused to allow the boosters to add their tribute to the braggingest Texan of 'em all.

"He is here in spirit," said Chester Hollis, one of the boosters. "If he were here, he would say, 'Let the show go on.'"

The boosters boomed out the word on the 1962 stock show at Alvarado, Grandview, Itasca, and Hillsboro Wednesday morning, then dined with the Waco Lions Club.

Corky Makarwich of the River Oaks Lions told the Waco group that the stock show has been going on for 66 years, and invited them to see the 1962 show.

Wednesday afternoon, the booster bus stopped at McGregor, then went on to Gatesville, where it was welcomed by Chamber of Commerce Manager Al Hopkins and Chief of Police Glenn White.

At Clifton, Police Chief George Robinson was on hand, and Makarwich and Hap Hovenkamp told about 200 persons attending a stock auction there about the Fort Worth show.

At Granbury, the bus was met by Bill Pike, police chief; Jack Wortham, chamber of commerce president; Joe Noah, chamber director; and Homer Sargent, chamber manager.

[From the Fort Worth Star-Telegram, Jan. 4, 1962]

FUNERAL SERVICES HELD FOR HUMORIST

(By C. L. Richhart)

The soft strains of "Texas, Our Texas" were heard Wednesday as a final tribute to Boyce House, author and humorist who made Texas the theme of his lifework, at funeral services for him.

A blanket of yellow Texas roses covered the casket as Rev. Hayden Edwards, pastor of First Methodist Church in Arlington, commended House for "a good life and the homespun philosophy and good humor" he provided for people around the world.

"As a Texan who had a close association with Boyce House for more than 25 years, I thought so highly of his books on Texas that I carried them with me as an Air Force chaplain on preaching missions in many parts of the world," Rev. Mr. Edwards said.

He said he had considered it a privilege to have helped bring pleasant memories of Texas to men across the seas by presenting them with copies of House's "I Give You Texas."

The minister said he first met House about 25 years ago in Clifton when Lions Clubs members came there to boost the Southwestern Exposition and Fat Stock Show.

"But what I remember most vividly about Boyce House were the thoughtful letters that came to me after those visits, expressing appreciation for our hospitality and his personal thanks for kindnesses," Rev. Mr. Edwards recalled. "This brand of thoughtfulness was so typical of Boyce House wherever he went."

Rev. Mr. Edwards remembered that when he came to Fort Worth it was Boyce House who introduced him at the Fort Worth Lions Club, "and I recall it was the year I served the club as president that Boyce became a candidate for Lieutenant Governor.

He reminded the many friends and longtime associates of House who filled the Harveson & Cole drawing room that "all of you remember and can put to good use through the years to brighten the lives of others, the writings and many fine things Boyce House accomplished in his lifetime."

Rev. Mr. Edwards read the 23d Psalm as the text for the scriptural part of the services, and Mrs. James W. Davis sang "The Lord's Prayer." Mrs. Walter L. Zichner, organist, played the State song to conclude the services.

Floral displays were centered with a large horseshoe, a symbol of the tireless efforts of House both as writer and speaker expended in behalf of the stock show and livestock interests throughout west Texas and the Southwest.

Among those who came to pay him last respects were a number of long-time friends, newspapermen, and others, from west Texas.

Active pallbearers were Vic LeMay, Jack Gordon, Tony Slaughter, Les Strother, Paul Monroe, and Amon Carter, Jr.

The services were concluded at Greenwood.

ANNUAL REPORT BY THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the annual report by the Federal Bureau of Investigation is always a matter of real significance to those whose duties are concerned with law enforcement and the internal security of this Nation.

Last year's annual report was a sobering one in that it depicted the continued growth of crime and subversion, yet reassuring in that it painted the true picture of an FBI that is moving capably and efficiently to preserve both our laws and our security.

The year 1961 was another of achievement by this splendid agency.

I wish to pay tribute to its Director, J. Edgar Hoover, and to the many dedicated Federal agents who labor ceaselessly for our protection.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a résumé of the annual report of the Federal Bureau of Investigation to the Attorney General of the United States.

There being no objection, the résumé of the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION,
Washington, D.C.

In a yearend report to Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, Director J. Edgar Hoover has announced that significant increases were recorded in several major categories of FBI accomplishments during 1961.

Mr. Hoover disclosed that final tabulations for the year will show more than 12,400 convictions in FBI cases compared with 12,021 in 1960; the apprehension of nearly 10,700 FBI fugitives compared with 9,739 last year; and fines, savings and recoveries totaling approximately $150 million—an amount far exceeding the funds spent to operate the FBI during 1961.

Calling attention to major crime problems confronting the FBI, Mr. Hoover stated that a record total of more than 900 violations of the Federal bank robbery and incidental crimes statute have been reported to the FBI this year. Another alltime high was established with the location of nearly 19,000 stolen cars in investigations under the interstate transportation of stolen motor vehicles statute.

The FBI Director also stressed the critical menace to society of sex criminals, pointing to the kidnap-murders of the Carroll Vernon Jackson family by Melvin Davis Rees, Jr. Rees, a violent sex offender, was convicted of the sadistic crimes against the Jackson family at trials in both State and Federal courts this year.

Among the other kidnapers successfully prosecuted in State courts during 1961 following FBI investigations were:

Joseph Corbett, Jr., who was convicted of the murder of intended kidnap victim Adolph Coors III near Denver, Colo.

Frank Marrone and four criminal associates who were responsible for the abduction of Anthony Alessio at San Diego, Calif. In addition to apprehending Mr. Alessio's kidnapers, FBI agents recovered more than $182,000 of the $200,000 ransom which had been paid for his release.

Other FBI cases singled out for special mention were the attempted hijacking of a jet airliner at El Paso, Tex., last August by a 38-year-old parolee and his teenage son, and the investigation of attempts to control certain areas of professional boxing by an underworld syndicate. In the latter case, the notorious "Frankie" Carbo, "Blinky" Palermo, Joseph Sica, Louis Tom Dragna, and Truman Gibson, Jr., were convicted on Federal extortion and antiracketeering charges.

Commenting on the series of anticrime bills passed by the 87th Congress, Mr. Hoover stated: "These laws provide us valuable new tools for combating the professional elements of the underworld whose operations extend across State lines. Effective use is already being made of them in our intensive campaign against organized crime and racketeering."

These anticrime bills include laws designed to combat interstate aspects of illegal gambling and racketeering enterprises, as well as to curtail interstate travel of hoodlum elements. The FBI Director was particularly enthusiastic in heralding the extension of the Fugitive Felon Act last October.

"The Fugitive Felon Act is one of law enforcement's most effective weapons for countering the operations of fast-moving, modern-day hoodlums," Mr. Hoover said, "During 1961, FBI investigations under this statute resulted in the apprehension of nearly 1,400 fugitives who were being sought at the request of State and local authorities from whose jurisdictions they had fled. Now that the scope of the Fugitive Felon Act has been expanded to cover interstate flight in connection with any felony, more requests for these investigations are being received, and we anticipate greater accomplishments than ever before."

As in previous years, the FBI Director expressed appreciation for the cooperation and support which his Bureau receives from confidential informants and other alert citizens. "Information furnished our agents by confidential informants has resulted in more than 4,000 arrests and in the recovery of some $4 million in stolen and contraband valuables this year," he said.

The statistics include arrests and recoveries in FBI cases, as well as arrests and recoveries by other law-enforcement agencies resulting from facts provided by FBI informants and passed along to the authorities concerned. In addition to this data furnished by its confidential informants, the FBI also disseminated well over 100,000 other items of criminal intelligence information to local, State, and Federal investigative agencies during the past year.

Warning that the United States remains the primary target for Soviet-bloc intelligence operations, Mr. Hoover stated that during the past year two men were convicted on espionage charges—Dr. Robert Soble, now facing imprisonment for life, and Irvin Scarbeck, who has been sentenced to a term of 30 years. A third man, arrested for Soviet intelligence activities, was permitted to leave the country in lieu of deportation. In addition, following FBI investigation, the departure or exclusion of four official representatives of Communist-bloc countries was effected because of activity beyond the scope of their recognized duties.

The FBI Director described the Communist Party, U.S.A, as "an inseparable arm of the international conspiracy against God and freedom which is directed from Moscow." The Communists in this country are completely subservient to the dictates of their Soviet masters, he said.

"Particularly significant in this regard were the actions of the delegation of party officials from this country who attended the 22d Congress of the Soviet Communist Party in Moscow this fall. Not only did the American delegates pledge full support to Nikita Khrushchev in the disagreement between the Russians and their Albanian and Chinese comrades, but three of them appeared on a Moscow television program to give the Soviet people a distorted impression of conditions in the United States."

On December 1, 1961, an indictment was returned against the Communist Party, U.S.A. as an organization, for failure to register with the Attorney General under provisions of the Internal Security Act of 1950. The indictment contains 12 counts subjecting the party to possible fines totaling $120,000. The trial has tentatively been set for February 1, 1962.

The party's leaders, as well as its individual members, also are subject to prosecution under the Internal Security Act of 1950 for failure to register with the Attorney General.

In his yearend report, Mr. Hoover also noted that 1961 witnessed a heavy volume of requests for the laboratory, identification, and training services which the FBI makes available to other law enforcement agencies free of charge.

The FBI Laboratory, which receives specimens of evidence from authorities in all 50 States, conducted more than 230,000 examinations during the past year. "Many of these examinations assisted local police in identifying wrongdoers. Others helped to establish the innocence of falsely accused persons," he said.

The FBI's Identification Division, which serves as a national repository for fingerprint identifying data, received an average of nearly 23,000 fingerprint cards each working day throughout 1961. As the year ended, its files contained 161,800,000 sets of fingerprints representing an estimated 76,400,000 persons.

In addition, during 1961, the FBI Disaster Squad, a team of experts from the Identification Division, was sent to the scenes of air crashes in Colorado, Illinois, Virginia, and Belgium, as well as to the scene of a fire and explosion in West Virginia, to assist in identifying the bodies of victims.

At the request of law enforcement agencies in all parts of the Nation, the FBI rendered assistance in connection with more than 3,400 local and regional police training schools. Additionally, two sessions of the FBI National Academy were held—with 150 officers from 42 States, the District of Columbia, Canada, Puerto Rico, and the Republic of the Philippines in attendance. The graduation of these 150 men brought to 4,093 the total number of officers who have completed this 12-week course of specialized instruction.

Commenting upon the assistance which his Bureau receives from other investigative agencies, Mr. Hoover stated, "Each year the bonds of mutual cooperation grow stronger throughout the entire law enforcement profession. Working together, we are reaching higher peaks of efficiency and protection of individual rights than ever before."

MICHEL CIEPLINSKI, DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR SECURITY AND CONSULAR AFFAIRS—AND GEN. THADDEUS KOSCIUSKO

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, America's strength has always derived from its diversity. And I believe that this statement is more than ever true in the mortal struggle with the forces of world communism.

We are fortunate in having in our midst large communities of immigrant Americans of Polish, Hungarian, Ukrainian, Baltic, and even Russian origin. They know the meaning of communism better than most men, not merely because their friends and their relatives are today suffering under its yoke, but also because many of them have experienced Communist tyranny and have had a long experience in fighting it.

I believe that we have thus far not made adequate use of this tremendous reservoir of dedication, understanding, and courage. Because of this, Mr. President, I was delighted when I learned last year that President Kennedy had selected a prominent Polish-American, Mr. Michel Cieplinski, for the important position of Deputy Assistant Secretary for Security and Consular Affairs.

I consider it particularly appropriate to say a few words about Mich Cieplinski today, because today we observe the birthday of another great Polish patriot, one of the authentic heroes of the American Revolution, Gen. Thaddeus Kosciusko. There is, in my opinion, a direct line from Kosciusko to Cieplinski.

Kosciusko came to America to fight for freedom because from the tragic struggle of the Polish people against Russian imperialism he was intimately familiar with the meaning of slavery and the meaning of freedom. Kosciusko understood, even at that early date in history, that the freedom of the Polish people was intimately bound up with the fate of America.

Since the days of Kosciusko, many millions of his compatriots and of other central European peoples have come to America in the quest for freedom. They have brought with them to this country the same hatred of tyranny and the same love of freedom that animated Kosciusko.

But, in our attitude toward our immigrant Americans, we sometimes forget the services of Kosciusko and the debt we owe to him.

I know for example, that some of my very good friends had misgivings about the appointment of Mich Cieplinski to so important a post because he was not a native born American. I believe that if they had known as much as I do about the background of Mich Cieplinski and about his many positive contributions to the cause of freedom, their fears would have been allayed.

Mich Cieplinski has been a lifelong foe of totalitarian tyranny both Nazi and Communist. Before World War II, he served as manager of the largest group of Polish newspapers. When Poland fell he came to New York where he was immediately offered the editorship of the largest daily Polish newspaper in this country, the Polish Morning World.

Mich Cieplinski has the kind of ability and integrity that commanded the immediate recognition of all those who met him. He was elected president of the association of all foreign language newspapers published in the United States. Simultaneously he was selected commissioner of intergroup relations for the city of New York.

In 1948 President Truman personally selected Mich Cieplinski as executive director of the nationalities division of the Democratic National Committee, a position which he filled with great distinction until his appointment to the Department of State in early 1961.

But despite Mich Cieplinski's exceptional record of public service, there were some critical voices at the time of his appointment; and there were many more who, though they said nothing, had misgivings. By his performance in office, Mich Cieplinski, who is now serving as Acting Administrator of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, has dispelled the misgivings and satisfied the critics. In doing so, he has performed a service that will redound to the benefit of all Americans of foreign origin.

It is my own fervent hope that the precedent and example of Mich Cieplinski will clear the way for the use on a wider scale of Americans of immigrant origin in positions of responsibility in the Government and in the conduct of the cold war.

THE COLD WAR—ADDRESS BY DR. CHARLES MALIK

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, some of the greatest statements of the past decade concerning the cold war have been made by Dr. Charles Malik, the former Ambassador from Lebanon, former President of the General Assembly of the United Nations, and presently a professor at the American University, Washington, D.C.

On October 18, 1961, Dr. Malik made another magnificent statement in his great tradition at the John Carroll Society dinner in Washington. I reread this address a few days ago and found in it so much that goes to the heart of the life-or-death issues which confront the Nation that I believe every one of us can profitably read and study it.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that this address be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOME URGENT TASKS

(By Dr. Charles Malik)

These are great days in which we live. History is being decided at its deepest level. When such is the case, two sins are unpardonable: to fail to raise the most decisive issues, and having raised them, to fail to do something about them. Superficiality and paralysis, mediocrity and inaction—these are the two failings which history will never forgive. But for that obscure moment in history when a certain lowly maiden in Palestine was secretly told by the Angel of God what God was holding in store for her, and but for the decisive events that flowed from that incredible disclosure, I doubt whether any moments in history compare in decisiveness with the moments amidst which we are privileged to live.

Two conditions must be fulfilled for the real appreciation of history. First, we must live history. Unless we are profoundly moved by what is deciding history today, we cannot appreciate the historic moment. Those who watch history from the outside as though what is taking place did not concern them, as though not only their very existence, but what is dearest to them in that existence, were not therein involved, are a veritable deadweight on history. They are watching and waiting to see what will happen; after it happens they will adjust; they do not want to take part in this "it" that happens; they never burn their bridges; and because they are thus outside history, because they are "neither hot nor cold," history takes no notice of them. Only the moved and responsible, only he who takes a stand on fundamental issues, no matter how delicate the issues and how dangerous the stand, has a place in history today.

HISTORICAL IMPASSE

But, second, while living history, one must also have his roots outside history. History is not self-sufficient. It is this fallacy of historical self-sufficiency that has more than anything else brought about the present impasse in history. If only people recognized their transcendental reference in history we would not be where we are today. To confine oneself only to the forces of history is in the end to condemn oneself to chance and accident and the balancing of brute force. He who sees and knows only history can never understand history, and while, because he is in history, he will certainly be a factor of history, his will not be the last word. Just, then, as it is most essential to live and act in history, so the axis of this living and acting must lie outside history. To save oneself from total meaninglessness, from that blind groping in the dark in which the existentialists, for all their zeal and purity, finally land, one's living roots must extend to God—to God, not only as the judge of history, but as the Creator of all that there is, and therefore as the providence outside whose wisdom and care and permission nothing of what is can be.

I speak from the perspective of a participation that has been and still is quite intense and personal; and I speak from the perspective of Christian faith. These are at once my credentials and my profound limitations.

With these two limiting perspectives I propose to examine some urgent tasks arising from the cold war. But first a few words about the nature and fact of this war.

RED EXPANSION

The cold war is the fundamental tension introduced into the world by the Marxist-Leninist challenge. Ever since the Manifesto of 1848 a radical revolutionary spirit has been let loose in the world. This Marxist-Leninist spirit has so far met with phenomenal success, partly owing to the great genius of those in whom it has incarnated itself, partly owing to the stupidity and complacency of the rest of the world. It follows that nothing about its development and success was inevitable. But here we are: the Marxist-Leninist-Communist Party rules today Russia, China, and Eastern Europe; it has succeeded in neutralizing, that is to say, in frightening and partially winning over, the governments and peoples of vast regions in Asia, Africa, and Latin America; and it has significantly penetrated, in all sorts of subtle ways, Western Europe and North America, so that Western policy, no matter how much Western governments vaunt their independence, is often some kind of a function of the will of Moscow. Non-Communist politicians have undertaken pilgrimages to Moscow just before national elections, with distinctly advantageous political results. Nor can it be maintained that at certain critical points in recent years the crude or subtle, direct or indirect, interference of Moscow in the internal affairs even of large non-Communist states did not determine events in those states. And the essential point to remember is that this extraordinary worldwide influence of Marxism-Leninism started virtually from zero in our lifetime.

The military-nuclear might backing the Marxist-Leninist-Communist Party in the cold war is vividly present in the minds of all of us. So far as effective deterrence is concerned, we are told that ours is the era of nuclear stalemate or parity. It appears that either side can obliterate the other regardless of who strikes first.

CIVILIZATION IMPERILED

What is at stake in this war is the traditional view of man, society, history, truth, and God which the Mediterranean-European-Western World has painstakingly developed over 4,000 years of history. Make a list of the 20 most fundamental convictions of this world—from the ultimacy of the individual human person, to the objectivity and independence of truth, to the existence and self-revelation of God—and you will find that Marxism-Leninism is a militant and radical denial of all these 20 convictions. It is as though a demonic spirit has been suddenly unleashed with the specific, conscious aim of destroying every value, truth, and being that has been tested and handed down. On every page of every fundamental doctrine of Marxism-Leninism is proudly declared the open intention of overthrowing every existing government, regime, system, outlook, philosophy, and religion. But to the discerning mind, nothing is more certain and clear than that it is Jesus Christ, and all that He is and means and stands for, that they, first and foremost and above everything else, aim absolutely at destroying and obliterating from the face of the earth. What is ultimately at stake is Christ Himself.

All this talk about economic justice and social security and raising the standard of living of the people, while at times perhaps genuine, is nevertheless nothing when it comes to man, his basic rights and the freedom of his spirit. When the aim is to destroy these things, what is the good of all the economic and material things in the world? "For what shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his soul?" (Mark 8:36 and Matthew 16:26.) Moreover, the lure of the economic and material is used for the most part as a bait to enlist more and more recruits in the ranks of the revolution. The deprived masses, not knowing their own ultimate good, easily fall for this lure. In communism, the economic and material serve the political, and the political is for the sake of the destruction of the 20 fundamental propositions of the Western World.

COEXISTENCE IMPOSSIBLE

There remains the matter of coexistence and the matter of change. Let us coexist peacefully, we are enjoined, and with time communism will mellow and will change. These are fallacies unworthy of the active mind. Coexistence is impossible with the radical spirit of denial of Marxism-Leninism. The Communists themselves, while they certainly use the term to fool the simple and gullible, always explicitly make clear that peaceful coexistence is, in their own words, only a more intensive form of the class struggle. It follows that coexistence is possible only when communism gives up the class struggle altogether; namely, only when it overcomes itself and denies its own spirit of denial.

As to change, an individual Communist here and there certainly may change; he certainly may be converted, say, to Christianity or to some other passion; but the basic dogmas of the Marxist-Leninist party, and therewith the fundamental character of this party, will never change. These basic dogmas stamping communism with its fundamental character are six: (1) Militant atheism; (2) dialectical materialism; (3) thoroughgoing totalitarianism; (4) radical collectivism; (5) proletarian internationalism; and (6) the messianic impulse to dominate the whole world. The Marxist-Leninist-Communist Party will never give up these six tenets. It will never worship God; it will never repudiate the class struggle; it will never allow political freedom; it will never view the individual human person as an end in himself; it will never cease inciting the proletariat all over the world; and it will never settle for less than the whole world. This is what Mr. Khrushchev meant when he said: "We have never abandoned and will never abandon our political line which Lenin formulated for us; we have never abandoned and will never abandon our political program. This is why we tell those gentlemen who wait for a change in the political program of the Soviet Union: 'Wait till the crayfish whistles.' " (Pravda, Nov. 26, 1955.)

IMMEDIATE NEEDS

The slightest responsible meditation on the nature and fact of this sort of thing that the world is up against points up some exceedingly urgent tasks that must be immediately faced and prosecuted.

Nothing is more urgent than to understand fully the nature of communism, and, in particular, to make absolutely sure that one has grasped the five irreducible facts: (a) that you are here dealing with the most radical spiritual revolutionary thrust; (b) that the ultimate aim of this revolution to which every other tactic is ordered is the destruction of the deepest traditional values of the West; (c) that therefore it is not ordinary international relations that govern communism's intercourse with the rest of the world, but relations of a totally different order; (d) that coexistence with such a thrust is absolutely impossible without this thrust first completely calling off the revolution; and (e) that, because Marxism-Leninism is at bottom a fundamental spiritual phenomenon of rebellion and negation, its essence cannot change, no matter what economic and social changes may take place in the Communist realm. I am not sure some policymakers of the non-Communist world fully understand these five facts.

Concerning the method of warfare of international communism, it is patent you are not dealing here with hostilities and aggression in the classical style, namely, by armies crossing national frontiers and attacking from without, but with intimidation, blackmail, infiltration, subversion, propaganda, inciting civil strife, character assassination, and with every conceivable trick of the new warfare of indirect aggression, whereby communism creepingly spreads in itself without "endangering international peace and security." Therefore nothing is more urgent than to understand this war of indirect aggression, and develop effective techniques, not only to counteract this war on one's own soil, but to carry it over to the soil of the enemy. I am not sure some policymakers, who still talk and think in terms of war in the classical sense, have grasped the full significance of the modern war of indirect aggression. If they did, they would not have kept on congratulating themselves because we are still in a state of peace, when as a matter of fact we are and have been for years absolutely at war, and a war indeed that the free world has been consistently losing.

BE PREPARED FOR WORST

Nuclear war is depicted as something absolutely terrible, as endangering the human race, as rendering the distinction between victor and vanquished altogether untenable, and therefore as validating once and for all the dictum, "there is no alternative to peace." I tend to believe all this, or at least to hold that everything must be done to avoid nuclear war. But what if, despite every conceivable effort, war did break out: Should one be caught unprepared for that? The distinct and disturbing impression that one gathers is that from the fact that nuclear war is terrible and everything must be done to avoid it, some people conclude that it is not going to take place and therefore one should not be prepared for it. This is an absolute non sequitur. Nothing therefore is more urgent than that, while doing everything to avoid, and indeed to ban, nuclear war, or any kind of war, one should be prepared absolutely for the worst.

Another non sequitur is to hold that under the threat of nuclear holocaust the West has no choice but to yield and withdraw. When one expresses the hope that the West will stand firm at this or that crucial point, say, in Berlin or Laos or the Middle East, one is often confronted with the rejoinder—"then you are advocating nuclear war and the destruction of the human race?" Of course nothing is farther from one's mind than that. But nothing also is more pleasing to communism than to have the West constantly retreat under the threat of war; namely, than to use the threat of war as an instrument in the successful prosecution of the proletarian world revolution. Nothing therefore is more urgent than so to deploy the forces of freedom—in the diplomatic, military, economic, political, psychological, and moral fields—as to make, under the umbrella of the nuclear stalemate, the threat of nuclear war at least as frightening to communism as to the Western World.

THIRTY WAYS TO WIN

Nuclear war must be avoided. The conclusion I draw from this is not that freedom is therefore doomed, but that freedom must win under conditions of peace. Nothing therefore is more urgent than the development of an effective strategy to defeat communism in peace, namely, without resorting to nuclear war. There are 30 ways that can be used toward that end, if only the free world awakens to its latent possibilities.

Some people appear to feel and argue that the only alternative open to the West is either to go dead or to go Red. Regardless of how sincere these people might be—and some of them are very sincere—it is obvious that this feeling serves the cause of communism. President Kennedy refuted this false alternative the other day when he declared in Chapel Hill that "we shall be neither dead nor Red, but alive and free." This is a wonderful assurance for those who love and believe in freedom. Nothing therefore is more urgent than to keep on exposing all false alternatives, and to demonstrate, in thought and in action, that the only real choice open to the free and to the enslaved alike, is man in the fullness of his freedoms and his rights.

The Marxist-Leninist party firmly believes that it is destined to do away with every existing order, regime, system and government. It bases this belief on what it considers first principles and it acts on it day and night. This is the meaning of the universal proletarian revolution. What follows for the Western World—partly out of sheer self-defense, partly owing to the values at stake—is that since every war has an objective, and since the cold war is a war, the only worthy objective of this war is elimination of the Marxist-Leninist Communist Party as a politically ruling party everywhere in the world, regardless of whether it takes to accomplish this objective a year or a decade or a generation or a century. Nothing therefore is more urgent than to galvanize the will of the West according to this objective.

GREAT ILLUSION

When some Western thinkers and leaders urge realism and accommodation, when they poke fun on the slogan of "total victory," when they manifest obvious resistance to the thought that the cold war must be fought to a successful conclusion, one is not sure that they do not thereby mean that the West must keep on losing and the realm of freedom must keep on contracting. What then are their proposals for turning the tide? I am certain they do not want to see the West overwhelmed, but some of them, I feel, do not at heart want to see communism overwhelmed either, even if you presented them with the possibility of overwhelming it. They appear to be unwilling to contemplate the possibility of erasing it from the face of the earth. They seem badly to miss it then. Some people—worthy products of Western thought and life—feel emotionally and existentially happier and more secure in a world in which Marxism-Leninism is powerful and entrenched. What is it in the spirit of Marx that so strangely captivates them? Because they are very fine people, and because they are very influential, nothing is more urgent than to demonstrate to them, on the deepest possible plane, through reason, suffering, and love, that their existential security is a very great illusion.

If one is skilled in penetrating to the hidden meaning of fundamental Communist declarations and statements—and the meaning sometimes is not very hidden—one readily perceives that they are appealing to the masses over the heads of their governments. Should the West not develop a similar strategy of separating the Communist rulers from the peoples whom they dominate? Should it not put aside all timidity and false decorum in order to assure the peoples under Communist rule that it is their friend, that it has no quarrel with them whatsoever, that it has the highest respect for their cultures and achievements, that it is only the ruling Marxist-Leninist Communist Party with whom it cannot do business, and that therefore there is a live and worthy alternative to Communist rule for them? So far the West has been struck by a certain strange nemesis whereby it appears to be existentially incapable of addressing the masses under Communist rule direct. It fights shy of offending their Communist masters. Again, out of sheer self-defense, and also because of the ultimate values at stake, nothing would seem to be more urgent than to make the radical distinction, effectively and politically, between the great peoples and cultures of China, Russia and Eastern Europe, and the alien Marxism-Leninism which is now trying by force to transform these cultures and peoples in its own image.

DIVIDED WEST

What has helped more than anything else to bring about the astounding phenomenon of the Western retreat and the Communist advance is Western nationalism and Western disunity. This is what the Communists in their jargon call "contradictions in the Western camp," and they openly seek to exacerbate and exploit them to the utmost. Despite the presence of strong Communist parties in Italy and France, Western Europe has learned since the Second World War that it must either unite or perish. The decision of the United Kingdom last week to enter the Common Market is one of the most far-reaching decisions of this century. European nationalism is gradually softening into a sense of common European destiny. But between Europe and the United States, nationalism still plays a debilitating role so far as the common struggle against communism is concerned. The crying need is for a much deeper political and economic identification between Europe and America than is envisaged and provided for in NATO. During the 12½ years since NATO was born the world situation has radically changed with the emergence of Communist China, with the loss of the atomic and nuclear monopoly by the West, with the considerable rise in Soviet prestige and relative power, and with the development both of neutralism and anti-Westernism. Events therefore have overtaken and outrun the NATO concept. America cannot stay aloof from the common fate of Europe. Nothing therefore is more urgent than for the United States, as a government, as a people and as a culture, to become persuaded that, in the face of the total Communist onslaught, as well as of the other anti-Western forces astir throughout the world, the old forms of national sovereignty and independence must develop into new forms and new concepts, because what is threatened, attacked and undermined today is not just the American nation or the British nation or the French nation, but the whole of Western civilization with all its cumulative tradition for thousands of years. This is not a war between nation-states: this is a war between whole civilizations. The extent to which this persuasion shall supervene measures the adequacy of American life and thought as a whole to the ruthless demands of this historic movement. This is how whole cultures prove adequate or inadequate to the requirements of history, and this is how they either survive or perish. I assert also that the Mediterranean is an offshoot of the Atlantic, and its complex civilization cannot be sundered from the civilization of the West.

HELPS TO BE ANTIWEST

In the vast world that now calls itself neutral and nonalined a strange phenomenon has developed. You can exist and prosper in certain parts of this world only if you attack the West and at least remain silent about life and conditions in the Communist realm. It is very dangerous to develop the reputation that you are what is called pro-Western, but not only do you realize handsome political and other dividends from being known as pro-Communist, or at least as neutralist, but the West itself will treat you as a leper if you believe in its fundamental values. You become then a source of embarrassment to it. There is no sanction against being "anti-Western," but God help you if you are "pro-Western," which only means that you wish to move hand in hand with the West in the great world struggle. The West itself encourages you to be at least "neutral" to its fate, and preferably even "anti-Western," before it will have anything to do with you. It is as though the West is in a state of spiritual rout in which it is ashamed of itself. It is as though the West can only deal today with hypocrites and split personalities. When, if you believe in and practice Western values you are penalized, and if you believe in and practice Communist-totalitarian values you are rewarded, and indeed you are penalized and rewarded not only by international communism, but by the West itself—can there be a more shameless spiritual rout than that? This whole phenomenon raises some of the deepest issues facing Western existence today. Can a civilization last if it studiedly abdicates its universal character? Can a civilization last if it is profoundly ashamed of its deepest values? And pray tell me, how is a value deep and worthy of faith if you do not believe in its validity for the whole world? Nothing therefore is more urgent than for the West to cease to be ashamed either of itself or of those who wish to be called by its name.

If one believes and knows that all government finally derives from man and answers to him and not man from government, then one cannot be indifferent to a doctrine and way of life that makes government everything and man virtually nothing.

BASIS OF LAW

If one believes and knows that law is not just the will of the ruler or stronger, but the objective expression of the common good, then one cannot be indifferent to a doctrine and way of life that bases law only on the interest of the powers that be.

If one believes and knows that there is a whole set of human rights and fundamental freedoms which flow integrally from man's inherent dignity as a being endowed with reason and conscience, then one cannot be indifferent to a doctrine and way of life that makes man's enjoyment of his rights and freedoms dependent solely upon the pleasure of the State.

If one believes and knows that the State has no right to tamper with the family in the enjoyment of its rights, nor with the university in its free and independent search for and exposition and transmission of the truth, nor with the church in her freedom to preach the gospel and reconcile man to God, then one cannot be indifferent to a doctrine and way of life that makes of the family, the university, and the church only so many departments of the state.

If one believes and knows that pluralism is the true international order, then one cannot be indifferent to a doctrine and way of life in which diverse cultures and peoples have no right to be themselves under an order of juridicial equality and mutual respect.

If one believes and knows that past ages had their own beauty, truth and being, that mankind struggled in them just as nobly and just as fruitfully as it does today, and that what was seen and achieved in some of them was vastly superior to anything seen and achieved today, so that in a sense we are judged by them rather than they by us, and so that the proper attitude of the present to the past is to appreciate it in itself, in humility and love, then one cannot be indifferent to a doctrine and way of life that makes a clean break with the past, that never appreciates it in itself, that views it only as a stage, a preparation, for the present, and that therefore recognizes as true and worthy of respect only those elements in it that the present in its magnanimity has allowed and accepted, no matter how lean and miserable and sordid this present might otherwise be.

MAN'S HIGHEST GLORY

If one believes and knows that reason in man is not a sort of joke played upon him by the fortuitous forces of the universe, but that it is man's highest glory, more dependable when unperverted and thoroughly disciplined than everything else, then one cannot be indifferent to a doctrine and way of life that subordinates reason to the dark and elemental and arbitrary.

If one believes and knows that there is simple trust, simple confidence, simple transparency between man and man, then one cannot be indifferent to a doctrine and way of life that bases itself on mistrust, suspicion, contradiction, and the war of all against all.

If one believes and knows that the individual human person, with his inner joy and freedom, and with his infinite spiritual possibilities, is the most precious thing in the world, so much so that when we think of God we cannot think of anything higher than to speak of Him as a person, then one cannot be indifferent to a doctrine and way of life that subordinates the human person to the party or the collective or the state.

If one believes in the primacy of the spiritual and knows it in his own life, then one cannot be indifferent to a doctrine and way of life that subordinates everything to matter and desire and economics.

If one believes in God and knows His power in his own life, then one cannot be indifferent to a doctrine and way of life that not only denies God, but militantly seeks to destroy every faith in him.

If one believes in Christ and knows His grace and forgiveness in his own life, then one cannot be indifferent to a doctrine and way of life whose supreme passion is to efface the name and memory and grace of Christ from the thought and life of men.

RUSSIA'S SPIRITUAL TRADITION

If one knows the wonderful spiritual tradition of Russia—her devotion, her piety, her humility, her liturgy, her icons, her saints, her dedication to the Virgin—if one knows the place Christ occupies in her tremendous literature, if one only knows Dostoyevsky, then one cannot be indifferent to a doctrine and way of life that exults in ridiculing and trampling all this tradition under foot.

My fear is that these things are not sufficiently believed and known in the West. My fear is that under the joint influence of commercialism, materialism, relativism, subjectivism, liberalism, idealism and secularism, the process of decay is already pretty advanced in the West. The ultimate crisis therefore is entirely spiritual: it is one of knowledge and faith. For it is not difficult to show what with respect to many of these things there is now a blur as between communism and the West. Therefore nothing is more urgent than to pray and work very hard, to the end that true government, natural law, human rights, fundamental freedoms, the dignity of the family, and university and the church, and just international order, the fullness of history, right reason, simple trust, the human person, the primacy of the spirit, the real God, the authentic Christ, and the wonderful Russian spiritual heritage, be known, believed in and affirmed. If that happens, then the West will be truly set on fire, and then, subject always to the chastening and will of God, I am not afraid of the issue of the cold war.

THANKSGIVING MESSAGE BY RABBI ABRAHAM J. FELDMAN

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, for the past 23 years Rabbi Abraham J. Feldman, an outstanding citizen of Hartford and a prominent religious leader in Connecticut, has given an annual Thanksgiving speech before the Hartford Rotary Club. His Thanksgiving messages have thus become a tradition in the State; they have, each year, contained some of the very best there is in American thought, grounded in a deep and fervent patriotism, and evoking the true meaning of our democracy.

Dr. Feldman's Thanksgiving message for 1961, again delivered before the Rotary Club of Hartford, contains such timely advice, such a strong and persuasive appeal to all that is best in us, such convincing reference to our great history in these times of danger, that it deserves to be widely read, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOBLE SOULS COMMENDED AS THANKSGIVING GUESTS—HISTORY HAS TREASURE TO TAP, RABBI ASSERTS

(By Rabbi Abraham J. Feldman, D.D.)

A little less than a month ago, the Macmillan Company published a little book entitled "Common Sense About Religion" written by an Anglican clergyman whose pen name is John Hadham. I found it to be an exceedingly stimulating book.

At the end of the book he narrates what he calls "The Tale of Father Peter" (I have permission to share this story with you).

"Once upon a time there was an extremely learned and pious monk named Father Peter. He was the special pride of a small and obscure monastery in Ruritania * * *. He had floored all the scientific and humanistic enemies of his Holy Religion, and * * * he had become so holy that, on the rare occasions when he was in difficulties, he used to receive private messages from the Almighty providing him with any arguments he had not yet thought of.

"One day he was sitting in the refectory at lunchtime, shoveling peas into his mouth. Suddenly his eyes grew glazed; his mouth fell open, and he became silent. His brethren recognized the signs that Father Peter had received a special message from the Almighty, and they wondered what it might be. As the messages had become part of the regular life of the monastery, an appropriate technique had been evolved to honor them. So, after lunch, all the brothers adjourned to the chapel to sing a Te Deum in thanks for the message which Father Peter had received.

"But Father Peter seemed strangely unable or unwilling to deliver his message; the brothers sang the Te Deum again, and yet a third time, while Father Peter maintained an obviously embarrassed silence. But after the third repetition he got slowly to his feet and said: My brothers, I know that some of the younger among you have murmured the blessed word auto-suggestion at the messages with which the Almighty has previously chosen to honor this unworthy servant.

"But none of you will be able to say 'autosuggestion' to what I distinctly heard the Lord say to me at lunch. Nothing could have been further from my thoughts or my imagination: for what the Lord said to me was: 'Father Peter, why don't you pay more attention to those lovely peas I made for you? Do you think I enjoy never being anything to you but a subject for argument?' "

My good friends—I read this story at the time when I began to think of what I might say to you, as for the 23d year, by your gracious invitation, I would speak with you about the approaching day of our national Thanksgiving. It occurred to me then that the message which came to Father Peter, in the parable I just read to you, gives us something of the essence of what Thanksgiving is all about.

What the Lord said to Father Peter was, "Why don't you pay more attention to those lovely peas I made for you?" God ought not to be only a subject for argument and definition, an abstraction far, far removed from all tangible sensory living, a being for the theologians and metaphysicians to speculate about. To us believers, God is the creator and giver of all we are and have. It behooves us, then, to make humble and grateful acknowledgment to Him for the blessings, yes, the miracles, we enjoy daily.

REALIZING BLESSINGS

The message to Father Peter—as I understand it—said in effect, that we ought not take earthly things for granted, that we should cultivate an ongoing realization of the significance, the importance, the abundance of the gifts which are placed in our cradles as our birthright, an appreciative realization of the kinds and qualities of these gifts, a challenging realization of what life would be without them.

And when such realization becomes ours, then, seeing that we are rational and sensitive creatures, there would well up from the very depths of our hearts and souls the emotion of gratitude which may even come to utterance as Thanksgiving. And, oh, my friends, what rich and enduring blessing such realization and consequent giving of thanks could and would bring to life and society.

But I want to talk with you today not about "the lovely peas" which God has made for us. Not about the juicy turkey and its delectable stuffing and the ruddy cranberries of this season. I want to speak about the guests we shall welcome at our respective Thanksgiving boards.

Of course, we begin with our families, and what a thrilling, comforting sight it is to behold all across our country. Americans gathered by their families—grandparents, parents, children, at a feast of Thanksgiving with all the heartwarming tenderness which exudes thence—exuding not as a mushroom cloud of death and devastation but as a life-preserving atmosphere of love, of joy, of devotion.

And then, added to our families, many of us will have also friends and colleagues and associates to share with us in the happiness of that day, and we shall include them in the warmth and peace of our family circles.

Is not this fact by itself—the possibility of having such gatherings, the blessings which accrue from them, the delights which we experience because of them; is not this in itself a reason for singing a song of joy and gratefulness to Almighty God, our Creator and our loving Father?

So—we shall thank God for these guests at our Thanksgiving boards.

And yet—I want to draw your attention to another fact of which most of us are perhaps unaware.

POIGNANTLY RECALLED

Out of the recesses of a forgotten past, something has been coming up in my recollection in recent weeks. This is a matter of nearly a half a century ago when I was at college.

There was then a play which we read and studied diligently and saw on the stage delightedly. It was written by the great Belgian playwright, Maurice Maeterlinck. The name of the play was "The Bluebird." In that play two children set out in quest of the Bluebird of Happiness. In their quest they visited many places and one of these was the mystical "Land of Memory." As they entered this area, which looked like a cluttered-up attic, there were discarded books, an old grandfather's clock, rocking chairs, a departed cat. There were also somnolent people. And as the two children entered this "Land of Memory," it happened that everything they touched, everything which they looked at became alive: The old grandfather clock began to strike, the rocking chair began to rock, the cat began to meow and the people who seemed to be lifeless, came alive.

Of course, Maeterlinck suggested that when we think of and recall the past and those who live in it, they are not gone or dead; they live—because we think of them and remember them. Memory resurrects the dead and departed and, through the gift of memory, they become real again and vital.

Now then—in the context of our national Thanksgiving Day, if we are at all aware of our Nation's history and its meaning, we give thanks not only for the lovely peas and yams today; we give thought also to our national history, to our national memories; and when we do, our history and they who wrought it, come to life.

Then they are with us, they are about us—a great and blessed company of—

"Pilgrim feet—
Whose stern, impassion'd stress
A thoroughfare for freedom beat
Across the wilderness."

A great company of—

"Heroes prov'd
In liberating strife,
Who more than self their country loved,
And mercy more than life."

A noble company who had a "patriot dream, that sees beyond the years."

I am wondering whether because of Thanksgiving Day when we visit in the "Land of Memory" we may not discover other guests than our families and friends, invisible guests who might be with us at our Thanksgiving boards, in your home and in mine? Invisible—but real.

Now this idea of invisible guests in our homes has for me a charm and a challenge.

FIVE MEMORIAL GRAINS

Just imagine that someone of that decimated Pilgrim band, who was present at that first Thanksgiving, were seated at our laden board. Recently I read something by Dr. Robert Luccock of New Haven, to the effect that "In early New England it was the custom on Thanksgiving to place five grains of corn at every plate as a reminder of the first winter when food was so depleted that only five grains of corn were rationed to each individual at a time.

The Pilgrim Fathers wanted their children to remember the suffering which made possible the settlement of a free people in a free land, that on the day on which their ration was so reduced only seven healthy colonists remained to nurse the sick, and nearly half their numbers lay in the windswept graveyard on the hill; but when the Mayflower sailed back to England only the sailors were aboard."

Perhaps it would be something for us if we, too, placed five grains of corn beside our Thanksgiving plates to help us become aware of the presence of our invisible guest, for if we think of him—he assuredly will be there.

Again, as we invoke his memory let us welcome George Washington to our family board on Thursday next; George Washington who, in a letter to the Governors of the Thirteen Original States (June 8, 1783), voiced the prayer:

"That God * * * would most graciously be pleased to dispose us all, to do justice, to love mercy, and to demean ourselves * * * with charity, humility, and pacific temper of mind * * * (without which) we can never hope to be a happy Nation."

We need this reminder of charity, of humility, of pacific temper today and always, do we not?

I welcome the thought that Benjamin Franklin might be an invisible guest at your home and mine on Thanksgiving Day; Franklin who, at the Constitutional Convention on June 28, 1787, made the motion that prayers be recited at the beginning of each session. Said he:

"I have lived, sir, a long time; and the longer I live the more convincing proofs I see of this truth, that God governs in the affairs of men * * * I firmly believe this; I also believe that, without His concurring aid * * * we shall be divided by our little, partial, local interests, our projects will be confounded, and we ourselves shall become a reproach and a byword down the future ages * * *"

This speaks to us today, does it not?

AND LINCOLN, TOO

I rejoice in the possibility that one of the invisible guests at my Thanksgiving board may be Abraham Lincoln, challenging us today as he did his generation at Cooper Union on February 27, 1860:

"Let us have faith that right makes might, and in that faith let us to the end dare to do our duty as we understand it."

I would welcome as an invisible presence at my Thanksgiving board Theodore Roosevelt, whose ringing challenge to America voiced in a speech made in Kansas on August 31, 1910, is a message for us:

"Oh my fellow citizens, each one of you carries on your shoulders not only the burden of doing well for the sake of your own country, but the burden of doing well and of seeing that this Nation does well for the sake of mankind."

And, oh, how I would welcome to my family circle the invisible presence of one who was the hero of my young manhood and remains one of my heroes today, Woodrow Wilson, who in a noble utterance in Philadelphia on May 3, 1915, said:

"You do not love humanity if you seek to divide humanity into jealous camps. Humanity can be welded together only by love, by sympathy, by justice, not by jealousy and hatred * * * the man who seeks to divide man from man, group from group, interest from interest in this great Union is striking at its very heart."

And how truly welcome and blessed is the recollection of the message which the invisible presence of Franklin D. Roosevelt voiced in his memorable first inaugural on March 4, 1933:

"We face the arduous duties that lie before us in the warm courage of national unity; with the clear consciousness of seeking old and precious moral values; with the clean satisfaction that comes from the stern performance of duty by old and young alike."

My friends, does not all this add up to that which President Kennedy said only the day before yesterday in Los Angeles?

"In the most critical period of our Nation's history, there have always been those on the fringes of our society who have sought to escape their own responsibility by finding a simple solution, an appealing slogan or a convenient scapegoat.

"At times these fanatics have achieved a temporary success among those who lack the will or the vision to face unpleasant facts or unsolved problems.

"But in time the basic good sense and stability of the great American consensus has always prevailed.

"Let our patriotism be reflected in the creation of confidence rather than crusades of suspicion. Let us prove we think our country great by striving to make it greater. And above all, let us remember that, however serious the outlook, however harsh the task, the one great irreversible trend in world history is on the side of liberty—and so, for all time to come, are we."

STRENGTH TO BORROW

There are other invisible guests whom we might and should welcome to our Thanksgiving boards, many, many others from our American past and immediate present, whose spirit and example endured your spirit and mine, and through them who are now in the "land of memory" we can become aware again of the grandeur, the nobility, the compulsion of our American heritage.

Gentlemen, we need this recall of greatness amidst the current vogue of sneering and scoffing of the memories of our past. We need—for the good of our souls and the soul of America—to reestablish contact and communion with the guests whom we may be thus privileged to welcome to our Thanksgiving boards.

The day before yesterday also, the Roman Catholic bishops of the United States issued a very significant and meaningful statement. As might be suspected, I do not altogether accept their premises; but they did reach conclusions which from my own different premises I do warmly support. Let me quote to you a few of their sentences in warm approbation:

"It is the American tradition to look at ourselves, to examine our conscience, to reappraise our moral position. In a dictatorship this is impossible; in a democracy it is a constant necessity. "Because we have been a moral people it has been characteristic of Americans ultimately to be guided by moral considerations and, even in periods of laxity, to respond vigorously to moral appeals. Our best traditions have been based on moral principles and ideals. We must remain true to them. "Since we are a people of many religious beliefs, of diverse racial and national origins, there will undoubtedly always be tensions and some misunderstandings. But these differences will not constitute insurmountable barriers to national peace and cooperation if we are faithful to the moral principles which are the foundation of our traditions—particularly if we complement justice with charity."

To this end we may invite from the "Land of Memory" others, invisible guests whom we have placed in the hall of fame and glory of the moral consciousness and conscience of our Judeo-Christian tradition.

I am thinking of the incomparable Moses, liberator of men from both physical and spiritual serfdom. I am thinking of the prophets Elijah and Amos, Hosea and Isaiah, Micah and Jeremiah. I am thinking of the gentle Rabbi Hillel and of Jesus of Nazareth. All of these—heroes of the spirit, saints and sages of faith, vehicles of the divine; all of these now in the "land of memory" but through our recall of them welcome guests at our Thanksgiving boards.

What a company they are. And what challenge and what inspiration they bring and impart. What a rebirth of glory may be ours, and what spiritual strength we may come into, as we purge the dross out of living, and through faith and perspective rediscover our own ideals which may have become dimmed, our own goals which sometimes become engulfed by smog. Through such rediscovery we shall rise from our Thanksgiving boards filled not only with food but filled of the spirit, a renewed, a reborn people, rededicated and blessed.

THE PEACE CORPS

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article written by Mr. Roscoe Drummond on the Peace Corps, published in the Washington Post of February 10, 1962.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEACE CORPS SUCCEEDS

(By Roscoe Drummond)

If you thought that the Peace Corps was going to be a political boondoggle, a joyride for the volunteers and likely to alienate foreign friends—the facts are proving to be quite different.

I certainly had my own reservations at the beginning. I thought the Peace Corps was a good idea likely to go wrong in operation.

It has gone right.

When its 1962–63 budget comes before Congress for approval, the Peace Corps will find that it has won many new supporters in both parties.

On the basis of its efficient management and first-year achievements, the Peace Corps clearly deserves the increasing—even enthusiastic—acceptance it is getting on Capitol Hill.

Director Sargent Shriver, Jr., is giving the Peace Corps a drive and dedication which are reflected throughout its operation.

Thus far there are 802 Peace Corps volunteers working in 14 countries in Africa, the Near East and south Asia, the Far East and Latin America.

These young, well-motivated and college-trained volunteers are working about 18 hours a day teaching students and teaching teachers, mapping roads, improving health and sanitation, improving methods of farming. The Peace Corps men received tourist travel and living expenses (some of it paid by the host countries) and $75 a month deposited to their credit in the United States.

The only practical basis for judging the Peace Corps at this time is whether the countries in which it is serving are satisfied. On this point the facts are these:

Every one of the 14 countries wants the work continued.

But this might be a wish not to offend. It is more than that because every one of these governments—from Ghana to Thailand, from Tanganyika to Chile—is asking for more Peace Corps help.

Furthermore, 13 other countries are asking the Peace Corps for volunteers. How have the Peace Corps volunteers themselves shown up under stressful conditions? Out of 802 volunteers working in remote parts of relatively underdeveloped countries, only 1 has quit and another has been ordered home.

At headquarters, Mr. Shriver has attracted—and the Peace Corps idea itself attracted—outstanding, able people from business, from academic life, and from other Government agencies. The Peace Corps is a spartan operation in the field and it is being spartanly but firmly managed in Washington.

What is life and work like for the Peace Corps? Here is a typical report from a volunteer in Ghana:

"Real privations have been at a minimum. My house, a 2-mile walk from the school, is without electricity, refrigeration, and transportation; but it is compensatingly located on the beautiful, grassy, warm-windswept plains of Winneba and faces the distant and lovely Mount Mankoadze.

"In order to reach school for the morning service and the first class at 7, I rise each day at 5:30. Classes are completed at 2, at which time I return home for lunch except when I remain on duty until 9, or for student meetings which last the afternoon. My teaching, 28 hours a week of English language, French language, English literature, and British history, demands many extra hours of preparation.

"I usually cannot retire before 10 or 10:30. Extra activities include additional classes for the upper forms in English and history (often for students not officially in my classes), and being a form master, the entertainment master, and the debating union master. When we move to our new location, I hope to do some coaching of wrestling, tennis, and basketball.

"It has been interesting to give a few Saturday night lectures to the school. * * * I was pleased to discover how much an objective, unbiased American point of view (on Berlin) can be appreciated by one uninformed but eagerly curious group of students."

The Peace Corps hopes to expand its volunteers working abroad from 800 to about 6,700 in the next 18 months.

Here is a New Frontier enterprise which is really creating a new frontier for practical American idealism in action.

"SURVIVAL U.S.A." RALLIES

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter to the editor entitled "As the Twig Is Bent," written by James Keene of Collinsville, Okla., and published in the Washington Post on February 10, 1962.

There being no objection, the letter to the editor was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AS THE TWIG IS BENT

I think a Tulsa conservative evangelist is using fear of communism as his most valuable asset. I observed frightened people flocking to the "Survival U.S.A." rallies in Tulsa last week to hear anti-Communist speakers.

I condemn communism as much as the anti-Red leaders at the rallies, but I contend that some anti-Communist organizations are using the public's basic hate for communism to promote rightwing platforms. They have made many constructive suggestions, but some of their other ideas are so extreme they are close to untruths.

The survival speakers frequently pictured U.S. officials and newspapers as being un-American. At the rally one night a speaker stated, "Communist China was communized by Americans." All four speakers grouped communism, Marxism, socialism, and liberalism together. In rally speeches and literature distributed, repeated pleas were made to stem the forces of liberalism and thus stop the growth of socialism and communism. These quotes and numerous others imply that the liberals or leftwingers who disagree with the rightwing leaders are Communists and intend to injure the United States.

Filled with contempt for communism, the thus gullible audience had often lost its power to discriminate between the helpful suggestions and these recurrent one-sided extremist views. Most of the people I spoke to knew only the rightwing side of the story and were scared to death of communism. One man said, "The Communists are poisoning Tulsa water. We are all going to be poisoned." So, if this rightwing group can successfully appeal to the public's emotions rather than its reason, they will win them to their way of thinking and may even turn the people against the Government.

Tulsa has heard nothing but the conservative point of view. Send us liberal leaders to this conservative playground.

JAMES KEENE.

COLLINSVILLE, OKLA.

DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS AND HOUSING—REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1962

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, on the anniversary of the birth of a great American, whose name has been written by historians on the scroll of fame because of his dedication to the preservation of our Union, I deem it to be fit and proper for me to say that the best way to preserve our Union—the best bulwark against dictatorship—is to preserve the constitutional rights of the States. I deplore the trend of recent years on the part of the Federal Government to encroach more and more upon those rights. That trend has not been limited to an effort by the executive branch of the Government to exercise powers not delegated to it by the Constitution. It is a program in which the Congress has deliberately participated, first, by treating the general welfare clause, intended by the framers of the Constitution to be a limitation upon delegated powers, as a separate and unlimited grant of power to the Federal Government to engage in unrestricted spending and then by completely ignoring, when it served its purpose to do so, the provisions of the 10th amendment, which clearly reserve to the States, or the people thereof, all powers not delegated to the Federal Government.

On February 14 hearings will start before a Senate committee on the proposed Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962. This plan is another step in the direction of increasing the Federal power over the States and their political subdivisions by transforming the Housing and Home Finance Agency into a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, headed by a Secretary with Cabinet rank.

I oppose this plan. I think it is entirely unnecessary to make the HHFA a Department and to make the HHFA Administrator a Cabinet member. Rather than saving money, such a move would waste it. It would waste money not only by increasing the salaries and expenses of running existing HHFA programs, but it would waste money by increasing the propaganda activities directed toward expanding these programs. Also, the plan would set up an administrative monstrosity that would cut across the powers and authority of all other executive departments and agencies. Finally, in my judgment, it would create a false conflict between urban and nonurban areas, and between residents of urban areas and those who live elsewhere—an unwise departure from established precedent of organizing a department on the basis of functions and not of geography.

It seems to me clear that HHFA does not need to be transformed into a department in order to provide assistance either for urban affairs or for housing. The Congress has already provided generously for renewing and maintaining our cities even without a Secretary at the head of a Cabinet-rank department devoted to promoting local interests. Since 1946, as the President pointed out in his message concerning the reorganization plan, major urban affairs and housing legislation has been enacted in every year except one. Included in this total are eight omnibus housing bills. The latest bill—the Housing Act of 1961—authorized HHFA to distribute some $9 billion in additional back-door loans and grants to urban and other communities, and to underwrite billions of dollars more in mortgages.

Even now, HHFA is a big-money spender. During the fiscal year 1963, HHFA budget expenditures will come to $1,383 million, according to the President's budget estimates, and HHFA will lay out an additional $470 million in net trust fund expenditures under the secondary market operations of the Federal National Mortgage Association. By mid-1963, HHFA plans to have 14,981 employees on its payroll.

These facts provide striking evidence of congressional concern for our cities. In my opinion, it is evidence of concern that has passed beyond the bounds of reason and fairness. HHFA's projected budget expenditures of almost $1.4 billion for the fiscal year 1963 will be nearly triple the $502 million expended in fiscal 1961, only 2 years earlier. Large as these amounts are, I am sure that much larger sums will be spent if HHFA ever becomes an established Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

Some persons think the reorganization plan will achieve economies. But even the President in his transmittal message admitted that the plan, if adopted, "will not in itself result in immediate savings." That is an understatement, to say the least. On the contrary, the adoption of the plan will result in immediate expenditures involving substantial increases.

The plan would create a new hierarchy of higher paid officials. They would consist of a Cabinet member and six sub-Cabinet officials. All would be paid at the salaries of comparable officials in existing departments—and, I understand, the Randall committee intends to recommend very great increases in these Executive Pay Act salaries.

Solely on the basis of present salaries, increased expenditures would be marked. The administrator's salary would rise from $21,000 a year to $25,000, although the scope of his duties would change little, if at all. To help him carry out essentially the same job, the Secretary would have the assistance of a new Under Secretary at a salary of $21,000, three new assistant secretaries and one general counsel at salaries of $20,000 each, and an administrative assistant secretary at a salary of $19,000. This makes a total of $145,000 a year in Executive Pay Act salaries, not counting an upgrading in salaries of all the assistants, executive assistants, confidential assistants, secretaries, and confidential secretaries that go along with this ballooning process.

At the same time, it is interesting to note that while the Administrator would receive a pay boost of 19 percent for doing about the same work with more help, the salaries of the Commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration, the Commissioner of the Public Housing Administration, and the President of the Federal National Mortgage Association would not be changed. In effect, these officials would be downgraded by having a layer of six sub-Cabinet rank officials placed between them and the new Secretary.

Higher salaries would be only the first step toward larger departmental expenditures. With Cabinet status would soon come requests for a new office building, erected in a style befitting a department directly concerned with the construction industry. Demands would multiply for chauffeurs, limousines, public relations officials, speech writers, mimeograph machines, flags, carpets, and all the other status symbols of an executive agency with Cabinet status.

Pressures would also mount for an expansion in other expenditures as well as in personnel. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare provides the most recent example of what happens once an agency becomes a department with Cabinet status. Created by Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953, HEW made budget outlays of $1,981 million in the fiscal year 1954, its first complete year of operation. In the fiscal year 1963, HEW's budget expenditures will amount to $5,183 million, or an increase of 160 percent over 1954, according to the President's budget estimates. Meanwhile, HEW personnel will have risen 125 percent in 10 years. It is hard to say just how much Federal outlays and personnel for programs of health, education, and welfare might have grown during this period if HEW had not been created. But I have no doubt that HEW's experience sets an example that a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing would try to emulate, if not surpass.

Mr. President, the proposed reorganization plan has other objectionable features that call for its rejection. In the first place, the very concept of the plan, as well as the Department it would create, is confused and uncertain. While the emphasis of the Department would apparently be on urban affairs, urban housing, and urban renewal, it would not be confined solely to urban matters. Many present HHFA programs are not limited to urban or even to suburban communities.

The community facilities program, for example, was originally designed for very small communities. Even now, it is limited to communities having a population of less than 50,000, except in redevelopment areas where the program is limited to communities of less than 150,000. If the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing were ever established, would the community facilities program then be broadened to include the biggest cities? And even if the program were not so broadened, what chance would a rural community have to obtain any help from a program placed in a department devoted principally to aiding the biggest communities?

The same thing applies to the college housing program. Would the new Department substantially confine its efforts to colleges and universities located in major metropolitan areas? If so, all the hundreds of small colleges in the country or in small towns would more or less be left to fend for themselves.

HHFA's programs are not now limited to urban areas. If a Department of Urban Affairs is to be created, functions of HHFA belonging to rural areas should not be sent to this new agency, where they would be smothered.

The reorganization plan gives the false appearance of covering all urban affairs. Of course, it does no such thing—at least, at the present time. Urban affairs include labor questions, industrial, financial, and commercial matters, and transportation policies. Urban affairs include schools and colleges, highways, water, and sewage systems, electric, and gas supplies, airports, and post offices, libraries, and law courts. The new Department would have no direct responsibility for any of these subjects, except to the extent they might be taken over under the guise of urban renewal or community facilities.

Nor would the proposed Department of Urban Affairs and Housing have jurisdiction over all housing. Some major programs would continue to be independently operated. The Veterans' Administration would still administer its direct and guaranteed home loan programs, under which more than $31 billion in loans is outstanding. The Federal Home Loan Bank Board—a constituent agency of the HHFA as late as 1955—would still supervise most savings and loan associations, whose residential mortgage holdings exceed $65 billion. The Department of Agriculture would still operate its rural housing loan programs, under which more than $250 million is outstanding.

While some major housing programs would remain outside the proposed Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, at least one program within the Department would be altered radically. Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962 would relegate the operations of the FHA to a secondary role in a manner inconsistent with the long legislative history of the agency which dates back to 1934.

The HHFA Administrator is currently responsible, under the Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1947, "for the general supervision and coordination" of the functions of FHA. But the proposed Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962 would transfer the functions of the FHA and its officers to the Secretary of the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. The plan specifies that these functions "shall be carried out under his—the Secretary's—direction by the Federal Housing Commissioner."

Today, the FHA Commissioner, who administers the most important program of a private-enterprise nature in the HHFA, is subject to the general supervision and coordination of the HHFA Administrator. According to the proposed plan, the FHA Commissioner would be placed under the direction of the Secretary in a subordinate capacity well below the rank of the Under Secretary and Assistant Secretaries created by the plan. He would carry out only those functions that the Secretary deemed desirable to delegate to him, whether of a private enterprise or of a welfare-type nature.

Mr. President, even though the proposed Department would administer some urban affairs and some housing, it would probably continue to operate for the benefit of larger cities at the expense of smaller towns and rural areas. In other words, it would primarily be a department of large city affairs and housing. Even now, public housing and urban renewal—the biggest programs in HHFA—are oriented toward the larger cities. Many smaller towns have yet to receive assistance.

In the case of public housing, projects are located in every one of our 21 largest cities. But they are situated in fewer than one-fourth of all places with 10,000 to 25,000 inhabitants. Urban renewal projects are located in over four-fifths of our 21 largest cities. But they are found in fewer than 10 percent of all places with 10,000 to 25,000 inhabitants. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table showing the distribution of public housing and urban renewal projects by size of locality.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Public housing and urban renewal projects by size of locality

	With population in 1960 of—										
	Under 2,500	2,500 to 4,999	5,000 to 9,999	10,000 to 24,999	25,000 to 49,999	50,000 to 99,999	100,000 to 249,999	250,000 to 499,999	500,000 and over	Unclassifiable	Total
Total number of places, 1960	14,345	2,152	1,394	1,134	432	201	81	30	21	--------	19,790
Number of places served by public housing projects	423	251	236	257	143	101	63	25	21	22	1,542
Number of localities with urban renewal projects	-------	100	------	104	87	83	55	24	17	--------	470
	Percent of total population size group										
Places with—											
Public housing projects	3	12	17	23	33	50	78	83	100	--------	------
Urban renewal projects	([1])	([1])	([1])	9	20	41	68	80	81	--------	------

[1] Less than 1 percent.

Source: Number of places: April 1960, from Census of Population: 1960, includes 13,740 rural places under 2,500. Public housing: Sept. 30, 1961, from PHA semiannual report on local authorities, for places served by local authorities with PHA low-rent projects or reservations, excluding Puerto Rico. Urban renewal: June 30, 1961, from URA "Urban Renewal Project Characteristics," by most advanced project approval. Data include Puerto Rico.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the table indicates that, if past trends continue, a vote for a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing would be equivalent to a vote for a Department of Large City Affairs.

A vote to disapprove the President's proposed plan, on the other hand, would be a vote to help preserve State and municipal autonomy. States and localities need greater encouragement to work out their own problems—not greater incentive to lean on the Government for aid, regulation, and control.

To give Cabinet status to HHFA would provide a direct Cabinet voice for the larger cities requesting Federal help in order to solve their own problems for them. This, in turn, would multiply demands upon the Treasury well beyond what is now available. Even under present arrangements, the HHFA Administrator clearly implied in hearings last year before the Housing Subcommittee of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee what is at stake. Referring to urban renewal, he said at page 249 of the hearings:

> As more and more communities undertake and expand their urban renewal, the Federal Government must be prepared to meet its share of the cost.

Federal loans and grants dispensed by a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing would undoubtedly be made available in the future for a wider variety of purposes, and upon progressively more generous terms. Recent precedents are provided by the Housing Act of 1961. It opened up new vistas for Federal aid toward subsidized middle-income housing, open space, and mass transportation, to mention only a few, and liberalized further the terms under which Federal assistance could be extended for certain programs. Pointing to these and similar changes, a new Department of Urban Affairs and Housing would certainly press for their extension to other fields and other programs.

Under existing authority, the HHFA Administrator has already shown in the case of the community facilities program what can happen to broaden Federal lending activities. As I pointed out on the Senate floor on January 23 of this year, the HHFA Administrator—who would become the Secretary of Urban Affairs and Housing—has reinterpreted a basic statutory limitation upon the program in a manner inconsistent with the interpretation given to the same language by several other Federal agencies. As a result, HHFA loans for community facilities have been made available under generous conditions that discourage localities from seeking alternative private sources of funds.

In conclusion, Mr. President, the proposed reorganization plan appears—though without complete success—to create a new department representing the city dweller. The Department would stand in opposition to everyone who is not a city dweller. In my opinion, it would be most unfortunate to create a department for this purpose.

No sharp cleavage now exists, as the plan implies, between city dwellers and everyone else. I do not think we should create a department to make such a cleavage artifically. Our major problems—problems of war and peace, problems of employment and unemployment, problems of industry, finance, commerce, and transportation—apply to all of us whether we live in the city or in suburban, rural nonfarm, or farm areas. Existing executive departments and agencies are based on programs and functions, not on location. The creation of a new Department of Urban Affairs and Housing designed to cater solely to the city dweller and to lobby for him would discriminate unjustly against the 3 out of every 10 persons who now reside in rural areas.

Recently a nonpartisan analysis of this entire issue was made by two political scientists and members of the faculty at Duke University, Robert H. Connery and Richard H. Leach. Their extensive study was published in 1960 by the Harvard University Press under the title of "The Federal Government and Metropolitan Areas." Chapter 5 of their book is entitled "A Department of Urban Affairs: Pro and Con."

After discussing the question at length, the authors conclude by rejecting the idea of a department in these words:

> The proposal does not make political sense, it is not in accord with the administrative concepts on which the rest of the executive branch is based, and functionally it would add to the difficulties of effective administration.

In addition, as I said in opening this discussion, the proposal would represent another invasion of the rights of sovereign States.

Mr. President, in view of all the considerations I have mentioned, I urge the Senate to disapprove the proposed Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962.

CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, one of the most challenging problems we face as a Nation in the cold war is to prevent disclosure of vital military information to our Communist enemies. This problem has afflicted three administrations through the years since the close of World War II. The present administration faces the problem today to a degree as severe as that which faced the administrations of Presidents Harry S. Truman and Dwight Eisenhower, or more severe.

At the start of this session of Congress, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, I attended a series of executive briefings by various members of the Defense Establishment. Department of Defense officials disclosed in detail to the members of the committee what purported to be classified information respecting the posture of the military departments.

Much of the classified information conveyed to us was considered so secret that not even staff representatives of committee members were permitted to hear officials of the Defense Department.

I need not tell you, Mr. President, of my great shock upon receiving a copy of the Budget of the United States Government for fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, House Document No. 265, part 1, which gave to all who would read this document information contained in the hearings and given to Members as classified information.

I shall cite some specific examples, beginning with a chart, on page 62, entitled "Summary of Composition of Major Active Armed Forces." The chart gives the actual and estimated numbers of military personnel in every branch, the inventory of their hardware, the number of active aircraft and air wings, and other similar information. At this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the chart on page 62 of the Budget Report.

There being no objection, the chart was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Personnel strength and force structure. The estimated Active Forces at the end of fiscal year 1963 compared with the 2 preceding years are shown in the following table:

Summary of composition of major active Armed Forces

Description	Actual, June 30, 1961	Estimate	
		June 30, 1962	June 30, 1963
Military personnel (in thousands):			
Army	858	1,081	960
Navy	627	666	665
Marine Corps	177	190	190
Air Force	820	888	869
Total, Department of Defense	2,482	2,825	2,684
Military forces:			
Army:			
Divisions	14	16	16
Armored cavalry regiments and combat commands	7	6	6
Brigades	2	1	3
Battle groups (infantry)	8	9	10
Missile commands	4	3	3
Air defense antiaircraft battalions	77	65	63
Surface-to-surface missile battalions	24	30	33
Helicopter aircraft inventory (active)	2,721	2,785	3,039
Fixed-wing aircraft inventory (active)	2,843	2,818	2,855
Navy:			
Commissioned ships in fleet	(819)	(898)	(862)
Warships	375	395	383
Other	444	503	479
Attack carrier air groups	17	18	17
Carrier antisubmarine air groups	11	12	11
Patrol and warning squadrons	38	53	35
Marine divisions	3	3	3
Marine airwings	3	3	3
Aircraft inventory (active)	8,793	9,297	8,950
Air Force:			
U.S. Air Force combat wings	(88)	(98)	(86)
Strategic wings	37	37	33
Air defense wings	19	18	17
Tactical wings	32	43	36
U.S. Air Force combat support flying forces	(119)	(132)	(122)
Air refueling squadrons	65	67	59
MATS air transport squadrons	21	30	26
Other specialized squadrons	33	35	37
Aircraft inventory (active)	16,905	16,244	15,449

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, regardless of classification, this information is valuable aid to our enemies in determining their own military needs vis-a-vis our strengths and weaknesses.

This information and similar statistics are available for the price of $1 to any potential enemy. This is a cheap price, indeed, to pay for information the counterpart of which our own intelligence agencies spend countless dollars and engage in great risks to obtain. An enemy need only write to the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government, Washington, D.C.

Let me cite some other examples contained in this document:

On page 60 of the same budget report appears the following sentence:

> In addition, the Army will purchase nearly 40,000 tactical trucks, a large variety of supporting vehicles, and about 600 aircraft, including the Caribou transports and several types of helicopters.

Nowhere in the unclassified report made publicly available by the Department of Defense presentation do we find these actual figures. However, behind closed doors of the Senate Armed Services Committee these were given as classified information.

Page 61 of the report states:

> The Navy will also procure about 900 aircraft.

Although the closed hearings involved a breakdown as to types on this figure, the number was not contained in the unclassified version of the Department of Defense report issued for public consumption.

On page 58 any potential enemy may read that—

> The budget provides for continuing the capability of maintaining one-eighth of the heavy bomber fleet on continuous airborne alert.

Once again we find a statement—released to members of the committee in guarded executive hearings—appearing in a public document which can be purchased by anyone for the sum of $1.

Finally, page 58 tells anyone interested in the subject that—

> These funds will support an operations force of almost 1,200 bombers at the end of 1963, about half of which will be maintained on a 15-minute alert.

Certainly no one who believes in our open society would contend that information about our defense efforts should be withheld from the public, unless it would lend aid and comfort to a potential enemy. I would go a step further; I think public debate is useful in informing Americans about our readiness and about what is being done with their tax dollars. But I personally cannot see why we must disclose everything in our inventory, the purpose and performance of our hardware, and our plans for future military strength. Can this information fail to aid potential enemies of this country and enable them to tailor their own military posture in a more efficient manner?

This is not to imply that the examples I have listed are necessarily security breaches, or that they have not appeared publicly in other places. However, I feel that if this information is deemed proper for presentation to the public, we should not indulge in the fakery of disclosing it to Senators behind locked doors.

In my view, there exists within the Department of Defense and between the military services a great deal of confusion over what should and should not be classified. To cite an example, during the recent armed services hearings, the Department of the Army, in its presentation, classified certain material that had several days before been publicly released by the Department of Defense. Both reports had been prepared for the same week of hearings before the same committee.

There is a vital and urgent need for the Department of Defense to make its rules on classification and secrecy as clear as possible. The whole situation of disclosure of military information needs a thorough examination at the highest level, with a view to tightening security policy, where necessary, and permitting public disclosures, when possible.

I should like to see the Department of Defense assign the highest priority to such a review; and I feel certain that Congress and the public would welcome a policy which would result in making the work of foreign agents more difficult, rather than easier.

I hope that in the future our enemies will be unable to purchase for the sum of $1, or at any price, information such as that contained in the Budget and numerous other publications.

TAXATION OF FOREIGN OPERATIONS: ITS EFFECTS ON THE DOMESTIC ECONOMY AND THE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, one of the very important subjects of congressional consideration and action this year will be the taxation of income earned abroad by U.S. citizens and U.S. corporations, including branches and subsidiaries of these corporations. Elimination of preferential treatment of income earned in foreign countries is urgent from three standpoints:

First. Fairness and equity in taxation.

Second. Balance-of-payments difficulties and other adverse economic effects that flow from preferential tax treatment of foreign income.

Third. Equalization of international trade opportunities for products produced in the United States.

In an effort to examine this subject in some depth and detail, it is my purpose to make, in the next few days, three or four separate speeches in the Senate, each dealing with major facets of this subject.

President Kennedy and Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon are entitled to commendation for their persistent requests and recommendation to the Congress that tax favoritism for income earned abroad be eliminated. It is, in my opinion, eminently in the public interest that the Congress pass the necessary amendments of tax law this year. Moreover, I think it is necessary that this be done before enactment of the President's reciprocal trade recommendations.

Large and powerful special interests are opposing with all their vigor the closing of these loopholes of tax favoritism. In their intense opposition, these interests are resorting to uncommendable tactics, to say the least. In fact, a very high official in the Kennedy administration informed me last week that some of the large vested interests with farflung investments abroad are attempting to blackmail the administration and Congress into inaction on this subject. He described this attempted blackmail as aimed at the President's recommended international trade program, and described their actions as blatant and vicious.

So, Mr. President, the Senate should be aware of this pressure campaign against correcting an evil favoritism in our tax laws. Let us hope that neither the House nor the Senate nor any department of the executive branch will yield to this pressure and to such tactics. It is with regret that I say, however, that there are already some signs that this pressure campaign is having an effect in at least one of the departments in the executive branch of the Government. This, I am glad to say, is not the Treasury Department.

Our Government, including several members of the legislative branch of Government, has been tardy in adjusting to changed and rapidly changing world conditions, its thinking on the balance of payments, and the taxation of foreign income.

After World War II, there was a dollar and gold shortage among the major trading nations of the world, with the exception of the United States. During this period, my colleagues will recall, one of our major policy objectives was to assist in the buildup of their dollar balances. This policy objective lasted through the late 1940's and early 1950's. The need for such a policy, however, ended at that time, since the necessary buildup by most major nations was accomplished by the middle 1950's.

But, Mr. President, long after the goals of this policy had been accomplished, the policy was continued and strenuous efforts were made by some to provide further tax incentives which, if they had been approved, would have made the severe difficulty of today even more severe and worse. For instance, in 1959, H.R. 5 was introduced in the House, hearings were held, and early in 1960 the bill was approved by the House Ways and Means Committee and passed by the House. It was only by strenuous efforts that a few Members of the Senate were able to prevent its enactment. Fortunately, the Senate declined to pass the bill.

This bill had, as a primary purpose, the draining away of U.S. dollars into foreign investment when even then the crying need in this regard was already not only for the elimination of special tax incentives for promotion of such an outward flow, but for some way to slow the outflow of dollars. Even today, as I have said, one finds strenuous resistance to the correction of these mistaken provisions of our tax law, both in the Government and outside the Government.

It is easier to understand the action on the part of a private interest which is receiving vast benefits from this laxity in our tax law with respect to foreign income. I find it difficult indeed to understand how legislative committees and officials in the executive branch of the Government could take a similar position.

The success of the Marshall plan and other measures for post-war rehabilitation in both Western Europe and Japan was so phenomenal that the results literally caught the United States off guard. This may explain the tardiness of our Government in adjusting to the drastically changed situation affecting international economies and monetary exchange. It is possible that some of our people were misled by the aberrant year, 1957, when the Suez crisis threw all our foreign transactions out of kilter.

The following table, showing gold reserves and dollar holdings of certain foreign countries for the years 1949, 1956, and 1960, shows the rapid buildup to 1956 and the excessive buildup between that year and 1960.

[In millions]

	1949	1956	1960
Austria	$92	$377	$539
Belgium	820	1,054	1,314
France	713	1,557	2,165
Germany	149	3,343	6,450
Italy	564	1,270	3,080
Netherlands	370	983	1,783
Japan	356	1,149	2,169

From 1950 through 1960 we lost about $7 billion in gold and all foreign countries combined increased their liquid dollar holdings by about $12.5 billion.

By 1958 it was obvious to most students—and certainly by 1959 it was, or should have been, obvious even to the casual observer—that the United States was face to face with a real problem in its international transactions and that, unless something happened to reverse the trend, we faced a seemingly permanent adverse balance of payments.

By 1959 and 1960 the problem was becoming acute, but the Eisenhower administration, outgoing and moribund, offered no real leadership for a national adjustment to this increasingly pressing problem, though both President Eisenhower and his Secretary of the Treasury, Robert Anderson, became alarmed over the situation. As a result, there was considerable confusion during 1959 and 1960 as to our national policy and whether fundamental changes would be made.

Indeed, as I have said, the House of Representatives passed a bill, H.R. 5, which, in my opinion, went in the wrong direction. Fortunately, we were able to stop it in the Senate.

The new administration of President Kennedy quickly recognized the danger and difficulty of this growing problem, but it, too, has been slow to provide the necessary leadership to make fundamental corrections.

An important part, though only a part, of the necessary corrective action is the elimination of preferential tax treatment of income earned abroad by U.S. citizens, U.S. corporations, and their subsidiaries. One of the greatest uncontrolled outflows of dollars is associated with the rapid buildup of American investments abroad, especially manufacturing operations in Western Europe, though the problem exists to a certain degree with respect to Canada, Japan, and other areas.

During the past 10 years, the United States has sent abroad, or rather permitted its citizens to send abroad, about $13 billion for investment in American-owned businesses. Two-thirds of this has gone into already well-developed countries. This does not include foreign earnings of such interests that were not repatriated to the United States.

Direct, long-term U.S. investment abroad by U.S. citizens and companies now amounts to approximately $35 billion, and this investment is increasing at a rate of about $3 billion per year. This buildup is due in large part to our faulty tax laws, which encourage runaway investment abroad, and, at the same time, discourage, or at least do nothing to encourage, the repatriation of earnings from this investment in the form of dividends from American-owned foreign subsidiaries and branches.

Even more disturbing is the fact that almost half of our direct investment abroad is going into manufacturing facilities. Our tax laws play a big part in this, too, as I shall now demonstrate.

THE TAX MAGNET

Tax favoritism serves as a positive force to pull capital funds into economic activities thus favored. There are, of course, other forces which also operate to influence the allocation of capital and resources among different economic activities, and we must know something of all of them if we are to understand the direction and magnitude of the resultant vector. But one of the strongest and least understood of the forces pulling dollars out of the country is our faulty tax code which lends undue encouragement to investment abroad at the expense of domestic investment.

In foreign operations there are considerations of cost—often greatly exaggerated—as I shall discuss later. Tariffs and other factors adverse to international trade play a part. But we have done much during the past 30 years to minimize these barriers, and will soon be able to consider legislation which may do even more in this regard. In some types of operations, it is desirable to be near markets in order to render proper service. This is sometimes a compelling reason for locating in one or more countries abroad, but hardly ever the reason for setting up a sales office in a tax haven country.

But the tax factor is the most important consideration in many of our runaway operations.

Many who have given this little thought, as regards foreign operations, can clearly see tax considerations at work in the allocation of capital among various domestic activities. We can see it most clearly, perhaps, in petroleum exploration. It is often not too difficult to persuade an individual in the high-income brackets to put money into drilling for oil, even if the chances of bringing in a productive well do not appear too good. If one ends up with a dry hole, the Government pays for a very large part of the cost. If, on the other hand, one hits it lucky, the Government lets him keep much of the profits tax free. It is considerably more difficult to raise money to start a business that does not have favorable tax treatment. In much the same way, tax favoritism acts to influence foreign as against domestic investment.

We hear much about lower foreign costs as a factor favoring oversea location of a plant. Costs are certainly important, and we must be careful to avoid uneconomic increases in costs here at home. We must, of course, be realistic about price and wage increases. But, let me repeat, the cost factor abroad has been oversold. If our runaway factories are going to Europe for the sake of lower costs, many of their owners are doomed to disappointment.

The cost factor was put in pretty good perspective by a survey made last year by the National Industrial Conference Board. This survey covered 100 firms which had plants both in the United States and abroad. While, among these firms, 89 articles could be made and marketed abroad more cheaply than in the United States, 94 products showed higher unit costs abroad. These costs included overhead and sales expense. Purely on production costs, the United States would look even better. I question that a manufacturing plant is very often located in Europe purely on the basis of lower cost of production. But where cost is an element, it is something everyone can understand.

The pull of tax incentives, on the other hand, is not nearly so well understood. We hear comparatively little said about the movement of factories to Europe because of the lower taxes imposed as compared with Federal, State, and local taxes imposed on a domestic plant.

There are several separate and distinct tax advantages to locating a factory in Europe:

First, deferral. Most foreign enterprises owned by U.S. corporations, except those connected with petroleum and mining operations, are organized as subsidiaries rather than branches. This means that no U.S. taxes are due until such time as dividends are paid to the parent organization in the United States. In many instances income taxes in foreign countries are considerably lower than in the United States. Furthermore, even when the tax rate is substantially the same, as in the case of Germany, a sales office in Switzerland can be used in such a way as to lower the effective German tax.

The value of tax deferral is real and measurable. It amounts to an interest-free loan of tax moneys which should have been, and were not, paid over to the United States. This tax-free loan continues as long as the profits are not repatriated to the United States. In many instances this situation has lasted for many years. In other instances ways are found to liquidate the foreign operation and to return the money in a form which is taxed at a much lower rate.

A study made about 2 years ago by the American Management Association showed that, because of this preferential tax on operations abroad, as compared with taxes here at home, reinvestment of foreign earnings could provide, over a 3-year period, roughly double the rate of profit accumulation for reinvestment that is possible under domestic tax schedules.

This, Mr. President, certainly should illustrate that tax deferral on the earnings of foreign subsidiaries is very real, very great and measurable. The deferral privilege then both draws funds overseas and tends to keep them there.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. The distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee is making a most important statement, one of the most important which has been made in regard to the problem we face as to the outflow of gold, which impairs the soundness of the U.S. dollar. The vast amount of investment abroad which the Senator recites, of nearly $13 billion, indeed is a claim against our dwindling gold stocks because of the overexport of American dollars abroad, beyond a balance of trade. If there were an outflow of dollars connected only with our genuine trade balance, we would be in a surplus position rather than a deficit position, would we not?

Mr. GORE. Yes, indeed.

Mr. MONRONEY. So it is the investment abroad which causes the difficulty. As the distinguished Senator points out, this has been in excess of $13 billion in the last 10 years, and is now running at a rate of about $3 billion a year. A large part of the dollar deficit in our trade balance shows up because of that; is that not correct?

Mr. GORE. That is correct. I wish to emphasize that this is only direct investment abroad. This outflow of investment capital does not include the reinvestment of profits, untaxed profits abroad, nor does this $13 billion figure include types of capital outflow other than for direct investment.

Mr. MONRONEY. I was coming to that, which is a most important point. I was merely laying a predicate, by stating that we are exporting dollars at the rate of $3 billion a year for investment abroad. There is little or no return on the $3 billion in taxable profits made by contractors who build buildings, or by suppliers who supply raw materials, or by laboring men who draw wages and pay income taxes, which would have been generated had the $3 billion a year been invested in an expansion at home.

Mr. GORE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. Therefore, we must take it one step further. I think this is the important point. There is in fact little, if any, repatriation of earnings on these investments abroad. I have discussed the problem with leading industrialists who defend the process by saying, "This gives us capital to reinvest." Certainly the reinvestment, as the Senator points out, would not be made until the profits were repatriated. It is strictly a voluntary repatriation, and there is a heavy tax on the part of the United States when the money is repatriated. So we almost put a ransom, so to speak, on the dollars remaining abroad. If the dollars come back to the United States, they are taxed and shrink in accordance with the U.S. tax. If the dollars remain abroad, they need not be taxed at all until they are brought back to the United States.

Mr. GORE. Why does the Senator use the word "almost"? Do we not in fact give a premium to people to keep the money abroad?

Mr. MONRONEY. I quite agree. One leading industrialist told me of a plant which had been started several years ago in France, and said that they had been able, by plowing back earnings from the plant, to build a plant in Switzerland, a plant in Germany, and a plant in Italy. There are some 10 more countries to go. By the time they have built a plant in each of those countries, they will probably get around to rebuilding or expanding the original plant. The dollars will never come home.

I cannot see any reasonable prospect, unless there is a severe war scare or a severe threat of the taking over by an irresponsible or unreliable government, that the dollars will finally come back to the United States in the form of dollars to be taxed. In other words, as long as we help support—and I am all for this, as is the distinguished Senator—an economic climate in an effort to combat communism and, to some degree, socialistic tendencies abroad, for that length of time we insure that the dollars will never return to the United States. They will go on and on, like the babbling brook, and forever the income from the original investment will remain abroad to benefit the economies abroad and to provide jobs and work for the people of Western Europe, because the security which our own defense forces and our efforts in NATO have created keeps them there.

Is that not a correct statement?

Mr. GORE. The Senator is correct. I thank the Senator for his able contribution. I was interested in the quotation he gave from a leading American industrialist with investments abroad. I believe that gentleman said to him that the provision of the tax law about which we are speaking, "gives us capital to reinvest." Indeed, that statement is correct, if one should compare the tax treatment of a business investment in the United States with that of such an investment abroad.

If the gentleman about whom we are speaking should make a profit of $1 million from the operation of a factory in the United States, the corporate income tax would be 52 percent of the $1 million. But if he should make $1 million on his investment through earnings by a subsidiary abroad, he would pay absolutely nothing to the United States, until, unless, or if the money was brought back to the United States. So, in fact, such an industrialist would retain the tax moneys which he owes and should pay annually, in my opinion, to the U.S. Government to invest abroad.

What might be the consequences of a continuation of such practice? We shall find that export markets for American factories will be taken away, not because in many instances we are priced out of the market, but because our tax laws give preferential treatment to income earned abroad by our own corporations through their foreign subsidiaries. Therefore we find typewriter factories moving from the United States to Italy. We find prominent automobile concerns making parts abroad and then assembling cars here in the United States, or even shipping in the completely assembled automobile. Why? I could not illustrate the point better than the quotation I read from a survey made by the American Management Association. The association said that over a 3-year period "roughly double the rate of profit accumulation for reinvestment that is possible under domestic tax schedules" could be accomplished.

So when the industrialist with a foreign investment states to my friend the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma that the tax laws give him money to reinvest, then indeed that statement is correct. The U.S. Government, in effect, lends him the money interest free, and puts the most favorable interpretation possible upon the action.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am afraid that the term "lend interest free" might be misleading, because it is not a loan that has a due date upon it. The money is not returned. It is an indefinite advance against which, during our lifetimes, the results of the American investment abroad may never return, or it may never return until a great crisis faces the investment abroad. Then it may run away from Europe and seek a haven here.

Mr. GORE. The Senator is correct. In turn I suggest to the able Senator that even though there might be a threat of expropriation or socialization of factories in Ghana, Belgium, or Italy, the dollars which have been invested in a plant may not be returned to the United States. In fact, if the dollars are not in liquid funds but rather invested in plant and facilities, they cannot be returned to the United States unless the property is sold. The property might be seized. So there is no assurance that the profits will ever be repatriated.

Of course, under the tax laws there are other ways of proceeding, such as the collapsing of a foreign subsidiary, in which case the funds would be returned and taxed at a capital gains rate.

Mr. MONRONEY. The rate would be only 25 percent, as I recall, and all the resulting earnings of 10 or 20 years of oversea profits could be collapsed in one operation and taxed at a capital gains rate. Is that statement correct?

Mr. GORE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. But if the parent corporation had had a capital gains loss by reason of the disposal of unprofitable properties, then even that would be subject to credits against the write-off allowed—quite properly under the capital gains laws—for the destruction, tearing down, or abandonment of other producing properties here.

Mr. GORE. The Senator is correct.

Another one of the advantages in any tax treatment of foreign operations is the foreign tax credit.

Second, foreign tax credits. A business enterprise located in a typical city in the United States must pay State taxes, county taxes, city taxes, and often other special taxes in addition to its U.S. income tax. All these non-Federal taxes are, of course, business expenses and are properly deductible from gross income in determining income subject to tax by the Federal Government.

But in the case of foreign income and similar taxes, these items of actual business expense are not charged off as expenses. Instead, they are applied as a credit against the U.S. income tax if and when that tax is finally paid. This ability to use foreign income taxes as a credit against U.S. income taxes rather than a deduction from taxable income gives a decided edge to foreign investment.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am very glad that my distinguished colleague from Tennessee is speaking on this subject again. I know that he has called to the attention of the Senate and the public many times the fact that at the present time instead of goods we frequently export capital to compete with the goods we make here.

My colleague from Tennessee is talking about foreign taxes in foreign countries. I should like, first, to ask him how they compare with taxes on income earned in the United States, generally.

Mr. GORE. As a general rule, the income tax rate is lower abroad. Of course, the tax on income varies from country to country. It varies also as to the interpretation of what is or what is not taxable income. I could answer my distinguished colleague only generally by saying that on the average the income taxes abroad are lower than they are in the United States.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Then, as I understand, any tax that is paid abroad is not just a deduction against income, but it is also a deduction against any tax that might sometime be paid on the earnings of that foreign corporation to the United States. Is that correct?

Mr. GORE. That is correct. I maintain that that gives a decided advantage to a foreign operation. Let me illustrate that point. Suppose that a factory is located in New Orleans, La. There, a State income tax would be levied against the profits of the factory. The city of New Orleans might levy a similar tax also. In this case, the factory would treat these taxes as a cost of doing business. They would be subtracted from gross income, along with other expenses of doing business, in order to arrive at the taxable income.

Not so with the foreign tax. It is subtracted from the taxes which are paid to the United States or which should be paid to the United States, if and when such taxes are paid.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I remember that when a committee of which I am a member conducted an investigation into the operations of the Middle East oil companies—and my colleague also has spoken on this subject several times—we had a very vivid example of what the Senator is speaking of now, and that is, that the Middle Eastern countries levied a tax which was to some extent in lieu of royalty on the number of barrels of oil taken out of the ground. This was charged not as an operating expense, but was considered a credit on any tax that might be paid to the United States. As a result these companies have paid little or no tax on their very large operations in the Middle East. Is that not true?

Mr. GORE. Many large international oil companies pay little or no tax. As a matter of fact, I have seen the tax return of one very large international oil concern. I have seen this return, as have also the other members of the Finance Committee, in executive session. That return showed that over a 5-year period the corporation paid absolutely no tax at all to the United States.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yet the United States gives them protection and tries to see to it that their property is not taken over.

Mr. GORE. Yes; and I think the United States should. But I also believe that these corporations, which are making these enormous profits, ought to pay their fair share of the burden of national defense and the cost of government. Let us compare that with the cost of the independent operator in the State of Oklahoma. How can a man there compete?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I think it is high time that something be done about the situation. I know the bill originates in the House of Representatives. However, I hope that the Senator from Tennessee will press hard for some remedies when the bill gets to the Senate, if it gets here.

Mr. GORE. I surely shall. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. What I am about to ask relates to a kindred subject. Coming back to the $13 billion outflow in the last 10 years and the present rate of $3 billion a year and the disproportionate tax rate——

Mr. GORE. That is outflow of $3 billion is the current increase in value of direct investment.

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes; not reinvestment.

Mr. GORE. That is direct investment.

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes. Does not the financing of the construction and the plant operations abroad add further pressures to the availability of capital in the United States for expansion? In other words, it is in direct competition, because whatever expansion is done is largely done on financing floated inside the United States, on the stock market or by bonds or debentures, with the dollars acquired here and exported abroad. Therefore, the law of supply and demand of investment capital being sought for the expanding growth that President Kennedy has warned we must have, the trend to a higher and higher interest rate level is adding not only to the difficulties of the necessary domestic expansion of industrial capabilities, but in doing so is also adding to the long-range interest burden that these people must pay; whereas, if these investors abroad wish to set up genuine foreign corporations, their credit is good enough so that they can go into the foreign market and borrow deutsche marks or pounds sterling or other currencies, like liras or francs, and use those for their plants abroad, paying perhaps a slight interest premium, but in this way in one stroke eliminating the outflow of $3 billion a year in the dollar deficits balance in the United States.

Mr. GORE. The Senator makes a pertinent point. To the extent that capital flows abroad as a result of this lax tax treatment of profits earned abroad, tight money is that much tighter, and competition for investment capital and competition for the sale of municipal and county and State and Government bonds is made just that much keener.

Thus the pressure on interest rates in the United States is upward. Strange as it may seem, the same groups that oppose eliminating this loophole in tax favoritism on their foreign earnings are now pressuring the U.S. Government to raise the rediscount rate in order to stop the outflow of funds. It seems that they get it both ways. This should not be permitted.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator has heard, as I have, the cry and has read the newspaper stories emanating from high places in the Federal Reserve that, having gone through this upward spiral of interest rates before, it sounds like the band coming down the street with the banner reading "Higher and Higher Interest Rates."

It would seem to me, partly because of the excessive outflow of dollars abroad for investment in well developed countries and partly because of the tax haven that this investment offers, we are, in our own businesses that the President is lecturing to, and in the Nation that he has been lecturing to, on the need for growth of our own industrial capabilities, and to not take second place in the economic race against the Communist world, face to face with a difficult problem, and the Senator's speech shows one of the causes of the brakes being put on domestic industrial expansion. It seems these brakes are being applied by the very pressure of taxes which penalize domestic American industry and work to the advantage of those who seek to invest abroad. So we get it in a 3-way punch: First, the jeopardizing of our gold supply by the investment of huge sums of money abroad, rather than paying foreign corporations with foreign currencies; second, in higher interest rates because of the law of supply and demand, requiring us to change the rediscount rate, and therefore to apply the brakes—and they are 4-wheel brakes; and, third, by hampering the necessary industrial expansion the President is seeking to obtain in the next 4 years to protect our status as the principal industrial Nation in the world.

Someone in the White House ought to be concerned about this situation. I am somewhat disappointed to observe that over at least a year the monetary problems inherited from the past administration have so largely been left unattended. I know the President has been a busy man; but there are persons in his administration who have ample time to study the problem and focus public attention upon the difficulty we are experiencing.

Mr. GORE. I point out one additional way in which America is slapped by this lack of tax treatment of profits earned abroad. Our unemployment rolls continue high. In many areas in the United States employment opportunities are scarce. Indeed, one of the bills enacted last year undertook to provide stimulus for the development of industry in distressed areas; but the premium which Congress placed upon the locating of an industry in any one of the many distressed areas of the United States is not nearly so great as the tax premium for building a factory abroad, which is inherent in the provisions of the tax law which I am discussing.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to my distinguished senior colleague from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I know that some persons unthoughtfully might wish to characterize this discussion or colloquy as tending to advocate something in the direction of isolationism; that is, not wanting Americans to build factories abroad; not wanting foreign companies to build factories here. My colleague from Tennessee, the Senator from Oklahoma, and I, being what we might term internationalists, know that that is not the situation.

All my colleague from Tennessee is saying is that if American industries wish to build factories abroad—and certainly they should if the economic situation justifies it—they should at the same time pay their fair share of taxes in the United States. They should not build their factories abroad purely, simply, and only for the purpose of trying to avoid tax responsibility to the Government of the United States. I think that is the basis of this discussion; and on that basis it is very sound.

Mr. GORE. I thank my distinguished colleague from Tennessee. It is true that those who wish to preserve this privileged tax treatment will use almost any argument to keep it; and among the arguments they use is that to close this loophole will interfere with freer trade. I am glad my colleague from Tennessee has raised that point.

Needless to say, both he and I have, without fail, supported the liberalization of international trade throughout our careers in the U.S. Congress which, in each instance now, extends beyond 20 years. This is likewise true of the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], with whom it was my honor to take the oath of office in the U.S. Congress on the same day.

Let us examine this proposition. If a barrier is erected in one country to the free flow of trade and commerce, then that is called a tariff wall; it is called an impediment or a hindrance to the free flow of international commerce. Indeed, that is what a tariff wall is: It is there to give protection to a domestic industry.

Now suppose that a wall is not erected, but that a subsidy, a premium, an enticement, or a reward is offered to induce the flow of investment funds abroad. That is an impediment in reverse. One situation contributes to inequality; one inhibits the free flow of trade and commerce. Both are impediments. That is one reason why I say it is necessary to deal with preferential tax treatment of income earned abroad at the same time as, or before, we pass a bill further to facilitate international trade. This is a hindrance of the equality of economic opportunity, as I have tried to point out.

Let us take an example. Suppose a U.S. typewriter manufacturer finds that by making its typewriters in Italy or Switzerland, in a period of only 3 years the accumulation of profits which it can earn and set aside for reinvestment is twice as great as it could accomplish in the United States. Then I should say that that is a great inducement; it is a subsidy by way of taxation to the exportation of the U.S. typewriter factory. What will we find? We will find that factory stopping its production in the United States. It will maintain only a sales agency in this country, but will conduct its manufacturing abroad. What effect will that have? It will throw American workmen out of their jobs. It will reduce the revenue in the form of taxes paid to the Federal, State, and local governments. It will thereby prevent the standard of living of the American people from being increased to its proper level.

So long as there was in the free world the problem of the dollar gap, when the excess of holdings of the United States created an imbalance of trade, there may have been justification for a policy of tax incentives to encourage such investment abroad. I seriously doubt the use of our tax laws in pursuance of foreign policy, although there may have been an argument for it then. However, when the problem is no longer a dollar gap for Great Britain or West Germany or Switzerland or Belgium or Holland or Italy or almost any other country, but, rather, is the outflow of capital from the United States, the imbalance of payments for the United States, then I say it is time for us to consider this problem in the light of the circumstances as they exist in 1962, not as they were in 1952.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, if my colleague will yield further——

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to his colleague?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. In addition to the sales in the country in which the factory may be located, I believe the record shows that quite often the factory built abroad with American capital, which is receiving a preferred tax treatment, competes by means of importing materials back to the United States. Certainly in the markets of other countries such an arrangement has reduced exports from the United States to many of our best customers. Is not that true?

Mr. GORE. That is very true.

AMENDMENT OF ACT ESTABLISHING CODE OF LAW FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business which will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 5143) to amend section 801 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901.

TAXATION OF FOREIGN OPERATIONS: ITS EFFECTS ON THE DOMESTIC ECONOMY AND THE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, to cite another example: A U.S. corporation with a large export trade will build a subsidiary abroad, first to service, then to sell to its customers abroad from the subsidiary foreign factory. This cuts down on the exports from the U.S. factory. It cuts down on the production from the U.S. factory, and may even result in imports back into the United States of the products of its foreign subsidiary. On the profits of this foreign subsidiary it pays no taxes currently, and may, indeed, pay very little taxes at any time. This is very damaging to international commerce.

Another step which was not typical until recently, although it may be typical now: A holding company, another subsidiary, is established in a tax haven country—for example, in Liechtenstein, Monaco, Panama, or Switzerland. The profits are funneled from the foreign manufacturing subsidiary located in, let us say, Germany, and from the sales back in the United States, into the tax haven corporation, thereby avoiding the payment of taxes in any substantial amount to anyone, anywhere. That is being done by hundreds of U.S. corporations; and, as I have said, the managers of these corporations are now threatening, or are undertaking to blackmail, the U.S. Government into inaction to correct this loophole of tax favoritism—threatening to oppose the President's recommended reciprocal trade program unless the administration agrees to withdraw its support of its own recommendation that this favoritism be corrected. This we must not stand for.

Third, gross-up. There is another provision of the law which needs correction; it is the provision which permits a faulty gross-up. Due to imperfect language in the statute dealing with the crediting of foreign taxes against U.S. income taxes, there is allowed, in effect, both a deduction and a credit for foreign income and associated taxes paid. This has the effect, even without setting up a tax haven operation, of reducing the effective U.S. tax rate to close to 40 percent in some instances.

Fourth, tax-haven abuses. Mr. President, I have already referred to tax-haven abuses. I do not wish to take the time today to detail all of the various types of tax-haven abuses possible under our tax laws. At a later date I expect to deal at some length with such tax-haven abuses. Let me say just now that these abuses are legion, and are used, not only to reduce foreign taxes and pull profits of legitimate foreign operations into tax havens almost tax-free, but tax havens are also used to pull profits from American domestic operations into tax havens, so as to escape U.S. taxes. This latter type of outflow, or lack of proper inflow, of dollars is doubly harmful.

It is also often possible to collect profits for several years in a tax-haven dummy corporation, then collapse the corporation and bring home the accumulated profits in the form of capital gains which are subject to a maximum tax rate of 25 percent. I have already referred to this.

Many of these tax-haven abuses are subject to correction administratively—if they can be detected, if the books are available, and if all taxpayers concerned are cooperative. These circumstances seldom prevail. Detection is difficult, and requires the time of many more highly trained and skilled revenue agents than we have available, even if all of them were put on such cases. Furthermore, with the books in a foreign country, and often subject to strict so-called antiespionage laws, it is impossible for the U.S. Government to get at the true facts.

Mr. President, as I have said, within the next week or two, I shall have more to say about tax-haven operations and abuses. Suffice it to say right now that similar operations and opportunities for tax avoidance and evasion are not available to domestic operations.

Fifth, income earned abroad by individuals. Foreign operations have a further tax advantage over domestic operations, in that U.S. citizens are allowed, under our faulty tax laws, to go abroad and work for a number of years and avoid payment of U.S. income taxes. This makes working overseas relatively attractive, and enables companies with foreign operations to hire capable U.S. personnel at lower salaries or wages than those they would otherwise have to pay.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. GORE. Yes; I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Yesterday, in one of the leading Washington newspapers, I read a review of a new motion picture. It started out by saying:

> This is one of the few featured pictures that have been made in California in recent years.

Mr. GORE. What has happened to Hollywood?

Mr. MONRONEY. Hollywood has suffered from what the able Senator has been talking about, in that the premium in the retention of dollars abroad has created not only a tax haven, but the movement abroad of an industry which was once distinctly American, and which poured hundreds of millions of dollars into this country not only from the taxation of the motion picture industry and motion pictures themselves, but also from the extremely high salaries paid to the movie stars. The industry is finding it cheaper to export stars. Today, if one wants to find an American movie star he finds him or her in Italy, France, Spain, Mexico, or other areas in the world. This has had a very depressing effect, if not an almost catastrophic effect, on the once giant movie industry of California. The great studios that once produced prize pictures are now manufacturing 15-minute television horror shows. We have gone from art to horror in our classic treatment of drama, and both our intellectual diet and our financial income have suffered greatly from the very thing of which the Senator is speaking.

Not only is the income earned abroad by the individual movie stars, as well as the engineers, machinists, or designers, but also the group who earned their great reputation in American-made pictures now find it of great advantage to make moving pictures abroad, as do the producers of which the Senator speaks, under the tax haven which allows a much greater amount of the gross to be retained under the tax laws of the United States.

Mr. GORE. When I was last in Geneva, sometime last year, someone remarked that there were more U.S. movie stars in Geneva than there were in Hollywood. I do not know whether that was an accurate statement, but I find it extremely interesting that the Senator read an advertisement yesterday regarding a new movie which stated that it was one of the few motion pictures which have been made in the United States in recent years. The salaries of movie stars, of course, are only a small part of the overall problem, but I ask the Senator from Oklahoma why an American citizen who earns his income in Bermuda or in Canada, even though he is there only temporarily, should have less of an obligation to contribute to the defense and welfare of his country than if he lived in Hollywood or Tennessee or Pennsylvania.

The Senator has cited something which he read in the daily press of yesterday. I too read an interesting article—not an advertisement; this was a news article. I shall not name the company, because I am not certain of all the facts, but let me recite the purport of the article. It was a news story that one of our large automobile companies was going to produce a new compact model automobile. Deep in the story I read that the parts were to be made in a factory abroad, but the automobile was to be assembled in the United States. This illustrates one of the trends to which this tax loophole contributes directly.

What the able Senator from Oklahoma said about the salaries of our movie stars goes for the salaries of the officials and the employees of the foreign subsidiaries, and some of them are not so far away. It does not take very long to fly from Miami to Nassau—about 20 or

30 minutes. Yet, if an American citizen establishes a home in Nassau and has a subsidiary there from which he earns a large salary, he not only makes no tax payment to the U.S. Government, but, under the tax laws, he does not owe any on this particular income.

President Kennedy has recommended that that loophole be closed. He has recommended that many more of the loopholes of tax favoritism on income earned abroad be closed. I hope the Congress will not delay very long in correcting these loopholes. I must say that we have been tardy. The legislative branch has been tardy, and some elements of the administration are already weakening on the recommendation. I do not think they include the President. I have talked with him personally about it. I do not think they include the Secretary of the Treasury. I want to see these loopholes closed.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Lest someone say that, after all is said and done, and after all of the tax postponements and deductions, and matters of that kind, finally, in the end, the inheritance tax will get you, if you are an American citizen. It is my understanding those who choose to buy a palatial estate particularly in the British Commonwealth countries, in the rapidly growing sunshine areas of the Bahamas or Jamaica, will be allowed a heavy tax deductibility by the British for homesteads. This also would be one way in which, even in the final analysis of the inheritance tax which might be due, the graciousness of our tax laws will permit exemptions abroad.

Mr. GORE. There is a provision in our tax law which exempts foreign real estate from U.S. estate taxes. It is a complete exemption. I can cite some very interesting cases to the able Senator from Oklahoma, some of which have come to me in a confidential way, in which huge fortunes have been passed on to sons and daughters without the payment of any estate taxes whatsoever through this particular device. It is not limited to the Bahamas, where real estate is now thriving. This is a complete exemption under the U.S. estate tax laws. It, too, is a loophole which President Kennedy has asked Congress to close.

It, too, is a loophole which the Congress has been tardy in closing.

Earlier, the able junior Senator from Oklahoma expressed some disappointment that the administration of President Kennedy had not moved as effectively and as promptly as possible to correct some of the evils in our monetary and taxation field. He is certainly not without cause for his disappointment, but in this instance the President 1 year ago asked the Congress to close these loopholes which discriminate against American citizens, against U.S. communities, against U.S. factories, and against U.S. production, which help to create the serious problem of capital outflow, of imbalance of payments, and of the flight of our gold. The Congress has not closed these loopholes. I think it is in the process now of closing some of them, but only some of them. I am anxious to see all of them closed.

All of these provisions to which I have referred give an advantage, insofar as taxation is concerned, to operating abroad as against performing the same operation here at home. This tax advantage cannot help but act as a magnet to draw funds abroad—funds which could and should be allocated to expanding and modernizing our domestic plant and equipment—funds which could and I think should be invested in our own distressed areas, of which there are many—funds which could and I think should be invested to provide employment opportunities for approximately 4 or 5 million American citizens who are now without jobs.

I do not think it necessary to penalize oversea operations, although the situation may get so bad that some positive, active steps must be taken to prevent or slow down the flow of capital into certain foreign countries. But it seems to me that we should now, during this session, take the necessary legislative steps to insure that taxation is at least neutral. We should at least tax foreign operations as heavily as operations here at home.

To put it another way, we should at least require payment of as much taxes on income earned abroad as upon income earned in the United States. This would not put an end to foreign investment—indeed, such would not be desirable. Such is not my goal. But it would slow down the currently rapid growth of foreign investment and insure the repatriation of sufficient foreign earnings in the years immediately ahead to be of material assistance in the balance of payments as well as to assist in the needed modernization of domestic plant and equipment.

EFFECT ON DOMESTIC ECONOMY

Many who are concerned, and who so often express that concern, about the so-called export of jobs because of the liberalization of trade restrictions and the lowering of tariff barriers will rarely stop to examine our faulty tax laws and the part they play in exporting entire factories and almost entire industries to Europe.

When we break down artificial trade barriers we promote a two-way trade which ultimately benefits and strengthens the economy of all trading nations. This is not to say, of course, that some individuals or segments of industries will not be hurt temporarily, or even permanently. A glass manufacturer, for example, may curtail his activities and his employees may be thrown out of work. But at the same time, production for export may be increased in other lines such as chemicals, machinery, electronics, and farm products. President Kennedy has recognized the domestic problems associated with increased trade and has proposed ways to deal with those problems.

But what about the factory which is lured abroad by a tax loophole? Who benefits from that? Surely our economy as a whole does not. A few large stockholders may benefit. A few insiders may profit from speculation.

A few officials with large salaries earned abroad may escape competely U.S. taxes. But our national interest is injured. Payrolls are lost. People are left unemployed. The productive potential of the country is lessened. The gross national product is lessened, and our standard of living is just that much lower.

Of course the host country benefits from our shipping industries to it. For this reason Congress may not want to discourage investment of a proper type in certain underdeveloped countries. Unfortunately, most of the private investment in such countries is in the extractive industries and this may do the host country but little permanent good. Moreover, the use of tax favors in foreign policy, even in foreign aid, to underdeveloped countries is not the best or most effective means of achieving our objectives.

Now, though, we are interested in building up our domestic economy. We still have a long way to go to reach full employment and production. We are not going to reach this goal by giving our domestic corporations a tax cut—and the fact that this tax cut is computed on the basis of certain plant and equipment purchases does not at all mean that it will influence in one iota the amount or types of such purchases—if at the same time we continue to encourage them to move overseas.

We need to stop this hole in the bottom of our economic bucket through which our economic potential is pouring to other countries. We must do this before or in conjunction with whatever other steps we may take which we hope will build up our domestic economy and improve our international economic position.

A BIG PROBLEM

Sales by U.S.-controlled foreign factories in 1960 amounted to about $24 billion, up about 29 percent from 1957.

Our Commerce Department has estimated that expenditures for plant and equipment abroad by U.S.-controlled foreign operations will amount to about $4.5 billion this year. How many new jobs would such expenditures, added to our normal expenditures for domestic plants and equipment, create here at home? I have no satisfactory yardstick with which to measure this, but we are surely shipping many thousands of jobs overseas every year.

What a stimulus $4½ billion invested in new factories would provide for our distressed areas.

For example, in the State of Massachusetts, from which the distinguished Presiding Officer [Mr. SMITH] hails, there has been a relative loss of population so severe that the State is losing two of its Representatives in Congress as a result of the last census and existing law. What a stimulus would be provided for a State like Massachusetts if it received a fair and reasonable share of the $4½ billion invested in new plant and equipment abroad.

I know that one of our national problems is the stimulation of investment in modern plant and equipment. But our tax laws provide specific stimulus for investment in plant and equipment in subsidiary corporations abroad.

As I said earlier, there may have been a time shortly after World War II when our allies were suffering from a serious dollar shortage and it was advisable to have such a policy. But the need for such a policy ended in 1954 or 1955. But we still have the policy. Various people in and out of government are trying to make the situation worse instead of trying to correct it.

I do not know how many jobs would be involved in the investment of an additional $4.5 billion a year in plant and equipment. I have no yardstick upon which I can rely. Former Secretary of the Treasury George Humphrey estimated that it was necessary to invest $10,000 in order to provide one industrial job. I do not know whether that is a correct measurement or not. Therefore I shall not attempt to give any definitive answer as to the amount of stimulus in employment in the United States that would result from a similar investment in the United States.

When this subject comes up, many will invariably advance the argument that our foreign operations assist our domestic economy because of the increased sales of exports which our activities overseas generate. As in the case of most arguments, there is some truth in this one. One needs to know just how much truth there is in it. The answer is, as I see it, it is just about 10 percent true.

There are four general types of oversea investment. Each must be viewed in a different light insofar as its effects on the domestic economy are concerned. These are:

First. Sales promotion: This is the first type of foreign activity to be discussed by most of those who would defend our present lax tax laws regarding foreign operations. Those who rush to the defense of the tax status quo argue, first and foremost, that to tax foreign operations equitably would destroy this type of activity overseas and thus ruin our export business and harm our domestic economy.

A strange and baseless argument.

In the first place, this type of activity accounts for only 10 percent of our foreign direct investment. In the second place, this type of activity exists because of the profits it can promote for the factory in the United States, not for the profits the sales activity itself can earn in a foreign country. The tightening up of taxes on this small sales activity would not disturb or lower the profits of the major activity which is, after all, located in the United States.

The type of tax reform I am talking about would not harm our foreign sales activities.

I should like to promote such activity. I want to see U.S. exports increased. Sales by a foreign subsidiary of a product manufactured in a foreign subsidiary, the profits from which are not repatriated to the United States, do not in any way help our balance-of-payments problem. Indeed, the problem is only made worse. What I wish primarily to see, and what is needed today, is an increase of exports from the United States, which would correct our balance-of-payments problem. We need an increase of about $2 billion in exports in order to correct our basic imbalance of payments.

Second. Raw materials and supplies: This type of activity now accounts for about 42 percent of direct foreign investment. By and large, these operations do not harm the domestic economy. In fact, they are decidedly of assistance. This is where we get 54 percent of our minerals, metals, and semifinished imports. These operations ship very few jobs out of the country. These operations probably do us more good than they do the host countries.

But what is of importance vis-a-vis taxation is that these operations are not particularly encouraged by our faulty tax laws. Being in the extractive field, these enterprises are set up so as to take advantage of our very generous depletion allowances. They are, therefore, usually organized as branch, rather than subsidiary, operations and repatriate earnings annually on which they pay the regular U.S. rates, less the credit for foreign taxes paid.

The changes in the taxation of foreign operations which I am now advocating would have little bearing on the taxes of branch operations and, therefore, little effect on this segment of our foreign private economic activity.

Third. Public utilities, transportation, and banking: This type of foreign activity might be curtailed somewhat by tightening up on foreign taxation, although I doubt it. At any rate, this accounts for only 15 percent of our direct foreign investment, and this percentage is declining. These are types of activities, also, it might be noted, which lend themselves readily to nationalization.

Fourth. Manufacturing: This is the activity which hurts the United States. This is the activity which helps in an important way to create our serious problem of imbalance of payments. This is also the activity which would be most affected by tightening up our foreign tax laws.

Manufacturing already accounts for 33 percent of our direct foreign investment and is the fastest growing segment. In Western Europe 75 percent of our direct investment has gone into manufacturing—in the United Kingdom, 85 percent. It is this type of foreign investment which hurts our domestic economy and contributes to our balance of payments deficits.

Since this type of activity is usually organized as subsidiaries, and since it often is associated with tax havens, there is less current repatriation of earnings. This is where the deferral privilege, the credit, the gross-up and the tax haven sales hookup really pay off.

This is where these things really hurt the United States most. Changes in these areas of taxation would slow down—although this would not stop the movement of enterprises drawn abroad legitimately—the wholesale movement of manufacturing plants to Europe.

EFFECT ON BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

A great deal has been said about the balance of payments problem in the last 2 or 3 years. In fact, it is currently one of the more fashionable topics of conversation. I must say that it is somewhat misunderstood, even by many who are directly concerned with its solution.

As with so many other problems in this country, the balance of payments is not an absolute, but a relative, problem. There are several ways by which we might solve the problem, or at least greatly lessen it without serious damage to our domestic economy or our ability to compete in the markets of the world. Some solutions, however, are not compatible with our broad national policy.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Before the Senator gets too far away from the discussion which he has just had about the different types of investments abroad, I should like to make a very brief comment and ask a question regarding it. I am sorry I had to leave the Chamber and was not present when the Senator completed that discussion.

Mr. GORE. I welcome the participation of my distinguished and able friend and neighbor, the junior Senator from Alabama, who is chairman of the Small Business Committee in the Senate.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I merely wish to say that I believe the Senator has performed a real service in separating the types of investment abroad and in making the comments he has made regarding them.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SPARKMAN. When the Senator started the discussion, before he got to the 1, 2, 3, 4 spelling out of the subject, my view was running right along that line, namely, that there are some investments abroad that we want to encourage, and do encourage.

Mr. GORE. And which operate beneficially to the United States.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And operate beneficiary to both sides.

Mr. GORE. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Operate beneficiary to both sides. On the other hand, there are some investments abroad which work distinctly to our disadvantage. I will not say that they would be disadvantageous to the country in which they operate. Usually they are advantageous to that country. However, they would be to our disadvantage.

I spent most of November of last year in South America. I was there as the head of a subcommittee of the General Economic Committee which was studying the economic situation in the various South American countries that we visited, particularly with the Alliance for Progress program in mind.

It was quite easy to see that in some of these countries we did have investments made by business people of the United States that were quite beneficial to those countries. Some of them were beneficial to us also. For instance, let us consider the iron ore industry in Venezuela. It is good for Venezuela for private business from this country to be engaged in mining in Venezuela. It is good for us to get the iron ore here.

The Senator from Tennessee has pointed out that one of the great steel centers of the United States is in my State, namely, Birmingham. Birmingham is in a very rich iron ore, coal, and limestone center. It is one of the few places in the world where all three are located in the same neighborhood, which is quite advantageous. Yet the Tennessee Coal & Iron Co., which operates its great installation in Birmingham, has found it to its advantage to import Venezuelan ore. It is richer ore than ours. By mixing it with the local ores, which are produced in Alabama, they are able to get out a better product, and really step up employment. Both sides are thus helped.

I do skip over very lightly the question of whether or not it might be better for Venezuela if it had its own steel mill down there. I do not know. I do not know what the economic factors involved are. At any rate, the Senator has, I believe, done a real service in lining up the different types of investments abroad, showing the effect that they have on our economy and on the economies of those countries. I am sure that he would advocate, in setting up a tax program, that it ought to be one that would encourage these types of investments which will be to the advantage of the economies of both countries, and discourage, if that is the right word, those tax investments that merely are perhaps running from our taxes and which are not contributing to the economy of our country, but enjoying the protection of the laws that this country has made, the protection of the conversion, that is, the guarantee of profits being able to be converted and brought back to this country, and those guarantees that our laws give, without helping to support through taxes the administration of the very laws that they enjoy. I wish to commend the Senator for the job he is doing.

Mr. GORE. I am very grateful to my distinguished and able friend. The extractive industry is not particularly benefited by the deferral provision, because, as I have said, the U.S. companies which operate the extractive industries abroad usually operate in a branch form, rather than in a subsidiary form. There are reasons for that, one of which is the very favorable depletion allowances which are available. The earnings of branch operations in the extractive field are repatriated.

It is largely through subsidiaries that the income which ought to be repatriated and taxed remains abroad and contributes so heavily to our problem of the imbalance of payments.

Many countries, on the other hand, have an absolute problem with their balance of payments. Many countries must import large quantities of important items. These may be raw materials and fuels, or they may be manufactured products beyond the capability of the local economy. Furthermore, domestic consumption must often be curtailed in order to get together enough goods for necessary exports. In such cases, there is generally a low level of gold, dollar, or sterling reserves to fall back on. The balance of payments, then, becomes a problem which must be resolved year by year by such countries—and they are usually small countries—on an absolute basis. If the solution is not forthcoming within a year or two, the economy of the country will collapse and a political upheaval will be inevitable.

Our problem is not of this sort, as I have said. We could cut off the flow of private funds abroad through different types of controls, direct or indirect. We could reduce military expenditures overseas by bringing troops home, by bringing dependents home, or by reducing oversea purchases for their maintenance. We could reduce our foreign aid. We could refuse to allow tourists to carry dollars out of the country. We could refuse to make pension or social security payments to anyone who moved outside the country. We could reduce imports by instituting licensing controls such as those which are in force in many countries. We could raise our tariff walls so high as to prevent imports. We could increase exports immediately in several ways—by subsidies, for example.

But there are reasons, perhaps good ones, for not doing these things—at least not all at once or to an extreme degree. Steps we take along these lines must be taken with a view to the welfare of our friends and allies and to the overall strength of the West as well as to strengthen our own domestic economy.

We have taken some reasonable steps in recent years to take up some of the slack in our balance of payments. We can do more in this regard and still not damage our domestic economy and our Western allies. But certain steps are more productive of good and less productive of harm than others.

The great emphasis now is on increasing exports, and this is all to the good. There are limits to such increases, however, without also increasing imports. It would seem that we will have difficulty in maintaining a favorable balance of trade in excess of $5 billion.

But we must find a way to reduce our balance-of-payments deficit by about $2 billion per year. It is partly because of this problem and partly because of the unfairness of the tax treatment of companies which maintain operations abroad that the President has twice asked Congress to close these loopholes of tax favoritism. I doubt that increased exports can carry the burden alone. In my view, we could reduce our deficit by more than $1 billion by tightening up on our taxation of foreign operations. In other words, we could cut this problem in half and provide a 50-percent solution by tightening up on the taxation of foreign operations, as the President has recommended.

Although we talk a great deal about the balance of payments, and everyone is concerned, we still do not know enough about the subject. Even our statistics are not much better than informed guesses as to what is actually going on. It appeared last year that we were doing very well—up until the fourth quarter. It is possible that there is something wrong with the fourth quarter figures. It is just as likely that there is something wrong with the figures for the first and second quarters of 1961. We simply do not know.

There are at least two things we do know about our balance-of-payments figures. First, much of the short-term investment flow that we classify as "hot money" seems not to come back. Both the fourth quarter of 1960 and 1961 showed abnormally high flows of such funds. A lot of it never shows up as coming back—at least not in the same form. I am convinced that much of it gets overseas and is converted there into long-term investment of one kind or another. Second, it is not possible to know very much about any set of figures when such a large errors-and-omissions item is necessary to make debits and credits balance. This balancing errors-and-omissions figure for 1960 was 20 percent of the deficit in recorded transactions. In other words, we thought we knew where our deficit was coming from, but we missed it by 20 percent. For 1961 it will probably be worse. I say this, because on the basis of what we thought was happening during the first three quarters of 1961 a deficit of about $1.5 billion was predicted—see table 17, page 149 of the President's Economic Report, January 1962. We now think the deficit was about $2.6 billion.

In my opinion, we do not know as much about our true balance-of-payments position and what really causes it as our tables would lead one to think. I think it likely that our capital outflows of different types have been understated in recent years.

Be that as it may, we must try to analyze the situation on the basis of such statistics as we have, uncertain as they are. We do know how much gold we are losing and how much our liquid liabilities to foreign countries and international institutions are increasing. That drain is great; the problem is serious.

We do know something of the part which is being played by private oversea investment. We know something of its effect on our domestic economy as well as on our balance of payments. Many are not yet willing to acknowledge the role which is being played by the rapid buildup of U.S.-owned manufacturing facilities in Europe in the sluggishness of the domestic economy and the deficit in our balance of payments. We must examine this matter closely and take such action as is in the public interest.

One of the things which we must surely examine in this regard—and we must do it when the tax bill now before the Ways and Means Committee gets to the Senate—is the role which the taxation of income and profits earned abroad is playing, and has been playing, in the pull of dollars overseas and in the retention and reinvestment of profits made overseas.

As I have said, we do not know as much as we should about just how we stand on our investment flows. The only year for which we have any real detailed study is 1957. Unfortunately, that was an aberrant year, the year of the Suez crisis, and many of the figures developed for that year now have doubtful validity.

Furthermore, the picture has changed since then in some ways, generally for the worse.

One thing which that 1957 study by the Commerce Department did show, however, was the lag in repatriation of earnings from manufacturing activities abroad—that is, from subsidiary operations. Again I am grateful for the contribution made by my distinguished friend, the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], because unless we identify the problem, we shall be unable to provide a specific solution. About one-half of our receipts from direct investment overseas in 1957 was from petroleum operations. Only one-fifth was from manufacturing. But one-third of our investment is in manufacturing, and the profits are said to be large—at least, it is claimed by those who are going there that the profit margin is considerably higher in Europe than in the United States. This shows conclusively, it seems to me, that earnings from manufacturing abroad are not being repatriated as are earnings from some other types of investment. One reason is that our tax laws allow deferral of taxes for subsidaries; and this, Mr. President, is to put one's finger on the real problem. In branch form, as is the case with petroleum and mining generally, there is more repatriation. Removal of the deferral privilege should help us to repatriate more funds from manufacturing, and thus clear up a part of our payments deficit. The other, and associated, reason for lack of repatriation lies in tax-haven operations.

Last year, Secretary Dillon made a very forceful presentation, to the Ways and Means Committee, on the need for tightening up on the taxation of foreign activities. Particularly useful were the figures which he used showing the breakdown of investment and dollar flows by geographical areas and types of activities. His figures showed an absolute deficit on European operations. I am sorry to say that his presentation has been attacked on the basis of figures of an altogether different sort furnished by certain other witnesses before the Ways and Means Committee.

At a later date I shall have more to say about statistics which were used in this regard. Suffice it to say now that Secretary Dillon's statistics showed that new money going from the United States into subsidiaries in Europe and Canada alone amounted to $655 million more than dividends repatriated from those subsidiaries during the period 1957–60. These operations, said to be highly profitable, ought to be contributing positively to our balance of payments, not creating a deficit.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Taxing the profits of subsidiaries currently will assist materially our balance of payments. It will not destroy foreign subsidiary operations; but it will slow down their rate of growth, at the expense of our own economy, in the already developed areas. It will encourage greater repatriation of dividends. It will put taxation in a position of neutrality, so that allocations of capital to enterprises at home and abroad will be made on economic factors, rather than on consideration of tax preference.

Unless we do this, Mr. President, our tax laws provide a subsidy for the movement of U.S. industries to other countries. This has been happening for several years now. It has grown to such proportions that the problem is acute, and is becoming more so by the day.

One thing which definitely would be accomplished by the current taxation of subsidiary profits is the termination of most of the tax-haven abuses about which I have spoken many times, and about which I shall soon speak in greater detail.

I think we would do well to look seriously at the outflow of capital of all types. Some of it must be stopped, or at least slowed down. This may well require more active measures than corrections of faulty tax laws. But certainly our taxation of foreign profits and income should be tightened immediately.

The balance-of-payments situation is apt to get worse, instead of better. In fact, we may do very well to hold our present edge in exports.

Frankly, Mr. President, I see little possibility of increasing our export surplus by another $2 billion, particularly when U.S. corporations are investing $4.5 billion to increase productive facilities abroad, the products from which will compete with, and in many instances will replace, exports from U.S. based factories, and the products of which in other instances will, indeed, be shipped back to the United States.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish to join my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], in commending the Senator from Tennessee for the detailed speech he is making this afternoon. Let me say that the disinguished Senator from Tennessee never fails to make a contribution when he makes a speech, regardless of the side he happens to be advocating.

In reference to U.S. companies which move overseas and initiate capital establishments there, can the Senator state, for the information of the Senate, whether some of those products, which supposedly are manufactured here in the United States, in some instances are made up of parts manufactured overseas and then cloaked with a name which gives the impression that the material is of American manufacture?

Mr. GORE. Yes, indeed. I was discussing this subject not long ago with a very distinguished publisher, and I called attention to the particular situation about which the distinguished and able majority leader has just now propounded his question. The publisher reached under the seat in the plane—we were riding on an airplane—and pulled out a small radio which bore the trade name of a well-known U.S. product, but in very fine print were the words "made in Japan."

Just a moment ago—while the distinguished Senator was momentarily out of the Chamber—I stated that yesterday I read a newspaper article in which it was stated that one of our large automobile manufacturing concerns is going to bring out a new model; but deep down in the story it was stated that the parts for the new model would be made abroad.

I also cite to the able Senator the case of the typewriter industry.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Tennessee has anticipated my next question.

Mr. GORE. There are many instances in which virtually entire industries have been moved abroad, largely because of this preferential tax treatment of profits made abroad; and then the product is shipped back to the United States, where only a sales and service agency is maintained.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Would that apply in general to—let us say—the typewriter industry, exclusive of IBM and electric typewriters?

Mr. GORE. I believe it certainly did the last time I looked at the figures for that particular industry. I should like to have the privilege of reviewing the current situation, and then I shall be glad to state to the Senator and to the Senate what the situation is with respect to the typewriter indusry.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would appreciate that, not because of any particular interest I have in the typewriter industry, but because of the point the Senator has been driving home, not only today, but over the years, about the outflow of American capital investment for the purpose of creating manufactories overseas, whereby articles can be produced at cheaper costs, based on labor rates, tax treatment, tax laws, and other factors. The result is that some of the companies are incorporated in other lands, but their main source of consumption or sale is in the United States.

Mr. GORE. And the source of their capital is in the United States.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Basically, yes. I am delighted the Senator is bringing attention to this matter today. I commend him for a fine speech.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator for his kind compliment and for a fine contribution. As I have said, I have spoken on this subject before. Our balance-of-payments deficit is one of the serious problems before the country, and one of the means of solving the problem, which the President of the United States has repeatedly recommended, is the correction of the lax tax treatment of income earned abroad. This would be done by elimination of the deferral privilege, by correcting tax haven abuses, by eliminating the utterly indefensible provisions by which the income of an individual American citizen earned while in residence abroad is tax exempt, and by changing the estate tax provision by which real estate owned in a foreign country is completely exempted from the U.S. estate tax.

These are loopholes of tax favoritism that operate adversely to the public interest of the United States. They help create a very serious problem, and I hope we can provide correction at least when the bill reaches the floor of the Senate.

Capital outflows seem likely to increase under current circumstances. Last year, it has been estimated, U.S. companies started 653 new businesses overseas and spent $4.5 billion on new plant and equipment. This means that there has been a large capital outflow; and a large capital outflow, let me remind the distinguished majority leader, at the same time the U.S. Senate was passing a bill to try to bring about employment opportunities to distressed areas in the United States.

Too, our exports are directly and adversely affected. Among 75 large companies having substantial foreign sales, only 36 percent of the goods sold abroad by these companies in 1950 was produced abroad in their foreign plants. In 1960, the percentage of products sold abroad which was produced abroad by these companies amounted to 68 percent. So the situation is getting worse year by year, and rapidly. Each year these foreign manufacturing subsidiaries of U.S. corporations eat away a little more of our export market, and each year they increase imports to the United States which multiply the difficulty.

There are many signs to indicate that our U.S. products are being pushed out of foreign markets by goods produced abroad by foreign subsidiaries of our own corporations, not priced out of foreign markets, as we so often hear alleged.

In this connection, Mr. David H. Conklin, assistant general manager of the international department of Du Pont, said last November:

> We'll be happy if our exports remain level next year. Sales of our oversea operations, on the other hand, are expected to go up considerably.

The jobs lost here at home and the resultant stagnation of our domestic economy flowing from these operations should be of concern to all of us.

It would seem obvious that some steps must be taken to slow down the outflow of dollars and gold, particularly into manufacturing facilities in Europe and other developed areas. This slowdown can be best accomplished, in line with our traditions of free enterprise and a minimum of Government direct interference with business, by tightening our tax laws which act now as an incentive to foreign investment in preference to plant improvement and investment at home.

In addition to taking steps in the tax field, we may need to take more positive action to control the flow of "hot" money. We cannot forever continue to run up domestic interest rates and wreck our domestic economy in the vain hope of convincing jittery foreigners and our own sharp operators that they should leave large deposits in New York. This is too much of a sacrifice on the part of all of our people to benefit a relatively few without providing any solution of the problem whatsoever.

At any rate, in the field of taxation, the Congress should adopt the following changes in our taxation of foreign operations:

First. The deferral privilege for subsidiaries should be terminated. Such organizations' profits should be taxed currently just as our own businesses at home pay taxes currently.

Second. The gross-up provision should be rectified so that a deduction is not allowed, in addition to the credit for foreign income taxes.

Third. All income earned by tax haven operations should be taxed currently. This would tend to stop tax haven abuses. At the same time, companies legitimately located in tax haven countries would be at no disadvantage as compared with companies operating and located in countries having a tax structure more nearly like our own.

Fourth. The income of individuals earned abroad should be taxed just as such income earned here at home is taxed. Why should a citizen have less responsibility for his country's defense and welfare because he is temporarily abroad?

Fifth. Improved reporting of oversea activities by American interests should be made compulsory.

Sixth. Foreign taxes paid should be treated as deductions from taxable income rather than credits against U.S. taxes.

I am grateful for the opportunity to address the Senate and I hope Senators will give these matters the serious study they merit. At a later date I shall speak further on additional aspects of the taxation of foreign operations.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. I wish to join other Senators in commending the distinguished Senator from Tennessee for the very brilliant analysis he has just presented. He seeks a most reasonable objective—that our tax laws be so revised as to implement important public policy.

I think we are remiss in so many ways in our failure to see to it that our tax laws act as an inducement toward the realization of sound public policy, rather than as a detriment.

I remember when the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] proposed a most material change in the corporate income tax; that is to say, he proposed a graduated income tax for small corporations to help preserve small business in an economy that is rapidly moving toward giantism and the extinction of small business.

Another objective to be served by the proposal of the distinguished Senator from Alabama would be to promote the growth of small business, as well as to combat the trend toward giantism in our economic affairs.

I have been concerned, on another front, about the extent to which political campaigns in America are becoming polarized about big labor and big business, because of their large contributions, and the degree of our general dependence upon such contributions at election time.

Certainly, our tax laws could be modified to provide a suitable inducement to the small contributor, in order to expand the base of responsibility that all citizens have in supporting the election process. Again and again, it has been proposed that our income tax laws should provide for deductions of up to $100 from taxable income of individual citizens of modest means who contribute to candidates or the party of their choice. This provision is badly needed as an inducement in our tax laws toward a sound public policy.

This afternoon, the distinguished Senator from Tennessee has come forward with an analysis of how our present tax structure creates an impediment in the very effort we are currently making to recitfy the serious deficit in our balance of payments. Clearly he has pointed out how appropriate changes in our tax laws could go far toward restoring a favorable balance of payments.

I think the Senator is to be warmly commended for having made a most significant contribution this afternoon. I hope all Members of the Senate will read it. I hope it will be considered in the Treasury Department and in the Administration, and that this might be the first step toward the correction of our tax laws in an area where repair is sorely needed.

I commend the able Senator from Tennessee for doing what he so often does—rendering high public service.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I am very grateful for the generous remarks of my distinguished and brilliant young friend the junior Senator from Idaho. I am even more grateful for his recognition of this problem and his willingness to contribute to its correct solution. As the debate has proceeded this afternoon, I believe it is clear to see that more and more Senators are becoming concerned about the problem and interested in bringing about an equitable solution.

Once again I thank my distinguished young friend, the junior Senator from Idaho.

CENSORSHIP OF ANTI-COMMUNIST STATEMENTS BY MILITARY LEADERS

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the subject of censorship of anti-Communist statements by our military leaders has proved very interesting to the American public, as has been evidenced by the vast amount of correspondence which I and others have been receiving on Capitol Hill. It has also attracted a sizable amount of comment in the press. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD several articles and editorials on the subject of this important investigation by the Special Preparedness Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

There being no objection, the articles and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Greenville News, Feb. 9, 1962]

STRANGE DELETIONS MADE BY GOVERNMENT CENSORS

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON.—It isn't true, of course, that the Kremlin has been able to appoint the small number of persons at the Defense and State Departments who act as censors of military books and speeches. But a man from the moon who did not know this, would be mighty suspicious of the deletions which are being gradually read into the record of the Stennis subcommittee hearings.

Using only quotations which have been cut from, or used to soften, high-level military utterances, the man from the moon could construct a weird story of America's military reaction to the cold war.

If an attack on our country occurs, it will not be by the Communists, since both quoted phrases were deleted by the State Department from the address of an Air Force officer.

It was not true, as recently as June 4, 1961, that "Russia and Red China * * * espouse revolution, by subversion or by violence," for these terrible words were stricken from the testimony of an admiral who was appearing before the House Foreign Affairs Committee. It would have to be assumed by the man from the moon that Congressmen weren't supposed to hear such things.

Lt. Gen. Arthur Trudeau, a pretty mature man in his fifties, once assistant chief of Army intelligence, presently chief of Army research and development, and a corps commander in Korea, must have been imagining things (thinks the M-from-the-M) because in September 1959, the State Department didn't want Trudeau to say:

"Surely we want peace, but at the same time, until the fist is unfolded, we must remain prepared for the worst. Henry Kissinger pointed out the other day that 'The cold war is not the result of a misunderstanding between our leaders and those of the Soviet Union. It is the product of a conscious Soviet policy.' "

These are only a few of 12 examples which I could cite of seemingly conscious efforts to abolish the Communist conspiracy by censorship. Turning to another phase of the eerie, American brainwash (which, thank heaven, we don't do very often or very well), the censors have laid down a blue pencil blitz against the idea of American victory in the cold war. The man from the moon would have to conclude from the following examples, that:

Americans have a new motto: "Never say win." An Army general was gagged as recently as last April 1961 when he tried to urge that we "emerge victorious" during the 20th century. He was told to say "achieve our goals." While permitted on a subsequent occasion to mention "the godless ideology of communism," he was not allowed to pursue the indictment by accusing the Kremlin of following its own special brand of Russian imperialism to enslave freemen everywhere, or to denounce coexistence * * * a fatal disease.

Americans don't want to win any war, even a cold one. This was illustrated when a military leader was recently forbidden to exhort American citizens "to place the interests of our country first" and to declare that "either totalitarian communism will prevail or the freedom of the West will expand."

These are only smatterings from 19 examples on my desk of military men having their mouths washed with soap for saying "victory" or its equivalent.

Here in America we are wiser than the man from the moon. We know that our policymakers and censors aren't Kremlin men. We have every faith that Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy, with knowledge far beyond our own, know what they're doing.

But this is a society of public opinion. And pretty soon, the President will have to justify this strange policy—or change it.

[From the Shreveport Times, Jan. 27, 1962]

McNamara Bars Testimony

Secretary of Defense McNamara has ordered Defense Department personnel not to disclose which censor handled what speech or article by Pentagon or military officials. The order replies directly to testimony before the Stennis Senate subcommittee investigating muzzling of the military. Secretary McNamara refused last summer to give such information to another congressional committee.

This is certain to cause a rumpus in Washington, for the identity of some of the State Department and Defense Department censors is exactly what Senator Strum Thurmond and some others want to bring out. The testimony of admirals and generals who already have appeared before the Stennis committee has included implication that civilian underlings far down the line in Cabinet department authority, military majors, and others perhaps lacking experience, have been permitted arbitrarily to delete criticism of communism from speeches by the military.

The issue here is not policy review of speeches but endless deletion of criticism of communism when American policy is anti-Communist. Who keeps deleting such criticism is important.

The Defense Secretary contends that "it is not appropriate that specific individuals shall be charged with responsibility for specific deletions from speeches and articles, when those individuals are acting under policies for which my senior associates and I must assume responsibility"—the quotation being from his official order.

In other words, Mr. McNamara insists, as do many officials in both public life and private business, that a top official always must assume responsibility for what takes place under his authority.

No one is likely to question the Secretary's authority to issue such an order and make it stand up. Nor is it likely that any committee would want to set a precedent of bucking a Cabinet member or the President in such a matter.

On the other hand, there has been testimony from the military that when an officer's speech is censored with no reason for the censoring obvious to the officer, he should have a right to know who is telling him what to say or what not to say. And if there is anything in the background of any of the censors indicating censoring that has nothing to do with national security or national policy, it might be well to bring it out.

In the Defense Department, Arthur Sylvester, formerly a Washington correspondent for a Newark (N.J.) newspaper, is Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs. Presumably, censoring comes under his Department. The Deputy Assistant Secretary is Mills Lennartson. These two are presumed to be the senior associates to whom Secretary McNamara referred. There are various underlings below them.

In the State Department, Roger Tubby, a small-time ex-newspaperman who had a public relations job in the Truman administration, is Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs. The Deputy Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs is the Negro, Carl Rowan, who recently was reprimanded publicly by Undersecretary of State McGhee for a speech Rowan made on the Congo.

It has been published in Washington that Mr. Sylvester and another Defense Department official of lesser rank "engineered" the case against Major General Walker which resulted in removal of him from command of the 24th Infantry Division in Germany, and his later resignation from the Army. It also has been published that Secretary McNamara reportedly was trying to trade Mr. Sylvester off to some other Cabinet Department to get rid of him. Mr. Sylvester has been a controversial figure in other matters. But at the moment, Secretary McNamara obviously is standing solidly behind him.

[From the Kalamazoo Gazette, Jan. 24, 1692]

American Iron Curtain Idea Is Abhorrent

Clarification is, perhaps, the most we can expect from the current hearings before a Senate Armed Services Committee on censorship of speeches by military officers.

The process of clarification and, perhaps, an amplification in the public mind of a military tradition of long standing in our forces was well begun as the hearings opened.

Former President Dwight D. Eisenhower certainly was the right man to set the stage and put the whole question into the right perspective. He is intimately familiar with both sides of the picture—as a career officer who rose to top command, as civilian Commander in Chief.

His assertion that officers have a role to play in alerting the Nation to the dangers of communism and that they should not be "thrust behind an American iron curtain" should set the tone for the proceedings.

The tradition that American officers stay out of politics is a good one.

We have seen what happens when military leaders, as such, get into the political arena. Robert A. Lovett, former Secretary of Defense and a Republican who also served as Under Secretary of State in the Truman administration, pointed to the problems of unhappy France.

But in a very real sense the matter before the subcommittee is, as Mr. Lovett said, a straw issue, since, as he rightly stated, military leaders in the United States do not challenge the principle of civilian control.

We believe that every professional officer understands this principle.

It does not deny the officer's citizenship, his right to vote, his entitlement to hold his own opinions. But his is a fulltime job, 24 hours a day. He is never off duty. He cannot take public issue with his superiors, civilian or military, without risking danger to the discipline of the organization in which he serves.

On the other hand, an officer would be remiss if, seeing a clear and present danger in the communism which Khrushchev says will bury us, he failed to speak up. This is not the same thing as interfering in domestic politics. It is a far cry from what has been happening in other armies where officers have organized military coups and led revolts against their governments.

Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, former Chief of Naval Operations, put it well when he said that officers have a proper and moral right to speak out against communism if they avoid purely partisan politics and respect civilian controls. Every military man he knows, he said, would agree that partisan politics is off limits.

That would include such persons as former Maj. Gen. William A. Walker who, when he wanted to say things he could not say in uniform, resigned his commission. We felt at the time, and we still feel, that he took the proper course of becoming a civilian with all a civilian's freedoms and prerogatives.

The current hearings should clarify this nonpolitical tradition for nonmilitary people. They may go beyond that to disclose whether the civilian leadership at the Pentagon has overstepped in prior censorship of speeches, and whether top officers did or did not violate either the written or unwritten law that governs their public utterances.

[From the Shreveport Journal, Jan. 27, 1962]

Let the Military Speak

"Those of us who over the years have had to deal directly with the Communist leaders and system believe—unanimously, I think—that the more our people can be brought to comprehend the all-compassing nature of the threat, the stronger will be our determination to preserve freedom at home, and the greater will be our national willingness to sacrifice to advance freedom throughout the world."

General of the Army Dwight D. Eisenhower, drawing on his lifetime experiences, thus revised his own warning, in his farewell address as President, against the influence of the military-industrial complex. For, in a half century of national service, he said he had met no budding Rasputins or Napoleons. And he recalled that the three major modern dictators—Hitler, Mussolini and Stalin—were civilians.

General Eisenhower offered his observations to the Special Senate Armed Services Subcommittee investigating the muzzling of military officers. The memorandum written by Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, Arkansas Democrat and chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, calling for restrictions on military participation in public seminars; the publicized censorship of speeches by Adm. Arleigh A. Burke while he was Chief of Naval Operations and the admonishment of former Maj. Gen. Edwin A. Walker for his troop indoctrination courses provide the background for the hearings, which have been brought about through efforts of Senator STROM THURMOND, of South Carolina.

By virtue of their experience, mission and educational system, General Eisenhower said the military is singularly well trained to provide the public, as well as the members of the Armed Forces, with the implications of the extreme threat of Communist imperialism. He urged that nothing be done to impair their opportunity to speak out on public issues, always under proper established policies and the general—not petty—supervision of their civilian superiors.

The subcommittee will hear many witnesses, pro and con. But General Eisenhower's statement—that telling the stark truth about communism is the best way to make our own citizenry and other people appreciate the blessings of liberty—goes to the heart of the problem. The danger is real. The men trained to fight it certainly should be permitted to mobilize public opinion against it.

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune, Feb. 10, 1962]

A DEFENSE REJECTED AT NUREMBERG

President Kennedy has invoked the doctrine of Executive privilege, dating from 1789, in the Senate Armed Services Subcommittee's investigation of military censorship. The President thus provides a cloak to shield Secretary of Defense McNamara from the subcommittee, and the Secretary finds enough folds in the cloak to shield both his own staff of censors and the State Department's similar staff.

Mr. McNamara and his chief censor, Willis D. Lawrence, have declined before the subcommittee to identify the particular censors who made specific deletions from some hundreds of speeches and statements of high military officers which were bluepenciled. The subcommittee has voted without dissent that Secretary McNamara has no legal right to direct witnesses under his supervision to withhold answers.

Defense Department censors have said that, whatever policy considerations governed the application of censorship, the standards were set by the State Department. The subcommittee believes that the Defense Department's reticence is intended to provide a precedent so that the State Department need not explain its outlook and reasoning.

The inquiry so far has disclosed a tendency by the censors to excise any harsh remarks about communism or any statements tending to assert that the United States is in a fight for survival against the drive for Soviet world domination. The censorship of such references has, of course, been arbitrary, but it has also been capricious, picayunish, and inconsistent.

The Executive attempt to shield individual censors from the obligation of explaining their deletions and suggestions for alterations may stem from the fact that there is no coherent set of rules to apply, simply because there is no coherent foreign policy which the administration follows and does not want prejudiced or embarrassed. The net effect, however, is to disclose an extremely solicitous administration disposition not to offend Communist sensibilities.

Mr. Kennedy, of course, is doing no more than Mr. Truman and Mr. Eisenhower did before him. In 1947, when he was confronted by the imminent probability of an investigation of Communist penetration of the New Deal with the advent of the Republican 80th Congress, Mr. Truman issued an Executive order to hamstring such activity to the best of his ability. Mr. Eisenhower did the same when the controversy between Senator McCarthy and the Pentagon was at its height and there were indications that a White House strategy meeting had outlined a campaign to "get" the Senator.

Mr. Kennedy, however, was on shaky ground when he said at his news conference that he could not agree to the "harassment of individuals who are only carrying out the policies dictated by their superiors." He thus invokes the doctrine of superior orders as a proper defense although this doctrine was disallowed at the Nuernberg and all other war-crimes trials as a legitimate defense when offered in behalf of accused enemies. An American Supreme Court Justice, sitting as a judge at Nuremberg, joined in denying the validity of the protection now invoked by the President.

In all this we see no issue of maintaining civilian control of the military. The issue does not lie between the Executive and the military. It lies between the Executive and the legislative branch, which is conducting the investigation and has commanded the testimony. In this constitutional no man's land, we see small possibility for resolution of the dispute. Mr. Kennedy must suffer any injury resulting from his reluctance to be frank with Congress. Congress will probably have to settle for less than the full facts.

Text of Letter From AFA President Joe Foss to Senator John C. Stennis, Chairman of the Special Preparedness Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee

DEAR SENATOR STENNIS: In response to your letter of January 16, the Air Force Association is pleased to furnish herewith its views regarding military activities in cold-war education, which your subcommittee is investigating. We address ourselves to the following specific areas of interest as requested in your letter:

The proper role of the military in national security affairs:

This role has remained essentially unchanged during the 174 years of this Republic's existence. The Constitution of the United States makes abundantly clear the principle of civilian control over the military, a principle which has never been successfully or even seriously challenged in our history. Traditionally the military has been an instrument of national policy, with no direct responsibility for its final formulation. This is as it should be.

On the other hand, the military does have an obligation to participate in the formulation of national policy through the statutory role of the Joint Chiefs of Staff as principal military advisers to the President, the Secretary of Defense, and the National Security Council. While acknowledging that final policy judgments must be made by our civil leaders, we reiterate our belief that, in the interest of wisdom and prudence, full weight must be given to military advice and counsel in matters pertaining to national security.

We hear assertions that the military is going beyond its constitutional role and usurping policy formulation privileges. We find no evidence of this. This Nation has no history of military coups, juntas or mutinies, and there is no indication of any such future threat. Indeed, with civilian control of the military stronger than ever before, the subcommittee might profitably examine the extent to which professional military advice is being considered in making national security decisions.

The problem remains, however, of defining the extent to which military men should be permitted to voice publicly their personal professional opinions. The borderline between legitimate public expressions on essentially military matters and public disagreement with stated national policies is a fuzzy one, and your subcommittee would perform a great public service if it could contribute to clarification of that line. We do not wish to see generals and admirals engaging in partisan politics. But barring them from public discussion in the field of strategic concepts would be equally tragic.

New strategic concepts and doctrine must emerge if our military forces are to keep pace with technology. These new concepts can best emerge if openly proposed and debated by the experts. Likewise, new ideas must be evaluated and tested, largely through professional writing, public speeches, and open discussion. Only in this way can all considerations be brought to light and sound ideas obtain acceptance and support.

Forbidding professional military people to discuss national security concepts would stifle thought in this area by those most qualified to contribute, and this at a time when the threat to security is greater than ever before. Further, the search for new concepts has attracted the attention of numbers of civilian experts who have no hesitation in making their views known and no restrictions on doing so. Their contributions are often useful but only if measured against professional expertise with regard to the actual implications of their adoption.

If the military is denied the right to comment on or challenge the views of civilian experts the country will come to look to nonmilitary sources for guidance on basically military matters. The freedom of professional discussion of purely military concepts must not get lost in any effort to suppress undesirable political statements and activities of military personnel.

The adequacy of troop information and education:

The Air Force Association keenly believes that additional effort in this area is desirable and passed a resolution at its latest national convention to that effect. We reserve judgment, however, as to the adequacy of present and planned programs, in the light of the study currently being conducted by the committee appointed by the Secretary of Defense.

Participation of military personnel in national security seminars:

Free and open discussion is an essential element of democratic government. National security seminars can make a great contribution to better understanding by the military man of his mission. There is no reason to discard this educative tool because the technique has been subverted in a few isolated instances to promulgate partisan political views.

Proper use of military personnel in educating the American public to the dangers of the cold war menace:

Broad public understanding of the nature of the threat to national security is basic to the support of programs necessary to safeguard this Nation against the threat. Military personnel can contribute much to such understanding. Their public utterances must be subject to reasonable security and policy restrictions, it is true. Pentagon censorship is neither new nor necessarily evil. But it is clearly wrong to censor material which is not in conflict with national policy as publicly enunciated by our civil leaders. If such material is censored, then one might logically conclude that national policy as publicly enunciated differs from national policy in fact. Widest latitude should be given to the free play of ideas. The burden of proof should rest on the censor, not on the military speaker or writer. Capricious and arbitrary use of the censor's pencil is a hallmark of totalitarianism and has no place in a democratic society.

Sincerely,

JOE FOSS,
President, Air Force Association.

[From the San Diego Union, Feb. 8, 1962]

RESPONSIBILITIES DEFINED—SOUND ADVICE FROM VFW CHIEF

The proper relationship between the Nation's military and the administrative and legislative branches of Government has been definitely and astutely outlined by Robert E. Hansen, commander in chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

The Special Preparedness Subcommittee, Senate Committee on Armed Services, requested Mr. Hansen's views on such matters as the role of the military in national security affairs; adequacy of troop information and education, and the participation of military personnel in national security seminars.

Mr. Hansen reminded the subcommittee that efforts to lodge greater control of the military within the executive branch is an effort "so alien to our form of government as to contain the seeds of the destruction of our constitutional system and concepts." It is the duty of Congress alone, he said, to insure against changes, organizational or otherwise, that eventually would erode the constitutionally established civil-military relationship.

"The wisdom of Congress in this regard never has been more apparent," Mr. Hansen continued. "Nowhere has this been more true than in the operation of the Joint Chiefs of Staff system. Attacked constantly as command by committee * * * it has, in fact, served consistently as the means to bring broad and all-inclusive military advice to the highest levels of government. In continuing the Joint Chiefs of Staff system, Congress has provided the single most important means to solving one of the eternal problems of a democracy—how to be militarily strong without becoming militaristic."

Mr. Hansen wrote forcefully against the Defense Department's attitude toward education of troops, particularly to restrictions on the showing of the documentary film, "Operation Abolition," in the training program of the armed services.

"The Veterans of Foreign Wars cannot understand why U.S. citizens can inform themselves as to the techniques and dangers of communism by seeing 'Operation Abolition' in their own school, church, or other community activity, while at the same time the young men who serve in our Armed Forces, which are maintained largely for the purpose of resisting communism, are deprived by official directive of the opportunity to see this historically important film as part of the troop information and education program."

He proposed also that the Defense Department should issue a clearly written, specific directive that would enable military leaders to participate in national security seminars.

Mr. Hansen's statement was not presented on his behalf alone. It reflects the thinking of 1,300,000 oversea combat veterans. The recommendations are sound, based on long experience of the men who comprise one of the world's greatest veterans organizations.

By heeding Mr. Hansen's proposals, the Senate group would be acting in the best interests of all Americans.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Feb. 10, 1962]

DON'T STIFLE MILITARY INITIATIVE

(By Gen. S. L. A. Marshall)

Anyone who views the Senate inquiry into the muzzling of the U.S. military as a time-wasting performance by several battalions of governmental big hats is invited to take another look.

While it is true that the Senator from South Carolina started with the hope that he would harpoon the White Whale and thus far has been casting bent pins after minnows, he should not be unhappy wholly about the catch. Several points of great consequence have been established about the murky waters in which he fishes.

First, his investigation has proved beyond a doubt that generals and admirals in the Pentagon would be well advised to discharge their present corps of speech writers and start afresh. Most of the time they are not saying anything. Most of the phrases which have been curried out of the manuscripts which other hands contrive for them are remarkable only for their triteness and their almost meaningless generalizations.

Second, the so-called censors of the Pentagon are afflicted by overinflated egos and need to be given fatherly advice. The stuff they blue-pencil is not dangerous, but merely badly done, and they do not make it any better by their smalltown editing. They perform as copy handlers not as guardians of a national policy.

The absence of anything explosive, bold or particularly enlightening in what was blue-penciled is more eloquent of a dubious condition in the Pentagon than all of Senator STROM THURMOND's bellowing about it. Nothing thus far revealed would even faintly suggest that the top military people are reckless, unworthy of trust by their political superiors or deserving to be nursemaided like a flock of children. On the contrary, their public utterances are so bland, so inocuous as to indicate that they and their ghost writers work in fear of running afoul of higher authority.

Is it good? If conformity is the final test of all virtues, well then, yes. Civilian control, if it tries hard enough, can convert all chief military subordinates into an echelon of yes-men, incapable of voicing strong objection even when conscience tells them that taking a stand in opposition for the sake of the Nation is a duty. It is not to the credit of so many of the chiefs that they parade to the witness stand and obediently concur with what is being done. The one notable exception is Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau.

Just what are the others talking about? By their words of approval, they are helping to scuttle almost two centuries of a strong, free national tradition. The American military has never been suppressed in this manner. It was taken for granted that honor and judgment attended high military responsibility. Now the chiefs respond like trained seals who live by the rule that tenure and getting along with the bosses are more important than all other values.

When high commanders accept unprotestingly a curb imposed on freedom of expression in their public relations, they will ultimately become just as pliable, just as neutral in the councils where major questions of strategy, armament, and force levels are debated behind closed doors. It is impossible to gag the mouth without dampering the spirit.

There is a larger consideration. The Nation has never been in as great danger as now. To survive, there must be a strengthening of national spirit. And do we expect to work miracles of reform by stifling the military voice while leaving it to the figures in civilian control to set and maintain higher standards? They come and they go as political opportunity presents itself. Only in the military is there lifetime service to the established national ideals.

To get back to fundamental principles, let us look at a few passages from the combined services' manual on field censorship, published in 1954, but written in 1949.

"The United States is served by a free press and its Constitution insures to the people that this freedom will be maintained. It is a basic right, as greatly cherished by the citizens of the Nation as are freedom of speech and freedom of religion. In protecting these rights, the interests and obligations of members of the armed establishment are identical with those of all other citizens.

"Censorship is always a strain on mutual confidence and good will between the armed establishment and the people. When censorship is applied by the military, the people are suspicious that its authority may be misdirected toward the covering up of blunders, waste, and general incompetence. This has occasionally happened and in every instance it has been an abuse of power."

Either these words are pious platitudes never meant to be taken seriously, or the admirals and generals are wrong in lauding a censorship which is wholly alien to the guiding philosophy.

[From the Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle, Feb. 9, 1962]

AN ABUSE OF THE PRIVILEGE

The historic doctrine of executive privilege, employed by U.S. Presidents from Washington to Eisenhower, is a legitimate instrument for protection of the rights and privileges of the executive branch of Government. But like any other instrument of power, it contains destructive as well as constructive potential; it has improper uses as well as proper ones.

To us, President Kennedy's invocation of the doctrine clearly represents an abuse of the executive powers vested in him. The doctrine of Executive privilege is designed to aid members of the executive branch and to serve the best interests of the Nation. Mr. Kennedy's employment of the doctrine does neither.

Through the President's claim of privilege and Senator STENNIS' acceptance of it, the identity of Pentagon censors who deleted specific sections of military speeches apparently will be kept secret. But this will not protect the censors. Rather, as Senator STROM THURMOND pointed out, it will create more public suspicion about their actions.

As matters stand now, the censors' inclination to soften references to communism remains unexplained. It obviously has no relation to national security, and it should have no foundation in the policies of the Federal Government. Defense Secretary McNamara's attempt to shoulder the entire responsibility for censorship is a noble gesture, but it hardly explains the pattern of toning down criticisms of communism and Communists by military leaders.

As the Chronicle said earlier this week, the Senate subcommittee must have names of persons responsible for questionable deletions if it is to perform the task it has been assigned.

We regret that Senator STENNIS has honored the plea of executive privilege in this instance. We would like to see Mr. Kennedy's use of the doctrine overruled and tested in court. If it is not, abuse of the Executive privilege may become another powerful weapon in the hands of an administration bent on widening the authority of the White House at the expense of Congress.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 11, 1962]

Power in the Pentagon—Defense Secretary's Growing Authority Is Called Factor in Clash With Congress

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

Growing centralization of power in the office of the Secretary of Defense formed the background for the clash between the executive and legislative branches of Government last week.

The Special Senate Preparedness Subcommittee provided the forum. The subcommittee, investigating the censorship of speeches of military officers, refused to accept a plea of Executive responsibility for withholding the names of censors who edited specific speeches. It did, however, accept a plea of Executive privilege.

Executive privilege, the right of a President and, on his orders, his official family, to withhold from Congress information pertaining to the operation of the executive branch, has been invoked many times from George Washington to Dwight D. Eisenhower. As Senator JOHN STENNIS, the subcommittee chairman, noted, the courts have never rejected this plea.

On the other hand, the concept of Executive responsibility, if accepted, would have established a precedent—another reason for secrecy—in the eyes of Congress, could mean additional erosion of its legislative powers, and particularly its ability to get the facts and to exercise its constitutional right to raise and maintain armies.

THE CONCEPT DEFINED

"Executive responsibility," as defined by Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara, means loyalty down—the acceptance of responsibility on the part of top executives for the actions of their subordinates.

Mr. McNamara took the position that if mistakes were made in censoring specific speeches it was his responsibility, that he should be questioned and blamed—not the subordinate who did this actual editing. But the Senate subcommittee, stressing the legal aspect, contended that only the invocation of Executive privilege—the right of the executive departments to cloak their privileged operations in secrecy—would be acceptable.

The difference is of major constitutional importance, particularly in view of a long-term trend combined with recent developments in Washington. The long-term trend has been the tremendous expansion in size and power of the executive branch. Moreover, changes in Defense Department organization and procedures of the last decade, particularly those made by Secretary McNamara, have tended toward greater and greater centralization of power in the hands of the Secretary of Defense.

The two trends have resulted in a reduction in congressional power compared with executive power. It has also led to a reduced capability on the part of Congress to supervise the Defense Department and the armed services. Some observers believe these trends are endangering the constitutional authority of Congress to "raise and support armies * * * to provide and maintain a Navy * * * and to make rules for the Government of the land and naval forces."

A paper that specifically addressed itself to the constitutional issue involved was filed with the subcommittee last week just before the denouement between executive and legislative branches. The paper was the statement of Robert E. Hansen, commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. It dealt at length with congressional powers over the Armed Forces.

Preservation of strong congressional authority over the military is essential, Mr. Hansen emphasized, to adhere to the "fundamental constitutional principles of civil control of the military." Mr. Hansen traced the division of powers and checks and balances established in the Constitution, and noted they provided for "a partnership of the executive and legislative branches with respect to national military policy." He contended, quoting the late Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes of the Supreme Court, that "ultimate control" of the military resided in Congress.

"Congress provides," he said, "the President commands."

The dangers of external threats greater than ever before have tended to upset this balance, he said, quoting Alexander Hamilton:

"To be more safe, they [the people] at length become willing to run the risk of being less free."

The nub of Mr. Hansen's argument was the contention that "the Defense Establishment must be so organized as to serve and perpetuate the constitutional concept of civil control. Defense organization must facilitate at the national level the jointure of civilian judgment and direction with broad, professional military advice."

JOINT CHIEFS SYSTEM BACKED

Mr. Hansen strongly supported the present Joint Chiefs of Staff system and strongly opposed various suggested changes to it, including the separation of the Joint Chiefs from their services, or the establishment of a single superchief of staff.

"Professional military leadership must have the fortitude and the opportunity to present advice on military matters to both branches of the civil authority—with vigor and with candor. If Congress is to be adequately informed, there must be no arbitrary restriction upon the testimony of responsible military leaders appearing before its agencies."

Organizational centralization in the Pentagon has fostered an increasing tendency toward such restriction. Moreover, Mr. McNamara and his civilian associates have more and more undertaken to be the spokesmen for the services. As a result many in Congress, already disturbed about their inability to analyze the huge Defense Department, are worried about their access to frank opinion and detailed information.

Among some Congressmen, the issue is not one of making headlines, of witch hunting, or of partisanship. It represents a key constitutional problem involving the partition of powers the checks and balances on which our Government was founded.

[From the Nashville Banner, Feb. 8, 1962]

Public Still Wants Facts—Privilege Doesn't Acquit of Gag Accountability

The President and his Secretary of Defense may be upset by recurring signs that the Senate Armed Services subcommittee will not leave that service gag undisturbed—and Mr. Kennedy's petulant remarks at his press conference yesterday so indicated. But they are far off base if they suppose that invocation of "Executive privilege" to block the inquiry will terminate public concern about "who did what, and why" in censoring out of military speeches remarks factually critical of communism. The same applies to the State Department, as well as the Pentagon.

This is no ordinary case of bureaucratic monkey business, to be lightly dismissed or casually whitewashed as a harmless indiscretion. If the freak treatment accorded informative statements, for troop indoctrination or otherwise, was the doing of individual idiocy, both the Senate and the country wants to know the identity of the individual thus recklessly assigned. And if the group performance of an act contemptuous of public intelligence was a dictated "policy," the Nation is properly concerned about that policy.

Whichever it was, the American people are entitled to know why it was done.

Senators digging for the facts are not the only ones discomfited by the idea that such could be policy—the purblind delusion that by ignoring the facts of communism, or eliminating references to them in public discussion they either would be altered, or go away. If that is the policy concept, the policymakers are in a vital business beyond their depths.

Granting that the blue pencil was used by underlings, that certainly does not excuse either frivolity or mischief in the exercise of such weighty assignment. Nor will it be rectified by the disowning of responsibility—or the coverup device of shielding it by refusal to testify.

The Senate Armed Services subcommittee recognized the glaring facts of this episode in stupidity. It is properly concerned to find out the reasons behind it. It has a responsibility to investigate, by calling witnesses and asking pertinent questions.

The picture of what went on in the censor room (State or Defense)—how, why, and by whom—isn't made any prettier by Executive and departmental determination to draw the curtain across the area of record, and excuse reckless asininity on grounds of "privilege."

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune, Jan. 28, 1962]

War Is Dirty Word When a Censor Sees It—Nikita Gets Strange Sort of Protection

(By Willard Edwards)

WASHINGTON, January 27.—On May 9, 1961, a State Department employee, reviewing a proposed speech by a major general, ran a firm pencil through the word, "war," whenever it appeared in the address.

Feeling, perhaps, that the aggrieved general might not understand, the unknown censor scribbled on the margin:

"War is a dirty word."

The current Senate probe into the censorship of military leaders has disclosed hundreds of dirty words deemed offensive by a group of low-level State Department workers when uttered by a high-ranking military officer.

GAG MAY PROTECT THEM

The Senate Armed Services Subcommittee, headed by Senator JOHN STENNIS, Democrat, of Mississippi, plans to summon these employees and ask them why they killed entire speeches and consistently deleted anti-Communist or anti-Russian statements.

Both Democratic and Republican members of the subcommittee agree that the motivation of these subordinates holds the key to a pattern of censorship which has been termed "strange and odd" by STENNIS. Stronger terms have been used by Senators in private conversation.

The names of the censors are known to the subcommittee but they may be protected from questioning by Executive order. Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara has already decreed that no witness may identify an individual employee in the Defense Department's Security Review Agency.

WILL QUIZ CENSORS' BOSSES

The inquiry will be resumed next Tuesday. The Joint Chiefs of Staff will testify. Then the subcommittee will begin probing the actual operations of the censorship system by questioning Arthur G. Sylvester, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs, and Roger Tubby, Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs.

Both men supervise the censorship divisions in their departments. Both are former newspapermen. Tubby was an assistant public relations man for the Democratic National Committee.

Stennis said the hearings thus far have established reasonable justification for some form of clearing military speeches but that there was an obvious need for improvement in existing proceedings.

WHY THE CAPRICIOUSNESS?

Sylvester and Tubby will be asked if the censorship branches under their supervision act capriciously on their own or in accordance with national policies which have not been made public.

Whatever their answers, some indication of the thinking of the individual censors has been gained from anonymous comments they contributed as they slashed the proposed speeches of military men.

These were discovered as marginal comments on the scripts of more than 160 censored speeches placed in the subcommittee's record during the first 3 days of hearings.

Gen. George H. Decker, Army Chief of Staff, had difficulty in getting speech clearances from both the Defense and State Departments. When he proposed to address an annual meeting of Army chaplains on January 30, 1961, the Director of Security Review, Defense Department, killed a long passage and offered this comment:

"Portions of the speech do not conform to the tone and spirit of the inaugural address [by President Kennedy] and particularly the following thought: 'Let both sides explore what problems unite us instead of belaboring those problems which divide us.'"

SUBSTITUTES KENNEDY QUOTES

Decker had planned to tell the chaplains that "some very intelligent and articulate people * * * would rather be Red than dead." He said this was false rationale, based on a hope that the Communist character was changing.

Striking this out, the censor substituted several quotations from the Kennedy address, stressing "that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship * * *" in the cause of liberty.

Decker was again the target of censorship when he prepared an address for the Army War College in June. He said the United States was engaged in a virtual war, not peaceful competition with the Russians, that the pace of the cold war was accelerating. He noted how the Russians used military power as a pressure, below the level of actual warfare, and said the United States could do the same.

KHRUSHCHEV PROTECTED

Clearance for the press was denied by the State Department censor who gave this explanation:

"It is recognized that much of this kind of material has already been made public but it is resulting in increasing unfavorable publicity abroad and is subjecting the United States to mounting adverse criticism. * * * This particular article, it is believed, would provide an especially high-level and authoritative spokesman for unfriendly propagandists to quote at length."

A protective complex in behalf of Russian Premier Nikita Khrushchev was repeatedly displayed by the State Department censors. In addition to killing all references to his personal behavior and his claim that he would "bury" capitalism, mention of his attacks upon his predecessor, Stalin, was also deleted.

TENDER CARE FOR CUBA

Slighting references to Cuba were banned. A remark about communism in America's backyard was stricken with the comment: "Cuba is not in the U.S. backyard and resents being told so."

Adm. Arleigh Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, wrote a speech for delivery June 4, 1961, which referred to communism as "an alienist philosophy that has taken over whole countries without firing a shot."

This language was stricken and Burke instructed to call communism "an expansionist movement that assigns a high priority to nonmilitary means."

KNOWS HIS FIASCOES

Any reference to the antireligious character of communism were almost invariably killed by the censors. Burke proposed to quote the late Cardinal Newman as saying that "we are personally responsible for what we do—that we have no means of shifting our responsibility and that dereliction of duty involves punishment." The entire quotation was stricken, without explanation.

Particularly odious to the censors was any mention of slavery in the Soviet captive states.

The word "conflict," referring to United States-Russian relations, was killed from one speech with the instruction, "Use a softer term."

Mention of the Korean and Cuban incidents as "fiasco," was deleted with the curt admonition: "See Webster—'fiasco' also means action that comes to a ridiculous end."

The censors imposed a general ban on talks of possible trouble because of Red infiltration in Laos, South Vietnam, Cambodia, and other countries in Asia.

"VICTORY" DIRTY WORD, TOO

"Victory" was another dirty word to the censors and was usually deleted. Almost all derogatory adjectives referring to communism such as "vicious," or "treacherous," met a similar fate. Comparisons of communism to Hitlerism were taboo.

When Maj. Gen. William T. Thurman proposed to speak of the "big lie propaganda techniques" of Communists in a speech for delivery February 17, 1961, the censors struck out the phrase with this reproving note "implying motives."

[From the Army Times, Feb. 10, 1962]

Let's Eye Self-Made Muzzle

(By Monte Bourjaily, Jr.)

The Stennis committee, which is looking into the alleged "muzzling" of senior military officers, could be led down the garden path by a concern for details which don't really contribute to a solution, if one is needed, of the problem of how to assure that military leaders support civilian-made policy without compromising their own personal convictions.

This hearing, generally billed as an investigation which could dramatize the "great debate" between conservatism and liberalism, so far has been less than spectacular. And there is a hint that it will be turned into a farce in which an officer, of one of the military services, becomes a scapegoat or hero for doing his duty as he understood it.

There have been suggestions that what the committee should be looking into is whether or not civilian authority has any right to control the public speeches of government employees in general and generals in particular.

I believe not only that civilian governmental authority has this right but also the duty to assure that what Government employees and military officers say, whether in an official capacity or from a public forum in an unofficial capacity, if they are sought as speakers because of their position or status as Government servants, conforms to the policy of the administration in power.

Government employees, including military careerists, who cannot accept the policy of the Government they work for should quit if they feel so strongly that they cannot keep quiet. Then they can talk to their hearts' content. If they can carry out the policies adopted by an administration without compromising their personal beliefs, even though they are not ardent in their support of the policies, they should keep quiet.

Senior military leaders and Government officials, by their very positions, can be effective spokesmen for national policy as enunciated by the administration in power. If in their speeches these people want to do more than report on their stewardship, then they should be policy salesmen of an approved policy.

But this brings us to a very real "muzzling" that is going on and that has been imposed by the military on itself. And here is a fit subject for the committee to look into.

There are many problem areas in which no solution exists and where no policy has yet been enunciated. By Defense directive, there is permitted free and full debate of possible solutions and approaches to solutions in these problem areas, but only within the "Defense family" as one official puts it. Such debate is not to be disclosed to "outsiders," meaning the citizens of the United States for whom, in the long run, every Government employee, civilian or military, works.

This is like the butler refusing to tell his employer why the stairs are dirty while the upstairs and the downstairs maid debate who should clean them, or even worse, his refusal even to admit they are dirty until he decides the dispute. Then when it is all over and the upstairs maid cleans them on her way downstairs, he can point to the stairs and ask, "What dirt?"

It seems to me perfectly proper to refuse to divulge decisions, or even the likely decision, to the public until those who are to put the decision into effect (this is known as respecting a commander's prerogatives) know what it is. And it also seems to me perfectly proper to require that all those in a position to put decisions into effect should support a decision, when it is made.

But it seems to me perfectly improper to refuse to discuss the existence of problems or the potential solutions to identified problems on the ground that this will interfere with the development of a solution.

This is exactly contrary to the entire political philosophy of the United States. Our strength, allegedly, is in the knowledge of all our citizens. To ask them to present a united front in support of policies about which they have no knowledge with respect either to alternatives or to the way in which the policy is arrived at is totalitarianism. Yet essentially this is the information policy of the Defense Department.

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune, Jan. 25, 1962]

Here Are Typical Phrases Cut Out of Speeches

Washington, January 24.—Here are some of the examples of Defense and State Department censorship revealed today by Senate investigators in questioning Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, Army Chief of Research and Development.

The date of the delivered speech, its original wording by Trudeau, and revised wording or deletions are shown.

January 21, 1961: "We will be blocked and harassed by the Fabian Socialists and Communists." The phrase "Fabian Socialists" was deleted.

MORE OF CENSORS' WORK

January 31 (to a Canadian audience): "Your country and mine are the targets of worldwide communism. This is why we and our allies are arming to counter the Communist threat." Entire section deleted.

"As we engage the Communist," changed to "as we strive for a real peace."

"Yet, if our technology is to continue to accelerate, and it must to outperform the Reds." Last phrase deleted.

February 1: "Locked as we are in vital competition with the Communist." Delete and substitute: "In order to negotiate from a position of strength for peace."

OUT WITH "BURY US"

"The Communist conspiracy directed toward absolute, universal domination of the world" deleted.

"These totalitarians in thought and action have clearly stated again and again that their simple, sole, and stark objective is to bury us" deleted.

"Khrushchev created a new kind of war" deleted.

"Our ability to meet the challenges of Soviet imperialism will determine whether our way of life will continue" deleted.

"Today, in the face of the worldwide threat of international communism" deleted.

"We must field new and improved weapons systems more rapidly if we are to retain a military advantage over the Soviets." "Military" deleted.

HE CAN'T SAY "CONGO"

"The vicious worldwide conflict forced upon us." Delete and substitute "our lives and future."

February 17: "Faced as we are by the implacable mask of communism." "Implacable" deleted.

"With Soviet infiltration menacing this Nation" deleted.

March 3: "Last year, in the United Nations we witnessed the growth of a new world power group—the so-called neutralist or Afro-Asian nations." "Afro-Asian" deleted.

"The record in the Congo." "In the Congo" deleted.

"Diplomatic dealing without powerful cards is a bluff at best" deleted with this comment: "State Department feels diplomacy should not be compared to a card game."

"And beat the Communist challenge" deleted with instructions to substitute: "The threat of foreign aggressors."

April 26: "Nothing less will permit us to emerge victorious." "Emerge victorious" deleted and changed to "achieve our goals."

"Coexistence is not a choice. It is a fatal disease," deleted.

"The critical Communist threat." "Critical" deleted.

June 1: "We must win this struggle or we lose the world." Last phrase deleted.

Some anti-Communist phrases by Trudeau were also censored when the Eisenhower administration was in power, the record disclosed. These were few in number but revealed deletions of such phrases as: "I do not believe that the Soviets have relented in the slightest in their determination to dominate the world and to destroy our way of life."

In July, 1960, Trudeau spoke of the "growing Communist drive in Latin America in open violation of our Monroe Doctrine." The phrase beginning "in open violation" was deleted.

On February 1, 1960, he mentioned "Khrushchev's challenge." "Khrushchev" was deleted and "Communist" substituted.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Jan. 25, 1962]

FAVORED DELETION INVOLVES WORD "COMMUNIST"

(By Williard Edwards)

WASHINGTON, January 24.—The motivation of unidentified low-level State Department censors, who cut anti-Communist statements out of speeches by military leaders, drew the attention of Senate investigators today.

Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, Army Chief of Research and Development and former Chief of Army Intelligence, told the Senate Armed Services Subcommittee that he had frequently wondered why he had been barred from using such phrases as "world communism" and "the Communist challenge."

M'NAMARA BARS NAMES

More than 50 of Trudeau's speeches in 1961 were placed in the record. They showed copious deletions, mainly ordered by the State Department, of passages and phrases referring in strong terms to the threat of international communism and the Soviet Union.

Chairman JOHN STENNIS, Democrat, of Mississippi, said the State Department censors would be called for questioning. Earlier, Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara had issued an order prohibiting military witnesses from identifying individual censors in the Pentagon. But these are known to the subcommittee and will also be called, it was announced.

CALLS IT VERY VALUABLE

President Kennedy, meanwhile, said at his press conference that he had no inclination to modify the censorship system as suggested by former President Eisenhower yesterday.

Eisenhower was entitled to his opinion, the President said, but he regarded the present system as very valuable in providing "guidance" for military men when they make speeches on foreign policy and other sensitive issues.

Kennedy said his own speeches on foreign policy were reviewed by the State Department. In a large government, this coordination was essential, he said, when extremely important and sensitive questions were under discussion. He urged support of the views of Gen. Lyman L. Lemnitzer, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and Adm. Arleigh Burke, former Chief of Naval Operations.

Lemnitzer told the subcommittee that he found the coordination process very helpful. He conceded that he had encountered no censorship difficulties in the 11 speeches he delivered in 1961.

Whether it was his high office and prestige or his shying away from controversial questions, he couldn't say. He had spoken of the threat of international communism only as it related to military needs, he remarked. Senator STROM THURMOND, of South Carolina, read Lemnitzer a number of the anti-Communist phrases deleted from Trudeau's speeches, without identifying them as such, and asked him if they were objectionable. Lemnitzer said they were not. He eventually guessed what THURMOND was doing and suggested that he could not answer without hearing the entire speeches.

The record disclosed some State Department explanations for the censored phrases.

WHY NO WORLD COMMUNISM

In cutting out one long passage from a Trudeau speech which spoke of the enslavement of one-third of the world's peoples in the chains of world communism, the unknown employee noted:

"We want to discourage the term 'world communism.' It sounds very pessimistic and also, to some, pleasantly international, like the United Nations."

Subcommittee members joined in describing this type of censorship as odd, strange, and remarkable. They were interested in the deletion from a Trudeau speech of March 9, 1961, of the phrase, "steady advance of communism for over a century—and it still remains unchecked as no successful counterforce has been adequately developed."

The State Department censor corrected the manuscript to read, "steady advance of Sino-Soviet communism * * *" and added this comment:

"It is only the externally aggressive type [Sino-Soviet] which the United States is committed to check."

ALWAYS SUPPORTED POLICY

THURMOND remarked that this statement "by some unknown subordinate in the State Department" stated a policy that the United States was not committed to check any form of communism except the Sino-Soviet brand.

"Are we against checking the internal threat of communism which, according to J. Edgar Hoover of the FBI is very real?" he asked.

Trudeau told the subcommittee that he had always supported national policy in his public addresses. There was no Government directive, to his knowledge, he said, which prohibited members of the Defense Establishment from "speaking out clearly and forthrightly against communism."

MARX, LENIN TENETS OUT

He noted the proposed deletion from one of his speeches of the statement that "the tenets of Marx and Engels and Lenin are as firm a part of the Communist doctrine as when they were announced."

The censor said the statement was untrue, that the Communists have "jettisoned many of these tenets."

In this case, since the deletion was not mandatory, Trudeau said he disregarded the suggestion. But he followed most of them, he conceded.

"My staff and I wondered about the motivation involved," he testified. "But a soldier does not question the policies and decisions of higher governmental authority.

"I know of no military officer who questions the historically accepted principle of civilian control of the military, or the responsibility of the Secretary of Defense and higher officials to review, for policy and propriety, the statements of military spokesmen."

PATTERN IS INCONSISTENT

Trudeau expressed resentment of what he called "attempts to downgrade the military" by accusing officers of lack of knowledge of international affairs. He did not mention a memorandum prepared by Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, which declared that military men lacked the background to speak publicly on matters which were not purely military.

The pattern of censorship was inconsistent, Trudeau said. Phrases deleted in one speech would be permitted in another.

"Let them spell out the rules for us," he suggested. "If it is anathema in this country to talk of the threat of world communism, they should tell us so, and not rely on the personal opinion of some subordinate who may have some shade of motivation unknown to us."

[From the Washington Daily News,
Feb. 7, 1962]

SECRETARY STILL SAYS "NO"—MCNAMARA COULD GET CENSORS OFF HOOK

(By Jim G. Lucas)

The Pentagon's 14 beleaguered censors—including 11 decorated combat officers—could get off the hook if their boss, Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara, would let them talk.

But as of today, Mr. McNamara says they can't. He has issued written orders against their telling the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee, in its "muzzling" probe, who made specific deletions and why.

The committee says they must make identifications, unless Mr. McNamara claims executive privilege, a step he says he is loath to take. A second "peace conference" collapsed yesterday, and Committee Chairman JOHN C. STENNIS said there would be no more public hearings until the deadlock is broken.

However, Senator STENNIS called a secret meeting of his subcommittee today to discuss future procedure.

ADDED DATA

Meanwhile, it was learned, Mr. McNamara gave the committee additional information showing his own men actually had censored only 8 of 167 military speeches now in the committee record. Moreover, most of those changes were either ordered or strongly suggested by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Defense Director of Research and Development, Dr. Harold Brown.

Another 31 censorship jobs were completed by the Army, Navy or Air Force before speeches were referred "upstairs." The remaining 128 were simply marked "State Department," indicating censorship there. Defense censors, who worked all Monday night on the job, did not attempt to give reasons for State Department actions.

Mr. McNamara had his censors take the 167 speeches already in evidence and show by pencil notation the department or agency making the deletion; the reason, where known; and the policy or regulation calling for it.

The Secretary obviously hoped this would avoid a showdown with the committee.

TWENTY-SEVEN SPEECHES

Of the censored speeches, 27 were written for Lieut. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, Army Research Chief, who recently testified he wondered about the censors' motivation in some cases. The big book now shows the State Department struck from General Trudeau's many speeches all references to a possible U.S. "victory" over communism. No reason was given.

Defense censors partly rewrote a 1961 speech by Air Force Gen. Thomas D. White in which he decried those "who would retreat from nuclear strategy and start reconstructing our so-called conventional forces on an enormous scale."

The Army objected to that as "inaccurate," fearing it might be "included by implication" in General White's indictment. One of those objecting to White's speech could have been General Trudeau, an active proponent of an increased conventional warfare capability.

At the other end of the scale, Army Brig. Gen. Harold H. Shaller, commander of the Columbus, O., General Depot, wanted to refer jokingly to "gray-headed" faculty members and "wisened old seniors" in an address at Ohio State University last fall. The Defense censor deleted it as "too flip." The censor was not identified.

SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT COMPANIES

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, Members of the Senate have undoubtedly been aware of the fact that small business investment companies, licensed and operating under the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, have been the subject of increasing attention, both on Capitol Hill and around the country, in recent months. The interest shown in these companies has followed, quite naturally, I think, the tremendous growth and expansion experienced by this new investment medium during the last year. I am frank to admit that the progress being made by SBA in making available equity capital and long-term credit to small business has far exceeded my original expectations.

According to the latest available figures, there are some 481 licensed small business investment companies now operating in every State of the Union, plus Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. When compared with the 175 companies licensed at the end of 1960, it is obvious that about two-thirds of the total number of companies have been licensed during the past 12 or 13 months. In addition, at the end of 1960, fewer than 800 businesses had received long-term financing from small business investment companies. According to the latest available figures, small business investment companies have now made more than 2,500 commitments to small businesses for a total of $116.5 million. I might add that these figures are based on reports made by the small business investment companies to SBA in September of last year. If up-to-date figures were available, I am sure that these figures would be increased substantially. In terms of capital actually available for investments in or loans to growing small businesses, this program has generated more than $440 million. An interesting thing about this, too, and the one thing that I think can be pointed to above all others to indicate some measure of success in this program, is the fact that there are about $7 in private capital for every dollar of Federal funds. Many of us will recall that when the Small Business Investment Act was before the Senate in 1958, it was generally felt that, if this act would generate $1 of private capital for every $2 of Government money, we would have a successful program. As is the case with so many progressive programs, I think many of us had a tendency to underestimate the confidence which the American public would place in a sound Federal program designed to solve a basic problem in our economy.

Of course, the basic problem which the Small Business Investment Act was designed to solve was the so-called equity gap. Prior to 1958, it had been long accepted that small businesses were severely handicapped by the unavailability of long-term credit and equity capital. There were several economic facts of life which lay at the roots of the problem. In the matter of long-term credit, of course, there simply was no source from which small business could obtain this type credit on reasonable terms. As for equity capital, the problem was a little more complicated. There were rare occasions when a small business, in need of equity capital, was successful in offering its stock to the public. Where the amount needed was less than $1 million, however, the cost of such a public offering was usually prohibitive. And even where the need exceeded $1 million, it was not unusual that factors such as the lack of sufficient operating experience of the business or the fact that market conditions were not always favorable when the need for additional capital arose, made a public offering inadvisable.

There were innumerable cases, also, where a small business had been able to make a successful public offering of its stock, but found itself after a short time in need of additional capital at a time when its stock was not in style on the public market. Oddly enough, the need for this type of followup capital was often more acute and more difficult to meet than was the need for initial growth capital for small businesses.

These were the problems to which the Congress addressed itself in passing the Small Business Investment Act of 1958.

Following the passage of that act, there was a period during which its implementation by SBA was slow and cautious, and this met with general approval by all who were interested in the success of the program. We knew that this was an experimental program, and deliberate caution is always a necessity in any experiment. However, after 2 years of very little progress, in 1960 the Select Committee on Small Business of the Senate conducted a field study of the program and held hearings in Washington on two occasions. As a result, recommendations for improved administration and legislative changes were made by the committee, most of which were adopted by SBA, and by the Congress last year in the passage of the Small Business Investment Act Amendments of 1961.

Undoubtedly, the committee's study in 1960 and the support given by the Members of Congress to its recommendations, together with the aggressive administration of the act by SBA during the last year, have accounted for the expanding development of this new investment industry. I know that many of you have shared with me the feeling that we should look forward to the time when there would be a sufficient number of SBIC's operating, and a sufficient volume of loans and investments by them to provide a basis from which we could determine just what has been accomplished toward solving the equity gap problem of our economy. In my opinion and in the opinion of my distinguished fellow members of the Senate Small Business Committee, that time has come.

With this in mind, the committee has undertaken a comprehensive study of the operations of the small business investment companies. The committee has sent to every licensed small business investment company a questionnaire inquiring primarily into the investment activity of the company. We are seeking to determine precisely what type of loans and investments are being made to small business, the dollar amount of these transactions, the type and size of small businesses receiving assistance, the cost to the small businesses of such assistance as is being provided and last, but by no means least, the extent to which any small business investment company has obtained a voice in the management of its small business clients. With regard to this last item, we have found so far that one of the most frequent reasons given by small businessmen for not wishing to deal with a small business investment company is a reluctance to part with sole ownership of the business. In my opinion, this is one area which might very well provide fertile ground for misunderstanding on the part of the small businessmen of the country, as well as among Members of Congress. It may be that during the first few years of this program's existence, small business investment companies have traded too hard with their small business clients in this respect. If there have been abuses, of course, this is one of the things that we will want to discover. Let me hasten to add, however, that after all, the small business investment companies are private investment firms, and they deal at arm's length with their small business clients. It would seem only natural to me that, in the beginning a relatively few companies, operating in an area where the demand for their service far exceeded the supply, may have been able to strike a hard bargain in their negotiations. However, it seems equally logical to assume that as more and more companies are licensed, and as competition among them increases, we should find the terms of their bargains becoming more and more liberal. As I have said, this is certainly one of the things that the Small Business Committee is looking into.

An important part of the study being made by the committee, as I announced several weeks ago, will be a series of hearings in various sections of the country, at which we expect to receive testimony from representatives of the small business investment company industry, small businessmen who have dealt with the small business investment companies, representatives of the investment banking community, and from SBA personnel in some of the regional offices who are in charge of the administration of the program.

I am pleased to announced that my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], who is the chairman of the Financing Subcommittee of the Senate Small Business Committee, and who has always been one of the most active and tireless members of that committee, has agreed to conduct the first of several hearings that are planned. This will be in his own State of Oregon at Portland on the 24th of this month. I am confident that this first session of the committee's hearings will provide us with a great deal of information on how this program is operating out in the far western section of the country.

Following the hearings in Portland, we expect to move rather quickly to Chicago for a 1-day hearing on February 26, after which we plan to rest up a bit before moving to Miami during the later part of March and then return to Washington for a final session.

While I expect to preside at the Chicago hearing, the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], whose efforts on behalf of small business in America are well known, and who has served with distinction as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Procurement of the Small Business Committee, will conduct the hearings in Miami. I know that much valuable information will be obtained from a review of the numerous small business investment companies which are licensed and operating in his State of Florida and in the surrounding area. I regret that my distinguished colleagues from Oregon and Florida are not able to be present here today. In their absence, however, they have requested that I submit for the record brief statments which, were they able to be here, they would deliver in person to the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these statements by the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], and the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], be printed following my remarks in the Record.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement of Senator Morse

I am happy to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished chairman of the Select Committee on Small Business. As chairman of the Financing Subcommittee of the committee, I have shared with him for quite some time the hope that it would not be too long before a comprehensive appraisal of the activities of the small business investment companies would be possible. The program under which these companies are licensed constitutes, in my opinion, one of the most courageous experiments ever undertaken by this Government. Unquestionably, the action of Congress in passing the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 was founded upon voluminous and uncontroverted evidence of the existence of a so-called equity gap insofar as small business was concerned. The fact remains, however, that Congress was plowing new ground in creating this new investment medium. I have been generally pleased with the information that I have received concerning these companies. Although some criticism of the program has come to my attention, by and large the reports I have received have been favorable. As the Senator from Alabama has said, the purpose of the planned hearings will be to determine just what kind of job these new investment firms are doing in meeting the credit and capital demands of small business.

I am highly pleased with the decision of the chairman and the members of the Small Business Committee to undertake this review of the small business investment companies. I am especially pleased and honored by the request of the distinguished chairman that I conduct the first of this series of hearings at Portland in my home State on February 24. I am happy to have this opportunity to join with him in making this announcement of the committee's plans. I know that there are five small business investment companies licensed and operating in my State, and a number of others in California and the surrounding States. Over 90 percent of the business firms in my section of the country, as in most other sections, are small businesses. The demand for long-term credit and growth capital by these firms has always been high. However, I think it might be well to remember at this point that, while the primary purpose of this program was to solve the credit and capital needs of individual small firms, a very important byproduct was to be the vigor and strength that would be added to the general economy by allowing these small firms to grow, expand and prosper. The failure of our economy, prior to 1958, to provide the means whereby this type of credit and capital could be obtained, served as an artificial brake on economic growth and prevented the most efficient allocation of capital resources.

The point I am making is that, in my opinion, the study which the Small Business Committee is undertaking will not only determine for us how well the credit and capital needs of small businesses are being met, but we shall also determine the contribution made by this program to the economic growth of America—a matter of such vital importance in these days.

Statement of Senator Smathers

It is indeed a pleasure to join with the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Oregon in announcing the plans of the Senate Small Business Committee to review the manner in which small business investment companies have been operating under the Small Business Investment Act of 1958.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Procurement of the Senate Small Business Committee, I have come to know firsthand the problem faced by small firms in need of additional capital, particularly small manufacturing firms which sell their products to the Government as well as to the public generally. There is no greater frustration within the American free-enterprise economy than that resulting from the inability of small concerns to obtain the capital necessary to realize a clearly indicated growth potential.

I recall, that, when the Small Business Investment Act was before the Senate in 1958, the record compiled by the Small Business Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee and the Senate Select Committee on Small Business confirmed that the greatest need for growth capital was found among small manufacturing firms. Now, this is not to say, of course, that there are not a great many small firms operating in the retail, wholesale, or service fields that have growth potential and thereby a need for additional capital. Nevertheless, the evidence was clear that the greatest need was in manufacturing. In my opinion, the forthcoming study by the committee, through examining firsthand the investment activity of the SBIC's, will determine for us precisely the types of small firms which have applied to these companies for help. This information will doubtless be of great value to the Congress in determining whether or not legislative changes are necessary.

There is one other thing, I think, that we will want to learn about this program, and that is the general effect upon the economy of the area within which a small firm, that has dealt with a small business investment company, operates. Congress wisely provided in the Small Business Investment Act that the financial assistance provided by these companies should not result in a substantial increase of unemployment in any area of the country. I think that we shall certainly want to satisfy ourselves as to whether this provision has been complied with. But other than this, it seems to me that the best criterion upon which to determine the success or failure of the program will be the general effect upon the economic life of those communities into which SBIC assistance has gone. What job opportunities have been provided? What payrolls have been provided or saved through supplying the necessary capital or credit to sustain a small business concern? The answers to these questions will be a true measure of the success of this program.

I look forward with enthusiasm to the hearings which I shall conduct in Miami on the 29th and 30th of March. There are 21 small business investment companies licensed in my State of Florida, more than in any other southeastern State. It will come as no surprise when I say that I am particularly interested in reviewing the activities of these 21 companies. From the reports that I have received, these companies are generally doing a good job for small business in Florida. It will be our purpose to determine whether further improvement can be made.

At the Miami hearings, we expect to have as witnesses representatives of the small business investment company industry both from the southeastern and southwestern sections of the country. We hope to get a complete picture of the program as it is being operated within this area. In addition, we expect to receive testimony from SBA officials and small businessmen who have had occasion to deal with a small business investment company. I know that the information we receive will enable the Congress to see what this program has done for small business, and what may be necessary to steer its future course in line with the original intent of the act.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I have appreciated very much this opportunity to inform the Senate of the work being carried on by the Senate Small Business Committee in regard to small business investment companies. When the Small Business Investment Act was passed in 1958, I was of the opinion that Congress had made a giant step forward in its never-ending struggle to solve the many problems of the American small businessman. I am hopeful that the study undertaken by the Small Business Committee will serve to confirm that opinion.

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 1962

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate at this time, I move, pursuant to the order previously entered, that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday, February 15.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until Thursday, February 15, 1962, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 12, 1962:

U.S. ATTORNEY

Edward L. Shaheen, of Louisiana, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of Louisiana for the term of 4 years, vice T. Fitzhugh Wilson.

IN THE ARMY

The Army National Guard of the United States officers named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3392:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. George Justus Hearn, O295111.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Lyle Everett Buchanan, O1000717, Adjutant General's Corps.

Col. Paul Leonard Kleiver, O397818, Adjutant General's Corps.

Col. Roy Elcanah Thompson, O360841, Adjutant General's Corps.

The Army National Guard of the United States officers named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3385:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. William John Lange, O1175482.

Brig. Gen. Henry William McMillan, O323208.

Brig. Gen. Weston H. Willis, O289949.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Glenn Charles Ames, O328307, Armor.

Brig. Gen. Thomas Sams Bishop, O403542.

Col. Wilbur Henry Fricke, O340397, Artillery.

Maj. Gen. Henry Vance Graham, O398163.

Col. Jack Guest Johnson O370102, Signal Corps.

Col. Howard Samuel McGee, O387469, Artillery.

Col. Luther Elmer Orrick, O357391, Artillery.

Col. James DeWitt Scott, O381931, Armor.

Col. Max Henry Specht, O383575, Artillery.

Col. Herbert Owen Wardell, O293295, Artillery.

Col. Charles Austin Willis, O357988, Artillery.

The officers named herein for promotion as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3384:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Chester Pilgrim Hartford, O288390.

Brig. Gen. Herbert Russell Morss, Jr., O293333.

Brig. Gen. Cooper Burnett Rhodes, O258656.

To be brigadier generals

Col. William Henry Baumer, O2201379, Infantry.

Col. Phillips Leland Boyd, O230117, Medical Corps.

Col. Edward Stephens Branigan, Jr., O325381, Artillery.

Col. Joseph Hall Buchanan, O407996, Artillery.

Col. Costas Louis Caraganis, O306965, Armor.

Col. John Peter Connor, O416675, Infantry.

Col. Felix Albert Davis, O466259, Corps of Engineers.

Col. Carl Jens Dueser, O300655, Infantry.

Col. Denver Woodrow Meacham, O314699, Artillery.

Col. Franklin Lewis Orth, O307198, Infantry.

Col. Carl Curtis Saal, O923083, Transportation Corps.

Col. Myron Jewell Tremaine, O336516, Medical Corps.

Col. Lawrence Grant Treece, O291041, Corps of Engineers.

Col. John Edward Vance, O229832, Corps of Engineers.

Col. Louis Burton Wolf, O387002, Armor.

Col. Spurgeon Brown Wuertenberger, O295174, Artillery.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 12, 1962:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSIONER

Kenneth H. Tuggle, of Kentucky, to be Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the term of 7 years expiring December 31, 1968.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the Coast and Geodetic Survey:

To be ensigns

Donald Glen Popejoy
Harold Neill Estes, Jr.
Robert Anthony Ganse
Thomas Patrick Gilmore
Rolland Lee Lech
Daniel Dignan Sweeney
Herbert Lee Mansbridge

U.S. COAST GUARD

Rear Adm. Edwin J. Roland, to be Assistant Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard with the rank of vice admiral.

The following U.S. Coast Guard officers for promotion to the permanent rank indicated in the U.S. Coast Guard:

To be rear admirals

Capt. William D. Shields
Capt. Richard D. Schmidtman
Capt. Willard J. Smith

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

James V. Day, of Maine, to be Federal Maritime Commissioner for the term expiring June 30, 1965.

John S. Patterson, of Maryland, to be Federal Maritime Commissioner for the term expiring June 30, 1962.

Ashton Barrett, of Mississippi, to be Federal Maritime Commissioner for the term expiring June 30, 1963.

Thomas E. Stakem, of Virginia, to be Federal Maritime Commissioner for the term expiring June 30, 1964.

John Harllee, of the District of Columbia, to be Federal Maritime Commissioner for the term expiring June 30, 1965.

U.S. ARMY

The following-named officer, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in rank as follows:

To be general

Lt. Gen. Earle Gilmore Wheeler, O18715, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

BUREAU OF YARDS AND DOCKS

Rear Adm. Peter Corradi, Civil Engineer Corps, U.S. Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks in the Department of the Navy for a term of 4 years.

U.S. NAVY

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. Carl F. Espe, U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade indicated on the retired list, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

Under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, the following-named officers for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, for appointment to the grade indicated while so serving:

To be vice admirals

* Vice Adm. William A. Schoech, U.S. Navy.
* Vice Adm. Roy L. Johnson, U.S. Navy.
* Vice Adm. Rufus E. Rose, U.S. Navy.

(NOTE.—Asterisk (*) indicates ad interim appointment issued.)

U.S. ARMY

The nominations beginning Frank M. Alley, Jr., to be first lieutenant, and ending Gary L. Zwicker, to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on January 25, 1962.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

John 13: 35: *By this shall all men know that ye are My disciples, if ye have love one to another.*

Almighty God, we acknowledge gratefully that daily Thou art sheltering us under the outstretched arms of Thy divine providence.

Today we are praising Thee for a great American patriot whom Thou didst endow with a profound and penetrating spirit and of whose fame there will be no end.

We thank Thee that the windows of his soul were always open toward the unseen and the eternal as he passionately prayed and labored that love and righteousness might prevail and Thy will be done.

When we search for the elemental and supreme qualities and virtues of his inner life we find that his spirit was too magnanimous to harbor a wrong and too merciful to hate.

Grant that we may be inspired to hasten the coming of that glorious day when in the mind and heart of man there shall be no malice toward anyone but only charity toward all.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 8, 1962, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with an amendment, in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 8723. An act to amend the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act with respect to the method of enforcement and to provide certain additional sanctions, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the House thereon, and appoints Mr. McNamara, Mr. Morse, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Smith of Massachusetts, Mr. Pell, Mr. Burdick, Mr. Goldwater, Mr. Prouty, and Mr. Tower to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 258) entitled "An act to amend the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act to increase the rate of tax imposed on certain gross receipts, to amend the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Parking Facility Act of 1942 to transfer certain parking fees and other moneys to the highway fund, and for other purposes."

MEMBERS OF U.S. DELEGATION, CANADA-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86-42, in addition to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Gallagher], chairman; the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. Kelly], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Curtis], and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Broomfield], who were appointed to serve for the 87th Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the U.S. delegation of the Canada-United States interparliamentary group for the meeting to be held in Ottawa, Canada, from February 28 to March 4, 1962, the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. Dulski, Mr. Philbin, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Donohue, Mr. Giaimo, Mr. Cunningham, Mr. Tupper, Mr. Robison.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary have until midnight tonight to file certain reports on private immigration bills.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

THE 44TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE RESTORATION OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Derwinski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I wish to call to the attention of the Members of the House the 44th anniversary of the restoration of Lithuanian independence which occurred on February 16, 1918. The brave people of Lithuania have suffered for many years under Soviet domination—not only in their own country, but wherever they are, scattered throughout the vast Soviet slave empire.

Certainly it is fitting that we as Members of the House of Representatives pay tribute to the courageous spirit of the Lithuanian people, and to emphasize again their aspirations for true freedom and independence, for someday they will be free again and assume their proud and rightful position among the free nations of the world.

Mr. Speaker, the most effective way for us to show the heroic Lithuanian people and the other captive peoples who are victims of Soviet colonialism our true interest in and concern for the restoration of their freedom would be to create a special House Committee on Captive Nations. The resolutions that are before the Rules Committee have been stopped by the objections of the State Department. Secretary Rusk and his ghost writers show a lack of real knowledge of European history, and an equally disturbing attitude toward Soviet domination of the captive nations. It is certainly fitting and proper for the Congress to take affirmative action, and the work of this special House committee would be a major step in thoroughly exposing Soviet colonialism to world view, and in maintaining the spirit of independence that marks the courageous people of Lithuania and of all captive peoples, which will lead to the eventual breakup of the Soviet empire.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS AND COST OF PRINTING THE RECORD

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, it might be of interest to know that the latest estimate by the Public Printer is that the cost of printing the Congressional Record is now $90 per page; so, as we extend our remarks and make revisions I think we should also figure what the cost will be.

I think a glance over the Record since the first of this year will show that we are printing, it seems to me, more useless information than we have ever done in the past.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding estimated costs of $182.25 and $344.25, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Multer] may be permitted to extend his remarks in the Record in two instances and to include therein extraneous matter.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman to whom I should refer an inquiry as to the reason for unanimous consent despite the fact it exceeds the limit and costs more? Why is that necessary? Can anybody answer the question? Can the whip answer?

Mr. BOGGS. A parliamentary inquiry should be directed to the Speaker.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. That is not a parliamentary inquiry; I would just like to know why.

The SPEAKER. It is the understanding of the Chair—and, of course, the Chair is not answering a parliamentary inquiry, but making an observation of the Chair's understanding—that under the law the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted a resolution that any insertions of extraneous matter in the Appendix of the Record shall not exceed two pages without an estimate of cost, and the estimate of cost must be stated when the consent request to insert the matter is made.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to object, I am merely calling to the attention of the House how often when we submit consent requests to extend we often add that if it exceeds the limit it may still be inserted. I have not heard anybody object to a consent request and, as I say, I do not intend to object, but I just want to get these observations on the record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

BRITISH PROBLEMS WITH HUGE CHEMICAL MERGER ILLUSTRATE VIRTUES OF AMERICAN ANTITRUST LAWS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Patman] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the pending merger between Imperial Chemical Industries, Ltd., and Courtaulds, Ltd., now being debated in Great Britain, provides a vivid illustration of the values of the American antitrust laws and the sharp contrast between our approach to monopoly and theirs. In a nutshell, the British are satisfied to permit a monopoly to be established and then wait and see whether the effects of the monopoly are good or bad. In this country, on the other hand, Congress and the courts have taken the wise position not only that monopolies are forbidden, whether good or bad, but also that mergers tending toward monopoly are unlawful.

BRITISH CONCERN WITH MONOPOLY REVIVED AFTER WORLD WAR II

Although England was the cradle of the theory of free competition, the British abandoned this concept long ago. Speaking of the situation in the late 1930's, one commentator described it in the following words:

> Dramatics aside, England is experiencing nothing more "revolutionary" than a completely planless, muddling decline of competition—decline on a wide front, firmly motivated and actively in process, but opportunistic and piecemeal nonetheless. * * * (Ben W. Lewis, Price and Production Control in British Industry, Public Policy Pamphlet No. 25 (University of Chicago Press, 1937).)

After World War II, the British for the first time in their history passed antitrust legislation. A Monopolies and Restrictive Practices Commission was established by the act of 1948—subsequently modified and supplemented by later legislation—and procedures and policies were formulated for dealing with the two major categories into which the monopoly problem is usually divided—market dominance (monopoly) and restrictive agreements. One might have thought that the British would have profited from some of our mistakes, for it was not until the Celler-Kefauver Act was passed in 1950 that we had an effective antimerger law. The difference between the new British antimonopoly program and our own has been succinctly described by Paul H. Guenault and J. M. Jackson in "The Control of Monopoly in the United Kingdom"—pages 2 and 3:

> The American and British policies, both designed to strengthen the forces of competition within the economy, are diametrically opposed in character. The former was based, at least originally, on a general condemnation of monopoly and restrictive practices which was sufficiently strong to override any objections to an attempt to eradicate monopoly and many forms of restrictive practices through direct prohibition. Despite the fact that certain sectors of the economy have been exempted from the scope of this legislation, and though in the crisis of the thirties, principle gave way to expediency, this lively spirit of condemnation of monopoly still inspires American policy. The British legislation of 1948 was, on the other hand, based on the belief that suspected cases of monopoly or agreements should be carefully examined and the practices scrutinized prior to any condemnation or subsequent action. Even the later British legislation has not broken away, in any significant respect, from this approach.

The British Monopolies and Restrictive Practices Act now faces its most crucial test in the matter of the ICI-Courtaulds merger, the largest merger in British history. This merger will bring together 95 percent of the synthetic fiber market in Britain and 75 percent of the market for paint. As the New York Times recently remarked:

> In the United States, such percentages of concentration would guarantee a suit by the Department of Justice. In the case of the Bethlehem Steel Corp. and the Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co., for example, the proposed merger of the Nation's second and sixth largest steel companies was struck down because together they would have had 20 percent of the Nation's steel capacity. The United States Steel Corp., the Nation's biggest steel producers has 30 percent of the industry's capacity.
>
> In the Brown Shoe Co. case, now before the U.S. Supreme Court, Brown Shoe so far has been prevented from acquiring the G. R. Kinney Co. and its chain of retail shoe stores. Together they would hold 4½ percent of the market.

In contrast, the Monopolies Commission in Great Britain may investigate and make recommendations on a merger such as that of Imperial Chemicals and Courtaulds. However, according to Frederick J. Erroll, president of Britain's Board of Trade, it had been the policy to judge monopolies by their actual effects in practice and not to attempt, in his words, "to reach conclusions on the possible effects of any particular monopoly before it has come into existence and there has been practical experience of its working."

SHERMAN ACT DOES NOT DISTINGUISH BETWEEN GOOD AND BAD MONOPOLIES, BUT FORBIDS ALL

Thus, in two respects American antitrust laws are more preventive of monopoly than is the British act. First, the Sherman Act would forestall a monopoly from being created, without waiting to see whether it is a bad or good monopoly. As Judge Learned Hand said in the Alcoa case (*United States* v. *Aluminum Company of America*, 148 F. 2d, 416, 427):

> It is no excuse for monopolizing a market that the monopoly has not been used to extract from the consumer more than a fair profit. The act has wider purposes. Indeed, even though one disregarded all but economic considerations, it would by no means follow that such concentration of producing power is to be desired, when it has not been used extortionately. Many people believe that possession of unchallenged economic power deadens initiative, discourages thrift and depresses energy; that immunity from competition is a narcotic, and rivalry is a stimulant, to industrial progress; that the spur of constant stress is necessary to counteract an inevitable disposition to let well enough alone. Such people believe that competitors, versed in the craft as no consumer can be, will be quick to detect opportunities for saving and new shifts in production, and be eager to profit by them. In any event the mere fact that a producer having command of the domestic market, has not been able to make more than a fair profit is no evidence that a fair profit could not be made at lower prices.

Judge Hand concluded:

> Be that as it may, that was not the way that Congress chose; it did not condone good trusts and condemn bad ones; it forbade all.

CELLER-KEFAUVER ACT DOES NOT DISTINGUISH BETWEEN GOOD AND BAD MERGERS BUT FORBIDS ALL THAT MAY SUBSTANTIALLY LESSEN COMPETITION OR TEND TO CREATE A MONOPOLY

But the second bulwark against monopoly is contained in section 7 of the Clayton Act—as amended by the Celler-Kefauver Act of 1950. This act challenges incipient monopoly, or more specifically, mergers which may substantially lessen competition or tend toward monopoly.

Judge Weinfeld, who banned the Bethlehem-Youngstown Steel merger, succinctly described the congressional purpose behind this act as follows (*United States* v. *Bethlehem Steel Corporation*, 168 F. Supp. 576, 581):

> It is stating a fact of history to say that Congress felt that the Sherman Act passed in 1890 had proved quite ineffective in halting the growth of "trusts" and monopolies. * * * The evils of corporate mergers and combines with their increasing concentration of power commanded the concerned attention of the Nation. The "rule of reason" enunciated by the Supreme Court in 1911 in *Standard Oil Company* v. *United States*, regarded by many as having weakened the Sherman Act, gave impetus to efforts to secure more effective means of preserving our free enterprise system. * * * Congress acted in 1914 by passing the Clayton Act. Its essential purpose was preventive—to check anticompetitive acts in their incipiency before they had reached the dimensions of Sherman Act violations.

Despite the clear purpose of the original section 7 of the Clayton Act, its objectives were not realized because of the loophole enabling corporations to escape the application of the act when they acquired the assets, rather than the capital stock, of their competitors. Thus the economic concentration permitted to develop by the failures of the Sherman Act were compounded—particularly during the merger movement of the 1920's—by the loophole in the Clayton Act. When Congress plugged this loophole in 1950, the Celler-Kefauver Act made crystal clear the congressional purpose to prevent further increases in economic concentration.

In the Bethlehem-Youngstown case, the first Government antimerger action to be decided under amended section 7, Judge Weinfeld echoed Judge Hand's comment regarding good versus bad monopolies in the following words (op. cit., p. 618):

> Congress in seeking to halt the growing tendency to increased concentration of power in various industries was fully aware of the arguments in support of the supposed advantages of size and the claim of greater efficiency and lower cost to the ultimate consumer. It made no distinction between good mergers and bad mergers. It condemned all within the reach of the prohibition of section 7.

LONDON ECONOMIST CITES AMERICAN ANTITRUST POLICY AS ONE "THAT QUITE OFTEN WORKS"

The ICI-Courtaulds merger has even become a subject of heated debate between the two major political parties in Great Britain. On the one hand, the Labor Party accuses the Government of a timid and complacent attitude toward the growth of private monopoly. The

Conservatives, on the other hand, are taking a wait-and-see approach to the matter.

The erudite London Economist has entered the discussion with some telling observations on the pitfalls involved in any attempt to distinguish between good and bad monopolies, and tosses a few bouquets toward American antitrust policies.

Regarding alleged efficiency of monopoly, the London Economist notes:

> No economist could pretend that there are any conclusive economic arguments, in the current state of this art-cum-science, against a merger between Imperial Chemical Industries and Courtaulds * * *. Nobody—ICI and Courtaulds not excluded—knows enough about the effects of bigness and vertical integration in a modern science-based industry to say with any real certainty that they would conduce to promote greater business efficiency in the production of manmade fibers in Britain than would freedom to buy the intermediate materials for any or all of these fibers in a market that is for the present in surplus.

On the matter of good versus bad monopolies the Economist adds:

> The Government's commitment to empiricism in examining monopoly and restrictive practices would in any case have given it excuses for deciding (as Mr. Erroll announced on Tuesday) not to decide whether this merger would or would not be in the national interest. Such empiricism—monopoly's not good or bad, but thinking (by the Monopolies Commission afterward) makes it so—is built into British political attitudes toward the restraint of competition.

Finally, the Economist points with favor to the American approach to antitrust as follows:

> The United States—which is often accused in Europe of having an exaggerated animus against monopoly, because it has a policy that quite often works—seldom falls into this trap. Its legal prejudice, per se, against anything calculated to restrain competition, is avowedly based, in the last resort, on social and even moral grounds; the economic efficiency that it believes competition generally promotes is the secondary justification, not the first. Primarily, American attitudes toward monopoly (public as well as private) are based upon a distrust of concentrations of economic power, irresponsible in that they are not finally accountable to the public. This does not make American antitrust legislation emotional and ineffective; it makes it at times even embarrassingly effective.

This discussion in the London Economist of the problems of coping with monopolistic mergers is of such significance that I include the full article herein.

[From the Economist, Feb. 3, 1962]

No Policy for Mergers

No economist could pretend that there are any conclusive economic arguments, in the current state of this art-cum-science, against a merger between Imperial Chemical Industries and Courtaulds. The "technological considerations" into which Mr. Erroll sought to delve last week afford no oracular guiding light. Nobody—ICI and Courtaulds not excluded—knows enough about the effects of bigness and vertical integration in a modern science-based industry to say with any real certainty that they would conduce to promote greater business efficiency in the production of manmade fibers in Britain than would freedom to buy the intermediate materials for any or all of these fibers in a market that is for the present in surplus.

The Government's commitment to empiricism in examining monopoly and restrictive practices would in any case have given it excuses for deciding (as Mr. Erroll announced on Tuesday) not to decide whether this merger would or would not be in the national interest. Such empiricism—monopoly's not good or bad, but thinking (by the Monopolies Commission afterward) makes it so—is built into British political attitudes toward the restraint of competition. Not into Conservative attitudes alone, either: Labour made it the core of the Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Act of 1948, defends big trade unions against any scrutiny at all, and has had kind words for cartels arraigned before the restrictive practices court. The Government's entranced indecision before the prospect of ICI's gobbling up Courtaulds is only the latest demonstration of the basic inadequacy of this whole political attitude, which sounds so sensible and constantly turns out to be so ineffectual.

It arises perhaps from the mistaken assumption—which economists are guilty of encouraging—that political objections to monopoly can be altogether based on evidential grounds, economic or technical. The United States—which is often accused in Europe of having an exaggerated animus against monopoly, because it has a policy that quite often works—seldom falls into this trap. Its legal prejudice, per se, against anything calculated to restrain competition, is avowedly based, in the last resort, on social and even moral grounds; the economic efficiency that it believes competition generally promotes is the secondary justification, not the first. Primarily, American attitudes toward monopoly (public as well as private) are based upon a distrust of concentrations of economic power, irresponsible in that they are not finally accountable to the public. This does not make American antitrust legislation emotional and ineffective; it makes it at times even embarrassingly effective. It is no accident that the only British procedure in this field to have achieved even formal success, that of the restrictive practices court, does lean toward the per se outlawry of restrictive agreements, holding them wrong unless, under specified heads, they can be proved to be right. But a similar proposition toward single firm monopoly is not one that can ordinarily be demonstrated in logic: either you feel it or you do not.

The present British Government, elected to represent a country where political democracy is still suffused with respect for established hierarchies of one kind or another, does not feel it. Starting from the assumption that bigness will only become bad when it can be proved to have been bad, it can form no opinions about the future results of the engrossing behavior of businessmen. No doubt it was embarrassed by the project for an ICI-Courtaulds merger, the more so when it found that the eminent businessmen in whose wisdom it at first counseled Parliament to trust were calling each other fools or liars (a spectacle that may yet have more effect on the end of the affair than most of us have yet reckoned on—as perhaps the Tory backbench disquiet may indicate). But it did not feel competent to decide, on the evidence, whether this merger was in fact in the public interest or not, and did not feel that any clear principle was involved.

This, rather than the mechanics of any possible intervention, lies behind the Government's refusal to intervene. Both companies, could, as it is, be said to fall within the purview of the Monopolies Commission, which is indeed ordinarily asked to say whether conditions existing in an industry "operate or may be expected to operate" against the public interest. And any hint of Government uneasiness or disapproval, on grounds of the national interest, would certainly have had some considerable effect upon the attitudes of the directors and shareholders concerned. The idea of a quick inquiry—to find out the "facts of the case," or to take Parliament off the boil?—was never a good one. But had the Government been prepared to form an opinion, it would have had no difficulty in making that opinion prevail. It was not ready to do this; and one suspects that it will go on finding reason for not making up its mind about mergers. Tory ministers still do not stand for laissez faire in the sense of securing the largest practicable limits of effective competitive enterpirse and choice; they tend to believe instead, as perhaps they always have done, in laissez faire for the biggest and best businessmen to pursue their expert objectives as they think most appropriate. What is good for the private barons may be good for the country; Mr. Erroll washes his hands. Sometimes indeed this may be right; but the Tories have no public test, political or moral as well as economic, to judge by. It is almost symbolic that, in this property-owning democracy, the last people formally to be consulted about this transaction will be the shareholders of ICI.

DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS AND HOUSING—REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1962

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Addonizio] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, in his message to the Congress calling for the establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, the President called attention to the Nation's dramatic urban growth when he said:

> In a few short decades we have passed from a rural to an urban way of life; in a few short decades more, we shall be a nation of vastly expanded population, living in expanded urban areas in housing that does not now exist, served by community facilities that do not now exist, moving about by means of systems of urban transportation that do not now exist.

Let us pause for a moment to see just what has happened. Then we can better judge what the future holds in store. When the first census was taken in 1790 only 1 out of every 20 Americans—5 percent—lived in urban communities. Even in 1860 we were still essentially an agricultural Nation. But in the second half of the 19th century, as we began to flex our industrial muscles, our cities began to grow at a spectacular rate. By the turn of the 20th century 2 out of 5 Americans lived in urban communities. Today the ratio is 3 out of 4.

We Americans are a mobile people. We have been willing to move to places where the best jobs are available and where our children have the best chance to get ahead. Increasingly these opportunities have been in our cities.

So it is not surprising to find that out of a population of 180 million in 1960 the Census found that 125 million or 70 percent were living in towns or cities and their suburbs. It was also not surprising to find that 113 million or 63 percent of our people were concentrated in metropolitan areas. What may surprise some of my colleagues, however, is the extent to which these trends of urbanization and metropolitanization have spread into almost every nook and cranny of these United States. No longer is it just the industrialized eastern seaboard in which urban dwellers are concentrated. In 1960 there were only four States in which some significant proportion of the population was not to be found living in metropolitan communities. Even in the so-called farm belt, official census figures show that better than one-third of the population was in metropolitan areas and that an even higher proportion was to be found in urban communities.

People who study population trends look for the upward surge to continue at a rapid pace for the rest of the century. Between now and 1980 we can expect our population to rise to better than 260 million with the entire 80 million increase concentrated in urban places. Looking on to the year 2000, still another 125 million may be added to our urban population to bring our total population to nearly 385 million.

Now this tremendous growth is not only a challenge—it is also an opportunity. An expanding population will offer a huge market for new homes, home furnishings and appliances, automobiles, and other items that add up to a high and rising standard of living. Community facilities and public improvements of all types will have to be provided by our local governments.

What is the size of the job facing our homebuilders? It has been estimated that during the present decade alone new construction of houses and apartments will total over 16 million dwelling units. Over 9 million units are needed in the 1960's to accommodate the increase in our population, and almost as many again are needed to replace units to be demolished and those lost through fire and flood and other acts of God. The construction of new units during the 1960's will involve expenditures of about $200 billion.

But merely building new homes is not enough. We must also preserve our existing resources. To do this there must be expenditures for additions to and alterations of, existing homes of approximately $61 billion; and for hotels, motels, dormitories, and other such nonhousekeeping structures of an estimated $15 billion. The total construction cost will come to nearly $280 billion during the decade. Maintenance expenditures may well amount to another $75 billion.

But the present decade tells only part of the story. Let us look further into the future to the year 2000, when the country's population will have grown to over 380 million. To house the net addition of approximately 200 million persons, a great expansion in the rate of homebuilding activity will have to take place. It will in fact have to grow to almost three times the present size by the year 2000.

Shelter alone is by no means the only problem with which urban areas must cope in the years ahead. A related task to be faced is that of providing urban facilities in general. A leading authority in the field of municipal affairs, Luther Gulick, has estimated that the additional urban facilities needed by the population growth of the 1960's will cost $33 billion. Another $200 billion may have to be spent between 1970 and 2000.

The pressures resulting from the population increase on the construction and financing facilities of the Nation will require all the foresight, planning, and coordination we can muster. We can ill afford to use our resources and our facilities inefficiently or to put our improvements in the wrong places.

The job of providing an improved urban environment for all Americans is one in which a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing can provide invaluable coordination, advice, and financial assistance. As the President said:

> The present and future problems of our cities are as complex as they are manifold. There must be expansion: but orderly and planned expansion, not explosion and sprawl.

URBAN AMERICA COMES OF AGE

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Rodino] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, one of the most disappointing events of the first session of this Congress was the failure to act upon any of the bills that proposed the establishment of a new Cabinet-level department—the Department of Urban Affairs.

I introduced a bill that would do this on the first day of the last session. As others who sponsored similar bills with me know only too well, it was never cleared out of the Rules Committee.

Now, however, the courageous and prompt action of our President has raised the hopes of the millions of urban Americans that they will at long last be properly represented in the executive branch of the Federal Government.

Despite the efforts of some misguided individuals to make it so, this is not a partisan issue. Nor is it an issue of States' rights, although I have heard a lot of talk and read some purple prose about how this new Department is a further threat to those rights. We all know what they mean by this modern use of the old battle cry—the right of the one farmer on his one section to be represented as well as the hundreds of people in the square mile in town.

I was fortunate enough to hear a radio broadcast a few days ago by my next door neighbor and good friend, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Brewster]. Dan represents, among others, Baltimore County, a major metropolitan area in his beautiful State. I was very happy to hear him speak out, in positive terms, buttressed by solid reasoning, in favor of the new Department. If I remember the ratios he quoted about his State, the urban counties have a total of 14 representatives in the general assembly, while the Eastern Shore rural counties have 35—2½ times as many representatives, although with only about one-fourth of the population of the urban counties.

This is all too typical today. Where are our cities going to turn? The same place they have been turning to for years now—to Washington. But does any one force them to? No. If they want help in urban renewal, they will receive it. If they do not, that is that, and nobody is going to bother them.

But, irrational critics say, if they are able to get such help now, why create a new Department? Those of you like myself who have been working with cities to help plan their redevelopment I am sure have had the same experience as I downtown among the present various departments, agencies, and offices. You feel as though you are walking in a swamp with snowshoes on, and sound as though you are talking in Echo Canyon.

The proposal to put the assorted functions relating to cities and housing where they belong, under one man and one roof is analogous to a situation in my hometown—city, that is—Newark. Ever since I came to the Congress in 1949, I have been trying to secure a new Federal building for Newark. Then, and now, the various field offices of Federal agencies are spread among a score of buildings. Now, finally, Newark has reached the top of the GSA priority list, and funds will be requested this year for a new Federal building. After it is finished, all activities will be under one roof, where they belong, providing a more efficient as well as economic service to the thousands of citizens who now have to run all over the city to get answers to their questions.

This is what creation of the new Department will accomplish for our thousands of urban officials who annually come or write to Washington to get answers to their questions.

That is all it will do. But this is just what must be done.

One final word about the gentleman who will properly be named by the President to head the new Department.

One of the singular successes of President Kennedy's administration thus far has been the uniformly high quality of those he has appointed to high office. The present Cabinet has many times been described by objective reporters as the most effective of modern times. With such a history behind him, we know that the President appoints only after a thorough and studied evaluation of possible candidates for a post. We know that his decision to appoint the Honorable Robert C. Weaver to the new Cabinet position was made in this manner. We know also that nothing but praise described Mr. Weaver's past achievements when he was originally nominated by the President to become Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and nothing but praise has described his performance as Administrator. I am sure he merits the President's confidence, and our best wishes for his continued success.

DR. LEWIS LLOYD—COURAGEOUS ECONOMIST

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, recently, a well known author, economist, businessman, and industrialist appeared as a witness before my Committee on the Impact of Imports on Employment. He appeared there at my request. This was necessary because in the year of our Lord 1962 it is almost impossible to find men courageous enough to face the issue of trade and tariffs for fear of namecalling, misunderstanding, and personal abuse.

I found none of these fears in Mr. Lloyd. His courage in the face of almost universal disapproval by leaders in Congress, the administration, banking, AMA, the press, radio, and TV merits more than passing praise. Although the Congress and the national media of public relations have been flooded with reports showing the benefits of so-called free trade, those of us who have a different view of the matter find ourselves in a blackout.

This is only important because of the seriousness of the results of our actions in the Congress in the field of international legislative action. It is not enough reason for passing this legislation just because "big name" sponsors make wild and unproven statements. It is still not enough reason just because the Committee for an Effective Congress, through its mouthpiece, Mr. Rosenblatt, offers as gifts to Congressmen of $250,000 based mainly on their votes on this issue.

It is still not enough reason when the Secretary of Commerce makes headlines with a statement as misleading as most of the wild claims of benefits to the American workers in our foreign trade. The headlines screamed "6 Million Workers in Export Plants." This is the oldest propaganda trick in the world and used effectively by many of the demagogs and tyrants of our own generation.

I do not charge the Secretary with personal demagoguery but I do charge the "headline" with serving the purpose of demagoguery. My proof is contained in the body of the release, way down in a hidden paragraph which states "the Secretary was counting all the employees in a plant engaged in the exporting of goods." That is the story, my colleagues. In plain words, all of the employees of Ford, GMC, GE, Westinghouse, Alcoa, every coal miner, every worker in any plant that may ship less than 1 percent of its product to foreign trade. There is nothing wrong with this if you believe in the technique of the "big lie" or that the "means justify the ends."

In my opinion, when any legislative action is based upon such facts, it is time we take a second look. The Department of Labor says 3 million jobs, Department of Commerce says 6 million jobs, Charles Percy of Bell & Howell—importers of Jap cameras, large defense suppliers, oversea runaway operations, and free trader de luxe—says up to 15 million, some proponents just say millions of workers owe jobs to exports. This is the technique of the half-truth, the big lie, the one-sided approach which is used to sell soap, cigarettes, and beer, but certainly should have no place in such a serious matter as the far-reaching effects of our trade policies.

Due to the very limited expenses allowed our committee, I take this means to give the Members of Congress an opportunity to read and study the statements and testimony of Dr. Lewis Lloyd, author of the prophetic book "Tariffs: The Case for Protection," written in 1953 and 1954. The events of the intervening years have proven his knowledge of the subject.

[From the District Fifty News]

LEADING ECONOMIST ATTACKS TARIFF PLAN

(The following is the statement of Dr. Lewis E. Lloyd, economist for the Dow Chemical Co., before the Dent Subcommittee on the Impact of Imports and Exports on American Employment, Committee on Education and Labor, in Washington, D.C., last December 4. Dr. Lloyd points out that the continuation of our foreign trade policy toward freer trade will have "dire consequences" for our country's future growth and job opportunities. At its recent convention in Miami, Fla., the AFL-CIO supported with reservations the proposal to reduce tariffs, while District 50 is firmly opposed to "exporting the jobs of Americans.")

Mr. Chairman, I appear before your committee today not as a representative of the Dow Chemical Co., but rather as a professional economist who has spent years in studying the economic implications of foreign trade. I am concerned about the future of this great country of ours. Fundamental economic considerations indicate that our foreign trade policy has caused unemployment and that continuation of the trend toward free trade will have dire consequences for our future growth and job opportunities.

I would like to review for your committee some of the fallacies in the arguments which are being used to rationalize a program for rapidly further moves toward free trade.

FREEDOM TO TRADE

First, let us take note of the difference between "freedom to trade" and "free trade." Those who believe that an orderly domestic market must be maintained and that our external economic policies must be consistent with our internal policies, are often pictured as being against trade. This is not the case. I know of no responsible spokesman in this country who is opposed to foreign trade. Freedom to trade does not require free trade. It does require orderly markets, which in turn require sound foreign trade rules, just as antimonopoly laws reinforce the free market domestically.

INCREASING FOREIGN TRADE AS AN OBJECTIVE

One of the widespread concepts which has influenced our foreign trade policies is the notion that we must increase our foreign trade. The proponents never indicate how much it should be increased. The supposition is that it should continue to increase, without limit. By making this false assumption an objective, we are in a curious position. To completely realize such an objective, we would export everything we made and import everything we used. This, of course, would only maximize shipping costs. Clearly, trade just for the sake of trade is not a sound objective, and we must find a more rational basis for trade policy. Not only is increased foreign trade as an objective unsound theoretically, it is also out of step with historical trends.

About 1800, foreign commerce made up 12 percent of our national product. Seventy-five years later it was down to 6 percent, and now it is in the range of 3 percent. Before synthetic materials were developed, we had to depend on natural products and trade with whatever region had suitable climate and soil for the desired product. For many things this is no longer true. We no longer have to import silk to get a luxury fabric. Our rubber requirements, most of our drugs and medicinals, and many other products are now made synthetically. Modern synthetic plants can be run as well in one place as another. The only requirement is suitable technical competence and economic environment.

TRADE AND JOBS

It is generally recognized that our foreign trade should be conducted under conditions which advance the best interest of all our citizens. The difficulty comes in recognizing the diverse and often subtle effects of particular policies. To evaluate the general welfare with respect to trade policy, we must turn our attention to basic economics—to economic growth and job opportunities.

One of the fallacies which is being used to support our unsound trade policies is the fallacious data concerning the relation of employment and foreign trade. In the past half dozen years, various reports and so-called studies have claimed that 4½ to 7 million American jobs are dependent upon exports. Some of these reports have further claimed that complete free trade for the United States would affect not more than a few hundred thousand workers, at the most. Any careful study of these data shows that their value lies only in their propaganda impact. The only meaningful way to examine the effect of foreign trade policy on employment is to examine the overall economic relations between the given country and the rest of the world. This can be done through an examination of our balance of payments.

To understand the impact of our trade policy on jobs, we need to examine the basic economics of exchange. Foreign trade consists of the exchange of economic goods and services between nations. When this exchange balances, a healthy trade relation exists and jobs are neither lost nor gained as a result of the trade in and of itself.

Money becomes involved in two ways: as a standard for evaluating diverse products and as a medium of exchange. Simply stated, the exchange equation takes the form:

$$\text{Goods} \leftrightarrows \text{Money} \leftrightarrows \text{Goods}$$

It is important to note that the economic exchange process is not complete with merely exchanging goods for money but only after the second step of exchanging the money for another economic good.

"Balance of payments" is the term which is applied to the accounting of the exchange of goods, services, and capital transfers between a given country and other countries. If the sum of all these exchanges does not balance, then there will be a shift of the exchange medium, money, into or out of the country. The balance of payments is made up of the net of trade, the net on tourism, the net on services such as shipping charges, insurance, etc., the net of capital flow for investment, interest payments, and dividends, and the net of unilateral transfers (foreign aid and personal gifts). In recent years the dollars which foreigners have obtained from our imports, from tourists, capital transfers, and foreign aid have exceeded the total dollars which have returned; and so we have had a negative balance of payment—an outflow of dollars. We have consistently had a negative balance since 1950 except for 1957 when the Suez crisis caused Europe to purchase substantial petroleum from the dollar area. The total deficit for this 11-year period is now more than $25 billion.

This large and growing outflow of dollars which have not come home indicates that we are noncompetitive. If our goods were not overpriced relative to world markets, most of these dollars, especially in recent years, would have been used to buy from us. It is difficult if not impossible to determine for particular products the relation between domestic and foreign production costs, and hence, the competitive position of domestic producers. The balance of payments, however, sums the judgments of all interested businessmen, domestic and foreign, as to what is the best buy in each case. It gives the free market answer as to the average overall competitiveness of a nation relative to others. It gives the only true and overall evaluation of the impact on jobs. If foreigners keep some of the dollars which they get or spend them elsewhere, it is because we are noncompetitive. To the extent that the dollars do not come back they fail to support jobs and we add to unemployment.

This kind of overall accounting of our foreign economic relations takes into account the net of jobs produced by exports, the jobs lost from imports, and the jobs lost from the buying of services, as well as the jobs which would have been created by the dollars that did not come home. No other approach is able to take account of all the multiplier effects and indirect job relationships which are related to our international economic activities. In 1958, 1959, and 1960 our loss of dollars averaged more than $3.5 billion. If these dollars had come back to buy manufactured goods in the United States, it would have added more than a million jobs to our employment.

How has it come about that the United States, the greatest industrial nation in the world, has become a high-cost producer? For the answer to this question we must examine the changing economic and political situation in the world.

In recent years we have seen a breakdown in the colonial system which for two centuries had integrated the underdeveloped and industrial nations into an economic unit. At the same time we find a resurgence in the industrial nations. Europe and Japan have replaced their war-torn plants with new modern efficient ones. During World War II they were unable to continue to supply the export markets which they had built up around the world. We filled the gap. Now they want their export markets back and we are determined to hold onto them and even expand our exports.

In the past two decades while these sweeping changes were taking place, we have rapidly reduced our tariff rates. They are now more than 75 percent below 1930 levels and average only a little more than 10 percent on all dutiable items. These reductions, which have been made under the Trade Agreements Act, will be extended under administration proposals, which call for further across-the-board tariff cuts in another major step toward complete free trade.

THE FREE TRADE THEORY

The key fallacy underlying our foreign trade policy is a widely held misconception of the free trade theory. Simply stated, free trade is supposed to maximize economic efficiency through further extension of the principle of division of labor.

This is a fine theory and sounds very plausible in the classroom. Unfortunately, few proponents of free trade realize that its application will advance economic efficiency only if all the assumptions upon which it is based are met. The necessary conditions involve a free market in essentially all the contacts and relations between nations.

For example, there should be:

1. No embargo or tax on raw material exports;
2. No world cartels or commodity agreements;
3. No immigration restrictions;
4. Similar tax burdens and laws governing business;
5. A completely free market in currency exchange;
6. No overriding defense requirements; and
7. Finally, no government subsidies for any sectors of the domestic economies of the trading partners.

No one of these conditions is fully met even in the free world today and the one single factor of exchange controls and pegged rates is sufficient to bring consequences not intended by the free trade theory.

A recent actual case illustrates this point. When six nations in Europe decided to form the European Economic Community, called the Common Market, they found that they could not accept free trade without taking account of the assumptions underlying the theory. As a consequence, the Rome Treaty proposes the free and unrestricted movement of workers from country to country. It proposes equalization of indirect costs to producers so that fringe benefits and social taxes and the like will not make a producer noncompetitive in one country as compared to others in the Market. They sought to outlaw cartels. They found they had to take account of the exchange problems, and finally they proposed gradualism, for they realized that too rapid an adjustment would bring undesirable and unnecessary hardships—unemployment and economic dislocation.

Perhaps another illustration will clarify the importance of the assumptions upon which a theory or general practice is based. Penicillin has proven a great boon in the treatment of pneumonia. In most cases its use gives a rapid and complete cure. At first many physicians did not realize that in applying this antibiotic they were accepting the premise that there would be no side reactions. Experience has taught that some patients are so allergic to penicillin that a single treatment quickly brings death. So now the medical profession is well aware that penicillin may be used to cure pneumonia only in those cases where the "other conditions are met," namely, that there is no serious side effect from the use of the antibiotic.

Another matter which we need to keep in mind with respect to world trade is that of stability. There is considerable doubt that, given a free choice, people everywhere would choose maximum efficiency, because maximum division of labor to get maximum efficiency, also maximizes instability and risk. In our own society we reject this. Communities, companies, and even individuals find it desirable to spread the risk, to diversify. It is highly questionable that the maximum in international division of labor would be the most desirable state in the economic relationships between nations.

Stability is becoming an increasing goal or objective for our American society, but maximum stability would be stagnation. What we need is to have constructive change at such a rate that it will not cause undue hardship. Rapid changes in economic situations, local or national, can damage the social unit and bring suffering, just as too rapid a change in acceleration can damage the human body. The adjustments that are required in foreign trade relations are no exception; if we force too rapid a change, we will pay the penalty of severe economic and social stress.

INFLATION

The inflation which we have experienced in the past two decades is the root of much of our difficulty. During World War II we chose to pay our war costs in large part with inflation. The Government printed bonds, many of which went to the Federal Reserve banks, where in turn they became the base for an enormous credit expansion. Since 1940 we have poured about $90 billions of fiat money into the purchase media stream. As a result of this monetary inflation, we now have in circulation more than one worthless, inflationary dollar for every good one.

Following the war there were essentially $2 for every dollar's worth of goods, and so prices were bid up to more than twice prewar levels and today we have a 46 cents dollar. The price of labor, of course, went up along with the price of everything else, in fact more than the price of finished goods. Thus through the well-known process of inflation we built distortions and maladjustments into our economy, the chief one of which is our noncompetitive position in the world markets.

Prior to the war our mass production technology was so much more advanced than that of Europe and Japan that it easily supported our higher wage rates. Since the war this has changed. We financed the rapid rebuilding of their plants with some $80 billion of foreign aid. We invited teams of industrialists to visit our plants and learn American methods. They were apt at copying everything except our militant union movement. As a result their productivity has increased enormously, while their wage rates have risen only moderately. In spite of this we would still be competitive if it had not been for our doubling of prices due to the inflation. As a consequence of all this, the unit labor cost of foreign manufacturers is well below that of ours for many items; and so today foreigners who receive dollars prefer to spend them elsewhere where they can get more for their money.

A look at the basic exchange equation will show us the fundamental problem. Normally, foreigners would exchange goods and services for dollars, and then exchange those dollars for some of our goods.

Gold
↑ ↓
Goods⇄Dollars⇄Goods

Gold is one of the goods which we offer them in exchange for their dollars. Now we have not changed the price of gold since 1934, when it was set at $35 an ounce. The price of our other goods has essentially doubled on the average due to our inflation. As a consequence, gold is the cheapest commodity we offer in the world market today. In the face of this it is not surprising that foreigners prefer gold, or to hold their dollar claims which are convertible into gold upon demand, rather than using the dollars to buy our manufactured goods.

We are in a very vulnerable position; and if at any time the foreigners lose confidence in the dollar to the point where they begin to withdraw gold in sizable quantities, we will face a real balance-of-payments crisis. This could have considerable repercussions on our economy here at home and shake our position as the leader in the free world. Faced with this situation what should be our course of action?

Basically and over the long run, the only real solution to our problem is for the U.S. producers to become competitive again in world markets. Unfortunately, this is easier said than done.

One remedy which has been proposed is that manufacturers reduce costs by increasing productivity in giant strides. We are urged to intensify research and automation. This suggestion sounds plausible, but has no chance of solving our problem. First of all the Europeans, and the Japanese too, are also good at research; and their research costs are only a fraction of ours because their wage rates are so much lower. Moreover, in recent years they have been getting more than their share of real research breakthroughs.

Our foreign competitors are alert to new ideas and any research findings or productivity improvements which we make, they will quickly apply. It is just unreal to expect that we can advance, while our foreign competitors stand still in the race for improved productivity.

A second way in which we might regain competitiveness would be for foreign wage rates to rise rapidly so that unit costs overseas would match our own. This would be an ideal solution. It would mean that foreign workers would realize rapid increases in purchasing power and this would broaden their mass market. This, however, is only daydreaming and shows promise only in the distant future. It is true that in recent years the percent increase in wages in Central Europe has been larger than in the United States. But this is of small comfort when the gap is so large. For example, if wages in Germany at 75 cents an hour increase 10 percent, it adds only 7½ cents per hour to the labor cost. In the United States a 5-percent increase on a $3 wage means a 15 cents per hour increase. This is little remedy on a short-term basis.

Another alternative would be to have reductions in prices, both of labor and products, in this country. A very neat solution would be to have all wages and price reduced, say 25 percent, as of some morning. Obviously, with aggressive unions, which year in and year out have won wage concessions in excess of productivity, we are not likely to obtain such wage rate reductions * * * and let me add parenthetically that I favor good wages for workers. This is what spreads purchasing power on a broad base and gives us our wonderful mass market, without which mass production would not be feasible. So this offers no possibility as a practical solution.

There is a way, however, in which the same purpose might be accomplished without affecting the wage and price relationships in this country. This would be to readjust the exchange rate between the dollar and other currencies. Last summer a responsible Swiss financier estimated that the dollar would sell at more than 25 percent discount relative to the Swiss franc on a free market basis. Were this to happen we would get a readjustment downward of our wage rate and prices relative to that of the other countries of the world. In a free market on exchange rates, the exchange rate adjustment would continue until our products on the average had become competitive again in world markets and the total dollar outflow was balanced by the inflow.

WHY HASN'T IT BEEN DONE?

If this is so easy and sound, why hasn't it been done? It hasn't been done and isn't being contemplated because of the short-term foreign claims against our gold. If the dollar were trading at substantial discount relative to gold in foreign markets, these dollars would be tendered as claims against our gold. If we did not repudiate our promise to supply gold at $35 per ounce, we might well lose all of our gold supply and still be short of meeting our commitments.

A primary factor in our negative balance of payments in recent years has been our foreign aid. The data on our foreign obligations indicates that we cannot and have not been able to finance this level of charity. In the early days of the Marshall plan, practically all of the aid dollars were spent in the United States and thereby at least supported jobs in this country. As industry was rebuilt overseas, less and less of the aid dollars have been spent here, until by 1959 only about 30 percent came back to support American jobs. If we are going to continue this massive international dole, the least we could do is to require that all purchases of goods and equipment be made in the United States so that it will support jobs in this country, and not add to the problem we now face in our balance-of-payments deficit.

WE NEED TO FACE REALITY

At this critical time we need to face reality. We must not let our concern for the well-being of others divert our attention from the need to remain strong and vigorous ourselves as a bulwark of the free world. We must develop a foreign trade policy which is consistent with and reinforces domestic policy to insure increased economic growth and job opportunities. To this end we should:

1. Recognize that trade is not an end in itself and that increased trade may or may not be desirable, depending on the conditions of the trade.

2. Realize that the free trade theory will work only under idealized conditions and we should seek to develop the proper conditions before trying to apply free trade.

3. Seek to adjust dollar exchange rates on a free market basis to return our producers to a competitive basis relative to foreign competitors.

4. We should maintain reasonable control of imports to protect American jobs and permit a gradual, not a panic, adjustment to new foreign industrial might.

We must maintain a sound footing ourselves if we wish to remain the pivot man in the free world.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. BAILEY, for 20 minutes, on Thursday next.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. FLOOD.

Mr. ADDABBO.

Mr. BOLAND.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. NELSEN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. KEARNS.

Mr. WIDNALL.

Mr. BERRY.

Mr. ALGER.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BOGGS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DOYLE in three instances.

Mr. RODINO.

Mr. MULTER.

Mr. SANTANGELO.

Mr. DENT to revise and extend his remarks during his special order today and include therein extraneous matter.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 4876. An act for the relief of Mary C. Atkinson;

H.R. 5181. An act to amend Private Law 85-699;

H.R. 5324. An act for the relief of Dr. Serafin T. Ortiz;

H.R. 6013. An act for the relief of the Houston Belt & Terminal Railway Co.;

H.R. 7473. An act for the relief of Albert R. Serpe; and

H.R. 8325. An act for the relief of Harrison Thomas Harper.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

On February 7, 1962:

H.R. 2470. An act to provide for the establishment of the Lincoln Boyhood National Memorial in the State of Indiana, and for other purposes.

On February 8, 1962:

H.R. 2147. An act for the relief of Kenneth Stultz;

H.R. 2973. An act for the relief of Anthony Robert Lowry (Antonio Piantadosi);

H.R. 3710. An act for the relief of Giles L. Matthews;

H.R. 4194. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ann W. Edwards;

H.R. 4211. An act for the relief of Alessandro Bottero;

H.R. 4280. An act for the relief of Dimitri Elias Sartan;

H.R. 4381. An act for the relief of Walter H. Hanson;

H.R. 6120. An act for the relief of Francis Ainsworth;

H.R. 6226. An act for the relief of Arlin David English;

H.R. 6243. An act extending to Guam the power to enter into certain interstate compacts relating to the enforcement of the criminal laws and policies of the States;

H.R. 6644. An act for the relief of Julius Bonikosky;

H.R. 6938. An act for the relief of Dr. Robert E. Hiller;

H.R. 7740. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sharon Lee Harden; and

H.R. 8779. An act for the relief of George B. Olmstead.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until Thursday, February 15, 1962, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1679. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend further section 201 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, to authorize payment toward the construction or modification of approved public shelter space, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1680. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to adjust the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over lands within Eglin Air Force Base, Fla."; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1681. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of the supply management of ship repair parts by the Ships Parts Control Center (SPCC), Mechanicsburg, Pa., Department of the Navy, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1682. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting disposal report No. 62-11 dated February 7, 1962, on records proposed for disposal in accordance with the provisions of 57 Stat. 380, 59 Stat. 434 and 63 Stat. 377; to the Committee on House Administration.

1683. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to change the name of the Petersburg National Military Park, to provide for acquisition of a portion of the Five Forks Battlefield Area, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1684. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report on war risk insurance and certain marine and liability insurance under title XII of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended and pursuant to section 1211 of the same act; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1685. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated March 31, 1961, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on an iterim hurricane survey of Myrtle Beach, S.C., authorized by Public Law 71, 84th Congress, approved June 15, 1955 (H. Doc. No. 336); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with two illustrations.

1686. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Acting Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated November 8, 1961, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on an interim hurricane survey of Surfside and Garden City Beaches, S.C., authorized by Public Law 71, 84th Congress, approved June 15, 1955 (H. Doc. No. 337); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with two illustrations.

1687. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated October 6, 1961, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a cooperative beach erosion control study of Belle Pass to Raccoon Point, La., authorized by the River and Harbor Act, approved July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented (H. Doc. No. 338); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with six illustrations.

1688. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Acting Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated November 8, 1961, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on an interim hurricane survey of Cherry Grove, Tilghman, Ocean Drive, Crescent, Atlantic, and Windy Hill Beaches, S.C., authorized by Public Law 71, 84th Congress, approved June 15, 1955 (H. Doc. No. 339); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with two illustrations.

1689. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated October 6, 1961, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on the Great Lakes harbors study and interim report on the Erie Harbor, Pa., requested by resolutions of the Committees on Public Works, U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, adopted May 18, 1956 and June 27, 1956 (H. Doc. No. 340); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration.

1690. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated October 6, 1961, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of the reports on the Gloucester Harbor, Mass., requested by resolutions of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted March 30, 1955 (H. Doc. No. 341); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1330. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 9804. A bill for the relief of Cuyahoga County, Ohio; with amendment (Rept. No. 1355). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 10043. A bill to amend Public Law 86-272, as amended, with respect to the reporting date; without amendment (Rept. No. 1356). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1451. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elfriede Prischl Rogers; with amendment (Rept. No. 1331). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1671. A bill for the relief of Edvige Cianciulli; with amendment (Rept. No. 1332). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. POFF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6082. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Vartanus Uzar; with amendment (Rept. No. 1333). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6276. A bill for the relief of Athanasia Dekazos; without amendment (Rept. No. 1334). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6343. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Izabel A. Miguel; with amendment (Rept. No. 1335). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7777. A bill for the relief of Elisabetta Marchegiani; with amendment (Rept. No. 1336). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 235. An act for the relief of Evagelos Mablekos; without amendment (Rept. No. 1337). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 241. An act for the relief of Haralambos Agourakis; with amendment (Rept. No. 1338). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 531. An act for the relief of Eugenia Chrzastowski; without amendment (Rept. No. 1339). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1076. An act for the relief of Nancie Ellen Williamson; without amendment (Rept. No. 1340). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1560. An act for the relief of Yasuko Otsu; without amendment (Rept. No. 1341). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1685. An act for the relief of Brigitte Marie Ida Kroll; without amendment (Rept. No. 1342). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1776. An act for the relief of Francis E. Sarcone; without amendment (Rept. No. 1343). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1791. An act for the relief of Dr. Tzy-cheng Peng; without amendment (Rept. No. 1344). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1793. An act for the relief of Mrs. Alfia Alessandro Milana; without amendment (Rept. No. 1345). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1832. An act for the relief of Susanne Rae Deremo; without amendment (Rept. No. 1346). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1866. An act for the relief of Dr. Berchmans Rioux; without amendment (Rept. No. 1347). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1870. An act for the relief of Lucia Bianca Cianto Rosa; without amendment (Rept. No. 1348). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2149. An act for the relief of Hugo Kolberg; without amendment (Rept. No. 1349). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2163. An act for the relief of Sai-fook Chan; without amendment (Rept. No. 1350). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2385. An act for the relief of Dr. Hau Cheong Kwaan, his wife, Tech Phaik Loui Kwaan, and their daughter, Laura Wai Man Kwaan; without amendment (Rept. No. 1351). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. POFF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2684. A bill for the relief of Mohan Singh; without amendment (Rept. No. 1352). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5652. A bill for the relief of Kevork Toroian; with amendment (Rept. No. 1353). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8422. A bill for the relief of Sister M. Theophane (Jane Carroll); without amendment (Rept. No. 1354). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H.R. 10179. A bill to authorize waiver of indebtedness growing out of erroneous payments by the Armed Forces to military personnel or their dependents and to bar recovery of these payments if recovery is not initiated within 6 years of payment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H.R. 10180. A bill to authorize assistance to States for the financial support of public elementary and secondary education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 10181. A bill to relieve ship operators of part of the cost of designing vessels as required under operating-differential subsidy agreements; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 10182. A bill to amend title XII of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to remove certain limitations with respect to war risk insurance issued under the provisions of such title; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H.R. 10183. A bill to establish an Office of Public Works Coordination and Acceleration; to authorize the preparation of a plan for acceleration of public works when necessary to avoid serious nationwide unemployment levels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 10184. A bill to amend section 130(a) of title 28, United States Code, so as to reconstitute the eastern judicial district of Wisconsin to include Menominee County, Wis.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10185. A bill to prohibit wiretapping by persons other than duly authorized law enforcement officers engaged in the investigation or prevention of specified categories of criminal offenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 10186. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H.R. 10187. A bill to relieve ship operators of part of the cost of designing vessels as required under operating-differential subsidy agreements; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 10188. A bill to amend sections 2 and 5 of the act entitled "An act to regulate the height, exterior design, and construction of private and semipublic buildings in the Georgetown area of the National Capital," approved September 22, 1950 (64 Stat. 903); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 10189. A bill to promote safe driving and eliminate the reckless and irresponsible driver from the streets and highways of the District of Columbia by providing that any person operating a motor vehicle within the District while apparently under the influence of intoxicating liquor shall be deemed to have given his consent to a chemical test of certain of his body substances to determine the alcoholic content of his blood, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 10190. A bill to amend the law relating to pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 10191. A bill to assist in providing necessary instruction for adults not proficient in basic educational skills in order to achieve the higher levels of education demanded by industry, agriculture, commerce, and national preparedness through grants to institutions of higher learning for development of materials and methods of instruction and for training of teaching and supervisory personnel and through grants to States for pilot projects, improvement of State services, and programs of instruction; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 10192. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to provide that upon application therefor, real property donated to the United States by any State or political subdivision which is surplus to the United States shall be returned to such State or political subdivision; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 10193. A bill to repeal the tax on transportation of persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHERER:

H.R. 10194. A bill to amend section 6, title 1, of the Internal Security Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. TOLL:

H.R. 10195. A bill to validate payments of certain special station per diem allowances and certain basic allowances for quarters made in good faith to commissioned officers of the Public Health Service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H. Con. Res. 418. Concurrent resolution to condemn Communist oppression in Lithuania and of the Catholic faith therein; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. Res. 543. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to conduct an investigation and study of the adequacy of the regulation of nonscheduled airlines; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. ELLSWORTH: Concurrent resolution of the Kansas Legislature memorializing the Congress of the United States in regard to legislation pertaining to the agricultural conservation program; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, concurrent resolution of the Kansas Legislature, relating to Federal income taxation of the interest derived from public bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kansas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States in regard to legislation pertaining to the agricultural conservation program; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to establish a Federal medical school in the city of Pittsburgh, Pa.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kansas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relating to Federal income taxation of the interest derived from public bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Rhode Island, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States with respect to Federal income taxation of the interest derived from public bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H.R. 10196. A bill for the relief of Thomas C. Barringer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS:

H.R. 10197. A bill for the relief of Ann Caris Pappadoupoulou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGAN of Georgia:

H.R. 10198. A bill for the relief of Bernardo Petruso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 10199. A bill for the relief of Lester A. Kocher; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.R. 10200. A bill for the relief of William Lusk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 10201. A bill for the relief of Dr. Rebecca Y. Tanseco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of the rule XXII,

237. The SPEAKER presented a petition of American Legion, Madeira Post 412, Madeira, Ohio, petitioning consideration of three resolutions unanimously agreed to with reference to legislation pertaining to the "Flag Code", retaining a steadfast position relating to the Immigration and Nationality Act, and the provision of additional allocations for the work of the Internal Security Subcommittee, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Senator Mundt Salutes Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 12, 1962

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, on this anniversary observance of the birth of the Great Emancipator—Abraham Lincoln—Republicans are paying tribute to the memory of this man who was the first Republican to be President of the United States. One such tribute is contained in the newsletter of my colleague in the other body, the senior Senator from my home State of South Dakota, Senator KARL MUNDT. I request permission that, on this Lincoln Day, the newsletter "Your Washington and You," of Senator MUNDT be included in the RECORD:

THE LINCOLN HERITAGE

Americans this week are saluting the memory of one of our great Presidents, Abraham Lincoln. He was the first Republican to serve as President. Much of what he said 100 years ago is today the foundation upon which the Republican Party stands. One statement of Lincoln's, perhaps better than any other, provides guidelines which the Republican Party as a whole has accepted as its philosophy of government. It is this:

"The legitimate object of Government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all or cannot do so well for themselves in their separate and individual capacities. In all that the people can individually do as well for themselves, the Government ought not to interfere."

This is the dictum followed by most Republicans and by which they gird themselves in the Congress to do battle against the policies designed by the Kennedy administration to further erode the freedoms of the individual while expanding the power of the Central Government. And it is this power the New Frontier policy planners constantly seek as message after message comes forth to the Congress demanding for the President "the power to reduce taxes," "the power to regulate foreign trade," "the power to control city governments through the Cabinet," "the power to spend without limit." The struggle continues, and on this anniversary of Lincoln's birth, we again attempt to give meaning to his expression by achieving that ultimate in public policy that Government ought not to interfere. The cause is not lost, nor the victory won.

FEBRUARY 19: A BIG DAY

When Congress returns to its full-time activities Monday, February 19—following the Lincoln Day observances—two major items of business are on the agenda for your Senator. Our Senate Agriculture Committee will begin hearings on the new farm bill of the Kennedy administration. Later in the day the Senate will take up the President's proposal to establish a Department of Urban Affairs. Both measures are controversial and will be the subject of heated debate, with the decision on Urban Affairs expected to come within a few days. The agriculture bill, of course, has the long road of committee hearings ahead before the measure comes to the floor of the Senate. Testimony has already been received in the House Agriculture Committee from Secretary Freeman in behalf of his program.

SENATE CALENDAR

The Senate has approved a $2.6 billion program for colleges, but whether the figure will stand is questionable since the bill now goes to a House-Senate conference committee which will also consider the House measure calling for $1.5 billion expenditures. The program is for college construction and scholarships. The House bill does not contain the $926 million scholarship feature of the Senate bill. The Senate bill calls only for loans for construction while the House measure would make grants in addition to loans. The differences must be adjusted.

SPRAY FROM THE POTOMAC

The Kennedy administration has added more than 90,000 employees to the Federal payroll. However, not all of them are relatives of the President * * * Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, addressing the Alfalfa Club here, quips that Chester Bowles is to appear on the TV program "What's My Line?" as soon as he finds out what his line is.

Gen. Tadeus Kosciusko

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1962

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, by happy coincidence, the annual celebration of Gen. Tadeus Kosciusko's birthday falls on February 12, the day we honor the memory of America's own great emancipator, Abraham Lincoln. This year is the 216th anniversary. General Kosciusko is known as the leader of Poland's fight for freedom and liberty, and for his service in America as a brigadier general in the American Revolution. Kosciusko is still today a vibrant symbol of the fight for the liberty of the Polish people.

Most American school children remember General Kosciusko as the Adjutant to General Washington, and for his great career as a soldier in the battles of the Revolutionary War at New York, Yorktown, and elsewhere. Kosciusko came to this country as a trained and experienced soldier and engineer, of enormous value to the inexperienced Continental Army, trained at the expense of the Polish Government in England and Germany and France. After the war the Congress expressed its thanks and accorded him the rank of brigadier general, which he carried with him upon his return to the Polish Army. Less well known in the United States is Kosciusko's brilliant career in Europe, where he led the Polish armies in their struggle for freedom in the 1790's. General Kosciusko refused high rank under Napoleon because Napoleon would not pledge himself to a free and unified Poland.

Mr. Speaker, it is fitting that the anniversary celebrations for Abraham Lincoln and Tadeus Kosciusko fall on the same day. Kosciusko, like Lincoln, was a great American patriot; Congress voted him citizenship in the United States. Both men expressed the ideals and goals and devotion to freedom which characterize the greatest Americans. I am proud to salute Gen. Tadeus Kosciusko for his part in the struggle for freedom in America and the struggle for freedom in Poland.

Boy Scouts 52d Anniversary on February 8, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1962

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I call attention to the fact that February 8, 1962, was the 52d anniversary of the founding of the Boy Scouts of America, which organization was chartered by this very Congress of the United States of America.

No doubt every Member of this great legislative body will concur with me that the Congress of the United States did well in chartering the Boy Scouts of America; for this Boy Scouts program has now affected the lives of over 34 million American lads and men since the year 1910; the Boy Scouts of America now has an active enrollment of more than 5,200,000 and more than 70,000 are actively in such program within the Los Angeles area, California, which includes the councils in the suburban areas of Los Angeles, Calif.

The other morning I was pleased and honored and inspired to be called upon by one of the Scout members of the Washington area council who visited me and pinned on the lapel of my coat, the same as similar Scouts did on the lapels of each and every Member of the House, a Boy Scout pin, and he reminded me in his 1-minute speech of presentation that "Boy Scouts program strengthens America and the Boy Scouts program aspires to build a strong America."

Mr. Speaker, many years ago it was my pleasure to be a Boy Scout troop leader and president of the first Boy Scouts council in the important city of Long Beach, Calif., and for a few years to be a member of the National Council of the Boy Scouts of America. I am sure that very many Members of this legislative body have had similar experiences which continue to inspire and thus carry forward our continued and vigorous interest and support of the Boy Scouts program. I am sure also that you, Mr. Speaker, and each and every Member of this House, join with me in extending to the Boy Scouts organization our compliments and continued best wishes and our daily felicitations and good will.

The Scout program in the great 23d District, California, is one of excellent and dedicated adult leadership and sound, steady numerical growth in the troops of Scouts.

The House Should Have Equal Representation With the Senate at the Forthcoming Conference on Amendments to the Pension and Welfare Fund Disclosures Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1962

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of a letter which I have sent to the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, ADAM C. POWELL. In this letter I have named the two minority conferees for the forthcoming conference on the amendments to the Pension and Welfare Fund Disclosures Act. I have also requested that the chairman of our committee take cognizance of the fact that the Senate has again named nine conferees to this conference and as a result the five House conferees will be badly outnumbered.

As far as I can determine, there is no justifiable reason why the House should not have as many conferees as the Senate. Certainly the bill which we have enacted is as important as the Senate's and should be as stoutly and vigorously defended. It is tragic but true that this cannot be done when the conference membership is so heavily weighted in favor of the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, it almost appears that a pattern is developing. You will recall that at the time of the conference on the proposed amendments to the minimum wage law, the House only had five conferees, while the Senate had nine. At that conference the Senate provisions were almost without exception accepted and the House provisions were stricken from the bill. I cannot believe that the membership of this House wishes to have that procedure duplicated at the forthcoming conference. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I most earnestly recommend, and urge, that this very important matter be given additional consideration and that four additional House conferees be named. I am certain all will agree that the House must have equal representation in a conference or there will be grave danger that its views will be subordinated to those of the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, my letter to the chairman follows:

Hon. ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your letter dated February 8, 1962, wherein you request that I indicate who will be the two minority conferees for the forthcoming conference on the amendments to the Pension and Welfare Fund Disclosures Act.

Please be advised that Mr. GOODELL and I will be the minority conferees.

On the basis of this request, I assume that there will be only five House conferees for this important conference. As you know, Mr. Chairman, the Senate has named nine conferees, which means that again we will be badly outnumbered and at a serious disadvantage. I believe that this is both unnecessary and unfortunate for we have every right to name as many conferees as the Senate, and I am certain that the membership of the House would like to have us do just that.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I most earnestly recommend that the number of House conferees be increased to nine.

Just as soon as this is done, I will be very happy immediately to designate two additional minority conferees.

Sincerely yours,
CARROLL D. KEARNS,
Member of Congress.

Tadeusz Kosciuszko (1746-1817)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 12, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the success of the American Revolution was assured by the wholehearted efforts and the sacrifices made by the people here struggling for their independence. Other peoples, not native to this country, or related to the people living here, also contributed significantly to the successful culmination of that historic event. Tadeusz Kosciuszko, of Poland, that gallant and gifted soldier of freedom, was one of those whose personal participation in the American Revolution marks him as one of the great heroes of his day.

This gallant son of Poland was born on February 16, 1746, came to America in 1776 and volunteered for military service here. At once he was assigned to the task of fortifying the Delaware River. He performed this task so well that he was made a colonel of engineers in the Continental Army. Subsequently he was in the Northern Army and saw action in Ticonderoga; he also supervised the fortifications at Saratoga. Then he was put in charge of the building of fortifications at West Point. He was one of the first of the Continentals to enter Charleston after that city was evacuated by the British. On October 13, 1783, he was made a brigadier general.

After thus serving the cause of freedom in this country brilliantly and with distinction, he returned to his native Poland in order to fight for her freedom. He did this for 20 years, and breathed his last as an exile in Switzerland. Today, on his 216th birthday, we commemorate his memory as a sign of appreciation of his services to this country.

The Doyle Bill To Outlaw All Communist-Action Organizations, Including the Communist Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 12, 1962

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, on January 30, 1962, I filed the Doyle bill, H.R. 9944, "to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 to provide penalties for becoming or remaining a member of Communist-action organizations, and for other purposes." This bill is designed to have the effect of outlawing the Communist Party in the United States, or any other Communist-action organization whether under the name of communism, or not. It will have this effect of outlawing such, I believe, by making membership, per se, either in the Communist Party or any Communist-action organization a criminal offense. It makes punishable the continuing or subsequent membership in any Communist-action organization after such an organization is found to be a Communist-action organization by final order of the Subversive Activities Control Board.

In connection with the formation of this bill I received, and I very much appreciate, the very great aid of the legal counsel of the House Committee on Un-American Activities and of the Legislative Council of the House of Representatives.

But let me make it clear that this H.R. 9944 is not a bill by or from the House Committee on Un-American Activities, of which committee I have been an active member for about 15 years. The bill has been referred to that committee for further proceeding.

It is my premise that since the decision of the U.S. Supreme Court on June 5, 1962, in the case of the *Communist Party of the United States* v. *The Subversive Activities Control Board*, the provisions of H.R. 9944 will make most trials not only more effective and expeditious but will be comparatively inexpensive, and I believe the bill is deliberately drawn so that all the defendants' constitutional rights and due process under established law will be definitely accorded each and every defendant prosecuted under the bill.

My bill, I believe, will not in any way alter or amend the present existing Smith Act but will, on the contrary, supplement the Smith Act. For instance, whereas the Smith Act, as I understand it, requires, first, proof that the defendant knowingly became, or is, a member of the Communist Party; second that the Communist Party in the United States advocates and teaches the overthrow and destruction of the U.S. Government by force and violence; third, that the individual defendant knew of such purpose of the organization, and, fourth, that the individual defendant actively and purposely participated and took part as a member of the Communist-action organization in such activities. Therefore, under my bill, Mr. Speaker, the only basic fact which must be established in any individual prosecution is that the individual defendant knowingly has continued his or her membership in the Communist Party, or any Communist-action organization, whether the name Communist is attached to it or not, after June 5, 1961, which was the date the Supreme Court of the United States upheld the findings of the Subversive Activities Control Board, which finding was that the Communist Party in the United States is a Communist-action group.

Maximum penalties under my bill would be 5 years' imprisonment, or $10,000 fine, or both.

Mr. Speaker, since the filing of my bill on January 30, 1962, several Members of this great legislative body have spoken to me and asked, approvingly of my bill, whether I would permit them to take the Doyle bill, H.R. 9944, and file the same in their individual name to aid and assist in the premises. I have answered each and every one of them affirmatively and cordially so.

This statement by me is to say to all other Members of this House that any Member who wishes so to do hereby has my hearty approval in doing just that.

Tadeusz Kosciuszko (1746-1817)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 12, 1962

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, Tadeusz Kosciuszko was one of those rare and brave soldiers of fortune, so abundant in 18th-century Poland, who was willing to go anywhere and serve under any banner for the cause of freedom and liberty. This gifted and gallant son of a well-to-do Polish peasant was destined to be a soldier of great distinction. He was born on February 12, 216 years ago. Even though at the age of 13 he lost his father, his yearning for education led him to the Royal School at Warsaw in 1765. There he graduated in 1769 with the rank of captain, and earned a scholarship to France where he studied at the famous military school at Mezieres, specializing in artillery and engineering. In 1776 he was in Paris when he heard of the American Revolution, which stirred his imagination and his restless soul. He saw his chance for action in a good cause, and with borrowed money he sailed for America, arriving in Philadelphia in August of that same year.

On his arrival he at once applied for military service. First he was employed to draw up plans for the fortifications of the Delaware River. In 3 months the successful completion of these plans earned him a commission as colonel of engineers in the Continental Army. In the spring of 1777 he joined the Northern Army at Ticonderoga, and there he advised on the fortifications of Fort Defiance. During the next 2 years he was placed in charge of the erection of fortifications at West Point. Subsequently, he was in action at Charleston, S.C., and was one of the first Continentals to enter that city after its evacuation by the British.

In recognition of his signal services for the cause of the Revolution, Congress made him a brigadier general on October 13, 1783. A year later he returned to Poland, hoping to serve there in her struggle for freedom. Unfortunately, all his efforts to that end were unsuccessful. In 1789 he was made major general in the Polish Army, and for many years he continued to lead the unfortunate Poles in their hopeless fight against almost insuperable enemy forces. He was sadly disappointed in his gallant attempts, and he ended his stormy career in exile in Switzerland. There he died on October 15, 1817. Today on the 216th anniversary of his birth, Americans of all rank and creed solemnly observe his birthday and do homage to his blessed memory.

The Building of the American Character

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure and an honor to speak in praise of the Boy Scouts of America. This fine organization is now celebrating its 52d anniversary and it is fitting that we pay tribute here in the House of Representatives to the great service to the Nation made by the Boy Scouts.

In the 52 years since the Scouts organized here in Washington they have contributed to the building of good character in our boys and young men perhaps more than any other secular institution. Not the least important of its many services has been the encouragement and development of physical fitness.

Many millions of American men are grateful for the attitudes of mind and body received through their association with scouting. The 5 million boys presently in the scouting movement will equally benefit in the same manner from a great organization devoted to America and its youth.

As a longtime supporter of scouting, I am happy to again take official notice of this fine movement.

The Ideal of Abraham Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1962

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, today, Monday, February 12, is again the birthday of Abraham Lincoln, who was twice elected President of these United States: To wit, on November 6, 1860, and November 8, 1864.

Most of the present Members of this great legislative body have heard me say on previous birthday occasions of Abraham Lincoln that since early boyhood he has been my ideal of American statesmanship in the best interests of our beloved Nation. I think that it is a fact that as February 12 came around each calendar year of the 15 years I have now served in this body I have taken occasion to say something on the floor of the House, or do something on said birthday which would indicate my continued highest regard for and respect of this former President of the United States who was born in Kentucky on February 12, 1809, and admitted to the practice of the law in the State of Illinois in 1836.

And let us not forget that he was a duly elected Member of the House of Representatives and served in the U.S. Congress as a member of the Committee on Education.

During most of the 30 years I actively and enjoyably practiced law in Los Angeles County, Calif., before I came here more than 15 years ago, I continued my established habit of having a facsimile of Abraham Lincoln on one side of an attractive card about U.S. postal card size with statistical data about him and on the reverse side thereof I had printed the following text:

EXTRACT FROM LINCOLN'S GETTYSBURG ADDRESS DELIVERED NOVEMBER 19, 1863

(Compliments of one who is inspired by Lincoln's life)

Fourscore and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.

Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that Nation or any nation so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure. We are met on a great battlefield of that war. We have come to dedicate a portion of that field, as a final resting place of those who here gave their lives that that Nation might live.

But in a larger sense, we cannot dedicate—we cannot consecrate—we cannot hallow this ground.

It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain—that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom—and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth.

Mr. Speaker, because Abraham Lincoln's Gettysburg speech to me has always been one of the most magnificent and appropriate speeches in the English language, in meeting newsboys, Western Union messengers, and other lads from time to time I would present to them one of such cards and say to them that if they would learn the Gettysburg speech within a period of 30 days from the time I delivered them the card, and would look me up and recite it to me, I would present to said lad the sum of $1. So it is, as I consider in retrospect, I believe that there are hundreds of American men who thus learned the text of Abraham Lincoln's speech and earned and received at least $1.

Mr. Speaker, I know you and my colleagues will pardon this personal anecdote but I speak for many other Members of this great legislative body the very satisfactory experience of emphasizing and giving due place to the life of Abraham Lincoln and to the historical value and significance of his Gettysburg speech.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of February 10, 1962:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District of Texas, February 10, 1962)

Federal Government size is growing by leaps and bounds: (last year 78,262 Federal employees were added). This week an additional Secretary of Commerce was added, vote 231 for 169 against (ALGER against). The amendments to the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act it is estimated will add 8,550 people to the Department of Labor staff and up costs $45 million, an increase entirely unwarranted according to the facts developed during debate on this bill. These increases cost heavily and with the money and increased personnel goes power and in the same degree freedom is taken from the citizen taxpayer through tax increases and the necessary regulations and Government controls. The danger is, the Government scope and power is greatly accelerating under the Kennedy administration.

"The national debt ceiling must be raised, $2 billion and then $8 billion more" the President informed the Ways and Means

Committee. It is interesting to note the distorted logic and statistical misuse of figures presented by the President and his advisers. For example, to show expenditure increases for the military, international and space agencies are lumped together to be contrasted to civilian agencies. Thus, the cost of the Peace Corps, Export-Import Bank, the U.S. Information Agency, foreign aid, aeronautics and space research, are classed as military rather than civilian and in this way the greater increase can be shown as military. The truth, on the contrary, is that the welfare expenditures have gone up 60 percent while military has increased only 40 percent, so the military is not the reason for greater increased spending. Another example is the attempt to show that by increasing our debt we are decreasing our debt. This is done by percentages of the gross national product at earlier periods as contrasted to now and projected in to the future. This is fallacious because (1) Government spending is used to increase the GNP (like a person borrowing at the bank to show he has more money); (2) The same items are covered various times in the GNP total; (3) The President forecasts a $45–$50 billion jump in our GNP next year (this is like borrowing against your own projected next year's credit standing). I shall oppose any increase in the debt limit since I have opposed the increased scope of spending which now necessitates a debt increase.

The Public Welfare Amendments of 1962 is now before the Ways and Means Committee. The changes would include: (1) Increase from 50 to 75 percent the Federal share of Federal-State participation for rehabilitation care; (2) expand child welfare services, including more services to unmarried mothers; (3) more and better trained Federal welfare workers; (4) eliminate State residence requirement for aid recipients and others. The conclusion stated, "We cannot afford our present methods. They are costly to the taxpayer and often shattering to the recipients." With this conclusion I agree. So it is that I fail to see how continuing and expanding existing programs will solve the problems. How strange it is that the President and his spokesman, Secretary Ribicoff, fail to realize that charity begins at home, at the local level, through private and church facilities and activities and that adding thousands more Federal bureaucrats and workers at great expense does not solve welfare problems. My objections include these: (1) Federal coercion of the States using Federal taxes as the bribe and bonus; (2) destroying individual initiative and self-respect (Federal aid does not restore dignity as the Secretary claims); (3) wrong assessment of the situation and the public's needs—deprived of opportunity, bowed down under a bewildering array of new problems, suspect by their fellows, they are devoid of hope in the midst of a society providing abundantly and well for most of us—is not an accurate description of needy Americans today, that Federal aid will correct. Indeed, the old hackneyed, New Deal spend ourselves rich in the name of compassion is not the spirit of America, nor the medicine needed to correct ever-present human problems. Further, the wrong medicine will hurt, not cure the patient. "The new program which has been designed to carry out President Kennedy's recommendations bespeaks a compassionate heart and hard head" statement of Secretary Ribicoff should be rephrased as "bespeaks a lack of understanding of (1) human nature, (2) basic economics, (3) the role of Federal Government in our lives and is designed to be used for political purposes, perhaps by Secretary Ribicoff as a campaign issue in his impending race for the Senate."

The President's message on aid to education requesting a $20 billion per year expansion beyond our present expenditures for education concludes with this fine statement: "The education of our people is a national investment. It yields tangible returns in economic growth, an improved citizenry, and higher standards of living. But even more importantly, free men and women value education as a personal experience and opportunity—as a basic benefit of a free and democratic civilization. It is our responsibility to do whatever needs to be done to make this opportunity available to all and to make it of the highest possible quality." Isn't it a distressing paradox that in seeking such a laudable goal, the President, in the rest of his message completely contradicts and makes impossible the attainment of that goal?

WAYS AND MEANS KEY COMMITTEE

"The fate of a major part of the administration's program will rest this year in the hands of just one committee, the House Ways and Means Committee. Traditionally this has usually been a cautious conservative group, and when they finally act their recommendations nearly always become law."—Representative **Frances Bolton**, of Ohio.

Cabinet Status Needed for Urban Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1962

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I take this opportunity to insert my statement which I delivered on February 8, 1962, to the Committee on Government Operations which has been holding hearings on Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962, to create a Department of Urban Affairs:

Statement of Congressman Alfred E. Santangelo in Support of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962, To Create a Department of Urban Affairs

Gentlemen, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you to speak in behalf of the Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962 submitted to Congress by the President of the United States. This plan proposes to create a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, with a Secretary of Urban Affairs.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, Subcommittee of Agriculture, I have seen the effectiveness of an agency guided by a Secretary of Agriculture. Without a Secretary of Agriculture, the myriad and intricate problems of agriculture would be unresolved and our Nation of 180 million people could not be fed by a segment of our population which constitutes less than 10 percent working their farms.

The Secretary of Agriculture handles and supervises activities which many would regard as not relating to farming, but on closer analysis, there is a relationship between the farm and the activities to which the Secretary of Agriculture gives sense and direction. The major objective of the Secretary of Agriculture and the Department of Agriculture is the supervision of the production of food and fiber with the management of its supply. The Agriculture Department deals with research, not only in food, but also in the basic sciences which bring about new products, improved quality of the food supply, and variations in the type of food we eat and the clothing we wear. The Department has jurisdiction over the inspection of meat and poultry. It supervises the conservation of soil and the prevention of floods. It manages a special school milk program and a school lunch program which affects the lives of 13 million of our schoolchildren and aids the pocketbook of families which perhaps could not afford a decent meal for their children. The Department administers a program of housing for the farmer, not only in the improvement of present housing, but in the construction of new shelter. When crops fail, a program of crop insurance is administered by the Agriculture Department. The rural people find available to them, through their cooperatives, electrification of their homes and farms and communication in a REA telephone system. The food supply which the farmers produce in abundance requires the storage of wheat, corn, feed grains and cotton, which the Department supervises and administers. In far-off lands when people are hungry, and, yes, also in our own country, programs to combat famine and to furnish food to those suffering poverty are administered by the Agriculture Department. Without sense and guidance, the farm program in these United States would be chaotic, and could not possibly be administered to feed the people of the country or many of the nations throughout the world.

Just as the Secretary of Agriculture in a Cabinet position has given sense and guidance to the myriad problems of agriculture, so will a Secretary of Urban Affairs give sense and direction to the manifold problems of urban affairs. Since 1949 urban development has been a program which Congress has said was necessary and essential for a better standard of living and for the improvement of urban conditions. Apart from the improvement in housing, the problems of cities are complicated and difficult of solution. Three-fourths of our national population, or approximately 130 million, live in the cities. Over 130 cities have populations of more than 100,000 residents. The experience of other areas and the effectiveness of a Secretary of Cabinet status demonstrate that cities should be represented in the Cabinet with a Secretary of Urban Affairs. A Cabinet position for cities is not only justified by need, but also by its contributions. Metropolitan areas produce most of our wealth, exclusive of food and fiber. They produce enough to enable most communities to build a floor under misery, to provide leisure for the working mind, and to support institutions to advance our way of life called civilization. The manufacturing of clothing, the production of chemicals, the forging of steel ingots, the manufacturing of appliances and farm equipment, the processing of foods and textiles are performed in metropolitan areas. Those who work in cities require decent shelter, pure water and air, effective mass and private transportation, educational facilities, recreational outlets, such as theater, television, radio, press and parks, places of worship, such as churches and synagogues. In the furtherance of the attainment of these requirements, the cliff dwellers need protection at work, on the way home, and at home. These measures consist of housing regulations, factory rules, police supervision and fire protection, correctional institutions, hospital care and preventives of juvenile crime must also be considered. All of these activities must have a sense of direction and guidance. They can find such direction through a Secretary of Urban Affairs, and we, as responsible legislators, must make provision to create a department which will do the job.

Cities today face many difficulties. Financial limitations hamper solutions. Diversified agencies hinder the attainment of goals. Unplanned and sprawling growth require urban renewal and revision to provide better living quarters and functional construction. Proper planning in the form of urban renewal requires direction and commonsense to eliminate the bottlenecks which retard proper growth and which will maximize space for healthy and safe living conditions.

A hue and cry has been raised because our President has suggested the appointment of Robert Weaver as the first Secretary of Urban Affairs. I have known Mr. Weaver for many years, and I am familiar with the work that he has performed in the field of housing which is an important factor in any urban program. Mr. Weaver is preeminently fitted by experience and character to hold the position as secretary of the proposed agency.

In the interest of our country and in the interest of human relations, I urge this committee to recommend the approval of Reorganization Plan No. 1 submitted by the President of the United States.

Legislative Program of the DAV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1962

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, on February 8, 1962, I had the distinct honor and privilege of introducing to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs a friend and neighbor, Francis R. Buono, national commander, Disabled American Veterans. Commander Buono made an outstanding presentation of the legislative program of the Disabled American Veterans.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include my introductory statement and the statement of National Commander Buono:

STATEMENT OF JOSEPH P. ADDABBO, INTRODUCING FRANCIS R. BUONO, NATIONAL COMMANDER, DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS, 1961–62, TO THE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, FEBRUARY 8, 1962

Francis R. Buono, 46, was elected to a 1-year term as national commander of the Disabled American Veterans at the organization's 40th annual national convention in St. Louis, Mo., on August 25, 1961.

He lives with his wife and three children in Bayside, N.Y.

Buono served with the U.S. Infantry in Africa and Italy during World War II, and was wounded three times. His principal military decorations include the Bronze Star, Purple Heart, Soldiers Medal and Combat Infantryman's Badge.

Buono volunteered as a private in 1942 and was discharged with the rank of captain in 1946. He was a platoon sergeant, company commander, and battalion operations officer.

For the past 11 years, Buono has been deputy warden in charge of transportation for New York City's Department of Correction. A civil service employee of that city for 21 years, he has risen through the ranks to a position with executive responsibility for supervision of 275 employees and disposition of an annual agency budget of $9 million.

Buono became active in DAV in New York State in 1946. He became State commander in 1952, after serving terms as State senior vice commander, State junior vice commander, chapter commander, and chapter adjutant.

Buono's other national DAV activities include: national executive committeeman in 1953 and 1954; chairman of the national finance committee in 1955, 1956, and 1957; and national senior vice commander, 1960–61. He also is a member of the DAV Service Foundation's Board of Trustees.

Buono received his military training at the Motors Division of the Cavalry School, Fort Riley, Kans.; Infantry Officers School, Fort Benning, Ga.; and the Command and Staff School, Fort Leavenworth, Kans.

A native of Bayside, N.Y., Buono attended the School of Engineering at Manhattan College and New York University's Graduate School of Administration, Management and Executive Development.

Buono also is active in civic and other organization work. He is chairman of the finance committee, Columbia Association, Department of Correction; past president of the Deputy Warden's Association, Department of Correction; and past president of the Civic Association. He is active in the Community Chest Fund, Boy Scouts of America, and Explorer Scouts. Buono also is a member of the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

STATEMENT OF FRANCIS R. BUONO, NATIONAL COMMANDER OF THE DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS TO THE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, FEBRUARY 8, 1962

Subject: Legislative program of the Disabled American Veterans.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee:

As the national commander of the Disabled American Veterans, I, Francis R. Buono, wish to thank this committee for the opportunity of appearing here today for the purpose of introducing the legislative program of the Disabled American Veterans and to briefly discuss with you some of the thoughts of our organization on veterans' affairs, and to give you some of the expressions I have received from our members in my travels throughout this great Nation of ours when visiting our chapters and departments. However, may I take a moment to introduce our Washington staff. First I would like to introduce our national director of legislation, Mr. Elmer M. Freudenberger, who has appeared before you on numerous occasions in the past. Next, Mr. Irving Peltz, our national service director, and also our assistant national service director of claims, Mr. Frank G. Wood. The next gentleman is Mr. Pasquale Gervace, our assistant national service director of employment. All are members of the Disabled American Veterans assigned to our national service headquarters in Washington and they are available for consultation on problems concerning legislation, claims and employment matters affecting veterans and their dependents.

This week we are holding our annual conference of department commanders and adjutants here in Washington, as well as the winter meeting of our national executive committee. I would like to ask all of these State and national officers to stand at once rather than taking time for individual introductions.

As the national commander of the Disabled American Veterans, I approach this meeting with a sense of grave responsibility. This feeling comes to me as I reflect upon the visits I have made to the "grass roots membership" of our organization throughout the country. This enabled me to gain an insight into the fears and feelings of frustration in the minds and hearts of so many of our members. My feelings of responsibility are magnified in the knowledge that the more than 209,000 members of our organization actually reflect the problems, feelings, and emotions of more than 2 million disabled veterans in this land. My statement this morning is therefore more than just a personal presentation, but rather a reflection of what I have heard, what I've seen, and what I've felt as a result of my contacts. Much of what I have heard and what I convey to you this morning is the result of the feelings of so very many of our disabled members in their keen disappointment over the events occurring to our compensation increase bill in the closing days of Congress in 1961.

There is more involved than just the matter of an increase. The 50 cents a month or even $20 per month that might have resulted in the passage of the compensation increase bill has become less important than the feeling that the cause of the disabled veteran in this land of ours is less important in the eyes of some than it was during the days immediately after the war. But the philosophy of compensating veterans is the same today as it was when first set forth by George Washington. There is more involved here than simply giving lip service to a group of men and women who were unfortunate enough to have been disabled. The whole economy of the Nation is involved. As an economic principle, it is imperative that the largest number of people possible, approach in purchasing power, the normal standard of living set by the economy of a nation. If a large segment of the population of any society is unable to maintain the standard of living enjoyed by the great majority, this minority will drag down those standards with the result that eventually all of the people will share the poverty brought about by an imprudent economy that fails to recognize the needs of all the people. The whole theory of compensation should be viewed from the principle that it is wise economy to provide for those who are totally unable to work and to partially provide for those who have lost a portion of the ability to maintain a standard of living they might have achieved were it not for the physical disability acquired by service to the Nation.

It was appalling to the members of our organization to know that while our legislation was not passed, at the same time $4 billion in foreign aid was granted to aid other countries and other peoples, including nations we had defeated in World War II. In retrospect, we wonder if the fates of war had been unkind to us and if we had been the vanquished instead of the victor, if the Axis Powers and the Communist powers would have given us in the United States billions of dollars in foreign aid? While we in the Disabled American Veterans are fully aware of the need for the foreign aid program particularly as a measure to fight communism and maintain the peace of the world, we cannot help but inquire if we might not also be entitled to consideration in our fight to provide for our service-connected wartime disabled veterans, a life with dignity and security, free from the fear of poverty, and conducive to a feeling of pride, as well as recognition for services rendered to a grateful American Nation.

We note with considerable dismay the tendency on the part of some to infuse into the structure of compensation, some of the principles of pension and to attempt to base compensation more and more upon the need theory inherent in the philosophy of pension. The application of the need theory to the principles of compensation is, in our opinion, completely repugnant to the whole philosophy and ideal of compensating a person for a disability incurred in the service of the people of this Nation. The need theory takes into consideration only the immediate situation, but does not encompass the broader aspect of disability. Disability has three major aspects:

(1) There is the immediate effect upon the individual; (2) there is the effect of the condition on securing employment and in job

retention, and also in job advancement; (3) there is the effect of the disability upon the vocational longevity of the disabled person.

The first two principles are self-evident and we do not feel it necessary to elaborate on them except to state that they are so elementary to the whole concept of compensation that it should be readily discernible that to modify or dilute these principles is to cause irreparable damage to the entire theory. The third item, however, is one that has never been properly explored and we feel it is timely to consider this problem. We can see this problem in better perspective today because the World War II veteran is now facing the fact that his disabilities are becoming increasingly noticeable to him as he grows older. Thus we see the paraplegic, who used to pose for pictures and even was seen in motion pictures, hopping into his car from his wheelchair and performing many amazing feats with and in spite of his disability, having to decrease his activities and in many cases give up his vocational life. With the aging process, man's disabilities acquired through his lifetime become more and more prominent in his ability to work and to perform functions which others at the same age are able to perform. The total effect, then, of disability, is that it does sometimes dramatically curtail and shorten the disabled person's vocational life. The need theory does not take this into consideration. The income that one receives from compensation from the Veterans' Administration can, to a degree, take up the slack in lost earning power, make up for lost earnings due to disablement, and aid in planning for a premature retirement age brought about from the rigors of disability. Who can tell how long the individual who is disabled is going to be able to work? This cannot be answered precisely in each case, but we do know that the more severe the disability, the more drastic will be the reduction in the number of years employment may be maintained. We therefore denounce the need theory as entirely unrealistic, calculated to limit consideration of the disability to the present only, with no thought to the future problems inherent in all disability factors. Economically, the disabled veteran has become adjusted to the role of compensation which we have tried to keep on a par with living conditions to the extent that with what he is able to earn in wages coupled with his compensation, he is able to be in a position where he has some degree of security for himself and his family and some degree of self-respect mentally, spiritually and economically.

In any provision made for general disability compensation increases, we of the Disabled American Veterans continue to believe that an across-the-board percentage increase, using the figure "15 percent" as to all rates, is by far the most equitable and sound solution to this problem. The range provided by this formula would provide, for example, an increase from the present rate of $19 to $22 monthly for the 10 percent disabled veteran and from $225 to $250 monthly for the 100 percent disabled veteran.

Our national legislative committee, composed of Bill H. Fribley, a past national commander from Kansas as chairman, Bernard O. Killin, of Michigan, and Raymond J. Isley, of Alabama, met in Washington, D.C., with the national commander in November of 1961 and as to the matter of increased compensation it was determined that our legislative program for 1962 would call for a 15-percent across-the-board increase in compensation rates and including the section from our original bill last year on multiple sclerosis, and the section on aid and attendance hospital adjustment. The committee assigned the highest legislative priority to this measure, which has resulted in the drafting of a new bill introduced by your chairman, and now H.R. 9565. We commend this bill to your early and favorable consideration.

In addition to the compensation increase bill, the national legislative committee of the Disabled American Veterans assigned top priority to other DAV bills. As to those coming within the jurisdiction of this committee, I mention the following:

(1) The dependency allowances for the lower ratings 10 to 40 percent. The pending bill on this is H.R. 882; (2) the bill to freeze the VA rating schedule. The pending bill on this is H.R. 881; (3) Federal reimbursement to State workmen's compensation funds, etc. The pending bill on this is H.R. 871; (4) the bills on statutory awards embodied in pending bills H.R. 846 and H.R. 873. (Passed by House and now in Senate Finance Committee.)

The Disabled American Veterans has never become reconciled to the inequity of excluding dependency allowance to those disabled veterans rated below 50 percent. The veterans rated 10 to 40 percent need this family allowance also. Attention is called to the fact that most of these ratings have been lowered through the years to below 50 percent after review. We shall have more to say on this matter when hearings are held on the specific bills in the field of compensation benefits.

The bill regarding the freezing of the rating schedule is not a new proposal. If enacted, this bill would bring about a stabilization of the present provisions of the schedule and would require future changes to the schedule to be placed in the hands of Congress. The reasons for our position on this subject are numerous and born from our experiences in the past involving schedular changes working to the detriment of scores of our disabled veterans. The DAV is conducting a survey and study of representative cases and our latest findings will be brought to the attention of this committee prior to further hearings pertinent to the subjects of compensation ratings. I mention this bill to assure this committee that we do regard the measure with great seriousness regardless of how other groups and organizations may feel about it.

The bill regarding Federal reimbursement to State workmen's compensation funds would serve the excellent purpose of encouraging employers to hire disabled veterans knowing that they will not be penalized for their humanity if the disabled employees suffer further injury while on the job. The commendable results achieved through campaigns designed to urge employment to the physically handicapped would be given great impetus through the enactment of H.R. 871, and we strongly recommend that your committee report out this bill.

In the last session of this Congress, your committee did report out and the House passed the two statutory award bills, but the Senate Finance Committee, as on other occasions, tabled these very meritorious bills.

It should be pointed out the establishment of top priority bills in connection with the DAV legislative program does not in any way lessen the interest we have in or in any way detract from the vigor of our efforts in the matter of other legislation pending from the last session or those measures which have been or will be introduced at this session in behalf of our organization. Many of these matters will be referred to specifically at subsequent meetings and hearings to be scheduled by this committee.

For the reasons stated, I will not delve into the very important subject of hospital, medical, and domiciliary care except to state that the DAV believes that the ceiling on hospital beds should be raised from 125,000 to 150,000. We also believe that comprehensive plans should be expedited to care for the aging veterans of our wars. We are aware that your committee reported out and the House passed House Joint Resolution 73, which is still before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

I must not let this occasion pass without expressing the sincere gratitude of our members to this committee for the interest and sympathy you have always shown to the problems of the disabled veterans. To be sure, 1961 was a disappointing year for us in some respects. The increase in compensation rates still remains an unresolved matter. There are other matters which still must be resolved, but I want each and every member of this committee to know that we do look to this committee with great hope, that the tradition established over the long years by the many wonderful people serving on the committee, toward humane and equitable treatment of the problems of the service-connected wartime disabled veteran, will continue and grow with even greater understanding so that all disabled veterans may walk in dignity and security. We pray that favorable action will be taken by this Congress to show the way to the youth of America, and educate them so the cause, efforts, and sacrifices made by our disabled veterans were not in vain but rather to guarantee their freedom in our American way of life.

May I express to you my great pleasure in being permitted to appear before you this morning. I speak for every officer and member when I convey our sincere good wishes to you and thanks to you for your tireless efforts in behalf of all our war disabled and their families.

We hope to see all of you who can possibly be there at our national service headquarters tonight for a social get-together.

Thank you.

Symposium on Antitrust Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 12, 1962

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, it was my privilege to participate in a symposium on antitrust law held by the New York State Bar Association in New York City on January 25, 1962. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my remarks be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS BY SENATOR ESTES KEFAUVER TO THE ANTITRUST SYMPOSIUM OF THE NEW YORK STATE BAR ASSOCIATION, NEW YORK, N.Y., JANUARY 25, 1962

Antitrust law, like every other body of regulatory law, must constantly be reexamined and amended to insure that it is keeping pace with developments in our complex and dynamic economy. Studies have shown that in many ways, our antitrust laws are presently inadequate.

For example, the Department of Justice has long sought the power to obtain information for civil investigations. S. 167, passed by the Senate and now pending before the House as H.R. 6689, will fulfill this need.

The Federal Trade Commission is presently powerless to stop either a corporate merger or price discrimination, no matter how patently unlawful and harmful to competition, until the termination of long and complicated proceedings. The Justice Department faces a similar problem, especially with respect to scrambled assets in merger cases. I plan to introduce legislation this session which will be designed to remedy this frustration of original congressional intent.

The recent electrical and other price-fixing cases have demonstrated the inadequacy of present sanctions against clearly unlawful conduct. We are presently completing hearings on a series of bills which will not only raise penalties to the level of meaningful deterrence but will also reach top executives who ratify or wrongly fail to halt clearly illegal practices.

Finally, our drug industry hearings have shown the urgent need for introducing some competition into an oligopolistic industry which has used its patent monopolies and irresponsible advertising to keep the prices of indispensable drugs at artificially high levels.

No doubt you are familiar with some or all of these, and my distinguished colleague, Congressman CELLER, will probably discuss many of them in some detail. Today, however, I should like to discuss certain international developments which raise profound and fundamental issues of increasing concern to our policymakers, both in Congress and in the executive.

The successful establishment of the European Common Market may well be the most significant economic and political event of the last decade. A powerful new community is emerging and in order to deal with it we shall need some new thoughts.

Impelled by the vision of a united Europe, the Common Market countries are now engaged in a program of eliminating restrictions on the free flow of goods, services, capital, and labor. So far, they have had remarkable success. The forces of competition so released have made the Common Market a very dynamic economic force, with a faster rate of growth than ours, an enormous internal market with a population roughly equal to ours and a highly efficient export capacity. In these first years, the aggregate trade in and among the member countries has expanded dramatically as has their aggregate gross national product. Imports to the Common Market have also risen. England and many other countries who long stood aloof have been forced either to seek entry and association or be frozen out. It has just been reported that we, too, are negotiating for some form of cooperation with the Common Market; if we fail in these efforts, we risk loss of access to what will probably be the greatest market in the world.

We also risk the loss of something equally significant. The Common Market represents more than simply a great trading area. It can be the foundation for closer political and social ties within the Atlantic community, because, as our national economies become more and more integrated, so will many of our most vital political and social interest, institutions, and policies.

Nor will this integration necessarily be limited to the Atlantic community. The Common Market now has special relationships with some of the new countries in Africa and elsewhere, the so-called associated countries. Other European countries are also seeking some form of association. We must obtain similar benefits for our Latin American friends, and the British will try to do the same for their other commonwealth countries.

We are thus at the threshhold of a community of free nations so rich and powerful as to withstand any threat, a community which can serve as an example to the uncommitted world of how freemen can solve the fundamental problems of economic sustenance, a community which, by its aid and assistance to the poorer countries, can bind them to the free world by the ties of common economic and social interests.

What has all this to do with a legislative antitrust program? Simply this: the underlying principle of the Common Market is free competition. The elimination of tariffs, quotas and various forms of discrimination, the removal of restrictions on the free flow of labor and capital—all these reflect a recognition that the bracing wind of competition is the most effective device for stimulating growth.

The Europeans have recognized, moreover, that the removal of publicly imposed restrictions on competition is only part of the task. They have come to realize that private groups must be prevented from replacing the soon to be abolished tariffs and quotas with private restrictions like price fixing, market sharing and other anticompetitive devices. As the Action Committee for a United States of Europe, headed by Jean Monnet, said in July 1960:

"The firm application of a European antitrust law is essential in order to ensure that all consumers and producers alike enjoy the benefits of the vast single market. The large number of agreements and concentrations envisaged or concluded as part of the producers' reaction to the Common Market underline the risk that it will be dominated and divided by monopolies and cartels."

It can thus no longer be argued that antitrust is a purely American aberration, rejected by public and private interests everywhere else, and a hindrance to American foreign trade. The philosophy underlying our Sherman and Clayton Acts is now reflected to varying extents in every European country and in the supranational bodies. Thus, the Rome Treaty which established the Common Market contains antitrust sections which have just been implemented this past December by supplementary regulations. The Coal and Steel Community Treaty and the Euratom Agreement also contain antitrust provisions. In the last 5 to 10 years, almost every Western country has either adopted or strengthened its national laws against restraints on competition.

These European antitrust laws are, as could be expected, extremely diverse. In the first place, in the Common Market itself, there are overall Common Market treaty provisions as well as national legislation to implement these treaty provisions. Some of these national laws stress prohibitory measures designed to prevent unfair trade practices. Others focus on registration procedures, designed to publicize and control restrictive practices. Few are designed to halt mergers although almost all seek to regulate abusive practices by dominant enterprises. Violations are more severely punished than here, for in the Common Market fines can run to a million dollars, and under the proposed Italian law, it will be possible to suspend officials of guilty companies. Of great significance is the fact that the Common Market legislation, like all other antitrust laws including our own Webb-Pomerene Act, exempt restraints limited to export trade.

It is still too early to appraise the impact and effectiveness of these new antitrust laws. The English legislation seems to have been remarkably effective in bringing to light and breaking up many price fixing and other restrictive arrangements.

On the other hand, the Coal and Steel Community seems to have run into great difficulty in trying to enforce competition and deconcentration in the coal and steel industry. And it is certainly too early to assess the impact of these laws on the attitudes of European businessmen who, long accustomed to cartels and cooperation, may be slow to change their habits. Indeed, our recent electrical equipment cases show that anticompetitive attitudes still persist in this country despite the passage of some 70 years since enactment of the Sherman Act.

Naturally, these developments also raise problems for American businessmen trading with and investing in Europe. For one thing, the very diversity of the legislation raises a host of potential conflict-of-laws problems. The old controversy about extraterritorial application of American and other antitrust laws is one facet of these problems, for many of the European antitrust statutes apply to agreements made outside their territory which affect the domestic market, or in which one or more of the participants does some business locally. As a matter of fact, it is now quite clear that those who have sought to restrict application of our antitrust laws to acts within the United States were seeking to limit our laws in a way that few nations have done, and without any support in international law. The possibility of jurisdictional conflicts, will, however, require some means for their resolution; the recent GATT resolution calling for consultations between governments affected by restricted practices may point the way.

It is vitally important that we cooperate with and further the effective operation of these new antitrust laws. We must not permit European and world trade to again become cartelized, and thereby lose the many benefits to consumers and producers of freer world trade. For example, it was not until European cars became more freely available that the American consumer was able to force our concentrated automobile industry to produce a small economical car. As a matter of fact, freely available imports may be one of the few effective ways to introduce competition and lower prices into some of our concentrated industries.

Moreover, a cartelized world will lend force to Soviet charges of Western monopoly capitalism, and these charges will find fertile ground among the poorer countries, because it is they who will probably be the prime victims of such cartels.

We must therefore take steps now to study these matters and coordinate our antitrust efforts with those of other free countries to further international competition. For one thing, we and the other countries should reexamine the wisdom of exemptions from our antitrust laws for export trade. Following the example of our Webb-Pomerene Act, the European countries seem to be adopting a narrow mercantilistic attitude that they have no concern with restrictive practices adversely affecting foreign markets. Whereas competition is to be the rule in the home market, cartel practices are permitted insofar as export trade is concerned. This attitude is dangerously out of date, for, as our economies become more and more interdependent, the differences between internal and external trade will diminish. Unless steps are taken to reverse this archaic approach, we may be faced with trade wars and discrimination which will seriously impede the healthy development of our overall economy. Efforts were made during the first postwar decade in the U.N. and elsewhere to obtain an international convention on such international practices. The time may now be ripe for a successful renewal of such efforts, perhaps through GATT, perhaps through the U.N.

Other areas we might reexamine are the wisdom of our own antidumping legislation, first enacted in 1921 and now possibly outmoded in its present form. We should try to coordinate this legislation with the recent European provisions.

We should also reconsider and reject such policies as are reflected in the pirated drug rider tacked on to last year's foreign aid bill, whereby we eliminate any chance of competition where patent monopolies are concerned. Other import and export restrictions also deserve scrutiny in the light of the developments in the last 10 years.

Our subcommittee plans an inquiry this year into the recent antitrust developments in the Common Market in order to obtain some guidance for the furtherance of American public and private interests in the years to come.

We are on the threshold of a great challenge and a great opportunity. We are now in a world economy where foreign trade is a vital element of our political and economic well-being. We must therefore do all in our power to encourage the formation of a great and free community of trading nations which will be free not only of such public impediments as tariffs and quotas but also from private restraints. We cannot afford to do a partial job.

Address by Senator Kefauver Before League of Women Voters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT GORE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 12, 1962

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very able address by my colleague from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], delivered before a meeting of the League of Women Voters at Nashville, Tenn., January 19, 1962.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS OF SENATOR ESTES KEFAUVER, OF TENNESSEE, BEFORE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS, NASHVILLE, TENN., FRIDAY, JANUARY 19, 1962

In the fall, I was privileged to visit Western Europe as chairman of the U.S. delegation to the NATO Parliamentarians Conference in Paris. This was the seventh such Conference to be held and the fifth I have attended as a delegate.

The NATO parliamentarians are a voluntary body of elected lawmakers from the 15 NATO countries. Each year we meet for 1 week to consider new ways to unify, strengthen and expand the free world against the Communist menace. This year I found an electric excitement among European delegates about the future role of the United States in the community of North Atlantic nations.

Although they are still concerned about our steadfastness to the NATO military alliance, they are becoming more interested in our response to the economic revolution which is now sweeping free Europe. The European Common Market may well be the most significant event of this century. Nations which have been bitter enemies for centuries are now discussing a common currency—and the English are even thinking about abandoning their tradition of driving their cars on the left-hand side of the road.

A brief look back over the years since World War II may help explain why our European friends are so anxious about the course of our foreign economic policy—and why we are rapidly approaching a rendezvous with the destiny of the Western World.

When the war ended, the economies of Western Europe were shattered and some of our allies were threatened with economic bankruptcy. By contrast, our economy was secure. We were the only Nation with sufficient international credit to continue to trade. Our friends had nothing to sell and no credit with which to buy our goods. They needed help and we needed them—both as allies in the cold war and as markets for goods produced in our postwar economy.

These nations were turning to currency and exchange restrictions and other artificial devices which might strengthen their domestic economies but which impeded international trade. Our response was the Marshall plan, one of our truly outstanding expressions of responsibility for the needs of fellow freemen. By helping these nations rebuild their economies, we also continued advantages which the United States had enjoyed through the existence in Western Europe of a large market with low-trade barriers.

At the same time, the Soviet Union was repudiating its wartime pledges to the allies and lowering the Iron Curtain between East and West, thereby setting off the international tensions which persist today. The Atlantic community's unified answer to this threat was NATO, the free world's most effective shield against Communist enslavement. It was the military counterpart to the Marshall plan's economic effect.

The cold war years which followed saw vast changes within this Atlantic community. Western European recovery so exceeded expectations that instead of our being Europe's protector, the United States and free Europe are fast becoming competitors, both in their domestic markets and in our markets here at home. The Common Market is the climax of this achievement of economic stability and vigor in Western Europe. It was formed in 1957 by Belgium, France, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, and West Germany.

Although they call themselves the European Economic Community, these separate nations are really becoming a sort of United States of Europe for trade and economic purposes. Their ultimate goal is the total elimination of all tariff barriers among the participating countries while maintaining a uniform tariff wall against outsiders. Goods, capital, labor, and tourists will move between these countries as freely as they do among the States of our own Union.

In moving toward these goals, the Common Market has surpassed its own timetables. At the end of 1961, internal tariffs had been cut 30 percent and another cut of 10 percent had been agreed for January of this year. A still further 10-percent cut is under discussion for early 1962. Originally, it had not been thought that their uniform external tariff could be established until 1966, but it now appears that this wall against outsiders may be thrown up in 1963. Their separate outside tariffs have already been adjusted some to bring them nearer to uniformity.

The results to date of this unprecedented step are astonishing. The Common Market countries have increased their trade with each other by 44 percent and their world trade by 20 percent. They have worked against old national rivalries and suspicions and the influence of colonialists, cartels, and political feudalists. Despite these handicaps, they are creating a consumer-oriented, competitive enterprise, free continental market in the pattern of our own American example.

In 1961 they produced 4 million automobiles, 75 million tons of steel, and 250 billion kilowatt-hours of electric power. Their gross annual product now exceeds $180 billion and accounts for almost one-fourth of world imports.

Perhaps the greatest proof of the Common Market's success came in July of last year when Great Britain abandoned its proud separation from the Continent and applied for membership. With Britain as a partner, the Common Market's population will exceed 220 million people, its gross annual product will rise to $245 billion, and it will account for more than one-third of world imports.

Denmark and Ireland have also applied for membership and Norway has it under consideration. Switzerland, Austria, Sweden, Greece, Turkey, and Israel have begun moves to become a part of this regional economic community. It is estimated that by 1970 the Common Market will become a single economic unit of 300 million people, compared with 215 million in the Soviet Union and 185 million in the United States.

These facts pose implications for us as a nation which cannot be ignored. If we face reality and do not sell short our faith in America and the cause of freedom, the Common Market can become a blessing for us and for all freemen.

In 1952 Joseph Stalin predicted to a Moscow conference that the Communists would win the world peaceably through overwhelming trade agreements. He viewed West Germany and Japan as the keys to this and forecast that the West would greedily hamper their foreign trade and drive them to the Soviet orbit.

Khrushchev has spoken more recently of burying capitalism and declaring war on us in the field of trade. But Khrushchev's threat did not consider that the Western democracies might unite to confront communism with a joint economic front. His prophesy is becoming a desperate, wishful hope. I think he was trying to cover up the handwriting he could read on the wall.

The course of these great historic events has led the United States to a year of decision in 1962. Many of our people are frustrated and worried as they survey the world fronts of the battle between communism and freedom. Berlin is tense and unsettled. The uncertain Congo divides us at home. Vietnam and Laos are insecure. The United Nations is in a period of crisis.

But I believe all these sore spots can be overshadowed by the opportunities which are opening to us on the greater battlefront of world trade. Here we can seize the intiative. We can build a free world strength and unity which the Communists cannot combat.

A great step forward in trade is more than a chance to deal communism a body blow. It can be the breakthrough which brings greater prosperity to all freemen everywhere.

Freedom of trade and commerce welded our separate States into the greater productive machine the world has seen. The same principle among the nations of the Common Market is now moving their economy ahead at a growth rate twice as great as ours. This principle can be further extended to build economic strength and unity in the free world.

This obviously involves relaxation of tariff barriers. Internal tariffs among our States would have made America as we know it impossible—just as Europe's old internal tariffs were obstacles to the prosperity it is beginning to enjoy. In the same way, tariffs can be barriers to the peace and prosperity of the entire community of free nations.

President Kennedy is urging that the Congress enact a trade program under which the United States can seize the initiative and lead the Western World into a great new era. In this I wholeheartedly support him.

Our present reciprocal trade laws expire in 1962 and must be rewritten by this session of the Congress. At the least we must give the President the tools he needs to negotiate effectively with the Common Market and create a strong trading partnership across the Atlantic. This will require the authority to eliminate or reduce tariffs on broad scales in across-the-board bargaining with the Common Market nations as a unit.

The temptation will be great for our European friends to guard their gains and protect their expanding consumer markets from American competition. They can now offer to their own people the benefits of mass production in a competitive economy. We must set the example and take the lead in offering progress, not retreat, in the face of new challenges and opportunities.

What are the alternatives if we reject this opportunity and revert to economic isolationism?

First of all we may see ourselves cut off from trading with our principal allies. Our exports to the Common Market countries in 1960 amounted to $3.4 billion, an increase of more than $1 billion since 1958; our imports were much less. If we lose access to these expanding consumer markets, not only will our industries suffer, but some may choose to move plants and capital inside the walls of the Common Market, with the resulting loss of jobs and income here in the United States.

If we fail to keep up our exports, we will cause a renewed squeeze on our balance of payments with threats to our gold reserves and the stability of the dollar. This could in turn require a retreat from some of our vital overseas military and aid commitments.

Of greater concern is the possibility that the Common Market could become our competitor instead of our ally. With mass of industrial and consumer goods, Europe might be drawn into a trade war with America for the markets and raw materials of the world. Europe organized economically without the United States could become a Europe organized against the United States.

Nothing could please Khrushchev more than to see trade barriers crack the historic unity of Western civilization and its united efforts in behalf of freemen and free institutions. By the same token, nothing will dismay the Kremlin more than a united free Europe with strong economic links with the United States.

The success of such a combination would demonstrate conclusively the superiority of democratic capitalism over communism and would lay to rest Karl Marx's prediction that capitalism would destroy itself.

The flexibility of Western capitalism and its capacity to adapt to changed conditions would mock Communist comparisons. The prosperity of an economic community of all the Atlantic nations would be a great magnetic force which could, and I think will, pull satellite nations out of the Soviet orbit.

Protectionism has never made sense in terms of the welfare of the Nation as a whole. Time and again we have allowed protective tariffs to sacrifice the interests of the whole people to the demands of a few. Free competition within our country benefits the consumer by improved technology and lower prices. It can have the same effects in the long run in foreign trade.

A freer trade policy can stimulate a nation's economy by causing it to produce those things which it produces best. Competition from imports may increase productivity and iron out stagnant or inefficient pockets in a nation's economy.

Look at the healthy effect foreign imports had on American tastes in automobiles. And look, too, at the successful transition which our auto manufacturers made to smaller, more economic cars to compete with these foreign imports.

I do not say that building the trade partnership which we must build within the free world will be easy. The transition may be hard. To compete successfully with foreign products we must produce quality and we must sell at prices which may require discipline and restraint in both profits and wages.

Nor do I say that this can be accomplished overnight. It is a complex problem. I appreciate the position of the man who fears he may go out of business, or the worker who fears he may lose his job because of competition with foreign imports. Any program must consider them and treat them fairly.

Any liberalized trade legislation should include trade adjustment features which will aid those businesses, communities, and workers who suffer hardship as a result of import competition. The President's program contains such features and you can be assured that the Congress will look at them closely.

Our new trade offensive will be launched in the national interest—to deal with national problems. Any displacement of plants and jobs and special hardships which it causes should also be treated as a national problem.

Where the change hits hardest—from the point of view of employer and employee alike—there is no question that we must devise adequate means to make the transition fair.

But I do not believe we should let special interests stand in the way of the ultimate accomplishment of something so vital and beneficial to our people as a whole. We must never forget that uniting the economic strength of the free world may well be a question of survival.

The unenlightened protectionist, who is not willing to work with this serious question might unwittingly find himself in the position of making Marx and Stalin prophets and Khrushchev a conqueror. For if sight of the vital goal is lost, then we could find ourselves with nothing left to protect.

If we lose the entire free competitive enterprise system, we lose everything—not only those few protected jobs and companies—but every job and company and our freedoms, too. Restrictive tariff protection could be a tragic Trojan horse which our enemies would be delighted to leave within our gates.

The economic isolationism of the twenties led us to raise tariffs in 1930 on the pretext of helping our jobless. We then saw other countries' tariffs raised in retaliation with disastrous results for all countries. It was the great Cordell Hull who then led the United States and the world to new economic frontiers with our first Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

If he were alive today, I have no doubt that he too would enthusiastically support the President's efforts.

The trade debate of 1962 promises to compare with the historic tariff debates of the early 19th century. It will be difficult and probably bitter, but it deserves the open-minded attention of all of us. I hope business, farm, labor, and civic groups will all give it full consideration and aid the Congress with informed and objective viewpoints.

The League of Women Voters has published some excellent material and is doing a fine job of presenting these issues impartially and educating the public to the issues in foreign trade. I hope other groups will follow your example.

We must again capture the vision of Cordell Hull and move with giant steps as he did. If we do, we will meet the responsibilities of the United States in a free world, we will deal our enemies a death blow, and we will herald a new era of peace and prosperity for all men.

Meeting Freedom's Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1962

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, last year on October 14, 1961, a richly deserved recognition was awarded to our colleague Representative Frank C. Osmers, Jr., of the Ninth District of New Jersey. On that date he received the honorary degree of doctor of laws from Fairleigh Dickinson University.

Frank Osmers has all his life displayed his ability as a very effective leader. He has unstintingly served his community, his State, and his Nation in many elective and appointive capacities. In addition to his many outstanding contributions to good government, he served with distinction in action during World War II. Many do not know that he left the 77th Congress the day war was declared to enlist as a private in the Army, where he remained on active duty until February 22, 1946. At the time of his release he had achieved the rank of major of infantry.

The honor conferred upon our colleague was well deserved. At the time the honorary degree was bestowed, he delivered a fine address entitled "Meeting Freedom's Challenge." In emphasizing the absolute necessity for our people to rededicate themselves "to that faith and to those ideals that brought freedom and democracy into existence," he called attention to the weakening of America by the pursuit of material things. In his talk he quoted a statement from the letters of Theodore Roosevelt:

> The things that will destroy America are prosperity at any price, peace at any price, safety first instead of duty first, and love of soft living and the get-rich-quick theory of life.

The timely message that Representative Osmers delivered should be read by all. Under leave to extend my remarks, this message is included in the Record:

MEETING FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

Mr. President, members of the faculty, students, and distinguished guests, Fairleigh Dickinson University has given me a great honor, indeed. To become an adopted son of this university is for me a great occasion and one I shall cherish throughout my life. I am your grateful debtor for this honor.

I am very proud to be here for, in many ways, Fairleigh Dickinson represents a direct reflection of the growth, vitality and progress of the State of New Jersey and of our beloved country. Within the past decade, the growth and development of this institution have been phenomenal. The rate of progress probably exceeds that of any institution of higher learning in America, the service it renders a great community is second to none, the opportunities it brings are priceless. Such a spectacular growth emphasizes an optimism, a forward look and a faith in the future of America which is encouraging and heartwarming. It augurs well for the future of our democratic institutions and is truly an inspiration to education everywhere.

At the same time, I feel very humble as I receive this high honor from Fairleigh Dickinson and I pledge again, as I have so many times in the past, to give my utmost support to the cause of education and the progress of our educational institutions in this State and in the entire country. It is a cause in which I firmly believe and for which I have always worked. Let us never forget that liberty and learning must lean on each other for their mutual and surest support. If liberty is denied then learning is restricted and narrowed and if learning is denied, then liberty loses the means to defend itself or to increase its scope and promise.

Education in America today has many problems. Our country has many problems. We face a changing world.

We live in a world where the amount and quality of education and understanding may well determine whether democracy will survive or perish.

We must provide for the growth and well-being of an expanding economy, secure and train the necessary manpower for a world of advancing technology. We must insure new avenues of communication and understanding. Much of this responsibility rests to a large degree on our colleges and universities. They will not be found wanting. But make no mistake, meeting freedom's challenge is not just a task for educators. It is a job for every man and woman in this country. You, me, the fellow next door.

It is the challenge to freemen to maintain, protect and enhance the dignity and worth of the individual to increase the concept, the meaning, the understanding and the application of freedom to guard and protect the American way of life and to insure the growth of the spirit of man as he reaches for the stars.

In a material, down-to-earth sense the protection of our freedom is a manpower problem. In a word, we are outnumbered. We simply do not have the manpower that the totalitarian nations have. We cannot compete in numerical strength with the hordes that temporarily swept back the forces of freedom in Korea or overpowered our allies in Indochina, nor can we build our fortifications on the backs of coolie labor, nor would we even wish to do so.

We hear much these days about the increase in population. But the growth of population does not mean that we will automatically have a labor force that is adequate to all the Nation's needs in the years ahead. In 1940 we were a nation of 132 million. Today we have reached 170 million. By 1980, it is expected that our population will have grown to 250 million. But these figures bear a little study.

The fact is, the population explosion is largely centered in the groups at either end of the age scale—among the young and old. The number of people in the prime working years has remained relatively constant and will for the next 20 years.

Thus, by 1980, when our total population will have risen to the tremendous total of 250 million, we will have fewer people in the most productive bracket (40–50) than we have today.

Not only that, but our younger workers will be living and working in an increasingly complex and technical world. They will be responsible for the future productive balance, for progressively high standards of performance, and much of the leadership that this Nation and the entire free world will so greatly need.

This lack of raw manpower can only be counterbalanced by a determination to train and make available the skilled manpower which is the basic fruit of freedom. The needs of the future demand that every facet of our educational system must provide more rigorous training and demand higher levels of achievement and excellence. Unless we have the fullest possible development of the Nation's fundamental resources in the years ahead, we will indeed be in desperate danger.

Probably an even more important part of the challenge to freemen, is the necessity for rededication to that faith and to those ideals which brought freedom and democracy into existence—those essential character qualities that make a nation strong. Paradoxically the very qualities which have made us great have brought us a living that has weakened those qualities. We are called the affluent nation. We have more money, more prosperity, and more of the good things of life than any nation on earth. In possession of these material things, have we, perhaps, lost some of our respect for hard work, thrift, sacrifice, devotion to duty, and loyalty to common good? These are strengths which we must recapture in order to hold fast our freedom.

Recently I read from the letters of Theodore Roosevelt a statement that ought to be imprinted in the mind of every American today.

He said: "The things that will destroy America are prosperity at any price, peace at any price, safety first instead of duty first, and love of soft living and the get-rich-quick theory of life."

The challenge of freedom has another front—a world front. We seek freedom not only for ourselves but for all men everywhere. But despite all we have attempted to do we have, somehow failed to communicate with them.

The true image of America is being grossly distorted in critical areas around the world. This is more than unfortunate in these crucial times; it is a serious threat. We have seen the resulting damage in the neutral countries, even in friendly nations, and certainly among the undeclared peoples. Our motives are twisted by vicious propaganda and we are made to appear as a rich and grasping nation, concerned only with our own selfish advantage. We see the evil effects of lack of understanding even in the shadow of our own coastline. It would indeed be a cruel turn of events if a generous people should lose because of their failure to adequately communicate the meaning of freedom. It would be a dangerous turn if we should fail to interpret the blessings of democracy and thus lose potential friends to a contrary way of life and find ourselves exposed and alone.

Our failure to enunciate clearly the meaning of democracy is not only a failure in communication but in understanding. Loyalty and love can't be bought. We have learned that lesson the hard way.

New technology has made it possible for us to communicate in many new ways, to inform, unify or divide our world as never before, but wonderful as the new technology tools may be, they are still only tools of transmittal. We must remember that the most marvelous media can communicate no more and no less than a man can feel and express and impart from the mind and the heart and the soul.

Though the transmittal be orbited through space to impinge upon this and other worlds for the rest of time, what still really counts is the substance of the message and its applicability and meaning to those for whom it is intended. And the substance depends upon the real meaning of freedom.

It is the substance that we must communicate to all the world. It is this substance which must be the warp and woof of all our education.

This is freedom's challenge to all of us. How shall we meet it?

1. We can meet it by increasing our education for democratic citizenship and in saying this I give much credit to Fairleigh Dickinson for the programs already in operation on every one of your campuses. The extension work you are carrying on, the evening school programs, the off-campus activities, the reexamination and reorientation of your entrance requirements, the sharpening of your curricula, the adult education programs, and your ability to fit into the communities you serve—all of these heart-warming activities bespeak your interest and understanding.

2. It is important that all our citizens gain new understanding of the meaning of democracy and liberty and freedom. Active participation in public affairs can no longer be left to the few. The right to vote is not only a privilege; it is an obligation. The duty of keeping informed is no longer a duty but a necessity. The study of government can no longer be confined to the pages of a textbook—it is a way of life.

3. We can meet the challenge of freedom with an old-fashioned rededication to the virtues which inspired that freedom.

4. We must educate for more efficient and effective manpower. Our present waste of human resources must be stopped. We must educate for the pursuit of excellence by building an educational program that will discover and encourage the abilities and potentialities of every single individual.

We must educate for greater understanding among all peoples. Education must challenge our own young people with an idealism, a feeling of mission, a better understanding of themselves and the world in which they live, and appreciation of the brotherhood of man and a realization of the power and the glory of a working democracy.

But we must export this education (and import a bit of it, as well) by the exchange of teachers and students with foreign countries, by the establishment of branch universities in other lands, by informational centers, by all the ingenuity at our command.

Such an educational program is now in operation and a number of governmental agencies have the responsibility to speed its progress. But the program cannot be entirely a governmental responsibility. Its success will depend in great measure upon the initiative, the resourcefulness, the ability, and the understanding of the individuals of our great foundations, of religious and social organizations, of educational institutions, of schools and colleges, and faculties and individual teachers. Only thus can success be assured. Only thus can we fully meet the challenge, the obligation, and the responsibility that freemen must meet, if freedom is to prevail.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Dr. Joseph Vaskas, Marian Hills Seminary, Clarendon Hills, Ill., offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

Almighty and merciful God, we adore Thee and we thank Thee for Thy loving providence, which from all eternity hath predestined this continent to be discovered by Western man only as recently as 1492 in order that it become a haven and a home for the oppressed and persecuted peoples of the world. We thank Thee for having enriched it so prodigally with the goods of this earth, that, according to Thine own example and precept, we are now able to help and succor the needy of the world from our own superabundant stores. We thank Thee for having given our forefathers a living faith, so deeprooted, vigorous, and unequivocal, they caused to have engraved on the metal of our coins the inscription: "In God We Trust." We thank Thee for the farsighted wisdom and prudence of the Founding Fathers of our Republic, who gave us a Constitution, the principles of which are but the eternal law as applied to the organization and administration of a free and ordered society of men. In Thy provident wisdom, Thou hast permitted the people of this Republic, strong in their faith in Thee and in the spiritual, cultural, and material wealth with which Thou hast deigned to bless them, to emerge today as the most powerful and benevolent Nation on earth. Grant us to understand, O Lord, that this prerogative of eminence is weighted with a corresponding responsibility before Thy judgment seat and that of the world in which Thou hast allotted us to play such an important and decisive part. Faithful to its historic and noble national traditions of justice and charity in both its domestic and international relations, may our Nation and its Government persevere and triumph in the good fight it leads in waging for that peace, based on justice and charity, which is the tranquillity of order. It is for this tranquillity of order that captive, exiled, and free Lithuanians throughout the world are praying today, O just and merciful God, on the occasion of the 44th anniversary of Lithuania's Declaration of Independence, that in this peaceful order of justice and charity, enslaved Lithuania, together with her sister Baltic Republics Latvia and Estonia, and all captive peoples behind the Iron Curtain and wherever in the world, would again and soon enjoy all the rights and blessings of a free, independent, and sovereign people.

In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 12, 1962, was read and approved.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time in order to ask the acting majority leader if he will kindly inform us as to the program for next week.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, on Monday we will take up the Consent Calendar.

On Tuesday the Private Calendar will be called, to be followed by H.R. 10050, temporary debt ceiling increase for fiscal 1962, if a rule is reported.

On Wednesday and the balance of the week we will have H.R. 8399, the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962.

On Thursday, even though we may have not finished the Manpower Development and Training Act, we will have read the Farewell Address of President Washington.

Of course, conference reports will be in order at any time during the week, and any further program will be announced later.

Mr. ARENDS. I thank the gentleman.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules have until midnight tonight to file reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar Wednesday be dispensed with on Wednesday, February 21, 1962.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

POWERS IS NOT A SPY—ABEL IS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, there is real gain for the United States in the Soviet Union's release of Francis Gary Powers and Frederic L. Pryor in return for Colonel Abel's being permitted to go back to the Soviet Union.

From the time of Abel's arrest until the present the Soviet Union has refused to admit that this master spy was one of its agents. Now, Moscow itself has, in effect, confirmed the trial exposure of the espionage activities of Colonel Abel and the others who were members of his apparatus in the United States.

At the same time, I deplore the fact that a significant segment of the U.S. press is giving great aid to the Soviet Union by repeatedly describing Powers as a spy and his release in return for that of Colonel Abel as a spy swap.

A press dispatch of February 12, which was a featured page 1 story in newspapers across the country, opened with the following words:

> AMERICAN U-2 SPY PILOT FRANCIS GARY POWERS
>
> On February 11 and 12, articles written by two different New York Times reporters and published in that newspaper referred to Powers and Abel as two celebrated spies of the cold war.
>
> On February 11, the New York Times went so far as to report falsely that Powers had earned the unusual distinction of having been acknowledged as a spy by the U.S. Government.

Numerous headlines and articles published in newspapers in this country during the past few days have referred to Powers as a spy pilot and to the exchange as a spy trade.

Thus, with the help of the U.S. press, Khrushchev has been able to get across to the American people and to the people of many other nations the one big propaganda point that he wants to sell them on—his phony claim of U.S. guilt in a flagrant case of espionage on the eve of the May 1960 summit conference which justified his torpedoing the conference and then reneging on his agreement to have President Eisenhower visit the Soviet Union.

Most competent newspaper editors, with the best interests of this country at heart, would flatly reject such Communist-serving statements if they were released by the Soviet Embassy in Washington. Too many of these same editors, however, have accepted statements of this type put out by wire services and their own reporters.

From the very beginning the U.S. Government has correctly refused to admit Moscow's false claim that Powers was guilty of espionage. It has defended the U-2 flights as legitimate aerial surveillance and intelligence gathering that was essential and of vital necessity to protect this country from surprise attack.

Espionage, by its very definition, is secret and covert. Open intelligence gathering, which includes reconnaissance of various types, including plane flights, is not espionage. For about 4 years before Powers' crash in the Soviet Union, Powers, and possibly other U.S. pilots, had been flying U-2's in reconnaissance flights over Soviet territory. With modern methods of detection, these marked planes with their 90-foot wingspreads—even when flying at 80,000 feet—were about as secret or covert as a tank rumbling down a street. Whether Powers' plane was taking photographs or gathering some other type of intelligence data is beside the point. The important fact is that the Soviet Union, for a period of several years, had been able to detect these planes flying openly over its territory, obviously on reconnaissance missions.

It knew that they were there, but rather than admit to the world that it did not have any weapon capable of bringing them down, it made no public protest.

It is most unfortunate that some newspapers and a major wire service in this country are now undermining the correct U.S. position in the Powers case, giving credence to Khrushchev's false contentions and seemingly justifying his outrageous conduct.

The Soviet Union undoubtedly wanted Abel returned because although his value as an espionage agent is now destroyed, his experience in this country could be put to good use in training other Soviet agents for assignment here. Despite this, the United States gained by obtaining the release from Communist prisons of two American citizens who were innocent of the charges made against them. Although these men are not spies and have not been trained in espionage, we should get from Powers the answers to some important questions, including that of just what caused the crash of his U-2 reconnaissance plane on May 1, 1960.

THE LITTLE-PEOPLE-TO-LITTLE-PEOPLE PROGRAM

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, thousands of our citizens have been inspired and are responding to the President's already historic words delivered in his inaugural address:

> Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country.

Among those thousands is my 10-year-old son, Peter.

Like most American children today, Peter is vitally aware of the problems our Nation faces. He realizes the solution of those problems is the job and the duty of you and me, and all other Government officials, aided by all of our citizens. But he does not allow his youth and inexperience to curb his thinking of the problems and their solution.

Overriding all other problems is the threat to the very existence of our own and yet unborn generations of people everywhere that hangs over the world in the form of the Russian bombs' fallout cloud.

Peter knows that many fine men from our own and other governments have been trying through conferences to persuade the Communist leaders to stop atmospheric testing.

But—

He told us one night at dinner—

> maybe Mr. Khrushchev does not believe the ordinary people in America and other countries really want him to stop the bombing. Maybe if a lot of children wrote him, he would believe it. If he gets a fallout of letters, he might stop the fallout of bombs.

So Peter wrote to Mr. Khrushchev. He talked about it with his chums. They wrote, too. And, as the idea spread, other children from beyond our neighborhood heard about, and now many of them are writing. Parent Teacher Associations, Boy Scout groups and veterans' organizations are encouraging still more children to write. It is beginning to take shape as a real children's crusade.

When the President appointed General Eisenhower head of the people-to-people program, it seemed that Peter's activity was a natural corollary—a little-people-to-little-people program. The general and Mr. Nutter, the executive director of the program, agree and I am working with them to develop the little-people program.

After some discussion, we have decided to broaden the scope of this modern-day children's crusade. We agree that a fallout of letters to the Soviet Premier would have a stimulating psychological effect on people throughout the non-Communist world; but we wonder if it will have much effect on Khrushchev or the Comintern. We are apprehensive, moreover, that a fallout of letters about the bomb alone would intensify the Comintern delusions of grandeur that they are the masters of world events.

The project that we feel will be most effective is a massive worldwide effort, started here in the United States, to discredit and destroy the myth of communism in the minds of men throughout the world.

We believe that an important task in this project is to enlist the youngsters of our Nation into this political warfare which we didn't start, but which we do have to fight.

To be sure, this is taking a page from their own book. The Communists start the political training of their citizens at an early age, enlisting their youth in the young pioneer movement, preparing them for more sophisticated political training. I think we must conclude that this has been an effective system for the Communists. It can be even more effective for freemen. For we shall write on the white pages of freedom, not on the red pages of tyranny.

Let us use their example to initiate a movement that will give the children of the free world some facts about today's world. We know from various polls that at the moment our own youth, and many among our adult population, believe that communism is bad, but they do not know for sure because they do not know what communism really stands for, and does and is. We know, also, from the experience of our men captured during the Korean episode, that there is a concomitant ignorance about America, what our country and way of life stand for, do and are.

My colleagues, I believe we have a unique opportunity and a special responsibility to organize that movement here. We in the two bodies of Congress come from every corner of our great Nation. Some bring our families here, but, as we hope will be shown next November, our roots are in the districts we represent. We have available to us the scholarly and timely publications of our distinguished congressional committees, of the executive departments and agencies and all other appropriate material as soon as it is published. What better than we can give this movement an auspicious start and insure its orderly, successful momentum? Who better than we who meet in the Chambers of this building understands the utter need of our Nation to lead the fight of freemen everywhere against the Red menace. Let us answer the Communist crusade for world domination with our children's crusade for world education. Let us give meaning to the battle cry of freedom—"better brave than slave."

I solicit your comments. I ask your help. I shall welcome both.

THE KREMLIN'S CRIME

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the session of Congress now before us promises to be one of the most crucial in our national history. Under your wise and dedicated leadership, it promises to be also one of the most fruitful.

Two among the many vital and urgent issues that will come before us stand apart in their importance. For while most issues are concerned directly only with our own domestic welfare today, these two transcend all boundaries, spatial and temporal. Their significance reaches across the seven seas, and touches everywhere all nations, their institutions, their people—even those nations not yet named, those institutions not yet founded, those generations as yet unborn.

The two issues of such heroic, historical importance are: first, resumption of nuclear testing; and, second, America's trade policy.

It is to the first that I address myself today.

My feelings about the bomb, about the entire armaments race, you know well. You will remember that I and others among you introduced bills in 1960 and 1961 that ultimately led to the establishment of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. Through the leadership of our Agency, I hoped, I still hope, that the road to peace may be found for all the world.

But in November at Geneva I attended some of the meetings of the Conference on the Discontinuance of Nuclear Weapons Tests. My colleagues, it was a most distressing affair. For while the distinguished British Minister of State, Joseph Godber, and our own equally distinguished delegate, Arthur H. Dean, came and spoke with earnest dedication to the task at hand, the Russians prevented the attainment of any progress.

Having contemptuously disregarded the entire world and poured more poison into the atmosphere in their 1961 tests than the total of all previous tests, the Russians dared to take the pose of being opposed to nuclear weapons. With their 1961 series concluded, they ignored the carefully prepared test-ban treaty draft which had been submitted to them last April by Mr. Dean, and substituted for it a meaningless four-paragraph agreement on banning the tests—with no attempt at monitoring controls.

Mr. Dean has my complete admiration for the courageous way he maintained his composure, and for continuing with his sincere and determined efforts to achieve progress toward a test ban.

Shortly after my return from Geneva, Ambassador Adlai Stevenson, speaking for the President, announced that the United States and Russia had agreed to the formation of an 18 nation committee to begin negotiations toward general and complete disarmament.

When I heard this, I thought back to Geneva. And when I thought back to Geneva, I thought of the utter hypocrisy of daring to speak about banning almost at the very time they were bombing.

Two weeks ago, the Russians delivered another blow against disarmament when they broke up the 3-year-old negotiations for nuclear test-ban agreements. This week their leaders are nonresponsive to the efforts of our President and Prime Minister Macmillan for a Foreign Ministers' Disarmament Conference.

We do not want to resume atmospheric nuclear testing, for our own sake, but, more importantly, for the sake of our children and of those not yet born all over the world. By the words of her President and Congress, America has proclaimed this again and again for all the world to hear.

As Americans we can all be proud of our Presidents, and their representatives, in their sustained and dedicated attempts in the past 3 years to remove the threat of the poison of nuclear tests.

If further negotiations are not at the moment possible, if the atmosphere is again contaminated, it will not be because of America. For these crimes against humanity itself, the leaders in the Kremlin, and they alone, will be guilty.

LIMITATION ON PURCHASE OF UNITED NATIONS BONDS

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I introduce a bill today to provide that the President be authorized to purchase up to $100 million in United Nations bonds in an amount equal to that which is subscribed by other nations or individuals.

The United Nations has been a valuable asset to the world over the 17 years of its existence. It has proven to be a valuable instrument of the U.S. foreign policy over these years. Basic to its past value and its future success in our own conduct of foreign affairs and in that of other member nations is the universality of its support.

As a financial transaction, the United Nations bond issue is rather noncontroversial. The bonds will pay interest and will be repaid over a period not to exceed 25 years. The U.S. Government has loaned the United Nations money before. The Republican-controlled 80th Congress authorized the lending of $65 million to the U.N. for construction of its present headquarters facilities. Repayment of that obligation has been in strict accordance with the lending agreement. As a debtor, the United Nations has established a perfect credit record with its creditor, the United States.

From the standpoint of fiscal operations of the United Nations, the bond issue is vital. United Nations obligations have exceeded income on its special project missions. This has been caused by reluctance of member nations to pay special assessments authorized by the General Assembly to carry on the police activities of the organization.

It is obvious, then, that the bond issue is sound financing by the United Nations and sound lending by the United States. The critical problem at issue in the current debate is whether or not the United Nations serves a useful purpose to the United States in the conduct of its foreign affairs and whether or not it merits further support as an instrument of our foreign policy. To analyze the issue, it is necessary, therefore, to make a general review of the activities of the United Nations, and how they have affected our Nation and its goals in the world.

The United Nations was created in 1945 prior to the end of World War II at a conference in San Francisco. It was organized with the support and with the insistence of the leaders of the Allied Powers who were fighting and winning the war against tyranny. The purposes set forth in the preamble of the U.N. Charter are basically the preservation of peace with the corresponding prevention of future wars, and the promotion of the basic concept of human dignity with a corresponding recognition of human rights.

When the charter was drawn, the atomic age had not yet dawned. The exploration of space was still a science fiction subject. America and Russia were allies and China was ruled by Chiang Kai-shek. The Security Council was formed with practical recognition of the United States, Great Britain, Russia, France, and China as the political and economic leaders of the world. In the Security Council they were given broad powers to keep the peace and each given a veto power over proceedings in that Council. In practice, the General Assembly has grown more powerful and more dynamic in carrying out the objectives of the charter in recent years.

Since that San Francisco Conference just 17 years ago, the world has undergone the most rapid and most effective social, political, and technological revolution in history. More than one-fourth of all the world's people—700 million—have thrown off the yoke of colonialism since 1945. The progress of human rights and human dignity has been at its most rapid pace in man's history. Technology has opened new worlds and created vast new fields of opportunity for human endeavor.

In this complex and changing environment, the United Nations has stood as the central clearinghouse for disputes, the champion of civil rights and liberties, and the source of political guidance for all of the nations in the world. It has not always been as effective as it could or should have been. There are instances which anyone might cite as the failures of the U.N. to live up to its ideals and goals.

In the 17 years of the United Nations, the United States has relied heavily on it as its basic instrument of foreign policy. When the Korean peace was broken, President Truman turned to the U.N. to provide the solution. When President Eisenhower sought to promote peaceful use of the atom and to provide for disarmament through aerial inspection, he turned to the U.N. to present his "atoms for peace" and "open skies" proposals. When chaos developed in the newly independent nation of the Congo, Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy relied on the U.N. to establish the rule of law.

Certainly the United States has relied heavily on the United Nations and not always with complete success. The Soviet Union has been forced to use her veto power in the Security Council more than 100 times to thwart implementation of free world policies. With the increased membership due to the newly emerging independent nations, control of the actual voting assembly has passed informally from the Western democracies to the new nations of Asia and Africa. American dominance of the assembly has, therefore, waned, but there has not been an increase in Soviet-bloc control.

In his state of the Union message, President Kennedy this year asked for a vote of confidence in the United Nations. He said:

> Our instrument and our hope is the United Nations—and I see little merit in the impatience of those who would abandon this imperfect world instrument because they dislike our imperfect world. For the troubles of a world organization merely reflect the troubles of the world itself. And if the organization is weakened, these troubles can only increase. We may not always agree with every detailed action taken by every officer of the United Nations, or with every voting majority, but as an institution, it should have in the future, as it has had in the past since its inception, no stronger or more faithful member that the United States of America.

A critical analysis of the United Nations and its role in U.S. foreign policy will show that the world organization has consistently been a force for peace and instrument for good which we have been able to use to good advantage. It needs our continued support and the support of all member nations to continue to be successful. I believe that this universality of support is a critical point in the prospects for the United Nations. The United Nations needs the moral, political, and financial support of all its members. It must have a universal foundation on which to build for progress. U.S. leadership in this support is good and worth while, but it cannot be a substitute for the participation of the entire membership.

The United Nations is a world organization with 105 sovereign member nations. Its value and its successes to a large degree are dependent on the scope of moral, political, and financial support that it receives from its members.

This is not a phenomenon unique to the world organization. It is a simple and basic fact of political life whether it be on the local scale of a village, on the metropolitan level, or the State level; it is also true in the international organization that the effectiveness of a governmental organization is largely dependent on the base of active support for that governmental organization.

I believe that a basic premise on which our support of the United Nations rests is that the organization has the support of its member nations and the respect of the world. Without this, it is bound to be ineffective and doomed to crippling inactivity.

I believe that this position should be made clear to the world. By limiting our own participation in the U.N. bond issue to an amount equal to that which has been subscribed by other nations, this basic promise of our support is emphasized.

The State Department has indicated that they have received favorable reaction to the issue from 25 other nations and that 6 nations already making commitments have agreed to buy nearly $30 million in bonds. This gives me great confidence that the other nations will bear their full share of the financial burden and that our share will eventually amount to $100 million. Other nations must recognize the need for strong universal support of the United Nations; and with our lead, I am confident this method of authorization will not in any way imperil the total success of the bond sale but will, in fact, be beneficial to it.

The United States has long borne the major burden of financial support for the United Nations. I do not address myself to this fact or to its desirability or undesirability. There are certainly logical reasons for our large share of the financial support of the organization. But along with our support, there must be the support of other member nations. By charter, the United Nations demands universal support of its members through annual assessments. The reluctance to pay special assessments for specific activities is damaging to the moral strength of the U.N. as well as to its financial position.

Let us stand now and tell our fellow members that our support hinges on yours. What the United Nations needs is not more and more of our support, but more participation by the entire membership. Let us make our position on this vital point clear by authorizing the purchase of the bond issue only in such amount as that which is subscribed by other nations.

And let this not be construed as a lack of support on the part of our Nation of the United Nations. Let it be taken as intended as a declaration of support and a position favoring multilateral support of the organization. It is in the own best interests of the United Nations to have broad support. My proposal is directed toward the best interests of the organization and is aimed at strengthening its position in the world.

I ask the Committee on Foreign Affairs to consider this proposal along with the request of the President. I believe it provides the substance for which he has asked and adds strengthening influence in recording the U.S. sentiment for broad and universal support of United Nations operations.

DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS AND HOUSING—REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1962

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, from some of the comments made by those attacking the proposed Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, one would believe that this new Department would be concerned solely with big cities. If this is a big city proposal, who would be concerned with the needs of our smaller cities and towns? After all, nearly 50 percent of the urban population of the United States live in cities and towns of under 50,000 population.

Part of the answer to this charge is in the President's message transmitting the reorganization plan. In that message he said:

> It should not be assumed that these are matters of concern only to our larger cities. Hundreds of smaller cities and towns are located on or near the fringes of rapidly growing urban areas. The problems of the cities affect them today, and will be theirs tomorrow. Hundreds of other smaller towns and cities not now affected will be so situated in a few short years hence. Thus, the smaller towns and cities have a stake in this proposal as vital as, and only a little less immediate than, that of our large urban centers. This plan is addressed to their needs as well as to those of the major cities.

The evident concern of the President is certainly to the point, and one that should be considered by all of the Members of the House whose constituencies include small cities and towns. But also to the point is the extent to which the programs of the Housing Agency have been tailored to the needs of smaller cities and the extent of small city participation in these programs.

An outstanding example of this is the public facility loan program which assists small cities in obtaining financing for their public works at reasonable interest rates. With the exception of some communities in redevelopment areas, this entire program is concerned with the needs of cities with populations of under 50,000.

The program of Federal advances for planning specific public works is another Housing Agency activity which has been predominantly concerned with the needs of our smaller cities and towns. Eighty percent of the applications for these planning advances have come from cities with a population of less than 50,000. Of this 80 percent, approximately half have come from communities with populations of under 5,000.

The program of Federal grants for overall urban planning is still another outstanding example of the way in which the programs of the Housing Agency serve the needs of smaller communities, and of the way in which these smaller communities are voluntarily participating in the programs. Over 2,000 localities with populations of less than 50,000 have received, or are receiving assistance to help them to the kind of planning which is so necessary for sound local decisionmaking. This represents 85 percent of the total number of communities receiving assistance under this program.

The urban renewal program is frequently talked about as being a big-city program, but what is little recognized is that it is also a small-city program. Over 63 percent of the localities participating in the urban renewal program have populations of less than 50,000 and have undertaken 43 percent of the total number of projects. This Congress has recognized the special importance of urban renewal to small cities and the special problems involved. In the recently enacted Housing Act of 1961, cities with populations under 50,000 were accorded 75-percent grants as compared with the two-thirds grants available to larger cities.

Public housing is also a concern of smaller localities. Eighty-six percent of the more than 1,500 communities participating in the public housing program had populations of less than 50,000. More than half of the participating communities had populations of less than 10,000.

With this record before us, I think the conclusion is clear—the programs of the Housing Agency are meant for communities of all sizes and communities of all sizes have been participating in these programs. It is clear from the President's message that he intends this new Department to serve all of the cities in America.

MEDICAL CARE

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, in my view, the single most important domestic issue before the Congress this year is that of providing adequate medical and hospital care for the elderly. This is a "gut" issue that involves the health and welfare of millions of older persons who cannot absorb the costs of a lengthy illness. It is an issue that other major industrial nations in the West have resolved by adopting, as did Great Britain, a national health plan. As a larger proportion of our population is concentrated in the older age category, provision for adequate medical care will remain a major problem that can neither be avoided nor interred.

I think it instructive, Mr. Speaker, to look at the position of that great closed-shop trade union of the medical profession, the American Medical Association. And in recent months we have had an opportunity to peek behind the gauze curtain, so to speak, and see what is inside.

The Journal of the American Medical Association, an official publication, in September 1961, carried an article bearing on the remarks of a William DeMougeot, professor of speech at North Texas State University, to an AMA institute. He analyzed the arguments put forth by the AMA against any form of Government interest in medical care and what did he find? Well the speech professor is quoted to this effect:

> Remember that most of the arguments we've examined work quite well on most people * * * it's only when facing more informed audiences or arguing with an intelligent opponent who possesses some of the facts I've cited that the vulnerabilities I've mentioned become a problem.

So what are these arguments that the AMA seemingly with success palmed off on the uninformed?

The speech professor listed five that he labeled as scare arguments.

National health insurance will be a step toward socialism—well now, countered the professor, for those attracted by slogans this may prove an effective argument. But, said the professor:

> For more sophisticated people, it is the most flagrant sort of propaganda—name calling—and it has long since lost its respectability because conservatives have applied it to almost all social legislation.

Scare argument No. 2 is that the Federal Government will control medical care and both patient and doctor will lose freedom.

This—

Said our professor—

> is simpy not true—of course, not everyone could have the best doctor, to prevent overloading; but does the average person have that privilege now? * * * This is a good argument with which to scare people, but you'd better not use it if you have an audience or an opponent who knows how foreign systems are run.

Scare argument No. 3: The quality of medical care will deteriorate. Mr. DeMougeot said:

> There have been unnecessary calls and arbitrary demands but the person who has put off needed medical care because of costs will prefer second-rate care to no care. And, besides, he said 71 percent of physicians in Britain felt the system helped them to fend off serious illnesses.

Bogey-man argument No. 4 is that the system will be expensive. The reply given the AMA Institute audience here is that Britain spends only 4 to 4½ percent of its national income on the health service to give complete care to all, while we in the United States spend even more for much less care quantitatively and their percentage is going down while ours is rising.

He estimated that in Britain about $50 is spent per person for a rather complete system, while in the United States about $114 is spent for partial care. And he added:

> Do not treat the taxes which support such a system as if they would be an additional burden on each American; most such taxes would merely replace what is now spent on medical care.

A national health plan has failed in foreign nations and therefore we should avoid it here. This final scare argument simply has no basis in fact, according to Mr. DeMougeot, since 59 nations have adopted a national compulsory system of State payment for medical care and none has abandoned it, this argument hardly holds. And he points out the United States is the only major nation in the world without such a national plan.

So now the arguments most frequently used by the AMA lobby have been shown to be both specious and demagogic.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I turn to the AMA News of September 4, 1961, under the business and finance section where physicians are shown how to get a tax break. There are Federal income tax advantages to the physician and his family which he should consider in deciding whether to have a member of his immediate family work for him in his business, the article points out.

Parenthetically I point out that the AMA's opposition to having physicians covered by social security is well known. But this article in the AMA News, also an official publication, boldly suggests that a doctor pay $10 a week to his mother for straightening up his office. He could then deduct 3 percent from her wages and send it along with a matching 3 percent as employer to the Social Security Administration. This would be employment creditable toward social security benefits for the mother and, happily, the article goes on, the physician would have a business deduction.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I really despair for the health of the medical profession when I encounter such items as I have been reading.

When the AMA is driven, as it is being driven, from trench to trench and finally takes up a stand in its final redoubt I have a feeling its final proposal to offset a needed comprehensive medical insurance plan will be on the order of providing medical and hospitalization care for Americans on condition they work off the bill by doing weekend ward duty in hospitals—carry trays, handle bedpans, work in the kitchen and the laundry. On past performances, I think the AMA is capable of making such a proposal. There are thousands of devoted and able physicians in the United States, among them my personal physician. But I suggest that the AMA is unrepresentative of their thinking.

JAY N. "DING" DARLING

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the curtain has been drawn on the life of Jay N. "Ding" Darling, one of Iowa's most distinguished citizens and long one of the Nation's favorite cartoonists as well as a powerful leader in the battle for conservation of our natural resources.

Mr. Darling died of a heart ailment in Des Moines last Monday at the age of 85.

Twice, in 1924 and again in 1943, Mr. Darling won the Pulitzer Prize. In 1934, in a poll conducted by Editor and Publisher, the Nation's leading editors named him the best newspaper cartoonist.

Alarmed by the critical drop in the population of migratory waterfowl as a result of the drought years, Mr. Darling left his drawing board in 1935 to take an $8,000 job as Chief of the Biological Survey in Washington and launched the successful campaign that stands today as a monument to his efforts. For this and his other great contributions to the conservation of natural resources he was made honorary life president of the National Wildlife Federation.

In 1949, after a 48-year career, "Ding" Darling laid aside his eloquent pen. He used it once again in 1958 when, seriously ill, he drew a last cartoon and instructed his secretary to keep it hidden until after his death. It was a farewell to his legion of friends and admirers. It was published in the Des Moines Register last Tuesday morning.

Mr. Speaker, I join today in mourning the death of this distinguished American, and personal friend.

"PHANTOM ACRES" PAYMENTS

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, Secretary Freeman's flimsy explanation of phantom acres payments in the 1961 feed grains program makes it apparent he will try to perpetuate this $150 million annual waste in the 1962 and future programs.

In a speech to a regional meeting of the USDA Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service February 8, 1962, in Atlanta, Ga., Mr. Freeman said:

> The facts should phantomize the phantom acres into thin air—the same thin, hot air from which they came.

Actually, Mr. Freeman's facts bring the phantom acres down to earth with a $150 million thud that is loud enough for all taxpayers to hear. The responsibility and the blame rests with Mr. Freeman, not with the farmers. It is obvious he will do nothing to stop this waste. The 1962 feed grains signup has already started. Congress itself must take the initiative.

Under the 1961 program, Mr. Freeman was supposed to base payments on average 1959–60 plantings. In corn, for example, the average was 82.2 million acres, according to official USDA reports. Instead he based payments on 87 million acres—up 5 million acres.

At an average of $30 an acre these cost $150 million.

Why the difference? Why does the USDA use two different figures to represent 1959–60 average planting? Here is Mr. Freeman's explanation, a full transcript from the test prepared for his February 8 speech in Atlanta:

> Another catchy phrase used to deride the efforts of more than a million farmers taking part in the program has been phantom acres.
>
> At the risk of using too many figures, I want to be very specific—this is a charge that needs to be nailed.
>
> A check of feed grain acreage on participating and nonparticipating farms reveals the true facts.
>
> While participants were reducing their acreage even more than diversions under the program, acreage of feed grains on nonparticipating farms was increasing. The check shows that participants underplanted their permitted acreage by 6.2 million. Nonparticipants increased their acreages by 6.7 million.
>
> Let's take this further. While the law based acreages to be used in the program on average 1959–60 plantings, it also wisely recognized the need to make adjustments for abnormalities and inequitable situations that might exist among farms. As a result, base acreages used under the program were higher than the simple 1959–60 planted-acre averages. But participants underplanted their actual 1959–60 acreage by 2 million acres more than the 25.2 million acres for which they received diversion payments.
>
> A part of the effort of participating farmers to stop unneeded production was nullified by acreage increases on other farms. The increases by noncooperators could not be

> known at the time the critics were trying to show discrepancies in program figures and to create their phantom acres. Now, however, the facts should phantomize the phantom acres into thin air—the same thin, hot air from which they came.

Mr. Freeman was on target when he alluded to the risk of using too many figures. He used too many which were meaningless. As a matter of fact, none of the figures he used has anything to do with phantom acres.

His figures relate to planting in 1961. Phantom acres relate solely to the 1959–60 average plantings.

What farmers did, or did not do, in 1961 cannot change the record for 1959–60.

Mr. Freeman takes note of the fact that participants underplanted their permitted acreages by 6.2 million. This is misleading.

It fails to mention that farmers were free to use these acres for other crops, that such underplanting is normal in all similar programs, and that the figure relates to 1961, not the period in question.

He mentions nonparticipants. Are farmers who did not sign up but increased their plantings by 6.7 million acres to blame for phantom acres? Of course not. Here again, the figure relates to 1961, not 1959–60.

Mr. Freeman states that participants underplanted their actual 1959–60 acres by 2 million acres for which they received diversion payments.

This is a back handed way of saying that farmers claimed underplanting 27.2 million acres but were paid for only 25.2 million acres.

One can reasonably conclude that Mr. Freeman thus eliminated 2 million phantom acres. Why? What's the difference between one phantom acre and another? Why pay for 5 million of them but deny payment for 2 million others?

If all phantom acres consist of nothing but thin, hot air, as Mr. Freeman says, why play favorites?

In the final paragraph of Mr. Freeman's defense, he blames phantom acres on increased planting by noncooperators. Once again, this is irrelevant, having no bearing on 1959–60.

Mr. Freeman's one and only statement which relates directly to phantom acres is this:

> While the law based acres to be used in the program on average 1959–60 plantings, it also wisely recognized the need to make adjustments for abnormalities and inequitable situations that might exist among farms.

In other words, in any program of this type, room is needed for corrections and appeals. Otherwise, inequities will occur. This is certainly fair and reasonable, but in all previous programs—tobacco, rice, cotton, wheat—this room for correction and appeals has been provided within the total acreage base.

In cotton, for example, USDA administrators reserve about 5 percent of the total acreage base to provide room to adjust for inequities among farms.

In drafting and voting for the 1961 feed grains bill, Congress confidently expected that the same administrative standard would apply here.

Nothing in the bill's legislative history gave a hint of what was to follow.

After enactment of the bill, the Department of Agriculture announced—Federal Register, June 15, 1961, page 5358:

> In those counties where the Department of Agriculture has established the average adjusted corn and grain sorghum acreage produced in the county in 1959 and 1960 for use as a guide in determining the feed grain base for farms in the county, the total feed grain bases for all farms in the county, excluding any increase in farm feed grain base resulting from corrections, requests for reconsideration or appeals, pursuant to the provisions of paragraph 495.13 to the extent practicable, shall not exceed 105 percent of such average adjusted corn and grain sorghum acreage.

This was a clear invitation to 5 percent exaggeration in the 1959–60 planted-acre average, and it also opened the door so the acreage needed for corrections and appeals could be added to the 5-percent boost.

In corn alone, the 5-percent leeway produced 4,100,000 of the phantom acres. Allowances for corrections and appeals accounts for the rest.

The mystery of the phantom acres is solved. They are the result of an unprecedented regulatory interpretation.

This interpretation wasted $150 million last year and will do the same needlessly this year unless my bill, H.R. 9329—to prohibit payment for phantom acres—is passed.

For an account of previous efforts to stop payments for phantom acres, refer to page 563, Congressional Record, January 18, 1962.

A PLEDGE OF PEACE AND LIBERTY

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend by remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for this opportunity to describe a most unusual ceremony, possibly the only time it has ever occurred in the United States, which took place at Brant Beach, Ocean County, N.J., on January 25, 1962, when a French flag which was found washed up on the ocean shore was identified and delivered to the French Consul for return to its owners.

This flag which belonged to a group of French Army recruits drafted in 1922 was found by two boys, Vincent Scali and James Walzak, both 11 years old and members of the fifth grade in the Long Beach Island Consolidated School, washed up on the beach and they took it home with them. Later they brought it to school and showed it to their French teacher, Miss Joan Singley. Inscribed on the flag were the words "Honneur Aux Conscrits—RF—Classe 1922—Blainville-Sur l'Eau," and Miss Singley promptly wrote to the mayor of Blainville-Sur l'Eau asking for any information he could give concerning it. Under date of October 27, 1961, she received a reply, as follows:

> BLAINVILLE-SUR-L'EAU,
> MEURTHE AND MOSELLE,
> *October 27, 1961.*
>
> MISS JOAN M. SINGLEY,
> *French teacher, Long Beach Island grade school, Ship Bottom, N.J.*
>
> DEAR MISS: I have the honor to inform you of the receipt of your letter of October 20, 1961, which didn't fail to surprise me. Here are the answers to your questions.
>
> In France the custom is that young men having reached their 20th birthday, undergo a collective medical examination called the council of review which declares them fit or unfit for military service. These young men join together and make up a group called the class (nothing in common with school).
>
> They all contribute and buy a flag with the lettering which you have seen. The care of the flag is confided, by drawing lots, to one of the draftees.
>
> For the class of 1922, the young man chosen was killed in 1944 during the last war. His widow must have married again, an American soldier with whom she left for America. Most likely the flag was part of their baggage and was separated from it when it was no longer found useful. This is I believe the most reasonable solution to explain this long trip.
>
> The letters RF are the initials of the Republic of France.
>
> The golden metallic fringe decorates most of the French official flags.
>
> I will add that the flag of the draftees is present at all the presentations to which they are called to take part; national holidays, parades, visits to military graves, etc.
>
> Also, they call conscripts (draftees) all the young boys called to military service at the age of 20.
>
> The class of 1922 were very surprised to find their dear flag so far away. All their attempts to find it had been in vain. They thank you sincerely for having respectfully taking care of their flag.
>
> It obviously would be happy for them to see the flag travel again to Blainville before 1962 to celerate their 60-year birthdays.
>
> Would you agree to send it to us? Will you let me know the price of the postage? I will send it to you so that you can proceed with the mailing.
>
> Also thanks to your two students who will long be remembered for their discovery.
>
> It's a pleasure to read your letter, and with my repeated thanks—please accept, sir, my most respectful greetings.
>
> MR. AUDIBERT,
> *Mayor of Blainville-Sur-L'Eau, Counselor General.*

Under date of November 17, 1961, I received a letter from Frank H. Klein, executive director of the Long Beach Island Board of Trade, and quote from it as follows:

> I am enclosing herewith two copies of a letter received from the mayor of Blainville-Sur-L'Eau, France. As you will note, one copy is in French, the other an English translation.
>
> This letter is a reply to a communication sent by our French teacher, here at the Long Beach Island Consolidated Elementary School, in reference to a flag found by two students, on the bayfront in Ship Bottom, N.J.
>
> As you will note from the tone of the mayor's letter, the flag seems to be of quite some sentimental value to the men of his community and they are anxious for its return.

In my humble opinion the return of the flag with appropriate ceremonies might well be the means of building another bridge of friendship between the people of France and the United States down at the grassroots level. It would most certainly be a fine experience for our future citizens here at the local school.

My thought at this point would be for us to have a luncheon here at Wida's in Brant Beach, at which some person representing the French Embassy would receive the flag and promise to return it to its rightful owners. Or perhaps the presentation could be made in the school auditorium with lunch either before or after the ceremony.

I am sending the mayor's letter in the original French for your use in interesting the Embassy in the matter, should you think the project worthwhile.

On the receipt of this letter I contacted the French Embassy here in Washington sending them copies of the letter from the mayor of Blainville-Sur-l'Eau and arrangements were completed for the delivery of the flag to M. Pierre Gabard, consul of France in Philadelphia, and the date selected was January 25, 1962.

The ceremonies were started at a luncheon held at Wida's Restaurant in Brant Beach on the occasion of the weekly meeting of the Rotary Club of Long Beach Island and I quote from the official minutes of that meeting as follows:

FEBRUARY 1, 1962.

As predicted last Thursday was quite a day, one of the most heartwarming in many a moon. The sun shone from a cloudless sky, there was no wind, the temperature hit 50° F., and many of the flags that had been sold for our scholarship fund flew along the boulevard. And because two bright lads from the Ship Bottom Grade School had found a French flag on our beach and taken it to Miss Joan Singley, their teacher—

1. Representative JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS drove up from Washington because, as he stated, the finding of the French flag seemed to him "an act of God."

2. French Consul M. Pierre Gabard came from Philadelphia to receive his flag and return it to its owners in France.

3. Freeholder A. Paul King came from Toms River to enjoy the occasion.

4. Reporters and photographers came from four newspapers to record it all.

Representative JIM AUCHINCLOSS told us the episode would be read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to remain there forever as a bright moment in international friendship. To honor the occasion he brought with him to present to the grade school the national flag which had flown over the Capitol in Washington the previous day.

Miss Joan Singley told the story of how the flag had been found and brought to her by the two boys.

Monsieur Gabard told us of the flag's significance. It belonged to a class of conscripts of the year 1922. It had been sought by the survivors of the class to be displayed, as was customary, at a reunion on their 60th birthdays.

Dick Van Dyk presented each of the two lads with a $2 bill.

Sea Dog Tom Bossert suggested our Rotary banner accompany the flag to France. All agreed.

For this day Frank Klein must be thanked. He perceived this opportunity to advance international understanding. He brought it into being. So, Frank, thanks from all hands.

After the luncheon the meeting was continued in the gymnasium of the Long Beach Island Consolidated School and I include herewith an article appearing in the Asbury Park Press on January 26:

LONG BEACH TOWNSHIP.

The ties between the United States and France that have existed since the American Revolution were strengthened yesterday by an auditorium of grammar school children, two young boys, a French teacher, and the French consul in Philadelphia.

The story started several months ago when the two boys, Vincent Scali and James Walzak, both 11 and both fifth graders at the Long Beach Island Consolidated School, were walking along the Barnegat Bay beach.

Vincent and James spotted a bag floating in the water. They recovered it and found inside a flag with some French words on it.

They knew it was French because they studied the language in Miss Joan Singley's class at school. They took the flag to her. She traced it to the 1922 class of military draftees from Blainville Sur L'Eau, a town in France.

FLAG RETURNED

Yesterday, in a ceremony at the school, the flag was given to Pierre Gabard, French consul at Philadelphia, for return to Blainville Sur L'Eau.

The auditorium of children made their contribution at the ceremony. They opened the program by singing the "Star Spangled Banner" and the "Marseillaise," the French national anthem, and closed it by singing two French children's songs they had learned in class.

M. Gabard, obviously moved, grasped Miss Singley warmly by the hand at the program's end. He had told the auditorium of children, teachers, parents, and members of the Long Beach Island Rotary Club:

"I know these two young men are good citizens because they have respect for the flag of another country. In the name of France and the mayor of Blainville Sur L'Eau, I thank you from the bottom of my heart."

Representative JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS, Republican, of New Jersey, who had arranged with the French Embassy in Washington for M. Gabard's appearance, told the audience the return of the flag was nourishment "to that friendly feeling that has always existed between this great country and France."

Mr AUCHINCLOSS then presented School Principal Warren Hickman with the U.S. flag which flew over the Capitol Building in Washington on Wednesday.

"You can well cherish the meaning of this day for a long, long time," Mr. AUCHINCLOSS told the children.

Earlier in the day, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS had addressed a Rotary Club luncheon at Wida's Brant Beach Hotel.

How the flag came to be in Barnegat Bay is not certain, but Miss Singley learned this much from Mayor Audibert of Blainville-Sur-l'Eau:

Each class of draftees has its own flag to be used in memorials and other ceremonies. A guardian is picked to keep the flag. The guardian for this particular flag was killed in action during World War II.

Some American soldiers were billeted in the guardian's home after France's liberation, and the mayor guessed the flag might have been presented to one of them as a souvenir. In any event, he wrote, the men of the class—all of whom will be 60 years old this year—were pleased to hear their flag had been found and would be returned to them.

M. Gabard went away with another flag, too. Ralph H. Reynolds, Rotary Club president, presented him with one of the club's own flags.

At the school ceremony, Vincent told of finding the flag and James recited its history.

Vincent is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Scali, 510 Central Avenue, Ship Bottom. James is the son of Mrs. Pauline Walzak, 8 West 64th Street, Ship Bottom.

I conclude these remarks with the translation of a letter dated February 8, 1962, I have received from M. Gabard as follows:

FRENCH CONSULATE,
Philadelphia, February 8, 1962.

Hon. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS,
Member of the House of Representatives, Congress of the United States, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. AUCHINCLOSS: I permit myself to write you this letter in French because I know all the interest you have in my country and her language; you proved it at Brant Beach and Ship Bottom.

I was very honored to make your acquaintance on the occasion of the simple ceremony—but how moving—of returning to France a tricolor flag belonging to the conscripts who are now 60 years old.

As you very well said, our two Republics have already been sisters for a long time, and for a long time, as I said, I have been acquainted with American good will. It will remain for us all an important pledge of peace and liberty.

I thank you infinitely for the $10 bill, which I have sent in the form of a check to the mayor of Blainville-sur-l'Eau. I am certain that the old men of the class of 1922 will appreciate your generosity and your amiability toward them.

In the hope of receiving you soon at Philadelphia, I pray you to accept the assurance of my high consideration.

PIERRE GABARD,
Consul of France.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means have until midnight Friday, February 16, to file a report on H.R. 10050.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

SENIOR CITIZENS MONTH

Mr. ST. GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST. GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great personal pleasure and satisfaction that I offer this joint resolution to the House.

As one of the sponsors of the several bills to provide medical care for senior citizens, I am particularly concerned with the pressing need for action in this area. Over 50 million Americans are either approaching or included in senior citizen status. Medical advances in recent years have made it possible for the average person to expect to live to a ripe old age. In view of this fact, we are now faced with the distinct obligation to explore ways and means of helping to insure that these additional years will be useful, productive, and healthful.

Our older citizens still have an invaluable contribution to make to our national well-being. The enormous potential which they possess as a group must be put to good use. These individuals deserve to be recognized as needed and worthwhile on the domestic scene as face the American people in this generation.

The needs of our senior citizens are great. Older men and women are frequently discriminated against solely because of their age. For this reason, and by reason of the financial inability which often accompanies the later years of a person's life, many of them are forced to live in substandard housing and to suffer the ill effects which this condition invariably brings.

Employment opportunities for the elderly—even those in good health—are extremely limited. It is ironic that medical science has prolonged human life only to create the problem of chronic unemployment for the older age group. Well-planned vocational retraining and a positive approach to the problem of job placement should be of the highest priority.

While the previously mentioned problems are of great importance, the most pressing issue and the area in which there is the greatest need is that of medical care for senior citizens. I shall not attempt to review the desirable features of this legislation or to argue its merits. These things have been done by me and other Members before both the Ways and Means Committee and on the floor of the House. I would like only to remind the House of the great need which exists—here and now—for the prompt enactment of this program. We should not and must not fail in this important task. It is my sincere hope that medical care for senior citizens will become a reality before the end of this session of Congress.

I would also like to make special mention of the fact that my distinguished colleague from Rhode Island, JOHN E. FOGARTY, has introduced an important bill for the benefit of our older citizens, H.R. 10014. This farsighted measure would create a U.S. Commission on Aging and authorize Federal grants to assist in the development of programs which will benefit older persons. In my opinion, this is excellent legislation, and it deserves favorable consideration by the House.

May this resolution authorizing the designation of the month of May as Senior Citizens Month remind all our people of our obligations to the senior citizens of our country which, in effect, are obligations to ourselves and future generations as well.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

The **SPEAKER**. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. **FLOOD**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and to include appropriate material.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. **FLOOD**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter on the subject of my special order.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. **FLOOD**. Mr. Speaker, it is a distinct honor to be asked to head such a program as this one in celebration of the 44th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day. I am both proud and gratified to take part in it. To do so is to be identified with the finest motives of mankind. For the Lithuanian tradition is one which from antiquity has been marked by courage, devotion to ideals, development of civilizing influences, respect for one's fellowman, and the pursuit of liberty.

It is the mark of a great people, of great strength of character individually and collectively, that the Lithuanians have been able to emerge from the vicissitudes of centuries as a people distinct in their identity, determined in their preservation of high standards, undaunted in their faith in the future, and indomitable in their quest for freedom. Had it not been for such fortitude, such perseverance in the face of odds, the maintenance of high values, and such insistence upon liberty of thought, the Lithuanian people might long since have succumbed to the inundations of foreign forces to which they have been subjected over and over again in the course of their long history.

The present deplorable state of political dominance of Lithuania by the Soviet Union is by no means a hopeless situation. If we but look at the past record of these indomitable people, we can look to the future with hope and confidence. For theirs is a history of repeated emergence from the onslaught of their enemies, and an emergence not as a cowed and beaten people, but as proud Lithuanians unconquered in spirit and undivided, despite the temporary plight of their mother country.

More than once has the nation of Lithuania occupied an important place on the map of Europe. Though the independence which we honor today dates from 44 years ago, when the Lithuania of the 20th century became a democratic republic after World War I, that day in 1918 was not just a beginning. It was a rebirth of a nation.

Lithuanian history is a long and splendid one, though troubled. The Lithuanian people were known to Tacitus, who wrote of them in the first century of the Christian era. They can trace their identity through their language, which like only the Basque, in continued purity predates that of all of the other countries of Europe. Lithuania as a nation dates from the Middle Ages, when it was the dominant state of central and eastern Europe. History records it as divided into many principalities in the year 1009. But by the 14th century it was an entity stretching from the Baltic to the Black Sea. In the year 1386, through the marriage of the thrones, Lithuania and Poland were joined together. Two centuries later these countries were officially joined by parliamentary action. The union lasted until 1795, though Poland twice suffered partition before then.

The development of Lithuania and Poland was far superior to that of the rest of eastern Europe politically, socially, and economically. Lithuania was one of the first countries of Europe to embrace Christianity. Respect for the individual, a corollary of Christianity, developed early, and the Lithuanians enjoyed more human freedoms than did their neighbors in countries on either side of them. In the general development of European civilization their part was an important one.

Because of their powerful independence and their superior culture they were able to protect Europe from the eastern hordes of Mongols and Tartars, at the same time withstanding for centuries the German drive to the east.

It was in 1795, at the time of the third partition of Poland that Lithuania fell prey to the domination of Russia. Repeated attempts to throw off the Russian yoke were unsuccessful during the 19th century. But equally unsuccessful were the tsarist efforts at russification of the Lithuanians. After a century of vain attempts to repress the Lithuanian spirit, to replace the Lithuanian language and culture with that of Russia, the policy was abandoned in 1905. While Lithuania remained politically a part of Russia until the Russian revolution of 1917 and the emergence of the new states after World War I under the policy of self-determination of peoples, the heart of Lithuania had never been conquered.

Nor was it conquered when invasion from Germany followed upon Russian withdrawal. Nor yet when, with Germany conquered, the Red army of Russia returned to install a Communist government. When political independence was finally a reality, it was to remain undisturbed only until World War II, when first German and then Russian invasions were renewed.

Despite, though, all ravaging and occupation of their country, the Lithuanians have never been conquered in spirit. They are an intrepid and indomitable people, and their independence will survive as it has for a thousand years survived. Lithuanian Independence Day is a day of triumph and of promise.

At this point, I take pleasure in inserting a series of gubernatorial proclamations designating February 16 as Lithuania's Independence Day.

The aforementioned proclamations follow:

GUBERNATORIAL PROCLAMATIONS DESIGNATING FEBRUARY 16 AS LITHUANIA'S INDEPENDENCE DAY

STATE OF CONNECTICUT

Persons of Lithuanian birth or decent, living in the United States and elsewhere in the free world, are leaders of the effort to liberate Lithuania from the Communist occupation it has endured for more than 20 years.

To these people, February 16 is a date of great significance since it was on that day in 1918 that Lithuania became an independent state, and remained so until it and other Baltic nations fell under Soviet domination.

To call attention to the desire of the Lithuanian people themselves supported by all lovers of freedom everywhere, for a return to return to their independent status, Friday, February 16, is designated as Lithuanian Independence Day.

May the observance of this event inspire us to turn an attentive and sympathetic ear to the appeal for justice which comes from within Lithuania.

May the time be near at hand when Lithuanian Independence Day can be celebrated openly in that country itself, as it is here by those who recall the days when Lithuania was free.

STATE OF ILLINOIS

Whereas the 44th anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Lithuania occurs on February 16, 1962; and

Whereas this 44th anniversary will be observed by Americans of Lithuanian birth and ancestry and friends of Lithuania everywhere with suitable commemorative exercises; and

Whereas it is altogether fitting and proper to accord official recognition to this anniversary in the name of free peoples everywhere: Now, therefore,

I, Otto Kerner, Governor of the State of Illinois do hereby proclaim February 16, 1962, as Republic of Lithuania Day throughout Illinois and request the appropriate observance of the occasion.

STATE OF MARYLAND

Whereas the people of Lithuania were deported, enslaved and mass-murdered by Communists; and

Whereas their religion was repressed and their freedom obliterated; and

Whereas a liberty-loving nation is not easily shackled, particularly when that nation has known the experience of freedom; and

Whereas the plight of Lithuania is known to all of us, and we cannot, as Americans, take a casual view of the loss of freedom of any nation; and

Whereas those whose ancestors came from Lithuania, and their friends of all national origins, join them in their hopes and prayers for liberation from communism: Now, therefore,

I, J. Millard Tawes, Governor of the State of Maryland, do hereby proclaim February 16, 1962, the 44th birthday of Lithuania's independence, as Republic of Lithuania Day in this State, in recognition of the faith and courage of the Lithuanian people and in support of all men who fight for freedom.

STATE OF MASSACHUSETTS

Whereas Friday, February 16, 1962, marks the 43d anniversary of the independence of Lithuania, that once free and proud nation now humbled under the yoke of Soviet oppression; and

Whereas from 1918 until 1940 this small nation displayed the exemplary characteristics of maturity, political stability, and social growth; and

Whereas despite the invasion and annexation of Lithuania in 1940 by Russia, the people of this indomitable country retain their fervent hope that liberty will once again be restored to them; and

Whereas the United States has refused to recognize the annexation of Lithuania and deplores the continued suppression of human rights by the Soviet Government; and

Whereas the citizens of Lithuania should be given inspiration to carry on their fight for liberty and justice: Now, therefore,

I, John A. Volpe, Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, do hereby proclaim February 16, 1962, as Republic of Lithuania Day and urge the citizens of Massachusetts to pay tribute to the oppressed people of this brave nation.

STATE OF NEBRASKA—PROCLAMATION

Whereas the Lithuanian Council in Vilnius on February 16, 1918, proclaimed to the world in the oldest living European language the rebirth of a free and independent Lithuania after 120 years of Russian occupation; and

Whereas Lithuania, during a score of years of independence, demonstrated her ability to advance, grow, and prosper, and to become an active member of the League of Nations; and

Whereas the people of Lithuanian origin or descent have helped this country to establish its independence and then contributed their share in the development of its natural resources, industry, and life; and

Whereas Lithuania, with her sister Republics of Latvia and Estonia, and first to disappear behind the Iron Curtain and to suffer and expose the aggressive imperialism of Soviet Russia and thus to apprise the world of the aims and techniques of communism; and

Whereas this country has demonstrated our sincere devotion to freedom, liberty, and justice by not recognizing the Communist occupation of Lithuania: Now, therefore,

I, Frank B. Morrison, Governor of the State of Nebraska, do hereby proclaim Friday, February 16, 1962, as Lithuanian Independence Day throughout Nebraska and commend the day and its significance to the patriotic consideration of all our citizens.

STATE OF NEW YORK

The inhabitants of Lithuania are a proud people with a history of many centuries of independence. Toward the close of the 18th century their land was brought under complete domination of the Russian czars. During more than 120 years of Muscovite misrule, the Lithuanians never accepted their defeat as final, never gave up their struggle.

With the collapse of the German armies at the end of the First World War the Lithuanian people seized the opportunity and their National Council, on February 16, 1918, issued a declaration calling for the reestablishment of Lithuania on a democratic basis. Heroically they fought off an attempt by the Bolshevik government to reestablish the Russian yoke.

During the country's brief period of freedom, the Lithuanians maintained a government based upon equality of opportunity for all, a government which won the respect of the entire world.

This happy period of freedom ended in 1940 when by force of arms and under conditions of characteristic brutality, the Soviet suppressed Lithuania and forced it into the Soviet bloc.

We are fortunate in having among our citizenry, many Americans of Lithuanian origin. They are among our most valued neighbors and true friends. It is fitting that we join them in expressing the hope that the people of the land of their fathers may once again be freed of their bondage: Now, therefore,

I, Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York, do hereby proclaim February 16, 1962, as Lithuanian Independence Day in New York State.

STATE OF OHIO

Whereas February 16, 1962, will be the 44th anniversary of the proclamation of a free and independent Lithuania;

Whereas Lithuanians all over the world are celebrating February 16, 1962, as a memorial to a once free Lithuania; and

Whereas Lithuanians in America are observing this date by reasserting their belief in freedom for all people and reaffirming their conviction that tyranny and despotism cannot long prevail where we believe in and courageously struggle for liberty; and

Whereas Americans, citizens of a free Republic, have a warm and instinctive sympathy for the aspirations of freedom-loving people in other lands; and

Whereas citizens of Ohio of Lithuanian origin and descent have made a fine and substantial contribution to the growth and welfare of the State of Ohio: Now, therefore,

I, Michael V. DiSalle, Governor of the State of Ohio, do hereby proclaim February 16, 1962, as Lithuanian Day in Ohio and urge all the citizens of this State to join with those of Lithuanian descent in appropriately and suitably noting this date and the great significance which it has, especially for the Lithuanian people.

STATE OF OREGON

February 16, 1962, will be observed in many areas of the free world as the 44th anniversary of the restoration of the independence of Lithuania. Although presently this once-free country is behind the Iron Curtain of totalitarianism, I would hope that throughout America those citizens of Lithuanian descent and others who are concerned with the cause of freedom throughout the world may, through appropriate observances, recognize the continued need for support of those liberty-loving people of Lithuania who are prevented from observing this national holiday in their Soviet-occupied homeland.

STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA

Whereas on February 16, 1918, the council of Lithuania formally declared Lithuania a free and independent Republic; and

Whereas Communist Soviet Russia, despite treaties and agreements, has suppressed and forcibly violated the political and territorial liberties of Lithuania and neighboring Baltic nations; and

Whereas Lithuanians and their neighbors were scattered and destroyed by murder, exile, and imprisonment in concentration camps; and

Whereas there is the fervent hope that Lithuania will regain her liberties and rights as a member of the world community. Americans of Lithuanian descent commemorate the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania as a free and independent state; and

Whereas Pennsylvanians of Lithuanian descent have contributed in many ways to the welfare and strength of this Commonwealth: Now, therefore,

I, David L. Lawrence, Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, do hereby proclaim February 16, 1962, as Lithuanian Independence Day, and I call upon all citizens of the Commonwealth to join with our citizens of Lithuanian descent in the observation of this important anniversary and to mark the occasion with appropriate ceremonies.

STATE OF TEXAS

February 16, 1962, will mark the 44th anniversary of the restoration of the independence of Lithuania.

While for the last 22 years this nation has been under the domination of Soviet Russia, the nearly 1 million freedom-loving Lithuanian-Americans annually observe this day when Lithuania obtained its freedom in World War I.

It is appropriate that Texans of Lithuanian descent be joined by their fellow citizens in marking this observance and continuing to work for freedom in Lithuania and other independent countries which have fallen under the heel of Russian communism: Therefore,

I, as Governor of Texas, do hereby designate February 16, 1962, as Lithuania Independence Day in Texas.

STATE OF WISCONSIN

Whereas the 16th of February marks the 44th anniversary of the restoration of independence to the more than 700-year-old Lithuanian state; and

Whereas although the Lithuanian nation has been under the oppressive tyrannical rule of Communist Russia since 1940, the love of liberty and independence continues to burn brightly in the hearts of Lithuanian people; and

Whereas all the people of Wisconsin and the Nation are in deep sympathy with the plight of this oppressed country: Now, therefore,

I, Gaylord A. Nelson, Governor of the State of Wisconsin, do hereby proclaim February 16, 1962, as Lithuanian Day and pay tribute to the heroic Lithuanian people who have struggled against so many odds for the peace and freedom of their beloved country.

STATEMENT BY GOVERNOR OF NORTH DAKOTA

We are proud to observe with you Lithuania's Independence Day. We certainly hope that this observance will be successful throughout the country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN], who chaired the famous Katyn Massacre Committee of several years ago, upon which I had the honor of serving. We investigated here and all over Europe the massacre by the Communist Russians of thousands of Polish officers during the war years; and thus we struck one of the great blows against this evil.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, today we are again commemorating the anniversary of Lithuanian independence which marks the 44th time which the people of Lithuania and their friends do honor to that eventful day in the history of that liberty-loving nation. The Lithuanian people for 800 years have at intervals enjoyed freedom and independence and regrettably on too many occasions have the people of Lithuania been compelled to live in virtual enslavement under control of more powerful neighboring nations.

During the 18th century, this nation was under the tyrannical yoke of Russian tyranny for over 120 years. But during this time against terrific odds, the Lithuanian people launched five major revolts against their conqueror. At each interval during its history when Lithuania enjoyed free government, its leader demonstrated outstanding leadership to rule and legislate for its freedom of all its people.

World War I brought about an international situation which gave Lithuania a long-awaited opportunity to proclaim to the world that it was a free and independent nation. For more than 20 years as a free country, no nation has ever demonstrated its capacity and ability for self-government more than Lithuania. Its civic leaders brought about long-needed land reformation, created and expanded industry, established an adequate transportation system, enacted social legislation, and an educational policy which could well be copied by other nations throughout the world. This great progress by a free nation continued up until World War II when Lithuania again became the victim of a powerful aggressor nation who succeeded in enslaving its people.

I have on former occasions spoken on the floor of this House outlining the infiltration duplicity and force used by the Communists to submerge Lithuania and I shall not repeat these sordid facts today. I can only say that the people of Lithuania will not be alone in their fight for freedom against the Soviet tyrants. Millions of others are today temporarily held under the yoke of Communist tyranny. They, along with the free nations of the world, including the United States, must keep up the fight not only to curtail the expanse of communism but to wipe its tyranny from the face of the earth and restore liberty and independence to the valiant and heroic people of Lithuania.

Back in the 83d Congress, I was a member of the special committee on investigating Communist aggression and particularly as it pertained to the Baltic States. That committee took the testimony of over 200 witnesses and recorded hundreds of exhibits at hearings held in the United States and Europe. This committee did major service over the period that it was holding hearings to expose to the world the unlawful and barbarous methods used by Stalin, Khrushchev, and other Soviet leaders in enslaving Lithuania and other small nations surrounding its borders.

Our colleague, Congressman DAN FLOOD, who has reserved this time today to honor the Lithuanian people was also a member of that committee and contributed major service to the successful findings exposing Communist aggression.

As a Member of the House Rules Committee during the last two sessions of Congress, I have fought within the committee to report favorably on the floor of the House the pending resolutions to create another special committee for the purpose of further exposing to the people of the world true facts, methods, purposes, and international crimes committed by the Communist leaders in their long ranged program to enslave the world under Communist tyranny. I do hope that we can get favorable action in this session of Congress on the creation of a Special Committee for Captive Nations. I have this week introduced House Concurrent Resolution 418, asking the Congress to condemn the false and oppressive persecution against all religions not only in Lithuania but in other satellite countries behind the Iron Curtain. Other Members have introduced similar resolutions and I do hope that we can get favorable action by the Congress on this concurrent resolution during the present session.

Mr. Speaker, I include a copy of House Concurrent Resolution 418 along with my remarks commemorating Lithuanian independence.

Whereas the atheistic governments of the Soviet Union and the captive nations of international communism have directed their forces toward the complete destruction of all religious worship and other liberties; and

Whereas the prosecution of Roman Catholic priests in January of 1962 by the Government of Lithuania represents the latest oppression of religion in the Communist bloc nations; and

Whereas the false charges upon which such prosecution is maintained may indicate a final program by the Government of Lithuania to eliminate the Catholic priesthood in Lithuania; and

Whereas the prosecution of Roman Catholic priests in Lithuania may demonstrate a growing campaign throughout the Communist bloc of severe persecution of all peoples who believe in God: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress condemns the false and oppressive prosecution of Roman Catholic priests by the Communist Government of Lithuania and the Communist persecution of religion everywhere behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. Speaker, along with other Members of Congress, I have cosponsored a concurrent resolution which I have this week introduced in Congress asking for the creation of a committee to investigate these various countries behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], with whom I have served in the 83d Congress as a member of the Committee on Communist Aggression, will agree with me, that it was the leaders of Lithuanian folks in this country who were responsible for the creation of that committee. Hearings were held not only in this country but throughout Europe, during which we took the testimony of some 250 witnesses. The publicity from the committee's hearings was sent to nations over the globe revealing some of the startling international crimes committed by Stalin, Khrushchev and other leaders of the Soviets in their efforts to enslave Lithuania and other nations. Although 8 or 9 years have now passed, the effects and results of the work of that committee have been valuable in informing millions throughout the world of the true tactics of communism.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] has appeared before the Rules Committee on a number of occasions, along with other Members, asking for the approval of a resolution to establish a Special Committee on Captive Nations. As a member of that committee, I have fought on behalf of those resolutions to get favorable action so that this Congress may be authorized to investigate the methods used by Communists in keeping the satellite nations enslaved. I hope that in this session of Congress the resolution of the gentleman from Pennsylvania will be acted on favorably by the Rules Committee. I shall make every effort to get favorable action by that committee so that we may establish a special committee to investigate the Communist enslavement of captive nations in this session of the Congress. The people of the world should know the history of Soviet aggression in the satellite nations, including Lithuania, and the methods used in keeping the people of Lithuania and other people under enslavement.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include a resolution.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. I am grateful to the gentleman from Indiana. He has recited well the history of our experiences in special investigations of committees of this House dealing with the Communist menace. I was especially pleased to hear him refer to my pending resolution now before the Committee on Rules calling for a special committee again for the investigation of the captive nations, which has struck a chord all throughout this Nation. I hope and pray with him that the Committee on Rules will see fit to report out this resolution so that this committee can be established once more and again show the world the weight of this body on this subject.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE], who has worked with me this session mainly to point out that this is a bipartisan approach or a nonpartisan approach, if you will, to the subject and who has helped me greatly in our efforts to create the Captive Nations Committee.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, at the outset I want to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] for his forthright statement here today on the 44th anniversary of Lithuanian independence. I also commend him for his tenacious fight through the years, not only for the enslaved people of Lithuania, but the millions of others who are trapped today behind the Iron Curtain. It certainly has been my privilege, for the short time I have been in the Congress, to work with the gentleman from Pennsylvania for legislation which would create a committee in the House—the Special Committee on the Captive Nations—to investigate the facts and the evidence of the peoples who are now enslaved behind the Iron Curtain. He certainly is to be encouraged and commended for his fight has been a long and a hard one. But it has been a consistent one, and I hope that within the near future it will bear fruit here in the House of Representatives.

I can think of no more fitting commemoration of this anniversary of Lithuanian independence than for this House to establish the Captive Nations Committee to give voice to the struggle that these valiant people have withstood in the past 22 years. Too long this gallant little nation has suffered the domination of the Soviet Union. Her people yearn to be out from under the yoke that has suppressed them at various stages over the centuries. They want to determine their own destiny through a government and a way of life of their own choosing. To say that they chose Soviet tyranny would be to make a mockery of the free elective process which is held so dear by those who have experienced it.

Though small geographically, Lithuania possesses a great cultural tradition totally independent of the monster to the east which seeks to eradicate all significant singular characteristics of its conquered nations. This is but one of the crimes committed by the Soviet Union when she brings down her reign of terror upon another nation.

Today, through our commemoration, we attempt to shine a ray of hope through the Iron Curtain into Lithuania. We proclaim our friendship for her people and our intention to one day see them free.

Mr. FLOOD. The gentleman from Massachusetts is, as usual, most kind, and I, of course, hope that he will get his wish.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MURPHY] who last year had the honor and the privilege of sharing this exercise.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] for giving me this opportunity to speak today in paying tribute to Lithuania. I also want to commend him for the many years that he has handled the Lithuanian hour in the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, it is a particular honor to take part in these exercises marking the 44th anniversary of Lithuanian independence. During the Middle Ages Lithuania was a great and powerful nation. She successfully turned back the invasions of Germans, Mongols, and Tartars. Finally, in 1795 she lost her freedom to czarist Russia. After that there were many attempts by the Lithuanians to throw off Russian domination, but they were tragically unsuccessful. After the third revolt, which took place in 1831, the czarist government initiated an attempt to replace Lithuanian language and culture with Russian. This merciless and repressive policy was intensified after still another revolt in 1863, but the Lithuanians refused to give in to the overwhelming power of the foreign dictator and remained faithful to their language, religion, and traditions. The policy of forceful russification was abandoned in 1905, and the Lithuanian refusal to accept the full weight of Russian rule remains an example for all peoples who are under the ruthless Russian dictatorship today.

In 1915 Lithuania was overrun by German armies, and Russian domination came to an end. The cost of the First World War to the Lithuanians was great, with first the retreating Russians and then the Germans seizing or destroying everything that could be of use. In 1917, in response to Lithuanian pressure, the German Government authorized a gathering of 200 Lithuanians to discuss the possibility of Lithuanian independence. On February 16, 1918, the council proclaimed an independent Lithuanian state based on democratic principles. The defeat of Germany, combined with Russian revolution, gave the tiny Lithuanian people an opportunity to fulfill its ancient yearning for real independence.

But the hopes of a long suffering people were not so easily fulfilled. Less than a year after the declaration of independence whose anniversary we are celebrating today, German troops evacuated the city of Vilnius and the Red army entered the city and installed a Communist government. In 1920 the Red army was driven out by the Polish Army led by Marshal Joseph Pilsudski and Lithuanian fighting units. Having no other alternative, Russia signed a peace treaty with Lithuania on July 12, 1920, recognizing it as an independent nation and pledging itself to renounce forever all rights of sovereignty.

But as is so often the fate of small countries the brute power of larger neighbors proves to weigh more on the scales of history than the rightful aspirations of the people, even when these aspirations are recognized in formal treaties. Antanas Smetona was elected the first President of Lithuania, and a permanent constitution was adopted on August 1, 1922, granting the Lithuanian people freedom of speech, assembly, religion, and communication. But independence lasted only until 1939, when the Lithuanian people became one of the first victims of both German and Soviet aggression. In the summer of 1940 the Soviet Union engineered the establishment of a friendly government, which under Soviet pressure duly requested the incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union, and the country was declared a constituent republic of the U.S.S.R. Lithuania was overrun by German invaders, and when the fortunes of war turned against the Nazis, Lithuanians returned not to independence but to Soviet domination.

Mr. Speaker, we know that deep in the heart of every native Lithuanian there is a passion for liberty and freedom which will never die. There is no earthly power that can forever hold in servitude a God-fearing people who are determined to overcome the will of the tyrants. On this 44th anniversary of Lithuanian independence I am proud to join with my fellow Americans of Lithuanian origin to salute the Lithuanian people everywhere.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN], who I am pleased to say has done as much as anyone in the many years that I have been here to join me and others in fighting this kind of cause with any weapon at hand against communism. He has served on several of the committees which we have heard named. I am pleased that he will speak today.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the gentleman and express my sincere congratulations and gratitude to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] who has taken this opportunity to enable his colleagues to have time to give their remarks and observations with reference to the 44th anniversary of the declaration of independence by that once great, free, and friendly independent nation of Lithuania.

Mr. Speaker, Lithuania as a nation had never, during the many centuries of independence and Lithuanian rule over vast areas of Eastern Europe, practiced intolerance or oppression in her relations with the nationalities inhabiting those areas.

Defending themselves and Europe from the Mongol invasion, and defending themselves from the Teutonic conquest, the Lithuanians had maintained magnificent traditions of neighborly collaboration with their friends and subjects on terms of cultural and political equality. The Lithuanian underground struggle for the freedom of the printed word in their own language, represented the unique 40-year epic which ended in a Lithuanian victory over the czardom in 1904. Following the pronouncement of the 14 points by President Wilson in January 1918, the Lithuanians were the first Eastern European nation to proclaim their independence within a month thereafter—on February 16, 1918. Their declaration of independence, promulgated in the ancient capital city of Vilnius, referred simply to "the recognized right of nations to self-determination," and the restoration of the Lithuanian state.

Independence was not won easily. Even while fighting battles against the encroaching enemies, the Lithuanians held free elections in 1920 and promulgated a democratic republican constitution.

Peace was signed with Russia at Moscow on July 12, 1920, and the Soviet Union renounced forever any and all claims to the Lithuanian people and soil. Lithuania soon thereafter was admitted in the League of Nations and scrupulously observed her international obligations. Her Government was active in every major international peace undertaking, such as the Kellogg-Briand Pact and the Litvinov definition of "aggression pact." Nonaggression and arbitration pacts with Germany and the Soviet Union seemed to guarantee Lithuania's independence. Her people were energetically raising their cultural standards and economic prosperity. By 1938 excellent relations were maintained with all the neighbors of Lithuania.

Lithuania did not deserve the cruel fate imposed upon her by the predatory action of Stalin and Hitler. Lithuania is perfectly justified in continuing to resist the Soviet Russian oppression and in demanding that the principles of the Atlantic Charter be honored. The Lithuanian people have earned liberation—and liberation must come ultimately.

I pay my humble tribute to the valiant fighters for freedom of Lithuania. I condemn the horrible crime of genocide being perpetrated by the Soviet Russian occupant in Lithuania and the Baltic States.

Again I wish to congratulate the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] for introducing his resolution to create a Captive Nations Committee. What is lacking in this world, I think, is candor and courage and fortitude to present to the world the fact that the Russian Communists, as well as the Chinese Communists, have by their predatory action deprived God-fearing people of the right of national self-determination.

We as a Nation were born in revolution and it is up to us, upon whom the mantle of world leadership has been placed, to present forthrightly to the world and to the United Nations the true facts of world Russian and world Chinese communism and imperialism, and to demand that the Russian and Chinese Communists live up to the agreements which they have made. It is about time that we in Congress set up this Committee on Captive Nations, the reasons for which have been so clearly presented by the distinguished and able gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Because other nations and because our representatives at the United Nations are unwilling to bring up resolutions demanding that the Russians abide by the commitments they have made in the United Nations, such as the General Assembly Resolutions on Hungary, I think it is up to the U.S. Congress to set up this Captive Nations Committee which will bring to light the terrible events that have occurred and are occurring behind the Russian and Bamboo Curtains. The world will then again know that the U.S. Congress stands behind Public Law 86–90 in its determination that all nations, large and small, must have the opportunity to exercise the right of self-determination.

Again, I congratulate the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I urge the Committee on Rules to approve the Flood resolution. This committee, if it is set up under the leadership of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], will be of inestimable value and assistance in the case of peace.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 44th anniversary of the independence of the Lithuanian nation which now suffers under the yoke of Soviet tyranny. We in the United States have never recognized the legality of this Soviet takeover and we look forward to the day when our country may resume diplomatic relations with a truly free and independent Lithuanian Government. It is fitting on this occasion as we commemorate the independence of a brave, though small, nation to ask ourselves what it is that distinguishes our American position toward the Russian satellite states. Why do we urge, at every opportunity that is offered us, that the satellite states of Eastern Europe be allowed the right of freedom and independence? It is because we recognize and uphold the essential dignity of the human being wherever that dignity is imperiled.

Man has an inherent and inviolable right to the choice between good and evil, truth and falsehood, right and wrong. When this right is destroyed, all our free civilization is endangered. National boundaries can no longer blind us to the dangers to ourselves when these rights are violated anywhere. It is for this reason that we call to mind today the search of the Lithuanian people for national independence and personal freedom.

The Lithuanian struggle for liberty has a long history. Five major revolutions took place during their 120 years under Russian domination from 1795 to 1915. The Napoleonic era saw Lithuanian volunteers unite to form nine regiments to fight for the liberation of their country. The defeat of Napoleon, however, brought an end to the provisional Lithuanian Government. Churches, schools, monasteries were abolished as Czar Nicholas decreed the policy of "Russification" that sought to turn Lithuania into a Russian province. Undaunted by previous failures, the Lithuanians again rebelled in 1863 and 1864, only to be crushed again with cruelty, Siberian exile, and forced emigration. In 1905, yet another revolt suffered the same fate.

Russian domination temporarily came to an end in 1915 when Lithuania was overrun by the German armies. And on February 16, 1918, the Lithuanian National Council adopted what may be called a declaration of independence. It called for the reestablishment of an independent Lithuania on a democratic basis, with Vilna as capital and the severance of all political ties which had linked it with other nations. In 1920 the new Soviet Communist government agreed by a treaty to recognize the "self-rule and independence of the State of Lithuania." This was the pledged word of the Soviet state that was broken when it suited the Communist dictators a few years later. Observe the words carefully. The treaty said that the Soviet Union renounces with good will all the sovereignty rights of Russia which it has had in regard to the Lithuanian nation or territory.

These events appeared to herald the birth of a long and glorious life of freedom for the Lithuanian people. Lithuania was admitted to the League of Nations in September 1921. Sweeping reforms were initiated within the country. At the head of the list was land reform, a subject of intense interest throughout the world today. Before World War I approximately 450 families in Lithuania owned 3½ million acres or 22 percent of the land. Within a few years the new democratic government of Lithuania had made possible the establishment of over 45,000 new farms and more than 200,000 persons had been provided with regular jobs and permanent homes through agrarian reform. The nation flourished. In the 10-year period before World War II grain production increased almost 100 percent and there was a 15-fold rise in the butter output of this rich farming country. Industry and transportation increased as Lithuania moved forward in freedom for the first time in more than a century. Progressive social legislation was introduced. The 8-hour day was instituted and provisions made for medical care of the rural people. Tremendous changes took place in the field of education. In 1920, for instance, there were only 9,000 students in high schools; by 1939 the number had doubled. Progress was even greater at the grammar school level where the number of students rose from less than 72,000 in 1920 to almost 300,000 in 1939. During this time Lithuania became a modern nation.

World War II shattered all this progress as Lithuania became Russia's first victim in the holocaust. By means of threats and intimidations Russia extracted a so-called 15-year mutual assistance pact from Lithuania. But this was merely a smokescreen for Soviet annexation. On June 15, 1940, which is a day of infamy in recent Lithuanian history, Soviet troops occupied the land. With the exception of the 3 years of German occupation during the war, the Soviets have been there ever since.

Americans may well be proud of their relations with this courageous occupied country. The U.S. Government and its citizens made important contributions to the attainment of Lithuanian independence. During the First World War the 14 points of President Woodrow Wilson, notably the principle of self-determination, brought inspiration to Lithuanians in their struggle for independence and facilitated their winning of independence. Americans of Lithuanian descent, who are fine Americans, have continued to furnish moral and material support to their friends and relatives at home. And I would emphasize again that the United States has steadfastly refused to recognize the Soviet annexation of Lithuania.

During World War II President Roosevelt met with Prime Minister Churchill of Great Britain and issued a declaration of policy which has continued to be a true expression of the principles upon which U.S. policy is based. In the Atlantic Charter we pledged "to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them." May we soon see the day when those words are realized in Lithuania.

Nationalism, the desire for freedom and independence, is one of the most potent forces in the world today. But we sometimes forget that nationalism is not restricted to the colonial areas of Africa and the Far East. The people of Lithuania also want and richly deserve their freedom. In fact, their passion for self-determination may be even stronger than that of the colonial peoples because there is no freedom in Lithuania today, whereas there is in most African colonies. Soviet Russia poses as the friend of nationalism and the enemy of imperialism. But her continued subjugation of Lithuania is a living refutation of these Soviet claims. Let Khrushchev give the Lithuanian people their long-denied freedom before he again sings the praises of anti-imperialism. It is well to remember this today when we pause to honor the birthday of Lithuanian independence. Lithuania must again become a free and independent nation dedicated to friendly progress and cooperation with the citizens of the free world. And we pray that the arrival of that day may not be prolonged. Until then let us help to nourish the defiant hope of liberty that burns within the hearts of the people of Lithuania.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join once again in this annual observance of the 44th anniversary of the restoration of Lithuania's independence as a sovereign nation. This independence was ruthlessly destroyed by the Soviet Union in 1940, and since that sad time, the people of Lithuania have been existing under the yoke of an aggressive foreign power which they detest and abhor.

In 1940, the Soviet Union repudiated its treaty obligations with this small and helpless neighbor, invaded the country by armed might and forcibly took over the government. It acted similarly against Lithuania's small neighbors, Estonia and Latvia.

Throughout these past 22 years, these little states have been exploited as mere colonial possessions of a ruthless Communist dictatorship, which is completely foreign to the ideals and aspirations of these defenseless peoples.

We observe this anniversary of Lithuania's former independence in order once again to bring to the world America's sympathy for these subjugated peoples behind the Iron Curtain. Let us ring out the message that we have not forgotten them and we shall never condone the deplorable action of the Soviet Union in denying these peoples the right of self-government, independence, and freedom.

As in other Communist-ruled nations in Eastern Europe, Lithuania and its small neighbors are ruled by the force of the Russian Army, their guns, their tanks and the secret police. They are the victims of intolerable oppression. They long for the day when they shall again live in the sunlight of liberty and independence.

The people of America join in their determination that this day will eventually come.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marks the 44th anniversary of the restoration of independence for Lithuania. On February 16, 1918, a congress of 200 Lithuanian delegates elected a 20-member council which proclaimed an independent Lithuanian state based on democratic principles.

Lithuanians were not fortunate enough, however, to be permitted to enjoy the blessings of freedom for any sustained period of time. Almost constantly since their proclamation of independence, the Lithuanian people have suffered under German occupation or the oppression of the Soviet Communist invaders. Under Communist domination, Lithuania has turned into a slave state, and suffered the loss of thousands of its citizens through execution or deportation to Siberia.

U.S. policy toward the freedom-loving peoples of Lithuania has never changed. The United States recognized the independent Lithuanian Government on July 27, 1922, and it has never recognized that nation's incorporation into the Soviet Union. It continues to maintain diplomatic relations with the representatives of the former independent Government, which has a Legation in Washington.

The words of the late U.S. Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, marking the commemoration of the 41st anniversary of the declarations of independence of the Baltic States, clearly reflect the attitude of this country today with regard to the method by which these countries were incorporated into the Soviet Union. The statement read:

> The United States was quick to denounce this aggression and refused to recognize the forced incorporation of the Baltic States into the U.S.S.R. Today, over 18 years later, we wish to assure the people of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia once more that they are not forgotten. The United States still aspires, in the words of the Atlantic Charter, "To see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them."

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, each year on February 16 we take cognizance of the anniversary of Lithuanian independence and today we are reminded that 44 years have passed since these brave people originally broke the shackles that held them in bondage.

Twenty-two years ago the Russian colossus moved in upon the Baltic States and gave a demonstration to a war-occupied world of how coldblooded a totalitarian power can be when bent on world domination. The brave Lithuanians, in particular, since that hour of aggression have given all liberty-loving people everywhere an example of adjustments that must be made in the face of naked tyranny and there is evidence, despite the proximity of the U.S.S.R., that the spark of liberty still burns brightly within the breasts of these courageous people.

Americans sitting in the comparative security of the Western Hemisphere are too prone to accept the Baltic situation as something that does not concern them. Indeed, the fact must always be taken into account that when liberty is denied any race of people anywhere it can quite possibly threaten our own peace and security. Among us today are many brave sons and daughters of Lithuania and their hearts bleed for their compatriots who are held in thralldom by a ruthless conqueror. In this day and age when we are taking a forthright stand against colonialism let us not lose a single opportunity to point to Russia as the greatest colonial power in history. And on this anniversary of Lithuanian independence let us pledge our military, economic, and moral resources to the eventual liberation of this great people so that they can once more assume their rightful place in the commonwealth of free nations.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, there is a particular appropriateness in the fact that the session of the House of Representatives began today with a prayer by a distinguished visitor, the Reverend Dr. Vaskas, instead of by our own Chaplain, for it set the theme for the speaking of what is on the minds of many of us today as we take notice of the 44th anniversary of the restoration of the independence of Lithuania, which took place on February 16, 1918.

The free world is sad because Lithuania today is not independent. But even while the Kremlin pretends to the world that Lithuania and her Baltic sister republic, Estonia, are full-fledged Socialist states in the Soviet Union, the whole world knows—and to Russia's disgrace—that these and other states that ought to be free and independent are mere colonies of the Russian colonial empire, the largest but most constricted colonial empire that exists in the modern world.

For as long as I have been a Member of the Congress, I have participated in observances such as this, in recognition of the anniversary of Lithuanian independence. Much time has passed, and unless one has the opportunity to be informed as to real happenings behind the Iron Curtain, we might feel that we have been contenting ourselves with uttering empty words about the hopes which we have for the liberation of the Lithuanian people and for their early arraignment as an independent nation in the family of free nations.

There are stirrings in Lithuania, difficult though it may be for the people even to maintain their language, their religion, their culture, and, indeed, in many instances, even life itself. Here in our own country there are stirrings too, that at the strategic time can have an important effect upon events which will mean independence again for Lithuania.

If it is among the many fine Americans of Lithuanian ancestry in my own district and in the districts of many of my colleagues, that these stirrings are most in evidence, that is only to be expected.

Through them, in their day-to-day relationships with their neighbors and fellow citizens, they can stimulate the interest of the American people as a whole. Such interest, as has been proven a number of times in our history, notable examples of which are Ireland and Israel, can be the most potent instrument in helping friendly but subject peoples to gain or regain their independence.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, February 16, marks the 44th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Republic of Lithuania.

I wish to join with my esteemed colleagues in paying tribute to the people of Lithuania who are striving to regain their freedom and national independence.

While the heavy yoke of Communist tyranny rests upon the shoulders of the Lithuanians today, their spirit has not been suppressed. The Lithuanian people, and Americans of Lithuanian ancestry, can take great courage in the fact that the free mind of man has always conquered the tyranny of an aggressor.

History rests on the side of the free world and of the people of the captive nations who are striving for freedom. But history is shaped by men. Hence, we must again pledge ourselves to the goal of a better world where all peoples will live in peace, freedom and justice. And we must continue to direct our actions to this goal.

I am confident that the American people will continue in their efforts to hasten the arrival of the day when the people of Lithuania, and the peoples of the other captive nations, will throw off the oppressive yoke of communism and once again resume the role of free and independent nations.

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, this 44th anniversary of Lithuania's Declaration of Independence provides freemen with two vital opportunities:

Again, it gives us a chance to express with all the people of Lithuania—both those enslaved in their native land and those who fled to freedom—our conviction that the force of righteousness will give Lithuania a new declaration of independence.

Second, it provides us with a telling chance to remind the world again that the Soviet Union is history's greatest and harshest enslaver of free people.

On February 16, 44 years ago, the proud and free nation of Lithuania marked its Independence Day, climaxing a statehood of liberty extending back to the year A.D. 1200.

In 1940, however, a long night of enslaved darkness fell on Lithuania and her Baltic neighbors, Latvia and Estonia. The Soviet Union tore up treaty commitments, invaded Lithuania and imposed its force upon her.

Since that time, Lithuanian freedom and independence have been suppressed by the Soviet Union and the nation has been subjected to ruthless Soviet colonial exploitation.

But Lithuania has not been forgotten. Her spirit, her people, and her history of freedom burn brightly today in the minds of her children and her friends everywhere. The world will not forget and some day Lithuania will again be free.

In its present state, Lithuania has for the world a message in addition to that of freedom—a message of warning.

In an age when new nations are emerging by the dozens, the people of the new nations should remember Lithuania when the cynical salesmen of Soviet slavery appear on the scene. Far too many of these new nations seemed swayed by the spurious Soviet claim of anticolonialism when in fact it is the most vicious colonial power of all history.

I would strongly recommend that the case of Lithuania and its neighbors have a permanent place on any U.S. agenda for negotiations with the Soviet Union.

As the world's greatest free republic, the United States will not forget its friends in Lithuania and the smoldering fire of freedom that they personify.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, this February 16 will be the 44th anniversary of the restoration of Lithuanian independence. But there will not be the rejoicing that such an occasion usually brings. Instead the day will be observed by solemn ceremonies, for the great expectations with which Lithuania declared its independence were dashed in 1940. Soviet Russia's treachery stamped out the liberty of Lithuania and her Baltic neighbors, scattering their peoples to the far corners of the earth. Yet, in the face of great suffering and cruel disappointment, the Lithuanians have continued to keep their hopes and courage high. Burning with idealism, those fortunate enough to escape the iron yoke of Russian oppression are constantly working toward regaining freedom for their brothers forced to live as captives in their Soviet occupied and dominated homeland.

The free world joins in commemorating the birth of Lithuania's century-old dream of freedom and pledges itself to advocating the continued censorship of Russia's colonization of the Baltic countries—the free world retains the firm belief that self-determination and freedom will once again return to the Baltic coast.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to join with my many colleagues in the House of Representatives in noting the 44th anniversary of Lithuanian independence. Each year we in the Congress recognize the 16th of February as a day to pay tribute to this proud and courageous nation. As we know, in the late Middle Ages Lithuania was a powerful state, and in the years following the First World War she was an enlightened and progressive republic. However, in the 1940's she was destined to fall prey to the totalitarians of left and right Soviet Russia and Nazi Germany. Since then she has come upon days of sorrow. Despite all the horrors they have undergone, the sturdy Lithuanian people have not lost heart. They are determined never to accept Soviet domination as their ultimate destiny. They have not been broken and there remains hope within their hearts of a new day of redemption.

Let this day, therefore, be a constant reminder to the people of the United States of the evils of communism; let it also be a symbol of the meaning of courage. To the courageous people of Lithuania goes our fervent hope that true freedom and independence will come.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, to celebrate the anniversary of the restoration of independence for any country is a heartwarming and thrilling occasion but this 44th anniversary celebration of the restoration of independence of Lithuania is a time of special significance. During these years the real heart of Lithuania has been glorified by the loyalty of its people to the highest standards of freedom and independence and their determination to exercise their will in the interests of peace and justice. The spirit of such a people can never be cowed or broken no matter how ruthless or how coldblooded the onslaughts of the godless ideology of communism may become. It is altogether fitting and most appropriate that we here in America who cherish these things should remember and draw inspiration from the example of the Lithuanian people. By their example they give us courage and renew our determination to guard our own heritage of liberty handed down to us through the years. May we ever remember these wonderful people and do whatever we can to bring about their liberation from the yoke of slavery and once again bring peace and righteousness among their people.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, this 44th anniversary of the restoration of independence of Lithuania is a happy and yet a solemn occasion. It is happy for us to contemplate the days when Lithuania was a free nation, when its people knew independence. It is solemn, for we must then bring our thoughts to the present time and the fact that another year has passed since we marked this anniversary and the people of Lithuania are still living under the hobnailed boot of the Soviet army.

Let us raise the torch of freedom a little higher and hope that its flame can be seen from behind the Iron Curtain. Let us reassure the people of Lithuania that our thoughts and prayers are with them on this anniversary. Let us work and hope for the day when a new independence anniversary for Lithuania can once more be marked.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marks the 44th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day. Lithuania is a small nation but it has suffered greatly at the hands of Soviet imperialism. Its people still languish under the Soviet imperial power today. They deserve our recognition and our support for continuing to maintain their integrity and their hope for the future in the face of the overwhelming might of the Red army.

Let us look for a moment at the record of this small nation of brave men and women. It shows conclusively that the Lithuanian people recognize themselves to be a nation and have consistently fought for their right to self-determination. And when Lithuania achieved its independence in the years between the two World Wars it quickly proved to be a modern progressive state. The continued Soviet occupation of Lithuania, therefore, is a case of raw, unvarnished colonialism regardless of what the Communist propagandists may say.

From the late Middle Ages and almost to the end of the 18th century—from 1385 to 1795—Lithuania was united with Poland and formed one of the great states of central and eastern Europe. But in 1795 Poland was brutally carved up and Lithuania was seized by Russia. From then until 1917 she remained a Russian province. But on February 16, 1918, the Lithuanian leaders proclaimed the political independence of their country and realized the ideals cherished by all Lithuanians for more than 100 years. In 1920 Russia signed a peace treaty with Lithuania recognizing it as an independent nation and pledging itself to renounce forever all its former rights of sovereignty. Let us observe the words of this treaty for they validate Lithuania's right to be free and show the full depth of the later Soviet treachery. The treaty stated:

> In conformity with the right declared by the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic that all people have the right to free self-determination, including the right of full secession from the State of which they were a part, Russia recognizes without any reserve the sovereignty and independence of the State of Lithuania with all juridical consequences resulting from such recognition, and voluntarily and forever renounces all sovereign rights possessed by Russia over the Lithuanian people and territory.

The next 20 years saw a period of progress and of achievement in Lithuania. Following the World War, Lithuania made up for the lost time brought about by the foreign invaders. The government took the initiative in land reform and social legislation. Improvements in transportation and education were diligently pursued. The advancements made by the new republic would certainly serve as proof that Lithuania was capable of governing its own affairs and that national sovereignty had been long overdue.

This period of freedom with all of its precious liberties came to an abrupt end for the courageous Lithuanians. After achieving an admirable record in reestablishing their free nation on a firm footing, they were again threatened by Russia. The treaty of 1920 was conveniently forgotten by the Communist dictator, Stalin. In 1939 the Soviet Union violated Lithuanian sovereignty by signing a secret agreement with Nazi Germany turning over to the Nazis certain territory belonging to Lithuania. Despite these ordeals Lithuania opened her doors and offered assistance to the Polish refugees who came pouring across her borders after the fall of Poland. But the forced mutual assistance pact doomed the Lithuanians to Soviet domination. This pact provided that military bases for Soviet troops were to be established in Lithuania. From that time to the present the brave people of Lithuania have been subjected to the Soviet Union.

In the case of the Soviet Union we are faced with the greatest hypocrisy of the century. It poses as the friend of oppressed peoples everywhere, but refuses to give freedom to its own colonies like Lithuania. Make no mistake about it, Lithuania is just as much a colony of Soviet Russia as Angola is a colony of Portugal. Today world public opinion is incensed over the terror and mutual slaughter in Angola. And, indeed, opinion should be aroused over these events, for they are tragic. But where are the cries against Soviet imperialism in Lithuania and the rest of Eastern Europe? I do not hear the new and resurgent nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America complaining about this Soviet imperialism. They are concerned with their own problems and seem to care little about what happens in Europe. But I say today that if the neutralist nations continue to disregard the lessons of Eastern Europe they will do so at their own peril. Whenever the Soviet Union can win control of a foreign government it will do so. And it will use whatever means it possesses and that appear to be effective in the particular situation. Let us not continue to permit the Soviet Union to masquerade as the friend of the poor and the oppressed, and the enemy of colonialism. Let us tell the world over and over and over again of the treacherous Soviet hypocrisy.

Hear, if you will, what Khrushchev said about colonialism to a group of Indian newspapermen in 1958. He said:

> Colonialists are people with rather low morals. In their public statements they appeal very often to God, and at the same time they keep their knives in hiding, ready to use against the weak in order to seize their riches—oil or other assets. Now the colonialists are raving particularly against the Soviet Union, and trying to discredit it in the eyes of the peoples. Why? Because they see that the Soviet Union has won great respect among the peoples, since its policy is based on high moral principles.

But I ask, What are these high and moral principles that underlie Soviet policy? The Soviet record in Lithuania makes it plain that they are neither high nor moral, but low and immoral. They are the old principles of grab and plunder, only now they are dressed up with the fiction of "peoples democracies." Let us not permit the world to forget this truth.

Today we pause to honor the brave people of Lithuania and we will continue to do so until they have once again become independent. But this celebration has an even broader significance because it is one more instance when we can remind the world of what Soviet "anticolonialism" really means. Lithuania is the living proof that Soviet "anticolonialism" is really a mask for the most vicious brand of colonial imperialism of the 20th century.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to be one of the speakers at the 44th anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day which was celebrated on January 21, 1962, in the common council chambers, city hall, Buffalo, N.Y.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the address which I delivered on this occasion:

UKRAINIAN NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE

Today marks the 44th anniversary of modern day Ukrainian national independence. After several centuries of occupation by the Russians, the Ukrainian people seized the opportunity made possible by World War I to declare their national independence. By this act, the people of Ukraine expressed their determination to be then and forever free of the imperial chains of Moscow. This was an act, a political act, which served notice on the peoples of the world that Ukraine was dissolving the bonds which connected them with the empire of the czars. More than that, it was an affirmation of the long held aspirations of the people for national independence, national identity and a rightful place in the world community of sovereign nations.

We are gathered here today to pay tribute to those patriots who led the fight for that independence, those who made the supreme sacrifice in this cause during the long twilight before 1917, those who led the way during the struggle of 1917–18, and those who continue to carry on the fight in Ukraine today. This is an unbroken chain of sacrifice, of dedication and of courage, which the new leaders of the Russian empire have come to know and fear. A people with this determination and national purpose cannot long be denied their aspirations for freedom.

Ukraine is no more a legal and voluntary part of the Soviet Union than it was a legal and voluntary part of the empire of the czars. Those who claim that Ukraine is a traditional part of the Soviet Union demonstrate their profound ignorance of the facts of history. And those who claim that it is undesirable for the U.S. Government to advocate the peaceful dismemberment of the Soviet Union, by advocating national independence of Ukraine, are taking us down the road to national disaster. Since the beginning of our Nation we have defended the right of all people to be self-governing. We have expressed this policy by our support for the principle of self-determination. In doing so we have acted in concert with our own Declaration of Independence and in keeping with our rich heritage as a self-governing people. Every time we have taken the bold initiative to support this universal principle we have been acclaimed by the common man the world over. When we have faltered in support of this principle, which thank God has been a rare exception, we have earned the distrust of the oppressed and brought crisis and calamity down upon our backs. Here the record of our national behavior is clear for all to see, who want to see the truth in its stark reality.

President Kennedy has said that we are living in the revolutionary age, that we are the legitimate children of the greatest political revolution in the history of the world. He has made it clear that we do not fear revolution by those who are oppressed and exploited just as he has made it clear that our basic goal as a nation is "a peaceful world community of free and independent states." This was the keynote theme of President Kennedy's state of the Union message given before Congress on January 10 of this year. I will support the President to the limit of my abilities in the winning of that objective. In doing so, I am confident that I serve the highest interests of our Nation as well as the hopes of the people in all the captive nations behind the Russian Iron Curtain.

This is a most suitable occasion for me to pay a well-deserved compliment to the members of the Citizens Committee To Observe Captive Nations Week. This committee, established to support Public Law 86-90, the Captive Nations Week resolution, has attracted national attention during the past 2 years. The work of this committee as a trail blazer in educating the public to the cause of the captive nations and the vital role they are playing in thwarting the Kremlin's plans for world conquest has won the acclaim of the national committee and similar committees established throughout the United States. Others are following the fine example you have set. Buffalo is an acknowledged leader in this fight for peace with freedom and justice for all nations and people. You are to be congratulated for this show of leadership.

But much remains to be done. The tidal wave of self-determination is sweeping the world. As President Kennedy pointed out in his address before the United Nations, "the crest of this wave is yet to hit the Communist empire. You and I know that no amount of propaganda, or no Iron Curtain, no matter how high or how deep it may be, can contain the human power of that tidal wave. The empire of the commissars will fall before this tidal wave, just as the old empires in Asia and Africa have been dissolved by its political power. You and I can hasten that happy day by standing firmly by our American traditions and ideals and supporting all who aspire to freedom and national independence. This is what the people in the captive nations expect of us. This is the formula for peace in our times."

The day is not far off when Ukraine will regain its national independence. That happy day will see all the captive nations returned to their rightful place in the family of nations. Let us move forward to that objective in the strong conviction that human freedom is the wave of the future, believing as we do that the death knell of tyranny and despotism has sounded.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on February 16 we commemorate the 44th anniversary of Lithuania's declaration of independence. Yet as we mark this day, the 3 million Lithuanian people who fought to obtain freedom at the end of World War I are perhaps further from that goal than ever before in the history of that nation.

As daily we work to halt the onslaught of the Communist menace in countries in this hemisphere, we scarcely have time to reflect on those captive nations in Europe where there is no longer an obvious struggle going on between the Red masters and their targets for tyranny.

Yet this struggle still does proceed as millions of freedom-loving people in the world are forced to live under the yoke of totalitarianism. Since that fateful day in June of 1940, when the Communist Russian hordes invaded Lithuania and forcibly incorporated it in the U.S.S.R., the spirit of these people has never been broken.

During the Second World War the Lithuanian people formed an active underground force to resist the Communist occupation. As late as 1949 the first Secretary of the Communist Party, speaking before the party congress, revealed that although 12,000 resistance fighters had been killed, the struggle was still continuing. We are told that as many as 100,000 patriots were massacred before active resistance was finally suppressed. Although the Lithuanian people have not known freedom now for 22 years, their spirit of resistance to the Red tyranny remains to this day.

On this occasion of the celebration of Lithuanian independence, we join with the friends of Lithuania and the other captive nations of Europe to look forward to that day when the founding of a new Lithuanian democracy will take place, a democracy which will rise above and persevere beyond the tyrannical forces which now enslave it.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is a day of solemn commemoration and tribute. It is the 44th anniversary of the proclamation of independence from Russia by the founders of the Lithuanian Republic. We celebrate it now with pride in remembrance of this event and with sadness at the realization of the present plight of this great and tragic country.

Although freedom and independence have been denied to them, the Lithuanian people have won the admiration of the freedom-loving nations of the world who include them among the most brave and stalwart fighters for justice.

Recently it was my privilege to join with several hundred Americans of Lithuanian descent at a rally in Waterbury, Conn., in observance of this anniversary of the Lithuanian Declaration of Independence.

It was a colorful ceremony, rife with the undying spirit of the Lithuanian people, and stimulated by the presentation of folk songs and dances by boys and girls of Lithuanian lineage.

I was moved, in witnessing this program, to give assurance to this gathering that the U.S. Government and we of the House of Representatives would continue to strive for the day when all the Baltic nations would once again be free.

I saw neither desperation nor resignation in the words of Anicetas Simutis, vice consul at the Lithuanian General Consulate in New York, who told his Waterbury audience that while communism is being imposed on the people of the Lithuanian nation, there is a longing for freedom in their hearts. He also expressed the opinion that the Baltic nations "are lucky in having the strongest and most dependable ally in the world, the United States."

As we observe this solemn anniversary of Lithuania's independence, we fan the still-burning flame of freedom with words of encouragement and hope. We make no reckless promises. We do offer sympathy and encouragement to a nation of people with whom we join in prayer for a new era of freedom. Above all, we must determine to keep their plight and fate before the people of the world.

I yield to no one in my admiration for the people of Lithuania and their courageous and continuing struggle. I know the people of this race in my district as warm, personal friends and associates. They are sturdy people, self-reliant and dependable. They are factory workers and business and professional people; musicians and politicians; merchants and men and women of letters. I am proud of my association with them.

On this 44th anniversary of Lithuanian independence, we review the heights that have been attained through freedom and democracy, and the depths that have been plumbed as the result of oppression. The temporary enslavement of this proud race behind the Iron Curtain is the immediate concern of peoples of courage and determination in the free world. Our thoughts must be solemn as we contemplate the present plight of this once free nation.

I trust that the current efforts of the European Subcommittee of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, under the leadership of our colleague, Mrs. KELLY, will help markedly to dramatize the scope and acuteness of the plight of the captive nations. This committee is presently holding hearings to review the status of each of these tragic countries with the view to reexamining congressional attitudes toward this sad and difficult problem.

Our prayers and hopes on this anniversary date of independence are for the termination of the brutal slavery of the talented and courageous Lithuanian people.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marks the 44th anniversary of Lithuanian independence. It is not a day of joyous celebration, for the independence which was proclaimed for Lithuania on February 16, 1918, has been denied by the Soviet Union since 1940. Instead, Lithuanian Independence Day is one of solemn commemoration of that nation's achievement of independence, a day of rededication to the cause of freedom everywhere.

Lithuania's achievement of independence in 1918 followed more than a century of domination by czarist Russia, a domination which began in 1795. Prior to this the history of the Baltic state is a long and proud one, dating back to the 11th century. During the Middle Ages, Lithuania was a powerful state which helped protect Europe against invasions from the east.

It is their long history as a nation, together with their distinctive language and culture, which provides assurance that their love of independence can never be eradicated. Just as the Lithuanian people in the past steadfastly rejected all the attempts of the czars to superimpose the Russian language and culture upon them, we can be confident that the Lithuanian people of today continue to long for free institutions to replace the totalitarianism which has been imposed upon them from Moscow.

On this 44th anniversary of their independence day, let us reassure the Lithuanian people that they have not been forgotten and that the United States will continue working toward the goal of freedom throughout the world.

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Lithuanians, who in the Middle Ages and in early modern times had their glorious days, lost their status as a free nation toward the end of the 18th century. For more than 100 years they struggled to regain it. Finally, in 1918 they succeeded in attaining their goal, proclaimed their independence, and established a democratic form of government. Under this government of their own choice they lived for more than 20 years, engaged in the task of reshaping a better life for themselves in their historic homeland. Before this self-imposed task was completed, however, the clouds of war descended over their country. The aggressors struck and in 1940 Lithuania as an independent state ceased to exist when the troops of Stalinist Russia invaded the country.

Since 1940 the Lithuanians have experienced the cruel tyranny of both Nazi and Communist domination. The end of the war brought no relief. In fact, since 1945 under the Communist Russians their suffering has been aggravated. Since then Lithuania has become a vast concentration camp for its liberty-loving inhabitants. Tens of thousands of Lituanians have been deported to distant areas of the Soviet Union, and their homes have been given to new settlers from Asiatic Russia. During all these years the country has been practically sealed off from the free world, and of course no Lithuanian is allowed to leave the country.

In celebrating the 44th anniversary of Lithuanian independence we rededicate ourselves to the spirit of freedom which unites the Lithuanian people with all peoples of the world. We know that the Lithuanians will continue to resist the despotism thrust upon them. Their courage, their perseverance, and their loyalty to the historic tradition of their nation will defeat the guns and tanks of their oppressors. On the anniversary of their independence day our prayers are with them.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, in observing and commemorating the 44th Anniversary of the restoration of Lithuania's independence, we are doing so under the most unusual circumstances. The perpetrators of Soviet colonialism and of Communist dictatorship are making extreme efforts to exploit the Lithuanian nation and its resources while, at the same time, hypocritically offering their so-called friendship and brotherliness.

Knowing that they will not be able to destroy by force the Lithuanian yearning for freedom, and that they will not gain the trust and friendship of the Lithuanian people by compulsion, the Soviets announced a utopian program of progress and well-being, purportedly designed to surpass even the most advanced countries of the world.

Yet the actual situation in Lithuania has not improved. On the contrary, freedom of conscience has been further restricted and the Lithuanian people remain bereft of their basic rights and are exposed to misery as well as to a constant threat of being deprived of their right to remain in their homeland.

While the people in Lithuania cannot observe their independence day, Lithuanians in the United States and we in the free world can and do commemorate and speak for these subjugated people.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, February 16, 1962, marks the observance of the 44th anniversary of Lithuania's declaration of independence, an independence only briefly enjoyed over a span of some 20 years.

Lithuania as a country is now held in Soviet bondage, but the people themselves will never be truly held in bondage. A free spirit is never daunted, merely dimmed by necessity until the moment returns when it may burn brightly and freely again.

Soviet tyranny and oppression hold forth at the present time in Lithuania and in other captive nations. The free world refuses to accept this situation as permanent.

This 44th anniversary of Lithuanian independence is a reminder of the hopes of the free world that the millions of Lithuanian people may once more enjoy the fullest measure of freedom.

Mr. SCRANTON. Mr. Speaker, once again this year, as I did last year, I am privileged to join my colleagues in saluting Lithuanian Independence Day.

On the 16th of February, 1918, the people of Lithuania declared themselves forever free from foreign rule. In this freedom—the first they had known in more than a century—Lithuania flourished in every respect. Agriculture, the primary occupation of Lithuanians then and now, developed at its most rapid rate. Industry increased 100 percent. Grammar and secondary schools mushroomed everywhere. Just labor laws were enacted. Literature and music blossomed out in forms and expressions more beautiful and more numerous than ever before.

But this prosperity, this Golden Age of Lithuania, was shortlived. Despite the Lithuanians' stanch resistance, they were conquered and occupied—first by the Russians, then by the Nazi Germans, and ever since World War II by the Russians again.

Under the Soviet Russians, the Lithuanians have suffered untold hardships. In the prewar period of Soviet domination, the Russians shipped Lithuanian intellectuals by the hundreds from their beloved homeland to the bleak Siberian wastes, and executed other Lithuanian patriots by the thousands. Since the end of the Nazi regime, the Soviets have refined their methods of oppression, but the degree of oppression has not diminished in the slightest. Now, instead of Russian overlords, Lithuanian puppets perform the acts governing Lithuania—but the Kremlin still pulls the strings.

During the most unbearable periods of oppression, waves of Lithuanians have fled their fatherland and migrated to the free nations of the Western world. They and their descendants have become responsible, productive citizens in the countries which they now call home. I will personally vouch for the industry and integrity of the many wonderful Lithuanian-Americans in my home district, the 10th District of Pennsylvania.

On February 16, all over the world, people who are rightfully proud of their Lithuanian ancestry will be commemorating this, the 44th Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day. Those in the free world can and will extoll the merits of this milestone so that all may know and honor its significance. Those behind the Iron Curtain must celebrate in silence. Let us speak out for those who cannot speak. Let us join Lithuanians everywhere in the fervent hope that Lithuania may soon wrest itself loose from the Soviet Union's crushing, crippling grasp, so that it may flourish as an independent nation once again.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, on the 4th of July, Americans at home and abroad manifest their appreciation of their cherished independence and freedom. Our celebration is without reservation and without hindrance.

Tomorrow is the 44th anniversary of the restoration of independence for the brave people of Lithuania. Tragically, there will be no public celebration by these people in their homeland. The restraint imposed upon them by a foreign power will prevent them from giving voice to sentiments such as we here in America do each year. Moreover, the independence that was restored to them 44 years ago has again been taken from them.

This does not mean, however, that the aspirations and hopes for independence are dead in the Lithuanian people. Those of them who are in the United States and other parts of the free world are commemorating this day and expressing the dreams of their countrymen at home. During their earlier subjugation by Russia they continued to foster their hopes and refused to accept foreign ideologies and customs. Now under the Soviet's dominance they still continue to look forward to the day when they will again be free, and in their hearts they are commemorating this anniversary of the earlier restoration of their freedom.

The U.S. Government has not recognized the subjugation of Lithuania—or of Latvia or Estonia—and many Americans are today remembering the plight of these people. We all hope that one day in the not too distant future they may be able to indulge in independence day celebrations just as we do here.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, for several centuries unhappy Lithuanians had lived under alien regimes. Late in the 18th century their country had become part of czarist Russia, and for more than a century they had suffered under the oppressive czarist rule. They had tried to free themselves many times, but all their attempts were unsuccessful. In 1918, when the czarist regime was no more, the Lithuanians felt free and proclaimed their independence on February 16 of that year.

Thenceforth for more than two decades, until the outbreak of the last war, Lithuanians enjoyed freedom in their historic homeland and they made their war-ravaged country a happy haven for themselves. The war and subsequent events, however, not only robbed them of their freedom but placed them under the ruthless Communist Russian regime. Since 1940 these liberty-loving Lithuanians have lost their country, their freedom and nearly all their worldly possessions, but they still cling to the hope of regaining their freedom. On this 44th anniversary of their Independence Day let us hope that they attain their goal and live in peace in their historic homeland.

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, Americans of Lithuanian descent and their kinsmen in other free countries will observe the 44th anniversary of the restoration of Lithuanian independence on February 16. Unfortunately, their ancestral homeland has fallen under the yoke of tyrannical communism and is today one of the captive nations of Eastern Europe.

The people of Lithuania have not relinquished their desire for freedom and independence, and I am sure they never will. Their quest for freedom, however, must be kept alive and vibrant for their own sake as well as for the sake of the free world. They must not think of themselves as a forgotten people in this very dark moment of their history, for if they lose courage then they are really doomed to extinction. This is what the ruthless rulers of the Kremlin would like to happen, so that they can forever wipe out the small peoples.

It is extremely important that we in this country and freedom-loving people of other free countries should continue to focus the spotlight of world attention on the subjugated and oppressed status of the captive nations of Europe struggling under the yoke of Communist imperialism. We must do so in order to gain the offensive in the cold war. We must do everything possible to put communism on the defensive and to subject Russia to worldwide criticism and derision.

On this day of Lithuania's anniversary of independence we pledge our continued support and we join with our fellow Americans of Lithuanian extraction in prayer for the early liberation of their ancestral homeland and their kinsmen who live there.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, 44 years ago tomorrow, the Lithuanian National Council, on February 16, 1918, adopted a Declaration of Independence providing for the "reestablishment of Lithuania on a democratic basis." Today, we commemorate the 44th anniversary of that memorable day in the history of Lithuania—a history that records the story of a suffering, yet courageous people, possessing an unquenchable will to freedom and liberty.

This land had been under the domination of its more powerful neighbor, Russia, for more than 120 years, but the determination of its people to stand as free men never wavered. The end of World War II gave the Lithuanians an opportunity, once again, to establish their own government. As a free people, they drove the Bolshevik invaders from their lands, and in July 1920 signed a treaty of peace with the Soviet Union, under which the Russians renounced all sovereign rights over the Lithuanian people and their territory.

During the short period as an independent nation, Lithuania became a full member of the international community of nations and won worldwide respect for its efforts to promote the social, economic, and cultural welfare of its people.

It was not long, however, before the Soviet Union rejected its treaty obligations, and despite its many declarations of respect for the independence of this small nation, demanded in 1940 that a government friendly to the Soviet Union be installed and that the Red Army be permitted to enter the territory of Lithuania. In this imperialistic manner, Lithuania was made a constituent republic of the U.S.S.R.

Although the yoke of communism hangs heavy in that land, neither the tyranny of oppressors nor time can erase from the memory of these people their glorious tradition of freedom and courage. We know that they cannot openly commemorate this cherished occasion, but we are sure that their faith in the deliverance of their nation and the restoration of their rights as human beings remains strong.

And so today, we rise in the Congress of this great and free nation to pay tribute to Lithuania and to the indomitable spirit of its people—a people who have so exemplified and fought for their freedom that they will never permanently accept the deprivation of their rights and of their human dignity. We rededicate ourselves today to the cause of justice and freedom for all men and reiterate our firm resolve to stand fast with all those who refuse to abandon that cause.

It is fitting also on this occasion to pay tribute to all Americans of Lithuanian descent who have made so vital a contribution to the strength and spirit of this country. I join with them in their prayers for the return of their homeland to the family of free nations.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, Lithuania's 44th anniversary of independence is an inspiring occasion. It marks the survival of an ideal. It marks the survival of a people by virtue of sheer idealism and willpower, down through the ages. It marks the survival of independence of spirit despite oppression, extreme suffering, and repeated efforts at political extirpation. It marks the survival of hope.

The faith of the Lithuanian people in the eventual restoration of their country to its independent status is itself inspiring. Nor is this belief in some future revivification of Lithuania as an autonomous country merely a visionary dream without substantial backing. The history of the Lithuanian people and of Lithuania as a nation bears ample witness to the substantial basis for the conviction that the country will once again become independent. The Lithuanian people are among the oldest in Europe who have maintained their identity throughout all the changes of the centuries. The Lithuanian nation once occupied a large portion of the map of Europe. It was a powerful and highly developed state when the Russian regions around it were still barbaric. The people of Lithuania maintained their traditions and their individuality in spite of repeated ravaging from without. They emerged again as a nation after World War I. It is that independence which we celebrate today. And it is that independence as a nation which the United States has never ceased to recognize, despite Communist domination. On such a foundation rests the faith that Lithuania will ever endure.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, on February 16 Lithuanians will again commemorate one of their anniversaries. On that day, these hardy and independent-thinking people will celebrate the 44th anniversary of the declaration of their independence. The Lithuanians have not lost their taste for freedom, it has only been dulled for a time by a harsh deterrent, the Soviet Union—the aggressor who took over this little country as well as Latvia and Estonia, somewhat as a big bully dominates and rules smaller neighbors. This enslavement by force by colonial Russia will never kill the love of freedom living in the hearts of the Lithuanians. This flame of the love of liberty will live on forever.

The Lithuanian American Information Center at New York has made a number of very timely comments on the subjugated Lithuanian peoples, and I would like to insert in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, this brief statement:

THE 44TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE RESTORATION OF LITHUANIA'S INDEPENDENCE, FEBRUARY 16, 1962

The people in Lithuania under the harsh yoke of the Soviet Union cannot observe their Independence Day, but Lithuanians in the United States and the free world can commemorate and speak for these subjugated people.

In 1940, the Soviet Union tore up treaty obligations with Lithuania, perfidiously invaded Lithuania and by force imposed its will on the three Baltic States—Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia. Lithuania's freedom and independence were suppressed by Soviet Russia and she has been subjected to ruthless Soviet colonial exploitation ever since. It is ironic that Eastern Europe countries with centuries of culture behind them should be colonies of the Soviet Union just as Asian and African countries are emerging from colonialism.

However, despite the long enslavement, Lithuanians in the old country still have an invincible will for freedom.

Lithuania is not a "new" state in Europe. The ancient Lithuanian statehood dates back to the year A.D. 1200; she has a splendid historical record of tolerance, of individual, racial, linguistic and cultural liberty. She has every right to freedom and independence.

Our Government and other governments through their delegations at United Nations should declare the Soviet Union an aggressor and demand the withdrawal of its military forces and agents from Lithuania, to return all Lithuanians from exile in Siberia, prisons, slave labor and concentration camps and demand free and unfettered elections after the withdrawal of Soviet armed forces and agents.

The subject of Lithuania and the other two Baltic States should be brought up at any forthcoming negotiations with the Kremlin rulers and at international conferences.

The U.S. Government has never recognized the forcible seizure of Lithuania and the other two Baltic States—Latvia and Estonia.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues and the many friends of Lithuania in commemorating the 44th anniversary of the restoration of Lithuania's independence.

There can be no real joy in the observance of this anniversary, for we know that the people of Lithuania, now subjected to the tyrannical rule of Soviet Russia, are prohibited from observing it.

After many years of sacrifice, Lithuania was finally in a position to declare her independence to the entire world on February 16, 1918. She was not permitted to enjoy freedom very long; in June 1940 her territory and institutions were unjustly seized by Soviet Russia and since then her people have suffered persecution and tyranny. Our sympathy is extended to them and to the many Lithuanian Americans who deplore the enslavement under which their kinfolk in Lithuania must live.

We know that the ancient Lithuanian statehood dates back to the year A.D. 1200. Lithuania achieved an enviable historical record of tolerance, of individual and cultural liberty. During the short period of their independence and before being brought under the harsh yoke of the Soviet Union, the people earned the admiration of all democratic peoples for their high ideals, industry, and courage.

Once again we salute the brave people of Lithuania. We extend the hand of friendship to them. The United States has never recognized the forcible seizure of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia. The cause of Lithuania is just and righteous; we maintain that she is entitled to her freedom. We hope and pray that the day is near when her independence will be restored to her.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, February 16, marks the 44th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania. The people in Lithuania, now under the iron heel of the Soviet Union, cannot observe their Independence Day, but we can join with Lithuanians in the United States and the free world in commemorating this event for these subjugated people.

Forty-four years ago, on February 16, 1918, the Republic of Lithuania declared herself to be free of Russian domination. The small Baltic nations of Latvia and Estonia joined Lithuania in this gallant action, and all three nations formed democratic governments and made excellent social and economic progress in their brief years of freedom.

But, in 1940, the Soviet Union invaded Lithuania and subjugated the three Baltic States. Lithuania's freedom was suppressed by Russia, and she has been subjected to ruthless Soviet colonial exploitation ever since.

Despite their long enslavement, however, Lithuanians in the old country are keeping alive their desire for freedom. They have not lost hope for ultimate victory, and the indomitable spirit of the people lives on.

We must continue in our refusal to recognize this forcible seizure of Lithuania. To keep alive the cause of liberty and freedom everywhere, we must continue to strive for the restoration of independence to the people of Lithuania and the Baltic States.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the Lithuanian national anthem closes with the words "May our land ever stand peaceful and united." Tomorrow, on the 44th anniversary of the Lithuanian Declaration of Independence we are reminded that this pledge remains unfulfilled. We join with the brave Lithuanian nation, not only in celebrating the anniversary of their freedom, but in expressing the hope that the day may not be too far away when Lithuania will once more stand free, peaceful and united.

After a long period of czarist rule, the Lithuanian nation declared its independence on February 16, 1918. This act marked the realization of a goal for which this sturdy people had been striving ever since the Russians took over in 1795. But when the retreating German troops left the city of Vilnius in 1919, the Red army entered and set up a Communist government. The Lithuanians were able to realize their aims only after they joined a Polish army and drove out the Soviet forces. The perfidious Russians signed a treaty which "voluntarily and forever renounces all sovereign rights possessed by Russia over the Lithuanian people and territory." Yet only two decades later, after being occupied by the invading Germans at the start of the Second World War, this suffering nation was again occupied by the Red Army and fell under Russian domination. Lithuania was declared a constituent republic of the U.S.S.R., although this act of wanton aggression has never been recognized by the United States.

Thus vanished the independent and sovereign state of Lithuania. But the loss of national independence did not mean the loss of the Lithuanian spirit of freedom. The Communist regime has not been able to subdue and suppress the ancient spirit of freedom and independence of the Lithuanian people. This is the only bright aspect of their miserable and unenviable existence. Mr. Speaker, on this 44th anniversary of Lithuanian independence we hope and pray that the Lithuanian people will soon have freedom to enjoy life in their historic homeland.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marks the 44th anniversary of Lithuanian independence, an independence which was achieved after more than a century of foreign domination. Farther back in its history, during the Middle Ages, Lithuania had been a powerful sovereign nation. However, it had entered into a union with Poland and, in 1795, when Poland was partitioned for the third time, had been annexed by Russia.

Lithuania remained under czarist domination until 1915 when World War I brought first merely an exchange of Russian rule for German rule but, ultimately, also brought independence. During 1917 the German Government authorized a congress of Lithuanians which elected a 20-member council. It was this council which proclaimed an independent Lithuania on February 16, 1918.

The two decades during which Lithuania was independent were marked by trials as well as joys. No sooner had the German army evacuated the capital of Lithuania than it was overrun by the Red army. A year of fighting was required before the Soviets were driven out and Russia signed a peace treaty recognizing Lithuania as an independent nation and renouncing forever all rights of sovereignty. In the Second World War Lithuania experienced the aggression of both the German and the Soviet armies. At the end of the war, in blatant violation of the treaty of 1920 in which Russia recognized Lithuania's independence, the ancient nation was incorporated into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Thus Lithuania today is one of the captive nations in the Soviet empire. However, by their long experience with foreign domination, for the most part Russian domination, the Lithuanians are well equipped to retain their identity, their culture, and their love of freedom in spite of all Soviet efforts to force them into the Communist mold.

We in this country commemorate the anniversary of Lithuanian independence as a salute to the valiant people of Lithuania who must live behind the Iron Curtain without an opportunity to enjoy the freedom for which their ancestors struggled so long and finally won. We commend the million Americans of Lithuanian descent for their contributions to the growth of our own country. Finally, on this occasion we rededicate our efforts to the task of building a world in which some day all men and women can live in freedom and dignity.

Mr. ST. GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, in the ebb and flow of history many nations have wielded great power only to decline in time to a lesser rank. In the days of its greatest power, Lithuania stretched from the Baltic to the Black Sea, and covered over 350,000 square miles of territory. It was a Lithuanian-led force, which together with Polish, Russian, Czech and Tartar allies crushed the Teutonic knights at Grunewald in 1410.

But the Lithuanian people do not regard their past military prowess as their true glory. Rather it is to their independent Republic that they look back, a republic which managed to maintain itself for 22 years on the chessboard of Europe as a model of progress and enlightenment.

This Republic was proclaimed 44 years ago, on February 16, 1918. It was the climax of the Lithuanian movement for self-determination, a movement that had been suppressed under the Russian czars, who had ruled Lithuania since 1795. With the disorders in Eastern Europe following World War I, it took some time for Lithuanian territory to be cleared of foreign troops, but once its sovereignty was established, the Lithuanian Government compiled an enviable record. Land was distributed to the peasants, industrial production increased, great progress was made in transportation, health, and education. In its international dealings Lithuania displayed an open and friendly attitude. Unlike some other small European states, it was not puffed up with false pride. It allowed its record to speak for it.

But Lithuania paid a price for its international decency. In 1938 it was forced to accept a Polish ultimatum to recognize the cession of Vilnius, which Poland had seized 15 years before, and in 1939 the Nazis seized Memel, which had been awarded to Lithuania by international agreement. The Lithuanians felt compelled to fall back upon the Soviet

Union for friendship and protection, and now suffered the greatest betrayal of all. For with Soviet troops garrisoning much of the country, the pressure on Lithuania became intolerable. With the opposition largely under arrest, a plebiscite was held on July 14, 1940, and Lithuania was incorporated into the Soviet Union.

The day after hostilities broke out between the Germans and the Russians the Lithuanian population rose as one man, and once again declared its independence. But once again popular hopes were dashed, as the Germans showed no disposition to recognize Lithuanian aspirations, but treated the country as conquered territory. When the Russians swept back into the country in their 1944 offensive, Lithuania disappeared behind the Iron Curtain.

But the Lithuanian people have not accepted the fate meted out to them by their Communist masters. Officially they may be citizens of the Soviet Union, but unofficially—in their hearts—they are citizens of a free and democratic Lithuania. Soviet persecution and despoliation have not broken their spirit. Terrorism and brainwashing, the carrot and the stick, have not altered their determination to regain their freedom. On this 44th anniversary of the Lithuanian Republic we salute their brave resolve.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, the 44th anniversary of the declaration of independence in Lithuania is celebrated on February 16, but the ruthless Soviet dictators are still depriving the Lithuanian people of their freedom. What the Soviet Union has been unable to take from the Lithuanian people is its exalted spirit of liberty. Like the Russian czars who tried to impose an alien way of life on this sturdy little nation before World War I, the Soviet rulers have learned that it is easier to dominate a people by the brutal controls of a police state than to make them forget a historic tradition of independence. As time passes the free world more and more appreciates the devotion that Lithuanians in exile have for their native land, and by their persistent and continued efforts their flame of independence is kept a bright and shining example to all nations that cherish freedom.

On this 44th anniversary of Lithuanian independence, I am proud to join my fellow Americans of Lithuanian origin who yearn for national independence with political and social justice. Lithuania wants the free exercise of her God-given right to enjoy liberty and freedom, and I am convinced that the people of America are inspired and thrilled at such patriotic devotion. May we join with these courageous people in hoping that the day of deliverance for Lithuania soon will be realized and that the light of freedom will glow once more over their land.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, this is the 44th anniversary of the restoration of Lithuania's independence. Lithuania is not a new state in Europe. The ancient Lithuanian statehood dates back to 1200 A.D. Their freedom was lost in 1795 and not regained until 1918. From 1918 until 1940 Lithuania enjoyed freedom. Then, in 1940, the Soviet Union discarded treaty obligations and invaded this small country and the two other Baltic States of Latvia and Estonia. They were compelled to become a part of the Soviet Republic. In the years since, the people have endured oppression, slavery, and exile. It is a well-known fact that many citizens of these little countries have been in exile in Siberia, in prisons, and in slave-labor camps.

It is appropriate for us to pause here today to pay homage to the brave people of Lithuania. Lithuanians have contributed a great deal to the culture and welfare of Europe. Lithuanian-Americans have made great contributions to this country. The United States has never recognized the forcible seizure of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by Russia. In commemorating Lithuania today, we reaffirm our belief in freedom and our opposition to Soviet oppression. We pray that the people of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia will regain their freedom.

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for this opportunity to join with my colleagues in this observance of the 44th anniversary of the declaration of Lithuanian independence. At the same time, it is my hope that one day soon we may be able to celebrate the freedom of Lithuania and the end forever of the imperialist domination by the Soviet Union which exists there today.

This coming Sunday, the Lithuanian-American community in my home city of Rochester, N.Y., will gather once more in commemoration of Lithuanian independence and I look forward eagerly to being with them on that occasion. I have said before that many of us whose roots are buried deep in this country often do not appreciate our freedoms as do those who have known what it means to be denied the precious fruits of liberty. And so I look forward to renewing acquaintances with my Lithuanian-American friends, to whom freedom means so very much, and to joining with them in their solemn prayers for the early liberation of their homeland.

As we join together today in this observance, I hope that we can rededicate ourselves to the cause of Lithuanian independence and reaffirm our intention to leave no stone unturned in our efforts to secure the release of the Lithuanian people from the bondage of the Soviet Union.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, February 16 is the 44th anniversary of the independence of a small but brave nation, Lithuania. The Lithuanian people have no independence today and are not even permitted to celebrate this anniversary of an historic event. But these speeches in the halls of the U.S. Congress will serve to remind the people of Lithuania that we have not forgotten them. And they will serve to remind the Soviet Union that we have not forgotten its imperialistic enslavement of the Lithuanian nation for these last two decades. It is indeed fitting that we should honor this anniversary of Lithuanian independence each year until independence has once again been achieved.

Soviet Russia has laid down many lines of propaganda which it pursues with fanatic zeal. But none has been more consistent and vitriolic than the charge of colonialism and imperialism which it has leveled against the United States. Khrushchev hopes to create in the minds of the Asians and Africans the image of the Soviet Union as their champion; that the Soviet Russians were in fact the leaders of all the forces opposed to colonialism; that they themselves stood as the perfect example of the spirit of anti-imperialism. Mr. Speaker, Lithuania is the living refutation of these Soviet claims.

For centuries Lithuania had been an independent nation. But it was her misfortune to be absorbed into the old Russian Empire at the close of the 18th century. When World War I ended, however, Lithuania won her independence and succeeded in establishing an independent nation. And Lithuania prospered for two decades. In every way—economic, social, political and cultural—the Lithuanian people demonstrated to the world their ability to govern themselves. But on June 15, 1940, the Soviet Union violated its treaty commitments with Lithuania and the Red army moved in. Without provocation or justification, and in utter contempt of international law, the Soviet Union overran the independent Baltic countries and installed regimes deliberately organized to obliterate the new-found freedom of these peoples. Is this the record of a country that is the champion of anticolonialism? No, it is not. Let the record be spread before the world to see in order that the Soviet Union's pretensions of righteousness may not go unchallenged.

We want the citizens of Lithuania to know that the people of America and of the free world have not forgotten Lithuania's glorious history of independence. The free world will never complacently accept Soviet occupation of Lithuania. And we will continue to hope that the national independence won 44 years ago will be recovered and that Lithuania will again be free.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, on this 44th anniversary of the restoration of Lithuania's independence, it is fitting for this House and for Americans everywhere to pause to pay grateful tributes to the gallant people of Lithuania and their noble heritage.

For centuries, the Lithuanian nation struggled for freedom and the advancement of democratic ideals and it is well to remind the world of the unconquerable spirit and outstanding contributions of the Lithuanian people to the cause of freedom and independence. Here in our own great land the sons and daughters of Lithuania have made conspicuous and outstanding contributions to the defense, the development, the welfare, and the protection of this nation. Their impressive culture, their inestimable gifts of loyalty and their richly constructive citizenship have contributed immeasurably to the advancement and glory of our own great country.

In hailing the cause of free Lithuania, let us not forget the cruel fate that now afflicts the unhappy Lithuanian nation. The oppression that the Lithuanian people suffer is not confined to Lithuania alone, but encompasses the Poles, the

Latvians, the Rumanians, the Serbs, the Hungarians, the Czechs, the Slavs and many other free peoples who are victims of the callous brutality of the slave state and Red oppression.

The anguished people of Lithuania, stirred by poignant memories of a happier day, are unable to observe their Independence Day. Let us today here in America and let free peoples everywhere commemorate this anniversary for them.

At the same time, let it be known on this anniversary day that the American people stand by Lithuania and other oppressed peoples who are the victims of confiscation, aggression, exploitation, and brutal tyranny. Let us give hope and inspiration to the helpless and the oppressed by encouraging the forces of freedom in the world.

Long live free Lithuania.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, Lithuanians form one of the oldest racial groups in northeastern Europe. For centuries they had constituted their own independent state and lived there happily, but late in the 18th century their country became part of the Russian Empire and they unwilling subjects of Russian czars. But these stouthearted people were never reconciled with their unhappy lot, and when the czarist regime was overthrown in 1917, they proclaimed their independence on February 16, 1918. Thenceforth for about two decades they lived happily in their homeland and enjoyed the blessings of freedom and democracy.

World War II was disastrous to the Lithuanians. In 1940 they were forcibly annexed by the Soviet Union. After suffering under Soviet communism for a year, their country was overrun by Nazi forces; then early in 1944 the Red army returned once more, and it has been there ever since.

Thus on the 44th anniversary of their independence day unhappy Lithuanians find themselves sealed off from the free world in their homeland, but they still cling to their hope of regaining their freedom. On their independence day our wholehearted sympathy goes to these gallant people.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marks Lithuanian Independence Day. It is a day which should not be overlooked in the hurly-burly atmosphere of today's world. We have much to learn from the Lithuanian people, and it is good that we remember our debt of gratitude to them.

The Lithuanian people have given us an inspiring example of devotion to freedom. This independence day signifies their continuing love of liberty, although they had fallen victim to Hitler's armies, and now find themselves under the oppressive boot of Khrushchev's military forces. They still have not given up the hope of regaining their independence in the face of what presently appears to be almost overwhelming odds. Lithuanians have died before in their fight for freedom, and they are no less prepared today to give their lives in the name of this noble cause. Can we do less?

We have freedom. We know how it enriches our lives and gives purpose to our every action. If the Lithuanian people are willing to die for the freedom which they presently are denied by their Communist masters, we, too, should be ready to make sacrifices to preserve it. We are grateful to them for showing us the way. It is a pleasure to honor their courageous spirit on this independence day.

The American people hope that the freedom-loving forces within Lithuania will not be disheartened in the future struggle against Communist tyranny. Let them know that we stand by them; that we are making every effort to check Communist imperialism; that we are actively working for the day when people everywhere will be able to choose the life which they deem best. Lithuania has successfully asserted its independence before. The continued celebration of Lithuanian Independence Day indicates that they will again take their rightful place in the sun of nations.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting that we turn our thoughts to the countries under the domination of the Soviet Union on the anniversaries of their national holidays. We are ordinarily concerned in this House with the unsolved political, economic, and social problems of the United States. Without minimizing our difficulties in living up to the highest ideals of our country, I would like to suggest that directing our attention regularly to the plight of the captive nations helps us to place our own problems in the proper perspective. There are no more brutal police states in the world today than the Communist dictatorships of Eastern Europe. It is a sobering experience indeed to consider the human suffering which continues to exist behind the Iron Curtain, where freedom is unknown and the full force of Communist totalitarianism reigns supreme.

Today we commemorate the 44th anniversay of the restoration of independence in Lithuania, a once powerful nation which suffered for over a century under the ruthless domination of czarist Russia. On February 16, 1918, a group of 200 Lithuanian leaders assembled to consider the future of their country, which at the time was occupied by Germany. Like our own Founding Fathers, the Lithuanian leaders proclaimed their independence fully conscious that they would have to redeem their pledge with their own blood. When the German troops evacuated the capital city of Vilnius on January 15, 1919, the Red army entered the city and installed a Communist government. The next year the Russian forces were driven out by Polish and Lithuanian troops, the Soviet Union signed a peace treaty renouncing all future rights to Lithuania, and the steadfast Lithuanian people embarked on a regime of freedom and independence. But the era of Lithuanian independence which we recall today was not destined to survive, in a world which is ruled by force of arms rather than peace treaties. At the outset of the Second World War the long-suffering Lithuanian people were invaded by Nazi Germany, which after causing immeasurable human and material damage was driven out by the equally ruthless dictatorship of the Soviet Union. The Lithuanian state was forcefully incorporated into the U.S.S.R., an act which the United States has never recognized. Mr. Speaker, on this 44th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day we are united in hoping that the future will bring a better life to the Lithuanian people and fulfill their ancient desires for freedom and independence in their historic national home.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 44th anniversary of the restoration of independence to the Baltic nation of Lithuania. With my good friend and colleague, the Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD, I join in paying a personal tribute to the Lithuanian people behind the Iron Curtain and the American citizens of Lithuanian descent in our own land.

On last Sunday, Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to address the American-Lithuanian Society of Washington, D.C., at their annual event commemorating the 44th anniversary of Lithuania's independence. It was an honor for me to be the guest of the society and to receive the warm and cordial greeting from Mrs. Barbara Darlys, president of the society, and from other members and guests.

Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks the address which I delivered at this inspiring event.

> It is a great honor and privilege to be with you today to help celebrate the 44th anniversary of Lithuanian independence. Those who have come from that land to the United States have contributed much to the progress and to the strength of our own great Nation.
>
> In my own congressional district we have some, but not many, American citizens who claim Lithuania as the homeland of their fathers. We are very proud of these fellow citizens because of their high cultural, moral, and spiritual standards, and the part they have played in the progress of our community.
>
> In the Congress of the United States you have many friends and supporters of your ideal of freedom for your fatherland.
>
> As a people you have a rich history, a glorious past, and a love of freedom. You have suffered the tragedy, not only of Soviet oppression and tyranny, but czarist rule and slavery as well.
>
> Despite the long and enduring struggle for freedom in your fatherland, you have kept the faith and the determination to be free. That the spirit of freedom and national independence can still burn so brightly after years and years, generations and generations, of cultural and physical oppression is a tribute to the strong character of the Lithuanian people. It gives hope to all of us who share the Christian faith and love of freedom that liberty and justice, and not Communist and totalitarian tyranny, is the wave of the future.
>
> You are to be commended for your faith and confidence in the future. Some of our own American citizens who are confused and overwhelmed by the almost insurmountable problems which we face could profit by your determination and efforts.
>
> To look with suspicion and distrust on our own Government and its leadership creates disunity and unwittingly helps the Communist conspiracy.
>
> President Kennedy understands the Communist threat. He has given our Nation and the free world new faith and confidence. I share with the President his philosophy that social reform is an effective weapon

in wiping out the conditions under which the Communist seed takes root and grows.

Khrushchev and the Red legions of China are ready to push forward at every break in our ranks. Dedicated agents of the international Communist conspiracy are now busily at work in Laos, in Vietnam, in Cuba, in Africa, and in every underdeveloped area of the world. Where arms can be used, they are employed. Where guerrilla warfare works better, it becomes their major weapon. And where the slow but steady subversion is required, that becomes their tool of destruction.

The Communist challenge is a total one, employing not only military means, but economic, propaganda, political, and ideological weapons as well.

There has never been a time in history when free men and women have needed to think more seriously about the past and use their historical knowledge to chart their course in the fight for freedom.

It would be wise for those of us who are here today to take a moment from our festivities and consider the deep historical significance which the biography of Lithuania holds for people everywhere.

Although Lithuania regained her independence after World War I, this historic event did not mark the beginning of an independent Lithuania. Nor did it mark the appearance of a new people on the stage of history. Both of these occurrences had taken place centuries ago, long before the arrival of Christianity in the Baltic States.

During the early Middle Ages, the Lithuanian people had established one of the most powerful and independent states in Europe—a state which was almost as large as France and Germany. Because of their power and their love of independence, the Lithuanian people were the chief defenders of Western civilization against the Mongols and Turks. In their golden age, they encouraged education and toleration and played their part in the general development of European civilization.

But in 1794 the Lithuanian people were overwhelmed by superior numbers and placed in the bonds of czarist slavery. For the next 120 years, they and their children, and their children's children lived under the cruelist oppression and brutality.

Schools, churches, and monasteries were closed. Repressive measures were taken against all forms of Lithuanian culture, including language, schools, the Catholic religion, and the personnel in the nation's administrative offices.

Condemned patriots were shackled, brought to their home communities, and executed publicly with fanfare and display. Priests were beaten and murdered. Parents were forced to witness the execution of their sons. Many thousands were exiled to Siberia.

Yet, in spite of all the oppression and cruelty, there had never been a single generation within those 120 years in which the Lithuanian people did not take up arms in a desperate effort to recover their lost liberty. It was the First World War, however, that again made possible the freedom of Lithuania. With the collapse of czarist Russia and the end of hostilities, the nation of Lithuania was finally able to return to self-government.

A permanent constitution was adopted on August 1, 1922. It was truly a liberal document. The state of Lithuania was termed an "independent democratic Republic" and sovereign authority was vested in the nation, which exercised it through its Parliament, Government, and courts. The people of the Republic were guaranteed their constitutional rights to freedom of speech, assembly, and religion.

The new state was a progressive one. Its land-reform program was a most effective one. Within a few years after its initiation over 45,000 new farms had been established, and more than 200,000 people were provided with regular occupations and permanent homes.

Along with land reform came the improvement of traditional farming methods.

In education, great progress was also made. Between 1920 and 1937 the number of elementary schools more than doubled and the number of teachers and students increased over threefold.

There was also a great deal of social legislation in the new state. Numerous hospitals were built and community medical centers were set in operation. The 8-hour day became firmly established, and provisions were made for the medical care of the rural population. A sickness insurance system was taking care of 133,000 workmen and their families. It is evident that in the area of progressive and humanitarian legislation, this newly formed Republic was even ahead of us in the United States.

The industry of the nation also thrived during this 20-year period. And the new Republic quickly set to work to improve the neglected railroads and inadequate highways which were left by the czarist henchmen.

The record of the Lithuanian Republic was a highly-commendable one. I relate it to you today because it is a record of what a free people can do when they join together in a common effort. I relate it to you today because it is a record of which you and your countrymen can be justly proud.

But just when the fruits of 20 years of hard toil and labor were being realized, war rumblings were heard again in Europe, and the Kremlin leaders broke their promises of peace and friendship and resorted to cynical treachery. Proclamations of Lithuanian neutrality meant little to the Soviet leaders.

Leaders of the young Republic foresaw the real Soviet intentions and were forced into exile. On June 15, 1940, the tiny Baltic nation was crushed by the iron heel of Communist tyranny.

Almost at once, all non-Communist parties and political organizations were abolished. Only the Communist apparatus remained as the legal political party. Elections became a mockery of the democratic process.

On August 25, 1940, a Soviet constitution was shoved down the throats of the Lithuanian people and a long-range program for the sovietization of the Lithuanian political, economic, and social order began.

After the war these efforts increased. A vigorous drive against individual farmers was waged, and complete collectivization of these people became the Soviet's goal. With this regimentation the productivity and living standard of the farmers diminished.

Books were burned, churches were razed, monasteries closed. Hundreds of priests were beaten, tortured, and deported to Siberia. Those people who were brave enough to openly observe their religious holidays were summoned, intimidated, and arrested. The teaching of religion to children was absolutely forbidden.

In 1 week alone in 1941, more than 34,000 persons were deported to remote areas of Siberia and the Arctic.

Between 1948 and 1949, when Lithuanian farmers resisted Soviet collectivization of farmlands, about 10 percent of Lithuania's population was driven to Siberia.

The story of Lithuania is a tragic one. It is a story which tells us much about the nature of our enemy and the will of a courageous people to be free and secure.

The experience of Lithuania is evidence of Communist hyprocrisy and their cynical definitions of words like "freedom" and "democracy."

Between 1920 and 1940 the Soviet Union, time and time again, made solemn pronouncements of their policies of noninterference in Lithuanian affairs and of their desire for peaceful coexistence and friendship.

Those who know the story of Lithuania, of Poland, of Lativa, of Estonia, of Hungary, of East Berlin, of Czechoslovakia, understand the real meaning of Soviet peace movements and overtures.

The story of Lithuania teaches us that the will to be free cannot be extinguished in a courageous people. Neither the United States nor any other free country has recognized the Soviet conquest of the Lithuanian people.

The situation existing in Lithuania today is a blot on the conscience of mankind. It makes a mockery of every Soviet expression of "self-determination" and "national independence."

People of future generations will bear witness to the fact that history is against Communist oppression and dictatorship. Even a hundred and twenty years of most brutal and czarist oppression could not stifle the breath of a freedom-loving people. Despite brutality and conquest, I am sure that the old Lithuanian phrase will, in the end, prevail. "Kas bus, kas nebus, O Lietuva neprazus."

The ancient and wonderful people of Lithuania have been bred to hardship. They have endured pain and suffering from time immemorial. They have seen nations in turmoil. They have felt the stirrings of nations on the move. They have known hardship in warfare against the Crusader, the Tartar, the Russians, and the Germans. They have passed through the crucibles of hate, and have never completely bowed before Slav or German. Their will to be free has never died.

The people of Lithuania have a faith that no amount of brutality and oppression can destroy. The people of Lithuania have a courage that the Soviets can never vanquish. The people of Lithuania have the character and strength to survive all the fraud and the force and the fear of Communist tyranny.

The people of Lithuania have been free in the past. They will be free in the future. And those of us in America will again welcome her to the world of free and peaceful nations.

Your faith in the future can be strengthened by rumblings behind the Iron Curtain. Many in the Soviet Union are living in the hopes that they, too, will one day enjoy the freedom and liberty that all good people hope and pray for.

Time and history are against the rule of tyranny and dictatorship. The desire and determination to be free are universal, even where it seems hopeless today. The spark of human freedom never dies. It burns deeply in the human breast. It will again one day burst into a flame. We trust that the day is not far away when your fatherland and people everywhere will enjoy their God-given rights and move forward to a world of peace, friendship, and justice.

Mr. Speaker, I also wish to include with my remarks the following resolution which was adopted by the society last Sunday:

AMERICAN LITHUANIAN SOCIETY, WASHINGTON, D.C.—RESOLUTIONS

Citizens of the Metropolitan Washington area gathered February 11, 1962, under the auspices of the American Lithuanian Society, at the Washington Hotel, in the Capital of the United States, for the observance of the 44th anniversary of the restitution of independence of Lithuania, after due deliberation voted the following resolutions to be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Ambassador to the United Nations, Members of Congress of the United States, the diplomatic representatives of the Republics of

Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, and to the press:

"1. We wish to add our voices to other expressions by fellow American citizens of their gratitude to the several succeeding administrations which, ever since July 23, 1940, steadfastly refused to recognize the fruits of the Hitler-Stalin connivance at aggression and continued to recognize the diplomatic and consular representatives of the Republics of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia in the United States.

"2. Viewing with gratification the steady progress and peaceful accession by various peoples on the Asian and African continents to sovereign statehood and independence since World War II, achieved in most cases in cooperation with the countries formerly possessed of those areas, we deplore the contrary trend on the European Continent, where the Muscovite Soviet Empire subverted or conquered and reduced to colonial status a number of formerly independent countries with centuries-long traditions of sovereignty and which had played an active part in the development of the Christian European civilization, viz., Lithuania and other countries of central and eastern Europe.

"3. The Washingtonians, Marylanders, and Virginians gathered at this commemorative observance, urgently request the Government of the United States to concern itself more actively, in its quest for peace with liberty and justice, with the urgent problem of removing the major obstacle to peace in Europe—by promoting actively in the United Nations and in meetings with the leaders of the Soviet Union the effects to restore to the peoples of Lithuania and other similarly situated countries their untrammeled sovereignty and to provide the conditions enabling those peoples to choose their own government without the presence of the troops of a foreign dictatorship and of its political arm.

"4. Finally, we extend our greetings and best wishes to the people of Lithuania on the occasion of their cherished independence day."

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, once again we direct our thoughts to the brave people of Lithuania, who today observe their Independence Day as best they can behind the Iron Curtain. It is now over 20 years since the Lithuanian people lived in freedom under rulers of their choice, and 44 years to the day since 200 Lithuanian delegates, meeting with the permission of their German rulers, proclaimed an independent Lithuania based on democratic principles. Shortly after this proclamation German troops evacuated the capital city of Vilnius and the occupation from the West was succeeded by a new occupation from the East, led by the Red army of the new Soviet Government. Only after driving out this army with the help of Polish forces were the Lithuanian leaders able to realize their proclaimed aim of independence, thus fulfilling the legitimate historical aspirations of the Lithuanian people to be the masters of their own fate. After 1921 the Lithuanians enjoyed a few years of freedom, but the interwar period must have seemed very short indeed for this once mighty nation which had just emerged from 120 years of czarist Russian imperialism.

With the start of the Second World War Lithuania was once again overrun by ruthless invaders, first from Nazi Germany and then from the Soviet Union. The Russians tore up their treaty obligations and incorporated the three tiny Baltic States into the U.S.S.R. Today the captive nations of Eastern Europe constitute the largest colonial empire in the world, just as the other subjugated peoples of the world are receiving their freedom. But the people of Lithuania have not forgotten their ancient heritage, despite Soviet efforts to cut them off from the world and make them forget that their homeland was ever free. The Communist efforts to make the national minorities in the Soviet Union forget their traditional loyalties has failed in Lithuania, as it has failed in other parts of the Soviet Empire.

Thus we commemorate Lithuanian Independence Day without joyous celebrations, but with a deep sense of responsibility, which I know is shared by every Member of the U.S. Congress. Just as we dare not give the Lithuanian people false hopes regarding their chances for regaining their freedom in the immediate future, so also must we commit ourselves totally to the cause of the free world, which is also the cause of the Lithuanian people, in order that this ruthless Communist dictatorship will eventually give way to an international order which respects the rights of all people to enjoy peace and independence in their homelands. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to salute the Lithuanian people on the 44th anniversary of their independence.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, we pause to celebrate the 44th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day. By doing so we help to keep alive the hopes and aspirations of the Lithuanian people who languish under the heel of Soviet Russian imperialism. Lithuania has every right to independence and we must not let the world forget these truths.

The state of Lithuania is actually more than 1,000 years old and its modern-united state reaches back to the beginning of the 13th century. The Lithuanian Lincoln was Grand Duke Mindaugas. In the year 1236 he already led a united Lithuanian Army against the Teutons. In 1251 he adopted Christianity and in 1253 he was crowned King of Lithuania. So the modern Lithuanian state is at least 700 years old. During 120 of these years Lithuania was occupied and ruled by the Russian Empire and many Lithuanians were exterminated and deported to the depths of Russia during this period. The Lithuanians did not, however, surrender to Russia. Succeeding generations rebelled against the occupying force until finally, on February 16, 1918, Lithuania proclaimed the severance of all ties with Russia and her restoration as an independent Lithuanian Republic founded on a democratic basis.

For more than two decades Lithuania stood as a bulwark of democracy until, in the name of liberation, it was overrun and forcibly incorporated under the totalitarian tyranny of Soviet communism. But the Lithuanians' love of liberty and democracy could not be extinguished—they burn as brightly as ever.

Americans of Lithuanian descent will celebrate again this year the anniversary of their nation's independence. They will again voice their sympathy for their enslaved countrymen and once more protest vehemently against the alien forces of darkness that have seized their homeland. I think that today we all realize our commitment not only to the people of Lithuania but to those people in all areas of the globe under Soviet tyranny—a commitment to keep uppermost in our minds the goal that they will again be free. Therefore, we resolve it to be our duty to see that political freedom again takes its proper place in the world scene.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, today, February 16, is the 44th anniversary of Lithuanian independence. Unfortunately, however, this day will not be one of rejoicing in Lithuania for these brave people are under the firm grip of communism. Nevertheless, this anniversary date does offer the people of the free world an opportunity to express their hope that this brave nation, with a history filled with the determination to be free, will once again be able to celebrate its independence day.

During their period of independence—from February 16, 1918, until their occupation by the Nazis in 1941 and later their incorporation with the Soviet Union in 1944—the Lithuanian people showed the world what they could accomplish living in an atmosphere of freedom. This free nation through the creative efforts of her people became a progressive, independent, democratic republic. Rapidly, she became a respected member of the international community.

Communist control of Lithuania, however, marked the end of liberty for the Lithuanian people. Since then, this captive nation has been unable to observe February 16 as a day of celebration. Consequently, this day has become an occasion for the free world in the name of these silenced people to protest the fraudulent incorporation of this helpless nation into the Soviet Union.

In this country, all Americans join with Lithuanian-Americans in expressing this concern for the subjugated Lithuanians by proclaiming that their conscience will never know peace until Lithuania once again will resume her rightful place among the free nations of the world. Furthermore, this day offers us an opportunity to reiterate our promise that we will never accept the bondage of these brave people. In all fairness, we should never encourage false hopes for liberation, but we should assure them that we will continue to work realistically for the truth expressed so appropriately in the Atlantic Charter—that all peoples have the right to choose the form of government under which they desire to live. We are confident that this truth in the end will prevail and that freedom and liberty once more will be restored in Lithuania.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, all wars and revolutions cause death and destruction, but some of these bring happiness and joy to some people. The First World War and the Russian revolution of 1917 ushered in a new era to many oppressed nationalities in the defunct

Russian Empire. Many of these asserted their freedom after the overthrow of the czarist regime in 1917, and proclaimed their independence. Thus the Lithuanian independence, proclaimed on February 16, 1918, was a child of the Russian revolution of 1917.

Since the late 18th century, Lithuania had become part of czarist Russia and for more than 100 years Lithuanians had to endure the oppressive yoke of Russia's autocratic regime. The czar's callous and cruel officials during that long period did all in their power to eradicate and uproot all signs and symbols of Lithuanian nationalism. Yet against all oppressions the Lithuanians retained their sense of nationality. They venerated their national traditions, clung steadfastly to their ideals, and longed for their national independence.

On February 16, 44 years ago, Lithuanians regained their freedom and proclaimed their political independence. In the employment of that freedom they worked ceaselessly and tirelessly, and in the course of two decades, during the interwar years, they rebuilt their war-ravaged country as a model of prosperous and progressive democracy. Then came the Second World War, which in the course of its first year swallowed independent Lithuania and made it, much against the wishes of the helpless Lithuanians, part of the Soviet Union.

Since 1940, except for the 2-year period during the war, the unfortunate Lithuanians have been oppressed by the tyrannical government imposed upon them by the Communist rulers of the Kremlin. This they suffer in misery and under conditions approaching servitude beneath the heel of their detested and despised overlords. At the same time, in their hearts they all cherish the hope that someday, somehow, freedom and independence may dawn over their heads in their historic and beloved homeland. On the 44th anniversary of their independence day I am glad to join all freedom-loving Lithuanians and echo their genuine patriotic feelings for a free Lithuania.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, in Connecticut, February 16 has been officially designated as Lithuanian Day to commemorate the 44th anniversary of the Lithuanian declaration of independence. Whereas all of America will be marking this day, Connecticut will be taking special note to honor the many citizens of Lithuanian descent who reside in Connecticut. While honoring the Lithuanian people on this day, we also join them in their sorrow and in their hope for their native land.

The tragic history of Lithuania's abortive attempt at independence has been recorded in the hearts of freemen as a lesson in the cruelty of Soviet subjugation and also in the faith and tenacity of a nation striving to retain her national identity. Lithuania's fate has typified all too realistically the conflict between freedom and totalitarian communism, between the very elements of good and evil. Lithuania had the courage and the spirit to resist tyranny, but because it lacked the force of arms, Bolshevik Russia reconquered the young nation.

To their everlasting honor, the idea of freedom has never been erased from the minds and hearts of the Lithuanian people. Although the conquering Bolshevik hordes executed or deported her intellectual leaders and crushed with unlimited terror the valiant resistance movement, the Lithuanian people have heroically clung to their cultural and spiritual heritage. Thus, in its oppression and frustration, Lithuania has become a living symbol of the love and sacrifice of freedom.

We who are free from the restrictions of the Iron Curtain can openly honor and commemorate Lithuania on this day and reaffirm our support of Lithuania's fight for freedom.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on the first day of Lithuanian independence, February 16, 1918, the Lithuanian people emerged from several centuries of domination by their Russian neighbors, as well as from several years of occupation by the German forces of World War I. Liberty was won at last, but difficult to retain.

Lithuanian freedom lasted only the length of the interwar period. A few days after the German attack on the Soviet Union, in 1941, Lithuania was overrun by Nazi troops. Later when the tide of war turned against the Germans, Lithuania came under the equally ruthless domination of the Soviet Union. Since that time Lithuania has remained a Russian captive, virtually isolated from the West.

But Lithuania's brief taste of freedom has been enough to keep the will to be independent alive. Today, in observing this day of independence that is the symbol of Lithuanian aspirations, we reflect upon the tragic history of that brave land. We cannot allow the desire for freedom, the hope for independence, to go unnourished. The future does not belong to the Soviet Communists any more than it did to Hitler's "master race." The United States has not and will not forget the plight of the Lithuanian people. Today we rededicate ourselves to the cause of freedom everywhere, in the name of Lithuania, and in the name of justice for all men.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, February 16, will mark the 44th anniversary of the declaration of independence of the Republic of Lithuania and the attainment of a long cherished dream of freedom from foreign domination. On that date in 1918, before the end of World War I, a few million people courageously overcame generations of despotic rule and, at the same time, inspired the hearts of freedom-loving people all over the world.

Our celebration of the freedom won by the Lithuanian people is clouded, however, by the knowledge that these people are again in captivity. In the tragic events which preceded our entry into World War II, two decades of independence ended abruptly with the Soviet occupation of Lithuania in 1939. Along with the other Baltic Republics, Estonia and Latvia, Lithuania was drawn by the force of the Red army into subjugation by the Soviet Union.

There was the pretense of free elections during the occupation, but the very presence of Soviet force made it dramatically clear that those elections were only a mockery. The need for such force, furthermore, demonstrated that the Kremlin had not completely defeated the desire for liberty by the valiant Lithuanian people.

Today, Americans of Lithuanian descent are continuing to keep alive the many aspects of Lithuanian tradition and culture which have enriched our country. They also nourish the hope that national independence may be restored and under a regime which truly seeks social and political justice.

All Americans, I know, share with me the earnest hope that Lithuanians will again enjoy the God-given rights of freedom and liberty. I join the other Members of this House to express sympathy and friendship to a brave people. We pray that for them the future will bring independence to their homeland and the right to pursue in peace their own national destiny.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marks the 44th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania and later during the same year in 1918 Lithuania became a republic.

The anniversary of this day which we now celebrate brings to our mind very vividly the birth of independence and freedom in our own country many years before.

We realize full well the long road that was traveled by the Lithuanian people prior to the time they could shake off the yoke of bondage and call themselves free. This freedom was not theirs for long, however, for in 1940 Lithuania was seized by the Russians and immediately the cloak of censorship was dropped over that little country and today it is engulfed with the other satellite nations behind the Iron Curtain.

Just as the spirit of freedom lived on in the minds of the early American settlers during the days of the Revolution, so also does that spirit of freedom still grow in the hearts of the Lithuanian people in their own country.

Today we honor these people and it is our fervent prayer and fond hope that one day they too will regain that precious gift and to that end we join them in our hopes and our prayers.

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with my distinguished colleagues in expressing tribute to the people of Lithuania on this 44th anniversary of their independence. February 16, 1918, marked the end of well over a century during which Lithuania suffered under a hostile, foreign rule. There was confidence and rejoicing that day as independence became theirs at last. Lithuania's social and economic record between the World Wars was a good one and she assumed the obligations of a modern progressive state.

Her hopes for continued freedom, however, were soon crushed between the pincer drive of Germany and Soviet Russia into the Baltic area. After a preliminary period of conquest by the Russians, occupation by the Germans, and then reconquest by the Russians, Lithuania was annexed to the Soviet Union in 1944. Since that time Lithuania has been held within the Russian orbit as a Soviet republic. The U.S. Government, however, has consistently refused to acknowledge this imperialistic conquest and still recognizes Lithuania as a free and independent nation.

One could not blame the Lithuanian people if they were to assume a defeatist attitude after such tribulations. And yet the spirit of independence still fires the hearts of these courageous men and women. They live for and dream of the day on which the flag of free Lithuania may once again wave over their land. Let us salute them today and pledge our continued efforts to support their undying fight for freedom.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, it is rightly said that the whole world is kin. That is why we, as liberty-loving Americans, take cognizance that tomorrow, February 16, 1962, will mark the 44th anniversary of Lithuania's independence. We feel a kinship with our fellow human beings on the other side of the ocean which strikes a responsive chord in our hearts. We understand and appreciate the longing for freedom and independence that the brave people of Lithuania have.

Forty-four years ago, Lithuania regained her freedom which, unfortunately, was short lived. In 1940, during the course of the last war, Lithuania's independence was lost and that unhappy country fell under the ruthless heel of Communist tyrants who were bent on destroying the rights of man to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Yet, the spirit of liberty and the dedication to self-determination still lives strongly in the bosom of every person in that now unhappy land.

Here we can see a striking example that the world cannot take the word of the Russians nor believe anything they might say or agree to. By the Treaty of Moscow of 1920, Soviet Russia recognized the sovereignty and independence of Lithuania and forever renounced all rights possessed by it over the Lithuanian people and its territory. Notwithstanding such guaranteed liberty and a solemn treaty and agreement of nonaggression, Russia regarded such formal covenant as a mere scrap of paper and violated it with wanton disregard.

The mere fact that we, here in the Congress of the United States, take time out from our pressing legislative duties to not only take note of Lithuania's plight, but to recognize Russia's failure to live up to their treaty obligations, should give new hope to the captive nations behind the Iron Curtain. We cannot, we will not, abandon these people who have been so sorely oppressed by the evil and dark forces of communism. I maintain that it is our duty as human beings to encourage enslaved peoples everywhere in their hopes for freedom and the achievement of dignity to which man is fully entitled.

It so happens that during the month of February, the United States joyously celebrates the birthdays of two truly great men, Washington and Lincoln, fighters for human freedom, liberty and justice. We Americans are, indeed, blessed to possess such precious rights and feel that people in other lands are also entitled to them. That is why I am in favor of House Resolution 211, a measure calling for the establishment, in the House of Representatives, of a Special Committee on Captive Nations.

To our fellow Americans of Lithuanian descent who have contributed so very much to enrich our own culture and economy, we must show that we will continue to support the cause of liberty and freedom everywhere and strive for the restoration of true independence for Lithuania. This we must do until their liberation is an established fact.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, this is a day of special significance, and I hold it a great honor to join in this commemoration of the 44th anniversary of Lithuania's independence.

Lithuania's history as a nation dates back to the year 1200. She possesses an inheritance of rich cultural values and a splendid record of individual people who have a deep sense of compassion for their fellow men.

Lithuania's long struggle toward freedom has been marked with blood and tears. The forcible seizure of this freedom-loving country by the Soviet Union, and the occupation by the Soviet of Lithuania's two neighboring states, Latvia and Estonia, is an indelible stain on the history of civilization. This illegal action has never been recognized by the United States, and we are committed to the restoration of freedom in these brave nations.

Untold sufferings, privations, and blood have been paid by liberty-loving Lithuanians to gain their freedom. To retain this glowing spirit of liberty, to strengthen and to expand it, requires constant vigilance and perseverance, and that is our task.

On this occasion, we rededicate ourselves to principle and to the long hard struggle of regaining freedom for Lithuania. May the courage and loyalty of Lithuanians the world over draw the admiration and praise of all liberty-loving people of every nation.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, on Friday the 16th of February, the men and women of Lithuania and Lithuanian descent will be celebrating the 44th anniversary of that nation's independence. Only in Lithuania itself, where the iron rule of a Communist Russian dictatorship holds sway, is this day not celebrated.

Today we pay homage to a proud but enslaved nation, and in so doing, we serve warning to all oppressors that freemen everywhere look with disdain and repugnance on the deeds of tyranny.

Mr. Speaker, for more than a hundred years, in the 19th century, patriotic Lithuanians worked for their day of freedom from czarist oppression. At last their cherished dream came true in 1918. For more than 20 years Lithuanians enjoyed their newly won independence. They organized a democratic form of government, enacted many progressive social and economic institutions, and became a respected member in the family of nations. But, unfortunately, in the fall of 1939 it was forced into a nonaggression pact with the Soviet Union, and in the summer of 1940 it was incorporated into the Soviet Union. Since then Lithuanians have not known freedom. First came the Nazi occupation, and then in 1944 the dreaded Red army returned, and has remained ever since. Lithuania has been cut off from the outside world and the country is again under foreign domination.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with my colleagues on this memorable occasion in sympathetic greetings to all those in Lithuania in the hope that we may soon see a new day in which Lithuania may again enjoy freedom as a nation and contribute to the progress of a free world.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, once more it is with a feeling of privilege and honor that I join my colleagues here on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives in tribute to Lithuania. Tomorrow marks the 44th anniversary of the independence of that proud country. After a prolonged period of Russian domination followed by German occupation during World War I, the Lithuanian people finally reached the goal for which they had been striving on February 16, 1918. As history records, that freedom was short lived and Lithuania was once again dominated when occupied by Russia in World War II. In July of 1940 she was forcibly made a part of the Soviet Union.

The dedication of the people of Lithuania to regain their independence as a nation and to reestablish personal freedom throughout their land remains steadfast—this despite the cruel yoke of Russian suppression which has held Lithuania in virtual slavery.

Today all patriotic and liberty-loving Lithuanians in the free world celebrate their national independence. Unfortunately their brothers in the homeland are not permitted to do so by their Communist overlords. That sacred privilege is denied them. Let us all hope and pray that soon they will once again become masters of their own destiny, and that they will be able to celebrate this great day in freedom and honor.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, Lithuania has been known to history since the year 1009, when it was a nation divided into many principalities. As a result of repeated threats from abroad these principalities joined together in a united state, and in 1253 a delegate of Pope Innocent IV crowned Mindaugas, who had been baptized 2 years earlier, as the king of a united Lithuania. By the 14th century the Lithuanian state had extended its boundaries into what is now the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic. Lithuanian influence was further extended by a union with Poland, first in the 14th century as a result of a marriage between the rulers of the two countries, then as a legal union which lasted from the 16th century until almost the end of the 18th. During the Middle Ages the Lithuanians established a powerful and independent European state, which successfully turned back various foreign invasions. The eastern Slavs enjoyed far more freedom than the residents of Moscow and were able to live in peace with neighboring countries.

It may help us to understand the present unfortunate condition of the Lithuanian nation if we recall that Russian domination goes back to 1795, when Poland was divided for the third time. The Lithuanians repeatedly tried to throw out the Russians, but without success. The Russians reacted to the revolts by trying to replace Lithuanian culture and language with Russian, but the Lithuanians remained loyal to their traditional religion, language and culture, and the Soviet attempts at Russification were finally abandoned in 1905.

Lithuania was overrun by invading armies in the First and Second World Wars, and on both occasions she was at the mercy of both German and Russian conquerors. However, the Russian revolution and the defeat of Germany provided Lithuanian nationalists with a long-awaited opportunity to make good their suppressed desires for freedom. In 1917, 200 Lithuanians received permission from the German Government to hold a congress on the future of Lithuania, and on February 16, 1918—44 years ago today—this meeting proposed an independent Lithuanian state based on the principles of freedom and democracy.

But the evacuating German troops were replaced by members of the Red army, who promptly installed a Communist government. Only after the Soviet forces were driven out by the Polish Army, led by Marshal Joseph Pilsudski and with the help of Lithuanian soldiers, did Russia sign a peace treaty. This document, signed in 1920, proclaimed Russia's recognition of Lithuania as an independent nation and a Soviet pledge that "Russia recognizes without any reserve the sovereignty and independence of the State of Lithuania with all juridical consequences resulting from such recognition, and voluntarily and forever renounces all sovereign rights possessed by Russia over the Lithuanian people and territory." How ironic do these words sound 40 years later, and how little weight do legal documents carry when pitted against the overwhelming force of a large nation.

The peace settlement with Russia was followed by a dispute between Lithuania and Poland over their common boundary and the city of Vilnius, which the Lithuanians wanted as their capital. This controversy was resolved by the League of Nations in 1923. The Lithuanians lost Vilnius but gained the formerly German territory of Memel. Lithuania was herself admitted to the League of Nations in 1921 and like so many other smaller powers served as a constructive force for peace. Meanwhile the Lithuanians elected their first president and adopted a constitution, guaranteeing the basic civil liberties and freedom to all its citizens.

The Soviet Union's sympathy for Lithuania, expressed in the decisive language of the 1920 peace treaty, is explained by the geographical position of the small Baltic State, with her common frontiers with both Poland and Germany, which made Lithuania a convenient pawn in the diplomatic and military game. During the interwar years the Soviet Government consistently supported the Lithuanian claim for the return of her historic capital of Vilnius from Poland, even though the Lithuanian Government of this period were strongly anti-Communist. But Soviet friendship was, of course, deceptive. When Russia and Germany divided Poland between them in 1939, the Soviet Union returned the city of Vilnius to Lithuania, but the gift did not cost the Russians anything, for shortly thereafter they annexed all of Lithuania into the U.S.S.R. The tiny country of Lithuania was overrun by successive waves of Soviet, German, and in 1944, once again, Soviet armies.

After their incorporation into the Soviet Union the three Baltic States were kept sealed off from the outside world. Until 1959, when Vilnius was opened, no Western observers were allowed into Lithuania. The rest of the country remains closed today, perhaps because the Baltic coast is ideally suited for missile bases.

Mr. Speaker, I have recalled the unhappy modern history of the Lithuanian people in some detail because I believe it important that we appreciate the background of Lithuanian suffering. The Kremlin can deny the freedom to work, talk or travel, but the Lithuanian people still remain the masters of their souls, and the passionate desire for freedom remains. This desire is a common heritage of the people of Lithuania and the people of the United States; it forms a bond no Iron Curtain can break.

And therefore, the privilege we have today of celebrating the Lithuanian independence, like all privileges, carries with it a responsibility. We here today, and the entire free world, have the heavy responsibility and the awesome challenge to be sure that someday Lithuania again will be free. We have this responsibility not only because Lithuania deserves her freedom, but also because the free world would not long remain free if it forgets those who are less fortunate.

On this 44th anniversary of Lithuanian independence the American people take the opportunity to tell the people of Lithuania that their plight is not forgotten and their hopes are also our hopes. This is an opportunity too to give notice to the Soviet jailers that we have not forgotten the brave people of Lithuania they hold as prisoners. And so today is primarily a day to rededicate ourselves to the age-old struggle for freedom that has characterized the history of both the United States and Lithuania, a struggle for the dignity of man, a struggle to free him from oppression of all kinds, a struggle full of hope for the coming day of deliverance. I am proud to join with my fellow Americans of Lithuanian descent, with the entire American people and with the whole free world in a salute to the people of Lithuania.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, it is an impressive fact that Lithuanian Independence Day is being celebrated here in America. Here we cherish freedom. We honor those who defy domination. We welcome the heritage from a rich past, the contribution of a determined present, and the inspiration of a faith in the future. The Lithuanian people brought to America their love of liberty, their courage in the face of vicissitude, their tradition of centuries of civilization, their industry, and their hopefulness.

Though the Lithuania whose 44th anniversary we celebrate on February 16 is currently dominated by the Russians, it has a confidence in its regeneration which is supported by the very vicissitudes of its centuries-old past. For Lithuania, with a history and a civilization older than that of most of Europe, has been repeatedly overrun by hordes from east, west, and south. Repeatedly, it has emerged, retaining its traditions, its individuality, and its hope. The Lithuanian people have remained free in spirit, stalwart in their resistance.

There have been long periods in Lithuanian history of great progress and renown. Politically, socially, economically, and culturally the contributions of Lithuania to the development of western civilization have been great.

We in America have benefited greatly from the Lithuanians in our midst. The Lithuanian-Americans have perpetuated here their culture as old as the Christian era. A religious people, they have maintained their piety and their ideals. The suffering of generations under violence from without, domination, and disaster has but refined their endurance and their determination to retain their native characteristics. They have lived in closely knit groups, pursuing their particular arts, crafts, religion, and social habits; but with great concern for one another. Philanthropy has marked their contributions to society.

They have given, too, of their talents to the outside world. Lithuanian farmers, journalists, tailors, musicians, and artists have made names for themselves in the history of American development. The progress of the United States has depended upon the blending of such ethnic groups as these, maintaining withal their individuality, their hardihood, and the pursuit of their ideals.

Those who are aware of the richness of their past, the tenacity, the courage, and the vigor of her people today will have no doubt as to the future of an indomitable, indestructible Lithuania.

Mrs. KELLY. On February 16 we commemorate the 44th anniversary of the declaration of independence of the Lithuanian nation.

The history of Lithuania has not been a happy one. For a century and a quarter czarist Russia ruled the small Baltic state and even attempted to replace the Lithuanian language, culture, and traditions with its own. This forced Russification was, however, unsuccessful, and with the collapse of the czarist regime the Lithuanian people reasserted their desire for independence and, in 1918, proclaimed the Republic of Lithuania.

The next two decades saw the new nation grow and progress. It was admitted to the League of Nations in 1921 and thus became a member of the community of nations. Its infant industry expanded, and a successful land-reform program was put into effect. Lithuanian literature flourished, and significant achievements were made in opera and music. On August 3, 1940, however, this progress came to a halt. The Soviet Union forced the formation of a friendly government, occupied the country, and finally declared Lithuania a constituent republic in the U.S.S.R. After this occupation the country was overrun by Nazi forces and then once again, near the end of World War II, by the Red army.

Despite the heavy yoke of communism which they bear, the Lithuanians have never lost their hope for freedom and independence. They have caught what Thomas Jefferson once called "the disease of liberty" and refused to relinquish their inalienable right to self-determination. We Americans, as leaders of the free world, have an obligation to keep that hope alive not only in Lithuania but in all the countries behind the Iron Curtain. It is for this reason that I have established within the House Foreign Affairs Committee a Subcommittee on Captive Nations. In its hearings on captive nations, the subcommittee will have the following objectives in mind:

First. To focus attention on the people of the captive European nations.

Second. To study present conditions within the captive European nations, including the possibility of changes from their present status, to study present policies of the United States regarding them, and to provide the Congress with the latest and most reliable information on the situation in the captive European nations.

Third. To expose to the rest of the world that the Soviet Union has ruthlessly welded these captive nations into the Soviet colonial empire and is despotically keeping their peoples oppressed, while at the same time falsely and hyprocritically posing as the international champion of those seeking liberty and independence.

On this anniversary I can only pledge my continued support for the Lithuanian people and hope that they will soon see the realization of their dream of a free and independent Lithuania.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, since 1918, the Lithuanian people, having tasted of the precious fruit of freedom, have never relinquished their hope that one day it will be theirs again. It was in 1918, after centuries of subjugation to czarism, that the people established their own government and chose the pattern of independence, but the securing and maintaining of liberty is a never-ending battle as the Lithuanians have learned again and again. They fought off the Bolsheviks in 1920 only to find that 22 years later they were once again subjected to Soviet rule.

Thus the celebration of Independence Day by a people no longer free is not a contradiction in terms but a massive symbol that the spirit of liberty is alive. This celebration of Lithuanian Independence Day is not only a reminder to all of us how many peoples still live in subjugation but it is also a reminder, as history proves again and again, that tyranny carries within it the seeds of its own destruction.

The friends of freedom hail Lithuanian Independence Day.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to join with my fellow Representatives here today in paying tribute to the great people of Lithuania and our own Lithuanian-Americans who are celebrating the 44th anniversary of Lithuania's independence.

Forty-four years ago, Lithuania stood forth as an independent, democratic republic with a happy, prosperous people who faced the future with confidence in their destiny.

In this year of 1962, our observance here is, unfortunately, shaded with sorrow. The bright star of Lithuania's freedom has been clouded over by the violent storms of tyranny. We gaze with sadness upon the advancing tragedy of sacrifice to ruthless imperialism that has enveloped Lithuania; she has ceased to be an independent nation.

Hundreds of thousands of good Lithuanians have been torn from their families and their homes for service as slaves in Siberia. It is slave labor that the Kremlin is using to equip Russia for further expansion, for further despotism, for further persecution, and, perhaps, even for war, and a substantial part of the slave force has been kidnaped from Lithuania.

The case of Lithuania, and the other small nations, is a challenge to the moral conscience of this Nation and the United Nations to establish the great, basic principles of freedom and liberty for all peoples.

In simple justice, our Government must insist that the Lithuanian people be permitted their inalienable right to govern their internal existence as they themselves see fit.

We must dedicate ourselves today to the continuing revelation and presentation—to the world—of the facts and truth about Lithuania, so that the United Nations and the free world shall accept the full moral and humanitarian responsibility of restoring the independence of Lithuania. May God grant that this restoration will soon be accomplished.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the Lithuanian people constitute one of the smaller ethnic groups in northeastern Europe, but in the past they have played an exceptionally important part. The state they founded some 700 years ago endured for centuries, and at one time was a real force in all east European affairs. Then late in the 18th century Lithuania became part of the Russian empire, and for more than a hundred years Lithuanians lived under czarist autocracy. During the First World War when the czarist regime was no more, they asserted their freedom and proclaimed their independence on February 16, 1918.

Having thus attained their national goal they worked hard in making Lithuania a model democracy, and there they lived happily for two decades. Then came World War II and with it Lithuania's tragedy. In 1940 it was forcibly incorporated into the Soviet Union and independent Lithuania vanished in thin air. For a couple of years during the war it was occupied by the Nazi forces. Then in 1944 Russia returned and reoccupied the country once more, making it again part of the Soviet Union. Since then unhappy Lithuanians have not known freedom and have been suffering under oppressive regimes instituted and maintained there by the Kremlin. But the people of Lithuania have not surrendered their right to freedom and independence, and today in their Independence Day we hope that they attain their goal once more and live in peace in their historic homeland.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, 1918, Lithuania was proclaimed an independent state. This proclamation signaled the end of more than a century of foreign domination and the beginning of a new era for the Lithuanian people. On July 12, 1920, Lithuania's right to freedom was recognized by Russia when that country pledged to renounce all rights of sovereignty over Lithuanian territory. It was recognized as a sovereign and stable member of the world community when, on September 22, 1921, it was admitted to the League of Nations.

The next two decades were marked by the fulfillment of many of the hopes which had sustained Lithuanian nationalism through the long period of czarist rule. A constitution was adopted which accorded freedom of speech, religion, assembly, and communication. A land reform program enlarged the number of farms, and new industries were established. Lithuanian culture, unfettered at last, flourished with new accomplishments in literature and music.

Unfortunately, the location of Lithuania, with Germany to the west and the Soviet Union to the east, rendered it almost impossible for it to survive the aggressions of the Second World War. Although Lithuania attempted to maintain its neutrality, it was occupied first by the Soviets, then by the Germans, then again by the Soviets. On August 3, 1940, Lithuania was declared a constituent republic of the Soviet Union by the Supreme Soviet in Moscow.

The freedom which the Lithuanian people enjoyed between the two World Wars stands in sharp contrast to the subjugation which Lithuania has experienced in the past two decades. In place of freedom of speech and communication and other civil liberties are rigid controls and restrictions. In place of mutually beneficial contacts with the West there is the Iron Curtain which keeps at a minimum the number of meetings between Lithuanians and outsiders.

On this 44th anniversary of Lithuanian independence, it is my hope that these statements in the U.S. Congress will demonstrate to the Lithuanian people that they have not been forgotten. If freedom-loving people throughout the world continue to have faith in their beliefs and to work unceasingly to strengthen liberty, we can be confident that ultimately freedom and democracy must be victorious over totalitarianism and tyranny.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, today free people throughout the non-Communist world take a few moments from their daily activities to pay tribute to the Lithuanian people. Forty-four years ago today, the freedom-loving Lithuanians reestablished their independence and proclaimed the formation of a

Lithuanian Republic founded on the principles of liberty and freedom.

Lithuania was united in 1253 when the many principalities of Lithuania were formed into a single state. Mindaugas, who had been baptized 2 years earlier, was crowned as king by a personal delegate of Pope Innocent IV. This was one of the first expressions of the Christian faith of the Lithuanian people, and Lithuania was officially proclaimed a Christian state in 1387.

It was this same Christian faith that contributed strongly to saving Europe from barbarism in the late 14th century, when the Lithuanians successfully repulsed the Tartar hordes seeking to sweep in upon Europe. During the Middle Ages they also defended their independence against the Germans and the Russians. At that time they were one of the greatest states of eastern Europe, as Lithuania's boundaries in the 14th century reached into what is now the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Russian Soviet Socialist Republic.

Through marriage ties and parliamentary action Lithuania and Poland were joined legally in the 16th century. In 1795, by the third partition of Poland, Lithuania was annexed by czarist Russia. The Lithuanians struggled in vain to throw off the Russian yoke. The Russians responded by attempting to destroy the Lithuanian language and culture, but they too were unsuccessful, as the Lithuanians tenaciously clung to their historical religion, language, and cultural traditions. Finally the Russification policy was abandoned in 1905.

During the First and Second World Wars Lithuania was overrun by both the Germans and the Russians. In these two terrible wars, the innocent Lithuanians, due to an unfortunate accident of geography, stood on the lines and march between the two giants of Europe, and as the military advantage changed from one side to the other, the country became a tragic battlefield, ravaged by gigantic armies.

During the ebb and flow of World War I the Lithuanians capitalized on the conditions favorable for asserting their independence. In 1917 delegates representing the people of Lithuania met to determine the future course of the Nation. Out of this Congress came the announcement of the formation of the Lithuanian state, on February 16, 1918. It is the 44th anniversary of this proclamation that we honor today.

But Lithuanian independence had not yet become a reality, as the Red army invaded the capital and set up a Communist puppet regime in January of 1919. During the following year Lithuanian and Polish fighting forces under Marshal Pilsudski drove out the oppressive Bolsheviks.

In the peace treaty signed with Lithuania on July 12, 1920, Russia pledged to recognize Lithuania as an independent nation and to renounce forever all rights of sovereignty. The language of the agreement reads in part: "Russia recognizes without any reserve the sovereignty and independence of the State of Lithuania with all juridical consequences resulting from such recognition, and voluntarily and forever renounces all sovereign rights possessed by Russia over the Lithuanian people and territory." How false and cynical those words seem today, over 40 years later. Today it has become such a commonplace to speak of Communist duplicity that sometimes we tend to disregard the tragic consequences of that duplicity. The pillaging of a proud and freedom-loving nation is not a matter to be lightly passed over, and I would maintain that if ever we should become apathetic to such outrages, the moral fiber of our country will have been gravely weakened.

When the Russians forced a mutual assistance treaty upon Lithuania in October 1939 they were acting in direct violation of the peace treaty of 1920 and the Soviet-Lithuanian treaty of nonaggression of 1926. Under the terms of this so-called mutual assistance treaty, Lithuanian sovereignty was drastically compromised as the Russians demanded the right to have airbases and Soviet garrisons on the soil of Lithuania. In June 1940 the Russians compounded their tyranny by demanding the formation of a friendly government. Then they ruthlessly occupied the country, and by August 1940 Lithuania had been incorporated into the U.S.S.R. After the Nazi attack on Russia, Lithuania became a German colony for 3 years, until it was recaptured by the Soviets in 1944.

From World War II until 1959 all of Lithuania was closed to Western observers. Since 1959 some Americans have been allowed to enter the city of Vilnius, but the rest of the country remains sealed off. From scattered reports we can put together a pretty clear picture of what has been happening inside Lithuania during the years it has suffered under Communist domination. The picture is not a pretty one. It tells of brutal murders, of deportations, and of slave labor camps. It testifies to a vicious campaign to scatter the Lithuanian people and replace them in their homeland by Russians. And it exposes a brutal plot to destroy the religious faith and love of liberty of the Lithuanian nation. But from this somber story emerges a message and an inspiration for freemen everywhere. The Lithuanian people love God and they love their country deeply. And no Soviet atheist totalitarianism can destroy this precious heritage. The Lithuanian passion for freedom will never die, and communism will not be able to hold in bondage a proud people yearning and determined that one day they shall again be free.

The United States has on many occasions reaffirmed its support of Lithuanian independence. We recognized the independent Lithuanian Government in 1922 and have never accepted Soviet domination of the country. Emphasizing our moral commitment to the cause of Lithuanian freedom, we continue to maintain diplomatic relations with a representative of the former independent Government, which still has a legation in Washington.

Lithuanians who have come to settle in the United States have made many unique contributions to American civilization. The first known Lithuanian immigrants landed at New Amsterdam in 1688. Today there are an estimated one million Americans of Lithuanian descent. These Lithuanians have been widely praised for their patriotic devotion, their religious piety, their close family ties, and their community spirit.

Today I take great pride in joining with loyal Americans of Lithuanian ancestry in celebrating this anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, 1918, the Lithuanian people brought to an end the ruthless rule of czarist Russia, which had lasted 120 years. During the Middle Ages Lithuania had been a powerful and independent state, whose borders extended into the heart of what is now the Soviet Union. The legitimate national aspirations of the Lithuanian people were crushed in 1795, when their country was annexed to Russia as part of the third partition of Poland. Yet the steadfast Lithuanians repeatedly revolted against their Russian overlords and remained loyal to their ancient language, culture, and traditions despite continuous Russian efforts to make them forget their independence.

In 1919 and 1920 the Lithuanians established their independence by force of arms, and during the next two decades they made significant contributions to the cause of world peace, both through the efforts of their spokesmen at the League of Nations and by living peacefully with their Polish and Soviet neighbors. The history of this tiny independent state between 1920 and 1939 effectively destroys the Soviet claim that their domination of the captive nations of Eastern Europe is necessary to insure the security of the Soviet Union. Yet the period of independence was not destined to last. Despite the Soviet renunciation in 1920 of "all sovereign rights possessed by Russia over the Lithuanian people and territory," Lithuania was forcefully incorporated into the U.S.S.R. in 1940. It was one of the first countries to suffer under the brutal occupations of Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union. After the war the Soviets ordered large-scale deportations of Lithuanians to Siberia and many Russians have settled in Lithuania. For a long time the country was completely closed off to foreigners, who are now permitted to visit the capital city of Vilnius. Stalin's attempt to disperse the Baltic peoples has since been abandoned, and in the small towns and farms of rural Lithuania the ancient tradition of national independence has not been forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, Lithuania is no longer a free and independent nation, but the spirit of freedom lives on in the hearts of this sturdy people. As happens so often in the history of Europe, a small nation is in bondage because the military force of a larger neighbor proved more powerful than its legal commitments. We Americans may take some pride in the fact that the United States has never recognized the Soviet incorporation of Lithuania into the Communist empire, has never given its sanction to this lawless act of brute force perpetrated on a small and defenseless nation. We salute the Lithuanian people on the 44th anniversary of their national independence with a sense of deep responsibility and commitment to the ideals of liberty which they share with the entire free world.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, today we pause to celebrate the 44th anniversary of the independence of the Lithuanian nation. In doing so we pay tribute to the gallant people of Lithuania who cannot themselves publicly celebrate this important event which marked a milestone in their struggle for freedom.

Lithuania declared its independence on February 16, 1918, after centuries of subjugation, sometimes German, but mostly Russian. Never during those years of struggle did the Lithuanian people lose sight of their ultimate goal of self-determination. In 1940 Lithuania lost its independence once again when the Soviet Union annexed it and its Baltic neighbors, Latvia and Estonia, and made them republics of the U.S.S.R. This act was in such callous disregard of the sovereign and human rights of the Lithuanian people and in complete violation of international law that it has never been recognized by the United States. Yet despite their many trials the people of Lithuania are neither broken nor discouraged. The passion for liberty and freedom is heightened, not dispelled, by this adversity. Their courage and indomitable will to resist Soviet attempts to inculcate communism and the Soviet way of life, remain strong.

On this day the American people who cherish individual freedom and national liberty as their most priceless possession, join their hopes and aspirations with their fellow men in Lithuania. We renew our devotion to the cause of Lithuanian independence. We hope that the day may not be prolonged when Lithuania will once again regain her rightful position in the family of free nations which she so richly deserves.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, the nation of Lithuania has been known to history for almost a thousand years. During that time the Lithuanian people have experienced the joys of greatness and independence as well as the tragedies of war and subjugation. Today Lithuania is in one of its darkest periods. On this Lithuanian Independence Day it is fitting that we who are fortunate enough to live in the free world pay tribute to the gallant Lithuanian people and express our hope that the light of liberty will someday shine in their land again.

The first great period of Lithuanian independence was in the Middle Ages. During this period the Lithuanians established a powerful state which was able to check the German drive to the east and protect Europe from the Mongols and the Tartars. They gave their people a degree of freedom which was far higher than in neighboring countries, and through their education and toleration played a significant role in the development of European civilization.

In 1795, however, this bright period of Lithuanian history came to an end and Lithuania was annexed by Russia. The Lithuanians undertook many revolts against czarist oppression, but they met with no success. Following these revolts the Russians launched attempts to wipe out the Lithuanian language and culture and replace them with Russian ways, but such attempts proved impossible and eventually had to be abandoned.

This long dark period of Russian domination was brought to an end by the First World War. Although the Lithuanians paid a terrible price in that war, in terms of lives and devastation, they emerged as an independent state once again. It was this period of independence, proclaimed on February 16, 1918, that we commemorate today. The Lithuanians thrived in their work of improving the economic and social conditions of their people and building an independent state, and the next two decades marked one of the happiest periods in Lithuanian history.

But just as the First World War had brought freedom to the Lithuanian people, the Second World War deprived them of their liberty. Although Lithuania tried to remain neutral, it was occupied by the Red army and in 1940 was declared a constituent republic of the Soviet Union. Later, in 1941, it was overrun by German forces. Still another reversal took place in 1944 when Lithuania was retaken by the Soviets, and today Lithuania remains under the Soviet domination imposed at that time.

Thus it is that today Lithuania finds itself again in a period of darkness, with an iron curtain draped around its borders to keep out rays of light from the free world. However, it is impossible to prevent all contact with the outside. I feel sure that the statements being made here today, showing that the Lithuanian people and their love of freedom have not been forgotten, will find their way to those who cling to their ideals. It is my hope that in some small way our words will add to their faith that the free world will eventually triumph in the cold war and the Lithuanians and all other peoples denied their political and human rights will be able to hold high the torch of liberty once again.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, only the marked sadness of this, the 44th anniversary of the restoration of Lithuania's independence as a free nation, mars the conscience of the free people of the world.

The sufferings of its people in the bloody grip of Soviet rule, first under the czarist oppression for 123 years and now under Soviet tyranny and slavery since 1940, have not destroyed the will of its people to be free. This brave race, cultured in the glorious traditions of its heroic leaders dating before the Christian era, facing the many sufferings of her people with tolerance and with prayers to the Almighty, courageously awaits the day of her liberation from Soviet domination.

The 7 mass deportations of her citizens and many lesser ones—2,000 to 3,000 a month—totaling 600,000 souls, has failed to quench this brave nation's thirst for the freedom of those enslaved within and without her borders. One-fourth of her sons have been transported to the interior of Russia, as slaves. Thousands have died in prison camps and in exile. Thus, through mass fear, the inevitable weakening of her patriotic national will lies diluted with despair, questioning if freedom will ever be realized.

The great problem confronting the United States is, Can we really maintain our own institutions of freedom for long—as we view the encroachments made by the Communists upon the free nations of the world—each falling within its aura of godless enslavement?

The United States has already moved with celerity to curb the menace at our own doorstep. This administration, in 1 year, has put the seal of the Monroe Doctrine on the North and South American Continents. Our neighboring nations are alerted to the communistic practices that lead to domination.

We must do more—we must use every force to release the small nations throughout Europe and the Baltic areas. The West must force its preparedness programs to the extreme of our national abilities to pay, in order to give confidence to the new nations of the East and Africa, that no one dare controvert our desires to keep the world of freemen free.

The nations enslaved must be freed, that Christianity prevail. The bodies of men may be enslaved, but the "self," "the spirit," "the soul," can never be lost to tyranny. Lithuania must be saved. Her independence must be restored. The dignity of man must be preserved with free institutions to protect it. America is the one hope that keeps alive the fires of freedom among all men—let us not let them down. We are prepared to march in freedom's name—with God's guidance, we will prevail.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, Lithuania has had a stormy history. For 22 years, following the war of 1914–18, it was an independent state. In the era of its greatest power it stretched from the Baltic to the Black Sea. After it was converted to Christianity in 1385, it was dominated by Polish influence for more than 400 years. It was annexed by imperial Russia in 1795 but at the time of the Communist revolution it broke away from the Soviet Union and proclaimed its independence.

But the lights of freedom were soon put out by the sharp winds of World War II. In June 1940 Lithuania was occupied by Soviet troops, and soon after was blackmailed into becoming the 14th Soviet republic. Thousands of Lithuanians were deported to the east as the Soviet war lords sought to communize the country. The United States refused to recognize the Communist conquest.

The whiptides of war loosed the Soviet hold on Lithuania and the German Nazis occupied the country from 1941 to 1944. But with the German defeat Lithuania was again annexed to the Soviet Union. It remains a captive nation, tied to its eastern overlords in unhappy bondage.

Lithuania looks to the West, not to the East. It has a Christian heritage. Like all people, the Lithuanian people would like to be free to decide their own destiny. And some day they will be.

For if there is one thing that we can be sure of, it is that the wave of the future is on the side of human liberty, and that the various totalitarianisms, whether they be Communist or Fascist, will eventually die away. This is the hope which those of Lithuanian descent in this country can always hold out to their kinsmen behind the Curtain.

SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'Hara] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it has been my practice since I have been a Member of this historic body annually on the 15th of February or the date nearest thereto, when the House is in session, to observe the anniversary of the sinking of the *Maine* with some remarks in memory of the 266 Americans who perished with the *Maine* in Havana Harbor, and the war with Spain that followed.

Today I have an especially warm sense of audience receptability in talking of the Spanish-American War. The eminent and beloved gentleman who is now the Speaker of this House, the Honorable John W. McCormack, a great American in every sense and by every measure of accomplishment and human qualities, is from Massachusetts, and in the Spanish-American War, the outfit to which I belonged—the 33d Volunteer Infantry of Michigan—was brigaded with the great 9th of Massachusetts, and during the years John McCormack has been the unfailing friend of the Spanish War veterans. I feel I am speaking in a sympathetic atmosphere with this great gentleman in the chair, one who has always been understanding of the spirit of 1898 and of the volunteers who went to Cuba and who saw action in the siege of Santiago.

Mr. Speaker, 92 veterans of that war of 64 years ago, a war that started our country on the road to a world destiny have served in this body. When I came here in the 81st Congress, I was one of four Spanish-American War veterans who were Members of that Congress and with two of the other three I had soldiered in Cuba in the same regiment, the 33d Michigan Volunteer Infantry.

I am the last remaining, the last veteran of that war in the Congress. My colleagues have been sympathetically understanding of the sense of solemn obligation that possesses me to set the record straight so far as it is within my humble power to do so in the brief time remaining, of the history of a war that was preceded by the Civil War and followed by two World Wars, conflicts that engaged vastly larger numbers and extended over much longer periods of time which despite its tremendous impact on the history of the world and the brilliance of its action on both sea and land because of the overshadowing events that followed has become the forgotten little war, as one latter-day historian not too aptly described it.

I think that future historians when the passage of time has furnished a truer scale of measurements more accurately will say that the rise of the United States to world power was preceded by a 50-year war commencing with the war with Spain, then an interlude of peace when military muscles were being flexed, then World War I, and then another interlude of peace, and finally World War II.

I look back 64 years, and it does not seem very long. Yet when in 1898 events that had happened in 1834, as I read of them in history, seemed so far, far away. What changes had come to our Republic in the 64 years between 1834 and 1898. What changes have come in the 64 years between 1898, when the United States was rising to meet the challenge of her destiny, and 1962—all in just a part of the span of my life.

The seats of this historic Chamber are filled with the veterans of World War I and World War II, many with years of the test of combat. The story of their deeds, if it could be compressed in a volume, would be a classic epic of heroism.

But one by one, two by two, they will depart in the march of the years until one day in the Congress, where had served with distinction and dedication so many hundred veterans of the World Wars, but one will remain. I wish for him the warmth in his association with his younger colleagues that you have given to me. From the bottom of my heart wells a sentiment of gratitude.

When the Honorable James Hamilton Lewis, of Illinois, was in the other body, he was a member of Columbia Camp of the United Spanish War Veterans, a camp to which I have belonged for many years and twice have served as camp commander, once in 1915 when I was Lieutenant Governor and again some years later. There were close to a thousand members of Columbia Camp at that time. Now few remain. The column of the names of past commanders on the camp letterhead is almost a solid row of asterisks, which a footnote explains means deceased.

I am reading from a letter I received some months ago, a letter signed by Charles Ziesenhenne, commander, and attested by Sam Black, adjutant:

> Seven of our members live outside of Chicago, and of the 11 who do live in town, only 3 of us are physically able to attend meetings. The same officers have to hold over year after year because there are no others able and willing to take over the jobs. We no longer pay camp dues and our per capita tax to national is paid up for some time yet. Our only expense is for funerals. Columbia Camp will not be disbanded. We will continue to the last comrade, whoever he may be. We have been friends as well as comrades. But now we are all so near to that last turn in the road of life that we can no longer function as we would like, and can only do the best we can for just as long as we can.

RESEARCHERS' MEASURE FOR EVALUATION

Mr. Speaker, I can only trust that what I am saying here today, on the 64th anniversary of the sinking of the *Maine*, and which will find its lodgment in the permanent pages of the Congressional Record, will furnish to future researchers some measure for the evaluation of writings in recent years on the Spanish-American War that have given me great concern. These writers in the main seem to have been obsessed with a passion for downgrading the United States and converting the Spirit of '98, which was the expression of the finest idealism of any people in any period of the world, into a coarse and vulgar and selfish thing.

Within the last year my good friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Edmondson], who is high on my list of the ablest Members of this body, told me of his indignation on reading a book by a French writer of some repute and which he understood was being widely circulated and read in the United States. He thought that I could perform a service to my country and to the idealism that always has motivated Americans by making some reply thereto. Fortunately, perhaps, I could not obtain a copy of the book. I inquired at a number of bookstores and found it on sale at none, and from this I concluded that it was finding little reception by the American people.

Some months ago Mr. Geoffrey Gould, a highly respected member of the Press Gallery of the House, wrote a special article that was carried nationwide by Associated Press newspapers and in which he made overgenerous comments on my combativeness during many years for causes in which I believed and which I thought embodied the idealism of our country. In this connection he mentioned my service in Cuba, a lad just turning 16, one of the 19,000 Americans in the fighting days of the siege of Santiago.

A well-known columnist, whose father, although 15 or 20 years older, had been a warm personal friend of mine in my earlier newspaper days, responded with an article in which he took issue. I had no resentment, smiled a bit when I read that he doubted that he had ever met me since some years ago we did meet at the annual banquet of the Chicago Press Veterans and he informed me that his father, then past 90, was still living and I sent to him a message of old time friendship, and this columnist and I chatted for a long time in an atmosphere that to me was warm and genuine.

In his article he got a little mixed up in his data, and some of my friends thought that he was unduly unkind and others thought, as did I, that his motivation was only to give me an additional bit of publicity, in the doing of which friendly service he was handicapped by the fact that he is spokesman for a different philosophy than the one to which I, during the entire period of my life, have given my devotion and my humblest ability to the fullest extent.

But this paragraph I must answer, not because it has personal reference to me, but it is something, that on reflection, the son of my old friend I know will agree should not have been said in honor to the memory of the 266 Americans who died in Havana Harbor 64 years ago today and to the memory of the youth of this Nation that went out as volunteers to establish freedom in this world of ours, went out, fighting in the Tropics with winter clothing and antique weapons with little food and the very minimum of medicine, went out in the greatest adventure in idealism in the history of any country. This is the passage that I wish my good friend, the columnist whose father was a warm friend of mine, had omitted:

> Congressman O'HARA has a reputation as a scrapper. This includes the firecracker war in Cuba where nobody could possibly have run up a timecard of more than one 8-hour day in battle, although the cumulative pensions of some of those boys by now have amounted to thousands of dollars an hour.

The fact, my friends and colleagues, is that the veterans of the Spanish-American War, both individually and cumulatively, have received from the Government far less than any other veterans' group in the history of our country. They served for $13 a month. They were ill equipped and subsisted in the Tropics on a diet of sowbelly, which they heated into streams of grease in which they soaked their hardtack. This, mind you, in the Tropics. There was no record kept of their injuries. On their return home many were sick in bed for weeks and months. Thousands died at home of illnesses contracted during their service, those who had been in the disease-infected camps in this country suffering as severely from this neglect as those who had served overseas, and their families, not the Government, had to bear the expenses of doctors and medicine. There were many families impoverished and placed hopelessly in debt, in the care of their son, returning from the war with Spain to languish in illness and die. There, of course, was no provision for their education and rehabilitation. It ill becomes anyone to cast aspersions on the Spanish War veterans and to imply that they were moochers.

Moreover, the Spanish-American War brought to this country greater revenues and greater wealth than any other war in our history.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I wish to congratulate my distinguished and able colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA], who is so highly revered by all his colleagues for his ability, his courage, and for his continued and effective fight for truth and justice.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I thank my good friend from Ohio. Without warm friendship, on the pattern of the understanding friendship of the gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from Illinois, this could become a dreary world.

There were families at that time who had exhausted all their savings and were hopelessly in debt by reason of having to provide doctors and medicines for the veterans of the Spanish-American War who returned home sick. And for anyone to say that these veterans have been mooching at the expense of the public is just beyond my comprehension.

Hawaii never would have become a State in the Union but for the war with Spain and the spirit of 1898 that changed the thinking in the minds of men everywhere. The Philippine Islands never would have had an opportunity to expand and become a bulwark of free government and our ally and ever a faithful friend in time of peril and of need except for the Spanish-American War. Far out in the Pacific there is the little island of Guam, the most far-flung American territory, which has the same kind of a government that we have, a State legislature, exactly on the pattern of our own State legislatures, and without the Spanish-American War, Guam would never have been part of this great country of ours. Since I have been in the Congress I have been the steadfast friend and champion of little Guam, and as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I know perhaps better than some how important to us in world understanding is Guam, the showcase of democracy in the far Pacific, the base of our naval strength. As I speak, my youngest son, Howard, is lying grievously ill in the Guam Memorial Hospital. He has given many years of his life to Guam and her people, and I think that in this dedication to a task he has experienced some sense deep within him that he in his lifetime was continuing the boyish dreams and ideals of his father. Anyway, Guam is part of the expanded world for freedom that was opened by the youth of 1898, who, as volunteers embarked upon the greatest adventure of idealism in history. I know that in the hands of the people of Guam, my son in his illness will receive every care and attention that affection can accord.

If it so could be measured—and God forbid there ever should be such a rule of measurement—but if it should be measured by returns to us of dollars and advantage, the Spanish-American War would top all the wars in history.

Mr. Speaker, I have been concerned with some of the books that have been coming out. Here is one somebody sent to me last Christmas Day. It is supposed to be a history of the Spanish-American War. There are parts in it that are good, that are thrilling. In parts it is interestingly and dramatically written, but throughout the book is enough poison to undo in the eyes of the world, if this book were read all over the world, so much of the good in world opinion that came to us as the result of the idealism of 1898 and the war with Spain. I hope this was not by intent, merely that the writer, reaching for a gullible public that would flock to the bookstores, reached into the forgotten files of trivialities, picked out, as from the gutter, distended statements of proven untruths that he dressed up in lurid, gossipy, scandalous attire as the fact of the history.

This book says on one of the early pages:

> Salute.
>
> The helpful and valuable cooperation is most gratefully acknowledged of: Thelma E. Bedell, Chief of Readers' Service, U.S. Military Academy Library; Olga J. Carney; Sidney Forman, Librarian, U.S. Military Academy; Maj. Gen. Philip E. Gallagher, U.S. Army (retired).

And then follow some other names, giving the impression that the material in this book is on the authority of the U.S. Military Academy and of the U.S. Government. I shall direct a letter to the Department of the Army pointing out the grievous mischief to us in the eyes of the world by some of the statements, entirely without foundation in the fact, and conclusions at which any author has the right to reach and to present to his readers as his own conclusions, but should be forbidden by punitive law from presenting by implication as the findings and conclusions of the great Academy at West Point, a school with an unblemished reputation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I shall offer in due course a bill to state that hereafter when anyone gives credit to these research government libraries that it shall be stated that the writings and conclusions based thereon are not to be attributed to the U.S. Government. The research libraries do a real service for the Congress and the other branches of Government. They are entitled to protection against exploitation.

This book says that the Cuban soldiers were cowardly, that the only time they were seen was when they were stealing from knapsacks. That is what this book says. And it is the barest faced lie ever put between book covers. What are the facts? I ought to know. I ought to know because I knew some Spanish when I arrived in Cuba on June 27, 1898, and had had some experience in jungle traveling about in Central America before I was in Cuba. I was assigned six Cuban soldiers to serve on a squad to do observation work. With those Cuban soldiers we penetrated the Spanish lines day after day, of course, encountering all of the perils that soldiers always encounter when they are on duty in densely wooded terrain far within the enemy line with sharpshooters around.

Mr. Speaker, I was with General Garcia, stationed just outside of Santiago at an outpost in the area of greatest danger far beyond the outer American lines. I never saw better soldiers in my life than the Cuban soldiers that fought with us at the siege of Santiago. When after an absence of 57 years, I returned to Santiago, where I had not been since I was a boy just turned 16, Two Cubans came up and threw their arms around me and hugged me. I hugged them and we hugged again and kissed one another, old men of the two armies that had fought together to free Cuba. They were two of the Cuban soldiers with whom as a lad of 16 I had been on that mission. For a modern American writer, lured by the sale of his book, at this late day to throw mud at the Cuban soldiers at Santiago is hitting below the belt with the instinct of a sadist.

Then, when I find that someone writes a book like this, without one iota of fact, but fiction, and the publisher puts it out and says that at the time of our present relations with Cuba this will make a contribution to better understanding, yes, that is why I am taking this full hour today. There must be some answer to this.

Mr. Speaker, there is also in this book an attack—a sneaking, cowardly attack—on General Shafter, the commanding general of our army in Cuba. Yes, he was a large man. He weighed, I think over 300 pounds. He was badly affected by the climate. But all military men are agreed that he was a great strategist. Yet this fellow says that he had no plan of battle. It apparently was more convenient to say that than to take the time to look at a chart of the campaign. Now, let me explain the plan of battle to you. We hear so much about San Juan Hill, and we should. It is one of the great chapters of heroism in the history of our country.

But it was only part of the action. The action extended from San Juan Hill to Fort Aguadores. At Fort Aguadores 8,000 Spanish reenforcements were reported on their way. That point was defended by 3,000 Cubans and 900 raw American troops, of which I was one. The action was scarcely as tame and placid as a day at a summer picnic. I did not feel that way when, within minutes, four of my comrades nearby were killed by cannon fire. As far as the author of this book was concerned the death of my comrades meant nothing to him. The 33d Michigan did not exist. He had reached the conclusion that Shafter was just a fat, old, crazy fool, that General Jose Toral, commander of the Spanish forces and, as brave, competent and gentlemanly as any general in Spanish history, was a cowardly incompetent, and he persisted in his determination to have his way by burying every known hurt in the graveyard of his determined will. We had left Siboney at 4 o'clock in the morning of July 1, 1898 carrying heavy luggage. In those days you had heavy cartridge belts around your shoulders and around your waist. It was a long walk, but we got there.

And here was a great river with a bridge that had been partly destroyed, and across it fortifications in the mountains. It was not long until we suffered our first casualties. And where were those casualties? In Company M, composed of the sons of Civil War veterans. Each one of the members of Company M was the son of a boy in blue. Five of them were killed or maimed.

Now, mind you, in this book there are some parts that are good and exciting. The publisher says that this man successfully writes history because he makes it readable. Well, he does. It is absolutely just as readable as one of these gossip magazines; you know the kind, they hear a whisper someplace and a lot of gossip. That is all right in its place, although it is no place I wish to be. But when it is put in there to reflect upon veterans of the Spanish-American War, to reflect upon our officers, to reflect upon the privates and the individuals, to reflect upon the honor of our Nation, there is a limit to patience and toleration. The cruelest cut of all was an acknowledgment that put the West Point Academy right in the center, and that was not coming to a military academy—that is part of our dearest traditions.

Now, the day will come when the researchers will be trying to reconstruct the period through which we have gone and, believe me, my friends, the Spanish-American War was just part of one 50-year war that started America on her course of destiny. When they come to that period they will be reading so many of these books that are coming out now, written by people who think that the way to get into the writing business and to get people buying new books is to avoid facts and write what the people will read. So I hope that when these researchers of the faraway future may be thumbing through the forgotten pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD they will find what I am saying today on the floor of the House of Representatives in my 79th year.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know how often again I will be talking on the 15th of February on the anniversary of the sinking of the battleship *Maine*. As long as I am here, I am going to talk on that subject on this anniversary. But I have no way of telling what measure of years are left. My own philosophy is that I will be here for many, many years. But I could be very, very wrong. My own philosophy is that one lives best when one lives in the present. When one is young and wants to be older, he loses the joy of living in the present of his youth. So it is when one has gone far toward the setting sun. I have heard a saying, not that I take it too seriously, someone told me once that there was a rumor around, and I hope it is only a rumor, that every man has to die. Well, I am not going to believe that rumor until they prove it in my case, and then I will be past the point of protest.

NO REALLY GOOD HISTORY OF THE WAR

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I have looked over many of the books on the Spanish American War. We have no really good history that has been written of the Spanish American War. I was looking for some mention of the 33d Volunteer Infantry of Michigan. When I was in Cuba after 57 years absence, I went out to the place at Siboney where we had landed 2 or 3 days after Teddy Roosevelt, getting out of small boats, as they did in the recent war, to fight our way shoreward. There I found a plaque, I suppose some commercial concern had made it up and put it there. It had been there a good many years. It announced that the 33d Michigan Volunteers had arrived weeks after the fighting and then some other regiments were mentioned as having been in the fighting which were not there until some time after the fighting.

As I have said there is no mention of the 33d Volunteer Infantry of Michigan in the book I have been biting at. I thought if I left this record stand, my good friend, the columnist whose father was a good friend of mine, will say, "Now there is a phony—he talks of getting to Cuba with that regiment of his a few days after Teddy Roosevelt and of being in all the fighting and here these modern writers do not mention it. He must be a phony."

Well, I want this to be in the RECORD. Maybe I am enough lawyer to want a little something in the record, this is admissible under the laws of evidence, to combat the things good people get into their heads when they listen too much to chatty gossipers, you know the species. This is from the history of the war by the then Secretary of War Alger:

> June 27 the *Yale* arrived at Siboney with General Duffield and part of his brigade consisting of the 33d Michigan and 1 battalion of the 34th, about 1,200 officers and men.

Then he goes on to explain that an invasion of 8,000 new Spanish troops was reported and that the action had been held pending our arrival, and so we were immediately pushed to the front in that gap.

Only 900 men of General Duffield's brigade had landed in Cuba at that time, the remainder of our brigade being delayed, but only a few days after that, the 9th Massachusetts arrived and the 34th Michigan arrived.

He goes on to say that in this circumstance the first to arrive in Cuba on the 27th day of June participating in all the fighting that lasted from the 27th to the 2d day of July—the armistice was not until the 17th, but the fighting practically ended the 2d day of July—were these 900 men of the 33d Michigan Volunteers.

So Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in my remarks what Secretary of War Alger said about the 33d Michigan Volunteers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered. There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

FROM SECRETARY OF WAR ALGER'S HISTORY OF THE WAR

June 27th the *Yale* arrived at Siboney, with General Duffield and part of his brigate, consisting of the 33d Michigan and one battalion of the 34th, about 1,200 officers and men. General Duffield was at once directed to place a large force at work upon the road leading from Siboney to the camp of the army in the vicinity of Sevilla. Late in the afternoon of the next day, General Shafter was informed that General Pando, with 8,000 Spanish regulars, was advancing from Manzanillo to relieve the garrison in Santiago. Pando was reported to be within 54 miles of the city, and moving at the rate of 12 miles a day, with an abundance of supplies in the way of pack-trains and beef on the hoof. If the Spanish general met with no opposition, this would bring a strong force, with a large quantity of food, for the relief of General Linares, by the 2d or 3d of July. General Shafter determined, if possible, to prevent General Pando's entering Santiago, and to make the attack without waiting for the additional reinforcements, consisting of the remainder of Duffield's brigade, then en route.

General Garcia, with 3,000 Cubans, was requested, on the 29th, to proceed from Siboney to the west and northwest of Santiago and guard the approaches over which the advancing Spanish reinforcements, under Pando, would come. The American outposts were pushed forward to within 1½ miles of Santiago, and General Shafter established his headquarters in advance of the whole army on the Santiago road at the point where it branches with the trail leading to Caney. The next day he determined upon his plan of attack, and gave directions for the disposition of the several divisions, preparatory to the assault, July 1. He proposed to throw his army against the entrenched position of the enemy on the heights of San Juan: Lawton's division on the right Wheeler's division in the center, and Kent's division on the left. Bates' brigade was ordered up from Siboney to the front, to be held in reserve, with two batteries of light artillery, and three troops of Rafferty's mounted cavalry. The remaining troop of the 2d Cavalry was sent with Lawton, as well as a battery of artillery—Capron's (the father of Captain Capron, who was killed on the 24th at Las Guasimas)—while General Shafter directed General Duffield, with one regiment, to make a demonstration against the extreme right of the Spaniards at Aguadores Bridge.

Only 1,200 men of General Duffield's brigade had landed in Cuba, as the Navy had directed the *Harvard*, transporting the remainder of his brigade, to convoy a repair ship which could make but 8 or 10 knots an hour. This delayed the arrival of his command by nearly 2 days—too late to take part in the engagement of July 1. General Duffield's command on the 1st of July consisted only of the 33d Michigan and one battalion of the 34th Michigan. The latter acted as a guard at Siboney. It was not intended that General Duffield, with his small force of 900 men, should attack, across the San Juan, the fortified heights which rose abruptly from that river 300 or 400 feet; but, as General Shafter stated in an official report, General Duffield "was expected to make such a demonstration at Aguadores as would hold at the place all Spanish troops occupying it, and prevent their reinforcing the main body at Santiago. This he accomplished perfectly."

A deep and wide ravine separated the Spanish position from General Duffield's advance. At this season of the year the river, which flows between the high and precipitous banks of this gorge, was broad, swift, and deep—600 to 700 feet in width, and spanned by an iron girder bridge 60 feet above. About 100 feet of the trestle on the Spanish side of the San Juan had been blown up. Moreover, as was subsequently learned and at the time suspected, all that was left of the bridge had been mined. Then, too, the river was not fordable, and had General Duffield's instructions contemplated an assault, which they did not, it would have been impossible for him to cross the San Juan River, since he had no boats or means of throwing any part of his small force across the swollen river.

The enemy, protected by stone forts, blockhouses, and rifle pits along the cliffs, was subsequently learned to have been 500 strong, supported by artillery—a force almost equal to that which kept General Lawton's division of over 4,000 a whole day at Caney. In addition to these troops, two companies of marines (about 400 men) from Cervera's fleet were at Las Cruces and vicinity, where they were held in reserve at a distance of about 5 miles on the railroad leading to Aguadores and from where they could be brought to this place in a very short time. The local conditions were such that our warships could not see nor reach many of the trenches across the river confronting General Duffield, and at the very instant the vessels firing upon the heights signaled "there are no Spaniards in the rifle pits," a volley from the enemy wounded several of our men.

General Duffield's demonstration, coupled with the movement of Garcia on the northwest of Santiago, brought about what General Shafter had hoped—i.e., the Spaniards were kept in doubt as to his real movements and deterred from concentrating their forces at San Juan Ridge.

While General Duffield was making the beforementioned feint at Aguadores Bridge, Admiral Sampson was requested to bombard that place, as a part of the maneuver, and to direct such firing against the Spanish works at the mouth of the harbor of Santiago as in his judgment might seem best to further divert the enemy's attention from the main advance. This he did.

Before moving out to take up the positions assigned them, preparatory to the attack the next morning, General Shafter called the general officers to his headquarters and explained to them fully the plan of battle and the part each was to take in it. This meeting was attended by the division commanders Lawton and Kent, acting division commander General Sumner, and the brigade commanders Chaffee, Hawkins, Ludlow, and Duffield, as well as the Cuban General Castillo. The battle of July 1 was conducted in direct accord with these plans, with the exception that it took Lawton's division a day instead of 2 hours, as estimated, to reduce Caney.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am closing with a voice that is shaky; and I feel, Mr. Speaker, that I am very close to tears, all from the feeling within me that I have not adequately treated and as is my solemn obligation to my comrades of a war of 64 years ago, most of them gone, this subject which to me is sacred. I would have wished that I could have made it as crystal clear as clearness itself that the war of 1898 and the spirit of 1898 were the embodiment of the greatest ideals that ever moved any people in any stage of history. I have tried, Mr. Commander of Columbia Camp, to follow your orders to our remaining veterans: "To do the best we can for just as long as we can."

Mr. Speaker, I have finished.

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST CITIZENS OF THE UNITED STATES IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the President of the United States is reported to have discussed with King Saud of Saudi Arabia continued United States presence at the Dhahran Airbase, I believe that it is important for the Congress, in the words of Woodrow Wilson, "to square our politics with our principles" and to make clear our unyielding opposition to discrimination by foreign governments against U.S. citizens.

Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced the following concurrent resolution:

> Whereas it is a fundamental principle of the United States Constitution that there shall not be discrimination against United States citizens based on race, religion, creed, or color; and
>
> Whereas the protection of the integrity of United States citizenship and of the basic rights of United States citizens in their lawful pursuit of trade, travel, and other activities abroad is a principle of United States sovereignty; and
>
> Whereas any attempt by foreign nations to discriminate among United States citizens on the basis of race, religion, creed, or color in the granting of personal or commercial access or any other rights otherwise available to United States citizens generally is inconsistent with our principles: Now, therefore, be it
>
> *Resolved by the House of Representatives* (*the Senate concurring*), That it is the sense of the Congress that any such discrimination directed against United States citizens is incompatible with the relations that should exist among friendly nations, that the United States should issue a strong protest against such discrimination, that in all negotiations between the United States and any foreign state, the United States should insist upon the elimination of such discrimination, and that the United States should not be a party to any agreement which allows a foreign nation to discriminate against United States citizens because of race, religion, creed or color.

The Dhahran Airbase was established during World War II. In 1951 a 5-year agreement for the use of the Dhahran facilities by the United States was signed with the Saudi Arabian Government. The agreement was extended for an additional 5 years in April 1957. Both the 1951 agreement and the 1957 treaty gave the Saudi Arabian Government the right to reject any member of the American mission which it considers objectionable or unacceptable. The practical effect of this clause has been to exclude American Jews from serving at Dhahran.

By acquiescing in the barring of U.S. personnel from our installations at Dhahran, our Government has countenanced affronts to our citizens and cast doubt upon our ideals. It is impossible to defend and deny democracy simultaneously. Either our men are serving overseas to defend freedom and our principles—in which case they must be permitted to live up to them—or they are men without a mission.

Last year Saudi Arabia notified the United States that the lease would not be renewed in April 1962. Now there are reports of negotiations for continued use of the base. I urge the administration to insist that there be no further restrictions because of race, religion, creed, or color upon the admission of military personnel to the base. We should not send a single American to a base where all Americans are not accorded equal treatment.

Our Government should make it clear that the ethnic, racial, or religious background of American citizens is not the legitimate concern of any foreign government. Ever since our Nation was founded, we have opened our doors to the people of many nations and given them new life, new hope, and a new nationality. The rights of American citizens under the Constitution must be upheld.

Mr. Speaker, discrimination by Arab countries against U.S. citizens is well known. Only last year Helen Hayes and the American Theater Guild Company were banned from Cairo because the group planned to visit Israel on its tour; a former Washington, D.C., WAC on her way from Bombay to Rome was forced to remain on the plane during a stopover at Dhahran, Saudi Arabia, because the crew feared that the Saudis would discover that she was Jewish and the plane would be detained; the central office of the Arab League Boycott of Israel in Damascus, Syria, announced that Actor Eddie Cantor and six American business companies were placed on the blacklist.

Arab discrimination has persisted since May 15, 1948, when after almost 2,000 years of exile and after the slaughter of 6 million of their brethren the Jews of Palestine proclaimed the State of Israel.

Although the creation of the new state was sanctioned by the General Assembly of the United Nations, six states set themselves above the community of nations. Egypt, Syria, Jordan, Lebanon, Iraq, and Saudi Arabia attacked Israel with the announced intention of effecting "a momentous massacre which will be spoken of like the Mongolian massacres and the Crusades." However, they were unsuccessful. Israel defeated the invaders, and in the spring and summer of 1949 Egypt, Syria, Lebanon, and Jordan signed armistice agreements with Israel.

The armistice agreements had been concluded with a view to promoting the return of permanent peace in Palestine and to facilitate the transition from the present truce to permanent peace. As a provisional measure they were generally expected to be a brief prelude to formal peace treaties. This hope was short lived. Most people are familiar with the military aspects of the continuing Arab war on Israel. Not so well known is the economic warfare employed by the Arab States to undermine Israel's economic stability and to isolate her.

In May 1951, the Council of the League of Arab States adopted a resolution calling for the establishment of economic boycott offices in all of the Arab States. The boycott itself was applied to all firms with branches in Israel and all companies doing business with Israel. They were blacklisted. In addition, any ship calling on an Israel port was prevented from docking in an Arab port, and no planes landing in Israel were permitted to fly in Arab skies. These were the original provisions of the Arab boycott.

Since 1951, however, the scope of the boycott has been vastly extended to include: the blacklisting of many American companies having Americans of the Jewish faith among their officers, owners, directors, or even personnel; the refusing of visas to Americans of Jewish faith and forbidding them to disembark in some Arab countries.

Mr. Speaker, the State Department should be resolute and vigorous in protecting our citizens from such religious discrimination. On August 15, 1961, during the debate on the foreign aid bill I fought for a strong statement of policy against these abuses of our national sovereignty and indignities inflicted upon our citizens. I said then, "we must be resolute on this issue or fail to live up to our ideals." Our principles are basic. Justice and equality are empty slogans unless we demand equal treatment for all our citizens from all nations.

In considering the question of the Dhahran Airbase and the Arab boycott, we might well recall the words of Woodrow Wilson, then Governor of New Jersey, on December 6, 1911, in protesting Russian discrimination against Americans of Jewish faith. He stated:

> They are not Jews in America; they are American citizens. * * * By our action for them shall be tested our sincerity, our genuineness, the reality of principle among us. * * * There is here a greater stake than any other upon which we could set our hearts. Here is the final test of our ability to square our politics with our principles. We may now enjoy the exhilaration of matching our professions with handsome performance. We are not here to express our sympathy with our Jewish fellow citizens, but to make evidence our sense of identity with them. This is not their cause; it is America's. It is the cause of all who love justice and do right.

I urge my colleagues to join with me in upholding the finest traditions of our Nation and support this concurrent resolution.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentlemen from New York.

You will recall last year I offered a similar amendment to the Peace Corps bill, and it was adopted by the House but taken out by the Senate. The conference committee agreed to the Senate's elimination of the amendment. I agree with the gentleman. I feel this should be true in the armed services as well as in the Peace Corps or any other agency of the U.S. Government.

Mr. RYAN. I thank the gentleman for his remarks. I am happy he has been one of the leaders in this fight to eliminate such discrimination wherever it is.

CERTAIN FRANKING PRIVILEGES

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, several years ago the Post Office and Treasury Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, of which I am a member, inserted a clause in an appropriations bill which would give Members of Congress the right to send mail under their franking privilege merely by addressing the envelope "Occupant." At that time, I opposed the particular amendment to the bill, and we were successful in defeating it.

Last year the same amendment was inserted in the appropriation bill for the Post Office and Treasury. Adding this clause giving Members of the Congress the right to send "Occupant" mail to their constituents was one of the last things the House of Representative did under the final supplemental appropriations bill of the 1st session of the 87th Congress. It is interesting to note that the measure came to the floor in the wee hours of the morning. I tried to open it to debate, but I was ruled out of order.

Mr. Speaker, originally, 2 years ago, I stated on the floor of this House that the privilege would be abused if given to Members of Congress. I further stated that it was unfair to the taxpayers of the United States because they did not enjoy the same privilege and that if we were going to extend it to Members of Congress, then all the taxpayers should have it as well.

Several weeks ago this House of Representatives passed a postal rate increase amounting to 25 percent on first-class mail and up to 61 percent on other classes of mail. In total, it is an increase in rates to the taxpayers of $700 million. We have an enormous postal deficit at the present time and that was the reason for approving the postal rate increase. We are now compounding the felony by adding to the future deficit of the Post Office through increasing the amount of "Occupant" mail that it must handle without payment. This is a flagrant use of a double standard—one for the taxpayers and another for ourselves.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and all Members of the House to take a walk down through the tunnel from the Old House Office Building to the cafeteria in the New House Office Building. There, lined up like a camel caravan, are millions of pieces of mail addressed "Occupant" and ready to be sent out to people all over the United States. It is my understanding that the House folding room is over a month behind in its work because of the vast increase in the use of "Occupant" mailings. I hope that this year, when the appropriations bill is considered by the House, we can offer a successful amendment to repeal this legislation.

Furthermore, only recently the House passed a bill providing $475,000 to study fire hazards here in the buildings on the Capitol Grounds and to make certain improvements to prevent fires. Certainly, if I have ever seen a fire hazard here in the Capitol Buildings, it is that hall crowded with piles of mail that nearly close off the passage. Up on the wall in that same hall is a sign sometimes hidden by the stacks of mail, designating it as a "shelter area." This, to me, is just another mockery of the nationwide effort to provide protection against the dangers of atomic attack, for the number of people that could possibly use the hallway as a shelter has been greatly reduced as a result of its usage as a storage area.

Many of our constituents have written to us that they dislike receiving junk mail from mailing houses throughout the country. I agree with them. And, I know that if I were an American taxpayer, I would resent receiving an envelope carelessly marked "Occupant" from any Congressman. To me it would be just as objectionable as receiving junk mail. I hope that we will repudiate this measure yet this year.

AIR FORCE CONTRACTS WITH CONVAIR

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I want to direct the attention of the House to the yearend report by the Comptroller General which examines cost-plus-incentive-fee contracts made by the Air Force with Convair, a division of General Dynamics Corp., for special tooling pursuant to the B-58 program.

The report discloses that Convair received unwarranted fee allowances to the amount of $382,000 on a $6 million contract. Under the present system, as the Comptroller's report points out, the Air Force has categorized its contracts in two ways: The first is for routine procurement, for example, industrial facilities which procurement regulations specify should be acquired under a no-fee facilities contract; the second is for special tooling and permits special fee allowances. Special tooling by definition includes "acquisitions by the contractor for use in performance of the contract, which are of such a specialized nature that, without substantial modification or alteration, their use is limited to the production of such supplies or parts thereof, or the performance of such services, as are peculiar to the needs of the Government."

The present grievance concerns the fact that Air Force contracting officials allowed Convair to acquire at Government expense, hangar-type buildings and certain test equipment as special tooling under supply contracts for B-58 airplanes and to receive additional fees of $328,000 on the estimated cost of these items, even though ample information was available to show that the buildings and equipment were not special to the B-58 but could be readily adapted for use with almost any military or commercial aircraft in service. Thus by classifying the hangars as special tooling the Air Force bypassed a number of procedures specifically designed to insure that such overcharging and misclassification did not occur.

As the Comptroller emphatically points out:

> Convair and Air Force contracting officials should have recognized * * * that the items were not special tooling but were industrial facilities which procurement regulations specifically designate to be acquired under no-fee facilities contracts.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to emphasize that through the combination of the practices of Convair and sloppy administrative procedures by the Air Force, Convair has been allowed to charge exorbitant special fees for the procurement of routine hangars for airplanes. Necessarily the cost of such sheer inefficiency and incredibly poor business practice falls on the taxpayers.

Only because of this study by the Comptroller General were we able to detect these high overcharges in one $6 million contract. I believe that such discrepancies as the study uncovers pinpoints the immediate need for a correction of such procedural loopholes in Government contracting and I urge the immediate formulation of more businesslike procurement and administrative reforms to insure against duplicity or oversight.

Specifically, I recommend that the Air Force should initiate action to recover the additional charges on the Convair contract. It should also change its records procedures to transfer the B-58 run and maintenance stations from a special tooling contract to a nonspecial facility contract.

In closing, I would like to reemphasize that, as in the B-58 hangar case, the improper treatment of facilities resulted in bypassing reviews needed to assure that contractors do not procure facilities already available in Government inventories.

We need to institute new procedures which protect us against overpurchasing and against overcharging. The taxpayer can ill afford such unnecessary waste.

I hope that the recommendations and the report of the Comptroller General is given early and positive consideration.

ABUSE OF THE FRANKING PRIVILEGE

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SEELY-BROWN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill which I believe will terminate a serious abuse of the franking privilege.

A few weeks ago, the House passed the Postal Revision Act of 1962, the chief purpose of which is to abate or eliminate the recurring deficits in the operations of the Post Office Department, which have become a serious drain upon the Treasury.

The bill, as it passed the House, made an allocation of costs to public service operations by the Post Office Department which apparently nearly all of the Members here regarded as fair and reasonable. Then, to bridge the gap in postal revenues between costs and receipts, we increased to nearly all users of the mails the rates which we will require them to pay for such use.

The rates for users of first-class mail, which is the type which the general public uses most in its own mailing, are increased by 25 percent in the Postal Revision Act of 1962 which the House passed and sent to the Senate. The rates for the various types of commercial users of the mails have been increased by even higher rates, ranging up to 61 percent.

Although the general public appears to be tolerant of this necessary increase in rates, it is apparent that some of the commercial users of the mails are not happy, but so long as the rates are equitable in relation to the extent the postal service is used, we may expect that the increases which have been proven necessary will be absorbed as part of the increased cost of doing business.

In the hearings last year on the Postal Revision Act, and in discussions off the floor, there has been a lot of discussion about junk mail. All of us I am sure, have been receiving from some of our constituents a considerable volume of mail concerning it. Junk mail may be an inappropriate term, depending upon whether you are the sender or the receiver; but the term has come to be applied to all third class bulk mailings, and particularly to those which are sent to no addressee by name. In the bill which the House passed, the minimum rate for third class bulk mailings has been increased to 3 cents. The minimum bulk rate, as compared with what it was in 1950, has been increased by 150 percent.

The justification for these increases is that the Government needs the additional money to run the Post Office Department.

Under the circumstances, then, it seems particularly inappropriate, unwise, and unjustifiable for us as Members of Congress to use the franking privilege in a way that is extravagant and outrageous.

The bill which I have introduced today would repeal the authority given in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1962, passed by the House and by the Senate and signed by the President on September 30, 1961, to send mail to occupant at every address in every post office, on city carrier routes and on rural routes, and to send it under the congressional frank.

I have never used this type of mail. Perhaps my mailings are less extensive than those of some other Members. But at a time when the postal deficit is a matter of such great concern to the Congress, it seems to me self-evident that it is up to us as Members to help to eliminate it or to keep it within bounds by restricting the use of the frank to what has been customary and acceptable throughout our history.

My bill today would eliminate the mailing of matter by Members of Congress with a simplified form of address. If commercial firms want to send out tons of mail to "Occupants," let them pay for it; but, under the terms of my bill, the Members of Congress will not do it.

In eliminating this, I suspect that we may be doing ourselves a favor. Advertisers and commercial firms insist that the average citizen feels no resentment when mail is addressed to him as an "Occupant" and not by his name.

Be that as it may; but I believe that the average voter likes to be addressed by name when his Congressman communicates with him, and not as a faceless, anonymous "Occupant," communicated with only in bulk.

At any rate, I sincerely believe that the bill which I have introduced will clarify a situation which is unsound from every standpoint. I hope that it may receive prompt and favorable consideration at this session of the Congress.

COMMEMORATING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF THE FIRST SOKOL (FALCON) EDUCATIONAL AND PHYSICAL CULTURE ORGANIZATION IN PRAGUE, CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues this afternoon in commemorating the 100th anniversary of the founding of the first Sokol Educational and Physical Cultural Organization in Prague, Czechoslovakia, on February 16, 1862. This organization, which was to have a profound effect on history, was organized by a group of public-spirited men to whom liberty and democracy were a cherished ideal. These men, well versed in the history and philosophy of the past, wanted freedom and liberty for their people. They realized that only a nation which is willing to prepare for and retain independence must maintain it by constant vigilance. They stressed, realized, and fought for the development of the entire individual—physical, mental, moral, and spiritual. The founders of this organization created a terminology for calisthenics, apparatus exercises, and games that is so precise that units thousands of miles apart can practice the assigned drills, then meet at the great Sokol exhibitions and after only one general rehearsal, perform as if they had trained together for months.

The first Sokol unit in the United States was organized in St. Louis in 1865, and within a few years units were organized in Chicago, New York, Milwaukee, and other cities in this country. Today, they reach from coast to coast—from Canada to Mexico, and there are also Sokol units throughout the world—all dedicated to freedom and liberty. Their loyalty and ability to serve is proverbial. In every war in which this country has been involved, Sokol gymnasiums have become bare of their men's and junior classes. Within the last few years, units have been built new or expanded their old gymnasiums in Baltimore, Cleveland, and other cities. Many more are planning new improved facilities in dozens of localities. They support their own gymnasiums, community centers, and children's camps. They have trained and given outstanding coaches and leaders to colleges, high schools, and playgrounds by the hundreds. Now, on the threshold of their own centennial, they are intensifying their efforts to bring more of their fellow citizens into their active life.

The Sokols are respected in every land that is free. They are hated and feared by every form of dictatorship. They were the first organizations to be dissolved by the Nazis and Communists wherever these usurped power. The Sokol leaders were the first to be imprisoned and liquidated. The Second World War saw 90 percent of the Sokol leaders liquidated in Czechoslovakia, Poland, Austria, Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria. The few that were left have found a similar fate at the hands of the Communists. The great mass of the former powerful Sokol organizations in Europe are far from being exterminated or completely docile. The great spirit of freedom, liberty, and human justice instilled in them by courageous men and women for almost a century is still very much alive and is transferred to each new group of children. We know that those who have once known freedom and liberty as we know it will never forget it.

These Sokol trained people have faith in the inexorable destiny of mankind. The Sokols in America have produced their own great leaders and thinkers. Men and women in all walks of life have felt that their greatest contribution to this great land would be to devotedly serve in the Sokol ranks, to constantly train the young in that physical, mental, moral, and spiritual strength that is the bulwark of a nation.

FLOOD CONTROL AND WATER CONSERVATION PROJECTS IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Hiestand] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sincerity that I appear before this House today to extend appreciation and gratitude to Members who have played an important part in providing funds for flood control and water conservation projects in southern California.

As you have seen and read, the Los Angeles area was recently struck with a vicious, multiday rainstorm. After 6 days of driving rain, Los Angeles residents thought they might be living and working in an oversized bathtub. The Small Business Administration has declared Los Angeles County a disaster area.

Television and newspapers recorded pictures of the scene: rivers of water running down city streets, front lawns that served as bottoms of huge lakes, automobiles submerged to their rooftops.

Certainly, the damage done by city street flooding is terrible, but it is far better than having an entire mountainside come tumbling down onto our cities and towns. Fortunately, this was not the case and we in southern California can thank the Members of this House for the part they played.

I have appeared before numerous committees since coming to the Congress, pointing to the need for Federal funds to protect the Los Angeles metropolitan area from the potential disasters of the Angeles National Forest. The Angeles National Forest, which lies almost entirely in my district, is a Federal responsibility—and that responsibility must be met. The dangers of flood and fire are ever present. And, as we have also said many times, the taxpayers of Los Angeles County have not been remiss in their responsibilities in helping to protect their lives and property.

The recent tremendous rainstorms, which dumped 10 to 23 inches on the Los Angeles area, supplied the first real test of preparations we have made over the past 8 or 10 years. Cogswell Dam above the foothill cities of Monrovia, Sierra Madre, and Arcadia—all in my congressional district—was deluged with 23 inches of rain, but this and other check dams held fast.

These dams were constructed, in part, through funds supplied by the U.S. Congress. This heavy rainfall is a test which proves the worth of such measures. Much more is to be done, but the progress already made has protected lives and property.

City street flooding was serious. The problem of city street flooding must be met by more and better local storm drain systems. Yet, Federal funds and the Los Angeles County Flood Control District, under the magnificent guidance of Chief Engineer M. E. Salisbury, staved off potential disaster. Floods coming out of these mountain canyons are more than walls of water; they are composed of debris, rocks and stones, and boulders which reach the size of automobiles.

I pay thanks to my colleagues in the House today for their splendid support in the past and we in southern California shall hope for that support in the future.

SUSAN B. ANTHONY

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, today we commemorate the 142d anniversary of the birth of a great woman and noble American, Susan B. Anthony.

Her life was dedicated to achieving equality for the women of America. Through her influence and effort, the New York Legislature passed the act giving married women the guardianship of their children, the possession of their earnings, and a greater degree of equality under the law. Her most notable contribution to our society was, of course, her part in securing the enfranchisement for American women. But more important than these legal measures were the opportunities they opened to women to contribute to the cultural, intellectual, and professional progress of our great Nation.

Susan B. Anthony was a native of Adams, Mass., which I have the privilege to represent. Her crusade took her across our land though, and to accomplish her goals, she became a teacher, newspaperwoman, and lecturer. We are proud of Susan Anthony, not only for what she did for the status of American women, but because she has become a symbol for a cause still being fought in many parts of the world. By no means is the battle over, nor will it be until all the women of the world are given equal educational, political, and economic rights and opportunities. This Nation has led the way by maintaining a firm belief in equality of opportunity. This principle has been amply substantiated when we look at the role played by women in the professions, politics, and all walks of life.

On this, the birthday of Susan B. Anthony, I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to her memory and with women everywhere who are grateful for her having devoted a lifetime to their cause.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. Weis] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I should like to pay tribute once again to the memory of Susan B. Anthony, on this the anniversary of her birth.

Susan B. Anthony, born February 15, 1820, was perhaps the most devoted and courageous leader of the women's suffrage movement in America. She was a dynamic, selfless crusader who devoted herself completely to the cause of equality for women. She had few equals as a leader, for she possessed those qualities of greatness which marked her immediately as a giant among women.

Miss Anthony spent much of her life in Rochester, N.Y., my own home city, and her memory lingers today in the minds and hearts of many women of our community. Her home has been restored as a memorial and the Susan B. Anthony Memorial, Inc., has been established to perpetuate her memory and the memory of the great work which she accomplished.

Gov. Nelson Rockefeller has designated today as Susan B. Anthony Day in New York State, and I should like to include at this point in the Record the text of the Governor's proclamation concerning Susan B. Anthony:

Proclamation—State of New York,
Executive Chamber

Although Susan B. Anthony was born in Massachusetts, we proudly claim her as one of the great New Yorkers who helped to make history. Most of her adult life was passed and her effective work for freedom, justice, and equality was accomplished in the Empire State.

She was agent of the American Anti-Slavery Society for New York State before she began to devote herself almost exclusively to the agitation for women's rights. Her motto was: "The true Republic—men, their rights and nothing more; women, their rights and nothing less."

Susan Anthony could not foresee the preponderance in numbers of women over men which exists today. Her work resulted in adoption of what we know as the Susan B. Anthony amendment to the Constitution of the United States, the 19th amendment giving women the right to vote.

It is right that we honor this great and fearless American. Courage of a rare sort was needed to carry her and her associates through the hostility, and above all, the ridicule they encountered: Now, therefore, I, Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York, do hereby proclaim February 15, 1962, as Susan B. Anthony Day in New York State. Given under my hand and the privy seal of the State at the capitol in the city of Albany this 6th day of February in the year of our Lord 1962.

Nelson A. Rockefeller.

I should also like to include in the Record at this time a resolution adopted by the Susan B. Anthony Memorial, Inc. regarding the proposed equal rights amendment to the United States Constitution:

Whereas Miss Susan B. Anthony believed in perfect equality of rights for women, civil, legal, and political; and

Whereas at first women obtained only political; and

Whereas women now are working to secure civil and legal equality: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Susan B. Anthony Memorial, Inc., at the corporation meeting held in the Anthony Home on November 28, 1961, go on record as favoring the civil and legal equality which Miss Anthony in her lifetime approved; and be it further

Resolved, That the Anthony Corp. approves the equal rights amendment which reads: "Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex," and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Representative Jessica Weis and to Representative Harold Ostertag and to the New York State Senators Keating and Javits.

Mrs. George Howard,
President.
Mrs. Fred Wilkinson,
Recording Secretary.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Hemphill (at the request of Mr. Boggs), for 1 hour, for Tuesday, February 20, 1962.

Mr. James C. Davis, for Wednesday, February 21, 1962, vacating his special order for Monday, February 19, 1962.

Mr. James C. Davis, for 2 hours, on March 8, 1962.

Mr. Ryan, for 15 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Joelson in two instances.

Mr. Madden and to include a speech by the Honorable Chet Holifield.

Mr. Lane.
Mrs. Dwyer.
Mr. Reuss.
Mr. Brademas.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Conte) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Robison.
Mr. Poff.
Mr. Rousselot.
Mr. Ayres.
Mrs. Weis.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Ryan) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Hemphill.
Mr. Burke of Massachusetts.
Mr. Natcher.
Mr. Gallagher.
Mr. Rhodes of Pennsylvania.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on February 12, 1962, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 4876. An act for the relief of Mary C. Atkinson;

H.R. 5181. An act to amend Private Law 85–699;

H.R. 5324. An act for the relief of Dr. Serafin T. Ortiz;

H.R. 6013. An act for the relief of the Houston Belt & Terminal Railway Co.;

H.R. 7473. An act for the relief of Albert R. Serpa; and

H.R. 8325. An act for the relief of Harrison Thomas Harper.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 19, 1962, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1691. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the annual report on orderly liquidation of stocks of agricultural commodities held by the Commodity Credit Corporation and the expansion of markets for surplus agricultural commodities, pursuant to section 201(b) of Public Law 540, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1692. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1693. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on a selective examination of payments for construction of facilities and installation of equipment under Department of the Air Force combination firm fixed-price and cost-reimbursement prime contracts negotiated with Air Products, Inc., Allentown, Pa., pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67) and the authority of the Comptroller General, as set forth in 10 U.S.C. 2313(b); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1694. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a review of selected activities of the Federal-aid highway program of the Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce, in the State of Tennessee, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1695. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on review of selected highway transportation activities, Post Office Department, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and Public Law 86-682 (39 U.S.C. 2206); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1696. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on review of procurement and storage of general-use hand tools for the Air Force by General Services Administration, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1697. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to repeal subsection (d) of section 2388 of title 18 of the United States Code"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1698. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to amend sections 1821 and 1825 of title 28, United States Code, to increase the per diem, mileage, and subsistence allowances of witnesses, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1699. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report of all tort claims paid under section 2672 for the period from January 1, 1961, to December 31, 1961, pursuant to section 2673 of title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1700. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to amend section 7652(b)(3)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. THORNBERRY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 448. Resolution amending rule XXXV, Rules of the House of Representatives, 87th Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 1358). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 544. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 8399, a bill relating to the occupational training, development, and use of the manpower resources of the Nation, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1359). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. House Resolution 530. Resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962; without amendment (Rept. No. 1360). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. House Resolution 10050. A bill to provide for a further temporary increase in the public debt limit set forth in the Second Liberty Bond Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 1361). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1588. A bill for the relief of Fong Kai Dong; with amendment (Rept. No. 1357). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. VINSON:

H.R. 10202. A bill to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H.R. 10203. A bill to provide for research into and development of practical means for the utilization of solar energy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 10204. A bill to amend section 47 of the Bankruptcy Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORD:

H.R. 10205. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to preserve the confidential nature of copies of information filed with the Bureau of the Census on a confidential basis; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 10206. A bill authorizing the modification of the general plan for flood control and other purposes on Red River, Tex., Okla., Ark., and La., below Denison Dam, Tex. and Okla.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H.R. 10207. A bill to amend the St. Lawrence Seaway Act to provide that the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation shall not engage in publicity or promotion of the St. Lawrence Seaway; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 10208. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an exemption from the cabaret tax in the case of certain fund-raising affairs conducted by nonprofit charitable organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 10209. A bill to establish an Office of Public Works Coordination and Acceleration; to authorize the preparation of a plan for acceleration of public works when necessary to avoid serious nationwide unemployment levels; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H.R. 10210. A bill to provide an increase of 15 percent in the compensation of employees in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H.R. 10211. A bill to amend section 109 of title 38, United States Code, to provide medical care for certain veterans of armed forces allied or associated with the United States during World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 10212. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 165th anniversary of the launching of the U.S. frigate *Constellation* at Baltimore, Md.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H.R. 10213. A bill to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 to authorize the payment of rewards to persons who furnish information leading to convictions of organizations or individuals of failure to register as required by such act; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 10214. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1961 to define the term "person" or "producers" under the 1962 wheat and feed grain programs; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 10215. A bill to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 10216. A bill to extend the apportionment requirement in the Civil Service Act of January 16, 1883, to temporary summer employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 10217. A bill to repeal the provision of the Hill-Burton Act which permits Federal assistance for hospitals which discriminate against persons on the basis of race, creed, or color; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROUSH:

H.R. 10218. A bill to authorize the purchase by the United States of United Nations bonds, and to provide that the dollar value of such bonds purchased by the United States shall not exceed the aggregate dollar value of such bonds purchased by other nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCHERER:

H.R. 10219. A bill to place certain limitations on the authority of the Federal Communications Commission to delete previously assigned very high frequency television channels, to give the Commission certain regulatory authority over television receiving apparatus, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H.R. 10220. A bill to eliminate the mailing of matter by Members of Congress with a simplified form of address; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 10221. A bill to authorize the modification of the existing project for the New Melones Dam and Reservoir, Stanislaus River, Calif., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H.R. 10222. A bill to authorize the coinage of special 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the 200th anniversary of the founding of Charlottesville, Va.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H.R. 10223. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit life insurance companies to be taxed on capital gains in the same manner as all other corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H.R. 10224. A bill to relieve ship operators of part of the cost of designing vessels as required under operating-differential subsidy agreements; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mrs. WEIS:

H.R. 10225. A bill to amend sections 2 and 5 of the act entitled "An act to regulate the height, exterior design, and construction of private and semipublic buildings in the Georgetown area of the National Capital," approved September 22, 1950 (64 Stat. 903); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H.R. 10226. A bill to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce and to provide for the restitution of wages lost by employees by reason of any such discrimination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 10227. A bill to amend title III of the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants for family clinics for domestic agricultural migratory workers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Maryland:

H.R. 10228. A bill to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 to provide penalties for becoming or remaining a member of Communist-action organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

H.R. 10229. A bill to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 to authorize the payment of rewards to persons who furnish information leading to convictions of organizations or individuals of failure to register as required by such act; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.J. Res. 627. Joint resolution extending the duration of copyright protection in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.J. Res. 628. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the week in May of each year in which falls the third Friday of that month as National Transportation Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST. GERMAIN:

H.J Res. 629. Joint resolution to authorize the President of the United States to proclaim the month of May of each year as Senior Citizens Month; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H.J. Res. 630. Joint resolution to adopt a specific version of "The Star-Spangled Banner" as the national anthem of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Con. Res. 419. Concurrent resolution providing for additional copies of "Hearings on Small Business Problems in Poultry Industry, 87th Congress"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RYAN:

H. Con. Res. 420. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to discrimination against U. S. citizens by foreign nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. Res. 545. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to conduct an investigation and study of the extent to which employment in the Federal Government is denied to individuals because of age; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. Res. 546. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. CONTE: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to increase the amount of Federal aid authorized to cities and towns in their construction of sewage treatment facilities; to the Committee on Public Works.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States authorizing the Director of the Mint to issue a commemorative half-dollar coin in honor of Arizona's 50th year of statehood and so that the people of the whole Nation may join hands in honoring this significant event; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the urgent need for the Auburn Dam-Folsom South Canal project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to increase the amount of Federal aid authorized to cities and towns in their construction of sewage treatment facilities; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 10230. A bill for the relief of Lilias Jane Reid McKnight; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10231. A bill for the relief of Olimpia Barbano Clingo, Rosa Clingo, and Pietro Clingo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRY:

H.R. 10232. A bill for the relief of Myra Milne; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 10233. A bill for the relief of Umberto Vecchiarelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10234. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ilya Spigland, Shila Spigland, and Nitsana Spigland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 10235. A bill for the relief of Ferdinand A. Hermens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.R. 10236. A bill for the relief of Pedro Aguinaldo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H.R. 10237. A bill for the relief of Eleni Andrikopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H.R. 10238. A bill for the relief of Chryssanthi Stavros Katsaras and Andronikos S. Katsaras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 10239. A bill for the relief of Lidija Franklin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE:

H.R. 10240. A bill for the relief of Dennis Koutroubis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 10241. A bill for the relief of Dan Fong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. WEIS:

H.R. 10242. A bill to amend Private Law 86-339; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10243. A bill for the relief of Sheu Chwan Shaiou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H.R. 10244. A bill for the relief of Arie Abramovich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

238. By Mrs. ST. GEORGE: Petition of taxpayers of the town of Masonville, Delaware County, N.Y., relative to welfare relief regulations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

239. Also, petition of the Community Garden Club of Newburgh, N.Y., urging passage of the wilderness bill, S. 174; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 1962

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Hon. LEE METCALF, a Senator from the State of Montana.

Rt. Rev. Michael Kemezis, pastor, Sts. Peter and Paul's Lithuanian R. C. Parish, Elizabeth, N.J., offered the following prayer:

Our Divine Majesty, Lord and God, look down, we beseech Thee, upon this august gathering of the Senators of our Nation and hear our suppliant plea.

O God, how long, how long is our sister nation Lithuania to suffer. We realize that Thou chastiseth those whom Thou lovest, and it will always be the prayer of Thy Son—not our will but Thine be done.

We beseech Thee to listen to our plea. We, who are of this great land which Thou hast blest, thank Thee for our President, our Vice President, and for our great men and women in Congress.

O Lord, help and assist them to be imbued with a spirit of prayer and divine inspiration to work and make our laws and our country's commitments according to Thy will.

O good and almighty God, help our Lithuanian brethren in their bondage, give them courage and hope, so that by their suffering and sacrifice, they may gain Thy favor, so that once more they may live as freemen in a world created by Thee—to serve and honor Thee—to live in peace with our fellow men and our sister nations.

Peace Thou came to give—yes, peace Thou can give to men of good will. We pray and beg of Thee to make us understand Thy charity for our fellow men and our sister nations.

May God bless you and keep you. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., February 15, 1962.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. LEE METCALF, a Senator from the State of Montana, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. METCALF thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 12, 1962, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection with the morning hour be limited to 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

W. Averell Harriman, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of State;

Walt Whitman Rostow, of Massachusetts, to be Counselor of the Department of State;

Vice Adm. Edward Nelson Parker, U.S. Navy, of Pennsylvania, to be an Assistant Director, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency;

Jacob D. Beam, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Director, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency; and

Walter P. McConaughy, of Alabama, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Pakistan.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

U.S. MARSHAL

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Harry M. Miller, of Kentucky, to be U.S. marshal for the western district of Kentucky.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

U.S. ATTORNEY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Alexander Greenfeld, of Delaware, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Delaware.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON LIQUIDATION OF STOCKS OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES HELD BY COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the orderly liquidation of stocks of agricultural commodities held by the Commodity Credit Corporation and the expansion of markets for surplus agricultural commodities, dated December 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

ADJUSTMENT OF LEGISLATIVE JURISDICTION OVER CERTAIN LANDS

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to adjust the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over lands within Eglin Air Force Base, Fla. (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 7652(b)(3)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF SELECTED ACTIVITIES OF THE FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM IN THE STATE OF TENNESSEE

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of selected activities of the Federal-aid highway program in the State of Tennessee, Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce, dated February 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF SELECTED HIGHWAY TRANSPORTATION ACTIVITIES, POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of selected highway transportation activities, Post Office Department, dated February 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF PROCUREMENT AND STORAGE OF GENERAL-USE HANDTOOLS FOR THE AIR FORCE

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of procurement and storage of general-use handtools for the Air Force by General Services Administration, dated February 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON SELECTIVE EXAMINATION OF PAYMENTS MADE UNDER CERTAIN CONTRACTS NEGOTIATED WITH AIR PRODUCTS, INC., ALLENTOWN, PA.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the selective examination of payments made for construction of facilities and installation of equipment under Department of the Air Force contracts negotiated with Air Products, Inc., Allentown, Pa., dated February 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that Department, for the period January 1, 1961, to December 31, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPEAL OF SUBSECTION (d) OF SECTION 2388 OF TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE

A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal subsection (d) of section 2388 of title 18 of the United States Code (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF SECTIONS 1821 AND 1825, TITLE 28, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO ALLOWANCES OF WITNESSES

A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend sections 1821 and 1825 of title 28, United States Code, to increase the per diem, mileage, and subsistence allowances of witnesses, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADJUSTMENT OF IMMIGRATION STATUS OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered in the case of certain aliens, relating to adjustment of their immigration status (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Archivist of the United States on a list of papers and documents in the files of several departments and agencies of the

Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. Johnston and Mr. Carlson members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, and so forth, were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

Resolutions of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Resolutions Memorializing the Congress of the United States To Increase the Amount of Federal Aid Authorized to Cities and Towns in Their Construction of Sewage Treatment Facilities

"Whereas one of the great problems facing the local, State, and Federal Governments today is water pollution; and

"Whereas although great progress has been made on this problem, a great financial burden has been placed on many cities and towns because of the requirement to appropriate large sums of money in carrying out this program: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Massachusetts House of Representatives urges the Congress of the United States to pass legislation increasing the amount of Federal aid authorized on approved projects from 30 to 60 percent of the cost of construction of sewage treatment facilities and to increase the maximum amount authorized on each project to $800,000; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be sent by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

"Adopted by the house of representatives January 9, 1962.

"William C. Maiers,
"*Clerk*.

"Attest:

"Kevin H. White,
"*Secretary of the Commonwealth*."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Commerce:

"Senate Resolution 34

"Resolution relating to the initiation of Federal studies and programs regarding the condition and exploitation of the North Pacific and Bering Sea fisheries

"Whereas the vast fisheries of the North Pacific and Bering Sea are a natural resource historically recognized as vital to the economy of the United States; and

"Whereas in addition to the tremendous take of salmon and halibut in these international waters the immense Russian and Japanese fleets have been harvesting more than a billion and a half pounds of other fish and shellfish annually; and

"Whereas both Russia and Japan have yearly expanded their operations in the taking of salmon, halibut, and other demersal and pelagic fish which abound in the waters beyond the 3-mile limit; and

"Whereas both nations, but particularly Japan, are now operating extensive and expanding oceanographic and marine fisheries research in these areas, thus establishing strong prior rights through subsidized fishing and research; and

"Whereas at the present time the U.S. fleet plays only a secondary or tertiary role in the research regarding and the actual harvesting of the offshore fishery resources except for salmon and halibut; be it

"*Resolved by the senate in second legislature, second session assembled*, That the Government of the United States is respectfully urged to take immediate steps to initiate projects for offshore fish and shellfish studies and the necessary oceanographic, processing, transportation, and marketing research essential to the proper implementation of the Nation's right to the beneficial exploitation of this natural resource in international waters; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That this resolution be directed to the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States; the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate; the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives; the Honorable Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior; and the honorable members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

"Passed by the senate January 22, 1962.

"Frank Peratovich,
"*President of the Senate*.

"Attest:

"Evelyn K. Stevenson,
"*Secretary of the Senate*."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Resolution 19

"Resolution relative to the Auburn Dam-Folsom south canal project

"Whereas the Secretary of the Interior of the United States, with letter dated January 15, 1962, forwarded to the Congress of the United States reports recommending the early authorization of the Auburn Dam-Folsom south canal project and related units; and

"Whereas the facilities to be constructed are vitally needed to supply water to areas within Placer, Sacramento, El Dorado, and San Joaquin Counties; and

"Whereas the supplemental water which will be made available by the Auburn Dam-Folsom south canal project is urgently needed, in part, to preserve the use of large acreages of highly productive farmland which is now endangered by a rapidly falling water table and a lack of adequate surface water supplies; and

"Whereas the proposed facilities are necessary for the full development of the American River as a working unit of the Central Valley project; and

"Whereas these facilities will provide much needed additional flood control protection, for the city of Sacramento, along the lower regions of the American River, along the Sacramento River, and within the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta; and

"Whereas the entire State of California will benefit from the proposed project by additional flood protection for the capital city of the State and by the provision of an adequate supply of water for an important agricultural and urban area of California: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Senate of the State of California commends the Secretary of the Interior for recognizing the urgent need for the Auburn Dam-Folsom south canal project; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Senate of the State of California urges appropriate action, particularly by the U.S. Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and by the U.S. House of Representatives Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, directed toward the early authorization and construction of the Auburn Dam-Folsom south canal project; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of the senate shall transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the chairman of the U.S. Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, to the chairman of the U.S. House of Representatives Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to the Secretary of the Interior of the United States.

"J. A. Beek,
"*Secretary of the Senate*."

A letter in the nature of a petition from the American Order of St. David, Camden, N.J., signed by Andrew E. Griffith, national president general, favoring the enactment of legislation to designate St. David's Day, March 1, as a general holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SOIL CONSERVATION AND WATERSHED PROGRAM—RESOLUTIONS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, Kansas is greatly interested in programs of conservation of soil and the control of water runoff within our State.

At a budget session of the Kansas Legislature, the legislature recognized the importance of this work and urged Congress to vote sufficient funds to carry on an expanded program.

I am personally familiar with the fine work that is being done in our State and, therefore, urge the Senate to vote a fund of not less than $250 million this session for our agricultural conservation program.

The State Association of Kansas Watersheds held its annual meeting December 12, 1961, at Topeka, Kans. This organization has been actively engaged in the control of water runoff through the watershed programs. We have completed some of the projects in our State and many others are ready for construction and completion as soon as funds are available.

The future growth and development of our State will be determined largely by the amount of water that we can conserve and use for beneficial purposes. The watershed program should be the basis of this operation.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of House Concurrent Resolution 22 and the resolutions adopted by the State Association of Kansas Watersheds at its annual meeting in Topeka on December 12, 1961, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 22

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States in regard to legislation pertaining to the agricultural conservation program

Whereas the ever-increasing demands for effective soil and water conservation impose a major responsibility on Kansas farmers; and

Whereas watershed development in the State of Kansas involves accelerated conservation work; and

Whereas the farmers of Kansas have demonstrated a willingness to spend more of their own time and money for conservation of soil and water in the public interest; and

Whereas for the past 14 years the Federal appropriation for agricultural conservation work on a cost-sharing basis has remained at $250 million; and

Whereas before the end of the year 1961 more than 60 counties in the State of Kansas were using advance allocations of funds appropriated for the year 1962; and

Whereas in the State of Kansas these funds have consistently been used for fundamental and permanent conservation activities such as terraces, waterways, restoration of native grasses, and other projects and practices of enduring value; and

Whereas some States do not use their full allocation of the Federal funds, commonly known as agricultural conservation program money: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Kansas (the Senate concurring therein), That we respectfully urge and request the Congress of the United States to maintain the appropriation of agricultural conservation program funds at no less than $250 million per annum; and, be it further

Resolved, That we respectfully urge and request the Congress of the United States to amend the basic agricultural conservation program law so as to permit unused funds in any State to be reallocated to States which demonstrate a need for additional funds for permanent conservation work; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be instructed to transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, the chairmen of the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, and to each member of the Kansas delegation in the Congress of the United States.

Adopted by the house February 1, 1962.

ALLEN L. MITCHELL,
Speaker of the House.
A. E. ANDERSON,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Adopted by the senate February 5, 1962.

HAROLD H. CHASE,
President of the Senate.
RALPH E. ZARKER,
Secretary of the Senate.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED DECEMBER 1961 BY THE STATE ASSOCIATION OF KANSAS WATERSHEDS

I

It has been accepted procedure the past several years for proposed Federal flood control and other water resources development projects to be reviewed by the State water resources board. It also has been accepted procedure that the recommendations of the water resources board becomes the official state recommendation. In line with this, we will oppose congressional authorization of those proposed Federal projects which did not in this past year win the recommendation of the State water resources board.

II

In connection with several bills pending in the Congress on the subject of water resources planning; we endorse the objective of coordinating the planning activities of the Federal and State agencies dealing with water resources. However, we do not believe that efficient and economical coordination can be achieved by interdepartmental review; and we favor the creation of an independent advisory commission to review water resources projects proposed by various departments and agencies. We believe such a review commission should function on principles, standards and procedures approved by the Congress; and that the sovereign rights of the States must be protected in State projects and water allocation.

III

We recommend that on small streams where watershed groups are active, the authorization for large reservoirs should be delayed until the watersheds' development has an opportunity to prove their value.

IV

A fundamental need for implementation of a complete nationwide soil survey is vital and necessary. We urge the Congress to establish a commission composed of the presidents of land grant colleges to immediately institute and complete a survey of the Nation's soil productivity and capabilities. The survey should be taken with full cooperation of the individual farmer.

V

More than 60 Kansas counties have been using 1960 ACP funds since late summer. There is a severe shortage of SCS planning and construction funds in Kansas and a few other States—while such funds allocated to other States are unused. We recommend that State ACP and SCS funds be transferable between States; and that the Kansas congressional delegation strive to secure passage of the necessary legislation.

VI

We urge the SCS to exert strenuous effort to identify downstream benefits in order that the most comprehensive watershed program can be developed.

RESOLUTION OF GOVERNING BODY OF CANEY, KANS.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the governing body of the city of Caney, Kans., at a regular meeting of the council of that city on February 5, 1962, adopted a resolution approving the survey report of the Corps of Engineers of the Tulsa Engineer District covering the Verdigris River and tributaries in Kansas and Oklahoma, with particular respect to the Copan Reservoir.

The control of the water runoff is vital to our State and early action by Congress on the resolution submitted by the Corps of Engineers would be of great value to Kansas and the community of Caney. It is my hope that we may get early action on it.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution endorsing the survey report of the Corps of Engineers be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas said survey report proposes construction of certain improvements for flood control, water supply, pollution abatement, recreation, development of fish and wildlife benefits, and maintenance of low flow in certain streams in the vicinity of Caney, Kans.; and

Whereas said survey report has been reviewed by and between the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Kansas Water Resources Board, and the proposed design of the Copan Reservoir has been adjusted to the mutual satisfaction of both agencies; and

Whereas the construction of said Copan Reservoir as proposed by said survey report will result in a very favorable economic impact and accelerated development in the city of Caney, Kans., and its surrounding trade territory; and

Whereas the said survey report includes estimates of cost for relocating, reconstructing, or protecting utilities and other facilities in the same condition as they exist at the time of reservoir construction at no expense to the city of Caney, Kans., or private interests; and

Whereas the said Copan Reservoir, in conjunction with certain upstream projects proposed by the State of Kansas under Public Law 566, will result in improved ability of the city of Caney, Kans., to provide for future supply of industrial and domestic water: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the governing body of the city of Caney, Kans.:

SECTION 1. The governing body of the city of Caney, Kans., after thorough consideration of such survey report and by reason of such benefits which will accrue to the city of Caney, Kans., and its surrounding area, hereby endorses said survey report.

SEC. 2. The governing body of the city of Caney, Kans., will cause copies of this resolution to be placed in the hands of its elected representatives in the legislature and in the Congress of the United States. It will also make copies of this resolution available to the congressional delegation of the State of Oklahoma.

Passed and approved this 5th day of February 1962.

W. E. JONES,
Mayor.
F. G. FRANKS,
City Clerk.

RESOLUTION OF KANSAS OIL MEN'S ASSOCIATION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the oil industry in the United States is in a depressed condition. We must keep this in mind as we consider future programs for oil development in the United States.

Kansas is one of the large oil-producing States of the Nation and the annual production of oil in the past 5 years has declined from a high of 124 million barrels to 113 million barrels.

We should also keep in mind that crude oil sells for less than it did in 1957, 5 years ago. Our wells are producing the minimum allowables and with not much apparent hope for an increase in price or allowables under present conditions. The drilling operations are at an alltime low. It is essential that we maintain incentives for increasing discovery of new oil reserves, not only in Kansas, but in the Nation, if we are to maintain our oil production for national defense and for economic expansion.

At a meeting of the Kansas Oil Men's Association, held in Wichita on January 22, 1962, a resolution regarding the importance of percentage depletion to the oil industry was adopted.

I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ON PERCENTAGE DEPLETION

Whereas an adequate supply of oil and continuous oil exploration is essential to the national welfare and defense; and

Whereas Congress in 1926, recognizing the need for an incentive for oil exploration, enacted a provision for percentage depletion, allowing 27½ percent of gross income from an oil well as a tax deduction, limited to any 1 year to 50 percent of the taxable income from the well; and

Whereas attempts are being made to reduce this rate which, if carried out, would sharply reduce drilling activities; and

Whereas less drilling activity would soon cause shortages of domestic supplies bringing about higher prices for gasoline and oil products, contributing to inflation and accelerating the trend toward smaller cars, resulting in less tax revenue: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Kansas Oil Men's Association in convention here assembled, That we strongly oppose any effort to reduce, eliminate, or otherwise tamper with present percentage depletion for oil and natural gas.

That copies of this resolution shall be sent to the Kansas congressional delegation in Washington, D.C.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 2840. A bill to provide authority for the President, under the control and direction of the Congress, to make such necessary adjustments in the trade policies of the United States as may be necessary to meet the complex and rapidly changing economic and political conditions prevailing in the world, and to provide the means for assisting domestic enterprises, communities, and individuals to adjust their productive activities to change economic conditions resulting from the increased participation of the United States in world trade; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. RUSSELL (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

S. 2841. A bill to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. RUSSELL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for Mr. CHAVEZ):

S. 2842. A bill for the relief of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2843. A bill for the relief of Thomas E. Speer; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 2844. A bill for the relief of Alice Amar Froemning;

S. 2845. A bill for the relief of Dieter F. Scholz; and

S. 2846. A bill for the relief of Drs. Manuel S. Lina and Constancia L. Ortega Lina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2847. A bill to provide for U.S. participation in international programs of assistance which utilize agricultural commodities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. KERR (for himself and Mr. WILEY) (by request):

S. 2848. A bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research, development, and operation, construction of facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

(See the remarks of Mr. KERR when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 2849. A bill to provide for research into and development of practical means for the utilization of solar energy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. METCALF:

S. 2850. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to use surplus grains on land available under section 3 and section 15 of the Taylor Grazing Act; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. METCALF when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 2851. A bill to repeal the Inland Waterways Corporation Act; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

S. 2852. A bill to authorize the disposal of the property known as Ellis Island for purposes consistent with the public interest and welfare; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. CASE of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts:

S. 2853. A bill for the relief of Dr. Francisco B. deCarvalho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 2854. A bill for the relief of Joo Yon Ohm Cederberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HART:

S. 2855. A bill for the relief of Weng Chiew Wong and Moy Chong Wong; and

S. 2856. A bill to amend section 245 of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. HART when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S.J. Res. 156. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim the period from February 10, 1963, to February 16, 1963, as Negro History Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. DIRKSEN when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONSTRUCTION AT CERTAIN MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would authorize certain construction at military installations. This bill is requested by the Department of Defense. I ask unanimous consent that the letter of transmittal from the Secretary of Defense, relating to the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2841) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. RUSSELL (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The letter presented by Mr. RUSSELL is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., February 13, 1962.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation "To authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes."

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1962, and the Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to its presentation to the Congress. The Department of Defense recommends that it be enacted.

This legislation would authorize military construction urgently needed by the Department of Defense at this time, and would provide additional authority to cover deficiencies in essential prior construction authorizations. The appropriation of money required for military construction is provided for in the budget of the U.S. Government for the fiscal year 1963.

Titles I, II, and III of this legislation would authorize new construction for the Active Forces totaling $1,099,415,000, of which $148,750,000 is for the Department of the Army, $206,312,000 for the Department of the Navy, and $744,353,000 for the Department of the Air Force. Titles IV and V would authorize new construction totaling $133,517,000 for defense agencies and activities. Title IV also makes provision for fallout shelters in military facilities of the Active Forces and Reserve components, including the National Guard. Title VI is for general provisions relating to these titles.

Title VII would authorize construction of 16,503 new units of family housing at a cost of $311,451,000. In addition, it would authorize establishment of a new military family housing fund, and it contains other legislative recommendations considered necessary to implement the Department of Defense family housing program.

Title VIII totaling $46,500,000 would authorize construction for the Reserve components, of which $11 million is for the Army National Guard, $9,900,000 for the Army Reserve, $8,200,000 for the Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, $12,700,000 for the Air National Guard, and $4,700,000 for the Air Force Reserve. Consistent with the desires expressed in Senate and House reports accompanying Public Law 87-57, title VIII contains provisions necessary in reverting to the lump-sum method of authorizing facilities for Reserve components which was in effect prior to fiscal year 1959.

With respect to deficiencies in prior construction authorizations, this proposal would provide additional monetary authority in the amount of $5,527,000 on projects authorized under previous laws. This amount is distributed: $66,000 to the Army, $5,276,000 to the Navy, and $185,000 to the Air Force. Also, this legislative proposal would repeal as of June 1963 all authorizations for military construction contained in laws enacted prior to June 9, 1960 (with certain specified exceptions).

In summation, the total authorization requested in this legislative proposal for all of the agencies mentioned, including military family housing, is $1,596,410,000.

Sincerely,

ROBERT S. MCNAMARA.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and myself, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research, development, and operation, construction of facilities, and for other purposes.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the letter of James E. Webb, Administrator of NASA, requesting the proposed legislation.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2848) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research, development, and operation, construction of facilities, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KERR (for himself and Mr. WILEY), by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

The letter presented by Mr. KERR is as follows:

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND
SPACE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., February 6, 1962.

The Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Herewith submitted is a draft of a bill "To authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research, development, and operation, construction of facilities, and for other purposes."

Aside from changes in the dollar amounts and other figures involved, the only major difference between this bill and Public Law 87-98 (75 Stat. 216), the corresponding authorization act for fiscal year 1962, is that appropriate revisions have been made to combine the present "Salaries and expenses" appropriation with the "Research and development" appropriation, which is retitled "Research, development, and operation," and is to remain available without fiscal year limitation if so specified in an appropriation act. The objective of this change is to achieve more effective use of funds and greater fiscal flexibility by permitting NASA to apply its financial resources to those areas of its activity where they are most urgently required. It is not intended that this combination have any effect other than to combine the two existing appropriations into a single "no year" appropriation. That is to say, except as to the elimination of the current fiscal year limitation on the present "Salaries and expenses" appropriation, the scope of the combined appropriation is intended to be as broad as the two current appropriations but no broader.

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration recommends that the enclosed draft bill be enacted.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that the enactment of the enclosed draft bill will be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. WEBB,
Administrator.

ESTABLISHMENT OF AN OFFICE OF SOLAR ENERGY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, today I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would authorize the establishment of an Office of Solar Energy within the Department of the Interior.

Representative VICTOR L. ANFUSO is introducing similar proposed legislation in the House today.

The new developments and the unmeasurable potential of solar energy are matters of great interest to me. Many private firms have pioneered with research and development projects in this field in the past few years, producing limited numbers of devices which transform the heat and energy of the sun into controlled electricity.

The Federal Government has played an active and effective role in the development of hydroelectric power and, more recently, atomic energy.

But in this relatively new but exciting field of solar energy, the Government needs to coordinate and to step up its activities for development of solar energy devices and techniques.

With stepped-up research and development, we can utilize solar energy for a vast array of positive purposes. Power for communications, hospitals and agricultural equipment, to name a few purposes, can be placed in isolated areas of the Nation—and the world—where no power exists now.

Man has long hoped to harness the sun's energy for practical purposes, but only in recent years have specific devices been developed.

I add that in our missile program, particularly in respect to the Mercury project, the solar energy batteries will be used, which indicates the possibilities for this type of energy.

Two methods are now under study and limited utilization. One is to store the sun's heat energy for conversion later to power. The other is to channel the light energy of the sun through particular metals for immediate conversion to electrical power.

Several agencies of our Government are presently interested in the potential of solar energy. The Department of Defense is experimenting on the use of solar energy for communication devices, and has already utilized solar cells to power electronic devices in our satellites.

The Department of Commerce has considered the possibility of ocean buoys, remote weather stations and auxiliary generators on ships powered by solar energy.

The U.S. Forest Service has considered utilizing solar energy for some of its more remote stations.

No one agency or office of the Government, however, has an overall responsibility or total interest in solar energy research and development. The Department of Interior, with its great interest and experience in the development of power and energy sources, would have much to offer.

My bill would authorize the Secretary of Interior to conduct solar energy research and development projects and would direct him to work closely with other departments with potential uses for solar energy power.

This bill also would direct the Secretary of Interior to establish a Solar Energy Advisory Board, composed of five scientists, to work with him on a consulting basis.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2849) to provide for research into and development of practical means for the utilization of solar energy, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

USE OF SURPLUS GRAINS ON CERTAIN LAND UNDER TAYLOR GRAZING ACT

Mr. METCALF. Madam President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Interior to use surplus grains on land available under section 3 and section 15 of the Taylor Grazing Act.

Portions of the Taylor Grazing Act lands, administered by the Bureau of Land Management, could be improved by better conservation practices. In several Western States, recent droughts have seriously depleted range available for permittees. In some cases, a temporary reduction of grazing, in conjunction with range rehabilitation practices, would permit more rapid recovery of the range.

Range improvement, to be attained through seeding and other rehabilitation measures, will in the long run increase carrying capacity. However, reduction of grazing privileges by itself would work a hardship on some users of the Federal range. Some stockmen would have insufficient range, and perhaps have to reduce foundation herds.

This bill, Madam President, would permit an alternative feed source during the period of rehabilitation. The bill would permit stockmen who are entitled to BLM range to receive surplus grains held by the Commodity Credit Corporation, provided they reduced the length of time on which their stock used the range. The Secretary of Interior would charge those receiving grain an amount equivalent to that which they would have been charged had they made use of the Federal range, with funds so collected going to the Commodity Credit Corporation.

To illustrate how the program might operate, let us assume a northwestern rancher has 200 head of Herefords. In normal years he would bring the cattle in from the BLM range about October 1. They would be grazed on hayfield for about a month, fed hay and perhaps concentrate, and returned to the range about April 1. But under this plan, the turnout would be deferred a month. The rancher would have received surplus grains prior to this time, which could be used as supplemental feed through the winter.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2850) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to use surplus grains on land available under section 3 and section 15 of the Taylor Grazing Act, introduced by Mr. METCALF, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

DISPOSAL OF ELLIS ISLAND TO THE TRAINING SCHOOL, VINELAND, N.J.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Madam President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the disposal of Ellis Island for use by the training school at Vineland, N.J.

Several years ago Ellis Island was declared surplus to the needs of the Federal Government and the General Services Administration was authorized to arrange for disposal of the property. In 1960 the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare invited applications for acquisition of Ellis Island at up to 100-percent public discount to groups acting in the field of health, education, or welfare, or a combination thereof. After review of the applications submitted at that time the Department rejected all applications and, in effect, returned the problem of disposing of Ellis Island to the General Services Administration.

Early in the first session of this Congress several bills were introduced in both the House and the Senate directing the Administrator of General Services Administration to convey Ellis Island to different organizations for varying financial considerations and varying purposes.

The training school sought to purchase Ellis Island outright from the General Services Administration but was informed that inasmuch as these bills were pending in the Congress, the agency could not consider any bids.

It is apparent that the General Services Administration is looking to the Congress to make the policy decision as to the purpose to which Ellis Island should be devoted in the future and the organization which should acquire the island to carry out this purpose.

The training school at Vineland is a nonprofit corporation of the State of New Jersey which has pioneered in the field of mental retardation since 1888. The school was one of the first institutions in the world to establish a laboratory for basic research in mental retardation and to establish a school for the training of teachers in this field, leading to the development of techniques of special education which are commonplace today. One result is that the training school has become a demonstration center receiving annually more than 5,000 visitors to observe these techniques and methods in action.

The board of trustees of the training school is headed by Pearl Buck, of Dublin, Pa., the author. Besides the chairwoman, the board of trustees include John B. Prizer, of Chestnut Hill, Pa., vice president and general counsel, Pennsylvania Railroad; Elwood F. Kirkman, of Margate, president, Boardwalk National Bank, Atlantic City; George K. Batt, of Morristown, executive vice president of Dugan Bros. Bakery; Bernard Shanley, of Bernardsville, attorney; Morris Feld, of Clifton, secretary of National Cleaning Contractors, Inc.; Bayard England, of Linwood, president, Atlantic City Electric Co.; Mrs. Margot Studer, of Montclair, civic leader; Webster B. Todd, of Oldwick, businessman; Carl R. Bopp, of Drexel Hill, Pa., president, Federal Reserve Board of Philadelphia; Warren Somers, Jr., of Northfield, businessman; Judge Francis A. Stanger, of Cedarville, attorney; Albert C. Strang, of Vineland, president, Tradesmans Bank & Trust Co.; Dr. Harry Vandegrift, medical director, Children's Seashore House, Atlantic City; and Richard C. Bond, of Bryn Mawr, Pa., president of John Wanamaker, Philadelphia.

It is interesting to note that exactly 50 years ago, in 1912, the then research director of the school, Dr. Henry H. Goddard, made a preliminary study of mental deficiency among immigrants at Ellis Island which aroused much interest. This study reached the conclusion that even with the limited techniques then available a successful screening process to identify defectives at Ellis Island could be established. While Congress at that time did not see fit to provide funds for such a program, today current research studies at the training school receive Federal Government support from both the National Institute of Mental Health and the National Science Foundation.

It has become increasingly evident that competent, comprehensive diagnosis in the area of mental retardation is properly a matter of national concern. Such a diagnosis is necessarily the first step in any program of training or treatment.

The training school seeks to acquire Ellis Island to expand its programs in this vital area by establishing there an international diagnostic center for development and exposition of efficient methods of diagnosis of mental deficiency. Such a center would also afford greatly expanded clinical study and examination in a comprehensive variety of fields related to mental deficiency. A research and professional training program in the field of mental retardation would be developed in cooperation with universities and other organizations interested in mental deficiency. All of these services would be made available on an international basis, with worldwide dissemination of the information acquired.

The bill which I am introducing would direct the Administrator to convey Ellis Island to the training school at a price equaling the appraised value as determined by the Administrator of the General Services Administration less such public discount as may be recommended by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. In making this recommendation the Secretary would apply the principles which have evolved under the policy established in section 203(k)(1)(C) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended.

Appropriate safeguards are included to insure that Ellis Island will be used only for the intended purposes.

The training school is an outstanding institution which has been pioneering the frontiers of knowledge in mental deficiency for nearly three-quarters of a century and has achieved a worldwide reputation in this field. For much of this period arrival at Ellis Island, in the shadow of the Statue of Liberty, represented the achievement of years of work and hope on the part of millions of people yearning to be free—free from tyranny, free from persecution, free from lack of opportunity.

Only recently have more than a few dedicated people come to realize that millions in the world today suffering from the cruel burden of mental deficiency can—through improved diagnosis and training based on continuing research—make equally dramatic progress toward freedom from their own intolerable handicaps: the tyranny of total dependence, the persecution of prejudice and the lack of opportunity to achieve the best that is possible with the limited endowment accorded them.

To those concerned with the symbolic value of Ellis Island, there could be no more exciting prospect than that the historic gateway to freedom in the New World be rededicated as a new and perhaps even more dramatic gateway to freedom.

If it is found—as I am confident it will be found—that the program envisaged by the training school is feasible and desirable, and that the training school is the most responsible organization—professionally and financially—to carry out this program, I would hope that this bill would be enacted promptly.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2852) to authorize the disposal of the property known as Ellis Island for purposes consistent with the public interest and welfare, introduced by Mr. CASE of New Jersey, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to assure that the property known as Ellis Island, in the harbor of the city of New York, will be utilized effectively in the public interest, the Administrator of General Services (hereinafter referred to as the "Administrator") is authorized and directed to dispose of the real property constituting Ellis Island, including buildings, fixtures, and equipment situated thereon, as provided in section 2 of this Act.

SEC. 2. Within a reasonable period after the date of enactment of this Act, not in any event to exceed two years, the Administrator shall, subject to section 4 of this Act, convey the property described in section 1 to The Training School at Vineland, New Jersey (hereinafter referred to as the "school") (1) for such monetary consideration, if any, as may remain after reducing the appraised value of such property as determined by the Administrator by such public benefit discount as may be recommended by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare as consistent with the policy established in section 203(k)(1)(C) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, and (2) on such terms, conditions, reservations, and restrictions as the Administrator may reasonably determine to be necessary to insure the use of the property by the school for the establishment and operation of an international diagnostic center for mental retardation which shall include opportunities for research and training in the field of mental retardation.

SEC. 3. With respect to the property which is transferred pursuant to this Act, the Administrator may exercise the authority which is available to certain other designated officers of the Government in connection with certain other transfers of property under paragraph (2) of section 203(k) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, to the extent that the provisions of said paragraph are not inconsistent with this Act.

Sec. 4. In the event that the school has not accepted the conveyance authorized by this Act within two years after the date of enactment thereof, the property which is subject to this Act shall revert to the status held by it prior to such enactment, and all authority conferred by this Act shall terminate.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 245 OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Mr. HART. Madam President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to permit the adjustment of status of refugees resident in the United States who are natives of countries contiguous to the United States or of any adjacent island.

The exclusion of such aliens from adjustment of immigration status while in the United States from temporary status to permanent status stems from the assumption that investigations and determinations of eligibility can be better determined by the U.S. consular offices in the alien's native country, and with a minimum of inconvenience to the alien because his country is in close proximity to the United States.

Since we have terminated diplomatic relations with Cuba, we, of course, maintain no consular offices in that country and Cubans cannot return to their native land to arrange for reentry into the United States as regular immigrants.

The Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees, of which I have had the honor of being chairman, recently conducted extensive hearings on the plight of the Cubans who have fled to the United States from the Communist regime of Castro. Over 94,000 Cubans are presently in the United States as nonimmigrants, parolees, or refugee overstays subject to voluntary deportation orders. The majority of them are concentrated in Miami, Fla. Most of them presently aspire to return to their native land when Cuba is freed from its present Communist tyranny. Until that happy day arrives, opportunities must be found for the Cuban refugees to find employment and pursue a reasonably normal life. At present, a major effort is underway to resettle them throughout the United States where employment opportunities exist.

Some of them, however, wish to go to Central or South American countries where their familiarity with the Spanish language and Latin American customs are important assets. I believe that we should encourage democratic anti-Castro Cubans to emigrate to Latin American nations. Certainly we could find no more effective spokesmen to describe the destruction of freedom under Castro's brand of communism.

Cuban refugees, however, are often hesitant to leave the United States without some assurance that they can return if necessary. Ordinarily, the breadwinner proceeds ahead to establish himself in the new country before calling his family to join him. In the event that the opportunity which he hopes to develop does not materialize, he wants the assurance that he can return to his family in the United States. Under the present law, there is no assurance that his immigration status of visitor, parolee, or overstay will permit his reentry into the United States.

The bill which I now introduce would remedy this situation. It would permit Cubans as well as refugees from other adjacent Western Hemisphere nations to adjust their status without leaving the United States. They would be accorded no privilege not already enjoyed by most other aliens. In the event that political upheavals occurred in other countries in the Caribbean and some of their residents fled to the United States for asylum to escape persecution, they also, as refugees, would be eligible for adjustment of status.

I hope sincerely that the Senate and the House will act promptly to enact this legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2856) to amend section 245 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, introduced by Mr. Hart, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NATIONAL NEGRO HISTORY WEEK

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution which would authorize the President of the United States to proclaim the period from February 10 to February 16, 1963, as National Negro History Week.

One of the outstanding traditions of the people of this country is the erection of monuments to distinguished citizens who have been pathfinders and leaders of movements that have made this great Nation of ours.

Another of our long-continued traditions is the practice of holding rites and celebrations honoring various faiths, creeds, races, and nationalities. The combined efforts of all peoples have made the United States the most important free republic of the world today.

Such a proclamation will give the President an opportunity to say to America and to the whole world that the Chief Executive of the United States, the Congress of the United States, and the people of these great United States have made eminent forward strides in the conventional acceptance of the recognition of the heritage and history of Americans of African descent. This is indeed in the interest of all Americans. It is in the interest of freedom. It is in the interest of world peace.

Although the Emancipation Proclamation became effective January 1, 1863, it was issued by Lincoln on September 22, 1862. For that reason, I thought this year would be the appropriate time to issue a proclamation to mark National Negro History Week.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. Res. 156) authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim the period from February 10, 1963, to February 16, 1963, as Negro History Week, introduced by Mr. Dirksen, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PURCHASE OF UNITED NATIONS BONDS—AMENDMENT

Mr. JAVITS submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 2768) to promote the foreign policy of the United States by authorizing the purchase of United Nations bonds and the appropriation of funds therefor, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed.

MEMBERS OF BOARD OF VISITORS TO COAST GUARD AND MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMIES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Commerce, I wish to announce that I have appointed the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton] as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy.

I have also appointed to the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy the Senator from California [Mr. Engle] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case].

CROPLAND RETIREMENT ACT OF 1962 — ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of February 7, 1962, the name of Mr. Miller was added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 2822) to establish a cropland retirement program, introduced by Mr. Hickenlooper (for himself and Mr. Bennett) on February 7, 1962.

NOTICE CONCERNING CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Vance W. Collins, of Kansas, to be U.S. marshal, district of Kansas;

Leo A. Mault, of New Jersey, to be U.S. marshal, district of New Jersey;

Alvin Grossman, of New York, to be U.S. marshal, western district of New York, term of 4 years, vice George M. Glasser; and

Edward L. Shaheen, of Louisiana, to be U.S. attorney, western district of Louisiana, term of 4 years, vice T. Fitzhugh Wilson.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Thursday, February 22, 1962, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF J. SKELLY WRIGHT TO BE U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, February 22, 1962, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of J. Skelly Wright, of Louisiana, to be U.S. circuit judge for the District of Columbia circuit, vice J. Barrett Prettyman, retired.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], chairman, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], and the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF FRANK B. ELLIS TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE, EASTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Friday, February 23, 1962, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Frank B. Ellis, of Louisiana, to be U.S. district judge, eastern district of Louisiana, vice J. Skelly Wright, elevated.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], chairman, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and myself.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

Address delivered by Representative SILVIO O. CONTE at Lincoln Day dinner, on February 8, 1962, in Boston, Mass.

MONTANA AND THE FEED GRAIN PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the feed grain program of the Department of Agriculture has generated more controversy and discussion in Montana than any other issue in recent months. Because of the many communications which my colleague, Senator METCALF, and I have received, we have endeavored to summarize for our own purposes and for the edification of our fellow Montanans exactly what the program is and what it is designed to do.

Both Senator LEE METCALF and I have had with Department of Agriculture officials many conferences at which the Montana situation was thoroughly reviewed. It was contacts such as those which recently brought about the reclassification of Campana barley as a malting barley for the 1962 program. This will be of considerable value to Montana graingrowers.

The President's message on agriculture has been submitted to the Congress, and the program which will be enacted will govern the 1963 crop year and a period thereafter which has not yet been determined. Extensive hearings will be held in both the House and Senate. Senator METCALF and I will present to the Senate committee Montana's problems and recommendations. We appreciate receiving from our constituents sound, reasonable suggestions which will help us in supporting a new farm bill which will benefit Montana and the general agricultural economy of this country. We are also happy that we were able to make it possible for a delegation of Montana farmers to appear before the Senate Committee on Agriculture on February 28. It is our understanding that the same group will appear before the House committee on March 1. We are indebted to the chairmen of the two committees, Senator ELLENDER, of Louisiana, and Representative COOLEY, of North Carolina, for showing this consideration and courtesy to this group.

We intend to recommend that consideration be given to increasing the number of specialized grains which can be grown on diverted acreages, inclusion of safflower production in determining barley acreages, and special consideration for grains which are not generally in surplus, such as the varieties of high quality wheat now grown in many areas of Montana.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD my impression and understanding of the farm program now operating in the State.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MANSFIELD

The American farmer's techniques and rate of production in recent years have improved to such an extent that he can produce far more in quantity and quality than ever before. They are producing more with less land and fewer people. As a result of this progress in technique and conservation the United States is confronted with a massive oversupply of agriculture commodities. The most immediate result has been a decline in the market price for the items in surplus. A 1960 report issued by the Joint Economic Committee on economic policies for agriculture in the 1960's summarizes the problem as follows:

"In spite of the isolation of existing surplus stocks, a conservation reserve of 30 million acres, and continuation of Public Law 480 exports from current production, prices for farm products would decline sharply in 1965 in the absence of programs to balance supplies with market outlets available. A prolonged period of severely depressed farm incomes adversely affecting all who deal with farmers appears probable if agriculture's full production potential is utilized in the 1960's."

To return our farm economy immediately to the natural law of supply and demand would undoubtedly bring chaos. Because our farmers are producing in excess of the market demand the price would naturally be less and the farmers will try to produce more to make up the difference. It would result in a sharp drop in agriculture economy. The small farmer would be forced off his land. Heavy concentration and control of our agriculture by a few persons would be a natural tendency if this happened. The farming communities of the Nation would suffer and there would be considerable displacement and unemployment. Some Federal guidance and cooperation with farmers appears to be the best means of providing some stability into the farm economy until such time as production can be leveled off to meet demands. This will give protection in the future of the family-operated economic farm unit.

There are some who propose that price supports and production controls be abolished altogether, leaving farmers to face a free market at a time when agricultural production is outstripping consumption. Few who advocate this step fully understand what the consequences might be.

This subject has been studied at great length by two universities in agricultural States (Iowa State and Cornell), by the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress, and by the U.S. Department of Agriculture under the previous administration.

Here is the consensus of these reports:

They foresee, within 4 years after the end of price supports and production controls, farmers' net income cut almost 40 percent below the present level.

They predict drastic drops in the prices farmers would receive for the crops that are now supported—and also for the livestock, dairy, and poultry products that are produced from feed and grain.

Here are their projections of the national average prices farmers would receive 4 years from now for major Montana farm commodities if price supports were abandoned:

Wheat, 92 cents per bushel, a drop of 48 percent from the national average price of $1.78 farmers received during the first 9 months of 1961.

Barley, 63 cents per bushel, a drop of 28 percent below the 88 cents received nationally on the average during the first 9 months of 1961.

Beef cattle, $14.77 per 100 pounds, a drop of 27 percent below the national average price of $20.20 received during the first 9 months of 1961.

Milk, $3.44 per hundred pounds, a drop of 17 percent below the $4.14 per hundred average farm price during the first 9 months of 1961.

The best judgment of the Nation's foremost agricultural economists would not give us a very pleasant picture to contemplate in the future of Montana agriculture if Government programs were eliminated.

However, Government farm programs must deal with agricultural problems on a realistic basis. The price support program for feed grains has been in trouble. Uncontrolled production has pushed feed grain surpluses to unreasonably high levels. This has greatly increased Government costs through heavier storage costs and larger initial costs in acquiring feed grains under the price support program.

In an effort to cope with the increasing surpluses of feed grains, with their threat to the stability of important segments of agriculture, the administration recommended and the Congress passed the feed grain program which has been extended to 1962 crops of corn, grain sorghums, and barley.

In 1961, the first year of the program, feed grain production was rolled back below utilization and a 10-year trend of yearly additions to the feed grain surplus pile was reversed. The Government's total holdings of all feed grains will actually drop instead of continuing on upward as they have every year since 1952.

The Government inventory of feed grains has increased constantly during the past decade and at mid-January totaled more than 1,780 million bushels of the 5 feed grains of corn, grain sorghums, oats, barley, and rye. At the end of December, nearly 100 million bushels of barley were either in the Government inventory or under price support loans from 1961 and previous crops.

Montana has made its contribution to these Government feed grain holdings. Since 1952, more than 80 million bushels of Montana barley has been taken over by the Government under the price support program. While Government holdings of barley in Montana at the present time are somewhat limited due to the present drought, the Commodity Credit Corporation did have more than 3.2 million bushels in bin and commercial storage in the State at the end of December. More than 6 million bushels of Montana barley from other crops were still under price support. Chances are most of this barley will eventually be turned over to the Government in payment of loans. In the meantime, Montana farmers are earning storage payments on farm-stored barley under the older loans that were resealed.

Another factor in reduced stored surpluses in Montana is the more rapid shipment of grains for export from Montana to the west coast. But let us not forget that massive Government programs to encourage these exports through export payments, donations to friendly nations, barter, and sales for foreign currencies have contributed greatly to the favorable export total. While the second highest combined volume of corn, barley, oats, and grain sorghums exported from the United States during fiscal year 1961—11.5 million metric tons valued at $531 million—25 percent of this total value moved under Government programs, Public Law 480, and the mutual security programs.

Under the feed grain program established by Public Law 87-128, the Secretary of Agriculture has set a 1962-crop barley support price of 93 cents per bushel national average. Barley price supports will be available to producers who participate in the feed grain program. Participation is voluntary. The alternative to a voluntary program may well be no program at all with a resulting disastrous drop in barley and other feed prices.

The feed grain program is designed to restore a more orderly supply situation for the benefit not only of grain producers but also of the livestock industry which could be dangerously overexpanded as a result of present feed grain production potential.

Any producer can choose to participate in the program or not—as he wishes. If he participates, he will be eligible for price support on the normal production of the 1962 acreage of barley on each eligible farm based on its average yield for the 1959 and 1960 acreage.

In addition, farmers will receive a payment for shifting land out of barley production and into a conserving use. About half of this payment can be obtained at the time the farmer signs to participate in the program in February and March. The minimum acreage diversion under the program is 20 percent of the farm's base acreage, and up to 40 percent of the base acreage can be diverted. Many areas of the State will undoubtedly welcome some added cash income this winter. The payments to be made will result in a saving for the Government over a period of years because of the tremendous costs incurred in storing and handling grains taken over under price support. The 1961 program has already resulted in a large saving, with Government expenditures over the next 9 years estimated to be approximately $600 million less because of the lower level of feed grain carryover, resulting from the rollback in 1961 corn and grain sorghum production.

The program applies to all States and there has been no shifting of acreage from one State to another. The Montana base acreage from which farmers may cut back their plantings is 1,862,050 acres. This is higher than any single year's planting with the exception of 1959 when 1,949,000 acres were planted to barley in Montana.

Montana acreage of barley has expanded greatly as has the national acreage during the past 10-year period when the surplus of feed grains has been building up. The base acreage of 1.8 million acres for Montana is nearly four times the barley planting of 582,000 acres in the State in 1953. During this same period, national barley plantings went from 9.6 million acres to 15.8 million acres in 1961. I realize that the increase in Montana barley acreage coincided with the decrease in wheat acreage, and barley provided a much needed alternative for the acreage taken out of wheat. However, this program gives Montana farmers in total a base acreage that is very nearly at their highest planting's figure. It offers substantial payments for diversion of acreage out of barley production this year.

Some farmers have requested that the barley yields on which payments would be based be established on 5- to 10-year histories instead of a 1959–60 average. The Department of Agriculture has refigured a number of barley yields set in Montana counties and has adjusted yields in some instances to reflect 5-year averages (1956–60) where higher than the 10-year or the 2-year average.

Each farmer has the right to appeal the yield set for his farm through his county ASC committee. The feed grain program is voluntary and participation is not required if the farmer does not desire the protection afforded.

Montana: Price support activity for barley, 1952–60

[Bushels]

Year	Number of loans	Total loans	Delivered to CCC	Total CCC-owned barley on June 30
1952	173	328,088	52,521	57,664
1953	2,056	5,122,229	4,332,778	10,100
1954	7,109	17,438,181	15,548,362	471,561
1955	7,835	23,711,191	21,393,055	12,866,906
1956	4,533	15,040,182	13,281,733	3,055,202
1957	8,152	24,736,794	20,740,412	3,807,651
1958	3,386	11,417,942	3,302,511	5,542,606
1959	2,368	5,444,171	1,337,881	7,787,374
1960	1,864	6,051,354	[1] 414,312	8,065,810

[1] The following resealed barley in all probability will be delivered to CCC in the near future. 1958 crop reextended reseal 1,724,838 bushels: 1959 crop extended reseal 1,733,180 bushels; and 1960 reseal 1,722,342 bushels.

Exports of barley

[Millions of bushels]

Year beginning July:	
1953	19.0
1954	43.5
1955	102.9
1956	61.8
1957	91.6
1958	116.7
1959	118.7
1960	85.6
1961	70.0

Montana and national barley plantings

[Millions of acres]

	Montana	National
1953	0.6	9.6
1954	1.4	14.7
1955	1.4	16.3
1956	1.2	14.8
1957	1.8	16.5
1958	1.7	16.3
1959	1.9	16.9
1960	1.8	15.6
1961	1.8	15.8

REGULATIONS GOVERNING STAFF PERSONNEL OF COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Rules and Administration, and with the concurrence of the committee's ranking minority member, Senator CURTIS, I have recently issued regulations governing the committee's staff personnel.

For the information of the Senate, and in the belief that other committees may wish to consider the issuance of similar regulations, I ask unanimous consent to have these regulations printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the regulations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION REGULATIONS GOVERNING COMMITTEE STAFF PERSONNEL

Section 202 (a) and (c) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601 of the 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, relating to staff personnel of congressional committees, provides, in part:

"Professional staff members shall not engage in any work other than committee business and no other duties may be assigned to them.

* * * * *

"The clerical staff shall handle committee correspondence and stenographic work, both for the committee staff and for the chairman and ranking minority member on matters related to committee work."

By way of implementation of the above provisions, and to enhance the effective management and coordination of committee business, the following regulations shall govern the staff personnel of the Committee on Rules and Administration:

1. Under the direction of the committee chairman, the chief clerk and counsel of the committee shall exercise general supervision over the committee activities and assignments of individual staff members and shall be held primarily responsible for their efficient execution.

2. All absences from work due to illness or pressing personal business shall be promptly reported. All periods of vacation shall be scheduled and approved in advance.

3. Except as may be required within the scope of official committee business or personal family matters, no employee of the committee shall perform services for any outside employer. Questionable situations shall be resolved by the chief clerk and counsel or the committee chairman, as necessary.

4. Any action taken by staff personnel beyond the regular committee duties assigned or additional work performed for any member of the committee, which action or work purports to reflect the interest of the committee or any individual member thereof, shall first be cleared through the chief clerk and counsel and, by him, with the committee chairman or individual member concerned.

5. Staff personnel shall refrain from pursuing any activity in behalf of or in the

name of the committee or any Senator without first obtaining the express permission of the committee chairman or the Senator involved. In all cases wherein action has been taken after permission given, a report thereon shall be made, as appropriate, to the chief clerk and counsel, or to the Senator concerned.

MIKE MANSFIELD,
Chairman.

OAKLEY, ILL., DAM AND RESERVOIR

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, recently I introduced a bill (S. 2645) to authorize the construction of a multiple-purpose dam and reservoir at the Oakley site on the Sangamon River, in the State of Illinois.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a clear and concise statement with respect to this proposed project. The statement is dated February 6, 1962, and was submitted by the Association of Commerce of Decatur, Ill.

Let me take this opportunity to say that this association is now in its 58th year. It has rendered valuable and outstanding services to the people of that area of the State.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT SUPPORTING SENATE BILL 2645

From the very beginning, the community of Decatur, Ill., through the association of commerce, and the city of Decatur, have urged the kind of long-range planning that has helped to bring about the present status of the proposed dam and reservoir known as the Oakley project.

This project will bring to our region a variety of benefits, both local and regional in impact. The regional benefits lie in the following two areas: (1) flood control; (2) recreation.

Flood control: Oakley Reservoir will be the uppermost one on the Sangamon River. In the engineers' proposed overall plan for the Illinois River Basin Oakley Dam will provide full benefits without the installation of other flood control reservoirs farther downstream in the system; thus will protect from periodic floods several thousand acres of land downstream from Decatur. It will protect Lake Decatur itself and the city's water plant, which was seriously affected in the flood of 1943 (and at other times from 1926 to 1943).

Recreational facilities: The State of Illinois, through both its Governor, Otto Kerner, and its director of the department of conservation, Mr. William Lodge, have stated that Oakley Reservoir could be a great recreational asset to this section of Illinois and have expressed their sincere interest in the possibility of establishing a State park in the general vicinity of the proposed reservoir. Such a facility as Oakley would make possible recreational facilities for many central Illinois citizens, students from Millikin University, the University of Illinois and also enlisted personnel and officers of the U.S. Air Force who are located at Chanute Air Force Base nearby.

Local benefits: Local benefits can be classed into two categories: (1) recreation and (2) water supply.

(1) Recreation: The same benefits expressed under the heading of regional recreational benefits would apply even more fully in the local area.

(2) Water supply: This reservoir is planned as a multiple purpose facility. The city of Decatur, through the association of commerce, the city administration and other civic groups, is very much interested in obtaining water supply which will be made available by this project. Decatur, since 1939, has been planning in order to provide a water supply to meet the growing needs of the Decatur area and to offset the continued silting of Lake Decatur.

Lake Decatur has been expanded to its maximum practical size. If the city continues to grow at its predicted rate, Lake Decatur could become inadequate as a water supply during years of maximum drought. As early as the late 1960's it will become imperative that additional storage be provided. The Oakley Reservoir will be the most logical additional storage. The site is ideal. Being immediately above Lake Decatur, it would constitute a protection to Lake Decatur by reducing the silting and would also make administration of the lake more efficient.

Decatur has expressed a willingness to bear its share of the cost in this multiple purpose project from the early thirties when the Corps of Engineers first displayed any consideration for such a plan. The effort of the corps resulted in their first report in 1946.

FORTY-FOURTH ANNIVERSARY OF DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE OF LITHUANIA

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, February 16 is the 44th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania as a republic. However, its independence was short lived—for several years later it fell under the yoke of the Soviet Communist power which took in many other nations, such as, Estonia, Latvia, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Albania, Bulgaria, and East Germany.

Mr. President, the Members of Congress are well aware of the fact that the Soviet Communists have introduced a reign of terror against these peoples, such as in Luthuania, and have deprived the Lithuanian people of their human rights and fundamental freedoms, confiscated their properties and business enterprises, converted them into slaves of the Soviet Union, deported approximately 300,000 of them to Siberia and other parts of Russia. There have been resolutions introduced into the Senate and speeches have been made on the floor of the Senate urging that the United States ask the United Nations to request the Soviets, first, to withdraw all Soviet troops from these enumerated nations that are behind the Iron Curtain and, second, to permit free elections so people may have the right of self-determination which has always been a principle of our American way of life.

Mr. President, since many of these speeches were made last year on the various independence days of these countries behind the Iron Curtain, we have seen the Soviet Communists through their Communists leaders in East Germany and East Berlin throw up an impregnable wall to stop the free flow of East Berliners from going across into West Berlin, which had been the practice and procedure prior to that time. We have also seen what has happened in Laos, the Congo, Cuba, and other parts of Asia and Africa where the Soviet Union is trying to force upon those peoples the Communist doctrine, which, if successful as it has been in several areas, will subjugate more people to the Communist thinking.

Sometimes it is difficult in this great country of ours with its many freedoms and many blessings—where even the most renowned Communist or hardened criminal is given protection under our laws—to visualize and understand the struggles, oppressions, and deprivations that are inflicted on a people who were once a part of proud nations who are now under the heel of a Communist dictator.

Mr. President, I have made speeches on the floor of the Senate on Americanism versus communism so people of this country can understand what Americanism really is and in the hope that everyone who is well indoctrinated in Americanism can understand the onslaught of the Communist doctrine. It is this belief in Americanism that gives me the privilege to speak out against Communist infiltration into the freedom-loving areas. It is my fervent hope that when next Lithuania Independence Day rolls around the peoples of the free world will have made some gains in moving the machinery of the United Nations toward greater freedoms to the people behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that letters written by Mary M. Kizis, director, Lithuanian American Information Center, New York City; Albert L. Zakarko, of Chicago; and Miss Lillian M. Sasnauskas, of Philadelphia, in which these people have shown the concern for the plight of those people behind the Iron Curtain, be placed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LITHUANIAN AMERICAN
INFORMATION CENTER,
New York, N.Y., February 5, 1962.

Hon. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
U.S. Senator From Illinois,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR DIRKSEN: We are again asking the friends of Lithuania in the Congress of the United States to pay tribute to her on the 44th anniversary of the restoration of her independence, Friday, February 16.

We hope you can be in the Senate that day, Senator DIRKSEN, to pay tribute to Lithuania.

Only Lithuanians in the free world can commemorate this anniversary and speak for a silenced people.

Lithuania overcame insurmountable obstacles in throwing off the yoke of nearly 120 years of Russian misrule. The reborn Lithuanian state made remarkable progress in all fields of endeavor. She was an honored member of the family of free nations.

After the Soviet occupation of 1940, the Soviets propagandized that Lithuania voluntarily joined the Soviet Union, but the United States has never recognized the Soviet incorporation.

Conditions in Lithuania have not changed from previous years. The youth is still being sent for "volunteer" labor to distant parts of the Soviet Union; the religious are continually persecuted, and Russification goes on.

In remembering Lithuania, we are remembering a gallant little nation silenced temporarily. But just as she shook off the previous Russian yoke, so she will again shake off this Soviet one.

We are grateful to you, Senator Dirksen, for your many kind considerations in the past.

Very sincerely yours,
Mary M. Kizis,
Director.

January 29, 1962.

Hon. Everett M. Dirksen,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Dirksen: During 1961, Lithuania again suffered another year of enslavement by the iron-fist rule of colonialistic and imperialistic Soviet Union.

This enslavement is really unfortunate and sad not only to the people within the border confines of Lithuania, but to all of the world. The world certainly needs a variety of cultures and traditions, such as Lithuanian, to enrich all of our lives. Yet we see nations such as Russia try to suppress, confine, and destroy not only national customs and traditions, but also nationalities.

The people of Lithuania, with the protection of God, will never succumb to the propaganda of Communist Russia and will one day remove their chains of enslavement and be free to further enrich the world in Lithuanian culture.

Although Lithuania is far from being a free nation, if it is possible, I would like to urge you to give public moral support to commemorate the 44th aniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day on February 16, 1962.

Sincerely,
Albert L. Zakarko.

January 15, 1962.

Senator Everett M. Dirksen,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Dirksen: The 44th anniversary of Lithuanian independence will be commemorated by millions of Lithuanians on February 16.

For the past 22 years, however, Lithuania has been under Russian rule.

It would be sincerely appreciated if you would commemorate this day in the Chamber of the Senate.

Yours truly,
Miss Lillian M. Sasnauskas.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I join with my colleagues today in commemorating the 44th anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Lithuania, which will be observed on February 16.

At a time when so many millions of freedom-loving peoples of the world are forced to live under the yoke of Communist totalitarianism, it is appropriate that we pay tribute to Lithuanians all over the world and particularly to those 3 million stouthearted Lithuanians now living under Soviet enslavement.

Lithuania has been subjugated to frequent conquest by tyrannical rulers since the 13th century. After years of valiant struggle, this little freedom-loving country finally was able to break from the bonds of Russian domination, and proclaimed her independence on February 16, 1918.

The next two decades saw the Lithuanian people make remarkable strides in all walks of life, and they soon established a model democracy in their area of the world. However, with the outset of World War II, this industrious nation was overrun again by the Russian Army and subsequently stripped of her right of self-determination and national identity.

Despite all the trials and tribulations under Soviet domination, the Lithuanian love of liberty, fortified by a firm belief in Christian principles, has not died. Americans of Lithuanian descent have kept these ideals of their homeland intact. They have contributed to the culture and political heritage of our country through demonstrated devotion to democratic ideals and a strong belief in justice and liberty.

I share with all Lithuanians their aspirations for the freedom and independence of the land of their forefathers, and fervently hope and pray that the day is not too distant when this country justly will enjoy true and lasting independence.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, if it had not been for Russian aggression in 1940, the people behind the Iron Curtain in Lithuania would tomorrow be openly celebrating the 44th anniversary of its independence. It is an irony of our time that these brave people are enslaved after two wars were fought to preserve democracy and the right of all people to be free.

We who are free should stop on this occasion to ponder on the hardships of the Lithuanian people and consider what we can do to encourage them. We should stop on this occasion to renew our pledge never to relax our efforts to help them. It is our responsibility. It is the responsibility of all free peoples.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, tomorrow, February 16, will mark the 44th anniversary of Lithuania's Declaration of Independence. It is appropriate that the Senate should pause each year at this time to pay tribute to the Lithuanian people who, for years, have had to endure Soviet oppression.

It has been said that one cannot appreciate freedom until he has known slavery. The people of Lithuania have known both. Today, Lithuania is not free. Today, the people of Lithuania do not enjoy the freedom and liberty they once knew. Today, as we pay tribute to the anniversary of Lithuania's independence, we must also take note of another anniversary—that of her enslavement.

Since 1940, Lithuania has been dominated by the Soviet Union. Her people have witnessed mass deportations to slave labor camps. The Soviet Union has exploited this country to the point where freedom exists only in the hearts of the Lithuanian people. I salute the valiant people of Lithuania, who, in the face of such great odds, have continued to fight against oppression.

Unfortunately, our salutes and tributes have little value unless we are prepared to back them up with action. The U.S. Government does not recognize the Soviet annexation of Lithuania. We all know that this is just another case of Soviet aggression.

Let us, then, do more than eulogize freedom. The time has come for this Nation to press the question of Soviet exploitation of the Baltic States. If we are to give meaning to the principles which we hold so dear, then we must speak out officially on this question.

This subject should be raised in the United Nations and at every other international conclave where the Soviet Union is represented. In this way, perhaps, we may truly look forward to the day when Lithuanian independence will be a reality rather than a memory.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, we are edified today in being led in our devotion by a minister of God whose homeland has felt the heavy crush of its oppressors' shackles.

Let us heed the request for grace asked by one who knows the terror of a heathen tyranny, the hopes of a beleaguered people.

We must rededicate ourselves to that highest objective of God-fearing peoples—that all men shall live in dignity as freemen. We must be inspired by the strong hearts which beat today in Lithuania, on this anniversary of restoration of independence, and take a fresh and deep vigor from their great demonstrations of faith and courage.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, it is the power and the glory of America that many peoples have contributed their cultures to her character of humanity, equity, opportunity and responsibility.

We are ever grateful, ever ready to recognize our debt to each who shares our democracy.

In a special way at this time in February we find it fitting to pay our respects to Lithuania.

A million men, women and children of Lithuanian descent add their merit to the mosaic of our Republic. One might think that 1 million in a panorama of 180 million might make only a faint coloring. But in the natural clinging of newcomers to one another, there is a concentration of Lithuanians in favored places. Rhode Island is fortunate to be such a place.

From their churches we know our valued neighbors to be God fearing and God serving. From their organizations, we know their helpful activities in our community life. From their record we know their loyal part in the development and defense of our country. From their personal history, we know their gifts for leadership evidenced in the places of honor they have attained in scholarship, statesmanship and citizenship.

We share the Lithuanian pride in the 1,000 years of their recorded history as a nation.

If I were to borrow one paragraph to describe that history it would be this:

> The Lithuanians had established a powerful and independent state in Europe during the Middle Ages. They were able to check the German drive to the east for centuries. They protected Europe against the Mongols and Tartars. They furnished a power and a government behind which the eastern Slavs could live in peace and safety with a freedom that was unknown in Moscovite Russia. They blessed their subjects with more human freedoms than in the neighboring countries. They encouraged education and toleration, and they played their part in the general development of European civilization.

But, as we share their pride, we share the pathos of Lithuanian history. They lost their liberty as a nation just at the time that we had won our independence. Russia's heel was upon Lithuania from 1795 to the Russian Revolution of 1917.

February 16, 1918, was Independence Day for Lithuania. On that date she had chosen to become a republic in those days of self-determination.

But night closed in on Lithuania's dream of liberty when the hordes of Soviet communism moved in with treachery and torture in August of 1940.

Lithuanians by countless thousands were sent to death or to an existence worse than death. I will quote another paragraph of Lithuanian history. We will look over the shoulder of a Soviet commissar to read the instructions on how to torture the Lithuanians.

The document is labeled "Top Secret." It reads in this section:

> The deportation of anti-Soviet elements is a problem of great political importance. It must be borne in mind that operations must be accomplished without noise or panic so as to preclude outbreaks or other excesses by those scheduled for deportation. Since most of the deportees are to be arrested and placed in special prison camps and their families sent to special settlements in remote districts, it is necessary to remove the heads of families along with other members of the family without notifying them of their impending separation. The whole family will be conveyed to the loading station on the same cart; only at the station will the head of the family be separated from the family and placed in a special car designed for the heads of families.

Such is the efficiency of terrorism. Such is the introduction to extermination. That quotation is from the authoritative book, "What We Must Know About Communism."

The Lithuanians in their blood and tears have taught us a lesson in communism.

That lesson is that only in strength can we preserve freedom. We must never forget that lesson—and we must never forget the people in whose suffering the true character of Soviet aggression is written.

We shall be vigilant—or we could be next.

We salute the Freedom Day of February 16, 1918, because we salute the Lithuanian people whose love, desire, and daring for freedom will never die.

Lithuania will live forever.

America has never ratified the Russian rape of that courageous land. America never will.

America's prayer is that one day Lithuania shall again be free and at peace.

America's promise is that she shall ever be more powerful—but that she shall use her power for peace—to the end that the whole world may be one in humanity, equity, opportunity, and responsibility.

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, tomorrow marks the 44th anniversary of the restoration of Lithuanian independence in 1918.

On that day, after centuries of czarist subjugation, the people of Lithuania threw out their Russian overlords and declared their independence. The Soviets tried to reinvade the country but were driven out and signed a treaty with Lithuania in 1920 voluntarily renouncing all sovereign rights imposed by Russia over the Lithuanian people and their territory.

The country was invaded by the Nazis early in World War II. Then, in 1940, in precise violation of their word the Soviets reentered. Since that day, for over two decades, Lithuania has been under Russian rule. During that time constant attempts have been made to wipe the country's culture out entirely. The night Lithuania was occupied it is estimated that 30,000 of its people were deported to Siberia. Hundreds of thousands more deportations followed in subsequent years. Thousands of intellectuals were executed or deported and Russian settlers brought in in order to convert the Lithuanian civilization to Russian civilization.

The Russians have also systematically oppressed the Lithuanian Catholic Church. The last bishop in a country that had once been overwhelmingly Catholic was placed under house arrest last year. Last month, Roman Catholic priests were put on trial in Lithuania on false charges of currency speculation. Sources believe this may be the beginning of a program to eliminate the priesthood and the Vatican feels it may provide a starting point for attacks on the church throughout Eastern Europe.

All these actions indicate that the Russians are determined to eventually eliminate all traces of Lithuanian religion and culture as it once existed and to make it unrecognizable from any other Soviet province. I am glad to say that the U.S. Government has refused to recognize the Soviet occupation of this country since 1940. I know that all Americans will join me in deploring the actions taken by the Soviets against the sovereign people of Lithuania and hope as I do that some day these people will be free from Soviet tyranny and able to live under a government of their own choosing.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I wish to join today with the millions of Americans of Lithuanian descent who are commemorating the 44th anniversary of the Republic of Lithuania.

On February 16, 1918, the Lithuanian people, after centuries of czarist domination, established their own Government and proclaimed their independence. This period of independence lasted until 1940, when Lithuania was again brought under Russian rule.

Today we here in the United States should reflect upon the valiant struggle for freedom which Lithuanians have waged. Our thoughts should go out not only to Lithuanians but to all the peoples of the world who have no right of self-determination.

The Lithuanian struggle for national identity and freedom will continue. We all join in the hope that they will some day soon become one of the free and independent nations of the world.

Let these words of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt be a constant reminder to all of us:

> It is stated that Lithuania has lost her independence. It is a mistake to say so. Lithuania has not lost her independence. Lithuania's independence has only temporarily been put aside. Time will come and Lithuania will be free again. This will happen much sooner than you may expect.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, February 16 this year is the 44th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania in 1918—an independence which unfortunately lasted only until 1940, when Lithuania was occupied by the Soviet Army. Since then, following 3 years of Nazi rule, Lithuania has been a component republic of the Soviet Union.

Our own country recognized the independence of Lithuania in 1922 and has never recognized its incorporation by the Soviet Union. We continue to maintain diplomatic relations with the representative of the former independent government, which has a legation here in Washington.

The political, religious, and cultural freedom of the Lithuanian people in a world of freedom is a continuing U.S. objective. We must continue to work by all peaceful means for the day when Lithuania and her sister Baltic States will be able to emerge from their present condition and join in the mainstream of free national development.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this week we celebrate the 44th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day and it is altogether fitting that we pause to mark this important event in the history of a brave nation. February 16, 1918, marked the end of well over a century during which Lithuania suffered under a hostile, foreign rule. But on that day she stood forth as an independent democratic republic. There was cause for rejoicing and confidence in the future as Lithuania joined in the great flowering of national self-determination at the end of the First World War. But we all know that this independence came to an end little more than 20 years later when the Soviet Union decreed that Lithuania was to become a constituent "republic" of the U.S.S.R.

Some people may ask why we continue to celebrate Lithuanian Independence Day here in the U.S. Congress. They may point to the massive power of the Soviet Union and to the fact that Red troops have occupied Lithuania continuously since the so-called liberation in 1944. What hope, they may ask, is there that Lithuania will ever again be independent? Why keep on fooling ourselves and the 1 million Lithuanian-Americans by celebrating Lithuanian Independence Day each year? But I say that this view is shortsighted, presumptuous, and constitutes a betrayal of our own democratic faith.

We have no power to know what possibilities the future may bring. The Lithuanian people may find the way to independence and freedom opened to them by means that we do not even dream about today. Let us not, therefore, help to consign Lithuania to an eternal colonialism by failing to keep alive the memory of the independent Lithuanian nation. We are not engaged merely in a sentimental recollection of something that happened 44 years ago and has no importance today. We must help keep alive the hope that the brave Lithuanian nation will once again become a sovereign unit of this world.

But there is a second and equally important reason for marking Lithuanian Independence Day here in the U.S. Congress. If we truly believe that man ought to be free and that totalitarianism is evil then we cannot cease to proclaim these convictions. If we forget our fellow men who live under the heavy yoke of Soviet Russian imperialism then we will have betrayed our own faith. We must not permit the truth that man was created in the image of God and that he has a right to justice and freedom in this world to be obscured by the actions of the Soviet dictator. Let us continue, therefore, to celebrate Lithuanian independence here in the United States in order to speed the day when Lithuania will again be independent and to affirm our belief that man was created for freedom.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the independence of the people of Lithuania was proclaimed on February 16, 1918; and I am proud to join in the observance of the 44th anniversary of that historic day.

For 21 years after that date the Lithuanian people enjoyed the reestablishment of their freedom; but shortly after the outbreak of World War II, their country was overrun by the Soviet armies. Conquest by the Kremlin was followed by deportations, imprisonment, religious persecution, labor camps, and other repressive measures; but the spirit of the people could not be broken, and the hope of regaining their liberty continued to burn brightly in the hearts of the Lithuanian people.

The right of the oppressed people of this unhappy country to liberty and independence is upheld by the principle of self-determination which the United States has championed.

This principle applies to Lithuania as well as to all other captive peoples who are striving to keep alive the light of liberty and the hope of independence. In the fight against Communist imperialism, all the resources of diplomacy, morality, and our friendly relations with other peoples must be brought to bear in support of this principle of self-determination. I hope the people of Lithuania will find encouragement for their hopes for independence and freedom from Communist tyranny in the not too distant future.

So, Mr. President, I call attention to the unflagging spirit of freedom of the Lithuanian people; and I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks, the proclamation on Lithuanian Independence Day, by Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, of New York.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROCLAMATION BY GOV. NELSON ROCKEFELLER, OF NEW YORK

For two happy decades the people of Lithuania enjoyed freedom. They won worldwide respect by setting up a government based on the ideas of equality of opportunity and the dignity of the individual.

In 1940 the Soviet Union trampled on its treaty obligations and the rights of its neighbors. Lithuanians suffered under a ruthless process of colonization and systematic decimation.

Soviet cruelty has been unable to quench the eternal spirt of freedom in the people of Lithuania. They cherish, as we do, the principle of full human right for all human beings, no matter what their station, race, creed, or color. We have an obligation to them which we must discharge in ways small, and large, and in ways private and public. We must show our solicitude for the Lithuanian people by our prayers for them, by demonstrating our sympathy by every legal means. By our words and our actions we can continue to give them hope, trusting that, by the intervention of divine providence they may enjoy again that freedom which is so close to their hearts: Now, therefore, I, Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York, do hereby proclaim February 16, 1961, as "Lithuanian Independence Day" in the State of New York.

Given under my hand and the privy seal of the State at the Capitol in the city of Albany this first day of February in the year of our Lord 1961.

NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER.

By the Governor:

WILLIAM J. RONAN,
Secretary to the Governor.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, on Friday we mark the 44th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania in 1918 from czarist Russian rule. It should be a joyous occasion. It is not, for today Lithuania suffers once again Russian rule—that of Soviet Russia—in the form of one of the cruelest tyrannies in history.

Although there is no cause for rejoicing today, we should pause nonetheless and commemorate if nothing else the shocking fact that in this enlightened 20th century, in Europe—the cradle of one of the great civilizations in the world—an ancient and noble people with a long and glorious history and a high culture is victimized by the savage imperialism of Soviet Russia.

Whereas since the close of World War II in other parts of the world colonial areas began gaining their freedom and emerging as sovereign nations, in Lithuania, a hitherto free and independent nation in the Western community of nations, there was imposed by Soviet Russia as ruthless and bloody an imperialist regime as the world has ever seen.

Not only were the Lithuanian people deprived of their freedom, not only were they viciously exploited economically, but great numbers of them were deported to Siberia and other inhospitable areas of Russia there to live a dog's life or die.

The infamous Russian methods of systematic repression were instituted. The intellectuals of Lithuania were liquidated, the beautiful Lithuanian language was forbidden, religious orders were persecuted, and churches closed.

Mr. President, throughout its history down to the very present day, Europe has stood in danger of being engulfed by the autocratic despotism of the East. In the 14th century, Lithuania freely associated with Poland, accepted Christianity and the elevating values of the great Greco-Christian-Judaic tradition and thus became a part of Europe. For centuries thereafter Lithuania with Poland fended off Eastern pressures, holding back the inimical forces of autocracy which constantly threatened Europe from the vast Asiatic landmass.

To play this role in history, to develop their beautiful music, their literature, and their high culture, the Lithuanians had to be a sturdy, inventive, and persevering people. And today, despite monstrous oppression, the Lithuanian people, true to their history and their traditions, remain utterly devoted to the European idea of individual dignity and freedom and with all the meager means at their disposal oppose their oppressors.

Americans of Lithuanian background today reaffirm with their brothers in Europe the Lithuanian ideal of freedom and dignity for all human beings. They in their country preserve the Lithuanian language and music and culture, and constantly press upon the world's conscience the plight of the Lithuanian nation. From this and the reiteration that America has not forgotten them, let us pray that the Lithuanian people take added strength in their continuing fight for freedom and liberty.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I wish to recognize, with my colleagues in this body, the fact that tomorrow will be Lithuanian Independence Day.

Our hearts are with our Lithuanian friends. Lithuanian Americans have made a great contribution to the progress of our country in the fields of art, literature, music, commerce, and all forms of education. We all look forward to the day when Lithuania as we once knew it will again breathe the fresh air of freedom.

Forty-four years ago, on February 16, 1918, Lithuania was proclaimed an independent state based on democratic principles. Today, in sharp contrast, the nation of Lithuania is submerged in one of the most extensive totalitarian empires the world has ever known. It is my hope that our tributes today in the Senate of the United States will encourage the Lithuanian people to keep alive the hope that someday they will again know the joys of freedom and of democratic institutions.

Many times in its 1,000 years of recorded history Lithuania has been subjugated by one of its larger neighbors, but never has its culture been lost and never have its people lost their love of freedom. For example, in 1795, Lithuania was annexed to Russia, and in 1831 the czarist government launched an attempt to replace the Lithuanian language with Russian. Although the policy of forced russification was followed for several generations, it was so unsuccessful that it was abandoned soon after the turn of the 20th century.

The many years of resistance to tyranny and of striving for independence were rewarded at the end of the First World War. After occupation by the Russian Army, then the German Army, and then again the Russians, all the invaders were at last driven out and Lithuania emerged as a sovereign state. Russia signed a peace treaty with Lithuania, recognizing it as a sovereign state and promising to renounce all rights of sovereignty forever. For the next two decades the Lithuanian people had an opportunity to experience the liberty which they had cherished as a goal for so long.

Unfortunately, the Second World War wiped away the independence which Lithuania had achieved in the First World War, and from it Lithuania emerged unwillingly as a constituent republic of the Soviet Union. But just as the Lithuanian people have survived other dark periods in their history, let us have faith that they will survive this one. On this 44th anniversary of their independence day, let us reassure them that the United States is continuing in the never-ending effort to strengthen freedom throughout the world. Let us reaffirm our hope that someday all people everywhere will have the right to choose for themselves the system of government under which their nation shall live.

THE BUDGET RECORD — FISCAL YEAR 1954 THROUGH FISCAL YEAR 1962

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, very shortly the Senate Appropriations Committee will be dealing with the Federal budget and with the appropriation bills, if it has not already done so. I have caused to be prepared what I believe to be a careful and authentic budget record from the fiscal year 1954 through the fiscal year 1962. I ask unanimous consent that it and the appended papers be printed at this point in the Record, in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement and the tabulation were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Budget Record—Fiscal Year 1954 Through Fiscal Year 1962

FISCAL YEAR 1954

Prior to leaving office in January 1953, President Truman submitted to Congress his final budget covering his recommendations and estimates for the fiscal year 1954. In comparison with final results for fiscal 1953, the budget reflected a reduction of $8.1 billion in new obligational authority—almost wholly because of lower defense appropriation requests—but it provided for a $3.6 billion increase in expenditures. Receipts were estimated at $3.2 billion above the actual total in 1953.

Promptly after taking office, the Eisenhower administration began preparation of its own budget recommendations with the objective being a substantial reduction in the level of Federal spending. The Republican 83d Congress gave its full support to this economy effort and was able to effect considerable additional budget reductions beyond those made by the new administration.

The final results, including actions taken during the second half of the 1954 fiscal year, reflected reductions from the Truman proposals of $9.4 billion in new obligational authority and $10.1 billion in expenditures. Receipts turned out to be $3.3 billion less than the Truman budget estimate, but the $9.9 billion Truman deficit was reduced to $3.1 billion for a net improvement of $6.8 billion in the final budget results.

Comparisons of final results with the budget figures for 1954 and subsequent years are shown in tabular form on page 12 of this analysis.

FISCAL YEAR 1955

President Eisenhower submitted his first budget to Congress in January 1954. It covered his fiscal program for the 1955 fiscal year. The budget provided for new obligational authority of $56.3 billion and expenditures of $65.6 billion. These amounts represented reductions of $6.5 billion in obligational authority and $2.2 billion in expenditures from the final results for 1954. Receipts were estimated at $62.7 billion, or $2 billion less than in 1954, after allowing for substantial tax reductions recommended in the budget. A deficit of $2.9 billion was expected.

The Republican Congress made relatively modest net changes in the budget proposals. Obligational authority was increased by $0.8 billion, principally by provision of $500 million new Treasury borrowing authority each to the Export-Import Bank and to FNMA. This total of $1 billion was not provided for in the original budget document. On the other hand, the Congress effected enough appropriation reductions in current expenditure items to help lower the final expenditure total to $64.6 billion, or $1 billion less than the original budget estimate.

Actual receipts were $60.4 billion, or $2.3 billion less than estimated. A part of the lowering of receipts was accounted for by a $1 billion reduction in excise taxes, effective April 1, 1954, which was not recommended in the budget. Other tax reductions which became effective in calendar year 1954 and were effective for the full fiscal year 1955 amounted to $6.4 billion on an annual basis. Thus, the total tax reductions were $7.4 billion. The deficit was $4.2 billion, or $1.3 billion more than the budget estimate.

FISCAL YEAR 1956

In his fiscal 1956 budget President Eisenhower proposed new obligational authority of $58.6 billion for an increase of $1.5 billion over 1955. Estimated expenditures, however, were down to $62.4 billion from $64.6 billion in 1955, and receipts were estimated at $60 billion, or slightly lower than in 1955. A deficit of $2.4 billion was anticipated.

The final results showed substantial changes from the original budget totals. New obligational authority and expenditures were increased $4.6 billion and $4.1 billion, respectively, and receipts rose $8.1 billion above the original budget estimate. Over half the increase in new obligational authority was for agricultural programs. Interest and housing programs rose about $0.5 billion each. The housing legislation was not recommended by the President. The first year's authorization for the interstate highway system accounted for $1.2 billion of the increase in obligational authority.

It was not included in the original budget because bond financing was contemplated by the administration.

The sharp rise in economic activity in 1955 and 1956—from $363 billion GNP in 1954 to $398 billion in 1955 and $419 billion in 1956—caused a rise in receipts from the budget estimate of $60 billion to an actual total of $68.1 billion. It is more than coincidence that this rise in economic activity and revenues followed the $7.4 billion tax reductions effected in calendar 1954. The final budget results showed a surplus of $1.6 billion for an improvement of $4 billion over the originally estimated deficit of $2.4 billion.

FISCAL YEAR 1957

The 1957 budget called for new obligational authority of $66.3 billion, and expenditures and receipts were estimated at $65.9 billion and $66.3 billion, respectively. Thus, a surplus of $0.4 billion was anticipated.

Obligational authority and expenditures in the final results showed increases of $3.9 billion and $3.5 billion, respectively, above the budget estimates. These increases were largely accounted for by rising costs of agricultural programs and defense. New spending authority was increased $2.9 billion for farm programs and $1.4 billion for defense. Foreign aid authorizations were cut $1.1 billion. The rise above budgeted expenditures included increases of $2.9 billion in defense and $1.3 billion in farm programs. Foreign aid expenditures were $0.4 billion less than the budget estimate.

Receipts continued to rise with further gains in economic activity and totaled $4.7 billion above the budget estimate of $66.3 billion. The surplus came to $1.6 billion, the same as in fiscal 1956, and was $1.2 billion above the original estimate.

FISCAL YEAR 1958

Estimates in the 1958 budget anticipated a continuation of the rise in spending and receipts which had been experienced in the 2 previous years. Proposed new obligational authority totaled $73.3 billion and expenditures were estimated at $71.8 billion.

These amounts were $3.1 billion and $2.4 billion higher, respectively, than actual obligational authority and expenditures in 1957. Receipts were estimated at $73.6 billion—$2.6 billion above 1957—and a surplus of $1.8 billion was indicated.

The Nation was in an economy mood during the 1957 congressional session. The President himself reduced his new fund requests by $1.2 billion and Congress made additional sharp reductions in appropriations with the result that it approved only $67.7 billion of new obligational authority, or $5.6 billion less than originally proposed in the budget. Reductions effected by the President and Congress included $3.2 billion in defense and $1.6 billion in foreign aid. In addition, the President vetoed Federal civilian pay increase bills and a veterans home loan bill which would have added $1.1 billion in 1958 spending.

Early in the 1958 session, however, some large additional authorizations were approved for fiscal 1958. They included $2.0 billion for Export-Import Bank, $1.6 billion for farm programs, $0.4 billion for VA programs, $1.6 billion for housing programs, $1.4 billion for defense, $0.3 billion for HEW, and $0.7 billion for Labor (temporary Federal unemployment compensation). As a result of these second session increases new obligational authority approved for 1958 was $3 billion above the original budget in spite of the heavy budget cutting in the first session. Expenditures in 1958 rose only $0.1 billion above the budget.

The economic recession which became quite apparent in the fall of 1957 affected fiscal 1958 receipts adversely, in the second half particularly, and they fell $4.5 billion below the budget estimate to $69.1 billion. The result was a deficit of $2.8 billion instead of the $1.8 billion surplus projected in the budget.

FISCAL YEAR 1959

The fiscal 1959 budget estimates were prepared without adequate recognition of the impact of the 1957–58 recession on revenues, particularly corporate taxes. The spending spree of Congress in the 1958 session could not, of course, have been foreseen. Proposed new obligational authority totaled $72.5 billion and the expenditures estimate was $73.9 billion. Receipts were estimated at $74.4 billion, and a surplus of $0.5 billion was anticipated.

Two factors existent at the time the 1959 budget came up for consideration had a very large impact on the final results. The primary factor was the recession, but the Russian sputniks also had an important effect on spending. Even before Congress actually began to consider the budget, the President increased his request for defense funds by $1.5 billion.

Final results showed a rise in new obligational authority of $8.9 billion above the original 1959 budget. This increase included the additional requests of $1.5 billion defense funds proposed by the President, a $3.2 billion subscription to the World Bank, and a $1.4 billion subscription to the International Monetary Fund. These latter two items were proposed in the fiscal 1960 budget message as supplementals for 1959. The remaining $2.8 billion of increase in obligational authority was largely due to decisions of Congress contrary to recommendations of the President.

Actual expenditures in fiscal 1959 also rose sharply from the original budget estimate of $73.9 billion to $80.7 billion for an increase of $6.8 billion. Of this total increase, $1.4 billion was the payment to the International Monetary Fund and the remaining $5.4 billion was for regular budget purposes. The larger increases in expenditures were $1.5 billion in defense, $0.3 billion in VA programs, $0.3 billion in Export-Import Bank activities, $0.7 billion in housing programs, $2.1 billion in farm program costs, $0.2 billion in HEW programs, and $0.6 billion in Department of Labor programs.

Budget receipts came to only $68.3 billion, or $6.1 billion less than the original 1959 budget estimate. Corporate income taxes fell $3.1 billion below the estimate and individual income taxes were short by $1.8 billion. All other revenues except customs duties also failed to reach expectations. The increase of $6.8 billion in expenditures and the revenue decrease of $6.1 billion from budget estimates combined to wipe out the anticipated surplus of $0.5 billion and produce a deficit of $12.4 billion.

FISCAL YEAR 1960

When President Eisenhower submitted his fiscal 1960 budget to Congress in January 1959, economic recovery was well underway. The expected level of receipts was placed at $77.1 billion against which expenditures of $77 billion were budgeted. Proposed new obligational authority amounted to $76.8 billion, a decline of $4.6 billion from the amount actually provided in fiscal 1959.

The ink on the 1960 budget had barely a chance to dry before several committees, particularly in the Senate, began to consider a number of new spending measures providing for expenditures far in excess of budget recommendations. The Senate quickly passed three of these bills—housing, civilian airports, and area redevelopment. But then budget-busting actions were slowed up considerably, mainly because of the strong stand taken by President Eisenhower on holding expenditures down to the budget level. Through vetoes and implied threats of vetoes, enactment of most of the bigger spending measures under consideration was forestalled.

The final results show that expenditures were held in line in spite of a $1.3 billion rise above the original budget estimate for interest costs. Total expenditures were $76.5 billion, or $0.5 billion less than the budget. On the other hand, receipts at $77.7 billion were $0.6 billion more than anticipated, with the result being an actual surplus of $1.2 billion instead of the original budget surplus of $0.1 billion. New obligational authority, however, came to $79.6 billion, or $2.8 billion above the budget. Principal factors accounting for this increase were the rise in interest costs, a doubling of the President's $0.4 billion request for housing programs, failure to enact proposed postal rate increases of $0.4 billion, and a $0.3 billion increase in HEW programs.

FISCAL YEAR 1961

In January 1960 the budget estimates for the ensuing fiscal year anticipated a continuing rise in economic activity through the calendar year 1960. Receipts and expenditures for fiscal year 1961 were estimated at $84 billion and $79.8 billion, respectively, and a surplus of $4.2 billion was indicated. Proposed new obligational authority totaled $79.4 billion.

Congress approved three major spending measures which were not proposed in the budget, and actively considered several others which failed of enactment because of Presidential vetoes or by being blocked in the House Rules Committee. The three that were enacted—Federal pay raises, veterans' housing loans, and medical services for the aged—added about $0.9 billion to the budget. Expenditures were also increased by the failure of Congress to approve $0.6 billion proposed postal rate increases.

Estimates for fiscal 1961 in the budget document for fiscal 1962 were revised materially from the original 1961 estimates. New obligational authority was increased to $82.1 billion from $79.4 billion, in part because of increases previously effected by Congress above budget recommendations and in part on the initiation of the President. An example of the latter was a $0.5 billion supplemental for the new Inter-American social and economic cooperation program. The effect of the business decline in calendar 1960 on fiscal 1961 receipts was evident in the new estimate which was down $5 billion from the original estimate of $84 billion. Expenditures were also revised downward by $0.9 billion to $78.9 billion, and a surplus of $0.1 billion in 1961 was indicated instead of the $4.2 billion surplus originally budgeted.

On March 24, 1961 President Kennedy submitted to Congress revisions of the budget for 1961 and 1962. The 1961 revisions included a $0.5 billion reduction in receipts and a $1.7 billion increase in expenditures. These changes put the 1961 budget into a $2.2 billion deficit position instead of the $0.1 billion surplus position in the January 1961 estimates. In addition, proposed new obligational authority for 1961 was increased from $82.1 billion to $87.1 billion.

The President stated in his March 24 message that $0.4 billion of the $1.7 billion expenditure increase for 1961 was due to reestimates of budgeted programs and $1.3 billion was the result of his administration's program changes and administrative actions. Of this latter amount approximately 20 percent was for defense and 80 percent for nondefense programs.

Virtually all of the proposed $5 billion increase in new obligational authority was for nondefense purposes, with only $63 million being for defense. The larger nondefense increases included $0.4 billion for foreign economic assistance, $0.7 billion for housing programs, $2.5 billion for CCC programs, $1 billion for temporary extended unemployment compensation, and $0.2 billion for the special milk program.

The final results for fiscal 1961 show that approved new obligational authority totaled $86.6 billion, or only $0.5 billion less than Mr. Kennedy proposed. Expenditures at $81.5 billion were $0.8 billion above the President's March 24 estimates and receipts at $77.6 billion were $0.9 billion below March 24 estimates. Thus, the deficit for 1961 was $3.9 billion as compared to the March 24 estimated deficit of $2.1 billion. The adverse change from President Eisenhower's January 1961 surplus estimate of $0.1 billion to an actual deficit of $3.9 billion was due to a $1.4 billion decline in receipts and a $2.6 billion increase in expenditures.

FISCAL YEAR 1962

The last Eisenhower budget (for fiscal 1962) proposed new obligational authority of $80.9 billion and estimated expenditures of the same amount. Receipts were placed at $82.3 billion and a surplus of $1.4 billion was indicated.

While budget revisions were sent to Congress throughout the last session, major revisions with revised overall budget totals were submitted by the Kennedy administration in three stages. The first was the March 24 and 28 revisions of nondefense and defense programs, respectively. The second was on May 25 and the third was on July 25.

The March revisions increased new obligational authority for 1962 $5.1 billion above the Eisenhower budget, increased expenditures $3.4 billion, and lowered receipts $0.9 billion. The revisions in expenditures and receipts shifted the 1962 budget from a $1.4 billion surplus to a $2.8 billion deficit. Of the $3.4 billion expenditure increase, $0.8 billion was in major national security programs, and $2.6 billion was for other purposes.

The $5.1 billion increase in obligational authority included $1.8 billion for national security and $3.3 billion for other purposes.

On the basis of the May 25 revisions, proposed new obligational authority was increased an additional $1.6 billion to $87.6 billion and expenditures were revised upward to $85.1 billion. At that time there was no change in the estimate for receipts, but rising expenditures boosted the deficit estimate to $3.7 billion.

Following the July 25 revisions, proposed new obligational authority stood at $91.1 billion, or $10.2 billion more than the Eisenhower budget total. Estimated expenditures of $87.7 billion were $6.8 billion above the budget, and receipts at $82.4 billion were slightly above the budget. The deficit then stood at $5.3 billion.

The next official budget estimates appeared in the 1962 Budget Review of October 29. These estimates took into account the changes made by Congress in acting on the fiscal program for 1962 and included more up-to-date estimates on expenditures and receipts. Major decisions of Congress reducing spending were the 1962 foreign aid appropriations cut of almost $0.9 billion and refusal to approve the general school aid bill. Congressional actions increasing spending authority and expenditures in 1962 were its refusal to approve $0.7 billion postal rate increases and its voting $0.5 billion more in appropriations and reappropriations for defense than President Kennedy requested.

The October 29 Budget Review indicates that Congress approved $91.9 billion of new obligational authority for 1962 and that $1.4 billion supplemental requests for 1962 will be submitted to Congress. These supplementals include $600 million for CCC programs, $300 million for military functions, $140 million for public assistance, and lesser amounts for several other purposes. With the supplementals included, the total of new obligational authority in 1962 is $93.3 billion. This is $12.4 billion more than was proposed for 1962 by President Eisenhower. The expenditures estimate is $89 billion, or $8.1 billion more than in the Eisenhower budget.

The increases of $12.4 billion in new obligational authority and $8.1 billion in expenditures are broken down as follows:

[In billions]

	New obligational authority	Expenditures
Major national security	+$6.1	+$3.7
International affairs and finance	+.3	+.3
Commerce, housing, and space technology	+2.0	+1.7
Agriculture and agricultural resources	+2.2	+1.2
Natural resources	+.1	--------
Health, labor, welfare, and education	+1.1	+.8
Veterans' services and benefits	--------	--------
Interest	+.4	+.4
General government	+.1	+.1
Total	+12.4	+8.1

Receipts are estimated at $82.1 billion in the October 29 Budget Review. With expenditures estimated at $89 billion, a deficit of $6.9 billion is anticipated. This represents an adverse change of $8.3 billion from the surplus of $1.4 billion planned in the Eisenhower budget.

THE 1963 BUDGET

It is now generally expected that the fiscal 1963 budget to be submitted by President Kennedy will be in balance at about $92 billion. To arrive at budget balance at that level it will be assumed that receipts in 1963 will rise about $10 billion above the October estimate for 1962 and that postal rate increases of about $600 million will be enacted.

Military expenditures will probably be close to $49 billion, or $2 billion more than the current estimate for 1962. A total of $780 million voted by Congress for three projects in 1962 has been withheld by the administration from availability for obligation. The total includes $514 million for additional B-52's, $180 million for the B-70 program, and $86 million for the Dynasoar. These funds will be applied to reduction of appropriations being requested for 1963. Reportedly, the budget will include no funds for the railroad-based Minuteman ICBM missile program or for production of parts for the Nike-Zeus antimissile missile.

[In billions]

	New obligational authority	Expenditures	Receipts	Surplus or deficit
Fiscal year 1954:				
Truman budget	$72.2	$77.9	$68.0	−$9.9
Final results	62.8	67.8	64.7	−3.1
Difference	−9.4	−10.1	−3.3	+6.8
Fiscal year 1955:				
Budget document	56.3	65.6	62.7	−2.9
Final results	57.1	64.6	60.4	−4.2
Difference	+.8	−1.0	−2.3	−1.3
Fiscal year 1956:				
Budget document	58.6	62.4	60.0	−2.4
Final results	63.2	66.5	68.1	+1.6
Difference	+4.6	+4.1	+8.1	+4.0
Fiscal year 1957:				
Budget document	66.3	65.9	66.3	+.4
Final results	70.2	69.4	71.0	+1.6
Difference	+3.9	+3.5	+4.7	+1.2
Fiscal year 1958:				
Budget document	73.3	71.8	73.6	+1.8
Final results	76.3	71.9	69.1	−2.8
Difference	+3.0	+.1	−4.5	−4.6
Fiscal year 1959:				
Budget document	$72.5	$73.9	$74.4	+$.5
Final results	81.4	80.7	68.3	−12.4
Difference	+8.9	+6.8	−6.1	−12.9
Fiscal year 1960:				
Budget document	76.8	77.0	77.1	+1
Final results	79.6	76.5	77.7	+1.2
Difference	+2.8	−.5	+.6	+1.1
Fiscal year 1961:				
Budget document	79.4	79.8	84.0	+4.2
January 1961 estimates	82.1	78.9	79.0	+.1
Kennedy revisions	87.1	80.7	78.5	−2.2
Final results	86.6	81.5	77.6	−3.9
Difference between January 1961 estimates and final results	+4.5	+2.6	−1.4	−4.0
Fiscal year 1962:				
Eisenhower budget	80.9	80.9	82.3	+1.4
Kennedy revisions, Mar. 28	86.0	84.3	81.4	−2.8
Kennedy revisions, May 25	87.6	85.1	81.4	−3.7
Kennedy revisions, July 25	91.1	87.7	82.4	−5.3
October 1961 estimates	[1] 93.3	89.0	82.1	−6.9
Difference between Eisenhower budget and October 1961 estimates	+12.4	+8.1	−.2	−8.3

[1] Includes amounts enacted plus anticipated supplementals of $1.4 billion.

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF CONGRESSIONAL SERVICE OF SENATOR HAYDEN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, let me state that it is my understanding that yesterday Arizona celebrated its 50th anniversary of statehood. I wish to call to the attention of the Senate the fact that next Monday, February 19, will mark the 50th anniversary of the assumption of office, as a Member of the Congress of the United States, of the President pro tempore of the Senate, the Honorable CARL HAYDEN of Arizona.

U.S. APPROACH TO LATIN AMERICA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the Washington Daily News of February 14, 1962, there appeared an article by Virginia Prewett, a highly informed correspondent on Latin American affairs. Miss Prewett touches on a significant and dangerous tendency in our approach to Latin America—our tendency to become obsessed with the sensational, the dramatic, and the extreme, and to overlook the steady and progressive forces that also are at work in Latin America. Miss Prewett describes a land-reform movement and its leader in the nation of Peru which she categorizes as such a force. So far as I am aware, this is the first time it has been brought to the attention of the people of the United States. In noting this development, Miss Prewett has reminded us of the need for a balanced understanding of the Latin American situation, and has thereby performed a distinguished journalistic service.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANTI-RED LEADER OF PEASANTS

(By Virginia Prewett)

Francisco Juliao, the self-avowed Communist peasant leader who has been built up as an international threat in Brazil's northeast, has visted Cuba and Mexico with great international fanfare.

But has anybody ever heard of Rafael Avalos?

Rafael Avalos is a Latin-American anti-Communist peasant leader whose national federation, quietly at work in Peru, has beaten the brains out of opposing Communist leagues that have tried to organize peasants living in ultrafeudal conditions.

Juliao burst into prominence as result of discovery by the U.S. press, just as Fidel Castro did. This writer, who met Sr. Avalos in Lima last March, has deliberately waited nearly a year to see if Sr. Avalos would ever be similarly discovered.

The Avalos case would indicate that we're a lot quicker to build up our opposition in Latin America than recognize those leaders who share our democratic aims.

Rafael Avalos is an intense, earnest young man, a leader of the Federacion Nacional de Campesinos del Peru (Fencap), which is allied with the world free trade union movement. Fencap is old, but had fallen into inactivity. Under the auspices of the anti-Communist Peruvian Labor Confederation, Sr. Avalos and his group prepared carefully through 1958 and 1959 to do battle with the Communists. The latter were then creating "ghost" organizations among the peasants.

LANGUAGE

In 1960, the Fencap called 350 local leaders from all over Peru to a national meeting. Peru has 6 million peasants, who represent 72 percent of the labor force. Three-fourths of the peasants speak only Indian tongues. Fencap's first task was training enough Indian-speaking organizers.

Fencap launched a program to help, protect, educate, and train the campesinos for landownership and membership in cooperatives, as opposed to the communistic tactic of promoting revolutionary strikes and urging peasants to seize land. Meanwhile, Fencap presses for land reform.

In 2 years of rugged infighting, Fencap has routed most of the pro-Communist leagues, while gaining a solid peasant membership of more than 40,000. One hundred and sixty locals have been formed in Indian villages. (Juliao's peasant league is reported to have no more than 4,000 members.)

The Communist attempt to thrust totally unprepared peasants onto land plots as members of politically controlled cooperatives is no more than a device to shift domination of the peasants from landowners to the Communist Party. Peru's peasants can grasp this and they chose to follow Fencap as the prodemocratic way gives them an alternative.

FIRST MEETING OF PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on December 14, 1961, President Kennedy issued an Executive order creating the

President's Commission on the Status of Women.

That Commission has now been organized and has held a 2-day meeting in Washington presided over by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, whom Secretary Goldberg described in his opening words to the Commission as "the finest person we could get in the country and in the world."

This is a Commission made up of both men and women members, representing industry, labor, the Congress, editors, church groups, lawyers, sociologists, club women, and academicians. In addition, six members of the Cabinet and the Chairman of the U.S. Civil Service Commission are active members.

In his remarks at the time of the establishment of the Commission, the President said:

> It is my hope that the Commission's report will indicate what remains to be done to demolish prejudices and outmoded customs which act as barriers to the full partnership of women in our democracy.

This is the goal which the Commission is now embarked to attain.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statements of Mrs. Roosevelt, Secretary Goldberg and the President be made a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement of Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Chairman of the President's Commission on the Status of Women

The President's Commission was established to examine the needs and rights of American women and to make recommendations for the elimination of barriers that result in waste, injustice, and frustration.

We live in a world of rapid economic and social change. Women have much to gain from tremendous new productive possibilities. Their burdens may be further lightened, their lives enriched, and their skills utilized as homemakers or, if they wish, as workers outside the family circle.

But to translate the promises into reality we must assure rapid expansion of essential services and industries. Otherwise automation means unemployment and bitter competition for jobs.

Within a rapidly growing economy, with appropriate manpower planning, all Americans will have a better chance to develop their individual capacities, to earn a good livelihood, and to strengthen family life.

Because I anticipate success in achieving full employment and full use of America's magnificent potential, I feel confident that in the years ahead many of the remaining outmoded barriers to women's aspirations will disappear.

The President's Commission on the Status of Women can contribute notably to this accomplishment and thus bring significant longrun benefits to the entire Nation and to the cause of democracy throughout the world.

Statement of Secretary of Labor Arthur Goldberg, First Meeting of the President's Commission on the Status of Women

The President's Commission on the Status of Women has a mandate from the President to tackle a wide range of problems in a field vital to every home in America. The welfare of our children, the functioning of our public and private institutions, the very social life we live is wrapped up in questions involving the status of women in our Nation and the world.

In the Department of Labor we have had a Women's Bureau for many years. The assigned task of this Bureau is to foster and promote the welfare of working women, to improve their working conditions, increase their efficiency, and advance their opportunities for profitable employment.

Now the President has established a special Commission to crystallize the countless expressions of opinion regarding the status of women in our Nation and combine these views with hard facts. The Commission will cover a much broader field of study than that covered by the Women's Bureau. It will study the great contributions of women in all modes of life.

The Commission has as one of its major purposes the strengthening of family relationships through seeking means to provide for women, especially those who work, a more equitable chance to enjoy the fruits of our social, political, and economic life.

Under the able direction of Mrs. Roosevelt, the Commission will move ahead quickly, and I feel sure that its findings will lead to great, forward steps in the months ahead.

It has been estimated that 9 out of 10 women are gainfully employed at some period in their lives. It is important that during these periods of employment, women are treated in an equitable fashion.

Today their earnings are typically lower than those of men. Several million women, in fact, earn less than a dollar an hour.

Since hearings on a House-sponsored equal pay bill are scheduled for next month, it seems to me that the gathering and presentation of all facts regarding job discrimination because of sex is a first order of business.

Women have labored under the term "weaker sex" for so long that it has become a stigma when they go out seeking employment or move into public life. It is time we evaluated women on merit and fitness alone when they apply for jobs.

I urge every American who is concerned with the problems of women who work to consider also the many other social, political and civil problems of women which the Commission will investigate. Only by an all-inclusive approach to the problem will we achieve the Commission's assigned purpose.

Today the Nation commemorates the birthday of the Great Emancipator, Abraham Lincoln. In a letter to Horace Greeley, Lincoln stated what I think should be the guideline of the work of the Commission or of any governmental body.

Lincoln wrote: "I shall try to correct errors where shown to be errors, and I shall adopt new views as fast as they shall appear to be true views."

By adopting this approach to its work this Commission cannot fail but to make a great contribution to our Nation.

Remarks of the President to the First Meeting of the President's Commission on the Status of Women

The President. Mr. Secretary, ladies and gentlemen, I want to express my thanks to all of you for an important assignment. We have established this Commission for two reasons. One is for my own self-protection. (Laughter). Every 2 or 3 weeks Mrs. May Craig asks me what I am doing for women.

The other reason is because this is a matter of great national importance—and of international importance. One-third of our working force are women. They have a primary obligation to their families and to their homes but they also—their work makes it possible to maintain that home and that family in many cases. We want to make sure that they are able to move ahead and perform their functions without any discrimination by law or by implication and we want that in the Government and stimulus through Mrs. Peterson and the Secretary and the Civil Service Commission we have attempted to make it possible for every woman to receive compensation and receive a response from her work completely in accord and with the work which she does. We want that to be true legally. We think that this Commission could usefully examine laws across the country which may adversely affect the rights of women. We want to examine this question of their compensation and whether they are receiving compensation in accordance with the service they render, whether they are being protected in their promotion rights and all the rest. The Commission should examine the things that are right and things that are wrong. So they are very interdependent. Mrs. Roosevelt has once again offered to serve the country in this important job and I am glad that all of you here who are leaders in this country have been willing to give your time to it. I can't imagine any more important assignment—not merely for women, but for Members of Congress, organized labor, women's organizations themselves, religious groups and all the rest. I think that this is a job that we ought to do. So we look forward very eagerly to your results and I promise you that we are strongly behind you in all your work.

RESOLUTION BY WASHINGTON COUNTY LABOR COUNCIL SUPPORTS HIGHER POSTAL RATES

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the Washington County Labor Council, AFL–CIO, representing organized labor in one of the major counties of my State, has in a recent meeting strongly endorsed legislation to increase postal rates.

More and more people are realizing that the postal deficit should be paid by the mail users rather than through higher taxes collected from the general public or through deficit financing.

As the Washington County Labor Council points out, legislation which has already passed the House of Representatives provides substantial increases in second- and third-class mail rates. These increases amount to more than $200 million annually in additional revenue.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a letter from Mr. Purnell Sisk, president of the Washington County Labor Council, together with an accompanying resolution adopted by the council January 24, 1962, supporting postal rate legislation.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Washington County Labor Council,
Forest Grove, Oreg., January 27, 1962.

Hon. Maurine Neuberger,
The U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Neuberger: Enclosed you will find a resolution passed by the Washington County Labor Council at our last regular meeting, January 24, 1962.

Sincerely yours,

Purnell Sisk,
President.

Resolution of the Washington County Labor Council

Whereas the House of Representatives has passed legislation increasing postal rates by $690 million; and

Whereas this increase will materially help to balance the budget; and

Whereas appreciable percentage of this increase will be collected from the highly subsidized users of the second- and third-class mail: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Washington County Labor Council respectfully request the Senators from Oregon to vote for and work for the passage of this legislation in the U.S. Senate; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be mailed to Senators Wayne Morse and Maurine Neuberger, and to the press in Washington County.

WHERE THE MISSILE GAP WENT

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, in the February 15 issue of the Reporter, my distinguished colleague from Missouri [Mr. Symington] writes on "Where the Missile Gap Went."

In a most enlightening article on the subject, Senator Symington raises some disturbing questions about the manner in which we have estimated Soviet missile strength. He concludes by pointing out that the questions as to which estimates are correct must be adequately answered "before we take to dancing in the streets to celebrate the disappearance of the missile gap."

Senator Symington states the case of the missile gap with great clarity. The article is well worth the attention of my colleagues, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Where the Missile Gap Went

(By Senator Stuart Symington)

The term "missile gap," so far as I know, was coined by a well-known newspaperman several years ago. It meant that the Russians were ahead of us in developing and building intercontinental ballistic missiles, which they would have in significant numbers before we did. It was thought that this situation would continue for a long time because this country had failed to put enough effort into developing long-range ballistic missiles. But the missile gap, from the day it became a matter of public concern, had an unaccountable way of narrowing, closing, and occasionally vanishing altogether.

Sometimes this was accomplished simply by official pronouncements. Sometimes, as in 1959, it was accomplished by adding unmanned bombers to our predicted stockpile of ICBM's while making no compensating addition to the predicted Soviet stockpile. Needless to say, the missile gap could not be so easily disposed of. Former Vice President Nixon's assurance in 1959 that the gap was narrowing was followed by former CIA Director Allen Dulles' testimony in 1960 that the Soviets were widening their lead.

In recent months, however, the missile gap appears to have been done away with once and for all. Not only is there no gap, we are informed by the press, but there never was one, and those who said there was were guilty at best of hallucination and at worst of something like bad faith. Consigning the missile gap to the "limbo of synthetic issues where it always belonged," a New York Times editorial not long ago declared, "The same forces and the same congressional and journalistic mouthpieces who manufactured an alleged bomber gap in the 1950's sponsored, and indeed invented, the alleged missile gap in the 1960's." A somewhat unusual rewriting of history was provided by William Stringer in the Christian Science Monitor: "The old missile gap never existed except in speculation—and in politics," he wrote, reinforcing this claim with the information that Presidential Candidate Kennedy, "with an eye to accuracy, referred very sparingly to the missile gap. What he mainly discussed, in his campaign speech to the American Legion convention at Miami Beach, October 18, 1960, and elsewhere, was what might be termed the vulnerability gap." By my count, Mr. Kennedy warned of the missile gap in no less than nine campaign speeches just among those which have been reprinted. To the American Legion convention in Miami Beach, he in fact quoted Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor's statement, "We are now threatened with a missile gap that leaves us in a position of potentially grave danger."

Whether or not there was a missile gap, it is clear that President Kennedy believed there was. So for that matter did former Secretaries of Defense McElroy and Gates and Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, among others. Relying on authoritative sources, so did I. That a possible Soviet missile lead in the early 1960's was a legitimate matter of concern was also acknowledged by the New York Times. "Are we doing all that we can do or should do to assure that the missile gap specter never becomes reality?" an editorial asked in 1959. "This is obviously a key question of our times. There can be little doubt that it will be the obligation of the new Congress to explore this question thoroughly."

Surely the question we should be asking ourselves now is why so many of those who believed there was a missile gap have changed their minds.

MOVING THE GOALPOSTS

The missile gap was not invented by columnists and politicians. It was invented—if that is the word—by comparing our national intelligence estimates of Soviet missile strength with the programs of the United States. By the same token, if the gap has been eliminated, it has been largely a result of a downward revision of our estimates of the Soviet Union's missile strength.

In late July of 1958, acting on information that had come to me—including some from the CIA itself—I took up the matter with Allen Dulles. His analysis showed that there was to be a substantial and growing missile gap. The facts available to me, however, suggested that he had underrated Soviet missile development, and I so reported to President Eisenhower. Nonetheless, in December of that year, the national intelligence estimates were reduced. Then early in 1960 Defense Secretary Gates informed Congress that new ground rules were to be used for interpreting intelligence data regarding the Soviet Union's ICBM's. "Heretofore, we have been giving you intelligence figures that dealt with the theoretical Soviet capability," he said. "This is the first time that we have had an intelligence estimate that says, 'This is what the Soviet Union probably will do.'" Just by changing the basis of evaluation from capability to probability, we immediately made an immense and costless advance in the missile race—without actually moving.

The chart reproduced here gives the long-range missile capacity our national intelligence estimated in December 1959, that the Soviet Union would have by July 1, 1961. For security reasons, this estimate, like others on the chart, is presented in percentages, with the mid-1961 Soviet ICBM capacity as it was predicted in December 1959, given as 100 percent. In February 1960, as a result of the change in methods of formulating intelligence estimates, the long-range missile strength the Soviets would have by July 1961 was reduced 66 percent from what it had been 2 months before. Even after that reduction, however, the new estimate of what the Soviets would have by mid-1961 was many times what we were to have at that date; and therefore, as of February 1960, a large missile gap was expected in mid-1961. But in August 1960, a further reduction was made. As the chart shows, the national intelligence estimate of mid-1961 Soviet ICBM strength was again revised downward, this time to only 30 percent of what we had predicted a few months previously. In comparison with the plans of the United States, there was still a large gap in favor of the Soviet Union.

Less than a year later, in June 1961, the national intelligence estimate of Soviet ICBM capacity for the next month—July 1961—was reduced to a mere 15 percent of the figure that had been projected 18 months previously. In September 1961, the estimate went down once more. At that time, it was estimated that Soviet ICBM strength was exactly 3.5 percent of the original 1959 estimate—a reduction of 96.5 percent in less than 2 years. Thus the missile gap vanished.

THE DANGERS OF GUESSING INTENT

One of the most important factors in determining our national military strength is the estimate of the enemy's military capability. Not long ago, Secretary McNamara told the Senate Armed Services Committee that "the latest intelligence data on the capabilities of the Soviet Union and its satellites" was one of three criteria by which he had judged service proposals for the 1963 defense budget. Congressional committees also examine the state of our Nation's defenses in the light of this estimate in preparing to make their recommendations to Congress, which must authorize and appropriate funds for the Department of Defense. The contradictory and confusing estimates of Soviet ICBM strength we have received in the past 2 years raise serious questions about the accuracy and effectiveness of our intelligence apparatus. To realize the infinite possibilities for miscalculations, one need only consider the labyrinthine route by which the first estimates are reached through a welter of Government agencies and subagencies—ACSI, AEC, AFCIN, BNE, CIA, CS, DCI, EIC, FBI, GMAIC, IRA, J-2, JAEIC, NSA, NSC, OCI, ONI, OO, ORR, OSI, OSO, SIC, USIB, and WATCH are the initials of some of the organizations that participate.

Given the tentativeness at best of our intelligence estimates, the wisdom of basing them on Soviet intent rather than capability (particularly at a time when the Soviet Union has shifted from a policy of persuasion to one of intimidation) is open to question. Military history testifies to the danger of basing one's own preparedness on an enemy's probable intentions, which can readily be altered or faked. Before the new system was adopted, Secretary McElroy had described it as "very dangerous," adding, "I think we should assume that they [meaning the opponent] will have these numbers [of missiles] in being when the national intelligence estimate says that they could have it." Further, there is the testimony of Khrushchev himself discussing the Soviet lead in missile launching in 1957. The capitalist countries, he said, "may, sooner or later, draw even with us. But it would be naive to think we are meanwhile going to sit with our arms folded." Still, according to our new estimates of the Soviets' ICBM strength, that is what we assume they have been doing.

An example of the discrepancies that can exist between what the Soviets are doing and what we think they are doing may be seen in the field of bomber production. In 1958, as the second chart shows, our national intelligence revised its previous estimates of Soviet heavy-bomber production sharply downward. At the time, one of the chief reasons given for the reduction was increasing evidence that the Soviets were accelerating their long-range missile program. Khrushchev, it was said, had leapfrogged bomber production to concentrate on the production of missiles. Estimates of potential Soviet heavy-bomber strength by mid-1961, as the chart shows, were lowered 75 percent between August 1956 and December 1958, and 81 percent by February of 1960.

The 1961 Soviet military airshow, however, raised considerable doubt whether we really knew what they were doing in this field, although we had been told in 1958, 1959, and 1960 that there would be no future manned-bomber threat. It was difficult to believe that the Soviets had not continued their bomber development and production in very substantial fashion, given the development of such planes as the new supersonic bomber larger than any aircraft we now make except the subsonic B–52. The new Russian bomber was flown at the air show in formation numbers, indicating early operational capability. Last summer we were told by defense authorities that several other planes were presented in that airshow that we had previously known nothing about.

BEFORE WE CELEBRATE

It should not be necessary to point out the dangers of underestimating the Soviet Union's ICBM strength. Fortunately, there is no reason to believe that President Kennedy has underestimated it. In accordance with his campaign statements, he has ordered a 50-percent increase in the Polaris submarine force to be achieved by the end of 1964, a 50-percent increase in the portion of the strategic bomber force on 15-minute ground alert, and a 100-percent increase in our capacity to produce the Minuteman solid-fuel missile. If the missile gap has closed, however, it has not been as a result of these necessary measures but as a result of our downgrading Soviet strength.

Clearly if the previous estimates were right, the revised estimates are terribly wrong. Which estimates are correct? These are the questions that must be asked by Senators and Representatives who must appropriate defense funds and for politicians and responsible journalists. How was it possible to be 96.5-percent off in either direction? Is probable intent a satisfactory basis for judging Soviet strength? Is our machinery for formulating national intelligence estimates adequate? All these questions must be asked—and, it is to be hoped, adequately answered—before we take to dancing in the streets to celebrate the disappearance of the missile gap.

TRIBUTE TO KENNETH NAKAMURA

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, today I should like to pay tribute to my administrative assistant, Kenneth Nakamura, who after 2½ years of outstanding service on my staff is returning to Hawaii to engage in private law practice and to take the post of house minority attorney in the State legislature.

An attorney, Ken Nakamura was one of the members of my original staff who came to Washington with me after the 1959 statehood elections in Hawaii. He was instrumental in setting up what I consider a most efficient and effective office operation.

Ken Nakamura was born in Lihue on the island of Kauai, Hawaii's lovely garden island to the northwest of Oahu. While he was still a teenager, his family moved to Honolulu where he studied as a junior and senior at McKinley High School. I am proud to say Ken and I are both alumni of McKinley High, although I must confess I graduated some several years before he did.

He then attended the University of Hawaii, receiving a bachelor of science degree. At this point, his schooling was interrupted by service in the U.S. Army from 1951 to 1953, where he earned the rank of first lieutenant. He was a member of the Congressional Command Operations Group, serving as captain in the U.S. Army Reserve, which commission he still holds.

On leaving the Army, Ken Nakamura resumed his formal education at the University of Wisconsin Law School, graduating in June 1956 with the coveted LL.B. degree. In the same year he was admitted to practice law in Hawaii and in 1960, to practice before the U.S. Supreme Court.

On his return to Hawaii in 1956, he became credit manager of Pacific Lumber Co. in Honolulu. Following this, he briefly practiced law until he was selected as deputy prosecuting attorney of the city and county of Honolulu. He served ably in this post from May 1958 to August 1950, when he journeyed to Washington to become my legislative assistant.

In a sense, my staff and I were pioneers plowing new ground, for this was the first time in history Hawaii had representation in the Senate. That we were able to accomplish so much so soon was due in large part to the ability, diligence, and resourcefulness of Ken Nakamura. The solid groundwork he helped to provide will make the task of his successor much easier.

Ken Nakamura is now returning to Hawaii where, in addition to the practice of law and his legislative work, he plans to run for a seat in the State legislature. I am confident he will serve Hawaii with the utmost distinction and integrity. To whatever Ken undertakes, I know he will apply abundant intelligence and perseverance and will reap in return good will and good fortune.

I would be remiss to let this occasion go by without expressing my gratitude and appreciation for his fine efforts in my behalf and in behalf of the people of Hawaii. His wife Jane and his family may be justly proud of his achievements.

Ken will be sorely missed by me and by all the members of my staff as well. We all join in hoping the blessings of health, happiness, and success will be his without limit. Godspeed and aloha.

TRIBUTE TO MRS. MAMIE NORRIS TILLMAN

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the State of South Carolina suffered a great loss in the death on February 1, 1962, of a noble woman, Mrs. Mamie Norris Tillman, of Edgefield, at the age of 86 years. The State, Columbia, S.C., of February 2 carried an obituary entitled "Mrs. James H. Tillman, of Edgefield, dies at 86," that was worthy of a great statesman or a person of national renown, covering her full life of service to her day and generation. The Edgefield Advertiser, Edgefield, S.C., of February 7 carried a similar obituary and also an editorial entitled, "Mrs. Tillman." I ask unanimous consent that the obituary which appeared in the State and the Edgefield Advertiser and the editorial of the Edgefield Advertiser be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

Mrs. Tillman was a woman of lofty ideals and represented the best in Christian womanhood. The beauty of her face was matched by the beauty of her character. The broad scope of her mind envisioned the best for her county and State, and even reached out to the uttermost parts of the world. Her heart beat warmly for the woes of the world and she did not cease from her labors to make it better until ill health laid its hand upon her. Hers was an ennobling influence that reached into every nook and corner of Edgefield. Through her church and temperance organizations she influenced the lives of many.

She typified the spirit of Edgefield that has given to the State of South Carolina and to the Nation some of their greatest statesmen and religious leaders. The Halls of both branches of Congress have rung with the voices of her kinsmen, Senator Benjamin Ryan Tillman and Congressman George D. Tillman. From Runnymede to World War II and Korea members of her family have served their generation in war for the preservation of human freedoms. They have sat in the gubernatorial chair. They have proclaimed the truths of Holy Writ from pulpits of rural churches.

The great of the Nation who knocked at her door found a gracious welcome. The humblest person who came was received with a warmth that dispelled any doubt as to her interest and friendship. She was an inspiration especially to young people who came to her for advice, and many today have attained high positions of trust because of her helpful guidance.

As president for over 20 years of the Edgefield County Historical Society she led in the erection of a number of monuments to commemorate the great heroes of Edgefield. But she herself will ever be commemorated in the hearts of hundreds who knew and loved her.

Mrs. Mamie Norris Tillman was a wonderful woman and dedicated to the best interest of her community, State and Nation. She was kind, gentle and helpful to her family and friends. She was a gracious example of Christian womanhood at its finest.

There being no objection, the obituary and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Edgefield Advertiser, Feb. 7, 1962]

MRS. TILLMAN

Mrs. Tillman's life was such an active one that accounts of her life and deeds have been written often, but it is hoped that historians will in time be led to record more fully the golden period in which Mrs. Tillman lived and present it and its great personalities in the light of the goodness, the righteous zeal, the sincerity, love, and unselfishness that, through them, lifted the South to a pinnacle of culture based on high ideals.

Her age was the golden age of the South, the South that had overcome the era of slavery and was reaching upward for the perfect life.

On the basis of a provident aristocracy of the land and a people of matchless generosity that spilled over into every field of endeavor, and a spirituality that reached its noblest form in the obedience and grace of religious fundamentalism, was a confluence that drew the line against every form of evil, without compromise, and, gaining momentum, it reached its highest point in the national crusade against strong drink, that resulted in the noble experiment.

So perfectly clear in this great era of the South was the fact that a way of life is reflected and becomes ascendant in great personalities.

Edgefield, where Mrs. Tillman was born and spent her entire life, except the years of her higher education, was bursting with the zeal of inspired people such as Dr. John Lake, who became world famous for his prodigious work in China.

The names of religious leaders of that period are still mentioned with veneration and almost awe, for their remarkable gifts of personality and the significant unity and harmony with which they challenged their times.

Mrs. Tillman's contemporaries were also giants in the area of public representation in every government—National, State, and local; and as Governor Evans used to say, Edgefield influenced even the staid and far-off New Englanders.

With every personal charm, Mrs. Tillman's life was a flowering of spiritual love and enlightment, and those in public life, or private, who wanted to know the conscienceful right direction in public or private matters knew that she was ever a teacher of truth and right.

Mrs. Tillman's life centered around her church, the Edgefield Baptist. She was present at every church gathering, perhaps leading a program of constructive community effort, or she might be playing the piano or organ, for she was a gifted musician.

She spent much of her life working with the people in the rural churches.

Her presence was inspiring, and often the reason for success of a good cause. In later life she devoted most of her time honoring, through the Edgefield Historical Society, those who had made significant contributions to the civilization that had taken its stand what it believed in and had acquitted itself with honor.

Thus was Mrs. Tillman a leader in an age of American ascendancy.

"The great of the earth, having lived and died, now live again and forever through their undying thoughts. Thus living though their footfalls are heard no more, their voices are louder than the thunder and unceasing as the flow of tides or air. The prophets seem almost useless in their time. But when you look at the life they have lived since you shall find they have been the pilots. What archer could hit them now? They ask no leave of elector or emperor, but are the monarchs of thought and the noblest defenders of the faith to the end of time."

[From the Columbia (S.C.) State, Feb. 2, 1962]

Mrs. James H. Tillman of Edgefield, Dies at 86

Edgefield.—Mrs. Mamie Norris Tillman, 86, died Thursday afternoon at Self Memorial Hospital at Greenwood after a long illness.

Mrs. Tillman was born August 2, 1875, in the same home she has occupied her entire life. She was the only child of Alfred J. Norris, lawyer and banker of Edgefield, and Mrs. Mary J. Norris.

Their handsome home of colonial design was the center of social activity during their lifetime and Mrs. Tillman continued to maintain it in a spirit of gracious southern hospitality.

It is now headquarters of the Edgefield County Historical Society of which Mrs. Tillman was president 21 years. It was a tribute to her life of service that the Kendall Co., owners of the property for some years, deeded it to the society in 1959. The most recent meeting was held at the home on her 86th birthday when Mrs. Tillman gave a report of the society's activities for the year and extended cordial greetings to all.

During her younger years she studied under local tutors. She attended Hollins College in Virginia and College for Women in South Carolina from which she was graduated with honors.

For more than 60 years Mrs. Tillman's influence was felt in the religious and cultural life of Edgefield. She united with the First Baptist Church at the age of 12. For years she was director of the Sunbeams, a children's organization, in her church and in the Edgefield Baptist Association. She was president of the local Woman's Missionary Society and superintendent of the Edgefield Associational WMU for many years.

She was active in temperance work, being president of the Edgefield WCTU and vice president of the State organization for some years.

For a number of years she was teacher of the TEL Sunday school class, and continued her interest in Sunday school, training union, and missionary society until ill health prevented.

Her musical gifts found expression in serving as church organist for 17 years, as teacher of piano, and directing an orchestra of young men.

She was an inspiration to the young people of Edgefield and through her help some gained a new concept of life and were enabled to obtain a higher education.

She was twice regent of Old 96 District chapter, DAR, and was at one time vice regent of the State society. She was on the State executive boards in other years of the DAR, UDC, and more recently the Colonial Dames of the XVIIth Century. She was a member of the Daughters of the Knights of Runnymead; the University Caroliniana Society; and the South Carolina Historical Society.

Under the leadership of Mrs. Tillman the DAR and the Historical Society sponsored erection of markers to Edgefield County's 10 Governors and 5 Lieutenant Governors; the dead of World War I; the Martins of Martintown; the birthplace of Confederate Gen. James Longstreet; to John Thurmond of the Revolution, and to Cols. LeRoy and Samuel Hammond of the Revolution. Last year she participated in commemorating Pvt. Sidney Weeks, first Confederate casualty from this section.

With continued love for her church she carried out programs honoring Dr. William B. Johnson, first president of the Southern Baptist Convention, and Dr. John Lake, missionary to China. On those occasions portraits of the two and other leaders were placed in the prayer chapel of the church, and markers were placed in the nearby cemetery.

Other patriots whose graves were marked by the society in the same cemetery were F. H. Wardlaw, author of the "Ordinance of Secession," and members of the family of Pierce Mason Butler, former Governor and colonel of the Palmetto Regiment in the Mexican War.

Mrs. Tillman was active formerly in the Civic League and helped establish the D. A. Tompkins Memorial Library. When the sale of the old Martin W. Gary place, Oakley Park, was pending, she enlisted the interest of former Gov. John Gary Evans in having it preserved as a memorial to General Gary and others who redeemed South Carolina from carpetbag rule in 1876.

Hers was a life rich and full in service to her day and generation, and she was known and beloved far beyond the bounds of her local community.

She was the widow of James H. Tillman, a Lieutenant Governor of the State.

Surviving are one daughter, Mrs. Taylor Stanley, of Cincinnati; two grandchildren, Mrs. John S. Nicholson, of Columbia, and Ethan Bates Stanley II, of Darlington, and two grandchildren, Mary Norris Nicholson and Helen Nicholson, of Columbia.

Funeral services will be held from the First Baptist Church of Edgefield, with her pastor, Dr. J. Graydon Dukes, in charge, at 3 p.m. Saturday. Interment will follow in nearby Willowbrook Cemetery.

Active pallbearers will be Walton Mims, Senator J. Strom Thurmond, Manley Timmons, John Felthan, John Bocker, and Raymond Folk.

GOV. EDMUND G. "PAT" BROWN PRESENTS A BALANCED BUDGET TO THE CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, Gov. Edmund G. "Pat" Brown, of California, faces the electorate this November with a record of solid achievement.

To meet the people's needs the Brown administration has developed constructive programs in many fields—education, water resources, social welfare, civil rights, air pollution control, narcotics control, electoral revision, and many other areas.

That so much has been done in his first term is the more remarkable in face of the fact that Governor Brown has presented to the legislature four consecutive balanced budgets, the last three requiring no new taxes.

In his budget message to the Senate and assembly on February 5, 1962, the Governor set forth in eloquent terms the State's fiscal requirements for 1962–63. Because it shows what a great State is doing and is prepared to do to meet its complex problems—because it demonstrates that State government in California is a vital, dynamic institution—I commend the message to my colleagues and others.

I ask unanimous consent that its text be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Budget Message by Gov. Edmund G. Brown

(The 1962–63 budget transmitted to the California Legislature, Monday, February 5, 1962)

To the Senate and Assembly of the Legislature of California:

I present to you a $2,885,523,247 budget for the 1962–63 fiscal year.

It is the fourth consecutive soundly balanced budget transmitted to you by this administration.

It is the third consecutive budget requiring no new taxes.

It recognizes in size and scope that this is the year when California takes its destined place as the first State in the Union, as the leader in population, in government, in education, and in dedication to the principles of equal opportunity.

It contemplates no major new expenditure programs.

It includes increases in existing programs only where they are required by growth and quality, the two traditional hallmarks of life and government in California.

It is once more based on an allocations system which guarantees that the State government will live within its resources without impairment of that level of services which has made California the most attractive State in the Union—to its citizens, to new population, and to new industry and commerce.

It adheres to strict standards of austerity and economy.

Expenditure increases were limited to those areas in which direct services to people were involved. New administrative workload and overhead costs were pared from departmental budgets, even when formulas and ratios justified the requests involved. The only major exceptions were in our revenue-collecting agencies where added staff costs demonstrably would produce even more added revenue.

I renew my annual invitation to the legislature to produce even more economies to reduce this budget wherever possible without stunting the State's growth or reducing the quality of its essential services.

I also renew my pledge to economize in the administration of this budget.

I believe the record of the past 3 years reveals that both the invitation and the pledge are sincere.

As evidence, I offer the fact that this administration has averaged $27 million a year for the last 3 years in savings from legislative appropriations. In the 10 years prior to my election, two preceding administrations averaged $15 million and $14 million respectively.

This last year we have also held thousands of authorized positions vacant for long periods of time in order to achieve greater productivity and slow the expansion of the work force.

Together, in these 3 years, you and I have restored California's fiscal responsibility, returned its bonds to an envied status in the national financial marketplace and turned a $68 million deficit into a $20 million surplus.

At the same time, we have kept faith with the future of this great State.

This budget is founded not alone on principle of investment—investment in the eduthat we must meet both the needs of the present and the challenges of the future.

The major cost increases in this massive budget testify to our adherence to the principle of investment—investment in the education of our youth, investment in the development of water and the other great natural resources, and investment in people and programs designed to make California a better place to live and work.

Consider education, the area in which the largest growth is taking place and in which the most significant new investments are being made.

Local school districts will have 212,000 more students next year, bringing the total to 3,775,000 students in the elementary and secondary grades through junior college. The districts will receive $58 million more in operating and debt service costs. The total proposed expenditure is $863 million.

The rapidly expanding State college system will have 8,500 more students in 1962–63, bringing the total enrollment to 86,440. The trustees, the 16 present campuses and the 2 new ones will receive $19 million more in State funds for operation and construction purposes. The total proposed expenditure is $149 million.

The great University of California, destined to double in size in this decade, will admit 5,128 more students in 1962–63, increasing total enrollment to 57,203. The proposed State-supported budget for the university calls for an increase of $16 million. The total proposed State contribution is $197 million.

Next in importance among the few major increases are those resulting from 1961 legislation to improve health care for the aged and meet other deficiencies in the State's programs for the aged, the blind, and the disabled. The forecast last year was for a $70 million increase in these items in 1962–63, the first full year of operation. The estimate now is for $54 million.

Another major cost factor is the first general pay increase for State employees in 2 years, a 5-percent raise to be retroactive to January 1 of this year on the urgent recommendation of the State personnel board, the official factfinding agency on proper State salary levels. That will cost $39.8 million in 1962–63.

State employees themselves have helped to finance this raise with increased productivity. Their efforts in work improvement plans and their money-saving suggestions submitted through the merit award system have also helped give impetus to the formulation of new standards of efficiency and economy in many departments.

If you examine the budget in another way, a different kind of increase factor stands out. Of the entire budget, $1,514,200,000, or some 55 percent, is in local assistance, an increase of $145.6 million in school, welfare, health, and flood control programs administered at the local level where the burden would otherwise fall on the property taxpayer.

California continues to have the largest local assistance program of any State.

Fortunately, this budget was prepared at a time of growing prosperity in California and the Nation.

The revenue estimates on which it is predicated reflect the same steadfast confidence and faith in California's future that I expressed in less auspicious circumstances just 1 year ago.

Our determination then to press forward with antirecession measures in partnership with the Federal Government has been more than justified by events.

In almost every category of economic activity, California is at record highs and is continuing its steady upward climb.

Having doubled personal income in California in the last decade, we should see another increase of 8.6 percent in 1962. The Nation's income will go up only 6.8 percent.

The employment situation, already better, will continue to improve. As the State's population increases another 600,000, requiring 245,000 new jobs for proper support, we actually anticipate the creation of 288,000 new jobs. That would permit a welcome and substantial reduction in unemployment.

This splendid economic climate in California is not an accident. Government and industry and labor have worked hard to create and sustain it.

Recent comprehensive national surveys show that California is the leading choice of business executives for new and expanded plant capacity, not only because of our large and growing market, but because of the high level of publicly financed education here, a level essential to the advanced technology of most modern industry.

This is especially true of the Nation's burgeoning new business giant, the interrelated electronics and space exploration industries. It is in such areas that California's unique investment in higher education is paying dividends not only in culture and civilization, but in new levels of personal income and prosperity.

This budget, just as the other budgets I have transmitted to you, has other contributions to make to a thriving economy.

There is an accelerated thrust in the California water program as it surges toward peak construction activity at Oroville and at the San Luis Reservoir, and the Nation's finest highway program is progressing ahead of schedule.

We are also continuing our assault on the ills of our society with some marked successes.

Despite our huge growth in population, a splendid treatment program has reduced the number of mentally ill in our State institutions to the lowest point in 8 years.

The prisoner conservation camp program has a record number of adult and juvenile offenders doing useful and self-rehabilitating work in our forest and wilderness areas. Without their firefighting efforts in the last 2 years, untold thousands of acres more of California forests would have gone up in smoke.

The comprehensive narcotics program begun last year is still gathering momentum, but has already swept hundreds of addicts off the streets and out of the contagious centers of infection. This is a costly program, but one worth every dollar we have to pay to rid ourselves of this sordid traffic in human misery and degradation.

These and other comparable expenditures, are largely in the pattern pioneered in previous years of this administration.

In one area, however, I am supporting a drastic new approach to a task at which the State has long been laboring with only partial success.

I feel that our recreation programs have not kept pace with our needs.

Despite the greatest fiscal and planning effort of any administration in the State's history, we still have not met the challenge fully. Lands which should be held for public use have slipped away into private hands because of inadequate funds for acquisition. The costs of other available and desirable lands is moving swiftly out of the range of the limited public purse, and within 10 years will be completely beyond our resources.

Moreover, much property now held is not adequately developed to meet immediate public demand for recreational facilities.

Therefore, with this budget, I plan to submit a $100 million bond issue proposal to finance an immediate 5-year program of acquisition of land for beach, park, and other recreational purposes.

At the same time, I am earmarking the general fund money heretofore used for acquisition to accelerate the pace of our development program from $4 to $6 million a year.

I will ask that the legislature place the new recreation bond issue on the general election ballot.

If it is approved, as I confidently expect, then I would ask that the legislature work out, at the 1963 session, a method and program of acquisition which would take into account not only the needs of the State as a whole, but those of individual communities, counties, and regions.

The 1962–63 budget contemplates other bond financing but with only one other basic variation from the traditional pattern of use of long-term capital outlay bonds in California. That one is of critical importance, however.

To the category of institutions for which proper expenditures from State construction bonds can be made legally, now including the University of California, the State college system, mental hospitals, prisons, government buildings, and other purely State institutions, I propose we add the State's junior colleges.

Because the master plan for higher education adopted in 1960 calls upon the junior colleges to assume a major new role in meeting added statewide responsibilities in the field of higher education, a beginning capital outlay appropriation of $5 million was authorized by the legislature last year.

It was agreed by all concerned, however, that no permanently satisfactory solution to the shared responsibility of the State and junior college districts was achieved at that time.

The Coordinating Council for Higher Education is now hard at work on this matter, and I am confident that the 1963 session of the legislature, acting after it has had the benefit of the council's study and advice, will be able to write adequate legislation covering the very complex problem of financing new junior college facilities cooperatively.

It will be important that there be funds available immediately to implement that decision next year, and I am therefore asking that the new State construction bond issue be so written as to permit the legislature to use construction bond funds for junior college facilities.

As of the beginning of the new fiscal year, only $52 million of the State construction bonds authorized in 1958 will be available to meet the capital outlay needs of $141 million dollars projected in this budget.

I therefore ask this session of the legislature to place a new bond issue of $270 million dollars on the June primary ballot to meet the remaining needs for 1962–63 and the probable needs in 1963–64.

Building at the new campuses of the University of California and the State college system will be at its highest level for the next few years as the 5-year building plan submitted with this budget discloses. In addition, as indicated above, junior college assistance, perhaps as much as $20 million, may be required in the 1963–64 budget.

Thus, more than 80 percent of the total $270 million bond issue will be devoted to meeting the drastic needs of our institutions of higher education as they absorb the first full impact of the postwar population boom.

The increased use of bonds in these two areas is more than offset by decreased use in two other areas.

The declining volume of new bond sales required to sustain the self-liquidating California veterans' farm and home loan program will permit drastic reduction in the renewed bond authority sought and the amount to be offered.

Instead of the $400 million issue required 2 years ago, I am recommending that the new issue be limited to $250 million for the next 2 years without making any changes or restrictions in the loan program. Ample funds on hand will permit the issue to wait to go on the general election ballot in November.

The bond program for assistance in local school construction has done its job well in reducing drastically the number of double sessions in the State. There is now for the first time in years no backlog of requests waiting on a priority basis.

The slackening of demand makes it possible for me to recommend that we reduce the 2-year school construction bond issue from the $300 million level authorized 2 years ago to $200 million for the next 2 years.

I would further recommend that this issue be placed on the primary ballot in June with the $270 million State construction bond issue.

The net effect of these four proposals will be to reduce rather than to increase the number of general obligation bond sales in California during the next fiscal year while shifting the focus of long-term financing to the areas of greatest need.

California has already sold more than $500 million in bonds this year, and, because of steadily increasing confidence in California's fiscal soundness, it has sold them at the lowest rates of interest since the State surpluses of the postwar years disappeared in the prior administration.

Yet, next year, we will be able to make a $50 million sale of water bonds if necessary and still hold the total to little more than $400 million.

To any among you with lingering doubts as to California's fiscal health, I would cite two remarkable facts.

California has the lowest net bond debt among nine comparable industrial States and ranks 37th in the Nation.

California ranks 27th among the States in tax rate per $100 of personal income.

In the last 10 years, the tax rate per $100 of personal income in all States has gone up an average of 20 percent and in such industrial States as New York and Pennsylvania has gone up 36 percent and 50 percent respectively. California's rate is up just 5 percent.

The fiscal moral is clear. Together you and I have kept economic faith with the people of California and with their future.

I submit this budget to you with the utmost respect, and with confidence that your ultimate judgment will not stem from narrow partisanship, but will reflect your traditionally broad outlook on what is required to keep California in the position which she is just achieving, that of first among equals in this great Union.

SUMMARY

In summary, this budget totals $2,885 million, including $141 million of bond financing of essential State building needs. It represents an increase of almost $199 million, or 6.7 percent over current year requirements. Total revenues will reach $2,653 million, a corresponding increase of 8 percent.

Of particular importance are the general fund obligations of $1,917 million contained in this total, up 10 percent over current requirements. General fund income for this budget is anticipated at $1,883 million, a comparable increase of 10 percent over the present year.

A summary of the condition of the general fund is presented below:

General fund condition

[In millions of dollars]

	1960-61	1961-62	1962-63
Beginning surplus and reserves, July 1	$131.8	$58.3	$38.7
Income: Revenue and transfers	1,613.0	1,723.9	1,882.7
Expenditures:			
State operations	547.3	623.8	687.4
Capital outlay	117.8	36.4	16.1
Capital outlay—bonds	(12.6)	(110.6)	(141.1)
Local assistance	1,018.9	1,083.3	1,213.1
Total expenditures	1,684.0	1,743.5	1,916.6
Committed reserves	20.3	19.3	[1] 2.7
Ending surplus, June 30	38.0	19.4	2.1

[1] This amount has been reserved by the 1961 legislature from county school service fund surpluses for future educational needs.

In conformity with section 34, article IV of the constitution, I submit to you the budget for the State of California for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1962, and ending June 30, 1963.

Respectfully submitted.

EDMUND G. BROWN,
Governor.

FEBRUARY 5, 1962.

PADRE ISLAND SEASHORE PROPOSAL GAINS INCREASED SUPPORT

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, in recent weeks, the proposal to create a national seashore recreational area on Padre Island on the Texas gulf coast has received editorial support from newspapers from a wide area including a newspaper in southeast Texas, another in west Texas, and another in New York City. These three are all well written, including one from the New York Times, and two from a group of the more progressive members of the Texas press.

This growing interest and support is evidence of the far-reaching importance attached to our urgent national need for the preservation of areas for the enjoyment of this and future generations of Americans.

The bill which I have introduced to establish an 88.5-mile park on Padre Island, S. 4, will help all of the area around Padre Island become a magnificent resort center that will benefit hundreds of thousands of new tourists.

Texas and other States with a coastline well know the price of waiting to preserve coastal recreation areas.

The cost of available land reaches up to the heavens; the new fences reach out past the waterline and into the waves.

The importance of immediate action to preserve recreation areas for the American people cannot be overemphasized.

Action is urgently needed at this session.

From a standpoint of recreation elbow room, the time is approaching when a little strip of sand and speck of sunshine will take on a striking similarity to gold in its value.

The population is increasing at explosion rate, the national trend is toward city living and weekend or vacation-time search for wide open spaces.

The sweeping reaches of Padre Island offer the finest remaining available source in the United States for preservation for the use of all the people.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the following editorials:

"Friend of Padre Island," from the Beaumont Journal, January 30, 1962.

"Needed: New National Parks," from the New York Times, January 2, 1962.

"Texans Should Support Padre Seashore Project," from the Abilene Reporter-News, February 4, 1962.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Beaumont Journal, Jan. 30, 1962]

FRIEND OF PADRE ISLAND

Proponents of a national seashore park on Padre Island in Texas have a powerful friend in New York City.

An editorial in a recent edition of the New York Times has this to say about it:

"Congress made a start toward expanding the system [national park system] last year when it added the Cape Cod National Seashore, but this is only a start. In the 1962 session Congress should move promptly to complete action on the pending bills to establish national seashores at Port Reyes in California and Padre Island in Texas."

People in New York City may be more conscious of the need for national parks than people in Texas. They should be, for Gothamites lack, and long for, the elbow room and wide open spaces most Texans take for granted. But the fact is that public property everywhere is diminishing as the population grows and commercial interests corral new ground. The Lone Star State has much to offer the national park system. Much to gain from it, too.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 2, 1962]

NEEDED: NEW NATIONAL PARKS

The national park system of the United States is an example for the world of how a great nation can set aside outstanding areas of its land, not for commercial or industrial exploitation but for the inspiration, esthetic enjoyment and physical refreshment of its people. It is an example that gives the lie to the accusation, frequently leveled by its critics and enemies, that this Nation is governed by gross materialism and devotion to the dollar.

But our existing national parks, besieged by the recreational hungers of an exploding population, are proving inadequate to the purpose. In this, the first of two editorials on the parks, we call attention to the major park proposals which should be enacted in the near future; tomorrow we will discuss briefly some of the principal problems involved in carrying out such a program.

Congress made a start toward expanding the system last year when it added the Cape Cod National Seashore, but this is only a start. In the 1962 session Congress should move promptly to complete action on the pending bills to establish national seashores at Point Reyes in California and Padre Island in Texas. Also needed, to insure the preservation of the best of our fast-dwindling, unspoiled shorelines, is passage of pending legislation affecting the outstanding Oregon Dunes area on the Pacific coast and both the Indiana Dunes and the Sleeping Bear Dunes on Lake Michigan.

Fortunately there still remain a few inland scenic and relatively unspoiled areas in the East and Midwest that would be worthwhile additions to the system. The historic and unique C. & O. Canal area along the Potomac River, now partially protected as a national monument, deserves to be enlarged into a national park. Other interesting proposals, in various stages of advancement, are for an Allagash national recreation area in the unspoiled forest and river country of Maine, a Robert Frost National Park in the Green Mountains of Vermont, an Ozark Rivers National Monument along the famous Current and Elevenpoint Rivers in Missouri, and a Prairie National Park to save the last of the virgin grasslands of the Great Plains.

Western areas of special scenic and wilderness values include the North Cascade Mountains of Washington, the Oregon Cascades, the Wheeler Peak region in Nevada, and a wild, sweeping expanse of canyon and desert in southeastern Utah where Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall has proposed the creation of a Canyon Lands National Park.

[From the Abilene Reporter-News, Feb. 4, 1962]

Texans Should Support Padre Seashore Project

Away down on the lower Texas coast, a national seashore on Padre Island was proposed 5 years ago.

Senator Ralph Yarborough introduced a bill to establish it in 1957. Since then it has struck numerous hurdles.

The most recent and least needed blow was landed last August 31 when Land Commissioner Jerry Sadler called upon the State government to make a State park on Padre Island.

The absurdity of this is apparent to those who know that because of niggardly legislative appropriations, the State has not been able to develop adequately the parks it already has.

How it would muster the money to buy the Padre Island land, much less develop it, is a prime question.

Though the suggested project is from 400 to 500 miles away from west Texas, we, as well as Texans all over the State, have a stake in this proposal.

Texas is trying to develop its tourist industry. The Padre Island National Seashore would prove a major tourist attraction.

That of course is not sufficient justification for establishing the seashore. The national seashore would preserve a vast stretch of land in a more or less primitive state for the enjoyment of this and future generations of Americans.

Commercial development of the better areas eventually will wipe out such priceless natural landscapes.

Texans should join in support of the seashore project in this session of Congress, ere it is too late.

One necessary step is for all the State's delegation in Congress to get together and agree on a bill.

BOY SCOUT WEEK

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, with Boy Scout Week arriving in February, it gives me an excellent opportunity to offer a salute to the Boy Scouts of America as it celebrates its 52d birthday. I know that each of you share my pride in the fine job that scouting does for the youth of America. Over 30 million boys, I understand, have participated in this virile movement since it was founded in our Nation's Capital more than 50 years ago.

Let us not forget that this outstanding organization, which today numbers more than 5 million active Scouts and volunteer leaders, performs a tremendous service in helping build both the character and physical fitness of our leaders of tomorrow—and let us not forget, too, that it does this superb job without asking for or receiving one cent of Federal moneys.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

THE PROGRAM FOR FORESTRY RESEARCH

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I shall briefly present to the Senate a review of the program for forestry research, the program which has been completed, and the program for the future.

Mr. President, again, as in the past 2 years, I call attention to the forestry research program of the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture. This has been one of the most productive programs of the Federal Government—a program of developing the Nation's extensive forest resources through systematic and aggressive research. It is not only a program of research required to put a sound scientific basis under the protection, management, and utilization of our valued national forests, but also provides a sound foundation for the entire forestry resources of the country.

Last year I referred particularly to the forestry research program submitted to the Congress the previous year by the Department of Agriculture. I pointed out that the amount of money in the plan for the forestry research work, plus the research construction program, was 13 times the amount we were providing at the time the report was presented. That figure, I again submit, graphically illustrates the neglect, from year to year and from decade to decade, of one of our greatest natural resources.

During the last 2 or 3 years we have made a good start rectifying past neglect. I take great pride in the constructive attitude of this body when I review recent action on matters of forestry research. We have had before us a research plan prepared by the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture.

The Senate recognized the soundness of this plan. We have joined in providing additional funds for this important work. I am sure each Member of the Senate believes—as I firmly do—that we must continue to make substantial, orderly progress in the further expansion of forestry research. And we must do this during the years immediately ahead. We have made a beginning only. Each year, for the next several years, this important activity must continue to grow. It must meet the requirements of a truly essential forestry research program—a truly national program that unfortunately has been neglected far too long.

I have before me the budget estimates for the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture that have been recommended to the Congress for fiscal year 1963. The budget proposal for forestry research is a great disappointment to me. Instead of an increase of funds for the program, the recommendation is for a decrease. The budget recommends that only $23,150,000 be allowed to cover all of forestry research nationwide, including the construction of research facilities. This amount is $3,218,000 below that appropriated for the same purpose by the Congress for fiscal year 1962. Eliminated almost entirely is the vital program dealing with construction of research facilities. This budget cut is difficult for me to understand because research construction is of key importance in the forestry research plan.

I do not think this country can afford to allow a step backward in this forestry research program. As has been my custom over the years, I have spent considerable time obtaining from informed people in various parts of the country an an appraisal of where we are heading in forestry research and what we need to do. I have systematically visited the forests of this country, making trips into the forests of my own State and of other States, to see the problems first hand and the progress being made in forestry and in research. I cannot agree with the budget recommendation. It calls for much too slow a pace in reaching reasonable and essential research goals. It would put a halt to the construction of research facilities that are desperately needed to implement and make more effective the research work that is now underway. It would likewise interrupt with serious consequences the orderly construction of the research buildings sorely needed for the expansion of research work. This expansion must come in the near future if we are to meet the requirements of the carefully planned forestry program of the Department during the next 10 years.

For these reasons, I am again this year proposing that the budget estimates for fiscal year 1963 be increased for the research work of the Forest Service. I propose an increase of $10,555,000 over the 1962 appropriation. This increase over 1962 would be divided: $6 million for acceleration of research work and $4,555,000 for construction of research facilities. I have a table that shows where we stand in fiscal year 1962 with respect to financing the forestry research program, the budget recommendation for fiscal year 1963, and my proposal of the funds required for fiscal year 1963 to maintain reasonable and essential progress in this very important program. I ask unanimous consent that the table showing these relative positions be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. Neuberger in the chair). Is there objection of the request of the Senator from Mississippi?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record.

Forestry research—Budget estimate for fiscal year 1963 and proposed increases required for planned progress

[In thousands of dollars]

Research items	Appropriated, fiscal year 1962	Budget estimate, fiscal year 1963	Budget estimate, increase or decrease over fiscal year 1962	Funds required for planned progress	
				Increase over fiscal year 1962	Total fiscal year 1963
Forest and range management	$9,737	$10,214	$477	$1,950	$11,687
Forest protection	4,344	4,729	385	2,450	6,794
Forest products and engineering	4,477	4,717	240	1,200	5,677
Forest resource, economics and products marketing	2,615	2,740	125	400	3,015
Subtotal, research investigations	21,173	22,400	1,227	6,000	27,173
Construction of research facilities	5,195	750	−4,445	4,555	9,750
Total for forest research	26,368	23,150	−3,218	10,555	36,923

LABORATORY FACILITIES NEEDED

Mr. STENNIS. Madam President, I also have a table which shows the individual research construction projects that would be undertaken with the additional funds my proposal would provide. Preceding this list, I show the projects—mostly scientific equipment to complete buildings now under construction—and the amounts that are provided for them in the 1963 budget estimate. I fully endorse the completion of these projects, as well as propose the 12 additional ones.

The 12 additional construction projects that I propose are in a high priority category. I developed these projects from the forestry plan that we have had before us and from discussions and correspondence I have had with the scientists and others involved. I requested and received review by the Forest Service of the estimated cost of a number of projects and those that I have included are believed by me to represent especially worthy cases and to be feasible for undertaking now.

This entire list was prepared strictly from nationwide needs. It relates to the basis of the forestry program throughout the Nation, and the State in which a laboratory or facility may be located is purely incidental.

It so happens that in the proposals of this year there are none for my State. That circumstance is due solely to the fact that Mississippi did not rate one on the list of priority needs. I hope that in the near future some special needs that exist in my State will be reached on a priority list.

My position is that the problem is a national one, and that the proposed projects must be undertaken. The needs must be met. I am entirely willing, as are other Senators, to let the projects be developed on a priority scale. The list of projects which I have presented is realistic and contains up-to-date cost estimates. I strongly recommend and will vigorously support the position that those projects should be included in the fiscal year 1963 funds to the Forest Service.

I ask unanimous consent that the table on research construction to which I have referred be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Forestry research construction

CONSTRUCTION INCLUDED IN BUDGET

Location	Research facilities	Estimated cost
1. Athens, Ga.	Scientific equipment and auxiliary facilities	$250,000
2. Princeton, W. Va.	do	150,000
3. Stoneville, Miss.	do	45,000
4. Durham-Raleigh, N.C. (research triangle).	do	126,000
5. Corvallis, Oreg.	do	80,000
6. Delaware, Ohio	do	64,000
7. Olustee, Fla.	do	35,000
Total for projects now in budget.		750,000

ADDITIONAL CONSTRUCTION PROPOSED

1. Parsons, W. Va.	Forest watershed management laboratory	$150,000
2. Alexandria, La.	Forest utilization, protection, and forestation laboratory	900,000
3. Warren, Pa.	Forest recreation and wildlife habitat management laboratory	450,000
4. Sewanee, Tenn.	Forest soil and silviculture laboratory	200,000
5. Madison, Wis.	Forest Products Laboratory—addition for wood chemistry and pulp and paper research.	4,000,000
6. Olympia, Wash.	Timber management and animal damage prevention laboratory	300,000
7. Ames, Iowa	Hardwood silviculture laboratory	200,000
8. Tempe, Ariz.	Forest watershed, range and wildlife habitat management laboratory.	900,000
9. Fort Myers, Fla.	Forest and range management laboratory	150,000
10. Houghton, Mich.	Forest engineering laboratory	400,000
11. Logan, Utah	Forest watershed management laboratory	900,000
12. Redding, Calif.	Timber management and utilization laboratory	450,000
Total for additional construction.		9,000,000

Mr. ENGLE. Madam President, will my distinguished colleague yield for a question and an observation?

Mr. STENNIS. I gladly yield to the Senator from California. I know of his interest in this subject and his continued support of the proposed projects.

Mr. ENGLE. I wish to compliment the distinguished Senator from Mississippi for the leadership and the effort that he has given to this very important subject.

I observe that the table that he has asked unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD includes 7 projects which are in the budget and includes 12 additional ones which have, as he stated, a high priority rating.

One of those proposed 12 projects is for a timber management and utilization laboratory at Redding, Calif. In order not to transgress upon the time of the Senator from Mississippi, or to intrude within the continuity of his remarks, I intend, following his statement, to comment on that particular subject as well as upon other problems affecting California. But I do wish to take this opportunity to say to my distinguished friend that he will have my wholehearted and vigorous support for the program on which he has shown such great knowledge and experience. I believe him to be correct in every particular. I believe that he has been careful and meticulous in selecting the projects on the list. I observe that there are no projects proposed for his own State. He has been perfectly willing to accept the projects on the basis of a priority arrangement in the Forest Service. The Senator from Mississippi will have my vigorous support; and I hope that at some time that he can get the laboratory that he has in mind included in a priority list. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from California. His support of the proposed projects will certainly be valuable. The project at Redding, Calif., is very timely indeed. That project is a laboratory for timber management and utilization. It would cost only $450,000. As research laboratories go, that amount of money is relatively small. The facility would not be expensive, and would be one at which scientists and technicians who do this important work would have a reasonable opportunity to do their best work. I do not think we could possibly find a better investment anywhere in a plan for the present or the future than the proposed small investment in these laboratories. We find in them some of the finest scientists in the Nation laboring faithfully with present problems and future planning.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I join the distinguished Senator from California in commending the Senator from Mississippi on his statement of an expanded program for forestry research. I would have expected the Senator from Mississippi to do what he has done because of his continuing championship and support of sensible, prudent, and I think, productive agricultural research programs. The Senator knows that time after time, as he has taken the floor to uphold programs in the field of research and agriculture, it has been my privilege at least to commend him, and I think I have always supported him.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Minnesota. The Senator has been very active, diligent, and consistent in his vigorous support in committee and on the floor of programs of the kind proposed. I highly commend him.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator. I want him to know that as a member of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations I shall do all I can to forward the program that the Senator from Mississippi has advanced here today.

I believe that it needs to be underscored that such programs as proposed actually produce revenue. When I was at home during the past weekend I was met by some of our leading scientists from the University of Minnesota College of Agriculture, which is one of the land-grant colleges. We are very proud of this great university and its agriculture program. These scientists pointed out to me that by research, not only in forestry projects but in what we call land crops—such as wheat, corn, feed grains, cotton, and many other crops, by crossbreeding and by processes of biochemistry—we are able to make what are known as food products available for industrial and commercial uses, so that instead of a farmer leaving his land idle, he is able to utilize the land, taking what was once called a food product and moving it into the chemical industry for new types of processed commodities that meet the needs of modern American industry, such as homebuilding, and the many other needs of our fellow citizens. What I have said is also true of wood products and forest products.

We, in Minnesota, with 22 million acres of forest land, are vitally concerned about this subject.

Yesterday afternoon I had a call from Ely, Minn., in reference to the improvement of a forest products laboratory in that area. The laboratory has been a going concern. It could mean much in terms of employment. We are saddled with a shocking and tragic problem of unemployment in northeastern Minnesota. The proposal of the Senator from Mississippi would help in every part of the Nation, not only to stimulate greater research for the sake of research, but, more importantly, to stimulate research to aid the producer, to aid the consumer, and to build a stronger economy.

I thank the Senator. I will support him wholeheartedly.

Mr. STENNIS. I appreciate very much the remarks of the Senator from Minnesota. His support is valuable. The proposal which the Senator from Minnesota mentioned with regard to further utilization of agricultural and forest products is one of the key points in this program.

Of the 12 additional projects that I propose for fiscal year 1963, the first 5 listed were ones I endorsed a year ago but were not provided for in the 1962 appropriation. They are even more badly needed now than last year.

One of them deserves special comment. The $4 million listed for the addition to the Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, Wis., would be the first stage of a construction program that will when completed cost $10 million. Other stages could follow within the next few years. As was developed in hearings before the Appropriations Subcommittee on this point last year, it is feasible to construct these Forest Products Laboratory facilities in two or three stages. The first stage is for the work on wood chemistry and pulp and paper. I have recently checked this point with officials of the Forest Service and they have confirmed that the Madison project could be efficiently constructed in stages if the full amount could not be made available at once.

The present laboratory building at Madison is overcrowded and ill adapted to the modern scientific and experimental equipment needed for the forest products research program. I have looked into this and know that additional laboratory space there is needed. It is the same story here as at many other forestry research locations: a need now for more space and better and more modern facilities for research.

Madam President, that is the story in so many words. New facilities have been developed, new processes, new ways of doing old things better and proposals for doing new things well. But the buildings that are available to house the necessary facilities in order to use them properly are simply not available.

These additions are necessary to be made to the old laboratories. Wherever they do not now exist, they must be started, and these buildings must be constructed.

The other 7 projects in the list of 12 additional I propose are for locations where going programs are underway and where their need, because of lack of space and modern experimental facilities, seems especially urgent to me. As I have said many times before, we cannot have a modern, efficient forestry research program without good laboratories and the scientific equipment and other facilities that scientists need to do productive research. The techniques and methods used today in scientific work have advanced at rates typical of the missile age. But these techniques require new equipment to capitalize on the speed and refinements they bring to the research job.

Several years ago I visited one of the laboratories, and there I found highly paid and efficient scientists, who ranked at the very top in their particular field, sitting on nail kegs and using boxes for desks, and old microscopes and equipment of that kind, in carrying on this high level work. Obviously they could not do their very best work. Obviously they did not have the tools of their trade. There now is a better laboratory at that location. Naturally these men are now doing finer work. All this illustrates one of our great resources, namely better growth and better forests and better and more products, through the utilization of new methods in connection with these related matters, which constitute one of our most vital problems for the future and which is one of the most neglected at the present time.

The planned research construction by the Forest Service would cost over the next several years an estimated sum of about $50 million. I base this estimate on the plan presented by the Department 2 years ago. My cost estimate may be too low. This previous plan, we are given to understand, has been revised by the Department and made more complete and up to date as to cost, and will be presented to the Congress at an early date. The revised forestry research plan has been made available to the Appropriations Committee in broad outline. The construction of research facilities would be planned for completion prior to fiscal year 1972. I urge that we must maintain a steady pace with a substantial yearly allowance for forestry research construction so that it can be completed during the planned period. My proposed $4,555,000 increase over the appropriated amount for research construction in 1962 would give the Forest Service $9,750,000 for fiscal year 1963 for this purpose.

This is an area that has long been neglected. It is a sound plan. We do not propose that we should try to do all this at once. We should stretch it out over the years. However, if we miss these years in between, we will create a great waste, in addition to lagging behind as we do now, and throwing the entire plan out of balance. Therefore, we must get along with this work.

RESEARCH PROGRAM INCREASES ALSO NEEDED

In addition to an increase for research construction, I am recommending an increase for research work for fiscal year 1963; that is, $6 million—$4,773,000 over the budget estimate—to provide for a more aggressive research attack on high priority problems. Accelerated research is especially needed on forest fire, insect, and disease-protection problems; on improvement of watershed management; and on forest products utilization and marketing problems.

Members of the Senate will recall vividly the newspaper, radio, and television accounts of forest fire disasters of the past year. In California, 2 recent fires destroyed 450 high-priced homes in 48 hours. Millions of dollars of damage was done to precious watersheds and further destruction of resources and property resulted from an aftermath of floods and erosion coming from the burned-over mountainside.

This is a graphic illustration of the burnt dwelling houses being just the beginning of the destruction. The erosion and destruction of the potential growth and the destruction of the watersheds, which mean so much to these areas, are the big values that are involved.

But as black as this picture appears, the relatively small research program available to the Forest Service is making some progress in solving critical fire problems. A recently developed thick water combined with a fire suppressant chemical offers new hope for firefighters. In fact, many chemicals are being evaluated and new aerial techniques evolved to make control effective. Progress such as this would be greatly speeded up by increased research on forest fire control.

Anyone who wants to get a thrill out of a group of fine young Americans who operate in this field should visit these fine young men whom the Forest Service calls fire jumpers. I did not go up with them in their planes. It is said that they are the only ones who are happy when they get a call to jump in fighting these fires.

Mr. ENGLE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. ENGLE. I should like again to interrupt the Senator from Mississippi to compliment him anew in again hitting the nail right on the head. He has referred to the disastrous fires of California and he has called attention to the fact that these fires have a double-barreled effect. They burn down property of immense value, and leave the land eroded. Then when the torrential floods come, the hillsides are washed down into the gullies, and in that way more property is ruined.

The Senator has clearly illustrated that situation, when he said that the key to the problem is to develop some kind of fire-resistant material, such as he has referred to, and thick water, and other means. I have urged some research in that area.

We held hearings on the subject in California in 1958, and we urged that that be done at that time. We have a research center in San Bernardino County.

I observe that my colleague from Mississippi has advocated some additional funds for research in this area. I propose shortly, following the distinguished Senator's speech, to elaborate on this subject somewhat and urge an expenditure of an additional $500,000 in California for this purpose. I again compliment most highly the excellent speech of the Senator from Mississippi and the fine work that he has done, and also to assure him of my support.

Mr. METCALF. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. METCALF. I hope that at the conclusion of the Senator's fine speech I shall be able to say something about some of these activities in Montana. At this point I cannot refrain from joining the Senator from California and the Senator from Minnesota in offering my compliments to the Senator from Mississippi on his great leadership in advocating the expenditure of more funds for forest research construction and more research activities. He has been a leader in this field. The money that has been spent in this activity has returned dividends many times over compared with the cost.

I interrupted the Senator's speech at this point in order to call attention to the activities of the smokejumper center at Missoula, Mont., to which the Senator has referred and which the Senator helped us to maintain.

These men at the smokejump center have worked all over the West. Some of them have been killed in their activity. They have saved millions of acres of timber and millions of dollars because they have been able to apply the new facilities which have been developed as a result of the research activities in the laboratory. They have been able to apply these special chemicals to forest fires at the earliest possible moment, and in that way have brought about tremendous savings of money and timber. The activity of the smokejumpers alone, along with the development of new firefighting techniques, has more than paid for the cost of the laboratories and the production of research facilities which the Federal Government has established in these activities. I hope I may have further comments to make at the conclusion of the Senator's speech. However, at this point I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator for his most gracious remarks. I am aware that he knows his subject and is vitally interested in the problem.

I should like to make one more comment about the smokejumpers. It is a good tonic for any American to go out and talk to the men who fight fire with parachutes from the air. It is a thrill to go to where they are stationed with their planes and to observe their fine spirit of willingness. I understand they have to be trained for only about 90 days before they become proficient in the use of parachutes, as well as in firefighting. I think the record is that a man has never been lost by falling or jumping, but that lives have been lost because men have been cut off behind the fire and have been burned to death.

I asked the men how they avoided landing in the trees. They said they were trained and tried to land in the trees; that this is a good way to get safely to the ground.

Mr. ELLENDER. Madam President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish to join with other Senators in paying tribute to the Senator from Mississippi, who has been the leader in this field. Only a few days ago I said to the Senate that I was surprised to learn that $900,000 which we requested to construct a utilization research laboratory in Louisiana, particularly to solve the problem of increased uses of southern pine, and this item was not approved by the Bureau of the Budget. It was my privilege to visit, last winter, a number of towns in Louisiana that are dependent on the southern pine industry. The people there are very much disturbed because, although Louisiana is becoming green with timber again, no effort is being made to find ways and means to utilize the timber which is now being grown. I am sure the Senator from Mississippi knows that in his State and my State—in fact, in quite a few of the States of the South—large areas of hardwood are being destroyed to make way for pastureland.

Imagine the good that would come from a program of finding ways and means to grow and utilize hardwoods on land which is now being used for pasture. I hope that we may continue the fight which is being led by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, and that Congress will provide sufficient funds with which to construct the laboratory.

In my judgment, the creation of this laboratory in Louisiana will not in any way detract from or duplicate work prepared in Madison, Wis. The laboratory there was established when the lumber people in that area were in trouble. It grew from a small start to the point where it is now the leading laboratory of the country in this field. However its work must be augmented and aided by other regional laboratories.

It seems to me that we are in great need of additional research in this field. I hope that the Congress will approve this appropriation of $900,000 to establish a needed laboratory in Alexandria, La., to find ways and means to increase utilization not only of hardwoods but also of the thousands of southern pine trees which are being planted in all parts of the South.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Louisiana. No one has a better knowledge of the research and needs than does he. No one does more work in this field in a very constructive role because of his alertness to the need in his own area.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. All the laboratories listed here, except one which operates on a large scale, cost a modest amount, relatively speaking. They begin at $150,000; another cost $200,000; another cost $900,000; another cost $300,000. One of the lowest in price is only $150,000. Another one is $400,000; there is one for $900,000; and the last one is for $450,000. They are not expensive; they do not involve costly programs. The program is operated more or less on an austerity basis for a highly essential work.

This is a case, too, if I may suggest it, in which the thinking of the legislative branch of the Government and its leadership is running ahead of that of the executive branch and the Budget Bureau. I think the reason is that the Members of both Houses are closer to the problem and realize the potential of these new means to further utilization. Progress such as this would be greatly speeded up by research in many fields, of which forest fire control is one of the most important.

Other major forest protection problems are the heavy losses suffered from insect and disease depredations. These pests cost Federal, State, and private agencies millions of dollars every year for control measures.

Think of that. The destruction each year through insects and disease in the forest is roughly equal to the amount of wood that is used in a year. That includes the national forests and the great areas of forest land which are privately owned.

It is hard to put a real value on the damage these pests cause, although we know they destroy or eliminate growth of timber roughly equal to the total wood we use. So, it is encouraging to know that real progress is being made on some pests. For example, painstaking research on chemical formulations and methods of application have resulted in control methods that cost but a fraction of earlier ones. In the West, control of a pine needle insect in one area was achieved at a savings of $100,000 over the cost of the old method. An antibiotic has been found and proved effective in controlling the white pine blister rust disease in Idaho. This significant discovery will bring back into production 1 million acres of the valuable white pine.

Madam President, there is a practical illustration of white pine blister rust which has taken out of production something like a million acres. This discovery, which cost a small amount of money, will bring that wood back to production.

This brief list of achievements of forestry research scientists could easily be expanded. But even these few examples will show how research is paying off in better forestry. I am confident that a speedup in research on fire, insect, and disease problems will return the cost many times over in forest resources saved and in reduced expenditures for forest protection control measures.

This is no theory of mine. As we walk through the forests, many times we see the effects of disease upon the leaves and the limbs. There are innumerable instances, as one passes from one acre to another. That shows the need for the search for remedies and the application of those remedies. It is obvious what the payoff would be.

Another important field of research that needs additional strengthening is watershed management. America's forests and related rangelands are our major water-producing lands. Their maintenance in a productive condition, free of erosion, is a complex technical job because these same lands must also produce timber, forage, recreation, and fish and wildlife.

I marvel at the skill and ingenuity of the research men who probe into the secrets of better watershed management. In one high-mountain study in Colorado, they have found out how to increase the yield of water produced from the snowpack by 20 percent. Here is a source of additional water for irrigation, domestic supply, and industrial use in an area where water is the key to future domestic and industrial expansion. Research results of these kinds are returning many times over the small cost of the research programs.

A few years ago, I visited a large Marine Corps installation in California, where I was greeted by the commanding officer, a general. The first thing he said was: "I want you to know that since I have been in command here we have not wasted one barrel of water."

I come from a part of the country where we sometimes have excessive rainfall. I was impressed with his statement and did not understand his emphasis. However, after spending a couple of days with him on that fine reservation, I realized just how important it was to conserve every barrel of water. I joined with him then in his evaluation. I think that it should go in his record that he, the commanding officer of the vast installation, could achieve so fine a record of conserving water. It illustrates the problem with which our western friends, as well as our friends from other parts of the country, are confronted. That problem is tied directly into our forestry program and the research in connection with it.

This is true in the eastern as well as in the western forests. In North Carolina, on the well-known Coweeta Experimental Forest, scientists have developed methods for logging timber in keeping with good soil and water conservation. Many of these research results are being applied today.

But we need far more intensive effort on still unanswered problems in many regions. In New England, the Lake States, the Southwest, and the Deep South—in all parts of the Nation—we have forest watershed problems. We must get on with the forest water and soils program of research that is so sorely needed.

Certainly forest-products research deserves the special attention which we urge be given to it.

I am told that about three-fourths of all the precipitation that falls on the United States, actually falls on forest land. It is in the forests that water and soil problems can and do start, and research can help solve them. Forest watershed research must be stepped up now if we are going to get the answers in time to point the way to better erosion control, more effective flood abatement, and better water yields for the irrigated agriculture and the industrial developments that so heavily depend upon water from these watersheds.

Forest-products research deserves our special attention. The pulp and paper research of the Forest Products Laboratory, for example, has led directly to methods that open up markets for species of trees heretofore unsuited for certain paper products. That work has been particularly valuable in many areas of the Nation. New knowledge from basic research on fiber bonding is speeding the papermaking process and is reducing unit costs to a point where marginal sizes and heretofore little-used species of trees can now be profitably harvested and marketed. In my State—in fact, all over the South—the pulp and paper industry is our very lifeblood. It provides thousands of jobs and hundreds of millions of dollars of income every year. New knowledge such as I describe keeps an abundant raw material base for this industry. The landowners benefit by having a market for their lower quality timber, as well as for the more readily marketable high-quality trees.

Madam President, a few years ago I made an all-day visit in and around Natchez, Miss., which was the first cotton empire to develop following Eli Whitney's invention of the cotton gin, which made cotton a fiber with wide uses. Although in that area the cotton is almost gone, I found that on the edge of that city the International Paper Co. had established a large unit which was producing from pulpwood a very high quality rayon which also is used in the manufacture of some of the modern fibers and clothing. That shows how close to the economy, as a practical matter, these programs are.

The need for strengthening research on forest products utilization and marketing is especially essential in the Nation's areas of chronic underemployment. Almost all these areas are characterized by abundant forest land. The forests represent their principal raw material. There is a great deal of forest land in these difficult areas, but much of the timber is of small size and of poor quality for traditional uses. Research is needed to develop new uses and markets for it. Better marketing systems need to be developed, so that a more efficient flow of a broad variety of products gets into industrial channels, with reasonable profits all along the line. All this will mean new jobs, more abundant wood products, and flourishing wood industries. All our people, and especially those in these underdeveloped forest-industry areas, would benefit.

One example will demonstrate how wood utilization and marketing research pays off. I am told that in recent years more than 60 sawmills have either shut down or operated at a loss in the State of Maine. The problem was the low quality of the white pine logs on which these mills had to depend. These mills produced such knotty lumber that a profit could not be realized. Just a few months ago, a team of forestry research experts found a way to organize the conversion of lumber from these operations, so that major defects in the low-quality lumber would be cut out and the small, clear pieces would be glued into high-grade boards that bring a premium price. A new processing plant now being planned by industry will provide a market outlet for the products of small sawmills. This new market should enable most of the shutdown mills to resume operations and to employ hundreds of workers once more.

In addition to the various programs I have cited as in need of an accelerated attack, there are other essential ones. These include research on the problems of reforestation, forest genetics, timber growing, range management, improvement of wildlife habitat, and forest recreation. Our forestry research program should move ahead in a balanced way, since many of the forestry problems are interrelated, and their solutions cannot be found in a lopsided or uncoordinated hit-or-miss fashion.

In concluding, let me say this: America's future and our system of life are based on a philosophy of abundance. We are richly blessed with natural resources. But we must manage these resources wisely and we must utilize them intelligently. The increases I am proposing for forestry research are an insignificant price to pay for the benefits that will flow from a rich and varied base of wood, water, forage, wildlife, and recreation. Let us keep America's scientific knowledge moving ahead on every front, and particularly on the front of research in connection with our forests, which, as I have said, constitute America's prime reproducible natural resource.

Mr. METCALF. Madam President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. Again I wish to congratulate the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Stennis] for his splendid speech on the need for forest research and forest-research laboratory construction. As I looked at the list of additional laboratories proposed, I observed that not one would be located in my State. Yet, as the Senator from Mississippi has pointed out, these forestry-research programs are interrelated; and laboratories established in Minnesota or at Madison, Wis., are vitally related to the best utilization of the forest in Mississippi or Montana.

One year ago a new forestry-research laboratory was authorized for Bozeman, Mont. This project is now under construction, and will be ready to be occupied 1 year hence. We need to push vigorously ahead now with implementation of the research program for this important station in the northern Rocky Mountains. The proposal of the Senator from Mississippi to strengthen forestry research on utilization and engineering is therefore timely.

The research at Bozeman emphasizes the forest engineering aspects of timber harvesting with at least two highly important objectives: First, more profitable systems of harvesting, transporting, and handling the small-sized but abundant lodgepole pine timber; and second, safe methods of logging in mountain areas where slopes are steep and soils highly erodible. Prior to this research activity, the lodgepole pine was regarded as a weed tree, something to get rid of, something that handicapped forestry operations. But now it has been found to be a valuable forest product which, if properly utilized, is an important additional resource. Both of these problems require new and unique engineering systems. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Stennis] has proposed that these research programs be speeded up and strengthened. The work at Bozeman by the Forest Service research scientists is in cooperation with Montana State College engineers. The arrangement is working well and is highly productive. It needs greater support now for a harder attack on these pressing problems.

A proposal to strengthen forest-fire research also has much merit.

I have already referred to the fact that at Missoula, Mont., we have a good start, in the new laboratory there, on solving many troublesome fire-control problems. Promising early results of lightning-storm modification suggest that intensified efforts will pay big dividends in future fire prevention. Studies of how to control fires by new aerial methods, chemicals, and a whole new technology are needed if we are to cut the high cost of control and if we are to reduce excessive damage to our forest resources. The laboratory at Missoula is well equipped to handle an accelerated fire research program; and we need to speed up the development of the new techniques for the handling of these problems.

Again I congratulate the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Stennis] for his outstanding leadership in calling this matter to the attention of the Senate and for the fine statement he has made in support of this program.

Mr. STENNIS. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Montana very much.

I may say that last year the Members of both Houses who are interested in the program made much progress. This year, additional progress in this field will be more difficult, for we shall have to justify fully any increases outside of the budget. But by working together and pushing vigorously, I am sure we can make some headway.

Madam President, before I conclude, I wish to say that the Forest Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture is, in my opinion, one of the truly great services in the Federal Government; and it includes the management at the scientific level and the direction of the workers in the field, including the smoke jumpers and other groups which I have found to be highly effective. Those who are engaging in this work are devoted to their missions and are very much interested in obtaining results. I think they personify the Government service at its very best, and I am glad to commend them highly. They are gradually bringing into being finer and finer forests, which constitute one of our Nation's great resources; and unnumbered generations ahead of us will benefit from their very fine work. So I am very glad to commend them.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record, a statement prepared by the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], who could not be on the floor today.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MOSS

First of all, may I commend the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, Mr. Stennis, for his efforts to increase Forest Service research activities, and offer him my full support. Nothing is more important than sound resource development of our public domain, and adequate research is the basis for such development.

The watershed research laboratory proposed for establishment at the Utah State University at Logan in northern Utah would facilitate research in watershed management in the high mountain areas of the Intermountain West. It would serve not only Utah, but Idaho, Montana, western Wyoming, and Nevada, as a research arm of the U.S. Forest Service regional office which is located at Ogden, Utah.

The estimated cost of the laboratory is $900,000, with $600,000 needed for the basic structure. I sincerely hope the full amount can be written into the fiscal year 1963 appropriations, and I shall take all proper steps to see that this is done.

Water is extremely important in the entire Intermountain area to agriculture, industry, and livestock production. The amount of water produced on high watersheds, and the timing of the yield, all contribute to whether there is enough water in some years, and at certain times in every year, to sustain the industries, animals, and individuals depending on that water. The proper management of wildlife, timber growing, and grazing are all part of the problem.

The uncertain water supply situation of the Intermountain area is at least partly due to unsatisfactory soil and vegetative cover conditions on many of the forest and range watersheds. There have been some serious and destructive floods in the Great Basin area in Utah. Almost all of these floors have been traced to heavy rainstorms falling on watershed areas having poor vegetation cover and subject to much soil erosion. These are unusual and difficult soil areas, where growing vegetation requires special attention; yet they are critical areas to control excess runoff and erosion and flooding.

The Logan laboratory will facilitate the study of soils, their erodibility, and their suitability for growing vegetation for rehabilitating the unsatisfactory watersheds. It will also help to develop types of vegetation suitable to such harsh conditions for establishment and growth.

The hydraulic behavior of water in steep mountain streams will also be a subject for study at the laboratory. These stream channels are unstable for the most part, and every spring when the snow is melting and in the summer when heavy storms strike, large quantities of soil and rock are carried into the storage reservoirs and irrigation systems. It is costly and time consuming to clean this material from the storage areas and ditches in the valleys.

The laboratory will permit studies with models of how water behaves in stream channels of this kind and the types of small structures and other streambank improvements that may be helpful in stabilizing mountain stream channels. In this regard, this facility will serve a large part of the steep mountain areas of the Western United States.

In conclusion, I again reiterate my support of the Senator from Mississippi in his efforts to increase construction funds in the fiscal year 1963 budget for Forest Service research facilities, and especially for the construction of a Forest Watershed Management Laboratory in Utah.

Mr. ENGLE. Madam President, again I wish to say for the Record that I sincerely compliment the Senator from Mississippi on the great speech he has made today with reference to a subject matter which is vital not only to the area from which he comes, but to the Far West.

A CRASH PROGRAM OF FOREST FIRE RESEARCH

A few months ago people everywhere across the Nation were once more made keenly aware of the critical forest fire problem we have in California. They read of it in the newspapers, heard it on the radio. Many persons saw television broadcasts of fires sweeping through southern California mountains. They saw expensive homes being consumed by the flames. In one short 48-hour period, more than 450 homes were destroyed in the Los Angeles area.

As the Senator from Mississippi has pointed out, some of these floods were directly related to last year's destructive brushfires.

I asked the Forest Service to prepare a memorandum on the results of damage from burned areas in southern California, and I ask unanimous consent that that memorandum be made a part of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREST SERVICE,
Pasadena, Calif., February 12, 1962.

DIRECTORS, P.S.W.F. & R.E.S.
(Attention of Walt Hopkins, T. D. Robertson, Assistant Forest Supervisor, by Information Services (watershed)):

Regarding your telephone request this morning for information for Herbert Storey, of the Washington office, and Senator CLARE ENGLE, on the flood conditions after the recent southern California rainstorm. The following information has been obtained from a personal survey by Supervisor Jarvi, our flood control engineers, and information from the Los Angeles County Flood Control District.

Before listing individual canyon totals, in the Angeles National Forest and the condition as of today: the recent 5-day storm totaled a maximum 22.85 inches of rain at the Cogswell Dam, inside the forest on the West Fork of the San Gabriel River. This brings the season's total to date to 38 inches at this location in the forest. A normal seasonal total is 33 inches, so we are far ahead of our normal at this point.

Running from west to east, along the front country of the forest, the following observations were made from these surveys:

Pacoima Dam: Watershed unburned north of San Fernando. Twenty-five percent capacity, releasing some water for water conservation and spreading basins. No flood problems in this area. Average runoff. Debris production minimum.

Little Tujunga Canyon: Portions of the watershed burned in 1960 and 1961 north of San Fernando. No extensive flooding problems. Drainage directly into Hansen Dam in Los Angeles City. Extensive highway damage due to washouts and slides in the burned area. Estimate 2 days to reopen. Some scattered ranch homes isolated due to swollen streams. Debris problems in large dam.

Big Tujunga Canyon: Partially burned watershed in 1959. Extensive highway slides and washouts. Estimate 1 to 2 days to reopen. Debris production heavy.

Big Tujunga Dam: No burned area above dam. No problems, not much debris. Four thousand cubic feet per second over spillway. One hundred percent retention at lower Hansen Dam for water conservation. Scattered ranches and homes stranded by road washouts, but no severe hardships.

Arroyo Seco Canyon: Completely burned watershed in 1959. Heavy silt production into Devil's Gate Dam. Cooperative channel clearing project by Forest Service personnel financed by Los Angeles County Flood Control District and Pasadena Water Department, prevented blocking of channel by trees and other debris.

Devil's Gate Dam: Average discharge. Dam filled to 80-percent capacity. Releases being made.

Eaton Canyon Dam: No burned watershed. No debris problems. Average streamflow. One hundred percent retention for water conservation.

Santa Anita Canyon, north of Arcadia: Santa Anita Dam, 1,600 cubic feet per second over spillway. Retention of majority for water conservation and spreading basins. No debris movement due to effectiveness of stabilization dams upstream built by Forest Service under Los Angeles River program. Same conditions for Sawpit Canyon.

Hastings Canyon: Completely burned watershed in 1961. Emergency channel diversion dam operating efficiently preventing flooding of many expensive homes in lower subdivisions. This was a cooperatively financed project by U.S. Forest Service and Los Angeles County Flood Control District immediately after the Sierra fire. Immediately to the east a small watershed extensively damaged two expensive homes. Lower debris dam extensive filling with mud, rocks, and other debris.

Sierra Madre: Some localized flooding and washouts directly below the denuded area. Several homes damaged.

San Gabriel Canyon: Burned watershed of 1960 and 1961. Extensive highway slides closing all roads. Estimate 2 to 3 days to reopen. Highway inundated and washed out in places. Extensive runoff into San Gabriel dam No. 1,. Considerable silt and debris production.

San Dimas Canyon eastward: No additional problems reported. Heavy damage occurred during previous storms.

This generally is the picture with regard to the Angeles National Forest and foothill areas. With relation to the Bel-Air-Los Angeles City area, extensive flooding and backyard mudflows were experienced in the Roscoemare Road area. In the entire Hollywood Hills section, bordered by Ventura Boulevard on the north, Sunset Boulevard on the south, Beachwood Drive on the east, and in the vicinty of Sepulveda on the west, land slippage occurred on many hillside areas as well as debris production and improvement damage due to the Bel-Air fire.

In Sherman Oaks a fatality did occur to a child when a slide moved into the rear of a house and into the bedroom suffocating the victim. Another fatality occurred in the Monterey Park hills east of Los Angeles when the same type of land slippage problem occurred at a home in a new development. Neither of these two fatalities had relation to burned areas. Most of the newspaper accounts relate to the low-lying south portion of Los Angeles.

In general, from the surveys it was noted that chaparral watershed in good condition flowed freely with clear water, no problems in erosion or in flooding were noted. In those watersheds where fire had recently occurred extensive damage was noted. Undoubtedly the damage would have been more extensive had the rainfall not have been spread over 5 days and been of low intensities which varied from 0.20 to 0.40 inches per hour. Extensive damage has been experienced in the forest from washouts and slides to forest fire roads (truck trails).

Soil conditions were such that low intensities were absorbed without heavy runoff.

At this writing, both the private weather consultants to the Los Angeles County Flood Control District as well as the U.S. Weather Bureau, are predicting another storm of the same type as we have just experienced, to hit southern California some time Wednesday and to last through Saturday. With watersheds in their present saturated condition a new storm would spell disaster.

DON K. PORTER.

Mr. ENGLE. Madam President, the State of California had 3,300 forest and brush fires in 1961. This was a record number. They burned 315,000 acres. Besides the tremendous damage to valuable timber stands and watersheds, they inflicted the greatest loss of improved property in suburban areas that the State has ever experienced. Damages will run into the millions of dollars. Although the final total has not yet been determined, we know the losses are staggering, and there is no way to put a dollar value on human lives lost.

This is not the first time that the seriousness of the forest fire problem has been recognized. In October of 1957 I was chairman of a special subcommittee and held hearings in southern California. It was obvious then, as it is now, that forest fire problems in this area are more acute than anywhere else in the country. Since 1957, fire problems statewide have worsened. Weather has continued to be critical. We have hundreds of thousands more people using the forests and increasing the risk of fire. Values at stake have mounted rapidly as urban and industrial developments have mushroomed into forest areas.

In spite of increased effort by county, State, Federal, and private agencies, fire losses and fire control costs continue to rise. Some progress has been made in getting better firefighting equipment. Fire control forces have done a herculean job. Increased funds have been made available. Last year almost one-third of the total emergency fire funds used in the 155 national forests and 18 national grasslands were expended on the 4 southern California national forests. But the plain fact is, brute strength has not and will not solve the problem.

A NEW TECHNOLOGY IS NEEDED

As laudable as present fire control efforts are and as necessary as it may be to continue to maintain them, something new must be added. In 1957 our subcommittee recognized this. It recommended a strong research program that would show the way to a new technology—a fresh approach to old problems.

I firmly believe that our only hope of solving the forest fire problem is through a crash program of fire research. I do not mean a one-shot program. I do mean a total and sustained research effort with all the stops pulled out—one that is daring, farsighted, and imaginative. It is reasonable to believe that fire control technology can be advanced.

In this respect I propose to support vigorously and wholeheartedly the 12-point program advocated by the Senator from Mississippi.

The trouble is we have been too timid and too modest in what we have tried. Scientists have been limited by lack of strong financial support, working with hundreds of dollars while millions were being poured into control programs. It is time we got started on a thorough, imaginative, and speedup program .of research.

CONTENTS OF A NEW RESEARCH PROGRAM

At least three major phases of the overall fire problem should be vigorously attacked in a speedup fire research program: First, fuel hazard reduction; second, prevention of man-caused fires; and third, improvement of firefighting with chemicals.

Other new ideas and leads may open up as research on these three important problems move ahead.

Fuel hazard reduction research is needed to find a way to break up the large brush fields in California which often extend, without material interruption, for miles. Under severe burning conditions, no present method of firefighting can stop a fire until it runs out of fuel. We need to know how these large brush fields can be strategically and effectively broken into strips or blocks and separated by greenbelts or areas with low-growing, less-flammable vegetation. Here is a real challenge for research to bring skill and ingenuity to a difficult program.

The added risk created by thousands of people requires new and positive advances in fire prevention. We must find effective methods of keeping fires from starting, especially under critical conditions. Maybe this can be achieved through research on better methods of getting the message across to people. Maybe it will require new methods to fireproof roadside, campgrounds, or other critical areas. I am convinced we need a new and thorough research job done on how better to prevent man-caused fires.

Now, with respect to better firefighting chemicals and methods to use them in fire control: In the last few years the use of fire retardants has grown by leaps and bounds, and with good results. Last year, I am told, 8 million gallons were cascaded on fires on the national forests. But this is expensive business. Results are not as good as they could be. Research has advanced in this field, but not far enough or fast enough. Not only are better chemicals needed, but aerial techniques can be improved. One estimate I have suggests that $1.5 million could be saved in 1 year just through the development of more effective and precise methods of delivering retardants by air.

FUNDS NEEDED FOR CRASH PROGRAM

To attack the foregoing three problems aggressively in California would require an increase of $500,000 per year.

The Senator from Mississippi advocated an increase of the budget in these areas of $4 million, and I hope we can get into that program and use a part of that money for this purpose.

I strongly urge that this amount be added to the Forest Service fire research appropriation estimate in the fiscal year 1963 budget as submitted to the Congress. While this research is badly needed in California, it would also benefit the rest of the country where forest fire problems occur.

The distinguished junior Senator from Montana mentioned that point just a few minutes ago. Certainly, anything we do in California with respect to fire research will be helpful in any part of the country.

The cost of this acceleration in fire research would be more than offset by preventing only one major conflagration. I do not know what the total fire fighting bill may have been in California in 1961, but I dare say we could support the kind of a speedup research program I am talking about—10 to 20 years—on just 1 year's direct outlay for fire control.

It would be poor economy to go longer without an all-out effort to create a new fire control technology. The potential savings in resources, human lives, and direct dollar outlay make this one of the best investments of our time. I strongly recommend and urge that an additional $500,000 be made available for forest fire research in the Southwest.

TIMBER MANAGEMENT AND UTILIZATION LABORATORY, REDDING, CALIF.

A timber management and utilization laboratory at Redding, Calif., costing an estimated $450,000, is badly needed to provide the research scientists already working in Redding with the facilities they now lack.

The Senator from Mississippi has included this item among the ones he mentioned.

The proposed laboratory would house the research being done on reforesting the 2 million acres of brush fields that now occupy much productive land in northern California.

It would speed research on insect pests that threaten billions of board feet of valuable timber. And the new laboratory would provide for research on wood utilization problems peculiar to the large and varied timber industry of the State.

Again, Madam President, I concur with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] with respect to the need for more research on better wood utilization.

A great deal of fine research has been accomplished in northern California. We have seen new hybrid trees developed that are now ready for large-scale use. But additional problems such as conversion of brush fields to plantable conditions, must be solved. The program needs additional emphasis and the proposed laboratory at Redding will supply the equipment and other facilities needed for this work.

PEST CONTROL

Madam President, pest control has gone forward for many years, but we have not had enough of it. I say that the "Insect Logging Co." cuts more timber than any commercial operation in the United States. I hope we can cut down the productive activities of the "Insect Logging Co." and preserve those trees for the kinds of use we should be making of them.

Finally, Madam President, I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate a study made on forest fire control in southern California by a special subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives in the 85th Congress, 1st session. The hearings were held in Los Angeles, Calif., and in the adjacent area. They were attended by me, as chairman of the subcommittee; Representative James A. Haley, of Florida; Representative George A. Shuford, of North Carolina; Representative B. F. Sisk, of California; Representative Stewart L. Udall, of Arizona, who is now the Secretary of the Interior; Representative John P. Saylor, of Pennsylvania; Representative Craig Hosmer, of California; and Representative John J. Rhodes, of Arizona.

These hearings developed a definitive analysis of the special type of fire control problem we have in southern California, where our forests are mainly brushlands and where, in the past fall, there were devastating floods which led to the disastrous sweep of the torrential rains in recent weeks in southern California. These cut, we might say, like a double-bitted ax, well known in the lumber industry. The ax of fire cuts one way, as it burns down the timber and denudes the hillsides; and then the ax of rain comes along, sweeping the soil from the hillsides down into the gulleys and valleys, ruining valuable property.

In conclusion, Madam President, I wish to say I hope that the program the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] has advocated will go forward with speed. It will have my enthusiastic support. I feel that nothing is more important than broadening our knowledge with reference to the utilization and the conservation of the basic resources of this Nation.

Mr. HART subsequently said: Mr. President, I wish to subscribe to the excellent presentation made by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] on the need for adequate funds for forestry research. His factual statement on the Nation's needs should be fully persuasive.

In particular I support the inclusion, among the priority items for construction, of the forest engineering laboratory at Houghton, Mich. The purpose of this laboratory, to be constructed at an estimated cost of $400,000, will be to solve engineering problems associated with forest management and utilization peculiar to the hardwood forests of Northern and Eastern United States. It will provide the facilities urgently needed for research in mechanization of operations for converting deteriorated northern timber stands and deforested areas to improved species and culture, including removal of brush and large cull trees and transport of forest products to primary plants.

Even at the current rate, the harvesting of forest products in the Lake States is a materials handling job of major proportions—approximately 15 million tons per year. By the time this material is handled and re-handled by present inefficient methods the total annual tonnage is estimated to exceed 120 million tons. Vastly improved systems are needed.

The laboratory will be located adjacent to the planned expanded campus of the Michigan College of Mining and Technology, an outstanding engineering, educational, and research institution with which the Forest Service now has and expects to continue cooperative projects in forest products and engineering research. Much specialized skill and equipment necessary in a program of forest engineering research are available on a cooperative basis at the college and will not be duplicated in the proposed laboratory.

I hope the Congress will see fit to allow us to move forward on these projects—which, as the Senator from Mississippi noted, will mean new jobs, more abundant wood products, and flourishing wood industries.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana subsequently said: Mr. President, unfortunately, I was not able to be here when the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] spoke earlier today on the forestry research program proposed by the administration for fiscal 1963. However, I wish to associate myself with him in his remarks, and I want to express my appreciation to him for drawing attention to the fact that altogether too little is being done in the important area of forestry research.

As Senator STENNIS pointed out, the 1963 budget calls for an appropriation of $23,150,000, which is $3,218,000 below the 1962 budget. And the reason that the 1963 budget is below that of 1962 is because there is a $4½ million decrease in the all-important item of construction of facilities for forestry research. As a matter of fact, there is no money in the proposed budget for construction of new facilities for forestry research. Only the adding on to existing laboratories would be permitted.

Now, certainly, there is a need for expansion of some of the present forestry research stations; but there is just as great a need for the establishment of new facilities to handle the particular problems peculiar to certain areas, if not more.

Such a new facility is urgently needed at Alexandria, La. The forest utilization, protection, and forestation laboratory which has been talked of for Alexandria is high on the priority list of new research stations to be built. Senator STENNIS ranked it second of 12 additional construction projects which he thinks should be put in the 1963 forestry research program, and he estimated its cost at $900,000.

The present needs for the Alexandria laboratory are several. There is no market for 30 percent of the trees now being grown in the South. Forest growth has doubled, but lumber production has dropped 40 percent in the past 20 years in the South. There is a rapidly declining market for trees reaching maturity, causing a great hardship on the small growers, who had been encouraged by the U.S. Forest Service to get into tree farming.

The poor conditions prevailing in the tree-growing industry of the South will soon mean that there will be a decline in the growth of trees in that section or that there will have to be a costly Federal subsidy given to landowners to grow trees which cannot be sold. We all know the undesirability of such a subsidy, but it may not be realized that a decline in the growth of trees cannot be permitted to happen either. The Forest Service has indicated that, rather than decline, the South's forest productivity must double its present level in order to meet national wood requirements in 40 years and to take up the slack when the forestry resources of the West are exhausted.

So, the problem is that while there is no abundance of market for southern-grown timber now, there will become a great need for such timber in as few as 13 years, and, at the outside, 40 years. A tree planted in the South today will barely be large enough to cut for pulpwood in 1975, and will not produce sawlogs until the year 2000. So, we must keep the trees growing. But in order to do that and still keep the growers interested, we must make it profitable.

This is where such a facility as the research laboratory, at Alexandria, comes in. It can lead the way in developing new products from wood, in developing new and better methods of manufacturing and in developing new and better markets for wood.

Therefore, I strongly urge Congress to adopt Senator STENNIS' proposal to increase the 1963 budget for forestry research by $10,555,000, bringing the figure up to $36,923,000. And especially do I recommend that the 1963 budget figure of the research facilities construction program be increased by the approximately $9 million necessary to take care of the cost of the 12 new laboratories outlined by Senator STENNIS.

NEW FRONTIER CORRECTS ITS FANCY BOOKKEEPING

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Madam President, last Monday I called attention to some fancy bookkeeping on the New Frontier wherein the Department of Agriculture was issuing reports showing $1½ billion reduction in the Government's investment in inventories of surplus agriculture commodities as compared with the previous year, when in reality on practically every commodity except cotton there had been increases in inventory. I pointed out that the November 1961 report indicated that there had been a $1,400 million reduction in the inventories of three commodities—wheat, corn, and grain sorghums—when in reality there had been increases in all three.

The Department of Agriculture has just issued another report dated February 13, 1962, and I am glad to note that they correct this discrepancy. In their new report, February 13, 1962, they have retroactively readjusted the December 31, 1960, valuation of inventories from the old method of computation to the new method. This had the result of reducing the amount which had previously been reported from $9,228,604,000 to $7,908,135,000 as of the same date. This lower figure for December 31, 1960, results from the New Frontier style of valuation.

Thus, in their new report for February 13, 1962, they recognize and correct a discrepancy as compared with the previous accounting system of $1,320,469,000.

By using the same formula for evaluating the inventories last year as presently being applied, the Department of Agriculture now shows a reduction in overall inventories in surplus agriculture commodities of only $222,209,000.

I accept this latter figure as accurate, and I hope that in future releases no further reference will be made by any of the administration officials trying to claim the fictitious $1½ billion reduction.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD first the report issued by the Department of Agriculture under date of January 12, 1962, wherein the new style of valuation is compared with the old method, thus indicating a $1½ billion reduction in value of agriculture inventories. Next I ask to have printed in the RECORD their report of February 13, 1962, showing both December 31, 1960, and December 31, 1961, adjusted on a comparable basis with the result that they now claim only a $222 million reduction. This represents a correction of $1,320,469,000 in their previous claim.

There being no objection, the reports were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CCC OPERATING RESULTS AND STATUS OF CCC PRICE-SUPPORT PROGRAM AS OF DECEMBER 31, 1961

PRICE-SUPPORT LOANS AND INVENTORIES

The U.S. Department of Agriculture reported today that as of December 31 the total investment of Commodity Credit Corporation in price-support loans and inventories amounted to $7,685,946,000. This total investment includes loans outstanding of $2,437,470,000 (lending agencies financed $895,220,000 of these loans) and inventories amounting to $5,248,476,000.

The December 31 estimate of the loss which will be realized upon ultimate disposition of price-support inventories amounted to $1,655,306,000, comprised of $174,734,000 estimated loss on commodities under loan and $1,480,572,000 estimated loss on inventories. These amounts of estimated losses are reflected as reserves for losses in the December 31 financial statements of the Corporation.

A comparison of total investment, the reserves for losses, and the net book value as of December 31, 1961 and 1960, follows:

	Investment	Reserve for losses	Net book value
Dec. 31, 1961:			
Loans	$2,437,470,000	$174,734,000	$2,262,736,000
Inventories	5,248,476,000	1,480,572,000	3,767,904,000
Total	7,685,946,000	1,655,306,000	6,030,640,000
Dec. 31, 1960:			
Loans	1,829,051,000	179,269,000	1,649,782,000
Inventories (revised)	6,079,084,000	1,805,607,000	4,273,477,000
Total	7,908,135,000	1,984,876,000	5,923,259,000

NOTE.—In order to facilitate comparisons with amounts reported for Dec. 31, 1961, and the current fiscal year, designated amounts in this press release which relate to dates or periods prior to June 30, 1961, have been revised in accordance with the changes in accounting policy adopted by Commodity Credit Corporation as of June 30, 1961. (See press release USDA 3157-61, dated Sept. 28, 1961, for explanation of the accounting policy changes.)

CCC Operating Results and Status of CCC Price-Support Program as of November 30, 1961

PRICE-SUPPORT LOANS AND INVENTORIES

The U.S. Department of Agriculture reported today that as of November 30 the total investment of Commodity Credit Corporation in price-support loans and inventories amounted to $7,647,236,000. This total investment includes loans outstanding of $2,206,223,000 (lending agencies financed $716,756,000 of these loans) and inventories amounting to $5,441,013,000.

The November 30 estimate of the loss which will be realized upon ultimate disposition of price-support inventories amounted to $1,530,503,000, comprised of $165,401,000 estimated loss on commodities under loan and $1,365,102,000 estimated loss on inventories. These amounts of estimated losses are reflected as reserves for losses in the November 30 financial statements of the Corporation.

A comparison of total investment, the reserves for losses, and the net book value as of November 30, 1961, and 1960, follows:

	Investment	Reserve for losses	Net book value
Nov. 30, 1961:			
Loans	$2,206,223,000	$165,401,000	$2,040,822,000
Inventories	5,441,013,000	1,365,102,000	4,075,911,000
Total	7,647,236,000	1,530,503,000	6,116,733,000
Nov. 30, 1960:			
Loans	1,636,232,000	185,966,000	1,450,266,000
Inventories [1]	7,513,855,000	3,213,301,000	4,300,554,000
Total	9,150,087,000	3,399,267,000	5,750,820,000

[1] Investment in inventories as of Nov. 30, 1960, included storage, handling and transportation costs, incurred subsequent to acquisition; costs of storing on farms certain grain commodities while under extended loans prior to acquisition; and certain loan financing expenses. Such costs were removed from inventory accounts as of June 30, 1961, and similar costs incurred thereafter are recorded as operating expenses. Exclusion of such costs from investment value of inventories has the effect of reducing the reserve for losses; therefore, net book value of inventories is not affected.

OVERCHARGE TO GOVERNMENT UNDER NEGOTIATED CONTRACT FOR SPARE PARTS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Madam President, today I call attention to a recent report—January 31, 1962—of the Comptroller General wherein he outlines another instance whereby under a negotiated $3 million contract for spare parts—stage units and tuned circuits—the Government was overcharged by 33⅓ percent.

The Comptroller General in this report points out that the Magnavox Co., Fort Wayne, Ind., obtained this $1 million overpayment by failing to show the Government the true production costs of the parts being purchased.

Magnavox failed to reveal the fact that at the time of the negotiations they already had offers from subcontractors to build these parts far below those prices which were quoted; for instance, one part of the contract called for 22,960 ARC-34 stage units and tuned circuits. They presented to the Government a production cost of $27.52 per unit, but they already had in their possession a bid from a subcontractor, Forbes & Wagner, Inc., Silver Creek, N.Y., offering to build this identical unit for $24.82. Thus, on this portion of the contract there was an overestimate of $62,000.

In another part of the contract Magnavox charged the Government $2,717,100 for certain types of stage units which the Comptroller General said should have been only $1,936,200, thus representing an overcharge of $780,900.

On other parts of the contract approximately $200,000 was padded to production costs. The result was that altogether this $3 million spare parts contract Magnavox was overpriced to the Government by $1,055,000. This overcharge is over and above the amount which should have accrued to it as legitimate profits.

I am not placing the sole responsibility for this overcharge on Magnavox although certainly they cannot be excused, but the major responsibility rests upon the Air Force which uses such irresponsible business practices as negotiating these contracts when these same parts could just as well have been bought after solicitation of competitive bids.

Had competitive bids been solicited on these standard parts Forbes & Wagner and others could have submitted their lower bids direct to the Government. It is absurd that a subcontractor who had been building these parts should have his price negotiated to a close profit by a prime contractor who was padding his own price to the Government by an excessive 33⅓ percent.

It is these million-dollar wasteful items resulting from the irresponsible buying practices of the Defense Department which represent some of the excessive billions in our national budget.

Again, I urge congressional action on the bill which I have been introducing for the past several years, the purpose of which is to make it mandatory that all agencies of the Federal Government solicit competitive bids on all contracts except only in those instances where for security reasons such open solicitations would not be feasible, such as in the production of new and untried weapons of the atomic and missile age.

I congratulate the Comptroller General again upon a well-detailed report and note that he is referring copies to the appropriate Government agencies with the recommendation that action be taken to obtain recovery of these overcharges from the contractor. He has also called this to the attention of the Secretary of Defense with the suggestion that the procurement officers of that Department be more careful in the future.

MILITARY ANTI-COMMUNIST SPEECH DELETIONS

Mr. THURMOND addressed the Senate and received unanimous consent to have printed in connection with his remarks certain materials, which will appear hereafter in the Record.

LEWIS AND CLARK HIGHWAY

Mr. METCALF. Madam President, in 1805 the Lewis and Clark Expedition, searching for a pass through the Rockies, turned west from the Bitterroot Valley in Montana and traversed an Indian trail through Lolo Pass, one of the most difficult parts of the long trip, exploring the territory acquired in the Louisiana Purchase.

The following article is an account of the obstacles that have been overcome in following the Lewis and Clark trail over this rugged terrain. Capt. John Mullan, who built the famous Mullan Road, another East-West route, summed up the difficulties when he said the Lolo Trail "is the most difficult, rugged, severe and broken of any I have seen in my explorations of the Pacific Northwest."

Yet on August 19 of this year there is going to be a ribbon cutting at Parker's Meadows, about 10 miles west of the Montana-Idaho line, commemorating the opening of the Lewis and Clark Highway over the Lolo Trail and opening a new and shorter route to areas in the Pacific Northwest.

Chief credit for this achievement must go to two of our colleagues: to Senator Frank Church, who has made the completion of the Lewis and Clark Highway almost a crusade in his work in Congress, and to Senator Albert Gore, who held hearings in Idaho and Montana and worked out the formula for Federal-State assistance that made this road possible.

I ask unanimous consent to include as part of my remarks an article written by Del Klaus, public information director of the Idaho Highway Commission, describing the history of this scenic and historic route.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Lewis and Clark Highway Gets Through Primitive Area

The Lewis-Clark Highway, crossing a rugged primitive area in northern Idaho, is now a reality. Completion of this historic route opens up a vast area of untouched scenic Idaho. No other State in the Nation can boast of such an accomplishment in the progress of modern ways for transportation.

It all started more than a century and a half ago. The great northwestern part of our United States was an unexplored no man's land. In 1803, U.S. President Thomas Jefferson, took action toward expanding our western boundaries to the Pacific Ocean. In a secret message to Congress, he requested authority for the first transcontinental exploration sponsored by the U.S. Government's Congress, thereupon approving an appropriation of $2,500 to investigate new frontiers for "the external commerce of the United States."

Meriwether Lewis, 28, private secretary to President Jefferson, was chosen to lead the military expedition. He selected his boyhood Virginia companion, an experienced frontiersman, William Clark, age 32, as his associate commander. They were to explore the territory acquired by the Louisiana Purchase of 1803 from the Mississippi River to the Rocky Mountains, and east into the Oregon Territory. Lewis and Clark were to report among other things, "as to the practicability of constructing a roadway across the mountains, and the possibility of the country for agriculture and settlement."

The new venture started in the spring of 1804. Lewis and Clark and their expedition party used three canoe-type boats to make their way up the Missouri River for 1,600 miles. They made their winter headquarters at Ford Mandan, just north of Bismarck, N. Dak. Here, Sacajawea, a Shoshone Indian girl, and her French-trader husband, Touissant Charboaneau, were enlisted as interpreters and guides.

Favored by spring weather on April 7, 1805, the explorers resumed the boat journey up the Missouri River. Beyond the headwaters horses were obtained through Sacajawea's brother for the 300-mile land crossing of the Continental Divide to the headwaters of the Clearwater River.

The only available passage through this rugged area was the Lolo Pass, an Indian trail used by the Nez Perce Tribe in their treks in search for buffalo. This was the route followed by Lewis and Clark.

Nearly 50 years later, the first official interest was shown in this route when the War Department authorized funds for exploration and survey to locate the most feasible routing for a railroad connecting the Mississippi River with the Pacific Ocean. Capt. John Mullan made this investigation and said of the Lolo Trail, "It is the most difficult, rugged, severe and broken of any I have seen in my explorations of the Pacific Northwest." In 1858 he completed the famous Military Road or Mullan Road some 100 miles to the north.

The necessity of opening a more direct route between Virginia City, Mont., and Lewiston, Idaho, than was afforded by the Mullan Road, prompted the Government in 1866 to make an appropriation of $50,000 for that purpose. A Mr. A. W. Tinkham undertook this task and found there was little he could do except improve the Lolo Trail to permit the passage of heavier pack trains. The record indicates that the bulk of the appropriation was spent in this manner. Very little, if any, highway was constructed.

About 1900, this route again became prominent when a survey was undertaken by the Clearwater Short Line Railway Co. for a railroad between Missoula, Mont., and Kooskia, Idaho. Although the railroad was never completed, as an adjunct to this work, serviceable wagon roads were constructed which gave limited access to sections of the route both in Idaho and in Montana. Part of the first forest highway funds expended on this route were used for extension of these wagon roads.

Construction of the Lewis and Clark Highway was stimulated in large measure by activities of the U.S. Forest Service. Early in its program, the Forest Service established ranger stations at Powell and Lochsa for administrative purposes and fire protection. For years these stations along the Lochsa River were accessible by trail only. The proper management of the area required better access to these stations and prompted the initial programing of Federal funds for roads. Construction with forest highway funds was initiated on the Idaho portion of the route in 1918. This first project provided for 23.1 miles of grading to a top width of 9 feet. Cost of the project was $235,740.

In 1935 approximately 150 Federal prisoners from Leavenworth, Kans., were assigned to projects on the Lewis and Clark Highway. These prisoners were retained on construction until the spring of 1941, at which time they were returned to Leavenworth and replaced by Japanese detainees from the coastal area. Work on a WPA project was also started during this period.

Total estimated construction costs for the 101-mile Idaho section from Kooskia to the Montana line is estimated at $13.3 million. This covers the period since 1918 to date, which includes money now available for construction to bring the Idaho portion to a bituminous surface standard.

Following is a breakdown of Federal and State funds expended and programed for completion of this historic route:

From 1918 to completion—expended and under construction:	
Emergency relief funds	$30,323
Forest highway funds	4,946,063
Forest road development funds	406,924
Forest road emergency funds	92,869
Federal lands funds	3,770,229
WPA funds	281,563
Federal-aid primary funds	1,276,179
Total Federal	10,804,150
State of Idaho	1,064,126
Total	11,868,276
Additional appropriations:	
Forest highway funds	1,000,000
Federal lands funds	275,000
Federal aid primary and secondary funds	169,000
Total	13,312,276

This summer construction work has been in progress on three projects on the Lewis-Clark Highway in Idaho. The total length of these projects is 74 miles. Cost of the projects are included in the above subtotal of $11,868,276.

Two of the above-mentioned projects were recently completed: The grading and bridge construction work on 12.6 miles between Powell and the Montana line, and bituminous surfacing of 22.5 miles extending east from Lowell. The third contract involving 38.9 miles of base and surfacing construction between Fish Creek and Wendover Creek is still underway. Bids will be opened September 29, 1961, for a project to provide 38.6 miles plantmix paving between Lost Creek and the Montana line (includes 3.4 miles of grading and 16 miles of basework).

The figure of $13.3 million is the estimated cost to bring the Idaho portion to a bituminous surface standard. This bituminous surfacing for the first 62 miles east of Kooskia is only a surface treatment. This complete section will be scheduled for bituminous paving at a later date with Federal aid, forest highway or other funds as they are made available. Cost for completion of this final project is estimated at $1,104,000. This estimate would bring the total investment, over the period of years since 1918, in the Lewis and Clark Highway to $14.4 million. Only $2 million of this total was spent between the years 1918 and 1946.

In addition to this, planning is now underway for a 1.4 mile relocation to provide a bypass at the village of Kooskia. The new location here would leave the present highway at a point approximately 0.2 mile north of the north city limits and would stay on the north side of the Clearwater River and connect to the Lewis and Clark Highway just east of Kooskia. The estimated cost of the bypass is $250,000.

The 101-mile section of the Lewis and Clark Highway in Idaho follows a water grade throughout, except for about 6 miles of 6-percent grade needed to cross Lolo Pass (elevation 5,233 feet) at the Idaho-Montana border.

The route (from east to west) follows the Lochsa River to Lowell, Idaho, where the stream connects with the Selway River to form the Middle Fork of the Clearwater River, which continues to Kooskia and meets with the South Fork of the Clearwater River.

Opening of the Lewis and Clark Highway will provide arterial access to more than 1,500 million board feet of timber tributary thereto. This main route will serve the many miles of existing access roads not in use and will promote the construction of a network of new access necessary to market the available timber reserves.

Travelers from central and southern Idaho, southeastern Washington and eastern Oregon to destinations east of Missoula, Mont., will be saved up to 220 miles by this scenic shortcut. A few examples are listed below:

From Kooskia, Idaho to Missoula, Mont., saving 220 miles.

From Lewiston, Idaho to Missoula, Mont., saving 82 miles.

From Boise, Idaho to Missoula, Mont., saving 101 miles.

From Portland, Oreg. to Missoula, Mont., saving 12 miles.

The forest lands adjacent to this highway provide shelter for some of the finest elk herds in the United States. Thousands of hunters pack into the area each fall. Those from Idaho have been forced to travel hundreds of extra miles to reach destinations near the Montana-Idaho borders. Unfortunately, there have been devastating forest fires in years past which have ruined thousands of acres of natural cover. The proposed route traversed some 30 miles of burned area. New growth has started, however, and is making good progress. One of the foremost attractions in the area is the Bitterroot-Selway Wilderness area. The Lochsa River and the highway bound this area on the north for approximately 50 miles. Good access will be thus afforded to the northern sector of this 3,000 square mile area, our largest and best established wilderness.

What will this new highway mean to Idaho's economy? Briefly, it is not expected that new industries and business will spring up overnight because it has been built; but it can definitely be considered as a contributing factor to the rapidly developing potential that is moving the Northwest and Idaho into a period of increased economic growth.

Also, when the value of this highway is weighed in connection with the development of slack-water navigation on the Columbia-Snake River Waterway to Lewiston, the growth of the immediate area seems a near certainty. However, to do justice to each major industry this new route will touch, it would be pertinent to consider individual benefits to the agriculture, mining, forest and tourist industries of the region.

The consensus of opinion seems to be that the greatest impact the road will bring will be felt by the timber industry. Forest products are the chief output of the region surrounding the Lewis and Clark Highway, both in volume and dollar value. Although the annual timber cut in this region is less than the annual growth much of this timber is cut from the growing stock. This has been due to problems of accessibility. Much of the mature sawtimber is in Clearwater and Idaho Counties, and completion of the highway will make it possible to harvest large tracts of mature virgin timber and thus reduce the cut of immature stock.

Completion of this highway will also provide an improved avenue to areas that have been heavily burned in the past because of inaccessability by firefighting equipment. This factor alone should save in useable timber enough to pay for the cost of the entire highway.

Transportation being a high-cost production factor has had a diverse effect upon the manufacturing and selling of products made from the region's wood supply. It is felt that competitive freight rates will be a real assist to the growth of secondary wood industries. In addition, new advances in wood utilization research at universities and colleges in the Northwest give every indication that the growth and consumption of new products made chiefly from wood and wood byproducts will increase faster than present production. There is little doubt that with the proper stimulation the region's timber resources can be combined with low transportation costs, power and skilled labor to build north Idaho as the center of a growing timber industry for years to come.

Although there will be some immediate effects felt by the agricultural industry most of the benefits will show up 4 or 5 years in the future when secondary processors will find it profitable to manufacture food and nonfood products from the region's ample wheat and other grain supplies.

Five years ago southern Idaho wasn't the center of the potato processing industry but the right combination of research, business know-how and available production factors have made that dream a reality. It seems reasonable to believe that the right combination for further development of northern Idaho agriculture will be found in the traffic that the Lewis and Clark Highway will channel to barge transportation at Lewiston. In effect, reduced transportation costs will also spur the growth of associate service and trade business in the area. The result will be that agriculture products will be afforded not only cheaper cost in transportation to market (something many farmers have been working on for years) but will find some markets close to home.

In addition, it has been estimated that by 1970 Montana alone will export westerly close to 4 million tons of commerce suitable for water transportation. At least one quarter of this total is expected to move along the Lewis and Clark Highway on its way to river transportation.

Other benefits will come simply because the road opens a little known area for general exploration. Mining, which has been an empire builder in the past has also been hampered by distance to market, high transportation costs and Federal import policies. The new highway will provide access to regions which have been heretofore neglected by exploration surveys, or geological studies. However, increasing demands by the national defense and space programs will undoubtedly bring some attention to the strategic metals and nonmetals in the surrounding areas. There is a great need for rare metals such as columbium, beryllium, cesium, tantalum, cobalt, thorium, titanium, and zirconium. The discovery of one or more of these metals in workable quantities would greatly fortify the mining economy of the 10 northern counties and would again prove the Lewis and Clark Highway a very definite asset to the area's overall business climate.

Every year Idaho is visited by about 1½ million tourists who enter the State by an eastern route. Of this amount about 20 percent are coming to vacation in Idaho. The rest are passing through on their way to other vacation areas. If properly advertised, many of these people and countless numbers of their friends will want to travel over the historical trail that bears the names of the men whose adventures have been written in the history books of every schoolchild in the United States since the advent of public education.

This highway also opens up new vistas to the sportsman. Fish and game abound in an area where there are countless lakes and boundless forests which have never felt the ceaseless plod of man. This is truly a virgin wilderness for many areas within its boundaries have never been explored by humans. The first people to see this land will see it much as God made it, clean, and with a freshness unsurpassed.

JAY N. DARLING

Mr. METCALF. Madam President, with the passing of Jay N. Darling, Monday, at the age of 85, America is a poorer place than it was before. But he enriched the Nation so greatly during his lifetime that the net gain has been enormous. Although he was known and loved by millions of Americans for his devastatingly incisive cartoons in the fields of politics and social reform, he will be missed especially by the conservationists, among whom he ranked with the leaders.

He was a firm champion of natural resource conservation from his earliest days to his last. One of his first nationally famous cartoons dealt with the plight of waterfowl in 1916 when the Migratory Bird Treaty Act was being debated. This and subsequent cartoons in the Des Moines, Iowa, Register launched him at the age of 40 into a career as a syndicated cartoonist, from which he retired in 1949.

Mr. Darling probably took more personal pride in his achievements in the field of conservation than he did in his chosen professional field. His contributions to conservation were tremendous. Named to the Special Committee To Investigate Waterfowl Refuge Needs by President Franklin D. Roosevelt, Darling was instrumental in obtaining the enactment of the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of 1934, and designed the first duck stamp. Proceeds from duck stamp sales are used to acquire wetlands as recommended by the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, on which I serve. Elevated to the position of Chief of the Bureau of Biological Survey under the Roosevelt administration, although he was a Republican by persuasion, Darling proved himself an able administrator, dealing with flagrant abuses of the Federal hunting regulations with a vigor that sent poachers and market hunters scurrying for cover.

Although he was an avid duck hunter himself, he clamped down in the face of depleted waterfowl flights with the tightest waterfowl hunting regulations that America has ever known almost as soon as he entered Washington, and he stuck to his guns in spite of political and sometimes physical threats. In accepting the appointment, which carried the salary of $8,000 per year, he temporarily abandoned a career that was bringing him $100,000 annually. He was responsible during his year and a half as an administrator of the Bureau of Biological Survey for obtaining $6 million for launching the national waterfowl refuge system. During this period, he also launched the National Wildlife Federation, organized the first North American Wildlife Conference, and was responsible for reorganizing the American Game Protective Association into the North American Wildlife Foundation and the American Wildlife Institute, forerunner of the present Wildlife Management Institute. He established the cooperative wildlife research unit program which, since 1935, has produced many of our foremost trained wildlife workers.

"Ding" Darling will be missed, but he leaves behind him monuments to his own greatness, as a cartoonist, and as an editor, and as a conservationist. Few men enjoyed life more, and even fewer have lived it more fully and usefully.

THE KENNEDY FARM PROGRAM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I have been pleased for the most part with the editorial comment on this administration's farm program. The tribute being accorded proposals set forth in President Kennedy's recent farm message speak highly for the President and Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman.

It should be noted that the other day, when the Secretary of Agriculture appeared before a subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture of the House, he was greeted by a standing ovation from the members of the committee. This indicates to me the sincere appreciation Members of Congress have for the diligence and intelligence of the efforts and the program of the Secretary of Agriculture.

These words of commendation for a job well done also should be a source of self-satisfaction to the many unsung heroes whose contribution to this program can never be measured. These are the producers and representatives of commodity organizations who served on advisory committees, countless individuals whose suggestions were incorporated into the program, and members and leadership of all the farm organizations.

Madam President, the Des Moines Register is located in the heart of the Corn Belt. It serves farmers and it knows farmers. This paper is as familiar to most Iowa farmers—and, incidentally, to many in the States which border Iowa, including my own State of Minnesota—as is the land they plow. It is because of this close association with the family farmer that I was especially pleased to see the Register's February 1, 1962, editorial entitled "Hard Farm Choices." It is a good editorial and it is a thoughtful editorial. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Hard Farm Choices

The farm policy proposals just submitted to Congress by the Kennedy administration are a considerable improvement over the rather hasty recommendations made last spring. Congress rejected at that time the sweeping enabling legislation which would have permitted commodity groups to develop supply control programs with marketing quotas.

Now Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman is coming back to Congress with a more carefully worked out long-range adjustment plan. The emphasis in the new proposals is on land retirement to limit production of wheat and feed grains in order to indirectly limit output of livestock.

This is the same basic farm program that has been in effect for nearly 30 years. However, Freeman wants a stronger effort to tighten up the acreage control programs, to make them more effective. For example, farmers would be given an opportunity to vote mandatory controls on themselves for feed grains, for the first time in history.

Freeman also wants stricter production control in the dairy industry. Instead of relying on Federal milk market orders, under which supplies are controlled in many milksheds, a national quota system would be established. Farmers would choose in a referendum between the present program with considerably lower price supports and a new program with quotas and higher price supports.

The proposals are realistic in posing the right questions to farmers and to the general public.

The administration is saying, in effect, that, if farm income is to be maintained at its present level, the choice is between continuation of the present high level of subsidies or production controls. If farmers don't want to subject themselves to production controls, they cannot expect to continue receiving the present level of price supports.

The Kennedy administration proposals also are realistic in recognizing the need for further adjustment in number of farms and farmers. The administration wants a pilot program to start a long-range transfer of many millions of acres of cropland to other uses.

This is the soil bank on a much larger scale and extending for 20 years ahead. The program also would emphasize education of farm people and other aids to smooth transition to nonfarm jobs. It puts into a practical program ideas that have been floating around in agricultural circles for many years. We like it because it would start small and build on the basis of practical experience.

The Freeman proposals do not put forward an extravagant and unrealistic goal of farm income, as did the famous Brannan plan a few years back.

In fact, Freeman already has been criticized by the Farmers Union for setting his sights too low on farm income. The program calls for maintaining the 1961 level of national net farm income, about $13 billion per year to 1965. Farm income per person and per farm would rise over the next several years, as the number of farmers and farms decline.

The Nation is long overdue on facing up, in a practical way, to the hard choices in agricultural policy.

In the past there has been too much dream world philosophy in agricultural affairs. Political proposals often have suggested that everything would be rosy if farm price supports were abandoned and if the Government would get out of agriculture.

But analysis by at least three responsible research agencies shows beyond doubt that farm income would fall by about one-third if supports were abandoned.

There also has been a lack of political realism about maintaining a high level of farm subsidy without any effort on the part of farmers to control production and keep it in line with the Nation's needs.

In the Freeman proposals, those who want to cut farm subsidies but also want to maintain farm income are told what must be done to accomplish this.

If these production control programs are rejected and Congress continues to appropriate the money for a high level of farm subsidies, then the responsibility will be on Congress. The administration is showing a way out of the dead end of high farm subsidy costs and surpluses.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I also ask unanimous consent that other editorial comment on the Kennedy farm program, from the Des Moines Register, the Christian Science Monitor, the Denver Post, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, the Washington Post and Times Herald, the New York Times, the Wall Street Journal, and the Springfield, Mo., Leader and Press be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

"The Nation is long overdue on facing up, in a practical way, to the hard choices in agricultural policy.

"In the past there has been too much dream world philosophy in agricultural affairs. Political proposals often have suggested that everything would be rosy if farm price supports were abandoned and if the Government would get out of agriculture.

"But analysis by at least three responsible research agencies shows beyond doubt that farm income would fall by about one-third if supports were abandoned.

"The administration is showing a way out of the dead end of high farm subsidy costs and surpluses."—The Des Moines Register.

"If producers of a given commodity wish the Government to pay them a guaranteed price, they cannot reasonably ask that the guarantee extend to an unlimited output. This is the dilemma which the President's message puts before farmers, big and little, in the United States.

"The signs of a turn are here, and the Kennedy message, if followed, would make it a sharp one."—Christian Science Monitor.

"President Kennedy has proposed a strong and comprehensive farm program. At heart it is a workable program.

"Either the farmer should accept the hazards of a free market—which the congressional farm bloc seems to oppose—or he should be prepared to accept controls which will prevent overproduction."—Denver Post.

"The goals set forth in President Kennedy's farm message are sound and should meet with general approval, but the methods the President recommends for achieving them appear to differ more in degree than in kind from the unsuccessful programs of the past.

"The broad purposes of the program are to increase farm income, reduce costly surpluses and cut down the agricultural burden on taxpayers. Further exposition of ways in which this is expected to be accomplished will be developed in congressional and public debate. There is certain to be plenty of that."—St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

"As an analysis of the plight of agriculture, and as a statement of farm policy objectives, surely there is much to applaud and very little to criticize. There is a proper acknowledgment of agriculture's great efficiency, of its role in the Nation's growth, of its disproportionate share of national income. Urban critics of farm programs frequently have exhibited an almost indecent disregard of the fact that they get more and better food for less money than any other consumers on earth. They quite as often stand aghast at the recorded subsidy to agriculture while they exhibit a complete obliviousness to the less conspicuous subsidies that national policy has heaped upon other industry. The tone and temper of the message is good."—Washington Post.

"The problems of abundance * * * are far pleasanter and more manageable than Khrushchev's problem of scarcity.

"Opponents will no doubt stress the socialistic features of this program, though it differs only in degree and extensiveness of coverage from earlier arrangements under both Republican and Democratic administrations."—New York Times.

"History presents no evidence that efforts of government to manage scarcity—as in the case of the OPA—have ended in anything other than confusion or worse. Nothing in the present chaotic farm controls suggests that much stiffer controls would manage abundance any better."—Wall Street Journal.

"President Kennedy gave American agriculture a blunt take-it-or-leave-it ultimatum yesterday as he presented his long-awaited farm program to Congress. Either farmers can take rigid production controls, the President said, or they can give up any expectation of much further Federal aid in the way of subsidies.

"A year ago, we would have protested angrily. Other businesses and other industries have been, and are being subsidized, why exclude farming? Two or three events of the past year, however, have sharply altered our thinking in the matter. One, the fiasco in the broiler industry; another, the dairy industry's leap from a nearly balanced production pattern into a veritable binge of overproduction; still a third, recognition that there is no limit to the meteoric climb of subsidy costs, unless production curbs are imposed, and that conversely, with power curbs, there will be little or no need for subsidies.

"The individual always thinks it can't happen to him, but it has happened to thousands of dairymen in recent years, and one can predict with mathematical certainty that uncontrolled production will convert a certain percentage of those who are still making it today to marginal milk producers next year and to ex-dairymen in 2 years."—Springfield (Mo.) Leader and Press.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, recently in St. Louis, Mo., a conference of farm leaders of the Midwest farm organizations and groups was held, and a joint statement was made by the farm organization officials attending that farm leaders conference in St. Louis, Mo. Secretary Freeman addressed that conference and was enthusiastically received.

I ask unanimous consent that the farm leaders' statement be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Farm Leaders' Statement

We sincerely appreciate the firm and aggressive efforts of the Kennedy administration, and particularly those of the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Orville Freeman, to raise farm income and to improve public understanding of the farmer's problem. These efforts have resulted in materially improved farm income in 1961 and firm prospects for the maintenance thereof in 1962.

We recognize, however, that these improvements have been accomplished primarily through the use of emergency programs and measures. It is essential that a new dynamic, long-range, permanent farm program, dealing with the problems of agriculture, be adopted now in 1962. We have the blessing of great abundance, but it is essential to the well-being of our agricultural community and is in the public interest that such be a managed abundance. We need a program to meet the problem of low incomes and underemployment in our farm population; to strike at the problem of inadequate diets, both at home and abroad, and to insure proper use of our agricultural resources.

We specifically endorse the positive goals of President Kennedy and Secretary Freeman to achieve proper use of our agricultural abundance; to achieve balance by providing a means of adjustment of production of commodities now in serious oversupply; to encourage conservation and achieve better land uses, and to upgrade the living standards of rural people by the development of new opportunities on the land through rural renewal programs, all of which will be achieved at a reduced cost to Government.

We emphasize the immediate need for these programs and unanimously pledge our full support to the attainment of these goals.

FARMER COOPERATIVES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I also ask unanimous consent that a report from the Department of Agriculture relating to the activities, growth, development, and services of the farm cooperatives be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., February 6, 1962.

For nearly a century now, the U.S. Department of Agriculture has been interested in the progress of farmer cooperatives. This year's statistical report shows the volume of farmer cooperative business up almost 3 percent over the previous year, while numbers of memberships and associations were down slightly.

This information comes from statistics just released by USDA's Farmer Cooperative Service on the business of marketing, farm supply, and related service cooperatives.

Since the early report of the Department back in 1863 on farmer cooperatives—a report that dealt with the development of cooperative cheese factories begun 10 years earlier in New York—these farmer cooperatives have come a long way.

The FCS figures, covering the period July 1, 1959, through June 30, 1960, give a broad picture of the extent of cooperative progress. They show:

1. Dollar volume: Gross business volume of a little more than $15.6 billion, representing an increase of 2.7 percent over the previous year's $15.2 billion. Total net business—after adjusting for business done between cooperatives—amounted to a little more than $12 billion, up 2.4 percent over the $11.7 billion a year earlier.

2. Number of memberships: A total of almost 7.3 million memberships, representing a decrease of about 4 percent from the previous year's nearly 7.6 million. This is in line with the decrease in number of farmers in the United States. This membership figure contains duplications since many farmers are members of more than one cooperative and are counted twice or more times.

3. Number of cooperatives: Total number of associations was 9,345 compared with 9,658 the previous year, or a decrease of 3 percent. Much of this decrease was the result of continued mergers, consolidations, and acquisitions among cooperatives—a trend reflected in these annual statistics for a number of years.

Other highlights of this annual statistical report—issued regularly each year since 1928—are given here in net figures from which interassociation business has been excluded:

Marketing volume of $9.3 billion was up 2.5 percent over the previous year. This represented 77.4 percent of the total cooperative business.

Farm supply volume of more than $2.4 billion was up 1.6 percent over the previous year. This supply business represented 20.1 percent of the total cooperative volume.

Related services amounted to more than $298 million, up 9 percent over the previous year. They accounted for 2.5 percent of the total business of cooperatives.

Dairy products continued to rank first in total marketing volume.

Feed continued in first place in volume among farm production supplies.

Seventy-seven percent of the 9,345 cooperatives handled one or more farm supplies.

Seventy-one percent of them did some marketing.

Minnesota continued to hold first place in number of associations and memberships.

California continued to rank first in total dollar volume of business.

Increases in the dollar volume reported for cotton products, dairy products, fruits and vegetables, grain, rice, and tobacco largely contributed to the increase in total volume reported for 1959–60.

Dairy products had a net value of more than $3 billion, about a third of the net value of all farm products marketed by cooperatives and up 2.8 percent over the previous year. Grain remained in second place with a net value of $1.93 billion, accounting for a little more than a fifth of the total net value and up 1.8 percent over the previous year. Livestock stayed in third place, despite lower hog prices, with a net value of $1.47 billion, a decrease of 4 percent from the previous year.

Feed accounted for almost 37 percent of the supply business, and showed a net value of almost $886 million, down 1 percent from the previous year.

Petroleum products continued in second place among farm supplies with a net value of more than $596 million, up almost 2.8 percent over the previous year. They accounted for almost 25 percent of the total farm production supplies handled by cooperatives.

Fertilizer, in third place, had a net value of $334 million, up more than 6 percent from the previous year. It accounted for almost 14 percent of the total supply business of cooperatives.

Nearly three-fifths of all cooperatives reporting did some kind of service for their patrons that related to marketing and farm supply operations. These services included trucking, storage, ginning, drying, grinding, and spraying. Total receipts for these services continued to increase, as they have each year since FCS began to compile statistics on this segment of business by cooperatives.

This steady upward trend in service receipts reflects the increasing diversification of cooperatives to better serve the needs of farmer patrons.

Minnesota held first place in number of cooperatives with its 1,189 associations, Wisconsin was second with 707, and Iowa retained third place with 636.

Second place to Minnesota's memberships of 584,540 was Illinois with 484,140. Iowa moved up to third with 430,655.

California held its first place in net value of combined volume of business with $1.29 billion, almost 11 percent of the total net business volume of all cooperatives. Minnesota remained in second place with $842 million, or 7 percent. And Iowa moved into third place with more than $684 million, or almost 6 percent of the total.

California also led in value of farm products marketed with its $1.16 billion; Minnesota stayed in second place with almost $672 million; and Illinois continued in third place with almost $513 million.

Cooperatives voluntarily furnished current figures for the survey, with 95 percent of all those contacted supplying the information needed.

Estimated business in specified commodity and service groups of marketing, farm supply, and related service cooperatives, 1959–60[1]

Item	Number of cooperatives handling	Gross business (includes intercooperative business)	Net business (excludes intercooperative business)
		Thousands	*Thousands*
Products marketed for patrons:			
Beans and peas (dry edible)	63	$41,598	$28,849
Cotton and cotton products	562	668,747	607,390
Dairy products	1,669	3,679,523	3,055,521
Fruits and vegetables	723	1,285,441	905,829
Grain, soybeans, soybean meal, and oil	2,649	2,944,798	1,929,114
Livestock and livestock products	549	1,613,026	1,471,069
Nuts	122	136,854	114,533
Poultry products	613	464,730	390,488
Rice	59	167,680	145,018
Sugar products	67	336,952	336,952
Tobacco	32	241,287	241,287
Wool and mohair	282	23,291	22,527
Miscellaneous	215	48,500	45,355
Total, farm products	[2] 6,643	11,652,427	9,293,932
Supplies purchased for patrons:			
Building materials	1,699	$138,814	$91,114
Containers	1,088	59,970	27,725
Farm machinery and equipment	1,898	110,081	76,472
Feed	4,489	1,198,680	885,924
Fertilizer	4,338	583,628	334,404
Meats and groceries	905	63,767	52,753
Petroleum products	2,803	965,184	596,180
Seed	3,961	141,446	101,635
Sprays and dusts (farm chemicals)	2,906	78,639	53,202
Other supplies	4,650	319,760	188,748
Total, farm supplies	[2] 7,162	3,659,969	2,408,157
Receipts for services: Trucking, cotton ginning, storage, grinding, locker plants, miscellaneous	[2] 5,564	[3] 298,177	[3] 298,177
Total business	[2] 9,345	15,610,573	12,000,266

---

[1] Preliminary.

[2] Adjusted for duplication arising from multiple activities performed by many cooperatives.

[3] Charges for services in which no duplication occurs.

Estimated number of cooperatives, memberships, and business of marketing, farm supply, and related service cooperatives, by States, 1959–60[1]

State	Number of cooperatives with headquarters in State	Number of memberships in State	Net business (excludes intercooperative business)
			Thousands
Maine	19	20,825	$41,104
New Hampshire	9	7,110	22,819
Vermont	28	18,445	87,243
Massachusetts	36	22,510	65,584
Rhode Island	2	2,870	8,576
Connecticut	25	11,895	45,758
New England	119	83,655	271,084
New York	402	148,415	565,305
New Jersey	69	31,695	106,716
Pennsylvania	184	170,120	355,729
Middle Atlantic	655	350,230	1,027,750
Ohio	272	375,795	566,282
Indiana	139	421,705	401,825
Illinois	459	484,140	668,886
Michigan	209	184,650	358,417
Wisconsin	707	390,305	640,580
East north central	1,786	1,856,595	2,635,990
Minnesota	1,189	584,540	841,846
Iowa	636	430,655	684,396
Missouri	223	401,070	303,350
North Dakota	507	251,070	323,062
South Dakota	299	186,225	183,357
Nebraska	387	256,120	324,194
Kansas	346	193,410	379,100
West north central	3,587	2,303,090	3,039,305
Delaware	17	27,455	31,687
Maryland	61	95,475	98,663
Virginia	155	247,710	193,664
West Virginia	77	74,360	42,630
North Carolina	116	302,875	169,970
South Carolina	35	65,475	40,841
Georgia	75	154,325	$126,545
Florida	107	39,495	276,173
South Atlantic	643	1,007,170	980,173
Kentucky	97	211,945	188,685
Tennessee	141	139,690	89,616
Alabama	48	90,965	67,264
Mississippi	142	133,640	190,202
East south central	428	576,240	535,767
Arkansas	112	87,105	136,352
Louisiana	54	24,960	61,289
Oklahoma	172	173,200	232,900
Texas	511	178,310	560,290
West south central	849	463,575	990,831
Montana	177	74,185	131,338
Idaho	97	59,385	106,707
Wyoming	23	10,885	22,098
Colorado	113	63,670	175,359
New Mexico	35	12,170	53,134
Arizona	14	67,435	62,779
Utah	70	29,760	95,736
Nevada	4	265	2,907
Mountain	533	317,755	650,148
Washington	185	111,115	347,649
Oregon	114	70,645	215,438
California	425	132,070	[2] 1,290,109
Pacific	724	313,830	1,853,196
Total (48 States)	9,324	7,271,840	11,984,244
Alaska	2	90	7,415
Hawaii	19	1,525	[2] 8,607
United States	9,345	7,273,455	12,000,266

---

[1] Preliminary.

[2] Volume of a sugar cooperative with headquarters in California whose business originated in Hawaii was included in California.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, the report indicates that the farm cooperative business has expanded during the past year by approximately 3 percent. It also indicates something which is of particular significance to the State of Minnesota and to those who are privileged to represent that State in the Congress. I quote from the report:

> Minnesota held first place in number of cooperatives with its 1,189 associations, Wisconsin was second with 707, and Iowa retained third place with 636.
>
> Second place to Minnesota's memberships of 584,540 was Illinois with 484,140. Iowa moved up to third with 430,655.

Madam President, it is significant that in the State of Minnesota over a half million individuals belong to farm cooperatives, including producers' cooperatives, distribution cooperatives, consumers' cooperatives, electric cooperatives, and supply cooperatives. I feel that that is one of the reasons that the State I am privileged to represent in part has had a stable and growing economy, and has had a rise in its per capita income and in the general welfare and well-being of the people of that State.

The report should be good reading, not only for the people of the United States, but also those in the embassies of other nations located in Washington, D.C., because it offers to their agricultural attachés, economists, and program planners an opportunity to see what can be done in agriculture, in family farm agriculture, and in individual ownership agriculture through the farm cooperative movement. I commend that movement for its outstanding success and growth and for its great contributions to the welfare and the economic prosperity of our Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that an advertisement that is being published in a number of newspapers in the United States by the farm cooperatives, particularly the dairy cooperatives, relating to our dairy products, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the advertisement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESIDENT KENNEDY TELLS THE NATION: "MILK IS OUR MOST NOURISHING FOOD, AND AN IMPORTANT AID TO OUR GOOD HEALTH"

The President of the United States, John F. Kennedy, and Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman this week delivered messages of vital importance to all Americans, young and old.

These messages—presented before the National Conference on Milk and Nutrition in Washington—were concerned with our health, as individuals and our physical fitness as a nation.

In addressing this national conference, President Kennedy and Secretary Freeman did not deal in platitudes or generalities. They faced some serious and controversial problems involving our diet; and they spoke some basic truths, in plain, everyday language, which have needed telling for a long, long time.

They spoke on our Nation's declining milk consumption.

They spoke on the scare over radioactive fallout contamination of milk.

They spoke on the relationship between milk and weight control.

They spoke on the relationship between milk and cholesterol levels.

And, they spoke on milk's importance to a balanced diet.

We applaud President Kennedy and Secretary Freeman for speaking out squarely on these important problems * * * for underscoring with plain facts the national significance of these problems around which in the past too much fiction, too much hysteria have been woven.

Because of the importance of these facts to all of us, we present as a public service the following highlights of the addresses by President Kennedy and Secretary Freeman:

1. Is the overall decline of milk consumption in America serious?

President Kennedy: "This is a serious matter for us all * * * a matter of concern because it implies poor nutrition and a less balanced diet."

Secretary Freeman: "This development has implications far beyond the immediate economic effect on agriculture. * * * Its most serious implication may well be in the long-term effect it can have on the health and vigor of the people and the Nation."

2. How severe is the effect of radioactive fallout upon our food supply?

President Kennedy: "Most of the discussion (concerning fallout contamination of food) has unfortunately used milk as an example of food products that might be contaminated.

"I should like to correct any misunderstandings that may exist about this. * * * It is abundantly clear that for the foreseeable future there is no danger from the present amount of exposure. The milk supply offers no hazards. On the contrary, it remains one of the best sources of nutrition for our children and for adults."

3. Is there a relationship between milk and weight control?

Secretary Freeman: "We have become extremely weight conscious in this country in recent years. If the drop in milk consumption is related to this question, we ought to be greatly concerned. Weight control involves the extent to which we use our muscles as well as the amount of food we eat. Food alone should not be expected to carry the entire burden.

"Insofar as we reduce calorie intake, it should be of foods important chiefly for calories—not of foods that carry indispensable proteins, minerals, and vitamins. The American people should not make wrong changes in their dietary habits to prevent or cure obesity."

4. Is there relationship between milk and cholesterol levels?

President Kennedy: "The Food and Nutrition Board of the National Research Council has concluded, after intensive research, that the association of milk consumption and coronary disease due to an increase in cholesterol level has not been sufficiently established to justify the abandonment of this nutritious element, except where doctors have individually prescribed special diets for those found to be susceptible to special cholesterol or coronary problems."

5. How important is milk in a balanced diet for young and old?

President Kennedy: "If we are to be a vigorous and vital nation, as we all desire, then of course we must depend upon the consumption of a balanced diet, and milk must be a part of it.

"In the past 50 years our children have grown more vigorous and sturdy because of better diet and better health. Our young adults are now about 2 inches taller than they were half a century ago. I should like—and I am sure all of us would like—to see this trend continue. A large proportion of our people now attain a physical condition once attained by a very few, but nutritionists tell us that 10 percent of our people still have an inadequate diet. The most serious deficiencies, I am told, are in the very minerals and vitamins, such as calcium and vitamin A, most prevalent in milk. I am sure all of us would like to see this nutritional gap narrowed.

"Those who are familiar with the needs and the problems of our older citizens, also tell us that older people need more calcium than they now get. Again, milk offers the best and most economical source of this vital mineral."

Secretary Freeman: "Unquestionably, there are many people who, on competent medical advice, must certainly follow special diets. But there are countless others—both young and old—who now do not receive adequate nutrition, particularly those essential building blocks of life for which milk is the best and most convenient source. Infants and growing children especially need milk and dairy products in their diet because of the large amounts of calcium and high-quality protein required to keep up with the growth needs.

"Milk contains three important nutrients—calcium, riboflavin and protein, in addition to other essential food elements—which people get to little of for their best nutritional health, and usually because they do not get enough milk.

"In fact, milk makes it easy to get the calcium and riboflavin we need. In this Nation's food supplies, milk provides about two-thirds of all the calcium, nearly half of the riboflavin, and a fourth of the protein.

"Another reason that milk is a necessary food source is that it contains many different nutrients in highly beneficial balance which meet one of the basic requirements of good health. The nutrients work together efficiently to meet the body's needs."

Thus did our President and our Secretary of Agriculture face up to five critical questions directly affecting the lives and well-being of all Americans * * * serious questions concerning milk to which they gave the American public straightforward, factual, reliable answers.

The key question, of course, that so many Americans—confused by the myriad anti-milk claims of health and diet faddists—ask:

Just how important to our health is milk—is it harmful, or is it nature's most nearly perfect food?

President Kennedy said: "I have long been convinced that milk is an important aid to good health. This has led me to direct that milk be served at every White House meal from now on—and I expect that all of us will benefit from it * * *."

We say, "Thank you, Mr. President, thank you, Secretary Freeman, for your service to the vital cause of better health and sounder nutrition for all Americans."

Mr. HUMPHREY. The advertisement relates to what President Kennedy told the Nation about milk as a nourishing food. The headline of the copy reads as follows: "Milk Is Our Most Nourishing Food and an Important Aid to Our Good Health."

The President of the United States, as we know, has worked closely with the Secretary of Agriculture in a sincere and, I hope, successful effort to promote the greater consumption of dairy products. Last year the drop in consumption of dairy products was the main reason for the large carryover of dairy products in the hands of the Commodity Credit Corporation. There have been those of us who have asked that the confusion relating to certain health aspects of dairy products be investigated by appropriate scientific and medical personnel. The Representative from Milwaukee, Mr. REUSS, has taken the lead on this subject and has addressed a communication to the Secretary of Agriculture and to other officers of our Government urging that there be accurate factual and objective medical information relating to the qualities of dairy products and their effect upon our health.

There are those of us who know and believe what President Kennedy said on this subject, namely, that milk is our most nourishing food and an important aid to our good health. But last year consumption of dairy products went down substantially. I do not believe that circumstance is good for the Nation, and it surely is not good for the agriculture economy.

Therefore, I respectfully urge that the questions relating to what are known as cholesterol and the so-called health effects of milk and dairy products be looked into at once, and that as much scientific and factual information as possible be given to the public. I think we all recognize that throughout the centuries good wholesome milk has been looked upon as the source of good health, energy, and good feeling for many millions of people.

IDEALISM IN ACTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that an article by Mr. Roscoe Drummond entitled "Idealism in Action" be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IDEALISM IN ACTION—PEACE CORPS SUCCEEDS

(By Roscoe Drummond)

If you thought that the Peace Corps was going to be a political boondoggle, a joyride for the volunteers and likely to alienate foreign friends—the facts are proving to be quite different.

I certainly had my own reservations at the beginning. I thought the Peace Corps was a good idea likely to go wrong in operation.

It has gone right.

When its 1962–63 budget comes before Congress for approval, the Peace Corps will find that it has won many new supporters in both parties.

On the basis of its efficient management and first-year achievements, the Peace Corps clearly deserves the increasing—even enthusiastic—acceptance it is getting on Capitol Hill.

Director Sargent Shriver, Jr., is giving the Peace Corps a drive and dedication which are reflected throughout its operation.

Thus far there are 802 Peace Corps volunteers working in 14 countries in Africa, the Near East and south Asia, the Far East, and Latin America.

These young, well-motivated and college-trained volunteers are working about 18 hours a day teaching students and teaching teachers, mapping roads, improving health and sanitation, improving methods of farming. The Peace Corpsmen received tourist travel and living expenses (some of it paid by the host countries) and $75 a month deposited to their credit in the United States.

The only practical basis for judging the Peace Corps at this time is whether the countries in which it is serving are satisfied. On this point the facts are these:

Every one of the 14 countries wants the work continued.

But this might be a wish not to offend. It is more than that because every one of these governments—from Ghana to Thailand, from Tanganyika to Chile—is asking for more Peace Corps help.

Furthermore, 13 other countries are asking the Peace Corps for volunteers. How have the Peace Corps volunteers themselves shown up under stressful conditions? Out of 802 volunteers working in remote parts of relatively underdeveloped countries, only one has quit and another has been ordered home.

At headquarters, Mr. Shriver has attracted—and the Peace Corps ideal itself attracted—outstanding, able people from business, from academic life, and from other Government agencies. The Peace Corps is a spartan operation in the field and it is being spartanly but firmly managed in Washington.

What is life and work like for the Peace Corps? Here is a typical report from a volunteer in Ghana:

"Real privations have been at a minimum. My house, a 2-mile walk from the school, is without electricity, refrigeration, and transportation; but it is compensatingly located on the beautiful, grassy, warm, windswept plains of Winneba and faces the distant and lovely Mount Mankoadze.

"In order to reach school for the morning service and the first class at 7, I rise each day at 5:30. Classes are completed at 2, at which time I return home for lunch except when I remain on duty until 9, or for student meetings which last the afternoon. My teaching, 28 hours a week of English language, French language, English literature, and British history, demands many extra hours of preparation.

"I usually cannot retire before 10 or 10:30. Extra activities include additional classes for the upper forms in English and history (often for students not officially in my classes), and being a form master, the entertainments master, and the debating union master. When we move to our new location, I hope to do some coaching of wrestling, tennis, and basketball.

"It has been interesting to give a few Saturday night lectures to the school * * *. I was pleased to discover how much an objective, unbiased American point of view (on Berlin) can be appreciated by one uniformed but eagerly curious group of students."

The Peace Corps hopes to expand its volunteers working abroad from 800 to about 6,700 in the next 18 months.

Here is a New Frontier enterprise which is really creating a new frontier for practical American idealism in action.

Mr. HUMPHREY. One of the most successful and heartening programs of the New Frontier has been the Peace Corps. As an early advocate and sponsor of legislation to establish the Peace Corps, I was certain it would be a great success, and the record of the Corps to date—I am pleased to say—bears out my confidence.

I may say to the Presiding Officer of the Senate, the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], that only the other day a number of recruits for the Peace Corps were with us in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee room as they were getting ready to go to Brazil on a new project of the Peace Corps. The late and beloved husband of the Presiding Officer and our fine and wonderful colleague, Senator NEUBERGER, would have been delighted and pleased to see those young men and women, because he was one of the first to speak up in this body and in this Nation for the Peace Corps. It is a living tribute to his idealism and to the idealism of the American people.

I invite Senators attention to the column by Mr. Drummond and the fine record of the Peace Corps. Mr. Drummond refers to it as "a new frontier for practical American idealism in action."

We can all be proud as Americans in the work of the Peace Corps.

They teach. They educate. They act. I think that is in the best tradition of our country. The Peace Corps is doing an outstanding job; and its Director, Mr. Shriver, is proving what a fine sense of administrative ability he has in setting the program in action. It is doing an outstanding job in helping others to help themselves and to bring to people of others lands a positive, constructive, and hopeful image of our country. We are indebted to the dedicated, selfless, and constructive work of the Peace Corps volunteers and staff.

AMERICAN PEOPLE BACK THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, in recent weeks I have been receiving, as I am sure my colleagues have been receiving, a good deal of mail expressing opposition to the United Nations. This mail drive has been in large measure the result of a stepped-up campaign of extreme rightwing elements in the country to destroy the United Nations.

They get themselves in a rather peculiar position, however. They find themselves mouthing the same phrases that come out of the Kremlin—phrases like, "Get the U.S. out of the U.N.," which is exactly what the spokesmen and the propaganda artists of the Kremlin have been saying.

We also hear the phrase, "Get the U.N. out of the U.S.," which is again what the propaganda machine of the Kremlin has been saying. However, the American people do not feel that way, thank goodness. I have not been too concerned about that flow of mail because of my confidence that it does not reflect the views of the vast majority of the American people. Furthermore, most of the mail comes first class and carries a 4-cent stamp. The Post Office Department can make a little money through such mail. There is a very serious deficit in the Post Office Department. So I suggest to all the "aginners," particularly the "aginners" of the U.N. and the "aginners" of the Peace Corps and those who are the "aginners" on foreign trade, and all the other professional "aginners" that use first-class mail, that we can find some way to relieve some of the postal deficit.

But in a much more serious vein, I was reassured that the views of the vast majority of the American people were not being properly represented by the mail drive that tends to inundate our offices.

A Gallup poll of February 4 shows this to be the case. Those polled were asked: "How important do you think it is that we try to make the United Nations a success—very important, fairly important, or not so important?"

Eighty-three percent answered that it is "very important" to make the United Nations a success. Another 9 percent said it was "fairly important." Only 4 percent answered "not so important."

It must be most frustrating to the extremists who are out to destroy confidence in the United Nations to see their efforts bear so little fruit. But I have no doubt that it will not discourage them. As a matter of fact their sound and fury will probably increase as support for their position dwindles. But their outpourings of hate and suspicion will not frighten the American people; they will not convince anyone who thinks for himself that we should reject the United Nations.

There may be those who have honest differences of opinion as to the best way to finance the activities of the United Nations. For these people I have the highest regard. There can be an honest difference of opinion as to whether the bond issue should be the manner in which the activities of the U.N. should be financed in part.

However, most of the noise and sound and fury at this time is heard because the United Nations bond issue has given a wonderful opportunity to these opponents of the United Nations to lash out at that Organization.

The United Nations is vital to our country, and is vital to our search for peace. As President Kennedy so aptly said in his speech before the United Nations last September, it is vital in the peace race. He urged the world to forgo the arms race and to enter upon the peace race.

That peace race must be conducted within the framework of the United Nations. All of us should feel encouraged by the good sense of the American people when 83 percent of them in a public opinion poll say they feel the success of the United Nations is very important, and only 4 percent say it is not important. It appears that people have a better understanding of the need for the United Nations than do some of their spokesmen. It is one of the most heartening developments in recent days on the subject of American foreign policy.

In conclusion, Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that this Gallup poll to which I refer be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EIGHTY-THREE PERCENT STRONGLY SUPPORT U.N. AS BEST VEHICLE FOR PEACE

PRINCETON, N.J.—Racked by crisis, and under fire from many quarters, the United Nations nonetheless remains the best hope for peace in the world today in the eyes of the American people.

Recent events in the U.N.—causing some observers to fear its impending demise—have done little to shake the belief of an overwhelming majority of the public that it is very important to make the U.N. a success.

One year ago—before Soviet demands for a troika, the death of Dag Hammarskjold, and the Indian invasion of Goa confronted the U.N. with some of its gravest problems—83 percent of persons interviewed by the Gallup poll said it was very important for the United States to work toward making the world body a success.

FORUM FOR PEACE

In a just completed repeat of that survey, 83 percent again said the same thing.

To Americans, the U.N.—no matter what its shortcomings—continues to offer one forum where international tensions can be talked over rather than fought over.

The sentiment of many people is typified in the remarks of a miner's wife from Grindstone (population 1,094) in southwestern Pennsylvania:

"If the United Nations fails, there's no chance remaining for peace."

The question: "How important do you think it is that we try to make the United Nations a success—very important, fairly important, or not so important?"

The vote:	Percent
Very important	83
Fairly important	9
Not so important	4
No opinion	4

The current vote of confidence cuts across partisan differences and regional boundaries.

Big majorities of Republicans, Democrats, and independents in all sections of the country feel that assuring the U.N.'s success is highly important.

STRONG SUPPORT

In November 1952, with U.N. forces engaged in the then unpopular Korean war, 77 percent of Americans still felt it was important for the United States to work for the success of the United Nations.

Four years later, with the U.N. trying to effect a peace in the Suez crisis, but blocked by Russian veto from a similar effort in Hungary, 85 percent expressed similar hopes.

From its birth, 17 years ago, in fact, the United Nations has had strong support from the American people.

A TRADE POLICY TO MEET THE CHALLENGES OF OUR TIME

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, I send to the desk and ask unanimous consent that out of order, it may be referred at this time, a bill which I call the National Trade Policy Act of 1962; also I ask unanimous consent to be inserted at the end of my remarks, an analysis of the bill, showing the differences between my bill and the administration bill; also a supplementary statement showing a comparison between the tax relief provisions in the adjustment assistance sections of H.R. 9900, the administration bill, and my bill.

Madam President, the bill is a very inclusive bill, as Members of the Senate will note when they peruse it. It is an alternative to the President's program. I consider it to be a feasible and a more effective alternative, which, it seems to me, is better calculated to realize the trade expansion objectives of the President. Certainly it should be considered, so that those who favor the President's program can formulate the best means of implementing it.

Others are working on this program in the same spirit. For example, a Subcommittee on Economic Policy of the Atlantic Community of the CED, under the chairmanship of Dr. Emilio Collado, is just now considering this question and their ideas should be most sympathetically received.

The administration, with its great resources of factual material, has been emphasizing to the Congress and to the people of the United States the great stake we all have in international trade. I should like to point out that it is important not only to the Nation as a whole, but is vitally important also to the individual States. For example, my own State of New York exports nearly $1.5 billion worth of goods annually, leading the Nation in the export of manufactures. It also should be borne in mind that some 20 million American workers depend for their livelihood on our ability to export and import; about 15 million of them on the importation of products which are processed by our industrial machine. Thousands of businesses count on our $20 billion annual exports to provide the margin of profit for their operations. All of our 185 million potential consumers must look to imports which are earned through exports for help in getting, through competition which imports engender, a greater choice in price and quality of the goods they need.

Furthermore, the $35 billion of our annual trade furnish the toughest, strongest ties, economic and political, we as a nation have with the rest of the free world. As the free world economy expands, these ties must grow accordingly, lest they lose their ability to bind us together in carrying out the common purposes of freedom.

It is highly significant that during the past decade, while trade in the free world more than doubled, U.S. trade increased by only 75 percent—a weakening of our participation in the expansion of the free world's economy which was accompanied during the last years by sizable balance-of-payments deficits and a potentially serious drain on our gold reserves. Continued operation of our economy on the increasingly false assumption that there is no strong competition for our products in the world has contributed to a U.S. rate of productivity growth about one-half as high as the growth rates of our strongest competitors—though we remain far ahead in total production. And, since 1954, we have seen a threefold increase of trade between the Communist bloc and the newly developing nations of the free world, while our trade with these free world nations has hardly grown at all.

The nature of the challenges and the opportunities is being presented to the Nation. We are properly engaged in a great debate on how best to meet these challenges and opportunities in the national interest and in the interest of our ideals of freedom. I stand firm in the conviction that we must meet them through a major expansion in trade.

I join the President in his determination to bring about the implementation of this idea. However, I believe that some of the major provisions of the administration's trade bill are misdirected. I should like to present, for the consideration of the Congress, my approach.

First. We must not be solely confined to the item-by-item or commodity concept of world trade.

Although the President does attempt this in his general approach, he ties himself to current levels of commodity trade in negotiations with the European Economic Community; and he encumbers his bill with item-by-item consideration of proposed trade concessions and with intricate exceptions for agricultural and for tropical commodities. Furthermore, he runs the danger of excluding some of our best trading partners, including Canada, Australia, and other developed nations, which take some $4 billion of our exports annually, from the full benefits of large-scale trade negotiations, to be conducted only with the EEC, the present members of which took comparatively less—$3.5 billion—of our exports last year.

I believe that we must also deal with the basic and long-range problems of world trade which reside in the relative productivity of nations. Reliance on current commodity prices to provide the basis for a trade policy for the future, exposes the free world to the possibility of sudden, discriminatory reversals in trade liberalization. Complete removal of trade barriers on categories of items like electronic components, which would include radio apparatus and parts; on chemicals, which would include fertilizers; and on other categories, which would include rubber footwear, certain glass, clay, steel mill, aluminum, paper, and textile products, could induce the developing nations to concentrate their limited capital resources in such lines of production. Even the developing nations have the capacity to produce efficiently and with low wage costs items in some of the lines which I have cited. In the expectation of earning foreign exchange they could seriously affect the markets of developed nations on a small but concentrated number of items, perhaps forcing the reimposition of import restrictions and effecting a setback in the economic development prospects of the developing nations. It is therefore my view that while we should seek to engage in the fullest possible competition with nations having economies complementary to our own, we must also seek to provide stable and expanding markets for the developing free world economies so that they may raise their earning power and begin to close the productivity gap. My bill proposes to accomplish this purpose by directing the President to use his negotiating authority with the developed nations to open up their markets on an equitable basis to the products of the newly developing and of the low-cost producing industrialized areas: Latin America, Africa, the Middle East, south and southeast Asia, Japan, Hong Kong, and others. This would result in a greater contribution by the fully developed nations of Europe to the economic development of newly developed nations through trade, and spread the trade of low-cost producing industrialized nations, thereby relieving the United States of a part of the heavy responsibility it has carried since the end of World War II.

Second. The Congress must participate in the broad direction of foreign trade policy and must be able to make its will effective.

Although the President's bill would provide for reports and messages on the trade agreements program to keep the Congress informed, neither effective direction nor control by the Congress is envisaged, after the basic authority is granted.

I cannot see any avoiding of the congressional retention of a veto power over the results of negotiations, as well as a veto power on what is done with the other specific authorities given to the President.

My bill would provide for congressional policy directions in the utilization of Presidential negotiating authority and for congressional veto power over the most important phases of the exercise of Presidential authority: (a) trade agreements, (b) national security proclamations, (c) escape clause actions, and (d) adjustment assistance administration.

A veto power is now contained in the Reciprocal Trade Act, which will expire in June. I propose that Congress extend it to the other major grants of authority to the President in the trade program.

The third item which requires attention, the third reason for introducing alternative legislation, is that the United States must take the leadership in forging a unified free-world trading policy toward the Soviet bloc.

Madam President, I have returned fairly recently from the Soviet Union and have also made a report on this subject in the Senate. One of the marked things which stand out is the Soviet success in playing off major industrial nations against one another. It is anomalous that the Communist bloc does hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of business with the German Federal Republic and the United Kingdom, and others of our allies, but far less than $100 million worth of business a year with the United States. That is because we exercise an infinitely greater amount of self-restraint in our dealings. It may very well mean that we or they must escalate down and they up. But certainly the time has come for a unified policy with our allies on such trade. I believe the authority for increased trade negotiations with our allies gives us the best opportunity to shape such a policy. Hence I include in my bill a directive to the President to that effect.

Although the President's bill proposes to continue the exclusion of Communist dominated nations from unconditional most favored nation treatment, it does not provide for positive leadership action.

I do not believe that a negative policy is enough to counter the divisive and politically oriented economic strategy of the Communists. My bill expresses the sense of the Congress that the President should utilize his authority to enter into trade agreements, in order to negotiate with our allies for the formulation of a treaty which would unify our trading policies with the Communist bloc. Adherence to such a treaty should be open to other free world nations. Such a treaty should provide for effective multilateral and bilateral controls on the shipment of strategic goods and on the extension of export credits. It should open up alternative marketing and purchasing opportunities for free world nations injured by Communist bloc economic policies. It should contain contingency plans and measures, and common proposals for and means to enforce specific rules of behavior in trade with the Communist bloc.

These are the three broad areas in which my bill differs from that of the administration, and offers what I call a feasible alternative.

I repeat that this is not a matter of antagonism to the President's purposes on trade. I fully intend to join with the President in the trade expansion purpose.

My bill is an effort to give us, perhaps, a better way in which the purposes may be realized, with special attention being paid to other critical items which I have described, one being the need to open European markets—far more than is now the case—to the products of newly developing areas, as well as the products of industrialized low-cost producing areas.

Second, participation by Congress in trade policy through the exercise of specific directions and the right to exercise veto power.

Third, the need for a unified policy on free world trade with the Communist bloc. All of these items are contained in my bill.

In summary, I believe the United States must have the power to take truly new measures in the field of trade; that the President must have the negotiating authority to carry out such measures; and that Congress must share as an effective partner in the direction and control over such measures. In this way, the Nation can meet the historic challenges and opportunities of our time.

I have introduced my bill with that in mind. During the coming weeks, I expect to address the Senate on the various issues involved in these two different approaches—mine and the administration's—to the goal of trade expansion. I have already summarized the principal features of the approach of my bill.

For the study of Senators, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at the conclusion of my remarks a comparison of the major portions of the administration bill with mine, and a supplementary comparison of certain tax relief provisions in both bills.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, I conclude by saying that I think the idea of presenting a feasible alternative to Congress is a very desirable one, certainly from our side of the aisle, as carrying out some of the approaches which we have in mind and as giving an opportunity and a rallying point for those who may agree with the fundamental objectives of the trade program, but who may have differences in method which may be resolved. I have offered my bill in that spirit.

I think it is well known that if trade legislation is to become law at this session of Congress, it will be necessary to get votes from both sides of the aisle in order to accomplish it. I hope very much that those votes may be obtainable, and I shall do my best to help bring that about; but that can only happen if the views of those on both sides of the aisle who are fighting for the same objectives find some reflection in the ultimate legislative package which goes to the President for his signature.

The analysis and supplemental statement presented by Mr. JAVITS are as follows:

EXHIBIT 1

COMPARISON OF MAJOR PROVISIONS IN PROPOSED TRADE LEGISLATION

Javits bill	*Administration bill*
Title	
National Trade Policy Act of 1962 (S. 2840).	Trade Expansion Act of 1962 (H.R. 9900, introduced by Mr. MILLS).
Purpose	
To provide trade negotiating authority for the President, under the control and direction of the Congress; to meet the challenges of the economic forces sweeping the world—such as the growth of regional trading groups, the requirements of the newly developing free world nations, and the Soviet bloc potential for economic penetration.	To lower trade barriers through mutually beneficial trade agreements, in order to stimulate U.S. economic growth, enlarge foreign markets for U.S. products, benefit the U.S. consumer, strengthen U.S. ties with the European Economic Community and foreign countries through nondiscriminatory free world trade, assist newly developing free world nations, and counter Communist economic penetration.
To provide assistance to business enterprises, individuals and communities in adjusting to changed economic conditions resulting from increased U.S. participation in world trade.	To provide assistance to enterprises, workers and farmers in adjusting to new conditions resulting from increased trade with the European Economic Community and foreign countries.
Advisory Committee on Trade Policy	
Shall be composed of nine members, appointed by the President, and shall be broadly representative of production, commerce, finance, agriculture, labor, and consumer interests. One of the members shall be a member of the National Export Expansion Committee which was established in 1960. The advisory committee shall meet one or more times a year, on the call of the President, for consultation on the administration of this act.	NOTE.—See below: "Adjustment Assistance Advisory Board."
PART I. PRESIDENTIAL AUTHORITY IN TRADE AGREEMENTS, AND CONGRESSIONAL VETO	
Extent of and Limitations on Presidential Authority	
In agreements with low-cost producing industrialized and developing nations or areas, duties may be reduced by 50 percent, or reduced to a rate of 30 percent—whichever is lower. In agreements with fully developed nations or areas, duties may be reduced by 100 percent.	Duties may be reduced by 50 percent except that agreements with the European Economic Community can exceed this limitation on all articles within any category (three-digit group of the Standard International Trade Classification) in which the United States and the European Economic Community account for 80 percent or more of the world export value.
NOTE.—The bill defines fully developing nations or areas as having a substantial manufacturing output and a productivity rate at least one-third that of the United States. Other free-world nations or areas are low-cost producing industrialized or developing.	
Not more than one-half of the maximum authorized decrease shall become effective in any one year.	Duty reductions shall take effect in five annual installments.

PART I. PRESIDENTIAL AUTHORITY IN TRADE AGREEMENTS, AND CONGRESSIONAL VETO—continued

In agreements with low-cost producing industrialized and developing nations or areas, items may be transferred from the dutiable to the free list, if such items are not produced in the United States in significant quantities or if the duty on such items does not exceed 3 percent. (This limitation does not apply to agreements with fully developed nations or areas.)	Items may be transferred from the dutiable to the free list, if the duty on such items does not exceed 5 percent. (This limitation applies to all agreements.)
NOTE.—The specific authority on agricultural trade with the EEC, and on tropical agricultural and forestry commodities, contained in the administration bill, can be exercised under the broad authority of the Javits bill (see above)—except as such authority in the administration bill refers to "other import restrictions" on tropical commodities.	In agreements with the European Economic Community, relating to agricultural commodities, duty reductions may exceed the 50-percent limitation even if the United States and the European Economic Community do not account for 80 percent or more of the world export value. Duties or other important restrictions on tropical agricultural and forestry commodities may be removed, if the European Economic Community makes comparable concessions and if such commodities are not produced in significant quantities in the United States.
Unconditional Most-Favored Nation Treatment Shall apply to all fully developed nations or areas; and may be extended to other free world nations or areas—so that the President may be able to act according to the extent to which such treatment is extended by the fully developed to the other free world nations or areas.	Shall be carried out in all agreements.
Expiration of Negotiating Authority June 30, 1965.	June 30, 1967.
Trade With Communist Dominated Nations The above authority does not apply to trade with Communist-dominated nations or areas.	The above authority does not apply to trade with Communist-dominated nations or areas.
It is the sense of the Congress that the President should utilize his authority to enter into trade agreements, in order to negotiate with our allies for a treaty which would unify our trading policies relative to the Communist-dominated nations or areas. Adherence to such a treaty should be open to other non-Communist-dominated nations or areas. Such a treaty should provide for effective and unified controls on the shipment of strategic goods and the extension of export credits; alternative marketing and purchasing opportunities for free world nations experiencing or threatened with serious economic injury as the result of Communist economic policies; contingency plans and measures; and common proposals for and means to enforce specific rules in trade with the Communist-dominated nations or areas.	
Further Presidential Authority and Congressional Directions Duties may be raised up to 50 percent above the rate existing on July 1, 1934. (See below: "Escape Clause.")	The reduction or elimination of any duty or other import restriction under any trade agreement may be suspended, if the President determines that a foreign nation discriminates against U.S. commerce or engages in other practices contrary to the purposes of this act. (See below: "Escape Clause.") NOTE.—The specific authority on tropical commodities, contained in the administration bill (see above), provides for certain marketing opportunities for developing nations or areas.
The President shall utilize his authority to assure expanding markets and nondiscriminatory treatment for U.S. products, and provide for special arrangements—such as tariff quotas, and marketing and servicing assistance—in order to provide stable and expanding markets for the products of low cost producing industrialized and developing nations or areas in the economies of the fully developed nations or areas. Consideration shall be given to the effect of the importation of such products on the United States and other fully developed nations' economies.	
The President shall utilize his authority to enter into trade agreements, in order to provide adequate protection for holders of U.S. patents and copyrights.	
It is the sense of the Congress that the President should utilize his authority to enter into trade agreements, in order to negotiate an agreement with all contracting parties to GATT, and with other nations whereby they would report annually to GATT on the progress achieved in raising living standards and improving working conditions.	

PART I. PRESIDENTIAL AUTHORITY IN TRADE

National Security No action shall be taken under the above authority to decrease the duty on any article, if the President finds that such a reduction would threaten to impair the national security.	
Whenever the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning believes that the imports of any article are threatening to impair the national security, and the President agrees that there is reason for such belief, the President shall institute an immediate investigation. On the basis of such an investigation, he shall proclaim such action as he deems necessary to adjust the imports of such an article to a level which will not threaten to impair the national security. Such a proclamation shall be submitted to the Congress.	
Impact of imports on the domestic economy—the former peril-point provisions The President shall utilize his authority to enter into trade agreements with due consideration of the effect of resulting imports on the domestic economy. Before entering into such an agreement, he shall consult with the Tariff Commission.	
Congressional veto of trade agreements and proclamations under the national security clause The President is required to submit to the Congress any trade agreement, or any proclamation under the national security clause, immediately after it is entered into or issued.	
Any such agreement or proclamation is subject to veto by the Congress through a concurrent resolution passed by both Houses by a two-thirds vote, within 60 days after such an agreement or proclamation has been submitted to the Congress.	
Furthermore, any trade agreement calling for concessions greater than the kind specifically authorized with low cost producing industrialized and developing nations or areas is subject to veto through a concurrent resolution passed by both Houses by majority vote. (This would affect agreements with fully developed nations.)	

PART II. THE TARIFF COMMISSION, ADJUSTMENT

The Tariff Commission Shall be prepared at all times to advise the President with respect to conditions of competition prevailing between imported products and domestic production. It shall keep up to date and publish the "Summaries of Tariff Information." (Powers previously granted to the Tariff Commission remain in effect, unless specifically changed in this act.)	

AGREEMENTS, AND CONGRESSIONAL VETO—con.

No action shall be taken under the above authority, if the President determines that such action would threaten to impair the national security.

Upon request of the head of any agency, upon application of any interested party, or upon his own motion, the President shall institute an immediate investigation to determine the effects on national security of the imports of any article. On the basis of such an investigation he shall adjust the imports of such an article so that such imports will not threaten to impair the national security, as he deems necessary.

Among other things, the President shall give consideration to the capacity of domestic industry to meet projected national defense requirements, and the existence of supplies and services essential to the national defense. The President shall further recognize the close relation of the economic welfare of the Nation to our national security.

A report shall be made and published by the President upon the disposition of each request, application, or motion on this matter.

Before entering into trade agreements, the President shall utilize the advice of the Tariff Commission. In preparing such advice, the Tariff Commission shall hold hearings and afford opportunity for interested parties to be heard, and shall take into consideration the probability of the idling of facilities in industries affected by such trade agreements, the inability of firms to operate at a profit, and the probability of the unemployment or underemployment of workers.

After entering into any trade agreement, the President shall submit it to the Congress, stating, in the light of the advice of the Tariff Commission and of other relevant considerations, his reasons for entering into the agreement.

ASSISTANCE, AND CONGRESSIONAL VETO

Shall at all times keep informed concerning the operation and effect of the provisions of trade agreements, and may conduct preliminary investigations and exercise other powers previously granted to it, in order to perform its functions under this act.

PART II. THE TARIFF COMMISSION, ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE, AND CONGRESSIONAL VETO—continued

Eligibility for Adjustment Assistance (and the Escape Clause) Any business enterprise, community, industrial development corporation, individual or organization representing individuals, may apply to the President for a certificate of eligibility for assistance. To be eligible, a business enterprise or individual must first be found by the Tariff Commission, under existing escape clause procedure, to be suffering or threatened with serious injury from increased imports resulting from a trade agreement. A community must be suffering or threatened with such injury as the result of reductions in personnel by business enterprises cited above. An industrial development corporation must be operated for the purpose of improving the economic situation of a community cited above.	**Any firm, worker, or representative of a firm or worker may file a petition with the President for a determination of eligibility to apply for assistance. The President shall transmit such a petition to the Tariff Commission for advice on the extent to which import competition has increased. A firm shall be eligible to apply for assistance with an administering agency designated by the President, if the President determines that increased imports are causing or are immediately threatening to cause serious economic injury, as defined in the bill, to the firm or its workers. A worker shall be eligible to apply for assistance with an administering agency designated by the President, if the President determines that increased imports are causing or are immediately threatening to cause significant unemployment or underemployment among workers in the worker's firm.**
Furthermore, a business enterprise, community, or industrial development corporation must also submit satisfactory proposals for programs of economic adjustment. For the purpose of preparing such proposals, technical assistance shall be extended.	**Furthermore, a firm must present to the administering agency adjustment proposals which are calculated to contribute to the firm's economic adjustment, give consideration to the interests of its workers, and demonstrate that the firm will make all reasonable efforts to use its own resources for economic adjustment.**
Adjustment Assistance and Tariff Relief for Industries (and the Escape Clause) If the business enterprise or individual, found by the Tariff Commission to be suffering or threatened with injury from imports, represents, singly, or in combination with other similarly injured or threatened parties, a substantial part of any industry, the Tariff Commission may recommend to the President the raising of duties or the imposition of other import restrictions on the article being imported—in addition to or in the place of adjustment assistance. **(The President may give adjustment assistance in addition to or in the place of the rise in duties or imposition of other import restrictions recommended by the Tariff Commission.)**	**An industry must file a petition for assistance with the Tariff Commission. The Tariff Commission shall advise the President. An industry shall be eligible for assistance, if the President determines that increased imports are causing or are immediately threatening to cause serious economic injury on a widespread basis in the industry, reasonable efforts in the industry to adjust have been made, and the assistance given to firms and workers under this act have not sufficed to mitigate the serious economic injury. Furthermore, if the President determines that an industry is eligible for assistance, he shall proclaim such raising of duties or imposition of other import restrictions as he may determine to be in the national interest.**
The President may not raise duties to a rate more than 50 percent above the rate existing on July 1, 1934 (see above). The President may provide that increases in duties or the imposition of other import restrictions shall be effective on a gradually reducing basis over a period of not more than 7 years.	**The President may not raise duties to a rate more than 50 percent above the rate existing on July 1, 1934. Any increase in duty or imposition of other import restrictions shall expire not more than 4 years after going into effect, unless the President determines that the national interest requires a longer period, and is subject to change within that 4-year period at the discretion of the President.**
Congressional Veto of Presidential Acts **If the President does not take the action recommended by the Tariff Commission, he shall submit a report to the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee, stating his reasons. Within 60 days after the submittal of such a report, the Congress may cause the Tariff Commission recommendations to go into effect, through a concurrent resolution passed by both Houses by a two-thirds vote.** **The Congress may provide through a concurrent resolution, passed by both Houses by majority vote, that the President's authority to issue certificates of eligibility for adjustment assistance shall terminate—but this shall not affect the eligibility for assistance of those already holding such certificates.** Expiration of Certificates of Eligibility **Certificates shall be good for up to 18 months. They may be renewed by the President for not more than four successive periods.**	
Presidential Delegation of Authority **The President may delegate any power or authority in the extension of adjustment as-**	**The President shall assure that the functions in the extension of adjustment assist-**

PART II. THE TARIFF COMMISSION, ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE, AND CONGRESSIONAL VETO—continued

sistance to such departments, agencies, or offices of the Government as he deems appropriate.	ance are carried out through existing agencies and programs of the executive branch.
Advisory Board Any department, agency, or office performing the functions in extending adjustment assistance, shall consult with the other parts of the Government which are concerned with domestic and foreign trade policies and operations. NOTE.—See above: "Advisory Committee on Trade Policy."	An Adjustment Assistance Advisory Board, consisting of the Secretary of Commerce, as Chairman, and the Secretaries of Treasury, Agriculture, Labor, Interior, and HEW, and the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, and such other officers as the President deems appropriate, is created to advise him and the administering agencies on the development of coordinated programs of adjustment assistance. The Chairman may appoint an industry committee, representing employers, workers, and the public, for the purpose of advising the Board.
Substantive Adjustment Assistance Provisions Both bills contain basically similar provisions for minimum standards for unemployment compensation to be paid to workers adversely affected by increased imports, as well as for retraining programs and relocation allowances for such workers. The only substantial difference is that the Javits bill also provides for early retirement payments to such workers choosing to obtain them after the age of 60. Both bills contain basically similar provisions for loans, tax incentives and technical assistance to firms adversely affected by increased imports. The only substantial difference is that the Javits bill also makes applicable provisions available to communities.	

SUPPLEMENTARY COMPARISON OF THE TAX RELIEF PROVISIONS IN THE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE SECTIONS OF H.R. 9900 (REPRESENTATIVE MILLS) AND THE BILL OF SENATOR JAVITS

Essentially, the difference between section 317 of H.R. 9900 and section 207 of Senator JAVITS' bill is the difference between liberalizing the application of existing tax law (sec. 317 of H.R. 9900) and revising the annual amount of tax relief that would be available to a company adversely affected by the foreign trade policies of the United States.

Section 317 of H.R. 9900 revises the formula for the application of the loss carryback and carryover provisions of the Internal Revenue Code by enlarging from 8 years to 10 the permissible period for the inclusion, as tax deductions of net operating loss carrybacks and carryovers in the case of companies adversely affected by the foreign trade policies of the United States. At present, title 26, United States Code, section 172(b)(1) provides a net operating loss carryback to each of the 3 taxable years preceding the taxable year of such loss, and a net operating loss carryover to each of the 5 taxable years following the taxable year of such loss. Section 317(d) of H.R. 9900 would add a new provision to section 1721(b)(1) to allow a net operating loss carryback to each of 5 taxable years preceding the taxable year of such loss for companies adversely affected by U.S. foreign trade policies. Section 317 also amends other sections of the Internal Revenue Code (26 U.S.C. 6501(h), and 6511(d)(2)(A)) dealing respectively with limitations on assessment and collection in the case of net operating loss carrybacks, and with the special period of limitation on claims for credit or refund with respect to net operating loss carrybacks, to conform with the proposed change in section 1721(b)(1).

Section 207 of Senator JAVITS' bill would effect two things: (1) in section 207(a) it would provide a special, increased depreciation deduction (including a 5-year carryback) on property which is used in its trade or business, on the date the depreciation deduction is granted, by a company adversely affected by U.S. foreign trade policies, a special 5-year amortization deduction for so-called conversion facilities, i.e., any facility, land, building, machinery, or equipment, or any part thereof, the construction, reconstruction, erection, installation, or acquisition of which was completed after the date of enactment of the bill, by a company adversely affected by U.S. foreign trade policies and which has been determined to be necessary to enable the business concern either (a) to develop new or different lines of production, or (b) to renovate its productive facilities. Such an amortization deduction would generally be in lieu of the depreciation deduction provided under section 167 of title 26, United States Code, the business depreciation deduction section of the Internal Revenue Code and the section that would be amended by the increased depreciation provision in Senator JAVITS' bill.

The rapid amortization provision which would add a new section 181 to title 26, United States Code, is similar in concept but not identical in substance to the provision in the code (26 U.S.C. 168) permitting a special rapid amortization procedure for defense emergency facilities.

Section 167 of title 26, the proposed section 181 (both of which are in Senator JAVITS' bill) and section 172 (revised in section 317 of H.R. 9900), are (or would be) all parts of part VI of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (26 U.S.C. 161–180), relating to itemized deductions for individuals and corporations. Section 172, relating to net operating loss deduction defines "net operating loss" in subsection (s) thereof as "the excess of the deductions allowed by this chapter over the gross income." The deductions allowed by this chapter include section 167 (business depreciation deduction), and would include the proposed section 181 (rapid amortization).

Subsections (2) and (3) of section 207(a) of Senator JAVITS' bill provide that the special depreciation deduction would be applicable "only for the taxable year in which the certificate (of eligibility for assistance) is issued (under section 201(a) of the bill) and for the 4 taxable years succeeding such taxable year."

Section 201(a) of the bill provides that the effective life of certificates of eligibility issued thereunder shall not be more than 18 months, with successive renewals for periods of 18 months or less upon a showing of necessity.

Subsections 317 (a) and (b) of H.R. 9900 permit tax relief under the net operating loss carryback and carryover provisions of the code to such companies as are certified under section 311 of the bill to be eligible for assistance. An eligible company may apply for such assistance within 2 years after the close of any taxable year in which a net operating lass was sustained.

Section 311(d) of H.R. 9900 does not set a statutory maximum for the in-force period of duration of certificates of eligibility issued thereunder. It provides that they shall remain in force "only for such period as the administering agency may prescribe by regulations."

Section 207(b) of Senator JAVITS' bill which deals with the deduction for rapid amortization of conversion facilities, grants the privilege to business concerns which have secured certificates of eligibility under section 201(a) of the bill. The 5-year rapid amortization period "shall begin as to any facility, at the election of the taxpayer, with the month following the month in which the facility was completed, or with the succeeding taxable year."

BUSINESSES ELIGIBLE FOR ASSISTANCE UNDER SECTION 317 OF H.R. 9900 AND SECTION 207 OF SENATOR JAVITS' PROPOSED BILL

Section 317(a) of H.R. 9900 reads, "the administering agency may provide to a firm certified under section 311 of this act, adjustment assistance in the form of tax relief as provided in this section, if it determines that such assistance will materially contribute to the economic adjustment of the firm."

The term "firm" is defined in section 407(c) of the bill to include "an individual proprietorship, partnership, joint venture, association, corporation (including a development corporation), business trust, cooperative, trustees in bankruptcy, and receivers under decree of any court."

Section 311 provides that a firm eligible for adjustment assistance as a result of a determination made under section 302 of the bill may file an application with such agency as the President may designate as the administrative agency, for adjustment assistance in accordance with the bill; and, within a reasonable time after filing its application, the firm shall present a proposal for its economic adjustment.

The administering agency must certify that the firm's adjustment proposal (1) is reasonably calculated materially to contribute to the economic adjustment of the firm, (2) gives adequate consideration to the interests of its workers adversely affected by actions taken in carrying out trade agreements, and (3) demonstrates that the firm will make all reasonable efforts to use its own resources for economic adjustment.

If tax relief is to be provided, the administering agency must determine that it is necessary to carry out a certified adjustment proposal.

Section 302 of the bill provides that a firm shall be eligible for adjustment assistance "if the President determines that, as a result of continuance, reduction, or elimination of a duty or other import restriction, or continuance of duty-free or excise treatment under a trade agreement, an article like or directly competitive with an article produced by the firm is being imported into the United States in such increased quantities as to cause, or immediately threaten to cause (1) significant idling of the productive facilities of the firm, (2) prolonged and persistent inability of the firm to operate at a profit, or (3) unemployment or underemployment of a significant number of the workers of the firm."

Finally, the last condition is set forth in section 317(b) of the bill which provides that tax relief is to be granted (1) if a net operating loss (within the meaning of 26 U.S.C. 172) was sustained by a firm with respect to any taxable year, (2) if the administering agency shall determine that such loss arose substantially out of the carrying on of a trade or business affected as specified in section 302 of the bill, and (3) if the administering agency shall further determine that such tax relief is appropriate.

Upon the occurrence of all of these findings, a certificate of such determination shall be issued to the firm. This certification shall entitle the firm to treat such net operating loss as provided in title 26, United States Code, section 172, as amended by H.R. 9900, if the firm files with the Secretary of the Treasury a notice of its application for tax relief and, after its issuance, a copy of such certification (sec. 317(1), H.R. 9900).

Subsections 207 (a) and (b) of Senator Javits' bill provide that tax relief is available in accordance with its provisions, to a business concern adversely affected by the foreign trade policies of the United States, only if a certificate of eligibility has been issued to such concern under section 201 of the bill.

Section 207(b) provides that the rapid amortization deduction may be claimed by an "individual who owns a proprietary interest in an unincorporated business concern which has been adversely affected by the foreign trade policies of the United States," as well as by a corporation which has been adversely affected.

Senator Javits' bill is at some variance with H.R. 9900, however, in the administrative determination for extending tax relief to a firm, in that it rests such authority primarily in the Tariff Commission rather than an undesignated agency, and it sets forth more detailed conditions for the granting of such relief. It also provides for congressional action to effectuate a Tariff Commission recommendation for adjustment relief if such is disapproved by the President. These provisions are found in sections 201 and 202 of Senator Javits' bill.

This variance in procedures does not affect the ultimate result anticipated under either bill, however; i.e., the issuance of a certificate making a business concern eligible for adjustment assistance in the nature of tax relief.

One other area of the need for possible clarification between the two bills as respects tax relief is discussed in the following paragraphs.

ELIGIBLE RECIPIENTS OF THE RAPID AMORTIZATION DEDUCTION IN 207(b) OF SENATOR JAVITS' BILL AND TAX RELIEF IN SECTION 317 OF H.R. 9900

Section 207(b) of Senator Javits' bill provides that a rapid amortization deduction in respect to conversion facilities can be claimed by "an individual who owns a proprietary interest in an unincorporated business concern which has been adversely affected by the foreign trade policies of the United States."

While section 172 of title 26, United States Code, permits the net operating loss carryback and carryover deduction to be claimed both by individuals (including partners) and corporations, section 317(a) of H.R. 9900 grants the proposed special net operating loss deduction provision only to "firms" adversely affected by U.S. foreign trade policies.

The term "firm" in section 407(c) of H.R. 9900 includes partnership, joint venture, association, business trust and cooperative, all of which are unincorporated business units involving individual proprietary interests. No provision seems to be made, however, for the specific owner-member interests in these units.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2840) to provide authority for the President, under the control and direction of the Congress, to make such necessary adjustments in the trade policies of the United States as may be necessary to meet the complex and rapidly changing economic and political conditions prevailing in the world, and to provide the means for assisting domestic enterprises, communities, and individuals to adjust their productive activities to changed economic conditions resulting from the increased participation of the United States in world trade, introduced by Mr. Javits, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 2840

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "National Trade Policy Act of 1962".

FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

Sec. 2. (a) The Congress—

(1) affirms its primary responsibility for the trade policies of the United States and its power to exercise final control and direction over those trade policies in all of their aspects;

(2) recognizes the nature and magnitude of the economic and political forces sweeping the world, as exemplified by the growth of the European Common Market, by the other regional economic arrangements emerging in Latin America and elsewhere, by the expanding export-import needs of low-cost producing industrialized nations and areas of the free world, by the economic development requirements of the developing nations and areas of the free world, and by the Communist potential for market disruption and other economic penetration of the free world;

(3) further recognizes that the United States, in order to preserve and enhance its domestic prosperity, must maintain its economic leadership within the free world, acting as the major participant in international economic affairs, and must utilize the full extent of its great resources to this end, while (A) assuring that all of its citizens derive the greatest and fullest benefits from such a course of action, and where necessary, are assisted to derive such benefits, and (B) taking into consideration the requirements of national security; and

(4) finds that the President, who is responsible for the day to day participation of the United States in international affairs, must be given sufficient authority within the field of foreign trade policy to negotiate, subject to the control and direction of the Congress, in the best interests of the United States and to meet the short term and the long term exigencies of international economic affairs.

(b) It is the purpose of this Act to give the President for a limited time authority to negotiate trade agreements in the interests of the United States on a long-term basis, to assure that such authority is used under the control and direction of the Congress, to direct that such authority is used to meet specifically the different trading problems encountered in various regions and areas of the world, and to provide that such authority include the means for assisting business enterprises, individuals, and communities so that they may make the necessary adjustments in their productive activities required by changed economic conditions resulting from the increased participation of the United States in world trade.

DEFINITIONS

Sec. 3. As used in this Act, the term—

(1) "Free world nation or area" means any nation or area which is not dominated or controlled by the foreign government or foreign organization controlling the world Communist movement.

(2) "Fully developed nation or area" means (A) any free world nation or area in which the output per worker engaged in manufacturing is at least 33⅓ per centum of the output per worker engaged in manufacturing in the United States, or (B) a group of such nations or areas operating as a customs union or free trade association in which the average output per worker engaged in manufacturing is at least 33⅓ per centum of the output per worker engaged in manufacturing in the United States, which nation, area, or group of nations or areas is determined by the President to be engaged substantially in manufacturing.

Advisory Committee on Trade Policy

Sec. 4. (a) There is hereby established an Advisory Committee on Trade Policy (hereinafter referred to as the "committee"), which shall be composed of nine members, appointed by the President, who shall be broadly representative of production, commerce, finance, agriculture, labor, and consumer interests. One of the members of the committee shall be a member of the National Export Expansion Committee, established by the Secretary of Commerce in accordance with the message of the President to the Congress on March 17, 1960.

(b) The committee shall meet one or more times each year, on the call of the President, for the purpose of consultation in connection with the administration of the provisions of this Act.

(c) Members of the Committee shall be paid a per diem allowance of $75 for each day spent away from their homes or regular places of business, for the purpose of attendance at meetings of the Committee, and in necessary travel, and while so engaged they may be paid actual travel expenses and not to exceed $16 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses.

Conditions of competition prevailing between imported products and domestic production

Sec. 5. (a) The United States Tariff Commission shall be prepared at all times to advise the President with respect to conditions of competition prevailing between imported products and domestic production.

(b) The Commission shall bring up to date and publish, at intervals not to exceed five years, the "Summaries of Tariff Information."

Congressional veto of action taken by President

Sec. 6. (a) Any foreign trade agreement entered into under section 101(a), and any proclamation issued under section 2(b) of the Act of July 1, 1954 (19 U.S.C. 1352a(b)), as amended by section 103 of this Act, shall take effect in accordance with the terms thereof, unless within sixty calendar days after the submittal of a copy of such agreement or proclamation in accordance with section 101(d) of this Act, Congress, by a concurrent resolution duly passed by a two-thirds vote of the Members of each House (or a majority vote if the total amount of the decrease in duty under such agreement exceeds the maxima specified in paragraph (1)(B) of section 104(a)), declares its disapproval thereof.

(b) For the purposes of this section, in the computation of any period of sixty calendar days, there shall be excluded the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three days to a day certain or an adjournment of the Congress sine die; except that if a concurrent resolution under this section has been passed by one House and sent to the other, no such exclusion shall be made by reason of adjournments of the first House taken thereafter.

Rules governing congressional consideration of concurrent resolutions of disapproval

SEC. 7. (a) The following subsections of this section are enacted by the Congress:

(1) As an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in such House in the case of resolutions (as defined in subsection (b)); and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

(2) With full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far as relating to the procedure in such House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House.

(b) As used in this section, the term "resolution" means only a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress, the matter after the resolving clause of which conforms to one of the following:

(1) "That the Senate and House of Representatives do not approve the foreign trade agreement (or the modification of the foreign trade agreement), entitled ______, submitted by the President to the Congress on ______, 19__, pursuant to section 101(d) of the National Trade Policy Act of 1962", or (2) "That the Senate and House of Representatives do not approve the proclamation of the President, dated ______, 19__, and submitted by the President to the Congress on ______, 19__, pursuant to section 101(d) of the National Trade Policy Act of 1962"; the blank spaces being appropriately filled; and does not include a concurrent resolution which specifies more than one foreign trade agreement (or modification), or proclamation, as the case may be.

(c) A resolution shall be referred to the Committee on Finance of the Senate or to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives by the President of the Senate or the Speaker of the House of Representatives, as the case may be.

(d)(1) If the committee to which has been referred a resolution has not reported it before the expiration of 10 calendar days after its introduction (or, in the case of a resolution received from the other House, 10 calendar days after its receipt), it shall then (but not before) be in order to move either to discharge the committee from further consideration of such resolution, or to discharge the committee from further consideration of any other resolution with respect to the same subject matter which has been referred to the committee.

(2) Such motion may be made only by a person favoring the resolution, shall be highly privileged (except that it may not be made after the committee has reported a resolution with respect to the same subject matter), and debate thereon shall be limited to not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided between those favoring and those opposing the resolution. No amendment to such motion shall be in order, and it shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which such motion is agreed to or disagreed to.

(3) If the motion to discharge is agreed to or disagreed to, such motion may not be renewed, nor may another motion to discharge the committee be made with respect to any other resolution with respect to the same subject matter.

(e)(1) When the committee has reported, or has been discharged from further consideration of, a resolution it shall at any time thereafter be in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) to move to proceed to the consideration of such resolution. Such motion shall be highly privileged and shall not be debatable. No amendment to such motion shall be in order and it shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which such motion is agreed to or disagreed to.

(2) Debate on the resolution shall be limited to not to exceed ten hours, which shall be equally divided between those favoring and those opposing the resolution. A motion further to limit debate shall not be debatable. No amendment to, or motion to recommit, the resolution shall be in order, and it shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution is agreed to or disagreed to.

(f)(1) All motions to postpone, made with respect to the discharge from committee, or the consideration of, a resolution, and all motions to proceed to the consideration of other business, shall be decided without debate.

(2) All appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate or the House of Representatives, as the case may be, to the procedure relating to a resolution shall be decided without debate.

(g) If, prior to the passage by one House of a resolution of that House with respect to a foreign trade agreement (or modification thereof), or proclamation, such House receives from the other House a resolution with respect to the same subject matter, then—

(1) If no resolution of the first House with respect to such agreement, modification, or proclamation has been referred to committee, no other resolution with respect to the same subject matter may be reported or (despite the provisions of subsection (d)(1)) be made the subject of a motion to discharge.

(2) If a resolution of the first House with respect to such agreement, modification, or proclamation has been referred to committee—

(A) the procedure with respect to that or other resolutions of such House with respect to such agreement, modification, or proclamation which have been referred to committee shall be the same as if no resolution from the other House with respect to such agreement, modification, or proclamation had been received; but

(B) on any vote on final passage of a resolution of the first House with respect to such agreement, modification, or proclamation the resolution from the other House with respect to such agreement, modification, or proclamation shall be automatically substituted for the resolution of the first House.

Reports

SEC. 8. The President shall submit to the Congress a comprehensive annual report on the administration of this Act. Such report shall include (1) an evaluation of the success with which the negotiating powers conferred pursuant to title I of this Act have been applied to the reduction of trade barriers and the elimination of discrimination (A) against United States exports, and (B) with respect to those trading partners which are fully developed nations or areas, against the exports of other free world nations or areas, (2) a detailed statement on trade and trade policy with the Communist-dominated nations, and (3) a detailed statement on the adjustment assistance provided under title II of this Act to business enterprises, communities, industrial development corporations, and individuals, and an analysis of the effectiveness of such assistance in bringing about an adjustment to the economic conditions resulting from the increased participation of the United States in world trade.

Termination of authority

SEC. 9. All authority conferred upon the President by section 101(a)(1) of this Act shall terminate at the close of June 30, 1965.

Authorization for appropriation

SEC. 10. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

TITLE I. TRADE NEGOTIATING AUTHORITY OF THE PRESIDENT

Authority to enter into foreign trade agreements

SEC. 101. (a) In order to carry out the purposes of this Act the President is authorized from time to time, during the period commencing on July 1, 1962, and ending at the close of June 30, 1965, to—

(1) enter into foreign trade agreements with foreign governments or instrumentalities thereof; and

(2) proclaim such modification of existing duties and other import restrictions, or such additional import restrictions, or such continuance, and for such minimum periods, of existing customs or excise treatment of any article or class of articles covered by foreign trade agreements, as are required or appropriate to carry out any foreign trade agreement that the President has entered into hereunder.

The President may at any time terminate, in whole or in part, any proclamation made pursuant to this section. As used in this section, the term "duties and other import restrictions" includes (i) rate and form of import duties and classification of articles, and (ii) limitations, prohibitions, charges, and exactions other than duties, imposed on importation or imposed for the regulation of imports.

(b) The authority conferred by subsection (a) shall, subject to sections 102, 103, and 104, be utilized by the President—

(1) in trade agreements with fully developed nations or areas so as—

(A) to extend to such nations or areas, according to the principle of unconditional most favored nation treatment, any concession made by the United States in any trade agreement with any free world nation or area,

(B) to make the more substantial concessions on products of United States industries having (i) the greatest demonstrated capacity and potential for export expansion, and (ii) the greatest growth potential and highest productivity, and

(C) to base any concession made by the United States to the fully developed nations or areas substantially on the effectiveness of such a concession in obtaining (i) free access to the markets of such nations or areas for the products of United States agriculture and industry, including elimination of discriminatory restrictions, whether direct or indirect, applied against such products in such markets, and (ii) extension of any concession made by such nations or areas to the United States to all other free world nations or areas;

(2) in trade agreements with other free world nations or areas so as—

(A) to extend to such nations or areas, according to the principle of unconditional most favored nation treatment, any concession made by the United States in any trade agreement with any free world nation or area, except that at the discretion of the President such treatment may be extended to such nations or areas upon condition that such treatment is extended to such nations or areas, by the fully developed nations or areas, and

(B) to establish special arrangements, including tariff quotas and marketing and servicing assistance, to aid in the development of stable and growing markets in fully developed nations or areas for the products of such other free world nations or areas, with a minimum of economic dislocation and a maximum of economic benefit to such markets; and

(3) in trade agreements with any free world nation or area so as—

(A) to develop stable and growing markets for the products of United States agriculture and industry, and

(B) to protect the holders of United States patents and copyrights.

(c) Immediately after (1) any trade agreement (including any modification thereof) is entered into under section 101 (a), or (2) any proclamation is issued under section 2(b) of the Act of July 1, 1954 (19 U.S.C. 1352a (b)), as amended by section 103 of this Act, the President shall transmit to both Houses of the Congress a copy of such agreement or proclamation.

(d) It is the sense of the Congress that the President should utilize the authority conferred by this section to negotiate an agreement under which all nations receiving trade concessions pursuant to trade agreements hereafter entered into, and all contracting parties to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, report annually to the appropriate organ established pursuant to said General Agreement on the progress achieved in (1) improving working conditions in those industries the products of which have been subject to such concessions, and (2) raising living standards in those nations or areas which are dependent on such industries.

(e) It is further the sense of the Congress that the President should, in the exercise of the authority conferred by this section and the authority conferred on him by the Constitution, carry on negotiations with all nations with which the United States has defense treaty commitments to formulate by treaty, executive agreement, or both, a unified commercial and trading policy to be observed by the non-Communist-dominated nations or areas in their dealings with the Communist-dominated nations. Adherence to any such treaty or agreement should be open to any non-Communist-dominated nation or area on conditions to be determined in the treaty or agreement, and any such treaty or agreement should provide—

(1) Effective multilateral or bilateral controls on the shipment of strategic goods and the extension of export credits to any or all Communist-dominated nations;

(2) Alternative marketing and purchasing opportunities (including preemptive buying and stockpiling) for non-Communist-dominated nations or areas threatened by or experiencing serious economic injury as the result of the economic policies of any or all Communist-dominated nations;

(3) Contingency plans and measures to place additional restraints on, or to eliminate or increase trade with, any or all Communist-dominated nations; and

(4) Common proposals for, and means to enforce, a unified agreement with any or all Communist-dominated nations governing the basic and specific rules of commercial and trading relations between non-Communist-dominated nations or areas and any or all of the Communist-dominated nations.

Impact on domestic economy

SEC. 102. The authority conferred by section 101(a) shall be exercised by the President giving due consideration to the effect of resulting imports on the domestic economy. The President shall, not less than 180 days prior to entering into negotiations under such authority, furnish the United States Tariff Commission with a list of all articles to be considered for possible modification of duties and other import restrictions. Within 90 days after the receipt of such list, the Commission shall consult with and report to the President with regard to the potential impact on domestic industries and employment of any such modification of duties and other import restrictions.

National security

SEC. 103. Section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended", approved July 1, 1954, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1352a), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. (a) No action shall be taken pursuant to section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1351), or title I of the National Trade Policy Act of 1962, to decrease the duty on any article if the President finds that such reduction would threaten to impair the national security.

"(b) In order to further the policies and purposes of this Act, whenever the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning has reason to believe that any article is being imported into the United States in such quantities as to threaten to impair the national security, he shall so advise the President, and, if the President agrees that there is reason for such belief, the President shall cause an immediate investigation to be made to determine the facts. If, on the basis of such an investigation and the report to him of the findings and recommendations made in connection therewith, the President finds the existence of such facts, he shall by proclamation take such action as he deems necessary to adjust the imports of such article to a level that will not threaten to impair the national security."

Limitations on authority

SEC. 104. (a)(1) No proclamation pursuant to section 101(a)(2) of this title shall be made, in order to carry out a foreign trade agreement entered into by the President during the period July 1, 1962, to June 30, 1965, decreasing any rate of duty below the lowest of the following rates:

(A) In the case of any proclamation made to carry out any such agreement with fully developed nations or areas, the rate which would result from decreasing the rate existing on June 30, 1962, by 100 per centum of such rate.

(B) In the case of a proclamation made to carry out any such agreement with other free world nations or areas (i) the rate which would result from decreasing the rate existing on June 30, 1962, by 50 per centum of such rate, or (ii) the rate 30 per centum ad valorem or, if the article is subject to a specific rate of duty or to a combination of rates including a specific rate, any rate (or combination of rates), however stated, the ad valorem equivalent of which has been determined as 30 per centum ad valorem. The provisions of paragraphs (1)(B) and (3) of this subsection shall, in the case of any article subject to a combination of ad valorem rates of duty, apply to the aggregate of such rates; and, in the case of any article subject to a specific rate of duty or to a combination of rates including a specific rate, such provisions shall apply on the basis of the ad valorem equivalent of such rate or rates, during a representative period (whether or not such period includes July 1, 1962), determined in the same manner as the ad valorem equivalent of rates not stated wholly in ad valorem terms is determined for the purpose of section 350(a)(2)(D)(ii) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

(2) In the case of any decrease in duty to which paragraph (1) of this subsection relates, not more than one-half of the maximum authorized decrease shall become effective in any one year.

(3) Except as authorized by clause (A) of paragraph (1) of this subsection, no such proclamation shall be made to transfer any article from the dutiable to the free list, if such article is of a type produced in significant quantities in the United States, and the rate of duty on such article existing on June 30, 1962, exceeded 3 per centum.

(b) No proclamation pursuant to section 101(a)(2) of this title shall be made increasing by more than 50 per centum any rate of duty existing on July 1, 1934; except that a specific rate of duty existing on July 1, 1934, may be converted to its ad valorem equivalent based on the value of imports of the article concerned during the calendar year 1934 (determined in the same manner as provided in section 350(a)(2)(D)(ii) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended), and the proclamation may provide an ad valorem rate of duty not in excess of 50 per centum above such ad valorem equivalent.

(c) As used in this section, the terms "existing on July 1, 1934", and "existing on June 30, 1962" refer to rates of duty (however established, and even though temporarily suspended by Act of Congress or otherwise) existing on the dates specified, except rates in effect by reason of action taken pursuant to section 5 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951.

TITLE II. DOMESTIC ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE

Eligibility for assistance

SEC. 201. (a) The President shall determine, upon application by any business enterprise, community, industrial development corporation, individual, or organization representing individuals, whether the applicant is eligible, or, in the case of an organization, represents individuals who are eligible, to receive assistance under this title. If the President determines that any business enterprise, community, industrial development corporation, or individual is eligible for such assistance, he shall issue a certificate describing such enterprise, community, corporation, or individual or individuals, and such certificate shall conclusively establish for a period of not more than eighteen months the eligibility of the entity, individual or individuals described for assistance under this title. Upon application, the President may renew any certificate of eligibility for not more than four successive periods of eighteen months, or less, upon a showing that such renewal is necessary to accomplish the purposes of this Act.

(b) The following may be determined by the President to be eligible for assistance under this title:

(1) Any business enterprise or individual which has been found by the United States Tariff Commission, under section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended by section 202 of this Act, to be suffering serious injury or threatened with such injury from increased imports resulting from trade agreements entered into by the President under the authority of section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, or section 101 of this Act.

(2) Any community (including an incorporated or unincorporated town, or other political subdivision of a State) which is suffering serious injury or is threatened with such injury as a result of reductions in personnel by one or more business enterprises described in paragraph (1) of this subsection.

(3) Any industrial development corporation which is organized and operated for the purpose of aiding in the development of a more balanced and diversified economy or in the diversification of production in a community described in paragraph (2) of this subsection through industrial development, training and retraining of employees, or through any other means.

(c) Upon application of any business enterprise, community, or industrial development corporation for a certificate of eligibility under this section, the President shall consider, in addition to the criteria stated in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (b), whether such enterprise, community, or corporation has developed satisfactory proposals for programs of economic adjustment consonant with the purposes of this Act.

(d)(1) The authority of the President to issue certificates under this section shall terminate at the close of June 30, 1966, and the authority of the President to renew any such certificate shall terminate at the close of December 31, 1970.

(2) Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Congress may provide by concurrent resolution that the authority referred to in paragraph (1) of this subsection shall terminate prior to the termination otherwise provided therefor.

(3) The termination of the authority of the President to issue or renew certificates, as hereinabove provided, shall not affect the eligibility of holders of outstanding and unexpired certificates for assistance under any section of this title.

Investigations by Tariff Commission

Sec. 202. (a) Section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 7. (a) Upon the request of the President, upon resolution of either House of Congress, upon resolution of either the Committee on Finance of the Senate or the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, upon its own motion, or upon application of any interested party (including any organization or group of employees), the United States Tariff Commission shall promptly make an investigation and make a report thereon not later than six months after the application is made to determine whether any product upon which a concession has been granted under a trade agreement is, as a result, in whole or in part, of the duty or other customs treatment reflecting such concession, being imported into the United States in such increased quantities, either actual or relative, as to cause or threaten serious injury to any domestic business enterprise or individual producing like or directly competitive products.

"In the course of any such investigation, whenever it finds evidence of serious injury or threat of serious injury or whenever so directed by resolution of either the Committee on Finance of the Senate or the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, the Tariff Commission shall hold hearings giving reasonable public notice thereof and shall afford reasonable opportunity for interested parties to be present, to produce evidence, and to be heard at such hearings.

"Should the Tariff Commission find, as the result of its investigation and hearings, that a product on which a concession has been granted is, as a result, in whole or in part, of the duty or other customs treatment reflecting such concession, being imported in such increased quantities, either actual or relative, as to cause or threaten serious injury to any domestic business enterprise or individual, producing like or directly competitive products, it shall recommend to the President the withdrawal or modification of the concession, its suspension in whole or in part, the establishment of import quotas, and/or the extension of adjustment assistance authorized under title II of the National Trade Policy Act of 1962, to the extent and for the time necessary to prevent or remedy such injury: *Provided*, That the Commission shall not recommend the withdrawal or modification of a concession, its suspension, in whole or in part, or the establishment of import quotas upon a finding that any domestic business enterprise or individual is suffering or threatened with serious injury, unless such enterprise or individual represents, singly or in combination with other similarly injured or threatened parties, a substantial part of an industry. The Tariff Commission shall immediately make public its findings and recommendations to the President, including any dissenting or separate findings and recommendations, and shall cause a summary thereof to be published in the Federal Register.

"(b) In arriving at a determination in the foregoing procedure the Tariff Commission, without excluding other factors, shall take into consideration a downward trend of production, employment, prices, profits, or wages in the domestic business enterprise concerned, or a decline in sales, an increase in imports, either actual or relative to domestic production, a higher or growing inventory, or a decline in the proportion of the domestic market supplied by domestic producers. With respect to an individual who is unemployed or without regular employment, the Tariff Commission shall take into consideration whether his last regular employment of substantial duration was in such a business enterprise.

"Increased imports, either actual or relative, shall be considered as the cause or threat of serious injury to any domestic business enterprise or individual producing like or directly competitive products when the Commission finds that such increased imports have contributed subtantially toward causing or threatening serious injury to such business enterprise or individual.

"(c)(1) Upon receipt of the Tariff Commission's report of its investigation and hearings, the President may (A) make, in whole or in part, such adjustments in the rates of duty, impose such quotas, make such other modifications, and extend such adjustment assistance as is authorized under title II of the National Trade Policy Act of 1962, as are found and reported by the Commission to be necessary to prevent or remedy serious injury to the affected domestic business enterprise or individual, or (B) if the report of the Commission recommends only relief by way of duty or quota adjustments or modification, make available adjustment assistance to the injured or threatened business enterprise or individual in lieu of taking the action recommended by the Commission. If the President does not take the action recommended by the Commission in whole within sixty days, he shall immediately submit a report to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House and to the Committee on Finance of the Senate stating the reasons therefor, and if the President has taken or proposes to take any action recommended by the Commission but in the manner prescribed in paragraph (4) of this subsection, he shall include in such report the reasons therefor.

"(2) The action so found and reported by the Commission to be necessary shall take effect in whole (as provided in the first sentence of paragraph (1) or in paragraph (3), as the case may be)—

"(A) if approved by the President, or

"(B) if disapproved by the President in whole or in part, upon the adoption by both Houses of the Congress (within the 60-day period following the date of the report referred to in the second sentence of paragraph (1) is submitted to such committees), by the yeas and nays by a two-thirds vote of each House, of a concurrent resolution stating in effect that the Senate and House of Representatives approve the action so found and reported by the Commission to be necessary.

For the purposes of subparagraph (B), in the computation of the 60-day period, there shall be excluded the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than 3 days to a day certain or an adjournment of the Congress sine die.

"(3) In any case in which the contingency set forth in paragraph (2)(B) occurs, the President shall (within 15 days after the adoption of such resolution) take such action as may be necessary to make the adjustments, impose the quotas, make such other modifications, or extend the adjustment aids under title II of the National Trade Policy Act of 1962, as were found and reported by the Commission to be necessary.

"(4) In any case in which the President takes any action found and reported to be necessary by the Commission, he may provide that the adjustments in the rates of duty, the imposition of quotas, or other modifications (1) shall be effective during a period of not to exceed seven years, and (2) during such period shall be effective on a gradually reducing basis, as specified by the President in a proclamation duly made by him to effect the action so found and reported to be necessary.

"(d) When in the judgment of the Tariff Commission no sufficient reason exists for a recommendation to the President that a concession should be withdrawn or modified, or a quota established, or for the extension of adjustment assistance authorized under title II of the National Trade Policy Act of 1962, it shall make and publish a report stating its findings and conclusions."

(b) Sections 6 and 11 of such Act are hereby repealed.

Delegation of powers

Sec. 203. (a) The President may delegate any power or authority conferred on him by this title (except section 202) to such departments, agencies, or offices of the Government as he deems appropriate.

(b) Any department, agency, or office performing the duties and functions conferred on the President by section 201 of this title shall in the performance thereof advise and consult with the several departments and agencies of the Government which are concerned with aspects of our domestic and foreign trade policies and operations.

Administrative powers

Sec. 204. (a) In administering the provisions of section 201 of this Act, the President is authorized to—

(1) hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, and take such testimony, as he deems advisable;

(2) secure directly from any department, agency, or office of the Government information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics needed to carry out his functions under section 201; and each such department, agency, or office is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics upon request;

(3) require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents; administer oaths, take testimony, have printing and binding done; and make such expenditures as is deemed advisable within the amount appropriated therefore; and

(4) establish such rules, regulations, and procedures as may be appropriate to carry out the provisions of such section.

(b) The President is authorized to exercise any of the powers conferred upon the Securities and Exchange Commission by subsection (c) of section 21 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, and subsection (d) of such section shall be applicable to witnesses at any hearing held under this section.

Loans

Sec. 205. (a) The President is authorized to make loans (either directly or in cooperation with banks or other lending institutions through agreements to participate on an immediate or deferred basis) to any business enterprise (other than an enterprise eligible for assistance under section 7(b)(4) of the Small Business Act), any incorporated or unincorporated town, or other political subdivision of a State, or any industrial development corporation, which has been certified under section 201 as eligible for assistance under this title.

(b) Financial assistance under this section shall be on such terms and conditions as the President determines, subject to the following restrictions and limitations:

(1) The project for which financial assistance is sought is reasonably calculated to assist the applicant to adjust to changed economic conditions resulting from the trade policy of the United States;

(2) Assistance under this section shall not be extended if the assistance applied for is otherwise available to the applicant from private sources on reasonable terms, or pursuant to any other Act of Congress;

(3) No loans (including renewals and extensions thereof) shall be made for a period or periods exceeding twenty years, or bear interest, on the Government's share of the loan, at a rate in excess of the higher of (A) 2¾ per centum per annum, or (B) the average annual interest rate on all interest-bearing obligations of the United States then forming a part of the public debt as computed at the end of the fiscal year next preceding the date of the loan and adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum, plus one-quarter of 1 per centum per annum; and

(4) In any agreement to participate in a loan on a deferred basis under this section, such participation by the Government shall not be in excess of 90 per centum of the balance of the loan outstanding at the time of disbursement.

(c) The President is authorized to obtain money from the Treasury of the United States for the provision of financial assistance under this section. For this purpose appropriations not to exceed $100,000,000 are authorized to be made to a revolving fund in the Treasury. Advances shall be made to the President from the revolving fund when requested. The President shall pay into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury, at the close of each fiscal year, interest on the net amount of the cash disbursements from such advances at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury which shall not be in excess of the rate of interest on the Government's share of loans made under this section, less one-quarter of 1 per centum per annum.

(d) In the performance of his functions under this section, the President shall—

(1) prepare annually and submit a budget program subject to the provisions of sections 102, 103, and 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended (31 U.S.C. 847–849); and

(2) determine the character of and the necessity for obligations and expenditures and the manner in which they shall be incurred, allowed, and paid, subject to provisions of the law specifically applicable to corporations of the United States.

(e) In carrying out the provisions of this section, the President shall have the powers set forth in section 5(b), except paragraph 8, of the Small Business Act.

Amendments to Small Business Act

Sec. 206. (a) Section 7(b) of the Small Business Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (2);

(2) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and"; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (3) a new paragraph as follows:

"(4) to make such loans (either directly or in cooperation with banks or other lending institutions through agreements to participate on an immediate or deferred basis) as it may determine to be necessary or appropriate to enable any small business concern which has been certified as eligible for assistance, under section 201 of the National Trade Policy Act of 1962, to adjust to changed economic conditions resulting from the trade policy of the United States."

(b) Section 4(c) of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "$1,125,000,000" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "$1,175,000,000"; and

(2) by striking out the sixth sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Not to exceed an aggregate of $200,000,000 shall be outstanding at any one time for the purposes enumerated in section 7(b), of which amount not less than $50,000,000 shall be available for the purposes set forth in paragraph (4)."

Amendments to Internal Revenue Code of 1954

Sec. 207. (a) Section 167 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to the deduction for depreciation) is amended by redesignating subsection (h) as (i), and by inserting after subsection (g) the following new subsection:

"(h) Business Concerns Adversely Affected by United States Foreign Trade Policy.—

"(1) Special rule.—In the case of property described in paragraph (4) used in a trade or business by a business concern which, within the meaning of paragraph (2), has been adversely affected by the foreign trade policies of the United States, the reasonable allowance under subsection (a) shall, at the election of the taxpayer, be—

"(A) an amount equal to twice the amount computed under the method of depreciation used in respect of such property for the taxable year preceding the first taxable year in which this subsection applies to such property, or

"(B) an amount computed under the method of depreciation described in subsection (b)(1) and computed, with respect to the adjusted basis of such property on the first day of the first taxable year in which this subsection applies to such property, as if (i) such property had been acquired on such first day, and (ii) such property had a useful life of five years.

Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to limit or reduce an allowance otherwise allowable under subsection (a).

"(2) Business concerns adversely affected by United States foreign trade policy.—For purposes of paragraph (1), a business concern shall be considered to be adversely affected by the foreign trade policies of the United States only if a certificate of eligibility has been issued to such concern under section 201 of the National Trade Policy Act of 1962.

"(3) Taxable years to which applicable.—Subject to the provisions of paragraph (5), paragraph (1) shall apply with respect to any property used in a trade or business by a business concern only for the taxable year in which the certificate, referred to in paragraph (2), is issued to such concern, and for the four taxable years succeeding such taxable year.

"(4) Property to which applicable.—Paragraph (1) shall apply only to property which is—

"(A) used in its trade or business by a business concern on the date on which the certificate referred to in paragraph (2) was issued to such concern; and

"(B) used in an industry described in section 201(b)(1) of the National Trade Policy Act of 1962 and in respect of which such certificate is issued.

"(5) Election.—

"(A) When and how made.—An election to compute the allowance allowed as a deduction by subsection (a) with reference to this subsection shall be made, with respect to any property used in a trade or business by a business concern, at the time of filing the return for the taxable year in which the certificate referred to in paragraph (2) is issued to such concern. Such election shall be made in such manner as the Secretary or his delegate shall prescribe. At the time of making such election, the taxpayer shall select the method provided in subparagraph (A) or (B) of paragraph (1) to be used in computing such allowance with respect to such property.

"(B) Effect.—An election under subparagraph (A) shall be effective for the taxable year for which the return in connection with which the election is made is filed and, unless sooner terminated as provided in subparagraph (C), for the four taxable years succeeding such taxable year.

"(C) Revocation.—An election under subparagraph (A) may be revoked by the taxpayer at the time of filing his return for any of the four taxable years succeeding the taxable year for which the election was made. Such revocation shall be effective for the taxable year for which such return is filed and for succeeding taxable years. Such revocation shall be made in such manner as the Secretary or his delegate shall prescribe."

(b) Part VI of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to itemized deductions for individuals and corporations) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 181. Amortization of Certain Facilities of Businesses Adversely Affected by Foreign Trade Policies.

"(a) General Rule.—

"(1) Allowance of deductions.—In the case of—

"(A) a corporation which is a business concern which has been adversely affected by the foreign trade policies of the United States, or

"(B) an individual who owns a proprietary interest in an unincorporated business concern which has been adversely affected by the foreign trade policies of the United States,

there shall be allowed, at the election of the taxpayer, a deduction with respect to the amortization of the adjusted basis (for determining gain) of any conversion facility (as defined in subsection (d)) based on a period of 60 months. The 60-month period shall begin as to any facility, at the election of the taxpayer, with the month following the month in which the facility was completed, or with the succeeding taxable year.

"(2) Amount of deduction.—The amortization deduction provided in paragraph (1) shall be an amount, with respect to each month of the amortization period within the taxable year, equal to the adjusted basis of the facility at the end of such month, divided by the number of months (including the month for which the deduction is computed) remaining in the period. Such adjusted basis at the end of the month shall be computed without regard to the amortization deduction for such month. The amortization deduction above provided with respect to any month shall be in lieu of the depreciation deduction with respect to such facility for such month provided by section 167.

"(b) Election of Amortization.—The election of the taxpayer under subsection (a) to take the amortization deduction and to begin the sixty-month period with the month following the month in which the facility was completed shall be made only by a statement to that effect in the return for the taxable year in which the facility was completed. The election of the taxpayer under subsection (a) to take the amortization deduction and to begin such period with the taxable year succeeding such year shall be made only by a statement to that effect in the return for such succeeding taxable year. Notwithstanding the preceding two sentences, the election of the taxpayer under subsection (a) may be made, under such regulations as the Secretary or his delegate may prescribe, before the time prescribed in the applicable sentence.

"(c) Termination of Amortization Deduction.—A taxpayer which has elected under subsection (b) to take the amortization deduction provided in subsection (a) may, at any time after making such election, discontinue the amortization deduction with respect to the remainder of the amortization period, such discontinuance to begin as of the beginning of any month specified by the taxpayer in a notice in writing filed with the Secretary or his delegate before the beginning of such month. The depreciation deduction provided under section 167 shall be allowed, beginning with the first month as to which the amortization deduction does not apply, and the taxpayer shall not be entitled to any further amortization deduction with respect to such facility.

"(d) Definitions.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) Conversion facility.—The term 'conversion facility' means any facility, land, building, machinery, or equipment, or any part thereof, the construction, reconstruction, erection, installation, or acquisition of which was completed after the date of the enactment of this section, and with respect to which a determination under subsection (e) has been made. In no event shall an amortization deduction be allowed in respect of any conversion facility for any taxable year unless a certificate in respect thereof under this paragraph shall have been made before the filing of the taxpayer's return for such taxable year.

"(2) Business concerns adversely affected by the foreign trade policies of the United States.—A business concern shall be considered to be adversely affected by the foreign trade policies of the United States only if a certificate of eligibility has been issued to such concern under section 201 of the National Trade Policy Act of 1962.

"(e) Determination of Adjusted Basis of Conversion Facility.—

"(1) General rule.—For purposes of subsection (a), in determining the adjusted basis of a conversion facility there shall be included only so much of the amount of the adjusted basis of such facility (computed without regard to this section) as is properly attributable to such construction, reconstruction, erection, installation, or acquisition after the date of the enactment of this section as the President, or his designee under section 202 of the National Trade Policy Act of 1962, has determined to be necessary to enable the business concern either (A) to develop new or different lines of production, or (B) to renovate its productive facilities, and only such portion of such amount as the President, or such designee, has determined is attributable to the need of the business concern to develop new or different lines of production, or to renovate its productive facilities, because of the foreign trade policies of the United States. Such determination shall be under such regulations as may be prescribed from time to time by the President or such designee. Any such determination shall be made only upon application filed at such time and in such manner as may be prescribed by the President, or such designee, under such regulations, but in no event shall such determination have any effect unless an application therefor is filed before the expiration of six months after the beginning of such construction, reconstruction, erection, or installation, or the date of such acquisition.

"(2) Separate facilities; special rule.—After the completion or acquisition of any conversion facility with respect to which a determination under paragraph (1) has been made, any expenditure (attributable to such facility and to the period after such completion or acquisition) which does not represent construction, reconstruction, erection, installation, or acquisition include in such a determination, but with respect to which a separate determination is made, shall not be applied in adjustment of the basis of such facility, but a separate basis shall be computed therefor pursuant to paragraph (1), as if it were a new and separate conversion facility.

"(f) Depreciation Deduction.—If the adjusted basis of the conversion facility (computed without regard to subsection (e)) exceeds the adjusted basis computed under subsection (e), the depreciation deduction provided by section 167 shall, despite the provisions of subsection (a)(2) of this section, be allowed with respect to such conversion facility as if the adjusted basis for the purpose of such deduction were an amount equal to the amount of such excess.

"(g) Life Tenant and Remainderman.—In the case of property held by one person for life with remainder to another person, the amortization deduction provided in subsection (a) shall be computed as if the life tenant were the absolute owner of the property and shall be allowed to the life tenant.

"(h) Cross Reference.—

"For special rule with respect to gain derived from the sale or exchange of property, the adjusted basis of which is determined with regard to this section, see section 1238."

(c) The table of sections for such part is amended by adding at the end thereof:

"Sec. 181. Amortization of certain facilities of businesses adversely affected by foreign trade policies."

(d) Section 1238 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to amortization in excess of depreciation) is amended by inserting after "section 168 (relating to amortization deduction of emergency facilities)" the following: "or section 181 (relating to amortization deduction of certain facilities of businesses adversely affected by foreign trade policies)".

(e) The amendments made by this section shall apply only to taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Technical assistance

Sec. 208. (a) The President is authorized, whenever he determines such action is necessary or desirable in carrying out the purposes of this Act, to provide technical and managerial aid to any business enterprise, community, or industrial development corporation, described in subsection (b) of section 201, in the development of programs of economic adjustment consonant with the purposes of this Act. Such aid may include (1) consultation and advice concerning policies, principles, and practices of good management, particularly with respect to the conversion of old lines of production to new lines of production, increasing productivity, or the making of other economic adjustments consonant with the purposes of this Act, (2) consultation and advice with respect to the availability of assistance under this Act, or any other Act of Congress, and in the preparation of the necessary applications to qualify therefor, (3) cooperating and advising with voluntary business, professional, educational, and other nonprofit organizations, associations, and institutions, and with other Federal or State agencies, and (4) such other activities as are deemed appropriate by the President.

(b) Nothing contained in the Small Business Act with respect to the types of enterprises which are eligible for assistance thereunder shall be construed to prohibit the exercise by the Small Business Administration of any function under this section which may be conferred upon it by the President under the authority contained in section 203 of this title.

Unemployment compensation

Sec. 209. (a)(1) The Secretary of Labor (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") shall, on behalf of the United States, enter into an agreement with any State in which is located an enterprise or community, with respect to which a certificate of eligibility has been issued under section 201 of this title, under which the State, as agent of the United States, will make supplementary payments of compensation to unemployed individuals in the State as provided for in this section, and will otherwise cooperate with the Secretary and with other State agencies in making payments of compensation under this section.

(2) Supplementary payments of unemployment compensation under this section shall be made only to individuals within the class of individuals determined by the President to be eligible to receive assistance under this title.

(3) If the amount of unemployment compensation payable to an individual under the law of the State in which he is eligible to receive unemployment compensation is less than 70 per centum of (i) his average weekly wage, as determined under such law, or (ii) the average weekly wage earned by employees within such State, whichever is the lesser, then the amount of the supplementary payment of unemployment compensation to an individual under this section for a week of total unemployment shall be an amount equal to the amount by which 70 per centum of such individual's average weekly wage, or the average weekly wage earned by employees within such State, whichever is the lesser, exceeds the amount paid to the individual under the unemployment compensation law of the State (including payments made by reason of dependents). For the purposes of this section, the average weekly wage earned by employees within any State shall be computed by the State agency, designated in the agreement entered into under this section, on the first day of the first calendar month commencing after the date on which any such agreement is entered into, and on July 1 of each succeeding year, on the basis of wages paid during the last full year for which necessary figures are available.

(4) In any case where an unemployed individual who is eligible for assistance under this title is no longer entitled to payment of compensation under the unemployment compensation laws of the State solely by reason of the expiration of the period for which such compensation is payable under such laws, there shall be paid to such individual, out of amounts paid to such State by the United States for such purpose and without cost to such State, compensation in an amount equal to 70 per centum of (i) his average weekly wage, as determined under such law, or (ii) the average weekly wage earned by employees within such State, whichever is the lesser. The period during which an unemployed individual may receive assistance under this paragraph shall be equal to one-half the maximum period which, under the laws of such State, any individual may receive unemployment compensation, or three months, whichever is less: *Provided*, That if the period during which an individual may receive unemployment compensation under State law is less than four months, he may receive, irrespective of other provisions of this sentence, assistance under this paragraph for a period equal to six months less the period during which he may receive unemployment compensation under State law.

(5) In order to remain eligible for compensation under this section, an individual must comply with the provisions of State law with respect to ability and availability for work, and with respect to the acceptance of offers of suitable work, and failure to so comply shall result in immediate cessation of payment to such individual under this section.

(6) The amount of the Federal supplementary payment of unemployment com-

pensation to an individual for (i) any week of partial unemployment, or (ii) any week (not exceeding twelve weeks in the aggregate) during which such individual is receiving on-the-job or inplant training on a full- or part-time basis under a vocational training or retraining program approved by the Secretary of Labor under section 210 of this title, shall be the amount necessary to provide such individual with a weekly benefit equal to the aggregate he would have received under paragraph (3) of this subsection for a week of total unemployment, less his earnings for such week in excess of the partial earnings allowance, if any, permitted by the unemployment compensation law of the State.

(7) Any agreement under this section shall provide that compensation otherwise payable to any individual under the State's unemployment compensation law will not be denied or reduced for any week by reason of any payment made pursuant to such agreement. No agreement under this section for payment of compensation by a State agency shall be valid if compensation payable to any individual under the law of such State is less than it would have been under such law as it existed on January 1, 1962.

(b) Payments shall be made under this section to any such individual only with respect to weeks of unemployment occurring during a period covered by an unrevoked certificate of eligibility issued under section 201 of this title in respect to such individual.

(c) Each State shall be entitled to be paid by the United States an amount equal to the additional cost to the State of payments of compensation made under and in accordance with an agreement under this section which would not have been incurred by the State but for the agreement.

(d) In making payments pursuant to this section, there shall be paid to the State, either in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be determined by the Secretary, such sum as the Secretary estimates the State will be entitled to receive under this section for each calendar month, reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum by which the Secretary finds that his estimates for any prior calendar month were greater or less than the amounts which should have been paid to the State. Such estimates may be made upon the basis of such statistical sampling, or other method, as may be agreed upon by the Secretary and the State agency.

(e) The Secretary shall from time to time certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payments to each State sums payable to such State under this section. The Secretary of the Treasury, prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, shall make payment to the State in accordance with such certification, from the funds available for carrying out the purposes of this Act.

(f) All money paid to a State under this section shall be used solely for the purposes for which it is paid; and any money so paid which is not used for such purposes shall be returned, at the time specified in the agreement under this section, to the Treasury and credited to current applicable appropriations, funds, or accounts from which payments to States under this section may be made.

(g) An agreement under this section may require any officer or employee of the State certifying payments or disbursing funds pursuant to the agreement, or otherwise participating in its performance, to give a surety bond to the United States in such amount as the Secretary may deem necessary, and may provide for the payment of the cost of such bond from funds available for carrying out the purposes of this section.

(h) No person designated by the Secretary, or designated pursuant to an agreement under this section, as a certifying officer shall, in the absence of gross negligence or intent to defraud the United States, be liable with respect to the payment of any compensation certified by him under this section.

(i) No disbursing officer shall, in the absence of gross negligence or intent to defraud the United States, be liable with respect to any payment by him under this section if it was based upon a voucher signed by a certifying officer designated as provided by this section.

(j) For the purpose of payments made to a State under title III of the Social Security Act, administration by the State agency of such State pursuant to an agreement under this section shall be deemed to be a part of the administration of the State unemployment compensation law.

(k) The agency administering the unemployment compensation law of any State with respect to which an agreement is entered into under this section shall furnish the Secretary such information as the Secretary may find necessary or appropriate in carrying out the provisions of this section, and such information shall be deemed reports required by the Secretary for the purposes of paragraph (6) of subsection (a) of section 303 of the Social Security Act.

(l) Whoever makes a false statement or representation of a material fact knowing it to be false, or knowingly fails to disclose a material fact, to obtain or increase for himself or for any other individual any payment authorized to be paid under this section or under an agreement thereunder shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both.

(m) The Secretary is hereby authorized to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section. The Secretary shall insofar as practicable consult with representatives of State unemployment compensation agencies before prescribing any rules or regulations which may affect the performance by such agencies of functions pursuant to agreement under this section.

Retirement

SEC. 210. (a) Whenever the Secretary of Labor shall determine that any individual sixty years of age or older, who is eligible for assistance under this title, is unable to find employment because of his advanced age, the Secretary shall issue a certificate containing such a finding.

(b) Section 216 of the Social Security Act is amended by inserting immediately before subsection (b) thereof the following new subsection:

"Persons deemed to be age 62

"(a) Any individual who—

"(1) has attained 60 years of age but has not attained 62 years of age,

"(2) is eligible for assistance under section 201 of the National Trade Policy Act of 1962, and

"(3) is certified by the Secretary of Labor as unable to find employment because of advanced age,

shall be deemed for purposes of section 202(a) of this Act to have attained age 62."

(c) The amendment made by this section shall apply only with respect to monthly insurance benefits under title II of the Social Security Act for months beginning more than one month after the date this Act is enacted.

(d) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund such sums as the Congress may determine to be necessary to reimburse the fund for additional benefits paid out under the provisions of this section.

Vocational training

SEC. 211. (a) The Secretary of Labor shall prescribe and provide suitable training for individuals, eligible for assistance under this title, who are in need of retraining, reemployment, vocational education, or vocational rehabilitation. For that purpose the Secretary may utilize and extend all existing Federal governmental facilities, and utilize the facilities of any other governmental agency maintained by joint Federal and State contributions, and by agreement or contract with public or private institutions or establishments, provide for such additional training facilities as may be deemed necessary.

(b) The Secretary shall have the power and the duty to cooperate with existing Federal, State, and local agencies and officials in charge of existing programs relating to retraining, reemployment, vocational education, and vocational rehabilitation for the purpose of coordinating his activities with those of such Federal, State, and local agencies.

Relocation payments

SEC. 212. Whenever the Secretary of Labor shall determine that—

(1) no job opportunity for an individual, certified as eligible for assistance under this title, exists within such individual's current labor market area,

(2) a job opportunity for such individual, comparable to his last regular employment of substantial duration, is available at a place in the United States outside his current labor market area, and

(3) such individual agrees to take such job opportunity, he is authorized, under rules and regulations to be prescribed by him, to make relocation payments to such individual in an amount which shall not exceed the reasonable and necessary moving expenses to be incurred by such individual (including the dependent members of his family, if any) in order to accept such new job opportunity.

Mr. KEATING. Madam President, there are very few men in the Senate who are as knowledgeable on foreign trade as my distinguished colleague. I take this opportunity to commend him for the important spadework which he has done in developing the bill which he is introducing today.

He has made a very eloquent statement on the challenge facing our Nation in the field of foreign trade. He has put forth a number of important ideas as to how our country must meet this challenge.

I am particularly delighted that the Senator has included in his trade bill provisions for a congressional trade veto of trade agreements and modifications of agreements. This is an area in which I am very much interested. On several occasions I have addressed the Senate urging that we restore some semblance of balance whereby both the Congress and the President will have a say as to what is being done in the field of foreign trade.

The Constitution clearly gives the Congress responsibility for trade matters. In this complex and fast-moving era in which we live, there is no question that the actual day-to-day implementation of trade policy must be handed over to the executive branch. However, and I want to make this very emphatic, Congress must retain a broad oversight as to whether the President in implementing the trade policy is carrying out the basic intent of the Congress.

It is my feeling that the Congress not only should include a congressional trade veto in the 1962 Trade Extension Act, but beyond this, I do not believe that there is sufficient support in the

Congress to pass a trade bill unless we include it. I am confident the Congress will not delegate broad new trade negotiating powers, without at the same time seeing to it that some procedure is provided so that we can make certain that these powers are used in the best interest of our country and in the manner in which the Congress intended.

Madam President, I again commend my distinguished colleague for the significant work which he has done in this field and for the brilliant way in which he has expounded his views.

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. JAVITS. I did not realize my colleague was referring to me. I am very grateful to him. I might say that, considering the extent of business interests in New York, it will take at least the two of us to do that which needs to be done in the interests of both our State and the Nation. I am grateful to the Senator for his gracious remarks, but, even more, for our working as brothers in arms in this effort, as we have before.

Mr. KEATING. I thank my colleague. I am sure he is correct in saying it will take both of us, and many others, in order to fashion the kind of trade program which will have the support of Congress and which is in the best interests of our country.

DANGERS OF CRITICAL UNEMPLOYMENT ON LONG ISLAND—DEFENSE ORDERS

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, last week I protested the action of the Defense Department in cutting back the current production of the F–105, an all-weather fighter bomber produced by the Republic Aviation Corp. on Long Island—an action that will result in the immediate layoff of 1,500 persons and by 1963 may result in a total layoff of 13,000 people.

Yesterday, the President commented on this serious problem at his news conference. I ask unanimous consent to have the question and answer printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the question and answer were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Question. Mr. President, going back to the question of unemployment, some 13,000 workers in 1 plant on Long Island are facing layoffs as a result of the Defense Department's decision to phase out one type of aircraft. Do you see any need for new steps to offset the economic impact of changing defense requirements such as cases like this?

President KENNEDY. I think that the figures of the possible layoffs are not—are overstated in your question, because to the best of my information, they'd be substantially—very substantially—less than the figure that you gave, and that would be our—it is a matter of considerable concern, however, that anyone will be laid off at that particular factory, and we are concerned about it.

In fact, I think that your publisher wrote me about the matter last week. We even heard from the Congressman and we are concerned about seeing if we can maintain employment at the highest possible level at that plant. The difficulty, of course, comes because the particular plane that they are manufacturing has not been—is not being—continued and that presents us with a difficult decision at a number of areas.

But we are very conscious of the problem that's faced at that plant, and we are going to try to see if we can maintain employment as high as it's possible for us to do so, even though some cut—but of a much less figure than you mentioned—will, perhaps, inevitably come.

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, it is gratifying to know that the President is aware of the problem that is so vital to the Long Island economy.

But his answer does not deal with the crucial questions: What were the reasons behind the Defense Department decision to curtail production of the F–105D fighter-bomber in favor of the F–4H fighter? And were there not alternatives to this drastic action which the Defense Department could have taken to prevent the critical dislocation to the Long Island economy?

The President's promise that an attempt will be made to maintain employment on as high a level as possible may refer to suggestions that subcontracts will be earmarked for Republic.

For example, today I was informed by the Office of Economic Utilization Policy in the Department of Defense that the contract for the F–110 with the McDonnell Aviation Corp., in St. Louis will be based on the assurance that a substantial part of the contract will be subcontracted to Republic on Long Island.

While this represents a new emphasis in procurement policy, it remains to be seen how much effect it could have on preventing a serious economic dislocation on Long Island. It is a matter which the New York congressional delegation will study carefully in the days ahead to determine whether such a move would have any satisfactory effect.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a report on the problem by Justin Ostro, president of Republic Lodge No. 1987, International Association of Machinists, as well as articles from Newsday, which has played such an outstanding role in bringing the facts to the attention of public officials and the Long Island people.

There being no objection, the report and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION
OF MACHINISTS,
Melville, Long Island, N.Y.,
February 8, 1962.

Memo to New York congressional delegation.
From Justin Ostro, president of Republic Lodge No. 1987, International Association of Machinists, AFL–CIO.

Pursuant to your request, I have noted below the important facts surrounding the proposed action of the Department of Defense in cutting back the current production of the F–105, an all-weather fighter-bomber produced by the Republic Aviation Corp., in favor of the F–4H produced by the McDonnell Aircraft Co., St. Louis, Mo.

THE PROBLEM

On or about January 22, 1962, the Department of Defense announced that the planned procurement of the F–105 would be reduced from 13 wings to 7 wings, and that the remaining wings would be procured from McDonnell Aircraft Co. Republic Aviation Corp., the producer of the F–105, is located at Farmingdale, Long Island, and employs 15,500 people. Of this number, 13,500 reside in Nassau and Suffolk Counties and the remainder are from Kings, Queens, and New York Counties. If the Department of Defense finalizes this curtailment in the production of the F–105, employment will be reduced by 1,500 immediately; further reductions in employment during 1962 and 1963 will reduce the work force to a low of 2,500 by December 1963, resulting in a total layoff of 13,000 people.

The current annual payroll at Republic is over $125 million and an additional $28 million (at an annual rate) is paid to subcontractors performing work for Republic—primarily in the immediate vicinity of the Long Island plant. The total amount of work subcontracted in the State of New York is in excess of $500 million.

Should the Department of Defense cut back the production of the F–105, it is estimated that the rate of unemployment in the Long Island area would reach 6.1 percent by December 1962 and 7.75 percent by December 1963. Long Island would again be declared a depressed area. Because of our prior experience in matters of this nature, it is not necessary to emphasize and elaborate the extreme hardships and difficulties which the people of this area would again experience. Needless to say, the economy of this area to a great extent is based upon the production of aircraft and if this source of employment is discontinued, the entire life blood of the community will be stopped.

TECHNICAL EVALUATION OF THE F–105 AND F–4H

The Department of Defense, when announcing the cutback in F–105 production, proclaimed that the F–4H was a superior aircraft. As laymen, we are not competent to challenge the findings of the Department of Defense, primarily because their evaluation is considered classified information, and further, we are not fully acquainted with the standards used. Of necessity, we must rely upon the testimony of representatives of the Air Force when questioned before congressional committees approximately 1 year ago. Expert testimony (see attachment) revealed that both aircraft exceed one another in performance, depending upon the nature of the mission prescribed in the testing. While the F–4H was shown to be faster at higher altitudes and had a shorter takeoff and landing capability (since it is carrier based), the F–105 was shown to be faster at lower altitudes (the F–105 had a load factor of 8.76 g.'s compared to 4.2 g.'s for the F–4H) and could carry a heavier load of bombs.

According to evaluations performed by Republic, the F–105 excelled in 17 out of 22 functions. While the company was not at liberty to disclose those specific areas in which the F–105 was proven a superior aircraft, their experience as producers of fighter aircraft assured them that the Department of Defense could not challenge their findings.

Without attempting to detail all specifications of each aircraft, one can reasonably conclude from the testimony given that the difference between the performance of both ships was extremely small and of minor importance. Further, testimony revealed that the F–105 costs approximately $400,000 less than the F–4H (Navy version). The Department of Defense has not announced what the actual cost difference will be when the F–4H is modified to meet the Air Force specifications, but one can correctly assume that it will be far in excess of the $400,000 noted in earlier releases.

The action of the Department of Defense in now contemplating the cutting of the procurement of the F–105 raises certain questions as to the reasoning motivating this action. It must be pointed out that the initial contracts for the F–105 and the F–4H were let at approximately the same time. If it is now the decision of the Department of Defense that the F–4H is a superior aircraft, why were the initial contracts for the procurement of the F–105 let? Why didn't the Department of Defense—at that time—disqualify the F–105? What has occurred since the initial letting of these contracts to change the minds of the technical personnel of the Department of Defense?

While I can only speculate on this matter, I believe it reasonable to assume that this action is consistent with the pronounced assertions of the Secretary of Defense to standardize all defense hardware and weapons systems between the three services. As a taxpayer and an individual who is vitally concerned with the urgency and tremendous costs of defending the free world, I would not differ with this policy as it is applied to weapons systems presently in development or systems about to be let on contract. That is to say, I would not differ with the fundamental soundness of this philosophy as it is applied prospectively. I would, however, strongly differ with any attempt to apply this policy on a retroactive basis—particularly where it cannot be shown that it would result in tremendous savings or tremendous advantages in protecting the security of the free world. The Department of Defense cannot show or prove their assertions and, as is evident from statements in the trade journals, advocates of the F–105 in the Air Force have, because of limited patience and pressures from other sources, refused to challenge the authority and this decision of the Secretary of Defense.

This action of the Secretary of Defense raises a serious question as to whether the Secretary's office is presently in a position to tell each service what their needs are and procure what they consider to be the best weapons systems for their respective missions.

In this regard, it is important to note that it is the intention of the Department of Defense to use the F–4H as both an Air Force fighter and reconnaissance plane. The presently designed F–4H used exclusively by the Navy, will have to be modified to Air Force specifications, and it will be necessary to establish two additional production lines at the McDonnell plant to produce the Air Force F–4H fighter and the Air Force F–4H reconnaissance plane. In view of the production lag which will occur, and further, since it is very probable that each of these ships will be obsolete within 4 years, it is highly questionable whether the proposed action would be in the best interests of our defense posture.

It is our strong belief that the Republic Aviation Corp. can produce the needed fighter and reconnaissance aircraft (F–105 and RF–105) for the Air Force to meet our defense needs in a far shorter period of time than if the responsibility were given to the McDonnell Aircraft Co. in producing the F–4H and reconnaissance F–4H. This we believe to be the most important reason for continuing the present production of the F–105 and the proposed RF–105.

VALIDITY OF PROPOSED ALTERNATIVES

Numerous individuals have proposed that if the Department of Defense carries through with the cutback of the F–105, the Republic Aviation Corp. be awarded other defense contracts and subcontracts to maintain the present employment in this community. Further, it has been suggested that the effective date of the cutback be delayed 6 months in order to forestall the inevitable.

First, there is a serious question whether it is at all possible to award sufficient subcontracts to maintain a work force of over 15,500 people having a weekly payroll in excess of $2 million. While Republic could perform many of the current subcontracts being let, it is necessary that we consider the present plans of the company.

Republic has invested over $35 million—in both buildings, facilities, machinery and personnel—in research and development. Unlike most firms in the aircraft and missile industry, Republic stockholders own all of the plant and machinery. On the other hand, the average for the industry is approximately 36 percent. The company is very much aware of the prospective limited market for manned fighter aircraft and is doing its utmost to diversify its sales. Notable achievements have been made in perfecting a target drone and also in certain phases of electronics. However, it is acknowledged that the degree of diversification at the present time is not sufficient to utilize its entire work force, or even one-tenth of its present work force. Additional time is required to avert a serious recession in the area if we were to rely on production of diversified products. Should the current procurement of the F–105 be completed as originally planned (13 wings) in 4 more years of production, the company would be in a far better position to absorb its present work force in other diversified fields in which it is now performing research. Essentially, permitting Republic to complete the production of the 13 wings of the F–105 would place them in a far better position to maintain the economic lifeblood of the Long Island community when the manned fighter aircraft become obsolete, than if procurement, as presently proposed, is curtailed in 2 years and then discontinued.

Additional time is a necessity. While there was some hope that Republic would be chosen to produce the currently planned triservice fighter (TFX), word has been received that they have been disqualified. Had this contract been secured, the impact of cutting back the F–105 would have been lessened, and sufficient time would have been available to intensify diversification. In view of this, the full 4 years of production is desperately needed.

CONCLUSION

I am attaching hereto a supplement from the Newsday of this date which very aptly reveals the concern of all residents of Long Island to this proposed action by the Secretary of Defense. This is not only a concern of the corporation and the employees—but a concern of the 2 million people of Long Island who would be directly and indirectly affected by this action.

In view of the fact that both the F–105 and the F–4H will become obsolete in approximately 4 years when the plane of the future, the TFX, is put into production, and when we take into consideration the question of whether in fact one plane is superior to the other, then the question can properly be raised as to whether the relative benefits of this action would be enough to offset the economic dislocation which would occur in our Long Island community. In addition to all of the foregoing, there is great concern over the injury which would be done to our defense posture if this very adequate defense facility and its reservoir of skilled personnel were to be lost to our Nation.

In conclusion, I can only urge that you use all of your resources in preventing this injury to our defense effort and to the economic well-being of our Long Island community.

Respectfully submitted.

JUSTIN OSTRO,
President.

[From Aviation Daily, Jan. 22, 1962]

ROLE OF NAVY FIGHTER IN AIR FORCE PLANS IS GIVEN

In outlining his general purpose program package in the fiscal year 1963 defense budget before the Senate Committee on Armed Services, Secretary McNamara noted that Navy's F–4H will be procured in quantity by both the Navy and the Air Force. Air Force F–4H's will be designated the F–110 tactical fighter. As more F–110's become available for purchase, production of the F–105 now being used in the category will be tapered off. More F–110's than F–105's are programed in fiscal year 1963 and larger numbers of F–110's will be purchased in future fiscal years by the Air Force.

No purchase of F–110's is contemplated in fiscal year 1963 for Air Force interceptor missions in the Air Defense Command. But the F–4H has been declared the preferred type for the mission in the Air Force report on Project Highspeed—a competition betwen the F–4H and the F–106. Now that the Air Force is committed to carrying spares and maintenance equipment for the F–4H, it has its "foot in the door" and future prejudices against its use instead of Air Force-developed fighters are expected to diminish. The Air Force is also purchasing a reconnaissance version of the F–110.

EXCERPT FROM THE TESTIMONY OF GEN. THOMAS D. WHITE BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS—REPRESENTATIVE GEORGE H. MAHON, CHAIRMAN

Mr. MAHON. Does the Air Force think well of the Navy plane and does the Air Force have a plane which the Air Force thinks is quite excellent in this area?

General WHITE. The F–4H is a current model aircraft. It is the newest, I believe, in the Navy and corresponds almost exactly to the Air Force's F–105, which is our newest tactical fighter. As a matter of fact, about a year ago, we had a Board look into whether or not we should shift from the F–105 to some other type aircraft. We considered very carefully the F–4H, equated it against the F–105 and came up with a continuation of the F–105 simply because it was cheaper. The performance differences between the F–4H and the F–105 are negligible.

Mr. RILEY. General White, what do you consider the most advanced fighter plane available at this time or in the immediate future?

General WHITE. Tactical fighter?

Mr. RILEY. Yes, sir.

General WHITE. Now I would class the F–105 and the F–4H as the newest and I can put what I have here in the records as a comparison: The maximum speed of both the F–4H and F–105 is [delete]. The combat ceiling of the F–4H is roughly [delete] feet higher than the F–105. The cost of the F–4H is $2.3 million and of the F–105 $1.9 million. The takeoff distance of the F–4H is [delete] and the F–105 [delete]. The F–105 will carry [delete] pounds of ordnance and the F–4H [delete] pounds. One will have a slight superiority in one respect over the other and vice versa, so I would say they are just about even.

Mr. MINSHALL. Would you give the comparative costs of the plane again, General?

General WHITE. For the F–4H, $2.3 million, and $1.9 million for the F–105.

Mr. MINSHALL. There is $400,000 difference on an airplane, with approximately the same flight characteristics, same ability, and so forth. Why is there such a spread?

General WHITE. I do not know, sir. Possibly we are further down the production line curve in the F–4H.

General BRADLEY. I would say we have bought more and are further down the line on the production curve on the F–4H.

Mr. MINSHALL. Was the F–4H beefed up more because of its carrier ability?

General BRADLEY. No, sir. It has two engines and the F–105 only has one engine. This runs into a little extra cost, quite a bit, as a matter of fact.

Mr. MINSHALL. Do you think it will come down? Will the graph get down to the cost of the F–105 eventually when they get into production?

General BRADLEY. Probably not all the way down because of the two engines but they both will come down on the curve as you build more airplanes. I would guess offhand we have built twice as many F–105's as they have.

Excerpt From the Hearings Before Same Committee by Lt. Gen. Bruce Holloway (the Following Developed During Committee Questioning Relative to a Triservice Fighter)

Mr. Mahon. How does this plane relate to the so-called triservice fighter?

General Holloway. It relates principally with respect to time. The triservice fighter which we think is so necessary would feed into the inventory beyond 1965. The original goal was [delete]. It is now [delete] for the first airplane. The main difference qualitatively which would fulfill the shortcomings of the F–105 woud be in the ability to operate from small fields and there is a much up-graded low-level penetration capability. Also we have the ability to deploy anywhere in the world without tankers. We would like to summarize this as freedom from concrete, freedom from tankers, and performance versatility that will allow operation out of soft, short fields. The F–105 does not do this.

Mr. Mahon. The Navy is very enthusiastic about the F–4H. It has indicated its desire that the Air Force adopt this plane with the hope this would increase the quantity of the buy and then reduce the overall cost. What is the position of the Air Force on that?

General Holloway. The F–4H, Mr. Chairman, in the words of the Navy, is the finest fighter in the inventory today. The Air Force, provided this is explained, would agree with this, certainly in certain respects. It does have performance superior to the F–105 in a couple of critical categories, namely takeoff and landing distances. It will get in and out of shorter fields. Its high speed is comparable, and its climb is better. It has two engines versus one in the F–105. It has two people versus one in the F–105, double the crew requirements. On the other side of the ledger, the F–105 is less expensive. It has a much better fire control system for delivering ordnance against ground targets, which is its primary mission orientation, and it is well programed into the Air Force inventory with all the ground support equipment that makes up the logistics support. I think this is about the rundown on it. They are both good airplanes. There are some advantages of the F–4H over the F–105. We ran a pretty good cost analysis on this. It shows the F–4H would cost appreciatively more than the F–105 with the required fire control equipment in them. I think it would run roughly one-half million dollars more per copy.

Excerpt From the Testimony of Gen. Curtis E. LeMay Before the Senate's Committee on Appropriations

Senator Russell. How about the F–4H fighter plane, General? What are the possibilities of that plane? Has the Air Force given any attention to it?

General LeMay. We have given some thought to this. It is a very good airplane. It was designed originally as an air support fighter for the Navy. In such a role, it is probably as good as any in the world that we know of. It is expensive, however, and would require modification to use it in support of ground troops. This could be done and it would be a very good airplane. However, the bill would be much higher than for the F–105, but it can be done.

[From Newsday, Feb. 8, 1962]

Republic Crisis Threatens Long Island

(By John Cummings)

Long Island is threatened with economic disaster. Republic Aviation Corp., one of the mainstays of the island's industry, may be forced to lay off 13,000 of its 15,500 employees.

The loss of that many jobs and an annual payroll of about $90 million is a serious problem in itself. But the blow would not be felt by the Republic worker alone. Like any sudden loss of jobs, the problem would feed on itself. The Air Force decision to phase out production of Republic's F–105D fighter-bombers affects virtually every Long Islander.

Officials from government, labor, and management who are fearful of the impact have gone to Washington to ask the White House and the Pentagon to reverse the decision.

Immediately affected by the Republic layoffs, besides Republic employees, would be thousands of others who work for the 997 Long Island subcontractors and suppliers of the giant airplane firm. Their business with Republic amounts to $28 million annually. Nassau County Executive Nickerson estimated yesterday that a total of 60,000 jobs would be involved in the layoffs.

RETAIL STORES WOULD FEEL PINCH

In addition, predicts Charles J. (Chuck) Browne, president of the Long Island Federation of Labor, another 65,000 to 70,000 Long Islanders employed in the retail field will feel the pinch from loss of sales. All of this is what Representative Otis G. Pike, Democrat, of Riverhead, had in mind when he said last week that the layoffs at Republic would mean economic disaster for Long Island.

Until Justin Ostro, president of the 9,200-member Republic Lodge No. 1987, International Association of Machinists (AFL–CIO), addressed his membership Monday, many Republic workers did not realize the seriousness of the situation. Unemployment has always been a fact of life at Republic, which has experienced serious periodic layoffs since the end of World War II. What makes the problem critical is that the era of the manned military airplane is coming to an end.

FINDING JOBS A PROBLEM

For many Republic workers, and others ultimately affected, the loss of jobs would mean living for at least a while on a $50 weekly unemployment check. State labor officials say many of the jobless would be hard to place. And for those the unemployment check would be replaced later by a welfare check. This would be the personal disaster behind the business-industrial disaster.

In this special report, Newsday looks at what the layoffs could mean to the community, the economy and the individual worker without a job. In addition, there are comments from Congressmen and local and State officials and a study of the decision to phase out the F–105D.

Mass Layoffs Endanger Long Island Economy

(By Harvey Aronson)

About $90 million in wages, the jobs of 13,000 persons, the profits of small businessmen, and food and fuel suppliers, approximately $28 million worth of business with other Long Island firms—these are some of the economic lifelines threatened by the mass layoffs facing Republic Aviation Corp.

The impact of the pending layoffs would spread far beyond the giant East Farmingdale defense plant. It would affect the lives and livelihoods of thousands, in a chain reaction starting with those who do business with Republic and its workers. The economic effect would be measured in millions of dollars by Main Street merchants. It would hit everyone from bakers to bartenders, from candlestick makers to car dealers. In the words of a labor leader, it would be "like there's no tomorrow." In the words of a chainstore executive, it would be "a tremendous burden on the community." In the words of a small businessman, it would be "rough all over."

A great many factors would combine to create economic suffering if the Federal Government went ahead with its plans to phase out production of Republic's F–105D fighter-bomber.

The aircraft company estimates that it will be forced to lay off as many as 13,000 of its 15,500 employees by the end of next year. As a result, these workers' annual payroll of about $90 million would be ripped out of the fabric of the metropolitan area's economy—the great bulk of the loss hitting Long Island. If these employees should remain in the area without finding new work, it is believed that most of them would qualify for maximum State unemployment insurance benefits of about $50 a week for as much as 26 weeks. This means they could draw a maximum of $16,900,000 in unemployment benefits. Some would undoubtedly find other jobs, reducing the benefits total. But in the past, defense employees have found it difficult to obtain new jobs—especially ones with comparable salaries.

WHAT'S GOOD FOR REPUBLIC

It is a dollars-and-cents reality that despite much industrial diversification on Long Island in the past few years, what is good for Republic is still good for many other Nassau and Suffolk enterprises. It is a fact that in 1961, Republic gave $28,192,000 worth of business to 997 subcontractors and suppliers on Long Island—buying thousands of items ranging from small screws to fuselage sections. During the year, for example Republic purchased about 2,800,000 pounds of aluminum, 87,000 pounds of rivets, and 4,340 miles of wiring.

It is also a fact that 12,681 Nassau and Suffolk residents earn their bread at Republic, making up a total payroll of $88 million. There are 2,385 of them living in Hempstead town alone, 2,319 in Oyster Bay Township, 2,180 in Babylon town, and 2,136 in Islip town. If these people lose their jobs and have to take emergency measures to make ends meet, they will have a difficult time paying the milkman and the oilman. They will cut down on their clothing and liquor expenditures; they will not be able to meet the payments on their cars and houses. And the people with whom they trade will, in turn, pass on their losses to others.

A small-picture view of this chain effect was visible yesterday in most of the businesses situated near the Republic plant and along Main Street, Farmingdale, a few miles away. "I still owe $2,000 because of what the Republic strike in 1956 did to me," said George Kapsopoulos, owner of a nearby restaurant. "These layoffs would put me out of business. And I have five employees here. What'll I do? I'll have to go look for work." Said Mrs. Adam Fiore, whose husband operates a gas station across the street from Republic, "Sure, we'll feel the layoffs. During the strike, my husband didn't bring home any money for 7 weeks."

On Main Street, Butcher Pat Marino remembered the strike and the closing of the Liberty Aircraft Co. within the last decade. Marino said, "We'll feel it up and down this street." Said furniture store proprietor, Louis Meyer, "Even the possibility of layoffs frightens people into not buying." Across the street, Sam Bernstein expounded amid the crowded counters of his Army and Navy store. "It will affect all of Long Island. Just the scare has had an effect."

A majority of merchants in the area were seriously worried about the future. "I've been through strikes and layoffs," said liquor store owner, Larry Rose, "I've felt it before: Layoffs like they're talking about would have to affect every business on Main Street." Frank F. Randazzo, manager of a men's shop, said that the Republic crisis is a topic of conversation among customers. "People are afraid, now," he said. "They get scared and they're afraid to spend money. This will hurt the whole economy of Long Island."

MANY FEAR THE WORST

Labor and management spokesmen throughout the island were pessimistic. "If 9,000 workers get laid off at Republic," said Long Island Federation of Labor President Charles J. (Chuck) Browne, "it will affect 65,000 to 70,000 people. And small merchants in Farmingdale will be hit like there's no tomorrow." Said Stanley Fox, secretary of the Times Square Stores Corp., "The entire Long Island economy will be affected. Where do you get 13,000 jobs to replace these?"

There would be other effects—some of them ironic. For instance, not only would Republic workers have to cancel their pledge of $265,000 to the Long Island Fund—some of them might have to ask it for help.

A Republic Worker Asks: "Where Do I Turn Now?"

(By Bernie Bookbinder)

Victor Bonventre, a stocky, balding man with a ready smile, has made a career of surviving aircraft industry layoffs. But this time, at 55, the Republic Aviation Corp. riveter fears he will not be able to get by.

He accepts as inevitable his dismissal by the company for which he has worked "on and off" during the past 27 years. He recognizes that at his age "I can no way whatsoever get a job any place else." Yet Bonventre smiles, because he is an eternal optimist and because "you gain nothing by crying."

Bonventre's job history has closely paralleled the growth of modern aviation. At 19, while with the Fairchild Airplane & Engine Co., he checked over Lindbergh's *Spirit of St. Louis*. Planebuilding was in its infancy then, hardly an industry. But in some respects it hasn't changed. Within 3 years, Bonventre was laid off. Six times since, companies or jobs have vanished beneath him.

Despite the failure of others, Bonventre has kept faith with his family. He and his wife, Marie, have raised 8 children and now have 16 grandchildren. But one of his sons is on relief and another is employed by Republic. "We won't be much help to them now," Bonventre said.

The most crucial test Bonventre faced—and met—came in 1957. He was laid off by Republic in October and wasn't rehired until March.

"We had four or five children at home then," he recalled, "and I was getting about $45 a week in unemployment insurance. I tried, really tried, to get work with some of the small aircraft plants. But my age was against me. They said I could do the work but they wanted somebody younger."

FORCED TO BORROW MONEY

After a few weeks, the situation became critical. With a family of 10, the Bonventres had never been able to save. They borrowed some money from his parents, but pride and necessity placed a limit on such loans.

"I just got up in the morning and went from door to door," Bonventre said. "I asked, 'Do you have work, any work?' I told them I could do carpentry and lay sidewalks. Sometimes they found something for me."

The children's shoes almost wore out, he said, and then there would be a job and new shoes. Their dresses and trousers would be mended and remended. "We went from steak to chopped meat to frankfurters to bread and butter and then, once in a while, to only bread. But their bellies were always filled," Bonventre said proudly.

Somehow, the Bonventres managed to maintain mortgage payments on their home at 51 Fallwood Parkway, South Farmingdale. But it will be another 10 years before the mortgage is paid off. Through the desperate days of 1957 and 1958, Bonventre was sustained by the hope that the crisis was temporary, that he would be recalled. This time, he admitted, there would be no basis for such illusions.

"When my children asked me why they couldn't have their allowances, I told them that 'some people have everything and some have to struggle for it.' They seemed to understand. I hope I can." When he said that, Bonventre wasn't smiling.

Officials Voice Concern, Demand Action

(By Francis Wood)

The crisis at the Republic Aviation Corp. drew reactions of grave concern this week in Washington, Albany, and the county seats of Nassau and Suffolk.

After Republic employees and local businessmen, public officials were the first to appreciate the seriousness of the problem. They got the first hurried calls for help, the pleas for quick action to stave off a potential disaster. In capsule form this is how they felt about the prospect of the layoffs at Republic:

Senator Jacob K. Javits, Republican, of New York: "These (layoffs) pose a critical problem for Long Island. I have conferred with management and the union and have assured them we'll do everything possible to alleviate this serious situation."

Javits deplored the "whole business of layoffs" and said alternate solutions must be found "that don't place such a strain on the economy."

Senator Kenneth B. Keating, Republican, of New York, called the threatened layoff a "shocking situation." He said he planned to see Defense Secretary McNamara himself to "try to attempt" a reconsideration of the Pentagon decision to phase out Republic's F–105D fighter-bomber. Keating said New York State had suffered a 30 percent drop in defense contracts in the last 3 months, and added, "I intend to fight as long as I can to keep more work from being lost." Both Keating and Javits said they would give "full support" to efforts by the "steering committee" of the bipartisan New York State congressional delegation to avert the Republic layoffs.

Representative Steven Derounian, Republican of Roslyn, was so stunned by the McNamara action, he said, that he was "starting my own investigation" of the Republic contract situation. "The State delegation will harness all support to avoid this potential blow to the island's economy," he said. Derounian believes the Defense Department must formulate a grace period system to ease the economic hardships of contract terminations.

Representative Frank Becker, Republican of Lynbrook, demanded a full review of the action from McNamara. In a letter to the Defense Secretary this week Becker said he believed in the "superior qualities" of the Republic plane and requested specific figures on the proposed phaseout of the plane. He called it an unfortunate Pentagon decision and said the Secretary should reconsider the contract on the "merits of the plane."

Representative Otis G. Pike, Democrat, of Riverhead, credited with disclosing the impending Republic crisis, has said he made repeated attempts behind the scenes in recent months to win reversal of the Government position on the basis of the Republic product's quality. He is following up demands he made to McNamara for a review of the case, warning that the decision would bring economic disaster. Representative Carl Vinson, Democrat of Georgia, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, said this week that Pike had argued Republic's case with force and vigor.

Governor Rockefeller: The Governor's office said Rockefeller was directing his staff in tackling the Republic problem. A spokesman said the whole matter was brought to the attention of the Governor by Assembly Speaker Carlino and that appropriate action was underway in Albany and Washington.

Nassau County Executive Nickerson: "The employment of numerous persons is imperiled by the production cutback. The serious adverse effect will go far beyond Republic and the entire local economy will be seriously dislocated." Nickerson has pushed through a resolution in the county board of supervisors, requesting a reconsideration by the Pentagon. He also made a personal trip to Washington to try to persuade the White House to review the case.

Suffolk County Executive Dennison: "It would be a crippling economic blow to us." Disturbed by the outlook at Republic, Dennison has worked behind the scenes, too, to use his influence for a reconsideration of the contract. He also lent support to the Committee to Preserve Long Island's Economy, a bipartisan group formed last Saturday to coordinate efforts for a reversal of the Pentagon decision.

Assembly Speaker Carlino: "I have talked to union officials and they met with the governor," he said. Dr. William Ronan, the governor's secretary, has gone to work on the problem with a committee headed by Representative Emanuel Celler, Democrat of Brooklyn. "Carlino said the State apparently was getting scuttled" in the allocation of negotiated contracts, such as research. "There is certainly room for improvement," he said.

Nassau County Democratic Leader Jack English: "This (Republic) cutback will have a cataclysmic effect on the economy of Long Island. Every concerted effort must be made by all concerned to preserve the present Republic program and work for the future security of their 15,000 employees."

Suffolk Republican Leader Arthur Cromarty: "I don't need to emphasize the effect this will have in our two counties. The Federal Government owes us a reconsideration of the Republic cutback. It was, after all, the defense operations that made our community grow the way it has. I'm hopeful that the committee (formed last Saturday) will remain in existence to work to prevent the recurrence of such panic situations."

Suffolk Democratic Leader Adrian Mason: "A tragic blow to our labor force and the economic well-being of Long Island. There will be enormous hardships for Republic workers, particularly those who have just bought homes in Suffolk. Something must be done now to stave off this tragedy."

Cutback Climaxes Feud

(By Bob Greene)

The decision by the Department of Defense to scrap production of Republic Aviation Corp.'s F–105D fighter-bomber in favor of a modified version of the F–4H fighter-interceptor, which would be called the F–110, is the climax to a dispute that has been quietly simmering for several years behind the closed doors of the Pentagon and the House Armed Services Committee.

Part of the dispute is based on the relative advantages of each plane—one developed by the Air Force and the other by the Navy. Another point at issue is Defense Secretary McNamara's desire to have one basic plane as the workhorse of all three service branches, a move which he regards as an essential step toward service unification.

The F–105D Thunderchief, produced by Republic with Air Force cooperation after 10 years of research, has often been described as a man-controlled missile. It is an all-weather plane. It can take off at zero ceiling; it can fly any place in the world with midair refueling; it can drop bombs on its target and return to its base without the pilot ever having seen the ground. It is a tactical plane, extremely efficient at low-altitude troop support, with the speed, heavy armament, and bomb load capacity necessary to make it also an excellent interceptor and bomber .

The F-4H, produced by McDonnell Aviation Corp. of St. Louis and designed to Navy specifications, is a different type of plane. Built as a fighter-interceptor, it operates at higher altitudes than the F-105D. It has two engines, is slightly faster, can take off from a shorter runway (it was designed to take off from a carrier deck as opposed to the F-105D, which needs a concrete runway), and can get off the ground faster. It carries less armament and a smaller bomb load than the F-105D. Air Force experts claim that the F-105D is perfectly designed for the job they want it to do. Navy experts claim the same for their plane. All agree the planes were designed for different jobs.

The ultimate aim of the Defense Department is to obtain a single plane designed to do all of these jobs equally well for all of the services—a triservice plane. This dream plane, known as the TFX, will not be operating until after 1965.

But recently McNamara has sought to substitute a temporary triservice plane until the TFX is operable. The Air Force, arguing that the F-105D was specifically developed to fit Air Force needs, has argued that it wants to keep the plane until the TFX is a reality. The Navy, arguing that the F-4H would cost far less if bought in bulk by all three services (the F-4H costs $2,300,000 as against $1,900,000 for the F-105D and also requires a two-man crew instead of one pilot needed to operate the F-105D), has urged that McNamara adopt the F-4H for all services. McNamara has agreed.

This, however, will require modifications of the F-4H to make it do the job of the F-105D—heavier armament, an all-weather control system and a greater bomb-load capacity.

The Defense Department is reluctant to predict how long this modification will take. Meanwhile, the F-105D will go out of production and as many as 13,000 Republic employees may lose their jobs. Many experts have criticized Republic for putting all its eggs into the F-105D basket instead of diversifying (Grumman Aircraft Engineering Corp. produces nine different planes). Republic has replied that its one-plane policy, in effect since before World War II, has made it one of Long Island's top employers for 20 years.

The Air Force would still like to keep the F-105D. "It's adapted to our specific needs," said a top Air Force official. "We don't see why we can't buy both of them." But McNamara thinks otherwise. He declared: "The F-4H is better suited for Air Force requirements."

F-105D

Range: 2,000 miles.
Speed: 1,400 miles per hour.
Thrust: 26,500 pounds.
Altitude: 55,000 feet.
Bomb load: 14,000 pounds.

F-4H (F-110)

Range: 1,600 miles.
Speed: 1,600 miles per hour.
Thrust: 30,000 pounds.
Altitude: 66,000 feet.
Bomb load: 10,000 pounds.

AN OPEN LETTER TO PRESIDENT KENNEDY

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Republic Aviation Corp., one of our major industrial plants on Long Island, has been advised by the Department of Defense that the F-105D fighter-bomber is to be phased out and replaced by the F-110. Since the F-105D has been produced by Republic, and since the F-110 is to be manufactured by McDonnell Aviation Corp. in St. Louis, this will lead to the laying off of 13,000 Republic employees by the end of 1963. Such mass unemployment would be seriously damaging to the economy of Long Island. It seems to us the Government has an obligation to provide Republic with other contracts so that this disaster will not occur. We do not presume to argue the technical point, whether the F-105D will perform as well as the F-110. The manufacturers and the Air Force say it will. The Department of Defense—which, short of you as President, has the final word—says the new plane is more efficient and will replace the F-105D.

We also support the doctrine that national security is more important than any local economy. But in this case it should be recognized that since even before World War II, the Government has encouraged Republic and similar defense plants to expand to the point where all of them represent a crucially important source of employment. The Republic workers settled in good faith on Long Island. They are a part of our communities. They want to stay on Long Island, but obviously only a handful can do so if Republic cuts down, as planned, to a skeleton staff of 2,500.

Thus the Government, in the broadest sense, has a responsibility to these people that extends beyond emergency help. They represent a skilled force of craftsmen whose abilities should not be allowed to go to waste.

If Republic is no longer to produce the F-105D—and if, as seems likely, this country is nearing the end of its dependence on manned planes and is to turn to missiles—there certainly must be other contracts that can be carried out by Republic.

If retooling and revision of the plant is necessary to make this possible, it is no more than the Government has done in the past through tax incentives, building loans, and other forms of assistance.

It may perhaps be argued that defense contracts are a speculative thing; that both the owners and employees of any defense plant in a sense have to take a chance. This is the mechanistic point of view. We espouse the human point of view. We urge that the Defense Department reconsider and suspend for the time being its drastic decision. That will give an opportunity to consider what other defense purposes the Republic plant can be used for. In this effort the Government will have the active support of all our Long Island officials and all of our Long Island people. The county executive of Nassau has already made his appeal to the White House. Our congressional delegation is working hard. Cannot a more positive approach to this cutback be taken? Cannot a more careful search be made for alternative contracts for Republic?

Thirteen thousand men out of work, Mr. President. Thirteen thousand families, roughly. That's a lot of people.

Respectfully yours,

NEWSDAY.

THE FUTURE OF FEDERALISM—LECTURES BY GOV. NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the first two parts of Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller's lectures—the so-called Godkin lectures—at Harvard University, entitled "The Future of Federalism," published in the Watertown (N.Y.) Daily Times of February 10, 1962. I shall submit for the RECORD the text of the other lectures as they are given.

There being no objection, the lectures were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Watertown (N.Y.) Daily Times, Feb. 10, 1962]

FUTURE OF FEDERALISM

(By Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller)

LECTURE 1: FREEDOM AND FEDERALISM

In the ominous spring of 1939, a bright and sunny May 3 was a day marked by Adolf Hitler with another bellicose speech to the Reichstag calling for a showdown on Poland. On the same day, the League of Nations opened its "peace pavilion" at the World's Fair in New York City.

And also on this same day, which seems so remote from the present instant, there was published a vigorous critique of American political life by a visitor from abroad, famed in intellectual and academic circles, who had just delivered a series of lectures on the American Presidency.

The visitor was Harold J. Laski. And the obituary he wrote upon an historic American political doctrine bore the title: "The Obsolescence of Federalism."

How did Professor Laski conclude that the age of federalism was languishing near death?

He did concede that "federalism is the appropriate governmental technique for and expanding capitalism." But, he declaimed, "a contracting capitalism cannot afford the luxury of federalism."

Leaping from this premise, he insisted that the failure of the Federal idea was unmistakably plain not only in the United States but also elsewhere in the world—in Canada, Australia, Germany. And he explained this universal failure in these words:

"Whether we take the conditions of labor, the level of taxation, the standards of education, or the supply of amenities like housing and recreation, it has become clear that the true source of decision is no longer at the circumference, but at the center, of the site.

"For 48 separate units to seek to compete with the integrated power of giant capitalism is to invite defeat in almost every element of social life where approximate uniformity of condition is the test of the good life."

The two decades since have dealt a harsh retort to Professor Laski's pronouncement on federalism in the United States.

It has been proven wrong in economic, social and political terms.

In the first place, the American economy has not contracted, but has continued its dynamic expansion.

Private enterprise has become more vigorous, more creative—and better able to bring to the American workingman and woman the highest standard of living ever known by any nation, any time, anywhere in history.

The political power of the people over the functioning of this economy, all this while, has been maintained and even extended. A great array of political and economic devices—the income tax, inheritance laws, antitrust statutes, new and diversified mechanisms for capital accumulation, and the revolution in science—have assured that giant capitalism, far from becoming more integrated, has become more decentralized.

And the grim prognosis of 30 years ago has also been proven wrong in strictly political terms.

For federalism—its idea and its practice—has continued to show itself the adaptable and creative form of self-government that the Founding Fathers of this Nation conceived it to be.

And decisions vital to national well-being have increasingly been made at the circumference—the State—as well as at the national center, of political power.

These lectures are dedicated to the conviction that these basic political, social and economic facts of life—and the lessons they carry for us—are crucial to the whole fate of freedom and of freemen everywhere in this mid-20th century.

I do not use the word "freedom" casually. For nothing less than the historic concept of the free individual's worth and dignity, defined and attested by the whole Judeo-Christian tradition, is at stake in our world.

Nor did I mention this Nation's Founding Fathers from mere historic sentimentalism. For the basic belief that these lectures will finally state is the urgent, historic necessity summoning Americans of this generation to match the founders of this Nation in their political creativity, boldness, and vision.

The Founding Fathers devised a structure of order for a nation within which freemen could work and prosper in peace.

We are required to help build such a framework for freedom not merely for a nation but for the free world of which we are an integral part. And we are called to do this with far greater speed, I believe, than many of us realize or admit.

Ultimately, the great part of our debt to the past may lie in this fact: The Federal idea, so basic to both personal freedom and national unity in the history of America, can now be extended and applied to bring order, strength and progress to the world of free peoples.

Let us look, first, at the Federal concept and its evolution in our Nation. Let us examine some of its practical applications on working levels of National, State and local government.

Let us observe its capacity for adaptation and change, over the decades. Let us see its critical relevance and relationship to a free economy—and a pluralistic society.

But let us always remember that the supreme issue before us through all the inquiry is this: How to make freedom itself work and endure in the world today.

I am sure you are not surprised that a Governor of a large State in our Federal Union elects to speak of the Federal idea of political life. The concept is associated in all our minds with the rights and powers of the individual States.

Yet my own political experience began in appointive posts at the national level under three different Presidents.

Like many members of the Harvard faculty who are not with us today, I went to Washington.

In my case, this was in 1940—more than two decades ago.

After mingled accomplishment and frustration in various appointive posts over a period of 16 years, I turned to elective public office on the State level—and ran for Governor of New York in 1958.

I made this choice on the basis of my recognition that the critical political decisions in government are, and must be, primarily shaped and made by elected officials, or, as my Latin American friends would say, by the authentic representatives of the people.

It is with this particular perspective on our democratic processes that I underline my deep personal conviction that the future of freedom lies in the Federal idea.

THE FEDERAL IDEA

The Federal idea: What does this mean?

Let me first make it clear that I do not speak of the Federal idea as merely a mechanical or technical or abstract formula for Government operations.

I refer to the Federal idea broadly as a concept of government by which a sovereign people, for their greater progress and protection, yield a portion of their sovereignty to a political system that has more than one center of sovereign power, energy, and creativity. No one of these centers or levels has the power to destroy another.

Under the Constitution, for example, there are two principal centers of governmental power—State and Federal. As a practical matter, local government, by delegation of State authority under the principle of home rule, is a third such key center of power.

The Federal idea, then, is above all an idea of a shared sovereignty at all times responsive to the needs and will of the people in whom sovereignty ultimately resides.

The Federal idea is complex and subtle. It involves a balance of strengths. It puts into play a sharing of powers not only among different levels of government but, on each level, a separation of powers between the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of government.

And it clearly signifies more than mere governmental structure. It demands faith in, and an environment for, the free play of individual initiative, private enterprise, social institutions, political organizations, and voluntary associations, all operating within a framework of laws and principles affirming the dignity and freedom of man.

A Federal system seeks stability without rigidity, security without inertia. It encourages innovation and inventiveness, governed by principle and guided by purpose.

It assures responsiveness more thoughtful than mere reflex—and liberty that does not lapse toward anarchy.

In short, it seeks to hold the delicately precarious balance between freedom and order upon which depend decisively the liberty, peace, and prosperity of the individual.

A definition of the Federal idea may be offered, in the form of what I believe are four of the critical ways in which the Federal concept operates.

First. The Federal idea fosters diversity within unity.

In this land that reaches from ocean to ocean, the great social, economic, and political problems vary profoundly as they may appear, for example, before the people of Wyoming, the people of Louisiana, or the people of Massachusetts.

In meeting many of these problems, a sweeping generalized edict from the National Government might well be futile or even fatuous.

Yet, in our Federal concept, the National Government is called upon to work with the State government in ways encouraging the States more effectively to resolve their own problems in their own way.

The simplest technical illustration of this practice is the granting of Federal aid to the States, which has two key purposes:

It stimulates the States to action—and to higher standards of action—by offering matching funds on specific conditions.

It also strives to equalize opportunities for the citizens of States with unequal resources.

Thus, in terms of the Federal tax dollar, a State like New York pays out $3 for every $1 of Federal aid returned, while a State like Arkansas gives $1 and receives back more than $2.50.

By all such devices the Federal concept recognized diversity—and achieves unity.

Second. The Federal idea permits and encourages creativity, imagination, and innovation in meeting the needs of the people.

Those needs, if not met by private action, can be met at the local, the State, or the National level of Government.

By providing several sources of political strength and creativity, a Federal system invites inventive leadership—on all levels—to work toward genuine solutions to the problems of a diverse and complex society.

These problems—whether they concern civil rights or urban development, industrialization or automation, natural resources or transportation—never arise at the same instant and in the same way throughout a great nation.

A Federal system, however, allows these problems to be met at the time and in the area where they first arise. If local solutions are not forthcoming, it is still possible to bring to bear the influence, the power, and the leadership of either the State or the National Government.

Third: The Federal idea is a pluralistic idea. It gives scope to many energies, many beliefs, many initiatives, and enlists them for the welfare of the people.

It encourages diversity of thought, of culture, and of beliefs. It gives unparalleled opportunity for the development of private institutions—social, political, and economic.

Whereas a tightly centralized government tends, by its disproportionate weight and power, to stifle diversity and creativity in both the public and private sectors, a Federal system provides room for both infinite variety and creativity in all sectors of national life.

This is equally true for political organizations, philanthropic associations, social institutions, or economic enterprises.

Fourth: The Federal idea is characterized by a balance which prevents excesses and invites the full, free play of innovation and initiative.

This balance is essentially achieved by:

The division of powers between the National and State Governments.

The separation of legislative, executive, and judicial authority.

The absence of monolithic national parties.

The permissive encouragement given to local municipal governments to achieve a measure of home rule either in fact or in law.

The competitive action of commercial enterprise.

And, above all, the freedom of individual initiative, rooted in a basic and unwavering belief in the dignity of the human person.

[From the Watertown (N.Y.) Daily Times, Feb. 12, 1962]

FUTURE OF FEDERALISM

(By Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller)

LECTURE 1: PART TWO

Let me immediately meet here an obvious challenge about the balance in the American Federal system. This is the assertion that the most dynamic forces in our society—social and economic needs, technological evolution, national peril, and governmental complexity—all conspire to decree a pitiless growth in centralization of political authority, whether we wish it or not.

The massive pressures of the Great Depression and of World War II (so it has been argued) made this bloating of Central Government inevitable. And hence State and local governments supposedly must withdraw from the arenas of great political, economic, and social decision.

GROWTH OF GOVERNMENT

As the demands of society have increased, the National Government has, indeed, not only become larger but also has become more deeply involved in State and local affairs.

But the striking fact in our domestic political experience since World War II has not been the growth of Federal Government—but the far more rapid expansion of State and local government, to meet growing social needs.

With the Federal Government's resources and attention increasingly devoted to defense, foreign aid, and international relations, the rising pressures to meet domestic needs have been directed more and more to State and local government.

It is true that, from 1950 through 1960, total national expenditures moved from $40.3 billion to $77.2 billion, a 92-percent increase in a decade. We must note, however, that practically all of this increase was allotted directly to the Defense Department.

If we subtract the expenditures of the Defense Department, national expenditures increased only 24 percent—from $27.1 billion to $33.5 billion. And included in these figures are huge sums for activities clearly tied to the defense effort—the Atomic Energy Commission, veterans' affairs, and mutual security. Considering the increased cost of goods and services in the fifties, there was only a modest increase in nondefense expenditures at the national level during the decade.

In the same period, total State expenditures jumped from $13.2 billion to $32.5 billion—an increase of 146 percent. Allowing for large population increases, this meant a leap from $89 per capita in 1950 to $182 per capita in 1960. Expenditures at the local level are equally impressive. In cities over 25,000, for example, the outlay went from $4.9 billion in 1950 to $12.3 billion in 1960, a staggering jump of 150 percent.

If we recall again the dismal prognosis offered on the future of federalism more than 20 years ago, we are tempted to ask: If this be obsolescence, what, then, would be the size of growth?

IMPORTANCE OF THE STATES

I offer further proof by referring simply to the magnitude of certain programs of the government of the State of New York—and their comparative relation to matching efforts by the Government of the United States:

In education: State aid to elementary and secondary education in the State of New York totaled $753 million in the 1961–62 fiscal year, or $87 million more than the President requested of the Congress for the whole Nation in 1961 (and, as you know, what was requested on the national level far surpassed what was appropriated).

In civil defense: The $100 million for the New York program, made law in the special session of the State legislature of 1961, is approximately one-third the program enacted in Washington the same year for the entire Nation.

In power development: The State power authority of New York has built more hydroelectric generating capacity on the Niagara and St. Lawrence Rivers in the past 10 years with the funds of private bondholders than all the dams of the TVA system.

In housing: While the Federal housing program enacted by the Congress last year authorized the sum of $5 billion, I recently proposed a New York State housing program which for New York City alone would involve the identical sum of $5 billion—these funds to be supplied through the newly created State housing finance agency at no cost to the taxpayers.

I do not cite these facts and figures to imply that State and National Governments are pitted against one another—locked in some bizarre contest to surpass one another in size and expenditure.

Nothing could be further from the true relationship of complementing and cooperating that must mark a healthy federalism.

Yet these statistics do suggest that the role of the State, within American federalism is far from obsolete. It is as dynamic and promising as is the Federal idea itself.

Something more than arithmetic attests the unique role of the State. It is dramatized by the whole sweep of our modern social history. Erroneously, this history has come to be exclusively associated, in the mind of a generation, with the New Deal.

The historical fact is, of course, that the New Deal did face and meet deep crises in our society, did institute vital social reforms and economic regulations, and did take the force out of stresses that could have resulted in conflict and catastrophe for the Nation.

Yet, while the New Deal accomplished these major social advances and did much to restore the confidence of the people—its leaders did not display great comprehension of the nature and workings of our economic system.

They showed little or no awareness of the need to create a climate for growth to encourage an expanding American economy, vital to the achievement of full employment, social objectives, and the self-realization of the individual. For all the New Deal's conscientious concern for human values, it took the advent of World War II to dispose of the problems of depression and unemployment.

This experience brought home the fact that it does not suffice to understand social needs and aspirations—without also fully understanding the dynamics of our economic system.

ORIGINS OF SOCIAL REFORM

A still more striking—and overlooked—fact about the New Deal is that its major and most successful actions in social reform had been anticipated, by experiment and practice, on the State level or by private institutions.

The history of the years before 1932 tells this story plainly. Time and again, States like Massachusetts, Wisconsin, or New York had acted on their own initiative to protect the health, safety, and welfare of the individual, while guarding his rights and broadening his opportunities in the Nation's free economy.

This was true of factory inspection or limitation of hours of labor. It was true of child labor or women's labor. It was true of unemployment compensation and social security.

In all such cases, the ferment of ideas and innovations worked its way up through the Federal system—often from private initiative.

It is also important to note, too, that those elements of the New Deal which failed were largely in areas not tested by prior experience at State level.

These included such major economic regulatory actions as the National Recovery Administration, the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and other actions based on an economy of scarcity and on restriction of competition and production.

These were examples of action by centralized government which proved counterproductive to the goal of full employment. They turned out to be deterrents to economic growth.

This parenthesis on the impact of the New Deal only serves to make still clearer the practical workings—and ultimate implications—of the Federal idea.

This idea deeply involves the whole political, cultural, social, and economic environment—just as it reflects a great part of our history as a nation.

And while this idea implies limits and checks against excessive power, its living purpose and intent are affirmative.

It is not a theoretical device to narrow or constrict political action. It is a way to amplify it.

It is not an excuse for keeping necessary things from being done.

It is almost the exact opposite—a flexible and imaginative device to open not one but many avenues of political action for economic and social progress.

The essential supremacy of the people, through their exercise of political power is, above all, vital to the life of the Federal idea.

So close to the people—so interwoven with their deepest beliefs and their daily lives—is the Federal concept that it is, in fact, conceivable and workable only as the people act as responsible individuals—as concerned citizens—and not merely as members of an economic class, ethnic group, religious faith, occupational calling, or private organization.

The working of the Federal idea, in short, depends upon the whole political environment—the full intellectual climate, the sum of the spirit and purposes of all citizenry, and their individual and collective sense of responsibility.

This responsibility, I deeply believe, means political participation—not merely in voting, but in active working for one's party and in standing for public office.

My decision to run for Governor in 1958 was firmly grounded on this belief. I promptly received much contrary advice.

"Don't get into politics," I was told repeatedly. "Politics is a dirty business."

My reply to those who gave me this advice was simply this:

"Politics is the lifeblood of democracy. To call politics dirty is to call democracy dirty."

The truth is that anyone in a democratic society who believes that his political environment has become dirty, but scornfully turns his back on it, has become, in effect, a political refugee in his own society.

Politics, of course, requires sweat, work, combat, and organization. But these should not be ugly words for any free people.

Organization in politics, for example, is not a sign of some sordid tyranny. It is what makes democracy itself function.

And its roots must strike far beneath the surfaces of National, State, or community government.

It must draw its strength and vitality from the people—through the ward leaders, the precinct chiefs, the block captains.

No concept of government, not even the lofty and rich promise of the Federal idea itself, can truly work except as dedicated men and women in these positions, men and women in the tens of thousands, make it work.

Grand ideas of government—lofty abstract principles, even the wisest constitutions and laws—depend for their very life and meaning on the willingness of citizens and leaders to apply them to improve them.

What factors, then, tend to impair—in political practice—the effectiveness of our Federal system in theory?

In the political environment of today, I would mark three pervasive attitudes or tendencies as plainly damaging to our processes of government.

The first is the scorn of skepticism toward practical, partisan politics that I have already mentioned.

The second is an addiction to political labels and slogans, along lines loosely called "liberal" and "conservative."

The third is a timidity of leadership that rarely glimpses the dawn of any new concepts—but passively awaits the high noon of crisis.

Let me say a few words on each of these dangers.

THE RULE OF LAW

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, the Conference for Africa and the Middle East on World Peace Through the Rule of Law was held in Lagos, Nigeria, in December 1961. Lawyers from African and Middle Eastern nations attended the Conference. These delegates, an unusually distinguished representation of the legal profession including past and present national bar association presidents, professors of law. and others with extensive diplomatic, judicial, cabinet, or ministerial experience, participated enthusiastically in the vigorous discussions and debates which took place throughout the meeting.

One other continental conference is scheduled for Rome, Italy, in April 1962. In early 1963 a world conference is planned. Through these conferences and the exchanges of ideas and information they generate, it is hoped that a realistic program will be developed to harness the manpower and brainpower of the legal profession to translate from ideal to reality the substitution of law for force as the controlling factor in world affairs.

At the conclusion of the Lagos Conference, the delegates produced and approved the "Consensus of Lagos," a document containing an outline of some of the general principles believed to be essential to a program for peace based upon law and a plan of action designed to strengthen the rule of law in the world community. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the "Consensus of Lagos," approved December 6, 1961, by the African and Middle East Conference, and on the same subject, the article by Charles S. Rhyne entitled "World's Lawyers Seek World Law," which appeared in War/Peace Report, February 1962.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSENSUS OF LAGOS

(Approved December 6, 1961)

We lawyers attending this conference of the nations of Africa and the Middle East, being aware of our professional responsibility to utilize and further develop international law and its institutions as the most effective means of justly resolving world tension and conflict, and recognizing the imperative need for positive and immediate action by the legal profession to fulfill its obligation to promote world peace through the rule of law, hereby declare the following as our consensus:

SPECIAL CALL FOR ACTION

Be it resolved, That the body of lawyers here assembled exhort the governments of all independent states in Africa and the Middle East to call conferences for the purpose of establishing a Permanent Organization of African States and a Permanent Organization of Middle East States for the promotion of the rule of law and amicable relations between these states, for the eradication of sources of conflict, and for the peaceful settlement of disputes.

This Organization for Africa should include an African Court of Justice for settlement of justifiable disputes and provision for arbitration, mediation and conciliation in appropriate cases.

In recognition of the fact that the Arab League has under consideration the establishment of an Arab Regional Court of Justice for member states, we strongly recommend that such a Court be formed as soon as possible in the interest of peace and for the promotion of the rule of law.

The Organizations should be related to the United Nations and the Courts to the International Court of Justice.

DECLARATION OF GENERAL PRINCIPLES

In order to establish an effective international legal system under the rule of law we declare that:

I. International law must be the supreme law of the world community and no person or state is above the rule of law.

II. The rule of law in international affairs must be based upon the principle of equality of all states before the law.

III. Founded upon general consent, international law must embody fundamental concepts of justice and human dignity of societies and legal systems, and the generally accepted customs and agreements of nations and individuals throughout the world.

IV. International law in a dynamic world must constantly evolve in the light of new needs and the contributions of new states.

V. A fundamental principle of the international rule of law should be that of the right of self-determination of the peoples of the world.

VI. Individuals, juridical persons, states and international organizations should, in appropriate degree, all be subject to international law, deriving rights and incurring obligations thereunder.

VII. All who are subject to international law should fulfill their international obligations and exercise their rights in good faith.

VIII. All who are subject to international law should resolve their international disputes by adjudication, arbitration, negotiation, or other peaceful procedures. The dispute settling method should be appropriate to the nature of the dispute. Generally, the legal aspects of disputes should be resolved by legal procedures and political aspects by political procedures.

IX. Judges on international tribunals must be professionally competent and free from political, national or other improper pressures.

X. International tribunals, although having no authority in matters which are within the domestic jurisdiction of states, should have the normal power to determine according to applicable agreements and international law the scope of their jurisdiction.

XI. Decisions of international tribunals should be enforceable by appropriate and expeditious international community action. National legislation should be adopted for the enforcement of the decisions of international tribunals.

XII. Those subject to international law must, prior to the application of any judicially imposed sanctions, be entitled to the benefit of third party adjudication.

XIII. Individuals must be entitled to effective legal protection of fundamental and inalienable human rights without distinction as to race, religion or belief.

XIV. The United Nations organization is the world's best hope for international peace under the rule of law and should be supported and strengthened by all possible means.

In order to effectuate and support the foregoing, this conference now therefore

RESOLUTIONS OF CONFERENCE

Resolves—

I. To participate to the fullest in the world peace through law program by working toward worldwide acceptance and application of the rule of law in international affairs, and to that end

II. To encourage individual lawyers and existing public and private international and national organizations and institutions to engage in a coordinated and sustained effort to seek agreement on the implementation of feasible ways of achieving world peace through the rule of law, and

III. To support the program of world peace through law by encouraging the formation and support of committees on world peace through law within associations of lawyers.

IV. To support the proposed World Conference on World Peace Through Law, and all preliminary action required for that conference.

In order to implement the foregoing resolutions, and recognizing the need for immediate and specific action, this conference now therefore

PROGRAM FOR WORLD PEACE THROUGH LAW

Recommends—

I. That a planning committee for the World Peace Through Law Institute proposed by the preceding conferences be established and charged with the responsibility for preparation of a draft charter for preliminary organization to be submitted to the proposed World Conference of Lawyers, said charter including but not limited to the following functions and purposes:

A. To effectuate by every available means the decisions and recommendations of lawyers convened at the World Conference.

B. To harmonize activities of lawyers and legal organizations in a cooperative effort to establish the rule of law in international affairs, including arrangements for periodic conferences to promote international understanding and the rule of law.

C. To stimulate, conduct and coordinate a continuous series of programs and activities to be carried on during the proposed World Rule of Law Year.

D. To undertake an intensive worldwide educational program designed to reach lawyers and citizens of all nations to make them aware that international law is an already living and constantly growing system of law which is practical and accepted; and to impress upon them the inescapable logic and vital necessity of fully establishing the rule of law in international affairs.

E. To create new and further develop existing systems for the continuous reporting and digesting of decisions of international tribunals, international agreements, and research or other documents of international law in order to create a readily available source of information for further development of the rule of law in international affairs.

F. To make awards of honor to states, public or private organizations and individuals in recognition of outstanding contributions to the establishment of the rule of law in international affairs.

G. To study and make recommendations with respect to development of the rules, principles, and standards of international law defining and controlling use of armed force, subversion, economic warfare, political propaganda, and defining the right of self-defense and reprisals, international sanctions, and other lawful means of countering aggression in international affairs.

H. To study existing national and international law with a view to developing recommendations for the facilitation of international commerce and economic development.

I. To further stimulate and help coordinate a global research program utilizing facilities of the Institute and existing national and international organizations to accomplish objectives including but not limited to the following:

1. Expansion of knowledge of the international law and its sources;

2. Identification of areas of common agreement which may be the basis of needed international conventions, treaties or understandings;

3. Definition of general principles of law recognized by nations generally which can form the foundation for an improved international legal system and harmonization of different conceptions of international law;

4. Drafting of model codes and recommendations dealing with subjects of international concern, including:

(a) International investment, to safeguard adequately the interests of both the capital importing and the capital exporting nations;

(b) International trade, especially in commodities and raw materials, to protect the legitimate interests of both consumers and producers, and of both importing and exporting nations;

(c) Outer space, to assure its development in accordance with principles of the rule of law and removing it from international politics;

(d) Nuclear test suspension coupled with inspection, to adequately provide security against possible violations, while simultaneously assuring inspected countries that their internal security would in no way be violated;

(e) International arbitration, public or private, including a model clause compromissoire;

(f) International arms control and disarmament;

5. Work on unification and harmonization of law in fields such as commercial documents in which unification or harmonization is practicable and desirable;

6. Engaging in a comprehensive study of existing judicial and nonjudicial machinery for resolving international legal disputes, and of proposals for creation of regional and specialized international tribunals, taking into account varying and common legal, economic, cultural, and political interests of nations;

J. To seek proper financing for all the above and other appropriate approved endeavors of the legal profession of the world aimed at creating and strengthening the legal system, and rules of law required to achieve and maintain world peace; seeking to include grants in aid of research and other projects undertaken or to be undertaken by law schools and other bodies throughout the world.

K. To seek consultative status to the Economic and Social Council under article 71 of the United Nations Charter.

II. That special committees be constituted and charged with the task of preparing a draft Convention on Disarmament, a draft Convention to End Nuclear Testing, and a draft Convention on Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, said drafts to be available for the delegates at the forthcoming World Conference of Lawyers.

III. That special committees be constituted for the purpose of drafting agreements and conventions for the facilitation of International Commerce and Economic Development to be available for the delegates at the forthcoming World Conference of Lawyers.

IV. That the lawyers of the world declare their support for and take action toward establishing a World Law Day.

V. That a World Conference of Lawyers be convened in 1962 with delegates from all nations in the world invited to attend.

VI. That the topics for discussion at the world conference include the following:

A. Basic principles underlying the rule of law in international affairs;

B. International judicial machinery for peaceful settlement of international disputes;

C. Arbitration, conciliation, mediation, good offices, and other means of peaceful settlement of international disputes;

D. The United Nations and regional organizations as factors encouraging the rule of law in international affairs;

E. Facilitation of international commerce and economic development through international law;

F. The role of lawyers in development of the rule of law in international affairs.

VII. That the world conference consider designating a World Rule of Law Year during which a concentrated global effort of the lawyers of the world to advance the rule of law in international affairs will be undertaken through a coordinated program of research, education, and cooperative action utilizing all existing institutions and international and national organizations, and establishing such new institutions and organizations as may be necessary to effectuate the objectives and purposes of the world peace through law program.

VIII. That there be established a global system of regional chambers of the International Court of Justice, from which appeals to the full court would be permissible.

IX. That there be established a Court of Justice for African Nations with a carefully drafted jurisdiction over matters of regional concern.

X. That there be established a Court of Justice for Arab Nations with a carefully drafted jurisdiction over matters of regional concern.

XI. That in international matters, individuals, judicial persons, nations, and international organizations be permitted to be parties in appropriate cases before international tribunals.

XII. That the membership of the International Court of Justice more accurately represent the areas and legal systems in the world which are not adequately represented on that body, notably African.

XIII. That efforts be made to establish a series of specialized international courts and tribunals to operate under agreements reached between nations having a common interest in matters specifically assigned to their jurisdiction. These matters could include among other things, trade in certain vital commodities or other items; international investment, public or private; water rights and related problems; and international economic activities, carried on through the United Nations and international organizations.

XIV. That international judicial and arbitration procedures be further developed; that more effective means of enforcing decisions of arbitral tribunals be sought; that ratification of the United Nations Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards be encouraged.

XV. That other means for the pacific settlement of disputes such as mediation, conciliation, good offices and investigation be resorted to when appropriate.

XVI. That all nations accept, on the basis of reciprocity, the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice.

XVII. That the United Nations Charter be revised to take into consideration the fact that the new independent status of many nations of Asia and Africa has nearly doubled United Nations membership, and in particular, that the Security Council and Economic and Social Councils of the United Nations be enlarged to permit adequate representation of these new members.

XVIII. That a concerted effort be made to find ways of making maximum use of existing provisions of the United Nations Charter which can contribute to world peace and security under the rule of law, including the further development of a strong independent Secretariat, the courageous use where necessary by the General Assembly of its powers under the Uniting for Peace Resolution, and the continued development of effective United Nations Peace Forces.

XIX. That efforts be made to achieve uniformity of law, notably in the fields of negotiable instruments, international sales and international transportation; to obtain agreement on uniform rules in the field of conflict of laws for internationally important private law and to secure more effective judicial assistance and to obtain national legislation in harmony with these objectives.

XX. That the Sixth (Legal) Committee of the General Assembly assume greater responsibility, in particular for assuring consideration of the legal aspects of matters brought before the General Assembly; and that the International Law Commission be strengthened and given more staff assistance, and that its sessions be lengthened.

XXI. That the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (World Bank) should establish regional branches in different areas of Africa and the Middle East and thereby more effectively and rapidly aid economic development in the developing countries.

XXII. That a world community of legal scholars be developed through expanded programs of international exchanges; the community to include law students, practicing lawyers, judges and professors of law, and that universities be encouraged to establish programs devoted to studies concerned with world rule of law.

CONCLUSION

We delegates attending this Conference on World Peace Through the Rule of Law, pledge our full support of the programs and principles set forth in this consensus, and the exertion of every effort to realize the ideal of the international rule of law as our contribution to the cause of world peace.

WORLD'S LAWYERS SEEK WORLD LAW

(By Charles S. Rhyne)

Are there practical ways in which international law and legal institutions may be strengthened to maintain peace and order between nations? This is the problem to which the lawyers of the world are addressing themselves in a movement which has been gaining momentum during the past year through a series of conferences sponsored by the American Bar Association.

During 1961 lawyers from 79 nations in Asia, Africa, and the Americas drafted blueprints for action on a plan which may mean as much to law as the International Geophysical Year meant to science. While the details of the blueprint for action are as complex as those of the IGY, the underlying idea is strikingly simple: that the rule of law can be instituted on a worldwide scale to facilitate peaceful relations and to replace force as the basis for settling international disputes.

COMMUNISTS TO PARTICIPATE

Already lawyers from nations in Asia, Africa, and the Americas have enthusiastically endorsed the idea of a worldwide effort to achieve this goal, and have created committees to implement this program. Next will be a conference of European lawyers to be held in Rome in April of this year. This will mark the first meeting in which Communist countries will participate, with representatives having been invited from Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Rumania, U.S.S.R., and Yugoslavia. (Red China was not invited to the Asian conference since the criterion used for invitations is that the countries represented must be members of the U.N. or have participated in the General Convention on the Law of the Sea.) Following the Rome meeting, plans will be made for a world conference of lawyers, probably in 1963 at New Delhi, India.

When lawyers from over 100 nations exchange ideas and information, certain conclusions based on shared experience become inescapably clear. Lawyers know that within domestic societies peace is maintained through settling disputes according to law. In international society everyone knows that disputes are settled by force, either direct or indirect. Lawyers feel that the reason for this difference is the existence of a moral consensus among the members of a domestic society, and the lack of such a consensus in international society.

With this point clearly understood, the task of lawyers participating in this movement is clear. It is to develop understandings which can serve as the foundations for codes of international law. Existing codes in such fields as aviation, the high seas and international trade have demonstrated their value as positive steps toward maintaining peace. At the three continental meetings, the assembled lawyers urged treaties in other areas. The movement intends to accelerate this process through cooperating with governments in updating existing agreements, in seeking ratification of existing drafts and treaties, and in helping draw up new pacts. Thus will international lawmaking be speeded up through utilization of the lawyer's unique capacity.

The consensuses which were approved at the three continental meetings in Costa Rica, Japan and Nigeria made significant progress in the direction of creating basic understandings on which new codes can be established. These three documents proclaim that, according to international law, nations must refrain from the unlawful use of armed force, political subversion, economic aggression and defamatory propaganda. A nation's obligation to protect human rights is stated, as is the requirement of a day in court before the imposition of international sanctions. Also, standards for judges on international judicial institutions are set.

SPECIFIC ACTIONS

The consensuses have, in addition, contained concrete suggestions for actions which may be taken now to advance the rule of law internationally. For example, at the recently concluded conference in Lagos, Nigeria, a call was made on governments of Africa and the Middle East to form permanent organizations of African states and of Middle Eastern states for promotion of the rule of law and settlement of disputes. The consensus of Lagos contained concrete recommendations that courts of justice for African nations and for Arab nations be established, with a carefully drafted jurisdiction over matters of regional concern. Proof that such suggestions are practical is the court established by the six nations of Europe which are members of the Common Market. These moves demonstrate one very practical aspect of the program; the drive to advance wherever international agreements already exist.

As evidence that more than words may be expected from this movement to utilize the positive value of law, at the Lagos meeting last December recommendations were approved that special committees be set up to prepare draft treaties on disarmament, nuclear testing and peaceful uses of outer space, as well as draft conventions on international commerce and development. In order that the drafts will represent the best in scientific, technical, economic, and other fields of knowledge, the cooperation of other professions will be sought. The resultant drafts will be available for consideration by the delegates at the forthcoming world conference of lawyers.

The idea of inviting lawyers from all nations to participate in the preparation of a law for outer space is an example of a dramatic new step inspired by the peace through law program. For although only two nations at present have space capabilities, the effects of developments in the outer atmosphere are worldwide. Here, then, is a project which can bring power under the control not only of those possessing it, but also of those affected by it.

HIGH LEVEL PARTICIPANTS

Indicative of the support the movement has received in its early stages has been the caliber of its participants. Past and present presidents of national bar associations, teachers and deans of leading law schools, members and former members of cabinets, members of supreme courts, and others with extensive diplomatic experience as ambassadors or representatives to the United Nations have been active in the program. Of particular significance is the fact that all of these delegates exercise a tremendous influence on public affairs in their own countries.

Each of the continental meetings has been initiated by an inspiring address by the chief executive of the host government. The numerous messages of support for the rule of law internationally from heads of governments read at the beginning of the continental conferences have given added momentum to the program. Typical of these messages was that which President Kennedy sent to the San Jose Conference, containing the following statement:

"Where people have the hope of enjoying a free and peaceful world with justice for all, they will undoubtedly find encouragement in the series of continental conferences starting with the San Jose Conference, in order to help create a world community in which the international disputes will be handled not on the basis of brutal force but by the rule of law. * * * The bar associations meeting there now, and later working with their colleagues from other continents toward that great objective, constitute a model and an incentive for collective action regarding the tremendous problems of the present era."

Research, education, and action are the means by which this program expects to achieve its goals. Appropriate institutions through which these actions will be taken have been outlined. In addition to utilization of all existing organizations and institutions, such as law schools, a World Peace Through Law Institute and a World Peace Through Law Year are envisaged to further the program.

Lawyers confidently believe that intensive research into those international areas which are ripe for immediate progress can be undertaken fruitfully on a coordinated global scale. Similarly, a worldwide educational program on international law must be pursued. In this way the public can come to understand the potential of international law as a positive means for the development of international cooperation. Such understanding, in turn, can facilitate desirable political settlements. Finally, with a permanent institute established to advance programs which have been developed through intensive research and supported by an educated bar and public, global campaigns for action toward world rule of law will be feasible.

Today the ultimate arbiter in international affairs remains military force, as it has for millenia. This program now being formulated can so strengthen law as to make it the major factor that it must be in regulating the actions of nations and men in the world community. Thus we may enter a new era in the development of civilization.

AMENDMENT OF ACT ESTABLISHING CODE OF LAW FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts in the chair). The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 5143) to amend section 801 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901.

VIETNAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the press of the country and at the President's press conference yesterday, questions have been raised relative to the situation in Vietnam, and how much or how little the American people have been informed, and how much or how little the leadership on both sides of the Congress have been informed, and how much or how little the Members themselves have been informed.

I did a little checking on this matter; and it appears to me, to judge from the figures which I have been able to obtain, that in 1961 and up to the present time there have been at least 50 meetings covering the question of Vietnam and our interest there. State Department officials have given a number of briefings to congressional committees. The Department of Defense has given a number of briefings to congressional committees. Some of those briefings have been several days in length. So I would say, to speak conservatively, that out of the 50 to which I have referred, there have been at least 40 meetings of various kinds between congressional committees and representatives of the Department of Defense and representatives of the Department of State; and last year and this year—for instance, on January 8, I believe—there have been leadership meetings at which the President has endeavored to keep us fully informed in regard to the delicate situation in Vietnam.

Mr. President, a most serious situation exists in Vietnam. It is a situation that is of proper concern to leaders of both parties in the Congress, and to the public. Since that is the case, it is a subject for proper discussion. But let me emphasize the word "proper." It is not a subject for political profiteering. It is not a subject for recrimination and scapegoating. Our security is involved in the Vietnamese situation; the lives of Americans and others are involved. Both have been involved for many years under administrations of both parties.

Any constructive advice from the Senate or any of its Members on how this situation may be ameliorated is to be welcomed. I am confident the President, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Defense would welcome it. I am confident that the people of the Nation would welcome it, too.

I am just as confident that the distinguished minority leader of the Senate, who is a great American before he is a party leader, feels the same way as I do in this matter.

I may have more to say on this matter later. For the moment, however, I want to stress that it borders on the irresponsible to suggest that Congress has not been well informed on this situation for many years. Countless congressional missions have visited Vietnam during the last half decade and have reported to their committees and to the Congress.

This administration has made a special point of keeping the Congress informed—as did its predecessor—on developments in Vietnam, because of the critical nature of the situation there and our deep involvement of many years' standing. On January 8 of this year—at the very beginning of the present session—the President raised and discussed the question at length with the congressional leaders.

Furthermore, the Senate will recall that in the spring of 1961 the Vice President went on a mission to southeast Asia. On his return he made an unprecedented report on Vietnam, not only to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, to which all Members of the Senate were invited—and a great number attended; I believe the number was 57 Senators—but also to the Foreign Affairs Committee of the other House. These reports by the Vice President were full, candid, and very much to the point of the difficulties in Vietnam and our efforts to meet them.

Nor is that all, Mr. President. Time and again there have been discussions of Vietnam with committees and Members by the U.S. Ambassadors to Vietnam, by the pertinent officials of the Department of State and of the Department of Defense, including the Secretaries and Assistant Secretaries, and by military officials under two administrations. Time and again this subject has come up in congressional proceedings. We have had, if anything, a surfeit of information on the situation in Vietnam and on our policies with respect thereto. The truth of the matter is that there has not been any reluctance on the part of responsible officials of the executive branch to provide significant information on this situation to any appropriate agent of the Congress. That is proper, and that is the way I hope it will continue. Indeed, it must continue.

But we have got to be very careful here, Mr. President, as to the constitutional line of demarcation between the prerogatives and responsibilities of the President and those of the Congress in connection with this matter. It is the President's responsibility to decide and to act. It is ours to advise as we are able in our individual and collective wisdom, and, to the extent that it is constitutionally required, to consent. I, for one, would welcome on the floor of the Senate, from Members of either party, any constructive comment on the course which our policies in Vietnam has followed for many years. Information is necessary for that purpose. It has been forthcoming from this administration, as it was from its predecessor, with respect to Vietnam. I hope that this effective collaboration and mutual accommodation will continue, because it is essential for the welfare of the Nation that they continue. But they are not likely to continue if the party headquarters become involved. They will not continue if partisans on one side insist that Congress has no concern in these matters or if partisans on the other insist that Congress should look over the President's shoulder 24 hours of a day and should tell him how to conduct the foreign policy of the United States. That is the President's responsibility. The President has the strength, the courage, and the wisdom to exercise it. It is in the Nation's interest that he be supported in exercising it. It will be a disservice to the Nation and, hence, to any party, to impede him, for whatever reason, in exercising it.

DECISIONS ON POWER ISSUES FACE PACIFIC NORTHWEST

Mrs. **NEUBERGER.** Mr. President, the economy of the Pacific Northwest is characterized by a lopsided pattern of industry, heavy seasonal fluctuations in employment, and acute sensitivity to cyclical trends.

Lumbering, farming, and tourism are our major industries; all are subject to the whims of weather. We are located long distances from major markets.

Growth in manufacturing employment in the last decade has been largely limited to the aircraft industry in the State of Washington; this industry is dependent upon expenditures for national defense and vulnerable to sharp drops in employment.

We need more stable year-round payrolls.

In the past, availability of an abundance of low-cost hydroelectric power has served as the competitive catalyst which stimulated economic development. The Eisenhower administration's "no-new-starts" policy plus its restriction of the Bonneville Power Administration's marketing and planning functions broke the pipeline of projects required to assure the region of low-cost firm power and eliminated a major industrial incentive.

Vast resources of hydroelectric power exist in the Northwest. Investment in Federal power projects in our region will all be repaid to the Treasury—with interest. Through multiple-purpose water development, flood damage has been reduced, navigation expanded, agriculture improved, and recreation enhanced. Tangible benefits have accrued to the Nation through strengthening of the total economy and increased tax revenues.

Whether or not the power potential of our region will continue to make the maximum contribution to the Northwest and the Nation will depend on decisions which must be made within the next few months. A. Robert Smith, Washington correspondent for a number of newspapers in the Northwest, recently summed up the problems we face in the field of power policies. In an article appearing in the Oregonian of January 11, 1962, he outlined the issues in cogent fashion. Because his comments so clearly describe the alternatives available, and because Congress will be called upon to decide many of the questions posed, I ask unanimous consent that A. Robert Smith's analysis be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Oregonian, Jan. 11, 1962]

PACIFIC NORTHWEST FACES CROSSROADS ON POWER POLICIES

(By A. Robert Smith)

WASHINGTON.—The Pacific Northwest is moving inexorably toward a compelling condition of either abundance or scarcity that will sharply influence its growth for a generation.

In 1962 decisions of vital significance to the future economic growth and industrial potential of the region will have to be made in Washington, in Ottawa, in Victoria, in Portland, and in the minds of political leaders and citizens in every corner of the great Northwest country.

These decisions will go far to determine the speed and extent to which the Northwest country, one of the most richly endowed regions of the North American Continent, develops the modern manufacturing centers which promise economic stability and growth the year around and from year to year.

These decisions will have a bearing on how fast Oregon, Washington, British Columbia and Alaska can shake off the economic instability and uncertainty which plague them because of Northwest dependence on seasonal industry, such as logging; its remoteness from great markets; its reliance on military payrolls, such as the bomber bases in Washington State and Alaska; and on defense contracts such as those of the Boeing Aircraft Co., which form so much of Seattle's economic base.

POWER IS KEY

The most striking consequence of these imminent decisions is that either the Northwest country will move boldly into the decades ahead on a policy of developing all of its cheap hydroelectric power; or it will move so cautiously, or even blindly backward, so to force the Northwest economy prematurely to turn to higher cost fuels that will inevitably hamper industrial growth.

Northwest hydropower is no panacea for all the region's economic shortcomings, but economists maintain that it is a major advantage which the Northwest cannot afford to toss aside if it is to pass completely out of the hewers of wood and drawers of water stage.

The decision between abundance and scarcity of this economic advantage will dictate to a great extent how vigorous or how sluggish the growth rate of the region will be the next few decades. The imminent possibility of scarcity underscores the gravity of the decisions facing the region in the year ahead.

The Northwest country has the greatest sources of hydroelectricity on the continent. While the creative magnificence of Grand Coulee has been realized in an earlier decade of daring decision, still other—and some greater—projects remain on the drawing boards. These include the proposed Rampart Canyon Dam on the Yukon River near Fairbanks, Alaska; the Taiya project on the Alaska-Canadian border; the Portage Mountain project on the Peace River in northern British Columbia; Mica Creek, Arrow Lakes, Duncan Lakes and Libby, the four major projects provided by the pending Columbia River treaty, and the complex of remaining dams in the middle Snake-Clearwater River area of the millions of kilowatts to satisfy the demands of growth in this vast region for a decade or more.

ERA MAY END

Or, if the Northwest suffers scarcity due to political shortsightedness in key places, the era of great dam building will soon end and the region's growth will have to be sustained by the same higher-cost fuels on which much of the rest of the continent is dependent. A Northwest advantage would thus be wasted.

The decisions which will determine the condition of abundance or scarcity are these:

1. Columbia River Treaty: If the Canadian Parliament follows the course of the U.S. Senate and ratifies this document, sharing of water storage and power benefits will add 2,600,000 kilowatts to the energy supply of the Northwest, whether it is all consumed in the United States or whether Canada uses its own half-share in British Columbia. An internal political squabble in Canada threatens this forward-looking step.

POWERLINES NOTED

The engineering feasibility of long-range transmission lines, as projected in the recent Interior Department task force report, makes possible the development of the most remote of these dam sites and the utilization of the energy in cities near and far where industries and residents choose to locate.

In short, here lies the potential for abundance.

2. Peace River: British Columbia Premier Bennett wants to build the 4,900,000 kilowatt Portage Mountain Dam to give his province a huge supply of cheap energy. But he says his depends on his getting U.S. dollars for

Canada's Columbia treaty entitlement, which in turn is challenged at Ottawa.

3. Alaskan power: Two huge projects in Alaska depend in large part upon Canada's cooperation. One is the Taiya project, a 2 million kilowatt dam in southwest Alaska near Skagway on the Canadian border utilizing diverted Canadian water from the Yukon River. The other is Rampart Canyon dam 100 miles northwest of Fairbanks, a 4,700,000 kilowatt project, which would rival Portage Mountain as the largest in North America if not the world.

LONG LINES VITAL

Long distance direct current transmission lines linking these projects with those in Canada and the Columbia Basin would permit early utilization of this vast reservoir of energy from California to the Arctic Circle. Without such interties, they may not be built for years, possibly never, due to their remoteness. Their development would foster the growth of Alaska which has the potential for becoming an American Scandinavia.

4. International power pool: Coordination of these great dams into an integrated system, crossing international borders as easily as State boundaries, would assure the minimum waste of these mammoth water resources and maximum utilization.

Such a pool could mitigate fears in Canada over the emotional issue of "export of power" from British Columbia to the United States which has delayed the ratification of the Columbia treaty.

As much or more American power from Alaska could be imported into Canada as Canadian power would be exported to the Northwest States.

TEAM BACKS POOL

A team of engineering consultants who last year studied the Peace and Columbia Rivers strongly recommended a Pacific International Power Pool embracing the projects of both rivers.

The recent Interior Department report on the intertie suggests that Alaska's Yukon projects could be added to this pool, based on principles developed for coordination of public and private dams in the Northwest.

5. The intertie bill: The intertie concept is threatened by some Northwest fears that it will lead to exporting cheap power to California. This is the same provincial view held by some Canadians. Some Alaskans would probably resist an intertie on similar grounds. But only power that is surplus to local needs would be consumed elsewhere; and the Northwest would likely gain more power from the North than it could send south to California.

The Interior Department plans to push legislation in 1962 to establish a Northwest priority on surplus Columbia power that is sold in California. Alaska could expect a similar protective clause. And U.S. officials recognize the same recapture rights would be extended to British Columbia under any contracts for buying Canadian power.

If fears dictate the decisions to be made in 1962, the Northwest and British Columbia and Alaska may realize none of these promising benefits. At stake here are projects capable of generating some 15 million kilowatts—or twice as much as all the Federal dams in the Pacific Northwest combined at present.

6. Snake River: Otherwise the Northwest would have only a handful of remaining economic power sites, mostly in the middle Snake River area, where the Army Engineers estimate that some 3 million kilowatts remain to be developed. Even here there is uncertainty. The dispute between private utility advocates of high Mountain Sheep Dam and public power seekers of Nez Perce Dam is far from being resolved. The Army Engineers recommended Mountain Sheep (but for Federal construction by the engineers), while the Interior Department wants a decision deferred several years pending more studies of fish passage problems at Nez Perce.

The Federal Power Commission must decide this one. Bruces Eddy and Penny Cliffs, opposed by conservationists, and other nearby projects will require congressional authorization.

7. Hanford atomic power: The administration wants to develop 800,000 kilowatts with a dual-purpose reactor at the Hanford works in Washington State. After the House declined last session to authorize it, the Atomic Energy Commission talked with local interests and is now reviewing a proposal from Washington Public Power Supply System for a partnership deal to achieve the same end. Either method, Federal or a partnership, would involve congressional sanction.

If the Hanford reactor is killed by private utility lobbying once again; if the FPC and the administration accede to public power wishes and delay the Snake River development; if Congress, under conservationist pressure, balks from authorizing Bruces Eddy, Penny Cliffs, and other dams recommended by the engineers; if provincialism prevents action on an intertie; if Rampart Dam looks like so much Eskimo pie in the Arctic sky to Congress; and if the Canadians can't resolve their dispute and the Columbia treaty lapses—if all of these gloomy possibilities materialize, the Northwest faces scarcity of cheap hydroelectricity within a few years.

One by one, taken individually, none of these decisions appears controlling. But like dominoes, a number of them stand or topple together. And collectively they will determine whether or not northwesterners will realize the promise which abundance holds out to the generation ahead.

ADMINISTRATION'S A–B–C–D FARM PROGRAM

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the administration recently sent us its A–B–C–D farm program, which we are told means "abundance, balance, conservation, and development." I have a different name for it. This is a burdensome program which might well be translated "authority, bureaucracy, controls, and deficits." I hope and believe the Congress will turn "thumbs down" on the administration's program for agriculture, just as the Congress turned a deaf ear to the President's 1961 do-it-yourself farm bill.

I am not speaking just for farmers. I am speaking for consumers too. If we control agriculture nail by nail, cow by cow, row by row, farms will be less productive, crops will be less abundant, and prices eventually will go up—rather than down. This is not the answer.

A very articulate constituent of mine wrote a letter to me a little while ago, and this is what she said:

> This morning, I heard on the news broadcast as I was dressing to come to work that the farmers of this country received aid to the tune of $2½ billion last year. While I do not begrudge the poor farmer a bit of assistance, it means that out of the miserable pittance ($67 a week) that I earn, it costs me close to $10 a week in income taxes to the Federal Government. Out of this miserable pittance must come rent, telephone, gas and electricity bills, food and clothes. After all, I also am claiming the right to be classified as a human being. I'd like being subsidized myself.
>
> I realize that $2½ billion must seem like small change to you by this time. When am I as a plain common ordinary citizen of this country going to get some aid? Honestly, Senator, I need it.

I would correct these sentiments only to say that the administration spent $4.7 billion on farm price supports last year, not $2.5 billion. This was $900 million more than Secretary Freeman's predecessor spent in 1960.

I would also remind my friend that we have been supporting agriculture like this for years. We have permitted price supports and our surpluses of commodities to get further and further out of hand. The time has come to call a stop.

I am willing to take some hard measures to cut down on these surpluses. But, we do not want to do it by Government fiat, by putting a Federal agent on the farm telling a farmer when to get up, when to go to bed, when to milk, when to plow, when to plant, and when to harvest. This is not the proper direction for progress on the farm.

The largest sector of the agricultural industry in New York State is dairy products. In 1959, the dairy industry contributed $500 million to the State's total income. New York ranks second in national production of milk and in the manufacture of ice cream and cheese.

Our dairying success is attributed mainly to a favorable combination of soil and climate, large quantities of hay and pasture grass, and proximity to key markets for fluid milk.

Last year, Secretary Freeman, in an incredible move, indicated departmental support for the so-called National Milk Sanitation Act. In my mind, this is just a vicious play to deliver eastern dairy markets to midwesterners. We, in New York State, cannot economically produce as many and as varied farm products as can Midwestern and Western States. Our dairy products are absolutely vital to agriculture in New York, and we are not going to stand aside and see them taken away from us on false pretenses through measures such as the Milk Sanitation Act.

The supply control program which the administration now recommends is not much different from the National Milk Sanitation Act. It has the same purpose. It is equally as objectionable to me and, I know, to many of my colleagues in the Northeast.

One very likely reason for overproduction of milk is that, because of the threat of national controls constantly emanating from the Agriculture Department, farmers have been raising their production at an unrealistic rate in order to make certain that their 1961 base year production will be high. It is the 1961 base year production that in the future would determine how much milk a farmer could produce under the administration's supply-management program.

A New York dairy farmer at a meeting in New York recently described this program as Khrushchev in reverse. Instead of forcing people to produce more, our Government is now going to force them, just as autocratically, to produce less.

I remind the Senate that milk and dairy products have long been produced and marketed on an orderly basis. Increases in the Government's stocks of dairy products have been limited. Dairy farmers operate as we know, under milk marketing orders. These orders are sensible regional arrangements to see to it that the price and production in a given area are kept in line. Farmers have considerable say as to how this is done; and I have heard very few complaints about this system. Although many farmers want to improve it, for many years these milk marketing orders have permitted farmers to get a decent return and have permitted consumers to get a fair price—all with a limited amount of Federal intervention and control.

In a pamphlet published in November of last year, the Agriculture Department proudly boasted that "milk orders do not control production, nor do they restrict the marketing of milk by farmers."

The President's dairy program would scrap this entire system. It would virtually mean national controls on dairying, which would render worthless and useless the present farmer-administered controls which have worked so well.

Mr. President, on January 23, 1962, the President and Secretary of Agriculture had a meeting for dairy farmers here in Washington. The farmers were told how important it is to get more people to drink milk. The President drank milk, the Secretary drank milk, Mr. Salinger drank milk to put the final stamp of approval on it. The President said:

> Ten percent of our people still have an inadequate diet. The most serious deficiencies are calcium and vitamin A.

Pursuant to the President's comments, I point out that per capita consumption of milk in the New York area is around eight-tenths of a pint per person a day. This is materially below the minimum quantities recommended by the U.S. Department of Agriculture and other recognized authorities. The suggested minimum, I am told, is two or more glasses per day for adults, three to four glasses per day for boys and girls, and four or more glasses for teenagers. It is obvious that if consumption could be raised to the minimum standards, there would be no surplus in dairy products.

Above all, steps need to be taken to correct the great amount of irresponsible public misinformation now reaching the consumer. This information concerns the diet-fat controversy, atomic fallout, and the importance of calcium and milk protein. Milk is a fine wholesome product, and I am fully convinced that there is no present danger of strontium 90.

So, according to the President, what is the solution? People need to drink more milk, so let us have less of it. This is no way to close the nutrition gap. Instead of getting the price structure back in line and developing an effective program to expand consumption, the President has in effect told us, "All right, people don't want to drink milk, so lets cut production." There is something very illogical about all of this.

Farmers in my State who produce large amounts of milk, vegetables, and fruit were very much disappointed with the President's farm message. Many Members of Congress are disappointed, too. The President's proposals for sweeping production controls as the major means of achieving his objectives are the product of a small brain trust in the Department of Agriculture. They are wrong, but they simply will not recognize that the achievement of across-the-board controls is not the best answer.

Mr. President, last year I urged that the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry establish a bipartisan study commission for agriculture. I called it the Joint Congressional Study Commission on Farm Policy.

In view of the President's farm message of a few days ago, and particularly his one-sided proposals for dealing with the dairy situation, I think it is appropriate to repeat that request. I hope the Congress will this year seriously consider the establishment of such a bipartisan commission, composed of citizens representing all sectors of agriculture and the consuming public as well. The Commission would start with the President's recommendations. It would be expected to invite representatives of all of the major commodity groups to prepare analyses of these and alternative proposals.

The Joint Study Commission would be established by the chairmen of the Senate and House Committees on Agriculture. I would suggest that one-half of the members be appointed by the chairman of each committee with the consent of the ranking minority member.

I have no fixed views on the size of the Commission. However, I think that 18 to 24 carefully selected farm leaders should be able to adequately represent all the important commodity groups and geographic areas. At least four additional members should be included to represent the interests of consumers.

A Commission such as this must have a competent staff. The Commission and its staff would be given a program for study by the relevant committees and would be given a definite terminal date for reporting to the Congress with specific proposals for action.

I further propose that the life of the Commission be limited to 1 year, and that a preliminary report be submitted at the end of each 3-month period, with a final report due at the close of business in 1 year.

Mr. President, every time someone proposes a study commission, he is accused of evading the problem. In many cases this is true. Some problems are studied to death and never resolved. But Secretary Freeman's advisory committees which were consulted in the formulation of the administration's recommendations were not representative of their industries. They were made up of individuals who were known to agree with the Secretary and his brain trusters.

The administration has failed to come up with an acceptable answer for the Nation's farms. The responsibility for long-range farm planning, for the development of sound policy, is now up to us. We must move ahead in a way that will permit the maintenance of a free agricultural economy to the fullest extent possible.

It is my view that such a commission as I have recommended would go a long way toward helping to find the right answer to the problem.

ANTI-SEMITISM IN RUSSIA

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I have read with great interest the informative and perceptive article by Harrison Salisbury on the persecution of the Jewish people in Russia. Mr. Salisbury points out that although pogroms and massacres have stopped, anti-Semitism and religious discrimination are rife throughout the Soviet Union.

Undoubtedly the successful emergence of Israel as a prosperous and democratic state has increased the desire of Russian officialdom to persecute and harass Jews in the Soviet Union. To be interested in Israel is considered to be virtually treason. The kind of fanatic Russian nationalism which is behind this kind of treatment is not new, but it acquires new significance and new impact when combined with the rigid doctrines of Communist dictatorship.

Frankly, Mr. President, I would like to see the American people and American organizations, both Jewish and non-Jewish, take more of a stand on this issue. I would like to see our Government publicly air the facts of this situation before United Nations committees and the General Assembly. After all, the Russians do not hesitate to make propaganda use of racial incidents in America in every possible way. We should lose no opportunity to show that in this area, too, Communist promises are utterly hollow.

Mr. President, it has, in fact, already come to my attention that the Communists are disturbed by this kind of pressure and are trying to resort to countermeasures to prevent American Jewish organizations from playing an active role in support of their coreligionists in the Soviet Union. There is mounting evidence that the Communists are trying to block these well-justified protests by casting aspersions on the integrity of some of the organizations involved and even going so far as to hint that American-Jewish organizations are being used as pawns by the American State Department in cold war tactics.

Mr. President, nothing could be further from the truth. All Americans are shocked by Soviet persecution and discrimination and all Americans have the right—or, even stronger, I would say that all Americans have the obligation to express their indignation at this kind of tactics both within the Soviet Union and on the part of Communist groups throughout the world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the illuminating article by Harrison Salisbury, to which I refer, be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEAR RISES AMONG SOVIET JEWS AT RESURGENCE OF ANTI-SEMITISM

(By Harrison E. Salisbury)

The Jews of Russia, historically the victims of persecution and prejudice, are encountering another time of trouble.

It is milder than past oppressions. There are no pogroms. The old czarist slogan "Beat the Jews and Save Russia" may be muttered by some hooligans but it gets no official encouragement. Nor are Jews being executed or shipped off to Siberia as in Stalin's days.

Nonetheless, anti-Semitism—endemic in Russia—again has shown its ugly face, especially in rural areas of the Ukraine and in some parts of Byelorussia and the Moldavian Republic.

Its revival has been stimulated by aggressive official propaganda against the Jewish religion, often couched in terms that blur the boundary between antireligion and anti-Semitism.

Fear and suspicion, never long absent from the Jewish communities in the Soviet Union, again are on the increase. Jews in many places are reluctant to have contacts with foreigners or coreligionists because of the reprisals that may be visited upon them by the Government.

The same Young Communist League gangs that have been thrown into action by Soviet neo-Stalinists against the Russian Orthodox Church, against restive youth groups and against any manifestation of liberalism in Soviet life have been mobilized to intimidate and browbeat Jewish communities.

The same antiforeign ruffianism displayed by the neo-Stalinists in other contexts is invoked against Jews.

Among diplomats it is believed that the chief motivation in the drive against Jewish communities and Jewish religious centers is xenouphobic rather than antireligious.

The Jews, the diplomats feel, are feared by the regime. The fear stems from two sources. The first is the phobia that the Communist Party persistently displays toward any kind of non-Communist social group, regardless of its basis. The second is the fact that Jews have connections with their coreligionists abroad and have repeatedly demonstrated their sympathy for and interest in Israel.

The Soviet secret police equate an interest in Israel with "security risk" and Israeli representatives, particularly diplomats, are considered to be spies and agents of the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency.

INTELLECTUALS CHALLENGING ANTI-SEMITIC CAMPAIGN

The revival of active measures against organized Jewish circles in the Soviet Union and the persistence of anti-Semitism have not, however, gone unchallenged in the present liberalized atmosphere of the country.

The Jews now have powerful and articulate allies within the Soviet intellectual community who are actively seeking to arouse Russians to a feeling of shame and anger at the anti-Semitic stain on the national conscience.

POET ASSAILS ANTI-SEMITISM

The most spectacular of these voices is that of the flamboyant young poet Yevgeny Yevtushenko, idol of Soviet youth and probably the most popular single figure in Soviet art and letters today.

Mr. Yevtushenko, a non-Jew, has a public platform for his views. His poetic denunciations of the continuance and quasi-official encouragement of anti-Semitism are published by the periodical press. He recites his poems to stormy audiences of students in clubs and assemblies all over Moscow.

When he declaimed his attacks on anti-Semitism last autumn on Poet's Day in Moscow's Mayakovsky Square the crowd of young people was so great that the police finally intervened.

When the youngsters refused to disperse at midnight, police vans were summoned. Dozens of youngsters were loaded into the vehicles and driven 20 miles outside town, dumped out and forced to find their way back to the city as best they might.

The youngsters demonstrated their contempt for the police by reassembling the next night. Again they refused to disperse and again they were carried out of town and dumped on the roadside.

Mr. Yevtushenko's participation in the fight of Russian liberals against anti-Semitism has been spectacular. But he is by no means alone. Another young writer, Vladimir Nekrasov, took a similar stand considerably earlier.

Among the older generations, Ilya Ehrenburg, himself of Jewish origin, has eloquently announced his determination to proclaim as long as anti-Semitism persists, "I am a Jew." Incidentally, Mr. Ehrenburg has long been a bitter opponent of Zionism and organized Jewish activity.

When the neo-Stalinist poet, Aleksei Markov, published a slanderous couplet characterizing Mr. Yevtushenko as a "pigmy" cosmopolitan, "a handwritten" poetic "answer to Markov" promptly began to circulate among the Moscow intelligentsia.

This compared the Soviet poet to a notorious anti-Semite of the czarist period known as "Markov the Second." The Soviet critic was promptly christened "Markov the Third."

The battlelines in the anti-Semitic controversy are almost identical with those on other issues dividing the two main tendencies in Soviet life today—the neo-Stalinists and the liberals.

However, despite criticism by liberals, the Government-sponsored anti-Jewish program continues.

ONE SYNAGOGUE SURVIVES IN JEWISH AREA OF KIEV

Its effect on the Jewish community can be clearly observed in such a center as Kiev, for example. Kiev, the capital of the Ukraine, was once a great center of Jewish life and culture and had many synagogues.

Today a single synagogue survives in the heart of the old Podol, the poor Jewish quarter of the city. It is a small building, rundown and worn, on a neglected side street.

"Is this the only synagogue in Kiev?" a recent visitor asked in surprise.

"Oh, no, there are others," said the tough-visaged "administrator" of the congregation, probably a nominee of the state security apparatus.

A bearded ancient with a black skull cap shook his head sadly and muttered: "That is not true."

The other synagogues, it finally developed, were two meeting rooms—one on the second floor and the other to the rear in a kind of storage building. Unfortunately, the keys could not be found so that these "beautiful rooms," as the administrator described them, could not be shown.

"Have any synagogues been closed recently?" the administrator was asked.

He shrugged his shoulders and said he had not heard of any. It might be true. Perhaps there were not enough people to support a synagogue.

"We have complete freedom to worship or not to worship," he said belligerently. "Just as you have in America."

"How many members are there in the congregation?" he was asked.

"We keep no statistics," was the reply.

"How many Jews are there in Kiev?"

"Ask the city council. That is not our business."

The old man with the beard and the skull cap shook his head in resignation.

Kiev was the scene of one of the worst Nazi massacres of Jews in the Soviet Union. The site of this was a gully called Babi Yar on the outskirts of the city. About 75,000 Jews were taken there and shot. Each group of Jews had to spread earlier victims before being shot.

Kiev is not indifferent to the lives sacrificed during the war. High on the cliffs overlooking the Dnieper there is a monument to all those who died in wartime Kiev, and an eternal flame burns there in memory of the victims. Each day there are pilgrimages and guided tours to the spot.

GUIDES DECLINE TO SHOW BABI YAR TO TOURISTS

But there is no mention at the monument that any Jewish lives were lost in Kiev. And the tourist asks in vain to be taken to see Babi Yar. "It is beyond the city limits," the guides say. "You have to have special permission. There is nothing to see there. It is too difficult."

Actually, there is nothing to see. The place is a deserted gully. Part of it is used as a city dump. The municipal council has plans for filling in the gully and building a sports center on the spot.

Babi Yar is not a term that Soviet officials like to hear. When the Jewish massacre is mentioned they are quick to say that the Jews were not the only people killed by the Nazis. There were Ukrainian and Russian victims, too.

"Babi Yar," a poem dedicated by Mr. Yevtushenko to the Jewish victims, has been translated into Yiddish. Aaron Vergelis, editor of the new Yiddish language literary journal Sovietish Heimland, has said that the poem will appear in his publication. After 4 months, however, it still has not appeared.

The symptoms of fear and suspicion observable in the Kiev synagogue are typical of Jewish communities in the Soviet Union today.

A recent visitor to the Moscow synagogue asked about G. R. Pechorsky, head of the Jewish community who was tried in semisecrecy in October on charges of contact with a foreign power, Israel. "We do not know anything about Pechorsky and we do not want to know anything about Pechorsky," was the response.

There have been administrative moves against the leaders of most of the more important Jewish communities in the Soviet Union in recent months. There have been arrests and trials in Moscow and Leningrad.

In other cities such as Riga, Kiev, Vilna, and Tashkent, the known and respected Jewish leaders have been compelled to resign and more pliable men have been put in their place.

In a number of cities there has been a calculated effort to create a public image of Jewish graft, corruption, and drunkenness. Propaganda stories have been published "exposing" scandals in synagogues and among Jewish communities.

There have been trials of speculators and absconders in which persons with Jewish names are prominently associated. In one such trial in Tiflis, some of the most respected families in the Jewish community were involved. One of the ringleaders was said to be a 94-year-old leader in the local synagogue. He received a death sentence.

The effort to blur the lines and smear the Jews by confusing them with criminal and antisocial elements in the population is identical with the tactics employed by the same coalition of police and young Communist agents in attacking nonconformist youths and liberal writers. It is obvious that it has the same source and is inspired by the same persons.

ANTI-JEWISH PROPAGANDA CIRCULATED IN PROVINCES

Examination of anti-Jewish propaganda materials circulated in the provinces shows the same pattern. For example, an anti-Jewish pamphlet published for local use in Kishinev is filled with revelations about drunkenness and speculation by synagogue officials.

This work seeks to link the Jews to the Rumanian forces that occupied Moldavia in World War II. It even hints that the Jews were supporters of the czarist regime.

In Kishinev and other areas pressure has been brought upon members of the Jewish community to petition the authorities for permission to close the synagogues on the ground that they no longer are interested in maintaining them.

How many synagogues have been forced to close by such intimidation is not known, but the number is not insubstantial in the rural areas of the Ukraine and Moldavia. The same technique has been used against Russian Orthodox and Roman Catholic congregations.

Most diplomats believe a prime factor in the creation of an atmosphere of permissive anti-Semitism is insensitivity on the Jewish question by Premier Khrushchev. The Soviet leader has frequently discussed Jewish questions and almost invariably has displayed traces, at least, of the anti-Semitic prejudices common to the borderland of the Ukraine where he grew up.

Another factor, in the opinion of many Moscow diplomats, is the hypersensitivity of the Soviet regime to the Zionist question. Soviet relations with Israel are poor at best. With a population of 3 million Jews the Soviet regime suffers from security qualms because of the sympathy of many Soviet Jews for Jews abroad.

In this situation the Soviet authorities are highly suspicious of any links or contacts between Israel diplomats and Jewish communities in the Soviet Union. In the last 2 or 3 years, with the general liberalization of the Soviet regime, such contacts have rapidly broadened and deepened.

ISRAEL DIPLOMATS GIVEN WARM JEWISH WELCOME

In many cities Soviet Jews have demonstratively welcomed Israel diplomats. In Leningrad, for example, during the celebration of Simhath Torah 3 years ago about 4,000 Jews turned out and serenaded an Israel diplomat. The next year 7,000 Jews appeared and last October between 8,000 and 12,000.

This kind of display alarms Soviet security officials. Many diplomats believe it is no coincidence that the secret trials of Jewish community leaders in Leningrad and Moscow quickly followed the Simhath Torah celebration of last fall.

The vigor and intensity of Israel diplomatic activity in the Soviet Union and its contacts with the Jewish communities are believed by Western diplomats to have stimulated the Soviet Union in its recent widespread reprisals against Jews. The most prominent Jewish victims have been persons who had social and cultural contacts with Israel diplomats.

There is no sign that any of the Israel activities were anything but perfectly legal. None of them would have caused the slightest reaction in any country but the Soviet Union.

However, these personal and cultural contacts have aroused the Soviet security apparatus and its propaganda affiliates to a fury of activity.

The Israel Embassy has been publicly charged with espionage and secret activity of a subversive nature. One Israel diplomat has been expelled and others threatened with expulsion. And, inevitably, they have been branded "agents of the CIA."

Despite all this, so-called administrative anti-Semitism—that is, dismissal of Jews from posts or exile and execution—is not occurring as it did in Stalin's day.

At least in Moscow and Leningrad, Jewish students appear to have less difficulty than previously in winning admission to higher educational institutions. Jewish scientists have played a leading role in space and rocket research and this fact has won grudging recognition in high Government circles.

For all that, anti-Semitism is still a blot on the Soviet scene.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY NEXT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its deliberations today it stand in adjournment to meet at 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF ACT ESTABLISHING CODE OF LAW FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5143) to amend section 801 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, during this lull period in the proceedings of the Senate, when many of our colleagues are out in various States and are expected to return within the next few days, I thought I should lay the foundation this afternoon for future debate by presenting some reference material on an issue we shall be considering in the Senate next week.

As one who is never going to lose his abiding faith that Senators will read, I wish to provide them with some reading material this afternoon for future reference on this very important issue.

I start out, Mr. President, by referring to an editorial which was published in the Washington Post and Times Herald this morning. I think it is a very sound and unanswerable editorial dealing with the subject matter of capital punishment.

There is now before the Senate a bill to deal with this subject matter. It is the unfinished business, H.R. 5143, the bill relating to amending a code of law for the District of Columbia.

The bill became the unfinished business before this "recess period" of the Senate. I notified the majority leader, at the time that the District of Columbia capital punishment bill was made the unfinished business, that I was very desirous of having a yea-and-nay vote on the subject matter when we finally reached a vote on it.

In his usual cooperative manner, the majority leader assured me that when it came time to vote on the question, I would have adequate opportunity to make my request for a yea and nay vote, and he was quite sure I would get it. He assured me that it was not contemplated that we would vote on the subject matter, in view of my request for a yea-and-nay vote, until Senators returned.

So this afternoon, in order to prepare the way for that debate, I shall give Senators some reading material to reflect upon when they return. I do not know any better reading material that I could give to them, because it is so concise, so succinctly stated and so unanswerably presented, than an editorial published in the Washington Post today entitled "Archaic Law." The editorial reads as follows:

> ### Archaic Law
>
> Deputy Attorney General Byron White has reminded the Senate that the District of Columbia is the sole remaining jurisdiction in the United States where the death penalty is mandatory for first degree murder. The law is archaic, he declared, and has effectively discouraged convictions in the District because of the reluctance of judges and juries to impose death sentences. Over a 10-year period, according to the Deputy Attorney General, only 28 of 276 persons indicted for first-degree murder were convicted of that charge.
>
> The reluctance of judges and juries to condemn a man to death is not hard to understand in a civilized community. The punishment, imposed in first-degree murder convictions, follows the philosophy of exacting an eye for an eye and is barbaric. Imprisonment serves quite as well to protect the community from dangerous felons and does a great deal more to promote respect for the sanctity of human life. In addition, it affords a means of correcting a mistaken jury verdict.
>
> This newspaper is in thorough agreement, therefore, with the amendment which Senator Wayne Morse has proposed to the pending bill, already passed by the House, which would make the penalty of death discretionary with judge and jury. Mr. Morse would eliminate the death penalty altogether but permit the jury, in connection with certain crimes which now entail a death sentence, to impose a sentence of life imprisonment without possibility of parole.
>
> The Senate is scheduled to consider the death penalty bill early next week. We hope at the very least that it will follow the lead of the House and eliminate the mandatory imposition of the penalty, allowing a jury to impose life imprisonment by unanimous recommendation.

Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference—and will call it up in debate next week—my amendment to H.R. 5143, to amend section 801 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Hickey in the chair). Without objection, the amendment will be received, printed and appropriately referred, and without objection, the amendment may be printed in the Record as requested.

The amendment submitted by Mr. Morse is as follows:

> Amendments intended to be proposed by Mr. Morse to the bill (S. 1380) to amend section 801 of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia", approved March 3, 1901, viz: On the first page, line 3, immediately after "That", insert "(a)".
>
> On the first page, line 8, beginning with "death", strike out all through the period on line 4, page 2, and insert in lieu thereof "life imprisonment."
>
> On page 2, line 7, beginning with "be", strike out all through the period on line 9

and insert in lieu thereof the following: "not be eligible for parole.".

On page 2, beginning with line 14, strike out all through the period on line 9, page 3.

At the end of the bill add the following:

"(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) of this section shall be applicable with respect to any person who, on or after the date of enactment of this Act, is sentenced or resentenced pursuant to a conviction of murder in the first degree.

"SEC. 2. (a) Section 808 of the Act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1189), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

Mr. MORSE. In essence, the amendment provides as follows:

SEC. 808. RAPE.—Whoever has carnal knowledge of a female forcibly and against her will, or carnally knows and abuses a female child under sixteen years of age, shall be imprisoned for not more than thirty years: *Provided*, That in any case of rape the jury may add to their verdict, if it be guilty, the words "with life imprisonment", in which case the punishment shall be life imprisonment: *Provided further*, That if the jury fails to agree as to the punishment the verdict of guilty shall be received and the punishment shall be imprisonment for not more than thirty years as provided in this section. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any person sentenced to life imprisonment under this section shall not be eligible for parole.

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) of this section shall be applicable with respect to any person who, on or after the date of enactment of this Act, is sentenced or resentenced in the District of Columbia pursuant to a conviction of rape.

SEC. 3. (a) Any person who, prior to the date of enactment of this Act, was convicted of murder in the first degree in the District of Columbia and sentenced to death and who, on such date, is awaiting the execution of that sentence shall be resentenced (by the court which imposed such death sentence) in accordance with the provisions of section 801 of the Act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1189), as amended by this Act. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any person so resentenced shall not be eligible for parole.

(b) Any person who, prior to the date of enactment of this Act, was convicted of rape in the District of Columbia and sentenced to death and who, on such date, is awaiting the execution of that sentence shall be resentenced (by the court which imposed such death sentence) to life imprisonment. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any person so resentenced shall not be eligible for parole.

The sections that I have read are in essence the substantive sections of my amendment. I wish to talk for a few moments about the philosophy of the amendment, for the amendment gives the Senate of the United States a long overdue opportunity to face up to the capital punishment issue. In 1956, late on a Friday afternoon, I spoke on the floor of the Senate when an attempt was made to get through the Senate by unanimous consent an amendment to a Narcotics Control Act an amendment which provided for the dealth penalty in the case of any person found guilty of selling narcotics to a person 18 years of age or younger. The parliamentary situation at the time was as follows: I was satisfied that a quorum of the Senate could not have been gathered within a 100-mile radius of Washington, D.C. The record will show that I informed the majority leader that I was, so far as I knew, in perfect health and good voice, and that I was sure a vote on the amendment would not be held until a quorum could be obtained, and I was sure that would mean the following Monday.

I think in reading that record Senators will find that there was a little good-natured repartee when I suggested I was sure my majority leader would not want to be the first majority leader in the history of the Senate to hold the Senate in session on Sunday.

So we worked out an understanding that I would make my speech for future reference of the Senate in opposition to capital punishment, and on Monday we would limit debate on the issue and vote on it on Tuesday.

We did that. The record is clear that the amendment, on Tuesday, was overwhelmingly defeated. The reaction of my colleagues in the Senate was very interesting when they had an opportunity to vote on this very limited phase of the capital punishment issue—limited, because the only issue then before them was whether or not they would vote for an amendment which would impose capital punishment on a person who sold drugs to anyone 18 years of age or under.

There was no disagreement among us that the selling of drugs to anyone 18 years of age or under, or to anyone else, is a heinous crime. It did raise the very definite moral issue as to whether or not in carrying out a system of government by law by self-governing people, a majority of whom claim to be Christian, and a majority of the rest devout religious people of other faiths, we could possibly justify on moral grounds playing God.

I have no right, as I said then, and as I repeat now, to impose my religious faith on my colleagues in the Senate. However, I have a trust to keep faith with my religious faith. I say now, as I said in 1956, that as a Christian I cannot support capital punishment. I believe that the prerogative of taking life is God's prerogative and not man's.

Oh, but it is said, "Mr. Senator, what about self-defense?" I have no problem with it. It has been recognized for all time, as far as the history of man is concerned, that man has the moral right to defend his own life in self-defense. In my judgment that principle of self-defense also runs through the argument in regard to war, where society as a whole is defending itself from an enemy that seeks to destroy the life of the members of society as a whole.

I have always taken the position, as a former teacher of criminal law, as one who for years worked in the field of criminal law administration, that there is no relevancy between the doctrine of self-defense on the part of an individual exercising it against an attacker and on the part of the people of a nation exercising it in war against an enemy of the country that seeks to destroy them on the one hand and an attempted justification of capital punishment as a penalty for crime.

The capital punishment issue deals with an act of volition on the part of the State, whereby the State, through statutory enactment, lays it down as public policy that it shall take human life by way of any one of the various forms of capital punishment, as a punitive measure, as a punishment—yes, as an act of revenge or an eye-for-an-eye and a tooth-for-a-tooth policy because of a criminal act by a wrongdoer.

In my judgment that places the State, and, through it, the citizenry of the State in a position in which I consider it transgresses upon the prerogative of the Almighty. As God gave life, and as God in His various ways imposes what we well recognize are divine penalties for transgressions of moral law, I hold to the belief that organized society has no moral right to play God and decide by legislative fiat that some act, no matter how heinous, can justify the State exercising the prerogative of God and take that life.

I wish to make perfectly clear that I am limiting my remarks today to a discussion of capital punshment as a penalty for crime imposed by law. For the reasons I have set forth again on moral grounds as a Christian I am opposed to the enactment of legislation which makes capital punishment a statutory penalty for so-called major offenses.

I wish to make clear that if such a statutory penalty exists in any State, no Governor sworn to enforce the laws of his State is deserving of any criticism if on the basis of the facts of a given case he decides that an imposed sentence of capital punishment should be carried out in accordance with the authority and power of the court under the law to render such a sentence.

Here again it is up to the individual Governor, in accordance with the facts of each individual case and in light of terms of the criminal statutes of each State, to determine what his executive action should be, case by case.

What I am directing my attention to today is a very simple issue as to whether or not we should vote in the Senate for H.R. 5143 which proposes to continue capital punishment but under certain restrictions in the District of Columbia as a punishment for certain major offenses. It is my position that H.R. 5143 should be rejected unless there is added to it my amendment which in effect abolishes capital punishment and substitutes therefore mandatory life imprisonment.

It should also be noted that my amendment does not deal at all with the pardon power of the President. My amendment limits itself to a restriction that makes life imprisonment a mandatory sentence and specifically provides that the convicted person shall never be eligible for parole.

It is my judgment that the pardon power of the President or a Governor should likewise be restricted to those cases in which it can subsequently be established that the convicted person did not, in fact, commit the offense for which he was sentenced to life imprisonment. However, my amendment limits itself to a legislative enactment which provides as a matter of law that no person sentenced to life imprisonment can ever be released on parole.

I have not covered the pardon issue in this statute because the pardon authority of the President of the United

States could not be modified except by constitutional amendment, and I am sure that would be found to be the case in most, if not all, the States for the reason that the pardon power granted to a Governor is a constitutional grant of power which cannot be changed except by constitutional amendment.

On the other hand, there is no constitutional problem involved in my amendment which simply provides that if a prisoner is sentenced to life imprisonment, he shall never be eligible for parole.

In an issue such as this, which involves, of course, much subjectivity, which involves—and one need only read my mail to see how much—deep emotional attitudes and patterns, and which deals with matters of conscience, I recognize that the presence of those elements in this controversial subject matter means that it is not to be expected that one who holds a contrary point of view is likely to be persuaded or convinced that he should change that point of view.

That fact, however, in no way removes the responsibility of the Senate to take a long, thorough look, and make a careful study of this subject matter, and take note of the second major reason that I lay down this afternoon in support of my position; namely, that we should face up to the capital punishment issue in the District of Columbia and abolish capital punishment. I do not want to leave the moral issue without making as clear as I can for the record that we should stop legislatively supporting such bills as are now pending before the Senate under which we will determine whether a human being shall live or die through the administration of our choice in criminal law penalties.

I do not ask for support for my position because of the fact that the cases are many in which, in the administration of capital punishment, after the passage of time, it was discovered that an innocent person was executed. Criminal trials without exceptions never have been infallible, and they never will be. There has always been occasional repetition of miscarriages of justice in capital cases in which an execution has been ordered, with all involved in the trial, on the prosecution and jury end, sincerely believing at the time that the person who was the defendant was, in fact, guilty of a capital offense, only to discover some time later—and sometimes not so long later—that a horrendous miscarriage of justice had taken place in the execution of an innocent party. I think that fact is really irrelevant to the moral issue I am discussing this afternoon.

But as a religious person—and I do not say that anyone who holds a contrary view to my own is any the less religious according to his sights and his faith and his religious precepts—but I do wish to say that on the basis of my religious training, my religious conditioning, my interpretation of the teaching of Christ, I could not in the U.S. Senate in the year 1962 reconcile a vote for capital punishment with my religious faith. To me, it is a moral issue, and all the arguments that we will hear next week to the effect that legislation must be a compromise; that a very unsatisfactory situation now existing in the District of Columbia must be modified, at least to some extent, by eliminating mandatory features of the present law, are arguments which, in my judgment, simply amount to clear expediency, to an evasion of the moral question as to whether, at this stage of civilization, we really have not yet reached a point of taking a position as a Congress that we will not exercise what I allude to as God's prerogative of taking human life as a form of punishment.

Let me make it very clear that the senior Senator from Oregon casts no reflection upon the sincerity and the religious dedication of any colleague who, from the standpoint of his religious faith, finds no moral conflict in this subject as does the Senator from Oregon.

But moving from the moral issue, I wish now to consider the question from the standpoint of what I believe is recognized on the part of most authorities in the field of criminology to be the modern, most scientific approach to the subject of punishment. I very quickly dismiss the argument that capital punishment is necessary as a deterrent by saying that the books are full, for those who will read, of indisputable evidence that capital punishment does not deter. I suppose the main reason why capital punishment does not deter is that most murders are crimes of violence; most murders are committed when the glandular system has blocked off the cortex. Oh, I know all about the law of premeditation; but the fact remains that the scientists in the field of criminology are quite uniform, based upon their legion of case studies, that it is a lot of wishful thinking to argue that capital punishment is a deterrent.

So I move to my next point: Does the senior Senator from Oregon believe that a soft approach should be made toward the murderer or the rapist or the traitor or anyone who commits a capital crime under present criminal law definition? Hear me through, Mr. President, if you think my approach is soft.

I am inclined to believe that one of the main reasons for the legislative difficulty which has confronted those who have urged the adoption of a humane and what they consider to be a moral approach to the punishment of the capital offender is what also the records show to be the final outcome of too many—in fact, probably a majority—of the cases in which capital punishment was not imposed, but only a prison sentence, and usually a sentence which on paper reads "life imprisonment." The undeniable fact is that, by and large, a life imprisonment sentence does not mean life imprisonment. The undeniable fact is that in jurisdiction after jurisdiction in the United States most so-called lifetermers do not serve out their lives in prison.

And those, like myself, who have opposed capital punishment have that thrown at them; it is thrown at us whenever we seek the enactment of legislation which would abolish capital punishment.

Mr. President, my position on this matter has been of years standing, long before I entered the Senate. It is the position which I took when I was in the U.S. Department of Justice, and served as director of the Attorney General's survey and research study, published in a five-volume work on "Pardon, Parole, Probation, and Prison Administration," including a digest of the criminal laws of the country. I have always taken the position that life imprisonment should mean life imprisonment. I have always taken the position that one who commits a capital crime, is found guilty of it, and is also found to be responsible for his acts, and is sentenced to life imprisonment, should be sentenced under a mandatory statute that denies him parole and denies him pardon, and would entitle him to release from prison only if subsequently it could be shown by judicial process that, in fact, he was not guilty. In other words, that his case was among the limited group to which I referred earlier in this speech when I mentioned cases in which the wrong persons were sentenced—in other words, only if such persons fell in the limited group of cases which, under present policy which prevails in many jurisdictions, sometimes result in the legal murder by the State of innocent persons who, in fact, did not commit the murder or rape or other capital offenses with which they were charged.

Mr. President, some persons who oppose my point of view from time to time have tried to argue that in some way, somehow, actual mandatory life imprisonment would be illegal and unconstitutional. Of course, I say most respectfully, that is legal nonsense. Inasmuch as the State has the legal power to provide for capital punishment—and I do not deny the power; I only deny the wisdom and the morality of exercising it—the State also has the power to provide for mandatory life imprisonment, and to deny any release by way of parole. Mr. President, is that "soft"? What is lenient or "soft" about a law which provides for a penalty, and says, in effect, "If you are found guilty of murder or some other capital offense, and if you are sentenced to life imprisonment, you will be put away for life. That 'will be it'; then you 'have had it.' "

Mr. President, I shall not argue that such a law would be a greater deterrent to the commission of capital offenses than is capital punishment; but I do argue that to whatever extent a heavy penalty is a deterrent, such a law would be as much a deterrent. In fact there are writings—and I think they have great cogency—in which it is argued that the present possibility of being able to "beat the rap," insofar as a capital punishment penalty is concerned, tends—to whatever extent the criminal gives any thought to the penalty, before he commits the crime—to cause him to be inclined to take a chance with the law. But I am satisfied that if we put on the statute books a law which provides that there will be mandatory life imprisonment, and that "will be it," and that there will be no pardon or no parole, then—to whatever extent the existence of penalties acts as a deterrent—that mandatory capital punishment would be as much of a deterrent as would an immoral capital punishment provision—immoral in accordance with my religious sights.

Some interesting studies have been made of criminals, from the point of view of their views in regard to the capital punishment issue. This afternoon I do not present them by way of summary, except as a matter of interest. I am not suggesting that any Senator should vote for my bill because there is this reaction on the part of the criminal world; but I say it does have a bearing on the argument—so frequently made—that there must be capital punishment if capital offenses are to be stopped.

Mr. President, the interesting thing is that criminals of this type or class seem to hold the view that they would prefer to be executed, rather than spend the rest of their days in prison. But I wish to make clear that I am not suggesting that we adjust our criminal statutes to meet the preferences of the criminals. I only make this observation—because it is borne out by the studies—as part of my answer to what I consider to be the very unjustifiable charge, made by the proponents of capital punishment, that life imprisonment, mandatory in nature, would be a "soft" approach to the treatment of capital offenses.

To the contrary, it would be a tough approach.

I close this subject—although I have another one to talk about later—with my last point, Mr. President. I think one of the great needs in the world today, and I speak as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, is to emphasize the importance of human values; to take advantage of every opportunity on the part of this country to demonstrate to millions of people in the world, in those areas in which human values do not count to any such degree as they do in our country, that we mean it, believe it, and serve the ideal when we talk about the dignity of the individual.

"Oh," it may be said, "Mr. Senator, do you mean to imply that there is any dignity in the life of a criminal?" My answer is, "There is dignity in all life, for it is divine"; and the sinful and the wayward should be placed in a position of custody, so far as societal safety is concerned, so that the sinful and the criminal and the wayward are subjected to those penalties, those custodial, supervisional procedures, that organized society decides are necessary to prevent recurrences of their wrongful conduct. But that is as far as organized society, according to my sights, should consider it has a moral right to go or a legal duty to perform in the protection of society. I say that because the bar of ultimate judgment in regard to human conduct, the bar of judgment over the issue of life, is the bar of God's judgment, and not that of any court anywhere in America.

That is my thesis; and I think we would be an inspiring example around the world if, in this field of criminal law—and there are many other fields in which we must also manifest and prove our belief in the dignity of the individual—the Congress of the United States in 1962 stood up in support of the dignity of life. We should follow that course of legislative action even though the heartbeat is that of a criminal. By following that humane course of legislative action we would put the criminal away so that he could not continue to endanger other lives, but we would leave to God the judgment as to when his life would be called before the bar of God Almighty for final judgment, in accordance with what I happen to believe is the ultimate right of God, and not of man.

On the basis of the premises that I have presented this afternoon, Mr. President, I offer my amendment. I shall debate it next week. I shall ask for a yea and nay vote on it. I shall continue to pray and hope that the Senate of the United States will support my amendment and, by so doing, set an example, in my judgment, in support of the great ideal encompassed in what we so frequently refer to as our deep faith in the dignity of the individual. We thus can demonstrate to the peoples of the world that we practice our preachments of human and moral values.

ACCESS ROAD LOAN PROGRAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in December 1960, after an extended period of consultation with SBA and the U.S. Forest Service in the Department of Agriculture, a new program developed to assist small business. In essence, this program involved loans to small forest products processors to enable them to finance the construction of primary access roads, which were an integral part of a timber-sale contract.

The purpose of this program was to assist small business in retaining a competitive position in the purchase of Government timber sales. It is often necessary to build a fairly substantial road to harvest national forest timber in the Pacific Northwest, and this construction must be completed before any of the timber can be removed. This might mean that a small firm could have more than $100,000 of its working capital tied up before any timber was removed.

Last year, in connection with the cutting of national forest timber, allowances totaling $44 million were made in the prices of national forest timber for timber purchaser construction, and of this amount $21 million was in Oregon. Therefore, this loan program is of special interest to me.

In the first 6 months of the SBA-Forest Service program, four loans totaling approximately $650,000 were made in the Pacific Northwest. In the following 6 months, through December 31, 1961, 26 SBA-Forest Service loans were authorized to small concerns in the Pacific Northwest, for a total amount in excess of $2,800,000. Sixteen of these loans totaling $1,800,000 were authorized to small firms in Oregon who had purchased national forest timber. This is a commendable program and one which I am sure will expand and prove most beneficial.

This program would also be applicable to the Bureau of Land Management in the Department of the Interior and could be extremely beneficial in the State of Oregon where this agency has extensive timber holdings. The Bureau of Land Management and SBA are working out the terms of the agreement that they will sign and I trust that this will be done promptly.

The Forest Service and the SBA are to be commended for the vigor with which they have proceeded to place this program into effect.

RESOLUTIONS OF AGRICULTURAL COOPERATIVE COUNCIL OF OREGON

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Mr. R. H. Wilcox, president of the Agricultural Cooperative Council of Oregon, by letter dated January 24, has brought to my attention the position of that body with respect to the taxation of cooperatives and as well its position on foreign trade and tariffs.

The resolutions, which embody the expression of 40,000 members of the 64 farmer cooperatives in Oregon, were adopted on December 12, 1961, at the 40th annual membership meeting. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter from Mr. Wilcox, together with the resolutions, be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter and resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AGRICULTURAL COOPERATIVE
COUNCIL OF OREGON,
Gresham, Oreg., January 24, 1962.

HON. WAYNE LYMAN MORSE,
Senator from Oregon,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have been instructed by the membership of the Agricultural Cooperative Council of Oregon to transmit the attached resolutions expressing the unanimous opinion of council membership.

The ACCO is a service organization, representing 64 farmer cooperatives and their 40,000 members, founded in 1921 to provide educational and service benefits to farmers and their business organizations. A list of our farmer cooperatives, which unanimously voted for these resolutions, is attached.

Farmer cooperatives contribute vitally to the economy of Oregon by increasing incomes of farmers, thereby making possible increased volumes of business for merchants. Increased incomes of farmers are also reflected in increased income taxes paid by farmers to the Treasury. Furthermore, farmer cooperatives make possible increased employment of permanent and season employees, as well as income for school children who harvest farm crops.

For these reasons, we encourage you to take all steps possible to bring to the attention of appropriate Members of Congress, the interests of farmer cooperatives from your district.

Sincerely yours,

R. H. WILCOX,
President.

RESOLUTION ON COOPERATIVE TAXATION

Whereas the Agricultural Cooperative Council of Oregon believes that there exists considerable confusion and uncertainty concerning the taxability of patronage refunds and/or allocations of cooperatives; and

Whereas Congress made clear in the 1951 Revenue Act its intent that cooperatives should continue to treat patronage refunds, under whatever form issued, as treated at that time and a long time past; that is, patronage refunds allocated to patrons pursuant to a pre-existing contract between patrons and the cooperative shall not be deemed to be income to the cooperative or be included in computing its net or gross income. If the net savings or retains were unallocated, then such earnings should be taxable to the cooperative, but if the retain funds are allocated to patrons, then each individual patron should be liable for the tax on his allocation for the year in which it is made; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this, the Agricultural Cooperative Council of Oregon, assembled this 12th day of December 1961, at its 40th annual membership meeting, recommend that appropriate legislation be adopted to clarify and make effective the intent of the 1951 Revenue Act to the effect that all patronage allocations of agricultural cooperatives distributed under a preexisting contract be included in the gross income of the recipient patron; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each of the Oregon congressional delegation, and to each member of the House Committee on Ways and Means, and to each member of the Senate Committee on Finance, the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, and other interested parties.

RESOLUTION ON FOREIGN TRADE AND TARIFFS

Whereas the Agricultural Cooperative Council of Oregon recognizes the need of maintaining a sound and healthy exchange in international trade of agricultural commodities produced in surplus by one country for which there is a demand by another country, it does at the same time recognize the right and necessity for the United States to protect the domestic market of its own agricultural producers against excessive and unduly competitive imports of agricultural commodities and products therefrom which already are being produced domestically in substantial quantities; and

Whereas a growing list of agricultural commodities grown in Oregon are being confronted and threatened with increasing imports in alarming quantities at prices which are ruinous and below the domestic producer's cost of production; and

Whereas Oregon farmers are already in a dilemma with rising costs and lowering returns disproportionate with all other branches of the economy; and

Whereas the loss of market outlet for one agricultural commodity due to cheap foreign competition of imports from low-wage countries throws the burden of surplus upon the remaining commodities when land usage is diverted to production of those commodities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this, the Agricultural Cooperative Council of Oregon, assembled this 12th day of December 1961, at its 40th annual membership meeting, do hereby recommend and urge that Congress give the particular problems of agricultural producers more attention in foreign economic policy by taking action to safeguard U.S. agricultural products against any further tariff reductions, and to retain and strengthen the peril point and escape clause provisions of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, if renewed, and further that "growers of any agricultural product used in the manufacture of a commodity involved in a peril-point or escape clause proceeding be considered a part of the domestic industry producing that commodity in such proceedings"; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent by the secretary to Oregon's congressional delegation, the Secretary of Agriculture, USDA, and other interested parties, including the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives.

THE CHALLENGE TO AMERICAN LAWYERS IN A THERMONUCLEAR AGE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on December 7, 1961, a very brilliant lawyer, at one time counsel to one of our committees in the Senate, Mr. Edward P. Morgan, delivered a speech to the Kansas City Bar Association on the subject of "The Challenge to American Lawyers in a Thermonuclear Age."

I do not introduce speeches into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD without giving very careful thought to the question as to whether I believe the speech should be made a matter of historic record. I think there are two main reasons why material should be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The first is because we think the subject matter of the insertion will be of help to our colleagues in the Senate in connection with consideration of legislative proposals to come before the Senate in a given session. The other is because we think the matter we offer to insert merits being made part of the historic RECORD.

This speech meets that test, in my judgment, and so I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHALLENGE TO AMERICAN LAWYERS IN A THERMONUCLEAR AGE

(By Edward P. Morgan)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Edward P. Morgan, a native Missourian and a member of its bar, comes from three generations of Missouri lawyers. He is a practicing lawyer in Washington, D.C., a partner in the law firm of Welch, Mott & Morgan. Prior to his active practice, he was an inspector of the FBI and counsel to several committees of the U.S. Congress, notably the Joint Committee of Congress on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Disaster and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in its investigation of allegations of communism in the State Department. Over the past 15 years, Mr. Morgan has made hundreds of public addresses all over the United States, seeking to alert the American people to the menace of totalitarianism and Soviet imperialism and to suggest solutions to these imponderable problems of our generation.)

Twenty years ago today, the armed forces of Japan with deliberate and premeditated treachery attacked the American Pacific Fleet based at Pearl Harbor. We were at peace with the Empire of Japan and her ambassadors were in Washington in conversation with our Government looking forward to an amicable settlement of differences in the Pacific. One hour after Japanese air and naval forces had struck the Territory of Hawaii, the emissaries of Japan delivered to our Secretary of State a reply to a recent American diplomatic note, a reply containing no suggestion of attack by force upon the United States. With the benefit of information now available, it is known that the Government of Japan had planned for many weeks the barbarous act of December 7, 1941. The Pyrrhic victory of having executed the attack with surprise, cunning, and deceit belongs to the war lords of Japan who happily have been dispatched to an ignominious fate so richly deserved. The unprovoked attack upon the United States provides a saddening but signal truth for all people who would be free: Freedom may not be assumed; for it is a living, tender ideal that must be eternally nurtured and protected by the peace-loving nations of the earth.

Pearl Harbor presents one of the military enigmas of history. Our Government was breaking the Japanese code. We literally knew not only what the Japanese were saying, but what they were thinking as well. It was clear many months before Pearl Harbor that the Japanese program of aggression was immutable and that the United States, despite anything we might do, would be drawn into the conflict. We had war plans that contemplated in great particularity the exact type of attack which the Japanese executed on the morning of December 7, 1941. We knew that war was but a matter of hours away on December 6, and yet Hawaii was caught by the Japanese hopelessly undefended and the United States subjected to the greatest military and naval defeat in its history.

There are many considerations that enter into the question of responsibility for this disaster. But above and beyond all of the administrative shortcomings and other considerations, there was an overtone which to my mind constituted one of the real causes of Pearl Harbor. I refer to the fact that military and diplomatic officials of our Government realized we were not a united people. Accordingly, dispatches alerting outposts were qualified with the admonition not to take any step which would alarm the civilian population of Hawaii or be designed to be construed by Japan as an act of war. The result was a military non sequitur, which prejudiced the effectiveness of our military and naval effort and to my mind explains in some measure our national embarrassment on the morning of December 7, 1941.

The time must never again come in our history, particularly in an atomic age when an enemy may strike with paralyzing swiftness, that our own military forces are hamstrung by a consciousness that the people of the United States, whom they are charged with defending, do not have a singleness of purpose. This Nation must be resolved perennially to defend itself and there must always be a consciousness in the minds of our leaders, of whatever party they may be, that the American people essentially and fundamentally are determined as one to defend our heritage of freedom.

In another sense, Pearl Harbor epitomizes the last glorious spectacle of a great Nation, cherishing peace so consummately, that it would not first raise its hand to forestall an enemy aggressor poised to destroy it. On the night of December 6, 1941, as an intercepted and decoded Japanese diplomatic dispatch was being read by President Roosevelt in a quiet study of the White House, he sadly raised his head and said to Harry Hopkins: "This means war." Mr. Hopkins thereupon expressed the view that since war appeared inevitable and was undoubtedly going to come at the convenience of the Japanese, it was "too bad" that we could not strike the first blow and prevent any sort of surprise. The President sighed and said: "No, we can't do that. We are a democracy and a peaceful people—we have a good record."

History must record, however, that this was the last instance, however beautiful and symbolic, where a great peaceful democratic nation indulged the principle of permitting an enemy aggressor to strike the first blow.

For in a thermonuclear world the luxury of such indulgence is to be equated with national annihilation. Even in the setting of Pearl Harbor, two decades ago, our peacefull passivity almost spelled disaster. Vice President (then Senator) Alben W. Barkley told of the meeting called at the White House of congressional leaders on Sunday evening, December 7, following the attack. He said:

"As we entered the White House, President Roosevelt sat pale and drawn. His first words I shall never forget: 'Gentlemen, the American Pacific Fleet in Hawaiian waters has been destroyed and we have no military effectives to prevent Japan's sailing into San Francisco Bay.'"

If such a result was precipitated in the "horse-and-buggy" days of Pearl Harbor with slow moving aircraft and explosives of puny potential in the modern sense, it requires little imagination to visualize the result as we sit here at this very moment only 15 minutes from eternity itself. For 15 minutes is the flight-target warning time of Russia's transpolar missiles.

But how does all of this have meaning for us as lawyers? In this regard, I must confess that for a period of time I experienced a sense of deep personal depression at the rise of a new so-called scientific-military elite. I viewed with wonder the penetration of outer space and the probing of God's divine order with an attendant capacity for the destruction of mankind. And I momentarily asked a question that seemed without answer: "As I sit here essentially consumed with the purely private legal interests of my clients, am I making or indeed capable of making any significant contribution to solving the distinctly new and imponderable problems of my generation?"

Then came the dawn—the certain realization that the only hope for mankind rests upon those trained to face and deal with facts, untinged by emotion, and to condition opinion and results based upon facts. This is essentially the task—indeed the life—of us lawyers. Reduced to its simplest analogy, our scientific-military elite had done little more than place in the hands of two neighborhood children, who didn't like one another in the first place, the infernal machines for their mutual destruction. Nothing could be more obvious and simple—the real contribution to civilization must come from those capable of inspiring restraint and a modus vivendi for living in those very "children" themselves.

I submit to you that never before in the long heritage of our profession has a greater, more meaningful challenge been posed for us as lawyers. It is ours to pioneer the way for law and order—peace with justice—in a thermonuclear age, which, after all, is the only hope for man's salvation. Most of all, however, we have a present impelling duty to assume a role of leadership and influence commensurate with the historic traditions of our profession. The American people are confused—and understandably so—what with a multiplicity of easy, pat answers from the John Birchers on the one hand, and on the other, that champion of surrender and his ilk, who said, "I'd rather be Red than dead." Most of all, however, we are plagued by a lurking recollection of the era of McCarthyism, which precipitated such profound consternation in our national political leaders that bold, decisive leadership was aborted for a safe status quo.

We must not forget that the threat of an external enemy is not the only menace to American free institutions. This I learned through bitter experience as counsel in 1950 to the so-called Tydings committee of the U.S. Senate inquiring into charges of disloyalty in our State Department made by the late Senator Joseph R. McCarthy of Wisconsin. I seriously doubt if anyone ever assumed a Government assignment with such feeling of deep responsibility and at the same time genuine pleasure as did I in the thought that it would be possible to make a real and meaningful contribution to the welfare of this country. My attitude was conditioned necessarily in the belief that Senator McCarthy had at length succeeded in piercing the veil of Washington departments and bureaus and had come up with new and startling information indicating a widespread plot by Communists and fellow travelers to control the foreign policy of this Nation.

My initial enthusiasm soon became utter and abject disillusionment. It became apparent that Senator McCarthy had raised a false issue and that his charges were founded in untruth. I thus found myself in the very anomalous position of one who had fought communism diligently and intensely over a period of 10 years (even during the time when it was highly unpopular to be strongly and openly condemning the purposes of Soviet Russia) being forced to expose the utter falsehood in the charges of one who had been built up in the popular mind as a great champion against and fighter of communism, which of course some segments of the press succeeded in doing in the case of Senator McCarthy.

I found shocking parallels between the methods employed to give the McCarthy charges ostensible verity and the very methods which have been used by the totalitarian dictators, both Communist and Fascist alike, in controlling and perverting the thinking of whole nations. I found charges of disloyalty to their country leveled against individuals on the basis of the most flimsy evidence and in several instances on the basis of alleged facts that did not actually exist. I found instances where the writings of an individual were quoted out of context and the actual language of those writings altered, all with a view to sustaining a charge of disloyalty.

I have seen an effort to establish guilt not merely by association but by accusation alone. By a mere allegation, shouted loudly and often repeated, an effort was made to place the most abhorent stigma known to Americans—that of disloyalty to country—upon many individuals. In the investigation, I saw a prostitution of the basic principles of our Bill of Rights, designed to guarantee security of the individual. If there is anything that distinguishes this free Nation from the peoples under the totalitarian yoke, it is the dignity of the individual, secure in the basic rights accorded him by law. When one sees these rights circumvented, undermined, and bypassed, he comes soon to realize that the great values that make America a nation worth fighting and dying for can indeed be compromised and destroyed by those who ostensibly would protect her. One cannot escape reflecting upon the fact that the great civilizations of history have invariably fallen—not at the hands of an aggressor from without but by reason of the fact that the people of those civilizations had lost the will and determination to protect inviolate the incidents of its existence which made it great.

Similarly, contemplation of the rise of the dictators of our generation—Stalin, Hitler, Mussolini and others—makes us realize that, under the guise of defending and protecting their peoples, they played upon current and existing prejudices and ultimately subverted dignity and self-expression of the peoples upon whom they foisted their influence and control.

Through an impartial analysis of the techniques and methods utilized to give the McCarthy charges weight, any one of you here today will find a pattern and, indeed, a prelude to totalitarianism. If we are to destroy communism and still preserve America, we must do so within the pattern, the framework, of our basic laws and institutions. The very minute we compromise any of the guarantees to the individual, we have taken a step which leads inexorably down the road that has brought so much sorrow, death, and degradation to mankind within the memory of us all. We must continue to be a government of laws and not of men. The very moment we permit our people to be accused promiscuously and convicted by methods and procedures not in conformity with our Bill of Rights, at that moment we have ceased to be the America which you and I cherish. I fervently pray that the time will not come when, seeking to destroy communism, we shall be inclined by demagogs and pseudopatriots to embrace the incidents of any "ism" other than the constitutional Americanism you and I know and revere.

As lawyers, we must face these challenges—boldly, honestly, confidently—and, above all, objectively; for when we permit the prejudices and proclivities of our clientele to condition our principles and purposes we cease to be worthy of the name "lawyer."

We must interpret for the American people the distinctly different problems and solutions required by this brandnew thermonuclear world in which we live; and we must establish a bulwark of popular understanding and support from which our national leaders will find the courage to move forward with vision and decision.

In concluding my comments tonight, I would like to advance my own suggestion of a first step toward curing the ills of a sick and dying world. This projected solution may be called naive—controversial—even revolutionary—but I espouse it in the deep, honest, personal conviction that it provides the only hope for us and our children.

Having reviewed the emotional and sentimental manner in which we as a nation proceeded prior to and following the catastrophic attack upon Pearl Harbor, we need now to translate our thinking some 20 years later to the present moment—when we live in a world where wishful thinking, sentimentality, and emotional concepts of nationalism and sovereignty have either become the certain road to death by "fire and brimstone" or, hopefully, as dead as the proverbial dodo. Today we must face the facts, cold and inexorable, and our actions must be conditioned by reason of the world as it now exists and not as we in a dream world would like to see it. In order that any present meaningful solution can evolve from what is a hopeless stalemate, fraught with the omnipresent threat of nuclear destruction, we must face 10 hard, bitter facts and act in recognition of those facts:

Fact 1: We have a consummate distrust of the Soviet Union and her purposes—and with good reason.

Fact 2: The Soviet Union consummately distrusts us and our purposes—and from her standpoint, for good reason. We must, for example, recognize that it was the Allies who actually invaded Russia to suppress the Communist revolution at the end of World War I; and that we have effectively sought to ring the Soviet Union with bases, allies, and related strategically advantageous situations in the interest of our own security.

Fact 3: A nuclear war, whether we win or lose, means the destruction of everything we hold dear. Should we win (and this is only a relative evaluation of the extent of our destruction), millions upon millions of American lives will be lost, and only a dictatorship, with all of its abhorrent connotations, can hold a nation so devastated together. If we lose, then all hope of mankind for freedom is truly lost and we shall know the peace of extinction.

Fact 4: Within any reasonable and foreseeable time limits, there is little or no likelihood that the Soviet Union will curtail her nuclear arms, nor much less will she abandon them. For this reason, if for no other, we cannot curtail our own nuclear capability. Two world powers thus exist—capable of nuclear destruction, each of the other, and indeed of humanity.

Fact 5: There is no hope whatever for a complete defense against nuclear attack. Pearl Harbor taught us, even in the days of slow-moving aircraft, that no matter how good the defense barrier, some planes will always manage to get through and carry home the attack. Today it is missiles traveling far beyond the speed of sound, to say nothing of submarines, capable of launching more destructive forces than the combined weapons and explosives of all the wars of history.

Fact 6: We may not look to national consciences as a deterrent to war. The triggering of live nuclear warheads rests in the hands of a very, very few individuals, all giving rise to a daily threat of a war of human annihilation by miscalculation—by sheer accident.

Fact 7: If the instruments of total destruction must rest in the hands of two powers, perhaps the greatest restraint will be employed by those who presently have that ultimate capacity—the United States of America and, paradoxically, the Soviet Union. Such is true with respect to the Soviet Union by reason of the historically demonstrable fact that preservation of the geographical integrity of "Mother Russia" has always been a paramount consideration under czarist Russia and even more so under the Communists.

Every strategic move of the Soviet Union can be related to the manner in which those moves are consonant with preserving the geographical integrity of Russia as a bastion for world communism. Indeed, this truth is implicit in the first cornerstone of Russia's formula for world domination—"Self preservation of the Soviet Union plus the elimination of capitalist encirclement equals the final victory of socialism."

Fact 8: A nuclear capacity for effective destruction even approaching that of the United States and Russia must not be permitted to develop in any other nation whose restraint may not be so marked. From our standpoint, this includes particularly Red China, which would have less to lose from a nuclear war than any other nation on the face of this earth.

Fact 9: Time is running out. We cannot continue indefinitely in a posture of suspended life and death, nor can the Soviet Union. For reasons too numerous here to mention, the likelihood of effective nuclear controls through the United Nations or other existing or foreseeable world organizations cannot be realized within time limitations of a significant or meaningful character.

Fact 10: The people of the United States and of the Soviet Union have one thing in common—they want to live.

Confronted with the foregoing 10 facts, there can be but one answer to the problem which they present: The United States and the Soviet Union must—out of their mutual distrust and indeed by reason thereof—join together, bilaterally, to insure that a further nuclear military capacity does not develop in any other country of the world.

And for those of you who might be offended by such an association of survival under any circumstances, I can think of no more fitting comment than that of Winston Churchill: "I would make an alliance with the devil if it meant saving the Empire."

For us, far more than a mere empire is at stake—embracing the solution means our very lives, the salvation of America, of civilization, and of humanity.

THE PRESIDENT'S REQUEST FOR A NEW TRADE LAW

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, last Sunday it was my pleasure to speak to the International Affairs Conference for College Editors in New York City at the Overseas Press Club.

One of the other speakers was Mr. Peter Jones, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Trade Policy. He gave these student editors, and all of us in the audience, an outstanding presentation of the issues involved in the President's request for a new trade law.

I was unable to obtain a copy of the speech Mr. Jones gave on this particular occasion, becaues he spoke extemporaneously, but I ask to have sent to me manuscripts of other speeches he had given on this subject, which covered in essence the substance of his remarks last Sunday. The Department of Commerce has sent me copies of other addresses Mr. Jones has delivered on the same subject.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the Record an address by Mr. Jones entitled "Free Trade and the Future of America," delivered before the Southeastern World Trade Group, Charlotte, N.C., on December 6, 1961.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the Record a speech by Mr. Jones entitled "Foreign Trade: An Opportunity and a Challenge," delivered before the National Paperboard Association in New York City on November 15, 1961.

There being no objection, the speeches were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Free Trade and the Future of America

(Address by Peter T. Jones, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Trade Policy)

I am delighted to have an opportunity to come before this distinguished audience to discuss a subject close to every one of us. On behalf of Secretary Hodges, and all of us at Commerce, I want to thank you for your invitation and for your hospitality.

Since I arrived, I have become conscious of a curious paradox. In commerce and industry, the unhurried graciousness of the old plantation economy has given way to a zeal and an energy and a creativeness that has made the South one of America's fastest-growing and most exciting areas. But in your personal and human relationships, in your willingness to make a Yankee stranger feel welcome as a Smoky Mountain breeze in August, the Old South is still the Old South. This, I suppose, is what is meant by "Southern Comfort." To this Yankee, it is the happiest of paradoxes. I hope it never changes.

I said a moment ago that the subject of world trade is close to every one of us. I mean just that. I mean that world trade involves not only importers and exporters, but housewives and teachers and policemen. I mean that it involves us, and our children, and our children's children for generations to come. I mean that when we talk about world trade, we are talking not about profits and losses alone, but of the very survival of our economy and our vitality and our freedom. We are talking about the future of America.

In this part of our Nation, the vision and leadership of men and women like yourselves long ago caused an awakening to the challenges and the opportunities—of increased trade, both at home and abroad.

During the fifties, the Southern States recorded a phenomenal 95.5 percent increase in wages and salaries in manufacturing—the second highest increase in the Nation. In five of your States, manufacturing payrolls reached the billion-dollar mark. By 1960, you had more commercial and industrial establishments than any other section of the United States, yet your rate of business failure was the lowest. You added more than 3¼ million more taxpayers to the Federal rolls, attracted close to 2 million new readers for your newspapers, built hundreds of thousands of new homes, and assumed national leadership in a number of vital industries.

The carryover of this unprecedented growth is evident as we move into the sixties. During the first half of 1961, you produced nearly 90 percent of the Nation's supply of cotton broad-woven and manmade fiber fabrics, more than 80 percent of our tufted textile products, and close to half of all our woolen and worsted-woven goods.

Nor have you ignored the worldwide implications of your domestic growth. North Carolina, for example, climbed into fifth place in the Nation in rate of gain in export trade—34 percent in the first 8 months of 1961. Today, 12 Southern customs districts handle more than 25 percent of our country's total exports.

How have you accomplished this? You have done it by the same formula you used to attract hundreds of new industries to North Carolina. You have done it by a formula as old as America itself. You have done it by competing—in ideas, in facilities, in products, in salesmanship.

I think another remarkable example of this kind of forward-looking approach was your North Carolina World Trade Mission, back in 1959 and 1960. You may recall that a gentleman named Luther Hodges played some part in this exciting project, along with Voit Gilmore, who now heads our new U.S. Travel Service, J. Edgar Kirk, of Raleigh, and distinguished citizens of Charlotte like Mac Wasson, Col. Norman Pease, Edwin Jones, and many others.

The kind of spirit and imagination that sparked this operation also characterizes your aggressiveness in other trade areas—your North Carolina Trade Fair, for example, which President Kennedy had the pleasure of opening just this past October.

In the years immediately ahead, the South will be challenged as never before to use this same ingenuity, vision and resourcefulness to help maintain America's position of leadership in the free world and to improve America's competitive position in free markets.

The challenges to the resiliency of our business system come from many quarters. But perhaps the most potent lies in the economic alliance known as the European Common Market. But the Common Market is more than a challenge. It is an unparalleled opportunity for new and greater achievements for industry, and the attainment of new heights in the American standard of living, in the South and throughout the Nation.

The South can be a leader in this achievement. Its past record of growth and progress leaves no doubt that it can successfully match its brainpower, its manpower, and its sellingpower against businessmen anywhere. Its assets are infinite; they must be equalled by its determination.

What exactly is the challenge and opportunity of the Common Market? Let's look at the facts.

The Common Market today includes Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, and its soon-to-be associate member, Greece—a total of roughly 170 million people.

Within the immediate future, it is likely that three additional nations may be admitted—England, Denmark, and Norway. Finally, there is the possibility that these nations' partners in the European Free Trade Association will also become Common Market associate members.

The Common Market would then embrace more than 300 million people—people who last year alone purchased some $5½ billion worth of American products.

Today, the Common Market is the world's second largest producer of steel. Last year, its gross national product rose 6.5 percent, its industrial production was up 11 percent, and its external trade increased by 23 percent.

And the Common Market will continue to grow, with its gross national product expected to increase by 50 percent or more during the next 10 years.

At the same time, tariffs between the member nations have been reduced 30 percent—a year ahead of schedule—and eventually will be eliminated altogether.

Well, where does this leave the United States in its ability to do business in this huge marketplace?

Under present circumstances, the external tariff barriers of the Common Market—that is, the tariffs which Common Market member nations levy on the incoming goods of nonmember nations—make it increasingly difficult for the United States to compete effectively.

An American-made car, for example, could be exported to Germany prior to the Common Market at a duty of 17 percent. A French-made Dauphine would have paid the same amount. Today, the Dauphine pays 11.9 percent which will probably be reduced to 8.5 percent in 1962. The American car must now pay 18.86 percent, and eventually will have to pay 23.2 percent. This is a disadvantage hard to overcome.

A similar pattern could develop for many of the $5½ billion worth of American products now sold to Europe—a pattern whose net effect would be a shrinkage of American foreign commerce, a severe loss of jobs and profits, a serious blow to our position of leadership in the free world.

Yet we are in a position today to help prevent this. We can make it possible for the nations of the Common Market to welcome American-made products on a truly competitive basis by lowering their external tariff barriers.

We can do this by accepting their products on the same basis, that is by lowering our own barriers to their trade. Only in this way will our common market—50 States, 185 million people strong—be able to continue to do an expanding business with theirs, a business upon which many jobs and many enterprises absolutely depend.

The alternative is virtually to assure the success of the determined efforts of the Soviet-bloc nations to drive a divisive trade wedge between America and her allies.

To keep this from happening, we must cast off the prejudices of McKinley's America, and look for the modern meanings behind scareword bugaboos like "high protective tariffs."

Just how protective are they? And to whom? At what cost to our national economy do we erect prohibitive tariff walls to shelter this industry or that from foreign competition if the result is to invite retaliation and thus exclude many other industries from lucrative markets abroad.

The answer is they often are not very protective because the cause of the problem frequently is not imports; they help relatively few and the national cost is enormous.

The obvious but too often forgotten fact about a reciprocal trade program is that it must be reciprocal to work.

The Common Market will lower its external tariff wall only if we are prepared to lower ours. It is a straight business deal. And we can lower ours only when we give President Kennedy the necessary new legislative authority to do so—which is why the President will send new trade legislation to Congress this coming year. When Congress passes the new trade act, the resulting gains will far outweigh the losses.

There are additional reasons for bringing down this Common Market trade barrier which affect our whole economy. Once we know the wall is going to come down, thereby assuring access for products made in the United States, we will stop exporting capital and jobs to Europe in order to get behind the tariff wall. If this happens we will have launched an attack on our balance of payments and unemployment problems simultaneously.

And if you don't think this flight of U.S. capital and jobs to Europe is of consequence, let's look at the record. In the last decade our capital investments in all Western Europe more than tripled and last year alone we invested more than $2,500 million of our private capital in the six Common Market countries. In the last 3 years over 800 American enterprises became active in some form in Western Europe.

Assuming we do receive the requisite tariff reducing authority, we must then ask whether the best method to negotiate with our European friends is to swap one brick at a time off our respective tariff walls, or to offer to trade layer for layer? Most Europeans are convinced that item by item reciprocal tariff reductions, the one brick at a time approach, no longer can achieve reductions which will substantially increase the flow of trade from the United States to Europe and vice versa. In part, they say this is so because the European and U.S. rates whose reductions are likely to increase trade substantially are so politically sensitive that it is extremely difficult if not impossible to obtain their lowering through conventional selective negotiations. They argue that only some form of across the board, layer by layer, reductions can make any real progress. This is especially true in view of the fact that each Common Market member would probably have a veto right over any particular concession under the one brick at a time formula. I might add that for much the same reasons an across-the-board approach is being used to lower the internal tariff.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk focused on the whole matter of the Common Market recently when speaking to an audience about its importance to our national interest. "It is crucially important," he said, "that the United States be in a position to negotiate for fullest possible access to the Common Market. Our present trade law does not provide enough leeway for negotiating with the European trade bloc, which last year emerged as the No. 1 U.S. export customer, surpassing Canada. The present law, which permits only superficial and sometimes self-defeating tariff cuts on only a handful of relatively unimportant trade items," he said, "requires us to act defensively and timidly when our true interests call for boldness."

Representative HALE BOGGS, of Louisiana, long an authority in the trade field, echoes this in calling the present law hopelessly inadequate to negotiate with the Common Market. He calls for authority to negotiate across-the-board cuts in the tariff and in order to be able to do so he urges a tightening up of the current law's escape clause, peril point, and other procedures which have impeded effective negotiations heretofore.

At the same time we must, and will, never forget that a freer and more flexible trade policy will not be without problems and hardships; it won't. We know that there are many business people—perhaps some of you right here—who are genuinely fearful of the effects upon your particular industry of competition from abroad. They, and you, should not be expected to bear the costs alone of a program which is so vital to the national interest.

Both the President and the Secretary of Commerce are very much aware of these problems. The Secretary has stressed on a number of occasions that the new trade act must contain proper safeguards for U.S. industry. And the President made it clear just yesterday in his speech before the National Association of Manufacturers that he intends to keep and improve those safeguards and to send to the Congress a proposal to permit industries seriously injured or threatened by increased imports to be eligible for assistance from the Federal Government.

It is the President's conviction—and ours—that far more businessmen, workers, and farmers will gain direct and tangible benefit from a bold new trade policy than will experience any adverse effects from resulting foreign competition. We had $20 billion worth of U.S. exports last year supporting the statement I just made, while only $5 billion in imports competed with U.S.-made products, the other $10 billion of last year's imports being in commodities we don't produce at all or don't produce in sufficient quantity to create any serious competitive problems. Twenty billion dollars in job, business, farm supporting exports versus only $5 billion in competing imports. Far more jobs and more profits—it isn't Luckies 2 to 1, it's exports 4 to 1.

But what, we must ask, are the prospects of getting such legislation? Congressman BOGGS, who is well acquainted with the politics of foreign trade, says the chances are just as good for pushing through a bold new program as they are for trying to hold the line with the status quo. Essentially the same political forces will be at work. Nevertheless there are problems which can only be overcome by real effort.

There is a potential renaissance of protectionist strength evident today as indicated by the upturn in the number of protectionist bills, resolutions, hearings, and general activity in Congress, and, of considerable importance, the continuing problem of unemployment. As one lawmaker said recently, "Whatever may be the cause of unemployment, imports get the blame."

Protectionists in and out of Congress have been hard at work for the past year building their case against trade liberalization through hearings, advertisements, newspaper articles, etc. Their aim: not only to block any attempt to liberalize the trade legislation, but if possible to restrict it further.

For example, they will almost certainly put on a drive to make Tariff Commission decisions mandatory on the President; a power, incidentally, all six Tariff Commissioners unanimously testified in 1958 they did not want and should not have. This is because it is beyond their capacity or responsibility to weigh the many factors affecting the national interest which must be taken into account before a final decision on tariff relief can be made.

What then must be done, in view of this protectionist activity, to make sure that we have a new and more effective trade policy so vital to our national interests.

We believe that if the facts about the need for a new program are gotten to the American people and their representatives in Congress, they will come to realize fully what is at stake and the country's needs in this field will be taken care of.

This can be done and people such as yourselves can help immensely. The economic and business aspects of foreign trade, such as the opportunities of the Common Market, can be readily brought home to all Americans, including the ever-growing number of businessmen, farmers and workers whose own livelihoods are directly and increasingly affected by this activity. All it takes is some elbow grease.

What is less well understood, and still more important to the country and to the passage of the bill is the critical role trade plays in our Nation's foreign affairs.

The Communists understand this and thus have made foreign trade an integral part of their strategy for years. The analysis which guides much of their action today was set forth by Joseph Stalin in October 1952 before the 19th Communist Party Congress. Although he has been downgraded, the analysis has not been and we can learn much about the important role of foreign trade in foreign affairs by examining it.

"The disintegration of a single world market," Stalin said, "must be considered the most important economic consequence of the Second World War. China and the satellite nations of Eastern Europe, have broken away from the capitalist system, forming with the Soviet Union a united and powerful camp opposing the camp of capitalism."

He maintained that as Britain, France, Germany, and Japan began competing with the United States and other non-Communist countries for the shrunken world market left to them, tensions within the more industrialized non-Communist nations would intensify.

As Japan, for example, sought to expand her markets in south Asia and elsewhere, Stalin said she would run headlong into the commercial interests of America, France, and Great Britain. "If Japan attempted to expand her sales in the United States itself, the threat of unemployment and loss of profit in American factories," he said, "would create pressure to raise tariffs to shut out Japanese goods, and bitterness between Japan and the United States would mount."

In the meantime, the rapidly expanding industrial power of the Soviet Union could be used to disrupt further the economic ties between the Atlantic nations and the underdeveloped middle world of Asia, Africa, and South America.

As to the importance of disrupting these ties, Stalin once said: "The backs of the British ultimately will be broken not on the Thames, but on the Yangtze, the Ganges, and the Nile."

By capturing the markets and raw materials of China, India, Egypt, and the other underdeveloped countries, by means of trade, aid, subversion, and open aggression, the Communists would seek to break the economic back of England and the rest of Europe which depend so heavily on the oil, rubber, metals, and markets of these turbulent areas. With the weakening or neutralization of Europe, the United States would stand little chance of escaping eventual Communist domination.

In view of the fact that the Yangtze is now in Chinese Communist hands, and the Nile can hardly be said to be freely and securely at the disposal of the free world, although by no means under Communist control, we would do well to keep this prophecy in mind.

This is particularly important because of the stepped up trade and aid offensive by the Communist bloc in the last few years.

Since about 1954, the policy of the Soviets has been to achieve political, cultural, and economic penetration of many countries, especially underdeveloped nations.

Let me cite a few facts and figures that the State Department released earlier this year.

From the start of 1954 through the end of last year, the Sino-Soviet bloc poured a total of $4.8 billion in credits and grants into 24 less-developed countries on four continents. Of the $4.8 billion, almost $3.6 billion was for economic, rather than military aid.

There has also been a marked upturn in Soviet trade with developing nations. Before 1954, the Soviet Union showed relatively little interest in building up trade with the less-developed countries. Since then it has eagerly made trade offers, both for imports and exports; has increased the number of its trade missions and its participation in trade fairs; and has mounted an intensive campaign to push through bilateral trade agreements with the developing nations. As of the end of last year, Soviet bloc nations had signed over 200 such agreements with 32 different countries.

Between 1954 and 1959, total trade of the Soviet bloc with less-developed countries shot up from $860 million to $2.3 billion, a gain of nearly 170 percent. Meantime, the trade of the U.S.S.R. alone with developing countries has climbed from a modest $215 million in 1954 to $810 million in 1959, or almost a 300-percent increase.

In 1960, the Sino-Soviet bloc accounted for more than 10 percent of the trade of Turkey, Finland, Iraq, Jordan, Sudan, Cambodia, and Uruguay. It accounted for more than 20 percent of the total trade of Iceland, Guinea, Iran, and Greece. And in Egypt, its share was more than 40 percent of the total, which compared with 15 percent in 1955.

Add to this financial assistance, some 6,500 Communist technicians now living and working in these areas as engineers, trade and financial advisers, and agricultural workers, and you have a formidable cold war weapon which the Soviets are not at all bashful about using. As Premier Khrushchev once said: "We value trade least for economic reasons and most for political purposes."

What is our answer to this? In overall terms it must be to pursue one simple and clear purpose. It is to further the growth and cohesion of the free world. For if we can strengthen and hold together the principal associations we have; and strengthen and encourage the uncommitted nations in their independent development and participation in an open economic and political world system, we will more than compensate in expanded economic activity for the prior loss of some markets to the Communists, we will reduce to manageable proportions the tensions that are bound to arise within the free world and we will be furthering our own positive goals as to the kind of world we wish to live in, while at the same time doing much to counter the Communist drive for world domination.

That growth is necessary to accomplish this is obvious. That cohesion is equally necessary may not be so obvious, but it is just as true. Benjamin Franklin's words apply now as they did then: "We must all hang together or we will surely hang separately."

Every specific policy ought to be tested against this overall purpose—does it contribute to the growth and cohesion of the free world? The lowering of trade barriers and the expansion of international trade clearly does; a retreat into a shell of protectionism clearly does not. As U.S. News & World Report said the other week one result of a move toward freer trade with Europe will be that Russia will be an "economic pigmy" compared to the U.S.-Common Market combination.

It is time for boldness. Secretary Hodges summed it up recently when he said:

"We are not afraid of competition. We welcome the increased opportunities for trade which have resulted from the revival of other industrial economies.

"We shall do all we can to prevent restrictive trade policies. Instead we shall seek to increase our exports, expand our markets, stimulate travel from the rest of the world to the United States, and attract foreign investment in our own country."

With a new and more effective extension of the reciprocal trade act we will be able to carry out this program. With your help this will be done. And remember, for more jobs and more profits "Buy Foreign Trade, It's Exports 4 to 1."

FOREIGN TRADE: AN OPPORTUNITY AND A CHALLENGE

(Address by Peter T. Jones, U.S. Department of Commerce)

We thought it might be of interest to you to know that the post of Deputy Assistant Secretary for Trade Policy, for which I have been designated, was created in the Department of Commerce for the first time this year because of Secretary Luther Hodges' firm belief that our Nation's reciprocal trade program and the signficant opportunities it presents for growth of the American economy, is vitally important to American business, as well as to the Nation as a whole.

To this end, the President has made it clear that he regards an effective extension of our reciprocal trade legislation as being in the highest national interest, and as he indicated at his press conference last Wednesday, final decisions on matters of timing and content of the legislation will be made in the next several weeks.

Even before these decisions, however, it is possible to begin to define what is meant by an effective extension of the Reciprocal Trade Act.

By an effective extension of the act we mean, in the broad sense, one which will enable us to make substantial strides toward the further reduction of trade barriers and the continuing expansion of international commerce. These two goals have been the overriding trade policy objectives of our two major political parties ever since the inception of the reciprocal trade program under Cordell Hull in 1934. They are objectives which both parties reaffirmed in their 1960 presidential platforms.

The Economic Advisory Committee of the National Association of Manufacturers also in effect endorsed these objectives in a recent report in saying:

"The prosperity of any one nation does not depend on the poverty of other nations. On the contrary, given sound economic practices, each nation's prosperity is promoted by the prosperity of other nations, since under such circumstances there are more opportunities for mutually advantageous trade among them. Economic growth in the rest of the world should open up new markets for American products which those countries could never afford before."

This same viewpoint is actively supported by important civic, farm, and labor groups as well.

At the same time, since our entire American community receives the benefits of this policy, its costs should not work an undue hardship on a few. This principle that the individual must not be unjustly sacrificed for the good of the community is deeply embedded in our western heritage. Thus, as Secretary Hodges reiterated again last week, the new extension of the trade act must contain proper safeguards for U.S. industry. In this connection, the President has said previously that he would "send to the Congress a proposal to permit industries, seriously injured or threatened with serious injury as a result of increased imports, to be eligible for assistance from the Federal Government." It is thought that a proposal of this sort may well be included in the administration's new trade program.

Further light can be shed on the general dimensions of what is required by examining one matter of great importance to all of us, including your own paperboard industry.

This is the European Common Market, now composed of Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands and its associate member, Greece. Over 170 million people strong, and the world's second largest producer of steel, the Common Market last year increased its gross national product by 6.5 percent, its industrial production by 11 percent and its external trade by 23 percent. Within the coming decade, and probably sooner, this powerful economic entity plans to eliminate entirely its internal duties, that is, those duties which apply to the transactions of member nations with each other. Already tariffs between the six countries have been reduced by 30 percent—a year ahead of schedule—and they will be cut another 10 to 20 percent by the end of this year. Some authorities are willing to make the roughest guess that 70 to 80 percent of the internal tariff may be eliminated by the end of 1965.

In addition, there is the distinct possibility that England, Denmark and Norway—now members of the European Free Trade Association—will also join the Common Market; and that other members of this group, which also includes Austria, Portugal, Sweden and Switzerland, may work out an associate status along the lines now enjoyed by Finland. The Common Market would then embrace over 300 million people to whom last year alone we sold some $5,500 million worth of American products.

With continued growth a foregone conclusion, to the extent of a 50 percent or greater increase in gross national product by 1970, according to some authorities, the Common Market clearly presents American business with an enormous opportunity for expanded sales.

To take advantage of this opportunity there is one thing we must, and can, do. This is to make certain that each reduction in the internal duties does not in effect add another brick to the external tariff wall surrounding the Common Market which American businessmen, workers and farmers have to climb over before they can do business there. This could only happen if the Common Market external tariff—the tariff which applies to the rest of the world—remained unchanged while the internal tariff went down. Under such circumstances the tariff costs to an American trying to sell his products in Europe would increase relatively every time the internal tariff, which his European competitor pays, is lowered. This is why it is of such importance to have the Common Market external tariff reduced.

Look for a moment at its importance to your own industry whose production for export has jumped 425 percent since 1950 compared to a domestic increase during that time of 40 percent. Last year you sold about $72 million of paperboard to some 65 foreign countries. The largest single customer of your industry was the United Kingdom which alone bought over $22 million of U.S. paperboard. West Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Denmark, and Belgium also were large purchasers and their consumption of paperboard is expected to increase markedly in the future.

Looking ahead we have seen that it is not at all unlikely that the United Kingdom and Denmark will soon be nestled comfortably behind the Common Market's external tariff wall with the 6 percent members. And along with them will probably be one or more of the Scandinavian countries, your chief competitors for Europe's paperboard business. These competitors will then be able to sell paperboard to all Common Market countries without contending with any duties, while we outsiders will have to continue to climb over the external tariff wall before we can do business—unless we persuade the Europeans to tear it down.

A portent of this future problem is seen in the present situation regarding the United Kingdom. On sales to England, Sweden, and Finland, two important paperboard exporters, today pay a 30 percent lower duty than do U.S. paperboard manufacturers because of the preferential tariff arrangement extended countries included in the European Free Trade Association. And the competitive disadvantage will get worse as these preferences increase, hitting our Kraft liner board sales to the United Kingdom very hard indeed.

The only answer is to bring down the external tariff wall so we can compete on equal footing with our European neighbors.

There are additional reasons for bringing down this trade barrier which affect our whole economy. Once we know the wall is going to come down, thereby assuring access for products made in the United States, we will stop exporting capital and jobs to Europe in order to get behind the tariff wall. If this happens we will have launched an attack on our balance of payments and unemployment problems simultaneously.

And if you don't think this flight of U.S. capital and jobs to Europe is of consequence, let's look at the record. In the last decade our capital investments in all Western Europe more than tripled and last year alone we invested more than $2,500 million of our private capital in the six Common Market countries. In the last 3 years over 800 American enterprises became active in some form in Western Europe.

But assuming the external tariff wall did come down, some of you may still be asking how can American business compete? Lower wages, lower transportation costs, strange methods of doing business and other uncertainties all prompt this question. One partial answer was given right here at this meeting just a year ago when Dr. James Gates, dean of the College of Business Administration at the University of Georgia said: "Innovation is the source of profits.

"They don't come from higher production; they come from producing things which are new, in getting into this temporary monopoly position—because they can come temporarily until everybody catches up; if you have a superior marketing kind of setup, and the like."

I am told your own industry has demonstrated the truth of this principle by taking over an increased share of the container business for transcontinental and other shipments of iced vegetables, etc., by adding resin materials to linerboard to toughen it and make it moistureproof. I am also told you feel that increased research and development expenditures for your industry would yield greater results along this line.

A more general answer to the question is that we can compete successfully here the same way we have always done—by becoming better in a thousand different ways. This includes becoming better in the field of statistical data so vital to future planning, and here's where your own National Paperboard Association comes in.

For example, in your annual report on "Statistics—Paperboard Industry," you show considerable detail on grades of paperboard produced for domestic use but include production for export in your "all other paperboard" category. Perhaps in the future you will want to expand your statistical breakdown to help your members take advantage of the growing importance of foreign markets.

We also can be of some assistance in this area. This past year, for example, in connection with the Commerce Department's export expansion program, our Forest Products Division reviewed with officials of your association the growing importance of foreign markets and the substantial potentials that exist for increasing paperboard exports in the years ahead.

Working in close cooperation with your association and at its request, the Forest Products Division undertook this summer a comprehensive "World Paperboard Supply-Demand Survey." With only limited facts now available concerning world trade in paperboard, this survey proposed to assemble, through the facilities of the U.S. Foreign Service, data on capacity, production, imports, exports, and apparent consumption by four major groups of paperboard. The data will cover actual figures for 1958–60 and projected figures for 1961–63. These basic statistics, coupled with supplemental information on industrial and social trends in each country, should point up the growing opportunities throughout the world for further enlarging the markets for paperboard produced in the United States. We believe that the results will be assembled and available to your industry sometime early this spring.

An informational survey of this type is really only the starting point. As individual manufacturers and exporters are awakened to the potentials that appear to exist, the Commerce Department services can supplement their own initiative in investigating markets, establishing oversea outlets, and selling their products.

And the general awakening doesn't have to await the results of the Commerce Department study either. We already have the projections of Western Europe's demand for paperboard, prepared by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, which are enough to whet any appetite.

By 1965 Western Europe's consumption of paperboard will jump from the 1959 figure of 4,500,000 metric tons to about 6 million tons, and 10 years later in 1975 it is expected to be more than 8,500,000 tons.

It is clear foreign competition can be overcome with substantially increased profits the result. But once again, all this depends on first bringing down the Common Market's external tariff wall or our competitive disadvantage will be too great to overcome in many cases.

But how do we go about persuading our European friends to dismantle their tariff wall? First and foremost, we must be prepared to lower our own barriers to their trade or there will be no deal. This is the heart of the matter. Neither as politicians, statesmen, or businessmen are the Europeans going to give us something for nothing very long. If they did, the politicians would be voted out, the statesmen fired, and the businessmen sent to have their heads examined. Thus the new extension of our Trade Act would have to give the President authority to reduce our own tariffs substantially in order to permit us to negotiate effectively.

Assuming we do receive the requisite tariff-reducing authority, we must then ask whether the best method to negotiate is to swap one brick at a time off our respective tariff walls, or to offer to trade layer for layer? Most Europeans are convinced that item-by-item reciprocal tariff reductions, the one-brick-at-a-time approach, no longer can achieve reductions which will substantially increase the flow of trade from the United States to Europe and vice versa. In part, they say this is so because the European and U.S. rates whose reductions are likely to increase trade substantially are so politically sensitive that it is extremely difficult if not impossible to obtain their lowering through conventional selective negotiations. They argue that only some form of across-the-board, layer-by-layer reductions can make any real progress. This is especially true in view of the fact that each Common Market member would probably have a veto right over any particular concession under the one-brick-at-a-time formula. I might add that for much the same reasons an across-the-board approach is being used to lower the internal tariff.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk focused on the whole matter of the Common Market the other day when speaking to an audience about its importance to our national interest. "It is crucially important," he said, "that the United States be in a position to negotiate for fullest possible access to the

Common Market. Our present trade law does not provide enough leeway for negotiating with the European trade bloc, which last year emerged as the No. 1 U.S. export customer, surpassing Canada. The present law, which permits only superficial and sometimes self-defeating tariff cuts on only a handful of relatively unimportant trade items," he said, "requires us to act defensively and timidly when our true interests call for boldness."

Representative Hale Boggs, of Louisiana, long an authority in the trade field, echoes this in calling the present law hopelessly inadequate to negotiate with the Common Market. He calls for authority to negotiate across-the-board cuts in the tariff, and in order to be able to do so he urges a tightening up of the current law's escape clause, peril point, and other procedures which have impeded effective negotiations heretofore.

But what, we must ask, are the prospects of getting such legislation? Congressman Boggs who is well acquainted with the politics of foreign trade says the chances are just as good for pushing through a bold new program as they are for trying to hold the line with the status quo. Essentially the same political forces will be at work. Nevertheless there are problems which can only be overcome by real effort.

There is a potential renaissance of protectionist strength evident today as indicated by the upturn in the number of protectionist bills, resolutions, hearings, and general activity in Congress, and, of considerable importance, the continuing problem of unemployment. As one lawmaker said recently, "Whatever may be the cause of unemployment, imports get the blame."

Protectionists in and out of Congress have been hard at work for the past year building their case against trade liberalization through hearings, advertisements, newspaper articles, etc. Their aim: Not only to block any attempt to liberalize the trade legislation, but if possible to restrict it further. For example, they will almost certainly put on a drive to make Tariff Commission decisions mandatory on the President; a power, incidentally, all six Tariff Commissioners unanimously testified in 1958 they did not want and should not have. This is because it is beyond their capacity or responsibility to weigh the many factors affecting the national interest which must be taken into account before a final decision on tariff relief can be made.

What then must be done, in view of this protectionist activity, to make sure that we have a new and more effective trade policy so vital to our national interests?

We believe that if the facts about the need for a new trade program are gotten to the American people and their representatives in Congress, they will come to realize fully what is at stake and the country's needs in this field will be taken care of.

This can be done and people such as yourselves can help immensely. The economic and business aspects of foreign trade, such as the opportunities of the Common Market, can readily be brought home to all Americans, including the ever-growing number of businessmen, farmers and workers whose own livelihoods are directly and increasingly affected by this activity. All it takes is some elbow grease.

What is less well understood, and still more important to the country and to the passage of the bill, is the critical role trade plays in our Nation's foreign affairs.

The Communists understand this and thus have made foreign trade an integral part of their strategy for years. The analysis which guides much of their action today was set forth by Joseph Stalin in October 1952 before the 19th Communist Party Congress. Although he has been downgraded, the analysis has not been and we can learn much about the important role of foreign trade in foreign affairs by examining it.

"The disintegration of a single world market," Stalin said, "must be considered the most important economic consequence of the Second World War. China and the satellite nations of Eastern Europe have broken away from the capitalist system, forming with the Soviet Union a united and powerful camp opposing the camp of capitalism."

He maintained that as Britain, France, Germany and Japan began competing with the United States and other non-Communist countries for the shrunken world market left to them, tensions within the more industrialized non-Communist nations would intensify.

As Japan, for example, sought to expand her markets in south Asia and elsewhere, Stalin said she would run headlong into the commercial interests of America, France and Great Britain. If Japan attempted to expand her sales in the United States itself, the threat of unemployment and loss of profit in American factories, he said, would create pressure to raise tariffs to shut out Japanese goods, and bitterness between Japan and the United States would mount.

In the meantime, the rapidly expanding industrial power of the Soviet Union could be used to disrupt further the economic ties between the Atlantic nations and the underdeveloped middle world of Asia, Africa, and South America.

As to the importance of disrupting these ties, Stalin once said: "The backs of the British ultimately will be broken not on the Thames, but on the Yangtze, the Ganges, and the Nile."

By capturing the markets and raw materials of China, India, Egypt and the other underdeveloped countries, by means of trade, aid, subversion and open aggression, the Communists would seek to break the economic back of England and the rest of Europe which depend so heavily on the oil, rubber, metals and markets of these turbulent areas. With the weakening or neutralization of Europe, the United States would stand little chance of escaping eventual Communist domination.

In view of the fact that the Yangtze is now in Chinese Communist hands, and the Nile can hardly be said to be freely and securely at the disposal of the free world, although by no means under Communist control, we would do well to keep this prophesy in mind.

This is particularly important because of the stepped-up trade and aid offensive by the Communist bloc in the last few years.

Since about 1954, the policy of the Soviets has been to achieve political, cultural, and economic penetration of many countries, especially underdeveloped nations. Let me cite a few facts and figures that the State Department released earlier this year.

From the start of 1954 through the end of last year, the Sino-Soviet bloc poured a total of $4.8 billion in credits and grants into 24 less-developed countries on four continents. Of the $4.8 billion, almost $3.6 billion was for economic, rather than military aid.

There has also been a marked upturn in Soviet trade with developing nations. Before 1954, the Soviet Union showed relatively little interest in building up trade with the less-developed countries. Since then it has eagerly made trade offers, both for imports and exports; has increased the number of its trade missions and its participation in trade fairs; and has mounted an intensive campaign to push through bilateral trade agreements with the developing nations. As of the end of last year, Soviet bloc nations had signed over 200 such agreements with 32 different countries.

Between 1954 and 1959, total trade of the Soviet bloc with less-developed countries shot up from $860 million to $2.3 billion, a gain of nearly 170 percent. Meantime, the trade of the U.S.S.R. alone with developing countries has climbed from a modest $215 million in 1954 to $810 million in 1959, or almost a 300 percent increase.

In 1960, the Sino-Soviet bloc accounted for more than 10 percent of the trade of Turkey, Finland, Iraq, Jordan, Sudan, Cambodia, and Uruguay. It accounted for more than 20 percent of the total trade of Iceland, Guinea, Iran, and Greece. And in Egypt, its share was more than 40 percent of the total, which compared with 15 percent in 1955.

Add to this financial assistance, some 6,500 Communist technicians now living and working in these areas as engineers, trade and financial advisors, and agricultural workers, and you have a formidable cold war weapon which the Soviets are not at all bashful about using. As Premier Khrushchev once said: "We value trade least for economic reasons and most for political purposes."

What is our answer to this? In overall terms it must be to pursue one simple and clear purpose. It is to further the growth and cohesion of the free world. For if we can strengthen and hold together the principal associations we have; and strengthen and encourage the uncommitted nations in their independent development and participation in an open economic and political world system, we will more than compensate in expanded economic activity for the prior loss of some markets to the Communists, we will reduce to manageable proportions the tensions that are bound to arise within the free world and we will be furthering our own positive goals as to the kind of world we wish to live in, while at the same time doing much to counter the Communist drive for world domination.

That growth is necessary to accomplish that is obvious. That cohesion is equally necessary may not be so obvious, but it is just as true.

Benjamin Franklin's words apply now as they did then: "We must all hang together or we will surely hang separately."

Every specific policy ought to be tested against this overall purpose—does it contribute to the growth and cohesion of the free world? The lowering of trade barriers and the expansion of international trade clearly does; a retreat into a shell of protectionism clearly does not. As U.S. News & World Report said the other week one result of a move toward freer trade with Europe will be that Russia will be an "economic pigmy" compared to the U.S.-Common Market combination.

It is a time for boldness. Secretary Hodges summed it up recently when he said:

"We are not afraid of competition. We welcome the increased opportunities for trade which have resulted from the revival of other industrial economies.

"We shall do all we can to prevent restrictive trade policies. Instead we shall seek to increase our exports, expand our markets, stimulate travel from the rest of the world to the United States and attract foreign investment in our own country."

With a new and more effective extension of the reciprocal trade act we will be able to carry out this program. With your help this will be done.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to have these speeches in the Record at this point as a preface to the very short comment I wish to make on the President's trade program.

I was so favorably impressed with the analysis of the President's trade program presented by Mr. Jones that I have asked him to make himself available for an informal, unofficial coffee hour meeting with members of the Foreign Relations Committee—and I extend an invitation to all Members of the Senate—who may wish to gather some afternoon at 4:30 in the Foreign Relations room in the Capitol to listen to Mr. Jones present the same analysis I heard him present to the college editors last Sunday and to subject himself to our questions.

Mr. President, this is one of the most important legislative issues which will confront us in this session of Congress. I emphasize that it should be approached, I care not what the party alinement of any Senator is, in a nonpartisan manner. We are all in the same boat so far as the economic future of the United States is concerned. The problem which confronts us is to try to find what are the facts and what the legislative course of action ought to be in the light of those facts, to best protect the greatest and most important security weapon we have for our battle in the years ahead against the threat of communism. That security weapon is the economy of this country.

It should not take any argument, but ought to be a matter of judicial notice, that the strength of America in the contest between economic freedom and economic totalitarianism is the economy of America. This is the contest, when all is said and done, between political freedom and communism. That contest will be resolved in our favor only if we keep the economy of economic and political freedom strong.

I should think we also ought to be able to take judicial notice of another fact, which is that we can no more live in the world of today as economic isolationists than we can live in the world of today as diplomatic isolationists.

I hold to the view that economic, diplomatic, military, and political isolationism is gone forever if America is to survive forever. But if we seek to resuscitate economic isolationism as a part of a great political grand strategy on the part of partisans in the United States, we shall do the work of the Communists for them. Of that I am convinced.

In my judgment, the goal and objective of the President's trade program are sound. As legislators our problem, so clearly brought out by Mr. Jones in his discussion last Sunday, is to determine what courses of action we need to take that will make it possible for the free economy of the United States to compete successfully with the Common Market of Europe.

We shall have to determine also what courses of action will successfully compete with another common market that is on the horizon and is coming fast. That is the common market of Latin America. We must consider competing with another common market, with only a few years to go, for which we must plan now, and in regard to which the legislation that we pass this year could pave the way for successful competition, and that is the common market of southeast Asia. In the foreseeable future—and already talk of it has started—we must consider a common market of Africa.

To the extremists on the right I say that, "I will be no party to your aiding the extremists on the left."

I know that a specific case of disjointure, hardship and injury which might be caused to some segment of the American economy could be used to whip up a political storm, and the instigator might receive the plaudits of those who want us to vote against the President's program. But I forewarn that yielding to that temptation would do great damage to the future strength of the economy of this country.

Let me make it clear that what I have said does not mean that the senior Senator from Oregon will not insist upon a careful appraisal of each segment of the economy that may suffer great disjointure or injury through the adoption of the overall trade program recommended by the President. But I would have all keep in mind what the President has said. The President has made very clear that he wants to know what the effect of his trade program will be on each segment of the American economy. He has made perfectly clear, both in his public statements—and I betray no secret when I say in his conferences—that he does not sit in the White House to liquidate the American economy, but that he firmly believes that the policy he is following will strengthen the American economy.

I shall undoubtedly propose, in connection with some of the segments of our economy, definite Government programs of aid and assistance that will take up the shock of any damage to any part of the economy until sufficient time has elapsed for the economic readjustment necessary to provide either a competitive equality with foreign trade with regard to a particular item or a subsidy to the particular business—which would be a wise expenditure of defense dollars—or a retraining or relocation of the personnel into other jobs, with assistance to management to transfer into other production.

But I shall not lose sight of the overall goal of the President of the United States in regard to the proposed trade program. My mind is open for an evaluation of such facts as will be presented in the historic debate that will occur on this subject; and in keeping with my desire to find out what the facts are, I have made the announcement this afternoon that I have invited Mr. Jones to come to the Foreign Relations Committee room at a date to be announced later to brief us and discuss with us some of the problems that he raised last Sunday at the Overseas Press Club.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNamara in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, when I discuss the capital punishment issue next week, I shall give some attention to the matter of the pardon power, particularly with respect to the pardon power of the President of the United States which, I wish the Record to show, cannot be taken away from the President by any legislative act of Congress. I sought not to give that impression when I discussed pardon policy this afternoon. I am talking about the power of the State legislatures in respect to pardon, subject, of course, to one exception, and that is if a pardon power is in such a constitutional form in a State constitution which would require a constitutional amendment by the State to limit in any way the exercise of the Governor's pardon power, then my position is that such constitutional amendment should be adopted.

The controlling feature of my amendment, as will be seen from a reading of it—is that I seek as a matter of law, and which can be done by statute, to deny one sentenced to life imprisonment any right to parole thereafter.

AGRICULTURAL MARKETING ORDERS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on January 12, 1962, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture James T. Ralph, addressed the Kansas Agricultural Convention in Topeka, Kans. He spoke on the subject of self-regulation as a principle basic to our democratic system and he urged that this principle be given greater play in the economic order of agriculture.

Dr. Ralph presents this thesis simply, yet persuasively. In the course of his speech he asks us to recall the elements which make up our economic order, and in so doing, he makes us, once again appreciate the brilliance of those who molded our free economic system with the tools of political democracy to create the regulated capitalism which, by any test, meets in better fashion the needs, desires, and aspirations of our citizens.

Mr. President, I think that there is one point, and I now speak in a jocular vein, concerning Dr. Ralph which the Senate will find of interest. Like most of the New Frontier farmers in the Department he is a very hardworking man. I rather suspect that Secretary Freeman has set a pattern which permeates all of his agencies in this regard, but I can testify from personal observation that when Dr. Ralph visited my State last November he was working with our mint people, our fescue people and our poultry people not only on weekends but on a weekend, Veterans' Day, which included a national holiday.

In all seriousness I do wish to pay tribute on behalf of the farmers in my State for the help which Dr. Ralph has been to them in connection with the manifold activities of the Department.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the speech entitled "Equality for Agriculture," to which I have alluded, be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EQUALITY FOR AGRICULTURE

(Address by Dr. James T. Ralph, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, before the Kansas Agricultural Convention, Topeka, Kans., January 12, 1962)

We Americans enjoy a system of regulated capitalism. The role of Government in this system of regulated capitalism is to equate the balance of strength between economic groups; to be certain that no one group has enough power to unfairly treat another one; to create a climate in which all groups may share in the bounty made possible by our system; to preserve the principles which make the system workable—private enterprise with competition and widespread ownership of private property.

Said another way the role of Government is to protect the rights of the economically weak, to preserve their hope that by hard work they too can improve themselves and become bigger in an economic sense. Many of our institutions are designed just for this purpose: To maintain hope among the great mass of our people that they can improve themselves under our system of regulated capitalism.

Most notable of these is our public education system. Every person is offered a minimum level of education to better equip him or her for the economic struggle for improvement of position. This is the economic rationale of our entire welfare program—to raise these people high enough to latch onto the ladder of hope—to renew their confidence that they may improve themselves by hard work. To rehabilitate people in a capitalistic society is really to reestablish incentive, give them the means to work but more important give them the purpose, the hope that by working they can improve themselves. Our unemployment compensation insurance is designed to correct one of the weaknesses of a highly organized private enterprise economy. That is, unemployment. With unemployment compensation we assist people to maintain their dignity and their status until they again can be employed so that hope is not lost. All of these things serve to maintain a belief in our system. Although we know our system is the most productive for all of our people, individuals may lose hope and belief in the system as a result of their individual circumstances.

THE REASON OUR SYSTEM WORKS

Private enterprise expands production by encouraging individual initiative. The profit incentive leads to efficient production. Widespread ownership insures the participation of a greater number of our people in the entrepreneural function. Even if ownership is not in productive facilities, widespread ownership insures a greater respect for private property and consumers enjoy fully the benefits of private enterprise. Much of our regulation of industry is designed either to maintain competition within business or to preserve the principle of widespread ownership. Without the profit incentive private enterprise would be less efficient. Without widespread entrepreneurship, understanding of the system would be less prevalent. Without the widespread ownership of property itself, respect for private property would not exist. These points are understood by many but what is not so well understood is that the system would not work if there were no regulations to preserve these principles.

SUPERIORITY OF THE AMERICAN CAPITALISTIC SYSTEM

Communism maintains that the State can best organize productive facilities to avoid economic waste and that the State is better qualified to decide what each individual should have. Capitalism maintains that if every man is allowed to pursue his own selfish interest he will produce more goods for the good of all, and further, that with private enterprise production will be more efficient. However, there is a strong tendency under unregulated capitalism for all property to agglomerate into the hands of a few people.

Communists and Socialists overlook or ignore the possibility that under Democratic Government regulatory measures may be instituted to preserve competition and to protect the principle of widespread ownership. Early proponents of capitalism recognized this could be done and advised that it should be done. They knew that for capitalism to work the principle of widespread ownership must be preserved. The hope of the masses that they, too, could improve themselves by hard work must be maintained. This has been done in America. Regulated capitalism in America has proven itself. It is the best economic system man has ever devised.

IMPORTANCE OF THE EFFICIENT COMMERCIAL FAMILY FARM

The efficient commercial family farm is the outstanding example of widespread ownership of productive resources in our country. The farm owner and manager is our best example of widespread entrepreneurship. It also illustrates well the central theme of capitalism that every man pursuing his own selfish interest will produce more goods for the good of society. Certainly our family farm system has proven that it can produce more foods and fibers than any other known or tested organization for agricultural production. Because of the close connection between the family farm and the principles which have made our society so productive the family farm should be protected. The family farm is important not only because of its efficient productive tendencies but because of the social effects of having so many thousands of capitalists scattered all over our country.

TWO TYPES OF REGULATIONS

Whenever we speak of regulated capitalism most people automatically think of direct Government regulation. It is too often overlooked that one of the chief stabilizers of our economy is Government authorized self-regulation. Regulation that is organized and run by members of a business or profession itself exercising a privilege granted by law.

DIRECT REGULATION

Our antitrust laws are among the best examples of direct Government regulation. Through these laws we prevent the encroachment of the strong upon the weak. We maintain competition by avoiding excessive mergers and we prevent the excessive agglomeration of economic power into the hands of a few. By Government allocation of air routes excessive and wasteful competition is prevented. The companies which are granted airlines are given a situation with a reasonable expectation of profit. Another example of direct regulation is ratemaking for public utilities such as gas or electric companies or railroads. Such ratemaking prevents persons who have been granted a monopolistic position from unduly harming the interest of others.

One of the most regulated industries in the country is the banking industry. In banking the Government not only regulates the supply of the service sold—credit—but the Government also administers a minimum price for this service. It is interesting at times for a student of agriculture to observe bankers criticizing price supports for farmers. It is almost comical to see those who benefit from an industry with administered prices as well as administered production criticizing the administered minimum prices for a few commodities in agriculture. We might even suggest that there is such a thing as licensing in the banking industry in addition to the administration of supply and price. Licensing is, of course, a further means of restricting entry into a profession.

Interesting enough this bastion of private enterprise, the banking industry, is run well. It works well. It serves the public interest. And it is doing a good job in serving the public interest. Certainly if Government regulation was harmful the banking industry would have been dead long ago because it is the most regulated industry of any I can think of.

GOVERNMENT AUTHORIZED SELF-REGULATION

A form of regulation which is most effective, especially for those who are participating, is indirect regulation. In the case of self-regulation of an industry or profession under particular laws, it is too often overlooked that this type of regulation represents a privilege granted by Government. A good example of self-regulation is the medical profession. By their system of standards, examinations and licensing, the medical profession has been allowed to self-regulate itself for many years by setting high standards to limit entry into the trade. By a code of ethics they regulate how a person may practice and by the practice of licensing they operate a check on all those who would practice their profession. At the same time this quality control, of course, increases confidence in our great medical profession and encourages us to make greater use of their services. Supply management by means of quality regulation has been very effective in this profession. Over the last 30 or 40 years the percentage of doctors among our people has varied very little. As a matter of fact the number has ranged from 125 per 100,000 in 1930 to 132 per 100,000 in 1960. If farmers were authorized to regulate supply in this manner they would have little difficulty in maintaining their income or price position.

The legal profession also has a means of self-regulation. Through the institution of the bar examination they are able to maintain high standards for their profession and at the same time limit entry into the trade. Such quality regulation, of course, increases the income that is possible for lawyers to earn and strengthen public confidence in the legal profession.

In many States our barbers and other tradesmen have been given the privilege of setting standards, rates, and requiring a license of anyone who wishes to practice the trade.

Even the self-regulation of many of our basic manufacturing industries is made possible through privileges granted by Government. The formation of a corporation is a privilege granted by law. Certainly if we did not have the institution of corporations the organizers of industry would be unable to amass the capital necessary to operate the large-scale firms which dominate most of our basic manufacturing industries.

The Securities and Exchange Commission type of regulation strengthens public confidence in and bolsters the institution of corporations. By Government regulation of the sale of stocks and bonds investors spread wide over our country are given the necessary confidence to invest in ownership of a corporation whose plants are distant from them and whose managers and officers they do not know. Thus, the self-regulation of our basic industries by a few large firms is made possible by Government.

EQUAL PRIVILEGES FOR AGRICULTURE

A few basic commodities in agriculture have been publicized a great deal. The majority of farmers have not until recently had available to them any means of self-regulation. Farmers should have the same privileges of self-regulation made possible for them that have been made possible for other industries and professions. At the same time, this should be a means of self-regulation which preserves the valuable institutions existing within agriculture. Some years ago the Congress offered farmers the privilege of forming cooperatives through the Capper-Volstead Cooperative Marketing Act of 1922. At that time it was thought this would be an effective means of self-regulation.

However, due to the widespread nature of production in agriculture and the existence of so many hundreds of different entrepreneurs in any one commodity, it has been impossible for voluntary cooperatives to organize a sufficient number of producers of any one commodity to have the same type of effect over the supply or price as is exercised by people in other industries and professions.

Some may suggest that if aluminum producers and steel producers who are also basic manufacturers can organize together into a small number of corporations, why don't farmers do the same thing. This is possible but not probable. It overlooks a basic characteristic of agricultural production. Until the Agricultural Act of 1961 was passed only a very few of America's farm producers were eligible for programs of self-regulation. This act has added for the first time an additional 90 or so commodities which may develop programs of self-regulation having the economic effect similar to the self-regulation authorized for other people.

Someone may ask the question: Why can't agriculture organize itself into a few corporations such as other basic industries have done and then not rely on the Government for any form of regulation? There are two reasons why this is either difficult or undesirable. First, the natural resources available for the production of any agricultural commodity are far more widespread than the resources necessary for the production of such products as steel and aluminium. While the number of sources of high grade iron ore or bauxite are so limited that a few firms can readily gain control of these known sources the resources available for production of an agricultural product are widespread over practically the entire country.

Let us take avocados for example. This is an agricultural product that can only be produced in a limited number of areas where the soil and climate are suitable. Yet, even today, if the price of avocados was guaranteed at any reasonable level there is at least 10 times as much land readily available to be put in production of this restricted product as is now being used. The point is, for any small group of private firms to control the production of any agricultural commodity they would have to control every acre of land in America that could be put into production of that product.

But there is an even more compelling reason why most of us would not like to see self-regulation of agricultural production through a small number of private corporations. That is, that food is far more important to the day-to-day needs of our people than steel or aluminum. Food is something that must be purchased and consumed regularly. The supply of food must be readily available. We want that our people should have adequate quantities of food at a reasonable price. If self-regulation is authorized for agriculture many of us think it far better to be a form of self-regulation where the Government has some power to veto decisions that may harm the public interest.

A means for agriculture to self-regulate itself with self-determined programs developed by the industry, but with a public official having veto power in order to protect the public interest, is available through marketing orders and agreements.

GIVING FARMERS EQUALITY OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY FOR SELF-REGULATION

A marketing order may be defined as a legal document which sets the limits within which an agriculture commodity group may self-regulate itself. Marketing orders are always initiated by the industry concerned. They are always designed by an industry committee and for 25 years they have been administered by industry nominated boards of producers and handlers.

But in the broader context a marketing order is an institution that may be compared with the self-regulation of the medical profession, the self-regulation of the legal profession, or self-regulation of our other basic industries. This sort of an institution is in keeping with the American tradition.

One proponent of the national turkey marketing order, as proposed, has compared marketing orders with our form of government itself. He would say that the marketing order compares with our Constitution; the advisory board with our Congress. An advisory board may make regulations under the marketing order just as the Congress may pass laws in conformity with our Constitution.. Just as the President has veto power over laws proposed and passed by the Congress, the Secretary would have veto power over regulations proposed or passed by an advisory board.

There is an essential difference here. The Secretary of Agriculture having all the legal power has an absolute veto over the proposals of an advisory board, while a Presidential veto of an act of Congress may be overridden. The Secretary's veto, we believe, is justified because a marketing order board is representative only of the interested groups within an industry and not representative of the public as a whole.

EXAMPLES OF UNREGULATED CAPITALISM

Our system has been described as one of regulated capitalism. I have stated that it is by far the best economic system the world has yet seen organized. As an economic system it also contributes greatly to social values by cultivating individual responsibility, individual initiative, and by giving pride and dignity to the citizens as a whole that they are working to take care of themselves. We all agree that this system contains the methods for gradual progress and thus is vastly superior to any system of communism or socialism. It is also helpful to compare our system of regulated capitalism with unregulated capitalism.

We have several examples in the world of capitalism which were unregulated. We have only to look at some countries in Africa, Asia, and South America to see a form of capitalism which did not have the democratic regulation that is existing in America, Canada, and Western Europe. We can see in some of those it is obvious that all property has agglomerated into the hands of the few. We do not see the regulation to preserve competition nor do we see the democratic institutions to maintain the hope of the masses. In most of those countries a few people have taken over all the property and the great masses of the people have lost the hope that they can improve themselves through hard work. They did not establish early a broad system of public education to prepare people to compete in a capitalistic economy. They did not ordain the institution of family farms which have contributed greatly to our economic development. Many of their social measures have been designed to alleviate poverty rather than to correct its causes. In short, in countries where capitalism has not been regulated it has not worked as well as it has in our country.

Sometimes one is caused to think that if the people we send abroad could explain our capitalism as it is and could show how democratic government has regulated capitalism to maintain the principles of widespread ownership, then they would be able to encourage hope in the great mass of people to provide equality of economic opportunity. Certainly, people of those countries would then want to adopt a system similar to ours rather than going to the extremes of socialism or communism.

Individual initiative and the profit incentives are great instigators to bring forth high levels of production. I sometimes wonder if our people who go abroad make the mistake of trying to sell our system along the classical economic theory that we have never lived under.

Since our country was first started we have had regulated capitalism. The subsidization of railroads and turnpikes and canals was a governmental means of promoting enterprise and pushing industry. The granting of free lands to veterans in the homestead laws was designed to promote widespread ownership of property. Our early tariffs were designed to protect industry. Government in America has been acting to regulate business to maintain equality of economic power between the various segments since 1789. I submit to you that this is why our capitalism has worked while capitalism in other countries has not worked so well.

GIVE FARMERS PRIVILEGES OTHERS HAVE

Our program and our policy has been to ask Congress to make available to all commodity groups in agriculture the right of self-determination which has been enjoyed by many professions and industries for many years. We are not promoting programs for particular commodities, but we are promoting the idea that all commodities be afforded the right to set up their own regulatory program if they wish to have one. We believe that if industry-nominated committees can design stabilization programs they will be well constructed. We believe that if an industry-nominated board is allowed to administer a program it will be well run.

We believe that if the industry is required to pay the cost of its stabilization operations, these measures will be judicious. And we believe that when the Secretary has the veto power over the actions of a board the public interest will be protected. We submit that a great part of the reason that farmers have been forced to look to Government for direct means of regulation to protect prices and incomes is that farmers have not been given the equal opportunity for self-regulation with other people.

Proper self-regulation in different industries takes different forms. We want to see made available to farmers a means of self-regulation which allows them to protect our time-honored institution of the family farm.

We believe this to be in the best interests of farm people. We believe it is in the best interests of our system of regulated capitalism and private enterprise. We, therefore, believe it is in the best interests of our American way of life and our system of self-government.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter and an attached resolution adopted by the executive committee of the Democratic Party of Oregon relating to the subject be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Democratic Party of Oregon,
Portland, Oreg., January 15, 1962.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Wayne: Yesterday afternoon at the executive committee meeting we discussed the enclosed resolution and passed it unanimously. Many local farm groups and leaders are very concerned by two things in regard to a potential change in agricultural policy.

First is the apparent lack of emphasis given to the title IA approach in the state of the Union message. Many of our local farm groups see in title IA the first real chance that producers have to design a program to fit their real needs on a continuing basis.

The second problem arises from reports that the title IA approach is in substantial jeopardy.

The reason that the executive committee acted, rather than waiting for the full State convention in March, is the proximity of the President's special message on agriculture. We understand that the first draft of that speech tends to reduce the importance of the title IA approach. If this is true, and the administration does not stand firmly behind title IA, we fear that Mr. Cooley's opposition may destroy it.

You will notice that the second part of the resolution deals with personnel rather than theory. The reason is that Dr. James Ralph, who originally comes from California, is the stanchest defender of title IA and has been a very great help to our people in approaching the Department for title IA assistance. We feel that he deserves any backing or help that you can give him.

We would appreciate anything that you can do to influence the executive department to maintain and, if possible, expand the application of title IA.

Sincerely,

E. D. Spencer,
State Chairman.

Resolution of Executive Committee of Democratic Party of Oregon, January 14, 1962

Whereas the health of agriculture is of extreme importance to the economy of Oregon; and

Whereas title IA of the Agricultural Enabling Amendments Act of 1961 is a great step toward the sound and continuing solution of the agricultural problems of the United States and particularly of Oregon: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the executive committee of the Democratic Party of Oregon, That President John F. Kennedy is respectfully urged to promote most strongly the following concepts in regard to agriculture:

1. That title IA of the Agricultural Enabling Amendments Act of 1961 be utilized as widely as possible in order that producers, who are those most directly affected by depressed agricultural markets, may have a strong and direct voice in proposing solutions to the problems of their respective commodities;

2. That the expanded availability of marketing orders, developed, administered, and paid for by producers, is a vital part of the change in approach to agricultural problems which is expressed in the 1961 act;

3. That where they are applicable, and desired by producers, marketing orders offer the best continuing solution to the problems of many individual commodities;

4. That the power of the Secretary to protect the interests of consumers under a marketing order is essential to the fair resolution of agricultural problems; and be it further

Resolved, That the executive committee of the Democratic Party of Oregon commends Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman on the high quality of his appointments, particularly the appointment of Under Secretary Charles Murphy and Assistant Secretaries John Duncan, John Welch, and James Ralph.

We further commend Secretary Freeman and Assistant Secretary Ralph for the excellent work done by Assistant Secretary Ralph during his trip to Oregon on the weekend of November 10 through 13, made at the request of grower groups, during which he assisted groups of growers of more than 15 commodities to work on self-help stabilization plans for their commodities.

RESOLUTION FAVORING PRESENT NATIONAL FARM POLICIES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am most pleased to bring to the attention of the Senate a resolution recently adopted by the Riverview Farmers Union No. 113, of Scio, Oreg. This organization, which represents many of the farmers of the area, commends the excellent work of Secretary Freeman and his associates. It is a heartening thing, in my judgment, when such organizations composed of grassroot farmers find themselves in a position to commend the work being carried on through the Department of Agriculture. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution to which I have alluded be placed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolution Favoring Present National Farm Policies

Whereas the Kennedy administration's Agriculture Department, under the direction of Secretary Orville Freeman, has brought about an upturn in farm income and a downturn in costly grain surpluses; and

Whereas the 1961 Farm Act has broadened the list of commodities eligible to use Federal marketing orders as a supply-control device; and

Whereas farm credit laws have been streamlined and the food-for-peace program extended: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Riverview Farmers Union No. 113 place in their records written approval of the present administration's efforts to increase economic equality for the Nation's farmers; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Secretary Freeman, each of our Senators and Representatives, and to our Oregon-Washington Farmers Union and National Farmers Union headquarters.

PROPOSED REORGANIZATION OF DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Mr. HART. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Hickey in the chair). The Chair recognizes the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, there is at present pending before the Senate Committee on Armed Services a proposed reorganization of the Department of the Army. The Secretary of the Army, when he testified before that committee, and the report transmitted to the Congress on the reorganization indicated that this was primarily a reorganization involving the simplification of command responsibilities and improvement of top management efficiency.

Employees at the Ordnance Tank Automotive Command in Detroit and the entire Detroit community have been disturbed by persistent rumors that a part of this reorganization plan involved the impending transfer of a large number of positions and functions at OTAC out of the Detroit area. The distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara] and I, along with other members of the Michigan delegation, have sought assurances from the Secretary of the Army and Department of Defense officials that this was not a part of the plan nor were these rumored substantial shifts of employment contemplated in the future.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a statement which Senator McNamara and I issued on February 13; a statement issued by the Department of Defense to the press on that date, and a letter which Senator McNamara and I have addressed to the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell] chairman of the Armed Services Committee. In addition, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a series of letters and telegrams I have received from individuals, companies, and employee groups in the Detroit area expressing their concern over the reported reorganization.

Similar expressions of concern have been received by other members of the Michigan delegation.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senators McNamara and Hart

We have been assured by the highest authorities of the Defense Department that the Army contemplates no significant movement of jobs or work from its Detroit Tank-Automotive Command.

We have been informed that the only possible changes in the foreseeable future would be the reassignment of titles and command responsibilities but no physical movement of OTAC operations.

The proposed Army reorganization plan submitted to Congress suggests, among other things, that the responsibilities of OTAC be assigned to a newly created Army weapons and mobility command.

According to the report, this would help provide the Army with the "flexibility essential to meet rapidly changing technological developments." We are told this could well mean movement of additional work into Detroit rather than out of it.

Included with the report are a series of working-paper charts which show how the various reorganization proposals might be implemented.

One such chart, clearly labeled "Concept of Weapons and Mobility Command," implies that command responsibility for tracked vehicles, which now rests with OTAC, might be shifted to Rock Island Arsenal, Ill.

It is this chart that apparently gave rise to rumors that actual jobs would be moved from Detroit to Rock Island.

However, this definitely is not what is intended, according to the strongest assurances from the Army and the Defense Department. In fact, we are given to understand that the chart is erroneous.

In any event, the chart simply is a concept of how command responsibilities might be assigned; it has not been studied and approved by top officials of the Army and the Defense Department; its attachment to the reorganization report does not mean it is adopted along with the report.

We have been aware of these proposals for some time. We, too, were concerned. But, as a result of our initial inquiries, we were verbally assured that the employees of OTAC had no cause for concern.

However, as rumors began to spread in the Detroit area, we decided it would be helpful to have further assurances so that there could be no question.

Thus, last week the Michigan Democratic congressional delegation jointly addressed a letter to the Secretary of Defense asking for clarification. This resulted in reaffirmation of Army's intentions.

STATEMENT BY THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, FEBRUARY 13, 1962

The current Army reorganization plan visualizes that the existing, as well as the planned facilities at OTAC, will be fully utilized—specifically the production of M-60 tanks will continue to be performed at the Detroit Arsenal.

If at some future date it is determined that certain activities are to be relocated from the Detroit area, such action will be offset by the transfer of other activities into the area.

There can be no doubt that the Detroit area, long known as the arsenal of democracy, will continue as a major contributor for the national defense effort as it has in the past.

FEBRUARY 14, 1962.

Hon. RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman, Senate Armed Services Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The proposed Army reorganization plan submitted to the Congress, which is pending before your Senate Armed Services Committee, has been presented to the committee and to us as basically a reorganization affecting top command and management levels. The Secretary, in transmitting the proposal, has stated, "It should be pointed out that while this plan for reorganization involves significant changes in the Army major command structure, it calls for little change in military and civilian personnel at the operating level in the field. The main impact of this plan is on the headquarters of the Department of the Army, the headquarters of the U.S. Continental Army Command, and the headquarters of the two new commands. Below these headquarters, installations and personnel, by and large, are undisturbed. The emphasis is on simplifying command responsibilities and on improving managerial efficiency, while preserving the operating structure in the field."

Within recent days a great deal of confusion has resulted in the Detroit metropolitan area as to the effect this proposed reorganization might have on existing arsenal and Army ordnance installations. Specifically, the proposal to reassign the responsibilities of the Ordnance Tank Automotive Command has resulted in persistent speculation that upward to 2,600 employees presently at this command would have their functions reassigned to the Rock Island Arsenal in Illinois.

The only firm basis for this rumor seems to be the chart 14 which was attached as a concept to the reorganization proposal. Enclosed is a statement which we have issued as a result of our inquiries made to the Department of Defense and the Secretary of the Army. It is our understanding that the Secretary's statement to your committee and to Members of Congress that is quoted above also applies to the specific situation with regard to any large number of present employees at OTAC.

Prior to your committee's approval, we would sincerely hope that the committee might assure itself that the information we have received on this is essentially correct. It would be most disturbing, not only to us, but we believe to other Members of the Senate who have installations in their States involved in this reorganization, to feel that behind the proposal pending in your committee are plans in being to effect major personnel and installation changes.

With every best wish.

Sincerely,

PAT MCNAMARA.
PHILIP A. HART.

DETROIT, MICH., *February 13, 1962.*

Senator PHILIP A. HART,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Regarding the proposed reorganization of the Department of the Army Ordnance Corps as reported in the Detroit News Sunday, February 11. This report is causing deep concern among the employees and the community. The reported transfer of a function at the Detroit Arsenal and command headquarters will affect the employees most adversely. The said change might necessitate a reduction in employees of approximately 50 percent. This would further complicate the surplus labor force in the Detroit area. The employees that might be absorbed at Rock Island and Fort Eustis would necessitate the disposal of their properties at an estimated tremendous loss and would affect the employees of a minority group adversely more seriously. The facilities and technical know-how and enthusiasm of this command surpasses or equals any in the Nation. To cease utilizing it is not deemed to be in the best national interest. On Thursday, February 15, the Congress will have an opportunity to veto this proposed reorganization. I implore you to use influence of your office to insure the continuation and perhaps an increase in the mission function of this most efficient organization. It is my sincere hope that this agency might become the headquarters for the Weapons and Mobility Command, if it should be deemed in the best interest of the Government that the ordnance corps be reorganized.

Thanking you in advance in the behalf of employees of this command.

WILLIAM A. COLIN,
Vice President, Local 16, National Federation of Federal Employees.

MOUNT CLEMENS, MICH.,
February 14, 1962.

The Honorable PHILIP A. HART,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

The Macomb County Board of Supervisors has been informed of the possibility of a transfer of over 2,000 positions of employment from the Detroit Tank Arsenal to Rockford, Ill. A protest is hereby registered on behalf of Macomb County residents and request is hereby made that a course of action be pursued to prevent this move which would critically affect the economy of this area.

MRS. MILDRED B. STARK,
Vice Chairman, Macomb County Board of Supervisors.

WARREN, MICH., *February 14, 1962.*

Senator PHILIP A. HART,
Washington, D.C.:

In light of this area having been proclaimed a distress area having high unemployment and being the recipient of the food stamp plan the city council of Warren at a special meeting held on Tuesday, February 13, 1962, went on record as being opposed to the removal of the Ordnance Tank Automotive Command facilities to another site. The council urges that you use every endeavor to halt the shift.

HAROLD F. STILWELL,
Secretary of the council.

WARREN, MICH., *February 13, 1962.*

Senator PHILIP HART,
U.S. Senate Building, Washington, D.C.:

Stop proposal of reorganization of Army Ordnance Corps, 5,200 employees affected in Detroit area, incurring undue hardships on many of the citizens of the State of Michigan.

LEONARD WAMBACH
(And 10 employees, of Ordnance Tank Automobile Plant).

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES UNION NO. 16,
NATIONAL FEDERATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES,
Warren, Mich., February 10, 1962.

Senator PHILIP HART,
U.S. Senate Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HART: The reorganization of the Army Ordnance Corps goes before the committee next Thursday, February 15 for approval. Unless this plan is vetoed, approximately 2,500 employees in the Ordnance Tank Automotive Command will be affected.

Many of these employees have purchased their own homes in this area and stand to lose thousands of dollars if forced to move to other localities in order to retain their employment.

I do not believe that this move would be in the best interest of the Government, as it would cost millions of dollars to transfer the functions and construct new buildings to handle the research and development activities now performed at the Detroit Tank Arsenal.

As president of Local No. 16 NFFE, and the Michigan State Federation of Federal Employees Unions, NFFE, I seek your support in getting this plan vetoed and keeping these jobs in the State of Michigan.

Thanking you for any help that you may give us, I remain,

Cordially yours,

RAYMOND C. BEATTY,
President.

THE A. C. LEUCHTMAN CO.,
Detroit, Mich., February 11, 1962.

Senator PHILIP A. HART,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HART: Reference is made to the attached clipping from the Detroit News of this date concerning the proposed transfer of tank development and procurement responsibilities from Detroit to Rock Island, Ill.

In the article, Mr. Pipp points out that this would immediately mean a loss of over 2,600 jobs in an area already plagued with chronic and increasing unemployment. Mr. Pipp was merely speaking of Government employees. What he did not discuss was the strong possibility of a far greater loss in employment through the reduced business available to the many small manufacturers in this area who are producing replacement tank parts on direct contracts as well as on subcontracts with prime manufacturers.

These men will lose an advantage they now enjoy over manufacturers in lower-paid labor areas in that their proximity to the procurement agency insures their receiving every bidding opportunity as well as access to engineering data.

It seems strange that with a $50 million investment in facilities at the Detroit Arsenal alone, and a staff of experienced personnel, the Army finds it necessary to transfer this responsibility elsewhere. Certainly, corps consolidation can be effected without such excessive cost to the taxpayer. Since OTAC is to be part of the new command, there seems no logical reason for the transference of a function which OTAC has ably performed.

We ask that you give this matter your immediate consideration and do everything possible to prevent this wasteful and costly move.

Thank you for your consideration.

Yours very truly,

A. C. LEUCHTMAN.

[From the Detroit News, Feb. 11, 1962]

TANK CENTER MOVE STILL UNCONFIRMED

(By Edwin G. Pipp)

The commander of the Ordnance Tank Automotive Command (OTAC), Saturday refused comment on reports that the Army plans to move tank development and procurement activities from the Detroit area.

Brig. Gen. John F. Thorlin, OTAC chief, said a reorganization of the Army's Ordnance Corps is planned, but that he cannot comment on details.

This reorganization plan will go into effect next Friday if not vetoed in committee Thursday by Congress. Army Secretary Stahr has said it will take 18 months to complete the reorganization.

THREE-WAY MERGER

Under the plan OTAC would merge with the present Ordnance Weapons Command at Rock Island, Ill., and the Transportation Corps with its research center at Fort Eustis, Va., to form the Weapons and Mobility Command.

The reports are that OTAC's function of developing tanks at the Detroit Arsenal and purchasing them and their parts from the office at 150 Beard Street will be moved to Rock Island.

Development and procurement of wheeled vehicles would remain here.

OTAC employees say that this could mean a loss of nearly half the jobs of workers at OTAC and the arsenal.

TOTAL OF 5,300 JOBS IN ALL

The 2 installations have a combined employment of 5,300, mostly civilians.

The arsenal in Center Line is considered one of the most modern tank and automotive development facilities in the country. The cost of replacing its specialized buildings and equipment is estimated at nearly $50 million.

A new $5 million office building to serve as OTAC Headquarters is under construction on a site near the arsenal.

In a report to employees of the two installations General Thorlin told them to continue work as usual, that no definite plans have yet been announced on how the reorganization could affect the Detroit area installations.

AWAITS DETAILS

In an interview he said he did not believe he should comment publicly on the reorganization program until he was given specific details and asked by the Army for his recommendations.

"If Congress does not object, a new organization called the Materiel Development and Logistic Command will replace the present Ordnance Corps," he said.

"It would not be right for me to comment on this organization which has not yet been formed," he said.

HAZEL PARK, MICH.,
February 13, 1962.

Senator PHILIP A. HART,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HART: Having recently heard about the planned movement of the Ordnance Tank Automotive Command (OTAC) from the Detroit area, I felt it my duty to write you a short note concerning this matter. As I understand, this proposed movement will affect approximately 5,200 persons who are now employed for OTAC in the Detroit area.

Sir, I feel that the movement of OTAC from Detroit is doing the people of Detroit a great injustice. As you know, Detroit and the Detroit area, has been hard hit by high unemployment. The movement of OTAC will only increase this unemployment greatly; not to mention the financial difficulties incurred by the individual.

The estimated cost of the proposed movement is approximately $50 million. This is indeed an expensive movement. Also, what is to be done with the already partially constructed building which was to serve as OTAC headquarters at an estimated cost of $5 million? Are these moneys just to be forgotten? In these troubled times, the estimated cost of this movement, and the increased unemployment would only add to the already heavy burden.

Senator HART, I feel it is your duty to object strongly to the proposed movement of OTAC from the Detroit area because of the above-mentioned reasons. I hope you will act accordingly.

Sincerely yours,

RAYMOND PACKWOOD.

DETROIT, MICH., *February 13, 1962.*

Hon. PHILIP HART.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am an employee at Ordnance Tank Automotive Command, Detroit. Suggest you take necessary action to retain OTAC in the Detroit area.

Yours,

A. P. SCHWARTZFELD.

ST. CLAIR SHORES, MICH.,
February 13, 1962.

Hon. PHILIP HART,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Take a good look at Army reorganization as it affects Michigan. As a taxpayer I protest wanton disregard of millions already invested in combat vehicle R. & D. facilities at Detroit Arsenal. Let's keep tank-automotive activities in our distressed auto capital of the world.

R. H. BARNOWSKE.

DETROIT, MICH., *February 14, 1962.*

Senator PHILIP HART,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The possibility of losing the tank-automotive buying and research programs in the Detroit area is abhorrent. To keep on top of this problem is not enough. The proposed move will result in further economic chaos for Michigan and Detroit. You must take action to save these 6,000 jobs.

MARVIN RICHELSOPH.

GREATER DETROIT BOARD OF COMMERCE,
Detroit, Mich., February 13, 1962.

Hon. E. J. STAHR, Jr.,
Secretary of the Army,
The Pentagon,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SECRETARY: An unconfirmed report has been called to the attention of the Greater Detroit Board of Commerce that a part of OTAC will be moved out of this area. Up to the present, we have been unable to confirm this proposed move-out.

Since ou- organization is always interested in jobs in the Detroit area and in anything that might affect them, this report is of prime concern to us.

We have always advocated greater efficiency and economy in Government. This is evidenced by our support of the new OTAC headquarters building now being built at the arsenal which will result in tax savings.

It is our hope that before any move of the tank facilities is recommended, a thorough study be made. We feel that these facilities are well developed and are certainly located ideally for manufacturers and suppliers concerned with the building of tanks. From the meager information that we have of the contemplated transfer of tank production from Detroit to Rock Island, we cannot see any economic justification for such a move.

The know-how in metalworking of our citizens is well recognized. Our research facilities are immense and constantly expanding.

We hope that your office will inform us as soon as possible as to the details of that part of the reorganization plans affecting OTAC and the Detroit arsenal.

Sincerely yours,

H. G. BIXBY,
President.

DETROIT, MICH., *February 13, 1962.*

DEAR MR. HART: Relative to planned moving of OTAC mission from Detroit to Rock Island request that you do everything in your power to retain this activity in Detroit.

Hundreds of Government employees, who need their jobs, major industries, small business, people and merchants will suffer from such a move.

Sincerely,

MABEL C. MEEHAN.

HIGHLAND PARK, MICH.,
February 13, 1962.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Relative to the planned moving of OTAC mission from Detroit to Rock Island, please do everything in your power to retain this activity in Detroit, Mich. Not only would its removal affect hundreds of jobs of Government employees who need the work, but it would also take away business and hurt both major industries and small business, and hurt both the people and merchants of Detroit.

Thank you.

T. M. HAAFF.

SEVENTIETH BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF ARCHBISHOP JOSEPH SLIPYJ, PRIMATE, UKRAINIAN CATHOLIC CHURCH

Mr. HART. Mr. President, February 17, 1962, marks the 70th anniversary of the birth of the metropolitan confessor, Archbishop Joseph Slipyj, primate of the Ukrainian Catholic Church, who has been a prisoner of the Bolshevik regime for the last 17 years. During that time he has suffered and continues to suffer for the Christian faith and the Ukrainian people and has become a symbol of faithfulness to God, to the Catholic Church, and to his nation.

By the initiative of Metropolitan Ambrose Senyshyn and under the direction of all our bishops, the Ukrainian clergy and faithful in the free world will honor this anniversary with the celebration of Divine Liturgies and prayers for Metropolitan Slipyj on this coming Sunday, February 18, 1962.

The city of Detroit, on Sunday, February 18, will be the scene of a celebration in the form of a solemn concert by those dedicated men and women sympathetic to this worthy cause.

I know the Senate salutes this demonstration of devotion and patriotism on the part of those who will assemble and, as well, those who in spirit will join in the assembly on Sunday next.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday, February 19, 1962.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 53 minutes p.m.), the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until Monday, February 19, 1962, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 15, 1962:

NATIONAL SCIENCE BOARD

Dr. Emanuel R. Piore, of New York, to be a member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation, for the remainder of the term expiring May 10, 1966, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Walter L. Lingle, Jr., of Ohio, to be a Deputy Administrator of the Agency for International Development.

U.S. MARSHALS

Cornelius J. McQuade, of West Virginia, to be U.S. marshal for the southern district of West Virginia for the term of 4 years, vice Russell R. Bell, resigned.

Antonio C. Baza, of Guam, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Guam for the term of 4 years. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired February 22, 1961.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in rank as follows:

Maj. Gen. James Lowell Richardson, Jr., O18232, Army of the United States (brigadier General, U.S. Army), in the rank of lieutenant general.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officer of the Marine Corps Reserve for temporary appointment to the grade of major general:

Walter A. Churchill

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps Reserve for permanent appointment to the grade of brigadier general:

Charles H. Cox
George E. Tomlinson
John L. Winston

The following-named officer of the Marine Corps Reserve for temporary appointment to the grade of brigadier general:

Charles F. Duchein

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Curtis C. Gauntt, Talladega, Ala., in place of B. B. Hardegree, resigned.

ALASKA

Maude I. Wright, King Salmon, Alaska, in place of F. L. Nally, resigned.

ARIZONA

Laurie V. Guthrie, Gadsden, Ariz., in place of H. H. Butterworth, retired.

ARKANSAS

Charley E. Wahlquist, Mammoth Spring, Ark., in place of E. E. Sterling, retired.

CALIFORNIA

Helen S. Kinderman, Ludlow, Calif., in place of V. E. Sherraden, retired.

Carroll A. LaJaunie, Palm Desert, Calif., in place of W. L. Myers, resigned.

Daniel J. Stanton, Redlands, Calif., in place of W. A. Page, retired.

Martin H. Scheeper, Stateline, Calif., in place of H. S. Clifton, resigned.

Jim H. Mann, Yucaipa, Calif., in place of J. C. Cummings, resigned.

FLORIDA

Robert L. West, Stuart, Fla., in place of R. W. Hartman, retired.

GEORGIA

Annie M. Carroll, Allentown, Ga., in place of E. L. Johnson, retired.

H. Rhodell Dunn, Jr., Richland, Ga., in place of M. W. Overby, retired.

Thomas O. Fowler, Woodstock, Ga., in place of J. P. Dawson, resigned.

ILLINOIS

Russell W. Miller, Ashley, Ill., in place of S. S. Barrett, retired.

Lola M. Baumunk, Bardolph, Ill., in place of J. L. Baumunk, retired.

Verna H. Welsh, Durand, Ill., in place of Lillie Doyle, retired.

John R. Ryan, Mundelein, Ill., in place of C. E. Teson, retired.

Curtis J. German, Rossville, Ill., in place of Joseph Brown, deceased.

INDIANA

Carl F. Cloyd, Clinton, Ind., in place of H. L. Mitchell, retired.

IOWA

Carl M. Dudden, Grundy Center, Iowa, in place of P. A. Thoren, deceased.

John M. Kuster, Persia, Iowa, in place of C. E. Hamann, retired.

KANSAS

I. Miller Wilson, Easton, Kans., in place of B. M. Stafford, retired.

LOUISIANA

Carrie E. Doughty, Tullos, La., in place of B. D. Dunlap, retired.

MAINE

John R. Fortin, Portland, Maine, in place of J. L. Cook, retired.

MARYLAND

Loise S. Copes, Brooklandville, Md., in place of R. E. Slaughter, retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

Joseph F. Smyth, Grafton, Mass., in place of E. F. X. Jalbert, retired.

MINNESOTA

Orville J. Mortensen, Lyle, Minn., in place of D. W. Matter, resigned.

MISSISSIPPI

Clyde C. Parker, Calhoun City, Miss., in place of Inez Hiller, deceased.

Joy S. Rials, Jayess, Miss., in place of J. W. Sartin, retired.

William L. Barbee, Lula, Miss., in place of L. H. Birdsong, deceased.

MISSOURI

Robert H. Theiss, Warrensburg, Mo., in place of H. M. Cash, retired.

MONTANA

Clinton L. Sennett, Lewistown, Mont., in place of E. J. Coyle, retired.

NEVADA

William A. Morby, Sparks, Nev., in place of Katie Reilly, retired.

NEW JERSEY

Charles H. Schubert, Allendale, N.J., in place of F. A. Farrell, removed.

John B. Porter, Runnemede, N.J., in place of F. R. Barker, retired.

NEW YORK

Edith L. Walker, Farnham, N.Y., in place of C. L. Walker, retired.

Olga A. Mihanowich, Glenham, N.Y., in place of O. B. Timmons, removed.

George L. Nelson, Glen Head, N.Y., in place of J. T. McLaughlin, retired.

Stanley W. Cermak, Holcomb, N.Y., in place of C. R. Hallock, retired.

William B. Mackey, Schenectady, N.Y., in place of J. F. Connelly, deceased.

Edna M. Mulvey, Wilmington, N.Y., in place of F. H. Courtney, deceased.

NORTH CAROLINA

Ophelia S. Wilson, Columbus, N.C., in place of A. T. Clarke, retired.

Leslie T. Fowden, Williamston, N.C., in place of W. E. Dunn, retired.

Ruby M. Dawson, Zebulon, N.C., in place of M. J. Sexton, retired.

OHIO

Lyman D. Wise, Hillsboro, Ohio, in place of W. R. Hapner, retired.

John M. Tertel, Toledo, Ohio, in place of W. P. Kilcorse, deceased.

Charles F. Seither, West Richfield, Ohio, in place of H. R. Eastwood, retired.

OKLAHOMA

Rex E. Pettijohn, Stigler, Okla., in place of C. E. Shepherd, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

John W. Richard, Elysburg, Pa., in place of S. L. Hower, removed.

J. Perry Hockersmith, Shippensburg, Pa., in place of C. F. Hockersmith, retired.

Robert J. Faust, Tower City, Pa., in place of R. A. Ganly, retired.

RHODE ISLAND

John J. Bento, Tiverton, R.I., in place of R. L. Campbell, resigned.

TENNESSEE

Joe B. Campbell, Blaine, Tenn., in place of J. B. Campbell, retired.

VIRGINIA

Alvis T. Davidson, Jr., Faber, Va., in place of A. T. Davidson, retired.

E. Guy Smith, Gloucester, Va., in place of T. W. Cooke, retired.

G. Hoyt McCartney, New Castle, Va., in place of J. W. Ohmer, deceased.

WASHINGTON

Keith E. Hand, Malott, Wash., in place of K. A. Hand, retired.

Sheldon P. Sageser, Poulsbo, Wash., in place of J. V. Mayrand, retired.

WEST VIRGINIA

George E. Nolte, Bethany, W. Va., in place of Miriam Netting, resigned.

Virginia L. Kyle, Hendricks, W. Va., in place of W. H. Ryan, retired.

WISCONSIN

Blanche M. Huggett, Fall River, Wis., in place of J. A. Lane, retired.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 15, 1962:

U.S. MARSHAL

Harry M. Miller, of Kentucky, to be U.S. marshall for the western district of Kentucky.

U.S. ATTORNEY

Alexander Greenfeld, of Delaware, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Delaware.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Older Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD H. POFF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, in recent years, the tendency has been for industry to refuse to employ older workers and to terminate older workers when a reduction in force becomes necessary. A worker who loses his job after the age of 45 finds it almost impossible to obtain employment with a new firm, even though his training, experience, skill and productive capacity may be at the peak of proficiency. At the age of 45 a worker's financial load is probably higher than ever before. At that age, his children are in the midst of their educational careers, and many promising young students in the scientific and professional fields are compelled to abandon college because their parents have lost their jobs. This is a loss not alone to the worker and his children but to America where the deficit in scientific graduate students is already alarming.

The problem is just as important with reference to workers who are approaching their 60th birthday. They are too young to retire and too old to find a new job. Yet, they may be burdened with mortgages on their homes, heavy hospital and medical expenses and other obligations peculiar to our elder citizens.

This is an acute national problem but one which is not easily solved by government. Congress has no constitutional power to compel employers to hire older workers or to retain older workers in their employ. Even if Congress had the power, a compulsory statute would be offensive to our sense of economic freedom and to the principles of the free enterprise system. Moreover, such a compulsory statute could not be properly policed without greatly expanding the ranks of the Federal bureaucracy.

Accordingly, the only possible solution to the problem is an incentive program to encourage employers voluntarily to employ and retain in employment older workers. I have introduced a bill (H.R. 531) providing for a voluntary tax incentive program. Under that bill, an employer would be allowed to deduct as a business expense not only the gross salary paid to an employee but an additional 2 percent thereof for every employee between the ages of 45 and 50, 3 percent for every employee between the ages of 50 and 55, 4 percent for every employee between the ages of 55 and 60, and 5 percent for every employee over the age of 60.

The passage of this bill would mean an initial loss of revenue, but over the long run there would be a corresponding increase in tax revenue from the salaries and wages paid to these older employees and there would be a corresponding reduction of unemployment benefits consumed and the load on the State and local welfare rolls would be lightened.

It might be argued that a policy encouraging the employment of older people would reduce the job availability of younger workers. Such an argument is at odds with the laws of economics. Economic history proves that the more people we have working, the more we produce; the more we produce, the more we transport and sell; the more we sell, the cheaper the price; the cheaper the price, the more we consume; the more we consume, the greater the demand; the greater the demand, the more we need to produce; the more we need to produce, the more jobs we have available. More jobs for everyone, regardless of age, must be our continuing policy.

We as a nation have, over the years, depended for our growth upon the wisdom, training and acquired skills that come only with age and experience. Some of our most revolutionary inventions and some of the greatest contributions to our economic, cultural and scientific life have come from men and women of advanced years in both humble and exalted positions. This reservoir of wisdom and skills is one of America's greatest assets and one in which we have a great investment. We must by every appropriate means protect that investment and use that asset to advance our national interests.

Monsignor Wrzeciono

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month the Eighth District of New Jersey and the city of Paterson lost a distinguished resident.

It is with deep regret that I announce to the House of Representatives the death of Rt. Rev. Monsignor James Wrzeciono, prothonotary apostolic, pastor of St. Stephen's Roman Catholic Church.

Monsignor Wrzeciono was born April 30, 1879, in Tarnau county of Oppein, upper Silesia. He pursued his seminary studies in Krakow where he was ordained to the sacred priesthood on June 6, 1903.

The young clergyman migrated to the United States in 1940. After serving as a curate in two New Jersey parishes, he became pastor of St. Ann's Roman Catholic Church, Jersey City, where his pastorate extended until January 1932.

Thirty years ago, Monsignor Wrzeciono came to St. Stephen's. The parish continued to thrive over three decades. Pope Pius XII recognized the dedicated pastor's many accomplishments by elevating him to the rank of domestic prelate with the title of "right reverend monsignor." The Pope further honored Monsignor Wrzeciono by appointing him as a prothonotary apostolic in 1954.

This beloved servant of God was buried in the parish grounds adjoining the church he had served so faithfully.

Urban Affairs Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting during this week in which we are observing the birthday of a great American, Abraham Lincoln, that I bring before you for your study a matter involving our present President and his actions on the Urban Affairs Department.

I wonder what Abraham Lincoln would think, could he, who genuinely loved freedom and wanted it for all Americans, regardless of pigmentation or nationalistic background, today witness the recent attempt by our Chief Executive to play on racism in its worst form, as a threat, in an attempt to get urban affairs legislation passed.

I am hopeful that Mr. Kennedy's injection of the racial issue, into what should be a starkly legislative consideration, was the result of too hasty acceptance of ill-proffered advice, and not a measure of his true beliefs. I cannot believe that our President is guilty of personal advocacy of the cynical demagoguery which his statements would seem to imply.

Viewed clinically, the urban affairs bill is simply an attempt to create an artificial Cabinet position. It is an attempt to establish a Negro Cabinet member as a symbol of progress, in an effort to derail the necessity of taking positive action for the good of the entire Negro race.

Examples of failure are not difficult to see. It was the President himself who said that by a stroke of the pen he could end racial bias in housing. Yet the pen has laid in its holder, unused. It was the President himself who 2 years ago said that civil rights legislation was even then in preparation and would be put before the Congress in short order. Congress is still waiting.

And where is the FEPC legislation so loudly and broadly demanded in the Democratic platform? Would this symbolic Cabinet member truly compensate for the very real failures in the field of civil rights by the Kennedy administration?

As for the Urban Affairs Department and its functions, it is inevitable that once established it would grow just as have other Government agencies. The scope of functions in the proposed bill which the House Rules Committee killed, is astronomical.

Perhaps we should all take note that this is the 100th anniversary of the founding of the Department of Agriculture. It was formed to bring a few scattered agencies together under one department. In 1862 it had nine employees and a budget of $80,000. In 1962 it has 100,000 employees and a budget of $7 billion. The employees spend much of their time and the Department's money paying farmers not to farm. Every farmer who gets a Government check is under Government control. This is how a "harmless" agency that just brings a few scattered Government functions together can grow until it strangles the purpose for which it was created.

I believe that it is high time that the administration and the Congress stop talking about hyphenated Americans. I do not believe we gain anything for America by discussing the voting power, the likes and dislikes and the political potentials of Negro Americans, Jewish Americans, Polish Americans, Latin Americans. All of these are just plain Americans. On the bloody beachheads of World War II and in the freezing misery of the Korean conflict, no one stopped to ask whether or not our GI's were hyphenated Americans—they were there, they fought, they were wounded, and many died, for the simple purpose of defending what America means—freedom.

The Kennedy administration has chosen to cast its lot on the urban affairs issue with racial discrimination. I propose we consider and vote on American traditions.

As a matter of information to my colleagues, I have compiled a list of congressional districts in the United States with more than 10 percent nonwhite population.

It is obvious that very few congressional districts are affected basically by considerations influenced wholly by the racial nature of their population. Therefore I think the viewpoint expressed by our white and Negro national leaders in both political parties is a sound one: race should not be a factor in congressional voting—on the Urban Affairs Department issue, or on any other.

Many Members of Congress do not realize how very, very few congressional districts in States outside of the traditional South have nonwhite populations of 10 percent or more. For this reason, and because recent statistics on this point are available from the Bureau of the Census, I am submitting the following table which shows clearly the total nonwhite population for each State and for each congressional district with 10 percent or more.

The only States omitted from this table are Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia—all States which have a nonwhite population of obviously heavy proportion.

The table also includes a breakdown by race into white, Negro, other races and percentages of nonwhite population. I invite your attention to these figures, which should be of aid in properly assessing the unfortunate course of threats which have been made in the sending of the Executive order for the Urban Affairs Department to Congress for acceptance or rejection.

The table follows:

	Total nonwhite	White	Negro	Other	Percent
Alaska	51,621	174,546	6,771	44,850	22.8
Arizona	132,644				
2d District	96,214	542,437	18,284	77,930	15.1
California	1,261,974				
4th District	42,997	332,374	17,775	25,222	11.5
5th District	92,916	272,029	56,608	36,308	25.5
7th District	92,077	201,440	77,846	14,231	31.4
15th District	126,241	263,512	96,367	29,874	32.4
23d District	122,646	410,133	119,581	3,065	23.0
26th District	164,327	348,349	150,208	14,119	32.1
Delaware	61,965	384,327	60,688	1,277	13.9
Illinois	1,070,906				
1st District	216,504	18,698	214,034	2,470	92.1
2d District	180,180	168,660	177,223	2,957	51.7
3d District	125,602	293,907	124,907	695	29.9
6th District	117,924	227,360	117,110	814	34.2
7th District	120,964	221,937	119,360	1,604	35.3
9th District	32,925	269,733	24,686	8,239	10.9
24th District	60,205	426,993	59,790	415	12.4
Indiana	273,944				
1st District	87,628	425,641	87,109	519	17.1
11th District	100,729	596,838	99,912	817	14.4
Kentucky	218,073				
1st District	33,203	284,233	32,870	333	10.5
2d District	20,206	301,097	20,121	85	6.3
3d District	78,890	532,057	78,350	540	12.9
4th District	21,398	282,033	20,802	596	7.1
5th District	8,902	320,214	8,804	98	2.7
6th District	42,134	369,325	41,822	312	10.2
7th District	4,657	416,159	4,574	83	1.1
8th District	8,683	314,965	8,606	77	2.7
Maryland	526,770				
1st District	56,580	186,990	56,318	262	23.2
2d District	27,376	594,559	26,649	727	4.4
3d District	82,647	176,179	81,386	1,261	31.9
4th District	128,938	154,382	128,069	869	45.5
5th District	94,213	616,832	91,391	2,822	13.2
6th District	22,220	586,446	20,398	1,822	3.7
7th District	114,796	258,531	114,199	597	30.7
Massachusetts	125,434				
12th District	32,322	252,734	31,235	1,087	11.3
Michigan	737,329				
1st District	117,398	165,904	116,873	525	41.4
13th District	134,835	133,205	133,135	1,700	50.3
14th District	66,666	395,526	65,733	933	14.4
15th District	157,100	179,917	155,964	1,136	46.6
Missouri	396,846				
1st District	111,612	456,417	111,030	582	19.6
3d District	112,403	230,066	111,240	1,163	32.8
5th District	66,008	236,805	65,190	818	21.8
10th District	32,134	268,964	32,019	115	10.7
New Jersey	527,779				
2d District	46,497	269,788	45,155	1,342	14.7
4th District	49,932	440,959	47,994	1,938	10.2
11th District	92,092	216,568	91,331	761	29.8
12th District	63,541	299,373	62,857	684	17.5
13th District	35,131	221,846	34,628	503	13.7
New York	1,495,233				
5th District	82,357	309,046	81,177	1,180	21.0
8th District	61,233	295,728	59,518	1,715	17.2
9th District	97,629	293,610	96,524	1,105	25.0
10th District	141,601	212,181	140,000	1,601	40.0
11th District	41,023	370,965	39,620	1,403	10.0
16th District	267,005	34,569	265,401	1,604	88.5
18th District	43,728	225,640	42,195	1,533	16.2
19th District	34,914	266,585	19,124	15,790	11.6
20th District	28,287	251,188	24,036	4,251	10.1
21st District	44,730	241,400	41,054	3,676	15.6
22d District	48,531	278,682	47,588	943	14.8
23d District	85,095	250,071	83,870	1,225	25.4
41st District	62,099	270,677	60,948	1,151	18.7
Ohio	796,699				
1st District	66,076	309,680	65,355	718	17.6
2d District	58,578	429,790	58,082	496	12.0
3d District	73,029	653,127	72,201	828	10.1
12th District	81,601	601,301	80,235	1,366	11.9
21st District	105,744	226,060	194,911	833	46.4
22d District	49,827	308,171	48,802	1,025	13.9
Oklahoma	220,384				
1st District	37,837	483,705	29,753	8,084	7.3
2d District	49,104	319,872	27,132	21,972	13.3
3d District	26,092	201,600	16,939	9,153	11.5
4th District	27,150	225,058	17,327	9,823	10.8
5th District	49,830	503,033	42,396	7,434	9.0
6th District	30,371	374,632	19,537	10,834	7.5
Pennsylvania	865,362				
1st District	67,318	193,449	66,621	697	25.8
2d District	124,663	219,511	123,435	1,228	36.2
3d District	64,566	209,345	62,803	1,763	23.6
4th District	232,476	82,433	231,684	792	73.8
6th District	37,236	310,228	36,506	730	10.7
28th District	82,964	245,200	82,126	838	25.3
South Dakota	27,416				
2d District	19,600	163,245	729	18,871	10.7
West Virginia	90,288				
1st District	7,437	265,670	7,315	122	2.7
2d District	8,061	268,813	7,875	186	2.9
3d District	9,398	258,936	9,302	96	3.5
4th District	6,150	339,058	6,015	135	1.8
5th District	29,771	246,042	29,680	91	10.8
6th District	29,471	391,614	29,191	280	7.0
Wisconsin	92,874				
5th District	63,429	457,245	61,324	2,105	12.2

An inflated myth is being used to persuade, threaten, or force Members of Congress to vote for the proposed new Urban Affairs Department and its prospective head, Housing Administrator Robert C. Weaver.

I agree with President Kennedy, Bob Weaver has done a good job as Housing Administrator. Whether or not we should permit the creation of a new Urban Affairs Department is a matter that should be considered on its merits, not on the basis of prejudice for or against the Negro race.

Very few Members of Congress need fear the adverse votes of Negroes on this issue. Outside of 12 Southern States there are very few congressional districts—only 57 out of 437—where Negroes equal 10 percent or more of the total population.

In the 57 congressional districts where a Negro population is significant outside the Southern States, the Census records show that there are 8 districts where the Negro population is between 15 and 20 percent; there are 14 districts where it totals between 20 and 30 percent; and there are only 15 districts where the total is over 30 percent of the population.

In light of these figures, it seems clear to me that the current furor about the prospective appointment of Mr. Weaver as a possible Secretary of Urban Affairs is misleading, divisive, and simply political propaganda both for Members of Congress and for the general public.

It is clear from the table that no Members of this body outside of the South and the few congressional districts listed are elected from population in which the Negro electorate forms a significant factor so as to influence voting. Therefore, I earnestly plead again for all Members to disregard the false arguments now appearing in their mail and in the press. The voting for or against the Urban Affairs Department should be upon the merits of the question.

My own record in the field of race relations is well known. The good people of my congressional district have not been fooled by the hypocrisy surrounding the urban affairs proposals.

As for me, I shall continue to represent my people as citizens of the 14th Congressional District of Ohio.

Tadeusz Kosciuszko, February 12, 1746–October 15, 1817

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, Tadeusz Kosciuszko, whose 216th birthday is today, was one of the many gallant Poles who played a very important part in our War of Independence.

This gifted son of a middle-class family was born with the determination to fight for the freedom of his own people. With that purpose in mind he decided to become a soldier and a fighter. When he had completed his military education in Poland, and then in France, he had become a specialist in artillery and military engineering. By 1776 he had had no real chance to liberate his people, but when he heard of our War of Independence, he rushed to Paris, there borrowed money from friends, set sail for America and arrived in Philadelphia in August of that year. There he applied for military service; he was admitted at once and then charged with the drawing up of plans for fortifying the Delaware. His success in this first assignment earned him a colonel's commission. From then on a high place in our Revolutionary War was assured for him. Everything he undertook was performed with distinction, and in October 1783 Congress made him a brigadier general.

Today in observing the 216th anniversary of his birth we do homage to his memory.

Horizons Unlimited for Future Farmers of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, National Future Farmers of America Week will be observed this year from February 17-24, and it is indeed a pleasure at this time to pay tribute to this fine organization. The members of the Future Farmers of America fully deserve our support, encouragement, and respect. The continued success and growth of American agriculture depends to a great extent on the ability of the farmer of tomorrow to utilize intelligently and scientifically the rich and productive land that is our heritage. The training our young men are today receiving in their FFA work assures us that the future of American agriculture will be in good hands.

In 1928, the national FFA organization was launched at Kansas City, Mo., and on August 30, 1950, the 81st Congress, through passage of Public Law 740, granted a Federal charter to the Future Farmers of America. If I had been a Member of Congress at that time, I would most certainly have cast the vote of the Second Congressional District of Kentucky for passage of this law.

When we realize that agriculture is America's largest single industry, it is at once obvious that the proper training of our future farmers is of paramount importance. The necessary preparation for a career in agriculture is ably provided by the nationwide program of vocational education in agriculture and its accompanying organization, the Future Farmers of America. Membership in the FFA is open to all boys studying vocational agriculture in a public secondary school.

This country must have a constant supply of new farmers every year to replace those who die, retire, or otherwise leave the farm, and they must be men with experience and training. It is necessary for today's successful farmer to have skill in science, business, mechanics, and other technological advances which the industry has undergone in recent years. Knowing this, the FFA places a great deal of emphasis on training, and each member is required to conduct a profitable farming program at home or on another farm. The success of this program of "Doing to learn," a phrase in the FFA motto and an integral part of the program of the Future Farmers of America, is evidenced by the fact that by the time many FFA members are ready to marry and start a family they are firmly established in a farming program that promises a good future. For those who do not become full-time farmers, many find careers in some phase of agriculture and their experiences in vocational agriculture and the FFA serve well to help them to success. The theme for FFA Week this year is "Honoring Rural Opportunities and Responsibilities" and it is a most appropriate one.

We are fortunate in the Second District of Kentucky in having many chapters of the Future Farmers of America, and we have only to look at the achievements of the individual members of this organization to become aware of the beneficial results this program has on rural communities. I know many members of the FFA and enjoy visiting with these young men and their families when I travel throughout Kentucky. It is always gratifying to see their enthusiasm for farming as a challenging and satisfying way of life.

In closing, I would like to say that I am in complete agreement with the FFA creed which begins with the declaration "I believe in the future of farming." I also believe that the Future Farmers of America are playing a vital part in America's future by training our rural youth to be prosperous and successful farmers, and I wish the members of this outstanding organization and their leaders continued success in all their endeavors.

Gen. Tadeusz Kosciuszko

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, this month we celebrate the birthday of Gen. Tadeusz Kosciuszko, a man honored in the history of both the United States and his native Poland. After a desperate battle against despotism in Poland, Kosciuszko came to America during the days of our Revolution and offered the leaders of our infant Nation every aid to win liberty from another tyrant. He, along with hundreds of other Polish heroes, won undying glory in aiding America to win the Revolution.

General Kosciuszko was trained in the art of war and especially in military engineering; and his services were invaluable to the American cause. His advice and counsel were listened to during the dark days of the Revolution and General Washington bestowed upon him every credit for bringing the War of Independence to a more rapid victory. Congress, in deep gratitude, made him a brigadier general.

Upon his return to his native Poland, he fought against the Russian imperialists in 1792 and 1794. The odds were against him and failure was inevitable. The Russians imprisoned him for over 2 years. When he was freed he returned to America where Congress voted him money and lands. A part of this later went to found one of the first Negro schools in the United States. This great general was not content to live quietly on his farm, however, and when there seemed to be a possibility of freeing Poland from its Russian conquerors he returned home once more in 1798. He spent the rest of his life until he died in 1817 in an effort to win victory and establish the freedom and independence of Poland.

Tadeusz Kosciuszko was a freedom fighter who fought for freedom on two continents. The memory of his life and his devotion to freedom are an inspiration to the Polish people today who are not free but who live under a Communist government. But we also honor him here in the Halls of the U.S. Congress because of the debt of gratitude which we owe to this memory and to the memory of all the other brave Polish men who fought in the cause of liberty during the American Revolution.

Remarks of Representative Silvio O. Conte at Annual Lincoln Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the remarks of Representative SILVIO O. CONTE before the Middlesex Club on Thursday, February 8, 1962, in Boston, Mass., when he delivered a historical speech on Abraham Lincoln. I think Representative CONTE made an excellent presentation, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN SILVIO O. CONTE BEFORE THE MIDDLESEX CLUB ON THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1962, BOSTON, MASS., AT ANNUAL LINCOLN DAY DINNER

Gen. George Pickett, the fighting Confederate commander, was to remember all the days of his life that fateful day at Gettysburg when he led his long gray lines up Cemetery Ridge in the bloodiest assault of the war. And Mrs. George Pickett was long to remember that afternoon at war's end when she opened the door of her Richmond home in answer to the knock of a tall stranger asking her if George were at home. Replying that George wasn't and wouldn't be for some time yet, she asked the visitor's name. The tall, frock-coated man in the stove pipe hat answered simply, "Just an old friend of George's, ma'am, just an old friend from before the war." With that he turned, stepped out into the sunlight and walked slowly down that Richmond street, leaving Mrs. Pickett to the startling realization that the President of the United States had come to call.

The President of the United States, Abraham Lincoln was that—of course he was—but really a great deal more too. For this was a man of many parts, all of them human, most of them great.

As a Republican, a Member of Congress, and an American, I am honored and pleased at your invitation to share a few moments with you tonight in commemoration and consideration of this great man.

The appeal of Lincoln to mankind is universal and indefinable. There is something in Lincoln for all men. He was the master politician, who in 30 long, devoted years of service to his party came to realize that politics, like life, is the art of achieving the possible. Scholars tell us that if we are to realistically seek the man who made Lincoln President in 1860, we must look to the activities of Lincoln himself. In the Presidency he is recognized as more independent of direct appeals to Congress or the people to achieve his aims than any other strong President. He worked behind the scenes with the organization men of his party. In short, he was a "politician's politician." Yet we hardly think less of him for all this.

Then, too, he was Lincoln the family man and father, whose home was torn by strife and dissension and the tragic death of children. Yet it is not here, nor ever, our task to judge Mary Todd Lincoln. The hearts of these two are best known but to themselves. Suffice it for us to remember that on the night of Good Friday, 1865, in Ford's Theater, Mary Todd and Abraham Lincoln sat holding hands in a darkened box.

President, Commander in Chief, statesman, this too was Abraham Lincoln. Intellectual power, moral strength, a feeling for the spirit and needs of the time, instinctive understanding of the masses, a passion for democracy—all these are the qualities of a statesman. All these Lincoln possessed Devoted above all to preserving the Union "with the dignity, equality, and rights of the several States unimpaired." This he said, this he did and, in so doing, he brought freedom to the slave.

Lincoln was a martyr, too. And in this capacity history preserves and, yes, even enshrines him forever. A martyr, indeed—to the Union, to peace, and to freedom. Lincoln had a lifelong premonition of death, yet he knew that death was not life at its worst, for to him defeat without trying was true failure, and his ceaseless effort to preserve our Union stands as one of the great successes of all time.

This, then, was Abraham Lincoln—politician, husband, and father, President and Commander in Chief, martyr for all mankind. He was truly a man of such dimensions that he made all others seem small, though he would have been the very last to wish to do so, for he was a man with an attractive sense of humility and humor, rare among his peers.

It is these latter aspects of Lincoln that have special appeal to me, for of all the great lessons of democracy and statesmanship our generation owes Lincoln, we, as Americans in our difficult time, like Lincoln in his, also need humor as our safety valve—our weapon against the harassments of life.

An old friend from Illinois once visited him in Washington. "Mr. Lincoln," he asked, "How do you like being President?" "Well," he answered, "It reminds me of the man in Indiana who was being ridden out of town on a rail." He said, "If it wasn't for the honor of the thing, I think I'd rather walk."

His reputation as a storyteller preceded him to the White House and was well deserved. As a boy in Indiana, as a young man in New Salem, as a lawyer in the dreary taverns of the eighth judicial circuit of Illinois, he was always the center of attraction. With his long legs crossed, leaning slightly forward, his face radiant with anticipation and enjoyment, Lincoln delighted both himself and his audience. His humor, like his compassion, was that of the people he understood and loved so well, with all its, and their, good and bad.

But his stories did more than amuse. They often served to reinforce the point he wanted to make in a way that few could misunderstand. Once, when criticized for allowing General Grant to parole an entire Confederate army after the surrender at Vicksburg, he replied with the story of Bill Sykes' dog. Some cruel boys had fed Bill's little yellow cur a sausage stuffed with gunpowder and attached a makeshift fuse to it. When Bill heard the explosion, he came outside and said to what was left of the poor animal, "Well, I guess you won't be much use again—as a dog." "Gentlemen, I don't think that army will be much use again—as an army."

Condemned and maligned more bitterly and personally than any other American President, saddened beyond knowledge by the struggle that was dividing his country, standing almost alone for what he believed to be right against the demands of both conservatives and radicals, he once confided to a friend, "Without humor, I think I should die."

The earthy and the sublime, the magnificent and the humble, the ridiculous and the profound—contrasts in the man are never ending. A mind that could encompass Bill Sykes' dog and the Gettysburg address, stories which could delight a rough frontiersman and his second inaugural address—these are the complexities, the mystery, the greatness of the man whom we commemorate this evening. A man whose appeal so moved Carl Sandburg to say: "Not often in the history of mankind does a man arrive on earth who is both steel and velvet, who is as hard as a rock and soft as drifting fog, who holds in his heart and mind the paradox of terrible storm—and peace unspeakable and perfect."

Lithuanian Citizens' Club of Lawrence, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my remarks at the annual installation banquet of the Lithuanian Citizens' Club, Inc., of Lawrence, Mass., on Sunday, February 4, 1962:

The Lithuanian Citizens' Club of Lawrence was organized in 1907—almost 33 years before the Russian Communists invaded Lithuania and deprived that country of its independence.

But I believe that your club will be an active social and civic center for Americans of Lithuanian origin long after the Soviet Union has been replaced by a democratic government that abandons imperialism and liberates its own people as well.

This may sound like wishful thinking.

There are signs, however, of trouble within the Soviet Union.

When Communists start to argue among themselves, that's a good sign for the rest of the world.

And as Russian children grow up to become teachers, doctors, or engineers they expect a more comfortable, more peaceful way of life, free from treachery and terror.

The denunciation of Stalin and his cruelties shows that there are changes going on behind the Iron Curtain.

Khrushchev has publicly denounced Stalin as a criminal and a murderer.

The Lithuanian people will never forget the thousands of their countrymen who were liquidated and the tens of thousands who were forcibly deported to remote areas of the Soviet Union. The younger generation, having heard from their parents' lips of uncles, aunts, and cousins who were the victims of Communist oppression, will remember and will look forward to the day of their country's emancipation.

Khrushchev is caught in a contradiction that must be plain to intelligent Russians. How can he denounce the crimes of Stalin, which include the brutal subjugation of the Lithuanian people and at the same time expect the rest of the world to forget Lithuania's right to be independent again?

Even Stalin—at his worst—could not break the spirit of the Lithuanian people or their religious faith.

Since the beginning of history, oppressive governments have come and gone because they could not crush the fundamental courage and decency that is found in most human beings.

More than 12 million people have escaped from Communist countries since the end of World War II. Add to this number the silent, thinking, and suffering people of Russia and China who resent the closed systems of government that drive them mercilessly—plus the hundreds of millions of people in the free world—and we have the overwhelming majority of mankind either actively or passively opposed to communism.

That's what the Communists fear most.

While they bluster and threaten and conspire against the world in front of them—they secretly worry about the world behind them that they control—on the surface.

In this modern world, no "iron curtain" can succeed in completely isolating one group of people from another. We have means of getting information through to the people of Lithuania and other captive nations, and they have means of communicating with us.

In this way we strengthen our mutual hope and determination to join hands one day in a world without fear united by representative and cooperating governments.

The Lithuanian Citizens' Club of Lawrence, by encouraging the rights and responsibilities of freemen, is doing its share to build a better future for the United States, for Lithuania, and for all nations in the family of mankind.

Little People to Little People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it was with a great deal of interest that I read the remarks of my distinguished colleague from the State of New Jersey, the Honorable Peter Rodino, concerning the initiation of a little-people-to-little-people program.

There is indeed much merit in this suggestion and Congressman Rodino's son, Peter III, is to be commended for the effort to transform this meritorious idea into an effective program. At a time when understanding between the people of the world is essential to peace and cooperation, it could go far in breaking down the inaccurate stereotypes which exist in the minds of men.

The children of our country are our greatest asset. In many instances they, in their simplicity, can see and perceive more clearly than those whose minds are lost in intricate details. Certainly a children's crusade of letters urging the children of the world to join them in a campaign for world peace and security could be an important contribution to good will and understanding among the peoples of the world.

Congressman Holifield for Quality and Stabilized Merchandise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday our colleague, Chet Holifield of California, a retail clothier, delivered the following address, in part, before the National Convention of Retail Clothiers being held here in Washington, D.C.

His remarks and advice, considering his long experience as a retail merchant should be read by all Members of Congress:

Congressman Holifield for Stabilized Merchandising

(Remarks of Congressman Chet Holifield, of California, at the National Association of Retail Clothiers and Furnishers luncheon meeting, Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D.C., February 14, 1962)

THE DOMESTIC RETAILER LOOKS AT THE EUROPEAN COMMON MARKET—PART I

Mr. Chairman and fellow clothiers, 35 years ago I became a retail clothier in a small southern California town. Though serving in Congress for the past 20 years, I have maintained my original business and increased its operation with the help of a good manager. Therefore, I have more than a passing acquaintance with the basic problems which you face.

New problems have arisen over the past three decades. Our customers are more sophisticated. They demand a wider selection of style, color, and materials. Expanded use of charge accounts has increased our capital investment. We face a new type of competitive challenge from giant discount houses in many areas. Protecting the normal profit margin of a legitimate business operation is indeed a serious problem.

Along with many of you, I built my retail business on lines of nationally known brand merchandise. If discount houses continue to acquire such brand merchandise and slash normal retail prices, you and I are threatened with the damage or destruction of our traditional way of doing business.

Court decisions have practically nullified the protection of the so-called fair trade laws. It is evident that the independent merchant, to survive and prosper, must reexamine the legislative possibilities.

Congressman Madden's quality stabilization bill seems to offer a carefully considered new approach. It seeks to establish a more complete property right in the brand name so that the manufacturer can (a) specify conditions under which the brand name can be used in the final sale to the consumer, and (b) reclaim merchandise at no actual loss to the seller, in the event the latter offers the merchandise in violation of the manufacturer's specified conditions of sale to the ultimate consumer.

While I am not a lawyer (I only help to make the laws which confuse lawyers), I have been advised that the legal barriers in the fair trade laws may be overcome by the concept of the quality stabilization bill.

Certainly the manufacturer should have the right to protect his distribution system and his branded merchandise from the cannibalistic practices of the "loss leader" and "price gimmick" operator.

Manufacturer and retailer collectively expend millions of dollars in advertising national brand merchandise. The resulting consumer recognition and acceptance of brand name merchandise is a real tangible business asset to both manufacturer and retailer. This joint asset should not be misused and dissipated by others.

I note that on February 2 of this year, the National Retail Hardware Association, comprising 22,000 independent retailers, endorsed the Madden-Capehart bill. Certainly it deserves serious attention by all independent retail associations.

As a Member of Congress who knows the problems of the retail clothing industry and believes in the fair trade principle, I have cosponsored the Madden-Capehart quality stabilization bill.

Now, may I turn to a matter of great importance to our Nation's destiny, and therefore of great importance to you and to me as businessmen.

Because of our great economic and military strength, the United States has become the leader of the free world.

Since the end of World War II, under a bipartisan national policy decision, we have expended many billions of tax dollars to help rebuild the economic, political and military strength of allied, neutral and former enemy nations. These nations have survived and remained free. They have done more. Great Britain, West Germany, France, Japan and smaller nations have expanded their industrial production far beyond pre-World War II levels. The European part of this great industrial productive capacity is now being melded into a trade and tariff alliance of tremendous potential economic power.

Initially the Common Market consisted of the so-called Inner Six nations on the European Continent. Then in a belated move for self-protection, Great Britain organized the Outer Seven. Now, as you know, there are negotiations for melding the Inner Six and the Outer Seven into a greater Common Market grouping of nations. If this occurs during the next few years there will be a close trade and tariff arrangement among nations containing some 300 million producers and consumers.

Listen carefully—this Common Market trade alliance will increase the economic strength of the participating countries individually and as a whole. The growing economic power of the Inner Six is shown by the rapid strides in output. Over the last year this area increased its gross national product by 6½ percent. Since 1950, its annual growth rate has averaged more than 5 percent compared with our bare 3 percent. In the industrial sector of production its annual rate of increase for the past 10 years has averaged 8 percent, compared with our slightly more than 3 percent.

This is a powerful economic challenge to the United States—make no mistake about it.

The prospects for the Common Market complex then are these:

First, through reducing or eliminating internal tariffs, it will accelerate the interchange of merchandise and labor resources. Therefore, it will become more self-sufficient and less dependent upon imports from the United States.

Second, unified and growing economic strength and industrial capacity will generate greater quantities of goods for export throughout the world.

On the first point, bear in mind that the 13 nations of the European Economic Community were customers last year for $5½ billion worth of American goods. This is an important segment of our total exports of $20.4 billion. It would be very damaging if we should find ourselves excluded by high tariff walls from this market.

On the second point, we must consider the impact of the Common Market on our export trade to other areas, which amounts to $15 billion, or three-fourths of our yearly total of exports. The Common Market nations will be strong competitors in exports because of their growing production capacity, and they will in turn offer the powerful inducement of potential markets among their 300 million people for goods of the other trading nations.

Why should we, as retail clothiers in small or large towns, be concerned with all of these complicated problems of international trade and tariffs and the Common Market Alliance?

In the brief time of this luncheon speech—and every luncheon speech should be brief—I cannot do justice to the question and give a full answer. Part II of my speech, which I shall not read, has facts and figures which many of you will find interesting and relevant to your business role in the national economy. The second part amounts to a brief for the proposed new approach to international trade which will be debated in Congress in the coming weeks and months.

The remainder of my remarks today, I hope, will be a stimulus to your examining this problem in depth—a problem which I believe is second only to that of avoiding a nuclear world war.

I could speak to you with great feeling and a wide background of information on the Soviet military challenge. As chairman of the House-Senate Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, my responsibilities are heavy in the field of atomic energy development. The nuclear weapons we need for deterring war range from small tactical weapons to megaton bombs carried by our great SAC bombers, many of which are on constant airborne patrol. Our nuclear submarines armed with Polaris missiles are gliding silently and continuously under the surface of the great oceans, and our great intercontinental ballistic missiles stand guard for freedom.

But these are programs in being. These fantastic weapons and weapon systems are in professional scientific and military hands. They are under the direction of the President of the United States as Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces. There is little that we can do individually in this area of national survival—except to pay taxes.

But if we turn our attention to the economic destiny of the United States to those areas of business development and Federal legislation having to do with our stability as a nation, then there is something important and constructive which we can do.

If our Nation is to remain strong militarily, we must take every step necessary to maintain the strength of our economic system. We speak of the American way of life and we speak of competitive free enterprise. Are we mouthing generalities which are familiar enough to sound pleasant, but fuzzy enough to hide the crucial challenges of our times?

Our American way of life is changing. We have moved rapidly from farm to city. Seventy-four percent of our people live in urban areas. Ten million farmers produce more food and fiber than 60 million produced five decades ago. Our great industrial plants, steel, textile, rubber, automobile, operate on a part-time basis. The workweek dwindles from 60 hours or more when I was a young man to 40 and even 25 for some. Our labor force grows at the rate of 1½ million per year.

We are employing more people but the percentage of permanent unemployed has risen to between 5 and 7 million. Automation takes its toll in industry after industry, and pools of technologically displaced workers grow in stagnant areas of our Nation. I know all the stock answers, but I also know the inadequacy of most of them and so do the unemployed, the displaced miners, automobile workers, railroadmen and others.

Yes, we have problems which are not being solved. They invoke basic factors of change in our American way of life.

Our agricultural production outruns the domestic ability to consume. We use all kinds of controls and subsidies to keep it from collapsing, not under the blessing, but under the curse of abundance.

Our industrial plants, running only part time, produce more steel, autos, refrigerators and soft goods including men's clothing than our domestic market can buy. If you look beneath the surface of general prosperity, you see these cracks in the foundation of our economy.

What can we do to keep those cracks in the economy from spreading? The basic need is a wider distribution and greater consumption of goods. If this can be accomplished our factories can operate more hours. They can utilize more employees which will help to reduce our stagnant reservoir of unemployed and add domestic consuming power.

But how do we get this wider distribution if our domestic market is saturated with goods?

It seems to me we must look to new markets for our goods from factories and fields. This means increased exports.

If the European Common Market threatens our present export market, as I believe it does, then we must meet that challenge promptly.

The President, backed by expert economic advisers from the financial and business world, has asked Congress for more flexible tariff adjustment powers—powers that will allow him to bargain with the Common Market tariff controllers so that we can continue to participate in that great 300 million population market. It will take congressional action to delegate to him this broad general power. If after study you believe it is wise, you can help by making your wishes known to your Senators and Representatives.

But far more is needed than our continued access to the European Common Market consumers.

We need to develop new markets in the underdeveloped areas of the world. Here lies the great challenge and the great opportunity for our part-time production capacity.

If we are to really turn our production capacity loose, if we are really going to utilize our skilled manpower and train our unskilled workers for the production job for which we are capable, then we must become masters of the machine and not the victims of technology.

So, I say to you today, the United States must meet the challenge of greater distribution. It must fight a more efficient competition in existing world markets to maintain our existing exports.

It must vigorously, courageously, and intelligently move into the great underdeveloped markets of the world where millions, yes, hundreds of millions, yearn for the goods we know how to produce.

We must take the place as the leading international trading nation which Great Britain occupied for so many centuries. She can no longer play the part. She has handed the baton to us.

We will either ignobly fail this task or we will carry the baton to victory.

We can falter in our obligation to meet today's challenges to the American way of life as we have known it, and if we do fail, we will slip into the oblivion which is reserved for all nations or civilizations which grow old and tired and fail to cope with new problems in a new and dangerous age.

I do not believe we will fail. I believe that we have the intelligence to solve the problem of distribution—greater distribution to domestic and foreign consumers through utilizing unused or partly used manpower and machine power. Our Nation of free people has in a period of some 300 years built the greatest production capacity ever known in the history of the world. Starting with a wilderness to conquer and faith in freedom and the democratic way, we have eliminated the scarcity of food, shelter, and goods which has plagued mankind for thousands of years—yes, which still plagues more than two-thirds of the human race.

It would be unthinkable for us to allow this magnificent system of production to choke on its own abundance, while two-thirds of the world starves for food and cries for goods. It would be a tragic ending indeed for the American dream, if we were to falter in the face of the Communist threat, be it military or economic.

We are facing up to the military threat, but do you know that since 1955 the Soviets have completed 206 trade agreements with non-Communist nations? Did you know that from 1954 to 1960 the export trade volume of the Soviet Union jumped from $860 to $2,700 million—more than triple in a 6-year period?

Gentlemen, this is your world. This is your Nation. This is your challenge. It is a challenge which we can and will meet. It is a goal worth winning if we are to have a world of liberty and freedom for ourselves and our children.

The 100th Anniversary of the Founding of the Sokol Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, 100 years ago, on February 16, 1862, the world-renowned Sokol gymnastic organization of Czechoslovakia was founded in Prague. This event which has long been commemorated by Czechoslovaks, is an appropriate one for commemoration now by the entire Western World. It represented not only the attempt of that well-known Czechoslovak, Dr. Miroslav Tyrs, to educate his countrymen to a high level of physical, spiritual, and moral fitness, it was also a notable advance in the history of the democratic idea. The Sokol organization, which became an integral part and feature of Czechoslovak national life, had as its ideal from the very start democracy and human freedom. The basic principles of democracy and freedom were an integral part of its organizational structure from the very beginning, and its regulations were based on the principles that all officers should be freely elected by all of the members. Membership was open to all regardless of class, creed, or political affiliation.

One has but to review the history of Czechoslovakia over the past 100 years to see the role that this organization has played. At times when the Czechoslovak people have been brutally suppressed the Sokol movement has led them in their heroic efforts to resist and throw off suppression. The organization participated valiantly in the First World War, and after the war helped to make secure the newly created Czechoslovak state in the center of Europe. In the period between the two world wars the organization was one of the strongest elements in Czechoslovak democracy.

It was not surprising, in view of the organization's historic opposition to the evil of totalitarian movements, that very soon after the Nazi occupation of Czechoslovakia in 1939 the organization was declared an enemy of the Third Reich and was disbanded by the Nazi authorities. Although its property was confiscated and some 5,000 of its leading members were put to death, those who survived were notable in the successful resistance against the Nazis during the war.

After the war, under the Czechoslovak Republic, the organization once again came out into the open and carried on its work of training its members in accord with its ancient motto, "Healthy mind in a healthy body."

The subsequent history of this organization, as of all freedom-loving movements in Eastern Europe, is a well-known story. Suffice it to say that wherever individuals are dedicated to freedom, the names of such organizations as the Sokol organization will ring loud and clear. We have a Sokol organization in Milwaukee, Wis., which is continuing its good work in building healthy minds and healthy bodies and a healthy respect for freedom. It is with great pleasure that I salute this organization on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of its founding.

Senator Keating Cautions Against Loss of Congressional Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JESSICA McC. WEIS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, in a very timely and perceptive speech earlier this month, Senator KENNETH KEATING, my predecessor in the House of Representatives, called attention to one of the most disturbing trends in Government today. I refer to the determined efforts being made by the President and the executive branch of the Government to assume power and authority which traditionally has been vested in the Congress.

Speaking before the 43d Midwinter Trust Conference of the American Bankers Association, held in New York City on February 6, Senator KEATING discussed the President's new trade legislation and outlined his own proposal for retaining a modicum of congressional control over the tariffmaking function.

In a still larger context, the Senator warned of the repeated attempts of the present administration to usurp legislative prerogatives. He suggested that if the procedures and deliberative processes of the Congress are too cumbersome and antiquated to deal effectively with present-day problems, the proper solution lies not in abdicating legislative responsibility in favor of the Executive but rather in reforming and improving the legislative process.

Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly endorse the Senator's position on this matter and I commend his thoughtful remarks to the attention of every Member of the House and to everyone else who is concerned with the continued vitality of our system of responsible self-government. Under leave granted, I include Senator KEATING's address in the RECORD:

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

(Address of the Honorable KENNETH B. KEATING, U.S. Senator, New York, before the 43d midwinter trust conference sponsored by the Trust Division of the American Bankers Association, New York City, Feb. 6, 1962)

"Where Do We Go From Here?" That's quite a title. It limits me a great deal to what I can talk about. It leaves out the past. I hope that this title, which was suggested by Tom Beacom, was not meant to reflect on my past.

You are all trust officers, or most of you are. That's a name that has always intrigued me. I wonder, is there any relationship between a trust officer and a confidence man?

* * * * *

We in the Congress in 1962 will wrestle with several great issues which will have a dramatic effect upon our Nation's future. Trade, health care for the aged, aid for higher education, tax reforms, civil rights, many others are critical. But new trade legislation, I believe, will be in the forefront of our problems.

This is one of those exciting turning points in our history. We are facing a new phenomenon—the growth of mighty constellations of trading power: the Common Market of Europe and the common markets of the future of Africa, Asia, and Latin America. Will we move forward or backward? Will we accept this challenge to speed the building of closer economic relationships among the nations of the free world, relationships which depend even more greatly upon the exchange of goods and services among nations?

This is not an issue for conservatives or liberals. It cuts both ways. It is liberal in the sense that it will expand trade. It is conservative in the sense that it will help us to preserve and strengthen the free enterprise system around the world.

We must move ahead: not as Democrats or Republicans, but as Americans.

We must work to build a businesslike understanding among free people, joined in a mutual striving for prosperity and peace—combining, to the fullest extent possible, the talents and energies of every nation that loves freedom and hates the atheistic Communist ideology that is dedicated to its destruction.

How shall we do this? This is the only real question; for do it we must.

The Congress will, I hope, enact a program that will permit an orderly progression toward wider trade contracts. I stress the word "orderly" for it is this concept of an orderly movement to expand trade that we must keep uppermost in mind.

Let me explain what I mean by orderly expansion.

While increasing our trade with the nations of the free world, we must at the same time see to it that our domestic economy is strong and that we permit it to continue to grow and prosper by reserving the condition for it to do so. Here at home, we must avoid having trade policy decisions bring about the unnecessary disruption of men and industries.

The President, as well as the Congress, is not unmindful of the importance of assuring an orderly expansion of trade among nations of the free world. I support the general objectives which the President outlined in his trade message, although I am certain that changes will and should be made in certain parts of the trade bill which he has recommended to the Congress.

Above all, the President left out one big and important point that affects the fundamental workings of our Government.

Since the war, the structure of our Government has changed drastically. The balance of powers within our Government is very different. It will never be the same again. The Congress, once the nerve center of initiative, has taken a distinct secondary role. For generations, Congress was in the front seat driving carefully at 35 miles an hour. Now, Congress is in the backseat and the President is navigating at thousands of miles per second, just to keep up in this age of space and astronautics.

The field of trade is one of the best examples. The Congress under the Constitution has the responsibility for trade matters. According to the Constitution, this power belongs to Congress and Congress alone. But this too is part of the past—gone the way of buggy whips, outdoor plumbing, and mustache cups.

Today, under the Trade Agreements Act—the so-called reciprocal trade program—the President negotiates trade agreements with foreign governments, which amounts, in fact, to the levying of tariffs. This act expires on June 30, 1962. In requesting an extension in the form of sweeping new tariff-cutting powers, the President did not make as much as a single mention of the role of the Congress in this vital area.

CONGRESSIONAL TRADE VETO

I have advanced a proposal to bring the Congress back into this picture. I recommended granting to the Congress—by a two-thirds vote—veto authority to disapprove major trade agreements negotiated by the executive branch.

Article 1, section 8, of the Constitution clearly assigns the Congress authority to "lay duties, imposts, and excises" and to "regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States." My proposal seeks to restore a portion of this authority to the Congress, recognizing that in the fast-moving world in which we live, the day-to-day implementation of trade policy must be under the control of the President.

This is how my proposal would work: When the President had negotiated a new trade agreement or a modification of an old one, he would send it up to the Congress. It would be referred to the Ways and Means Committee in the House and the Finance Committee in the Senate. The agreement would be before Congress for 60 days, at the end of which time it would go into effect as negotiated by the President unless both bodies of the Congress voted to disapprove it by a two-thirds vote.

If the relevant committee did not report out a resolution of disapproval but a Member of either body wanted to reject a given agreement, after 10 days the Member could move to discharge the committee. Discharging a committee requires a simple majority vote. If a resolution of disapproval passed both bodies, which would only be possible under quite extreme circumstances, the agreement would go back to the White House disapproved.

When you consider that the recent agreement with the Common Market took 16 months to negotiate, giving the Congress 60 days to think it over is not unreasonable.

It is my opinion that granting such a trade veto power to the Congress would have the additional advantage of helping to win the kind of broad congressional support necessary to take the giant step that we must take to strengthen and secure America's trade relations with the Common Market and with all of the nations of the free world.

In this continuing process of breaking down our own trade barriers, we must, of course, make certain that we get our money's worth. We must not trade horses for rabbits.

It is worthwhile to keep in mind that after World War II, when Europe was rebuilding, we went along with certain rather restrictive tariff rates and trade practices which have no justification under present conditions. For example, while we have always admitted large quantities of low-wage goods from countries such as Hong Kong and Japan, we have condoned the virtual exclusion of these goods from European markets. While we poured billions in foreign aid into war-ravaged areas and more recently into underdeveloped countries to bolster their economies and their standards of living, we have received relatively little help in this undertaking from some of our now prosperous allies. These factors are not given much notice in the various Executive messages touting the importance of the President's new trade bill.

Our Nation has long been at the forefront of the battle for expanded trade. In trade negotiations, when circumstances seemed to demand it, we have given miles to get inches. But the tables are turned. Europe is strong and prospering, a fact in which all Americans can take considerable pride. Now, Europe and the Common Market have an obligation to us. They must join in promoting and expanding trade. They must also put their shoulders to the task of rebuilding the less fortunate nations who want and deserve our support.

The growing strength of the Common Market is too often cited as the major and only reason for the President's new trade proposals. There is also good reason for insisting that our prosperous allies pay a fuller share of the aid programs, absorb a larger part of the world's exports, and do away with certain remaining preferential tariffs and quotas.

Reserving a veto power to the Congress appears to me necessary not only to conform to constitutional requirements, but to make sure that American industry and employees get a square deal. I am strongly in favor of breaking down artificial trade barriers. However, I would prefer to see more stress placed on flexibility than on the power of the President to make concessions. Trade is a two-way street. We are not going to get much from our trading partners if they think the only direction we intend to go is down.

POWERS OF THE PRESIDENT AND THE CONGRESS

This is not an isolated example of an area in which the President has attempted to assume powers formerly lodged in the Congress. Back-door spending—a banker's nightmare—is now a routine governmental practice. The President gets funds directly from the Treasury to spend as he wants, circumventing the time-honored, deep-voiced solons of Capitol Hill.

The President's annual budget message and his Economic Report are today major engines of initiative. The President acts. The Congress reacts.

The Reorganization Act, the means by which the President can rearrange the agencies of Government, is another example. The President submits a plan. The Congress can merely approve or disapprove. The initiative is his alone. The President, for instance, has used machinery to set up a new Department of Urban Affairs.

In this complex world in which we live, Executive action is being relied upon more and more. I do not question that there is justification for the Executive being given certain new powers to cope with the complex conditions of the postwar world. But I am concerned about the recurrent insistence on the part of the present administration that more authority be taken from the Congress and given to the President. If this trend is allowed to continue unchecked, I fear that the question, "Where do we go from here," will receive a less favorable reply. We cannot afford to permit our machinery of Government to become too centralized in terms of giving new and broader powers to the President.

The year 1962 has seen a new raft of proposals for more Presidential and less congressional initiative. The President now wants the power to lower taxes and to have a shelf of public-works projects to start when he thinks the economy is on the "bum."

Now you are bankers. Think about this. The President wants the power to lower taxes. Tell me, who in this whole wide country of ours is really against lowering taxes? Let the President send a bill to the Congress telling us how he wants to cut taxes; it would pass quicker than a bill to give lollipops to orphans.

He doesn't want the power to raise taxes. I wonder why?

I have made it clear that I am willing to accept a certain part of this trend away from the Congress and to the President, but I do not for a minute go along on his request for the power unilaterally to lower taxes. Nor can I readily accept his request for wide, new authority over tariffs unless it is coupled with congressional oversight to assure that the President administers our trade laws in the way in which the Congress intended.

Perhaps what we most need to do to govern our Nation effectively in the space age is modernize and strengthen the Congress, rather than to weaken it. We must make the Congress more responsive and more efficient. For example, it has been suggested that we could have longer sessions to meet today's challenges, with only a short summer recess. Similarly, we could set aside a special session for appropriations, obtain more and better staff people to serve our committees, get rid of the filibuster (the greatest evil in the legislative process), and make it easier to bring bills to the floor and act upon them with dispatch. I would endorse such moves. These and similar steps would help redress the growing imbalance between the executive and legislative branches of our Government.

This relationship between the President and the Congress cuts across many issues which are essential to our Nation's future. I hope that we will not make the mistake of permitting the Congress to become a vestigial, honorary branch of government—a parlor for thoughtful seers—a French Parliament or a House of Lords.

THE STRENGTH OF OUR ECONOMY

As bankers, I hope I have given you some insight into my views on economic issues as well as on the present challenge to the structure of our Government which I believe will greatly affect our Nation's future. Trade and taxes, both of which I have discussed, are economic issues of great moment in the Congress.

Let me add to these comments a few of my predictions as to the course of our economy in the months ahead.

Despite the President's insistence, I do not think his fiscal 1963 budget will balance. If it is not balanced, this will, of course, mean a speedup of inflation.

One of the best indicators of the condition of the price level, believe it if you like, is the price of mink pelts. Many observers claim that fur prices are an accurate barometer of overall price movement. This winter, prices on mink pelts are running 7½ to 10 percent ahead of last year. A bad omen.

If any of you gentleman are planning to buy minks for your ladies, you had best reconsider. You can tell them Ken Keating suggested that out of a patriotic service to our national economy, you should hold off. Fight mink. Fight inflation. This isn't going to make me popular with the ladies or the furriers, but it ought to nail down a great big slice of you gentlemen.

Prices, in recent weeks, have shown signs of deterioration in a number of other key industries. With our economy moving ahead in the thrust of a recovery, I reiterate that I am very much concerned about inflation in 1962.

On the international scene, our balance of payments position has gotten much worse. In the fourth quarter of 1961, we hit a sky-high rate of $5 billion outflow per year. This could become a grave problem, especially with inflation, if it continues into 1962.

These, I believe, are the two most important potential trouble spots. With the exception of inflationary pressures and an acceleration of our imbalance of international payments, I think we are in for good times. Our economy should continue upward, hopefully carrying with it a decline in present high unemployment rates.

So here I am. I have revealed my innermost prognostications. Next year, at your midwinter meeting, you may want to invite me to dinner. I hope I won't have to eat my words. But if I am wrong, you can serve me deflationary stew with a side order of balanced budget; and, for dessert, a small slice of recession pie, topped with a scoop of whipped predictions.

The 44th Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, in proportion to population few if any of the countries of the world have contributed so importantly to the growth and development and strength of the United States as has the small Baltic nation of Lithuania.

As one who represents a congressional district which includes among its residents a substantial number of people of Lithuanian descent, I speak from personal knowledge that Union County, N.J., is a better place in which to live because of their presence as our neighbors and fellow citizens.

If I may be pardoned a further personal reference, Mr. Speaker, I should like to inform our colleagues in the House that the prayer to be delivered at the opening of today's session in the Senate is scheduled to be offered by a distinguished constituent, the Right Reverend Monsignor Michael G. Kemezis, pastor of SS. Peter and Paul's Lithuanian Roman Catholic Church in Elizabeth, a man and priest greatly loved and honored by all who know him.

By commemorating the 44th anniversary of the declaration of Lithuanian independence, Mr. Speaker, we are honoring not only our fellow Americans of Lithuanian ancestry but all Americans, regardless of their national heritage, who share the love of freedom and liberty which has motivated the determination of Lithuanians everywhere to see their homeland free again.

Freedom is not an accidental quality, to be awarded or withdrawn arbitrarily or capriciously. It belongs, by the very nature with which Almighty God has endowed mankind, to every individual human being. Governments are required by the moral law to respect this freedom and to rule their countries in such a way as to give full scope to the growth and development, in freedom, of the capacities and talents of their people. Governments which deny freedom and which subject their people to the burdens of tyranny violate the law of God and invite the condemnation of the free world.

Freedom has another characteristic. It flourishes only where those who enjoy it take it seriously and strive to protect it and strengthen it and extend its benefits to others. It withers and dies where it is taken for granted, where apathy and disinterest reign, where it is used and exploited only to serve a selfish purpose.

It is important to remind ourselves of these fundamental facts about freedom, Mr. Speaker, and it is particularly appropriate that we do so on the occasion of Lithuanian Independence Day. Tragically, Lithuania lost its freedom or, more properly, was deprived of freedom by the force of arms and by the perpetuation of a foreign-supported tyranny, in gross violation of international law and of the God-given rights of man.

But Lithuanians have not capitulated to tyranny. They have not surrendered. At great sacrifice, they have continued to resist oppression. And in their determination to be free again, to establish once more an independent, truly Lithuanian government, they have the dedicated support of their fellow Lithuanians in America and of all Americans who cherish our Nation's heritage.

We shall not abandon Lithuania, nor forget her sister states of Latvia and Estonia. We, who represent our people in the Congress of the United States, are proud to rededicate ourselves to the noble objective of the independence of the Baltic States and the freedom of people everywhere.

As a part of my remarks on this occasion, Mr. Speaker, I include the text of resolutions adopted on January 28, 1962, by the Lithuanian-Americans of Linden, N.J., gathered under the auspices of the Linden Branch of the Lithuanian American Council, and signed by Vladas Tursa, president, and Stasys Vaiciunas, secretary:

RESOLUTIONS UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED ON JANUARY 28, 1962, BY THE LITHUANIAN AMERICANS OF LINDEN, N.J., GATHERED UNDER AUSPICES OF LITHUANIAN AMERICAN COUNCIL, LINDEN BRANCH, FOR COMMEMORATION OF THE 44TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DECLARATION OF LITHUANIA'S INDEPENDENCE

Whereas on February 16, 1918, the freedom-loving people of Lithuania through their representative council at the historic capital of Vilnius, proclaimed to the world the rebirth of a free and independent Lithuania; and

Whereas the years of independent government fully proved and justified the nation's integrity for self-government and completely warranted credence and recognition as a free and independent state, accorded her by the other world nations; and

Whereas the Soviet Union, in pursuance of secret agreements between Joseph Stalin and his government with Hitler and his government, in 1940 invaded, occupied and subjugated the three independent Baltic States—Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; and

Whereas Nikita Khrushchev, present head of the Communist Party and of the present Soviet Government, in October of last year at the assembled 22d Congress of the Communist Party made charges against Joseph Stalin, the late head of the Communist Party and Government of the Soviet Union, condemning him as an insane criminal and denouncing most of his acts and those of his government: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the American citizens of Lithuanian birth or extraction of Linden, N.J., reaffirming their adherence to the moral and political principles enunciated in the American Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States of America, call upon the Government of the United States to take cognizance of the admission by the present Government of the Soviet Union that the policies and actions of the Soviet Government under Stalin were criminal and that this admission should be made applicable to the Soviet policy in the Baltic States; and be it

Resolved, To request the Government of the United States to take appropriate steps through the United Nations and other channels to stop the policy of colonialism of Soviet Russia in the Baltic States and bring about the reexamination of the Baltic situation with the view of reestablishing freedom and independence to these three nations; and be it

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States, His Excellency John F. Kennedy; to the Secretary of State, the Honorable Dean Rusk; to the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, the Honorable Adlai Stevenson; to the U.S. Senators of New Jersey, the Honorable Clifford P. Case and the Honorable Harrison A. Williams; to the Representative of the Sixth Congressional District of New Jersey, the Honorable Florence P. Dwyer; and to the Governor of the State of New Jersey, the Honorable Richard J. Hughes.

A Tribute to DAV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to a statement made in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a U.S. Senator, calling the Disabled American Veterans an organization which has "little more than a shirttailful of active members who attend meetings."

I am familiar with the Paterson Chapter of the Disabled American Veterans, and I know that it is an active group composed of men who are dedicated to the protection of the rights of disabled veterans as well as to the welfare of our great Nation. I understand that other posts throughout the country are similarly active.

I do not think that the gentleman who made the statement intended to belittle the organization, but was carried away by the heat of debate. However, I would be remiss if I did not express my own sentiments about this fine organization.

Robert Welch and the John Birch Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I should like to include this statement which I have released to the press.

It may clear up some of the misunderstanding about Robert Welch and the John Birch Society.

The statement follows:

ROBERT WELCH AND THE JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY

There have been many comments recently about Robert Welch, the founder and present leader of the John Birch Society. I have the following observations to make on this subject:

1. I totally disagree with Mr. Welch's position about former President Dwight D. Eisenhower. I made this position very clear in April 1961 at a regular press conference. I have reaffirmed this position publicly on many occasions. The thesis that Mr. Eisenhower was either used by or was (a conscious agent of the Communist conspiracy) was advanced by Mr. Welch in a manuscript known as "The Politician." This has never been part of the John Birch Society. As a matter of fact, the council, made up of 28 fine dedicated citizens, disavowed Mr. Welch's position on this issue very clearly when the John Birch Society was founded in 1958. I personally have had other areas of strong disagreement with Robert Welch and have made this clear not only to the press and my constituents, but also to Mr. Welch himself.

2. Though I have had obvious and pointed disagreements with Mr. Welch in certain areas this does not mean that Robert Welch and/or other members of the John Birch Society cannot unite in several basic purposes.

(a) To encourage the education and responsible understanding among Birch members and all Americans of the threat which the Communist conspiracy poses for our Nation. Attorney General Robert Kennedy confirmed the need for knowledge and alertness when on September 24, 1961, he said: "Communist espionage here in this country is more active now than it has ever been." In the "Blue Book," Mr. Welch has stated: "All we must find and build and use, to win, is sufficient understanding. Let's create that understanding and build that resistance, with everything mortal men can put into the effort—while there still is time" (p. 174).

(b) To give all Americans a full understanding of the insidiousness of the Marxist doctrine to destroy our concept of constitutional freedom in this country.

(c) To regenerate in each citizen a proper appreciation of the protection of individual rights given to us by the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence.

3. Robert Welch and all the members of the John Birch Society are doing their part

to contribute not only to the resurgence of the conservative movement within the country, but also positively contributing to the anti-Communist program in this country.

4. There have been recommendations that Mr. Welch be asked to step aside because he is "damaging the cause of anticommunism." I disagree with this thought and wish to make that clear at this time. It seems unrealistic to me to ask any segment of our conservative anti-Communist movement to be removed from the battle line at the time when we are beginning to win and just because we do not agree with every item.

5. Strenuous discussion on all the vital issues is healthy and necessary in order to develop new approaches to solve the problems which face our Nation. Furthermore, the very existence of strenuous disagreement within conservative rank proves the vitality of the conservative anti-Communist movement. Conservatives, contrary to the concept peddled by the collectivist establishment, not only tolerates discussion and disagreement, but encourage it as a means of achieving the desired end of intellectual honesty and academic freedom.

6. Robert Welch is an intense foe of communism and the fact that he is the anti-Communist most often attacked in Pravda as well as other Communist publications throughout the United States and the rest of the world, attests to the validity of this thesis.

7. Finally, claims that the John Birch Society is Fascist or dictatorial are preposterous. Mr. Welch has said over and over: "Our members are told specifically and emphatically in our bulletins, about once every 3 months, never to carry out any of our requests or to do anything for the society that is against their individual consciences or even contrary to their best judgment." (Footnote 27, p. xv, 4th printing of the "Blue Book.")

Members of the John Birch Society are fine, dedicated, intelligent Americans who adhere to the motto "less government, more individual responsibility, and a better world." This motto as well as activities of the members, directed to this end, are completely consistent with the heritage passed on to us by the Founding Fathers of America.

All of Us Should Drink More

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, many of us have been alarmed for some time at the declining consumption in milk and dairy products brought about, in great measure, by overemphasis in certain media on the problems of nuclear fallout and cholesterol.

It was gratifying that the Department of Agricuture, with the participation of President Kennedy, recently held a National Conference on Milk and Nutrition. I hope that the conference has resulted in a clearing of the air with regard to the fears, real and imagined, which have blighted the reputation of milk as instrumental in adequate nutrition and good bodily health.

I recently received a letter from Mr. Vincent Crowley, of Crowley's Milk Co., Binghamton, N.Y., forcefully outlining the problems which have beset the dairy industry as a result of milk's poor publicity in recent months. I forwarded the letter to Secretary of Agriculture Freeman for his comments, and I here include excerpts from Mr. Crowley's letter, the letter of comment by Secretary Freeman, and a summary of the remarks made by President Kennedy at the recent conference:

CROWLEY'S MILK CO., INC.,
Binghamton, N.Y., December 27, 1961.
Hon. HOWARD W. ROBISON,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR HOWARD: I am writing you this rather lengthy letter because of two situations which are causing the milk industry considerable concern; namely, radioactive fallout in milk and milk products, and diet-cholesterol findings. It seems that every time we turn around, we are being clobbered by the press, radio, and television with regard to these two items. Since you are representing a dairy farming area, and this fallout scare certainly affects the farmer * * * your constituents need to be made aware of the facts in order to combat the sensationalist press.

Milk seems to be the press' favorite whipping boy. ..Why? We think it is because it is a food item produced the year around all over the United States. It is perfect for testing whereas other products used for testing are, at some time of the year and in some parts of the country, not in production, with the result that the milk industry is carrying the full burden of the testing and the publishing of the results. Our plight is partly the result of the sensational headlines which frighten our people and they curtail the use of dairy products which can lead to malnutrition. Unfortunately, the press does not try to make amends when someone does make a find which reverses much of the material they have put in print and circulated. This is not considered sensational, or apt to build their circulation, and consequently they bury such items in the back of the newspaper.

We have been hearing a great deal about strontium 90 in milk. In fact, HOWARD, we have accumulated a considerable file of articles, pamphlets, etc., on this very subject. Recently, the USDA reported the building of an extractor for taking strontium 90 out of milk. It is a very small and costly one, and it is estimated it will cost us 5 cents per quart to use such a machine for this purpose. It is possible to put one in use, however, considering all of the reports submitted here by the National Dairy Council, the Milk Industry Foundation, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and the Surgeon General, we can see no justification for putting this machine into use at this time.

From my own conclusions drawn from a recent report which appeared in the U.S. News & World Report (Nov. 27, 1961) by R. Lauriston Taylor, the chairman of the National Committee on Radiation Protection End Measurements, and chief of radiation physics, National Bureau of Standards, I am wondering what all the shouting is about. Mr. Taylor does not seem to be greatly concerned about the problem, at least not to the point the hysterical press is. His approach and outlook seem most sensible and what seems to be needed at this particular time, is a calm look at things, and a commonsense approach to the problem. After all, Mr. Taylor stated among other things, that a man sitting in front of his TV set night after night is getting as much radiation from sitting near the set as he is getting from fallout. (And I'll bet he won't give up his TV viewing just because this is so.)

I think we need to get the experts in this field to come to an agreement on what is and is not dangerous and above all, we need to have some strong assurance with regard to foodstuffs that there is no need for concern and for the changing of dietary patterns which could lead to malnutrition.

Pretty much the same situation exists with regard to cholesterol and the diet. Medical men so far cannot agree on the relationship between high blood cholesterol levels and cardiovascular disease. As a result, many physicians advise against specific fat-containing dairy products for the high cholesterol and cardiovascular disease patients with the result that margarine is substituted for butter, skim milk is on the increase, and in this year more doctors recommended against cheese and cream as butterfat containing products as did in 1959. These items appear in our newspapers, on radio and television as a matter of course, and many perfectly healthy, normal individuals become fearful, and curtail the use of dairy products in the hope of avoiding high cholesterol counts. In many cases, this practice leads to bad health habits and an impairment of bodily well-being. * * *

Sincerely,

VINCENT C. CROWLEY.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., February 2, 1962.
Hon. HOWARD W. ROBISON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ROBISON: Thank you for your letter of January 19, enclosing a letter from Mr. Vincent Crowley on the publicity on radioactivity and cholesterol in milk and its effect on milk and dairy product consumption.

The President and I have been concerned about the overemphasis in the press and other communication media of this subject and the implications of this publicity on the Nation's nutrition and physical fitness. The National Conference on Milk and Nutrition was called to discuss this problem. We are concerned also about other ramifications of this problem, including the effects on the welfare of our farm population and on our soil, water, and animal resources.

Enclosed are copies of two of the statements made at this conference including the statement by the President. As you will note, the President had this to say regarding fallout: "* * * It is abundantly clear that for the foreseeable future there is no danger from the present amount of exposure." Regarding cholesterol, he stated: "* * * The Food and Nutrition Board of the National Research Council has concluded after intensive research that the association of milk consumption and coronary disease due to the increase in cholesterol level has not been sufficiently established to justify the abandonment of this nutritious element except where doctors have individually perscribed special diets for those found to be susceptible to special cholesterol or coronary problems." He also pointed out that milk is still one of the best sources of nutrition for children and adults.

These points were brought out more fully at the conference by experts in each field.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary.

PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S REMARKS AT MILK AND NUTRITION CONFERENCE

Following is a summary of remarks made by President John F. Kennedy before the National Conference on Milk and Nutrition, Interdepartmental Auditorium, Washington, D.C., January 23, 1962, 10:30 a.m.:

"Thank you, Mr. Secretary. Ladies and gentlemen, I want to express my appreciation to all of you for participating in this conference, which I think is most important to our farmers and to our country.

"And I want to say a few words this morning about a very important subject to us all. And that is milk.

"Almost every State produces milk. It provides twice as much of the cash income for our farmers as any other basic crop. It's our most nourishing food.

"And last year we consumed either in the form of milk or in the form of butter, cheese, or ice cream, about 125 billion pounds of dairy products. But in the year before we consumed between 2 billion and 3 billion pounds more. At the same time, our population increased 1.7 percent. And milk production, in an effort to keep pace with population production, increased 1½ percent. And in that same time, milk consumption declined 2½ percent.

"This is a serious matter for us, serious for the dairy industry, for all of our farmers, and for the United States.

"First, it's a matter of concern because it implies poor nutrition and a less balanced diet.

"Secondly, it presents problems in the area of the management of our milk production. It will require adjustment. We cannot continue to accumulate dairy products in still larger inventories. Nor can we embark upon a policy that will jeopardize the economic interest of so large a segment of our farm population. For there is a close relationship between prosperity on the farm and prosperity in the city, between economic health of our farm community and the economic health of our Nation.

"Third, the drop in milk consumption has a serious implication for the best use of those soil, water, and animal resources that are now involved in dairy production. I doubt that anyone can be sure of the reasons of this sudden drop in consumption. We only know that the slow decline in consumption over a period of time became immediate and precipitous last year.

"I have long been convinced that milk is an important aid to good health. This has led me to direct that milk be served at every White House meal from now on. And I expect that all of us will benefit from it.

"If we are to be a vigorous and vital nation as we all desire, then, of course, we must depend on the consumption of a balanced diet. And milk must be a part of it.

"I am aware that there has been a good deal of public discussion about the effect of radioactive fallout upon our food supply. Most of the discussion has unfortunately used milk as an example of food products that might be contaminated. This recognizes the importance of milk in our daily diet, but it has the unfortunate effect of causing an identification in the minds of some between fallout and milk. I should like to correct any misunderstandings that may exist about this.

"The Public Health Service and other agencies have been instructed to keep the problems of fallout in food under constant surveillance. Detailed guidelines to protect the health of the people against radiation have been developed by the Federal Radiation Council. It is abundantly clear that for the foreseeable future there is no danger from the present amount of exposure.

"The milk supply offers no hazards—on the contrary it remains one of the best sources of nutrition for our children and for adults. And I hope that the American people will appreciate this more and more as time goes on. In addition, the Food and Nutrition Board of the National Research Council has concluded after intensive research that the association of milk consumption and coronary disease due to the increase in cholesterol level has not been sufficiently established to justify the abandonment of this nutritious element except where doctors have individually prescribed special diets for those found to be susceptible to special cholesterol or coronary problems.

"In the past 50 years, our children have grown more vigorous and sturdy because of better diets and better health. Our young adults are now about 2 inches taller than they were half a century ago. I should like, and I am sure all of us would like, to see this trend continue.

"A large proportion of our people now attain a physical condition once attained by a very few. But nutritionists tell us that 10 percent of our people still have an inadequate diet. The most serious deficiencies, I'm told, are in the very minerals and vitamins such as calcium and vitamin A—most prevalent in milk. I'm sure all of us would like to see this nutritional gap narrowed.

"Those who are familiar with the needs and the problems of our older citizens also tell us that older people need more calcium than they now get. Again milk offers the best and most economical source of this vital mineral.

"There are many schoolchildren today who do not participate in the school milk and school lunch programs because their schools do not and often cannot make them available. Last year we expanded these programs. I hope more and more children will be able to receive school milk and lunches in the days ahead. These find, I think, increasing support, these programs, among the people of other nations. We have encouraged this development and will continue to do so.

"These are some of the areas which I hope this conference will cover. I do not say that it is an easy matter that we are now faced with, but we do want to emphasize that this is a great productive resource of our country. We're rich in a very basic food. We are anxious to have the consumption of it increased as our population mounts and I believe that this conference will help bring attention of the public to what a valuable asset we have and to make sure that we develop it more fully. And therefore I want to express my thanks to all of you for being here today."

Speech Delivered by Senator Kerr at Columbia, S.C., February 7, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include a speech delivered by the Honorable ROBERT S. KERR, distinguished Senator from the State of Oklahoma, before a Democratic audience in Columbia, S.C., on February 7.

The speech follows:

I am delighted to be here tonight in this beautiful capital city with so many fighting, unterrified Democrats from the great Palmetto State—a State which was one of the original 13; a State whose star was sewed upon this Nation's first flag with the threads of bravery, patriotism, and religious reverence. Tonight that star still brightly shines in the constellation of the 50 States of this mighty Union, which is again moving ahead under the leadership of another great Democratic President.

I am delighted to be in the home State of all of your distinguished congressional delegation, especially my two great colleagues in the Senate, OLIN JOHNSTON and STROM THURMOND. I am glad to be here with your distinguished Governor Hollings and Congressman BOB HEMPHILL. I join with you in mourning the passing of your beloved Congressman, John Riley.

I came here tonight at the request of one of the Senate's most respected and powerful Members—my cherished friend and your senior Senator, OLIN D. JOHNSTON. Meeting and talking with many of you tonight made it easy for me to understand why the good people of your fair State have for 30 years elected OLIN JOHNSTON to serve them in public office. I became acquainted with him when we were both Governors. While I was Governor of Oklahoma I visited him in your Governor's mansion—a house unique in all America, fashioned from what was left of two homes after parts of each had been destroyed during the Civil War. Those of us who have been fortunate to serve as Senators with OLIN JOHNSTON in the Senate respect his knowledge and grasp of all the difficult matters that come before the Senate. And specifically, we look to him for leadership as chairman of the powerful Post Office and Civil Service Committee, as ranking Democrat of the virtually important Agriculture Committee, and as a member of the Judiciary, Appropriations, and other Senate and joint committees. In view of this, it is no wonder that since 1944, when you first sent him to Congress, his seniority in the Senate has grown to the extent that out of 100 Senators, only 10 now outrank him. Yet, in power and influence he is second to none.

I was not surprised when I read not long ago that the Republicans here have listed him as their No. 1 target for defeat in this State. I've got news for them—they will be like the fellow who tied himself to the 3-year-old bull. He said after about three jumps, he saw where he had made a terrible mistake.

A little over a year ago, during the last presidential campaign, both candidates came to this gracious southern capital city and asked for your votes for the highest office in this land.

Nixon stood on the steps of your capitol and told you that the Democratic Party had "forfeited its right to ask you to support it when it adopted its platform in Los Angeles."

Nixon further told you that you had never had it so good as you had during the past 8 years under Eisenhower, and he promised that it would be even better under him.

Kennedy stood on those same steps and sought your vote as the first Democratic nominee for President in the history of South Carolina to come to this State and ask your help. He did not promise you an easy road if you followed him. He said: "I think to be a citizen of the United States in the 1960's is going to be a burdensome and hazardous occupation." He asked for your prayers and your help, and he promised if he were successful he would get this country moving again."

The results of that historic election are known and have been felt in South Carolina and throughout this country. South Carolina joined the majority of the people across this Nation who shouted "no" to Nixon and another 8 years under the Republicans, and "yes" to John F. Kennedy. Thus in the tradition of Jefferson, Jackson, Wilson, Roosevelt, and Truman, we elected our youngest, and one of the greatest Presidents this country has ever known. And with him we elected the wise and able, distinguished, and competent Vice President, LYNDON JOHNSON. We do not claim perfection for either Kennedy or JOHNSON, but just think how much better off we are under them as our leaders than we would have been with Nixon and Lodge.

Since that election "poor Richard" has been in a state of confusion and semiretirement, and I understand that a fellow named Brown out in California is going to make Nixon's retirement permanent. But the confusion and frustration of the rank and file members of the Republican Party is even worse than Nixon's. No longer can they say "take me to our leader," because they don't know who their leader is. I understand the

Republicans have organized a committee to pick a nominee for 1964 who: looks like Rockefeller, talks like Goldwater, plays golf like Ike, who is as tricky as Dickie, and who thinks that a Rambler is somebody wheeling toward the White House. However, they wouldn't unite behind such a candidate if he could be found. They would much rather pursue their present course of "feuding, fussing and fighting."

John Kennedy assumed the Presidency during one of the most perilous times in the history of this country, and for that matter, in the history of mankind. After 8 years of Eisenhower there was deep trouble at home, and with the increasing Communist menace, there was more trouble abroad. Now we Democrats aren't like the Republicans who for 20 years have called us the war party. We do not say the Republicans created the cold war. But neither did they meet its challenges. And so when Kennedy assumed the Presidency, he also assumed the problems of a nation needing able and decisive leadership and of a world needing renewed hope and confidence in the United States and in the cause of freedom. And I might add, that not since the early days of Franklin D. Roosevelt's first term has a President moved so quickly and decisively on so many fronts.

In the field of agriculture, Kennedy inherited from Benson and Eisenhower a situation which shocked even the most hardened sensibilities. During the bleak period of the Eisenhower administration the farmer's share of the national income had been reduced from its alltime high to far below what it had been even in the dark days of the Hoover depression. While the farmer's net income had fallen to a 21-year low, the cost of his farm production had risen to an alltime high. But in spite of this sorry record, the cost of running the Department of Agriculture during those 8 years exceeded what it had cost to run that same department in the 100 years "B. B.", that is—"Before Benson." Benson may have gone back to sheep-herding but his name will live in infamy for a hundred years because of his mistreatment of the American farm families and their problems. What he did was like giving them an enema when what they needed was a transfusion. Benson sawed off the supports and cut back the parity on every agricultural commodity except tobacco. And had it not been for your ever-vigilant OLIN JOHNSTON, who helped write into law the firm 90 percent parity which could not be tampered with, Benson would have ruined your tobacco industry.

Since Kennedy took office, support prices have been increased, farmers have had a $1½ billion rise in net farm income, while the administration was making a real start in reducing the farm surplus. Kennedy promised to restore rural electrification to its former role of preeminence, "enabling that remarkable American institution to get on with its work of providing low-cost electricity and telephones for every American farm family." This was no idle campaign promise. He added $100 million to the Eisenhower budget request last year, and next year he has asked for $100 million more, for a total of $345 million, whereby more loans will be made and even more farm homes lighted. Here in South Carolina alone, nearly $95 million in loans were made to 28 borrowers who serve 143,000 farms and other rural consumers in this State. This year, service will be extended to 25,000 more rural consumers in South Carolina. What a record this is, in view of the fact that when REA was created in 1935, only 2.3 percent of the farms in this State had central electric service. OLIN JOHNSTON, as Governor of this State at that time, had a survey of rural electrical needs made, and then established South Carolina's REA program, a program which now accommodates 97 percent of your farm population with central station electrical service.

These are but a few examples of progress in the farm program since Benson left, but we know that many problems still face us in this area. Let us give thanks, however, that men and women sympathetic to the family sized farmer and his problems are in the saddle in Washington after 8 long desolate years under Eisenhower, Benson, Nixon. They are building programs which will help restore the faith in their Government of our producers of feed, food, and fiber.

Farmers now have more faith in their Government, and the consumers will have more faith in the farmers. We can be thankful that we now have a Secretary for instead of against agriculture.

Secretary Benson spent his time misrepresenting instead of representing the farmer. Now Secretary Freeman has a double load, not only to provide justice for the farmer, but to undo so many of the wrongs of Benson. Can you imagine Secretary Benson popping up in a supermarket to tell the housewife the farmer's side of the story? Thanks to Secretary Freeman, the consumer will learn that the farmer is his best friend, and that the average farmer does not have two Cadillacs in every field.

Now, for a moment, let us look at what is being done by this administration on other fronts.

A million more people are at work today than last year at this time. How different was Kennedy's attitude to the problems of unemployment than were the cruel words of Eisenhower's Secretary of Defense, when he called the unfortunate unemployed "kennel dogs who do nothing but sit on their fannies and howl."

In 1 year the Kennedy administration has brought us back from the valley of three recessions to the highroads of recovery and growth. Shortly after taking office, the President increased greatly the distribution of surplus food to the needy, established a pilot food stamp plan for critical areas, reduced FHA and community facility loan interest rates, directed the Veterans' Administration to speed up distribution of $258 million in life insurance dividends, and slowed the outward flow of our gold from Fort Knox and reduced the number of foreign claims against this gold. All of these quick decisive moves put more money into the sluggish economy left over from Eisenhower's recessions. How different were these actions from the cruel policies of the Republican leaders of high interest rates, hard money and tight credit.

President Kennedy also ordered a speedup in Federal procurement and in the building of public works and highway construction. What a pleasant change are these policies from Eisenhower's death knells of no new starts. I have often wondered where I would be if my mother and father had practiced the philosophy of no new starts.

President Kennedy's determined buildup, speedup, and firmup in the related fields of military preparedness, space, and foreign affairs have brought a complete change in the answer to the question, "Who's winning the cold war?"

In 1 year, the first year of the Kennedy administration, our overall military strength has almost doubled.

Our Navy is in control of the major seas of the world with close to 900 ships in our 4 fighting fleets containing 17 attack aircraft carriers (of which Russia has none). With the doubling of the acquisition rate of Polaris submarines we shall shortly have 41 of them carrying a total of 700 missiles with ranges of up to 1,800 miles.

In the air we have doubled the number of aircraft on ground alert since Kennedy took office, and at the end of this year, we shall have added to our current number of 1,200 jets capable of carrying nuclear weapons by building up 14 wings of the long-range B-52 bombers. Our bomber fleet is now several times the size of Russia's force, and this favorable gap is increasing daily.

On the ground, we will have by the middle of this year a total of 19 Army and Marine divisions equipped with modern weapons and experienced in guerrilla and other new tactics of warfare. These ground forces are expected to be 45 percent more effective than our forces last year.

The pendulum of the missile gap has now swung in our favor with production doubled on Minuteman missiles, and with the current rate of production on that missile and the Polaris, Titan and Atlas, we will have 1,700 missiles capable of being launched at Russia by 1965.

In the field of space, under President Kennedy, we have stopped strolling in the moonlight and have started racing for the moon.

Our space research has been broader, more methodical and has been conducted on much higher standards. We seek to conquer space not only for our national security but even more so for peaceful purposes. We strive, and will succeed to master the science of weather forecasting. Then will come control of the weather.

In a few short years, we will be operating a worldwide system of communication satellites—telephone, radio, television. What a day it will be when the golden voice of a Billy Graham or a Bishop Sheen can carry the message to a billion people of Jesus Christ, the Saviour and Prince of Peace.

In the overall space effort, we are now ahead of Russia and our lead continues to increase. A major deterrent to the U.S. space program has been the lack of a larger booster rocket. We now have it—the world's largest known rocket—the eight-engine Saturn which was successfully and dramatically fired from Cape Canaveral on October 27, a total success on its very first firing. It was larger than the Statue of Liberty, the height of a 20-story building, and generated a total thrust of approximately 1,300,000 pounds. This is half a million pounds more than the 800,000 pounds generally estimated for the first stage of the vehicles that put the Soviet Union's astronauts into orbit.

Real facts of the acceleration under President Kennedy and our programs for the future are both illuminating and dramatic.

Last year we launched more than eight times as many earth satellites as did the Russians, scoring a 34-4 victory.

In a few days, we hope, a U.S. astronaut will orbit the earth and later this year astronauts will make day-long journeys of 18 orbits.

In 1963 and 1964 we plan to orbit spaceships carrying two men on week-long orbits around the globe.

In 1964-65 our Apollo mooncrafts will be operational and will make training flights, training crews of threes for trips to the moon.

In 1966 our Saturn rocket will launch Apollos and crews on half-million-mile flights around the moon and back.

And, in 1967, President Kennedy's space program shall reach the spectacular goal of landing Americans on the moon by the use of the powerful Nova rocket.

In the field of foreign affairs Russia has been plagued by failures, while America has begun to regain prestige and respect.

Albania and Communist China have openly defied Russia's control of the Communist world, and other countries such as Rumania and Poland are tugging at the Russian leash. Inside the Kremlin an ideological battle is now dividing the leaders of Russia.

A great new economic force, the Common Market, is rising up on Russia's doorstep, and is becoming a new factor in the world's balance of power.

Since 1948 the only new conquest brought home to Moscow was that of Castro's Cuba. Guinea, once thought to be in the Communist orbit, recently caught and ousted the Russian Ambassador for directing a plot to overthrow the Government.

In this same field of foreign affairs, the United States has outstripped the Russians and we have stopped merely reacting to Communist aggression and started acting and taking decisive steps. Kennedy established a Peace Corps, harnessing our most valuable resource, our young people, as ambassadors of good will at the local level, working side by side with and among the people of 11 countries. Already numerous other countries have asked that a contingent of the Peace Corps be sent to them.

President Kennedy has strengthened NATO, has stood firm in Berlin, and has fought for a neutral government in Laos and for the unity and peace of the Congo. And Cuba has been made to swallow their own Castro oil; last week, Cuba was kicked out of the Organization of American States, thanks to the diplomatic moves by this administration at Puenta del Este. How good and how pleasant has been the change our image from the Ugly American to the image of strength and determination against our enemies, yet one of compassion and help to our friends and to those who need our aid in withstanding Communist aggression.

But all of these facts and figures cannot and do not tell the complete story of why we are winning the cold war under President Kennedy.

I believe the decisive ingredient is what is contained, and what has been rekindled, in the hearts and minds and spirits of 185 million Americans.

It is because of my faith in their faith, my confidence in their confidence, my courage because of the knowledge of their courage, my strength to endure because of their strength to endure, that makes me positive and convinced that America is most certainly winning and will continue to win the cold war.

Is there any wonder that after a year of positive action on all fronts that the Gallup poll shows that 85 percent of the people of this country approve our new President and his leadership.

We know that Kennedy and Johnson were elected because Eisenhower, Nixon and company had been tried and found wanting. After 8 years of being lulled with misstatements, misevaluations, and overdoses of political tranquilizers, the alarm clock has sounded. We have awakened to a world full of peril and pain, but a world offering the greatest opportunities and challenges ever known to mankind. We have accepted the challenges of the cold war, of outer space, and of our duties to our fellow Americans instead of dozing and dreaming with the Rip Van Winkle Republicans. You can feel the quickened pace, the vitality and the new will to compete and win. John Kennedy's election as President has brought about one of the most exciting transitions in evolutionary government that I have ever witnessed.

Let us unite under the banner of Democracy.

Let all Democrats show the way to America and to the world.

Let the battle be joined. Let us not be idle dreamers, but let us dare to dream.

Let us be fully prepared if war is forced upon us, but let us pray for peace.

Let us not act from fear, but not be afraid to act.

Let us gird our loins with patience in the knowledge that communism will not end tomorrow, but that when it does end, it will be a complete victory for democracy and freedom.

Let us bring a new meaning to those words our Founding Fathers penned at the conclusion of the Declaration of Independence, that to insure the successful outcome of this struggle we hereby "dedicate our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

Automation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday February 15, 1962

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert in the Congressional Record the text of an outstanding article entitled, "Automation," by my distinguished colleague on the House Education and Labor Committee, Congressman Elmer J. Holland, of Pennsylvania, who has been serving as chairman of the Subcommittee on Unemployment and the Impact of Automation.

Few Americans are so well informed on the implications of automation as Congressman Holland. His article contains a valuable summary of the reasons it is essential that Congress this year pass his bill, the Manpower Development and Training Act. I hope very much that the House of Representatives will soon have an opportunity for action on this legislation which was favorably reported by a bipartisan majority of 24 to 3 in the House Education and Labor Committee.

The text of the article, which was published in the February 2, 1962, issue of the Criterion in Indianapolis, Ind., follows:

Automation

(By Congressman Elmer J. Holland, of Pennsylvania)

There is little doubt but that automation has become a household word within the last decade in America.

We have pushbutton kitchens, laundries, garages and appliances in our newer homes and our older homes are being renovated and modernized to include these improvements.

The horizon holds almost unbelievable vistas for the individual with all our laborsaving devices.

However, on our way to that horizon we will—and we are—encountering quite a hazardous and rocky road.

As chairman of the special Subcommittee on Unemployment and the Impact of Automation during the first half of the 87th Congress, I listened to representatives of labor, management, government and educational institutions, testifying at our public hearings on this subject and they described the immediate and future problems for which we must find a solution. We all realize that automation is the promise of the future, but we also recognize that it is also a problem of the present.

We do not fear automation nor do we wish to avoid it. We know that we must have it in order to maintain the strength of the American economy and retain our world leadership.

However, we feel that the fruits of automation should be shared by all, not just a few.

We know the housewife welcomes all laborsaving devices in the home and the manager of an industrial plant welcomes laborsaving devices in the plant just as readily. The difference, however, is that in the plant, the mill, or factory these laborsaving devices mean the elimination of jobs.

If jobs are not available the housewife will not be in a position to buy these modern appliances nor can she look forward to enjoying the fruits of automation because an unemployed husband cannot supply such benefits for his home.

During our recent hearings it was brought out that—if we continue to automate at the present rate—we will eliminate 1½ million jobs a year. These are jobs in heavy industry and the service industries—production jobs, office jobs, clerical jobs, cleaning jobs, vending jobs, elevator jobs, and many more. These are both blue- and white-collar jobs.

Let me tell you what has happened in the past 10 years—the years of experiment and development in automation. (The official term is R. & D.—research and development.) You can then well imagine what the future holds since they are advertising now machines which make other machines.

In the electrical industry, production jobs decreased 10 percent or 89,000 less jobs, but production (output) increased 21 percent. Production jobs in the appliance field dropped 50 percent and in the production of electrical instruments production jobs dropped 15 percent or 30,000 jobs, but output increased.

Over 20,000 Illinois packinghouse workers have seen their jobs vanish in the meatpacking industry.

In the oil industry there are 10,000 less production workers than before but, here again, production is up. Incidentally, this is one of the most highly automated industries in our Nation.

In the auto industry, it is estimated that over 160,000 auto workers will never be recalled to work because of modernized plants.

In the chemical industry, production rose 80 percent from 1953 to 1960, yet production workers' jobs shrank by 13,000.

In the steel industry, it now takes 12 men to produce the same amount of steel that it formerly took 20 men to produce. In 1960 the same amount of steel was produced as in 1950 but there were 80,000 less steel workers in 1960.

During the postwar period, productivity in the soft coal industry rose 96 percent but employment—jobs for miners—fell by 262,000 jobs.

Railroad productivity rose by 65 percent during these years but employment fell by 540,000 jobs eliminated.

In the offices, it has been estimated, there were 10,000 computer installations during 1961 and each installation affects approximately 140 people. Therefore, it was expected that 1,400,000 workers would be affected last year as a result of these installations. Mr. Howard Coughlin, president of the Office Employes' International Union, testified that within the next 5 years he would not be surprised to see at least 4 million office workers replaced by computers.

It is true, of course, that many of these individuals who have been replaced by machines, computers and the like, have not been thrown out of work immediately. Many of our industries have found other jobs for them. However, in most cases the workers have been downgraded, or forced to work for less money at a lesser job. Upon their retirement or resignation, their job is eliminated and no one is hired to replace them.

This practice is called silent firing and covers—in many cases—the claims made by industry that automation is not responsible for our present unemployment problem. Nevertheless, jobs are not available for the new entrants into our labor market.

During the years between 1960 and 1970, we will have from 1½ to 2½ million yearly enter the labor market. These are high school graduates and, while some will go on to college, it is estimated there will be 26 million seeking jobs. What jobs?

In New York City alone, during the past 10 years, 25,000 elevator operators have been replaced by the automatic elevator. Vending machines have replaced salesmen, cleaning machines have replaced charwomen and custodians, dishwashing machines have replaced dishwashers in hotels, hospitals, schools, institutions and similar establishments. These conditions exist in other cities too.

Today there are over 1 million long-term unemployed. These are men and women—unskilled or skilled in only one field—and that field has been automated.

We also have 1.5 million young people between the ages of 17 and 21 who are unemployed, many of whom never have been able to find a job.

Both these groups need additional education and training if they ever hope to secure employment.

This, then, is our immediate problem.

In an effort to assist those who are classified as "long-term unemployed" last August I introduced legislation known as the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1961, H.R. 8399.

At the time of this writing, the Holland bill is in the Rules Committee of the House and is expected to be among the first order of business of that committee when it meets later this month.

There has been much interest in this legislation. The Kennedy administration has endorsed it and is anxious to see it passed. Many of the more liberal leaders of industry are also in favor of its passage. However, I must admit there is opposition to it and that comes from some highly organized groups within industry such as the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers.

The Holland bill provides a program for training our long-term unemployed. While attending such classes, the participant will receive an allotment from the Federal Government equal to the unemployment compensation rate paid by the State in which he resides.

This, of course, will not be in addition to unemployment compensation for those who are attending these classes are no longer eligible for unemployment compensation. (At the present time all but 15 States in America prohibit those on unemployment compensation from attending retraining classes as the laws in the 39 States explicitly say that "the recipient of unemployment compensation must be able to go to work immediately if called upon to do so." There is a move on to correct this as it is now recognized that everyone should have the opportunity to secure additional education in order to improve their capability. However, the correction cannot be made under this particular legislation—it must be a separate bill presented by the Ways and Means Committee.)

The courses, under the Holland bill, will be given under vocational school supervision and on-the-job training and will be no longer than 52 weeks in duration.

In order to qualify for such training, the applicant will apply to the State employment offices and there he will be given necessary tests to find out his aptitude and ability. He will then be counseled as to what course he should take.

The courses recommended and taught will be in skills which will be needed in the years ahead.

In order to assure those taking part in this program that they will not be taught needless skills, the Holland bill has provided that authority be given to the Secretary of Labor to conduct a nationwide survey on our manpower needs and our manpower resources.

There is little doubt that many of the long-term unemployed are undereducated for our highly automated industrial world, and unless we help them to secure additional educational opportunities, the remainder of their lives will be spent on public assistance rolls at the full expense of the taxpayer.

The cost of the program, under the Holland bill, has been estimated to be approximately $260 million for 2 years. Those who oppose it state we cannot afford to spend this money now.

I would like to point out that our public relief rolls are continually growing and today we are spending over $2 billion a year—that is State, county, and Federal costs. If we can get a program, such as I have suggested, underway, I am sure the public assistance rolls can be reduced, little by little. I firmly believe we cannot afford not to put this program into effect.

The Department of Labor expects to get at least 200,000 retrained and reemployed under this program, thereby letting these people again support their families, educate their children, live as human beings and contribute to the national economy with their purchasing power.

The Secretary of Labor will find out the plans of our industries and our businesses and their need for specified manpower in the next 5 or 10 years. This will be based on an estimate, of course, for we all know that every successful industry or business enterprise has plans for their future. However, their cooperation is needed if we hope to have full employment and an expanding economy here in the Nation.

When the needs of our industrial society are known, the Secretary of Labor can then specify the courses to be provided and financed by the Federal Government. The individual States will then be notified and through their departments of education such schooling can be offered the unemployed.

We recognize that even with the passage of the Holland bill, all our problems will not be solved. However, many of us feel that without it we will never be able to get many of our long-term unemployed off the relief rolls and enable them to become self-sustaining.

In 1959, a special educational census was conducted and it showed that we had 7.8 million functional illiteracies in our Nation—of these 2.6 million had never attended school. This total consisted of 6.4 percent of the white population over 25 years of age and 23.5 percent of the nonwhite population over 25 years of age. These people will become taxpayers again, and cease to become "taxtakers."

There will be some who say that under the recent Area Redevelopment Act a retraining program was offered and, up to date, it has not proved to be very successful. I would like to call their attention to the fact that the training provided under this act is only for 16 weeks, and in today's world of automation and technical skills, not much can be learned in 16 weeks, especially if any academic training is needed as is the case most of the time. Also, only those residing in certified depressed areas can receive this training.

Those opposing this bill—H.R. 8399—state that individual workers, under the free enterprise system, have the responsibility to secure additional education themselves. They also state that industries and businesses should be required to retrain those whose positions have been eliminated.

In answer to the first suggestion, unemployed workers cannot afford to pay for additional education, even if it is available.

As to having industries and businesses retrain those they dismiss, in the cases of large companies this may be feasible, but here I should like to point out that even Westinghouse Electric has just discontinued its apprentice training course. In the case of small companies—the cost would be too great.

Recently the Wall Street Journal had a feature story—"Job Outlook—Many Firms Will Boost Hiring, but Efficiency Increase Limits Needs." In the story it says: "The Nation's factory workers will find more jobs open in the early months of 1962 but probably not enough more to put back to work everyone furloughed during the recent recession." It further states: "The companies which do not need more workers now say they have no trouble finding unskilled or semi-skilled workers to man production lines, but for skilled workers, including machinists, draftsmen, and especially engineers, the story is often very different." Also the paper reported: "Other concerns are relying largely on greater efficiency rather than more workers to boost output."

In Houston, Tex., just several weeks ago, it was announced that there was in operation a wholly automated steel mill which produced seamless pipe.

In New York City, a wholly automated train was put into operation in the subway between Times Square and Grand Central Station. This was on a trial basis, but the handwriting is on the wall. Similar trains are now being suggested to solve the mass transit systems in many cities.

At Boeing Airplane Co.'s plant in Wichita, Kans., a piece of aluminum is lifted onto a machine bigger than a three-story house. After more than 100 operations, it comes out the wing skin of a B–52 plane. Nowhere in the machining process does a human hand touch the aluminum, nor is there a machinist standing by. A computer does the work.

At Food Machine and Chemical Corp.'s plant in Hoopeston, Ill., 80 holes are drilled and tapped in a piece of steel moving through another giant tool. The steel comes out a finished part for a food-processing machine. No human operator is in sight.

In Washington, D.C., a computer is coming to the rescue of lawyers who must wade through thousands of old cases in search of precedents. The project uses computers to track down information such as law case references and legislative history buried in the mass of legal literature. It is aimed at cutting to a minimum the delays and drudgery connected with research or merger or monopoly cases. At the hearings of my subcommittee last summer, it was reported that such a machine could—in 11 minutes—do the work now done in 7 hours by a law clerk.

These examples are just a few of what is ahead of us, what we can expect, and what we must prepare for.

While the Holland bill deals only with our long-term unemployed, the heads of families, so to speak, we realize the problem of our young people entering the labor market is one that must be faced and solved, also.

Let me point out that our young people must be encouraged to get as much education as possible.

Today, even a high school diploma is seldom enough to secure a position. Last year one of the mills in Pittsburgh hired only young men with 1 or 2 years' college education for laboring jobs. Their argument was that in the years ahead—in order to grow with the company and the continual increasing use of technology—at least a basic college education was necessary.

Possibly if our high schools upgraded their curriculum and offered some technical training—definitely more mathematics, more languages, more science—our young people would be better fitted to work and live in the highly automated society we will have.

Possibly junior colleges must be opened in our cities and counties, providing additional educational opportunities to our youth thereby preparing them more adequately to earn a living, support and raise a family, and eventually take over the management of this Nation of ours.

We must remember today's youth—tomorrow's leaders.

The future of our Nation depends upon them. We must give them the best if we want America to remain a world leader.

As I stated earlier in this article, the administration is in favor of the Holland Manpower Development and Training Act, and President Kennedy, in his state of the Union address stressed the importance of this act and asked for its immediate enactment.

He said that our unemployed "whose only skill has been replaced by a machine, or moved with a mill, or shut down with a mine" must be given the opportunity to secure retraining if we ever hope to have them return to work.

In recognition of the unemployment problem of our inadequately educated and trained youth, the President also asked that the Youth Employment Opportunities Act be passed this session.

The word "automation," that household term, is certainly changing our present way of life. It will be responsible for even greater changes in the years ahead.

SENATE

Monday, February 19, 1962

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, strong to save, amid the shifting shadows of the temporal, take Thou the dimness of our souls away, so that with clear and clean eyes we may discern the shining truth of the eternal.

Forgive us that in the heat of partisanship so often we have forgotten that above our selfish ambitions and our hollow pride lie unchangeable verities like granite peaks piercing the sky.

Facing days which tax all their resources, give to Thy servants here in the stewardship of public affairs the untroubled calm which illuminates faith in the final triumph of every true idea let loose in the world, against which the gates of hell cannot prevail.

In a world which is a battlefield where truth and falsehood are locked in mortal combat, even as we face unnumbered foes endeavoring to destroy the things which to us are dearer than life, bar our own hearts to all cynicism and hatred.

As we fight the good fight with all our might, may our strength be as the strength of 10 because our hearts are pure.

We ask it in the name of the Holy One who declared, "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God."

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 15, 1962, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 258) to amend the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act to increase the rate of tax imposed on certain gross receipts, to amend the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Parking Facility Act of 1942 to transfer certain parking fees and other moneys to the highway fund, and for other purposes.

CALL OF THE CALENDAR DISPENSED WITH

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the call of the Legislative Calendar was dispensed with.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, it was ordered that statements in the morning hour be limited to 3 minutes.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, at this time I should like to ask the majority leader about the schedule for today and for the remainder of the week, if at this time he can give us some indication in that regard.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in reply to the question asked by the distinguished minority leader, let me say it was anticipated that today the Senate would proceed with consideration of the President's proposal to create a Cabinet position for Urban Affairs.

However, in view of the fact that the committee under the chairmanship of the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan] has worked with such diligence and dispatch in holding hearings and in trying to comply with the wishes of the Senate in this respect, I believe it only fair and proper that the Senate, in turn, observe the normal rule of procedure which has marked this institution through the years. Consequently, there will be a postponement, for the time being, of consideration of the President's proposal.

The pending business will be House bill 5143, Calendar No. 496, to amend section 801 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901. There has been some small amount of debate on that measure. It is hoped that the Senate can dispose of it either today or tomorrow.

It is anticipated that other items on the calendar will be brought up during the course of the week; and the Senate will be in session every day this week, in an effort to clear the calendar.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I certainly applaud the majority leader's decision. Over the weekend I have followed the news in regard to the reorganization proposal—not only through the Committee on Government Operations, headed by the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas, its chairman, but also through the minority leadership. I understand that some of the testimony taken before that committee is still to be corrected, before it can be returned to the committee. The distinguished chairman of the committee can speak about that for himself.

However, under the circumstances I think the course stated by the majority leader is a wise and prudent one to follow—and then to make sure that every Member is on notice that, other things being equal, the reorganization measure will be taken up a week from today.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I cannot commend too highly the chairman of the Government Operations Committee, the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan]. Certainly he has shown diligence and dispatch in connection with consideration of the reorganization plan. It is the feeling of the leadership, after consultation, that the course which has been announced is the proper one; and we hope it will apply wherever possible in all cases in connection with proposed legislation of this nature.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the distinguished majority leader yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I appreciate very much the statement of the majority leader in regard to this problem. There are some who are very anxious to have the bill he has mentioned disposed of at an early date.

As chairman of the committee—and I speak for all members of the committee—I wish to state that there has been no undue delay. In fact, we have moved with expedition in an effort to process the bill, so there will be a record on it, and so that those who have very firm views about the merits of the proposal will have had an opportunity to register their views and to give their testimony.

So far as I know—and I said this also last Friday afternoon—the public hearings are closed. We did keep the record open, so that insertions might be made of statements which were submitted—as is proper—and also so that we might insert in the record certain information requested from the Director of the Budget. That information had not been received early this morning; it may arrive here during the day. When it is received, it is the intention of the chairman of the committee formally to close the hearing and to close the record, and to send the record to the Public Printer. After it is returned from the Public Printer, we shall call a meeting of the committee and shall ask it to deliberate and to take appropriate action—whatever it may desire. Then, of course, we shall undertake to file a report in due time.

There never has been any purpose to procrastinate, delay, or obstruct. Quite the contrary, the committee has moved expeditiously, in view of the fact that the plan was submitted on the 31st of last month, and also in view of the fact that 60 days in which to act are available. So we have moved with dispatch, for before the end of 20 days we have the record at the point of being closed, and now we are ready to have the committee proceed with its action and report thereon. Thus, obviously, if this matter comes up next Monday, or even if it is delayed until the following Monday, it will be disposed of by this body in half the time allowed by the statute for the taking of action.

If that is done, I think we shall have moved with considerable dispatch in dealing with this highly controversial matter.

I thank the majority leader for the announcement he has made.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time available to the Senator from Montana, under the 3-minute limitation, has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be recognized for an additional 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is my hope, in accord with what the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan], and the distinguished minority leader [Mr. Dirksen] have said, that we shall be able to call up the reorganization proposal between now and Monday next. It would be my guess, barring unforeseen circumstances, that the day might well be this coming Monday.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. On the Senate Calendar is a bill, Order No. 1187, S. 2533, to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act. I was wondering if there could be early consideration of that measure, for the reason that it has a March 20 time limit. The Department of Agriculture is in favor of the bill, which will have an effect on the signing up for wheat acreage allotments in the wheat-producing areas.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish to assure the Senator from Kansas that that proposal will be taken up within the next few days.

Mr. CARLSON. I thank the Senator.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, and take up nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the nominations in the Department of State.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Department of State be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

AMBASSADOR

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Walter P. McConaughy, of Alabama, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Pakistan.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the nominations in the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Without objection, the President will be immediately notified of the nominations confirmed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

Standby Capital Improvements Act of 1962

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to help achieve the objectives of the Employment Act of 1946 by providing standby authority to accelerate capital expenditure programs of the Federal Government and State and local public bodies (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Report on Manned Spacecraft Center

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the construction of the new Manned Spacecraft Center, Houston, Tex.; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

Amendment of Section 7 of Federal Home Loan Bank Act

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 7 of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Report on Federal Aid in Fish Restoration Program

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on activities of the Federal aid in fish restoration program, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

Recording of Liens on Motor Vehicles and Trailers Registered in the District of Columbia

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of July 2, 1940, as amended, relating to the recording of liens on motor vehicles and trailers registered in the District of Columbia, so as to eliminate the requirement that an alphabetical file of such liens be maintained (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Report on Review of Maintenance of Certain Tanks Assigned to Fort Bragg, N.C.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a secret report on the review of maintenance of M48 and M48A1 medium tanks assigned to and reserved for the 4th Medium Tank Battalion, 68th Armor, Fort Bragg, N.C., dated February 16, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Personal and Real Property Received by State Surplus Property Agencies for Distribution to Public Health and Educational Institutions and Civil Defense Organizations

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on personal and real property received by State surplus property agencies for distribution to public health and education institutions and civil defense organizations, for the period October 1 through December 31, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Coal Research

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on activities relating to coal research, dated February 15, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Revision of Boundaries of Capulin Mountain National Monument, N. Mex.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to revise the boundaries of Capulin Mountain National Monument, N. Mex., to authorize acquisition of lands therein, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Suspension of Deportation of Certain Aliens

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law pertaining to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Temporary Admission Into the United States of Certain Aliens

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered, granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Proposed Report of Chief of Engineers, Relating to East Fork of Trinity River and Tributaries, Texas

A letter from the Director of Civil Works, Office of the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, Washington, D.C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of the proposed report of the Chief of Engineers, together with a copy of the report of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, on a review of the reports on the East Fork of the Trinity River and tributaries, Texas (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

Disposition of Executive Papers

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Archivist of the United States on a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. Johnston and Mr. Carlson members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the Sixth Guam Legislature; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Resolution 362

"Resolution relative to soliciting the necessary participation of commander, naval forces, Marianas, in assisting the Government of Guam in the establishment of new businesses within Guam, particularly the establishment of another fuel distributing company on Guam

"Whereas for the past 4 or 5 years, numerous comments have been made on the floor of the Guam Legislature and resolutions have been introduced soliciting other fuel distributing companies to establish a distribution branch here on Guam, because of the unfair practices of the single solitary fuel distributing company which has been here on Guam for many years; and

"Whereas again very recently, the attention of the members of this legislature was solicited relative to the unfair practices of this solitary fuel distributing company on Guam, in that it has now started on a crash program, purchasing or leasing lands, and constructing service and gasoline stations within close proximity to independently owned service and gasoline stations; and

"Whereas in addition to the foregoing, several years ago, independent service and gasoline station owners engaged in the business of hauling and selling fuel oil to retail gasoline stations, but that this company thereafter, by making its own deliveries, at lower cost than the small independent operators, finally closed these small independent operators in such business; and

"Whereas such company again has been asserting tremendous pressure on independent owners of service stations to execute contracts with such company to purchase fuel oil exclusively from said company to the extent that these small independent gasoline owners were threatened to have their fuel pumps and fuel tanks removed from the premises; and

"Whereas this Legislature, ever mindful of its duty to safeguard the public good, will protect these owners who are depending on their service stations for their livelihood from the tentacles of this monopolistic oil company now here on Guam; and

"Whereas several years back this existing oil company was leasing U.S. Government property for a minimum rental, but after another fuel distributing company had signified its intention and interest in establishing another fuel outlet here on Guam, the authorities and the said fuel company increased the rental from a few dollars per year to $40,000; and

"Whereas the establishment of another fuel company here on the island will give this existing monopoly competition, all for the good and welfare of not only the civilian community but also the military as well, for the simple reason that two companies may provide lower prices in fuel oil to the military as well as to the civilians and further in case of an emergency, two suppliers rather than one will be available for the distribution of this essential commodity; Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That Commander Naval Forces Marianas be and he is hereby respectfully requested to assist the Government of Guam (and by doing so to promote our program of national defense) in providing the necessary land site in Cabras Island for the construction of a bulk plant and other necessary equipment; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That Commander Naval Forces Marianas be and he is hereby respectfully requested to extend his full cooperation and assistance, upon which so much depends, toward the establishment of another fuel company on Guam, and to whichever fuel oil company is interested in establishing a distribution plant here on Guam; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the speaker certify to and the legislative secretary attest the adoption hereof and that copies of the same be thereafter transmitted to Commander Naval Forces Marianas, to commander in chief, Pacific, to the Secretary of the Navy, to Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson, to the Secretary of the Interior, to the chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and to the Governor of Guam.

"Duly adopted on the 6th day of February 1962.

"V. B. Bamba,
"Legislative Secretary.
"A. B. Won Pat,
"Speaker."

A resolution adopted by the National Lutheran Council, New York, N.Y., reaffirming its 1951 statement of confidence in the usefulness of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Fort Worth, Tex., Real Estate Board, protesting against the enactment of legislation to establish a Department of Urban Affairs; to the Committee on Government Operations.

A resolution adopted by the Austin, Tex., Association of Home Builders, protesting against the enactment of legislation to establish a Department of Urban Affairs; to the Committee on Government Operations.

RESOLUTIONS OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Smith] and myself, I present resolutions of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to Federal aid authorized to cities and towns in the construction of their sewage treatment facilities. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be printed in the Record and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, as follows:

Resolution Memorializing the Congress of the United States To Increase the Amount of Federal Aid Authorized to Cities and Towns in Their Construction of Sewage Treatment Facilities

Whereas one of the great problems facing the local, State, and Federal governments today is water pollution; and

Whereas although great progress has been made on this problem, a great financial burden has been placed on many cities and towns because of the requirement to appropriate large sums of money in carrying out this program: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts House of Representatives urges the Congress of the United States to pass legislation increasing the amount of Federal aid authorized on approved projects from 30 to 60 percent of the cost of construction of sewage treatment facilities and to increase the maximum amount authorized on each project to $800,000; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

Adopted by the house of representatives January 9, 1962.

William C. Maiers,
Clerk.

Attest:

Kevin H. White,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

RESOLUTION OF RHODE ISLAND GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pell] and myself, I present, for appropriate reference, a certified copy of a resolution passed by the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations at the January session, 1962, and approved by the Governor on February 2, 1962.

This is a resolution memorializing the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States with respect to Federal income taxation of the interest derived from public bonds.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

Resolution Memorializing the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States With Respect to Federal Income Taxation of the Interest Derived From Public Bonds

Whereas the State of Rhode Island and the political subdivisions thereof have, in the past, and are now currently engaged in financing, through the issuance of bonds, needed public improvements such as the building of schools, highways, water and sewer distribution systems, and other projects for the promotion of the health, safety, and welfare of the people; and

Whereas the interest income which the owner derives from such bonds has in the past and is now currently exempt from the imposition of any Federal tax; and

Whereas the Federal taxation of the interest of such bonds, as income, would result in the curtailment of construction of needed public improvements and would result in either an increase of taxes imposed by the State of Rhode Island and any political subdivision thereof in order to pay higher interest costs, or the assumption by the Federal Government of the responsibility of financing such improvements; and

Whereas there is currently a national movement to permit the imposition of the Federal income tax on the interest income from the bonds issued or to be issued by the several States and their political subdivisions: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to oppose any amendment of the Constitution of the United States, or any other action by the Congress of the United States, or the executive branch thereof, which would have the effect of subjecting the income from State and local bonds to a Federal tax or to cause the tax to be increased because of such bond holdings by a taxpayer whether or not the increase is in fact titled a tax; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States.

COLORADO OPPOSES CHANGE IN PENSION RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, the senate and house of representatives of my State of Colorado recently memorialized the Congress to advise of Colorado's opposition to any amendment of the Social Security Act which would lower the period of residence required for persons claiming State old-age assistance.

As Senators know, old-age-assistance programs in the several States are partially dependent on the Federal Government for grants-in-aid. Several weeks ago President Kennedy, in his welfare message, recommended that States participating in this Federal aid be required to lower their residence requirement for claimants to a maximum of 1 year.

Colorado, like 18 other States, requires its class A pensioners to be residents for at least 5 of the 9 years preceding application for assistance. In all, there are 23 States requiring residence periods of more than 1 year by individuals applying for old-age assistance.

Colorado has excellent reasons for opposing any change in residence requirements. For 25 years my State has maintained a pioneering program in old-age assistance. Colorado citizens have cheerfully paid a 2-percent sales tax to help maintain that program for their needy aged. Since 1957 Colorado has maintained a medical care program for its elderly and needy citizens financed out of this tax. Monthly cash benefits to Colorado pension recipients average $98, and the maximum monthly benefit is $108 per person. I am informed that only one State, Connecticut, pays more.

This program, Mr. President, is a great source of pride to most Colorado people. Inevitably, it is also an object of envy for elderly citizens of other States which are not doing as much for their elderly.

Benefits in neighboring States fall far short of the levels provided by Colorado. It is feared that if residence requirements are suddenly and sharply lowered by Federal legislation, many thousands of citizens of other States will flock to Colorado to share in the Colorado program. But there is a limit to the money available for this purpose. Colorado has many other needs. And the medical care program—for which all Colorado pension recipients are eligible—is limited by the State constitution to $10 million per year.

Inevitably, an influx of new pension recipients from other States would dilute the benefits available to those who have lived in Colorado for many years and helped build the State.

Mr. President, the people of Colorado believe this is no way to encourage other States to be as humane as Colorado has been toward its elderly.

Although the objective of President Kennedy's request is laudable and high minded, I am quite certain that Mr. Kennedy was not informed of what the effects would be on Colorado and on certain other States. Had he been informed, I am equally certain that his proposal would have been modified.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the Record the memorials passed by the Colorado Senate and House of Representatives.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SENATE MEMORIAL 3

Memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States not to take any action which would lower State residence requirements for recipients of old-age assistance

Whereas Colorado has, by vote of its citizens, provided one of the most adequate pension systems for the aged in the entire United States; and

Whereas Colorado in 1957 substantially improved the care for its aged citizens by providing the finest medical program in the Nation; and

Whereas the 5-year residence provision in the present program is a reasonable protection against an influx into Colorado of aged people from other States with lesser pension programs; and

Whereas the proposal by the national administration to reduce this residence requirement to 1 year would encourage great numbers of aged persons from other States to move to Colorado in order to take advantage of the Colorado pension system; and

Whereas the addition of great numbers of persons to the present program would substantially reduce the level of medical care now provided under the $10 million limitation of Colorado's medicare program and cause serious dislocations in the entire program: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the 43d General Assembly of the State of Colorado, That this general assembly hereby memorializes the Congress of the United States and the President of the United States to take no action which would lower the residence requirements now in effect for recipients of old-age assistance, with the resultant disastrous effects on the States now providing the best old-age pension and medical programs; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the United States and to the Members of Congress of the United States from the State of Colorado.

ROBERT L. KNOUS,
President of the Senate.
LUCILE L. SHUSTER,
Secretary of the Senate.

HOUSE MEMORIAL 2

Memorializing the President and the Congress of the United State not to take any action which would lower State residence requirements for recipients of old-age assistance

Whereas Colorado has, by vote of its citizens, provided one of the most adequate pension systems for the aged in the entire United States; and

Whereas Colorado in 1957 substantially improved the care for its aged citizens by providing the finest medical program in the Nation; and

Whereas the 5-year residence provision in the present program is a reasonable protection against an influx into Colorado of aged people from other States with lesser pension programs; and

Whereas to reduce this residence requirement to 1 year would encourage great numbers of aged persons from other States to move to Colorado in order to take advantage of the Colorado pension system; and

Whereas the addition of great numbers of persons to the present program would substantially reduce the level of medical care now provided under the $10 million limitation of Colorado's medicare program and cause serious dislocations in the entire program: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 43d General Assembly of the State of Colorado, That this general assembly hereby memorializes the Congress of the United States and the President of the United States to take no action which would lower the residence requirements now in effect for recipients of old-age assistance, with the resultant disastrous effects on the States now providing the best old-age pension and medical programs; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the United States and to the Members of Congress of the United States from the State of Colorado.

ALBERT J. TOMSIC,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
GENE MANZANARES,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF KANSAS LEGISLATURE

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the recent budget session of the Kansas Legislature adopted House Concurrent Resolution 12, relating to Federal income taxation of the interest derived from public bonds.

This resolution expresses their opposition to any amendment to the Constitution of the United States or any action by Congress or the executive branch which would tax the income from State, municipal, or local bonds.

I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be referred to the Senate Finance Committee.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 12

Concurrent resolution relating to Federal income taxation of the interest derived from public bonds

Whereas the State of Kansas and the political subdivisions thereof have in the past and are now currently engaged in financing, through the issuance of bonds, needed public improvements such as the building of schools, highways, water and sewer distribution systems, and other projects for the promotion of the health, safety, and welfare of the people; and

Whereas the interest income which the owner derives from such bonds has in the past and is now currently exempt from the imposition of any Federal income tax; and

Whereas the Federal taxation of the interest of such bonds, as income, would result in the curtailment of construction of needed public improvements, and would result in either an increase of taxes imposed by the State of Kansas and any political subdivision thereof in order to pay higher interest costs, or the assumption by the Federal Government of the responsibility of financing such improvements; and

Whereas there is currently a national movement to permit the imposition of the Federal income tax on the interest income from the bonds issued or to be issued by the several States and their political subdivisions: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Kansas (*the Senate concurring therein*), That the Legislature of the State of Kansas respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to oppose any amendment of the Constitution of the United States, or any other action by the Congress of the United States, or the executive branch thereof, which would have the effect of subjecting the income from State and local bonds to a Federal tax or to cause the tax to be increased because of such bond holdings by a taxpayer whether or not the increase is in fact titled a tax; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representatives from Kansas in the Congress of the United States.

DAYTIME BROADCASTING BY LOCAL RADIO STATIONS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the directors of the Lyons Creek Watershed Joint District No. 41, with offices at Herington, Kans., adopted a resolution in regard to daytime broadcasting by local radio stations.

This area is served by a number of stations which broadcast news, weather, and emergency reports that are local in nature. This service is essential to the welfare of these communities, and I share the concern expressed in this resolution.

I ask that this resolution be referred to the Committee on Commerce, with the request that no action be taken that would affect the present service being rendered to this area.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be made a part of these remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

Whereas it has come to the knowledge of the board of directors of the Lyons Creek Watershed Joint District No. 41, of Geary, Dickinson, Morris, and Marion Counties, Kans., both as individuals and by request from interested electors of said joint watershed district that certain interested parties in the radio broadcasting industry have made request of the Federal Communications Commission of the United States; that section 3.87 of the FCC rules and regulations be amended by striking therefrom the exception which permits daytime broadcasting stations when their broadcasts do not interfere with stations licensed for 24 hours operations to go on the air as early as 4 a.m. this being prior to sunrise which is the beginning time of daytime broadcasting as defined by such rule; and

Whereas the electors of the Lyons Creek Joint Watershed District No. 41 are farmers and stockmen residing in Geary, Dickinson, Morris, and Marion Counties, Kans., said district comprising 213 square miles, 176,415 acres, and occupied by approximately 4,000 persons living on farms of whom approximately 2,500 are adults; and

Whereas the workday begins for these people about 7:30 o'clock; and

Whereas the shortening of the radio broadcast day would work a hardship upon such persons working away from home or in the fields and barns; and

Whereas the programs now heard during the early morning hours prior to sunrise are essential to the welfare and well-being of said persons, being news, weather, and emergency reports restricted to the local area, which are not broadcast by the larger urban directed stations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Board of Directors of the Lyons Creek Watershed Joint District No. 41 of Geary, Dickinson, Morris, and Marion Counties, Kans., That the Federal Communications Commission be respectfully requested to make their order; upon considering of the request that section 3.87 of the FCC rules and regulations be amended by striking therefrom the exception which permits daytime broadcasting stations when their broadcasts do not interfere with stations licensed for 24 hours operations to go on the air as early as 4 a.m. denying such request.

RESOLUTION OF 35TH DIVISION ASSOCIATION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the 35th Infantry Division, which was formed during World War I, has had a record of outstanding achievements in our military operations since that time.

Its record of service to our Nation is one that records courage, bravery, and distinction. Presently it is one of the National Guard divisions of the United States, and its training programs are being carried forward under able leadership and are important additions to our national defense.

Recently the 35th Division Association adopted a resolution expressing concern over the proposed reorganization of the Reserve forces indicating the elimination of some of the divisions.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution, which was adopted on February 4 in Topeka, Kans., at a meeting of the 35th Division Association, be made a part of these remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE 35TH DIVISION ASSOCIATION IN EXECUTIVE MEETING AT TOPEKA, KANS.

Whereas the Department of Defense has announced it will ask the Congress of the United States for a major reorganization of the Reserve Forces of the U.S. Army, indicating the elimination of some divisions now in being; and

Whereas the 35th Infantry Division, in which all members of this Association have served at one time or another since 1917, is one of the outstanding National Guard Divisions among the present 27 in the United States that might be affected by such proposed reorganization; and

Whereas in combat and training the 35th Division has demonstrated gallant and superior performance, presently with one of the highest training indexes of National Guard of the U.S. divisions and with past records of great Federal and State services: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this association, with one of its aims perpetuating the 35th Division in military service of the United States, requests the retention of the present 35th Infantry Division in the National Guard and directs copies of the resolution be forwarded to the Secretary, Department of Defense; Members of Congress from both the States of Missouri and Kansas wherein the 35th Division is now assigned.

JACOB MCGINNIS,
President.

RESOLUTION ON ALL-AMERICAN CANAL

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, a month ago the Corps of Engineers announced that preliminary studies have been made on the economic feasibility of an all-American canal between Lake Erie and Lake Ontario. These studies have indicated that further investigation is warranted.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the attached resolution from the mayor of the village of Kenmore memorializing the Members of Congress to provide adequate funds for the necessary investigation.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the United States has assumed an obligation with its good neighbor, the Government of Canada, to contribute its full share toward the successful operation of the St. Lawrence Seaway-Great Lakes shipping route; and

Whereas the only existing navigable facility connecting Lakes Erie and Ontario is the Welland Canal which has been sorely pressed to meet the increasing demands of shipping; and

Whereas the construction of an alternate ship canal would make a major contribution to the security of the United States as well as Canada, because (1) in the event of breakdown or destruction of the existing Welland Canal, the commerce of the entire Great Lakes area of the United States and Canada west of Lake Ontario would be denied access by water transportation to the St. Lawrence Seaway and international shipping lanes; (2) it would provide a more secure inland route for the movement of iron ore in the event of war; (3) it would ease the strain on congested rail facilities and east coast ports in the time of emergency; and (4) it would allow the construction and repair of oceangoing vessels in the more secure areas of the Great Lakes; and

Whereas the construction of the canal would contribute greatly to the prosperity of commerce, industry, and agriculture, not only in those States bordering the Great Lakes, but throughout the entire Nation; and

Whereas the commerce of the lake ports of New York State—Buffalo, Rochester, Oswego, and Ogdensburg—would be increased by the benefits accruing to the St. Lawrence Seaway-Great Lakes shipping route; and

Whereas the construction of the canal would stabilize employment, provide job security and expand job opportunities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the board of trustees of the village of Kenmore, N.Y., hereby respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States immediately to provide adequate funds to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for the necessary surveys and plans for, and to initiate the construction of, the canal, as aforesaid.

GEORGE V. ALLEN,
Mayor, Village of Kenmore.

ADMINISTRATION OF PUBLIC WELFARE—RESOLUTION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Westchester County, N.Y., relating to the administration of public welfare.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 33-1962

Whereas public welfare assistance in the State of New York is a locally administered, State-supervised governmental activity, and

Whereas the Federal Government in providing grants-in-aid to States and localities for public welfare assistance has promulgated certain laws, rules, and regulations which adversely affect the reasonable administration of public welfare assistance by the States and localities: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Supervisors of the County of Westchester urge that the State of New York exert all influence possible to encourage the Federal Government to change, alter, and amend said Federal laws, rules, and regulations in order to (among others)—

1. Give States freedom of choice in determining whether or not federally aided public welfare assistance is to be administered within their jurisdiction as a single program or as combined programs, instead of stipulating five separate categorical programs as now required by Federal law;

2. Establish a single formula for Federal financial participation applicable to all categories of assistance and to all assistance expenditures whether administered as separate or as combined categories;

3. Eliminate the Federal requirement of accumulating individual case counts in certain categories in order to compute Federal grants-in-aid and, instead distribute grants-in-aid on a flat percentage basis similar to the new medical assistance for the aged category;

4. Eliminate the Federal requirement that State policies on eligibility and standards for assistance and other services to welfare recipients must apply equally in all localities as a prerequisite to receipt of Federal grants-in-aid regardless of varying local conditions;

5. Eliminate the Federal requirement prohibiting the use of Federal grants-in-aid for work relief;

6. Eliminate the Federal requirement that, without exception, all money payments to public welfare assistance recipients must be made with no restrictions imposed by the local welfare department on the use of funds by the recipient;

7. Provide a method by which a State may test in court its rights to receive grants-in-aid before the Federal department can cut off funds from a State; and be it further

Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be sent to Hon. John F. Kennedy, President of the United States; Hon. Abraham Ribicoff, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for the United States; Hon. Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York; Chairman, Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, Washington, D.C.; Commissioner Raymond W. Houston, New York State commissioner of social welfare; Senator Jacob Javits; Senator Kenneth Keating; Congressmen Edwin B. Dooley and Robert R. Barry; and the boards of supervisors and mayors of all New York counties.

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—FEDERAL STOCKPILE INVENTORIES

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit a report on Federal stockpile inventories as of December 1961. I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed in the RECORD, together with a statement by me.

There being no objection, the report and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL STOCKPILE INVENTORIES, DECEMBER 1961

INTRODUCTION

This is the 25th in a series of monthly reports on Federal stockpile inventories under the Department of Agriculture, General Services Administration, Department of Defense, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It is for the month of December 1961.

The report is compiled from official data on quantities and cost value of commodities in these stockpiles submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures by the agencies involved.

The four agencies reported that as of December 1, 1961, the cost value of materials in their stockpile inventories totaled $14,249,536,000 and as of December 31, 1961, they totaled $14,112,690,000, a net decrease of $136,846,000 reflecting acquisitions, disposals, adjustments, etc., during the month.

Price-support inventory revaluation

The Department of Agriculture, as of June 30, 1961, revaluated the price-support inventory downward by $1,268,525,000. It should be noted that revaluated cost value figures for the price-support inventory and affected totals are not strictly comparable to corresponding figures in previous committee reports on the subject. (See Committee Print No. 19 of this series.)

Different units of measure make it impossible to summarize the quantities of commodities and materials which are shown in tables 1, 2, 3, and 4, but the cost value figures are summarized by agency and program, as follows:

Summary of cost value of stockpile inventories

[In thousands]

Agency and program	Beginning of month, Dec. 1, 1961	End of month, Dec. 31, 1961	Net change, reflecting acquisitions, disposals, adjustments, etc.
Department of Agriculture:			
Price-support program:			
Agricultural commodities	$5,340,323	$5,189,485	−$150,838
Exchange commodities—strategic and critical materials	100,690	58,991	−41,699
Total, Department of Agriculture	5,441,013	5,248,476	−192,537
General Services Administration:			
Strategic and critical materials:			
National stockpile	6,089,500	6,088,152	−1,348
Federal Facilities Corporation: Tin inventory	4,412	2,907	−1,505
Defense Production Act program	1,484,731	1,482,772	−1,959
Supplemental stockpile	1,037,931	1,037,931	
Supplemental stockpile inventory in transit		60,369	+60,369
Total, General Services Administration	8,616,573	8,672,130	+55,557
Department of Defense: Civil defense stockpile	21,123	21,094	−29
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Civil defense medical stockpile	170,827	170,990	+163
Grand total	14,249,536	14,112,690	−136,846

NOTE.—Figures are rounded and may not add to totals.

Detailed tables in this report show opening inventories at the beginning of the month in quantity and cost, transactions during the month, and the closing inventories at the end of the month. Each inventory is shown by commodity except the national stockpile for which commodity detail is classified.

Pertinent information and explanation are set forth in notes accompanying the respective tables. Statutory authority and program descriptions are shown in the appendix to the report.

The inventories covered by the report are tabulated in detail as follows:

Table 1: Agricultural price-support program inventories under Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, December 1961: Including agricultural commodities and strategic and critical materials acquired by exchange or barter.

Table 2: Strategic and critical materials inventories under General Services Administration, December 1961: Including materials in the national stockpile, Federal Facilities Corporation tin inventory, Defense Production Act purchase program, the supplemental stockpile of materials acquired by exchange or barter of agricultural commodities, etc., and inventory in transit from Commodity Credit Corporation to the supplemental stockpile.

Table 3: Civil defense stockpile inventory under the Department of Defense, December 1961.

Table 4: Civil defense medical stockpile inventory under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, December 1961.

TABLE 1.—*Agricultural price support program inventories under Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, December 1961: Including agricultural commodities, and strategic and critical materials acquired by exchange or barter*

EXPLANATORY NOTES

The Department of Agriculture defines the content of the columns as follows:

Program and commodity: Lists each commodity in the form in which it exists. In some instances, commodities have been processed after acquisition by the Corporation, to increase marketability or to make them suitable for program outlets. The commodities are grouped under the appropriate statutory subclassifications as "Basic," "Designated nonbasic," "Other nonbasic," and "Exchange."

Unit of measure: The applicable unit used in the accounting records and reports of the Corporation.

Inventory, beginning of month: Quantity: In number of units. Cost value: Represents acquisition cost plus cost of any packaging or processing performed after acquisition. Acquisition cost for commodities stored in commercial warehouses, acquired from price-support loans or purchase agreements, is generally the amount due on the loan, excluding interest, or the purchase agreement settlement value of the commodity, plus any accrued warehouse charges assumed by the Corporation. Acquisition cost for commodities stored on farms, acquired from price-support loans or purchase agreements, is generally the loan or purchase agreement settlement value of the commodity plus any additional costs of obtaining delivery in storage or on board cars for shipment to storage. For purchases from commercial vendors, acquisition cost is the purchase price. Acquisition cost of materials acquired through barter is the exchange value of the materials stated in the contracts.

Adjustments: Warehouse settlements, processing and/or packaging costs, exchanges and transfers (net): Warehouse settlements include the net differences in quantity and/or value represented by the net of overdeliveries, premiums, underdeliveries, and discounts arising from movement of commodities. Processing and/or packaging costs include only such costs incurred by the Corporation after acquisition of commodities. Exchanges represent the net change in quantity and/or value for inventories exchanged or in process of exchange. On completed exchanges, the change in value represents differentials due to location, quality, and quantity. Unprocessed commodities removed from inventory for conversion or processing (on a contractual or fee basis and excluding conditional sales) are included as a reduction of inventory. Processed commodities acquired as a result of this conversion or processing are included as an addition to inventory.

Acquisitions: As reflected in accounting records and reports; and includes commodities acquired by delivery of collateral securing loans, commodities purchased under terms of purchase agreements, commodities purchased directly from producers or processors as a part of the support operation but not under purchase agreements; and processed commodities acquired by purchases which offset conditional sales of unprocessed commodities from inventory. The cost value of acquisitions is described under the explanation of the cost value of inventory.

Disposals: As reflected in accounting records and reports. Inventory transactions generally are recorded on the basis of transfer of title. Disposition commitments are not reflected in the accounts. Cost value: Represents acquisition cost plus cost of any packaging or processing performed after acquisition, computed on the basis of average unit cost. Cost allocated to commingled commodities removed from price-support inventories is computed on the basis of national average unit cost of the commodity acquired from the oldest crop year for which any quantity remains in the inventory accounts. Cost allocated to identified commodities is computed on the basis of average unit cost for the identified crop year as reflected in the records of the office accounting for the inventory.

Inventory, end of month: Closing inventory after transactions for the month have been applied to the inventory at the beginning of the month.

[In thousands]

Program and commodity	Unit of measure	Inventory, beginning of month, Dec. 1, 1961		Transactions during the month						Inventory, end of month, Dec. 31, 1961	
				Adjustments		Acquisitions		Disposals			
		Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value
Agricultural commodities:											
Basic commodities:											
Corn	Bushel	1,472,845	$1,878,186	−182	−$524	13,587	$15,004	74,057	$100,891	1,412,193	$1,782,775
Cornmeal	Pound					23,947	499	23,947	499		
Cotton, extra long staple	Bale	27	7,402					9	2,319	18	5,083
Cotton, upland	do	1,449	245,283			(1)	−50	(1)	−61	1,449	245,294
Peanut butter	Pound			+1,238	+375			1,238	315		
Peanuts, farmers' stock	do					18	2			18	2
Peanuts, shelled	do	17,262	2,760	−1,287	−206	2,771	415	5,096	788	13,650	2,181
Rice, milled	Hundredweight	517	5,416			162	1,460	202	2,056	477	4,820
Rice, rough	do	2,548	11,877		(1)			394	1,841	2,154	10,036
Tobacco	Pound					2,833	1,667	2,833	1,667		
Wheat	Bushel	1,145,343	2,269,494	−72	−482	16	31	15,007	32,072	1,130,280	2,236,971
Bulgur	Pound			+4,059	+235			4,059	235		
Wheat flour	do					198,982	10,325	198,982	10,325		
Total, basic commodities			4,420,418		−662		29,353		161,947		4,287,162
Designated nonbasic commodities:											
Barley	Bushel	42,977	$37,892	−8	−$40	68	$55	3,534	$3,345	39,503	$34,562
Grain sorghum	Hundredweight	350,373	670,700	−16	+17	(1)	2	8,953	19,092	341,404	651,627
Milk and butterfat:											
Butter	Pound	199,611	120,544	−1	+162	22,188	13,401	16,118	9,843	205,680	124,264
Cheese	do	57,627	21,895	+210	+72	11,699	4,540	9,827	3,767	59,709	22,740
Milk, dried	do	355,429	56,564	−10	+133	74,713	13,811	75,215	12,948	354,917	57,560
Milk, fluid	do					55,372	2,409	55,372	2,409		
Oats	Bushel	8,195	5,064	−2	−1	23	11	364	223	7,852	4,851
Rye	do	3,241	3,210	−7	−7	5	4	8	9	3,231	3,198
Tung oil	Pound	532	112					243	51	289	61
Total, designated nonbasic commodities			915,981		+336		34,233		51,684		898,866
Other nonbasic commodities:											
Beans, dry, edible	Hundredweight	465	3,016		−6			62	461	403	2,549
Turpentine	Gallon	1,730	908							1,730	908
Vegetable oil products	Pound					2,825	461	2,825	461		
Total, other nonbasic commodities			3,924		−6		461		922		3,457
Total, agricultural commodities			5,230,323		−332		64,047		214,553		5,189,485
Exchange commodities:[2]											
Strategic and critical materials:											
Antimony, metal	Pound	2,950	892			203	64	1,357	403	1,796	553
Asbestos, amosite	do	8,405	975			442	49	4,453	502	4,394	522
Asbestos, chrysotile	do	1,021	240					1,021	240		
Asbestos, crocidolite	do	7,096	904					4,100	527	2,996	377
Bauxite	do	3,440,076	20,380			211,272	1,395	1,683,003	9,377	1,968,345	12,398
Beryllium copper master alloy	do	231	469					231	469		
Bismuth	do					32	60			32	60
Boart	Carat	1,000	2,758			500	1,379	1,000	2,758	500	1,379
Cadmium	Pound	364	556			141	216			505	772
Chrome ore, chemical grade	do	247,494	2,024					247,494	2,024		
Chrome ore, refractory grade	do	5,705	72					5,705	72		
Chrome ore, metallurgical grade	do	42,472	787			5,633	105	26,872	498	21,230	394
Chromium metal	do	124	104					124	104		
Diamonds	Carat	1,958	20,822			421	3,856	966	10,107	1,413	14,571
Ferrochrome, high carbon	Pound	3,501	514				29	3,501	543		
Ferrochrome, low carbon	do	4,513	938					3,202	669	1,311	269
Ferromanganese	do	83,506	7,645			33,783	3,063	83,506	7,645	33,783	3,063
Fluorspar, acid grade	do	107,124	1,854			24,536	402	63,536	1,128	68,124	1,128
Iodine	do	99	102							99	102
Lead	do	28,872	2,535			19,372	1,739			48,244	4,274
Manganese ore, chemical grade	do	84,842	2,685			21,253	674	54,939	1,729	51,156	1,630
Manganese ore, metallurgical grade	do	355,983	6,928			114,333	2,153	274,310	5,390	196,006	3,691

[1] Less than 500.

[2] See appendix, p. 16, for notes relating to reporting of strategic and critical materials acquired by exchange or barter of agricultural commodities.

Table 1.—*Agricultural price support program inventories under Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, December 1961: Including agricultural commodities, and strategic and critical materials acquired by exchange or barter*—Continued

[In thousands]

Program and commodity	Unit of measure	Inventory, beginning of month, Dec. 1, 1961		Transactions during the month						Inventory, end of month, Dec. 31, 1961	
				Adjustments		Acquisitions		Disposals			
		Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value
Exchange commodities—Continued											
Strategic and critical materials—Continued											
Manganese ore, natural, battery grade	do.	85,166	$4,249			56,647	$2,767	24,098	$1,263	117,715	$5,753
Mica	do.	1,298	3,092			175	244	760	2,055	713	1,281
Palladium	Troy ounce	100	2,255					80	1,804	20	451
Platinum	do.	50	3,987					25	1,993	25	1,994
Quartz crystals	Pound	150	2,030							150	2,030
Rare earths	do.	10,056	3,100					10,056	3,100		
Rutile	do.	2,503	95					2,403	95		
Silicon carbide	do.	31,637	2,987					27,476	2,597	4,161	390
Titanium sponge	do.	2,410	3,143			180	216	1,500	2,051	1,090	1,308
Tungsten carbide powder	do.	641	1,568			100	250	501	1,226	240	592
Total, strategic and critical materials			100,690				18,670		60,369		58,991
Total, Department of Agriculture			5,441,013		−$332		82,717		274,922		5,248,476

Note.—Figures are rounded and may not add to totals.

Table 2.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories under General Services Administration, December 1961: Including materials in the national stockpile, Federal Facilities Corporation tin inventory, Defense Production Act purchase program, the supplemental stockpile of materials acquired by exchange or barter of agricultural commodities, etc., and inventory in transit from Commodity Credit Corporation to the supplemental stockpile*

EXPLANATORY NOTES

The General Services Administration defines the content of the columns as follows:

Program and commodity: Identifies the program and the minerals, metals, fibers, and oils acquired under the program.

Unit of measure: The standard weight or measure of minerals, metals, fibers, and oils determined to be the stockpile unit of measure.

Inventory, beginning of month: Opening inventory represents quantity and cost of material in storage at the beginning of the accounting period.

Adjustments: Represents increases (+) or decreases (−) of materials in inventory other than increases from acquisitions or decreases from disposals. Decreases occur from theft, loss incurred while in transit to stockpile location, repacking from one type of container to another, beneficiation of a low-grade material to a higher grade, and the removal of material for sampling and testing purposes. Increases occur from return of material previously removed for sampling and testing purposes and from quantities received at storage locations in excess of quantities billed by the contractor. A new chemical analysis of the materials may cause an increase or decrease where the weights are based on chemical and moisture content. Increases or decreases are also made from findings of audits of inventory and accounting records.

Acquisitions: For the National Stockpile and Defense Production Act acquisitions include open market purchases at contract prices; intradepartmental transfers at market or appraised value at time of transfer; transportation to first permanent storage location; and beneficiating and processing cost in upgrading materials. For the supplemental stockpile acquisitions include the market value or CCC's acquisition cost whichever is the lower at time of transfer from CCC.

Disposals: Cost of disposals are calculated at the average unit price of inventory at time of removal from inventory. For the national stockpile inventory disposals consist of sale of materials that by their nature would deteriorate if held in storage for lengths of time; and sale of materials that have been determined to be obsolete or excess to the needs of Government. For the Defense Production Act inventory disposals consist of sale of materials that have been determined to be obsolete or excess to the needs of Government.

Inventory, end of month: Closing inventory represents quantity and cost of material in storage at the end of the accounting period.

[In thousands]

Program and commodity	Unit of measure	Inventory, beginning of month, Dec. 1, 1961		Transactions during the month						Inventory, end of month, Dec. 31, 1961	
				Adjustments		Acquisitions		Disposals			
		Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value
National stockpile: Total (classified detail omitted)			$6,089,500		+$4		$2,794		$4,146		$6,088,152
Federal Facilities Corporation: Total, tin	Long ton	2	4,412					1	1,505	1	2,907
Defense Production Act:											
Aluminum	Short ton	802	406,985			5	2,385			807	409,369
Asbestos, chrysotile	Short dry ton	2	2,103							2	2,103
Bauxite, metal grade, Jamaica type	Long dry ton	1,370	18,168							1,370	18,168
Beryl	Short ton	2	1,279			(1)	2			2	1,281
Bismuth	Pound	23	52							23	52
Chromite, metallurgical grade	Short dry ton	986	35,880							986	35,880
Cobalt	Pound	25,213	52,110	−4	−8					25,208	52,103
Columbite	do.	10,624	51,736							10,624	51,736
Copper	Short ton	124	69,224					1	576	123	68,648
Cryolite	do.	36	9,850					(1)	112	35	9,738
Fluorspar, acid grade	Short dry ton	20	1,394							20	1,394
Lead	Short ton	8	3,036							8	3,036
Manganese, battery grade, synthetic dioxide	Short dry ton	4	2,524							4	2,524
Manganese, metallurgical grade	do.	3,125	180,328							3,125	180,328
Mica, muscovite block and film	Pound	6,378	38,579			14	262			6,392	38,841
Nickel	do.	110,502	95,816					6,338	3,914	104,164	91,902
Palladium	Troy ounce	8	177							8	177
Rare earth residue	Pound	6,086	658							6,086	658
Rutile	Short dry ton	18	2,725							18	2,725
Tantalite	Pound	1,531	9,734							1,531	9,734
Thorium	do.	849	42							849	42
Titanium	Short ton	22	172,868							22	172,868
Tungsten	Pound	79,785	325,458	+6	+2					79,791	325,460
Subtotal, Defense Production Act commodities			1,480,726		−6		2,648		4,602		1,478,767
Machine tools inventory:											
On lease	Tool	(1)	3,966							(1)	3,966
On loan	do.	(1)	39							(1)	39
Subtotal, DPA machine tools			4,005								4,005
Total, Defense Production Act			1,484,731		−6		2,648		4,602		1,482,772

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 2.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories under General Services Administration, December 1961: Including materials in the national stockpile, Federal Facilities Corporation tin inventory, Defense Production Act purchase program, the supplemental stockpile of materials acquired by exchange or barter of agricultural commodities, etc., and inventory in transit from Commodity Credit Corporation to the supplemental stockpile*—Continued

[In thousands]

Program and commodity	Unit of measure	Inventory, beginning of month, Dec. 1, 1961		Transactions during the month						Inventory, end of month, Dec. 30, 1961	
				Adjustments		Acquisitions		Disposals			
		Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value
Supplemental stockpile: [3]											
Aluminum oxide, fused, crude	Short ton	178	$22,715		+$1					178	$22,716
Antimony, metal	do	13	6,984							13	6,984
Asbestos, amosite	do	9	2,156							9	2,156
Asbestos, chrysotile	Short dry ton	5	3,739							5	3,739
Asbestos, crocidolite	Short ton	8	2,310							8	2,310
Bauxite, metal grade, Jamaica type	Long dry ton	3,189	49,298		+1					3,189	49,299
Bauxite, metal grade, Surinam type	do	1,847	28,560		+1					1,847	28,560
Beryl	Short ton	11	22,337							11	22,337
Bismuth	Pound	1,497	3,348							1,407	3,348
Cadmium	do	6,609	10,967							6,609	10,967
Chromite, chemical grade	Short dry ton	279	14,476	(1)	+1					279	14,476
Chromite, metallurgical grade	do	1,394	217,362		−1					1,394	217,361
Chromite, refractory grade	do	177	4,961							177	4,961
Cobalt	Pound	1,077	2,169							1,077	2,169
Colemanite	Long dry ton	68	2,636							68	2,636
Columbite	Pound	389	782		(1)					389	782
Copper	Short ton	11	7,398							11	7,398
Diamond, industrial, bort	Carat	3,510	9,653	+14	+183					3,524	9,836
Diamond, industrial, stones	do	11,511	147,496	−14	−183					11,497	147,313
Fluorspar, acid grade	Short dry ton	570	29,645	(1)						570	29,645
Fluorspar, metallurgical grade	do	43	1,500							43	1,500
Graphite, natural, Ceylon, amorphous lump	do	1	341							1	341
Iodine	Pound	242	231							242	231
Lead	Short ton	222	58,676							222	58,676
Manganese, battery grade, natural	Short dry ton	70	7,349							70	7,349
Manganese, chemical grade, type A	do	39	2,788							39	2,788
Manganese, chemical grade, type B	Short ton	56	4,020							56	4,020
Manganese, metallurgical grade	Short dry ton	2,307	174,303		−1					2,307	174,302
Mercury	Flask	16	3,446							16	3,446
Mica, muscovite block, strained and better	Pound	263	698							263	698
Mica, muscovite film	do	27	212							27	212
Mica, muscovite splittings	do	4,826	6,226							4,826	6,226
Mica, phlogopite splittings	Pound	503	$485							503	$485
Palladium	Troy ounce	548	9,872							548	9,872
Quartz crystals	Pound	82	1,099							82	1,099
Rare earths	Short dry ton	2	2,427							2	2,427
Ruthenium	Troy ounce	15	560							15	560
Rutile	Short ton	10	1,007							10	1,007
Selenium	Pound	157	1,071							157	1,071
Silicon carbide, crude	Short ton	116	23,221		(1)					116	23,221
Tantalite	Pound	8	21							8	21
Thorium nitrate	do	4,080	9,966							4,080	9,966
Tin	Long ton	8	16,404							8	16,404
Titanium	Short ton	8	27,799	(1)						8	27,799
Tungsten	Pound	4,493	15,627		(1)					4,493	15,627
Zinc	Short ton	324	79,592		(1)					324	79,592
Total supplemental stockpile			1,037,931		+1						1,037,931
Supplemental stockpile inventory in transit: [3]											
Antimony, metal	Short ton					1	403			1	403
Asbestos, amosite	do					2	502			2	502
Asbestos, chrysotile	Short dry ton					1	240			1	240
Asbestos, crocidolite	Short ton					2	527			2	527
Bauxite	Long dry ton					751	9,377			751	9,377
Beryl	Short ton					(1)	469			(1)	469
Chromite, chemical grade	Short dry ton					124	2,024			124	2,024
Chromite, metallurgical grade	do					13	498			13	498
Chromite, refractory grade	do					3	73			3	73
Chromium metal	do					(1)	104			(1)	104
Diamond, industrial, bort	Carat					1,000	2,758			1,000	2,758
Diamond, industrial, stones	do					966	10,106			966	10,106
Ferrochrome, high carbon	Short dry ton					2	543			2	543
Ferrochrome, low carbon	do					2	669			2	669
Ferromanganese	do					42	7,645			42	7,645
Fluorspar, acid grade	do					32	1,129			32	1,129
Manganese, battery grade, natural	do					12	1,263			12	1,263
Manganese, chemical grade	do					27	1,729			27	1,729
Manganese, metallurgical grade	do					137	5,390			137	5,390
Mica	Pound					760	2,055			760	2,055
Palladium	Troy ounce					80	1,804			80	1,804
Platinum	do					25	1,993			25	1,993
Rare earths	Short dry ton					5	3,100			5	3,100
Rutile	Short ton					1	96			1	96
Silicon carbide, crude	do					14	2,597			14	2,597
Titanium	do					1	2,051			1	2,051
Tungsten	Pound					501	1,225			501	1,225
Total, supplemental stockpile inventory in transit.							60,369				60,369
Total, General Services Administration			8,616,573		−1		65,811		$10,253		8,672,130

---

[1] Less than 500.

[3] See appendix, p. 16, for notes relating to the reporting of strategic and critical materials acquired by exchange or barter of agricultural commodities.

NOTE.—Figures are rounded and may not add to totals.

TABLE 3.—*Civil defense stockpile inventory under the Department of Defense, December 1961*

EXPLANATORY NOTES

The Department of Defense defines the content of the columns as follows:

Commodity.—Composite groups of many different items.

Unit of measure.—Shown only for engineering supply units; not feasible for other composite groups.

Inventory-quantity.—Shown only for one item; namely, engineering supply units. It is not feasible to furnish quantity figures on the other commodity groups because they are composite groups of many different items. To report quantities, it would be necessary to list numerous different items.

Inventory-cost value.—Dollar value figures on commodities in the stockpile inventory essentially reflect their actual cost. The stockpile inventory is generally augmented by acquisition of Government excess property without reimbursement to the several holding agencies. The value assigned to these materials is (1) original acquisition cost if known, (2) estimated current market value of items in similar condition, or (3) average unit cost of identical or similar items purchased in the open market for stockpiling. Government excess property acquired by reimbursement is assigned a value equal to the amount of the fair-value reimbursement required.

Adjustments.—Represent inventory pricing adjustments resulting from recalculation of fixed average unit prices, transfers of commodities from one composite group to another, etc., during the month.

Acquisitions.—Materials placed in inventory during the month, including return to inventory of items previously released from inventory for reworking, etc. Value stated in terms of actual costs of the commodities.

Disposals.—Materials removed from inventory during the month, including items released from inventory for reworking, etc. Values shown are based on average unit costs.

Inventory at end of month.—Closing inventory after transactions for the month have been applied to the inventory at the beginning of the month.

[In thousands]

Commodity	Unit of measure	Inventory, beginning of month, Dec. 1, 1961		Transactions during the month						Inventory, end of month, Dec. 31, 1961	
				Adjustments		Acquisitions		Disposals			
		Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value
Engineering stockpile (engine generators, pumps, chlorinators, purifiers, pipe and fittings).	10-mile units	(1)	$10,102		−$50		$8			(1)	$10,150
Chemical and biological equipment			1,994		−14				[2] $1		1,980
Radiological equipment			8,936		+14		175		[3] 160		8,964
Total, civil defense stockpile, Department of Defense.			21,123		−51		182		161		21,094

[1] Less than 500.

[2] Grants to other Federal agencies and to States.

[3] Grants to other Federal agencies and to States in the amount of $159,876, and inventory writeoff of $496.

NOTE.—Figures are rounded and may not add to totals.

TABLE 4.—*Civil defense medical stockpile inventory under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, December 1961*

EXPLANATORY NOTES

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare defines the content of the columns as follows:

Commodity: Composite groups of many different items.

Unit of measure: Shown only for hospital functional units; not feasible for other composite groups.

Inventory cost value: The dollar value figures in the civil defense medical stockpile inventory reflect essentially the average acquisition costs per unit of the commodities. No transportation, delivery, or storage costs are included.

Adjustments: Represents increases (+) or decreases (−) of materials in commodity groups other than increases from acquisitions or decreases from disposals. Normally these transactions result from inventory pricing adjustments due to recalculation of fixed average unit prices, transfers of commodities from one composite group to another, removal of material for sampling during testing or reworking, etc., during the month.

Acquisitions: Materials placed in inventory during month, including new procurement and acquisition of Government excess property.

Disposals: Materials removed from inventory during the month. Costs of disposals are calculated on a basis of the average unit price of items in inventory at the time of removal. Disposals consist principally of items no longer suitable for stockpiling due to deterioration and of samples consumed through testing.

Inventory, end of month: Closing inventory after transactions for the month have been applied to the inventory at the beginning of the month.

[In thousands]

Commodity	Unit of measure	Inventory, beginning of month, Dec. 1, 1961		Transactions during the month						Inventory, end of month, Dec. 31, 1961	
				Adjustments		Acquisitions		Disposals			
		Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value
Medical bulk stocks and associated items at civil defense mobilization warehouses.			$110,882		+$448		$149		$7		$111,472
Medical bulk stock at manufacturer locations			3,957				98				4,054
Civil defense emergency hospitals	Each	2	38,270		+18				2	2	38,287
Replenishment units (functional assemblies other than hospitals).			17,718		−541						17,177
Total, civil defense medical stockpile, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.			170,827		−75		247		8		170,990

NOTE.—Figures are rounded and may not add to totals.

APPENDIX

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The price-support program

Price-support operations are carried out under the Corporation's charter powers (15 U.S.C. 714), in conformity with the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1421), the Agricultural Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1741), which includes the National Wool Act of 1954, the Agricultural Act of 1956 (7 U.S.C. 1442), the Agricultural Act of 1958 and with respect to certain types of tobacco, in conformity with the act of July 28, 1945, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1312). Under the Agricultural Act of 1949, price support is mandatory for the basic commodities—corn, cotton, wheat, rice, peanuts, and tobacco—and specific nonbasic commodities; namely, tung nuts, honey, milk, butterfat, and the products of milk and butterfat. Under the Agricultural Act of 1958, as producers of corn voted in favor of the new price-support program for corn authorized by that act, price support is mandatory for barley, oats, rye, and grain sorghums. Price support for wool and mohair is mandatory under the National Wool Act of 1954, through the marketing year ending March 31, 1962. Price support for other nonbasic agricultural commodities is discretionary except that, whenever the price of either cottonseed or soybeans is supported, the price of the other must be supported at such level as the Secretary determines will cause them to compete on equal terms on the market. This program may also include operations to remove and dispose of or aid in the removal or disposition of surplus agricultural commodities for the purpose of stabilizing prices at levels not in excess of permissible price-support levels.

Price support is made available through loans, purchase agreements, purchases, and other operations, and, in the case of wool and mohair, through incentive payments based on marketings. The producer's commodities serve as collateral for price-support loans. With limited exceptions, price-support loans are nonrecourse and the Corporation looks only to the pledged or mortgage collateral for satisfaction of the loan. Purchase agreements generally are available during the same period that loans are available. By signing a purchase agreement, a producer receives an option to sell to the Corporation any quantity of the commodity which he may elect within the maximum specified in the agreement.

The major effect on budgetary expenditures is represented by the disbursements for price-support loans. The largest part of the commodity acquisitions under the program result from the forfeiting of commodities pledged as loan collateral for which the expenditures occurred at the time of making the loan, rather than at the time of acquiring the commodities.

Dispositions of commodities acquired by the Corporation in its price-support operations are made in compliance with sections 202, 407, and 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, and other applicable legislation, particularly the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1691), title I of the Agricultural Act of 1954, title II of the Agricultural Act of 1956, the Agricultural Act of 1958, the act of August 19, 1958, in the case of cornmeal and wheat flour, and the act of September 21, 1959, with regard to sales of livestock feed in emergency areas.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION, STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS STOCKPILING AND RELATED PROGRAMS

1. National stockpile

The Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act (50 U.S.C. 98–98h) provides for the establishment and maintenance of a national stockpile of strategic and critical materials. GSA is responsible for making purchases of strategic and critical materials and providing for their storage, security, and maintenance.

These functions are performed in accordance with directives by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning (formerly Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization). The act also provides for the transfer from other Government agencies of strategic and critical materials which are excess to the needs of such other agencies and are required to meet the stockpile objectives established by OEP. In addition, GSA is responsible for disposing of those strategic and critical materials which OEP determines to be no longer needed for stockpile purposes.

General policies for strategic and critical materials stockpiling are contained in DMO V–7, issued by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning (formerly Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization) and published in the Federal Register of December 19, 1959 (24 F.R. 10309). Portions of this order relate also to Defense Production Act inventories.

2. Tin received from Federal Facilities Corporation

Public Law 608, 84th Congress (50 U.S.C. 98 note), provided, among other things, for the continuation of operation of the Government-owned tin smelter at Texas City, Tex., from June 30, 1956, until January 31, 1957. It provided also that all tin acquired by the Federal Facilities Corporation by reason of such extension should be transferred to GSA.

3. Defense Production Act

Under section 303 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2093) and Executive Order 10480, as amended, GSA is authorized to make purchases of or commitments to purchase metals, minerals, and other materials, for Government use or resale, in order to expand productive capacity and supply, and also to store the materials acquired as a result of such purchases or commitments. Such functions are carried out in accordance with programs certified by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning (formerly Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization).

4. Supplemental stockpile

As a result of a delegation of authority from OEP (32A C.F.R., ch. I, DMO V–4) GSA is responsible for the maintenance and storage of materials placed in the supplemental stockpile. Section 206 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 (7 U.S.C. 1856) provides that strategic and other materials acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation as a result of barter or exchange of agricultural products, unless acquired for the national stockpile or for other purposes, shall be transferred to the supplemental stockpile established by section 104(b) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1704(b)). In addition to the materials which have been or may be so acquired, the materials obtained under the programs established pursuant to the Domestic Tungsten, Asbestos, Fluorspar, and Columbium-Tantalum Production and Purchase Act of 1956 (50 U.S.C. App. 2191–2195), which terminated December 31, 1958, have been transferred to the supplemental stockpile, as authorized by the provisions of said Production and Purchase Act.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, CIVIL DEFENSE STOCKPILE PROGRAM

This stockpiling program, conducted pursuant to section 201(h) of Public Law 920, 81st Congress, as amended, is designed to provide some of the most essential materials to minimize the effects upon the civilian population which would be caused by an attack upon the United States. Supplies and equipment normally unavailable, or lacking in quantity needed to cope with such conditions, are stockpiled at strategic locations in a nationwide warehouse system consisting of general storage facilities.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, CIVIL DEFENSE MEDICAL STOCKPILE PROGRAM

As authorized under Public Law 920, 81st Congress, and following the intent of Reorganization Plan No. 1, 1958, the Director, Office of Emergency Planning (formerly Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization) has delegated responsibility to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to plan and direct operation of the medical supply portion of the OEP stockpile. The warehousing of the medical stockpile is principally within the OEP warehouse system; in addition, the medical stockpile includes a program designed to preposition emergency hospitals and other treatment units in communities throughout the Nation.

Explanatory Notes Relating to the Reporting of Strategic and Critical Materials Acquired by Exchange or Barter of Agricultural Commodities

Surplus agricultural commoditions in the Commodity Credit Corporation's price-support inventory may be exchanged or bartered for strategic and critical materials under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480), and other basic legislation including the CCC Charter Act, as amended, the Agricultural Act of 1954, and the Agricultural Act of 1956.

Except for small amounts which may go to the national stockpile, the strategic and critical materials acquired by Commodity Credit Corporation under the barter program are transferred to the supplemental stockpile.

Direct appropriations reimburse Commodity Credit Corporation for materials so transferred from the price-support inventory.

The General Services Administration is charged with the custody and management of strategic and critical materials, and becomes the responsible reporting agency when title to these bartered materials is placed in the supplemental stockpile.

For purposes of this report, strategic and critical materials acquired by barter may appear in three inventories, reflecting the stages of the transfer of title.

1. The Department of Agriculture reports those to which the Commodity Credit Corporation still has title, prior to transfer to the supplemental stockpile.

2. The General Services Administration reports those which have been transferred from the Commodity Credit Corporation exchange inventory in two parts:

A. Materials for which title is "in transit" from Commodity Credit Corporation to the supplemental stockpile.

B. Materials for which title has passed to the supplemental stockpile.

Statement by Senator Byrd of Virginia

The cost value of materials in nine Federal stockpile inventories as reported by the Agriculture Department, General Services Administration, Department of Defense, and Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, on December 31, 1961, totaled $14,112,690,000. December activity in these stockpiles resulted in a net decrease of $136,846,000.

Net change in these stockpile inventories reflects acquisitions, disposals, and adjustments. December activity and end-of-the-month totals are summarized:

[In thousands of dollars]

Inventories by agency and program	Cost value, December 1961	
	Net change during month	Total, end of month
Department of Agriculture:		
Price support program:		
1. Agricultural commodities	−150,838	5,189,485
2. Exchange, strategic and critical materials	−41,699	58,991
Total, Department of Agriculture	−192,537	5,248,476
General Services Administration:		
Strategic and critical materials:		
3. National stockpile	−1,348	6,088,152
4. Federal Facilities Corporation, tin inventory	−1,505	2,907
5. Defense Production Act program	−1,959	1,482,772
6. Supplemental stockpile		1,037,931
7. Supplemental stockpile inventory in transit	+60,369	60,369
Total, General Services Administration	+55,557	8,672,130
Department of Defense:		
8. Civil defense stockpile	−29	21,094
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:		
9. Civil defense medical stockpile	+163	170,990
Grand total	−136,846	14,112,690

These figures are from reports certified by the agencies involved as compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

INCREASES AND DECREASES

The major net decreases in cost value during December were $95 million in corn, $33 million in wheat, and $19 million in grain sorghum. This was partially offset by net increases including $9 million in manganese, $6 million in milk and butterfat, and $5 million in diamonds.

AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Of 18 agricultural commodities in Commodity Credit's $5.2 billion price support inventory on December 31, 1961, those leading in cost value include:

Wheat, with 1.1 billion bushels at a cost of $2.2 billion;

Corn, with 1.4 billion bushels at a cost of $1.8 billion; and

Grain sorghum with 341 million hundredweight at a cost of $652 million.

STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

Strategic and critical materials are shown in six inventories totaling $8.7 billion, including the $6.1 billion national stockpile for which itemized detail is classified. Combined figures from the other five inventories show materials (in all grades and forms) leading in cost value as follows:

Aluminum, bauxite, etc., with 9.1 million tons at a cost of $550 million; manganese (and ores), with 6 million tons at a cost of $401 million; and tungsten, with 85 million pounds at a cost of $343 million.

CIVIL DEFENSE SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT

Supplies and equipment in two civil defense stockpile inventories total $192 million. Nearly 90 percent is in the medical stockpile valued at $171 million.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. RUSSELL (for himself and Mr. Saltonstall) (by request):

S. 2857. A bill to further amend section 201 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, to authorize payment toward the construction or modification of approved public shelter space, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. Russell when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 2858. A bill to authorize certain improvement of the Illinois River at Peoria, Ill., for flood protection purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. Dirksen when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 2859. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, in order to increase the number of new counties in which crop insurance may be offered each year; the the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. METCALF (for himself and Mr. Mansfield):

S. 2860. A bill providing that certain privately owned irrigable lands in the Milk River project in Montana shall be deemed to be excess lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOGGS:

S. 2861. A bill to establish a Department of Federal-State-Urban Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Boggs when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 2862. A bill for the relief of Mai Har Tung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 2863. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code to provide an additional 150 miles of highway in the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BURDICK:

S. 2864. A bill to provide additional places for holding court in the District of North Dakota; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JORDAN (for himself and Mr. Ervin):

S. 2865. A bill for the relief of Ferdinand A. Hermens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia:

S. 2866. A bill for the relief of Estelle L. Heard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOWER:

S. 2867. A bill for the relief of Dimitrios Tyropanis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine (by request):

S. 2868. A bill to provide that certain written or typewritten matter, previously transmitted in the mails and the contents of which no longer possess the quality of a present communication, may be mailed as third-class or fourth-class mail; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

PROHIBITION OF MILITARY TRAINING IN THE UNITED STATES OF PERSONNEL FROM ENEMY COUNTRIES

Mr. TOWER submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 58) relative to military training in the United States of personnel from enemy countries and prohibiting shipment of weapons of war thereto, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Tower, which appears under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

TRIBUTE TO HON. CARL HAYDEN, PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE OF THE SENATE, ON HIS LONG TENURE IN CONGRESS

Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. Dirksen) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 296) paying tribute to Hon. Carl Hayden, President pro tempore of the Senate, on his long tenure in Congress, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Mansfield, which appears under a separate heading.)

PRINTING OF HEARINGS ON EXPORT OF STRATEGIC MATERIALS TO SOVIET-BLOC COUNTRIES

Mr. EASTLAND submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 297), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary three thousand copies of a hearing entitled "Export of Strategic Materials to the U.S.S.R. and Other Soviet-Bloc Countries, Part 2," held by its Internal Security Subcommittee during the Eighty-seventh Congress, first session.

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT A COMPILATION OF TRIBUTES TO HON. CARL HAYDEN

Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. Dirksen) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 298); which was referred to the committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there be printed as a Senate document, a compilation of tributes, together with other related material, delivered on the floor of the United States Senate, to commemorate the occasion of the fiftieth year of congressional service of the Honorable Carl Hayden, of Arizona; and that ——— additional copies be printed for the use of Joint Committee on Printing.

ASSISTANCE FOR CONSTRUCTION OR MODIFICATION OF APPROVED PUBLIC SHELTER SPACE

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall], by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize payment toward the construction or modification of approved public shelter space. This bill is requested by the Department of Defense. I ask unanimous consent that the letter of transmittal from the Secretary of Defense, relating to the bill, be printed in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2857) to further amend section 201 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, to authorize payment toward the construction or modification of approved public shelter space, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Russell (for himself and Mr. Saltonstall), by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The letter presented by Mr. Russell is as follows:

The Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D.C., February 8, 1962.

Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson,
President of the Senate

Dear Mr. President: There is transmitted herewith a draft of a bill entitled "To amend further section 201 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, to authorize payment toward the construction or modification of approved public shelter space, and for other purposes."

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program and the Bureau of the Budget advises that its enactment would be in accord with the program of the President. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted by the Congress as one of the essential tools we are forging to meet the needs of our times.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of this legislation is to authorize payments to any nonprofit institution engaged in health, education, or welfare activities toward the construction or modification of approved shelter space; to authorize shelter protection in civilian or military facilities of the United States; and to authorize certain funds appropriated for shelter and research purposes to remain available until expended. The Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, and Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1958 (72 Stat. 1799) already authorizes the President to provide for other elements of a national civil-defense program.

The major protection of the Nation against a thermonuclear attack is the deterrent effect of our nuclear striking force. Our military posture is being steadily improved to increase this deterrent. But we must also be prepared to meet any possible aggression from any source by an organized, long-range, sensible program of civil defense.

Although there appears to be no practical program that would avoid loss of life during a nuclear attack, we can develop our program of civil defense to increase the number of people who can create the base for recovery after an attack. Details of this program must change as the force and technology of weapons change, but the essential elements of any civil defense program are the same.

First, there must be a warning system to alert the civilian population when an attack is imminent.

Second, we must have shelters constructed, equipped, and provisioned to furnish protection against those effects of attacks for which protection is feasible, such as radioactive fallout.

Third, the system must provide training and equipment so that after an attack, the task of decontamination, firefighting, rescue, and reconstruction can take place.

An effective civil defense requires the participation of every citizen. It calls for advance planning at every level of government—local, State, and National. It demands the complete discharge of the responsibilities for civil defense as expressed by the Congress in the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 by the Federal Government, by the several States, and by their political subdivisions. Planning for civil defense measures must be flexible enough to adapt itself to changes in enemy weapons and tactics. It must be comprehensive enough to cover people living under widely different conditions throughout all geographic areas of the country. The Federal Government will, under the proposed legislation, assume its responsibility and will provide assistance to the State and local governments so that they can assume operating functions.

By July 1962, there will be available detailed information of the extent of the need for fallout shelters in each locality, as a result of the national shelter survey now being conducted. In the meantime, this legislation offers an incentive to the construction of shelter space. It is estimated that enough shelters will be found for about 50 million people. However, many of even this limited number are at daytime locations and could not be reached at night. The deficit in shelters can be made up by family shelters in basements or yards, group shelters in factories, hospitals, offices, apartment houses, and other large buildings, and community shelters in schools and community centers. These group or community shelters can be incorporated into new construction or created by modifying existing structures. They can be designed solely as shelters, but it is expected most of them will serve peacetime purposes as well.

The Federal shelter incentives program provided by the new legislation will offer financial assistance to permit the construction of public shelters by institutions which generally have limited access to financial resources which could be used for this purpose.

Shelter incentive payments under the new subsection 201(k) would be determined on the basis of shelter capacity and would be set at levels substantially below average estimated cost allocable to shelter features of the construction. It is anticipated that the rate of incentive payments to eligible institutions will be set at $25 per approved shelter space, or the cost of shelter construction, whichever is less. The average incremental cost is estimated at $40 per shelter space ($4 per square foot of floor space allowing 10 square feet for each shelter space). New construction or modification, including dual purpose space, will be approved and payment will be determined in accordance with standards and criteria to be contained in regulations prescribed under provisions of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended. Any payment made for shelter would be in addition to any other assistance in construction to the eligible nonprofit institutions by the Federal Government, irrespective of whether such assistance is provided by loan or grant.

Appropriate arrangements would be made for coordinating this new program with related Federal programs.

Schools, colleges, hospitals, clinics, and welfare institutions will be eligible for public fallout shelter incentive payments if they are operated by a State or local government unit or by a nonprofit organization, and if they otherwise meet standards and criteria under the act. The nonprofit character of private institutions will be determined under the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code. To avoid discouraging shelter construction pending enactment of the bill, payment would be authorized for projects which otherwise qualify and construction was begun after January 1, 1962.

All the approved public shelter spaces for which a subsidy payment is made will accommodate 50 or more people, will be open for public use in time of emergency or tests under local civil defense direction, and will be stocked and equipped by the Federal Government. As is now being done in the national shelter survey, supplies will be procured by the Federal Government and transferred to local governments and civil defense organizations. They will make periodic shelter inspections and assure the maintenance of the shelter and the supplies and equipment.

The Federal Government is also including public fallout protection in appropriate new Federal buildings and is now modifying certain existing Federal buildings to include fallout protection. These programs are to be continued, and it is hoped that State and local governments and commercial and industrial concerns will make similar modifications in their facilities, where appropriate.

Important responsibilities for civil defense programs rest with the State and local governments. Their success will depend largely upon the cooperation they receive from the citizens in each community. This bill will help coordinate the programs into an efficient and effective defense against enemy attack.

Section 2 of the draft bill would add a new section 414 to the Federal Civil Defense Act to authorize certain funds appropriated for the civil defense program to remain available until expended. The categories of the funds to which this new authorization would apply are appropriations for payment toward shelter construction, for civil defense research and development activities, and for civil defense construction authorized and approved under the act, for which appropriations are to be made.

It is essential that funds appropriated remain available until expended in the shelter program, the research and development program, and for civil defense construction, to assure the most efficient and economical use of the funds.

Research and development and construction programs of the military departments are on an available until expended basis, and the new section 414 to be added by the draft bill would place these civil defense appropriations of the Department of Defense on the same footing.

An additional new section, 415, also would be added to the Federal Civil Defense Act, as amended, which would specifically authorize shelter protection to be included in civilian or military facilities of the United States. During fiscal year 1962, pursuant to general statutory authority, shelter is being placed in certain Federal facilities best suited for inclusion of shelter features in new construction or by modification of existing facilities. This program is to be continued, and it therefore seems advisable to include at this time specific statutory authorization for the carrying out of this activity as a part of the total civil defense program.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

The cost of Federal incentives program which would be authorized by the proposed new subsection 201(k) is estimated at $450 million for the first year of operation. This will provide an estimated 20 million shelter spaces in nonprofit institutions engaged in education, health, and welfare activities. Administrative support from military, governmental, and nongovernmental facilities is estimated at $10 million, which is 2 percent of the total involved. This estimate includes the cost of services of military engineers, civilian engineers and architects, administrative support, and computer services. The cost of the Federal incentives program in future years will depend on the degree to which the education, health, and welfare institutions respond to the program in its first year.

The amendments to the act proposed by section 2 of the draft bill are technical in nature and would cause no increase in the expenditures of the Federal Government.

Sincerely,

ROBERT S. MCNAMARA.

(Enclosure: Draft of bill.)

FLOOD PROTECTION FOR THE CITY OF PEORIA, ILL.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize certain improvement of the Illinois River at Peoria, Ill., for flood-protection purposes.

The protection would be provided by levee construction, floodwalls, and related work, at an estimated cost to the United States for construction of $10,876,000; provided local interests construct a new storm drainage system, exclusive of the interceptors and pumping stations, and of conversion of the storm drainage outlets for the upland areas to pressure-type sewers.

The city council of the city of Peoria, together with the city manager, in a special policy meeting on Tuesday, February 6, 1962, considered the merits and benefits of this flood-protection project. Their unanimous decision at that special meeting was: First, to express favorable attitude toward the development of the flood-protection project for the city of Peoria as one which merits local, State, and Federal support; and second, to urge the continued study and planning necessary for the development of such a proposal.

The decision reached at the special meeting was later substantiated by formal action of the city council at its regular meeting on Tuesday, February 13, 1962.

The proposal has been recommended by the division engineer, North Central Division, Corps of Engineers, which was concurred in by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors of the Department of the Army.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2858) to authorize certain improvement of the Illinois River at Peoria, Ill., for flood protection purposes, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

PROPOSED DEPARTMENT OF FEDERAL-STATE-URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish a Department of Federal-State-Urban Affairs, and for other purposes.

The purpose of this bill is to strengthen the ability of our Federal system to meet the problems of an increasingly complex society by promoting greater cooperation, coordination of activities, and understanding among the various levels of government. This bill is a reaffirmation of the principles and concept of our Federal system of government. It is designed to bring the full impact of our Federal system into effective action in meeting today's urban growth and change problems. It provides the basis for working together of the various levels of government in such a manner as to anticipate and prevent situations arising, as in the past, which give cause to unnecessary Federal action and big government at the national level.

This bill was prepared to be offered as a substitute for S. 1633 which I considered inadequate and lacking the sound basic concept of our Federal system.

However, after the hasty judgment to abandon S. 1633 and to proceed by the reorganization plan which cuts off the opportunity to improve the proposal, I believe the parliamentary situation justifies introducing this bill at this time as a better, more constructive and sounder alternative in meeting the challenge of growth and change in our communities. I would vote against the reorganization plan as I believe this bill is a better alternative.

This bill not only includes existing agencies of the Housing and Home Finance Administration, the Public Housing Administration, the Federal Housing Administration, the Federal National Mortgage Association, and the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations but it also legislatively makes a declaration of policy and prescribes the duties and responsibilities of the Secretary and the Department. This bill brings into the Department the advisory committee on a permanent basis. This gives Governors, State legislators, mayors, and county officials the personal participation and voice their problems, offices, and responsibilities justify.

In the establishment of any new department, it seems essential to me that the act creating the department must clearly make a legislative declaration of policy as the guiding spirit for the department. This would establish the overall concept, goal, and mission in proper relationship with other agencies of the National Government and to our Federal system. This bill sets out the declaration of policy. The declaration of policy is as follows:

> SEC. 2. The Congress finds and declares that the complexity of modern life intensifies the need in our federal form of government for the fullest cooperation and coordination of activities between the levels of government, and that population growth and scientific developments portend an increasingly complex society in future years. In recognition of the foregoing the Congress finds that the establishment of an executive department is desirable to give continuing attention to matters requiring Federal, State, and local cooperation; to achieve the best administration of certain programs of the Federal Government which have a major effect on State and local development; and to provide for full and appropriate consideration, at the national level, of the needs and interests of the States and their local communities.

This bill prescribes the duties and responsibilities of the Secretary and the Department. Those duties and responsibilities, in addition to those transferred with agencies, are as follows:

> Conduct continuing comprehensive studies with respect to problems requiring Federal and State or local cooperation (including problems relating to housing, transportation, and community development); advise the President with respect to Federal programs and activities relating to such problems; develop and recommend to the President policies for fostering, in cooperation with the States, the orderly growth and development of the Nation's communities, whether incorporated or unincorporated; exercise leadership at the direction of the President in coordinating Federal activities affecting the Nation's communities; provide technical assistance and information, including a clearinghouse service to State, county, town, village, or other local government, in developing solutions to State and local problems; and encourage comprehensive planning by the State and local governments with a view to coordinating Federal, State, and community development activities at the local level. Bring together representatives of the Federal, State, and local governments for the consideration of common problems; provide a forum for discussing the administration and coordination of Federal grant and other programs requiring intergovernmental cooperation; give critical attention to the conditions and controls involved in the administration of Federal grant programs; make available technical assistance to the executive and legislative branches of the Federal Government in the review of proposed legislation to determine its overall effect on the Federal system; encourage discussion and study at an early stage of emerging public problems that are likely to require intergovernmental cooperation; recommend, within the framework of the Constitution, the most desirable allocation of governmental functions, responsibilities, and revenues among the several levels of government; and recommend methods of coordinating and simplifying tax laws and administrative practices to achieve a more orderly and less competitive fiscal relationship between the levels of government and to reduce the burden of compliance for taxpayers.

Of course, no new department should be created unless there is a need for it. In this case, I sincerely believe that there is a need for a Department of Federal-State-Urban Affairs with a declaration of policy and an outline of its duties and responsibilities giving it substance by a statutory mandate. It seems to me this is the way we can overcome the fragmented and conflicting efforts of the various levels of government and at the same time give vigorous recognition and strengthening support to State and local governments as a vital part of our Federal Union.

The facts justifying this need are apparent wherever we look. They are more fully discussed in part and outlined by various reports and studies of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. I refer to its publications, "Governmental Structure, Organization, and Planning in Metropolitan Areas," "Intergovernmental Responsibilities for Mass Transportation Facilities and Services in Metropolitan Areas," and an information report entitled "Tax Overlapping in the United States—1961."

I believe that the Federal Government, when appropriate, and it is appropriate in many areas, should render cooperative assistance in dealing with our urgent problems throughout the Nation such as those existing and developing across most State lines and levels of government as a result of urban growth and change.

Certainly, the Federal Government should leave to State and local governments those programs and problems which they are capable of best handling, including tax sources as a part of local capacity. In order to accomplish this, we must look at the total picture of Federal, State, and local governments so that we might more effectively know when, where, and how the Federal Government should render assistance in dealing with these problems and when it should not. Otherwise, as it has been the trend, the Federal Government, bit by bit, will creep into areas as problems arise which could be best handled by the State and local governments.

Furthermore, with the executive branch of Federal Government over these past years getting bigger and bigger, it is important to organize it in such a way that it is manageable, effective, efficient, and responsible to our electorate. The creation of a Department of Federal-State-Urban Affairs would place Federal, State, urban relations in proper perspective and relation to the President and the Congress, thus giving the electorate the opportunity to pass its judgment on the direction of these affairs.

As it now stands, without an adequate Federal department created by the Congress responsible to the President, the Federal activities are fragmented, uncoordinated, operating in many directions and areas, and hard to keep up with. As a result, the Federal Government grows bigger, takes more taxes; and the State and local governments find it more difficult to meet their problems; and, most important, the public does not have the total picture in perspective to exercise its judgment.

The Department of Urban Affairs and Housing reorganization plan is totally inadequate. It fails because it is unable to place the Federal Government in a sound position under our Federal system to meet the urgent problems related to urban growth and change. It does not have a declaration of policy for broad guidance and direction. It does not even have a basic concept and it could not have under the reorganization procedure because the President cannot legislate. It does not provide a goal or mission or prescribe responsibilities and duties other than those limited ones of the agencies incorporated. It does not make provision for the bringing together of representatives of the Federal, State, and local governments for the consideration of common problems. It does not cope with the total problem of urban affairs.

To approve the President's reorganization plan would, at most, accomplish nothing more than is being done. It is a name that has an image. But a name and image are not enough to successfully help meet the urgent problems with which our people are confronted in our fast-growing communities and country.

This plan, no matter how well intended as a start, is a sham. To approve it would be a step backward because the time would be delayed when a department would be legislatively created with purpose and substance to make real progress in strengthening our Federal, State, and local governments' efforts to successfully meet the pressing current and future problems requiring coordinated government action at all levels.

It is my hope that the President's plan will be disapproved and that the Congress will move ahead in a sound legislative manner to work on the total problem of strengthening our Federal system and meeting the urgent problems of urban growth and change.

I hope the Congress will give consideration to the bill I have proposed as well as other bills that have been or may be introduced on this subject.

There is a national awareness and urgency for the development of policies and organization based upon the sound concept of our Federal system for dealing with the many, varied, and expanding problems requiring the closest functioning and best appropriate efforts of all levels of government.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2861) to establish a Department of Federal-State-Urban Affairs, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BOGGS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

TECHNICAL AND MATERIAL AID TO COMMUNIST COUNTRIES

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a concurrent resolution in behalf of the National Indignation Convention, which calls for an end to technical and material aid to Communist countries, and that material in process or transfer shall be returned to our own land.

I send the concurrent resolution to the desk and ask for its appropriate reference.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 58) was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That no funds will be appropriated for the purpose of training military personnel from any Communist country or any country dominated by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

All Communists and other representatives of enemy countries now being trained in the United States as pilots, technicians, and other military personnel shall be returned to their own lands at the earliest possible moment.

The transfer to Communist and other enemy nations of all planes and other weapons of war, and materials that may be converted to weapons of war, shall be terminated at once.

Any such material in process of transfer shall be stopped in transit and returned to the United States; and any and all agreements relative thereto shall be canceled immediately.

Any persons in Government found guilty of violating the provisions of this resolution shall be removed from office.

REPORTS ON UTILIZATION OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND U.S. DOLLARS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, in accordance with the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the reports of the Committee on Public Works and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized by that committee in 1961 in connection with foreign travel.

There being no objection, the reports were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate

[Expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1960]

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Pat McNamara:											
Norway	Kroner	670.59	95.78	471.84	67.40	2,005.62	286.51	83.45	11.92	3,231.50	461.61
Sweden	do	132.89	26.58	160.70	32.14	50.00	10.00	34.70	6.94	378.29	75.66
France	New franc	290.21	58.04	358.08	71.61	473.03	94.60	196.56	39.31	1,317.88	263.56
Total			180.40		171.15		391.11		58.17		800.83
Senator Stephen M. Young:											
Norway	Kroner	622.74	88.95	571.84	81.69	2,110.62	295.86	104.45	14.78	3,409.65	481.28
Sweden	do	132.89	26.58	210.70	42.14	100.00	20.00	59.70	11.94	503.29	100.66
France	New franc	442.36	88.47	483.08	96.61	673.03	134.60	116.56	23.31	1,715.03	342.99
Total			204.00		220.44		450.46		50.03		924.93
Senator Jennings Randolph:											
Norway	Kroner	697.44	99.63	746.84	106.69	2,145.62	306.52	368.25	52.61	3,958.15	565.45
Sweden	do	211.84	42.37	57.70	11.54			34.70	6.94	304.24	60.85
France	New franc	283.96	56.79	508.08	102.01	463.03	92.60	346.56	69.31	1,601.63	320.71
Total			198.79		220.24		399.12		128.86		947.01
Senator Oren E. Long:											
Norway	Kroner	693.74	97.95	621.84	87.69	2,155.62	301.86	383.45	53.78	3,854.65	541.28
Sweden	do	7.89	1.58	10.70	2.14			34.70	6.94	53.29	10.66
France	New franc	362.36	73.77	408.08	82.41	473.03	95.00	291.56	59.11	1,535.03	310.29
Total			173.30		172.24		396.86		119.83		862.23
Senator Ernest Gruening:											
Norway	Kroner	593.74	83.95	627.64	88.66	2,305.62	322.86	470.05	66.15	3,997.05	561.62
Sweden	do	157.89	31.58	160.70	32.14	50.00	10.00	184.70	27.94	553.29	101.66
France	New franc	662.36	134.97	708.08	143.61	373.03	74.60	391.56	79.71	2,135.03	432.89
Total			250.50		264.41		407.46		173.80		1,096.17
Senator Hiram L. Fong:											
Norway	Kroner	700.88	98.95	867.84	122.13	2,184.19	305.86	369.16	51.78	4,122.07	578.72
Sweden	do	293.60	41.58	260.70	37.14			56.27	10.00	610.57	88.72
France	New franc	475.81	95.16	804.43	160.88	504.98	100.99	613.56	122.71	2,398.78	479.74
Total			235.69		320.15		406.85		184.49		1,147.18
Irving E. Moore, chief clerk:											
Norway	Kroner	798.89	112.00	921.84	129.12	2,145.62	300.52	223.45	31.37	4,089.80	573.01
Sweden	do	156.39	31.28	313.70	62.74			78.20	15.64	548.29	109.66
France	New franc	362.36	72.42	608.08	121.61	448.03	89.60	166.56	33.31	1,585.03	316.94
Total			215.70		313.47		390.12		80.32		999.61

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate—**Continued**

[Expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1960]

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Charles Davis:											
Norway	Kroner	580.00	81.95	580.00	81.95	2,220.00	316.52	225.00	31.78	3,605.00	512.20
Sweden	do	158.00	31.58	261.00	52.14	50.00	10.00	85.00	16.94	554.00	110.66
France	New franc	562.00	112.47	833.00	166.61	523.00	104.60	167.00	33.31	2,085.00	416.99
Total			226.00		300.70		431.12		82.03		1,039.85
Theo W. Sneed, staff member:											
Norway	Kroner	580.00	81.95	636.00	89.66	2,220.00	316.52	225.00	31.78	3,661.00	519.91
Sweden	do	158.00	31.58	261.00	52.14	50.00	10.00	85.00	16.94	554.00	110.66
France	New franc	562.00	112.47	833.00	166.61	523.00	104.60	167.00	33.31	2,085.00	416.99
Total			226.00		308.41		431.12		82.03		1,047.56
George W. Sundborg:											
Norway	Kroner	393.74	55.95	627.64	88.66	2,255.62	321.52	383.45	53.78	3,660.45	519.91
Sweden	do	7.89	1.58	110.70	22.14	50.00	10.00	384.70	76.94	553.29	110.66
France	New franc	662.36	134.97	683.08	139.01	473.03	96.60	316.56	64.11	2,135.03	434.69
Total			192.50		249.81		428.12		194.83		1,065.26
Grand total			2,102.88		2,541.02		4,132.34		1,154.39		9,930.63

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	$9,930.63

DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works.

FEBRUARY 7, 1962.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, U.S. Senate

[Expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1960]

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Joseph S. Clark:											
Sweden	Kroner	118.27	22.90							118.27	22.90
France	Franc	72.95	14.84	34.41	7.00	73.74	15.00	59.34	12.07	240.44	48.91
Total			37.74		7.00		15.00		12.07		71.81

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	$71.81

LISTER HILL,
Chairman, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PRESERVATION OF CERTAIN VETERANS' EDUCATIONAL RIGHTS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] may be added as a cosponsor of S. 2697, a bill to preserve veterans' educational rights for reservists and National Guardsmen called to active duty.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF MILITARY PERSONNEL

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, is absent from the Senate today because of official business. In his absence he has asked me to announce that the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights will hold 2 days of hearings this week on the constitutional rights of military personnel.

The hearings, which will commence at 10 a.m. tomorrow, February 20, in room 457 and continue through Wednesday, February 21, are the first of a series which the subcommittee will conduct on the subject of military justice. This week the subcommittee will hear testimony from members of the Department of Defense, the armed services, and judges of the U.S. Court of Military Appeals. Additional hearings will be held early in March, at which time the subcommittee will receive testimony from members of the bar of the District of Columbia, the New York bar, from representatives of veterans' associations, the American Bar Association, law professors, and other persons of wide experience in the field of military law.

As the Senate knows, these hearings were originally scheduled earlier in February, but urgent legislative business necessitated their postponement. I am pleased to announce that they have been rescheduled and I am confident that they will make a meaningful contribution to the subject of military law and its administration.

NOTICE OF CHANGE IN DATE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF J. SKELLY WRIGHT, TO BE U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that the hearing originally scheduled on the nomination of J. Skelly Wright, of Louisiana, to be U.S. circuit judge for the District of Columbia circuit, vice J. Barrett Prettyman, retired, for Thursday, February 22, 1962, has been rescheduled for Wednesday, February 28, 1962, at 10:30

a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], and myself, as chairman.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

Report of poll recently conducted by himself in North Dakota on various administration policies and programs.

TRIBUTES TO SENATOR HAYDEN, OF ARIZONA, ON THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF HIS SERVICE IN THE U.S. CONGRESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, it is anticipated that at the conclusion of the morning hour time will be set aside in which those of us who wish to do so will pay tribute to our distinguished President pro tempore, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], on the 50th anniversary of his entrance into the Congress of the United States.

BY WHAT STANDARD SHOULD U.S. TV BE JUDGED?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD portions of an article entitled "By What Standard Should U.S. TV Be Judged?" written by Richard P. Doherty.

I have known Mr. Doherty for over 20 years. He worked under me during the war as a director of our civil defense in Massachusetts. Since that time he has been in Washington as a consultant in broadcasting. He has visited radio-TV stations in 49 of our 50 States, and has observed and worked with TV systems in 15 foreign countries.

This is an excellent article on the advantages we now have in the United States in our TV programs.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BY WHAT STANDARD SHOULD U.S. TV BE JUDGED?

BROADCASTING EXPERT WITH WORLDWIDE EXPERIENCE CHALLENGES CRITICS

(Broadcast consultant Richard P. Doherty, who contributes this stimulating article, is well known to Sponsor readers for his year-end economic forecasts. He has visited radio-TV stations in 49 of our 50 States, and has observed and worked with TV systems in 15 foreign nations. He represents a major Japanese TV network in the Unitd States as well as numerous American outlets, and has attended many international economic conferences. A member of Phi Beta Kappa, he is author of many respected textbooks and articles.)

(By Richard P. Doherty)

By what standards should the American TV industry be appraised and judged? As a medium, it should not be evaluated according to the personal tastes of an individual, a group of individuals, or even a few thousand individuals. For many, many months, various persons—with good access to the printed media—have cast aspersions on American TV because, too frequently, they have chosen their own cultural and literary standards as arbitrary measures of public interest and public needs.

We are not a nation of morons. The millions of Americans who daily watch TV programs are the fabric of the Nation—they are not misguided, uneducated people of low cultural standards. Against the articulate criticism of a few thousand persons who like to write letters, there are millions of solid Americans who go on, daily and weekly, liking our American brand of TV.

The FCC has received several thousand letters which criticize TV programing. How many letters were sent to the FCC from the 12 to 15 million homes which regularly, each week, tune to "The Untouchables," "Bonanza," "Gunsmoke," and similar programs? These millions of citizens include factory workers, housewives, doctors, lawyers, farmers, secretaries, professors, government workers, schoolteachers, business executives.

Television is the current object of attack from certain public groups, from the intelligentsia, the avant garde, and the newspapers and magazines. The latter—newspapers and magazines—are fighting a dollar and profit battle against TV and are not always objective in their opinions and articles, because the rapid expansion of TV hurts their advertising pocketbook. Many other critics of TV are motivated by their specialized interests and often ignore or disdain mass public interests even though their criticism may be offered in good faith.

There would be far more justifiable criticism of American TV if the medium primarily served segmentized group interests rather than mass public interest.

As producers of a consumer service, every network or station executive would welcome objective criticism and objective appraisal by the public. Unfortunately, much of the criticism of TV has come from persons who assume that they know what interests the public, or assume that they know what is best for the public.

It is, indeed, constructive to subject a mass medium of communication, such as TV, to objective appraisal and criticism. However, to be objective, one must have some standards or yardsticks from which he may evaluate results and achievements.

Why not examine American TV industry according to the programs, accomplishments, and public services of TV throughout the world?

The critics of American TV will not prefer this standard because, by it, overall American TV programing is the best and most diversified which is offered to the public in any nation, anywhere in the world.

In no other nation is TV watched and enjoyed by the public for so many daily and weekly hours, by the average family, because in no other nation is TV so interesting and so much to the varied total public taste as in the United States.

In no other nation does the public possess the wide choice of diversified program selection as in the United States. Japan ranks second and Canada and England third regarding diversified public choice of TV programing. In France, Italy, Switzerland, Russia, Spain, Portugal, Holland, Egypt, and every other nation, the public has only the limited program presentations of the governmentally owned, dominated, and dictated TV system.

American TV has become a preeminently greater medium of mass communications than any other in the world.

During any given week, the U.S. public has more total hours of free choice of discussion, talk, forum, education, news, farm information, and so-called public service programs than is available to the public in any nation of the world including England, France, Italy, Germany, Japan, Sweden, Holland, Switzerland, Egypt.

Religious TV programing hardly exists outside of the United States.

In no other nation of the world is there so much fully equal TV time for political talks and controversial discussions as in the United States—and without political bias.

During each and every year, the three American networks devote more money, manpower, know-how, and total telecast hours to education, talks, discussion, and public affairs than in all the nations of the world combined. Who, among TV's critics, gives the networks full credit for these many hours of TV program service despite the loss of profits involved and the public service rendered? As one single example, the three networks spent upwards to $500,000, with a crew of nearly 150 persons working for 2 weeks, to bring the dramatic Alan Shepard space flight to all of America on May 5, 1961.

Television, as a broadcasting and set manufacturing industry, has had its greatest growth and widespread public acceptance in the United States—and by a wide margin—and because TV programing has progressively appealed to the vast American public.

The most highly developed public use of TV, except in the United States, is in England, Japan, and Canada. It is significant that in all three of these nations, American programs rank among the most popular in public favor.

Ironically, to the consternation of the critics, the American TV programs which are popular with the people of foreign nations are the same programs which attract the largest mass public audience in the United States. Many critics shudder at the thought that our adult western and detective TV shows are big favorites with the Japanese, Canadian, and other foreign people.

In no other nation of the world, without exception, does the public possess the tremendous variety of total entertainment choice as is telecast daily and weekly by the American networks and stations.

In no other nation is there the massive TV news coverage that prevails—daily and weekly—throughout the United States.

* * * * *

No TV system, in England, continental Europe and elsewhere, achieves the overall professional production techniques of American TV. Throughout 80 percent of the world, TV program production doesn't remotely approach our networks and, in fact, rarely equals the local production competency of individual stations in our first 75 metropolitan markets.

The author of these observations has either worked with or has visited or observed TV broadcast operations throughout most of the world and around the world. Except possibly in England, France, and Italy, he has been impressed by the fact that American TV is regarded by the broadcast professionals as the ideal standard of accomplishment and the goal of achievemeant. Throughout the world, the United States has set the mark of program-production achievement for other national TV systems.

On the basis of our personal worldwide experience with TV, we view many of the self-appointed critics as comparable to those persons who point to our city slums as being typical Americana. Of course, there is mediocre TV programing but this does not truly represent the overwhelmingly predominant hours of good network and station TV programing. However, whenever mediocre programs—by public interest standards—are put on the air by stations or networks, public disapproval is prompt and rapid via audience circulation. No TV executive can possibly force the public to like any given program regardless of his personal opinions.

Who is to say that any given TV program is bad and should be replaced if millions of Americans like the program enough to tune in week after week?

This brings us to a second objective or yardstick by which American TV should be appraised, namely, public interest in our network and station TV programing.

As of today, American TV belongs to the public and free public tastes dominate program choice. No group or governmental agency decides what the public should watch on its home TV screen.

RECTIFICATION OF WRONG ARISING FROM WAR OF INDEPENDENCE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, it is my pleasure and privilege today to advise the Senate that I have received information that one of the remaining vestigates of conflict arising from our War of Independence has been liquidated. I ask unanimous consent that a series of letters between certain citizens of the United States and the Right Honorable Selwyn Lloyd, Chancellor of the Exchequer of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, be inserted in the RECORD. It is my firm belief that these letters, signifying the rectification of an ancient wrong, may herald the dawn of a new era of Anglo-American amity.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. PETER'S CHURCH,
Philadelphia, Pa., August 11, 1961.

Rt. Hon. SELWYN LLOYD, C.B.E., T.D., Q.C., M.P.,
Chancellor of Exchequer, the Treasury, Whitehall, London, S.W. 1, England.

SIR: St. Peter's Church will celebrate its bicentennial on September 10, 1961, and we are desirous of starting our third century of Christian worship after that date with all accounts settled. Therefore, we must ask you to reimburse this parish for a quantity of firewood obtained by British troops in the winter of 1777–78 by the expedient of tearing down our fence.

Mr. Frank E. Seymour, our accounting warden, has informed me that on February 1, 1778, one Maj. Edward Williams, of the Royal Artillery, wrote to the Reverend Mr. Coombe, then rector of St. Peter's, stating that his commander, General Pettison would see that "a reasonable allowance" was made for the fence.

Although a copy of that pledge is included in the minutes of the vestry for February 1778, no such reasonable allowance has been forthcoming.

In view of the length of the fence, which was seasoned at the time, although relatively new, I should judge that a reasonable allowance in 1778 would have been approximately $18. There is no legal justification for making any greater demand.

At the same time, it is suggested that 183 years is an unconscionably long time for an indebtedness of this nature to remain unpaid. As a consequence, we in turn would consider it reasonable to ask for the payment of interest at the rate of 6 percent, compounded annually, in addition to the principal sum of $18.

Yours truly,

JOSEPH KOCI, Jr.,
Rector.

SEPTEMBER 8, 1961.

The Reverend JOSEPH KOCI, Jr.

DEAR SIR: The Chancellor of the Exchequer has asked me to thank you for your letter of August 11, bringing damage allegedly done to the fence round your church by British troops in the winter of 1777–78.

The Chancellor observes that, as this is said to have occurred before the Treaty of Versailles in 1783, Pennsylvania was at that time a British colonial territory. The convention is that claims by citizens of colonial territories against the Government, which have not been settled by the date of independence, lie against the successor government unless a special arrangement is made to the contrary. No such special arrangement can be traced; and, therefore, I am asked to advise that you should refer your claim either to the Federal Government of the United States of America, or to the State government of Pennsylvania, as you feel appropriate. This is quite apart from the issue of claims lapsing by passage of time according to English law.

I am, however, asked by the Chancellor being, as presumably Major Williams was, of Welsh origin himself and being also formerly an officer in the Royal Artillery, to forward to you his personal cheque for £6 8s. 1d. the present equivalent, at $2.81 to the pound, of $18, by way of a contribution to the funds of your church, and as a token of his deep regard for the American people, in the hope, however, that it will not be considered to prejudice your claim against the Federal Government of the United States of America, or the State government of Pennsylvania.

Finally the Chancellor wishes me to convey his very best wishes for your bicentenary; and to commend to you the words of the 15th verse of the third chapter of St. Paul's Epistle to the Corinthians.[1]

Yours faithfully,

C. J. CAREY,
Private Secretary.

ST. PETER'S CHURCH,
Philadelphia, Pa., September 12, 1961.

Rt. Hon. SELWYN LLOYD, C.B.E., T.D., Q.C., M.P.,
Chancellor of the Exchequer, Treasury Chambers, Great George Street, S.W. 1, London, England.

DEAR SIR: I wish to extend my sincere thanks for your personal check in the sum of $18 to cover the longstanding debt owed for the fence at St. Peter's Church, and to convey my appreciation for the most gracious letter from your secretary, Mr. Carey.

With an evergrowing sense of oneness that allows for such humor and friendly jesting, one of another we cannot fail, with God's grace, to remain strong in our purpose to be witnesses of God's commandments to the world.

Faithfully,

JOSEPH KOCI, Jr.,
Rector.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *September 13, 1961.*

Hon. SELWYN LLOYD,
Office of the Exchequer, London.

DEAR SIR: My late father was a choirboy at St. Peter's in Philadelphia, and in his memory I should like to assume and discharge the alleged indebtedness with respect to the church fence, notwithstanding your recent generous act in personally assuming this claim. With all due respect, would I not be a more appropriate donor?

Accordingly, I beg you to accept my enclosed check in the sum of $18.

With sincerest regards, I remain,

Very truly yours,

JOSEPH R. SIEGERT.

VAN NUYS, CALIF., *September 15, 1961.*

The Honourable SELWYN LLOYD,
Chancellor of the Exchequer, London.

DEAR SIR: I have read in the newspaper that you have sent your personal check to a church in Pennsylvania in payment of alleged damages done to the church fence by British soldiers prior to the independent status of the United States.

In appreciation of your high honour in paying off the claim of the church with your personal check, and in sympathy with England's plight in trade balances, and its austerity program, I am sending my personal check so that your donation will be compensated in international monetary exchange. I do this also as a token of my esteem of the English people (and, of course, the Welsh) and your contribution to honouring the name Lloyd.

Sincerely yours,

J. STANLEY LLOYD.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, the 44th anniversary of Lithuanian independence, which occurred on February 16, again calls attention to the fate of this gallant people, who throughout long periods in their history have suffered under Russian imperialism.

After having attained liberty in 1918, and after having enjoyed freedom for about two decades, Lithuania came under the domination of their giant neighbor, and to this day they have been denied their independence by the Kremlin leaders.

There is no greater hypocrisy than Khrushchev's announcement to the effect that the Soviet Union advocates the principle of self-determination of peoples. This is a fraud and a deceit. Khrushchev merely hopes to gain the support of the so-called neutrals or uncommitted nations in the cold war struggle. We must never tire, therefore, of reminding the new emerging nations that the greatest system of colonialism the world has ever known exists in the Communist empire today. We must remind them also that Communist imperialism must one day be eliminated if peace with justice is to be established among nations.

Let us hope that our national policy will continue to reflect the sincere desire and purpose of the American people to work for the eventual liberation of the captive peoples including the long-suffering people of Lithuania.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following excerpt from a publication entitled "Problems of the Peoples of the U.S.S.R.," 1961, No. 12, dealing with the Soviet record of imperialism, be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SOVIET RECORD OF IMPERIALISM

But the question remains why the Soviet Union decided to launch such a reckless attack on those countries which oppose its drive for world conquest at this time. Every outstanding colonial question of real substance is to be found on the agenda of this session of the General Assembly. There are two major items on the agenda of the plenary alone which will make it possible to discuss all aspects of the general problem.

---

[1] "If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss: but he himself shall be saved; yet so as by fire."

Why has the Soviet Union twice in the last 2 years attempted to seize the initiative on the colonial issue from the new states of Africa and Asia? Why has the Soviet Union attempted to inject East-West differences into the complicated and difficult North-South problems, thereby making it less likely that we will be able to find realistic and meaningful solutions? Why has the Soviet Union sought to distract the General Assembly from the tried and true procedures it has followed for 15 years with such marked success, substituting a war of words for detailed discussion and specific recommendations of individual territories and problems?

There are at least two answers.

First, the Soviet Union does not wish the United Nations to operate successfully in this or any other field. The Soviet Union is fearful that the solution of outstanding colonial problems involving the West will impel the United Nations to focus attention on the situation in the vast Soviet empire.

Moreover, in the past 15 years, as the process of self-determination in the ex-colonial areas of Asia and Africa was rapidly expanding the world community of free and independent nations, the contrary process was taking place within the periphery of the Soviet Union. Wherever the influence of the Soviet armed forces could be brought to bear, independent countries, many of which had just been liberated from Hitler's terror, were absorbed and their national aspirations savagely repressed by a state bent on the eradication of the national identity of all peoples within the Soviet domain.

This indicates the second wellspring of Soviet interest in the colonial question in the United Nations. The Soviet memorandum and initiative is a diversionary move; and attempt to prevent the world organization from focusing on the serious deprivations of human rights in the Soviet world.

Many criteria have been developed over the years to determine whether or not a particular situation falls into the colonial category. Surely the key, however, is the absence of self-determination for the dependent peoples concerned.

Because the world cannot long remain half slave and half free, the United States expects that the United Nations will focus its attention as carefully on the colonialism of the Soviet Union as it does on that of Portugal or any other nation. For if the Soviet Union comes to believe it can enforce a double standard in the world with complete impunity, no country in the world will be safe.

The record speaks for itself.

LITHUANIA'S DAY OF LIBERATION WILL COME

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, today I pause for a moment to hail a gallant people and to note that February 16 was the 44th anniversary of the restoration of the independence of Lithuania. Lithuanians still await the date on which they can celebrate this occasion together on their own soil, free from Communist domination and free to express their own national self-determination. We know this nation can endure, and its people will prevail. We stand together.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, freedom and independence, democracy and popular government were the goals for which the First World War was waged, and the Lithuanians were among the small oppressed peoples for whom these goals were attained. The autocracies in Europe were overthrown when the war ended, and the long-oppressed and downtrodden nationalities found their opportunity to fulfill their ancient yearnings for independence.

The Lithuanian people had been striving toward this goal ever since 1795, when a sturdy independent Lithuania gave way to the overwhelming might of the czarist dictator. When the decrepit and detested czarist dictatorship was shattered by the Russian revolution, the Lithuanians proclaimed their independence on February 16, 1918. They then established the Lithuanian Republic, rebuilt their war-torn country, strengthened democratic institutions, and proved themselves worthy of their ancient tradition of freedom. Lithuanian spokesmen advocated the cause of peace in the League of Nations after Lithuania was admitted to the world body in 1921.

During this period the Lithuanians lived in friendship with their Russian neighbors, and ancient conflicts between Lithuania and Poland became less important than ever before. This demonstrates the ridiculousness of the Soviet claim that independent nations in Eastern Europe would constitute a threat to her national security. The happy period between the wars came to an abrupt end in 1939. The country was again invaded, first by the Germans and then—as the war drew to a close—by the Red army. Lithuania was incorporated into the Soviet Union, and thus ended the independent Lithuanian Republic.

For over 20 unhappy years, the Lithuanian people have not known the freedom which they expected to be theirs at the end of the war. Having suffered cruelly, they were then rudely shocked to find themselves behind the Iron Curtain. In their historic homeland they are held a satellite of a foreign power, dominated by Communist totalitarianism. During all these years they have been holding firm to their cherished traditions and hoping and praying for their deliverance.

In the United States Lithuanians and their children have made outstanding contributions in the arts, education, business, and sports. Lithuanian-Americans have made strong efforts to preserve their original culture within the framework of the American way of life. Lithuania has a tenacious hold on her sons in America, although their memories of the old country have been well integrated with their allegiance to their country of adoption.

Mr. President, I am proud to join the Lithuanian people on the 44th anniversary of their independence in the prayer that the independence and freedom of their homeland will eventually be realized.

TRIBUTE TO LONG ISLAND UNION'S PROTEST ON TRADE WITH COMMUNIST BLOC

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I wish to invite the attention of the Senate to the protest of a Long Island local of the International Association of Machinists to U.S. policies on trade with the Communist bloc. This protest has unusual significance because, if successful, it will mean the loss of jobs for the union's members in an area already seriously threatened by employment cuts. The union's members are willing to suffer this risk rather than contribute their labor and know-how to producing valuable machinery for the Soviet Union.

The attitude of this local union is inspiring. It demonstrates that the American people are willing to make sacrifices for the Nation's welfare far beyond those which the Government has asked. In recent years the United States and our free world allies have made a substantial contribution to Communist growth and power by being major suppliers of advanced technology and machinery to the Sino-Soviet bloc. This trend has continued unabated despite the Berlin crisis and the outbreak of actual hostilities in Vietnam and Laos. The action of this IAM local is a warning that the American people have no stomach for a business-as-usual policy with our avowed enemies.

My investigation of this subject has convinced me that most of our difficulties stem from the failure of the United States to obtain the cooperation of our allies on a firmer policy toward Communist bloc trade. In this case, for example, the Commerce Department apparently has approved the shipment of the machinery to the Soviet Union because the same equipment could be purchased from other Western countries. No one can expect American industry and labor to bear the whole burden of the political and economic struggle in which the world is engaged. But perhaps the example of self-sacrifice provided by the members of the IAM will be contagious beyond our borders and will spur a greater effort by the State Department to tighten and coordinate our international control system.

The Communist bloc is waging an unrelenting war against freedom on many fronts. The economic battleground is less apparent to some than the military and political battlegrounds, but it is no less real. We have most of the advantages in any economic contest with the Communists, but they have been largely forfeited by lack of imaginative policy planning. We must wake up to the fact that trade can be a positive weapon for winning concessions from the Communists if a sensible and unified control system is instituted. Failure to do so will permit the Communists to continue to gain on the West in every transaction despite their weak bargaining position. Mr. President, I am glad to pay tribute to the patriotic spirit and high sense of purpose of the members of this IAM local.

FANCY BOOKKEEPING ON THE NEW FRONTIER

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, yesterday in a television interview the Secretary of Agriculture said that he was unable to determine from what source I obtained the figures I used in my remarks of February 12 and February 15, as appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on pages 2173–2174 and 2295–2296, respectively, when I suggested there had been some fancy bookkeeping on the New Frontier. It seemed he could not recall their erroneous claim of a $1½ billion reduction in agriculture inventories.

I am always delighted to assist the Secretary of Agriculture by furnishing any information he may need. For his information, I obtained some of my figures from the Department of Agriculture reports published January 12, 1962, designated as USDA 159–62. In this report the Department claimed that the loans and inventories of agricultural commodities on November 30, 1960, were $9,150,087,000, and that on November 30, 1961, they had declined to $7,647,236,000, thus indicating a reduction of approximately $1½ billion.

The second report on which I based my remarks was published by the Department of Agriculture under date of February 13, 1962—last week—and designated USDA 565–62. In this report the Department corrected the method of bookkeeping and used the same method in arriving at the valuations of inventories of 1960 and 1962. This later report showed the December 31, 1961 loans and inventories as being $7,685,946,000, and the December 31, 1960, loans and inventories after comparable adjustment as being $7,908,135,000. That puts both figures on a comparable basis and reduced their earlier claim by around $1,300 million.

I congratulated the Secretary last Thursday for making this correction.

The reason I raised the question in the first place was that a misunderstanding was being given by several of the administration officials in their speeches.

By comparing figures which had been arrived at on two entirely different bases they were intentionally or unintentionally leaving the impression that great progress had been made toward reducing these agriculture surpluses.

For instance, I quote what the President said in his message submitted to the Congress on January 30, 1962. He said:

> By the beginning of 1961, when the emergency legislation was introduced to reduce inventories, the Commodity Credit Corporation had over $9 billion in loans and inventories.

In his press conference held on January 31, 1962, the President when discussing our strategic stockpiling program made a statement in which he referred to the agricultural inventories as being less than $7.7 billion. I quote from the article published in the Washington Post and Times-Herald February 1, 1962:

> He said the total stockpile now amounts to $7.7 billion worth of materials—a figure beyond the value of the mountain of surplus farm products now in storage.

Thus, the President by referring to the present inventories of agriculture commodities as being less than $7.7 billion and then referring to the inventories of a year ago as having been in excess of $9 billion, left the impression of a $1½ billion reduction.

The fact is that there has been very little change in the inventories during the past year. The December 31 corrected report which was released last week, February 12, 1962, showed increases in inventories of practically all commodities except cotton.

The point I am making—and the point I raised—is that the Department has been using two methods of evaluation of the inventories of the different years. Based upon their own report of last week, they acknowledged this error and the correction reduced their previous claim by $1,430 million.

I sincerely hope that the Secretary will take the time to read the two reports which have come out of his own office, and if at any time I can be of any further assistance, I trust that he will feel free to call on me.

DEDICATION OF OKLAHOMA PRESS ASSOCIATION HEADQUARTERS

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, the Oklahoma Press Association recently dedicated a new headquarters building in Oklahoma City. This magnificent edifice stands on Lincoln Boulevard, a few blocks north of the Oklahoma Capitol Building, as a symbol as well as a workaday reminder of the integrity and vitality of the fourth estate in Oklahoma.

When this new structure was dedicated January 26, 1962, the dedicatory prayer was offered by Dr. James R. Scales, President of Oklahoma Baptist University, Shawnee, Okla. Dr. Scales reminded us anew of the profound responsibility which must be borne by the free press of our State and of our Nation. I call his prayer to the attention of the Senate and, hopefully, to the attention of the newsmen who work with us here from day to day, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD for all to read.

There being no objection, the prayer was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

PRAYER FOR THE OKLAHOMA PRESS ASSOCIATION

BY DR. JAMES R. SCALES

O God, our dear Father, source of all truth and knowledge, we call for Thy blessing upon all who gather and distribute the words which bind our world together. We ask that Thou wouldst bless this building, dedicated to light, truth, and freedom, as Thou hast blessed and used the press in the days of Gutenberg, Defoe, and John Milton.

On this happy day, we pray with Milton, "Give me the liberty to know, to utter, and to argue freely according to conscience, above all liberties." Renew our faith to believe that where "truth and falsehood grapple, truth will not be put to the worse in a free and open encounter."

Inspire the men and women who work here with an unquenchable love of truth. Make the fourth estate too proud to exploit fears and inflame hatreds. Give its members a contempt for lies, lest they call light darkness and darkness light. Charge them with a sense of their awesome responsibility for the wisdom of the Nation. May they never drug the minds of the people with cheapness, or half-truths, or prejudice.

Embolden them to turn light on those whose deeds are evil. Make them worthy successors of John Peter Zenger, William Lloyd Garrison, and Thomas Nast, who held their work to be a holy thing for which men should be willing to die. Help them to remember that the Nation may be served by their courage, or lost through their contentment with what the people want. When they face defeat or ridicule or contempt, let them be sustained by Thy approbation and the knowledge that they have been servants of a higher law.

In the name of Christ Thy Son, Who died to communicate the richness of God's love to the poverty of men, we pray. Amen.

TO BAIL OUT THE U.N.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, an editorial, entitled "To Bail Out U.N.," appeared in the February 7, 1962, issue of the Chicago Daily Tribune, which covers a matter that concerns every citizen. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO BAIL OUT U.N.

President Kennedy has called upon Congress to authorize the purchase of $100 million of United Nations bonds—half the issue U.N. proposes to float in the hope of working its way out of bankruptcy. The President calls U.N. "an essential part of the machinery to bring peace out of this world of danger and discord." He also calls the bond plan sound.

Despite their misgivings about the performance and prospects of U.N., a substantial number of Americans feel that if the organization is to founder, the blame should not be attached to the United States because of any act of omission or commission on its part.

On the other hand, a great number of Americans would not agree with Mr. Kennedy that the bond proposal is sound. They think that it is fraudulent, spurious, and that the bonds will prove worthless. They therefore believe that Secretary General U Thant and Mr. Kennedy are making false representations.

A prominent Wisconsin businessman has proposed that there is an honest way of resolving this dilemma. If the existence of U.N. is at stake, and enough Americans believe that it should be provided with a further chance to prove itself, he suggests that no one in Congress vote to buy any bonds, but that Congress vote a flat donation of $100 million to U.N.

The United States has already poured $1,600 million into U.N. It can afford to grubstake the Organization in the amount proposed, especially inasmuch as Mr. Kennedy will always be able to find some other way of getting rid of all the tax revenue upon which he can lay his hands. Whatever the reaction to U.N. and its works, this enterprise is hardly less sensible than such other administration projects as shooting the moon or scatter-shot Federal doles to education and teachers' salaries.

This can be stated even though the double standard practiced by U.N. and the questionable usefulness of the Organizations have drawn the merited criticism of such responsible statesmen as Prime Minister Macmillan and Lord Home, the British Foreign Secretary. President de Gaulle of France has dismissed U.N. as a forum for tumultuous and scandalous activity, filled with Communist invective. Adlai Stevenson has warned that U.N.'s subservience to Asian-African jingoism, abetted by Moscow, "could end with its death."

Nevertheless, if the United States feels obliged to apply artificial respiration, the open and honest way to do so is to make a gift in cash on the assumption that Mr. Kennedy is aboveboard in implying that this is to be a one-shot deal. If the Members of Congress voted to buy what the U.N. calls securities, they would be accessories before the fact in dignifying a swindle with the representation that it is an investment.

UNITED NATIONS BONDS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the February 8, 1962, issue of the Chicago

Daily Tribune carried an editorial, "Those U.N. Bonds," which should be of interest to every American. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be placed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Those U.N. Bonds

Secretary of State Rusk was obliged to admit many disabilities in the United Nations' proposed $200 million bond issue when he presented the administration's sales pitch to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee for purchasing $100 million of this paper.

Yesterday we quoted the sage opinion of a midwestern businessman that Congress would be better advised, if it recognizes any necessity to rescue U.N., to vote a $100 million contribution to the organization, rather than subscribe to the fiction that these worthless bonds represent any sort of investment whatsoever.

As to the spuriousness of the paper, President de Gaulle of France has been quoted as saying that he wouldn't buy a single centime of the issue even if the bonds were printed on 24-karat gold sheets.

So, before Congress acts at all, it should seek an advisory opinion from the Securities and Exchange Commission. This agency supervises the registration of security issues and suppresses fraud in the sale of securities. It should be asked whether the U.N. flotation would qualify under its rules and regulations.

This is no frivolous suggestion, for consider the facts: The bonds are issued by an organization which is admittedly broke. It has no tangible assets to back up the paper. Even its building is subject to a U.S. lien. If the U.N. were considered an operating company, the SEC would be obliged to consider some additional facts.

Among them is that of the 104 "partners," some 84 are now in default on their debts to the company. If the 11-member Security Council is to be regarded as the board of directors, the SEC would find that even the directors themselves, such as the Soviet Union and France, were so conspicuously lacking in confidence in the enterprise that they would not take up their share of operating expenses.

There is the further fact that $30 million of the money raised by bond sales would be used to repay debts the U.N. already owes the United States. In other words, Mr. Kennedy proposes paying $100 million to get back $30 million. Perhaps the SEC would decide that an investor so imprudent needed to be protected from himself.

What is unethical for private companies to do is equally unethical when practiced by governments or international organizations. The U.N bond issue is objectionable not primarily because it is unsound, but because it is fraudulent. Mr. Kennedy therefore should not be permitted to join the U.N. Secretariat in practicing deception on the American people. The SEC, though composed of political nominees beholden to him, should have enough principle to prevent him from doing so. If it does not, it discredits itself.

ASSISTANCE TO CUBAN REFUGEES

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, as a former vice president of the International Rescue Committee and a person who was deeply involved with Hungarian refugees, I have, naturally, followed closely the efforts of our Government and various voluntary agencies to assist Cuban refugees. In this connection, I recall the magnificent response which America made toward the victims of the Hungarian revolution. In contrast, I wonder how many of us are fully acquainted with the fact that the United States is the country of first sanctuary for 110,000 escapees from Castro's regime—three times the number of Hungarian refugees which we received.

Mr. President, aside from the important humanitarian considerations involved, it is politically imperative that greater efforts be made to assist Cuban refugees. Last week, we all followed the actions taken by the Punta del Este Conference. As we all know, the United States took the leadership in urging other nations of the Americas to bar Cuba from the activities of the OAS. Thus, at this time, it is all the more appropriate that we take renewed cognizance of the 110,000 victims of the Castro regime and renew our determination to insure that they receive more adequate assistance.

Last December, the Senate Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees, under the able leadership of the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart] conducted a series of penetrating hearings which shed a great deal of light on the conditions of the Cuban refugees in this country. I am hopeful that the committee's recommendations, which I understand will soon be forthcoming, will receive prompt and favorable consideration.

At this time, I also ask unanimous consent that a letter to the editor of the New York Times, signed by Mr. William Vanden Heuvel, the president of the International Rescue Committee, which appeared in the New York Times on January 17, 1962, and an article on the Cuban refugee problem by Mr. Philip S. Cook, which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on January 23, 1962, be inserted in the Record. In my judgment, Mr. Cook's article and Mr. Vanden Heuvel's letter do an excellent job of underscoring the need for immediate action.

There being no objection, the letter and article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 17, 1962]

Cuban Refugee Aid Crisis—Governmental and Private Funds Reported at Low Ebb

To the Editor of the New York Times:

Please permit me to supplement your December 27 editorial concerning Cuban refugees which has left implications that may be subject to misunderstanding. I refer particularly to your statement that "food, shelter, clothing, and education needs of the refugees seem to be taken care of adequately * * *" and that a major goal is "inducing them to accept jobs and aid in other parts of the United States."

The Federal Government, the State of Florida, and the voluntary agencies have done magnificently in meeting the hardships and difficulties occasioned by the largest single influx of refugees into our country in this century. This is the first time that the United States has been a nation of "first sanctuary" and we have met this historical obligation with generous compassion.

Both governmental and private funds, however, have diminished to a critical point. Unless Federal appropriations are renewed and private generosity increased, the groups charged with the responsibilities of relief and resettlement will not be able to carry on.

Only those refugees registered with the reception center in Miami are entitled to Federal assistance. Most of the 25,000 refugees who have come to the New York-New Jersey area are dependent solely on the voluntary agencies for help. Many of them are desolate in the face of the high cost of urban living.

As a witness before the Senate subcommittee which held hearings on the refugee problem in early December, I urged an extension of the Federal program to the New York area so that the State, the city, and the agencies could meet their commitments.

CONTRIBUTION OF AGENCIES

The immediate needs of the winter months are urgent. The International Rescue Committee's clothing center in New York has been struggling to supply warm clothing to thousands of refugees who have sought its help. Since July 1960, when the I.R.C. first established its relief program for the victims of Castro (and also for the refugees from Trujillo), the voluntary agencies have given counsel and personal assistance to additional thousands.

The I.R.C. experience shows that the Cuban refugees prefer to make themselves self-supporting and independent, regardless of where they are obliged to live while waiting out their exile.

There is little need to induce them to accept jobs and aid in other parts of the United States—the real need is to find the jobs and assistance in other areas to make refugee resettlement possible. The recently announced drive by the Federal Government toward this goal, reported in your columns of January 6, is a welcome first step. But if we are to succeed, the voluntary agencies urgently need the generous support of our citizens throughout the country.

No one knows how much longer the refugees' exile must endure. But we must take advantage of their presence so that upon returning to Cuba they will remember and exemplify generosity and freedom as the hallmarks of our society.

William vanden Heuvel,
President, International Rescue Committee.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Herald Tribune, Jan. 23, 1962]

Triple the Hungarian Tide of Humanity—Castro Refugees Versus U.S. Apathy: 2,000 Arrive Each Week, Few Find Homes

(By Philip S. Cook)

The problem of Cuban refugees in the United States has caused mounting concern among officials of some private agencies responsible for their care and resettlement. They feel that the country is headed for serious trouble if something more is not done.

The mathematics of the problem are cold and compelling. Something like 110,000 refugees from Castro's Cuba have already arrived, almost three times the number of the Hungarian refugees absorbed in 1956 and 1957.

The Cubans continue to pour in directly by plane from Havana to Miami at the rate of nearly 2,000 a week. Hundreds more filter in weekly to Florida by boat or to New York, New Orleans and other cities from Spain, Jamaica, Puerto Rico and Central America.

ONLY 17,000 RESETTLED

Some 83,000 have registered with the refugee relief center in Miami and less than 17,000 of these have been successfully resettled outside Dade County. For every Cuban who is moved out to New York, Chicago, Cleveland or some other resettlement area, another three arrive to take his place.

By all accounts the Federal Government is doing a superb job of helping the Miami and Dade County authorities to cope with a situation, the likes of which the country has never seen. Already it has cost the taxpayers $17 million. If the incoming arrival and resettlement rates remain the same for another year, which they easily could, the bill may easily double or triple.

Between 8,000 and 9,000 refugees have been resettled in the New York area by private agencies which picked them up through the Federal registration center in Miami. The actual number of Castro exiles living in New York City may be as high as 25,000. No one knows for sure.

ROUGH TIME FOR SOME

Some of them, especially the middleclass professionals and white-collar workers, are having a rough time. The files of the International Rescue Committee, a private, nonsectarian organization which has been responsible for about 20 percent of the resettlements, are full of pathetic examples.

This is not to say that the Cubans are strikingly worse off than any other refugee group, but public concern for the Cubans seems astonishingly tepid when one considers the warmth of President Kennedy's official welcome.

A 48-year-old Cuban lawyer willingly took a factory job for which he was not suited by skill or training. He became embittered only after a machine fell on his hand, taking off three fingers, and forced him to exist on $25 a week of workmen's compensation. After months of looking, he finally got a job as an elevator operator.

DENTIST WORKS AS PORTER

A dentist in his early forties tried several restaurant jobs and now works as a porter in Rockefeller Center because the pay is better.

Some of the hardest cases are the young people whose university educations were cut off. Now they work long hours at menial restaurant kitchen tasks which leave little time or energy for special classes to improve their English, the key element in obtaining a better job.

The experience of the private agencies handling resettlement varies somewhat, but there is general agreement that something more must be done. Catholic Relief Services which has arranged 60 percent of the resettlements is anxious to see new Federal registration centers opened in major areas to discourage the refugees from congregating in the Miami area.

DIFFICULT TO GET HELP

It is difficult or impossible for a refugee to obtain emergency welfare relief in some cities unless he has registered with the refugee center in Miami because only then will the Federal Government reimburse local welfare offices for funds paid out to Cuban exiles. This is not to say that the refugees are clamoring to go on relief or that those who do apply are invariably refused.

James Norris, assistant to the executive director of Catholic Relief Services, says that more than half the refugees have families or friends outside Florida who are willing to serve as resettlement sponsors. But these potential sponsors must be checked out carefully by the administering agency because many of them turn out to be broke themselves and totally unable to help someone else start a new life.

URGES MASS TRANSFERS

The immigration division of Church World Service, the Protestant unit aiding refugees, has found that the Cubans are extremely reluctant to leave Florida even when resettlement possibilities are offered. James McCracken, the director of CWS refugee work, believes that the mass transfer of large Cuban exile groups to a sponsoring community is the only technique that will overcome this reluctance and relieve the pressure on Miami promptly. The refugee will go with his friends when he will not go alone.

The International Rescue Committee under the Waltham plan (named for Waltham, Mass., the pilot community) believes that local chambers of commerce and other service organization sponsors can be persuaded and helped to find jobs and housing for refugees in communities throughout the country. But they must be shown that it will work.

PUBLIC SUPPORT LAGS

All this requires an immense backlog of public support, expressed both in money and in community effort. For reasons which are often complex and bewildering, this support has not been in such generous supply for the Cubans as it was for the 40,000 Hungarian refugees who came here after the abortive uprising of October 1956.

The church-affiliated agencies have not been so hard pressed. But the nonsectarian International Rescue Committee, which relies on donations from corporations and individuals, has found it extraordinarily difficult to evoke much concern for the Cubans.

"IRC raised close to $2 million for the Hungarian refugees in 3 months and another million by the end of 4 months," said Leo Cherne, chairman of the group. "Since July of 1960, when IRC became the first to press for aid to Cuban and Dominican refugees, we raised less than $400,000, and nearly one-third of this has come from a few large corporations."

In contrast to the Hungarians who had been cared for initially at camps in Austria, the Cubans reach the United States as the country of first asylum. They are anxious to remain in Florida, warm, close to their friends, only 90 miles from Havana, and they want to return to Cuba as soon as possible. They have been officially welcomed by President Kennedy and promised every assistance in returning to Cuba when this again becomes possible.

All the more reason why the people of the United States should respond to the Cuban refugee problem. But much of the Nation is apparently convinced that the Federal Government is taking care of everything, unaware that the role of Washington was designed purely to relieve a desperate public welfare situation in Dade County, Fla.

STEADY FLOW

"We have become immune to other than vast numbers of political exiles," said Mr. Cherne, in accounting for the apparent public apathy over the Cubans. Where the Hungarian exodus was a sudden, massive movement of people (100,000 in 90 days) the Cuban refugee flow continues at a steady, undramatic rate by commercial aircraft rather than a special government-sponsored airlift.

Neither the press nor the public tired of hearing about the Hungarian story, said Mr. Cherne. And the spectacle of loud U.S. protests at the U.N. coupled with an inability or unwillingness to match words with action left a sizable measure of guilt which the American people were eager to ease by welcoming the Hungarian refugees.

Ironically, public apathy over the Cubans appeared to increase after the ill-fated landing at the Bay of Pigs. Cuba was something which most people apparently preferred to forget.

"The Puerto Rican, who is a citizen, is less welcome than a Hungarian, who is not," said Mr. Cherne.

Mr. Norris, of the Catholic Relief Services, spoke of the Cuban's "extraordinarily high sense of honor, especially financial responsibility." This is more than borne out by the $250,000 which Cuban refugees voluntarily returned to Federal relief funds.

The Federal Government has recently launched a resettlement drive, but in the end, the Cuban refugee problem will be solved by public good will expressed through jobs, housing, and understanding.

THE POLITICS OF OIL

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, several days ago the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] made a number of laudatory comments on the floor concerning a recent book entitled "The Politics of Oil."

I suggest to my colleagues that a more balanced assessment of this work is given in the review by Mr. William Letwin, professor of economic history at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, which appeared in the New York Times book review on November 19, 1961. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Letwin's review appear at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the review was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POWER CAN BE PRECARIOUS

("The Politics of Oil," a study of private power and democratic directions; by Robert Engler; New York, the Macmillan Co.)

(By William Letwin)

Ever since it began, the oil industry has irresistibly attracted the attention of crusading social critics. Robert Engler has brought this literature up to date with his account of how the industry reacted to such postwar events as the tideland controversy, the Mossadegh crisis and natural gas regulation. His book fits the tradition; it is full of riproaring episodes, with bold actions on stage and subtle manipulations behind the scenes.

The author, a professor of political science at Sarah Lawrence, has advanced the thesis that the oil industry is a "private government," which, by exercising its great powers for its private ends, distorts the individualistic, democratic basis of American political institutions. Unfortunately, he does not explain clearly why the oil industry should be described as a "private government." In many of the episodes he recounts, oil executives can be seen working hard to get something from some government, and the record shows that they often have to settle for much less than they want. Mr. Engler seems to think that anyone who treats with kings must be a king himself, but if the fact that oilmen wander through the corridors of Congress and executive waiting rooms proves anything, it proves that they are suppliants rather than sovereigns.

At other times Mr. Engler seems to be saying that the oil industry is a private government, because great wealth, controlled by a few, is tantamount to political power. If that is the chief argument, then it is ironic that Mr. Engler should have chosen the oil industry as his example of an overawing complex of private power.

The American oil industry today is beset with troubles on every side, all of which Mr. Engler mentions. It is becoming more competitive; the big distributors, by invading each other's territories, are weakening the structure of price leadership. The industry is threatened abroad by sharp Russian competition, by the nationalization of oil in some countries and the prospect of more nationalization and by the constant demands of Near Eastern monarchs for higher royalty rates. It is threatened by technology; atomic energy is already encroaching and shale oil soon may. It is threatened above all by the superabundance of petroleum; if the delicate rationing operated by such public bodies as the Texas Railroad Commission were to break down, a flood of oil would inundate the oil companies.

What all these threats add up to is that American oil companies, like American farmers, are in an industry so prone to glut that if the Government did not support them, many would go under. The oil industry owns a great deal of oil, but oil would not be worth much if its price were not bolstered by Government. If wealth creates power, then the power now enjoyed by the oil companies is precarious.

Much of the evidence that Mr. Engler produces shows that the managers of oil companies recognize how dependent their power is. The tremendous investment that they make in maintaining good public relations is more likely to stem from nervous apprehension than from a sense of great power and security.

That American business doubts its power is, indeed, the happy conclusion that should be deduced from the heavy emphasis it puts on public relations. These attempts to ingratiate oneself with the public show that if there is a tyrant in American economic life he is the consumer. His whim may mean life or death to the producer, and only those corporations survive that, like cunning courtiers, learn the little ways to keep their master happy. If Government did not intervene to protect the bigger and weaker party in this relation, the sovereignty of the American consumer would be complete.

LIDICE AND COVENTRY—SERMON BY THE VERY REVEREND FRANCIS B. SAYRE, JR., IN WASHINGTON CATHEDRAL

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, Dean Francis Sayre, of the Washington Cathedral, who recently visited on both sides of the Iron Curtain, preached a sermon on his return which dramatized the difference between present-day Lidice, the Czechoslovakian village destroyed with its inhabitants by the Germans, and Coventry, an English town also destroyed by Nazi ferocity.

The contrast he painted between hate and healing in those two rebuilt towns was dramatic, but just as dramatic were the experiences Dean Sayre had in 2 days of preaching behind the Iron Curtain, where his listeners endangered their livelihood by attending worship. In meetings with church leaders, he came to feel that despite the divergent settings on either side of the Iron Curtain, we are all confronted by the same challenge. His description of that challenge and of the symbols of Lidice and Coventry make that sermon one I want to share with all my colleagues. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIDICE AND COVENTRY

(Sermon preached in Washington Cathedral by the Very Reverend Francis B. Sayre, Jr., dean, February 11, 1962)

"And behold, there arose a great tempest in the sea: * * *
But he was asleep.
And they came to him, and awoke him saying, 'Save, Lord; we perish!'
And he saith unto them:
'Why are ye fearful, O ye of little faith?'
Then he arose and rebuked the winds and the sea;
And there was a great calm." (St. Matthew 8: 24–26, ASV.)

Surely a storm at sea is a terrifying thing. I was once on a ship that was all but broken in two by a hurricane. She held together only by a few twisted plates of steel. Like the disciples, in their little boat, the crew and I commended ourselves to God's mercy; and I suppose that our fear betrayed our little faith. But such a tempest, upon the waters of the deep, is but a tiny squall compared to the holocausts that sweep through history—the wars and empires, revolution and slaughter. We, who live at this moment in the aftermath of the most devastating of these turmoils, are aware that the vessel of man's common life is sundered all but in twain. It hangs together by a few twisted strands: A world divided and broken, in danger of the final break which will send it to the depths.

Those who had known Christ, by that Sea of Galilee, remembered Him later on when the wrath of the Roman Empire crackled about their ears. They remembered how He alone stilled the storm and gave calm. They recorded in their Bibles the story of the lake, knowing now that it was the truth of all history. Through Christ's love the holocaust is quelled, and brokenness healed.

There are some in the world today who believe this. But many more do not. Never was the watershed between them of little faith and them of none made plainer to me than by two visits—in the space of 6 days last week—to two towns newly rebuilt after their destruction by the Nazis.

The first of these was Lidice, that quiet village in Czechoslovakia of which the Germans made a dreadful example of killing every male inhabitant, imprisoning the women and children, and flattening every house literally to the ground. But it was no joy to see the new village erected by the Communist regime of the latter day. For hate had been answered by hate. We were taken to no homes of Christian folk, but only to see the gruesome film the Germans themselves had taken of the slaughter. We were shown the museum where the pitiful remains are preserved; the monument that records in granite every other atrocious obliteration of hapless cities wiped out by war. Most of all we missed the lovely church, which had stood at the center of old Lidice. There was no church at all in the new town; only hate and fear—fear of Germany and hatred of the West for contributing to German rearmament. It seemed as if amid the vivid memory of the bitter storm, Christ alone had been forgotten.

The other town was Coventry in England: Victim of the same Nazi ferocity; now built up again with great good sense in modern dress—and all on a human scale, rather than with the madness that defiles our American cities by deifying the motorized wheel. People count in England, and the chief street in the new Coventry is a mall for pedestrians only. But the heart of Coventry is still the cathedral, built anew in modern idiom, perfectly related to the humane concept of all else in the new-sprung city.

In the forecourt of the new cathedral is the shrine that contrasts so poignantly with Lidice. The forecourt of the new is the nave of the old cathedral, now planted in grass, still outlined by the broken tracery of its charred windows. There, where the high altar once stood, stones are piled, crowned by a cross made of two ancient spikes from the roof. And behind this cross are written just the two words: "Father forgive." When one stands in that place, the holy whisper of Christ is almost audible, as He rebukes the wind and the sea. And the people of Coventry, forgiving, in imitation of Him, have received 16 boys and girls from Germany who have given a year of their labor to help rebuild this shrine of peace. They gave me tea, there among the ruins.

Lidice and Coventry. Hate and healing. Fear of the storm, and the shelter of faith. At first I thought that these were symbols of East and West: signs of a differing temper on either side of the Iron Curtain. It is perhaps understandable that we Americans should be caught prisoner by our own propaganda and come to believe that everything on the other side is atheism, while God can only rejoice in the temperateness of our own culture on the hither side. However, my recent sojourn in Czechoslovakia illuminated for me the fact that faith dwells on both sides of the political boundary. The truth is that "in Christ there is no East or West."

Five days spent in conference with Christian leaders of Russia, Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and Eastern Germany—and 2 more days preaching and visiting in two parish churches in Prague—confirmed the holy communion which no political or military force can breach. Christianity in the Russian orbit has been stripped of any complacency, any advantage, any security it may once have had. There it costs dear to confess the faith. A pastor's child may not enter a university, but is condemned by the father's profession to a life of manual labor. Those who openly attend divine worship are the last to be promoted to any job worth having. Yet I preached, unannounced by any advance notice, to congregations well populated by young and old—even soldiers in uniform who dared to go. All received me with love, the kind of love that prompted an old man to press an apple into my hand after service—precious gift for him. The kind of love that yearned for communication and understanding across the world's dread barricades, knowing that Christ alone can calm the storm and redeem the time.

Nor did our brothers behind the Iron Curtain allow their American visitors to think of them as pitiable remnants of some little engulfed coterie. Rather they presented themselves as a little band of disciples on the march, not defending, but attacking—out to conquer by the Holy Spirit, the whole man-centered crass ideology of the Marxist masters, just as centuries ago the 12 pitted themselves against the Empire of Rome. Stripped of all fat, shorn of the comfortable irrelevance of the past, these men and women are seeking to come to terms in their lives with whatever is good in the economic revolution with which, for better or for worse, they have to live; but at the same time to wrestle with the terrible emptiness, the soul-killing futility, of the Communist doctrine.

When I prayed with them, when together we said the litany from our own prayerbook, I thought of that story of Joshua which was read this morning: how Moses sent him forth to spy out the land of Canaan which God had promised; how he came back to report that it was a goodly land, but that it was peopled with a race of giants, who looked upon Joshua and Caleb as no more than grasshoppers. "The land we have explored is a land that eateth up its inhabitants." Such is a Communist country today "Nevertheless," said Joshua, "the Lord has given us this good land." And such is the spirit of Christians behind the curtain at this moment.

No, Lidice is not the sign of all that is behind the Iron Curtain, for there is love beside the hatred, in the courage of our Christian brothers who brave the storm in the strength of Christ. It is good, surely, that we can be in touch with them; and with them pray that somehow, perhaps beyond comprehension, the Son of Man shall bring calm to the tossing tempest of our life.

There is one thing more. I would not leave the impression with you that such a prayer is the final culmination of Christian communion. If all we can finally do together is only to echo the disciples in their plea, "Save, Lord, we perish," then surely Christ must turn to us with the same words of old, "Why are ye fearful, O ye of little faith?" Nor did the recent colloquy of Christians from East and West in fact end there. Whereas we began by discussing our differences—exploring the divergent contexts of our situations, trying to see in each other's reflection the delicate line that separates all of our compromises from our principle—we came gradually to realize that despite the divergent setting on either side of the Iron Curtain, we are all confronted by basically the same challenge. And that is the challenge of a brandnew age, an age of exploding knowledge and immense technical possibility; an age industrialized and secularized, which on both sides of the curtain is absorbed with man and his infinite potentiality, his incorrigible sin, but which no longer speaks the language or thinks the thoughts of God.

In Coventry there is still forgiveness, but still Coventry is really no more the salient symbol of the West than is Lidice of the East. For all of us in common are engulfed in a moment of history, poised upon the threshhold of space, that has reshuffled every familiar landmark of earth, requiring of us immeasurably deeper knowledge of creation and radically new categories of understanding the saving grace of God in Jesus Christ.

We came to see that in many ways we Christians resemble Christopher Columbus, who thought he would reach familiar Cathay by sailing westward but who in reality came upon a brandnew world. When he got there, nothing fitted the frame of his expectation. All geography had to be revised. It may well be true that Christians the world over are in that situation. Reality is no longer described by the old categories, theological, and ecclesiastical, by which in centuries past we tried to comprehend the mystery of God at the center of all things. Before the mystery of this truth, the differences of East and West pale to inconsequentiality, as did the fears of the disciples at Galilee. And by the same token, the healing wonder of God's victory in Christ is greatly magnified and captures our lives anew in the blessedness of the calm beyond the storm. God grant that in the age at hand we may together come to a new understanding of that holy peace.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUMMER WHITE HOUSE IN RHODE ISLAND

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, in the hearts of the people of the State of Rhode Island there has been growing the hope that they might make to the President of the United States a gift in keeping with our natural treasures that might be shared with our national figures.

We recognize that the heavy duties of state of our era demand a period of relaxation and a place of recreation where the burden of Washington's pressures may be eased without the burden of Washington's summer heat.

From earliest colonial days the Rhode Island city of Newport at the ocean head of Narragansett Bay has been a chosen vacation spot of America.

From the days of Washington, 18 Presidents of the United States have favored Newport with their presence.

President Eisenhower, for the last three summers of his office, selected Newport for his vacation spot. We were most happy to welcome him, to accord him public honor on occasion, and to respect his privacy when that was desired.

We were equally happy when President Kennedy chose Newport for part of his vacation last summer. The spot has a special appeal to him. It is within sight almost of his PT boat training area, a prelude to his heroic performance in the Pacific. It is the scene of the culmination of his romance, his marriage to Jacqueline Bouvier.

The Rhode Island welcome is no surface sentiment. Its citizens wish that an appropriate place be made permanently available to their Presidents. They are prepared to present one of their most beautiful estates, Annandale Farm, as the summer White House.

Annandale Farm meets every concept of location and loveliness, size and security, adequacy, and acceptability.

I was happy, in association with my colleague the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], to make our factual proposal through the proper channels, the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Udall. Naturally, the immediate decision will rest with the President.

In all this there is no pressure beyond the patriotic happiness of greeting our Chief Executive as our neighbor.

Though the summer White House will be provided by private subscription the enthusiasm is universal and official in our State. The General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island has passed a formal resolution expressing the people's joy in the proposal.

The Council of the City of Newport supports the proposal by a resolution that pledges all its facilities in cooperation.

The press of the State heartily commends it. I ask unanimous consent that an editorial of this nature appearing in the Newport Daily News of February 9, 1962, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks:

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SUMMER WHITE HOUSE

Selection of our city as the site for a permanent summer White House, should present plans materialize, would add to our prestige among resort communities, if that is necessary. It would also confirm what Newport has contended for so long, that this is the ideal site for the headquarters of the administration when Washington's hot, sticky, humid weather makes living there almost unbearable, even in the air-conditioned White House.

President and Mrs. Eisenhower proved the truth of that when they three times favored Newport over many other localities as the spot for their vacation, even over their delightful farm at Gettysburg.

President and Mrs. Kennedy had reason to spend some time here last year as they had Hammersmith Farm, home of her stepfather and mother, available to them, even though their own home on Cape Cod was open. If they hadn't liked Newport, it's doubtful if they would have returned each time, as they did.

The preliminary work toward affirming Newport as a summer capital, with a charming mansion in an attractive setting available for a summer White House, has been well and efficiently carried out by a variety of people. How the preparatory steps could have been handled without the plan becoming public in its early days is a wonder. But it was kept well under cover.

Now, it remains for the President and Mrs. Kennedy to decide if they approve of the plan. The Department of the Interior, which would have charge of a summer White House, can't very well say to them, "Here is a summer home for you," and expect them to occupy it. They might have other plans. Their home on the cape is an important tie, of course.

But Newport and Annandale Farm, the Barclay Douglas estate that has been selected for the summer White House, have about all the Presidential family needs for a summer vacation, we should think. All we can do now is to wait and to hope for a favorable decision from the White House. Newport and Rhode Island have made the offer. It remains for the Kennedys to accept.

Mr. PASTORE. I should like to read an editorial that appeared in the Providence Journal last Friday morning, February 16, 1962. The title of the editorial is "A Summer White House in Rhode Island Is an Excellent Idea," and the editorial reads:

A SUMMER WHITE HOUSE IN RHODE ISLAND IS AN EXCELLENT IDEA

A plan to set up a permanent summer White House in Newport has caught national attention because the question of Presidential interest in the idea was aired at President Kennedy's press conference the other day. He didn't say no, and he didn't say yes, but he fielded the question with disarming good humor.

The plan is to buy Annandale Farm, a Newport estate, by private subscription and to give it to the Federal Government for permanent summer use by Presidents and their families. The proposal has been submitted to Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior, who will report his findings to Mr. Kennedy.

When asked how he felt about the proposal at the press conference, Mr. Kennedy said he would make up his mind after Mr. Udall reported. But the trace of a smile on his face suggested to us—and we agree in advance that we may be victims of wishful thinking—that he certainly is not predisposed to oppose the idea.

There is merit in the concept of a summer White House at Newport—merit for its place in Rhode Island and merit for the Presidency. Certainly, it would be a great privilege for the smallest State in the Union to be host annually to the President on his summer vacations.

It was a great pleasure to have President and Mrs. Eisenhower visit here twice. It was an equally great pleasure last summer to play host to Mr. and Mrs. Kennedy and their two youngsters. It is not immodest to recall that both families appeared to enjoy their stays thoroughly.

An objection has been made that what would be an ideal resort on the shores of Narragansett Bay for one President might be anathema for another President. As a theory, the objection may be valid, but what President could resist the lure of a place of his own at Newport, ready to use at a moment's notice?

As things now stand, when a President picks a vacation site, an enormous amount of behind-the-scenes work must be done annually. Security arrangements must be made, sometimes in difficult circumstances. Incredibly difficult arrangements must be made to assure instant communication between the resort and Washington.

If a permanent home were developed in Newport, all facilities could be installed from the beginning, ready to use on a second's notice that the President was flying to Rhode Island. This standby readiness would make it possible for him and his family to spend even weekends by the sea.

In terms of convenience alone in a vastly complicated world, a summer White House would be attractive even to a President born in a Mountain State in the Far West. In terms of vacation profit, any President would have to go far to find the attraction almost under foot in the historic city by the sea.

It is our hope that Mr. Udall recommends approval of the plan to the President and that the President translates his smile to a ready yes. Let Mr. Kennedy say the word, and Rhode Island will show the country that it means most profoundly what it says in offering the Government a summer White House.

Mr. President, my colleague from Rhode Island and I desire to do nothing to precipitate the President's decision. We realize that this is a matter which requires his own thinking and his sole, exclusive judgment.

However, our reason for bringing this matter up this morning is, first, because of the two excellent editorials which appeared in our Rhode Island newspapers; secondly, to let the President know that Rhode Island has a very warm hand of welcome extended to him.

We have prepared a background relating to Newport and the Allandale Farm proposal. I ask that this material be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MISCELLANEOUS FACTS ON PRESIDENTIAL VISITS

Several regional firsts were accomplished by the Presidents during their Newport, R.I., visits.

George Washington was presented with a bottle of drinking water made from sea water by Jacob Isaacks, who had devised a process of utilizing sea water in this manner. The trip to Newport was the second sea voyage ever made by Washington.

James Monroe, who arrived at Newport in a sailing vessel, departed from Newport aboard the steamer *Firefly*, the first President to use this type of vessel at Newport.

John Quincy Adams, who traveled by steamboat, was the first to use steamers of a line maintaining a regular schedule between Newport and New York. It is believed that he was the first President to visit famous Redwood Library, built in 1748, which still stands and is the oldest library in continuous use in the Nation.

James K. Polk was the first President to ride on a steamer of the famous Fall River Line.

Millard Fillmore was the first President to attend a Newport ball.

Ulysses S. Grant was the first on record to enjoy a Rhode Island clambake. He took time out from a Newport sojourn to attend a reunion of the Grand Army of the Republic at Ocean Cottage, near Providence. The bake was enjoyed by 20,000. Grant is considered to be the first President to stroll along beautiful world-famous Cliff Walk, and to fish off Newport. Other Presidents, like Jackson and Hayes, enjoyed carriage rides to points of scenic and historical interest.

Chester A. Arthur was a great enthusiast of the fighting striped bass, and fished Newport waters for many years. He was the only Chief Executive to visit Newport successively as Vice President (1881), President (1882, 1883, and 1884), and ex-President (1885).

Franklin D. Roosevelt, whose love for the water is universally known, was the first President to view the famous international yacht races for the America's Cup, off Newport.

Dwight D. Eisenhower is the first President to golf at Newport.

Zachary Taylor had rooms reserved in a Newport hotel for his planned vacation in 1850. He died July 9, 1850.

John Quincy Adams, Franklin Pierce, Millard Fillmore, Chester A. Arthur, and Grover Cleveland visited Newport as ex-Presidents.

Millard Fillmore was the only President to have a Newport hotel named for him. He returned to Newport in 1859 with his wife and had rooms in the Fillmore House.

Vice President Schuyler Colfax made numerous visits to Newport and spent much time during summers between 1860 and 1875. His first wife died in Newport during the Civil War.

Vice President Levi P. Morton was a Newport summer resident. In 1889, the year elected to office, he presented Morton Park to the city.

President Truman and President Eisenhower were made honorary members of Rhode Island organizations. In 1946 Mr. Truman was made an honorary member of the Rhode Island Yacht Club of Cranston, and the Junior Victory Army, Colin Kelly Corps of Newport. Mr. Eisenhower is an honorary member of the Rhode Island Golf Association.

President Truman dedicated the Masonic USO club in Newport in 1941 while he was a Senator from Missouri; 4 years later he became the Nation's Chief Executive.

President Eisenhower first to vacation in Newport 3 years in a row since Chester A. Arthur who vacationed in Newport in 1882, 1883, and 1884.

Newport has been a summer vacation center since the 1720's. It is small wonder that between the visits of Washington and Kennedy, a span of 170 years, so many Presidents have enjoyed the climate and recreational facilities of this famous resort.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION CONCERNING PRESIDENTIAL VISITS TO NEWPORT

Eighteen of thirty-four Presidents visited Newport while in office: George Washington, James Monroe, John Quincy Adams, Andrew Jackson (accompanied by Vice President Martin Van Buren), John Tyler, James K. Polk, Millard Fillmore, Ulysses S. Grant, Rutherford B. Hayes, Chester A. Arthur, Grover Cleveland, Benjamin Harrison, Theodore Roosevelt, William Howard Taft, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman, Dwight D. Eisenhower, John F. Kennedy.

Visits by Vice Presidents while in office: George Clinton (Thomas Jefferson), Aaron Burr (Thomas Jefferson), John C. Calhoun (Andrew Jackson), Martin Van Buren (Andrew Jackson), Levi P. Morton (Benjamin Harrison), Chester A. Arthur (James Garfield), Garret A. Hobart (William McKinley).

Other distinguished leaders who visited Newport and became Presidents: Thomas Jefferson, Secretary of State; John Quincy Adams, Secretary of State; James Buchanan, visitor; Millard Fillmore, candidate for Vice President; Col. Theodore Roosevelt; Senator Harry S. Truman; Senator Schuyler Colfax, Vice President; William R. King, President of the Senate.

Twenty-three of thirty-four Presidential administrations represented in Newport by visits of Presidents and Vice Presidents since 1790: George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, James Monroe, John Quincy Adams, Andrew Jackson, Martin Van Buren, James Garfield (visit of Arthur), Chester A. Arthur, Benjamin Harrison, Grover Cleveland, William McKinley (visit of Hobart), John Tyler, James K. Polk, Millard Fillmore, Franklin Pierce, Ulysses S. Grant, Rutherford B. Hayes, Theodore Roosevelt, William Howard Taft, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman, Dwight D. Eisenhower, John F. Kennedy.

ANNANDALE AND NEWPORT

Historic Newport, R.I., has long been an international vacation resort for visitors from all over the world.

Seventeen Presidents, beginning with Washington, have visited Newport while in office, attracted by the many charms of the old seaport with its modern naval base and reminders of its colonial past.

An offer has now been made by generous Rhode Islanders of the free gift of a summer White House of an estate facing Narragansett Bay off world-famous Ocean Drive. Annandale Farm, a 15-acre estate, would be purchased by citizens of that State for Presidential vacation use if the Federal Government will accept it.

World figures, such as Nehru of India and former Prime Minister Eden of England, are no strangers to Newport, having joined with others who have found it a welcome haven for a rest, to escape from the summer heat of Washington, D.C., or to meet with American leaders.

The idea of a permanent summer vacation refuge for the President is not a new one. U. E. Baughman, recently retired Chief of the Secret Service, has advanced the proposal of an ideal vacation spot based on security requirements.

The Newport estate reportedly meets such standards because it is isolated on one side by an expanse of lawn and screening shrubbery and on the other side by the sea.

It is looked upon as being ideal for any President because of the proximity of the naval installations in Newport and the Quonset Naval Air Station to meet the demands of rapid communication and transportation so necessary to this high office.

Newport is unparalleled in other ways, too, for a summer White House. It is only a short air trip from Washington, and its attractions are scenic with international and local yacht and sailboat racing, nearby Newport Country Club for golf, and the historic buildings and heritage of the first capitol of one of the Thirteen Original States.

Both Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy are those who have vacationed in Newport in recent years. President Eisenhower returned there for three summers to spend time in Newport.

The estate, when not in personal use by the President as a summer White House, could serve as a tourist attraction for visitors, open to public inspection. It might also prove of great value to the Navy for the housing of visiting dignitaries and to serve as an extension of naval activities.

Gen. Ulysses S. Grant was the first President to enjoy a Rhode Island clambake and is thought to be the first Chief Executive to stroll along Cliff Walk and to fish while in Newport. President Franklin D. Roosevelt was the first to view the famous international yacht races for the American Cup.

President Eisenhower was the first to golf at Newport, while others in the past have sailed upon Narragansett Bay or attended a ball in the city where society once reigned supreme.

The main building of Annandale Farm resembles the White House, as it consists of four large pillars of two-story height on the north side and is of white masonry and brick. The terrain slopes downward to the shore.

Senators JOHN O. PASTORE and CLAIBORNE PELL, of Rhode Island, have been instrumental in advancing the proposal to locate a summer White House in Rhode Island. The idea has also the enthusiastic backing of Republican State Chairman William T.

Broomhead, who has pledged his help and cooperation in telegrams to both Senators.

A group of Rhode Island residents, spearheaded by Umberto Patalano and Cornelius Moore, is ready to join in a statewide campaign to raise the necessary $250,000 to acquire the estate from its present owners, Mr. and Mrs. Barclay Douglas, who have made extensive improvements to the property and added a swimming pool since they purchased it in 1952.

It is felt that whoever the occupants of the White House may be, they will not always have suitable vacation homes of their own to use, nor should they be forced to depend upon private fellow Americans of independent means who own their own retreats.

Instead, it is thought that there should be a permanent summer vacation retreat, similar to the year-round residence at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, which belongs to all Americans for the use of their Presidents.

And, since the offer is for free acquisition of such a summer White House, the cost of maintaining such an installation is looked upon as no problem since household services and security would have to be provided the President no matter where he goes for a vacation.

The only additional costs would be incidental ones such as mowing of the lawn and painting of the house.

A number of foreign countries have summer vacation retreats for their leaders, and there is a growing belief that the Chief Executive of our country, burdened with tremendous problems and responsibilities, also should have some permanent vacation spot where he and his family can go and where he can still carry on the everyday responsibilities of his great office.

In the minds of the backers, the testimony of the visits of many former Presidents, the attractiveness of the famous resort, and the many attributes from the standpoint of security, recreation, and beauty makes Newport the logical answer.

Rhode Island Has Many Places Connected With President and Mrs. Kennedy

When President John F. Kennedy makes his proposed visit to Newport sometime during this summer, he will be the 17th Chief Executive to sojourn in that historic city. Former President Eisenhower, a Newport enthusiast, spent month-long official vacations there in 1957, 1958, and 1960.

Rhode Islanders are proud of their association with the present Chief Executive and the First Lady. Mrs. Kennedy, the former Jacqueline Bouvier, is the daughter of Mrs. Hugh D. Auchincloss. The Auchincloss family have been summer residents of Newport for almost 100 years. In 1889 John Auchincloss built the present summer cottage and Mrs. Kennedy has been a member of the summer colony for many of her younger years.

Visitors in the southern New England area may see many places in Rhode Island associated with President and Mrs. Kennedy, according to the Rhode Island Development Council. Naturally there's the Auchincloss residence, known as Hammersmith Farm, which may be seen as you motor around world-famous Ocean Drive. Situated atop a hill, the mansion is opposite the grounds of the Newport Country Club and near the entrance to Fort Adams, where President Eisenhower stayed in 1958 and 1960.

On Easton's Point in adjoining Middletown is the famous Clambake Club, where Mrs. Kennedy made her debut on August 16, 1947; a gay occasion enlivened by the music of Meyer Davis and his orchestra.

Near the center of Newport, on Spring Street, is St. Mary's Church, where the young couple were married on September 12, 1953. The large brownstone church was filled to overflowing, and outside was a throng of well-wishers and one of the biggest gatherings of the press seen in Newport up to that time. From 1953 up to the time of his campaign for the Presidency, the couple were often seen in the State. They attended many social functions including the biennial Breakers Ball at the Vanderbilt estate in Newport for which Mrs. Kennedy served as a committee chairman.

Tourists crossing lower Narragansett Bay from Jamestown to Newport (Route 138) will be able to view the harbor and channel where President Kennedy took his training for his PT boat command. In 1942 he was assigned to the Motor Torpedo Boat Training Center at Melville. Melville is a section of Portsmouth, adjoining Newport where, during World War II, the PT center trained the officers and men assigned to the squadrons of this fast, hard-hitting mosquito fleet. In addition to the Jamestown-Newport ferry passage which affords a view of the channel to the ocean where the PT's practiced, the Bristol to Prudence Island ferry offers an opportunity to view Melville, where the fast boats were moored.

The U.S.S. *Joseph P. Kennedy, Jr.*, one of the destroyers of the U.S. Atlantic Fleet that has Newport for its home port, is named in honor of the President's older brother who died in action during World War II.

President Kennedy's Rhode Island identification is found mainly in Newport, but our First Lady's extends up to Woonsocket on the State's northern boundary. In this city with its huge French-Canadian population, there are more names of Bouvier listed in the telephone directory than there are in the Manhattan book. The Bouviers of this industrial city claim a distant kinship to the First Lady, according to Harry S. Van Brocklyn, feature writer of the Woonsocket Call, who has done research on the family name. Mrs. Kennedy is descended from Pierre Bouvier who migrated from France to Canada a few generations ago. The late Joseph Bouvier, a noted citizen of Woonsocket, who served as a city councilman in the 1900's, is also descended from this same Pierre. West Park Place in that city was once called Bouvier Place and the Bouvier home still stands nearby.

In addition to the many social reasons for President Kennedy's warm regard for Rhode Island, there may also be a political consideration. This is the fact that Rhode Island gave him the highest voting percentage of any of the 50 States in the recent election.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, it is 315 years since Newport united with Providence and other towns to form the colony of Rhode Island. These principles were written into the constitution of the colony, establishing "a government held by the voluntary and free consent of all or the greater part of the free inhabitants" and providing for freedom of conscience. Thus Rhode Island, under the guidance of Roger Williams, became the great pilot experiment in American democracy and religious toleration.

Rhode Island will be most happy to have this humble beginning of the pattern of our Republic honored by the presence of its President.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted at this point a resolution adopted by the Rhode Island General Assembly on February 13, 1962.

There being no objection the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolution Endorsing Location of the Summer White House in the City of Newport

Whereas it has been announced that there is under consideration a plan for the acquisition of a site in the city of Newport, to be offered for a summer White House; and

Whereas the city of Newport is a natural selection for summer residence of the Nation's Chief Executive because of the area's unrivaled natural beauty and climate, during this season and the renown hospitality of its residents; and

Whereas the location of the summer White House in Newport would bring honor to the residents of the city and to the citizens of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the members of the general assembly endorse with pleasure the plan for the location of the summer White House in the city of Newport, earnestly solicit the continued aid, assistance, and support of the State's U.S. Senators, Hon. John O. Pastore, and Hon. Claiborne Pell, who were instrumental in the formation of this plan and others intimately interested, therein; and be it further

Resolved, That all of the facilities of the State government are pledged toward accomplishing this end.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I wish to support my senior colleague from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore], and I emphasize the tremendously warm and full welcome all the inhabitants of our State of Rhode Island would give President Kennedy, or any President of the United States, if the administration chooses to accept the offer of our citizens to donate a summer White House. Actually, if the administration accepts our proffer, it will not be an altogether new concept. Seventeen Presidents, starting with General Washington, have summered or visited Newport, R.I. They were Presidents Washington, Monroe, John Quincy Adams, Jackson, Polk, Fillmore, Grant, Hayes, Arthur, Cleveland, Harrison, Theodore Roosevelt, Taft, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, and John F. Kennedy.

In fact, President Eisenhower spent three summers in Newport.

There is not only a warm welcome to the President from Rhode Island as a whole, but also from the local community of Newport, as is shown by the editorial published in the Newport Daily News, inserted in the Record by my senior colleague.

This welcome to President Kennedy in his capacity as President of the United States is shared equally by all Rhode Islanders regardless of political party. In fact, I would like to read a telegram that was sent by William Broomhead, chairman of the Republican State Committee, to my senior colleague, Senator John O. Pastore, and to me, expressing his warmhearted approval of the plan:

> May I offer you my enthusiastic endorsement and support of the proposal to establish a permanent summer White House in our State. Every Rhode Islander would take pride in having the President of our country enjoy the hospitality and share in the warmth Rhode Islanders hold for our Presidents. I am delighted to pledge my personal support in this endeavor. The success of this endeavor would also serve to focus once again the attention of the Nation on Rhode Island's excellent recreational facilities.

Mr. President, this offer of a permanent summer vacation spot is not a new one. What is needed is a place that provides sea access, adequate space for privacy and for a helicopter pad, proximity to a communications network, and a refreshing climate.

Some months ago Mr. U. E. Baughman, recently retired Chief of the Secret Service, advanced the idea of an ideal vacation spot, and it is curious that the description of his ideal vacation spot almost coincides with the place that is being suggested, Annandale Farm.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Record at this point a reprint of Mr. Baughman's article.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Something New for Our Presidents

(By Fred Blumenthal)

Washington.—One day last summer, I called on U.S. Secret Service Chief U. E. Baughman at his spacious office in the Treasury Building. He seemed unusually relaxed, and I soon found out why: he confided that on the following day he was announcing his retirement after 33 years of active duty, the last 13 of them as bossman of the "silent service" that guards the lives of our Presidents and the integrity of our currency.

We talked for a while about his retirement plans and he reminisced about his years of chasing counterfeiters and protecting Presidents. Suddenly he smiled and reached into the big center drawer of his desk.

"Fred," he said, "let me show you a secret. Nobody knows about this except my secretary, Miss Duncan. It's sort of a Secret Service man's dream."

As he spoke, he unrolled a huge sheet of drawing paper. It was covered with penciled sketches, symbols, and topographical details. I looked closely and saw it was a plan for a seaside estate complete with houses, roads, and recreational facilities of all kinds.

"There it is," Chief Baughman said, "my personal dream for a permanent summer White House. We're probably the only country that doesn't have a permanent summer residence for its Chief Executive."

Now, with the completion of sketches, Parade is able to present Baughman's idea.

"The way I see it," Chief Baughman went on, "this would be a place where all our future Presidents, rich or poor, could work and relax, in privacy and, above all, security.

"Few people realize that the crushing burden of the Presidency of the United States makes it absolutely imperative that he be able to relax completely from time to time, to get away from crowds, to find a little breathing room."

POTLUCK FOR PRESIDENTS

"Throughout our history, this has been a problem for our Presidents. Only the very wealthy could afford their own summer homes. The others had to take potluck, visiting with friends or using makeshift facilities at Government installations such as Key West, Fla., or Camp David, in the Catoctin Mountains of Maryland. And in any case, they all posed serious security problems."

During the Civil War, President Lincoln liked to relax occasionally on the grounds of a Government reservation a few miles from the White House. That worked out all right until one day when Mr. Lincoln set out for a ride around the grounds and a sniper put a bullet through the crown of his stove-pipe hat. Harry Truman was endangered by barracudas while swimming off Key West, and John Adams is said to have had a swimming mishap that was almost as bad: he slipped down to the Potomac for a quiet dip one hot summer day and was trapped by a lady jobseeker. She sat on his clothes until he promised her a job.

Another problem is the fact that Presidents' preferences in recreation have varied as widely as their individual personalities. Calvin Coolidge liked to sit. Teddy Roosevelt was a rugged outdoorsman who loved hunting and fishing. Harry Truman delighted in early morning walks. President Eisenhower was happiest on the golf course. The Kennedys, one of the youngest families ever to occupy the White House, go in for active outdoor sports—sailing, water skiing, tennis, horseback riding, touch football, and the like.

"Just the other day," Baughman explained with a grin, "we had to buy a bicycle for one of our agents in Hyannis Port. Caroline had been soloing on her new bicycle and we couldn't have the agent running alongside on foot or trailing her in a limousine.

"If we had the permanent summer White House that I've been dreaming about, it would give our First Families the privacy and security they need, plus just about every kind of recreational facility they could want.

"Ideally, it would be located on the seacoast about 200 miles from Washington, an easy range for our new, fast helicopters. The main residence would be a small replica of the White House, fully equipped with worldwide communications.

SECURITY SHUFFLEBOARD

"As I see it, the entire estate would cover an area of about 9 square miles—3 miles on each side—fronting on the ocean. The whole grounds would be a security area, but within it there would be a small, tight security area for the First Family, containing the official residence, offices, private beach and boating facilities, swimming pool, tennis courts, shuffleboard, and even a ball field.

"There also would be an 18-hole golf course on the estate, a big lake, riding paths, picnic areas, anything you could think of except maybe mountain climbing.

"And, of course, there would be appropriate quarters for visiting dignitaries, the White House staff and press, an auditorium for movies and news conferences, and underground utilities and parking.

"Security would be relatively simple, since there would be only one access road to the grounds and a 300-foot watchtower equipped with radar and television cameras to scan the whole area day and night.

"But let's not forget," Chief Baughman added, "that the permanent summer White House, like 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue in Washington, would belong to all the American people. I think there should be 50 summer cottages, one for each State in the Union, built along the ocean front.

"That way, each State could send outstanding families or individuals who have performed exceptional public service for 2-week vacations on the summer White House grounds. They would have complete access to and use of all the recreational facilities except those that were within the immediate Presidential compound.

FUNDS FROM THE PEOPLE?

I asked Chief Baughman how much all this would cost and how it would be paid for.

"Undoubtedly, millions of dollars," he replied. "But the way I see it, this should not be a congressional appropriation of Treasury funds. It should be financed by public subscription, with every citizen who is concerned with the health and well-being of our Presidents contributing whatever amount he deems appropriate.

"But please tell Parade's readers not to send any money to me or the Treasury for this purpose. It seems to me that the ideal way would be for some group of private citizens to obtain official sanction to form a commission that would raise the necessary funds."

Today, the summer White House is one man's dream. Tomorrow, it may become a reality. And, who knows, the man who dreamed it up may one day be called out of retirement to administer it.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the cost of upkeep of the summer White House would be negligible. Wherever the President and his family are, there are certain basic costs that have to be met—housekeeping, preparation of food, and the like. But the only additional costs that would be necessary for the maintenance of this summer White House would be the mowing of the lawn and the painting of the house.

This idea, which started with Umberto Patalano of Providence and Cornelius Moore of Newport, is a gesture of the regard and affection our citizens have for the President of the United States and the wish that President Kennedy and future Presidents may see fit to come increasingly to our State. It is, in fact, their putting into effect the idea "Ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country."

Actually other governments already provide a summer White House for the chief executive, and over the past weekend I noticed that the West German Government was buying a summer residence for its Ambassador here in Washington.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record at this point a list of the foreign governments which maintain summer residences for their chiefs of state.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Among the other governments maintaining summer residences are:

France (for both Premier and President): Chateau Rambouillet.

Spain (for Chief of State, the Cabinet, and Diplomatic Corps): San Sebastian.

Britain (for the Queen (Scotland), for the Prime Minister): Balmoral Chequers.

Philippines (for the President): Baguio.

Iran (for the Shah): Qasr-Shemiran.

Canada (for the Governor General): Citedel (Quebec City).

Italy (two for the President): Castell Porziano and San Rossore.

Turkey (for the President): Florya Kusku.

Lebanon (for the President): Beit-Ed-Dien.

Portugal (for the President): Cidadela de Cascias.

Republic of China (two for the President): Kaohsiung and Taichung.

Pakistan (for the President): Murree.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, with these facts in mind, I sincerely hope that Secretary Udall may see fit to recommend to the White House acceptance of this free gift offering from the people of the State of Rhode Island. By fortunate coincidence the Secretary of the Interior is in the Chamber at this time. I hope he will take cognizance of these words.

TRIBUTES TO SENATOR HAYDEN, OF ARIZONA, ON THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF HIS SERVICE IN THE U.S. CONGRESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, this is a momentous day in the history of the United States of America. In this morning's New York Times there appears an article, written by Russell Baker, part of which I should like to read at this time, because it shows an excellent understanding of a man whom we all honor and love. I quote from the article:

WASHINGTON, February 18.—Tomorrow will be a day of severe inner trial for Senator CARL HAYDEN, of Arizona.

His name is going to be prominently displayed in the newspapers, and that, in the Hayden philosophy of politics, is bad.

In the afternoon, he is going to have to spend a lot of time sitting on the Senate floor listening to a lot of talk. Public talk, in the Hayden philosophy of politics, is one so much had as an utter and absolute waste of good working time. ("Who wants to listen to a tirade?" he once asked a man who said the Senator ought to make a speech once in awhile in deference to tradition.)

Tomorrow, however, Mr. HAYDEN will have to listen because the talk is going to be about him. The occasion is the 50th anniversary of his coming to Congress.

No previous Member in history has served so long. Few have attained the status of living institution that Mr. HAYDEN enjoys among his colleagues.

Fewer still have done so much with so little talk.

Above all, Mr. President, he is a Senator's Senator.

I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of my remarks this article published in the New York Times be inserted in the RECORD; as well as a copy of the transcript of the "Washington Conversation" program as broadcast over the CBS television network yesterday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MANSFIELD. The TV appearance of our distinguished President pro tempore yesterday was an outstanding success. My wife, who was also watching the telecast, commented several times that Senator HAYDEN is a humble man. Humility sometimes is the mark of greatness.

Mr. President, as I stated earlier, this is a momentous day in our history. It is my honor to inform the Senate that we celebrate today the 50th anniversary of the commencement of service in the U.S. Congress of our beloved President pro tempore, CARL HAYDEN.

On February 19, 1912, CARL HAYDEN, until shortly before that sheriff of Maricopa County, Ariz., took his seat in the House of Representatives as the first Congressman from the new State. More than a month later, on April 2, 1912, Arizona's first Members of this body—Henry Ashurst and Marcus Smith—took their places in the Senate.

Representative HAYDEN had been helped into office, he says, by a number of sheriffs with whom he had exchanged prisoners in his extensive travels through the Arizona Territory. They formed a highly effective Hayden organization—the first of a long succession of such that were to support him in seven succeeding congressional elections and in six contests for the Senate.

On February 19, 1912, the Speaker of the House was Champ Clark, of Missouri, later that year to be an unsuccessful candidate for the Democratic nomination against Woodrow Wilson. In the House at that time were men like Oscar Underwood, of Alabama; Joseph Cannon, of Illinois; Pat Harrison, of Mississippi; George Norris, of Nebraska; Cordell Hull, of Tennessee; and Carter Glass, of Virginia. These men would make their mark on American history in the decades to come, either in Congress or in the executive branch. But none of the Members of the House in the 62d Congress would build a more enduring monument of service to the American people than CARL HAYDEN.

This fair, wise, and kindly man has always used his great power with restraint. He is a living refutation of Acton's famous dictum that power tends to corrupt. In CARL HAYDEN, power has been associated with responsibility and tempered by humility. He has throughout his career displayed the same openness and candor with junior Members of this body, with the staff of the Senate, and with the public at large as he has with other men of great position in Government. There is not an ounce of false pride or cant in him.

Senator HAYDEN has been called a living link between the frontier and modern America. He bears within him, as he performs his responsibilities in 1962, the generous and hardy spirit of the pioneer West.

Now he has completed 50 years of responsible service to the democracy. His is the longest congressional career since the First Congress, in 1789. It is also one of the noblest. May we have him here with us for years to come.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the New York Times, Feb. 19, 1962]

SENATOR HAYDEN, 84, WILL MARK HALF-CENTURY IN CONGRESS TODAY—DEMOCRAT FROM ARIZONA HAS SERVED LONGER IN CAPITAL THAN ANY OTHER MAN

(By Russell Baker)

WASHINGTON, February 18.—Tomorrow will be a day of severe inner trial for Senator CARL HAYDEN, of Arizona.

His name is going to be prominently displayed in the newspapers, and that, in the Hayden philosophy of politics, is bad.

In the afternoon, he is going to have to spend a lot of time sitting on the Senate floor listening to a lot of talk. Public talk, in the Hayden philosophy of politics, is not so much bad as an utter and absolute waste of good working time. ("Who wants to listen to a tirade?" he once asked a man who said the Senator ought to make a speech once in awhile in deference to tradition.)

Tomorrow, however, Mr. HAYDEN will have to listen because the talk is going to be about him. The occasion is the 50th anniversary of his coming to Congress.

No previous Member in history has served so long. Few have attained the status of living institution that Mr. HAYDEN enjoys among his colleagues.

Fewer still have done so much with so little talk.

In Arizona, Senator HAYDEN is an institution roughly on a par with the Grand Canyon. He entered the House on February 19, 1912, as Arizona's only Representative, just 5 days after the State was admitted to the Union.

Over the years, the power and prerogatives of seniority have silently elevated him to the small circle of first-rank Senators whose support is essential for Senate success and whose opposition may be fatal. As the Senate's oldest Democrat—he holds the office of President pro tempore, which makes him third in succession to the Presidency after the Speaker of the House.

He sits on the Democratic policy committee and the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, which runs the place, and is chairman of the Joint Congressional Committee on Printing, which controls every Congressman's access to the Government printing presses.

Most important of all, he is chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, the supreme goal of all Senators because it controls the purse strings to the Treasury.

What is remarkable in all this is that, for all his power, Senator HAYDEN is virtually unknown to the American public. Whippersnappers without one-tenth of his power in the Senate have strutted and pranced across the front pages to glory or doom while Mr. HAYDEN has quietly secured his position by unobtrusively doing his duty for party and Arizona. Above all, he is a Senator's Senator.

Never a man to stake out strong ideological positions, he has left Arizona covered with monuments to his effectiveness at combining party regularity with backroom know-how. Dam and reservoirs, power transmission lines, great highways that make the State a tourist center of the West, airports and military bases, thousands of acres of fertile land blooming in the desert with Federal irrigation projects—these are the legacy his acumen has left to Arizona.

In view of the performance record, even the conservatives who like the ideology of his Republican junior colleague, BARRY GOLDWATER, have found it hard to develop any rancor over Mr. HAYDEN's consistent loyalty to the New Deal and Fair Deal and President Kennedy's New Frontier.

Senator HAYDEN comes from pioneer Arizona stock. His father, Charles Trumbull Hayden, a Yankee trader whose forbears came from England in 1630, set up business in Tucson in 1848. The Senator was born in Hayden's Ferry (now Tempe) in the Arizona Territory.

Educated at Stanford, he entered politics shortly after the turn of the century as sheriff of Maricopa County. The Senator's memories of this period afford small sustenance for devotees of old West tales.

Once he caught a pair of train robbers after pursuing them in an Apperson Jackrabbit, an early automobile.

"The nearest I ever came to using a gun," he said recently, was an occasion when he heard that "a notorious horsethief who was badly wanted in Colorado and Utah, had turned up in Phoenix.

Sheriff Hayden found his man drinking at a bar. "It was evident that he had a pistol under his coat in his hip pocket," he said. "I stuck my gun in his back, told him to throw up his custody."

"It turned out that Colorado and Utah did not want the man badly enough to go get him, so the sheriff turned him loose.

"I told him I did not mind * * * Arizona," Mr. Hayden recalled. "He didn't."

The story that Senator HAYDEN shuns newsmen as if they were lepers is a base canard, he insists. The myth has grown out of firm policy adopted shortly after he came to Congress.

At that time, an oldtimer advised him that Congressmen came in two varieties: the "work horse" and the "show horse." Work horses get along; show horses got the headlines but usually failed to last long.

Mr. HAYDEN chose to become a work horse. He avoids publicity. There are aging members of the Senate Press Gallery who cannot recall ever hearing him make a floor speech proper.

There is a story told by President Kennedy that on first coming to the Senate he sat beside Mr. HAYDEN one day and, to make conversation, asked about the difference between the modern Senate and the Senate of 30 years before.

"Young men didn't talk so much then," Mr. HAYDEN is said to have answered.

Young men for the last two decades, however, have found the Senator from Arizona an invaluable friend and guide to the arcane ways of the Senate when first trying to adjust to it.

One piece of testimony comes from former President Harry S. Truman. When he entered the Senate labeled with the brand of the Pendergast machine in Kansas City, Mo., Mr. Truman once said, "Senator HAYDEN was one of the few Members who did not act as if he were beneath contempt."

"You were nice to me," Mr. HAYDEN said later during a campaign encounter with the Senator in Arizona. "You treated me like a normal human being."

WASHINGTON CONVERSATION

(As broadcast over the CBS television network, February 18, 1962, 12:30 to 12:55 p.m.)

Guest: The Honorable CARL HAYDEN, U.S. Senate (Democrat, of Arizona).

Host: Paul Niven.

Producer: Michael J. Marlow.

ANNOUNCER. Join us now for a "Washington Conversation" with a man who came to the Nation's Capital exactly 50 years ago, and on February 19, 1912, was sworn in as a Member of Congress—CARL HAYDEN, Democrat, of Arizona.

The CBS television network presents "Washington Conversation," an attempt to sketch in some of the details of one of the most influential men in the Congress of the United States—a different approach to the private mind and public philosophy of an 84-year-old "Senators' Senator." In 1912, when CARL HAYDEN first came to Washington William Howard Taft was President and HAYDEN was starting out as Arizona's first and only Representative in Washington.

Today we invite you to meet this man who has served his State and his country for over one-half a century—Senator CARL HAYDEN.

Your host for this informal, unrehearsed "Washington Conversation"—prerecorded on video tape in our studio conference room—is CBS News Correspondent Paul Niven.

Mr. Niven.

Mr. NIVEN. So, Senator HAYDEN, it was 50 years ago this weekend you arrived to take your seat in Congress. What was Washington like in those days? What were your impressions when you got off the train? Do you remember?

Senator HAYDEN. I had been here before. It appeared about the same. It really was not nearly the busy town that it was. You traveled by streetcar, of course. And, I rode to the end of all the lines here just to kind of orient myself.

Mr. NIVEN. You first came here about 1890 when you were 13, I think?

Senator HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. NIVEN. Is it true you climbed a pole in front of the White House?

Senator HAYDEN. As a small boy I wanted to see the last grand parade of the Grand Army of the Republic, that was being held at that time, and I climbed up on one of the gate posts in front of the White House and saw the old veterans go by.

Mr. NIVEN. They were then—they were not really old men, were they, in 1890? I suppose they were getting on.

Senator HAYDEN. They were——

Mr. NIVEN. In their sixties, perhaps.

Senator HAYDEN. Yes, in their sixties.

Mr. NIVEN. Senator, I understand that your mother began calling you "the Senator" when you were a very small boy. Is that true, and how did it happen?

Senator HAYDEN. I don't remember that myself but there is a story to that effect.

Mr. NIVEN. It is a legend.

You, or your family had come from Connecticut, your father had come from Connecticut——

Senator HAYDEN. My father was a native of Connecticut and my mother a native of Arkansas.

Mr. NIVEN. And you were the first white child born in the city of Hayden's Landing, weren't you?

Senator HAYDEN. It is Hayden's Ferry.

Mr. NIVEN. Hayden's Ferry, pardon.

Senator HAYDEN. Yes. My father established the ferry there and a flour mill way back about 1872 and I wasn't born until 1877.

Mr. NIVEN. And all the children that had been born there before were Indians?

Senator HAYDEN. There was an Indian community nearby, yes.

Mr. NIVEN. Senator, your first public office was as sheriff, was it not?

Senator HAYDEN. No. My first public office was a member of the town council of the town of Tempe. I served on that for 2 years. Then I served for 2 years as the county treasurer of Maricopa County; and then for 5 years I was the sheriff of the county.

Mr. NIVEN. Did you carry a .45, as sheriff?

Senator HAYDEN. Yes, for 5 years.

Mr. NIVEN. Ever have to use it?

Senator HAYDEN. No, no—just as a matter of precaution. I missed it greatly when I came to the Senate and to the House, and a Member said, "Why, if that is all your trouble, put a couple of doorknobs in your pocket." [Laughter.]

Mr. NIVEN. You caught a couple of train robbers in a rather famous posse, didn't you? Could you tell about that?

Senator HAYDEN. Well, they robbed a train at Maricopa, tied their horses in the brush on the Gila River, and the train came up some distance. Why, they had robbed the passengers and all. The train came in the evening, we put our horses on the cattle cars and went over there the next morning. I called up some Indian scouts to go along with us and the sheriff of the adjoining county came and he wanted to go so I went in an automobile that waited until one of the Indians came back and indicated which way they were going. And, when he did, we pursued them in an automobile.

I remember it was an Apperson Jackrabbit, a very popular car in those days. Accompanied by the proprietor of a hotel and a customs officer, I finally caught up with the party, and we captured the train robbers.

Mr. NIVEN. You had a problem with an Indian who had three wives, didn't you?

Senator HAYDEN. That is a story told by Charley Carter about something that happened in Oklahoma 50 years ago that somebody erroneously attributed to me. Indians in Arizona do not have three wives.

Mr. NIVEN. Well, there was another story which may be erroneous, too, that the local ladies complained that Indians came into town in breechclouts and made—got you to go and tell them to wear trousers. Is that true?

Senator HAYDEN. There was a city ordinance in Phoenix that required them to put on their pants before they came into town.

Mr. NIVEN. How did you get your salary as sheriff?

Senator HAYDEN. Paid quarterly.

Mr. NIVEN. Well, you also collected fees, didn't you, from saloon keepers?

Senator HAYDEN. Yes. It was principally a fee office. I would have to go around with my receipt book and collect for a crap game or a roulette wheel or poker games and faro and the saloon itself and any gambling devices there.

Mr. NIVEN. Was there ever any difficulty in getting these fees?

Senator HAYDEN. Oh, no. They were glad to pay them, and the protection on that account. The time of collection I had decided would be about 10 or 11 o'clock in the morning after the old boys had been there and had their morning's morning and before they were crowded, and usually after I had made the collection the bartender would invite me to take a drink and I would explain that I had a rule—nothing before sundown.

Mr. NIVEN. Did you ever stop to play, could the sheriff gamble himself, properly?

Senator HAYDEN. No. I never was interested in gambling. I saw roulette wheels from the time I was big enough to stick my chin up over them and always in my mind it was the other man's game, you couldn't beat it.

Mr. NIVEN. You were never tempted?

Senator HAYDEN. No.

Mr. NIVEN. Never did play at all?

Senator HAYDEN. No. Oh, I don't mean to say I haven't put four bits on a wheel, or something like that, but to be a gambler—no.

Mr. NIVEN. When you first came to the Congress, was the work of the Congress much simpler, much easier than it is now?

Senator HAYDEN. Oh, yes; because the Government did not have as many activities. I can illustrate that by a statement made to me by Governor Shallenberger; he had been Governor of Nebraska and was a Member of the House. He had time to devise the system whereby we established local boards instead of sending soldiers to get men for the draft, a local board sends a man to—to tell the man whether he was to go or not. And I asked him how he had time to think about those things. He said, "Well, you know, the only Federal interest in my State at this time is a rural letter carrier."

It's very different now.

Mr. NIVEN. You worked very hard, though, from the beginning, didn't you, spending many hours in the Library of Congress doing your own research?

Senator HAYDEN. What I had to do was work on committees that I thought would help build a territory into a State, and so I asked for the Committees on Irrigation of Arid Lands and Public Lands, Indian Affairs, Mines and Mining, so that there was always work to do in that connection, my committee work.

Mr. NIVEN. And you went on Appropriations at a later stage in your Senate career——

Senator HAYDEN. No. That was after I came to——

Mr. NIVEN. After you came to the Senate. Did you go out right onto Appropriations when you came to the Senate?

Senator HAYDEN. Yes. I had become chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs in the House, that appropriated money for the Indian Bureau at that time, and very modest appropriations—oh, if we got $12 or $14 million, we were doing very well.

But Senator Pittman, of Nevada, and Senator King, of Utah, said that our part of the United States had not had representation upon their Appropriations Committee for a long time, and this "South in the saddle" didn't go any more and that I must become a member to represent that area. And they were influential enough to fix it so that I became a member of the Appropriations Committee, but it was a week after I became a Senator in 1927.

Mr. NIVEN. And Arizona has had a long inning on the Appropriations Committee since?

Senator HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. NIVEN. When you first came here as a Congressman, did you get any valuable advice from some of the older members?

Senator HAYDEN. Oh, yes; they were very kind to me. I inquired about how things were done, and so on, and they were very good to me.

I remember one old Congressman from Missouri gave me some very good advice. I had been there from February until June when Congress adjourned and he called me off and said, "Now, look, you're a Congressman and you're going home and you are supposed to know a lot of things. Actually you haven't been around here long enough to know anything." He said, "If you go home and follow the usual method of meeting your friends, go along on the street, go into the places of business, but if somebody wants to talk to you about some important subject, you'll be sorry because you have an appointment up the street because he'll soon find out you don't know any more than he does."

Mr. Niven. How long—how long did it take you to fully understand the legislative system? Can you remember?

Senator Hayden. Oh, I don't think anybody fully understands it yet. There are all kinds of angles to it, you know.

Mr. Niven. But I don't imagine after 50 years you are still learning new facets, and—

Senator Hayden. Well, there is always something new turns up.

Mr. Niven. There is?

Senator Hayden. Yes.

Mr. Niven. Extraordinary.

President Kennedy, when he spoke at your testimonial dinner in Phoenix, quoted a speech you had made years ago in which you said, "I know that Congress does not conduct its business in an efficient manner. If any corporation had a board of directors as inefficient as Congress, it would become bankrupt in a year."

Do you still believe that, sir?

Senator Hayden. The President reminded me of something I said a long time ago. And I hesitate to say that, although it is true that there are many places in the Government where good business practice would be very helpful.

Mr. Niven. Would you like—do you favor any particular reforms of the legislative branch?

Senator Hayden. No. Avenues to obtain information necessary to make appropriations are wide open; you can get anything you want to know.

Mr. Niven. You don't—you're not, for instance, among those who say a parliamentary system would be more effective and more efficient?

Senator Hayden. No, no. I would not. I like the way the Senate operates.

Mr. Niven. It is essential, I suppose, to geographically—your part of the country particularly, to Arizona the Federal system has been very important, isn't that true?

Senator Hayden. No more so than anywhere else. The whole point of it is that the Senate represents States, not the Nation as a whole. The House is the national body and of course represents population. We represent the areas of States, and we also enjoy freedom of debate. I would never have been a Senator but for the fact that we had freedom of debate in the Senate. Oklahoma, an Indian territory, was admitted, and it was well known they would be a Democratic State because of that area. To make up for that the Republicans in Congress wanted to unite Arizona and New Mexico, and so provided.

A small group of Senators just simply talked and talked and talked and said, "You can't do that," and finally they made an arrangement whereby we would have a separate vote in Arizona and New Mexico, and if either State decided that it didn't want to join statehood, we would then come in separately. Well, they voted overwhelmingly for it in New Mexico and very much against it in Arizona so that made it possible for me to come to Congress. I never could have been here if it had been one State with New Mexico.

Mr. Niven. After making very few speeches for the first few years you engaged in a filibuster yourself, didn't you, at one point, quite an important one?

Senator Hayden. We had a bill to authorize the construction of what was called the Boulder Dam—it's now called the Hoover Dam—built in the administration of President Hoover, and prior to that time they had negotiated a compact between the States which related to the distribution of water and how it should be handled. And, President Hoover was then Secretary of Commerce and presided over that. Unfortunately Arizona did not ratify the compact; all of the other States did. Then the other States made up their mind we couldn't get a drop of water out of the river until we did ratify it and in the meantime they proceeded with the construction of what was known as Boulder and now Hoover Dam. And of course we had to resist that and we did successfully for about a month in the long session of Congress. But, in the short session, why they made it the exclusive unfinished business of the Senate and held us right to it so finally we had to allow a vote, the bill to come to a vote after we obtained some concessions that we believed to be important.

Mr. Niven. It has been said that Arizona is just a big collection of monuments to Carl Hayden—roads, airports, dams—

Senator Hayden. That is an overstatement.

Mr. Niven. But you have got quite a few things for your State over the years.

Senator Hayden. Not for Arizona alone. For example, we have a policy of conserving water everywhere, not only in Arizona or anywhere else. It so happened that one of the first reclamation—the first project under the reclamation law that was passed in 1902 when Mr. Roosevelt was President was carried out in Arizona, but there have been many other projects which we have helped to inaugurate and put into effect.

And, the same way with power development and highways. We have been interested in a national system of highways because—not for Arizona alone, but so that people could come to Arizona. We have wonderful scenery in northern Arizona, the Petrified Forest and the Grand Canyon. We think we have the finest winter climate in America, so that Arizona—a national system of highways made it accessible to the American public.

Mr. Niven. Well, has your success in getting these things for Arizona and for other States stemmed mainly from your power as appropriations chairman or your seniority or simply your ability to get a lot of——

Senator Hayden. It doesn't stem from any power. If you have a good project, the Congress will adopt it. Nobody has the power to impose anything on the Congress or procure the enactment into legislation.

Mr. Niven. A lot has been written about the so-called Senate Club, or the Inner Circle, the group of, loosely defined informal group of very influential senior Senators who——

Senator Hayden. That is more or less a myth.

Mr. Niven. It is a myth?

Senator Hayden. Yes. There are Senators that have been there longer and know their way about, but they don't get off in a huddle and decide what the rest of the Senators will do. They wouldn't stand for that.

Mr. Niven. Is all legislation, as a Senator once said, the result of compromise?

Senator Hayden. That is exactly what Champ Clark told me when I first came to the House. He said: "Young man, I want you to remember, you can't have everything your own way. There never was an important piece of legislation enacted by Congress which was not the result of compromise."

Mr. Niven. It has to be.

There is a great suspicion I think in the country at large of compromise, of logrolling and of horse trading but isn't this the only way a country as large as this can govern itself?

Senator Hayden. Champ Clark stated a fact.

Mr. Niven. Uh-huh.

Senator Hayden. You just don't enact important legislation except by coming to an agreement, where there are differences of opinion.

Mr. Niven. And does one Senator go to another Senator and say, "I will join you on this if you will support me on this"?

Senator Hayden. That would be a very unusual circumstance.

Mr. Niven. It would be unusual?

Senator Hayden. Yes.

Mr. Niven. Is that necessary, would that necessarily be——

Senator Hayden. I don't know, that is just—looks like you didn't care anything about the merits of what you do, and Senators don't do that.

Mr. Niven. Senator, you have been very famous for avoiding publicity all your life. Why is that?

Senator Hayden. Well, I couldn't see any advantage in talking a great deal about something. It's much better to do it and let the results speak for itself.

Mr. Niven. It has been said that Senator Hayden detests publicity, distrusts newspapers, and avoids reporters as if they were emissaries come direct from Typhoid Mary.

Senator Hayden. Well, it's not quite that bad. But nevertheless, I have considered that where we had executive sessions and confidential information that I would not spill it and I in that way, of course, avoided the press because if you don't see them, you don't have to talk to them.

Mr. Niven. And you never held press conferences.

Senator Hayden. Pardon?

Mr. Niven. You have never held press conferences, news conferences.

Senator Hayden. If I have, they have been very exceedingly rare.

Mr. Niven. How about publicity in Arizona? Surely in an election campaign, while your opposition has never been very formidable, seldom been very formidable——

Senator Hayden. My whole theory is that—you do your work and if people inquire of you about it, you can explain it, if they don't understand it; but the work speaks for itself and you don't have to make a parade.

Mr. Niven. Have you worried much at election time, have you run scared?

Senator Hayden. Well, I always feel a little more confident after all the ballots are cast and the count begins to favor me.

Mr. Niven. You once lost an election in college, didn't you?

Senator Hayden. Yes. I was candidate for president of the student body at Stanford University. Herbert Hoover's brother, Theodore Hoover, was one candidate, I was another, and a gentleman by the name of Diggles. Diggles had a very good organization. I had the most votes on the first time and then we had to run it off, like a Texas primary, and everybody thought I had run so well in the first ballot that there was no question. I went all around over the campus telling them that Diggles had a good organization, was getting the votes in and please come over and vote for me. But I remember there were at least four students from Arizona who promised to go but didn't, and I lost out by four votes.

Mr. Niven. Senator, do you plan to run for reelection to the Senate this year?

Senator Hayden. Why, I answer that question always, when the filing time is in July, that after every time I have been elected the next day they want to know whether you are going to run next time and my answer is, "Why not?"

Mr. Niven. Is that your answer now?

Senator Hayden. Yes.

Mr. Niven. So, in other words, you will be announcing in the proper time?

Senator Hayden. I say, "Why not?"

Mr. Niven. Well, thank you very much, Senator Hayden. It's been a pleasure to have you with us in this Washington Conversation.

Senator Hayden. Thank you.

Announcer. Our guest has been Senator Carl Hayden, Democrat, of Arizona. He was interviewed by CBS News Correspondent Paul Niven.

Today's program with Senator Carl Hayden has been presented on the eve of his 50th anniversary as a Member of Congress.

For a copy of the written transcript of today's program—"The Private Mind and Public Philosophy of Senator Carl Hayden"—send 10 cents and a stamped, self-addressed envelope to Washington Conversation, Post Office Box 200, Washington 4, D.C.

This is Jamie Bragg speaking.

Washington Conversation is a public affairs presentation of CBS News.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen], the minority leader, and myself—and, I am sure, the other 98 Senators—I submit a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk read as follows:

Whereas the Honorable Carl Hayden, senior Senator from Arizona, first became a Member of the House of Representatives on February 19, 1912, upon the admission of Arizona as a State of the Union; and

Whereas from such date until March 3, 1927, he continued to serve as a Member of the House of Representatives from Arizona; and

Whereas from March 4, 1927, until the present time, he has served as a United States Senator from Arizona; and

Whereas during his long and distinguished career as a Member of Congress, he has been admired and respected for his outstanding ability, courage, and untiring devotion to duty, and has been loved for his modesty, sincerity, and understanding; and

Whereas his able and dedicated service as a Member of Congress has contributed immeasurably to the welfare of the peoples of his State and his Nation; and

Whereas today, the nineteenth day of February 1962, marks the fiftieth anniversary of continuous service by the Honorable Carl Hayden as a Member of Congress from the State of Arizona: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate, in tribute to his long and distinguished service to his State and Nation, extends to the Honorable Carl Hayden, senior Senator from Arizona and beloved President pro tempore of the Senate, its sincere congratulations and felicitations on this, the fiftieth anniversary of the commencement of his service as a Member of Congress, and expresses the fervent wish that the Senate and the Nation may, for many years to come, continue to benefit from the wise and capable guidance and leadership which he has so long and so generously rendered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, there is current in the English language a word which is one of the most useful I have ever encountered. It is the word "tradition." It fits everywhere. It has a rather amorphous meaning, in a sense; but when one is at a loss for a word, just insert the word "tradition," and it will probably fit. But "tradition" does have a real meaning; and in the history of this country, by our national tradition, we think of all the events, all the achievements, all the personalities, all the tears, all those things which conjoin to give us a great and glorious history.

Tradition would include the Pilgrims coming to Plymouth Rock and the sacrifices of the Puritans. It would include the War of the Revolution and all its great exploits. It would include the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. It would include the unfortunate civil strife. It would include the entry of the great Lone Star State of Texas into the Union upon her own request, after that great State had wrested its own independence from Mexico, and did not come into the Union particularly as a suppliant, but actually on equal ground with the Union. All these things are included in tradition.

Tradition includes personalities, and one need only talk of the ghosts that are in this Chamber or the ghosts that were in the first Capitol in New York, great men who have studded the history of the country with outstanding achievements.

Out of that progress one gets a sense of continuity; but I think one gets it best if in our own lifetime there is a great contemporary statesman whose lifetime is the equal of one-half of the life of this Republic.

Carl Hayden was born in 1877. I must say, Carl, that you picked an awfully unfortunate time; because only 4 years before, almost to the day, occurred the panic of Black Friday, in 1873.

I think if it had been up to me to select a time to be born, I would not have asked to be born particularly in that feverish economic period in our history. But I think it was a good time for you. However, if you go back beyond that only the length of your own lifetime, you go back to 1789, and that was when the Republic was founded. So your lifetime has spanned half the life of the Republic. All we have to do today is to look closely into your contribution to the Republic, and there we see a sense of continuity, a picture of continuity, which gives one a better estimate of our own history.

When we go back to 1877, we think of all the economic difficulties, the building of the West, the expansion of the railroads, and the ultimate geographic integrity of the Union, because six or eight States were still to be added from then until now—perhaps more. Nevertheless, we have witnessed the unfolding of the Union in its geographic and its economic sense.

So when I saw you yesterday on the television program—and may I congratulate you upon it—I thought of how quickly so many of the incidents and details concerning the events through which you lived have come so rapidly to pass. If I were to advise any student on how best he could obtain a graphic picture of the development of the Republic, I should say he could well address himself to your lifetime, covering half the life of the Republic; and there it would be.

What a pleasure, Carl, it has been to serve with you; and what a double pleasure it has been to serve, under your benign chairmanship, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations. I shall always cherish that experience. You have contributed much to the Republic, and you have done it so gracefully and with a minimum of persuasion.

Mrs. Dirksen remarked, when we were watching the television program yesterday: "He has done so much for Arizona. Has he made so many speeches on the floor of the House and Senate?"

I said: "No; his speeches have been few and far between. What has actually happened has been that whenever Representative Carl Hayden or Senator Carl Hayden came before a committee with a project or any other request for his State, one could be quite certain that it was worthy, it was justifiable, and it needed little persuasion and rhetorical advancement."

So I count myself singularly fortunate to have been privileged to serve in this body with you. I come as a younger person; but I am always willing, as disciple and a pupil, to sit at the feet of a master.

I wish we could create and bestow upon you a title, and call it Senator emeritus; because if anyone richly deserves it, that gentleman is Carl Hayden.

So, on this notable occasion, I congratulate you.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Washington Star of this afternoon carries on its front page an article with the headline "Fifty Years in Congress—Hayden Sets New Record."

Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden] is the only Member of this body serving here today who occupied a seat in the Senate when I first took the oath of office as a Senator of the United States. That has been almost 30 years ago. I can assert without any fear of contradiction that in that 30-year period there has not been a single year when the distinguished President pro tempore of the Senate, my good friend, Senator Carl Hayden, has not set new records by his service here. He has served longer than any other Member of the Senate. I do not know with how many hundreds of men he has served in the Senate; but I do know that every man with whom he has ever served has had a real affection for him. Every one of them liked to feel that he had a little special knowledge—a realization that Carl Hayden is something very extraordinary in the way of a man. We also like to feel that this realization is shared only by his good friends. That statement is accurate, Mr. President, for that realization is shared by Carl Hayden's good friends—by all who have served in the Congress during half a century, and also by all the citizens of Arizona and by a goodly portion of the population of these United States.

Mr. President, as a Georgian, I am proud of my native State. I love her red-clay hills, the broad expanses of her coastal plains, and her beaches where the Atlantic ceaselessly rolls. I thrill to the glorious history of my State. But, Mr. President, I must confess that I am a little jealous of the State of Arizona, for through a combination of good luck and good judgment, since Arizona first achieved statehood, in 1912, there has not been a single moment when the State of Arizona has not enjoyed the leadership of this remarkable man. I venture to say here, in the presence of many men who have worked with him, that in all the history of these United States no one man has contributed more to the building of a State than Carl Hayden has contributed to the State of Arizona.

When Carl Hayden first came to the Congress, Arizona was one of the most sparsely populated States of the Union. Arizona then had vast expanses of desert and mountains, but very little agriculture, some cattle, and a good many gunmen, bandits, and Indians on the warpath.

But what do we find in Arizona today? Today, Arizona has the most rapidly growing population of any State in the Union, and Arizona has developed a great industrial system, airports, and military bases, and has magnificent highways that bring thousands of tourists into the State each year. Irrigation has brought water to her fertile plains, and Arizona's agricultural production is not equaled per acre, by that of the other States of the Union. The handiwork of Carl Hayden will be found in each and every one of those developments.

Mr. President, I remember when I first came to the Senate, almost three decades ago, I heard the late Senator Carter Glass, of Virginia, say in the cloakroom that if Virginia were ever allowed to have a third Senator, he was going to try to get Carl Hayden to fill the place. It did not take me long to find out why he said that, and I doubt not that every man who has been in the Senate long enough to learn his way around would feel the same way about Carl Hayden, when we see what he has done to develop and to build the State of Arizona.

Mr. President, Carl Hayden is not one who is without weaknesses for he has one outstanding weakness: It is his excessive modesty. For many years I have heard references made to those who have "a passion for anonymity." But, Carl Hayden is the only man I have ever seen in Washington, in any position, high or low, who really, genuinely has a passion for anonymity. Yet—and I know that none of my colleagues would contradict this statement, either on or off the record—despite that trait, there is no more highly respected or influential man in either House of the Congress. Mr. President, I think all of us can find a lesson in that simple fact. Carl Hayden's influence arises from his role as a doer, not a talker; his influence is founded on his record of performance, rather than on mere words and promises.

Mr. President, many men who have come into this body might well have taken advantage of the pearls of wisdom that have come from Carl Hayden's vast experience. When I first came here, he said to me something that I have carried with me from that day to this. He said to me that "It is comparatively easy to explain a vote, no matter on which side of the issue one may have voted, but it is always extremely difficult to explain a speech." I have thought about that a thousand times, and whenever I have been tempted to take the floor and address the Senate at a time when I was not absolutely sure of the facts, I have remembered that Hayden proverb, and have remained silent, rather than be compelled at some later date to explain such a speech.

I venture to say that very few men who have served in the Senate for only one term have had as few words put in the Record as Carl Hayden has had since he came to this body in 1927, and that despite the fact—perhaps I should not say this, in this enlightened age, when the word almost has a connotation of great crime—that on one occasion he was one of the outstanding filibusterers of the Senate, when he held the floor for days, to prevent the passage of proposed legislation which he deemed harmful to his State and to its people. Mr. President, Carl Hayden does not fill the Record with useless verbiage.

We may say of Carl Hayden that if he has ever promised anything, he has delivered; and he has never performed any less than he has promised. In his case, the old saying that "his word is as good as his bond" is an understatement, because Carl Hayden's word is a guarantee—as certain as the mark "Sterling" on old silver—that what he says he will do will be done.

That alone is a mark of true greatness. But it is only one of this man's qualities.

To my way of thinking, a great leader is a man of integrity; a man of courage; and a man of wisdom. Over the nearly 30 years I have been privileged to serve with this man I have discussed many grave problems and issues with Carl Hayden. In every case he has approached those problems with integrity, courage, and wisdom.

I can assert at this moment that I have never made a mistake when I have followed his advice and counsel.

Mr. President, lawyers predominate in this body. I have not checked on it, but I know that down through the years a majority of the Members of the Senate have been members of the bar. But I discovered many years ago that, although Carl Hayden is not a lawyer, there is no greater authority on our National Constitution in this body than the distinguished President pro tempore, the Senator from Arizona. He has true reverence for the Constitution of the United States, and that has made him one of our truly great scholars in that field. The Senate could do well to listen to him when he gives his interpretation of constitutional questions. He has respect for the oath he took at yonder desk. He has undertaken to support and defend and carry out the provisions of the Constitution of the United States.

He is a believer in the true American concept of law and government under that Constitution. I am proud to say that he believes in the Senate of the United States as a unique institution among the parliamentary bodies of the earth. He is, to quote that distinguished journalist, William S. White, a "Senate man," a "Senate type."

Mr. President, you will never find Carl Hayden trading the prerogatives which have made this the greatest parliamentary body in the history of the world for any mess of votes from any corner of the State of Arizona. He would never abandon the position that the Constitution of the United States intended for the Senate in any effort to rush helter-skelter to adopt legislation designed with purely political motives in mind.

And after another 50 years of service here, before he finally retires or shuffles off this mortal coil, he can face any man and say, "No act of mine has subtracted one jot or title from the standing of the U.S. Senate as the forum of the States of this Union."

The passage of his five decades in Congress has been through many soul-searching, world-shaking periods of the history of the earth. Whatever the times or the issues, Senator Hayden has been a bulwark of constitutional government. He has been a national leader through three great wars; through periods of boom and times of depression. Each one of the 50 years he has served in this body has seen his stature increase. He has accumulated with the years an even greater store of wisdom and honor. He is a legend in the Senate and the experience he has acquired he bestows freely on his colleagues, on his party, the Democratic Party. Overall, the welfare and security of our beloved country has been the lode star that has guided him always.

I say to my friend, as you enter into your second 50 years of service in the Senate of the United States, that you carry with you the affection and best wishes of all who have come in contact with you.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Record an article from the Associated Press appearing in the Washington Star this afternoon.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Fifty Years in Congress—Hayden Sets New Record

Senator Carl Hayden, who swapped his sheriff's badge for a seat in Congress 5 days after Arizona became a State, today becomes the first man to serve as a Member of Congress for 50 years.

The 84-year-old Democrat, third in line of succession to the Presidency, was sworn into the House of Representatives February 19, 1912. After 15 years as Arizona's only Representative, Senator Hayden moved to the Senate in 1927.

Today he is dean of the Senate and of Congress. However, he is little known outside Washington, because he resolutely shuns publicity and rarely speaks in public.

Asked in a recent interview to name his greatest accomplishment, he replied:

"I just can't do it. A man does one piece of work one time; another piece of work, and then another. To look back 50 years and say one thing is more important than another is something I can't do."

TRIBUTE FROM KENNEDY

Last November, at a testimonial dinner in Phoenix, President Kennedy had this to say about Senator Hayden:

"Every Federal program which has contributed to the West—irrigation, power and reclamation—bears his mark. And the great Federal highway program which binds this country together, which permits this State to be competitive east and west, north and south—this in large measure is his creation."

Senator HAYDEN is expected to be a candidate this year for his seventh 6-year Senate term.

Senator HAYDEN, a tall, lean, bald man who smokes cigars, is President pro tempore of the Senate, a position that goes to the member of the majority party who has served longest. This puts him third in line to the Presidency, behind Vice President JOHNSON and Speaker McCORMACK.

Although he has served longer than any of the more than 10,000 other Congressmen in U.S. history, Senator HAYDEN balks at the suggestion that he fully understands the legislative system.

"Oh, I don't think anybody fully understands it yet," he said in an interview taped for a television program, CBS—"Washington Conversation."

"There are all kinds of angles to it. There is always something new turns up."

Senator HAYDEN brushed aside the theory that an inner circle of senior Senators controls the "so-called Senate Club."

"That is more or less a myth," he said, adding that the ranking Senators may "know their way about, but they don't get off in a huddle and decide what the rest of the Senators will do."

"They (others) wouldn't stand for that."

Senator HAYDEN was born October 2, 1877, at Hayden's Ferry, now Tempe. His father had founded the settlement.

He was educated in the public schools of Tempe and Stanford University where he met his future wife, Nan Downing, whom he married in 1908. Mrs. Hayden died last June.

Senator HAYDEN concedes that his performance as a sheriff in the pioneer West would be a disappointment to today's TV western fans.

"I never shot at anyone and nobody ever shot at me," he said.

"The nearest I came to shooting anyone was the day I identified a horsethief who was described as badly wanted in Utah, Colorado, and Wyoming."

Senator HAYDEN confirmed that as an Arizona sheriff he helped capture two train robbers in an adjoining county. Indian scouts located the robbers the day after the robbery, he recalled, and "we pursued them in an automobile."

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I most happily and sincerely join in the sentiments that have been expressed in eulogizing our distinguished colleague and the senior Member of this body. I can add little to what has been said.

I think it was sometime last fall that a dinner in his honor was tendered Senator HAYDEN in Phoenix, Ariz. I was in my home State at the time, and, having an invitation to attend, and being unable to go, I sent a telegram of congratulations. I somehow gained the impression then that the date of the dinner was the 50th anniversary of the commencement of his service in the Congress, and I worded my telegram accordingly. My message took that assumption into account.

Mr. President, the date may have been premature, but the sentiments I expressed were not. They were true then; they are true today. And if I said and meant my words then, I say them and mean them today. I say them with even stronger emphasis. I know of nothing more appropriate I could say than to read into the RECORD at this time the telegram I sent congratulating him on that occasion. The telegram reads as follows:

> I join with all of our colleagues, your host of personal friends and with millions of Americans throughout the country in extending to you warmest greetings and congratulations on this 50th anniversary of your distinguished statesmanship and service to your country in the National Congress. For me it has been a personal joy to serve with you and work under you as chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate and to work with you in many other areas of congressional activities and responsibilities. I look forward with the keenest of pleasure to the continuation of our laboring and being associated together.
>
> For you, I have the deepest admiration and respect and I trust there may be many more happy returns of this day for you.

Mr. President, I can only add to that message today that I have looked upon and relied upon our distinguished colleague as a friend and a counselor.

Many times have I sought his advice. Every time I have received the information I needed and the guidance that my inexperience, as compared to his experience, required.

I know he is President pro tempore of the Senate, an official position which in a sense makes him head of this body in the absence of the Vice President of the United States. Mr. President, I seldom refer to him as President pro tempore of the Senate. I have a term of my own, a little greeting which I fondly and affectionately use. To me he is the "chief." I greet him frequently as "Chief." I do that in a spirit of highest respect, because among all the Members of this body he is my chief.

I congratulate him on this day. The Lord bless him and keep him, and may he continue to be with us and to labor with us for our country for many years to come.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, we are indeed proud and happy as we celebrate the 50 years of service of our friend and colleague CARL HAYDEN, in the Congress of the United States.

When I was privileged to enter the House of Representatives some 38 years ago, CARL HAYDEN was one of the most respected and beloved Members of that body and surely one of its most outstanding Members in his ability, his dedication, and his statesmanship. He gave to me, then the baby Member of the House, the help, the encouragement, and the inspiration of his friendship—a friendship that has continued through the years with unabated warmth and with many blessings for me.

We who know CARL HAYDEN's worth and his works, who have been privileged to witness at firsthand his lifelong enterprises dedicated to the common good, who have witnessed his devotion to our country and his splendid achievements in her cause, who honor him for the magnificent example he has set for the younger generations by his pursuit of knowledge, by his skill and his courage, by the integrity of his character, and by the purity of his purpose in maintaining the dignity and highest ideals of his profession, rejoice to salute him today. We, who love CARL HAYDEN for what he is personally and professionally, hail the advent of his golden jubilee with the acclaim that is due the prize winner in the race of life's noblest achievements. We salute CARL HAYDEN, the man, the friend, the patriot, and we salute CARL HAYDEN, the institution of statesmanship. May it be said of him, as was said of Sophocles in his 100th year, "In his heart forever flows the warm blood of youth."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I join with the many friends of CARL HAYDEN in congratulating him on the 50th anniversary of his service in the Congress of the United States, and wish for him many more happy years to come.

My first acquaintance with Senator HAYDEN came in 1909 and 1910, when I was a schoolboy in Mesa and he was sheriff of Maricopa County. Our acquaintanceship then was brief, I am glad to say, because he was keeping order in a baseball game in which I participated. We won the game and went home as quickly as we could, and without any loss of life or limb, because of the order the sheriff kept on that day.

Later our acquaintance became friendship when I became a U.S. Senator.

I have served on the Appropriations Committee for some 14 years, and he has served on the committee and has been chairman of it for a considerable number of those years.

What appeals to me about CARL HAYDEN is that he knows his business. He knows his business as a U.S. Senator, because he knows how to get things done in this body. He knows how to get legislation passed. Those of us who have come here after him can take lessons from the way CARL HAYDEN works. When he is interested in a subject he keeps after it. He sees the individual members of the committee considering the proposed legislation and uses his persuasive abilities to show them how his position is the right one and why they should join. We seldom hear from him on the floor of the Senate. We seldom hear from him on the floor because we do not need to. He has accomplished his job and he has accomplished his work before that time, before the bill is presented to the Senate. He accomplishes his objective because he is patient, because he is intelligent, because he is helpful to other Members, and because he is always an optimist. He always believes in what he feels is the right way, and what should become the law of the land sooner or later.

For these reasons Arizona has benefited from his long service. All of us in the United States have benefited from that service, because of his great understanding of the problems of today as they affect us domestically and as they affect our country internationally.

CARL, I hope you and I serve together on the Committee on Appropriations for many years to come, because I know that during that time I shall still be greatly influenced on this side of the aisle by your persuasive arguments on matters which come before us.

Congratulations and best wishes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am particularly happy to be able to join in the tributes, commendations, and messages of good cheer and good will to a distinguished patriot, a great Senator, an outstanding legislator, a statesman, a public servant, a good man and a good friend by the name of CARL HAYDEN.

I have visited Senator Hayden's State of Arizona on several occasions. All one really needs to do to make sure he will be received with the most cordial and gracious hospitality and welcome is to say he knows Carl Hayden or is a friend of Senator Hayden. Then the great hospitality of the people of Arizona becomes even more generous and more considerate, because the people are so justly proud of this fine and good man.

Mr. President, if ever there was a man who exemplified the famous words of Abraham Lincoln in his second inaugural address, "With malice toward none; with charity of all; with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right," it is the senior Senator from Arizona. I have never heard Senator Hayden say an unkind word about his colleagues or about anyone. I do not believe there is such a thing as malice in his heart, in his background, or in his words. I have known that he has exemplified that great principle of charity every day of his life. I can to this attribute from personal experience, because he has been charitable to me, and that kind of charity one never forgets.

I read this morning the New York Times article about Senator Hayden, written by Mr. Russell Baker. I wish to thank Mr. Baker publicly for the article, and of course all the other journalists and commentators—and there have been many indeed—who have written so sincerely, so objectively, and so complimentarily of Senator Hayden.

I think it was in the Russell Baker article that President Truman is reported to have said that one of the reasons why he grew to love Carl Hayden was that when he, President Truman, first came to the Senate, Carl Hayden treated him like a genuine human being, with kindness, warmth, and friendship. What finer qualities can one have than those qualities of humanity?

I believe that in its 50 years of statehood, Arizona has sent only six men to the U.S. Senate. As we know, one of those men has truly endured, and that man is the gentleman whom we salute today, Arizona's first U.S. Representative, and certainly Arizona's first citizen—Carl Hayden.

Today Carl Hayden marks the 50th anniversary of his arrival on Capitol Hill and begins his 51st year of dedicated service to his State and Nation. What a wonderful thing it is to see one so rich in experience remain so young. He typifies that wonderful musical number "Young in Heart." He does not make many speeches in the Senate. When he does speak, Senators give him their attention. I have yet to see a request of this distinguished Senator that has not been fulfilled. It is a privilege to be associated with him, if only indirectly. No State in the Union bears the mark of one great man to a greater extent than does Arizona, with respect to its senior Senator, Carl Hayden.

No State has a stronger and more devoted champion in the U.S. Congress. No State owes more to any one single individual, and no State has a stronger, more devoted, or more sincere champion of its interests and of its welfare in the Senate than Senator Hayden.

As the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall], and others, have said, Carl Hayden has proven himself a thousand times over as a man who can get a job done. He is the man who can perform the job, whether it is obtaining authorization for some valuable and important irrigation or hydroelectric program in the Far West that means so much to the people of that area, or whether it is bringing about a compromise between what seems like a deadlock situation between the two Houses of Congress. I do not believe Carl Hayden has ever heard the word "impossible." If he has, he has ignored it. He has shoved it aside, and he has performed what is possible. He has always made the word "impossible" a possibility of success.

Here is a man without a trace of condescension, one who has given valuable advice and instruction to every Senate freshman who has ever asked for it, from Harry Truman to John F. Kennedy. Here is a man who has never faltered on the road to his only objective—what is best for his State and what is best for the United States of America.

Carl Hayden is a partisan but, first of all, as has been said here so many times, he is an American. He bears the one title above all others that is so meaningful in this country—citizen.

He is indeed a great citizen. Those of us who have had the privilege of standing alongside him or standing in the shadow of his greatness, feel that it is a distinct honor to serve with him and to be his friend. I wish him many years of continued good health, many years of continued service in the Senate, and many reelections.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article about Carl Hayden, written by Oren Arnold and published in the Point West magazine, issue of February 1962, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Hayden

(By Oren Arnold)

(Editor's Note.—It is right and proper that in celebrating our golden anniversary of statehood, Arizonians should honor the one man who has done the most for our State.)

In one of the public schools a while back, eighth graders were asked on a written exam to name the three great branches of the American Government. One child wrote with more accuracy than the unimaginative teacher let her get by with—"The President, the Superb Court, and Mr. Carl Hayden."

Truly it is not to farfetched to list Hayden as a separate branch of the Government, for more than any other man alive he personifies the Congress of the United States. "Who says so?" Truth is, almost everybody in the know says so. Ike Eisenhower, for instance. And Dick Nixon. And Herbert Hoover. And when Jack Kennedy was invited to Phoenix in November to speak at a dinner honoring Hayden, he leaped at the chance, saying, "Indeed, yes. This is a historic occasion." How many Presidents leave the crises of national and international affairs to fly 2,500 miles just to greet one shy little man? Republican Senator Case of South Dakota says flatly that "Carl Hayden knows more about the U.S. Government than any other man alive." Almost all the leading Members of Congress gathered to celebrate Hayden's 80th birthday; scrolls of praise came in signed by thousands; wine flowed, speeches were made, the highjinks echoed all over Washington. But guess what?—the honoré himself didn't even attend the party. He was much too busy at his desk.

Our Mr. Hayden's amazing political power stems from two sources:

1. He has long been chairman of the immensely important Senate Appropriations Committee. This means, in effect, that he controls the spending of almost all the billions of dollars we taxpayers pour into Washington each year, and the additional billions for which we have mortgaged our future.

2. He consistently makes himself the best informed, most knowledgeable man concerning all legislation (not just that affecting Arizona) of all the Representatives and Senators sent to Congress. And they usually turn to the grizzled old veteran from Arizona for his appraisal. They have learned that he knows more about the bill than does its sponsor; he, the silent one who never, never makes speeches up there, is better informed about its impact on the sponsor's home State and on the Nation as a whole. This may sound incredible, but it is also true; his own colleagues frankly admit it.

How has all this come about? How did a farmboy from the desert emerge as one of the most powerful political personalities of our time?

Carl Hayden launched his career at age 22. Upon news of his father's death, he took over the family business interests in Arizona, which were extensive. Immediately, too, he felt the call for public service—and it was a call. At that time, running for office held the self-sacrificial dignity it too seldom enjoys now. At age 25 he was elected to the Tempe Town Council, his very first office. Next step was up or down, as you view it; he was the town fire chief. But he also was in the Territorial militia, then in 1904 ran for Maricopa County treasurer, won it and served 2 years. After that he hit as high as he himself ever expected to go—from 1907 to 1912 he was county sheriff.

Smirking gents in Maricopa County said that Carl Hayden was much too mild to sling a gun as a lawman. One episode corrected that impression.

Two tough Woodson brothers from Oklahoma held up a passenger train near Gila Bend, robbed everybody, pulled the emergency cord, and escaped on two horses they had staked in the bush.

Normally Sheriff Carl should have ridden hell-for-leather at the head of a big horseback posse, dust flying in the golden sunset. And Carl did send a posse out. Their dust telegraphed their presence for miles around, which was helpful to the Woodsons.

But Carl himself commandeered a wheezy old Apperson Jackrabbit automobile, circled fast toward Flattop Mountain and—yes, cut them off at the pass. The Woodson boys saw him coming up to their camp. Being in a car, this stranger naturally wouldn't be a lawman, they figured; he'd be a rich mining man out looking at his claims. So they'd play it cool and wait him out, their guns hidden under saddle blankets.

But that drama was as real as a rattlesnake, and next moment the Woodsons were looking into the muzzle of Sheriff Carl's rifle. He sent an Indian back for the galloping posse, took his bandits in and shepherded them into Leavenworth prison. When his wife Nan was audibly worrying about what disaster might have fallen her young husband-sheriff, he gave her dubious comfort. "There was no danger," soothed her. "I couldn't have hurt them, for my rifle had no cartridges in it. I never carry a loaded gun."

He was born in an adobe house still standing near the Salt River. His papa, Charles Trumbull Hayden, had known men who fought for American independence. He came westward from Independence, Mo., with 14 wagons and founded Haydens Ferry, the town now famous as the home of Arizona State University, the town renamed for that beautiful Grecian Vale of Tempe. Baby Carl appeared October 2, 1877, weighing 9 pounds 10 ounces. The Salt River Herald called him "the prize baby of Maricopa County," and from that, fate seemed to take its cue.

He did not immediately live up to prize promise; as a small boy he was puny. At age 6 he ran away from home and hid for hours on top of Tempe Butte, a nearby mountain, just to nag his mother. At age 7 he was sent after the milch cows with a specific warning to "beware of that dangerous bull." Mother screamed in horror when he came home riding the huge bull and driving the milkers.

He and little sisters Sallie and Mary (whom he nicknamed "Mapes") attended a one-room school. Carl was the star pupil, the star problem. He swapped his mother's carefully prepared "growing diet," packed in a lard bucket, for the more exotic cold tortillas and tamales which a Mexican boy brought. Probably both lads benefited; at any rate since about 1890 Carl Hayden has known nothing but excellent health. To the envy of many younger Senators and citizens everywhere, he still has all but one of his original teeth. Mr. Hayden credits his good luck to his mother's good cooking and to the fluorine content of Arizona's water.

"Carl was born before germs were invented," Miss Sallie Hayden told us not long ago. "Our school was on an irrigation canal. Upstream it served, as always, as something of a sewage disposal plant. When Carl would lie on his tummy to drink from it, teacher was horrified and said he must drink from the bucket and dipper that hung in the classroom. This bucket water also came from the canal, but somehow bringing it inside gave it respectability."

Carl was an expert horseman, but also loved walking. He still does. He used to walk the 9 miles from Tempe to Phoenix. Even now in Washington he takes a walk each night after supper, a "constitutional"—what else?—down Constitution Avenue. One recent winter he slipped on ice, then showed up next day at the office with a wonderfully black eye. "Stop," the aged Senator commanded instantly, when his staff began an outcry. "Save your sympathy for the other fellow."

The staff of course couldn't let that pass, so they built it up around the Senate Building. They told of the boss clobbering some obnoxious colleague—a Republican, naturally—and a naive reporter heard it. He, poor soul, spent an intense 24 hours trying to track the "exclusive" story down.

That sort of thing is right up Hayden's alley; as a lad in Tempe he was eternally pulling somebody's leg. He was a skinny twerp and so stooped that his father made him wear shoulder braces. Even as a freshman years later at Stanford University Carl weighed only 132 pounds. But there, he suddenly got his growth; he became a center on the famed Stanford Indians football team. He could have played in the very first Rose Bowl game in 1902 (Michigan 49, Stanford 0) but he elected to go home for the holidays instead. A substitute center called "Rosy" Roosevelt from New York took his place—and suffered a broken leg in that game.

His new strength in college also gave him new courage. One Saturday an opposing center, many pounds heavier, kept driving his fist into Carl's abdomen during close scrimmage. The referee didn't detect it, so Carl made his own penalty for the tough. At next charge he lifted a knee—wham—into the vicious center's chin. It took about 10 minutes to restore him to action. "All right," Carl said to him then, "shall we play it clean or rough?"

"We'll get along," rumbled his opponent. This was powerful Jack Monroe, soon to achieve fame by fighting World Heavyweight Boxing Champion Jim Jeffries at Butte, Mont.

As a small boy Carl learned to swim the Salt River near his home. (No cracks, you modern folk; the Salt hadn't been dammed then.) At age 10 he attended a baptism at Point of Rocks on the Salt, and the preacher sent him out to test the depth. Carl enjoyed this moment of glory but the preacher lost face. "He didn't trust the Lord," cried his flock, "but sent out a child." Carl declined baptism; he figured that with his competence he didn't need it.

As a boy he read so constantly that he won a reputation for being lazy. One day at age 11 he was supposedly helping the family get in the alfalfa hay ahead of threatening showers, but the air was humid hot so Carl disappeared. Father found him in the shade of a haystack reading a book 4 inches thick, volume 3 of Redpath's "History of the World." Questioning him, father learned that he had read all three books.

"Why did Rome fall?" the stern parent tested him, switch in hand.

"Because," the frightened lad replied, "the people grew soft and pampered theirselves."

"Work as such was not exactly offensive to him," his sister Sallie recalled a short time ago, "but Carl was expert at avoiding it. At age 12 he'd stand on the sink and recite the Preamble to the Constitution while Mary and I did the supper dishes. He was supposed to help us, but he spoke so entertainingly, with Patrick Henry gestures, that we could only laugh."

What happened? What brought about such a drastic change? Senator Carl Hayden of the 1930's, 1940's, 1950's, and 1960's is renowned for his silence. Senator Hayden never issues a statement, almost never makes a speech even in the Senate itself. Recently he did have the Senate floor for a moment, and he suddenly interrupted himself, turned his face up to the press gallery and called out to the renowned correspondent for the New York Times: "Young man, can you come here a moment? I want to say something."

The scholarly writer, himself middle aged and as sedate and dignified as his paper, all but fell over his feet hastening down. Obviously he had a rare scoop, some world-shaking announcement, no doubt. The other reporters could only watch with envy.

The Senator was indeed serious minded. Said he to the eager Times correspondent, "Young man, I like your newspaper. Please make sure that I get a copy of it every day." That was all.

You'd think a man so unique and powerful would be etched on every Washingtonian's memory. But not so. A short time ago 5 veteran newspaper correspondents there were given 90 seconds in which to name 10 U.S. Senators. Only one included Carl Hayden. No matter how much oratory he showed his sisters from the kitchen sink, he shows none of it in Washington. But it wasn't always that way. When he first went there, a tall ex-sheriff in a cowboy hat, he was impressed with himself as Representative from a brand-new State. He leaped at the first opportunity to make a speech. "It was notable," a colleague said, "for its longevity and vacuity." But at the end of it that colleague, Representative Fred C. Talbott, of Baltimore, an ex-Confederate private, took young Carl by the arm and walked him down the hallway.

"All right now, son," the older man began gently, "you just had to say it, and say it you did. But remember, that speech will always be in the Congressional Record. In time you will want to change it, but you can't. There are two kinds of Congressmen, Carl—show horses and work horses. One will get your name and picture in the papers. The other will get you votes plus the respect of your colleagues." Carl Hayden never from that moment let oratory tempt him again.

Mothers have always been wonderful, of course. Carl Hayden's may have been exceptionally so. In 1887 she beheld her small son reading deep books and making good speeches, noted especially his consuming interest in history, which holds to this day. So with rare prescience she nicknamed him "The Senator," and often introduced the 10-year-old son by that name.

"Some day," she would say proudly, "he will be the greatest man in the U.S. Senate."

She was right.

Young Carl learned to speak Spanish fluently by playing with Mexican children. At age 14 he went sightseeing to Mexico City, alone. Women friends of his parents were indignant. But, ruled his dad, "If he can't take care of himself at this age, it's high time he was learning." That same year he also rode horseback 250 miles to the Grand Canyon, down the dangerous trail to the bottom, and back to his farm home in Tempe. When Chicago opened its first great world's fair in 1893, he went there alone. His father encouraged every such endeavor.

High school years began an accelerated life for the farm boy. This included much courting, his sister Sallie recently recalled. "His main pal then," said she, "was Abner Wade, and for the two of them Carl wrote poetry to send to girls. Some of it was very sweet."

Handsome Carl—period photos show him to be striking indeed—went for a while to the Tempe Normal, now ASU, which his father had founded. (In 1957 ASU presented Carl a citation calling him its most distinguished alumnus.)

Then he went to Stanford University to study economics. One day there he saw, "the most beautiful girl who ever lived"—his own words—crossing the quadrangle there. He followed her in a state of happy hypnosis. She was Nan Downing, a student of English literature. They were married in 1908, and she stayed at his side, almost literally, until her death a short time ago. Her pet name for him was "Bugs."

At this stage he was tall and proud in a stiff collar 4 inches high, a middle-of-the-road hair part, and a sultry lady killer gleam in his eyes. These and other collegiate qualifications enabled him to be elected president of the sophomore class in Stanford. Then in 1899 he was candidate for the student body presidency there.

The first plunge into politics seemed to enthrall him. He studied vote-getting techniqus with thoroughness, discovered that misrepresentation, foolish promises, bombastic tactics, all in the end withered before straightforward simplicity and truth. So, he turned quiet and dignified. Unfortunately, he also turned lazy. His two opponents for the presidency were nice chaps named Coverly and Diggles, and he easily eliminated Diggles but a runoff with Coverly was necessary. "Don't worry friends," coached the handsome Carl. "You'll win in a breeze."

Carl agreed. He played it cool, as modern collegians would say; he acted modest. He even told sweetheart Nan not to vote for him but to support the other boy. "He can't win," he confided, "and it might be unseemingly for you and me to vote for me, so we must vote for my opponent."

That is just about the only political mistake Carl Hayden ever made. Certainly it is the only election he ever lost. He went on to become the greatest U.S. Senator of this century, but back at Stanford he was deflated as few young men ever are.

He lost that campus presidency by just two votes.

By 1912 when Arizona became a State, Hayden had achieved enough stature to become her first Congressman at large. He has been serving under the Capitol dome ever since, but his first few days as a lawmaker were hectic. On the train to Washington at noon February 14, 1912, a portly man came to shake hands with the new statesman from Arizona. "I am William Jennings Bryan," said he. "I want to wish you well."

"He was kind enough to talk with me for an hour and a half," Mr. HAYDEN recalls. "And he coached me on being a Congressman. Told me not to make any Fourth of July speeches, because everybody goes and nobody listens. He was right."

Being from a new State, he naturally attracted newspaper reporters; besides which he was as tall as a giant cactus and wore the 10-gallon hat of a cowboy. They interviewed him, and he answered in monosyllables with a bobbing Adam's apple. One particularly astute newsman said, in a Press Club talk, "Hayden was all right as a frontier sheriff, but he'll never amount to a damn in Congress." Freshman HAYDEN heard of that remark, and was inclined to agree.

Exactly how much he has amounted to, depends some on the point of view. A few Republicans feel that he had best been shot by the Woodson brothers who robbed the train, for time and again he has scorched pet bills they wanted to use in raiding the U.S. Treasury or some such. But virtually all Democrats revere him, and all latter-day Republicans as well. And how about our own Arizona Republican Senator? Well sir, BARRY GOLDWATER himself said on the Senate floor, "CARL HAYDEN's popularity oversteps party lines. He has universal support among members of both parties. He is not looked upon as a Democratic Senator, but as one of whom all Arizona is justly proud." This is entirely true.

During those first few months in Washington, Carl made friends with a young clerk in the Department of Justice. The clerk seemed unimpressive, even shy, but both men needed friendship then. The clerk's name was about as ordinary as CARL HAYDEN's. It was Ed Hoover. And because CARL had been a sheriff, they naturally talked shop. CARL said that he had used the old Bertillon (body measurement) method of identifying criminals. Ed thought it should be replaced by the more modern fingerprint system, and CARL agreed. Nobody else seemed much interested. But on July 1, 1924, friend Ed got a break; he was appointed chief of the FBI, and rushed to CARL with this exciting news. CARL forthwith pushed a bill through Congress, appropriating the then mountainous sum of $56,230 to start our Nation's truly important fingerprint system. The two men are still pals.

From the lower house, CARL moved to the Senate in the election of 1926. He had already been seasoned; he pitched in anew as a dedicated man. Since then few bills of importance to Arizona, or to America, have escaped his touch. Many have had his direct but often unseen personal guidance. He has always been skilled at getting a thing accomplished while avoiding any publicity or prominence concerning mining, agriculture, irrigation, Federal highway paving, reclamation. "Ours is a mobile civilization," says he. "We live on wheels. We must have good highways just as we must have good homes." Wherefore much of the vast Federal road building program under way today is the brain child of CARL HAYDEN.

His avoidance of the limelight has become so pronounced as to become a limelight itself. He perfected his hideout technique while a Congressman at Large. The 1917 Draft Act was critically needed. Representative Kahn was struggling with it, but couldn't get the emergency measure through Congress, so he asked HAYDEN's counsel. HAYDEN, an avid student of history, especially of the War Between the States, copied the old Confederate Draft Act, updated it, changed the names and gave that to Kahn, who promptly put it through to law.

There are countless such instances of his working behind the scenes. An important one began when an obscure haberdasher from Missouri turned up in Washington as Senator. Unfortunately, this one was dubbed a "tool of the Pendergasts", and some spelled that first word with an "f" instead of a "t". He was so suspect that almost no Member of the Senate would even speak to him. The newcomer, hypersensitive anyway, felt their unfriendliness so much that he even considered resigning.

But one day he was walking through the Capitol when a tall stranger approached him smiling, shook hands and said, "Good morning, Senator Truman, and welcome to Washington. If I can do anything for you here, just let me know. I'm HAYDEN from Arizona, an old timer." The freshman latched onto CARL as a true friend in need.

In due time the bill to create a War Investigating Committee was introduced by Bennett Champ Clark, a Missouri colleague of Senator Harry Truman. This committee, they all knew, was destined to be of great importance. And by long-established tradition the man who introduced the bill would automatically be its chairman. But this was unthinkable here; to the rest of the Senator Members Mr. Clark was—as one paper politely phrased it—"somewhat less than popular." Yet how could they seal him off?

In desperation they turned to their dean for advice, and he came up with a shrewd suggestion, "Simply have Harry Truman introduce an identical bill," counseled Mr. HAYDEN. "Then we'll have a choice of two men to make committee chairman."

They were elated; even Alben Barkley, the great unoffending politician, quietly endorsed this maneuver. It was seen through. Truman became chairman, thereby acquiring the national prominence which, with dramatic help from fate, shot him into the White House itself. But for CARL HAYDEN, he might have remained relatively unknown.

Truman never forgot that boost. Whatever his enemies may say against him—and this is considerable—he is a man of gratitude. As candidate for Vice President in 1944 he called HAYDEN to him. "CARL," he said, "when I was new in the Senate everybody was mean to me except you. Time and again you gave me a shove upward. I owe you a favor. Now you are running for reelection, so I'd like to go out to Arizona and make a speech in your behalf." He did so, and HAYDEN was reelected with votes to spare.

Now in 1962, of course, another ex-Senator who is President, has flown to Arizona to "make a speech in HAYDEN's behalf," because HAYDEN once again is running for reelection. And while this is not the moment to reveal the background facts on our current President, it is true that he too was befriended by a mild, wrinkled, aging, but smiling and generous senior Senator in the Senate halls.

Many Senators feel that their name on any bill is important, that it is a lasting monument. HAYDEN seeks only to get the legislation through regardless of credit or publicity. For years one prominent but inefficient Senator introduced two bills, without success. His own prestige regarding them had sunk to zero. But the time came when they were vital to the country, and the President quietly asked HAYDEN to "look into them." HAYDEN personally revised them, had two powerful men from other States sponsor them, spoke to certain other key colleagues and got both bills passed—with the new sponsors credited. That broke the original sponsor's heart, but did get the needed legislation.

The only flaw in such parliamentary techniques is that feelings are sensitive. On such occasions, Mr. HAYDEN is unhappy for days. He goes out of his way to reestablish friendship and good will with the disappointed one. He does not apologize; he explains, quietly and earnestly. His gentle spirit is hurt most when he has unavoidably hurt someone else. "It is virtually impossible," says one prominent Republican, "to stay mad at CARL HAYDEN, even when he has whipped you to a frazzle."

He is meticulous at keeping promises. Some years ago he had agreed to support Pat Harrison for Senate Majority Leader. Shortly after that, President Franklin Roosevelt wrote his famous "Dear Alben" letter indicating his preference. CARL and Alben were close personal friends, and on caucus election day CARL was in a hospital with a chest cold. Thus he had every opportunity to evade keeping a promise. But he ordered an ambulance and had himself hauled to the meeting just so he could vote for Harrison.

President Calvin Coolidge, a Republican, nicknamed HAYDEN "the Desert Fox." And thereby hangs yet another tale, wholly true. In 1926 Arizona wanted the San Carlos Project Act, so HAYDEN fought hard for it. It would build a new dam and open vast new irrigation acres in Arizona. Nevertheless, HAYDEN and his colleagues knew that Mr. Coolidge was economy minded; almost certainly he would veto the act. How could they possibly prevent his doing so—they asked one another, during a long evening session. At midnight CARL HAYDEN said he thought it could be arranged.

Next morning "the Desert Fox" rounded up another distinguished Arizona Senator, Henry Fountain Ashurst, and with him called at the White House. Mr. Coolidge, shrewd New Englander that he was, instantly sensed something important. But before the Chief Executive could get in a word beyond the cordial greeting, HAYDEN had begun.

"Mr. President," said he earnestly, "the great new dam in Arizona will be the largest multiple-arch dam in the world. Thus it will be a thing of rare beauty, destined to impress all who see it forever. It will be in a Biblical setting of scenic grandeur. Nowhere will there be anything like it. The people of Arizona, sir, want to name it in your honor. Have we permission to call it Coolidge Dam?"

Cal beamed like an Arizona sunrise—and signed the bill.

HAYDEN has been friends with every President since 1912. He does not fraternize with them as many Congressmen seek to do. In HAYDEN's case, they court him. Woodrow Wilson frequently asked his counsel. Cabinet members seek him out. The people who run America, in short, feel that his guidance is invaluable. This has held for decades.

The reason is that he is always the best informed man around. "In Washington as his executive secretary," said Paul Roca a short time ago, "I once spent 12 hours a day for 3 weeks boning up on an important matter so that I could brief the boss on it. When I was ready I went before him, but I had barely mentioned the subject before he took the reins.

"'Yes, now let me explain that,' said Mr. HAYDEN. And darned if he didn't tell me all that I had learned and a whole lot more. He personally digs out facts on every phase of American life, and he has an amazing memory."

In electioneering, he has one infallible pattern; he ignores the existence of opponents, and talks to people about what they need and want. If he doesn't think they should have it, that it wouldn't be good for Arizona or the Nation, he tells them why and says, "I won't support it."

Arizona's big interests used to try pressuring him. In one case a utility company had each of its thousands of employees write him a letter threatening to vote against him unless he supported a bill the company favored. Mr. HAYDEN studied the matter, wrote back a short summary of his reasons for opposing it, and said he would not change. That year his vote plurality was the highest ever.

Another year he locked horns with the world champion Governor, George W. P. Hunt, who served Arizona seven terms. Nobody, period, could buck George Hunt. And so Mr. Hunt ordered Hayden not to run for the Senate, because he himself wanted the Washington job. Hayden went directly to Hunt's office.

"George," said he, "I got your orders. But I'll run against you and I'll beat the pants off you."

Hunt was just astute enough to realize that was true, and so did not run. Hunt tried many other political gambits to get Hayden. They always backfired. So has many a lesser politician tried to outwit or outgain Hayden with nothing but failure.

Indeed he had approached political impregnability as early as 1916. For in that year a wail came from the opposition Republican Party via the weekly Tombstone Prospector:

"We wish the Arizona Republicans would sometimes nominate a man for Congress who could start the perspiration on Carl Hayden. Nothing they have produced has yet even made him break into a trot."

That still holds.

Mr. HOLLAND and Mr. CARLSON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Hickey in the chair). The Chair recognizes the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I believe the Chair has been recognizing Senators from opposite sides of the aisle alternately. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson], who has also sought recognition.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the courtesy and the generosity of the Senator from Florida. It was not necessary that I speak at this moment.

Calvin Coolidge once said, "A man is not honored for what he receives but for what he gives."

Our distinguished colleague Carl Hayden has given 50 years of devoted and dedicated service to his Nation and to his State. When I came to the Senate as a junior Member of this body, I met and visited with the distinguished Senator from Arizona. I have always appreciated his kindness and willingness to give advice to a junior Senator. I shall never forget his kindnesses to me on many occasions. His service in this body has given stature and dignity to it. When I receive distinguished guests from various sections of the Nation, particularly from Kansas, I like to point out to them the Member of this body whom we honor today. I do so with a feeling that Senator Hayden truly represents a Senator to whom we like to look and as one who has served with honor and dignity. He is truly a patriot. We like to look up to him. I know that the people of our Nation look up to him. So today I did not want this opportunity to pass without expressing my personal appreciation to him. I also wish him many years of continued service in this body, because we need men of his ability and service.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, today we are here to pay our several respects to the real nestor of the U.S. Senate, whose wisdom, patriotism, and courage Senators on both sides of the aisle wish to honor.

Aside from our desire to show our affection for him and our appreciation of him, it seems to me that if anyone who has ever served in this great institution has had good cause while he is still serving here to be happy over his service, it would be Carl Hayden, of Arizona.

He came here 50 years ago today from a State so sparsely inhabited that there had to be two filibusters before Arizona could be separately admitted as a State at the same time that New Mexico came in separately.

Senator Hayden came here from the most populous county in that State, of which he was sheriff. It was a State which was better known at that time for its Indian wars, for the hair-raising Tombstone happenings, than it was for any other values. It must be a matter of great pleasure and gratification to him to see the remarkable growth and development of that State, in which he has had a larger part than has any other citizen of Arizona or of our country. His State has multiplied more than seven times in population in these 50 years. The sparse areas that were desertland at that time are now fed with water from its various rivers, small or great, because of structures that he helped to place there. The great hydroelectric power values which were created by the erection of huge dams, largely through his effort and support, have contributed greatly to the advancement of that State, and as he has helped the State of Arizona in its advancement, he has helped every other part of the Nation.

I think it should be made a matter of record today, if such has not already been done, that as a member of the committee of the other body which was handling the subject at that time, one of his first duties was to visit the Panama Canal site in the early days of that effort and to follow through in its construction. He made a very real contribution to the building of the Panama Canal.

Later Senator Hayden made a very great contribution to the building of the St. Lawrence Seaway. I was unhappy that he could not be present for the dedication of that great seaway.

He has made enormous contributions to the development of navigation from one end of the country to the other, both on the sea coasts and on the great rivers and lakes, and to the protection of great areas of our country from floods. He has helped in bringing life-giving water to other equally great areas which could not have grown and prospered but for the service which he has typified, which has brought in waters to turn arid lands into fertile producing gardens. Senator Hayden must have the greatest degree of pride and pleasure as he sees what he has helped so effectively to accomplish.

Mr. President, there are three things that I should like to comment upon very briefly. One is his contribution to the development of this country, which I have touched upon already, and on which I could only touch. I have not commented on his leadership in creating the Federal-aid highway system, or upon the Hayden-Cartwright Act, which is one of the great keystones of that highway system. In every form of communication and transportation he has rendered great service in aiding the development of this country.

The second thing I wish to comment on is his service on the Appropriations Committee. That committee consists of 27 Senators. It is almost twice as big as any other standing committee of the Senate. It is sometimes said that it is a very unruly committee, one which even a former sheriff of Arizona would be expected to find trouble dealing with. Instead, with gentleness Senator Hayden keeps order and complete organizational activity underway at all times. I have been amazed no end by his detailed knowledge of activities all over our farflung Nation, which are completely beyond his observation, but about which he shows just as much interest and just as much appreciation as if they touched the people of his State of Arizona.

The third thing I wish to mention is his ability to "take it." He has more stamina than almost any other man in the Senate. I remember two occasions which illustrate that fact. One of them was the all-night session that lasted until 8:30 in the morning, in July 1960, when we debated and passed the bill to cut out the Cuban sugar purchases. There were several rollcall votes during the course of that night. One rollcall shows 44 Senators absent on that vote; 43 Senators were absent on another vote; and 41 Senators absent on still another vote; but on each one of those votes Senator Hayden was in his place voting to give what he believed was necessary power for the President to deal with that critical situation.

I wish to call attention to one other incident. It deals with the adoption of the conference report on the supplemental appropriation bill, which involved arguments that lasted all during the night on the last night of our 1961 session. The Senator from Arizona was present in the Chamber every minute during that argument. I believe only two other members of the Appropriations Committee on this side of the aisle were here for the conclusion of that long and sometimes vigorous argument.

Senator Hayden never runs away from a duty. He is ever ready to stand up for the best interests of his State and the Nation.

It will always be an inspiration to me that I have been able to serve for some years now on that committee over which he presides with such dignity, patience, and skill, and with such detailed understanding of the farflung interests of this great Nation.

I join other Senators in wishing Carl Hayden many added years of service here which I know will be of added great service to our Nation as a whole.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I do not know how best to express my own feelings of high respect to our beloved colleague from Arizona, Carl Hayden.

On this occasion, it is rather moving and intriguing for me to realize that during almost all the days of my life, this Chamber and the House of Representatives have been graced by the presence of a very great man, a very humble man, one who has demonstrated his marked courage and his capacity for public service over the last half century.

I recall with interest the anecdote which Time magazine referred to about Senator HAYDEN. It occurred when CARL HAYDEN was sheriff of Maricopa County in Arizona. It seems that some Indians of a trip out there were practicing polygamy. Sheriff HAYDEN called upon one of the Indian chiefs who was guilty of that practice. He said to the chief, "This is against the American law. It must stop." He said, "You tell your wives that you can only have one of them remain with you."

A period of silence ensued, and then the chief answered, "Sheriff HAYDEN, you tell them."

At that juncture Sheriff HAYDEN returned to his office in the Maricopa County sheriff's office.

I shall be eternally grateful for the friendship that Senator HAYDEN has given to me during the 10 years when it has been my privilege to serve with him in the Senate. I shall be grateful, too, for all his assistance.

I can speak as a neighbor. I come from California. Not once, but on many, many occasions, the Senator from Arizona has given lavishly of his own counsel and aid to the people of the State which I have the honor in part to represent.

CARL HAYDEN is fond of his neighbor State. He went to Stanford University. During his long years of service in Congress, he has recognized the many calls which my State and my people have made upon the Congress. One of our colleagues in the Senate referred to his capacity to filibuster. I recall one of the debates in the Senate about which I read, which took place years before I had the opportunity and the honor to come here.

It was a debate which involved California. My late, great, illustrious predecessor, Hiram Johnson, was on the floor fighting valiantly for the construction of the great Hoover Dam, so important to the people of southern California and, in a very real sense, so important to all the people of my State. The distinguished Senator from Arizona felt that some amendments should be written into the bill. It was on that occasion, when Senator Johnson had, I think, the votes, that Senator HAYDEN and his very great and very able colleague, Senator Ashurst—who lives here in Washington, D.C., now, and for whom all of us have great affection—conducted what could be described as a king-size filibuster. They were successful. Finally, I am glad to recall, the happy last chapter was written. The Hoover Dam authorization bill was adopted in the Senate and went on to become the law of the land.

On Saturdays many Senators do not frequent the restaurant provided for our Democratic colleagues and for my Republican brethren over here. Usually I wander over here to the Senate dining room on Saturdays, and there among the few who are present I always find the President pro tempore of the Senate. On many of those occasions I listen with real glee to the recollections and reminiscences which he brings to us. I listen to his lucid, careful, and searching discussion of the problems which are pending in the Senate.

It has been said by one of my senior colleagues that CARL HAYDEN is a Senator's Senator. That is true. CARL HAYDEN in his responsibilities as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has assumed a burden in the farflung field of intelligence and its operations which is unique among all the Members of the Senate. It is the senior Senator from Arizona, among a very few in this body, who knows the policies which are being carried out in the field of intelligence and who has helped successfully to provide the sinews which that arm of our Government continually and so desperately needs.

So with all the rest of his colleagues, on the occasion of his first half century of service to the Nation in both Houses of the U.S. Congress, I too, rise to say: Good luck and Godspeed for many years of additional happy and constructive service to all the people.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I wish to share in the deserved tributes which are being paid our colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona. While I have not been a Member of the Senate so long as many other Senators who are speaking so eloquently today, nevertheless in the short time I have been here I have enjoyed the friendship, counsel, and advice which Senator HAYDEN has given so freely at all times.

Mr. President, although he and his beloved wife were not blessed with children, CARL HAYDEN could accurately be called the father of many vital projects of benefit to the United States.

He certainly deserves the title, "Father of the United States Highway System," for his pioneering work toward better roads. Early in the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt, CARL HAYDEN recognized that road construction was one way to get thousands of unemployed men to work quickly. He knew that each State had a highway department, and that each department laid its plans for a year ahead. So he persuaded President Roosevelt to send Federal aid to the States quickly, to alleviate unemployment.

At the same time, CARL HAYDEN was advancing one of the projects dear to his heart providing better highways so that people could get to the scenic beauties of his State.

Now we are well underway with the greatest roadbuilding program ever undertaken by any nation. That program would not exist without the foresight and the persuasive abilities of our distinguished friend and colleague, CARL HAYDEN, of Arizona, whom we are honoring today for his 50 years of service to the United States.

I wish him continued good health and hope that for many years to come he will be with us in this great body which he enjoys so much and to which he has contributed so greatly.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, for all but about 4½ years of my life, the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona, CARL HAYDEN, has served in the Congress of the United States. During this half century, our history has indeed been enriched. Our Nation has met many challenges, including two World Wars, the Korean war, and the worst depression in the Nation's history.

Senator HAYDEN, as a leader in this body, has contributed to the wonderful response by the American people, under our system of government, to meet the challenges presented in those moments of crisis.

I feel very humble, indeed, as one who has served in Washington for less than one-third of Senator HAYDEN's tenure, and who has served in this body for only about one-tenth the length of his service in Congress. I am happy to join with other Senators in extending my own tribute to this great American, who has so well and nobly served his country and his State. I, too, wish him well, and I take this occasion to thank him for making this land of ours a better place in which to live.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with other Senators in saluting the senior Senator from Arizona, CARL HAYDEN, upon his completion of 50 years of distinguished public service in the Congress. No one else has ever served his country so long as a Member of Congress as has Senator HAYDEN. No one else has ever represented his State for so many years in Congress.

I can point with pride to the fact that it was a Virginian, a Representative from my own district, who sponsored the resolution to admit Arizona as a State. His name was Henry D. Flood, who for 20 years so ably represented the 10th Congressional District of Virginia in the House. Incidentally, Representative Flood was an uncle of the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia, HARRY FLOOD BYRD.

Senator HAYDEN's tour of duty in Washington has indeed been unique. Starting under the administration of President Taft, he then served during the administrations of Presidents Wilson, Harding, Coolidge, Hoover, Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, and now Kennedy. CARL HAYDEN's congressional experience spans more than one-fourth of the history of our Republic.

I understand that Senator HAYDEN's term as a public servant stretches back even further than the 5 years he served as sheriff of Maricopa County, Ariz., before coming to Washington.

Today CARL HAYDEN is well known as a former law enforcement officer, soldier, and Congressman, and as the present chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee. He is still more famed as a statesman who helped to bring water and life to a vast arid region of our country. Being a persistent champion of transportation, power, and reclamation projects—including what is now called Hoover Dam—CARL HAYDEN has greatly contributed toward transforming our deserts into gardens. It is no accident that Arizona has long been among the fastest growing States in the Nation.

Since 1947, the junior Senator from Virginia has been fortunate to serve as a member of the Committee on Appropriations along with the senior Senator from Arizona. During these 15 years, I have benefited on numerous occasions from Senator HAYDEN's insight and assistance. I have repeatedly come to recognize the appropriateness of a tribute once paid to Senator HAYDEN by Carter Glass, the Senator from Virginia whom I had the honor of succeeding.

Senator Glass was chairman of the Committee on Appropriations at the time of his death in 1946, and had been President pro tempore of the Senate for nearly 4 years. Of his 27 years in the Senate, Carter Glass served nearly two decades on the same committee with Senator HAYDEN. As I have recalled to the Senate several times before, it was this association that led Senator Glass to remark that if the Constitution were ever amended so that every State could have three Senators, he hoped that his own State of Virginia could have CARL HAYDEN as the third.

In writing about the Upper Chamber in his recent book, "Citadel," William S. White said:

> HAYDEN could very nearly be the president of the club, if only it had officers.

That was an understatement. CARL HAYDEN has already held such an office for more than 5 years. Beginning in 1957, as we all know, he has been elected and has served as President pro tempore for three consecutive Congresses. Not only is he president of what Mr. White calls the club, as President pro tempore of the Senate, CARL HAYDEN is third in order of succession to the Presidency of the United States.

Over the years, it has been a privilege for me to come to know CARL HAYDEN and to work with him. I salute him again at this time—the beginning of his 51st year in Congress. I look forward to many more years of leadership by the senior Senator from Arizona.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to CARL HAYDEN, the senior Senator from Arizona, on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of his congressional service to his State and to his Nation.

Others have spoken about the monuments in Arizona and elsewhere in the Nation that bespeak the character of the service Senator HAYDEN has rendered to the people. Those monuments are to be found in the buildings, highways, irrigation projects, and other material contributions he has made.

However, Mr. President, instead of speaking of the material contributions he has made, I wish to speak of the unique characteristics of this great man, for I have carefully watched him and listened to him during the 5½ years that I have served in this body.

Frequently, when trying to determine what should be our course of conduct in order best to serve our country in times of crisis, we study history. In Senator HAYDEN we find one who reflects 50 years of experience—50 years of reaction to crises and periods of triumph—and on the basis of that experience we learn from him what should be our course and our attitude in relation to significant problems.

Mr. President, fidelity to the country and its people is undoubtedly one of Senator HAYDEN's great attributes. Orderliness of thinking is another of his outstanding traits. Yesterday, while I was in Cleveland, I listened to a radio and television interview which a commentator had with Senator HAYDEN. My brothers and my sisters also were listening to that interview; and when it concluded, they said that Senator HAYDEN exhibited outstanding and most refreshing clearness of thinking, objectivity, and fairness.

Integrity is another of Senator HAYDEN's attributes. In my contacts with him I have found that whenever I have requested consideration of problems in my State, Senator HAYDEN has been most considerate. Although he has served Arizona well, instead of thinking only of Arizona, he has also considered the other parts of the country to be benefited by the programs he has advocated.

Certainly one of CARL HAYDEN's greatest qualities is his calmness of attitude. I have never seen him grow excited on the floor of the Senate. When controversies have become keen and when acrimony has developed on both sides of the aisle, Senator HAYDEN has always remained calm—a quality so greatly needed at all times.

A few moments ago the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] spoke of the fact that Senator HAYDEN has served for 50 years in Congress. Mr. President, Senator HAYDEN was serving in Congress when the grief of World War I descended on the people of the United States; and he was serving in Congress when the triumph, with all of its joys, came. Senator HAYDEN was serving in Congress during the prosperity of the 1920's and also during the depression of the thirties; and he also witnessed what was probably the darkest day in the history of our country—the day when the Japanese bombs began to fall on the Hawaiian Islands. I am certain that no one has known our Nation's depths of trouble and also her heights of triumph as intimately as has Senator HAYDEN.

It seems to me that the message Senator HAYDEN would bring to us is this: When things grow black, remain calm. Be loyal to your country, and be prepared to give; but, above all else, do not become hysterical.

Mr. President, almost daily we find that hysteria grips many persons when untoward developments occur in the world. In that connection we can always learn from Senator HAYDEN the great lesson that although there have been many dark days, the skies have always cleared.

Shakespeare wrote of the young prince who was about to ascend the throne:

> The time is out of joint: O cursed spite,
> That ever I was born to set it right.

Mr. President, the times have always been out of joint; but we have found that a benign hand rules the destiny of men, and in the end things work out well.

Again in the play "Hamlet," Shakespeare wrote:

> This above all: To thine own self be true.
> And it must follow, as the night the day,
> Thou canst not then be false to any man.

Mr. President, I think those words are most applicable to Senator HAYDEN: He has been true to his own self; and yet, as certain as the night follows the day, he has been true to all his fellow men.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to join those who today honor one of the great Senators of all time, CARL HAYDEN, of Arizona.

It has been Senator HAYDEN's privilege to represent his State in the Congress ever since the day when the Arizona Territory became a State. However, Mr. President, he has been much more than a Senator from the State of Arizona: He has been a Senator for the entire country. We have found that CARL HAYDEN always has at heart the interest of all the States. I have never known him to discriminate against any State because of party or for any other reason.

So, Mr. President, I would feel remiss in the performance of my duty if today I did not state that Senator CARL HAYDEN is a monumental credit to the State of Arizona and to the entire Nation.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I wish to join in the remarks made today in tribute to Senator CARL HAYDEN, of Arizona.

Mr. President, seldom in the life of our Nation does the grand opportunity of commending a colleague for 50 years of service in the Congress ever present itself.

The public service record of CARL HAYDEN goes back to the frontier days of our Nation, before the Territory of Arizona even became a State in 1912. The fact that he has represented Arizona in the U.S. Congress ever since she became the 48th State is a great testimonial. The confidence and respect of the people of Arizona in this man demonstrate wise judgment on their part.

CARL HAYDEN today is a guiding hand in the affairs of our Government, and there have been few Members of the Congress in recent decades who have not, at one time or another, sought his advice, his counsel, or his support.

CARL HAYDEN has been active in Democratic Party affairs practically all of his life, and was first named to the Democratic National Convention back in 1904, the same year he was elected treasurer, and 2 years before he became sheriff of Maricopa County. After he was elected to the 62d Congress as a Member of the House of Representatives in 1912, he was reelected to the House for seven succeeding Congresses, until 1926, when he came to the Senate.

I welcome the privilege to congratulate this fine, longstanding servant of the people on the golden anniversary of his election to the Congress.

Our Nation can well be proud of CARL HAYDEN, for his service over the past half century has helped to guide our Nation through probably the most turbulent period of history to its present position of greatness.

Every Member of the Congress today realizes what he has meant to this Nation of ours.

I ask unanimous consent that there be published in the RECORD following my remarks an editorial from the Arizona Daily Star of Thursday, November 16, 1961, entitled "Distinguished Career Brings Honors."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DISTINGUISHED CAREER BRINGS HONORS

CARL HAYDEN, who has served longer in the U.S. Congress than any other man, deserves every honor which his friends from President Kennedy down will bestow upon him tomorrow night. By his record, Senator HAYDEN has brought more honors to his own State than his State could give to him.

The nonpartisan, friendly nature of the dinner for Senator HAYDEN in Phoenix is evident in the fact that Friday will be Hayden Day in Arizona, proclaimed by Republican Gov. Paul Fannin.

The fact that the dinner is a sellout at $100 a plate indicates the esteem Arizonians place on Senator HAYDEN.

CARL HAYDEN was born of pioneer parentage (and is himself a pioneer by every standard) on October 2, 1877, at Tempe—then known as Hayden's Crossing, because the Hayden flour mill was built there at the spot where early settlers crossed the Salt River.

HAYDEN was educated in Arizona public schools and the then normal school at Tempe, now Arizona State. He went from Tempe to Stanford University, where he had an active career—in some ways, his friends like to recall, a little too active sometimes for authorities. In other words, he was a red-blooded collegian capable of joining in pranks.

When he returned to Arizona he went into business. He followed his family's occupation of milling and mercantiling from 1900 to 1904. In 1904 he entered politics as a delegate to the Democratic National Convention in St. Louis that nominated Judge Alton Parker for the Presidency. In 1904, also, HAYDEN ran for Maricopa County treasurer and won, taking office on January 1, 1905.

In 1907, he became sheriff of Maricopa County. Probably few who see the Arizonian in his distinguished senatorial role as chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, realize they are looking at a genuine oldtime western sheriff.

He ran in the fall elections of 1911—Arizona's first experience at naming officers to serve on the Territory's becoming a State—and, with statehood, entered Congress. He took the oath as this State's first and lone, Representative in February 19, 1912, 5 days after statehood. Until April 1912, he was the only Arizonian in either House of Congress.

During World War I he served as a major of the infantry.

In 1926 he decided to seek a senatorial seat. He entered the Senate on March 4, 1927, and has served there since. In addition to his Appropriations Committee chairmanship, which gives him vast powers, HAYDEN is chairman of the Joint House-Senate Committee on Printing and is second in command of the House Rules and Administration Committee.

More than HAYDEN's record in the minds of many Arizonians is his warm and human approach to the people of his State—all of the time keeping a good eye out for the welfare of the Nation. Only in recent years has HAYDEN been featured very often by the newspapers and magazines of the East, because of his preference for never making speeches and working as quietly as possible. But about 10 years ago the East awoke to the fact that this kindly, quiet Arizonian was having a tremendous amount to do with the Nation's business both at home and abroad.

He deserves being honored by his home State. He has served it well.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I am happy to be here today joining in the accolade of approval, respect, and admiration for the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona. I recall very well, after my election to the Senate in 1952, when I immediately came here because I was elected to fill an unexpired term, that Senator HAYDEN was the first U.S. Senator I met. I met him on the plaza outside as I was walking to the office building. Recognizing him, I stopped and introduced myself.

We leaned against a tree or lamppost and chatted for 20 minutes. I remember the Senator gave me some homely and friendly advice, containing many details concerning the Senate, one's offices, and various little details that a new man would hardly think of.

It is this very delightful capacity for friendship which I first learned about him on that day. I have regarded him with increasing admiration in the past 10 years. Of course, it is a most remarkable event that no one has attained 50 years of service in the Congress until this day, but what is even more remarkable is the work done today by this man, who now is virtually at the peak of his powers. He presides over the great Appropriations Committee with ease, grace, and dignity, and is fully effective in every respect.

So I join with Senators who admire this great Senator, and I hope we may live to see him here many years in the future.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I count it a real privilege to be here today to join in celebrating this, the 50th anniversary of service in the Congress of the United States of a great man, CARL HAYDEN, of Arizona.

Mr. President, this golden anniversary would be noted under any circumstances, because no other Member of Congress in the history of our Nation has served continuously, or at all, for a full half century. It seems almost incredible. It also seems wonderful in every way. Some of us in the Senate who long since have concluded we were in "the sere and yellow" were only small boys when Senator Hayden came out of the West to assume his seat in the House of Representatives. And others, of course, were not yet born.

However, this occasion could well be a pro forma anniversary observance if the man now being praised and saluted had merely demonstrated an ability to live and to be returned to Congress by the voters of his beloved State, Arizona. That it is far, far more is what counts. What we are actually noting here is a half century of distinguished service in behalf of his State, the entire West, the Nation, and, indeed, the world by this man who possesses such unusual abilities. I dare say that if Members of Congress were to be ranked in importance by the number of words uttered, the senior Senator from Arizona would be close to or at the bottom of the list. He does not require words to speak for him. His actions do that and most eloquently. His comprehension, his instinct for separating the important from the less important, his devotion to his country his leadership qualities, his great influence—all these, and other virtues, go to make up the fine human being, the outstanding American that CARL HAYDEN is.

Many, many times during my period of service here I have had reason to thank Senator HAYDEN for his powerful assistance in behalf of Alaska, first as a territory and more recently as a State. I have found him, too, a hard man to thank. He is so very unassuming, so very modest, that it is his habit to denigrate his own achievements and to seek to deny that the helping hand which was given was his.

I would wish, in company with millions of other Americans, for CARL HAYDEN continued years of service. His State needs him. So does the Nation. Now and always he will be a young man—young in willingness to examine and adopt new ideas, young in heart, young in spirit, questing always for progress, development, and improvement. He rode out of the West—and happily for all of us, CARL HAYDEN did not ride away again.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, from the page of Time magazine the handsome sheriff of Maricopa County, Ariz., of 50 years ago, looked out at me, and by his side gazed at me, too, my colleague as of today, the hearty senior Senator from Arizona.

Half a century separates those pictures, but, of course, the subject is one and the same—the endearing, endurable CARL HAYDEN. Four years ago we of the Senate met on this floor in a tender tribute to the gentleman from Arizona when he had achieved the longest continuous service in the Congress of the United States of any man in history.

The superlatives of that day were sincere. What could we add to the accolades? And yet the 4 years that intervened have each added something to the appreciation and affection we have for this quiet statesman, gifted legislator, and helpful friend.

New England likes to restate its claim to CARL HAYDEN—or at least to his father. It was a long haul a century ago for the senior Hayden from Hartford, Conn., to Hayden's Ferry, Ariz.

But history wanted it that way. The pioneering Charles Trumbull Hayden was no less the father of Arizona than he was the father of CARL HAYDEN. It was natural for the father's son to come to the first Congress upon Arizona's admission to statehood February 14, 1912.

Eight years before that he had been at the National Democratic Convention at St. Louis to choose a candidate against the first Roosevelt. In 1932, CARL HAYDEN, himself was a candidate on the ticket with the second Roosevelt. Already, for almost a score of years, he had served in the Congress. The Democratic resurgence found an experienced legislator in this man of Arizona.

Today, 30 years later, we mark his golden anniversary. We are not the first. Last November, in the city of Phoenix, the great of the land and the grateful of Arizona gathered in tribute to him. From the words of the President to the eloquent silence of his humble neighbors, there was a paean of praise for the past and a petition for the future—to look forward to the second 50 years of CARL HAYDEN's stewardship.

I could not be present that night in Phoenix, but I would like to borrow again the sentiments that I sent to the occasion. I said:

> I am ever so happy that the people of Arizona who know him best and love him most are honoring my boss CARL HAYDEN on the golden anniversary of his splendid service in the Congress of the United States. Though I am a continent apart, I will toast that night to the young of heart whose congressional half century has seen our land through its most difficult times. The frontier-fashioned wisdom and experience of CARL HAYDEN served to smooth difficulties and surmount dangers as our country blazed new trails in a world of lightning changes. Those qualities have helped to produce an America infinitely stronger in the sixth decade of the century than CARL HAYDEN surveyed in its first decade. That may be the date of the special dedication of the statesman but he was ever the good citizen and always the good friend. I admit that the good people of Arizona know him best and love him most—but we in the Congress feel ourselves a close second in those sentiments. And we add one more most—we need him most. America has never been in greater need of the made-in-Arizona Americanism of CARL HAYDEN. We know that the Grand Canyon State of his first and enduring love will continue to share its illustrious son with the other 49 States. We are truly the '49'ers seeking the golden worth and wisdom of CARL HAYDEN.

With all the sincerity of my heart, I repeat those sentiments today.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I wish to pay my respects to the dean and President pro tempore of the Senate of the United States, the distinguished CARL HAYDEN, of Arizona.

On this, the golden anniversary of the admission of Arizona as a State and the admission of Senator HAYDEN to the Congress, I wish to extend my congratulations to both.

I speak as their friend and as a representative of Virginia. We of the Old Dominion hold Senator HAYDEN and the fine people of Arizona in the highest esteem and deepest affection.

Virginia, the cradle of the Republic, and one of the oldest States in the Union—as it did in 1912—extends again and constantly her very best wishes to Arizona, one of the newest.

Mr. President, I take a peculiar pride in the State of Arizona. My uncle, Henry Delaware Flood, of Virginia, after whom I am named, was the chairman of the House Committee on the Territories who presented to the House on August 19, 1911, the resolution establishing Arizona as a State.

As third ranking Member of the Senate in point of service, I am pleased at every opportunity to assert my great and lasting admiration for Senator HAYDEN, who ranks first.

As one who has had the high privilege of representing Virginia in the U.S. Senate longer than any other man, I appreciate the distinction of representing a State since its admission.

Certainly no State has been better represented more continuously than Arizona; and surely no State has chosen more wisely than Arizona in electing and reelecting Senator HAYDEN.

He is a man of great work; but what is more, he is a man superior to his works. He seems to act always without effort, but his accomplishments for his State and country are monumental.

Evidence of his matured judgment and constructive powers has marked the work of Congress for 50 years. He has the capacity to foreshadow the future while working for the present.

He has a great faculty for accumulating, analyzing, and producing knowledge; and he has earned the reputation of knowing a little more than most of us about many things.

In the Senate we know Senator HAYDEN as a man of reserve but not isolation. We know him as a warm personality without egotism. We know him as a man of wisdom, but with indulgence and kindly wit.

Personally, I shall always regard him as a real and splendid man. I love him as a friend and greatly admire him as a statesman.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I am, of course, delighted to be a colleague and personal friend of Senator CARL HAYDEN and to pay him tribute today on the 50th anniversary of the beginning of his remarkable congressional career.

When we think of CARL HAYDEN we think of a symbol of character, integrity, and honor and dedication to the finer purposes in life, as well as a national legislator.

He has a favored place in history for many reasons. One of the most outstanding reasons is his long and consistent work in the Congress, protecting and promoting and reproducing the natural resources of our Nation. Some years ago I presented him with a gavel made from a tree which was one of several trees found in his State that are believed to be more than 3,000 years old, the oldest living things in the world. When I presented Senator HAYDEN with the gavel, I said then and repeat now, that people of our Nation for untold generations will benefit from his career as a legislator longer than this 3,000-year-old tree has lived.

When I first came to the Senate I was told that Senator HAYDEN could get a bill passed here easier than anyone else. The reason given was that everyone trusted him; and his speeches were so short and to the point that one could not make an opposing argument to what he said.

The Senate as well as the rest of the Nation has been blessed by his many years of service here and the happy thought is that there are many more years of service to come.

I am happy, indeed, to be among his friends and admirers in extending him hearty greetings and congratulations on this special occasion.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I am sure it is an honor and a pleasure for all of us who serve in the Senate today to be present on the occasion of the golden anniversary of service of CARL HAYDEN in the Congress of the United States. I think it is most significant that his golden anniversary coincides with the golden anniversary of Arizona as a State.

Coming into the Union as it did in 1912, Arizona is not one of the newest States of the Union, and therefore I think it is all the more remarkable that we have in our midst this highly esteemed colleague who has served in the Congress as long as Arizona has been one of the States of the Union.

Very often, in talks I give around the country, I have occasion to refer to that rare, phenomenal fact as illustrative of the youth and vigor of America. Our country is very young in the calendar of the mountains and our country is quite new in the family of the major organized countries around the world, yet many, many countries of great antiquity—countries many times older than the United States—have come to look to us for assistance, for guidance, for leadership, and for succor in order to take their proper place in the great fight against communism.

In CARL HAYDEN we have a man young in spirit and high in vigor, who has been a Member of the Congress during the 50 years in which the United States has moved far out in front in the parade of countries of the world.

I like to refer to that because it seems to me that every patriotic American can get some real inspiration from the fact that ours is a country which can do so much in the lifetime of a living Member of the Senate and which is still so young that one of the esteemed Members of this body came to Congress at the time his State joined the team. This kind of young and successful country must have something in its formula of achievement worth preserving.

I think it is well to reflect upon the fact that within the public service lifetime of CARL HAYDEN we have made such remarkable progress. That progress ought to emphasize for all of us that America could not do so much in so short a time by doing everything all wrong. Certain ingredient concepts and principles have been espoused and exemplified by CARL HAYDEN. They are worthy of our adherence and of perpetuation. The capacity of growth which we have demonstrated in this short era certainly illustrates the vigor and significance of the concepts of America which have made it possible for us to have achieved so much.

Serving, as I do, on the Appropriations Committee, which CARL HAYDEN so admirably and effectively heads, and serving as the ranking Republican member of the little Subcommittee on Appropriations of the Department of Interior activities, I have spent many long hours sitting side by side with CARL HAYDEN. Sometimes there have been two and sometimes three or four of us in the committee room. I must confess that on occasion I have been unable to be present, but CARL HAYDEN is always present, listening to the many laborious, informative, and necessary hearings in which the executive departments place before Congress their desires and aspirations, which on occasion far exceed their needs. He sits there and guides the activities of the full Appropriations Committee. He serves full time as chairman of the little subcommittee on which I serve as ranking member. He does so always without partisanship, passion, or prejudice. He does so always with a clear sense of duty and with a capacity for energy and clear thinking which is unexcelled in this body.

So I have had a long, intimate opportunity to study Senator Hayden, to watch him in operation, and to develop an admiration, which we all have, for this great American.

Last week on Thursday and Friday I was absent from the Senate, as were many other Republican Senators—and I discovered that Democratic Senators also stole away—to visit around the country during Lincoln's Birthday holiday. I spent 2 of those days speaking before public groups in Arizona, particularly in Tucson, Phoenix, Scottsdale, and other places. I suspect that there was a liberal sprinkling of Republicans in most of the audiences which I addressed in Arizona.

I would be less than candid if I did not say that I am happy to report that I found among Republicans, as much as among Democrats, a high regard for this grand man of Arizona. They share the esteem which I, as one who has worked with him intimately, have for him. But they share with the Democrats of Arizona their pride over the fact that they have a great leader who, I am happy to say, at least so far as the senior Senator from South Dakota is concerned, seems to conjure a much more sincere and accurate symbol of the old frontier than he does of the New Frontier, because he came to us from the old frontier.

Somehow, when people in public life come to us from that six-gun-totin' era and area of America, it is pretty hard to make them forget the environment of their youth in the great independent free-thinking, vigorous, don't-want-to-get-pushed-around area that we call the West. He typifies that attitude in the Senate, as he does in the committee on which he serves. He is universally admired and respected by his home folks; and who in the Senate does not consider that point important? I suspect that is one reason why he has been here for 50 years.

I wish Senator Hayden good health, good luck, and continued success for many years in the future.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I join with my colleagues who have so eloquently paid tribute to the senior Senator from Arizona. I congratulate him upon the commencement of the second half century of his service. I join with all Senators in wishing for him many years of continued good health, success, and happiness.

I, too, wish to speak about this remarkable man, whom I have observed so closely during the years I have been a Member of the Senate.

He was a veteran when I came here. But I have often watched him handling the appropriation bills on the floor of the Senate. I have appeared before the committee of which he is chairman and testified on many different occasions. I bear out the suggestion offered by the Senator from South Dakota as to his always being present.

Other Senators may have found it necessary to be absent, but Carl Hayden was present at the committee meeting. Not only was he present in person, but he was there with complete control of the facts and information regarding the proposed appropriations.

I was always amazed to observe that, however small the matter that was brought up before his committee, he knew as much about the subject as the one who was testifying, and sometimes actually more.

I have appeared before the Committee on Rules and Administration many times; and again, even when Carl Hayden was not chairman of that committee, he was always present, and again with complete mastery of whatever question was before the committee.

I have had the privilege of talking with Senator Hayden many times about conditions as they existed when he entered Congress 50 years ago and about conditions back in Arizona before he ever came to Congress. As the Senator from South Dakota has suggested, I have found him to be a frontiersman of the old days. But he has remained a frontiersman into the new days. Today he has a spirit of youthfulness and willingness to venture and to adventure that must have marked him when he was a young man back in Arizona. He is the leader in many of the best movements that are taking place in the Senate. He occupies a very large place in hearts of all his colleagues in the Senate, all of whom greet him and congratulate him on this his 50th anniversary, and wish him well throughout many more years.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I wish to join all the other Members of the Senate in paying tribute to Carl Hayden on the anniversary of his 50 years of service in the Congress of the United States. His record is truly remarkable and unmatched in the history of the Congress of the United States.

Carl, as he is always called by his friends and associates, attained this great record because of many fine qualities. He has always been a tireless worker, a true and trusted friend, a square shooter, if I may use that expression, and one of the most able legislators I have ever known. No State ever had a more devoted Representative or Senator in Congress than Arizona in the person of Carl Hayden. No problem Arizona ever had was too big or too small to receive Carl Hayden's personal and able attention.

One of the finest things about Carl Hayden is that he has more personal and admiring friends than anyone else who has ever served in this body. It has been my privilege to serve for 16 years with him on the Appropriations Committee of the Senate, of which Senator Hayden is chairman. Here, too, he enjoys the esteem of every member. He has been most fair and courteous at all times. May I join with other Members of the Senate in wishing Carl Hayden many more years of good health, happiness, and service in the U.S. Senate.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, time is fleeting. Time is endless. Half a century in the perspective of mankind's journey would appear to be a speck in the spectrum of time. Fifty years in the life of our Nation is a large and an important period. In the life of a man it looms large indeed. For one to be privileged to be an actor for 50 years upon the preeminent immortal stage called the Senate, is something that has never come to a mortal being. It is something to be achieved by others only a few times, and perhaps not for long or for a long while.

It has been my privilege to serve in Congress with Senator Hayden for almost a quarter of a century. I have observed him closely. He is a man and has always been a Senator of industry and judgment. His record typifies the conviction that a representative of the people owes to the people not only industry but also judgment. Lesser men can be industrious; only a wise man can be possessed of sound judgment. Upon occasion only a courageous man in this body can exercise sound judgment.

In this, the greatest of deliberative bodies, the personal equation between Members is a matter of abiding concern, of deep appreciation, and of great meaning. The personal equation which Senator Hayden has maintained with his colleagues is perfect. He is respectful. He is helpful. He will go as far, and has long been willing to go as far as any one—in fact I know of no one who is willing to go further—in helping a colleague than Senator Hayden, to the point of his judgment of what is in the public interest.

Senator Hayden is regarded by all as a helpful colleague. However, all of us know that he can say "No" as emphatically as anyone who has ever served in this body.

Yes, 50 years is a long time. But once again time is fleeting and endless. No man possesses time. He enjoys time for a period. Some men, as they approach the age of Senator Hayden, live in the past, become retrospective, closing their mind to the promise not only of the future but even of today. Not so with Senator Hayden. There is no Senator who is more concerned with the space program than is the Senator from Arizona. Blessed with the opportunity to serve, he has availed himself of the industry and the judgment that is his, availed himself of the friendship of his colleagues, of the information which he could obtain here, and of the action which through his influence and position he could bring about.

Thus here is a man who is a part of the history of our country, an important part of an important period in the history of our country, a Member of the Congress for 50 years, and just as concerned about the next 50 years, and setting an example which those of us who are younger would do well to emulate.

It is with genuine personal pleasure that I salute and honor and pay tribute to Carl Hayden.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, it has been said many times—and accurately so—that no man is better versed in or more dedicated to the rules and traditions of the Senate than the man we honor today, Carl Hayden, of Arizona.

We all know him as a man who chooses his words carefully. In a body not noted for its lack of verbiage, he is the soul of brevity. As CARL HAYDEN has often said, "If you have the votes, you do not need to talk." It is equally true that if one does not have the votes, no amount of talk can get his measure passed.

Someone should write a book about this distinguished Senator. If it were done properly it would serve as a guide for every Member of the Senate. The subtitle might be "The Senator Who Gets Things Done."

I have never seen a great man who did not have outstanding personal virtues. Of the two outstanding characteristics of CARL HAYDEN I would say the first is his modesty. No man in or out of office has been more completely free of vanity than is CARL HAYDEN.

His second outstanding virtue, I would say, is his kindliness and attitude of helpfulness.

That was well impressed upon me when I came to the Senate as a freshman just 5 years ago and was assigned to serve with him on the Rules Committee. Senator HAYDEN went out of his way on many occasions to be kind, generous, and helpful and to explain to me and other new Senators about Senate procedures and the reasons for them.

In many respect, Mr. President, he was a godfather to us.

The signal honor which our friend and colleague has achieved today is unique in the history of the United States. No one is more richly entitled to such distinction.

Mr. President, as a part of my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "Service Beyond Oratory Is What Matters," written by Cecil Holland and published in the Washington Sunday Star of November 12, 1961.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR HAYDEN'S 50 YEARS—SERVICE BEYOND ORATORY IS WHAT MATTERS

(By Cecil Holland)

Star Staff Writer

Senator CARL HAYDEN, of Arizona, who will be honored at a testimonial dinner in Phoenix this week for 50 years of congressional service, first came to Congress 5 years before President Kennedy was born.

When he stepped into the well of the House on February 19, 1912, to become the Representative of the newly admitted 48th State, Vice President JOHNSON, with whom he has worked closely in many a Senate battle, was a 4-year-old playing under the Texas cottonwoods. His Arizona Republican colleague, Senator GOLDWATER, was 3. At least 15 of the Arizona Democrat's Senate colleagues had not been born.

The nonpartisan dinner for the Senate's Nestor is expected to attract 1,200 people. The President will make it an important port of call on his Western swing. Vice President JOHNSON will be there, too, and will join in the tributes to the 84-year-old Senator whose record of accomplishments will be found written in the law books and appropriation bills and not in the flamboyance of Senate debate.

SELF-EFFACING SERVICE

The gathering will be more than a tribute to Senator HAYDEN personally. It will be a recognition of an elusive quality, a tradition of self-effacing public service which, more than oratory, has made the Senate what it is.

Aside from the imposing length of his service in the Senate and House, Senator HAYDEN stands apart from many of his colleagues. As far as his associates can recall, he has never called a news conference.

And he has never found it necessary to get out weekly newsletters to the people back home, as many Senators do. Except during campaigns he has not bothered to make weekly visits to the Senate recording room to tape interviews and reports for use by the television and radio stations in his home State.

Until recently he never felt the need for a public relations aid on his staff. He has one now. "Some of the Senator's friends," an associate explained, "thought that other fellow was getting all the publicity." The other fellow is Senator GOLDWATER, who has become recognized as the articulate spokesman of the Republican Party's conservative wing and a possible candidate for the Presidential nomination in 1964.

There's no Madison Avenue touch in Senator HAYDEN's public relations efforts. It is definitely low-keyed.

Senator HAYDEN, who served seven successive terms in the House before moving to the Senate, likely is thinking about running for a seventh full 6-year term in the Senate where he is president pro tempore and chairman of the powerful Senate Appropriations Committee which must provide the funds for Mr. Kennedy's expanding New Frontier.

When Senator HAYDEN, who had served two terms as sheriff of Maricopa County, first came to Congress he looked around and remarked "This is a pretty good place. How does one stay here?" An oldtimer of the day supplied the answer. "You take care of your people and the people will take care of you."

Another thing Senator HAYDEN recalls being told was:

"There are two kinds of Congressmen—show horses and workhouses. If you want to get your name in the papers, be a show horse. If you want to gain the respect of your colleagues, keep quiet and be a workhorse."

Senator HAYDEN took the advice to heart. He chose to be a workhorse. In his 14 years in the House and long years in the Senate he labored mightily in the committees and still does. He seldom speaks on the Senate floor and only then on matters affecting Arizona or the West, or in guiding an appropriation bill or some related legislation through the tortuous paths of Senate debate.

HE IS A LISTENER

He doesn't sit in the front row of the Democratic side of the Senate with the Democratic leader and other Senate veterans which his rank would entitle him to. He is content with his seat on the aisle one row removed from the rear. From this vantage point he listens closely to the debate. When necessary he will rise and speak—and right to the point. What he has to say is factual and presented without oratorical flashes. "If you want to challenge CARL on some point," said a Senate colleague, "you'd better be prepared with facts, too. He will demolish your arguments, if you're not."

Senator HAYDEN knows his Senate as well as any man could. "When you've got the votes," he once said, "you don't have to talk."

And when you have got the votes back home, as Senator HAYDEN always has, you don't have to try and get your name in the newspapers. The Senator has never found it necessary to cultivate newspapermen. In talking with them he is courteous, if a little wry. Looking owlishly over the rims of his glasses, he will answer questions and little more. "Senator HAYDEN," said one veteran Capitol Hill reporter, "is not one you would think of passing the time of day with in hopes of picking up a little news."

When Congress adjourns and many of the Members fly off to different parts of the world, Senator HAYDEN usually goes home to Arizona. Always his political fences have been in good repair. In this connection this writer has an unforgettable picture of Senator HAYDEN. As a party of reporters accompanying former Vice President Nixon on a cross-country political tour rushed into a Phoenix hotel for a thunderous rally, Senator HAYDEN ambled out, serenely confident in his bearing, smiling faintly and extending a quiet greeting to those he recognized. Memory may be faulty but it seems that the Republican orator of the day was careful to avoid any reference to the veteran lawmaker whose hold on the affections of Arizona voters goes back nearly to the turn of the century.

SERVED AS COUNTY TREASURER

Senator HAYDEN was born October 2, 1877, at Hayden's Ferry (now Tempe) and was educated in the public schools, Normal School of Arizona and Stanford University. Before being elected sheriff he served a term as country treasurer.

In the vanishing frontier of his day Senator HAYDEN was no gun-slinging peace officer in the Hollywood tradition. Being sheriff, Senator HAYDEN says, required "commonsense rather than gun play."

In his long years in Washington the Senator has shunned the Capital's social swim. He seldom went out. The Senator whose wife is dead, continues to live in an apartment hard by the Senate, and his life, said a longtime associate, "is a lot of work."

"He's always been a wonderful person to work for," said another. "He's never autocratic." Some other impressions from those who have worked with him over the years: "He has no political machine. He's just an individual." "He has never been a man to blow off a lot of steam."

When the distinguished group, Republicans as well as Democrats, gathers in Phoenix to pay him honor, it would be a safe bet to say that Senator HAYDEN, as usual, will not have much to say. He will not blow off steam. He will just be, as he has become, "Mr. Senate."

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, it is with a very full heart that I pay tribute to Senator CARL HAYDEN on his 50th anniversary as a Member of Congress. I find myself particularly personally moved at this time, since my father and he were colleagues in Congress more than 40 years ago, and my predecessor, Senator Theodore Francis Green, the oldest Senator ever to serve in our body, was a colleague and close friend of Senator HAYDEN for many years.

In the short time that I have been serving in this body with Senator HAYDEN and with him on the Committee on Rules and Administration, I have come to know him and to share the same very high regard that Senator Green has and my own father had for him. He is a man of honor, of judgment, and of commonsense; in fact, he is truly a Senator's Senator.

I congratulate him on a full, productive, and well spent life which has still, I trust, many more years to run. I only hope that in the course of my own work in the Senate I may do anywhere nearly as well for my State and my country as Senator HAYDEN has done for his.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I wish to add my voice to the voices of other

Senators who are today paying tribute to our distinguished and learned colleague, the venerable senior Senator from Arizona. His record of longevity is unparalleled. He has served in Congress as long as there has been a State of Arizona, and has now started on his second half century of service.

There is a quiet dignity and efficiency in the manner in which Senator Hayden goes about his business. Certainly length of service alone does not indicate in any way Carl Hayden's devotion to the United States, the Senate, and his constituents.

Carl Hayden moves. He gets things done. His work as head of the large and highly important Committee on Appropriations is especially impressive. The committee has played an important role in the shaping of America. He, his fellow members, and their efficient staff are always ready to work on any money problem with any Senator. This, too, is a tribute to Carl Hayden and the way he works.

There is nothing pompous about Senator Hayden. When a young man comes to the Senate, Carl Hayden is one of those who seems to be willing to make time to show the young man the ropes. He is one of those who is always ready to assist a colleague to get a job done.

One of the great pleasures and privileges of being a Member of the Senate is to be a colleague of Carl Hayden. The Senate, the country, and the world are better for having him here.

CARL HAYDEN: A LEGEND IN HIS OWN LIFETIME

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, 35 years ago, in 1927, I went to El Paso, Tex., as a young, newly licensed lawyer to begin the practice of law. I found a land with different legends and heroes from those I had known in the eastern part of my home State. There in the West I heard of Carl Hayden; he had already become a legend in the whole Southwest, just as he was then a hero in Arizona, in that State's search for water. For west Texas was as proud of Carl Hayden as his own native State of Arizona.

That year, 1927, after 15 years in the House of Representatives, Carl Hayden came to the U.S. Senate. And his stature has grown in the Southwest, in the Senate, and in the Nation, with each passing year. Decades ago, a saying grew up among the rangers of the Southwest, expressive of a man in whom they would put full trust and confidence in every possible situation; that term describes Carl Hayden: "He will do to ride the river with."

In Texas and all the Southwest, as well as in Arizona, he is appreciated for his stanch stand for conservation of soil and water, for reclamation and public power, and for his belief in the maximum utilization of natural resources for the general good.

It is a great privilege to be a Member of this body on the day when a Senator becomes the first Member of the Congress of the United States to serve a half century in the Congress. It is a personal pleasure to see the honored and respected Carl Hayden, of Arizona, become the first and the only one of all the men who have served this Nation, to touch that golden marker. Carl Hayden has had that honor that seldom comes to any man: He has become a legend in his own lifetime.

For a half century he has met every test that national political duty laid upon him in the National Congress. In that time two World Wars, the great depression of the 1930's, booms and recessions, severe droughts in the Southwest, and other exacting economic, social and political upheavals, have washed around him their waves of change. Only Carl Hayden's character was unchanging. With calm self-confidence and a serenity born of high character and innate courage, he is as serene and unperturbed in a political storm as at a spring picnic.

Carl Hayden knew adverse conditions before he came to the Senate. Droughts he had seen, that dried up the scant water supply of his native State, and left the bleached bones of the starved herds glistening upon every sandy plain.

High hot winds, for days on end, driving grains of sand with cutting edges into the skin of man and beast, he knew, too. He had felt the sting of a hot sun that dried the moisture out of a man's body, and made points of heat jump around on his arms and body like pin pricks. And bitter cold winds and cold snows covered the Painted Desert and the Grand Canyon and the Petrified Forest in the northern part of his native State, and he felt their bites too, in the days before automobiles took men off to quick refuge in heated rooms.

The fierce Apaches were still fighting the U.S. Army and ambushing Arizona ranchers when Carl Hayden was a boy; he, of all of us in this body, is the only one who actually grew up on a hostile, fighting frontier.

Carl Hayden was a territorial sheriff in Arizona before statehood, in the times before television, when tough hombres really went to the Southwest, and a sheriff's word was the law, but it was the law only if he had the will and the nerve and the moral force to make it stick. Carl Hayden had that will and that nerve and that moral force. Since he did, the people of Arizona voted him in with statehood, and sent him to Washington as their first Congressman, and have kept him here ever since.

What gave this long life and this far more remarkable long tenure of service? Character—and the calm self-assurance and faith within that comes only with the knowledge of duty done to the best of one's ability, with fairness to all, and with rancor toward none.

And having served in that faith, and on that unbreakable rock of character and fairness, providence has brought him, alone of all Americans, here today to lay his hand upon the golden milepost.

Mr. President, the Nation salutes the senior Senator from the United States of America, but, that the opinion of his home State will be remembered, too, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a salute to our distinguished colleague, ably written by Mr. Charles Franklin Parker, and published in the February–March 1962 issue of Arizona Highways, under the title "Senator Carl Hayden: The Distinguished Gentleman From Arizona."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SENATOR CARL HAYDEN: THE DISTINGUISHED GENTLEMAN FROM ARIZONA

(By Charles Franklin Parker)

Carl Hayden has represented Arizona either in the U.S. House of Representatives or the U.S. Senate since the granting of statehood in 1912. He has served under nine presidents—from William Howard Taft to John F. Kennedy.

His record of 50 years of service, embracing the entire period of statehood, has never been equaled by any other person in U.S. history. If the development of Arizona has been spectacular, it has not been hindered but importuned by the efforts of this famous native son whose devoted service has been dedicated to her interest.

Just as boys outgrow their trousers on the journey to manhood so it is that some men outgrow the designations that might properly apply to some of lesser stature. Senator Carl Hayden, at 84, has outgrown a party personality to become the respected image of a servant of all of the people of Arizona and the United States. He is a political officeholder become statesman and one beyond party in the love and admiration of the people of his native State.

On the occasion of the 45th anniversary of Hayden's continuous service in Congress his colleagues in the U.S. Senate testified to his greatness in glowing terms as recorded in the Congressional Record of February 20, 1957. The then Senator from Texas and now Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson eulogized:

"It was just 45 years ago [now 50] that Arizona entered the Union as a State and Carl Hayden entered Congress. Both events were of tremendous significance. The emergence of Arizona as a State ended the process of creating a Nation that stretched from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean. The entry of Carl Hayden into the Congress brought us one of our wisest, one of our ablest, and one of our most beloved colleagues."

And the junior Senator from Arizona, Barry Goldwater, speaking for Arizonans, stated:

"It may seem peculiar to my colleagues in this body, who would expect a Republican and a Democratic Senator from the same State to be fighting, to find them not doing so. As a Republican, Mr. President, I find myself in great sympathy with the people of my State who have eternal gratitude for the service of Carl Hayden in the Senate."

When the Flood-Smith statehood resolution, the enabling act for both Arizona and New Mexico, passed Congress on August 21, 1911, and was signed by President William Howard Taft at 3:08 the afternoon of the same day, Carl Hayden received the news in Phoenix while serving as sheriff of Maricopa County. What this meant to him at this moment we perhaps can not surmise. It is possible that his mind picked up the thought early implanted by his mother. Sallie Davis Hayden had called Carl "the Senator" from an early age and spoke of her expectation that he would some day serve in this greatest deliberative body of our Nation.

Regardless of our surmise, sometime after the proclamation was issued by Gov. Richard E. Sloane on September 20, 1911, Carl Hayden filed the necessary papers to have his name placed on the primary ballot as a candidate for the lone seat in the U.S. House of Representatives granted to the new State. He was one of three candidates seeking the nomination on the Democratic ballot in the primary held October 24 of that year. He received 4,237 votes against 2,685 for Mulford Winsor and 2,662 for Lamar Cobb. In the general election on December 12, HAYDEN was elected to Congress by a vote of 11,556 as against 8,445 for his Republican opponent, John S. Williams.

He was ready to assume his duties in Congress as soon as the great day of admission for Arizona as the 48th State came on February 14, 1912. Five days later, on February 19, CARL HAYDEN appeared in the House of Representatives to take the oath of office as Arizona's first Congressman. Though elected, HAYDEN did not leave Arizona until after statehood had been attained and the time of travel involved took him into Washington on a Sunday so he could not take the oath of office until the following day.

It is interesting to note that because article XVII which amended the Constitution of the United States and established the procedure of direct election of Senators was not to be passed until 1913, and since the Arizona Legislature could not convene until after statehood to elect two Senators from Arizona, CARL HAYDEN was this State's lone Representative in the Halls of Congress for some period. His services, therefore, antedate those who became Arizona's first Senators by election of the legislature.

HAYDEN served in the House of Representatives from 1912 to 1927 and since 1927 has been in the Senate. In the senatorial primary election on September 27, 1926, when he first ran for the upper House, HAYDEN defeated his Democratic opponent for the nomination, C. H. Rutherford, by 36,745 to 8,995. In the general election on November 2, he defeated his Republican opponent, R. H. Cameron, by a vote of 44,591 to 31,845. In the succeeding five contests to retain his Senate seat, HAYDEN has been opposed, both in primary and general elections, but it can be stated honestly that his seat has never been in serious jeopardy. He is now completing his sixth term (36 years) in the upper body.

CARL HAYDEN has been a shy, quiet student of government, whose great efforts have been expended behind the doors of committee rooms and in persuasive conversations in the cloakrooms of Congress. Unassuming and modest, he is still known as one of the few Senators who does his own research in the Library of Congress. Never a speechmaker, HAYDEN has given only three in his 50 years of service; he prefers to expend his time, energy, and wisdom in forming sound legislation after long research and consultation. As has been noted, "almost every bill that passes Congress bears upon it some part of CARL HAYDEN's stamp."

Senator HAYDEN himself has told of the experience that probably set the pattern for his characteristic role in Congress over these many years. He tells that his most cherished piece of advice came in his early days from Representative Fred C. Talbott of Maryland who said, "There are two kinds of Congressmen—show horses and work horses. If you want to get your name in the papers be a show horse. If you want to gain the respect of your colleagues, keep quiet and be a work horse." CARL HAYDEN has definitely been a work horse.

His fellow Senators, in their 1957 tribute to him, ran the gamut in adjectives of praise. They said of HAYDEN that "he has performed great service for his State and country" * * * "no more effective legislator ever served in either House of the Congress" * * * "one of the most likable Members" * * * "has the reputation, among young Senators on both sides of the aisle, of always being available and helpful to them" * * * "in legislation affecting the Government of the United States, his actions have been based not on narrow partisan lines, but on what is best for the welfare of our country" * * * "has a grasp of the affairs of this Government which few Members of the Senate have had."

The Washington Star has called HAYDEN "the only real-life frontiersman still in public life whose worries today are much the same as they were in 1912: The largest Indian population of any State in the Union, mining, irrigation and reclamation, agriculture and highways."

Throughout his years in Congress HAYDEN has never lost sight of the fact that he was elected to represent his own State of Arizona. He began his career in Washington with a determination to help Arizona shoulder the full burdens of statehood and he has successfully watched over her interests and growth for half a century.

HAYDEN has been a tireless champion for irrigation of arid lands, and Arizona's wide areas of reclaimed desert are verdant monuments, mile after mile, to the Senator's success. In 1937 he obtained $3 million for the Salt River project, Headgate Rock Dam and the Gila project; in 1938 he persuaded the Bureau of Reclamation to start engineering work for the great Central Arizona project; and he obtained funds for Coolidge Dam and the San Carlos project. With Senator Henry Fountain Ashurst he filibustered the Boulder Dam (now Hoover Dam) bill until California agreed to provisions for water supply protection for Arizona and other basin States.

A Senate leader in highway legislation, HAYDEN coauthored in 1934 the Hayden-Cartwright bill that established the formula for distribution of Federal aid to highways on the basis of area rather than population. This was the financial highway boost that the Southwest and the West needed so desperately to provide transportation links between its farflung cities in a nationwide highway chain.

HAYDEN has steadfastly worked to advance mining operations in the entire country, provide fair prices, protection against unfair foreign imports, and subsidy grants for strategic metals. One of those in Congress who worked hardest on social security legislation, HAYDEN later fought and won the right of American Indians to be included within its framework. His concern for our Indian population has always been paramount.

While water is liquid gold to all the Southwest, the clear desert air of Arizona provided another natural ingredient which HAYDEN promoted to great benefit. Through his efforts Arizona in World War II became a prominent air training center and today its airbases and military sites are important installations in American defense and to the State's economy.

Recognized today as probably the best informed man on this Nation's financial problems, HAYDEN has held the country's purse strings within his grasp. As member, vice-chairman and then chairman of the powerful Senate Appropriations Committee, he has exerted strong influence so that the Western States received their fair share of funds.

HAYDEN's foresight has meant much to Arizona, and in fact the whole country, in the preservation of scenic wonders in a system of national parks and monuments for all mankind to enjoy. Perhaps an appreciation of the Senator's farflung services to Arizona is best summed up in part of the citation that accompanied the honorary doctor of laws degree awarded him in 1948 by the University of Arizona:

"His services to the State have been various and unsurpassed * * * he has played a major role in the reclamation of her fertile acres and in opening her scenic, climatic, and industrial treasures to new citizens and visitors from all over the world."

Throughout his life HAYDEN has had many interests which blossomed to the Nation's good. He is credited with a large role in the chartering of the National Council of the Boy Scouts of America by Congress in 1916 and with promoting rifle clubs as part of civilian training. This interest grew naturally from his service as an officer in the Arizona National Guard, prior to being elected to Congress, when he served as captain of the Arizona rifle team. In 1911 at the championship matches at Camp Perry, Ohio, HAYDEN won the national long range title, scoring 15 bullseyes at 1,000 yards out of a possible 15. During World War I he was commissioned an infantry major in the U.S. Army.

A recognition earned by his long tenure in office came in August 1961, when the League of Women Voters honored him as the only incumbent Congressman to have voted for the 19th amendment which ushered in woman suffrage in 1919.

However outstanding has been HAYDEN's career in the guiding of legislation and serving as a mentor in both House and Senate, these attainments, which are monumental, are probably less than the remarkable personal service that he has given to the high and the lowly alike. The case of the unknown Chinese family gives only a glimpse.

The family had come to the United States and to Arizona as refugees from the Red revolution. After the man's wife died, leaving some children to be cared for, he later desired to marry a sister of his deceased wife and wanted to bring her to the United States from Hong Kong. The Chinese man had tried many means and all failed until an appeal was made to CARL HAYDEN. Then it appeared that the Senator had nothing else to do. He gave personal attention to this request and after some little time the redtape was cleared and a happy family lived for years in Phoenix because one man, who could help, had cared.

Great as is CARL HAYDEN's devotion to State and Nation, he has known one greater. That was to Nan Downing Hayden, his loving wife for 53 years. He referred to her as a good pal and his sister, Miss Sallie Hayden, testifies to their long and mutual devotion.

Miss Sallie recalls that one summer she had a friend visiting her and this friend found some of the poetry that CARL had written. They took one poem and put it on a card to use in a game of authors. The lines read:

"Did it ever occur to you, my gentle little dove,
Did it ever occur to you that a lad could fall in love."

While these lines were written long before he found Nan Downing on the campus of Stanford University, where both were students, the falling in love was truly a great and important event for these young people. Some 15 years before her death in June 1961, Mrs. Hayden had a stroke, and the care of her deepened the love that had ever been between them.

Mrs. Hayden was known as the "Betsy Ross of Arizona." She designed and made from copper, gold and blue cloth the flag that was to be adopted 3 years after statehood as the official State flag without a single change in its design. She had made the flag for the Arizona National Guard rifle team as their banner for the national meet at Camp Perry in 1911.

With complete devotion and avoiding the political front, Mrs. Hayden centered her whole life around the Senator. She mirrored in many ways the warm personality of her husband, his concern and love for people, and his reticence to be in the headlines.

No man can be in public life, however, for more than 50 years and keep many secrets about himself from his constituency. Therefore about everything in HAYDEN's life has now been publicized. But we must herein recapitulate some events for this record to be complete and since the boy is father to the man possibly explain some facets of this great Arizonian.

The direct descendant of colonial Americans who first settled in Connecticut in the 1630's, CARL HAYDEN was born October 2, 1877, at Hayden's Ferry (now Tempe). He was the first white child born in the town founded by his father and from his parents rightfully inherited a tradition of pioneering for and service to Arizona.

His father, Charles Trumbull Hayden, was a true Connecticut Yankee who declined an appointment to West Point, taught school for awhile, and planned to study law in New York before he turned westward because of health. He brought 14 cattle-drawn wagons loaded with goods over the Santa Fe Trail in 1848 to New Mexico, Arizona, and California, and his trading in the Southwest was a steppingstone for American settlement in this Spanish-dominated area.

On one trip between Tucson and Prescott, Charles Hayden came to realize the potential of the Valley of the Sun and centered all future activities at Hayden's Ferry on the Salt River. Here he established not only the ferry but a grist mill, mercantile store, blacksmith shop, barns, stables, and lime kiln, and planted orchards. He was a pioneer trader in the true sense. An educated merchant and freethinker, he wore a boiled shirt, bow tie, and coat in contrast to the traditionally range-garbed, gun-carrying men of that day.

Sallie Davis Hayden, the Senator's mother, was a spirited, independent woman with an unerring faculty for knowing people, making her the "politician" of the family. Daughter of a wealthy plantation owner, she had run away to seek a higher education, attended a convent in Tennessee for a year and then normal school in Illinois before venturing to California where she met her future husband. She was 32 years old and her husband 51 when they were married, and they were to have three children, a son and and two daughters. When CARL was yet a small boy—shy, book-reading and contemplative—his mother called him "the Senator" but she died before her son began his great career in Congress.

Despite somewhat delicate health, CARL HAYDEN did have a rounded life in a pioneer town. He swam in the river, brought his father's cows in from pasture while riding on the back of a bull, made a round trip to Grand Canyon by horseback—yet all the while pursuing an insatiable quest for book knowledge. He was educated in the Tempe schools, at the newly established Tempe Normal School (now Arizona State University), and at Stanford. He entered Stanford just 3 months after Herbert Hoover had been graduated, was rugged enough to play center on the football team, shone equally well on the debating team, and lost the only election of his lifetime—for president of the student body.

When CARL HAYDEN's father died in 1900, he left college to look after the family interests in Tempe. He was 25 in 1902 when he began his career of public service. For two years he was a member of the Tempe Town Council, from 1904 to 1906 was Maricopa County treasurer, and from 1907 was county sheriff until he was elected Arizona's first Representative to Washington in 1912.

From HAYDEN's sister, Miss Sallie, who still resides in Tempe, there come insights into the boyhood of the Senator.

"CARL would not wear shoes," she said. "He went barefoot regularly until he entered the Normal at Tempe. I remember that church services were held in a community hall and CARL had to wear shoes to church. But once the service was over and he was outside, off came the shoes for the walk home."

"He was a very curious boy," says Miss Sallie. "This prompted him to run away for the simple purpose of investigating his surroundings. This caused much alarm to the family, especially since this curiosity could lead to disaster such as the loss of an index finger from the exploding of a giant powder cap."

She also recounts that CARL's mother became concerned about the influences that were coming into his life in the town. She, thereupon, went out from the town, homesteaded a place removed from this environment.

Individualism has characterized the Senator's life. Never a fighter yet a leader not by might but by ability and insight. Perchance one reporter summed it up well thus: "He seeks no headlines, yet constantly is in the thick of history-making news. He makes few speeches, yet his counsel is heeded as fact. And his persuasive power is stanch against the political whims, his role unchanged no matter which party controls Congress."

It must be understood, as an editorial in the Arizona Republic said, that "the senior Senator from Arizona is a Democrat, make no mistake about that. He's proud of the fact and he bears the badge of party regularity with honor and distinction. But he doesn't use party allegiance as a test of his willingness to help a constituent. Once he wrote to a friend in Phoenix: 'I have friends in both political parties and I do not forget that fact when there is an opportunity to be of service to them, regardless of whether they are Republicans or Democrats. Thomas Jefferson said that he had never allowed a political difference to interfere with friendship, and I have tried to be a good Jeffersonian.'"

CARL HAYDEN escapes the usual formula. He is honored by all—partisan or not. He is an Arizonan without peer, an American statesman unique in his position. The prophet Joel once spoke to Israel:

> "Your old men shall dream dreams
> And your young men shall see visions."

The Honorable CARL HAYDEN, Senator from Arizona, is both old and young. In the light of his long experience he dares to "dream dreams" and from his youthful spirit he sees "visions" that still lead him on to more accomplishments directed by sagacity for the welfare of his Nation and the development of the resources and life of his beloved Arizona.

CARL HAYDEN—50 years an American statesman—we salute you as we mark the semicentennial of Arizona's statehood.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I met CARL HAYDEN, our dean, whose 50th anniversary we are celebrating today, only a few days after I entered the Senate. I had been given the hotspot of investigating Senator McCarthy's participation in the Maryland election, as a very junior member of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections. The Senator from Arizona was chairman of the parent Rules Committee. He also was already one of the senior Members of the Senate, but he called on me. I was amazed that a senior Senator would come to a junior's office, but he never has sat back on seniority.

Sometimes new men in the Senate are appalled at the mountainous problems which beset them. CARL HAYDEN endeavors to bring them into a comfortable relationship with the Senate. He helps, guides, and counsels with valued and sage advice that is never forgotten.

On the floor, I believe the senior Senator from Arizona speaks less, yet influences more votes, than any individual in the U.S. Senate. His quiet, lovable personality and his low key approach affect us all. He is never excited, but he can cut through the verbosity of others' presentations and reveal any phoniness, while he always comes up with a pure gold nugget.

At 84, after 60 years in public life and 50 years in the House and Senate, CARL HAYDEN is the dean of Congress. His accomplishments for the world, our Nation, and his State since he was sworn in as a House Member February 19, 1912, have been unmatched.

He has served in Congress during the entire life of his great State of Arizona and longer as a Senator than any other of his State's great Senators. Persons who are devoted to the conservation of water, soil, wildlife, and all the other things which are good in our Nation, owe a great debt of gratitude to CARL HAYDEN. There is no more influential Member in either House of Congress than our modest, quiet colleague from Arizona who can outwork and outthink us all.

Mr. President, as an additional tribute to the very effective chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, I wish to state that in an article on CARL HAYDEN's life, published in the CWA News in March 1956, it was stated that CARL HAYDEN entered public life at age 25—in 1902. Thus, Mr. President, he has served in public life ever since the year of my birth. I am constantly amazed at the youth and the vigor he exhibits in all of the many, varied, complicated tasks which, by his great commonsense, he so ably masters.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as part of my remarks, the article from the CWA News to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR CARL HAYDEN IN PUBLIC LIFE FOR THE PAST 54 YEARS

CARL HAYDEN, Democratic Senator from Arizona, has been in public office for the past 54 years, and in that time, has never been turned down by the voters.

In 1902, at the age of 25, he became a member of the Tempe Town Council, continued through with 2 years as county treasurer, then five years as sheriff.

Arizona was still Federal territory during that early period. When the State was admitted to the Union—the 48th State—on Valentine's Day, 1912, the voters sent CARL HAYDEN to Congress. He's been there ever since, his seniority in the Senate being surpassed only by one man, Senator George, of Georgia.

While serving under eight presidents—Taft, Wilson, Harding, Coolidge, Hoover, Roosevelt, Truman and Eisenhower—Senator HAYDEN has worked loyally and effectively for his State, his country and his party.

He is a modest man—we had trouble getting him to pose for the picture that accompanies this article. He is a hard worker. During a summer recess some time back, he had an opportunity to accompany an Appropriations Committee trip to Europe. Instead, he stayed home and studied economic problems of the coming session.

Politicians say his hard work is one of the reasons the voters keep on reelecting him.

At comment of Senate Majority Leader LYNDON B. JOHNSON covers the situation neatly. He says:

"There is something reassuring about the future of a country which can produce leaders like CARL HAYDEN. He is a modest man, an unassuming man. He is not given to snap judgments and passionate outbursts that end in flaming headlines. Yet, I believe all my colleagues will agree with me when I say there is no more influential Member in either House of Congress."

Reporters like HAYDEN. The Washington Post and Times Herald has said of him:

> "The wry, shy Arizonian has come a long way without headlines. In the Senate his behind-the-scenes influence is second to none on the Democratic side."

Another reporter has written of Senator HAYDEN:

> "He seeks no headlines, yet consistently is in the thick of historymaking news. He makes few speeches, yet his counsel is heeded as fact. And his persuasive power is stanch against the political whims, his role unchanged no matter which party controls Congress."

When he first came to Washington, he got some good advice he has followed ever since. It came from an old Confederate veteran, Representative Frederick C. Talbott, of Maryland. Talbott said to him after one of his early speeches:

> "There are two kinds of Congressmen—show horses and work horses. If you want to get your name in the papers, be a show horse. But if you want to gain the respect of your colleagues don't do it. Be a work horse."

CARL HAYDEN's long record of service proves the advice was well received. He's been quietly working for the people and gaining the respect of his colleagues ever since.

CARL HAYDEN was the first white child born in Hayden's Ferry, the town founded by his father. The adobe house that was his birthplace is today a landmark of Tempe.

As a boy, CARL HAYDEN was molded by the spirit of pioneers and by the cultural heritage of his parents. He swam in the Salt River, drove his father's cows in from pasture on the back of a bull, once rode a favorite horse to the Grand Canyon and back.

He's now been in Washington as a Representative or Senator for close to half a century. Many changes have taken place in America in that time, and HAYDEN has had an important share in molding those changes.

In the Senate he has made as his special fields highways, irrigation, reclamation, agriculture, and mining.

As the Senate leader in highway legislation, he made one of his most noteworthy contributions to Arizona and the West as coauthor of the Hayden-Cartwright bill that set the formula for distribution of Federal aid to highways on a basis which includes both area and population.

When Senator HAYDEN was awarded an honorary doctor of laws degree by the University of Arizona in 1948, the citation said in part:

> "His services to the State have been various and unsurpassed. Particularly as a specialist in legislation affecting irrigation and Federal highways he has played a major role in the reclamation of her fertile acres and in opening her scenic, climatic, and industrial treasures to new citizens and visitors from over the world."

Huge irrigation and power projects, green vistas of reclaimed desert, and uncounted miles of wide, straight highways will long endure as monuments to CARL HAYDEN, of Arizona.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, elated citizens in both the Oklahoma and the Indian territories were still "whooping it up" to mark their combined entry into the Union when in still another Territory—one farther west—a friendly, quiet man with a gridiron physique lowered his right hand and grasped his sheriff's badge. He had just sworn to maintain the peace and to uphold the law in an Arizona Territory county where violence and disorder were normal symptoms in the birthpains of a new, rugged State.

Mr. President, Sheriff CARL HAYDEN maintained the peace with respect, instead of with a revolver; he upheld the law with a firm, friendly hand, but not a heavy one. He was the true prototype of all the fictional Matt Dillons and Wyatt Earps, but he was no gunslinger. This rugged, friendly peace officer used brilliance for bullets, poise for posses. He had the fastest grin in the West.

His personality and exploits became a regional legend, and some years later, when his sprawling new State got its first breath of life spanked into it, CARL HAYDEN became for a short period its sole Representative in the U.S. Congress. At that time Senators were named by the legislatures, and Arizona's had not yet convened when Congressman HAYDEN arrived in Washington in 1912.

Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Arizona has been intimately associated with the law for more than 60 years. He has gained eminence in enforcing the law, renown in creating the law, and respect for lending a rare brand of dignity to both functions. He is this Nation's greatest legislator statistically, historically, numerically, factually, and emphatically.

Our exceptional President pro tempore has sought anonymity almost as vigorously as he has avoided animosity. His incredible legislative record has never been fully logged, and only scant accounts of the colorful life of this remarkable westerner have been recorded.

One of these rare stories appeared a couple of years ago in the Reader's Digest. It related a score of incidents—any one of which would have justified a complete novel—that give us a slight insight into his intriguing early life in Arizona Territory. It told how he used his fists to tame a notorious gunman who had threatened him; it recounted his pioneer life and his unique quest for knowledge. It also recalled his meeting of the great and gracious Nan Downing, on the campus of Stanford University. It was she, this lovely lady, who for more than a half century showered on him inspiration, understanding, and absolute devotion.

I recall that someone asked the Senator from Arizona about his reaction to that article.

One paragraph was inaccurate—

He asserted—

> It said I lost an election for president of the student body by two votes because I gallantly voted for my opponent. I didn't vote for an opponent then, and never have since. I just plain lost that race.

Mr. President, so far as I know, that election was his lone defeat. In this century he has not yet been outpolled by an opponent.

The Senator from Oklahoma has reached an age considered as a mature one—an age identified with chronological fulfillment, and associated with retirement. But, Mr. President, he was in his midteens, doing what chores were forced on him on an Oklahoma farm, when the great Senator from Arizona came to Congress. Despite this wide gap between our congressional careers, I have finally established some measure of kinship to this great legislator: I believe he and I are the only two Senators who were born in a mainland territory, not a State, and have spanned the colorful era from frontier to New Frontier.

Our great and beloved colleague, who has aided and counseled nine Presidents, today is observing a dual and distinguished event. Although Arizona was admitted to the Union on February 14, 1912, its Representative took the oath of office in the House of Representatives exactly 50 years ago today, following a 5-day journey. His is a historical story of a remarkable man and a fabulous State.

Arizona's entry into the Union did not create the Nation, but it made the United States a solid Republic from coast to coast; and although the Representative it wisely dispatched to Washington did not create Congress, he certainly has helped to improve and perfect it.

CARL HAYDEN has found it unnecessary to resort to the use of many of the weapons usually associated with a sheriff or a Senator. He is eloquent, without orating; he is resounding, even in a whisper; he is aware, without prying. He is at all times effective.

Mr. President, the people of Oklahoma are grateful to CARL HAYDEN for a host of kindnesses. I know the senior Senator from Oklahoma has served his State and his Nation better as the result of the inspiration and guidance of this great man from Arizona. I am certain that 49 other States and hundreds of other Senators are equally as grateful.

Our mighty but modest President pro tempore has heard millions of words on the floors of the two Houses of Congress; and it seems that a material and more suitable tribute should be proffered. It seems that his portrait should grace the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today; but I am certain this unassuming man would not permit his Joint Committee on Printing to relax that rule.

I think a mighty statue should be carved and placed conspicuously in the Halls of Congress, as an inspiration to all lawmakers, present and future; but so long as CARL HAYDEN is chairman of the Appropriations Committee, it would never be permitted to allocate the necessary funds.

It seems that there should be placed above the entranceway to this Chamber a stone carving reading "CARL HAYDEN Served Here"; but the Rules Committee, which he headed for so many years, would never agree to it.

So, Mr. President, we must pay him only vocal tributes. I sincerely congratulate this greatest of all Senators on his half-century of unparalleled service. I commend the great State of Arizona for having the wisdom to send him to us. I am grateful that providence has permitted me to know and to serve with such an outstanding American, who can be addressed either as "Mr. HAYDEN, the Senator from Arizona," or as "Mr. Arizona, the Senator from Hayden."

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the tributes expressed this afternoon in this forum are genuine. They come from the grateful colleagues of Senator CARL

HAYDEN, and regardless of their length they are given in full measure to a truly great legislator.

A short story of a personal nature may best serve to indicate the kindness and the helpfulness of the senior Senator from Arizona: In November 1958, I came to Washington to serve in the Senate for the unexpired term of the late distinguished Senator M. M. Neely. I had been in my temporary offices perhaps less than 3 days—I believe it was the second day—when a kindly, unostentatious visitor came to call. His eyes twinkled. I was being welcomed by the Senator from Arizona. He just walked in and asked, if not in these exact words, in the essence of these words: "Can I be of any assistance to you as you begin your work in the U.S. Senate?"

I shall never forget that friendly and yet forceful way in which he impressed a new Senator with his sincere desire to be of service.

I recall that on November 17, 1961, I was privileged to attend the celebration in his honor in Phoenix, Ariz. Senators and Representatives in Congress were present. His own beloved folk, more than 1,000 of the citizens of his own State, were happy in an outpouring of true tribute to this truly remarkable man.

To have served a State continuously in the Congress of the United States since its admission to the Union of States a half century ago is an honor not experienced by any other citizen. We acclaim CARL HAYDEN today for this achievement.

But in bestowing upon the venerable Senator from Arizona our praise for having completed 50 years of uninterrupted tenure in the Congress, we express our respect for him not for having graced these Halls with his presence for a half century, but, rather, for the quality of the service he has performed for his State and the Nation during that span of years.

Those of us who have had the privilege of serving in the Congress with Senator CARL HAYDEN know why grateful constituents never have failed to return him victorious. This representation covers the years from January 19, 1912, to March 3, 1927, in the House of Representatives and from March 4, 1927, to the present in the U.S. Senate.

Faithful, patriotic, and unpretentious service has been the hallmark of CARL HAYDEN's unequaled period of tenure.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, one of the hardest, yet most pleasant, of the many responsibilities which comes to each of us is that of voicing, both as an individual and as the representative of our State, words of well-earned commendation and deserved tribute to our colleagues. It is hard, because so many Senators justly deserve such tribute and the opportunities of giving commendation are many.

But when it comes to paying tribute to the dean of the Senate, our beloved President pro tempore, the senior Senator from Arizona, it becomes even more difficult because there are so many areas in which he has placed upon our country the stamp of his wise counsel, the imprint of his legislative foresight, the hallmark of his compassion, and, to use the Biblical phrase, the signature of his charity, which is the true love of his fellow man.

In the 13th chapter of the First Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians, we are told that:

> Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not charity, I am become as sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal.
>
> And though I have the gift of prophecy, and understand all mysteries, and all knowledge; and though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing.

CARL HAYDEN speaks but seldom, but when he does, it is to the point and his judgment is received with respect. It is based upon five decades of cool and considered appraisal of men and proposals weighed against the national need and the public good. Yet, in spite of his position of power, which he holds as a trust, Senators from every part of the country, of every shade of political belief, respect, revere, and love him. The reason for this, I think, is that he, above all of his colleagues, understands the problems of their constituents and he is unstinting in his efforts to find practical solutions which will resolve them. This quality is the quality of charity in its widest sense, and it gives resonance to his words, as it tempers the clarity of his insight.

Senator HAYDEN is gifted with prophetic foresight, but since in him this is based upon a faith in the democratic process and a belief that under law honest men can work together to create a sound and enduring nation despite their individual frailties, this gift of prophecy has enabled him to translate the vision into reality. He has brought water to the arid regions; he has helped to span the continent with broad highways; he has brought light to remote farm areas; and he has ushered in the age of electronic power for good.

Surely it has been given to few men in history to have presided as a wise counselor over so much which has changed our patterns of living in such a short span of time.

The 51st year he now starts in the Congress of the United States continues a record of unparalleled service to all of the people in each of the States. Arizona has him as her senior Senator, but all America is his constituency. Oregon knows him for a true friend and is proud to claim him as her honorary legislator, for Bonneville and all the other great dams which tame the Columbia to the work of man stand as silent testimonials to his vision, his faith, and his friendship, which is another definition of his charity.

As a man, and as a Senator, I am honored to claim his friendship for I am deeply indebted to him for his wisdom and sage judgment. On behalf of my State, and in a very personal way on my own behalf, I tender thanks to CARL HAYDEN for all he has done in the past, confident that in the coming decades he will, as is his custom, be ever ready, for the benefit of the people of the United States, to carry out with high distinction his manifold responsibilities.

In closing, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be included in the RECORD at this point in my remarks an article on Senator HAYDEN appearing in the New York Herald Tribune of February 19, and a copy of the statement of tribute I submitted at the CARL HAYDEN golden anniversary dinner on November 17, 1961.

There being no objection, the article and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Feb. 19, 1962]

SENATOR HAYDEN BECOMES A 50-YEAR MAN

WASHINGTON.—Senator CARL T. HAYDEN, who has been representing Arizona in Congress ever since it became the 48th State in 1912, made history yesterday by rounding out 50 years of continuous service in the House and Senate.

He marked the occasion by giving one of his very rare interviews which—typically—was devoted largely to deprecating any suggestions that he wields the great power which generally is credited to him.

The modest, onetime Territorial sheriff now is dean of the Senate in both service and age and is expected to seek reelection this fall for a seventh 6-year term. He came to the Senate in 1927 after 15 years in the House.

A Democrat, Senator HAYDEN is chairman of the powerful Senate Appropriations Committee and Senate President pro tempore. He seldom takes part in floor debate and even more rarely talks to reporters for publication.

ALL KINDS OF ANGLES

Although he has served longer than any of the more than 10,000 other Congressmen, Senator HAYDEN balks at the suggestion that he fully understands the legislative system.

"Oh, I don't think anybody fully understands it yet," he said in an interview taped for the CBS television program "Washington Conversation."

"There are all kinds of angles to it. There is always something new turns up."

Senator HAYDEN, who will be 85 October 2, brushed aside the theory that an inner circle of senior Senators control the so-called Senate club.

"That is more or less a myth," he said, adding that the ranking Senators may "know their way about, but they don't get off in a huddle and decide what the rest of the Senators will do.

"They (others) wouldn't stand for that."

Senator HAYDEN has no plans for reforming the legislative branch or changing the unlimited Senate debate that sometimes runs into filibusters.

AIDED BY FILIBUSTER

In fact, he credits a filibuster with helping him get to the Senate, when a plan to admit New Mexico and Arizona Territories as a single State was defeated by long debate.

And he told about helping Arizona get some share of waters from Boulder or Hoover Dams by some lengthy debate.

"I like the way the Senate operates," he said.

Asked if the numerous Federal dam, highway, and other projects in Arizona resulted from his seniority and power, Senator HAYDEN again balked.

"It doesn't stem from any power," he said. "If you have a good project, the Congress will adopt it. Nobody has the power to impose anything on the Congress or procure the enactment into legislation."

Senator HAYDEN confirmed that as an Arizona sheriff he helped capture two train robbers in an adjoining county. Indian scouts located the robbers the day after the robbery, he recalled, and "we pursued them in an automobile."

SHERIFF 7 YEARS

He was the first white child born at Hayden's Ferry, Ariz., established by his father and now known as Tempe. Senator Hayden served 2 years on the Tempe Town Council, 2 years as county treasurer, and 7 years as sheriff before election to Congress.

The sheriff then collected fees. He said: "I would go around with my receipts book and collect for a crap game or a roulette wheel or poker games and faro and the saloon itself and any gambling devices there."

Senator Hayden said he did this in the forenoons and usually the bartender would invite him to take a drink.

"I would explain that I had a rule—nothing before sundown," he said.

"I never was interested in gambling," he replied to another question. "Oh, I don't mean to say I haven't put four bits on a wheel, or something like that, but to be a gambler—no."

Carl Hayden—Man of Achievement

The happy occasion of Senator Hayden's golden anniversary of service in Congress provides a welcome opportunity for expressing some of my thoughts about the honored and respected dean of the Senate, though I am certain that I cannot summarize them in words that do ample justice to my very good friend and colleague, the Senator from Arizona.

As the Vice President has said on numerous occasions, Carl Hayden's most remarkable attribute is the very high degree of affection in which his colleagues hold him. The public records of the Congress bear witness to his many spontaneous acts of courtesy, consideration, and friendliness to new generations of Senators. He is renowned for his willingness to listen with sympathetic understanding, for his capacity to advise soundly and for the gracious manner in which he renders assistance. I believe there is no man in the U.S. Senate who has not been for the better influenced by the Senator from Arizona.

As we have heard from Congressmen from both lawmaking bodies, from both parties, and from all sections of this country, Senator Hayden's performance as a legislator has made a major contribution to the building of the United States. Beginning with his own State, his astuteness, knowledge, and understanding have had a direct effect upon progress in every corner of the country.

Westerners of today and those of future generations will always be indebted to him for bringing life-giving water to arid lands and the countless benefits that flow from multiple-use development of the great river resources of the United States.

On many occasions my own State of Oregon has celebrated major developments made possible through the fine help of the senior Senator from Arizona as we did last month in the case of the Harney Electric Cooperative project. His timely assistance made it possible to bring low-cost Bonneville electric power to farmers and ranchers in remote areas of Oregon and Nevada. Through him we banished much toil from the lives of people in the Northwest. I do not think there is a man or woman in Oregon whose life is not a little easier as a result of his wisdom and foresight.

It deserves to be known and appreciated throughout the country, that the United States is exceedingly fortunate to have Carl Hayden's experience, prudence, and perspective in the administration of its affairs. In consistently placing the interests of the Nation above the interests of a selfish few, he has fulfilled the highest vision of the Founding Fathers in setting up the Senate as a body composed of men from the States, yet for the Nation.

History will record the senior Senator from Arizona as one of the great men of that body. His is a career that Senators of the future may well strive to emulate. I regret that I cannot attend in person or offer my heartfelt congratulations and best wishes for many more years of dedicated public service to one of the true and steadfast builders of American strength, character, and fame.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. President, it gives me a great deal of pleasure at this time to join my colleagues in paying tribute to my friend, and to the friend of every Senator in this great body, Carl Hayden.

I will never forget the day I was sworn in as a Member of the Senate, and it was certainly one of the great moments of my life. Carl Hayden administered the oath to me. I suppose every Senator, when he is sworn in, has a certain amount of nervousness as he walks up to take the oath, but the genuine warmth and friendship that he exhibited at that time dispelled any of the fears and uneasiness I had.

Mr. President, one of my most prized possessions is a picture made with Senator Hayden immediately after I was sworn in. I shall always prize it as one of my great possessions.

Mr. President, today is a great day for the Congress of the United States. We are pausing to pay tribute to one of the truly great leaders of our time. Senator Hayden, in every sense of the word, is a man among men.

Public service—unselfish service—has been the life of Carl Hayden. Since the days he served as sheriff of Maricopa County, Ariz., Senator Hayden has stood tall among those who devote their lives to making society better for all people.

When I came to the Senate just 4 years ago, I was deeply impressed with Senator Hayden. I found him most helpful. I found him understanding. I found him fair.

I have heard that there is an old saying out in the West. When a man has the reputation that you can "ride the river with him," it means that he is "tops."

Senator Hayden is such a man. You can ride the river with Senator Hayden.

Senator Hayden is a modest man. Over the years, I am sure no one has had more influence over the course this Nation has taken than Senator Hayden. But even today, with the key positions he holds in the Senate, Senator Hayden goes about his work without a great deal of talk or fanfare. He would rather just work—and get the job done.

To him today I would like to say, "Thanks, and keep up the good work." I sincerely hope that Senator Hayden will represent his State and Nation for many, many years to come.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, since Arizona became a State 50 years ago there have been 14 Senators and Representatives in Congress as the elected advocates of that sun-blessed section of our land. And there has been one man here all the while, first as a Member of the House of Representatives and then as Arizona's distinguished Senator, Carl Hayden. His continuous service since Arizona statehood makes him "Mr. Arizona" and "Mr. U.S. Senate." Few men have served their country as effectively and as well as Carl Hayden. It has been my great pleasure to be a colleague and personal friend of Senator Hayden for 21 years, and my respect for him has expanded with passing time. He is a man of great wisdom, judgment, and humility. Arizona has been fortunate in having him as its wise and able servant.

Recently I saw a copy of a Phoenix newspaper that carried an eight-column headline stating "All Hail Carl Hayden," on the occasion of an anniversary dinner held there honoring him. He is a man respected and beloved in his home State, just as he is here in the Senate of the United States. I know that the people of Arizona will continue to benefit from his rich experience.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, it is very difficult to find the words adequately to describe my profound respect and admiration for the great qualities of the senior Senator from Arizona, our friend, Carl Hayden.

Ever since I have been a Member of this body, Senator Hayden has carried one of the heaviest loads of all, and yet he is always available for advice and has never failed to be helpful and cooperative when his advice or assistance is requested.

His sympathetic and gracious personality is especially encouraging and helpful to one who first enters this body. When I was a freshman Member of the Senate, in the old days of some 18 years ago, few Senators had the time or the patience to help the uninitiated, but Carl Hayden was always most generous with his time and was never impatient.

Above and beyond his personal qualities as a fine gentleman with a kindly sense of humor, he has always taken a progressive attitude toward America. He has never lent his influence and prestige to the carpers or the critics who see nothing but failure and disaster in the future of our country. He believes in America, and he has done more than any other one of us has done to build a strong and forward-looking nation. I find it difficult to recall any progressive piece of legislation which has not received the support of the senior Senator from Arizona.

I know of no one more beloved by his colleagues or for whom I have greater affection than Carl Hayden.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement by the Vice President relating to the 50 years of service in Congress of the President pro tempore of the Senate, the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], be printed in the Record at that point where the testimonials and commendatory statements by Senators were being made.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Vice President Johnson

The event celebrated today is of such historical significance to the country, and of such personal significance, that the Chair desires to join with those who have already spoken in paying tribute to the great senior Senator from Arizona.

It is entirely true that the Congress and the country have profited by Senator Hay-

DEN's half century of service in the legislative branch. But the Chair would remind Members that there has been a mutuality of benefit between the country and the Senator from Arizona. For it is given to few men to devote a long lifetime to the betterment of their fellow men; to exert every effort of will and reason toward the enrichment of public life; and, finally, to be so respected by their neighbors and colleagues that they are entrusted with the power to make their exertions effective. Such men—few in number in any society—are themselves enriched by their experience, beyond all measure of counting.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, on this unique occasion, which marks the 50th anniversary of Senator CARL HAYDEN's illustrious service in Congress to his State of Arizona and his country, it is my privilege to join with my colleagues to remark on this occasion, which, my neighbor, friend, and mentor, CARL HAYDEN, has made unique.

I add my words to any and all others which may be said, in complete humility; knowing beforehand, that nothing I or anyone else may say now or in the future can add or detract from the actuality of the monumental work and untiring devotion and service which Senator CARL HAYDEN has given and continues to give to his State and country.

Let us say that his public life is made up of many chapters, say 50 chapters—one for each of his years in Congress. Each, or any of these chapters alone, would stand out as a complete book of accomplishment and greatness for any man.

His knowledge, his superior judgment, and sheer hard and persevering work have backed his sage advice and efforts and influence on more legislation than any other Congressman or Senator in history.

Thus, surely, he has affected and benefited every man, woman, and child in this country for many years. And will affect and benefit all of us for years to come.

But, aside from the permanent and material benefits which his able and untiring efforts in legislation have made possible to his State of Arizona and his country, and these are numberless, CARL HAYDEN has lived a life of singular devotion to public office.

In fact, CARL HAYDEN has written a new and gloriously shining chapter, solely on keeping the faith as a public servant. He has written this glowing chapter simply by the acts of his own faith and high purpose and true accomplishment through hard work.

Few men in the future will even be able to hope to equal Senator HAYDEN's number of years of accomplishment in the Congress or even in the Senate.

However, all men can hope and try to benefit from the example he has set in living his life of service.

In the years ahead, his exemplary life may well overshadow the great and lasting material benefits which he has been able to provide for his State and Nation.

His vision and foresight and ability have provided unnumbered valuable public benefactions, including dams, public roads and other public works.

But, his humaneness, integrity, and humility—the core of his greatness—may overshadow all his other great accomplishments in the years to come.

This basic pattern of his life, through inspiration available to all men, in all walks of life, may give benefits beyond price to him who chooses to be guided in daily endeavors by the example of a great American, a great Senator, and my friend, CARL HAYDEN.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, it is certainly a privilege for me to join in honoring our colleague from Arizona, Senator CARL HAYDEN, on this golden anniversary of his coming to the Congress. For half a century, Senator HAYDEN has willingly deferred to the more loquacious Members of the House and the Senate to handle the oratory associated with most legislation while he himself has accepted the less glamorous but highly effective role of a worker. His success is known to each of us and to a grateful Nation. In fact, an article on the front page of today's New York Times states factually that few individuals in the history of the Congress "have done so much with so little talk."

On a personal basis, I would like to say that one of the greatest rewards of my public life has been the opportunity to form friendships with some of the outstanding leaders of our Nation, and I surely share the universally accepted fact that CARL HAYDEN is in the forefront of this group.

His reputation as a great American and as a true statesman has been well earned, and he can take justifiable pride in it.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, it is a great privilege to join with my colleagues in expressing our respect and admiration for, and our gratitude to, the senior Senator from Arizona on this day which marks his completion of 50 years of dedicated service to the people of the United States in the Congress.

No Member of Congress had done more for the Nation and his State than Senator CARL HAYDEN. Yet he has managed to do his work without fanfare. He has labored long and hard doing the most difficult jobs facing Congress. Whatever the cause, if it has his support, you know it is wise and serves the best interest of the people.

Mr. President, the thing which has impressed me the most concerning the senior Senator from Arizona is his sharing of his experience and wisdom with new Members of the Senate. Even though he carries the heavy responsibilities of President pro tempore and chairman of the Appropriations Committee, he always has time to give a helping hand to freshmen Members of the Senate. During my 13 months in the Senate, much of my education has been received from Senator HAYDEN. Whenever I have a question concerning legislation, Senate procedure, or any other matter, I always know where I can find help in reaching an answer. He is never so busy that he will not share his valuable time and wealth of knowledge. He is truly a great teacher and a great leader.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, to know CARL HAYDEN and to serve with him in the Senate is not a unique experience. Several thousands of Members of both Houses of the Congress can be numbered among those who have shared our personal good fortune. But the hundreds of millions of American citizens who have lived during his congressional career should realize the great bounty which has come to us as a nation as a result of Senator HAYDEN's tenure of office.

Fifty years is a very long time. And for the full length of that time CARL HAYDEN has devoted himself completely to the interests of the people of Arizona and of this entire Nation. Even more than that, however, Senator HAYDEN's career of public service extends to 1904—a grand total of 58 years. I commend the people of Arizona for having recognized so early the extraordinary abilities of this man. Their wise choice has been nobly rewarded.

Senator HAYDEN is without peer in this Nation's history with respect to length of congressional service. He must also be numbered among a very select few in our entire history about whom it could be said that the course which the United States has pursued through time was due largely to their efforts.

Mr. President, I have found Senator HAYDEN to be a good friend, and an able Senator. But more than that, I have been impressed most forcefully by his almost unique effort to disregard the limelight as he has exercised his very considerable talent and ability to the full. Cicero said it this way: "The higher we are placed, the more humbly should we walk." CARL HAYDEN is that kind of Senator.

I am happy to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to this truly remarkable man, and to wish him good health and happiness in the years ahead.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, it is a deep personal satisfaction to extend to CARL HAYDEN my warm and heartfelt congratulations on this 50th anniversary of his membership in the U.S. Congress. His combined record of service in both the House of Representatives and the Senate is one that has never been duplicated in the past and will probably never be surpassed in the future. It is also most gratifying to know that CARL will add many more years to this golden anniversary.

To catalog CARL HAYDEN's accomplishments as a devoted and capable public servant would require volumes. His tenure in public life has spanned the most critical years in the life of our Republic; years marked by our greatest period of growth and development and our greatest periods of supreme trials and tribulations in the course of three great wars and the great depression. In spite of this span of years, there is no Member of this body today who works harder in the present and looks forward more zestfully to the future than does our beloved colleague.

The people of Arizona whom he has served so faithfully and so well since the day the State was admitted to the Union deserve the thanks of all the people in this country for having made this great man available to look after the welfare and interests of all the people of these United States. Every Member of this body likewise owes Carl Hayden a lasting debt for the advice and guidance that he has given to each of us, not only when we entered upon our duties as U.S. Senators, but continuing throughout whatever period that each of us may have served.

While we pause today to pay our tribute to 50 full and satisfactory years of unequaled service and devotion, it is even more gratifying to know that this day is just another milepost in the remarkable career of a man still yet far from reaching fulfillment.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the senior Senator from Arizona. I wish also to gratefully acknowledge his many kindnesses to me as a Member of the Senate and as a member of his Appropriations Committee.

It was my pleasure to serve on the Senate Rules and Administration Committee when Senator Hayden was chairman and he was most considerate and kind as well as being an excellent chairman.

I salute him on his tremendous accomplishment and wish 50 more years of happiness for him.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, Senator Hayden, from one of the youngest in terms of Senate service, to you, one of the youngest in heart, come these greetings and congratulations. The devotion shown by your many years of service to your State and country serves as an unparalleled example for the rest of us. Please accept my best wishes to you for many full and satisfactory years yet to come.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, it is with the warmest sense of pleasure that I join in the richly earned tribute to Carl Hayden on the occasion of his completion of a half century of service to his State and to his Nation in the Congress of the United States.

The dedication of Carl's outstanding talents to the manifold duties and responsibilities of his career spans a period of great progress, of tremendous significance in the history of our country. He has contributed notably to that progress by his own spirit and intellect and energy. Carl has won a secure place in the esteem and affection of all of us privileged to serve with him in the Congress of the United States. I extend to him the most heartfelt congratulations and best wishes on this epochal day in his personal history, and in the history of his State and Nation.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with my colleagues in commending the distinguished President pro tempore on this 50th anniversary of his installation as the 1st U.S. Representative from the 48th State, Arizona.

Carl Hayden's long tenure in the Congress, his seniority, if you like, is not the principal reason for his ability to get things done for his State and the Nation. The main reason why Arizona's senior Senator get things done is that he does not ask for the impossible, only for that which is reasonable. Further, his colleagues on both sides of the aisle know that if Carl Hayden is for a measure, it is good legislation.

Long ago Carl Hayden mastered the art of getting along with his fellow men. He first demonstrated this ability over 50 years ago, when during 5 years as sheriff of the brawling western county in which he was born he never had to use his pistol to keep law and order.

As one of the junior members of this body, of which he is the dean, I can testify that Senator Hayden is consistently considerate of new Members, and his counsel and guidance are invaluable.

It is doubtful that any other man will ever equal the 50-year record established here today. It is certain that the U.S. Senate will never again know such a dedicated, self-effacing Member.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with my colleagues today in paying tribute to the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona. Senator Carl Hayden is the oldest Member of this body. I am the youngest. In deference to the fact that many of you have had the privilege of working with Senator Hayden through the years, I am not going to take a great deal of time to express my tribute to this wonderful man.

Senator Hayden, the people of New Hampshire extend to you their good wishes and congratulations. New Hampshire, traditionally a Republican State, still recognizes the greatness of men such as yourself in the Democratic Party. Your service to the State of Arizona since it joined the Union in 1912 has been marked by your personal courage and integrity. You have been a dedicated Congressman and Senator, and all America is better because of your service here.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, it is a pleasure and a privilege to unite with my colleagues today in paying tribute to Carl Hayden on his 50 years in the U.S. Congress.

In the half century that Carl Hayden has been a Member of the House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate he has endeared himself to the countless numbers who have come and gone through the Halls of Congress. He has endeared himself especially to the young freshman Members, who have found him always patient, never patronizing, and ever ready to listen and counsel.

Carl Hayden has brought to the U.S. Congress a rare blend of commonsense, compassion, and dedication.

As chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, he has one of the most difficult assignments in Congress. The problems that come before this committee are touchy and complex. Yet, under circumstances that would try most men, Carl Hayden consistently maintains a gentle spirit and a fair and reasonable hand.

We in the Senate tend to overuse the word "distinguished," but Carl Hayden has the qualities of mind and character that make him in the real sense a distinguished Senator.

I salute Carl Hayden, a great American and a great human being.

Mr. HICKEY. Mr. President, today a rare privilege is given to a junior Senator from Wyoming, to give testimony to the success of the great American governmental philosophies as exemplified in the life of an individual who continues to serve his State and his Nation.

The story of a young man who became a member of the Tempe Town Council in 1902 and who now occupies the position of the senior Senator in the U.S. Senate is the story of an individual who has given unselfishly of himself to the justification of making the experiment in self-government work. The record of a man who began as a youngster to exercise the freeman's prerogative of participating in his government at the municipal level and who quickly moved along in government service through the county establishment as county treasurer and county sheriff, to the Congress of the United States, constitutes a tribute to the American way of life and an incentive to the young people of America. It is a true life example from which the world about us can and will profit.

Carl Hayden's devotion to a political party dates further back than his attendance at the national Democratic political convention in 1904, and it has continued through a lifetime of exemplary service in that party. This alone is justification enough to the young people of America to adopt one of the two major political parties and adhere to its principles with loyalty and perseverance.

Serving his country not only as an outstanding public servant but also in the Armed Forces as a major of Infantry in the U.S. Army during World War I, Carl Hayden has truly given the full measure of dedication to the cause of freedom in his country, which he continues to serve as the senior Senator of the United States of America, the Senator from the State of Arizona.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to have the opportunity to pay tribute to the Honorable Carl Hayden on this, the occasion of his 50th anniversary in the Congress of the United States of America. No other man has had the distinction of serving this long in Congress, and I venture to say it will be a long time before another does. This occasion marks a milestone which is befitting a man of such high character, and one who has so well worn the mantle of responsibility which the people of Arizona have had the wisdom to place upon him from the date of admission of that State to the Union until now.

Probably Senator Hayden's remarks in the Congressional Record consume less space than that of any other Senator; however this is by no means an indication of his powerful influence or his accumulation of knowledge over the years. I can say without fear of contradiction that the senior Senator from Arizona is one of the most effective men in the Senate today.

His customary smile and his unfailing courtesy are traits which all of his colleagues could well emulate. I consider it a distinct privilege to have had the honor to serve in this body with Senator Hayden.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I rise to salute the senior Senator from Arizona, Carl Hayden, on the 50th anniversary of his service in the Congress.

To several generations of House and Senate Members, Carl Hayden has been counselor, friend, and guide, and this is especially true of those of us from the Western States whose problems he knows so well.

On countless occasions his wisdom has saved his colleagues and the people of this country from a trying situation. One incident that particularly comes to mind is the dispute last year over the transmission lines for the Upper Colorado River Basin. Tremendous and conflicting pressures were brought to bear in that dispute. But Carl Hayden's keen mind, his stability and his integrity were a beacon that guided many others. In the end, Senator Hayden's formula was the one which was accepted, and the people of the West are only beginning to learn how much it will benefit them for decades to come.

This episode was only one of many which our friend from Arizona has handled in his characteristic quiet and effective way. Perhaps no one is quite so much the target of pressures, of threats and blandishments and pleas, as is the chairman of the Appropriations Committee. Everybody wants something from him, or wants him to deny something to someone else. Through all this our friend from Arizona has remained fair and firm to all.

Arizona and the West and our country and the world have changed in the last 50 years in ways that could not have been imagined when Carl Hayden began his service in the Congress. Carl has never looked back. Unlike some younger men, he knows that our world is changing, willy-nilly, and that we have to keep running just to stay where we are.

His voice is seldom heard in debate, but his influence is felt, and felt deeply, in every important action taken by this body. He is a Senator's Senator.

It is almost impossible for me to imagine a Senate Appropriations Committee headed by anyone else, or indeed a U.S. Senate without Carl Hayden. May he be with us to share his wisdom and wit, his vision and courage for many, many more years to come.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, today we here join in tribute to a colleague who has achieved an unprecedented record of service in the Senate of the United States. His work in Congress has embraced the entire period of statehood for Arizona; he has exerted many forms of service for his State and for the Nation. It is a privilege to join in the comments made today for Senator Carl Hayden, but I think one of the best tributes paid to him was made in the February-March 1962 issue of Arizona Highways previously made a part of the Record by Senator Yarborough. Mr. Charles Franklin Parker, the author of the article, has given us a warm account of Senator Hayden's contributions over the years; he reports that: "Carl Hayden escapes the usual formula. He is honored by all—partisan or not. He is an Arizonian without peer, an American statesman unique in his position." I know that all those who have been privileged to serve as his colleagues will unanimously agree.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, it is a great pleasure for me to add my voice to the many that are heard today in tribute to the 50 years of congressional service of our esteemed colleague, Senator Carl Hayden, of Arizona.

Senator Hayden has been a vital part in the growth and development of Arizona since the admission of that great State to the Union. His entire life contains the record of the development of the State which gave him birth and for which he has labored so unfailingly.

But his record in the Congress and in the Senate has been without equal in the Nation's history. His voice has been a vibrant and progressive one through the modern developments of the United States.

I am particularly grateful for the warmth of his friendship and the cooperation which he has always given to me and to the younger Senators who came to Washington lacking the experience which he so greatly possesses. I think it fitting that the Nation and particularly the Senate commend him at this eventful moment in his life and in the life of the State of Arizona, which Carl Hayden has represented so well and so faithfully for half a century.

Thank you Mr. President.

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, it is a privilege for me to be able to join in the tribute to the senior Senator from Arizona. Senator Hayden began his service in Congress before many of us in this Chamber were born. His career here spans a half century, during which our country developed into the most modern of nations and the leader of the world.

It is impossible to estimate how much of our Nation's growth is due to him. Every Senator in this Chamber has benefited from his kind counsel and patient wisdom. Every State in the Union has benefited from his hard work and dedication. Every person in America benefits from the skill with which he supervises the affairs of the Appropriations Committee.

Truly it can be said of Carl Hayden that if he would seek a monument he should look about him—at his colleagues who revere him, at a people who respect him, and at a Nation which has been enriched beyond measure by the fruits of his labors.

I congratulate him on this anniversary and I sincerely hope he will be able to continue his service for a long time to come.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to identify myself with the many congratulations which have been extended today to Senator Hayden, and the respects which have been so properly paid to one of our very distinguished Senators, on the great record he has set in the Senate, during the long and fruitful life he has lived. I wish also to express my pleasure at the alertness and the capacity with which he handles his responsibility as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and the great pleasure which all of us have in seeing how the years of his service in this greatest of all deliberative bodies wear so well upon one of our Members who has been through so many legislative struggles that Senator Hayden has.

I join my colleagues in bespeaking for him many years of continued good health and valuable service to the Nation and to the free world.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie], who is absent because of illness, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point a statement prepared by him in tribute to the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden].

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Tribute by Senator Edmund S. Muskie

Few men in the history of our country have matched the record of service achieved by our beloved President pro tempore, Senator Hayden. I doubt that many will in the future.

If his contribution as a Member of Congress were measured simply in terms of his length of service it would be impressive enough. He was first elected as a Member of the House of Representatives when Arizona became a State. I am not a little awed when I reflect that he was sworn in as a Member of the House 2 years before I was born. He came to the Senate when I was a student in the eighth grade.

But Senator Hayden does not rank first in the Senate simply because of his longevity. He is honored for the devotion he has given to the service of his State and Nation, for his steadfast dedication to the principles of democracy, and for the wisdom he has brought to the councils of government in peace and war.

I shall always be honored to say that I have served with Senator Hayden in the Senate of the United States. It is a privilege and a challenge to be counted one of his colleagues. I salute him and the State which he represents.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I am happy, indeed, to join my colleagues in paying well deserved tribute to the beloved dean of the U.S. Senate, the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona, the Honorable Carl Hayden.

Throughout the few years I have been privileged to serve in this body, I have shared the respect and affection, which all of my present colleagues and those who have gone before feel and have felt for Senator Carl Hayden.

It has been said that he represents a landmark in American history, and with this I agree. While we still are a young, vigorous, and growing Nation, it nonetheless gives me a real and personal sense of history to find myself serving with one who came to the Congress when the great sovereign State he represents was admitted to the Union. His has been a contribution to the American scene of huge magnitude. His record of accomplishment may never be surpassed. In much the same sense as does Lincoln belong to the Nation, so does Carl Hayden.

We in New Hampshire have felt a particular and warm identification with Senator Hayden throughout the past few years. My late colleague and friend, Senator Styles Bridges, whose untimely death represented a loss to our country which still is felt in this Chamber, occupied much the same position on the

Republican side of the aisle as does Senator Hayden on the Democrat side. In my judgment, the people of this Nation were fortunate in having the dedicated skillful services of the late Senator Bridges. No less is true of the great Senator from Arizona. His wisdom, ability, experience, and dedication to the American way of life make him an outstanding figure of our age.

It is a source of real pride and personal gratification to me that I recently was assigned to the Committee on Appropriations, of which Senator Hayden is chairman. I shall value every day that I serve under his guidance and direction and hope it may continue a long time.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the Senate along with Americans everywhere is paying proper observation to the occasion of my senior colleague's 50th year as a Member of the Congress of the United States. I would not want this historic date to pass without my adding my sentiments to those of others in this body. There are no words nor any eloquence which I could use to express my respect for this lifelong friend—both words and eloquence have been exhausted. Let me then put it in this simple way—whenever my service in the Senate is terminated, I hope that my service to my country and my State equals a small fraction of what Carl Hayden has provided in both areas.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, it is a rare privilege to be able to join in paying tribute to the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona on the occasion of his 50 years of service in the Congress of the United States.

Carl Hayden will go down in history as one of the great men of this body. His services to the people of his country and his State will be remembered for as long as there is a United States Senate.

Senator Hayden's contributions to the development of the resources of this country are the work of a lifetime.

But the President pro tempore has given much more. He has been kind and unselfish with his time and his wise counsel and advice. I doubt if there is any Member of the Senate to whom he has not furnished advice based on his intimate knowledge of the Senate and the legislative process.

All of us know of his good humor, and his wise and calm approach to the work of this body. He has made the Senate more fruitful and more enjoyable for all of us.

On behalf of the people of the State of Missouri and of this Nation too, it is a pleasure to extend to Senator Hayden best wishes on this notable and historic occasion.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I would not want this fine moment to pass without adding a few personal words of my own to the Record on the occasion of Senator Hayden's 50th anniversary in the Congress.

He is not only Arizona's senior Senator; he is also the Nation's senior statesman.

Senator Hayden has a tremendous grasp of what goes on on Capitol Hill. Having served under him on the Committee on Appropriations, I know how kind and thoughtful he is, how helpful he is toward new Senators, how he attacks a problem without regard to its size.

I have visited Arizona many times and seen him in action. He is never too busy to help with even the smallest problem of a constituent, regardless of party affiliation. This no doubt accounts for his long and unbroken tenure in the Congress.

But to me, the finest thing about Senator Hayden is his great faith in our country. He is a builder. Some men, however liberal in the beginning, become reactionary with age. Not Carl Hayden. He may be old in years, but he is ever young in spirit.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I wish to say something concerning the very unusual and the very outstanding record of the public service of the President pro tempore of the Senate, the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona, Mr. Carl Hayden.

The story of Arizona as a State is a fascinating one. It has occurred during the lifetime of many Americans. It is, however, very unusual that one individual's adult public service should include the entire lifespan of a sovereign State of this Union.

Much has been said about Senator Hayden's distinguished service in the House of Representatives and in the Senate of the United States. I shall not undertake to enumerate dates and times of those specific services. I wish to add my voice to the other voices raised in recognition and praise of this illustrious American.

Carl Hayden's record of public service is, and can be, an inspiration to every boy and girl in the United States. When we think of the tremendous advances and happenings that occurred in the last quarter of a century, we realize that Senator Hayden has been a part of this as an official of the U.S. Government, and has seen his desert State grow into one of the great States of the Union. When we consider the improvements in technology that have come about, that this Government has had to adapt itself to during the quarter of a century, we can get a notion of the great storehouse of information and knowledge possessed by Mr. Hayden. I believe that everyone who has served with him can testify to that point.

Regardless of what might come up—and I think Senators serving on the Committee on Appropriations will bear out what I am about to say about the Committee on Rules and Administration—Senator Hayden is able to turn to past experience and throw considerable light on the matter before us.

He has a tremendous grasp of the workings of the Government of the United States, of the traditions and customs of the Senate of the United States; and few persons, if any, will be able to match the public service of Senator Hayden.

We have here in our midst an individual whose knowledge and understanding of the problems of our Republic, as well as the problems of the day-to-day work of the Senate, are great. This situation could not have been brought about without Mr. Hayden's possessing many fine qualities of mind, character, and devotion to duty.

In addition, he is an individual who is stalwart in all respects. Mr. President, it takes a good physique to serve in public office this long and to stand for reelection many times.

Another noteworthy characteristic of Senator Hayden is the fact that he is so highly respected by those who find themselves on the opposite side of an issue or in a political party other than Mr. Hayden's. I think the respect that his adversaries hold for him is a true measure of the greatness of the man.

I should not say "adversaries," because he has none. I use the term in the sense of those who may disagree with him on a particular issue, or in the sense of someone who finds himself in a political contest on the opposite side.

Mr. President, we not only honor and respect Mr. Carl Hayden, but also we hope the words which have been uttered—not necessarily those uttered by me—in reference to him will point out his illustrious career to the educators of the country, to the boys and girls, and to all others who are interested in the great job of self-government, a government under law.

I pay my respects to Mr. Carl Hayden, a great man from Arizona.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I wish to join in the tributes being paid to Carl Hayden.

In late November I was advised that Carl Hayden's admirers and friends in the State of Arizona were holding a golden anniversary dinner for him. I welcomed the invitation to write a letter at that time to the committee to express my personal appreciation of his service.

It came to me with particular interest, perhaps, because at that very time plans were underway in my State for a 25th anniversary dinner commemorating my own service, which has been divided between the House and the Senate. Along with all the little things which were being said about the junior Senator from South Dakota completing 25 years of service in the Congress, I was humbled by the fact that this was a man, in the person of Carl Hayden, who had served twice that long and in very significant years.

Mr. President, some years ago, on an occasion when we were saying something of the service of Senator Hayden, I quoted a remark which had been made to me by the head of one of the agencies of Government. He said that he had appeared before many committees of the Congress but that in all his experience he had never met any other single individual who knew as much about the Government of the United States as did Carl Hayden. My own experience would second that tribute.

White I was in the House of Representatives I was privileged to serve on some conference committees on appropriation bills, as to which Carl Hayden was a conferee from the Senate. I came at that time to have a very high regard for his knowledge of government in all its aspects. I came also to have a very high regard for his sense of fairness, of equity, and of justice.

When I came to the Senate, my admiration increased as I saw in more detail the way he knew about the Government of the United States and the way in which he sought to make it an effective instrument.

In the Senate also I came to appreciate the sense of devotion that he had for the people of Arizona and the sense of devotion and dedication he had for his wife.

During the last years of her life Mrs. Hayden was bedridden, but CARL HAYDEN never complained. He attended to his duties on the floor of the Senate day after day, and then went home at night to take care of her.

I developed an increased respect for the true spirit of service which has marked CARL HAYDEN's life publicly and privately. I am glad to join in this tribute to him, and I hope that the remarks of the Senator from Nebraska and myself may be printed in the permanent RECORD next to those uttered Monday.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I might state to the Senator that a resolution will be presented from the Committee on Rules and Administration, providing that the speeches made in reference to the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona may be published as a Senate document. The resolution will be presented not today but a while later. It is the plan to incorporate the speeches which have already been delivered and those which may be delivered in the next 4 or 5 days, or not to exceed a week, before the material is sent to the printer.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the Senate is paying a well-deserved tribute to the able and distinguished senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] on the occasion of his having served 50 years in the Congress.

It is altogether fitting that I join my colleagues in such tribute today, since Senator HAYDEN himself personifies the link between the eras that have passed and the eras that lie ahead.

When CARL HAYDEN first came to the House of Representatives on February 19, 1911, many of our modern day marvels were still unconceived or in their infancy. Through the years since then he has steadily, patiently, and skillfully worked for the people of Arizona and of the United States. He has seen the Nation linked first by a modern system of roads traversed by that new invention of the 1890's, the automobile, and then crisscrossed by jet airplanes linking the Nation at speeds unbelievable at the time he first took his seat as a Representative from the newly admitted State of Arizona. And now, at the conclusion of 50 years of loyal, devoted, and superlative service in both bodies of the Congress, he has witnessed man's ascent into outer space. No other Member of our body has had a comparable experience, none other will have. For the period of CARL HAYDEN's service encompasses the greatest changes in the life of our planet. There will be more and great changes ahead, but they will be quantitative. No other Senator will live through the unprecedented and unduplicatable transition from the horse and buggy age to the space age.

Working with CARL HAYDEN has always been a pleasure. He has been uniformly kind and understanding. He has never hesitated to put himself out for a colleague. He has been more than the Senator from Arizona. He has truly been the representative of all the people of the United States.

As chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee he has had a hand in bringing about the great advances of our Nation. From highways to airports, from airports to launching pads, from hospitals to health institutes, from tanks to missiles, CARL HAYDEN's influence and guidance have always been a constructive force.

As I join my colleagues in paying tribute to the senior Senator from Arizona, I cannot but think that these few simple words of praise are totally unnecessary, since the works which he has wrought through the years will ever live as monuments to his years as a true statesman in the Halls of Congress.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, it is difficult to add to the splendid tributes paid Senator CARL HAYDEN as he marks half a century of service in the Congress, but I would not have the occasion pass without expressing my regard and good wishes to him.

At a luncheon in his honor a few days ago, Senator HAYDEN was asked to respond to a toast. His reply was characteristic:

> You wouldn't want me to break my record, would you?

It is this quiet, unassuming manner which marks CARL HAYDEN's greatness. Yet we who are privileged to be his colleagues know that if we could parallel his tenure in the Congress it would still be difficult to match his grasp of the art of government, his respect for our democratic institutions, and his devotion to this legislative body. And, I might add, it would be difficult to match his wise counsel and leadership as our President pro tempore.

CARL HAYDEN's career in the Congress parallels the history of his State. That is remarkable enough. But underlying that fact is the irrefutable statement of stability of democratic government. Senator HAYDEN is himself a living legend, a legend that spans more than a fourth of our Nation's history.

When I first came to the Congress some years ago, Senator HAYDEN was then, as now, respected for his kindly interest in counseling freshmen. I recall what a thrill it was for me to visit with him.

He asked how I was getting along. My reply was that I was pretty confused. It is sobering to realize how little I knew about my job and how great were my responsibilities.

Senator HAYDEN was most generous. "Don't let that bother you," he said in a kindly fashion, "you have a lot of company."

After we visited for a while, I grew bold enough to ask him whether he had any advice for a newcomer just starting out in this business.

I shall never forget his reply:

> Yes, I think I have some advice for you. You are sitting in a body where the votes on a good number of issues are often quite close. And your vote is going to count. It will count every time—every time you are there to cast it. Sometimes it will be your vote that will decide whether an issue goes one way or another.
>
> You will have to face up to that. Because you'll either have praise heaped on your shoulders, or you'll have ashes poured on your head—one or the other and sometimes both.
>
> But always remember this: Take your work seriously, but never take yourself too seriously.

Mr. President, every Senator can get plenty of advice. But the Senator from Nebraska has never received any more honest and helpful advice than that offered by my good and valued friend from Arizona.

It has been my pleasure to serve under the chairmanship of Senator HAYDEN on the Appropriations Committee where his experienced, knowledgeable leadership leaves its imprint on every bill.

If it is true, as Arthur Frederick Shelton once said, that "he profits most who serves best," then I might say that Senator CARL HAYDEN has a legacy beyond measure.

With deep gratification for his friendship and counsel, I salute him and wish him many more years of continued service.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on the evening of February 19 it was my distinct honor and pleasure to attend a dinner honoring Senator CARL HAYDEN, of Arizona. He was given a gold medal in recognition of his services in the Knights of Pythias. The record showed that he had been a Pythian for some 62 years. The dinner was held at the Hotel Shoreham in Washington, D.C.

It was my pleasure, after he was given the medal, to say a few words. I ask unanimous consent to insert a copy of my remarks in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> The Honorable Supreme Chancellor, Senator HAYDEN, and fellow Pythians, it is a distinct honor for me to have this opportunity of paying tribute to a fellow Pythian, CARL HAYDEN, U.S. Senator from Arizona.
>
> Although I have been in the Senate for nearly 24 years, I am a freshman compared to CARL HAYDEN, who was elected to the Senate in 1926, having served in the House of Representatives before that from 1912. His position as the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee and President pro tempore of the Senate is one which requires some of the hardest work done by any Member of the Senate. His complete dedication to his work and to his country is well known.
>
> Certainly, the Pythian admonition that there should be sincere and warm affection among the brotherhood need not be too much elaborated upon here when one considers his relationship with CARL HAYDEN. Certainly, CARL is the embodiment of friendship and he knows what it is to be his brother's keeper.
>
> In this tension-ridden era when all men and all institutions are put to the test, we see in the fires of experience the value of those concepts to which we have committed our solemn trust. Thus, fraternalism lives in the hearts of men and brotherhood is the fruit thereof.

The general practice of brotherhood, releasing the good in man and bringing in turn a new and lasting happiness, is the one true way to promote the general welfare and spread the light of morality and knowledge.

On this occasion of the celebration of Carl Hayden's 50th year in the order, Knights of Pythias, I am grateful that it has been my privilege for so many years to have the benefit of the counsel, the wisdom, the generosity, and the understanding of so capable and devoted a public servant and fellow Pythian as Carl Hayden. Certainly, this son of Arizona has truly given of himself not only to the people of his State, but to the people of the Nation. My congratulations to you, Carl, on this 50th year in the Pythians.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, we are observing the 50th anniversary of the installation of our colleague, Carl Hayden, as the first Member of Congress from the 48th State, Arizona. As an additional tribute to the senior Senator from Arizona, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the address delivered in Phoenix by the U.S. Commissioner of Reclamation, Mr. Floyd E. Dominy, to the Arizona Society of Professional Engineers.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> Just 2 weeks ago Arizona celebrated its 50th anniversary of statehood. Arizona and reclamation have literally grown up together. And the dean of the U.S. Senate—the Honorable Carl Hayden—has been out in front all the way. His vision, foresight, and dogged perseverance to get the job done continue to be an inspiration to reclamationists everywhere.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I join my colleagues on a very special occasion—the 50th anniversary of Senator Carl Hayden's service in the Congress. I join them in paying tribute to our distinguished colleague who has the unique distinction of having served uninterruptedly for a half century in the House of Representatives and the Senate. It is with a sense of deep respect and admiration that I avail myself of the privilege to add my own voice to the many that have already been raised so eloquently and with deserved praise for our veteran leader. Senator Hayden's calm, inconspicuous and thoughtful approach to the everyday legislative problems has won for him the esteem and high regard of everyone who has had the good fortune to work with him. His soft-spoken manner, while not diminishing his influence in areas where it counted most, has made him one of the Senate's most beloved Members. I know I express the sentiments of everyone who has ever been associated with him in wishing him many more years of continued useful service coupled with a sense of fulfillment and satisfaction which are indeed his due.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I join in the tributes to our beloved colleague, the senior Senator from Arizona, on the occasion of his 50th anniversary as a Member of the Congress of the United States. I hasten today to add my feelings to those expressed, believing with you that the image of the U.S. Senate as the world's greatest deliberative body is strengthened because of men like Carl Hayden.

Gentle, kindly, understanding, unobtrusive—these are all words that fit Senator Hayden, whose half century of devoted service to his State and Nation is a vibrant testimonial to a truly great man.

I am now in my eighth year in the Senate—years crowded with memories—some of achievement, some of frustration, but all permeated by the warm knowledge of working side by side with dedicated men. Senator Hayden epitomizes to me the acme of dedication. As President pro tempore of this body and as chairman of the Appropriations Committee, he wears both mantles with typical modesty—his principal satisfaction coming in the key part he plays in making the legislative process of our Government function smoothly and efficiently.

Our former colleague, President Kennedy, not long ago articulated the feelings of all of us in a moving tribute to this stalwart gentleman:

> Although Chairman Hayden exercises the vast power of his office without noise and fanfare—

The President said—

> his influence is felt in every department and agency of the Federal Government. He enjoys the respect and admiration of his colleagues, not because of the tremendous power of his office, but because of the strength and warmth of his personality.

These are sentiments I know we all share. I salute him not only as a respected colleague but as a revered friend, whose counsel I have sought on many occasions and upon whose wisdom I have often relied. May God grant him many more years of useful service.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point as a part of my remarks an editorial entitled "50 Years in Congress," published in the Baltimore Sun, being a tribute to the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden].

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Fifty Years in Congress

Most people can name the junior Senator from Arizona. Very few outside Washington are familiar with the senior Senator. Yet Senator Carl Hayden, who on Monday was honored on his 50th anniversary as a Member of Congress, is a very influential man. Not only has he sat longer in Congress than any other man in American history, but he has used those years well. Seniority means a great deal on Capitol Hill, but seniority without strength and diligence do not carry a man to the eminence of influence attained by Senator Hayden. He may be virtually unknown outside Washington and his own State, but he makes policy to a far greater extent than most of his noisier colleagues.

The Senator is definitely not a gabby man—present congressional reporters, indeed, are hard put to recall ever having heard him make a real speech. But his jobs include chairmanship of the Appropriations Committee, second to none in influence, and a long memory combine with long experience to make him a guide to his juniors. His length of experience, indeed, borders on the fabulous. When the century was new Mr. Hayden was serving as sheriff of Maricopa County in the Arizona Territory. He went to Washington as a Representative a few days after the territory became a State. This quiet and canny old man has survived pioneer America to become a force in a country undreamed of in his youth. What is more, those who know him would be willing to bet that he will be around for quite a while longer.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point as a part of my remarks an editorial entitled "This Great and Humble Man," published in the Arizona Journal, in tribute to Senator Hayden.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

This Great and Humble Man

In the excitement of Colonel Glenn's triumphant voyage through space this week it was easy for editorial writers, even in Arizona, to overlook comment on an event of at least equal importance in our State—the 50th anniversary of Senator Carl Hayden's arrival in Washington.

His colleagues in the Senate were not so forgetful. Following are some of their comments, as carried in the Congressional Record:

Senator Everett Dirksen, Republican, of Illinois: "His speeches have been few and far between. Whenever Carl Hayden came before a committee with a project or any other request, one could be quite certain that it was worthy, it was justifiable, and it needed little persuasion and rhetorical advancement."

Senator Richard Russell, Democrat, of Georgia: "I venture to say here, in the presence of many men who have worked with him, that in all the history of these United States no one man has contributed more to the building of a State than Carl Hayden has contributed to the State of Arizona."

Senator John McClellan, Democrat, of Arkansas: "To me he is the chief. I greet him as "Chief." I do that in the spirit of highest respect because among all the Members of this body he is my chief."

Senator Winston L. Prouty, Republican, of Vermont: "Senator Hayden is without peer in this Nation's history with respect to length of congressional service. He must also be numbered among a very select few in our entire history about whom it could be said that the course which the United States has pursued through time was due largely to their efforts."

These men who have seen Carl Hayden in action realize even better than we that Arizona and the Nation owe much to this great, humble man.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point as a part of my remarks an editorial entitled "Arizona's Senior Senator," published in the New York Times, being a tribute to our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden].

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Arizona's Senior Senator

Arizona's senior Senator is 32 years older than the junior Senator, has spent 26 more years in Congress, and does not care for publicity. These items tend to distinguish Carl Hayden, Democrat, from Barry M. Goldwater, Republican, both of Phoenix. Yesterday Senator Goldwater joined in the tributes paid on the occasion of Senator Hayden's 50th anniversary on Capitol Hill—a new record for length of service. He came in half a century ago as Arizona's first Representative, when the State was admitted to the Union. The only change in his status since that time has been when he moved from the House to the Senate in 1927.

Senator Hayden may or may not be the only politician in this country's or any other country's history who did not care to be paraded in the public prints. His work has been done quietly and well, as he has climbed up the committee ladder and become favorably known to several generations of legislators. If Arizona needed something, he needed it too. He worked for good roads, for irrigation, for public power development, for social security, and the prohibition of child labor. He has never been a flaming liberal nor an immovable conservative. He once conducted a filibuster but had no real liking for that device, and has made few speeches.

A resolution sponsored by Senator Mike Mansfield expressed the Senate's admiration for Mr. Hayden's "outstanding ability, courage and untiring devotion to duty" and its appreciation of his "modesty, sincerity, and understanding." He has grown old gracefully and in service. May he continue to do so.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The entire Western United States shares with the State of Arizona the proud moment of Senator Carl Hayden's anniversary of service in the Congress of the United States.

Actually, there is not a State in the West—or elsewhere in the Nation, for that matter, which has not known firsthand his work as chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee.

In this capacity, he has done much to build his Nation's defense, assure its economic growth, and develop its natural resources.

It has been a pleasure and privilege to serve with him on the Senate Appropriations Committee and to sit with him in the Senate of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to Senate Resolution 296, submitted by the Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen].

The resolution was unanimously agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate I wish to state that tomorrow a motion will be made to discharge the Committee on Government Operations from further consideration of Reorganization Plan No. 1, which is the Department of Urban Affairs proposal. It is my understanding that when the motion is made, debate will be limited to 1 hour, and that a vote will be taken on the motion, if one is desired.

In the form of a parliamentary inquiry, is that statement correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. One hour of debate is permitted on a motion to discharge the committee.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its deliberations today it stand in adjournment to meet at 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF ACT ESTABLISHING CODE OF LAW FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (H.R. 5143) to amend section 801 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901.

PROPOSED DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, we have heard the announcement by the majority leader as to the schedule tomorrow, which means that at 12 o'clock or soon thereafter there will be a motion to discharge the committee. I presume, if the motion is successful, there will be a move to consider immediately the reorganization proposal of the President.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MUNDT. While I am against the motion to discharge the committee, that is not my primary purpose for taking the floor this afternoon. I wish to say, however, in the presence of the chairman of our committee, I think the diligence which the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan] and our committee have devoted to this problem really does not justify the Senate taking such precipitate action to discharge the committee.

We have held hearings even during the annual slowdown period of the Lincoln Day recess. The committee was in session and held hearings.

The hearings are not yet printed and available to the Members of the Senate, through no fault of the committee, but solely because during the course of the hearings some requests were made for additional information from the Bureau of the Budget, which the Bureau of the Budget agreed to supply, which it has not yet been able to compile and provide so that the hearings can be completed and printed.

I submit, for the general consideration of the Senate in guiding the course of action tomorrow, when Senators will be called upon to vote, that the Senate should not discharge a committee which has been diligently endeavoring to get down to the facts, which has been holding hearings which will be invaluable to the Members of the Senate in helping them to arrive at a sound and appropriate conclusion, before the hearings can be printed and the information made available. First, it seems to me to do so would be unduly attempting to destroy the committee function and the responsibility of the committee system; and, second, it would sort of make a travesty of the hearings, and certainly would involve the committee in a cruel sort of hoax on the witnesses who appeared, who had every right to expect that the hearings would be transcribed and made available to Members before the Senate would decide the matter and do its voting. The testimony should be printed, so that Senators would have an opportunity to read it before they vote.

Committee hearings are serious things. Someone must pay the expense of a witness to come to testify before the committee. The committee does not do that. The Government does not do that. A community or an individual or an organization does so.

We should not establish the habit and the precedent tomorrow of bringing people from all over the country to appear before a congressional committee and then saying, "We were just kidding you all the time. We are not even interested in what you had to say, because we are going ahead with the vote before the processes of the printing plants make it possible to record the hearings, to print them into testimony, and to make them available to Senators." I do not believe the Senate would enhance its dignity or that the committee process would be able to convince people of its sincerity if we were to engage in that kind of precedent-developing action tomorrow.

I will not discuss that subject any further. It is not the purpose of my talk. I wish to speak primarily about another precedent involved in the discussion, which I hope Senators will relate to their decisions tomorrow on the motion to discharge. Certainly if the discharge motion prevails, though I hope it will not, we shall then be confronted, as the majority leader has just advised us, with a decision on the reorganization plan itself. I hope my statement will help Senators to arrive at a proper decision in that connection, because I think it is important that we point up that the so-called precedent, under which reorganization plans come from the White House, is in fact not an accurate precedent to go by in this connection. Therefore, we would actually be creating a brandnew precedent if by a reorganization plan we should propose for the first time in American history to expand the size of the Cabinet, to create a new department of government, and to provide for a reshuffling of the executive agencies to that extent.

Never before in Congress have we made that kind of important decision and taken that kind of important action under the Reorganization Act and the processes provided in that act, as amended. I believe that the decision is no small one. In some respects it is even a question which would have more far-reaching effects upon the course of American history than the decision as to whether we vote "yea" or "nay" on the substantive question of the reorganization plan itself, because for the first time we shall be determining in a clear-cut issue whether by reorganization plan and by reorganization method the executive department of government from now on in perpetuity shall have the right and the power, recognized and established by precedent, to create new departments of government and expand thereby the power and authority of the central state over the people, over the States, over the separate communities, and over the businesses and industries of America.

I think the question of procedure, therefore, is so important that it is incumbent upon the Senate and the House of Representatives to air thoroughly and debate the procedural question before moving on to the substantive discussion of the wisdom or unwisdom of establishing a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, because once we establish such a procedure and develop a new precedent or stop it at its inception, we shall be writing the guidelines of history into the future for a good many years.

In preparing to consider an issue of the magnitude of the one proposed, we are traversing a procedural avenue which would deny to Congress its traditional legislative prerogatives. I cannot believe that within this great deliberative body we shall reflect a total absence of concern with the procedural course we are being asked to follow, because that course will govern us and determine the power of Congress vis-a-vis the power of the administration long after all the present Members of this body have lived out their life expectancies.

Reorganization Plan No. 1 is not merely a simple housekeeping proposal. It is not a mere recommendation directed at improved administration and management within an executive agency. On the contrary, in the proposal that we shall confront tomorrow to do, we shall be considering that which has been done only 10 times in the 173-year life of the U.S. Constitution; namely, to create a new Cabinet-level department of government. It will be the first time that we shall have ever conveyed upon the Executive the power to expand itself, to develop its own additional departments almost by executive fiat, almost by a sort of divine order from a royal hierarchy, instead of following precedent and, to secure the collective judgment of Congress, voting with the full power to amend, to change, and to modify. To the legislators of the country that question must remain important.

I do not believe that in the 87th Congress we have sunk to a point at which we have little regard for the exclusive power of Congress to legislate. We are asked to consider a question of this importance and consequence under a procedural formula which would deprive Congress of the very essence of its legislative power, which is the power to amend and the right to impose its deliberative judgment on the proposal it is asked to approve, because if what is requested were to become a precedent to destroy the right of Congress to amend, such action would create a new formula, so that thenceforth Congress would exercise its legislative authority by voting "yea" or "nay" at the point of a gun, without the right to modify, change, or amend.

We should then have cut down to kneepants size the power of the Senate. Such a decision would come back to plague every Senator and Representative who voted to degrade the authority of the great body of which he is a Member.

I have too high a regard for this sacred body, and the fine Senators who belong to it, to believe that tomorrow a majority of them will vote to cut themselves down to half-pint size and elevate the Executive to the size of a 14-foot man merely because the pressures of politics and the pressures of the White House have one by one induced valiant Members of that body to say on this occasion, "Mr. President, we will give you full power and authority." We cannot take such action on one occasion without creating a precedent for action No. 2 and action No. 3.

That method is one of the slow and insidious processes by which the rights and freedoms of men have been lost in democracies around the world which once flourished and finally fell under the complete domination of an exalted executive.

So I hope tomorrow, when we have an opportunity to vote on a motion to discharge the committee, Senators will vote as Senators, proud of their authority, determined to protect the coordinate branch of government to which they belong, and unwilling to delegate their responsibility and authority to any executive branch of the Government at any time. I hope we defeat the motion to discharge the committee. Failing at that, I hope we defeat the proposed reorganization plan.

I think the decision we make in that arena and in that area is much more important than whether or not in years to come we shall have another Member of the Cabinet and a department of the Government called the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, although I think there are good and valid reasons why we should not at this time create a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. If by some unhappy tendency to bow the knee and kiss the boot the Senate votes tomorrow to discharge the committee, I shall in what time is available to me at that juncture give reasons why I believe it would be unwise to create such a department, especially by executive decree.

Today I am concerned about why I believe it is unthinkable and unwise to create a precedent to destroy in this whole area the right, the function, the power, and, I believe, the duty of Congress to maintain its legislative authority.

In an effort to place the entire picture before this body, which will vote upon the question soon, I wish to review the circumstances surrounding the establishment of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in 1953, and the procedures followed at that time, to demonstrate that in fact they do not provide a precedent for doing what we are being asked to do tomorrow. In fact, they provide a precedent for doing just the opposite, and insisting that we proceed according to the Constitution and traditional authorities which Congress has in its legislative function.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. MUNDT. I am glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. My distinguished colleague from South Dakota is making a very important argument on the basic principle involved in the issue before the Senate. There is a technical situation which exists, it seems to me, and which raises what I consider to be possibly a parliamentary question. If my colleague will yield I should like to address a parliamentary inquiry with respect to it and bring it to the attention of the Parliamentarian, who may or may not wish to give his opinion immediately, or perhaps may wish to review the question for some time. It deals with the submission of a reorganization plan, in this instance Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962.

In the Reorganization Act, contained in title 5 of the United States Code, section 133Z–1, there is the following provision:

> POWERS AND DUTIES OF PRESIDENT; PREPARATION AND CONTENTS OF REORGANIZATION PLAN; SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS
>
> The President, in his message transmitting a reorganization plan, shall specify with respect to each abolition of a function included in the plan the statutory authority for the exercise of such function, and shall specify the reduction of expenditures (itemized so far as practicable) which it is probable will be brought about by the taking effect of the reorganizations included in the plan.

I invite the attention of the Chair to the fact that the language of the Reorganization Act calls upon the President in submitting his reorganization plan to specify "the reduction of expenditures which it is probable will be brought about by the taking effect of the reorganizations included in the plan."

The closing paragraph of the President's letter of transmittal of January 30, 1960, reads as follows:

> Although the taking effect of the reorganizations provided for in the reorganization plan will not in itself result in immediate savings, the improvement achieved in administration will in the future allow the performance of necessary services at greater savings than present operations would permit. An itemization of these savings in advance of actual experience is not practicable.

The parliamentary proposition I should like to submit for the Chair to consider is whether or not this reorganization plan, by the letter of transmittal in the President's message, conforms to the requirements of the basic act.

For the purpose of clarity, if I may, I will reread the provision of the code, as follows:

> The President, in the message transmitting a reorganization plan, shall specify with respect to each abolition of a function included in the plan the statutory authority for the exercise of such function, and shall specify the reduction of expenditures (itemized so far as practicable) which it is probable will be brought about by the taking effect of the reorganizations included in the plan.

In the message of the President in this instance, the President said:

> Although the taking effect of the reorganizations provided for in the reorganization plan will not in itself result in immediate savings, the improvement achieved in administration will in the future allow the performance of necessary services at greater savings than present operations would permit. An itemization of these savings in advance of actual experience is not practicable.

My parliamentary inquiry is, first of all, Is it a parliamentary inquiry to raise the question of the adequacy of the President's message within the language of the act providing for the submission of a message with a plan?

If it is a parliamentary inquiry, then I should like to have the opinion of the Chair as to whether or not the President's message conforms to the authority of the Reorganization Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PELL in the chair). The Chair rules on this question that it is not a parliamentary inquiry. It is a question of interpretation of law, on which, as the Senator knows, the Presiding Officer has no authority to pass.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I have a further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The basis of the Reorganization Act is that the President is acting as the agent of Congress by making certain findings in order that he may get the authority to legislate, so to speak. Under the doctrine of the separation of powers, and under the provisions of the Constitution, it is Congress which is empowered to legislate. The President is not given authority to legislate. Is there not, then, the constitutional question as to whether the President has the power to effect this kind of reorganization when he does not follow the language laid down in the basic Reorganization Act in submitting the plan?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will reply that this is not a matter of parliamentary inquiry. It is a further question of interpretation of law.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If the junior Senator from South Dakota tomorrow were to raise the question as to whether a constitutional question were involved, would that question be referred to the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the precedents of the Senate, the Chair has no authority to pass upon constitutional questions, but is required to submit them to the Senate for decision.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I thank the Chair. I thank my colleague from South Dakota for yielding to me.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, it has been claimed by the administration and by certain congressional proponents that, in seeking to establish a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, procedures are being used which comport in all important aspects with the procedures used by the Eisenhower administration and the 83d Congress in the establishment of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. I must respectfully submit that this claim simply does not stand the test of close analysis.

It is true that on March 12, 1953, President Eisenhower submitted to the 83d Congress Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953 to create the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. To this extent and to this extent only the Kennedy administration can look to the action of 1953 as a precedent for its actions in 1962 in submitting a reorganization plan to create a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. Beyond this point the conditions existing and the procedures followed in 1953 are in significant contrast with the situation confronting us today.

In 1953, when President Eisenhower submitted his reorganization plan, which elevated the Federal Security Administration to departmental status, there was a great background of history supporting this action. The need for a Department of Health, Education, and Welfare had long been recognized at the highest levels of government. In 1923 President Harding had proposed a Department of Education and Welfare, so that the idea had actually had Presidential endorsement fully 30 years in advance of the Eisenhower reorganization plan. In that intervening three decades the idea of a unified department for health, education, and welfare activities had been endorsed by Presidents Hoover and Roosevelt; it had been a formal recommendation of the Hoover Commission; and President Truman sought to achieve the creation of such a department by a reorganization plan which met defeat because of the widespread congressional disapproval of the policies and philosophies and attitudes of the then head of the Federal Security Agency, Mr. Oscar Ewing, an admitted and acknowledged advocate of compulsory medicine. What this history tells us, Mr. President, is this: In 1953 there was no significant congressional opposition to the elevation of the FSA to departmental status, but quite to the contrary, President Eisenhower knew that he had broad bipartisan support for his reorganization plan at the time it was submitted. Mr. President, I think even the most ardent proponent of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing must concede that Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962 has come to the Congress with no such history of support.

Interestingly, President Eisenhower formally announced in a message to Congress his intention to submit the HEW reorganization plan fully 6 weeks in advance of its actual submission—a rather striking contrast to the conduct followed in the submission of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962, which comes to us as the result of an afterthought during the course of a press conference conducted immediately after the prepacked Rules Committee of the House demonstrated that the administration had not packed it quite full enough with suppine New Frontiersmen, so that they could always control it.

When one lays all these facts before him for contrast, he does not have to be a Philadelphia lawyer to reach the conclusion that the present administration can find precious little evidence to support the claim that the 1953 creation of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is a perfect precedent for the present effort to create a Department of Urban Affairs under the procedures of the Reorganization Act. I shall be the first to admit that the examples of contrast which have been presented thus far raise no question of legality. Nevertheless, they raise questions of propriety; and is there any Member of the Senate who will say that questions of propriety are not of the greatest import when they relate to matters involving the joint responsibility and concern of any of the three separate departments of the Government?

In the instant case, I think the administration, by resorting to the Reorganization Act after a setback in the House Rules Committee, has chosen a course of action which raises some real and serious questions of propriety concerning the coordinate power of the three branches of Government. However, it is not my intention nor is it within my province to counsel the administration on the manner and conduct it chooses to follow in prosecuting its legislative program. But it is most assuredly within my province—indeed, it is rather my solemn obligation as the ranking minority member of the committee which has had the bill before it, both now, when it is sought to take the bill away from us by a discharge motion, and back during its original legislative consideration, which preceded the action by the Senate—to counsel with my colleagues concerning the manner and procedure by which we in Congress will consider proposals once they have been submitted to us for action and consideration.

Apparently a part of the drive for power is not only to create a vast new bastion of strength for the executive department, but, in the process, to vitiate the congressional hearing program, and to demonstrate to the people generally that when they are called upon to testify before a committee they might just as well stay home, because the likelihood is that their testimony will not even be printed and distributed and made available to Congress, before Congress answers to the whiplash of the administration by voting as it is told to do by another branch of the Government, instead of as they are counseled to do by those who appear before the committee or by those who write to them from their constituencies.

I therefore respectfully refer Senators to the specific procedure and the history by which, in the 83d Congress, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was approved and organized, for there we have the nub of the question. There we find a striking contrast between the action of 1953 and the action proposed in 1962, a contrast which is so sharp and significant that it should cause every Member of Congress to pause and question whether, in fact, we are being asked now to take action under which the President may create new precedents, tending further, even, to destroy the strength and the significance of Congress, and specifically to destroy the power of a once proud Senate which used to be most jealous of its place in the constitutional scheme of things.

In 1953, Congress did not—I repeat: did not—adopt the HEW reorganization plan under the procedures of the Reorganization Act of 1949. Instead, Congress took affirmative and general legislative action by the passage of House Joint Resolution 223, which provided that the provisions of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953 should become effective 10 days after the enactment of the legislative resolution. The procedure thus followed was distinctly different from the reorganization procedure now before the Senate, because it preserved the fundamental right of a parliamentary assembly to amend, alter, modify, or change the substantive provisions of the proposal before it. In brief laymen's language, in 1953 the plan by which the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was approved was a legislative step permitting Congress to legislate and to amend—the way we expect Congress to do.

In 1962 we are asked to establish a new Cabinet department under a procedure denying to Congress the right to amend, modify, or alter; under a procedure which surely must function much more comfortably under some totalitarian concept of Europe and Asia, than to function on the banks of the Potomac, where a legislative body is supposed to legislate independently of the pressures of the White House.

The procedure followed in 1953 was distinctly different from the reorganization procedure which we shall have before us tomorrow, because it preserved the fundamental right of Congress to work its will on a legislative proposal. That legislative proposal happened to be an affirmative recommendation that a new department of Government be created. Lest there be some doubt among those who so glibly say that in what happened in 1953 we have a precedent to guide us, there may still be some in this body and some around the country who are studious, painstaking, and thoughtful enough to want to review the record, so I shall document the facts.

A review of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the 1st session of the 83d Congress reveals that on March 17, 1953, House Joint Resolution 223 was reported by the House Committee on Government Operations. On the same day, House Resolution 179 was reported by the House Committee on Rules, granting a rule for the debate of House Joint Resolution 223. Under the rule thus provided by the House, the provisions of the reorganization plan were open to amendment from the floor of the House under the 5-minute rule. As one who served in the House of Representatives for 10 years, I know full well, as do many of my colleagues in the Senate, that that is the way the House legislates. It legislates under the 5-minute rule. It was an open rule to grant the House the power to change, modify, and legislate.

Even more interesting, not only did the procedures followed in 1953 preserve the right to amend; the record of debate in the House of Representatives reveals that that right was twice exercised in efforts to modify the substantive provisions of the HEW reorganization plan. So, on the one hand, in 1953 Congress preserved the right it is asked in 1962 to nullify and destroy; on the other hand, in 1953 Congress exercised the right denied to it by the force-feed formula we are asked to follow in 1962. All of it is a matter of historical record which can be studied by those who are not so busy running that they cannot stop for just a little bit to read as they go.

Mr. President, even more interesting, if any Member of the Senate doubts that the 83d Congress followed general legislative procedure in its consideration of the establishment of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, he has only to look to the words of Representative CLARE HOFFMAN, the author of House Joint Resolution 223, which appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 99, part 2, page 2089. Let me quote the pertinent portions of his remarks.

I shall point to the pages where the greatest skeptic in the land cannot fail to see them if he opens his eyes enough to examine the RECORD. There we find that in 1953, Representative CLARE HOFFMAN, of Michigan, still a Member of that great body and the author of House Joint Resolution 223, which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 99, part 2, page 2089, showed how this procedure actually has operated in preserving the machinery of freedom and what is left of the dignity, the pride, and the power of the House of Representatives, and the Senate, which for a quarter of a century have been nibbling away at their own powers of authority, and then have been wondering why they have moved so steadily in the direction of a type of heavily centralized government which has been spending too much, controlling too much, and ordering around too many of the American people. So, Mr. President, let me quote from this important historic record, as made by Representative HOFFMAN; and I ask my colleagues to listen now to the statement he then made:

> The purpose behind the introduction of this resolution was twofold. As introduced on the 12th of March and reported by the committee on the 17th, the resolution provided, "the provisions of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953, submitted to the Congress on March 12, 1953, shall take effect 10 days after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution." In committee, the resolution was amended by adding after the word "resolution" the words "and its approval by the President." As so amended, it was reported to the House by the Rules Committee yesterday, the 17th.
>
> Those familiar with our basic reorganization legislation will recall that reorganization plans sent down by the President are not, under usual procedure, subject to amendment and become effective unless—to use understandable common language—the plan is vetoed by a majority vote of the authorized membership of either the Senate or the House.
>
> That method of legislation has always been opposed by me, as it has previously been opposed by an overwhelming majority of the Republicans of the House—on one occasion, 164 of the 168 Members who were voting opposed such a method. And this resolution was introduced by me in an effort to demonstrate that, by this unusual procedure, the House could, if it desired, bring before it a proposed plan in such a way that it might be amended either in committee or from the floor.
>
> When the day ends, we will have established the fact, provided that, when the procedure providing for the consideration of a reorganization plan is followed, the plan cannot be amended either in committee or from the floor by the introduction of and action upon a resolution such as the one now before us, a plan can be amended; this for the reason that the resolution was amended in committee, and, before the debate has ended, amendments will be offered from the floor and voted upon.

Mr. President, this statement by Representative HOFFMAN makes it abundantly clear that one of the major reasons underlying the use of the joint-resolution procedure in 1953 was to preserve and protect the right of Congress to amend and to affirmatively legislate on questions of major consequences. It must be admitted, Mr. President, that we have no such right under the procedures we are presently pursuing toward the consideration of the plan to create a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, because some among us have proposed to take it out of the legislative plan of action, and are trying to get it done by a reorganization message submitted from the White House.

Mr. President, this is a very important matter, for not only are we presently acting without precedent, but we are using a procedure which I am certain is not favored by a great number of my colleagues, including many of the proponents of a Department of Urban Affairs. During the hearings last week before the Government Operations Committee, many of the proponent witnesses indicated disappointment because of the fact that Reorganization Plan No. 1 did not go far enough. I regret that under the shotgun procedure we are being asked to follow, no Member of the Senate who is not on the committee will have any chance to read what the witnesses before the committee said. Those witnesses were just "conned" into coming to Washington and presenting their views before the committee, and then were sent home again—a procedure which resulted in more or less muzzling the witnesses in reverse, instead of muzzling the military at this time—giving them a chance to talk in committee, but not giving us any chance to read what they said there.

Mr. President, it seems that the view taken by those who favor such a procedure is that no one is very much interested in what the witnesses before the committee said, and that we who serve in this body are so busy having our own remarks printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at very considerable cost to the taxpayers, that we are not willing to permit the printing of the statements made by our constituents who come to Washington and testify before congressional committees.

Mr. President, some Senators and some witnesses have indicated a desire for additional authority to deal with mass transit problems, if a separate governmental branch on urban affairs is to be established. Some have testified and have said that they believed the proposed new Department should have expanded authority in regard to research and planning, and still others hinted that they believed that the Federal programs relating to water pollution and air pollution should be transferred from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to the proposed new Department.

In a debate I had recently on the radio with one of the proponents of this plan who is a Member of the Senate, he stated that he thought perhaps the new Department should deal with snow removal, juvenile delinquency, and better education, and then conjured up a whole family of fast-spending bureaus which one segment of our society or another would like to find involved in a new Cabinet position, so they could say to someone at the President's Cabinet table, "We want more money for this project or that project of our metropolitan communities." The hearings also revealed that opposition to the plan might be softened somewhat if the Federal National Mortgage Association were located outside the new Department. Alternatives were likewise suggested.

Mr. President, I hope I shall not be censured by the Senate for disclosing some of the things the witnesses before our committee said, if the Senate decides not to permit the Members of the Senate to find out what some of the witnesses have testified. In all events, I shall proceed at this time to state some of that testimony—as quoted from the presentations the witnesses made before the committee. At this time let me point out that various things of importance were disclosed by the about-to-be-forgotten and never-to-be-read hearings before the committee which is about to be discharged from the further consideration of this measure, before the Government Printing Office is allowed to have an opportunity to print the committee hearings. For example, one national association vitally concerned with the problems of urban growth suggested that the matter of Federal responsibility in this area could be far better achieved by the establishment of a staff agency within the Executive Offices of the President. It is quite likely, too, that the housing experts in Congress would like to have an opportunity to rework the language of the reorganization plan which appears to give the new Secretary some added authority over the Federal Housing Administration, which has achieved such a brilliant record in the private housing field from its present semiautonomous status in the HHFA.

These are only a few of the changes which might be made in the substantive provisions of the reorganization plan if they were considered under general legislative procedures, but I think these examples amply demonstrate the general lack of enthusiasm for the use of a procedure which denies the Congress all the important incidents of its constitutional role to legislate.

I shall not mislead my colleagues into the belief that the 1953 joint resolution procedure was adopted without criticism, for, as a matter of fact, several Members of the House and Senate spoke out quite strongly against this method of considering a reorganization plan.

This, too, is a matter of easy research for those who are presently deluded into thinking that the HEW procedure in any way forms a precedent for what we will be asked to do tomorrow.

The criticism in 1953 was of two varieties. Some charged that by proceeding to adopt the joint resolution, the Congress was taking unprecedented action. This argument, however, was laid soundly to rest when it was pointed out to the critics that reorganization plans 3, 4, and 5 of 1940 were approved by an identical procedure. If there continue to be any doubters among us, I refer them to page 230 of volume 54 of the U.S. Statutes at Large.

The main criticism of the 1953 procedure went to the fact that House Joint Resolution 223 accelerated the reorganization process—thus denying Congress the full 60 days of consideration provided for in the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended. It occurs to me, Mr. President, that this acceleration argument would not be in particular good taste for the proponents of the Department of Urban Affairs, who are now giving thought to an acceleration procedure of their own through a motion to discharge the committee on tomorrow.

Mr. President, this concludes my review of the action taken by the 83d Congress in passing on the merits of the HEW reorganization plan. It has been my intent and my effort to be both objective and fair in this review. At least, I have been historically accurate, as I have given the bench marks of reference, for anybody who cares to find the facts so far as precedent is concerned.

I cannot but conclude that we are presently preparing to consider a substantive recommendation to create a new Cabinet-level department of Government under a procedure which is without precedent in the nearly 2-century history of the Congress of the United States, and in so doing face the future by establishing a new precedent reducing drastically, for all time to come, the significance, scope, and strength of the Senate and its companion branch of Government, the other body known as the House of Representatives.

I cannot, of course, impose my judgments upon my colleagues. I cannot even be sure that all of them will give attention to the facts presented here today, or even go back to find the historical references. But even if I were a strong proponent for the establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs—which I am not, for reasons quite apart from those discussed here today, which I shall discuss tomorrow, in the event of the unhappy eventuality of having to make a decision at the point of a shotgun—I would hesitate to approve its creation under the present "take it or leave it—no amendment" procedures, when such approval will establish a new and questionable precedent for future Congresses and future Presidents.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of these remarks—and I have about concluded them—there appear an article from this morning's issue of the Washington Post under the heading of "Our Changing Economy," and then the subheading, in big, bold letters, "Uncle Sam Faces $1 Trillion Debt," written by Maurice H. Stans, former Director of the Budget.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, since all must agree that the creation of a new Department of Urban Affairs is about as far away from practical economy as the sun is from the moon, and moves in the direction of greater expenditures, higher taxes, faster inflation, and an unbalanced budget, since we may well have a follow-up message from the White House saying, "When I asked for an increase of the national debt authority by $10 billion, I did not ask enough: Please make it $20 billion, to help finance this new department," since finances are involved, since the test of whether or not this Congress can make a recovery from its current record of fiscal irresponsibility is involved, I call the attention of my colleagues to the astute and indisputable comments and facts incorporated in this article by Mr. Stans.

Let me cite his concluding observation, which he documents in this carefully written treatise. At the end, says he:

> This is a national debt of more than $22,000 for every family of four in the country. . . .

Then he asks the questions:

> Quite a spending spree we've been on for the last 30 years, isn't it?

Mr. President, it is quite a new spending spree we are going to be asked to adopt tomorrow in providing additional dollars to lubricate and finance the affairs of the metropolitan areas of America.

Exhibit 1

Our Changing Economy—Uncle Sam Faces $1 Trillion Debt

(By Maurice H. Stans)

Treasury Secretary C. Douglas Dillon has asked for a $10 billion increase in the ceiling on our national debt. This would bring it to an all-time high of $308 billion.

The Congress has indicated that it will deal with this request in two installments. An increase of $2 billion will undoubtedly be authorized immediately, as an emergency measure, to permit enough new funding to pay current bills. This will bring the debt total to the magic line of $300 billion.

Above this amount, Dillon will have tougher sailing, and the Congress may give him only a part of the additional $8 billion he wants. Senator Harry F. Byrd, Democrat, of Virginia, long-time champion of solvent Government, has announced that his Senate Finance Committee will hold hearings on the state of the Government's financial position before voting any further increases. By the time the hearings are concluded, the Senator will have some shocking news to report to the American people.

INTEREST IS $9 BILLION

The annual interest on the national debt is now running above $9 billion, and for the last several years this carrying cost, without any payment on the debt itself, has been taking 11 cents of every dollar of Federal taxes collected. And the chances that any of this debt will ever be paid off seem less and less as time goes on.

This is quite a contrast with the past. From the beginning of the Nation in 1789 until recent years, a major objective of every President was to pay off the national debt. It was done once—by Andrew Jackson in 1834. But each succeeding war built the debt to a new plateau; intervening efforts accomplished reductions but never eliminated the entire amount.

Even so, at the end of fiscal 1916, the debt was only a little more than a billion dollars. By the end of World War I, it had soared above $25 billion. From this high point it was reduced in 11 consecutive years, cutting it by more than one-third to $16 billion in 1930.

From there it began an upward climb, through wartime and peacetime, with the budget in the red 26 years out of 32. The depression years increased the debt regularly, and it had reached nearly $50 billion before the outbreak of World War II. At the close of the war it was $270 billion. Three subsequent surpluses by Truman and three more by Eisenhower could not match the costs of the Korean war and the intervening peacetime deficits. The current year's spending will push the debt to $300 billion, or more, and the end is not in sight.

CREDIT CARD GOVERNMENT

Up to now I have been referring only to the interest-bearing debt. But this isn't all that we owe as a Nation. By a continuing policy of national extravagance, we have been committing the Government's future resources beyond this to an incredible degree. We have adopted in Washington a program of "credit-card government" that is placing a burden of staggering proportions on our children and grandchildren.

As Director of the Budget, I undertook in 1960 to add up all the liabilities of our Government. Here are some of them. We owe $30 billion in unfunded pensions to retired civilian employees of the Government. We owe almost $40 billion in accrued pensions to retired military servicemen. The total of our present commitments to veterans for future pensions and compensation (not counting many other benefits) is in excess of $300 billion. All of this $370 billion is for past services and in the financial statement of a business would be accounted for among liabilities.

Then there are many other present contractual or legislated Government undertakings that will have to be financed in the future. Taking all of them—housing subsidy contracts, shipping subsidies, the Interstate Highway System, unfinished public works projects, unpaid purchases of military supplies, and many others—this group adds up to more than $150 billion in further bills to be met in the coming years.

SOCIAL SECURITY, TOO

Altogether, counting the interest-bearing debt of $300 billion and the other obligations and commitments I have mentioned, we have placed a mortgage of over $800 billion on our national future to be met in taxes. This does not include untold billions of dollars in guarantees by the Government on housing loans and other mortgages, bank deposits and other savings, and so on.

Even this is not the full story. Under our social security system, we have scheduled a series of benefits that far exceed, in actuarial terms, the resources that would be available at present tax rates. This deficiency, which can only be made up out of future tax increases already provided in the law, is another $250 or $300 billion.

This makes the total present undertakings of the Government, to be paid from future taxes, in excess of a trillion dollars. And that is beyond the regular annual costs of defense, welfare, and other Government activities.

This is a national debt of more than $22,000 for every family of four in the country. Quite a spending spree we've been on for the last 30 years, isn't it?

FISH PROTEIN

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I have today a preliminary report on a study now underway on manufacturing methods of fish protein, also known as fish flour.

This product, made of cleaned, ground fish, is an inexpensive high protein food additive. It can be manufactured anywhere in the world where fish are available for as little as 15 cents a pound. It represents a potential major weapon in our worldwide battle against hunger and in particular against protein malnutrition, the most widespread disease on this planet.

This study, which is being made with a $50,000 grant given by Congress last year to the Interior Department, was presented recently at a luncheon on Capitol Hill to Members of Congress and the fishing industry interested in fish protein. Dr. E. R. Pariser, formerly of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and now with the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, is conducting the study.

Dr. Pariser's task as outlined by Congress is to gather information on the different ways in which fish protein is being manufactured in all parts of the world. This information will then be evaluated and a decision made as to which of these methods the United States should pursue in making this product.

Dr. Pariser so far has traveled through North and South America. He has already found, as this report shows, interest in the manufacture of fish protein in many countries, including Canada, Chile, Peru, and Uruguay.

More important yet, Dr. Pariser has found widespread need for this product throughout Central and South America. He said:

> A really cheap and nutritious protein supplement is most urgently required in almost all countries of Central and South America that were visited.

The raw materials, he added, are available on the seacoasts, but no satisfactory method of manufacture exists in those parts.

I would like to point out that a satisfactory method of manufacture for fish protein is already available in the United States along with a product whose value has been proven in many parts of the world. It is manufactured presently in New Bedford, Mass.

Utilization of this product, however, by the United States as well as our foreign neighbors is being hindered by a recent shortsighted, and irrelevant ruling of the Food and Drug Administration. The FDA has ruled that fish protein may not be consumed in the United States unless made from fish that is degutted, deheaded, and definned. This makes the product prohibitively expensive, lowers its nutritional value, and essentially defeats the purpose of making it in the first place.

The FDA has not said that fish protein is harmful or unfit for human consumption in any way. It simply says that the American public would consider this product filthy if allowed to purchase it, hence should not be permitted to do so. In producing this ruling the FDA has not attempted to refute the very substantial body of scientific evidence which exists in favor of fish protein. It has, moreover, said nothing on why the finicky American public has no difficulty downing such FDA approved products as bottled whole fish, canned whole sardines, and chocolate covered ants, grasshoppers, and bees.

I feel that the American public deserves to decide for itself whether it should be allowed to utilize fish protein. I am protesting this ruling of January 25, along with a number of my colleagues in the Senate, and am asking that a fair hearing be given on this matter.

The United States has made a significant breakthrough in this field by being the first country in the world prepared to market fish protein commercially on a large scale. Secretary of Interior Udall, Director of Food for Peace George McGovern, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, and several United Nations organizations including the Food and Agriculture Organization, World Health Organization, and UNICEF, recognize the value of this product and are supporting it.

It is also of potential great use, as Dr. Pariser points out, to the fishing industries of this country and the world. It would enable fishermen to balance the fish mix in the oceans by taking profitably smaller, inedible fish, and would give the larger species that are often overfished a better chance to survive.

I believe it is in the interest of this country to have the obstacles which the Food and Drug Administration has placed in the path of fish protein removed, and I urge all my colleagues in the Senate to join me in seeing that this is done as quickly as possible.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD the report of Dr. Pariser, an editorial of February 11 on this subject from the Boston Herald, and my letter of protest to Secretary Ribicoff.

There being no objection, the report, editorial, and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FISH PROTEIN CONCENTRATE [1]

(By E. R. Pariser [2])

"One man's hunger and want is every man's hunger and want. One man's freedom from hunger and want is neither a true nor a secure freedom until all men are free from hunger and want." These are the words with which the Director General of FAO, B. R. Sen, launched the freedom-from-hunger campaign on July 1, 1960.

Hunger is still the biggest human problem of the century: According to FAO more than half of the world's total population suffers from lack of food, adequate in quality and quantity to sustain health, growth, and physical vigor. Progress to relieve this condition has largely been offset by the alarming and accelerating rate of population growth. By the year 2000 the population of Asia, Africa, and Latin America will increase by about 3,000 million people—an addition equal to the total world population of today.

Malnutrition, undernutrition, is largely the result of an inadequate consumption of high quality animal protein which is needed to complete and to balance the diets of peoples in developing nations, diets containing preponderantly vegetables and cereals. Sadly enough, young growing children and expectant mothers suffer most from a lack of proteins containing sufficient quantities and correct proportions of the required amino acids. Of course, milk, eggs, beef, and chicken all contain quality animal protein but cannot be made universally available or are too costly.

Other sources of high-quality proteins must, therefore, be found * * * fast. The sea can supply these sources in the form of concentrated fish protein. Wisely managed, the sea, with its great population of fish, represents a vast reservoir of animal proteins, proteins of exceptionally high quality.

---

[1] Speech given at joint Congress-industry meeting, Feb. 1 in the Vandenberg Room, U.S. Capitol.

[2] Research chemist, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries Technological Laboratory, College Park, Md.

The above considerations are by no means new, yet, today, fish represents only a minor percentage of the food consumed by human beings. This is the more surprising in view of the fact that more than 70 percent of the surface of this planet is covered by oceans and seas and that, furthermore, the sea is considered by many authorities (for instance FAO) to be, acre for acre, potentially about as productive as arable land.

Systematic efforts to farm the seas on a rational, industrial scale with a view of producing concentrated protein for direct human consumption have lagged far behind similar efforts to harvest and utilize the fruits of the land. The time has now come upon us, however, when we can no longer leave this opportunity unchallenged, when old ideas have to be translated into action, and when the pursuit of the production of concentrated fish protein has become a duty.

Aside from purely humanitarian and political issues, the capacity for producing a satisfactory fish protein concentrate would provide a tremendous economic stimulation for our domestic fishing industry.

Such production would provide all-important product diversification for our industrial fisheries—eliminating such conditions of imbalanced supply and demand as were experienced some short time ago. Trash fish, as well as waste products from edible fish, could be converted into fish protein concentrates. It is estimated that over one-half of the catch of the North Atlantic is discarded at sea before docking—protein waste that could feed thousands. In many areas glut periods lower the price of the catch and often no market is available. If, however, the processor were able to manufacture fish protein concentrates during these times of surplus, markets would stabilize and starving individuals benefit.

From a biological standpoint, the manufacture of fish protein concentrate would help us realize our goal by achieving efficient utilization of resources compatible with sustained optimum yield. Our fishermen would also be able to reestablish a favorable balance on our fishing grounds between the more desirable predatory fish, such as tuna and cod, and the grazing types of fish, such as anchovy and herring. Many years of selective fishing for the larger species has favored growth of smaller, less desirable, fish until, in many areas, the latter are now superabundant.

Our industrial fisheries could supply from the catch of just one fishing season all the protein needed by our entire population during the expected 2-week period of national emergency due to a massive nuclear attack. Today, our fishing industry could produce enough fish flour to squelch the severe protein malnutrition in South America.

It is an obligation to provide the means by which our great fishing industry can remain economically sound in order to realize its role as a major supplier of protein, today and in the future.

Although many attempts have been made to develop methods to manufacture fish protein concentrate, none of these efforts has yet met with complete success. Either these methods are still beset with processing problems or they have not been conscientiously approved by nutritionists, pediatricians, FAO, and the like. Also, with very few exceptions, such as the VioBin Corp., the United States is not conducting, as other nations are, the scientific studies designed to achieve a satisfactory product. It is for these reasons that Congress appropriated $50,000 last year to the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries for the first year of a research project designed to study existing methods and, if necessary, to improve these or to develop new concepts for the manufacture of fish protein concentrates suitable for worldwide incorporation into human diets.

Our project objectives are designed to specify ultimately methods that will: (1) require low initial capitalization; (2) be economical in operation; (3) be flexible for large and small scale operation; (4) be flexible to permit operation in those parts of the world where public utilities are limited; (5) result in the production of an end product that will be acceptable to peoples who may have varying taste preferences, cultures, and taboos; (6) result in the production of an end product that will be approved as being fully satisfactory and suitable by world recognized experts in the field of protein supplementation; (7) result in the production of a product that could be cheaply shipped to distant parts, that could be stored for varying periods of time without quality loss, and that could be easily incorporated into the local diets of undernourished peoples.

The project is supported not only by some members of the U.S. Congress, and industry, but is also endorsed and assisted by United Nations agencies, such as FAO, UNICEF, and WHO. It is being conducted with the support and approval of the food-for-peace and the freedom-from-hunger campaigns and operates in cooperation with the interdepartmental committee on nutrition for national defense.

PROGRAM

The overall program, set up for this 5-year research project, will consist of the following three phases: (1) Survey of processing methods, (2) assembly of a consulting group, and (3) laboratory developments.

1. Comprehensive survey

In order to insure that the funds allocated by Congress to this project will be used in the most effective manner, it was decided to conduct a general survey of methods, used or studied, for the manufacture of fish protein concentrates for human consumption. Part of this survey, which is still underway, has been completed by the staff of the College Park Laboratory; the results of this first phase of the investigations will be reported presently. Labor, time, and funds spent upon this preliminary work are insignificant compared to the labor, time, and funds that would be required to establish, by independent experiments, the knowledge that will, in this way, be gathered from different sources. On completion of this general research, a detailed monograph will be prepared for the U.S. industry which will constitute a record of scientific data concerning the partial successes and failures of the different attempts to develop a satisfactory manufacturing process.

2. Formation of a consulting group

The formation of a consulting group is considered to be an essential condition for the success of this highly complex project. It is indeed hoped to assemble a number of experts who would be presented with the findings in the monograph. The members of the group would be asked to examine critically the facts contained in the report in order to be able to assist in the programing and planning of the Bureau project. It is furthermore envisaged that the group would meet at least once a year, after the initial assembly, to advise us on our research program. Experts from a wide field of scientific disciplines would be asked to participate in this group. The urgency, magnitude, and significance, both domestic and international, of our aims are ample justification for calling upon the foremost scientific and technical authorities that this country has to offer. It is, furthermore, realized that, before any method can finally be considered as fully successful and satisfactory, it has to be conscientiously approved by an interdisciplinary body of scientists such as the Protein Advisory Group of the United Nations. Some of the members of the latter organization will participate in the work of our consulting group and in this way help to assure the global approval of our work. Failure to work in close cooperation with such a group has proved to be a great handicap in previous trials carried out by private industry.

The survey and, it is hoped, the initial formation of the consultant group is expected to be accomplished this year.

3. Laboratory development of a satisfactory process

With the assistance and advice of the panel of experts mentioned, the final phase of the research program will be designed either to attempt to improve existing methods, or if indicated to develop, on a laboratory scale, new approaches to this problem.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

As was just mentioned, the first part of the general survey has now been completed. During this initial phase, plants in this country, Canada, Central and South America were visited. Observations made during these trips are summarized below:

1. United States

Considerable efforts have been made by a number of private industrial concerns, primarily by the VioBin Corp., Monticello, Ill., and the J. Howard Smith Co., at Lewes, Del. The VioBin Corp. is presently able to produce commercially sizable quantities of fish flour, whereas the J. Howard Smith Co. is not now in commercial production. These and other developments have been noted and will be described to the advisory group for objective evaluation.

2. Canada

Scientists at the Technological Station of the Canadian Fisheries Research Board in Halifax have been working for some time now on the problem of fish protein manufacture; at the moment, the station's research program is directed toward the production of the best fish protein concentrate that can possibly be manufactured, irrespective of cost. Our Canadian friends hope to produce a concentrate that might well, one day, be introduced on the U.S. market, both for use as a protein fortifier in various food products and in an attempt to compete on the casein and egg albumen markets. The careful and scientific manner in which the fish flour program is conducted at Halifax is impressive, but it appears that a number of outstanding important problems remain to be investigated. It is impossible to predict when a product of constant quality will be produced, and, needless to say, the Canadian method cannot be regarded as fully satisfactory, until and unless all remaining problems have been solved.

3. Central and South America

This journey was undertaken in December of last year with a twofold purpose: It was in the first place, to be part of the general fact-gathering program discussed earlier. Secondly, it was designed to assist FAO in their planned mass-feeding study in South America, in which refined fishmeals and fish flour are to be introduced into various local diets. In this connection, it was hoped to observe the state of readiness of the pilot plant, constructed and operated by UNICEF in Quintero, Chile; work has been going on here over the last years to manufacture fish protein concentrates on a semi-industrial scale. It was, furthermore, planned to investigate whether fishmeal plants were presently in operation in Peru, suitable for the sanitary production of a nondefatted and nondeodorized fishmeal that could be used in the proposed feeding studies.

The observations made during this journey are summarized as follows:

(a) A really cheap and nutritious protein supplement is most urgently required in almost all the countries of Central and South America that were visited;

(b) suitable raw material is available in sufficient quantities along the west coast of South America and on many parts of the east coast as well;

(c) no satisfactory process to manufacture fish protein concentrate exists today in Central and South America; and

(d) interest in fish protein concentrates is alive in Central and South American countries.

Indicative of the great value of the survey is the knowledge gained, for instance, of a process developed by Dr. Bertullo, a staff member of the University of Montevideo, Uruguay. This process is characteristic of the independent and energetic efforts that are being made in many places to develop manufacturing methods. During a survey of microorganisms associated with marine life, Dr. Bertullo isolated a new strain of yeast from a local species of fish. He discovered furthermore that this yeast had proteolytic activity, that is, that it was capable of breaking down proteins into amino acids. Inoculation with this yeast of a mass of comminuted fish, to which a small amount of molasses had been added, leads, within about 72 hours, to the production of a liquid mass. Bones, scales, etc., have disappeared during this process and so has the characteristic fishy odor and taste of the raw material, which is now rich in vitamin B_{12}. The product appears, on the basis of present experience, to have a remarkably long shelf life. I believe that this type of product may become increasingly important, not only because it lends itself by a process of spray-drying, to the production of a cheap dehydrated protein (or amino acid) flour, but also because it has, so far, shown itself to be of excellent nutritive value.

Independent efforts to develop a satisfactory processing method are also in progress at the University of Concepcion, Chile, and at the Government institute in San Salvador in Central America.

It is highly indicative that the Peruvian Ministry of Health and the Peruvian National Fisheries Society are very interested in the FAO campaign designed to test the value and acceptability of different types of fish protein concentrates introduced into the local diet. It was tentatively suggested by representatives of the Peruvian Government that the Ministry of Health would provide field services for these tests, and later for promotion campaigns. Ten locations in three different areas of Peru will be selected for these studies, each with approximately 3,000 people, centered around a school where health services are available.

None of the plants that I managed to see during my visit appeared to be suitable for the manufacture, under truly sanitary conditions, of a high grade, nondeodorized and nondefatted fish meal, nor a fully satisfactory fish protein concentrate. The Peruvian Fisheries Society, aware of this deficiency, is presently contemplating the construction of a model plant, created to realize the production of both a satisfactory sanitary fish meal and fish protein concentrate.

The UNICEF fish flour plant in Quintero, Chile, is still laboring under processing difficulties, but will, it is hoped, turn out quantities of experimental batches of fish flour that will then be evaluated. At the moment it looks as if cost of the product is still above the limits set for a product that could be used for nationwide distribution. Little is known, as yet, as to the quality of the product, its physical characteristics, and the possibility of producing a concentrate of constant nutritional value.

In conclusion, let me say that the successful, large-scale extraction of proteins from the seas for us in the human diet is today the ambition of a small number of engineers and scientists in many countries (including Soviet Russia), but will, once successfully accomplished, represent the beginning of an entirely new fishing industry; it will develop as explosively as the growth of world population; it will rank foremost in importance with but a few other industries, capable of producing a cheap, high-quality food, available to everyone, everywhere. We feel so confident about this trend that we consider it to be our duty to make a most vigorous effort for the United States to be in the vanguard of this advance.

[From the Boston Herald, Feb. 11, 1962]

FISHY FINDING

The Federal Food and Drug Administration has now made a formal finding that whole fish flour, as manufactured in New Bedford and other places in the United States, is an adulterated product under U.S. law and may not be sold in this country.

This is a great disappointment to Senators SALTONSTALL and SMITH and Representative HASTINGS KEITH, among others, who have been pushing the product as a cheap and abundant source of protein for millions of persons throughout the world who are now suffering from protein deficiency.

The FDA order does not prevent the export of whole fish flour to other countries. But it would be awkward, to say the least, to ship to Asia, Africa, and Latin America a food product that had been labeled unfit for human consumption in the United States. So the pure food men have effectively squelched a promising nutritional experiment.

Was the move justified? The Bay State legislators are convinced that the only legitimate objection to the carefully processed fish flour is aesthetic. Whole fish admittedly are unappetizing, but after they have been dried, defatted, deodorized, and reduced to a fine powder they appear to be as harmless as they are nutrition filled.

Representative KEITH has introduced a bill which would permit a new test. This adds a proviso to the Food and Drug Act that "no processed seafood product shall be deemed to be unfit for food because such processed seafood product is derived from whole fish, provided such product is processed under sanitary conditions and after processing is nutritious and in no manner harmful to the health of the consumer thereof."

The Keith amendment should pass, and the issue should then go back to FDA for review. If the flour is truly harmful to health, it can still be banned, but the burden of proof will be on the bureaucrats.

ABRAHAM RIBICOFF,
Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I would like to protest the ruling made on January 25 by Mr. George P. Larrick, Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration, that fish protein concentrate shall only be permitted for human consumption in the United States if made from beheaded, eviscerated fish.

I feel that the Commissioner's decision in this instance is irrelevant to the question at hand. The task of the FDA is to decide if any product is injurious or harmful to the American people—then to protect them from it. In past years, the agency has done this on many occasions with excellent results.

There is, however, little evidence that it has done so in this ruling. The ruling cites section 402(a)(3) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, which states, "A food is deemed to be adulterated if it consists in whole or in part in any filthy, putrid, or decomposed substance, or if it is otherwise unfit for food." It then ignores the criteria mentioned and makes an arbitrary decision that the American public would deem this food filthy if given the opportunity to use it. The FDA has, in fact, previously stated that fish protein is in no way harmful to human beings, much less a filthy or putrid product.

I do not understand why the FDA has chosen this instance to keep from the American people a product it says they would consider filthy, yet which is not by its own standards. Why hasn't it made a similar decision in the past to keep canned whole sardines, bottled whole fish, and such oddities as chocolate-covered grasshoppers, bees, and ants from the public?

The FDA claims, furthermore, that there is no apparent need for fish protein in the United States. I sincerely doubt that there is a country in the world where there is no need for an excellent protein food additive that can be produced for 15 cents a pound. One hundred ten million pounds of surplus food are distributed monthly to ill-fed families in this country alone. It is among people such as these, particularly in the mothers and young children, that you encounter the worst cases of protein deficiency. Fish protein could also be used beneficially to feed schoolchildren, older people, and hospital patients.

I feel it is time that this case was decided on its merits and on scientific evidence and not on interpretations of what the taste of the American public may or may not be. The FDA's ruling in this instance has served little purpose other than to render the product, if produced as directed, less nutritious and three times as expensive.

I ask that a proper hearing be set up on this subject before an impartial examiner as soon as possible.

Sincerely yours,
BENJAMIN A. SMITH.

TAXATION OF FOREIGN OPERATIONS: STATISTICS RELATING TO THE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, last week I addressed the Senate on the taxation of American private foreign investments and operations. At that time, I pointed out that, in my view, excessive flows of dollars were being siphoned off to Europe for investments in manufacturing plants which were competing with our domestic industry both in our export markets and in our own domestic markets, that this activity was worsening our balance-of-payments problems and weakening the domestic economy by shipping jobs out of the country.

At that time, also, I showed the relationship between our preferential tax treatment of profits earned abroad and the excessive outflow of funds. Specifically I recommended that our tax laws be altered so as, among other things, to: First, terminate the deferral privilege for subsidiaries whereby they may delay the payment of the U.S. income tax until funds are actually repatriated; second, rectify the faulty gross-up provision now in the Internal Revenue Code; and third, terminate tax haven abuses.

The President has made recommendations similar to these.

Those who defend our existing preferential tax treatment of foreign operations—generally those who are profiting excessively from it—attempt to bolster their case by citing statistics which seem to show that all direct investment activities are beneficial and create a net inflow of funds. I want to examine and discuss some of our balance-of-payments statistics relating to foreign investment and try to explain just what these statistics do show—and what they conceal.

I know that statistics are pretty dull. They are often hard to obtain in a form suitable to the purpose at hand. Once obtained, they are sometimes difficult of proper interpretation.

Some people seem to feel they can prove or disprove any proposition by statistics, that they can obtain statistics to support any side of a question. But this is true only when one chooses to bolster his argument by selecting statistics which are incomplete, inaccurate, or subject to misinterpretation.

Statistics are stubborn things. Statistics do not lie—although some would seek to misinform by using misleading statistics.

Statistics relating to our balance of payments are important, and need to be understood by all of us if we are to formulate intelligent decisions affecting the balance of payments, gold loss and dollar drain. Everyone agrees that we have a balance-of-payments problem which must be solved. One part of this solution lies in changing our method of taxation of certain types of foreign operations.

Even though they may be somewhat dull and difficult, we must look at our balance-of-payments statistics and see which figures may be affected by tax laws, and note how they might be affected by tax laws, and note how they might be affected by recommended changes in those laws.

DIRECT SUBSIDIARY INVESTMENT

The statistics in which we are primarily interested in this connection concern one type of private foreign investment—direct subsidiary investment. There are several types of foreign private investment, and their intermingling and confusion in our published statistics often lead to the first area of misunderstanding.

The income from foreign investment is important to our balance of payments. Except for exports of merchandise, it constitutes the largest item on the plus side of the ledger. In 1960, for example, exports of merchandise amounted to $19.4 billion, of which about $14 billion was nonagricultural. Income from foreign investments amounted to $3.2 billion, certainly an important item. Of this amount, direct investment income amounted to $2.3 billion. We ought to be receiving a much greater return from foreign operations. This, it seems to me, is out of proportion and I shall have more to say on this point.

But for the time being, in order to narrow down the field to the point where we can consider that part of foreign direct investment which would be affected by proposed changes in taxation, let us look briefly at the different types of foreign investment. These are:

First. Short term: This is often referred to as "hot money" and is thought to flow into and out of the country in response to such stimuli as interest rates, safety of funds, and convertibility of currencies. This type of capital flow would be little affected by proposed tax changes unless, as I strongly suspect, some of the funds which leave the United States as "hot money" are converted to long-term foreign investment.

Let me make this one observation, somewhat parenthetically. Most of the world's industrial and trading countries place some sort of positive controls on the flow of hot money, the major exceptions being West Germany and the United States. West Germany has had controls in the past and likely would not hesitate to reimpose them at any time such controls appeared to serve her own national interest. Such capital flows are highly volatile and of questionable value to the international community. Indeed, this hot flow needs to be slowed down at times. In this country we have sought to slow these outflows by raising short-term interest rates, thereby hoping to keep these funds in New York banks. But this is a heavy price to pay, and all of us pay it. We bid fair to hobble our entire economy in this way. To me, it makes little sense to try to outbid London or Frankfurt banks for funds on the basis of interest rates when, in the process, the whole interest rate structure of our domestic economy is pushed up. But a discussion of this point is beyond the scope of my remarks today.

Second. Portfolio: This type of foreign investment is generally of a long-term character and was formerly composed largely of foreign securities purchased in New York by U.S. taxpayers. Now, however, a great many corporate and individual U.S. taxpayers are purchasing securities abroad. This type of investment would be affected very little by proposed tax changes.

Third. Direct: This type of investment is the one we generally have in mind when we talk about the foreign activities of American corporations. This includes investment in foreign corporations or other enterprises largely owned or controlled by American companies. It also includes investment in branches of American businesses operating abroad. This is the type of foreign investment which competes with our domestic economy both here at home and in oversea markets. This is the type of foreign investment which would be affected by the changes in tax laws proposed by the Kennedy administration.

It is, then, with respect to direct foreign investment for which we want to find appropriate statistics. Even so, not even all foreign direct investment would be materially affected by the proposed tax changes. This is true because a great deal of our foreign direct investment is in petroleum and mining operations, and these are generally organized in branch form. The removal of the deferral tax privilege for foreign subsidiaries and the tightening up on tax haven abuses would have little or no bearing upon the operations or the taxation of the profits of branches, since all of their profits are already taxed annually by the United States.

The specific statistics to which I seek to direct attention, then, are those related to capital outflows of new money going into foreign subsidiaries of U.S. corporations and the inflows of dollars from earnings and profits which may be repatriated from such subsidiaries.

STATISTICAL INADEQUACIES

Two caveats should be considered by those who seek to examine our published statistics relating to foreign direct investment.

First, our statistics on capital flows are far from adequate. There are a great many things we would like to know about dollar flows which we simply do not know. Our figures do appear, however, to be sufficiently reliable to show trends from year to year. They are valid, however, only as approximations, there being no mandatory reporting of oversea movements of funds. The Commerce Department compiles direct investment statistics on the basis of questionnaires sent out to a few hundred corporations. Some do not respond; some do. The sample of companies is usually out of date and not well balanced. Under these circumstances, the figures which are reported are likely to be neither highly accurate in detail nor very reliable for conclusion.

Second—and this will require some explanation—it would appear that our capital outflows of all types have been understated in recent years. This observation is based upon the Commerce Department's detailed study of foreign investment activities for 1957, and on the violent swing taken by the unrecorded transactions figure over the past 3 years.

The Commerce Department made a detailed study of our foreign business operations for the year 1957. This study took some time to complete, and was not published until 1960. It was based on compulsory reporting in this specific instance, and the statistics it developed for that 1 year appear to be valid. This study showed that direct investment capital outflow for the year 1957 amounted to nearly $2½ billion, considerably larger than previously estimated. Two things are noteworthy about this statement. First, it is admitted that our regular statistical data relating to capital outflow are nothing more than estimates. Second, it is admitted that our regular statistics, specifically those for direct foreign investment—and this is the type we are interested in for tax purposes—were understated in our regular statistics for 1957. The regular statistics for that year show direct investment capital outflow of $2.058 billion. This is an understatement for that year of about 20 percent. It naturally leads one to wonder if direct investment capital outflows for other recent years may be similarly understated in our published statistics.

An internal examination of our balance of payments figures will give further proof that our statistics for at least the past 2 years understate capital outflows. The errors and omissions figure, usually large, took a violent swing of about $1.8 billion between 1959 and 1960 in the direction of unrecorded outflows.

Those who arrive at our balance-of-payments statistics approach the problem in two ways in seeking to determine just how we stand each year in our payments to and from foreigners. First, estimates are determined from the best available data as to just what is happening in exports, imports, capital flows, and so on. These estimates are then set down as recorded transactions. This is something of a misnomer, but these figures do reflect what is thought to be taking place. In this way, a deficit or a surplus on recorded transactions is constructed or determined.

The problem is then approached from a different direction. The gold outflow or inflow is set down, as is the increase or decrease in liquid dollar holdings by foreign countries and international financial institutions. These figures are thought to be reasonably accurate, though not entirely so. The algebraic sum of these two figures should give us the same surplus or deficit figure that was obtained from our recorded transactions.

But these figures never exactly balance out. For most years it has taken a positive figure, that is, a figure indicating an understatement of inflows, to balance. In 1960, however, as I have said, the swing was the other way and it took a large negative figure to create a bookkeeping balance.

Officials of the Commerce Department noted this shift in 1960 and observed:

> Very large shifts in capital movements are also indicated by the changes in the balance on unrecorded transactions from net receipts of nearly $800 million in 1959 to net payments of over $1 billion in 1960. The difference between the average (for recent years) of $600 million net receipts and the 1960 balance of net payments of about $1 billion may give a measure of the unrecorded capital outflows.

Although the official detailed figures have not yet been released for 1961, it would appear that this large unrecorded capital outflow item will show up again in last year's statistics. In the 1961 preliminary figures which have been made public, it would seem that the Commerce Department again assumed a capital outflow for direct investment of about $1.7 billion, the same figure which was assumed for 1960. In my opinion, this again understates this capital outflow.

But let us proceed on the basis of the figures we do have, recognizing that they are approximations and that they do understate capital outflows.

SUBSIDIARY OUTFLOWS

All direct investment taken together, whether in branch or subsidiary form, whether located in developed or underdeveloped countries, whether for manufacturing, mining, or petroleum operations, showed for the years 1957 through 1960 a net inflow of about $2.2 billion, or an average inflow of $550 million per year. On the basis of this figure alone, it would appear that foreign direct investment is of some positive assistance in achieving a favorable balance of payments. But this is neither all of the truth nor specifically appropriate to the pending issue.

Let us look a little further. Let us break down these figures between activities carried on in developed and underdeveloped countries and between foreign activities organized in branch and subsidiary forms.

During the 1957–60 period there was a net inflow from underdeveloped areas of $3.4 billion. But there was a net outflow to the developed countries of $1.2 billion. Activities in the developed countries, then, have not been paying their way from a balance-of-payments standpoint. At the same time we are taking more capital out of the underdeveloped countries than we are putting in—and these are the countries and areas which are so much in need of capital for development.

Let us carry this one step further. It so happens that most of our investments in underdeveloped areas are in the extractive industries, principally petroleum. It also happens that these operations are generally organized in branch form so as to be able to take advantage of the percentage depletion formula by which petroleum operations, whether foreign or domestic, escape paying any appreciable U.S. income tax.

In the developed areas, on the other hand, our direct investments center around manufacturing. This generally is organized in subsidiary form.

The proposed changes in the taxation of foreign operations would have practically no effect on branch operations. They would have some effect on subsidiary operations. Let us look a little more closely, then, at statistics relating to subsidiaries.

Subsidy operations definitely affect adversely our balance of payments. For the period 1957–60 new money sent to European and Canadian subsidiaries of U.S. corporations amounted to $3.1 billion. During the same period, dividends remitted from these subsidiaries amounted to only $2.4 billion. This constitutes a drain on the balance of payments of almost $700 million.

Furthermore, we should not be satisfied even if there were no drain on dollars and gold from these subsidiary operations. Equity and fairness in tax policy require changes in tax law. Moreover, direct investments of all types should make a positive contribution to the balance of payments. We cannot expect increased exports to carry the whole load. Taking our domestic operations as a guide, we find that dividends paid by domestic corporations in 1960 amounted to more than 160 percent of new money going into these corporations. With this as a guide, our foreign corporate subsidiaries ought to be sending home in dividends at least 60 percent more than new money we send abroad to pump into them. Perhaps they should send back even more, since we are often told that profits abroad are higher than at home. On this basis, then, during the period 1957–60 our European and Canadian subsidiaries should have remitted and repatriated $5 billion—more than twice the amount actually sent home.

On the basis of the domestic dividend-new capital ratio, our European and Canadian subsidiaries should be contributing $500 million per year on the credit side of the balance of payments, rather than almost $200 million per year on the debit side. Applying this yardstick to all subsidiaries, it would appear that our foreign subsidiaries could together contribute a $1 billion improvement each year in our balance of payments. This is about half the estimated $2 billion which is needed to correct our basic balance of payments deficit.

The tax changes which have been proposed would assist materially in encouraging foreign subsidiaries to pay their way. More dividends would be repatriated. Perhaps less new money would be sent abroad for manufacturing plants in Europe. A smaller percentage of profits would be hidden away from reparation and taxation in tax havens. And income earned by foreign subsidiaries would bear a fair share of the national tax burden annually.

NONGOVERNMENT STATISTICS

The statistics I have been using are the best available. I think they understate capital outflows, for the reasons I have given.

Some of the witnesses who came before the Ways and Means Committee last summer, and who will, I hope, appear before the Finance Committee later this spring, were not at all satisfied with our official statistics and brought their own. Because their statistics have received so much publicity, and because it appears likely that they may have misled a few people, I should like to discuss them. Some of these statistics, typified by those presented by Mr. H. J. Heinz II on behalf of 19 companies, present an entirely different conclusion than do the official statistics I have cited.

Let us examine Mr. Heinz' statistics. In my view, Mr. Heinz has brought his own lamp to the sundial. This may be a comforting way to reenforce a point of view already strongly held or to buttress an argument, but it may not be very helpful in really understanding the problem at hand.

The statistics Mr. Heinz furnished the Ways and Means Committee are so favorable to foreign subsidiary operations that, if one accepts these statistics as being valid, he must conclude that the more of our factories we move to Europe the stronger will be our domestic economy and the more easily will our payments to and from foreigners be balanced. Eureka.

Mr. Heinz stated that he represented 19 companies in compiling and presenting his statistics and that these U.S. corporations represented somewhat over 5 percent of the total U.S. investment in manufacturing abroad.

These companies are: American Machine & Foundry Co., Armco International Co., Cabot Corp., Continental Can Co., Corn Products Co., Eastman Kodak Co., General Electric Co., Goodyear International Corp., H. J. Heinz Co., Merck Sharp & Dohme International., Monsanto Chemical Co., Otis Elevator Co., Pfaudler Permutit Co., Pfizer International, Inc., Ritter Co., Inc., Taylor Instrument Companies, Texas Butadiene & Chemical Corp., the Procter & Gamble Co., and Union Carbide Corp.

Mr. Heinz further stated that the companies I have just mentioned had asked him to appear as their spokesman. Mr. Albert E. Sawyer, an accountant, was retained to gather the statistical data used.

Did the managers of this group of companies just happen to get together for this purpose? After examining some of the statistics cited, I have become most curious to learn just who first retained Mr. Sawyer, who paid him, who contacted the particular companies, and how many other companies' books or statements were examined and discarded because they did not fit a predetermined pattern.

Interestingly enough, these companies seem to have little in common. An odd fact with which one is struck is that, in the case of four of the companies listed, the companies are subsidiaries of a parent corporation. I am led to wonder whether the inclusion of data for all the foreign subsidiary operations of the parent U.S. corporations would have altered the pattern.

Armco, for example, has a large operation in Canada as well as other foreign operations which do not appear to be a part of Armco International.

Merck Sharp & Dohme International is a subsidiary of Merck & Co. I have been informed that the parent corporation established several new foreign subsidiaries during 1960, and that these new subsidiaries are not subsidiaries of Merck Sharp & Dohme International. Presumably, these new operations called for some outflow of new money. Why were these not included?

I do not know the reason why each of these 19 companies was selected for this list, or why only these were included. A brief examination raises some interesting questions. For example, the General Electric Co. appears to have repatriated $7.9 million from foreign earnings of $8.4 million from its nonconsolidated subsidiaries in 1959. This is a very high percentage of repatriation. Otis Elevator changed its bookkeeping in 1960. As a result its foreign subsidiaries paid three dividends in that one year. Though I do not know whether these untypical facts caused these companies to be included, one can see that if a company is selected which has a large inflow of funds usually, or for one particular year, it would, of course, distort the statistics for a small sample like this, making the summary or conclusion more unrepresentative and untypical of the general facts.

With the knowledge that these figures may present a distorted picture, let us examine them in some detail.

Let us consider, first, dividends repatriated by these subsidiaries. The foreign subsidiaries owned by these 19 companies sent home during the 1957–60 period, according to Mr. Heinz, $141 million more in dividends than the parent companies sent abroad in new money. Multiplying this by 20, since these companies represent about 5 percent of U.S. manufacturing abroad, we would conclude that all foreign U.S. manufacturing subsidiaries sent home, during this 4-year period, $2.8 billion more in dividends than they took out of the country in new money. This is a rather large figure, particularly when we compare it with our official figures. According to our official statistics all our foreign direct investment, branch and subsidiary of all types combined, sent home only $2.2 billion more than they took out during these same 4 years. Furthermore, as I have pointed out, subsidiaries, at least those in Europe and Canada where our principal manufacturing activities are located, according to our official statistics caused an actual drain on the balance of payments.

Our official statistics appear, as I have said, to understate outflows, but no matter how inaccurate they are, or in which direction, they could not conceivably be this far off. Petroleum alone accounts for half our inflow, yet Mr. Heinz would have us believe that manufacturing subsidiaries contribute billions of dollars on the plus side of the balance of payments through dividends remitted.

To pin this down, let us look at the year 1957. As I have pointed out, we do have good statistics for that year, based on compulsory reporting. According to these figures for 1957, compiled by the Commerce Department, all our foreign direct investment activities sent home $2.249 billion in earnings and profits. About half of this came from petroleum. Only about one-fifth of it, or $429 million, came from manufacturing. Yet Mr. Heinz claims that foreign subsidiaries of his 19 companies sent home in 1957 $64.8 million in dividends. Extrapolating this figure, one would assume that all manufacturing subsidiaries would have remitted dividends in 1957 in the amount of $1.296 billion. This misses the mark by a factor of three.

Mr. Heinz' other figures appear just about as unreliable. He piles on hundreds of millions of dollars in dividends, fees, and exports which he attributes to the activities of foreign subsidiaries of U.S. manufacturing corporations.

Let us look at the export figures which Mr. Heinz cited. He claimed that these 19 companies, representing about 5 percent of our foreign manufacturing, had exports generated by their own direct foreign investments in 1960 of $595.1 million. Multiplying this by 20, we would conclude that all foreign direct investment activities of U.S. manufacturing corporations for that year accounted for about $12 billion in exports. But our total nonagricultural exports in 1960 amounted to only about $14 billion.

These export figures seemed so outlandish that the Treasury Department asked the Commerce Department to try to arrive at some proper comparable figure. The Commerce Department queried our larger manufacturing companies and got replies from 155 of them, accounting for 80 percent of all manufacturing investments abroad. These companies credited their foreign subsidiaries with generating $2.7 billion in exports in 1960.

To credit almost 90 percent of our nonagricultural exports to the activities of the direct foreign investment activities of U.S. manufacturing corporations, which appears to be the implication of Mr. Heinz' testimony, certainly strains logic. Yet some people seemed impressed.

The same types and amounts of exports can be, and are, generated by aggressive selling, by licensing arrangements, or by any other form of exposure of a foreign buying public to American products. For example, Borg-Warner licensed a South African company to produce one of its refrigerators. The licensee purchased from Borg-Warner other types and sizes of refrigerators produced in the United States to round out its line. As a result, Borg-Warner has increased its exports of refrigerators to South Africa from 600 to 3,500 per year.

There is no more logic in crediting large amounts of exports cited by Mr. Heinz to subsidiary activities than there is in crediting to a wholesaler's retail activities all the goods sold through retail stores which he happens to own directly. The wholesaler might well have sold a larger quantity of goods had he closed his own retail chain and wholesaled to 8 or 10 competing retailers.

It so happens that these companies cited by Mr. Heinz also show a large income from royalties and licensing and management fees. In the case of these companies it is claimed that these fees originate in their own subsidiaries. The implication is that without subsidiaries there are no fees of this sort to be collected abroad by U.S. corporations. This is not at all correct.

Many U.S. corporations collect large amounts of fees of this type from foreign operations other than their own subsidiaries. I do not have a breakdown on these statistics, but I would invite attention to an article which appeared in the Wall Street Journal on June 14, 1961, in which certain companies' licensing arrangements are detailed. It was pointed out in this article that a great many of our large companies use licensing arrangements in preference to setting up foreign subsidiaries. Bendix Corp., for example, is said to have over 400 licensing agreements in effect abroad and to have received about $2.9 million in royalties in 1960. According to this article there are now more than 12,000 licensing agreements in effect between American companies and foreign companies. In my opinion, a representative list of U.S. companies would show a large amount of royalties and licensing fees originating in foreign companies neither owned nor controlled by an American corporation.

Now, I am not accusing Mr. Heinz of coming to the Congress with deliberately distorted statistics. Special pleading is not unusual even if that should have been the case. But I look forward to the opportunity of raising some questions with him when he appears before the Finance Committee later this year.

As I said in the beginning, statistics are dull things. They are also stubborn. When understood, they are most useful. Sometimes they play the petard to those who engineer them.

The statistics which the Treasury has presented show conclusively that foreign subsidiaries are contributing to the deficit in the balance of payments. I think the Secretary of the Treasury can defend his statistics.

EFFECTS OF PROPOSED TAX CHANGES

The changes which have been proposed by the President, by me, and by others in the taxation of the income and profits of foreign corporations owned and controlled by U.S. taxpayers are reasonable and necessary.

These tax changes would not prevent foreign activities now carried on by domestic corporations. Payment of taxes on an annual basis would be required. And why not? Many corporations have prospered abroad in branch form, paying annual U.S. taxes on profits earned abroad the same as on profits earned at home. Many such other opportunities still exist.

These tax changes would slow down somewhat the flow of capital to Europe and other already industrialized areas. They certainly would alter decisions which are now made on tax grounds, removing the tax subsidy for export of capital and industry. These changes would also encourage the repatriation of more funds as profits are earned.

I hope my colleagues will study the statistics I have cited today, as well as any others they may obtain from other sources. We should reach decisions on the basis of the best possible information. We should understand as clearly as possible just what is causing this rush of manufacturing plants to Europe.

I say in all sincerity that if changes in the tax laws will not slow down the export of our factories, we will be forced to take other, more direct, and more drastic steps.

PROPOSED DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, inasmuch as only 1 hour will be permitted for debate on the motion to discharge the Committee on Government Operations from further consideration of Senate Resolution 288, I wish to explain very clearly my views concerning the President's proposal to establish a Department of Urban Affairs.

I might say at this point, Mr. President, I hope very much the motion will be defeated soundly tomorrow, because I do not think it represents sound legislative procedure. I have a feeling that our distinguished majority leader would not follow this procedure except for the great pressure which is being brought to bear on him at the present time.

Mr. President, the President of the United States has determined in one way or another to fulfill a campaign promise to establish in the Federal Government a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. He is apparently convinced that any mandate which his small majority of popular vote might have given him requires that he conform to the wishes of a small, special-interest group in three or four of our larger cities—those who have, in the recent past, clamored so loudly for some recognition on the Federal level of what they call the plight of our urban centers. With apologies to the inimitable Winston Churchill, it is appropriate to observe that never before has so much been offered to so few by one man.

This Department of Urban Affairs neither will be necessary to accomplish its intended purpose; nor will it be sufficient to accomplish anything other than to insure the votes of a small segment of urban politicians. It is, indeed, a sop to special interest. Worse that this, the devious means through which the administration has chosen to create this new Department imbues this New Frontier with political overtones not unlike attributes of the world's oldest profession.

If this new Department is necessary, the people will endorse its creation. If it is not, there should be no attempt to use Executive power to force upon this Nation the whims of special interest.

I should like to demonstrate to the Senate that this Department as conceived by the administration will accomplish nothing other than to increase the size and wasteful character of the Federal Government. I should like to show you how this is attempted to be done through means which, at best may be described as devious, duplicitous and deceitful.

I have said the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing is not necessary to accomplish what its proponents refer to as its purposes. The administration proposal would, as outlined in the Committee Report No. 879, accompanying S. 1633:

> Confer Cabinet departmental status on the Housing and Home Finance Agency; elevate the level of national attention to the problems * * * in urban areas; provide an urban spokesman at the "Cabinet table"; "coordinate housing and other urban programs of the Federal Government; (and) strengthen the ties of intergovernmental relationships among local, State, regional and Federal levels * * *; and more efficiently and effectively organize housing and urban functions of the Federal Government.

Mr. President, the reorganization plan which is presently pending in the Senate, is little different from S. 1633, its predecessor bill. Its simple language, however, is deceptively innocuous. The intent of both is the same, and the effect of the passage of either will bring upon us havoc of equal intensity. Further, I am quite certain that the full import of the bill itself will not be long delayed in being brought before the Congress should the reorganization plan be approved.

To implement this grandiose scheme, the report states:

> The programs and functions initially to be administered by the Department would be those now vested in the Housing and Home Finance Agency. No new programs would be established by the bill, nor would existing provisions of substantive law be altered.

Here, Mr. President, is the crux of the matter. The proposal to establish this new Department provides for functions as large as all outdoors. It opens a Pandora's box for further expansion beyond present comprehension, and provides an opportunity for this Parkinsonian colossus to invade the present domains of virtually every other previously established department of the Federal Government. The Department will concern itself with coordination, whatever that might mean, of urban programs relating to housing, recreation, mass transportation, health, industrial planning in urban centers, air and water pollution, location of airports, if you please, and even the wise use of open land in and near urban areas. These and other functions one may envision in this massive zoning board from a casual perusal of the hearings and report of the Senate Committee on Government Operations and the President's message to the Congress.

To accomplish these many and varied purposes, however, the administration would have us believe that, in fact, it wants only to give Cabinet status to the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

The distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], has said no less than three times in his testimony to the subcommittee that the bill simply confers status upon the Housing and Home Finance Agency. Other proponents of the plan have echoed this.

The President himself, indeed has indicated as much. A report from the Washington Post of January 25 of this year on the President's disappointment over the House Rules Committee's rejection of the Urban Affairs Department bill, states:

> His [the President's] bill would simply have upgraded Weaver's Housing and Home Finance Agency to Cabinet status.

Here too, however, a wider, more invidious import is indicated.

That article continues:

> But the hope evidently was to bring scattered related functions into it [the Department] later.

The distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania, however, was questioned by the distinguished junior Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], a member of the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations, concerning section 2 of the bill, and the opinion of some persons that that section might be too loosely worded and an invitation to expansion beyond the limits of current services performed by the Federal Government. The distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania then admitted that that section of the bill did refer to things like the promotion of effective mass transportation within urban areas and the provision of open space, which are not yet Federal policy.

There, then, is the admission by the principal sponsor of the establishment of this Department in the Senate, that the proposal goes very far beyond simply status for the HHFA, and that its real intention is to plan ahead to provide a Department to perform functions which are not yet even Federal policy to preempt from the States and local governments.

I have said that the creation of the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing is not necessary. I believe that. It is not necessary for the purpose of giving status to the various housing functions of the Federal Government. Mr. Weaver, whom I regard, and who is regarded generally, as one of the most capable public servants presently heading any Government agency in Washington, does not need status most effectively to perform his job. He is eminently capable. There is no restriction upon the President to invite him to Cabinet meetings, nor to have him present at all of them as a matter of course. If there is such a restriction, or if Mr. Weaver is prevented from total effectiveness in his job, it is certainly through no fault or deficiency of his own. I submit that it is perhaps through some unwillingness of the President or his advisors to give to the office of Administrator of the HHFA the ear of the White House which it so fully deserves.

I submit, as I think the statements of the proponents of the creation of this new Department will amply prove, that they are not concerned at all with department rank for the housing functions of the Federal Government, nor for Mr. Weaver himself. It is rather that they wish to accomplish through enlargement of the Federal Government—that which they have been unable to do, so they say, in their respective States—that is: complete domination of the State legislatures by the few city politicians who control the affairs of our large cities. And, that this is true is shown by the precise language of the bill, S. 1633, after which the proposed reorganization plan is patterned. It gives special consideration to the special problems of small towns and communities, and, again for the purposes of this act, the terms "urban areas and urban communities" are intended to include all communities, regardless of size, whether incorporated or unincorporated. Under such an all encompassing definition, even two small homes in the smallest hamlet in the United States can be considered to be urban, and, therefore, within the jurisdiction of this new Department. Virtually no person in the United States would be excluded from the purview of this new Department. Thus, the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing is by its own definition a department of national affairs, practically without limit with respect to jurisdictional outlines. Thus, effectively bypassing the State government, the urban planner would become, through regulation of Federal legislation which would in large part be initiated through that Department, the Federal overlord of every homeowner and landholder in the entire United States.

Mr. President, the attempt to create this Department of Urban Affairs and Housing is not only unnecessary, it is, in simple language, bad. If it seeks simply to give status to the housing functions of the Government, then it is among the most flagrant wastes of the public funds ever conceived by a national administration. In supergrade public service jobs alone, the proposed Department will be authorized to fill more positions of such caliber than can five other of the long-established Departments of the Federal Government. Admittedly, the reorganization plan does not touch on this subject of supergrade positions as did S. 1633. But which of us can suppose that if this Department is created, it will be only a matter of a very short time indeed before the entire bill will be before the Congress for adoption.

The administration seeks to give status to Federal housing functions. Yet none of the proponents of this plan has suggested that the housing functions of either the Veterans' Administration or the Home Loan Bank Board be included in the new Department. And these two agencies together insure over 63 percent of the home mortgage market in the United States.

I am not suggesting that these two worthwhile agencies should be included in this new Department. Nor, apparently for political reasons, do the proponents of this Department. Anyone in this Chamber, or in the galleries, can imagine the great cry of protest which would be raised throughout this country if such an attempt was made. I am, however, suggesting that neither does status require that any of the other agencies proposed to be herded into this departmental fence, should be downgraded into an urbanized vacuum cleaner of administrative detail. Expenditure of Federal funds solely for encouragement of symbols of status, I submit, is bad.

If creation of this Department is intended for the purpose of spending much of our time searching out functions for it to perform that could better be performed where they are now, and I submit that that is its real purpose, then it is also bad. Or, if its purpose is to duplicate or embrace unto itself functions of most of the presently established departments, and having read the hearings and committee reports on the bill, S. 1633, and the administration's statements on the plan, I am certain it will do just that, then it is bad.

In sum, Mr. President, there has been no demonstration of need for this Department other than hints through spurious platitudes that Cabinet status alone will provide an avenue of approach to the Federal till for urban planners who will not do for themselves those things which they blame State legislatures for not doing for them.

Mr. President, not only do I think there has been no need demonstrated for a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing; I have also said that efforts to create it apparently will be sufficient only to serve partisan political ends.

I have shown that one of its purposes is to provide more room at the Federal trough for the dispensation by city politicians of largesse and political favor. In addition to this, the administration has, more flagrantly than I would have imagined probable, injected into this issue the race question in attempt to remove focus of this debate on the establishment of this Department from the merits of the question to the issue of whether or not the Administrator of Housing and Home Finance Agency, Mr. Weaver, should be confirmed to a Cabinet post. A Cabinet post, indeed, which does not exist. I submit, Mr. President, that not being a member of either, I find it unnecessary to complain that this administration has used the Metropolitan and Cosmos clubs as "whipping boys" on the question of race relations. I am, however, as a Member of the U.S. Senate, entitled, indeed obliged, to object vehemently to the President's use of racism, to the elimination of which he has given so much lipservice, as a means to mollify his own political cronies and those of some few urban political bosses.

In all my years in both Houses of the Congress, I have remained consistent in my statements and in my votes, in my endorsement of all civil rights proposals which seek to eliminate the question of race from the American scene. I deplore situations which continue to exist in this country which discriminate against a citizen because of the color of his skin or the nature of his belief in God. But, Mr. President, I deplore equally the use by the administration of such nefarious tactics in an attempt to ram through the Congress a proposal of absolutely no necessity, no justifiable purpose, and of no benefit to the United States or its citizens. I can think of no greater disservice to all the people of this country than has been done so recently by this administration. I can think of nothing more appropriate at this time than that the administration should offer apology to the Negro population of the United States for its inexcusable use of their race for purely political ends.

Mr. President, we are asked here not to legislate simply to assent or veto. It is true that in the case either of properly introduced legislation or a negatively approached reorganization plan, the Congress will consider the creation of the Department of Urban Affairs. But there, the similarity between the two approaches ends.

In the case of a bill, the Congress itself legislates—it thus exercises its primary constitutional function. The bill could be amended, revised, rewritten or—as has happened in this case, and I think properly so—it could have been refused a rule in the House. Such procedure has been followed in the case of each of the other Cabinet Departments which have been created in the executive branch of our Government. It is equally appropriate to the instant matter.

On the other hand, the administration in this case, has chosen to pursue a course totally without precedent, and in my judgment, of questionable constitutionality. It seeks to open the door to vast projects—largely useless things—through the device of congressional veto of executive legislation. To permit this to occur, Congress shirks its duty; Congress does not delegate—it rather abdicates what could someday amount to total power; and, having done so, Congress would deserve its then subordinate role of sniveling, fawning beggar before the prince of new departures.

In my judgment, the methods and means employed by the administration in its effort to establish a Department of Urban Affairs can only be construed as a big city war level type of approach.

It is politics at its worst. It is a baldfaced attempt to corral votes by strengthening the relations between the administration and metropolitan area political bosses. It is a deliberate attempt to arouse racial passions and to create dissension and discord among the American people for purely partisan political purposes.

At a time when our country is engaged in a life or death struggle, at a time when maximum national unity is essential to our survival as a nation, and at a time when sound fiscal policies are of supreme importance, such conduct on the part of any administration is indefensible.

I am sorry, Mr. President, that the administration has, in this instance, chosen to degrade itself and act in derogation of the interests of the people of the United States. But, since this has happened, I have no alternative other than to vote against the proposal to establish a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a series of articles on the Common Market which recently appeared in the Portland Daily Reporter be inserted in the RECORD.

The author of this series of articles, Mary Ann Campbell, recently returned from a trip to Europe where she obtained firsthand information on the Common Market and other European economic developments. I highly recommend these articles for those interested in a more detailed explanation of the benefits to be derived from the European Economic Community.

I ask unanimous consent that this series appear at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Portland (Oreg.) Daily Reporter, Jan. 18, 1962]

THE COMMON MARKET—I: EUROPEAN ECONOMIC COMMUNITY BASIS FOR POLITICAL, ECONOMIC UNIFICATION

(By Mary Ann Campbell)

On the map of Europe, draw a penciled outline, starting at the Danish-German border. Follow down the North Sea coast, around the Hook of Holland and along the French channel ports. From Brittany continue to Biarritz, the fashionable playground of exiled royalty, and cut across the Pyrenees to the Mediterranean. Trail your pencil along the Riviera to Italy and outline the boot from its high heel to its frilled top. Dodge around the western edge of Switzerland and continue up the line that cuts Germany into east and west, back to the starting point.

You have just drawn a map of the Common Market of Europe, which includes the Netherlands, Belgium, Luxembourg, France, Italy, and West Germany.

This area, which contains the largest industrial and agricultural components in Western Europe, has its headquarters in Brussels. I spent last weekend there, talking with former Portland newspaperman Robert Dorang, who is now the only American in the Common Market's information section. Dorang has been with the Common Market since last April, when he left the Washington, D.C., bureau of the Wall Street Journal to accept the position in Europe.

Dorang reminded me that this six-nation segment provides the food and manufactured goods that keep Europe alive.

Formerly separated by sharply drawn nationalistic lines across which armies have marched three times in the past 90 years, the region is rapidly becoming a unified coalition, growing stronger with each passing month.

The European Economic Community, the formal name for the Common Market, established by the Treaty of Rome in March 1957, is creating an economic union of 170 million people by the establishment of a vast, single internal market. From this economic union, Common Market members along with the European Coal and Steel Community and the European Atomic Energy Community (Euratom) are looking forward to the day when Europe will be united politically as well as economically.

In the official listing of the aims of these organizations, the final and perhaps most important is "to set up institutions which will form the basis for a future United States of Europe."

This goal is no idle dream.

The ECSC, the Common Market, and Euratom are all governed through the council of ministers, the only community organization whose members are national representatives; the 142-memter European parliament and a supreme court of seven judges.

The parliament, divided into political groups (Christian Democrat, Social, and Liberal) rather than along national lines, is at present elected by the legislatures of the member countries, but direct universal suffrage will be established in the future.

After centuries of bitter rivalry, Europeans are discovering they can work together for a common good.

"As a German, I've always hated the French," said one member of the Common Market organization at the headquarters in Brussels. "I never imagined I could sit down and talk with the French at the same table, but I'm doing it. We get along very well, too."

On the train from Nuremberg to Brussels, I talked about the Common Market with a textile manufacturer from Milan, who travels throughout the world on business for his firm.

"The United States of Europe is coming soon," he said. "Europe must become the third great world power. We cannot go back, that would be disaster. With the Common Market, we can only go forward."

A group of German teenagers was asked by an American reporter if they thought of themselves primarily as Europeans or Germans. Without hesitation, they replied that they regard themselves as Europeans first, then Germans.

In Brussels, a little girl attending the school maintained for the children of families working in the three community organizations, was asked what country she was from.

"We're from Euratom," she piped happily.

[From the Portland (Oreg.) Daily Reporter, Jan. 19, 1962]

THE COMMON MARKET—II: CONCESSIONS, BASIC AGRICULTURAL PLAN VITAL REQUISITES TO FINAL AGREEMENT

(By Mary Ann Campbell)

The United States and the six countries that are members of the European Economic Community, better known as the Common Market, have agreed on a mutual cut of 20 percent in tariffs on industrial products and some reductions on agricultural products.

Working out concessions was one of the most urgent steps, according to Hugo de Grood, an official at the Common Market headquarters in Brussels with whom I talked.

De Grood, whose title is chief of the North American section, department of external relations, felt the two parties needed a basic agricultural policy before finishing the recent negotiations.

"The Common Market is primarily a European organization," De Grood explained. "Other countries may associate themselves with us—in fact, we welcome them—but those outside Europe can settle barriers and differences without joining as full members."

Great Britain, which also negotiated for a Common Market membership, had previously seen the Common Market as a competitor, although she already has many economic ties with the Common Market, De Grood explained.

"The British have been used to a quarreling Europe for centuries," he said, "so they didn't believe the Common Market would succeed. Great Britain attended the meeting where the Treaty of Rome was signed and thought it was only a piece of paper. Now, she sees it works and gets results."

Great Britain will have to end her preferential trade system with commonwealth countries, De Grood said, "because the Common Market must have the same rules for all."

He pointed out that countries without free competition, such as the state-controlled Iron Curtain nations and Spain, can't join the Common Market.

Also, member countries must adapt their trade regulations to Common Market requirements, De Grood said.

"Both France and Italy have state tobacco monopolies," he remarked, "and they will have to end this by a certain date. Each member nation has to give up some of its sovereignty for a common good."

Switzerland, although traditionally neutral, applied the end of December for a chance to discuss her participation in a limited field.

"The Swiss will have to accept less than the other partners," De Grood said, "but they will get help in solving some problems particularly sensitive to them."

Although De Grood is optimistic about the future of the Common Market and looks forward to the certainty of a united states of Europe, developed through economic policies, he worries that unification is taking too much time.

"We should be broader in our whole approach," he said. "We may all have the same ideals of freedom and democracy but there is too much discussion of technical differences in all fields. This slows us down, prevents our getting to our goals as quickly as possible."

The chief goal of the Common Market members is the unification of Europe and the expansion of Europe's world trade.

[From the Portland (Oreg.) Daily Reporter, Jan. 22, 1962]

THE COMMON MARKET—III: EUROPEAN COAL, STEEL COMMUNITY LINK IN THREE-PART UNIFICATION PROGRAM

(By Mary Ann Campbell)

The Common Market of Europe, the branch of the European community looming biggest in the news these days, is only one of a three-part organization, aimed at bringing about political as well as economic unity to the European nations on this side of the Iron Curtain.

The two others are the European Coal and Steel Community, which was originally identified as the Schuman plan, and Euratom, a coalition of scientists and engineers developing peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

The Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) was established on April 18, 1951, by the six countries that belong to the Common Market. Created by Robert Schuman, then French Foreign Minister, the idea of unifying European coal and steel production seemed a revolutionary policy. But, the Schuman plan worked, and its success inspired the establishment of the Common Market and Euratom.

In the 10 years since the Schuman plan was adopted, ECSC has abolished customs duties, quantitative and currency restrictions, a dual-pricing system, under which prices charged on exported coal or steel differed from those charged to home consumers, and ended discriminations in transport rates based on the nationality of customers, and special frontier charges.

All this applies to coal, steel, iron ore and scrap.

Increased steel production and reorganization of Europe's coal industry have been two of ECSC's major achievements.

Steel output has risen from 42 million metric tons in 1952 to an annual rate of 72,800,000 tons today, an increase of 74 percent. Trade in steel products among the six Common Market member nations has grown from 2,108,000 metric tons in 1952 to 8,800,000 in 1960. Along with this increased market, prices in ECSC countries remained more stable than in other nations. Between 1953 and 1960, indices show that steel prices in the United States rose from 88 to 124, and in Great Britain from 89 to 116, while ECSC steel prices went from 100 to 103.

Part of this improvement in the steel market is due to major research projects set up and financed by the High Authority, the nine-member governing body for ECSC.

So far, the high authority has allocated $25 million to these projects, which include direct reduction of iron ore in plants other than blast furnaces, measures to combat air pollution and development on an industrial scale of improved methods of pig iron production.

Coal production has fallen off in the past 10 years in Europe, largely due to competition from oil and electric power. From providing 80 percent of Europe's fuel needs in 1950, the coal mines were supplying less than 60 percent in 1960. Meanwhile, oil consumption went from 13 percent to 32 percent in the same period.

Hardest hit were the Belgian collieries, where productivity is low at any time.

The high authority has undertaken a series of special measures for the Belgian mines, beginning with closure of the most uneconomic pits. By 1963, Belgium will be producing about 10 million tons less per year, a cut of nearly one-third in Belgian coal mining capacity.

Now, the ECSC high authority is working with the executives of the Common Market and Euratom to establish a coordinated energy policy. Their objectives are to bring community fuel prices to a favorable level and, at the same time, to give coal producing countries a chance to reorganize mining operations, retrain displaced miners and redevelop areas affected by pit closures.

The ECSC, Common Market, and Euratom councils suggested to the council of ministers, which represents all member nations, on national lines, that the different governments start adjusting commercial policies toward third countries, particularly in regard to customs duties and quotas for imported coal, and start negotiations to fix common import duties on refined petroleum products.

[From the Portland (Oreg.) Daily Reporter, Jan 23, 1962]

THE COMMON MARKET—IV: READAPTATION OF LABOR FORCE POSES BIG HURDLE IN SOLVING COAL CRISIS

(By Mary Ann Campbell)

A major problem in the coal crisis currently facing the European Coal and Steel Community's nine-man governing body is readaptation (resettlement and retraining) for miners and others who are put out of work by closing the pits.

Due to a lessening demand for coal and increased coal production, the ECSC's High Authority executives have been reorganizing the European coal industry, especially in Belgium.

"Readaptation" for the Belgian miners and workers in other industries affected by the coal mine reorganization consists of providing tide-over allowances between jobs for a maximum of 1 year, at 90 to 100 percent of the worker's previous earnings for the first 4 months; making up of pay in the new job to 100 percent of the old wage; payment of removal and transfer costs and free training for a new job.

The High Authority approved readaptation projects for 110,000 workers—92,000 in the coal industry—and expenditure of $43 million from 1953 to February 10, 1960. An equal sum was given to the projects by the governments of the countries involved.

In 1960 the European social fund, to promote employment facilities and the mobility of labor, was established through the Common Market organization, in cooperation with industrial and trade-union associations. Operating in a similar way to the ECSC's High Authority readaptation system, $30 million were allocated to the fund in the budgets of the past 2 years.

The ECSC also is empowered to work to attract new industries to areas where coal mines are closing, by granting loans itself or arranging other loans.

Under the ECSC treaty, European workers for the first time can go to any of the six-member countries to find employment without restrictions. The first European labor card was issued September 1, 1957, and since then skilled colliery and steel workers have been able to take up jobs anywhere in the community.

Passports are no longer required for citizens of the Common Market countries traveling in Europe.

Social security for migrant workers, covering retirement and disability pensions, family allowances and sickness and unemployment benefits, was put into effect in December 1957.

Housing for coal and steel workers has been made available through High Authority loans of more than $90 million for work on 52,000 dwellings.

These apartment buildings can be seen all over Germany and the Benelux countries. They are big, modern structures, white or light cream, with bright-colored balconies hanging from every apartment. The balconies are bright blue, red, green, and yellow, giving a gay, patchwork effect.

The High Authority also has allocated some $10 million for research in industrial medicine and safety, such as silicosis, pneumoconiosis, industrial noise, and rehabilitation after accidents.

To assist in labor-management relations, the ECSC publishes surveys on wages, employment, purchasing power, and on social security for the unions, to permit workers' representatives to arrive at labor-management negotiations with a better knowledge of economic and social conditions in their firms and industries.

In all this, standards of living have been rising in all Common Market countries, and the effect can be seen even in nonmember countries, such as Austria.

Ten years ago far too many Europeans were thin from malnutrition during the war years. They looked shabby and discouraged. Their clothes were worn, and they seemed despondent. Now that is all changed. The average European today is cheerful, well dressed, and, in many cases, getting so well fed that waistlines are a problem.

Between 1954 and 1958 steelworkers' incomes rose 13 percent in Belgium, Germany, and France; 23 percent in the Saar, 12 percent in the Netherlands, 15 percent in Luxembourg, and 2 percent in Italy.

COMMUNISM IS NOT LIBERALISM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I invite my colleagues' attention to an excellent editorial entitled "Communism Is Not Liberalism" which appeared in a recent issue of the Daytona Beach (Fla.) News-Journal.

This editorial does an extremely effective job of presenting the differences between liberalism and communism. It is important that this distinction be clearly spelled out—especially in view of the campaign of the radical rightwing groups to make it appear that liberalism and communism are all the same thing, and that anyone who expresses the liberal viewpoint is somehow a part of the Communist conspiracy.

Mr. President, I am a liberal and I am proud to be one. I believe it is significant that I have always been opposed by extremists of both the right and left. So it is a matter of concern to me when people try to create the false impression that liberalism is synonymous with communism. Nothing could, of course, be farther from the truth. They are diametrically opposed.

I wish that this editorial could be read by all American citizens. It would certainly give a greater understanding of what we mean when we talk about liberalism and what we mean when we talk about communism. If we are to successfully oppose communism it is imperative that we know what communism is. If our people do not appreciate the vital differences between liberalism and communism we are in a sorry state of affairs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this excellent editorial appear at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMUNISM IS NOT LIBERALISM

More than ever in the history of U.S. politics, there will be much talk in this just beginning 1962 of the right and the left, of conservatism and liberalism.

Conservatism, or a swing to the right on a worldwide scale, is being noted by some political analysts. The liberalism of the thirties will not be the trend of the sixties, they say.

The reason given for this is that in the thirties, the enemy was fascism, or the extreme right. It required the efforts of liberals to defeat it, so that by the mid-forties, liberal directed governments were in power in the United States, Britain, France, Belgium, Holland, Australia, New Zealand, Norway, and Sweden.

But now, say these same analysts, the enemy is on the left; it now is communism. So, accordingly, there is a swing to the right in the effort to defeat it.

In our view, there is something drastically wrong in this picture, if indeed this is the trend for the sixties.

The left is identified with liberalism; it is off to this side of the middle which communism so glibly is ascribed as having its place. Blindly, some contend that a liberal today is one who is tolerant of, if not downright sympathetic toward, communism.

But to accord communism the courtesy of an appellation of liberalism, we believe, is to admit to an utterly confused state of mind.

There is nothing liberal about communism—not even now with the relaxation it's been provided by a self assured Nikita Krushchev. In all its practices, be it in East Germany, Russia or China with their varying intensity of its grip, communism is far more akin to fascism than it is to any other political mode.

The regimes which have imposed this philosophy on the people must depend on the tools of fascism—on a well disciplined Army; on thought control; on a propaganda line which fits a particular situation; on purges of nonconformists, and on the absence of political freedom.

Where, in such a picture, are the tones of liberalism?

What, then, is liberalism?

It's quite opposite of the Fascist nature of communism. The most basic tenet of liberalism is a belief in political freedom. It was due to the need for such freedom that Liberal Parties sprang into being during the Reformation period. True, in the manner of the early Bolsheviks in Russia, the early liberals stood for the abolition of serfdom, and, like communism today, they were anticlericalist. But their movement was not designed to abolish religion; it was to free men from the political power of the church so they might explore other ways to worship.

Liberalism is the opposite of communism in every respect. Liberalism stands for universal suffrage expressed through secret ballot and a choice of candidates. It stands for free political discussion. It advocates social reform that is not hamstrung as is the social reform in the Soviet Union, where reform is based not on what's best for the people, but what is best for the state.

In short, liberalism seeks the extension of the people's power, not its restriction.

In this sense, then, liberalism is more conservative than the philosophy off to the right, misnamed conservatism. Its objective is to conserve that which belongs to the people—the power to govern through free discussion and the absence of coercion either by the state or an "elite" through the use of economic pressure.

However, we do not doubt but what the year 1962 will see a still farther swing to the right.

It most likely will get a hefty shove from the U.S. House of Representatives which is coming more and more under the control of rightists. With the help of State legislatures which have gerrymandered congressional districts so as to retain the power in rural areas, 19th century philosophy prevails in a period of rapidly increasing urbanization.

Such a political misalinement is certain to stymie needed social reforms and impede the Nation's progress in fighting that menace far, far off to what should be the right—imperialistic communism. Liberalism will have a hard go of it, because the rural element of Congress mistakenly believes that championing social reforms is akin to that menace, and so they fight it.

How wrong it is. Liberalism seeks to conserve the basic rights and to enhance the ability of the people to live useful lives—not to increase the power of the state to stifle individual liberty. It seeks still the same goals of its beginning—political freedom, universal suffrage, and the right of individuals to economic opportunity and religious liberty. It seeks to wipe out poverty and neglect in certain elements of society so they do not provide soil for an imperialistic bent philosophy.

In 1962 liberalism will be seeking again a goal of one of the earliest liberals—the freer trade advocated by the great English statesman, Gladstone.

A relaxation of the U.S. tariff policies is going to be a necessity in this new year, if we are to participate in the Common Market of Europe. And if we are barred from that participation by the refusal of Congress to relax our trade barriers, then we indeed shall know we are in the hands of the "right."

If the trend actually is in that direction, then we'll be in for a bad time in 1962 and beyond. It took liberalism to quell the fires of fascism in our recent past. The would-be conqueror today is different only in name, and he's still far right of center where repression of liberty and the other opposites of liberalism reside.

FEDERAL SUPPORT OF SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, for many years I have been concerned about the lack of attention by Federal agencies to research on broad-gaged human needs.

Fortunately increased resources have been allocated for medical research; but otherwise the Federal Government has tended to be so concerned with problems in the physical sciences—particularly as to military and outer space applications—that it has tended to downgrade research on man's relationship with man.

FOUR PERCENT OF TOTAL FEDERAL BASIC RESEARCH

Thus, in the 1960 fiscal year, research in the social and behavioral sciences received only around 4 percent—$65 million—of total Federal support—$1.9 billion—for basic research in all the sciences, for example, the physical, mathematical, engineering and life sciences.

To point up this problem, I was glad to contribute an article urging a change in this state of affairs. The article appears in the February 1962 issue of the magazine, American Behavioral Scientist. The article is entitled "A Magna Carta for the Social and Behavioral Sciences."

Its theme is to free the social sciences of the restraints which have been placed upon them. I refer to the restraints of lack of understanding and lack of long-range, basic support.

MAGAZINE EDITORIAL

Following my article, there appears a followup editorial. It proposes specific steps to bring about greater recognition and use of the social and behavioral sciences by the Federal Government.

The editorial is a frank, indeed a blunt, statement expressing straight-from-the-shoulder views.

It renders a service in urging, first, appointment of a top-level group of social scientists to recommend a full-scale social science research program; second, broader application of the social sciences in the U.S. foreign aid program; and, third, allocation of adequate funds through public and private means.

NEED FOR INFORMATION RETRIEVAL

The editorial concludes with an important statement on a subject which has long been of special interest to me, avoidance of tragic waste through adequate retrieval of information.

PURPOSE OF THE JOURNAL

The American Behavioral Scientist, is written by and for scientists and associated laymen. It carries accounts of interdisciplinary research, articles on creativity and social invention, comments on the relations between behavioral scientists, society and Government, and broad, annotated listings of new studies.

Publisher and editor is Alfred De Grazia.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of my article be printed in the RECORD, followed by the aforementioned editorial.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A MAGNA CARTA FOR THE SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES

(By HUBERT H. HUMPHREY)

Virtually everyone is aware that, in recent years, science in the free world has attained the greatest freedom, the largest magnitude of support and the broadest social scope in all human history. Fewer persons seem aware or concerned about the fact that one vast segment of science continues to lag behind the others in all of these respects.

To begin with, in a certain sense, the social and behavioral disciplines are less "free" than their sister disciplines in the physical, mathematical, engineering, and biological realms. It is not that the former's academic freedom is in question; fortunately, the right of scholars—sociologists, psychologists, anthropologists, historians, or others—to pursue the truth is less restricted than on many occasions heretofore.

Rather, the "freedom" of the social and behavioral sciences is limited in the sense that these sciences are often so little understood and esteemed that they are held back from fullest growth. The lack of understanding and of esteem are reflected in the fact that these disciplines continue to receive a disproportionately small level of financial support from public and private quarters. The support they do receive is invariably limited in scope, short-range in duration, and oriented to applied fields.

These observations do not detract in any way from the enlightened support provided by numerous foundations and by other scurces, including in some instances, Federal agencies. But the social and behavioral sciences are almost in an "orphan status" in comparison to other disciplines. They are chained by circumstances and limited in their potential contribution to mankind. Many other observers have come to similar conclusions. Views such as this have been expounded on various occasions by social scientists in and outside of the Government. Report after report has been written on the need to give more Federal and other impetus to the social and behavioral sciences.[1]

NATURE OF "MAGNA CARTA"

A "magna carta" is needed, a blueprint for future national support for the social and behavioral sciences. Such a pronouncement should represent the combined efforts of scientists in and outside of Government. It should express policy guidelines which will help unleash men's fullest insight and talents.

The magna carta should first define its terms carefully and concisely; the widest possible audience should be helped to understand both the similarities and differences between these and other sciences, as well as among the respective social and behavioral sciences themselves.

The magna carta should stress the value of both basic and applied research on the part of Federal "inhouse" scientists and, principally, extramural sources such as university faculties. The magna carta should point up the facts that scholarship provides the only seedbed for new knowledge, and that scholarship requires scholars—meaning adequate personnel, career opportunities, and facilities. Above all, the magna carta should stress that a climate of fullest freedom is necessary, one in which creativity is fostered.

SPECIALIZED STUDIES BY SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE

Part of these personal views derive from a survey which has been conducted by the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, of which I have the honor to be chairman. This survey has brought to light a few of the phases of this problem. I emphasize "a few," because it is not feasible within our particular committee's jurisdiction to survey the broad gamut of problems of this nature. Our interest is necessarily in Government operations, per se, i.e., the needs and responsibilities of agencies of the U.S. Government, particularly those of highest priority and expense. We are required under the rules of the Senate and under special resolutions to review problems, primarily from the standpoint of their fiscal implications to the Government. Nevertheless, within this particular jurisdiction, we have been able, I believe, to illuminate certain phases of the problem which have been far too long neglected.

---

[1] See for example, Graham, Milton D., "Federal Utilization of Social Science Research, Exploration of the Problems: A Preliminary Paper," the Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C., August 1954 and "National Support for Behavioral Science," February 1958.

We have touched upon these phases from the standpoint of three separate but interrelated reviews, authorized by the Senate: (a) International medical research, (b) Federal budgeting for all types of research, and (c) science information.

MEDICAL RESEARCH AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE

As far back as July 1959, we received testimony from Dr. Margaret Mead [2] on the contributions which applied anthropology and related disciplines can make in international medical programs of technical assistance and research. Dr. Mead confirmed, in my judgment, that whereas the U.S. Government had used the social and behavioral sciences to considerable advantage in the winning of World War II, it had, by and large, in the postwar years, seriously downgraded these disciplines.

A fortunate exception has been the National Institute for Mental Health which, for a decade and a half, has supported an increasingly large body of scholars engaged in basic and applied research in the behavioral sciences.[3] The Division of Social Sciences of the National Science Foundation has likewise been a valuable sponsor of basic research.

FEDERAL BUDGETING FOR RESEARCH

In July 1961, our subcommittee held hearings on the $9 billion Federal budget for research, development, testing, and evaluation. Once again, a phase of the problem came to light in terms of the meager financial support provided the social and behavioral sciences.

One of the byproducts of this review [4] is the chart that is reproduced herein. It shows that in the 1960 fiscal year, only around 4 percent of total Federal research support of $1.9 billion was allocated to the social and psychological sciences. This estimate is about the best that could be developed under circumstances of wide differences in interagency definition as to what constitutes "social" and "psychological" science.

SCIENCE INFORMATION

Meanwhile, for 3½ years, the parent committee and the subcommittee have intermittently, as opportunity permitted, examined the problem of science information. We have been concerned with more effective publication, abstracting, indexing, dissemination, and utilization of masses of scientific data.

We have noted a number of significant efforts to secure improved management of information in the social and behavioral sciences. Regrettably, some of the most promising of these efforts have died aborning or have been held at low plateaus. Today, in the judgment of our staff [5] information management in the social and behavioral sciences appears far less advanced than in other sciences. To some extent, this is due to the very nature of the respective data, e.g., the relatively "soft" nature of social science information with its infinitely subtle and difficult to quantify variables as to human conduct. But some of the management lag is due to the fact that the social and behavioral science professions do not appear to have devoted enough of their energies toward coming to grips with the information problem, per se.

It is, of course, a paradox that those who are expert in communications do not appear to have addressed themselves sufficiently toward absorbing and communicating information in and about their own discipline. But if the shoemaker's shoes need mending, he is not alone in not applying his own skills for new ends.

The fact is that much of science has only dimly perceived its new and higher responsibilities in this fantastic age.

OPPORTUNITY AND PERIL

It is an age of supreme opportunity and supreme peril. Obviously, man can usher in a golden age of abundance—of progress, prosperity, and plenty—or he can extinguish life on this planet. If he is to avoid planetary suicide, he must do so through the mobilization of every branch of human knowledge. No branch is more significant than that which concerns man's relationship with man. The proper study of man is indeed man. The proper interest of government is in man. The proper concern of government should be with support of the study of man, the total organism—man, the social creature. At home and abroad, we as a nation confront awesome problems to which we must look to the social and behavioral sciences for interdisciplinary answers.

FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC PROBLEMS

In the field of foreign policy:

How can we best communicate to the Government of the Soviet Union, to the people of the Soviet Union, to the government and peoples of the satellite nations in the Soviet bloc, to the government and people of mainland China, and of areas within Peiping's domination? How can we best communicate to the government and peoples of the developing nations? What, for example, are the very words which are most meaningful to the various societies? What are the aspirations, the felt needs of these countries?

In the field of domestic policy:

How can we come to grips with problems which are impairing the enjoyment of their birthright by vast numbers of individuals in our society—intergroup tensions, breakdown of the family unit, urban decay and suburban sprawl, adult crime and juvenile delinquency, and a wide variety of other problems?

THE ADMINISTRATION'S REVIEW

Fortunately, there is evidence that the administration of President John F. Kennedy is not only concerned about these problems but is interested in mobilizing science to do something constructive about them.

A considerable number of background papers have been prepared for study in high policy circles. The special assistant to the President for science and technology, Dr. Jerome Wiesner, is sensitive to the opportunities and challenges of the type which I have described, particularly as they relate to Federal decisionmaking.

The President's Science Advisory Committee would be an ideal forum for preparation and promulgation of the Magna Carta of which I write. The Federal Council for Science and Technology would be the logical instrumentality for followthrough, so far as Federal agency policies are concerned. The Department of Defense would be the primary agency from the standpoint of national defense and survival, as well as volume of funds, to help implement the program. Already, DOD has supported much important research in persuasion, motivation, leadership, group behavior, man-machine communication, and other areas. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration has likewise not been unaware of its responsibilities.[6] Vigorous followthrough is, however, required.

But each and every Federal agency should make a searching self-appraisal of its responsibilities and opportunities. One such laudable self-appraisal is that which has been conducted by the Social Security Administration in the field of human welfare, under the wise leadership of Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Abraham Ribicoff. As his Department is aware, and as other Federal agencies should recognize, the "buck should not be passed" to the National Institute for Mental Health simply because it has had more bucks, relatively speaking, available.

Other Federal agencies, with Bureau of the Budget support, must make known their individual needs to the Congress. Our legislators, despite obvious differences of opinion which have prevailed and will no doubt continue to prevail, are far more likely to respond favorably if the executive branch closes ranks and if the social and behavioral sciences do likewise in communicating on the great needs of our times. The Committee on Behavioral Science of the National Academy of Science—National Research Council can play a particularly important role in interagency consultation. But responsibility and accountability must be definitely fixed in selected high officers and offices.

This should not imply that the program must be pursued only for so-called practical techniques and goals. Unreasonable demand for quick and practical results can be the bane of science. Solid inquiry requires breadth, adequacy of resources, and time. Science is not like a jukebox in which you put in a nickel or dime and expect answers to tumble out a few seconds later. Science must have opportunity to ask the right questions in the right way before it can hope to generate what may or may not prove to be the right answers.

In seeking the fulfillment of the Magna Carta for the social and behavioral sciences, none of us should look "to the other man alone." Nor to the agencies, where governmental or nongovernmental. If each of us does what he can, whether in a university department, a professional society, a journal, or in the Halls of the U.S. Congress, we shall see a more dependable and broader progress of the social science. Ultimately, as well, we shall approach the new dawn that we seek for the family of man.

---

[2] U.S. Senate, Committee on Government Operations, Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations, hearings on "The U.S. Government and the Future of the International Medical Research," pursuant to S. Res. 347, 85th Cong., pt. I, pp. 68–81.

[3] See National Institute of Mental Health, Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, "Research in the Behavioral Sciences Supported by the National Institutes of Health: A Summary Description," Apr. 21, 1961.

[4] U.S. Senate, Committee on Government Operations, Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations, hearings on "Federal Budgeting for Research and Development," pursuant to S. Res. 26, 87th Cong., pts. I and II.

[5] Cahn, Julius N., director of scientific research project, Committee on Government Operations, Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations, manuscript, "The Crisis in Management of Information in Science and Technology," January 1962.

[6] Brookings Institution, "Proposed Studies on the Implications of Peaceful Space Activities for Human Affairs," prepared for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, U.S. House of Representatives, Committee on Science and Astronautics, H. Rept. 242, 87th Cong., 1st sess.

An Editorial

Senator Hubert Humphrey has affirmed the need for an expansion of social science, proposing a national charter to be drawn up by professional groups with governmental cooperation. He indicates that a vastly increased Federal expenditure in this area is required.

We have several explicit proposals to add to his appeal. The first is that the Congress, perhaps through the Government Operations Committee, authorize a committee of persons acting as individuals to report to it on the nature and possibilities of a full-scale social research program with a plan for its accomplishment. If Senators such as Senators Humphrey, Paul Douglas, and Clifford Case were active in their selection, we might have some chance of a committee that could rise above some common vices of research authorities: the narrowness of a census taker, the caution of a foundation executive, the disorientation of an educator, the expediency of a politician, and the scornfulness of a businessman. The appointees should be social scientists of experience, achievement, courage, toughness, and large vision; such would be Francis Keppel of the Graduate School of Education at Harvard, Evron Kirkpatrick who directs the American Political Science Association, Edward Litchfield who is president of the University of Pittsburgh, John Ivey of Michigan State, Allen Wallis of the Business School of the University of Chicago, and James Miller who directs the Mental Health Research Institute at the University of Michigan. Let these men, or men like them, say what social science can do for this world, how much support it needs, and how to organize the effort.

We have derived several conclusions from our years of observing the general condition of the social sciences, which, without wishing prematurely to foreclose other alternatives, we would hand over to such a group as hypotheses.

We believe that the best location for the highest types of applied social research is in relation to the highest councils of the Government, and therefore would recommend that the Library of Congress should be the seat of the Policy Sciences Research Group in the national social research establishment. An Assistant Secretary for Research and Development of each major department of Government should be ex officio a member of this group, dealing there with Members of the Congress, the President's representative, and several Library of Congress social scientists and public members.

A second kind of recommendation concerns specific areas of research. At this stage of human knowledge, which is much further along than the vast majority can conceive, every operation of Government can receive direct and major benefit from applications of the social sciences. Every agency of Government requires an understanding and an extended use of social science. The Agency for International Development provides an example. This Agency can waste a billion dollars a year without effort. Yet the psychology, pedagogy, economics, administration, and political science of aid and development are subject matters well enough developed to guide a highly fruitful and prudent operation. One of the suggestions that persistently emerges from accounts of our foreign aid operations is that educating social scientists and gearing intelligence inputs to operations are critical factors everywhere. If a third of all aid money were spent on these problems, the total aid benefit would be greatly enhanced and the other two-thirds of the funds would bring in much greater value.

A third kind of recommendation would treat of the relation of Government research support to all other research support. Here the problem, and its answer, are parts of the general problem of Government's place in society's operations. The problem is that Government means uncreativeness, slowness, and timidity. The answer is that foundations, States, localities, corporations, universities, and institutes also signify bureaucracy and its consequences. The overall principle is that in autonomous numbers there is safety. Keep many sources of research open and no one source can be effectively dogmatic and imperative. The expenditure of $2 billion per year in the social sciences would (after the initial shock felt by social scientists) cause scarcely a tremor in the body politic, but would preceptibly raise the level of data gathering, data analysis, and systematic application of social science throughout society.

How should this money be raised?

By increasing the tax advantages of giving or investing in social science.

By increasing greatly the proportion of social science scholarships and grants in current aid given by the National Science Foundation and other Federal science agencies.

By applying pressure to those officials now spending many billions on hardware research to reconsider their policies. (Let us recall two suggestive historical situations: a maximum use of social science techniques could probably have ended the Japanese portion of World War II without the atomic bomb; a more psychologically planned bombing of German installations would have ended the war more quickly and reduced loss of Allied and German lives and property.)

By scrutinizing present-day Government spending for social research and redirecting some of the less useful activities into more useful channels. There has never been a respectable survey of governmental social research.

By matching grants to all social institutions for basic social research, including State and local governments, corporations, universities, unions, operating foundations, and ad hoc associations.

By direct appropriation of funds in increased amounts.

Finally, two paramount principles to guide the whole program are suggested. Every action in support of research should be prefaced by a statement of how it may advance (1) individual scientific creativity and freedom of inquiry, (2) benefit the whole society, and (3) promote the cause of scientific inquiry. Moreover, the primary and perhaps major aim of all social science expenditures should be to advance communications among individual scholars, and between scholars and users of science. The need for information retrieval, in its broadest sense, is more urgent than any area or subject need. Perhaps three-quarters of the time of all social scientists is wasted (or would in retrospect be considered so) in activities that new data storage and retrieval systems can be employed or developed to replace. Whether we speak of nonmechanized or of mechanized aids, the principle does not change: the greater the communication, the more the possibilities of innovation and invention, and the greater the liberty of the scientist to take from the intellectual storehouse of the world only what he needs and wants.

GOVERNOR ROCKEFELLER, OF NEW YORK, ON EQUAL OPPORTUNITY LEGISLATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the speech made by Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, of New York, at the Lincoln Day dinner of the Niagara County Republican Committee, Niagara Falls, on February 15, was momentous in the struggle for equal opportunity in the United States of America. In this speech, Governor Rockefeller gave a splendid analysis and a most forceful presentation of two critical points in the struggle for equal opportunity. He pointed out, first, that fidelity to its mission makes it essential that the Republican Party be unequivocal in its fight for civil rights in Congress; and, second, that the appointment of Negroes to high office in the Federal Government and vigorous action in the executive department will not alone achieve what must be done. Both our own domestic situation and the world situation require not only that the President act on civil rights, but that the Congress act as well; the Federal Civil Rights Commission has in effect by recommending so much legislation in its fine reports certified that this is the only way in which effective and adequate equal opportunity action is possible at the Federal level. Governor Rockefeller stated that the President has definitely been derelict in fulfilling his civil rights pledges, made so solemnly during the campaign, and that this is an issue on which the Republican Party has every right to press very hard as a service to the Nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record the address delivered by Governor Rockefeller.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Excerpts of Remarks by Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller at the Lincoln Day Dinner Sponsored by the Niagara County Republican Committee, Niagara Falls, N.Y., February 15, 1962

We meet tonight in honor of a great American and a great Republican, Senator Earl Brydges, a man whose deep human concerns are written in the records of this State. These records tell of Senator Brydges' work to advance education, to promote mental health, to help retarded children, and otherwise to further human goals. All of us, as his friends and admirers, deeply regret his illness, which deprives us of the pleasure of his company tonight, but we are cheered by the progress he is making and are looking forward to his early recovery.

It is most appropriate that in honoring Earl Brydges, we should meet here in his home territory in memory of another great American, great Republican, and great humanitarian, Abraham Lincoln. For the human goals set forth by Lincoln to guide the Republican Party are the same goals that have guided Earl Brydges in his service to the people of New York State, the same goals that have guided the Republican Party in more than a century of service to the people of the United States.

As Republicans, we take pride and assume special responsibilities in the fact that ours is Lincoln's party. This party was born in the fight to make men free. It did make them free, and its mission remains what it has been from the beginning—to extend that freedom to every individual in every phase of his life—in the home, in the neighborhood, in the school, in the office and the factory, in the train and the bus, in all public places—and most important of all, in the hearts of his fellow men.

How well has that mission been fulfilled?

Not perfectly. We still have a long way to go—as a nation and as a party. But there has been progress and Republicans can take great pride in that progress.

Despite all that has been said to the contrary the fact remains that what has been accomplished has been accomplished largely on Republican initiative and through the Republican Party. The first antidiscrimination laws were Republican laws enacted in the States, beginning with New York State's pioneering action in 1945 under Governor Dewey, with a Republican legislature, to outlaw discrimination in employment.

Since that time, here in the State of New York, Republican legislatures with Republican Governors have amended our laws to eliminate and prevent discrimination because of race, creed, color or national origin in housing and in places of public accommodation, resort, and amusement.

Last year, my Republican administration with a Republican legislature closed the gap in our State's prohibitions of discrimination in various types of housing by extending the law to the area of private housing and commercial space including the activities of lending institutions.

This year, I have proposed further steps:

To spell out specifically the ban against discrimination in all apprenticeship and other training programs;

To close gaps by expanding the specific list of places of public accommodation in which discrimination is outlawed;

To broaden and strengthen the administrative authority of the chairman of the State commission against discrimination and to provide for designation of a vice chairman; and

To change the name of SCAD to the State commission for human rights, reflecting a conceptual evolution to the point of view that a citizen of this State does not merely have the right to ask State assistance because he has been discriminated against, but rather that he is endowed with affirmative rights inherent to all Americans.

We Republicans have every reason to be proud of our civil rights record as a party in New York State and every reason to be proud of our record as a party in the Nation.

On the national scene, under the Eisenhower administration, the greatest civil rights advances since the Civil War were achieved. The first Civil Rights Act in 82 years was enacted in 1957 under President Eisenhower's leadership. It provided more effective guarantees of the right to vote, the basis of all civil rights. It set up a Civil Rights Commission to recommend more effective measures for the protection of the constitutional rights of Americans.

Again under Republican leadership, in 1960, on recommendation of the Civil Rights Commission and under administration prodding, another civil rights bill was passed to further guarantee voting rights.

All this was done under the moral leadership of a Republican President, operating without congressional majorities and with the militant resistance of a large segment of the Democratic Congress.

In addition, during the Eisenhower administration, unprecedented progress was made in the desegregation of schools, of the Armed Forces, of other Federal establishments, and of interstate travel. Unprecedented progress was also made in the removal of discrimination in employment by the Government and Government contractors.

This was a period of breakthrough, a period of major progress in the field of civil rights.

It reflected—in action, not just talk—the commitment of the Republican Party at both State and National level to the achievement of complete and genuine equality for all of our citizens.

The Republican Party cannot, dare not, and will not break faith with this commitment.

For this party was born of the struggle for human equality and dignity. This is the reason for its being, this is the essence of its heritage.

The suggestion is occasionally made that the party warp or abandon its heritage and, to put it bluntly, speak softly on civil rights to whisper an appeal for southern votes.

The party of Lincoln cannot try to strike so cheap a bargain without dishonoring its own heritage and betraying the American people.

Any such political trade would distort or deny the most basic principles that give this party life, principles ultimately rooted in the moral and religious values that proclaim the dignity of man himself. In short, a party without a conscience would be a party without an identity.

Thus the Republican Party by its very nature, in New York and throughout the Nation, must forever reject the preachers of racism or extremists of reaction.

The future of the Republican Party lies with the millions who are dedicated to our spiritual heritage, with the millions seeking equality whose cause has been the Republican Party's cause from the day of its birth—just as the future of these millions lies with the Republican Party.

We Republicans are dedicated to principles and we stick by them.

Let us look, then, in contrast, to the present Democratic administration's record of performance in the civil rights field as compared with its promises.

During the 1960 campaign, the Democratic presidential candidate expressed scorn for the Republican record on civil rights. He called civil rights a moral issue on which there could be no temporizing.

He said: "In the next 4 years, a Democratic President, working with a Democratic Congress, will write human rights into Federal law."

He said: "As a legislative leader, the President must give us the legal weapons needed to enforce the constitutional rights of every American; he must himself draft the programs, transmit them to Congress, and fight for their enactment, taking his case to the people if Congress is slow in acting."

He said: "We must continue and strengthen the President's Civil Rights Commission."

He said: "We must grant the Attorney General power to enforce all constitutional rights, not just the right to vote."

He said: "We must wipe out discriminatory poll taxes and literacy tests, and pass effective antibombing and antilynching legislation. And we must continually strengthen the legal framework which will allow us to move toward economic, educational, and political equality."

He was asked: "Do you favor a Federal Fair Employment Practices Commission?"

He answered: "Yes; the Democratic platform calls for its enactment now."

The candidate who promised these things was elected. He went in with almost 2-to-1 majorities in both Houses of Congress and on every committee of Congress.

The Democratic President and his Democratic Congress had, and have today, full mastery and control of the machinery of Government.

The Democratic President and the Democratic Party could, and can, pass any piece of legislation they really want.

What has been done about those promises?

The answer is practically nothing.

Not one piece of new civil rights legislation has been passed under this Democratic administration, only a bill to extend the life of the Eisenhower Civil Rights Commission another 2 years.

Only one other bill has been proposed with administration backing, a literacy test bill forced out just the other day by the threats of a Republican Senator and now languishing in the democratically controlled Judiciary Committee, traditionally the graveyard of civil rights legislation.

Nothing has been done legislatively to strengthen the Civil Rights Commission. Moves to strengthen it, to make it permanent, were tabled on motion of the Democratic majority leader.

Nothing has been done, or proposed, in fulfillment of the promise to empower the Attorney General "to enforce all constitutional rights." In fact, a Republican move to grant such power was frustrated in the Senate last August, again on motion of the Democratic majority leader.

No measure has been proposed by the Kennedy administration as to poll taxes, or antibombing, or antilynching legislation—all solemnly proposed by President Kennedy when he was the Democratic candidate.

We have seen nothing from the President about his promise of a Fair Employment Practices Commission.

In fact, when a bill was being considered to withdraw Federal support from apprenticeship training programs which allow racial discrimination, the Assistant Secretary of Labor withheld any positive endorsement.

On September 9, 1960, Mr. Kennedy said: "Such legislation (implementing all the above promises) is already being prepared. I have asked Senator CLARK, of Pennsylvania, and Congressman CELLER, of New York, to prepare a bill embodying all the pledges of the Democratic platform, and that bill will be among the first orders of business when a new Congress meets in January."

He meant the new Congress meeting in 1961, 1 year ago.

The Clark-Celler bills were prepared. They were designed to bar poll taxes through a constitutional amendment;

To require every school board operating a racially segregated public school to adopt a desegregation plan within 6 months of enactment and provide for first-step compliance by the 1963–64 school year;

To authorize the Attorney General to file civil suits seeking court injunctions against denial of any civil right on grounds of race, creed, or color;

To outlaw literacy tests for voting through a constitutional amendment;

To establish a Federal Fair Employment Practices Commission and provide administrative and court remedies for those discriminated against in their jobs because of race, making it an unfair employment practice for any business or union employing more than 50 members to so discriminate; and

To make the Civil Rights Commission, then scheduled to expire November 8, 1961, a permanent agency with strengthened fact-finding powers.

The Clark-Celler bills, doing all this, were introduced on May 8, 1961.

What happened?

The next day, on May 9, 1961, White House Press Secretary Pierre Salinger said that "the Clark-Celler bills are not administration-backed bills," and the President "does not consider it necessary at this time to enact new civil rights legislation."

The result was that these bills have been buried ever since in Senate committees, all controlled by Democratic majorities.

Now, during his campaign, there were certain things that Mr. Kennedy pointed out could be done without congressional participation.

Among other things, he said: "As Chief Executive, the next President must be prepared to put an end to racial and religious discrimination in every field of Federal activity by issuing the long-delayed Executive order putting an end to racial discrimination in federally assisted housing."

Repeatedly he pledged he would do this, pointing out that this could be done "by the stroke of the Presidential pen."

As one commentator observed, to ill-housed Negroes who heard this and whose votes were influenced by it, this phrase must have suggested that the order would be signed as soon as Mr. Kennedy's bags were unpacked at the White House.

As President, however, Mr. Kennedy has never been able to find the pen.

At a news conference 3 weeks ago, he explained that he would not sign such an Executive order at this time because he did not want to get too far ahead of the consensus of opinion in the Nation.

There you have the record, the record of broken promises by the new Democratic administration and the Democratic Congress in this most sacred field of the rights of human beings.

No appointment of a distinguished Negro to a Cabinet post, no amount of job appointments, can erase or compensate for this record.

For certainly this record must constitute one of the most cynical exploitations of minority aspirations that has ever occurred in the history of American politics.

Granted that the Kennedy administration has taken certain welcome administrative actions in the field of civil rights. For example, the Interstate Commerce Commission order barring discrimination on interstate buses and in waiting rooms serving them was a significant advance which I applaud.

But these actions are nowhere near enough; in the light of all the Kennedy campaign promises, of the failure to issue the much-promised Executive order in housing, and the almost total abdication of legislative leadership by the administration in the civil rights field, these facts remain:

The promises of the Democratic platform and the Democratic candidate gave false hope to millions of our people striving for equality.

Believing they could achieve it on these assurances, they voted for those who gave them.

Their votes won an election and now they are left high and dry on the beaches of frustration.

This must never happen again. They must look past the promise to the performance.

They must see—we must help them see—not on the basis of words but on the irrefutable basis of performance that the party of Lincoln, which was their party then, remains their party now.

We must rededicate ourselves as Republicans—here in the State of New York and in the Nation as a whole—to the great unfinished tasks which lie before us, to the achievement of human equality and dignity for each and every American.

Then shall we be worthy of our heritage as men and women who give true honor to the memory of Lincoln and the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I also ask that there be inserted in the RECORD an analysis written by Arthur Krock, published in the New York Times of Sunday, February 18, 1962, referring to Governor Rockefeller's speech and the validity of the issue which he so effectively raises.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GOP'S FUTURE—PARTY MOVES TO COUNTER THE CURRENT PREDICTIONS THAT IT IS MORIBUND

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, February 17.—Once again the Republican Party is being shown the way to dusty death. "Out, out brief candle" is the sentence of a sudden burst of analyses of its weakness that struck the press in the week of Lincoln's Birthday.

These analyses may prove sound; also the prophesies of no future that were based on them. But death sentences have been passed and disapproved so often before, with respect to both major political parties, that they have become established as very dubious long-range wagers. And, though the Lincoln Day speeches by Republican leaders revealed a diversity of counsel for victory in 1962 and 1964 as great as the Democrats for years have disclosed in their splits on congressional legislation, and Senator MARGARET SMITH voiced suspicion of a defeatist psychology for 1964 among the front-run availables, the orators exuded confidence that success was attainable.

OPINIONS IN DEPTH

Not so the variorum of press oracles and "in depth" political reporters. "The difficulty about making a new image," was one unconditional conclusion, "is that the Republican theorists have created such a false image of the Kennedy Democratic Party that there is no effective way they can oppose it. The latter-day Republican propaganda (that the current rate of public spending and its upward urge by the Democrats) puts us on the road to, or anywhere near the road to socialism and communism * * * does not work for the very simple reason that it is not true."

Another diagnosis—in a news magazine—that the Republican Party is succumbing to an incurable disease, though almost instantly pulverized by the resumption of Soviet buzzing of Allied aircraft in the West German-Berlin corridors, was this: "Nikita Khrushchev can be blamed for the present (Republican) plight. By ceasing pressure on Berlin and failing to create, immediately, a new crisis to take its place, he has given American voters a chance to pay close attention to domestic affairs." But, unless the Berlin recess returns and is long, this theory, which is founded on the conviction that the voters overwhelmingly favor Mr. Kennedy's proposed expansion of the welfare state, confronts the dismal fate of never being tested.

In this newspaper last Sunday Russell Baker reported less transitory reasons why the Democratic professionals and several political observers in the press see an ever-dimming Republican prospect. "The party's (small town and rural dominated) congressional leadership," he wrote, "* * * tends to favor strong ideological (and vote losing) stands in an era when voters seem distrustful of dogmatists."

PREMATURE GRAVE DIGGING

These examples suffice to demonstrate that the grave digging of a major political party is again an active occupation, pursued by some who would not be mourners at the interment. In seeking to trace previous occasions this department consulted a political historian, Malcolm Moos, because his research has not been guided by partisanship. He deposed in part as follows:

(1) The Democratic Party, its factions fighting each other in the bloody chasm of the War of the States, was pronounced "dead as the Confederacy but doesn't know it." In 1874 it gained control of Congress, elected a President who was counted out in 1876 and in 1884 elected another who was not.

(2) In 1936 the Republican Party carried only 89 House and 17 Senate seats, was widely notified of its demise, and its shattered fragments were counseled to seek resurrection under a new name. But Republicans made substantial gains in Congress in 1938, controlled it in 1946, elected a two-term President in 1952, and came within a hairline voting percentage of electing his successor in 1960.

(3) Except for the two Cleveland and the two Wilson administrations, the Republicans suffered no serious reverses from Lincoln's first election to F. D. Roosevelt's in 1932.

(4) But the Democrats, thought "mighty low at times," such as in 1920 and 1924, have never undergone as deep dejection of spirit as the Republicans have at their own low points. And generally since 1926, though their 1928 presidential candidate, Alfred E. Smith, was soundly defeated, the Democrats have been supplanting the Republicans in voting strength in the big cities.

MOUSETRAPPING

It is this last point by Professor Moos that accounts in large degree for the current swollen chorus of Republican obsequies. The main theme is President Kennedy's "mousetrapping" (his own jubilant word) through his proposal to create a new Department of Urban Affairs. His mousetrap, it seems, was to have this sent to the House Rules Committee, in confidence that the Republican members would rush into it by opposing the new Department, which they did, all unaware that he would then apply the coup de mort to them by announcing his intention of appointing the first Negro in history to head the new Department. He also knew all the time that the legislation he sought was already under his reorganization authority. And since this plan could be be blocked only by the disapproval of one branch of Congress, the President believes he twice mousetrapped the Republicans.

GOP RETALIATES

But it quickly developed that the Republicans had a trap of the same nature—baited for Negro and other minority group votes—waiting for Mr. Kennedy. He had constructed it himself in his campaign for the Presidency, and Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller of New York, at the Lincoln Day dinner at Niagara Falls, gave the specifications. He quoted Mr. Kennedy as saying that the next President "must be prepared to put an end to racial and religious discrimination in every field of Federal activity" by issuing "a long-delayed Executive order, which he repeatedly pledged he would do with a stroke of the pen. But, as President, Mr. Kennedy has never been able to find the pen * * * one of the most cynical exploitations of minority aspirations."

In this vein of belligerency, and actively at work to elect Republican Governors in 1962 in five key States (Michigan, California, New York, Pennsylvania and Texas) that could decide the 1964 election, the Republican Party once more is asserting that predictions it is moribund are premature.

SEGREGATION IN HOSPITALS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, Americans who need hospitalization are subject to segregation because of the color of their skin and qualified Negro physicians cannot treat patients in hospitals because they have been refused hospital staff appointments. Court action against such hospital discrimination has been instituted in the Federal district court in Greensboro, N.C. No part of the country is entirely free from this discriminatory program of exclusion, and as a first step in its elimination, I have introduced an amendment to the Hill-Burton Hospital Construction Act which currently permits Federal funds to be used for separate but equal facilities. My amendment would bar Federal funds from hospitals which maintain segregated facilities and I hope it will be acted on promptly by the Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD the report on the Greensboro court action headlined "Hospital Segregation in South Challenged by NAACP Suit," which was published in the New York Times of February 13, 1962.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Hospital Segregation in South Challenged by NAACP Suit—Medical Bias Charged

(By Claude Sitton)

Greensboro, N.C., February 12.—Racial barriers in federally assisted hospitals were challenged today in a suit filed in Federal district court here.

The suit, which strikes at segregation and discrimination in various forms, marks the first such attack on the separate-but-equal provisions of the 1946 Hill-Burton Act.

The program has provided Federal financing to help construct more than 2,000 medical-care facilities in the 11 Old South States. Authorities on racial matters contend that virtually all of these institutions discriminate against Negroes in one way or another.

The possibly far-reaching implications of the legal action were underscored by Jack Greenberg, general counsel for the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc., with headquarters in New York.

"We would hope that this suit and others like it would result in the integration of health services throughout the South," Mr. Greenberg said when reached by telephone.

He and other fund lawyers brought the suit in behalf of 11 Greensboro Negroes—6 physicians, 3 dentists, and 2 patients—and other residents of that race as a class. Named as defendants were the Moses H. Cone Memorial Hospital and Wesley Long Community Hospital and their administrators.

The suit was filed this morning with the clerk of the U.S. District Court for the middle district of North Carolina by Conrad O. Pearson of Durham, N.C.

He is legal counsel for the State Conference of Branches of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

The complaint noted that the two Greensboro hospitals had received Federal funds from the State agency charged with administering the Hill-Burton program, that they were licensed by the State and that they had tax-exempt status.

Both hospitals were accused of denying use of their facilities to Negro doctors and dentists. Cone segregates Negro patients and Long does not admit them at all, according to the accusations.

DENTIST'S LETTER TO HOSPITALS

One of the plaintiffs, Dr. G. C. Simkins, Jr., a dentist, who is president of the Greensboro branch of the NAACP, wrote the institutions in March 1960. He pointed out that neither would admit Negro physicians and dentists.

As a result, his letter said, a Negro patient desiring to enter Cone would have to discharge his Negro doctor or dentist and accept treatment from a white staff member.

Applications for admission to the staffs of the hospitals were filed in April 1960, by the six physicians and three dentists. Cone officials declined to accept them, according to the suit, while those at Long promised "due consideration" but took no further action.

The suit contended that another plaintiff, A. J. Taylor, was suffering from a gastric ulcer and needed to enter either Cone or Long, where "the best facilities for treatment in the Greensboro area are available."

DENTAL CASE NOTED

Donald R. Lyons, the second patient among the plaintiffs, is said to require hospitalization for removal of an impacted tooth. The suit said that Cone and Long were the only hospitals in the Greensboro area with dental facilities.

It contended that Long would not admit Mr. Lyons because he was a Negro and that his dentist, Dr. Simkins, could not perform the operation at Cone, also because of race.

The complaint argued that the discriminatory practices violated the guarantees of due process and equal protection contained in the 5th and 14th amendments to the Constitution. The court was urged to issue an injunction prohibiting their continuation.

The sweeping nature of the requested injunction was emphasized in a paragraph that asked that the defendants be prohibited from:

"Continuing to enforce the policy, practice, custom, and usage of denying admission to patients on the basis of race and in any way conditioning or abridging the admission to, and use of, the said facilities * * * on the basis of race."

The court was also asked to issue a declaratory judgment that the separate but equal provisions of the Hill-Burton Act violated the constitutional guarantees of due process and equal protection.

One of the key provisions under attack states that, as a condition for receiving Federal aid, applicants must assure that:

"Such hospital or addition to a hospital will be made available to all persons residing in the territorial area of the applicant, without discrimination on account of race, creed, or color, but an exception shall be made in cases where separate hospital facilities are provided for separate population groups, if the plan makes equitable provision on the basis of need for facilities for each such group."

The principle involved is similar to that which prevailed in the public education field until it was overturned by the Supreme Court in its 1954 decision against public school segregation.

Approximately 100 of the 4,000 hospitals in the Nation that have received Hill-Burton aid have used the equal-facilities provision and barred Negroes on the ground that similarly qualified institutions in their area were open to that race. The estimate was provided by an official of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, who was reached by telephone in Washington.

Most Hill-Burton hospitals in the South admit Negroes and then place them in segregated wards. The Department official pointed out that the Hill-Burton Act rendered the Department powerless to prevent this and other discriminatory practices because it forbade interference with a hospital's internal operations.

Dr. Montague Cobb, professor of anatomy at Howard University and chairman of the NAACP health committee, said checks indicated that racial barriers of some kind were applied in all Hill-Burton hospitals in the 11 Old South States.

"I don't know of any instance where they have dropped the bars as such," he said in a telephone interview.

Mr. Greenberg asserted that hospitals that refused to permit Negro physicians to treat their patients were violating a key principle of the American Medical Association: A patient's right to choose his physician.

Moreover, he contended that the practice constituted a vicious economic boycott against the Negro doctor. "His best paying patients have to dispense with his services when they want to enter the better hospitals, which are usually those that refuse to admit Negroes to the staff," he said.

Exclusion of Negroes from medical and dental societies is also involved in the hospital issue. Most hospitals admit only members of these associations.

Since inception of the Hill-Burton program the 11 Southern States have received $562,921,000 of the $1,550,214 spent or obligated by the Federal Government, a Public Health Service report shows.

The region's share has been added to $795,957,000 in State and local funds for 2,151 projects. A majority of these projects are in areas that are largely rural. These include general, mental, tuberculosis, and chronic disease hospitals and public health centers, nursing homes, diagnostic and treatment centers, and rehabilitation centers.

The States included are Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia.

THE FUTURE OF FEDERALISM—GODKIN LECTURES BY GOV. NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER, OF NEW YORK

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have heretofore placed in the Record the first parts of the Godkin lectures delivered by Governor Rockefeller, of New York, at Harvard University. I now ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record part 3 of lecture No. 1 and part 1 of lecture No. 2. I shall shortly submit for inclusion in the Record the concluding portions of the series.

There being no objection, the lectures were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Watertown Daily Times, Feb. 13, 1962]

Future of Federalism

(By Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller)

LECTURE 1

Part 3

The aversion to the rough and tumble, the public exposure of partisan political life has choked off a vast amount of civic energy and creativity, precisely at the time in our history when such energy and creativity are most urgently needed.

The sources of this aversion go beyond the shallow attitude that shuns politics as "dirty."

For a whole generation, now, this withdrawal has tended to be rationalized as something wise and discriminating.

A great part of our youth has grown up to believe that political parties are cheap and shoddy instruments, that political life is either comic or corrupt, and that partisanship itself must be intellectually suspect.

The fashion, in all this, has been to exalt the calm and detached surveyor of the cluttered political scene, untroubled by the noisy turmoil beneath him, serene upon his pinnacle of self-appreciation, uncontaminated by the touch of reality.

I am not criticizing intellectual independence or political mobility. Freedom—and freshness—of political judgment are essential to the vitality of our two-party system.

The voter who splits his ticket—or who changes parties when he feels the candidates or the issues warrant it—is adding to the responsiveness and responsibility of both national parties.

But I do criticize political aloofness—based merely upon an overly fastidious distaste for partisanship itself.

This I deeply deplore.

It is foolish, because it ignores the very nature of a democratic process that depends upon active, intelligent, aggressive partisanship for its very life.

And it is reckless, because the level of this real-life combat, the constructiveness of political debate and the rationality of political argument, cannot be improved by persuading a free people to declare themselves, politically, a nation of conscientious objectors.

No democracy, in short, can afford to view the political scene as a kind of spectator sport, played for the amusement of the detached observers.

The truth is that our democracy needs to sharpen the debate between parties and within the parties. And this need is denied or evaded by a condescension and contempt for the political life, a muting of voices, a preference for smug silence.

POLITICAL LABELS

A second distortion of political reality can be equally damaging. This is the obsession with political labels which insists on rigidly classifying laws, leaders, and politics as "liberal" or "conservative."

We all know that, in any serious historical sense, these terms have lost all meaning. The use of such artificial labels, in political debate, merely distorts the issue and confuses the citizen.

It substitutes the slogan for thought, the false label for the serious goal. It invites the citizen, in effect, to say: "Don't confuse me with the facts. I've already made up my mind."

The confusion caused by such labels can be quickly seen if we note, for example, the policies and actions essential to accelerated economic growth—which is basic to all our major objectives as a people today.

Under the now meaningless terms of "liberal" and "conservative," some would hold that economic policies welcomed by labor are liberal, while those cheered by business are conservative.

Yet all progress for all sections of the community depends upon interrelated factors of economic growth.

A prospering business depends upon a favorable economic climate. Labor depends upon the jobs that only a prospering business can provide. Business depends upon a responsible and prospering labor force. Both need the productive genius of agriculture. And all the social services of the Government depend for their financing upon revenues attainable only through general economic progress and growth.

This is the dynamic circle of progress for our free society. It must not be broken by false issues, imaginary conflicts, or false labels. And it can be forged only by the kind of political leadership that looks, realistically and steadfastly, to the general good of all the people.

To illustrate specifically from personal experience.

When I took office as Governor, there were 600,000 unemployed in the State of New York. Business had been leaving the State because of an unfavorable economic climate. And the outgoing administration left, as its fiscal heritage, budget requests calling for expenditures of $2.3 billion, backed by revenue of only $1.6 billion—a deficit of $700 million.

To restore the State's fiscal integrity required cutting expenditures, instituting economies, and raising taxes. None of these moves was popular, I can assure you.

But the restoration of confidence in the State was fundamental to improving the climate for economic growth. And it set us on the road to expanding business and industry, rising employment, declining unemployment, and a far greater capacity to meet our social responsibilities as a State.

As an example of this capacity, the State this year is providing $500 million more for education than when I took office—in other words, a 90-percent increase in State aid to education in just 4 years.

Where—in all this brief history—does a policy or an act become "liberal" or "conservative"? According to the labels, action to improve the business climate is "conservative"—and increased aid to education is "liberal."

The fact is that the implied distinction is false and deceiving.

If the action clearly serves public good, what responsible leader will refrain from it for fear of the label it may bear. And if the action bring harm to the commonweal, no label or slogan can make it right.

TIMIDITY OF LEADERSHIP

The power of the Federal idea rests, in important part, upon the opportunity it gives for action. We have noted some of the ways in which this power and opportunity may be limited, in real life. Yet the truth is that there may be no limitation upon leadership of any kind so severe as the simple unwillingness to lead.

In concrete terms: If a State government lacks the political courage to meet the needs of its people by using its own taxing power, so it prefers the escape of letting the National Government do the taxing and then return the money to the State, then the leadership of this State puts itself in an exceedingly poor position to weep over the growth of Federal power.

The preservation of States rights, in short, depends upon the exercise of States responsibilities.

Obviously, this is the key: Responsible leadership in executive and legislative branches of Government—its presence or absence.

Here, as in the case of federalism itself, we cannot seize some simplified definition to explain the matter. The quality of leadership is a many-faceted thing, subtle in the kind of strength that prudently falls short of the arbitrary or the authoritarian.

But I think that this leadership has one most clear sign and expression: It must have the vision to foresee and meet problems and challenges before they grow to the ugly size of crises, by which time even the most detached or unperceptive public opinion clamors for action.

We live in an age that, by its very pace of change, severely tests all capacity for such leadership. The challenges themselves come larger, and they surge swiftly.

In higher education, for example, and in New York State alone, a survey of coming needs based on existing school enrollments has shown that we must double the total of all existing facilities in the next 10 years—and triple them in 25 years. Full public awareness of such accelerating needs almost surely must lag far behind the facts.

In such a time of rapid change, timidity in government only compounds the problems.

One is reminded, here, of the French Premier who said sardonically: "The art of politics lies not in finding solutions to fundamental problems, but in keeping quiet those who raise them."

To anyone who might be tempted to live by this formula in politics, I can only say that it offers a possible prescription for the tragedy that befell France 20 years ago. Surely we can find happier models for our American destiny.

Yet few things may trouble this destiny so much as a political disposition to confuse the leading of public opinion with the reflecting of it. We have all witnessed, in recent years, the widening temptation to hinge political judgment on techniques of marketing research—the polls and surveys supposedly measuring the public temper.

There exist, today, some 40 or 50 firms operating on the national level to tell political leaders and groups how the public is reacting and what it would most like to hear. Any leadership that is merely a creature of such devices is not even playing politics. It is merely caught in the complex conjuring act of a ventriloquist.

Nor do I believe for an instant that the public, in our democracy, wants any such passive and acquiescent leadership.

It does not turn to leadership as to a mirror, to study its own reflection. It looks for something very different: A definition of, and a dedication to, those principles and policies that can enable a free people to grow, to prosper, and to extend its own horizon of hope.

I doubt if any democracy, without such vision and courage, without such leadership, can seriously expect to survive the mortal trials of our century.

CONCLUSION

Let me summarize briefly:

The historic application of the federal idea—reconciling unity and diversity—is probably the supreme American contribution to the struggle of all self-governing peoples to build political structures strong enough to assure freedom and order in their lives.

Our own federal system provides a unique arena for imaginative and inventive action and leadership, responsive and responsible to the people.

The practical fulfillment of this promise in our political heritage depends critically, however, upon the health of the national economy, the momentum of our social progress, and the vitality of the whole political environment.

This environment can be rendered cold and barren by a citizenry fearful of political partisanship, by a public or a leadership that prefers to deal with labels and slogans rather than real problems and needs, or by a leadership too timid to venture from seemingly safe paths of the past.

The truth, in short, is that the Federal idea—like the whole American experience—is a political adventure. It is no static thing, no dead definition, no dogmatic proclamation.

Old as it is in our history, its secret strength is that it forever summons a free people to learn and try the new.

It requires us, I believe, to imitate its authors in only one respect: To be, like them, unchained to the past and unfearful of the future, to be—in our time as they were in theirs—political pioneers.

[From the Watertown Daily Times, Feb. 14, 1962]

FUTURE OF FEDERALISM

(By Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller)

LECTURE 2

Part 1

The reports of the death of federalism, so authoritatively asserted in the 1930's, were, as we have seen, highly exaggerated.

It serves little purpose, however, to dwell on the pitfalls of prediction. The task I have set for myself in this lecture is to examine the performance and the expanding promise of federalism in light of the hopes and aspirations of contemporary society of social progress, economic growth, and political stability.

From this, I propose to develop, in this and the succeeding lecture, a still wider view of the Federal idea—as indispensable not only to the solution of our domestic problems, but perhaps even more importantly as the key to securing order and freedom for the free peoples of the international community.

If one examines the catalog of hopes and fears before us today, there appears a striking similarity to the list that confronted our countrymen in 1787 when the new Constitution, proposed by the Philadelphia convention, was submitted to the 13 States for ratification.

What was the dialog between the voices in praise of and in condemnation of the proposed federal frame of government?

The fears were many, and stridently expressed. In my own State of New York, in a series of letters signed "Cato," Governor George Clinton denounced the Constitution as being "as inconsistent with the sovereign rights and powers of the States as it would be of the civil rights and liberties of the citizens."

A North Carolina preacher campaigning for election as a delegate to the State ratification convention declared that "the proposed Federal City would be a fortified fortress of despotism."

Elsewhere, critics attacked the powers given to Congress by the new Constitution, contending that the hangman's noose would be among the mild instruments Congress used to discipline.

One of the most frequently expressed criticisms of all was the brooding fear that the new Government would establish a standing Army to enslave the people who will be disarmed.

Any catalog of these fears reveals that what bothered these early Americans most was the prospect of—

Loss of sovereignty;

Arbitrary central authority;

Loss of freedom of action;

Loss of the people's control over their own destiny; and

A people and Government motivated solely by provincial self-interest.

This was an imposing list, and in light of their fresh recollections of oppression, none of these fears could be casually brushed aside.

Side by side with these fears, however, were the hopes of those patriots who perceived the far brighter side of the promise of American federalism under the new Constitution.

And what were they? They were preeminently the hopes for:

Common security;

Assuring of personal freedom and the protection of civil rights;

Economic growth through a wider free trade area and a common currency; and

Social progress through the spread of education, cultural institutions, the other monuments of human progress without which no great civilization can exist.

We all know, more or less well, the dramatic tale of how hope prevailed over fear in the launching of the American Federal system.

Yet, as Andre Gide remarked, "Everything there is to say has been said before, but since no one listens we must say it again." Seldom in the long corridors of history can we find a better example of where the past can instruct the present.

In that remarkable document, "the Federalist," which Jefferson called "the best commentary on the principles of government ever written," Hamilton, Madison, and Jay brilliantly marshaled the arguments for the hopes of the new Government.

The overriding mission of these men was to demonstrate in political practice that the more perfect Union they envisioned would best serve the interests of their countrymen, and thus to expound a sweeping federalist idea beyond mere administrative federation.

It was a goal well outlined in the minds of many among the Founding Fathers, but for most of the people, it remained yet a matter of discovery, persuasion, and a need for unflagging leadership.

As we review the record after the passage of almost 200 years, the outstanding fact is that the Federal framework of Government, as it has evolved in the United States, has been an outstanding success.

The fears of those early Americans as they considered the new Constitution of 1787 for ratification have not materialized.

The constitutional authority of the individual States today is undiminished. No arbitrary central authority has seized power—and neither has provincialism crippled national policy.

There has been no loss of freedom of action by the States nor of the people's control over their own destiny.

The hopes of our forefathers have been realized—and in some respects, beyond their wildest imaginings.

The common security they sought has been maintained through six wars from 1812 to Korea, including the terrific struggle of the Civil War in which the very life of the Federal Union was at issue.

This Nation's strength has not only tipped the scales in favor of freedom's cause in the two great World Wars of this century—it has also been, for more than 16 years since World War II, the bulwark of freedom throughout the world.

Jefferson was convinced our Federal system would nourish life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness in an infant nation of less than 4 million people with an economy built around the small independent farmer and shop proprietor.

Yet this same fundamental political system today embraces and serves an economy that has achieved the widest distribution of individual earning power and wealth and the highest standard of living in recorded history—a nation producing 35 percent of the world's goods through the organized effort of only 6 percent of the world's population.

This economic growth has resulted not only from achievement of free trading among the States and adoption of a common currency, but also from a climate of economic freedom that unleashed the dynamism and mobility, the inventiveness and the incentive of free enterprise.

And it is this economic growth, in turn, which has made possible achievement of the social, cultural, and educational goals our forefathers sought.

The Founding Fathers created, in short, a Federal system that, over the years, has proven flexible enough to foster both Hamilton's dream of modernized economic progress and Jefferson's passionate regard for the enhancement of individual freedom, opportunity and responsibility.

I think that Jefferson would be generally pleased by the degree to which his values have been preserved in Hamilton's world.

Why has our Federal system worked so well? Why has it been able to foster and adapt itself to fantastic growth and change over 175 years while preserving our fundamental human goals?

The answer lies in the nature of the federal idea and in the leadership which it summons.

The truth is that in our Federal system, the sources of productive power, initiative and innovation are to be found at all levels of government—and interact on each other—with the initiative depending importantly on where the most dynamic leadership exists.

This means leadership with the vision to anticipate emerging problems and shape the forces behind them before they overwhelm us as crises.

As the needs and desires of peoples are perceived, in a federal system, they thus can be met as the opportunity, imagination and energy of those who staff the multiple posts of power make it possible.

At one time it may be the thrust of wholly private initiative that matches a need with both action and ideas.

As often, it will be an agency of State or local government that seizes the opportunity to serve.

Or again, when the Nation as a whole is moved by a condition not resolved by other public or private institutions, the National Government can and will act with the necessary boldness and understanding.

There are many illustrations of this complex, productive sharing and yielding of power.

Let us look, for example, at the persistent and fundamental concern of our people for civil rights.

It is significant that the Federal Constitution was approved by the States only when there was assurance that the first 10 amendments designed to guarantee individual rights would be added. And most of the later amendments of substance have had similar purpose.

Such basic guarantees in our society have enabled individual States to advance the granting of additional privileges and enhancement of civil liberties. Women's suffrage, for example, started in Wyoming in 1869, 51 years before the 19th amendment to the Federal Constitution.

In this fashion one or more States have set the pace of change. Action by one State can create the issue and the pressure for other State and National action.

My own State of New York, I am happy to note, has been a pace setter in effective legislation for individual opportunity and human rights.

Over the years, it has pioneered in outlawing discrimination, based on race, creed, color, or national origin, in employment, education, public housing, multiple private housing, places of public assembly and common carriers.

Just last year we took action to close the final major gap with legislation outlawing discrimination in multiple private housing and commercial space—including discrimination by real estate brokers and mortgage institutions.

The power of the National Government is available and in many cases has been used to resist State or local action which might deprive a person of basic civil rights.

Thus in the 1930's it acted to assure freedom to read aloud the Declaration of Independence in Jersey City during the regime of Frank Hague. And more vivid and recent was the action to allow Negro students to attend the public schools in Little Rock.

But there is still need for more courageous leadership at the national level, both legislative and executive. For example, even by executive action alone, discrimination in federally financed housing may be eliminated.

In short, it is the availability of alternate sovereignties, Federal and State, competing and cooperating, which enforces and augments the people's rights.

PROPOSED U.S. ARTS FOUNDATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have fought for some time for a U.S. Arts Foundation, analogous to the British Arts Council, to provide a basis for the support of culture in our own country. In my own State, we have the New York State Council on Arts, which has made an extraordinary record, one of the most luminous achievements of the Rockefeller administration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an article entitled "Rockefeller Hails State's Art Unit," written by Harold C. Schonberg, and published in the New York Times of Sunday, February 11, 1962.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Rockefeller Hails State's Art Unit—Sees Its First Year as Sign of Cultural Resurgence

(By Harold C. Schonberg)

Of all the legislation sponsored by Governor Rockefeller since he entered office, the formation of the New York State Council on the Arts—and its pioneering work—is perhaps closest to his heart.

Now that the council is about to enter its second fiscal year the Governor looks forward to a resurgence in the cultural life of New York State. He also envisions a future in which many States that have sent representatives to watch the operation of the New York council will form arts councils and will interchange cultural attractions.

In conversations with friends, the Governor speaks with enthusiasm about the first year of the arts council. He is especially pleased that New York was the first State to form an arts council, despite some opposition in the legislature, and is excited about the reception accorded it by the people.

Last year was the first of three provided in the enabling legislation of 1960. The Governor is confident that 3-year extensions will be granted, and that the council is here to stay. He has asked for an appropriation of $560,250 for the second year, an increase of $110,250 over the current figure.

Mr. Rockefeller does not look on the arts council as a form of subsidy, but rather as a pump-priming effort. One result he likes to cite is the development of a real grassroots phenomenon in the arts.

EXPECTS LOCAL COUNCILS

The grassroots aspect, Governor Rockefeller has said, is by far the most important result of the council's work to date. In future years he hopes to see local arts councils, close to the people, working directly with the State arts council. Such local councils are beginning to be organized in Plattsburgh, Troy, Albany, and Middletown.

The Governor believes that by encouraging the appreciation of the arts, an ambiance will be developed in which the creators will be helped. "One always helps the other," he has been reported as saying.

It is his opinion that all over the country the arts are a latent force that has been waiting to be released, and that legislators are beginning to realize it.

The Governor has watched closely the response to the arts council, and is said to be encouraged by his findings. Communities throughout the State have hailed the efforts of the council, and local newspapers have been making a big thing of it when cultural attractions arrive under council auspices. This strong local reaction is immediately felt by the legislators.

Opera, symphony, ballet, theater, and art shows have been sent out during the first year of operation, starting last July 13. The Governor himself is most closely allied to painting. His own collection of modern art is one of the finest in the country, and he once served as president of the Museum of Modern Art.

IS FOND OF BALLET

He has admitted that of all the arts music means least to him, though he enjoys it and is fond of ballet. In ballet, he once said, he could watch the formal relationships of line against line, mass against mass, and understand the basic design.

In a speech last month at the opening of the Albright-Knox Art Gallery in Buffalo, the Governor cited some of the accomplishments of the arts council. These included:

A 19-city tour of the State by the Buffalo Philharmonic, and two young people's concerts by the Rochester Philharmonic.

A Phoenix Theater tour of 24 communities, with presentations of Shakespeare and George Bernard Shaw.

An 11-city tour by the New York City Opera Company.

A 19-city tour by the New York City Ballet Company.

A symposium at Binghamton to seek guidance for local arts programs.

Technical-assistance programs, in which experts work with museums and historical societies; and guidance programs in the preservation of historic houses.

A 12-city tour of an exhibition of art by the Hudson River School.

A 12-city tour of an exhibition called Masterpieces of Photography.

A series of exhibitions prepared for schools and libraries on art, printmaking, and other subjects.

A 12-city tour of an exhibition of American Indian art.

An 11-city tour of an exhibition called How To Look at a Painting.

OTHER PROJECTS LISTED

Not mentioned by the Governor, but also on the agenda, are exhibitions of architecture, a concert by the New York Philharmonic and ballet lecture-demonstrations throughout the State.

John H. MacFadyen, executive director of the State council, says that there can be no set plan of operation. He has tried to keep administrative forces down—at present he has a staff of four—to avoid anything in the way of bureaucracy. His hope is to maintain programs that will reflect the highest standards, and to help cultural organizations without the intervention of a direct subsidy.

In his first report, published last month, Mr. MacFadyen pointed out that the council was a temporary State commission not interested in perpetuating itself through direct subsidy. The council he wrote, "must seek to make permanent headway while avoiding a position wherein the ultimate health of the arts in our State might become disproportionately dependent on its existence."

"The council seeks to develop programs based on community initiative," he said, "which will ultimately reach the point where they can continue to exist and expand without further significant aid from the State."

All concerned with the council state that until now its work has been nonpartisan, with no hint of politics. However, there have been rumblings from some concert managers.

COMPETITION IS NOTED

One manager says that while he welcomes and supports the major premise of the arts council, he objects to the formula it has adopted with touring musical organizations. In effect, he says, the council is offering such attractions as the New York City Opera at half price, and is therefore in competition with nonsubsidized groups.

Mr. MacFadyen, who, like Governor Rockefeller, is sensitive to a charge of conflict with private enterprise, admits that there is a certain amount of truth in the statement. But, he says, most of the large organizations could not be booked at their regular prices (more than $7,000 for the opera, for example); that few communities could afford them, and that even fewer have concert managers.

In any event, Mr. MacFadyen says, the arts council is constantly experimenting, and may come up with a new formula that will remove criticism.

The arts council, Mr. MacFadyen says, will gladly work with concert managers. No conflict is intended.

He reports that Governor Rockefeller, the members of the council, of which Seymour H. Knox is chairman, and its advisory panels all believe that the council will make an audience for managers that until now has been only a dream. And, perhaps, a dream that will belong not only to New York State but to the entire country.

THE LUMBER INDUSTRY OF THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, over the past few weeks I have received a substantial number of similar letters from people in my State regarding the conditions facing our lumber industry. Many of these letters seem to follow a pattern. Therefore, I was not surprised when I also received from several of my constituents of copies of a suggested employee letter which I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUGGESTED EMPLOYEE LETTER

DEAR ———: The slump in lumber demand during the past 18 months has forced some mills to close, some to work shorter weeks and all to operate with lean order files and an uncertain future. Many employees have lost employment and pay which they really needed.

(Here follow with a paragraph about your own experience.)

The trouble hasn't all been due to poor demand. Part is a result of steadily rising lumber imports from Canada. They have tripled during the past dozen years. For the first 6 months of this year, when the western pine region mills shipped 2.6 percent less than last year, softwood imports from Canada were up about 8 percent.

Imports from Canada during 1960 were up 2,270 million feet from 1949. This increase is equivalent to about 16,000 year-around jobs in woods and mills. Here are the reasons why Canadian manufacturers can boost their shipments to us in spite of depressed demand and prices:

1. Canadian labor is cheaper by 18 to 20 percent.
2. Canadian timber is 25 to 30 percent cheaper than Forest Service timber in the United States.
3. Canadian Government timber sales methods encourage operators to continue and expand their operations.
4. The rate of exchange encourages Canadian exports.
5. Canadian water shipments move in foreign vessels at lower cost.
6. Our tariff and excise taxes are extremely low, $1 per thousand at most.

Further increase in Canadian lumber imports means that more employees in the U.S. lumber industry will lose their jobs. While we hope to keep operating, we know you and we both have a real interest in holding Canadian imports within reasonable limits. Won't you join us in writing Representative —— (give address) and Senators —— and —— (give addresses) to ask that something be done to protect our markets and our jobs from increasing imports. Just put the request in your own words but do it now, if you will, please.

Sincerely yours,

——— ———.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, those who have forwarded these letters work for several different concerns. They point out that their employers have strongly urged that this letter be sent to me and to other Members of the Senate and the House.

I believe that the lumber trade associations operating in my State should recognize that where a legitimate problem exists, their Senators and Representatives need not be used to take action. The truth is that the Democratic members of the Oregon delegation have been on top of the Oregon and Pacific Northwest lumber industry crisis for many months. The attempt of some lumber operators to give the false and unfounded impression to the lumber workers and voters generally in Oregon that the Oregon delegation has not been at work in Washington, D.C., on the lumber problems of Oregon and the Pacific Northwest is a disservice to themselves, to the lumber workers, and to the entire region.

Representative GREEN, Representative ULLMAN, Senator NEUBERGER, and I have been at work on the lumber crisis for many months. We have discussed it at various levels of the Kennedy administration and have had conferences with White House representatives.

Any attempt on the part of lumber industry representatives to create the impression that the Kennedy administration is not sympathetic to their serious problems is also without foundation in fact. I know from my own personal discussion with the officials of the Kennedy administration who are charged with jurisdiction over lumber problems that they intend to do whatever they can to provide a fair and equitable solution of our lumber problems.

Early last November, I called to the attention of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Commerce the critical situation facing our lumber industry. During the fall, I met with a number of Oregon lumbermen to discuss the situation. There have been a series of meetings with key Government officials to discuss ways and means of improving the vigor of our western lumber industry.

I value most highly the views of the people of my State, and I value above all the independent views expressed by people who put down in their own words exactly how they feel about a situation. I want the views and the help of the lumber operators of my State, and also of the various lumber associations, local, regional, and national. In a spirit of cooperation with them, I suggest that they must offer to the Pacific Northwest delegation irrefutable facts about what is actually the situation in the lumber industry. I am positive that the facts are with us in support of our claims that this administration must provide some assistance to the lumber industry on several fronts.

We need some changes in Forest Service regulations and policies. We need a thorough review and evaluation in respect to Canadian competition with Pacific Northwest lumber. We need a thorough review of the shipping requirements that face our Pacific Northwest lumbermen—both those who use rail and those who use water. We need to do what is necessary to protect our lumber companies and our lumber workers from what can amount in fact to the exporting of thousands of lumber jobs to Canada.

Yes, we need to hammer out on the anvil of conscionable compromise an administration lumber program which will correct the many injustices and economic hardships from which the lumber industry of my State is at present suffering.

However, organized letterwriting campaigns of the type being stirred up by the form pressure letter I have just placed in the RECORD do not serve any useful purpose. They consume a substantial amount of the energies of myself and my office staff in acknowledging these letters, and divert our energies from finding practical ways to cope with real problems.

I am always delighted to hear from my constitutents. Should the Western Pine Association, the West Coast Lumbermen's Association, the Western Forest Industries Association, the Industrial Forestry Association, the National Lumber Manufacturers Association, or any other group, or the heads and employees of any company, wish to advise me on exactly how a situation looks to them, I shall always be delighted to have their views. I can assure these associations, however, that a pressure letterwriting campaign of the type now under way is not the best way to secure prompt and thorough consideration of this problem.

As I have pointed out to the Department of Agriculture, the Department of the Interior, and the Department of State, a very serious problem exists in the Pacific Northwest in connection with hardships being suffered by our lumber industry at the present time, both in respect to trade policies existing between the United States and Japan and between the United States and Canada. For a long time we have been working on the problem of log exportation to Japan. I have discussed this on the floor of the Senate; I shall speak on it briefly this afternoon, more by way of reiteration and review.

There is no doubt about the fact that until there was a recent order policy on the part of the Japanese Government, due of Japan's monetary policies, rather than to her economic policies, in relation to the purchase of logs in the Pacific Northwest, Japanese buyers or their agents in the United States were buying logs taken from Government-owned land at prices considerably in excess of what American lumber operators could afford to pay and have any hope of making a profit.

What needs to be remembered, of course, is that most of the land in the Pacific Northwest on which there are large stands of growing timber is owned not by private concerns but by the Federal Government, although there are some private holdings.

Incidentally, we have some problems with those private holdings, too; and I should like to suggest to the various lumbermen's associations that they give some thought to working out with the Federal Government a cooperative arrangement in connection with getting access across private timber holdings, without our having to get into a hassle with the great lumber operators of the country in gaining, on a voluntary basis, access to Government-owned timber. So let me most respectfully and politely—but without any question as to my meaning—serve notice that I am going to continue to support the proposition that the American people are entitled to have access across private lands, in order to get out the publicly owned timber. I wish to say to the Forest Service that if it does not think it can do that by regulation, then it had better explain very clearly why it cannot act in the public interest on this problem, because the taxpayers are entitled to a Federal forest policy which will stop a practice—one all too prevalent in regard to public land—whereby private timber holders are able to lock up and, in effect, put into storage Federal timber and make it nonaccessible, because of an unwillingness voluntarily to negotiate with the Federal Government rights-of-way over private timberland. The result is that millions and millions of dollars of loss have occurred on the national forests to the Federal taxpayers, for thousands of acres of federally owned timber which now are overripe or insect-infested or windblown or diseased should be subjected to scientific harvesting. But the Forest Service has, for too long a time, taken the position that it will not follow a course of getting a right-of-way, if necessary, by way of eminent domain, although the Federal Government has a right to exercise that power; and it is a fact that some of the great timber holders have succeeded for too many years in preventing the construction of such roads across private land to those Federal timber holdings.

For a long time I have taken the position that public policy and the public interest demand a Federal timber policy which will result in making clear to the owners of private timber that the Federal Government should either be voluntarily granted access to Federal holdings across those private holdings, or it will not grant the private timber holder access across the Government land.

Mr. President, I desire naught but the maximum of cooperation with the private timber owners. But I wish to say to them that in this body I represent the public interest; and if the interest of the private owners of timber is consonant and consistent with the public interest, they can count on me to be battling in the interest of the timber owners, as well.

I am awaiting the issuance of an opinion by the Attorney General of the United States on the access question. For the past several weeks I have received from the Department of Justice advice that such an opinion will be forthcoming, and will be submitted to the Secretary of Agriculture. I hope we shall receive that opinion in the next few days.

Mr. President, the point I wish to stress to the Forest Service is that we cannot continue to have a policy of wasting the wealth of the American people in their great timber resources, by letting huge tracts of federally owned timber remain inaccessible because it is landlocked by the private timber owners. If it continues to be landlocked, it will result in the loss of millions of dollars of value to the taxpayers of the United States, because the timber becomes overripe, diseased, or windblown. Therefore, let me say that the entire matter of cooperation in the field of timber policy is a two-way street; it calls for cooperation by both the timber owners and the Federal Government. Of course I know it also involves the matter of access roads; and for some 18 years, now, during my service in the Senate I have fought here for a Federal Government access-road program. I am proud of the record we have made during those 18 years, because as a result of that battling, a good many millions of dollars have been appropriated for the construction by the Federal Government of access roads which are so essential if the small operators are to be protected from unfair competition by the large operators.

I am perfectly willing under some circumstances to agree to an access-road program whereby it is understood that the large operators will build the access roads and to have that cost taken into account in determining the stumpage charges they have to pay the Federal Government. But, Mr. President, that should not be the general policy or the common practice, because the access roads should be built not only for the purpose of getting out the timber, but also for other purposes, inasmuch as today almost a hundred million Americans have discovered that one of the most valuable assets they have in the great natural-resource areas of the Nation is the recreational opportunities on the national forests. That is a fact because from the standpoint of the return to the Treasury of the United States and to the cash registers of the communities in those great natural-resource areas, the income from the recreational benefits will often equal the income from the timber.

Today we need to work out a very wise conservation program based upon the multiple-use doctrine in regard to our national forests, so that we shall obtain the maximum of economic benefit from the use of the forests; and part of that economic benefit will come from following a very wise conservation program in connection with harvesting the timber. We must see to it that we get out the overripe timber and the windblown timber which is an ever-present fire hazard, and clear our forests of those very dangerous fire threats—a forestry practice which of course has been in operation for decades in other parts of the world, but never has been developed in the United States to the extent it should have been. All of this points to the fact that we have been wasteful of God's gift of great timber stands.

All one has to do is look at Sweden, Norway, Germany, and Switzerland for good examples of sound forestry practice. They do not permit great fire hazards in the form of windblown timber rotting on the ground and providing potential torch for great forest fires once a match or other burning object has been placed there.

So I make my plea again to the lumber companies, the workers in the woods, the taxpayers, the Forest Service, and all who have an interest in the wise management of our forests, that, in connection with the access road program, we recognize that the greater part of the building of access roads in the Federal forests should be performed under Federal financing. These access roads are of value not only in bringing out the logs, but, if properly constructed from the standpoint of use and increasing need, they are valuable also as so-called recreational access roads—that is, roads that will take campers, hikers, those who want to commune with nature, into areas where they can ride on horseback or hike on foot into the great caverns, canyons, and rivers in the snow-capped mountain regions of some of the most beautiful areas of the United States.

The type of access roads program for which I have battled for 18 years in the Senate is of great importance to the small lumber operator, because the small mill operator cannot compete with the big operators if a tract of Federal land is to be put up for bid in such a large acreage that, included in the bidding on that timber, will be the responsibility of building a very expensive access logging road into the Federal timber.

For that reason I have urged that most of the access roads should be built by experienced road contractors with the financing through the appropriation process. The cost of the road will be taken into account as the Government sets the stumpage price on the logs to be purchased by way of competitive bidding in the national forests to be served by such access roads. The timber purchaser will be relieved from the very risky business of building this road as a part of the timber sale.

But the particular problem I speak of this afternoon is a change in Forest Service policy in relation to reaching landlocked Federal timber. It is understandable, from the standpoint of seeking to hold an economic advantage, that if a large tract of Federal timber is landlocked on all sides by private timber, the private operators will not be too enthusiastic about getting the Federal timber out until they decide what they want to do with the private timber. Yet there are bidders besides the big operators who would bid on the Federal timber, and take out the windblown and overripe timber, if they had a road across the private land which would enable them to travel into the forests and take out the logs.

There is no question of the applicability of the law of eminent domain, based on the law of public necessity; but it has been the policy of the Forest Service not to exercise the eminent domain power. Moreover, in my judgment, the Forest Service has followed a clearly unsound legal doctrine that the lumber companies, under the homestead laws, are "actual settlers." The Attorney General has been asked for an opinion on that question, because I am perfectly satisfied that these companies do not qualify as "settlers." There was not the slightest intention on the part of Congress that a lumber company should be considered a settler, in the legal definition of the word "settler" under the Homestead Act, which would give it special protection. I have urged the Attorney General to render an opinion.

I am satisfied that the legal opinion would necessarily have to give to the Secretary of Agriculture discretionary authority to move in the situation and proceed to protect the taxpayers from the loss of millions of dollars that they are now suffering because the Forest Service has not adopted a policy, heretofore, at least, which would make it possible for the Federal Government to cross private land and proceed to take out timber that ought to be taken out in order to save the taxpayers the great waste and loss they are now suffering.

There is another phase of the lumber problem that our congressional delegations have been on top of for many, many months. We have been working on this problem ever since we were first apprised of the problem. We have been working with the State Department in connection with the Japanese log problem.

The situation is particularly acute in the so-called tidewater mills. The State Department, in its report to the delegation, said, "It involves only 2 percent of the logs." I said: "That shows how statistics can mislead. Has anyone in the State Department asked the question, 'What 2 percent?' " What is the effect of the concentration of purchases of these logs in the 2-percent bloc? We find it is in the tidewater mill areas. The result is they have closed down, or they were closing down until the latest stop order. But operations will open up again in only a few months. Some of the tidewater mills are closing down. Others are being put on short shifts. The result is that it has the effect, so far as our job economy is concerned, of exporting jobs to Japan; and we have no jobs to export to Japan. We have our own unemployment problem. We have our own automation problem.

So, I said: "Let us take a look at Alaska." We have great holdings of Federal timber in Alaska.

There is a need for developing a lumber economy in Alaska. I have made the suggestion to the State Department that we ought to see to what extent we can divert some of the excess purchases of logs from the Pacific Northwest, from Oregon and Washington, into Alaska. Washington has been hurt even more than Oregon, but Oregon has been hurt enough.

I am not saying that all sales of logs to Japan should stop, but I am saying that the excess purchase of logs at very high prices, at prices so high that our American lumber operators can no longer compete in the bidding on the logs, must be regulated in some way in order to stop the economic hardship to the lumber industry of my State.

It is very easy for easterners or midwesterners who have not stopped to analyze the facts in regard to the lumber industry to say, "What is wrong with selling them to Japan at exceptionally high prices, at prices so high that they could not be manufactured economically in this country?"

I will tell Senators what is wrong with it. It means that thousands of our fellow Americans will be put out of work. It means that great damage will be done to a large number of lumber operators and businessmen. It means a blow against the economic well-being of our country. It should not require any argument to point out to any American that the greatest defense weapon we have is a strong economy. If we weaken that, we shall have to look out.

One may say, "Senator, do you take the position there should be no foreign trade?" Of course not. That would be nonsensical. We must arrive at an adjustment of these problems. It is a sincere offer on my part to seek to work out with the State Department a program which will protect American jobs, at the same time see to it that Japan gets the logs she needs, and at the same time see to it that a reasonable quantity of logs continues to be sold from the mainland of the United States.

Now we come to the Canadian problem. That is a horse of another color. I spoke of the Canadian problem a couple of weeks ago in the Senate, and I said I would speak about it again. I shall speak only briefly this afternoon.

I have made very clear to the State Department, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, that when we consider the foreign trade program proposed by this administration we shall have to take a long, hard look at the effects of that program in relation to United States-Canadian trade policy. There are many reasons why Canada is being given an advantage over the American lumber operators in the whole lumber field.

The Congress passed the Jones Act. Of course, American producers of lumber are bound by the Jones Act so far as intercoastal shipments are concerned. They have to ship their lumber in American ships. Canadians do not. One of the great economic advantages the Canadian lumber sellers have over Americans is that they are shipping in foreign bottoms at a great transportation cost advantage.

I voted for the policies under the Jones Act. I shall continue to do so, for I know how important it is that we keep a strong merchant marine. I know how important a strong merchant marine is so far as a defense weapon is concerned, but I say to all the American people, "You do not have any right to expect the lumber operators of this country to pay that defense bill."

If it is desirable to have a strong merchant marine—and it is—and if there is a requirement that the lumber operators have to ship their lumber in American ships, which means that they will go broke, that mills will have to close down, that lumber workers will be thrown out of jobs, then my position is that all the taxpayers of the United States, not the lumber workers and operators alone, have an obligation to pay that defense cost.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] has given us assurance that there will be hearings on the subject in the near future, to the end of considering what, if any, amendments to the Jones Act are necessary, or what trade policies, if any, should be adopted in order to alleviate this gross injustice against the lumber industry of his State, of my State, of Idaho, and of the whole Pacific Northwest area.

I am not ready this afternoon to offer any specific legislative proposal, because I wish to wait for the development of the facts in the hearing, but I do not have any hesitancy at all in indicating this afternoon some of the approaches which I think ought to be considered. If we are to continue to require shipment in American ships, and if the facts prove—as I think they will, once they are made a matter of record—that this is producing a great economic disadvantage to the lumber mills, then the subsidy—for that amounts to the lumber mills paying a defense subsidy for all the American taxpayers—should not be paid by the lumber mills and workers, but should be paid by the general public.

There is nothing new about that, in our policies in regard to paying for defense costs. This is an important defense cost. We ought to stop having it paid by some segment of our economy, when a trade policy we maintain puts Canada in a preferred position.

The Canadian lumber operators have another trade advantage. The Canadian Government also owns a lot of Government timber. It has been alleged that the Canadian Government is selling its timber to its lumber operators at substantially lower prices than the U.S. Forest Service is selling American timber to American lumber operators.

All I ask is that we get the facts as a matter of official record, and that we then take a look at the public policy question involved. We cannot justify exporting lumber jobs to Canada; and that, in effect, is what we do whenever we support a price structure on Federal timber so high that it places the Canadian lumber mills in a position of competitive advantage over American lumber mills, leaving our lumber mills with no feasible course other than to hire fewer men, to go on short shifts, or to close down entirely.

I think we have to take a look at the possibility of a stumpage price policy. We had better take a long look at certain claims of the Forest Service as to what they think they can or cannot do by way of administrative order and regulation.

In fact, I have noticed—and the Forest Service is no expection in this regard—that when some bureau or department in our Government does not wish to look with favor upon some new policy, it is quick to say, "We would have to have new legislation," and to pass the buck to the Congress.

But a good many times in my 18 years in the Senate, after I have dug into that contention on the part of some department, I have found that what is presented is the imagining of the head of the department and not a statement of legal fact.

I look more and more askance at some of the announcements of the Forest Service as to what it can or cannot do under existing law. Therefore, this afternoon, I say to the Secretary of Agriculture and to the Attorney General of the United States that I intend to be asking for more and more legal opinions in regard to what the Forest Service can or cannot do under existing law, because once we determine what the Secretaries can do these various contentions can be weighed on the balance scale of sound public policy.

I have always thought—and I shall insist that it shall be carried out—that the obligation of the Forest Service under existing laws is to so administer our public forests as to protect the economic welfare of the American taxpayers, who own those forests. We must take a look at the stumpage price policies of the Forest Service. Also I raise a serious question this afternoon as to the so-called projection principle of the Forest Service, under which they seek to sit as prophets and project what they think the price structure might be some months ahead. I do not happen to think that that is their responsibility. I think their responsibility is to determine, in connection with an oncoming competitive sale, what a fair stumpage price would be as of now.

It is no answer to me either to get out of the Forest Service the argument, "Oh, but the lumber operators bid in competitive bidding above the price they put."

That statement does not necessarily mean that the price that they established is fair and reasonable. The bidding situation has to be considered against allowable cuts, the timing of sales, and other similar performance criteria. These sales are not in an economic vacuum. I have talked to many lumber operators about this problem—and there are a considerable number of them in Washington now—and I have said, "What is your answer to the claim of the Forest Service that you bid higher than the appraised value that the Forest Service puts on Government stumpage?"

They say, "We do sometimes. We know sometimes, in buying a tract of timber, that we are going to suffer a loss in its manufacture." But, they say, "Senator what would you do with the huge investment in a mill, with the number of employees who are dependent upon it for their sustenance, when it is found that competition for timber is such that a choice must be made as to whether or not to bid more than its worth and wait with the hope that there may be some upward shift in the lumber market, or run the risk of losing money on that bid, to keep the business going for another 6 months or a year."

That is a part of the explanation as to why some of the timber operators on some of the sales have bid higher than the appraised price that the Forest Service has put on the timber.

There is another phase of competition with Canada that we had better take a look at. I am not ready to make any commitment as to what my final position will be on it, but I am certainly going to urge that we take a long hard look at whether or not we should establish some lumber quotas in connection with Canadian lumber.

There also is the problem that the big operators created through their urging the Interstate Commerce Commission to adopt Order No. 7050. Our small producers lost their 2-week free diversion privilege. The wholesalers now go to Canada where they can secure this privilege from the Canadian National Railway. The ICC should consider whether this policy has taken business from our railroads while also upsetting our lumber industry.

I am not too happy about some of the economic policies of Canada. The other day I had something to say about Canada putting profit dollars in connection with trade with Cuba above standing with the free nations of this hemisphere against the threat of communism in the Western Hemisphere. I say again to my Canadian friends that, so far as the senior Senator from Oregon is concerned, I am not too anxious to countenance a continuation of a Canadian trade policy that is doing such great harm to the lumber industry of my State—and there are other industries that Canadian trade policies are damaging, too—while Canada does not cooperate with the United States and the other free nations of the Western Hemisphere in trying to stem the tide of communism in Latin America through the onmarch of Castroism.

I repeat today that in my judgment Canada cannot justify selling one dollar's worth of spare parts to Cuba to keep the Communist apparatus of Cuba operating on the ground of the specious arguments I have heard coming from Canada thus far that Canada will determine for herself what her foreign trade policies are, for that is a decision for Canada to make. But let me say in the Senate that the same policy ought to exist in the United States, and we ought to make perfectly clear to Canada that if she is to follow the course of action she is following in putting her profit dollars above a united stand in the Western Hemisphere against Castro communism, we had better take a look at quotas, not only in connection with Canadian lumber, but also Canadian grain, Canadian oil, and other commodities that are coming across the border in such volumes these days to the economic disadvantage of the United States.

I have named only a few problems this afternoon on this subject matter that I shall raise in much greater detail, and list more of them, later. But I have made these statements because they ought at least to help elucidate a fact that some of the senders of this pressure mail are not aware of, namely, that those of us in the delegations from the Pacific Northwest have been at work on the lumber problem for a good many months past, and we are going to continue to cooperate with the lumber operators and the lumber employees in respect to all facets of it. But they might as well save their stamps and save their time and our time, too, as far as sending stereotyped, out-of-the-same-typewriter type of pressure mail that is pouring in now asking us to do something about their problems, when what we have been doing for many months has been just that, and the headway we have already made is the result of the effort that those of us in the delegation from the Pacific Northwest have contributed to this problem.

THE POLITICAL WORLD OF AMERICAN ZIONISM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, last August 10, 11, and 17, Senate colleagues on both sides of the aisle joined in paying deserved tribute to the American Political Science Association for the valuable services it annually provides to the Congress of the United States through the operations of the congressional fellowship program. This program, which enables a score of outstanding young political scientists, journalists, and law school professors to share actively in the day-to-day work of the Congress, is helping the American people to understand better the difficulties as well as the challenges of our task here. I certainly concur in the sentiments of our distinguished majority whip [Mr. Humphrey] who said last August:

> If more teachers and reporters of American Government possessed this understanding today, I am convinced that this Nation would comprehend more clearly the problems and challenges which confront the free world.

Serving last year with the Education Subcommittee, of which I have the honor to be chairman, was one such congressional fellow, Dr. Samuel Halperin, assistant professor of political science at Wayne State University. Dr. Halperin rendered great assistance to our subcommittee during the 5-month period in which we labored over the School Assistance Act, amendments to the National Defense Education Act, and the College Academic Facilities and Scholarships Act. His commitment to the cause of quality education has since carried him to the Office of Education where, as a legislative specialist, he continues to serve the Congress, and particularly our subcommittee, with the information necessary for the effective performance of our educational responsibilities.

I am happy to note now that the Portland, Oreg., Sunday Oregonian has discovered another facet of Dr. Halperin's work. In a review of his new book, "The Political World of American Zionism," Associate Editor Malcolm Bauer describes Dr. Halperin's study as one of "compelling interest." In Mr. Bauer's further words:

> Another new book of compelling interest on the subject of Israel, "The Political World of American Zionism," by Samuel Halperin (Wayne State University, $8), is of an entirely different character.
>
> Dr. Halperin has traced in scholarly detail the ascent of Zionist influence in the United States and its relation to the successful establishment of a Jewish homeland in Israel. One will find no more complete record—politically and financially speaking—of the long and continuing campaign to forge an alliance between America and the pioneers of Israel.

Because I believe this new book will be of great interest to members of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and to others concerned with world affairs, I request unanimous consent to have the following more detailed review of Dr. Halperin's book, in the Detroit Jewish News of January 5, printed in the Record at this point, also a review published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

There being no objection, the reviews were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Detroit Jewish News, Jan. 5, 1962]

Political Consequences of Zionism, Movement as Common Denominator in Jewish Life, Described by Halperin

Dr. Samuel Halperin, former assistant professor of political science at Wayne State University, now on leave from his Detroit post as American Political Science Association congressional fellow in Washington, has produced a most thorough study of the influence of Zionism in his new book, "The Political World of American Zionism," published by Wayne State University Press.

In his several years of study, which included research in Israel in 1958 on a fellowship from the Wayne State University Research Committee, Dr. Halperin has accumulated all the basic data for his subject, and his thoroughly annotated book contains the basic material necessary for an understanding of the emergence of Zionism as "virtually the sole common denominator in an otherwise badly divided community."

While Dr. Halperin finds that Zionist strength was not impressive before World War II, he shows how the movement's "actual base of support" grew and "extended into virtually every organized group in the American Jewish population * * *. Under the pressure of world events and Zionist proddings, numerous Jewish and non-Jewish groups explicitly made assistance for Palestine a corollary object of their major programs, albeit without the 'ideological overtones' of some Zionist party platforms."

Showing how only the American Council for Judaism, among all of the American Jewish organizations, was willing to be placed in a position of a "wrecker of Jewish unity and welfare," Dr. Halperin explains that there was a desire not to harm the movement for a Jewish Palestine, and he makes this point:

"Perhaps this marked unwillingness to harm Jewish interests in Palestine can most succinctly be expressed by a statement of U.S. Supreme Court Associate Justice Benjamin N. Cardozo at the time he joined the Zionist Organization of America in 1918. Confessing to Dr. Stephen S. Wise that he had signed the Zionist membership application with 'some misgivings' since he was not yet an enthusiast for the Zionist cause, Cardozo concluded: 'Today, the line seems to be forming between those who are for the cause and those who are against it, with little room for a third camp. I am not willing to join those who are against it, so I go over to the others.' "

Dr. Halperin's effective study delves deeply into the opposition as well as the adherents of Zionism and he reaches this conclusion: "The American Council for Judaism did not provide effective opposition to the Zionist movement. Founded in the darkest days of World War II, when the tragic fate of European Jewry was rapidly becoming known to American Jewry, it presented no alternative to the Zionist program. That its peak formal membership never amounted to more than 1 or 2 percent of Zionist strength is a significant indication of its failure to stem the tide of Zionist influence in the American Jewish community. Furthermore, while it cannot be practically demonstrated that the 'psychopathological motivations' of council members were exactly as depicted by Zionist propagandists, the fact remains that existence of the anti-Zionist group provided Zionists with a potent appeal and a new incentive for intensified activity. Exploiting the alleged danger of Council for Judaism activities to Jewish group survival, and cultivating the picture of wealthy anti-Zionists as 'Jewish escapist' and 'self-hating' individuals, Zionist leadership found a useful device to win over previously apathetic sympathizers to their ranks."

In a footnote, Dr. Halperin relates that "an anecdote which made the rounds shortly after the establishment of Israel in 1948 declared that the Council for Judaism would voluntarily recognize the Jewish state—if only Zionist leaders would change the country's name from Israel to Irving (the 'Americanized' form)."

Dr. Halperin's "The Political World of American Zionism" has many merits—as history, as a study of political maneuvering, as an evaluative study of Jewish leadership. The militancy of Dr. Abba Hillel Silver in the trying days of Zionist struggles to secure political endorsements for a Jewish Palestine, the efforts of Stephen S. Wise, Louis Lipsky, Emanuel Neumann and scores of others; the activities of the many Jewish communities in this country and the support that came from non-Jews—these are reviewed factually and in historical perspective.

While reviewing Zionism as a political movement, Dr. Halperin also devotes considerable space to an evaluation of the status of the American Jewish community and the reactions to Zionism among American Jews during the years of Zionist developments. Zionism and the labor movements, the support given the Zionist idea by labor leaders; the controversy over partition, the negotiations with non-Zionist Jews, the formation of the American Jewish Conference, Christian America's interest in Zionism and the support that came from non-Jewish groups, the problems of philanthropy and fundraising—these are many more issues and are part of this very commendable study.

Dr. Halperin has enriched his book with many charts and valuable appendixes. "The Political World of American Zionism" is in all respects a highly scholarly and very informative work that will always be rated among the most important historical analyses of the Zionist cause.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch]

BETWEEN BOOK ENDS—ZIONISTS AND JEWS

(By Gerhardt Neumann)

"The Political World of American Zionism" by Samuel Halperin (Wayne State University Press, 431 pages, $8).

Zionism was born in Europe under the impact of pogroms, persecution, intolerance and injustice. It therefore always had a different complexion than American Zionism, which was mainly based on the desire to help the unfortunate. Whereas European Zionism was an ideological movement which went far beyond the immediate suffering of the Jewish community, American Zionism remained a charity affair. However, without the generous assistance of American Jewry, the development of the State of Israel would certainly have taken a different direction, or would have been impossible altogether.

What were the relationships between the Zionist Organization of America and the large Jewish organization? Their struggles and gradual rapprochement in the years 1929–48 are the subject of this study, ably conducted by Dr. Halperin, a renowned social scientist.

Because of the many differentiations in American Jewry, and also because of the widespread indifference of American Jews toward Jewish subject matters, Zionism had a steep road to climb. It took such crushing events as the Arab riots in 1929, the Nazi atrocities, the anti-Jewish policies of the British in Palestine, and the establishment of the Jewish state to arouse public opinion. Over the years, the study shows, the Zionists were able to widen their influence in certain groups despite initial resistance, and the funds for Palestine were obtained from circles going beyond those of the Zionist parties.

Zionism in America is an "indirect movement" supported by people who are not formally Zionists. The Zionists demanded a sovereign political entity in Palestine, whereas the non-Zionists were more concerned with the humanitarian and nonpolitical upbuilding of Palestine. "The more culturally assimilated American Jews become," the author predicts, "the less they will tend to be Zionists." But on the other hand, they cannot escape the magnetic influence of the renascence of the Jewish people in their own state. The revival of language and culture has had its effects on Jewish education in America.

The author finds that the objections of some small groups (such as dual loyalty) did not block the rise of Zionist power and influence but rather enhanced Jewish cohesion on the Zionist question.

MILITARY ANTI-COMMUNIST SPEECH DELETIONS

[Mr. THURMOND resumed and concluded the speech begun by him on Thursday last. The speech entire is as follows:]

Mr. THURMOND. Madam President, soon after the current hearings into censorship of military anti-Communist statements were started on January 23, 1962, the chairman of the Special Preparedness Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee had placed in the record of the hearings a volume of anti-Communist censored items from approximately 170 speeches. Since these hearings will not be available for some time, and particularly in view of the President's statement at his news conference yesterday that he was not familiar with the fact that certain phrases on the subject of victory in the cold war had been censored, I now realize that these censored items have not been readily available for appropriate study and consideration by the Members of either the House or Senate or the public at large. I therefore ask unanimous consent, Madam President, to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks these censored items as they appear in the volume I have in my hand which I now send to the desk. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD following this insertion some charts on speech deletions which, in many cases, supplement those contained in the volume I have sent to the desk.

If it is not possible, Madam President, to have this material and my remarks printed in the body of the RECORD of today, then I ask unanimous consent that all of this material together be printed in the body of the RECORD of Monday, February 19, 1962.

Madam President, at the conclusion of each censored item there is a notation indicating whether the item was censored by the Department of Defense or the State Department or by any other agency. Also of special interest in most instances are the notes penned to the deleted items by the speech censors.

I am convinced, Madam President, that anyone studying these censored items in depth will find certain patterns which reflect what I have called no-win, defeatist policies formulated by policy planners of this and past administrations, in meekly moving to meet the challenges and threats posed to our Nation and the free world by the insidious forces of world communism. It can be noted, Madam President, that most of these deletions were made by the State Department.

So that there might be no mistaken notions, Madam President, as to justification of these censored items on the basis of so-called sensitive negotiations, I wish to present a brief explanation to show that the defense of "sensitive negotiations" is not a valid one.

The censored actions which are now in the record demonstrate clearly that the "sensitive negotiations" reason will not suffice to justify the deletions. Two specific examples have been given as instances of sensitive negotiations. The first concerned the release of the RB–47 fliers. Those fliers were released on January 25, 1961, and, indeed, were back in Washington on January 27, 1961. The other sensitive negotiation which has been cited was the Vienna conference between the President and Khrushchev which commenced on June 4, 1961.

From an examination of the censored actions, which are in the record, it is apparent that the censors used the sensitive negotiations when possible to explain the deletion or change of statements on the subject of communism and the cold war. They deleted the same type of materials, however, with a high degree of consistency when they made no pretense of the existence of any sensitive negotiations. A number of illustrations are available.

In a speech submitted for review by Maj. Gen. T. C. Darcy, scheduled for delivery on May 21, 1960, the censor deleted a personal reference to Khrushchev and inserted in the margin of the speech the following comment: "Let us stay away from Khrushchev for the time being." Further analysis shows, however, that similar personal references to Khrushchev were deleted by the censors, without any comment or reason being stated on the face of the speech, in speeches reviewed on January 12, 1960; February 14, 1961; March 18, 1961; April 12, 1961; April 20, 1961; April 21, 1961; May 11, 1961; July 1961; and August 24, 1961.

The same consistency appears in the other types of deletions or changes. In a speech prepared for delivery on April 25, 1960, Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau proposed to state:

> The outcome will determine not only whether we will live in a free or a slave state but whether by the turn of the century world trade will be based on four rubles to the dollar, or four dollars to the ruble. [Either] We can remain the champion in this vicious race by exerting our full strength and rise to great heights for the benefit of all mankind, or we can skulk and sulk like fearful and frustrated people and [go] *face one possibility* of going down in the ignominy of defeat. The choice is ours; the hour is late; the time for decision is now.

The censor noted in the margin the following comment:

> This section might well be tempered since it largely rules out any chance of an evolution of the Soviet system. It is a little too militant on the eve of the summit. Eliminate either-or concept to allow possibility of evolution of Soviet system.

Again, in this instance, "sensitive negotiations" were stated as the reason for the censorship. This proposed statement had been submitted just prior to the proposed meeting between the heads of state of the United States, Great Britain, France, and U.S.S.R. in Paris. However, the "either-or concept," as the censor called it, was invariably deleted from proposed speeches without exception whenever submitted. This concept was contained in proposed speeches, and deleted, in February 1961, April 1961, May 1961, and July 1961. It should also be noted that the censorship action on the eve of the Paris meeting was a suggested deletion, just prior to what could be classified as "sensitive negotiations"; while the deletions of this material on other occasions was mandatory.

The matter of sensitive negotiations, therefore, would appear to have had little bearing on the degree or manner of censorship imposed with regard to the speeches under review.

In fact, when the Secretary of Defense was before the Armed Services Committee last fall, he quoted from speeches of military officers in an effort to show that criticism of communism is permitted. One of those he quoted was by Gen. George Decker, Chief of Staff of the Army, which was delivered on June 4, 1961, the very day that the meeting between the President and the Soviet Premier began.

If this consistent pattern of censorship is indeed in accord with policy, then such a policy should be exposed and changed. It reflects an abysmal ignorance of communism and Communist methods. Communist tactics do not change or react according to the words spoken by our own people or leaders. If it suits the Communist purpose to negotiate—and they have been much more successful in this area than we have—they will negotiate even if we spit in their faces. If they do not intend to negotiate, no sweet words from Western officialdom will induce them to negotiate. The Communists react only to raw power, never to words.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the requests of the Senator from South Carolina? The Chair hears none, and the several items will be printed in the RECORD.

The matters ordered to be printed in the RECORD are as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM SPEECHES OF DEFENSE PERSONNEL SHOWING CENSORSHIP ACTIONS

[Deletions are in black brackets, inserted material in italic, original matter in roman]

Abbreviations—DSR—Directorate of Security Review, D.O.D.; ASD(PA)—Assistant Secretary of Defense, Public Affairs.

INDEX

Speaker and speech number

Ahroon, T. Andrews (rear admiral), 131.
Ailes, Stephen (Under Secretary of the Army), 48.
Anderson, George W. (admiral), 15.
Anderson, S. E. (admiral), 95.
Atkinson, J. H. (lieutenant general), 136.
Bennett, Rawson (rear admiral), 94.
Bradley, Mark A. (lieutenant general), 27.
Briggs, James E. (lieutenant general), 129.
Broadhurst, Edwin B. (major general), 116.
Brucker, Wilber M. (Secretary of the Army), 72, 127.
Burke, Arleigh (admiral), 52, 61, 74, 77, 82, 159, 161.
Carpenter, John W. III (major general), 50.
Carroll, Joseph E. (lieutenant general), 33, 80, 88.
Cooper, Marcus F. (major general), 128.
Daniel, Derrill M. (major general), 132.
Darcy, T. C. (major general), 72, 146.
Decker, George H. (general), 4, 5, 22, 30, 76, 100.
Dougherty, John E. (brigadier general), 26.
Duncan, George T. (major general), 132.
Eaton, Robert E. L. (major general), 153.
Eddleman, Clyde D. (general), 38, 111.
Erskine, Groves B. (general), 96.
Everest, F. F. (general), 137.
Felt, Harry D. (admiral), 7.
Fitch, Alva R. (major general), 53.
Freeman, Paul L., Jr. (lieutenant general), 83.
Gerrity, Thomas P. (major general), 114.
Grant, N. W. (major general), 65.
Griffith, P. B. (brigadier general), 54.
Hefley, William T. (major general), 35.
Holland, J. (lieutenant colonel), 99.
Houseman, E. M. (major general), 38.
Kelly, Joe W. (lieutenant general), 143.
Kerr, Clayton P. (major general), 104.
Klocko, Richard P. (brigadier general), 150.
Knapp, James B. (brigadier general), 126.
Kuhfeld, A. M. (major general), 56.
Lee, Robert M. (lieutenant general), 3.
LeMay, Curtis E. (general), 113.
Lessig, Cecil P. (brigadier general), 149.
Losey, Melvin (brigadier general), 44.
Mather, George R. (major general), 87, 88.
Mayo (general), 43.
McCarty, Chester E. (major general), 154.
McGuire, Perkins (Mr.), 158.
McKechnie, Raim (Mr.), 58, 139.
McNamara, Andrew T. (major general), 13.
McNaughton, John T. (Mr.), 39.
Melson, C. L. (vice admiral), 120.
Merrill, Eugene H. (Mr.), 29.
Morse, Richard S. (Assistant Secretary of the Army), 42.
Morris, I. Sewill (major general), 140.
Mott, W. C. (rear admiral), 119.
Mundy, George W. (lieutenant general), 34, 155.
Murphy, Joseph N. (rear admiral), 109.
Nitzi, Paul H. (Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense), 59.
Palladino, Ralph A. (major general), 124.
Pearson, Willard (colonel), 122.
Pierpont, Powell (Mr.), 1.
Pirie, Robert B. (vice admiral), 25, 49, 62, 75, 112, 133.
Powell, Herbert B. (general), 31, 37, 125, 148.
Power, Thomas S. (general), 101, 103, 110.
Powers, Robert D. (rear admiral), 107.
Prichard, G. L. (brigadier general), 144.
Ramage, Lawson P. (rear admiral), 84, 138.
Ricketts, Claude V. (rear admiral), 117.
Russell, James S. (admiral), 115.
Schewe, M. W. (brigadier general), 32.
Schoech, William A. (rear admiral), 91.
Schriever, B. A. (lieutenant general), 2, 9, 11, 46, 134.
Shaller, Harold H. (brigadier general), 12.
Simmes (rear admiral), 142.
Smith (general), 8.
Speck, Robert H. (rear admiral), 118.
Stahr, Elvis J., Jr. (Secretary of the Army), 51, 55, 130, 157.
Taylor, George W. (colonel), 6.
Terhune, Charles A., Jr. (brigadier general), 85, 86.
Thurman, William T. (major general), 93.
Triebel, C. O. (rear admiral), 106.
Trudeau, Arthur D. (lieutenant general), 10, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24, 41, 57, 63, 66, 67, 68, 69, 71, 78, 79, 81, 89, 90, 91, 92, 135, 156, 160.
Wade, S. S. (major general, U.S. Marine Corps), 102.
White, John W. (brigadier general), 97, 151.
White, Thomas D. (general), 141.
Wilson, Albert T. (major general), 145.
Wood, Robert J. (lieutenant general), 123.
Yarborough, William P. (colonel), 121.
Zuchert, Eugene M. (Secretary), 36, 40, 45, 147.

Speech No. 1: Mr. Powell Pierpoint; review date, June 8, 1961; delivery date, June 1961.

Page 7: "In addition to Soviet forces, we should also realize that the Chinese *Communist* Army of 150 divisions plus supporting units has been reorganized and modernized since 1952. In addition to the sheer weight of its forces, Communist China has territorial objectives of its own [which must be reckoned with quite apart from loyalties to Moscow]. The size and versatility of Sino-Soviet conventional forces indicates the breadth of the spectrum of possible conflict with which we must be ready to deal realistically. There have been wars of one kind or another almost constantly since the end of World War II, but not one of these has called for the use of any ground weapon larger than conventional field artillery. There is no reason to doubt that such situations will continue [as communism exercises its strategy for world domination]."

State.

Speech No. 2: Lt. Gen. B. A. Schriever, commander, Air Research and Development Command; no review date; delivery date, March 16, 1961.

Page 2: "New scientific and engineering advances bring with them new problems. In the broad spectrum of competition we are in with the Communist world, the relative positions of our free world and Communist technology are vital to our future. True technological surprise could place the loser in a position from which he might find it most difficult, if not impossible, to recover. For example, if the Communists were to develop an effective anti-ICBM before we do, they would have a tremendous advantage. [They might be able to negotiate any solution they desired without the fear of armed conflict or retaliation.]"

DSR with concurrence of Deputy ASD (PA).

Speech No. 3: Lt. Gen. Robert M. Lee, commander, Air Defense Command; review date, July 11, 1961; delivery date, July 14, 1961.

Page 9: "From an air defense measured in minutes, or quarter hours, we have been propelled into an age of space weapons where time is measured [and victories determined] in split seconds."

Department of the Air Force prior to submission to DSR.

Speech No. 4: Gen. George H. Decker, Chief of Staff, U.S. Army; review date, January 27, 1961; delivery date, January 30, 1961.

Page 8 (suggested deletion): "It appears better to some—by their false rationale—to accede to totalitarianism than to risk the destruction of millions of human beings and large segments of the fruits of civilization [they would rather be Red than dead]."

DSR under State guidance.

Speech No. 5: Gen. George H. Decker, Chief of Staff, U.S. Army; review date, February 16, 1961; delivery date, February 21, 1961.

Page 4: "It was only last December that the leaders of 81 Communist nations (*parties*) reiterated their basic goal of world domination. Following their usual illusive line, they stated that peaceful methods would be [used] (*preferred*), and they asserted that general war is not inevitable. Yet, they quickly add other types of war—local and limited—cannot be ruled out as a means for assuring continued and constant progress toward their objective *and they announce their support of armed insurrection which they call 'wars of national liberation.'* Communist actions during the past year—in Laos, the Congo, Cuba, and elsewhere—demonstrate the global and diversified nature of their intense interest in the spread of their doctrine. They have disclosed their intention to interject themselves as conflict managers wherever the opportunity appears."

State.

Speech No. 6: Col. George W. Taylor; review date, June 4, 1961; delivery date, June 15, 1961.

Page 3:

"4. Intelligence—[perhaps after our fiasco in Cuba the less said about this element in our setup the better. Certainly, we hardly dare hope that our potential enemies could have done as badly]."

State.

Speech No. 7: Adm. H. D. Felt, USN, commander in chief, Pacific, before House Foreign Affairs Committee; review date, June 4, 1961; delivery date, June 16, 1961.

Page 2: "In the Communist view, all of the free world nations are targets [in the warfare being conducted against us] *for their expansion.* In the southeast Asia area, the immediate objective of the Communist movement is to get control of Laos and Vietnam. To attain these objectives, the Communists are not [conducting warfare in the conventional sense. Economic warfare is being waged, not for trade purposes but as a lure for political designs. It is warfare involving diplomatic threats, nuclear blackmail, development of hatreds, the big lie technique. It is psychological warfare to probe and] (*using exclusively conventional means. They are employing economic, political, diplomatic, psychological weapons. They*) manipulate a rash of tensions—to divide us—to confuse us and cause us to do nothing—to get American power to go home. [The Communist strategy is one of subversion and armed revolution supported from outside the target nation.]

"The threat of invasion across borders is maintained, but the application of military power is being effected by means of guerrilla warfare—the device employed successfully by Mao Tse-tung in China and Ho Chi Minh in Indochina. [Guerrilla warfare is coordinated with espionage, sabotage, terrorism, and mass demonstrations. Organization is all important. Their campaign is characterized by infiltration and hit-and-run actions, planned according to a set pattern. It can be] *Their efforts can be* defeated, as proven by Magsaysay in the Philippines and by the British Commonwealth in Malaya. To do so, we must have superior organization and must be willing to pay a price."

State.

Page 4: "In the longer term picture are other dangers—the threat to Thailand, Burma, and Cambodia if Laos is lost to communism—the constant danger in Korea where open warfare has been halted only by an armistice and where there is no peace in a divided country—possible resurgency of Huk terrorism in the Philippines—increased pressures on the Republic of China [engaged now in a bitter struggle for life]—Communist maneuvers to gain control of the Japanese industrial complex."

State.

Page 6: "[Russia and Red China are seized by a fear psychosis. They espouse revolution, by subversion or by violence, but they are deadly] *Communists are* afraid of our strength and our ability to export it as a counter to their designs on the world. We need to improve our strengths so as to be feared by our enemies and respected by our friends."

State.

Speech No. 8: General Smith at Texas A. & M. commissioning ceremony; review date, May 9, 1951; delivery date, May 1961.

Page 5: "Under such circumstances the mission of our Nation's Military Establishment is clear. It must be prepared to defend our Nation * * * and to assist the free nations of the world * * * if [the Communists] *an* attack *on our country or its allies occurs.*"

State.

Speech No. 9: Lt. Gen. B. A. Schriever to ROTC cadets, Purdue University; no review date; delivery date, April 12, 1961.

Page 2: "He may use the threat of nuclear rockets, or he may use the prestige value of space probes. [He has even been known to take off a shoe and bang that on the table.]"

Department of the Air Force prior to submission to DSR.

Speech No. 10: Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, Chief of Research and Development, Department of the Army; review date, April 28, 1961; delivery dates, April 26, 27, 29, 1961.

Page 1: "Talk of liberty and freedom is common throughout this Republic, yet there are today many indications that Americans fail to realize fully how much is at stake if we lose the present *struggle* [conflict] and suffer the loss of these concepts and of hope for freemen everywhere."

State.

Page 2: "Nothing less will permit us to [emerge victorious] *achieve our goals* as the end of the century approaches."

State.

Page 3: "There is a growing recognition of this fact as America stands today in a world truly torn by three revolutionary phenomena occurring simultaneously.

Foremost of these is the godless ideology of communism [encompassing Marxism, socialism, Nihilism and using its own special brand of Russian imperialism to enslave free men everywhere]."

State.

Page 4: "[Coexistence is not a choice. It is a fatal disease.] Well did Rudyard Kipling describe the cunning of [our] *an* adversary when he said:

" 'This is the time to fear. * * *
When he shows as seeking quarter, with
paws like hands in prayer,
That is the time of peril—the time of the
truce of the bear.' "

State.

Page 7: ["The fires of racial passion threaten to burn through the thin veneer of Western civilization and temperatures are rising. The resurgence of barbarism is fearsome to behold.

["This situation is compounded by a world where radio and television can be utilized to inflame popular demand for privileges and luxuries that stir the political imagination and appetites of minds incapable of evaluating the truth or falsity of any thesis. Motion pictures have also contributed their deadly share to this dangerous situation by arousing and stimulating surging passions which will run a bloody gamut."]

State.

Speech No. 11: Lt. Gen. B. A. Schriever, commander, Air Research and Development Command; no review date; delivery date, February 11, 1961.

Page 9: "The key figure in this hierarchy is the scientist and engineer. I have already mentioned that he is the leader in industry, in research and development and in the Government. He is the hero of progress. The Russian economy has been and is on the march. Communism has been and is expanding. Russia is growing in power. Soviet scientists and engineers are in the forefront of this growth. Promotions, pay, privileges and prestige are concentrated upon Soviet scientists and engineers. [And, according to Communist doubletalk, these people are working for the peace of the world—a peace on Communist terms."]

Department of the Air Force prior to submission to DSR.

Speech No. 12: Brig. Gen. Harold H. Shaller. commanding general, Columbus General Depot; review date, May 1961; delivery date, May 29, 1961.

Page 1: ["As I look out over this audience, I don't see many gray heads. Those I do see undoubtedly belong to faculty members or wisened old seniors."]

(Censor's comment: Too flip for occasion.)

Department of the Army prior to submission to DSR.

Speech No. 13: Maj. Gen. Andrew T. McNamara, Quartermaster General, U.S. Army; review date, April 28, 1961; delivery date, May 2, 1961.

Page 11: ["Perhaps there can be a tie for first place—perhaps there can be such a thing as coexistence. Only time and history will tell. Certainly, we can hope—and pray—that mankind will come to his senses before it is too late."]

Source unknown.

Speech No. 14: "A Seabee Looks at the Current World Situation," presentation; no review or delivery date.

Page 7: "By this training we can attain the 'unique military-construction capability,' which together with the famed seabee 'can do' esprit de corps, will achieve the readiness posture necessary for the truly effective performance for our role as a member of the seapower team. And this balanced force of seapower will be able to meet any situation in the spectrum of the [cold, the limited, or the general war] *political or military* requirement."

State.

Speech No. 15: Adm. George W. Anderson, Jr., Chief of Naval Operations; no review date; delivery date: August 21, 1961.

Page 5: "Yet—even though such deterrence continues to be successful—we can by no means look forward to a utopian peace—because in spite of numerous Communist pronouncements in favor of peaceful coexistence—and peaceful competition—their actions [clearly demonstrate that the leaders of the Sino-Soviet bloc do not choose to compete with us on an honorable basis] *too often belie their words.*"

DSR.

Speech No. 16: Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau; review date, September 28, 1959; delivery date, September 30, 1959.

Pages 4, 5 (suggested deletions):

["As Secretary McElroy said recently: "The military threat is as great as ever. Nothing has happened to indicate that the goals of international communism have changed.'

"Let's take a moment to look around. Has the clenched fist been relaxed? Five years after the armistice was signed in Korea, our troops still man their battle positions. Quemoy and Matsu remain under siege. The most flagrant infiltration plagues South Vietnam. Whose troops are committing recognized aggression in Laos? What is behind the military takeover in Tibet and the incursions into Indian territory? Who foments unrest in the Middle East? Why is not the threat to free Berlin lifted?

["The answers to these questions point squarely at the Communist bloc. Surely we want peace, but at the same time, until the fist is unfolded, we must remain prepared for the worst. Henry Kissinger pointed out the other day that: 'The cold war is not the result of a misunderstanding between our leaders and those of the Soviet Union. It is the product of a conscious Soviet policy which includes the suppression of freedom in Eastern Europe * * *; the Soviet refusal to accept schemes for the control of arms; Communist pressure on all peripheral areas * * * and the unprovoked threat on Berlin.'

["We surely are the targets of an endless, an all-out, and an all-around offensive against us despite sugared protestations to the contrary. We are attacked on every front and by every tactic—ideological, technological, political, subversive and economic—as well as military."]

State.

Speech No. 17: Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, Chief of Research and Development, Department of the Army; no review date; delivery date, January 29, 1960.

Page 5: ["I, for one, do not believe that the Soviets have relented in the slightest in their determination to dominate the world and to destroy our way of life. At the present time, the Soviet Union presumably wants to relax tensions, but only those they themselves have created, such as Berlin. Remember this: If Russia relaxes them, it will only be in her own interest. She will tighten the tensions, when it is again to her interest.

Such is the nature of communism; and against it we can mount only eternal vigilance for our security and positive measures to neutralize Soviet advances. We must not be lulled into a false sense of security, no matter what the tactic."]

State.

Page 17 (suggested deletion): ["History fairly brims over with examples of proud nations which have slowly sunk into oblivion because they sowed the seeds of their own decay. Nations who will learn nothing from these examples are doomed to repeat them. The eminent British historian, Arnold Toynbee, has pointed out that 19 of 21 notable world civilizations have died from within and not by conquest from without. Ours must not be No. 20."]

(Censor's comment: Toynbee is a highly questionable historian not likely to impress this audience.)

State.

Speech No. 18: Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, at seminar in fourth dimensional warfare, Philadelphia Quartermaster Center, Philadelphia, Pa.; no review date; delivery date, January 21, 1961.

Page 5: "The success of the American way is indeed anathema to the proponents of Marxism whose privileged pedestals will topple once their [classless] slave populations learn the truth."

State.

Page 7: "We will be blocked and harassed, not only by selfish interests who are unable to rise to occasion, but by the [Fabian Socialist and] Communists who, most of all, fear the power of an aroused American that seizes the initiative in the present struggle."

State.

Speech No. 19: Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, at House Science and Astronautics Committee; review date, February 8, 1961; delivery date, February 1961.

Page 2: "Surely this is a time of trouble—a world experiencing travail like unto few periods in its history. [With Soviet infiltration menacing this Nation and extending through the far corners of the globe, freedom of spirit and self stands in great jeopardy. The threat of catastrophic war again haunts the lover of liberty and the protagonist of peace. The Reds deliberately, fanatically, unceasingly, strive to destroy the shreds of stability remaining as we enter the New Frontiers of the sixties. A tower of peace founded on anarchy and chaos cannot stand.]"

DSR, with concurrence of ASD (PA), under State guidance.

Page 2: "We must make sure that our military strength is geared to cope with the [Sino-Soviet bloc] threat today and in the future."

DSR, with concurrence of ASD (PA), under State guidance.

Speech No. 20: Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, at Materials Advisory Board; review date, May 22, 1961; delivery date, June 1, 1961.

Page 12: "In the words of Tennyson, we must continue 'to strive, to seek, to find, and not to yield.' We must reach better solutions to our research problems in every field because, in this 20th century, the technological race with the Soviet Union is indisputedly of vital importance in supporting the military and economic facets of the crucial [power] struggle of our times.

"Basic to this race, and underlying all other areas of our competition with communism, is the great struggle for the hearts and minds of men everywhere. I must emphasize, lastly but with brevity, the psychopolitical aspects of this contest. We must win this struggle, [or we lose the world]."

State.

Speech No. 21: Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, before Royal Canadian Military Institute; review date, January 27, 1961; delivery date, January 31, 1961.

Page 5: ["Beyond a shadow of a doubt, your country and mine are the prime targets of the worldwide, all-out offensive of world communism. This offensive has forced nations that glory in free institutions to join in defending these priceless values. This is why—and the simple, sole and irrefutable reason—we and our allied arm—to counter the Communist threat. Since the day of their bloody, Red revolution, the Soviets ceaselessly have increased their weapon capabilities against the day when, in Khrushchev's words, they 'will bury us.' "]

State.

Page 5 (suggested change): "As we [engage the Communists] *strive for a real peace*, let us be fully aware of the significance of two of the phenomena which characterize the [vicious worldwide struggle now upon us] *world today*."

State.

Page 7: "One cannot reflect upon these startling facts without considering their influence in our [life or death competition with the Communists] *lives today and in the future*.

"[The Soviets, straining every scientific and economic sinew, picture mighty military power, capable of attacking under the shield of an all-out nuclear offensive and every success they achieve technologically sharpens the edge of the weapons race and enhances the effectiveness of their operations in related areas of the conflict—political, sociological, psychological, and economic.

"[Truly, the free world has decisive weapons to defeat the Reds in every realm of conflict and one of the mightiest is the incomparable technology of our two great nations. In this field, we have significant advantages over the Communists, and it is our business to be ever aware of this superiority and strive not only to maintain but to extend it].

"Yet, if our technology is to continue to accelerate [and it must to outperform the Reds]—greater emphasis must be placed on basic research for new scientific knowledge and on applied research for new hardware items."

State.

Page 23: "And here is a truly dramatic illustration of how Zeus drops off its powerful single-unit, solid-propellent motor successfully fired in the free world—and that there is an urgent requirement for such a *defensive* weapon while we [are faced with the growing ballistic missile threat of the Communists] *negotiate for peace*. We are confident the Nike-Zeus can do this job in the 1960's."

State.

Page 24: "Here, we must sense new horizons—continuously—to meet the critical challenges of [communism] *the day*."

State.

Speech No. 23: Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, before meeting of Diplomatic and Consular Officials, Retired; no review date; delivery date; March 9, 1961.

Page 15: ["Diplomatic dealing without powerful cards is always bluff at best, and cannot stand a showdown."]

State.

Page 23: "This new equipment is evidence of the technological progress which we as a Nation must continue to enjoy on a broad basis if we are to meet [and beat the Communist challenge] *the threat of foreign aggression*."

State.

Speech No. 24: Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, before corps of cadets, the Citadel; no review date; delivery date, March 18, 1961.

Page 2: "These challenges are arising from three concurrent phenomena:

"One, the threat of [the insidious ideology of] world communism;

"Next, the rising tide of technic nationalism in the underdeveloped areas of the world; and

"Last, the worldwide explosion of science and technology."

State.

Page 23: "It will be a measure of our collective courage in meeting this challenge of the future that will determine not only your individual success but whether the free world will survive and progress or else go down in the dust of despair and defeat, if the torch of liberty is snuffed out [by the poisonous fumes of world communism]."

State.

Speech No. 25: Vice Adm. Robert B. Pirie; review date, June 14, 1961; delivery date, June 17, 1961.

Page 9: "And, second, work for understanding and harmony in the community. Without this we are particularly vulnerable to [our] *a* very formidable *potential* enemy.

DSR in accordance with similar changes previously made by State.

Speech No. 26; Brig. Gen. John E. Dougherty; review date, May 31, 1961; delivery date, June 10, 1961.

Page 9: "If we are successful in preventing war, the peril to freedom will still exist. The struggle will continue to be carried on in the political, economic, and ideological areas. [And defeat in these areas could be as costly as military defeat, if it results in the extinction of our freedom.]"

Department of the Air Force prior to submission to DSR.

Speech No. 27: Lt. Gen. Mark A. Bradley, Jr.; no review date; delivery date, April 20, 1961.

Page 8: "Whereas in the old systems, people's poor data simply rested till eternity on a stock record in file, now they pop out of the computer [like Khrushchev popped out of Paris] *upon demand*."

DSR.

Speech No. 28: Maj. Gen. E. M. Houseman, opening talk at National Security Seminar, Evansville, Ind.; no review date; delivery date, February 27, 1961.

Page 8: "Our form of Government was a radical departure. It was a unique attempt to compromise with our twin desires for order and human freedoms. This attempt by our ancestors sparked a revolution.

"That well-known author and writer, Edwin Canham, refers to it as 'The Authentic Revolution.'

"This authentic revolution was [not of the Castro variety] *unlike some of more recent memory*. Our revolution was unique on several counts."

DSR.

Speech No. 29: Mr. Eugene H. Merrill, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army; review date, May 9, 1961; delivery date, May 11, 1961.

Page 5: "It is now possible to send certain devices to the United States [from Moscow] *from half way around the world* in a matter of several minutes."

State.

Speech No. 30: Gen. George H. Decker; no review date; delivery date, March 18, 1961.

Page 11: "On the other hand, we must not permit [the enemy] *an aggressor* to upset the balance of the nuclear deterrent by fielding—before we do—an effective defense system against our intercontinental ballistic missiles; if they were to do so the resulting odds would shift dangerously against us."

State.

Page 12: "The emerging balance between long-range strategic nuclear forces of the United States and the [Communists] *Sino-Soviet bloc* places a new emphasis on what has been termed conventional forces. In addition to their capability to wage intercontinental nuclear warfare, the [Communists] *Sino-Soviet bloc* also possess impressive means to wage other forms of war."

State.

Page 14: "Last, some factors to be considered in determining a balanced posture for [subbelligerency actions] *during a period of international tensions.*

"To an increasing degree the [Communist] *Sino-Soviet* conflict managers are emphasizing actions which are designed to resist and topple legally established governments. These actions take the form of penetration, subversion, and eventually—armed actions in the forms of guerrilla or insurgent activity. Essentially, [the Communists] *they* have brought to a high state of perfection a politico-military form of warfare which falls outside conventional concepts."

State.

Page 16: "Lastly, if we are to preserve our position of greatness and honor in the world of nations—we must consciously strive to place the interests of our country [first] *above those of ourselves.* If we are not prepared to accept the sacrifice, the disciplines and the great risks which this mighty nation must demand of its own—then those peoples who [will place their country first will] *seek to dominate others may* pass us by and [win the domination of] *dominate* the world."

State.

Speech No. 31: Gen. Herbert B. Powell, C.G.U.S., Continental Army Command, to University of Oregon Alumni Association, New York, N.Y.; no review date; delivery date, April 13, 1961.

Page 3: "There are many factors which affect the defense of the United States and of the free world. The basic challenge, of course, stems primarily from [rampant communism] *a foreign ideology* intent on achieving its declared goal of world domination. This is not just between the United States and [the Soviet Union or Red China] *a couple of other powers.* The [Communist] challenge is [the challenge of the entire Communist world] to the entire free world. I shall not elaborate on that statement since this audience needs no briefing on the nature and scope of the Communist threat. But I shall mention some of the trends involved."

State.

Speech No. 32: Brig. Gen. M. W. Schewe, Deputy Assistant Chief of Staff for Reserve Components; review date, May 16, 1961; delivery date, May 25, 1961.

Page 2: "The United States today faces a most profound crisis. The Communist offensive against the United States and the free world is increasing in scope and intensity. Power is the hallmark of this offensive—power amplified by discipline and deceit. [On the outcome of the conflict depends the nature of the future world order. Ultimately either totalitarian communism will prevail or the freedom familiar to the societies of the West will expand.]"

State.

Page 3 (suggested change): "U.S. military strategy must be designed to support this objective. It must enable the application of measured military force, suitable to any situation to support a foreign policy that will preserve [and extend] freedom."

State.

Speech No. 33: Lt. Gen. Joseph F. Carroll; no review date; delivery date, February 26, 1961.

Page 3: "After the Potsdam Conference of Allied leaders in 1945 it became clearer, month by month, that instead of the peace the world longed for, a new kind of conflict was beginning. [By its consistent pattern of violations and aggressions the Soviet Union became an antagonist.] The peace that Potsdam was to have helped create became the cold war. [It was at last clear that Soviet leaders saw the United States as the biggest obstacle to their domination of the world and that they would not hesitate to launch an assault against us whenever the time seemed right.]"

Deputy ASD (PA).

Speech No. 34: Lt. Gen. George W. Mundy, USAF; review date, April 4, 1961; delivery date, April 11, 1961.

Pages 8–9: ["In fact, the big question of our day is just simply this: Will the future world, that is, the emerging world order, be in our image, the image of the Western World, or will it be in the image of world communism?"]

(Censor's comment: No, we want people to have the right and freedom to choose own destiny.)

State.

Speech No. 35: Maj. Gen. William T. Hefley, commander, Warner Robins Air Material Area, Ga.; review date, June 22, 1961; delivery date, June 24, 1961.

Page 3: "This conflict is so acute that it even has a name. We call it a cold war, simply because there are no bombs being dropped in anger. Even though this distinction exists the present state of affairs is nevertheless [an actual war] *a challenge and a struggle.*"

State.

Page 3: "[The Sino-Soviet bloc is] *Communists are* dedicated to changing the face of the world and to replacing the democratic system of law by the dictator [system]*ship* of the proletariat. In the course of advancing this program, they have promoted violence and class struggle as one of their chosen instruments.

The Communists have a blueprint for conquest. It is not a rigid plan, but [Soviet] *their* strategy is flexible, permitting adjustment to changing conditions in the world and the use of its weapons singly or in combination to attack the interests of the United States."

State.

Page 4: "Too many, motivated by wishful thinking, grasp at [every Soviet whim] *Communist proposals*—their call for coexistence and their grandiose and impracticable schemes for universal disarmament."

State.

Speech No. 36: Secretary Eugene M. Zuckert; review date, May 18, 1961; delivery date, May 19, 1961.

Page 13: "We cannot afford to relax in hopes [the Russian people will pull down the structure of political power which has given them material means and national power unknown in their history] *that the Sino-Soviet Communists will change their avowed objectives.* We dare not withdraw and isolate ourselves in dreams that the *Sino*-Soviet Communist machine will [destroy itself or be engulfed in the evil tide of] *be halted in* its own expansion."

State.

Page 19: "We are sharpening the military aid program, not just to equip friendly countries for their own defense but to broaden and strengthen the base of free world forces for resistance to the [cancerous] advance [of the dictatorial conspiracy] of Sino-Soviet communism."

State.

Speech No. 37: Gen. Herbert B. Powell, commanding general, U.S. Continental Army Command; review date, April 20, 1961; delivery date, May 5, 1961.

Page 2: "[Not all of the world shares our desire for peace.] Today freemen are again challenged by [the] *those* [apostles of greed and avarice] who find our very way of life objectionable. Today's enemy has many faces. He is armed with many weapons, from the soldier's sword to the propagandist's lies."

Department of the Army prior to submission to DSR.

Page 4: ["The answer has been written for the world to see in the blood of martyrs and the ink of genius. In the Ukraine, East Germany, Poland, China, Hungary, and other Communist-dominated slave states, brave men have given their lives to show us the weakness behind the facade."]

Department of the Army prior to submission to DSR.

Page 5: ["The world Communist movement today is but a single conspiracy by a small, organized minority—against humanity as a whole. They plot to impose on all humanity a self-confessed dictatorship operating through individual parties centrally controlled through the principle of democratic centralism, and coordinated under the leadership of the Communist Party of Soviet Russia."]

Department of the Army prior to submission to DSR.

Speech No. 38: Gen. Clyde D. Eddleman, Vice Chief of Staff, U.S. Army; review date, April 11, 1961; delivery date, April 20, 1961.

Page 6 (suggested change): "Next, there is the Communist appeal (*to the free world*) for peace—the plea for coexistence. Khrushchev has said that coexistence is 'a continuation of the struggle between the two social systems, with peaceful means—without war and without interference of one state in the affairs of another.' (*On the other hand the declaration of 81 Communist Parties in Moscow in November 1960 wholeheartedly supported what they describe as 'wars of national liberation.' The Korean war was such a war.*)"

State.

Speech No. 39: Mr. John T. McNaughton; no review date; delivery date, August 14, 1961.

Page 2: ["In the past, when the Soviet Union has played the theme of coexistence, there was a genuine reduction of Communist evangelical zeal—always, of course, for a purpose. In the early twenties, Lenin used this technique to gain breathing space in order to consolidate the gains of the revolution then in its painful evolution. In the mid-thirties, Stalin utilized the same technique to build popular fronts as a defense against Nazi Germany. And during World War II, Stalin employed the theme of coexistence to collaborate with the Western Powers in the defeat of German military forces.

["Now during this era of Nikita Khrushchev, the Prime Minister of the Soviet Union has challenged the West to coexist with the East. He does not even suggest, however, that 'coexistence,' as he uses the word, involves any letup in the Communist international program. To him, peaceful coexistence serves as a basis for the peaceful competition between socialism and capitalism on an international scale and constitutes a specific form of, and I emphasize, class struggle between them. They say that peaceful coexistence implies the renunciation of war as a means of settling international disputes and their solution by negotiation. This is where disarmament comes in. The trouble, of course, is that the Soviet leader does not reject the so-called class struggle. That is he does not reject subversion, or what he calls wars of liberation or just wars. According to the Soviet view, since history is on the side of communism, it would be proper for the Soviet Union to give military aid to a faction in the Congo, but it would be improper for the United States to give military aid to the people of Hungary.

["Try talking to a Russian about this sometime. It is like arguing religion. Indeed, it is arguing religion. To the Communist, the world is a ratchet. It properly moves in only one direction.

["In striking contrast to the Soviet view of coexistence, the United States believes in a world of live and let live, of peaceful change, of political freedom, of self-determination. We reject the view that changes in the world necessarily lead in the direction of world communism."]

ASD (PA).

Speech No. 40: Hon. Eugene M. Zuckert, Secretary of the Air Force; review date, August 24, 1961; delivery date, August 28, 1961.

Page 3: "Certainly one purpose of this meeting is to get part of the answer to that question. We are gathered here to find out what is going on in missiles and space technology, not, however, just in order to upgrade ourselves as developers and manufacturers. We are here as one step in many to strengthen and prepare ourselves to [help save the Nation] *preserve our way of life.*"

Department of the Air Force prior to submission to DSR.

Page 4: ["Khrushchev's boastful threats are not aimed at the scoreboard. They are aimed at our jugular."]

State.

Speech No. 41: Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau; review date, May 5, 1961; delivery date, May 17, 1961.

Page 3: "[Communism] *The Sino-Soviet Bloc,* openly dedicated to the ruthless destruction of freedom and liberty of all mankind, already has subjugated 15 freedom-loving nations on the fringes of the Iron and Bamboo Curtains—territory in excess of 5 million square miles and 1 billion people."

State.

Page 2: "Talk of liberty and freedom is common throughout this Republic, yet today there are too many indications that the bulk of Americans fail to realize fully how much is at stake if we lose the present [conflict] *struggle* and suffer the loss of these blessings that are the hope of free men everywhere."

State.

Page 8: "I speak of them not only because of their military interest, but because our attitude as Americans toward science and technology is an increasingly important factor in the fight of free men to withstand and overcome the growing incursions of [world] *Sino-Soviet* communism."

State.

Speech No. 42: Hon. Richard S. Morse, Assistant Secretary of the Army; review date, May 11, 1961; delivery date, May 12, 1961.

Page 2 (suggested change): "There is even more cause for concern when we consider the Soviet denial of consumer goods to their own people plus absolute control of the price structure permits a great portion of the Soviet gross national product to be used for furthering [international] communism."

State.

Speech No. 43: General Mayo; no review date; delivery date, January 25, 1961.

Page 4: "As the dreadful days of World War II began, and the Nazi banner was raised everywhere in triumph, [Christian] *peace loving* people had nothing but fear for the future. Doubt and uncertainty were common."

Department of the Army prior to submission to DSR.

Speech No. 44: Brig. Gen. Melvin Losey, Assistant Chief of Transportation; no review date; delivery date, April 1, 1961.

Page 3: "Now, however, a short 15 years later, our country faces [a well organized deadly challenge by the leaders of the Soviet Union and China] *potential adversaries* with [their] vast human and material resources.

"The objectives of [these leaders and] the Communist [Party] *leaders* are crystal clear—destruction of capitalism and *to leave open their path to* world domination—by whatever means will best attain these ends."

State.

Speech No. 46: Lt. Gen. B. A. Schriever; review date, May 11, 1961; delivery date, May 17, 1961.

Page 2: "The danger that confronts us is evident. Mr. Khrushchev has said flatly to the free world, 'We will bury you.'"

(Censor's comment: "He has denied that he meant this literally.")

Speech No. 47: Speech reviewed May 9, 1961, "The Communist Challenge Today."

Page 1: "I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak to you today. I am particularly pleased that the subject area is communism. Why? Because I believe that the threat of the world Communist movement is the most important single factor affecting your lives and mine today. Regardless of whether you are a member of the military community or of the civilian community, this challenge is shaping virtually every aspect of our life today. Their challenge is all inclusive and *according to their leaders* is aimed very simply and clearly at one goal—[world communism] *conquest of the world.*"

State.

Page 5: "In the field of propaganda, the [world] Communist movement expends tremendous amounts of money and other resources."

State.

Speech No. 48: Hon. Stephen Ailes, Under Secretary of the Army; no review date; delivery date, April 15, 1961.

Page 4: ["We are looking the wrong way up a loaded gun. The man on the other end of the gun is a very unfriendly looking fellow and a fellow who has a look in his eye that we do not really understand."]

State.

Speech No. 49: Vice Adm. R. B. Pirie, U.S.N.; review date, February 23, 1961; delivery date, February 26, 1961.

Page 1: "Let us understand that the cold war, or as it is sometimes misleadingly termed, peaceful coexistence, is only an integral part of the communistic attempt to ultimately dominate the whole world—[an attempt that is better described as the broad war]."

Deputy ASD(PA).

Page 2: "It is conceivable, [and even likely], that so long as we remain militarily strong, we will never be called upon to use our strength for war. This does not mean that such a condition will result in [our winning the broad war] *ultimate victory for us,* however. The fact is, if all we do is to attend to our military strength, we will surely lose the struggle against Communist domination. The military stalemate, [or as someone has called it, the balance of terror], is only a holding action. The battle goes on at all of the other levels, while the military stalemate exists. And it is in some of these other levels that [the broad war and] the rights of man for the entire world can be lost. [We can protect the overcoat of Freedom from the violent theft in the daytime, only to find that the moths of subversion and slow revolution have devoured it in the night.]"

Deputy ASD (PA).

Speech No. 50: Maj. Gen. John W. Carpenter III, commander, Commander AFFPC; no review date.

Page 3: "The X-15 is the Man o' War of the stable of research aircraft to date."

(Censor's comment: let's use another steed—Zev, Gallant Fox, etc., but not this one.)

DSR.

Speech No. 51: Hon. Elvis J. Stahr, Jr., Secretary of the Army; review date, March 13, 1961; delivery date, March 14, 1961.

Page 1: "The whole history of [Communist] *Sino-Soviet* imperialism is a history of one limited aggression after another for limited objectives; of advances in the face of weakness and retreats in the face of strength and determination of moves carefully calculated to [advance the Communist cause] *expand its area of control* little by little without touching off a world [holocaust] *conflict* which could profit them nothing. [There is no reason to believe that the Communist conspiracy will abandon its goal of world domination; or alter the basic strategy contrived to attain that goal.]"

State.

Page 1: "I can think of no aspect of national defense which is of greater significance today in view of the all-embracing nature of the threat to our liberty, our ideals, and indeed our very survival [which is embodied in the aggressive aims and policies of militant communism, and the multiplicity of means by which that threat might be put into effect] *which is present in the world today.*"

State.

Page 3: "Alone we can expect to contain the [Communist] *Sino-Soviet* empire only at tremendous risk of global nuclear war."

State.

Speech No. 52: Adm. Arleigh Burke, Chief of Naval Operations; no review date; delivery date, November 3, 1960.

Page 1: "On the continent of Africa alone 15 new countries have just been admitted to the United Nations. These new countries are taking their first steps—in some cases, uncertain steps—as soverign world powers."

["In many ways they are like children. Like children they are proud, exuberant, and excitable. Like children they must still learn about their responsibilities in the world and *to* the world. And like children some of them look for a quick and easy road to maturity, a road which would bypass the rough spots and the uphill climbs. To some of these new nations communism looks like this quick and easy way to get ahead without the hard work—the very hard work—that the earning of freedom demands."]

State.

Speech No. 53: Maj. Gen. Alva R. Fitch, Deputy Assistant Chief of Staff for Intelligence; no review date; delivery date, July 1961.

Page 1: ["History is moving at an accelerated pace towards a showdown between the free and the Communist worlds. The lines were clearly drawn at the recent Kennedy-Khrushchev talks in Vienna."]

State.

Page 3: "As I implied earlier [the Soviet] *Communist* leaders today appear to view the future with confidence."

State.

Page 3: "Much has been done to meet the [Soviet] *Communist* challenge; more is being done at present; much more must be done in the future if we are to emerge victorious."

State.

Speech No. 54: Brig. Gen. P. B. Griffith; no review date; delivery date, May 9, 1960.

Page 2: "First, adequate military force in being alert and combat capable. Second, the determination and the split second decision making processes to use this force if necessary, and third, the realization by [the Soviets] *an aggressor* that if they start a major war, we will [use it against them] *prevail.*"

State.

Speech No. 55: Hon. Elvis J. Stahr, Jr., Secretary of the Army; review date, September 2, 1961; delivery date, September 6, 1961.

Page 3: ["Communist leaders, if not actually planning to precipitate a war, have at least shown a penchant for taking all but the next-to-last step toward the brink. As a result, they have managed to advance their cause in southeast Asia, Africa, the Middle East, and in Cuba."]

State.

Speech No. 56: Maj. Gen. A. M. Kuhfeld, Judge Advocate General, USAF; no review date; delivery date, November 11, 1961.

Pages 4–5: "[Are we God's chosen people?]

"This, too, has been advanced by some, during the course of history, as the reason for being and the guarantee of survival.

"[We are a Christian nation.] Our forefathers came to these shores so that they might have the privilege of worshipping as they pleased. But there is no single faith in the United States. Virtually every God-loving creed in the world has its own adherents among our people."

State.

Speech No. 57: Lt. Gen. Arthur Trudeau; no review date; delivery date February 1, 1961.

Page 2: "There can be no doubt in any of our minds today as to why we must have the best possible weapons and equipment in all the Armed Forces [locked as we are in vital competition with the Communists] *in order to negotiate from a position of strength for peace.* Without a doubt, our ability to maintain a qualitative weapon superiority [over the Reds] may mean [own survival in years to come]. (Two unreadable words) *the success or failure.*"

Page 2-3: ["As a longtime student of communism, I am convinced that the Communist conspiracy directed toward absolute, universal domination of the world—the philosophy of Marx and Lenin, the philosophy of Stalin and Khrushchev, is unchangeable. These totalitarians in thought and action have clearly stated again and again that their simple, sole and stark objective is to bury us. It mkes no difference to them how they do it—militarily, economically, or otherwise—or in combination.

["The glaring proof lies in their action of last December. After endless days of wrangling and compromise by the 81-Communist summit in Moscow, the Reds reaffirmed in a weighty manifesto the policy of so-called peaceful coexistence, and at the same time they hailed the continuation of the worldwide class struggle and they charged this Nation with being the world's leading protagonist of aggression and war.

["Again, just a month ago in a report to a general meeting of the party organizations in Moscow—a speech generally considered to be the most important pronouncement issued in the Communist capital since the close of World War II, Khrushchev created a new kind of war. According to Communist doctrine, this is a war of liberation and he proceeded, conveniently, to drop into this so-called third category of conflict such Communist ventures into anarchy and chaos as support for Castro's Cuba and the agony in Algeria.

["Now, our ability to meet the challenge of Soviet imperialism will determine whether our way of life will continue on this earth in the decades and centuries ahead. If we fail what we face, our schools in the year 2000 A.D. will teach Communist doctrine; our children will be specialist slaves."]

State.

Page 3: "These are the things we must think of and act upon. Truly, our world today is electrified with revolutionary upheavals. [As we engage the Communists] Let us be fully aware of the significance of two which are part and parcel of [the vicious worldwide conflict forced upon us]" *our lives and our future.*

State.

Page 5: "[Today, in the face of the worldwide threat of international communism,] *The* stakes are such that there is no room for bluff or indecision."

State.

Page 7: "Meanwhile, the [Reds] *Communists* could steal the information 2 years after we have it and still beat us to the punch."

State.

Speech No. 58: Rear Admiral McKechnie.

Page 1: "and yet, just as surely as we stand here tonight, [world war three is already underway]. Just so you don't label me as a warmonger, let's take a look at some facts."

Censor's note: "State says will affect foreign relations due to tone of speech."

State.

Speech No. 60: CINCNORAD address to the Los Angeles World Affairs Council; no review date; delivery date, February 14, 1961.

Page 2: "The remaining 12 years have seen us up to our necks in something short of a shooting war—yet a real [war] *contest,* nonetheless, and its [battles] *challenges* are just as real and just as important as any *struggle* we or anybody else has ever engaged in. The danger is that we may or will not recognize cold war as [real war] *a vital struggle* and that we may not devote our every energy to the pursuance of it. It is a [war] *struggle* fought less with bullets than with ideas, ideals, economics, ideologies, pressures, and above all with character and faith in the rightness of our beliefs.

Page 4: "If the [mind in the Kremlin] *aggressor* is not so persuaded, NORAD has, of course, a critical operational role. And, I think it is safe to say that air and space defense assumes a very major role in the event of sudden irrational acts; [and the red faced, shoe beating demonstration in the United States may be taken as evidence that irrational decisions in the Kremlin at this time are not at all impossible]."

State.

Speech No. 61: Adm. Arleigh Burke, Chief of Naval Operations; no review date; delivery date, November 18, 1960.

Page 2: "In the Communist [dictionary] *terms* 'peaceful coexistence' [is defined as] *actually means* a period in which communism can further its goal of world empire without interference or resistance. A program of organized starvation and murder is neatly labeled [agrarian reform] *collectivization of agriculture;* and 'people's democracy' is the name given to rule by brutal dictatorship."

State.

Speech No. 62: Vice Adm. R. B. Pirie; no review date; delivery date, March 21, 1960.

Page 10 (suggested deletion): "Southeast Asia, Laos, Taiwan, India are all familiar names, and rumblings connected with them continue to be heard. Other parts of the world are now also feeling the pressure of Communist aims and are being actively wooed with enticing offers of help. [What is hard for us to grasp is that many unwary nations are responding like puppets on a string—some right in our own backyard.]"

Censor's comment: "Cuba is not in U.S. 'backyard' and resents being told so."

State.

Speech No. 63: Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau; review date, April 19, 1960; delivery date, April 25, 1960.

Page 2: "The second phenomenon involved in this world collision is the growth and spread of an international conspiracy—world communism. This [vicious] *alien* ideology is dedicated to gaining control of the minds of men, and through that control unlimited power over the globe;".

State.

Pages 11, 12 (suggested deletions): ["This is no mean task and it will require the best *efforts* of all of us. Even Cato, the wily Roman leader, could not destroy Carthage by himself. But by the iteration and reiteration of the demand 'Delenda est Carthago'—'Carthage must be destroyed'—he persuaded a Roman Senate that the future of Rome required the destruction of its greatest rival, Carthage. And, as you know, an aroused Rome went on to raze Carthage to the ground.]

(Censor's note: Are we suggesting 'Delenda est U.S.S.R.'? If left in, modify by some such comment as 'exertions equivalent to those of wartime are required today in America if we are to maintain peace with honor.)

The outcome will determine not only whether we will live in a free or a slave state but whether by the turn of the century world trade will be based on four rubles to the dollar, or four dollars to the ruble. [Either] We can remain the champion in this vicious race by exerting our full strength and rise to great heights for the benefit of all mankind, or we can skulk and sulk like fearful and frustrated poeple and [go] *face one possibility of going* down in the ignominy of defeat. The choice is ours; the hour is late; the time for decision is now.

(Censor's note: This section might well be tempered since it largely rules out any chance of an evolution of the Soviet system. It is a little too militant on the eve of the Summit. Eliminate either or concept to allow possibility of evolution of Soviet system.)

State.

Speech No. 64: Speech for Safoi, No. 12 in series "Aerospace Talks"; review date, July 28, 1960; no delivery date.

Page 1: ["The men in the Kremlin like red. They seem to think they invented it and that it belongs to them. To the Communists, red is the color of revolution and violence. Certainly it is the color of the blood they spill so freely in purges, and in the suppression of revolts in Hungary and elsewhere.

["But here, in the United States, there is one red object the Communist bosses devoutly wish did not exist.

["It is simply a red telephone."]

Department of the Air Force prior to submission to DSR.

Speech No. 65: Maj. Gen. N. W. Grant; no review date; delivery date, May 21, 1960.

Page 6: "However, we must remember that behind that smiling face there still remain numerous statements of purpose that indicate no change in the Communist plan for world conquest. Khrushchev himself in an exchange with a reporter from one of our newspapers not long ago said, 'We will bury you.' When he was asked to explain the meaning of this statement, he jokingly responded that he meant that the Soviet Union would surpass us economically. [Nevertheless, in his written statements and in other talks, he has indicated that the Soviet Union intends to bury us literally, rather than figuratively. For instance,] *Yet,* Khrushchev said at one point, 'The working class of one country unites with the working class of another in order to do away with capitalism.' "

(Censor's comment: "This is against policy.")

State.

Speech No. 66: Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau; review date, February 19, 1960; delivery date, February 19–24, 1960.

Page 2: "As a longtime student of communism, I am convinced that the Communist intention of world domination stressed by Marx and Lenin and their successors remains unchanged. They have clearly stated many times that their objectives is to destroy *or bury or outproduce* us. [This] *These* cold hard facts can still be seen through the [veneer of smiles and honeyed] *contradictory, ambiguous* words flowing from the Kremlin.

State.

Page 3: "To combat this *vigorous, great, or determined* [vicious] Communist challenge which is economic and political as well as military—the free world has united together in a series of pacts and alliances to withstand the surge of communism."

State.

Speech No. 67: Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau; review date, March 14, 1960; delivery date, March 20, 1960.

Page 5: "The [vicious] Communist challenge, in all its insidious aspects calls for a national awakening commensurate with the national danger."

DSR in accordance with similar changes previously made by State.

Speech No. 68: Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau; no review date; delivery date, April 5, 1960.

Page 2: "As I see it, we are locked in a death struggle with communism to prevent this [vicious] ideology from gaining the unlimited power it seeks over the globe and the whole of mankind."

State.

Speech No. 69: Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, ninth meeting of Army key scientists, Brooke Army Medical Center, Fort Sam Houston, Tex.; review date, April 21, 1960; delivery date: April 27, 1960.

Page 10: ["Let us not be deceived by beguiling assurances that Communist aggressors have had a change of heart. Let us not be hoodwinked by Khrushchev's cunning conniving."]

DSR in accordance with similar changes previously made by State.

Page 11: "Never for an instant, however, must we forget that our *potential* enemy, and I mean the fanatically determined forces in the Kremlin and Peiping, is implacable."

DSR in accordance with similar changes previously made by State.

Speech No. 70: Talk to be given at the Squadron Officers School graduation exercises; no review date; delivery date, July 29, 1960.

Page 3: "To people of high national integrity, it is difficult and distasteful to have to deal with as an equal, [an opponent who uses every gutter fighting trick against us] *such an opponent*.

State.

Page 4: "In the final analysis, we [knew] *believe* that Communist materialism has nothing to offer to the rest of the world."

State.

Speech No. 71: Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau; review date, May 20, 1960; delivery date, May 27, 1960.

Page 3: ["At the present time, the Soviet Union presumably wants to 'relax tensions', but only those they themselves have created such as Berlin."]

State.

Speech No. 72: Maj. Gen. T. C. Darcy, Assistant for Western Affairs, Deputy Chief of Staff, Plans and Programs; no review date; delivery date, May 21, 1960.

Page 3: "The weapons of the cold war include politics, diplomacy, economics, propaganda, [espionage,] and every other action short of armed conflict. [Clearly enough, our opponent here has been the Soviet Union.]"

State.

Page 6: "I think we may fairly say that we are a peaceful people. We do not seek wars, nor do we seek to impose our will upon the people of other nations. We have, therefore, continued to hope that the Communist countries would modify their approach and be content to remain within their own bounds. [That is why we have been eager to believe that Khrushchev's smiling face and outstretched hand were indications of a new attitude on the part of the Soviets. We have wanted to believe that he was coming to us in friendship and to establish peaceful relationships.]"

(Censor's note: "Let's stay away from Khrushchev for the time being.")

State.

Page 7 (suggested deletion): ["Khrushchev, himself, has made a sufficient number of statements to indicate that the Communists have not modified their philosophy."]

State.

Page 7: ["for example, not too long ago he said that his country would bury us. Did he mean this merely economically or in peaceful competition, as he phrases it? It doesn't seem very likely, for in another statement, he pointed out that Communists attach great importance to revolutionary theory and were achieving their successes precisely because they are always guided by Marxist-Leninist teachings. The revolutionary theory, the early teachings of Marx and Lenin, all forecast a continuing struggle against the capitalist states ending only when these states were overthrown.

["Consequently, Khrushchev means that the Communist Party, the Soviet state, has not veered away from early Communist revolutionary theory. It not only still believes in it, but it will act upon this belief. Any other intentions we read into Communist statements are merely derived from their belief in expediency. They will employ any ruse, practice any cunning to achieve their end. And if they can lull us into a false sense of security by disassembling, we may be sure that they will do it so that they may ultimately achieve their ends of overthrowing our type of government and ending our way of life.

["Once we recognized the constancy of purpose of the Communists, we set about to prepare ourselves to resist communism as effectively as possible. The Soviet threat is a very dynamic one, and we must adopt dynamic means to counter it. Dynamic means suggest that we must have strength and that is the position we have adopted to protect ourselves. We believe, from the facts that face us, that we must be strong in order to protect ourselves from the threat of the Communist world."]

State.

Speech No. 73: Hon. Wilber M. Brucker, Secretary of Army; review date, January 12, 1960; delivery date, February 7, 1960.

Page 3 (suggested deletions): "In seeking an example to influence our children to a life of virtue, diligency, and good citizenship, how fortunate it is that we need never cloak the memory of this man with borrowed trappings of virtue, honesty and humility—[like the embalmed body of a Lenin lying entombed in Red Square]. How fortunate for us that Washington had immortal greatness, born of truth and genuineness—[not the kind so easily discredited, like the fleeting glory of a Stalin, branded as a murderer by the next ambitious man to come to power]."

State.

Speech No. 74: Adm. Arleigh Burke; no review date; delivery date, June 4, 1961.

Pages 7–8: "Today—as in the past—the United States is engaged in a grim competition with [an alien philosophy that has taken over whole countries without firing a shot. That is why the only real way to increase the strength of our Nation is to strengthen what is under attack, to strengthen the individual] *an expansionist movement that assigns a high priority to nonmilitary means in its drive for world dominion.*"

State.

Page 8: ["In the words of Cardinal Newman, if there is any truth brought home to us by conscience, it is this: that we are personally responsible for what we do, that we have no means of shifting our responsibility, and that dereliction of duty involves punishment."]

Speaker's office.

Speech No. 75: Vice Adm. Robert B. Pirie; no review date; delivery date, March 18, 1961.

Page 3 (suggested deletion): ["Khrushchev said: 'We will bury you.' "]

State.

Speech No. 76: Gen. George H. Decker; review date, February 3, 1961; delivery date, February 6, 1961.

Page 11 (suggested deletion): "However, after World War II, the aggressive designs of the [Soviet Union] *Communists* became all too clear."

DSR suggested change under State guidance.

Speech No. 77: Adm. Arleigh Burke; no review date; delivery date, July 11, 1961.

Page 2 (suggested deletion): ["The insidious cancer of communism inching down the peninsula of southeast Asia; the festering sore of Cuba; the almost malarial reoccurrence of Communist threats over Berlin; the growing infection spread by Communist infiltration and subversion throughout the underdeveloped areas of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, are only the latest symptoms of a sick and troubled world."]

State.

Speech No. 78: Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau; no review date; delivery date, February 3, 1960.

Page 14 (suggested change): "There must be no doubt as to our determination not only to win in this mad race but to [destroy the virus] *prevent the expansion* of communism as a major threat to freemen everywhere."

State.

Speech No. 79: Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau; review date, December 30, 1959; delivery date, January 15, 1960.

Page 5: "Additionally, the Soviets have provided large quantities of weapons and equipment to various [subverted or controlled], ultranationalist movements outside the Iron and Bamboo Curtains, [such as] *in such countries as* Iraq, Indonesia, and Afghanistan."

State.

Page 6: ["I ask you, is it not probable that in the event of hostilities within Fidel Castro's Cuba that Communist volunteers with modern weapons from the Soviet Union and Red China will be in action? Let us not forget Guatemala."]

State.

Speech No. 80: Lt. Gen. J. F. Carroll, IG USAF; review date, May 11, 1961; delivery date, May 19, 1961.

Page 16: "A negative philosophy won't sustain us [in this conflict]. We must live a positive philosophy."

(Censor's comment: "Use softer term.")

State.

Page 17: ["Make no mistake; we are at war right now—a total war of ideas. War becomes total when the price is total; the world itself."]

(Censor's comment: "Too strong.")

State.

Speech No. 81: Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau; review date, February 4, 1960; delivery date, February 8, 1960.

Pages 2–3: "Beyond the shadow of a doubt this country is still the prime target of an endless and all-out offensive by world communism. The Communists [attack] *engage* us on every front and by every means at their disposal *short of direct military action.* Their strategy [of threats] includes a powerful posture, subversion, [police actions,] economic warfare and [even widely published technological accomplishments] *a massive propaganda machine geared to the exploitation of dramatic technological accomplishments.*"

State.

Speech No. 82: Adm. Arleigh Burke; no review date; delivery date, February 22, 1951.

Page 2 (suggested deletion): ["For just this sort of free, unrestricted thinking has produced most of the remarkable accomplishments throughout our Nation's history. And it is precisely this kind of free discussion of alternative solutions to our problems that we must rely on for our future progress."]

DSR on recommendation of JCS with concurrence of Deputy ASD (PA).

Speech No. 83: Lt. Gen. Paul L. Freeman, Jr., deputy commanding general for Reserve Forces, U.S. Army Command, Fort Monroe, Va.; review date, May 2, 1961; delivery date, May 16, 1961.

Page 1: "[There is no doubt but that everyone in our Nation has] *Most people in our country have* heard much about communism [and knows that we are engaged in some sort of a struggle with the Soviets, generally known at present as the cold war. They also know that Red China is involved, that bearded Castro's Cuba is giving us trouble and that there is much confusion]. *They know that the Soviet Union and Communist China are using it as the vehicle for expansion and domination of other nations. They see this in Castro's Cuba and in the troubles* in Africa and southeast Asia.

"Of course, the better informed and more intelligent segment of our population has a very good knowledge of the nature of the Communist threat and of *Soviet-Sino* intentions and capabilities, [to injure us physically, economically, and spiritually]. They realize that we and our allies face an all-out struggle with [a treacherous and deadly adversary] *adversaries* whose fully publicized objective is world domination."

State.

Page 5: "Then came the Korean [fiasco] *war*.

(Censor's comment: See Webster, "Action that comes to a ridiculous end.")

State.

Speech No. 84: Rear Adm. Lawson P. Ramage; review date, February 23, 1961; delivery date, February 23, 1961.

Page 11 (Suggested deletion, ?): "[Our enemies] *The Communists* are engaged in a massive and tragic effort to twist men's minds into intellectual putty, to stifle the questioning and individualistic nature of man.

"The sickness is contagious, it spreads. Unfortunately we see it not merely in the totalitarian countries; there are signs of it in the free world, even in our own land.

"There is developing a dangerous tendency, I think, to suppress ideas, to drown mankind in the foamy detergency of so-called right thinking."

DSR in accordance with similar changes previously made by State. (Deletion was only of struck portion, not of entire paragraph.)

Speech No. 85: Brig. Gen. Charles A. Terhune, Jr.; no review date; delivery date, April 19, 1961.

Page 2: ["We face a powerful enemy committed to world domination and prepared to use force, if necessary, to attain that end."]

DSR in accordance with similar deletions previously made by State.

Speech No. 86: Brig. Gen. Charles H. Terhune, Jr.; review date, illegible; delivery date, April 19, 1961.

Page 1: "Today the United States faces the most serious threat in its history [a powerful enemy committed to world domination and prepared to use force, if necessary, to obtain that end]."

DSR in accordance with similar deletions previously made by State.

Speech No. 87: Maj. Gen. George R. Mather; review date, March 14, 1961; delivery date, March 16, 1961.

Page 1: "It was in 1776 that Col. Henry Knox made the first proposal for a military academy in this country, and George Washington and others time and again urged that Congress provide for such an institution. It is clear, then, that the need for West Point existed long before it was established, and that this need willl continue to exist [so long as the forces of aggression confront us]."

Not known.

Page 6: "U.S. Army forces deployed abroad as part of [a tri-service] *the Armed Forces* team, make a major contribution to holding [Communist] *any potential* aggression in check."

Source of first deletion unknown. Second deletion made by State.

Speech No. 88: Lt. Gen. Joseph F. Carroll, IG, USAF; review date, August 25, 1961; delivery date, August 29, 1961.

Page 9: "For the Communist, such illegal action poses no moral problem. To betray any trust, to betray even the nation of his birth, is justifiable if it advances the cause of world revolution and [international communism] *the Soviet Union*."

(Censor's comment: "International" is a nice word which we prefer not to apply to communism. Makes it sound like a brotherhood of equals, whereas it is actually merely the external area of Russian foreign policy.)

State.

Page 11: "It is a fact borne out repeatedly in the almost daily apprehension of Communist agents throughout the free world, agents whose sole purpose in life is to subvert and destroy our basic freedoms and thereby advance the cause of [world communism] *the Soviet Union*, achieving—in the words of Lenin—'* * * the victory of the world revolution and the establishment of an international. proletarian Soviet Republic.'"

State.

Page 13: "Within less than 10 years, this Communist combination of military force and subversive activity has resulted in antigovernment guerrilla operations in *Burma*, the Philippines, and Malaya; civil war in Vietnam and Laos; and, most recently, the establishment of a Communist-*line* government in Cuba—within the heart of our own hemisphere."

State.

Speech No. 89: Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau; no review date; delivery date, May 1, 1961.

Page 4: "Your presence here is proof of the keen awareness by American business and industry that, in addition to business, employment, and profit, a reawakening of the pioneering spirit is needed today as we of the free world grapple with the [vicious] challenge of [world] communism."

State.

Page 11: "Leadtime is a key factor in meeting the [critical] Communist threat. Our present weapon leadtime is too long; it is running on the average of 7 to 8 years. This means that if we achieve a technological breakthrough today, it will be 1967 or later before our new weapons systems will be in production. Meanwhile, if [the Reds] *a potential enemy* can steal the secret a full 2 years after we have it or have it handed to them for that matter, they can still beat us to the punch."

State.

Speech No. 90: Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau; review date, May 5, 1961; delivery date, May 17, 1961.

Page 1: "Yes, it was this Boston massacre that sowed the seeds of moral indignation that led to the boldest concepts and greatest advances in human relationships man has ever known. But let us remember that the principles they fought for that day are freshly challenged every day. They must be fought for and won, again and again—through continuous, dedicated struggle. They can never be taken for granted. Already one-third of the world's peoples are enslaved in the chains of [world] *Sino-Soviet* communism."

(Censor's note: We want to discourage the term "world communism." It sounds very pessimistic and also, to some, pleasantly international, like the U.N.)

Indication that entire passage suggested for deletion is in error—only change made was substitution of "Sino-Soviet" for word "world."

State.

Speech No. 91: Rear Adm. William A. Schoech, U.S. Navy, Deputy Chief of the Bureau of Naval Weapons; no review date; delivery date, February 24, 1961.

Page 2: "We must have no delusions about the aspirations, the undiminishing goals of the Communist powers[, namely, the Soviet Union and Red China]. As President Kennedy has [said] *indicated*, 'We must never be lulled into believing [that either power has] *the Communist powers have* yielded [its] *their* ambition for world domination.'"

State.

Page 3 (suggested deletion): ["But for the present, we can be sure that the basic objectives of the Communists remain the same, no matter what facade is constructed to obscure their relentless drive for conquest. In reality, they prefer to use methods short of aggressive action. They are masters at political infiltration, subversion, economic warfare, and propaganda; and with these weapons they have expanded their drive into what is now called cold war.']

State.

Speech No. 93: Maj. Gen. William T. Thurman; no review date; delivery date, February 17, 1961.

Pages 5–6: "Rather, it seeks to establish a world [wide Soviet dictatorship] *Union of Soviet Socialist Republics* [. It represents a combination of the worst aspects of atheism, Hitlerism, and godless materialism. Under the pressure of this force,] *under the practice Sino-Soviet communism*, the individual is not the recipient of the good of the state."

State.

Pages 6, 7, and 8: "To achieve their ends, the Soviets have created a military force which is second only to our own. It is true that [Mr. Khrushchev] *the Soviet leadership* has recently modified the inevitability of war [with the West] doctrine. However, we must not allow this shift to lead us into believing that the Soviets would hesitate to use this military might if they felt [it was the only way for them to] *they could do so with little risk to themselves and* achieve the ultimate aims of international communism. Rather, we must make certain that *their apparent* * * * shift away from the inevitability of war is made a permanent change by our own continued superior military capability."

(Censor's note: Personalities.)

State.

"[Knowing that their global war military capabilities are currently stymied.] The Soviets are turning more and more to the use of [other kinds of conflict. They are using] political subversion, economic [intimidation] *means*, and [the big lie] propaganda techniques to extend their sphere of influence into the uncommitted and underdeveloped nations of the world."

(Censor's note: Implying motives. Civility.)

State.

"[Whenever possible, they will create turmoil, then militarily, economically and politically attempt to exploit the confusion that results. Or if confusion already prevails, they will infiltrate with their highly skilled specialists so that a controlling government sympathetic to them will emerge. They thrive on civil war, whether or not it is of their own making.] *There, local confusion or* local conflicts represent perfect invitations [for this type of aggression] *to Communist activity*.

"The total challenge to world peace does not stem solely from the Soviet Union. Within Asia, the Red Chinese are frantically driving to build up their own [potent military] force *and influence*. Although they lack the modern industrial machinery which the Soviet Union has, they are substituting manpower for motorpower. By our standards their methods are crude; nevertheless, they are making military production headway. [Though they are less adept at propaganda, they are vocally more belligerent than are the Soviets. Further, it appears that their leaders would not mind sacrificing many of their people if they felt that a war would benefit them.]

"[In the West we] *Some observers* have tended to believe that overpopulation within Red China and the ensuing requirement for consumer necessities would deter their buildup efforts. However, they are turning this population overflow to their own advantage. [They are sending large colonies of their people into foreign countries, there to set up Communist cells. These colonies do not attempt to infiltrate the government in the same way that Soviet specialists do. Nevertheless, they are just as deadly. By sending these pilgrimlike groups out with coerced assurance of continued allegiance to the home country, the leaders of Peiping are creating a subversive machine which threatens to become a major obstacle to the cause of freedom for all mankind.] *Manpower becomes a substitute for other kinds of power."*

State.

Speech No. 94: Rear Adm. Rawson Bennett; no review date; delivery date, April 13, 1960.

Pages 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14:

["May I make clear at the outset that all the opinions that follow are those of the four authors of the book—William P. Kintner, James E. Dougherty, and Alan J. Cottrell—and are not necessarily our own nor do they reflect the studied viewpoint of the Navy Department or the Department of Defense. My only purpose in reviewing and summarizing this book is to call to your attention some of the new ideas about our relations with the Soviet Union that deserve serious consideration by all thinking Americans.

["The basic thesis of protracted conflict is that in the conflict between the free world and the Communists, which we call the cold war, it is pointless to talk in terms of war versus peace. Specifically the United States and the U.S.S.R. are locked in a contest over the domination of the earth and, now, its outer space, and over the future of human society. The Russian and Chinese Communists hope to win this conflict though protracted conflict is to concentrate on the total objective, to follow always carefully controlled methods, to shift the battleground constantly, and to utilize weapons systems and operational tactics whose purpose is to confuse the opponent, keep him off balance, and wear down his resistance. This is a revolutionary strategy which exploits politics, economics, culture, science, and technology for its own ends and denies their exploitation to the enemy.

["The basic principle of this strategy is that a general, direct, decisive encounter with the enemy must be avoided at all costs unless and until overwhelming physical superiority sufficient to insure the enemy's complete destruction—and his alone—has been acquired. In seeking to avoid such an encounter, the fullest possible reliance must be placed upon indirect, irregular, and unconventional tactics. The important point to be underlined is that in order to survive or win this conflict, strategies must be planned not years ahead but decades.

["According to the Communist doctrine of protracted conflict, war, politics, diplomacy, law, psychology, science, and economics are all closely interwoven and integrated in the conduct of foreign policy. In fact, the authors describe the Communist methods as largely psychopolitical. Their strategy in the broadest terms has been to eschew the massive use of hardware and to produce psychological disturbances within the West while at the same time keeping uncommitted nations uncommitted or drawing them into the Communist orbit. The Communists have applied Freudian techniques in order to induce a guilt complex in the West about such things as armament, colonial possessions and foreign bases, and thus to paralyze the West's will to take a resolute stand anywhere.

["Since 1945, the Communists have been able to confine the cold war to the war zone of the non-Communist world, while keeping the peace zone—namely, the Communist bloc of satellites—virtually closed to Western intervention and, incidentally, the ministrations of the United Nations. When the West wins a round as, for example, in the Berlin blockage and Quency, it is to maintain the status quo. When the Communists win a round as, for example, in Indochina and the Middle East, they gain access to ground previously closed to them. Meanwhile, the Soviets are immune from outside intervention because we consider the Communists' zone of peace as untouchable. For example, even in the Hungarian crisis, the United States took pains to reassure the Soviet Union that it had no intention of exploiting the only real international conflict which had yet occurred within the Communist zone. We instinctively draw back from any action that might accidentally * * *. The Soviets are equally reluctant to get involved in war, if not more so, at least at this time. The Communists exploit this Western characteristic by making veiled threats of war when it suits them.

["The authors maintain that the West can only hope to defeat the Communists by learning to counter the strategy of protracted conflict, to manage conflict in space and time. This will be immensely difficult for us. The Communists possess a mentality that is much better suited to protracted and controlled conflict. They are patient and tenacious. For example, when the Western statesmen attended the Geneva summit conference, they may have had private reservations, but they were under the pressure of their people's perennial hopes for a settlement with finality and a surcease from all strife. The Soviets, on the other hand, came to establish another position of maneuver in the protracted conflict.

["The next 10 years of the protracted conflict may prove to be the most momentous in history. The Communists will try to exploit this period to disarm and divide the West, to complete their military buildup, and to win the technological race. The Communists recognize that not until they have achieved a decisive margin of superiority in the realm of military-technology weapons can they either attack with impunity or pose to the West the choice between surrender and total defeat. It is only through such a decisive 'breakthrough' in the weapons race that the protracted conflict could be terminated by a strategic blow. If they simply can achieve a marginal superiority in the weapons race, they can utilize this margin to make more effective other means of conflict—political, psychological, organizational, or economic.

["The authors, arguing that the Communists will keep their hand well away from the trigger unless or until they can suddenly deliver the knockout punch, logically point out that the concept of global dispersion of strategic capabilities takes on added significance for Western nations. The greater the dispersion—through a global network of missile-launching capabilities—the more technically difficult will be an attempted knockout.

["However, the central military problem, as the authors see it, is to stand up against the Soviets' military-scientific blackmail and not to be misled by their skilled techniques in deception and exaggeration. The Communists are masters in displaying such exhibits as military power and technological achievement. They are also experts in the art of planned misinformation.

["For example, in August 1957, the Soviets, while engaged in disarmament talks, announced the successful firing of an ICBM. The implicit claim by the Soviets that they had mastered, in one fell swoop, all the complex phases of rocketry met with deserved skepticism in Western capitals. However, when the sputniks were launched, most Western observers immediately accepted this as the final proof that the Soviets did possess an operational ICBM as they had claimed. The Soviet claims were accepted at face value.

["The fact of the matter, according to the authors, is that the placing in orbit of two earth satellites supplied no proof that the Soviets had solved the reentry problem; nor did the satellite launching substantiate Soviet claims for the accuracy of their alleged missiles. There is a considerable gap between the launching of a sputnik and the zeroing in, with Soviet intercontinental missiles, of all the West's farflung strategic installations. The authors' declare that it is the responsibility of the free world scientists to scrutinize the significance of sensational Soviet technological achievements, especially those which are announced by Communist political news agencies, and not accept them at face value. It is the responsibility of Western journalists to place those achievements in proper perspective.

["The United States has many policies, each more or less sensible, for coping with the Communists. Sensible or not, they do not total up to a coherent overall strategy. Also, we do not work hard enough to project our image of the open society to the millions behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains in contrast to the Communist system of the closed society. The West, unless it tempers its paralyzing fear of global war and brings the full impact of the open society against the Iron Curtain, will lose some of its most natural valuable allies—the peoples under Communist rule. More than that, it will lose the potentially decisive battle in the protracted conflict.

["The sands have not yet run out. But if the precious time that still remains shall not be lost, the West must resolutely join the issue.

["For the past 15 minutes or so I have been giving you the words—partly quoted and partly summarized or paraphrased—of the four authors of protracted conflict. They have made it obvious that military technology is one of the major ways to eventual victory. The Navy also holds that view and will continue to be in the forefront of advancing American science and technology.

["As for the validity of the rest of the thesis propounded by this book, this is a democracy where we are free to form and express our own political viewpoints. It is up to each one of us to think out the * * * make up his own mind. The important thing to remember is that it is a problem for all Americans—not just your leaders in Washington.

["Finally, I would like to conclude by telling you a story which you will see applies to our discussion this evening.

["(Joke.)

["As a nation, and personally, we spend entirely too much time talking, talking about what we are going to do. While we should not rush hastily into situations without the facts, the world's greatest power must not be timid. One reason for our talk is that we would prefer to convince others, to have everyone like us. But the strong, however just and logical, will never be liked by everyone.

["Theodore Roosevelt many years ago gave us good guidance in one sentence: 'Speak softly, but carry a big stick.' "]

State.

Speech No. 95: Gen. S. E. Anderson; review date, May 4, 1961; delivery date, May 17, 1961.

Page 2: "The free world has faced and must continue to face a hard reality of our times—the growing economic and military power of the [Communist world] *Sino-Soviet bloc."*

State.

Page 16: "Citizens who realize all that is [at stake in the world struggle that we call the cold war] *jeopardized by the threat of Communist aggression* cannot remain apathetic or complacent."

State.

Speech No. 96: Gen. Groves B. Erskine; no review date; delivery date, June 22, 1961.

Page 6: ["At the present time the principal efforts of our enemies (the Communists) are directed toward political attack on—and subversion of—the areas of interest to them. They seem to have concluded for the time being, at least, that there are no benefits to be gained by major military operations."]

State.

Speech No. 97: Brig. Gen. John W. White, National Security Forum, Columbus, Ohio; review date, March 3, 1961; delivery date, March 3, 1961.

Page 16: "Responding to such a clear call to duty, patriotic Americans everywhere can contribute to [eventual victory in all phases of the cold war. And with the defeat of the godless ideology of communism they can] make sure that human liberty will not perish from the earth."

DSR, with concurrence of ASD (PA), under State guidance.

Speech No. 98: Maj. Gen. George R. Mather; no review date; delivery date, April 4, 1961.

Page 6: "Moving on to the second of our bilateral defense agreements in the Pacific area, [we consider that] the U.S. Army['s part] *has an important role* in the advice, aid, and training [rendered to] *of* the army of the Republic of China [has produced a military force which acts as a very real deterrent to the Chinese Communists announced desire to seize the offshore islands and Taiwan]."

Department of the Army prior to submission to DSR.

Page 10: "I would like to make reference to one additional element of Army capabilities which seem to have received much attention of late—our guerrilla and counterguerrilla programs. These are of increasing importance [as the Communists appear to be turning more and more to] *with the growth of enemy-inspired* insurgency-type operations [to achieve their ends: in today's Cold War the threat of Communist-inspired insurgency faces many of the free or uncommitted nations of the world]."

Department of the Army prior to submission to DSR.

Speech No. 99: Maj. Gen. C. G. Dodge; review date, May 5, 1961; delivery date, May 10, 1961.

Page 1: "And to turn to a more serious vein, the United States today is in the most dangerous period of her history. We are faced today by [a more ruthless enemy] *forces more dangerous* than we have ever known before; [an enemy] *forces* determined to [destroy] *undermine* our very way of life by any and all means available—economic, political, psychological, and military. Regardless of the tactics used, I am sure of one thing—that this ultimate objective of the Communists to dominate the world will not change. It has not wavered in more than 40 years. It has been reiterated over and over again by [the] Communist leaders [of the Soviet Union] and it has been stated in [all the Communist] *their* literature [that has been published] since [the Communists came to power in Russia in] 1917.

State.

Speech No. 100: Gen. George H. Decker; review date, February 9, 1961; delivery date, February 11, 1961.

Page 3: "Communist power continues to grow, and—from a position of developing military and economic strength—we of the free world are faced with varied political and military initiatives which daily test our will and determination to resist. *Aggression,* intervention and subversion in Africa, Asia, and Latin America are timely examples of the means used *by others* to pursue their aim of world domination."

State.

Speech No. 101: Gen. Thomas S. Power; review date, May 26, 1961; delivery date, June 7, 1961.

Page 7: "Therefore, in order to serve as an adequate tangible deterrent, our Armed Forces must have a credible capability to win a decisive military victory, that is, to destroy any enemy's ability [and will] to continue to war which he may have forced upon us."

Department of the Air Force prior to submission to DSR.

Speech No. 102: Maj. Gen. S. S. Wade, USMC, to NROTC students at Marquette University; no review date; delivery date, May 13, 1961.

Page 3: "The enemy.

"Next, who is our enemy and where can we find him? Why does he attack our way of life? The answer to these questions we all know. The President says the enemy is advancing around the globe. For more than 40 years, [Communists] *they* have been engaged in subjecting mankind to their way of life— atheistic materialism."

DSR agreement with speaker in order to avoid delay involved in State clearance.

Page 4: "Our course of action:

"Therefore, what is our course of action? Strength is the one thing the Communists respect. Their moves against Berlin, Taiwan, and Korea were halted when we refused to allow further aggression. [Of equal importance to the actions of the United States in those situations, is the mission being carried out—at this very minute—by thousands of our fellow countrymen.]

DSR agreement with speaker in order to avoid delay involved in State clearance.

Page 5: "Defense of the free world requires that we have the *wartime* capability of applying great naval power, generated from the sea [, against a ponderous landlocked antagonist—an opponent who is vulnerable the world around to attack from the ocean].

DSR agreement with speaker in order to avoid delay involved in State clearance.

Speech No. 103: Gen. Thomas S. Power, Commander in Chief, SAC, before the Omaha Chamber of Commerce; no review date; delivery date, May 19, 1960.

Page 4 (suggested deletion): ["To do so, we should first consider the worst condition, namely, the possibility that this threat may materialize and that, despite all our efforts to the contrary, we are subjected to a massive surprise attack. If we were to start out from the conviction that such an attack would mean an end of everything, we need not go any further.

["Indeed, there would be no use whatever in maintaining our expensive Military Establishment if we are so convinced of the futility of nuclear war that we are too scared to face it. If we are that scared or if the Soviets *think* we are, nothing will stop them from taking over the rest of the free world piecemeal. Once they have succeeded in doing so, they anticipate that the United States, as Lenin put it, will fall into their lap 'like an overripe apple.' And that would be even worse than nuclear war, as far as I am concerned."]

State.

Speech No. 104: Maj. Gen. Clayton P. Kerr (at National Guard refresher course, JAG School); no review date; delivery date, May 31, 1960.

Page 6: "I recommend that you all let your legal imaginations soar, and have thoughtful and practical solutions ready [, not only] for day-to-day National Guard operations, [but for speedy recovery from surprise enemy attack, which may well mean national survival], *under conditions of war or peace.*

Department of the Army prior to submission to DSR.

Speech No. 105: Tactical Air Command Operation "Big Picture" (basic briefing); review date, illegible; delivery date, not indicated.

Pages 1–2: "As a result of this reevaluation [following World War II] *and the failure of the Potsdam Conference in 1945* our military might became centered on long range strategic forces capable of [delivering a devastating blow against an enemy in proportions which heretofore has surpassed the imagination. The highly controversial queen of the skies, B–36 bomber, was produced in quantity to carry these massive retaliation weapons] *intercontinental nuclear warfare. B–36 survived its critics to become the backbone of the long-range strike force and fully earned the nickname of the Peacemaker.*"

Department of the Army prior to submission to DSR.

Pages 2–3: "The post-World War II period saw our Tactical Air Forces fall into a rapid decline. The reduced military budget compelled the Air Force to follow a course of action which put most of the military effort into one basket, so to speak—that of [massive retaliation] *intercontinental nuclear capabilities.*"

Department of the Air Force prior to submission to DSR.

Page 3: "Unfortunately, we were able to enjoy the monopoly of the atomic weapons for only a few short years. The Russians too were testing atomic bombs by 1949. [The concept of using our nuclear stockpile to deter all types of war did not prove valid when put to test, as was demonstrated forcefully in Korea. Political consideration] *Foreign policy* dicated that [the threat of general nuclear war would not be used to bring the Korean war to a quick conclusion]. *Nuclear weapons would not be used to demonstrate to Soviet leaders the grave risks involved in any military aggression.* It then became necessary to frantically rebuild tactical forces to be used [in a relatively new military environment defined as a limited or small war] *under the novel military circumstances of a war fought from sanctuaries—now commonly called small or limited war.*"

Substitution of "overall policy" for "political consideration" made by State. All other changes by the Department of the Air Force prior to submission to DSR.

Page 5: "Further, to be [responsible] *responsive* to our national policy, it is important that we maintain forces to defend [neutral nations as well as help allies defend themselves] *uncommitted members of the United Nations who may ask for assistance in repelling communism.* [It is far better that a nation remain neutral than fall under Communist influence].

"Mr. Henry Cabot Lodge, former Ambassador to the United Nations, summed up the threat to the United States when he said: 'We could lose our country in two ways: Either all at once * * * by the all-out nuclear war, or gradually by being isolated and nibbled to death.'

"As a result of the [limited war threat] *continued pressure of militant communism* the United States must have fast reacting forces able to counter with appropriate and politically acceptable military measures [all types and degrees of aggression] *aggression short of general war.*"

Department of the Air Force prior to submission to DSR.

Page 21: "[The Korean war demonstrated an inability to combat, other than the all-out war, in a swift and decisive manner].

"As technology continued to advance our overall capability, it became necessary for the Tactical Air Command to develop a concept of operation which would meet the jet age requirement for realistic employment of tactical air forces."

Department of the Air Force prior to submission to DSR.

Page 22: "Should [a limited] war ensue, it will understandably remain limited in extent only if [the major powers choose to keep it that way] *the United States remains strong, and by prompt response, clearly demonstrates to Soviet bodies the greater risks of continuing or expanding the action.* [Therefore, a small war necessarily has only limited objectives or goals. Nevertheless, piecemeal advances through such actions are dangerous and must be prevented.] *The aggressor must then voluntarily 'limit' or modify his original goals and objectives or run the greater risks of national defeat if he becomes totally committed.*"

Department of the Air Force prior to submission to DSR.

Page 23: "Generally, it can be stated that small wars are likely to occur in those areas where [a military vacuum exists] *superior forces can most easily be brought to bear.* [Korea, Central and South America.] The Middle East and southeast Asia can be included in this generalization. The countries in these areas [are for the most part militarily weak, have a low standard of living.] *maintain relatively small forces, are underdeveloped, and* are [prime] *considered by the Communists to be* targets for [Communist] subversion and aggression in its many forms."

Department of the Air Force prior to submission to DSR.

Speech No. 106: Rear Adm. C. O. Triebel, USN; review date, July 25, 1961; delivery date, July 29, 1961.

Pages 4–5: ["Now, let's take a look at the geography of Russia. This tremendous land mass is one-sixth of the total real estate on our globe. It is the largest country in the world. The eastern part of Russia is very rough terrain. It is very hard for mankind to communicate and make a living. The ground remains frozen year round from about the central part of Russia down to the eastern seaboard. Because of this rugged condition, we find most of the population concentrated in the western half.

["Visual 00–33.

["This is the heart of the Soviet Union. Its industries and government are very vulnerable to a submarine that can shoot a missile from 1,500 miles. Notice the land border of Russia. It extends all the way around the west and to the south and up into the east. This explains why the Russians have always been forced to maintain a large army for defensive purposes. Notice, also, the area in the north, an uninhabited ice cap which up until the past few years has remained a closed wall of ice to all potential invadors, something they haven't had to worry about. However, this formerly secure frontier has been breached by the historic voyages of the nuclear powered submarines under the ice. We have complicated their defenses and now present the potential of counterattack from the northern frontier.

["All of this probably sounds a little warlike, but our objective here is to calmly but seriously present to any aggressor nation such a powerful persuasive instrument of retaliation that they will never try to begin another world war."]

Voluntarily deleted to eliminate necessity for State Department clearance.

Speech No. 107: Rear Adm. Robert D. Powers, Jr., USN, Deputy Judge Advocate General of the Navy; review date not indicated; delivery date not indicated.

Pages 14–15: "Do you know the provisions of the charter of the United Nations? [Though often termed useless.] The United Nations has been an important instrument in the preservation of peace and the settlement of international controversies. Admittedly it is not perfect nor the ultimate answer to the world's problems, but it is the best model to date. [And until a better vehicle is constructed it is better than none.] An hour or two of reading will give you a general knowledge of the charter under which the United Nations operates."

State.

Speech No. 108: Maj. Gen. George T. Duncan, Commanding General, IV U.S. Army Corps; review date illegible; delivery date, April 11, 1961.

Page 3 (the following was not altered): "After World War II, the United States found itself in circumstances completely new in its history. Whether we like it or not, we had fallen heir to a heavy share of responsibility for international leadership. World conditions convinced most Americans that we could not return to our traditional peacetime policy of no foreign entanglements.

"Partly because of this, and partly out of humanitarian concern, much of our national effort overseas during the period 1945–50 was devoted to providing both our wartime allies and defeated enemies with extensive assistance in restoring their governments and economies.

"The Marshall plan, begun during this period, was to be the genesis of the global aspect of our foreign policy which has become known today as the mutual security program."

Speech No. 109: Rear Adm. Joseph N. Murphy, USN; no review date; delivery date, March 17, 1961.

Page 2 (suggested change): "The free world is locked in a [life and death] struggle with the Communist world."

State.

Page 4: "The Communists have built and maintained the second largest fleet in the world with a tremendous submarine force. [They understand that if their avowed intent of world domination is to be attained they must cut the sea ties of the Western allies.] *In the event that war should be forced upon us,* it is the Navy that must keep these avenues of approach [open.] *to our allies open.*"

State.

Speech No. 110: Gen. Thomas S. Power, commander in chief, SAC; review date not indicated; delivery date, October 21, 1960.

Page 13 (this was approved): "Yet, in the face of the growing threat to our technological leadership, we are still spending less than 4 percent of our gross national product for education—far less than we are spending for some of our luxuries. But even if we were to spend a great deal more, dollars alone will not reflect the intrinsic value of what might be termed our 'gross educational product.' I am using this term advisedly because it represents the sum total of the Nation's intangible assets created by education, just as the gross national product is the sum total of the Nation's tangible assets represented by products and services."

Page 14 (this was approved): "It is not within my province to offer any specific criticisms because I do not feel qualified to offer any specific suggestions for improvement. But I submit that the nature of the threat we face, the complexities of the age are so unprecedented in the annals of history that we must resort to equally unprecedented approaches in all our national endeavors if we are to prevail as a nation in the critical era ahead. As we were forced to revise many of the historic concepts in science and technology, and as we had to discard traditional techniques of warfare, so we must have the wisdom and courage to critically review our long-established methods of education and, wherever indicated, replace them with approaches as radically new and dynamic as the needs they must fill."

Speech No. 111: Gen. Clyde D. Eddleman, Vice Chief of Staff, USA; review date illegible; delivery date, May 10, 1961.

Page 2 (suggested deletion): "The United States and the free world face an increasingly tense situation in the 1960's—one involving a power struggle which is greater in scale than the struggle of the recent past, but against the same enemy—[world] communism."

State.

Page 4: "We must accept the fact that the Communists will continue their deliberate program for worldwide expansion, patiently seeking small power vacuums into which they can drive wedges. [International] Communism cares nothing for tactical defeats, so long as these setbacks are not barriers to their hoped-for eventual strategic victory."

State censor's note: "This word's connotation is too good to be applied to Communists and weakens idea of Russian control."

State.

Speech No. 112: Vice Adm. R. B. Pirie, USN; no review date; delivery date, April 12, 1960.

Page 10: "Our attack aircraft carriers with manned aircraft have the inherent mobility and flexibility to operate precisely in support of our national goals in most world trouble areas. They can carry our naval airpower to places we couldn't otherwise reach. [They operate on the free, high seas which we can see without commitments to or agreements with foreign nations]."

State.

Speech No. 113: Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, Vice Chief of Staff, USAF; review date not indicated; delivery date, April 22, 1960.

Page 17: "SAC has the capability to destroy the warmaking capacity of any aggressor [and to achieve victory]."

DSR.

Speech No. 114: Maj. Gen. Thomas P. Gerrity, commander, Ballistic Missiles Center (AMC); no review date; delivery date, October 14, 1960.

Page 2 (suggested change): "The Soviets have *often* been [extremely] successful in the past. Americans, and other free nations, still treat the cold war as a figure of speech rather than as a [cruel] reality."

Department of Air Force prior to submission to DSR.

Speech No. 115: Adm. James S. Russell, USN; no review date; delivery date, May 20, 1960.

Page 6: "The Communist Party member believes implicitly and fanatically that the party is destined to rule the world. He preaches the inevitability of success to spread defeatism in the opposition. [He believes that any means to better the cause is a proper and fair means.]

State.

Speech No. 116: Maj. Gen. Edwin B. Broadhurst; no review date; delivery date, May 21, 1960.

Pages 8–9: [Just 2 weeks ago, the Soviets proclaimed to the world that they "may not have large numbers of bombers in the sky, but we do have rockets which can be launched against the United States or any country which is supplying bases of operation for that country." The Soviet Communist chief made the statement to the U.S.S.R. parliament after his announcement that the Soviets had shot down an American aircraft which they said had "invaded Soviet territory."]

State.

Speech No. 117: Rear Adm. Claude V. Ricketts, USN, Director, Strategic Plans Division, Office of the Chief of Naval Operations; no revision date; delivery date August 23, 1960.

Page 3: "Some new nations [spawned into the world with only short gestation] will be in turmoil. [Lacking the maturity to spurn the bait.] Their emotions distorted by insensate rage toward their former masters, some will be a prize sought by the Communists."

Censor's note and initials: "These derogatory remarks are clearly pointed at African states whom we particularly desire to avoid offending (MGH)."

State.

Page 3: "Purposes—To what purpose do we address our military posture? To the maintenance of the status quo only? Do we want nothing more than that the menace of communism fade away so we may resume our former ways—in serenity and repose? Or do we want to extend our ideals and beliefs throughout the world? [Is our military power to be a part of a forceful and determined prosecution of our national policy—or is our military power to be a dyke, massive, but inert, and serving only to deter military aggression while the battle is waged on other fronts with other weapons]? *Is our military power destined to be used or is it to deter military aggression while the battle is waged on other fronts with other weapons, be they political, economic, psychological?"*

Censor's note: "The purpose of military power is not necessarily to use it, but to avoid using it."

State.

Page 6: "[This is not advocating military aggression. The United States has always abhorred aggressive violence in international affairs, and we have tried in the past to stay away from quarrels. But at a sufficiently high threshold we have resorted to force. And so it must be now—that the world knows that there is some degree of provocation that will spur us to military action. The precise degree of provocation need not be known—in fact, it is best that it not be known. But it is important that we have, along with our military posture, the willingness to use it when the need to do so comes.]"

(Censor's note: "This is a wooly paragraph which if it has meaning, sounds provocative—the basic point already made on page 5.")

State.

Page 6: "There is another aspect of willingness that has especial pertinence for us—the credibility of our determination in the eyes of our friends and allies. As the leader of the Western World, the United States must always consider carefully the effect of her actions upon others. [It may be trite to say that power attracts but we may be sure that most nations are practical, and in the final analysis they will be governed by self-serving actions. They would most prefer to be on the winning side.]

(Censor's note: "Not flattering to our allies.")

State.

Page 7: "Also, our military posture must be consistent with our way of life. Our democracy has always been suspicious, to a degree, of the role of the Armed Forces during peacetime. One safeguard has been the frank and open discussion of our military* policies in the press and the Congress. There is no need to assess the pros and cons of this—it is a fact that is not about to be changed. It must, though, influence our military posture, for we must deal from a deck that lies face up,** and with almost all of our cards showing. Subterfuge, deception, duplicity, and ruses are not for us to use to the extent that others do.*** Our strength shows, and we cannot build false-fronted cities along the river to impress the queen."

Censor's notes:

*"First amendment of the Constitution not implied by fear of military."

**"This suggests we are a simple folk not able to act in the league with sophisticated Europeans. It is inaccurate—implies a poor impression overseas."

***"What about Manhattan project?"

State comment: No deletion.

Page 18: "It is essential that we maintain diversified and dispersed forces in the future. We have seen too often in the post-World War II years the ability of the Communists to take advantage of weak spots in the free world's armor. We have seen North Korea and North Vietnam go. We have seen the oppressions in Poland, Hungary, and Tibet. At the same time, however, we have seen the Communists back down in the face of our strength and determination. Thus, we have seen the request for a cease-fire in Korea, and we have seen the stabilizing influence in the Taiwan Straits as a result of our immediate response and determination in assisting our allies in the Republic of China."

Censor's note: "N.K. was never a part of the free world in post-World War II, and I do not think North Vietnam was. Better examples would be Czechoslovakia coup, February 1948; Tibet, 1960."

State comment: No deletion.

Speech No. 118: Rear Adm. Robert H. Speck, USN; no review date; delivery date, October 17, 1960.

Page 13: "We, too, are for change, actively and positively. We believe that the way to improve the lot of men and women in this world is through freedom of thought and by the methods of education, trade, commerce, and culture which have been developed and proven in the long and sometimes bloody struggles of history. This is the reason we have assisted the countries with military aid to maintain their security and with economic aid to improve their standards of living. We think this is the best counterattack to Soviet expansion."

Above passage not changed. Speech approved without amendment.

Speech No. 119: Rear Adm. W. C. Mott, U.S. Navy, before the American Law Student Association; review date, July 25, 1961; delivery date, August 10, 1961.

Page 11: "Believe me, gentlemen, speaking as a teacher, which I have been, I know that teaching of communism in the public schools is not an easy task. There is no place for amateurs in the field. In fact, amateur anti-Communists are about as helpful as amateur brain surgeons. We don't need space age witch hunters. We need informed citizens who have done their homework."

Passage not changed. Speech approved without amendment.

Speech No. 120: Vice Adm. C. L. Melson, USN; review date, May 6, 1961; delivery date, May 16, 1961.

Pages 3–4: "*The President has said that the primary purpose of our Armed Forces is to deter war. But if war is forced upon us,* [O]ur ability to project our military power depends on the free use of the oceans. Through seapower the United States can fully support and sustain forces overseas, either our own or those of our allies. With the aid of the other free nations of the world, we must stand ready at all times to insure our unrestricted use of the seas, and in war, to deny such use to an enemy. To do this, we must [control the seas] *maintain a respected power afloat*.

"This does not mean the absolute control of 140 million square miles of ocean. But it does mean the ability to *maneuver freely in* [exert control over] those areas essential to our freedom. We must be able to [maintain this control] *move* in the face of any challenge by an aggressor: above, on, or below the surface.

"Naval power provides the means to control the seas[.] *in time of war*. We must have a balance of seagoing forces and seagoing weapons ready and able to exploit the special advantages inherently available at sea. A force afloat is constantly moving. It is hard to find, hard to hit. A naval force has the strategic mobility to act swiftly, precisely and effectively and to accomplish its assigned task with a minimum of shore-based support.

"[But control] *Should foreign aggression occur, control of the sea* can be won only by a Navy with offensive power, by naval forces that are capable of operating offensively in response to any act of aggression. Naval striking power—naval offensive power is the key to control—the key to projecting American military power of the proper magnitude where and when it is needed.

"We must consider the *potential* threats—will our country be endangered by the threat of an all-out attack with a devastating nuclear exchange or will [it] *there* be a limited war, far from our shores yet a threat to our security.

"[In] *If there were* an all-out, no holds barred nuclear attack, our ability to strike back *would* depend[s] on the survival of our forces. All our ships at sea have the capacity to survive. Two of the more powerful weapons that are a part of our survival force are the Fleet Ballistic Missile System and the aircraft carrier."

Censor's comment (State): "We can only talk about control of the seas in wartime; otherwise, it should be only in terms of maintaining freedom of the seas."

State.

Speech No. 121: Col. William P. Yarborough, CO, USA Special Warfare Center; review date, June 10, 1961; delivery date, June 14, 1961.

Page 1: ["Within the last 6 weeks you have probably read some of the newspaper and magazine articles under these eye-catching headlines: 'Elite Units Spark Native Aid'; 'Army Adding to Force of Brainy Brain'; 'Army Reveals Foreign Legion'; 'Guerrillas Expanding at President's Request'; 'Unveil Elite Unit in War Cause'; 'Aliens Enroll in Guerrilla War Courses'; 'Changes in U.S. War Strategy?' The same publications carry stories daily on the conflicts continuing in underdeveloped areas of the world."]

DSR on recommendation of Office of Assistant to Secretary of Defense (Special Operations) under State guidance.

Page 2: "Thus the deep respect of the Communists for guerrilla warfare is a two-sided coin. Most publicized of late is their determination to use guerrilla warfare against established governments; *the* [Moscow's] flooding of Latin America with Guevara's book illustrates this exploitation aspect."

DSR on recommendation of Office of Assistant to Secretary of Defense (Special Operations) under State guidance.

Page 6: "What does the Army plan for the future? I shall first outline the plan.

"[The concept is this: We must attack Communist-inspired insurgency in each threatened country before its emergence in such form as to demand more drastic action.]

"Task forces, called counterinsurgency forces, would be employed, upon request, to train indigenous forces in all aspects of counterinsurgency operations, psychological operations, [intelligence,] counterintelligence, and civic actions."

DSR on recommendation of Office of Assistant to Secretary of Defense (Special Operations) under State guidance.

Page 7 (this was deleted): "In general or limited war, at a minimum expenditure of U.S. men and material, a tremendous force of dissident peoples behind the Iron Curtain can be generated against the Communist member to wreak havoc in his rear areas.

"In the present state of cold war these same Army special forces can advise and assist friendly governments in underdeveloped areas in combating Communist inspired insurgency."

DSR on recommendation of Office of Assistant to Secretary of Defense (special operation) under State guidance.

Speech No. 122: Col. Willard Pearson; review date, May 26, 1961; delivery date, May 28, 1961.

Page 3: "(Flip No. 2): [An ICBM located in Fairbanks, Alaska, having a range of 5,000 miles could easily engage targets in most of Western Europe, Russia, and China.

["A missile firing from Alaska (flip No. 3) to China (pause) has a significant range advantage over a missile located on the west coast of the United States (flip No. 4) firing on the same target. Note range differences (1,900 miles)."]

State censor's note: "No. This could be interpreted as aggressive intent."

State.

Speech No. 122: Col. Willard Pearson, revise date, May 26, 1961; delivery date, May 28, 1961.

Page 4: ["Next, for a consideration of water-based missiles.

["The Polaris-equipped submarine, operating from Alaskan bases (chart No. 8), and using the Arctic Ocean as a mobile underwater launching platform to achieve concealment, dispersion, and surprise has a range that can launch missiles south into Eurasia generally as far as the 50° of latitude (flip No. 1). This would include the (point) British Isles, France, northwest Europe to include the Scandinavian Peninsula, and a hugh chunk of Russia to include the Trans-Siberian Railroad. From the Barents Sea, the Polaris missile can fire (flip No. 2) over Moscow and hit the Black Sea.

["These shorter distances to the heartlands of the United States and Eurasia from arctic bases insure greater accuracy for missiles, heavier payloads, less time in flight as well as fewer failures in flight. Greater accuracy and heavier payloads reduce the number of missiles required. The reduction in flight time to target increases the chance of achieving surprise and reduces the time a missile is subject to attack. It also reduces the time the enemy (or ourselves) have to react to a surprise attack. These reduced distances via the Polar route bring the strategic importance of the far north into sharp focus when viewed through the lens of our rapidly developing ability to travel above, across, or under the arctic."]

State censor's note: "No. Could be interpreted as aggressive intent, naming targets."

State.

Speech No. 122: Col. Willard Pearson; revise date, May 26, 1961; delivery date, May 28, 1961.

Page 20: "Point No. 3 (chart No. 32). The Army must have a program to improve its operational potential in the far north. A realistic program that will prepare the Army to fight at any time or anywhere in the northern areas.

"Alaska (chart No. 33) can serve as the Army's testing and training ground to achieve this objective. We must achieve this objective. This is apparent to those of us here who are living in Alaska now because we are aware of the current *Communist* threat (chart No. 34) [posed by the Russian bear just across the straits as it faces Uncle Sam]."

State.

Speech No. 123: Lt. Gen. Robert J. Wood, USA, CG, USAADC; no revision date; delivery date, May 9, 1961.

Page 5: "This calls for the ability, if we are to counter the wide and shifting range of [Soviet] *opposing* capabilities, to give our military forces effective, operational weapons on a continuing basis."

DSR in accordance with similar changes previously made by State.

Page 6: "This becomes even more serious when we realize that if we attempted to produce a counter-weapon to a known [Soviet] *opposing* weapon, a 3- or 4-year period would expire during which there might be very meager means, or none at all, in which to combat the [enemy's] new weapon."

DSR in accordance with similar changes previously made by State.

Page 6–7: "Nike-Ajax was developed to meet the threat of the [Soviet] long-range bomber and was first deployed in 1953."

DSR in accordance with similar changes previously made by State.

Page 7: "Hercules also gives us a definite target coverage and a tangible lead in the future against [Soviet] manned or unmanned aircraft and air-to-surface missiles."

DSR in accordance with similar changes previously made by State.

Page 8: "Fortunately, the U.S. Army had already started development of a third generation missile program, the Nike-Zeus, to counter the [Soviet] ICBM, but that missile will not be operational until later on in this decade."

DSR in accordance with similar changes previously made by State.

Speech No. 124: Maj. Gen. Ralph A. Palladino; no review date; delivery date, November 11, 1960.

Page 8: "Our answer to this type of war—this protracted conflict must be loud and clear. We must answer the utterances of the Communists, be they from the Soviet Premier, from Red China, [from Castro], or any other communistic nation in strong, and, if necessary, even by harsh words—but words alone are not enough."

DSR.

Speech No. 125: Gen. Herbert B. Powell; no review date; delivery date, May 15, 1961.

Pages 6–7: "[The antireligious cult that opposes us] *The foes of democracy* fully recognizes the implications of this law of life. [to their dream of world domination]. They are making every conceivable effort to undermine our confidence and that of the peoples who look to *the great English-speaking democracies* for leadership and support in the free world.

"[By focusing attention upon a few spectacular technological achievements, they have attempted to destroy our faith in the scientific and industrial capabilities of the free world. It is as easy for such a totalitarian society to produce sputniks as it was for the Pharaohs to build pyramids. Both are gigantic achievements realized at the expense of the ordinary citizens. And] *We must recognize fully the magnitude of Soviet achievements in various fields of science. To the extent that these achievements contribute to man's conquest of the unknown, we should unstintingly offer our congratulations to the Soviet technicians involved—and voice the hope that the results of their work will one day be made available to the peoples of the world. At the same time,* no serious observer, whether outside or inside the Communist bloc, can be in any doubt about the health and vigor of science in the free world. Never before have scientific discoveries and developments been so great, or their results so far reaching. They range from the application of atomic energy in war and peace to the development of pesticides and antibiotics which have transformed the pattern of human health.

"[Can a few million atheistic Communist fanatics devote more effort] *Can those who have committed themselves to the doctrine that man is but a tool of the state—can they devote more effort* to the subversion of human freedom than the united people of the free world can to defend it. Is their faith in their [godless] cause stronger than our faith in the cause of liberty and dignity of the individual."

State.

Speech No. 126: Brig. Gen. James B. Knapp; no review date; delivery date, January 16, 1960.

Page 2: "[Unfortunately, we, the free world, appear to be losing some of our strength and military advantage, while] T[t]he Communists are making formidable military strides. If the point should be reached that [we become so weak that] the enemy need not fear us, then the war of words and scientific achievements will cease and we [will] *could* be attacked."

DSR on recommendation by JCS.

Page 3: "In order for us to keep pace with the enemy and prevent this balance of power from swinging decidedly in his favor, we must take specific measures. We must maintain a force sufficiently strong to assure him that to attack we would [bring down a great retaliatory force upon his homeland] *result in his defeat*."

DSR on recommendation by JCS.

Page 7: ["As we enter a new decade, we are faced with a momentous decision—whether we will continue to expend great amounts of fiscal funds to improve our deterrent position, or whether we will cut back our military programs and accede to the growing demands from some sources and follow a road leading to disarmament.

["The facts before us are obvious: The balance of power, which saw the United States and the Soviets on an almost equal footing militarywise, does not now appear to be an assurance against a nuclear war. The Communists, ahead on missiles, according to many surveys, gaining in power and dedicated to world dominance, may soon be in a position to blackmail the United States under threat of nuclear attack."]

DSR on recommendation by JCS.

Page 8: "[A serious impairment of our strategic structure could result in the end of the democratic system of government.] We must not allow ourselves to assume a false sense of security. [We must be visionary enough to observe that p] *P*resent day technology is advancing at such a rate that weapons will be developed which will have a much greater capability of destruction than those of today. [Several well placed bombs carried in present day missiles or aircraft could damage a nation to such an extent that it would be physically impossible for that nation to recuperate for many years to come.] Future weapons conceivably could create even greater damage.

"The United States has the moral responsibility to make itself so strong that no nation would dare attack us [for fear of the retaliation which we could wreak on that potential enemy]. To do this will require the American people to [put aside their attitude of indifference in world affairs and] be prepared to make the sacrifices that their safety *and that of their allies* calls for."

Deletions made by DSR on recommendation by JCS. Insertion by Department of State.

Speech No. 127: the Honorable Wilber M. Brucker, Secretary of Army; review date, September 30, 1960; delivery date, October 2, 1960.

Page 1: "In paying tribute to Count Pulaski, I also render just honor to the heroic people of Poland, [which today lies under the heel of a brutal oppressor. In them] *in whom* burns the same fierce love of liberty which characterized their forebears through long years of trial and tribulation, and which will, as sure as the sun rises out of the darkness of night, eventually triumph. [over tyranny.]"

Department of Army prior to submission to DSR.

Speech No. 128: Maj. Gen. Marcus F. Cooper; no review date; delivery date, February 22, 1961.

Page 6: "In the field of military intelligence, *our potential antagonists* [the U.S.S.R. has no problem. It] can easily assess the strengths, weaknesses, and intentions of the United States and the free world[.], *because we live in open societies.*"

State.

Speech No. 129: Lt. Gen. James E. Briggs; no review date; delivery date, February 18, 1961.

Page 3: ["There are those who believe deterrence to be the threat of indiscriminate bombings. They say an enemy would not dare attack if we possess ample power to retaliate by destroying his major cities. The advocates of this minimum deterrence seem to disregard the need for military strength sufficient to defeat any enemy. They seem to feel that a suitable deterrent can be contained in military force which is sufficient only to hurt an enemy while leaving his weapons free to destroy us. This approach to national security is diametrically opposed to man's experience throughout all military history.

["In the final analysis, deterrence exists in the mind of the potential enemy. The enemy must know that no matter what he does, he cannot win, that he and his forces will be destroyed. We cannot afford to assume that limited actions, such as bombing of key cities, would be so frightening to him that he would not wage war. Some Communist leaders have indicated a willingness to accept the destruction and terrible loss of life associated with a nuclear war if, in the end, the Communist way of life would prevail. We must, therefore, possess a force which can destroy the enemy's capability and even his will to wage war. We must have the ability to selectively and decisively destroy enemy military forces that might otherwise destroy us. We must have forces that can prevail, if we would deter."]

DSR with concurrence of Deputy ASD (PA).

Speech No. 130: Elvis J. Stahr, Jr., Secretary of the Army; review date, March 22, 1961; delivery date, March 23, 1961.

Page 3 (suggested change): "Although I am convinced of the necessity for massive retaliation if the true occasion for it should develop—and we must always be ready in every way for that unhappy possibility—I am equally certain that a capability for retaliation is only one element of the power we need to defend [and extend freedom] and to cope with the complex perils of our time."

State censor's note: "Suggest omitting since implies military liberation."

State.

Speech No. 131: Rear Adm. T. Andrew Ahroon, USN; reviewed date, May 17, 1961; delivered date, May 17, 1961.

Page 5: ["If we did not have this team of deterring military forces strong and in being, the United States would be a sitting duck for international blackmail. These nations under the leadership of communism could merely say, 'buy sugar here.' 'Send half your gross national product to us,' 'We will send commissars to control your economy.' 'Abandon your churches, or we will launch missiles to New York, Los Angeles, Chicago, and Denver tomorrow at dawn."]

State.

Speech No. 132: Maj. Gen. Derrill M. Daniel; no review date; delivery date, April 1961.

Page 1 (this was approved): "Ever since World War II the United States has been aware of its responsibility to assist both new and war-ravaged nations in order that they may develop democratic societies of their own choosing. To whom should aid be offered, and in what amounts? The answer was eloquently stated by President Kennedy in a recent message to Congress when he said:

" 'Why should we not lay down this foreign aid burden which our Nation has now carried for some 15 years? The answer is that there is no escaping our obligations: Our moral obligations as a wise leader and good neighbor in the interdependent community of free nations, our economic obligations as the wealthiest people in a world of largely poor people, as a nation no longer dependent upon the loans from abroad that once helped us develop our own economy, and our political obligations as the single largest counter to the adversaries of freedom.'

"This acceptance of obligations—that is, accepting the responsibilities of our role in the free world—came about largely after World War II when conditions convinced Americans that we could not return to our traditional peacetime policy of no foreign entanglements."

Speech No. 133: Vice Adm. R. B. Pirie, USN; review date, August 3, 1961; delivery date, August 7, 1961.

Page 5: ["Naval aviation furnishes the various gradations of responses that a flexible national policy must have. In Hanson Baldwin's analysis of the present military buildup resulting from the current tension over Berlin, he referred to several kinds and degrees of sanctions, or counteractions that the United States has at its disposal, should the blockade of Berlin be reinstated. They ranged all of the way from cessation of cultural and commercial exchanges with the Soviets, to various degrees and kinds of embargoes, to a pacific blockade of Cuba, to the stopping of a Soviet ship at sea for every convoy halted on the way to Berlin. This was a very interesting and thought-provoking piece by one of our most thoughtful and well-informed civilian military analysts."]

State.

Speech No. 134: Lt. Gen. B. A. Schriever; review date, May 11, 1961; delivery date, May 17, 1961.

Pages 11–12: "The fact that man has reached space may make it necessary for *us to defend ourselves against attack from space* [him to fight there]. Our military interest in space stems from the fact that it is a medium in which *a potential enemy may perform* many military missions [can be performed] better than on land, on the seas, or in the atmosphere. It promises to be the realm in which freedom to operate will have decisive significance for the future of this Nation—indeed, for the future of freemen everywhere."

State.

Speech No. 135: Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, Chief of R. & D.; review date, July 21, 1960; delivery date, July 22, 1960.

Page 8: "Consider for a moment the growing Communist drive in Latin America [in open violation of our] *and the provocative Soviet remarks on the* Monroe Doctrine. [It was high time o]Our President told the Communists as well as our friends that the policy announced by his courageous predecessor over 135 years ago was a rock that the surging waves of communism could not wash away."

Change in first sentence by Department of State. Deletion of words "It was high time" in second sentence made by Department of Army prior to submission to DSR.

Speech No. 136: Lt. Gen. J. H. Atkinson, commander, Air Defense Command; no review date; delivery date, November 9, 1960.

Page 3: "The best insurance for peace, in this era, is to *convince any aggressor of his certain defeat should he* [insure destructive retaliation to these powers who would] disrupt that peace. How can this insurance be obtained? Let's examine a few of the facts of life.

"The first issue I would like to settle is why any aerospace defense at all? There are those who say that if our offensive posture is strong enough to [afflict immediate, wholesale destruction of] *attack with such decisive results* any power foolish enough to start a war, we should not spend our resources for defensive reasons. There is a dangerous lack of logic in such statements."

Department of Air Force prior to submission to DSR.

Speech No. 136: Lt. Gen. J. H. Atkinson, Commander, Air Defense Command; no review date; delivery date, November 9, 1960.

Page 4: "The enemy must be made to believe that if he launches an attack, his attack will be parried and simultaneously, he, himself, will be [the victim of a devastating counterattack] *defeated*. For a defender to accomplish this, a shield is needed as well as a sword—one is no good without the other. Some folks like to use the phrase 'mutual destruction' when comparing the offensive might of the United States and the Soviet Union. It seems basic to me that the first nation which builds an effective shield will [take the mutuality out of destruction and ascend to the dominant] *considerably improve and strengthen his* military position. I believe this is true because when faced with an effective defense the aggressor would hesitate. He would have doubts as to his capability to gain necessary results in his first strike. This makes deterrence really credible."

Department of Air Force prior to submission to DSR.

Speech No. 137: Gen. F. F. Everest, Commander, TAC, before Portland, N.H., Chamber of Commerce and Senator STYLES BRIDGES; no review date; delivery date, May 19, 1960.

Pages 3–4: "As you all well know, the strategy of the free world is a deterrent strategy. The word 'deterrent' has been used by so many people in such a variety of ways, however, that I must make clear my own meaning. A deterrent to war is a capacity to [do the] *inflict damage on an* enemy [immediate mortal harm]. A deterrent strategy is one aimed at convincing the enemy that if he undertakes an aggression he will be dealt this mortal blow and there is no effective way to parry it. In effect, we have gone on record [to our adversary] *as far as any potential aggressor concerned* with a cost statement in advance of his aggression."

State.

Pages 5–6: "It is quite generally recognized that the principal deterrent power of the United States is contained in the Strategic Air Command. This force has so far been sufficient to convince the Soviets that the cost of overt aggression was too high. But they have turned to other avenues to achieve their aims. They have employed every means from economic pressure and subversion [as in Iraq] to indirect military action—limited in area and scope [as in Korea and Indochina]. And through these actions they have made some important piecemeal advances."

State censor's note: "Red China not Soviets."

State.

Speech No. 138: Rear Adm. L. P. Ramage, USN; no review date; delivery date, October 12, 1960.

Page 13: "This question is often asked: 'How many Polaris submarines does the Navy intend to build?' The Navy considers an optimum number to be about 45. The lesser numbers we will have while we build up to this strength will be an effective deterrent, but 45 will permit deployment of ships to maximum advantage [around the periphery of the Communist heartland], confounding enemy intelligence and multiplying his defensive problem beyond any forseeable solution."

DSR.

Speech No. 139: Rear Adm. Arnold McKechnie, USN; no review date; delivery date, December 7, 1960.

Page 13: " 'Lenin—Promises are like piecrust, made to be broken. It would be mad and criminal to tie one's hands by entering into an agreement of any permanence with anybody.'

" 'Lenin—Our morality is entirely subordinated to the interests of the class struggle. It is necessary to agree to any and every sacrifice, and even, if need be to resort to all sorts of devices, maneuvers, and illegal methods, to evasion and subterfuge. Conspiracy is so essential a condition of organization of this kind that all other conditions must be made to conform with it.' "

State censor's note: "Spurious."

State comment opposite first paragraph: "Passage apparently not deleted."

Speech No. 140: Maj. Gen. I. Sewell Morris; review date, March 7, 1961; delivery date, March 28, 1961.

Page 5: "Since World War II, both Moscow and Peiping have paid lipservice to peace and freedom. During those years, communism proceeded to gobble up more than 4 million square miles of free soil and at least 700 million free people. Crisis has succeeded crisis in various parts of the globe, as the overlords of communism have relentlessly followed their blueprint for world domination. Have no doubt about it, the Communists are unalterably committed to [taking over] *converting* the entire world *to communism* one way or another."

Department of Army prior to submission by DSR.

Page 6: "Let us *not* be so naive as to think that the chronic outbreak of armed conflict throughout the world is spontaneous. Rarely do these things just happen. Much of our present global strife, beyond any doubt, is centrally controlled. Whenever and wherever there exists the potential for large-scale political unrest, the Communist overlords become busy pushing buttons and pulling switches.

"[At the push of a button, figuratively, a new outbreak of rebellion starts in Laos, where the Red tide of communism is gradually driving a wedge into the heart of southeast Asia. That Communist effort is aimed not only at Laos but at South Vietnam, Cambodia, Thailand, and eventually at Malaya, Indonesia, and Burma.

"[A second button is pushed, and the cauldron of the Congo boils up with the great land mass of central Africa as the ultimate prize. Another button on the Communist keyboard controls the antics of the bearded Cuban puppet, and still another button stands ready to reactivate the new dormant political volcano of Berlin.]

"Yes, much of the armed conflict that has pockmarked the globe since the end of World War II has been instigated by the Communist button-pushers. The continuing chain of armed clashes throughout the world has been, and is, most serious. Yet, on the Communist chessboard of global domination, these successive crises have been but opening gambits. According to Communist rules, checkmate is not achieved until free government everywhere in the world is [completely crushed] *replaced with the Soviet brand of communism.*"

Department of the Army prior to submission to DSR.

Speech No. 141: Gen. Thomas D. White; review date, January 27, 1961; delivery date, January 30, 1961.

Page 4: "[The Soviet economic military potential is guided by a regime which can count on the backing—however unenthusiastic—of the Russian people. In addition, the Soviets have another great intangible resource which can best be described as gall. They are showing ever-increasing confidence—even arrogance—in their military and scientific strength and in the growth of their influence. Spawned and perpetuated in brutal wars, dedicated to the mission of world revolution, their fervor for subversion and force makes them believe that Communist domination of the world is inevitable. They are further strengthened in this belief by their close partnership with Communist China.] *Furthermore, in any evolution of the Communist threat we cannot disregard the close partnership between Soviet Russia and Communist China.*"

Speaker's office as result of question raised by State.

Page 5: ["Current Communist propaganda to the world concentrates on the same central theme which it has always emphasized—the destruction of capitalism, colonialism, and imperialism. But, under this guise, they really intend the destruction of everything which does not bend to their will. Their's is the language of total war. They have a consistency and single-mindedness about promoting world revolution which is unique in the history of dictatorships. The only sensible view of Communist intentions is that they seek to destroy us by any means which they can use."]

Speaker's office as result of question raised by State.

Speech No. 142: Rear Adm. Simmes; delivery date, February 4, 1961.

Page 2: "The end of World War II brought the emergence of two powerful [and ruthless] dictatorships—Soviet Russia and Red China [whose avowed and frequently announced purpose is to impose upon the free world their squalid and tyrannical Communist system]. Both of these dictatorships have immense land armies of demonstrated skill and courage.

"We are a great maritime nation, irrevocably committed to support of the Eurasian rimlands. We are strongly bound to this critical area by cultural, ethnic, and economic ties, but perhaps most strongly by the unifying challenge of a [common] *potential* enemy. We recognize our [geopolitical identity] *common interest* with the rimland powers. We have emphasized this responsibility with gigantic economic and military aid programs and by binding military alliances. Certainly the Communist Empire is under no illusions regarding our position in the conflict. [In their quest for dominance of Eurasia and the world, the United States has been stipulated by them to be the prize adversary.]"

State.

Speech No. 143: Lt. Gen. Joe W. Kelly, Commander, MATS; no review date; delivery date, March 1, 1961.

Page 14: "In either event, MATS is called upon, as an instrument of national diplomacy and policy, [to airlift a show of force] or perform a mission of mercy to the global point that is in trouble.

"In the summer of 1958, for example, it was [a show of force] *employed* in the Middle East, at the request of the Government of Lebanon. Before that operation was finished, the Chinese Communists brought Quemoy and Matsu under attack, and MATS *provided another* airlift[ed another show of force] to Formosa."

DSR with concurrence of Deputy ASD (PA).

Speech No. 144: Brig. Gen. G. L. Prichard; no review date; no delivery date.

Page 1: ["Such a national emergency exists today. We are at war. In the military sense of course we are actually sparring. Ideologically and technically we are in an all-out conflict. Economically the war is just beginning."]

Department of Air Force prior to submission to DSR.

Page 2: "General White recently emphasized that effective deterrence includes the possession of military forces to deter war, and should war occur, the military strength to prevail. He placed considerable weight on the fact that the ability to prevail is actually what provides real and effective deterrence.

"[In contrast, a second school of thought has developed which interprets deterrence as merely the possession of sufficient military strength to inflict severe punishment upon an aggressor. This school of thought disregards the need for military strength sufficient to defeat an aggressor. They avow that an adequate deterrence may be achieved by military strength sufficient only to hurt him generally, while leaving his striking forces free and undamaged to destroy us. The validity of this philosophy has been disproven throughout the recorded military history of civilization.]"

DSR.

Speech No. 145: Maj. Gen. Albert T. Wilson; review date, May 9, 1961; delivery date, May 20, 1961.

Page 1: "Perhaps my subject of discussion may seem somewhat incongruous when introduced into this atmosphere, because today I have come here to talk to you about [war.] *defense.* I have come to you about *some of* the ways of [waging war.] *military defense of our freedom.* And yet, at the same time, and contrary to the philosophy of the inevitability of war, I have come here to talk to you today about the perpetuation *of* peace. Peace with honor. And peace that is consistent with our aim of [retaining] *maintaining* our [national integrity] *freedom and security and contributing to the peace and well-being of the world.*"

(Censor's note: "State—'war' is a dirty word and its use in this context runs the risk of excerpting out of context, with some other passage by hostile media.")

State.

Page 2: "In general war, of course, the [fate of our Nation—indeed our very existence—is at stake] *security and welfare of the free world would be jeopardized, yet it is the one that presents the gravest threat and the* one that we must be prepared to face resolutely if that need ever should arise."

State.

Page 2: "[The cold war] *International tension caused by Sino-Soviet aggression or threat of aggression,* of course, has been with us almost constantly since the closing days of World War II. It, in many ways, is the most insidious type of warfare, for in reality [the] *their* olive branch of peace only disguises the sword of war."

State.

Speech No. 146: Maj. Gen. T. C. Darcy; review date, not legible; delivery date, May 17, 1961.

Pages 8–9: "Rather, it seeks to establish a worldwide militant dictatorship. Communism represents a combination of the worst aspects of atheism, [Hitlerism,] *totalitarianism,*[1] and godless materialism. Under the pressure of this force, the individual is not the recipient of the good of the state. Rather, he is a servant to the state's cause and is thus little more than one kind of natural resource.

"To achieve their ends, the Soviets have created a military force which [is second only to] *rivals*[1] our own. Although Mr. Khrushchev has recently modified the inevitability of war with the West doctrine, we must not expect that the Soviets would be unwilling to use this military might if they thought they could achieve their ends without suffering unacceptable damage. [I think that t] *T*he fact that Khrushchev has modified his attitude on this point is evidence of our own military [superiority] *strength.* [I believe] He would realine himself with this doctrine tomorrow if he thought the forces of communism could defeat the forces of the free world *without suffering unacceptable damage.*"[1]

Speech No. 147: Hon. Eugene M. Zuckert; review date, August 1961; delivery date, August 28, 1961.

Page 4: ["Khrushchev's boastful threats are not aimed at the scoreboard. They are aimed at our jugular."]

State.

Speech No. 148: Gen. Herbert B. Powell; no review date; delivery date, April 30, 1961.

Page 2–3: "*Facing the* [Circling the] free world [hungrily], the forces of world communism stand always ready to take advantage of any opportunity. Rulers of the Communist world declare publicly and repeatedly that the Communist system will engulf the whole world—that it will triumph over the liberal *and* democratic [and capitalistic] societies of the free world. They state openly that it is part of their mission to exploit and hurry this march of revolution by any possible mean."

---

[1] Indicate State changes. Other changes made by Department of Air Force prior to submission of speech to DSR.

Department of the Army prior to submission to DSR.

Speech No. 149: Brig. Gen. Cecil P. Lessig, USAF; review date, May 25, 1961; delivery date, May 27, 1961.

Page 2-4 (suggested deletion in entirety): "*Minimum* [Limited] or finite deterrence, massive retaliation, more bang for the buck—these were the thought and the philosophy of the age. [And until just a few years ago, these were good thoughts.] Certainly, it *appeared to be* [was] the cheapest way out of a difficult situation. And as a private citizen and taxpayer, I appreciate economy as much as you—perhaps more. With a fleet of B-36 bombers and later B-47's equipped with nuclear and thermonuclear bombs ready and poised to strike at [the heartland of] an aggressor, we *may have* averted a war—a big war, that is.

"Another factor has crept into the picture, however, that has [outmoded] *exposed* this concept. We are no longer the sole possessors of a nuclear-equipped bomber fleet. As you well know, the Soviet Union even has a sizable number of thermonuclear-tipped ICBM's. This fact, our Air Force believes, calls for a new philosophy, a new concept.

"To a government that sacrificed millions of their peasants—their own people—in collectivizing the farms of Russia, what does the loss of a few million of their people mean, if in the end they could impose communism on the Western World?"

DSR on recommendation of Joint Staff. State also recommended deletion of last paragraph.

"I believe that they would not hesitate to launch a war—no matter what the cost—if they thought that they could win. [And if it came to a mutual suicide type of fight, our Air Force figures that our highly urbanized United States would suffer many times the losses of ruralized Russia. If we] *Yet, if we attacked—and then* destroyed [the] Russian cities *and people* [and left] *leaving* their military forces largely untouched—what then? *Why, then we would be utterly decimated as a people.*"

State note: "State feels Khrushchev does not want general war and is unwilling to bear the losses such as war would entail, even though he could win it. This passage also discusses war in specific U.S.-U.S.S.R. terms, which we wish to avoid. Suggest deletion on both grounds."

DSR on recommendation of Joint Staff. State also recommended deletion of above portion.

Speech No. 150: Brig. Gen. Richard P. Klocko; review date, May 10, 1961; delivery date, May 20, 1961.

Page 2: "This year's Armed Forces Day is a particularly important one. Today the Communist countries control one-third of the world's population and one-fourth of the dryland surface of the world. They are this Nation's greatest concern in Africa, the Middle East, Asia, South America, and now Cuba—only 90 miles from the Florida coast [and a rocket's throw from here across the Gulf of Mexico]."

Department of the Air Force prior to submission to DSR.

Speech No. 151: Brig. Gen. John W. White, AMC; no review date; delivery date, March 3, 1961.

Page 6: "[Victory] *Defeat of Communist aggression* on each of the four battlefields of the cold war is essential to the survival of freedom."

State.

Page 9-10: "And again, I would like to refer to my observations in Iceland. There are five political parties in Iceland including the Communist Party. No one party is strong enough to carry a majority of the vote. We find, therefore, the Communist Party, which polls only about 15 percent of the popular vote, eager bargain from its balance of power position as the four democratic parties in the normal democratic tradition vie among one another for political power. In 1936, this struggle for political power become so intense that two of the democratic parties joined with the Communist Party to [gain a majority and the right to] form a coalition government. In this political swap, the Communist Party gained two of the six Cabinet seats, including the important post of Ministry of Trade. [In less than a year, barter type of trade with the Soviet Union in fish and fish products, which represents 95 percent of the Icelandic economy, had increased from less than 15 percent to even 30 percent. Imagine, if you will, the state of our economy if one-third of it were tied to barter agreements with the Soviet Union. Needless to say, we would have lost the economic phase of the cold war. And, please note the interplay between the political and economic battlefields in this instance—a fundamental weakness in the political structure of Iceland, i.e., the division of political power between several parties, was the means by which the Communists made substantial political and economic gains.]"

Censor's note: "This is incorrect. The development of trade with the Soviet bloc countries started rapidly in 1952 and kept on increasing steadily under democratic party governments. The Communist ministers in the Government can take very little credit for it."

State.

Page 15: "[Despite the considerable inroads made by communism.] *T*[t]he people of Iceland are predominately friendly to America and are pro-Western in their ideals and beliefs."

State.

Speech No. 152: CINCNORAD address to the American Association of Airport Executives; no review date; delivery date, April 22, 1961.

Page 12: "NORAD has a complementary role during either cold or limited war, in achieving our national objective of deterring [the Soviets] *an aggressor* from initiation of general war and a primary role in preserving the means and will to fight back and win if they are not deterred."

State.

Speech No. 153: Maj. Gen. Robert E. L. Eaton to annual convention, Maryland Department, American Legion; review date, July 1961; delivery date, July 21, 1961.

Page 7: "The American Legion recognized early the *ideological* threat to our freedom [, posed by the Communist ideology]."

Department of Air Force prior to submission to DSR.

Speech No. 154: Maj. Gen. Chester E. McCarty; review date, May 6, 1961; delivery date, May 19, 1961.

Page 1-2: "When our nuclear monopoly ended in 1949, [the time seemed closer. For the first time] the United States [was exposed to direct attack by] *became a potential target for* hostile airpower.

"Our national budget has been channeled more and more into those forces which most effectively could deter [the Soviet Union] *an aggressor* from an attack against this country or its allies. For more than 10 years Strategic Air Command—the Sword—and U.S. and allied forces overseas—the Shield—have [deterred communism from a major military aggression] *acted as a deterrent to the Sino-Soviet bloc.*"

State.

Page 3: "A nation which engages in aggressive war must weigh all possible consequences. When this includes defeat, even after total commitment, withdrawal may seem to be a more acceptable alternative. The only way a limitation can be exerted on aggressive wars today is for the United States to be strong enough to deter the [Soviets] *aggressor* from making a desperate attack on us and, if we are attacked, to be able to destroy his warmaking forces.

"We have known for years that we may expect continuing Communist provocations. [Soviet Communists are dynamic, as well as ruthless, and because they may not always be able to control China, we can expect that aggressions will continue.] Bitter lessons from the past have taught us that the price of continuing peace is readiness to [fight] *defend ourselves by force of arms.*

"Resistance to aggression, when necessary, takes place under the shadow of our long-range nuclear strike force, including SAC and the Navy's Polaris submarine. *This provides some* assurance that any rational [Communist] *enemy* leader will not permit the conflict to grow, uncontrolled, into a general war [involving directly the United States and the U.S.S.R.]. But it is not enough to confine the conflict: It must be ended decisively, rapidly and favorably."

State.

Page 6: "[I wonder what the Commies thought when they saw on their radar screens the 1,480 miles per hour flights of the F-104, Starfighters and the only slightly slower flights of the F-100's and F-101's.

"[They never told us what they thought, but the shooting war in the Formosa Straits gradually turned into * * *.] By Christmas of that year, we were able to redeploy our TAC strike force back to the United States. The crisis had passed."

State.

Speech No. 155: Lt. Gen. George W. Mundy, USAF; no review date; delivery date, May 19, 1961.

Page 6: ["In fact, the big question of our day is just simply this: Will the future world, that is, the emerging world order, be in our image, the image of the Western World, or will it be in the image of world communism?"]

DSR in accordance with identical changes by State in speech previously cleared.

Speech No. 156: Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau; review date, illegible; delivery date, February 1, 1960.

Page 1: "My work, especially my experience as a former Chief of Army Intelligence, has given unusual opportunities to acquaint myself with the many threats and challenges which face this great Nation today, tomorrow, and into the foreseeable future. The most serious of these is world communism[, but]. *Not a threat, but a challenge and an opportunity to which we must respond, are* the rising tide of nationalism and the struggle for self-determination of their own futures by the people of the underdeveloped areas [would still be a great challenge even if communism were suppressed]."

State.

Page 2: "The unfortunate peoples of Hungary, Tibet, Poland, and many other countries can testify to the harsh consequences if [Khrushchev's] *the Communist* challenge is not met adequately."

State.

Page 5: "These people are basically Catholic and, therefore, anti-Communist [but spiritual and mental enlightenment as well as material advancement is necessary to prevent despair, disillusionment and subversion]."

(Censor's note: "State amendment, with comment: 'Terribly patronizing'.")

State.

Speech No. 157: Hon. Elvis J. Stahr, Jr.; review date, February 10, 1961; delivery date, February 11, 1961.

Page 7: ["The Soviet Union has for years applied the major portion of its industrial capacity to the creation of military might, depriving its citizens not only of most of the comforts but many of the virtual necessities of life. We have no reason to emulate the Soviet in this respect, but."]

(Censor's comment: "State requests deletion or rewrite of bracketed portion because of inaccurate sentence. People not denied necessities.")

State.

Speech No. 158: Perkins McGuire; review date, November 7, 1960; delivery date, November 11, 1960.

Page 2: ["History is crowding us once again. Its course is no longer to be taken for granted. Powerful outpourings are entering the stream from new and hostile sources on the darkened sides of the earth. At such a time, there is an advantage in having a long memory. We of the war generation have better reason than most to know that no good man can safely rest, no family can feel rightfully secure, no society can consider its duties fulfilled, when its freedom and its ideals are under threat."]

Change made by speaker before submission of text to DSR.

Page 4: ["Stalin has been quoted as saying, 'A diplomat's words must have no relation to action; otherwise what kind of diplomacy is it? Words are one thing, actions are another. Good words are a mask for the concealment of bad deeds. Sincere diplomacy is no more possible than dry water or iron wood.'"]

Change made by speaker before submission of text to DSR.

Speech No. 159: Adm. Arleigh Burke, USN; no review date; delivery date, March 25, 1961.

Page 2 (suggested deletions): "Today, in this era, we are confronted by the grim challenge of [communism] *competing ideologies*. We know that the [Communist] challenge threatens not only *our* goals, but relentlessly seeks the overthrow of all free society. And we know, too, that this threat will continue for a long, long time.

"The most dramatic—and certainly the most publicized—form of the [Communist] threat is the possibility of general nuclear war."

State.

Pages 2–3: "[But as the nuclear stalemate continues, both the Communists and ourselves recognize that in the havoc and destruction of such a war no one could really be a victor.

"[That is why this form of warfare becomes more and more remote, why general nuclear war becomes less and less a rational instrument of national policy.

"[Nevertheless] Should a nuclear war occur, either through an aggressor's gross miscalculation of our strength, or through some other irrational act on his part, we must insure that the balance of surviving nuclear retaliatory power always remains well in favor of the United States."

State.

Page 3 (suggested change): "[The Communists, however, are not going to abandon their relentless drive toward world empire, even though they dare not risk the inevitable retaliation that a nuclear war would bring to them.] *Potential aggressors, however, cannot be expected to surrender their objectives without a struggle.* They will merely resort to other methods to test free world strength."

State.

Speech No. 161: Adm. Arleigh Burke, USN; no review date; delivery date, May 19, 1960.

Page 4: ["They are political conspirators. ["Communist leaders have risen to power—consolidated and expanded their power—through ruthless political conspiracy. They are masters of deceit, concealment, subversion, and intimidation.

["To such men military force is important; they respect it. It sustains them in power. It gives them the prestige, the persuasive and implicit threat, of great military strength. But still they think and act primarily as political conspirators.

["It is very important to remember this, lest due to our own forgetfulness the Communists mislead us, focus our attention on the military threat, while they push toward their goal of empire by less dramatic but equally effective means."]

ASD (PA).

I

The following is an address submitted for review by Adm. Arleigh Burke, U.S. Navy. This speech was censored in its entirety in that Admiral Burke was prohibited from delivering it:

"ADDRESS BY ADM. ARLEIGH BURKE, U.S. NAVY, CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS, UPON ACCEPTING THE 1960 SILVER QUILL AWARD AT THE STATE OF THE NATION DINNER, NATIONAL BUSINESS PUBLICATIONS, WASHINGTON, D.C., JANUARY 27, 1961

"Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, it has been my privilege to attend the state of the Nation dinner for a number of years, and on each occasion I have been conscious of the pride of the men who have received this award. Now I understand why they were proud. The Silver Quill Award is an honor which I accept with humility and deep appreciation.

"You of National Business Publications represent dedicated service. You stand for free competition, free enterprise, hard work, integrity—these are words, almost trite, overused; yet these are the things that have made us the most powerful nation in the world. Belief in these principles, making them work, has also placed on us the responsibility of leading the free world.

"But the world is seething, there is confusion and turmoil. The destructive forces of communism are tearing at southeast Asia. Currently the small country of Laos is feeling the effects of Communist treachery. We are trying to help Laos retain her freedom. There are no minerals, no raw materials, no resources in Laos which the United States covets. But it is important to the Lao, important to the United States that Laos, resting uneasily on the borders of Communist Vietnam and Communist China, retain her freedom.

"The difficulty in Laos has achieved a significance far greater than the size of the country. It is significant because it is a conflict between two opposing ideas—ideas which can be distilled into two words—freedom or slavery.

"The Laotian people and all the people in southeast Asia are learning a difficult but essential lesson. They are learning that freedom, dignity of an individual, progress of a country is not something which can be inherited or accepted as a gift. It must be earned. And they, and we as well, are beginning to realize that freedom must be earned; that it must be earned over and over again.

"The other countries in southeast Asia are watching the Laotian situation with thoughtful eyes. They are beginning to understand they, too, may have to fight if they wish to remain free. They are also observing very carefully what happens to a nation willing to fight for its freedom. They are watching to see if other free nations, and in particular if the United States, will help to preserve that freedom.

"I say preserve, not win, for a nation's freedom can be won only by the people of that nation.

"But this struggle for freedom is not confined to Laos. The African giant is stirring. Millions of people in Africa are shouting for independence, without really knowing what independence means.

"There are some who say these people are not yet ready to govern themselves—who say they do not have the experience, the judgment, the knowledge to govern themselves.

"To a large extent the people of Africa have decided they are ready—ready now.

"Some of the people do not understand that with independence, with freedom, go responsibilities—responsibilities of a nation to its own people and to other nations. Many have not seen the sacrifice, the hardship, the work through which freedom is won. They have seen only the benefits of freedom.

"Theories of government do not impress a man who has never seen a tractor, a steel plowshare, who cannot read or write. He is impressed only by what he sees or what he hears. He is impressed only by results. This is especially true in some African nations.

"Just beyond our doorstep the Communists have taken over in Cuba, a nation which was a good neighbor of ours. Cuba also represents a curious paradox for the United States for we, the United States, gave Cuba its freedom. We presented it freely. We paid for it with the blood of our sons. But somewhere between 1899 and 1959 we did not do those things we should have done. We failed to teach the Cubans the basic responsibilities of democracy. Perhaps we gave too much of material things—too little of the moral, the spiritual strength of our national character.

"Yet in spite of our generosity, our friendship for Cuba, a few aggressive, Communist-trained, bearded fanatics enslaved an entire people.

"Castro is teaching his people to hate—to hate the Yanqui, to hate us. He teaches vilification, scorn, deceit. But he is the victim of a greater tragedy. Here was a man with unequaled opportunity to do good for his people, for his country. He will never again have that opportunity. He has betrayed his people, he has betrayed himself, he has sold his soul.

"There are other disturbing areas in this hemisphere. San Salvador has had a recent revolt. Guatemala is restless. Ecuador is uneasy. Venezuela has had a series of continuing crises.

"Much of the trouble we see in Latin America is caused by Castro's agents preaching hatred and creating unrest.

"The United States cannot ignore all of this subversion. We cannot put these problems on the shelf to be decided at some future time convenient to us.

"The United States must decide now what we as a nation are going to do about Africa, about Cuba. We must convince other people, other nations, of the necessity for action; for lack of action will mean the loss of part of our own freedom.

"We want the new nations of Africa to accept the philosophy of work and responsibility, the philosophy which built the United States from a small to a great and powerful Nation. But Africans will accept this philosophy only if they have respect and admiration for what we as a nation, what we as a people, what we as individuals do.

"That is why we cannot falter, why we cannot waiver; why we cannot be indecisive. We have no reason to be indecisive, to falter, to lack confidence, for we are the most powerful nation in the world. We have no reason to fear anyone. Why should we let our national will be undermined by the unjustified weakness of a few voluble people who shamefully proclaim they would rather be Red than dead. What a terrible thing, what a craven way to escape responsibility—to demean the principles for which so many men have willingly given their lives.

"Too many of our people, people who should know better, are fearful—fear based on Russian propaganda, on Communist psychological warfare. Yet these same mulling people discount the enormous and effective examples of our own military might. Right now, tonight, somewhere in the vast reaches of the ocean, *Patrick Henry*, a nuclear powered Polaris submarine is on station. I do not know exactly where *Patrick Henry* is, but I have the means of finding out. The important thing is the Communists do not know where *Patrick Henry* is, and they do not have the means of finding out.

"There are 16 Polaris ballistic missiles in *Patrick Henry*—16 missiles with a combined destructive power greater than all the bombs, all the rockets, all the ammunition used by all the armies, all the air forces, and all the navies during World War II.

"This ship, moving silently beneath the surface of the ocean, is a sentinel, a sentinel, a sentinel for peace. But *Patrick Henry* is an alert sentinel, and a deadly sentinel, ready to retaliate, ready to destroy 16 vital Russian targets should the Soviet Union launch an attack upon us.

"When the *George Washington* returns to her station there will be 32 targets that can be destroyed if we are attacked. When the *Robert E. Lee* slips beneath the surface in a few days, 48 targets will be lined up.

"This is only one reason why I believe there will not be a general nuclear war. For should the Soviet Union start such a war there is nothing, absolutely nothing, she could do to prevent her destruction. We know this and so do the Russians.

"Now what is our responsibility? What must we do? What must we do as a nation? As groups? As individuals?

"We, the people of the United States, must exercise our initiative. This is not the time for recriminations, for blame, for squabbling over the past. Now is the time for action.

"The responsibility for national action rests with no one party, no one organization, no one group. Rather it depends on concerted and combined effort by all the people. We as individuals sometimes fail to realize this.

"Basically we are faced with the problem of understanding and dealing with people, with individuals, many of whom do not think as we do. We are dealing with emotions, with feelings, with the aspirations and ambitions of people.

"Responsible individuals in the areas I have discussed want their people, their nations, to make progress. They desire better education. They desire improvement in their lot. They want a better life. They want to be respected, to be treated with dignity.

"It is up to us to assist these people, these free people, not only to retain their freedom but also to acquaint them with the requirements of freedom.

"A foreign newsman, a captive of the Nazis and later a captive of the Communists, was in my office recently. He made a very significant statement. He said that when his nation was fighting the Nazis they were certain that sometime in the future they would regain their freedom.

"The Nazis, he said, destroyed material things. They destroyed buildings. They destroyed homes. They destroyed industry.

"You can rebuild material things. You can construct new buildings. You can rebuild your industry. But, he said, communism destroys the soul. Once you have lost this you can never regain it.

"This was a man from another nation speaking, and his thoughts should be examined very closely by individuals of all nations. This is the lesson which all of the awakening countries of the world would do well to ponder.

"We in the United States do not want to dominate the world. We do not wish to control the lives of other people. We do not desire real estate in some other nation. We do not attempt to take over the governments of other countries. Three times in the last 42 years we had every opportunity to do so but we did not.

"But it also must be made very clear that we do not like, nor will we submit to, any nation pushing us around.

"Aggressor nations in the past have always miscalculated how far the United States could be pushed. Aggressor nations in the past thought we were soft and decadent, that we were unwilling to fight. Yet when we did fight, when we had extended the limits of our patience, we fought and we won.

"Recently a Soviet official pointed with great indignation to what he called harassing action by free world planes against Soviet ships. This is empty indignation indeed from a country which has shot down our planes over international waters. How many Russian planes have we shot down off Alaska? How many so-called fishing ships have we sunk off our east coast?

"I suggest that the burden of irresponsible actions rests upon the Soviet Union and not with the United States.

"Unfortunately too many of our own people are willing to criticize our actions, they want to believe the Communists are cast in the same mold that we are. That they are reasonable, that they will subscribe to logic. But the Communists are not reasonable, they are not logical.

"We are dealing with fanatic, godless, unprincipled individuals who have used, and will continue to use, every deceit, every unethical trick in order to achieve their ends.

"This does not mean the United States should resort to these same tactics. We must prove not only to the Communists but to all the nations of the world, old and new, that our way of life, our method of doing things, our belief in the dignity of the individual can win. We must prove our way can overcome the unprincipled, the unethical, the deceitful.

"And we can do this if we exercise the individual responsibility which each of us must recognize, which each of us must be willing to shoulder.

"I have been discussing generally what action the United States as a nation should take in these troubled times. But in the final analysis the action our country takes is the action that our citizens want it to take. It is the individual citizen who represents the will, the stamina, the strength of our country. It is the individual citizen who bears the responsibility for what our country does or does not do.

"What can individuals do? You as parents can insure that your children are educated for the responsibilities which they must assume when they become adults. This is your individual responsibility.

"The committees, the groups, the organizations that deal with the education of your children are dependent upon an expression of your desires, upon an expression of your interest, upon an expression of the standards you want your children to attain.

"National attitude is the result of many forces, all of which can be traced back to the actions taken by relatively small groups, some far removed from the seat of government. Members of Rotary, Lions, and Kiwanis, of various professional and social societies, members of church groups, of women's clubs and organizations, are instrumental in expressing your desires.

"But here again these organizations depend on you, on your interest and participation. Unless you express your desires by letter, by petition, by appearance, the men who make up our representative governing bodies must determine as best they can how you want them to run your Government.

"The quality of government in this country is dependent upon what the people are willing to work for, upon what the people are willing to support. The quality is high only if the standards of the people are high.

"The national business press is in a unique position to contribute to the strength of the United States and to the respect in which the United States is held throughout the world. You are influential. You are powerful. You can use your influence to convince your readers that the United States must stand for principles, principles stated so well in our Constitution.

"You can assure the world that we, the United States, intend to stand for what we believe to be right, unpopular though this stand may be. But most of all you can use your strength to guard against compromise, for there can be no compromise with what is right. The moral fiber of a nation is measured by its willingness to stand for what it believes to be right.

"A nation's respect, its integrity in the eyes of its own people as well as those of others, can be maintained only as long as it can prove that it has the ability and the willingness to stand for the principles it claims as cornerstones of national policy. We, as citizens, as individual members of this free society, must take up this challenge. We have in the past and we have won. We will win again.

"We must stand up for what we believe."

II

The following address by Adm. Arleigh Burke was submitted for review and was objected to in its entirety, as indicated by the memorandum to Admiral Burke from Joseph S. Edgerton, Director, Directorate of Security Review. Subsequently, at Admiral Burke's instance, the Department of Defense reversed its position and allowed Admiral Burke to make this speech.

APRIL 6, 1961.

Memorandum for the Chief of Naval Operations.

Subject: Address before the National Military, Industrial, and Educational Conference, Chicago, Ill., April 11, 1961.

CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS,
Washington, D.C.:

The Department of Defense has reviewed the attached address entitled "Education for Responsibility—The Answer to the Communist Challenge" and objects to its delivery on the grounds that it is in violation of the policy expressed in Department of Defense Guidance No. 18 (Public Statements in the Foreign Policy Area and Related Activities).

JOSEPH S. EDGERTON,
Director, Directorate of Security Review.

"ADDRESS BY ADM. ARLEIGH BURKE, U.S. NAVY, CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS, BEFORE THE NATIONAL MILITARY, INDUSTRIAL, AND EDUCATIONAL CONFERENCE, CHICAGO, ILL., APRIL 11, 1961

"*Education for responsibility—The answer to the Communist challenge*

"It is a great privilege for me to attend this annual National Military, Industrial, and Educational Conference. And I am indeed honored to have this opportunity to share some of my thoughts with you.

"While flying to Chicago I reviewed your agenda in detail, and I wish to congratulate the committee responsible for its preparation. It explores almost every aspect of your theme 'Education and Freedom in a World in Conflict.' And this is important. For today, more than ever, education and freedom are truly inseparable.

"Each age must face its own conflicts, each age must face its own challenges. But the striking fact of our age is that the challenge that we face holds grave consequences not only for ourselves but for future generations as well.

To put it bluntly the future of the free world, the conditions of human life for years to come, are now being determined. And we, we the people of the United States, must win this conflict or witness the death of freedom and the end of free society.

"The fate of our country depends on what we, as a nation and as individual citizens, are willing to do today. In our hands rests the responsibility for the future of the American dream.

"Fortunately millions of our fellow citizens sense the urgency of our times and the importance of the actions that such times require. But there remain many others in our affluent society who are so self-satisfied, so comfortable, so content, that they cannot be bothered with the realities and the dangers which surround them. To such people the conflict, the challenge, the urgent need for action are meant for someone else.

"If this seems critical let me assure you that it is meant to be. It is meant to be critical of every American in any walk of life who fails to recognize the forces of aggression that are now at work in the world. Most of all this criticism is meant for those who shirk their responsibility to do something about it.

"For should we shrink from the hard contests bolder men will pass us by. Years ago a brilliant statesman said: 'For evil men to succeed it is only necessary that good men do nothing.'

"And this, perhaps, is one of the most perplexing problems of our times—to discover why so many of our good men do nothing to discover why they refuse to grasp the grave significance of the threat that confronts us.

"We've been told with almost tiresome repetition of the struggle for the minds of men. We've been warned by eminent people in our own society, and perhaps more importantly we have been warned by those who seek to dominate us.

"As our Secretary of State, Mr. Rusk, said recently: 'Those who would bury us are moving with energy, speed, and sophistication. We cannot compete by consulting our comforts nor by nourishing our illusions.'

"Why then, when we observe these forces relentlessly at work, when we see storm flags flying everywhere, do so many fool themselves that there is no threat? Why do so many stubbornly refuse to understand the grim realities of the conflict in which we are engaged?

"One of the answers may lie in our own national character, in the fact that Americans are naturally optimistic. Our Nation was founded with optimism, and generation after generation we have been inclined to look at the brighter side of issues.

"We often tend to indulge in wishful thinking. And when faced with stern realities Americans often have a nostalgia for the good old days. We want a return to normalcy.

"But a troubled world will be normal for a long, long time. Our problems are not going to disappear in this generation or even in the next.

"And there is perhaps another reason that some Americans have become casual about the threat we face. They have become preoccupied with only one phase of this struggle between vigorously competing ideologies. For them the totality of the conflict has become obscured.

"This is dangerous. For we cannot become so absorbed with any single aspect of this conflict that we underestimate all the others.

"Some Americans have done just this. They have become preoccupied with the military aspect, with the strength of our Armed Forces. They are aware of our tremendous military power, and they feel secure.

"I have no intention of saying military strength is unimportant. We need armed forces and we need good ones. We must continue to maintain strong national military power all across the board. We must possess not only the means but the will to deal with military aggression in any form.

"In the words of President Kennedy: 'We dare not tempt those nations who would make themselves our adversary with weakness. For only when our arms are sufficient beyond doubt can we be certain beyond doubt that they will never be employed.'

"But at the same time we must recognize that the ruthless forces threatening our society today depend primarily on nonmilitary means to achieve their objectives. The real threat covers the whole spectrum of human activity.

"Our Communist opponent fights in the field of politics, in the fields of economics, psychology, culture, and even athletics. And he fights just as hard as any soldier on any battlefield.

"But the Communists also depend on us to make their jobs easier. They hope that our own indifference, our own apathy, our own preoccupation with material things will in themselves weaken the ideas and the ideals they seek to destroy.

"The totalitarian prediction for the ultimate destiny of society is based on the assumption that stupidity and selfishness dominate the conduct of freemen. The Communists have based their expectations on the assumption that the values which free people profess are not the values by which they live.

"Should this assumption be correct for us, individually as a nation, all the thermonuclear power we can produce could not protect our freedom.

"That is why today, more than ever, freedom and education are inseparable. That is why we must teach our young citizens coming to maturity the values of the American heritage, teach them to respect these values in their daily lives. For in these values lie the real strength of our society.

"And what are those values that must be taught to American youth?

"The first thing, the most important thing, our Nation's youth must learn is the real meaning of the word 'freedom.' We hear a lot of 4th of July speeches about freedom. We read about it. But there is good cause to wonder if all those who praise the blessings, and enjoy the privileges of freedom, really understand it.

"Freedom to me describes that magnificent privilege, with its grave responsibility, which permits a man to work out his destiny according to his own mind and according to his own abilities. This is the essence of freedom, the unhindered opportunity for man to choose. And our country's future will depend on the wisdom of these choices.

"Our moral fiber will depend on whether we choose what is right or what is wrong. Our national strength will depend on how much stamina, how much courage, we choose to display. The achievements of our industry will depend on how hard we choose to work.

"And these achievements will be made by the individuals in the Nation, by the work the individuals choose to perform, by the self-discipline individuals choose to exercise, by the principles individuals choose to support.

"That is why it is so important that the youth in America, the new generation, learn to make the correct choices.

"For the essential questions, the vital questions, which all freemen must answer are: How do we use our freedom? What kind of choices do we make?

"Just living in a free society is no great achievement. Nations do not become great, nor do they remain great, just because of freedom.

"Recently I read about a nation which was described as a pleasant place for business enterprise, a place where young men were taught to get on, where extravagance kept pace with shrewd finance. Its citizens were self-satisfied, placid, self-confident; a money-getting, woman-loving people, honoring success and hugging their financial security. This description sounded familiar, and it was very disturbing. For that nation was Carthage just before its fall.

"History is filled with accounts of wealthy civilized nations that lost the desire, and with it the ability, to respond to hardship. And history records that they fell, overwhelmed by other nations less wealthy, less secure, but more willing to accept hardship.

"The Greeks and Romans, masters of the ancient world, saw empires slip away. They saw their freedom vanish simply because their citizens made the easy choices, which all too often were the wrong choices.

"The citizens of Athens and Rome chose no longer to support their states. They chose the pleasure of soft living. They chose to look after their private wealth, their private success, their private interests, while public interests took second place.

"Life has become considerably more complicated since the days of Greece and Rome. And it is even more difficult always to make the right choice. But in any age there is one concept, one sure guide that can be relied on in making choices. And that guide is a well-developed sense of responsibility.

"A deep sense of personal responsibility has remained at the root of progress down through the years. And continued progress rests squarely upon the idea of individual freedom of choice and action, with the same personal responsibility for one's own decisions.

"But responsibility cannot be ordered into being. There are a lot of people who would like to create a sense of responsibility merely by passing a law. This looks like the simple solution, the easy way. But it is not the way people learn to be responsible.

"Responsibility like everything else must be learned. And responsibility must be learned today by the new generation that is emerging, learned by those who will take charge in the 21st century.

"Learning to be responsible is a long process. No one just suddenly learns to accept responsibilities. He must be educated in them, trained slowly and carefully. The process starts in childhood in the home, and it continues in our churches and in our schools.

"That is why we cannot wait until our youngsters have become adults before preparing them to take their full place in society.

"Children as they grow up must be given responsibilities. They must be faced with making choices. And when they've made their choice, they must be held accountable for that choice.

"They must learn to accept the consequences for their actions or for their failure to act. They must learn the meaning of reward and of punishment.

"Sometimes it is simpler to overlook an irresponsible act. It causes less trouble, less bother. No one's feelings get hurt.

"But in the long run sanctions and punishments are far kinder to both the child and society than permissiveness and license. Because if we can't be troubled by responsibilities today we can be sure we will be troubled tomorrow. We will be troubled by irresponsible citizens, by men and women without a sense of duty or obligation to their families, to their communities, or to their nation.

"Our youth must learn less about how to make money and much more about their responsibilities. We must educate them in the basic values that have made our country great. We must demonstrate by our example the importance of hard work, of competition, the importance of patriotism and integrity. Most of all we must teach our young people to respect and to stand up for principles.

"For at the very heart of a man's sense of responsibility are his principles, his beliefs, his convictions. Responsibility rests on a man's convictions because a man's judgment is also based on his convictions.

"Our country was built by men with principles. Our fathers and our grandfathers were stanch men, men who held fast to their principles even when the rewards seemed to go to those who compromised their integrity.

"Our forebears knew that they could compromise on issues but never with principles. They knew what future generations must learn—that a man's strength, a nation's strength, is founded on principles and on a willingness to stand up for them.

"Today some people seem to feel that this modern age has removed the need for principles. There are those who believe that situations now control principles, that principles no longer control situations.

"But fundamental principles never change. A man must have convictions in which he believes deeply and for which he must be willing to stand up and be counted.

"When a man sacrifices his principles he loses everything. He loses his self-confidence. He loses his self-respect and the respect of others. He loses his sense of purpose, he becomes weak and vacillating. Ultimately he becomes fearful, he loses his courage.

"If this happens to one man it is usually important only to him. But if it happens to a lot of men, if it happens to most of the men in a nation, then the nation itself loses courage. And when a nation loses courage it loses security.

"For in the final analysis national security is based on courage, not on money, nor on material wealth, nor on military power. Military strength can reinforce courage, can help make resolution effective and believable. But there can be no substitute for courage itself.

"That is why it is so important that our future citizens learn the meaning of principles, learn to accept responsibility for them, learn to safeguard them with courage.

"The fundamental qualities of our national life are being tested by the forces of tyranny. We are engaged in a struggle that will last for a long, long time. And we must have the strength, the stamina, and the courage for the long pull.

"The future won't be easy for us. But when has the future ever been easy?

"Was the future easy for our 13 little colonies when they defied the overwhelming power of the British Empire? Was the future easy for our pioneers when they moved west toward a hostile frontier with a little powder, a little salt, and a great deal of determination?

"We've known trouble before. Our way of life was born in struggle and has survived some appalling tests. We've faced up to tyranny before. We've watched dictatorships rise and fall.

"Since 1776 extraordinary men and women, extraordinary Americans, have overcome extraordinary obstacles. And I am confident future Americans will overcome them again.

"Our Nation is fundamentally sound; within our Republic are the sparks of courage and the latent qualities to meet any task, to answer any challenge.

"Our duty, yours and mine, is to bring out those qualities in ourselves and in others, to provide the example that young America can follow with pride. If we carry out this duty we can look to the future with confidence. The future will be in good hands."

III

The following speech by Rear Admiral McKechnie was rejected, with permission for Admiral McKechnie to rewrite and resubmit the speech. Admiral McKechnie declined to resubmit the speech:

"ADDRESS FOR INSPECTION OF STATIONKEEPERS AND NAVAL AIR RESERVE OFFICERS BY REAR ADMIRAL M'KECHNIE, NARTU, JACKSONVILLE

"Captain Holt, shipmates (guests, if any present), in making my inspection just a few moments ago, I noted that many of you were around for either World War II, Korea, or both.

"It is my fervent hope none of us have to get involved in another shooting war. But, just as surely as we stand here in Jacksonville, you can be assured that we are at war now. It is a war of words, a war seeking the control of men's minds, but it is certainly a war.

"We have only to look at our neighbor to the south, Cuba, to see evidence that the Communist aim of world domination is going ahead according to a plan laid down by Lenin back in 1903. At that time the aim of the Marxist movement was written down, step by step; their first target was to gain control of Western Europe; then Asia and its hundreds of millions of people; and the final aim was the encirclement of North America. Cuba is clearly another step in the encirclement plan.

"A lot of Americans seem to think that Cuba's current plight is a minor skirmish—if it were in line with our treaty agreement we could step in at any moment and douse the fire. What a lot of Americans do not seem to realize is that the Communists have placed their agents in Cuba for further prosecution of their world plan, not only throughout Cuba but the entire Western Hemisphere.

"Last summer, for example, the schoolteachers in Cuba held an indoctrination course in Havana before the current school year began. What do you suppose the indoctrination consisted of? It was certainly not a 'love America' lecture they received before they went into the country to start the year's courses.

"Even if Cuba is taken over by a counterrevolutionary government tomorrow, a lot of the disease of communism will have been spread among the children of Cuba—it'll take a lot of reeducation to undo the harm done among the future leaders of Cuba. One of the basic theories of Communist educational philosophy is that, if you pound the theory of communism into a child for just 8 years, you'll have a Communist forevermore.

"When you look back over the 50-odd years that the Communist movement has been in existence, the step-by-step domination of country after country has been the same each time. Upon moving into power, the Communists first liquidate all persons who might resist or try to stir up revolutionary forces against them. After control of the people is attained, the process of educating the masses begins, with children the prime target. The final step is the lowering of the Iron Curtain so that news about free people cannot filter in and possibly arouse the people to arms against the regime.

"By now most of you here have been exposed to the moral leadership program in the Naval Air Reserve Training Command. You have been given some of the fundamentals of freedom as Americans know it. You should know why this intangible something called freedom is so precious; almost a third of the world's population has been deprived of freedom of individual movement, freedom of religion, freedom of speech, or some of the other freedoms described in our Bill of Rights. Those people know the value of freedom; but, for them, it's too late.

"The choice for Americans is clear, I believe. We can live in freedom or in slavery. Once the Communists take over a country, there is no choice. There is only slavery.

"As Americans, we must stop this creeping encirclement program. By maintaining the strongest possible Armed Forces—Army, Navy, Air Force, Marines—we can prevent a fighting war. Let's face facts: The enemy is not going to advertise the start of any future war. We must be ready for any eventuality. We can't afford to be caught with all our eggs in one basket, all our offensive or defensive strength in one force or one weapon. This is why nuclear submarines armed with Polaris missiles are so important today.

Because of its underwater endurance and evasive capabilities, the nuclear sub gives us a tremendous retaliatory force that is virtually impossible to wipe out. Even if all of our land bases were knocked out in a surprise raid, the subs would be available to us to launch a counterattack.

"We need forces for fighting a limited war, too. If we ever lower our guard the Communists will find some arena in the world for testing our strength, as they did in Korea.

"Also, we must be ready for the propaganda war that we are in.

"As active duty Navy personnel, and as citizens, it is incumbent upon you to keep informed on world events, know what's going on. The Director of the FBI says that every American can, as individuals, resist the Communists by—

"1. Fighting against public apathy toward communism.

"2. By attacking bigotry and prejudice wherever they appear.

"3. By showing respect for human dignity—human rights do not exist under communism.

"4. By keeping informed, and by exercising your voting privileges.

"5. By making it your business to know the true nature and tactics of communism.

"In a word war the only ammunition needed is words. And knowledge is the weapon which fires it."

IV

The following is a speech by Rear Adm. Charles B. Martell, Assistant Chief of Naval Operations (Development), prepared for delivery at the Aerospace Sciences Joint Institute of American Rocket Society meeting on January 12, 1961. The first pages of the speech, down to the subtitle "Launch Location and Azimuth Flexibility," was, as noted in the margin of each page of the speech, "deleted by State Department":

"INTERACTION OF LIMITED WAR AND SPACE

"(By Rear Adm. Charles B. Martell, U.S. Navy, Assistant Chief of Naval Operations (Development))

"Introduction

"In the post-World War II world we have seen the growth of two unique and significant influences in the relations of men and nations—limited warfare (such as Korea) as a safety valve in the association of nations or groups; and space technology as a step forward in man's living standard and as a relative power index and a propaganda instrument.

"At first glance it may appear that the exploitation of space, even to satisfy military requirements, has little or no relation to limited warfare. I suggest to you tonight that there is a strong interconnection between space and limited war—a relation we must recognize and an interaction which affects both our preparation for limited war and our concept for research and development in the field of astronautics. As we see the exploding technology of astronautics and contemplate on its military significance, there are certain subtle lines drawn that may grow to be the main features of the space picture. These lines, oddly enough, are not the first outlines of the sketch: scientific exploration, man in space, communications relay, lunar study, navigation beacon, and meteorological systems appear among the prominent early features of the space picture. After devoting considerable thought in recent weeks to the more hidden features of the space scene, I hope to stimulate your thinking tonight in a particular direction which has heretofore not been discussed in connection with space. These concepts may have substantial national and naval significance.

"The big game

"Let us examine first the similarities of space and limited warfare as instruments of national policy. Reduce to their lowest denominator, space technology as it has been conducted to date by the Soviet Union and limited warfare are two methods for showing force—two extensions of a gigantic athletic contest or muscle demonstration. Space is much cleaner and cheaper in terms of men's lives, national effort, and dollar cost than any form of hot warfare. The science of astronautics is much broader and deeper and should eventually touch each man much more forcefully than that evidenced in its role as simply a demonstration of muscle or national prowess. However, we all recognize that this less-honest role of space has been important since 1957.

"Limited warfare as an instrument of national policy results primarily from recognition of the consequences of general war in the nuclear age. It is, in one sense, a return of chivalry to warfare; the participants agree (sometimes unilaterally) to constrain the conflict to a certain geographic area and to restrict the method to certain types of weapons. Fear of reprisal, and the willingness to go only so far in defending a cause are motivating factors in the acceptance of limited war as a means for settling differences. It is analogous to the gambler who risks only the money in his hand in the hopes of making a profit—after the amount in hand is gone he refused to go to the wallet.

"Using space achievements as a propaganda weapon and resorting to limited warfare to attain national objectives are somewhat similar. A space race with the U.S.S.R. is similar to a situation in which a Russian athlete lifts a heavier weight than the U.S. athlete, then the press declares the Soviet Union to be the superior nation. The U.S. athlete in turn runs a faster race, and the press declares the U.S. way of life is superior.

"Who wins? It depends with whom you talk. Gross liberties are taken in generalizing from a specific achievement to an overall military status, a standard of living, the educational systems, the happiness of the citizens, etc.

"We therefore see that, in one restricted sense, the space race and limited war are different degrees of a big game. We do not need to play this game if we do not choose to do so. I think we all recognize that limited war is a definite part of world diplomacy. Those with a knowledge of the importance of good public relations and the value of advertising also stress scientific achievements (particularly space achievements) as a necessary part of our national repertoire and as an important part of the U.S. image.

"Although space is a propaganda star of the first magnitude, I think we all recognize its technical importance far transcends transient propaganda achievements. It is not my desire to dwell on the propaganda effects of space achievements and to relate these to limited war. I should like, instead, to discuss how space systems and our outlook on ways for utilizing space may influence both our ability for and our success at waging wars which are limited geographically.

"Geographic containment and space

"Since World War II there have been a number of conflicts which have broken out across the globe, each of which has been limited geographically to a specific area. By far the most costly and difficult of these was in Korea; other outbreaks have occurred in Suez, in Lebanon, and more recently we have seen United Nations action required in the Congo. It may appear difficult to relate geographic containment to space systems, which, by their very nature, operate globally.

"There are two fundamental facts that we should recognize:

"1. Limited war exists as a tool of world diplomacy. We are likely to see local conflicts break out many times in the years ahead, some of which may or may not involve the United States.

"2. The science of astronautics and resulting military space systems may be used by us or used against us in limited war situations.

"Let us examine briefly some of the fundamental aspects of Keplorian mechanics and see how they may be applied to specific geographic areas. It is necessary first to examine the relative movement of the orbital plane of a satellite in relation to the surface of the earth. The orbital plane of the satellite is fixed in inertial space; the earth rotates on its axis inside the orbit of a satellite moving in this plane. For an orbit of high inclination the intersection of the equatorial plane and the orbital plane moves at a relative velocity of about 1,000 miles per hour. Geographic locations north or south of the Equator move with respect to the orbital plane at lesser velocities. For high inclination orbits, latitudes equivalent to the Atlantic Missile Range or Pacific Missile Range move at supersonic speeds. A point having a latitude somewhat less, perhaps half a degree, than the inclination of the orbit will remain essentially stationary in relation to the orbital plane for quite some time. This point will stay in the vicinity of the orbital plane for more than 3 hours. Any operations in a predetermined orbital plane will be greatly simplified if they are conducted at the latitude nearly equal to the inclination.

"A space system may be used by us or against us to accomplish military objectives in a specific geographic area, perhaps the area of a limited war. With the satellite operating at an inclination equal to the latitude of the geographic area in which the war is being prosecuted, the vehicle may perform useful military services for roughly 4 hours out of each 24.

"Let us look at what happens on the other side of the world. If we go 180° around the orbit, we find that, on the other side of the globe, the satellite will pass similarly over a certain geographic area for three or more passes. I'd like to call this the phantom point, the 180° shadow of the area in which the satellite is performing military services. This particular point may be appropriate as a data link with the satellite or the point physically to recover the satellite. If the satellite is hostile, this is an appropriate point to neutralize it. For war in a European area, western Asiatic area, or north African area, this opposite point or phantom point is in the southwest Pacific. For any land area of the globe where limited warfare is likely to be conducted, the phantom point is at sea.

"The unique feature of operating at a latitude in the vicinity of the maximum orbital inclination in contrast to any other latitude is that the satellite passes over a localized area for three or more successive passes. The vehicle's utility as a military vehicle is greatly expanded.

"From a reconnaissance standpoint, it covers this specific area much more thoroughly than any other area. Similarly, recovery of the vehicle is much less difficult at the phantom point because three or four orbits are available during which to initiate recovery. For example, retrorockets can be fired at a predetermined time during a particular orbit by a signal injected during the pass immediately proceeding. Since there is very little motion of the orbital plane in relation to the phantom point, the primary error of the recovery impact will be caused by time programing of the reentry phase by physical uncertainties.

"Looking at the other side of the fence, satellites launched by an enemy with hostile intent in the localized area can best be inspected and neutralized near the phantom point. The inspection and neutralization problem is effectively reduced to a two dimensional problem.

"I think it is clear that a fundamental requirement for developing the capability for limited war in the space age is that the space operations be taken to sea. This means a requirement for developing all necessary data links from mobile bases; it means that launch and recovery operations must be capable of being performed from mobile platforms; it means that all aspects of military space operations must be capable of being performed over ocean areas. Recognition of this fact and development of this capability will provide the United States with tremendous advantages in any limited war situations which may arise in the future.

"Launch location and azimuth flexibility

"The launch azimuth restrictions of our land bases can be greatly relieved by launching at sea. Several possible needs are here today: the need for an equatorial orbit for the 24-hour communication satellite system (Project Advent); the low inclination orbits required for the worldwide satellite navigation system (Project Transit); the need for launch points which minimize booster fallout or overflight problems; the need for a unique launch for a particular experiment such as the Argus shots in 1958; the need for a precise launch point to achieve optimum reentry or recovery conditions. Many of these tasks are occasional affairs and do not warrant extensive site preparations or permanent facilities. A mobile launch platform can have a long life and can be used repeatedly.

"The problem of booster fallout is a constraining factor in trajectory selection from fixed launching sites. Overcoming this objection by means of dog-leg trajectories is expensive in terms of payload losses and system complexity. The rising tide of opposition to the oversea location of harmless activities, such as tracking stations for scientific purposes (particularly in equatorial areas) leads to the conclusion that the acquisition of fixed foreign launching sites may be difficult and time consuming.

"Many nations of the free world are interested in space and astronautics and are desirous of undertaking projects. Canada, Great Britian, and Japan have already made overtures for assistance to their programs. We launched a Canadian galactic noise experiment with our Transit satellite in June 1960.

"The advanced state of solid propellant sciences in the United States as a result of the Polaris development together with the demonstrated ability to launch at sea establishes an arena for astronautics in which the Soviets could only compete at a disadvantage. If the United States could provide a relatively economic method to launch space vehicles to foreign nations—such launches to be conducted in or near their own waters if desired—the scientists of the free world would be encouraged to develop payloads to the benefit of all mankind.

"Launch mobility for space operations constitutes freedom to choose the geographic launch location, launching azimuth, and time of launch. Control of these three factors, plus the capability of the launch vehicle itself, completely determines the nature and scope of space operations.

"Conclusion

"The military space program of the United States embraces many programs and spans many philosophies with respect to the role space can best play in advancing the cause of all mankind. I have suggested tonight one potential application to limited war situations which may be important to the security of the free world. I think it is important for all of us to realize that astronautics and space technology are in their infancy. The exploitation of space to serve man's needs, and exploration of space to satisfy his thirst for knowledge, adventure, and the conquest of the unknown are little beyond the stage of the sprouting seed. The technical changes which occur each month and the achievements regularly being recorded high above the launching pad have led to a continuous reorientation of our outlook on space as a partner in science, defense, and diplomacy.

"Since exploitation of space is just emerging as a reality in our lives, I think it is highly improper that we attempt to draw rigid patterns in our national organization and in our national programs of space exploration. Although a workable organization and an established program are important in order to prevent chaos and wasted effort, we as individuals, organizations, and a nation must remain flexible if we are to insure that more than pigeons fly above the county courthouse on the Fourth of July.

"The relation of the military services and the vast complex of private industry, educational institutions, scientific laboratories, and civilian governmental agencies is not always easy to define, nor should it be so. A spirit of cooperation must prevail in a program which is so expensive and multifarious as to require the combined efforts of many agencies. This spirit is more important than all the legislative acts or Executive orders that may define the role of this or that organization. The spirit of dedication to a purpose and a national cause, the sense of urgency to defend liberty and justice, and the morality which places a cause above the color of the uniform or the size of the bank account, these are the things which are more important in the race for space than a space act or a Secretary of Defense memorandum. These are the things which, if present, will make a poor legislative and organizational foundation work; and these are the things which, if absent, will make the best laid plans fail."

V

The following article, which is a sanitized version of a speech which Gen. George H. Decker, Chief of Staff, delivered to the Army War College in June 1961, was submitted for clearance as a news article and clearance was denied. State Department expressed the following as reason for denial of clearance: "It is recognized that much of this kind of material has already been made public, but it is resulting in increasing unfavorable publicity abroad and is subjecting the United States to mounting adverse criticism. The Communist press and radio are having a field day quoting back the words of U.S. sources, including military publications, on the role and capabilities of paramilitary units and special forces groups which are charged with actively interfering in the internal affairs of other countries. This particular article, it is believed, would provide an especially high-level and authoritative spokesman for unfriendly propagandists to quote at length":

"THE MILITARY ASPECTS OF THE COLD WAR

"(By Gen. George H. Decker)

"Today, the free world is confronted by a type of conflict that does not meet its traditional concepts and definitions of war. The peaceful coexistence theme expressed by the Communists is but a masquerade by which low-intensity conflict is waged subtly by means of new techniques. We must recognize the fact that the low-intensity conflict waged by our opponents is a threat to our national and free world survival. Conquest need not take the form of armed aggression.

"To meet this challenge, all forms of power must be integrated and coordinated in their application to cold war situations. Within this context, it is my purpose to spell out some views as to the role of military power in such cold war situations.

"In doing so, four major aspects of the subject are discussed:

"First, the differences between the Communist concept of cold war and that of the free world nations.

"Second, the conditions throughout the world favorable for cold war tactics.

"Third, the influence of military power in the cold war.

"And, finally, a means for improving our capability to oppose the Communists on the cold war front.

"While the role of military power in meeting cold-war situations is emphasized in this discussion, it must be understood fully that this should by no means be construed as a lack of recognition of its interrelationship with political, economic, and psychological means and their equally important influences.

"The roots of the cold-war problem are to be found in the economic and social conditions that exist in many areas of the world.

"As the President said recently, the great battleground for the defense and expansion of freedom today is the whole southern half of the globe—Asia, Latin America, Africa, and the Middle East—the lands of the rising peoples.

"Excluding Red China, about 900 million people live in Asia and the Middle East. Another 225 million occupy Africa, and approximately 190 million live in all of Latin America. This is about 46 percent of the world population. Experts estimate that this total of 1.3 billion people will more than double in the next 40 years. The vast majority of them live close to or at the bare subsistence level. Stimulated by their own emerging leadership and influenced by both free world and Communist ideas, great masses of these people are clamoring for immediate improvement of their lot. They want material things now—more food, better clothing and shelter, education, and improved medical care. Moreover, they want a voice in determining their lot, the right to express their views. Their urge for improvement is marked by impatience with slow reforms, by pressures for political change, and for dramatic and immediate economic growth.

"In order to satisfy these basic wants, economic assistance is required on a long-term basis. As suggested by President Kennedy, provision of such assistance must include a greatly expanded effort on the part of our allies, and be carefully integrated with political and military actions. Given the time and a secure environment, we can in this manner improve economic conditions measurably in these underdeveloped areas. But our efforts are often made ineffective or interfered with in some way by factors generated in the cold war.

"As a type of conflict, cold war can be defined as the attempt to attain political objectives by the application of all forms of national power short of overt conflict. As it applies to the struggle with communism, it could well be defined as low-intensity conflict between free and open societies on the one hand and those that are closed and totalitarian on the other. It is conflict that is complex, extensive, subtle, and persistent. However, great care is taken to keep the level low enough to avoid provoking the opponent into open military counteraction. Even though the actual conflict is of low intensity we must never lose sight of the fact that it is truly a struggle for national survival.

"Any consideration of the cold war must take into account the wide and basic difference in concepts between the Communists and ourselves as they relate to the application of military power for the attainment of national objectives.

"Despite all their protestations of a desire for peaceful coexistence, the Communists consider that a fundamental element of cold war is armed conflict. Khrushchev made this point unmistakably clear in a speech on January 6, 1961, which included these words: 'Wars of liberation are not only justifiable but inevitable; * * * the Communists support just wars of this kind wholeheartedly and without reservations.'

"In fostering and supporting these so-called just wars, the Communists take pains to insure that the struggle appears to be a just struggle for liberation and not primarily a struggle between organized communism and the free world. These are three of their typical safeguards.

"First, they keep the level of provocation low and ambiguous. This makes it difficult for the free world to satisfy its self-imposed requirement for legal and moral justification before resorting to military counteraction.

"Second, they are careful to avoid overt participation by Soviet or Chinese Communist conventional forces. Instead, they rely on cadres of advisers, technicians, and indigenous Communist-trained guerrillas.

"Third, although overt engagement with free world forces is carefully avoided, the Communists maintain a constant threat and capability to engage in conflict of higher intensity. For example, the military strength of the Chinese Communists and the North Vietnamese casts a dark shadow over the so-called war of liberation in Laos—and Communists, all over the world, have been active in making sure that the shadow is seen by the West.

"Turning to the U.S. view of cold war, we find quite a different concept. We view a cold war situation as essentially a nonmilitary conflict. We prefer to think of it as competition. When confronted with an ambiguous military challenge, we search for clear-cut issues, and attempt to define it in terms of open and declared belligerency. This is most difficult to do. Perhaps these differences in cold war concepts between the United States and the Communists have significance that none of us fully recognize.

"Today there are many situations that lend themselves admirably to the application of Communist cold-war tactics. Good examples can be found in every strategic area of the world. In Berlin, a very high order of Western-sponsored economic and social development exists within the shadow of very powerful Soviet and East German military forces. There the tension is heightened by Communist threats to cut off access to the city or to take it over by military force. Since Allied access rights to Berlin are guaranteed by formal agreement with the U.S.S.R., we have a legal and moral basis for remaining there. While we attempt to preserve these rights in the face of Communist threats, they try to confront us with the apparent alternatives of accepting the risk of general nuclear war or acquiescing to Communist takeover. They are fully mindful of the loss of face and stature we would suffer in international circles should we be unwilling to take the steps necessary to prevent a takeover by East Germany military forces.

"In Africa, south of the Sahara, there are areas where conditions are ideal for Communist exploitation. In such areas we find:

"A military vacuum;

"A very low order of economic and social development;

"Ardent nationalism; and

"Strong anticolonialism.

"This area presents the United States with perhaps its most difficult cold-war challenge. The Communists constantly stress our close association with other Western powers—the old colonial powers from whom the emerging and struggling indigenous leadership gained their independence. This association causes the emerging states of Africa to view our motives suspiciously as we attempt to counter the effects of Communist political penetration, subversion, and arms assistance.

"In certain areas of southeast Asia, political instability, a tendency toward neutralism, and the pressure created by the persistence of Chinese Communist expansion into this rich rice-producing area have created conditions that are ripe for cold-war tactics. The presence of powerful Communist military forces has set the stage for penetration, subversion, and guerrilla action operating to undermine and, as soon as possible, to take over local governments.

"In all of these areas, so susceptible to Communist cold-war tactics, military power has a wide range of application. It can be calibrated to a variety of uses that range from those that are essentially peaceful—and not usually associated with the military—to those involving overt armed hostilities.

"In order to appreciate the potential role that military power can play in the cold war, it would be well to consider the general influence of such power in situations that confront us today.

"Laos is an excellent example of the Communist use of force to gain a political objective. Large Communist military forces are immediately available for any task. Designed not only for the preferred low-intensity conflict, but aslo ready for warfare of greater magnitude, they are ideally adaptable to this situation. This conflict illustrates the three concepts I mentioned earlier. The challenge is skillfully presented, gradually and ambiguously. Proxy forces are employed. Both sides are aware that the presence of powerful military means in China and North Vietnam gives an initial advantage to the Communists in the event of free world intervention.

"On the other hand, consider the example of Cuba, a troubled area just 80 miles away from the free world's strongest nation. Here, the proximity of our vast military power—immediately available for deployment—did not prevent an active form of Communist penetration. The skillful use of cold-war techniques and means—carefully geared just below the level of unacceptable provocation—has so far won Cuba for the Communists. Khrushchev threatened the use of Communist bulk military power when he announced that Red artillerymen—firing rockets from the Soviet Union—would support Cubans fighting for their liberation. Although this threat lacked credibility, the United States, faced with a low level of military provocation in Cuba, did not choose to threaten or actually employ its military forces, although we had the evident ability to do so.

"Military power, if it is to have the desired influence on a cold-war situation, must possess four characteristics: First, adequate elements of military power must be reasonably proximate to the cold war scene. Second, these elements must be appropriate for application in the specific situation. Third, there must be in being a full range of capabilities adequate to meet any level of escalation. Finally, the nation controlling these elements must make obvious its will and ability to use them.

"A brief evaluation of the military means which the United States possesses today will help determine their cold-war utility in terms of these four criteria.

"First, there are our nuclear strike forces including manned bombers, ICBM's, Polaris submarines, and other similar weapons systems. While they are designed primarily to deter or prosecute thermonuclear war, they have an indispensable role in any form of conflict. They represent the ultimate response of military power, and, as such, have a formidable psychological impact on our allies and the Communists alike.

"These forces, capable of delivering tremendous destructive power over great distances in a very short time, represent a vital part of the array of military power. However, the practical cold war value of these forces is limited in some respects. Their usefulness and credibility for situations short of general war make them more symbolic than utilitarian. They are symbols of advanced technological superiority—symbols of the ability of a nation to bat in the major leagues of world power politics. Conversely, they provide a restraint for the great powers to keep the intensity level of conflict as low as possible in order to avoid uncontrolled escalation.

"The other major elements of our military power are the land, sea, and air combat units that make up our forward-deployed forces, theater reserves, and strategic reserves. These forces are dual capable; that is, they are designed for both nuclear and nonnuclear combat. They are general purpose forces since they have a vital role in any conflict, including general war. Since they possess a strong conventional capability, and this capability is being improved in our new Army divisional organization, these forces have greater direct cold war utility than the more specialized nuclear strike forces. Nevertheless, even they are designed primarily to meet clearly defined, unambiguous military threats above cold war levels of intensity.

"We have these conventional forces deployed in forward areas along the Iron and Bamboo Curtains. Most of these forward deployed forces are relatively fixed by reason of their formal and firm commitment to collective security tasks; for example, the defense of the NATO area and of Korea. We are able to afford these relatively large, permanent deployments only at the most critical points on the periphery of the Communist empire. Where they are deployed, they serve as visible evidence of U.S. willingness and ability to fight, at any level of conflict, to protect our own interests and those of our allies. It is important to recall that communism has made no territorial gains in any of the areas where such forces are deployed. Their redeployment to meet military requirements elsewhere would weaken the free world defense of NATO and Korea.

"Theater reserves provide some flexibility and reinforcement to the forces deployed along the Iron and Bamboo Curtains. They include certain elements of the 7th Army in Europe, the 25th Division in Hawaii, and Army and Marine units on Okinawa, for example. These could be used in adjacent areas where no U.S. forces are now stationed, but there are several limiting factors. These reserves are not yet adequate in strength, but action has been directed by the President to improve their capabilities. Also, they should remain reasonably available in the event of hostilities in the most critical areas, and some of the distances they would have to be moved are great. For example, Reserve elements in Hawaii would have to be lifted roughly 4,000 miles to respond to an emergency in southeast Asia.

"Whenever deployed reserves are inadequate or unavailable, we must depend on our critically important strategic reserves—Strac, composite air strike forces, and naval task forces. These powerful, combat-ready units are available for deployment to critical cold war areas on extremely short notice. Though a long way from most potential areas of conflict, they exert a considerable psychological impact on our allies as well as on the Communists, and contribute much to the effectiveness of our diplomatic moves. However, the means required to move them quickly are relatively costly and are not now as adequate as we would like. Here, more and better airlift, which is being provided, as well as sealift can play an important role in reducing the time and effort now required to deploy these forces. If we do deploy our strategic reserves to critical cold war areas for any extended period, our overall strategic flexibility is diminished proportionately, unless we reconstitute these forces promptly from other sources, such as the mobilization of Ready Reserve units.

"Within our capabilities, the deployment of these U.S. conventional forces is designed to cover the most critical areas. However, they leave gaps in the sensitive cold war areas of southern Asia, Africa, the Middle East, and Latin America.

"We try to fill these gaps by building indigenous military strength. Our military assistance advisory groups and military missions are located in more than 40 countries. These groups are not organized military units. They have a training and advisory mission to assist our friends and allies to develop and increase their own military capabilities.

"These MAAG's and missions have made significant contributions toward strengthening the capability of our allies to defend themselves. However, because they are too small to do more than the work for which they are designed, the maximum potential of this close association with friendly nations cannot be realized in all instances.

"Moreover, the military problem confronting the nations located in the cold war battleground is not primarily one of resisting overt external invasion; it is, rather, one of coping with internal aggression and cold war threats against the stability and security of their governments.

"A look at the nations located in southeast Asia, Africa, Latin America, and the Middle East shows that their governments are faced with certain common, essentially military, problems. Some of these are:

"Intelligence and counterintelligence systems require improvement as to organization, equipment, procedures, and the training of personnel. Effective intelligence organizations should be established or greatly strengthened. These are key instruments in the cold war. It is not possible to fight effectively unless one knows his enemy.

"Effective plans and doctrine at the national level in each country for countering insurgency, subversion, and guerrilla activities are lacking. Even though such activities are only a latent threat in some areas, plans must be made early to alert all levels of the country government to the danger, scope, and nature of potential Communist capabilities.

"An apparent apprehension, in some countries, seems to be centering on the idea that the United States may not actually honor her collective security commitments in time to prevent a Communist takeover. We must convince our allies of our determination to stand with them in their hour of peril. We must have the courage and loyalty of the old sergeant who told his platoon:

"'If you want to get along in this platoon, stay out of trouble. But if you guys are trying to do the right thing, and get into trouble, and if I can't get you out of it, I'll get in with you.'

"This brief evaluation of our total military power leads one to conclude that while our present forces have marked utility for cold war, they are not completely adaptable to many low-intensity, ambiguous conflict situations.

"Having discussed the problems of the cold war and analyzed our present potential for meeting them, let us examine some ways in which we might improve our capability in this field.

"The United States recognizes that major social changes will take place in the developing areas of the world, but we must work actively to bring about desirable changes through orderly, evolutionary processes. Communism is working rapidly toward other ends through revolution.

"Because the United States works to bring change by evolutionary processes, the apparent results seem more remote than those promised by militant communism. When the gap is wide between the local people's aspirations and the government's ability to satisfy them, our efforts appear to offer less than the Communists promise but seldom deliver. Although we have tried to overcome this disadvantage by greater economic outlays, other methods are available to us and should be used.

"Rapid and direct access to the people and their government is available through the indigenous military forces, the instrument that supports political stability and power in these underdeveloped areas.

"We recognize that control of native military forces is the goal of Communist action, and, if we can prevent this, we will hold the key to an effective frustration of Communist plans for the piecemeal takeover of the threatened countries.

"One suggestion, offered for consideration, would involve creating relatively small U.S. military task forces especially organized and trained for employment in cold war areas. Such task forces can easily be prepared to handle several missions designed to take advantage of this opportunity and further our national objectives.

"I believe that military units are most appropriate because they have the training, the necessary equipment, and, above all, the self-contained ability to sustain themselves and to function in any environment, however primitive or dangerous. Moreover, in the many areas involved, there is currently an associated military problem of one kind or another.

"Cold war task forces could be formed and tailored for use in any specified area. They would vary in size depending on the nature and scope of the particular mission. They would contain the types of units appropriate to the problem existing in their area of employment. Included would be service support units, unconventional and special warfare elements, and combat and combat support units.

"In low-intensity cold war situations, a task force composed largely of engineer, medical, signal, supply, transportation, civil affairs, and aviation components could provide a real and immediate capability for accomplishing many essentially nonmilitary tasks.

"Field-type communications between isolated villages and districts in outlying areas can be established. Medical treatment clinics can be opened and operated in remote areas so as to extend simple first aid and field sanitation to countless persons who now have no such service available. Simple water development and land reclamation projects can be started in the hinterlands—small dams might be built and minor soil erosions checked. Minor roads and trails could be improved and bridges constructed. Simple material and equipment could be made available through MAP sources, as well as from growing stocks of obsolete equipment that will be replaced through the Army's modernization program. Civil affairs and intelligence personnel can begin training and operations in their specialized fields.

"The jobs can be started by technically competent U.S. military units that are trained to perform just such tasks. Concurrently, these units can organize and train local personnel to assist in the work and eventually to take over and continue the programs working hand in hand with civilian agencies of our Government.

"Next, there is the higher intensity cold war situation where civic action programs alone cannot operate effectively because a stable internal security environment is lacking. Vietnam is typical of this sort of situation where direct support to the native military, paramilitary, and police forces is necessary to help them regain and maintain proper internal stability.

"A task force designed for this type of situation would contain capabilities in addition to those already mentioned. A special forces group, intelligence and counterintelligence teams, and psychological warfare units would be added.

"The creation of local special forces to conduct offensive operations against Communist assaults on internal security—would be done by the special forces group. Such a local capability could provide well-coordinated, hard-hitting guerrilla and counterinsurgency operations against Communist-supported forces.

"In circumstances where there has been an extensive penetration by guerrilla forces coupled with subversion, the development of effective intelligence and counterintelligence measures should be undertaken as a matter of priority.

"The psychological warfare unit, with broadcast and leaflet elements, would be employed in connection with the civil action program. Its members would organize, train, equip, and assist local civilian and military agencies to instill in the people the will to preserve and to fight for their freedom.

"Finally, there are those areas where overt combat operations may be underway.

"Where we are faced with these more severe conditions the design of the task force would require greater emphasis on combat units. In addition to the elements useful for civic action and internal security tasks, actual combat units—infantry and airborne battle groups and artillery battalions—would be included.

"These combat units could engage in a wide variety of tasks in support of the combat operations of the local forces. In certain circumstances they could be used to provide U.S. advisers at field headquarters to assist in the detailed planning and coordination of the combat operations of indigenous forces.

"The service elements would now shift the scope of their activities to provide direct advice to their counterpart elements. Moreover, these units could furnish a wide range of effective support of the combat operations by performing supply, communications, transportation, and medical tasks in rear areas.

"As evidence of our willingness and capability to honor our collective security commitments, these U.S. combat troops would be present in the area as backup for the indigenous forces and would stand ready to fight side by side with them. Their commitment to combat, of course, requires a timely political decision at the highest level. The responsibility of the military professional is to insure constant preparedness to execute such a decision.

"The deployment of these task forces, each attuned to the region concerned, could stimulate Allied solidarity and provide an effective means to resist Communist aggression at the low-intensity level.

"For example, such task forces deployed in or near critical cold war areas would serve three purposes.

"First, they would provide a most flexible and versatile military means in those relatively large regions where no U.S. forces are now immediately available. This would—in itself—help to deter Communist infiltration, and generate a more favorable political climate before something happens.

"Second, and of equal importance, is the fact that their presence on the outpost line would help us prepare ourselves psychologically to take timely action in the event of an emergency.

"Third, our presence on the ground and the resultant intimate knowledge of the area of operations would greatly facilitate the introduction of larger U.S. and allied forces if eventually required.

"The effectiveness of a program similar to that I have suggested is supported by practical experience. A dramatic example of what has been accomplished by military forces is found in the AFAK program that the United States has been administering in Korea for the past 8 years. AFAK is not a word in the Korean language; although if it is mentioned in even the most remote village there, it is sure to produce a happy smile and warm welcome. AFAK stands for Armed Forces Assistance to Korea, a program that had its beginning in 1953 when our soldiers voluntarily rolled up their sleeves to help the Korean people pull themselves out of the great devastation of the war.

"The humanitarian efforts of these Americans were quickly expanded into a comprehensive program that involved almost every unit of the Armed Forces stationed in Korea. It was soon supported by money made available through Korean economic aid funds provided under the Mutual Security Act. The simple purpose of the program has been achieved; that is, to employ the skills and capabilities of military forces in low cost, immediate impact, social, and economic development projects.

"This is the way the program works. Throughout Korea at the village level, councils are composed of local Korean community leaders and personnel from U.S. military units stationed nearby. Community projects—such as construction of technical and vocational schools, medical facilities, YMCA's, and the like—are selected from among those proposed by local civil leaders. Then the civilian-military team goes to work. American military men furnish architectural and construction supervision, loan heavy equipment, and procure material not locally available. The civilian community furnishes the labor, land, and native materials.

"When the project is completed, the Korean contribution—expressed in dollar value—is usually over twice that contributed by the United States. For example, since the program began, the United States had invested about $28 million in terms of surplus material and off-duty soldier time for a return value in completed projects of over $78 million.

"Thus far the AFAK program has resulted in the construction of over 1,600 schools, 400 civic buildings, 300 public health facilities, 200 churches, 100 separate highway construction and improvement projects, and 70 land reclamation and flood control projects.

"It is conceded that the suggestion that has been proposed is strikingly similar to the cold war methods employed by the Communists.

"It goes against the grain of human nature to adopt the methods of the enemy, but it would also be the height of folly to ignore the successful pattern that the Communists have established in direct military support to the forces they have pushed into action.

"For example, I refer to the Communist trained and equipped army of North Korea that very nearly swept the boards at the start of the Korean war. The intelligence, counterintelligence, and guerrilla operations established by the North Koreans prior to the overt invasion were outstandingly successful. Our preinvasion efforts in South Korea were relatively ineffective.

"We know now what the Communists can do. We know what we failed to do, and we know the price paid in human life and suffering.

"Therefore, it seems to be simple commonsense to examine today all areas of the world where the cold war conditions that existed in Korea in 1950 are now present. Wherever these conditions are found, our intent to support and, if necessary, to reinforce indigenous forces with whatever level of U.S. military effort may be necessary must be made clear and evident to the Communists.

"The access to local governments and to their people by U.S. military forces—as we have demonstrated by our AFAK program in Korea—is direct, rapid, and inexpensive.

"Military power can assist us in seizing the initiative from the Communists. However, and as emphasized earlier, military power must be integrated with political, economic, and psychological means to insure its maximum effectiveness.

"To be most effective the formulation of our cold-war strategy requires thorough coordination at the national level. We must reexamine specific objectives for each area of the world and develop a national doctrine and a responsive apparatus, at all levels, by which these objectives can be achieved. We must continue our efforts to coordinate the capabilities of the Defense and State Departments, CIA, ICA, USIA, and other agencies into more effective, combined programs.

"In conclusion, four major points should be borne in mind:

"First, the United States is engaged in war now. This is not peaceful competition. The ambiguous and devious military challenge that confronts us is especially designed, and carefully managed, by the Communists to apply military power below the level of traditional open war. This selected form of conflict has maintained the initiative for communism and has succeeded, so far, in eroding free world strength.

"Second, although the United States is now beginning to recognize this form of Communist aggression, our response, until now, has not been fully effective. To redress the balance, we must act with vigor and purpose now. The Communists are accelerating the pace of the cold war—time may be running out for us.

"Third, we can develop and apply power as subtly and persistently as the Communists. We can do this without automatically causing escalation. Military power applied skillfully has great potential beyond its evident combat application. The Army is uniquely suited to contribute to this task.

"And, finally, the value of historical parallels, like those of intelligence, depends entirely upon correct interpretation. An attempt to establish an exact similarity between our position today, and one in the past, can lead up an historical garden path, if we misinterpret either situation.

"With full realization of this hazard I recall to your minds the oft repeated cry of the Roman senator, Cato, 'Delenda est Carthago,' and ask this question, Does Khrushchev's 'we will bury you' have like meaning for us? My answer would be: Only if the free world fails to recognize the sinister nature of the threat or are lacking in our determination to prepare adequately to meet it."

VI

The following is an excerpt from pages 9 and 10 of a proposed address by Gen. George H. Decker, Chief of Staff, U.S. Army, proposed to be made at the annual Department of the Army Chaplains Conference on January 30, 1961. A note was written in the margin after submission to DOD Directorate of Security Review, which stated: "This general comment is offered: Portions of the speech do not conform to the tone and spirit of the inaugural address and particularly the following thought: 'Let both sides explore what problems unite us instead of belaboring those problems which divide us.' Particular attention is called to pages 9 and 10, but there are other portions which it is recommended be reviewed in accordance with the criteria specified above":

"* * * particularly on those who have little or nothing with which to defend themselves.

"These threats, coupled with overtures for complete disarmament, have moved some very intelligent and articulate people to advocate accommodations with Moscow. It appears better to some—by their false rationale—to accede to totalitarianism than to risk the destruction of millions of human beings and large segments of the fruits of civilization—they would rather be Red than dead. Others rationalize their behavior with hope that the character of communism is changing. This is precisely the result the Communists desire—dilution of the will to resist.

"In reacting promptly and effectively to Communist challenges, problems of understanding will arise. For example, the decision to defend Korea was not completely understood nor accepted by all our citizens as a necessity in our national interest. Was it worth the cost in human casualties, much less dollars, some critics ask? This particular threat was far removed from the continental United States. The same questions are being asked today about Laos, tomorrow it could be Berlin.

"An additional complexity in this problem of assuring a resolute response is the question of our alliance. It is extremely important that we present a united front indicative of our collective determination to resist. Khrushchev threatened a missile attack on Britain should U.S. missile bases be established there; they are there, and no attack was forthcoming. At the time of the U–2 incident, he threatened to strike the countries from where the planes took off. Such threats are designed to fragment free world alliances. I am confident the future will confront us with stratagems far more subtle and ingenious than those used in the past. We can expect the Communist hierarchy to utilize every means to demonstrate their military strength. By demand or implication they will stress that there is no need for other members of an alliance to suffer from the warmongering acts of the United States.

"Those threats to our way of life point up, I believe, an especially important role for the Army chaplain. Now, and in the coming decade, the members of your corps will have direct contact with literally millions of persons.

"During this period millions of young men and women will pass through the Military Establishment and be exposed to the influence of our chaplains. These young people—most of them soldiers for a few years only—represent in total a large segment of the population of the United States. You can do much to increase their moral strength and improve their understanding of our national values. We must reenergize the spirit of dedication to the basic principles for which we stand; I am not speaking of Fourth of July patriotism, a once a year shot by many. I am speaking of the * * *."

In lieu of the foregoing, the following was substituted:

"First, 'that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe to assure the survival and the success of liberty.'

"Second, 'let us never negotiate out of fear. But let us never fear to negotiate.'

"These challenges to our way of life point up, I believe, an especially important role for the Army chaplain. Now, and in the coming decade, the members of your corps will have direct contact with literally millions of persons.

"During this period millions of young men and women will pass through the Military Establishment and be exposed to the influence of our chaplains. These young people, most of them soldiers for a few years only, represent in total a large segment of the population of the United States. You can do much to increase their moral strength and improve their understanding of our national values. We must reenergize the spirit of dedication to the basic principles for which we stand; I am not speaking of Fourth of July patriotism, a once-a-year shot by many. I am speaking of the indifference, complacency, arrogance, and fear that are in evidence in America today. These are the elements which undermine and weaken our national heritage and will. We must reawaken the feeling of personal challenge in every American. We must face up to a clear understanding that this Communist challenge can be met by hard work and sacrifice—sacrifice in time, in income, and personal pleasure. We must be competent and competitive, we must give our creative best.

"I believe we have begun to assert this new revitalized nationalism; it will demand all our efforts to make it grow. We can and we must make it felt abroad as well.

"Over 1,100 Army chaplains are on duty with soldiers in the continental United States and in scores of countries around the world. They reach not only soldiers and their dependents but tens of thousands of foreign nationals ranging from the most enlightened to the most backward. I am convinced that we share with these peoples a desire for dignity, individual freedom, and self-determination, a desire for freedom from fear and from want.

"The task of broadening the understanding of all people is a great one. The young U.S. Army soldier returning to civilian life should carry with him a newly developed awareness of his heritage—a heritage which has always demonstrated in the past the determination to resist tyranny and aggression. A heritage which, he must understand thoroughly, is based on spiritual and ethical values. Correspondingly, many foreign nationals—persons who have had work and social contacts with hundreds or thousands of American soldiers—can be strengthened also."

Public speeches delivered by Gen. Curtis E. LeMay (Jan. 1–Dec. 31, 1961)

Identity of speech	Date cleared	Date delivered	Changes made in manuscript		Type of change	Responsible agency	Reason
			Original wording	Revised wording or deletions			
1. 66th Annual Convention, Jewish War Veterans, Baltimore, Md.	Aug. 15	Aug. 19	No change				
2. 62d Annual Convention, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Miami Beach, Fla.	Aug. 17	Aug. 24	P. 4: "It takes only a daily reading of newspaper headlines to realize that this *enemy* is charting new ground in technology."	"It takes only a daily reading of newspaper headlines to realize that this *adversary* is charting new ground in technology"	Suggested	DOD	Semantics.
3. National Convention, American Legion, Denver, Colo.	Sept. 11	Sept. 14	P. 7: "Modern warships, armor, and supersonic combat aircraft are ineffective against guerrillas * * * *examples are the French experience in Algeria and the British in Malaya*"	"Modern warships, armor, and supersonic combat aircraft are ineffectual against guerrillas." (Deleted remainder of original sentence.)	Mandatory	State	None given.
4. 15th Annual Convention, Air Force Association, Philadelphia, Pa.	Sept. 18	Sept. 21	No change				
5. 83d General Conference, National Guard Association, Las Vegas.	Sept. 29	Oct. 3	do				
6. American Ordinance Association (Michigan Post), Detroit, Mich.	Oct. 25	Oct. 26	P. 10: "Nor can we delay our drive for defensive capabilities in space simply because so many have the idea that nuclear weapons will always overwhelm any conceivable defense against them"	"Nor can we delay our drive for defensive capabilities in space simply because so many *who are uninformed* have the idea that nuclear weapons will always overwhelm any conceivable defense against them"	Suggested	DOD	Clarity.
			P. 11: "Perhaps they will be *radiation* weapons that strike with the speed of light"	"Perhaps they will be weapons that strike with the speed of light"	Mandatory	do	For avoidance o misinterpretation.
7. U.S. Olympic Association, Washington, D.C.	Dec. 1	Dec. 4	No change				

Data concerning clearance of Admiral Burke's speeches (period Jan, 1, 1961–Aug. 2, 1961)

Identity of speech	Date cleared	Date delivered	Changes made in manuscript		* Type of change	Responsible agency	Reason
			Original wording	Revised wording or deletions			
Distinguished Services Award banquet, Houston, Tex.	Jan. 18	Jan. 21	1. "For with the relentless forces now loose in the world seeking to destroy freedom—in a world threatened by those who fanatically believe that men need masters * * *" (p. 2). 2. "The aggressive threat of communism * * *" (p. 2). 3. "Our cherished heritage of liberty and justice have been challenged with grim determination by those who are sworn to overthrow free civilization" (p. 2). 4. "The Communist efforts to aggravate and exploit the tensions—the crises—the disorders—which rock our troubled world—unfold daily in the headlines of our newspapers. The situations in Laos—in the Congo—in Algeria—in Cuba—leave no doubt that freedom is in jeopardy" (p. 3). 5. "* * * responsible individuals can supply the ideas—the direction—and the effort that produces achievement and progress" (p. 5). 6. "* * * all the speeches in the world can never be a substitute for action" (p. 8).	No change		Cleared by Eisenhower administration. Review—JCS, Army, Navy, AF, State and DSR.	
Silver Quill Award before National Business Publications, Washington, D.C.	(1)	(2)	(Rejected in its entirety. Speech discussed destructive forces of communism at work in southeast Asia, Africa, and Cuba and need for United States to take action. Pointed out enormous military strength of United States and fact that we could destroy an aggressor. Stated that citizens of United States must exercise individual responsibility, stand up for principles and refuse to compromise.)		Mandatory	Have no evidence as to actual authority for rejection. Was informed by Admiral Burke that speech had been rejected.	
Freedom Foundation banquet, Philadelphia, Pa.	Feb. 8	Feb. 13	1. "The free world is faced with the grim challenge of godless communism * * *" (p. 2).	No change		Reviewed by State, Army, Navy, AF, and DSR.	
			2. "The Communists seek to degrade * * *" (p. 2).				
			3. "* * * relentless Communist challenge * * *" (p. 3).				

See footnotes at end of table.

Data concerning clearance of Admiral Burke's speeches (period Jan, 1, 1961–Aug. 2, 1961)—Continued

Identity of speech	Date cleared	Date delivered	Changes made in manuscript		*Type of change	Responsible agency	Reason
			Original wording	Revised wording or deletions			
Freedom Foundation banquet—Continued	Feb. 8	Feb. 13	4. "The future of our Nation * * * depends upon the efforts of the individual citizen * * * acting with a strong * * * sense of responsibility" (p. 5).	------	------	------	
			5. "We have to act" (p. 6)	------	------	------	
			6. "As individuals—we must stand up and be counted wherever and whenever our principles are at stake" (p. 7).	------	------	------	
			7. "But if the United States is to lead—you and I—as individuals—must likewise accept the responsibilities of leadership whenever we have the opportunity" (p. 7).	------	------	------	
Lake Champlain luncheon.†	Feb. 20	Feb. 22	1. "But at all times—we must be able to exercise firm control of the seas" (p. 3).	No objection to this particular sentence.	------	Reviewed by State, Army, Navy, AF, JCS, DSR.	
Navy League, Fort Lauderdale, Fla.	Feb. 20	Feb. 22	1. "'For—just this sort of free—unrestricted thinking has produced most of the remarkable accomplishments throughout our nation's history. And—it is precisely this kind of free discussion of alternative solutions to our problems—that we must rely on for our future progress" (p. 2).	It was suggested that this particular section de deleted.	Suggested	Reviewed by State, Army, Navy, AF, and DSR.	Unknown.
Lake Champlain luncheon.	Feb. 20	Feb. 22	"The Soviet Union—realizing that the free world depends greatly upon the free use of the seas—is the only nation in history to mass-produce submarines in time of official peace. The Russian Navy has developed a fleet of over 400 submarines—the majority of long-range—and modern design. The seriousness of this threat can best be appreciated when the Soviet undersea fleet is compared to the 57 U-boats with which Hitler entered World War II—and with which the Nazis nearly isolated England from her friends and allies throughout the world. Yet the threat of this large Soviet submarine fleet cannot be overcome by matching each of their submarines with one of our own."	"The Soviet Union today has a fleet of more than 400 submarines—the majority of long-range—and modern design. The significance of this fleet can be appreciated if one considers that Hitler entered World War II with U-boats and was able nearly to isolate England from her friends and allies throughout the world. The tactical answer to a potentially aggressive submarine fleet is not to match each submarine with another."	Mandatory	Reviewed by State, Army, Navy, AF, JCS, Directorate for Security Review (DSR). State made mandatory change.	Do.
Armed Forces Wives Club, Washington, D.C.	Mar. 10	Mar. 14	1. "Our belief—in the principles of freedom and human dignity—has been ruthlessly and relentlessly challenged by the Godless—aggressive doctrines of communism" (p. 1).	No objection to this sentence.	------	Reviewed by State, Navy, DSR.	
American Association of School Administrators, Philadelphia, Pa.	Mar. 13	Mar. 25	1. "Challenge of communism" (p. 2).	1. "Challenge of competing ideologies."	Mandatory	Reviewed by JCS, State, Navy, AF, Army, DSR, State made mandatory change.	Do.
			2. "Communist challenge" (p. 2).	2. "challenge"			
			3. "The Communist threat" (p. 2).	3. "the threat"			
			4. "The Communists—however—are not going to abandon their relentless drive toward world empire—even though they dare not risk the inevitable retaliation that a nuclear war would bring to them" (p. 3).	4. "Potential aggressors, however, cannot be expected to surrender their objectives without a struggle."			
National Military Industrial and Educational Conference, Chicago, Ill., titled "Education for Responsibility: The Answer to the Communist Challenge."	([illegible])	Apr. 11	(This speech was originally rejected in its entirety and a copy is being submitted to the subcommittee. When ultimately cleared, the following words and sentences were *allowed to stand:*)		do	Reviewed by Army, Navy, AF, and DSR.	Was rejected originally in its entirety as a violation of the policy expressed in DOD Guidance No. 18.
			1. "* * * we the people of the United States—must *win* this conflict—or witness the death of freedom—and the end of free society" (p. 1).				
			2. "* * * ruthless forces threatening our society today * * *" (p. 4).				
			3. "Our Communist opponent * * *" (p. 4).				
			4. "The Communists * * *" (p. 5).				
			5. "The fundamental qualities of our national life are being tested by the forces of tyranny" (p. 11).				

See footnotes at end of table.

Data concerning clearance of Admiral Burke's speeches (period Jan, 1, 1961–Aug. 2, 1961)—**Continued**

Identity of speech	Date cleared	Date delivered	Changes made in manuscript		*Type of change	Responsible agency	Reason
			Original wording	Revised wording or deletions			
Covered Wagon Council, Omaha, Nebr.	May 9	May 16	1. "A determined—highly competitive ideology has directed its unrelenting efforts—to subvert and capture the minds—the morals—the loyalties of freemen everywhere" (p. 2).	No suggested change to this sentence.	--------------	Reviewed by Navy and DSR.	
Armed Forces Day, Salt Lake City, Utah.	May 10	May 17	1. "But living in a world where ruthless aggressors consider the weak and fearful fair game—our need for effective national military power is a fact of life" (p. 3). 2. "Exploitation of local tensions can easily result in nibbling aggression—in attempts to take over the world a bite at a time. Totalitarian infiltration and subversion — in Africa — in southeast Asia — and in Cuba—provide the most recent examples of aggressive pressure exerted in situations already tense and dangerous" (p. 5).	No suggested change to this material.	--------------	Reviewed by State, JCS, Army, Navy, AF, and DSR.	
Loras College, Dubuque, Iowa.	May 26	June 4	"Today—the United States is engaged in a grim competition with an alien philosophy that has taken over whole countries — without firing a shot. That is why the only *real* way to increase the strength of our Nation—is to strengthen what is under attack—to strengthen the individual" (pp. 7, 8).	"Today, as in the past, the only *real* way to increase the strength of our Nation is to strengthen what is under attack — to strengthen the individual."	Mandatory	Reviewed by State, Army, Navy, AF, and DSR. Mandatory change made by State.	Unknown.
Loras College, Dubuque, Iowa.	May 26	June 4	1. "Your lives will be complicated by the aggressive—ruthless forces at work in the world—powerful forces that no nation—that no individual can ignore" (p. 4). 2. "Totalitarian ideologies are not new in this world. Communism is nothing more than ancient tyranny with modern refinements—an old idea poured into a new mold" (p. 4). 3. "The disciples of atheistic communism first denied God—and then denied the individual" (p. 6). 4. " . . . the threat of an armed aggressor" (p. 8).	No suggested change to this material.	--------------	Reviewed by State, Army, Navy, AF. and DSR.	
U.S. Naval Academy Baccalaureate, Annapolis, Md.	May 22	June 5	1. "Today—our Nation once again is challenged by a ruthless ideology which seeks to strangle the liberty and dignity of free men everywhere" (p. 4). 2. "The forces of tyranny are still on the march. A relentless ideology has challenged the philosophy of freedom to a deadly competition. The stakes of this competition are high. For our opponent seeks to prove that freedom is an obsolete concept—that free societies are outmoded" (p. 8).	No suggested change to this material.	--------------	Reviewed by Navy and DSR.	
American Management Association, Saranac Lake, N.Y.	July 6	July 11	1. "The insidious cancer of communism inching down the peninsula of southeast Asia—the festering sore of Cuba—the almost malarial reoccurrence of Communist threats over Berlin—and the growing infection spread by Communist infiltration and subversion throughout the underdeveloped areas of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, are only the latest symptoms of a sick—and troubled world" (p. 2). 2. "Today—we face a tough—determined—implacable foe. Our Communist opponents have capacity and strength. Through totalitarian methods—a Communist society can focus its efforts—and develop its resources with a great singleness of purpose" (p. 6). 3. "And with a ruthless aggressor loose in the world—it is well that we look to that strength—it is well that we keep our powder dry" (p. 6).	No suggested change to this material, except in the case of item 1. State suggested that this paragraph might be reedited to include thoughts that in an era of great changes, communism was trying to hinder orderly progress and to induce failures so that it could achieve power. The suggested reediting was not followed.	--------------	Reviewed by D.D. R. & E., State, OASD (ISA), Navy and DSR.	

See footnotes at end of table.

Data concerning clearance of Admiral Burke's speeches (period Jan. 1, 1961–Aug. 2, 1961)—Continued

Identity of speech	Date cleared	Date delivered	Changes made in manuscript		* Type of change	Responsible agency	Reason
			Original wording	Revised wording or deletions			
Ecuador Naval Academy, Salinas, Ecuador	July 11	July 14	(On p. 4 State originally desired that the words "control of the seas" be either deleted completely or that the words "free use of the seas" be used as substitutes. Ultimately State's changes became only suggested ones.)			Reviewed by State, Navy, DSR. State indicated it had certain mandatory changes, but these apparently were later changed to suggested changes and were not used. Speech was cleared by DSR as written.	

---

[1] Rejected about January 26.

[2] Scheduled for January 27—not delivered.

[3] Rejected Apr. 6. Ultimately cleared on Apr. 7.

*Suggested change (indicated by *). Areas involving no comment are unmarked. (Page numbers refer to draft sent to clearance.) Mandatory change (page numbers refer to draft sent to clearance.)

†(See also mandatory change on 2d Lake Champlain speech entry.)

Summary of changes made on speeches of Lt. Gen. A. G. Trudeau (period Aug. 1 to Dec. 8, 1961)

Identity of speech	Date cleared	Date delivered	Changes made in manuscript		Type of change	Responsible agency	Reason
			Original wording	Revised wording or deletions			
1. Annual meeting of the Association of the United States Army, Washington, D.C.	Aug. 14	Sept. 8	"In this regard all of our people—in all walks of life throughout these 50 United States—must resolutely resist those disciples of despair who crawl around the [campus clubs,] cocktail lounges, corner drugstores, and country clubs selling us short with scientific shibboleths" p. 2.	Delete "campus clubs"	Suggested	O.D.D.R. & E	Comment: This is a derogatory remark about university personnel and is considered poor policy.
			P. 5: "Here is a demonstration from our tropical testing [to prepare us for the kind of terrain we face in Laos, in central Africa, and in Cuba]."	"Here is a demonstration from our tropical testing—to prepare us for the kind of terrain we face in *possible brush fire areas of the world*."	Mandatory.	State	Not given.
			"Here is a demonstration from our desert testing [to prepare us for the kind of terrain we face in Africa, in the Middle East, and in some parts of Asia]."	"Here is a demonstration from our desert testing."	do	do	Do.
			"Never has the United States Army failed to lead—and here, in our materials research effort, is an illustration of why we maintain this proud tradition" (p. 6).	Delete "Never has the United States Army failed to lead."	Suggested	O.D.D.R. & E	Comment: Accuracy, because, in fact, many of our scientific and technological advances have been made by others, including the Navy, Air Force, U.S. industry, and foreign countries.
			P. 13: "The full system tests, which will be against [Atlas] ICBM targets, will take place at Kwajalein Island. That will be the day, gentlemen, when the [Air Force is tossing targets for our Zeus fielder's glove."]	"The full system tests, which will be against ICBM targets, will take place at Kwajalein. That will be the day, gentlemen, when the capabilities of Nike-Zeus will be determined."	Mandatory.	Made by Air Force and also recommended by O.D.D.R. & E.	Comment: To avoid interservice rivalry.
2. Civic and defense industry representatives, Washington, Pa.	Sept. 29	Oct. 3	No changes				
3. American Management Association, New York, N.Y.	Oct. 3	Oct. 6	do				
4. 13th Symposium on Shock, Vibration, and Associated Environments, Detroit, Mich.	Oct. 10	Oct. 10	P. 2: ["I believe that if we surrender certain of our rights today, then inevitably, and soon, we shall lose what rights remain."]	Entire sentence deleted	Mandatory	Made by OASD(PA) with State Department concurrence.	In conflict with the provisions of Public Affairs Guidance No. 18 (foreign policy).
5. American Management Association, Los Angeles, Calif.	Oct. 26	Nov. 8	No changes				
6. Veterans Day Luncheon, 13th District Council, American Legion, Cleveland, Ohio.	Oct. 31	Nov. 10	P. 2: "On toward the turn of the century—[world] communism."	"On toward the turn of the century—Sino-Soviet communism."	Suggested	State	Not given.
			P. 3: "There are voices today which whisper that the vicious, dangerous and false doctrine of 'peaceful coexistence' and expediency * * *"	"There are voices today which whisper that the vicious, dangerous and false doctrine of aggression masquerading as 'peaceful coexistence' and expediency * * *"	do	do	Do.

Summary of changes made on speeches of Lt. Gen. A. G. Trudeau (period Aug. 1 to Dec. 8, 1961)—**Continued**

Identity of speech	Date cleared	Date delivered	Changes made in manuscript		Type of change	Responsible agency	Reason
			Original wording	Revised wording or deletions			
6. Veterans' Day Luncheon—Continued	Oct. 31	Nov. 10	P. 4: "Let those who today seek to send us into the Communist camp with the cry 'Better Red than Dead, or who sing of 'Peace, Peace at any Price,' and shrink not from a (Red) price tag to move to Moscow."	"Let those who today seek to send us into the Communist camp with the cry 'Better Red than Dead,' or who sing of 'Peace, Peace at any Price,' and shrink not from a Communist price tag to move to Moscow."	Suggested	State	Not given.
			P. 5: "The American way is indeed anathema to the proponents of [Marxism] * * *"	"The American way is indeed anathema to the proponents of communism * * *"	do	do	Do.
7. The cadets of the Virginia Military Institute, Lexington, Va.	Oct. 31	Nov. 16	No changes				
8. Public Affairs Forum, Boston College, Chestnut Hill, Mass.	Nov. 17	Nov. 20	P. 1: "Evil beyond measure is the character of the [Red] conspiracy * * *"	"Evil beyond measure is * * *"	Suggested	State	Do.
			P. 15: "These people—diseased, undernourished, illiterate, impoverished * * *"	"These people—vast numbers of whom are diseased, undernourished, illiterate, impoverished * * *"	do	do	Do.
			P. 18: "If the Russians can mobilize 1,000 scientists and a billion dollars to [seize] space, we must equal and surpass this effort—or [lose space]."	"If the Russians can mobilize 1,000 scientists and a billion dollars to try to dominate space, we must equal and surpass this effort—or give them a free hand."	Mandatory	do	Comment: It is not our policy to state that either Russia or the United States is going to "seize" space.

Data concerning clearance of General Trudeau's speeches (*period Jan. 10–July 1, 1961*) (*comments prepared by Directorate for Security Review*)

1. Society of Automotive Engineers.		Jan. 11		None			
2. The Brookings Institution.		Jan. 13		None			
3. National Strategy Seminar.		Jan. 21	"The success of the American way is indeed anathema to the proponents of Marxism whose privileged pedestals will topple once their [classless] slave populations learn the truth" (p. 5).	Delete "classless"	Mandatory	State	Comment: Speech coordinated with Department of State which made changes indicated.
			"We will be blocked and harassed not only by selfish interests who are unable to rise to the occasion, but by the [Fabian Socialists and] Communists who, most of all, fear the power of an aroused America that seizes the initiative in the present struggle" (p. 7).	Delete "Fabian Socialists and."	do		
4. Army Management School (classified).		Jan. 25					
5. Royal Canadian Military Institute.		Jan. 31	"Beyond a shadow of a doubt, your country and mine are the prime targets of the worldwide, all-out offensive of world communism. This offensive has forced nations that glory in free institutions to join in defending these priceless values. This is why—and the simple, sole, and irrefutable reason—we and our allies arm—to counter the Communist threat. Since the day of their bloody Red Revolution, the Soviets ceaselessly have increased their weapon capabilities against the day when, in Khrushchev's words, they 'will bury us' " (p. 4).	Delete	Mandatory	State	Comment: Speech coordinated with Department of State and indicated changes made under State telephone guidance.
			"As we [engage the Communist] let us be fully aware of the significance of 2 of the phenomena which characterize [the vicious worldwide struggle now upon us] * * * (p. 4).	"Engage the Communist" changed to "strive for a real peace."	do		
			"One cannot reflect upon these startling facts without considering their influence in our [life-or-death competition with the Communists]" (p. 5).	"Life or death * * *" changed to "lives today and in the future."	do		

Data concerning clearance of General Trudeau's speeches (period Jan. 10–July 1, 1961) (comments prepared by Directorate for Security Review)—**Continued**

Identity of speech	Date cleared	Date delivered	Changes made in manuscript		Type of change	Responsible agency	Reason
			Original wording	Revised wording or deletions			
5. Royal Canadian Military Institute—Con.		Jan. 31	"The Soviets, straining every scientific and economic sinew, picture mighty military power, capable of attacking under the shield of an all-out nuclear offensive and every success they achieve technologically sharpens the edge of the weapons race and enhances the effectiveness of their operations in related areas of the conflict—political, sociological, psychological, and economic" (p. 5).	Delete entire paragraph.	Mandatory		
			"Truly, the free world has decisive weapons to defeat the Reds in every realm of conflict—and one of the mightiest is the incomparable technology of our two great nations. In this field, we have significant advantages over the Communists, and it is our business to be ever aware of this superiority and strive not only to maintain but to extend it" (p. 6).	do	do		
			"Yet, if our technology is to continue to accelerate [* * * and it must to outperform the Reds * * *] greater emphasis must be placed on basic research for new scientific knowledge and on applied research for new hardware items" (p. 6).	Delete "* * * and it must to outperform the Reds * * *."	do		
			"[Even some] of the results of your Defense Research Kingston Laboratories are well known to me" (p. 7).	Delete "even some" and substitute "certain" and "also".	do		
			"We also have extensive Army research on the Greenland Icecap to learn more about the physical properties of snow, ice, and frozen soil. Greenland is a part of Denmark and our investigations are possible because of the cooperation extended there by our Danish NATO partner" (p. 8, suggested insert by State).				
			"I want to stress right here that the 450,000-pound-thrust Zeus booster engine is the most powerful single-unit, solid-propellant motor successfully fired in the free world—and there is an urgent requirement for such a weapon while we [are faced with the growing ballistic missile threat of the Communists].	Change to "*defensive* weapon"; delete "are faced with the growing ballistic missile threat of Communists," and change to "negotiate for peace."	Mandatory		
			"Here, we must sense the new horizons—continuously—to meet the critical challenges of [communism.]" p. 22.	Delete "communism," change to "the day".	do		
6. American Society of Mechanical Engineers.		Feb. 1	"There can be no doubt in any of our minds today as to why we must have the best possible weapons and equipment in all of the Armed Forces [locked as we are in vital competition with the Communist]. Without a doubt our ability to maintain a qualitative weapon superiority [over the Reds] may mean [our survival in years to come]" (p. 2).	Delete "locked as we are in vital competition with the Communist." and substitute "in order to negotiate from a position of strength for peace." Delete "over the Reds" and "our survival in years to come," and substitute "the success or failure of our efforts."	do	State	Comment: Speech coordinated with Department of State and indicated changes made under State telephone guidance.
			"As a longtime student of communism, I am convinced that the Communist conspiracy directed toward absolute, universal domination of the world—the philosophy of Marx and Lenin—the philosophy of Stalin and Khrushchev—is unchangeable. Thes totalitarians in thought and action have clearly stated again and again that their simple, sole and stark objective is 'to bury us.' It makes no difference to them how they do it—militarily, economically, or otherwise—or in combination" (p. 2).	Delete	do		

***Data concerning clearance of General Trudeau's speeches (period Jan. 10–July 1, 1961) (comments prepared by Directorate for Security Review)*—Continued**

Identity of speech	Date cleared	Date delivered	Changes made in manuscript		Type of change	Responsible agency	Reason
			Original wording	Revised wording or deletions			
6. American Society of Mechanical Engineers—Continued		Feb. 1	"The glaring proof lies in their action of last December. After endless days of wrangling and compromise by the 81-nation Communist summit in Moscow—the Reds reaffirmed in a weighty manifest the policy of so-called peaceful coexistence—and at the same time they hailed the continuation of the worldwide class struggle and they charged this Nation with being the world's leading protagonist of aggression and war.	Delete	Mandatory		
			"Again, just a month ago in a report to a general meeting of the party organizations in Moscow—a speech generally considered to be the most important pronouncement issued in the Communist capital since the close of World War II—Khrushchev created a 'new kind of war.' According to Communist doctrine, this is a 'war of liberation'—and he proceeded, conveniently, to drop into this so-called third category of conflict such Communist ventures into anarchy and chaos as support for Castro's Cuba and the agony in Algeria.	do	do		
			"Now, our ability to meet the challenges of Soviet imperialism will determine whether our way of life will continue on this earth in the decades and centuries ahead. If we fail what we face, our schools in the year A.D. 2000 will teach 'Communist doctrine; our children will be Socialist slaves.'	do	do		
			"[Today, in the face of the worldwide threat of international communism] the stakes are such that there is no room for bluff or indecision.	Delete "* * * today * * * communism"	do		
			"We must field new and improved weapons systems more rapidly if we are to retain a [military advantage over the Soviets and with it the] military strength and flexibility to support a viable and effective foreign policy.	Delete "military * * * and with it the"	do		
			"[As we engage the Communist,] let us be fully aware of the significance of 2 which are part and parcel of [the vicious worldwide conflict forced upon us.]" (p. 3).	Delete "As we engage the Communist,) Delete "the vicious worldwide conflict forced upon us"; substitute "of our lives and our future."	do		
			"Witness the steady advance of communism for over a century and it still remains unchecked as no successful counterforce has been adequately developed."	Mandatory			
7. R. & D. Seminar, Fort Leavenworth, Kans. (classified).		Feb. 6					
8. Army War College (classified).		Feb. 16					
9. House Science and Astronautics Committee.		Feb. 17	"Faced as we are by the [implacable] mask of communism, we cannot afford to do less than seriously review and modernize our programs, and then act agressively and enthusiastically to carry them out" (p. 2).	Delete "implacable"	Mandatory		Comment: OASD (PA) under State guidance previously by telephone coordination. No record of formal State coordination.
			"With Soviet infiltration menacing this Nation and extending through the far corners of the globe, freedom of spirit and self stands in great jeopardy. The threat of catastrophic war again haunts the lover of liberty and the protagonist of peace. The Reds deliberately, fanatically, unceasingly, strive to destroy the shreds of stability remaining as we enter the new frontiers of the sixties. A tower of peace founded on anarchy and chaos cannot stand" (p. 2).	Delete	do		Comment: Both changes made by OASD (PA) under State guidance. Records not clear, but apparently made as result telephone coordination or on basis previous State guidance. No record of formal coordination with State.

Data concerning clearance of General Trudeau's speeches (period Jan. 10–July 1, 1961) (comments prepared by Directorate for Security Review)—Continued

Identity of speech	Date cleared	Date delivered	Changes made in manuscript		Type of change	Responsible agency	Reason
			Original wording	Revised wording or deletions			
9. House Science and Astronautics Committee—Continued	----------	Feb. 17	"We must make sure that our military strength is geared to cope with the [Sino-Soviet bloc] threat today and in the future" (p. 3).	Delete "Sino-Soviet bloc".	Mandatory ----------	----------	
			"Based on past experience [we] feel that the military use of space is too vital to be entrusted with any one agency but should come within the jurisdiction of centralized military control at the Department of Defense level, separate from the services" (p. 4).	Delete "we" add "I personally".	---do----------	O.D.D.R. & E.----------	Comment "misleading. Not DOD opinion."
			"Even today, with a relatively small number of satellites and deep space shots, we [find] ourselves unable to cope with the problem of logging these activities" (p.5).	Delete "find" add "I believe that" and "are".	---do----------	-----do----------	
			"In this case, today, it would probably be the Mauler missile project" (p.11).	Delete----------	----------	----------	
			"This is a tremendously challenging project, combining the resources and talents of all the services and of NASA for a communications system that [will] melt the stringent military requirements [as well as those for commercial use]" (p.11).	Add "research and development of"; add "is expected to"; delete "as well as those for commercial use."	----------	----------	
10. Nebraska State Legislature, Lincoln, Nebr.	----------	Mar. 3	"This tide is creating truly significant problems in [the] *some* overpopulated areas of Africa, Asia and *in some parts of* South America. [These uncommitted] *In these depressed areas*, peoples—diseased, undernourished, illiterate, impoverished, living in a wheelbarrow or an A-frame economy call—and call loudly—for an improved standard of living. It is in these areas that [the bulk] *a large portion* of the world's population is [mainly] concentrated" (p. 3).	Delete "the"; add "some" * * * "in some parts of"; delete "These uncommitted"; add "In these depressed areas,". Delete "the bulk"; change to "a large portion".	Suggested--- ----------	---------- ----------	Comment: Changes made by State.
			"Overcrowded areas with uneducated, underfed populations *tend to* produce political instability—a condition that has a high potential for causing local conflicts with possible extension into global war" (p. 4).	Add "tend to"----------	Suggested---	----------	Comment: Change does not appear in DOD record copy.
			"[In Libya] *In one nation of North Africa*, for example, out of a total population of more than 4,000,000, only 57 persons a few short years ago had achieved the equivalent of a cultural education. *Elsewhere* the record [in the Congo] was even worse" (p. 5).	Delete "In Libya"; add "In one nation of North Africa". Delete "Congo"; add "elsewhere".	Mandatory-	----------	Changes pp. 5 and 6 made under Department of State guidance.
			"Last year in the United Nations we witnessed the growth and extension of a new world power group—the so-called neutralist [or Afro-Asian bloc] *Nations*. [Its] *The* influence *of these nations* will grow in the immediate years ahead and will certainly affect the balance of world power from now on" (p. 6).	Delete "or Afro-Asian Bloc"; substitute "Nations"; delete "Its" substitute "The"; add "of these nations".	-----do-----	----------	
			"Today, they are an anachronism in a missile age when Nike missiles ring our great centers of population and industrial powers: at a time when we labor unceasingly to perfect our Nike Zeus [umbrella] *missile to protect* against the Communist threat of a nuclear hailstorm hurled through space" (p. 8).	Delete "umbrella"; add "missile to protect".	-----do-----	----------	Comment: Change by O.D.D.R. & E. "Misleading—implies ZEUS to be countrywide protection."
			"The difficult art of exploiting this great [weapon] deserves the most profound study and implementation. The second unique [weapon] we possess and share is in our incomparable stock of foodstuffs and our ability to produce annual excesses to alleviate malnutrition to a large extent throughout the world. Here is one area	Delete "weapon" and substitute "strength"; delete "weapon" and substitute "strength" "and can share"; delete "a weapon" and substitute "an advantage"; add "token supplies of"; delete "how do" substitute "must * * * our advantage in. * * * for	Suggested---	----------	Comment: Portion quoted was in 2-page insert submitted after original speech had been reviewed by State. This portion checked by telephone with State and changes were made to meet State request that religion and food not be presented as weapons.

***Data concerning clearance of General Trudeau's speeches (period Jan. 10–July 1, 1961) (comments prepared by Directorate for Security Review)*—Continued**

Identity of speech	Date cleared	Date delivered	Changes made in manuscript		Type of change	Responsible agency	Reason
			Original wording	Revised wording or deletions			
10. Nebraska State Legislature—Continued	----------	Mar. 3	close to your midwestern hearts, where we have [a weapon] unmatchable by the Soviet bloc for decades to come. When we see Red China, with its starving millions and tens of millions, shipping food to foster subversion and create chaos, the potency of this weapon should be obvious. [How do] we use it [?]" (p. 9).	the betterment of mankind and the cause of freedom."	Suggested---	----------	
			"Shortly thereafter, [we should have] *will come* plastics and ceramics with the same strength-weight characteristics" (p. 11).	Delete words in brackets add those italicized.	-----do------	----------	Comment: This change not shown on DOD file copy.
			"Of importance to you in Nebraska are our efforts to provide this Nation with an antimissile defense system that will not only meet the ICBM threat of today, but one that possesses a growth potential to defend [us tomorrow against satellites] *against the missile threats of tomorrow.* [This is our] *The Army sees such a system in the* Nike Zeus—the mighty successor to Ajax and Hercules now guarding America's great centers of population and industry and our Strategic Air Command *against manned aircraft*" (p. 13).	-----do----------	-----do------	----------	Comment: Change made by O.D.D.R. & E. with this comment "Misleading. Implies complete protection for Nebraska.
			"We are proud of the many successful component tests of the Zeus and [know] *I believe* unquestionably that it is a practical obtainable concept. The powerful Zeus radars, working in close harmony with high-speed computers [can] *are designed to* detect and acquire incoming missile targets—and, in a matter of seconds, [can] *are expected to* send Zeus missile in high-speed flight toward interception and destruction of the target (p. 13).	-----do----------	-----do------	----------	Comment: Changes made by O.D.D.R. & E. with comment: "Future expectations versus present accomplishment."
			"We *in the Army* are confident that Nike Zeus can do this job in the 1960's. Should the Soviets be first to develop an *effective* antimissile and install it as protection for crucial centers of their population, industry and military might—they will have taken a giant step toward neutralizing the retaliatory striking power of the free world" (p. 14).	-----do----------	Mandatory-	----------	
			"Diplomatic dealing without powerful cards is a bluff at best—and usually gets "called." Today's international game is no 'penny ante' " (p. 15).	Delete----------	Suggested---	State----------	State feels diplomacy should not be compared to a card game.
11. AUSA, New Orleans, La.	----------	Mar. 6	"Here is Nike-Zeus, *now in development*" (p. 16).	Add italicized words----	Mandatory-	----------	Comment: Change made by OASD(PA) to describe Zeus status accurately.
			"I want to stress right here that the 450,000-pound thrust Zeus booster engine is the most powerful single unit solid-propellant motor successfully fired in the free world—and *I feel* that there is an urgent requirement for such a defensive weapon while we negotiate for peace. [We are] *am* confident the Nike-Zeus can do this job in the 1960's" (p. 16).	Delete words in black brackets and add those italicized.	-----do------	----------	Do.
12. Retired diplomatic and consular officers.	----------	Mar. 9	"And fear today stalks all parts of the world as peoples everywhere dread the day of possibility when thermonuclear power [will] *could*, by design [or miscalculation] *of some foreign aggressor* break loose and wreak havoc upon all nations" (p. 6).	Delete words in black brackets and substitute those italicized.	Suggested---	----------	Comment: Change made by State with following comment: "The possibility of nuclear war by miscalculation is a favorite theme of Russian 'scare' propaganda, often using statements of prominent Americans. It would be better to say that may be started by 'some foreign aggressor.' since President Kennedy has reiterated that we will not strike first."

Data concerning clearance of General Trudeau's speeches (period Jan. 10–July 1, 1961) (comments prepared by Directorate for Security Review)—Continued

Identity of speech	Date cleared	Date delivered	Changes made in manuscript: Original wording	Changes made in manuscript: Revised wording or deletions	Type of change	Responsible agency	Reason
12. Retired diplomatic and consular officers—Continued		Mar. 9	"This tide is creating truly significant problems in *some* overpopulated areas of [Africa, Asia, and in some parts of South America] *the world.* In [these] depressed areas, most of the peoples—diseased, undernourished, illiterate, impoverished, living in an A-frame economy—call, and call loudly, for an improved standard of living" (p. 8).	Delete words in black brackets; add those italicized.	Suggested		Comment: Changes made by Department of State.
			"Areas where humanity crawls, and cannot walk—these are the fertile grounds for *Sino-Soviet* Communist political and economic penetration; and here [the Communist] *their agents* 'strike while the iron is hot and keep it hot by striking'" (p. 9).	do	do	State	
			"Diplomatic dealing without powerful cards is always bluff at best and cannot stand a showdown" (p. 15).	Delete	do		Comment: Previous changes made by State on this same passage indicated that diplomacy should not be likened to a card game.
			"This new equipment is evidence of the technological progress which we as a nation must continue to enjoy on a broad basis if we are to meet [and beat the Communist challenge] *the threat of foreign aggressors*" (p. 23).	Delete words in black brackets; add those italicized.	do		Comment: Change made by Department of State with no comment. The last word was "aggression" rather than "aggressors."
			"On such theories socialism thrives" (p. 24).	Delete	do		Comment: Changes made by Department of State with the following comment: "Some of our best friends are Socialists."
			"Witness the steady advance of *Sino-Soviet* communism for over a century—and it still remains unchecked as no successful counterforce has been adequately developed" (p. 24).	Add italicized words	do		Comment: Passage in question was amended by State Department to read "witness the steady advance of Sino-Soviet communism * * *". State comment: "It is only the externally aggressive type [Sino-Soviet] which the United States is committed to check."
13. AUSA, Fort Monroe		Mar. 6		None			
14. AFCEA, Fort Monmouth		Mar. 16	"Our Communist competitors realize this. They boast of their missile and rocket record in the space race; they continually boost heavier vehicles into orbit; they propagandize the world with pronouncements of successes scored, successes which, while consequential, are limited when compared with our own in terms of true scientific value and potential."	Recommend complete rewrite: *marginal note:* "The Department of State suggests that this paragraph could better point out the importance of the United States remaining 'in front' by presenting factual information relative to Soviet accomplishments rather than inferring to such successes as a form of "boasting or propagandizing the world."	Suggested		Comment: Change suggested by Department of State with comment as indicated in the marginal notes column.
			"This tide is creating truly significant problems in some overpopulated areas of [Africa, and Asia, and in some parts of South America] *the world.* [A] *some* billion and a quarter peoples living in these underdeveloped areas have an average income of less than [$100—far less than] the weekly income of the poorest man in this room" (p. 3).	Delete the words in brackets and substitute those italicized.	do		Comment; Change suggested by State Department.
15. The Citadel		Mar. 18	"One—the threat of [the insidious ideology of] world communism" (p. 2).	Delete the words in black brackets.	do		Comment: Change made by Department of State without comment.
			"Here is Nike-Zeus *now in development*" (p. 20).	Add the italicized words.	Mandatory		Comment: Change made by OASD (PA) in keeping with policy to present factual information on Zeus status.
			"I want to stress right here that the 450,000 pound thrust Zeus booster engine is the most powerful single-unit solid-propellant motor successfully fired in the free world; and [that] *I feel* there is an urgent requirement for such a weapon	Delete the words in black brackets and substitute the italicized words.	do		Comment: Change in last sentence made by OASD (PA) in accordance with Defense position which at this time did not reflect the optimism expressed by the author regarding Nike-Zeus.

Data concerning clearance of General Trudeau's speeches (period Jan. 10–July 1, 1961) (comments prepared by Directorate for Security Review)—Continued

Identity of speech	Date cleared	Date delivered	Changes made in manuscript		Type of change	Responsible agency	Reason
			Original wording	Revised wording or deletions			
15. The Citadel—Cont.		Mar. 18	while we are faced with the growing ballistic missile threat of the Communists. [We are] I am confident the Nike-Zeus can do this job in the 1960's" (p. 21). "It will be a measure of our collective courage in meeting this challenge of the future that will determine not only your individual success but whether the free world will survive and progress or else go down in the dust of despair and defeat if the torch of liberty is snuffed out [by the poisonous fumes of world communism]" (p. 23).	Delete the words in black brackets.	Suggested		Comment: Change made by Department of State without comment.
16. AUSA Fort Rucker (classified).		Mar. 23					
17. Marine Corps School (classified).		Apr. 12					
18. Naval War College (classified).		Apr. 14					
19. Canadian liaison officers (classified).		Apr. 17					
20. Air War College (classified).		Apr. 20					
21. COC, Kansas City		Apr. 26	"Talk of liberty and freedom is common throughout this Republic, yet there are today many indications that Americans fail to realize fully how much is at stake if we lose the present [conflict] *struggle* and suffer the loss of these concepts and of hope for freemen everywhere. Nothing less will permit us to [emerge victorious] *achieve our goals* as the end of the century approaches. Now I stand with those who deeply believe that we and other free peoples must uplift and advance the torch of liberty or, failing this responsibility be extinguished by the toxic darkness of [world] communism" (p. 1).	Delete the words in black brackets and substitute the italicized words.	Mandatory		Comment: Passage referenced to p. 1 was made by Department of State with no comment. The phrases in question are included in separate passages. The passage from which the words "emerge victorious" are deleted appears on p. 2. Change made by Department of State with no comment.
			"Another is the rising tide of [ethnic nationalism] *expectations* in the underdeveloped areas of the world" (p. 4).	do	do		Comment: The passage from which the word "world" is deleted appears on p. 3. Change made by Department of State with no comment.
			"Coexistence is not a choice. It is a fatal disease" (p. 4).	Delete	do		Comment: Changes were made by Department of State with no comment.
			"Foremost of these is the godless ideology of communism [encompassing Marxism, socialism, nihilism and using its own special brand of Russian imperialism to enslave freemen everywhere]" (p. 3).	Delete the words in black brackets.	do		Do.
			"However, if communism were a dead issue today, the rising tide of [ethnic nationalism] *expectations*, which burst forth from the agonizing struggles of World War II and since, would alone present us with one of the greatest challenges of all ages" (p. 4).	Delete the words in black brackets and substitute the italicized words.	do		Do.
			"Well, did Rudyard Kipling describe the cunning of [our] *an* adversary in days past when he said:" (p. 4).	do	do		Do.
			"Their personal property is less than the clothes you have on your back [and under the rules of communism this would be all they could ever hope to acquire] (p. 6).	Delete the words in black brackets.	do		Comment: Change made by Department of State with following comment: "They could hope for a lot more. That's why the Commies make hay."
			"The fires of racial passion threaten to burn through the thin veneer of Western civilization and temperatures are rising. The resurgence of barbarism is fearsome to behold. This situation is compounded by a world where radio and television can be utilized to inflame popular demand for privileges and luxuries that stir the political imagina-	Delete	do		Comment: Changes made by Department of State with no comment.

Data concerning clearance of General Trudeau's speeches (period Jan. 10–July 1, 1961) (comments prepared by Directorate for Security Review)—Continued

Identity of speech	Date cleared	Date delivered	Changes made in manuscript		Type of change	Responsible agency	Reason
			Original wording	Revised wording or deletions			
21. COC—Continued		Apr. 26	tion and appetites of minds incapable of evaluating the truth or falsity of any thesis. Motion pictures have also contributed their deadly share to this dangerous situation by arousing and stimulating surging passions which will run a bloody gamut" (p. 7).				
			P. 7: "There is a crying need to advance the [mental] *educational* level of man in these areas, but the task is tremendous."	Delete the words in brackets and substitute the italicized words.	Delete		Comment: Changes made by Department of State with no comment.
			"As an example, more than 6 years ago I advocated the establishment of universities in selected world areas. Among others I suggested a University of the Americas, a University of the Far East, a University of South Asia, and a University of the Middle East. I particularly recommended a University of East Africa located in Ethiopia, and a University of West Africa located in Liberia. I wonder what their impact would have been?" (p. 8).	Deleted	do		Do.
			P. 9: "In less than 10 years, in 1969, the member nations of NATO, the bulwark of our free world, became free to withdraw from the alliance, should they wish to do so. We must guard lest the creation of this new group weakens rather than strengthens major realinements of the free world."	do	do		Do.
			P. 14: "[Unquestionably] *It is my opinion* that the most important contribution we can make to the active defense of the United States in the near future is Nike-Zeus, the only weapon system in development anywhere, to our knowledge, designed to attack incoming ballistic missiles."	Delete the words in brackets and substitute the italicized words.	do		Comment: Change made by OASD(PA) with ODDR&E guidance previously received. Zeus not yet a proven weapons system.
			P. 16: "A second unique moral asset we possess and can share is in our incomparable stock of food and *feed* stuffs [and our ability to produce annual surpluses to alleviate malnutrition to a large extent throughout the world.] Here is 1 area where we have a tremendous [weapon] *resource* unmatchable by the Soviet bloc for decades to come."	do	do		Comment: Deletions in 1st sentence made by Department of State with no comment; deletion of the word "weapon" made by Department of Army.
22. Chamber of Commerce, Sioux Falls, S. Dak.		Apr. 27	Same as 21				
23. American Legion, Harrisburg, Pa.		Apr. 29	do				
24. AMA, San Francisco, Calif.		May 1	"Your presence here is proof of the keen awareness by American business and industry that in addition to business, employment and profit, a reawakening of the pioneering spirit is needed today as we of the free world grapple with the [vicious] challenge of [world] communism. [Whatever the merit of Communist claims.] If America is to continue as heavyweight champion of the world, this is a time when our leaders in industry—in business, in government, in all walks of life—must, with the utmost seriousness and dedication, engage the challenging problems facing us, our Nation and the free world" (p. 4).	Delete the words in black brackets.	Delete		Comment: Change made by Department of State with no comment.
			"Leadtime is a key factor in meeting the [critical] Communist threat" (p. 11).	do	do		Do.

***Data concerning clearance of General Trudeau's speeches (period Jan. 10–July 1, 1961) (comments prepared by Directorate for Security Review)*—Continued**

Identity of speech	Date cleared	Date delivered	Changes made in manuscript		Type of change	Responsible agency	Reason
			Original wording	Revised wording or deletions			
24. AMA—Continued		May 1	P. 11: "Meanwhile, if [the Reds] *a potential enemy* can steal a secret a full 2 years after we have it—or have it handed to them for that matter—they can still beat us to the punch."	Delete the words in black brackets and substitute the italicized words.	Mandatory		Comment: Change made by Department of State with no comment.
25. Personnel Management Conference, Asbury Park, N.J.		May 10	None				
26. Western Electric Co., Winston-Salem, N.C.		May 15	"I stand with those who deeply believe that we and other free peoples must uplift and advance the torch of liberty or, failing this responsibility, be extinguished by the toxic darkness of [world] communism" (p. 4).	Delete the word in black brackets.	Suggested		Do.
			"*Soviet-style* coexistence is not a choice; it is a fatal disease" (p. 4).	Add the italicized words.	do		Comment same as above.
27. Armed Forces Celebration, Boston, Mass.		May 17	"Already ⅓ of the world's peoples are enslaved in the chains of [world] *Sino-Soviet* communism. Talk of liberty and freedom is common throughout this Republic, yet today there are too many indications that the bulk of Americans fail to realize fully how much is at stake if we lose the present [conflict] *struggle* and suffer the lose of these blessings that are the hope of freemen everywhere" (p. 2).	Delete the words in black brackets and substitute the italicized words.	Mandatory		Comment: 1st sentence changed by Department of State with the following comment: "We want to discourage the term 'world communism'. It sounds very pessimistic and also, to some, pleasantly international, like the U.N." Deletion of word "conflict" and substitution of word "struggle" made by Department of State with no comment.
			"[Communism] *The Sino-Soviet bloc* openly dedicated to the ruthless destruction of freedom and liberty of all mankind, already has subjugated 15 freedom-loving nations on the fringes of the Iron and Bamboo Curtains—territory in excess of 5,000,000 square miles—and billions of people" (p. 3).	do	do		Comment: Change made by Department of State with no comment.
			"I speak of them not only because of their military interest but because our attitude as Americans toward science and technology is an increasingly important factor in the fight of freemen to withstand and overcome the growing incursions of [world] *Sino-Soviet* communism" (p. 8).	do	do		Do.
28. Philco, Philadelphia, Pa.		May 24	None				
29. USMA		do	do				
30. Materials Advisory Board, Washington, D.C.		June 1	"We must reach better solutions to our research problems in every field because, in this 20th century, the technological race with the Soviet Union is indisputably of vital importance in supporting the military and economic facets of the crucial [power] struggle of our times. We must win this struggle. [or we lose the world:] (p. 2).	Delete the words in black brackets.	Mandatory		Comment: Changes appear on p. 12 and were made by Department of State with no comment.
31. Eastern Seaboard Apprenticeship Conference.		June 5	None				
32. Burlington, Vt., Chamber of Commerce.		June 6	do				
33. Military Assistance Institute, Arlington, Va. (classified).		June 20					
34. Far East and European Trip (unclassified version).		(1)	None				

***Data concerning clearance of Admiral Anderson's speeches* (period Aug. 1, 1961, to Jan. 17, 1962)**

Institute of the Aeronautical and Space Sciences, Navy National Aviation Meeting, San Diego, Calif.	Aug. 16	Aug. 21[2]	1. "* * * in spite of numerous Communist pronouncements in favor of *peaceful* coexistence — and *peaceful* competition—their actions clearly demonstrate that the leaders of the Sino-Soviet bloc do not choose to compete with us on an honorable basis."	"* * * in spite of numerous Communist pronouncements in favor of *peaceful* coexistence — and *peaceful* competition — their actions too often belie their words" (p. 5).	Mandatory	Reviewed by State, JCS, Army, AF, ISA, and DSR. State made mandatory changes as indicated.	Unknown.

[1] Trip (July 15–Sept. 1, 1961).

[2] Due to requirement for Admiral Anderson's presence in Washington, D.C., speech was actually delivered by Adm. J. S. Russell, U.S. Navy.

Data concerning clearance of Admiral Anderson's speeches (period Aug. 1, 1961, to Jan. 17, 1962)—Continued

Identity of speech	Date cleared	Date delivered	Changes made in manuscript		Type of change	Responsible agency	Reason
			Original wording	Revised wording or deletions			
Institute of the Aeronautical and Space Sciences—Continued	Aug. 16	Aug. 21	2. "These highly mobile—self-sufficient—islands of seapower—move freely across the oceans of the world—independent of changing political climates—infringing on no one's sovereignty—unfettered by rights of transit—capable of projecting U.S. military power—wherever and whenever it is needed."	"These highly mobile—self-sufficient—islands of seapower—move freely across the oceans of the world—capable of projecting U.S. military power—wherever and whenever it is needed" (p. 8).			
			3. "* * * although general nuclear war remains very remote * * *."	"* * * although general nuclear war may remain remote * * *" (p. 11).			
Dedication of the Swirbul Communications Center and Living Library, Adelphi College, Garden City, N.Y.	Sept. 20	Sept. 24	No changes			Reviewed by DSR.	
Navy League, Chicago, Ill.	Oct. 23	Oct. 27	1. "But he's doing this because of an implacable foe—a foe whose leaders orally and in writing have avowed their intent to conquer us and all other free nations—whose leaders have never, in our relations with them, hesitated to deviate from the provisions of any treaty or any agreement we have signed with them: whose leaders, past and present, regard lies and terror and murder only as a means to an end and who have enslaved the greatest number of people in the history of our civilization. It is the same foe whose leader recently bragged that he would explode a 50-megaton bomb 4 days hence—for what reason no one knows, except to perhaps terrorize those who lack the determination and plain guts of Americans and their allies into giving up without a battle."	"But he's doing this because of an implacable foe—a foe who both orally and in writing has from the very beginning avowed his intent to end the free world—a foe who has never hesitated to pursue any course or tactic. The Communists regard lies and terror and murder only as a means to an end and have enslaved the greatest number of people in the history of this world. It is this same foe who would explode a 50-megaton bomb — for what reason—why?—to terrorize" (p. 5).	Suggested	Reviewed by DSR. Changes were made by Admiral Anderson's office prior to the speech's final clearance. Changes. Nos. 1, 4, and 5 to the speech were based on recommendations of DSR and informal guidance received from State. Speech was never sent to State for formal clearance. Changes Nos. 2 and 3 were not based on recommendations by either DSR or State, but were made by Admiral Anderson's office to facilitate the tracking and clarity of the text after recommended change No. 1 had been made.	
			2. "We have the task of trying to tell our young man of the menace of this foe. And, you know, this isn't easy. After all, we Americans are brought up with the basic understanding that when a man promises something, he means it. When that selfsame youngster shakes hands with one of his buddies in high school in agreement over something, he expects the agreement to be carried out. As a consequence, he has a hard time understanding why, when Khrushchev says he's willing to live in peaceful coexistence with us and will sign papers saying so, we cannot believe him. He doesn't understand that this statement and the signed papers mean nothing, for he hasn't been brought up that way. Thank God he hasn't, for the principles with which he is imbued are those which will be the salvation of our country and our way of life."	Deleted for tracking and clarity (pp. 5 and 6).			
			3. "* * * across to him."	"* * * across to the young man" (p. 6).			Clarity.
			4. "* * * why little pieces of land * * *."	"* * * why distant pieces of land * * *" (p. 6).			
			5. "* * * * if one of these little places falls into Communist hands, that action might be the proverbial straw that broke the camel's back—and as a consequence all of southeast Asia or the Middle East might progressively be beyond our reach. And that if this happens, we might be watching the beginning of the end of a free world as we know it."	"* * * if one of these places falls into Communist hands, the military and moral strength of the free world are thereby weakened" (p. 6).			
Society of Naval Architects & Marine Engineers, New York, N.Y.	Nov. 14	Nov. 17	No changes			Reviewed by DSR	

Data concerning clearance of General White's speeches (period Sept. 21, 1960, to Apr. 25, 1961)

Identity of speech	Date cleared	Date delivered	Changes made in manuscript		Type of change	Responsible agency	Reason
			Original wording	Revised wording or deletions			
1. AFA Convention, San Francisco, Calif.	*1960* Sept. 21	*1960* Sept. 22	P. 5: "Some argue that the United States and its allies should retreat from a nuclear strategy and start reconstructing its so-called conventional forces *on an enormous scale.*"	"* * * on an increased scale."	Mandatory.	OASD(PA)	Change was made because of Army objection: "Army is included by implication in those advocating reconstructing conventional forces on 'enormous scale.' Unless 'enormous scale' is defined, the impression given is inaccurate as concerns Army's position re conventional forces."
2. General White to DOCA meeting, Pentagon.	Sept. 29	Sept. 30	P. 18: "Since the Air Force's future *offensive and defensive* missions, as we reach farther out into aerospace * * *."	"Since the Air Force's future missions, as we reach farther out into aerospace."	do	do	At the time policy was to play down war in space.
3. General White to 71st Annual Chamber of Commerce Dinner, Montgomery, Ala.	*1961* Jan. 27	*1561* Jan. 30	P. 4: "The Soviet economic-military potential is guided by a regime which can count on the backing—however unenthusiastic—of the Russian people. In addition, the Soviets have another great intangible resource which can best be described as gall. They are showing ever-increasing confidence—even arrogance—in their military and scientific strength and in the growth of their influence. Spawned and perpetuated in brutal wars, dedicated to the mission of world revolution—their fervor for subversion and force makes them believe that Communist domination of the world is inevitable. They are further strengthened in this belief by their close partnership with Communist China."	Following substituted: "Furthermore, in any evolution of the Communist threat we cannot disregard the close partnership between Soviet Russia and Communist China."	do	do	It is believed that these changes were made if not at the initiative of General White's former special assistant, they were made with his concurrence.
			P. 5: "Current Communist propaganda to the world concentrates on the same central theme which it has always emphasized—the destruction of capitalism, colonialism, and imperialism. But, under this guise, they really intend the destruction of everything which does not bend to their will. Theirs is the (p. 6) language of total war. They have a consistency and a single-mindedness about promoting world revolution which is unique in the history of dictatorships. The only sensible view of Communist intentions is that they seek to destroy us by any means which they can use."	Deleted	do	do	Do.
			P. 9: "The opposite is true of the U.S.S.R.—with history also testifying to this fact."	do	do	do	Do.
			P. 10: "Satellite systems, for example, would enable us to exploit with realism and confidence any warning we may get—even if the time available is only 15 to 30 minutes."	"Communication" added in front of "Satellite."	do	do	Not given.
			P. 13: "Lesser military strength cannot win should war be forced upon us—and as a deterrent it *is* an open invitation to increased Communist pressures."	"Lesser military strength cannot win should war be forced upon us—and as a deterrent it would be an open invitation to increased Communist pressures."	do	do	It is believed that these changes were made if not at the initiation of General White's former special assistant, they were made with his concurrence.
4. General White's statement before the House Armed Services Committee.	Mar. 14	----------	P. 2: "In the context of this growing threat, I consider Air Force capabilities *to be marginal.*"	"* * * in the context of this growing threat I consider current Air Force capabilities *need to be examined carefully.*"	do	OASD(PA) and State	Unknown.
			"We must consider the full spectrum of contingencies ranging *from the cold war* through limited wars to general war as well as the probability of countless degrees of intensity within each category. Only in this way will we be able to counter the diversified threats posed	Deleted: "from the cold war"; revised: "* * * threats posed by *potential aggressors*"; deleted: "*both cold and hot war.*"	do	do	Do.

Data concerning clearance of General White's speeches (period Sept. 21, 1960, to Apr. 25, 1961)—Continued

Identity of speech	Date cleared	Date delivered	Changes made in manuscript		Type of change	Responsible agency	Reason
			Original wording	Revised wording or deletions			
4. General White's statement—Continued	*1961* Mar. 14	*1961*	by *our enemies* who possess an increased and dangerous flexibility which gives them a solid military backing *for both cold and hot war* aggression" (pp. 2–3).				
			"The ability of the Air Force to cope with the demands of the cold war will be based to a great extent upon our known capabilities for a hot war; the size and intensity of any actual conflict may well be limited by the existence of an unquestionable ability to prevail in the event of global nuclear war. Thus, * * *" (p. 3).	Deleted entirely	Mandatory	OASD(PA) and State	Unknown.
			"The cold war is generally considered to be primarily a political effort. Nonetheless, the Air Force is directly involved in this struggle" (p. 3).	do	do	do	Do.
			"As a substantial contributor to the national deterrent posture, *our primary cold war mission is to assist* in creating conditions *under which the cold war activities* of the free world nations *can be pursued*" (p. 3).	Revised: "As a substantial contributor to the national deterrent posture, *the Air Force assists* in creating conditions *beneficial* to the free world nations."	do	do	Do.
			"In addition, the Air Force *participates in the cold war* by *exploiting* routine operations and through specific preplanned actions such as the Congo airlift and the airdrop of supplies and equipment in Pakistan" (p. 3).	Deleted: "*participates in the cold war * * * exploiting*"; revised: "* * * airdrop of supplies and equipment in Pakistan *makes a contribution*."	do	do	Do.
			"If our cold war efforts fail, armed conflict could occur * * * as has happened in the past. The Korean and Taiwan actions are examples" (pp. 3–4).	Deleted entirely	do	do	Do.
			"These same forces could also contribute substantially to a *general war effort*" (p. 4).	Revised: "These same forces could also contribute substantially to a *major aggression*."	do	do	Do.
			"Now, let me turn to Air Force capabilities *for general war operations*" (p. 6).	Revised: "Now, let me turn to Air Force capabilities *to meet a major aggression*."	do	do	Do.
			"potential *enemies*" (p. 7)	Revised: "potential *aggressors*."	do	do	Do.
			"Approximately 90 percent of the *general war striking power*" (p. 7).	Revised: "*A very large percentage* of the *deterrent* power."	do	do	Do.
			"Could place *one-eighth* of the B–52 force" (p. 8).	Revised: "Could place *a significant portion* of the B–52 force."	do	do	Do.
			"Another significant element of our *general war strength*" (p. 10).	Revised: "Another significant element of our *ability to deter aggression*."	do	do	Do.
			"event of *war*" (p. 11)	"event of *aggression*"	do	do	Do.
5. General White's statement before Senate Armed Services Committee.	Apr. 10	Apr. 11	"There also are many indications that they (Soviets) *will* put a man in space in the very near future" (p. 2).	Change *will* to *may*	do	Unknown, but believed to be OASD(PA) with concurrence of General White's former special assistant.	Not given.
			"* * * The Soviets have demonstrated by intensive R. & D. programs that they *intend* to acquire a clear military advantage at the earliest practicable date" (p. 2).	Change *intend* to *would like*.	do	do	Do.
			"I consider the total power represented by the Soviet aerospace strength *to be* the greatest threat in the history of our country" (p. 2).	* * * "to be the greatest *threat*" to "*to be perhaps the greatest threat*."	do	do	Do.
			"The Air Force also helps to preserve peace by creating conditions beneficial to the nonaggressive activities of the free world nations" (p. 3).	"The Air Force also helps to create conditions beneficial to the peaceful activities of the free world nations."	do	do	Do.
6. General White to Duke University Student Union, Durham, N.C.	Apr. 25	Apr. 25	"Today the Chinese are not far advanced * * * " (p. 3).	"Today, the *Communist* Chinese are not far advanced * * *."	do	(DSR has no record copies of this speech, but it is believed changes were made as a result of telephone discussion by General White's former special assistant with the Department of State.)	Do. Do.
			"and defeat a first-class Western power" (p. 4).	* * * "and defeat a *major* power."	do	do	Do.
			"* * * portends a grim picture for the future" (p. 4).	"* * * portends a *potentially* grim picture for the future."	do	do	Do.

Data concerning clearance of General White's speeches (period Sept. 21, 1960, to Apr. 25, 1961)—Continued

Identity o. speech	Date cleared	Date delivered	Changes made in manuscript		Type of change	Responsible agency	Reason
			Original wording	Revised wording or deletions			
6. General White to Duke University Student Union—Con.	*1961* Apr. 25	*1961* Apr. 25	"and will continue to be—aerospace weapons in the form of aircraft, ballistic missiles, and manned and unmanned aerospace vehicles" (p. 5).	"aircraft, ballistic missiles, and *possibly in the future* manned and unmanned aerospace vehicles". (Deleted *and will continue to be—aerospace weapons in the form of*).	Mandatory	(DSR has no record copies of this special etc.	Not given.
			"If there was ever any doubt that this threat is indeed increasing—and rapidly—it has been erased by the historic flight made by the Soviet astronaut who first circled the earth 2 weeks ago. This great achievement * * * " (p. 5).	"The historic flight made by the Soviet astronaut who first circled the earth 2 weeks ago". (Deleted: "*If there was ever any doubt that this threat is indeed increasing—and rapidly—it has been erased by*" and "*This great achievement.*"	do	do	Do.
			"and their concentration on the near earth regions as the logical area for expansion of military aerospace power" (pp. 5 and 6).	Deleted	do	do	Do.
			"Furthermore, the Soviets have demonstrated by their intensive research and development programs that they unquestionably seek a clear military advantage over the free world alliance at the earliest possible date" (p. 6).	do	do	do	Do.
			"under positive system of controls" (p. 8).	"under an effective system of controls".	do	do	Do.
			"* * * the unquestionable capacity to *repel* and decisively counter any attack * * *" (p. 8).	Deleted "repel and"	do	do	Do.
			"weapon systems have been developed to over*power* either * * *" (p. 10).	"* * * weapon systems have been developed to over*come* either * * *".	do	do	Do.

Unclassified speeches/articles, Gen. George H. Decker (January–September 1961)

[Comments by the Directorate for Security Review]

Identity of speech	Date cleared	Date delivered	Changes made in manuscript		Type of change	Responsible agency*	Reason
			Original wording	Revised wording or deletions			
1. Army Chaplains Conference, Washington, D.C.	Jan. 27	Jan. 30	As a consequence * * * and for the foreseeable future * * * the contention between this (i.e. Communist) social system and that of the free world will continue to exist.	As a consequence * * * and for the foreseeable future * * * the *competition* between * * *.	Suggested	State	None given.
			It appears better to some * * * by their false rationale * * * to accede to totalitarianism than to risk the destruction of millions of human beings and large segments of the fruits of civilization—[they would rather be Red than dead.][1]	Delete final phrase	do	do	Do.
			The following note was made on clearance copy: "This general comment is offered: Portions of the speech do not conform to the tone and spirit of the inaugural address and particularly the following thought: 'Let both sides explore what problems unite us instead of belaboring those problems which divide us.' Particular attention is called to pp. 9 and 10, but there are other portions which it is recommended be reviewed in accordance with the criteria specified above."				
2. Address to 111th Infantry, Pennsylvania National Guard, Philadelphia, Pa.	Feb. 9	Feb. 11	Aggression and subversion in Africa, Asia, and Latin America are timely examples of the means used to pursue their [i.e. Communist] aim of world domination.	*Intervention* and subversion in * * * are timely examples of the means used *by others* to pursue their aim of world domination.	Mandatory	do	Do.
			To support our national policies * * * and particularly our foreign policy * * * the Defense Establishment must maintain a military posture which is capable of meeting any kind of military threat which the Communists might offer.	To support our national policies * * * capable of meeting any kind of military threat which *potential enemies* might offer.	do	do	Do.
			The Communists continue to improve their military power. While moving ahead on long-range nuclear weapons and defense against them * * *.	The Communists continue * * *. While moving *forward* on * * *.	Suggested	do	Do.

See footnotes at end of table.

Unclassified speeches/articles, Gen. George H. Decker (January–September 1961)—Continued

Identity of speech	Date cleared	Date delivered	Changes made in manuscript		Type of change	Responsible agency[1]	Reason
			Original wording	Revised wording or deletions			
3. Kiwanis Club, Atlanta, Ga.	Feb. 16	Feb. 21	It was only last December that the leaders of 81 Communist nations reiterated their basic goal of world domination. Following their usual illusive line, they stated that peaceful methods would be used, and they asserted that general war is not inevitable. Yet, they quickly add other types of war—local and limited—cannot be ruled out as a means for assuring continued and constant progress toward their objective.	It was only last December that * * * 84 Communist *parties* * * *. Following their usual * * * stated that peaceful methods would be *preferred* * * * Yet, they quickly add * * * toward their objective, *and they announce their support of armed insurrection which they call "wars of national liberation."*	Suggested	State	Avoid misinterpretation.
			* * * there is a continuing requirement for * * * forces—both American and Allied Active and Reserve Forces—which could engage and ultimately defeat similar enemy forces in either limited or general war.[2]	* * * there is a continuing requirement for * * * engage and ultimately defeat similar enemy *aggression* in either.	do	do	None given.
			Paradoxically. our forces for general war are designed to make the occurrence of this type of war improbable. [Although a general nuclear war in the immediate future appears to me to be relatively unlikely,] the deliberate initiation of a surprise attack on the United States remains a [constant] threat that we cannot ignore. [Nor can we discount completely the possibility of error in judgment, an accident or an irrational act which could trigger such a war.] Consequently, I am convinced that we must not only be able, but we must also be conditioned, to fight and survive a protracted general nuclear war if one is forced upon us.[3]	Deletions as indicated. Addition at end of last sentence: * * * if one is forced upon us *by an attack of the aggressors.*	Mandatory	do	Do.
4. Founders Day Dinner, West Point Society of New York, N.Y.	Mar. 17	Mar. 18	The development of the Soviet Union as a [highly] modern, influential, [ever-expanding] world power.	Deletions as indicated	do	do	Do.
			[Today, who knows how many] satellites whirl about our heads, in [addition to that Soviet space vehicle which may reach Venus before the USMA class of 1962 is graduated!]	Rewritten: *In addition*, satellites whirl about our heads in outer space.	do	do	Do.
			Unless suitable solutions are found, these conditions [i.e. poor conditions in underdeveloped areas] will eventually lead to subversion and rebellion against legally constituted authority.	Unless * * * these conditions may well lead to * * *.	do	do	Do.
			* * * Soviet power * * *.	* * * *Sino*-Soviet power * * *.	do	do	Do.
			Following their usual illusive line, they stated that peaceful methods would be preferred, and they asserted that general war is not inevitable.	Following * * * they stated that *it may be possible to achieve their aims* by peaceful methods, and that perhaps general war is not inevitable.	do	do	Do.
			Communist actions during the past year * * *	Sino-Soviet actions * * *	do	do	Do.
			* * * flexibility requires relatively large and powerful military forces capable of countering aggression at every level of conflict ranging from the cold war to all-out general nuclear war.[4]	* * * flexibility * * * ranging from *a state of international tension* to * * *	do	do	Do.
			* * * the Defense team in Washington is devoting its best thinking to learn how to improve our military capabilities. As you know, the first short-range appraisal * * * has been forwarded to President Kennedy. [A second, long-range and more comprehensive overall evaluation will probably be undertaken in the near future.][5]	Deletion as indicated	do	OASD(PA)	Do.
			[Not only is the possibility increasing that sizable conventional military actions may occur—under the mutual deterrence of strategic nuclear capabilities—it is also obvious that counterinsurgency actions will be-	Deletion	do	State	Do.

See footnotes at end of table.

Unclassified speeches/articles, Gen. George H. Decker (January–September 1961)—**Continued**

Identity of speech	Date cleared	Date delivered	Changes made in manuscript		Type of change	Responsible agency*	Reason
			Original wording	Revised wording or deletions			
4. Founders Day Dinner, West Point Society—Continued	Mar. 17	Mar. 18	come more frequent. This is a subject which I shall discuss in more detail in a few moments.]		Mandatory	OASD(PA)	None given.
			* * * a balanced posture for subbelligerency actions.	* * * a balanced posture *during a period of international tension.*	do	do	Do.
			Lastly—if we are to preserve our position of greatness and honor in the world of nations—we must consciously strive to place the interests of our country first. If we are not prepared to accept the sacrifices, the disciplines and the great risks which this mighty Nation *must* demand of its own—then those peoples who will place their country first will pass us by and win the domination of the world.[6]	Lastly * * * place the interests of our country *above* those of ourselves. If we are not prepared * * * then those peoples who *seek to dominate others* may pass us by and *dominate* the world.	do	do	Do.
5. Combined Civic Clubs, Columbia, S.C.	Apr. 17	Apr. 17	[In my judgment, we can expect the Communists to continue with their concept of protracted conflict.]	Deleted	do	do	Do.
			The uncommitted—or third force—nations are rapidly gaining increasing recognition in international affairs.[7]	The *new and neutral* nations * * *.	do	do	Do.
			Correspondingly, critically important training of these forces [i.e., Special Forces] in the fields of intelligence, counterintelligence, civil affairs, and psychological warfare can be stepped up.[8]	* * * in *such fields as counterintelligence and civic affairs* * * *.	do	do	Do.
6. U.S. Armor Association, Fort Knox, Ky.	May 10	May 12	[I am sure that you have read with interest the announcement made of the plan to modernize the Army's divisional organization. You will recognize that the new structure is in conformance with the objectives of adaptability and flexibility that I have just outlined. [Also apparent in the design of the new division is the influence of Armor's combat command concept. Your long experience in building the mission-type formation has proven invaluable in arriving at a division that can be tailored from combinations of standard infantry, tank, mechanized units for a particular mission. [All of the combat arms will find increased opportunities for the use of their capabilities in the new organization. The mechanized division, for example, will afford opportunities for infantry-armor training and operations that we have previously had only in very limited degree. [Those who have developed this new structure and those who have thus far reviewed it—find it a sound step in modernization. We believe it offers a logical move in the continuing evolution of combat formations.]	Deletions	do	do	Do.
			[The study of a concept of organization along these lines is actively underway. This concept envisions flexible armored, mechanized, infantry, and airborne divisions whose basic tactical units would be interchangeable, both within and between divisions. [All of the divisions would have a common base. By the addition of standard infantry, armored mechanized unit "building blocks" to this base, divisions could be tailored for particular missions and specific geographic areas. [I believe that you recognize the influence of Armor's combat command structure in this study. I feel, also, that you recognize the need for a mechanized division to meet the requirements for increased mobility, and for protection on both the nuclear and nonnuclear battlefields.][9]	do	do	do	Do.

See footnotes at end of table.

Unclassified speeches/articles, Gen. George H. Decker (January–September 1961)—Continued

Identity of speech	Date cleared	Date delivered	Changes made in manuscript		Type of change	Responsible agency*	Reason
			Original wording	Revised wording or deletions			
6. U.S. Armor Association—Continued	May 10	May 12	[In this connection, you have perhaps noted the proposal that is now under study to establish a Strategic Reserve Command that would include both the Strategic Army Corps and elements of the Tactical Air Command. This would offer a number of advantages. As the plan is under consideration, it would not be appropriate for me to list the advantages without due recognition of the difficulties involved. I can, however, point out that the Army has long sought a closer command relationship between our troops and their tactical air support. We consider such a system essential, both for combined training and for operations. You in Armor need no convincing of the effectiveness of a well coordinated combination of ground arms and close air support.] [10]	Deletions	Mandatory	OSD	None given.
7. Armed Forces Day address, Berlin, Germany.	Apr. 27	May 20	No significant changes				
8. Pennsylvania Military College graduation exercises, Chester, Pa.	May 19	June 4	No changes				
9. Inter-American Army Conference, Panama Canal Zone.	July 3	July 10	[In all the history of this close association (i.e., between United States and Latin American military), there has been no offer of violence to the security or welfare of any nation in the world.]	do	Suggested	OASD (ISA)	Accuracy of statement subject to interpretation.
			However familiar the principle, this danger [i.e., imposition of despotisms]—stemming from a power base in the U.S.S.R. and Red China—has reached ominous proportions.	However familiar * * * stemming from a *Communist* power base—has reached. * * *	Mandatory	State	None given.
			We recognize that the end objective is to extend the despotism of a Soviet colonial empire over the Americas [as it has been extended over Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and East Germany. The possibility that Red China may develop as a rival Communist power, seeking to extend its oriental type of despotism over our countries, is hardly a more inviting prospect.]	We recognize that the end objective is to extend the despotism of *communism* over the Americas. Remainder deleted.	do	do	None.
			The contradictions between these promises and the realities of life in the U.S.S.R. and in Red China. * * *	* * * realities of life in the *Communist world* * * *	do	do	None given.
			As you know, the Conference of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council—the Alliance for Progress—will open in Uruguay within a few days of our meeting. This conference will launch a dynamic 10-year plan aimed at satisfying the basic needs of the American peoples for homes, work and land, health and schools. This plan, if successful, should do much to correct economic conditions which the Communists exploit.	As you know, the *First Extraordinary Session* of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council will open * * * within a few days * * * *This meeting is one of great potential significance and promise for strengthening the free and independent nations of this hemisphere and both national and inter-American institutions for social progress and economic development. The massive planning effort begun at this meeting will be at the heart of the Alliance for Progress.*	do	do	Do.
			[The remote and virgin areas where it can operate most effectively are also the areas that the Communist seek to launch their campaigns of insurgency and guerrilla warfare.]	Deletion	do	DOD	Do.
10. American Legion Boys Nation, Pentagon.	July 24	July 27	No changes made				

See footnotes at end of table.

Unclassified speeches/articles, Gen. George H. Decker (January–September 1961)—Continued

Identity of speech	Date cleared	Date delivered	Changes made in manuscript		Type of change	Responsible agency*	Reason
			Original wording	Revised wording or deletions			
11. Association of the U.S. Army, Washington, D.C.	Sept. 7	Sept. 8	[Today on the other side of the world from Berlin, the officers and men under General McGarr, working on the ground with the government and military forces of South Vietnam, are projecting the will of the American people in a way that cannot be duplicated by any other means.]	Deletion	Mandatory	State	State furnished comment "We are cooperating with allies by training Vietnamese troops to defend their vital interest." Army's proposal to substitute quoted wording for deleted portion was approved.
			* * * we will be able to procure some [3,300] of the modern M-113 armored personnel carrier [some 1,200 of] the modern T-114 full tracked command and reconnaissance vehicle, and [some 14,500 of] the new M-151 ¼-ton truck * * * helicopters [of which we will obtain some 225] of the light observation type.	* * * we will be able to procure *sizeable quantities* of * * *. Deletion of numbers	do	OASD (PA)	None given.
			* * * we will obtain [some 10,000] of the modern VRC-12 radio * * *.[11]	* * * we will obtain several thousand * * *.	do	do	Do.
12. 25th Infantry Division Association, Hawaii.	Sept. 12	Sept. 30	No changes made				
13. "Military Aspects of the Cold War" (article proposed for publication).			Proposed manuscript is attached at tab F of the large volume. This was not cleared for reasons expressed as follows: "It is recognized that much of this kind of material has already been made public, but it is resulting in increasing unfavorable publicity abroad and is subjecting the United States to mounting adverse criticism. The Communist press and radio are having a field day quoting back the words of U.S. sources, including military publications, on the role and capabilities of paramilitary unit and special forces groups which are charged with actively interfering in the internal affairs of other countries. "This particular article, it is believed, would provide an especially high-level and authoritative spokesman for unfriendly propagandists to quote at length."			State	As indicated in 2d column.

---

[1] Comment: the original draft of this speech was submitted for review on Jan. 23, 1961, and was coordinated with Department of State. Resulting State comment (as above—"This general comment is offered: Portions of the * * *") applied to pp. 9 and 10 of that original draft (tab C), and not to pp. 9 and 10 of a revised draft submitted later (tab A). Army withdrew original draft upon hearing of State's comments, and submitted revised draft Jan. 27, 1961, which was cleared that same day with two suggested changes indicated above. Source of these two changes not clear but believed result of telephone coordination with State.

[2] Comment: Both above changes made by State. No reason was indicated.

[3] Comment: Source of deletion of portion "Although a general nuclear war * * *" cannot be determined. The other changes were made by State with this comment: "Suggest omitting this sentence since it is a favorite Russian propaganda theme."

[4] The above 7 changes were made by the Department of State.

[5] Deletion made by OASD(PA) as premature announcement.

[6] Above 3 changes were made by the Department of State.

[7] Above 2 changes were made by the Department of State.

[8] Change made by OASD(PA) to avoid emphases on sensitive Special Forces activities.

[9] Above deletions made by OASD(PA) "Subject to release of official announcement."

[10] Deleted by OSD as premature.

[11] Deletions made by OASD(PA) to protect quantity figures.

*Source of change, as indicated on clearance copy. Entry "DOD" means no source other than OASD–PA so indicated.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, under the previous order, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 20, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 19, 1962:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

John Bartlow Martin, of Illinois, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Dominican Republic.

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

James A. Coolahan, of New Jersey, to be U.S. district judge for the district of New Jersey, vice Mendon Morrill, deceased.

FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BOARD

The following-named persons to be members of the Federal Farm Credit Board, Farm Credit Administration, for terms expiring March 31, 1968:

Jennings B. Fuller, of Wyoming.

William T. Steele, Jr., of Virginia.

PEACE CORPS

Paul F. Geren, of Texas, to be Deputy Director of the Peace Corps, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 19, 1962:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

W. Averell Harriman, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

Walt Whitman Rostow, of Massachusetts, to be Counselor of the Department of State.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

AMBASSADOR

Walter P. McConaughy, of Alabama, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Pakistan.

U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY

Vice Adm. Edward Nelson Parker, U.S. Navy, of Pennsylvania, to be an Assistant

Director, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

Jacob D. Beam, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Director, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rabbi Eli B. Greenwald, Congregation Mispallelim, Chester, Pa., offered the following prayer:

Our God and God of our fathers, grant enduring peace to a troubled world which yearns for peace in this era of insecurity and conflict.

Bless with good health and keen judgment the Members of this House of Representatives. Make them aware of the needs of all the people, so that the legislation they consider today will reflect the lofty American ideals of democracy, equality, and human compassion.

Grant our Nation the will to make sacrifices for the common good. Cause the peoples of the world to flock to our banner of freedom; let us all—as children of the Almighty—join together for the benefit of all mankind.

O God, look upon us with mercy, and cause us always to do Thy will. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 15, 1962, was read and approved.

THE WILDERNESS ACT

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, the people of New York State are vitally interested in the enactment of the Wilderness Act, S. 174, in this 87th Congress.

That they understand and appreciate wilderness is proven by the fact that they maintain and are enlarging in size their 2½-million-acre forest preserve in the Adirondack and Catskill Mountains. The sanctity of such wild lands has, since 1895, been guaranteed by their State constitution. They have repeatedly turned down attempts to weaken such protection by amendments.

Our people rightly feel that they have a big stake in the Wilderness Act. They know that modern pressures of our rapidly expanding industrial and commercial complex mandates decisive action to permanently protect unspoiled remnants of the American scene. The Wilderness Act is fundamental legislation and it represents a historic opportunity for such preservation of our irreplaceable wilderness heritage. The act has within it provisions of a sound program for its enduring protection.

We are especially eager to see this measure passed by the House this session without crippling amendments because we know it has already been properly adopted to other needs of our economy and culture.

NOT JUNK MAIL

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, my attention was called to an article in the Washington Post of Friday, February 16, a statement by one of the distinguished gentlemen in this House from Massachusetts [Mr. Conte] with whom I spoke a couple of hours ago and told him I was going to mention his blast at junk mail as soon as Congress convened today. While the article in this Washington daily newspaper on the front page thereof does not positively state that any of my mail in the subway near the folding room was junk mail or was being mailed out as occupant mail, nevertheless, the reading of the full article where it says that the gentleman from Massachusetts made a speech "touching the raw nerve of congressional 'junk mail,'" could be easily understood, I think, by the ordinary reader to tell that the reprints of a speech by Representative Clyde Doyle, Democrat, of California, called, "My Bill Will Outlaw Communist-Action Organizations, Including the Communist Party," were to go out as occupant mail. The gentleman from Massachusetts did not say that the reprints of my speech on my bill to outlaw the Communist Party were going out as occupant mail, but my name being associated in the article as it was with other Members of Congress specifically named I wish to make it crystal clear that the reprints of my speech on the floor of the House about my bill to outlaw the Communist Party several days ago and which reprints were not paid for by the Government, but by me personally, were there by the folding room to be inserted in due course in envelopes with my frank on them, but not with any occupant addresses on them. They had no addresses upon them as yet for they were to be shipped by the folding room to my great 23d Congressional District office in Los Angeles County where they were to be hand-addressed under the supervision of my office staff there at an addressing party attended by volunteer workers who wished my message about the Communist Party and my bill to outlaw all Communist-action organizations in the United States to be received by many people. I do not use occupant mailing. I did not use it in this case. I wish to make that crystal clear. Therefore, the reported blast at junk mail reportedly made by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts cannot be applied to my envelopes and the reprints of my speech which were paid for by me and not by the taxpayers.

ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS IN LATIN AMERICA

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, would not commonsense indicate that the Alliance for Progress in Latin America is doomed to failure unless the Government stands by a policy of not giving our wealth to any Latin American country until that country has lived up to our understanding of the Bogotá Conference and brought into being realistic land and tax reforms?

Short of the fulfillment of such an agreement, the program is doomed to failure. The poor will remain poor, the rich will be richer, and America's resources will be nearer exhaustion, our public debt larger, and certainly our political and financial entanglements, agreements, and contracts more frustrating and disillusioning than ever. We are too anxious to substitute dollars for commonsense in dealing with people in other parts of the world. In many instances, the recipients are smarter than we give them credit for being. Can we deny the fact that there are more millionaires on a per capita basis in Latin America than in North America?

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SALES TAX

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 258) to amend the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act to increase the rate of tax imposed on certain gross receipts, to amend the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Parking Facility Act of 1942 to transfer certain parking fees and other moneys to the highway fund, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House may be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I trust the gentleman will give us some explanation of what the other body did with respect to the bill as passed by the House.

Mr. McMILLAN. I will be happy to make such an explanation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

Conference Report (H. Rept. No. 1328)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 258) to amend the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act to increase the rate of tax imposed on certain gross receipts, to amend the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Parking Facility Act of 1942 to transfer certain parking fees and other moneys to the highway fund, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SALES TAX ACT AND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA USE TAX ACT

"Sec. 101. (a) Section 125 of the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act (D.C. Code 47–2602) is amended by striking out '2 per centum' and by inserting in lieu thereof '3 per centum' and by striking out in the proviso thereof '3 per centum', and inserting in lieu thereof '4 per centum'.

"(b) Subsection (a) of section 127 of such Act (D.C. Code 47–2604(a)) is amended to read as follows:

"'(a) On each sale, other than sales of food for human consumption off the premises where such food is sold, and other than sales or charges for rooms, lodgings, or accommodations furnished to transients, such amounts as may be prescribed by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to carry out the purposes of this section.'

"(c) Subsection (c) of section 127 of such Act (D.C. Code 47–2604(c)) is amended by striking out '3 per centum' and inserting in lieu thereof '4 per centum'.

"Sec. 102. Section 212 of the District of Columbia Use Tax Act (D.C. Code 47–2702) is amended by striking out '2 per centum' and inserting in lieu thereof '3 per centum'.

"Sec. 103. The amendments made by the first two sections of this title shall take effect on the first day of the first month which begins on or after the thirtieth day after the date of enactment of this Act. From and after the effective date of such amendments, all references in the District of Columbia Use Tax Act to sections 125, and 127 of the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act shall be deemed to be reference to such sections 125 and 127 as amended by the first section of this title.

"TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA INCOME AND FRANCHISE TAX ACT OF 1947

"Sec. 201. Paragraph (1) of subsection 7(a) of title XII of the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947, as amended (61 Stat. 353; sec. 47–1586f(a)(1), D.C. Code), is amended to read as follows:

"'(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection, the total amount of tax due as shown on the taxpayer's return is due and payable in full at the time prescribed in this article for the filing of such return.'

"Sec. 202. The provisions of this title shall be applicable to the taxable years beginning after December 31, 1961.

"TITLE III—REAL ESTATE DEED RECORDATION TAX ACT

"Sec. 301. Definitions.—When used in this title, unless otherwise required by the context—

"(a) The word 'District' means the District of Columbia.

"(b) The word 'Commissioners' means the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, or their duly authorized agents or representatives.

"(c) The word 'deed' means any document, instrument, or writing (other than a will and other than a lease), regardless of where made, executed, or delivered whereby any real property in the District of Columbia, or any interest therein, is conveyed, vested, granted, bargained, sold, transferred, or assigned.

"(d) The words 'real property' mean every estate or right, legal or equitable, present or future, vested or contingent in lands, tenements, or hereditaments located in whole or in part within the District.

"(e) The word 'consideration', except as otherwise provided in section 304 of this title, means the price or amount actually paid, or required to be paid, for real property including any mortgages, liens, or encumbrances thereon.

"(f) The word 'person' means an individual, partnership, society, association, joint stock company, corporation, estate, receiver, trustee, assignee, any individual acting in a fiduciary or representative capacity, whether appointed by a court or otherwise, any combination of individuals, and any other form of unincorporated enterprise owned or conducted by two or more persons.

"(g) The word 'deficiency' as used in this title means the amount or amounts by which the tax imposed by this title as determined by the Commissioners exceeds the amount shown as the tax upon the return of the person or persons liable for the payment thereof.

"(h) The word 'taxpayer' means any person required by this title to pay a tax, or file a return.

"Sec. 302. Exemptions.—The following deeds shall be exempt from the tax imposed by this title:

"1. Deeds recorded prior to the effective date of the enactment of this title.

"2. Deeds to property acquired by the United States of America or the District of Columbia.

"3. Deeds to property acquired by an institution, organization, corporation, association, or government (other than the United States of America or the District of Columbia) entitled to exemption from real property taxation under the Act of December 24, 1942 (Public Law 846, Seventy-seventh Congress, chapter 826, second session), which property was acquired solely for a purpose or purposes which would entitle such property to exemption under said Act: *Provided,* That a return, under oath, showing the purpose or purposes for which such property was acquired, shall accompany the deed at the time of its offer for recordation.

"4. Deeds to property acquired by an institution, organization, corporation, or association entitled to exemption from real property taxation by special Act of Congress, which property was acquired solely for a purpose or purposes for which such special exemption was granted: *Provided,* That a return, under oath, showing the purpose or purposes for which such property was acquired, shall accompany the deed at the time of its offer for recordation.

"5. Deeds which secure a debt or other obligation.

"6. Deeds which, without additional consideration, confirm, correct, modify, or supplement a deed previously recorded.

"7. Deeds between husband and wife, or parent and child, without actual consideration therefor.

"8. Tax deeds.

"9. Deeds of release of property which is security for a debt or other obligation.

"Sec. 303. Imposition of Tax.—(a) There is hereby imposed on each deed at the time it is submitted to the Commissioners for recordation a tax at the rate of one-half of 1 per centum of the consideration for such deed: *Provided,* That in any case where application of the rate of tax to the consideration for a deed results in a total tax of less than $1 the tax shall be $1.

"(b) Each such deed shall be accompanied by a return under oath in such form as the Commissioners may prescribe, executed by all the parties to the deed, setting forth the consideration for the deed, the amount of tax payable, and such other information as the Commissioners may require.

"(c) The parties to a deed which is submitted to the Commissioners for recordation shall be jointly and severally liable for payment of the taxes imposed by this section: *Provided,* That neither the United States nor the District of Columbia shall be subject to such liability.

"(d) The Commissioners are authorized—

"(1) to prescribe by regulation for reasonable extensions of time for the filing of the return required by subsection (b) of this section; and

"(2) to waive as to any party to a deed the requirement for the filing of a return by such party whenever it shall be determined by the Commissioners that a return cannot be filed: *Provided,* That any waiver granted by the Commissioners to a party shall not, unless specifically authorized, be deemed to be a waiver as to any other party. Any waiver made pursuant to this subsection shall not affect the requirements of subsection (c) of this section.

"Sec. 304. Absence of Consideration.—Where no price or amount is paid or required to be paid for real property or where such price or amount is nominal, the consideration for the deed to such property shall, for purposes of the tax imposed by this title, be construed to be the fair market value of the real property, and the tax shall be based upon such fair market value. In any such case, the return required to be filed with the deed shall contain such information as to the fair market value of the real property as the Commissioners shall require. Whenever, in the opinion of the Commissioners, a return does not contain sufficient information as to the fair market value of such real property, the Commissioners are authorized to make a determination thereof from the best information available.

"Sec. 305. Investigation by Commissioners.—The Commissioners, for the purpose of ascertaining the correctness of any return, statement, affidavit, or other document filed pursuant to the provisions of this title or pursuant to any regulations of the Commissioners promulgated hereunder, or for the purpose of ascertaining the correctness of any payment of the tax imposed by this title, or the consideration for any deed upon which a tax is imposed, are authorized to examine any books, papers, records, or memorandums of any person bearing upon such matters and may summon any person to appear and produce books, records, papers, or memorandums pertaining thereto and to give testimony or answer interrogatories under oath respecting the same, and the Commissioners shall have power to administer oaths to such person or persons. Such summons may be served by any member of the Metropolitan Police Department. If any person having been personally summoned shall neglect or refuse to obey the summons issued as herein provided then, and in that event, the Commissioners may report that fact to the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, or one of the judges thereof, and said court or any judge thereof hereby is empowered to compel obedience to such summons to the same extent as witnesses may be compelled to obey the subpenas of that court. Any person in custody or control of any books, papers, records, or memorandums bearing upon the matters to which reference is herein made who shall refuse to permit the examination by the Commissioners or any person designated by them of any such books, papers, records, or memorandums, or who shall obstruct or hinder the Commissioners or any person designated by them in the examination of any books, papers, records, or memorandums, shall upon conviction thereof be subject to the penalties provided in this title.

"Sec. 306. Recordation.—Except as otherwise provided in this title, no deed shall be recorded by the Commissioners until the return required by this title shall have been filed, and the tax imposed by this title shall have been paid.

"Sec. 307. Presumptions and Burden of Proof.—For the purpose of proper administration of this title and to prevent evasion of the tax hereby imposed, it shall be presumed that all deeds are taxable and the burden shall be upon the taxpayer to show that a deed is exempt from tax.

"Sec. 308. Deficiencies in Tax.—(a) If a deficiency in tax is determined by the Commissioners, the person liable for the payment thereof shall be notified by registered or certified mail of said determination which shall include a statement of taxes due and given a period of not less than thirty days after such notice is sent in which to file a protest with the Commissioners and show cause or reason why the deficiency should not be paid. If no protest is filed within such thirty-day period, the deficiency as determined by the Commissioners shall be final. If a protest is filed within said period of thirty days, opportunity for hearing thereon shall be granted by the Commissioners, and a final decision thereon shall be made as quickly as practicable and notice of such decision, together with a statement of taxes finally determined to be due, shall be sent by registered or certified mail to the person liable for the payment of the deficiency.

"(b) Any deficiency in tax which has become final in accordance with the provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall, if no protest is filed, be due and payable within ten days after the expiration of the thirty-day period provided in subsection (a) of this section or, if a protest is filed, shall be due and payable within ten days after notice of the final decision of the Commissioners upon such protest is sent to the person liable for payment of the deficiency.

"Sec. 309. Penalties and Interest.—(a) In case of any failure to make and file a correct return as required by this title within the time prescribed by this title or prescribed by the Commissioners in pursuance of this title, 5 per centum of the tax imposed by this title shall be added to such tax for each month or fraction thereof that such failure continues, not to exceed 25 per centum in the aggregate, except that when a return is filed after such time and it is shown that the failure to file was due to reasonable cause and not due to neglect the Commissioners may in their discretion waive, in whole or in part, the addition to the tax provided by this subsection.

"(b) The amount added to any tax under subsection (a) of this section shall be collected at the same time and in the same manner and as a part of the tax unless the tax has been paid before the discovery of neglect.

"(c) Interest upon the amount finally determined as a deficiency shall be assessed at the same time as the deficiency, and shall be collected as a part of the tax, at the rate of one-half of 1 per centum per month or portion of a month, from the date prescribed for the payment of the tax to the date the deficiency is assessed.

"(d) If the time for payment of any part of a deficiency is extended, there shall be collected, as a part of the tax, interest on the part of the deficiency the time for payment of which is so extended at the rate of one-half of 1 per centum per month or portion of a month for the period of the extension. If a part of the deficiency the time for payment of which is so extended is not paid in full, together with all penalties and interest due thereon, prior to the expiration of the period of the extension, then interest at the rate of one-half of 1 per centum per month or portion of a month shall be added and collected on such unpaid amount from the date of the expiration of the period of the extension until it is paid.

"(e) If any part of any deficiency is due to negligence, or intentional disregard of rules and regulations but without intent to defraud, 5 per centum of the total amount of the deficiency (in addition to such deficiency) shall be assessed, collected, and paid in the same manner as if it were a deficiency.

"(f) If any part of any deficiency is due to fraud with intent to evade tax, then 50 per centum of the total amount of the deficiency (in addition to such deficiency) shall be so assessed, collected, and paid.

"(g) Where a deficiency, or any interest or additional amounts assessed in connection therewith under subsection (c), (e), or (f) is not paid in full within the time prescribed by this section, there shall be collected as part of the tax interest upon the unpaid amount at the rate of one-half of 1 per centum per month or portion of a month from the date when such unpaid amount was due until it is paid.

"(h) The Commissioners are authorized at the request of the taxpayer to extend the time for payment by the taxpayer of the amount of the tax imposed by this title, whether determined as a deficiency or otherwise, for a period not to exceed six months from the date prescribed for the payment of such tax.

"Sec. 310. Compromise and Settlement—(a) Whenever in the opinion of the Commissioners there shall arise with respect of any tax imposed under this title any doubt as to the liability of the taxpayer or the collectibility of the tax for any reason whatsoever, the Commissioners may compromise such tax.

"(b) The Commissioners are authorized to enter into a written agreement with any person relating to the liability of such person for payment of the tax imposed under this title. Any such agreement which is approved by the Commissioners and the taxpayer involved, or his authorized agent or representative, shall be final and conclusive and—except upon a showing of fraud, malfeasance, or misrepresentation of a material fact—the case shall not be reopened as to the matters agreed upon or the agreement modified; and in any suit or proceeding relating to the tax liability of the taxpayer such agreement shall not be annulled, modified, set aside, or disregarded.

"(c) Any person who, in connection with any compromise under this section or offer of such compromise or in connection with any written agreement under this section or offer to enter into any such agreement, conceals from any officer or employee of the District of Columbia any material fact relating to the tax imposed by this title; destroys, mutilates, or falsifies any books, documents, or record; or makes under oath any false statements relating to the tax imposed by this title shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both. All prosecutions under this section shall be brought in the municipal court of the District of Columbia, in the name of the District of Columbia, on information by the Corporation Counsel of the District of Columbia or any of his assistants.

"Sec. 311 Compromise of Penalties and Adjustment of Interest.—The Commissioners shall have the power for cause shown to compromise any penalty which may be imposed under the provisions of this title. The Commissioners may adjust any interest, where, in their opinion, the facts in the case warrant such action.

"Sec. 312. Limitations.—(a) Except as otherwise provided in this section, the amount of any tax imposed by this title shall be assessed within three years after the deed is recorded by the Commissioners and no proceeding in court without assessment for the collection of such tax shall be begun after the expiration of such period.

"(b) In the case of a false or fraudulent return, with the intent to evade tax, the tax may be assessed, or a proceeding in court for collection of such tax may be begun without assessment, at any time.

"(c) In case of a willful attempt in any manner to defeat or evade the tax imposed by this title, the tax may be assessed, or a proceeding in court for the collection of such tax may be begun without assessment, at any time.

"(d) In the case of failure to file a return, the tax may be assessed, or a proceeding in court for collection of such tax may be begun without assessment, at any time.

"(e) Where, before the expiration of the time prescribed in this section for the assessment of the tax imposed by this title, the Commissioners and the taxpayer have consented in writing to its assessment after such time, the tax may be assessed at any time prior to the expiration of the period agreed upon. The period so agreed upon may be extended by subsequent agreements in writing made before the expiration of the period previously agreed upon.

"(f) The running of the period of limitations provided in this section on the making of assessments, or the collection of the tax imposed by this title in any manner authorized by law, shall be suspended for any period during which the Commissioners are prohibited from making the assessment or from collecting said tax, and for ninety days thereafter: *Provided,* That in any case where a proceeding is commenced by a taxpayer in any court in connection with the tax imposed by this title, the running of the period of limitations shall be suspended for the period of the pendency of such proceeding and for ninety days after the decision of the court shall have become final or, if the proceeding shall have been dismissed or otherwise disposed of, for a period of ninety days after such dismissal or other disposition.

"Sec. 313. Administration of Oaths.—The Commissioners are authorized to administer oaths and affidavits in relation to any matter or proceeding conducted by them in the exercise of their powers and duties under this title.

"Sec. 314. Appeal.—(a) Any person aggrieved by any assessment of a deficiency in tax finally determined by the Commissioners under the provisions of section 308 of this title may appeal to the District of Columbia Tax Court in the same manner and to the same extent as set forth in sections 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12 of title IX of the Act entitled "An Act to amend the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, and for other purposes", approved May 16, 1938, as amended and as the same may hereinafter be amended.

"(b) The remedy provided in subsection (a) of this section shall not be deemed to take away from the taxpayer any remedy which he might have under any other provision of law but no suit by the taxpayer for the recovery of any part of the tax imposed shall be instituted or maintained in any court if the taxpayer has elected to file an appeal with respect to such tax, or any part thereof, in accordance with the provisions of subsection (a) of this section.

"Sec. 315. Refunds and Collection.—The provisions of section 14 of title IX of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, as added by the Act of May 16, 1938, and as amended by the Act of July 26, 1939, and as added by section 4 of the Act of July 10, 1952, and the provisions of section 1601 and section 1602 of title XVI of the District of Columbia Public Works Act of 1954 shall be applicable to the tax imposed by this title.

"Sec. 316. Stamps.—The Commissioners are authorized to prescribe by regulation such methods or devices, or both, including the use of a stamp or stamps, for the evidencing of payment, and the collection of the taxes imposed by this title, as they may deem necessary and proper for the administration of this title.

"Sec. 317. Promulgation of Rules and Regulations.—The Commissioners are hereby authorized to prescribe such rules and regulations as they may deem necessary to carry out the purposes of this title.

"Sec. 318. Abatement.—The Commissioners are authorized to abate the unpaid portion of any tax due under the provisions of this title, or any liability in respect thereof, if the Commissioners determine under rule or regulation prescribed by them that the administration and collection costs involved would not warrant collection of the amount due.

"Sec. 319. Elimination of Fractional Stamps or Devices.—For the purpose of avoiding, in the case of any stamps or devices employed pursuant to authority of this title, the issuance of stamps or the employment of devices representing fractional parts of $1, the Commissioners are authorized, in their discretion, to limit the denominations of such stamps or devices to amounts representing $1 or multiples of $1, and to prescribe further that where part of the tax due is a fraction of $1, the tax paid shall be paid to the nearest dollar.

"Sec. 320. General Criminal Penalty.—Whoever violates any provision of this title for which no specific penalty is provided, or any of the rules and regulations promulgated under the authority of this title, shall be subject to a fine of not more than $1,000, or to imprisonment of not more than one year, or to both such fine and imprisonment. Prosecutions for violations of this title shall be on information filed in the municipal court for the District of Columbia in the name of the District of Columbia by the Corporation Counsel or any of his assistants, except for such violations as are felonies, and prosecutions for such violations as are felonies shall be by the United States attorney in and for the District of Columbia, or any of his assistants.

"Sec. 321. Criminal Penalty as to Stamps.—(1) Any person who, with intent to defraud, alters, forges, makes, or counterfeits any stamp, or other device prescribed under authority of this title for the collection or payment of any tax imposed by this title, or sells, lends, or has in his possession any such altered, forged, or counterfeited stamp, or other device, or makes, uses, sells, or has in his possession any material in imitation of the material used in the manufacture of such stamp, or other device; or

"(2) Fraudulently cuts, tears, or removes from any deed, parchment, paper, instrument, writing, or article, upon which any tax is imposed by this title, any adhesive stamp or the impression of any stamp, die, plate, or other article provided, made, or used in pursuance of this title; or

"(3) Fraudulently uses, joins, fixes, or places to, with, or upon any deed, parchment, paper, instrument, writing, or article, upon which a tax is imposed by this title,

"(a) any adhesive stamp, or the impression of any stamp, die, plate, or other article, which has been cut, torn, or removed from any other deed, parchment, paper, instrument, writing, or article upon which any tax is imposed by this title; or

"(b) any adhesive stamp or the impression of any stamp, die, plate, or other article of insufficient value; or

"(c) any forged or counterfeited stamp, or the impression of any forged or counterfeited stamp, die, plate, or other article; or

"(4) (a) Willfully removes, or alters the cancellation or defacing marks of, or otherwise prepares, any adhesive stamp, with intent to use, or cause the same to be used, after it has already been used; or

"(b) knowingly or willfully buys, sells, offers for sale, or gives away, any such washed or restored stamp to any person for use, or knowingly uses the same; or

"(c) knowingly and without lawful excuse (the burden of proof of such excuse being on the accused) has in possession any washed, restored, or altered stamp, which has been removed from any deed, parchment, paper, instrument, writing, package, or article;

shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction thereof, shall be fined not more than $5,000, or imprisoned not more than three years, or both.

"Sec. 322. Disposition of Funds.—All moneys collected under this title shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the general fund of the District of Columbia.

"Sec. 323. Separability Clause.—If any provision of this title, or the application thereof to any person or circumstances, is held invalid the remainder of this title, and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

"Sec. 324. Appropriations.—There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary for the carrying out of the provisions of this title, including the use of stamps or other devices for evidencing payment of the tax imposed by this title.

"Sec. 325. Effective Date.—The provisions of this title shall take effect on the first day of the first month which begins on or after the sixtieth day after the enactment of this Act.

"Sec. 326. Short Title.—This title may be cited as the 'District of Columbia Real Estate Deed Recordation Tax Act'.

"TITLE IV—AMENDMENTS TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE CONTROL ACT

"Sec. 401. Clauses (4) and (5) of subsection (a) of section 23 of the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act (D.C. Code, sec. 25–124) are each amended by striking out '$1.25' and inserting in lieu thereof '$1.50'.

"Sec. 402. The amendments made by this title shall take effect on the first day of the first month which begins on or after the thirtieth day after the date of enactment of this Act.

"TITLE V—AMENDMENTS TO WATER RENT RATES AND SANITARY SEWER SERVICE CHARGES

"Sec. 501. Section 101 of title I of the District of Columbia Public Works Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 101; sec. 43–1520c, D.C. Code) is amended by inserting the subsection designation '(a)' immediately after 'Sec. 101', and by adding to such section the following subsection:

" '(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, the Commissioners are authorized, in their discretion, to increase the rates charged by the District for water and water services furnished by the District water supply system: *Provided*, That no such increase shall exceed 25 per centum of the rate or rates in effect on January 1, 1961.'

"Sec. 502. Section 207 of title II of such Act (sec. 43–1606, D.C. Code) is amended by striking '60 per centum' wherever it occurs in such section and in each such instance inserting in lieu thereof '75 per centum'.

"Sec. 503. Section 208 of title II of such Act (sec. 43–1607, D.C. Code) is amended by adding thereto the following new subsection:

" '(c) If at any time, or from time to time, the Commissioners shall change the established sanitary sewer service charge, the sanitary sewer service charge for any period beginning prior to any such change and ending thereafter shall be prorated on a monthly basis, in accordance with the established charges prevailing in the respective periods.'

"Sec. 504. The provisions of this title shall become effective on the first day of the third month which begins after the date of enactment of this Act.

"TITLE VI—AMENDMENTS TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA MOTOR VEHICLE PARKING FACILITY ACT OF 1942

"Sec. 601. Section 7 of the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Parking Facility Act of 1942 is amended to read as follows:

" 'Sec. 7. All fees and other moneys collected under this Act, including all fees collected pursuant to section 11 of the Act entitled "An Act making appropriations to the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and for other purposes", approved April 4, 1938 (District of Columbia Code, sec. 40–616), and the Act entitled "An Act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to provide for the parking of automobiles in the Municipal Center", approved June 6, 1940 (54 Stat. 241), and all moneys derived from the sale or assignment of any property, real or personal, shall be deposited in a special account within the highway fund established in the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for a tax on motor-vehicle fuels sold within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes", approved April 23, 1924, as amended (District of Columbia Code, sec. 47–1901). Moneys deposited in such special account shall be available, first, to defray the expenses of enforcing laws, rules, and regulations relating to the parking of vehicles in the District of Columbia; second, to defray the expenses of operating parking facilities under this Act; third, for the acquisition, creation, and operation of parking facilities exempt from section 10 of this Act; and fourth, for the maintenance of highways within the District of Columbia, including the removal of snow and ice therefrom, and the purchase or rental of necessary equipment.'

"Sec. 602. The first sentence of section 8 of the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Parking Facility Act of 1942 is amended to read as follows: 'The Commissioners shall include in their annual budget such amounts as may be required from the highway fund established in the first section of the Act of April 23, 1924, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act.'

"Sec. 603. The District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Parking Facility Act of 1942 is amended by renumbering section 10 thereof as section 11 and by inserting immediately following section 9 the following new section:

" 'Sec. 10. Notwithstanding any provision of this Act, no real property shall be acquired under the authority of this Act for use as a parking facility on or after the date of enactment of this section, and the Commissioners and the agency are authorized to operate and maintain only those parking facilities which have been established prior to the date of enactment of this section. No such existing parking facility shall be expanded or otherwise altered except to the extent as may be necessary to permit its continued operation in the same manner as it was being operated immediately before the date of enactment of this section. This section shall not apply to (1) any parking facility which is limited to use by officers and employees of the Governments of the United States or of the District of Columbia by reason of their employment by any such Government, (2) any fringe parking facility, and (3) any parking facility located on property of the District of Columbia beneath any elevated portion of a public highway.'

"Sec. 604. All fees and other moneys which have been deposited in the special account of the Treasury of the United States before the date of enactment of this title to the credit of the District of Columbia in accordance wih section 7 of the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Parking Facility Act of

1942 are hereby transferred to the special account established in the highway fund by the amendment made to section 7 of such Motor Vehicle Parking Act of 1942 by section 601 of this title, and such funds shall be available for the purposes provided in such amendment to such section 7."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its amendment to the title of the bill.

JOHN L. MCMILLAN,
BASIL L. WHITENER,
JOEL T. BROYHILL,
Managers on the Part of the House.
BENJAMIN A. SMITH,
ALAN BIBLE,
J. GLENN BEALL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 258) to amend the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act to increase the rate of tax imposed on certain gross receipts, to amend the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Parking Facility Act of 1942 to transfer certain parking fees and other moneys to the highway fund, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendment strikes out all of the House bill after the enacting clause and inserts a substitute. The House recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, with an amendment which is a substitute for both the House bill and the Senate amendment. The differences between the House bill and the substitute agreed to in conference are noted in the following outline, except for incidental changes made necessary by reason of agreements reached by the conferees and minor and clarifying changes.

TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SALES AND USE TAX ACT

Title I of the conference substitute is identical to sections 1, 2, and 3 of the House bill, with the exception that the conference substitute increases from 3 percent to 4 percent the tax on transient lodgings. The House bill provided for no increases. The Senate amendment increased the tax to 5 percent. The conferees agreed on a compromise increase of 1 percent.

TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA INCOME AND FRANCHISE TAX ACT OF 1947

Section 401 of title IV of the Senate amendment amends paragraph (1) of subsection (7) (a) of title XII of the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947 so as to provide that the amount of tax due the District from a taxpayer shall be due and payable in full at the time prescribed in the act for the filing of the taxpayer's return.

Effect of this change is to eliminate installment payments which are presently allowed under paragraph (1) of subsection (7) (a) of title XII. This amendment does not affect the time of payment of individual income taxes. Such taxes are, by paragraph (2) of subsection (7) (a), payable in full at the time prescribed for filing individual income tax returns.

The House bill had no comparable provisions.

Title II of the proposed conference substitute is identical with the provisions of title IV of the Senate amendment with only appropriate renumbering changes.

TITTLE III. REAL ESTATE DEED RECORDATION TAX ACT

Title V of the Senate amendment creates an entirely new tax for the District of Columbia. This tax, which is imposed upon deeds submitted to the Commissioners for recordation, will produce an estimated revenue of $1,500,000 per year, and is a method of raising revenue which in various forms is in common usage in the States.

Section 501 of title V of the Senate amendment contains a number of important definitions. "Deed" is defined as any type of instrument, document, or writing (other than a will and other than a lease) which accomplishes the transfer of any interest in real property in the District. "Real property" is defined to include any kind of estate or right, legal or equitable, vested or contingent, in lands, tenements, or hereditaments located in whole or in part within the District. "Consideration" is defined as the actual purchase price paid or required to be paid for real property.

Section 502 of the Senate amendment contains the exemptions from tax. The class of deeds exempt are deeds recorded prior to the effective date of this title, deeds to property acquired by the United States and the District of Columbia, deeds to property acquired solely for an exempt purpose by institutions, organizations, corporations, associations, and foreign governments entitled to exemption under the general real property exemption statute in force in the District (Act of December 24, 1942), deeds to property acquired solely for an exempt purpose by specially exempt groups, deeds securing a debt or other obligation, deeds which, without additional consideration confirm, correct, modify, or supplement a previously recorded deed, deeds between husband and wife, or parent and child, without actual consideration, tax deeds, and deeds which release property which is security for a debt or other obligation.

Section 503 of the Senate amendment imposes a tax (with a minimum of $1) upon each deed at the time it is submitted to the Commissioners for recordation at the rate of one-half of 1 percent of the consideration for the deed. This section requires that each deed submitted to the Commissioners shall be accompanied by a return under oath on a form to be prescribed by the Commissioners executed by all of the parties to the deed setting forth the consideration, the amount of tax, and such other information as the Commissioners may require. All parties to a deed (except the United States and the District of Columbia) are made jointly and severally liable for payment of the tax. The Commissioners are authorized under certain conditions to waive the filing of a return or to extend the time for the filing of a return. Section 504 relates to the tax to be paid in the case of a deed for which there was, in fact, no price or amount paid or to be paid, or where such price was nominal. This section requires, in that event, that the parties to the deed represent to the Commissioners the fair market value of the property which is the subject of the deed and, if the information provided the Commissioners is insufficient, the Commissioners are authorized to determine the fair market value of the property from the best information available to them. The tax will be based upon the fair market value of the property.

Section 505 of the Senate amendment authorizes the Commissioners to make investigations for the purpose of ascertaining the correctness of any documents filed with them in connection with a deed, including the right to examine witnesses and to require the production of records and other materials. This section also authorizes the Commissioners to administer oaths and to summon persons for the purpose of obtaining necessary information. In the event of a neglect or refusal upon the part of a person summoned to obey the summons, provision is made for its enforcement through the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia. In the event any person who has control or custody of materials bearing upon the matters investigated by the Commissioners refuses to permit the examination of such materials, or if any person hinders the Commissioners in making an examination, a criminal penalty is provided.

Section 506 of the Senate amendment states that the Commissioners, except as otherwise provided, shall not record a deed until the necessary return has been made, as required by the title, and the tax has been satisfied.

Section 507 of the Senate amendment provides that all deeds are presumed to be taxable, and imposes the burden of showing otherwise upon the taxpayer.

Section 508 of the Senate amendment authorizes the Commissioners to determine deficiencies in tax in cases where an improper tax has been paid. Opportunity in such cases is given to the person liable for payment of the tax to protest the deficiency and show cause or reason at a hearing why it should not be paid.

Section 509 of the Senate amendment contains provisions for the imposition of civil penalties and interest, and includes authority in the Commissioners under certain circumstances to waive penalties as well as to extend the time for the payment of a tax by the taxpayer.

Section 510 of the Senate amendment authorizes the Commissioners to compromise a tax when there is doubt as to the liability of the taxpayer or doubt as to the collectibility of the tax. The Commissioners also are authorized by this section to enter into a written agreement with a taxpayer as to the amount of his tax liability. This section provides further that where, in connection with a compromise or agreement, a person involved with that matter conceals material facts or destroys, mutilates, or falsifies books, documents, or records or makes, under oath, false statements relating to the tax imposed by this title, such person shall be subject to a fine of not more than $1,000 or imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both. Prosecutions in such matters are to be brought in the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia on information by the Corporation Counsel in the name of the District of Columbia.

Section 511 of the Senate amendment authorizes the Commissioners for cause shown to compromise penalties and adjust interest.

Section 512 of the Senate amendment contains provisions relating to the periods within which the Commissioners may make assessments of tax and may proceed in court to enforce collection of the tax imposed by this title.

Section 513 of the Senate amendment authorizes the Commissioners to administer oaths and affidavits in matters arising under this title.

Section 514 of the Senate amendment contains provisions relating to appeals to the District of Columbia Tax Court and states that the right to such an appeal shall not be an exclusive right, but that the taxpayer shall retain any other remedies which he may have under any other provision of law. However, if the taxpayer elects to proceed in the District of Columbia Tax Court he is not permitted to file a suit in another court for recovery of the tax or any part thereof.

Section 515 of the Senate amendment incorporates by reference for tax refund purposes provisions already in existence for other District taxes. This section also incorporates by reference the collection procedures available to the Commissioners under the personal property tax laws of the District.

Section 516 of the Senate amendment authorizes the Commissioners to prescribe by regulation such methods or devices, or both, including the use of a stamp or stamps, for the evidencing of payment, and the collection of the taxes imposed by this title, as the Commissioners may deem necessary and proper for the administration of this title.

Section 517 of the Senate amendment authorizes the Commissioners to prescribe rules and regulations necessary to carry out the purposes of this title.

Section 518 of the Senate amendment authorizes the Commissioners to abate the unpaid portion of any tax due, or any liability in respect thereof, if it appears to the Commissioners, under rules or regulations prescribed by them, that the administration and collection costs involved would not warrant collection of the amount due.

Section 519 of the Senate amendment authorizes the Commissioners, in the event they conclude to employ stamps or other devices for the collection of the tax, to limit the denominations of such stamps or devices to amounts representing $1 or multiples of $1. The Commissioners are further authorized to prescribe that where part of the tax due is a fraction of $1, the tax shall be paid to the nearest dollar.

Section 520 of the Senate amendment sets forth a general penalty for violations of title V in cases where no specific penalty is provided. The penalty under this section is a fine of not more than $1,000 or imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both such fine and imprisonment, with prosecutions to be brought in the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia by the Corporation Counsel. This section provides, however, that in cases of violations which constitute felonies under this title, prosecutions shall be brought by the U.S. attorney and not by the Corporation Counsel.

Section 521 of the Senate amendment provides for a fine up to $5,000 or imprisonment up to 3 years, or both, for certain fraudulent acts relating to any stamps or devices the Commissioners may employ pursuant to this act.

Section 522 of the Senate amendment provides that all moneys collected by the Commissioners shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the general fund of the District of Columbia.

Section 523 of the Senate amendment provides that if any part of title V or its application to any person or circumstances is held to be invalid, the remainder of the title and its application to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

Section 524 of the Senate amendment authorizes appropriations for the carrying out of the provisions of this title, including use of stamps or other devices.

Section 525 of the Senate amendment makes the title effective on the 1st day of the 1st month which begins on or after the 60th day after the enactment of the act.

The House bill had no comparable provisions.

Title III of the proposed conference substitute is identical with the provisions of title V of the Senate amendment with only appropriate renumbering changes.

TITLE IV—AMENDMENTS TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE CONTROL ACT

The House bill made no changes in the present tax on spirits and liquor.

The Senate amendment increased the tax of $1.25 per gallon on spirits and alcohol to $2.

The proposed conference substitute would increase the tax to $1.50 per gallon on spirits and alcohol.

TITLE V—AMENDMENTS TO WATER RATES AND SANITARY SEWER SERVICE CHARGES

Section 601 of title VI of the Senate amendment gives to the District of Columbia Commissioners authority to increase water rates by not more than 25 percent of those rates in effect on January 1, 1961. This authority is standby only so that any increases in water rates will be made only in increments as required. The additional revenues which could be produced by the maximum increase would be approximately $1.8 million.

Sections 602 and 603 of the Senate amendment authorize the Commissioners to increase, in increments as needed, the sanitary sewer service charge which is presently a maximum of 60 percent of the water rate to a maximum of 75 percent of the water rate. Such maximum increase would produce additional revenue of $2.5 million.

The House bill had no comparable provisions.

Title V of the proposed conference substitute is identical with the provisions of title VI of the Senate amendment with only appropriate renumbering changes.

TITLE VI—AMENDMENTS TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA MOTOR VEHICLE PARKING FACILITY ACT OF 1942

Section 601: Section 4 of the House bill amends section 7 of the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Parking Facility Act of 1942 to place certain moneys (principally those collected in connection with parking of vehicles) in a special account in the highway fund. Such moneys are to be available, first, to defray the expenses of enforcing laws, rules, and regulations relating to the parking of vehicles in the District of Columbia by the Metropolitan Police force, second, to defray the expenses of operating parking facilities under this act, and, third, for the maintenance of highways within the District of Columbia including but not limited to the purchase of highway equipment.

Section 601 of the conference substitute is the same as section 4 of the House bill with the exception that moneys placed in the special account shall be available, first, to defray the expenses of enforcing laws, rules, and regulations relating to parking of vehicles in the District of Columbia; second, to defray the expenses of operating parking facilities under this act; third, for the acquisition, creation, and operation of parking facilities exempt from section 10 of this act; and, fourth, for the maintenance of highways within the District of Columbia, including the removal of snow and ice therefrom, and the purchase or rental of necessary equipment.

Section 602: This section of the conference substitute is a conforming change made necessary by reason of section 501 and is identical with section 5 of the House bill.

Section 603: Section 6 of the House bill added two new sections 10 and 11 to the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Parking Facility Act of 1942. The new section 10 prohibited the authorization of persons who are not police officers to enforce parking laws, rules, or regulations.

The Senate amendment did not contain this restriction.

The proposed conference substitute does not contain this restriction.

The new section 11 added to existing law by the House bill prohibited the acquisition under authority of the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Parking Facility Act of further real property for use as a parking facility and the Commissioners and the agency were authorized to operate and maintain only those parking facilities heretofore established. Existing parking facilities were not to be expanded or altered except to permit continued operation in the same manner as they are presently being operated.

The Senate amendment did not contain a similar provision.

The conference substitute is the same as the House bill with the exception that these prohibitions are not to apply to (1) parking facilities which are limited to use by Government officers and employees by reason of their governmental service, (2) fringe parking facilities, and (3) parking facilities located on property of the District of Columbia beneath the elevated portion of any public highway. It is intended by the conference committee that this exemption covers (A) those parking facilities for use solely by persons employed by the Federal and District Governments who are permitted to use those parking facilities by reason of their employment, (B) those fringe parking facilities, such as that presently located in the vicinity of the Carter Barron Amphitheater, which are located on the outskirts of the District of Columbia and are designed primarily for use by persons motoring to the District from outlying areas to enable them to use mass transit facilities for their transportation in the District of Columbia thus relieving traffic congestion, and (C) those parking facilities to be located underneath the elevated portions of freeways in the District when the land is owned by the District and is principally suitable for use for parking of vehicles.

Section 604: This section of the conference substitute is the same as the provisions of section 7 of the House bill.

Section 8 of the House bill provided that sections 4, 5, 6, and 7 of the House bill would take effect as of July 1, 1961.

Title VI of the conference substitute would take effect on enactment.

TITLE OF THE BILL

The Senate amendment amended the title of the bill to reflect more accurately the bill as amended by the Senate.

Since the proposed conference substitute does not contain certain of the provisions referred to in the title as amended by the Senate, the Senate recedes from its amendment to the title. Thus, the title of the bill will be that given it by the House.

JOHN L. MCMILLAN,
BASIL WHITENER,
JOEL T. BROYHILL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the questions propounded by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] may I say that the House passed a sales tax bill in 1960 and again in 1961 to add 1 penny to the present sales tax in the District of Columbia. The Senate added nine additional items when they took action on the House bill in August 1961.

In conference we struck from the bill the item that pertained to the impacted school area amounting to approximately $5 million, and we modified several other items presented by the Senate as the House District Committee had held no hearings on any of the other items that the Senate added to our tax bill. It is the wish of the House conferees that the District officials will reduce some expenses so it will not be necessary to pass another revenue bill during the next 10 years.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

U.S. COAST GUARD RESERVE

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment today to salute the U.S. Coast Guard Reserve. Today is only the 21st birthday of this fine organization, but it might be said that it became of age a long time ago in the service of our country. The Coast Guard Reserve was established by the Congress on February 19, 1941, and the SPARS—the women reservists—were made a part of the force a year later. Now almost 30,000 strong, the Reserve had 3,442 officers and 25,927 enlisted men as of January 1, 1962.

In my judgment the Coast Guard itself is one of the most economically and efficiently operated defense units in our Government. And I feel it should be stated that the Reserve program has been so successfully conducted it will enable the Coast Guard to bring into the service an adequate number of trained personnel to maintain this high standard of efficiency in time of emergency.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

A SURVEY TO DETERMINE THE PRACTICABILITY OF ADOPTING THE METRIC SYSTEM OF WEIGHTS AND MEASURES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2049) to provide that the National Bureau of Standards shall conduct a program of investigation, research, and survey to determine the practicability of the adoption by the United States of the metric system of weights and measures.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill would authorize the expenditure of $500,000 for a study of the metric system.

I want to say again it is my contention that it is wholly unnecessary to study the metric system. It is in use in any number of foreign countries.

If it is desired to put the metric system into effect in this country, then let us legislate to put it into effect. Let us not waste a half million dollars of the taxpayers' money studying something in reference to which there is no mystery whatever.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

DESIGNATING A NEW LOCK ON THE ST. MARYS RIVER AT SAULT STE. MARIE, MICH., AS THE JOHN A. BLATNIK LOCK

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 947) to designate the new lock on the St. Marys River at Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., as the John A. Blatnik lock.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, at the specific request of another Member who could not be present, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman if he can give us any reason why this bill that has passed the House previously is objected to?

Mr. WEAVER. I am making this request at the instance of another Member who could not be present at this time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in recognition of the fine leadership of Representative JOHN A. BLATNIK, and in tribute to his dauntless championship of the Saint Lawrence Seaway over a long period of years, and his persistent and successful efforts for harbor improvements and connecting channels on the Great Lakes, that the new lock to be constructed to replace the existing Poe lock on the Saint Marys River at Sault Sainte Marie, Michigan, be designated as the John A. Blatnik lock as a fitting tribute to this congressional leader for his contribution in making the Great Lakes-Saint Lawrence Waterway system a reality.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Public Works is to be congratulated for bringing before us H.R. 947, a bill to designate the new lock on the St. Marys River at Sault Ste. Marie as the John A. Blatnik lock.

Our good friend and able colleague from Minnesota [JOHN BLATNIK] was in the forefront of those men of vision who have made the St. Lawrence Seaway a reality. It was men like him who kept the grand idea alive during periods of disinterest and active opposition and who helped day by day to create understanding of its importance. The existence of this great project today is in itself witness to the leadership and inspiration of JOHN BLATNIK.

The unanimous report of the committee is a fitting tribute from the members who worked closest with him in his dedicated and tireless efforts. It is entirely fitting that the House should join in paying this deserved honor to a distinguished colleague in the designation of the John A. Blatnik lock.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL BOTANIC GARDEN IN HAWAII

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5628) to provide for a study and investigation of the desirability and feasibility of establishing and maintaining a National Tropical Botanic Garden.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to point out that on September 21, 1961, this bill was brought to the floor of the House under suspension of the rules. At that time an insufficient number of votes was cast in the affirmative to have this proposed legislation approved under suspension. It has remained since that time on the Consent Calendar. Obviously, there being a number of votes in opposition to the bill, it could not be considered under unanimous consent on the Consent Calendar. I therefore withdraw my reservation of objection and object to the consideration of the bill on the Consent Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WEAVER. I object, Mr. Speaker.

PARTICIPATION IN 1962 FEED GRAIN PROGRAM

The clerk called the bill (H.R. 8914) to amend subsection (d) of section 16 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PRINCE GEORGES COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD, MARYLAND

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6759) for the relief of the Prince Georges County School Board, Maryland.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

ACQUISITION OF A PATENTED MINING CLAIM

The Clerk called the bill (S. 383) to provide for the acquisition of a patented mining claim on the south rim of Grand Canyon National Park, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, on February 5, 1962, this bill was brought to the floor of the House for consideration under suspension of the rules. By a vote of 202 yeas and 136 nays, 96 not voting, this bill failed of passage under suspension of the rules. Obviously, with 136 nay votes, this bill does not qualify for consideration under the Consent Calendar. I therefore withdraw my reservation of objection and ask that this bill be stricken from the Consent Calendar.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WEAVER. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The **SPEAKER.** Objection is heard.

RELIEF FOR CERTAIN NAVAL OFFICERS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9884) for the relief of certain officers of the Naval Reserve erroneously in receipt of compensation based upon an incorrect computation of service for basic pay.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is another bill which seeks to take care of the error or the errors of certain people in the Government.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to object to this bill, but I had the dubious pleasure over the weekend of reading all the bills on the Private Calendar that will come up tomorrow. I have never seen on one Private Calendar more errors of omission and commission, and the bills provide for the payments of very substantial sums of money to individuals because of the errors that were made. Nowhere in any of the reports accompanying the bills did I read that anyone is taking to task the people who are guilty of the errors in bookkeeping and so on and so forth. Someone needs to get busy in this Government and start penalizing those who are making mistakes that result in the payment of money to people who are not entitled to it, but who would be severely punished if they had to make repayment to the Government.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Members of the House will read the bills on the Private Calendar that will come up tomorrow for the purpose of seeing the number of errors being made and the cost to the taxpayers.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the gentleman from Iowa has brought this matter to the floor of the House, because when we have the Private Calendar up for consideration, of course, such discussion is not in order.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make this observation as ranking minority member on the Private Calendar Committee: This represents to me a very serious question each time we have the call of the Private Calendar. But, the gentleman from Iowa, I am sure, does not want to leave the implication that these persons—the beneficiaries of the private bills who are being relieved of the responsibility of repaying this money, and that is the effect of the bill—he has not taken the position that such a bill is not in the public interest, because they are innocent victims?

Mr. GROSS. That is exactly right. I am not going to object to this bill, and my reason for taking time now is exactly as the gentleman stated, because time cannot be taken under the call of the Private Calendar to discuss these matters.

Mr. Speaker, there are too many of these mistakes occurring, and I believe the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Avery], being on the Private Calendar panel, will agree with me.

Mr. AVERY. I quite agree with the gentleman. On the other hand, I certainly would defend the right of the beneficiaries of the private bills to be relieved of the responsibility of repayment of these various sums of money because they were entirely not responsible for the error that was made by some pay clerk.

Mr. GROSS. Certainly; and I defend the right of the Members of the House of Representatives or the other body to bring in bills to take care of injustices that have been done. My quarrel is with the fact that somehow or other apparently there is a lot of laxness in all too many agencies and departments of Government in the handling of governmental affairs.

Mr. AVERY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. LANE. May I say to the members of the objector's committee that we quite agree with the statement made by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross]. These bills from time to time do give us some problems. Of course, we have to treat all of the individual private claims bills on the basis of a matter of equity. For that reason, of course, we bring these bills to the floor from time to time. But we are aware, as the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] is aware, that the Government makes a good deal of mistakes from time to time. Of course, we on the committee try to correct some of these errors.

Mr. Speaker, it has been brought to our attention, and we have talked about it in the subcommittee from time to time and brought to the attention of the various departments and agencies this particular bill before us. May I say that this has been going on for a period of about 15 years, and it affects about 40 of these employees in the Department of the Navy. Of course, it was not brought to the attention of anyone until this agency, the General Accounting Office, checked it up after 15 years. For that reason, of course, the committee felt that equity and good conscience warranted a favorable report on this bill. But I want to say to the gentleman from Iowa that it does trouble us from time to time. We have talked about it. We are trying to take care of the situation as best we can. But his criticism is well founded.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, there will be two bills on the Private Calendar tomorrow to compensate officers of the armed services for the loss of their furniture and certain personal effects. These bills will represent an outlay of a good many thousands of dollars of the taxpayers' money. I cannot understand why transporters of furniture and personal property of the officers of the armed services, anyone who undertakes transportation for the Government, should not be liable for the loss of such property through fire, as in the two instances that will be on the Private Calendar tomorrow. In one instance not one dime will be paid by the transporter.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. LANE. The gentleman is calling the attention of the House to these private bills on the calendar. Of course, there are thousands and thousands of these claims that are covered by insurance that do not come to our attention. We always try to look at these personal bills to see whether or not there was a carrier who had insurance coverage to take care of these losses or damage to furniture or personal belongings. All those cases, of course, do not come to our attention. They are taken care of privately. It is only those cases where there is no insurance, cases where the transportation company is not insured, that come to our attention.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, let me ask the gentleman this question: Why should the Federal Government do business with any carrier who is not responsible for one single dime of loss of property in his custody?

Mr. LANE. I quite agree with the gentleman that the U.S. Government should see to it that these carriers have proper insurance coverage to take care of these losses.

Mr. GROSS. Certainly they should.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I am interested in this colloquy because a constituent of mine is now being asked to pay for loss that has occurred to certain members of the armed services because of a fire in a warehouse. This constituent of mine is a common carrier who had these items warehoused. However, the insurance carrier whom he had employed apparently had not drawn the policy accurately and the carrier finds that he is not insured. The Government is asking that he pay a cost which was determined unilaterally; he was not asked his opinion as to whether or not it was a reasonable reimbursement. They just said, "Please pay." He did not have any insurance, either. If this is the kind of thing that is going on and we are paying private bills for the relief of carriers, which is about all that this boils down to, then I am going to put in a private bill to relieve my constituent, too.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I think perhaps one more comment may be in order and I invite the attention of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross]. Despite the fact that it seems to him and to me, and probably to the Subcommittee on Claims of the Committee on the Judiciary, that these private bills or similar bills are coming before the House rather frequently, when we consider the really small percentage of the Federal payroll these private bills represent, actually it is a reasonably good record of accuracy, is it not?

Mr. GROSS. I do not know that I can agree with the gentleman.

Mr. AVERY. I did not know whether the gentleman would agree, but I think it is a reasonable conclusion.

Mr. GROSS. I do not have any percentage figures.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That any member or former member of the naval service who—

(a) as an enlisted member of the United States Naval Reserve was appointed a midshipman in the United States Naval Reserve without termination of the enlistment contract; and

(b) was thereafter erroneously credited in the computation of his basic pay with a period of enlisted service on and after the date of appointment;

is relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the amounts, which were otherwise correct, received by him prior to March 15, 1961, as a result of the erroneous credit for service. Any person who has at any time repaid to the United States any amount paid to him based upon an erroneous credit for service as cited in this section is entitled to have refunded to him the amount repaid.

Sec. 2. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

Sec. 3. Appropriations available for the pay and allowances of members of the naval service are available for refunds under this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of eligible bills on the Consent Calendar.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works may have permission to sit while the House is engaged in general debate during the remainder of the week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

RESOLUTION TO STOP TRAINING COMMUNIST MILITARY PERSONNEL

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a resolution to put an end to the ridiculous policy which permits the United States to train and equip military personnel from enemy countries. The people of Dallas County, the district I have the honor to represent in Congress, have been exceedingly articulate in expressing their indignation over programs by which the United States trains Communist pilots and technicians and by which we supply these countries with military materiel and weapons which may eventually be turned on our own people.

In support of the resolution introduced today, I was presented in my office this morning, petitions signed by nearly 10,000 of my fellow citizens from Dallas County. I am told that additional petitions have been presented to many of my colleagues from other areas containing approximately a half million signatures of Americans, indignant about our shortsighted policy in this field. I am proud to be their spokesman and to stand with them on this issue because I believe our stand is in the self-interest of the United States and the freedom of all our people.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALGER. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. AVERY. I wonder if the gentleman would tell us if there is anything in his resolution that would revoke the annexation of Texas to the Union.

Mr. ALGER. No; and I think Mr. Kennedy, the Attorney General, may take care of that when he returns.

Mr. AVERY. Then we have the assurance that this would not in any way revoke the annexation of that State?

Mr. ALGER. We hope not. And we are not going to permit the Alamo to be torn down for urban renewal.

Mr. AVERY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALGER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I think the gentleman would find many who are in sympathy with his plea. I just wonder, however, why no legislation along this line was introduced by the gentleman under the previous administration when many of these contracts for the training of Communist pilots were first negotiated.

Mr. ALGER. May I point out to the gentleman that this gentleman has consistently for 7 years opposed on the floor of the House and by amendments such aid, to Yugoslavia for example, and I am doing no more today under this administration than I have done under the previous administration.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Was the bill the gentleman refers to introduced under the Eisenhower administration?

Mr. ALGER. Yes, by various Members of Congress, if not by the administration. I am not responsible for the introduction of legislation under the previous administration or under this administration. I am responsible for this resolution and I ask for the gentleman's support.

Mr. EDMONDSON. The gentleman from Texas was a Member of the Congress under the previous administration.

Mr. ALGER. I spoke then from the well of this House as I am speaking now.

ABOLISHING CONGRESSIONAL MAIL ADDRESSED TO "OCCUPANT"

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my distinguished colleagues, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Conte] and the gentleman from Connecticut, [Mr. Seely-Brown], in urging repeal of the 1961 law which permits Members of Congress to flood the U.S. mails with mail addressed to the "Occupant." Against the efforts of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Conte], myself and others, the Congress last year, under the Supplemental Appropriations Act, extended the use of the frank by authorizing Members of Congress to send mail to "Occupant" on all city carrier and rural carrier routes. This has resulted in a most enormous burden to the public and to the Post Office. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Conte], in his remarks on the floor last week, pointed to the logjam here in the mailing room of the House of Representatives. Toward this end I have today introduced a bill to repeal the 1961 "Occupant" mail law. It is a companion bill to the bill introduced last week by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Seely-Brown].

The franking privilege is an important one and one that should be used, but used properly. I think it not only proper but important that Members of Congress keep their constituents advised as to matters of state, legislation pending and passed, and the workings of the Congress and the Federal Government as a whole. But if such reports are sent, they should be sent only with the name of the addressee on the envelope, as in the case of any private citizen who wishes to send a letter by first-class mail.

I have never used "Occupant" mail and I doubt whether many Members of the House do. "Occupant" mail does not do a service to the public. Certainly, Members of Congress should lead the way in setting a better example. Some argue that it is burdensome to require Members of Congress to address envelopes by name to residents of their congressional district who wish to be informed of congressional affairs. Maybe so—but it is far more burdensome to the public to allow to remain on the books a law which permits indiscriminate use of the franking privilege in this fashion. A Member of Congress will be far more careful about the kind and quality of information he sends to constituents if he is required to go through the large task of addressing the envelopes to all persons to whom the communication is addressed.

Mr. Speaker, there still remains an excellent chance of reversing this diabolic law if the Senate will follow the lead of the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] in striking out from the laws this "Occupant" mail privilege. The bill that I have introduced today demonstrates the importance of the point. I will continue to press for it in the event the Senate does not send over to us a revised law. In such event it is still within the power of our own Appropriations Committee to act by attaching this bill and its companion measures by way of an amendment to the appropriations bill.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill, H.R. 10050, the temporary debt ceiling increase bill.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DUKE SAVANNAH RIVER DAM

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and to include a short resolution.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 6789 would authorize Duke Power Co. to build a retaining dam across the Savannah River at Middleton Shoals in Anderson County, S.C., and Elbert County, Ga. With the construction of this dam, Duke Power Co. proposes to build the largest steamplant in the world, at a total cost of $280 million. The Duke steamplant, when finally completed, would use approximately $26 million worth of coal annually, greatly helping our depressed coal fields. It would utilize 9,500 tons of coal daily, which would aid our depressed railroads. It would furnish employment for many employees in an area where new industry is needed. It would pay annually approximately $10 million in taxes to the Federal Government at a time when increased Federal revenue is essential to our defense and security. It would also pay annually to the State of South Carolina $7 million in taxes, and to Anderson County $1 million annually in taxes, where this vast new revenue is urgently needed for schoolteachers' salaries, and education.

The Duke proposal is an expression of confidence in the future growth of the entire Southeast. It is estimated, Mr. Speaker, that in 10 years the need for electric power in the United States will double. My own prediction is that the need for electricity will triple during this same period in the Southeast. The people of the Southeast need this plant. They want the Duke plant. Mr. Speaker, I know of no one who is opposing this fantastic manifestation of confidence in the future growth of our country.

For Duke to begin construction on schedule, H.R. 6789 must be passed at this session of Congress. It is urgent that the Congress approve H.R. 6789 as expeditiously as possible.

The South Carolina General Assembly unanimously adopted the following resolution urging the Congress to authorize construction. This resolution was unanimously introduced by the Anderson County delegation to the general assembly—Senator Taylor, who is a former Member of this body, and Representatives Thompson, Garrison, Castles, McDonald, and Wright.

The resolution follows:

Concurrent Resolution Memorializing the Congress of the United States To Enact as Promptly as Possible S. 1795 or H.R. 6789, or Similar Legislation, Authorizing Duke Power Co. To Construct a Dam Across the Savannah River

Whereas Duke Power Co. has announced plans for constructing a giant 2-million-kilowatt steam-electric generating plant on the Savannah River in Anderson County, S.C.; and

Whereas in order to form a pool for condenser cooling water for this plant, it is necessary for Duke Power Co. to construct a dam across the Savannah River; and

Whereas before this dam can be constructed, congressional approval is required, and bills for such approval, designated S. 1795 and H.R. 6789, were introduced on May 3, 1961, and are now pending in both bodies of the Congress; and

Whereas the proposed Duke Power Co. 2-million-kilowatt generating plant would be a great asset to the economy of South Carolina and the surrounding area in that it will not only involve construction costs of approximately $280 million and will create needed jobs during both construction and operation, but will annually add to the economy an estimated 10 billion kilowatt-hours production, 3½-million-ton coal consumption at a cost of $26 million, $2½ million payroll, $7,450,000 State and local taxes, and $9,240,000 Federal income taxes; and

Whereas the General Assembly of South Carolina, in furtherance of its belief in the importance of this proposed project to the State of South Carolina, desires to urge the Congress promptly to enact the necessary enabling legislation authorizing the construction of this dam: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring): That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to enact, as promptly as possible, S. 1795 or H.R. 6789, now pending before the Congress, or similar legislation authorizing Duke Power Co. to construct across the Savannah River a dam necessary for its proposed steam plant; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the following officers and Members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress: the Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the chairmen of the Committees on Public Works of the Senate and the House of Representatives, each Senator from South Carolina, and each member of the House of Representatives from South Carolina.

IN MEMORY OF "PADDY" DONOHUE—A MEMBER OF SERGEANT YORK'S FAMOUS SQUAD IN WORLD WAR I

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, a game little Irishman has passed on to join the immortal company of the brave. Patrick Donohue, of Lawrence, Mass., participated in one of the most heroic exploits of World War I, for which he was awarded the Silver Star.

He and 16 other American soldiers were members of the famous squad under the leadership of Sergeant York that stormed an enemy strong point, capturing 132 prisoners and 35 machineguns.

After the war he returned to Lawrence and went to work for the city. During the latter years of his retirement, he was a familiar and respected figure in the downtown area. Loquacious about all subjects, as only an Irishman can be, he became tightlipped when folks asked him to reminisce about the war. "I don't like blowing my own horn," he said, and then changed the course of the conversation to sports or politics. People understood, and admired him the more for his proud reticence.

Paddy lived alone, and when the end came, recruiters for the various branches of the Armed Forces in the Lawrence area volunteered for the honor of bearing him to his last resting place. A firing squad and buglers from Fort Devens paid military tribute to an old soldier answering the rollcall of eternity.

A game little Irishman, 3 days before the armistice of 1918, had made his personal contribution to the Army's traditions of valor. In memory of him, I ask for permission to insert in the Congressional Record the story Paddy Donohue's courage and final bivouac from a recent edition of his home city newspaper, the Lawrence Eagle-Tribune.

World War I Hero Dies; Fought With Sergeant York

Patrick J. Donohue, who was awarded the Silver Star for the part he played in assisting Sgt. Alvin C. York, in his remarkable feat in action against the Germans in World War I, was taken to the Lawrence General Hospital Thursday morning and was pronounced dead on arrival. He was found in his room at 492 Common Street and was removed in the fire department ambulance.

Mr. Donohue, one of Lawrence's outstanding heroes of World War I, was wounded in action and was cited for bravery under fire.

He was born in Ireland and came to this country in 1906 when he was about 17 years old. He attended evening school and was employed in the E. Frank Lewis plant when war broke out. He joined the colors on October 5, 1917, and was sent to Camp Devens where he was assigned to Company G, 328th Infantry, one of the units of the famous 82d (All American) Division.

After training at Camp Devens, the regiment was ordered to Camp Gordon at Atlanta, Ga., and later sailed for Liverpool and then for Le Havre, France.

Mr. Donohue was loath to talk about the part he played in the famous incident on October 8, 1918, when he accompanied Cpl. Alvin C. York to capture a German machinegun nest in the Argonne. He was discharged from service on June 4, 1919.

Mr. Donohue was one of the group of 13 privates and 4 corporals assigned to jump a nest of enemy machineguns which was holding up the regiment's advance in the Argonne Forest.

The detachment, headed by Cpl. Bernard Early, crawled through thick underbrush in the drizzling rain to circle the machineguns. They surprised the Germans and captured 132 prisoners.

Sergeant (then corporal) York gained national fame from this operation.

Surviving are two brothers, Ned and Timothy, of Ireland; a sister, Mrs. Jane Cremmins, of Ireland; and several nieces and nephews.

The funeral will be held Saturday from the John Breen Memorial Funeral Home, 6 Tremont Street, with a high mass of requiem at 10 a.m. in the Immaculate Conception Church. Burial will be in Bellevue Cemetery.

Friends may call today from 2 to 4 and 7 to 10 p.m.

Patrick J. Donohue

Sergeant Alvin C. York, then of Pall Mall, Tenn., was called the outstanding American hero of World War I, because he led his squad in a raid on Hill 223 in the Argonne, killing 20 German soldiers, capturing the "nest," and taking prisoner 132 of the enemy, including a major and three lieutenants, as well as 35 machineguns. But there were more than the man from Tennessee in that raid, although the glory, for the most part, was added to his name. He was but one of 16 American troops in the attack, 6 of whom perished; 3 suffered wounds and 7 were unscratched. One of the latter was Patrick J. Donohue, "a game little Irishman," as one magazine writer termed him, who died in the hospital the other day after being found seriously ill in his Common Street room. Like most men who face and conquer overwhelming odds, Donohue never had much to say about his participation in the exploit. Although he was awarded a Silver Star, was invited by and declined an invitation to participate in a reenactment of the historic episode at Washington military exposition, and had himself portrayed by another in a motion picture version of one of the war's greatest adventures, he would admit that he was present at the capture and little else. He summed it up as simply as possible. This is what he said: "During the whole affair I was guarding prisoners and devoted my attention to catching them. When we first came in on the Germans, I fired a shot at them before they surrendered. Afterward I was so busy guarding the prisoners and I did not shoot." In all the gloss of the halo circled around the head of York, only a slender light of the fringe fell on the others. It was okay with Donohue. "In the Army," he once related, "they told us not to have too much to say about what went on. Well, that seemed like a pretty good thing after the war, so I just kept still. I don't like blowing my own horn." And he never did.

REVERE (MASS.) JOURNAL—81 YEARS OLD—AND GROWING

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, a good newspaper is like a good friend because you trust it, and welcome it as a regular visitor to your home.

The other day a man said to me: "I'd like to read more personal news in the paper that is published in the small city where I live. About people I know or see."

The Revere Journal has been filling that need for the people of Revere, Mass., since February 5, 1881.

Its publisher, Sidney Curtis, its city room and its printing plant are not remote from the general public. You just walk in from street level on Broadway to pay for an ad, hand in a news item, discuss local politics with a member of the staff, or place an order for the wedding invitations.

There is a close relationship between the Journal and its subscribers because it reports local events, the activities of local residents, and local enterprises.

This mutual interest and loyalty has continued from generation to generation. In a world where the colossal confuses and overwhelms the individual, the people of Revere do not feel alone in a crowd. They get to know one another, and keep contact with reassuring human values, through the hometown news that identifies the Revere Journal.

It does not resort to scare headlines, or to high pressure promotional campaigns.

It is a community weekly, attuned to people that it knows and respects.

With the Journal, merit is its own reward.

Slowly but surely its readers have increased, until it now ranks 38th in the Nation on the basis of its paid circulation.

With big city newspapers going out of business, or merging for survival, the long and uninterrupted publishing record of the Journal is a tribute to the management and service of the smaller, weekly papers.

Perhaps it is because they keep in touch with the most interesting news; about human beings in our own community.

On Monday, February 5, 1962, the Revere Journal proudly observed its 81st anniversary.

I congratulate Publisher Sidney Curtis and his staff.

To the correspondents, domestic and foreign, who cover the proceedings of this House from the press galleries, I recommend the sturdy example of the Revere Journal, in tribute to the profession of gathering and publishing not only "What's new?" but "Who?"

Journal Observes 81st Anniversary Monday, February 5

The 81st anniversary of the Revere Journal will be observed next Monday by publisher Sidney Curtis, who has operated the local paper for the past 25 years. The paper was first published on February 5, 1881.

Cited many times for its service to the citizens of Revere, the Journal, about to enter its 82d year of publication, each week finds its way into some 8,500 homes in the community.

Last November, the Journal Publishing Co., located directly behind the Revere Journal Building and also managed by Mr. Curtis, marked its 21st anniversary. When Mr. Curtis took over the Journal in 1936, he had two associates. In 1941, he became sole owner and shortly after he opened the printing plant, one of the most modern of its kind in the country.

The Journal is the only continuous operating newspaper ever published in the city of Revere, having published weekly since its founding 81 years ago.

Under the direction of Mr. Curtis, the Journal and the Publishing Co. have continued to expand. The paper is now ranked 38th in the country on the basis of its paid circulation. The Publishing Co. is known throughout Boston and the Commonwealth as one of the finest printing houses in the country.

The printing plant started with two Intertypes and has been expanded to six Intertypes plus numerous other machines necessary for printing. The Revere Journal office was moved from Pleasant Street to Broadway in 1940. In the past few years, Mr. Curtis has had the Journal office completely renovated and redecorated in modern decor much to the enhancement of the business section in which it is located.

ORGANIZATION FOR COLD WAR

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, if Secretary Robert F. McNamara is running the U.S. hot war effort, who is running our cold war effort?

The question is unanswerable simply because the United States has no real cold war organization for anybody to run.

The global struggle between our way of life and communism can range in intensity from dropping thermonuclear bombs to dropping propaganda pamphlets. Its major segments in decreasing order of intensity are general war, limited war, sublimited war and cold war.

U.S. national strategy has been to deter Sino-Soviet leaders from general and limited war. Our magnificently organized Military Establishment consistently has implemented that strategy by maintaining such an overwhelming military retaliatory capability that Communist leaders have not been free to initiate general war nor successfully to pursue limited war.

As a consequence they have waged sublimited war and cold war with intense ferocity.

Sublimited war is exemplified by the strife existing in Vietnam today. Whether consisting of guerilla action, rioting, other forms of civil disturbance or the revolutionary means by which Castro seized Cuba, sublimited war is no Whether consisting of guerrilla action, by proxy—inside the borders of a victim country, carried on largely by that country's own citizens, with arms, munitions, organizational support and ideological goals supplied by the international Communist conspiracy.

Meeting the sublimited war threat is largely a military and intelligence task. For long we neglected it. Recent organizational and functional changes in U.S. military operations in Vietnam evidence serious attention now is being devoted to neutralizing Communist sublimited war efforts.

Success here will lead to further intensification of cold war, communism's last remaining battleground. The blunt truth is that as yet we remain woefully unprepared to contest communism successfully on the cold war battlefield. The Communists still continue making substantial cold war gains which reduce our influence and bring our prestige into question in various parts of the world.

The basic method for fighting any war, including cold war, is to, first, formulate sound objectives; second, develop supporting strategies and tactics; and, third, create, man, and support the organization required for their attainment.

The problem of properly organizing our cold war effort as a major enterprise on a scale for victory can no longer be neglected in public discussion. The fact that Americans, long noted for organizational talents and suffering serious cold war setbacks for over a decade and a half, have not effectively tackled this problem to date must be a matter of considerable surprise even to the Kremlin.

Past ineffectual efforts toward this end are evidenced by several reorganizations of the national security machinery of the executive branch. The National Security Council was established in 1947. Its composition and advisory status are well known. Its duty is to assess national objectives, commitments, and risks, and make recommendations to the President. The President alone has the broad power and authority required to initiate, integrate, and coordinate all the many activities which together fix the Nation's cold war posture. Once a Presidential decision on a given policy has been made in this area, it is transmitted to the various departments and agencies for action.

In an attempt to coordinate operational planning of these various governmental units, the Operations Coordinating Board was established within the National Security Council structure. Although it had the virtue of producing interagency Government plans to implement policy, it was ineffective to carry them out because it lacked authority to penetrate the many layers of Government bureaucracy blocking quick and coordinated action. As a result the Operations Coordinating Board was abolished.

Shortly after assuming office President Kennedy indicated his plans to carry out personally what the Board had failed to accomplish. He indicated he would maintain direct communication with the departments and agencies and keep himself well informed on actions taken to carry out decisions. To assist and advise him in this endeavor he selected a small group of individuals headed by his Special Assistant for National Affairs, McGeorge Bundy.

The dismal failure of the Cuban invasion at Bay of Pigs is but one example of the inadequacy of this latest attempt at cold war organization. The President simply does not have the time to run the cold war effort daily with personal attention and his advisory group does not have the authority to do so. In addition, the setup fails to provide comprehensive, up-to-the-minute intelligence, communications, briefings and analyses on which effective cold war command decisions must rely.

Perhaps the failure of Presidents Truman and Eisenhower to establish an adequate cold war organization is understandable. They were products of a pre-cold-war time and political environment which accepted peace and war as well defined and meaningful alternative conditions of international life.

In contrast, Mr. Kennedy has come to political maturity in an era during which our world has been characterized by desperate struggles between nations in the shadowy, gray areas of cold war. In his 1961 state of the Union message he evidenced an appreciation of the necessity to operate successfully in these areas by saying, "Before my term has ended, we shall have to test anew whether a nation organized and governed such as ours can endure."

Yet, over a year later, notwithstanding several routine organizational efforts, including recommendation of a Department of Urban Affairs, Mr. Kennedy has still to come to grips with the vital problem of workable organization for cold war.

It is not an insoluble problem even though it involves putting together into one task force the foreign affairs activities of more than a score of separate departments and agencies. The task force concept is ideal for cold war purposes. It can bring together the cold war operations of otherwise unrelated governmental units under coordinated, efficient, integrated operational control. Further, it permits them all an opportunity to contribute to long- and medium-range planning and take part in flexible response to unanticipated opportunities.

Inherent in the task force concept must be mechanics to insure that our cold war effort has balance, consistency, and completeness first, in the overall sense, second, country by country, and third, in the time dimensions: present, short range and long range.

Specifically it is recommended that the President act quickly to achieve the following cold war organizational objectives:

First. Establish a Strategic and Tactical Office of the Presidency—STOP—on the lines of a permanent cold war task force which will function to define our national cold war objectives, devise a series of operation plans for major functional and geographic areas according to sound strategy and tactics, and, under the President's authority, direct cold war operations pursuant thereto.

Second. Establish a Command Control Information Center—CCIC—within the structure of STOP to assist in the continuing daily review and direction of cold war operations.

Strategic and Tactical Office of the Presidency: Headed by the Vice President of the United States to give it maximum executive authority, this task force should consist of highly qualified and responsible representatives from the Under Secretary and Agency Administrator levels of the major functional areas of cold war interest: political, economic, informational, cultural, scientific, military affairs and the like. STOP's hard core operating units might include, but need not be limited to the following:

(a) Chief, Political Affairs—Under Secretary of State: Diplomatic Activity—State; domestic information releases—White House press; international labor activity—Labor; foreign liaison—State/CIA/USIA/FBI.

(b) Chief, Economic Affairs (Treasury Under Secretary): Financial Operations (Treasury/State/AID/Defense); commercial operations—Commerce/Labor/Agriculture; agricultural operations—Agriculture/Commerce/AID.

(c) Chief, Information Affairs—Administrator, USIA: Overseas psychological operations — USIA/CIA/Peace Corps; scientific operations — NASA/AEC/National Science Foundation/USIA.

(d) Chief, Cultural Affairs—Assistant Secretary of State: Cultural operations—State/USIA/AID/HEW; ideological positions — Cabinet/USIA/White House press.

(e) Chief, Military Affairs — Under Secretary of Defense: Military posture—Defense/Joint Chiefs; cold war posture—special evaluation panel/CCIC; secret operation, cover and deception—Defense/CIA.

Additionally, STOP's effective functioning would require a small but skilled permanent staff which might be directed by the President's Special Assistant for National Security Affairs. The staff's function would be to assist in long-range planning, perform daily routine supervision tasks, help dissipate bureaucratic inertia and aid the President and other national leaders to communicate clearly and forcefully our national cold war objectives and policies at home and abroad to people on both sides of the Iron Curtain whose beliefs and aspirations coincide with our own.

Command Control Information Center: The permanent staff also would operate the Command Control Information Center serving as a central facility to monitor worldwide activities for both long and medium range planning and day-to-day operations.

Information pertaining to our own cold war activities, those of our allies and of the Sino-Soviet bloc would be displayed concisely and currently for easy assimilation. The CCIC would analyze and evaluate progress of the cold war on a continuous basis and constantly monitor the success of our programs. It might be particularly valuable in spotting opportunities for quick, responsive actions to forward U.S. interests as they unexpectedly develop.

Information gathered and evaluated by CCIC well might be transmitted by closed circuit television and teleprinter systems so senior representatives of departments and agencies can be briefed, issue and receive information, and monitor daily activities without physically visiting the center. It is estimated that approximately 80 specialists will be required to man Command Control Information Center on an around-the-clock schedule. The most modern communications, display, and briefing equipment should be furnished CCIC.

The organization and procedures discussed here are intended only as a broad, skeleton outline of the management organization tools which are missing and must be supplied if the gaps and deficiencies in U.S. cold war efforts are to be closed.

Just as the President alone has the broad power and control of activities necessary for cold war operations, so does he alone have the power to initiate the organization here suggested as fundamentally required to exercise that power and control effectively. He should act promptly and decisively.

The time in which he has to act grows shorter and shorter. Continued weakness in our cold war posture can only result in a progressive deterioration of our military posture. The ignominious defeat suffered by France in World War II sprang from her concentration on Maginot line defenses. The Germans ignored them with a bypass move through the low countries. Similarly, in the struggle with communism we cannot safely concentrate only on its military aspects and our hot war defenses, leaving our cold war ramparts essentially disorganized and inadequately guarded.

The Congress, too, should give attention to its organization and procedures which need revising so that cold war responsibilities may be pinpointed rather than diffused. It is my intention to make legislative recommendations in this regard at a later time.

THE HONORABLE CARL HAYDEN

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. Morris K. Udall] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago last Wednesday my State, the State of Arizona, ended a 40-year quest for statehood. Throughout those decades, statehood was opposed by men as eminent as Daniel Webster who once described the territory of Arizona as a barren wasteland covered only by shifting sands and populated only by prairie dogs and rattlesnakes. Five days later—5 days after February 14, 1912, on another Monday, a young man about 35 years old got off a train here in Washington and took the oath of office as U.S. Congressman from Arizona. He is still here today. That man is Senator Carl Hayden, senior Senator from the State of Arizona. Today is an historic event. It is historic because this is the first time in the history of the U.S. Congress that any Member has ever completed one-half century of service. There have been several Members who have come close to this milestone, but no other Representative or Senator has ever achieved this record of service. I am proud that a Member from my State, which until 2 years ago was the baby State in the Union, was the one to do it. It has been estimated that some 4,000 Senators and Representatives have come and gone in the years since Carl Hayden first took his seat. He served under three Speakers in the House of Representatives—Champ Clark, of Missouri, Frederick Gillett, of Massachusetts, and Nicholas Longworth, of Ohio—prior to his election to the Senate in 1927.

There are only five Members of this body now serving who served with Carl Hayden when he was a Member of the House of Representatives. Those are the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson], the gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler], the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Cannon], the gentleman from New York [Mr. Taber], and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Martin]; and yet this amazing man is the dean of the Senate, having served in that body 6 years longer than the next Member in point of service. Mr. Hayden has served his country under Presidents Wilson, Harding, Coolidge, Hoover, Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy, and all of their various Vice Presidents.

When Carl Hayden came to Washington 50 years ago today to take his seat, he knew no Member of the House of Representatives. A friendly Congressman from Texas consented to walk with him into the well of this House when he took the oath of office.

This amazing gentleman, I might add, shows no sign of resting on his laurels; and, judging by the vitality with which he continues to serve his State and Nation, I would say he will add to this record for many years to come; in fact, there are people in Arizona who feel that one day he will celebrate his hundredth year of service in the U.S. Congress.

Let me, for the record, give a little background about Senator Hayden. He was born October 2, 1877, near a place called Hayden's Ferry, where his father had a mill, now called Tempe. He was educated in the public schools of Tempe, the Normal School of Arizona, and went on to Stanford University. He was a delegate to the Democratic National Convention in 1904. He was elected treasurer of Maricopa County in 1904 in territorial days, and sheriff of the county in 1906 and again in 1908. I might add that his history spans an amazing period of years. Here is a man who rode a horse, who carried a gun as a county sheriff in the territorial days of Arizona, and who has lived through the development of the automobile, the airplane, and into these troubled days we now live in.

Upon the admission of Arizona to statehood, he was elected to the 62d Congress. He was reelected seven times to this body and served until March 3, 1927. He was elected to the U.S. Senate in 1926, and was reelected in 1932, 1938, 1944, 1950, and 1956.

He tells the story that in his early days in the House here he told another Member he felt rather undressed and strange in Washington without wearing a gun. Of course he could not wear it onto the House floor. His colleague advised him that perhaps he should carry a couple of doorknobs in each pocket to make him feel more at home.

The Senator relates that when he first arrived in Washington he was given some advice by one of the older Members to the effect that there were two types of Congressmen and Senators, the workhorse and the show-horse. He says that he elected to become a workhorse. He has been one of the greatest workers in either House of Congress. He is an authority on reclamation and has probably done more in the interest of reclamation than any other person, living or dead.

Carl Hayden has the quality of humility, which is one of the essentials of greatness. He avoids publicity. It is said that he never holds a press conference. Last summer when I had less seniority and Carl Hayden had more than any other Member of either body, he nevertheless walked the half mile between his office and mine to welcome me to Washington and to offer his cooperation. His vitality remains undiminished.

This man knows the legislative processes as few others have ever learned them. He knows that legislation is a compromise; he knows that there must be give and take, and he knows how legislative work is accomplished.

In the course of his career in the Congress, Carl Hayden has seen tremendous changes in our country. History has moved in these years. There have been two great wars. Our people have gone from the farms to the cities. Vast transformation has occurred in our industry and our way of life. The United States which formerly was isolated from the pressures of the rest of the world has emerged as the world's greatest power and the leader of that part of the world which stands for freedom and self-government. In these years we have met enormous challenges in our economy, including a great depression that threatened our way of life. We have met these challenges and thereby refined our structure of government better to serve the people. As Burke said:

> A state without the means of some change is without the means of its conservation.

Carl Hayden knew this, and as a Representative and later a Senator, he played an important part in effecting the changes necessary to meet the challenges of the 20th century.

Today, when younger men born in this century—in fact, I was born 10 years after he first came to Congress—want to return us to the mythical world of the 19th century, Carl Hayden, who has a right to speak for that century, is a leader in advocating the changes dictated by the era in which we live. I am proud to serve with a man who has kept pace with our history as Carl Hayden has done.

The last 12 months has been a year of tragedies, and yet a year of fulfillment for Carl Hayden. Last summer his wife, Nan, whom he married in 1908, passed away—she was a wonderful and talented woman who had been close to him all of these years.

Last fall, President Kennedy honored Carl Hayden by coming to Phoenix to address a nonpartisan appreciation dinner honoring his long service in Congress, and through statehood celebrations which have been completed in Arizona he has been recognized for his valuable service to Arizona and the Nation.

Carl Hayden is a man who never looks back. He is still moving ahead. He is sharp, alert, and vital today. He has always had a sense of humor that is so essential in the tense and emotional work in which he has been engaged.

I would like to say, in concluding my brief remarks, that Carl Hayden through his continued service here in Washington is scoring a blow for economy in the Government. A few years ago the Congress passed a retirement plan for its own Members, and I am sure many citizens looked at the senior Members of the House and Senate and probably made some uncomplimentary remarks about them. But Senator HAYDEN was one of those senior Members who voted for that act, and probably took some criticism as a result. Yet he is still to collect his first dollar of retirement pay. And the way he is going I doubt that he ever will.

So, Mr. Speaker, lesser men have come and gone, but CARL HAYDEN continues to serve. I say that America needs more Carl Haydens.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago a young man stood here in the well of the House and took the oath of office as a Member of Congress.

He was really a tough hombre, as many western outlaws and desperadoes had learned to their sorrow. But as I looked at him standing there, with upraised hand, he looked hardly older than a high school boy.

At that time he was a very unimportant factor in the Government of the United States. He represented a new State which had been only 5 days in the Union and as he has since said, he felt he had much to learn. Today, as President pro tempore of the Senate, he is the third man in the right of succession to the Presidency of the United States, the greatest office ever conceived by the brain of man. And what is of more immediate concern, he is chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations. He rounds out today 50 years of uninterrupted service in the U.S. Congress. No Member of the House or Senate has ever served that long in the history of the Republic.

Gladstone's service as a Member of the House of Commons in the English Parliament was for a longer term of office than that of Senator HAYDEN, but it was an interrupted service. He had only 48 years of continuous service at any time during his career in the British Parliament. So, in length of continuous service, Senator HAYDEN has served not only longest in the American Congress, but so far as we are aware at this time, the longest sustained service of any member in the parliaments of the world.

He was sworn in as a routine procedure on a routine day in the House and through the years—without fanfare or screaming headlines—he has become one of the most influential and most useful Members of either body. He is the ideal legislator.

Speaker Clark who swore him in, and whom as he relates, he consulted then and later, epitomizing his advice to freshmen Congressmen, said:

> A man has to learn to be a Representative just as he must learn to be a blacksmith, a carpenter, a farmer, an engineer, a lawyer, or a doctor. The best rule is for a district to select a man young enough to learn and to grow, with at least fair capacity; industrious, honest, energetic, sober, and courageous, and keep him there so long as he discharges his duties faithfully and well. Such a man will gradually rise to high position and influence.

That has been the history of Senator HAYDEN. He conforms in every way and his career exemplifies in every respect the correctness of the statement made by the great Speaker.

Senator HAYDEN also entered service under a great President, President Taft. President Taft some years later reached the zenith of his career as Chief Justice of the United States and in the latter capacity was also able to evaluate the importance of the position of chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, now held by Senator HAYDEN.

It is related that the erection of the Supreme Court Building might have been delayed indefinitely but for the fact that Chief Justice Taft by personal importunity urged its planning, erection, and completion by appealing to the then chairman of the committee to provide this much needed building in time to permit him to have the honor and privilege of occupying it and presiding at the first session of the U.S. Supreme Court therein.

President Taft, speaking at a subsequent date, on the occasion of the anniversary of Speaker Joseph Gurney Cannon, of Illinois, said:

> The conscientious struggle which the chairman of the Appropriations Committee has to make in Congress—and it is conscientious—to keep down the expenditures within the possible revenues is a labor that no one can realize except those who come into close contact with the discharge of that responsibility. The character of the appropriation bills is not understood by the public, so that these bills cannot be referred to as a basis of great parliamentary reputation. And yet the fact is that in that committee harder and more conscientious work is done than in any other committee in Congress. Its members are struggling constantly against the human nature of their fellows, they are standing up against that which they have to recognize as the weakness of man, and they are not receiving any meed of praise from anybody, because everybody is against them for opposing appropriations—until after the session is over, and then everybody criticizes them because of the largeness of the appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, the 50 years in which Senator HAYDEN has served in the House and Senate have seen the greatest change in any like period of time in human history. More has happened, more changes have taken place, more perplexing issues have arisen, since Senator HAYDEN was sworn in as a Member of this House 50 years ago, than took place from the administration of President Washington down to that period. It is a period which grows in significance and importance—and in danger—with the years. We are to be congratulated; the country and the world are to be congratulated, that in these trying times, a man experienced and seasoned as Senator HAYDEN is experienced and seasoned, is in a position to be of such eminent service in solving the difficult problems which daily confront us.

In the language of Rip Van Winkle, "May he live long and prosper."

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL. I am delighted to yield to the Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. I join with the gentleman from Arizona and also the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee and other Members who have spoken and will speak in connection with paying a justified tribute to that great man and that great gentleman and that great American, that outstanding legislator from Arizona, Senator CARL HAYDEN. Not only has he served his State and our country with outstanding ability and great distinction, but his personality is an inspiration for all others to follow, particularly those in the legislative field. I treasure the friendship that exists between CARL HAYDEN and myself, a friendship that is close, a friendship based on respect, and I value the fact that as a Member of Congress I have been able to meet and to know this distinguished gentleman, this outstanding American. We of the House join with the Members of the Senate and his countless friends and admirers not only in Arizona but throughout the United States in congratulating CARL HAYDEN on his 50th anniversary as a Member of both branches of the Congress of the United States, and trust that God will bless him for countless years to come.

Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL. I thank the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure and honor to join in paying deserved tribute to the dean of the Senate, the Honorable CARL HAYDEN, of Arizona, a great American who has served his country in public office for a half century.

In comparative terms, our Republic is still young. Constitutionally, it is less than 200 years old, yet in 50 of those years CARL HAYDEN has served in the Congress of the United States—14 years in the House and 36 years in the Senate.

This is indeed a remarkable record in a free legislative body. Only a few men in all history can come close to matching it. Our late beloved Speaker, Sam Rayburn, had he lived would have completed 50 years of service on March 4, 1963. The dean of the House, the Honorable CARL VINSON, is now in his 48th year.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with CARL HAYDEN's many friends in this body and around the country in expressing congratulations and best wishes to him on this great day.

Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL. I yield to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy that the distinguished gentleman from Arizona has taken this time to pay tribute to one of the greatest men who ever served any legislative body in the entire world. Senator HAYDEN has had a distinguished career that goes back to the very foundation of his great State. He seems to be as eternal as the stars; and a great legislative star certainly he has always been.

Mr. Speaker, he is a kind man; he is a modest man. He is a hard worker. He has earned his spurs in the great legislative Halls of the Congress by hard and unostentatious work. The gentleman, as an Arizonian, and all of us as Americans, may be proud of the life and service of Senator Carl Hayden.

Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished majority leader. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, when I first came to the Congress, almost 40 years ago, Carl Hayden was a Member of the House. I can remember him as he moved about the House, but he seldom indulged in debate. But you could see that his service was productive, something that he could carry with him with pride down through the years.

Since he has been a member of the Committee on Appropriations in the other body and I have been going to conferences, I have met him a sufficient number of times so I believe I can say that I know him. Mr. Speaker, he is a gentleman of rare character, and very interesting to talk to. I think it is a fine thing for the House to take a little time today to honor Carl Hayden on the anniversary of his first service in the Congress of the United States and I pay my most sincere tributes to him.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a privilege and a pleasure to join in the tribute to my good friend Senator Carl Hayden. I first became acquainted with him when I was a freshman Member of the House, 37 years ago, when he was serving his State in the House. During that term, there developed between us a friendship that has endured through these many years.

What a singularly remarkable record Senator Hayden has achieved. A half century of service to his fine State, which he has represented with great ability and distinction ever since it was admitted to the Union. He has been a credit to the Nation, to Arizona, and to the Congress longer than any other man in history. He has been a powerful voice for a sound Government and he has saved the country billions of dollars through his careful scrutiny of Government spending.

There could be no greater tribute to the capacity and the integrity of an elected official than the fact that the people of his State have elected and reelected him ever since it attained statehood. As Carl Hayden begins his second half century of service, I wish him continued good health, happiness, and success in the work to which his life has been so zealously dedicated.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join with my colleagues in the House in paying tribute to my esteemed friend, Senator Carl Hayden, of Arizona, on this his 50th anniversary of service in the Congress of the United States. A half century is indeed a long time and for one to serve for that length of time in the Congress of the United States where service frequently depends on the caprice and whims of the voters is extraordinary. This evidence of the confidence of his constituents speaks louder than words of the many virtues of this great statesman. Senator Carl Hayden is a man of impeccable character, great wisdom, and charming personality. He is a stanch patriot, a distinguished legislator, and an eminent citizen. His long tenure of office is in itself a grand tribute to one of the noblest Americans of them all. Long may he live and continue to serve his people.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday I watched and heard Senator Carl Hayden on TV. I had been told that never before had the senior Senator from Arizona appeared on TV, such has been his adversion to anything smacking of the personal limelight. But yesterday on the memorable occasion of the completion of 50 years of service in the Congress of the United States he graciously, but reluctantly, capitulated to the wishes of a nation of his admirers and well-wishers.

I was thrilled as seldom before as I sat at my TV side. Here was America, the land of opportunity and of growth. Here speaking to me and millions of others, as though in our own homes, was a man born 84 years ago in a small cluster of homes called Hayden's Ferry, now the city of Tempe, home of the great State University of Arizona, born in a territory that would wait and grow another 35 years until attaining statehood, and which he had represented first in the House, then in the other body, for all the 50 years of its statehood. A half a century of dynamic growth, the expansion of a western territory with scant population into a rich and mighty State, all personified in the man who appeared before us on Sunday's TV, Senator Carl Hayden, the legislative architect of the destiny of the great State that came into statehood 35 years after his birth.

Carl Hayden will live in the history of the United States. He will be an inspiration to succeeding generations. All who saw him yesterday on TV were better Americans for having found in this man who had accomplished so much for his State, his Nation, and mankind a pattern of modesty and of humility in the best traditions of our Republic.

His appearance on TV was as refreshing as the breezes of a perfect day, as wholesome as the clear, clean winds that blow away the clouds.

Mr. Speaker, I think that my sister, living in Arizona in territorial years and during the 50 golden years of statehood, would not mind my repeating what she wrote me, that having voted for Carl Hayden in all the elections in Arizona for a half a century, she hoped to continue doing so for at least another quarter of a century. And as Senator Hayden said, when asked if he would be a candidate for reelection, "Why not?"

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, because the Committee on Armed Services was holding hearings on our defense posture, I was unable to be present here in the House to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the incomparable Senator Carl Hayden, the very distinguished senior Senator from Arizona.

For that reason I wish to take this opportunity to extend my congratulations to this very great and very outstanding American upon the occasion of his 50th anniversary as a Member of Congress.

Carl Hayden was a Member of the House of Representatives when I first entered the Congress in 1914. Today, Senator Hayden and I are the only Members of Congress, still serving, who were Members of the 63d Congress.

Yesterday, Senator Hayden achieved a monumental point in history, attaining the heretofore unequalled record of having served continuously as a Member of Congress for 50 years.

Carl Hayden has devoted a half a century of his life to the people of the United States and to the greatest legislative organization in the world.

I can well recall Representative Hayden as a Member of the House. He was active, energetic, efficient, and effective, but always in a quiet, unassuming, and dignified manner. At all times he was humble, and always willing to help his colleagues on every occasion.

I have watched Senator Hayden's remarkable career with increasing admiration from year to year. I well recall with sorrow at his leaving, but with pride in his achievement, when he left the House to become a U.S. Senator.

My respect and admiration for this great public servant has increased with each passing year.

I join with his admiring colleagues in the House and Senate, and his hundreds of thousands of devoted friends, in wishing him continued good health and success, and I sincerely hope that he will remain an active Member of the Congress of the United States for many, many years to come.

I hope that he will continue to make available to the American people his remarkable experience, his outstanding ability, and his high sense of integrity.

He is a man whom we could all emulate with honor and pride.

I offer him my sincerest congratulations on this very happy and precedent-shattering achievement.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, this week I will celebrate my 50th birthday. When I consider how old I sometimes feel, it is a refreshing thought to remember that Senator Carl Hayden began his legislative life in 1912 during the same week that I was born.

It is therefore with a certain amount of awe at this man's energy, strength, and endurance, that I take the floor today to salute him on the occasion of the completion of 50 years of distinguished service to his State and to the Nation.

The story of Carl Hayden is the story of the development of modern-day America. He first entered public service at the turn of the century at a time when most of the scientific advancements which we now take for granted had not yet been achieved. During his career in Congress the automobile, the telephone, the airplane, have all taken their place among the commonplace. And just this week the Nation which used horse and buggy when he was born has sent a man three times around the world at 17,000 miles per hour.

The increasing power which has come with America's increased material wealth has brought increased responsibility both at home and abroad. Senator CARL HAYDEN throughout his career has met these responsibilities with energy and imagination. His reputation as a legislator's legislator is well deserved. He has attained it and maintained it over a span of years which has seen many lesser men come and go. Many of those who have served in the Congress with CARL HAYDEN have received more publicity and more notoriety at any one particular moment in their political career. But in the long-term history of America his name will have a place above theirs. For while they made headlines he made progress.

What I am saying, in essence, is that while we celebrate today a quantitative record which CARL HAYDEN has established in the annals of American political history, what we should really celebrate are the many qualitative records which he has established during his long tenure. The example of service which he has set during the last 50 years is one to which we must all strive as we do our legislative jobs in the troublesome years ahead. I hope that we will have his leadership with us for many years to come.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I join with Senator HAYDEN's many other friends and colleagues in warmest and heartiest congratulations on his 50th anniversary in the Congress of the United States.

It has been my privilege to have a rather close association with the Senator during the last several years as his vice chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing. I have greatly benefited from that association.

Never have I had anyone be more kind and considerate, both personally and officially, than Senator HAYDEN. In deepest sincerity, I say that Senator HAYDEN is one of the most lovable characters I have ever known, and I wish for him many more years of devoted service to our country and to the great responsibilities which he carries in the Senate of the United States. It is an inspiration to know a man of such great stature and influence but who is also humble and modest. Senator HAYDEN is an example of one who, having great power and authority, uses it sparingly, carefully, and responsibly. To me, this is the principal attribute of greatness.

I extend warmest congratulations to Senator HAYDEN and to the State of Arizona and our entire Nation for the opportunity of his wisdom and his services.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, the greatest single truth about the life of Senator CARL HAYDEN, of Arizona, is that his career reflects credit on us all.

CARL HAYDEN and men like him have built into the Senate of the United States its profound reputation for the only aristocracy the democratic process encourages—the aristocracy of character. Because of him his State has been helped to enviable growth. That same influence of his strong but unspectacular statesmanship has, in the massive accumulation of the years, yielded spectacular benefits to the country and the legislative method.

Here is a half century of service in the Congress—the longest in history, for which in this document we seek to honor him—eight terms in the House and six in the Senate, that makes Senator HAYDEN our elder statesman in the most meaningful sense of the term. More than that he is the grand old man who, through merit, enjoys from his colleagues, his constituents, even his opponents, all that any man can hope for in the way of affection, or respect, or both.

To his own generation and to generations yet to come he is an object lesson in selfless dedication to the public good. Men in political life, striving for public office, will marvel at the example he set for winning the wholehearted endorsement of his constituency again and again and again, without any of the devices of display and self-promotion which so many find indispensable for attracting deserved public recognition.

The record will validate my statement that there is hardly a piece of legislation of any consequence in CARL HAYDEN's 16 years in the House and 34 years in the Senate that does not, at some point, bear the mark of his wisdom, his counsel, his persuasive and amicable collaboration. Yet in a half century of legislative history he made no more than a total of three speeches. He took his seat in the House when Arizona became a State in 1912. A descendant of colonial Americans he has been written about as the only real-life frontiersman still in public life. His father, a Connecticut Yankee, brought 14 cattle-drawn wagons over the Santa Fe Trail in 1848 and CARL HAYDEN was the first white child born in the town his father founded, then called Hayden's Ferry, now Tempe.

Young HAYDEN, in a rifle match in 1911, won the national long-range title by scoring 15 bulls-eyes out of 15 at 1,000 yards. And he had been the Maricopa County sheriff before he became a Congressman. He was a major of Infantry in World War I. One can think of him taking his education at what is now Arizona State University and at Stanford, in California. But it is difficult to think of CARL HAYDEN carrying a gun, much less using it.

Sagacity and tolerance, plus a genius for conciliation, have been his great weapons, not violence—physical or forensic. My association with him on the Joint Committee on Printing is a highlight in my experiences as a Member of the House. He is an inspiring chairman, and a force for understanding and objectivity in the complex work of the Joint Committee on Printing.

In a State having a large Indian population it was he, a champion of social security, who fought and won for the Indians their right to come under its benefits. HAYDEN may be said to have joined a divine partnership with Almighty God to preserve His scenic wonders in Arizona. Together they turned green and verdant the parched lands of the desert through legislation HAYDEN sponsored and saw enacted into law. His strategic espousal of better and badly needed highways can be seen, for example, in the Hayden-Cartwright bill of 1934 that bears his name. His workaday contribution to our legislative history is immense.

Great tributes will be paid CARL HAYDEN, of Arizona, down through the years. None will be greater than the monument he built to himself by his achievement and his character.

A PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE OF THE ORGANIZATION FOR ECONOMIC COOPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today for appropriate reference House Concurrent Resolution 425, expressing the sense of Congress that a parliamentary conference of the 20 member nations of the new Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development be established. This resolution calls upon the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Senate Committeee on Foreign Relations to establish special subcommittees for the purpose of jointly exploring, with appropriate officials of the Government of the United States, the OECD, and members of the parliaments of the other member nations, the desirability and feasibility of such a conference.

WHY A PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE?

Such a parliamentary conference will provide a valuable adjunct, at the legislative level, to the OECD. The sessions of the NATO Parliamentarians Conference, and of our parliamentary conferences with Mexico and Canada, have been markedly successful.

A parliamentarians' group is most essential in the case of OECD because of the clear intent in the discussions setting up the organization that it is to be primarily a consultative body with very limited powers. Specifically, in the OECD Convention the nations involved agreed to consult together on a continuing basis and where appropriate take coordinated action. It also provides that no such coordinated action shall be binding on any individual member nation until it has complied with the requirements of its own constitutional procedures. In the United States this would, of course, involve the Congress or at least the Senate. It is thus important that Members of Congress have an opportunity to discuss and deliberate on these problems while solutions and decisions are in the formative stage. A parliamentary conference would provide just such an opportunity.

THE NEED FOR CONGRESSIONAL PARTICIPATION

It is particularly important to the Members of Congress to have a parliamentarians' group because of the different nature of the systems of government in the United States and the other member countries. While the Cabinet members and Ministers who attend the OECD official meetings as delegates from the European countries and Canada are almost always members of their nation's legislatures, our delegates are not. This is because of our historic tradition of separation of powers, based on the constitutional prohibition that no Member of Congress can hold a position in the executive branch. The European tradition is just the opposite. In some countries, the entire cabinet must come from the legislature.

Mr. Speaker, I approved enthusiastically of U.S. participation in the OECD Convention last year, but I am very sympathetic with the worries which were expressed at that time by some of my colleagues. These worries were based on this very separation of powers problem I have just outlined.

For example, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS] said on the floor of the House on February 23, 1961:

> Decisions having far-reaching effects upon our industries, our workers, and our farmers would be reached thousands of miles away, completely out of the range of the eyesight or influence of the representatives they had elected to Congress. These representatives, in fact, would not be acquainted with the agenda or the order of business of the OECD; that is, the OECD would not deal with the Congress or the representatives of the people in considering the agenda that was proposed to be passed upon.
>
> If the representatives of the people ever knew about it, the burden would be upon them to find out for themselves. They would have no opportunity to voice even an opinion on the questions that would come before the international organization. In their place, in the place of these representatives of the people, would be delegates of the State Department and they would not be responsive to the electorate.

A conference such as I propose would greatly lessen the burden which would be placed upon us—as elected representatives—to keep informed about OECD developments.

It would give us an opportunity to voice to representatives from the other nations involved the opinions which the gentleman from Georgia feared we would be denied. In such vital questions as those which OECD will consider, an opportunity for these discussions is a necessity.

THE BACKGROUND OF OECD

The existence of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development presents great hopes for the future. It is a significant extension of the Atlantic Community which has—up till now—been centered on the military alliance embodied in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and in the Organization for European Economic Cooperation created in 1948 to carry out the European recovery plan—the Marshall plan. Before discussing the OECD it is relevant to look a little at that background.

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization was organized along military lines to unite the United States and her allies in a military response to the Communist menace in Europe.

NATO and the American program of aid to Greece and Turkey were two of the main military steps we took to stem the advance of communism into a war-torn Europe. These were, indeed, vital steps. But NATO has not been a completely successful entity for cooperation on economic matters because of its military nature and because of the absence of such important nations as Switzerland and Sweden from its membership.

The Organization for European Economic Cooperation was created by the Western European countries meeting in Paris as a result of the 1947 proposal by Gen. George Marshall to extend economic assistance to them. This assistance was to be coordinated by OEEC in an attempt to rebuild the war-torn area and get it back on its feet economically. It is now well known how much it exceeded all hopes and expectations. The countries were rebuilt, and have—within the framework of OEEC and other organizations such as the European Payments Union—made great achievements in increasing production and trade, and in arriving at extensive currency convertibility.

With European recovery a well-established fact, the OEEC has in recent years tried more and more to raise its sights.

The member nations had pledged themselves to promote production, to reduce barriers to trade, and to strive for financial stability and full employment. However, neither the United States nor Canada were members of OEEC. It became increasingly obvious during the late 1950's that the increasing economic interdependence between the economies of Western Europe and those of Canada and the United States required some completely new form of economic cooperation.

ORIGINS OF OECD

Looking toward the future, the United States proposed in late 1959 that a new organization be formed to promote closer cooperation among the members of an expanded Atlantic Community on policies toward economic growth, expanded aid to the developing countries, and expanded trade.

After extensive negotiations between 18 European nations, and the United States and Canada, the final treaty setting up the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development was approved December 14, 1960. Hearings were held by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on February 14 and 15, 1961, and the Senate officially ratified U.S. membership on March 16, 1961.

The members of the OECD at this time are the six countries of the Common Market—France, Belgium, Netherlands, Luxembourg, Italy, and Germany; the seven members of the European Free Trade Association—Austria, Switzerland, Denmark, United Kingdom, Sweden, Norway, and Portugal; Iceland, Ireland, Greece, Turkey, and Spain; and Canada and the United States.

GOALS OF THE OECD: GROWTH

The goals of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development as outlined in its charter, are to maintain a high growth rate, improve cooperation on aid to developing areas, and to expand trade. While not explicitly a goal, it is understood that solutions to these problems depend in part on a system of mutual solutions to avoid balance of payments problems.

The free world is faced with a challenge greater than free people have ever faced before. The Communist bloc of nations calls us to contest in numberless areas of the world. In all these contests, sustained economic growth is the key ingredient to strength and to success. The Communist nations have specifically hurled the challenge in growth terms. The nations of the West have accepted it in those terms. Coordination of our policies is important to attaining this growth.

TRADE

The Common Market is booming along. In the years immediately ahead, it will eliminate its internal tariffs and will establish a common external tariff.

Meanwhile, the countries of the European Free Trade Association, led by the United Kingdom, are seeking, or are about to seek, association with the Common Market. Both the Common Market, and its current enlargement, have been major objects of U.S. foreign policy. Historically, the hope of European unity goes back to Charlemagne.

But, ironically, the Common Market encourages a European particularism at just the time when what is needed is a free world generalism. If we let the Common Market erect its external tariff wall, and stop there, we shall have split the free world into enclaves at just the time when we should have been moving toward a free world community.

As the Common Market reduces its internal tariffs toward zero, and works toward a common external tariff, it cannot help but hamper exports from the United States and the rest of the free world outside the Common Market. The United States and other third-country exporters are going to find the booming Western European market increasingly difficult to infiltrate. This is particularly true of the countries of Latin America which, as competitors of the former European colonies in Africa, will suffer from the special treatment those African nations will receive.

Expanding U.S. exports is the best way to bring our international payments into balance. Yet the loss to U.S. exports by reason of the Common Market, as enlarged, has been conservatively estimated at $800 million a year.

Currently, our exports are running at the rate of roughly $20 billion a year and our imports at the rate of $15 billion. Yet we have a deficit in our balance of payments because of the many obligations—both military and economic—which we have assumed around the globe. These obligations benefit all the nations of the Common Market and of the OECD. Those nations must realize that if we are ever to balance our payments, we must expand our exports.

The OECD provides a forum in which we can seek ways to convince them of this, and to arrive at new trade expansion policies.

AID

Because the improvement of assistance to the developing areas of the world is so important, the countries which are providing a substantial amount of aid had already organized the Development Assistance Group before the OECD was fully in existence.

The work of this organization, which was always destined to be taken over by the OECD Development Assistance Committee, is a very important aspect of OECD.

Since World War II, the United States has lent or given $85 billion in foreign aid. Of this total, $56.5 billion has been in purely economic aid, and $28.5 for direct military aid or economic aid to areas in which we have a direct defense interest.

Nearly half of the $85 billion in both economic and military aid has gone to Western Europe. Now that these countries are once again strong, and the horizons of our aid needs expanded, it is fitting that they should join with us in aiding other nations. The United States cannot alone provide for future aid needs. OECD provides the forum in which we can work with the economically prosperous Atlantic countries to increase their contributions in a measure commensurate with their international reserve and payments positions and their level of total production.

PAYMENTS

Solutions to all their problems must have as their underpinnings an accompanying policy of mutual support against payments crises. The countries of the free world today hold their monetary reserves partly in gold and partly in convertible currencies. The great bulk held in currencies is in the form of either dollars or pounds sterling.

Monetary reserves are necessary because no country can have a continuous balance in its international transactions with the rest of the world. The amounts needed increase as trade expands and, particularly, as it becomes ever easier to transfer money freely from one country to another. When a country's payments exceed its receipts over a period as long as a year, its balance of payments is said to be in deficit.

Until the mid-1950's, the United States held to a deliberate policy of incurring deficits so that the rest of the free world could buy from us and also build their own monetary reserves. Since 1958, we have had larger deficits, but for a variety of reasons. For one thing, while we have almost always sold more goods to others than we have bought from them, this merchandise trade surplus narrowed in some years. At the same time, we continued to make large expenditures for defense and for foreign aid. In 1960-61, our trade surplus rose substantially, but there is concern that we shall not be able to maintain it. Exports to Western Europe may not continue to rise as new tariff barriers are raised against us, and as American firms do more and more of their manufacturing inside the Common Market tariffs walls.

It is, therefore, encouraging that the OECD now provides an opportunity for us to coordinate our efforts to create a free world "one for all, all for one" community of interest on payments matters.

EXISTING INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUPS

The United States now participates in four interparliamentary groups—the Interparliamentary Union, the NATO Parliamentary Group, the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group, and the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group.

The Interparliamentary Union, founded in 1889, is the oldest. Its membership has grown from 9 nations in 1889 to more than 60 today. Incidentally, it is the only parliamentary group which includes both members from the United States and U.S.S.R. The most recent meeting, at Brussels in September 1961, was attended by 20 members from the United States, 10 from the Senate and 10 from the House. It meets annually and is represented on the United Nations Economic and Social Council. Its aim is to further better relations "through the study of international law, international organization, reduction of armaments, economic problems, intercultural relations, social questions, and particularly, the evolution of the representative system of government."—Brief history of the Interparliamentary Union, Library of Congress, 1957.

The NATO Parliamentarians' Group was formed on a permanent basis in 1956. Members of the U.S. group are restricted to 18, 9 from each body. Its most recent meeting was at Paris last November.

The Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group was established in 1959, after the return of a special mission to Canada by two then members of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs—the gentleman from Arkansas, Mr. Hays, and the gentleman from Maine, Mr. Coffin. Membership is not to exceed 24, half from the Senate and half from the House. Its last meeting was in Quebec in February 1961.

The Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group was established in 1960. As with the Canadian group, membership is not to exceed 24, half from each body. Its first meeting was held at Guadalajara, Jalisco, Mexico, in February 1961.

The proposed OECD Parliamentary Conference would in no way conflict with these four existing interparliamentary groups, each of which serves a specialized purpose of its own.

The text of the House Concurrent Resolution 425 follows:

> Whereas the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development came into official existence on September 30, 1961, replacing the OEEC; and
>
> Whereas the United States is a full member of the OECD with Canada and 18 European governments; and
>
> Whereas the OECD will create a strong new economic tie between Western Europe and North America and will mark a new era in free world economic cooperation and progress; and
>
> Whereas the OECD will provide a forum in which its members may consult on questions of international trade, the advancement of developing areas, the strengthening of systems of international payments, and the promotion of policies designed to foster in each country the maximum employment, economic growth and price stability; and
>
> Whereas the discussions and decisions of the OECD will be of deep concern to the Parliaments of the member countries and to the constituencies thereof: be it
>
> *Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*; That, it is the sense of Congress that an OECD Parliamentary Conference be established, to be composed of representatives of the Parliaments of the member countries who shall meet jointly for discussion of the aims of the Organization and methods of achieving them; and
>
> That, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs shall establish subcommittees for the purpose of jointly exploring with appropriate officials of the U.S. Government, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, and with members of the Parliaments of the OECD nations, the desirability and feasibility of establishing an OECD Parliamentary Conference.

THE HONORABLE CARL HAYDEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. Rhodes] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure and an honor to join with the other Members of the House in commemorating the 50th anniversary of the day a great American took the oath as the first Member of the House of Representatives to represent the new State of Arizona. Of course, I refer to a fine gentleman who is now the senior Senator from Arizona, the Honorable Carl Hayden.

Carl Hayden has represented the State of Arizona in one or the other Houses of Congress ever since Arizona became a State. As has been said, he has seen the growth of the State of Arizona from a frontier community to the fine member of the Union of States which it now is. Here is a man who has served 50 years as a Member of the Congress of the United States. In those 50 years we have fought World War I; we have gone through the great depression; we fought World War II and we fought the Korean war. Since 1954, Senator Hayden has been chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the U.S. Senate, a position which I am sure we all recognize as one which is second in power and responsibility to very few positions in the Government. He is a man who has, I think, been able to keep his preeminent position in the hearts and on the ballots of the people of the State of Arizona because of the kind of man he is. In the first place, he has never forgotten who sent him to Washington. He has never forgotten that it is the people of Arizona to whom he owes his first loyalty after his overriding loyalty to our great American Republic. He has never forgotten that he owes his position to their good will, and to their continued awareness of and appreciation for his great efforts in their behalf.

Carl Hayden approaches his great job and the great responsibilities which it gives to him with a sense of deep humility. If there is one trait which predominates in the nature of CARL HAYDEN, it would be humility. He has never yet been accused, by anyone of being conceited, proud, puffed up, or too good for the people back home. This is true in spite of the many honors and privileges which have been his. Instead, he has always felt that the honors and privileges have come to him as the result of the gift of the people of the United States and of the people of Arizona, and that all the honor — whatever there might be in the way in which he has carried out his job—belongs to the people who sent him here. It has been stated that he has shunned publicity and this is true. He has no desire to make a "Federal case" of any votes that he has cast. In fact, another facet of his character which has insured his political success has been his penchant for playing down the votes which he has cast or which he has not cast.

The people of Arizona have always been told whenever they wanted to know how he had cast a vote; but certainly he was never one either to beat his chest about having done as they wanted him to, or to make undue noise about having, in good conscience, gone against what appeared to be the will of a majority of the people back home. In this way he has avoided entanglement in unnecessary arguments.

Here is a man who, in my opinion, epitomizes the best in the traditions of the House of Representatives, the Senate, and the government of the State of Arizona. It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that during the time CARL HAYDEN has served in the Congress, five other great Arizonians have served in the Senate.

The first two Senators to represent the State of Arizona were Marcus Aurelius Smith and Henry Fountain Ashurst. In 1920 Ralph Henry Cameron became a Senator, and afterward Ralph Henry Cameron was the unsuccessful candidate for reelection in 1926 when CARL HAYDEN went to the U.S. Senate. Since that time Senator Hayden has served with Ernest W. McFarland as a colleague, and with the present junior Senator from Arizona, Barry Goldwater.

During that time there have been eight Members of the House of Representatives from the State of Arizona. After Senator HAYDEN went to the Senate, Hon. Lewis W. Douglas was elected as a Member of the House. Lewis Douglas served as a Member of the House until 1933 when he became Director of the Budget and later became Ambassador to the Court of St. James. He was succeeded by Isabel Greenway who, in turn, was succeeded by John R. Murdock. In 1942, when Arizona got two Congressmen, Richard F. Harless became the second Congressman. He was succeeded in 1948 by Harold A. Patten, who was succeeded in 1954 by Hon. Stewart L. Udall, now Secretary of the Interior, who, in his turn, was succeeded by his brother, Morris K. Udall, who is now Representative of the Second District and my able colleague.

My predecessor was the Honorable John R. Murdock, as fine a gentleman as ever lived. I met John Murdock on the streets of Phoenix last fall, and John said:

> Will you please on February 19 next year take a special order and say something about the great services of CARL HAYDEN?

He said:

> In 1940 and in 1950 I took special orders and reviewed CARL's career on the floor of the House, and I hope that this practice will be carried on.

Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to join in doing this with my colleague from Arizona, and I hope that in 1972 some Representative from the State of Arizona will stand on this floor as we have today and recall again the great service of Senator CARL HAYDEN who will then have completed his 50th year representing the State of Arizona in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 530, A RESOLUTION TO DISAPPROVE REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1962 TO ESTABLISH A DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS AND HOUSING TO BE CALLED UP WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 21

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I take this occasion to advise the House that it is my intention on Wednesday next as the author of House Resolution 530, and pursuant to the rules of the House and the terms of the Reorganization Act of 1949, to call up House Resolution 530, which is a resolution of disapproval of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962, to establish a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

I had a talk with one of the members of the Government Operations Committee on the other side and advised him that I was going to do this. I do not see Mr. DAWSON, the chairman of our committee on the floor, and this I regret. I wish he were here, but it is necessary to give as much advance notice as possible so that the membership can arrange their affairs accordingly.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, of course the distinguished gentleman from Michigan is acting within his rights and prerogatives under the rules of the House in having this matter called up unexpectedly on Wednesday next.

Personally, I had hoped that the matter would go over until next week, and I did not know until a few minutes ago that the gentleman did intend to bring this matter up after we had already announced the program for this week. But I say that purely expressing my own views in respect to what I had hoped would happen. The gentleman is definitely within his rights.

The gentleman knows full well that this will mean that we will have to postpone consideration of the manpower bill which had been programed for Wednesday, and it will mean that the House will have to meet for legislative business on George Washington's Birthday, which is next Thursday, and on Friday, unless the manpower bill is disposed of on Thursday.

I take this time merely to advise the Members of the House we had not anticipated this matter would be called up at this time, and also to put Members of the House on notice of this change in the program. I may say this was entirely unexpected when we announced the program last week, and it was unexpected until a few minutes ago.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I do not see anything wrong about working on Washington's Birthday. I think if George Washington, former President of the United States, could come back to earth, he would heartily approve of this House working once in a while—just once in a while, and even on his birthday.

MAJ. JAMES C. ELLIOTT

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, the call to active duty last fall of Reserve and National Guard units of the Army, Navy, and Air Force undoubtedly caused a great many hardships. Generally speaking, the reservists themselves accepted without complaint the personal discomforts which they experienced, and the upheavals caused their families, because they recognized that there was then a need for bolstering our military strength in the face of threats to our security and to world peace.

Among the Air Force reservists in that recall is a young journalist from my district, Maj. James C. Elliott. He has written a splendid article, "To Maintain the Peace," which appeared in the January issue of Air Force and Space Digest. I commend this article to those of you who have not already read it. It will give you a better understanding of the readiness of our Reserve forces and of their dedication to duty, as well as a greater appreciation of the tremendous contribution which the reservists make to our Nation's defense.

HIGHER CONSUMER PRICES: REDUCED MARKET FOR DAIRY PRODUCTS INHERENT IN KENNEDY FARM PROGRAM

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. RIEHLMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the farm bill proposed by Secretary of Agriculture Freeman and his chief economic advisor, Prof. Willard Cochrane, is a complete example of the all-encompassing "supply-management" life the U.S. Department of Agriculture envisions for American farmers.

In the view of these theorists—many of whom probably see themselves as czars in this supply-management world—all farmers should be told what to do, how to do it, when to do it, and—indeed—whether to do it at all.

Secretary Freeman and company see supply management as the end-all answer to all problems. They ignore the lessons of history—Government controls simply will not work. They choose, instead, to urge that all we need to remedy our farm ills is a set of iron-clad controls that use economic coercion to compel conformity.

They imply, too, that these controls will not raise the price of food paid by consumers, but it is obvious the Secretary of Agriculture is promoting ideas which must result in higher cost food.

If the Secretary's bill ever should become law, efficient dairy producers would be cut back and producers who are streamlining their operations would be forced to abandon plans to enlarge their herds. The result has to be inefficient production and inefficient production necessarily must mean higher costs to the farmer. In turn, these higher costs are passed on to the consumers.

I think it can be said that higher milk prices would result in lower consumption. A dropping consumption pattern already is plaguing the dairy business. We all know that milk needs a sale stimulus, not a deterrent as harsh as higher prices.

We already have in our history a good example of the fate of a dairy product that priced itself out of a first run market. All of us can remember when butter was the product used in most households of the Nation.

But, under the strain of war conditions, butter became so high in price that millions of housewives turned to a substitute. Today, that substitute far outsells butter.

All I am trying to say here is that price is a most important factor in the choices made by every housewife every week of the year. We can predict quite readily that higher milk prices would mean lower consumption—and here again, the dairy farmer would be the loser because higher prices would bring about lower consumption of milk and dairy products.

The Secretary of Agriculture seeks to bring about this inefficient farming because of a half billion dollar Government inventory of surplus dairy products which he has played a significant role in acquiring. To remedy this problem which he has helped create, he now asks Congress to provide for regimentation of farmers to a degree never before contemplated this side of the Iron Curtain. We may be able to help solve the problem, Mr. Speaker, but it will be a sorry day for this Nation if we do so by accepting the suggestions of the present Secretary of Agriculture.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. RIEHLMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the 44th anniversary of the restoration of Lithuanian independence was observed on February 16. I always greet this and similar occasions with mixed feelings of pride and sadness.

I am proud to join with lovers of freedom throughout the world in saluting the Lithuanian people whose great spirit and yearning for liberty are as strong as ever. I am proud to reaffirm my dedication to the cause of independence, not alone in Lithuania but in all the captive European nations. I am honored to be able to pay tribute in some small way to the examples of courage and determination which the Lithuanian people have set for the world. I am glad to join hundreds of millions of people the world over in the fervent hope that Lithuania will once again soon take her place in the community of free nations.

At the same time I am deeply saddened that the Lithuanian people must continue to bear the terrible yoke of Communist oppression. I am saddened that these people are prisoners, deprived of the most basic human freedoms, in their own homeland. I am saddened that, in spite of the terrible destruction and bloodshed on this earth these last 50 years and in spite of the loss of so many young lives in pursuit of the cause of freedom for all, there is still a substantial portion of this earth in which mankind is under the domination of a murderous, godless, totalitarian dictatorship.

Our hearts go out to the Lithuanian people the world over, in whom the flame of liberty still burns brightly. I know we all look forward as one person to the day when freedom will reign on earth.

EXTENDING A JOB THAT IS DONE

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. TEAGUE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, the Rural Electrification Administration was created by Executive Order No. 7037 of May 11, 1935, under authority of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935, approved April 8, 1935. REA became a part of the Department of Agriculture under the Reorganization Plan No. 2, effective July 1, 1939. This was the beginning of REA, and being born out of the emergencies of the depression, it was designed to do a job which the general economy could not do at that time. Because of the serious shortage of capital for investment purposes, the public utilities were unable to do the job. They were further restrained by State commissions to increase rates to expand existing systems. Largely because of this, the Government was called upon to do a job private enterprise was unable to do under existing regulations. There was no disposition on the part of the city user to increase his electric bill to build transmission lines to serve his country cousin.

At that time only about 10 percent of all farms were electrified. There was an urgent need to extend electrical service into the rural areas. The intent, however, was to be of a temporary nature and to serve a temporary need. However, under subsequent changes, the law authorized REA to refinance certain rural electrification obligations owed to the Tennessee Valley Authority. The basic act was broadened and REA began to take on new dimensions. After World War II, there was a great expansion in the development of private utilities which could have satisfied the rural demands for electricity. The REA was not about to withdraw from this activity. Temporary ventures take on permanency and sponsors become zealot advocates.

With 2 percent money for 35 years available from the Government, REA was in a favored position financially to compete with private companies who are limited on the one hand by the rates they can charge, and on the other hand, by the availability of investment capital.

It is no surprise that REA development has been expanding and the need for additional Federal funds has increased. REA now has taken on an attitude of permanency though the original task of electrifying rural America has largely been accomplished. It is reported that nearly 98 percent of all farms now have electricity. With this task accomplished, REA is now looking for new fields of activity. The New Frontier has broadened the criteria for measuring the desirability of REA-financed cooperative generation and transmission facilities. REA will now approve feasible generation and transmission loans if it is necessary to protect the distribution systems. This action indicates the direction in which REA is intending to go under the New Frontier—more government into more things. Encouragement is also given for REA-financed participation in rural areas development.

Now, the New Frontier is advocating amending the REA Act of 1936, as amended, to provide that the revolving fund technique for accounting be used. This is a part of the 1962 version of the Cochrane-Freeman farm bill. The result of such an amendment would be to perpetuate the REA and to dilute congressional control over its programs.

Senate Document No. 11 gives the following as disadvantages of revolving funds:

> Several disadvantages have also been mentioned in connection with proposals to finance public enterprise activities by revolving funds. They include:

> 1. The financing of programs by revolving funds rather than by the usual appropriation procedures generally tends to dilute congressional control over such programs. This lessening of congressional control stems from the fact that, under the revolving fund method of financing, the determination of the size of operations so financed effectively passes to the agency so long as it can generate sufficient revenues to match its operating expenditures. Any contemplated expansion of the operations of a Government activity should be acted upon by the Congress, through the annual appropriation processes, based on consideration of the agency's financial and operating plans.
>
> 2. Establishment of a revolving fund for an activity provides permanent financing similar to the permanent capital of a Government corporation. In this respect, there is no essential difference between a Government corporation and a revolving fund. The revolving funds thus far proposed are without tenure, i.e., without any terminal date. Thus, financial means would be provided for self-perpetuation of these Government activities.

I agree with this analysis and urge that steps be taken to reduce rather than expand REA activities and weaken rather than strengthen its permanency.

ECONOMIC RECOVERY

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOX] may extend his ramarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, on February 2, 1961, the President sent to the Congress a program for economic recovery and growth in which he stated:

> The immediate subsistence needs of the people of these economically depressed areas must be met.

At the time of those words Congress was considering legislation to improve the economic status of communities and provide new job opportunities for people seeking work. Subsequently on May 1, 1961, the Area Redevelopment Act became law. Since that time six counties in the Upper Peninsula of the 11th Congressional District of Michigan, which I represent, have received provisional approval of their economic plans from the Area Redevelopment Administration. As a prerequisite of final consideration more detailed economic plans must be submitted to ARA within 1 year. It would seem to me then that already with some 10 months passed these depressed areas are going to have to wait another 12 months before they receive the final go ahead sign from ARA.

Knowing of this delay in what Congress was led to believe would be immediate assistance to areas with substantial and chronic unemployment I was quite amazed to read in the Washington Post of February 10, 1962, that the Agency for International Development had granted a $6 million loan to Peru to provide jobs for 30,000 unemployed workers in a depressed area for 1 year.

I include below the article to which I refer.

> [From the Washington Post, Feb. 10, 1962]
>
> PERU GETS AID $6 MILLION LOAN
>
> The Agency for International Development yesterday granted a $6 million loan to Peru to provide jobs for 30,000 unemployed workers in a depressed area of southern Peru for a year.
>
> The money will come from a special fund set up by Congress to help friendly countries meet emergencies, the Agency said. Through the creation of jobs on road, irrigation, and school projects, it said, the loan will benefit about 150,000 persons in the area.

How quickly the administration seems to respond to distress calls from foreign countries, but how slow the administration responds to the distress calls from areas in the United States.

WHY MARKETING QUOTA PROGRAMS FOR FEED GRAINS ARE IMPOSSIBLE

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise on the floor of the House today to protest most vigorously the impossibility of expecting feed grain growers to accept the decisions of a referendum as planned in H.R. 10010, the administration's farm bill.

I call the attention of this House to the fact that back in 1954 when corn farmers only were faced with marketing quotas the Congress eliminated such provision from the law. The Congress wisely did this because they fully understood from protests received from farmers in the Corn Belt that marketing quotas on corn could not possibly be enforced. Many Members of this House do not realize that most corn and feed grains are fed right on the farm or adjoining farms. Better than 75 percent of corn produced never goes through a market but is converted right on the farm into delicious beef steak, pork chops, dairy, poultry, and turkey products. This is the real reason most all consuming Americans have such a wonderfully balanced and delicious diet. Under the administration's farm bill, this might all come to an end. Obviously, if you are going to regiment by force farmers that produce and feed their own feed grains, you ultimately must also control the great livestock industry. After the failure of the basic commodity programs as evidenced by the size of the CCC surplus, why should anyone want to encompass the livestock industry in the same mess? The answer is no one that really understood feed grain and livestock agriculture would ever suggest such a program. Only the dreamer with no sense of practicability could suggest marketing quotas for feed grains.

It is apparent to anyone that understands feed grain and livestock agriculture that in all probability if the alternatives suggested in the administration's farm bill, H.R. 10010, were ever put to a vote of all feed grain and livestock producers who are affected, it would fail. However, the rigors in designing this bill do not propose to let livestock people vote even though they are the most affected of any group. The alternative in the referendum for feed grain growers is "pistol whipping," never seen before by any responsible Cabinet official.

Under H.R. 10010, the alternative to the controls for feed grain growers is complete loss of price support, no chance for land retirement payments, and the threat of dumping up to 10 million tons of feed grains out of CCC stocks annually into the open market. Ten million tons means about 350 million bushels of grain. Obviously, such a dumping exercise carried out by the Secretary of Agriculture would wreck the feed grain market. Such a threat is an insult to farmers in this country that produce feed grain and raise livestock. Let us be sure that we understand the implication of the strict controls envisioned in H.R. 10010. It could well be the end of the efficient livestock agriculture we brag so much about. It would be my conclusion that those that desire such a program should take it to Cuba, Russia, or Red China where policy such as envisioned in this bill would be much more acceptable. Farmers in these countries have been experiencing these kinds of controls and government domination for years, and, of course, the result has been dismal failure. Everyone from the farmer to the consumer to government itself has suffered.

In conclusion, I say to the members of the Committee on Agriculture that are currently conducting hearings on H.R. 10010, that their greatest service would be to kill this bill as it has been presented by the President and the Secretary of Agriculture.

A FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to establish a Foreign Service Officers Training Corps to be under the direct supervision and control of the Secretary of State under regulations prescribed by the President.

The United States is engaged in a worldwide struggle with the Soviet Union which will ultimately determine whether the world will be free or whether it will live under a system of dictatorships controlled from Moscow. We are all aware of this struggle. We all talk a good deal about it.

Our Government, of necessity, is our agent in this struggle and I believe that it is doing a creditable job in defending not only the interests of its own citizens, but also the interests of those in other countries trying to find their way toward freedom. A case in point is our support of the United Nations in the

Congo. It must be remembered that the U.N. Forces were not sent to the Congo to take the side of one group as against the other. These troops were sent in at the request of the duly recognized government of the Congo to restore order and to keep the peace. They could easily have moved in and suppressed whatever group the U.N. decided was dissident or recalcitrant. Instead they went in and are still there acting solely as a police force trying to prevent disorder.

The decision to back up the U.N. at this critical juncture took courage, and I am proud that I belong to the same party as the man who was not found wanting when that courage was called for, President John F. Kennedy. There are those on both sides of the aisle who disagreed with the administration for its support of the U.N. Congo policy, but I believe that ultimately they will see the wisdom of a policy which calls for—and backs up—the orderly development of free institutions in Africa.

This illustration, Mr. Speaker, brings me to the point of my remarks today. For many years our State Department has functioned as a rather misformed grandchild of 19th century diplomacy. It is the result of a hodgepodge of legislation, reorganization, and guesswork, that grew like Topsy. The fact that it works as well as it does, is a true commendation to the devoted men and women who have to cope with the problems the United States faces as a world power. Since World War II, both the Executive and the Congress have become increasingly aware that the existing State Department organization is badly in need of an overhaul based upon a realistic appraisal of the situation wherein the United States finds itself in the atomic age.

Some answers have been proposed and some of those have become part of the present State Department operation. A notable example is the U.S. Information Agency.

The Foreign Service, however, has been more or less left alone and our Government has continued to operate under a system whose inadequacies have been apparent for many years and now, in my judgment, can no longer be tolerated.

If we are to continue our efforts toward world peace we must have the very best of our citizens directly involved in those efforts. At the present time the Department of State can only attract this type of citizen if he or she happens to be willing to dedicate himself or herself for little reward, either monetary or in terms of recognition. The plain and simple truth is that the Department cannot compete with business for talent.

I believe that if the measure I propose is adopted it will solve the recruitment problem of the Department by instilling in young people the ideals of service and sacrifice necessary to take up a career in the service of our Nation.

The bill would create professional standards which are realistic and provide subsidies for 3,000 young men and women through a university or college education if they meet standards and follow the curriculum set up by the Secretary of State.

An individual who successfully completes training under this program would be appointed as a probationary Foreign Service officer for a 2-year period. At the end of that time if he or she has been successful in maintaining the promise originally shown, the reward would be a regular appointment in the Foreign Service.

Eligible young people would have to be between the ages of 17 and 23 and would contract with the Secretary of State for a specified period of service and agree to serve at least 3 years in the Foreign Service upon completion of their training in the corps program at the particular college or university.

As I am sure our colleagues are aware, Mr. Speaker, a number of bills have been introduced in the House and in the other body during the past several years presenting various solutions to this problem. Most of them provide for the establishment of a Foreign Service Academy.

I disagree with this approach because I believe that the advantages in having these young people trained in different schools throughout our Nation are much greater than the advantages in having them trained in an insulated, restricted, and uniform environment, isolated from the rest of the academic community. This is not meant as a slur upon our military academies. They serve the purpose for which they were set up very, very well, and the training which our future military officers must receive is of a much more highly specialized and scientific kind than that which our representatives overseas should have.

The proposal which I am making would not eliminate the necessary control of standards which must be maintained by the Secretary of State if he is to have ultimate control over the conduct of our foreign policy.

My bill would also give the Secretary of State discretionary authority to permit individuals above the age of 23 to enter the corps' training program when he determines that special circumstances require or make advisable such entrance.

This is an important matter which has not been included, as far as I know, in any previous bill. Another important feature of my bill is the authority given to the Secretary of State to appoint Foreign Service officers other than those individuals who have successfully completed the corps' program. The bill does not affect the Foreign Service Institute.

In view of the vast importance of our Foreign Service in the conduct of this country's foreign relations, Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Congress will consider this matter in the very near future.

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD BRANCHES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill to provide for the approval of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board for the establishment of branches by federally insured savings and loan associations. This bill would amend, for this purpose, the Home Owners Loan Act of 1933.

My bill will also amend the Federal Reserve Act and the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to provide for FDIC approval of branch applications by banks. This provision would carry over and supersede my bill H.R. 7790 which I introduced last June.

Section 2 of my bill provides that no insured bank shall establish and operate any new branch without the prior written consent of the FDIC, and that consent is not to be given until the application has been approved by either the Comptroller of the Currency—in the case of a national or district bank—or by the appropriate supervisory State authority in the case of a State bank. The bill further requires that public notice of the bank's intention be given and that any other bank or thrift or savings institution may become a party to the proceeding and be heard in opposition to the application.

Section 4 amends the Home Owners Loan Act of 1933 in the same manner, providing that no savings and loan association may establish a branch without the approval of the Home Loan Bank Board, such approval to be granted only to the extent that the law of the State involved permits State-chartered institutions to establish branches. It also provides for similar public notice to be given by the savings and loan association desiring to establish a branch and the opportunity for any other thrift or savings association to become a party to the proceeding and to be heard in opposition to it.

This is an important improvement in our statutory provisions relating to banks and savings and loan institutions, and I hope that the Banking and Currency Committee will set an early hearing date on this bill.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY, 1962

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marked the 44th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania.

It constitutes another occasion for us to recall that the light of liberty has not been extinguished in Lithuania, or for that matter, in the other oppressed Baltic lands. Americans have always cherished freedom, not only for themselves but for all the peoples of the world. I know that we all hope and pray that the day will come again when the proud people of Lithuania will be the masters of their own destiny.

These are not the first perilous times Lithuania has experienced. There have been periods of subjugation and misery in the past. But these have always been enlightened by the unceasing heroism of those who would not despair or give up, and this heroism has always ultimately led to freedom and independence. Before World War I, Lithuania was under Russian domination for 120 years. Yet, never was the glorious goal of liberty lost sight of. During that period alone there were five major revolts against Russian tyranny.

It was not until 1918, however, that the Lithuanians managed to declare their independence. Even so, they still had to battle the Red Army in 1919, and negotiate a peace treaty in 1920 before they could devote themselves completely to the task of consolidating their country. But in a remarkably short time, by means of land reform, industrialization, improved transportation, social legislation, and education, the Lithuanians established a model progressive and peace-loving country.

There independence was short-lived. In June 1940 the Soviet armed forces invaded Lithuania and occupied the whole country. All opposition was ruthlessly suppressed. Elections were held with only the Communists and pro-Communists represented on the ballot. And in August 1940 these "elected" and willing tools of Soviet oppression asked the Supreme Soviet of the Soviet Union to admit Lithuania as a Soviet Republic within the U.S.S.R. Since the war, the Red imperialist government has continued its work of Sovietizing Lithuania. In the course of a few years the entire state—its constitutional, political, economic, social, and cultural order—was molded into the Soviet image. The great suffering that resulted included forced collectivization, mass arrests and deportation, and slave labor. Lithuania is indeed a small nation but it has proved itself to be composed of brave men and women.

To the enslaved peoples of Lithuania I would say again: Do not lose hope. We have not forgotten you, nor will we ever forget you. The midnight of oppression surely will be lifted, for nowhere has liberty been permanently extinguished from the earth.

WASTEFUL PRACTICES IN GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Kastenmeier] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, the President has opened a new avenue of inquiry to many Americans who have been unaware of some of the most wasteful practices in government operations. His call for a study of stockpiling is welcome. Many of us have felt that much could be gained by a serious review of the situation.

Though the President has emphasized that the present operations have accumulated great amounts of costly surpluses, I believe he has not spent much time discussing another aspect of the problem. I refer to the records already available which indicate that sheer inefficiency and incredibly poor business practices have marked this program over the years.

At this point, I would like to call to the attention of the House the following excerpts from reports by the Comptroller General. These are only samples of the practices I have in mind:

> (a) Review of policies, procedures, and practices of the General Services Administration relating to the selection of sites for the storage of strategic and critical materials (December 1959):
>
> Our review disclosed that GSA, in the conduct of its storage operations for strategic and critical materials, incurred transportation costs of over $9 million which, in our opinion, were unnecessary and could have been deferred or saved without hindering the objectives of the stockpiling program. These costs were incurred because GSA did not select storage locations which were the closest to the domestic source or port of import for materials in excess of stockpile requirements when such action was feasible and would have been in accord with the storage policies of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization (OCDM).
>
> (b) Audit of General Services Administration Contract DMP–131 with National Lead Co., New York, N.Y. (April 1960):
>
> In our opinion, the need for entering into contract DMP–131 to help expand or maintain the Nation's capacity to produce nickel, cobalt, and copper is questionable in view of the circumstances prevailing and impending in December 1956 with respect to the production capacity of the nickel, cobalt, and copper industries. Since the Government expansion programs for cobalt and copper had previously been terminated and there was a substantial expansion of nickel production capacity impending, we believe that it would have been preferable for GSA to have let the prior contract with National Lead terminate instead of entering into contract DMP–131. In such event, the Government's prior advances of about $7,500,000 to the contractor might have been canceled and GSA might have acquired the new facilities, in settlement of the advances. Under the terms of contract DMP–131 GSA, in addition to canceling the advance and acquiring the facilities, agreed to purchase, if National Lead so desired, up to $27,600,000 worth of metals it did not need and of which it already had large supplies on hand and on order. The Government's purchase of metals under the contract, amounting in total to about $8,113,000, and the cost of transporting and storing the metals does not seem to have been warranted."
>
> (c) Audit of General Services Administration Contract DMP–9 with Climax Molybdenum Co., New York, N.Y. (July 1960):
>
> Our audit disclosed the following deficiencies in connection with the negotiation and termination of this contract.
>
> 1. The method used to establish the production cost element of the contract price was inappropriate in view of the nature of the mining operation to be conducted under the contract, and resulted in higher prices to the Government. We believe that information furnished to the Government prior to the execution of the contract should have indicated a need for a more appropriate pricing arrangement than that provided.
>
> 2. In amending the pricing terms of the contract in October 1954, GSA did not obtain current production cost data, available at the time. A careful analysis of such data would have disclosed that changes proposed by the amendment would result in unwarranted additional costs to the Government. In our opinion, the principal objectives of the amendment should have been achieved without undue increased costs to the Government.
>
> 3. The value to the contractor of significant quantities of byproducts recovered as a result of contract operations was not considered in determining the price paid by the Government for molybdenum.
>
> 4. The termination settlement did not include an amount as adjustment for high ore preparation costs paid by the Government in early phases of the contract which would have been offset by low ore preparation costs in the latter phases of the contract.
>
> (d) Review of procedures and practices of General Services Administration relating to the storage and physical inventory of strategic and critical materials at General Services Administration storage depots (July 1960):
>
> The more significant findings commented on in our report concern (1) our recommendation to discontinue die stamping certain metal bars in the stockpile with grade markings, which we considered unnecessary because the producers' brand names, already imprinted on the bars, served to identify the grade, (2) the need for revised storage procedures for certain metals to prevent possible additional handling costs in future inventory verifications, (3) the need for a uniform and improved system for locating materials at storage facilities, (4) the need for a procedure to detect differences between depot and central office inventory records, and (5) the need for prompt adjustment of perpetual inventory records to reflect results of physical counts.
>
> (e) Audit of General Services Administration contracts DMP–49, 50, and 51 with the Hanna Mining Co., Hanna Nickel Smelting Co., and the M. A. Hanna Co., Cleveland, Ohio (April 1961):
>
> Several matters of interest in connection with the negotiation and administration of these contracts are discussed in this report. They are—
>
> 1. The terms of the contracts resulted in limited financial risks on the part of the Hanna companies.
>
> 2. The sale of ore to the Government at fixed prices without provision for price redetermination does not appear to be appropriate for these contracts.
>
> 3. The terms of one of the contracts permit Hanna to acquire clear title to a smelter constructed with Government funds of over $22 million by paying the Government the estimated salvage value of the facilities (about $1,700,000). There now are indications that the smelter may have a commercial value after the contract is completed, and we suggest that the Administrator of General Servives enter into negotiations with Hanna to attempt to provide for additional payments to the Government if commercial operations are continued at the termination of the smelting contract. GSA has informed us that Hanna has given no indication of any willingness to make a payment beyond its contract obligation. Hanna takes the position that any additional value would be its compensation for operating the smelter at no profit.
>
> 4. We believe that GSA's practice of not selling ferronickel at prices based on the market price of nickel, because such prices would be less than it pays for the material, has contributed to the cessation of sales of ferronickel to industry. We are recommending that the Administrator of General Services confer with the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization (OCDM) regarding the changed nickel supply conditions which might make it advisable for GSA to dispose of the ferronickel inventory. GSA has in-

> formed us that it is in the Government's interest not to sell ferronickel from Government inventories since such action might interfere with a possible takeover of the plant by Hanna. OCDM has apprised us that it has offered other types of nickel for sale but not all the nickel offered has been sold and that there is no reason to believe that industry would have shown any preference for ferronickel.
>
> In addition, the contract with the Hanna Mining Co., under which most of Hanna's profits on the entire project are earned and which contains a negotiated fixed price, does not contain an adequate examination of records clause. Therefore, we were unable to review the contractor's records in order to evaluate the cost and profit factors making up the fixed price.

As I have said, the surplus problem has been compounded by bad practices such as those which cost the taxpayer over $9 million on one program because of poor storage location procedures. A December 1959 report says that this amount could have been saved if thought had been given to locating storage facilities near to production and import points.

Still another case cost $8,113,000 because of the negotiation of a contract which was simply unnecessary.

Another abuse has occurred in many cases because fixed price contracts have been negotiated where technological developments and uncertainties make a readjustment clause obvious business sense.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that the kinds of practices outlined in these reports have cost the taxpayers tens of millions of dollars over the years.

I want to say that I firmly support the President's call for a review of this situation. I would commend to the attention of all those interested in this problem the excellent studies prepared by the Comptroller General.

THE PATENT SYSTEM'S EFFECTS ON STIMULATING CREATIVENESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROUDEBUSH] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, America's industrial strength which has contributed to winning two world wars and assisting in the reconstruction of the world's economy stems largely from the creativeness of our people.

During the 19th century many of our people did not enjoy the educational opportunities which were more readily available in Europe. Yet, Americans contributed many of the inventions which increased the productivity of mankind, eliminated back-breaking toil and drudgery, and produced new goods and services for the enjoyment of everyone. These inventions have made it possible for more of our energies to be devoted to education and the cultural pursuits which are now bearing fruit in America's preeminence in the arts and sciences.

Without a patent system and the inventions which it has produced, it is doubtful that any of these spectacular developments would have first evolved in the United States. Mr. Speaker, let me cite a few of the more noteworthy.

One of America's earliest industrial pioneers was Eli Whitney, the inventor of the cotton gin. He was not a cotton grower, but rather a young teacher who thought of becoming a lawyer. However, he possessed the spark of genius for invention. On June 20, 1793, he presented his idea to the Secretary of State, Thomas Jefferson, and was finally granted a patent which was signed by President George Washington on March 14, 1794.

As soon as cotton planters realized the value of this new invention, a multitude of others attempted improvements on his basic concept. In 1795, the total cotton crop of the United States was 8 million pounds, and in 1807, when the patent expired, 80 million pounds of cotton were marketed. The increased wealth and income realized by planters throughout the South because of this unique development are virtually incalculable.

Eli Whitney himself embarked on a manufacturing career which played a major role in the development of mass production. His creative talents were directed toward the perfection of a rifle, and he was the first manufacturer to realize the importance of standardizing designs and developing completely interchangeable parts. His efforts required the development of new machine tools, and, in fact, he also invented the milling machine. It is difficult to appraise the significance of his conception of production and assembly. It certainly represented one of the crucial steps which made the United States preeminent in mass production.

Mr. Speaker, the lasting impact of Eli Whitney's methods are shown by Henry M. Leland, who applied precision concepts and techniques to the automobile industry. He had worked at the Springfield Armory during the Civil War and later at the Colt Arms establishment. These plants still reflected Whitney's pervasive influence. The precision machine work in these armories was responsible for Leland's approach to industrial problems. He later became the founder of the Cadillac Motor Car Co., and his slogan, "Craftsmanship a creed, accuracy a law," is found in Cadillac advertisements today.

In 1906 he sent three Cadillacs to London and, repeating Whitney's earlier demonstration with muskets, disassembled the cars, scrambled their parts, and then reconstructed three new automobiles. They were test driven and performed perfectly. Cadillac was awarded the Dewar Trophy by the Royal Automobile Club, the first American firm to receive this honor.

The 19th century was a period when America's creative achievements led to our recognition throughout the world as a great industrial power. It would be difficult even to begin to enumerate the more significant contributions of our earlier inventors without omitting the achievements of many prominent and noteworthy individuals.

In the field of communications, Samuel F. B. Morse, a portrait painter, invented the telegraph. The great distances and open spaces in a new continent were a great asset, as they provided opportunities for our growing population and for an abundance of raw materials. However, the vastness of America was also a liability, as it was difficult to maintain the close ties that are necessary for a well-integrated society. The telegraph made a fundamental and lasting contribution in welding our people into one Nation. Later, Alexander Graham Bell invented the telephone. It, too, provided a new dimension to communications technology.

Mr. Speaker, so many of the developments which we examine in the Science and Astronautics Committee are based on electronic developments which were originally undertaken to improve the telephone service. The transistor, the coaxial cable, and other more recent innovations had to precede computer technology and the long-line telephone networks which are essential for radio and television broadcasting. The complex devices which enable our satellite program to probe outer space and thus greatly enhance the knowledge of all mankind stem from these early American inventions.

A dominant role was played in the winning of World War I by the productivity of our agriculture. It is doubtful whether the greatly increased output of our farmers would have been possible without the use of the reaper first invented by Cyrus McCormack. It was followed by a host of other farm implements, including the tractor.

Fulton's steamboat, Howe's sewing machine, McKay's shoemaking machines—all advanced America's living standards and contributed to an acknowledgment of our inventive abilities by those in Europe who had long enjoyed a heritage of education and culture.

The airbrake invented by Westinghouse and the vulcanization of rubber perfected by Goodyear were major developments in enhancing the effectiveness of our transportation system. The airplane would not have been practical without the availability of aluminum. Young Charles Martin Hall, while still a student at Oberlin College, directed his attention toward the perfection of a process of converting aluminum ores which were readily abundant into a metal which has such widespread use today. He succeeded in his quest only after many experiments and disappointments.

It is significant that the Hall process is still the basic method used today. Naturally, there have been refinements, but this significant breakthrough was responsible for the creation of a totally new industry.

No discussion of the influence of the 19th century inventors would be complete without reference to the diverse contributions of Thomas Alva Edison, whom many still regard as one of the greatest geniuses of all time. His patent for an incandescent electric lamp was primarily responsible for the formation of the General Electric Co. in its present form. The research contributions of that organization are so well known and numerous that it is unnecessary to elaborate upon them at this point.

Mr. Speaker, I could continue this exposition of the contribution of great

Americans to enhancing the prosperity, security, and well-being of our people for many hours. However, I believe there is a significant lesson to be learned from 19th-century history. Each of these outstanding innovators was descended from European ancestors. Few would categorically state that their mere presence on American soil would inspire them to conceive and develop new ideas. It is reasonable to assume that the patent system played an important role in stimulating their creative abilities.

Inventors, like other talented people, are responsive to their environment. The opportunities in 19th century America were challenging and varied. The resources were abundant, but manpower was scarce. Products and processes which economized human efforts and enhanced productivity were a boon to those enterprising citizens who in a very short time had settled in the New World and were building one of the greatest nations of all time. It would be most unrealistic to minimize the incentives which the American patent system afforded these creative pioneers.

Mr. Speaker, there may be some individuals who believe that science would have progressed as rapidly and that our present industrial position might have been attained without the assistance of patent laws. However, I believe—and I am sure my colleagues are equally convinced—that the industrial supremacy enjoyed by the United States in a large part is attributable to well conceived patent laws which have stimulated creativity since our Republic was founded.

There were relatively few important inventions in the centuries between the first recordings of history and the latter 18th century. It was then that the incentives provided by the patent system were first fully understood. The continuous progress in science and technology in recent years justifies the assumption that the patent system played a significant role in this increased tempo of progress.

Certainly, no one can dogmatically declare that only the stimulus of the patent system is responsible for mankind's inventiveness and progress. However, the record shows that most of those indispensable inventions which provided a necessary breakthrough for future development were achieved in those countries which had developed patent protection as an incentive to bring forth the creative abilities of their citizens. It would be most difficult for anyone to suggest a lack of correlation between this positive incentive and the important results which have been achieved.

Mr. Speaker, many individuals only consider the incentive and reward to a creative inventor in appraising the usefulness of the patent system. They tend to equate the grant of a patent with a legal sanction for an individual to impose a monopoly. Each of us is a champion of the system of free, competitive, private enterprise. It is characterized by competition which provides a basis to allocate resources and insure that each productive element in our society makes its maximum contribution to the general welfare. Under this system the consumer determines the rewards of each producer, and our energies are directed toward satisfying the wants of individuals as reflected in a competitive marketplace. Without the imposition of arbitrary Government controls, we find few shortages or surpluses and our citizens live in a land without detailed regimentation of their daily lives. The protection of the sanctity of individual rights, including economic freedom is the justification for the impressive military and foreign aid programs of the Federal Government. However, the grant of a patent does not confer a monopoly privilege. This is a complete misconception. It is, rather, a reward for the invention of a product or process which never existed previously. It does not grant any rights to an individual with respect to existing products or processes. Our Founding Fathers believed that the granting of a patent by the Government which confers certain exclusive rights upon the inventor for a limited time promotes the urge to create and discover for the benefit of everyone.

The Patent Office has issued 3 million patents. Many of them have long since expired, and those inventions first disclosed in expired patent applications are now available for everyone's use and development. It is too often forgotten that the concept inherent in a patent establishes obligations upon the inventor as well as upon the Government. In other words, the Government confers certain rights to enjoy the fruits of creativity for a limited period of time in exchange for a complete and open disclosure of the invention.

In earlier times, and even today in some other countries, many industrial establishments were surrounded with an air of secrecy. In the absence of a patent system, venturesome individuals would proceed to manufacture their products with no disclosure of what they had accomplished. The far-reaching implication of such industrial secrecy must be carefully considered. Today, no inventor would apply for a patent without first making a complete and careful search of previous patents so that he is confident that he had made a unique contribution to civilization. The publication of all patents that have previously been granted insures that such a search will be made. However, the availability of this information as a contribution to the development of science and technology is far more significant.

The 3 million patents, all of which describe products and processes in great detail, constitute a national suggestion box to which inventors may look for inspiration in seeking new ideas capable of further advancing scientific progress.

Mr. Speaker, there have been many suggestions that the Patent Office should establish more stringent criteria with respect to the usefulness of patents. Historically, it has interpreted its power to grant patents for "any useful art, manufacture, engine, machine or device, or any improvement thereon not before known or used." The need for broad interpretation is obvious as products or processes that are completely new and original necessarily imply that there be no existing standard for judging their usefulness.

The patent laws, like all other enactments of the Congress, should be subject to constant review and improvement, but it would be a great disservice to our country if the basic tenets underlying the patent system, which have encouraged creativeness and provided the disclosure of new ideas for the inspiration of still other inventors, were curbed or basically modified in any way.

CAMPAIGN FOR UNITED NATIONS CENSURE OF THE SOVIET UNION FOR PERSECUTION OF ITS JEWISH CITIZENS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ZELENKO] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, while the Soviet Government is continuing its assault, both overt and covert, upon the free world, it has not been able to conceal its nefarious objectives, to subjugate all free peoples and thus create a one-world colony of Communists for the Soviet Union. It has further exposed its perfidy by persecution within its borders of Jewish citizens solely by reason of their religious beliefs. Members of other faiths inside the Soviet Union have likewise suffered its latter-day pogroms. Religious leaders are incarcerated and tortured without compunction; indeed the Soviets realize that God-loving people will never bow to its will. Their total elimination is necessary to further process the dogma of atheistic communism.

Though it is a signatory and charter member of the United Nations, it has with impunity flaunted and violated its solemn obligations, one of which is to preserve religious freedom for its citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to inform the House that I have urged our delegation at the United Nations to introduce a resolution censuring the Soviet Union for the violation of its obligations under the United Nations Charter in that it has persecuted its Jewish citizens and those of other faiths because of their religion.

I am happy to report that our Department of State has taken cognizance of this derogation of human rights of the Soviet Union and in response to my request has informed me that it is fully in accord with the feelings of the right-thinking people of the world that the actions of the Soviet Union in persecuting its Jewish citizens because of their religious beliefs is shocking. Not only has Ambassador Stevenson, to whom I addressed my original communication, expressed his personal dismay, but two subsequent official letters to me from the Department of State, signed by Frederick G. Dutton, Assistant Secretary, have affirmed the need for action and expressed the hope that the world will continue to be made aware of the Soviet's inhumane actions.

On February 1, 1962, Assistant Secretary Dutton wrote:

> In this connection, appropriate publicity on the initiative of religious groups themselves concerning violations of the rights of

their coreligionists in the Soviet Union, may also serve a useful purpose.

Further, on February 15, 1962, he again wrote:

> Concurrently, I hope that American Jewish organizations and others who have this matter at heart will carry on with the fine work they have already done in keeping American and world public opinion informed concerning violations of the rights of their coreligionists in the Soviet Union.

Therefore, I urge not only those of Jewish faith, but people of all religions to make known to the world, by every possible medium, our condemnation of these barbaric actions of the Soviet Union.

The Department of State has given me permission to make the communications between the Department and myself a part of this statement and, with pleasure, I take this opportunity to do so.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 18, 1962.

Hon. ADLAI E. STEVENSON,
U.S. Representative to the United Nations,
U.S. Mission, New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. AMBASSADOR: The increased persecution of the Jews in the Soviet Union because of their religious beliefs has worsened the previously intolerable situation which has long existed there with respect to the freedom of religion generally.

The persecutive actions on the part of the Soviet Government are in direct violation of its obligation under the Preamble to the United Nations Charter, and articles I and II of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights which redeclares and redefines the obligations of the member nations and the rights to be accorded to the citizens of the member nations, and specifically resolve the member nations to afford freedom of religion to their citizens.

Therefore, I urge that our delegation at the United Nations, as leaders in the free world, introduce a resolution censuring and condemning the acts of the Soviet Union in their persecution of their Jewish citizens, as being inconsistent with the declaration, passed and adopted without dissent December 10, 1948. I further suggest, that since other citizens of the Soviet Union are persecuted because of their religious beliefs that this resolution be directed not only to the plight of the Jews but to all religious groups in the Soviet Union.

I trust you will give this your personal and immediate attention.

With kind regards, I am
Sincerely yours,
HERBERT ZELENKO,
Member of Congress.

U.S. REPRESENTATIVE TO
THE UNITED NATIONS,
New York, N.Y., January 24, 1962.

Hon. HERBERT ZELENKO,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ZELENKO: I have just received your letter of January 18 on my return from a visit to Illinois. Reports of Soviet persecution of Jews are shocking. I have sent a copy of your letter to the State Department and am ready to do everything the Department thinks I can do to be of help.

Sincerely yours,
ADLAI E. STEVENSON.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 1, 1962.

Hon. HERBERT ZELENKO,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. ZELENKO: I wish to thank you on behalf of the President for your letter of January 18, 1962, enclosing a copy of your letter of the same date to Ambassador Stevenson, in which you urge the introduction of a resolution at the United Nations about the treatment which the Government of the Soviet Union accords to its citizens of the Jewish faith. The President has referred your letter to the Department of State for reply.

As you no doubt recall, Resolution 1510 (XV), condemning manifestations of racial and religious hatred, was adopted by the United Nations General Assembly in 1960. The general question of religious discrimination will again be before the next session of the Commission on Human Rights of the Economic and Social Council in March 1962 under the agenda item on draft principles on freedom and nondiscrimination in the matter of religious rights and principles. Enclosed for your information is a copy of these draft principles.

The Government of the United States is deeply concerned about oppressive Soviet policies of this or any other type. U.S. support of civil rights and freedom of worship has been made unmistakably clear on many occasions. For example, President Kennedy drew attention in his address of September 25, 1961, before the General Assembly of the United Nations to the colonialism and lack of self-determination that characterize the Soviet system.

U.S. representatives to the United Nations are fully informed in this respect and they will seek, as they have in the past, appropriate occasions during the debates in the General Assembly and other United Nations organs to direct attention to the violations of the principles of religious toleration in Communist-controlled areas in the hope of bringing relief to all those who are unjustly treated. In this connection, appropriate publicity on the initiative of religious groups themselves concerning violations of the rights of their coreligionists in the Soviet Union, may also serve a useful purpose.

The U.S. Government is opposed to Soviet violations of the rights of religious groups just as it is opposed to all discriminatory treatment on religious grounds anywhere and, alert to the importance of the subject, continually watches developments in this sphere with a view to focusing the disapproval of the world upon them.

Your expression of your views upon this subject is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,
FREDERICK G. DUTTON,
Assistant Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 15, 1962.

Hon. HERBERT ZELENKO,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ZELENKO: I wish to thank you on behalf of the Secretary of State for your letter of February 1, 1962, enclosing your exchange of correspondence with Ambassador Stevenson on the situation of religious minorities, especially the Jews, in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

By now you have no doubt received my reply of February 1 to your letter of January 18 to the President. As may be seen from my letter, the Department of State is well aware of the complex situation confronting the Jews of the Soviet Union and continues to seek opportunities to bring the attention of the world to bear upon violations within the Soviet Union of the right of freedom of worship.

Concurrently, I hope that American Jewish organizations and others who have this matter at heart will carry on with the fine work they have already done in keeping American and world public opinion informed concerning violations of the rights of their coreligionists in the Soviet Union.

I appreciate the renewed expression of your concern regarding this matter and assure you that the Department is keeping it under careful observation and will make use of every opportunity to remind the world that the United States stands for the right of freedom of worship for all men everywhere.

Respectfully,
FREDERICK G. DUTTON,
Assistant Secretary.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. MONAGAN (at the request of Mr. LIBONATI) for the balance of the week, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. REUSS, for 10 minutes today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH (at the request of Mr. SHORT), for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. ZELENKO (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 30 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. WRIGHT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. REUSS in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. O'Neill and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SIKES and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WHITENER and to include a statement.

Mr. ALGER.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. SHORT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SEELY-BROWN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BAILEY.

Mr. MULTER.

Mrs. SULLIVAN.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 20, 1962, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1701. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of maintenance of M48 and M48A1 medium tanks; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1702. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the act of July 2, 1940, as amended, relating to the recording of liens on motor vehicles and trailers registered in the District of Columbia, so as to eliminate the requirement that an alphabetical file of such liens be maintained"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1703. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report covering personal property received by State surplus property agencies for distribution to public health and educational institutions and civil defense organizations, pursuant to section 203(o) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1704. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the report of the Archivist of the United States on records proposed for disposal under the law; to the Committee on House Administration.

1705. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a comprehensive report concerning activities in the Office of Coal Research of the Department of the Interior, pursuant to Public Law 86–599; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1706. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to revise the boundaries of Capulin Mountain National Monument, N. M., to authorize acquisition of lands therein, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1707. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on activities of the Federal aid in fish restoration program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, pursuant to 64 Stat. 430; 16 U.S.C. 777; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1708. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives pursuant to 75 Stat. 216, 217, and submitted pursuant to rule XL of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

1709. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a copy of the order suspending deportation in the case of Andres Porras, A4329804, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1710. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1711. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases where the authority contained in section 212(d)(3) was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1712. A letter from the adjutant general, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, transmitting the proceedings of the 62d National Convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, held in Miami Beach, Fla., August 20–25, 1961, pursuant to Public Law 249, 77th Congress (H. Doc. No. 343); to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1713. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 7 of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on Un-American Activities. H.R. 9753. A bill to amend sections 3(7) and 5(b) of the Internal Security Act of 1950, relating to employment of members of Communist organizations in certain defense facilities; with amendment (Rept. No. 1362). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. O'NEILL: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 549. Resolution for the consideration of H.R. 10050, a bill to provide for a further temporary increase in the public debt limit set forth in the Second Liberty Bond Act; without amendment (Rept. 1363). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H.R. 10245. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to provide that the insurance premiums on FHA-insured one- to four-family mortgages shall be waived by the Federal Government where the mortgagor is a serviceman inducted or called to active duty in the Armed Forces after 1960, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CASEY:

H.R. 10246. A bill to amend section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act to provide for the retirement of the public debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 10247. A bill to establish a cropland retirement program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 10248. A bill to promote safe driving and eliminate the reckless and irresponsible driver from the streets and highways of the District of Columbia by providing that any person operating a motor vehicle within the District while apparently under the influence of intoxicating liquor shall be deemed to have given his consent to a chemical test of certain of his body substances to determine the alcoholic content of his blood, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H.R. 10249. A bill to authorize certain improvement of the Illinois Waterway, Ill. and Ind.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 10250. A bill to establish an Office of Public Works Coordination and Acceleration; to authorize the preparation of a plan for acceleration of public works when necessary to avoid serious nationwide unemployment levels; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H.R. 10251. A bill to confer jurisdiction in certain cases on the Secretaries of the military departments to authorize payment from appropriated funds of the military departments of amounts determined to be owing to contractors under armed services housing contracts; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MacGREGOR:

H.R. 10252. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1956 (70 Stat. 202) to provide donations of surplus food commodities to State and local penal institutions; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER:

H.R. 10253. A bill to authorize the modification of the existing project for the New Melones Dam and Reservoir, Stanislaus River, Calif., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MILLIKEN:

H.R. 10254. A bill to require the expenditure of 75 percent of the funds expended for the conversion, alteration, and repair of naval vessels to be expended at Government shipyards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H.R. 10255. A bill for the relief of the county of Cuyahoga, Ohio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 10256. A bill to amend section 9 of the Federal Reserve Act, section 18(d) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, section 5155 of the Revised Statutes, and section 5 of the Home Owners Loan Act of 1933; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 10257. A bill to amend the law relating to pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. PFOST:

H.R. 10258. A bill to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 to authorize the payment of rewards to persons who furnish information leading to convictions of organizations or individuals of failure to register as required by such act; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 10259. A bill to provide for the desegregation of public schools, with all deliberate speed, including nationwide first-step compliance by 1963, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 10260. A bill to amend part III of the Civil Rights Act of 1957; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10261. A bill to make the Commission on Civil Rights a permanent agency in the executive branch of the Government, to broaden the scope of the duties of the Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VINSON:

H.R. 10262. A bill to amend further section 201 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, to authorize payment toward the construction or modification of approved public shelter space, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 10263. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to adjust the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over lands within Eglin Air Force Base, Fla.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 10264. A bill to provide that the House of Representatives shall be composed of 438 Members beginning with the 88th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENDERSON:

H.R. 10265. A bill to authorize the Postmaster General in his discretion to pay increased basic salary to postal field service employees for services performed before the expiration of 30 days following their assignments to duties and responsibilities of higher salary levels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 10266. A bill to eliminate the mailing of matter by Members of Congress with a simplified form of address; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 10267. A bill to establish a Foreign Service Officers' Training Corps; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 10268. A bill to prohibit banks insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation from accepting deposits in excess of certain percentages of their outstanding real estate loans; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 10269. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code relating to highways in order to require the approval of the Secretary of the Interior to surveys, plans, specifications, and estimates for projects on the Federal-aid highway systems for the purpose of protecting fish and wildlife and recreation resources; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. PFOST:

H.J. Res. 631. Joint resolution to continue for an additional 9 months the current support price for milk and butterfat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.J. Res. 632. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to abolish tax and property qualifications for electors in Federal elections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALGER:

H. Con. Res. 421. Concurrent resolution to prohibit training enemy military personnel or aiding Communist nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BRUCE:

H. Con. Res. 422. Concurrent resolution to prohibit training enemy military personnel or aiding Communist nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. Con. Res. 423. Concurrent resolution prohibiting U.S. assistance to Communist countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H. Con. Res. 424. Concurrent resolution prohibiting the training of military personnel of Communist countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. Con. Res. 425. Concurrent resolution to explore an OECD Parliamentary Conference; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. Res. 547. Resolution creating a nonlegislative select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the aged and aging; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. Res. 548. Resolution creating a nonlegislative select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the aged and aging; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the initiation of Federal studies and programs regarding the condition and exploitation of the North Pacific and Bering Sea fisheries, which was referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H.R. 10270. A bill for the relief of Moshe Mozes Gelb; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINNEGAN:

H.R. 10271. A bill for the relief of Georgios Katsoydas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10272. A bill for the relief of Jean Vithoulcas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H.R. 10273. A bill for the relief of Ngoon Cheong Wong (also known as Ngoon Cheong Lum); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUCK:

H.R. 10274. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of R. Gordon Finney, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H.R. 10275. A bill for the relief of Capt. Oscar W. Cleal, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

240. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Gregory Bura, chairman, Ukrainian American Youth Association, Inc., Ukrainian Community Center, Jersey City, N.J., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to calling upon the people of the free world to condemn the Russian Soviet Communist government for its liquidation of the Ukrainian people, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Little-People-to-Little-People Program Is an Inspiring Thing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this opportunity to salute one of the youngest pioneers in the New Frontier. I am speaking of Peter Rodino, who has showed most clearly that the strength of America lies in the hearts and minds of her citizens both young and old.

Peter has studied in school, as have all young Americans, the history of present day efforts to achieve a peaceful world. After considering the implications to himself of present day problems, he decided that even at his young age there was something he could contribute to attaining peace.

His idea was to enlist young people of the United States in a crusade of their own, in a little-people-to-little-people program, in which they would strike a firm blow for peace.

Peter Rodino took the bull by the horns and wrote directly to Mr. Khrushchev of his hopes and of the hopes of all American children for peace. He has now started a crusade to urge many other children to write similar letters, and they are doing so.

In a day and age when so many lament the course of history and do nothing to contribute to the betterment of mankind, it is a refreshing thing to salute the vigor and imagination of a 10-year-old boy such as Peter Rodino. Certainly his father, the distinguished Congressman RODINO, of New Jersey, must be very proud of him.

Coast Guard Reserve Comes of Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to take notice in the House today of the fact that today is the 21st birthday of the U.S. Coast Guard Reserve.

In my district, perhaps more than in most districts, the Coast Guard is an important and distinguished force, and its members are everywhere highly regarded.

The Coast Guard Academy at New London trains most of the officers of the Coast Guard, and many of the highest ranking officers of the service today are among its graduates. At Avery Point in Groton, the schools for specialists are in progress all the time. At the Moorings, important operations of the Coast Guard at the entrance to Long Island are conducted.

The Coast Guard Auxiliary, with its power squadrons and leisure time personnel, provides a service to the part of recreation-seeking Connecticut which goes afloat, that is as unique as it is valuable.

The Coast Guard Reserve, however, is a component of our military reserve, and it was created on February 19, 1941, when Congress changed the name of the former Reserve to the Coast Guard Auxiliary, and established the present Reserve on the pattern of the Naval Reserve. One year later, a Women's Reserve was added.

In the 20 years which have passed since the Coast Guard Reserve was established, it has made a day-by-day contribution to help the Coast Guard itself deserve its motto, "Semper Paratus"—Always Prepared.

I take pleasure in congratulating the Commandant and the officers and men of the Coast Guard, and especially of the Coast Guard Reserve, on this anniversary.

Remarks of Secretary of State Dean Rusk in Presenting the 1961 Silver Quill Award of National Business Publications to the Vice President of the United States, Lyndon B. Johnson, February 1, 1962—Sheraton Park—Washington, D.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, on February 1, 1962, the Honorable Dean Rusk, Secretary of State, appeared in the Sheraton Park Hotel, Washington, D.C., to present the 1961 Silver Quill Award of the National Business Publications to the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Vice President of the United States.

So eloquent and fitting was the tribute paid to Vice President JOHNSON by Secretary Rusk in presenting the award that I ask that it be made a part of this RECORD. I strongly recommend that it be read by my colleagues.

The address follows:

REMARKS OF SECRETARY OF STATE DEAN RUSK IN PRESENTING THE 1961 SILVER QUILL AWARD OF NATIONAL BUSINESS PUBLICATIONS TO THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, LYNDON B. JOHNSON, FEBRUARY 1, 1962—SHERATON PARK—WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. Chairman, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen—early this morning, I was admiring the southern cross. It is a great privilege to be here this evening to admire the galaxy of stars in this room. Two minutes are just about adequate to honor a great American. But, since that great American also comes from the great State of Texas, I would ask you to give me 3 minutes.

Since we are honoring one of our own, I hope that our friends from the other countries will forgive me a moment of national pride and native presumption—for I believe that America at its best is a great America. And, I believe that the American people at their best are great people. And, I believe that the voice of America at its best is a respected voice. And we honor such a voice tonight.

A voice of tolerance—head of the President's Commission on Equal Opportunity. A voice of free political institutions—partisan when partisanship is required for the health of a vigorous democracy, but nonpartisan when unity is required for the peace and security of our Nation. A voice capable of indignation, where wrong has been committed. A voice capable of grim determination, where the right must be defended.

Economic and social development—a voice that can recall humble beginnings and the transformation of the life of his people by the combination of education, hard work, aspiration, ambition, neighborly cooperation, personal initiative. A voice of a generous spirit which said to a camel driver, "Why don't you all come and see us some time?"

A voice of peace. A voice that recalls that a nation with unparalleled power set that power aside after the greatest war in our history and committed itself to the purposes of the United Nations Charter. A nation holding out its hand to those who would reach for it in good faith and ready to cooperate with all those who would do so for common purpose. A voice which has been carried into almost every continent—into southeast Asia, to give confidence to those who are under pressure and attack; to Berlin, to give reassurance about firm support; to Africa, to extend the hand of brotherhood.

Wherever he goes, an authentic voice of America at its best and a voice given harmony by that of a great lady, a grace springing out of a genuine and simple nobility. Mr. Vice President, I am greatly honored to present to you the Silver Quill Award for distinguished leadership in behalf of the prestige and progress of the United States.

North Dakota Poll on National Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a tabulation showing the results of a poll which I recently conducted in North Dakota. I believe that Members of the Senate will find it as interesting and helpful as I have.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

These are the results of 7,156 questionnaires thus far returned from approximately 30,000 mailed out. With one or two minor exceptions I believe it represents a fairly good cross section of public thinking. It includes all Republican precinct committeemen, but not all Democrat precinct committeemen. (This list not available in time.) About twice as many farmers returned questionnaires as those from other occupations. This percentage of farmers is higher than their actual percentage of the total population. The poll was very interesting and most helpful to me. I was especially pleased with the great number of friendly personal comments. ("F" where used means farmers; "NF" means nonfarmers.)

1. How would you appraise President Kennedy's record during his first year in office?

Good: F, 1858; NF, 613; total, 2471.

Fair: F, 2,112; NF, 1,339; total, 3,451.

Poor: F, 681; NF, 434; total, 1,115.

2. Which do you believe represents the greatest danger to our national economy?

Internal Communist subversion: F, 3,430; NF, 1,865; total, 5,295.

Russia's armed forces: F, 784; NF, 421; total, 1,205.

3. Presently we are providing all the military equipment, technical advice, training and all of the financial support to Vietnam in her war against Communist guerrillas. If it should appear that Vietnam would lose, would you favor sending American troops to help them?

Yes: F, 1,480; NF, 972; total, 2,452.

No: F, 2,463; NF, 1,197; total, 3,660.

4. Do you believe the foreign aid program should be—

Continued: F, 568; NF, 274; total, 842.

Abolished: F, 580; NF, 313; total, 893.

Less and limited to anti-Communist nations: F, 3,311; NF, 1,732; total, 5,043.

5. What importance do you attach to balancing the national budget?

Great importance: F, 2,825; NF, 1,717; total, 4,542.

Some importance: F, 1,464; NF, 579; total, 2,043.

No importance: F, 266; NF, 74; total, 340.

6. Do you favor the administration's proposal for Federal aid to education?

Yes: F, 1,670; NF, 595; total, 2,265.

No: F, 2,823; NF, 1,780; total, 4,603.

7. Do you believe that farm price supports for wheat, corn, barley, rye, flax, oats, soybeans, dairy commodities, wool, etc., should be:

Abolished: F, 542; NF, 352; total, 894.

Gradually discontinued: F, 1,355; NF, 1,298; total, 2,653.

Continued and improved: F, 2,606; NF, 698; total, 3,304.

8. What do you think of the wheat price support program in effect for 1962?

Good: F, 1,257; NF, 333; total 1,590.

Fair: F, 2,224; NF, 1,092; total, 3,316.

Poor: F, 1,007; NF, 700; total, 1,707.

9. What do you think of the feed grain program in effect for 1962?

Good: F, 857; NF, 264; total, 1,121.

Fair: F, 1,691; NF, 784; total, 2,475.

Poor: F, 1,856; NF, 1,054; total, 2,910.

10. Congress is definitely considering the substitution of bushel allotments for acreage allotments in next year's wheat program. If, in determining bushel allotments, the same yields per acre would be used as those for diversion payments, which of the two plans would you prefer:

Bushel allotments: F, 2,725; NF, 1,186; total, 3,911.

Acreage allotments: F, 1,626; NF, 524; total, 2,150.

11. Which do you think is the best plan for providing additional REA power generating facilities for North Dakota?

Lignite electric: F, 3,194; NF, 1,744; total, 4,938.

Basin electric: F, 655; NF, 201; total, 856.

In several respects the returns from this questionnaire would indicate some conservative trend. For example, in a similar poll conducted 2 years ago North Dakotans favored Federal aid to education by a 3-to-2 vote. This poll indicates this thinking is completely reversed. While there is still strong sentiment for price supports among farmers, there is more criticism than previously.

Average Weekly Earnings of Various Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, at the request of Mr. Donald Laughlin, legislative chairman of the Milwaukee Postal Union, I have asked the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress to prepare for me a comparative study of the wage rates received by

postal workers and various production workers during 1961. The study follows:

To: The Honorable Henry S. Reuss.
From: Economics Division.
Subject: Comparison of postal clerks' pay with pay in private industries.

The pay scale for postal clerks in grade PFS-4 ranges from $4,305 to $5,305; the hourly rates range from $2.09 to $2.55. On the basis of a 40-hour week, the weekly earnings are:

	Hourly	*Weekly*
PFS 4—1	$2.09	$83.60
2	2.17	86.80
3	2.24	89.60
4	2.32	92.80
5	2.40	96.00
6	2.47	98.80
7	2.55	102.00

The Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Mr. Elmer B. Staats, in his testimony before the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee stated that the average hourly earning of the PFS-4 is $2.43, or $97.20 for a 40-hour week.

You will note in his testimony he states that most of the jobs in the postal service have few direct counterparts in private industry, making it impossible to price the private industry jobs by the methods used in pricing jobs for comparison with Federal classified work. Later, with reference to comparing average earnings in manufacturing with average earnings in the postal service, he says, "General wage trend information is pertinent, but almost impossible to apply directly in Federal salary fixing." He points out that there are too many variables involved in reaching an average wage in manufacturing industry, producing too rough a standard for direct use in Federal rate fixing.

The legislative director of the Postal Clerks' Union challenges the application of comparability. In his testimony he declared: "We know of no employment in outside industry that can be exactly compared with that of a post office clerk." Transportation and public utilities jobs, he said, come closest to postal clerk work for purpose of comparison.

Average hourly and weekly earnings in 1961 for production workers by industry appear in table C-7, pages 39–44, of the February 1962 edition of Employment and Earnings.

Mary R. Heslet.

Mr. Speaker, relevant items from the aforementioned table follow:

Average weekly earnings of production workers by industry, 1961

Durable goods:	
Ordnance and accessories	$113.70
Lumber and wood products	76.44
Furniture and fixtures	76.21
Stone, clay, and glass	95.00
Primary metal industries	114.55
Fabricated metal products	100.85
Machinery	107.16
Electrical equipment	94.24
Transportation equipment	113.12
Instruments	96.87
Miscellaneous manufacturing	75.84
Nondurable goods:	
Food and kindred products	89.16
Malt liquors	124.58
Meat products	97.58
Tobacco manufactures	69.06
Textile mill products	65.04
Apparel and related products	57.70
Paper and allied products	99.45
Printing, publishing, etc	104.67
Chemicals and allied products	106.81
Petroleum refining	124.42
Rubber and plastic products	96.32
Leather and leather products	62.66
Transportation and public utilities:	
Railroads (class I)	$112.41
Local transit	98.01
Motor freight	108.16
Pipeline transportation	131.45
Telephone communications	93.38
Electrical, gas, etc	112.48
Wholesale and retail trade:	
Wholesale trade	93.56
Retail trade	64.01
Finance, insurance, and real estate:	
Banking	69.19
Security dealers and exchanges	132.79
Insurance carriers	89.79
Services and miscellaneous:	
Hotels and lodging places	45.54
Personal services	49.28
Motion pictures	116.67

Statement of Basil L. Whitener, Member of Congress, 11th District of North Carolina, Before the U.S. Tariff Commission on February 19, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BASIL L. WHITENER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Congressional Record, I include herein a copy of a statement made by me today to the U.S. Tariff Commission:

Statement of Basil L. Whitener, Member of Congress, 11th District of North Carolina, Before the U.S. Tariff Commission on February 19, 1961

Mr. Whitener. Mr. Chairman and members of the Tariff Commission, I express to the Commission my appreciation for the opportunity to appear today in connection with the inquiry now being conducted by the Commission as a result of the request of the President. I think that it is commendable that the President has directed the Commission to determine whether articles or materials, wholly or in part of cotton, are being imported into the United States under such conditions as to materially interfere with the cotton program being operated by the U.S. Department of Agriculture under existing law.

This is a most important matter insofar as thousands of people in the congressional district I represent are concerned. The 11th Congressional District of North Carolina is the largest textile manufacturing district in the United States, and the thousands of people there who earn their livelihoods in the textile plants are greatly concerned about the determination which will be made by the Commission and the President as a result of these hearings since their means of earning a livelihood will be greatly affected by the conclusions reached.

At the outset I would like to commend the U.S. Department of Agriculture for its diligence in presenting the facts with reference to the effect of the importation of foreign-made cotton textiles into the United States. The hundreds of cotton farmers in my congressional district are directly affected by the problem which you are now studying, and I am sure that they have an interest equal to that of our textile workers in the outcome of these hearings. Justification for this interest is, I think, apparent when one reads the statistics set forth in the letter of the Secretary of Agriculture to the President dated November 13, 1961, in which it was recommended that these hearings be conducted. While the hearings are directly related to the effect of imports upon the cotton program administered by the Department of Agriculture, a favorable decision by the Commission and the President will directly benefit not only our cotton farmers but our textile employees.

While your hearings are related solely to the cotton textile field, I believe that it may be of value to point out some of the statistics with reference to the textile industry generally in recent years. These figures give support to the apprehension which our textile people have for the future of the industry and the people who work in that industry.

The Department of Labor has reported that the number of production workers engaged in textile manufacturing in my home State of North Carolina declined from 210,000 in 1954 to 196,000 in 1958. Bringing these figures down to 1960, we find that a report made by a special subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce reveals that between 1947 and 1960 the number of textile jobs involved in liquidations of textile mills in the United States amounted to 229,115. This represents the livelihood of many more persons than those who lost their jobs in the textile industry since the loss of those jobs fell with equal weight upon the members of the families of these job-losing textile workers.

The same report reveals that between 1947 and 1960 there were 838 textile mill liquidations in the United States. The U.S. Department of Labor in its latest report which has come to my attention indicates that in practically every major textile area in the United States there is a substantial labor surplus. Another report which has come to my attention that I think is of significance and relates directly to the hearings now being conducted by this Commission is the Bureau of Census report (FT-410), which states that between 1947 and 1960 there was a 70-percent decrease in U.S. exports of cotton manufactures. This report states that in 1947 our domestic cotton manufacturers exported the equivalent of 2,554 million square yards of cotton textiles; where as in 1960 exports had dropped to 756 million square yards. Further analyzing this report, we find that there was a decrease in our American exports of 80 percent in the yarn and thread division of the industry.

I believe that no one would argue that these figures do not indicate that there exists today a great threat to the thousands of Americans who find the textile industry to be the source of their employment and their opportunities to earn the necessities of life for their families.

Getting to the more specific issue laid down for inquiry by the Tariff Commission, I would point out to the Commission certain data which has been recently brought to my attention by very knowledgeable people in the cotton and textile trade in the United States.

These industry people feel that the principal relief that could be afforded our domestic cotton mills at this time is to permit them to obtain their raw cotton, which is produced in the United States, at the same price as foreign cotton mills can obtain it. Since August 1961 there has been an export subsidy on raw cotton in the amount of $42.50 a bale, or 8½ cents per pound export subsidy on cotton products, including cotton textiles. This $42.50 per bale price disadvantage to American cotton mills is one of the principal reasons that foreign cotton textiles can be imported into the United

States under a competitive situation which is grossly unfair to our own textile people. In effect we are under the present state of affairs having our American textile people at all levels taxed to subsidize the foreign textile industry, which industry constitutes an economic Frankenstein which should be destroyed immediately with every available weapon at the hands of the American people and, particularly, Government officials.

I urge the Commission to act favorably upon the request of the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the textile industry people throughout the Nation in the present case. I know that I speak for thousands of people in North Carolina and elsewhere when I say to the members of this Commission that we are grateful to you for hearing our pleas and that we will be most appreciative of any action that you can take to help in bringing about a stabilizing of our cotton textile industry in America and assisting us in preserving the opportunities for employment for many thousands of people.

Thank you.

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, Friday, February 16, the Lithuanian people celebrated the 44th anniversary of their Declaration of Independence. On this day in 1918, toward the close of World War I, the Lithuanian people, after many years of suffering under czarist rule, established their own government and proclaimed their independence. As soon as the German troops evacuated Vilnius on January 15, 1919, the Red army entered the city and immediately established a Communist government. The battles were extremely bitter but the Lithuanian people emerged triumphant. A Polish army including many Lithuanians drove the Red army out of the city, and not long thereafter Russia recognized the independence of Lithuania. The peace treaty which the Soviet government signed stated that it voluntarily and forever renounces all sovereign rights possessed by Russia over the Lithuanian people and their territory.

The Lithuanians were accepted by the League of Nations, where their spokesmen worked for world peace. In a constitution adopted in 1922, Lithuania promised freedom of speech, assembly, religion and communication to all its citizens. But the freedom of the Lithuanian people was unfortunately short lived, despite an attempt to remain neutral in the Second World War. Territory was yielded to Germany in March of 1939 and a few months later a mutual assistance treaty was forced on Lithuania by the Soviet Union. Despite an earlier nonaggression treaty with the Soviets the little country was forced to accept Soviet troops and grant airbases to the Russians. A rigged election produced a congress which requested the incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union. On August 3, 1940, at this "request," Lithuania was declared a constituent republic of the U.S.S.R.

For over two decades the Lithuanians have suffered under the totalitarian rule of the tyrants in Moscow. Scores of thousands of intellectuals were executed or deported to Siberia. The resistance movement was crushed through the application of unlimited terror. Russian settlers were brought in to help consolidate Soviet control and to supplant the ancient Lithuanian culture and civilization.

In celebrating the independence which they no longer enjoy, the Lithuanian people are expressing their faith that the future will bring the ultimate triumph of good over evil. Americans of Lithuanian descent join with their brethren in the motherland and throughout the free world. The voice of a brave, freedom-loving people has been stifled for many years but the ideal of human liberty still burns brightly for Lithuania. As the torchbearers of freedom in this world, the American people must never forget the struggle of these people. We must continue to do everything we can to aid the Lithuanians. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join with Lithuanians everywhere in honoring the spirit and traditions of Lithuanian independence.

Appreciation of Our Gallant Men in Uniform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure and a privilege under leave to extend my remarks to insert into the RECORD a copy of a letter from our Secretary of Defense, Robert S. McNamara, addressed to the relatives of our men in the Reserve Forces who have been called back to active duty. I also present a copy of a press release from Secretary of the Air Force Eugene M. Zuckert, as well as one from Gen. Curtis LeMay. All are thoughtful expressions of appreciation from their superiors to our gallant men in uniform.

The letter and press releases follow:

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., January 8, 1962.

DEAR FELLOW AMERICAN: During the last several months more than 150,000 men in the Reserve forces of the United States have been called back to active duty. This has been brought home to you in a very personal way, I know, because a relative of yours is among the reservists now in uniform, and it is for that reason I am writing you.

Every reservist called back to active duty is making a special contribution to his country's security, but I recognize—and the President recognizes—that this has meant difficulty, inconvenience and the disruption of civilian pursuits for thousands upon thousands of Americans, including the families who were left behind when the reservists reported for duty. The necessity for such sacrifice is not always understood. That's why your service has been using its internal information program to explain the callup and to answer many of the questions which I know have been raised.

As we enter a new year the United States continues to face a strong and determined adversary who is pushing and probing at freedom in many parts of the world. The United States is the chief defender of freedom in this world, and we can fill this role and maintain the peace only so long as we ourselves are strong and determined. The 150,000 recalled reservists have helped to keep us strong, and their recall has surely evidenced our determination.

We are taking other steps, of course, to convince the Soviet bloc we mean business, and as we build our strength in these other ways it will become possible to release the reservists from active duty. But in the meantime their country owes them a very great debt, and you who are sharing in the sacrifices they have made are equally entitled to the thanks of a grateful nation.

Sincerely,

ROBERT S. MCNAMARA.

PRESS RELEASE NO. 1

Secretary of the Air Force Eugene M. Zuckert dispatched congratulatory messages today to the Commander of the Tactical Air Command, Gen. Walter C. Sweeney, Jr., and to the commanders of the former Air National Guard units now in Europe. The messages are as follows:

"To Commander TAC:

"My congratulations to TAC on the professional manner in which you conducted the operational deployment of units from the Air National Guard. The success of the deployment reflects the cooperation between our active duty and Reserve forces and underscores the high degree of proficiency of both. Please extend my congratulations to all TAC units and personnel participating in this successful operation."

"To Commander USAFE for Individual Unit Commanders:

"My warmest salute to the men of your command on their highly successful deployment to Europe. The manner in which the deployment was conducted so soon after recall could only be the result of sustained superior performance. It is my desire that every man in your organization knows of the pride the whole Air Force feels in this accomplishment, which reflects the high standards set and maintained in Air National Guard training."

PRESS RELEASE NO. 2

Gen. Curtis E. LeMay has congratulated the Tactical Air Command and the Air National Guard on "the outstanding manner" in which the recent movement of more than 200 jet fighters to Europe was accomplished.

The Air Force Chief of Staff, who has just returned from a visit to Europe to inspect the recalled units of the Air National Guard, sent the following message to Gen. Walter C. Sweeney, Commander of the Tactical Air Command, and Maj. Gen. Winston P. Wilson, Assistant Chief of the National Guard Bureau for Air:

"The movement of the newly federalized ANG units to Europe was executed in an orderly, efficient, and professional way. This required the utmost leadership, planning, and cooperation on the part of all units and personnel involved. All obstacles were overcome by ingenuity and determination in spite of the extremely short preparation time available. The end result of the safe and expeditious arrival of the fighters should be a source of great pride to all who had a part in the operation. I wish to offer my congratulations for the outstanding manner in which this difficult and vitally important task was successfully accomplished. Please pass the above on to your people who were responsible for this."

Tactical fighter units included in the deployment to Europe were elements of the 122 Tactical Fighter Wing, Fort Wayne, Ind.; the 131 Tactical Fighter Wing, St. Louis, Mo.; the 121 Tactical Fighter Wing, Columbus, Ohio; the 102 Tactical Fighter Wing, Boston, Mass.; the 108 Tactical Fighter Wing, McGuire Air Force Base, N.J.; and the 117 Tactical Reconnaissance Wing, Birmingham, Ala. They are equipped with F-84F, RF-84F and F-86H aircraft.

Organizations which assisted in the deployment included the Military Air Transport Service, the Strategic Air Command, the Air Force Logistics Command, the United States Air Forces in Europe, the Air Defense Command, the Navy, and the Coast Guard.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following newsletter of February 17, 1962:

Washington Report

(By Congressman Bruce Alger, Fifth District, Texas)

"We see it, and to us it appears like principle, and the best sort of principle at that—the principle of allowing the people to do as they please with their own business."—Abraham Lincoln.

The Public Welfare Amendments of 1962 provoked some amazing testimony during the hearings concluded this week before the Ways and Means Committee. Representatives of Protestant and Catholic churches appealed for Federal aid in welfare work. The Protestant, Bradshaw Mintener, chairman of the Department of Social Welfare of the National Council of Churches of Christ, said the church-related agencies were willing to sell their services. Monsignor Gallagher, secretary of the National Conference of Catholic Charities, admitted Catholic agencies were already receiving Federal aid. The testimony included the following:

"Mr. Mintener. There are some 4,000 church-related health and welfare agencies in the United States under Protestant and Eastern Orthodox auspices. A member of these sectarian agencies may be in a position to sell a limited amount of service to their State or county. There is general agreement that church-related agencies may accept per diem payments on a case-by-case basis for services purchased by Government for individuals." Following is a transcript of my questions of Mr. Mintener and his answers:

"Mr. Alger. I wish to ask a question or two to be sure I understand. Mr. Mintener, you are suggesting then that church-related agencies sell their services to the Government?

"Mr. Mintener. Make them available to the Government.

"Mr. Alger. I am quoting you. You used the word 'sell.' I am not haggling over the word. In your statement you say sell their services. Do you not see that when the church-related agencies take money it is to be expected that they will be regulated by the Government? We at the Federal level constitutionally have to lay down the guidelines for Federal spending. At the least, Congress has the responsibility as watchdog of the purse strings to lay down the conditions by which the taxpayers' money is paid out. So you know it is an axiom without question when we distribute money at the Federal level we have to lay down the guidelines in regulations to accompany that money.

"Mr. Mintener. We would hope that such guidelines or such criteria would be such that these agencies could live under them.

"Mr. Alger. I am sure we would have the best intentions but I believe it is an axiom without contradiction that Federal money will necessarily be accompanied by a certain degree of Federal control. Do you see no clash whatsoever in your views expressed here today in the separation of church and state, a principle that we all champion?

"Mr. Mintener. I cannot see all the possibilities. I would certainly hope that this would not result in any clash between church and state. I hope that we can keep that separate.

"Mr. Alger. Is your hope well founded?

"Mr. Mintener. I hope we can keep that separate. I am an optimist.

"Mr. Alger. If you take some money from Uncle Sam, the church, you see no clash at all?

"Mr. Mintener. All I can say is that we hope this will not occur.

"Mr. Alger. You know how the church and state thought comes about?

"Mr. Mintener. Yes, sir.

"Mr. Alger. I am sure you understand the Bill of Rights as do I. It says, 'Congress shall make no law concerning the establishment of religion' and so forth. It does not say a law which we hope will have no strings attached or a law by which we sell at $50 per case. It says 'no law.' Therefore, I am frankly surprised, and I want to tell you, sir, as far as I am concerned, you do not speak for the church of which I am a member. I am not sure whether we are under your council or not. But so far as what you say today, I tell you I am shocked, I am surprised, and I think your argument is totally without foundation when you express hope that there will not be a clash. I say that you undoubtedly are putting the church under the Government because you will take the Government's money and have to live by the rules which we as responsible legislators will have to lay down. I say this without any bitterness toward you, or rancor. I feel your logic is inaccurate when you say you hope there will not be any confusion of church and state. It seems to me that we will be pretty well taking over your church-related agencies if we use you.

"Mr. Mintener. I hope not.

"Mr. Alger. You see no conflict in your logic today in what I am suggesting?

"Mr. Mintener. Well, we feel that this program can be worked out. I would say that.

"Mr. Alger. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Monsignor Gallagher said, "We further recommend wherever it is prudent to do so, public welfare administration should purchase service from private agencies and institutions where this service can be effectively rendered by this means. We believe that purchase of service agreements should be on a per diem, per capita, item by item basis."

Again I turn to the transcript of the hearings for my discussion with Monsignor Gallagher:

"Mr. Alger. Monsignor, are there Catholic Church or related agencies services available for hire as was pointed out by the preceding witness?

"Monsignor Gallagher. Yes, Mr. Alger, there has been a long established pattern of cooperation of this sort between public agencies and our institutions and in many cases day-care programs.

"Mr. Alger. Are they now receiving Federal aid or, rather, Federal contracts?

"Monsignor Gallagher. They are offering service to State programs where there is a Federal sharing, yes, sir.

"Mr. Alger. So this would just be an extension of something that is already in practice?

"Monsignor Gallagher. That is the way we understand it, Mr. Alger.

"Mr. Alger. Do you see any danger in the drying up of private money for the support of the church by the expansion of Federal programs?

"Monsignor Gallagher. Yes, sir, we do consider it one of the elements in the problem of voluntary effort. A second problem, if I may allude to it and answer both of them together, is our concern for the drying up of interest and activity on the part of people to use their own ingenuity and initiative to help meet their own problems or the problems of a neighbor or others in their general vicinity. For this reason we are anxious to have voluntary effort espoused in whatever legislative way is possible to do so, so that this ingredient of citizenship may never be lost or become inactive in a large number of our people. For this reason, e.g., we share some of the concepts expressed this morning, not entirely, by Mr. Reid to the effect that we don't believe a total amount of the operating budget of an agency should come through the sale of service to a public authority. Now to answer the two of them together, we do recognize that the increase of taxes to support welfare programs does have an effect upon the voluntary contributor and for this reason we would look for some prudent middle-of-the-road path to the increase of service under public welfare administration and those of the fruitful partnership available through voluntary effort.

"Mr. Alger. Do you have any uncertainty in your mind at all—I have and I am asking for help—Do you feel any uncertainty at all in asking the Government to move into the area which traditionally has been church and private?

"Monsignor Gallagher. I think the terms of the relationship as we have had the experience over the years would indicate that it is carefully spelled out so that none of the money obviously is used for the promotion of religious purposes per se. Similarly, that the careful detailing of the budgets supporting the bills that are submitted would indicate that the money is actually spent to fulfill the responsibilities of the public authority. Similarly, the relationship which already exists in the matter of licensing, e.g., by a public authority of our operations indicates that there is a working relationship already established which does not contravene the identity or the integrity either of the individual agency nor of the public authority feeling that his responsibility is not justly being fulfilled. I recognize what you have said earlier as being a very crucial issue in the matter of church and state relationships and the autonomy of religious organizations when they seem to be depending upon a public dollar for their support. But

I assure you that it has been worked out seemingly with great satisfaction in several of the States and that there does not seem to be any great reality to the danger of losing one's autonomy on the one hand or of feeling that they are supporting a religion on the other.

"Mr. ALGER. I appreciate the way you have expressed it. You said it far better than I. That is my worry. I don't share your view. Possibly, as I study what you have said and look at the record, I may change my thinking. But I must tell you right now I have a kind of unreal feeling that this is actually happening, I am sitting here listening to the Catholic and Protestant churches indeed selling their services. That is possibly my provincialism. My feelings may change.

"Monsignor GALLAGHER. I shall be happy to meet with you later to discuss this."

Public assistance is a Federal-State program approximately 50-50 percent matching of money, State administered under Federal guidelines. In the current bill (1) A greater Federal part is suggested; (2) State coercion by Federal Government is advocated; (3) 100 percent Federal aid for the training of welfare workers, including graduate studies; (4) exhortation of welfare workers to teach the public about the vast public assistance programs that are available; (5) greater Federal Government leadership in coordinating public and private welfare organizations which include church agencies.

Questions to be answered by my further inquiries of both HEW and churches include: (1) How much aid goes to churches now? (2) Doesn't this violate church-state separation? (3) How can Federal Government dominate (as it always must any joint operation) without destroying the church's autonomy, indeed merging it with government? The role of churches in a spiritually motivated nation is a subject near and dear to the hearts of all Americans and commands our most throughtful and temperate consideration. Further information on this problem will be furnished you in future newsletters as it is developed.

"If destruction be our lot we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a nation of free men we must live through all time or die by suicide."—Abraham Lincoln.

The St. Louis Story Is One of Cooperation Between Private and Public Groups—Address by Senator Symington at Federal Building Dedication

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, February 5, the new Federal Office Building in St. Louis was dedicated in my congressional district at ceremonies arranged by the Chamber of Commerce of St. Louis. Unfortunately, I was not able to attend the event because of official duties here, the invitation having arrived too late for me to be able to rearrange my schedule.

I am delighted, however, that among those who spoke at the dedication ceremonies was Missouri's senior U.S. Senator, the Honorable STUART SYMINGTON, who used the occasion to emphasize the necessity for close cooperation between the public and private sectors of the community and of the country to achieve real and lasting progress.

Senator SYMINGTON's excellent address was as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR STUART SYMINGTON, AT DEDICATION OF NEW FEDERAL OFFICE BUILDING, ST. LOUIS, MONDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 1962

It is a pleasure, and a very great honor, to participate in the dedication of this, the new St. Louis Federal Office Building.

Completion of this modern facility will now afford people of our city, State, and Nation many savings in time, money, and convenience.

It will enable the Government and its people to do a better job of serving you.

This new building is also a major link in the redevelopment of downtown St. Louis. Its location, right here in the plaza area, is symbolic of the cooperative work—private, local and Federal—that has gone into the overall efforts looking toward the renaissance of our town.

It is a tribute to the St. Louis congressional Representatives, especially that gracious and outstanding public servant, Congresswoman LEONOR SULLIVAN, in whose district we, and this building, now stand.

The people of St. Louis know that, if a city is to move ahead, if it is to rebuild, the real responsibility lies right here at home. And that is where it should be.

It has been shown that the most effective work is done by local people—and by local funds.

If we citizens had not voted the bond issue of 1935, you would have no Jefferson Memorial today.

Nor would you have the massive slum clearance and downtown redevelopment program without the bond issue of 1955.

The current large Federal investment here would not have had a major effect without the cooperative efforts of the city government—under such men as our outstanding mayor, Raymond Tucker, private business leaders who have made fine investments; and, most of all, the people themselves, who must review and approve what is done.

The defeat of the recent bond proposals—a decision many of us hope will be reversed—showed just how important these local efforts are. It was a defeat against the wishes of a majority of St. Louisans; but in itself it underscored the importance of decision here in our own town.

Whereas the Federal Government is investing less than $20 million in the Jefferson Memorial, private and local investment in this riverfront and stadium area will be well over $100 million.

Some believe that urban renewal is a strictly Federal effort. But experience has shown that for each $1 of Federal grants on renewal projects, about $5 of local expenditures are generated.

And of this local money, about one-half is spent for new housing, one-fourth for commercial and industrial development, and the remaining fourth for a variety of civic improvements.

The Plaza Square apartments right across the street provide an excellent illustration. Total city and Federal expenditures were less than $3 million; total private investment more than $20 million.

The "St. Louis story"—and comparable stories in towns and cities throughout the country—are stories of cooperation, cooperation between private and public groups, joint cooperative efforts of local, State, and Federal Governments.

No one group could possibly have done this part of the overall job which we dedicate today. It represents a joint effort, in the typical American way—and we will have more such dedications in the years to come.

Now we hear much protest these days about the great, and by implication undesirable, increase in Government spending for Federal projects such as this one; and for another Federal project we all want—adequate flood control; and for a Federal project most have wanted—urban redevelopment; and for another Federal project we want—the Jefferson Memorial; and for another Federal project we all want—the interstate highway program.

Very few Missourians have written us opposing any of these projects.

But thousands have written supporting them.

Now let me ask you this simple question.

How can people who write urging these particular projects for the betterment of their city and their State, which, of course, require Federal appropriations, nevertheless vehemently criticize Federal expenditures in general?

Is it not illogical to advocate Federal projects for one's own locality, but at the same time oppose similar Federal projects for other cities and States?

Why should people, who bombard their representatives to obtain improvements for their own area, term comparable appropriations for other areas "socialism"?

In simple justice, how can they expect to eat their cake and have it too?

How in the name of commonsense do they expect our delegation in the Congress to be successful in obtaining desired appropriations for St. Louis and Missouri—but at the same time also be successful in blocking comparable appropriations for other cities and States?

If they are against such expenditures in principle, and want St. Louis and Missouri to stay behind, while other communities move ahead, let them say so frankly. But let's have an end to even the semblance of hypocrisy.

In this connection, you will be most interested in the following figures:

In 1939, Government spending, in the nondefense area, amounted to 13.3 percent of the gross national product; in 1960 it was only 10.9 percent.

Do we in St. Louis want to move backward by standing still—in investment, in employment, in pride of future accomplishment, while other towns and cities and States move forward?

I believe we do not; and I am confident you agree.

Contrary to another inaccurate story being spread around by those who would seem to define as "socialism" any expense which does not directly benefit themselves, recent years have not seen a decline in Government stimulation of the private economy; in fact the reverse is true.

Of all funds spent by the Federal Government in 1960, 53 percent went for goods and services produced by private firms—firms that operate for profit, under the free enterprise system.

In contrast, in 1929 Government purchases from private firms were only 39 percent of the total expenditures; so the history of recent years is one of increasing cooperation, for mutual benefit, between private and public sectors of our economy.

The living standards of the people of America are higher today, after taxes, than any people in the history of the world.

The corporate profits of the last recorded quarter, after taxes, were $27 billion, the greatest in world history.

These are the facts.

This is the truth—and it makes for the "St. Louis story."

I, for one, am mighty proud of what our joint effort has done to create this story.

But that is the past. Let us look to the future. Let us now continue, together, to achieve an ever finer St. Louis and an ever greater Missouri.

Thank you very much.

It's Time for a New Look at Relief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, our able Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Honorable Abraham Ribicoff, has frequently discussed the misconceptions and misunderstandings in America about the problems of our citizens who are on what is called relief. Recently Secretary Ribicoff wrote an explanatory article on this most important subject which appeared in This Week magazine, February 11, 1962.

To help dispel some of the false impressions of the welfare programs, I commend the Secretary's article to the attention of our colleagues:

IT'S TIME FOR A NEW LOOK AT RELIEF

(By Abraham Ribicoff, U.S. Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare)

How much does welfare cost? Who pays? Who gets the money? The man in charge of it gives you a hard look at our 30-year-old U.S. relief system—and forecasts some important changes.

You have read and heard many disturbing things about public welfare recently. You have been told that your money is being wasted on chislers, immoral women and those too shiftless to work. You are worried, and rightly so, about abuses in relief.

I would like to tell you the truth about welfare. Yes, there is some foundation for some of the charges that have been made. Grafters and chiselers do exist on relief, as elsewhere. A few seriously distressed families do stay on relief down through the second and third generation. Welfare today does cost more in dollars than it did 10 years ago—like nearly everything else.

However, this is not only a part of the picture—and a very small part at that. The fact that it exists at all is one reason why we are taking a new look at public assistance. The whole picture is very different from the partial one so often held up to us. It shows, I believe, that we must do two things:

We must meet the few cases of real abuses with practical solutions instead of angry, nickel-saving schemes that cost more dollars in the long run.

We must pursue a new and constructive approach to the entire welfare problem—aiming to get people off relief and back into the self-respecting lives almost every one of them wants.

In this article, I would like to first present a clear picture of welfare in the United States today, and then tell you what I feel we need in the way of a new approach, and how I feel we must go about putting a new approach into effect.

1. Who is on relief?

The following shows in concise form the breakdown of present welfare cases in the United States. The total is 7.2 million people, 4 percent of the population, divided as follows:

Two million six hundred thousand children get $1 billion.

Children make up more than one-third of the total. Some are the children of disabled fathers. Other boys and girls are fatherless by reason of death, divorce, separation or desertion. Some children of unemployed fathers are also included. Despite wild accusations, more than 80 percent of these children are legitimate. Most receive aid to dependent children (ADC) support for less than 2 years.

We can be proud that through ADC many millions of young people in the last 25 years have been able to remain in their own homes with their own mothers, despite tragedy and deprivation. My files bulge with records of such youngsters who have gone on to earn fine scholastic records, get decent jobs, marry, and raise families—and very often support their own parents in the bargain.

Eight hundred thousand mothers get $300 million.

Mothers of ADC children who also receive aid number about 800,000. The point of this program is to enable a woman who has lost her husband to keep her family together. If you seriously believe that large numbers of women are bearing illegitimate children to increase their relief allotments, consider simple arithmetic. The average payment for all the expenses of each child is exactly $1 a day—hardly an inducement to take on the costs and problems of raising another child.

Two million three hundred thousand aged get $2 billion.

Aged men and women compose close to another one-third of our relief total. Surely this group of needy old people cannot be condemned as grafters.

Four hundred thousand disabled get $300 million; 100,000 blind get $100 million.

Disabled and blind people account for half a million welfare receipients. Nobody will quarrel with their right to assistance.

One million general get $300 million.

General assistance recipients (home relief) include 1 million people—a surprisingly low figure when you think that our unemployed number about 4 million. Many are in economic disaster areas; others are victims of automation. The Federal Government does not contribute toward general assistance. The program is in the hands of the States and localities.

To correct other false ideas that are widely held, you should also know that it is far from easy to get on relief. Nor is it possible to live in luxury on relief. The average welfare family squeezes by on one-fourth the income of the average non-welfare family. Imagine that in terms of your rent, food and milk. You may read of one family getting over $200 a month. Have you read of 99 other families who get less than $85 a month?

Studies have shown that fraud and outright chiseling amount to less than 2 percent.

Relief costs have not spiraled out of hand. While dollar costs are up the percentage of our gross national product devoted to public assistance has declined by about 11 percent since 1950.

That is the true picture of relief today. Close to 90 percent of welfare recipients are too old, too young, too disabled to work or are caring for young children. Of the remaining 10 percent, many would work eagerly if they could find jobs.

2. A new aim in welfare: save them from relief.

But we are far from satisfied with the current state of relief. Although our economy and our problems have become more complex and our knowledge of human behavior has deepened, we still go about public assistance the same way we did 30 years ago—passing out relief checks without correcting the causes that keep people on relief.

We must change. Public welfare must have a positive goal. The goal should be to move people off relief by renewing their spirit and creating economic and social opportunities for them. We must save them from relief.

Before I took office a year ago, I promised the Senate Finance Committee I would reappraise the country's welfare program. Months before Newburgh broke into the news, I called together outstanding social-welfare leaders and asked them to study the public-assistance picture and make recommendations. From these proposals I have announced certain changes in our welfare programs. Today I am happy to discuss our new program for the first time in a publication.

Major objective: prevention. Through our Federal welfare laws we want to help prevent delinquency, illegitimacy, chronic dependency, and family breakdown. We all know a stitch in time saves nine. Yet we hesitate to take that stitch. Among the children on ADC many are vulnerable to the forces that produce delinquency.

If we know that a particular child is fatherless, deprived financially, living in poor housing in a bad neighborhood, with a mother overwhelmed by worries, doesn't it make sense to act early rather than wait until that child commits some serious misdeed? Of course it does.

Another area for prevention is the rise of illegitimacy at all income levels. Of special concern is the woman who bears repeated children out of wedlock. Neither starvation nor a simple relief check offers a meaningful solution to her tangled problems. But careful studies show that preventive measures do work.

At a home for unwed mothers in New York, girls were given professional casework services at the time of their pregnancy. Eighty-five percent, over a 10-year period, had no more illegitimate children. The other side of the coin is seen in a Maryland study. Out of 100 girls who did have more than 1 illegitimate child, only 2 received casework services at the time of their first pregnancy.

Major objective: rehabilitation. Through welfare we must seek to restore thousands of individuals and families to self-respect and self-sufficiency. Most people want to work to earn an honest living. Most families want to handle their own affairs.

A job is a key step. But many workers are jobless today because their skills are no longer needed when factories automate or move away. Their best hope may lie in retraining.

The New York City Department of Welfare has set a fine example in training relief recipients in new trades and better work habits. In Huntington, W. Va., the whole country is watching as 325 long-term unemployed persons are being retrained under a new Federal program. One in ten workers in that area is out of a job because of chronic depression in the soft coal mines. But jobs for appliance repairmen, route salesmen, automobile mechanics are going begging.

Another approach to reemployment is through work opportunity programs. I think we are ready now for the Federal Government to participate in these programs, broadening them from mere make work to teaching new skills and eventually returning workers to payrolls in business and industry.

Still another road to rehabilitation is through treatment of the family as a whole. This can work. In Chicago, an experimental family restoration unit of 5 top-ranking caseworkers eliminated 163 families from relief rolls in 7 months. The team made it possible to cut grants in 29 cases and kept 8 families from going on relief. The saving was $182,000 a year.

In Indiana, accelerated counseling with 125 chronically dependent families resulted in savings of $16,500 in 1 year and $22,500 the next. We mean to step up efforts to bring such services to relief recipients.

3. What we need to achieve our new welfare goals.

Incentives: We must offer both States and individuals incentives to help themselves. We are working with the States to seek solutions to people's problems rather than to keep paying them relief. We have also issued a new policy encouraging teenagers receiving ADC assistance to work and save for their education and so train for future employment. In fact, we are examining all of our laws and policies to make sure none thwart self-reliance in even the smallest way.

Training: More and better trained social workers are essential. One untrained worker, in charge of 300 cases, becomes a mere conduit for a flow of money. We have already taken steps to begin a more effective training program in every State.

Money: Yes, it will cost a great deal to restore millions to independence and productivity. But it costs even more not to, as the chain of dependency lengthens and crushing burdens fall on schools, neighborhoods, courts, and all other institutions.

Legislation: When citizens and legislators understand what we are trying to accomplish, I feel sure they will support our legislative program.

To reach the point where relief billions may someday be released for other purposes, we must breathe a new spirit into our welfare laws. Indeed the word "spirit" might well sum up our approach. The letters of the word spell out the ingredients of our new program: Services, prevention, incentives, rehabilitation, independence, training.

To realize the uniquely American promise in our Constitution: "To promote the general welfare," let us start now to devise a great living program of human renewal in our land.

Reservists and Guardsmen Show Well in Current Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the contributions of the Nation's reservists and guardsmen have never shown more brightly than in the current period of crisis. This service, with particular reference to the Air Reserve Forces, is brilliantly set forth by the Honorable Joe Foss, president of the Air Force Association, in a letter to Members of Congress. I submit the letter and accompanying appropriate statements from national leaders for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The letters and statements follow:

FEBRUARY 12, 1962.

Hon. ROBERT L. F. SIKES,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BOB: In the midst of the controversy and complaints over the callup of Reserves as a result of the Berlin crisis, it appears that the public is largely unaware of the magnificent job done by the Air Reserve Forces during this period.

The Air Reserve units are and should be made up entirely of volunteers. We ask your assistance in making it clear to the men and their families that their sacrifices have been for a vital purpose, and that the Nation appreciates their continued willingness to serve. Few will want to serve in an organization that may be under a cloud of doubt and suspicion.

The Air Force Association has undertaken a project to set the record straight for all American. In the belief that the callup record of the Air Reserve Forces might merit coverage in your newsletter, I call your attention to the following:

First, the Air Force record shows convincingly that the Reserve Forces are a valuable component of our defense structure.

Second, the patriotic response of the members of the Air Reserve Forces and the sacrifices borne willingly by their families merit the Nation's gratitude.

Third, appropriate recognition of the reservists will help assure the continued strength and usefulness of the Air Reserve Forces when they are released from active duty.

Specifically, I call your attention to four examples in this record accomplishment:

1. Air Guardsmen flew 218 single-engine jetplanes over the Atlantic within a month after being recalled, providing much-needed conventional fighter strength for Air Force combat units in Europe. In a recent letter to President Kennedy, Chancellor Adenauer of Germany wrote that, in his opinion, the buildup to which these units contributed was the prime factor influencing Khrushchev to back down on Berlin.

2. The number of complaints from Air Force recallees was nearly zero—no greater under the circumstances than would have been experienced with career personnel.

3. Five Air Force Reserve and six Air National Guard squadrons entered on duty with four-engine transport aircraft, the first to be assigned to their respective components. In 3 months of active duty, their crews flew almost 4,000,000 miles on troop carrier and cargo missions.

4. The remaining 13 Air Guard tactical fighter and reconnaissance squadrons on active duty in the United States are combat ready, poised for immediate deployment wherever national security may be threatened.

The Secretaries of Defense and Air Force and the Air Force Chief of Staff have publicly expressed their high regard for the mission capability of Reserve Forces personnel and appreciation for the spirit in which reservists' wives and families have accepted the recall. Their pertinent statements are attached.

We hope you agree that the record of Air Reserve Forces on active duty deserves the attention of your constituents and all Americans. We hope you will help make the record clear.

Sincerely,

JOE FOSS.

P.S.—We would appreciate receiving copies of material emanating from your office on this subject, so we may give it proper recognition.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., January 8, 1962.

DEAR FELLOW AMERICAN: During the last several months more than 150,000 men in the Reserve Forces of the United States have been called back to active duty. This has been brought home to you in a very personal way, I know, because a relative of yours is among the reservists now in uniform, and it is for that reason I am writing you.

Every reservist called back to active duty is making a special contribution to his country's security, but I recognize—and the President recognizes—that this has meant difficulty, inconvenience, and the disruption of civilian pursuits for thousands upon thousands of Americans, including the families who were left behind when the reservists reported for duty. The necessity for such sacrifice is not always understood. That's why your service has been using its internal information program to explain the callup and to answer many of the questions which I know have been raised.

As we enter a new year the United States continues to face a strong and determined adversary who is pushing and probing at freedom in many parts of the world. The United States is the chief defender of freedom in this world, and we can fill this role and maintain the peace only so long as we ourselves are strong and determined. The 150,000 recalled reservists have helped to keep us strong, and their recall has surely evidenced our determination.

We are taking other steps, of course, to convince the Soviet bloc we mean business, and as we build our strength in these other ways it will become possible to release the reservists from active duty. But in the meantime their country owes them a very great debt, and you who are sharing in the sacrifices they have made are equally entitled to the thanks of a grateful Nation.

Sincerely,

ROBERT S. MCNAMARA.

NOVEMBER 14, 1961.

Gen. Curtis E. LeMay has congratulated the Tactical Air Command and the Air National Guard on "the outstanding manner" in which the recent movement of more than 200 jet fighters to Europe was accomplished.

The Air Force Chief of Staff, who has just returned from a visit to Europe to inspect the recalled units of the Air National Guard, sent the following message to Gen. Walter C. Sweeney, commander of the Tactical Air Command, and Maj. Gen. Winston P. Wilson, Assistant Chief of the National Guard Bureau for Air:

"The movement of the newly federalized ANG units to Europe was executed in an orderly, efficient, and professional way. This required the utmost in leadership, planning, and cooperation on the part of all units and personnel involved. All obstacles were overcome by ingenuity and determination in spite of the extremely short preparation time available. The end result of the safe and expeditious arrival of the fighters should be a source of great pride to all who had a part in the operation. I wish to offer my congratulations for the outstanding manner in which this difficult and vitally important task was successfully accomplished. Please pass the above on to your people who were responsible for this."

Tactical fighter units included in the deployment to Europe were elements of the 122d Tactical Fighter Wing, Fort Wayne, Ind.; the 131st Tactical Fighter Wing, St. Louis, Mo.; the 121st Tactical Fighter Wing, Columbus, Ohio; the 102d Tactical Fighter Wing, Boston, Mass.; the 108th Tactical Fighter Wing, McGuire Air Force Base, N.J.; and the 117th Tactical Reconnaissance Wing, Birmingham, Ala. They are equipped with F-84F, RF-84F, and F-86H aircraft.

Organizations which assisted in the deployment included the Military Air Transport Service, the Strategic Air Command, the Air Force Logistics Command, the U.S. Air Forces in Europe, the Air Defense Command, the Navy, and the Coast Guard.

NOVEMBER 7, 1961.

Secretary of the Air Force Eugene M. Zuckert dispatched congratulatory messages today to the commander of the Tactical Air Command, Gen. Walter C. Sweeney, Jr., and to the commanders of the former Air National Guard units now in Europe. The messages are as follows:

TO COMMANDER, TAC

"My congratulations to TAC on the professional manner in which you conducted the operational deployment of units from the Air National Guard. The success of the deployment reflects the cooperation between our active duty and Reserve forces and underscores the high degree of proficiency of both. Please extend my congratulations to all TAC units and personnel participating in this successful operation."

TO COMMANDER USAFE FOR INDIVIDUAL UNIT COMMANDERS

"My warmest salute to the men of your command on their highly successful deployment to Europe. The manner in which the deployment was conducted so soon after recall could only be the result of sustained superior performance. It is my desire that every man in your organization knows of the pride the whole Air Force feels in this accomplishment, which reflects the high standards set and maintained in Air National Guard training."

SENATE

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 1962

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

Rev. Bayne E. Driskill, D.D., Disciples of Christ, executive director of All-Church Evangelism, Inc., Church of the Disciples, Fort Worth, Tex., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who art love and the controller of time, we are ever conscious of the fact that time and love go on forever. Thy divine presence is requested this day to dwell in each heart of these noble and dedicated leaders in the Senate of the greatest nation in this world; greatest because Thy impelling love and invincible spirit have been constant in the souls of our forefathers from its very beginning.

We are not unmindful of the fact that our leaders of this serene body have not always used wisely the precious time You have given them, for they are human beings. Do forgive the mistakes they have made, and help this body do its best to redeem the time and the mistakes with fruits of love. As these chosen leaders of the people of the United States of America plan for the future of this Nation, may they be tempered by Thy love and guided by Thy infinite wisdom. Bless them as they seek to bring full freedom, liberty, and justice to every citizen of our glorious Nation and to every person in this world, regardless of race, color, or creed. May they never forget that it is Thy truth and love that shall set all men free in the time that lies ahead. At this hour we are conscious that it is later than we realize, both in our Nation and in our world.

Eternal God, we pray for our friends across the world who stand with us for freedom, liberty, and justice. Keep them steadfast and unmovable in these days of restlessness and danger. We pray for our enemies, also, believing that as time goes on, if we are righteous and if we will love them as Thou dost, in the tomorrow, they will be our friends.

We make these requests of Thee, Holy Father, in the name of Him who is here to lead us in such a time as this, even Thy Son, Jesus our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 19, 1962, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 947. An act to designate the new lock on the St. Marys River at Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., as the John A. Blatnik lock; and

H.R. 9884. An act for the relief of certain officers of the naval service erroneously in receipt of compensation based upon an incorrect computation of service for basic pay.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 947. An act to designate the new lock on the St. Marys River at Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., as the John A. Blatnik lock; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 9884. An act for the relief of certain officers of the naval service erroneously in receipt of compensation based upon an incorrect computation of service for basic pay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD obtained the floor.

Mr. RANDOLPH and **Mr. McCLELLAN** addressed the Chair.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield briefly to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wish to ask the distinguished majority leader, and my friend, if it is still his intention to move at this time that the Committee on Government Operations be discharged from the further consideration of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I must regretfully answer in the affirmative.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Let me further ask my distinguished friend, the majority leader, whether, instead of pursuing that course, he would move that the Senate take up Calendar No. 861, Senate bill 1633, to establish a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing; or if he does not desire himself to make such a motion under the circumstances, would he yield to me for that purpose?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I must regretfully decline.

Mr. President, I think the Senator from West Virginia wishes recognition.

MOTION TO DISCHARGE GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS COMMITTEE FROM FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF SENATE RESOLUTION 288, OPPOSING REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1962

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, at the request of the majority leader, I move that the Committee on Government Operations be discharged from the further consideration of Senate Resolution 288, opposing Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let the Senate be in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that on the basis of the motion made by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, there will be 1 hour of debate on the motion, beginning as of now?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is the information the Parliamentarian gives to the Chair.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, a point of order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana has the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may now be a quorum call, and that the time required for it not be charged to the time to be allotted under the motion.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, a point of order, and I think that takes precedence over a quorum call or anything else. When a motion has been made, I think we have a right to raise a parliamentary question of procedure.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from Arkansas state the point of order?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Am I correct—I ask this as a parliamentary inquiry—in understanding that I now have a right to raise a question as to the parliamentary procedure?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana has the floor. Does he yield for that purpose?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to raise a parliamentary inquiry of my own: I should like to have a ruling from the Chair as to the appropriate procedure for a motion of this kind.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The understanding of the Chair is that debate on the motion is limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided. If a point of order is made or if there is a quorum call or if the Senator from Montana or any other Senator obtains the floor and speaks, the time available under the motion will be running.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President——

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, do I have the floor?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana has the floor.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, a point of order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to speak on the motion which has been made by the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President——

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I had hoped that it would be possible, with the accommodation of the Senate as a whole, to have a quorum call at this time, with the time required for the quorum call not to be charged to the time available under the motion. But if it is not possible to do so, I am prepared to begin to speak now on the motion.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I have a point of order, whenever the Chair will hear it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Parliamentarian has provided the Chair with a memorandum pertaining to a motion such as the one the Senator from West Virginia has just now made. The memorandum states that under the reorganization plan of 1949, as amended, debate on such a motion is limited to not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided.

The Chair would assume that the majority leader would desire that the Senator from West Virginia control half of that time, and perhaps that the Senator from Arkansas control the other half of the time. Is that course agreeable to all parties concerned?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No, Mr. President.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, before entering into any agreement, I wish to propound a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Montana yield for that purpose?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the eligibility of the Senator from West Virginia to make the motion to discharge the committee from further consideration of the resolution has not been established under the rules of the Senate; and I raise that point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair inquires of the Senator from West Virginia whether he favors or opposes the resolution of disapproval.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I shall answer in the following manner, and shall state my reply in two parts: I am against the proposal of the President of the United States for the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. I also will vote against discharging the Committee on Government Operations. I have made this motion upon the personal request of the responsible and respected majority leader of the Senate. I was fully qualified to make the motion, and so acted in accordance with the rules of the Senate.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I think by implication, at least, from what the distinguished Senator from West Virginia has said, he does qualify. The test is that such motion may be made only by a Member who favors the resolution of disapproval.

Do I correctly understand that my distinguished friend favors the resolution of disapproval?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is what the Senator from West Virginia stated.

Mr. RANDOLPH. In response to the esteemed Senator from Arkansas, I did state that I was in favor of the resolution of disapproval and I reaffirm it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I said the implication was there.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes, there is no failure on the part of the Senator from West Virginia to accurately follow qualifying procedure.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Let me make a further inquiry: Would a vote on this resolution now be valid in the event the Senator who has moved the discharge of the committee should not vote? Would this proceeding then be valid?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Parliamentarian informs the Chair that a Senator is required to vote under the rules, unless he is excused from voting by the Senate.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Would the proceeding be valid? What I am trying to get at is, What situation would we be in?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Parliamentarian informs the Chair that, in his opinion, it would be valid.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if I may interrupt, is time running?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes, time is running.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield briefly to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In view of the fact that time is running and we are not given an opportunity to ascertain the appropriate parliamentary situation, I will desist, because I think it is a little difficult to operate under the circumstances. If that is the ruling, we will proceed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator desire to make a unanimous-consent request to be yielded to for that purpose?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I do not yield for that purpose. I ask unanimous consent that there may be a quorum call, and that the time for it not be taken out of the time allocated to debate on the motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana asks unanimous consent that he may make a point of no quorum without the time being taken out of the time allocated to the motion.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I ask if the time has been running until now? May I ask how much time is remaining?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has been running for 4 minutes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. To whom is this time charged?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Equally.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Not equally. The Senator had the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Chair charge the time to those who are against the motion of the Senator from West Virginia?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be charged to the time of the Senator——

Mr. McCLELLAN. Wait a minute, Mr. President. Those against the motion? Does the Chair so rule, Mr. President?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has not ruled. The Chair is prepared to rule, if the Senator will permit the Chair to do so.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I object, if that is what the Senator is asking unanimous consent for. I do not object to a division of time, but I want to have the right to present the views of those who do not agree with the procedure to be undertaken.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, may I suggest that the time on the motion be divided equally between the majority leader and the minority leader?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. May I ask also that the time consumed up to this moment be taken out of the time under my control?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I renew my request for a quorum call, the time not to be taken out of the time allocated for this motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 19 Leg.]

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Beall
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Burdick
Bush
Butler
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Capehart
Carlson
Carroll
Case, N.J.
Case, S. Dak.
Chavez
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Douglas
Dworshak
Eastland
Ellender
Engle
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Goldwater
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hickey
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Humphrey
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Jordan
Keating
Kefauver
Kerr
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, Hawaii
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McNamara
Metcalf
Miller
Monroney
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Scott
Smathers
Smith, Mass.
Smith, Maine
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Wiley
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. John T. France, of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, be permitted on the floor of the Senate during debate on the pending proposal.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana yields himself 3 minutes. The Senator may proceed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a good many questions have been raised about the proposal now before the Senate for consideration. I think it ought to be brought to the attention of the Senate that the reason for undertaking action of this kind is to face an issue which has been considered in committees, and which could not be brought before the House because of an action undertaken by a committee which evidently is superior to the regular legislative committee considering the particular proposal.

So far as the Senate is concerned, a somewhat similar proposal, generally speaking, was reported by the Committee on Government Operations. It was approved by the policy committee, but no action was taken on the floor of the Senate because of the lack of action, in a certain sense, in the other body.

As one who comes from an agricultural State, it is my belief that the people of our urban areas are entitled to as much in the way of Cabinet representation as are our farmers, businessmen, workers, and those in other segments of our economy.

I point out to the Senate that 70 percent of the people of our country live in urban areas and that those people are entitled to representation. At the present time representatives of cities and States come to Washington and are required to see representatives of various agencies. Many times they have not been able to achieve the objectives which they have desired in the way of public housing, public slum clearance, and other matters which affect our urban areas.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Montana has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Those people who represent 70 percent of the population of this country, I repeat, are entitled to the consideration proposed; and I express the hope that the proposal will not be considered a question of politics only because of the fact that the President of the United States has indicated that he would appoint Dr. Weaver to be the head of the proposed Department, if and when it is created.

Dr. Weaver is considered to be a good, decent, sincere and able American citizen. That is what counts. May I recall to the Senate that it is nothing new for the Chief Executive to request the creation of a new Cabinet post. A former President, Mr. Eisenhower, announced the creation of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and at almost the same time he announced whom he would appoint to head that agency. So as we enter upon the debate on this question, I hope that those factors will be kept in mind.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I am opposed to the proposed reorganization plan and I am against a discharge of the committee. I shall confine my brief remarks to the question of procedure. It is a question of orderly procedure on an extremely important issue that faces the Senate. The policy of adding a new Cabinet position in the executive department of Government is involved. We know that there are many other requests of this character pending before us. I believe that this is the first time the President of the United States has submitted a reorganization plan to Congress when a bill is pending before the Senate and a bill is pending in the House.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator yield and, if so, to whom?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I will yield if the Senator will take the time out of the time allotted to him.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, indeed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. How much time does the Senator yield to himself?

Mr. MANSFIELD. As much time as I need.

Mr. President, in response to the statement made by the Senator from Massachusetts, I wish to state that the President's hand was forced. The regular legislative committees in both Houses reported favorably a reorganization plan, and as far as the Senate was concerned, the plan was even approved for reporting to the Senate. But when the Committee on Rules in the other body refused to honor the approval already stamped on the proposal by the regular Committee on Government Operations in the House, there was no choice for the President but to do what he did. I am sure the Senator, who is a fair man, will recognize that point.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, in response to that statement, I merely wish to say that the bill is still pending in the House, and under the rules of the House there are methods by which it can be brought to the floor, if such action is necessary.

As I have said, it is a question of orderly procedure. I should like to quote a statement by the Vice President, when he was majority leader of the Senate. I refer to volume 106, part 2, page 2625, of the RECORD of February 16, 1960. On the question of a motion to discharge, the present Vice President said:

> Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon speaks of protecting the Judiciary Committee. He would protect that committee by a motion which would kick the committee in the teeth and would tell the members of the committee that we are going to take all these bills out of its procedure. The Senator from Oregon has criticized what he has called "disorderly procedure." But, Mr. President, I know of no more disorderly procedure that the Senate could take than for it to begin to discharge its various committees from the further consideration of bills under their jurisdiction.

Mr. President, I am heartily in accord with that statement of the Vice President.

As I have said, at the present time, the question is one of procedure. It is proposed to discharge a committee from further consideration of a question that is very important, a question which is still pending before the Senate and the House, relating to a proposed increase of the executive department by the creation of a new Cabinet position.

Finally, I point out that the motion is not in accord with proper procedure when a committee has been expeditiously conducting its proceedings and is almost ready to report.

We are now asked to discharge the committee because of problems of politics, and not on the issue as to whether the measure would be a good one for our Government. I hope that the motion to discharge will not be agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I shall vote against the motion to discharge the Committee on Government Operations from further consideration of President Kennedy's Reorganization Plan No. 1 of

1962, to create a Department of Urban Affairs, although I wish to make it clear that I favor the President's proposal and will support it if it comes before the Senate through the orderly processes of legislative procedure.

I shall vote against the discharge motion because it is part and parcel of the indefensible political maneuvering which has characterized the management of this issue by the politicians in the White House and the Democratic Party leadership in the Congress.

The purpose of the discharge motion is to bring this issue to the Senate before the House of Representative can vote upon it because, as admitted by the Speaker of the House, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK of Massachusetts, the reorganization plan faces almost certain defeat in the other body. The discharge motion is regarded by Democratic Party politicians as a clever tactic which will force Senators to take a position which may prove embarrassing to them in the coming elections. It is a steamroller tactic unsuited to a President's relations with the Senate of the United States.

The discharge motion robs Senators who may not have an opportunity to consider this issue as carefully as some of us have done of the benefit of the considered views of the Committee on Government Operations. The move to force a Senate vote before the committee has had time to submit its report, in conformity with established legislative procedure, is an affront not only to the committee but to all Senators.

There may be circumstances in which it is appropriate to discharge a committee. Such circumstances would exist if there was substantial evidence that the committee was unduly dilatory in its consideration of a bill, and was purposely delaying its report to prevent the Senate from acting.

No such circumstance exists in this case. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, Senator MCCLELLAN, held hearings promptly after the President's plan was submitted, and has stated he will have the committee submit its report in the near future. The distinguished majority leader, Senator MANSFIELD, admitted only yesterday on this floor that no dilatory tactics were being employed by the committee or by its chairman.

He said:

> In view of the fact that the committee under the chairmanship of the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] has worked with such diligence and dispatch in holding hearings and in trying to comply with the wishes of the Senate in this respect, I believe it only fair and proper that the Senate, in turn, observe the normal rule of procedure which has marked this institution through the years.

Mr. President, President Kennedy has said that he submitted his Reorganization Plan in order to force Republicans in Congress to "stand up and be counted" on the issue of whether a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing should be created. This is one Senator who does not hesitate to take a stand, for I took my stand last year before the administration submitted its own proposal for the new Department.

As a member of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, I have been in close touch with the operations of the Housing and Home Finance Agency and have long been convinced that a reorganization was needed in the interests of economy and efficiency. To that end, I introduced a bill in the first session of the present Congress to bring about such a reorganization and elevate the Agency to Cabinet status. The President's reorganization plan is substantially the same as the bill I introduced, and, accordingly, I will support it.

Mr. President, it is not only in the interest of urban areas, but in the national interest that the two-thirds of our people who live in cities, small as well as large, have a strong voice to speak for them at the highest levels of our National Government. Our urban communities must be strong if the United States is to continue to be a flourishing and prosperous nation.

President Kennedy's proposal has been subjected to severe criticism, based primarily upon:

First, the President's injection of a racial issue into this matter by announcement of his intention to appoint Dr. Robert C. Weaver, a distinguished Negro now Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, as Secretary of the new Department should it be created.

Second, fear that a Department of Urban Affairs would bypass the States, weaken their authority over the municipalities which are their creation, and thus contribute to a further centralization of power in Washington.

Third, fear that the creation of a new Department will lead to a vast expansion of Federal spending and of the Federal bureaucracy.

Mr. President, I share the resentment expressed by many persons because of the tactics used by President Kennedy in bringing this issue before the Congress.

The President's injection of racism into this issue was ill considered and unworthy of his high office.

I cannot, however, allow my resentment at the President's tactics to overcome my obligation to the people of my State to consider the reorganization plan dispassionately and upon its merits. As one of their U.S. Senators, I represent all the people of Connecticut, whether they be Republicans, Democrats, or unaffiliated with either party. I have a duty to them to decide each issue which comes before me on the basis of, first, what is right in the national interest, and, second, what is right in the interests of the people of my State.

I have concluded that not only the national interest but the interests of my State will best be served by the creation of the new Department. The programs administered by the Housing and Home Finance Agency are of importance to every community, small as well as large, in Connecticut. They require attention at the Cabinet level.

Mr. President, I have mentioned other factors in addition to the President's injection of a racial issue which have led to opposition to his proposal. These are fear that the new Department will weaken the States, and fear that it will increase both Federal spending and the Federal bureaucracy.

These objections have been voiced by many people in my State for whose opinions I have great respect. As one who himself is concerned because of expansion of the Central Government at the expense of the States, I have taken great care to satisfy myself that the creation of the proposed Department will not, in itself, lead to the consequences about which fear has been expressed.

The proposed Department would not in any way alter the existing relationships between municipalities, the States, and the Federal Government. Within our Federal constitutional framework, it is impossible for the Federal Government to subvert city-State relations. The cities are the creatures of the State governments, and have only the powers which the States grant to them. For example, no community in any State can undertake an urban renewal or redevelopment program, or a housing project for its senior citizens, or a public housing project for people of low incomes, unless there is enabling State legislation.

Mr. President, if the States discharge their responsibilities to the people who live in urban areas they need fear no loss of States rights. Unfortunately, it has been the failure on the part of many States to fulfill their obligations in this regard which has led the cities to turn to Washington for help.

I am proud that my own State of Connecticut is among the few that has acted to meet its responsibilities to its municipalities in activities which are administered by the proposed Department, most notably in the important field of urban renewal and redevelopment. Under legislation initiated by Republicans in the 1957 general assembly, Connecticut helps her towns and cities in planning urban renewal and redevelopment projects, in meeting the local share of the costs of federally financed projects, and in financing commercial-industrial projects which are ineligible for Federal assistance.

As a result, Connecticut has one of the most advanced urban renewal and redevelopment programs of any State in the Nation. As of September 30, 1961, more than $151 million Federal funds had been reserved for 48 projects in 26 towns and cities in our State. Our smaller towns, as well as the major population centers, are participating in this program, which can contribute greatly to the State's economic growth and expansion of job opportunities.

Mr. President, I have been vitally interested in the urban renewal and redevelopment program in Connecticut since its inception. As a member of the Senate Banking Committee, I participated in the drafting of the Housing Act of 1954 which injected new life into the program and introduced the new concept of renewal and redevelopment which transformed the old slum clearance program into an effective instrument for rebuilding our cities, and making them better places in which to live, work, and play. In 1955, at my request, the then Governor, Abraham Ribicoff, called an urban renewal conference at the State capitol in Hartford at which housing officials of the Eisenhower administration explained the new program to local officials from communities throughout the State. From this conference stemmed the remarkable progress which has characterized the urban renewal and redevelopment program in Connecticut.

I want to see that program carried forward vigorously, as well as the college housing program, housing for senior citizens, the mass transportation program which may help to solve the commuting problem which concerns so many people in southwestern Connecticut and other programs of major importance to my State. It is my conviction that the reorganization of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, as proposed in the President's plan, can bring about greater efficiency and economy in the operation of these programs, if there is proper administration at the Cabinet level.

Mr. President, I turn now to the argument that the creation of the proposed Department will lead to an expansion of Federal spending and of the Federal bureaucracy.

There is substantial foundation for the belief that the present administration is committed to increase both Federal domestic spending and the Federal payroll. But the way in which Federal spending and the Federal bureaucracy may be kept within proper limits is for Congress to resist the addition of new domestic programs, and the expansion of existing programs unless a clear case of urgent need is presented.

The creation of the proposed Department of Urban Affairs and Housing will not add a single new program to those now administered by the Housing and Home Finance Agency. It will not expand a single one of the existing programs of the agency.

If new programs or expansion of existing programs are proposed, an issue will be presented which the Congress must then decide upon the merits.

Mr. President, such an issue was presented in the last session of the 87th Congress when the conferees on the housing bill reported to the Senate a measure which exceeded President Kennedy's own requests by approximately $1.6 billion.

At that time, I proposed to recommit the bill with instructions to the Senate conferees to eliminate the $1.6 billion in excessive authorizations. My motion was defeated by the narrow margin of 42 to 47. The motion was supported by 30 of the 32 Republicans voting, and opposed by 45 of the 57 Democratic Senators who participated.

If I may be forgiven a partisan reference, I think the results of the vote demonstrate that those who wish to curb unnecessary Federal spending should elect Republicans to the Congress, for the record demonstrates that our party stands for economy in Government.

The way to achieve economy is by resisting pressures for unnecessary spending when, as and if they arise, and not by opposing a reorganization plan which, if faithfully administered, can bring about increased economy and efficiency in the operation of the existing programs administered by the proposed Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

Mr. President, for the reasons I have stated, I shall support Reorganization Plan No. 1, and oppose the resolution of disapproval.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the Record following these remarks, an editorial from the Hartford Times entitled, "Create That Department," an explanation of the proposed Department in question-and-answer form which I have had prepared, and sundry tables which show the scope of the programs administered by HHFA which are in operation in my State.

There being no objection, the materials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Hartford (Conn.) Times, Feb. 9, 1962]

Create That Department

The fairest, most sensible negative way to balance off argument that cities need no representation in the President's Cabinet would be to abolish the Department of Agriculture.

As Mayor Richard C. Lee, of New Haven, remarked in testimony before the House Subcommittee on Government Operations, in 1862–1889, during years when the Department of Agriculture was created and then became of Cabinet rank, our farms were the basis of the national economy. In those days 80 percent of our people lived in rural regions.

But by 1960, about 70 percent of all the Nation's people lived in urban areas. The 160 metropolitan concentrations today are the centers of productive power, wealth, and creativity.

And Mayor Lee referred to the 1959 taxyear figures when 35 percent of the total individual income tax was paid from but 10 of the larger metropolitan areas alone.

Now this is not information intended to root out of the field of importance the necessary functions of agriculture. However, in his statement, Mayor Lee did put the urban situation in clear and proper perspective.

He said, and we support him in it, "Our cities are the very foundation of our world leadership and if we are to continue to be a flourishing and prosperous Nation, our urban communities must be strong"—and yet today they are in trouble. They have fallen into disrepair or have been swamped by sudden growth.

Is it trouble that the cities themselves can cure?

Let us ask how many cities ever did so, or made any telling attempt to check decline and blight before the advantage of Federal redevelopment and renewal aid was offered.

This Nation is at the point where the slum population alone exceeds the entire farm population of the United States.

Is this a fragmented, local concern, or is it a national problem, to be handled as such?

And how better to handle it than to bring together the activities that are directed toward ameliorating the many vexing situations that yearly increase with concentrations of people, industries, vehicles, and public services?

Mayor Lee is correct when he states that these problems merit handling at the very highest level—the Cabinet table.

The fact is that interested cities, cities that have pride and initiative, already have committed vast resources of their own to their modernization. Hartford and New Haven are among them, as well as many of the smaller communities of this State and others.

It is useless and futile argument to propose that they do more for themselves out of their limitations.

Here we have a curious twist to an assertion that often can be substantiated; that local problems too often are shunted onto Federal Government.

This is the opposite. Those who talk against the establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs would have the communities stagger along and try to cope with the common national problem of urbanization, which is truly a Federal affair.

The problems are not those of the biggest cities alone. Mayor Lee points out that close to two-thirds of all public housing projects are in cities of less than 10,000 population, many of them the environs of larger places. And about 63 percent of all cities engaged in urban renewal programs have a population less than 50,000. In Connecticut 36 cities and towns are directly involved.

It is right that the Nation should assume the responsibilities proposed for an Urban Affairs Department. In 1849, when emphasis was on internal development, the Interior Department was created; the Department of Agriculture in 1889.

By 1903, when the interests of commerce and labor came to the fore, a department was created for them, later separated into two Cabinet-rank activities as the needs of each broadened. Health, Education, and Welfare required top-level administration by 1953.

Now the positive demand is to serve the complex physical plant where more than 70 percent of all Americans live. Create that Department.

Questions and Answers on the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962

Question 1. What is the purpose of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962?

Answer. It is the purpose of this plan to raise to departmental status the functions of the Housing and Home Finance Agency so that Federal functions relating to urban affairs and housing can have a voice in the Cabinet and be given the proper weight and position in the overall administration of the executive branch. The plan also has the purpose of providing in the Department better internal machinery for coordinating and otherwise administering these functions, in order to serve better our States, our cities and towns, the Congress, and the people whom all of the programs are designed to ultimately serve.

Question 2. Briefly, just what would the reorganization plan do and not do?

Answer. Basically and in legal effect, the reorganization plan would do one thing and one thing only: it would create a new Department in the executive branch and transfer to it the existing functions of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, providing for their administration in accordance with sound principles already approved by the Congress for other executive departments. This includes the placing of authority in the Secretary of the Department to supervise and direct all functions of the Department—a normal, logical, and consistent method of operation, as distinguished from some of the scattered authorities in the existing Housing Agency.

The reorganization plan would not do the following:

(a) It would not authorize any new function or program whatsoever.

(b) It would not provide any additional funds.

(c) It would not commit or obligate the Congress in any way to authorize any new program or function.

(d) It would not remove any authority or control of the Congress over the executive branch.

(e) It would not extend in the slightest any power or control of the Federal Government.

(f) It would not impinge on, or in any way affect, the authority of any State, city, or other local body.

(g) It would not transfer any function from any Federal agency or department except the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Question 3. Wouldn't the functions of the new Department be small in scope and importance compared with those of existing Departments?

Answer. No. The gross expenditures under operations to be included in the proposed Department are greater than those of 6 of the present Departments. Almost two-thirds of the financial assistance being provided by all Federal credit operations is being provided under programs of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. These programs now involve close to $50 billion in Government and private investment. Under one or more of these programs financial assistance has been provided to more than 2,000 communities.

Already 70 percent of our population lives in urban areas, and the massive shift of population to these areas continues. One of the greatest of all domestic problems results from the magnitude and complexity of providing adequate and properly planned commuting and other public facilities, especially in urban areas extending across municipal and even State boundaries. Administering the Federal measures designed to assist in meeting these urban problems is proportionately important in operating the executive branch of the Government.

The national economy is particularly sensitive to fluctuating conditions of the housing industry and to related Government aids, and interrelated Government policies regarding them are among the most important of all Government domestic policies.

Of great significance is the unavoidable complexity of these housing and urban development programs which present a continuing stream of extremely difficult problems. They play a major role in the whole relationship of the Federal Government to its States and localities.

Question 4. Wouldn't the establishment of the new Department for city dwellers be inconsistent with the past practice of establishing departments on the basis of their basic purpose?

Answer. The plan would certainly not deal with all of the activities that happen in cities or cover all of the functions of the Federal Government relating to people living in cities. The vast growth in the population of urban areas is indicative of the importance and magnitude of the urban problems which the new Department would handle, but this is not intended to indicate that all the Federal functions relating to these people would be handled by the new Department, any more than all the functions of people living in rural areas are handled by the Department of Agriculture.

Rather, the Department would be established for the basic purpose of dealing with those functions which are particularly urban in nature. They are the functions now being performed by the Housing and Home Finance Agency. Educational and health activities in cities would continue to be aided by HEW; transportation by air and interstate highway and rail would continue to be aided by Commerce; labor matters would continue to be handled by the Labor Department, etc.

The new Department would have as its basic purpose assistance to the improvement and development of urban areas. Thus, grants under the existing program to aid urban planning could enable a city to plan its own growth and placement of its residential, commercial, industrial, and recreational areas. This would enable the city itself to determine where an airport or a highway aided by an existing Department should be located.

Question 5. What could the new Department do that is not now being done? Isn't the proposed reorganization plan merely to change symbols?

Answer. It is true that the plan would provide no additional functions. However, the raising of existing functions to Cabinet level and the proposed new machinery for their administration would accomplish the purposes indicated above, which are extremely important to the welfare of the people in our urban areas and to the Nation as a whole. To the extent the Federal Government's machinery is improved, the States and localities should also benefit, and to the extent the Federal Government can provide better leadership in this field, it will assist the States and localities to strengthen their own machinery for the same purpose.

Question 6. Would the new Department have a unified purpose?

Answer. Yes, because the urban development functions are closely intertwined with the urban housing functions. The urban planning, urban renewal, and community facilities functions relate to the urban housing functions because all of them have a single unified objective—to provide homes in good neighborhoods in well-planned communities adequately served by related public facilities. Indeed, as a category, the functions of the new Department would be much more unified and interrelated than the functions of several existing Federal departments which require far less coordination of the day-to-day activities of their several bureaus or offices.

Question 7. Won't the establishment of a new Department lead to a vast new bureaucracy with increased Federal spending?

Answer. The creation of the Department would have no significant bearing on either extension of functions or increasing expenditures. It creates no new functions and provides no additional money. Nor is there any basis for assuming that the creation of a department carries any implied commitment or encouragement to increased expenditures. There is every reason to believe that the Congress will look at each program on its own merits.

Some agencies which are not departments, such as the Housing and Home Finance Agency, have greater annual expenditures than many of the departments.

Actually, the establishment of the new Department should save Federal funds and save funds of local communities in vast amounts. The only increased cost which can be expected as a result of the reorganization plan amounts to $50,000 annually for the salaries of several important new offices. The savings in interest costs alone, through more expeditious handling of urban renewal projects for example, could run into millions of dollars annually.

Question 8. Doesn't the reorganization plan centralize more power in Washington?

Answer. No. The reorganization plan deals only with the organization of existing Federal functions, and increases no authority or power. It in no way commits the Congress or the President to do so. In any event, this reorganization plan is not dealing with any subject matter involving Federal versus State power. All of the programs of the new Department are voluntary programs of aid to cities, States, or individuals who request it. Insofar as cities or other public bodies participate in any of the programs, such participation must be authorized by the State legislature or some specific constitutional provision, or both. In practice, the States control this participation in great detail. At all times, the State would be free to withdraw or change a city's rights to future participation in the programs. The State itself could participate in the aid programs for public bodies.

The States and localities are bound to benefit from improved administration under the plan. In every field where States are interested in themselves making a contribution to local urban development, the new Department would provide the most effective possible source of Federal encouragement to such State endeavors. It may be pointed out that the program of grants for the planning of urban communities, which would be transferred to the Department, is already administered almost entirely through States themselves, as distinguished from direct financial aid to cities.

Question 9. Wouldn't the reorganization plan impinge on States rights and reduce the status of States and cities?

Answer. No. The reorganization plan has no relationship to the constitutional or legal status of the States and their subdivisions whatsoever. The status of the States remains entirely unchanged. Their functions in this field would be encouraged and strengthened as a result of the plan.

Question 10. Won't the housing functions of the Federal Government be downgraded in the new Department?

Answer. No. Actually, this would be impossible because housing will always constitute the core of the new Department's activities and will be closely related to each one. About three-fourths of all the privately-owned structures of our urban areas are residential. All of the public facilities provided by municipalities have a direct relationship to housing. This is true in matters of planning, financing, and development. Even as to commuter transportation, there is an increasing need for closer coordination in planning transportation in relation to the planning of housing developments. In recognition of the importance of housing in the new Department, the reorganization plan has retained the structure of the Federal Housing Administration without change.

Question 11. Wouldn't the creation of the new Department emphasize aid to big cities, to the detriment of smaller communities?

Answer. Experience under the programs of the Housing and Home Finance Agency has proved that this would not be true. Emphasis has been given to aid for smaller communities because they frequently have the greater need.

Question 12. Wouldn't the creation of the Department tend to emphasize central city areas at the expense of suburbs?

Answer. No. Our suburbs would be the major beneficiaries of the improved administration of the programs of the Department relating to the future growth of our communities. This includes programs relating to the planning of the physical development of growing areas, whether residential, commercial, or industrial. It includes the planning of streets, roads, utilities, and the location of schools as well as housing. The permanent benefits of proper planning of suburban areas are not limited to esthetic considerations but include the savings to residents of their time as commuters, and their money as taxpayers.

Suburbs would also be the major beneficiaries of improvements in the administration of Federal programs of financial aid for new housing construction and for the provision of related public facilities, such as transportation, in the right place at the right time and at financial costs which are not unreasonably burdensome.

Question 13. Shouldn't creation of the Department await further study?

Answer. The entire subject has been studied so long and so thoroughly in both the executive and legislative branches, that no purpose would be served by undertaking a further study. As far back as 1937, the report of the National Resources Committee to the President suggested that the Federal Government give attention to the common problems of urban dwellers, as it had to farmers through the Department of Agriculture. In 1955 the Kestnbaum Commission thoroughly studied the problems of Federal, State, and local government relations in the areas of housing and urban affairs, and pointed to the need for greater coordination of the Federal programs in these areas. A similar study and report was made in 1961 by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

The Congress itself has studied the problem exhaustively. Committees of both Houses have held hearings and have taken volumes of testimony on this specific problem. A subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations held hearings on bills to create such a Department in 1955, in 1959, and in 1961. A subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Government Operations held hearings on the same subject in 1959 and 1961. In 1960, the Housing Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency held similar hearings. All three of these committees reported bills to create a similar new Department.

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

URBAN RENEWAL ADMINISTRATION

Urban renewal operations: By the end of September 1961 the Urban Renewal Administration had made reservations in Connecticut of $151.4 million for 48 projects in 26 localities. During the first 9 months of 1961 reservations of $21.7 million were made for new projects in 6 localities and increases in existing reservations of $34 million were made for additional work in 13 localities.

Approvals	During 1st 9 months		Cumulated through September 1961
	1960	1961	
Capital grant reservations (thousands)	$29,124	$55,628	$151,400
New approvals	20,856	21,673	
Increase in existing reservations	8,268	33,955	
Projects			48
New approvals	7	8	
Increases in existing reservations	4	16	
Localities			26
New approvals	6	6	
Increases in existing reservations	4	13	

Program of urban renewal operations cumulated through September 1961

Location and project	Grant reservation	Project approval date
Total, 26 localities with 48 projects	$151,399,752	
Ansonia:		
Broad St	2,498,201	October 1956.
Downtown renewal area	2,469,249	Do.
Bridgeport:		
State St. urban renewal area	7,952,500	January 1960.
West Side No. 1	976,707	Do.
West Side No. 2	4,200,330	September 1961.
Bristol: Bristol Center	5,014,249	December 1959.
Danbury: Central Flood urban renewal area	3,851,297	June 1957.
East Granby: Granbrook Park	246,193	November 1957.
East Hartford: South Meadows	4,515,750	October 1960.
Farmington:		
Farmington Ave	6,546	December 1957.
River Glen	18,423	Do.
Hartford:		
Bushnell-Plaza	5,501,181	July 1961.
Front St., sec. B	1,766,055	November 1950.
Front St., sec. A	49,850	July 1956.
Front-Talcott	193,764	January 1961.
Windsor St	6,580,136	July 1957.
Killingly: Lower Village of Rogers	202,922	March 1957.
Meriden: Central area	4,367,373	March 1958.
Middletown: Center St	2,163,211	March 1954.
Milford: Myrtle-Walnut Beach area	871,875	November 1960.
Naugatuck:		
Church-Water St. area	1,126,000	August 1956.
South Main St	188,513	December 1955.
New Britain:		
East Main St	2,602,943	November 1957.
South central project	7,757,840	July 1961.
New Haven:		
Community renewal program	247,333	
Church St	13,287,842	March 1956.
Dixwell	7,865,654	July 1956.
Oak St	3,675,122	February 1951.
Southwest area	4,800,000	March 1961.
State St. renewal area	2,317,000	February 1957.
Wooster Square	15,514,851	December 1955.
New London: Winthrop urban renewal area	5,617,950	June 1960.
Norwalk:		
South-Norwalk No. 1	932,923	December 1958.
Wall-Main renewal area	2,583,709	December 1955.
Norwich:		
Commerce-Water Sts	938,484	April 1958.
West Main St	554,757	May 1960.
Putnam: Quinebaug	2,646,903	February 1956.
Rockville: Downtown business area	394,088	June 1960.
Seymour:		
Derby Ave	132,419	May 1956.
2d St	268,926	Do.
Stamford:		
East Meadow	437,050	February 1951.
Southeast quadrant	18,111,267	March 1960.

Program of urban renewal operations cumulated through September 1961—Continued

Location and project	Grant reservation	Project approval date
Torrington: South central area	$1,558,555	November 1955.
Washington: Shepaug River project	360,855	February 1956.
Waterbury:		
Flood renewal area	604,296	September 1955.
Project B-2	422,820	July 1951.
B-2 extension	906,769	July 1961.
West Haven: Savin Rock urban renewal area No. 1	2,099,071	Do.

Urban planning assistance program

Federal grants for community planning in Connecticut increased to a total of $461,000 in the third quarter of 1961, of which nearly two-thirds was approved for 58 small areas. The remainder went to seven metropolitan and regional areas, and to one statewide project.

Approvals (net)	During 1st 9 months		Cumulated through September 1961
	1960	1961	
Federal grants, amount	$89,788	$46,010	$461,306
Small areas	69,038	5,930	289,642
Metropolitan, regional, or other areas	750	40,080	151,664
Statewide	20,000	0	20,000
Number of projects	5	3	22
Small areas	4	1	15
Metropolitan, regional, or other areas	0	2	6
Statewide	1	0	1
Number of localities:			
Small areas	8	1	58
Metropolitan, regional, or other areas	0	2	7

Urban planning assistance program, part A—Urban planning assistance to small areas cumulated through September 1961

State planning agency	Project No.	Small areas	Date		Federal grant approved
			Approved	Completed	
Total	15	58			$289,642
Development commission	P-1	14	October 1955.	August 1959.	71,465
	P-5	7	October 1956.	October 1959.	21,244
	P-7	4	February 1957.	March 1960.	32,607
	P-8	4	March 1957.	April 1960.	12,790
	P-9	2	August 1957.	March 1960.	5,428
	P-10	5	November 1957.	do	21,195
	P-11	5	October 1958.	do	19,070
	P-12	2	December 1958.	do	5,315
	P-13	6	June 1959.	do	18,360
	P-15	1	May 1960.	do	5,288
	P-16	4	March 1960.	do	18,025
	P-18	2	May 1960.	do	22,740
	P-20	2	June 1960.	do	22,985
	P-21	2	December 1960.	do	7,190
	P-23	1	June 1961.	do	5,930

Small areas in urban planning assistance program

Place	County	Project No.	Place	County	Project No.
Andover	Tolland	P-12.	Monroe	Fairfield	P-11.
Ansonia	New Haven	P-1.	Naugatuck	New Haven	P-1.
Avon	Hartford	P-1.	New Hartford	Litchfield	P-1.
Beacon Falls	New Haven	P-1.	Newington	Hartford	P-5.
Berlin	Hartford	P-5, 10.	New Milford	Litchfield	P-10.
Bethany	New Haven	P-21.	Newtown	Fairfield	P-8.
Bethel	Fairfield	P-8.	Norfolk	Litchfield	P-23.
Bloomfield	Hartford	P-16.	Plainville	Hartford	P-20.
Bolton	Tolland	P-5.	Plymouth	Litchfield	P-11.
Branford	New Haven	P-9.	Prospect	New Haven	P-16.
Brookfield	Fairfield	P-16.	Putnam	Windham	P-1.
Canton	Hartford	P-5.	Rockville	Tolland	P-16.
Cheshire	New Haven	P-8.	Rocky Hill	Hartford	P-11.
Colchester	New London	P-5.	Seymour	New Haven	P-1.
Danbury City	Fairfield	P-7.	Simsbury	Hartford	P-7.
Danbury Town	do	P-12.	Southbury	New Haven	P-5.
Derby	New Haven	P-7.	Southington	Hartford	P-8.
East Granby	Hartford	P-1.	Sprague	New London	P-10.
East Hartford	do	P-20.	Stafford	Tolland	P-1.
East Windsor	do	P-5.	Stonington	New London	P-13.
Essex	Middlesex	P-9.	Thomaston	Litchfield	P-1.
Farmington	Hartford	P-1.	Vernon	Tolland	P-13.
Groton	New London	P-13, 15.	Washington	Litchfield	P-1.
Killingly	Windham	P-7.	Westbrook	Middlesex	P-10, 13.
Madison	New Haven	P-13.	West Haven	New Haven	P-18.
Manchester	Hartford	P-18.	Winchester	Litchfield	P-1.
Mansfield	Tolland	P-10.	Windsor	Hartford	P-1.
Marlborough	Hartford	P-21.	Woodbridge	New Haven	P-13.
Middlefield	Middlesex	P-11.	Woodstock	Windham	P-11.

Urban planning assistance program, part B—Urban planning assistance to metropolitan, regional, or other areas cumulated through September 1961

Area	Planning agency	Date		Federal grant approved	Principal jurisdictions	
		Approved	Completed		Counties	Municipalities
Total, 7 areas in 6 projects				$151,664		
Greater Bridgeport region	Greater Bridgeport Regional Planning Agency.	June 19, 1961		20,080	Fairfield [1]	Bridgeport,[2] Fairfield, Stratford.
Farmington River (valley region)	Connecticut Development Commission.	November 1955	August 1959	52,893	Hartford,[1] Litchfield [1]	Bristol.
Naugatuck River (valley region)	do				Litchfield,[1] New Haven [1]	Torrington, Waterbury.
Central Naugatuck (valley region)	Central Naugatuck Valley Regional Planning Agency.	August 1961		20,000	Litchfield,[1] New Haven [1]	Naugatuck, Waterbury.[2]
Hartford metropolitan area	Capitol Region Planning Authority.	June 1959		26,220	Hartford,[1] Tolland [1]	East Hartford, Hartford, Manchester, West Hartford.
Quinebaug River (valley region)	Connecticut Development Commission.	March 1956	December 1959	17,165	New London,[1] Windham.[1]	Norwich.
Waterbury City [3]	do	February 1957	September 1960	15,306	New Haven [1]	Waterbury.[2]

[1] Only part of the county is aided by the project.

[2] Central city or cities.

[3] Disaster area project under disaster provisions of the act.

Part C—Urban planning assistance to States for comprehensive planning cumulated through September 1961

State planning agency	Project No.	Date approved	Federal grant approved
Connecticut Development Commission	P-17	May 1960	$20,000

HOUSING FOR SENIOR CITIZENS

The State of Connecticut has participated in the four sources of Federal aid for housing the elderly, however it participated mainly in the low-rent housing program. At the end of September 1961, 1,563 low-rent housing units, representing 95 percent of the States' total dwelling units under the elderly programs, were in planning stages or under construction in 16 locations.

Hartford, Conn., has projects under all but the programs for nursing homes with the exception of Fairfield and Winsted, which have nursing home projects; the remaining locations have low-rent housing projects.

Program	Dwelling units cumulated through September 1961		
	United States	Connecticut	Connecticut as a percent of United States
Total rental, senior citizens	78,165	1,685	2
FHA application	23,675	70	(1)
PHA reservation	37,648	1,563	4
CFA application	16,842	52	(1)
FHA nursing homes application	[2] 6,959	[2] 179	[2] 3

[1] Less than 0.5 percent.

[2] Number of beds, excluded from total.

Housing for senior citizens, cumulated through September 1961

Location	Dwelling units in applications received				
	Total	Federal Housing Administration	Public Housing Administration [1]	Community Facilities Administration	Federal Housing Administration nursing homes [2]
Total, 18 localities	1,685	70	1,563	52	179
Ansonia	22		22		
Bridgeport	362		362		
Bristol	100		100		
East Hartford	50		50		
Fairfield					91
Greenwich	50		50		
Hartford	222	70	100	52	
Manchester	100		100		
Meriden	74		74		
New Britain	130		130		
New Haven	215		215		
Norwalk	120		120		
Norwich	50		50		
Rockville	36		36		
Stamford	100		100		
Stratford	50		50		
Torkington					88
Winsted	4		4		

[1] PHA figures relate to reservations.

[2] Number of beds, excluded from total.

Low-rent housing programs for senior citizens cumulated through September 1961

Locality	Number of dwelling units				
	Total	Reserved not under annual contributions contract	Under annual contributions contract not under construction	Under construction	Under management
Total, 16	1,563	706	377	274	206
Ansonia	22		22		
Bridgeport	362	216			146
Bristol	100		100		
East Hartford	50			50	
Greenwich	50			50	
Hartford	100	50	50		
Manchester	100			100	
Meriden	74	60		14	
New Britain	130	70			60
New Haven	215	150	65		
Norwalk	120	60		60	
Norwich	50		50		
Rockville	36		36		
Stamford	100	100			
Stratford	50		50		
Winsted	4		4		

COMMUNITY FACILITIES ADMINISTRATION

Advances for public works planning

By September 30, 1961, the Community Facilities Administration had made advances totaling $1,549,000 to public agencies in Connecticut to provide for planning 34 public works projects.

Five loans aggregating $403,000 were approved during the first 9 months of 1961. They include advances for the planning of two sewer projects in East Haven and New Haven, a municipal building and a flood control project in Bristol, and a water processing plant in East Hampton.

Advances approved	During first 9 months		Cumulated through September 1961
	1960	1961	
Dollar amount (thousands)	$119	$403	$1,549
Number of projects	3	5	34

Program of advances for public works planning—Approved planning advances cumulated through September 1961

Location	Type of facility	Date approved	Advance approved	Estimated total cost
Total, 23 locations	Sewers (21)		$1,157,698	$44,820,377
	Water (4)		80,600	3,513,521
	Flood control (2)		55,300	3,241,400
	Municipal building (1).		67,500	1,629,815
	Park (1)		8,000	1,283,850
	Health center (1)		3,600	165,000
	Incinerator (3)		86,325	2,625,000
	Electric power (1)		90,000	2,627,500
Bethel	Sewer	March 1960	60,285	2,994,000
Branford	do	May 1958	105,000	3,612,000
Bristol	Flood control	September 1957.	30,000	2,545,000
Danielson	Sewer	January 1958	17,100	624,980
East Hampton	Water	June 1961	15,000	1,355,000
East Haven	Sewer	November 1957.	60,023	2,796,000
Groton	do	November 1959.	25,000	5,195,000
Hamden	do	August 1959	145,850	4,221,070
Middletown	do	April 1959	45,700	1,860,000
Milford	Education	November 1958.	90,000	2,627,500
New Britian	Water	August 1957	44,000	1,213,321
New Haven	Sewer	August 1961	145,000	3,660,000
North Haven	do	November 1959.	158,700	6,945,100
Norwalk	Park	April 1958	8,000	1,283,850
Plainville	Sewer	March 1959	25,600	1,863,318
Stamford	Health center	August 1956	3,600	165,000
Stonington	Sewer	June 1958	7,500	1,718,500
Stratford	do	July 1958	16,500	348,000
Wallingford	do	November 1956.	43,005	1,797,138
Washington	do	February 1956	20,300	307,753
West Haven	Incinerator	May 1960	34,700	1,125,000
Willimantic	Water	July 1956	4,600	462,200
Woodbridge	Sewer	December 1960.	16,000	370,000

College housing

By September 30, 1961, eight institutions in Connecticut had availed themselves of loans for college housing in a total amount of $15,810,000. The loans involve a total of 2,680 sleeping accommodations of which 724 were completed.

Net approvals	During 1st 9 months		Cumulated through Sept. 30, 1961
	1960	1961	
Dollar amount (thousands)	$5,100	$3,250	$15,810
Number:			
Loans	3	2	[1] 11
Institutions	3	2	8
Housing accommodations	623	621	2,680
Completed	0	0	724
Not completed	623	621	1,956

[1] The 11 loans were made in 7 separate locations.

College housing program, net approved loans through September 1961

Location and institution	Federal loans (thousands)	Housing accommodations		
		Total	Completed	Not completed
Total, loans (11)[1]	$15,810	2,680	[2] 724	[3] 1,956
Bridgeport: University of Bridgeport	1,496	312	312	
	1,532	412	412	
	900	[4] 0		
	2,300	408		[4] 408
Fairfield: Fairfield University	950	213		213
Hartford: Trinity College	752	124		124
Middletown: Wesleyan University	1,200	232		232
New Haven:				
Albertus Magnus College	900	150		150
Yale University	1,080	206		206
New London: Connecticut College for Women	3,000	500		500
West Hartford: St. Joseph College	1,200	123		123

[1] Includes 8 institutions in 7 locations.
[2] Includes 2 loans.
[3] Includes 9 loans.
[4] Approval given for facility other than housing accommodations.

Low-rent housing through September 1961

Location	Number of dwelling units				
	Total	Reserved, not under annual contributions contract	Under annual contributions contract, not under construction	Under construction	Under management
Total, 21	12,192	1,196	790	400	9,806
Ansonia	165		165		
Bridgeport	2,901	216			2,685
Bristol	300		100		200
Danbury	210		60		150
East Hartford	150			50	100
Greenwich	160			50	110
Hartford	2,579	50	50		2,479
Manchester	100			100	
Meriden	200	60		140	
Middletown	190				190
New Britain	630	70			560
New Haven	2,235	565	65		1,605
Norwalk	476	60		60	356
Norwich	150	25	50		75
Putnam	124				124
Rockville	100		100		
Stamford	772	100			672
Stratford	150		150		
Waterbury	400				400
Willimantic	150	50			100
Winsted	50		50		

Housing and community development programs—Counties and localities using aids available through the Housing and Home Finance Agency as of Sept. 30, 1961

Location	Program									
	Community development (workable programs) [1]	Urban Renewal Administration		Community Facilities Administration			Federal Housing Administration insurance written		Public Housing Administration low-rent housing	Housing for senior citizens [3]
		Operations	Planning assistance	College housing loans	Public facility loans	Advances public works planning	Homes or projects [2]	Property improvement [2]		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Fairfield County							X	X		
Bethel			X			X				
Bridgeport	X	X		X					X	X.
Brookfield			X							
Danbury	X	X	X							
Fairfield			X	X						X.
Greenwich									X	X.
Monroe			X							
Newtown			X							
Norwalk		X				X			X	X.
Stamford	X	X				X			X	X.
Stratford	X		X			X			X	X.
Hartford County							X	X		
Avon			X							
Berlin			X							
Bloomfield			X							
Bristol	X	X	X			X			X	X.
Canton			X							
East Granby	X	X	X							
East Hartford	X	X	X						X	X.
East Windsor			X							
Farmington	X	X	X							
Hartford	X	X	X	X					X	X.
Manchester			X						X	X.
Marlborough			X							
New Britain	X	X				X			X	X.
Newington			X							
Plainville			X			X				
Rocky Hill			X							
Simsbury			X							
Southington			X							
West Hartford	X		X	X						
Windsor			X							
Litchfield County							X	X		
New Hartford			X							
New Milford			X							
Norfolk			X							
Plymouth			X							
Thomaston			X							
Torrington		X	X							X.
Washington		X	X			X				
Winchester			X							
Winsted									X	X.
Middlesex County							X	X		
East Hampton						X				
Essex			X							
Middle Field			X							
Middletown	X	X		X		X				
Westbrook			X							
New Haven County							X			
Ansonia	X	X	X						X	X.
Beacon Falls			X							
Bethany			X							
Brandford			X			X				
Cheshire			X							
Derby			X							
East Haven						X				
Hamden						X				
Madisou			X							
Meriden	X	X							X	X.
Milford	X	X				X				
Naugatuck		X	X							
New Haven	X	X		X		X			X	X.
North Haven						X				
Prospect			X							
Seymour		X	X							
Southbury			X							
Wallingford						X				
Waterbury		X	X							
West Haven	X	X	X			X				
Woodbridge			X			X				
New London County							X	X		
Colchester			X							
Groton			X			X				
New London	X	X		X						
Norwich	X	X	X						X	X.
Sprague			X							
Stonington			X			X				
Tolland County							X	X		
Andover			X							
Bolton			X							
Mansfield			X							
Rockville	X	X	X						X	X.
Stafford			X							
Vernon			X							
Windham County							X	X		
Danielson						X				
Killingly		X	X							
Putnam		X	X							
Willimantic						X				
Woodstock			X							

---

[1] Active programs or expired programs in process of recertification.

[2] Data for individual localities within counties not available.

[3] May consist of housing under any or all of the following programs: FHA sec. 207, elderly, sec. 231 and sec. 232, nursing homes; CFA sec. 202, or PHA low-rent units specially designed for senior citizens.

Housing and community development programs—Dollar volume cumulated through Sept. 30, 1961

[In thousands of dollars]

Program	United States	Connecticut	Connecticut as a percent of U.S. total
			Percent
Total, all HHFA programs	92,230,864	1,197,088	1
Federal Housing Administration:			
Insurance written	72,096,312	936,056	1
Homes	49,390,033	706,911	1
Projects	8,708,048	123,841	1
Property improvement, title I	13,998,231	105,304	1
Public Housing Administration:			
Development cost to date of projects receiving annual contributions [1]	4,059,552	72,856	2
Annual contributions [1]	(890,317)	(20,737)	2
Federal National Mortgage Association:			
Purchases, total FHA and VA	10,910,464	9,006	(2)
Secondary market operations	3,968,770	246	(2)
Special assistance functions	2,021,674	1,730	(2)
Management and liquidation functions	4,920,020	7,030	(2)
Community Facilities Administration:			
Loans or grants approved	2,818,800	27,309	1
College housing loans	1,504,207	15,810	1
Public facility loans	120,637	0	0
Advances for public works planning	63,818	1,549	2
Senior citizens housing [3]	169,891	600	(2)
School construction [4]	960,247	9,350	1
Urban Renewal Administration:			
Grant reservations and grants	2,345,736	151,861	6
Urban renewal operations grant reservations	2,327,519	151,400	7
Urban planning assistance Federal grants	18,217	461	3

[1] Through June 1961, covering completed developments.
[2] Less than 0.5 percent.
[3] Applications received.
[4] Grants approved by Office of Education following recommendation by CFA.

Housing programs—Number of units provided cumulated through Sept. 30, 1961

[Dwelling units, housing accommodations, or beds]

Program	United States	Connecticut	Connecticut as a percent of U.S. total
Federal Housing Administration:			*Percent*
Insurance written, total units	6,862,872	86,037	1
Homes, estimate based on mortgages	5,925,900	73,900	1
Projects	936,972	12,137	1
Public Housing Administration:			
All stages from reservation, total units	649,650	12,192	2
Reserved, not under annual contributions contract	27,932	1,196	4
Under ACC, not under construction	84,012	790	1
Under construction, not yet completed	45,461	400	1
Under management, or completed	492,245	9,806	2
Community Facilities Administration: College housing, approved:			
Housing accommodations	361,779	2,680	1
Completed	240,119	724	(1)
Not yet completed	121,660	1,956	2
Special programs, senior citizens:			
Applications, total units [2]	78,165	1,685	2
Federal Housing Administration	23,675	70	(1)
Public Housing Administration	37,648	1,563	4
Community Facilities Administration	16,842	52	(1)
Nursing homes, FHA, applications, beds	6,959	179	3

[1] Less than 0.5 percent.
[2] PHA figures relate to reservations.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I consider it a privilege to be a Member of the Congress which will, I trust, place its stamp of approval on the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. My only regret is that the creation must, of necessity, come not from legislation upon which extensive hearings have been held, but with the approval of the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962, coupled with a move to discharge the Committee on Government Operations which I deplore.

As a member of the Committee on Government Operations I learned a great deal from the witnesses who appeared before the subcommittee on June 21 and June 22 of last year. Legislation to establish the Department was reported favorably by the committee and I was happy to cast my vote for it.

Of the 184 million persons comprising our population today more than two-thirds, or 130 million, live in urban areas. The urban sections of our Nation cross State lines.

Our east coast population lives nearly house-to-house, door-to-door from Boston to far south of Washington, D.C.

Commuters from Connecticut and New Jersey work in New York City offices. Their homes in urban areas are not in New York State. Similar conditions prevail as Philadelphia secretaries often live in nearby New Jersey, or as Chicago businessmen return home in the evening to their houses on the outskirts of Hammond, Ind.

Here in Washington, D.C., there is a daily influx of employees from nearby Virginia and Maryland. It would be extremely difficult for this Government to carry on without their services.

Those who consider that creating this Department would be an invasion of States functions overlook the increasingly interstate character of our metropolitan sprawl.

The able Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency recently summed up the function of the proposed Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. He suggests:

> The function of the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing would be to assist States, communities, and private interests in the preparation of comprehensive plans for community development and redevelopment; the elimination of slums and blight through clearance and rehabilitation; the planning and construction of redevelopments to provide better homes for Americans, better locations for the offices and shops where they work, and better commercial facilities to serve them; the preservation of open space in urban areas for recreation and conservation; the preservation and development of urban transportation systems; the planning and construction of community facilities; the financing of residential construction and rehabilitation; the financing of home ownership; the financing of home improvements; and the maintenance of a stable market for Government-insured mortgages.

Thus, Mr. President, the need in meeting the problems Dr. Robert Weaver has described affords an opportunity for the Federal Government to use its good offices.

When the President transmitted to the Congress his reorganization plan for the creation of the Department which we are discussing, he said:

> The times we live in urgently call for this action. In a few short decades we have passed from a rural to an urban way of life; in a few short decades more, we shall be a Nation of vastly expanded population, living in expanded urban areas in housing that does not now exist, served by community facilities that do not now exist, moving about by means of systems of urban transportation that do not now exist. The challenge is great and the time is short.

Some opponents think that creation of such a department is unnecessary. I suggest rather that coordination would be the principal benefit. Where better to coordinate plans for housing needs at or near military bases with plans of the Department of Defense? This type of coordination would be of particular interest in Alaska.

And should a community or many communities desire to preserve open spaces for recreation and conservation, where better to start than in the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, whose staff would work with the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture? Such coordination, such efficiency would interest Americans living along the Atlantic seaboard.

I have suggested that the proposed Department would benefit Alaska by simplifying housing needs procedures. I recall that during the Senate hearings on

S. 1633, S. 289, S. 375, and S. 609, the honorable chairman of our full committee, the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan], asked that our subcommittee chairman, Mr. Humphrey, place in the hearing record a letter he had received from the Governor of my State, the Honorable William A. Egan.

I will cite only a portion of the letter.

Governor Egan said:

> The argument has been raised that establishment of a department of this type would tend to weaken existing relationships between the States and their political subdivisions.
>
> I think this assumption is incorrect. The establishment of this Department would not create innovations in Federal assistance programs.
>
> Such functions as housing, home finance, urban renewal, slum clearance, pollution control, airport and highway construction, metropolitan planning, and civil defense mobilization have already been assumed by the Federal Government, and I think wisely so.
>
> While it is true that urban areas exist in certain locations which may benefit from the proposed program to the exclusion of locations which are not urban, I do not believe this is a valid argument against establishment of such a department. If this thinking is to be accepted, how can one justify having a Department of Agriculture, which deals solely with problems of agricultural areas, or Federal agencies dealing exclusively with national parks, oil reserves, rivers and harbors, or schools?
>
> I believe the evidence shows that State governments, for various reasons, have been unresponsive to the needs of the burgeoning urban areas. Passage of these measures would not make the States less responsive than they are already. Rather, affirmative action on these measures should serve to make State governments more responsible to this pressing need. And this response would lead not only to the needed improvements, but to a strengthening of the relationship between State and local governments.

We have come a long way from the days of 1789 when our Constitution went into effect and when there were only 24 communities in the country with a population of 2,500 or more, or about 5 percent of the Nation's population. Today 130 million of us reside in urban areas. And their problems are becoming increasingly complex.

The President has based his reorganization plan on S. 1633 which the Committee on Government Operations reported out. Both pieces of legislation simply coordinate scattered functions of the Federal Government related to urban problems. This reorganization plan we are considering authorizes no new programs. Individual States will not be subjected to intolerable legislation.

My knowledgeable colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark] has pointed out that the proposed Department would be able to deal with urban problems afflicting communities with as few as 2,500 inhabitants or as large as New York City.

Such a Department would benefit Alaska. Farming there, thus far, has been limited so our rural population is sparse. Hence, the division between urban and rural scarcely exists in Alaska, though many communities are small, being only villages. Between them are vast, uninhabited spaces of national forest or public domain. Suburban areas have sprung up near the larger cities along such highways as lead out from them. A few homesteaders live apart.

I should like to read at this time from a letter I received January 25, 1962, from Mr. Don M. Berry, executive director of the League of Alaskan Cities which has its headquarters in Juneau.

He writes:

> Dear Senator Gruening: The League of Alaskan Cities wishes to take this opportunity to express to you its emphatic support of legislation to establish a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.
>
> It is inconceivable that the great urban population is practically the only segment of U.S. society which does not enjoy the stature of a Cabinet-level spokesman.

We of Alaska live in a vast area where the facilities of the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing would be useful. Our cities grow fast and often haphazardly. The Kenai Peninsula is undergoing such growth. We anticipate more growth during these years ahead. We want to be ready for it.

Mr. President, I unqualifiedly support the President's proposal to create a Department of Urban Affairs.

The issue before us appears to have been complicated in some quarters when the announcement was made that Dr. Robert Weaver would head the Department. The issue has never been clouded for me. I consider the naming of Dr. Weaver both "excellent" and "expected." I have known him for more than 25 years and first met him when I was Director of Territories in the Department of the Interior. He was then, as I recall, adviser on housing in the Department. He is highly experienced in this important field. In every way he has demonstrated his ability as a public servant and his superlative qualifications for the important post to which the President proposes to nominate him. His selection places the Department in the best possible hands.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, within the past 50 years, America has been transformed from an essentially rural society to an urban nation. With this transformation of our population pattern has come a profound change in the way of life of millions of Americans. Many new and complex problems cry for solution.

Two of every three Americans now live in urban areas. In another decade it is estimated that 80 to 85 percent of our population will be city dwellers. Today the combined population of our metropolitan areas is larger than the entire population of the United States in 1920.

Of all the States, perhaps my own State of Ohio has been most affected by the tremendous growth of urban areas. Ohio, fifth among the States in population, stands third with cities of 100,000 people or more. Of the 38 largest metropolitan areas in the Nation, Ohio has 4, equaled only by California.

Urban America is entitled to its spokesman at the Cabinet table. It is imperative that the problems affecting the greater part of our citizenry be recognized at the highest level of government.

This reorganization will give city dwellers the same status that American farmers have enjoyed for almost a century. If a crisis arises in rural America, the Department of Agriculture automatically has jurisdiction. No one governmental agency has this same responsibility over urban crises.

This new Department can focus attention on the mounting problems of the cities and metropolitan areas. It will bring together and encourage those who know and care about these problems, and it can do much to get them a hearing.

At present a group of disjointed, lower level Federal agencies with overlapping functions are attempting to cope with this situation. The results are sadly deficient. The Housing and Home Finance Agency, parent organization for most agencies dealing with urban affairs, is a hybrid without any clear functions. New perspective and streamlined coordination is vitally needed.

The Federal Government already plays a large role in this field. Urban renewal, slum clearance, public housing, rapid transportation, air pollution control, construction of community facilities, insuring of home mortgages, sewage pollution control, and many other functions are presently being performed by the Federal Government. Under this reorganization no new programs would be established, nor would it transfer any functions from other agencies to the proposed Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. This is a reorganization and not a new grant of power. No new money will be authorized other than that which Congress has already authorized these agencies to spend.

Local and State governments are presently shouldering a fantastic burden. They are handicapped financially, jurisdictionally, and in many other ways in handling the new problems which have arisen in metropolitan areas. Mayors and city officials come to Washington on important municipal business and have to go from one agency to another before they finally find what they are looking for. It is time that the Federal Government takes a more active part in helping State and local governments cope with the tangled difficulties caused by their rapid increase in population.

We must think in terms of a single coherent approach to the tremendous problems and challenges facing our cities. I support this resolution so we may proceed with urgency to support our President's program to create a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, as has been said over and over again, the only issue before the Senate is whether or not we shall discharge the Committee on Government Operations from proceeding not only in an orderly fashion, but with dispatch. The committee has 40 days from today to complete its work. Mr. President, although he needs no defense, I wish to say a word in praise of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, who stayed in Washington last week, when there were few Senators in the Capital, to hold hearings, so that the reorganization plan could be brought before the Senate within the time required by law.

Today we are asked to slap that great chairman down, the chairman to whom we have turned time and time again when a difficult task had to be done. When there has been a difficult task of investigating campaign expenditures, or problems which arose with respect to the conduct of the Senate, we have turned to John McClellan. When labor rackets had to be investigated, it was the distinguished Senator from Arkansas to whom we turned.

The Senator from Arkansas is not in favor of the motion. Yet he moved with dispatch to hold hearings, so that the legislative proposal could be reported to the Senate. It is here now, and it could be acted upon.

When the reorganization plan was submitted, he again scheduled hearings. Everyone who wanted to testify before the committee was able to testify. I am certain that when he speaks today he will promise the Senate that if we do not discharge the committee, the resolution on the reorganization plan will be brought before the Senate.

I say to the Senate, if it has any interest in reorganization plans in the future, it should not discharge the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. CURTIS. May I have 1 more minute?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I say we should not discharge the committee. Congress delegated the power to the President to present reorganization plans to Congress with the understanding that Congress would have 60 days to consider them after the President had exercised that delegation of power.

If we are to establish a precedent here to the effect that a willing committee cannot conduct its business in an orderly fashion when it proceeds expeditiously and in ample time, then we are in effect voting against the use of reorganization plans for streamlining and improving the Government.

I say to the Senate that the operation of this body is at stake in the coming vote on the motion. I do not speak for anyone else, but as for me I say it would be a vote against the Senate of the United States.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I certainly cannot subscribe to the argument that discharging the committee at this time would be an affront to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, or to the other members of that committee, or to the Senate. There is no one in the Senate for whom I have greater admiration and respect than for the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan] who is chairman of the committee. I know that he has done yeoman work in this body, and everyone in the Senate respects him for the man he is.

However, I believe the majority leader has pointed out why we are asked to take this action today. After all, the proposal is within the procedural structure of the Senate. We have a perfect right to discharge the committee. The majority leader has pointed to the immediacy of the problem, because the House has already stagnated action on legislation which is so important to the welfare of 70 percent of the people of this country, the particular people who in all probability pay the biggest load of our income taxes.

It strikes me we are arguing around the point instead of to the point. Insofar as the senior Senator from Rhode Island is concerned, he does not construe this to be an affront to the Senator from Arkansas or to any other member of the committee or to the Senate. It is the one way of getting the job done in the way in which it should be done.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the Senate is facing a very serious precedent-making decision when we are asked under these circumstances to discharge a committee. For example, the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph], with his typical candor, in making his motion to discharge the committee, said that while he was against the reorganization plan, he was making the motion at the request of the majority leader. That was an honest, frank statement, truly understood. But a motion to discharge a committee from the consideration of a reorganization plan is supposed to rest with the forces who are opposed, to be sure that they have an opportunity to vote against the plan, not with those who are in favor of a President's proposal, since the plan becomes effective automatically in 60 days if no adverse action is taken by either House.

So we have, in the first place, clear evidence that the impetus for the motion to discharge in this instance comes from those who support the reorganization plan rather than those who oppose it. The whole purpose of providing for discharge of the committee considering the reorganization plan is to protect those who oppose it, in order to make certain that they will have the right to have a vote on the measure. So at best today's discharge proposal is the first attack in a one-two calculated punch to reduce the authority of Congress and to magnify further the authority of the Executive.

If we vote to discharge the committee, we immediately come into a situation whereby the reorganization plan method, for the first time in American history, will be employed to expand the size of the President's Cabinet if it is approved by an affirmative vote. That has never been done in this form before. I hope it never will be done, because it will deny the right of Congress to make amendments and the right to modify; these are all-important activities so necessary to an effective legislative body. I think we see here a clear effort on the part of the executive branch of the Government to push Congress around, so that it will not have to confront a situation which it has created by its own majority in the House of Representatives. In the procedural action in the House of Representatives, there are techniques available, even when the Committee on Rules has failed to clear a bill for action, to enable Members of the House who seek a vote to have a vote on any question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield an additional minute to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, one word, now, in defense of the Committee on Government Operations, headed by that great American, John McClellan, and of which I am the ranking Republican member. He has not been dilatory. He has held hearings. Now, however, even before the Printing Office has had a chance to print the hearings, it is proposed to discharge the committee. What kind of travesty are we engaged in, when a Senate committee has invited witnesses from far and near to testify, yet before the printing presses have had a chance to print the hearings, so that Senators may read them, we are asked to reject all the counsel of the witnesses, both pro and con, and discharge a committee which has not been dilatory, which has not delayed, which has been active in its efforts, simply because we are directed to do so as part of a great political scheme on the part of the politicians in the White House?

I hope the Senate will vote in this instance to continue to support the committee; to protect the dignity of the Senate and maintain its influence; and not to relegate the Senate to the position of a body which can be rubber stamped and ordered around by another political entity, the executive branch of the Government. I sincerely urge Senators to vote "no" on the motion to discharge our committee from further consideration of the President's proposal.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The Senate has ever been referred to as a club; and perhaps that description is apt. But one of the first attributes of a club member must be fairplay. The distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan] is a member of this club. He has done yeoman service. I recall that it was one of my pleasant duties to try to get him to undertake the monumental work of the McClellan committee. In my book, he has performed outstanding service, and deserves every consideration from the Senate.

The nomination of Mr. Weaver is not before us at the moment. The reorganization plan itself is not before us at the moment. The problem before the Senate is whether we shall discharge the committee headed by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, at a time when he has shown rare diligence in dealing with a plan which was sent to Congress 19 days ago. We still have two-thirds of the time specified under the Reorganization Act. That is the whole issue with respect to the motion to discharge.

What is proposed is to shoot the horse out from under the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, who could not even close his hearings because the detailed information requested by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota from the Budget Bureau did not arrive, as I understand, until 5 o'clock yesterday afternoon.

While some of us were out making Lincoln week speeches, the distinguished Senator from Arkansas remained here to hold hearings. He held the hearings up until 6 o'clock on Friday night. If that was not diligence, then I have not seen it. Notwithstanding that fact, it is now proposed that we say, "We will not wait on you. We will not give you time to write your report. We will discharge the committee today. We will give you a kick."

Never has a motion to discharge a committee been used unless it could be pointed out that there was delay or failure to exercise diligence on the part of a committee. I have served on committees which have not always been diligent. I would not quarrel with a motion to discharge a committee if it could be said that there had been a lack of diligence. But that cannot be said of the committee headed by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas. It cannot be said that he and his committee have been found wanting.

The proposal before us today is not a legislative proposal; it is an ethical proposal. Do we propose to demean the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations? That is what we shall be doing. There is no substance in the argument which was made a moment ago by the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE]. It is proposed to demean the chairman and his committee and to say that we do not care how diligent they have been; that we do not care whether they are ready to report or not. We will take over and get the first vote on this proposal.

But let us mark well, and let every committee chairman of the Senate realize it, that if we take such action today, no chairman will ever be free from the possibility that his work will be brought to naught. If we do that, we will then start to write the epitaph for Senate rules and Senate procedure.

Mr. President, how often has it been said, "We must not do this; we must not resort to this, that, or the other action. We must proceed in an orderly fashion. We must proceed in consonance with the rules of the Senate"?

The chairman of the Committee on Government Operations has operated within the Senate rules. He has been diligent to a fault. I say it would be an affront to the standing committee of the Senate and an affront to a distinguished chairman if the Senate today undertakes to discharge the Committee on Government Operations simply for the purpose of bringing a bill before the Senate a little sooner than it might otherwise come before us.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ].

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I will vote to confirm the nomination of Mr. Weaver or any other qualified person if the proper committee recommends such approval; but I cannot vote for the method resorted to in this instance.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 8 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, a glorious achievement is in progress at this hour. The astronaut, Col. John Glenn, is now in his second orbit around the globe. It is an achievement of American genius, and its successful completion should be engaging our prayers at this moment, rather than a squabble of this nature. Unfortunately and unhappily for us in the Senate, the glories of that achievement, as it is now in progress, are being marred by the deplorable action now taking place here in the Senate and without rhyme or reason in my judgment.

The proposal to discharge the Committee on Government Operations from the further consideration of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962 at this early stage of prescribed procedure, on the 20th day of the 60 days authorized by law, is contrary to all the precedents of the Senate. Only once has a committee been discharged by the Senate on a reorganization plan, and that was when the resolution of disapproval was filed only 13 days before the expiration of the 60-day period in which the plan would have gone into effect.

I did not, under those circumstances, oppose it. I said there was justification since the committee did not have time to process it. But there is no such circumstance or justification now. Someone has just said that this has to be done today. If it has to be done today, it should have been done 2 weeks ago. The committee should have been discharged before we invited the witnesses to testify at the hearings, in order to make a record for the information of the Senate.

But now, right in the midst of the committee's normal and proper procedure, some Senators want to crucify it. This action constitutes an unwarranted and wanton attack upon the committee system of the Congress. It violates due process and greatly impairs and moves toward the destruction of one of the most important functions of the Senate—a function and tradition which have earned for it the reputation of being the greatest deliberative body in the world. Does the procedure proposed today conform to that reputation? Do Senators want to now disparage that reputation? Certainly there is no real justification for doing that. There is only an excuse for it, but not one that is worthy of your acceptance.

It is true that the Reorganization Act of 1949 contains a provision that the committee may be discharged 10 days after a resolution of disapproval has been filed, but that provision does not carry with it a directive that a committee must act within the first 10 days after such a resolution has been filed.

Heretofore resolutions proposing the disapproval of reorganization plans have been submitted by Senators who have sincerely opposed the plans. But in this instance, Senate Resolution 288, proposing disapproval of the plan to create a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, was submitted by a Senator who supports the plan.

The record will show that in many instances, as the Congress anticipated when the act was approved, resolutions of disapproval have not been submitted until 30 days, 40 days, or in one case 47 days had expired after the resolution was submitted, before it was considered in the Senate. This provision was included so that if a Senator determined to submit such a resolution at any time prior to 10 days before the plan would become effective there was a specific assurance that a vote could be obtained on the resolution. That was and is its purpose.

In only one instance since the act was approved has the Senate Committee on Government Operations been discharged from the consideration of a resolution to disapprove a reorganization plan. That was on Reorganization Plan No. 7 of 1961, on which a resolution of disapproval was not filed in the Senate until July 28, 1961, 13 days before the plan would have become effective. At that time I took the position that that was not sufficient time within which to permit the committee to hold hearings and submit a considered and proper report on the plan. Accordingly, although I opposed discharging the committee, I interposed no objection to having the Senate bring the matter up for consideration through the discharge procedure.

The Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, in cooperation with the staff of the committee, prepared an analysis of actions taken by the Senate Committee on Government Operations, which shows all reorganization plans submitted since the Reorganization Act was approved in 1949. This tabulation reflects that, on the average, 55 days have elapsed from the time when a plan was submitted in the Senate until a resolution was reported, and that an average of 62 days elapsed during the time when the Senate deliberated on those plans. There were a total of 66 plans. Resolutions of disapproval were filed on 33 of them. On some of them, no votes were taken, since there was no opposition to them.

The hearings on Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962 have been completed after taking 3 full days of testimony—February 14, 15, and 16.

The committee heard a total of 16 witnesses, 8 for the plan and 8 opposed.

The committee tried to be fair. Statements were inserted in the record from 11 organizations who were for the plan and 4 who were against it. Also inserted in the record were a total of 300 telegrams and letters—240 telegrams against the plan, and only 3 for it; and 47 letters against and 10 for the plan. Some may ask why there is that ratio. It is because that is the ratio; that is the way the letters came in, and I cannot help that.

In addition to those letters and statements included in the record of the hearings, the committee also received a total of 178 telegrams and letters—62 telegrams and 116 letters—which were not included. Of these, 174 opposed the plan and only 4 favored it.

In addition, I received a total of 157 telegrams and letters from my own State of Arkansas. All but one of them were in opposition to the plan.

So we are not here considering the merits of the proposal. The arguments on the merits can be made after the committee has made its report to the Senate. But without due deference to the regular procedure, there are Senators who say that today they are going to violate what I believe to be the propriety of the legislative procedure. In other words, they say they are going to vote to discharge, and perhaps besmirch, a committee which in good faith has tried to do its duty.

Senators are correct when they say there will be other chairmen who, and other days and other proposed legislation that will face this same danger, this same challenge. Do this thing today and it will just be the beginning.

The course now proposed is not fair to the witnesses who came before the committee, and had labored to prepare their statements, and undertook to aid the Members of the Senate, their representatives, so as to help them resolve this issue. Senators asked that those witnesses be heard; and now the testimony of the witnesses can soon be made available, but Senators have not as yet had any chance to read it. Instead, some Senators wish to discharge the committee from further consideration of the resolution, without reading the testimony of the witnesses and without considering it.

I want to emphasize to the Members of this body that this important and necessary committee function of holding hearings is now proposed to be completely nullified. The hearings cannot now possibly be made available to Senators before the plan is scheduled to be voted either up or down. The corrected transcripts cannot be processed and printed and made available to Senators until Thursday or Friday of this week.

It is a disservice to the Members of the Senate to compel them to act on the motion to discharge the committee before they have had an opportunity to examine the hearings and to analyze the testimony.

The testimony taken at the hearings was not as pro forma as some may contend. Many issues which have been injected should have serious study before Senators are required to make a final decision on the merits of this plan and the wisdom of approving it.

The hearings contain strong arguments on both sides, which call attention to facts and elements of persuasion which this body should know about and consider before it votes.

The Reorganization Act was purported to be the legislative process in reverse; the President would submit a plan, with the veto power vested in the Congress. I ask every Senator to examine the regular legislative process, so as to determine how long it would take a committee, acting with due diligence, to hold hearings and to act upon a bill which carries with it the serious impact on our system of government that is proposed by this reorganization plan.

Although in recent years there has been a very ominous trend toward the surrender of the legislative functions of the Congress to the executive, Members of this body should not now take this most serious step to further undermine and eventually destroy the normal and legitimate legislative procedure.

Mr. President, I do not have enough time in which to sufficiently present this matter. I regret that, but the law limits the time for debate on the pending motion.

If, nevertheless, under these circumstances, and with the background which today is before the Senate, the committee is today discharged from the further consideration of the resolution, the Senate will make it difficult to get another Reorganization Act passed or to get the present law extended. There are some things that are right, and there are some impositions. When we passed the Reorganization Act we did not expect it to be used in this fashion.

Mr. President, my time is about to expire so let me say, in conclusion, that the brightness of the legislative skies is clouded, the brilliance of statesmanship is dimmed, and the light of fairness and justice in this Chamber is darkened today by this proposed deplorable action and the irrevocable injury that it would inflict upon the historic dignity and integrity of the legislative processes of the U.S. Senate.

The committee has been faithful in the performance of its duty. It has in no sense obstructed, delayed, or procrastinated. Instead, it has diligently cooperated and expeditiously pursued its task The committee has reported a bill which now is on the calendar; but I was denied the privilege of making a motion that the Senate take up today, that bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time yielded to the Senator from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. McCLELLAN. May I have an additional one-half minute?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield an additional one-half minute to the Senator from Arkansas.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized for an additional one-half minute.

Mr. McCLELLAN. But, Mr. President, now—instead of being praised for its work—the committee is being repudiated; instead of being commended, it is being publicly censured. Instead of being rewarded, it is being penalized and punished. Is that the record Senators want to make? That is the record they will make and that is the precedent they will set if this committee is discharged from the further consideration of the resolution. I urge my colleagues not to take that regrettable and unworthy course.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Has the Senator from Arkansas concluded?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I have concluded, Mr. President.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield 30 seconds to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Virginia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Virginia is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I hope the motion to discharge the committee from further consideration of the resolution of disapproval will not be agreed to.

There are many things into which the committee should look.

When I heard the President say we are not doing justice to the cities, in connection with matters of housing and urban renewal and similar matters, I inquired of the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency about what we were doing for the cities in just one phase—public housing. This is back-door financing. It is supposed to be a revolving fund, but it only revolves out; it does not come back. We have spent on public housing approximately $1,300 million, and have committed or spent on public housing an additional $7,800 million; and when we finance the 100,000 new units which we have authorized, we shall add another $1,400 million; and we shall put into public housing alone over $14 billion. That is all in the cities, and the majority of it is in only 20 cities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the letter, which I received today, which gives those figures on just one phase of what we have done; and yet there are some who want to create a new Department on geographical lines, to help only a limited proportion of our population—on the ground that the city people are not getting what is coming to them.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the letter will be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The letter submitted by Mr. ROBERTSON is as follows:

HOUSING AND HOME
FINANCE AGENCY,
Washington, D.C., February 19, 1962.

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ROBERTSON: The following information is furnished in response to your request of January 26, 1962:

The total deficit for the low-rent public housing program fund was $1,265,090,744.08 as of December 31, 1961. This represents the total cost of operating the program including the subsidy and administrative costs since its inception in 1937.

With respect to the 597,316 dwelling units under annual contributions contracts as of June 30, 1961, it is estimated that accruing annual contributions totaling $7.8 billion will be payable in the future.

As of December 31, 1961, the maximum annual contributions commitment under existing contracts totaled $275,003,719 per annum. The unused authority to enter into new annual contributions contracts was the difference between this figure and $336 million, or $60,996,281. The maximum commitment of $275 million will be substantially reduced as projects become permanently financed, as indicated in the table on page 333 of the hearings on housing legislation of 1961 before the Housing Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency. The contributions actually payable each year will be less than the commitment by the amount of all project residual receipts.

While there have been some outlays of cash by local governments, these amounts have not been significant in terms of the program as a whole and we are unable to furnish any figures because no attempt has been made to accumulate them for record purposes. The local contributions to the project required by the United States Housing Act are made in the form of tax exemption of the project property. The act requires that this tax exemption, less payments in lieu of taxes, equal at least one-fifth of the Federal annual contribution.

If you desire any further information, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,
ROBERT C. WEAVER,
Administrator.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, let me ask how much time remains to both sides.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana has 18 minutes remaining under his control; the Senator from Illinois has 1 minute remaining under his control.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield myself as much of the time under my control as I may need; and when I complete what I have to say, I shall yield back the remainder of the time under my control.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana may proceed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in answer to some of the allegations which have been raised on this floor this afternoon, I wish to call to the attention of the Senate the fact that Senate bill 1633, as presented last year by the administration, is identical in spirit and purpose with the reorganization plan sent down by the President this year.

Let me also say, that according to the information I have, the same witnesses, generally speaking, appeared on both occasions; and last year there came from the Committee on Government Operations 238 pages of hearings. That particular proposal, Senate bill 1633, was reported favorably by the Committee on Government Operations. It was also reported favorably by the counterpart of the House Rules Committee—and by the policy committee of this body. But it was not called up, because of the fact that in the other body the Rules Committee refused to allow a rule, after the appropriate legislative committee had approved the proposal.

There was no choice left for the President but to send down a reorganization proposal. I want to commend the distinguished Senator from Arkansas and the members of his committee for the diligence which they have shown, but I must say, in all frankness, that one of the reasons why I am bringing up this proposal at the present time is that it may well be the only opportunity Members of the Senate will have to vote on the creation of a new Department, a Department of Urban Affairs. Mr. President, we can talk about all the technicalities; that we are against this particular proposal, even though we are for the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs; but we cannot have it both ways. We are either for the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs or we are against the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs—all apologies and abilis to the contrary notwithstanding.

People can understand that, so far as the proposal before us is concerned, this is the only opportunity that Members of the Senate will have to make their views known as to whether they desire the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs, a Department which will look after the interests of 70 percent of the people of this country, people who in effect have no representation today, people who, when their representatives come down here to Washington, have to go to various departments, seeking aid, assistance, and advice.

There were no dilatory tactics used by the Committee on Government Operations under the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas. I repeat, he is to be commended for the way he has operated and conducted the affairs of his committee. I want to say again though, Mr. President, we can use all the technicalities we desire, make all the alibis and apologies we want—the only choice we are going to have is on this motion, and on this motion we are going to show whether we are for the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs or against it.

Mr. President, I support Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962.

There are no great metropolitan areas in Montana that compare with those in many other States of the Union. Nevertheless, Montana is growing steadily; her population increased by more than 16 percent during the 1950's. Much of that increase occurred in Montana's cities and large towns. They will be experiencing, in the years to come, the familiar problems of urban growth that make the creation of this Department necessary and desirable.

The creation of the Department of Agriculture was a necessary step toward serving the people of an agricultural nation. In the years since its establishment, the distribution of our population, as well as its number, has changed radically. We are no longer a predominantly agricultural nation. Seven out of every ten Americans now live in major urban areas.

This means, Mr. President, that 7 out of every 10 Americans are confronted by problems peculiar to urban life. The resolution of these problems is essential to the quality of our individual and common life.

The President said in his message on submitting the plan:

> There must be expansion; but orderly and planned expansion, not explosion and sprawl. Basic public facilities must be extended ever further into the areas surrounding urban centers: but they must be planned and coordinated so as to favor rather than hamper the sound growth of our communities. The scourge of blight must be overcome, and the central core areas of our cities, with all their great richness of economic and cultural wealth, must be restored to lasting vitality. New values must be created to provide a more efficient local economy and provide revenues to support essential local services. Sound old housing must be conserved and improved, and new housing created, to serve better all income groups in our population and to move ever closer to the goal of a decent home in a suitable living environment for every American family. We will neglect our cities at our peril, for in neglecting them we neglect the Nation.

This is an extensive list of problems and responsibilities, Mr. President. It does not overstate the needs of our city populations; rather it defines them exactly. What becomes clear from an examination of this list is that urban problems are real enough, distinct enough, and crucial enough, to require the establishment of a separate department of Cabinet rank, in order that the Government may meet its responsibilities to its urban population.

There should be included, in the highest councils of the Nation, a representative of the city dwellers of the United States. There should be brought together, under one roof and within one organization responsible to a single administrator, the agencies established by law to deal with the various facets of city life. What is here proposed is not the monopolizing of responsibility for urban affairs in the hands of Federal Government; the principal responsibility for city policy and administration will remain in the cities and States. What is proposed is a rational organization for what responsibility we do acknowledge as ours in the National Government.

Mr. President, as a proposal for better Government organization, how has the President's proposal withstood attacks within or without this Chamber? What conclusions can be drawn from the judgment expressed by those who are best informed on the subject—those who have worked with and best understand the organization of our Government and its problems? Without doubt, they overwhelmingly support the creation of the new Department. They include former administrators of the very programs we are discussing; special study groups and commissions established to study, investigate, and recommend proposals for improving Government organization; and people from our communities who have had the greatest experience with these same programs, and know what type of Federal organization can be of greatest service to them.

We also have the benefit of extensive hearings and favorable reports by committees of the Congress. We have the favorable report of the Committee on Government Operations on legislation almost identical with the reorganization plan. Above all, the proposal itself is a recommendation of the President of the United States for adjusting the organization of the executive branch. In his judgment, as head of the executive branch, the Department is urgently needed to enable him to discharge most effectively the responsibilities in this area placed upon him by the Constitution and by the statutes enacted by the Congress.

Why is expert judgment so overwhelmingly in favor of the President's proposal? Because the new Department will meet pressing needs to improve the facilities of the Federal Government for administering urban affairs and housing matters.

Should we in the Congress tell the President and the country that the affairs of our cities and other urban areas are not important enough for him to consider at the Cabinet level? This seems inconceivable today, with all of our mounting municipal problems of housing, commuter transportation, and public facilities, and with the tremendous impact of Federal programs in this field on the Nation's economy and the fiscal and credit policies of the executive branch. If these problems are sufficiently important for Cabinet level consideration, on what principle of good government do we deny the President's chief assistant on urban and housing matters the Cabinet rank warranted by the functions he administers? On what principle do we deny his agency the rank of a department?

Now, Mr. President, one of the reasons why the proposal was brought up in this body was to give to Members of the Senate a chance to vote, because had it been brought up in the House first, indications are that it would experience great difficulty over there.

I want to say that what has been done in bringing this particular proposal up today under this unusual procedure has not been meant to demean the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, a man for whom I have the highest respect, a man under whom I served, whom I admire and have a great deal of affection for; but we do want a vote in the Senate. May I say that the Congress, contrary to what has been said on the floor today, is not being penalized by the action, but the President is, because he has taken the only course open to him to take care of the needs of 70 percent of the people of our country; and by our votes we are going to make our decision known.

I have in my hand a telegram from McAllen, Tex., which reads in part as follows:

> Humbly but with all the vigor and force at our command, we solicit your active support for the bill creating a Department of Urban Affairs. As the official spokesmen of the three strongest and best known organizations of the Spanish-speaking citizens in the five Southwestern States and in many other parts of our country, we stand 100 percent behind President Kennedy on this issue.

The telegram is signed by Dr. Hector P. Garcia, of Corpus Christi, Tex., founder of the American GI Forum and national president of PASSO; Ralph Estrada, Tucson, Ariz., supreme president of Alianza; Ed Idar, Jr., McAllen, Tex., executive secretary for American GI Forum of Texas and for Texas PASSO.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire telegram be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

McALLEN, TEX., *February 19, 1962.*

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
Care of J. Carlos McCormick,
Silver Spring, Md.:

Humbly but with all the vigor and force at our command, we solicit your active support for the bill creating a Department of Urban Affairs. As the official spokesman of the three strongest and best known organizations of the Spanish-speaking citizens in the five Southwestern States and in many other parts of our country, we stand 100 percent behind President Kennedy on this issue.

We deplore exceedingly the fact that this issue is endangered by the misconception that it is a civil rights issue. We feel the mere fact that Dr. Weaver may head the new Department is completely immaterial and irrelevant to the real issue which is the need for people in urban areas to have a spokesman in the Cabinet pressing for their needs.

It is noteworthy that 70 percent of the citizens of our country reside in urban areas and that a very similar percent of our Spanish-speaking citizens are similarly situated and stand to benefit immediately and directly by the creation of this Department.

U.S. census and other statistical studies among the Spanish-speaking population in the five Southwestern States indicate the following shocking statistics in regards to housing among this population group:

In Arizona 43.9 percent of our people live in houses that have no inside flush toilet facilities. In California this percent is 14; in Colorado, it is 39.5; in New Mexico, 56.8 percent; and in Texas 58.4.

With respect to housing that is overcrowded and in which there are far more than the national average of 1.5 persons per room, the percent of Spanish-speaking persons in Arizona living in such housing is 28.5; in California, it is 16.3; in Colorado, 30.3; in New Mexico, 31; and in Texas, 39.5 percent.

With respect to housing among the Spanish-speaking population that has no piped running water inside the housing unit, the percent in Arizona is 18.8; in Colorado, it is 18.6; in New Mexico, 32.4; in Texas. 38.4; and only California shows this problem ameliorated to the extent where only 3.8 of our people are affected.

We can cite similar statistics in many other factors with respect to housing and to conditions affecting our people in every major urban area in the country where they are to be found.

The Spanish-speaking persons form the second largest ethnic minority group in the entire country but their living and working conditions are the worst in the country. The Department of Urban Affairs is vital to the development of this group of citizens, particularly in the southwestern part of the United States. We feel such Department will put all citizens in the urban areas on the same footing as those in rural areas who now have a Cabinet post looking to their welfare. A Department of Urban Affairs can be instrumental in solving housing problems and developing programs of benefit to urban dwellers many of whom, and particularly among the Spanish-speaking, do not now qualify under the various programs affecting housing.

The stand stated herein has been endorsed by proper resolutions and other actions of our respective organizations the last one being a resolution adopted by PASSO at its convention in San Antonio recently.

DR. HECTOR P. GARCIA.
CORPUS CHRISTI, TEX.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the RECORD a letter addressed to the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] from the American Municipal Association.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN MUNICIPAL ASSOCIATION,
February 16, 1962.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: On behalf of the American Municipal Association I strongly urge your support of the President's reorganization plan to create a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. Our association has been on record in favor of such a Department since 1956, and just last August the delegates to our American Municipal Congress reiterated our position.

There is no group which is more jealous of the powers of local governments to deal with local problems than the mayors and other municipal officials of America. If we thought this Department would in any manner lessen the vitality and independence of local government in America, we would be in the forefront of the fight against it. We are also convinced that it will not in any way alter our relationships with our own State governments. It cannot, because we are creatures of our States, and can only act with the acquiescence of the States.

The new Department will not create any new programs or appropriate any additional funds for urban areas. However, as you know, under legislation already passed by Congress our Federal Government and municipal governments increasingly and irrevocably are involved with one another in the field of urban development. We are convinced that these existing relationships will be more soundly administered under a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, headed by an official of Cabinet rank.

We believe the question before you is not a partisan one. If it were, our organization, which represents municipal officials of both parties, could not support it. We do support it, and we urge your support.

Sincerely yours,

GORDON S. CLINTON,
President, Mayor of Seattle.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, before the majority leader concludes, will he yield for three questions?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, I yield.

Mr. COTTON. If the committee is not discharged, is there any danger that the President's plan will go into effect without some of us who are against it having a chance to vote against it?

Mr. MANSFIELD. If the committee is not discharged, the proposal will remain in the Committee on Government Operations. I am quite certain that, if that is done, the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Arkansas, will do what he can to make a report to the Senate on the basis of the hearings held by his committee. It is my further understanding that if a vote were held in the committee, it might be favorable on the question of reporting the President's reorganization proposal. It is my understanding—I do not know, but it is my considered judgment—that if the Senate does not vote on this measure today, so far as the other body is concerned, they will vote, they may well kill the measure, and Senators will not have a chance to make their stand known.

Mr. COTTON. But if they do not kill the measure, some of us who are opposed to it will have a chance to record our stand against it later?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes. The outlook for House action is not too good. So far as we are concerned, in my opinion this is the only chance we will have to vote on the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs. We can use all the alibis, we can cite all the technicalities, but this is the test; if it carries it will be taken out of the hands of the committee and brought before the Senate for 10 hours of deliberation and debate. We will then have another chance, on the merits of the proposal, to decide whether we are in favor of the creation of such a department or not. The choice is that of the Senate.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I understood the Senator to say that unless this vote is taken affirmatively, Senators will have no chance to vote on the setting up of an Urban Affairs Department. What would prevent the majority leader at any time from making a motion to call up the bill now on the calendar, S. 1633, which the majority leader has said is identical to the proposal now pending?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Action by the House Rules Committee, and perhaps action by the House itself, if it acted on the proposal.

Mr. HOLLAND. Would that prevent the Senate from taking action?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No, but it would be a futile gesture, and the majority leader does not believe in futile gestures any more than the Senator from Florida does.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator has stated he believes this proposal is going to be defeated in the other body. Therefore, would it not be an exercise in futility to act on it and pass it here in this body?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No, because if we have a chance to pass upon the issue here, we would make our position known, and perhaps the other body would be influenced thereby. At the moment I would say action does not look too favorable in the other body, but who knows, if we are successful here, what the effect might be there? Nobody can foretell, but I think we ought to act in accordance with our responsibilities and do something which would be of benefit to the urban areas of our country.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana yields back his time. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen] has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, there is only one question before the Senate. Are we to preserve the integrity of the Senate committee system under the rules?

I might amplify what the distinguished Senator from Florida said. When the vote is taken—and I trust the committee will not be discharged—the majority leader can make a motion to consider the bill for reorganization, which is on the calendar, and along with that is the fact that it will be amendable by the Senate, unlike the reorganization plan, which cannot be amended. We can work our will on it, and we shall have a full and fair opportunity to be heard on this issue.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph] to discharge the Committee on Government Operations from further consideration of Senate Resolution 288, proposing Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962. Those in favor of discharging the committee will vote "yea"; those opposing discharging the committee will vote "nay."

The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 58, as follows:

[No. 20 Leg.]

YEAS—42

Bartlett
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Carroll
Case, N.J.
Church
Clark
Douglas
Engle
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hickey
Humphrey
Jackson
Javits
Keating
Kefauver
Kerr
Long, Mo.
Long, Hawaii
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McNamara
Metcalf
Monroney
Morse
Moss
Muskie
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Proxmire
Scott
Smith, Mass.
Symington
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NAYS—58

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Beall
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Bush
Butler
Byrd, Va.
Cannon
Capehart
Carlson
Case, S. Dak.
Chavez
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dworshak
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Goldwater
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Johnston
Jordan
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, La.
McClellan
Miller
Morton
Mundt
Murphy
Pearson
Prouty
Randolph
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Smathers
Smith, Maine
Sparkman
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Wiley
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

So Mr. Randolph's motion was rejected.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. As I understand the rule, a motion to reconsider the vote is not in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, while I am extremely disappointed at the outcome of the vote which has just been taken, I believe it should be brought to the attention of the Senate that the vote was 58 to 42, which indicates that all 100 Senators are present, which is an event in itself.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There are two events today; a 100-percent attendance by the Senate and the orbiting of the earth by Colonel Glenn.

LIMITATION OF TIME DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a morning hour until 2 o'clock, and at 2 o'clock, the unfinished business (H.R. 5143) be laid before the Senate for consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Irrigation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

MAJOR STATUTORY SALARY SYSTEMS OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 344)

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, today the President of the United States sent a message to the Congress relating to salary systems of the Federal Government. I ask unanimous consent that the message be referred to the appropriate committee, and that the message be printed in the Record, without reading.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The message was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

The success of this Government, and thus the success of our Nation, depends in the last analysis upon the quality of our career services. The legislation enacted by the Congress, as well as the decisions made by me and the department and agency heads, must all be implemented by the career men and women in the Federal service. In foreign affairs, national defense, science and technology, and a host of other fields, they face unprecedented problems of unprecedented importance and perplexity. We are all dependent on their sense of loyalty and responsibility as well as their competence and energy; and just as they have responsibilities to the Government, so does the Government have obligations to them.

We properly establish high standards for our public servants. We investigate their character and associations before considering them for employment. We hire them only after they have passed difficult examinations. We require them to abide by rigorous standards of conduct and ethics. We demand consistently high performance from them on the job. Accordingly, the salaries for the services they perform should be fixed under well-understood and objective standards, high enough to attract and retain competent personnel, sufficiently flexible to motivate initiative and industry, and comparable with the salaries received by their counterparts in private life. To pay more than this is to be unfair to the taxpayers—to pay less is to degrade the public service and endanger our national security.

Unfortunately these basic standards for Federal salary systems are not met today. Too many Federal employees are underpaid in proportion to their responsibilities. Too many receive smaller salaries than are paid by many private industries, and even by many State and local governments, for less responsible work. Too many top-grade or supervisory Federal employees are paid little more, and sometimes even less, than their subordinates. Too many key career employees are unable to afford continued public service.

Existing statutory Federal pay structures cannot be justified as sound and equitable, either internally or externally. Internally, salaries between various levels of work should be enough to provide an incentive to undertake more responsible duties and to represent, dollarwise, fair differences in work requirements. Over the years, piecemeal statutory revisions—with primary emphasis on bringing the lower pay levels abreast of changes in the cost of living—have severely compressed the spread between the top and bottom salaries. The 8.8-to-1 and 12-to-1 salary ratios between the highest and lowest Classification Act and Postal Field Service grades existing prior to World War II have shrunk to ratios of less than 6 to 1, making it impossible to offer pay increases consistent with the added responsibilities of grade-to-grade promotion, or to offer an appropriate range of incentives within a particular grade. There is little consistency or logic in the salary differences between existing grade levels. And employees paid under a wage board system, with wages based on the prevailing rates in industry, are frequently paid more than their supervisors whose salaries are fixed by the more rigid and less logical provisions of the Classification Act.

Externally, except for employees paid under wage board systems, Federal salaries generally do not compare favorably and cannot compete successfully with private industry. Every objective survey has demonstrated that salaried Government employees at almost every work level receive less compensation, on a national average basis, than private employees performing similar work—and the greater the level of difficulty and responsibility the greater the gap between Federal and private pay. A Federal employee beginning a professional or administrative career can look forward to a maximum salary increase of no more than four and one quarter times his entrance salary, whereas his counterpart in private industry can look forward to an increase of six or seven times his beginning salary. Moreover, the Federal employee's top salary, if he stays to reach it, will be less than half that of his private enterprise counterpart.

Even State and local governments have passed the Federal Government. The head of a Federal Cabinet department receives less than the head of a New York State department—less than the average salary paid to the superintendents of schools in cities over 500,000 population. The highest paid Federal employees under the Classification Act would obtain higher salaries if they were working in the State career service in Georgia, Ohio, New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Michigan, or California, for example—or for the cities of St. Louis, Denver, Detroit, San Francisco, Los Angeles, and Philadelphia.

The difficulty has been the lack of both an accepted objective standard for determining Federal salary levels and a consistent procedure for review and adjustment. The result has been a steady attrition of valued employees, an inability to attract many top quality college graduates and, in the long run, a waste of Federal funds—discouraging the initiative, efficiency, and dedication that accompany recognition and stature, and requiring enormous expenditures each year to recruit and train new replacements for employees who leave the service for reasons of inadequate pay. We can no longer defer the necessary corrective measures or continue the existing lack of standards; and recent studies and measurement techniques now make possible the kind of wholly new approach that commonsense requires.

A FEDERAL PAY REFORM PROGRAM

I am transmitting to the Congress with this message legislation designed to reform the major statutory salary systems of the Federal Government, benefiting all of the 1,640,000 employees throughout the world who are paid under the various Federal statutory pay plans—the Classification Act, the Postal Field Service Compensation Act, the Foreign Service Act, and the medicine and surgery salary system of the Veterans' Administration. Although flat increases for lower paid workers are included as a matter of equity, the essence of this bill's objectives is Federal pay reform, not simply a Federal pay raise. Where pay raises result from the establishment of objective pay standards, they are primarily a reflection of the extent to which Federal salaries have lagged behind the national economy.

This proposal has two principal features:

1. It establishes a sound, objective, and continuous standard for determining proper salary levels by following the concept of comparability—reasonable comparability with prevailing private enterprise salaries for the same levels of work insofar as this is possible, as determined from painstaking statistical surveys and careful job comparisons; and

2. It establishes realistic and appropriate salary relationships both within and among the several statutory salary systems and each of their grade levels, by following the principle of equal pay for equal work, with distinctions in pay consistent with distinctions in responsibility and performance.

COMPARABILITY

Adoption of the principle of comparability will assure equity for the Federal employee with his equals throughout the national economy—enable the Government to compete fairly with private firms for qualified personnel—and provide at last a logical and factual standard for setting Federal salaries. Reflected in this single standard are such legitimate private enterprise pay considerations as cost of living, standard of living, and productivity, to the same extent that those factors are resolved into the going rate over bargaining tables and other salary determining processes in private enterprise throughout the country.

The principle has a history of wide acceptance. Within the Federal Government, it has been used for 100 years: first applied to Navy yard workers, it is now applied to all Federal workers in trades and crafts, to employees of the Tennessee Valley Authority, and to work under Government contracts covered by the Walsh-Healey and Davis-Bacon Acts. Many State and local governments, as well as some other national governments (such as Canada and the United Kingdom) already rely on this principle.

It should be noted in this regard that, in marked contrast to the unfavorable situation of salaried employees, the Federal pay practices affecting over 660,000 workers in the skilled trades and crafts have functioned without serious conflict or confusion. Based on prevailing rates, and set on recommendation of wage boards, their pay has been continuously maintained at levels that are fair from the viewpoint of the Government, the taxpayer and the employee.

I have found no more sensible standard for determining Government salaries. The Advisory Panel on Federal Salary Systems, chaired by Mr. Clarence Randall, in its recent report to me called it not only equitable but valid and eminently desirable. The application of this principle permits the Government to meet its difficult personnel needs without paying more than is necessary or less than is equitable. It was not feasible in earlier years; but now the recently introduced annual survey of professional, administrative, technical and clerical salaries conducted by the Bureau of Labor Statistics provides the objective comparative salary data needed for setting Federal pay scales. Occupational rates paid by private employers at a given work level of difficulty, responsibility and required qualifications can be combined into a single national average private enterprise rate for work equivalent to a Classification Act grade. These Classification Act rates in turn can be used to establish rates for the corresponding grades in the specialized salary systems of the Postal Field Service, the Foreign Service and the Veterans' Administration.

INTERNAL ALINEMENT

The internal alinement principle rests on two basic concepts: equal pay for equal work, and distinctions in pay consistent with distinctions in work and performance. Although these concepts are stated in the present Classification Act and are implicit in the Postal Field

Service Compensation Act, the regressive and flat percentage pay adjustments of the past 17 years have gradually blotted out much of the meaning in the current pay differentials of all our salary systems.

The pay schedules I am recommending will regularize and generally enlarge the differences in salaries between successive grade levels, recognizing more appropriately the differences in responsibility involved, and providing a more uniform (not less than 10 percent) progression of salary levels between the entry rates of successive grades. This will furnish a greater incentive for employees striving to prepare themselves for higher responsibilities. At the same time, these new schedules will make more meaningful the within-grade promotions for competent performance of duties, and will provide better incentives for those who spend most of their careers within a single grade, by providing wider salary ranges (30 percent except for the top two grades) within each grade, more adequate and more numerous within-grade salary steps, and more flexible use of salary steps to recognize exceptional achievement.

Other provisions aimed at improving flexibility will (1) facilitate the adjustment of salaries to meet critical needs by competing more equally with private industry in areas or in occupations in which a shortage exists; (2) permit the assignment of positions to the upper grades of the Classification Act on the basis of duties and responsibilities, instead of arbitrarily limiting the number of such positions; and (3) create new upper grades to bring within the salary provisions of the Classification Act all those with top administrative responsibilities who are not Cabinet or sub-Cabinet officers or heads of separate agencies.

The new salary ranges would provide a 30-percent range between the entry rate and the highest rate in the grade for most salaried employees under the Classification Act and a 40-percent range for the lower levels of the Postal Field Service. This is comparable to the private industry ranges, which vary between 30 percent and 50 percent for each position. The pay ranges in the lower levels of the Postal Field Service are somewhat broader than those in the Classification Act, in recognition of the pattern of long service in such positions in the Postal Field Service and the need for incentives for sustained performance during the entire period of service.

ANNUAL REVIEW

To maintain the comparability principle, and to assure that other features are improved with experience, the bill provides that the President shall submit an annual report to Congress on the relationship of Federal salaries to those reported by the BLS for private enterprise, recommending whatever adjustments in salary schedules, structure, and policy he finds advisable. Where adjustments are indicated, they would be accomplished by revision of the Classification Act pay scales and by linkage of the other statutory systems to the Classification Act. A systematic annual review of this kind is essential to prevent Federal salary schedules from relapsing to their present conditions.

THE UPPER GRADES

Reform of the existing pay schedules necessarily involves immediate adjustment of salaries at almost all grade levels. But both our experience in the attrition of higher salaried men and women and all objective surveys have disclosed that the gap between private industry salaries and Government salaries is the widest at the upper levels. For example: The most recent Bureau of Labor Statistics survey shows that GS-14 and GS-15 employees receive 20 percent less than those employees in private industry in comparable positions. A 1960 survey of 21 large companies by the Civil Service Commission showed even more startling disparities at higher levels. Employees in these companies performing functions comparable to those of a GS-18 received twice as high a salary as their Federal Government employed counterpart.

Yet these are the very levels in the career service in which our need for quality is most acute—in which keen judgment, experience, and competence are at a premium. It is here that we face our most difficult personnel problems. It is at these grades that we employ our top scientists, doctors, engineers, experts, and managers. Surely if so many State and city governments, as earlier cited, are willing to compete with private industry for this talent, the Federal Government, with its urgent missions to perform, can face up to this problem as well. As a practical matter, the full principle of comparability cannot be applied to the higher salary levels of government; but I consider adequate adjustment in our top executive and professional positions to be the most vital single element of correction in this entire proposal.

This reform of top career salaries will, of course, boost the pay of many civil servants to a level above that paid to their chiefs in Cabinet, sub-Cabinet and similar positions. I recognize, however, that the salary level of these top executives has been quite properly related in recent years with the salary level of the Congress; and, while both are, in my opinion, inadequate, it is neither customary nor appropriate to either provide such increases during current terms of office or specify congressional increases in a Presidential message. Representatives of the executive branch stand ready, however, to cooperate with the Congress in determining what executive and congressional pay scales would be appropriate following the terms of the present incumbents.

TIMING AND COST

It is important for the Federal Government to adhere to its own precepts with respect to pay adjustments in the economy as a whole. Because of the salary lag that has developed over the past 17 years, full correction of the accrued inequities in 1 year would be unwise, involving the substantial cost of more than $1 billion. This cost would come at a time when heavy budgetary demands have been placed upon us to meet great national security needs, and when the Government is urging private labor and management to exercise self-restraint to avoid the creation of inflationary pressures. Therefore, to reduce the impact in any one year on the affected $10 billion Federal payroll, where each 1-percent increase costs $100 million, the plan that I recommend provides that the full 10 percent be distributed over three annual stages, beginning prospectively on January 1, 1963. The increase scheduled to take effect next year is clearly well within the national average productivity increase (in the private sector) which has taken place since the last Federal pay increase in July of 1960.

The substantial costs necessarily involved in achieving this pay reform make it especially important that these improvements in our pay systems take absolute priority over general percentage or dollar increases of the kind we have seen in the past—increases which make little if any contribution to efficiency or economy in Government.

CONCLUSION

As I stated in my budget message, the first requirement for efficiency and economy in Government is highly competent personnel. I believe that enactment of this plan for sound salary administration is fundamental to the maintenance of a standard of excellence in the Federal service. It is my belief that this measure, if enacted, will constitute the most important revision and reform in Federal personnel legislation in more than a decade. It is the most important proposal to improve the Federal service which has been presented by this administration; and I believe it is essential if we are to achieve and maintain proficiency in the Federal Government. If our civil servants are to fulfill with skill and devotion their obligations to the Nation, the Nation must fulfill its obligations to the career service.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 20, 1962.*

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

LOAN OF SUBMARINE AND DESTROYERS TO GREECE AND KOREA

A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, reporting, pursuant to law, on the loan of one submarine and two destroyers to the Government of Greece, and one destroyer and one destroyer escort to the Government of Korea; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON PRIME CONTRACT AWARDS TO SMALL AND OTHER BUSINESS FIRMS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Installations and Logistics, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Army, Navy, and Air Force prime contract awards to small and other business firms, for the period July–December 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Repeal of Certain Legislation Relating to the Purchase of Silver

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal certain legislation relating to the purchase of silver, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Appointment of Agents To Bid on Sale of Lands or Tenements of a Debtor

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 3470 of the Revised Statutes to authorize the heads of departments and independent agencies to appoint agents to bid on behalf of the United States, at sales, on execution at the suit of the United States, of lands or tenements of a debtor (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Declaration That Certain Land Is Held by the United States in Trust for Oglala Sioux Indian Tribe

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to declare that certain land of the United States is held by the United States in trust for the Oglala Sioux Indian Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Declaration That Certain Land Is Held by the United States in Trust for Prairie Band of Potawatomi Indians

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to declare that certain land of the United States is held by the United States in trust for the Prairie Band of Potawatomi Indians in Kansas (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Conveyance of Certain Lands of Minnesota Chippewa Indians to Little Flower Mission of the St. Cloud Diocese

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the conveyance of certain lands of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe of Indians to the Little Flower Mission of the St. Cloud Diocese (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Proposed Concession Contract, Yosemite National Park, Calif.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed concession contract in Yosemite National Park, Calif. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Donation of Certain Federally Owned Land to Devils Lake Sioux Tribe of Fort Totten Indian Reservation, N. Dak.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to donate to the Devils Lake Sioux Tribe of the Fort Totten Indian Reservation, N. Dak., approximately 275.74 acres of federally owned land (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Declaration That Certain Land Is Held by the United States in Trust for Oglala Sioux Indian Tribe

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to declare that certain land of the United States is held by the United States in trust for the Oglala Sioux Indian Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

RESOLUTION OF ASSEMBLY OF STATE OF WISCONSIN

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Wisconsin State Assembly recently adopted a resolution urging that surplus foods be made available to nonprofit homes for the aged. It asks that the rules governing the distribution of Federal surplus commodities be liberalized to permit such charitable institutions to benefit from surplus foodstuffs.

This important resolution was authored by Assemblyman Allen J. Flannigan, of Milwaukee. Because of the great interest of the matter it deals with, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolution 30

Resolution urging the Federal Government to liberalize the distribution of surplus commodities

Whereas the vast majority of nonprofit homes for the aged, nonprofit convalescent homes, and other eleemosynary institutions are operating at a loss; and

Whereas these homes provide a definite public service by providing care for the aged and helpless; and

Whereas present Federal regulations pertaining to distribution of surplus commodities are too restrictive and do not fully recognize the charitable nature of these institutions: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Wisconsin State Assembly, That the Federal Government be urged to liberalize the rules in regard to surplus commodity distribution to these institutions; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent forthwith to the President of the United States, the Solicitor General, the Comptroller General, the Secretary of Agriculture, and all Wisconsin Congressmen.

David J. Blanchard,
Speaker of the Assembly.
Robert G. Marotz,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

RESOLUTION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF RHODE ISLAND

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore], and myself, I present a resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to seriously consider the problems of the textile industry in the event of tariff reductions, recently passed by the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, and ask that it be printed in the Record.

Mr. President, I would also like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the work of the Textile Subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee and to the very able leadership of my senior colleague, Senator Pastore. I was delighted to learn that our Government has recently concluded an agreement with other concerned governments regarding textile imports, and I know that, in this connection, my senior colleague must feel a great sense of satisfaction for his untiring efforts.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 173

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to seriously consider the problems of the textile industry in the event of tariff reductions

Whereas the challenge of the European Common Market and the threat of Communist economic expansion is recognizable; and

Whereas adjustments in the tariff schedule are to be expected to prevent the loss of the European market to American producers; and

Whereas the textile industry of New England which has been in a decline over a period of years due to foreign competition can ill afford greater importations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island earnestly urges upon the Congress of the United States the most serious consideration of the projection of the textile industry as promulgated by the Honorable John O. Pastore, Senator from the State of Rhode Island, in his capacity as chairman of the Textile Subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be and he is hereby authorized and directed to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States earnestly requesting that each use his best efforts to assure protection for the textile industry which is still a vital factor in the economy of Rhode Island.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce:

Maj. Gen. Harold Winfield Grant of the U.S. Air Force to be the Deputy Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency; and

Jack N. Behrman, of Delaware, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce, vice Rowland Burnstan, resigned.

By Mr. KEATING, from the Committee on Commerce:

G. Joseph Minetti, of New York, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

PURCHASE OF UNITED NATIONS BONDS — ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of February 7, 1962, the names of Senators Neuberger, Williams of New Jersey, Young of Ohio, Douglas, and Long of Hawaii were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 2818) to promote the foreign policy of the United States by authorizing the purchase of United Nations bonds and the appropriation of funds therefor, and to afford an opportunity for the people of the United States to participate in the purchase of such bonds, introduced by Mr. Clark (for himself and Mr. Humphrey) on February 7, 1962.

NEGRO HISTORY WEEK—ADDITIONAL CONSPONSORS OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, under date of February 15, I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 156, which authorizes the President to proclaim Negro History Week. I ask unanimous consent that when the joint resolution is reprinted that the following cosponsors be added. Senators CAPEHART, ALLOTT, FONG, SALTONSTALL, GOLDWATER, KEATING, JAVITS, and KUCHEL.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Speech on "Federal Water Resources Planning and River Basin Management," by Senator RANDOLPH, at winter meeting of the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin.

By Mr. WILEY:

Excerpts from the address delivered by himself over Wisconsin radio stations on the weekend of February 17–18, 1962, on the subject of expansion of the Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, Wis.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

Statement issued by himself on January 23, 1962, on the subject of the meeting of Western Hemisphere foreign ministers at Punte del Este.

THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an excellent article appearing in the National Observer of February 18, 1962, entitled "Stockpile Scandal Is Very Old Stuff to Virginia's BYRD."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STOCKPILE SCANDAL IS VERY OLD STUFF TO VIRGINIA'S BYRD

Senator HARRY FLOOD BYRD, 74-year-old chairman of both the Senate Finance Committee and the Joint Committee on the Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, has been battling what he considers wasteful, inflation-breeding Government spending from the day he entered the Senate as a Virginia Democrat 29 years ago. Last week, the apple-cheeked Senator was stepping up the tempo.

Items:

He was querying the Pentagon about the proposed expenditure of $3 million to recondition (complete with gold-colored wallpaper) a destroyer-sized seaplane tender, the U.S.S. *Orca*, for the Imperial Ethiopian Navy under the military assistance program.

He was using his considerable power to fight President Kennedy's recommendation that the United States buy half of the United Nations proposed $200 million bond issue.

CLIMBING THE STOCKPILES

Finally, the Senator was deep—as usual—in the investigation of the Federal stockpile—a scandal which President Kennedy suddenly catapulted into the headlines with a statement that the total $7.7 billion of materials exceeds America's needs by nearly $3.4 billion and is a potential source of excessive and unconscionable profits. As he has for more than 2 years, Senator BYRD issued on February 16 his monthly mimeographed report on Federal Stockpile Inventories, including farm surpluses, which totaled $14,112,690,000 for the report period, December 1961.

Because the nonessential Federal expenditures committee has been digging out, tabulating, printing, and distributing these figures to every Member of Congress, the White House, and the public every month, Senator BYRD is wryly mystified that President Kennedy should suddenly be astonished at the size of the stockpile. In a letter to the President, Senator BYRD expressed gratification at the Chief Executive's interest in the matter and urged that the secrecy lid be lifted from the list of strategic materials with a cost value of more than $6 billion. He says this classification has been hampering the work of his committee for a long time. But it was not Mr. BYRD but a colleague—Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, Republican of Delaware—who noted that President Kennedy, when a Senator from Massachusetts, had voted eight of nine times to support stockpiles.

Other aspects of Senator BYRD's favorite subject of economy could bring future fireworks.

HE WANTS A LONG LOOK

Advised recently by Douglas Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury, that the national debt limit must be raised by March 1 to $300 billion if the Government is to meet its current bills and other obligations, Senator BYRD said he would support temporary legislation raising the limit to the minimum immediate requirement. But, he adds, "I shall ask the Senate Finance Committee to undertake a full-scale investigation into the fiscal condition of this country in all its aspects." With characteristic bluntness, in terms understandable even to constituents in the deepest of backwoods Virginia, he says:

"It isn't necessary to be an expert to recognize the fact that we cannot continue to spend and spend, and tax and tax, and borrow and borrow much longer. The United States, since World War II, has been the policeman of the world, the banker of the world and the Santa Claus for the world. Recently published figures indicate the U.S. Government has spent more than $100 billion in foreign aid. The people of this Nation are entitled to know exactly where this money has gone. We have just agreed, for example, to write off nearly $2 billion in aid to Japan for about 25 cents on the dollar. I recently visited Japan at my own expense. Her progress has been amazing. She could pay what she owes us in full."

WARNINGS IN THE PAST

Senator EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, Democrat, of Minnesota, a liberal member of the Finance Committee, shrugs off such Byrdisms, says he can remember a time when the Virginian was predicting dire results if the national debt ever reached $40 billion.

On the other hand, Senator WILLIAMS can't say enough for Senator BYRD. Says he: "Let's put it this way: Where would this country be today if HARRY hadn't been in there slowing down the spending?"

An air of quiet bustle prevails behind the mahogany-colored door in the Old Senate Office Building marked simply: "209—Mr. BYRD—Virginia—Walk in."

Soft-voiced Virginia gentlewomen pound relentlessly at typewriters in a large suite of high-vaulted offices, the walls of which are covered from floor to ceiling with hundreds of original political cartoons tracing Mr. BYRD's more than 50 years' service to the Old Dominion. (He was a Winchester, Va., city councilman in his 'teens; a State senator at 27; Governor at 38.)

The Senator's career is epitomized by one outsized cartoon showing a little "BYRD" pecking away furiously at an enormously bleated American eagle marked "Federal payroll." Other sketches recall attempts by Presidents Roosevelt and Truman to purge him; his coolness toward Presidential Candidates Adlai Stevenson and John F. Kennedy; his own favorite-son candidacy for President.

THE VOICE OF EXPERIENCE

Senator BYRD comes by his lifelong dedication to thrift by hard experience. He left school in 1903 at the age of 15 to take over the family newspaper, the Winchester (Va.) Star, which was facing bankruptcy. Within a few years he had made a financial success of the paper, had leased his first apple orchard near Berryville, Va., and had entered local politics.

Today, Senator BYRD is reputed to be the largest single owner of apple orchards in the world. His orchards now cover a 70-mile stretch in the Shenandoah Valley from Charles Town, W. Va., to Newmarket, Va., producing more than 1,500,000 bushels annually. During apple-picking time in the fall, the Senator rattles through the orchards from dawn 'till dusk in an old car, checking in at packinghouses and generally supervising the vast operation. With him in the apple business is his brother Thomas (his other brother was Adm. Richard E. Byrd, the polar explorer) and his three sons, Harry, Jr., a State senator; B. Beverley and Richard E. Byrd, the latter a close likeness of his famous namesake.

The Senator and his wife live in Rosemont, a handsome, white-columned Georgian house in Berryville overlooking the Blue Ridge Mountains. The subject of Government economy is apt to dominate even a private conversation with its owner; his points are likely to be punctuated with a quick grin, a wry laugh, and a gentle rap on his visitor's chest for emphasis.

He is fond of noting that when he entered the Senate in 1933, the national budget was $4,598 million and Government employees numbered 603,587. Now, he'll add, the Kennedy budget for the fiscal year beginning July 1, is $92,537 million and Government employees number 2,431,000.

Asks the Senator: "When will the breaking point come?"

ABLE TEXAS EDITOR H. M. BAGGARLY BACKS EDUCATIONAL ADVANCEMENT, AND FEDERAL MONETARY AID TO RAISE EDUCATIONAL LEVEL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, one of the great continuing stories throughout the history of the United States has been the progress made by our country in our efforts to make education available to all the people. One of the great stories today is the effort now being made from the smallest school district to the highest office in our Nation to see that this progress is maintained at a satisfactory pace.

In this national debate, it is easy for a single voice to go unheard, even though what this voice has to say is of exceeding importance. Such a voice is that of H. M. Baggarly, the editor and publisher of the Tulia Herald in Swisher County, Tex. His article on Federal aid to education is the most effective short article on that subject that I have read.

The Tulia Herald is a weekly newspaper in a county of 11,000 population.

Its circulation is not large in relation to the metropolitan papers with readers ranging in the hundreds of thousands. Yet, the Tulia Herald, through the columns written by H. M. Baggarly, is an eloquent, ardent, effective voice for advancement of education in the United States, in our time.

The editor, H. M. Baggarly, is one of the outstanding newspapermen of America. The Tulia Herald was the National Editorial Association prize winning newspaper from 1957 to 1961. It was the Texas Press Association prize winner every year from 1951 through 1961; the Panhandle Press Association prize winner seven times in the last 10 years; the West Texas Press Association prize winner seven times in the last 8 years; and the Alpha Upsilon chapter of Theta Sigma Phi, Texas Technological College, winner each year from 1954 through 1957.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article by H. M. Baggarly from the Tulia, Swisher County, Herald of Thursday, December 14, 1961.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COUNTRY EDITOR

(By H. M. Baggarly)

Larry Elms, a Silverton youngster, writes: "I have often admired your work in your column of the Tulia Herald. I was wondering if you would mind telling me in your column or by letter your views concerning Federal aid to public education. Thank you very much."

Well, Larry, this is quite an order, but it's a very timely and important order. No issue of the hour has been more misrepresented, more distorted, more abused, than Federal aid to public education.

There are those who confuse the issue deliberately so that the public will not discover that they are against all aid to public education, including personal, local, State and Federal. Then there are the confused who have become so brainwashed that they think they are opposing an immoral, un-American issue. They think there is a line which divides moral aid from immoral aid to education.

Since you are interested in this subject, let's try to isolate the issue of public education from the propaganda to which we are subjected and try to see the problem in true perspective.

Our ancestors came to this country because they were fed up with an imperialistic society in which a handful of men owned all the resources, had all the advantages, and considered the teeming masses as inferior slaves who deserved nothing but to serve their masters.

These ancestors of ours dreamed of a land where every man would have an equal opportunity to seek success, a land where there would be no artificial deterrents to success such as his ancestory, his family background, his color, his race, his religion, or his wealth.

These wise people knew that there is little chance for success apart from education. They knew that elementary and perhaps secondary schooling were something that must be provided for a youngster because at the age he needs this training, he is too young to provide it for himself. If his parents failed to recognize his need for education, or if they lacked the wealth needed to send him to school, he would be unable to compete in society through no fault of his own.

So it was that wise men believed that every youngster, such as yourself, should receive schooling regardless of the ability of his parents to pay, regardless of any other handicaps.

People of wealth can buy just about anything they want—including education for their children. But because some cannot pay, the philosophy of free public schools was embraced by most all the people. Please note that we said most all the people and not all the people. There were people at that time who disagreed with this philosophy, and there are people today who disagree. In fact, there are newspaper publishers less than 100 miles from Tulia who do not believe in free public schools. They say that if a parent can't pay the total cost of educating his child, then that child deserves no education and that it is socialistic to tax them to help pay for educating the children of their neighbors.

This, Larry, is the major issue concerning public education. It is not which unit of government aids education financially. The real issue, is, Shall education be a public or a private matter?

It is agreed by the majority of Americans that education is a public, not a private, concern. And so we turn to some of the problems of public education.

Let us divide these problems into two categories: economic and administrative.

We have already decided, as Americans, that we are going to tax everybody in order to provide free public schools for everybody.

It began in the early years of our Nation and continues to the present day that we establish our base on the local level. When I came to Tulia as a teacher, our district contained about 64 sections. Tax income from these sections supported the Tulia school system with the exception of the per capita apportionment from the State and a little tuition. In some localities, due to poor land and a general lack of local wealth, schools could not collect enough taxes locally to maintain their schools. So it was that State aid was provided. Tulia refused this aid on the grounds that it "didn't want to be controlled by Austin." It wanted to do for itself. It wanted to stand on its own feet, just like many people today. But the catch was, in turning down this State aid, the additional money was not raised locally, and so it was that the teachers were really the ones who absorbed the deficiency in funds. They did not raise the money locally and they wouldn't accept aid from Austin. So we had teachers receiving as little as $65 a month for 9 months not long before we came here.

Sometimes on graduation night in the spring, time would be devoted to telling the parents that Tulia wouldn't accept this dirty State aid—also that Tulia was able to employ teachers at salary levels below those paid by Happy, Silverton, Dimmitt and other schools who accepted this dirty State money.

Of course, the teachers couldn't do anything about it but burn inwardly since teachers were a dime a dozen and they were fortunate to have a job at any price.

Education is costly, and if we are going to make it a strictly local affair, then we are going to have a great variation in the quality of schools. We all remember when schools like Phillips always got the cream of the crop of teachers because they had money to burn due to oil resources. Schools like Silverton and Tulia had to take what was left because they couldn't pay as good salaries, couldn't provide as good facilities.

Those who advocated State aid did so believing that it was for the public good to equalize our finances so students wouldn't be penalized because they happened to be living in a poor school district like Silverton or Tulia.

They believed that it was financially sound to establish minimum salaries and minimum facilities so that a student graduating from Silverton High School wouldn't be the equivalent of the ninth grader at Phillips as was sometimes the case.

They believed that it was sound to enlarge the financial base of public education from the school district level to the State level.

This philosophy has been generally accepted in Texas and it has been a long time since we have heard anybody complain of "State aid" to education. We don't believe anybody even here in Tulia would want to refuse State aid and shoulder the entire burden locally.

Due to our changing world and Nation, we find that our Nation continues to grow smaller. Today we make more trips to Washington than we used to make to Austin, all because of our transportation and communication facilities. It used to be that most people lived and died within a small radius of their native towns. But today a student may attend the first semester of a term in California and the second in Mississippi, or vice versa.

Today we have some of the same problems that once existed among school districts now existing among States. Today, there are teachers in some parts of the Deep South still receiving as little as $900 a year. Some of the schools have facilities comparable to some of our Swisher County rural schools of 40 years ago. The people can't do better because of local economic conditions.

Even in the realm of higher education, southern colleges are not in the same class with their counterparts in the North, not because the North is more education minded but because they have greater financial resources. Just the other night on one of the network news programs we heard a southern educator, the president of a college in Atlanta, Ga., say that southern colleges have been content to compare themselves only with other southern colleges. "North Carolina is as good as Clemson," for example. He said the time is here when they must compare themselves with the first-rate colleges of the Nation.

If some of these southern schools are to improve, they must have more money—and their localities and even States are not able to raise the extra money.

So far as Texas is concerned, we have been accepting more Federal aid from Washington than we have been sending to Washington. For every $1 we have sent to Washington, we have received $1.08. So if any State wants to object to helping his neighbor through Federal aid, it should be States like New York that have been subsidizing some of the southern problems.

As to the economic aspects of Federal aid to public education, we must say that it is not a problem that involves socialism or political morality as some would have us believe. It is merely a problem of having public education on a base large enough to be economical and of maximum efficiency.

As it is now, we are financing our schools by local funds, State funds and Federal funds. Our vocational agriculture and home economics departments as well as our lunchroom programs have long accepted Federal aid.

The other aspect of the problem is what we term administrative. There are some who are less concerned with the economic problems of public education than they are with what they call Federal control of education.

By control, we presume they mean taking over the power now held by the local school boards and the Texas Education Agency, both of whom have a part in determining school policy.

A well-known slogan has been "with aid comes control."

Theoretically, schools could be controlled entirely locally, by the State, or by the Federal Government. All have their advantages and their disadvantages. If we had local control, we could still run into problems. We could conceivably get a local board that might decide that the local high school would not require English courses for graduation or who would abolish mathematics. Or, again, they might go to the other extreme. They might decide that we would have only a 6-months' school term instead of the usual 9-months' term—or they might decide to have school the year round. They might decide to employ teachers with no more than a high school education because they could get them cheaper.

Our opinion is that it is for the public good that the State set up minimum requirements for graduation while the local school determines what electives it wants to offer. We have flexibility here which we think is good. We think it a healthy situation when a State school agency is able to overrule radical actions of a local school board. From a practical standpoint, we think there is far less danger that a board responsible to the entire State would go off on a tangent than a local board responsible only to a small handful of people.

Now if there are advantages in having some State control over local schools, it just might not be all bad to have some national control. For instance, some of our most effective departments in public schools during the past three decades or longer have been our vocational agriculture departments, which long have been financed partially by Federal funds.

We know of not one instance where the Federal Government has tried to ram something down the throats of the local schools through the agricultural departments. True, they set up minimum standards in order to qualify for Federal aid, but we know of no requirement that hasn't been to the school's benefit.

Have you ever heard a vocational agriculture teacher, superintendent, or school board complain about so-called Federal control of our agriculture departments? And if they didn't approve of the program, all they had to do was refuse the aid and offer agriculture courses without Federal participation. Any time a school doesn't like the lunchroom program, all it has to do is refuse Federal funds and run its cafeteria according to its own liking.

The Federal Government has done just about everything to explain to people that it isn't interested in controlling public education, and certainly there isn't a morsel of evidence to dispute this claim. Surely, if it was interested in control, it would have done something through the vocational education programs to indicate its desire.

Now, Larry, we need to view this problem of Federal aid to education without prejudice, weighing just evidence, not prejudices and subjective reasoning. We need to read something in addition to the Amarillo Daily News on the matter.

A person may have his opinions on many minor phases of the problem, even the major ones. He may have an opinion as to the ratio between local and State support, or as to whether he wants any State or Federal support. He may want to shoulder the entire burden locally or shoulder none of the burden locally. But he has no right to make this a political issue. He has no right to use the issue of Federal aid to hide his opposition to public education in general and adequate support of public education in particular. He has no right to inject false charges as socialism into the picture just because someone may believe in Federal-State-local participation in education and not just local or local-State.

And remember this: We would never have had free public schools in the first place had we permitted the type of people who are now the most vocal in damning Federal aid to have their way. We would still be in the dark ages of education had we waited for Wes Izzard or Ted Dealey to do anything about the situation.

We have too many people left who would not be outspoken in opposing the principle of public education, but they would keep its budget so low as to be almost ineffective. If public schools are inadequate, these people can always send their daughters to Hockaday or their sons to Wentworth or Kemper. They are able and willing to pay the entire cost of their own children's education provided, of course, they don't have to help educate the children of the masses.

These people aren't against effective education. They're against it for the masses.

These people still haven't learned that the better educated a country is, the better the lot of the rich as well as the lot of the poor. The wealthy manufacturer enjoys his status because the masses have the money to buy his products. And they have the money to buy his products because they are educated. And they wouldn't be educated if it weren't for free public schools.

Back to your question, we are for the best possible system of public education. Money is never wasted when spent on education. Dollars spent on education come back to us multiplied many times. If local school districts in every instance can do the job, fine. If they must have help from the State, fine. If the local district and the State working together can't or won't provide first quality public education, we don't consider it immoral to widen the base to a size that can serve the children of all Americans as they should be served.

And even if it were true that with aid comes control, we'd feel safer with Uncle Sam controlling education in Texas than to have J. Evetts Haley at the helm. We'd rather have men like Lyndon Johnson and Jack Kennedy selecting our textbooks than organizations like the Minutemen, the Birch Society, and the Texans for America.

EXCERPT FROM SPEECH DELIVERED BY SENATOR KUCHEL AT A DINNER IN HIS HONOR

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the partial text of the speech delivered by the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel] at a dinner in his honor held in Los Angeles on December 5, 1961.

There being no objection, the partial text of the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Partial Text of Speech Delivered by U.S. Senator Thomas H. Kuchel, December 5, 1961, at Dinner in His Honor, Beverly-Hilton Hotel, Los Angeles

The issues before America are the issues which confront all mankind. The manner of their resolution will affect this planet, not for generations, but for centuries. The crisis we face demands the best and the finest that is in each of us.

There are two ways of life in this world. Ours is based upon our own unique American charter of freedom, which has stood the test of time for more than 170 years. The Constitution of the United States continues to guarantee to all our citizens individual liberty and a republican form of government based on democratic values. Government is based on the consent of the governed who, by majority, choose their representatives on succeeding election days. The servants come and go, but the constitutionally guaranteed freedoms of religion, of speech, of the press—all of them—live on.

The other way of life is international communism—a ruthless, imperialistic system which defies the Supreme Being, and mocks the nobility of man. It is, indeed, a totalitarian system of slavery, which denies to its subjects all those freedoms which we hold dear. It discards the theory that people are fit to govern themselves. There is no separation of powers in Moscow.

Peaceful coexistence, the Khrushchev theme, becomes a sham. Communism continues to teach the inevitability of worldwide Communist uprising as its basic goal. And the grand strategy of the Soviet Union, as it affects the West, is to weaken and then to destroy our Western collective security systems, to isolate our own country from our friends and neighbors, and by such methods as may be best suited to its evil purpose, to push us back to our own shores.

So long as our country and our allies maintain a superiority of defensive strength, so long as we maintain the supremacy of our nuclear arsenal, so long as our multilateral collective security agreements with our free friends remain intact and inviolate, and—of crucial importance—so long as the American people remain united here at home, Soviet strategy will fail and the Soviet goal will be frustrated.

This struggle will prevail for a long, long time. It will require of us more exertions and not less. Lincoln's phrase comes to mind: "'A house divided against itself cannot stand.' I believe this Government cannot endure permanently half slave and half free."

Neither will this earth permanently endure half slave and half free. Our problems are thus both immediate and long-range. The American goal, fixed and unyielding, must ever be before us: the perpetuation of our constitutional system of freemen, and the cause of a just peace in the world, where human beings, in every land, may enjoy the right to govern themselves.

I have said we need to be united here at home. We need to apply the rule of reason in what we do, what we think, and what we say. We need balance. We require perspective.

There is in this country a handful of people who are Communists. They flaunt our law. Their party is now under Federal indictment, and the law of this land must and will be enforced against its members. The constitutionality of that law has been upheld. In this connection, I am proud to recall that I voted in the Senate with a majority to outlaw the Communist Party and to provide criminal penalties for violation. I regret the House of Representatives did not concur.

There are some others—not too many—who, through fear or worse, attack our Government and its policies for our security. I saw some of them when I was in a Veterans' Day parade in Alameda County. Along the line of march were some people holding up placards proclaiming: "Communism is better than extermination." Think of it.

They have frightfully soiled their American birthright in demonstrating either their fear and cowardice or their willingness to abandon their country.

I regret to observe that there are others amongst us who, though their patriotism may be unquestioned, their judgment certainly is. Some people have completely abandoned reason in what they say and write. Many honorable men who have devoted long years to the public service have been contemptuously smeared with the false and fantastic charge of being Communists. Perhaps as vicious a falsehood as was ever hurled against a great American patriot occurred when one warped person called Eisenhower a dedicated, conscious agent of the Communist conspiracy.

Our fellow Americans do not help, indeed, they grievously undermine, American Government when they utter absurd and lurid and unsubstantiated charges against it. To imply, for example, that Secretary of Defense McNamara treasonably complied with orders from Moscow does a truly terrible disservice to our faith in our country.

I believe it is wise policy that members of our Military Establishment do not participate in partisan politics. Military commanders have the supreme responsibility of readying their personnel, in all phases of preparation, to defeat the enemy should conflict arise.

Other recent public statements come to mind, equally ridiculous, and designed, intentionally or not, to undermine our faith in Government. I do not belong to the President's political party. I have vigorously fought many of his proposals in the Senate. But, under our Constitution, every President, during his incumbency, is our Chief Executive. I agree with General Eisenhower when he said last September:

"Americans have always been confident that, in time of international crisis, their leadership would hold to principle, would never yield to threat or take a backward step—a leadership always ready to defend the rights, uphold the ideals, and meet the responsibilities of this free Republic. In this confidence we Americans are determined that where the Commander in Chief stands, there we must and shall stand."

That does not mean, my fellow Californians, that Members of the Congress should blindly follow the recommendations of the President. It does not mean that the civilian population should be foreclosed from speaking out on issues as they see them. It does mean, I think, that we should use the brains God gave us, that we should reason, that our criticism against our Government should be constructive. We should not hurl ridiculous charges against any man, simply because we disagree with him. Facts, proof, reason, and logic ought to be the guide of all of us.

J. Edgar Hoover is one of our greatest Americans. He has performed, and continues to perform, an incalculable service to the Republic. Listen to his words:

"Unfortunately, there are those who make the very mistake the Communists are so careful to avoid. These individuals concentrate on the negative rather than on the positive. They are merely against communism without being for any positive measures to eliminate the social, political, and economic frictions which the Communists are so adroit at exploiting.

"Those persons would do well to recall a recent lesson from history. Both Hitler and Mussolini were against communism. However it was by what they stood for, not against, that history has judged them."

Americans are peace-loving people, but we have fought before. Americans love liberty, and they do not propose to lose theirs or trade their citizenship for something else. Americans despise Communist imperialism, or any other kind.

In this country, we, all of us, native born or naturalized, Jew or gentile, Protestant or Catholic, black or white, stand equal before the law, and together, united, we present to the world an invincibility of freedom, American style. Americans want our Government to stand firm and steadfast on its honorable commitments, made in less strenuous days, whether in Berlin, or in any other hemisphere. Americans want no repetition of the indecision which produced the tragic fiasco in Cuba. They want no participation, of any kind, with Soviet China and the murderous oligarchy of Mao Tse Tung.

Americans want their Government to maintain and strengthen its defensive agreements with free nations. They want our leaders to strive for an honorable peace through honorable negotiation but never at the surrender of principle. They want our military and defensive strength to continue to be the most powerful in the world. They yearn for some first step disarmament agreements, but only upon a completely dependable and foolproof inspection, and they clearly recognize this goal may, if at all, be far, far away.

Here at home we want to strengthen our system of free competitive enterprise, and to take steps to alleviate the social and economic problems of which J. Edgar Hoover spoke. Americans recognize that while all progress is change, not all change is progress.

THE ORBITAL FLIGHT OF LT. COL. JOHN H. GLENN, JR., USMC

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, all Americans are thrilled today by the successful flight being undertaken at the moment by Lt. Col. John Glenn, Jr., U.S. Marine Corps. I am thankful, as I know all of my fellow citizens are, that the flight has been successful up to this time. I extend to Colonel Glenn my best wishes, and express the hope and the prayer that at the conclusion of his successful orbiting of the earth he will have a happy and successful landing.

Mr. **HUMPHREY**. Mr. President, I know that every one of my distinguished colleagues join me in congratulating Lt. Col. John Glenn and all the sung and unsung heroes who this morning achieved America's first orbital flight. After weeks of frustration, of weather-caused delays over which they had no control, of checking and rechecking to insure maximum safety for human life, these men have done their job: for the first time a red-blooded American has gone into global orbit.

As I am speaking, this historic flight is still in progress. So far it has gone magnificently, and it shows every promise of meeting its announced goals. In fact, although the launching took place after the theoretical time limit for three complete orbits, I understand there is still a possibility of attempting the third orbit. Whatever the final decision may be, this Nation owes a great debt to our space officials and to Colonel Glenn himself, who by his selfless courage and dogged persistence has provided a splendid example to generations of future astronauts. Let me say at this point that Colonel Glenn's conduct has lived up to the best traditions of his predecessors in space travel, Comdr. Alan Shepard and Capt. Virgil Grissom.

Mr. President, the numerous delays in our long journey into space have not all been caused by technical deficiencies, as our Soviet rivals would like the world to think. On the contrary, on many occasions we could have ignored the safety of our astronauts. We could have flung them broadside into space and perhaps even profited scientifically by their disasters.

I hardly need point out that our astronauts are not guinea pigs but human beings. Our self-limitations in space stem from our overriding concern for human life. We refuse, by trying for a third, fourth, or umpteenth orbit, to run the slightest risk of failing to pick up Colonel Glenn because of darkness in the recovery zone.

Mr. President, I have not the least desire to minimize the pioneering space feats of the brave Soviet cosmonauts, Majors Gagarin and Titov. But what do we know about their flights beyond the mere fact that they took place and that apparently Major Titov suffered a form of motion sickness while girdling the globe some 17 times? What measures were taken for their personal safety? How many aborted countdowns, how many rocket failures did they undergo? This the world has not yet learned, but I submit it is inconceivable that Soviet space efforts have gone off without a hitch.

By contrast, everything that we do is for all the world to see—from Mrs. Glenn's hairdo to the slightest wobble in Major Glenn's Atlas rocket. Thank goodness, Captain Grissom was saved when a mishap occurred at the end of his epochmaking flight last year. But if he had been lost, God forbid, we could not have hidden it from the general public for more than 5 minutes.

I congratulate our space officials for their public relations courage. I deplore the fact that their Soviet counterparts feel they must hide from the glare of publicity. Doubtless they imagine our own candor is a devious means of prying open the closed Soviet space program for purposes of espionage. Let us put their minds at rest. Our success today is not a public relations gimmick, but a giant step toward putting one of our own citizens on the moon and toward eventual interplanetary space travel.

Mr. **WILEY**. Mr. President, the Nation with pride and prayer stands by watching and waiting, excited and deeply gratified by the successful orbiting of the astronaut, Lt. Col. John Glenn.

The space flight of *Friendship-7* represents an opening of new horizons—indeed, a new world—to freemen.

Entrusted with this new miracle-type capability, we and humanity must now build further upon this initial foundation of space conquest, to dedicate and utilize space potentialities for serving, not destroying, mankind.

Justly proud of the successful launching of *Friendship-7*, the people of the United States—indeed of the world—witnessing this great, historically significant event, say, "Thank God. Our prayers go with him all the way."

THE PROPOSED BOND ISSUE OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. **SALTONSTALL**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the body of the RECORD the column of Walter Lippmann of February 20 on the subject of the $100 million loan to support the United Nations. It gives a very clear, simple picture of the purpose of the loan. It is mighty important for us all to understand the significance of the position in which the United Nations finds itself today with relation to its two special operations.

It is my personal feeling that we must make it clear to the other members of the United Nations that they must do their share in supporting the United Nations if it is to be of continuing value in keeping peace in the world.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 20, 1962]

PAYING FOR THE U.N.

(By Walter Lippmann)

While Congress is considering the President's request for authority to buy half of the proposed $200 million issue of United Nations bonds, we must ask ourselves what precisely is the crucial question. It is not whether the United Nations is to survive. That is a misleading overdramatization. The critical question is whether the United Nations can and should continue to enforce peace, as it has been doing since 1956 on the Israel-Egyptian frontier, since 1960 in the Congo.

The deficit, which the proposed bond issue is to cover, has nothing to do with the regular operations of the United Nations. The deficit arises wholly from these two highly controversial peacekeeping operations.

On the regular assessments for the regular budget the record is very nearly perfect. For the 4 years 1956 to 1959, inclusive, the collections were virtually 100 percent. For the 1960 assessments—those for the year when the great number of new States were admitted—the collections by the end of 1961 were already 94.6 percent. Countries in arrears do not lose their General Assembly vote until the amount owed is equal to the contributions due for the preceding 2 years. On the 1961 assessments, nearly 86 percent has already been collected. Of what has not been collected, China owes over half and the rest is owed chiefly by smaller Latin American countries.

All of this goes to prove that the normal and conventional activities of the U.N. are financially sound and that they have the support of the whole membership—West, East, and neutral.

The deficit is caused by the two special operations. One, known as UNEF, consists of about 5,000 troops under U.N. command, the troops being drawn from seven countries, none of them a "great power." These troops keep the peace along about 140 miles of the Israeli-United Arab Republic border. This operation costs about $20 million a year.

The other special operation deals with the Congo and is known as ONUC. Its average cost since July 1960 has been about $10 million a month. As of January of this year, 21 countries had contributed to the operation with a total of about 16,000 soldiers. None of the soldiers came from any of the great powers, so that the U.S.S.R., the United States of America, the United Kingdom, and France have no fighting men in the Congo.

The deficit is not due to the fact that these two operations are very expensive. They have been financed by special assessments, and various countries have refused to pay because they disagree with the purpose or the conduct of the special operations. Because the peace-keeping costs are not part of the regular budget, the nonpaying nations can escape the penalty of losing their U.N. vote.

The Soviet bloc and most of the Arab States have refused to pay either for the Middle East or for the Congo. France, Belgium, Italy, Portugal, Spain and South Africa have refused to pay for the Congo. There are a few others who have not paid, probably because their governments are bankrupt. The bulk of the deficit is due to the fact that, for their own reasons, a great many countries dislike the special operations and would like to put an end to them.

We have always supported the special operations in the Middle East and the Congo and we have been paying about 40-50 percent of the cost. This sort of thing cannot and should not go on, not because we cannot afford these trifling sums but because the United Nations should not become dependent on any one great power. The true significance of the bond issue is that it opens a way out of this quandary. The central fact of the bond issue is that interest and amortization are to be covered by the regular budget if, as is expected, the International Court of Justice approves the plan. Our share of the peace-keeping costs therefore would decrease to our regular share of the U.N. budget—32 percent. And the penalty for refusing to pay the interest and amortization will be the loss of the right to vote in the General Assembly.

Without insisting that every detail of the plan as presented to Congress is perfect, it is clear that the plan, which we conceived and invented, is good for the U.N. and good for the United States of America. It saves the U.N. from having to abandon the special operations which are playing such a mighty part in keeping the peace in the Middle East and in the heart of Africa. It brings to an end excessive dependence of the U.N. on the United States, and it brings to an end the unacceptable doctrine that a member can keep its privileges and still refuse to pay its share of operations duly authorized by the constituted authorities of the United Nations.

"WHAT FREEDOM MEANS TO ME"—PRIZE-WINNING ESSAY BY JUDY GUIDA

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, recently the Veterans of Foreign Wars, in cooperation with the National Association of Broadcasters and the State Association of Broadcasters, sponsored the 15th annual voice of democracy contest. Several hundred high-school students in our Nation participated in this contest, and the winner of the Kansas contest was Miss Judy Guida, of Independence, Kans.

Miss Guida wrote a very excellent statement on "What Freedom Means to Me."

I ask unanimous consent that Miss Guida's statement be made a part of these remarks.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT FREEDOM MEANS TO ME

(By Judy Guida)

Freedom is responsibility. It is only we, the people of America, who can keep our Nation free. This is a huge responsibility. It means that we must not take even our smallest liberties for granted, that we must not forget that men fought, died, and suffered great hardships to give us the right to make our own choices and decisions, to lead free lives.

Besides preserving freedom in our Nation, we have a responsibility to keep the meaning of freedom alive for people of other nations. As long as the Russian people are not allowed to read a book that won the Nobel Prize for literature simply because parts of it are critical of communism, as long as Russia may order students to major in science, simply because they need more scientists; as long as dictatorial policies like these exist, we in America are not free. We are not free from the responsibilities of freedom. We have a responsibility to bring messages of freedom and hope to the people who live without them. We have a responsibility to see that they learn how wonderful freedom is. We must make sure that dictatorial policies don't reach our Nation.

An Italian immigrant once said, "Ah, these Americans; they don't appreciate freedom, because they don't know what it ain't." I know that many of us don't really appreciate the freedoms we enjoy. For example, one of our main freedoms, the freedom of worship, is not always used. If one were to take a poll of how many church members didn't attend church last Sunday, I wonder how many of them would be teenagers or adults who stayed out late the night before and simply were too tired to attend church. This happens often. I know. I am a teenager. I have done this. When we do this we are being very irresponsible. How can we expect to convince others that freedom is wonderful, if we don't take advantage of it because we are too tired.

Freedom should mean so much to us in America. It is the right to speak, to worship, to write as we please. It means choosing our own careers, our own schools, even our own homes. It means a chance to become individuals, not merely puppets controlled by other's hands. It means we can choose a way of life that we want to lead and lead it.

Someone once said, "If we lose our freedom we have nothing else to lose." This is saying, in other words, that freedom is the basis of our existence. Without it we would survive, nothing more.

Because freedom means so much and because we are responsible for preserving it, we must always keep alert and not be irresponsible in its cause.

I am an American. I am free. It is wonderful to be free. I can speak, worship, and write as I please. I can choose my own career and the way of life I want to follow. I am an American, and I am free; but I have a responsibility. A responsibility to preserve freedom in my Nation.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, last week we celebrated the 44th anniversary of Lithuanian independence. On this anniversary I am proud to call attention to the history and culture of this gallant nation, which for so many long periods has suffered under the yoke of Russian domination.

For two decades following 1918, Lithuania enjoyed the blessings of liberty and self-determination. The First World War had been fought in support of the principles of independence, democracy, and freedom. The Lithuanians were a beneficiary of that victory. But unfortunately their period of freedom was not to endure.

Since 1795 Lithuania had been working toward this national goal. In that fateful year, the independent Lithuanian Nation was taken over by czarist imperialism. Through more than a century of Russian oppression, Lithuanians kept the light of self-identity, nationality, and their individual spirit alive. It was a cause for international rejoicing among all lovers of freedom when the Lithuanian Republic was established in 1918, and admitted to the League of Nations in 1921.

But dark days lay ahead. With the coming of World War II, first Germany, then the Soviet Union invaded and took over this gallant nation. At the end of the war an Iron Curtain slammed across Europe—and Lithuanian was behind it.

Lithuanians everywhere continue to keep alight the flame of freedom. In their hopes and prayers for this noble cause they are joined today by all Americans. It is a privilege and honor for me to salute them on this 44th anniversary of their independence.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, it is a most solemn occasion to observe the 44th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania. While the independence itself has been snuffed out by the Communists, the memory burns as brightly as ever.

Independence came to Lithuania in 1918. For the next 22 years the Lithuanians made great strides in self-government and economic affairs although they had to overcome many years of previous tyranny and the hardship of the postwar period. But in World War II the Soviets overran Lithuania and initiated purges, deportations, and forced labor that had seldom been equaled in history.

Miss Mary M. Kizis, director of the Lithuanian-American Information Center, wrote to me recently:

> If anything, conditions have worsened in Lithuania since last year, but the will of the people for freedom has not been crushed. They still look to us. The youth is being exploited by being sent to do "volunteer" labor in the Soviet Empire; the religious are persecuted; Russification goes on.

We mark this occasion each year because our faith in the people of Lithuania is one of the few lifelines that they still can cling to. The things we say here in the Senate are carried back to them despite every effort of the Russians to prevent the dissemination of such news. Our words keep the light burning in their hearts because it assures them that we expect someday to welcome them back to the community of free and sovereign nations.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, Friday, February 16, marked the 44th anniversary of Lithuanian independence. It should have been a day for celebration, but given the Soviet occupation of the brave Lithuanian nation, it was a day of sorrow.

The history of the Lithuanian nation runs deep into the past of the Western World. Lithuania was a part of Europe for at least five centuries before Columbus left on his pioneering journey to the Americas. Its history is one of grandeur, beauty, and tragedy. Grandeur and beauty rose from the accomplishments and will of its people. Tragedy stems from its geographic location. On one side is aggressive Russia and on the other side there have been the thrusts of aggressive Germany. Overbearing and unfortunately overpowering neighbors have been the tragedy of Lithuania.

Lithuania's independence in modern times has been only too short. After World War I, Lithuania flourished in freedom, but since 1940, the Lithuanian people have been without freedom, suffering alternately at the hands of the Russians and the Nazis.

Mr. President, all those who are familiar with the glorious history of Lithuania are filled with hope today that the time will come when Lithuanian Independence Day will not be a day for mixed emotions, but rather a day for uninhibited celebrations in freedom.

THE FORESTRY RESEARCH PROGRAM OF THE U.S. FOREST SERVICE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I wish to join the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] in encouraging and supporting the forestry research program of the U.S. Forest Service. As my colleague so well demonstrated, forestry research has been one of the most productive programs of the Federal Government. Yet, for many years, this exceptionally worthwhile program has been relatively starved for funds. A start has been made in the last few years to rectify this past neglect, but far greater efforts are needed if the full potential development of our forest and wood resources is to be realized.

I wish to draw special attention to the importance of our wood resources to our Nation's economy.

The industrial complex of forest products industry—lumber, plywood, millwork, laminating, factory built homes, and pulp and paper—ranks fourth among American industries in its contribution to the gross national product and fifth in total employment. In 1960, this was nearly $10 billion. Only metals and metal products, machinery, and food industries rank higher—the last mentioned by only $36 million. The forest products industries provide jobs for 1,136,000 men and women. Only machinery, food, transportation equipment, and apparel industries have larger employment. For this industry to remain in this high position, research in forest products must be rapidly expanded. The industry by its very nature is not in a position to do the basic research without help from the Federal Government.

I am glad to see that the Senator from Mississippi has drawn attention to the need to expand the physical plant at the Forest Products Laboratory in Madison, Wis. This eminently justified project of adding new facilities and modernizing the present 30-year-old plant is long overdue. It was part of the President's budget last year, and I strongly hope that funds to begin construction will be voted by Congress this year. The total cost of the project will be $10 million. The figure asked for by Senator STENNIS, $4 million, is adequate to construct the first stage—provided that the remainder be made available in the next 2 or 3 years.

Every area of research at the Forest Products Laboratory urgently needs additional specialized facilities to permit essential research to be done. For example, fundamental research on the performance of wood in fire is underway on a pilot basis. But expanded facilities where large laminated beams may be loaded and their strength evaluated to obtain engineering data are needed to determine the key strength and safety factors. We know that large wooden beams are resistant to fire because of the formation of a built-in insulator, charcoal. They do not melt and collapse. But we do not have the necessary engineering information for architects. Expanded facilities are necessary to extend the small scale fundamental research now in progress.

The pulp and paper research space at the Laboratory is badly crowded. Yet, more requests by industry point up the need for a new paper machine which can be used as a pilot plant for the study of paper formation at speeds above those now used in industrial plants—2400 feet per minute. This area of research can also lead to greater utilization of our low grade hardwoods, little used species, and plant and forest residues. Forest Products Laboratory research has formed the basis for the use of the hardwoods to produce pulp and paper products. The consumption of hardwood pulps in 1930 was 12 times that of 1920.

The housing industry is on the verge of major developments, especially in the area of low cost housing. The factory-built home industry has been developed largely upon principles developed by the Forest Products Laboratory. In 1960, nearly 200,000 homes were built by this relatively new industry with a value of about $800 million. The Forest Products Laboratory now needs a new structural laboratory to study the new uses of components and roof trusses in order to assist in simplifying house construction.

The chemical industry has moved to high pressure processing. Wood substance is an ideal raw material for chemicals, since the residues are lower in cost per pound than even petroleum, and yet are a truly renewable resource. The utilization of the residues necessarily developed by the forest products industries in their normal processing would maintain solid wood products such as lumber and plywood in an excellent competitive position. The development of a chemical industry could also provide an economic use for our low grade timber and species now having no market outlet. The Forest Products Laboratory should have facilities for high pressure research.

These are but a few examples of the expansion needs of the Forest Products Laboratory. Again, I am most pleased that the Senator from Mississippi has proposed that we proceed with the expansion of the facilities of this central laboratory serving all the 50 States.

It is plain that the more complex type of forest products research can be most effectively carried out in one central location. There are many reasons. A more efficient operation without duplication of the expensive equipment can be operated at lower cost. Personnel and equipment from all the necessary scientific disciplines are available to work on many different kinds of problems. The industry which will use this information can get it all at one place. Last but yet very important, competent scientific personnel are attracted to such an atmosphere on a major university campus.

I am aware of the need for regional research to complement the work of the Forest Products Laboratory. However, this regional research will proceed more rapidly and effectively if the research of the central laboratory is made more productive. These regional groups must build on the accomplishments of centralized research.

I was also very pleased to hear the Senator from Mississippi state that additional program funds of $1,200,000 should be made available for the next fiscal year to advance the research in forest products and forest engineering. While I realize not all these funds would go to the national laboratory at Madison, it is important to expand this area of research.

The Forest Products Laboratory has a long and splendid history of cooperation with the University of Wisconsin. Our State government as well as the university officials look forward to the continued activity and expansion of this important facility. I strongly hope that funds for this purpose will be provided without delay.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Governor of Wisconsin, the Honorable Gaylord Nelson, addressed to the Secretary of Agriculture, be printed in the RECORD. Governor Nelson expresses the full support of our State for this worthwhile project.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STATE OF WISCONSIN,
Madison, January 29, 1962.

The Honorable ORVILLE FREEMAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SECRETARY FREEMAN: I want to request your support for restoration of the $10 million expansion and remodeling project at the U.S. Forest Products Laboratory in Madison in the budget for fiscal 1963.

Wisconsin has long recognized the importance of this Laboratory. The significance to Wisconsin is obvious: In our State the estimated annual gross product value of the forest products industry is $1.3 billion, nearly 2½ times that of the dairy industry which gives Wisconsin the title of Dairy State.

Recognizing this significance, the University of Wisconsin 52 years ago generously made possible establishment of the first Forest Products Laboratory on the campus when sufficient Federal funds were not available. The support of the Department of Agriculture and Forest Service have enabled the Laboratory to develop into a center for forest products research unequaled anywhere else in the world.

When once again Federal funds were not available, the legislature passed and I signed last May a bill enabling the university to make 12 acres of campus land available for expansion of the Laboratory. Though the land had other possible university uses, the fact was recognized that the Laboratory's needs were more acute.

The Laboratory here has an international reputation. It is the central research establishment serving the forest products industry, the fifth largest industry in the United States. The need for forest products research has never been greater. The U.S. Forest Service, the other owners of the 600 million acres of forest land in this country, the industry itself, and the many people and activities that depend on it have a tremendous interest in having this research carried on. There is only one location where it can be conducted efficiently and economically, and that is the Forest Products Laboratory in Madison, where it has been carried on since 1910.

Yet the Madison laboratory must operate in a building 30 years old which has had only one major improvement—a new powerplant—since it was built. Its appropriation is only $3.25 million a year, despite the fact it has returned to government an estimated $70 for every dollar appropriated to it since its inception. The severe limitations on the facilities and budget of the laboratory mean that many of the needs of the industry for basic technical information cannot be met.

Last year Congress eliminated $300,000 from the budget for land acquisition and planning for the $10 million expansion program of the Madison laboratory. At the same time it approved 16 forest research construction projects in 15 other States. I appreciate the desires of other States to have forest research facilities; Wisconsin is not the only State interested in this field. But it cannot serve the broadest interests of the industry, here or in other States, to duplicate facilities and activities carried on successfully here for more than half a century.

The concentration of research effort and facilities is what is required to meet the industry's needs. The primary reason for the Madison laboratory's past success has been the concentration of specialized technical discipline which made possible an interchange of information seldom found in a single public establishment. Here, for $8 million in new construction and $2 million for remodeling and equipment, the further facilities needed can be established. To attempt to meet these needs elsewhere will require construction of duplicate facilities at many times the $10 million cost.

I earnestly solicit your support for this project, which is so necessary to the economy of Wisconsin and so many other States. I would also appreciate your advice on how I may be most helpful in furthering this effort.

Sincerely yours,
GAYLORD A. NELSON,
Governor.

PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S NEW DAIRY PROPOSALS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have just returned from a 10-day, 79-speech tour of Wisconsin, in which I discussed President Kennedy's new dairy proposal. In connection with it I encountered very serious and significant questions pertaining to it.

I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD at this point, together with a copy of the locations at which I spoke and the times when I spoke.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I have just returned from a 10-day 79-speech tour of Wisconsin and I report that President Kennedy's new dairy proposal is in serious trouble. I addressed over 10,000 dairy farmers and answered over a thousand questions on the most revolutionary dairy proposal in many years.

I found much more concern about the prospect of production controls in milk than the imminent 10-percent price cut which faces dairy farmers on April 1.

Recognition of the grim implications of last year's 3-billion pound drop in milk consumption—by far the biggest in the Nation's history—has persuaded some farmers that reduced production through controls is the only practical alternative to ruinously low-dairy prices. That realization is spreading and growing; but there is also a powerful resistance to controls and a series of specific objections to the dairy bill the President has proposed.

Among the most common objections are these:

1. The proposal does nothing about decreasing consumption which is the principal cause of dairy difficulty. Some farmers argued that higher prices to farmers without meeting the problem of weakening consumer demand may discourage consumption even further.

2. The proposal would authorize the Secretary to exempt so-called deficit areas where there is an inadequate supply of milk from controls. This is vehemently opposed in Wisconsin on two grounds: (1) If any significant part of national production is exempted it means a sharper cut in production and therefore in gross income in Wisconsin and elsewhere in the country; (2) for years Wisconsin has been trying to ship its milk into these deficit areas, but has met a tariff blockade of so-called sanitary restrictions. If production is to be controlled, then all production should be controlled without discrimination. Wisconsin is ready and anxious to meet the demands of any deficit area.

3. The Secretary is given power under the bill to provide minimum allotments. This could permit the exemption of diversified farmers for whom dairying is a sideline. Such farmers in aggregate may contribute billions of pounds to the surplus. If they are eliminated, the Wisconsin farmer who is in most cases exclusively a dairy farmer—and would rarely qualify for any minimum allotment exemption would suffer a larger proportionate cut.

4. What happens to the young farmer under an allotment program? The young farm couple who have 15 to 20 milkers and who are working and saving night and day to build up a herd that can give them a fair living—say, 35 milkers—would be seriously handicapped. Such a farmer could buy allotments, but he is already seriously short of capital and credit. This proposal would mean another burden for him. There are all kinds of variations of this objection from farmers who are hoping and planning and working to build up their operations. This is an especially hard and tough objection because farm expansion has been the principal way the farmer has met the tough squeeze of rising costs and low farm prices.

5. The well-to-do investor—the doctor or lawyer who buys a farm, puts in the latest equipment and often operates on a very big basis—would have yet another advantage over the legitimate family farmer because this "hobby farmer" would have ample money for buying allotments. This is viewed as a particular threat if there is a free market in quotas. Working dairy farmers have a deep antipathy toward these farm investors—a desire to have the Government and the internal revenue provisions that permit such businessman-farmers from writing off farm losses against other income.

6. There is a widely expressed conviction that if American farmers are to be controlled in their dairy production then there should be an absolute ban on the import of dairy products. Otherwise controls are viewed as a way of removing the market from domestic producers to open it up to foreign farmers.

7. Only once, out of a thousand questions asked, was the key objection raised—that will grow rapidly if the proposed law is passed. It is—"We won't be given any choice in the referendum—either way dairy farmers are hurt badly." This is because the administration proposes cutting Government acquisitions to $300 million per year, a big 40-percent cut from this year, and letting the dairy farmer choose between a "free" price that might mean a cut 25 to 30 percent or more below the present price he receives—a literally ruinous drop for millions of producers; or the alternative of controls which are anathema to some on principle, and very burdensome to others because they would stop their growth toward economical operation.

I found unanimous approval of President Kennedy's recommendation that Congress pass a joint resolution maintaining price supports for dairy products at present levels through December 31 of this year to give Congress a chance to work out a new law and farmers an opportunity to consider it and act on it, without cutting the price dairy farmers receive by the threatened 10 percent.

Time and Places of 79 Proxmire Speeches on Kennedy Dairy Farm Proposals

On Thursday, February 8, he spoke at Sparta, Tomah, and Wilton Townships in Monroe County; Whitestown, Stark, and Kickapoo Townships in Vernon County and in Boscobel, Fennimore, and South Lancaster Townships in Grant County.

On Friday, February 9, he spoke at Belmont and Darlington Townships in Lafayette County; Mineral Point, Ridgeway, and Brigham Townships in Iowa County; Blue Mounds and Perry Townships in Dane County; and in New Glarus and Monroe Townships in Monroe County.

Saturday, February 10, he appeared at Spring Valley and Union Townships in Rock County; Oregon, Dunkirk, Dunn, Cottage Grove, Christiana, and Windsor Townships in Dane County.

Sunday, February 11, he spoke at Farmington Township in Jefferson County.

On Monday, February 12, he appeared at Lowell, Oak Grove, Williamstown, and Lomira Townships in Dodge County; Oakfield, Lamartine, Rosendale, and Friendship Townships in Fond du Lac County; and in Algoma Township in Winnebago County.

Tuesday, February 13, he spoke at Omro, Winneconne, and Winchester in Winnebago County; and at Premont, Weyauwega, Waupaca, St. Lawrence, Little Wolf, and Larrabee Townships in Waupaca.

On Wednesday, February 14, he spoke at Wescott, Herman, Almon, and Birnawood Townships in Shawano County; and at Norrie, Plover, Wausau, Marathon, and Wien Townships in Marathon County.

Thursday, February 15, he appeared at Spencer Township in Marathon County; Loyal, Eaton, Longwood, and Thorp Townships in Clark County; and at Goetz and Estella Townships in Chippewa County.

On Friday, February 16, he spoke in Dunn, Eau Galle, Stanton, Tiffany, Hay River, and Wilson Townships in Dunn County; in Spring Lake Township in Pierce County; in Springfield Township in St. Croix County; and in Dallas Township in Barron County.

Saturday, February 17, the final day of the tour, he appeared in Oakgrove, Cumberland, and Almena Townships in Barron County; Clayton, Clear Lake, Lincoln, Balsam Lake, and St. Croix Falls Townships in Polk County; and in Somerset Township in St. Croix County.

THE U.N. BOND ISSUE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, 2 weeks ago I announced that I would seek to amend the United Nations bond issue proposal to provide that the United States purchase $20 million of United Nations bonds and then would match, dollar for dollar, bonds purchased by other nations up to $100 million.

I am gratified to note that two newspapers of such diverse editorial opinion as the New York Mirror and the New York Post see value and virtue in the amendment I have proposed. I ask unanimous consent that two editorials published in these papers, one in the New York Mirror of February 12, and the other in the New York Post of February 15, be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Mirror, Feb. 12, 1962]

How Many Bonds?

The poverty-stricken United Nations needs a quick $200 million. And where does one get quick millions these days? Why, from the good old United States, of course.

President Kennedy has asked Congress for permission to buy up half the issue, or $100 million worth. His idea did not bring cheers from many American throats, but it is under study by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

There is a growing, bipartisan feeling in Congress that, though the U.N. should be saved, Uncle Sam should not be the principal savior.

In this situation, New York Senator Jack Javits suggests a compromise. Let the United States set out by purchasing only $20 million of the proposed bonds, then offer to match the purchases of other nations. That certainly is a more sensible approach than grabbing the full $100 million, thereby relieving deadbeat nations of their responsibilities.

[From the New York Post, Feb. 15, 1962]

Mutuality and the U.N. Bond Issue

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee is nearing a decision on the President's request for authority to purchase one-half of the U.N.'s $200 million bond issue.

One suggested modification of the administration's proposal merits careful consideration. This would place U.S. participation in the 25-year-bond issue on a matching basis. An interesting variant of the matching formula is the suggestion of Senator Javits of an initial U.S. purchase of $20 million worth, and the remainder up to $100 million on a matching basis.

The matching formula will help create a spirit of mutuality which is now lacking at the U.N. in regard to fiscal matters. There is an unhealthy tendency among many Latin American, Arab, and African governments to hold back on the assumption that in the end the United States will pick up the tab. The matching formula might strengthen U Thant's hand in persuading member nations to buy their share of the bond issue.

In suggesting careful consideration of the matching proposal, we are not subscribing to right-wing caricatures of the U.N. as an assembly of "freeloaders." U.S. Ambassador Philip Klutznick has rightly noted that the failure of many nations to pay their special assessments for the Middle East and Congo operations has obscured an otherwise excellent record of payments in connection with the U.N.'s regular budget. After 16 years, in collections totaling some $1 billion toward the regular budget, only $11 million is outstanding.

The advantage of the matching formula is that it may impress upon all member states the need to demonstrate the same sense of responsibility toward the bond issue as they do toward the regular budget.

THE WORK OF THE FEDERATION OF JEWISH PHILANTHROPIES OF NEW YORK

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in the consideration and study that is being given the welfare needs of our country, the continued vitality and steady progress of voluntary philanthropy in serving those who need help is vital. Possibly the greatest effort in the history of voluntary philanthropy is currently being made by the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York, under its president, Lawrence Wien. The federation has undertaken a building fund campaign to raise $104,365,000 under the title "Let Us Build Us a City of Life," to meet growing demands for services, to modernize obsolete facilities and to house new developments in medical and social services.

Federation was founded in 1917 and today incorporates 116 agencies covering all aspects of health and welfare services. Last year these agencies helped more than three-quarters of a million New Yorkers on every economic and social level and every race and religion. This current great campaign is to be carried on under the campaign chairman, Salim L. Lewis, with the following associate chairmen: Mrs. Leonard H. Bernheim, Irving M. Felt, Gustave L. Levy, and Lawrence Marx, Jr.

A special supplement describing the work of the federation and its master plan for a city of life was published by the New York Times, October 22, 1961. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record excerpts from that supplement entitled "New Roads to Reality for the Mentally Ill"; "New Dimensions of Medical Care"; "New Hope for the Handicapped"; "A Future for the Aging"; "Haven and Help for the Troubled"; "Deepened Roots for the Community"; and "The Master Plan for Building a City of Life."

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

New Roads to Reality for the Mentally Ill

We have come a long way from the days when the mentally ill were considered "lunatics" to be put away in "insane asylums," or worse, "crazy houses." We recognize that mental illness is a disease, and that it takes a variety of forms, in many cases curable, in most instances treatable, and very often preventable. But we still have a long way to go.

Mental illness statistics today are higher than ever before—whether because the disease is more prevalent, because of better diagnosis, or because we have become enlightened enough so that ill people are treated rather than hidden away as never-to-be-mentioned skeletons in the family closet. The facts are, 1 out of every 7 people today is being treated for some form of mental disorder, and 1 out of every 10 hospitalized patients occupies a bed in a voluntary, Government or private institution because of mental illness.

We are constantly learning more of the reasons why some people are unable to cope with the conflicts, the tensions, the decisions, the realities of life. We find new methods for treating the mentally ill. In many cases psychotherapy is effective. Drug therapy, while not a panacea, helps many. We have just begun to explore biochemistry as it touches on mental illness, a line of research that holds great promise for many. We also recognize many mental disorders in their earlier stages, when they are more treatable. And we prevent mental illness by helping people solve their problems before they become serious. These are only some of the areas in which hospitals and other agencies of the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies are helping the mentally ill.

Institutionalization is not the only nor always the desirable answer for the mentally ill. But for people who can benefit from treatment in a hospital setting, Hillside Hospital's casual environment is a far cry from the traditional mental institution. Hillside, a model of the modern, open psychiatric hospital, is geared to prepare mentally ill adults and adolescent girls to return to the community through intensive psychotherapy and such therapeutic activities as music, art, dance, and vocational training. These activities, which constitute a vital part of Hillside's program, will be extended and centralized in a patients' activities therapy building to be provided through the building fund. Hillside Hospital, whose outstanding research program is conducted under difficult conditions, will consolidate these efforts in a projected new research institute. To attract the high level of professional personnel and residents required by Hillside, new staff quarters will be built. Finally, a new 66-bed patients' building and modernization of existing patient facilities are proposed to provide treatment consistent with the most up-to-date thinking.

Mount Sinai Hospital has been a pioneer in bringing psychiatric services to the community, for it has long recognized that the mind is indeed a part of the body. It integrates psychiatric care with all phases of patient care, and also offers the community the services of an adult outpatient psychiatric clinic, and child guidance and adolescent clinics. In addition, it conducts an aftercare clinic for discharged Hillside patients. All these facilities will be brought together under one roof in a new psychiatric institute which the building fund will make possible.

Most of federation's hospitals, including Hillside, offer outpatient clinic care to treat mental illness before hospitalization becomes necessary. Montefiore maintains an additional, and extraordinary service: A 24-hour psychiatric clinic, for people who need help when they need it—whether it is at 2 o'clock in the afternoon or at 2 o'clock in the morning.

Federation's family service agencies provide individual and group psychiatric therapy for the less severely disturbed and help for the families of patients—since mental illness, more than any other disease, affects deeply those close to the ill person. Jewish Community Services of Long Island has developed a unique service of finding foster homes for discharged Hillside patients who can benefit from living with a family. Many federation community centers have already established preventive mental health programs under the guidance of group and caseworkers and in cooperation with hospitals. Similar programs will be offered in new centers as they come into existence through the building fund.

Mental illness is a special problem for the aged. Many are prone to disturbing fears when they find they can no longer care for themselves and must depend on strangers. A pioneer project at the Home for Aged and Infirm Hebrews yielded the all-important information that short-term, relatively inexpensive psychotherapy helps allay these fears and so helps to avert mental illness. Other federation agencies are now extending this type of psychotherapy to the aged.

We are, none of us, immune to mental illness. It is an individual problem. It is also a community problem. It is a disruptive illness—one which extends beyond the patient to the family, and beyond the family into the community. Federation is strengthening its services for the mentally ill on a planned community-wide basis, in the conviction that we must fight mental illness with every community resource.

New Dimensions of Medical Care

Prescriptions for many of the "wonder drugs" that are filled routinely every day could not even have been written 10 years ago. Diseases such as pneumonia and influenza and diabetes which once were killers are now either curable or preventable or both. Infantile paralysis seems to be headed in the direction of smallpox and other diseases that are now completely under control. More medical knowledge has been acquired in the last 20 years than in all history. In no other field have the changes been more drastic, the advances more dramatic, the promise for the future more breathtaking than in medicine.

However, one thing is quite clear: our health problems are not yet solved. We do not know how to prevent cancer, heart disease, arthritis, or a host of other human ills. While medical advances have prolonged life, as we live longer we become more prone to the stubborn, degenerative chronic diseases—to the extent that these now constitute a leading health problem. We will learn what we do not know only through medical research. But as we seek the causes and cures, we can do a great deal in treatment and prevention.

However, the fact is, our city of New York, as advanced as it is, does not have enough facilities to give people all the help they need. We simply do not have enough hospital beds for long- and short-term care, enough clinic facilities for people who need hospital care but do not need hospitalization, enough space to house the gigantic miracle machines that arrest and treat many diseases, enough laboratories or trained personnel. There is, however, a remedy—it lies in a combination of imagination, courage, planning, leadership and money.

The Federation of Jewish Philanthropies is completely aware of the magnitude and seriousness of our medical problems. Federation institutions provide health services for a large percentage of New Yorkers. Almost one-fourth of all voluntary hospital patients in New York City are cared for annually at federation's nine general hospitals. Its three specialized hospitals treat the chronically ill, the mentally ill and the orthopedically handicapped.

But numbers of hospitals and people served only begin to tell the story. Through federation coordination and planning, its hospitals are major community health resources. They share with each other knowledge, facilities, expensive equipment and specialized personnel for the best patient care, research and training. And they work with community centers, child care, family and mental health agencies to bring new and dramatic programs for better health.

Through the building fund, federation will develop further services and provide the facilities to meet our medical needs in terms of today and the future.

On the grounds of Montefiore Hospital, a new 80-bed, intensified-nursing facility, the Solomon and Betty Loeb Home, formerly in Westchester, will be built as part of the hospital's medical complex. Both institutions have already mapped out plans for a close, mutually beneficial relationship.

Three new research institutes—at Hillside, Maimonides and Montefiore Hospitals—will be created as part of a growing arsenal in the fight against disease.

The Beth Abraham Home for the Chronically Ill, whose patients are assured all the resources of the neighboring Montefiore, will extend its long-term care facilities. A new private and semiprivate pavilion will replace a 33-bed, open-ward building which will be converted for expanded laboratories and medical and psychiatric treatment areas.

A new concept of medical care will come into being through the building fund, with the establishment of the very first complex of medical-psychiatric-geriatric institutions in the whole country, when the Home and Hospital of the Daughters of Israel is relocated in the vicinity of Long Island Jewish and Hillside Hospitals.

A centralized, expanded surgical facility will be built at Mount Sinai Hospital, where more surgery is performed than in any other voluntary general hospital in New York. Mount Sinai will also have a new psychiatric institute and clinical services building.

New housing for vitally important professional personnel will be provided at Hillside, Long Island Jewish, Maimonides, Montefiore, and Mount Sinai Hospitals.

Long Island's unprecedented growth led to the creation of Long Island Jewish Hospital by the last building fund. Now the hospital plans to add four floors and three wings to provide additional needed beds, treatment areas, and clinic facilities.

Outpatient facilities will also be expanded at Montefiore and Mount Sinai Hospitals. Bronx and Lebanon Hospitals will be renovated and modernized.

To meet the greater demand for private and semiprivate beds, a result of population growth and the extension of health insurance coverage to more people, new pavilions, maternity facilities, and wings will be built at Jewish Hospital of Brooklyn, Beth Israel, Maimonides and Mount Sinai Hospitals. A 66-bed unit will replace outmoded facilities at Hillside.

These are among the building fund projects which suggest the scope and range of federation's plans in the field of medical care. That more than half the entire building fund goal is earmarked for hospitals and medical care is an indication of the importance federation places on meeting the demands for more and better medical care—demands generated by a universal recognition that the strength of the Nation lies in the health of its people.

New Hope for the Handicapped

The brace, the wheelchair, the crutch—these are symbols. Even for handicapped people who need them, they are not the only answer. Yes, the handicapped person does need all the medical and physical and rehabilitative help it is within our power to give him. But he also must be given the chance to learn what he can do, and that underneath the brace he is a human being, always potentially a useful member of society.

We have eliminated many of the major causes of crippling and we continue to learn how to avoid and remedy many defects. But surely as significant as our scientific gains have been the change in recent years of our attitudes toward the handicapped. Today the emphasis is where it should be: on the person, not his handicap; on his potentials, not his limitations.

To treat the disability and at the same time equip the handicapped for as normal a life as possible, the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies maintains a whole range of services.

At Blythedale, a children's orthopedic hospital and rehabilitation center, youngsters are given not only complete medical care but a wholesome group life, which includes schooling for all. Of course, going to school is special—even the bedridden are wheeled to class in their beds. Through the building fund, the obsolete structure where classes are held will be replaced with a modern building to give these children the best chance possible for education and rehabilitation.

Orthopedically handicapped children have painfully limited opportunities for recreation, but one thing most can do is swim. Swimming is also invaluable for rehabilitation, not only physical but emotional—for when the handicapped youngster is in the water, he feels himself to be equal with all children. Through the building fund, Blythedale will be provided with a year-round swimming pool.

Federation camps try whenever possible to integrate handicapped children in a normal program. But some children are so severely handicapped that they cannot go to a regular camp. For them, federation maintains Camp Oakhurst, where they can enjoy the pleasures of the outdoors, play ball, swim and go on overnight hikes—even though the hike may only be 100 yards.

There are children with other handicaps—children, for example, who live in a silent world. At the Lexington School for the Deaf, a pioneer in helping the deaf become a part of the hearing world, children who have never heard the sound of a voice are trained to use their own voices and to speak and read lips, rather than depend on hand signs. The school maintains classes for little ones from the age of 3 through high school and prepares children for suitable jobs or for college. The Lexington School does an extraordinary job, despite its inadequate and obsolete 80-year-old building. However, federation is convinced that now is the time, through the building fund, to provide the school with a modern and suitably equipped plant to serve more children and train more teachers of the deaf.

Federation maintains the only community center in the United States for deaf adults and children. The Jewish Society for the Deaf, now located undesirably, will move into a new east midtown community center to be erected as an Associated YM–YWHA project of the building fund. The society not only will have separate space to conduct its essential recreational and social work services, but plans have already been made for an integrated program for the deaf and the hearing. And because recreational opportunities for the deaf are limited, the society will have a swimming pool in this community center, which it will share with other members of the center. This is but one example of the cooperative programs that come into being through federation.

The postmentally ill, cardiacs and tuberculous are gradually retrained, under medical and social work supervision, to return to full-time jobs at the Altro Workshop, slated for expansion through the building fund. Federation Employment and Guidance Service also offers sheltered workshop rehabilitation to return the handicapped aged to useful employment, and finds jobs for other handicapped as part of its services.

Federation hospitals offer orthopedic, eye, ear, and orthodontia services, cleft palate rehabilitation and even a cerebral palsy outpatient center. The most delicate open-heart surgery, which has become a commonplace procedure at many federation hospitals, saves the lives of children and adults with congenital and chronic heart disease. The Hospital for Joint Diseases, a major resource for the treatment of orthopedic ailments, completed in the late 1950's a modernization and expansion program.

All federation agencies will continue their search to find new cures, new methods to bring help to the handicapped. Through the building fund every resource of science and human concern will be developed to give new hope to our handicapped for a useful, independent future.

A FUTURE FOR THE AGING

Today in New York 1 out of every 10 people is over 65. In another decade, as dramatic advances in medicine continue to prolong life, it will be 1 out of every 7, and perhaps better. This is, indeed, a blessing.

But unless we do something now, the blessing will be mixed. For while the number of our older people is increasing, our facilities are painfully inadequate even to meet the present needs of the aged. The fact is, we have, as a country, been caught short. And by every index—money, health, housing, employment, educational and recreational opportunity and social adjustment—a good third of our aged are in dire trouble.

Because the problem is so vast, the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies has made a special study of the requirements of the aged—the senile and the sick, the dependent and the bedridden, the well. Federation institutions and social work agencies are already meeting many of their needs. So that a larger number can look forward to living out their lives in dignity and decency, the building fund will provide new and expanded facilities to help them remain in the community as long as possible, and assure them appropriate and adequate care when they do need institutional treatment.

Twenty years ago the average age of people in institutional homes was 68. Today it is 81. We do not know how high the average will go in another 10 years. And as the aged live longer, they become more subject to chronic illness. Ambulatory residents need different facilities when they become bedridden. Others enter homes only when they become seriously and chronically ill.

The chronically ill do not require full hospital facilities. They do need comprehensive medical care in a nursing home setting. And today's residential homes are not readily convertible for caring for the bedridden.

To provide for the well and chronically ill aged, federation is proposing three major building fund projects:

1. The Home and Hospital of the Daughters of Israel will be relocated from its obsolete building to a modern 300-bed home to be built in the vicinity of Hillside and Long Island Jewish Hospitals. This will create the first complex of geriatric-psychiatric-medical institutions in the country, and will offer, among other advantages, increased opportunities to treat senility and mental illness.

2. The Home for Aged and Infirm Hebrews will replace an 85-year-old, 278-bed structure with a new 410-bed residence to serve both the well and the sick aged. The Home offers all physical, social and spiritual facilities not only to residents, but also to guests in its apartment residences and participants in its home care program.

3. A modern 500-bed institution for the chronic sick and senile aged will be established. Every facility to assure comfortable living will be provided, including complete recreational, occupational and physical therapy facilities, a synagogue, gardens, lounges and an auditorium, in addition to the most up-to-date nursing and medical care.

Many of the aged who remain in the community have housing difficulties—they live in roominghouses, as boarders, in overpriced hotel rooms or with children in too-small apartments. An exciting answer to this need is being projected by the building fund: Apartments designed especially for the aged will be built with Government cooperation as part of the Educational Alliance, a federation community center, to give the aged adequate housing, a place in the community, social and recreational opportunities, and the care and reassurance they need. The Flushing YM–YWHA is planning similar apartment units.

Even with the burgeoning of Golden Age Clubs, recreational and educational facilities for the aged are painfully inadequate. Entire neighborhoods, especially in Queens and the suburbs, are without acceptable centers or clubs for the aged. Programs will be provided at 15 new community centers in underserved areas and expanded in existing centers.

Summer camping is one of the great innovations for the aged. Presently, only about 1,500 of a recorded 5,000 applicants are able to enjoy annual 2- or 3-week vacations at federation's camps for the aged. Under the building fund, a new 250-bed camp will be created; Surprise Lake Camp, now serving children, will add 100 beds for the aged; the Ella Fohs Camp of the Associated YM–YWHA's will add 70 beds for the aged, and other camps will expand their services.

Federation agencies are helping the aged with a variety of other problems. Many are unwillingly unemployed, the victims of enforced retirement. As one of its services, Federation Employment and Guidance Service helps find jobs for the aged who want to and can work. And while, understandably, most older people prefer to remain in their own community, many cannot do so without help. Federation agencies provide medical, nursing and homemaker services, "meals on wheels," friendly visitors, casework and counseling, and, in some cases most important of all, the knowledge that somebody does care.

Who of us is not touched by the problems of the aging? Who does not have an aging parent or relative or friend? Who of us is not aware of his own extended lifespan, his own advancing years? The problem of the aging is a total problem that involves all of us. It demands the creative and bold community planning that federation has proven it can do—in its past history and projected future.

HAVEN AND HELP FOR THE TROUBLED

Not so very long ago, there were three things that could be done with a severely disturbed child: he could be placed in a mental institution, sent to a reformatory, or kept at home, a disruptive force within the family, the school and the community. Times have changed, and for the better.

Today, whether a troubled child shows his disturbance by being overly shy, withdrawn, bizarre, highly destructive or delinquent, there are many ways he can be helped. We need them all, and more, because the problem is becoming more serious and more urgent, as the incidence of emotional disturbances continues to grow.

The Federation of Jewish Philanthropies maintains a whole spectrum of services for disturbed, dependent, retarded, and troubled children. Its Jewish Board of Guardians, Jewish Child Care Association, Louise Wise Services, Jewish Family Service, Jewish Community Services of Long Island, and Westchester Jewish Community Services offer help in all the problems that confront children. Depending on the needs of the child, every possible type of placement facility is available: from smaller group residences to group foster homes; from supervised city apartment dwellings to residential treatment units; from individual foster homes to cottage school settings. And when a child is in placement, the agencies work with families, so that when he does return home, the goal of all placement, it will be a more suitable place for him.

For children who can remain within their homes, federation day-care centers offer intensive help, casework agencies give guidance and counseling and, along with federation's hospitals, provide psychiatric care.

Two summer camps, Rainbow and Ramapo-Anchorage, give disturbed children psychiatric help and intensive supervision along with outdoor experiences. Through the building fund they will extend their facilities.

The Jewish Child Care Association will endow its medical clinic which cares for children in resident and foster-home placement. The Louise Wise Services will be provided with an additional residence for unmarried mothers to overcome crowded conditions at its Lakeview Home. The Jewish Board of Guardians will modernize residence facilities at the Hawthorne-Cedar Knolls School, a cottage school for disturbed adolescents; relocate the Linden Hill School, a residential treatment and research service for highly disturbed adolescents, and move to a more desirable location the Stuyvesant Residence Club, a "halfway house" where boys are helped to make the transition from a residential treatment setting back to the community.

Federation agencies are also helping thousands of troubled families throughout the metropolitan area to find appropriate professional solutions to their difficulties. Jewish Family Service, Jewish Community Services of Long Island and Westchester Jewish Community Services help to maintain or reestablish a healthy life through casework and counseling. They sponsor family life education and checkup clinics to help prevent family breakdown, and work with community centers to remedy the trouble at an early stage. They also provide homemaker services when a family is threatened with disruption by a mother's illness, or by any of the emergencies that arise in families.

The family location service helps with desertion cases. And federation agencies represent all Jewish children and their families who come before the courts.

Federation is constantly seeking new methods to help troubled children and families, and continually evaluates the effectiveness of its programs. To further strengthen this service to the community, federation will seek to create through the building fund a $1 million central research fund to enable its child care and family service agencies to evaluate the effectiveness of their programs. Federation is convinced that now is the time to weigh and probe thoroughly and scientifically all the methods we use to help troubled people. Data from individual projects will be collected and evaluated, and results will be made available to agencies throughout the country. Federation agencies hope to find new approaches, and, on the basis of the findings, will develop those programs that have been proven the most effective, with the solid knowledge that even better help will be given to those who need it.

All troubles are related; all troubles are contagious. Troubled children usually come from troubled families; the family with a disturbed child is a family in trouble. And the trouble of each and every person touches and affects the whole community. Federation, through the building fund, will strengthen its resources for helping each family be the secure haven where people can find love and peace, to help give children every chance to grow into happy, secure adults.

Deepened Roots for the Community

In this city of constant, unceasing change, one of our gravest problems is the gradual erosion of the family as a unit.

The character of neighborhoods shift. They become rundown and are built up again, not in 25 years, but in 5 years, and sometimes even less.

Apartments get smaller and there is no longer room for the aged parent. We are forced to segregate ourselves by age groups. Our older people are isolated and denied the stimulation of contact with the young; the young are deprived of the wisdom, the love of the old.

Perhaps it is more than coincidence that this disruption has been accompanied by a heightening, and frightening incidence of mental illness, divorce, separation, juvenile delinquency, adult crime, alcoholism, joblessness—the diseases of shallow-rooted people.

The Federation of Jewish Philanthropies has found in its community centers and camps formidable weapons in the attack on aimlessness, in the struggle to give purpose and deeper roots, a sense of family, a sense of community, to all people.

Its community centers offer programs that encompass recreation, social welfare and general and Jewish culture. There people of all ages come together to pursue special and group interests; parents are helped to relate to their children; children find healthy outlets for their energies; the aged are not a society apart; the orthopedically handicapped, mentally retarded, blind and deaf are also welcomed as individuals and helped through special group programs.

In 1957, in preparation for the building fund, federation undertook a scientific study of the Jewish population, neighborhood by neighborhood, to determine where centers should be built. The results were startling: Nassau, which had not even been considered for community centers in a 1956 blueprint of needs, was discovered to have a Jewish population of 329,000. In Queens, the Jewish population had almost doubled, and Westchester also showed a considerable increase.

On the basis of these studies, 15 new community centers, affiliated with the Associated YM–YWHA's, will be built in New York City and Nassau and Westchester. Existing centers will be expanded, enlarged and modernized. The West Bronx Y, which now functions in inadequate rented space, is slated for a new building. New buildings are also planned for Bronx House and the Educational Alliance. A three-story wing and auditorium will be added to the Bronx Y. A second floor will be built onto the Jewish Community House of Bensonhurst, and the East New York Y will also be enlarged. Renovations will be made at the Boro Park Y, Washington Heights-Inwood Y and Mount Vernon Y. And the addition of a new residence for about 300 girls, as part of the 92d Street Y, will remedy a serious lack of comfortable living facilities.

The Jewish Education Committee, which provides Hebrew schools, Talmud Torahs and Sunday schools with educational materials and a broad range of services, will improve the building into which it recently moved.

Federation's day-camp movement reached a new level with the introduction of day camps in the green-belt countryside, to which children commute each day. Federation operates three Henry Kaufmann Campgrounds, each less than an hour's travel from home base: The Flora Haas site in Staten Island, the Mildred Goetz site in Rockland County, and the Alice N. Proskauer Day Camp in Suffolk County. Despite the numbers served (almost 5,500 children daily), the demand is double the capacity. Through the building fund, additional acreage will be acquired and more swimming pools and overnight shelters built.

Almost 18,000 people of all ages, but in the main children, are given the opportunity to benefit from true outdoor living at federation's 18 resident camps. A number even provide year-round camping on weekends and school holidays. Two camps are for emotionally disturbed children, and another is for youngsters with such severe orthopedic handicaps that they cannot go to integrated camps.

In an effort to strengthen family life, three camps—Bronx House Emanu-El, Educational Alliance, and Wildwood—have introduced camping on a single site for all age groups, including families as units. Their facilities will be expanded through the building fund.

Camping for the aged, the most recent and perhaps most dramatic entry in the recreation movement, provides older people the opportunity for a country vacation—often their first. Through the building fund, a new 250-bed camp for the aged will be created, existing programs will be expanded and new programs for the aged will be introduced in other camps.

Camps Poyntelle-Ray Hill, Louemma, Isabella Freedman, Surprise Lake, and East New York Y will also be expanded to serve more people, from the child to the elder, so that each will be better able to contribute to a happier family life and a healthier community.

As it is written in the Shulcan Aruch, a commentary on the Torah, "It is a man's duty to be joyful and glad at heart, he and his wife and his children and those dependent upon him." Through its community centers, camping programs and Jewish educational services, federation helps man fulfill that duty.

The Master Plan for Building a City of Life

Here, project by project, is the master plan evolved by the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies and its member agencies during 4 years of study to meet the medical and social welfare needs of the people of Greater New York in terms of the next decades. Approved by the board of trustees of the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies on June 26, 1961, the plan will be expanded during the 3 years of the building fund campaign when new needs arise.

As a responsible community unites in support of the building fund, and as generous individuals, public corporations, foundations, and labor unions affirm the power of a free people to determine the shape of their future, the bold new skyline set forth in this master plan will come into being to make of New York a city of life.

HOSPITALS AND MEDICAL CARE

Beth Abraham Home, $4 million.

New nine-story private pavilion; conversion of old building to expand research and service laboratories, medical and psychiatric offices, and treatment facilities.

Beth Israel Hospital, $5,198,000.

New 300-bed private and semiprivate pavilion; modernization and renovation of service areas; conversion of present building.

Blythedale, $210,000.

New school building equipment for handicapped children; year-round swimming pool; staff residence.

Bronx Hospital, $400,000.[1]

Modernization and repairs.

Hillside Hospital, $3,095,000.

New research building; patients' activities therapy building; 66-bed patients' pavilion; staff residence; site development.

Jewish Hospital of Brooklyn, $3,190,000.

New maternity pavilion; conversion of present maternity division into outpatient building; remodeling of main building; construction of central kitchen, including kosher kitchen.

Lebanon Hospital, $200,000.[1]

Modernization and repairs.

Solomon and Betty Loeb Memorial Home, $1,800,000.

Construction of new 80-bed building on grounds of Montefiore Hospital.

Long Island Jewish Hospital, $9 million.

Construction of additional floors onto present main building; auditorium and conference center; staff residence; expansion of outpatient department and research laboratory facilities.

Maimonides Hospital, $6,600,000.

New patients' pavilion; research institute; interns and residents housing unit; nurses' residence; renovation of maternity building.

Montefiore Hospital, $7,280,000.

New Henry L. Moses Research Institute; ambulatory services building; staff apartment house; central kitchen and laundry facilities; renovation of emergency suite.

(In addition, plans are now being submitted for the following: basic science laboratories building; diagnostic and treatment center; addition of hospital patient floors to Loeb Center; intensive care unit; school of nursing; other facilities. These additional projects are estimated at $10,260,000.)

Mount Sinai Hospital, $17,715,000.

---

[1] If establishment of a federation-sponsored medical center in Bronx County is not achieved within 2 years, Bronx Hospital and Lebanon Hospital may each apply to the federation board of trustees for restudy of their originally submitted expansion programs.

New clinical services and psychiatric building; surgery center; apartment house for nurses and staff; renovation of semiprivate pavilion and outpatient and ambulatory care building.

CARE OF THE AGED

Home for Aged and Infirm Hebrews, $7,400,000.

New residence on 106th Street to replace present 85-year-old building, with facilities for ambulatory and bedridden residents.

Home and Hospital of the Daughters of Israel, $4,500,000.

New 300-bed residence—relocation in vicinity of Hillside and Long Island Jewish Hospitals.

Hospital for Aged (new project), $6,250,000.

Creation of new federation agency, a 500-bed, nursing home type facility for hospitalization and treatment of chronically ill aged and senile.

FAMILY WELFARE AND CHILD CARE

Altro health and rehabilitation services, $175,000.

Addition of floor to new wing at Altro Workshop; new receiving and storage building; modernization, renovation, and repairs.

Jewish Child Care Association, $200,000.

Endowment of medical clinic at central headquarters.

Jewish Society for the Deaf, $375,000.

Inclusion of additional floor in east midtown community center building of Associated YM–YWHA's; swimming pool for deaf and hearing members of center.

Lexington School for the Deaf, $4,500,000.

New school building to replace present 80-year-old structure; specially equipped classrooms and laboratories.

Louise Wise Services, $400,000.

Residence house in Manhattan for 15–20 girls; relocation and expansion of offices.

Jewish Board of Guardians, $1,906,000.

Installation of automatic sprinkler and fire alarm systems in all residences; replacement and modernization of cottages at Hawthorne-Cedar Knolls School; relocation and new cottages for Linden Hill School; new Stuyvesant Residence Club.

Central research endowment fund, $1 million.

For studies of family and child care programs.

COMMUNITY CENTERS

Associated YM-YWHA's of Greater New York, $9,000,700.

Completion of Mosholu, Coney Island, East Flatbush and Brighton Beach Y's:

Purchase of Kings Bay Site	$630,000
Completion of East Tremont Y	142,200
East Midtown Y	1,268,200
Kings Bay Y (excluding land)	706,200
Flushing Y	635,300
Rockaways Y	755,200
North Hills Y	706,200
Westchester Y	836,200
Parkchester-Bronx River Y	831,200
Corona-Elmhurst-Jackson Heights Y	830,000
Mid-Island Y (Levittown-Hicksville-Wantagh)	830,000
Central Nassau Y (Valley Stream-Elmont-Franklin Square)	830,000

Bronx House, $325,000.

New building; alterations to present building.

East New York YM–YWHA, $265,000.

Addition to present building; capital improvements.

Educational alliance, $600,000.

New building, to include gymnasium and special facilities for aged; alterations to present building.

Jewish Community House of Bensonhurst, $350,000.

Construction of second floor; repairs and renovations.

YM–YWHA of Boro Park, $4,500.

Renovation.

YM–YWHA of the Bronx, $350,000.

New three-story wing and auditorium, including furnishing and equipping.

West Bronx YM–YWHA, $781,200.

New building.

YM–YWHA of 92d Street, $2,500,000.

New seven-story building with girls' residence facilities (200–300 beds), clubrooms, auditorium and gymnasium.

YM–YWHA of Mount Vernon, $95,000.

Repairs and site acquisition.

YM–YWHA of Washington Heights, $45,000.

Additional play area on roof; renovation.

CAMPS

Henry Kaufmann Campgrounds, $716,000.

Flora Haas site (Staten Island): New swimming pool for beginners, double shelters; site acquisition; expansion.

Alice N. Proskauer Day Camp (Suffolk): Site acquisition; new shelter units.

Associated YM–YWHA's of Greater New York, $430,000.

Ella Fohs Camp, $130,000. Addition of 70-bed camp for aged.

Camp Poyntelle-Ray Hill, $300,000. Construction of new 300-bed camp.

Bronx House Eman-El, $62,500.

New bunkhouses in boys' area of work camp; recreation halls; modernization, repairs and expansion.

East New York YM–YWHA camp, $100,000.

Expansion of bunkhouses and recreational and other facilities for 120 campers.

Educational alliance camps, Israel and Leah Cummings Campgrounds, $144,500.

New recreation and administration building; development of recreational areas; expansion, modernization, and renovation of cabins, arts and crafts pavilion.

Camp Isabella Freedman, $16,500.

Winterizing of three cottages and dining hall; repairs and renovation.

Camp Louemma, $21,975.

Construction of three new cabins and supervisors' quarters.

Camp Oakhurst, $20,000.

New staff house.

Camp Rainbow, $100,000.

Expansion of site.

Camp Ramapo-Anchorage, $75,000.

Construction of five new cabins.

Surprise Lake Camp, $388,300.

Acquisition of property and construction of 100-bed camp for aged; expansion and renovation of girls' camp, including new bunkhouses, recreation hall, arts and crafts facility; improvement of waterfront areas; modernization and repairs.

Camp Wildwood, $20,000.

Dormitory for boys; garage.

Camp for aged (new project), $500,000.

Acquisition of land and construction of 250-bed camp for aged.

Jewish education committee, $60,500.

Renovation and repairs of headquarters.

LINK YOUR NAME WITH THE CITY OF LIFE

Walk into any hospital, research institute, museum, university. There you will find permanent indications of men who have linked their names forever with their good works.

People who choose to be remembered by contributing to the well-being of their fellow men act in the best traditions of American philanthropy. Perhaps nowhere else in the world have so many names of so many people come to represent community enterprises, great medicine, great scholarship, great music and art.

And what better way is there for a man or woman to be remembered than by identifying himself or his loved ones with a cause in the service of people? What better way of fulfilling his obligations to those who come after him? Throughout history, men and women of vision have felt this obligation to make a better world for the generations that followed them. Must we not do the same for our future generations?

To find out how you may link your name, or the name of a loved one, with the City of Life, please write to the Building Fund, Federation of Jewish Philanthropies, 130 East 59th Street, New York 22. A booklet listing opportunities for enduring and meaningful commemoration will be sent to you.

FEDERATION OFFICERS, 1961

President: Lawrence A. Wien.

Vice presidents: Charles Bassine, Irving M. Felt, Mrs. Randolph Guggenheimer, Archie O. Joslin, Samuel Lemberg, Isidor Leviton, Richman Proskauer, Mrs. Robert V. Tishman.

Chairman of the board: Norman S. Goetz.

Associate chairman of the board: Benjamin J. Buttenwieser, I. Edwin Goldwasser, Samuel D. Leidesdorf, Gustave L. Levy, Salim L. Lewis, Joseph M. Proskauer, Ralph E. Samuel, Milton Weill.

Treasurer: Richard Goldsmith.

Associate treasurer: Robert A. Bernhard, Henry A. Loeb, Lawrence S. Phillips, John Rosenthal, Milton Steinbach.

Secretary: Saul Horowitz, Jr.

Executive vice presidents: Dr. Maurice B. Hexter, Joseph Willer.

Assistant to the executive vice president: Max Engler.

Assistant secretary: Samuel Rosenthal.

BUILDING FUND CAMPAIGN COMMITTEE

Chairman: Salim L. Lewis.

Associate chairmen: Mrs. Leonard H. Bernheim, Irving M. Felt, Gustave L. Levy, Lawrence Marx, Jr.

BUILDING FUND COMMITTEE

Chairman: Ralph E. Samuel.

Vice chairman: Milton Weill.

Eli M. Black, Milton J. Bluestein, Simon H. Fabian, Henry J. Friendly, William K. Jacobs, Jr., Robert G. Janover, Archie O. Joslin, Robert J. Levy, Carl M. Loeb, Jr., Carl A. Morse, Ned L. Pines, Alan M. Stroock, Laurence A. Tisch, Mrs. Robert V. Tishman, Mrs. Clarence K. Whitehill.

MAINTENANCE APPEAL, 1961

Chairman: Joseph L. Mailman.

Associate chairmen: Bernard J. Lasker, Laurence A. Tisch, Alan V. Tishman.

THE NATIONAL TRADE POLICY ACT OF 1962

PART I—THE NATIONAL STAKE AND THE ROLE OF CONGRESS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, last Thursday, February 15, in introducing the National Trade Policy Act of 1962 (S. 2840), I stated that I expected to make a series of short addresses to the Senate, discussing the issues involved in my alternative approach to President Kennedy's goal of trade expansion—a goal which I share with the President and the overwhelming majority of my fellow Members of Congress.

Over the coming weeks I hope to deal with various points, including:

The need for an informed public.

The commodity versus the productivity concept, as a basis for trade policy.

Trade with Japan and other low cost producing industrialized nations, and with the newly developing nations.

Trade with the Communist bloc.

The peril-point provision.

The role of private oversea investment in trade expansion.

The concept of industry in escape clause and adjustment assistance action.

I believe that in these are the principal issues which differentiate the approach to trade policy which I have put forward from the approach embodied in the

President's bill (H.R. 9900), introduced in the House by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, Mr. MILLS.

In my remarks of last week, I summarized the great stakes which we, as a nation and as the leader of the free world, have in an effective policy of trade expansion. Mr. President, I shall not repeat myself now but ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks two brilliant articles on this subject, by Prof. Peter F. Drucker, "This Competitive World," in the Harvard Business Review of March 1961, and "The Economic Race: A Forecast for 1980," in the New York Times Sunday magazine of January 21, 1962; and a forthright editorial, "The Price of Protectionism," from the Wall Street Journal of January 16, 1962.

It is clear that international trade stands in the center of our national concerns today, central to the attainment of our objectives of domestic economic growth and to the implementation of our foreign policy.

During much of the two decades following enactment of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1934, the Congress was justified in authorizing the President to use, within certain limits, a part of its constitutional power over commerce and duties. Today, the profound national concern with trade policy requires a widespread national consensus on its implementation—a consensus which is represented best by a full partnership between the Congress and the President.

The President's bill does not provide for such a partnership. Instead, it relies on the old concept of authority within limits—a concept which, with the need for broader limits and the importance of the actions taken within them, leaves a potentially dangerous vacuum of congressional power and responsibility.

It is for this reason that the bill which I have introduced is built around specific congressional policy directions to the President and congressional veto power over his actions.

Congressional policy directions guide the President in his extension of trade concessions for specific purposes: expanding and nondiscriminatory access for U.S. exports to the markets of fully developed nations; opening of the markets of fully developed nations to the exports of low cost producing industrialized and newly developing nations; the protection of U.S. patents and copyrights; and the establishment of a unified free world policy on trade with the Communist bloc. Details of these provisions will emerge in my future statements.

Congressional veto power extends over trade agreements, national security proclamations, escape clause actions, and the administration of adjustment assistance.

Only full partnership between the Congress and the President can do justice to the new dimensions of trade policy and can fulfill our responsibility to the Nation.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Harvard Business Review, March 1961]

THIS COMPETITIVE WORLD

(By Peter F. Druker)

Only 2 years ago, America's international economic position seemed impregnable. So eminent an expert as Sir Geoffrey Crowther—then retiring as editor of the Economist (London)—called the "dollar gap" the one unalterable and basic fact of international economics for years to come. Those few who dared warn of dangers ahead got short shrift as scaremongers.[1] Today, who can doubt that the dollar crisis has replaced the dollar gap as the central problem of the international economy?

At the root of the dollar crisis is, of course, our balance of trade. Nontrade payments have risen neither absolutely nor relatively (except for movements of short-term swing capital which are effects of the payments balance rather than of its causes). Clearly, the real problem is not that imports have risen unduly, but that exports have lagged behind. Let's take a look at the facts:

Imports have been going up at the rate of 5 percent a year since 1953 (which can be considered the first normal postwar year, with reconstruction largely completed and the Korean war impact largely liquidated). This has been, however, a less rapid rise than we should have expected on the basis of our own country's experience and that of all other industrial countries. Imports of industrial raw materials and supplies (which make up two-thirds of our total imports) have tended to rise 1½ to 2 times as fast as the gross national product.

By contrast, our exports have risen no faster than the GNP—showing an average gain of 3½ to 4 percent for the 1953–59 period. During that same period, the economy of the rest of the free world expanded at a 6- to 7-percent annual clip.

Actually, these figures underrate the falling off of exports, for, during that period, the terms of trade swung heavily in our favor. Two thirds of our imports are industrial raw materials and supplies which had a downward price trend during the period. This was especially true over the later years when our trade balance so rapidly deteriorated. Two thirds of our exports are manufactured goods which, through 1959, had a strong upward price trend. Probably we did not export more, in volume, during 1959 than in 1953—the bulk of the increased export income deriving from higher prices. But we bought an increased volume of raw materials and supplies over what we could have bought if 1953 commodity prices had continued to prevail—or even if they had moved parallel to manufactured prices.

How has American industry reacted to this challenge? By and large, it has responded so quickly that 1960 ended up as a year in which American exports increased sharply. Obviously, a good many companies found effective ways of restoring the competitive edge to their products in foreign markets.[2]

But few American businessmen seem as yet able to understand what is really happening. They are responding with a good deal of energy to what they feel is a temporary emergency that requires "crash" measures.

PERMANENT CHANGES

What most American businessmen fail to realize is that there have been basic structural changes in the world economy—particularly with reference to the position held by the United States. What we must face is the fact that these are permanent changes which require new basic attitudes, new policies, and new concepts on the part of the American policymaker and, especially, on the part of the American businessman.

What are these new, but permanent, conditions that American businessmen have to understand and live with? Let me present them in a series of "theses."

1. The world economy has become competitive again for the first time since 1913 or, at the very least, for the first time since 1929.

This means, first, that everyone in the free world can get anything he wants—and can pay for—in the quantity and quality he wants, from a number of different suppliers, and in a number of different countries. It means, secondly, that these suppliers are actively competing for business in every market.

This is a great achievement—one that has been the aim (the almost utopian aim) of American policy since the end of World War II. It means not only that we have been able to rebuild a shattered world economy, but also that we have been able to infuse hope, dynamism, and economic growth into the countries of the free world, despite the trauma and destruction of the war.

But this achievement is not an unmixed blessing. One rather disquieting implication is that there no longer will be any orderly prices for any major industrial supply or product in the world market. As recently as 2 years ago, the world price structure was essentially based on prices set by American companies and on American costs and market conditions. Prices outside this country tended to be determined by adding a percentage to the American price. This was true in the automobile industry, for example, where the Chevrolet-Ford-Plymouth price was the norm against which all non-American car manufacturers priced their goods. It also was true in steel, coal, oil, aluminum, and a host of other major products.

But a decisive event suddenly brought this entire price structure of the world market crashing down. It was the collapse in 1959 of the oldest, most deeply entrenched, and most sacred of these prices—the gulf coast price base for petroleum. Today, there is only one such American-based world-market price left—that for aluminum. And there is every indication that it will not last long.

A further implication of this first thesis is that even in the domestic market major industrial products and supplies will not be priced on the basis of American conditions. What will determine the price in any major market in the world (including the American domestic market), is the marginal, incremental income of the most efficient major producer anywhere in the free world. Here are some illustrations of how this price determinative has worked and will work in the future:

Look at the way the American compact cars have been priced. Clearly, domestic producers paid just as much attention to the price of the Volkswagen as to the price of yesterday's standard car.

Another indication is the inability—or the unwillingness—of the American steel industry to raise prices in spite of the sizable increase in labor costs which followed the 1959 steel strike. Furthermore, one can expect, I think, a fairly sharp cut in U.S. steel prices unless steel production goes far above 80 percent of capacity. The simple reason for this is that the most efficient steel producer in the world today is likely to be one of the new U.S. mills with a break-even point (at 1960 prices) well below 50 percent, if not below 40 percent.

---

[1] One of the earliest such warnings of the dangers of an approaching dollar crisis was probably Mr. Drucker's own article, "Realities of Our World Position," HBR May–June 1959, p. 41.

[2] See Raphael Hodgson and Michael Michaelis, "Planning for Profits in World Business," HBR November–December 1960, p. 135.

2. Our ability to increase exports determines whether (and by how much) America's national income can grow; it can only grow less—and quite a bit less—than U.S. exports. The international economy, not the domestic economy, sets the limitations on U.S. growth and prosperity and is the determining area of economic performance.

This situation is something quite new for modern America to face—though it was pretty generally accepted for the largely agricultural United States that existed before 1900. For the rest of the world, and especially for our allies in Western Europe, it is, of course, "old hat."

It is not only that 4 million to 5 million jobs depend directly on export production and export sales (perhaps 3 million jobs in manufacturing and up to 2 million jobs in distribution, transportation, banks, insurance, and other services). It is also the fact that 15 million jobs or more depend on our ability to obtain raw materials and supplies abroad on the same terms, at least, as those on which the other industrial countries obtain them. As we grow, our import demands will grow disproportionately. Hasn't this been our experience over the last 10 years? And too many of us forget that there is only one way to pay for imports from abroad—with exports.

As our gold stock dwindles to the minimum reserve we need for internal uses and for the settlement of normal current balances, economic growth and a healthy and balanced economy will increasingly depend on our ability to raise exports faster than the national product, and at least as fast as our imports.

We can, within limits, control the impact of domestic events on the economy. But no economic or fiscal controls of ours are effective on the international economy. There we have to perform—and there our performance will determine the limits of our domestic economy. How we stand in the world markets will indicate the sickness or health of the American economy and of American business.

3. Protective tariffs, despite the fact that many businessmen regard them as panaceas, only serve to make matters much worse.

When I postulate this, I am not arguing for or against Government support of industries hard hit by foreign competition. I am only saying that a protective tariff is highly unlikely to help such industries. In fact, it is almost certain to hurt them, as well as everybody else in our country. If there has to be support for endangered industries, direct subsidies are much cheaper, much more effective, and much less distorting.

The reason that protective tariffs can harm our economy is simply that our major export markets are precisely the countries from which those undesirable imports come. The major market for most of our exports simply cannot be the underdeveloped countries, no matter how much aid we pump into them. Underdeveloped countries are no market for the products of highly developed economies. They do not have the money to pay for them or, and this matters more, the need or the ability to use them. Therefore, our major markets, and especially our major growth markets, are necessarily highly developed countries.

Let's face some other facts while we are at it. Most probably, we escaped a serious depression in 1960 only because the developed countries (i.e., our industrial competitors) greatly stepped up their purchases from the United States. This was accomplished mainly through lowering barriers against U.S. imports. The resulting additional 1960 exports to the industrial countries abroad provided something like an extra half million jobs for the American economy—over and above the 1½ million jobs that exports to these countries had already provided in 1959.

If we assume, roughly, that every $8,000 worth of goods produced equals one job, what effect on our economy resulted from the increased purchases of U.S. goods by the major foreign industrial nations? For example:

Our additional exports to Japan alone—$400 million worth—provided something like 50,000 additional U.S. jobs in 1960. I doubt whether all the jobs destroyed by foreign imports into this country would add up to 50,000.

France, by increasing her purchases of cotton cloth and cotton-synthetic blends from less than $10 million to $65 million in 1960, provided an additional 8,000 jobs for Americans in one of our most depressed industries.

As this 1960 experience proves, we stand to gain infinitely more through a liberal low-tariff policy on the part of competitive countries than we stand to lose from their exports into the United States. And we stand to lose infinitely more—in jobs as well as in balance of payments—from a high-tariff policy on the part of these countries than we could possibly gain from a high-tariff policy on the part of the United States.

Thus, while our tariff policy can be criticized for not being in step with the realities of our present international situation, our tariff cannot be criticized for being too low. The real criticism should center on the fact that we have not yet used our control of access to the increasingly tempting American market as the bait with which to lure other countries into lowering their barriers against American goods. For instance:

If Europe's automobile tariffs were as low as ours are, U.S. manufacturers should be able to sell two compacts there for every Volkswagon sold here. By European standards our compacts are luxury cars but are priced way below the European luxury car.

For us to go protectionist would, in other words, serve only to destroy major American markets. But for us to have and use the threat of going protectionist—unless we are granted abroad what we grant here—would certainly create major world markets.

4. Equally defensive—and equally dangerous—is the moving of productive facilities for the American market to another low-wage area.

First, let me stress that building plants abroad is all to the good—if the purpose is to broaden the market for American goods and hence increase our income. This includes building or expanding plants to serve markets abroad which have grown to such size and absorptive capacity that they can support fully efficient operations. Indeed, in such a situation the U.S. manufacturer, by building a plant, creates jobs for Americans—for suppliers of machines, for architects, for designers, and so on. And, in such a case, the only critical decision to be made is whether, when the plant is built, the American economy will benefit. This is at least more probable when an American company builds the plant, as opposed to having it built by someone else who, presumably, would be less likely to create export demand for U.S. machinery and equipment. At any rate, if the market is there, the plant will be built by someone.

There is also nothing wrong with building a plant in areas where tariffs or foreign exchange shortages make importation impossible. An underdeveloped country, in particular, can often become a customer for American products only if a local plant using local materials for the small local market (even though at prices way above the world market) saves enough foreign exchange to make possible the importation of machinery and equipment from the United States.

What I do hold to be completely foolhardy is the building of a foreign plant to supply the American manufacturer for the home market. This is rank defeatism; furthermore, it aggravates the disease by eroding purchasing power at home.

Here is the criterion that should be applied: Does building the plant result, ultimately, in a strengthening of America's competitive position? If it does—by supplying a part, for instance, that makes the finished product more salable at home and abroad—then all is well. But if it does not, this decision, in fairly short order, will not even be intelligent policy for the individual company—let alone for the economy. Such a move amounts to strangulation of our Nation's economic power and competitive capacity.

5. There is no way out but to restore U.S. competitive edge and product leadership—and above all to retain it in the many areas where it is still unimpaired.

The economic developments in the world that produced the dollar crisis are fundamentally good in the sense that they are situations calling for aggressive, offensive action by American business. But if we fail to rise to the occasion, things will not be good in any sense.

Thus, the maintenance of American competitive strength must be a major goal of American economic policy and of the policy of any U.S. business. This is something all other countries have had to learn—and in this process we usually supplied the teachers and the textbooks. Now, we have to learn a few lessons ourselves. One such lesson is in the area of labor relations; both management and unions will have to accept the fact that ability to remain competitive is just as important as ability to pay or the political balance of strength.

6. It is not likely that raw material prices today are too low; it is much more likely that prices of manufactured goods are too high—by something like 25 percent.

This assumption (and it is no more than that, even though it has high probability) rests on the fact that, measured by historical relationships, today's raw material prices are not too low in relation to the profitability of most efficient producer. In such a situation any attempts to inflate the price through price agreements or cartels (such as the international oil cartel recently proposed by Venezuela and some of the Arabian oil countries) are totally ineffectual.

This indicates, then, that manufactured goods are far overpriced in relation to raw materials. The orthodox way to restore the balance between them is to cut manufactured goods prices without cutting raw material prices and other costs, i.e., to deflate. There is plenty of this going on today, of course. Quoted prices bear little relationship to actual prices in a host of industries from paper to locomotives. A comic, but highly accurate, description of the U.S. price system today was given by a salesman to my young daughter when she asked how much a typewriter cost: "30 percent off list, and you start hagglin', honey."

But there is a second way to restore a proper balance between raw material and finished goods prices. This is the Keynesian method of reflation whereby raw material prices (and wages) are raised while finished goods prices remain unchanged. A good example of this is the steel-price trend of the last 12 months.

There is still a third way, which is, in an expanding, dynamic economy, both the easiest and the best method. It involves substitution. Thus:

The compact car offers as much automobile, as much transportation, and as much style as the standard model. Yet, on the basis of overall cost per mile, it is at least 20 percent less expensive.

Jet coach and economy flights are as good transportation as are first-class propeller flights that cost 20 to 35 percent more.

Prestressed concrete is used increasingly as a substitute for structural steel and is, in certain applications, just as good, and a great deal cheaper.

Developing substitutions which cut the cost to the customer without disrupting the price structure or the economy offers special opportunities to American manufacturers. Here the tremendous amounts of effort and money poured into research and development during the last 10 years should pay off. By judicious substitution, we might actually get substantially lower prices without any resultant lowering of returns on investments. To illustrate, let me point out that a full economy jet flight is as profitable in terms of return on investment as is a full first-class propeller flight. And it brings in more net dollars per employee.

To bring about such price lowering through substitution should be a continuing, major aim of business management. In pursuing this goal, management must not be confused by an amusing byproduct that might result. It is possible that large-scale substitution will effect a lowering of the real cost of living while official price indexes which are based on yesterday's standard products continue to rise.

7. Any American businessman, especially a manufacturer, should gage the effectiveness and the efficiency of his business by its ability to compete in the world.

Even if the businessman has no export business and does not intend to have any, the question he asks about his market, even his local one, should be this: "What will I have to do to make my product capable of competing in the Japanese market?" The one suggestion I can offer that applies to every case I have seen is that manufacturers concentrate their product lines.

The shibboleth of the full product line is, in my experience, a major cause of American inability to compete. Typically, our manufacturing businesses offer a thousand lines. Of these, 20 or 30 account for four-fifths of all sales and for all profits while constituting only two-fifths of the costs. The remaining 900 or so account for one-fifth of all sales, make no profit (even with all the breaks given to them by traditional cost accounting), and eat up three-fifths of all costs. The same situation, to a lesser extent, applies to all kinds of staff activities.

To be competitive, I have learned, companies have to concentrate on the three or four products (or activities) that account for the overwhelming bulk of all sales—and consider the others merely as sales promotions on which one spends only carefully budgeted amounts.

CONCLUSION

My purpose here has not been to discuss any form of how to do it. Rather, it has been to get across to American executives the fact that ability to be competitive begins right here at home. Such an ability begins by looking at the market in Kokomo, Ind., as a market in which one competes against all comers. It begins with one simple but all-important question: "What would I have to do to be able to compete in Osaka, or Dusseldorf, or Bordeaux?" If a product cannot compete in foreign markets, then foreign products can drive it out of Kokomo.

Seizing the offensive is the only strategy that can work in an expanding and competitive economy—regardless of whether it is national or international. U.S. business must take the initiative internationally—in price, in styling, in innovation and design, and in marketing. We have to accept what we all know to be elemental—that taking a defensive position can, at best, only limit losses. And we need gains.

[From the New York Times Magazine, Jan. 21, 1962]

THE ECONOMIC RACE: A FORECAST FOR 1980

(By Peter F. Drucker)

What will the U.S. economy look like in 1980? Nikita Khrushchev says he knows the answer. The United States, according to him, will be a kind of second-rate Russia, overtaken and overshadowed by the Soviet Utopia of 1980 which he promised his people at the Communist Party Congress last fall.

In making his prediction, Premier Khrushchev assumes that the all-out production drive called for in his 20-year plan will be fulfilled, and that the United States will continue business as usual, maintaining over the next 20 years the growth rates of the past 10 or 15. The conclusion that he draws from these premises is wrong on three counts.

First, even at its present, admittedly inadequate growth rate, the United States still would be ahead in 1980—although its lead would have shrunk considerably.

Second, the United States will not continue business as usual. We will do much more than that; major changes in technology, society and the economy in the sixties and seventies will make for a different United States in 1980.

Finally, the decisive unit of the 1980 world economy, in all likelihood, will be an Atlantic economy in which the United States and the countries of the European Common Market are closely linked as equals. President Kennedy's trade and tariff proposals in his state of the Union message anticipated this development—as did Britain's recent decision to join the Common Market. Such an Atlantic economy will, however, outproduce Mr. Khrushchev's Soviet Utopia 4½ times or so. In his message, President Kennedy did not even mention the economic race with Russia, but his trade and tariff proposals were clearly meant to be the American answer to Mr. Khrushchev's economic threats.

Before we look at what the U.S. reality of 1980 is likely to be, let us examine Mr. Khrushchev's predictions. By starting with his figures we can be sure that we ourselves do not indulge in wishful thinking regarding the future.

Mr. Khrushchev spelled out specific targets in five areas. These are the pillars on which his entire 20-year plan rests. Here are his figures for Russia in 1980, and 1980 projections for the United States, assuming business as usual in this country.

Steel capacity: Soviet Union, 250 million tons. United States, 350 to 400 million tons. (In 1961, Soviet Union capacity was 65 million tons; U.S. capacity, 150 million tons.)

Electric-power production: Soviet Union, 2,200 billion kilowatt-hours. United States, 3,200 billion kilowatt-hours. (In 1961 the Soviet Union produced 291 billion kilowatt-hours; the United States, 780 billion kilowatt-hours.)

Grain production: Soviet Union, 300 million tons; probably one-half or more of total food production. United States, 200 to 400 million tons, as needed; one-sixth of total food production. (In 1961 the Soviet Union produced 131 million tons; the United States, 200 million tons.)

College education: Soviet Union, 8 million college students; one-quarter of the college-age group. United States, 12 million college students; half or more of the college-age group. (In 1961, the Soviet Union had 2.5 million college students, or one-sixth of the age group; the United States, 4 million college students, or one-third of the age group.)

Housing: In the Soviet Union, most families in 1980 are to have "a comfortable apartment of their own with basic utilities." This apparently means the standard of the middle-class apartments now going up in Moscow with two rooms for a family of four, electricity, heat, and running water, but with toilet and bath shared with other families. In the United States, 9 out of 10 families already have a housing standard well above this level. The present acceptable minimum is three rooms for a family of four, electricity, heat, running water, and private toilet and bath. By 1980, this is likely to be considered substandard.

These figures call for a good many ifs and buts. In electric power, for instance, the Soviet Union would be a good deal further behind for peacetime purposes than the kilowatt-hour figures indicate—because, for example, a large part of new electric power will go into Soviet railroads, which are being electrified rather than converted to diesel operation as in the United States. On the other hand, in the event of conventional warfare, the U.S. advantage in electricity would be less important—because electrified railroads, unlike diesels, do not compete for petroleum with tanks and planes and ships.

The large grain crop promised the Russians for 1980 would actually mean a very poor diet, heavily overdependent on bread and flour. It is an admission of continued agricultural weakness rather than a claim to strength. And, of course, Russia has—and will have—a population one-fifth larger than the United States, so that the same total production represents a good deal less per person.

But Mr. Khrushchev's predictions, however rational they may be for the Russia of the next 20 years, are almost completely irrelevant to the United States of 1980. There are four key areas in which great changes already are underway. The United States of 1980 will be (1) a country of metropolitan areas; (2) a society of knowledge workers, rather than manual workers; (3) a consumer market with heavy stress on services; and (4) an economy integrated, in both competition and cooperation, with the other industrial economies of the free world.

Let us examine each of these key areas to see how the United States will look and how Russia will compare.

METROPOLITAN AREAS

Today 3 out of 4 Americans live in a metropolitan area. By 1980, the figures will be 9 out of every 10. There will not be much population growth in the core cities—the New Yorks or Detroits—and there will be fewer people in the rural areas. But all the 60 to 70 million additional Americans to join our population in the next 20 years will live in metropolitan areas—the suburbs and the industrial "satellites" such as the manufacturing towns in New Jersey across the Hudson from New York or in Connecticut along Long Island Sound.

Increasingly, several metropolitan regions—one, for instance, stretching all the way from Portland, Maine, to Norfolk, Va.; another from Buffalo-Rochester and Toronto along both shores of Lake Erie to Detroit, and on to Chicago and Milwaukee; a third from San Diego to the San Francisco Bay area, and so on. There will actually be wider and emptier spaces between these regions, but getting to them will take longer.

The Soviet Union, by contrast, will still have half its population on farms, as we had around 1900. Soviet cities will look much like the 1910 industrial city of the American Midwest—a Pittsburgh or a Toledo of 50 years ago: crowded, sharply defined neighborhoods, huddling around "the works."

Whether we like it or not, the metropolitan area will be the dominant fact of American society in 1980. None of its problems will be solved by then. But all of them will, almost certainly, have to be tackled during the next two decades. The metropolitan region and its problems will therefore increasingly dominate our domestic scene.

There will be fundamental issues of political organization and constitutional power;

of cultural and esthetic values; of the balance between individual freedom and the common good. But there will also be major economic problems and decisions: What are we going to spend on air pollution, for instance, and how? What are we going to spend on mass transportation, and shall we build on the old railroads, or on new technologies such as the monorail or helicopter? Within the next 20 years we shall, in all likelihood, make the decisions that will determine eventually whether this new human habitat, the metropolitan area, will become the most expensive jungle or a place fit to be the City of Man.

KNOWLEDGE WORKERS

Already those people whom the Bureau of the Census calls "technical, professional, and managerial"—teachers, engineers, accountants, scientists, doctors and medical technologists, market researchers, credit analysts, investment managers, and a host of others—outnumber industrial workers. They are also the fastest-growing group.

Twenty years hence such knowledge workers will constitute half the total U.S. work force—with another quarter employed in sales and clerical jobs, which are closer to knowledge work than to manual work.

The Soviet Union, by contrast, will still be a country of manual workers, who will make up three-quarters or more of the work force, as they do today. According to Mr. Khrushchev's 20-year plan, the need for manual labor on the farm will grow faster than the population; and even more mothers will tend machines in industry. The great bulk of Russian knowledge workers will be concentrated in one category: engineers. Otherwise, society and the economy will apparently have to get along with a supply no larger proportionately than ours was in the twenties.

The dominant position of the knowledge worker in American society will have profound political and social impact. Twenty years hence a college degree—or at least some years of college—will be a requirement for any but the lowliest job, and for any advancement beyond it. As a result, education, not only of the young, but of adults, may well become the outstanding growth industry.

Already, continuing education—the general studies programs of the large universities or the advanced management programs run by or for corporations—is the most rapidly growing part of the educational field. By 1980, teaching, full time or part time, will be the largest occupation by far in this country. The teaching vote, rather than the labor or farm vote, may even tip the political scales in key States.

Another major impact of the knowledge worker will be on the power, function, and role of American labor unions. If they are to succeed in organizing a significant number of knowledge workers—a task so far well beyond their capacity—they will have to become very different institutions, behaving very differently, let by different people, fighting for different goals. If they fail to organize the knowledge workers, they will become yesterdays' leaders—shrinking, aging, backward looking and fighting for the status quo.

CONSUMER MARKET

The United States is already consumer oriented, and services—travel, recreation, medical care, education, etc.—already take a growing share of the consumer's dollar. By 1980, our markets will have become even more consumer oriented, and services may take 50 cents of each consumer dollar spent. Two million Americans, for instance, now travel abroad each year. By 1980, there should be 15 to 25 million.

The past 10 years have seen a good many specialized mass markets come into being: for hi-fi sets, for classical recordings, for lawn-care products, to name but a few. Such specialized markets, rather than the old-fashioned mass markets, for automobiles or appliances, for instance, are likely to have the greatest growth in the next 20 years.

Only a nuclear war could stop this trend; only a major depression or a very great expansion in defense spending could slow it down. It reflects not only higher incomes. It reflects also the emergence of the knowledge worker, who spends a larger part of his income on services, and needs them more than does the manual worker. Also—a subtle but an important change—material things are not the status symbols for the knowledge worker they are for the manual worker. A son in graduate school gives him more prestige (and costs more) than a bigger car—a fact which underlies the rise of the compacts in recent years.

By contrast, Mr. Khrushchev does not intend to spend much money on satisfying the consumer. The Soviet Utopia of 1980 will be as much a production-oriented society as it is today, with heavy industries such as steel, electric power, and coal mining accounting for most of the country's nonfarm output. In the words of a popular Moscow joke, it will still be easier for a Soviet citizen to get to the moon than to get to Paris.

This emphasis on heavy production reflects basic moral and political convictions, rather than economic considerations alone. It is axiomatic to Mr. Khrushchev that what is good for the individual is likely to be bad for society. The Russian attitude toward such an essential service as the telephone shows this clearly.

The Soviet Union has paid for a modern telephone system but does not seem to want it. A modern transcontinental web, reaching into the smallest hamlet, has been constructed. Judging from American experience, it must represent a capital investment of $10 billion. Yet there are only 4 million telephones in all of Russia—no more than there were in 1938, and fewer than there are in New York City alone—and the 20-year plan makes no provision for installing more. After all, what good would more telephones be as long as telephone books continue to be treated as a military secret?

But then, one can also ask, what good will it do the Soviet worker to have (like his American counterpart) a 4-day week in 1980 if there is nothing available to him to do with his leisure? Indeed, one of the glaring weaknesses of Mr. Khrushchev and his Utopia is the inability to conceive the consumer demands and services which new leisure and higher incomes will produce.

INTERNATIONAL ECONOMY

The place, however, where United States economic reality in 1980 should differ the most from Mr. Khrushchev's prediction is our international position and policy. In Mr. Khrushchev's conception, the world economy still consists of two giants: the United States, the old champion, and the Soviet Union, the young and vigorous contender. But there is already a third giant around: the Common Market of Western Europe.

It outproduces the Soviet Union two to one or better. And it is rapidly catching up with the United States. With Britain considered a member (as she should be by this time twelvemonth), the Common Market already produces as many automobiles, for instance, as we do (though most of them are, of course, smaller than ours).

An Atlantic economy, embracing both the United States and Western Europe, would represent a concentration of economic power and economic dynamics beyond anything the world has yet seen—and far beyond anything Mr. Khrushchev has ever dreamed of.

Its total population, by 1980, would be well beyond the half-billion mark. Its production—at least twice that of today—would be so large as to make Mr. Khrushchev's Utopia look like one of the minor economies. It would consume at least one-third more food and twice the minerals, metals and petroleum products now produced by the entire free world. And the standard of life of its poorer classes (such as the Italian workers, for instance) is likely to be not far below that of the American at the end of World War II when he was the envy and wonder of the world.

Economic necessity will drive the United States toward such an Atlantic economy, as President Kennedy implied in his state of the Union message. Western Europe is already among our most important markets (matched only by Canada and Japan). And we sell to Western Europe two to three times as much as we buy from it—manufactured goods, raw materials or foodstuffs. We shall have to increase these exports. To grow ourselves, we shall need sharply higher imports, especially of raw materials.

There is, however, only one way to pay for higher imports—through higher exports. To make sure that our goods are not shut out of the Common Market by high tariffs and import restrictions is thus crucial to our own prosperity and growth. And this, paradoxically, means that we shall have to offer lower tariffs and greater equality of treatment to the producers of Europe—especially if we want to continue to sell to Europe more than we buy from it. Otherwise, we would simply not have anything to bargain with with this new economic giant, the Common Market.

By 1980, therefore, the American businessman will perforce have become a cosmopolitan—at home as much in the Copenhagen as in the Chicago market. In labor relations, the ability to remain competitive will play as large a role as ability to pay or the balance of power between management and union. In economic policy, concern for our exports, for our competitive position, for our balance of payments and for the strength of the dollar, will necessarily weigh as heavily as concern for full employment, for farm programs and for social security.

The young American executive may come to expect to be moved to Sapporo, Dijon or Duesseldorf as he now moves from Chicago to Atlanta. But the foreign businessman is likely also to become familiar with Peoria and Natchez. During the next few years, foreign, especially Western European, businesses may invest heavily in U.S. industry, start subsidiaries here and acquire American interests on a large scale.

We are some distance yet from the Atlantic Common Market of which a good many people talk today. But we are a great deal closer to economic integration of the free world than anybody—politicians, public or businessmen—realizes. And, simply because of our import needs, we will be even more international in our economy in 1980.

If the free world stays together, it will outproduce Mr. Khrushchev's 1980 Utopia at least three to one, perhaps four to one. If the free world, however, wastes its economic strength in internecine fighting, it may indeed prove Mr. Khrushchev right in his forecast that by 1980 the Soviet Union will be the leading economic power.

Many more things might be said about the United States of 1980—all things that would make it look less and less like the country which Mr. Khrushchev is out to overtake. The manufacturing industries most likely to grow very rapidly in the United States are not the industries for which Mr. Khrushchev plans the largest increases. They are not, for instance, steel, but aluminum, electronics, plastics, chemicals, pharmaceuticals—which are not even mentioned in Russia's 20-year plan.

Even faster growing will be new industries which no one yet knows about. Printing by other means than by impressing ink on paper—by electron beam, for example, or by chemical reaction—may be such a one which, still waiting to be born today, will be a major American industry by 1980.

The most important point is that Mr. Khrushchev's economic race as such is irrelevant. His 20-year plan for Russia is a plan for catching up—socially with the United States of 1920, if not with that of 1900; economically with the United States of World War II. Mr. Khrushchev is out to win yesterday's race.

The challenge to the United States, then, is not to compete in the areas of Mr. Khrushchev's choosing, but in the key areas for America's development. We have yet to set goals and decide on policies in these areas. What we do in each, and how well we do it, will largely determine our strength and our role in the world of 1980.

In these areas our job is not to do more of what we did before; it is to do well what we have not yet done at all.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 16, 1962]

The Price of Protectionism

Let us suppose that the United States decides to end its reliance on foreign coffee. A tariff is imposed at such a high level that it is prohibitive. No more coffee is imported, and an enormous incentive is given to American coffee growers.

Coffee thrives only in warmer climes, so the protariff American coffee growers were few, operating chiefly in such areas as Hawaii and Puerto Rico. These growers immediately rush out to buy more land, much of it less suited to coffee cultivation than the land they are now working. Higher wages woo workers from other activities in the islands and even draw some from the continental United States. Large amounts of capital are invested in new machinery and warehouses.

The market looks so attractive that some entrepreneurs on the southern fringes of the United States are encouraged to run the risks of recurring frosts; some producers elsewhere even put up greenhouses to simulate tropical temperatures. Again, massive amounts of capital and labor are diverted from other activities. The average cost of producing coffee is high and the retail price shoots up to around $10 a pound.

This exaggerated example illustrates the impact of tariffs and other trade restrictions, for it differs only in degree from the real world of today. It thus helps to explain why President Kennedy, in his state of the Union message, promised to ask Congress for new and broader powers to dispose of these artificial restraints on trade.

Any tariff, whether levied on British automobiles, Japanese textiles or Swiss watches, is in effect a subsidy to American producers of such products. As such, it has a significant effect on the policies and practices of those producers.

Behind a tariff wall, companies in a protected industry may and often do compete fiercely among themselves. But the tariff makes it possible for the industry to maintain a higher level of prices than would otherwise be feasible. Its incentive to modernize its plants and improve its products is less.

Producers become accustomed to relying on the artificial fence that has been erected around their market. When foreign producers threaten to scale the existing fence, the domestic companies incline toward building it higher, rather than fighting to get their costs down.

And who finances the fence? It's the consumer, of course. He says the bill through higher prices, whether he buys domestic products or such foreign goods as can get in. The burden of this consumer tax isn't lessened one whit by the fact that it's a hidden levy.

But the worst aspect of tariffs is not that they impose hidden taxes and award hidden subsidies. It is that they dangerously distort and debilitate the whole domestic economy.

A protected industry is able to bid capital and labor away from industries where they could be more efficiently employed. Its higher prices restrict its markets both at home and abroad; this is reflected by the problems of U.S. agriculture, which enjoys the quetsionable benefits both of complex direct subsidies and tariff protection. Some American farm products can be marketed abroad only after the Government pays still other subsidies to exporters to permit them to lower their prices.

With the sales of protected industries thus limited and with much of the Nation's resources employed inefficiently, the inevitable result is a severe restriction on the growth of the economy. Both national output and national income are held well below levels they might otherwise attain.

Admittedly, elimination of tariffs would lead to temporary economic problems in some industries. Because of this, an argument can be made for gradual removal. But however it's handled, the future health of the economy demands that a new beginning be made.

FUNDS FOR INDIAN PROGRAMS

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, those who have checked the budget requests for the 1963 fiscal year of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and related Indian programs are keenly aware that a total increase of $39 million is being asked in all these Indian programs. This is almost the total appropriation for the Indian Bureau in 1948; and if the budget request for 1963 is approved, it will amount to a total of $700 for every Indian man, woman, and child. In the current budget there is enough to provide $650 for every Indian covered by the program.

One would think after going over these figures that our Indians were being adequately taken care of as far as appropriations are concerned. However, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an editorial entitled "Fort Hall Stalemate," published in the Post-Register of Idaho Falls, Idaho, near the Fort Hall Indian Reservation, because the editorial causes serious doubt as to the effectiveness of the Indian programs and the handling of funds appropriated for these programs.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Fort Hall Stalemate

Nine hundred Indians on the Fort Hall Reservation recently complied with requirements for aid under the Idaho welfare program. This was no indiscriminate handout. The recipients were investigated and certified by the Idaho Department of Public Assistance as being in need of food.

Keep in mind that the Bureau office at the Fort Hall Reservation also has a welfare program. Keep in mind that the Indians themselves also manage a welfare plan. The fact that 900 Indians qualified for and are receiving State aid, presumably on a larger scale than both of the Indian and Bureau programs combined, can only be considered tacit admission that the Federal Government is not coping with the deteriorating situation at the Fort Hall Reservation.

What about those voices raised last year in Pocatello, in Caldwell, and Fort Hall that Post-Register reports of a large number of Indians being destitute were greatly overexaggerated? We submit that 900 Indians—those qualifying for State aid alone—are a disgraceful percentage of the 2,600 Indians who reside on the reservation.

Admittedly, the nature of the economic problem at Fort Hall is a complex one. The Bureau on the national level has not been able over these many years to find the economic platform for a gradual but effective development of the reservation system. But there should be no dodging the seriousness of the situation.

There may be hope in the new program now being enunciated by the Department of the Interior. Essentially it seeks:

(1) Development of the physical resources of Indian tribes for the benefit of the Indians themselves, bringing a halt to the land leasing that has only sapped Indian development; (2) development of recreational resources for tourists and other visitors (the sun dances at Fort Hall if properly staged and promoted could be of real value); (3) industrial development, coupled with vocational training and job placement for Indians; (4) improved educational programs for Indian youngsters and adults; (5) expanded and improved housing programs on reservations; (6) development of arts and crafts skills.

It sounds fine. But will it get execution? It is up to the Bureau of Indian Affairs eventually to implement such a program. It is up to the Indians to give it earnest application. And it is up to the non-Indians in Idaho—or anywhere—to see that it gets sincere help along the way. But first, it has to be placed in motion.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, last year I called for an investigation of the Indian programs, and no action was taken. I again think that some type of investigation is needed, and I urgently suggest that the proper committees of the Senate and House handling these programs seek to uncover what is happening to the millions of dollars that are appropriated each year for Indian programs. Let me also note that these programs are oftentimes in addition to other Government welfare programs on the State and Federal level in which the Indians may also participate. This problem is not of the Indians' making; and it is up to Congress to determine what can be done to adjust the administration of this program so that our Indians will not be in distress, as pointed out in the above editorial, a condition which has its counterpart on other reservations.

LINCOLN DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR FONG

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, last week on the 153d anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln, my good friend and distinguished colleague from Hawaii [Mr. Fong] delivered an eloquent and noteworthy address in the city of Pittsburgh before a standing-room-only audience gathered for the annual Lincoln Day dinner.

It is a most timely message, linking the humanitarianism of Abraham Lincoln with the continuing need for humanitarianism in the context of today's world. It is a sound and eminently practical message, one deserving of widespread attention and study.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire text be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LINCOLN'S LEGACY AND 1962

(Lincoln's Day speech, by U.S. Senator HIRAM L. FONG, Republican, Hawaii, Penn-Sheraton Hotel, Pittsburgh, Pa., February 12, 1962)

Chairman Walker, Congressman FULTON, ladies and gentlemen, fellow Republicans, your very gracious and enthusiastic welcome to a stranger in your midst warms my heart. May I extend to each and every one of you in this large assemblage my heartfelt mahalo—thanks—and my fondest aloha. To be invited to speak in this grand State, the home of my distinguished and able colleagues, Senator HUGH SCOTT, Congressman JIM FULTON, and Congressman BOB CORBETT, is a signal honor, for they are indeed great Republican representatives and honored men of our Nation.

Until tonight you and I were unacquainted, our home States separated by an entire continent and half an ocean. And yet I sense a most comforting glow of fellowship and comradeship—first, because we are all Americans, and, second, because we are all Republicans.

It is fitting then that we meet tonight on this, the 153d anniversary of the birth of America's beloved Abraham Lincoln, to pay homage to our party leader, the man who belongs to the ages and to all peoples.

For, on the long rollcall of renowned heroes and celebrated leaders our country has produced, Abraham Lincoln is undoubtedly the best known and most revered American throughout this entire planet—by men, women, and children of all colors, all creeds, all walks of life.

That he preserved the union of American States was indeed a monumental achievement, certainly sufficient to earn for him a permanent place in history. But his universal esteem rests upon yet another attribute: his ingrained, unswerving, and dedicated humanitarianism. A champion of human liberty, Lincoln was a compassionate friend of all humanity.

This is the key to his enduring fame—to this universal appeal—to the trust and faith which the people reposed in him.

Though Lincoln rose to a very elevated station in life, he never forgot his humble beginnings, and he never lost touch with the common people. "The Lord must love the common people," Lincoln said, "that's why He made so many of them."

And so it came to pass that Abraham Lincoln won everlasting reverence and esteem—not only as a successful politician who twice won America's highest office; not only as a lawyer of honesty, integrity, and ability; not only as a homespun humorist who spoke in persuasive parables; not only as the father of the Republican Party—but first and foremost as a humanitarian.

As men and women who believe in his precepts, who belong to his political party, who aspire to lead his countrymen, it behooves us to trod more firmly in his footsteps, to be convincing champions of human liberty as he was, to have compassion for our fellow Americans, to stay closer to the people.

As we face the coming elections, let us in all candor ask ourselves: Have we, as the party of Lincoln, given sufficient impetus to humanitarian programs, or have we lost touch with millions upon millions of our fellow Americans who no longer regard Republicans as their champions?

The preponderance of evidence suggests we have increasingly lost support of the people. Surveys show that Republicans fail to command majority allegiance of a single major group in America. Only 12 percent of unskilled workers believe the Republican Party best serves their interests; only 13 percent of skilled workers; 16 percent of farmers; 22 percent of business and professional workers; and only 23 percent of white collar workers.

Meanwhile, more than half of the unskilled workers, more than half of the skilled workers, more than half of the farmers, more than half of the business and professional workers and more than one-third of the white collar workers think the Democratic Party best serves their interests.

Furthermore, one recent survey shows 79 percent of the American people approve the way the head of the Democratic Party is handling his job as President—and that this popularity is high throughout most segments of the population and in all major regions of the country. Incredibly, the high point of popularity occurred right after the Cuba fiasco.

Such popularity, if true, is indeed incredible considering the blunders and broken promises of this administration at home and abroad.

Most memorable, of course, was Cuba. Having decided to sponsor the Cuban exiles' return to Cuba, the administration doomed it to failure by canceling air support at the Bay of Pigs. Then followed an ignoble sequel—the tractors-for-Castro deal instigated by the White House.

Let us hope the administration's recent action against Communist Cuba is not another case of too little, too late.

Then you remember there was Laos, where the administration learned the hard way that brave words are no match for Communist guns. Now the administration is trying to salvage the independence of Laos by a coalition government including Communists.

Does the police department ask criminals to join the force?

When India invaded Goa in an act of brazen aggression, the administration expressed regrets and then announced it would continue a multibillion-dollar aid program to Nehru.

Who said crime does not pay?

Remember the promises made in 1960 to help our crowded cities rebuild slum areas? In one of its first urban renewal projects, this administration gave $2 million to a ghost town in Texas, population 1,863. The funds were to rebuild homes, stores, and industries. The only hitch is there is no water available for industry. The mayor of Wink, Tex., summed it up when he said: "It almost knocked me dead when we got the money approved."

The administration also thought it had the answer to unemployment. Last year it hired 78,000 extra workers and now it wants to hire 46,000 more. But when all was said and done, average unemployment rose to a 20-year high.

In the brave new world of the New Frontier we were promised our economy would grow at the rate of 5 percent a year. But when all the backing and filling was over and the dust from the New Frontiersmen had settled, economic growth surged ahead at only 1.8 percent.

That 90 percent of parity income for farmers, so glibly promised in 1960, fell to a 1939-depression low of 79 under the New Frontier.

There was a lot the New Frontiersmen did not do that needs mentioning, too.

They did not pass civil rights legislation as they promised to do among the first orders of business.

They did not pass aid to education as they promised they would promptly do. It seems their 2 to 1 majority in the Congress was not enough.

They did not enact a medical care plan for the aged as they promised they would do immediately.

They did not balance the budget.

They did not enact tax reforms.

They did not revise the farm laws.

To recite the blunders and broken promises of this administration causes me no jubilation, and I am sure causes you no jubilation. We all deeply regret them. For as Americans we all want the President of the United States, whether he is Democrat or Republican, to succeed in the conduct of foreign relations and in promoting the well-being of the American people. The success or failure of the President's policies determines the destiny, indeed the very survival, of our beloved country.

As the loyal opposition, we Republicans have a solemn and constant duty to act responsibly. I know I speak for all Republicans when I say: "We will not play fast and loose" with America's foreign policy.

We will not endanger our country by phony charges of missile gap, phony charges of a space lag, phony charges of a second-rate standard of living and economic and technological growth.

I believe Republicans as a whole behaved with great restraint and great statesmanship during the foreign crises of the past year. As a matter of fact, I can tell you that it was Republicans who helped to stiffen the administration just when it appeared to be softening on Berlin. It was Republicans who helped put some backbone in the administration's Red China policy.

Yet today, despite all the blunders and broken promises, if the polls are right, nearly 9 out of 10 Democrats, three out of 4 Protestants, and nearly 6 out of 10 Republicans approve the way the President is handling his office. If the polls are right, 78 percent of the voters favor a Democratic Congress.

Now, maybe the polls are inaccurate and inconclusive. But there is other evidence which no sensible Republican can disregard, and that is actual election results.

The indisputable fact is that the Republican Party has had majority support in only 2 Congresses out of the past 16. Since 1930, Republicans controlled both Houses of Congress only 4 years, and only by a whisker in 1953 and 1954.

Equally dreary is our record on the Presidency—in the past 30 years a Republican occupied the White House only 8 years. In the 1960 presidential election, Republicans carried only 14 out of 41 cities over 300,000 population. This cost us victory.

An analysis of this dismal record in big cities shows just how much the party of Lincoln has lost touch with the millions of Americans living in metropolitan areas. In 25 major cities representing 25 million people, there are only 37 full-time Republican employees—less than 1 per every 700,000 persons. It is a political verity that in the big cities the Republican Party is outmanned, outorganized, outspent and outworked.

Even in Congress where Republicans comprise 36 percent of the Senate, we have been derelict in fighting for and insisting on proportionate representation on the congressional committee staffs. In one Senate committee, we are outnumbered 43 to 3, staffwise. We asked for 1 out of 10 and were turned down flatly a few days ago. Certainly to protect our minority rights a Republican filibuster is justified.

Without question, as we Republicans face the 1962 elections, in many places we are the decided underdogs, while the Democrats are riding the crest of the wave of a very popular President. What's more, they have a well-staffed, well-financed organization, buttressed by the extensive apparatus of many other organizations.

While we need not be discouraged by our past defeats, we had better get busy if we want to win.

Lincoln himself suffered defeats. He lost his first try for the Illinois State Legislature. He failed to receive the nomination for Congress when he first sought it. Although elected to Congress on a later try, he was defeated for reelection to the House. Twice he lost elections for U.S. Senator.

But, firm in his convictions on constitutional government, fiscal responsibility, and human rights, Lincoln persevered, took his case to the people, and eventually won their support not once but twice for our most coveted office.

Although the tide appears to be running against us Republicans, it is possible to win against the tide. In Hawaii's first election after statehood in 1959, the Republicans entered the campaign facing a tough uphill battle. We had suffered three successive and bad election defeats after 50 years of rule. Political prognosticators predicted another Republican disaster at the polls which would carry me to defeat, too.

Here is how we fooled the pollsters.

We were determined that we would not allow our cause to be lost because of shoddy preparation nor because we failed to organize in such a manner as to be persuasive to the citizenry.

How to organize and how to win an election when dealing with men's minds is certainly an abstract question. In the final analysis, we saw the sea of faces that comprised the electorate as individuals who must be contacted as individuals either at their homes or at their places of employment.

In this sea of faces, we discovered that there were approximately 5,000 schoolteachers, 4,000 insurance salesmen, 500 physicians, 400 lawyers, 300 dentists, 1,400 beauticians, and so forth.

We then asked a small group of schoolteachers to form the nucleus of a bigger group to talk to their fellow schoolteachers and we finally succeeded in having at least three persons in each school working for my election.

We did the same in all categories: doctors, lawyers, accountants, dentists, architects, engineers, or barbers, and so on.

Work was so divided that no one person had the burden of having to see too many people. By this method, we soon found out who was for me and who was against me. If someone were for me, he was solicited to talk to his friends in my behalf and if someone were against me, we looked for his friends to speak to him in my favor.

As individuals by their places of employment, they were classified as employees in public utilities, automotive establishments, hospitals, laundries, restaurants, gas stations, drugstores, financial institutions, contracting firms, advertising agencies, Government departments sugar and pineapple plantations, canneries, docks, and so on. These classifications were further subdivided. For example, the classification of public utilities was subdivided into electric, gas, water, sewage, and transportation. These classifications were further subdivided. For example, transportation was broken down into airlines, buses, steamships, and taxicabs.

Following further subclassifications, airlines, for example, were divided into Pan American Airlines, United Airlines, Hawaiian Airlines, and Aloha Airlines.

In each company, we found at least one to three persons to help us in the election. Such detailed classifications enabled us to find or to place at least one person who was responsible to deliver the votes in each restaurant, in each gasoline station, and in each drugstore.

We also attacked the problem by church membership. Churches were subdivided into Mormon, Seventh-day Adventist, Pentecostal, Baptist, Methodist, Catholic, Congregational, Buddhist, and so on. These were further subdivided into individual churches, and in each church we enlisted a few of the members to talk to their fellow worshipers.

It is a cardinal principle of politics that the voter must be asked to vote for you. It is best that the candidate ask for that vote. If not, then someone close to him or one of his friends or workers.

Many, many times I was told by people I had never met until I shook their hands, "Don't worry, HIRAM; so-and-so has already asked me to vote for you."

An entirely distinct and separate team was organized on the precinct level. This took care of the voters by precincts. In each precinct, we tried to have at least 30 to 40 friends who were willing to talk to the persons living in their precincts and ask them to vote for me.

Over and above all, I went out to meet the voters in the stores, shops, offices, and fields and used radio, television, and newspapers to get my message to the people.

Other candidates on the Republican Party ticket in Hawaii also carried on an aggressive, hard-hitting, and well-organized campaign. The net result was: Republicans captured the governorship, the lieutenant governorship, one U.S. Senate seat, and control of the Hawaii State Senate, all contrary to the predictions of the pollsters.

Now one swallow does not make a summer. And one victory in State politics does not make me an expert. I must confess to great trepidation and to great humility as I dare to offer suggestions to this politically experienced and astute audience.

But, as I looked at the figures showing how our party has lost touch with the American people in the major occupational groups and in the big cities, it occurred to me that one way our party can regain rapport with them is to organize and campaign by occupational groups and by precincts as I did. This type of campaigning cuts across social, economic, political, and racial barriers. Too long have we Republicans ignored the fundamental need to reach the individual voter.

Seventy percent of our U.S. population lives in urban areas. Yet look how we have neglected these millions of voters. City pluralities robbed our presidential candidate of victories in States like Illinois and right here in Pennsylvania in 1960. More than a year has elapsed, and still we have not taken the requisite steps to put the cities into the Republican column. By utter default, we have allowed the Democrats to harvest most of these politically ripe plums. Such neglect will cost us victories in the future until we make the necessary effort to reach the millions of city and suburban voters.

If the Republican Party intends to survive, it must win elections. Else we shall be relegated to the role of loyal minority and philosophical debating society—and maybe even to extinction.

If Republicans do not intend to win, then this meeting and those Lincoln Day dinners throughout the country are merely exercises in futility.

Taking first things first, then, our overriding consideration as a party and our first priority is to capture every possible office we can in 1962. Our least concern for the moment is the 1964 presidential election.

For this year's contests are not national elections—they are State and local elections, calling for grassroots organization, grassroots financing, grassroots programs, and grassroots candidates. The local ticket, the State ticket, local and State issues—these are the critical and determining factors in 1962.

Good will and voter support for Republicans in Portland, in Chicago, San Francisco, New York City, Honolulu, Pittsburgh, and all points in between depend upon what Republicans do to earn good will and support in Portland, in Chicago, San Francisco, New York City, Honolulu, Pittsburgh, and all points in between.

Therefore, it is imperative that we Republicans perfect our in-State organization for 1962, to solicit sufficient funds within our States to finance adequately the 1962 campaigns, to select within our States personable and appealing candidates of character and ability who are willing to work hard for their own election, and to devise within our State programs acceptable to a majority of voters within our respective States. Don't make the saddest of political mistakes, to hitch your political fortunes to a star in Washington, D.C., or anywhere outside your own State. By all means, hitch it to those at home, to those who travel in the political orbit of your choosing.

Let us not bewail the fact nor be disheartened that we do not have the Presidency, for history is with us in that the party out of the White House almost always gains in the congressional by-elections.

The big impetus for Republican victories in cities and States this year will come—certainly, not from far-off Washington, D.C.—but from the State and local Republican organizations within each of the States.

This is the way for Republicans to capture more governorships, more State legislatures, more U.S. House and Senate seats, more mayoralities and more council seats.

If a conservative platform and conservative candidates are what New Hampshire voters want in 1962, the Republican Party in New Hampshire should give them the best conservative platform it can devise and the best conservative candidates it can find.

If a liberal platform and liberal candidates are what New York voters want in 1962, the Republican Party should give them the best liberal combination it can produce.

If a moderate platform and moderate candidates are what Michigan voters want, the Republican Party in Michigan should give them the very best moderate team it can produce.

Certainly, we will not win everywhere in the country this year with a monolithic Republicanism. What might win majority support in New Jersey might lose in Indiana, so, let us not be so foolish and shortsighted as to disclaim those who may disagree with us on some issues.

Let us not try to silence the voices of our distinguished party speakers who are eloquent exponents of Republican principles as they interpret them. Such variation is a party strength, not a weakness, for it enables us to draw support from all areas of the United States. Our party is a confederation of 50 State parties, each of which has its own identity and shapes its own image. Differences on details indicate vitality and form the basis for progress. Too much in-breeding results in stagnation and sterility. What a party needs to endure is fresh ideas, new approaches, and new programs.

So let us not disparage our fellow Republicans just because their brand of Republicanism differs in some respects from our own. For who is to say which is the only right version of Republicanism? When election day arrives, the votes are counted—not as conservative, not as liberal, not as mederate—but as Republican or Democrat.

On fundamentals of constitutional government, fiscal responsibility, and human rights, we all agree or we would not call ourselves Republicans.

This, then, my Republican colleagues, is a plea for party unity in these crucial elections of 1962. Let us forgo quibbling among ourselves. Party quarrels drain our strength and can only help the Democrats. Let us unite as we have never united before.

Let Republicans everywhere put out a big welcome to voters to join us—regardless of age, regardless of ideological complexion, just so long as they subscribe to our fundamental party tenets.

We Republicans must do everything we can to strengthen our party in the States and nothing to weaken ourselves. Then in 1964, out of the blending of the visionary, the experienced, the new and the old, the liberal, the conservative, and all the in-betweens, we can present an image appealing to the vast majority of Americans.

Every indication is that, by all odds, most Americans prefer a philosophy that is forward-looking but not radical; one that is guided by past experience but not immovable; one that adheres to the Constitution but accepts change and willingly innovates; one that safeguards our individual freedoms and the buying power of our dollars but permits government to help us solve our problems when needed.

All Americans agree we must safeguard freedom and safeguard our money, but they also want to know: How do Republicans propose to strengthen education in America, to rebuild our blighted cities, to create jobs for our expanding population, to take care of the unemployed, to provide medical care for our senior citizens—to meet the real and human problems confronting us today?

As Lincoln said so wisely, "The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present."

In the stormy present, we Republicans cannot clothe ourselves in constitutional platitudes and remain aloof from the real and pressing problems of people. We must face up to these problems and offer sensible solutions. Actions speak louder than words. What we Republicans do and say we will do, to solve the problems of housing, education, unemployment, old-age needs, and all the other pressing problems of our modern society will determine whether we will gain and retain the trust and faith of the people.

Our greatest hope of reviving this image falls upon Republican Party organizations in each of the 50 States. If falls upon you and upon me. For if we take care of that image at the local level, at the State level, we can be sure that our Republican image will be good at the national level.

Moreover, if we Republicans fail to meet the human needs and human aspirations of our countrymen, our party may dwindle into nothingness and America may become a one-party Nation with all its tragic implications.

As Republicans, we are the trustees of the legacy of Lincoln. He showed us the way to the affections of the people.

Let us follow it.

Thank you. Good night and aloha.

BEFORE IT IS TOO LATE

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the Record an article entitled "Before It Is Too Late," written by Nino Maritano and published in the Commonweal of February 9, 1962.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Before It Is Too Late

(By Nino Maritano)

When I left Guatemala, the last of five Central American countries I visited, it was my impression that people of Central America are well aware of what is going on in their countries and abroad. Perhaps because of this increasing awareness they are tired of words and promises.

It was made clear to me by thousands of workers campesinos (small farmers) and professional men in the Central American nations that changes ought to take place. According to them a radical institutional evolution is necessary to break away from the present feudalistic form of society in which they live. I was told time and again that if drastic changes do not materialize soon, the Communists will have excellent grounds for their own revolution. But the people of Central America do not expect such changes to come from their wealthy present leaders, whom they distrust and hate. Thus communism seems to them as almost the only certain alternative.

Central Americans, like all Latin Americans, have long memories. They remind you of the time when the great fruit companies, by their political and financial intrigues, kept large areas of Central America in turmoil. They did not hide from this writer the fact that even today venality and influence play a disastrous role in the economic development of their countries. They do not expect any improvement from fantastic and vague economic programs. Empty and nonimplemented social legislation can no longer satisfy the hungry and destitute 75 percent of the population of Central America.

Besides, it is written in their eyes, they want a better life for themselves and for their children today, not tomorrow. But with the disparity between wages and prices—when there is a wage and a price—it is simply not possible for most Central Americans to make a living. Prices are high and capricious all over Central America. I discovered that a cup of coffee in El Salvador, Costa Rica, Guatemala, and Honduras costs from 10 to 12 cents. A bottle of local beer costs from 35 to 50 cents. A decent room in any hotel or pension goes from $5 to $15. A sandwich costs from 45 to 70 cents. The price of clothes is as high as in the United States—always higher than in any country in Europe. I found in El Salvador and Nicaragua, which are among the poorest nations of Central America, that it costs $25 to have a tooth filled, $20 to have it pulled. Any physical examination by any doctor costs from $5 to $20. Local shoes vary from $8 to $15; imported shoes cost from $35 to $50.

Yet wages all over are as low as 30 to 50 cents a day. The average wage for 90 percent of Central American workers is less than 75 cents a day. A waiter or waitress, for example, earns not more than $10 to $20 a month, putting in around 60 hours a week and 10 hours of work a day.

No Salvadorian, Nicaraguan, Costa Rican, or Guatemalan I met accepts such wages as just in countries where members of old Spanish families pad through the halls of mansions costing $3 million, $4 million, or $5 million. Moreover, such wages are for those who are lucky enough to get a job. If one adds to all this the chronic unemployment in all cities and towns of the Central American nations, the creeping inflation, the average earnings of many campesinos which amounts to something like $3 or $4 a month, one begins to understand the economic despair of so many of the Central American people, their impatience and bitterness, their readiness to revolt.

Why, they ask you, should a very few in our countries (4 or 5 percent of the population) dance in a sea of gold and light and 90 percent of the people in rural areas huddle at night around a fire outside a one-room hut and wash the only clothes they own at the light of a meager flame? Why, ask a group of young workers from El Salvador, should the sons and daughters of the few rich go to study at the most expensive colleges and universities abroad, touring Washington, Rome, and Paris in Cadillacs, when 70 percent or more of the families from Nicaragua, Honduras, and El Salvador are unable to have their children fed decently and taught how to read and write? I heard the same question echoed in Nicaragua, Honduras, and Guatemala.

The claim of the local aristocracy that the poor in Central America enjoy their way of life and have no desire to improve their social and economic conditions makes them laugh bitterly. Like any other human beings, Central American men and women prefer adequate housing to a hut. All poor young couples wish that they could afford better furniture in their dwellings and decent clothes for their little ones. No destitute Indian in Guatemala, no unemployed worker in El Salvador or Nicaragua, no poor mother from Costa Rica or Honduras I talked to blesses the hunger and death of her children, or wishes them to grow up ignorant and illiterate.

It is also unfair and false to say, as I heard many Europeans and Americans insist, that the average Central American is lazy and does not want to work. I saw thousands of them at work: businessmen, professional people, government employees, skilled and manual workers of both sexes. Those who can find work, work hard—in many instances much harder than we do. No American or European woman could stand the fatigue and hardship of the average Salvadorian or Guatemalan woman in the fields, in a factory or in a marketplace. The American construction worker would call slave labor the hours and the speed required from a Costa Rican or a Nicaraguan construction worker.

One would have to go back one or two hundred years in the history of this country or of Europe to find conditions comparable to the inhuman conditions borne by people working for a few absentee barons, landlords, or corporations in Central America. But no matter how bad those conditions are, how meager the reward is, the average Central American wants to work; he is constantly looking for a steady employment.

The poor resent, moreover, the fact that even in these abject conditions they are the only people in their countries who pay high taxes. They realize that since the governments themselves are deep in the affairs of business, people in privileged positions of government will not tax themselves. As a matter of fact, this interlocking of government and business is so widespread and so grave in Nicaragua and Honduras that it is difficult to say where private enterprise stops and public enterprise takes over. In too many parts of Central America the governors and senators are the most economically and financially powerful persons. They are owners of banks, plantations, shipping, urban real estate, airlines, railroad companies. On top of this, there is not a progressive but rather a regressive taxation system. For instance, it is impossible for the poor to escape tax eviction, but it is a mere question of routine for the rich to evade millions of dollars in taxation.

Many Central American economists and honest businessmen I talked to are convinced that this abusive system of taxation, among other things, explains a great deal of the backwardness of the Central American economy. Honest fiscal policy and effective public administration of the physical and human resources, they believe, are basic requirements for the economic development of their countries. But honest and effective administrations, according to some able and brilliant Salvadoran public servants, are impossible without a more human social philosophy, which too many political leaders and the wealthy elite alike lack totally.

Without some effective principles of human rights, and of equitable redistribution of wealth, no capital formation for sound investments, they feel, is really possible. No foreign aid will do any good. On this point, it was a shocking experience for me to find out in a survey taken among all groups of Central American people that more than 90 percent of them are against unconditional American aid. President Kennedy's Alliance for Progress will be a failure, they tell you, if every American cent is not supervised by honest American technicians with the help of honest and able Central Americans.

As a matter of fact, as far as I could see, the American dollars which have been poured into Central America have not won for us a single friend among the mass of people. The average Central American dislikes and is suspicious of the gringos. One reason for this, among others, I was told, is the fact that they have never seen any good results from American loans or grants. American money is too often used, or rather misused, for personal advantage. Thus the unemployed in El Salvador, the oppressed in Nicaragua, the poor campesino in Honduras, the underpaid worker in Costa Rica and the Indian in Guatemala all feel that the American dollars, if they come, serve in fact only one purpose: to keep in power inefficient governments and to perpetuate the startling contrast of economic misery for the majority and extravagant wealth for the few.

The sympathy for President Kennedy found among people of all the Central American nations is, I believe, quite significant in this regard. Kennedy understands our situation, they say. He is realistic, honest, and blunt. They think that if the social reform conditions of the Alliance for Progress are carried out, lots of things will be improved. But they all predicted to me that any such clause of conditional help will be opposed by most of their governments.

It is the deep conviction of this writer that the Central American people are not really Communist or communistic, but they do have a deep and increasing desire for social justice. They are not rebellious people, either, but misery and despair, if not drastically curbed, can in the very near future force them to become both rebellious and Communist. The governments of Central America give the impression of being afraid of sound social economic reforms. Some of them let the people believe that any social change will be economically disastrous by invoking the outmoded classical liberal theory of capital formation. This is an old story which no economist would accept today. On the contrary, a minimum of social justice, in terms of honest administration, sound fiscal policy, better redistribution of income, a minimum wage and job opportunity, constitute the very necessary conditions and bases for economic development, growth, and progress.

Drastic social reforms are not only the sole alternative to Castroism or communism in Central America, but also the only way out of the economic backwardness and bankruptcy of a feudalistic system, and the only way that political and economic democracy can appeal to the intelligent Central American.

Let us not label as communistic the elementary aspirations of the citizens of Central America. These aspirations are too human and too Christian to be confused with the brutality of communism. But they are also too urgent to be ignored. The future of much more than Central America itself is at stake; it would be a tragedy for the whole hemisphere if Central America were lost. I must confess, however, that I left Central America with the feeling that if it is already late for some Central America governments, it is too late altogether for the irresponsible Central American aristocracy.

MIGRATORY LABOR POLICY

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, only recently, events have occurred which are, I believe, prophetic of the general attitude and determination which may be anticipated during this session of the Congress respecting the need for migratory farmworker legislation. The President's Committee on Migratory Labor, at its first meeting during the Kennedy administration, established a united policy for the improvement of the economic and social conditions of migratory farmworkers and their families.

The Committee, under the chairmanship of the Secretary of Labor, Arthur J. Goldberg, is composed of the Secretary of Agriculture, Orville L. Freeman; the Secretary of Interior, Stewart L. Udall; the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Abraham A. Ribicoff; and the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, Robert C. Weaver.

That the Kennedy administration recognizes the pressing need for remedial legislation in the field of migratory farmworker problems is well demonstrated by the fact that this Committee meeting was attended by all of its distinguished members. In attendance also were the Honorable Harrison A. Williams, Jr., the distinguished junior Senator from New Jersey, and the Honorable Herbert Zelenko, Congressman from New York. Senator Williams, as chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, has made commendable efforts in bringing to the attention of the Congress and the public the plight of our migratory farmworkers and their families. In this endeavor, he has been most ably assisted on the House side by Congressman Zelenko.

Mr. President, the migratory farm labor problem presents an anomaly within our economy and society which will continue to perpetuate itself until national leadership has resulted in the implementation of practical solutions. During the last session of the Congress, notable progress was made in this direction with the Senate's passage of five migratory farmworker bills. These bills would provide prohibitions against agricultural child labor; improved educational opportunities for migratory farm children and adults; Federal registration of crew leaders; improved health services for migratory farm families; and the establishment of a National Advisory Council on Migratory Labor. This legislation is now, of course, before the House of Representatives.

I should like to point out, Mr. President, that the success of these migratory farmworker bills is largely attributable to the perseverance and dynamic leadership of Senator Williams.

The outcome of the recent meeting of the President's Committee on Migratory Labor was a truly outstanding and encouraging statement of policy, recommendations and directives respecting the pressing need for remedial legislation in the area of migratory farmworker problems.

In presenting its statement, the President's Committee evidenced its strong support of the five migratory labor bills passed by the Senate during the last session of the Congress. Furthermore, it urged prompt and favorable action on these bills by the House of Representatives. The Committee's statement also included its recommendations on those migratory labor bills which are now pending before the Senate and on other related aspects of the migratory farm labor problem.

Following the meeting of the President's Committee on Migratory Labor, President Kennedy issued a statement in which he wholeheartedly supported the committee's view that a united policy is necessary for the improvement of conditions under which migratory farmworkers and their families live and work.

The President specifically noted:

> The five migrant bills introduced by Senator Harrison A. Williams, of New Jersey, and passed by the Senate during the last session of the Congress offer the opportunity to make real progress in this important area consonant with the committee's recommendations.

The President's letter and the statement of policy by the President's Committee on Migratory Labor offer positive recognition of the need for improvement of economic and social conditions of migratory farmworkers and their families. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that they be included in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the letter and statement were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The White House,
Washington, January 17, 1962.

The Honorable Arthur J. Goldberg,
Secretary of Labor,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Secretary: I have read the statement of policy, recommendations, and directives of the President's Committee on Migratory Labor which you sent to me today. I wholeheartedly endorse the Committee's view that a united policy is necessary if improvements are to be made in this important field.

Having been long acquainted with the problems faced by migratory farmworkers and their families, I believe the Committee has outlined in its recommendations and directives the major areas of concern. A followthrough on the Committee's recommendations will, in my opinion, result in better conditions for the Nation's migrants—one of the most underprivileged groups in the American labor force. The five migrant bills introduced by Senator Harrison A. Williams, of New Jersey, and passed by the Senate during the last session of Congress offer the opportunity to make real progress in this important area consonant with the Committee's recommendations. I hope these bills will receive favorable action by the House this year.

John F. Kennedy.

Statement of Policy, Recommendations and Directives of the President's Committee on Migratory Labor

STATEMENT OF POLICY

Migratory agricultural workers have been given many names—"Excluded Americans," "Forgotten Americans," and the "Nation's Derelicts," among many others. Regardless what they are called, migrants perform an extremely important service to farming communities throughout the Nation during certain seasons of peak agricultural activity. Their appearance in an area may mean the difference between economic success and economic disaster. Between seasons, they retire to shack and shanty towns well off the main roads in their home base areas—out of sight and out of mind.

Domestic migrants are displaced people, usually lacking in education and bereft of training in anything other than agriculture. Most are members of minority groups—Negro, Mexican-American, Puerto Rican, and American Indian. Many are former sharecroppers, tenant and marginal farmers, and regularly hired laborers who have been replaced either by machines or foreign labor. They migrate because there are not enough jobs in their local communities to sustain them, or because local wages are too low to provide for the necessities of life.

Together, they comprise a depressed class of agricultural wage earners; a group which for many years has remained outside the broad scope of public concern and policy.

They are among the lowest paid of any group in the American labor force, able to find employment on only half the days of each year. They are excluded from most of the great social and economic legislation which protects the vast majority of American wage earners. Because they are constantly on the move, their children are denied the opportunity to receive an adequate education, and restrictive residence requirements deny them public health and welfare services. In many cases this restriction extends even to that most basic of American rights—the right to vote.

In their everlasting search for work, domestic migrants are forced to compete with hundreds of thousands of foreign workers for the few jobs that are available to them. Yet to many growers across the country, these workers are indispensable to harvesting, their importance far exceeding their numbers during crucial periods of the agricultural cycle.

The President's Committee on Migratory Labor recognizes the many earnest efforts made on behalf of the Nation's migrant workers by church, civic, farm, and labor groups in a great number of communities throughout the country. The Committee believes that as long as migrancy continues, the need for community services will also continue, and urges that there be no relaxation of these commendable programs.

The Committee also recognizes the valuable services of its working group, the members of which often contribute their own time in planning and programing interdepartmental services for migrants. The many National and State committees and organizations concerned with the problem of migratory labor have accomplished a great deal in publicizing the need for sound remedial action, and working for its realization. For over 2 years Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, of New Jersey, aided in the House by Congressman HERBERT ZELENKO, of New York, has worked strenuously on a migrant legislative program. Senator WILLIAMS, with the help of Congressman ZELENKO has done much to focus public and official attention on the migratory labor problem and has helped bring the extension of protective legislation to migrants closer to actuality than ever before in history.

The chief purpose of the first meeting of the President's Committee on Migratory Labor under the Kennedy administration is to establish a united Committee policy directed toward improving the economic and social condition of migrant farmworkers and their families. It is the Committee's hope that all public policy will be directed toward the creation of a stable and structured labor force in American agriculture, rather than toward the perpetuation of the present anachronistic labor system based on unemployment, underemployment, and poverty, both at home and abroad. The Committee supports a sound farm program which will assure prosperity for all American farmers, but insists that such prosperity be shared by all segments of the agricultural community, including both migratory and permanent hired labor.

It is, therefore, the policy of the President's Committee on Migratory Labor to accomplish in agriculture what we, as a nation, have already accomplished in most other sectors of our economy—the restoration of respect and dignity, based on good wages, good working conditions, steady employment, educational opportunities, and the extension of public health and welfare services to the men, women, and children who labor for hire in American agriculture.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND DIRECTIVES

I. *Federal Legislation*

A. *Legislation Passed by the Senate.*—The President's Committee on Migratory Labor recommends prompt and favorable action by the House of Representatives on five migrant labor measures passed by the Senate during the first session of the Congress. The Committee believes that passage of these bills would mark a historic turning point in public policy toward farm migrants and their families. Briefly, the five measures are as follows:

1. *Registration of farm labor contractors.*—Require registration of crew leaders and labor contractors in an effort to protect migrants against exploitation.

2. *Child labor.*—To extend the protection of the child labor provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act to the children of migratory farmworkers.

3. *Health services*—Grants to States to extend public health services to migrants and their families.

4. *Education.*—Grants-in-aid on a matching basis to States and local communities to help provide educational opportunities to both migrant children and adults.

5. *National Advisory Council on Migratory Labor.*—Composed of representatives of migrants, farm employers and experts in the field of migrant health, welfare, education, and employment, to advise the President and the Congress on matters pertaining to migratory labor.

B. *Other Migrant Legislation.*—The President's Committee on Migratory Labor, in seeking to remedy other areas of longstanding distress from which migratory and other farmworkers suffer, recommend that the Congress give serious consideration to the following proposals, each within its own context:

1. *Domestic worker stabilization.*—The President's Committee on Migratory Labor recommends prompt consideration and passage by the Congress of the measures introduced as the National Farm Labor Stabilization Act. The Committee believes the provisions of this bill would make it economically possible for many additional underemployed rural workers to accept employment in agriculture. This would work to the advantage of farm employers as well as employees.

2. *Minimum wages.*—The President's Committee on Migratory Labor supports in principle the appropriate extension of minimum wage legislation to agriculture. The Committee believes that there is rising public support for an agricultural minimum wage. This support comes not only from groups and individuals usually associated with reform in the farm labor field, but from many growers and their organizations as well. It is becoming increasingly apparent that growers who reside in States where farm labor wage rates are relatively high are at a competitive disadvantage with growers in low-wage States. The Committee directs the secretariat to review legislative proposals in this field, and in so doing to take into account the problems faced by farm operators whose difficulties are fully appreciated by the Committee.

3. *Day care.*—The President's Committee on Migratory Labor supports legislation which would provide grants-in-aid to the States on a matching basis to provide day-care centers for the children of migratory agricultural workers. Under present conditions, the children of migrants who are too young to work are left at the home camp during the workday without sufficient care, or are taken to the fields where dangerous conditions prevail.

4. *Housing.*—The President's Committee on Migratory Labor supports in principle legislation which would aid farmers and farm wage earners in improving on-farm and home-base housing. The Housing Act of 1961 will be of help in this regard, but it is possible that additional legislation may be necessary. The Committee recommends, therefore, that Congress give serious consideration to bills, introduced by Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS and others, which would provide direct loans to associations of farmers and other nonprofit organizations for improvement of off-farm housing. The PCML recommends also that the secretariat give further study to adjustments in the Housing Act of 1961 which would make it easier to provide adequate housing for farmworkers.

5. *Labor-management relations.*—The President's Committee on Migratory Labor supports in principle the appropriate extension of collective bargaining rights to agricultural workers. The Committee recognizes, however, that the unstructured and diversified character of both agriculture and agricultural labor must be properly considered before the type and scope of enabling legislation can be determined. The Committee's secretariat is accordingly directed to initiate a study of this problem and forward recommendations to the Chairman of the Committee as soon as possible.

6. *Unemployment insurance.*—The President's Committee on Migratory Labor supports in principle the extension of unemployment insurance legislation to agriculture. Specific recommendations in this field will be made following completion of studies now underway by the U.S. Department of Labor in cooperation with several State employment security agencies.

7. *Residence requirements.*—The great majority of States have residence requirements which exclude financially needy migrant workers and their families from public assistance. The President's Committee on Migratory Labor recommends that serious study be given to this problem by Federal and State authorities, with a view to eliminating or reducing the hardships these requirements impose on domestic migratory workers.

II. *Administration of Legislation Passed During the 1st Session of the 87th Congress and Other Programs Which Relate to Agricultural Labor*

A. *Public Law 78* (*Mexican Farm Labor Program*) *and Other Foreign Worker Legislation.*—The President's Committee on Migratory Labor believes that the amendments to Public Law 78 passed during the 1st session of the 87th Congress will be of help to the Secretary of Labor in preventing adverse effect to domestic farmworkers. The Committee would like to point out that in a statement accompanying H.R. 2010 (extension of Public Law 78, as amended), President Kennedy said the following: "The adverse effect of the Mexican farm labor program as it has operated in recent years on the wage and employment conditions of domestic workers is clear and cumulative in its impact. We cannot afford to disregard it. We do not condone it. Therefore I sign this bill with the assurance that the Secretary of Labor will, by every means at his disposal, use the authority vested in him under the law to prescribe the standards and to make the determinations essential for the protection of the wages and working conditions of domestic agricultural workers." The President's Committee on Migratory Labor welcomes this forthright statement of policy by the President and the initiative taken by the Secretary of Labor to fulfill this Presidential mandate, and the intent of the Congress. The Committee urges that affiliated State agencies, growers who use foreign labor, and other interested individuals and organizations offer their full cooperation to the Secretary of Labor. In line with this, the Committee recommends that growers who use foreign labor begin now to seek ways and means of recruiting and training available domestic labor, thereby reducing their dependence on foreign labor. The Committee recommends also that present farm placement activities be expanded to help achieve full utilization of unemployed and underemployed rural workers. Finally the Committee asserts that the temporary admission of aliens for work in agriculture under the Immigration and

Nationality Act, Public Law 414, can be no substitute for the kind of bilateral agreement that exists between the United States and Mexico for the temporary admission of Mexican nationals for work in agriculture under Public Law 78.

B. *Area Redevelopment and Rural Area Development Programs.*—The President's Committee on Migratory Labor directs the secretariat to study provisions of the Area Redevelopment Act and rural area development programs to determine how the benefits of these programs can be extended to migrants and their families—especially to migrants who make their home base in designated redevelopment areas. Recommendations from the secretariat to the Committee members should be made within 90 days of the date of this meeting.

C. *Housing Act of 1961.*—The President's Committee on Migratory Labor directs the secretariat, in cooperation with HHFA and FHA, to initiate an informational campaign to inform farmers and farm wage earners of the provisions of the Housing Act of 1961 which apply to the improvement and construction of home-base and on-farm housing.

D. *Special Food Programs.*—The President's Committee on Migratory Labor recommends additional special efforts to enable more migratory workers and their families to receive the benefits of the national school lunch and special milk programs, and the program under which federally owned foods are made available to the States for distribution to schools, nonprofit institutions, and needy families. The Committee, therefore, directs the secretariat to explore immediate areas of additional action, including the need to work with State migratory labor committees in order to achieve greater use of these programs in assisting migratory farmworkers and their families.

E. *State Programs.*—The President's Committee on Migratory Labor directs the secretariat to work closely with State migratory labor committees in the formation of programs to aid migrants. State committees and agencies are urged to call upon the secretariat for any help they may need in developing and carrying out programs, and are also urged to offer advice and recommendations concerning future actions of the President's Committee on Migratory Labor.

III. *Enforcement of Existing Legislation and Regulations*

A. *Federal Legislation and Regulations.*—The President's Committee on Migratory Labor urges all Federal and cooperating State agencies which administer laws and regulations pertaining to agricultural labor to improve related enforcement and compliance programs. If additional appropriations are necessary, the Committee recommends that the agencies request additional funds from the Congress, and that the Congress give serious consideration to these requests.

B. *State Legislation and Regulations.*—The President's Committee on Migratory Labor urges those States which have laws and regulations applying to agricultural labor to step up their enforcement and compliance programs. State action of this kind is especially needed in the fields of health, housing, or labor camp regulations, and safety regulations governing the transportation of farmworkers. The Committee also urges those States which do not have legislation and regulations pertaining to agricultural labor to act in this area as soon as possible. State action in the field of workmen's compensation is especially needed.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the efforts of Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS and his Subcommittee on Migratory Labor and the administration's support of remedial migratory labor legislation have received well deserved attention in an informative editorial which appeared in the New York Times on January 28, 1962. The editorial entitled "An End to Farm Peonage" succinctly states:

> It is up to Washington to rescue agricultural workers from semipeonage.

Because the editorial is indicative of public interest and concern for the migratory farmworker and his family, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN END TO FARM PEONAGE

President Kennedy and his Cabinet Committee on Migratory Labor have urged the House to pass the five migrant aid bills the Senate approved last year. These bills would require the national registration of farm labor contractors and crew leaders; outlaw child labor in agriculture; open broader health and educational facilities to roving farmworkers and their families, and create a national advisory council to press for improved protection for this most neglected section of our labor force.

The five measures are a monument to the perseverance of Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, of New Jersey, and his Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor. They would extend to migrants some of the safeguards that have long been standard for almost all other American workers.

Their enactment should be followed by measures to establish a minimum wage, unemployment insurance, collective bargaining guarantees and other statutory defenses against the mass exploitation of a group that now works and lives under conditions that are a national disgrace.

In Mississippi farm groups have just upset Federal plans to train 1,200 jobless farm hands for higher paid work as tractor operators. Here, too, it is up to Washington to rescue agricultural workers from semipeonage.

NEEDED: SPEEDED-UP GLOBAL ACTION ON DISARMAMENT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the world—divided into opposing camps possessing awesome, destructive weapons—is faced with alternative challenges of either, first, controlling armaments; or, second, an accidental, or premeditated war—destroying vast portions of the earth.

In the history of international affairs, there are perhaps few topics upon which there has been so much talk and, regrettably, so little progress.

The fundamental reason for this stalemate, of course, is the unwillingness of the Communist camp to adopt realistic safeguards for arms control.

In practice, there has been a generally accepted concept that the nations possessing nuclear weapons should carry the ball on disarmament.

Naturally, these nations need to be included in a general agreement—and should, indeed, out of a sense of responsibility for humanity—assume leadership for such agreement.

Nevertheless, this has not been successful.

For this reason, I believe that, in view of the lack of success in East-West negotiations—the world—through the agency of the United Nations—should undertake a more realistic, dynamic effort to establish and put into effect universally recognized principles of arms reduction and control.

Recently, I was privileged to comment further on this proposal.

I ask unanimous consent to have the statement printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

During the past 16 years, about 70 major East-West conferences, involving hundreds of lesser level meetings, have considered arms reduction and control. Unfortunately, there has been no progress. Why? Because the Communists stubbornly refuse to reach realistic, safeguarded agreements.

The Reds, however, continue to pay lipservice to disarmament. For what purposes? These include:

1. As a deceptive cloak of respectability in a world yearning for peace; and

2. As a kind of Trojan horse tactic to hide overt and covert acts of aggression aimed toward ultimate global conquest.

Currently, Mr. Khrushchev proposes an 18-nation, summit talk on general disarmament. Obviously, the ulterior motive—once again—is to create an international forum for promulgation of high sounding, deceptively worded principles for general disarmament—yet roadblocking any real progress. Realistically, there appears to be little promise that such a summit meeting could be any more successful than in the past.

Officially, the United States, and rightly so, is proceeding cautiously.

NEEDED: U.N. ACTION ON DISARMAMENT

Disarmament, of course, is a global challenge—involving not just the United States, U.S.S.R., and other nuclear powers or even the 18-nation conferees—but all of the 3 billion people on earth.

For this reason, the United Nations, in my judgment, has a fundamental responsibility for creating, according to universally recognized criteria and principles, a realistic, workable arms-control program.

Although the U.N., over the years, has adopted a variety of resolutions, it has failed to deal successfully with problems of disarmament.

Now, the time is ripe to—

Face up to this crucial challenge;

Halt the arms race; and

Create a workable formula for control and reduction of arms in the world.

Until now, there has been too much talk, too little real, effective action.

The specific steps should include the following:

1. The U.N. Disarmament Commission should be given the responsibility, and a deadline, for defining and presenting major alternative proposals to the General Assembly; and

2. The General Assembly should meet, if necessary, in a special session, to "hammer out" a workable program.

Admittedly, throwing the gauntlet to the Reds and to the world on disarmament would involve a stormy session. Despite threats of Red shoe-on-desk pounding, nuclear-missile blackmail, or other front-or-behind-the-scenes pressures, the U.N., fulfilling its obligation to its members and to posterity, should create now realistic standards for arms reduction and control in the world.

In the past, the Reds' major objection to disarmament proposals has been an unwillingness to open Communist territory to inspection, to prevent secret arms buildups and sneak attacks; instead, the Reds proposed simple agreements, depending for compliance upon the integrity of nations.

However, the world, by bitter, bloody experience, has been taught by Hitler, Stalin, Khrushchev, et al., that treaties signed by tyrants are only scraps of paper, to be torn up after they no longer serve the purposes of the aggressor.

In accordance with reason and logic, the U.N. would, I believe, find it not only desirable, but, essential, to endorse safeguarded inspection to any realistic program. Acceptance of this principle by a majority of nations would pull the rug out from under the Soviet position.

The establishment of universally recognized standards on disarmament, of course, would not assure automatic compliance by all nations. Nevertheless, the adoption of a fundamentally sound program would:

1. Give direction and guidance to, and set goals for arms reduction and control;

2. Clearly and distinctly point a finger at Communist or other nations that attempt to roadblock progress; and

3. Provide encouragement for greater dedication of manpower and resources by nations, individually and collectively, to disarmament.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, has morning business been concluded?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has not.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

AMENDMENT OF ACT ESTABLISHING CODE OF LAW FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 5143) to amend section 801 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1962—PROPOSED DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I wish to direct my remarks this afternoon to the proposal to establish a Department of Urban Affairs. To those unacquainted with Senate procedure, the action just taken by the Senate may seem unusual or perhaps even illogical. However, in my vote, which was "nay" on the motion to discharge the committee, there was ample reason to support such a position, even though I oppose the establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs.

First, I do not believe in encircling or usurping the functions of a Senate committee. If the Senate were to start the employment of such tactics as a general rule, we who devote ourselves assiduously to the business of the Senate in committees would soon find that our work was for naught and that our efforts were mostly in vain.

Second, the committee is prepared to report on the resolution, disapproving the reorganization plan. Therefore, I do not believe there is any necessity to skirt committee action through the discharge procedure. I hope the Senate will have an opportunity to vote on the resolution. If we do, my vote will be "yea."

However, as the distinguished majority leader said awhile ago, it is conceivable that the Senate might not have an opportunity to vote upon the measure if in the interim the House should decide to kill the President's proposal. Therefore, in order that my position may be made clear, and in order that I may make my statement before the House has had an opportunity to act, I wish to speak today upon the measure.

Mr. President, Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962 will probably soon be before the Senate for consideration. If approved by Congress, the plan would authorize the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs, headed by an individual with Cabinet rank. This is no ordinary proposal; its presentation by the President is abundant proof of that fact. Accordingly, circumstances dictate a meticulous probing into all facets of the plan.

H.R. 8429, an administration bill, was laid before the House Rules Committee early this year. The bill was playing to a packed house so to speak, since it was only a year ago that the President secured an enlargement of the Rules Committee. Despite such a favorable climate, the bill failed to secure a rule—a result which could scarcely be called a surprise, judging by the accompanying alacrity with which the President announced his Reorganization Plan. In fact, to examine the sequence of events could well lead to the conclusion that there is more to the plan than a Department of Urban Affairs. Rapid announcements of themselves leave little room for criticism, except when coupled with complicating factors. At the same press conference, the President not only made known his Executive order but announced that Mr. Robert Weaver, a Negro, would be appointed to the new Cabinet post. In a very brief span of time, the question of Government operations and efficiency was relegated to obscurity, being replaced by the issue of race.

Mr. Weaver, a very capable individual, has acquitted himself very well considering the uncomfortable position which he has been forced to maintain since the President's announcement. What a strange phenomena we are observing. The Democrats in 1960 pledge all Government resources being brought to bear to assist in the field of civil rights. Yet, in an effort to secure Reorganization Plan No. 1 just the reverse is happening. The administration seeks to use race and civil rights to bring pseudo procedural reform to Government. I wish my position clearly understood. My judgment on this plan will withstand any such pressures. I am proud to stand on my record in the field of civil rights and on the accomplishments of the Republican Party. The faintest suggestion that to vote in favor of Reorganization Plan No. 1 is to favor civil rights only indicate ignorance of the fact. Whether the needs of this Government can only be met by the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs is the sole question. It is to that issue, to the question of need, which I now will address myself.

Putting it bluntly, we as a nation do not need a Department of Urban Affairs, nor can we afford it.

It is inconceivable to consider laying the foundation for another bureaucratic empire, with all its trappings, at a time when one of our first orders of business this session is to raise the debt ceiling anywhere from $2 to $10 billion. Administration extravagances have already made this action mandatory.

In this respect I may say that in the past year and through the month of January, I am informed this administration has increased employment in the Federal Government by 78,162 persons, with another 40,000 projected for the coming fiscal year.

No new spending aims, but rather efficiency and economy, cry the proponents. Experience, however, shows that a new department or agency will rapidly become its own most earnest advocate and lobbyist before our committees. Past experience shows that any new agency or department tends to perpetuate programs assigned to it and use its resources for study and research to generate new programs and new projects within its sphere of operation—and in the case of a Department of Urban Affairs, this sphere would be well-nigh unlimited. As an example of this tendency, appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare have jumped from a figure under $2 billion in the fiscal year 1953 to more than $3.8 billion in the fiscal year 1961. During the same period, civilian employment in the agency jumped from 36,000 to 63,000.

Proponents most often argue the need for coordination, claiming this as the sole purpose for the Department. No new programs are to be established, they say, and no existing substantive law altered. The objective is simply to offer local officials a one-stop service in Washington—like a filling station—so as to avoid having to make trips from one Federal agency to another. Why then, I ask, are the Home Loan Bank Board and the Veterans' Administration omitted from the new Department? These two Federal agencies alone contribute from one-half to two-thirds of all residential mortgage financing. This omission was probably deliberate, so as to avoid, at present, controversies and to leave such annexation for a more favorable day. One-stop service? On the contrary. Look at the long, long list of urban programs, ranging from roads and airports to schools and water pollution treatment facilities, left separate and apart from the new Department in the proposed plan.

Until now, only the caution flag has flown; but we now approach one of the most serious defects in the entire plan. Urban affairs are manifold, and by their very nature do not adequately lend themselves to a single department. In the executive branch, existing agencies function side by side, but each is charged with a clear-cut area of responsibility. There is already too much overlapping. Each Department should work in an established zone. Consider what would happen, however, with a Department of

Urban Affairs. It would unquestionably function at cross purposes with those already in existence—the reason being that "urban affairs" means public health, water and air pollution, education, highways, railroad transportation, airports, immigration, unemployment, civil defense, fire protection, local recreation, and many others. The necessary result will be duplication and encroachment of authority. Where will the line of responsibility ever be drawn? Is it the ultimate hope to draw these overlapping functions into the Department? The proponents deny this; however, I would call attention to a letter written by Mayor Richardson Dilworth, of Philadelphia, president of the American Municipal Association, an organization which has backed this plan so strongly. This letter is dated January 9, 1962, and was written to me. I assume each Member of the Senate received a similar letter. In it he says:

> The extent and pace of urbanization in the United States have generated many complicated national problems. These include such vital areas as civil defense, transportation, hospital construction, air pollution control, housing, urban development and redevelopment, airports, atomic energy, and water resources. An awareness of these and other problems should constantly be brought to the Cabinet table, and so we strongly urge the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs.

Mr. President, it is perfectly clear to me those favoring the plan aline themselves, deliberately or otherwise, with a scheme to foster the growth of a Government bureaucracy of untold proportions.

To those who would say that we need the Department in order to permit the Secretary of Urban Affairs to have control of HHFA constituent agencies, I point out that such authority presently exists by reason of a 1954 Act of Congress. The HHFA Administrator has full authority to assign and reassign functions, to reorganize and to make whatever changes are necessary in the constituent agencies.

To those who say we need the Department as a matter of stature and prestige, I suggest that the reason is inadequate. Agencies such as NASA, AEC, and others have achieved optimum effectiveness and cooperation with other executive departments without being elevated to Cabinet status. In fact, NASA is now shooting for the moon, without a place at the Cabinet table.

This Republic, in the 186 years of its existence, has found it necessary to create only 10 executive departments. The number has now remained constant since 1913, with the Department of Defense absorbing two in 1947 and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare added in 1953. This stability should not be thwarted. Imagine the size of our Cabinet today if Congress had succumbed to every request for a new department. Presently, the Cabinet would become large and unwieldly, losing much of its value and significance. Even now, bills for the creation of a multitude of new departments of all kinds are pending.

Mr. President, just as I believe that there is no need for this new Department, I also believe, with equal conviction that we cannot afford this contemplated step; we cannot afford either its cost in dollars or the irreparable harm it would do to our constitutional form of government.

I alluded earlier to the added expense in dollars and cents which this move would entail. It is impossible to determine with certainty the cost of the proposal; but regardless of the amount, a government already operating on a deficit cannot and should not incur additional expense.

Instead of piling bureaucracy upon bureaucracy, like a layer cake, we should be trying to remove a few of the layers, so that the elements of our Government whose authority already is defined can act in those areas with efficiency and with expedition.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I am seriously concerned with the fact that the President's budget for fiscal year 1963 already calls for $92.5 billion, to meet the requirements of existing departments. What form of fiscal responsibility moves for increased spending, when at this very moment it is costing us $1 million an hour to meet the interest on our national debt—I repeat, Mr. President, to meet the interest on our national debt.

Money considerations aside, the effect of the proposal is apparent—the eventual but complete subjugation of State and local governments in favor of a centralized Federal bureaucracy. Let there be no doubt about it. The long-range strategy of the proponents of this measure is to bring the solution of the day-to-day problems of community life under the direction of centralized government. I, for one, am not ready to concede. On the contrary, I call attention to the fact that this plan runs headlong into the findings of two Hoover Commissions on Federal organization and to the Kestnbaum Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. All three called for abatement, not extension, of Federal intrusions into State and local affairs.

The National Association of County Officials has said:

> We feel establishment of such a department may well empower large metropolitan cities to deal directly with the Federal Government, bypassing not only the States but local communities as well.

The executive committee of the Governors' conference stated:

> A powerful Cabinet Department of this type would tend to weaken existing relationships between the States and their political subdivisions and would materially accelerate the dependency of local government upon the National Government.

This is representative of the thinking on the part of those affected by the plan.

Mr. President, whether it is this program or any other: If Washington pays the bill, Washington will direct the action. The new Department would create a direct line of communication from the mayor's office to the heart of the Federal Government. Inevitably, the State legislature or the city influence would diminish in direct proportion to the influence wielded by the city's spokesman in the President's Cabinet. And let no one be deceived over the problems that can be created by a dictatorial bureaucrat in charge of a local operation. Even the American Municipal Association, which supports this plan, has been incensed in recent months by the misdeeds they claim Federal agencies are committing in their towns. The association claims to have documented cases of Federal violations of local codes of health, safety, building, zoning, and city planning, and I am sure it has. Government officials arrive in the local community to direct federally aided projects and, in so doing, ignore local restrictions, the cities contend. That is even encouraged, the municipal officials complain, by Government regulations which claim complete or partial immunity to local jurisdiction. Specific complaints include violations of building specification codes, fire regulations, off-street-parking codes, and local redevelopment plans.

Let us keep the control over purely local and State problems at that level, and begin assessing greater, rather than less responsibility in the communities themselves. All the billions in Fort Knox will not suffice to rid the Nation of its slums unless responsibility attaches where it properly belongs.

Instead of a huge new bureaucracy lobbying to perpetuate itself, let us encourage and help the cities to use the facilities of existing departments. In the event something more is needed, a coordinating official in the Budget Bureau or the White House could adequately serve the purpose.

I add parenthetically that, heaven knows, they have enough of coordinating officials in both places to manage a little extra workload.

If money is the problem, we should return a portion of the staggering Federal tax intake to the State and local areas, where it can be used far better and far more wisely to solve what are and what of necessity must remain primarily local problems.

It has been my observation that, when there is control of expenditures of money at the local level, where the citizen at the local level can observe and criticize the expenditures and make his wishes and wants known, we end up with a far less wasteful and a far more efficient Government, and one which is more responsible to the will of the people.

Let us return from behind the looking glass, out of the Alice in Wonderland world. It is high time we recognize that all our problems cannot be met simply by a trip to Washington. There is no such easy course.

READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the order of the Senate of January 24, 1901, the Chair designates the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] to read Washington's Farewell address on Thursday next, the 22d instant.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to call measures on the calendar beginning with Order No. 1174, H.R. 8625.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DENNIS H. O'GRADY

The bill (H.R. 8625) for the relief of Dennis H. O'Grady was considered, was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 1195), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to pay Dennis H. O'Grady of Blaina, Monmouthshire, Great Britain, $18,500 in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States arising out of a vehicular accident involving a U.S. Army truck which occurred on August 18, 1956, near Camp Todendorf, Germany.

STATEMENT

On August 18, 1956, Mr. O'Grady was a first lieutenant in the British Army stationed at Camp Todendorf, Germany. At approximately 2:30 a.m. on the above date he was a passenger in a 1939 Mercedes-Benz sedan driven by a British medical officer. The officers were returning to Camp Todendorf after having spent the evening at a local gasthaus (inn). While traveling on the proper side of a concrete-surfaced road, approximately 20 feet in width, the sedan was hit head on by a U.S. Army 2½-ton truck traveling at a speed of approximately 40 miles per hour. The truck was on the wrong side of the road when it collided with the car in which Lieutenant O'Grady was a passenger, and a subsequent investigation disclosed that the driver of the truck and his passenger had misappropriated the truck and were intoxicated at the time of the collision. Both of the American soldiers fled the scene of the accident and returned to their barracks where they were apprehended later.

The truck skidded some 70 feet after the collision, dragging the sedan approximately 40 feet. Damage to the truck was estimated at $1,000, and the Mercedes-Benz was completely demolished. As a result of the collision the medical officer was killed. Lieutenant O'Grady was thrown clear of the vehicle and was later found in an unconscious state on the roadside by U.S. military personnel who had accompanied an ambulance dispatched from Camp Todendorf. Both of the victims of the accident were placed in the ambulance for transportation to the Luetjenburg Hospital. En route, the ambulance skidded on a curve in the road and overturned. As a result a second ambulance arrived and took Lieutenant O'Grady and the body of his companion to the Kiel Surgical Clinic.

Upon arrival at the clinic Lieutenant O'Grady's injuries were diagnosed as a fractured upper jaw, a mangled upper lip with some loss of flesh, loss of teeth, a skull fracture, possible brain contusion, and head and body lacerations. He remained unconscious for 4 days, until August 22, 1956, and was transferred to a military hospital on September 10, 1956. On September 14, 1956, it was ascertained that he was suffering from a severe disturbance of memory and intellectual capacity due to the extent of the head injury received in the collision. To date he has not fully recovered and it is the opinion of medical personnel that it is doubtful if he will ever regain the mental ability which he had before the accident.

Following these injuries Mr. O'Grady was discharged from the service on June 24, 1957. His disability, for pension purposes, was rated at 80 percent. On February 1, 1958, the rate of disability was decreased to 70 percent, but the amount of his pension was increased to approximately $619.36 per annum, which is the amount that he is receiving from the British Government at this time. A British board of medical officers examined Mr. O'Grady on October 20, 1959, and found him to have 80 percent disability based mainly on postinjury personality change. It was the opinion of the board that his disability is permanent in nature. A further review of his disability, for pension purposes, will be made in June 1961.

In its discussion on this statement of facts, the House Committee on the Judiciary in its Report 980 to the House of Representatives stated:

"It is clear that the accident in which Mr. O'Grady was so seriously injured was caused by the gross negligence of U.S. Army personnel and that if he had filed a timely claim against the United States under the provisions of the Foreign Claims Act (10 U.S.C. 2734) a sizable award would have been made to him. However, at the time his claim arose the Foreign Claims Act, supra, contained a 1-year statute of limitations. As Mr. O'Grady's claim was not filed until July 24, 1958, the Department of the Army was barred from administratively settling this matter. It is noted that the act of April 8, 1960 (74 Stat. 16), amended the Foreign Claims Act, supra, by permitting the filing of claims within 2 years after they accrue."

The Army letter noted that Mr. O'Grady's physical and mental condition was such that he was incapable of handling his own affairs. The committee feels that this fact is sufficient explanation for his failure to file his claim under the above statute. Therefore the committee agrees with the statement of the Army that he should not be penalized for his inaction as regards a claim at that time.

This committee has carefully considered the amount recommended by the Army and stated in the bill and has concluded that the nature and extent of the injuries and the serious and permanent nature of the resulting disability provide a clear-cut basis for such an award. This committee has been advised that this figure was computed on the same basis and in accordance with the same standards as apply to awards under the Foreign Claims Act provisions of section 2734 of title 10. The figure was arrived at on the basis of a computation that took into account the earnings of Mr. O'Grady at the time of injury at the age of 24 reduced by any amounts received or expected to be received from the British Government as a military pension. This figure also takes into account the life expectancy of the injured man which was taken to be 40 years.

In the light of the circumstances of the case, the recommendation of the Department, and the finding by this committee that there is a moral responsibility on the part of the United States to extend legislative relief in this instance, it is recommended that the bill be considered favorably.

JURISDICTION OF CLAIM AGAINST UNITED STATES OF AMIS CONSTRUCTION CO.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 2990) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to determine the claim against the United States of Amis Construction Co. and San Ore Construction Co., which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 2, at the beginning of line 16, to strike out the word "to" and insert "the".

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 1196), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation as amended is to confer jurisdiction upon the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Amis Construction Co., and San Ore Construction Co., joint venturers operating as Amis-San Ore, contractors under contract numbered 25–066–ENG–2700 for the construction of the north-south runway and adjacent taxiway at Lincoln Air Force Base, Lincoln, Nebr., for such increased cost as they may have sustained in compliance with an oral request by the Government to expedite the completion of the north-south runway at said base so as to advance its completion before the contract completion date. The claim is to be heard, determined, and judgment rendered thereon: without regard to whether the absence of written change order or written directive so to do may have placed the contractors in the legal position of having been volunteers for the performance of said work; without regard to the provisions of Public Law 547, 82d Congress, and Public Law 207, 83d Congress, section 803, which provide that none of the funds appropriated for the construction of said work should be used for the additional cost of expediting the construction of the project; and, without regard to whether the contractors administratively pursued their attempts to be paid beyond the denial of their claim by the Corps of Engineers Board of Contract Appeals.

REIMBURSEMENT OF CITY OF NEW YORK FOR REHABILITATION OF SLIP 7 FOR USE OF U.S. ARMY

The bill (H.R. 74) to reimburse the city of New York for expenditure of funds to rehabilitate slip 7 in the city of New York for use by the U.S. Army, was considered, was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 1197), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to pay the city of New York $8,872.56 in full settlement of its claims against the United States for reimbursement of actual expenses borne by the city in excess of the $100,000 contemplated to be advanced by it in the rehabilitation of slip 7 in the city of New York for the use of the U.S. Army.

STATEMENT

This claim of the city of New York arose as a result of the acquisition by the Army of two new ferries, longer and wider than existing ferries, which made it necessary to reconstruct ferry slips at Fort Jay on Governors Island and the ferry slip at the Battery, South Ferry, in New York City.

In 1954 initiation of preliminary planning for this project was authorized with final applications to be drafted when money was made available. Public Law 161, 84th Congress, authorized the expenditure of $631,000 for construction of waterfront facilities at Fort Jay to accommodate the new ferries. The authorized project included reconstruction of the Government-owned ferry slip at the Battery. During the preparation of plans for the reconstruction of the Battery slip, it became evident that an encroachment existed on city-owned land under water apparently as the result of various repair and improvement projects accomplished in the past.

During discussions between Army representatives and city officials on this matter, it was agreed that a hazardous navigation condition existed which was caused by the cross traffic between the Governors Island ferries and the city's Staten Island ferries, and, accordingly, the city offered a plan to relocate the Battery terminus of the Governors Island ferry from the existing location west of the Municipal Ferry Terminal to slip No. 7 of the Municipal Ferry Terminal. The city offered to the Army a lease of this slip and also offered to assume the $100,000 cost differential between the $160,000 current working estimate for rehabilitation of the Government-owned Battery slip and the $260,000 estimated cost for rehabilitation of slip No. 7 and the South Ferry Terminal Building. A condition attached to this offer was that the Army would give its assurance that it would recommend to the Congress that the city be reimbursed for the $100,000 expenditure in excess of the $160,000 already appropriated. In reply to the proposed condition the commanding general, 1st Army, stated that he was prepared to recommend that if the city of New York should seek reimbursement from the Congress the Department of the Army would interpose no objection.

As is noted in the Army report on this bill, in a memorandum dated October 25, 1955, from the Deputy Comptroller for the Budget, Office of the Secretary of Defense, to the Assistant Secretary of the Army the change in the ferry slip project was approved without objection to the participation of the city of New York in the amount of $100,000 in the cost of rehabilitation of the city-owned slip No. 7.

Subsequently the city leased slip No. 7 to the Government for a term of 8 months with an option for renewal by the Government on a yearly basis, for a further period of 49 years, at a rental of $1 per year. The lease (contract No. DA-30-075-Eng-6847) provided that the city would share in the cost of rehabilitation and repair to the extent of $100,000 by direct expenditure of funds or by the performance of a phase or phases of the work.

Public Law 968 of the 84th Congress authorized the expenditure of the additional sum of $350,000 for the project. Although the payment of the sum of $100,000 to the city was not specifically mentioned in the deficiency authorization, it was considered to be the intent of Congress that the city be reimbursed for its contribution to rehabilitation and repair of slip No. 7 to the extent of $100,000. Therefore, under date of August 6, 1956, the Government entered into a written agreement with the city whereby the city was to be reimbursed its costs for the performance of such work in an amount not exceeding $100,000. The city, pursuant to the terms of that agreement, has been reimbursed the amount provided therein.

The sum of $8,872.56 represents the amount in excess of $100,000 that is claimed to have been expended by the city of New York. Although the figure of $100,000 was the only specific amount mentioned throughout the course of the transactions it is noted that the amount was based on the differential between two estimated costs; namely, the estimated cost to rehabilitate the Government-owned ferry slip and the estimated cost to rehabilitate slip No. 7.

The Army report made the following statement concerning the basis for relief in this instance:

"However, the entire course of the transaction leads to the conclusion that it was the intent of all parties involved that the city be made whole even though the only figure mentioned and used throughout was the estimated cost differential of $100,000."

As is evidenced by that report, the voucher submitted to the Corps of Engineers itemized a total expenditure by the city of $108,872.56 in the reconstruction of slip 7.

On the basis of the above-delineated facts, the House Committee on the Judiciary reached the conclusion that the entire sequence of events discloses the intent of the parties that the city would be reimbursed for the additional cost borne by making slip No. 7 suitable for Army use. The House committee further stated:

"Clearly the lease of the slip under a lease and option arrangement which could extend for 49 years with a token rental of $1 a year can only be meaningful in the light that the city would be so reimbursed. This work was done for the benefit of the United States, and the committee finds that there is a moral responsibility on the part of the Government to pay the $8,872.56 as provided in the bill."

EVANGELOS J. MARTHAKIS

The bill (S. 1564) for the relief of Evangelos J. Marthakis was considered, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of section 4 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the entry of certain relatives of United States citizens and lawfully resident aliens," approved September 22, 1959 (73 Stat. 644), Evangelos J. Marthakis shall be held and considered to be eligible for a quota immigrant status under the provisions of section 203(a)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act on the basis of a petition approved by the Attorney General prior to January 1, 1959.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1198), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to enable the brother of a U.S. citizen to qualify for a nonquota immigrant visa under the provisions of section 4 of Public Law 86-363 as an alien who has a registration date prior to December 31, 1953, and who is the beneficiary of a fourth preference visa petition approved prior to January 1, 1959.

FELIX LEDINA MENDOZA

The bill (S. 1638) for the relief of Felix Ledina Mendoza was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Felix Ledina Mendoza shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1199), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to Felix Ledina Mendoza. The bill provides for an appropriate quota deduction and for the payment of the required visa fee.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

The beneficiary of the bill is a 29-year-old native and citizen of the Philippines, who entered the United States at Guam on December 31, 1957, as a nonimmigrant contract laborer. He was voluntarily inducted into the U.S. Army on January 27, 1959, and is presently serving in an active duty status with the grade of specialist, fourth class, with Headquarters, 1st Battle Group, 14th Infantry, Hawaii. His active duty was extended for 2 years at his request and he contemplates making the Army his career. His wife and two children reside in the Philippines. He has two U.S. citizen brothers, one who is a civil servant in Guam and another who is a member of the U.S. Army stationed in Alaska.

ROLAND FERNANDO MISHUTANI

The bill (S. 1874) for the relief of Roland Fernando Mishutani was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Roland Fernando Mishutani shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1200), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to Roland Fernando Mishutani. The bill provides for an appropriate quota deduction and for the payment of the required visa fee.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

The beneficiary of the bill is an unmarried 28-year-old native and citizen of Indonesia whose parents are deceased. He presently resides in Lyons, Ill., where he is employed as a bartender. He claims to be stateless. He first entered the United States as a crewman on April 19, 1953, and upon failure to depart was deported to Indonesia. He last entered the United States as a crewman in 1954. On March 22, 1957, he was inducted into the U.S. Army and served until March 20, 1959. He was honorably discharged and transferred to the Second U.S. Army Corps (Reserve) until March 21, 1963.

MARIA LA BELLA

The bill (S. 1881) for the relief of Maria La Bella was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Maria La Bella shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1201) explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to Maria La Bella. This bill provides for an appropriate quota deduction and for the payment of the required visa fee.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

The beneficiary of the bill is a 46-year-old native and citizen of Italy, who entered the United States on April 23, 1960, as a visitor and presently resides in Boston with her mother, a lawful permanent resident of the United States. The beneficiary's husband left her in 1952 and is living in Venezuela with their 23-year-old son. A married 26-year-old daughter resides in Italy. The beneficiary's father was naturalized a citizen of the United States in 1929 and died in Boston in 1953. Her mother entered the United States in 1948 and after her husband's death remarried a citizen of the United States in 1955. The beneficiary's stepfather is 73 years of age and her mother, who is 71, is in ill health and she cares for her. Information is to the effect that the beneficiary's father filed a fourth preference petition in her behalf in 1953, but she lost the preference upon his death.

AIDA MARY SORINO BOCCALERY

The bill (S. 2101) for the relief of Aida Mary Sorino Boccalery was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Aida Mary Sorino Boccalery shall be deemed to be within the purview of section 353(3) of that Act.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1202), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to enable Aida Mary Sorino Boccalery to retain her U.S. citizenship notwithstanding her residence abroad,

STATEMENT OF FACTS

The beneficiary of the bill is a 65-year-old native of Italy and citizen of the United States. She was married to a U.S. citizen in 1926 and was naturalized in 1927. Prior to her husband's death on November 1, 1958, his duties as a geologist with an American firm required him to live abroad a great part of the time, but because of the nature of his employment, the beneficiary as his spouse did not lose her citizenship under the provisions of the nationality laws relating to the loss of citizenship as a result of prolonged residence abroad. However, the beneficiary no longer enjoys an exempt status and although she has been naturalized since 1927, further residence in Italy, the country of her nativity, will cause her to lose her U.S. citizenship. Since the beneficiary was naturalized more than 25 years ago and is over the age of 60, the committee feels that this relief is justified.

MARIA ZAMBETOULLA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1841) for the relief of Maria Zambetoulla which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment in line 6, after the word "of", to strike out "Mr. and Mrs. Vasilios Christou, citizens" and insert "Mr. Vasilios Christou, a citizen"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That for the purposes of sections 101(a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Maria Zambetoulla, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of *Mr. Vasilios Christou, a citizen* of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of the said Maria Zambetoulla shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1203), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to grant to the minor child adopted by a citizen of the United States and his lawful permanent resident spouse the status of a nonquota immigrant, which is the status normally enjoyed by the alien minor children of citizens of the United States. The amendment is technical in nature.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

The beneficiary of the bill is a 15-year-old native and citizen of Greece, who was adopted in Greece on June 20, 1961, by a U.S. citizen and his lawful alien resident wife. The beneficiary is the niece of her adoptive mother. The adoptive parents reside in Tarpon Springs, Fla., and information is to the effect that they are financially able to care for the beneficiary.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY OF THE UNITED STATES

The bill (H.R. 1375) to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the former owners thereof was considered, was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1204), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This bill provides for the reconveyance, without consideration, to the original donors, of 1.0027 acres[1] which was given to the United States for a lookout fireman station. The Forest Service has not used the property for the intended purpose, has placed no permanent improvements on it, and has no present or foreseeable need for it. The Department of Agriculture has no objection to the bill.

The report of the House Committee on Agriculture is attached.

[H. Rept. 880, 87th Cong., 1st sess.]

The Committee on Agriculture, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 1375), to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the former owner thereof, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

PURPOSE

The purpose of H.R. 1375 is to return to its former owners approximately 1 acre of land which was donated to the United States in 1946 and has never been used for the purpose intended.

EXPLANATION

In 1946 Richard V. Evans and his wife donated to the United States a tract of land of approximately 1 acre in Elsinore, Riverside County, Calif., to be used by the Forest Service for construction and maintenance of a lookout fireman station. Since that time forest fire protection in the locality has been, and is now being, provided by the State under a cooperative agreement with the Forest Service and the land has never been used for the purpose for which it was donated. Neither the State nor the Forest Service has any present or foreseeable future need for the donated tract.

---

[1] The Department's report and records in Washington show the acreage as 1.0027. The bill describes it as "one and twenty-seven thousandths acres, more or less." The Department advises that so far as it knows its records are correct, but the only way to be sure would be to check the deed. Since the area is described in the bill as "more or less" the difference is so small, and the tract is otherwise clearly identified, the committee did not consider it necessary to verify the area or amend the bill.

COST

Since the United States received this tract of land as a donation and has not placed thereon any permanent improvements, its return to the former owners will not result in any cost to the United States.

RECREATION FACILITIES IN RESERVOIR AREAS

The bill (H.R. 4934) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to modify certain leases entered into for the provision of recreation facilities in reservoir areas was considered, was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1205), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This bill authorizes adjustment by mutual agreement of rental rates under leases for commercial recreational facilities on Forest Service lands at Federal reservoir projects when in the public interest. Most such leases already provide for such renegotiation, but some do not. Renegotiation may be necessary to provide for the development and maintenance of satisfactory public service facilities. During the first session of this Congress, S. 48 (Public Law 87-236) was passed providing similar renegotiation authority for the Corps of Engineers.

The report of the House Committee on Agriculture is attached.

HOUSE REPORT NO. 1104, 87TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

The Committee on Agriculture, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 4934) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to modify certain leases entered into for the provision of recreation facilities in reservoir areas, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the bill do pass.

The amendments are as follows:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "Chief of Forest Service, under the supervision of the".

Page 1, line 4, delete the comma after the word "Agriculture".

Page 1, line 5, strike out the words "before November 1, 1956," and insert "with respect to lands under the jurisdiction of the Forest Service".

Page 1, lines 7 and 8, strike out "water resource development project under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture" and insert "Federal reservoir project".

Page 2, line 3, strike out "or extension".

PURPOSE

The purpose of this bill is to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture, when he deems such action to be in the public interest, to renegotiate the terms of leases entered into for the construction and operation of recreational facilities in recreation areas administered by the Forest Service.

NEED FOR THE LEGISLATION

Need for the legislation is described in detail in the letter from the Department of Agriculture which is appended hereto and made a part of this report. Briefly, the legislation is required to permit renegotiation of leases which were entered into, generally prior to 1956, and which do not contain a renegotiation clause. Most of the leases entered into since that time have contained such a provision. In the absence of this legislation, in order to renegotiate the terms of a lease not having the renegotiation clause, it would be necessary to open the whole lease up to rebidding and reissuance.

COST

There would be no additional cost to the Federal Government as the result of this legislation.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS TO STATE OF WYOMING FOR AGRICULTURAL PURPOSES—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 875) to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey to the State of Wyoming for agricultural purposes certain real property in Sweetwater County, Wyo., was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask that we pass over that bill and proceed to consider Calendar No. 1186, H.R. 9013.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will be passed over.

TRANSFER OF RICE ACREAGE

The bill (H.R. 9013) to provide for the transfer of rice acreage history where producer withdraws from the production of rice was considered, was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1207), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPLANATION OF BILL

This bill makes express statutory provision for succession to rice acreage history in States and areas where rice acreage allotments are apportioned on the basis of producer acreage history. The Department of Agriculture has made provision in the past for such succession by regulation without clear legislative authority therefor; and the bill, with slight exceptions, follows the Department's regulations. The Department favors enactment. Rice allotments are currently based on producer history in California, Texas, Tennessee, North Carolina, Florida, and parts of Louisiana. Succession would be as follows:

(1) If the producer dies, his production history passes to his heirs or devisees continuing his farming operations.

(2) If the producer withdraws in whole or in part from rice production in favor of members of his family who succeed to his farming operations, the production history ascribed to such withdrawal may be transferred to such members.

(3) If the producer permanently withdraws from rice production, his history may be transferred to experienced rice producers acquiring his entire rice farming operation. The transfer in this case would be canceled if the transferee did not plant 90 percent of his total allotment for at least 3 of the 4 years following the transfer.

(4) Upon dissolution of a partnership, the partnership history will be divided among the partners as agreed by them; except that if the partnership was formed in an allotment year and dissolved in less than 3 crop years, the history would be divided in the same proportion as the partners had contributed to the first partnership allotment.

COST

There would be no additional cost to the Government resulting from this legislation.

AMENDMENT TO SOIL CONSERVATION AND DOMESTIC ALLOTMENT ACT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2533) to amend subsection (d) of section 16 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 105(c)(4) of the Agricultural Act of 1949 is amended by changing the parenthetical statement in the first sentence to read as follows: "(except in the case of a producer of malting barley as hereinafter described and except in the case of a producer of barley on a summer-fallow farm as hereinafter described)", and by changing the period at the end of such section to a colon and adding the following: "*Provided further*, That no producer of barley on a farm where summer fallow is the normal practice shall be required to participate in the special agricultural conservation program for 1962 for barley if he (i) does not knowingly devote an acreage on the farm to barley in excess of the average acreage devoted on the farm to barley in 1959 and 1960 plus the acreage devoted to summer fallow in 1961 which is diverted from the production of wheat under the special 1962 wheat program, and (ii) does not knowingly devote an acreage on the farm to corn, grain sorghums, and barley in excess of 80 per centum of the average acreage devoted on the farm to corn, grain sorghums, and barley in 1959 and 1960."

SEC. 2. Section 16(d)(1) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act is amended by changing the parenthetical statement in the second sentence to read as follows: "(other than a producer of malting barley as described in section 105(c)(4) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, or a producer of barley on a summer-fallow farm as described in such section)", and by inserting after the second sentence a new sentence reading as follows: "The excess, if any, of the acreage devoted to barley in 1962 on a summer-fallow farm as described in section 105(c)(4) of the Agricultural Act of 1949 over the average acreage devoted to barley on such farm in 1959 and 1960 shall be considered as planted to corn and grain sorghums for the purpose of determining extent of participation and payments under the special agricultural conservation program for 1962 for corn and grain sorghums."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read:

A bill to amend the requirements for participation in the 1962 feed grain program.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 1208), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The bill, with the committee amendment, would preserve the eligibility of a producer on a summer fallow farm for—

(1) 1962 crop price support on corn, grain sorghum, and barley; and

(2) participation in the 1962 corn and grain sorghum diversion program

even though the farm's 1962 barley acreage exceeds in 1959–60 average barley acreage, if—

(i) such excess does not exceed the acreage summer fallowed in 1961 and diverted from the production of wheat under the 1962 wheat diversion program, and

(ii) the farm's total 1962 acreage of corn, grain sorghums, and barley does not exceed 80 percent of its 1959–60 average of those three grains.

The Agricultural Act of 1961, providing for the diversion of land from wheat in 1962, was enacted after farmers had already summer fallowed their land for 1962 wheat production. In order to keep the soil from blowing during the winter many farmers planted barley on the acreage which had been summer fallowed for wheat and which was diverted from wheat. This bill is designed to permit such farmers, without plowing up their barley, to receive barley, corn, and grain sorghum price support and to participate in the corn and grain sorghum diversion program. In order to do so they would have to reduce their corn and grain sorghum acreage to the extent necessary to bring their acreage of corn, grain sorghum, and barley down to not more than 80 percent of the 1959–60 average acreage of those three crops.

Diversion payments could not be made under the corn and grain sorghum diversion program for an acreage in excess of the net reduction in corn, grain sorghum, and barley acreage on the farm. Any increase in barley acreage would be deducted from the farm reduction in corn and grain sorghum acreage to determine the extent of the farm's participation in the corn and grain sorghum program. For instance, assume a farm with a barley base of 70 acres, a corn and sorghum base of 100 acres, and a wheat diversion of 20 acres. If the farm planted 90 acres of barley, it would have to reduce its corn and sorghum acreage to 46 acres to qualify for barley, corn, and sorghum price support (90 barley plus 46 corn and sorghum equals 136 acres, or 80 percent of 170 acres). Although the farm reduced its corn and sorghum acreage by 54 acres, only 34 acres of this reduction (after deducting the added 20 acres of barley) would count toward participation and payments under the corn and sorghum program.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, Senate 2533, which amends the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, was introduced near the end of the 1st session of the 87th Congress.

The Department of Agriculture filed a favorable report on it at that time, but the legislative calendar was such that we did not get action on it.

The bill is drafted so as to permit farmers to plant barley on land taken out of wheat production and make barley interchangeable with other feed grains.

This proposed legislation applies particularly to areas in Kansas, eastern Colorado, Nebraska, and the northern counties of the Panhandle of Texas and the Oklahoma Panhandle, where summer fallow practices are used for the seeding of wheat.

Unless this summer fallow is covered, preferably by a growing crop, it will be threatened by severe wind erosion and the land severely damaged. Many wheat growers in this area, who were unable to use barley as a cover crop last fall, planted their entire allotment acreage to wheat.

The signup under the 1962 feed grain program is now in progress and the report from the Department of Agriculture, dated February 7, 1962, states that the Department still favors enactment of S. 2533 if congressional action on the bill can be completed before the end of the signup period.

This bill permits a farmer to plant winter crops to keep his land from blowing and then the next summer make a comparable reduction from his corn or grain sorghum acreage. There is no way whereby the total acreage when planted to feed can be increased. Any increase in barley will be exactly balanced by a like reduction in corn and grain sorghum.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Freeman, to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, February 7, 1962, regarding S. 2533, may be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C., February 7, 1962.

Hon. Allen J. Ellender,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and and Forestry, U.S. Senate.

Dear Senator Ellender: This is in reply to a telephone request from Mr. Harker Stanton of your committee staff for the Department's present views on the enactment of S. 2533, a bill to amend subsection (d) of section 16 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended.

Although the signup under the 1962 feed grain program is now in progress, the Department still favors the enactment of S. 2533 if amended in accordance with the draft bill submitted with our letter of September 19, 1961, and congressional action on the bill can be completed before the end of the signup period which is March 30, 1962.

In discussing the provisions of the Department's proposed bill with Mr. Stanton, we have agreed on a clarifying amendment to the bill which will make it more understandable with respect to its application in determining the overall reduction in corn, grain sorghum, and barley acres and diversion payments on summer fallow farms. The amendment to the proposed bill would be made by changing the period at the end of section 2 to a comma and adding the following: "and by inserting after the second sentence a new sentence to read as follows: 'The excess, if any, of the acreage devoted to barley in 1962 on a summer fallow farm as described in section 105(c)(4) of the Agricultural Act of 1949 over the average acreage devoted to barley on such farm in 1959 and 1960 shall be considered as planted to corn and grain sorghums for the purpose of determining the extent of participation and payments under the special agricultural conservation program for 1962 for corn and grain sorghums.' "

Attached is a revised draft of the Department's proposed bill which contains the amendment outlined above.

Sincerely yours,
Orville L. Freeman,
Secretary.

AMENDMENT TO THE AGRICULTURAL ENABLING AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1961

The bill (H.R. 8842) to amend subsection (h) of section 124 of the Agricultural Enabling Amendments Act of 1961 was considered, was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 1209), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

This bill would correct an error in the 1962 wheat program law with respect to the withdrawal of excess wheat stored from a previous crop to avoid payment of penalty. Release of excess wheat from a previous crop is permitted either where the allotment is underplanted or where the actual production is less than the normal production of the acreage allotment.

Under the 1962 wheat program wheat allotments were reduced 10 percent below what they otherwise would have been, and the 10 percent reduction was required to be diverted from crop production as a condition of price support.

Section 124(h) of the Agricultural Enabling Amendments Act of 1961 provides that underplanting of the allotment resulting from the 10 percent diversion should not be the basis for withdrawal of penalty wheat. While this provision causes no harm, it is not correct to refer to the 10-percent diversion as an underplanting of the allotment, since the 10 percent represents a reduction in, rather than an underplanting of, the allotment.

Similarly, section 124(h) provides that the normal production of the diverted acres shall be deemed actual production for the purpose of determining whether the actual production is less than the normal production of the allotment. Since the 10 percent diversion represents no diversion from the acreage allotment, it should not be deemed as having produced any quantity of wheat for this purpose. This provision of the 1961 act reduces the amount of penalty wheat which may be withdrawn from storage by farms having crop failures even though they comply with their allotments. For instance, a farm which otherwise would have received a 100-acre allotment receives only 90 acres by reason of the 10-percent reduction. Assuming a 20 bushel per acre normal production, the normal production of the acreage allotment is 1,800 bushels. Ordinarily, if the actual production was less than 1,800 bushels, the difference between 1,800 bushels and the actual production could be withdrawn from penalty wheat of a previous crop. However, since the 1961 act requires the normal production of the 10-percent diversion to be counted as actual production (200 bushels), penalty wheat can be withdrawn only to the extent that production falls below 1,600 bushels. This was not intended, and the bill would correct the errors described herein. Under the bill the 10-percent diversion would not be described as an underplanting of the allotment, nor would the normal production of the 10-percent diversion be counted as actual production.

The Department of Agriculture favors enactment and points out in its report that the present requirement creates an inequity between producers who participate in the diversion program and those who do not. Those who do not divert the 10-percent reduction are not required to count its normal production as actually produced for the purpose of determining the amount of penalty wheat from a previous crop which can be withdrawn without penalty. If the bill is enacted, the same rule will apply to producers who do participate in the diversion program.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT TO THE PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE WITH CANADA

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints to attend the Parliamentary Conference with Canada the following Senators: The Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS].

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMATHERS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in view of the circumstances attendant upon the flight of Lt. Col. John H. Glenn, Jr., of the U.S. Marine Corps, in his orbit around the world, and due to the fact that we have disposed of a fairly good amount of legislation this afternoon, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.), the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 21, 1962, at 12 o'clock meridian.

◆

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Philippians 3: 14: *I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus.*

Eternal God, we humbly confess that daily we are looking out upon a weary and bewildered humanity for whom the hard facts and experiences of life seem to be without sequence and significance.

Grant that we may be blessed with the spirit of sympathy and understanding and seek to minister to the deep longings and needs of mankind with the grace of generosity and good will.

Inspire us with a vision of the grandeur of a life that gives itself in devotion to Thee and puts itself on the side of faith and strives through discipline and effort to become morally and spiritually fit to attain unto the high calling of God in Christ Jesus, our Lord.

O Thou who art here and everywhere, we are sending our thoughts of love and good cheer to our fellow citizen who on this day is courageously carrying out a great mission for our beloved country and all for Thy glory.

Hear us in the name of the Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed a joint resolution and bills of the House of the following titles:

On February 13, 1962:

H.J. Res. 612. Joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the Veterans' Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

On February 16, 1962:

H.R. 2147. An act for the relief of Kenneth Stultz;

H.R. 2973. An act for the relief of Anthony Robert Lowry (Antonio Piantadosi);

H.R. 3710. An act for the relief of Giles L. Matthews;

H.R. 4194. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ann W. Edwards;

H.R. 4211. An act for the relief of Alessandro Bottero;

H.R. 4280. An act for the relief of Dimitri Elias Sartan;

H.R. 4381. An act for the relief of Walter H. Hanson;

H.R. 4876. An act for the relief of Mary C. Atkinson;

H.R. 5181. An act to amend Private Law 85–699;

H.R. 5324. An act for the relief of Dr. Serafin T. Ortiz;

H.R. 6025. An act to confer jurisdiction on the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of George Edward Barnhart against the United States;

H.R. 6120. An act for the relief of Francis Ainsworth;

H.R. 6226. An act for the relief of Arlin David English;

H.R. 6243. An act extending to Guam the power to enter into certain interstate compacts relating to the enforcement of the criminal laws and policies of the States;

H.R. 6644. An act for the relief of Julius Benikosky;

H.R. 6938. An act for the relief of Dr. Robert E. Hiller;

H.R. 7473. An act for the relief of Albert R. Serpa;

H.R. 7740. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sharon Lee Harden;

H.R. 8325. An act for the relief of Harrison Thomas Harper; and

H.R. 8779. An act for the relief of George B. Olmstead.

On February 19, 1962:

H.R. 2470. An act to provide for the establishment of the Lincoln Boyhood National Memorial in the State of Indiana, and for other purposes.

FEDERAL PAY REFORM MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 344)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

The success of this Government, and thus the success of our Nation, depend in the last analysis upon the quality of our career services. The legislation enacted by the Congress, as well as the decisions made by me and the Department and Agency heads, must all be implemented by the career men and women in the Federal service. In foreign affairs, national defense, science and technology, and a host of other fields, they face unprecedented problems of unprecedented importance and perplexity. We are all dependent on their sense of loyalty and responsibility as well as their competence and energy; and just as they have responsibilities to the Government, so does the Government have obligations to them.

We properly establish high standards for our public servants. We investigate their character and associations before considering them for employment. We hire them only after they have passed difficult examinations. We require them to abide by rigorous standards of conduct and ethics. We demand consistently high performance from them on the job. Accordingly, the salaries for the services they perform should be fixed under well-understood and objective standards, high enough to attract and retain competent personnel, sufficiently flexible to motivate initiative and industry, and comparable with the salaries received by their counterparts in private life. To pay more than this is to be unfair to the taxpayers—to pay less is to degrade the public service and endanger our national security.

Unfortunately these basic standards for Federal salary systems are not met today. Too many Federal employees are underpaid in proportion to their responsibilities. Too many receive smaller salaries than are paid by many private industries, and even by many States and local governments, for less responsible work. Too many top-grade or supervisory Federal employees are paid little more, and sometimes even less, than their subordinates. Too many key career employees are unable to afford continued public service.

Existing statutory Federal pay structures cannot be justified as sound and equitable, either internally or externally. Internally, salaries between various levels of work should be enough to provide an incentive to undertake more responsible duties and to represent, dollarwise, fair differences in work requirements. Over the years, piecemeal statutory revisions—with primary emphasis on bringing the lower pay levels abreast of changes in the cost of living—have severely compressed the spread between the top and bottom salaries. The 8.8

to 1 and 12 to 1 salary ratios between the highest and lowest Classification Act and postal field service grades existing prior to World War II have shrunk to ratios of less than 6 to 1, making it impossible to offer pay increases consistent with the added responsibilities of grade-to-grade promotion, or to offer an appropriate range of incentives within a particular grade. There is little consistency or logic in the salary differences between existing grade levels. And employees paid under a wage board system, with wages based on the prevailing rates in industry, are frequently paid more than their supervisors whose salaries are fixed by the more rigid and less logical provisions of the Classification Act.

Externally, except for employees paid under wage board systems, Federal salaries generally do not compare favorably and cannot compete successfully with private industry. Every objective survey has demonstrated that salaried Government employees at almost every work level receive less compensation, on a national average basis, than private employees performing similar work—and the greater the level of difficulty and responsibility, the greater the gap between Federal and private pay. A Federal employee beginning a professional or administrative career can look forward to a maximum salary increase of no more than four and one quarter times his entrance salary, whereas his counterpart in private industry can look forward to an increase of six or seven times his beginning salary. Moreover, the Federal employee's top salary, if he stays to reach it, will be less than half that of his private enterprise counterpart.

Even State and local governments have passed the Federal Government. The head of a Federal Cabinet department receives less than the head of a New York State department—less than the average salary paid to the superintendents of schools in cities over 500,000 population. The highest paid Federal employees under the Classification Act would obtain higher salaries if they were working in the State career service in Georgia, Ohio, New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Michigan, or California, for example—or for the cities of St. Louis, Denver, Detroit, San Francisco, Los Angeles, and Philadelphia.

The difficulty has been the lack of both an accepted objective standard for determining Federal salary levels and a consistent procedure for review and adjustment. The result has been a steady attrition of valued employees, an inability to attract many top quality college graduates and, in the long run, a waste of Federal funds—discouraging the initiative, efficiency, and dedication that accompany recognition and stature, and requiring enormous expenditures each year to recruit and train new replacements for employees who leave the service for reasons of inadequate pay. We can no longer defer the necessary corrective measures or continue the existing lack of standards; and recent studies and measurement techniques now make possible the kind of wholly new approach that commonsense requires.

A FEDERAL PAY REFORM PROGRAM

I am transmitting to the Congress with this message legislation designed to reform the major statutory salary systems of the Federal Government, benefiting all of the 1,640,000 employees throughout the world who are paid under the various Federal statutory pay plans—the Classification Act, the Postal Field Service Compensation Act, the Foreign Service Act, and the medicine and surgery salary system of the Veterans' Administration. Although flat increases for lower-paid workers are included as a matter of equity, the essence of this bill's objectives is Federal pay reform, not simply a Federal pay raise. Where pay raises result from the establishment of objective pay standards, they are primarily a reflection of the extent to which Federal salaries have lagged behind the national economy.

This proposal has two principal features:

(1) It establishes a sound, objective, and continuous standard for determining proper salary levels by following the concept of comparability—reasonable comparability with prevailing private enterprise salaries for the same levels of work insofar as this is possible, as determined from painstaking statistical surveys and careful job comparisons; and

(2) It establishes realistic and appropriate salary relationships both within and among the several statutory salary systems and each of their grade levels, by following the principle of equal pay for equal work, with distinctions in pay consistent with distinctions in responsibility and performance.

COMPARABILITY

Adoption of the principle of comparability will assure equity for the Federal employee with his equals throughout the national economy—enable the Government to compete fairly with private firms for qualified personnel—and provide at last a logical and factual standard for setting Federal salaries. Reflected in this single standard are such legitimate private enterprise pay considerations as cost of living, standard of living, and productivity, to the same extent that those factors are resolved into the "going rate" over bargaining tables and other salary determining processes in private enterprise throughout the country.

The principle has a history of wide acceptance. Within the Federal Government, it has been used for 100 years: first applied to navy yard workers, it is now applied to all Federal workers in trades and crafts, to employees of the Tennessee Valley Authority, and to work under Government contracts covered by the Walsh-Healey and Davis-Bacon Acts. Many State and local governments, as well as some other national governments (such as Canada and the United Kingdom) already rely on this principle.

It should be noted in this regard that, in marked contrast to the unfavorable situation of salaried employees, the Federal pay practices affecting over 660,000 workers in the skilled trades and crafts have functioned without serious conflict or confusion. Based on prevailing rates, and set on recommendation of wage boards, their pay has been continuously maintained at levels that are fair from the viewpoint of the Government, the taxpayer, and the employee.

I have found no more sensible standard for determining Government salaries. The Advisory Panel on Federal Salary Systems, chaired by Mr. Clarence Randall, in its recent report to me called it not only equitable but valid and eminently desirable. The application of this principle permits the Government to meet its difficult personnel needs without paying more than is necessary or less than is equitable. It was not feasible in earlier years; but now the recently introduced annual survey of professional, administrative, technical, and clerical salaries conducted by the Bureau of Labor Statistics provides the objective comparative salary data needed for setting Federal pay scales. Occupational rates paid by private employers at a given work level of difficulty, responsibility, and required qualifications can be combined into a single national average private enterprise rate for work equivalent to a Classification Act grade. These Classification Act rates in turn can be used to establish rates for the corresponding grades in the specialized salary systems of the Postal Field Service, the Foreign Service, and the Veterans' Administration.

INTERNAL ALINEMENT

The internal alinement principle rests on two basic concepts: equal pay for equal work, and distinctions in pay consistent with distinctions in work and performance. Although these concepts are stated in the present Classification Act and are implicit in the Postal Field Service Compensation Act, the regressive and flat percentage pay adjustments of the past 17 years have gradually blotted out much of the meaning in the current pay differentials of all our salary systems.

The pay schedules I am recommending will regularize and generally enlarge the differences in salaries between successive grade levels, recognizing more appropriately the differences in responsibility involved, and providing a more uniform (not less than 10 percent) progression of salary levels between the entry rates of successive grades. This will furnish a greater incentive for employees striving to prepare themselves for higher responsibilities. At the same time, these new schedules will make more meaningful the within-grade promotions for competent performance of duties, and will provide better incentives for those who spend most of their careers within a single grade by providing wider salary ranges (30 percent except for the top two grades) within each grade, more adequate and more numerous within-grade salary steps, and more flexible use of salary steps to recognize exceptional achievement.

Other provisions aimed at improving flexibility will (1) facilitate the adjustment of salaries to meet critical needs by competing more equally with private industry in areas or in occupations in which a shortage exists; (2) permit the assignment of positions to the upper grades of the Classification Act on the basis of duties and responsibilities, instead of arbitrarily limiting the number of such positions; and (3) create new upper grades to bring within the salary provisions of the Classification Act all those with top administrative responsibilities who are not Cabinet or sub-Cabinet officers or heads of separate agencies.

The new salary ranges would provide a 30-percent range between the entry rate and the highest rate in the grade for most salaried employees under the Classification Act and a 40-percent range for the lower levels of the postal field service. This is comparable to the private industry ranges, which vary between 30 and 50 percent for each position. The pay ranges in the lower levels of the postal field service are somewhat broader than those in the Classification Act, in recognition of the pattern of long service in such positions in the postal field service and the need for incentives for sustained performance during the entire period of service.

ANNUAL REVIEW

To maintain the comparability principle, and to assure that other features are improved with experience, the bill provides that the President shall submit an annual report to Congress on the relationship of Federal salaries to those reported by the BLS for private enterprise, recommending whatever adjustments in salary schedules, structure, and policy he finds advisable. Where adjustments are indicated, they would be accomplished by revision of the Classification Act pay scales and by linkage of the other statutory systems to the Classification Act. A systematic annual review of this kind is essential to prevent Federal salary schedules from relapsing to their present conditions.

THE UPPER GRADES

Reform of the existing pay schedules necessarily involves immediate adjustment of salaries at almost all grade levels. But both our experience in the attrition of higher salaried men and women and all objective surveys have disclosed that the gap between private industry salaries and Government salaries is the widest at the upper levels. For example: the most recent Bureau of Labor Statistics survey shows that GS-14 and GS-15 employees receive 20 percent less than those employees in private industry in comparable positions. A 1960 survey of 21 large companies by the Civil Service Commission showed even more startling disparities at higher levels. Employees in these companies performing functions comparable to those of a GS-18 received twice as high a salary as their Federal Government employed counterpart.

Yet these are the very levels in the career service in which our need for quality is most acute—in which keen judgment, experience, and competence are at a premium. It is here that we face our most difficult personnel problems. It is at these grades that we employ our top scientists, doctors, engineers, experts, and managers. Surely if so many State and city governments, as earlier cited, are willing to compete with private industry for this talent, the Federal Government, with its urgent missions to perform, can face up to this problem as well. As a practical matter, the full principle of comparability cannot be applied to the higher salary levels of government; but I consider adequate adjustment in our top executive and professional positions to be the most vital single element of correction in this entire proposal.

This reform of top career salaries will, of course, boost the pay of many civil servants to a level above that paid to their chiefs in Cabinet, sub-Cabinet and similar positions. I recognize, however, that the salary level of these top executives has been quite properly related in recent years with the salary level of the Congress; and while both are, in my opinion, inadequate, it is neither customary nor appropriate to either provide such increases during current terms of office or specify congressional increases in a Presidential message. Representatives of the executive branch stand ready, however, to cooperate with the Congress in determining what executive and congressional pay scales would be appropriate following the terms of the present incumbents.

TIMING AND COST

It is important for the Federal Government to adhere to its own precepts with respect to pay adjustments in the economy as a whole. Because of the salary lag that has developed over the past 17 years, full correction of the accrued inequities in 1 year would be unwise, involving the substantial cost of more than $1 billion. This cost would come at a time when heavy budgetary demands have been placed upon us to meet great national security needs, and when the Government is urging private labor and management to exercise self-restraint to avoid the creation of inflationary pressures. Therefore, to reduce the impact in any one year on the affected $10 billion Federal payroll, where each 1 percent increase costs $100 million, the plan that I recommend provides that the full 10 percent be distributed over three annual stages, beginning prospectively on January 1, 1963. The increase scheduled to take effect next year is clearly well within the national average productivity increase (in the private sector) which has taken place since the last Federal pay increase in July of 1960.

The substantial costs necessarily involved in achieving this pay reform make it especially important that these improvements in our pay systems take absolute priority over general percentage or dollar increases of the kind we have seen in the past—increases which make little if any contribution to efficiency or economy in Government.

CONCLUSION

As I stated in my budget message, the first requirement for efficiency and economy in Government is highly competent personnel. I believe that enactment of this plan for sound salary administration is fundamental to the maintenance of a standard of excellence in the Federal service. It is my belief that this measure, if enacted, will constitute the most important revision and reform in Federal personnel legislation in more than a decade. It is the most important proposal to improve the Federal service which has been presented by this administration; and I believe it is essential if we are to achieve and maintain proficiency in the Federal Government. If our civil servants are to fulfill with skill and devotion their obligations to the Nation, the Nation must fulfill its obligations to the career service.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 20, 1962.*

COLONEL GLENN'S ORBITAL FLIGHT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, along with the Vice President, yourself, the majority leader, and others, I was present in the White House this morning at the blastoff of Colonel Glenn in his spaceship now circling our earth. It was significant that you, sir, and the Vice President should be present, because it was the vision of both of you which created the two congressional committees which have been responsible for this magnificent program.

The marvel of the thing and the bravery of the man, Colonel Glenn, were felt throughout the morning breakfast. Each delay caused visible dismay. The President, in company with all of his fellow Americans, reflected the hopes and the aspirations riding with this 20th-century Christopher Columbus. At the time of the blastoff we all stood next to a small portable television set in the White House, and silently asked God to protect this lonely American patriot.

As we watched, the seconds stretched into minutes and the reports came back of success. The telephone rang and the President was on the phone with Cape Canaveral and now he, along with the peace-loving peoples all over our earth, is awaiting the return of Colonel Glenn.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that this is a magnificent tribute to our American free and open society, and a stark contrast to the Communist-closed society where their space operations have been closed in secrecy. In our country we have conducted this great adventure in full view of the entire world over television.

If Colonel Glenn succeeds, and pray God he will, not only will it be a tribute to his intrepid bravery but to the millions and millions of our fellow citizens who made this great journey possible.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to commend the majority whip for the remarks he has just made and to say that all of us share with him his feelings as he has expressed them. I suppose it goes without saying that I was not at the White House meeting. But on our side the Republican leaders of the Senate and House were meeting here in the Capitol and we ceased our deliberations to watch the blastoff on television.

I must say it is a happy day for all of us.

Col. John Glenn in orbit around the world.

Certainly this is another example of American dedication, know-how, and courage. Also I can properly say that this is the culmination of a long period of preparation in this vast scientific field. It was a long and stirring struggle and every American has a right to be proud today. Certainly, the delays that we have witnessed have been agonizing, but I think essentially they reflect our high regard for human life.

None of us would begrudge the precautions taken nor the delays occasioned by the insistence on this degree of perfection that so far indicates the safe return of Colonel Glenn. In respect to those precautions and those endeavors, none of us would want it otherwise.

I agree with the remarks of the gentleman from Louisiana when he points out that this accomplishment has come about in the complete and full presence of all the peoples of the world. Likewise do I agree with him that the flight is in significant contrast with the Soviet flights which have been shrouded in secrecy as they have gone along. If the world ever had a glowing example of the basic difference between freedom and communism, it had it today. I do not know whether the Russians were afraid of possible failure before the eyes of the world or not. If they were, then it is a sign of an inherent weakness that I say does not characterize our efforts in this direction. We have made no attempt to hide anything; rather has the whole world been informed of our progress and now of our accomplishment. I say it is a symbol, and a good one, of the strength and the faith that characterizes our great land and our system. I say Godspeed Colonel Glenn as he circles the earth, and God grant that he shall be brought safely back among us.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great pride I take the floor today, in behalf of the Ohio delegation, to join in the tributes which have been paid, and are being paid, to Colonel Glenn of the Marine Corps, who is now performing one of the great feats of our modern age, because, as most of you know, both Colonel Glenn and his good wife are fellow Ohioans; both reared in a small town in southeastern Ohio, New Concord; where they were childhood and high school sweethearts. Both of them come from pioneer families, have real religious convictions, true patriotism, and great courage. I apply these words to the colonel's good wife as well as to himself, because these weeks have been, I know, a trial and a burden to her as well as to her courageous husband.

So, all Ohio joins with the rest of the Nation in paying tribute to a great Ohioan, and to his good wife, a great Ohio woman, for that which is happening today. From all over the old Buckeye State there are going up at this moment prayers to Almighty God, as prayers are going up elsewhere throughout the Nation, that Colonel Glenn's adventure shall be culminated by success, and that before the day is out, he will have blazed the way as a new pioneer in space, to again put his beloved country in the lead in space exploration and related activities.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join the other Members of this body in extending my congratulations not only to Colonel Glenn, but the many American scientists and technicians that have made this first orbital flight possible. As a member of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics—perhaps better known as the House Space Committee—I have become most acutely aware of the teamwork that is necessary on a project of this type.

The House Space Committee was established July 21, 1958, and since that time a great deal of effort and a great number of dedicated people have contributed much to this program. A good example of this planning and effort can be realized by the knowledge that the initial booster used today in Colonel Glenn's flight was an Army Atlas. This type of missile has been operational for some time, and as is generally known that in an unmodified form exists in large numbers in the hardware stockpiles of our Nation, to provide for our Nation's defenses.

Such programs require painstaking preparation—many thousands—perhaps millions of separate and distinct tests. Sometimes I imagine that the public gets rather impatient with the time involved with these many tests—but please believe me when I say that much delay has resulted from a great desire for the safety of our astronauts.

One thing that delights me personally is that this gives a new viewpoint of the American scientific posture. Many have tended to scoff at our scientific prowess—and tended to hold that we were a second-class nation—in scientific knowledge. But I would like to point out that in the space of a very few years—we have made scientific gains that could not have been achieved by any other nation on earth. It speaks well for our education system—and denies the claims that we lag badly in the production of scientific personnel.

At this juncture—I join with all Members of this body in offering my prayers and hopes for a successful conclusion of the flight.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with other Members who have praised so highly the orbital flight of Colonel Glenn. As a member of the House Science and Astronautics Committee, I have had the opportunity to observe some of the excellent teamwork that goes into a successful flight of this kind. Our congratulations go out to Colonel Glenn and his astronaut team who made this flight possible, to NASA, the armed services of this country, and all those who played a part in this undertaking. Congratulations are also in order for the committees of the House which played a part in the legislative backing of this program. It points up the fact that both the Eisenhower and Kennedy administration, along with the American public have realized the importance of our race toward the conquest of outer space.

Starting early in the 1950's, this Nation has steadily picked up its tempo in development in this field. This successful undertaking represents the fruition of all of this effort.

The orbital flight of Lieutenant Colonel Glenn today constitutes a major breakthrough in our space program and one in which all of us can take pride. But Americans like to be first. And the fact that today's manned orbital flight had been successfully accomplished on two separate occasions by Russian cosmonauts serves to emphasize the nature of our space competition with the enemy. We have every right to be proud of today's accomplishment. At the same time, as realists, we must understand that our space challenge to the Russians is just beginning. There is a long way to go. We hope that the way will be made easier by the inspiration of frequent breakthroughs such as the one to which our Nation and the free world can point with pride today.

Our hearts and prayers go out to Colonel Glenn and his family for his safe return from a great achievement.

Mr. MOOREHEAD of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOOREHEAD of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues here today to pay tribute to Lt. Col John H. Glenn, Jr., and the Freedom 7 flight. What is occurring is so epoch making that it is difficult to express with any adequacy our feelings at this moment. This is a time for guarded satisfaction, humility, and prayerful gratitude.

Stated in its most simple terms, all Americans are extremely proud of John Glenn. I am sure that the Members of the House will understand the very special pride which I share with southeastern Ohioans this afternoon that this brave man now circling our planet was born and raised in the 15th Congressional District of Ohio which I have the honor to represent here.

It is a rare and awesome occasion that we are observing. One solitary man supported by the resources of this Nation as well as by the hopes and prayers of the American people and the peoples of virtually all of the world is now blazing a trail across the skies. His feat is open to our view as each detail unfolds.

The special place John Glenn has won in our hearts and in the bright pages of human history is evident to us all. We shall not relax until he has safely returned from his historic mission. But as the flight progresses, we stand in awe of his achievement, personifying as it does his own dedication and that of others who are opening a new uncharted age for mankind.

DALE WRIGHT AND MICHAEL MOK RECIPIENTS OF 1961 HEYWOOD BROUN AWARD

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the 1961 Heywood Broun Award was bestowed by the American Newspaper Guild upon Dale Wright and Michael Mok, two top-ranked reporters for the New York World-Telegram and Sun. The honor was richly deserved.

Dale Wright's award was for his excellent series of articles on the migrant laborer. Michael Mok's was for an equally fine series on mental hospitals.

Both Dale Wright and Michael Mok are crusading reporters who experienced at first hand the conditions they described. Mr. Wright lived for weeks along the Atlantic seaboard as a migrant farmworker. Mr. Mok feigned mental illness and spent 8 days and nights in a hospital.

The judges for the 1961 Broun Award were Richard Stroud, of the Christian Science Monitor; Henry Brandon, Washington correspondent for the Sunday Times of London, and Herbert Corn, former managing editor of the Washington Star.

The judges said:

> We feel that Heywood Broun would feel pride in having his name associated with the two winners of the 1961 award. Both showed concern for the underdog. Both series showed extensive personal research, first-rate writing and initiative.

Many of my colleagues in this House have, I am sure, read the Dale Wright series on the "Forgotten People" which resulted in this award, for I had the pleasure of having these articles inserted in the Record during January of this year. I have introduced a series of bills to deal with the serious and complex problems of the migrant laborers. I certainly hope that Congress will act this session to protect this forgotten segment of our population.

In addition to the award to the reporters, it was announced that a citation would go to the New York World-Telegram and Sun itself. This great newspaper is entitled to our commendation for having encouraged these men to engage in such excellent investigative reporting.

I hope that the Heywood Broun Award will serve to focus greater attention on these unresolved social issues facing America.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

MIN-SUN CHEN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 316) for the relief of Min-sun Chen.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

GIUSEPPE ANIELLO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1352) for the relief of Giuseppe Aniello.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a)(9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Giuseppe Aniello may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. CHOW CHUI HA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1934) for the relief of Mrs. Chow Chui Ha.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

MAJ. LEONARD H. POTTERBAUM, U.S. AIR FORCE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9059) for the relief of Maj. Leonard H. Potterbaum, U.S. Air Force.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Major Leonard H. Potterbaum, 35382A, United States Air Force, Box 7235, Area B, Aerospace Systems Division, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, the sum of $5,777.93 in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for reimbursement in addition to the amount he received under section 2732 of title 10, United States Code, for household goods and personal effects destroyed as a result of a fire on December 4, 1956, at the National Movers Company, Incorporated, East Rutherford, New Jersey, while the property was stored in a warehouse under a Government contract: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STANLEY HAYMAN & CO., INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1288) for the relief of Stanley Hayman & Co., Inc.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That the one-year limitation of time provided by section 140(a) of the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act (D.C. Code 47–2617(a)) is hereby waived in favor of Stanley Hayman and Company, Incorporated, of Washington, District of Columbia, with respect to its applications for refund of sales taxes paid by it during the calendar years 1954 through 1956, if such applications are filed within the one-year period which begins on the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. Conte: On page 1, immediately after the period in line 11 add the following: "The aggregate amount of refunds made under authority of this act shall not exceed $1,114.50".

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FREE IMPORTATION OF STAINED GLASS FOR ST. JOSEPH'S CATHEDRAL, HARTFORD, CONN., AND FOR THE CHURCH OF ST. FRANCIS XAVIER, OF PHOENIX, ARIZ.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7431) to allow the importation free of duty of certain stained glass windows for use in St. Joseph's Cathedral, Hartford, Conn.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS], I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

COL. SAMUEL HALE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 67) for the relief of Col. Samuel Hale.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Colonel Samuel Hale, 4534A, United States Air Force, is relieved of liability to the United States for the payment of so much of the aggregate amount of a loss of funds in his class B agent account that occurred during the period beginning on January 1, 1955, and ending on June 30, 1956, as has not been received by the United States before the date of enactment of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A1C. PERCY J. TRUDEAU

The Clerk called the bill (S. 429) for the relief of A1c. Percy J. Trudeau.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Airman First Class Percy J. Trudeau, the sum of $260, in full settlement of his claim against the United States for reimbursement of expenses incurred by him in moving his house trailer in connection with a transfer which he made pursuant to orders of December 4, 1958, from Hamilton Air Force Base, California, to Fitzsimons Army Hospital, Denver, Colorado: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLES J. UTTERBACK

The Clerk called the bill (S. 521) for the relief of Charles J. Utterback.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Charles J. Utterback, of Aiea, Hawaii, a sum equal to the amount he would have received as compensation had he continued in his employment with the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army, Honolulu District, from September 30, 1959, the date of his separation from service for the purpose of retirement under the Civil Service Retirement Act (in accordance with an erroneous computation of his term of service made by the Corps of Engineers) through October 12, 1959, the date on which he became eligible for retirement.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SULZBACH CONSTRUCTION CO.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1348) for the relief of the Sulzbach Construction Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Sulzbach Construction Company, of Sioux City, Iowa, the sum of $48,581.71. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the Sulzbach Construction Company against the United States, remaining unpaid, for certain additional amounts due on account of work performed under its contract with the Air Defense Command (dated July 3, 1958) for site preparation and construction of offsite utilities in connection with the two hundred and thirty-five unit family housing project built under title VIII of the National Housing Act at Sioux City Air Force Base, Iowa. The necessity for payment of additional amounts under the contract arose because of unforeseen expenses resulting from changed conditions during performance, and such payment was approved by the Armed Forces Board of Contract Appeals, but such payment could not be made in full on account of the statutory per-unit ceiling contained in section 505 of the Act of September 28, 1951: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM BURNICE JOYNER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1348) for the relief of William Burnice Joyner.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act providing for the barring of claims against the United States", approved October 9, 1940 (31 U.S.C. 71a), are hereby waived in favor of William Burnice Joyner, of Palatka, Florida, if his claim for retroactive adjustment of compensation for services rendered the United States Post Office, Palatka, Florida, during the period September 1, 1946, to and including September 1, 1948, is filed with the General Accounting Office within one year after the date of enactment of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANCIS JANIS AND CERTAIN OTHER INDIANS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1615) for the relief of Francis Janis and certain other Indians.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following Indians are respectively relieved of liability to the United States in the amounts set opposite their names:

Francis Janis, $450; Arthur Pat Janis, $380; Isaac Brave Eagle, $720; Donald Leroy Little, $720; Thomas Big Owl, $360; Charles Thunder Hawk, $360; Benjamin White Face, $360; Morris Eugene Kills Back, $360; Jackson One Feather, $720; Wallace Henry Little, $720; Betty Ann Merrival, $180; Paul Stands, $180; Theodore Kills Ree, $180; Ralph Ghost Dog, Senior, $360; Garvard Good Plume, $180; Eldred O. Brave Eagle, $180; Wallace Red Shirt, $180; Calvin W. Fast Wolf, $180; Lawrence O. Cross, $180; Gerald One Feather, $180; Maurice One Feather, $180; Edward E. Two Bulls, $180; Kenneth J. Short Bull, $180; Benton Rowland, Junior, $180; Eugene Rowland, $180; Paul J. Little, $180; David Bald Eagle, $180; Augustine Gus Knox, $1,080; Norman L. Knox, $180; Donald R. Knox, $180; Alexander E. Swalley, $180; George Brave, $360. Such amounts were advanced by the Department of State in 1958 to pay for the transportation of the persons named and members of their families to the United States from the World's Fair at Brussels, Belgium, where they were stranded when the organization which brought them there to take part in an exhibit, and which was obligated to return them to the United States, became insolvent. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, credit shall be given for any amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6: Strike "$380" and insert "$360".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VIOLA BORWICK WARBIS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1697) for the relief of Viola Borwick Warbis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Viola Borwick Warbis of Riverside, California, the mother of the late Private Merlin W. Borwick, Junior (US 56147735), who was killed in Korea on November 2, 1951, the sum of $5,000, representing the amount she would have received as beneficiary of a civilian life insurance policy issued to the said Merlin W. Borwick, Junior, if such policy had not lapsed prior to his death because of a mistake which resulted in the cancellation by the United States Army of a class E allotment authorized by him for payment of the monthly premiums on such policy.

With the following committee amendment:

At the end thereof add the following: ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MILDRED LOVE HAYLEY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2839) for the relief of Mildred Love Hayley.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mildred Love Hayley, the widow of Major Frank D. Hayley, United States Air Force, the sum of $42,450.17 in full settlement of the unpaid balance of all claims against the United States of the dependents of the said Major Frank D. Hayley for periods before Feburay 1, 1961, arising out of the death of the said Major Frank D. Hayley. The payment of such sum represents the difference between the amounts payable to the said Mildred Love Hayley pursuant to the Act of July 15, 1939 (53 Stat. 1042) for herself and her minor children and the amounts actually received by her under other laws of the United States for periods before February 1, 1961: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended (5 U.S.C. 765–770), are hereby waived in favor of Mildred Love Hayley, the widow of Major Frank D. Hayley, and her claim based on the death of the said Major Frank D. Hayley for compensation under that Act is authorized and directed to be considered and acted upon under the remaining provisions of the Act, as amended, if she files such claim with the Department of Labor (Bureau of Employees' Compensation) not later than six months after the date of enactment of this Act: *Provided*, That no benefits except hospital and medical expenses actually incurred shall accrue for any period of time prior to the date of enactment of this Act: *And provided further*, That the said Mildred Love Hayley may elect to claim benefits as authorized by this Act without regard to the restrictions of section 416(b) of title 38, United States Code."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GERTRUDE M. KAPLAN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3696) for the relief of Gertrude M. Kaplan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,315.85 to Mrs. Gertrude M. Kaplan, 60 Lovett Avenue, Little Silver, New Jersey, in full settlement of her claim against the United States as the widow of the late Major Benjamin Kaplan, United States Army, retired, for the balance of retirement benefits erroneously withheld from him in the period from June 16, 1947, to January 21, 1948: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike "$1,315.85" and insert "$1,227.16".

Page 1, line 10, strike "June 16, 1947" and insert "August 1, 1947".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CAPT. H. A. ROWE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6075) for the relief of Capt. H. A. Rowe.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Captain H. A. Rowe (service number 78775), of the United States Navy, the sum of $12,991.51, in full settlement of all his claims against the United States arising out of the destruction by fire of his personal property after the United States Army had erroneously shipped such property to Fort Huachuca, Arizona, and placed it in storage there: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$12,991.54" and insert "$3,272.08".

Page 2, line 1, strike out "in excess of 10 per centum thereof".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CECIL D. ROSE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6464) for the relief of Cecil D. Rose.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Cecil D. Rose, staff sergeant, United States Army (service number RA 6553668), Fort Lewis, Washington, the sum of $1,620. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Cecil D. Rose against the United States for reimbursement of money which he was compelled to pay to the United States because his class E allotment payments had been erroneously continued through May 31, 1948, after he had authorized discontinuance of such payments as of March 1, 1946: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike "staff sergeant" and insert "master specialist (E–7)".

Page 1, line 6, after "Army" insert ", retired,".

Page 2, line 4, strike out "in excess of 10 per centum thereof".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TEOFILO ESTOESTA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6740) for the relief of Teofilo Estoesta.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the limitation contained in section 2(b) of Public Law 217, Eighty-fifth

Congress, approved August 29, 1957, or any other limiting statute, the claim of Teofilo Estoesta, Army serial 10304217, for pay and allowances due him from December 1, 1941, until date of discharge March 22, 1945, shall be regarded as having been timely filed and may be considered and paid in accordance with other applicable provisions of law.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6: After the word "serial" insert "No.".

Page 1, lines 7 and 8: Strike "December 1, 1940, until date of discharge" and insert "April 1, 1943, to November 30, 1943, and February 1, 1944, to".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LOUANNA L. LEIS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7671) for the relief of Louanna L. Leis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Louanna L. Leis, Waukegan, Illinois, the sum of $150.79, in full settlement of her claim against the United States for reimbursement of the amount paid by her in good faith to a member of the Armed Forces upon his discharge from such forces on February 11, 1960, while she was performing her regular duties as agent cashier at the United States Navy Accounts Disbursing Office, Great Lakes, Illinois. On May 26, 1960, at the request of the disbursing officer in whose account the deficiency was created, the said Louanna L. Leis paid to the United States the sum of $150.79 to clear such deficiency from his account: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, lines 5 and 6, strike out the words "in excess of 10 per centum thereof".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHYUNG SANG BAK

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7704) for the relief of Chyung Sang Bak.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the time limitations of section 2734 of title 10 of the United States Code, or the provisions of former section 324d of title 31 of the United States Code (55 Stat. 880, as amended), or of any other statute of limitation, the claim of Chyung Sang Bak, numbered 57-2, railroad residence numbered 92, Chorang Dong, Third Dong, Pusan, Korea, filed on or about December 5, 1960, shall be held and considered to have been timely filed and the claim of the said Chyung Sang Bak for the disabling injuries he sustained on or about May 28, 1951, shall be considered and, if found meritorious, settled and paid in accordance with otherwise applicable provisions of law.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MR. AND MRS. GERALD BEAVER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7708) for relief of Mr. and Mrs. Gerald Beaver.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mr. and Mrs. Gerald Beaver, of Queen City, Texas, jointly, the sum of $10,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mr. and Mrs. Gerald Beaver against the United States arising out of the accidental death of their infant child during May 1950, in the Fifteenth Evacuation Hospital in Nuremburg, Germany: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, lines 10 and 11, strike "Nuremburg" and insert "Nurnberg".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RONALD L. MUTTER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8195) for the relief of Ronald L. Mutter.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Ronald L. Mutter of Pontiac, Michigan, the sum of $342.29, such amount representing reimbursement to said Ronald L. Mutter for paying out of his funds a judgment rendered against him in the courts of the State of Michigan, arising out of an accident which occurred May 8, 1959, when he was operating a Post Office Department vehicle in the course of his duties as an employee of the Post Office Department.

With the following committee amendments.

Page 1, line 8: After the word "judgment" insert "and costs".

Page 1, at end; add ": *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A. EUGENE CONGRESS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8368) for the relief of A. Eugene Congress.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized and directed to place A. Eugene Congress, a civil engineer employee, grade GS-13, in the Department of the Navy, effective August 25, 1958, in the maximum scheduled salary step of grade GS-13 of the Classification Act of 1949, to which step he would have been entitled if he had not been assigned to duty outside the United States between May 10, 1956, and August 25, 1958.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized and directed to pay A. Eugene Congress an amount equal to the difference in the compensation which the said A. Eugene Congress actually received from and after August 25, 1958, and the compensation which he would have received if he had been in the maximum scheduled salary step for grade GS-13 of the Classification Act of 1949 since that date.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAUL J. PERICLE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8482) for the relief of Paul J. Pericle.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be is enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Paul J. Pericle, of Stockton, California the sum of $538.47. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Paul J. Pericle against the United States for reimbursement for travel of his dependents from Stockton, California, to Washington, District of Columbia, during March and April 1952, and from Washington, District of Columbia, to Stockton, California, in June 1952, while he was serving in the United States Naval Reserve: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JAMES R. BANKS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8515) for the relief of James R. Banks.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That James R. Banks, Madison, Wisconsin, a civilian employee of the Department of the Air Force, is hereby relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of $974.40 which is the aggregate amount of the overpayments of salary received by him from the United States as a result of his appointment on January 3, 1960, in violation of section 1310 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952 (Public Law 253, Eighty-second Congress), as amended (5 U.S.C. 43, note), to the position of air traffic control specialist (general), 30th Air Division, Traux Field, Madison, Wisconsin, in grade GS-13 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, by administrative error and without fault or knowledge on his part. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said James R. Banks all sums which may have been paid by him, or withheld from amounts otherwise due him, in complete or partial satisfaction of his liability to the United States: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 2, strike out "Traux" and insert "Truax".

Page 2, lines 15 and 16, strike out "in excess of 10 per centum thereof".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOSEPH A. TEDESCO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8628) for the relief of Joseph A. Tedesco.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Joseph A. Tedesco, of Niagara Falls, New York, is hereby relieved of all liability for repayment to the United States for pay and allowances for excess leave used while on active duty with the United States Army for the period from July 17, 1957, to February 5, 1959, in the amount of $303.87.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Joseph A. Tedesco, the sum of any amounts received or withheld from him on account of the payments referred to in the first section of this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "$303.87" and insert "$307.87".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RHEA G. BURGESS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9060) for the relief of Rhea G. Burgess.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Mrs. Rhea G. Burgess, Dayton, Ohio, is hereby relieved of all liability to repay to the United States a sum of $373.97, which was erroneously paid to her by the Department of the Air Force for annual leave.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, any amounts refunded by reason of the liability referred to in section 1 of this Act by the said Rhea G. Burgess, or any amounts withheld by the United States from money otherwise due her. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THEODORE A. ANDERSON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9188) to relieve Theodore A. Anderson from loss of agricultural conservation program benefits.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the payments under the 1960 agricultural conservation program to Theodore A. Anderson of Rio Vista, California, authorized under section 8 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, for the construction of a dam, the rolling and crushing of brush, and range reseeding, on Bureau of Land Management land leased by Mr. Anderson in Fresno County, California, shall not be denied or required to be refunded on account of the Federal ownership of the land on which the practices were carried out.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DANIEL E. MOORE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9596) for the relief of Daniel E. Moore.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Daniel E. Moore the sum of $100 in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for the loss of certain personal property taken by armed soldiers from his residence during the Battle of Vientiane in December 1960, where he was serving as Public Affairs Officer, United States Information Agency: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JAMES N. TULL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9597) for the relief of James N. Tull.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to James N. Tull the sum of $597.47 in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for the loss of certain personal property taken by armed soldiers from his residence during the Battle of Vientiane in December 1960, where he was serving as Deputy Public Affairs Officer, United States Information Agency: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrosesd and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN B. HOGAN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9830) for the relief of John B. Hogan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That John B. Hogan, of Alexandria, Virginia, an employee of the Federal Aviation Agency, is hereby relieved of all liability to repay to the United States the sum of $1,345.72, representing travel and transportation expenses incurred by the said John B. Hogan in traveling with his dependents from San Francisco, California, to Honolulu, Hawaii, and transportation of household goods from Anchorage, Alaska, to Honolulu, Hawaii, pursuant to travel order numbered FSS56-600 issued by the General Services Administration on June 6, 1956, in accordance with the provisions of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended, and the Comptroller General is authorized and directed to grant the said relief.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HEIRS AND DEVISEES OF FLY AND HER GROWTH, DECEASED LOWER BRULE INDIAN ALLOTTEES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9831) to provide relief for the heirs and devisees of Fly and Her Growth, deceased Lower Brule Indian allottees.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of Her Growth, deceased Lower Brule Indian allottee, number 267, the sum of $1,289.96 for distribution to the persons entitled thereto.

SEC. 2. The heir and devisees, immediate and remote, of Fly, deceased Lower Brule Indian allottee, number 266, are hereby relieved of all liability to reimburse the United States for any payments erroneously made to them representing revenues from the allotment of Her Growth, deceased Lower Brule Indian allottee, number 267.

With the following committee amendment:

Add at the end thereof: ": *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contact to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdeameanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. ELFRIEDE PRISCHL ROGERS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1451) for the relief of Mrs. Elfriede Prischl Rogers.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (3) and (4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Elfriede Prischl Rogers may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided,* That, unless the beneficiary is entitled to care under the Dependents Medical Care Act (70 Stat. 250), a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act: *Provided further,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 9, after the word "under", strike out "the Dependents' Medical Care Act (70 Stat. 250)," and substitute in lieu thereof "chapter 55 of title 10 of the United States Code,".

On page 2, line 2, strike out the words "this exemption" and substitute in lieu thereof the words "these exemptions".

On page 2, line 2, strike out the words "a ground" and substitute the word "grounds".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EDVIGE CIANCIULLI

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1671) for the relief of Edvige Cianciulli.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Edvige Cianciulli shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bond, which may have issued in the case of Edvige Cianciulli. From and after the date of the enactment of this Act, the said Edvige Cianciulli shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. VARTANUS UZAR

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6082) for the relief of Mrs. Vartanus Uzar.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Vartanus Uzar shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bond, which may have issued in the case of Mrs. Vartanus Uzar. From and after the date of the enactment of this Act, the said Mrs. Vartanus Uzar shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ATHANASIA DEKAZOS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6276) for the relief of Athanasia Dekazos.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Athanasia Dekazos, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Doctor and Mrs. Frank J. Charvat, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. IZABEL A. MIGUEL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6343) for the relief of Mrs. Izabel A. Miguel.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Izabel A. Miguel may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 10, at the end of the bill, change the period to a colon and add the following: ": *Provided further*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said Act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELISABETTA MARCHEGIANI

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7777) for the relief of Elisabetta Marchegiani.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Elisabetta Marchegiani, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Peter Piccioni, citizens of the United States: *Provided*, That the natural parents of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 5, strike out the name "Elisabetta Marchegiani" and substitute in lieu thereof the name "Elisabetta Piccioni."

Amend the title so as to read: "For the relief of Elisabetta Piccioni."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "An Act for the relief of Elisabetta Piccioni."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EVAGELOS MABLEKOS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 235) for the relief of Evagelos Mablekos.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (19) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Evagelos Mablekos may be issued an immigrant visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such Act: *Provided*, That this Act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under such paragraph known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of the enactment of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HARALAMBOS AGOURAKIS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 241) for the relief of Haralambos Agourakis.

There being no objection, the Clerk called the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Haralambos Agourakis shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of John William and Effie Parashos, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EUGENIA CHRZASTOWSKI

The Clerk called the bill (S. 531) for the relief of Eugenia Chrzastowski.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Eugenia Chrzastowski shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NANCIE ELLEN WILLIAMSON

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1076) for the relief of Nancie Ellen Williamson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Nancie Ellen Williamson, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Percy Williamson, citizens of the United States: *Provided*, That no natural parent of Nancie Ellen Williamson by virtue of such parentage, shall be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

YASUKO OTSU

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1560) for the relief of Yasuko Otsu.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Yasuko Otsu, the fiancée of Ralph Allen Spellman, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of three months, if the administrative authorities find (1) that the said Yasuko Otsu, is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Ralph Allen Spellman and (2) that she is otherwise admissible under the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within three months after the entry of the said Yasuko Otsu she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within three months after the entry of the said Yasuko Otsu the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Yasuko Otsu as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRIGITTE MARIE IDA KROLL

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1685) for the relief of Brigitte Marie Ida Kroll.

There being no objection the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the periods of time Brigitte Marie Ida Kroll has resided in the United States since her admission as a lawful permanent resident on May 23, 1953, shall be held and considered to meet the residence and physical presence requirements of section 316 of the said Act, and the petition for naturalization may be filed with any court having naturalization jurisdiction.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANCES E. SARCONE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1776) for the relief of Frances E. Sarcone.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Frances E. Sarcone shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of September 18, 1951.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. TZY-CHENG PENG

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1791) for the relief of Dr. Tzy-cheng Peng.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Tzy-cheng Peng shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of September 26, 1952, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. ALFIA ALESSANDRO MILANA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1793) for the relief of Mrs. Alfia Alessandro.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

SUSANNE RAE DEREMO

The Clerk call the bill (S. 1832) for the relief of Susanne Rae Deremo.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Susanne Rae Deremo, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Charles E. Deremo and Elene Deremo, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of the said Susanne Rae Deremo shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. BERCHMANS RIOUX

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1866) for the relief of Dr. Berchmans Rioux.

There being no objection the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Berchmans Rioux shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of July 14, 1949, and the time he has resided and been physically present in the United States since that date shall be held and considered to meet the residence and physical presence requirements of section 316 of the said Act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LUCIA BIANCA CIANTO ROSA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1870) for the relief of Lucia Bianca Cianto Rosa.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Lucia Bianca Cianto Rosa shall be deemed to be within the purview of section 4 of Public Law 86-363, the Act of September 22, 1959.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HUGO KOLBERG

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2149) for the relief of Hugo Kolberg.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Hugo Kolberg, a naturalized citizen of the United States, shall be held not to lose nor to have lost his United States citizenship under section 352(a)(1) of such Act by residing in Germany: *Provided,* That he returns to the United States for permanent residence prior to September 1, 1964.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SAIFOOK CHAN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2163) for the relief of Saifook Chan. There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the provisions of the proviso to section 201(a) shall not be applicable in the case of Saifook Chan, a native of Malaya.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DOCTOR HAU CHEONG KWAAN AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2385) for the relief of Doctor Hau Cheong Kwaan, his wife Tech Phaik Loui Kwaan, and their daughter, Laura Wai Man Kwaan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the provisions of the proviso contained in section 201(a), and the provisions of sections 202(a)(5) and 202(b) shall be deemed not to be applicable in the cases of Doctor Hau Cheong Kwaan, a native of the British Crown Colony of Hong Kong, his wife, Tech Phaik Loui Kwaan, a native of Malaya, and their daughter, Laura Wai Man Kwaan, a native of the British Crown Colony of Hong Kong.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOHAN SINGH

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2684) for the relief of Mohan Singh.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mohan Singh shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KEVORK TOROIAN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5652) for the relief of Kevork Toroian.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, For the purposes of section 4 of the Act of September 22, 1959, the petition approved in behalf of Kevork Toroian, on October 22, 1959, shall be deemed to have been approved prior to January 1, 1959.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 6, at the end of the bill, strike out the period and add the following: ", and the provisions of section 24(a)(7) of the Act of September 26, 1961 (75 Stat. 657), shall not be applicable in this case."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SISTER M. THEOPHANE (JANE CARROLL)

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8422) for the relief of Sister M. Theophane (Jane Carroll).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Sister M. Theophane (Jane Carroll), who lost United States citizenship under the provisions of section 349(a)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, may be naturalized by taking prior to one year after the effective date of this Act, before any court referred to in subsection (a) of section 310 of the Immigration and Nationality Act or before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad, the oaths prescribed by section 337 of the said Act. From and after naturalization under this Act, the said Sister M. Theophane (Jane Carroll) shall have the same citizenship status as that which existed immediately prior to its loss.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FONG KAI DONG

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1588) for the relief of Fong Kai Dong.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Fong Kai Dong shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bond, which may have issued in the case of Fong Kai Dong. From and after the date of the enactment of this Act, the said Fong Kai Dong shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MIN-SUN CHEN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 316) for the relief of Min-sun Chen.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill S. 316, Calendar No. 287, be recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 549) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10050) to provide for a further temporary increase in the public debt limit set forth in the Second Liberty Bond Act. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed three hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the Chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means. Amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means may be offered to the bill at the conclusion of the general debate, but said amendments shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of my remarks, I will yield one-half of my time, or 30 minutes, to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown].

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 16]

Anfuso
Bass, N.H.
Bass, Tenn.
Bennett, Mich.
Bray
Broomfield
Cooley
Dooley
Fulton
Gubser
Hagen, Calif.
Hansen
Harding
Harrison, Va.
Hays
Hébert
Hoffman, Mich.
Holifield
Huddleston
Jones, Ala.
Kirwan
Kitchin
Loser
McFall
Merrow
Miller, Clem
Miller, George P.
Miller, N.Y.
Monagan
Moss
Moulder
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Powell
Rains
Rhodes, Ariz.
Riehlman
Roosevelt
Rousselot
Scherer
Shelley
Shipley
Sisk
Spence
Stratton
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, N.J.
Tollefson
Tupper
Willis

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 384 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'Neill] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 549 provides for the consideration of the bill H.R. 10050, to provide for a further temporary increase in the public debt limit set forth in the Second Liberty Bond Act.

The resolution is a closed rule providing 3 hours of general debate on H.R. 10050, which provides for a temporary addition of $2 billion in the debt limit for the fiscal year 1962.

The present permanent statutory debt limit is $285 billion. In recent years, however, temporary 1-year additions to the debt limit have been made. Last year, Congress provided a temporary addition of $13 billion for the period July 1, 1961, to June 30, 1962. Thus the present combined permanent and temporary debt limit of the United States for the fiscal year 1962 is $298 billion. This bill would increase the temporary statutory debt limit for the remainder of the fiscal year 1962 from $13 to $15 billion, which would increase the combined permanent and temporary debt limit from $298 to $300 billion.

The bill is recommended by the administration; and, as I understand, is recommended with some restrictions from the Committee on Ways and Means. The evidence before the Rules Committee showed that the working fund in the Federal Reserve System runs about $2,500 million a day. This, technically, is not enough money to have the Treasury operate on a sound financial basis; consequently, the Secretary of the Treasury should have more leeway. As a result this bill is asked at the present time to increase the temporary debt limit from $298 to $300 billion.

I urge the adoption of House Resolution 549 which would provide a closed rule of 3 hours' general debate.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown].

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Massachusetts, my colleague on the Rules Committee [Mr. O'Neill], has explained, this resolution would make in order, under a closed or gag rule which would prohibit the offering or consideration of any amendment except such as might be submitted by the Committee on Ways and Means itself, providing for 3 hours of general debate, with provision for one motion to recommit, either with or without instructions, H.R. 10050, a bill from the Ways and Means Committee for the increase, until June 30 next, of the temporary national debt limit from $298 billion, the present temporary debt limit, to $300 billion.

I would like to remind the House, if I may, that only once in the history of this Nation has our national debt limit ever been fixed at $300 billion. That was during World War II. I want you to understand that the debt increase asked for in this bill is purely a temporary one and would not only add to the present temporary debt limit but be temporary in nature, because all information we have been able to obtain indicates there will be another bill submitted to the Congress, probably in May or June, to again increase the national debt limit above the $300 billion fixed in this bill. The President, in fact, has requested of the Congress an increase in the national debt limit of $10 billion, or to increase it from $298 to $308 billion. Of course we are told by some the necessity for this continuing deficit financing, and for this present request for increase in the national debt for our great grandchildren to pay someday, if they can, is because of our great defense expenditures and the Berlin situation. We are told at the same time that the deficit at the end of the present fiscal year, 1962, ending on June 30, will be at least $7 billion and, according to the estimates of some fiscal experts, such as those on the Finance Committee in the other body, may run as high as $10 billion.

So this action today will be very temporary in nature, in the hope it may carry over the administration and the Treasury—this extra $2 billion—until June 30, so that in the meantime we may pass another bill to further increase the national debt limit, so as to permit further borrowing to finance continued deficits in Government operations.

This bill comes out under a closed or a gag rule.

I believe most Members of the House are aware of, and well informed on, the position many of us have taken as to gag or closed rules. It has been customary in most cases to vote for gag rules on bills which come from the Committee on Ways and Means dealing with tax problems, because the argument has been made that otherwise it might open up the entire Internal Revenue Code to any amendment that anyone might wish to introduce. So, usually the House has bound itself by a closed or gag rule. But, as has been stated many times in the well of the House, the other body has no such closed or gag rules, and any amendment may be offered by any Member of that body, and considered if it is germane.

No, this bill does not amend the Internal Revenue Act; instead, it would amend the Second Liberty Bond Act, which simply authorizes the Government to sell more bonds and borrow more money as a result thereof. Of course, the justification is made that perhaps someone might offer an amendment to some other portion of the Second Liberty Bond Act. Well, now, I doubt very much there are many Members of the House who would want to introduce, or would even want to support, any amendment to increase this new borrowing power above the $2 billion fixed in this bill.

We had an experience here in the House in the last session last summer. We were told that it was impossible to write postal rate legislation on the floor of the House; that it was too complex, and yet the House voted down a closed or gag rule at that time on that bill. And, the postal rate measure was brought up later, in the beginning of this session, under an open rule and, believe it or not, the House of Representatives—while I may not agree with everything done on that bill—was able to work its will, pass and send the bill to the other body where it now rests and is being considered. That, I think, is a good indication that if the House of Representatives is given the opportunity to work its will on almost any type of legislation, it has the good judgment, and certainly the ability, to work out as good and proper legislation as any other legislative body anywhere in the world, whether under the dome of this Capitol or elsewhere. For that reason a great many of us—not quite a majority but pretty close thereto—opposed and voted against the granting of a closed or a gag rule when this measure was before the Committee on Rules.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I still do not understand fully why the request was made by the Ways and Means Committee for a gag rule.

Mr. BROWN. I endeavored to explain that very quickly by saying that the request for the gag rule was made by the committee—as an expression of fear by some members of the Committee on Ways and Means that some other amendments might be offered to the bill. Just what they could be, I do not know.

Mr. GROSS. Would it be too bad if this bill was open to amendments? Would it be too bad if the Members of the House had an opportunity to work their will?

Mr. BROWN. Not that I know of. I have no information that indicates to me it would be a dangerous procedure to permit the House of Representatives, which is supposed to be a very able body, to work its will once in a while on legislative matters, even if it comes from the distinguished Committee on Ways and Means.

Let me say this in conclusion, for I want to be absolutely fair: I do have great admiration, great respect, and really great affection for the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], who came to the Congress a great many years ago at the same time I came here. I realize fully the difficult position he and the Committee on Ways and Means have found themselves in as the result of the request of the President for a $10 billion increase in borrowing power, and in the national debt limit, and through the presentation of this bill.

I would like to suggest to all of you, if I may—and I know this may be a little bit difficult and perhaps is asking too much of some of my colleagues—but I do believe you will find in the report on this bill a very able and a very well prepared minority report, on separate views, we might call them, of a great many members of this committee. I believe they are worthy of your reading. And, if you check the report carefully, you will find out that with the great increase in spending which has created these deficits which, in turn, has created the demand we raise the debt limit so that we can borrow more money to meet the deficits, most of those expenditures have not been for military or defense purposes but, instead, have been for domestic programs, most of them new domestic programs, which, of course, the Congress, as will be pointed out in debate, voted for too often and too many times—very seldom with my support, I might add. But notwithstanding, the charge is made the Congress voted for them, the pressure for passage came from somewhere else.

The requests for the enactment of these spending programs, and the expenditures of these huge sums of money, which created these deficits, came from the executive branch of the Government. It is economic history, if you please, and it has always been true, that the executive has held down public spending rather than the legislative branch. It is in that executive branch of the Government we demand, and need to insist upon, some real statesmanship and real leadership in behalf of economy in meeting the problems of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the reason I take the time is to try to emphasize further the position of which I approve which has been taken by the minority leader on the Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, for many years I have opposed the Ways and Means Committee's bringing other than tax measures out of that committee to the floor of the House under a closed rule. I do not believe it is necessary. I do believe that it prevents the House from working its will. This is an area where certainly we could have an open rule.

Mr. Speaker, I particularly want to emphasize this point, because during the fight on the so-called liberalization of the Rules Committee—I think some of you may recall that my position was a little different from most of the Members on my side of the aisle—I felt the principle of the party having the responsibility or the authority should have the power of moving forward. But I warned at the time that this looked phony to me and there was no liberalization about this. The one thing I was concerned about was whether the pattern we saw during the thirties, where the Rules Committee was used to bring out closed rules, was not what was really in mind rather than to allow the House to work its will. At the time I pointed out that the Rules Committee could not thwart the will of the majority of the House. The Rules Committee cannot keep measures off the floor of the House. Calendar Wednesday is always available. The procedure is simple. It provides for orderly debate and amendment under the commonly used 5-minute rule. Contrary to the propaganda of those who seek to escape the responsibility for the power of leadership they possess it cannot be impeded by filibustering tactics any more than any other House procedure. Nor can the Rules Committee impose a gag through a closed rule on the House of Representatives. All we have to do is what we did under the postal rate increase bill last year—to vote down the gag rule and then vote up a liberal rule. So, if this is going to be imposed, it is going to be because the majority control by the Democratic Party wants the gag rule and it has no intention of permitting the House to consider matters on the floor of the House which we could consider under the 5-minute rule which Calendar Wednesday provides, or when matters do come to the House with a rule, under an open rule that permits amendment under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY].

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I just want to make two very brief points under the consideration of the rule here this afternoon. In the first place, this legislation has been alluded to as a temporary increase in the national debt limitation. Now, I do not think anyone on the floor here this afternoon really believes that this is a temporary increase. The only thing temporary about it is that it is only supposed to last until June and then we are going to be asked to raise it even more. So, I think when we vote on this later this afternoon, we should bear in mind that this is not temporary to the extent that we are later going to lower it.

It is only temporary to the extent that we are going to raise it again. If we raise it in keeping with the request of the Executive it will be $8 billion; it may have to be more by June but at this time it looks as though it will be about $8 billion.

Mr. Speaker, the second point I want to make is this. Yesterday, when the very learned and the very persuasive chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means appeared before the Committee on Rules, he made a statement to this effect—he is on the floor, so if I misquote him, I hope he will correct me. He said if you are opposed to excessive Government spending, a limitation on the national debt ceiling is not the way to contain or to reduce or to control Federal spending. The only time you control Federal spending is, first, at the time a program is authorized, or, second, at the time the appropriation is made. After that particular milestone has been passed, we have a moral obligation, of course, to meet our commitments.

What I want to say is this. I agree with the chairman. Actually, if you are concerned about Government spending, excessive Government spending—and I think everybody is—today is not the day. The test is going to come tomorrow when we have the proposal for a Department of Urban Affairs before the House. That will be the test whether or not you are really concerned about Government spending, because that is the time, according to the chairman—and I fully concur—that we will be authorizing a new Department that, by the very nature of its concept, can only grow, can only assume more jurisdiction, in some cases, perhaps preempt jurisdiction from existing agencies and will require an increasing appropration as each year goes by.

So today I am going to vote for this increase. The hypocritical or political vote, of course, for me to cast would be against it because I have voted against most of these increases in authorizations for spending. But I am going to vote for it because I feel we do have a moral obligation to meet our commitments. But I am going to be watching tomorrow when we have the proposal before us to create a new Department of Urban Affairs and find out for sure who are those who are not concerned about additional Government spending.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AVERY. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The reason I asked the gentleman to yield is to clarify a point. I think we are all familiar with the procedures where the House can vote such a closed rule and then proceed, if they so choose, to debate this matter under an open rule. The issue comes on ordering the previous question. At that time I hope that everyone will vote down the motion to order the previous question so we will have an opportunity to proceed under an open rule. That is the gentleman's understanding of the procedure?

Mr. AVERY. That is my understanding. I am sure it can be clarified by way of a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AVERY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. The gentleman surely does not take the position that Members who have opposed these programs time after time are now obligated in any way whatsoever to vote for these increases, as they have not voted for the authorizations?

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, let me say to the gentleman that I certainly would be the first to recognize that he has voted against almost every authorization for an increase of Federal responsibility, and has voted against many appropriations. On the other hand, the majority determined the obligation of the Federal Government which committed us to these programs. So I can see no other responsible vote than "aye." I would be very much interested to observe when this vote comes how those who have always voted programs calling for increased expenditures feel about this proposal that calls for an increase in the ceiling on the national debt.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, does he not think that they have the responsibility to vote this increase, instead of those people who have opposed those programs?

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I am not passing judgment on that. I might say that I only said I was going to be very much interested to observe how some will vote on this matter later this afternoon.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, I have been in the Congress 9 years and every year this bill has always come before us in exactly the same manner, that is, under a closed rule. Only once in the years that I have been a member of the Committee on Rules did we report out an open rule, and before it came to the floor of the House the bill was recalled to the Committee on Rules where we changed our vote and voted out a closed rule.

Mr. Speaker, it has been the custom of the Committee on Ways and Means on bills of this kind to request a closed rule to the House. Why has that been the custom, Mr. Speaker? Because we do not want to open up tax bills and we do not want to open up a bill as highly sensitive as this bill is to the possibility of amendments by 435 Members.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEILL. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I want to point out to the gentleman that this is not a tax bill. I have supported reluctantly the theory with reference to a tax bill where you have to maintain a balance, but this is not a tax bill.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEILL. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I just want to call attention to the fact that during the years of the previous administration, we appeared before the Committee on Rules in behalf of temporary increases in the debt ceiling and asked for a closed rule to permit the consideration of this matter. The Committee on Rules provided a closed rule. The House adopted a closed rule. We have followed this procedure ever since I have been a Member of the House.

Mr. Speaker, of course, there are reasons for that procedure. I would think that those who are now complaining, perhaps, about the fact that we have a closed rule do not have in mind the offering of amendments even if the rule were open and, therefore, I do not know what their reason for asking for an open rule would be, if they do not have in mind the offering of amendments.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEILL. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. First, I might say in response to the gentleman from Arkansas, my good chairman, I think he will recognize that I am maintaining a position that I have tried to maintain in the Committee on Ways and Means, and I would call attention to the fact that the House, unfortunately from my standpoint, has been in control of the Democratic Party during the years that the gentleman mentions. I do not believe there are any amendments that are to be offered so far as I know. My purpose in making this an issue is a very clear one. I think it is about time the Committee on Ways and Means stopped leaning on this weak reed, as it were, the closed rule, and started debating these matters before the House under an open rule which I am satisfied we could follow that procedure. Now I certainly very seriously want to call the attention of the country, the best I can, if this is a device for doing it, and I think it is, this fight over the Rules Committee last year was a phony; it was not to liberalize the procedure and to allow matters to come before the House and to have the House work its will.

First, the House can work its will on Calendar Wednesday on any matter that is reported out by a committee. The matter does not have to go to the Committee on Rules.

Second, if the Committee on Rules does attempt to have closed rules, and that was during the 1930's, it is possible for the House to vote down that kind of procedure. In many respects, I am defending the Committee on Rules against unfair attacks as if it were actually a bottleneck in our House procedure when the real issue is that the Committee on Rules is accurately reflecting the will of the majority of the House and cannot thwart the will of the majority of the

House, and this is a very convenient opportunity to drive home this point, and I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEILL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, just for the record, I think it should be said that 2 years ago some 32 of us did ask for the privilege of an open rule in order that we might offer an amendment to the temporary increase in the national debt ceiling then being considered. I would have liked to have had that opportunity at that time, and I would like to have that opportunity at this time. The Committee on Rules in its wisdom, apparently, has felt that on a matter of this sensitivity, the House is not to be regarded as possessing sufficient discernment en masse to make prudent and judicious disposition of this bill under an open rule. I shall not quarrel with that conclusion, if it is a conclusion, beyond saying I would like to offer an amendment which was sponsored by some 32 of us as a group which would have committed the Congress in future years to a systematic plan of annual reductions of the national debt.

For that reason I would go against a closed rule. Beyond this I can recognize the judgment of the Rules Committee and respect its wisdom, but I think it should be said for the record that there are some of us who would like to have the opportunity to present amendments.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEILL. I yield.

Mr. MILLS. I think the membership should note that the Rules Committee in this instance is responding to the request which I made on behalf of the Ways and Means Committee. No one can criticize the Rules Committee because it reports legislation to the House providing for a closed rule when that committee is doing exactly what the membership of the Ways and Means Committee instructed its chairman to ask the Rules Committee to do. They instructed me as chairman and I appeared before the Rules Committee. This decision was made within the Ways and Means Committee.

It is true that my friend, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis], has in the past opposed a request of the Ways and Means Committee for a closed rule, but that view of the gentleman from Missouri is not shared within the committee by all of his Republican colleagues on the committee. So this is not a request that we made on the Rules Committee as a result of a vote of the Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee; this decision was shared by many of the colleagues of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] on the Ways and Means Committee, just as has been the case in the past when this matter has been before us.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEILL. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I simply want to confirm the statement of the chairman. What he says is certainly true, and I did not want to mislead anyone into thinking that I had been able to prevail with a majority of my colleagues on my side of the aisle, but this is an issue that I hope someday will prevail. There is no question, as the chairman stated, that the majority of the Ways and Means Committee requested the chairman to ask for a closed rule.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEILL. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. AVERY. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I do not think the matter of a closed rule is the issue. I just want to have the gentleman from Massachusetts enlighten me and the other Members if we would have an open rule what is the worst that could happen? Are there more than three amendments that could be offered to the bill, mainly to change the amount?

Mr. O'NEILL. I think a good many amendments could be offered. There is a great possibility that somebody might want to hamstring Federal borrowing.

There is a possibility that someone might offer an amendment that would destroy the borrowing power of the Secretary of the Treasury; in other words, there could be a limit upon the bill that would hamstring the borrowing of the Secretary of the Treasury; and we cannot allow such a thing to happen as a matter of good housekeeping.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEILL. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. Further answering the inquiry of the gentleman from Kansas as to the type of amendment that would be in order to this bill if an open rule were granted, the rate of interest to be paid on Government bonds could be affected by an amendment. The deposit of Federal funds within Federal Reserve banks could be affected by an amendment to this bill. The time of the issuance of Government securities could be affected within this bill; anything that has to do with the Federal debt which was provided for under the Second Liberty Loan Act would be in order.

Mr. AVERY. Did I understand the gentleman from Arkansas to say that the rate of interest could be considered as germane to amending the Second Liberty Loan Act?

Mr. MILLS. Yes. It is in that act that we have this 4¼ percent. In addition you could have amendments affecting open market operations.

Mr. AVERY. Is the gentleman fearful the interest rate might be raised?

Mr. MILLS. I was simply trying to answer the question as to what kind of amendments could be offered. It is not as simple or as free in the offering of amendments as some might think.

Mr. AVERY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MILLS. We are dealing with what I consider to be at the moment a very sensitive matter when we talk about the handling of our own obligations and what we might do in the process of passing legislation affecting those obligations and providing for the refinancing of them as they come due. It is possible that we could take some action—I know none of us would want to do that—that would have a very disturbing effect upon the market value of other bonds as well as these bonds.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEILL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Earlier in this debate or colloquy, the gentleman from Arkansas said he knew of no amendments to be offered. I can assure the gentleman if this is opened up I will be happy to offer an amendment to the bill.

Mr. MILLS. I was not referring to the gentleman from Iowa. I was referring to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown] who said if it is opened up he had no amendments. I was assuming my good friend from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] had no amendments to offer. They were the ones making the point it should be considered under an open rule, but they had no amendments in mind. That is what I was referring to. I know the gentleman wants to offer an amendment.

Mr. GROSS. I certainly would want to offer an amendment.

Mr. O'NEILL. The Rules Committee is always reluctant to report a closed rule, but in this case it was upon the insistence of the membership of the Ways and Means Committee because of the sensitiveness of the whole matter.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The **SPEAKER.** The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the "ayes" appeared to have it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **SPEAKER.** Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 258, nays 133, answered "present" 1, not voting 42, as follows:

[Roll No. 17]

YEAS—258

Abbitt
Addonizio
Albert
Alexander
Arends
Ashley
Aspinall
Avery
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett
Bates
Beckworth
Betts
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bonner
Boykin
Breeding
Brewster
Brooks
Broyhill
Buckley
Burke, Ky.
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Cannon
Carey
Celler
Chamberlain
Chelf
Chenoweth
Clark
Coad
Cohelan
Conte
Cook
Corbett
Corman
Curtin
Curtis, Mass.
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, John W.
Davis, Tenn.
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Downing
Doyle
Dulski
Dwyer
Edmondson
Elliott
Everett
Evins
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Fenton
Finnegan
Fino
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Ford
Fountain
Frazier
Friedel
Gallagher
Garland

Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Giaimo
Gilbert
Glenn
Gonzalez
Granahan
Grant
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Halleck
Halpern
Harding
Hardy
Harris
Harrison, Va.
Harvey, Mich.
Healey
Hébert
Hechler
Hemphill
Henderson
Herlong
Holifield
Holland
Ichord, Mo.
Inouye
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Md.
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Judd
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
Kilgore
King, Calif.
King, Utah
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kowalski
Kunkel
Landrum
Lane
Lankford
Lesinski
Libonati

McDowell
McFall
Macdonald
Mack
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marshall
Martin, Mass.
Mason
Mathias
Matthews
Miller, Clem
Milliken
Mills
Moeller
Montoya
Moorhead, Pa.
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Moss
Multer
Murphy
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
Norblad
Norrell
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
Olsen
O'Neill
Osmers
Ostertag
Patman
Perkins
Peterson
Pfost
Philbin
Pike
Pilcher
Poage
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Randall
Reece
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Rodino

Rogers, Colo.
Rooney
Rostenkowski
Roush
Rutherford
Ryan
St. Germain
Santangelo
Saund
Saylor
Schneebeli
Selden
Shelley
Sheppard
Shipley
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Miss.
Smith, Va.
Spence
Staggers
Steed
Stephens
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Toll
Trimble
Tuck
Tupper
Udall, Morris K.
Ullman
Vanik
Van Zandt
Vinson
Wallhauser
Walter
Watts
Weis
Westland
Whalley
Whitener
Wickersham
Widnall
Williams
Wilson, Calif.
Yates
Young
Younger
Zablocki
Zelenko

NAYS—133

Abernethy
Adair
Alford
Alger
Andersen, Minn.
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Auchincloss
Ayres
Baring
Barry
Battin
Becker
Beermann
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Berry
Blitch
Bolton
Bow
Bromwell
Brown
Bruce
Burleson
Casey
Cederberg
Chiperfield
Church
Clancy
Collier
Colmer
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtis, Mo.
Dague
Davis, James C.
Derounian
Derwinski
Devine
Dole
Dominick

Dorn
Dowdy
Durno
Findley
Fisher
Forrester
Frelinghuysen
Gavin
Goodell
Goodling
Gross
Haley
Hall
Harrison, Wyo.
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Hiestand
Hoeven
Hoffman, Ill.
Horan
Hosmer
Hull
Jensen
Johansen
Jonas
Kearns
King, N.Y.
Knox
Kyl
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
McCulloch
McDonough
McIntire
McMillan
McSween
McVey
MacGregor
Martin, Nebr.
May
Meader
Michel
Minshall

Moore
Moorehead, Ohio
Mosher
Nelsen
Nygaard
Passman
Pelly
Pillion
Pirnie
Poff
Ray
Reifel
Robison
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Roudebush
Rousselot
St. George
Schadeberg
Schenck
Scherer
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Scranton
Seely-Brown
Short
Siler
Smith, Calif.
Springer
Stafford
Taber
Thomson, Wis.
Tollefson
Utt
Van Pelt
Waggonner
Weaver
Wharton
Whitten
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Wright

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Kilburn

NOT VOTING—42

Addabbo
Anfuso
Bailey
Bass, N.H.
Bass, Tenn.
Bennett, Mich.
Brademas
Bray
Broomfield
Burke, Mass.
Cooley
Dawson
Dooley
Ellsworth
Fulton

Griffin
Gubser
Hansen
Hays
Hoffman, Mich.
Huddleston
Kirwan
Kitchin
Lindsay
Loser
Magnuson
Merrow
Miller, George P.
Miller, N.Y.

Monagan
Moulder
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Rains
Rhodes, Ariz.
Riehlman
Roosevelt
Sibal
Stratton
Thompson, N.J.
Willis

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Kirwan for, with Mr. Kitchin against.

Mr. Hays for, with Mr. Moulder against.

Mr. Monagan for, with Mr. O'Konski against.

Mr. Anfuso for, with Mr. Fulton against.

Mr. Bennett of Michigan for, with Mr. Bray against.

Mr. Riehlman for, with Mr. Kilburn against.

Mr. Willis for, with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Bass of New Hampshire.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Broomfield.

Mr. O'Hara of Michigan with Mr. Merrow.

Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Miller of New York.

Mr. Rains with Mr. Sibal.

Mr. Bailey with Mr. Dooley.

Mr. Stratton with Mr. Lindsay.

Mr. Loser with Mr. Griffin.

Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Ellsworth.

Mr. George P. Miller with Mr. Gubser.

Mr. Bass of Tennessee with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from New York [Mr. RIEHLMAN] who is at Cape Canaveral and, who, if present, would have voted "yea." I therefore withdraw my vote of "nay" and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10050) to provide for a further temporary increase in the public debt limit set forth in the Second Liberty Bond Act.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 10050, with Mr. JENNINGS in the chair.

By unanimous consent the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] will be recognized for 1½ hours and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] for 1½ hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS].

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, the bill H.R. 10050 was reported from the Ways and Means Committee after the committee heard the Secretary of the Treasury and the Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Budget explain to us what the situation is with respect to our potential obligations for the remainder of this fiscal year under legislation which is in existence at the present time.

Mr. Chairman, this bill provides a temporary addition of $2 billion in the debt limitation in effect for the fiscal year 1962. Presently there is in effect a temporary addition of $13 billion raising the statutory debt limit from the permanent level of $285 billion to a temporary level of $298 billion. This temporary increase is in effect for the balance of the current fiscal year, that is, until June 30.

The present bill which increases the temporary statutory debt limit by $2 billion will permit the public debt to rise during the balance of the present fiscal year to a level of $300 billion.

At the present time, we are not recommending any action with respect to the debt limit beyond June 30 of this year. We will not be able to make a useful recommendation on that matter until we know more of the expenditure and revenue outlook. If I may repeat this point, the present bill does not deal at all with the recommendation made by the President for providing a public debt limit of $308 billion for the fiscal year 1963.

The $2 billion temporary addition provided in the present bill is required to deal with the immediate financing problems. In setting the debt limitation in the past, we have given particular attention to the Treasury situation at the 15th of each month.

Generally, whatever taxes are due in a particular month are, under present law, due on the 15th or later if the 15th is a weekend. When tax payments are mailed close to the 15th, they may not be covered into the Treasury tax and loan accounts until a few days after the 15th. In any case, we find that during the first 2 weeks of each month expenditures which go on at a regular rate run ahead of receipts and the peak deficit each month is just before the bunched tax collections around the 15th.

In setting an actual debt limit, we have calculated that the Treasury should have a minimum operating balance in the Federal Reserve banks and the depositaries of $3½ billion. This is only 2 weeks of expenditures. In addition, we have borrowed the assumption that the Treasury should have $2 billion in unused borrowing authority to deal with unexpected developments and to provide some flexibility in debt management operations. Clearly the cost of debt management is increased if the Treasury must borrow from day to day just what it needs. Efficient debt management requires occasional larger borrowings, particularly as the market is favorable for floating new debt.

Applying these criteria, the debt situation will be unreasonably tight under the present $298 billion ceiling on March 15 and on June 15. On March 15 the Treasury's best estimate now is that the entire debt ceiling would be exhausted in maintaining its minimum working balance and there would be no allowance for contingencies. The situation is likely to be even tighter on June 15 when the existing public debt limitation would not even permit the Treasury to maintain its normal minimum working balance. To deal with these problems, the Committee on Ways and Means has agreed with the President that this public debt limitation should be raised temporarily to $300 billion for the balance of the current fiscal year.

When this committee last brought before the Congress its recommendations with respect to the statutory debt limitation for the fiscal year 1962, we applied the same criteria of minimum working balance and allowance for contingencies. The thing that has changed since our recommendation of last June has been principally the Government expenditure picture. Compared to what we expected in June of last year, estimated Federal expenditures have risen by $4 billion and receipts have risen by $700 million, making an increase in the deficit to be financed of $3.3 billion. We are only able to translate this into a somewhat smaller increase in the debt limitation by virtue of the fact that we are closer to the actual time of borrowing and we can get by with a somewhat smaller allowance for contingencies.

If the members of the Committee will look at page 4 of the report of the Committee on Ways and Means they will see the estimates that are made now of what the public debt, subject to this limitation, may be at periodic intervals, the 15th of the month and the last of the month for February, March, April, May, and June.

Members will observe that with respect to June 25, next, it is anticipated, if the Secretary of the Treasury has cash balances on hand on that day of $3½ billion there will be $299.2 billion of debt outstanding, leaving only $800 million of flexibility in the size of the debt on that day, under the ceiling which is contemplated in this legislation.

It would appear, therefore, Mr. Chairman, if the Secretary of the Treasury is to meet the obligations that have been created and are outstanding, this ceiling must be raised for the remainder of this fiscal year or else we place the Secretary of the Treasury in the position of doing one of two things: First, if we do not provide this additional ceiling, the Secretary of the Treasury could direct one of the other Government agencies that has authority to borrow money—the Commodity Credit Corporation for example—to go into the open market and issue its own securities to redeem the securities that the Treasury had purchased from that agency—in the example given, the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that would be a desirable action on the part of the Secretary of the Treasury. Why not? He would be requiring the Commodity Credit Corporation to go to the public to borrow money to pay obligations presently due the Secretary of the Treasury.

When this was done under the administration of Secretary of the Treasury, Bob Anderson, our very warm personal friend, at a time when he was cutting himself a little thin in his request for an increase in the debt ceiling, he had FNMA do that. FNMA went to the public and borrowed almost $800 million to pay obligations held against FNMA by the Treasury. What was the result? FNMA had to pay out $18 million more in that process, thereby charging against the public $18 million more than the Secretary of the Treasury would have been out in borrowing on his authority direct from the public.

Thus you can see that contrary to what some of my friends may think, there is an element of economy with respect to the adjustment of a ceiling on the public debt that may have escaped their attention. It cannot be said, therefore, that as a matter of fact, over and above theory, a vote against a debt ceiling is always a vote representing economy. The General Accounting Office called this matter to the attention of our friend who was then the Secretary of the Treasury. But there was not anything he could say about it, there was not anything he could do about it. He had just misguessed. He and the Congress had missed in their estimate. But as a result the American people were out an additional $18 million of cost in interest through the use of that device.

I am told by the present Secretary of the Treasury that if he is not given this additional authority, he is forced to do exactly what his predecessor did, except that at this time it would be the Commodity Credit Corporation that would be required to go to the public and float its bonds and pay for existing obligations in the hands of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Now, those bonds will not be bought by the public at as low an interest rate as will regular Government bonds issued under the Second Liberty Loan Act. We would, therefore, of course, have to go out and pay through this device more interest in order to take care of the obligations that are outstanding. That is one alternative. Is that economy? I do not believe it is.

The second alternative is this: If the Secretary does not borrow through that device, we force him to the point, on January 15—if his estimates are right, and the estimates that have been submitted have proven themselves correct—we force him then to confine himself on that day to slightly more money on hand in cash than it costs to finance the Federal Government and its activities for a 5-day period. Now, maybe he could do it; maybe he could not do it within this amount of cash.

If he could not do it, what would be his other alternative? He would have to cut back somewhere in the rate of spending that has been set by act of Congress. Regardless of who caused us to do it, the Congress did set the rate; we cannot escape that; we cannot escape the fact that by majority vote the Congress has fixed the rate of Government spending. We made that commitment by reason of these existing programs. Now, are we going to put the Secretary of the Treasury in the position of exercising that kind of authority? We are going to give him such authority, and do not think we are not, if it comes to this second alternative, that is, of having to reduce the rate of Government spending. Such a course would give him the authority to make the decision as to where the cuts will be. Where will they be? Does anyone know? Of course not. But, I do not want to give the Secretary of the Treasury the authority to make arbitrary cuts anywhere along the line any more than I want to give him authority to do anything else that I do not want him to do. This is a responsibility of the Congress.

Now, I do not think he would go that route. I think what he would do would be to go through the Commodity Credit Corporation and borrow this more expensive money. I think that is what he would have to do. That is not economical. That is not economy. So, I do not know how we can argue that when we vote against a ceiling increase—not the debt itself but a ceiling increase—how can we say that we are voting for economy? We are not. There is no element of economy in it.

Now, we may be trying to convince somebody that we are against the majority position taken by the Congress on expenditures; in many instances a position that we participated in after we have looked at the total of what we have done and do not like it as we see it. Actually, I have often wondered—as did one of my most revered colleagues on this committee, our late colleague from Pennsylvania, who has departed, and who served as the ranking Republican member of the committee for a time—I have often wondered what is the real purpose of a debt ceiling, anyway. And our very distinguished member of the Committee on Rules from the State of New York [Mrs. St. George] raised the same question when I was before the Committee on Rules.

I remember that my colleague, the tleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Simpson], earlier raised the same question with respect to the testimony of the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Anderson.

Mr. Chairman, on page 15 of the record of the hearings conducted by the Ways and Means Committee on January 17, 1958—and I am quoting from my departed colleague's question—there is the following:

> Mr. Secretary, I have never been able to understand why there is such a tremendous concern about the debt limit—

Not the debt but the debt limit—

> inasmuch as all you use the money for is to pay bills and the bills are the result of appropriations which are made by the Congress. Why is there a hesitancy in requesting authority to increase?
>
> Secretary Anderson. Mr. Simpson, of course what we do in the Treasury is to pay the checks for the bills which are drawn against us for operations of the Government, or for investment, or for purchases by all of the agencies of the Government, as you have indicated. I am sure that the existence of the debt limitation results from the fact that the Constitution gives the Congress the power to borrow money.

I think, undoubtedly, this colloquy between our friend from Pennsylvania and the Secretary of the Treasury has brought to the fore the basic point of why a ceiling at all? If that is its purpose, do we not want to give this extension of authority to the Secretary of the Treasury, this ceiling within which he must operate in a way that permits him to manage the public debt in the most economical manner possible? Is that not the issue? We talk in terms of the size of the debt; yes. I do not like the fact that we have to come in here because the size of the debt has increased, increased since June 1961, by an additional deficit of almost $4 billion over what we then predicted. I do not like that any more than you like it. The fact is before us, however, that there is a deficit now contemplated for this fiscal year of $7 billion instead of $3.7 billion which was the deficit we had before us as an estimate when we asked you to grant this temporary authority of $13 billion in June 1961.

Mr. Chairman, now what constitutes that change? Three billion dollars of it occurred as a result of what developed after this debt ceiling was passed last June—arising from the issues involved in the Berlin situation and our speeding up in trying to face that problem. That accounts for $3 billion of it. In addition to that, it developed that the Department of Agriculture, primarily through the Commodity Credit Corporation, had to have $737 million more than was estimated it would need in June due to better crops than anticipated. There was an increase of $300 million in the cost of handling the public debt over what was estimated in June. There was an increase in the spending of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration of $250 million, and an increase in the Atomic Energy Commission of $160 million since our estimates of June last year. There were some reductions, but the total adds up to these figures, largely from these operations that I have given you with reference to these particular increases.

Mr. Chairman, did we as a majority voting in the House—yes; upon the request of the administration—provide for a speedup in our military posture of $3 billion? Of course we did without a dissenting vote. We had no control in this Congress over this additional estimate for the Commodity Credit Corporation of the Department of Agriculture, but by a majority vote we provided for that situation. We had no control over this $300 million of additional interest required to finance the public debt. It was due in part to an increase in the rate of interest. It was due in part to an increase in the size of the debt.

We provided the additional money for the Space Administration. We provided the additional money for the Atomic Energy Commission. We thought it was the proper thing to do. I ask you now, regardless what the picture looks like, no matter how we may abhor the overall result, if it is not good commonsense to permit the Secretary of the Treasury to finance this in the most economical way possible to him. That is all we are asking, to provide him the tools to do that job.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I wonder if the Committee, with Secretary Dillon, explored the use of Public Law 86-567 which provides for a $5 billion cushion?

Mr. MILLS. Yes, we explored the possibility of the use of every law. I wonder if my friend, on the other hand, has explored the possibility of what might happen if that were used?

Mr. GROSS. If what were used?

Mr. MILLS. If that authority to which you refer were used. I would suggest that both sides of these questions have to be considered. I do not want to discuss what might or might not happen, but I think my friend should do as I have done, look into the possibilities that might occur as a result of the use of that authority. I am not saying that it is dark or earthshaking or destructive of our way of life, but there are some facets of it that I think my friend would want to look into.

Mr. GROSS. I am sure of that, but we have this law on the statute books for a $5 billion cushion.

Mr. MILLS. That is true.

Mr. GROSS. And it will be up for renewal this year. Why renew this law if it is not going to be used? This is a printing-press money bill. I was never for it.

Mr. MILLS. This is not a printing-press money bill.

Mr. GROSS. I am saying to the gentleman that Public Law 86-567 is a printing-press money bill.

Mr. MILLS. That is the very point that I wanted to bring to the gentleman's attention by my question. We certainly do not want to be financing Government obligations through printing press money, do we?

Mr. GROSS. Well, we are doing it.

Mr. MILLS. No, we are not; not through this bill. I am quite willing to stand by the collective judgment of this Congress in its various revenue and expenditure decisions. The existing debt problem is simply the outcome of these decisions—the decision to defend Berlin; to not increase postal rates last year; to provide certain public works; and the rest. Very few of these decisions were unanimous but they were ours. We should provide the Secretary of the Treasury with adequate financing to carry these congressional decisions into effect.

Mr. Chairman, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting at this point a letter from Secretary Dillon commenting on what would happen if we do not note an increase in the debt ceiling:

SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, February 20, 1962.

HON. WILBUR D. MILLS,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In connection with the pending bill to provide a temporary increase of $2 billion in the public debt limit, you have asked me to explain what would happen if the increase were to be denied. In other words, what is the effect on debt management if the Treasury is forced to conduct its debt management operations under too tight a ceiling?

Since the Treasury must obviously meet the Government's obligations as they become due, and since to do so it must borrow when tax and other revenues fall short of this objective, the answer is plain. If the debt ceiling is too tight to permit finding the necessary funds by public debt borrowing, then the Treasury Department must resort to special operations to find the needed funds. There are, in fact, other ways in which the Treasury may within limits find funds without resort to public debt financing. For example, we can ask the Commodity Credit Corporation to utilize its authority to borrow funds by selling to banks crop loan obligations which CCC had previously purchased. CCC will then use the funds to repay its indebtedness to the Treasury. While this can put the Treasury in funds, it is objectionable because the cost of the borrowing is more expensive than an ordinary Treasury public debt financing.

Indeed, the Report of the Comptroller General of the United States for the fiscal year 1959 sharply criticized the Treasury for persuading FNMA to borrow some $797 million under its statutory authority at an interest rate that was about seven-eighths of 1 percent more than the Treasury would have had to pay had it issued its own obligations of similar maturities. Secretary Anderson in a reply to this criticism advised the Comptroller General by letter dated March 11, 1960, that the Treasury was forced to resort to this special device since its outstanding public debt was only some $300 million below the statutory debt limit and its cash balances were inadequate to overcome the difference. Thus both the criticism of the Comptroller General and the reply of Secretary Anderson were justifiable. By being forced to manage the debt at a level too close to the debt ceiling, Secretary Anderson was able to meet the problem but only at an added expense to the United States of some $18 million over the life of the FNMA issue.

Accordingly, Mr. Chairman, it is clear that a failure to receive from the Congress the temporary increase in the public debt limit will force the Treasury to obtain the needed funds at substantially greater expense to the public than would otherwise be the case.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS DILLON.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, we have listened to a very persuasive and quite convincing statement of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means on this problem of increasing, temporarily at least, the debt ceiling by $2 billion. He has made a very convincing statement of the need for doing that. I want to say this, however, that I have never voted to increase the debt ceiling, only in wartime, when it was absolutely necessary. Then I did. And I am not going to vote to increase the debt ceiling today. I feel that this Congress should do as I have always done personally; I have lived within my income unless faced with an emergency that had to be financed.

Personally, I see no emergency facing this Nation today if—if the Congress will only cut its cloth to suit its pocketbook. But that is something this Congress does not do. The majority of the Members of this Congress, and I am not referring to one side or the other, like to spend more than is coming in. And so they vote to spend it. Therefore, when they vote to spend it, of course, they have to see to it that it is paid some way or another, and if it is to be paid by increasing the debt ceiling, why that is the only way to do it. But those Members of this Congress who have not been voting for the appropriations, that are more than the receipts of the Government, should not feel under obligation to vote to increase this debt ceiling. I do not feel that way and I shall not vote to increase it.

Mr. Chairman, that in substance is my attitude upon this question before us today. I voted for the rule to bring this before the House so the House could vote its will on the question of increasing this debt ceiling or not to increase it. I voted for the rule. I do not see any reason why anyone should not vote for the rule. That is my attitude on this question that is before the House.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOX] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the legislation before us, H.R. 10050, to increase the public debt limit by $2 billion, bringing the total debt limit to $300 billion for the remainder of fiscal year 1962. Thus, the total temporary increase in effect for the balance of this fiscal year is $15 billion.

Nothing has occurred since January 20, 1961, in Federal fiscal affairs that convinces me the Kennedy administration has a determined desire to live within the limitation of Federal revenues. Since the Kennedy administration took office the projected rate of expenditures of the Federal Government has increased by more than $1 billion per month and is still increasing. Congress is not obligated to accept blindly the budgetary recommendations of the administration. Indeed, Congress is obligated to exercise its judgment as to priorities of programs so as not to impair our national strength through waste and extravagance.

The debt ceiling has had no restraining effect upon the starting of new domestic programs nor in restricting the expansion of programs already in existence. In short the debt ceiling has not kept us from spending ourselves further into debt.

The mail coming to my office since the first of the year reveals that the overwhelming majority of my constituents do not favor the increasing of so-called Federal Government giveaway programs. My constituents know that we must bring to a halt the wasteful and unnecessary spending in Washington if we are to avoid destruction of the dollar and the imposition of our debts on future generations.

Some Members will excuse an affirmative vote by the rationalization that we must get ourselves out of this mess and the only way we can do it is to increase our debt limitation. I respectfully submit to the House membership that another course is open and that is to live within our means. Let the spenders come forward with the way to pay. Congress should follow the straightforward course of living within the limits of our willingness to pay our way.

I am opposed to the spending and borrowing fiscal folly of this administration. Increasing the public debt limitation must cease to be the expedient way and become an unheard method of conducting the fiscal affairs of the Federal Government. Our national security is at stake.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I voted against the rule because I felt it should be open, but I explained the reason behind that. I am in favor of the bill and I think the chairman of our committee has expressed my reasons. I might say those are the reasons of the majority on my side of the committee for supporting this measure, and supporting it with great reluctance. I do call the attention of the House to the separate views of the Republicans on this bill which appear on page 7 and run through page 11 of the committee report. The chairman is eminently correct when he says this is not a debt limitation bill. This is a debt management bill. The debt has already been created and the issues involved are how we are going to finance the authority to spend, and the appropriations that we have given to the executive department. Now I notice, and I would sure like to pin this on the record, that each year there are some of what I call spenders who vote for every appropriation and who try to up all the amendments on appropriations who use a negative vote on this bill as their device to try to tell their constituencies that they really are against the big Federal debt. That, to me, is most regrettable. However, I can sympathize and I do sympathize with those who vote against most of the spending programs or at least the programs to increase the budget and who vote to try to bring the expenditures down within a more reasonable figure in relation to our revenues. I think my record on expenditures is probably as tight as anyone's. I want to spend money for people and things, if we have it, but I recognize that if you do not have it, you are doing a disservice to them and you are doing a disservice to your country, and I think we have got to get discipline into this matter.

The question is raised each time: "What is the purpose of this so-called debt limit bill?" Or as it should be termed, debt-management bill. Really, from an economic standpoint it does not serve a purpose; in fact, it is a dangerous thing and probably should be eliminated. In these days, though, where the Congress still has failed to establish the necessary machinery to go into the overall expenditures in the budget, perhaps it does serve the purpose of providing some discipline. At least, on this day our eyes are focused on the question of our fiscal policy. Possibly it does serve that purpose of going over and discussing what has transpired.

I have about five points I think need to be made, and this bill before us does provide the appropriate time to do so.

First, I would observe that inasmuch as the President originally proposed, a $10 billion debt increase now dropped down to $2 billion for this bite and $8 billion later, he did not present to us a real balanced budget for the coming fiscal year. I think anyone who goes into the details of this so-called balanced budget for fiscal year 1963 realizes that it is only a balance in name; in actuality it is very definitely imbalanced because of unrealistic estimates on both the expenditure side and the revenue side. Certainly, that is something we all want to direct our attention to, because it is a serious matter. This request for increased debt ceiling certainly does prove so, because if the 1963 budget were a balanced budget we would not need this additional $8 billion. I think we would need this additional $2 billion.

Second, I think we should point out and go into detail whether or not this really was—that is, the $2 billion I am talking about now—a result of the Berlin crisis. I respect my chairman's position in stating that it was—and indeed the Treasury Department testified that it was, but I think there is considerable evidence to demonstrate that it is not. A case has not been established In executive session I interrogated the Bureau of the Budget people and the Treasury people to find out, and they finally said: "Well, we actually cannot prove it. You would have to go into too many details."

I am very anxious that we do go into detail. I know the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] is going to devote some time to this today and he, being on the Military Appropriations Subcommittee, is eminently qualified to speak to it. This does not seem to be the case. Possibly as much as $2 billion might be related to the Berlin crisis, but not $3 billion.

Thirdly, I want to call attention at this time to a letter that some other Members of the House on my side and myself directed to the President right after he delivered his message in regard to the Berlin situation, asking him where we should cut back in nondefense expenditures so that we could absorb whatever was necessary to meet the Berlin crisis. Not a single word has come from the President to the Congress or to this group who wrote to him about where we might cut back on nondefense expenditures. There was no attempt by the President to pay attention to the importance of a balanced budget as it relates to fiscal responsibility. Nor is this increased budget primarily for defense items. The increases in nondefense expenditures and new obligational authorities requests exceed the defense items.

I well recall the President's inaugural address to the people of this country, saying to them: "Do not ask what the Nation can do for you, but rather what you can do for the Nation." If those bold words, those brave words, words that I think sunk deeply into the hearts of all the American people, were to be meaningful, here was the time to have given to the Congress, to the people's representatives, reasons why because of the Berlin crisis and international problems, we needed to cut back in some of these nondefense areas. Instead the President requested the Congress to vote more great nondefense expenditure programs.

I think we can examine that at this time of considering raising the debt ceiling. We would not be in this crisis asking for a $2 billion debt increase had the President of the United States exercised some discipline on himself and on the executive branch of the Government in the nondefense area. Certainly there is no need for an $8 billion additional increase if the proper discipline and regard for a balanced budget is shown by the President.

Another point, a fourth point, can be made at this time and should always be made, a point really that has not been dwelled upon sufficiently in the past. I refer to the flexibility that the executive department has to translate obligational authority into expenditures. I came very close on this occasion to opposing this $2 billion increase because of the fact that the President does have great flexibility. My chairman pointed out that we do not want to give authority to the Executive to cut where he wants to, which we would force upon him if we do not grant this request. I would point out, however, that already the Executive has considerable flexibility to do just that if he chooses to do so.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. I was not talking about what the President or the Director of the Bureau of the Budget or other departments could do. I was talking about the Secretary of the Treasury being put in that position.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I misunderstood. I could not agree more with the gentleman. If the chairman had been making this point it would have had some possible merit, because, sure, we leave the President with this flexibility and he has the authority, but the Congress can move into this area and do something itself if it would. Congress is not on too firm ground in simply saying that the President has that flexibility even though he has. I think it is worth pointing out, however, because the people can rightfully criticize both the President and the Congress. Both are derelict. However, the President truthfully can do a great deal more about it than the Congress.

I want to illustrate this further by quoting a table directly from the President's budget message this year. I refer to page 10 of the report where the table appears. Here is the point I want to make. The President says this is a balanced budget because the budget expenditure for 1963 is $92.5 billion. Note the word "expenditure." Look at the bottom, however, for new obligational authority—the President asks authority to spend $99.3 billion not $92.5 billion. There is the flexibility. He requests $6.8 billion. Then, consider the unused obligational authority he has carried over from previous budgets. I have figured this up, and it is over $80 billion. There is considerable flexibility. He can program. He does not have to convert obligational authority into expenditures. He can accelerate or decelerate. As a mater of fact, normal routine. The Executive is constantly doing just that; and $2 billion is just about 2 percent of his budget—well within the area of reasonable discretion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, we break down the items in the budget to see where this differential between expenditure estimates and new obligational authority requests come. This is something that people of the country are interested in and should know. The President has been talking about his education bills. If he really is sincere about that, they should be budgeted. They are budgeted in, one, an item of $600 million for new obligational authority, for school construction and teachers' salaries, and so forth, but the estimate of expenditures for fiscal year 1963 is around $90 million. In reference to a bill we have already passed in regard to higher education, the budget request was for $332 million of new obligational authority and the expenditure $20.8 million. Who are we kidding—the people who think the Federal Government is going to give money for education or the people who think we have a balanced budget? If the people are going to get this money in education, the budget is unbalanced. Those who think the budget is balanced do so on the assumption that the money will not be spent, according to the President's own figures.

There is one other point I should like to make.

A lot of people are taking consolation in the fact that the debt is a less percentage of the gross national product than it was during World War II. We know we must have resiliency to be able to move in a crisis, or in the event we should have war. What resiliency do we have if in peacetime we have a debt of the same percentage of GNP we had during the war? Furthermore, let us look at what happened as the result of a debt that was of such high percentage of the gross national product as that of World War II, it resulted in serious inflation.

That is what cut the purchasing power of the dollar to 50 cents after World War II. We had to monetize the debt in order to manage it, or at least that is what President Truman's fiscal advisers recommended be done and it was done. I thought one of the great achievements of the Eisenhower administration was cutting the percentage of the debt in respect to gross national product. Now this administration comes forward and wants to use that leeway—it is not leeway, really—but wants to use that differential and go backward in peacetime saying, "Well, we don't have to worry because we are still not getting beyond the ratio to the gross national product we had during wartime." This, in my judgment, is dangerous, dangerous economics.

So, my concluding observations are, we have to increase the amount of bonds the Treasury can sell because we have a March 15 deadline where we have to have the cash to pay for these obligations to incur expenditures that this Congress has told the President he may make. Otherwise, it is going to cost us more money in handling the payment of our obligations. Good economics requires us to vote for this bill. But, we should use this occasion to point out some of the weaknesses of our present fiscal policy and to call the attention of the people of this country to this, and I hope of the Executive, if he reads congressional speeches.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'Brien].

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, just in case some members of the Committee are not aware of the latest developments of the historic flight taking place today, Lt. Col. John Glenn has landed 6 miles from the nearest destroyer, and helicopters from that destroyer are now at the scene, and he is in good shape.

Mr. Chairman, I have a rather unusual contribution to the debate today that might be titled "A Twice-Used Speech." As a prelude I would like to point out—and I think all members of the committee will agree with me—that no Member of the House ever forgets his first trip to the well of the House for the delivery of his maiden speech. It is a memory usually wrapped around shaking knees and a somewhat dry throat, and I think all Members hesitate long before they make that icy plunge and wait until they feel rather strongly about some bill or resolution.

Nine years ago, Mr. Chairman, I had this strong feeling. The then President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower, had a request for an increase of $15 billion in the national debt limit. I felt—in fact, I knew—that there was some partisanship at that time.

If you will bear with me, Mr. Chairman, I would like to repeat word for word what I said on that occasion. My remarks then, quite frankly, were aimed mainly at some of my colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle. They are addressed today mainly to some of my friends on the Republican side. On that day, July 31, 1953, I said:

> There has been some discussion as to the responsibility for the need to increase the national debt limit. It has been said that it is the impact of past appropriations and spendings. Some have said that it could have been avoided by lower appropriations this year.
>
> I am not interested in the political implications because I believe the integrity of the United States is far too important for politics or political advantage.
>
> In this savage world in which we live, the nations are choosing up sides. Many will go to the stronger side. Will those nations not regard as weak a country which might have to default on its obligations because we refused here today to lift the debt limit? Will they not be told by our enemies that the great United States is broke and bankrupt? We dare not risk the chance of blunting the weapons we already have forged in the cold war.
>
> Mr. Chairman, if the occupant of the White House was a Democrat and he sent to us this bill, backed by the facts we have before us, I would vote for the measure. I

would not be true to myself if I voted differently because the President today is a Republican. I shall support the bill.

I meant that 9 years ago, Mr. Chairman, and I believe by changing two words in that entire speech it is applicable today.

I was very happy on that occasion 9 years ago when the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] said something rather nice about my remarks, and he added:

> His conclusion nobody can contest or argue with. Because this request comes from a Republican administration is no justification for not standing up to it and voting for it.

Mr. Chairman, I say today that because this request comes from a Democratic administration is no justification for not standing up to it and voting for it.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I gladly yield to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Since the gentleman from New York mentioned my name and repeated what I said at that time, may I assure the gentleman that I today am going to vote for this $2 billion increase.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I would not have mentioned the gentleman's name if I had not really believed that from the beginning. I am sure that the gentleman believes that in matters such as this we must rise above partisanship. It is not a question of wanting to do it.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROUSSELOT].

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 10050, which would provide for further so-called temporary increases in the public debt limit by $2 billion.

The people of my district, and I believe the overwhelming majority of the American people, have been pushed to their limit in being asked time and time again to allow our Federal Government to live differently than they as individual citizens are required to live. There is a point beyond which the Federal Government, like local governments, big corporations, small businesses, voluntary organizations, and individuals, cannot go in building up its indebtedness. Every time we increase the Federal debt, we also increase the cost of keeping that debt afloat. I believe, therefore, that the time has come to stand firm against the policy of allowing the Federal Government to be any different than individual citizens in managing its debts.

My reasons for opposing this bill are very positive. They relate to the very survival of the integrity of our financial position in the world. My reasons can be summarized as follows:

First. Past experience in both this House and the other distinguished body, the Senate of the United States, has shown that opposition to increasing the debt ceiling has not resulted in chaos, panic, or irresponsibility. As my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER], has pointed out, opposition to increases has actually had a healthy effect on our economy. In 1954 a Member of the other body, Senator HARRY BYRD, vigorously opposed legislation to raise the national debt ceiling by $15 billion. His efforts helped defeat the legislation. The defeat of this legislation did not destroy the ability of the Federal Government to maintain proper defenses and to cover its major domestic responsibilities. In fact, it encouraged a more responsible approach to spending because the executive branch, which was then under the management of my party, the Republican Party, was forced to pare down expenditures.

Second. By refusing to increase the debt ceiling, we would be taking a positive step to force economy within the executive branch. I am sure that President Kennedy wants to be an advocate of economy within the executive branch. How can he show this? By using the much-abused Executive order privilege to effect an across-the-board reduction in all domestic programs. This need not hurt our defense posture one iota.

Third. Former Budget Bureau Director Maurice Stans recently said that our true deficit comes close to $800 billion, not $300 billion. Statisticians fail to include the back-door expenditures that occur each year in the oft-quoted $300 billion figure. I believe the national debt has gone beyond all reason. We must begin to take positive steps to reduce it.

Fourth. The interest charge included in our annual Federal budget just to maintain the present debt is the second largest expenditure item in the budget. This charge costs the American taxpayers $9 billion each year. I do not intend to be a part of adding to this charge by supporting a $2 billion debt ceiling increase.

Fifth. According to Maurice Stans, each American family of four is presently carrying $22,000 on his back as his share of the national debt. I know that the overwhelming number of families in my district does not want to have this burden increased. The statement is sometimes made that somehow we will be able to have better debt management by adding to it. This just does not make sense to me, and I am sure the average American family does not improve its individual debt management by continually adding to it.

Sixth. It has been said that we should support the bill now before us because under the Eisenhower administration some $25 billion was added to our debt. I am a Republican and plan to remain one, but this is no excuse. Two wrongs do not make a right. We are not going to rectify a mistake of the Eisenhower administration by increasing our Federal debt. I understand the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DEVINE] plans to point this out more clearly later today. He will make the point that mistakes of previous administrations should not be carried on by the present administration.

I am asked many times, "What is your alternative?" As a conservative you cannot just be against everything, and I am not. I have, therefore, today introduced a bill calling for the reduction of our debt on a systematic basis each year. I will have more to say about this bill in future days, but I have put in the hopper a piece of legislation which will accomplish the following: First, place a moral obligation on the executive branch to send a balanced budget each year; second, limit congressional appropriations each year to anticipated revenue, except in times of war, national disaster, or emergency; and third, 1 percent annual reduction of debt on Second Liberty Bond Act.

The text of the bill and other articles relating to this subject follow:

A BILL BY THE HONORABLE JOHN H. ROUSSELOT TO PROVIDE THAT FEDERAL EXPENDITURES SHALL NOT EXCEED FEDERAL REVENUES, EXCEPT IN TIME OF WAR, NATIONAL DISASTER, OR EMERGENCY, AND TO PROVIDE FOR THE RETIREMENT OF THE PUBLIC DEBT

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the expenditures of the Government during each fiscal year, including reduction of the public debt in accordance with the limitations thereon imposed by the amendment made by section 2, may not exceed its revenues for such year except—

(1) in time of war declared by Congress; or

(2) upon determination and certification to Congress by the President that a national disaster, or emergency has occurred, or is occurring if such certification is approved by each House by the affirmative vote of at least two-thirds of the authorized membership of that House. No such certification shall be effective except for the duration of the fiscal year with respect to which approval by each House is given.

SEC. 2. Section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended (31 U.S.C. 757b), is amended by inserting "(a)" after "Sec. 21." and by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(b) The aggregate face amount of obligations referred to in subsection (a) (other than obligations held by the Secretary of the Treasury) is hereby reduced, as of July 1 of the fiscal year which begins after the date of enactment of this sentence, and on July 1 of each fiscal year beginning thereafter, by an amount equal to not less than 1 per centum of the aggregate face amount of such obligations (other than obligations held by the Secretary of the Treasury) outstanding on July 1 of the year in which this sentence is enacted."

SEC. 3. (a) The budget submitted annually by the President pursuant to section 201 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, as amended, shall be prepared to insure compliance with the first section of this Act.

(b) Notwithstanding any obligational authority granted or appropriations made (except with respect to the legislative and judicial branches of the Government), the President shall from time to time during each fiscal year take such action as may be necessary (by placing funds in reserve, by apportionment of funds, or otherwise) to insure compliance with the first section of this Act.

SEC. 4. The Congress shall not enact appropriations measures which will result in expenditures by the Government during any fiscal year in excess of its estimated revenues for such year (as such revenues have been estimated in the budget submitted by the President), except—

(1) to the extent of any additional revenues of the Government for such fiscal year resulting from tax legislation enacted after submission of the budget for such fiscal year;

(2) in time of war declared by the Congress; or

(3) upon determination and certification to Congress by the President that a national disaster or emergency has occurred, or is occurring, if such certification is approved by each House by the affirmative vote of at least two-thirds of the authorized membership of that House. No such certification shall be effective except for the duration of the fiscal year with respect to which approval by each House is given.

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune, Nov. 27, 1961]

Dr. Palyi Comments: Threat of National Bankruptcy or U.S. Ability "To Pay on Dot"

(By Melchior Palyi)

Cologne, Germany, November 28.—If you cannot pay your bills—you are "illiquid." You may talk the creditors into some arrangement. You may sell some assets, or borrow fresh somewhere else. But if you go on spending more than you earn, bankruptcy is the end of the road, unless a rich uncle comes to your rescue.

Exactly the same problem and the identical choice of remedies face nations that live too high on the hog—spend abroad far beyond what they earn abroad. They run up deficits year after year in their international payments. At the day of reckoning, literally, they get stuck in "international illiquidity," a fancy name for a very prosaic situation. That is where we are. And we have ample company.

HEADING FOR BANKRUPTCY?

The threat of imminent national bankruptcy, by whatever name it goes, is staring in our collective faces. It consists in the inability of the Government to pay out in gold short maturity claims of foreigners at the fixed rate of one ounce of fine gold for each $35.0875 claimed. Thus far, the U.S. Treasury does hand out the gold at that rate to the foreigners who offer dollars. If they sell the dollars on a gold market abroad, the Treasury steps in by selling gold. So, the gold value of the dollar is being maintained approximately at par.

WHY IS THERE DOUBT?

Why should the foreigners ask for gold in lieu of dollars? They would much rather have the dollars (and short-term dollar securities which yield a return) as long as the dollars are "as good as gold." But the world has begun to doubt our Government's ability, or will, to fulfill its implicit contractual obligation—to pay in gold at the par value of the dollar.

Why should there be any doubt about our national solvency? National honesty is at stake. As to our ability to pay on the dot: Are we not the richest nation on earth? Actually, our balance of "current" trade produces every year a handsome surplus. This current balance includes all commodity and service transactions, even the transfer of capital for long-term investment, and the return on foreign investments. But the Government keeps overspending the surplus, turning it into deficits.

At the root of the trouble is the inflation. Inflated labor costs undermine the ability of our exporters to compete abroad. The volume of imports is boosted, ever more private and public spending abroad is induced, and our manufacturers are driven out of the country in search of greener pastures.

What does the Government do to restore confidence in the dollar? Rose colored speeches aside, all it does is—to look for a rich uncle to bail out the nephew who used to be the uncle not so long ago.

QUESTION OF CONFIDENCE

We still have a gold reserve of $17 billion, having lost more than $7 billion in gold since the last war, more than $5 billion since early 1958. This year, the deficit in foreign payments will be only $2 billion, provided that the run on the dollar does not restart. It might do so on no notice at all, in view of the fact that our short-term debt to foreigners—some $27 billion—keeps growing while the gold reserve is being whittled down.

We also have some $6 billion in "liquid" claims against foreign countries. Try to collect and pronto, they may "freeze" the flow of their currencies.

The dollar still enjoys worldwide repute, if a somewhat shaky one. It is not too late to take remedial steps in order to restore our balance of payments, the prime condition for a balanced economic growth.

[From Newsweek, Feb. 5, 1962]

Perspective: Big, but What Is It?

(By Raymond Moley)

As the new Kennedy budget reveals itself in the press, we pause for identification. For now, in the estimates for fiscal 1963, we see the first genuine pattern of New Frontier ideas and purposes. The President's budget for 1962 presented a year ago was a hasty revision of the budget prepared under the Eisenhower regime. Now there can be no suggestion of haste or improvisation. For the President, his Budget Bureau, and the various Departments and Agencies have had a year to put together their plans for the sort of nation they want to establish. In short, to implement their philosophy—if they have one. What emerges?

It is certainly big. The spending the President asked for is $11 billion more than the year ending last June and $16 billion more than the last full Eisenhower year.

Is this socialism? No, although there is some socialism in it. Generally, the pattern is not to take over means of production except in such areas as the production and transmission of electric power. The philosophy which has replaced socialism is not to undertake the immense responsibility of running the means of production. Instead, it is the easier process of taking the product of private production in money, through taxation.

Is it the welfare state? No, although there is a lot of welfare in it.

NO CONSISTENCY

Is it a return to the planned economy which so many were hopeful of establishing in the 1930's? No. To call this great indiscriminate mass of benefits and projects a plan is to desecrate a good old word. Nobody planned all this. It was not created; it simply accumulated.

That becomes clear when we examine the list of innumerable odds and ends for which money is to be spent. There is nothing homogeneous about such a collection. There is no likeness or interrelationship among such items as subsidized transportation for city and suburban dwellers, rural telephones, school lunches, a National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice, the preservation of life among ducks and bears, retraining workers displaced by automation, and aid to speculators in land through urban renewal. There is provided not only money for stopping juvenile delinquency but for the enlargement of prisons. For buying tombstones and for studying the Greek Orthodox Church in Alaska.

I prefer to call the new Federal establishment, which is casting its shadow over the Doric simplicity of our original constitutional system, by another name. This was suggested more than 40 years ago by Dean Pound of the Harvard Law School: The superservice state. Abundance there is, but consistency there is not.

Its limit is described by Parkinson's "second law," which holds that in modern governments expenditures rise to the limits of income. In the case at hand, if revenues from taxes fail to meet expenditures, a capital levy on savings is enacted through inflation.

SEMANTICS

There is also in the new dispensation a depreciation in the meaning of old words by a simple revision. A very large proportion of the increase in this budget comes because of back-door spending. These expenditures really take money from the Treasury, and the schoolboys of the Nation will read in their Constitution that no money is to be taken from the Treasury "but in consequence of appropriations made by law." Back-door spending since 1932 has been accomplished to the extent of more than $100 billion by the simple device of not calling these expenditures "appropriations."

In the President's state of the Union message he referred to the prospective purchase by the United States of $100 million of United Nations bonds. He admitted that many members of that organization do little to support it but that in order to have the right to sound off and vote they pay their dues. Those dues would, he said, pay the interest on the bonds. And then the President said that such borrowing with the payment of interest would keep the U.N. solvent. Since I never heard of anyone becoming more solvent by borrowing money, I sought Webster. It says that to be solvent is "to be able or sufficient to pay all debts." Thus we move into the frontier of semantics.

[From Newsweek, Feb. 5, 1962]

Business Tides: Notes on the Budget

(By Henry Hazlitt)

Is it balanced? The President estimates that the Federal Government will spend $92.5 billion in the fiscal year 1963, and will take in revenues of $93 billion, leaving a surplus of $463 million. This would be the first surplus in 3 years and the second in six. But the forecast is based on a series of the most optimistic assumptions. Revenue forecasts, for example, are based on the expectation of unparalleled prosperity. With no important net change in tax rates, revenues are counted upon to jump from $82.1 billion in fiscal 1962 to $93 billion in fiscal 1963. If revenues did not increase, the predicted surplus of half a billion would become a deficit of $10.4 billion.

How reliable? In the light of the past record, how much confidence can we place in the new estimates? It is ironic to recall that for the fiscal year 1959, which ended with a deficit of $12.4 billion, Eisenhower originally estimated a surplus of nearly half a billion, almost exactly what Mr. Kennedy now estimates for 1963. But in 1959 expenditures turned out to be $6.8 billion more than the estimate, and receipts $6.1 billion less. Eisenhower originally estimated a surplus for the current fiscal year of $1.5 billion. Last March Mr. Kennedy estimated instead a deficit of $2.8 billion. In July this was raised to $5.3 billion. It is now estimated at $7 billion—with the year only a little more than half over. If an estimated deficit is raised a billion dollars or so every 2 or 3 months, what confidence can we have in a paper-thin surplus forecast 17 months ahead?

Why so big? The spending estimates for fiscal 1963 are the highest on record in peacetime—$11 billion higher than in 1961 and $28 billion higher than in 1955. The taxes to support such spending must undermine productive incentives and siphon off the funds for investment. Sentences in the President's message give the impression that the rise in Federal spending is almost entirely caused by increased costs of defense. But even with the heavy increase in proposed defense spending to $52.7 billion, more than half of our total spending of $114.8 billion (when we count social security and similar payments) is still on nondefense and welfare items. Even when we confine ourselves to the regular budget, we find that compared with the last completed year, 1961, though projected national defense expenditures have increased $5.2 billion, nondefense and other expenditures have increased $5.8 billion. Nondefense expenditures of $39.8 billion projected for fiscal 1963 are almost double the $20.9 billion nondefense expenditures in 1954.

More needs met? It is a fallacy to suppose that the enormous new budget enables the American people to meet more needs on net balance than before. All it does is to transfer expenditures from the free enterprise sector of the economy to the socialized sector, from the voluntary sector to the compulsory sector. The Government can give nothing to Paul that it does not take from Peter. Everybody is forced to pay for somebody else's education or illness. As Bastiat put it more than a century ago: "Government is the great fiction through which everybody tries to live at the expense of everybody else."

Inflation threat: A few months ago Mr. Kennedy gave his support to the theory that an annually balanced budget was unnecessary; all that was needed was a balance over the years of the business cycle. But even this theory involved the implicit assumption that if, say, we ran deficits of $7 billion to $12 billion in our bad years, we would have to run equally huge surpluses in our good years. Now Mr. Kennedy's budget message rests explicitly on the theory that though we need heavy deficits to turn the business cycle from recession to recovery, even a budget balance at any time, let alone an actual surplus, may endanger prosperity, and that the President needs discretionary standby powers to cut taxes or increase spending to cure unemployment.

This theory is very fashionable but quite fallacious. Not merely the new budget itself, but even more the new explicit budget philosophy behind it, must increase the threat and fear of inflation and undermine confidence in the American dollar.

EXCERPTS FROM "A REPORT FROM YOUR CONGRESSMAN, JOHN H. ROUSSELOT, 25TH DISTRICT, CALIFORNIA."

The President claims in his state of the Union message that his budget for fiscal 1963 (July 1, 1962, to July 1, 1963) will be in balance. But I have my doubts in light of the President's request for a hike of $10 billion in the national debt limit and for standby authority to spend $99.303 billion in case of an emergency.

Commenting on the President's message, Representative HOWARD SMITH, a Democrat, and chairman of the House Rules Committee, has said:

"In the past, increased spending made necessary by defense programs has been offset in part by curtailment of domestic spending. I regret that there is no such indication in this message. On the contrary, Congress is being asked for an increase in the debt limit to meet the proposed additional expenditures in the domestic and welfare field."

In my opinion, the 1963 Federal budget, which is the first all-Kennedy budget, will fall short of expenditures by at least $1 billion. I hope the President realizes that unless we abandon the big-spending approach to government and start living within our means our free enterprise economy cannot survive. Continual deficit financing leads to higher taxes and higher taxes bleed the private sector of the economy of necessary capital.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER].

Mr. ALGER. My delay, Mr. Chairman, in walking onto the floor at this moment was in my hope that I among many others would hear the word from John Glenn personally that he was all right. Everything up to that point has been successful. Apparently the capsule is safe and we hope he is, too.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to add a few thoughts possibly beyond what has been said in this debate today, simply because I believe on the record these views need to be expressed. I shall be very brief, as is the minority statement signed by the gentleman from California [Mr. UTT] and myself, found on the last page of the report. My position is the same as that of last year when for the first time in my four terms I decided I would no longer support a continued increase of the debt ceiling, my feeling being that there might be a possibility of controlling spending by refusing to agree to these continual increases of the debt ceiling. As a matter of fact, I am one of those who, as in the minority views, as expressed, feels it is ridiculous to go along with this gimmick any further—the gimmick of a temporary increase. There is nothing temporary about a Government increase of taxes or of the debt ceiling. It is not temporary. It will be permanent. I decry the use of the word "temporary."

Second, I believe that the debt limit ceiling is not responsible at all for any restraint on spending, nor does it limit the Government's power to tax, spend, or borrow. Indeed, on the contrary. The Government has no such limitation and I am among those who believe that there should be a constitutional amendment to force the Government to live within a balanced budget so that the Members of Congress should not adjourn to go back to their districts until they have a balanced budget for the year.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for the purpose of making a very important announcement?

Mr. ALGER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I have just had a telephone call from NASA headquarters to the effect that Colonel Glenn has been landed aboard the carrier and has left the capsule. This is the culmination of a great scientific experiment that again reestablishes us in the forefront in the space effort. I am certain that Vice President JOHNSON, who has been active in this, and Speaker MCCORMACK, who pioneered the first Science and Astronautics Committee in the House, are very happy to get this information, as are the American people.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, what a pleasure it is for me to have yielded to the gentleman for that announcement and to assure him, of course, that all of us, regardless of party, join in the praise for the many who have been responsible for the program. And certainly, and most importantly, to this brave astronaut himself who went through so much for us all.

Mr. Chairman, now back to the matter of the debt limit; and I must say this is almost from the sublime to the ridiculous in view of my opinion on the debt limit itself. I want to remind my colleagues of something that a gentleman from the other body, one of the great chairmen of that august body said when confronted with an increase in the debt ceiling in 1954. These remarks I think have a bearing on our deliberations today.

It was a year ago that the President requested Congress to increase the debt limit from $275 billion to $290 billion. A bill making this increase was passed by the House of Representatives and sent to the Senate. The Senate Finance Committee heard the testimony of administration spokesmen who said unless the debt limit were raised by $15 billion at that time the Government would be unable to pay its bills and a panic would result.

After full deliberation, the Finance Committee, 11 to 4, refused to report the $290 billion debt limit bill. What happened? The heavens did not fall; panic did not occur. The administration reduced its spending and stayed within the statutory debt limit.

Mr. Chairman, that as I see it is the matter in a nutshell. Yes, the administration might have to tailor their program to the amount of money available. Yes, the President and Congress might indeed be forced to limit spending by holding down the debt ceiling.

One of my colleagues, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS], used to say that holding down Government spending by holding down the debt ceiling was like trying to hold the elevator by hanging onto the pointer. It might just be, in view of what Senator BYRD has said, that if we refuse to increase the debt ceiling the Government might be more responsible in its spending. At least that is my view. I, as one who has opposed increase in spending programs when I thought they were irresponsible fiscally, have opposed the spending that makes this increase of the debt ceiling necessary, so I, of course, consistently may refuse to go along with the increase in the debt ceiling.

It is my feeling that if a sufficient number of my colleagues did the same we could get our Government back on a fiscally sound basis, we could balance the budget, we could reduce taxes, and, most importantly, we could reduce the debt, not increase it.

It may well be that our deficit balance of payments could force the administration and the Democratic leaders to become fiscally more responsible. Our deficit in the last quarter of $1.4 billion is at an annual rate of $6 billion. We may be forced to cut back the tremendous increases in social and welfare fields, that is, nondefense, in order to preserve the value of our currency against the gold outflow.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT].

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I recognize the present necessity, a necessity which confronts us in almost this identical way each time it becomes expedient for us to increase the debt ceiling. Recognizing that, I acknowledge that those who speak against increasing the debt ceiling as a matter of principle may be voices crying in the wilderness. And yet it seems to me that whether you regard yourself as a Democrat or a Republican, a liberal or a conservative or a moderate, whether you might be called a spender or a tightwad, one fundamental principle might be agreed upon by all; and that is that this country is rich enough, it is able enough, it is prosperous enough to pay as we go.

If we desire additional services by the Government then we should be willing to vote the necessary revenues to pay for those services in the years they are required. If we are not willing to pay for them by additional current revenues then we ought to be willing to do without them.

It seems to me that there can be neither reason nor excuse for continuing year after year to increase the national debt.

The fundamental evil in so doing is that we are passing on to another generation the responsibility of paying for things which we will have used up and worn out before their time. This practice, by any standard of justice, is basically unsound and cruelly unfair.

Where in 25 years will be the things which our current borrowings will buy? Where will be the shiny missiles of today, or today's aircraft, or the unemployment compensation checks mailed out this month, or the services which bolster our present economy? Of what benefit will they be to those whose charge it will be to pay in another generation?

No more, I think, than the service we now enjoy from the B-24's and the B-17's which today lie in archaic abandon along deserted landing strips. At least they saved our freedom and preserved our Nation intact. There was an excuse for increasing the national debt during World War II. We were in a death struggle, a crash effort for our national survival. We had to borrow against the future.

But there can be no such justification today. Though we are indeed engaged in a conflict of wills and weapons to preserve both freedom and peace, we can pay for it on an annual basis. No nation of men has ever been so well able to pay for it as we are today. Shall we forever pass on to the future the unpleasant task of paying, when reason tells us that our progeny will have crises of their own?

In the past 7 years, we have five times increased the debt ceiling. Yet these have been years of truly unprecedented national prosperity. There is no plausible reason why prudent men acting upon the courage of their convictions could not have balanced the Federal budget during these years and begun some systematic plan of debt retirement.

To be sure, there have been emergencies during this period. But there will always be emergencies. Individual families and businesses have emergencies and still manage to pay their debts. They do so because they have to do so. By what logic should the Government operate on a different principle?

For 13 years, we have made no reduction in the national debt. We have merely paid interest and continue to increase the total indebtedness. The last time any payment was made on the principal itself, Harry Truman was in the White House.

What family would expect to occupy a house for 13 years and pay to the mortgageholder only the interest on the debt? What intelligent family would want to do so, earning no equity whatever in the property and still owing the total amount after making regular payment for 13 years?

As every family knows, the time to pay debts is when you have money. This Nation has been more prosperous and more able to retire its honest debts during these past 13 years than any nation or civilization in the entire history of the world. Yet we have not done so. One cannot help but wonder if we ever intend to do so.

During the last Congress, 31 of my colleagues and I introduced identical bills to commit the Congress to a program of systematic annual debt retirement. In 1959, some of us appeared before the Rules Committee and asked for the kind of a rule which would have permitted us to offer our proposal as an amendment to the bill then being considered to extend the national debt ceiling. We were denied, and that bill was brought out under a closed rule which as all of the Members understand prohibits, amendments of any type.

Today's bill comes before us under a similar closed rule.

We asked for permission to have our bills considered in the Ways and Means Committee to which they had been referred. To date, no hearing has been set.

Yet in the months which have intervened, the debt has risen from $283 billion to an estimated $295 billion, and authorization is being sought in the present bill to raise the ceiling to $300 billion. Is there to be no end to this?

At that time, we were being asked to pay $8.1 billion in annual interest charges. The budget for the new fiscal year anticipates that we shall be required to pay $9.4 billion in the year which begins next July 1.

Interest charges, as most of us know, today constitute the second largest item in the operation of our Government. They soak up approximately 11 percent of our total national budget. We pay 11 cents out of every tax dollar simply for the privilege of owing this huge debt. For every $100 paid in taxes, $11 are thus consumed.

Those $11 buy nothing of use to the American taxpayers. They do not help to buy a single weapon, launch a single missile, pave a single mile of road, mail a single letter, or perform a single service of the Government.

The taxpayer can never receive any relief from this ever-increasing annual burden of interest until first we begin to live within our Federal income annually and make a regular plan of debt reduction.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I think the gentleman has made a fine statement. Then to make his own position consistent, what additional taxes have you recommended or would you recommend that the Committee on Ways and Means recommend to the House to impose? We have a bill right now which has a deficit in it. Is that not a fair question?

Mr. WRIGHT. I am conscious of that and I do think it is a fair question. From time to time I have supported certain taxes necessary to maintain the pay-as-we-go principle. To name a few, I supported the highway user taxes to build the interstate program out of current revenues and opposed the long-term bonding proposal which would have created further debt. I have supported necessary increases in the social security tax to make that structure actuarily sound. I have on occasion supported increases in certain classes of postage where the rate structure was responsible for deficits. I opposed the lease-purchase plan for public buildings, as that was contributing to our debt, and insisted instead that necessary buildings be constructed out of current revenues.

I do not think it is my personal prerogative nor is it my desire to recommend additional taxes at this particular time. Rather I think we might wait and see if the President's budget is truly balanced and if there may be reductions and deletions which the Congress may see fit to vote, or proposals which the Ways and Means Committee may recommend. However, I would say that each Member ought to have a criterion of this type, and I have tried to devise one which is satisfactory to me personally and may be to other Members as well.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WRIGHT. If the gentleman would not mind withholding, there are a few things which I should like to say before my time expires. If time remains, I shall be glad to yield further.

Since coming to Congress I have rather carefully tried to keep a record of the expenditures for which I have voted and the proposed reductions in those expenditures which I have supported, and have balanced this against the taxes and revenues for which I have voted. If every Member of the Congress were to do this—voting only for those items of expense which can be paid for out of the revenues he personally supports—debt reduction would become a simple matter.

It is well enough to say that increased debt is not hurtful today because our national production and total national income are so high. Since they are so high, is not this the more reason to pay for our needs from current income?

It is true enough that our public debt, as a percentage of our gross national product, is less than it was a few years ago. But perhaps more to the point, our public debt as related to our annual Federal revenues is growing ever higher.

What it comes to is that we in government must exercise the same self-restraints which are required of our individual American families. Obviously government costs more today than it did in the past. Our Nation has grown. The military demands are greater. Prices are up to the Government even as they are to the individual taxpayer.

But if we spend more, then we must take in more revenues and conduct our business on a pay-as-we-go basis. To the extent that we are not willing to pay this year for certain services, then we should forego them. We have done this in the highway program. We can do it in all things, certainly under the present conditions of a prosperous America and an expanding economy.

I am convinced that the American taxpayer would appreciate this. I am convinced that he wants to pay his way. I firmly believe that he does not want to continue amassing additional debt for his children to pay.

Walter Lippmann in his book, "The Public Philosophy" seriously raises the question as to whether our system, depending as it does upon public support for government policy, can survive the stresses and strains of a world grown suddenly small and keenly demanding. I say that it can.

The American people are worthy of our confidence. They do not want to be coddled or shielded from unpleasant fact. Tell them the truth, and they will respond. Call forth their best, and they will rise to the challenge.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I intend to support the bill before us, calling for an increase in the debt limitation to $300 billion. I would not have supported the proposed increase to $308 billion. Unless unusual and unforeseen circumstances transpire between now and when we may be called upon to increase it to $308 billion, I do not intend to support such an increase.

I concur with the observation made on page 7 in the committee report under the separate views of the Republicans on H.R. 10050. The pertinent sentence on that page, in my opinion, is the following and I quote:

> An increase in the debt limitation would have been unnecessary if the administration had held nonmilitary expenditures within the amount estimated in the summer of 1961 when we voted the last increase in the debt limitation.

This statement I think is bolstered by another statement on page 9 of the minority views. This sentence reads as follows:

> However, the military increase attributable to any military buildup which followed the original budget estimates for fiscal 1962 amounted to only $2.2 billion.

This last statement tends to coincide with information contained in the January 31, 1962, daily statement of the U.S. Treasury. If you look at this daily statement for that date you will find that for the 7 months of the current fiscal year as compared with the same 7-month period for the previous fiscal year, our military expenses, including military aid under the mutual assistance program, have gone up $2 billion; whereas all other expenditures during the first 7 months' period for the same 2 fiscal years have gone up $6.2 billion. This proves conclusively to me that at least 75 percent of the increase in expenditures in fiscal 1962 compared to 1961 were of a nonmilitary nature; therefore, this $2 billion increase in the debt limitation will take care of the increased expenditures for the military contained in the original Eisenhower budget for fiscal 1962 and the three add-ons proposed by President Kennedy.

I want the record to show that starting with 1953 through 1961 I have consistently voted for all debt increases.

According to the record during this period there have been eight instances where there has been debt increase legislation. I supported President Kennedy's request last year. On June 26, 1961, on his request I voted for the increase.

It seems to me that if enough people such as myself, who have tried to be responsible in this area, forewarn the administration that we will not support an increase over and above this one, that they can make an honest and bona fide effort to curtail, restrict and limit nondefense expenditures; otherwise they will be faced with a situation which will not be to their liking.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. MILLS. I certainly join in the gentleman's desire to make every possible effort to reduce our rate of spending, certainly in nondefense areas. I am sure that is the gentleman's position, but I would hope that my friend from Michigan, feeling as he does and I do, would not close his mind to what the situation may be in the next fiscal year, that is, not on the basis of increased rate of spending in the next fiscal year, but because of the fact that a deficit in a fiscal year has an effect on a succeeding fiscal year.

If the gentleman will look at the record, almost invariably a ceiling adjustment has to be made in the subsequent fiscal year to accommodate the deficit of the preceding fiscal year.

With respect to the 1963 fiscal year, we may be faced with the necessity of some upward adjustment in 1962, even though the rate of spending in that fiscal year is less than this fiscal year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. FORD. I thank the gentleman from Arkansas. I do understand the problem the gentleman presents. I fully realize that in the first 6 months of any fiscal year we traditionally have relatively lesser income and greater expenditures. However, this Congress has a responsibility to do all it can to hold down the availability of obligational authority in all of the fiscal year 1963. In this way we can meet our responsibility. On the other hand the administration should be forewarned that there are many of us who try to be responsible; that this will be the last debt limitation increase I will support unless unforeseen circumstances arise.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman will agree with me, I am sure, that if defense spending and this lag we have referred to, that is, the deficit affecting the following fiscal year, were the causes of an increase, that would be one thing that might justify the gentleman's position. What the gentleman is calling attention to is, he does not want an increase in their ceiling in fiscal year 1963 as a result of increases in nondefense spending in 1963 compared to 1962. Is that correct?

Mr. FORD. That is correct. I fully appreciate some of the obligational authority which may be available in the fiscal year 1962, which was made available in the last session of the Congress, will not be reflected in expenditures until 1963. There is this lag, particularly in the procurement area. If the facts can be shown that that is the principal cause for another debt increase in fiscal 1963, I can understand the gentleman's position. But, on the other hand, we in this session of the Congress have an opportunity to control the nondefense expenditures area beginning in fiscal 1963, in the first 6 months, and into the second 6 months of this 12-month period.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

It was the desire of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means that we have more information in respect to the reaction of the Congress to the request made in the President's budget message before we did anything about a ceiling for the following fiscal year. It should be borne in mind this ceiling will have to go up if we finance these obligations and the Congress makes no reduction anywhere along the line.

Is that a fair statement?

Mr. FORD. I think you can argue that, but there are legislative proposals that will be before this Congress in the present session which will have an immediate impact on the expenditure picture, particularly in the fiscal year 1963 and carrying on through the years. If this Congress is serious about holding down the debt limitation, and I think many Members are, we must act responsibly in this area in the present session of the Congress.

Some can blithely go on voting for a lot of these legislative propcsals that will reflect themselves in immediate cash expenditures early in fiscal 1963. I do not intend to do so. I am thinking, for example, right now of a new pay increase for 2,400,000-plus Federal employees. If we vote a pay increase for Government employees, that reflects itself promptly in cash expenditures. And, there are other similar examples.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconson. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I do not want to put any words in the Chairman's mouth, but as I understood him, the point was that if we follow out the request of the President as submitted to us in the budget message, we will have to vote the additional $8 billion increase in the debt limit that the President has also asked for.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I do not object to having my friend from Wisconsin put words in my mouth, because he can better express those thoughts than I can myself. I certainly agree with what he said, provided that the estimates are wrong and the revenues are less. The ceiling would have to be higher.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The point I want to make is that if we follow out the recommendations of the President as far as spending is concerned, and if there is not the increase in the revenues that is anticipated, you are not only going to have an $8 billion further increase in the debt ceiling, but you are going to come in here for more increases and more increases in the ceiling, because every item of potential increase in revenue is preempted by increased spending, and even spending beyond that point by the new obligational authority requested.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I wanted to take this opportunity to thank the gentleman from Michigan for taking the floor and expounding upon the other side of this budget ledger, the appropriations side. I am very hopeful that we establish in the Committee on Ways and Means the procedure, if this $8 billion proposal comes before us, of inviting before our committee members of the Committee on Appropriations so that we can do the thorough job necessary in reviewing the budget with the Bureau of the Budget people and the Treasury people. We still have on the books, I believe, as the result of the Reorganization Act, this superduper committee that met twice, which is supposed to review the budget, composed of the Committees on Appropriations of the two branches and the House Committee on Ways and Means. But, it proved to be so unwieldy that it only met twice—and I suspected this—but I do believe the contribution that your people, the Committee on Appropriations and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford] have made has amply brought that home to us, and the pertinent points he is making here, the need for being able to go into the appropriations and expenditures side, which the Committee on Ways and Means, of course, does not have the depth of experience that the appropriation people have.

I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ALGER. Is the gentleman from Michigan acquainted with the budget expenditures by agency chart given us by the Treasury, wherein the military expenditures are listed as against civilian, showing increases? Under military we are told, as part of the military increases of expenditures, there is the Peace Corps, Export-Import Bank, Selective Service, U.S. Information Bureau, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Atomic Energy Commission—all of this as a part of the military as against civilian. And, on that type of a chart we see tremendous increases in military expenditures. Some of us on the committee went through this and took out of the military those functions that were not particularly military and put them in with the civilian, and we found that nonmilitary expenditures have gone up 60 percent but only 40 percent of those things related to the defense expenditures. Is that not in line with what the gentleman is telling us?

Mr. FORD. I think that is a somewhat different way of saying the same thing I tried to say a few minutes ago.

Mr. Chairman, may I conclude by saying this: I wish to commend the Committee on Ways and Means for coming in with the $2 billion increase rather than requesting the $10 billion increase recommended by President Kennedy, because it gives to us, that feel as I do, a chance to support this, based on what I believe is a bona fide increase in our military expenditures. On the other hand, it gives to us an opportunity to tell the executive branch of the Government and to perhaps forewarn our colleagues that in the next few months in this session of the Congress we have a serious fiscal responsibility.

Mr. Chairman, may I simply say again, as I said once before, the administration must act responsibly and the Congress must do likewise. I expect to vote in affirmative today, but my views in the future will be in the negative unless unforeseen circumstances arise.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Forrester].

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Chairman, during my service in Congress, the matter of raising the debt ceiling has arisen approximately nine times. I voted in favor of the raise on one or two occasions upon the premise that we would learn our lesson, and would be more careful with our expenditures and with the burdens we needlessly imposed upon future generations. I finally learned, however, that as long as we are willing to extend the debt limit, we will be faced with the necessity of doing so. If I thought we were ready to quit throwing away our future, I would be willing to vote for this raise this time, but I certainly do not intend to endorse huge indebtednesses that will whip us more surely than any foreign foe.

Just why we are asked to increase this debt limit only $2 billion, I do not know, because all of us know that the President has stated that he wants the debt ceiling increased to $308 billion. If the present debt of $290 billion were converted into silver dollars, it would require more than 25 million 1-ton trucks to haul it, according to the Washington Daily News of February 12, 1962.

That kind of indebtedness is absolutely startling. However, Mr. Stans, former Director of the Budget, says that our true indebtedness is over $800 billion, not including "untold billions of dollars in guarantees by the Government on housing loans and other mortgages, bank deposits, and other savings, et cetera." He also says that the national debt is approximately $22,000 for every family of four in this country.

Mr. Chairman, we now have a dollar whose value inflation has reduced to approximately 40 cents. The social security payments earned by our retirees, the pensions given our veterans, and commitments or responsibilities of our Government are placed in jeopardy because of this tremendous amount of debt. If our children are to have a sportsman's chance to maintain this Government, this profligate spending must stop and we must start living within our means plus paying some on our debts.

Some say that since we owe this money, we must vote to extend the debt limit. I believe in paying debts and, in fact, I insist on it. There is a weapon available for the administration to use to pay our debts and to make it unnecessary to follow this route which leads to bankruptcy and chaos. I refer to the route we hear so much of, to wit: Executive order. By Executive order, the President can cut the amounts of moneys to be expended so we can live within our means. That is what ought to be done and I hope he will do it.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, we have heard a good deal this afternoon about our orbiting astronaut. I wish that with the same facility, the same expedition, and dedication Congress would get the Federal debt out of orbit. And I would recommend to the Committee on Ways and Means a study of how this business is conducted by the Committee on Space and Astronautics.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to my friend from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, is my friend from Iowa inferring that the Committee on Ways and Means put this debt into orbit?

Mr. GROSS. I would have to be completely frank with the gentleman and say that as long as the committee brings bills to the House to increase the debt ceiling it is not offering much of an inducement to get the debt out of orbit.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. MILLS. The Committee on Ways and Means is not the committee that submits appropriations or authorization bills to the House; is that not true?

Mr. GROSS. The Committee on Ways and Means is the committee that brings debt-ceiling increase bills to the House.

Mr. MILLS. Is the gentleman saying that we control the situation?

Mr. GROSS. I am not saying that the committee controls the situation.

Mr. MILLS. I wanted to be clear on that.

Mr. GROSS. I am asking that the gentleman's committee offer a little help toward building a launching pad for the control and reduction of the Federal debt.

Responsibility has been discussed here a good deal this afternoon. What is the first responsibility? It ought to be to balance the budget and pay something on the debt, not to increase the debt ceiling. This is not responsible action, in my opinion.

Someone else described this as a debt management bill. How could an individual—and we are a government of individuals—manage his debts on any such basis as this?

I looked for the hearings on this bill. I should like to have read Secretary of the Treasury Dillon's statements before the Committee on Ways and Means but there was no hearings printed, and I cannot find out to what Mr. Dillon testified. I would like to know how he could square himself with his action last year in going down to Uruguay and pledging this country, without one scintilla of authority from the Congress of the United States, to spend $20 billion on the so-called alliance for progress. I would like to know something about Mr. Dillon's responsibility for increasing the huge Federal debt and now his support for an increase in the debt ceiling.

Mr. Chairman, approval of this bill means that Congress has again rubberstamped its approval of government by credit card. I should like to have had the opportunity to offer as an amendment the provisions of my bill, H.R. 144, to provide for an annual balanced budget and specific payments each year on the Federal debt.

As I stated previously, I am opposed to this legislation for the reason that it simply encourages the Government to plunge this Government ever deeper into debt, and because it is being considered under a gag rule which prohibits the offering of amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs].

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I think it is easy to hurl accusations of irresponsibility in this area, but I believe it is important that we keep the record straight.

In the first place, since the conclusion of World War II our national debt has remained substantially the same although it did increase about $25 billion under the administration of former President Eisenhower. Nevertheless, in 1945 at the conclusion of World War II, our national debt was about $300 billion. The proposal here today is that it be $300 billion. As a matter of fact, when you look at the wealth of our country, in 1946 the gross national product of the United States was approximately $300 billion. Today, the gross national product of the United States is approaching $600 billion. So that in essence, the amount owed by the United States has been reduced by 50 percent. The effect is the same as in the case of a man who earned $5,000 owing $5,000 as compared to a man owing $5,000 and now earning $10,000.

In addition to that, I think it only fair to say that the need for this increase is based almost entirely upon defense commitments that we had to make as a nation for our own security and these commitments were joined in by both parties for the Defense Establishment.

Today we are quite joyful and quite properly taking note of the fact that Colonel Glenn has orbited the earth three times, and that a few minutes ago it was reported that he was safely aboard the U.S. destroyer *Noa* south of Bermuda. Certainly, none of this would have been possible without the space program supported both by my Republican colleagues and by those of us on my side of the aisle. But this program meant an increase in appropriations last year of something over a billion dollars. My good friend, the gentleman from Iowa, talked about Secretary Dillon and his meeting in Latin America. I do not believe any person in this body really takes exception to a program which has for its goal the development of this area in the Western Hemisphere.

I listened to the report made here by my colleague, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Selden], when he came back from a recent meeting in Latin America attended by our own Secretary of State and by other officials of the other governments on this continent. He made a very optimistic report. The gentleman from Alabama, with considerable documentation, gave us a very definite impression that we were making progress—real substantial progress in that area of the world. So I think it might be easy to criticize Secretary Dillon and the statements that he made to our good neighbors to the south, but I would hope that the program that they have joined in with enthusiastic cooperation will be a successful program. The point I am making, Mr. Chairman, is that this request for $2 billion is made largely because of the defense commitments of the United States both in the area of space and in the Berlin situation and the situation in Laos and the situation in Vietnam and the necessity for maintaining a variety of commitments with respect to armed forces so that we can fight guerrilla tactics as well as nuclear warfare, and so on. In my judgment, the irresponsibility would be to vote against this bill rather than in voting for it, and I hope that the Committee on Ways and Means, which has considered this legislation carefully, will be sustained by the House. I know also, Mr. Chairman, that sometimes people come in and are critical of that committee, but I have had the privilege of being on that committee for many years. We approach these problems as best we can, and usually from the point of view of what we like to call fiscal responsibility.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote against the increase in the public debt limit as proposed in H.R. 10050, and would like to state the reasons for my vote. It is not that I do not believe the U.S. Government should meet its commitments and pay its bills, but rather I want to use this means of protesting the continual expansion of Federal programs. At a time when the President is asking us to increase our expenditures for national security I feel we should be cutting back on domestic programs rather than enlarging them. In those instances where Congress deems it necessary that we enlarge our Federal responsibilities we should face up to the need for some sounder method of providing the funds than adding to the burden of debt we will pass on to the next generation.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Devine].

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to speak on this bill, but after listening to some remarks made by some of our illustrious colleagues I thought it well to get back to some figures in connection with the national debt. I imagine it would be considered the responsible thing to honor one's obligations, and I am sure my friends and supporters of this legislation feel likewise. Let us look at the figures. At the present time we have a national debt ceiling of $298 billion. To the people in my district who do not understand big figures that is a tremendous amount of money. When you look at the budget submitted by the President of the United States, and I do not confine it to the present President, but to the last administration and others before that, you will find that the second largest item in the budget is the interest on the national debt. I believe at the present time it is $9 billion a year. I do not understand what $9 billion a year is except that it is a lot of money, and my people feel the same way, but to break that down not to a matter of months, not to a matter of weeks, nor to a matter of days, not to a matter of hours, but to a matter of minutes, what does it cost the American taxpayer every single minute of the day? It costs about $17,000 a minute just to finance the interest on the national debt; and here we are today not considering reducing the national debt, but increasing it by $2 billion temporarily. I understand the administration wants to take it up to $308 billion, an all-time high in the history of this Nation.

I would think that if we did not grant this increase in the ceiling on the national debt, perhaps some of those who have been so free in voting for expenditures would think twice before they voted for them.

I have had a bill in Congress for some time, under the Eisenhower administration as well as the Kennedy administration, a bill that would require the President to take a percentage of the anticipated revenues and apply it each year systematically to a reduction of the national debt. I had a hearing on that in the 86th Congress, but thus far in the 87th Congress I have not succeeded in having a hearing on my bill. This is not a matter personal to me alone, for there are 20 or 30 other Members on both sides of the aisle who are concerned in reducing the national debt rather than increasing it.

We must accept the responsibility of the heritage we will leave to our children, and the yet unborn generations.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN].

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the bill.

It is unfortunate that we must once again meet to consider raising this Nation's public debt limit. Many of us have repeatedly voiced our concern over deficit spending. We have been accused of a host of things, ranging from old fashioned thinking to obstructionism. It is with sadness that I observe the outcome of our concern; meetings such as this, when we must again decide whether or not an additional step toward financial bankruptcy will be our last.

I have noted, as have others, the Shakespearian inscription on the front of our National Archives. It says simply: "What is past is prologue." I have always been under the impression that we should build upon the past, not repeat its mistakes. But here we are again, considering another so-called "temporary" increase in our public debt limit. And from all indications, we will be here again before the year ends, considering an even further increase. We are now asked to increase the debt limit by $2 billion, bringing the "temporary" limit to $15 billion. We will be asked to increase it to $23 billion to accommodate fiscal 1963. It seems there is nothing quite so permanent as these temporary increases.

My point is simply this: one of these days we will reach the point of no return. We may reach it today. We may reach it tomorrow. One thing is certain, if we refuse to learn from the past we will surely reach it eventually.

Let us consider the immediate past for a moment, in an effort to learn just why we are gathered this day to consider raising our debt limit. We, and our constituents, have been fed a steady diet of explanation. The main theme revolves around the Berlin crisis and the resulting military buildup. When you lower your waving flag long enough to see the cold figures on the wall you note that the revised budget for fiscal 1962 shows an overall increase in expenditures of $8.2 billion over the original budget of the preceding administration. The absolute increase in expenditures for military personnel operations and procurement amounted to only $2.2 billion. That leaves $6 billion of additional expense that cannot be blamed on the Berlin crisis. The main crisis, it seems to me, is in the field of fiscal miscalculation if not irresponsibility.

In addition to threatening our economy by the all-too-easy method of deficit spending, we are weakening our position in the international arena. Since last summer, imports have increased to record proportions. Our accounts payable in the world exceeded our accounts receivable by about $19 billion. Right now we have only about $17 billion in gold, of which $12 billion is pledged to back up the money in circulation here at home. I shudder to think what would happen if our creditors demanded payment, since we simply could not pay it. We know from history that one of the major causes for a demand on our gold is a loss of confidence in the value of our currency. Round after round of temporarily increasing our public debt limit hardly instills much confidence anywhere.

It is evident once again that this consideration today could have been avoided by proper management and proper estimates. In a matter of months we will gather again to consider repairing the damages of another series of miscalculations. There is no assurance that the current budget proposals will fare any better.

I respectfully suggest this House look carefully at the immediate past and use it as a prolog to fiscal responsibility instead of a prelude to disaster.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CASEY].

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee for giving me this time, and I wish to state at the outset in voting against this bill that I have no criticism of the chairman nor the committee in bringing this bill before the House. In view of the expenditures made by this House in the past, it is incumbent upon the Committee on Ways and Means to present this matter to the House. Also, I would like to state that the Ways and Means Committee does not pass upon the appropriations and authorizations brought before this House for action.

But I will say to the distinguished chairman that I think it has been far too easy in the past to increase the limit on our national debt. I think this House has fallen into a bad habit of passing upon appropriations, not on the basis of our ability to pay for the programs, but with the theory and knowledge that this debt limit can be increased so easily.

Mr. Chairman, I am one of those who believes that there should be a systematic reduction of the national debt, and as some of my colleagues here have done, I introduced a bill to this effect.

This bill provides that there shall be included in each budget, an item requesting an appropriation equal to 1 percent of the debt outstanding to be used exclusively for retirement of this obligation. Even passage of this bill, Mr. Chairman, would be but a token effort toward retirement of this huge fiscal obligation, and a far cry from what I would like to see accomplished.

I would like to state emphatically that I am opposed to any further extension of the debt limit, and that is why I cast a "no" vote against the rule for considering this bill, and a "no" vote against the bill itself.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD and that all Members desiring to do so may have that opportunity.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I have asked the Bureau of the Budget to analyze the separate and minority views in the report on this bill. The Bureau's comments on those views follow:

Despite the arguments to the contrary, the facts since last June do amply support the proposed $2 billion increase in debt limit for the current year. Starting with the testimony of last June 15 by the Secretary of the Treasury:

	Billion
1. The 1961 budget deficit actually turned out to be $3.9 billion instead of $2.5 billion, increasing the debt by	$1.4
2. The Berlin crisis and congressional action in accord with President's proposal did increase defense spending in 1962	2.7
(The table on p. 9 of their views mentions $2.2 billion, but it "forgot" to include other categories of defense spending—such as testing and developing weapons and strengthening our civil defense.)	
3. Other increases in defense spending to increase our readiness and our longrun military capability	.2
4. Net increase in spending by the Department of Agriculture, mainly reflecting support payments on a larger harvest than had been expected	.7
5. Increased expenditures because of Congress' unwillingness to raise postal rates as the President and the Secretary recommended	.7
6. Interest on the public debt, mainly because of higher market interest rates and also because of somewhat higher debt, is now estimated to be more than last June's estimate by	.3
7. All other changes in estimated 1962 budget expenditures since last June net to	—.5
(This takes account of appropriation actions of Congress not approving President's education proposals, and all other changes. Total budget expenditures for 1962 are now estimated to be $89.1 billion compared to $85 billion last June 15.)	
8. Therefore, the larger 1961 deficit ($1.4 billion), and the increased 1962 expenditures listed above (totaling $4.1 billion)—of which the Berlin buildup is the largest single item—total	5.5

The Secretary's request for an immediate increase of $2 billion therefore does indeed seem conservative, and—as he stated to the committee—he will have to return for a larger increase later in this session of the Congress. (This is also true because of the seasonal nature of revenue collection, which has not been mentioned here.)

As to the comment in the separate views that: "During the stewardship of this administration, the projected rate of expenditures by the Federal Government has increased by more than $1 billion per month and is still increasing," this figure is apparently calculated by comparing the $78.9 billion estimate of 1961 expenditures in the Eisenhower budget, and the 1963 expenditure estimate of $92.5 billion in the Kennedy budget of a year later.

Thus: $$\frac{\$92.5\text{ billion}-\$78.9\text{ billion}}{12}=\frac{13.6}{12}$$
="more than $1 billion per month."

This calculation thus includes two types of change: (1) The change from an Eisenhower to a Kennedy budget; and (2) the passage of time from 1961 to 1963.

What accounts for this $13.6 billion figure?

Actual expenditures in 1961 were not $78.9 billion, as President Eisenhower estimated in January 1961, but $81.5 billion. The $2,531 million increase reflects a $561 million increase in Department of Defense expenditures for the programs in the January budget (rather than program changes); an increase of $143 million because postal rates were not increased effective April 1, 1961, as assumed in the Eisenhower budget; an increase of $498 million for temporary extended unemployment benefits; a further increase of $890 million in Department of Defense expenditures reflecting program changes and accelerated procurement; a $215 million increase in Department of Agriculture expenditures; and $224 million net increase in all other programs.

The $11 billion increase from actual expenditures for fiscal 1963 is accounted for as follows:

	Billion
National defense	$5.2
International affairs and finance	.5
Space research and technology	1.7
Subtotal	7.4
Interest on the national debt	.4
Subtotal	7.8
Domestic civil functions	[1] 3.0
Civilian pay reform	.2
Allowance for contingencies	.2
Total	[2] 11.0

[1] Breakdown shown on p. 10 of the budget.

[2] Detail do not add to total due to rounding.

Present estimate of fiscal 1962 budget expenditures and January 1961 estimate of previous administration (the $8.2 billion referred to in the separate views on page 9 of committee report.)

	Fiscal 1962, in billions
1. January 1961 estimate	$80.9

This estimate understated the expenditure effect of the proposals it included by $0.4 billion, as shown by the President and the Budget Director last March. Even ignoring that part, however, where are the increases since then?

2. Present estimate	89.1
Difference	8.2

This includes:

Department of Defense, military functions and military assistance ($44.7 to $48.3)	3.6
National Aeronautics and Space Administration ($1.0 to $1.3)	.3
Interest ($8.6 to $9.0)	.4
Unenacted postal rates	.7
Antirecession actions mainly temporary extended unemployment benefits, as approved by the Congress	.5
Department of Agriculture, mainly for price support costs due to greater crops than anticipated ($5.8 to $7.2 billion)	1.4
Housing and Home Finance Agency, reflecting the legislation enacted by the Congress in its last session ($0.5 to $0.9)	.4
Public assistance grants by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare ($2.3 to $2.6)	.3
National Institutes of Health, reflecting congressional increases in appropriations ($0.5 to $0.8)	.3
All other changes	.3

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I have voted against far more than $2 billion in unnecessary and wasteful Government spending; therefore, to be consistent, I must vote against this effort to raise the debt limit in order to spend this amount.

Additionally, when we fix a debt limit we have in mind there may be special situations arising which call for unexpected expenditures. The amount of the limit is calculated with that in mind. It is the obligation of the President to restrict less urgent expenditures if such unexpected contingencies bring expenditures close to the limit. That is the reason for the limit. If we do not stick to it, the whole matter of debt ceilings becomes a meaningless exercise. Naturally, when a real national emergency occurs, some exception might be made. I do not regard the mishandling of the Berlin crisis as such a national emergency, even though the fact that it was mishandled should be a subject of considerable national apprehension.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Arkansas yield me a minute?

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. We have just heard the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] expound on the subject of the gross national product. We had quite a substantial gross national product even in the depths of the 1930 depression. The gross national product is a statistic, and that is all it is. I can give you another statistic. The human body is approximately 2 percent skin. I suppose because it is 2 percent skin that you could skin the gentleman from Louisiana and it would not hurt him too much.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the bill is considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment is in order except those offered by the Committee on Ways and Means. Are there any committee amendments?

Mr. MILLS. There are no committee amendments, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the Committee rises. Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. JENNINGS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 10050, to provide for a further temporary increase in the public debt limit set forth in the Second Liberty Bond Act, pursuant to House Resolution 549, he reported the same back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the "ayes" appeared to have it.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 251, nays 144, answered "present" 1, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 18]

YEAS—251

Addonizio
Albert
Arends
Ashley
Aspinall
Avery
Ayres
Bailey
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett
Barry
Bass, N.H.
Bates
Beckworth
Betts
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton
Brademas
Breeding
Brewster
Brooks
Buckley
Burke, Ky.
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Cannon
Carey
Celler
Chelf
Chenoweth
Clark
Coad
Cohelan
Conte
Cook
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Curtin
Curtis, Mo.
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, John W.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Downing
Doyle
Dulski
Dwyer
Edmondson
Elliott
Everett
Evins
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Fenton
Finnegan
Fino
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Ford
Fountain
Frazier
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Gallagher
Garland
Garmatz
Gary
Giaimo
Gilbert
Glenn
Gonzalez
Granahan
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Griffiths
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Halleck
Halpern
Hansen
Harding
Hardy
Harris
Harrison, Va.
Harvey, Mich.
Healey
Hébert
Hechler
Hemphill
Henderson
Herlong
Holifield
Holland
Ichord, Mo.
Inouye
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Ala.
Judd
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
King, Calif.
King, Utah
Kluczynski
Kowalski
Kunkel
Lane
Lankford
Lesinski
Libonati
Lindsay
McDowell
McFall
McIntire
Macdonald
Mack
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marshall
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Matthews
May
Meader
Miller, Clem
Miller, George P.
Milliken
Mills
Montoya
Moorhead, Pa.
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Moss
Multer
Murphy
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
Norblad
Norrell
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
Olsen
O'Neill
Osmers
Ostertag
Patman
Perkins
Peterson
Pfost
Philbin
Pilcher
Pirnie
Poage
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Rains
Randall
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Rostenkowski
Roush
Ryan
St. Germain
Santangelo
Saund
Saylor
Schneebeli
Scranton
Seely-Brown
Selden
Shelley
Sheppard
Shipley
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Miss.
Spence
Stafford
Steed
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Teague, Calif.
Thomas
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Toll
Trimble
Tupper
Udall, Morris K.
Ullman
Vanik
Van Zandt
Vinson
Wallhauser
Walter
Weis
Westland
Wickersham
Widnall
Wilson, Calif.
Yates
Young
Younger
Zablocki
Zelenko

NAYS—144

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Alexander
Alford
Alger
Andersen, Minn.
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Auchincloss
Baring
Battin
Becker
Beermann
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Berry
Blitch
Bonner
Bow
Bromwell
Brown
Broyhill
Bruce
Burleson
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chiperfield
Church
Clancy
Collier
Colmer
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtis, Mass.
Dague
Davis, James C.
Derounian
Derwinski
Devine
Dole
Dominick
Dorn
Dowdy
Durno
Findley
Fisher
Forrester
Gathings
Gavin
Goodell
Goodling
Gross
Haley
Hall
Harrison, Wyo.
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Hiestand
Hoeven
Hoffman, Ill.
Horan
Hosmer
Hull
Jensen
Johansen
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Kearns
Kilgore
King, N.Y.
Knox
Kornegay
Kyl
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
McCulloch
McDonough
McMillan
McSween
McVey
MacGregor
Martin, Nebr.
Mason
Michel
Minshall
Moeller
Moore
Moorehead, Ohio
Mosher
Nelsen
Nygaard
Passman
Pelly
Pike
Pillion
Poff
Ray
Reece
Robison
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Roudebush
Rousselot
Rutherford
St. George
Schadeberg
Schenck
Scherer
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Short
Shriver
Siler
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Staggers
Stephens
Taber
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, La.
Thomson, Wis.
Tollefson
Tuck
Utt
Van Pelt
Waggonner
Weaver
Whalley
Wharton
Whitener
Whitten
Williams
Wilson, Ind.
Wright

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Kilburn

NOT VOTING—38

Addabbo
Anfuso
Bass, Tenn.
Bennett, Mich.
Boykin
Bray
Broomfield
Burke, Mass.
Dooley
Ellsworth
Fulton
Grant
Gubser
Hays
Hoffman, Mich.
Huddleston
Johnson, Md.
Kirwan
Kitchin
Landrum
Loser
Magnuson
Merrow
Miller, N.Y.
Monagan
Moulder
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Rhodes, Ariz.
Riehlman
Sibal
Springer
Stratton
Thompson, N.J.
Watts
Willis
Winstead

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Kirwan for, with Mr. Kitchin against.

Mr. Hays for, with Mr. Moulder against.

Mr. Monagan for, with Mr. O'Konski against.

Mr. Bennett of Michigan for, with Mr. Bray against.

Mr. Anfuso for, with Mr. Fulton against.

Mr. Ellsworth for, with Mr. Broomfield against.

Mr. Miller of New York for, with Mr. Gubser against.

Mr. Sibal for, with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona against.

Mr. Addabbo for, with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan against.

Mr. Riehlman for, with Mr. Kilburn against.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey for, with Mr. Springer against.

Mr. O'Hara of Michigan for, with Mr. Willis against.

Mr. Johnson of Maryland for, with Mr. Winstead against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Landrum with Mr. Merrow.

Mr. Loser with Mr. Dooley.

Mr. PASSMAN changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from New York [Mr. RIEHLMAN], who is at Cape Canaveral. Had he been present he would have voted "yea." I therefore withdraw my vote of "nay" and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so and who spoke on the bill just passed may be permitted to extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

TRANSFER OF SPECIAL ORDER FROM TODAY TO TOMORROW

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL] may have permission to transfer his special order from today until tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

COLONEL GLENN'S ORBITAL FLIGHT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MOOREHEAD], and myself, I have the honor of submitting a concurrent resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. CON. RES. 431

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress hereby extends its congratulations and warm good wishes to Lieutenant Colonel John H. Glenn, Junior, United States Marine Corps, of New Concord, Ohio, on behalf of the people of the United States, and commends him for his personal courage, skill, and dedication in the cause of scientific achievement in his successful and epochmaking three orbital flights around the earth on February 20, 1962.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in submitting this resolution on behalf of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MOOREHEAD] and myself, I know I am responding to the wishes of every Member of the House on both sides of the aisle.

The American people are tremendously proud of this great accomplishment upon the part of one of their own.

Flying on wings of courage and devotion, Col. John Glenn today has joined the immortal sons of this Republic.

In his feat there was something of Columbus when he crossed the Atlantic. There was something of the Pilgrim who faced the dangers of the wilderness and the Red man. There was something of the daring and devotion of the men who followed Washington at Valley Forge. There was something of the pioneer who turned back the frontier and built this Republic. There was something of Lindbergh crossing the Atlantic.

Colonel Glenn's accomplishment was one of the most heroic efforts in the history of man.

But this great flight was more than a manifestation of personal courage—this was a great scientific achievement. It is part of the opening door to the future potential of the human race. It is proof again of the quality of American science. It is a tribute to the American classroom and to the laboratory. This flight places our country in the forefront of the most spectacular and most modern of all the sciences.

Mr. Speaker, I was one of those privileged this morning to be with the President and Vice President of the United States, and our distinguished Speaker, when they were watching the blast-off of Colonel Glenn on the television. I sensed there among the most eminent men of our country that through their minds ran a feeling of confidence in the quality of our space efforts and in their hearts was an earnest prayer that the Heavenly Father would accompany Colonel Glenn in his historic flight. It must have been the same with every man, woman, and child in America and with every God-fearing person around the world.

When the first firm tones of Colonel Glenn came back there was reassurance that here was a man who could do the job.

Mr. Speaker, it is with deep personal pleasure that I have this opportunity on behalf of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MOOREHEAD] from whose district this great American has come, to offer this resolution and to ask for its unanimous passage at this time.

Mr. MOOREHEAD of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MOOREHEAD of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it is a real pleasure that the gentleman from Oklahoma joins me in accepting this resolution. I realize that the parliamentary procedure is unusual, but I am very grateful for the interest and active support of the leadership on both sides of the aisle in this resolution. I am immensely pleased that within minutes of the completion of the successful orbital flight of Lt. Col. John H. Glenn, Jr., we can consider official recognition of it here.

It is my honor to represent the area in southeastern Ohio where both Lieutenant Colonel Glenn and his charming wife were born and grew up. New Concord, Ohio, is still their hometown. It is also the residence of the parents of John Glenn.

Every American will remember this exciting day. Astronaut Glenn's feat is both a personal triumph and a spectacular demonstration of America's progress in space technology. In this, free men everywhere rejoice for the long stride forward in scientific advancement.

I believe that we are expressing the will of the people of the United States in this resolution. The deep respect and affection we hold for John Glenn is apparent. The intrepid spirit of this man, his fellow astronauts, and all of those whose soaring imaginations made possible this flight are deserving of the honors they receive. I urge that we consider and agree to this resolution now as a token of the Nation's gratitude for the memorable events we have witnessed today and to the man whose personal courage and skill contributed so largely to its success.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I desire now to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, naturally, we on the Committee on Science and Astronautics are delighted with the success that was achieved today in sending a man into orbit and recovering him in the fine manner in which it was done. However, I would like to point out to the House that this was in no way a stunt or an exhibition. It was rather, as the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] told you, a great contribution to science. What we have seen today was a scientific experiment whose end object was not the entertainment of the people of this country and the world, although it means a lot to us in international prestige. That was not its end object, either. Its end object is to wrest from space her secrets that can be used for the betterment of mankind. The space age today is in the same relative position that the airplane was some 10 years after the Wright brothers made their historic flight at Kittyhawk. I am sure they could not at that time anticipate that you could cross the continent in 3½ hours as the result of the work that they were doing. We know that in the space field there are certain very positive accomplishments that will contribute to our welfare, and this is the most challenging field in science today.

Mr. Speaker, I want to join in paying my tribute to Colonel Glenn and to the astronauts who preceded him. They will go down in the records with great Americans who have made great contributions to science, some of them even at the cost of their lives.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the distinguished gentleman from California and the distinguished gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may revise and extend my remarks and that all those who have spoken on this subject today may revise and extend their remarks and that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject matter of this resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRUCE].

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, I have perhaps more than ordinary interest in the feat of Col. John Glenn and in the experiences that he and his wife have gone through, having attended college with John and his wife, Annie.

I think this morning as this attempt was about to be made, we felt many of the emotions much more keenly, perhaps, than others because of our association with them in years past.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply say this: That while this is a great feat, a scientific accomplishment, the man that is John Glenn is even a greater feat. As I watched him on some of the television appearances when any ordinary man would have been under tremendous emotional pressures, the calmness of John certainly was an inspiration to every American. I remember one question that was asked him at one of those press conference and it was this: Whether or not he had said any special prayers in regard to what he was about to undertake. His reply was, "No; he and his wife tried to live day by day the religious and spiritual convictions which they had held from childhood."

Mr. Speaker, I think it is these qualities in John Glenn which make us even more proud today of the accomplishments that he has achieved for the United States and for the field of science—the qualities of the man which are the qualities of greatness. I am just simply proud to say that I have known him.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join in support of this resolution. I am sure that all Americans are extremely proud of the great accomplishment of Colonel Glenn in his orbital flight today.

Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege last weekend to be at Cape Canaveral and to see the absolutely fantastic preparations that were being made there for further probes of outer space. I think that the majority leader, Mr. ALBERT, and the chairman of the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER] were quite proper in pointing out that the real meaning of today's accomplishment is its great contribution to science. There is not the slightest doubt in my mind that the successful flight of Colonel Glenn today spells for all Americans a virtual avalanche of new space accomplishments by our Nation in the very near future.

Mr. Speaker, there is one thing, though, that I would like to call to the attention of the Members of the House which I have not heard or seen mentioned so far today: Unlike the secret flights into space that allegedly have been conducted by the Soviet Union, today at Cape Canaveral there were three official representatives of the Federation Aeronautique Internationale, which has its headquarters in Paris, and which is the worldwide international agency that has been established and is recognized as the official judge for all claims to speed records and space accomplishments. One of those three observers was actually up there at the top of the gantry; he actually saw Colonel Glenn get into the capsule and watched the launching of the capsule. Certainly, unlike the long and serious speculation that has existed surrounding the Soviet claims of space penetration, there can be absolutely no question about the great accomplishment of our American astronaut today and the men and women of science who made this possible. These international on-the-spot observers need not engage in any speculation about the veracity of Colonel Glenn's flight into space even though the federation has every right to question the Soviet claims because of the meager information the Russians have released about their flights.

It is of great significance to me that the Kremlin has released virtually meaningless data in support of the Gagarin flight and practically no information in its application for recognition by the FAI of the Titov flight. It would not surprise me if the Kremlin now took the scientific data gained today from Colonel Glenn's orbital flight and used it to beef up the Soviet report on the Titov flight which I understand the Soviet Union must file by May 11.

Mr. Speaker, it would seem to me very significant that in our free society we are not afraid to expose our failures and our disappointments, but by the same token we are proud to show to the world our accomplishments. There is no doubt in my mind that in adopting this resolution today and in paying tribute to Colonel Glenn we are in fact paying tribute to the ingenuity and the resourcefulness of the American people.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I am happy, indeed, to join with my colleagues from Ohio, in particular, and with all of my colleagues, in general, who have something to say about the epochal accomplishment of Colonel Glenn. I am boasting a bit when I remind the Members of the House that my great State of Ohio was first in electric light—first in air flight—and now first in space flight.

Colonel Glenn is, of course, a man of great ability and courage, in the best tradition of America. We have proof, if any be needed anywhere, in this well planned and perfectly executed space flight that anything that any country can do, we can do better.

Mr. Speaker, I think it should be said again, and again, and again, that we live in the greatest country in all the world, in the strongest country in all the world, and when the United States of America determines that there is something to be done, it will be done.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I join with our great majority leader in extolling the virtues of Colonel Glenn. But as ranking member of the Committee on Education and Labor I would like to say this—I would like to pay tribute, on the floor of the House this afternoon, to all those men who took care of every detail of every meticulous operation that made it possible for Colonel Glenn to be the No. 1 hero of the United States of America today.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, words cannot fully describe the feeling that today is in the hearts and minds of people throughout the United States of America because of the space achievement of Col. John Glenn.

Suffice it to say it is a feeling of deep pride and quiet jubilation.

Through the achievement of Colonel Glenn the United States has arrived foursquare on the space scene. He deserves each and every accolade that has been paid him and which will be bestowed upon him in the days to come.

His was a feat of dedication, courage, fortitude, brilliance, and determination. We, as a nation, owe him an everlasting debt.

And, as a nation, we also owe undying gratitude and thanks to the thousands upon thousands of people who helped make this achievement possible and thoroughly successful. It was a demonstration of a nation's skill and teamwork as the astronaut, the mechanic, the laborer, the scientist, the sailor, the soldier, the airman, the marine, and the white-collar worker all pulled together in a common cause.

On behalf of the people of the 12th Congressional District of New Jersey, I offer my thanks and congratulations to Colonel Glenn and his many teammates.

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, the heroic flight of Lt. Col. John Glenn today was a monumental achievement of which America can be justly proud. We can also be proud of the fact that all phases of the project were done openly and with complete publicity. The flight was a triumph not only to Colonel Glenn but also to the scientists, engineers, and technicians who worked on the project.

Colonel Glenn has the admiration of all of us, not only because of his patience and steady nerves in the face of many postponements, but also because of his complete mastery of his vehicle in space and his splendid demeanor after the successful conclusion of his flight.

We give thanks for Colonel Glenn's safe return, and we are also tremendously grateful for the very definite knowledge that his epochal flight gave to us as this Nation moves ever further into the conquest of outer space.

There is little more that I can add to what has already been said in praise of this wonderful American. As long as we have men like him in this great country of ours, we need never fear for its future.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman and I thank all those who have taken a part in these proceedings.

We all are grateful to Colonel Glenn for what he has done this day for his country. We are grateful to the loyal and brave family that has stood behind him—to his wife and children whose prayers were with him during every minute of his flight. The courage they demonstrated during the long months of training, and during the many frustrations which preceded the flight, has been in all respects exemplary.

We are grateful to all those who had a hand in the preparations that preceded the flight itself.

We salute our great space agency and all its personnel for a job well done.

We extend our congratulations also to the distinguished Speaker of the House who was chairman of the Select Committee on Science and Astronautics and under whose leadership the space agency was created.

We salute the wonderful men and women of our Armed Forces.

The tremendous recovery job performed by the U.S. Navy is another example of the quality of our men in uniform.

The coordination among all branches of Government who participated in this flight is indicative of the quality of teamwork of which our people are capable when a big job needs to be done.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in paying tribute to our great fellow American, Colonel Glenn, his wife, and children, and all who had supporting roles in this orbital flight. I thank God for watching over him and allowing this great scientific accomplishment. It has opened another door to tomorrow.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, as the Representative of the district from which Colonel Glenn took off this morning I certainly want to join the rest of the Members in congratulating him and expressing my deep and sincere appreciation to him for his dedication and devotion; and also to the many, many other people who joined with him, especially the people from our district, in making this magnificent feat possible.

ASTRONAUT GLENN'S GLOBAL ORBIT GREAT ACHIEVEMENT—NO STUNT

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, this is certainly a great day for the United States and all Americans. The spirit, courage, determination, and patience of Colonel Glenn will now blaze a new trail in our space efforts. The entire Nation and the world congratulates Astronaut Glenn for his magnificent achievement and felicitations go out to his wonderful and loving family.

The great fields of science and technology can take pride in the great accomplishment of this day in outer space. This was no stunt. Astronaut Glenn's global orbit opened up for the eyes of the world to see and the ears of the world to hear what the United States has done in space technology. This was so different in comparison to the manner in which the Soviet Union carried out their efforts in space exploration. The world was kept in darkness and in ignorance until the Soviet Cosmonauts landed amid the press flurries from Moscow.

PRICE TAG HIGH BUT TAXPAYERS' MONEY WELL SPENT

Mr. Speaker, we tip our hat to Colonel Glenn, his family, to the scientists and technicians, to the designers, planners, draftsmen, to the long line of men and women standing behind this great successful earth orbit of today. As a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee that appropriates funds to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, for this and other projects, I know that the price for space success is high but I can assure the American taxpayers that today's achievement was well worth the price tag because it has ended the gap between the United States and the Soviet Union in space explorations. The Soviets started long before we did and the United States has caught up to them in 4 short years. This is certainly a tribute to American ingenuity and capability. Today's success will hasten the United States toward the objective set last year by President Kennedy of placing an American on the moon in the decade of the sixties.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I shall ask for just a few minutes of the time of the House today, but those of us who are on the House Space Committee might well be pardoned for making a few observations for the RECORD on this very historic day of February 20, 1962.

Along with everyone else in America, those of us on the committee are elated at the complete success of today's Mercury-Atlas MA-6.

This event marks a significant milestone in our space program. Today, even more than at the time of the suborbital success of Commander Shepard, proves the favorable result of years of dedicated effort by thousands of people throughout our Nation who have contributed to Project Mercury.

While this event is certainly significant in itself, and taken alone will always stand out as a major achievement in astronautics by the free world, it is even more important in that it provides the springboard for the following generations of manned spacecraft which in present contemplation will be named Projects Gemini and Apollo.

It was our great privilege to personally meet and visit with Colonel Glenn during the time of our visit to the cape on the morning of Commander Shepard's flight into space. Because of his alertness then and endless enthusiasm we could almost sense that he would ultimately be chosen for our first orbital effort.

Several members of the committee last week sweat out each day's delay—first, on Wednesday, then last Thursday, and finally, last Friday—and had to return to the city of Washington because of the legislative program this week. I am certain everyone of us experienced deep regret today in having to forgo a direct view of this most historic event.

But there were some critics last week, and there were even some critics within the last day or two who were quoted as saying that this entire operation should be described as a "plumber's nightmare." Let us admit very quickly that the liquid propulsion system is complex and does involve a lot of valves and tubing and pressure devices, but this success today proves that we are making progress, even in liquid propulsion systems and the success of this shot, coupled with the degree of accuracy and reliability of control of the capsule, should prove that this operation was anything but a "plumber's nightmare," and instead was a carefully planned, perfectly executed project from countdown to recovery and should serve to classify such irresponsible critics into their proper category.

Mr. Speaker, it is my humble prediction that this will be a great year for our space program, and that we will experience many more successes before the end of this calendar year. We will most likely see flights of multiple orbit, and perhaps even a flight that will remain in full orbit for a 24-hour period.

If I may, I would like to take a moment to comment on the many previous delays that have gone on since December and all through January, and to point out that there was some impatience developing across the country—and on this I think we should remember that we set up for the world to see in a great showcase how we in America and the free world value a human life. It would have been easy to have sent Colonel Glenn into orbit based upon weather conditions at Cape Canaveral many times before today, but our concern was about the condition of the sea in the recovery areas. It was not simply a question of showing to the world that we could orbit a man, but the United States had equal concern for the protection of the life of one of its citizens. In my opinion, this was a great demonstration to the world that one life here in America is without limit as to its value, and this brings us to the concurrent wonder, and even suspicion, concerning some of the press releases and stories of purported Russian successes and particularly points up the slight value that is placed upon the life of one of their astronauts behind the Iron Curtain. The many delays and the great caution and care taken as to all phases of this project to preserve the life of our astronaut are just further proof of some of the good things in our American way of life, in sharp contrast to that of the secrecy behind the Iron Curtain.

At the time of the Shepard flight, it was our privilege and pleasure to ride back from Cape Canaveral to the city of Washington on the same plane with the head of Federation Aeronautique Internationale, a native of France, whose assignment was to journey to the United States to check upon and certify the suborbital flight. Today, again, at Cape Canaveral, a representative of this same organization mounted the gantry and personally saw Colonel Glenn sealed in the capsule, so to be able to make positive certification to the world that this orbital flight was commenced at Cape Canaveral and was subsequently checked upon throughout its three orbits by representatives of the organization. There were other representatives at the scene of the recovery 200 miles northwest of Puerto Rico.

We are proud today of this achievement and we can proudly say to the world that here is an event which actually happened. There is no make-believe, nothing to hide, everything is an open book, and if there are those who need to be convinced, we can call upon these neutral observers of the only organization in the world whose primary function it is to certify to feats of aviation and astronautics who were present and will put their imprimatur on all of the events preceding, during, and following this epochal event. Reflect for just a moment on what a difference there is in our way of doing things from that of the Russians, both as to the Gagarin and the Titov flights, with some quite apparent inconsistencies in their announcements of these two flights and even some conflicting explanations as to exactly what happened.

In talking with our family in the home city of Independence, Mo., today, we learned that the streets were deserted, and that every person in town was literally chained to his TV set, so absorbing was the interest. We guess this has been true today all over America, and rightly it should be. Our information from home but proves the truth of the admonition that we saw at Cape Canaveral last week on the marquees, and on dozens of signs on the fronts of business places, and in the front yards of residences at Cocoa Beach, Cocoa, and Titusville, in these words:

> Colonel Glenn, the hopes and the prayers of the free world are with you.

Mr. Speaker, after the elapsed time of 4 hours, 56 minutes, and 26 seconds, when the Mercury capsule had settled into the Atlantic Ocean about 200 miles northwest of Puerto Rico and was followed by the successful recovery of our Col. John H. Glenn, we have a feeling that when this word was flashed throughout the world, there may have been some long faces in the Kremlin, because the Russians should now know that America is in this space race to stay, and to win and that we will have other space spectaculars in this calendar year of 1962 to prove that the free world can maintain its leadership in space. Today is a historic day, but also a happy day for those thousands who have contributed to this successful effort, and a day of great joy throughout the free world.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, every American is prouder today of his country, his flag, and his great heritage, as a result of the heroic achievement of Lt. Col. John Glenn.

While this resolution salutes Colonel Glenn, it is well to remember that this brave marine's accomplishment was the result of tremendous and unparalleled teamwork on the part of many thousands of his fellow Americans.

This great team has included not only the dedicated men and women of NASA and our combined Armed Forces, but additional thousands of engineers, scientists, technicians, production planners, and managers, and working men and women who have backed up and made possible the colonel's splendid orbital flight.

It is another great illustration of what Americans can accomplish when hands are joined so firmly and strongly in a united effort for our country.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I am proud and privileged to speak in support of this resolution and urge its immediate unanimous adoption in order to commemorate one of the greatest days in the history of this great country.

Virtually before the eyes and ears of the whole world, the successful orbital flight of Lt. Col. John Glenn today renews the faith of our people and restores the confidence of our allies in the capability of the United States to compete in space exploration.

The open and complete revelation and account of all aspects of this flight is in marked contrast to the deliberate secrecy of the Soviet Union on similar occasions and should add even greater prestige to this wonderful space feat.

The congratulations and heartfelt thanks of all Americans go out to Colonel Glenn and every individual who helped to make this scientific achievement possible. We join in saluting the magnificent courage of Mrs. Glenn and the two Glenn children who have consistently exemplified the traditional pioneering spirit upon which this great Nation was founded and which will sustain it forever against any and every challenge of the future.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, like millions of other Americans, I watched the takeoff of *Friendship 7* spaceship with considerable anxiety. I listened to the reports of the flight, and finally saw the successful recovery. Together with the legions who have watched and listened to the progress of the flight, I am pleased and proud.

We have made a tremendous step in the direction of successful manned space flights. Colonel Glenn's accomplishment today will have a large impact on the U.S. position in the world.

I am proud of our Nation's accomplishment—and especially since it was performed in full view of the entire world. While many persons continue to doubt whether the celebrated Soviet cosmonauts Gagarin and Titov ever left the ground, we, and the whole world, know that Colonel Glenn was out there in space, went around the earth three times, and came back safely.

My sincere congratulations to Colonel Glenn, his fellow astronauts, and our team of scientists and technicians who made this feat possible. Their efforts, and their success, will serve as an inspiration along the long road that still lies ahead.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, this is a great day for America. I am filled with great pride and emotion when I try to speak of the triumphant feat of Col. John Glenn and his orbital flight three times around the earth today; however, I want to join our distinguished Speaker and majority leader and my colleagues in the Congress in paying tribute to this great American and to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and all those connected with the tremendous accomplishment performed in outer space. It will long be remembered that today's successful flight into outer space will be but the beginning of great scientific advancement in this field. Our minds go back to the days of the Wright Brothers at Kitty Hawk when airplane flight was in its infancy and we can review the tremendous progress made in this field. Considering the great potential of outer space exploration, I believe we can look forward to the future with great hope and expectation in finding ways of promoting this great scientific advancement for peace and well-being of all our peoples. To Col. John Glenn and his fine family I want to express my profound sense of appreciation for what I know has been a trying period for them during the 10 postponements of this magnificent venture.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my voice to the many today who are congratulating Lt. Col. John Glenn and the Mercury space team on their truly outstanding accomplishment of three successful orbital flights of the earth.

This was not only a truly successful triumph of man over the oft competing forces of nature, but it was also a vindication of our open society which permits the world to view our failures and our successes.

We have now taken an open and significant step forward in our further understanding of the universe in which we live, and once again, my warmest congratulations to those dedicated men and women who did so much to make successful this remarkable exploration of space.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with my colleagues of the House in expressing congratulations to Col. John Glenn on his historic achievement and to the thousands of men and women, both in civilian life and of the military, who proved by extraordinary teamplay the manner in which Americans work together in accomplishing a desirable objective.

Colonel Glenn's flight around the earth was indeed an extraordinary scientific achievement of universal importance and significance.

It not only was a demonstration of one man's courage and ability but was also a demonstration of a nation's skill, determination and ability to work together: The mechanic, the laborer, the scientist, the sailor, soldier, airman, and marine all joined hands in providing the greatest teamwork ever performed in bringing about the greatest scientific achievement ever attained. This flight was also a dramatic illustration to the world of the difference in the Russian way of life and the American way of life. It must be recalled that the alleged Russian orbit was reported after the flight, that it was viewed only by Russians, that no member of the international press was permitted to observe the preparation or the flight, whereas the American flight was announced weeks in advance with ample opportunity for the press of all nations to view not only the actual flight but all the preparations. America even broadcast over the airwaves actual conversations with the astronaut so the entire world could understand and note what was being done. America sought to hide nothing; Russia sought to hide everything.

Colonel Glenn's flight therefore demonstrates many things for many people and will, I believe, be a landmark not only in aviation and scientific achievement but in the field of international relations.

Personally and on behalf of all the people of the First Congressional District of New Jersey, I congratulate Col. John Glenn and his fellow workers on an outstanding success.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, the people of the 17th Congressional District through me as their Representative express their pride and delight in the accomplishment of Col. John Glenn today. Our congratulations go to him and to the United States as a whole which made this day possible.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage of the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the resolution was agreed to unanimously.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WHAT FREEDOM MEANS TO ME

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, today in an era when there is concern expressed from many sections about the caliber of our youngsters, it is gratifying to receive reports like the one that came to my desk recently from the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

This great organization recently conducted a nationwide campaign in the schools of this country, urging youngsters to express in their own words the meaning of democracy.

I am extremely happy to report that Pennsylvania's winner comes from my own congressional district. He is John C. Mills, Jr., son of Mr. and Mrs. John Mills, of Brodheadsville, Monroe County, an 11th-grade pupil at Pleasant Valley Junior-Senior High School in Brodheadsville.

This young man has put his finger on the true meaning of democracy in his essay, "What Freedom Means to Me."

WHAT FREEDOM MEANS TO ME

(By John C. Mills, Jr., grade 11, Pleasant Valley Junior-Senior High School, Brodheadsville, Monroe County, Pa.)

Freedom is my most precious possession.

It is not a possession of unit meaning; it is a possession of many meanings. It is a priceless possession that means many things to many people, and many other things to many other people.

I shall try to tell you what it means to me.

A possession of such ultimate value must be guarded. Hence, freedom to me means that I must not enjoy it without carrying my full load of the responsibility necessary to keep it. I must be constantly on guard for the preservation of my rights and the rights of other people. Freedom is never attained easily; freedom is never kept easily. It is a constant effort that pays dividends tenfold. My point, therefore, is that freedom means first of all responsibility.

But freedom means much more to me.

Freedom gives my mind an opportunity to grow. In other words, freedom gives my mind an opportunity to grow in freedom. It can grow freely as my mind wants to grow. I may read what I want to read. I may associate with whom I want to associate. I may travel when and where I choose. I may gather facts as I go my way. I may weigh these facts, disregard what I choose, keep those I want to keep. My mind grows in freedom without chains to limit its growth. With the facts I keep I may do research and the final conclusions I reach are mine. They are part of me. They are part of the great contribution of mankind to the processes, the flows, of life.

These conclusions are truths as I see them. My freedom gave me the right to do research and establish truth according to my interpretations. Hence, freedom means to me that I may arrive at truth as I see truth, not as someone else sees it. This means that freedom gives me the right to grow.

Therefore, since freedom gives me the right to grow, I may become creative. I may now step forward and create new facts from which new relative truths may be created. This right to create frees me completely and allows me to grow mentally, spiritually, and economically. This growth allows me, in turn, to build upon that which was given to me so that finally I may give back to the world a parcel of something greater than was given me. I am thus serving mankind in a most admirable way; but I am both taking and giving, but my giving exceeds my take.

Freedom in simple words means the right of man to rise above the past and to march forward to better worlds.

OFFICE OF AGING

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I include my statement before the General Subcommittee on Education, House Education and Labor Committee, in support of my bill (H.R. 710) to establish an Office of Aging within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, February 20, 1962:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee; it was 26 years ago that the Nation woke up to the serious and sometimes desperate economic problems of the aged. For many years previous to 1935, this problem had been relegated to the background like the aged themselves.

The harsh realities of the depression stripped away the careless but comfortable attitude of ignoring problems, and revealed the fact that millions of the aged were destitute, or so dependent on others that they were charity cases in the homes of their own children.

The conscience of the Nation was aroused. Through the pressure of public opinion, the Congress passed and the President signed the Social Security Act. At intervals since then, the act has been broadened and strengthened, to provide economic security for the aged.

As time went on we discovered that the monthly social security checks were only a partial solution of the many-faceted problems related to aging. The aged themselves told us of their needs. From the petitions of their various groups and organizations, I select the following as speaking for all. It is the "senior citizens bill of rights," drawn up by the Desmond committee of New York State that appeared in the pamphlet "once in a lifetime," published by the National Association of Retired Civil Employees:

"Each of our senior citizens, regardless of race, color, or creed, is entitled to:

"1. The right to an opportunity to continue to be useful.

"2. The right to an equal opportunity to obtain employment based on merit, not birthdays.

"3. The right to freedom from the specter of want in old age and burial in a pauper's grave.

"4. The right to a fair share of the community's recreational, educational, and medical resources.

"5. The right to obtain decent housing suited to the needs of later years.

"6. The right to the respect of the community, based on service to the community.

"7. The right to the support of one's family to an extent consonant with the best interest of the family.

"8. The right to live independently, as one chooses.

"9. The right to live with dignity as a free human being unfettered by antiquated concepts of the proper role of old people.

"10. The right of access to all available knowledge on how to make the later years happy years."

The Senate Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging, created by the Senate resolution in February 1959, was the first congressional body delegated to conduct a comprehensive study of all the difficulties faced by the aged and what can be done to ease them. The first major subcommittee report listed 12 recommendations for legislation concerning such problems as the financing of medical care, nursing homes, social security benefits, housing, employment, and social services for the aged.

With several agencies of the Federal Government, each authorized to carry out one aspect of the overall program, and with States, communities, and nonprofit institutions and organizations in the picture, there is apt to be confusion, duplication, and even blind spots of neglect, through lack of coordination.

I believe that your committee realizes the need for a central office to serve as a clearinghouse for information related to problems of the aged and aging; to develop research and demonstration programs; to administer grants that will help the States to develop their programs; to gather statistics in the field of aging that other agencies are not collecting; to stimulate more effective use of existing resources and available services; and to assist the new programs as they develop through separate bills that are passed by Congress.

I appear in support of H.R. 710, which I introduced on January 3, 1961. Its purpose is "to present a declaration of objectives for senior Americans; provide for the establishment of a U.S. Office of Aging within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to be headed by an Assistant Secretary for Aging; authorize Federal grants to assist in the development and operation of studies and projects to help older persons, and for other purposes."

H.R. 710 will authorize project grants totaling $70 million over a period of 4 years to assist the States in furthering the policies set forth in this act. Above all, it will bring together Federal-State-local relationships in the field of the aging on an integrated, across departmental lines, basis.

To coordinate the work of all public agencies from the national to the local level that will be responsible for the comprehensive program to benefit the aging that is well on its way, it is essential to establish a U.S. Office of Aging.

I respectfully suggest that H.R. 710 will be effective in meeting the need.

BULL SHOALS DAM TO BE NAMED HARRY S. TRUMAN DAM

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill providing that the Bull Shoals Dam and Bull Shoals Reservoir be known in the future as the Harry S. Truman Dam and Reservoir in honor of the great former President of the United States.

The Bull Shoals Reservoir is located in the Ozarks of southern Missouri, President Truman's home State, and of north central Arkansas, and extends for a distance of 87 miles along the White River from the Bull Shoals Dam, 10 miles west of Mountain Home, Ark., to the Ozark Beach Dam near Forsyth, Mo.

The project was authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1941 for flood control, generation of power, and other beneficial water use.

It is of immense benefit not only to the residents of the area but to the tremendous number of visitors who are attracted to the reservoir because of its recreational facilities. In 1960, for example, more than 2,580,000 visitors enjoyed the lake facilities, which include public boat docks, picnicking and camping areas.

President Truman, both as President and as a U.S. Senator, was an effective advocate of public power and flood-control measures, and in these respects the Bull Shoals Dam and Reservoir have been of maximum service to the people of the White and lower Mississippi Valleys.

Power generation was started in September 1952 and through June 1960 the project produced 3,782,555,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy which has been marketed through the Southwestern Power Administration, Department of the Interior.

Since July 1951, when filling of the power pool began, more than 35 floods have occurred in the White River Basin which were regulated by the combined operation of the Bull Shoals and Norfolk Reservoirs and, since 1957, Table Rock Reservoir. Flooding was prevented on an average of some 22,380 acres of improved land for each flood.

President Truman gave impetus to the construction of this great project and spoke at its dedication on July 2, 1952.

At that time, the former President noted:

> The project would stop floods and produce hydroelectric power, and benefit farm families who need electricity for refrigerators and freezers and hay dryers and feed grinders and a hundred other uses.
>
> That is where this public power ought to go, to lighten the burdens of farmers and workers and housewives, and to give free recreation and pleasure to all people.

President Truman and all other Presidents we have had, of all political parties, have worked diligently toward the goal that all rivers and streams, and indeed all the water resources that we possess, are controlled and developed to serve the people, to give them electric power and clean drinking water and recreation, and to eliminate the scourges of floods and pollution.

Many other dams and reservoirs bear the names of men, in and out of public life, who have led in this great program to harness our waterpower for maximum benefit. The Hoover Dam, for example, pays tribute to a President whose contributions to this goal are immeasurable.

The naming of this dam and reservoir as the Harry S. Truman Dam and Reservoir will give recognition to the President under whose administration and through whose efforts this project was established, and to whom Americans who benefit from the wise use of our water resources owe so much.

It is my hope that the committee to which this legislation is assigned will approve the bill and that it will receive the support of all Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

STRENGTHEN THE HOME FINANCING MARKET

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill (H.R. 10268) which will increase the amount of money available in the home mortgage market by requiring commercial banks to maintain a certain percentage of their thrift and time account funds invested in long-term loans on real property and a percentage of that invested in home mortgages.

In the past 3 years, Mr. Speaker, we have seen a phenomenal increase in the amount of time and thrift deposits in commercial banks. One of the reasons has been that the banks have increased the interest rate offered on these accounts. At yearend 1959, for example, time deposits in the commercial banks amounted to $62.9 billion. In 1960 these deposits increased by $4.1 billion. The 1960 Annual Report of the Federal Reserve noted that this increase occurred after midyear and was the largest July-December increase in the postwar period. As of December 31, 1960, these time deposits in commercial banks exceeded $67 billion.

This was nothing, however, compared with what was to happen in 1961. By June 30, 1961, time and savings deposits had shot up to $87.3 billion, an increase in the first 6 months of the year of more than $20.2 billion.

Let us look for a moment at what was happening to the mutual savings banks and savings and loan associations. In 1959 their combined savings were $83.1 billion. In 1960 this increased by $10.4 billion, bringing their yearend total to $93.5 billion. During the first 6 months of 1961 their total increase was $9.3 billion. Their estimated increase over the full year is only $15.6 billion as compared to the commercial banks increase of $20.2 billion in the first 6 months.

What is apparent here is that the commercial banks are siphoning off a considerable amount of savings dollars. Thrift and time account funds should be invested in long-term mortgages in the residential housing market. One may reasonably ask if this is being done.

With this huge increase in commercial bank time and thrift accounts one would hope that the available money for residential mortgage financing would be increased substantially. This has not been the case. The market has remained fairly steady. I believe that we may assume that the commercial banks have been investing these funds in the short-term market and home financing has been left primarily to the mutual savings banks and savings and loan associations.

We may have no right to require the commercial banks to lower the interest rate they pay on time and savings accounts. We do have the right to require them to maintain a percentage of these funds invested in long-term financing for residential housing. That is all I am asking—a simple measure to assure that thrift and time account funds are kept available for residential housing financing. We all know that the Federal Reserve Board and the FDIC have allowed commercial banks to increase their interest payments on these accounts up to 4 percent as of January 1, 1962.

In view of the 1961 increase in commercial bank thrift and time accounts it appears reasonable to assume that a similar or greater increase will occur in 1962. The response to this increase apparently has been much greater than anyone had expected. A mid-January survey indicated that about two-thirds of the banks had lifted their rates and that 20 percent went all the way to the 4 percent ceiling on savings and time deposits. Unofficial figures indicate that during the one month of January, 1962, these deposits in commercial banks increased by $2.5 billion. If this continues, we will have another tremendous increase in these accounts in commercial banks.

The time to act is now so that we can be assured that these funds will be directed into home financing where they are so necessary.

COMMENTS ON AGRICULTURE BUDGET

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, the President's budget message to Congress this year was a comprehensive, far reaching, declaration of intent and desired goals.

I believe the budget, on the whole, is realistic. However, there is one phase of the agricultural section, dealing with the conservation effort, to which I should like to address myself.

The President's budget requested an advance authorization for the 1963 agricultural conservation program of $150 million, which represents a reduction of $100 million in the amount which has been available to this vital program during the recent past.

Over the past quarter century, the ACP has been a vital force in the battle that has been waged unceasingly to conserve and protect our natural resources of soil, water, and woodland and keep them productive for generations to come.

The spectors of eroded hillsides, worn-out fields and abandoned farms have been dispelled, for the most part, through the agricultural programs generated by the Congress. These programs have been based upon the sound concept that the basis of a strong agriculture is productive soil. How well we have succeeded to date is evidenced by the fact that the productive capacity of the agriculture of this Nation is second to none on earth. Our abundance has been felt the world over in the form of food for the hungry and cloth for the naked. We have been generous to the pleas of the past and surely we are but standing at the threshold of the future.

The agricultural conservation program has operated as a vital conservation partnership wherein farmers and the Government join together to perform the needed conservation work on the land, that is in the national interest as well as the interest of the farmer. This program is based on a very frank acceptance of the fact that while needed conservation pays a nation in the long run, many conservation measures do not offer returns to farmers that are attractive enough in the immediate future to get the needed amount of such practices applied, thus the ACP partnership.

As I drive about the country today, I see many farms on which owners or operators have, to some degree, solved their soil and water conservation problems with the help of the ACP and other conservation services. Generally these farmers are producing more and living better. They are paying more taxes. They are contributing more to make their communities stable and prosperous. All of us are sharing the benefits of continued abundant production that comes from those farms. However, lest we conclude that the job is done and the problems solved—preliminary data, from the recently completed inventory of soil and water conservation needs, indicate that two-thirds of our farmland still needs conservation treatment. This being the case, I would like to go on record early in this session of Congress in support of a $250 million advance authorization for the ACP in 1963 in lieu of the $150 million requested in the President's budget.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to inquire of the majority leader if he can tell us at this time, and if he cannot, we will all understand, as to the program for the balance of the week.

Mr. ALBERT. Of course, as the gentleman knows, the House was advised on yesterday that a resolution dealing with the reorganization plan creating a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing would be called up under a privileged resolution tomorrow. So far as I know that matter will be called up tomorrow. Beyond that, I have no statement to make with reference to the program for the balance of the week at this time.

Mr. HALLECK. I thank the gentleman.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, on the rollcall vote in connection with the debt limit bill, I was unavoidably detained and could not be on the floor of the House. I ask that the RECORD show had I been present at that time on the floor, I would have voted for the rule.

BILL TO MODIFY THE LIMIT UPON THE DEDUCTION FOR ADDITIONS TO RESERVE FOR BAD DEBTS OF SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATIONS

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is becoming increasingly obvious that both the Congress and the public understand that mutual financial institutions should pay some additional taxes over their present payments and above those paid by their account holders on dividends. I feel that my proposal will not only bring in substantial tax revenue but it is fair and equitable for all mutual financial institutions, unlike the tax formula which the Treasury has suggested to the Ways and Means Committee.

Clearly the Treasury-suggested formula, which is based on the amount of an institution's growth in its mortgage account, will result in great unfairness. Under varying growth conditions small institutions might be paying large taxes, while big institutions paid virtually nothing. The formula would also cause inequities in various areas of the Nation where growth rate differs with the result that some institutions would be tax free, others burdened.

The bill which I have introduced for the consideration of the committee and all Members of Congress who are studying the question proposes a program which will produce some $175 million in tax revenues—on a basis which is fair and equitable to all concerned. As an example, in 1962 it proposes to raise $100 million from the mutual savings and loan associations and cooperative banks; $25 million from the private stock savings associations; and $50 million from the mutual savings banks whose assets are about two-thirds as large as those of the mutual savings and loan associations. In terms of total assets, mutual savings and loan associations account for $70 billion; stock associations $10 billion; and mutual savings banks $55 billion, 90 percent of which is in New York and Massachusetts.

Mutual savings banks will not be the source of as much a share of taxes due to their large holdings of tax-free municipal bonds and tax-free public housing bonds.

Mr. Speaker, the bill also takes into consideration the fact that there is every reason in public policy to provide a different type of taxation for the mutual financial institutions as compared to the guaranty stock associations which are prominent in California and Ohio and more recently in Maryland and Illinois. This difference in the two types of institutions was clearly and succinctly spelled out on pages 171 to 173 of the penetrating report of the Commission on Money and Credit. However, may I emphasize that the stock operation in Ohio is remarkably clean in comparison to the other three States.

This bill provides taxation for 25 percent of the net annual earnings of mutual institutions. This ratio is necessary to permit the transfer to loss reserves of funds sufficient to cover losses as is required by law and by State and Federal supervisory authorities.

Private stock associations are taxed in the same way as commercial banks and other private stock corporations. They are permitted to retain all reserves accumulated up to this time and they are allowed a tax-free debt reserve approved by the Secretary of the Treasury just as is provided for commercial banks.

I believe that this proposal will not only raise a fair and reasonable amount of tax revenue, but will also close the tax haven for private stock associations. It will also end the speculation in savings and loan holding company shares and the conversion of mutual institutions to stock associations for the benefit of a few insiders.

Mr. Speaker, this proposal is completely fair to the mutual savings and loan associations, cooperative banks, mutual savings banks and other financial institutions of a purely mutual character. Certainly the private stock savings and loan associations cannot object to being treated in the same tax manner as other American stock corporations.

PRIVATE ENTERPRISE VERSUS SOCIALISM IN SOUTH AMERICA

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, last year this Congress, at the request of the present administration, enacted into law a comprehensive foreign aid measure, known as the "Act for International Development."

This act embraces the administration's alliance for progress, under which the administration hopes Congress and private enterprise will provide assistance to the Republics of Latin America to the extent of approximately $2 billion per year for 10 years.

While that bill was under consideration, Members of the Congress were repeatedly assured by administration spokesmen that American private investment would play a strong and increasing role in bringing this needed developmental capital to Latin America. In fact, the very preamble of the act states:

> It is the policy of the United States to strengthen friendly foreign countries * * * by minimizing or eliminating barriers to the flow of private investment capital.

The events of this past weekend in Brazil raise serious questions as to whether the laws and policies we have so recently enacted in fact minimize or eliminate barriers to the flow of private investment capital to Latin America. These recent events create grave doubts as to whether the law, as enacted, adequately protects our private investment in Latin America. Further, it appears very doubtful that the administration intends to fulfill the policy in favor of American foreign investment which we incorporated in our aid legislation last year.

On Friday the government of one of the states of Brazil seized and confiscated a privately owned and operated telephone company, a subsidiary of International Telephone & Telegraph Corp. At the time of the seizure the local officials publicly announced that they would pay only the equivalent of 400,000 American dollars for this property, an amount which is said to be only approximately 5 percent of its true worth.

There are several important things to note about this seizure. In the first place, the Government of Brazil and the state government immediately concerned have steadily refused to guarantee U.S. private investors against the confiscation of their properties. Under the law we enacted last year, the U.S. Goverment is given no new authorities to protect against this type of cold-war risk. Nothing can be done unless the country itself will agree to do so. And nothing in the act requires the administration to negotiate toward these ends as a basis for furthering the aims of the Alliance for Progress. Thus, we appear to have left our private investments at the mercy of foreign governments.

Secondly, our Government has thus far taken no step under the power it always has had to rescind or defer foreign aid to Brazil in order to bring about a reversal of this act of outright confiscation. Unless this is done, U.S. foreign aid, in effect, will help to finance the confiscation of private property belonging to American citizens.

On Saturday, our Department of State issued a public protest against the seizure. In this protest, our Government recognized Brazil's right to seize American properties, provided adequate compensation is paid. Why do we have to lead off with the idea that any amount of state ownership of productive facilities is quite satisfactory to us? Unless we are trying to encourage these nations to move further into economics at the expense of private enterprise? In addition, it is true, the protest deplored the seizure as contrary to the spirit of the alliance for progress since it would absorb Brazilian funds which might otherwise go into needed improvements and developments. But it failed entirely to convince the reader that our Government felt that socialism was an inferior system to private enterprise and accordingly would take some concrete steps to promote this idea and to discourage and frustrate these kind of seizures.

In my judgment, gentlemen, the State Department protest is an inadequate response to this flagrant takeover of American properties, particularly since, by implication of neutrality on our part, it invites Brazil and all other Latin American nations to use our aid to force American firms out of business in Latin America.

Third, while the act of confiscation was that of a state of Brazil rather than the national government, the latter did exhort the state officials to negotiate the confiscation price. Nevertheless, the national officials disclaimed any ability to really control the acts of their state officials. This raises further serious questions. Are our policies for aiding Latin America to be thwarted by such legalisms? I understand also that the pittance offered for the property—a mere $400,000—may not be convertible into U.S. dollars in any case and may have to remain in Brazil to be eroded by inflation, since Brazil has also refused to enter into a treaty guaranteeing the convertibility into American dollars of local currencies owned by Americans.

Fourth, I call the attention of this House to the fact that at the very moment these outrageous events were taking place in Brazil our Government and the Government of Brazil were engaged in negotiations looking toward our granting to Brazil $1 billion in current foreign aid.

Fifth, we should not deceive ourselves into believing that we can win the cold war against the Communists in these contested lands by submitting to and so encouraging the political and economic actions which follow the theories of communism, not private enterprise and representative government of men such as Gov. Leonel Brizzola, of the State of Rio Grande do Sul. The New York Times of Sunday, February 18, describes him as a leftwing nationalist, whatever that is.

I believe the Members of this House will agree with me when I say that it is now time to ask the administration some pertinent questions with regard to our aid policies. Are we going to continue to provide vast amounts of foreign aid to countries which breathe defiance and hostility against the theories of the private enterprise system and of representative government? Is it truly in the interests of the United States to provide foreign aid through the governmental officials of Latin American countries who follow Communist theories and who refuse—as did Brazil at Punte del Este—to even denounce communism in our hemisphere, and who, while clamoring for our aid dollars, use them to steal our private properties in defiance of the very policies which should be clearly laid down in the aid legislation?

But this is not the end of these apparently conflicting policies. Last year on the very heels of the administration's presentation of the aid program to this Congress, the administration brought to the Ways and Means Committee a series of tax measures which would further stifle the flow of private investment capital to underdeveloped areas such as Latin America.

These tax proposals would sharply increase U.S. taxes upon earnings derived from investment in Latin America, thus discouraging the making of needed new job-creating investments there. Chief among these measures, as they apply to Latin America, was the so-called gross-up. Worldwide in its application, this new tax measure, which reverses a U.S. income tax rule of more than 40 years standing, would have its greatest adverse impact in the less-developed areas such as Latin America. This is for the reason that corporate income tax rates in such countries are lower than the U.S. tax rate. Hence, any increased U.S. tax on the difference will have its greatest effect in retarding U.S. investments there. In substance, the gross-up proposal levies a new U.S. tax upon the amount of tax already paid out to the Latin American governments—a double tax, if you please—since it is imposed on moneys which can never reach our shores.

Serious doubt must exist over whether or not the Ways and Means Committee and the Congress will finally endorse a tax measure which flies directly in the face of an aid policy explicitly designed to engender more—not less—private capital investment in Latin America. Yet I can assure the Members of this House that the administration appears determined to continue to press this gross-up tax proposal with all of the lobbying tools at its command.

We now have a duty to ask the administration and they have a duty to provide a clear answer to the question: What rationale, what foundation of consistency, what ultimate logic lies in the espousal of these conflicting policies? A policy to stimulate capital flow to Latin America is utterly inconsistent with an aid program which tolerates and, indeed, finances the confiscation of American investments once they are made. What possible justification can conceivably exist for the imposition of a new burden of U.S. income tax upon the very American firms best equipped to help increase the flow of private investment capital to Latin America?

Gentlemen, the inconsistency and self-defeating nature of these policies is becoming apparent, an inconsistency made even more transparent by the sad event which took place in Brazil this past weekend.

I have concluded to press for specific answers from the administration to some of the profound questions raised by this seizure and the administration's current tax proposals. For this purpose, I am today directing a letter to Secretary of the Treasury Dillon. I do so for the obvious reason that he took the leading role for the administration in the presentation to the Congress of the aid program as well as these tax measures.

I hope the Congress will be given specific answers to the following questions, among others:

First. Is it not in the best interests of the United States to deny foreign aid to governments who engage in the confiscation of American properties?

Second. Is not such confiscation contrary to U.S. public interest even if full compensation is paid?

Third. Should the United States, through its foreign aid program, finance the takeover of American investments in Latin America, directly or indirectly?

Fourth. Should we not devise a system of guarantees against political and cold war risks which does not depend for its efficacy upon the whim of a foreign government? I refer specifically to guarantees against expropriation, inconvertibility, riot and acts of war which Brazil and other Latin American countries have refused to adopt.

Fifth. What justification can possibly be shown for the enactment of new tax measures that will retard private investment in the underdeveloped countries, frustrating a policy which we enacted into law only last year?

Gentlemen, it is obvious that this Congress is being asked to enact a collection of inconsistent laws, including the tax proposals and the new reciprocal trade bill now pending before the Ways and Means Committee. The Congress is entitled to clear and concise answers to these questions from the administration before we proceed further to enact either the pending tax legislation, the reciprocal trade bill, or the pending foreign aid requests.

FARMERS REFERENDUM NOT A FAIR CHOICE

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. SHORT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, as I study the provisions of H.R. 10010, I am more and more concerned with the threats being made to farmers, the effect of which is: "If you don't buy my program, I will use the power of the Federal Government and the huge stocks of Commodity Credit commodities to make you wish you had. I will break your market."

Mr. Speaker, one of the salient features of the Agricultural Act, from the very beginning, has been outlined and revised in the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and is known as section 407. The Congress very wisely anticipated that there might come a time when we would have a Secretary of Agriculture who was so intent on forcing his program on farmers that the power of the Commodity Credit and the Department of Agriculture would be used.

Thus, the language in 407 is very clear with regard to this matter. Of course, the broad powers given the Secretary of Agriculture for administering these programs can be used always as an umbrella or an excuse for doing a great many things that are very detrimental to farmers. However, let me quote a few lines from section 407:

> The Corporation shall not sell any basic agricultural commodity or storable nonbasic commodity at less that 5 per centum above the current support price for such commodity, plus reasonable carrying charges. * * * Nor shall the foregoing restrictions apply to sales of commodities the disposition of which is desirable in the interest of the effective and efficient conduct of the Corporation's operations because of the small quantities involved, or because of age, location or questionable continued storability, but such sales shall be offset by such purchases of commodities as the Corporation determines are necessary to prevent such sales from substantially impairing any price-support program, but in no event shall the purchase price exceed the then current support price for such commodities.

The Department of Agriculture is about to make a laughingstock out of the referendum process. They say in the proposed legislation now before the

Agriculture Committee—which is 106 pages of regulations for farmers—that "yes; we will give farmers an opportunity to vote in a referendum with regard to these programs we are proposing." But, let us consider for a moment the choices available to farmers in such a process. The Secretary of Agriculture, in this bill, says, in effect: "It will be my program or no program at all; and if you disapprove the program I am advocating, I shall dump on the market 10 million tons of surplus feed grains, which is equivalent to about 357 million bushels of corn."

Mr. Speaker, to attempt to coerce corn and feed grain producers to vote for an unsound program through the threat of breaking the market by injecting at harvesttime—or any other time for that matter—large quantities of corn or other feed grains, is unheard of. I have observed these programs for many years—beginning with Henry A. Wallace in the 1930's coming through Mr. Wickard, the Honorable Senator Clinton P. Anderson, Secretary Brennan, Secretary Benson—and always the Secretaries have administered section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 in a most satisfactory manner. They seemed to recognize that to cause farmers to try to compete with the huge stocks of CCC grain would be completely out of order and, in fact, would be violating the spirit and intent of the law.

This is not so in the current situation—because we have seen in 1961 the Secretary of Agriculture use Commodity Credit stocks, on the theory that they were out of condition, to dump on the market at harvesttime in 1961 in order to punish the so-called noncooperators and to try to make farmers believe they had better cooperate in the 1962 program.

Mr. Speaker, I think we must keep in mind that when we are talking about feed grains, we are not simply talking of the cash feed grain market but we are involved in a production that directly and indirectly affects more than 65 percent of the farm income. We are talking in terms of between $20 and $25 billion in the value of farm products sold as a result of the use of feed grains. And, I say to you again, that one of the most disturbing facets of this whole matter is the stated and deliberate attempt on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture to utilize the all-powerful centralized Government to force farmers into line. I am sure the Congress of the United States will not sanction such a procedure and will, in fact, pass legislation limiting his authority to utilize these stocks.

Yesterday, when appearing before the House Agriculture Committee, Secretary Freeman—in defending the provision in H.R. 10010 relative to selling Commodity Credit Corporation feed grains in the event farmers would turn down the Department's plan in referendum—stated that this was less authority than the Secretary has under present law. This is true with regard to the present temporary feed grain program, but not so far as wheat is concerned.

It would be impossible for a real free market to work with the Government liquidating its stock of surplus grain at the rate suggested in H.R. 10010, on the American market. I cannot see why these surpluses of both wheat and feed grain could not be disposed of overseas under the food-for-peace program instead of being dumped on the American market in competition with current farm production.

PROPOSED COLD WAR GI BILL TO PROVIDE EDUCATIONAL AND VOCATIONAL TRAINING BENEFITS

Mr. ST. GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST. GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, the cold war GI bill which I introduced today will provide educational and vocational training benefits for more than 4½ million Americans who have served in the Armed Forces in the post-Korean period. Though there has been no sacrifice of American lives nor the great period of national suffering that accompanied the Second World War and the Korean conflict, the personal sacrifices and hardships endured during the cold war have been no less significant to the Nation.

The provisions of this bill are designed to restore, in part, the educational and other opportunities lost by the youth of the Nation who have been called upon to give a share of their lives for the defense of the Nation and its principles. The Nation can and should show its gratitude for the efforts of its citizen-soldiers during this period of stalemate and noncombative war. An opportunity should be given to these citizens to rejoin the mainstream of American life after their period of service. The college and vocational training provided under the provisions of this measure will assure these veterans that they have not lost the opportunity for higher education or training and that their careers have not been sacrificed because of their service to the Nation.

This measure is patterned after two of the most successful and far-reaching programs ever enacted by the Congress. The hundreds of thousands of Americans who benefited from the two previous GI bills are the basis upon which our present scientific, social, and economic structure has been built. The United States would be a much different nation had not Congress been willing to invest in the future. Not only did these programs produce college-trained professionals, but needed technicians and skilled workers were provided with the opportunity for on-the-job and on-the-farm training so that they might play their part in the economic life of the Nation.

The expense involved in this program is a self-liquidating debt. No one can deny that this program will cost money, a great deal of money. However, the educational and vocational training will increase the productive capacity and earning power of the veterans, bringing financial as well as social return to the Nation. The investment is small when viewed in the light of the dividends which will accrue to the Nation after operation of the program.

The measure provides 1½ days of schooling for each day of service, but it should not exceed 36 months of such education or training. Eligibility is conditioned upon 6 months or more of service or a discharge for service-connected disabilities. The monthly allowance for full-time college training would be $110 if the veteran has no dependents; $135 if he has one dependent; and $165 if he has more than one dependent. There are provisions for loan assistance and vocational rehabilitation for disabled veterans as well as for college, on-the-job and on-the-farm training.

Approximately 40,000 Rhode Islanders have served in the Armed Forces since 1955 and would be eligible for the benefits of this legislation. The potential of this measure can be seen in the effects of the World War II and Korean bills. I attended law school under the provisions of the Korean bill as did many of my colleagues. Testimonials to the successes of the two previous GI bills can be found in the ranks of the faculties of our schools and colleges, the professional men of the State, and our young scientists, engineers and executives. They are enriching the life of Rhode Island and the Nation. It would not have been possible without the action of the Congress in approving the earlier measures.

It is my view that even more of a percentage of the eligible veterans would take advantage of their opportunities offered by this measure than did those after World War II and Korea. The great interest in education which pervades the Nation and the increasing number of our citizens who desire higher education foretell events subsequent to passage of this legislation. At the present junction of world affairs an educated nation is the only nation which can adequately defend the principles and ideas of the United States in the battle for the mind of man which is being waged throughout the world.

This is an important measure with far-reaching effects. Its approval by the Congress will guarantee America a multifold increase in the Nation's most important resource, an educated people.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Hays (at the request of Mr. Burleson), for 4 days, on account of official business.

Mr. Broomfield (at the request of Mr. Burleson), for 4 days, on account of official business.

Mr. Scherer, for February 26 through March 6, 1962, on account of discussions on highway legislation at Los Angeles and San Francisco.

Mr. Fallon (at the request of Mr. Scherer), for February 26 through March, 6, 1962, on account of discussions on highway legislation at Los Angeles and San Francisco.

Mr. Addabbo (at the request of Mr. Gilbert), for balance of week, on account of illness.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. Baring), on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Michel, for 15 minutes, on Wednesday, February 21.

Mrs. Dwyer (at the request of Mr. Goodell), for 10 minutes, on Wednesday, February 21.

Mr. Rousselot (at the request of Mr. Goodell), for 1 hour, on February 22.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Albert) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Morris K. Udall.
Mr. Gilbert.
Mr. Baring.
Mr. Roush.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Goodell) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Dominick.
Mr. Hosmer.
Mr. Van Zandt.
Mr. Jensen.
Mr. Dole.
Mr. Findley.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 21, 1962, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1714. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to help achieve the objectives of the Employment Act of 1946 by providing standby authority to accelerate capital expenditure programs of the Federal Government and State and local public bodies"; to the Committee on Public Works.

1715. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, relative to the loan of certain naval vessels to the Government of Greece, and to the Government of Korea, pursuant to section 7 of Public Law 87–387; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1716. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to repeal certain legislation relating to the purchase of silver, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1717. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting the July–December 1961 report on Army, Navy, and Air Force prime contract awards to small and other business firms, pursuant to section 10(d) of the Small Business Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1718. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession contract which will authorize the Yosemite Park and Curry Co., to continue to provide concession facilities and services in Yosemite National Park, pursuant to (70 Stat. 543); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1719. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to donate to the Devils Lake Sioux Tribe of the Fort Totten Indian Reservation, N. Dak., approximately 275.74 acres of federally owned land"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1720. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for the conveyance of 39 acres of Minnesota Chippewa tribal land on the Fond du Lac Indian Reservation to the SS. Mary and Joseph Church, Sawyer, Minn."; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1721. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to declare that certain land of the United States is held by the United States in trust for the Oglala Sioux Indian Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1722. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to declare that certain land of the United States is held by the United States in trust for the Oglala Sioux Indian Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1723. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize an additional appropriation for the Rama Road"; to the Committee on Public Works.

1724. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An act to provide for commitments to, maintenance in, and discharges from the District Training School, and for other purposes' ", approved March 3, 1925, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1725. A letter from the director, the American Legion, transmitting the proceedings of the 43d Annual National Convention of the American Legion, held in Denver, Colo., September 12 to 14, 1961, pursuant to Public Law 249, 77th Congress (H. Doc. No. 345); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1726. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, and Managing Trustee of the Trust Funds, transmitting the 22d Annual Report of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund, pursuant to section 201(c) of the Social Security Act, as amended (H. Doc. No. 346); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 3444. A bill to approve an order of the Secretary of the Interior adjusting, deferring, and canceling certain irrigation charges against non-Indian-owned lands under the Wind River Indian irrigation project, Wyoming, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1365). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 201. An act to donate to the Zuni Tribe approximately 610 acres of federally owned land; without amendment (Rept. No. 1366). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 10264. A bill to provide that the House of Representatives shall be composed of 438 Members beginning with the 88th Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 1367). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1299. An act to amend the act of June 4, 1953 (67 Stat. 41), entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, or his authorized representative, to convey certain school properties to local school districts or public agencies"; without amendment (Rept. No. 1368). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 10079. A bill to amend section 104 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1369). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MacGREGOR: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 9612. A bill relating to the elections under section 333 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 by the shareholders of the G. L. Bernhardt Co., Inc., of Lenoir, N.C.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1364). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABBITT:

H.R. 10276. A bill to change the name of the Petersburg National Military Park, to provide for acquisition of a portion of the Five Forks Battlefield, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BECKER:

H.R. 10277. A bill to amend the law relating to pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. BLITCH:

H.R. 10278. A bill making an appropriation to the Secretary of Commerce to enable him to furnish to additional communities in Georgia certain agricultural weather services authorized by law; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 10279. A bill to repeal subsection (d) of section 2388 of title 18 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 10280. A bill to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 10281. A bill to authorize the establishment of a youth camp recreation program to assist those organizations which have for their purpose the providing of healthful outdoor and camp training for indigent children and to inculcate the principles of Americanism and loyalty to the Republic in these children who are its citizens of the future; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 10282. A bill to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 to authorize the payment of rewards to persons who furnish information leading to convictions of organizations or individuals of failure to register as required by such act; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H.R. 10283. A bill to amend the law relating to pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 10284. A bill to amend section 593 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to modify the limit upon the deductions for additions to reserve for bad debts of savings and loan associations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EVINS:

H.R. 10285. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the manufacturers excise tax on mechanical lighters for cigarettes, cigars, and pipes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 10286. A bill to establish an Office of Public Works Coordination and Acceleration; to authorize the preparation of a plan for acceleration of public works when necessary to avoid serious nationwide unemployment levels; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HECHLER:

H.R. 10287. A bill to amend the Randolph-Sheppard Vending Stand Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 10288. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HULL:

H.R. 10289. A bill to provide that the Bull Shoals Dam and the Bull Shoals Reservoir, White River Basin in Missouri and Arkansas, shall hereafter be known as the "Harry S. Truman Dam" and the "Harry S. Truman Reservoir"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H.R. 10290. A bill to establish an Office of Public Works Coordination and Acceleration; to authorize the preparation of a plan for acceleration of public works when necessary to avoid serious nationwide unemployment levels; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 10291. A bill to amend the law relating to pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 10292. A bill to amend paragraph (6) of section 4231 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the tax on cabarets so as to clarify the period of collection of the special tax imposed on amounts paid for admission, refreshments, service, and merchandise at roof gardens, cabarets, and other similar places; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 10293. A bill to designate the navigation lock on the Sacramento deepwater ship channel project, California, as the William G. Stone navigation lock, to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 10294. A bill to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 to authorize the payment of rewards to persons who furnish information leading to convictions of organizations or individuals of failure to register as required by such act; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 10295. A bill to amend the law relating to pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.R. 10296. A bill to facilitate the sale and disposal of Government stocks of extra-long-staple cotton; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama:

H.R. 10297. A bill to amend, clarify and make certain the applicability of section 4233 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, relating to exemptions from tax imposed under section 4231 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROUSSELOT:

H.R. 10298. A bill to provide that Federal expenditures shall not exceed Federal revenues, except in time of war, national disaster, or emergency, and to provide for the retirement of the public debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.R. 10299. A bill to establish a cropland retirement program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. YATES (by request):

H.R. 10300. A bill to place nicotine sulfate and nicotine alkaloid on the free list of the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARRY:

H.R. 10301. A bill to establish in the Executive Office of the President an Office of State and Urban Affairs; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 10302. A bill to establish in the Executive Office of the President an Office of Urban Affairs; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 10303. A bill to help achieve the objectives of the Employment Act of 1946 by providing standby authority to accelerate capital expenditure programs of the Federal Government and State and local public bodies; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ST. GERMAIN:

H.R. 10304. A bill to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces between January 31, 1955, and July 1, 1963; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.J. Res. 633. Joint resolution to encourage the discovery, development, and production of domestic gold; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.J. Res. 634. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim February 20, 1962, as National Astronautic Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.J. Res. 635. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim a week in 1963 as National Negro History Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H. Con. Res. 426. Concurrent resolution to prohibit training military personnel or aiding Communist nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McVEY:

H. Con. Res. 427. Concurrent resolution to prohibit training military personnel or aiding Communist nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama:

H. Con. Res. 428. Concurrent resolution to prohibit training military personnel or aiding Communist nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROUSSELOT:

H. Con. Res. 429. Concurrent resolution to prohibit training military personnel or aiding Communist nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SILER:

H. Con. Res. 430. Concurrent resolution to prohibit training military personnel or aiding Communist nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

Mr. LANE presented a memorial of the Massachusetts House of Representatives, memorializing the Congress of the United States to increase the amount of Federal aid authorized to cities and towns in their construction of sewage treatment facilities, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.R. 10305. A bill for the relief of Joo-Yon Ohm-Cederberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASEY:

H.R. 10306. A bill for the relief of Miss Ita Zwiebel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 10307. A bill providing that the President shall award in the name of the people of the United States a gold medal to Lt. Col. John Herschel Glenn, Jr.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JUDD:

H.R. 10308. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth A. Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 10309. A bill for the relief of Ie Liang Pouw, his mother, Tenglan Ong Pouw, his wife, Bie In Ijiang Pouw, and his minor children, Jennee Pouw and Sien Wie Pouw; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McSWEEN:

H.R. 10310. A bill for the relief of Gerhard A. Cely; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER:

H.R. 10311. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth A. Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H.R. 10312. A bill for the relief of Robert T. Barnes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 10313. A bill for the relief of Luigi and Maria Oppimitti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROUSSELOT:

H.R. 10314. A bill for the relief of William Radkovich Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H.R. 10315. A bill for the relief of Walter Wesolowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R.10316. A bill for the relief of Leopoldo Rocha Canas and Teofilo Caolle Servito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Conservation Reserve Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, February 8, I introduced H.R. 10166, a bill to extend and amend the conservation reserve program.

This program, as you know, was allowed to expire in 1960. When existing contracts expire, this program will come to an end unless we take action to extend it.

During its beginning, there were admittedly some inequities in this act, but many of the abuses that were not foreseen originally were since remedied and the program was working well and making a substantial contribution toward reducing agricultural surpluses toward its end. It met with favorable acceptance by farmers generally.

Obviously, there are usually ways of making any program more workable, more efficient, and less subject to abuses. I am sure there is also room for improvement in the conservation reserve program. For one thing, stronger safeguards could be provided against land speculators receiving any benefit from it, and insuring that it benefits only those legitimately engaged in farming.

The popularity of the conservation reserve among farmers is attested to by the large waiting lists of those who had decided to apply for participation in the program in 1961 and were denied because of the refusal of Congress to extend it.

The administration's farm bill envisages a grandiose land retirement scheme which at this point remains largely cloaked in mystery and vague generalities. It would no doubt involve great outlays of tax funds simply to implement.

Our taxpayers could be spared this added expense by our simply extending a tried and proven program, the conservation reserve, as I propose in H.R. 10166.

The bill I have introduced would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture, during the 5-year period 1962–66, to extend present contracts, other than contracts for the establishment of tree cover, for from 3 to 10 years beyond present termination dates. The bill also provides for a review by the Secretary of the rate of annual payments.

Kansas has 12,637 farms in the conservation reserve program, with 1,446,586 acres under contract. Annual payments to participating Kansas farmers totaled $17,220,382 during 1960 for an average payment of $11.90 per acre. Unless the program is extended, some 80,000 Kansas acres will come out of the cropland reserve in 1962, an additional 334,000 acres in 1963 and, by the end of 1969, all present contracts would be terminated.

Most of this land is presently in grass and legume cover. Virtually all of it will probably go back into crops, and with a much higher production potential, unless action is taken now to extend the conservation reserve program.

Farmers and local communities have already made the adjustments involved in the retirement of the acreage now in the CRP. It would be nothing short of ridiculous to encourage the return of these acres to crop production at a time when the administration has under consideration a new, massive, costly land retirement program reported to involve as much as 68 million acres.

Orville Threatens Rule or Ruin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, one of the most amazing statements to ever emanate from the office of any Secretary of Agriculture was that released by Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman on February 7, 1962, in testimony before the House Committee on Agriculture. The Secretary was testifying in behalf of the administration's Food and Agriculture Act of 1962, the proposal called by knowledgeable people government by threat.

Secretary Freeman's bill provides that in case farmers have the effrontery to vote down marketing quotas for feed grains and wheat that not only would all price supports be eliminated for these crops, but also the Secretary would be permitted to sell 10 million tons of feed grains and 200 million bushels of wheat with no lower limit on price. This means that the Secretary would sell 16 million tons of grain at whatever price the market would bring for feed.

In his prepared statement he said:

> It is absurd to assume that any such disposal program would be operated for the purpose of depressing the market. On the contrary, utmost care would be taken to prevent that result.

Certainly he should know better than to make such a public statement. Any student of elementary economics knows that the sale of 16 billion tons of grain in an unprotected market can do nothing but depress it. Even the threat of using such power would be bearish on market prices.

Certainly, the Secretary had available to him the many economic technicians in the Department of Agriculture who worked on Senate Document No. 77. The following two paragraphs completely refute the above-quoted statement:

> The assumption with respect to liquidation of excessive stocks results in the projected withdrawal of 7 million tons of feed grain stocks annually throughout the projection period. In addition, by 1965, it would be necessary to feed about 9.8 million tons of wheat more than current rates of wheat feeding. This level of wheat feeding plus the projected high level of exports is required to move the projected production of wheat and permit the assumed liquidation of wheat stocks. This total of 16.8 million tons of grain fed at the projected feeding rate of 0.84 ton per grain consuming animal unit would provide the feed for 20 million animal units or 10 percent of the projected number of animal units fed in 1965.
>
> If it were assumed that there were no liquidation of grain, including wheat stocks during the projection period, then there would be a reduction of about 10 percent in the number of grain consuming animal units fed. Consequently, there would be smaller livestock output, increased livestock prices, and a rise of around 10 percent in cash receipts for livestock and livestock products. With a reduction in the amount of grain fed, prices received by farmers for feed grains would be about 25 percent higher. Since production and sales of feed grains would be unchanged, cash receipts from feed grains would also be increased by about 25 percent. Wheat prices are related to feed grains in these projections and there would be an increase of 20 cents or so in prices of wheat. The projected cash receipts figure for 1965 under these conditions would be about $2 billion or 7 percent higher than the $30.6 billion projected under the primary assumptions of this request.

It is to be noted that this study shows that the net effect of the Secretary's rule-or-ruin proposal is to break not only grain prices but also livestock, poultry, and dairy product prices. The net effect of this proposal, according to the USDA's economic technicians—all available to Secretary Freeman—would be to reduce net income by $2 billion.

Let us examine what the greatest agricultural economists in the country said would happen to prices of the major livestock items and crops:

Commodity	Unit	Price under grain dumping assumption	1957–59 average price received
Cattle	Hundredweight	$15.00	$20.60
Hogs	do	11.20	17.30
Milk	do	3.60	4.19
Eggs	Dozen	.29	.354
Broilers	Pound	.15	.178
Corn	Bushel	.80	1.10
Oats	do	.42	.62
Barley	do	.64	.89
Wheat	do	.90	1.84
Grain sorghum	Hundredweight	1.25	1.72

Certainly, one part of the Cochrane-Freeman supply-management team knows better. It should be noted that Willard Cochrane, economic adviser to Secretary Freeman, was a member of the Advisory Committee from land-grant colleges which reviewed the study officially called Senate Document No. 77—"Farm Price and Income Projections 1960–65."

In commenting on the conclusions reached in the report the committee said:

> The projected volume of hogs might well depress farm prices by more than the indicated amount. For these reasons, among

others, the committee believes that the average level of farm prices in the Department report is somewhat higher than is consistent with the projected volume of total farm marketings in 1965.

Does not Willard talk to Orville? It is regrettable that any Secretary of Agriculture should tell the American farmer that if the wheat and feed grain producers do not vote in favor of his control proposals that he will take out his pique not only on the grain farmer but also on all the livestock, poultry, and dairy producers.

"Rule or Ruin," seems to be the motto.

Udall Upper Colorado Transmission Lines Proposal Blasted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, Interior Secretary Stewart Udall this afternoon announced a grandiose scheme to spend $151½ million of the taxpayers money to build a so-called backbone power transmission system for the upper Colorado River project's electric power generating facilities.

He calls for an irresponsible and unconscionable waste of public funds. His statement, made at the very moment this House debates a measure to increase the public debt limit to the astronomic amount of $300 billion is another evidence of callous disregard by Kennedy administration officials for fiscal sanity.

Private power companies stand ready, willing, and able to build every inch of needed transmission lines for this system at no cost whatever to the Federal taxpayers to wheel power at a reasonable cost, on a fair basis, and at the same time pay substantial State and local taxes. Not one cent of Federal funds need be spent to accomplish any objective listed by the Secretary as the reason for Federal construction of these lines.

Therefore there must be other reasons for his proposal. The principal reason, in my opinion, being that Fabian-minded reclamation bureaucrats again have propelled Udall into an egghead shaped orbit calculated to end in the transfer of control of the Upper Colorado Basin States from the local people to power hungry civil servants in Washington.

Coupling the demands for a $151½ million raid on the Federal Treasury with a statement that $27 million in private lines will be incorporated into the system is no more than a cynical and deceptive attempt to perfume a stinking socialistic power grab. Udall is trying to make it seem due consideration to non-Federal construction of the lines has been given. In truth and in fact he has spurned private construction and only tosses out this token bone to private enterprise to confuse the issue and smokescreen the fact that this, like his proposed Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest power intertie, is just another link in the public power chain which Fabian zealots for decades have sought to forge in order to control the Nation's power and exert overwhelming politic-economic influence on all American lives.

It is time this Congress and the American people wake up and start pouring some of the DDT of fiscal sanity on these new species of creeping insects plaguing us and threatening, like termites, to undermine the foundations of our national power.

Urban Affairs and Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my remarks before the House Rules Committee on January 24 citing my opposition to the creation of a Department for Urban Affairs and Housing:

REMARKS BY CONGRESSMAN WALTER S. BARING BEFORE THE HOUSE RULES COMMITTEE, JANUARY 24, 1962

Mr. Chairman and members of the Rules Committee, I am grateful for the chance to appear before you in opposition to H.R. 8429, a bill which would establish a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

On January 15, I sent a letter to every Member of Congress in both bodies making my position clear that I am a great believer in States rights and that I am firmly convinced that the enactment of the proposed legislation would result in too great a concentration of power within the proposed new Department.

A government that is big enough to give you everything you want is a government big enough to take everything you've got.

The proposed new Department would effectively put an end to home rule and States rights, for there is too great a centralization of power and control. A new Secretary of Urban Affairs would pull strings in all of the cities throughout the United States and the mayors and city officials would be merely puppets directed by the new Department, for power to control city governments would be vested in Washington. The people would lose personal contact with their local governments and this we do not want. This proposed new Department would be extremely powerful and, no doubt, there would be tremendously new large spending programs which would sweep across the country.

I have been worried for several years over an ever-increasing tendency on the part of both Republican and Democratic administrations to centralize power and control in Washington. Big government and centralized power are certainly steps in the direction of national socialism and I feel that the Congress has departed far too far from basic principles set forth in the Constitution of this country. Fear and frustration have ripped the hearts of the American people. Congress has given too many constitutional rights, rights that were delegated to the Congress, to the executive branch.

It matters not which major political party is in control, it is time to stop legislating in this manner and Congress should take back those rights that the framers of the Constitution intended them to have. We should put a stop to this sudden onslaught of liberalism which comes mainly from one group of people in this country, namely the Americans for Democratic Action.

The people of my State are definitely not for this liberalized program and they definitely oppose these actions which are leading us toward one-worldism and the welfare state. The urban renewal program has resulted in absolute chaos in my hometown of Reno. Eminent domain was put into the hands of appointed officials rather than elected officials and has created a very dangerous situation. Hundreds of homes have been condemned for resale and profit.

I believe sincerely that it is the duty of this committee, the Rules Committee, to oppose enactment of this bill which, in my mind, can only lead us further into socialism. May I, with your indulgence, complete my statement today with the quote from Thomas Jefferson, which is applicable to the present consideration of this bill: "I place economy among the first and foremost virtues, and public debt as the greatest of dangers to be feared. To preserve our independence we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt. If we run into such debts, we must be taxed in our meat and drink, in our necessities and in our comforts, in our labor and in our amusements. If we can prevent the Government from wasting the labor of the people, under the pretense of caring for them, they will be happy."

In order to make this country sounder, we have to quit spending. We must reduce the national debt instead of raising the debt ceiling every time a new bureau or a new liberal idea is put into effect. Foreign aid in itself is unconstitutional and should be completely terminated. If this were done, we could reduce the national debt each year by over $5 billion which would be a step in the right direction.

I thank the committee for this opportunity to come before you.

Federal Water Resources Planning and Potomac River Basin Management

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the development, protection and utilization of our Nation's water resources are vitally essential to the welfare and advancement of our civilization. The gravity and magnitude of the problem make it imperative that the Federal Government move as rapidly as possible to take affirmative action in its solution which has ceased to be a matter of exclusive local or State concern.

President Kennedy's water resources planning program as proposed by Senate 2246, now pending in the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, would set up a comprehensive framework for water resources planning within river basins throughout the United States. The enactment of this legislation would afford a proportional means for cooperative participation by Commissions and organizations presently active in this field.

Outstanding in its contribution to this program has been the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin. This Commission is an arm of the Government created by a treaty which was entered into by four States and the District of Columbia and approved by Congress. The Commission consists of 19 members, 3 appointed by each of the 5 signatories to its treaty—the States of Pennsylvania, Virginia, Maryland, and West Virginia, the municipality of the District of Columbia, and 3 Commissioners appointed by the President of the United States.

The Commission's Executive Director, Ellis S. Tisdale, has advised that since 1956, 58 pollution-abatement projects costing $32.3 million have been completed under its program, of which $5.9 million came from Federal grants-in-aid.

Of related significance is an editorial from the Evening Star of February 1, 1962, which reports that Col. Warren E. Johnson of the U.S. Army Engineers has estimated basic development costs for the Potomac River Basin will be approximately $500 million, spread over a 50-year period. He further anticipated that initial construction will be financed by the Federal Government with a large part of the financial burden falling within State and District jurisdiction.

The editorial continues:

> As Colonel Johnson suggested, some sort of basinwide authority seems to be by all odds the most logical and sensible means of dealing with the problem.
>
> Certainly one possibility which should be investigated, in our opinion, is that the functions of the existing Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin might be expanded to take over the necessary economic and political chores.

On January 25, 1962, I addressed the winter meeting of the Commission at a luncheon at the Willard Hotel, here in Washington, D.C., on the subject of "Federal Water Resources Planning and River Basin Management." Officials present were: from West Virginia, Commissioners Charles V. Bush, Berkeley Springs, and Samuel R. Pancake, Romney. Our third Commissioner, Dr. N. H. Dyer, Charleston, was represented by J. H. Millar, director, sanitary engineering division, State department of health; and also attending was Mr. Kenneth Old, Jr., engineer, Division of Water Resources, West Virginia Department of Natural Resources.

Representing Maryland were: Commission Chairman Hon. H. Winship Wheatley, Jr., Commissioner George F. Hazelwood and Alternate Commissioner Joseph F. Kaylor.

From the District of Columbia were Commissioners David V. Auld and Lee F. Dante. Alternate Commissioner William H. Cary, Jr., represented the third Commissioner, Dr. Daniel L. Finucane.

Others present were: Dr. Charles L. Wilbar, Jr., Commissioner from Pennsylvania and from the U.S. Government were Commissioner Lawrence M. Fisher and Alternate Commissioner Callis H. Atkins.

Included in my address were an outline of the Nation's water needs and a brief summary of the Water Resources Planning Act. This legislation is of timely interest to many of our citizens.

I ask unanimous consent to have my remarks printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows.

FEDERAL WATER RESOURCES PLANNING AND RIVER BASIN MANAGEMENT

(An address by Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, Democrat, of West Virginia, at the winter meeting of the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin, Willard Hotel, luncheon, 12:15 p.m., Washington, D.C., January 25, 1962)

It is always a pleasure to return and participate in the activities of this commission, activities which enlisted my support almost 25 years ago when we addressed the problem of pollution abatement before the Potomac Valley Joint Conference on River Pollution.

Your interstate commission, which grew out of that conference, has performed yeoman service in bringing coherent and effective pollution abatement practices to the Potomac River Basin, and in setting forth guidelines of action for other areas. Now, however, as the program of this meeting indicates, and as your most able director, Ellis Tisdale, informed me in a recent letter, your commission is prepared to move ahead into the broader field of water resources conservation.

This development is most encouraging. If I might be excused for quoting myself, let us note that the need for expanding your commission's responsibilities and actions was stressed in my remarks to your winter meeting 3 years ago.

I commented that "the most serious pollution problem, and one which indicates the need for expanding the Commission's responsibilities, is that of soil erosion and siltation. This presents a problem which reaches beyond the narrow limits of pollution abatement, a restrictive practice, into the fields of forest management, farming practices, urban and suburban housing developments, and highway construction."

It is my hope that legislation now pending in the 87th Congress will offer Federal leadership and financial assistance in facing not only this problem but the entire gamut of questions encountered in water resources management.

In his letter to the Congress which accompanied his proposed Water Resources Planning Act last year, President Kennedy stated that—

"We have a national obligation to manage our basic water supply so it will be available when and where needed and in acceptable quality and quantity—and we have no time to lose. The planning authorized by this legislation will provide a vital tool for achieving effective water resources management."

The measure of the problem is readily apparent upon even the most cursory examination of our water consumption figures. In 1900 we used 40 billion gallons of fresh water daily. At the present time our consumption is approximately 300 billion gallons a day, and it is estimated that by 1980—less than 20 years ahead—it will reach 650 billion gallons. The current estimate of usable fresh water in lakes, streams and reservoirs is 650 billion gallons daily. Thus, it is evident that we will soon reach our national limit in water supply, a problem which can be surmounted only by a wise management policy and the advancement of technology in the reusage of water.

Nor do these figures reveal the variable conditions of supply and the complexities of furnishing water when and where it is needed. The era of megalopolis, or the supercity, is already with us. Along the Atlantic seaboard, the area from Boston to Norfolk is virtually one unbroken metropolis. In 1900 some 35 percent of the American population lived in towns and cities; by 1950 the population of our urban centers comprised approximately 60 percent of the total. And by the year 2000 it is estimated that 85 percent of our population will be residing in urban complexes.

No person in public life has contributed more to the conservation and development of our national water resources or expended greater effort in the field of water pollution control than my knowledgeable colleague, the Honorable ROBERT S. KERR.

Senator KERR is the ranking member of the Senate Committee on Public Works and is chairman of its Subcommittee on Flood Control, Rivers and Harbors, of which I am privileged to be a member. He was also chairman of the important Select Committee on National Water Resources which was formed in April 1959, under provisions of Senate Resolution 48 of the 86th Congress to make studies of the extent to which water resources activities in the United States are related to the national interest and for other purposes.

The senior Senator from Oklahoma in the foreword of the committee's report, January 30, 1961, clearly and succinctly draws attention to the urgency of moving forward in the field of water conservation and pollution control. He said:

"The nature, the immediacy, and the gravity of the water resources problems faced by the United States vary greatly from region to region, but it is clear that all parts of the country either have or will have problems.

"The committee's studies show the importance of maintaining water quality through pollution abatement in order that increased reuse of water will be possible, and to improve conditions for recreation and for conservation of fish and wildlife to support increased leisure time activities of the people.

"The committee also stresses the importance of research and development in order to promote more efficient use of available water resources and to find economical ways of developing new water supplies through such techniques as desalting ocean water, purifying brackish water, weather modification, etc. The committee asks that Federal research programs in these fields be coordinated, so that the Congress and the public may be better informed."

Significant excerpts from part I of the report emphasize that:

"The task confronting the Nation in the water field is one of meeting the growing demands on water resources in the most efficient manner consistent with accepted public aims. It is important that plans be made to meet demands before they arise so as to avoid any retardation of economic activity in particular localities because of a deficiency in water development. The problem is a dynamic one because the rapid advances of science continually stimulate new demands while at the same time opening up new opportunities for meeting them. Since Government has of necessity assumed major responsibilities in many fields of water development and management, it must equip itself through the adoption of programs and policies to deal with this dynamic situation."

The 1st session of the 87th Congress committed itself to the pollution abatement aspect of the problem by enacting the Federal Water Pollution Control Amendments of 1961. Thus the annual Federal construction grants authorized to assist communities were increased from the existing $50 million to $80 million for fiscal 1962, $90 million for fiscal 1963 and $100 million for each of the fiscal years 1964–67.

The 1961 legislation also increased the annual Federal matching grants for administration of pollution control programs from $3 million to $5 million and extended the program for 7 years. It also authorized $5 million annually for the development of new methods of sewage treatment, and removed the $100,000 annual limitation on research fellowships granted by HEW. These provisions, as well as others not mentioned, have greatly augmented Federal assistance to State and local governments in their efforts to combat water pollution.

Yet, as I indicated, the need for an assured water supply of high quality throughout the United States poses questions which far exceed a pollution abatement program. It is this need to which the President's Water Resources Planning Act of 1961—now pending before the full Interior and Insular Affairs Committee in the Senate—is addressed.

Joint hearings in which I was privileged to participate were conducted last July and August before the Interior and Public Works Committees.

Briefly stated, S. 2246, which embodies the President's proposals would do the following:

In title I, it would establish a Cabinet-level Water Resources Council composed of the Secretaries of the Army, Interior, Agriculture, and HEW and a Chairman of the Council designated by the President. The council would serve as the principal focus within the executive branch for a comprehensive framework for water resources planning within river basins throughout the United States and as a source of overall guidance and standards for planning. The need for some such structure for overall coordination is apparent when one notes that there are at present some 22 Federal agencies from the various departments and independent administrative bodies which are active in the field of water resources conservation, planning, and development.

In title II, S. 2246 would authorize the establishment by the President, at the request of the Governor of one or more of the affected States or of the council, of a river basin, or group of related river basins in the United States.

These commissions, which would be composed of representatives of the States and Federal agencies concerned, would have the responsibility of preparing and keeping current comprehensive and integrated plans for Federal, State and local development of water and related land resources. They would also recommend long-range schedules of priorities for the collection and analysis of basic data and for investigation, planning and construction of projects.

Title III of the act would authorize Federal matching grants to the States of $5 million for each of the years within the 10-year target period, to assist the States in developing comprehensive water resources plans and in participating in the development of the plans authorized in title II. Thus, it provides an element more essential than ever before to the total water resources effort which the future of America demands.

Not only does the President's proposal offer a coherent framework within which such commissions as yours may be accommodated. But even more important, it is national in scope and will enable us to tackle not only comprehensive planning within river basins, but also comprehensive planning in dealing with the total water resources of the country.

It is worthy of mention that the proposal embodies the established policy of the Congress and of the report of the Select Committee on Water Resources in that the river basin planning contemplated by the proposed legislation would require that any river basin plan should take account of domestic, agricultural, recreational, industrial and energy needs as well as those of fish and wildlife and other conservation interests. In this regard, the proposal avails itself of the wisdom and experience of water resources planning achieved in almost three decades of administering the Tennessee Valley Authority, which, in its regional concept, constitutes one of the significant creations of Government in this century. I speak now, of course, not with reference to the issue of public power, but solely in terms of resources planning in the light of the total human and natural ecology of a region or river basin.

The President's Water Resources Planning Act offers a truly major step forward for America and, if enacted, will be the fulfillment of one of his most important campaign commitments. It is my hope, and my belief, that the bill will be reported and favorably acted on by Congress during this session.

Federal Assistance to Indiana Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I was notified today by the Commissioner of Education that the application of the Pipe Creek Township School District of Miami County, Ind., for assistance under Public Law 874 has been approved for the current operating year. This year's grant is the largest yet received under this program in my district and it is in the amount of $345,087.

With this grant the total Federal funds contributed to the construction and the operation of schools in this single school district pass the $2 million mark. The school district began participation in the program in 1956.

This year, the total operational budget of the school district is $850,000. The Federal contribution, then, amounts to 40.6 percent of the total operating budget of the school district. The Federal contribution to the district under the Public Law 815 program has totaled $1,227,024 for the construction of new facilities.

The reason for Federal contributions to this school district is the heavy concentration of dependent children of personnel assigned to the Bunker Hill Air Force Base. Public Law 824, of course, is a Federal contribution to the school system to pay, in some manner, for the cost of services to dependents and the loss of revenue represented by the Federal installation on which tax is not paid.

I have had occasion to discuss the program with the administrative executives of the district. My main concern was whether or not there was any Federal control over the school district. I was told and told rather emphatically that there had never been any direct or implied control over the local school administration, personnel, or curriculum. In other words, this is an example of Federal aid to education, which represents more than 40 percent of the total operating budget of the school district, that has been proven to be 100-percent control free.

After hearing so much about the inevitable Federal control following Federal financial assistance in previous discussions here in this Chamber, I investigated the program to see what measures had been introduced between the Federal Government and the local school authorities to protect them from the Federal domination. To my surprise, I find that there is no intermediary body. The money actually passes from the Federal Treasury to the local school authorities. This is not like the Federal assistance programs which have been proposed by this administration where the funds would be channeled through the State instruction agencies to place a State barrier between the Federal Treasury and the local school system.

The success of this aid to federally impacted areas certainly proves that Federal aid to education can be a reality without Federal control. The local autonomy is important and the administration of Public Law 874 and Public Law 815 prove without question that this autonomy can be maintained regardless of the source of operating funds. When the question of Federal aid to education is raised again, I hope those who oppose the legislation will use more valid arguments in their opposition. Certainly the old bugaboo of Federal control inevitably following Federal aid to education has long ceased to be a practical point of opposition.

Meeting of Western Hemisphere Foreign Ministers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement I issued on January 23, 1962, on the subject of the meeting of Western Hemisphere foreign ministers at Punta del Este.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY U.S. SENATOR HOMER E. CAPEHART, REPUBLICAN, OF INDIANA

A matter very close to my heart and of vital importance to every man, woman, and child on the face of the earth is the future of Latin America.

It is a matter of pride with me that very long ago I began to urge greater emphasis on and immediate action with respect to the Western Hemispheric solidarity necessary to protect Latin America against the long existent threat of Communist encroachment.

Some, but not enough, of that advice was heeded, else the cancerous Communist beachhead of Cuba which now exists 90 miles off our shores would not be there to spread its destructive fibers throughout Latin America.

It is not necessary here to review the tragic recent history of Cuba. It is sufficient to say we now recognize the mistakes which were made and, in the opinion of many, are continuing. My plea is that we, the people of the United States, now lend the weight of this Nation's stature to the support of Latin American nations seeking to protect themselves, and us, from danger approaching the state of gravity.

I refer, of course, to the position this Nation is to take at the meeting of Western

Hemisphere foreign ministers at Punta del Este in Uruguay. The meeting was called for the specific purpose of considering the threat Castro's Communist government poses to all of us.

It is difficult to understand why there should be any doubt at all about our position in the light of President Kennedy's statement last year that "* * * If the nations of this hemisphere should fail to meet their commitments against outside Communist penetration, then I want it clearly understood that this Government will not hesitate in meeting its primary obligations, which are the security of our Nation."

But, there are reasons to believe some persons at or near high diplomatic level in our Government are inclined toward a policy which would amount only to "moral isolation of Castro."

The Wall Street Journal, in its January 17 issue, quotes an unidentified Kennedy aid as saying that all that may be accomplished at Punta del Este is "collective moral isolation of Castro" and as commenting that "even that would improve the atmosphere." Presumably the Kennedy aid is in the White House.

The United Press International quotes Secretary of State Dean Rusk as "avoiding any specific forecast of whether he expects strong action against Castro's Cuba," before he left for Punta del Este.

To quote the United Press International further:

"Rusk said the Conference will reaffirm the principles of the hemisphere security system, it will point to events in Cuba 'in violation of the obligations' and will agree that 'events in Cuba represent an unacceptable penetration of this hemisphere by forces from outside * * *.' He declined to predict, however, whether the Conference will vote any sanctions against Cuba, saying there can be no 'congealing of a consensus' for action until the foreign ministers meet."

Secretary Rusk put his position this way, according to the eminent Associated Press diplomatic writer, John M. Hightower, on the day of the Secretary's departure:

"The ministers will be seeking agreement on measures appropriate to the present situation; that is, one in which Cuba, a member government of the Organization of American States, has made itself an accomplice to the Communist conspiracy dedicated to the overthrow of the representative governments of this hemisphere.

"I am confident that the foreign ministers, recognizing the danger which this situation presents to our free societies and the collective security of the hemisphere, will find within the inter-American system the most effective possible means for the protection and strengthening of the principles upon which this system was founded."

Mr. Murrey Marder, of the Washington Post, wrote in the edition of Sunday, January 21, that "there are mixed views inside the Kennedy administration about just how hard the United States can press for drastic anti-Castro action at Punta del Este before * * * the effort becomes 'counterproductive.'"

In the light of statements such as these attributed to the highest diplomatic places in our Government, it is not surprising that representatives of a group of Latin American nations—a good majority of the total number—became so uneasy about the U.S. position that they met in Panama City to arrive at a common approach to the Communist danger in Cuba.

These distinguished citizens, I am told, tried to figure out just what the U.S. position at Punta del Este will be—whether it will be firm enough to fulfill President Kennedy's pledge to our own Nation or whether we will finally accede to a position supporting only "a moral isolation of Castro."

They have heard officially that our firm decision is to insist on sanctions against Castro's Cuba—on quarantining the island as we did the Dominican Republic, and backing up the quarantine with force if needed.

But, I am informed they also have heard that the United States has a second and perhaps a third policy emanating from perhaps unauthorized talks engaged in by administration underlings.

I, for one, do not want this Nation again to be embarrassed by loose talk about coexistence as has been reported from other conferences. It would be a Western Hemispheric catastrophe if our representatives took the position that we would allow Mr. Castro 60 to 90 days to confess his sins, promise to be a good boy, and return to the hemispheric fold as a member in good standing—retaining all the while $100 million worth of offensive weapons which, I suppose he would forge into harmless Marxist-Lenin machetes.

As far as I am concerned, Mr. Castro long ago—even before he admitted he was a devoted Communist and would be the rest of his life—removed himself from coexistence with our system of government.

What will the Cubans do at Punta del Este? As far as I am concerned, it doesn't make much difference, but they're apt to do such things as trying to produce prisoners from the April 17 abortive invasion and attempting to prove that this was solely U.S. intervention and that Punta del Este is merely an extension of that policy.

Whatever Cuba may do, the Organization of American States is perfectly capable of taking concerted action against the Castro Communist dictatorship.

Fourteen nations of the OAS voted to convene the foreign ministers for the purpose of considering the expulsion of Cuba. Two voted against this meeting, including, of course, Cuba. Five abstained.

Some of our diplomatic advisers have been reported to believe that a simple majority of two-thirds is not enough. They are reported to favor serious concessions to gain one or two votes, even at the expense of the sacrifice of principle.

My familiarity with and deep respect (excluding Castroite Cuba) for all Latin American nations, and for our fellow Americans who live there, is well known. Anybody who seeks to cast an aspersion on the basic loyalty to the Western Hemisphere of any one of them, except for Castroite Cuba, has me to deal with.

Each has its peculiar problems. But each also looks to the United States for leadership. In that leadership we should not fail them at Punta del Este. To them, the voice of any one OAS member is as important as is the voice of any other. Each is basically devoted to the necessity of rejecting Communist dictatorship anywhere in the Western Hemisphere.

Despite the clarity of article 19 of the OAS Charter to the contrary, some contend that sanctions against a Communist dictatorship is, in fact, intervention in the internal affairs of Cuba. But these people do not speak of the intervention in the lives of the Cuban people by a Communist dictator. Cuba is not Castro and Castro will fall of his own weight in the vacuum of ostracism provided for within the legal structure of the OAS. But he will never fall if we, the dominant force in the Western Hemisphere, are so naive as to plead with him to forswear his communism rather than let the majority rule in the OAS.

We are not without important friends within those countries which abstained in the voting to convene the Conference at Punta del Este. The Mexican people are our friends. In Brazil three prominent newspapers have switched sides in Rio de Janeiro alone since Castro's defiant statement that he had always been and always would be a Marxist Leninist.

There is division in Argentina, Chile, and Ecuador. But it is division. Some predict that at least two of the abstainers will switch their votes to condemnation of Castro's communism and dictatorship if they are convinced that the present administration in this country is actually at Punta del Este with one, and only one, position.

We have a duty to perform here and now. First, we must give powerful encouragement to those nations which met in Panama. Second, we must make known to the entire hemisphere and the watching world that we will tolerate no soft stand at Punta del Este.

In a fight to the death with naked Communist dictatorship, let there be no compromise with either right or reality. And let no one representing the U.S. team at Punta del Este arrogate to himself any other position than stern determination to carry out the will of the American people.

Important Civil Rights Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, all questions and problems pertaining to civil rights are of great interest to the people I represent, who reside in the 23d District of New York. I am including in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my statement to the Committee on the Judiciary concerning two proposals now under consideration:

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee on the Judiciary, it is very gratifying to me that the Committee on the Judiciary, of which I am happy to be a member, has under consideration two proposals of vital interest and importance—to abolish the poll tax, and the elimination of unreasonable literacy tests for voters. These are the two civil rights proposals which President Kennedy included in his state of the Union message. I introduced bills providing for abolition of the poll tax and for the elimination of unreasonable literacy tests so that countless citizens of our country who are now prevented from participation in the essential democratic process of voting may enjoy the rights guaranteed them under our Constitution.

There is overwhelming evidence to show that many thousands of qualified Americans are denied the right to vote solely because they are Puerto Ricans or members of the Negro race. Six grades of formal education is sufficient qualification for voting in all elections where any State now requires any form of literacy or educational test. Congressional action making a sixth grade education an automatic and uniform standard for meeting literacy requirements would go a long way toward bringing relief from the evasive practices now in effect.

Illiteracy has practically disappeared in the United States; the quality of elementary education furnished by our schools is of high caliber; any person who has completed six grades of education in a State-accredited school can reasonably be expected to be literate—it follows that any test of literacy that denies the right to vote to any person who has completed six grades of education is arbitrary and unreasonable.

Congress should now take action to make effective the guarantees of the Constitution so that persons will not be denied the right to vote on account of race or color.

It has been said that the poll tax is not as serious a barrier to Negro voting as it once was. However, there is evidence to show that the poll tax is still used as a method of intimidating Negroes; furthermore, a poll tax of $2 or $3 a year is a financial burden on many Negroes. Five States continue to collect the poll tax and it remains a serious impediment to minority voting in Mississippi and Alabama; it is certainly a relic of our past which is incongruous and in direct conflict with the image we are trying to present to the world as a nation which practices true democracy. This device for disfranchising the poor must be abolished.

During my service in the New York State Legislature and ever since coming to Congress, I have fought the evils of discrimination based on race, color, creed, or national origin. The purpose of the bills now under consideration by our committee is to eliminate discrimination in connection with voting rights. I urge that the Committee on the Judiciary take favorable action and I trust that the Congress will pass the necessary legislation so that all our citizens can enjoy voting privileges on an equal basis and that we will thereby advance a step further in the battle for civil rights. I, for one, shall continue a constant, militant program in the field of civil rights, for unless the fight is won here, at home, we cannot hope to maintain our position as a leader for equality and freedom on the world front.

The Anti-U.N. Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report:

CONGRESSMAN'S REPORT—MUST WE REPEAT OUR MISTAKES?

(By MORRIS K. UDALL)

Forty years ago a small group of sincere and patriotic Americans—who hadn't the slightest thought they might be wrong—prevented the League of Nations from becoming an effective instrument for international peace. Another such group of people are in our land today, doing everything they can to destroy the United Nations. I wish I could be as cocksure as they.

Here in Washington there is great concern over the mounting pressure to "get out of the United Nations" and to refuse the financial support which that organization needs from us to survive. A small but vigorous band of well-intentioned people, having decided they know all the facts and are better able to judge them than anyone in Washington, are proceeding to flood all congressional offices with telegrams (at the new bargain rate for "public opinion messages"), newspaper ads, tracts and even bumper stickers, all in opposition to the United Nations and to our purchase of United Nations bonds.

A Midwest Congressman described the reaction of many of us in both parties when he said, "Politically, there is nothing I would rather do than vote against this proposal, but there is too much at stake." The fact is, the security of our country may hang in the balance.

Distortion of the facts by a vocal segment of the press has helped shape the thinking of many sincere citizens on this issue. The result is that they are now completely convinced that the United Nations is an instrument of communism, that our State Department is overrun with Communists, and that the only hope for our country is to get out of the U.N., pull out of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, end all reciprocal treaties, raise tariffs, and threaten to bomb Moscow if the Russians don't stop whatever it is they're doing at the moment.

"Believe me," one correspondent wrote, "if one woman with a shotgun could do any good in Washington, D.C., I'd be there."

Unfortunately, the people who make the decisions for our country—the President and the Congress—can't afford to engage in such extravagant emotionalism. We are living in a trying period in history; the safe road ahead is not easy to find; but I don't believe the United States can isolate itself from the rest of the world any more than the Russians can ignore the mounting economic strength of the free world. We live on the same planet, we need foreign raw materials and foreign trade, and we need allies.

Now, what are the facts in the United Nations bond issue?

The United Nations is in debt approximately $100 million. Its reserve funds have been exhausted. It cannot continue for long without obtaining funds to pay its bills, past and present.

A major factor in this situation has been the violent Soviet objection to the recent Congo operation. Whereas the Communist bloc wanted chaos, disorder, and anarchy in Africa, the United Nations action has checked the extremists of the left (such as Gizenga) and right (such as Tshombe) and brought some semblance of order in that country, so pitifully unprepared by the Belgians for independence. The U.N. action may still fail, but it has vastly increased our chances of putting the new African nations on the side of the free world.

Because of its objection to the Congo operation the Soviet Union has refused to pay the special assessments arising from it. Other Communist nations also have refused, and many nations have been hard pressed to raise the necessary sums. As a result the United Nations is threatened with bankruptcy.

From the standpoint of the United States, the bond proposal offers a means of reducing our share of the U.N. burden. Here is why: present legal opinion leaves some doubt whether a member can be denied membership for nonpayment of special assessments, but there is no doubt about regular annual assessments. You either pay or you lose your vote.

Since repayment of the bond issue will come entirely from regular annual assessments, this method of financing will require the Soviet Union and its satellites either to pay up or relinquish their votes. Either alternative has something to be said for it.

The United States currently, with its own special assessments, is paying 47½ percent of the United Nations costs; the bond issue, spreading the burden more equally throughout the membership, will reduce our share to 32 percent.

Even so, it would be absurd to say the U.N. bond proposal is a gilt-edged investment. While we can deduct a portion of this each year from our own regular assessments, it is conceivable that we might lose some of this money. In my opinion, the proposal has to be considered, not alone on its financial merits, but on its importance to our Nation's security.

It is time the people who oppose the bond issue did some real, hard thinking about the situation we would face if the United Nations were allowed to expire—to follow the sad road of the League of Nations. Where would the loss of the United Nations leave the free world? Killing the U.N. will not free one satellite, will not destroy one Russian missile or bomber, will not strengthen our military power one ounce. The Communist bloc doesn't need the United Nations (although it can't afford to stay out if the Organization survives), because the Soviet system is welded together as the free nations are not. Without the United Nations it will be easier for the Russian Communists to pick off one free or so-called neutralist nation after another.

Despite its shortcomings the United Nations has been and is an impediment to Communist expansion, and we would be very much worse off without it.

Congress has started hearings on the U.N. bond proposal, and these are expected to go on for some weeks. I intend to listen to all the arguments and take in all the facts. Perhaps there will be a compromise proposal, such as Republican Senator CAPEHART's suggestion that we match the purchases of other nations dollar for dollar. Perhaps some other way will be found to meet the U.N.'s financial crisis. In the end, however, the security of our country—and not the possible loss of one-fifth of 1 percent of our $50 billion military budget—will be the deciding factor in determining my vote.

The cartoonist, Herblock says: "Buy U.N. bonds—the world you save may be your own." There may be some truth in this wry observation.

The Communists are doing everything they can to wreck the United Nations. It is a strange fact that they are joined in this effort by another wrecking bar being wielded by sincere but misguided people in our own country. I do not intend to give either of them any help in this endeavor.

Expansion of Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, Wis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, across the Nation, forestry and forest products industries are making a tremendous contribution to better lives for our people—as well as the economy.

In this industry—as others, however—the key to progress is research.

Over the years, the Forest Products Laboratory, at Madison, Wis., has provided outstanding leadership in research for finding ways in which forest products can better serve the American people.

During this session, Congress will consider the need, not only for carrying forward the operations of this vital Laboratory, but also a much-needed expansion of its facilities, to better serve the needs of the country.

Recently, I was privileged to discuss these needs in a broadcast over Wisconsin radio stations.

Calling special attention of our colleagues on the Appropriations Subcommittee on the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies on the need for expansion of research facilities at Madison, I ask unanimous consent to have

excerpts of my comments printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Traditionally, Wisconsin has been most famous for its production of high-quality dairy foods—valued at $500 million annually.

Forestry and wood products, however, also represent an outstanding industry—not only in Wisconsin, but the Nation.

For 1960, for example, the latest year for which complete figures are available—the forest products industry in Wisconsin ranked high in our economy: (1) It provided over 54,000 jobs; and (2) the total value of all Wisconsin forest products is around $1 billion.

Wisconsin, too, is the Nation's top papermaker in both production and sales. Papermaking—an important aspect of the wood products industry—ranks third in payrolls and fourth in employment. Annually, it sells products worth over $800 million.

Nationally, also, the forest products industry is significant, providing (for the same period) jobs for about 1,136,000 people (a level of employment exceeded only by the machinery, food, transportation, equipment and apparel industries; and the manufacture of wood and paper products contribute about $10 billion to the Nation's income.

OUTLOOK FOR THE FUTURE

The outlook for the forest products industry, however, is problematical. The plywood, papermaking, lumber, fabricating wood products and other parts of this industry complex faces economic difficulties.

For this reason, Wisconsin—and the Nation—need to undertake realistic efforts to conserve and effectively utilize—as well as replenish—our forest resources. According to experts, the Nation's timber requirements are expected to double in the next 40 years.

In this technological age, research—in forestry, as in other industries—provides a fundamental key to progress.

Fortunately, we, in Wisconsin, benefit from the existence of the Forest Products Research Laboratory at Madison. Although a Federal institution, the Laboratory stands as a good example of governmental-free enterprise cooperation in research for better conservation, utilization and reforestation practices. Serving not only Wisconsin, but also the Nation, the Laboratory participates cooperatively with wood industries in more efficient utilization of wood and wood products for (1) improving wood quality for utilization for commercial and industrial purposes; (2) research on production and protection of solid wood products, including plywood, veneer and lamination—protection against fungi, insects, and fire; and to determine effects of chemicals, et cetera; (3) wood engineering—involving testing the strength and other potentials of wood utilized for building and other engineering purposes; (4) chemistry—including research into processes for changing low-grade products—including sawdust shavings and trimmings—into chemicals.

Overall, the work of the Laboratory—cooperating with private enterprise—is extremely important for the future of the wood products industry. For this reason, I shall (1) support adequate funds, not only to carry forward its present programing—including work in the previously mentioned fields—but also (2) support recommendations for needed expansion of facilities.

For fiscal year 1963, the budget contains about $3,300,000 for operation of the Laboratory. In addition, efforts will be made to obtain approval of additional funds for the needed expansion of the facilities involving a 3-year, $10 million program, with a first-year appropriation amount of $4 million.

Admittedly, this is a substantial amount of money for forest research. Consequently, we must ask the question: Is it justified? In my judgment—yes. Why? For the following reason: According to expert computations, there is about a $70 return for each dollar invested for forest products research. To me, this represents a good investment. For these reasons, then, I am supporting efforts to carry forward—and as necessary to expand—the work of the Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, Wis. As this can be done, it will be of tremendous significance to our forest and forest products industries; the thousands of people employed; the business and services dependent upon the buying power of workers in the industry; and the vast number of people, including America's homeowners, as well as many other industries who benefit from the work of the Laboratory.

Which Road for Transportation: Private Management or ———?—Part No. 3

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, in a nine-part series of interviews, Traffic World, a transportation news magazine, has published the views of a number of well-known figures concerned with the growing problems confronting our Nation's transportation companies. In this, the third in the series, Senator Warren G. Magnuson, chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce, expresses his ideas. The interview follows:

Interview 3

(Senator Warren G. Magnuson, of Washington, chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, has often publicly expressed his concern with many facets of the situation in which transportation, under regulation, finds itself. He has had long experience on the committee and in Congress in dealing with transportation. His answers to the questions posed deserve careful consideration.)

In the last 20 years there have been bills, introduced in Congress which, to one degree or another, would give to the President of the United States authority over the independent agencies created by Congress. What is the explanation for this tendency on the part of Members of Congress to make over their authority to the Executive?

I cannot agree with the premise that Congress is making over authority to the Executive in the administrative agency field. These agencies are arms of the Congress designed to decide matters which require a little more experience and flexibility than the Congress can give to any particular problem. Sometimes laws are introduced that look toward making the agencies more responsive to an overall executive program but these have never fared too well.

Basically, Congress has two controls over the agencies which will never be lessened: (1) There is the jurisdiction to write the substantive laws which are to be applied, and (2) there is legislative oversight which is the power to examine every aspect of the agency's work and change whatever is not satisfactory to the Congress. It is this latter control—legislative oversight—which Woodrow Wilson called Congress' most important function.

There has been some experience, as of now, with independent agencies for which the Chairmen have been appointed by the President. Is there any evidence that such appointments have actually made any difference in agency procedure or lessened the criticism of delay or inefficiency?

The Presidential appointment of the Chairman of an agency has been helpful in some cases. The centralization of authority and responsibility in one person is more important in this area of the administrative lag than the fact that the President appoints him. Today we have a situation of greater delay in the agencies than ever before, despite the fact that most Chairmen are appointed. This leads me to the conclusion that the heart of the problem lies in the division of the work within the particular agency and requires a separation of the administrative and housekeeping work from the decisionmaking process.

Coming to the present: A bill in the Senate would give the President power to remove a member of an independent agency who was "frustrating" the President's program. Would not passage of such a bill represent an abandonment by Congress of a vital part of its power to create such agencies and to set the policies they must follow?

Passage of this bill would be like giving the President an item veto, Congress might just as well fold up shop, go home and let the Executive run the country. The present standard for removal of agency members—neglect of duty or malfeasance in office—has rarely been used but is adequate to protect the public.

As the question recognizes, Congress has the duty and the right to create the agency, write its laws, and make certain the laws are carried out as written. If the President's program is being frustrated, he can come to the Congress and ask that the laws be changed. Roosevelt did this when he was in office. And, on occasion, when the Congress was not sympathetic, he went to the people to create a popular demand for certain changes.

Should the Reorganization Act be amended so that it would be clear that reorganization plans submitted to Congress by the President must deal only with agencies in the executive branch or with executive duties which Congress has seen fit to place in the independent agencies?

The Reorganization Act has as its only purpose the granting to the Executive of the right to submit plans recommending structural changes in the agencies and departments. This is a limited area and one that Congress watches carefully so that the particular plan does not go too far. As happened in this Congress, whenever a majority of either House thought the plan reached into an area of congressional prerogative, the plan was defeated.

The advantage of continuing the act as it now stands is that the submission of a particular plan overcomes inertia and gets the pot boiling until needed corrections are made. For example, the FCC (Federal Communications Commission) plan was defeated this year but legislation was introduced and has almost been enacted along the lines of the plan submitted.

Is there any validity in the suggestion that the antitrust laws could be substituted in the field of transportation for the present regulatory scheme?

A few years ago this would have been treated as a wild-eyed suggestion. Now, however, as the inconsistent pattern of our regulation is becoming more and more apparent, the suggestion that we repeal rate regulation and substitute the antitrust laws requires some serious consideration.

Extensive hearings before my committee have revealed that private transportation plus what were thought to be minor exemptions now account for about 70 percent of our total transportation. Regulated common carriage, which is the guts of our national transportation system, is deteriorating at a rapid pace; in a few years it may be nonexistent.

Like the Internal Revenue Code, our Interstate Commerce Act does not spread the burden of regulation equally—there are a lot of holes in the fabric. And the question we are beginning to face is whether everyone or no one should be subject to regulation on an equal basis.

It should be added that substitution of the antitrust laws would have to be supplemented with other provisions. For example, some thought would have to be given to modifying or repealing the Reed-Bulwinkle Act as well as the possibility of applying Robinson-Patman principles to transportation.

Assuming that the present basic regulatory scheme is to be continued, can it be rolled back in any way to give a larger area for the exercise of managerial discretion and still protect the public interest?

Not until two things occur: (1) The burden and benefits of regulation are spread evenly over the whole transportation system, and (2) sufficient information is available to each manager of transportation resources so that his decisions can be based on fact. I have complete confidence in our economic philosophy and the judgment of our men. These have brought us a long way in a few years. For example, ours is the only country that can boast a privately owned system by all modes.

Rational decisions cannot be based on a series of unknowns. Give a man enough information and decisions made for private gain will improve our whole economy. Of course, there will have to be someone to guard the public against excesses but possibly not to the extent we know the scope of regulation today.

Should some thought be given, now, to adjusting the competitive situation as between the railroads and the water carriers, air carriers, and motor carriers which use federally supported facilities and, for the future, as between the air carriers and the motor carriers of property?

The question really poses two problems: (1) The almost eternal battle between modes as to who gets the most Government aid and what should be done about it in competitive ratemaking, and (2) as air carriers through advancing technology begin to lower their costs to a point competitive with surface transportation, how is rate competition to be handled? The first problem has been the subject of continuing study and controversy as the need for revenues from our public resources increases. What it boils down to is that no mode really wants to avoid paying for the use of public facilities, including rights-of-way. But since competition is in a delicate balance between each form, a user charge cannot equitably be imposed unless there is a contemporaneous adjustment in the rate levels throughout the system.

Insofar as air freight competition with surface carriers, the agencies and the industries are just beginning to grapple with the problem. There are certain points of contact between them as in the matter of through routes and joint rates. Since there is a mechanism for a combination of the agencies in section 1003 of the Federal Aviation Act to work out these problems, it should be used. Once a tradition of cooperative settlement of the issues is established, large strides can be made toward a competitive balance.

From the standpoint of service to the entire public, the common carrier represents the mode which has emerged under the free enterprise system, and many in important positions have said that, if free enterprise in the field of transportation is lost, it will be lost in other areas of the economy. What steps, in principle, could be taken to preserve free enterprise in transportation?

America's modified version of free enterprise in transportation will be preserved so long as our transportation resources can serve the broad public interest and at the same time attract private investment. At the heart of our transportation system and philosophy is the common carrier which serves shippers large, small, and wherever located without discrimination or preference. Steps to preserve free enterprise, then, must be steps to preserve the common carrier.

In my answer to an earlier question, I suggested how consideration will have to be given by the Congress to broadening the regulatory fabric so that all public transportation is put on an equal competitive basis in this respect. Added emphasis will have to be given to enforcement of existing laws against the illegal operator. A third and vital step should be a study in depth of transportation with particular attention given to the cost characteristics of each form. Transportation decisions affecting the size of plant, the rate to publish, the mode to use—each has to be the rational result of an analysis of reliable information.

Two other areas of prospective effort are less dramatic but require attention. The first is the heavy load of paperwork imposed on interstate carriage. It is my understanding that industry is collaborating on a variety of fronts with this problem, including a study of electronic data processors.

Finally, State, local, and even some Federal taxes fall more heavily on transportation than on many other business resources. Our transportation industry will continue to pay its way but some reasonable ground rules have to be developed.

A number of bills have been offered which would permit single ownership of multiple modes of transportation as a means of coordinating the various modes. Is the view that the only true coordination would come from common ownership of end-to-end modes a valid one?

Coordinated carriage over different modes will provide the public the most efficient and lowest cost transportation. This is a common goal. But it is my judgment that we should exhaust every possible avenue for voluntary attainment of this objective with independent modes before resorting to the experiment of single ownership. I have not yet seen convincing evidence which eliminates the possibility of achieving through service by several modes under our present laws.

Difficult problems are presented in scheduling and divisions of rates, but the Commission has not been sufficiently aggressive in this area nor has the industry been cooperative within itself. It is almost axiomatic in our society that the public gets what the public demands. We are getting to the point in the field of transportation coordination where this axiom will apply. Hopefully, this can come with industry cooperation before we incur the well-known social and economic risks of single ownership.

It should be added that the coming of containerized service will facilitate efforts in this field. One of the difficulties has been the cost of handling at a transfer point, particularly with break-bulk freight, but this is now dramatically reduced.

Does the "piggyback" system, with independent motor carriers delivering the container at one end of the rail, water or air haul, and the same or another independent motor carrier making delivery at the completion of the rail, water, or air haul, hold the germ for future sound development of competing systems of transportation?

It's a little too early in its infancy to ascertain and evaluate all the implications of "piggyback." Certainly, at this point of time, the neat situation posed in the question has been expanded by the recent ICC decision upholding plans III and IV rates. Instead of an independent truck or an independent railroad, it could be a freight forwarder using a leased truck on his own flatcar. This much can safely be said now: "Piggyback" as one form of containerization will promote single unit movement over multiple modes due to the ease of transfer. Whether this will lead to systems of transportation or whether we even want such systems is another question.

House Resolution 530

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER H. DOMINICK

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. Speaker, the announcement has been made that tomorrow we shall take up the resolution (H. Res. 530) disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962, relating to the establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. As the sponsor of House Resolution 531, an identical resolution to the one being brought before us tomorrow, I should like to state for the record some of the glaring fallacies which have been used by the proponents of the bill which would have established this Cabinet level Department, and are now being repeated by the supporters of the plan to establish this Department through Executive order.

Great stress has been placed by the proponents and by witnesses before our committees on the number of people who today live in cities. Their estimates, percentagewise, range from 70 percent upward, but their estimates are not substantiated by the U.S. Census Bureau whose statistics show that according to the official census of 1960, less than one-third of our population lives in areas which are defined as "urban." The actual number in 1960 was 58,714,587 persons, or 32.9 percent of our total population. Thus it is obvious that the proponents of the creation of this Department either have grossly overstated the statistics, or else they have vastly broadened the definition of an urban area. There is strong evidence to indicate that they have in fact done the latter; however, again the official census statistics show that even by stretching the definition to include all persons living in both urban and suburban areas, the total would reach only 53.2 percent of our entire population—still considerably less than the percentage claimed by the proponents of this reorganization plan. Therefore, in order to reach a level of 70 percent or more, the definition had to be changed to include more people in the urban classification. The language of the bill shows how broad that definition was made: "For the purposes of this act, the terms 'urban areas' and 'urban communities' are intended to include all communities, regardless of size, whether incorporated or unincorporated." This language is all inclusive. With the possible exception of the isolated hermit's cabin or a trapper's lodge, no place of habitation could escape the jurisdiction of this proposed Department so long as one house is in sight of another.

Furthermore, I submit that the contention that the sole purpose in creating this Department is to "more efficiently and effectively organize housing and urban functions of the Federal Government" is equally fallacious. If this indeed were the purpose, why were the Veterans' Administration and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board housing programs not included? They total over 70 percent of these Government programs. Finally, we shall be told that our cities are demanding this so-called equal voice in Federal deliberations. Which cities? Certainly not the largest city in my State of Colorado. I have received a telegram from the mayor of our largest city, Denver, which I include in the RECORD:

DENVER, COLO.,
February 19, 1962.

Representative PETER DOMINICK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

We object to creation of a Department of Urban Affairs as providing the wrong solution to a problem not clearly defined. Its creation would be only an appeasement move to apologize for failure of local people and local leaders to recognize and solve their own problems. It would build another level of bureaucracy between the cities and Federal agencies now assigned responsibility for assisting them. May threaten programs already working well. Department of Urban Affairs would at best be only a temporary palliative. Overall problem definition should come first, then education of population to solve own problems with cooperation that is now available and is being extended effectively by existing agencies.

DICK BATTERTON,
Mayor, City of Denver.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with Dick Batterton that creation of this Department is the wrong solution, and that its creation would serve only as a move to apologize for the failure of local people and local leadership to properly define their individual problems and then make use of the existing programs of Federal-State-local cooperation which are working well. We should do well to pay heed to his remarks which are based on experience.

As Liberty-Loving, Sensible, Free-Born Americans, We Can and Must Solve Our Farm Problem Without Compulsion, Fines, and Jail Sentences

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, in order to raise the farm income to a proper, stable level, and as soon as possible, a farm bill must be made law to speedily reduce the price-depressing and costly surpluses, which can be done and must be done without compulsion, unnecessary Federal controls, fines, and jail sentences such as are specifically provided and spelled out in the 106-page bill recently sent to Congress by the Secretary of Agriculture, all of which can be avoided as I shall explain later in my remarks.

By making a full, fair study of the administration's farm bill you will find it is nothing more nor less than a patched-up version of old, ineffective and costly farm bills of bygone days, but with added controls and penalties.

Also, you will find that the greatest benefit provided in the bill will accrue to the large landholders who have been most responsible for the piling up of our huge surpluses of grains in CCC bins scattered all over the Grain Belt of the United States of America while the farmers who for many years past have conserved their soil by practicing proper land use and crop rotation will derive little or no benefits from the bill if made law in its present form. I am sure I need not elaborate further on that point, as a cursory reading of the bill will prove the correctness of my statement.

Hence, we see here another step toward the elimination of our family-sized farm, to which I will not be a party, for they are the backbone of our farm economy and, in fact, our national economy, as is farming as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, it would be a sad day for America if ever our farmers cease to be free by placing them in a Federal straitjacket or by the elimination of the small or medium family-sized farms. Look the world over and you will find in every nation where all or most of the land is owned by great and powerful land barons, there you will find without exception discontent, hunger, and revolutions. That must never happen to America, but it will, just as surely as darkness follows the light of day, unless we make an about-face and away from centralized government on many fronts.

Far too few Americans understand the value to every citizen in our land in the maintenance of a prosperous agriculture. To understand that value, one must know that all our new wealth springs year after year from mother earth in the form of all kinds of crops grown on the surface of mother earth, dug or pumped out from under the surface of mother earth or fished out of the waters of mother earth. Therein we find all our raw materials, from which our entire economy is generated for the very simple reason that every employed American is employed in producing, transporting, processing, manufacturing, marketing or using, in one form or another, the raw product or the finished product.

The United States is blessed with a far greater supply of raw products than any other nation on earth, which accounts for the fact that even though we have only 6 percent of the world's population, and because of our competitive free enterprise system of government, we have until recently done over 60 percent of the world's dollar business.

But Mr. Speaker, we now see clearly the danger signals appearing on the horizon, in most every direction, due mainly to our reckless, wasteful spending spree over the past three decades, to the end that our American dollar is losing its popularity all over the world, except of course, as a handouts called foreign aid. As proof, our gold stock at Fort Knox has diminished almost 50 percent during the last 10 years.

The financiers, importers and exporters of every foreign nation know only too well the condition of our U.S. Treasury. Hence, many nations who sell us goods have for years, and are yet demanding gold instead of dollars in payment for their goods. They know as we know that the Federal debt of the United States of America is greater than the debt of all the other nations on earth combined and still climbing. Can you blame them for demanding gold? They know we are traveling full speed ahead to the day when our dollar will be greatly depreciated, just as every school child should know by now.

But fellow Americans, all is not yet lost, if you will demand of your representatives in Congress to stop spending your tax dollars for any and all unnecessary purposes and programs demanded by the President and his party in control of Congress.

Now, back to the farm problem and to explain how billions of dollars can be saved, while at the same time bringing greater income to our farmers, which materially and beneficially effects our entire economy and hence, the welfare of every American.

First, we must consider and know the facts that records and statistics prove conclusively which are, that when our farmer's dollar is worth 100 cents in purchasing power, our farmers buy a fraction over twice as many dollars worth of manufactured goods year after year than do the rest of us on an average. This is understandable since farmers in this day and age must buy costly tractors, trucks, a full line of farm machinery, woven wire, steel and wood posts and building material for not only a dwelling house, but also for barns, hog and chicken houses, granaries, corncribs, machine sheds, and so forth, which means dollars in the pockets of every American in every walk of life from the corner grocer to the factory and mill wage earner.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, I need not elaborate further to prove that the welfare of our entire Nation is greatly dependent on the welfare of our farmers.

Records also prove conclusively that from the end of the Korean war to this day our farmer's dollar has been worth only on an average of 82 cents in purchasing power. Small wonder then that our farmers as a whole have been in a cost-price squeeze almost constantly during these 10 past years, which was triggered to a marked degree in 1951 when Mr. Mike DeSalle, then Director of the Office of Price Control, rolled back cattle prices 10 percent and would have rolled them back another 8 percent had not Congress stopped him. The rollback of cattle prices had the effect of rolling back the entire farm income. Look at the records.

That is all water over the dam. Now we must put our shoulders to the important task of properly and effectively reducing the price-depressing farm surpluses, especially the grain and corn surpluses, in order to materially raise our farmer's income, which must be done the American, commonsense, business way, and without coercion and unnecessary Federal controls and penalties.

Mr. Speaker, to even infer that to solve the farm problem our farmers must be subjected to stringent Federal controls, fined and even jailed, in order to solve the farm problem, is a rank insult to our farmers and their families.

Had the Congress during the last session adopted the substitute to the 1961 feed grain bill, which nine Members, including myself, from some of the largest corn and grain producing districts introduced, we would by now be 1 year closer to the solution of the farm problem for farm income as a whole would by now be on a higher level, and over a billion dollars of needless Federal expenses would have been saved.

Here is an analysis of our bill which we will again introduce at the proper time during this session of Congress, and we invite other Members to join us regardless of party and place of residence.

Our bill is short, concise, and to the point. It provides for liberal payments in kind for reducing corn and small grain acres below the average acres of the past 2 previous years. For such reduction the farmer will receive a Government certificate entitling him to take 80 percent of the amount of corn or small grain raised on his reduced acres of the average yield on such acres during the past 2 years, or he can sell his certificate to a neighbor, grain dealer, or to anyone except back to Uncle Sam. In any event, the grain will be taken out of Government surplus storage and gone forever.

The purpose of allowing just 80 percent payment-in-kind is to reduce by the other 20 percent the amount of corn and grain available for feed in order to hold down the available supply of feed so as to increase the market price of such feeds and in turn the price of livestock and poultry. I shall recommend to the cosponsors of our bill that grazing be permitted on the idled acres. I shall also recommend that to be in compliance to be entitled to all the benefits provided in the act, the farmer will be required to put in the program not less than 10 percent nor more than 33⅓ percent of the last 2 years' average acreage in such crops.

Our bill will not in any way affect the regularly established payment for soil conservation practices on any farm. Such farmers will profit proportionately with all farmers from the increased prices of all farm products which the passage of our bill is bound to bring about and soon after the law would go into effect. That, Mr. Speaker, is the most essential provision of our bill in a nutshell.

I have explained our bill to many farmers in the district I have the honor to represent in Congress, and without a single exception, after they fully understand our bill they have voiced their full approval. A farmer can easily figure without pencil and paper that if his average yield of corn, for example, for the past 2 years, was 70 bushels per acre, under the provisions of our bill he would receive 56 bushels in kind—of high feed value, or more bushels of corn of lower feed value—from CCC surpluses for every idled acre which he can take and use himself, or sell the certificate for at least the prevailing market price, which would by that time have increased, by the simple fact that the price-depressing surplus would then be in the process of being materially reduced. That being a fact which is bound to take place and on a voluntary basis, due to the dollar inducement provided in our bill, sufficient compliance will be no problem. Our farmers will remain free and independent to enjoy the fruits of their own labors. The billions of bushels of grain in Government storage belongs to you, Mr. and Mrs. American. It is all paid for with your tax dollars. Who among us dares say it shall not be used to solve most of our farm problem?

Let us also be ever mindful of this old adage which holds just as true today as when the words were first spoken, "If our farmers are ever told when and what they shall plant and reap we shall soon want bread."

And so, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, we must plead, "Speak up Americans for you are still the masters of your own destiny, if you will but use your constitutional inherent powers, reserved to the people."

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Psalm 33: 12: *Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord.*

Almighty God, we beseech Thee to endow us with reverence and humility as we unite our hearts in worshiping Thee at this noon hour of a new day.

Help us to realize how futile are all our plans and how vain all our searchings for a nobler civilization unless Thy Holy Spirit guides us in the ways of truth and righteousness.

Grant that through holiness of life and heroism of faith we may gain a clearer vision of the spiritual realities and resources which we need for our instruction and inspiration.

May Thy divine will be our law and Thy love our motive as we endeavor to bring the character and capacities of all humanity to a richer and fuller development.

Hear us through the merits and mediation and inspiration.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 74. An act to reimburse the city of New York for expenditure of funds to rehabilitate slip 7 in the city of New York for use by the U.S. Army;

H.R. 1375. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the former owner thereof;

H.R. 4934. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to modify certain leases entered into for the provision of recreation facilities in reservoir areas;

H.R. 8625. An act for the relief of Dennis H. O'Grady;

H.R. 8842. An act to amend subsection (h) of section 124 of the Agricultural Enabling Amendments Act of 1961; and

H.R. 9013. An act to provide for the transfer of rice acreage history where producer withdraws from the production of rice.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2990. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to determine the claim against the United States of Amis Construction Co. and San Ore Construction Co.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1564. An act for the relief of Evangelos J. Marthakis;

S. 1638. An act for the relief of Felix Ledina Mendoza;

S. 1841. An act for the relief of Maria Zambetoulla;

S. 1874. An act for the relief of Roland Fernando Mishutani;

S. 1881. An act for the relief of Maria La Bella;

S. 2101. An act for the relief of Aida Mary Sorino Boccalery; and

S. 2533. An act to amend the requirements for participation in the 1962 feed grain program.

The message also announced that pursuant to law, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], as chairman of the Committee on Commerce, appointed the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy. The Senator also appointed the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS] to attend the Canada-United

States Interparliamentary Group Conference to be held in Ottawa, Canada, from February 28 to March 4, 1962.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

February 20, 1962.

The Honorable the Speaker,
House of Representatives.

Sir: A certificate of election in due form of law showing the election of Harold M. Ryan as a Representative-elect to the 87th Congress from the 14th Congressional District of the State of Michigan, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of the Honorable Louis C. Rabaut, has been received and is on file in this office.

Respectfully yours,
Ralph R. Roberts,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

Mr. RYAN of Michigan appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

DISAPPROVING REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1962—DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS AND HOUSING

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Resolution 530, disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962; and, pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the resolution may continue not to exceed 3 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Meader] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Resolution 530, with Mr. O'Neill in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the resolution was dispensed with.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Harris). The Chair will count. [After counting.] Seventy-two Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 19]

Addabbo
Anfuso
Bass, Tenn.
Bennett, Mich.
Blitch
Broomfield
Celler
Dooley
Flood
Harrison, Va.
Hays
Hébert
Hoffman, Mich.
Kirwan
McMillan
Macdonald
Monagan
O'Konski
Powell
Scherer
Shelley
Slack
Ullman

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. O'Neill, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration House Resolution 530, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called when 408 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, House Resolution 530 now before us would disapprove Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962, which was transmitted to Congress by the President on January 30, 1962. Unless the resolution is adopted by the House within 60 calendar days after the plan is transmitted, the reorganization plan would go into effect automatically pursuant to the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended.

The Committee on Government Operations believes that the reorganization plan should be allowed to go into effect and, therefore, has recommended that House Resolution 530 be not approved. Another way of saying it, Mr. Chairman, would be: If you are for the reorganization plan, you would vote "no" on House Resolution 530. If you are opposed to the reorganization plan, you would vote "yea" on House Resolution 530.

Mr. Chairman, many things have been said about legislation to establish a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing and about this reorganization plan over a long period of time. I am sure no one here would want to play politics or be demagogic about any serious matter which comes before this committee. I would be the first to admit that whatever is said on either side is said with the highest sincerity, the highest motives, and the highest purpose, as long as any other speaker desiring to speak on the subject will give me credit for having the same high motives, the same sincerity, and the same high purpose. However, being rather pragmatic about certain things, I would assume that sooner or later, there might develop a bolt between the eyes, or one lower than that; and I would not be averse, let me say, to wrestling around a little bit if it becomes absolutely necessary. Frankly, I would rather not, because I think that in a logical and reasonable way our differences can be discussed, delineated properly for the Record, and that each of us can take what we know our position is going to be on this issue.

The purpose of the plan, Mr. Chairman, is to raise to departmental status the functions of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, so that Federal functions relating to housing and urban affairs can have a voice in the Cabinet and be given the proper weight and position in the overall position of the executive branch. The plan has the basic purpose of providing in the Department better machinery for coordinating and otherwise administering and controlling the functions in order to do a better executive job basically and logically. I wish to advise that the reorganization plan would do one thing and one thing only: It would create a new department in the executive branch, transferring the existing functions of the Housing and Home Financing Agency and providing for its administration in accordance with sound principles already approved by this Congress for other executive departments. This would, therefore, give us a line organization, which is one of the fundamental principles recommended by the Hoover Commission for executive departments, so that authority would be placed in the Secretary of the new Department for supervision and direction of all functions of the Department which would be the functions of the existing constituent agencies of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. This is normal and logical and, as I say, is a method of sound administration that should make for efficiency and economy, which was the basic purpose, of course, as we all know, of the original Hoover Commission recommendation.

Because of some of the things that have been generally misunderstood and certain misconceptions which have arisen, I think it would be wise to get on the Record what the reorganization plan, to which House Resolution 530 addresses itself, does not do.

The reorganization plan would not do the following: It would not authorize any new function or program whatsoever. I want to emphasize again, Mr. Chairman, that Reorganization Plan No. 1 would not authorize any new function or program whatsoever; that it deals strictly with the existing constituent agencies of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Now, I know that there are some who would want to raise the question about what is going to happen in the future. Maybe it is all right to raise that question in reason and in logic, because of their own fears. I do not want to debate that right now, but I will say that there is nothing inherent in the reorganization plan itself to raise this question. Any new programs or any new projects which might sometime in the future come into this Department would, of course, have to have the judgment and sanction of this Congress.

I am perfectly willing to let the future rest on the judgment and the reason of the Congress of the United States. I will not presume to make judgment today on what any future Congress will do with respect to enlarging programs or adding programs which may exist now or which may exist in the future. But Reorganization Plan No. 1, Mr. Chairman, does not authorize any new function or any new program whatsoever. Now does Reorganization Plan No. 1 provide any additional funds.

Obviously, as we all recognize and understand, this would take a separate bill, and we are not now considering such a bill. The matter that is before us today came from the Government Operations Committee, and not from the Appropriations Committee. So any misapprehension that may have been let loose upon the public that this plan would involve the expenditure of tremendous sums of money is exactly that—that is, a misconception, because, Mr. Chairman, the reorganization plan does not provide any additional funds. Nor does the reorganization plan commit or obligate the Congress in any way to authorize any new program or function. This is obvious to all of us here who are fully aware of our responsibilities and our prerogatives and the jurisdiction of the legislative branch of the Government. But unfortunately some people who are opposed to this idea have mistakenly sought to advise some of our friends that in some way, somehow, this Congress could bind all future Congresses on new programing. It would be bad enough, heaven knows, if the thought had been put forward that we could bind future Congresses with respect to existing programs. But I have seen some thinking on this legislation, which really has no explanation, that we in some way in this Congress could bind future Congresses on programs that do not yet even exist. I do not have to point out how obviously fallacious and legally impossible that would be.

Mr. Chairman, this reorganization plan would not remove any authority or control of the Congress over the executive branch. The language is explicit in the reorganization plan. We could not, other than by legislation, in any way delegate any existing authority of the Congress, or remove it or diminish it or modify it or abrogate it. This is not that kind of legislation. There is no language in the reorganization plan which would do any of those things. Specifically, it would not in any way diminish, remove, or modify the authority and control of the Congress over the executive branch of the Government. It does not, Mr. Chairman—and this is a very important point because I have heard it made so many times with respect to earlier proposed legislation and this reorganization plan—I have heard it in the hearings before our committee over the many years that our committee has considered this matter—this reorganization plan does not extend in the slightest any power or control of the Federal Government.

I want to repeat that, Mr. Chairman, because it is very important. I am afraid here again a great many people around the country have a misconception of what this reorganization plan would do. But one of the things it does not do is to extend in any way, in the slightest, any power or control of the Federal Government over any municipality, over any county, or over any State.

Mr. Chairman, I emphasize that statement because the allegation has been made, has been printed and circulated around the country, that this reorganization plan would in some way either circumvent, supersede or otherwise interfere, intervene, or impose itself at the Federal level in, over, under, about a municipality, a county government or a State government. I say without any reservation whatever, Mr. Chairman, as a matter of law, as a matter of logic, as a matter of reasonableness, I challenge any person anywhere to show me the language or the law that the reorganization plan in any manner, shape or form, does anything to article X of the Constitution dealing with States rights; that it does anything with respect to the powers and prerogatives of a municipality, which in most cases is a creature of the State legislature, is chartered by it, and exists at its will; that it does anything to a county government, which in most cases is a constitutional government of the State and can only be modified, abrogated or repealed by the State; or that it does anything to the powers of the States as they exist under our constitutional system.

Mr. Chairman, I have made my statement as a matter of law. I have made my statement as a matter of reason and logic. If there is anything to the contrary in the reorganization plan, it will be brought forth, I am sure, and laid down in the Record. But I am here to say, Mr. Chairman, that this reorganization plan would not in itself—nor is it inherent in the language—do any of the things which I have recently discussed with respect to any municipality, county government, or State government. It does not in any way transfer any functions which are not specifically itemized in the reorganization plan. These functions are specifically limited to those constituent agencies and units of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

It is interesting to note, Mr. Chairman, that those who oppose this bill do so for a variety of reasons. And it is paradoxical that one group of these people say that the plan is too broad and gigantic, that it would centralize tremendous power, and that it would increase all kinds of powers of government, none of which thinks it really does. Another group says that the plan is not broad enough or large enough because it does not encompass the home loan guarantee program of the Veterans' Administration, that it does not encompass the activities of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, that it does not encompass other activities. That is interesting; maybe it is even logical. But I find it difficult to reconcile those contradictory positions, as I find it very difficult in my own mind to reconcile the fears which have been expressed with respect to what this Department would do in the future.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is very important that everyone, including all my colleagues, who have been so far following me carefully, recognize that what I am doing at this point is making the basis for a legal record. I think this is important. I think I also made it plain, Mr. Chairman, that I do not wish to question any other reasons with respect to what my colleagues' positions may be on this or any other issue. This I leave to their judgment and to their ability and to their integrity. They know best how to represent their respective constituencies and to satisfy their own consciences.

But, for the legal record, I must pursue this matter in the manner which I have because of the many misconceptions and apprehensions regarding this reorganization plan which I say, Mr. Chairman, have been very unfairly attributed to it. So what I am saying is that it is all right for anyone to be opposed to it, because reasonable men may differ on almost any issue, and certainly men may differ on this issue. That is where the issue should be made in the Record, for reasonable people. I do not believe, in other words, Mr. Chairman, that issues should be made in the Record for unreasonable people.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to refer now to a colloquy we had in the Government Operations Committee hearings on this plan. Let me state that this is not a recent matter. The Committee on Government Operations has had this matter under consideration for a good many years. I do not recall just how long it has been, but it does seem to me that for at least 6 years the Committee on Government Operations has, in one form or another, been concerned with the problem of urban affairs and housing and with the question of giving Cabinet status to this major segment of the economy and the people of this country.

Mr. Chairman, this is a colloquy between myself and a Mr. Davis, a very fine gentleman who testified before our committee in opposition, mind you, to the reorganization plan. As I recall it, Mr. Davis spoke on behalf of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. This colloquy starts on page 101 of the transcript. It is not too long a colloquy. I think it is important for the Record, and I should like to read it. I will read it all so that there will not be any misunderstanding with respect to pulling a part of the transcript out of context. The colloquy is as follows:

> Chairman Dawson. Mr. Fascell, any questions?
>
> Mr. Fascell. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I have got a few.
>
> Mr. Davis, I think the first thing we ought to clear up, and the record ought to speak for itself, and that is what the mayor said with respect to one-stop service—

And we were referring to a previous witness—

> Mr. Davis. Yes, sir.
>
> Mr. Fascell. So that we don't add any more towering implications to this poor little old reorganization plan that some people are trying to put on it. What he did say exactly was, on page 3—

And here I quote what the mayor said:

> "What we small city people need is a one-stop service center in our dealings with the Federal Government on urban programs."
>
> Mr. Fascell. He did not say this reorganization plan was going to give it to them. The fact of the matter is by reading his testimony it is quite clear that he understands that it doesn't. It doesn't change his opinion on what the need is.
>
> Mr. Davis. Thank you.
>
> Mr. Fascell. I just thought in all fairness you would want to understand.
>
> Mr. Davis. Thank you, sir.
>
> Mr. Fascell. Because I know that my able colleague on the other side is just dying to get on the floor and quote you as saying this bill is going to be a one-stop service center, like a gasoline station.
>
> As I understand it, Mr. Davis, on behalf of the chamber of commerce actually your

feelings on this matter are that rather than to achieve any administrative efficiency in the operation of these programs, what you would really like to do is get rid of the programs.

We were talking about the Federal Housing Administration, the Public Housing Administration and Fannie Mae, that is, the Federal National Mortgage Association, the constituent agencies of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Continuing the colloquy:

Mr. DAVIS. There are certain programs that we are not in accord with.

Mr. FASCELL. Because as I recall prior testimony, the chamber has presented certain recommendations to other legislative committees for either the modification or the scaling down or the repeal of certain existing programs now.

Mr. DAVIS. That is correct.

Mr. FASCELL. But basically if I gather the intent of what you are saying, that you or the chamber really don't support grant-in-aid programs at a Federal level for any purpose, or for very few purposes.

Mr. DAVIS. That is correct.

Mr. FASCELL. So that you are really at odds with the existing programs.

Mr. DAVIS. Of many of the Federal grant programs such as urban renewal, yes.

Mr. FASCELL. Now are we agreed on this, Mr. Davis, that this reorganization plan, which I am sure you have studied very carefully, does not add any new powers or functions.

Mr. DAVIS. Yes.

Mr. Chairman, I want to reemphasize that because here again around the country certain misconceptions have arisen with respect to this reorganization plan. I asked the direct question of Mr. Davis, whether we were in agreement that this reorganization plan did not add any new powers or functions, and his answer was "Yes."

I am now reading from page 102 of the transcript of hearings of the Committee on Government Operations, which hearings were held on February 6, 7, and 8, 1962:

Mr. FASCELL. So that in no way can the reorganization plan be said to be in contravention of amendment No. 10 of the Federal Constitution dealing with States rights.

Mr. DAVIS. I wouldn't like to admit that, because this is like asking, "have I stopped beating my wife?"

Mr. FASCELL. I don't mean to put the question in that phrase, but I think we can do it without resort to a great deal of law or technicality. I think we can do it on the basis of just plain old commonsense.

Mr. DAVIS. I think the expansion of the Federal Government into certain areas that some feel should be better handled by the State or the local government, the resistance to it is because of a fear by some that it is an infringement on States rights—

I want to repeat, Mr. Chairman, what Mr. Davis has so candidly said here, and that is that he states resistance is due just to the fear of some that it would infringe on States rights. But there is nothing in the reorganization plan as a matter of law that gives any foundation or reason to that fear—

Mr. FASCELL. That may be true with respect to a particular legislative program that the Congress is going to enact, and the question would then arise as to whether or not it infringes in any way on the State's jurisdiction.

Mr. DAVIS. Correct.

Mr. FASCELL. Isn't that correct?

Mr. DAVIS. That is correct.

Mr. FASCELL. But under this reorganization plan, since you have no new function or new power, that question doesn't even arise, does it?

Mr. DAVIS. That is correct.

Mr. FASCELL. So then it wouldn't really be quite fair in opposing this particular reorganization plan to say that the plan would interfere with the operation of the States.

Mr. DAVIS. Well, it is the fear that this would, of course, promote further Federal inroads into the area of State responsibilities. As to the plan itself as it is written, you are correct.

Mr. FASCELL. You know I might go along with you on the fear as long as you don't relate it to this reorganization plan, because actually what you are saying, is it not, is that what you are afraid of is that future Congresses of the United States will impose additional programs, and this is what you don't want.

I have just got a couple of more questions. In other words, I am not objecting to your opposition, you understand that, for whatever reason it may be, even if it is based solely on fear or even if it is based solely on the idea that you don't like it. I think those are valid reasons. Every man is entitled to his own opinion.

But I think it is only fair and proper that within good reason and good judgment we now are down to the direct issues involved, without trying to embellish them either for or against a particular proposal, because obviously I am just as sensitive as you are about being jumped on or having my logic challenged or my judgment or my sincerity or my motivation.

I don't like it any more than you do. I am willing to test my logic and my judgment with any man alive on any issue and rise or fall with that, if we let it go that way.

I would like to ask another question. Just so we can have a predicate for the statement so we will have a common understanding, I got Webster's Dictionary so I wouldn't be using some other definition that might not be accepted:

"Socialism: A political and economic theory of social organization based on collective or governmental ownership and democratic management of the essential means for the production and distribution of goods; also a policy or practice based on this theory."

What I wanted to ask you is this, Mr. Davis. Is there anything in this reorganization plan which has to do with the nationalization of the production or distribution of goods?

Mr. DAVIS. No.

Mr. FASCELL. Then it can't be called socialistic, can it?

Mr. DAVIS. I think it can be claimed that the reorganization plan would contribute to the further centralization of the power of government.

Mr. FASCELL. You are not inferring that that is socialism?

Mr. DAVIS. No. I am using the term "centralization."

Now, going to page 104 of the transcript:

Mr. FASCELL. In other words, you do oppose the idea of any further power or authority being rested in the Central Government?

Mr. DAVIS. I think it should be very carefully considered.

Mr. FASCELL. Right.

Mr. DAVIS. There may be other powers that properly should be.

Mr. FASCELL. I did not mean to put words in your mouth, that is not what I meant at all. I am trying to make a distinction in your position. You are saying positively that this organization plan is not socialistic.

Mr. DAVIS. Under the terms of the Webster definition, correct.

Mr. FASCELL. If we don't agree with that——

Mr. DAVIS. I agree with that.

Mr. FASCELL. That is the reason I used the common definition.

Mr. DAVIS. Yes.

Mr. FASCELL. Now, this reorganization plan we agreed earlier doesn't add any new authority or power, does it?

Mr. DAVIS. Correct.

Mr. FASCELL. So that you can't use additional authority or power as an argument that the centralized Government is getting any bigger, can you?

Mr. DAVIS. I assume that this would require further Federal administrators, expense which would be possibly some increase in the Federal Government.

Also, for instance, I think it takes some of the agencies a little further away from Congress, such as FHA. They would be one step removed from Congress, FHA being under the Housing and Home Finance Agency would then also be under Urban Affairs, and I think that tendency is one which gets it a little further removed from Congress and from the people.

Mr. FASCELL. Do you think you can get any closer to the people than the Congress of the United States?

Mr. DAVIS. No. That is why I say if you put this on Cabinet level instead of its present situation—I was afraid that it would get a little further away.

Mr. FASCELL. Let's analyze that for a minute. Do you believe that the Congress of the United States ought to be the administrative body?

Mr. DAVIS. No.

Mr. FASCELL. Do you think it ought to be a legislative body?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes.

Mr. FASCELL. In accordance with the divisions of power in the Constitution. So actually what we are really saying is that no agency or department or commission of the Government is any further away from the Congress than the Appropriations Committee, is it? Is that right?

Now don't misunderstand me. I understand what your objection is, and I understand what the chamber's objection is. I would only say this: That when the time arrives that you can raise the issue of greater centralization of power, or when the time arrives that you can raise the issue of additional powers or functions being added to those which now exist, I think they can properly be raised.

I won't deny the fact that you can have the fear, whether it is well founded or not is a question of judgment on which reasonable men can differ. You will admit, will you not, that some time somewhere in the processes of administration, it is wise and efficient to clear up channels of command and responsibility.

Mr. DAVIS. Yes.

Mr. Chairman, I want to emphasize that because here is a distinguished businessman who understands the necessity for an efficient Government, who recognizes the necessity of command responsibility in a line organization as being the most efficient and economical type of administrative operation.

In direct answer to that question he says, Yes, he recognizes that and knows it should be done.

To continue from the transcript:

Mr. FASCELL. And that this is an important step sometimes in a large operation. Also one of business judgment, is it not?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not presume to my colleagues that this is all of the testimony in the record or that this colloquy to which I have referred in full is even the preponderance of the opinion of the record. But I would say that as far as the majority of the committee are concerned, and certainly as far as I am concerned, I think the colloquy delineates exactly what the plan is and what it is not in law and in reason, as well as in fact.

There are some other things which I ought to touch on very briefly, and we have so many speakers that would like to say something on this subject, Mr. Chairman. We would do several things by this reorganization plan. One, which I have alluded to, is the fundamental recommendation of the Hoover Commission for the establishment of line organizations. Before somebody jumps up, I do not mean that the Hoover Commission recommended Cabinet status for this particular agency. I am talking about the fact that the reorganization plan seeks to establish and pinpoint responsibility through the type of administrative line organization recommended by the Hoover Commission.

The plan also provides that all of the powers and functions, and the direction, responsibility, and control of those functions, shall vest in the Secretary. This is important because of the present legal status surrounding our HHFA and because of the question that has been asked: Why, if you want to clarify responsibility, do you not take the present agency and do it within that agency? Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1947 set up the HHFA. In that plan the administrator of HHFA was given the coordination and supervision of the functions of the constituent agencies. But very specifically he was not given—I repeat—he was not given direction and control of those agencies. By statutory law, therefore, and by the reorganization plan itself, there remained in the heads of those constituent agencies certain residual powers of direction and control.

This became important enough so that in 1955 the dilemma was recognized by our own Committee on Appropriations in the writing of the 1955 Independent Offices Appropriation Act, where they endeavored to put emphasis on what the President and the Congress had sought to do in the provisions of the reorganization plan of 1947 by way of giving broad authority to the Administrator. The language written into the appropriation bill was thought to be designed to recognize broad authority in the Administrator. But both the language itself and its legislative history indicate that this was declaratory legislation and therefore was not intended in any way legally to change the status of the constituent agencies or the authority of the Administrator as established under Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1947 or the statutory law creating the constituent agencies.

The Congress in 1955 under the powerful and able direction of the Appropriations Committee recognized the virtual impossibility of doing business inherent in the existing authority and tried to give its weight, emphasis and thinking to straighten this matter out. Unfortunately, this was not accomplished. It does take either a reorganization plan or legislation to straighten the matter out. That is what this reorganization plan would do. It would put all those functions in the Secretary and resolve the question of the residual powers of direction and control of the constituent agencies under existing law to the extent they were not dealt with in the reorganization plan of 1947.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield briefly to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. No additional powers will accrue to the proposed Secretary of the Department of Urban Affairs other than those which are contained in the constituent agencies themselves at the present time; is that correct?

Mr. FASCELL. The gentleman is absolutely correct. I appreciate his clarifying point on the question of law. There are no new powers or functions, and there is no increase in the existing powers and functions of the constituent agencies as they exist under statutory law or under the old reorganization plan. Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962 would simply bring them together and eliminate the question of the division of authority and control.

Mr. YATES. Will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois for a further question.

Mr. YATES. Does this not bear on the argument made by opponents of the plan that this plan is likely to result in a great deal of increased expense if HHFA is made into a department? If there are no new powers added or no new duties, is it likely that there will be increased expense as a result of the reorganization plan?

Mr. FASCELL. Of course, I thank the gentleman for that statement. I had dealt at length on the point that the plan does not as a result of any increase in powers or functions. There would be a net cost increase as a result of the differential beween old positions under the present status and new positions which would come into being under the reorganization plan. But I submit that the net increase in salary cost would be minimal. It would be less than $50,000—$49,430. If the gentleman is talking about what the reorganization plan itself would do, that is what it is. Then, if the gentleman is talking about cost of the reorganization plan, one must limit the cost to the estimate with respect to the creation of the new positions, which would be less than $50,000 under the plan.

Mr. YATES. Will the gentleman yield for one further question?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Is it not true also that any increase in positions in the department and any new activities will be subject to the continued scrutiny of the Congress?

Mr. FASCELL. Well, not only that, but I would say the Appropriations Committee first—I do not know about the Congress, because I never quite got past the Appropriations Committee myself. I want to wind up here very quickly, Mr. Chairman, with respect to the whys and wherefores of this reorganization plan.

We have the legal problem of the division of authority which the record has substantiated, I think, beyond any question as a real problem. The mayor of Chicago came before our committee and testified just exactly how this division of authority under existing law creates a tremendous problem for a municipality trying to work out its programs which now exist and which Congress has already approved. As I recall the testimony, it took them 2 years with respect to one project, because they had to go from the Administrator, to the FHA, then to the PHA, and finally back to the Administrator, in order to get them all together to work this thing out. This is extremely costly because you have funds tied up that are accumulating interest charges, and you have other losses and costs which are obvious to anybody who has had any connection with present municipal programs under the Federal law. This is something which should be resolved by this reorganization plan in the interest of efficiency and economy in government, and for the benefit of the municipalities themselves, because the plan would pinpoint the responsibility. The Secretary would have, by law, the direction and the control of all these programs. Therefore, while his subordinates obviously will have a major part in decision making, the responsibility will be his to make the ultimate decision, if he wants to, with respect to the program.

This is one thing that time after time witnesses from large cities and small cities have testified to before our committee. It is an important thing; it bears directly on the recommendation for achievement of administrative efficiency laid down as a principle by the Hoover Commission; namely, setting up a line organization for command responsibility.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, we talk about making a Secretary at Cabinet level. I would not for 1 minute diminish the importance of doing this thing. I want to say why it is important and why this reorganization plan seeks to do it. It is because the present Agency is an important agency dealing with the major portion of our housing functions in this country and the urban problems in this country. Right now, for example, the Housing and Home Finance Agency had gross expenditures of $3,981 million for the fiscal year 1961 and had 12,261 employees as of December 31, 1961.

Let us compare that with other executive departments to see the relative importance of HHFA's functions. And I do not say that this is the entire case at all. I just say it is a factor which should bear on the question of making this a Cabinet office.

State Department: $258 million, and 39,000 personnel. I shall round out the figures.

Treasury: $9,900 million and 80,000 personnel.

Justice: $302 million, and 30,000 personnel.

Post Office: $4.4 billion with 811,000 people.

Interior: $973 million, with 53,000 people.

Agriculture: $10 billion with 91,000 people.

Commerce: $3 billion with 28,000 people.

Labor: $1 billion with 7,000 people.

HEW: $3.6 billion and 72,000 people.

Defense: $45 billion with 1,059,000 people.

Mr. Chairman, it is obvious from reading that list that the Cabinet office under this reorganization plan would be exceeded in importance in these terms by only 3 or 4 others. One of the constituent agencies which would come under the Secretary of Urban Affairs and Housing is the Federal Housing Administration. This is in a very important area in the life of this country as we all recognize. Let us look at some of these figures, and again I am going to round them. The exact figures are available, of course.

Under title I, section 2, "Modernization and improvement, we had 25 million units and $14 billion worth of insurance.

Home mortgage insurance, 6 million units and $49 billion in insurance.

Project mortgage insurance, 937,000 units with $8 billion of insurance.

So we have some 32 million units affected with over $72 billion of insurance, in just one of the constitutent agencies.

I only point this out to show the ramifications of the Agency itself and the impact it has, as we all understand it, on our country and on our people.

I know none of us advocates the abolition of the FHA, which has done a fine job and will continue to do an even better job. But, I think it is reasonable and logical that an agency as important as this one, an agency which has as much direct economic impact on every family in the United States, ought to be represented at the Cabinet level along with these other Cabinet officers.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, we have come a long way in the last 100 years in this country. We are strong economically and militarily. Perhaps, the most important distinction among many, between what wonderful things we have under our system and what is to be had under other systems that exist around the world, is that all of our people have been able to participate in political matters, in the evolvement of power politically, and in economic matters. We find that in this flexibility, which is so much the trademark of our system, the great majority of our people have moved from the rural areas to the urban areas. At the time the Department of Agriculture, for example, was organized and placed at Cabinet level, 70 percent of the people of this country lived in rural areas. Since then there has been a great migration, and today approximately 70 percent of the people of this country now live in urban areas. I am not advocating, by any stretch of the imagination, the abolition of the Department of Agriculture; nor am I trying to use it as a crutch or as a reason for the establishment of this agency. I make the comparison solely to point out the fact that if the location of our population had a bearing on the question when the Department of Agriculture was established, and which, of course, it did have, then I think it is reasonable and logical to say that the location of the great majority of the people of today, the places where they live and work, has a bearing and should have a bearing on the question. The Housing and Home Finance Agency with its constituent agencies should be raised to the level of Cabinet status. If we consider that 70 percent of all the people of this country now live in urban areas and are directly concerned with the problems attendant upon urban growth so that it can no longer be said that they can be completely ignored, then I think it is within reason and within logic, and we have the right, to say it is important to lift this Housing and Home Finance Agency out of an independent agency status reporting directly to the President and place it at the executive department level under a secretary, thus giving it the importance it deserves at the Cabinet table. If this is done, Mr. Chairman, I believe we will have made it possible to take a very important step in the matter of efficiency and economy in the operation of this administration as it continues to serve the people of this country.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida has consumed 50 minutes.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962 would create an 11th department of the Federal Government to be known as the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, transferring to that Department the Housing and Home Finance Agency and its constituent agencies intact. No new functions or powers would be vested in the new Department and no other Federal activities relating to housing or the many other and different Federal activities of interest and assistance to municipalities would be vested in the new Department.

Reorganization Plan No. 1 is premature, unnecessary, will not accomplish what its proponents represent, and is contrary to sound principles of Government organization. It should not become law.

CREATING NEW DEPARTMENT A SERIOUS MATTER

The creation of a new department of the Federal Government is an important, historical step and ought not to be undertaken lightly or frivolously. In the 173 years of the Republic's existence, only 10 departments of the Government have been created. None has ever been abolished, although in 1949 the War Department and Navy Department, together with the Air Force, were merged into the Department of Defense with a single Cabinet member as head. This reduced the number of departments of the Government to nine.

The following is the chronology of the establishment of Cabinet departments:

Department of State, 1789.
Department of the Treasury, 1789.
War Department,[1] 1789.
Department of the Navy,[1] 1815.
Department of the Interior, 1849.
Department of Agriculture, 1862.
Department of Justice, 1870.
Post Office Department, 1872.
Department of Commerce, 1913.
Department of Labor, 1913.
Department of Defense,[1] 1949.
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1953.

The 10th Department—Health, Education, and Welfare—was created in 1953 by House Joint Resolution 223 of the 83d Congress which became Public Law 13 when it was signed by the President on April 1, 1953. This joint resolution incorporated the terms of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953 by reference and provided that the Department should come into existence 10 days after the joint resolution was signed by the President. Thus it may be said that no department of the Government has ever been created by reorganization plan.

In view of the seriousness of such a step, it is my judgment that no department should be created by reorganization plan, but should be created, if at all, only through the regular legislative process with opportunity for thorough committee consideration of alternatives and all points of view, weighing the advantages and disadvantages against general public interest with full opportunity for amendment both in committees and on the floors of the respective Houses of Congress.

It should be elementary that the burden of proof should be upon those who assert the desirability of creating a new Department and that desirability should be established by clear evidence, cold logic and sound principles of governmental organization and not upon a tacit assumption or emotional generalities. This was conceded by the principal witness favoring Reorganization Plan No. 1, the Director of the Budget, David E. Bell, on page 14 of the hearings of the House Committee on Government Operations in the following colloquy:

> Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman?
>
> Mr. Bell, as Budget Director, is it your function to attempt to minimize expansion of bureaucracy and expansion of expenditures of the Federal Government? Are you, in a sense, an opposing force to Parkinson's law?
>
> Mr. BELL. I should hope to merit that description, yes, sir, Mr. MEADER.
>
> Mr. MEADER. Would you agree that in addition to the two criteria that you mention on page 4 of your statement, for the establishment of a department there perhaps should be another one: That the burden of proof that a new department should be established is upon those who assert that proposition, and that the presumption would

---

[1] In 1947 the War Department, the Department of the Navy, and a newly established Department of the Air Force were consolidated in one National Defense Establishment, now known as the Department of Defense.

> be that there should not be a new department unless a strong case is made for it?
>
> Mr. BELL. Well, I would certainly agree that a sound case must be made for any action which modifies the structure of the Government.

This point was made in "Minority Views" to the report on H.R. 8429—House Report No. 1053, 87th Congress—establishing a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing as follows:

> According to its published calendar, the Committee on Government Operations has had before it a score or more bills in each of the last three Congresses (85th, 86th and 87th) to create new Government departments. These bills would have created a Department of Mineral Resources, a Department of Public Information, a Department of Public Relations, a Department of Rural and Suburban Government, a Department of Small Towns and Rural Affairs, a Department of Transportation and Communication, a Department of Urban Affairs, a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, a Department of Urbiculture, a Department of Aeronautics and Space, a Department of Consumers, a Department of Peace, a Department of Science and Technology, a Department of Veterans' Affairs, a Department of Civil Defense, a Department of General Services, and a Department of Science.
>
> How many times can the Cabinet be augmented without passing the point of diminishing returns? If the urge to create a new department were yielded to each time it asserted itself, the Cabinet would become so large and unwieldy that it would lose much of its value and a seat at the table would not mean much.

Let me interpolate at this point, Mr. Chairman. From the demonstration of Colonel Glenn yesterday, the fact that space is here to stay and that it is a legitimate important function of the Federal Government, it can be argued that it is much more in order to create a new department of the Government out of the National Aeronautics and Space Agency than it is to create a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

A CASE HAS NOT BEEN MADE FOR A NEW DEPARTMENT

Proponents of establishing the new Department of Urban Affairs and Housing have not met the burden of proof. No factual or logical foundation for establishing a new permanent organ of Government has been laid. The proposal to convert the Housing and Home Finance Agency into a department does not meet the criteria which should govern the establishment of a department of the Federal Government. These criteria are:

First. A department should have responsibility pursuant to a policy laid down by the Congress over an important area of Federal authority and activity.

Second. The functions and powers of a department should have been determined by the Congress to be permanent or at least of indefinite duration.

Third. So far as practicable, a new department should be comprised of all Federal activities related to the field of the Federal responsibility to be entrusted to the department.

I want to discuss these criteria one by one to show how this proposed Department of Urban Affairs and Housing falls far short of meeting criteria for establishing a new department.

A department should have responsibility pursuant to a policy laid down by the Congress over an important area of Federal authority and activity

The proposed new Department of Urban Affairs and Housing falls far short of meeting the first standard which should govern establishment of departments.

First, housing is primarily an activity of the private business community and the Federal Government's role has been and should be limited to the assistance in providing financial aid and credit thought to be necessary for a healthy housing program, but beyond the capacity either of private financial markets or such financial assistance as local communities and States are able to provide.

For the Federal Government to do more in home construction than to provide this limited financial assistance would be to put the Federal Government in private business and constitute a socialization of the home building industry.

With respect to urban affairs, our Constitution vests no power in the Federal Government, which is one of limited powers, with respect to the establishment of municipal corporations or other local governmental units. The power in this field was expressly reserved to the States or the people themselves by the 10th amendment of the Constitution. No major Federal responsibility, control or direction over municipal and other local governmental organizations could be assumed by the Federal Government without an amendment to the Constitution. Thus, the great bulk of governmental responsibility for municipalities and local governments will remain with the States. Urban affairs are not a Federal responsibility.

The functions and powers of a department should have been determined by the Congress to be permanent or at least of indefinite duration

It would seem to be basic that an activity of the Federal Government should not be frozen into the governmental structure by making it a department unless it has been established by the Congress as a permanent Federal activity of indefinite duration. This is not the case with housing.

Construction by its very nature has a termination date. Buildings get finished. It is true, of course, that with the massive migration into our metropolitan areas, housing shortages, slum clearance, mass transit problems, and other metropolitan needs which the Housing and Home Finance Agency and its constituent agencies are designed to alleviate may reasonably be anticipated to be with us for some time to come. Yet no one can foresee future developments, including the recommendations which may emanate from the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations and its studies of metropolitan problems. No one can be sure that these municipal problems and needs may not be met in such a fashion as to diminish the need for Federal assistance, or that alternative ways of meeting these problems may not be found. Whether this be true or not, Congress has seen fit in adopting housing legislation to fix terminal dates when the authority created by the statute would expire.

The reorganization plan would create a Department of Urban Affairs out of the HHFA and constituent agencies which the Congress has not established as permanent entities of the Federal Government. The authority of most of the constituent agencies is limited or temporary. Either dollar limits or specific expiration dates are expressly provided in statutes creating their powers and functions.

For example, the Federal National Mortgage Association, under its charter act, provides a means for its transfer to private ownership. It presently has approximately 8,600 private stockholders holding $80 million in common stock.

The Public Housing Administration was given 100,000 additional units by the Housing Act of 1961 and according to the chairman of the Senate Housing Subcommittee during the debate on the housing bill this was to launch a phasing out of the program. In addition the Congress authorized a $5 million demonstration grant program to find new ways to house low-income families. One of the methods to be studied involves direct subsidies to low-income families. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare which now handles public assistance programs would be a more appropriate vehicle for the disbursement of shelter subsidies to tenants.

The Federal Housing Administration was extended for 4 years in the Housing Act of 1961. Of the major programs under FHA, the middle-income submarket interest rate rental housing program has a 4-year life; the 3 percent down, 35-year program approved by the 1961 act has a 2-year life.

The fourth and remaining major program in the HHFA complex relates to the Urban Renewal Administration. This agency was given contractual authority for an additional $2 billion under the 1961 act. While it is conjectural how long the Federal Government will continue this program, certainly there is insufficient evidence that it is permanent enough to justify creation of a new executive department.

Thus, in another decade, we may find that we have established a permanent department of the Government, headed by a Secretary, having an Under Secretary, assistant secretaries, general counsel and all the trappings of a bureaucracy but with no powers or duties. Congress may have permitted the authority of the constituent agencies to expire finding that the Federal assistance had accomplished its purpose and was no longer needed, or had established alternative mechanisms for dealing with housing problems. The Department would still be there and all the high brass therein would be drawing their salaries, but with nothing to do.

It is basically unsound administration to convert agencies, which by their terms are temporary, into a permanent department.

This is in clear contrast with the programs administered, for example, by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which the proponents of the plan are fond of citing as precedent. In an examination of the statutes authorizing programs conducted by the following constituent agencies of HEW—Public Health Service, Office of Education, Social Security Administration, Bureau of Public Assistance, Children's Bureau, Bureau of Federal Credit Unions, Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, Food and Drug Administration, St. Elizabeths Hospital and Howard University—no specific references were found limiting the amount of money available for carrying out the provisions of the authorizing legislation, nor was any time limit imposed on the operation of these programs or agencies.

So far as practicable, a new Department should be comprised of all Federal activities related to the field of the Federal responsibility to be entrusted to the Department

Proponents of the plan have indicated that establishment of the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing will create a one-stop agency where municipal officials may find all of their needs met in one place without being shunted around from bureau to bureau in Washington. This is a snare and delusion. The one-stop agency will be no more as a Department than it is as a one-stop agency of the Housing and Home Finance Administration.

A multitude of Federal functions useful to metropolitan areas in meeting many of their problems will remain where they are now and in no way be affected by the organization plan. The Bureau of Public Roads administering the Federal highway program affecting access to municipalities and expressways through municipalities as well as city streets will stay right in the Department of Commerce where it is now.

Water pollution or sewage disposal programs will remain under the jurisdiction of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare where they are now.

Vocational education funds, social security activities, welfare activities, disposal of surplus Federal properties to schools and hospitals and other municipal entities, Hill-Burton funds, activities designed to promote public health, all will remain right where they are now.

These and other programs will in no way be affected by the establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, which at best will have jurisdiction over only a minor fraction of Federal activities and funds aimed at assisting States and municipalities to solve metropolitan problems.

Only about one-third of the Federal Government's housing activities will be encompassed in the new Department. The Veterans' Administration and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board will continue in their autonomous status. They account for approximately 63 percent of the housing financing activities engaged in by, or under the auspices of, the Federal Government.

Following is a list of the various departments of the Federal Government whose activities are of importance and assistance to municipalities:

PROGRAMS UNDER DEPARTMENT OR AGENCY

Highway construction, Commerce.

Improvement of rivers, harbors, and waterways, Corps of Engineers.

Water pollution control, Health, Education, and Welfare.

Control of communicable diseases, including tuberculosis and venereal, Health, Education, and Welfare.

Services to crippled children, Health, Education, and Welfare.

Health centers and clinics, Health, Education, and Welfare.

Disaster relief, Office of Emergency Planning.

Civil Defense, Defense Department.

Employment security, Labor.

School lunch program, Agriculture.

Special problems of federally impacted areas, Health, Education, and Welfare.

Airports and air terminals, Federal Aviation Agency.

Old age and survivors' insurance for local government employees, Health, Education, and Welfare.

Hospital planning and construction, Health, Education, and Welfare.

Suppression of crime, Justice.

General welfare assistance, Health, Education, and Welfare.

Categorical assistance under the Social Security Act, Health, Education, and Welfare.

Vocational education, Health, Education, and Welfare.

Vocational rehabilitation, Health, Education, and Welfare.

Donable surplus property, Health, Education, and Welfare.

It would seem logical if there is to be a Department of Urban Affairs that these various functions should be brought together under one administrative roof where municipal officers could truly get one-stop service.

This type of consolidation of functions would likewise be in accordance with the philosophy of the Hoover Commission recommendations, would lead to the elimination of duplication, overlapping, and parallel administrative services and might actually accomplish something.

An alternative means was suggested for bringing Federal activities of interest to municipalities together; namely, the transfer of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, where most of the grant-in aid programs of interest to municipalities are already located. While this would seem to make some sense, it has not been studied thoroughly and was rejected out of hand by those who wish to establish the new department and a new official of Cabinet rank. The cursory dismissal of this proposal indicates, first, that the reorganization plan does nothing to create a one-stop agency for municipalities; second, that it flies in the face of sound administrative structure in failing to bring related functions together; and, third, that the plan has been hastily concocted and prematurely presented without adequate study.

Would it not be far wiser to await the recommendations of a permanent agency only recently created by the Congress; namely, the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, a bipartisan agency—which has already undertaken to cope with metropolitan area problems and has issued two reports already in this field: "Intergovernmental Responsibilities for Mass-Transportation Facilities and Services in Metropolitan Areas," issued April 1961, and "Governmental Structure, Organization, and Planning in Metropolitan Areas," issued July 1961?

This Commission is composed of representatives of the legislative and executive branches of the Federal Government, Governors of States, mayors of cities and representatives of county and township governments. The two studies above mentioned are only the first of a series of studies in the important area of municipal problems and it is noteworthy that the Commission, on page 56 of its report of July 1961, refrained from recommending the establishment of a National Department of Urban Affairs. The Congress should follow this example of the bipartisan study group it created and likewise refrain from taking hasty action to establish a department in advance of thorough study.

FEDERAL ENCROACHMENT ON STATES AND MUNICIPALITIES

My colleague referred to Federal encroachment on States and municipalities.

Proponents of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962 belittle the fears of some stalwart advocates of local autonomy, independence and self-determination by arguing that the new Department will not seek to encroach upon rights and prerogatives of States and local governments, pointing out that no powers will be vested in the new Department which do not already exist in the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Those of us, however, who have watched burgeoning bureaucracy are somewhat skeptical of representations that the new Department would remain in status quo. There will be pressures for new programs, new funds, new responsibilities and new powers to be added to this new creature once it is established. In fact, some of the Governors and mayors indifferent to the prerogatives and powers of governmental units they head seem to advocate and welcome the possibility that the new Department would assume more and more of the responsibility, as well as the authority, of local units of government.

One would have to be unperceptive indeed to see the bloated expansiveness of centralized government as a lifeless skeleton. According to the Joint Congressional Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, civilian employment in Government increased 74,262 during 1961 alone, to a total Federal employment of 2,430,999.

The mushrooming tendency of a new department is attested to by the development of the latest one, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which came into being on April 11, 1953, by virtue of Public Law 13, 83d Congress.

The average number of employees in the Department has grown from 36,613 in fiscal year 1953, when it was established, to an estimated 63,154 in fiscal year 1961. Appropriations have increased correspondingly from $1,987.8 million in fiscal year 1953 to $3,823.4 million in fiscal year 1961.

Bureaucracies once established have a way of growing not only in size but in power. That is especially true with bureaucracies which handle vast sums of public funds. It may well be that the new Secretary of Urban Affairs may never be granted any constitutional power by the Congress to direct the affairs of a municipality. But it would be naive for anyone to suppose that conditions and criteria would not be established in the dispensation of loans and grants for municipal purposes which might induce hungry local officials, outbid in the taxation of the people by the huge take of the Federal Government, to surrender some of their autonomy and self-determination in exchange for Uncle Sam's largesse.

Money is power, and whatever may be said of the present Administrator, no one can be certain that some future housing czar will have the fortitude to oppose Parkinson's law and refrain from establishing a nationwide pattern for community development.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RIEHLMAN], member of the committee.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the resolution.

Mr. Chairman, I am supporting House Resolution 530 and opposing Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962.

In my considered judgment, the proponents of a Cabinet-level Department of Urban Affairs and Housing fail utterly and completely in their efforts to establish a genuine need for such a Department.

Those efforts have become clouded in partisan politics to the extent that the basic issues are hardly recognizable. I am hopeful that this debate today will serve to separate the wheat from the chaff and that once this proposal is laid open for all to judge it on its merits, this body will respond with a resounding vote for disapproval.

On what grounds do the supporters of Reorganization Plan No. 1 seek approval? They claim that urban dwellers have no voice in the Federal Government, and that this plan will give them one. They claim it will solve a great need to coordinate the various Federal programs having a bearing on urban problems. They claim that communities have no place in Washington to bring their problems, and that this plan will give them one. They claim that this plan will bring about greater economy and efficiency in government. They claim that the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency does not have sufficient status to represent and promote the great programs under his direction. Let us take a look at these claims.

When the proponents of this plan say that urban dwellers have no voice in the Federal Government, I cannot for the life of me fathom which branch of the Government they are talking about. Are they saying that the leadership in Congress is unresponsive to the needs of our urban communities? Are they saying that the many Members of this body who represent urban constituencies are not vigorous or resourceful enough to pursue the interests of their constituencies? Are they saying that the great Banking and Currency Committee in this body is unmindful of urban problems? I do not think they are saying these things because they would not be speaking the truth if they were.

What then are they trying to say? Are they trying to say that the Housing and Home Finance Agency is not carrying out its responsibilities? Are they saying that the members of the President's Cabinet ignore the needs of our great cities? Are they saying that the President of the United States himself is unable to speak for the benefit of urban dwellers? I hardly think they are trying to say these things. If they are, I will find it difficult to agree with them.

Are they saying that urban America, in order to survive, must have one single voice to represent it, just as rural America ostensibly has in the Secretary of Agriculture? If they are then they must be saying that urban America needs a man who will try to control its very life and breath, just as the Secretary of Agriculture is trying to control rural America. If having a Cabinet-level department does for urban dwellers what it does for our farmers, then I certainly want no part of it.

Who would this single voice be? Would he be a man who could speak out on such problems as air and water pollution? Would he be a man who could speak out on such problems as juvenile delinquency and public health? Would he be a man who could speak out on the location of highways and arterials and interchanges? Would he be a man who could speak out on unemployment or on public works? He most certainly would not, because the sponsors of this plan have done nothing to give the proposed new Secretary of Urban Affairs any authority over these problem areas so important to urban development. The new Secretary could speak out on nothing beyond what the present Administrator of HHFA can speak out on because this plan does not enlarge responsibilities, it merely transfers them.

Let us look at the claim that urban America needs a Cabinet officer in Washington to better coordinate the Federal programs relating to urban problems. If the proponents of this plan claim that we need just one single man to coordinate, then why do they not propose to place under this new Department authority over the multitude of existing Federal programs designed to cope with urban problems? All this reorganization plan will do is to elevate urban renewal, the community facilities program, and a minority share of existing Federal housing programs. It does not bring within the jurisdiction of the proposed new Secretary any of the other farflung programs which might need to be coordinated. To give one man greater control over and coordination of Federal programs aimed at urban problems, proponents of this new Department would merely upgrade the programs which presently exist under common direction and leave the rest of the pertinent programs right where they are. This plan would give the new Secretary nothing more to coordinate than that which the HHFA Administrator presently has.

Proponents of this reorganization plan argue that urban officials have no place in Washington to come with their problems. I find it very difficult to accept this reason as a valid one.

I represent the city of Syracuse, N.Y. Syracuse is one of the finest and most progressive cities in the country. Syracuse has had considerable experience with the existing public housing and urban renewal programs and, in light of this experience I am unable to accept the argument that there is no place in Washington for the cities to take their problems.

Syracuse has been one of the pioneering cities in the country in the construction of public housing for low-income and elderly families, and in the undertaking of broad-scale urban renewal programs for the betterment of the community. Representatives of the city, both Republican and Democrat, have worked in close cooperation with Federal officials, under both Republican and Democrat administrations, while the city's projects were in the making. I am not aware of any significant difficulties encountered during the course of these negotiations and dealings with the Federal Government. I have contacted Federal officials on a number of occasions in connection with these projects and I have experienced no problems myself.

Let me cite some examples of the manner in which Syracuse has been able to work with Washington for the progress and betterment of the community.

Syracuse obtained over $4,467,000 from the Federal Government in 1938 to build a public housing project; $4,547,196 in 1952 to build another; $3,059,684 in 1956 to build an annex to the earlier development; in 1956 Syracuse undertook an urban renewal project with the aid of $2,108,000 from Washington; in 1958 $9 million was obtained from the Federal Government to place yet another public housing project under construction; in 1960 Syracuse received a contract for $11,928,000 in Federal funds to undertake its ambitious Near East Side urban renewal project; in 1961 a reservation was approved for 350 additional units of public housing, for which there is no dollar estimate yet available; there is presently pending an industrial project which could well bring another several million dollars in Federal assistance; and at the present time still another project is under study, with no dollar estimates yet available.

Including estimates for amounts not yet made definite, this could total roughly $40 million in assistance from the Federal Government under the public housing and urban renewal programs alone. I ask you, does this give the appearance that a city has no place to go in Washington for help?

I think a worthwhile rule of thumb is that any community which has a constructive and sound program to better itself and is willing to bear the substantial amount of responsibility necessary to put that program into effect will neither have trouble finding nor obtaining the various forms of assistance presently available from the Federal Government. The line is, and should be, drawn when a community wants Washington to do all of its worrying, planning and financing for it. This, I am afraid, is at the root of the proposal which is under consideration today.

The supporters of this plan argue that it will bring greater economy to Government. How can this be? This proposal is clearly designed to give the Federal Government a bigger, and eventually controlling, voice in the handling of community problems. Inherent in this design is the probability that constant effort will be exerted to expand and extend existing programs, to broaden spheres of influence, and to get bigger appropriations. How this will cut costs is beyond me.

I do not see how this plan will bring increased efficiency to Government. By the admission of its supporters, this plan will do little more than upgrade an existing administrative agency. It will not give the proposed new Secretary any additional programs to administer, nor will it give him any authority over his present programs that he does not already have the power to exercise. Is there something magical about working for a department that is absent when one works for an agency? Can one do more work for the former than for the latter? I would be interested in hearing our Government personnel people comment on that.

Proponents of this plan apparently argue that the Administrator of HHFA does not have sufficient status in the bureaucracy to obtain a fair shake for the programs under his direction. They apparently argue that whoever holds that position does not have sufficient status to work out on an equitable basis conflicts between his programs and those of the Cabinet departments. Is our President unable to establish priorities or to dictate the bases for resolution of differences among members of his own team? Maybe the President does not consider the head of the Housing and Home Finance Agency as being a member of the team. If these problems exist, I do not think they can be remedied by attaching a new title to a job.

Although I cannot agree with any of these arguments, I will say at least that they are directed to the merits of the reorganization plan. That is more than I can say for what appears to be the primary method for gaining acceptance of this program. Rather than seriously attempting to sell this plan on its merits, which admittedly would be an extremely difficult task, supporters apparently take the position that anyone who challenges the program is prima facie against the urban dweller and against the Negro race. This is being implied at every turn and is as despicable and irresponsible a pitch as I have seen in many years.

Proponents will not admit that this plan can be opposed in good faith by a person who fully appreciates the problems of our growing urban communities and by a person who is genuinely interested in the progress of all Americans, regardless of the color of their skin. Nor will they admit that it can be opposed in good faith by a person who would like nothing better than to see a member of the Negro race become a member of the President's Cabinet. This is low, cheap demagoguery and I am certain that the American people will see through it.

The plan put forth here today will do nothing to speed the solution of urban problems. It attempts to pinpoint difficulties without doing anything about them. It has very little inherent value and is unworthy of the support of this body.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, when the gentleman from Florida introduced his bill last year to create a Cabinet Department of Urban Affairs and Housing I am personally convinced that he did so in the honest belief that this measure represented a meritorious approach to the problems of urban dwellers. However, the measure which we consider today, Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962, is a politically inspired document which a Member of the other body and a former chairman of the Democratic National Committee has excitedly labeled the first big political issue of the 1962 and 1964 elections. Indeed, a Washington newspaper yesterday morning in its lead editorial felt obliged to comment:

> This plan is mired in politics and it is haunted by hobgoblins. For the politics the administration must bear some of the blame.

However, I would certainly join with my colleague from the State of Florida on the committee and seek to lay aside the political issue and try to consider this proposal on its merits.

The major premise of those who have sought to present a logical case for this new Department is that 70 percent of Americans live in urban areas. There has therefore been a not-so-subtle inference from supporters of this plan that if we as Members of Congress oppose Reorganization Plan No. 1, we are somehow opposed to the best interests and to the welfare of 70 percent of the American people. This argument becomes even more astonishing when you contemplate the fact that a reorganization plan can create no new functions. It can create no new powers.

Here by way of digression I might mention it has been very interesting to me, as a member of the subcommittee, to notice the transformation in the arguments that have been made and to watch the progress of this legislation. We first held hearings in May of last year on the bill of the gentleman from Florida and today we come to a consideration of the reorganization plan itself. Originally this was presented and this was outlined to us as a real monument, as something that was absolutely essential, as something that would solve the problems of 70 percent of urban dwellers in this country. Now today we are being told that it is nothing of the sort; no new powers; no new functions—it is merely a regrouping of agencies, of the present constituent agencies of the Housing and Home Finance Agency under a Secretary of Urban Affairs and Housing. Well, if that is so, then how in the same breath can the gentleman argue that those of us who sincerely and who for philosophical reasons oppose the creation of yet another bureaucratic monstrosity in the Federal Government somehow are opposed to minority groups and that we are opposed to city dwellers. It simply is not so, by the very arguments they themselves have made.

I would like to address myself to one point mentioned by my colleague in his opening remarks; namely, that the principal reason for the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing is to give the housing administrator the authority to reorganize constituent agencies of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, on a more economical and efficient basis. Those are certainly very attractive words; are they not? We are all for economy and we are all for efficiency. Recently, in an address at Rutgers University, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator described his agency as "an administrative monstrosity" and he contended he needed Reorganization Plan No. 1 in order to reorganize his agency and his constituent agencies on a more economical basis. However, as I think has been already pointed out by my colleague, the Congress in the 1955 Independent Offices Appropriation Act gave the Administrator, and I quote, "full authority to assign and to reassign functions and to reorganize his agency to promote economy, efficiency and fidelity in the operations of the Housing and Home Finance Agency."

Now there has been some misunderstanding on this point and I want to invite the attention of the Committee to the majority report. It is in error in relating the proviso that I have just read from the 1955 Independent Offices Appropriation Act—in relating that to a House report of the independent offices appropriation bill for the previous year, which was 1954.

I call your attention to the majority report on page 18 which states that House Report No. 276, 83d Congress, which accompanied the independent offices appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1955 indicates that the provisions would have a limited effect.

However, the majority report in this case is in error because House Report No. 276 did not accompany the 1955 Independent Offices Appropriation Act from which I quoted this proviso.

The language in a report on a 1954 appropriation act is certainly not evidence of the intent of the Congress with respect to a provision which was inserted in an appropriations act 1 year later.

I think it is also very significant in this regard to point out that it was during the spring of 1954 that the Banking and Currency Committee of the other body launched a thorough investigation of the Federal Housing Administration, particularly some of the irregularities that have grown out of the section 608 program. It was as the result of these investigations that the FHA Commissioner, the General Counsel, the Assistant General Counsel, and the Assistant Commissioner for multifamily housing were removed from office. Then at this time there was some doubt as to the control which the then Housing and Home Finance Administrator, Mr. Cole, had over the FHA and other constituent agencies. There was some doubt, in other words, as to his ability under the powers that had been granted the Administrator under the Reorganization Act of 1947 to clean up the constituent agencies and to correct these abuses. It was then, following that, and this apparent deficiency in the earlier reorganization plan, that the conferees on the Independent Offices Appropriation Act of 1955 agreed to add this proviso which granted the Administrator full authority to assign and reassign functions. It strikes me, therefore, that there is ample authority in the existing statutes for the administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to promote the kind of efficiency and economy that the proponents of this reorganization plan say is the sole reason for presenting this plan.

It has been said we are merely rattling the bones of centralized government, and that we are raising unfounded fears when we say that by the adoption of this reorganization plan we may well be taking a step in the direction of usurping the responsibility and the ability of the State and local governments to handle their own problems.

I would point out in this connection that today the Federal Government is collecting roughly two-thirds of all of the tax revenues that are collected in this country. It is basically because State and local government are suffering from too little revenue that some problems have been neglected. Yet the other day in the other body when an amendment was offered to remit half of the federally collected cigarette tax to the State for disbursement, it managed to get hardly a corporal's guard of support in that body. Why? Because of the apparently growing conviction on the part of many that State and local governments, with or without revenue, are unable, are incompetent, to deal with local problems, problems that up to this time we have regarded as local. I feel that this bill can certainly in the future lead to a further debilitation of State and local government no matter how sincere its proponents may be today in saying that that cannot happen.

I want to call your attention to a quotation from the Solicitor General of the United States in his brief which was filed in the case of Baker against Carr. You will recognize this as the Tennessee Malapportionment Case. He has this to say regarding our existing system of bypassing States:

> Urban governments now tend to bypass the States and to enter directly into cooperative arrangements with the National Government in such areas as housing, urban development, airports, and defense community facilities. This multiplication of national-local relationships reinforces the debilitation of State governments by weakening the State's control over its own policies and its authority over its own political subdivisions.

If that is true now, I submit, Mr. Chairman, that if we adopt this reorganization plan, if we establish the trappings of yet another vast Federal bureaucracy, that we will have proceeded another very long step indeed along the road to eroding still further the powers and the responsibilities of local government.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Langen].

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, it is not very often that this body has a measure or a problem before it that has generated as much debate and as much noise and at the same time bears as little significance to the people it is supposed to help. We have before us a reorganization plan known as Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962. It is a plan that even its most ardent proponents admit does nothing. This, I think, is evidenced by the testimony that was presented before the committee in so many different instances. It is evidenced by the fact that it provides no new authority, no new moneys, and no new activities.

I suppose we might well use as substantiating evidence the statement that was made by Mr. Bell, the Director of the Budget, when he stated in response to my question relative to the authority—this is found on pages 28 and 29 of the committee hearings, and which reads, as follows:

> Mr. Bell. No, sir; there are no new authorities. I want to be sure there is no misunderstanding, Mr. Langen.
>
> There are no new legal authorities to be granted by this plan.

In further response he made the following statement:

> Mr. Bell. Well, as I have stated, this plan simply transfers authorities that exist now to the new Secretary.

So by virtue of these statements we now realize that we have a plan before us that does nothing more than to elevate the status of an agency and provide new titles to a total of three people, some of whom are already holding positions.

Before going any further, let me state here and now that I recognize the fact that cities and urban areas have difficult problems; problems that should be given attention. My objection today is in the use of the good people of our urban areas as a whip to promote a plan that merely elevates an existing, workable agency to departmental status. There is no guarantee that "status" alone will create miracles for our urban people.

GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS COMMITTEE

It is deplorable that the problems of urban communities should be used as a pawn to create a new department. Calmer considerations should be given in an effort to actually help urban communities without being panicked into adopting a premature, unnecessary reorganization plan.

In the last Congress a bill was reported favorably by the Government Operations Committee to establish a permanent bipartisan Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. That proposal became Public Law 86-380 and established a commission to, among other things, bring together representatives of the Federal, State, and local governments for the consideration of common problems.

Let me make a reference to a few assignments of this Commission. It is to provide a forum for discussion of administration and coordination of Federal grants and other programs requiring intergovernmental operation. It is to encourage discussion at an early stage and in merging problems that are local and require intergovernmental operation. Here is a commission designed to deal directly with the problems that we have been referring to.

Reorganization Plan No. 1 accomplishes nothing in the field of cooperation. In fact, it proposes absolutely nothing that is not already in existence.

There is one item with regard to this that puzzles me a bit.

It is the zeal with which the reorganization plan is being championed. Since these proponents admit there is nothing new, nothing extra, then I suspect there are hidden provisions that we cannot, or are not intended, to see. There must be some other purpose for the creation of another cabinet post.

Perhaps we can get some insight into possible hidden intentions by looking at some of the provisions contained in the original proposal to create an Urban Affairs Department. Under those provisions, no community could escape the solution of its problems.

Reading in part from that original proposal:

> For the purpose of this act, the terms "urban areas" and "urban communities" are intended to include all communities, regardless of size, whether incorporated or unincorporated.

Presumably a couple of houses at a country crossroads would have qualified. I bring this up only to demonstrate what some of the original intentions were, and what they may still be. Proponents of the plan before us today perhaps have settled for the simple elevation of an agency to departmental level on the theory that great things automatically happen when you achieve Cabinet status. But by their own admission, there are no new programs, no new moneys and no new actual authority. So, some of us wonder just what the real purpose is—how many hidden intentions will suddenly come forth to plague State and local governments in the name of urban affairs. This very title puzzles me a bit, too. Urban affairs? Seems as if we are making it the affairs of centralized government.

If the many accomplishments the supporters claim for this legislation are going to become a reality, then obviously it means a further concentration of power in Washington whereby State and local authorities will be circumvented. Suporters claim this would not be so;

that there are no new provisions in the plan. If not, why bother with the plan at all?

To proceed a little further, I think we should at this point recognize that the existing agencies are doing a good job, such as the Housing and Home Finance Administration and all of the others. It is admitted that they are doing a most commendable job, and I am not sure just what changing the status of a department is going to do to help the urban people. You know, in Minnesota, or the farm where I come from, some of them at times in jest refer to us farm people as being "agronomic engineers." Of course, that is a pretty fancy title and maybe gives us status of some kind, but I fail to see where it is going to improve the crops we raise or the work we do.

Now, while we are on the subject of agriculture, I was particularly amused to note the number of people testifying before the committee, and it has been referred to here on the floor today, that because we have a Department of Agriculture it now becomes desirable and beneficial that we should also have a Department of Urban Affairs. This has been referred to by the President and a good many others. So, by virtue of these statements we need to have this department because the rural people have a department, let me call to your attention just a couple of items relating thereto. While we have a large Department of Agriculture, now employing about 90,000 people, spending some $6 billion a year, I submit to you that there are still some problems in the farm area that are presently being considered by this House. But, probably more significant—and I refer to the statistics that were produced by the census in connection with my own State of Minnesota—according to the last census the per capita income of the farm people is $2,294, while at the same time the income of the urban workers is $3,906. Yes, the per capita income of urban people is $1,620 higher.

Now, what puzzles me at this moment is whether or not the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs is intended to bring the urban people down to our class or whether it is intended they are going to leave us even further behind.

Inasmuch as committee hearings brought out emphatically that there were to be no new programs, services or moneys, nor could they prove specifically any clear-cut advantages to urban people that cannot now be accomplished through existing agencies; we must therefore conclude that the approval of this reorganization plan can result only in a new title for three people and an agency without rewarding benefits to the people we are trying to help.

In view of these statistics, I submit to this House that if we respond in favor of this measure, which actually does nothing, has no evidence that it is going to improve the situation in the urban areas, that we are responding to the noise rather than to the statistical facts that accompany it. For these reasons I feel that the Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962 should not go into effect.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BARING].

Mr. BARING. Mr. Chairman, on January 15 of this year I sent a letter to every Member of Congress citing my opposition to the enactment of the proposed new Department for Urban Affairs and Housing and the creation of an additional Cabinet post for this new Department. I stated then, and I state now, that I am convinced that the enactment of this new Department for Urban Affairs, as now set forth by Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962, would result in too great a concentration of power. I am a firm believer in States rights and I fear that this proposed new Department would put an end to home rule and States rights.

Such a department would continue to grow much in the same manner as the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has grown over the past 10 years. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is a prime example, for in 1953 the agencies which became the new HEW employed some 40,000 people, their combined payrolls approximated $170 million and the HEW spent over $1.9 billion. Today, for the fiscal year 1963, the President's budget estimates that HEW, 10 years later, is expected to spend $5.2 billion, that their total payroll costs will be in the area of $473 million, and further that the HEW employee force will have risen to some 79,000 people.

This, Mr. Chairman, is an increase of 100 percent over the number of employees which HEW had 10 years ago, 200 percent more in payroll dollars, and an increase of 250 percent in overall departmental expenditures for HEW.

Now, with regard to the proposed Urban Department, the President's budget indicates that the agencies and programs which would be consolidated into the new Department of Urban Affairs and Housing would have the authority to spend $13.7 billion for the current fiscal year and by the end of this current fiscal year these agencies will have outstanding direct and insured loans totaling $52.9 billion.

Should the proposed new Department of Urban Affairs and Housing be established, and should it expand at the general growth rate of HEW, it would by fiscal year 1973 become a $165 billion department.

The new Department would comprise the existing urban renewal program, the college housing program, public facility loan program, housing for the elderly, open space land program, Federal Flood Indemnity Administration, Federal National Mortgage Association, Federal Housing Administration, Public Housing Administration, and the functional components of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

You could call this new Department, the Department of Back-Door Spending, for every major program and agency proposed to be consolidated into this new Department for Urban Affairs and Housing spends through the back door. Their total spending for the current fiscal year is estimated at $13.7 billion and all but $300 million is spent through the back door. Authority to spend proceeds from the sale of Federal bonds under contract authorizations, and out of revolving funds, all outside of effective appropriation control, are among the more readily recognizable forms of back-door spending.

Since we have had experience with HEW and its growth rate, it will not be difficult to imagine what would happen to back-door spending in the new Department for Urban Affairs over a 10-year period at the same growth rate.

Was this not the method of spending which we rejected on the floor of the House last year when we discussed the foreign aid legislation? Why now should we open a new avenue to another form of back-door spending?

Besides the vast expenditures involved, I have the distinct feeling that many proponents of this centralized control agency would be among the very first to rue its consequences. I would venture to say that a Secretary of Urban Affairs would be in a position to pull strings in all of the cities throughout the United States. The mayors and the city officials would merely become puppets directed by this new Department.

Big government and centralized control is leading this Nation of ours straight into socialism. Over the past 20 years, the Congress has departed from the basic principles set forth by the Constitution, with three separate branches of Government having clearly defined authority. Fear and frustrations have been embedded in the hearts of the people and this Nation for the truth has been withheld. Let us turn toward those basic Jeffersonian Democratic principles upon which this Nation was founded and resist that influence expounded by Khrushchev. Let us preserve States rights and lessen the tendency to turn to the Federal Government for every fringe benefit. Let us not flounder away the powers delegated by the Constitution to the Congress.

I am convinced that the creation of this Department at Cabinet level is not necessary. It is not necessary for the purpose of giving status to the various housing functions of the Federal Government. The proponents of this Department are not really concerned with the Department rank for this housing agency of the Federal Government, but rather they wish to completely dominate the State legislatures, and put the control in the hands of a few city politicians who presently usurp too much power in some of our larger cities.

As you will note in Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962 particular consideration is given to special problems of small towns and communities, and to urban areas and urban communities, and even the smallest hamlet can be considered a town in the language of this legislation, so that no individual in this country would ever be excluded from the purview of this newly created Department. In actuality, this Department would become a department for national affairs with hardly any limitation as to the jurisdictional boundaries and further, through regulation of Federal legislation, which would be initiated in this Department, the Urban Affairs and Housing Agency would become the Federal overlord of every owner of land and home in this country.

In closing I wish to quote from Thomas Jefferson, which I feel is applicable when considering a reorganization plan such as the one before us today:

> I place economy among the first and foremost virtues, and public debt as the greatest of dangers to be feared. To preserve our independence we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt. If we run into such debts, we must be taxed in our meat and drink, in our necessities and in our comforts, in our labor and in our amusements. If we can prevent the Government from wasting the labor of the people, under the pretense of caring for them, they will be happy.

Let us give our children as much, if not more, of what America stands for than that which we received, so that they may have an incentive in life and the will to continue to fight for those principles upon which this Nation was built. Let us turn from vast spending programs and start building a strong basic economy today.

Let us not put the proposed Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962 into effect. A government that is big enough to give you everything you want is a government big enough to take everything you have got.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, it gives me considerable anguish to vote against the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs, even though I know that there is no justification for such a department, because I know that my vote is subject to misunderstanding by many of my friends of the Negro race who cannot divorce their feelings about the Government issue from their deep desire to bring about the promotion of Mr. Weaver.

Many of them interpret any vote against the new Department as a vote against Mr. Weaver, and the President has made it virtually impossible for them to do otherwise.

I am not opposing the new Department because of Mr. Weaver. I believe that we should select the best qualified men and women for public office without regard to race or religion.

The President has an opportunity to demonstrate that he cherishes the same constitutional principle, and that his interest in promoting a Negro to Cabinet rank is not simply a device to use race as a lever in establishing a controversial new agency. He has an opportunity to prove this in the near future.

It is an accepted fact here and in Connecticut that Gov. Abe Ribicoff, the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, will resign shortly to campaign for the Senate.

Perhaps because of the underprivileged status of the Negro through many generations, there is no field of government in which Negro men and women have become more expert than that of social welfare, human relations, and education.

Last night in my hometown a distinguished young man, Whitney M. Young, Jr., executive director of the National Urban League, honored a number of the Canton men and women who have labored to improve community conditions.

Mr. Young, a graduate of Kentucky State College, holds the master's degree in social work of the University of Minnesota. He has served the Urban League, an outstanding agency in the field of social work and community relations, in Minnesota, Nebraska, and Kentucky. He was dean of the Atlanta School of Social Work from 1954 to 1960. He has been a member of the faculties of St. Catherine's College, the University of Nebraska and Creighton University.

Mr. Young is now on the advisory committee of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, a member of the executive committee of the National Social Welfare Assembly, and the advisory board of the New York School of Social Work at Columbia University.

Here is a man whose lifelong devotion to the programs that comprise the chief interests of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare qualify him admirably for recognition as Secretary of that Department.

Need I say that there are others, both Republicans and Democrats, from whom the President could make a distinguished selection.

In closing, I wish to express this public assurance to Robert C. Weaver that my vote today is based upon my sincere conviction that we do not need and should not have a new Department of Urban Affairs, and on no other consideration.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Albert].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, this matter has been brought on today under rather unusual circumstances. I respectfully contend that it has come up under action that, as far as I know, is entirely unprecedented. On Monday last, my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Meader], simply advised the Speaker of the House that he would call the matter up today. Normally matters of this kind are settled upon consultation between the majority and minority members of the committee and the majority and minority leadership of the House. This has been the practice in every single instance that I know anything about since I have been a Member of the House of Representatives.

In this case the Speaker was not asked for his opinion. The Speaker was not asked for his advice. He was simply told after the program had already been made up and announced for this week that the matter would be called up today. Of course, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Meader] was within his rights. The rules provide this method of bringing these resolutions of disapproval to the floor, but I would think the rule was meant to protect against undue delay or arbitrary action on the part of committees or of the leadership. Now, what were the circumstances in this case? The gentleman from Illinois, the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations [Mr. Dawson], expeditiously conducted hearings on this matter and expeditiously filed his report. I think it was well understood that the resolution would be called up at an early date. I think the distinguished minority leader [Mr. Halleck] knew this, and I want to say now that what I am saying has no reference to the minority leadership of the House. We could have brought this matter up last week, but in cooperation with the Republican leadership we gave the Republican Members a recess as we always like to do during the week of Abraham Lincoln's birthday.

Nobody at any time suggested that the matter was being delayed or that we should get together for the purpose of agreeing upon a time or of speeding up the time when this matter should be brought up for consideration. I want to state on behalf of the Speaker and the majority leader, and on behalf of the Committee on Government Operations, that it had been our intention to program this resolution regularly and expeditiously.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is a sound reorganization plan. The Congress has always kept step with the growth of America's population, industry, power, and prestige. In 1849 when Congress saw the need to group agencies concerned with internal affairs, it created the Department of Interior, and transferred to it the General Land Office, the Office of Indian Affairs, the Pension Office, the Patent Board, and a few other boards.

By 1870 the Office of the Attorney General, established in 1789, had become so important that the Congress created the Department of Justice. In 1872 it created the Post Office Department from the Postal Service. Then, as our Nation grew, congressional concern with economic and social problems of national scope increased. In 1889 Congress created the Department of Agriculture. In 1903 it created a Department of Commerce and Labor, and in 1913 split this Department into two departments. In 1947 and 1949 we drastically reorganized the military departments, and established the Department of Defense. In 1953 we allowed and in fact accelerated the effect of the reorganization plan creating the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Beginning in the 1930's, the Congress enacted a series of acts to permit the President to initiate reorganizations in the executive branch, subject to a congressional veto.

Since 1949 we have allowed 47 reorganization plans to go into effect. In many respects, Mr. Chairman, we have a situation here quite similar to that of 1953 when President Eisenhower sent up a reorganization plan to create the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. That plan created no new functions but merely raised the Federal Security Agency to Cabinet status. In connection with that the President said:

> But good intent and high purpose are not enough; all such programs depend for their

> success upon efficient, responsible administration. Now the establishment of the new Department provided for in Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953 will give the needed additional assure that these matters will receive the full consideration they deserve in the whole operation of the Government.

Mr. Chairman, I should hate to see the vote on President Kennedy's plan confirm what some people say about my Republican colleagues; that is, that they have not voted in accordance with what they know is best for the country but rather have voted to secure some momentary political gain.

In 1949 President Truman sent up a plan to create a Department of Public Welfare, which was defeated in another body. In 1950 President Truman sent up a second plan to create a Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and this time the Republican vote in the House was 143 to 1 against. But in 1953 when the Republican President sent up a plan almost identical to the Truman plan the Republicans not only supported it but even pushed through a resolution to accelerate its effective date by a Republican House vote of 195 to 13; and on the same resolution the Democratic Members of the House supported the reorganization plan by an affirmative vote of 96 to 73.

Of course, it is well known that the White House announced on the day it sent its plan to Congress that Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby would be the Secretary of the new Department, and this fact was referred to frequently.

As I have already noted, the reasoning of President Eisenhower is precisely applicable, it seems to me, to the plan we are now considering. The plans are clearly parallel in nature and in objective.

On July 2, 1957, Mr. Nelson A. Rockefeller as Chairman of the President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization stated:

> It is our conclusion that a Department of Urban Affairs is already needed and that the need will rapidly become more urgent.

And he also stated that the growth of the housing and urban renewal programs logically require that the Housing and Home Finance Agency be superseded by such an executive department.

On May 6, 1960, Mr. Norman P. Mason, President Eisenhower's HHFA Administrator, with the approval of President Eisenhower's Budget Bureau, reported to Congress:

> Judged against this entire background, and taking into consideration the necessary complexity of this agency's functions and their importance and magnitude as they affect the well-being of a majority of our citizens, I believe the time is near when the principal responsibilities of the Federal Government in the field of housing and community development ought to be organized into a new executive department.

Mr. Mason then proposed that the Department be established by a reorganization plan rather than by the particular bill which was then pending before the Congress.

Witnesses who strongly supported the plan before the Government Operations Committee included Mr. Bruce Savage, Republican Public Housing Commissioner under President Eisenhower, and the Honorable Gordon S. Clinton, Republican mayor of Seattle, Wash., and president of the American Municipal Association.

Mr. Chairman, I have reserved judgment on whether there will be a flip-flop on the part of our friends on the other side with respect to this bill.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, in a radio broadcast which took place last Sunday, a high-ranking Republican was asked a question as follows:

> The image of the Republican party across the country is pretty sorry right now. It is that of an obstructionist rather than of a leader, I would think.

In reply, the high-ranking Republican said this in part:

> I agree with you that we have too often, at least, through some of our leaders, appeared to be obstructionists. And in the cities particularly we have failed to carry the message. But we have a heart for the people. I think the heart is there. I know how I feel about it, but we have got to do better.

Mr. Chairman, I ask the majority leader does he think that the people in cities of all sizes are going to remember what is taking place here today and recognize the politics of the other party for what it is?

Mr. ALBERT. I think that is a sound observation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL].

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I like most Members here today, I think, have been impressed with the arguments during this debate and I am especially impressed with the fact all are concerned about this problem. I was grateful, too, that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] gave us the benefit of his study and that we have his statement and his thinking in the RECORD on which to base our judgment on this important matter.

Mr. Chairman, because I am interested in this problem in this general area, I have read extensively and studied the subject and the problems involved and have discussed this with people who I believe are real students in this area of Government responsibility, including two very distinguished and very able professors at the great University of Iowa, Dr. Russell Ross and Dr. Deil Wright.

First, Mr. Chairman, I should like to suggest that Reorganization Plan No. 1, the administration proposal to establish a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, seeks to deal in the wrong way with a very real and genuine problem. I certainly feel no prejudice against urban areas because I know firsthand from study and experience the existence and reality of the problems that the proposed plan seeks to resolve. As a member of a cities and towns committee of the Iowa Legislature, I first became familiar with these problems and developed a sympathy for them and, I believe, an understanding of them. I feel strongly that they need resolving through complete and intelligent application of policy and principle that would come from such a study as I have suggested.

My desire to work for a solution of these problems is strong and genuine, and, because it is, I must oppose this reorganization plan and the creation of a new department along the proposed lines which would merely, I think, give the illusion of coping with the problems rather than providing the substance of real solution.

The arguments against the establishment of a new department are many and, to me, they are very convincing. Let us look at some of them.

In the first place, it would create some new political difficulties and, I believe, intensify older ones. I refer to the relationship between the cities and the States. The sudden and tremendous growth of metropolitan areas in the past few years has left this relationship uncertain and, I believe, hazy. It is frequently asserted that the States have not done enough for the cities. In many cases this is undoubtedly true, and the charge is justified. But the fact remains that the cities are the creatures of the States and it is of vital importance that the government powers be so distributed that this fundamental relationship and balance is not upset.

As metropolitan areas have mushroomed, the tensions, the strains, and the misunderstandings between themselves and their States have proportionately grown. The great need is to close this breach rather than enlarge it.

One of the principal sources of this friction has been the role of the Federal Government and its increasingly direct intervention and assistance in coping with urban problems. The creation of a Department-level Federal agency designed to aid the cities would surely greatly intensify this problem.

It is almost inevitable that cities would come to look more and more to Washington for a solution to their problems. They would certainly come to depend more and more on Federal money as the easy answer to the great demands being made upon them for services.

With Federal aid and Federal intervention on such a massive scale, it is reasonable to assume a consequent increase in Federal control over local plans and activities. Almost nobody wants this; almost everybody concedes that such developments would be unfortunate. Yet it is difficult to see how it could be avoided, no matter how well intentioned both the Federal and local officials might be, if a full-scale Department of the National Government devotes all of its time and energy and money to the plight of the cities. If Washington foots the bill, it is a virtual certainty that Washington will also have a very loud voice in directing the action.

We cannot foresee all of the effects that this course of action might have on the relationship between the States and their urban areas. We cannot foresee, either, what the ultimate effect might be on local government. But certainly what might happen is not pleasant to contemplate for those of us—and I think

I can include virtually all of the American people—who believe that strong and vigorous State and local government are indispensable ingredients of American democracy.

Increasingly, the American people are turning, or are being turned, to Washington as the fountainhead of all that is good and desirable. This is a dangerous trend and frequently an unnecessary course of action that seems to be the easy way out. The creation of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing would be one more gigantic push in this same direction.

Another argument against the creation of this contemplated new Department is that there is no reason to think that such action would be administratively sound. In fact, there are good grounds for maintaining that from the standpoint of administration, it would be a backward step.

As Robert H. Connery and Richard H. Leach have written in their book, "The Federal Government and Metropolitan Areas":

> Not only are there strong political arguments against the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs, but there is a strong case against it on grounds of administrative soundness. Creation of a department has come to be regarded as a panacea for all administrative ills. * * * Establishment of a department, indeed, may only delay the cure or force it to take place in different surroundings. Back of the proposal is the idea that a simple organizational change will provide the answer for urban and metropolitan problems. This is a false belief. The mere creation of a new administrative unit is not the answer to a problem as complex as that presented by the phenomenon of metropolitanization.

Even more unfortunate than its potential administrative failure is the very real possibility that the creation of a new Department might actually make the metropolitan dilemma worse than it already is. A new organization chart by itself has never solved anything; but it has often created the comfortable delusion that mere manipulation and reshuffling are the answer.

Organizational changes can keep people busy while at the same time diverting their minds and energies from the real substance of the problem. This could be a very real difficulty with the new Department as the administration has proposed it because there is as yet no really clear-cut idea of what the role of the Federal Government ought to be in metropolitan affairs.

This is an extremely important matter, a very basic and unresolved issue that should be settled, or at least clarified, before the new Department is established. Let me quote again from Connery and Leach:

> Creation of a department (of urban affairs) would beg the most important question of all, What is the Federal Government's proper role in urban areas? The answer is not merely to assign urban affairs to a single organizational unit. It is a matter of principle and philosophy, not of method. To create a method without first having established a philosophy to base it on is to put the proverbial cart before the horse. Coming as it does at this time, when the basic issues of intergovernmental relations in metropolitan areas are still unresolved, such a proposal is clearly premature.

It may be that the problems of metropolitan areas and housing have, in their present proportions, come upon us so fast that we have been too busy struggling with them really to sit back and think them through. It is my belief that the formulation of a sound philosophy, a long-range policy, has been too long delayed and should certainly be our next stop.

To work toward these philosophical and policy objectives I would vigorously support the creation of a new, small organization which might be called the Council of Urban Advisers. Such a Council should be a staff agency set up on a continuing basis and composed of full-time experts. The agenda and the services that this Council might concern itself with are both numerous and important. It could conduct research, seek a coordination and integration of related activities, and make recommendations. Perhaps most important of all, it could think about and work toward the formulation of a basic policy which we do not now have.

I am so firmly convinced that the creation of a Council along these lines is the next proper and logical step that I am now working on legislation to implement the idea.

The Housing and Home Finance Agency which this reorganization plan would elevate to departmental status has been a useful agency of the Federal Government. It has served the American people well.

It should be permitted to continue to serve them in the future as it has in the past until the complex questions with which the new Department supposedly would deal are more thoroughly understood and thought out. A change in name, a change in status will not solve these problems and may very well only obscure them.

I shall vote against Reorganization Plan No. 1, not because I am unfriendly to urban areas and housing problems but because I am sensitive to them and in sympathy with them. We cannot find the right answers with the wrong methods, and the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing at this time would be a serious mistake.

To establish the fact that I have referred to some real students who are recognized authorities on the subject I should like to point out that Profs. Robert H. Connery and Richard H. Leach are distinguished scholars of the subject area of Federal Government and metropolitan areas and their problems.

Robert H. Connery holds degrees from the University of Minnesota and Columbia University, receiving his Ph. D. from the latter. He has taught at Columbia, Catholic University, Stanford, and the University of Illinois and Duke University.

Over the past 25 years he has served as consultant to numerous Federal, State, and local governments and officials including, among others, the National Resources Planning Board, the President's Committee on Administrative Management, the New York State Legislative Committee on Interstate Cooperation, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of Defense, the Hoover Commission, and the City Administrator of New York. He has been a Fellow as well as a senior staff member of the Brookings Institution.

During the Second World War he served for 5 years in the Navy as a commissioned officer. In that capacity he was assigned to Secretary Forrestal's office to write an administrative history which later was published as "The Navy and the Industrial Mobilization in World War II—1950." He is also author of "Governmental Problems in Wild Life Conservation—1936," "Administration of an NRA Code—1939," and other Government reports and articles.

Richard H. Leach is joint author of "The Administration of Interstate Compacts—1959," of "In Quest of Freedom: American Political Thought and Practice—1959," and of numerous articles. He was graduated from Colorado College in 1944 and received a Ph. D. from Princeton in 1951. He taught at Georgia Institute of Technology before joining the Duke faculty. He has had considerable practical experience in government as a member of the staff of the Southern Regional Education Board from 1953 to 1956, and of the Army Security Agency.

Both men are now members of the Department of Political Science at Duke University, Durham, N.C.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY].

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, this matter should certainly be considered solely on the merits, and should have been considered on the merits alone right from the beginning. In my judgment it is too bad that it has become a political roller coaster to the extent it has, and that extraneous considerations have been interjected in.

I favor the reorganization plan and I am going to vote for it, in other words against the resolution. You cannot have a scotch-tape approach, in terms of the Federal Establishment, to the exploding problems of the exploding metropolises of this country. From my examination of this problem, both as a legislator and as a member of the executive branch of the Government I have been of the opinion for a long, long time—I have written some articles on the subject—that we need a reorganization in the Federal Establishment in this field. When you have separate agencies and separate subagencies and bureaus all dealing with the subject of urban masses without the type of line organization that is necessary, you do not have a sound administrative structure.

When President Eisenhower created the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare he was not invading the responsibility of any State of this country. What he was doing, in fact, was to clarify areas of responsibility between the Federal Government, States, and localities.

Three years ago I introduced a bill on this subject which I think provided a better approach than the reorganization plan before us today. The administration sent up a bill to Congress 2 years later. I think my bill is a better bill than the administration bill. In any event we should have before us today at least one of those bills under a proper rule so that amendments could be offered. Then if such a bill is not sufficiently embracing—and I do not think the reorganization plan does enough—or if relationships between Federal and State Governments are not properly spelled out, additions and changes could be made. If the House wants to work its will, a bill under any open rule is the proper way in which to do it.

I think it is appropriate for me to point out that when the Rules Committee was expanded early in this Congress all of us thought we were giving the majority the necessary tools with which to put their legislative house in order. It is high time they did put it in order. Right now we are faced with a situation whereby we have in effect a closed rule.

Reasonable men can agree or disagree on this subject. For example, some who favor the subject of a Department of Urban Affairs argue that this particular reorganization plan does not do enough, does not cover the subject of the relationship between the Federal establishment and the States, or does not provide for mandatory coordination between the Federal and State Governments. Therefore we should have a bill which we should be free to amend. I intend to vote for the reorganization plan because I am strongly convinced we should have a reorganization, that we do need a Cabinet-level officer in charge of a Department on Urban Affairs. At the same time it is regrettable, in my opinion, that our friends on the majority side of the aisle cannot put their legislative affairs in order enough to give us a proper rule and to give us a bill on the floor we can work on, submit amendments to, and argue about.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH].

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote in favor of the negative resolution—House Resolution 530—because I am opposed to Reorganization Plan No. 1 for the following reasons:

The United States has become strong because of the independence of its people, and the strength of the United States lies in the ability of its people to govern themselves on the local level without domination and control from a Central Government.

The establishment of an Urban Affairs Department with a Secretary at Cabinet level would weaken and dissipate this strength. As a matter of fact, it was Thomas Jefferson, the founder of the Democratic Party, who was the strongest advocate for local government as opposed to Central Government.

I do not recognize this action today as a racial question. I am not voting against this because it might deny Mr. Weaver a position in the Cabinet. I would be opposed to it if President Kennedy proposed to appoint ex-President Eisenhower to this post.

I recognize Mr. Weaver as a competent Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. I would not oppose his appointment to the President's Cabinet.

I am opposed to the establishment of the Department—not the man who is proposed to be appointed to the post.

If President Kennedy wants to appoint Mr. Weaver to a Cabinet post, let him appoint him Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, which will soon be vacated because of the resignation of Secretary Ribicoff, who has announced that he will resign to run for Senator in Connecticut.

I think we should do all we can here in Congress to make local government strong and to depend upon themselves—not to become weak and to depend upon the Federal Government for the things they should and can do for themselves.

This is making big government bigger, and I am certain that many of the advocates and supporters of an Urban Affairs Department will live to regret their support of it.

There is a real fear that establishing a permanent Department of Urban Affairs and Housing may siphon away from States and municipalities some of the governmental authority that they now enjoy in meeting and deciding, on the basis of the wishes of the residents of the community through their elected representatives, the nature of the communities and the environments in which they live.

Bureaucracies once established, however, have a way of growing not only in size but in power. That is especially true with bureaucracies which handle vast sums of public funds. It may well be that the new Secretary of Urban Affairs may never be granted any constitutional power by the Congress to direct the affairs of a municipality. But it would be naive for anyone to suppose that conditions and criteria would not be established in the dispensation of loans and grants for municipal purposes which might induce hungry local officials, outbid in the taxation of the people by the huge take of the Federal Government, to surrender some of their autonomy and self-determination in exchange for Uncle Sam's largesse.

The following letter to Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, chairman of the Senate Government Operations Committee, from the League of California Cities against the establishment of a new Department of Urban Affairs and Housing:

LEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA CITIES,
Berkeley, Calif., July 26, 1961.

Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Government Operations Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: The board of directors of the League of California Cities meeting in Los Angeles, July 19–21, unanimously voted to oppose the above-numbered measures which would establish a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. This was the third time the league board considered the subject matter but the first time the bills establishing such a department were reviewed. The bills depart in some respects from proposals which have been suggested in the past in that they seem merely to upgrade the Housing and Home Finance Agency and related agencies to departmental status while purporting to make possible the coordination of Federal activities affecting urban affairs by statements of national purpose and policy designed to influence all Federal agencies. The League of California Cities is opposed to the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs and it is opposed to S. 1633 and H.R. 6433.

The league board of directors is fully aware of the various activities of the Federal Government and its many agencies which affect cities and urban areas. The league has supported Federal legislation where there is a clearly demonstrated national interest. We fully agree with the need for coordination of such activities and the need for consistent and uniform policies in connection with Federal-local relations. The Federal Government, for example, makes money available for comprehensive planning, urban renewal and redevelopment and a workable program which includes development and enforcement of adequate housing, building and subdivision codes. Federal agencies notoriously and rather consistently then proceed to take the position that they are not bound by nor need they pay any attention to local comprehensive plans and regulations. For these and many other reasons which could be cited we agree wholeheartedly with those who feel that such coordination and uniform policies are absolutely essential to the orderly growth of our urban areas and the general welfare and security of the Nation. We do not believe, however, that either a Department of Urban Affairs or a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing is the best method of achieving such coordination and development of consistent national and local policies.

The board of directors of the League of California Cities urges the creation by the President of the United States by Executive order of the position of special assistant to the President for urban affairs. Where an administrative controversy exists between departments of the Federal Government or there are inconsistent policies developed by Federal agencies in their relationships with local governments, the ultimate decision must be made by the Chief Executive or someone who can speak for the Chief Executive. It is for this reason that we urge creation of the position of special assistant to the President for urban affairs and assume that such an office would be adequately staffed to undertake the functions assigned to it.

The League of California Cities is against creation of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing for several reasons. In the first place we believe that the new Secretary of Urban Affairs and Housing, even though he has Cabinet status, would be unable to coordinate Federal activities located in other Federal departments. Not only would he have junior status among other Cabinet officers, but the record is not encouraging as to the ability of one Cabinet officer to coordinate the activities of his department and the activities within departments of other Cabinet officers. The most recent Executive order with respect to civil defense is a clear indication to us of reliance placed on senior rather than junior Cabinet departments or other Federal agencies having a lesser status. The same order also demonstrates the difficulty of properly placing a coordinating function outside the office of the President. On the surface it appears that lines of Federal-local civil defense relations will be more tangled than ever.

No one has suggested nor are they likely to suggest consolidation in one department of all Federal programs dealing in any way with urban affairs. Obviously this would retard rather than facilitate the administration of many important Federal-local activities and relations and would involve the creation of an unmanageable, bureaucratic giant which would rightly be looked upon by local governments as a real threat to the most basic of our democratic institutions (cities) which existed long before either the Federal or State Governments.

It is alleged that a President, not particularly sympathetic to the Office of Special Assistant to the President for Urban Affairs, could refuse to continue such an Office whereas a department once created by the Congress would continue until abolished by similar action. This contention overlooks the total urban problem and population and actually, the Secretary of a department as an appointee of the President would reflect Presidential policies or be replaced. Nor do we believe that creation of a Special Assistant to the President for Urban Affairs would be looked upon by Cabinet Secretaries as the creation of a super-Secretary. Inasmuch as the President or a spokesman for him must decide executive controversy, it is our belief that a fully informed and adequately staffed Special Assistant would do a better job of coordinating Federal activities affecting urban affairs than a department. He would do so with far less suspicion on the part of local government officials, fearful of the creation in this country of a controlling central agency or ministry of municipal affairs commonly found in other free countries of the world than would a department He would not be confronted with the problem of being last man on the Cabinet totem pole.

We are not opposed to upgrading HHFA to Cabinet status. Neither do we support such a measure. Undoubtedly, equally convincing arguments can be made for upgrading other Federal agencies to Cabinet status. We simply do not believe that the need for coordinating Federal activities relating to urban and municipal affairs should be used as a screen for upgrading any Federal department.

The scope of the national purpose, national policy, and findings made by the Congress in both bills can only lead to the conclusion that local governments are unable to solve any municipal problems without Federal encouragement, intervention, or assistance. Rather than repeat the statements, we simply refer you to section 2(a) of S. 1633 and H.R. 6433. We can conceive of nothing done by local agencies which cannot be construed as coming within these broad statements.

We believe that there is a need for many partnership relations between Federal and local governments, but we also believe that these relationships can be developed in the future as they have been in the past on the basis of demonstrated need and national interest and that coordination of these activities can best be achieved through the office of the President.

Sincerely,

RICHARD CARPENTER,
Executive Director and General Counsel.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER].

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, I have been asked the question if it is not a little embarrassing to come up here and tend to murder my legislative child. Well, I appreciate the recognition that I was one of the first to introduce legislation in this field, but I hasten to say this reorganization plan has little in common with what I had in mind as a department that would function in our urban territory. This reorganization plan, and it is agreed by all the testimony, includes only the Housing and Home Finance Agency, which is all in one agency.

I do not agree with the implied criticism that has been made by Mr. Dillon and those who testified on this bill that the present Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency is not doing a good job, that he could do a good job if they only gave him a different title. I think that is an implication that is not borne out by the facts. I have heard no criticism of the administration by the present Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. I do not believe he should be criticized for the increase in the foreclosures by FHA. That is due to economic conditions which do not seem to be improving very much. I read in the paper last night that unemployment in the District increased 4,700 last month. The article does not say whether the 4,700 are displaced Republicans or eager Democrats who are awaiting to be absorbed. If they are in the latter class I am sure they will be absorbed shortly because so far employment in the Government has increased 175,000 during the past year.

No, that is not a legitimate criticism, and I think that Mr. Ted Lewis, in his column in the New York Daily News yesterday probably hit the nail on the head, and I would like to quote what he said:

> The honest statement by Speaker JOHN MCCORMACK that he lacks the House votes to save President Kennedy's proposal for an Urban Affairs Department would appear to be a crushing blow to the administration. But it is neither a jolt nor a surprise.
>
> Kennedy on this and certain other key issues, is seeking to establish a legislative record this year not on what he gets from Congress but on what he asks Congress for.

And then later on he said:

> Yet there is little argument that the President was from the start more interested in the political value he could squeeze out of the urban affairs issue than in its actual passage.

And then again:

> When Harry Truman sent to Congress his proposal for a Health, Education, and Welfare Department, he tied in with it an announcement that Oscar Ewing, a controversial party politician, was his choice to head the new agency. Congress thereupon turned down the Department. It came into being only under Dwight Eisenhower.

As I said before the committee, I voted for that HEW reorganization plan. I was new in the Congress and I did not know the implications. But, I have found out that that was not the way to create a department. Education is still scattered over many agencies of the Government. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare the other day on the radio was asked the question:

> Well, how about the investigation of Mr. POWELL into the $2 billion that is being spent for education?

And the Secretary said:

> Well, it is not all in our Department. There is too much scattered all over the Government.

And, it is true. Had that been established by legislative process, it would not be that way.

Now, I agree with our fine chairman of the Committee on Government Operations. He was kind enough to give me credit at one time for being the father of this legislation, but told me my name would not be connected with the bill. And, that is very fine. But, I feel on this bill just like you did, on the health, education, and welfare bill. I am going to vote against this plan as he did on the health, education, and welfare plan and I am sorry I did not vote as he did then.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DEVINE].

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Chairman, as one who comes from an area that I think could well be classified as urban, representing the capital city of Ohio, Columbus, with a population of nearly half a million people, I conducted a poll—of course, it did not hit everybody in my district, but I think it is representative, because it went into reasonably large numbers—which showed that 9 out of 10 answering this question of the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs indicated their opposition to it. I do not know whether it is because of this particular Department or whether it is what the Department of Agriculture has done to the rural population of our Nation; I do not know. The gentleman from Florida indicated that the population shift has moved from 70 percent in the rural areas to 70 percent in the cities. Each Member will have to answer for himself whether or not this movement might have been due to the policies of the Department of Agriculture that brought about the shift to the cities. Now, do we want to create a Department for the cities that will drive the city folks back into the country? I think the American people are fed up with more control in Washington, creating a vast, sprawling bureaucracy that this would create. I think the proper vote would be a vote of aye indicating your disapproval of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER].

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the resolution and in opposition to the proposed reorganization plan which would create a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

Mr. Chairman, the case has been sufficiently made, as far as I am concerned, and there is absolutely no need for this proposed reorganization and the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. I think we very definitely need an abatement and not an extension of the affairs of the Federal Government into the affairs of the States and our citizens back home.

Mr. Chairman, as far as I am concerned the Government should leave this to the imagination, initiative, and ability of the taxpayers back home who make the money to run this Government. They have the ability whether we agree or not. We need to defeat this proposed reorganization plan. I am going to vote against it and urge you to do the same.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON].

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I strongly favor the establishment of the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

Mr. Chairman, there is a marvelous supply of nonsense in this world. I want to take about 3 minutes to describe to this House one of the more arrant pieces of nonsense that is being peddled by the opponents of the President's proposal to establish a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

This particular piece of nonsense concerns the omission in the President's plan of any reference to the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and the housing programs of the Veterans' Administration. Some of those who are inveighing against the President's proposal use this as one of their grounds of objection.

Mind you, they are against setting up such a Department at all. Just why they should want these important and popular programs included in a proposal which they are against in its entirety, they do not say. Perhaps they feel that if the Board and the VA programs were included they could be against the plan more, longer, and louder. But let us not make them squirm by inquiring why they raise the question; let us answer it instead. And it is really very easy and very simple.

Let us take the VA first. I think that a great many people—probably including a large number of veterans themselves—would agree that it may well have been a mistake for Congress to establish this program in the VA instead of the Housing Agency. It would have saved everybody a lot of time and trouble to do it the other way.

But that is beside the point. The Congress did establish the program in the Veterans' Administration, and there it has been all these years. The problems created by having an insurance program in the FHA and a so-called guarantee program in the VA have long since been worked out. The program is operating smoothly. The VA field offices understand it. The veterans understand it. The homebuilders understand it.

Bear in mind that, by its very nature, the VA housing program is a temporary affair—whether it runs for another 5 years, as the law now provides or for another 15. In due course, it will be over and will be liquidated. After a dozen years in its present organizational location, what earthly good does anyone think it would do now to uproot it and transfer it to another agency?

The plain fact is that it would cost an immense amount of money to make such a transfer, to accomplish practically nothing. Hundreds of people would have to move. Dozens of field establishments would be disrupted. God knows how many thousands of file cabinets of records would have to be loaded on trucks and dragged off to some other location. Whole accounting systems would have to be torn apart and put back together again. Individual veterans and builders would find themselves delayed for months trying to find out where their applications had gone, and what office, if any was now working on them. And for what?

I would agree, and I suspect that the President might well agree, that if we were starting the veterans' housing program today, from scratch, it should be assigned to the Housing and Home Finance Agency, or to the new Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. But that is not the situation. The mistake, if it was one, was made many years ago. Let us not talk seriously about compounding it now.

Now, what about the Federal Home Loan Bank Board? Why should it not be included in the new Department?

Well, let me say as one Member of this House that I think it probably should. And why then is it not? Because the Congress—this House—decreed otherwise. The Board and all its operations used to be a part of this very Agency that the President now proposes to reorganize as a Cabinet department. The Congress, by legislation, took it out of that Agency. The President did not recommend that. The Congress did it on its own initiative. Have we changed our minds? I know of no evidence that we have, and evidently the President knows of none.

So let us not play games about this. Let the reorganization plan go into effect. Then, if any of the carping critics be—I will not say sincere but rather serious about this—let him introduce a bill to transfer the Board to the new Department. Then we shall see where the votes are. In any case the executive branch contemplates no such proposal.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the House will not be diverted from the serious business of this reorganization plan by monkeyshines of this sort. The President of the United States has submitted, in accordance with law, an important change he wishes to make, which he believes will help him in his task as Chief Executive. The Congress should not deny him what he thinks he needs for light or frivolous reasons. In my judgment, there is every reason for the Congress to permit Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962 to go into effect.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TOLL].

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Chairman, I favor the President's reorganization plan.

Mr. Chairman, last June it was my pleasure to appear before the Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, when the subcommittee was holding hearings on proposals to establish a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. I believed then, and I believe now, that the most efficient way to handle the problems confronting our large urban centers is through the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. For that reason I support the President's reorganization plan.

The creation of a Department of Urban Affairs is further justified when one looks at the reasons for the creation of some of the existing departments. The Department of Labor, first organized as a Bureau under the Interior Department in 1884, was created March 4, 1913. It was pointed out at that time that the "purpose of the Department of Labor shall be to foster, promote, and develop the welfare of the wage earners of the United States, to improve their working conditions, and to advance their opportunities for profitable employment." Today there is another interest which must be protected—the interest of the urban dweller. Never before have the inhabitants of our cities been plagued with so many problems; never before have the solutions proved so difficult. A Department of Urban Affairs would be the boon to the urban dweller that the Department of Labor was to the wage earner.

The Department of Agriculture was created in 1862 and raised to Cabinet status in 1889. At the time of the creation of the Department, Congress stated that the general purpose of the Department would be to acquire and diffuse among the people of the United States useful information on subjects concerned with agriculture. In a like manner the new Department of Urban Affairs will disseminate information to local units of Government in order to provide assistance in the solution of their difficulties. Another reason for the creation of the Department of Agriculture was to procure, propagate, and distribute among the people new and valuable seeds and plants. Surely the Department of Urban Affairs will perform services for the urban dweller which are as important to him as the distribution of seeds was to the farmer.

The newest Cabinet-level Department, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, will provide us with another example. When the reorganization plan was submitted to Congress on March 12, 1953, it was stated that:

> The purpose of the plan is to improve the administration of the vital health, education, and security functions now being carried on in the Federal Security Agency by giving them departmental rank. Such action is demanded by the importance and magnitude of these functions, which affect the well-being of millions of our citizens.

Functions of similar scope and magnitude in regard to our great cities are being carried on by numerous Federal agencies today. Just as it was vital in 1953 to elevate functions of health, education, and security to departmental status, so it is necessary today to elevate the functions of these other agencies to the Cabinet level in order that they be most efficiently administered.

As a final example, let us look at the Department of Commerce. In the middle of the 19th century there was much agitation for the establishment of a Department of Commerce in order that the rapidly increasing volume of capital invested in commerce and manufacture could be the subject of Government supervision. In 1900 it was noted that the same arguments advanced for the Department of Agriculture were applicable to one for the commercial and industrial life of the country; that the manufacturing interests in the United States exceeded in volume and in importance the industrial interests of any nation in the world, and yet there was no Government office specially charged with any duties relating directly to them, and in this respect the United States was almost alone among the nations of the world. Just as the Department of Commerce was created to aid and supervise the commercial interests of the Nation, so must a Department of Urban Affairs be organized in order that the resources of our cities be fully developed. A new department would enable the urban centers to provide the best lives for their inhabitants and contribute to the general welfare of the entire Nation.

One of the most vital problems that plagues our metropolitan areas is that of human relations. Never before have so many different races, religions, and nationalities been brought so close together. Unfortunately, this close proximity of so many divergent groups breeds friction and the cities are saddled with another problem. The proposed Department of Urban Affairs is in a position to help in this area. This plan calling for the establishment of the Department paves the way for a bill which will call for the establishment of a Federal Bureau of Intergroup Relations. This would be a great stride in fostering better relations among the many diversified peoples who make up our Nation. This is a problem which cannot be ignored; it must be attacked and the proposed Department can provide the means to help stamp out this problem.

The problems of the urban areas can be solved. The cities themselves have taken great strides in this path toward progress. But, there is a limit to the abilities and to the financial resources of the metropolitan areas. The solution lies not in the hands of the cities, not in the hands of uncoordinated Federal agencies, but rather in a Department of Urban Affairs.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, the crisis facing our cities demands the most efficient use of our national resources. Deterioration of irreplaceable urban values and destructive urban sprawl will destroy the valuable economic assets in our cities unless we take action now. The degree of blight, the lack of efficient planning and administration of renewal work, and multiplicity of urgent problems facing our cities necessitates a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing which can facilitate the organization of research, planning, and programs in the critical area of housing and urban affairs.

The tremendous urban expansion, particularly in the suburban regions of our metropolitan areas has put unprecedented financial pressures on our cities. Explosive growth in my own city of Philadelphia will by 1980 put twice as many cars on our already congested roads as there are today. Somehow, an efficient mass transit system will have to be achieved to prevent the ensuing traffic jam from stifling the central business district which is an integral part of the economy of the Greater Philadelphia metropolitan area. Another $3 billion or so will be needed to provide the next generation with other municipal facilities like the ones we now have. Nationally the bill for these vital municipal services has been estimated as high as $80 billion, exclusive of highways. These are matters of national concern and require a specific Department of Urban Affairs.

Such a Department of Urban Affairs is equally imperative for smaller suburban communities. Many burgeoning suburban areas, which in Philadelphia amount to over a million and a half in Pennsylvania and another 725,000 across the Delaware River in New Jersey, are in an even worse predicament than the older core cities. Orderly transferral of some 600 square miles from farm uses to residential and industrial sites in the Philadelphia area will require overall planning for which there are no adequate facilities at present. In addition, hospitals, schools, sewage systems, and similar facilities will be needed to serve a new urban population which is expected to equal that of Philadelphia today. The expense of these facilities will press even harder on the slender tax base of the governmental units in these urban fringe areas than it would on the tax base of the bigger central cities.

One of the basic justifications for a unified Federal Department of Housing and Urban Affairs such as is proposed by the Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962 is the inability of local governments to finance the necessary urban redevelopment and provide the municipal facilities and services which are an essential part of urban life. Most cities are already allocating the maximum funds possible to renewal work, but what is currently being spent is not nearly enough to prevent the further spread of blight in urban areas. Nor can the States be counted upon to furnish all the financial resources that will be required to meet these growing demands. Only about four States now give any aid for urban renewal. Historically, the rural-dominated State legislatures have been notably unreceptive to urban problems. Moreover, the State's resources are limited and must be allocated among many pressing needs. The resultant dilemma of expanding needs and only limited financial resources makes this one of the major problems now facing us.

There has been a distressing lack of unified research, planning, and administration of urban-oriented programs on the Federal level. Urban renewal in Philadelphia and in many other cities has been slowed down by the fragmentation of Federal activity in this field. One of the biggest problems local redevelopment officials have to face is the confused Federal procedures and requirements, the papershifting from one Federal agency to another, and the general redtape in Washington. Outright conflicts can and have occurred between agencies administering the same program or between projects of different agencies. A Department of Urban Affairs and Housing which can better coordinate these programs can eliminate this needless waste of time and resources.

We can no longer afford to ignore these and other critical urban problems. This is a national problem which must be faced squarely and soon. I therefore urge that the House promptly approve Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962 to establish a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLYNT].

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, I support the resolution. I oppose the reorganization plan. It is particularly unfortunate that for reasons beyond the control of the legislative branch of the Government that an extraneous issue, wholly unrelated to the merits of the reorganization plan, has been injected into the question before us today.

Like most Members of this body, the gentleman from Georgia has carefully studied H.R. 8429, the purpose of which was the same as the plan of reorganization. This careful study has indicated to me that not a single function of Government now being carried on by the Housing and Home Finance Agency and by the other agencies of Government whose functions would be incorporated into the proposed Department of Urban Affairs and Housing is not as efficiently and appropriately carried out under existing law, as would be the case if the plan should be approved.

I have neither heard nor read of any argument in favor of the plan of reorganization which has attempted to deny the accuracy and correctness of the foregoing statement.

When H.R. 8429 was reported out of the Committee on Government Operations it was in the regular legislative form by which this issue could have been brought up on the floor of the House. The Committee on Rules rejected H.R. 8429 and the House of Representatives will probably confirm the judgment of the Committee on Rules today.

On this particular plan of reorganization upon which the House of Representatives is to vote today, there is every indication that the vote will not be anywhere near close. There will probably be more than 100 votes difference. Even though there will be many votes against the resolution to reject, there will not be a great amount of enthusiasm for the plan of reorganization.

As stated by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, sections 1 and 2 of the plan establish a new department, in the executive branch, the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, to be headed by a Secretary appointed by the President with Senate confirmation, and provide for an Under Secretary, three Assistant Secretaries, a General Counsel and an Administrative Assistant Secretary to perform duties prescribed by the Secretary.

Section 3 of the plan transfers to the Secretary the functions of the Housing and Home Finance Administrator and of the Public Housing Administration and its officers. It also transfers to the Department, as entities, the Federal Housing Administration, including the Office of the Federal Housing Commissioner as the head thereof, and the Federal National Mortgage Association. The functions of the Federal Housing Administration are transferred to the Secretary and are to be carried out under his direction by the Federal Housing Commissioner. The Secretary would serve as Chairman of the Board of the Federal National Mortgage Association as the Housing and Home Finance Administrator now does. Statutory powers with respect to the programs of the Community Facilities Administration and the Urban Renewal Administration are now vested in the Housing and Home Finance Administrator and the Administrator's functions would be transferred intact to the Secretary.

In other words, the plan provides for no new functions. In fact, the Reorganization Act does not permit the creation of any new functions.

Proponents of establishing a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing from the President on down have argued that metropolitan areas have been growing and will continue to grow very rapidly, that they are beset with stupendous problems of shelter, transportation, recreational areas, crime—including juvenile delinquency—air and water pollution, open space, and so forth; that municipalities and States find themselves unable to cope with these problems and that, therefore, a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing headed by a Secretary who is a member of the President's Cabinet, is urgently required.

This has led many columnists and commentators to foster the opinion, unfortunately too widely accepted by the unthinking part of the American public, that the establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing under a Secretary of Cabinet rank as proposed by Reorganization Plan No. 1, will solve pressing metropolitan problems; that a vote for Reorganization Plan No. 1 is a vote for helping municipalities, and that a vote against Reorganization Plan No. 1 is a vote to injure metropolitan areas.

It is hard to imagine a more preposterous misrepresentation.

The proposed new reorganization would accomplish nothing.

Every power the new Secretary or his Department will possess is already possessed by and vested in a functioning organization, the Housing and Home Finance Agency and its Administrator.

A multitude of Federal functions useful to metropolitan areas in meeting many of their problems will remain where they are now and in no way be affected by the reorganization plan. The Bureau of Public Roads administering the Federal highway program affecting access to municipalities and expressways through municipalities as well as city streets will stay right in the Department of Commerce where it is now.

Water pollution or sewage disposal programs will remain under the jurisdiction of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, where they now are.

Vocational education funds, social security activities, welfare activities, disposal of surplus Federal properties to schools and hospitals and other municipal entities, Hill-Burton funds, activities designed to promote public health, all will remain right where they are now.

These and other programs will in no way be affected by the establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, which at best, will have jurisdiction over only a minor fraction of Federal activities and funds aimed at assisting States and municipalities to solve metropolitan problems.

Only about one-third of the Federal Government's housing activities will be encompassed in the new Department. The Veterans' Administration and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board will continue in their autonomous status. They account for approximately 63 percent of the housing financing activities engaged in by, or under the auspices of, the Federal Government.

The creation of a department in the executive branch of Government should be one which is carefully considered by both Houses of Congress and should carry the wholehearted support of a majority of the House of Representatives and of the U.S. Senate. Any such new department, in order to function with the best wishes and closest cooperation of the Congress, should first have been created by a majority vote in each House of the legislative branch of the Government. In my opinion, an effort to create a new department in the executive branch in the face of the opposition of a majority of the Congress would, to say the least, be starting off a new department under very adverse conditions. The calendar of the Committee on Government Operations of the House of Representatives indicates that that great committee is very cautious in proceeding to create new departments. The record indicates that during the present and the 2 preceding Congresses more than 20 bills have been introduced to create new departments in the executive branch.

These bills would have created a Department of Mineral Resources, a Department of Public Information, a Department of Public Relations, a Department of Rural and Suburban Government, a Department of Small Towns and Rural Affairs, a Department of Transportation and Communications, a Department of Urban Affairs, a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, a Department of Urbiculture, a Department of Aeronautics and Space, a Department of Consumers, a Department of Peace, a Department of Science and Technology, a Department of Veterans' Affairs, a Department of Civil Defense, a Department of General Services, and a Department of Science.

The committee has acted favorably on only one of these.

Up until this time I have not seen any persuasive or convincing arguments presented which would indicate that there is any necessity for the creation of this new department at this time.

Until such time as there is both a demonstrated need and a justification for such a new department, I shall oppose the creation of such a department. When a need is demonstrated and a justification presented I shall naturally reappraise my position; and if there is both a demonstrated need and a justification, then I would gladly lend my support to the creation of a new department to bear this same name or to be known by a slightly different name.

Under the situation which exists today in which no need has been demonstrated and no justification has been presented, Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for the resolution and therefore oppose plan of Reorganization No. 1 of 1962.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished majority leader spoke a few moments ago and it seemed his feelings were hurt because this proposition is before the House today. He made some reference to the fact that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Meader] had not consulted with him. Well, I can say to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Albert] that if the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Meader] had not served notice he would call up this disapproving resolution, the gentleman from Iowa would have done so. And, I do not know whether I would have consulted with the leadership on either side of the aisle, because I do not find anything in the procedures that stipulates a Member must consult with the leadership in calling up matters of this kind.

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry the gentleman from Oklahoma feels so badly because this legislation is on the floor of the House today.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. May I say to my friend from Iowa that I am not feeling badly about this matter being up. I am not hurt because I was not consulted. I only commented upon the manner in which the Speaker was advised that this matter would be called up, and that it was not done in accordance with the general custom and procedures of the House. I admitted that the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Meader] was clearly within his rights. There is no question about that. It is just a question of the common practice of the House.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I am glad to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Chairman, I have been quite intrigued with this rather peculiar situation that has arisen here today in connection with the consideration of this measure. I have the highest respect for the majority leader of the House and also for the majority leader of the Senate. Rather peculiarly, we heard some complaint made here today about the House considering this proposition this week. But on Monday and then yesterday the leadership—the majority leadership—in the Senate was doing everything within its power to force the resolution up so the Senate could consider it.

I do not believe the House ever should take second place to any other legislative body in the world.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Oklahoma, the distinguished majority leader, also pointed to the fact that the chairman of the House Committee on Government Operations that considered this legislation handled it with great expedition. I am pleased to hear him say that because I picked up the Congressional Record this morning and I read in the Record the statement of one of the leading Democrats in the other body who said that the House had "stagnated" this legislation. I wish the Democrats would get together on whether it has been stagnated or handled with expedition. I want to expedite consideration and kill it as expeditiously as possible.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Reuss].

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, it is not an easy matter to appear here in support of a Department of Urban Affairs after the very cogent and eloquent exposition of the pros of the matter given by the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. Fascell] and our great majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Albert]. But I nevertheless feel in a relaxed mood, because I have been informed that the Republicans are going to win this one, they are going to triumph overwhelmingly and knock out the plan; and all I can say is that the Republicans may have the votes, but I believe that we have got the arguments, and I would like to tell you why.

I think the argument is very simple, and it comes down to this. Two-thirds of the people of this great Nation, with their terrible urban problems of slums and urban redevelopment and traffic, of water supply and sewerage, of green spaces and parks, deserve a seat at the governmental table at the Cabinet level. This plan simply gives them that.

I have examined carefully the arguments made here this afternoon by my distinguished colleagues on the Republican side, and as I gather the Republican argument, it boils down to this.

The Urban Affairs Department plan, you say, does not do enough, and it does too much. You say it does not do enough in that it ought to have in it juvenile delinquency and highways and some other things; and then you say that it does too much, that it creates a great sprawling bureaucracy. But I do not see quite how you can have it both ways. In one and the same argument you seem to be saying that this plan sprawls too much, and that it does not sprawl enough. This is what you might call the reverse sprawl argument. I would hope, having read in the papers of some injuries recently suffered by people who have attempted "the twist," that no one practicing the reverse sprawl will suffer any dislocations.

But this is not really the main reason behind the Republican opposition. I think to get that, you should turn to the minority report itself, on page 45, and there you see it set forth. On that page the minority Members, in discussing the various witnesses at the committee hearings said, putting it in their phrase:

> Yet one of the stars on this (Democratic) team, the enterprising young Governor of the State of Indiana, argued for the reorganization plan and the establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing on the basis—

Now hear this—

> that it would lead to the solution of the malapportionment of seats in the Indiana Legislature by helping to build up public opinion against the Indiana Legislature and induce it to redistrict the State so as to give a greater voice in State councils to urban areas.

The Republican minority then goes on to express what they call a real fear that a Department of Urban Affairs might do what the Governor of Indiana said it would do, namely, focus people's minds on the problems of their cities and maybe induce the legislature to redistrict, under the principle of one person, one vote, and give the city folks the same rights as people in the towns and in the countryside.

In other words, the Republicans seem to be against the Department of Urban Affairs because it might lead to sane and sound legislative reapportionment.

The overrepresentation of rural areas in this country in the legislatures, and the underrepresentation of urban areas, has become the shame and the scandal of American State government. That is the main reason why so many of our cities are rotting with slums, tangled with traffic, and overburdened with debt and taxes, at the end of their rope, and turning to the Federal Government for help, because the State legislatures deny them fair representation and are insensitive to their problems.

That is the truth of the matter, that is what every student of American Government knows. But I have never heard anyone until today in the House actually favor malapportionment in the State legislatures.

Page 45 of the report contains the minority views on this matter, and is set forth in solid type. The moving finger of the Government Printing Office has written, and all the piety and tears we may hear in the future cannot wipe away a single line of it.

The moment of truth came to the minority when they set forth their views there. I have not studied the Government Operations Committee minority staff roster recently to find out whether there is a psychoanalyst on the staff, but old Dr. Sigmund Freud himself could not have done a better job in digging out from the minority the exact real reason for their views.

I will tell you what this country needs. This country needs in its State legislatures fairly apportioned districts so that the principle of one person—one vote, can govern, and city people and country people are treated alike. What this country needs is a Department of Urban Affairs, so that our Federal Government, honestly apportioned State governments, and vigorous city governments can combine to solve the crying problems of our cities.

If we do not win today, we will be back.

Now, I want to address myself to some important and, in my opinion, overlooked aspects of the argument in favor of the President's proposal in Reorganization Plan No. 1 to establish a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

The basic premise underlying the President's proposal is simple and obvious. We are now an urban Nation with well over two-thirds of our people living in urban and suburban areas. Moreover, nearly all of the great increase in population expected during the next several decades will take place in our urban and metropolitan areas. The multiplicity of problems that have resulted from this transition from a substantially rural to an urban Nation have in turn caused changes in the focus, in the emphasis, and in the organization of Government activities dealing with urban areas. This is the basic reason for a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. It would reorganize and improve upon the changes which have already taken place since 1947 when the present Housing and Home Finance Agency was established.

I would like to emphasize, however, that the urban problem is not merely a problem of the great cities or even of all cities. It is the problem of towns and villages, both large and small. It is the problem of suburbs and of the countryside in the path of urban growth. It is as much the concern of the communities which will be engulfed by the ever widening spread of urbanization in the course of the next 20 or 30 years as it is of our cities.

By the same token, we cannot deal over this problem through Federal action alone, through State action alone, or through local action alone. All are necessary. President Kennedy's Reorganization Plan No. 1 is based solidly on the position that the problem demands cooperative action by all levels of government. In submitting the plan to Congress, the President explicitly stated:

> I propose to act now to strengthen and improve the machinery through which, in large part, the Federal Government must act to carry out its proper role of encouragement and assistance to State and local governments, of voluntary efforts and of private enterprise, in the solution of these problems.

I would place some stress on the President's use of the phrase "encouragement and assistance." These are key words in the President's message. This plan would not reduce by one iota the initiative or responsibility of the States and licalities for undertaking action on the problems created by urbanization. Rather, the new Department would strengthen the present Federal efforts to encourage and assist the States and localities in doing this.

I wish to point out the steps that have already been taken under the existing programs of the Housing and Home Finance Agency which would constitute precedents for the new Department in its relationships with State and local governments.

The officials now administering the Housing and Home Finance Agency have explicitly recognized the importance of the States in securing the objectives of the Agency's programs. Commissioner William Slayton, of the Urban Renewal Administration, noted, for example, in a recent speech that the States have an opportunity to take a much more active role in actually participating in urban planning and development than does the Federal Establishment.

The States have been a major factor in Federal aids for urban planning assistance. One of the basic prerequisites to sound urban development is good planning. In recognition of the serious inadequacies in urban planning, the Congress enacted in 1954 section 701 of the Housing Act to provide Federal grants to State and local governments to assist in planning in small cities and in metropolitan areas. Since that time, the program has been extended to include planning by States for their own activities. The administration of this urban planning assistance program is vested in the Housing and Home Finance Agency and would be transferred to the proposed new Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

A salient feature of this program is its heavy reliance on action by the State. The results to date have been strikingly successful in terms of the planning programs initiated and planning agencies established. By the end of 1961, 47 States had set up agencies to do planning or assist localities in doing planning. Sixteen States now have statewide planning projects underway and almost 2,000 small communities are receiving planning assistance through their State governments. There are 134 metropolitan and regional areas with studies and progress, many of which involve heavy participation by the State. These planning projects are directed toward one or more of the dozen facets of planning in the modern community—the coordination of activities between local jurisdictions, transportation, and land-use studies aimed at developing an adequate system of highways, and studies aimed at programs to develop the economic potential of our communities or to provide better public transportation.

Grants for planning assistance for the small cities are aimed at those communities too small to warrant maintaining a permanent planning staff. The effect of the Federal program was to encourage the establishment of many new State planning agencies, as well as the revival of many State agencies long moribund. Not only have nearly 2,000 small cities been assisted by planning financed with such grants, but also the States are now providing needed technical assistance to these small communities in very substantial measure. We have produced at comparatively small cost not merely plans, but a growing interest in participation by State officials in assisting local planning. Some crucial problems of growth and development are being solved, and, in many of the affected towns, there is a real and growing awareness of the problems of development.

In the area of metropolitan planning, leadership by the State plays a particularly important role. The floodtide of urban and suburban growth has spread over the countryside at about a million acres per year, bringing new subdivisions, schools, and facilities of all kinds to areas that just a short time back were farmland and woods. The urbanized area of greater New York, according to Prof. Robert C. Wood, now includes some 1,400 governments, and in most of our metropolitan areas the number of individual jurisdictions runs in the tens and hundreds. In these areas, there is an urgent and crucial need for metropolitan planning.

As Housing Administrator Robert C. Weaver recently stated:

> But what is the community with which metropolitan planning is concerned? It is all the people who rely upon a transportation system that laces together hundreds of residential neighborhoods and scores of work centers; it is all the people who make use of the beaches and parks; all who send their waste waters into a single drainage basin; all who live within a common sootfall district. For these areawide needs, autonomous planning and programing by dozens of local governments is bound to be wasteful or ineffectual. For such functions, metropolitan planning is most obviously required, and indeed is gaining increasing acceptance.

If regional and metropolitan planning is to be done, the State must act to authorize the establishment of metropolitan planning agencies or to undertake itself the role of coordinated planning.

It is a mark of some success that the Housing and Home Finance Agency has been able to provide assistance for planning in more than 100 metropolitan areas. I would like to mention two projects which emphasize the important place the State has in this process. In Los Angeles, the State of California, with Federal urban planning assistance, is sponsoring the important five-county Los Angeles regional transportation survey which is intended to provide a basis for the development of both highways and mass transportation in this rapidly expanding metropolitan area. The tristate transportation study of the greater New York area was initiated by the Governors of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut, with the promise of Housing Agency assistance under its section 701 planning grant program. In both cases, arrangements were made for participation by the respective State highway departments with funds available from the Department of Commerce under the Federal Highway Act. The planning process itself will thus serve as a basis for coordination of two important Federal programs with planning in the States themselves.

Since 1959 grants have also been available to the States for statewide planning activities. This is a relatively new but particularly important area. The comprehensive State development plan can, as Gov. Gaylord Nelson, of Wisconsin, has pointed out, "provide clear guidelines for future growth and develop and provide leadership to encourage more competent planning by local regional governments as well as by quasi-public and private agencies." Milwaukee's Mayor Henry W. Maier and County Executive John Doyna vigorously support these planning activities. I might just mention, in this connection, the significance of such planning in the treatment of the open country that is in the path of future urbanization; in the preservation of agriculture, water, and other natural resources; and in coordinating the work in many individual local planning agencies. A start is already being made with projects underway in 16 States with Housing Agency assistance under the section 701 planning grant program. For example, Connecticut is undertaking a statewide land use inventory as well as a study of its economic structure and employment which will provide a sound basis for effective planning in the cities and towns of the State. Statewide transportation plans are being developed in Hawaii and Puerto Rico. Wisconsin is undertaking a comprehensive approach to statewide planning including an economic analysis of the various regions within the State. The increasing assumption of State responsibility in this area is, in my opinion, one of the most encouraging signs on the scene today.

Much emphasis has been placed on the fact that a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing will give the cities a home in Washington. Little has been said about its potentially important role as a focus for Federal contact with the States on problems of urban development.

The new Department would help accelerate the present trend toward the establishment of comparable departments in the State government. The lack of an organizational unit in State governments responsible for problems of urban affairs and local governments has been a serious deficiency. Gradually, the States are establishing such units. Favorable action on the President's proposal will undoubtedly advance this movement in the States. I would like to note, in this connection, the great impact of the establishment of the Federal Bureau of Public Roads on the organization of State highway activities. The repercussions of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing should be no less favorable.

This Republic has survived and prospered for 174 years. This is due, in no small measure, to a form of government which has proved adaptable to the problems of change and growth in the Nation. New departments have been successfully created as new problems emerged. The organization of the executive branch has, within our lifetime, been adapted to fight, successfully, first, a great depression and then a great war. Now, in 1962, with the urban problem emerging as our most pressing domestic concern for the rest of this century, it behooves us to group and organize our resources in the most effective way. This demands, in my view, the early creation of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRUCE].

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Chairman, I will confess as a Representative from Indiana from the 11th District, a very urban area, I join in the amazement of most of the citizens of Indiana at the testimony of our Governor before the committee. We read it and we frankly just could not believe it. It was most interesting to us because the Democrat mayor of Indianapolis is in stated opposition to this type of legislation and interestingly enough the mayor of Indianapolis appears to be the leading Democrat candidate for the senatorial nomination at the moment in the State of Indiana. He has made extensive speeches in his position as mayor of Indianapolis and prior to that as a city comptroller, about the dangers of centralization of authority in the Federal Government. He is campaigning on a program in the State of Indiana on the Democratic ticket in opposition to Federal aid to education and in opposition to all of the expansion of Federal bureaucracy. So when you are talking about taking a backward split or whatever it was—I am not up on these modern terms, either acrobatically or politically—I think we really have a situation here. The Governor of Indiana comes down and advocates support of this and the mayor of the largest city, and the capital city of Indiana, has clearly indicated he does not want the Federal Government interfering in city affairs. He said they have interfered too much already and one of the biggest problems the cities have is the encroachment of Federal bureaucracy. So I suggest the mayor of the big city of Indianapolis is closer to the problems of the largest urban area in the State than is our newly elected Governor.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK].

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. Chairman, I am going to be very brief, but there are two facts I think should be brought out rather clearly. All during this debate we have heard reference made that 70 percent of the people live in urban areas, and, therefore, we need a Department of Urban Affairs. It is interesting to know that the Census Bureau in official census of 1960 defines the number of people living in urban areas as only 32.9 percent, and if you take in the suburban areas as well as the urban, you still only get slightly over 50 percent. So somewhere, somehow, a new definition of what is urban and the people who are living there came in, and it must have been the original definition in the bill which said that anybody was living in an urban area if he were in any kind of community, incorporated or unincorporated. Obviously it would include everybody except a hermit.

The other point I want to make is the question of who is and who is not in favor of it. I happen to live in a suburban area next to an urban area. I have a telegram here in my hand from the mayor of the city of Denver, which I will read to you:

> We object to creation of a Department of Urban Affairs as providing the wrong solution to a problem not clearly defined. Its creation would be only an appeasement move to apologize for failure of local people and local leaders to recognize and solve their own problems. It would build another level of bureaucracy between the cities and Federal agencies now assigned responsibility for assisting them. May threaten programs already working well. Department of Urban Affairs would at best be only a temporary palliative. Overall problem definition should come first, then education of population to solve own problems with cooperation that is now available and is being extended effectively by existing agencies.
>
> DICK BATTERTON,
> *Mayor, City of Denver.*

Denver is a city of almost 500,000 people and with the suburban area surrounding it the population is well over 750,000. As you can see, the mayor of Denver is very strongly against this proposal.

I would suggest that the attitude of the big city areas has not been correctly set forth, and the report that 70 percent of the people live in official urban areas is also incorrect as proved by the Government census statement.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DOOLEY].

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Chairman, it has been said that the only Republicans against the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing are those from predominately rural areas. Judging from this, I must be an exception because my constituency is one of the least rural of any of my State's 21 districts outside New York City. My district is considered to be only 13 percent rural.

It has also been said that Republicans need not fear a loss at the polls next November because of adverse reaction from our Negro citizens, for the simple reason so few of us represent sizable Negro minorities. Again, I must be an exception for at least four cities in my district have very sizable Negro populations.

Under these circumstances perhaps I should follow the line of least resistance and favor a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. However, I was elected by my constituents to do more than merely support the so-called vote-getting issues; I was sent down here to use my personal judgment.

We hear anguished cries from big-city mayors to the effect that they need more representation at the Federal level because they do not get a "fair shake" in the State legislatures. This is curious in that Mr. Weaver himself, in a letter to me dated February 14, admitted that only 18.2 percent of the Housing and Home Finance Agency's allocations in calendar year 1961 were administered by State agencies. In other words, over 4 out of every 5 Federal housing and urban renewal dollars flow directly to urban areas, without any State intervention whatsoever. With respect to urban renewal and community facilities, the big-city mayor need not bother making a trip to his State legislature because over 80 percent of the funds he seeks are presently administered directly from Washington.

In this area, a sound working relationship between the Federal and State Governments has long since ceased to exist. Permit me to quote to you the words of President Kennedy's Solicitor General before the Supreme Court in the Tennessee malapportionment case—Baker against Carr—when he said, and I quote:

> Urban governments now tend to bypass the States and enter directly into cooperative arrangements with the National Government in such areas as housing, urban development, airports and defense community facilities. This multiplication of national-local relationships reinforces the debilitation of State governments by weakening the State's control over its own policies and its authority over its own political subdivisions.

Yes, gentlemen, this was said by a member of the present administration against a situation which would become even more chronic under the proposed new Department.

The theory is offered that added prestige resulting from Cabinet-level status would solve our urban problems. Any observer of the lessening policymaking role of the Cabinet would be perplexed by this, the most specious of arguments.

To those who feel our urban areas are underrepresented in the executive branch of our Government, can there be any doubt after the presidential election of 1960 as to the vast electoral power of our urban areas?

Gentlemen, the answer lies in better coordinating the urban programs that are presently scattered in a number of agencies and departments, not in creating what will someday be a superdepartment. The means to coordinate these activities are presently available to the President, if he will only look around and use them.

We have before us today a completely fabricated issue. The spectacle of Members of Congress being threatened, in effect, with reprisals at the polls if they vote their convictions is not an admirable one. The injection of racism into the debate has been sinisterly contrived with a direct political end in sight. Once again, as so often before, our Negro citizens are being used, and I shall go back to my district and do my best to tell them so.

Be that as it may, in good judgment, I have no choice but to stand in support of House Resolution 530 to reject Reorganization Plan No. 1.

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY,
Washington, D.C., February 14, 1962.

Hon. EDWIN B. DOOLEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DOOLEY: In accordance with your request, we have made an analysis to show to what extent funds from programs administered by the Housing and Home Finance Agency and its constituents go to or flow through State or county instrumentalities.

Of the Agency's programs, those for which such an analysis is most relevant are those of the Urban Renewal Administration and the Community Facilities Administration. There we find that of some $4.4 billion of grants or loans approved through the end of last year, nearly $1 billion or better than 21 percent went to or flowed through State or county bodies.

The Federal Housing Administration's mortgage insurance program and the Federal National Mortgage Association's secondary market and special assistance activities center around the home mortgage market with the relationships primarily with borrowers, lenders, and investors. As far as the Public Housing Administration is concerned, the funds flow through local housing authorities which have been established under State enabling legislation. A large share of these housing authorities have a jurisdiction confined to a single locality. There are, however, some county housing authorities who administer public housing programs in various communities within their area of responsibility, although the general nature of the relationship between the Public Housing Administration and the housing authority is essentially the same for both city and county authorities.

A table summarizing the data on funds approved for State instrumentalities is attached.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT C. WEAVER,
Administrator.

HHFA funds approved to State instrumentalities, counties, and other bodies, Dec. 31, 1961

[Dollar amounts in millions

Program	Total	State and county			Other bodies	
		Total	State	County	Public[1]	Private
Total	$4,360.6	$930.5	$795.4	$135.1	$2,590.0	$840.1
Percent	100.0	21.3	18.2	3.1	59.4	19.3
Urban renewal, title I, grant reservations and contracts	$2,500.0	$125.0	$3.0	$122.0	$2,375.0	0
Urban planning assistance, sec. 701, grant approvals	$22.0	$20.8	$19.8	$1.0	$1.2	0
Community Facilities Administration:						
College housing loans, net approvals	$1,590.1	$761.6	$758.4	$3.2	$25.5	$803.0
Public facility loans, gross approvals	$143.7	$11.6	$11.5	$.1	$132.1	0
Advances for public works, gross approvals	$67.7	$11.5	$2.7	$8.8	$56.2	0
Senior citizens housing loans, reservations approved	$37.1	0	0	0	0	$37.1

[1] Principally cities and townships, but also includes regional bodies.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Colorado raised a question concerning certain statistical figures which we used in the discussion here today. I would like to clarify the record at this point so there will not be any confusion or misunderstanding, especially since he challenged the integrity of the figures used by a committee.

I am quoting from a document called "U.S. Census of Population—1960, Summary," published by the U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. On page 1–4, in table 3, Urban and Rural Population of the United States in 1960, in the last column—percent of urban to total—69.9 percent. Of rural to total—30 percent.

That is where the committee bases its statement that approximately 70 percent of the population of the United States is in urban areas, pursuant to the definition thereof contained on page 13 of the same document. This is the same definition as that used in taking the census of 1950.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, the arguments in opposition to the proposed Department of Urban Affairs which we have heard today would lead one to assume that the bill under consideration seeks to create for the first time new and costly relationships between the urban communities and the Federal Government. Of course, the contrary is true. A partnership has existed between the Federal Government, the States, and the municipalities for many years, not only in the field of housing and municipal affairs, but with respect to many other programs, as well. The point that the States are being deprived of their jurisdiction over municipalities is without foundation. Municipalities are still and will always be creatures of the States and their powers are limited or augmented as the States wish them to be. Programs under which the Federal Government provides matching funds with those of States can come into existence only with the approval of the States and when municipalities apply directly to the Federal Government for assistance, they do so only because the State governments have previously consented. The new Department, therefore, is not a sweeping grant of Federal authority over municipalities nor a device to permit the municipalities to skirt or avoid State control.

This bill is urgently needed for two reasons—the first is the opportunity it would give for providing more efficient and economical operation of the existing agencies through centralization of responsibility in the Secretary of Urban Affairs. It has been pointed out that the Director of the Housing and Home Finance Agency does not have direct control over either the Federal Housing Administration or the Public Housing Administration. This bill would give the Secretary the power to coordinate the activities of such agencies with those already within his jurisdiction, such as the urban renewal and community facilities programs.

Second, the Department is needed to provide recognition at the Cabinet level of the problems of our urban communities, and I am referring to smaller urban communities as well as metropolitan ones. At the time our country was established, only 1 out of every 20 of its 4 million inhabitants was living in a city over 2,500 in population. Almost every decade thereafter found the rate of growth of urban population exceeding that of the rural population. When the Department of Agriculture was created in 1869, 7 out of 10 people lived in rural areas. Today the opposite is true. Seven out of 10 persons live in urban areas.

But the population explosion has not yet ended, and its impact upon urban communities has not yet ceased. It is predicted that within the next 20 years this country may expect an additional growth of 80 million population, and every city and hamlet in the country is going to be affected.

Should we not plan now for what must come in the future? Is not thinking ahead—making plans for what is going to be—an American quality? Do not our large business firms concern themselves with future operations?

Certainly the Government should do so, too. It is reasonable and proper that it should be a Department which has responsibility for planning for the future, not the loose federation of agencies which now exist.

May I refer your attention to the testimony of Harold F. Wise, chairman of the legislative committee of the American Institute of Planners, which appears on page 189 of the hearings. Specifically, may I invite your attention to testimony on page 90 which reads as follows:

> I want to make this other final point. We would expect the proposed Department to continue to develop such progressive approaches and to continue, in fact, committed to programs and policies that have as their primary objectives the strengthening of local governments by aiding them in the accomplishment of programs that they cannot quite accomplish alone.
>
> Expanding on this last thought we wish to make clear our position that urban problems must be dealt with at local levels, in municipalities, by counties within metropolitan areas, and through State programs, with the assistance, where necessary, of the Federal Government. We believe, however, that it is clear that the national level of government must provide basic leadership and resources in order to make it possible for local governments to do their jobs. We want to emphasize strongly that we feel that the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing will act to strengthen local government, will permit the cities and metropolitan areas of the Nation to do a better job than they otherwise could, and will not result in undue Federal interference in local affairs, in short, the concept involved here is that the Federal Government will provide the tools that localities can use in meeting their pressing problems of growth, development, and redevelopment, tools the localities can use in their own way.
>
> We in the American Institute of Planners will continue to support legislation to increase appropriations and programs for much needed urban research, and will seek scholarship and grants-in-aid programs to make available larger numbers of professionally trained planners in this field. These are not at issue here. What the President has presented, too, is within his authority and responsibility, a proposed reorganization plan and increased efficiency to provide for better coordination and better administration.
>
> What is at issue is the fact that in the next 40 years, we shall see 100 million more people in the United States. Most of these will live in suburban areas—on the fringes of what are today our large cities in houses that are not built today—using water and sewer lines, streets and schools, that are not yet built, either. Comprehensive planning, open space programs, soundly conceived mass transportation, public facility planning and financing and mortgage insurance are all tools necessary to be applied—tools necessary if our suburban areas are to be soundly conceived, and economic and social assets—

> places where local taxes are equitable and healthy living opportunities are present.
>
> As we see it, the action before you will not only give hope and strength to the cities of America but will help vastly in the job of creating the cities and the suburbs yet to be born.

Mr. Chairman, as Mr. Wise points out, this Department will help the States and the local communities in carrying out their responsibilities to their people, responsibilities which they cannot meet fully by themselves because urban problems are not local problems—they are national problems. Metropolitan areas overlap State, county, and municipal lines. States must deal with a sharply limited tax base and States' budgets have increased percentagewise many times more than the Federal Government in the last decade.

Slums increase service costs upon a shrinking tax base, and the social cost in terms of traffic congestion, crowded housing, pollution, crime, and delinquency is enormous. And the very important point must be remembered that public investment provides the seed money for large-scale private investment.

This is not just a big city problem. It affects every community and as a matter of fact, over 90 percent of the loans made under the public facilities loan program have been made to communities of less than 5,000 population. The major part of the Federal Government's assistance in advances for public works planning, urban renewal planning, and public facilities loan programs go to communities of less than 50,000 population.

We can meet the challenge of the future by preparing for it now. This bill gives us the opportunity to create the framework for dealing with an ever-increasing, complex situation. It will permit a more efficient and economical method of operation for the partnership between the Federal Government, the States, and local communities. A Department of Urban Affairs should be established.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORHEAD].

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I would like to quote some very outstanding and experienced authorities in support of the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. In a memorandum to President Eisenhower on July 2, 1957, Nelson Rockefeller said, and I quote:

> In recent years the problems of planning, building, and conserving our cities and metropolitan areas have become increasingly acute, and demands have multiplied, in and out of Congress, for the establishment of a new executive department to take the lead in those aspects of urban affairs. At the same time, the Housing and Home Finance Agency has come to be charged with programs which go far beyond the encouragement of housing and which involves the Agency in the general physical planning and development of communities.
>
> The responsibility for assisting local governments through advances for the planning of public works and loans for the construction of public facilities was lodged in the Housing and Home Finance Agency. Also added were such functions as making loans for college dormitories and related facilities, administering grants to assist metropolitan area and general community planning, and providing flood insurance. Although the Home Loan Bank Board has been removed from the supervision of the Agency, the Housing and Home Finance Agency's housing finance functions have grown with the greater utilization of mortgage insurance, the acquisition of secondary market responsibilities, and the initiation of a voluntary home mortgage credit program.
>
> Consequently, the Housing and Home Finance Agency has become a serious contender for departmental status.
>
> In the course of administering its existing programs, the Housing and Home Finance Agency has developed close relationships with the officials of cities, towns, and other local authorities. Its staff understands the problems of the explosive metropolitan growth now taking place in this country and is helping in the solution of those problems with the tools now available. It is, therefore, already in important respects the Federal urban affairs agency.
>
> There is more justification for a new department than merely the present size of the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the cost of the programs which it administers.
>
> Departmental status would carry with it representation in the Cabinet, which has become increasingly important as a council for the consideration and resolution of important issues of national policy.

Mr. Rockefeller concludes his memorandum with an affirmative recommendation for the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs through the submission of a Presidential reorganization plan. His conclusion and his reasons for that conclusion are sound. Although he is apparently of a somewhat different mind today, his well-reasoned statement should be carefully considered because it was made during the time he was adviser to President Eisenhower and concerned only with the merits of the subject.

Other well-known authorities also support the Department. One is Albert M. Cole, who is well known to this body. He served for a number of years on the Banking and Currency Committee. For some 6 years he was the Housing and Home Finance Administrator under the previous administration, and he served as Chairman of President Eisenhower's Advisory Committee on Government Housing Policies and Programs. In writing on a particular bill pending in this body to create a department, Mr. Cole said he did not approve that bill, but continued:

> I should not want this to be interpreted, however, as reflecting a negative attitude on my part toward the whole broad question raised by those who have introduced this and similar proposals.
>
> On the contrary, it is my view that we are approaching and may well have reached a point where serious thought ought to be given to the long-range advantages which might be gained by establishing a new Cabinet department to embrace the Government's major responsibilities, functions, and programs in the general area of housing and community development. * * * Certainly, too, great as has become the part played by those problems and the programs associated with them in our national economy and in the fabric of national and local government, the years ahead will see yet further increases in their scope, complexity, and importance to the American community.
>
> Few agencies or departments of the Government exceed the Housing Agency in the importance and magnitude of their functions, or in the proportion of our population importantly affected by them.
>
> It seems to me equally clear that the problems and actions of this Agency are of major concern to those of virtually every executive department, and that to a large extent the converse is true.
>
> It would seem desirable to provide at the Cabinet level for the full integration of the Government's housing and community development programs with the overall program of the administration, so that the policies and programs of the Federal establishment as they relate to housing and community affairs could more easily be worked out at the highest level and developed in the light of the views of the other departments which closely related vital interests.

Mr. Cole also says in the same letter:

> I would not want to foreclose the alternative of accomplishing the desired result through a reorganization plan submitted by the President. I should think that the initiative looking toward establishment of a new department and the fitting of it into the structure of the executive branch and the Cabinet is a matter peculiarly within the province of the Chief Executive, to a degree even greater than more routine matters affecting the organization and management of the executive branch which in the modern practice are most often accomplished by reorganization plan. It has been the general theory of the reorganization acts, I believe, that in recognition of the President's responsibilities as Chief Executive he should be privileged to establish such organizational arrangements as may seem to him best for the discharge of those responsibilities, except to the extent that the Congress may deem it necessary to intervene in specific matters and vacate his proposed action in the manner provided by law.

Another Housing Administrator of the Eisenhower administration, Mr. Norman Mason, testified on this same subject. His views are almost identical with Mr. Cole's views. They are expressed in the May 1960 hearings on housing legislation held during the 86th Congress before the Housing Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency.

More recently, on March 2, 1961, the executive committee on ACTION, Inc., sent to the President of the United States and key leaders in the Congress the recommendations of its special committee formed to investigate and make recommendations concerning the creation of a Department of Housing and Urban Development in the Federal Government. That committee was headed by former Administrator Cole. The recommendations were as follows:

> 1. That the President give highest priority to housing and urban development, assuming strong personal responsibility for exercising the authority of his office in obtaining effective action by all departments and agencies affecting housing and urban development.
> 2. That Congress give the President authority to reorganize existing agencies in housing and urban development for more effective action.
> 3. To facilitate the above, that there be established a Cabinet post for housing and urban development.

Mr. Chairman, the statements I have quoted represent the thinking of leaders from both political parties who are experienced in Government. Those views were formed during the time they were coping with practical problems of their official duties, and should be given great weight. I hope those views will be followed today, and that this body will vote down House Resolution 530.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, we have heard a lot of arguments here both for and against Reorganization Plan No. 1. As a member of the subcommittee which heard this bill considered originally, I want to say that I think most of what we have heard has been chaff on both sides of the aisle as to reasons for and against the bill, because this bill does not—and nobody will disagree with this—create a single, solitary new power in the Federal Government. All it does is to abolish four agencies and put them under one head.

In 1949 the first Hoover Commission made a report after studying the operations of almost all executive agencies. Among the reforms recommended in the report on the "General Management of the Executive Branch" was recommendation 14 which read:

> Under the President, the heads of departments must hold full responsibility for the conduct of their department. There must be a clear line of authority reaching down to every step of the organization and no subordinate should have authority independent from that of his superior.

In its recommendations on business enterprises and housing, the Hoover Commission stated:

> We do, however, recommend that all housing activities be placed in one agency under a single administrator who should be given the type of authority which we have recommended for the heads of all agencies.

Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962 would go further toward meeting the recommendations of the Hoover Commission than any action that has ever been taken by the Congress or the President since that date. Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1947 had given the Housing and Home Finance Administrator only responsibility for the general supervision and coordination of the functions of the constituent agencies of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. That plan had placed in the head of the Federal Housing Administration and the Public Housing Administration the functions of those agencies. The Housing and Home Finance Administrator was left without power to direct their activities.

The committee received ample evidence in the testimony of mayors of both large and small cities of the frustrations and delays which have resulted from the lack of centralized authority in the Agency. This is also attested to by the testimony of former officials of the Agency. More efficient operation of the urban renewal program would help local communities save money.

It has been estimated that approximately $1,300,000 could be saved if each of the urban renewal projects under loan and grants as of December 31, 1961, could be expedited by only 1 month. Interest savings of $2,600 could be achieved on the average outstanding loan of $1,725,000 for every month that any one project is expedited. For larger projects the savings and interest cost could reach over $7,500 per month.

It is clear that language in the 1955 Independent Offices Appropriations Act which was designed to restate the supervisory and coordinating authority of the HHFA Administrator has not been effective in securing cohesive direction in control of the Agency. Local government officials still must travel around among the subagencies seeking decisions and doing their own coordinating. This is undoubtedly the result of the independent authority now resting by law in the subagency heads.

The reform so badly needed in order to improve efficiency and economy of the operations of the Housing and Home Finance Agency and to relieve the costly frustrations and delays of the local government agencies dealing with it cannot be accomplished without some change in the existing law whether it be brought about by reorganization plan or statute. We have the plan before us. It is an effective measure to secure increased efficiency and better direction of the Agency and there is no good reason for rejecting it.

Legislation similar to that of the present Reorganization Act has been on the books since the early 1930's. A multitude of useful governmental reorganizations have been put into effect through the reorganization plans. The first Hoover Commission recognized the usefulness and, in fact, the absolute necessity of a reorganization power in the President if the executive branch is to be effectively organized. In a letter of January 13, 1949, addressed to the President pro tempore of the Senate, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the first Hoover Commission stated:

> Some of the recommendations contained in the volumes of our report, which we plan to file from time to time between now and the expiration of the life of the Commission, can be put into effect only by legislation. Others can be accomplished by Executive action. But many of the most important can probably be accomplished only if the Congress reenacts and broadens the power to initiate reorganization plans which it had previously granted to the President under an act which expired on March 31, 1948.
>
> The Commission recommends that such authority should be given to the President and that the powers of the President to prepare and transmit plans of reorganization to the Congress should not be restricted by limitations or exemptions. Once the limiting and exempting process is begun it will end the possibility of achieving really substantial results.

In his message of April 1, 1957, to the Congress President Eisenhower vigorously advocated an extension of the reorganization act. He pointed out:

> In December 1954 the Second Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government unanimously recommended further extension of the act.

Thus the First and Second Hoover Commissions, several Presidents, and numerous Congresses have recognized the simple fact that action through reorganization plans is necessary to accomplish effective reorganization in the executive branch. Certainly the history of the recent proposal for a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing substantiates this conclusion. We in Congress have ourselves acknowledged that reorganization proposals would become involved in interminable delays and complications in the normal legislative processes. For this reason, we adopted the procedure of delegating reorganization power to the President, subject to congressional review. The validity of this approach was affirmed by the Supreme Court in the case of *Sibbach* v. *Wilson & Co.* (312 U.S. 1).

Certainly our experience with the proposal for a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing has again proven the wisdom of Congress in providing the President with the reorganization plan tool for securing the most effective organization of his branch of the Government.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. NEDZI].

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to House Resolution 530, which provides for disapproval of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962.

In the light of the intensive examination this idea has received over the months and particularly in recent weeks when President Kennedy proposed Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962, it is challenging to attempt to shed illumination which is worthy of consideration by this honorable body. I am doubtful that I can meet the challenge. Nevertheless, I should like to present for your deliberation some views I consider worthy of thought.

We are all aware of the arguments pro and con—these have been covered thoroughly by speakers preceding me, by witnesses appearing before the Committee on Government Operations, by written statements directed to the committee, the press editorials throughout the country, and discussions in public and cloakroom debates. After considering all carefully, I am impelled to conclude that the arguments pro outweigh the arguments con.

Approximately 70 percent of our people are now urban dwellers. Soon up to 80 percent of our people will live in cities so that one cannot sensibly say that the proposal is one which discriminates against vast segments of the country and is not one of permanence. Admittedly, the proposed Cabinet post does not concern itself with many of the problems which now plague areas of high population density; however, having a Cabinet department which, by definition, will concern itself with the problems of urban affairs at the Cabinet level, will reach far toward making the Nation aware of these diverse, complex, and seemingly hopeless dilemmas and contribute toward their solution. I am aware of the strong support which those who argue that these problems are matters for the States and local units of government to cope with have in all areas of the country.

My point is that with the advent of an urban civilization in this country and the daily expanding mobility possessed by all of our people through our modern highways and cheaper and faster air travel, primarily, no one State or municipality can assume the position that they can provide adequately for their people in terms of housing and urban renewal. Colonel Glenn's achievement yesterday certainly did not lessen this mobility. Many of our urban areas spill across State lines; for example, New York-New Jersey, Chicago-Indiana, the Kansas Citys, and there are many more and more to come. There is no assurance that a program commenced on a sound premise will not find itself almost totally ineffectual within a relatively short time because of mass migration either to or from the areas to which attention is given. I do not believe we have reached the position that we will restrict or eliminate interstate travel or migration from one State to another. We are the United States—we are 1 country—we are not 50 countries.

This mobility of our population has altered the traditional concept of Federal and State relations. It has drastically diminished the ability of State and local governments to cope with many problems which were once intrastate but now, because of changed conditions, concern the entire country. The housing and welfare problems of Detroit can quickly and easily become the housing and welfare problems of Los Angeles or Milwaukee or St. Louis or Minot or Macon. Only through Federal action can effective, coordinated effort be achieved. A Cabinet officer would be obliged to guard the interests of 70 percent of our citizens.

To effectively deal with the multiplying problems of urban living, a Cabinet post of Urban Affairs and Housing is mandatory.

I urge the defeat of House Resolution 520.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN]

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I urge all the Members of this House to support the establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing and defeat House Resolution 530.

As my colleagues know, this is not the first time I have spoken for the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs. Last session I introduced H.R. 6065 which would have accomplished virtually the same purpose. On June 22, 1961, I appeared before the Senate Government Operations Committee in favor of the creation of such a new department. In the House I testified before the House Government Operations Committee twice. Once last session and again this month. I believe that a vast majority of the American people were greatly disappointed by the failure of the Rules Committee to report out a bill to be considered on its merits. The President has acted wisely, in my opinion, by submitting Reorganization Plan No. 1.

The proposed executive department is of such major importance that I am compelled once again to add my voice to the fight to make it a reality. One of the gravest domestic problems faced by the Nation today is the crisis in housing and the obsolescence, deterioration and congestion which pervade so many of the urban areas. If we are to develop long-range solutions for these conditions, we will need a concerted attack at all levels of Government and coordination of the array of existing Federal aid programs. The establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing will make it clear that we are embarking upon a coordinated program committed to the eventual solution of the complex of metropolitan problems. Housing, urban renewal, mass transit are not local or State issues. They are national in scope.

To me, as to many others, the need has long been evident for a department primarily concerned with urban planning and metropolitanwide problems to cope more effectively with the increasingly complex and difficult problems of our cities. The rapid growth which has occurred in our urban areas since the turn of the century has transformed the United States from a predominantly agrarian society to an urban civilization. Two-thirds or more of the American people now live in urban regions which have spilled across city, county, and State lines. It has been predicted that by 1970, 25 million of our 30 million new citizens will settle in cities and suburban areas. Our cities are the centers of industry, commerce, education, and culture, containing more than 75 percent of our wealth and productive capacity and providing a major share of the economic base from which both Federal and State taxes are drawn. The population in our 10 largest metropolitan areas pays over $13 billion in taxes, 35 percent of the total amount of individual income taxes. These basic sociological, economic, and technological changes have made the fate of the Nation dependent in large measure on that of our cities.

The movement of masses of people from the farms to the city in increasing numbers has caused numerous urgent problems to accumulate in urban areas throughout the United States. Many of these problems have grown in geometric proportion to urban populations. Housing in many of our cities is shockingly inadequate. Urban blight is widespread. A distressing number of commercial and industrial facilities in downtown locations are deteriorating. The problems caused by residential and commercial slums have begun a vicious cycle of erosion which threatens the economic survival and fiscal solvency of our cities.

Other physical problems are challenging urban areas. For example, a paralyzing concentration of passenger cars, trucks, buses, and other common carriers is creating traffic congestion which will stifle the downtown business centers of our cities unless we can find a solution in time. By 1970 the number of automobiles in the United States is expected to increase by 40 percent. Already traffic congestion is estimated to cost some $5 billion a year. Air pollution, water pollution, the disposal of unbelievable quantities of trash and sewage also call for immediate attention.

The need for a Department of Urban Affairs should be apparent to anyone who has had any experience with urban problems. It was once apparent to Nelson A. Rockefeller, who in a memorandum dated July 2, 1957, stated to President Eisenhower:

> It is our conclusion that a Department of Urban Affairs is already needed and that the need will rapidly become more urgent * * * the institution of the urban renewal program logically requires that the HHFA be superseded by such an executive department.

He recommended a reorganization plan to create such a department and concluded:

> The reorganization plan should be prepared in time to permit its transmittal to the Congress early in 1958.

The problems have not changed, and indeed the need for a Cabinet-level department to deal with city problems has "rapidly become more urgent." Governor Rockefeller's views, however, have changed. With political winds blowing from Iowa, we might speculate on the reason for this about-face, but it is not our task today to make an interesting study in political litmus paper.

In addition to fixing executive responsibility in the Secretary of the Department, the proposal before us will give our urban population a voice in the President's Cabinet which means representation for those who are underrepresented in the State legislatures and in Congress. State legislatures dominated as they are by rural interests consistently fail to provide adequate authority and appropriations to the cities. New York is a classic example. This neglect through malapportionment is a crucial element in the urban problem. In the House of Representatives, according to a study published in the Congressional Quarterly on February 2, 1962, rural districts control 62.8 percent of the seats in the House although they account for only 56.2 percent of the national population. The city and suburban voter, so notoriously underrepresented, should have a spokesman on an equal footing with the Secretary of Agriculture.

Recognizing this need, the 1960 Democratic Party platform declared:

> We will give the city dweller a voice at the Cabinet table by bringing together within a single department programs concerned with urban and metropolitan problems.

It is now 1962. Let us redeem this pledge of 1960.

Mr. Chairman, I have talked about the need for this plan to bring the constituent agencies of the HHFA under the direct supervision of an executive department in order to coordinate present programs dealing with urban problems and the need for an urban spokesman in the Cabinet. I fail to understand the reasoning of the opponents of the plan. The opposition generally adopts two avenues of attack.

The first suggests that the creation of the Department would result in a vast and powerful bureaucracy with increased functions and sums at its disposal.

Under the Reorganization Act of 1949 no new function can be created by this plan. That is the responsibility of Congress and will depend upon future action. Last year we initiated programs for the preservation of open space and for assistance to mass transit. We saw the need and responded. The existence of a new department will not persuade Congress to enact larger programs, but it will assure us that our programs are more effectively and economically carried out.

The second avenue of attack suggests that the new Department would invade States rights. The specter has even been raised of the Secretary of Urban Affairs and Housing supplanting the elected mayors and city councilmen in several hundred cities.

This plan does not affect or change the relationship between the cities, States, and Federal Government. The extent of home rule is a matter between State and city. Cities exercise whatever power the States grant and participate in Federal urban renewal and housing programs through express authorization.

Since the inception of the slum clearance and urban renewal programs the HHFA has worked directly with the cities. With notable exceptions, such as New York State, the States have not assumed responsibility in the field of housing. In fact, the mayors of our cities are accustomed to dealing directly with the appropriate Federal agencies.

When Mayor P. R. Olgiate of Chattanooga testified before the House Committee on Government Operations on February 6, 1962, he effectively answered those who will raise the cry of States rights. He said at pages 54-55:

> I mean we hear a lot of talk over this country about States rights and home rights, and I believe in some local rights. Local rights is where the people live. We do not live in the capital of Nashville or the Capital of Washington. We live back home, and that is where we have the problems, back home where we are trying to raise and educate our children and create jobs and houses and facilities for them.

I think this demonstrates that local officials are not overly concerned with an invasion of States rights or home rule.

I should like to point out, however, that I should think Congress would insist that cities be strictly supervised in their planning and execution of urban renewal projects. For instance, I have fought on the floor of this House for legislation prohibiting the use of Federal funds under title I of the Housing Act for the construction of luxury housing and for legislation requiring humane and proper relocation practices by local bodies.

In any event, this plan has no effect at all on the relationship between the States and the Federal Government.

President Kennedy's announcement that he intends to appoint Robert Weaver as the first Secretary of Urban Affairs and Housing was good news in New York. I am particularly proud that Dr. Weaver comes from the West Side of Manhattan which I have the honor to represent. We know him as a neighbor and a distinguished public servant who has served his city, State, and Nation with distinction. Not only is he eminently qualified to head the new Department, but he is the logical choice. I hope that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will not forget that President Eisenhower announced that he would appoint Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby as first Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, before that plan became effective.

In closing, let me again urge approval of the plan. As Democrats, let us carry out our platform. As Republicans and Democrats let us give the city resident a voice at the Cabinet table.

The urban centers are here to stay. They will continue to be the centers of commerce, industry, education, and the many other pursuits of progressive citizens. The Nation's economic growth and social progress depend upon their efficient functioning. Rehabilitation and economic development of the urban areas is not a local problem; it is a national problem which must be solved within a national framework.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK].

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I want to urge the adoption of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962—to establish a Cabinet-level Department of Urban Affairs.

It is regrettable that the debate and the decision on this question should hinge on factors unrelated to the central question.

The issue before this House is not the person who the President has designated to fill this important post. It will be for the other body to study his qualifications and determine whether or not he should be confirmed. On this point, I must say, however, that the President's designee appears to be eminently qualified. As one who has carefully studied the work of the Housing and Home Finance Agency over the past 7 years, I must say that I have never seen the administration of the agency in more skilled hands. Dr. Robert Weaver gives every indication of performing up to the expectations which were indicated by his splendid background and preparation for the post.

I would like to make another observation. Last autumn, during the White House Conference in Cleveland, Dr. Weaver gave one of the most stirring discussions of his hopes and aspirations for the American city of the future. Everyone who participated in the Conference was "fired" with the will to make the life of the city better. Dr. Weaver's prescription and plans for city life and its betterment were the vitamins we needed to press forward with our plans and hopes for a revitalized city.

The issue before us is not the cost of urban improvement programs. The outlays of Federal funds for urban renewal, mass rapid transit, housing, and community facilities must be passed upon by this Congress. What Federal funds must be spent, must be spent. It is not the purpose of this reorganization bill to spend more—it is designed to more responsibly orient the administration of law so that what is spent is better spent.

In my city—throughout the Nation—our cities are going through a redesign and redevelopment which will establish patterns of life in cities for at least the rest of this century and beyond. The redevelopment now taking place is designed well beyond the life of the mortgages and the mortgage insurance which makes them possible. The new concepts of city planning under urban renewal will live long beyond even the new structures. There is reason to believe that these new plans will look good to the next several succeeding generations—yes, Mr. Chairman, they should look provident and wise in the next century. Those who so violently criticize urban renewal must close their eyes to its real purpose—to plan in urban betterment for every comprehensible future need.

The urban renewal program underway in the city of Cleveland constitutes the one bright hope of successful urban life in our community. My city's relationships with the agencies in the Housing and Home Finance Agency transcend all other interests. We have absolutely no business relationship as a city with the Department of the Interior and practically no business relationship with the Department of Agriculture. And yet we recognize the essential need of these departmental organizations to serve the national good.

Ohio, like most other States, still lives under the influence of a rural dominated legislature. Each county, regardless of population, is entitled to one representative. In the lower house of the Ohio Assembly, the so-called cornstalk brigade of the rural counties has successfully imposed its will on the State affairs. The inequity of this representation is quite obvious. Fifty-five percent of the State's population residing in 8 counties of the State have 54 State representatives, while 45 percent of the State's population in all of the other counties of the State have 85 representatives. Obviously, the population of the highly urbanized counties is disenfranchised by the disproportionate representation of rural communities.

Time and time again, our cities have unsuccessfully appealed to State legislature for authority to establish metropolitan government or for authority to make urban development more feasible. The constant rebuff by the so-called cornstalk brigade in the State legislature has forced my city to abandon hope of any substantial State assistance in its rehabilitation efforts. The hopelessness of State action has driven my community to look to the Federal Government for understanding in the complex urban problems of today.

The establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs at Cabinet level will help considerably to offset the disproportionate representation of cities in the State assembly. Cabinet-level status for this phase of public administration will stimulate the State legislatures to better consider the urban needs of city populations which are not provided adequate representation under existing State constitutions, laws, or customs. The States should be primarily concerned with the special problems of urban life. The new Department will prove to be the instrumentality which will assist the States in carrying out their long neglected obligations to the city.

The only other relief for urban dwellers is to press for constitutional reforms in the several States which will result in proper representation in the State assemblies. The other alternative may be court action to suspend the discrimination against the city dweller.

These alternatives do not present pleasant prospects. They would tend to be divisive and set urban residents against rural resident—a struggle which the rural resident must eventually lose. This is not the time to invoke conflict between the city and the farm—both have problems which are national in their scope—totally American. These are problems which can most effectively and harmoniously be resolved in this Congress by the approval of a Department of Urban Affairs.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Chairman, I support Reorganization Plan No. 1 sent to us by the President of the United States. I am a resident of the city of New York. I am old fashioned enough to believe that this country is one country. When John Glenn orbited the world three times yesterday, it thrilled the cliffdweller and farmer alike. I believe that the urban dweller and the farm person are brothers and that they have problems which can be solved mutually, but I am realistic enough to know that on occasions, we must have a spokesman with status who can present the viewpoints of the respective groups. In the past many of you know that many city and urban dwellers and suburbanites were disenchanted with the farm program, and in their anger they have tried to defeat some of the farm programs which are costly to the taxpayer, but beneficial to the farmer and to the consumer. I have espoused the cause of the farm program because I believe that our interests intertwine and they dovetail. Just as I believe that the farmers have need for a spokesman on a Cabinet level in the form of a Secretary of Agriculture, so do I believe that the cities and the urban dweller have need for a spokesman on a Cabinet level. Consequently, I support Reorganization Plan No. 1.

When the Department of Agriculture was created in 1862, our population consisted mainly of farm residents. Eighty percent of the people of the United States at that time were engaged in farming or living on farms, and the other 20 percent lived in urban areas. Today, 70 percent of the people of the United States, or 130 million, live in cities or in suburban areas. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, Subcommittee of Agriculture, I have seen the effectiveness of an agency guided by a Secretary of Agriculture. Without a Secretary of Agriculture, the myriad and intricate problems of agriculture would be unresolved and our Nation of 184 million could not be fed by a segment of our population which constitutes less than 10 percent working their farms.

The Secretary of Agriculture supervises activities which many would regard as not relating to farming, but on closer analysis would conclude that there is a relationship between the farm and the activities to which the Secretary of Agriculture gives sense and direction.

The major objective of the Secretary of Agriculture and the Department of Agriculture is the supervision of the production of food and fiber with the management of its supply. The Agriculture Department deals with research, not only in food but also in the basic sciences which bring about new products, improved quality of the food supply, and variations in the type of food we eat and the clothing we wear.

The Department has jurisdiction over the inspection of meat and poultry. It supervises the conservation of soil and the prevention of floods. It manages a special school milk program and a school lunch program which affects the lives of 13 million of our schoolchildren and aids the pocketbook of families which perhaps could not afford a decent meal for their children.

The Department administers a program of housing for the farmer, a housing program for the farmer under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture, not only in the improvement of present housing but in the construction of new shelter.

When crops fail, a program of crop insurance is administered by the Agriculture Department. The rural people find available to them through their cooperatives, electrification of their homes and farms and communication in a Rural Electrification Administration telephone system.

The food supply which the farmers produce in abundance requires the storage of wheat, corn, feed grains, and cotton which the Department supervises and administers. In far-off lands when people are hungry, and, yes, also in our own country, programs to combat famine and to furnish food to those suffering poverty are administered by the Agriculture Department. Without sense and guidance, the farm program in these United States would be chaotic and could not possibly be administered to feed the people of the country or many of the nations throughout the world.

Just as the Secretary of Agriculture in a Cabinet position has given sense and guidance to the myriad problems of agriculture, so will a Secretary of Urban Affairs give sense and direction to the manifold problems of urban affairs.

Since 1949 urban development has been a program which Congress has said was necessary and essential for a better standard of living and for the improvement of urban conditions. Apart from the improvement in housing, the problems of cities are complicated and difficult of solution. Three-fourths of our national population, or approximately 130 million, live in the cities. Over 130 cities have populations of more than 100,000 residents. The experience of other areas and the effectiveness of a Secretary of Cabinet status demonstrate that cities should be represented in the Cabinet with a Secretary of Urban Affairs.

Under the present condition, a mayor of a city cannot go to one agency to obtain information or to process any application. If he is interested in urban renewal, he must first go to the Housing and Home Finance Agency's Urban Renewal Administration Office where he discusses his overall plans. Having prepared a workable program in compliance with the urban renewal regulations, he must then contact the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the Public Housing Administration, the Community Facilities Administration; the Sanitary Engineering Division of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; the Civil Aeronautics Administration and the Bureau of Public Roads of the Department of Commerce; the Veterans' Administration; the U.S. Corps of Engineers in the Defense Department and the Office of Civil Defense Mobilization in the Executive Office of the White House. In addition, he must check into several other agencies.

It is our hope that if all the sources of all information are available in one agency that the difficult process of collating information and processing a plan can be brought together without loss of time, energies or courage.

A Cabinet position for cities is not only justified by need but also by urban contributions. Metropolitan areas produce most of our wealth exclusive of food and fiber. They produce enough to enable most communities to build a floor under misery, to provide leisure for the workingman, and to support institutions to advance our way of life called civilization. The manufacturing of clothing, the production of chemicals, the forging of steel ingots, the manufacturing of appliances and farm equipment, the processing of foods and textiles are performed in metropolitan areas. Those who work in cities require decent shelter, pure water and air, effective mass and private transportation, educational facilities, recreational outlets such as theater, television, radio, press and parks, places of worship such as churches and synagogues.

In the furtherance of the attainment of these requirements the "cliffdwellers" need protection at work, on the way home, or at home. These measures consist of housing regulations, factory rules, police supervision and fire protection; correctional institutions, hospital care and preventives of juvenile crime must also be considered. All of these activities must have a sense of direction and guidance. They can find such direction through a Secretary of Urban Affairs, and we, as responsible legislators, must make provision to create a department which will give that advice to do the job.

Cities today face many difficulties. They are the creatures of the State. They have limitations. Financial limitations hamper solutions. Diversified agencies hinder the attainment of goals. Unplanned and sprawling growth require urban renewal and revision to provide better living quarters and functional construction. Proper planning in the form of urban renewal requires direction and commonsense to eliminate the bottlenecks which retard proper growth and which will maximize space for healthy and safe living conditions.

A hue and cry has been raised because our President has suggested the appointment of Robert Weaver as the first Secretary of Urban Affairs. I have known Mr. Weaver for many years, and I am familiar with the work that he has performed in the field of housing, which is an important factor in any urban program. Mr. Weaver is preeminently fitted by experience and character to hold the position as Secretary of the proposed agency.

In the interest of our country and in the interest of human relations, I urge this committee to approve Reorganization Plan No. 1 submitted by the President of the United States.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Chairman, two issues are projected where only one is presented by the President: Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962 which recommends the establishment of a new Department of Urban Affairs. The mention of Dr. Robert C. Weaver is not a part of the President's proposal to this body.

As to the merits of the bill, providing for the establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs, there has been steadily mounting sentiment in its favor in recent years. All research indicates that the compelling demand for this measure is based on a rapid national expansion in housing and suburban development, population growth and mobility, pressing need for solutions to the baffling problems of urban mass transportation, the urgent necessity for the conservation, stabilization and rehabilitation of neighborhoods, and other factors already covered by filed reports.

The Members know that there was special attention and serious thought given to these problems by leaders of the Eisenhower administration. As early as July 2, 1957, Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, Chairman of President Eisenhower's Advisory Committee on Government Organization, wrote the President that a Department of Urban Affairs is already needed and that need will rapidly become more urgent.

Consequently, President Kennedy's proposal submitted to this session strikes me as a mere restatement of a vital need in the area of urban affairs left over from the previous administration. I am convinced every Member of this House will agree that there is a problem in urban affairs becoming more complex and acute as the days go by. In the following excerpt from the President's message to the Congress there is hardly anything to quibble over. In fact, the only difference between the Eisenhower and Kennedy proposals is a very thin hair that only the seventh son of a seventh son could detect.

> In a few short decades—

The President noted—

> we have passed from a rural to an urban way of life; in a few short decades more, we shall be a Nation of vastly expanded population, living in expanded urban areas in housing that does not now exist, moving about by means of systems of urban transportation that do not now exist. * * * The present and future problems of our cities—

He continued—

> are as complex as they are manifold. There must be expansion—

He maintains—

> but orderly and planned expansion not explosion and sprawl.

Here, however, it may be said that President Kennedy takes the problem one step further requesting congressional approval for a measure designed to bring together in one governmental agency the numerous different programs affecting the lives and welfare of families in our cities and their surrounding areas—programs covering a wide range of diverse but closely interrelated activities all presently impinging in one degree or another on each other.

> None—

The President insists—

> can or should stand by itself.

Further he added—

> The basic purpose of this plan is to establish a department which will bring a maximum degree of coordination and effectiveness to the planning and execution of all of them.

The issue before us then is simply to vote the request for a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing up or down on the basis of its merit. Of course, there are those who will argue that the authority to accomplish the objectives desired by the President has already been vested by law in existing agencies of the Government. I, Mr. Chairman, am opposed to this view. I further assert that even if the authority does exist in widely divergent agencies, the lack of planned coordination has created the present confusion and made essential support of the proposal under discussion.

Turning now to the second matter, the race issue, which has been so intemperately and unfortunately injected into the debate, I wish the RECORD to clearly show that among those who here raise the issue of race are some of the voices most vehement in denial of racial prejudice when the representatives of other nations in the past pointed an accusing finger at this country. Mr. Chairman, I further assert that those who accuse the President of injecting the race issue into the urban affairs proposal are refuting positive assertions made on numerous occasions by responsible people in our Government, past and present, to people all over the world that there is no official prejudice of race, creed, or color among us. Moreover, through such tactics they negate the efforts of others by making it possible for the world to read that because a competent, efficient, and dedicated public servant is a Negro citizens of the United States then vital and needed legislation is jeopardized.

Mr. Chairman, I would voice a solemn warning that there are prospective allies of the nonwhite world who remain yet unconvinced by our protestations of belief in freedom and equality and seriously question our intent and motives in spite of oft-repeated declaration by responsible diplomats in their intellectual, social, and diplomatic intercourse with them.

Let there then be no further disfiguration of democracy's image. Let those who accused the President of injecting the racial issue realize that they are toying with the very survival of our Nation. Let the test of what we are be what we do. Let us then close ranks and give unqualified support to the establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs with Cabinet rank.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of President Kennedy's Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962 to create a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

Certainly those who have said that this plan is a "sham," as well as those who would have the States, cities, and towns of this country go it alone, are either completely ignorant of the problems of the 75 percent of the people of this country who live in urban communities and have been unable to cope with the problems which a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing would assist them in mastering, or, more probably, they are desperately trying to avoid the consequences of a partisan negative vote against the best interests of the urban dweller.

The Evening Journal of Wilmington, Del., brought this whole matter into focus when it said editorially on January 26, 1962, that:

> If Congress blocks the new Department, the President has a readymade issue for next fall's elections. Republicans teamed with southern Democrats to halt the bill in the Rules Committee. If Republicans and southern Democrats again team up to block the Executive decree, the Republicans will be thrown up to Negroes in urban areas as being against the Negro. The issue is raised because the man who will fill the Cabinet post is Robert C. Weaver, a Negro.
>
> Does the Federal Government need a Department of Urban Affairs? In the sense that creation of such a department would be recognition of the overwhelming importance of our cities, the answer is "Yes." There are large numbers of Federal programs where aid is given to cities that need such a coordinating agency. However, we're under no illusions that the number of agencies involved in urban affairs will decrease; that rarely happens in government.
>
> But the creation of the Department should serve notice to the cities that they'd better be about setting their own houses in order if they want to avoid having excess Federal interference in their affairs. The example of what has happened in agriculture should be ample warning.
>
> The Department, certainly, is needed. But so is more effort back home in the cities, both in getting their own affairs in order and in working together for their common good.

At a meeting sponsored by the Pennsylvania-New Jersey-Delaware metropolitan project on June 19, 1958, Dr. John A. Perkins, president of the University of Delaware referred to the magnitude of some of our urban problems and of the significant resources already existing in the fine institutions of higher learning and in the many civic and research groups of the region.

Dr. Perkins made a statement in his speech which I believe should be adopted by President Kennedy as the motto for his great plan for a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

Dr. Perkins said that:

> The capacity of the great urban areas of America to meet the challenge of rapid growth and expansion will materially influence the future of America. In the international ideological contest, that capacity, or lack of it, may well influence the outcome of the worldwide struggle.

In 1961, I introduced a bill, H.R. 6538, to provide for the establishment of such a new Federal department; and on June 7, 1961, I submitted testimony in support of my bill and similar legislation which was in accord with certain recommendations submitted by President Kennedy in his special message on housing.

The creation of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing would, in the long run, save the taxpayers a great deal of money. Such a new department would not, as its opponents declare, provide a bottomless till into which everyone could reach at the expense of the suffering taxpayer. Under present arrangements duplications are unavoidable and costly. Coordination of these programs would achieve greater effectiveness in the use of our existing urban renewal and housing programs and, at the same time, save money.

Today our major cities are decaying at the core. They are faced with heavy burdens in many areas, and as their problems have increased their tax base has narrowed. People have moved to the suburbs, but continue to work in the cities and they require and demand just as many services as before without, in many cases, paying for them.

So the problems that face the cities today, in addition to the narrowed tax base, range from juvenile delinquency to health, sanitation, water, sewerage, and outmoded transit systems.

Our cities have not always been cesspools of crime and delinquency. They can become again, as they have been in the past, places where children can develop properly, not as delinquents but as law-abiding and law-respecting citizens, demanding no more for themselves than they would demand for others.

This will strengthen our country and make it safer in the future.

Nor is this a bill for the big cities at the expense of the small towns in our rural communities.

President Kennedy made this clear in his Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962, which your Committee on Government Operations is considering today.

The President said:

> Hundreds of smaller cities and towns are located on or near the fringes of rapidly growing urban areas. The problems of the cities affect them today, and will be theirs tomorrow. Hundreds of other smaller towns and cities not now affected will be so situated a few short years hence. Thus, the smaller towns and cities have a stake in this proposal as vital as, and only a little less immediate than, that of our large urban centers. This plan is addressed to their needs as well as to those of the major cities. Likewise, it should be emphasized that the Department will have important activities of service to the States.

The attack on this bill is based, in part, on its concern with the major cities. As I have indicated, we should all be concerned with the crime problems of our great cities because, as FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover has said, the rising rate of crime in our cities is matched these days with a rising rate of crime in our smaller towns and suburban communities.

The President has compared this new Department of Urban Affairs and Housing with the Department of Agriculture.

The President has pointed out:

> Just as the programs of the Department of Agriculture have strengthened the role of the States in measuring and helping solve the problems of their farmers, so the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing will provide additional opportunities for the States to play a strong role in the development of their urban communities.

A Department of Urban Affairs and Housing would be of very real and very great assistance to my own State of Delaware which I have the high honor to represent in the Congress.

For instance, at Delaware's Farm and Home Week which was held on February 7, 1962, in Agricultural Hall, Newark, Del., a panel of planning experts raised a specter of chaotic industrial and residential growth if new techniques of planning and zoning are not applied to the rural and urban fringe areas of the State.

Dover Planning Commission Chairman Alvin L. Leisey, Jr., said:

> We see industrial development moving down the State's coast and it will probably soon begin to move up the coast. Kent and Sussex Counties have no laws to permit them to plan this growth.

Mr. Leisey went on to say, according to an excellent report in the Evening Journal of Wilmington, Del., that the experience of Dover, the Delaware State capital, proves that a city cannot be a planned island in a sea of unplanned chaos. According to Mr. Leisey:

> We plan right up to the city line and then our problems begin.
>
> Already the city is surrounded by a hodgepodge of residences, commerce, industry, and shacks with the lack of proper traffic arteries to handle an increase of traffic and new industrial development.

Dr. George M. Worrilow, dean of agriculture at the University of Delaware, cited significant figures showing that 23 percent of the State of Delaware is undeveloped nonfarm woodland and marshland. Another 60 percent, he said, is agricultural. A total of 83 percent of the land area of Delaware is vulnerable to changing uses.

Dr. William M. Crosswhite, agricultural economist at the University of Delaware, said the first step in planning is to state the desired goals. He pointed out that research is essential, and research can lead to a change in goals.

As was pointed out by Harry Themal in a forceful article in the Wilmington Morning News of Tuesday, February 6, 1962:

> Delawareans interested in a favorable future for the State believe there has never been a better time than now to start metropolitan planning.
>
> Reasons for this optimism include:
>
> A State planning agency now exists.
>
> The Federal Government has increased available funds for metropolitan planning and is even considering a Cabinet department to handle the problems.
>
> Wilmington's decay and the country's growth have created a great community awareness of the need for planning.
>
> The city and county governments have given informal approval to coordinated planning for the future.
>
> Half a million dollars has been made available by the Ford Foundation for the urban affairs division at the university just to deal with such a program in all its facets.
>
> Penn-Jersey Transportation Study, backed by governments of this area with $3.5 million, can make available data necessary for the planning if Delaware joins the study.
>
> Regional coordination, through Pen-Jer-Del and similar private agencies, is at an all-time high along the Delaware River.
>
> The planning drive is being spurred by the enthusiastic approval of the Greater Wilmington Development Council, which includes most of the key business and government officials in this area.

For the reasons which I have advanced and on the basis what is clearly the best interests of the people of Delaware, I support the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs and Planning.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Chairman, the proposal to create a Department of Urban Affairs must be recognized for what it is: a bold bid by the Federal bureaucracy to usurp and ultimately to emasculate the authority and influence of our State and local governments.

America's cities do have troubles. But these problems cannot be solved by removing the power and influence of government from our cities and transferring this authority to a far-removed Federal department in Washington.

Community problems can only be met and mastered by community solutions, not by Federal interference. The Federal Government may aid and cooperate with communities in solving these problems, but the line between Federal and local authority must be maintained.

The creation of a Department of Urban Affairs would represent a large step toward obliterating that line and thereby reducing America's local governments to the status of mere agencies of the Federal Government.

Would this help to solve the problem of the future of our cities? Indeed, it is hard to understand how removing the source of solutions from the cities to Washington could accomplish this purpose. In fact, it is inevitable that a Department of Urban Affairs, once created, would compound our cities' problems by establishing another vast bureaucratic network—at tremendous cost to the American taxpayer.

Let the Federal Government assist our communities toward solving their problems. Let the Federal Government continue to cooperate with local authority toward meeting the challenge of our cities' future. But let us keep in mind the traditional role of local government in maintaining our system—a role envisioned by the framers of the Constitution who wisely provided for checks and balances to preserve our form of government.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Chairman, Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962 should be rejected by the House, and I shall vote to disapprove it. The plan, if adopted, would accelerate the trend toward eroding the constitutional position of the States. By giving Cabinet voice primarily to the demands of big cities, the plan would provide additional incentives for these big cities to lean more heavily upon the Federal Government for aid, regulation, and—ultimately—control. None of these results is desirable.

To make HHFA a Cabinet post would further centralize political power in Washington to the detriment of the

States. We have already moved too far in that direction, in my opinion. By establishing a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, another step would be taken toward expanding the sphere of Federal influence over local urban affairs and housing at the expense of State functions and powers, and at mounting cost to all taxpayers.

Mr. Chairman, these are not the only objections I have to the proposed Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. HHFA does not need to be elevated to Cabinet status in order to furnish aid either for urban affairs or for housing. HHFA now has ample authority to bypass the States and to deal directly with municipalities in extending or withholding billions of dollars in Federal credit and in Federal aid largely by means of back-door financing. Through major legislation enacted in every year except one since 1946, the Congress has authorized generous aid for housing, urban renewal, community facilities, open space, mass transportation, and city planning.

Nor does HHFA need to be elevated to Cabinet status in order to reorganize any of its existing programs. The Administrator was given authority to do this very thing under legislation enacted as long ago as 1955. If that proves insufficient, any necessary internal reorganization could be accomplished either through a special reorganization plan or through appropriate legislation.

A fundamental mistake in the reorganization plan, I believe, is that it would establish a new concept of administration. Up to now, Cabinet level departments have been established primarily on the basis of function and not of geography. A Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, organized on the basis of geography, would create administrative confusion. Its powers could ultimately cut across the authority of any existing executive departments or agencies whose present functions may include both urban and rural affairs.

Urban affairs, for example, involve highways, education, public welfare, and air pollution, to mention only a few. Housing comprises programs administered by the Veterans' Administration, the Department of Agriculture, and the Department of Defense as well as the operations of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board. Yet all these activities would be excluded from the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing except to the degree they might be part of urban renewal or community facility programs.

The organization plan, indeed, fails to define exactly what the ultimate jurisdiction of the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing might include. The proposal completely omits any definition of the term "urban," although it would set up a new Cabinet-level Department to deal with urban affairs. Actually, the word "urban" has no fixed meaning. The Census Bureau, which publishes statistics for urban and rural areas, has varied its definition of "urban" from time to time.

The definition followed by the Census Bureau in the recent census of 1960 was more inclusive than the definition used in 1950. According to the 1960 definition, some 125 million people resided in 6,041 places classified as urban. If the Census Bureau had continued to use the definition followed in 1950, only 113 million persons and 5,022 places would have been classified as urban in 1960. Thus it is that a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing would have ultimate dominion over an area of undefined extent.

Mr. Chairman, the reorganization plan should also be rejected for other reasons. It would waste money by requiring higher salaries for the new Department officials who would do essentially the same work now performed by HHFA employees. Demands would soon multiply for a new office building and countless other amenities deemed appropriate for an executive agency with Cabinet status.

This is no time to lay the groundwork for a further expansion of Federal expenditures by establishing a Cabinet-level Department for Urban Affairs and Housing. No such drastic reorganization is needed, either, to give the HHFA Administrator authority to reorganize the internal functions of the HHFA. The provisions of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act of 1955 gave the HHFA Administrator "full authority to assign and reassign functions, to reorganize and to make whatever changes, including the reallocation and transfer of administrative expense funds and authority where applicable, necessary to promote economy, efficiency, and fidelity in the operations of the Housing and Home Finance Agency." If any additional reorganization powers may be needed, ample recourse exists through legislation or through a reorganization plan designed to provide whatever changes are necessary.

It should be made clear that the reorganization plan now under consideration would drastically downgrade the Federal Housing Administration. At the present time, FHA operates under the general supervision and coordination of the HHFA Administrator. The proposed reorganization plan would relegate the FHA operations to a minor role by transferring the program to the Secretary of the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. The Secretary would have future direction of any delegated activities carried out by the FHA Administrator, who would be reduced to a subordinate position.

The proposed Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962 would unnecessarily encroach upon State constitutional functions and powers. It would encourage greater local dependence upon the Federal Government. It would create a Department with mushrooming expenditures and personnel. From the outset, this Department would discriminate in favor of big cities.

Ultimately, it could expand its jurisdiction over so-called urban affairs almost indefinitely by taking over many functions now performed by other Federal departments and agencies. If an internal reorganization of HHFA is needed, it can be accomplished more simply than by this plan.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the real question before us this afternoon is whether or not we are going to give the President reasonable latitude in organizing the executive functions for which he has constitutional responsibility.

This was the purpose of the Reorganization Act of 1949 and its predecessor acts—to vest in the President authority to set up the most effective and efficient means of carrying out the executive responsibilities of the Government.

Of course, we have retained the right to disapprove plans for executive reorganization submitted under the 1949 act, but I believe that we should exercise this right sparingly, and in full recognition of the seriousness of refusing to allow the President to have what he considers to be the necessary means of executing the laws enacted by the legislative branch.

In submitting Reorganization Plan No. 1 to us, the President exercised a prerogative authorized by law and which is essential to his position as Chief Executive.

What President Kennedy said about this particular reorganization plan in his message transmitting it to the Congress is:

> I have concluded that the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing is urgently needed to permit me to discharge most effectively the responsibilities in this area placed upon the President by the Constitution and by the statutes respecting these matters enacted by the Congress.

On what basis can we reasonably refuse this request? Is it because the action the President proposes is arbitrary and capricious? The answer to this is clearly "No." The elevation of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to departmental status has been under consideration, by students of public administration, by various committees and commissions, by other chief executives of our Government and by the Congress for many years.

In the last session, extensive hearings on this subject were held by committees of both Houses of the Congress. In each case bills were reported favorably.

Does the plan in anyway take away from the prerogatives of the legislative branch? Again the answer is clearly "No."

This plan is based on authority delegated to the President in the Reorganization Act of 1949. No new programs are authorized. No new expenditures are authorized. The plan does not even transfer to the new Department any of the programs not now lodged in the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

The plan does, however, permit the President to do a more effective job of carrying out those programs relating to urban affairs and housing which have been—and may in the future be from time to time—authorized by the Congress.

I think that it is inherent in the responsibilities of any executive—whether he be an executive in government or an executive in business—that he should be charged with devising the most effective way of doing his job, and I think that his views in such matters are entitled to the greatest respect.

The President of the United States has clearly stated his views in this case. He has presented for our concurrence a carefully thought-out and well-supported reorganization plan. We should allow this plan to become effective in the manner prescribed in the Reorganization Act of 1949.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my firm endorsement of the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1, creating a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

In my mind, it is now high time that the 70 percent of the American people who live in cities be given the attention their numbers require. Recently the San Francisco Chronicle stated in an editorial entitled "A Plan To Help Troubled Cities":

> Its prime objectives, the President has said, would be to "prevent the appalling deterioration" of cities and "insure the availability of housing for all segments of the population." It would concern itself with slums and blight, the location of industrial activities, urban mass transportation, transit planning between communities, development of parks and open areas for recreation, and facilities for cultural purposes.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this quotation sums up quite succinctly the role such a department would perform. Its establishment would not only benefit our cities, but would play a vital role in the continued health of our Nation.

At this juncture, Mr. Chairman, I would like to insert this editorial into the Record:

A Plan To Help Troubled Cities

> "Both equity and commonsense," said President Kennedy in his state of the Union message, "require that our Nation's urban areas—containing three-fourths of our population—sit as equals at the Cabinet table."
>
> With that preamble, he renewed an urgent appeal for legislation to create a new, Cabinet-rank Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. Bills for its creation were reported out by committees of both the Senate and House last year, but did not receive floor consideration.
>
> What the President seeks, his various utterances on the proposal have shown, is a department to provide leadership and assistance in solving the numerous, complex problems of the fast growing urban areas and to coordinate within it the numerous functions now performed by an assortment of departments and agencies. Thus it would absorb or annex the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the Federal Housing Administration, the Public Housing Administration, the Urban Renewal Administration, the Community Facilities Administration, the Federal National Mortgage Association, and some others.
>
> Its prime objectives, the President has said, would be to "prevent the appalling deterioration" of cities and "insure the availability of housing for all segments of the population." It would concern itself with slums and blight, the location of industrial activities, urban mass transportation, transit planning between communities, development of parks and open areas for recreation, and facilities for cultural purposes.
>
> In a discussion of this proposal, the Population Reference Bureau of Washington notes that urbanization is increasing everywhere and that planning has become urgent "if densely packed cities are to become pleasant places in which to live." (In this shift from country to city, California shares second place among the 50 States—its population is now 86 percent urban.) The bureau says cities must attain "high standards of well-being, freedom, and opportunity" and finds: "The problems are big enough to challenge the best efforts of government and private agencies."
>
> We heartily agree with this estimate of the problems and feel that a Cabinet-rank department would at least end the confusion and jurisdictional uncertainty now confronting local authorities who apply to Washington for help toward their solution.

Mr. Chairman, a short time after the above-noted editorial appeared in the San Francisco Chronicle, the other San Francisco morning newspaper, the San Francisco Examiner expressed in an editorial entitled "The Cities' Needs," the position of that newspaper that:

> The most convincing argument in behalf of the plan (to establish a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing) is this: The tremendous growth of our vast urban complexes makes them and their people deserving of representation in the Federal Government at Cabinet level.
>
> To deny it would be to disregard a dynamic phenomenon of our time.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I would like to insert this editorial in order that our colleagues may review these hard-hitting arguments:

The Cities' Needs

> Disregarding the politics now boiling around the issue and considering its probable merits against its potential defects, President Kennedy's plan to create a new Cabinet-level Department of Urban Affairs should be approved by Congress.
>
> In supporting it we are aware that opponents have valid points—the new Department could turn into just another huge bureaucracy and, at its worst, could develop into paternalistic interference in municipal and State affairs.
>
> These are risks, but the probable advantages outweigh them. The gist of the matter, in the words of the President, is this:
>
> "Our cities and the people who live in and near them need and deserve an adequate voice in the highest councils of Government."
>
> Ours has become largely an urban county. The U.S. Conference of Mayors and the American Municipal Association—which by the way endorse the President's plan—estimates that 70 percent of our population lives in and around cities. The percentage is increasing. Mr. Kennedy pointed out that taxpayers in the 10 largest metropolitan districts contribute 35 percent of the total income tax collections.
>
> As the urban areas have grown, as have the multiplicity and complexity of problems—transportation, housing, educational facilities, racial minorities, slums, traffic, downtown blight, and so on. They are becoming increasingly difficult to solve at local levels; in fact some of them spill over formal city boundaries and across State lines.
>
> The proposed new Department is not actually a radical innovation. It would coordinate the functions of a number of Government agencies. The Federal Housing Administration and the Federal National Mortgage Association would be brought into the Department. So would the functions of the Public Housing Administration, the Urban Renewal Association, and the Community Facilities Administration.
>
> The President's belief that such coordination would increase efficiency is soundly based, and his assertion that his plan "does not connote any bypassing or reduction in the powers and responsibilities of the States" is assuring.
>
> But the most convincing argument in behalf of the plan is this: The tremendous growth of our vast urban complexes makes them and their people deserving of representation in the Federal Government at Cabinet level.
>
> To deny it would be to disregard a dynamic phenomenon of our time.

Mr. Chairman, it is estimated that there will be 160 million urban residents by 1970—more than our total national population in 1950. American communities, with their limited tax revenues already swallowed up by rising service costs and diminishing property values, cannot individually provide the technical assistance and leadership that will be required for economically sound and orderly growth. This is not to say that the complex problems facing our cities will be solved overnight by the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. Without question, a coordinated attack by and at all levels of government—city, State, and national—is urgently needed. If our human and economic resources in our country are to be utilized adequately, the Federal Government must respond in assuming a positive role of leadership, stimulation and technical assistance to our cities. The time for assumption of this role is now before the House of Representatives. It is my fervant hope that this body will act with wisdom today in rejecting House Resolution 530, which would disapprove Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, some of the discussion of Reorganization Plan No. 1 seems to be based on the fear that housing will somehow be subordinated in the proposed new Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, with major attention going to urban affairs. In the nature of things, this is not possible. The fear is groundless.

Urban affairs and housing are not two separate things, but rather two sides of the same coin. The proposal to create a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing makes no distinction between the two. On the contrary, use of the two terms together dramatizes the inseparability of our concern for the housing of our people and our concern for the improvement of our towns and cities.

The mission of the new Department would be the same as that of the various programs it would embrace—to support the goal set by Congress in 1949 of "a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family." The urban community is the setting of the homes of two-thirds of our families. It is also their living environment. Good housing is not possible without good communities.

Every city is predominantly residential. Many of the suburbs and small communities that lie within urban areas are entirely so.

Here are some facts drawn from a 1955 study by the noted city planner, well known in Washington as former chairman of the National Capital Planning Commission, Mr. Harland Bartholomew.

Mr. Bartholomew studied the land uses prevailing in a representative sample of 53 municipalities. He found that, excluding streets, parks and playgrounds, and public and semipublic properties, 73 percent of the remaining area was devoted to residential use, 6 percent to commercial use, and 21 percent to industrial use and railroads.

When it is remembered that parks and playgrounds serve residential areas, as do schools and to a large extent hospitals also, and that streets serve the entire community, including its residential areas, then it is plain that homes and the services and facilities most necessary to them account for well over three-fourths of urban land area.

The point is that urban communities are in the main aggregations of housing, and that there is not and cannot be any real distinction between urban affairs and housing.

The programs that would be transferred to the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing make no such distinction.

These include, of course, the mortgage insurance operations of the Federal Housing Administration that reach into virtually every community of the country. They include also the special programs of assistance to low-rent public housing, housing for the elderly, and housing for college students and faculty and for student nurses and interns. They include aids for nursing homes for the elderly and the ill, housing for displaced persons, and special housing to meet a variety of other needs.

But our 30-year experience with housing programs has taught us that housing problems cannot be solved except in the context of the whole community.

Congress has authorized more and more activities that recognize this fact. Programs of slum clearance and the rehousing of low-income families led naturally to programs of urban redevelopment and urban renewal. We found that urban renewal could not be carried on without providing housing for the families it displaces. And also urban renewal has led us to a greater and greater emphasis on the rehabilitation of housing and neighborhoods. The expansion of urban areas into what had been open country pointed up the need for area and regional planning and for assistance to localities in extending public facilities to serve new concentrations of homes. Similarly, the growing congestion of cities and the outward movement of housing brought mass transportation problems to the fore. Again and again, when we take up some aspect of the problem of housing, we find we have grasped the problem of the whole community. This is as it should be, because our primary concern is not with housing as mere physical structures, but with houses as homes for people, and this requires us to look to the entire environment in which people live.

It is a virtue, not a fault, of the plan for a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing that it recognizes the truth to which we have come—that housing and community are one and inseparable.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, the Reorganization Plan No. 1 now under consideration appears to me to be another move toward further concentration of authority and power in Washington and a foot in the door leading toward further undisciplined spending by the Federal Government.

Creation of a separate Department of Urban Affairs purportedly would produce some new measure of coordination and effectiveness to the planning and execution of the programs which affect our urban areas. However, diligent investigation on my part fails to reveal, within the four corners of the reorganization plan, any such solid promise for the future or any proof that this vast new Department could somehow cope more effectively with the problems of urban areas than the agencies now authorized to deal with these problems.

There is the effort to justify this legislation on the basis of the fact that some State and local governments have failed to achieve solutions to all the complex problems which confront our cities. To infer that the creation of this new Department would solve these problems gives rise to the legitimate fear that the Federal Government plans to take over functions which rightfully belong to local governments, despite the protestations of the advocates of this plan to the contrary.

Even if the States and local communities are not doing enough in this field, this does not automatically establish the need for the creation of the new Department now proposed.

If the Congress authorizes a new Federal Department every time a State or local government cannot immediately solve every problem they encounter—even, as in this case, with substantial assistance from the Federal Government—it surely will not be long before our States are relegated to the posture of mere administrative subdivisions of the National Government.

When this occurs, this Nation no longer will have "government by the people."

The repeated assertions by proponents of this legislation that it would create no new Federal programs or alter existing laws relating to housing and urban development cause us to consider: Why is this huge new Department of Urban Affairs necessary?

The people of the urban centers of America are certainly entitled to effective spokesmen in the Federal Government, from the President through the Cabinet down through the executive agencies and to the Congress.

This they already possess in full measure, in President John F. Kennedy, in the members of the Cabinet, in many effective executive agencies and in the Congress.

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Secretary of Commerce, the Attorney General, the Postmaster General, even the Secretary of Agriculture, now represent at the Cabinet table the need of our urban dwellers to have adequate housing and hospitals, effective law enforcement, prosperous commerce, good mail service and the best food on earth.

The Federal Housing Administration, the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the Urban Renewal Administration, the Public Housing Administration, the Community Facilities Administration, the Federal National Mortgage Association—these and countless other agencies already exist for the purpose of serving the needs of urban citizens. They are fully empowered to do the jobs they are designed to do and already have a powerful voice in the conduct of governmental activities.

Amalgamation of these agencies into one department would create another gigantic bureaucracy which doubtless would mushroom over the years. What about those agencies such as the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, such bureaus as the Loan Guaranty Service of the Veterans' Administration and many divisions of such Departments as Health, Education, and Welfare, Commerce, and Labor which primarily deal with urban problems and programs? Are these many units eventually to be shanghaied into this new Department?

Creation of this separate Department to deal exclusively with urban affairs would, in my judgment, be a mere exercise in political science and theory and would serve no useful purpose.

The legislation should be rejected on that basis, not on the basis of some of the extraneous considerations which have been mentioned in connection with the plan, such as the appointment of Dr. Robert C. Weaver to head the Department if it is established.

Here no question of civil rights is involved. If the Congress in its wisdom approves the reorganization plan and if President Kennedy believes Dr. Weaver is the best man to head the Department, then his nomination should be approved by all Americans.

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Chairman, in discussing pending and anticipated legislation with various groups in my district in recent months, considerable emphasis was placed upon the proposal for a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. I found no sentiment whatsoever in support of this measure. Invariably, the reaction indicated it was an intrusion on the part of the Federal Government in local affairs, with expanding bureaucracy and incidental needless expense.

During my comparatively short experience in the House, our office, like many others, has grown to be sort of a service station where the little fellow comes as a last resort. He comes every day in exasperation following unanswered pleas, involvement in redtape and possibly, renewed disenchantment in all governmental process.

However, there has been a bright and shining exception in the case of Federal housing and urban programs and I have frequently marveled at the expediency and the absence of complaints in connection with municipal contacts back home. I am therefore opposing the proposed new Department in the light of favorable experience and the broad general premise that we should let well enough alone.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Government Operations that considered Reorganization Plan No. 1, I heard testimony pro and con, have studied the plan and its possible effects, and have come to the conclusion that I favor it.

My position, briefly stated and stripped of emotional or political consideration, is as follows:

Creation of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing will not establish a bureaucracy. Only a small increase in cost—$64,000—will result, and no new functions are added to the Cabinet post, but a greatly increased administrative efficiency will be achieved. Testimony from experts with experience in government has emphasized the need for better coordination with other agencies and even among constituent agencies. Other programs, with Cabinet status, have an advantage that should not exist.

It is expected that savings to the municipalities and Federal Government will result because a more effective administration of urban renewal problems, and other departmental functions, will save time and money. Now, it is often necessary for a municipality to deal separately with several agencies, some with overlapping jurisdictions and authorities, to reach agreement on a project or a series of related projects.

There was no testimony presented from mayors or Governors that local or State responsibility or rights would be bypassed, but the evidence was quite to the contrary. The mayors and many Governors supported the plan.

It is my conclusion that the creation of a single agency, which was recommended to President Eisenhower by an Advisory Committee in December 1953, is clearly indicated, and it should have Cabinet prestige and authority.

This method of establishing a Cabinet Department is not unusual. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was created by President Eisenhower under similar circumstances and is, in my opinion, consistent with the recommendations of the Hoover Commission for efficient and economical government.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, the plan which we are now considering was originally introduced in the House as H.R. 8429, and in the Senate as S. 1633. Upon conclusion of hearings in both Houses, the respective Committees on Government Operations favorably reported the measure, accompanied by strong minority reports. From the testimony elicited at the hearings many different groups were firmly opposed to the idea of creating a new Cabinet-level Department in this area.

This January, H.R. 8429 was considered and rejected by the Rules Committee. Normally, this would be the end to a bill. Those who propose and support it are naturally disappointed at its failure, but they bow to our legislative process. Not so the present administration. Early in the last session we were treated to a "preview of coming attractions" when the Rules Committee itself was enlarged, "packed," I believe, is the term so that it would henceforth reflect not the will of the House but the will of the White House.

This same "packed" Rules Committee—enlarged specifically for the purpose of insuring favorable consideration of legislation such as H.R. 8429—decisively turned down the measure by a vote of 9 to 6.

At this point we see the administration shift into high gear, ignoring now any pretense of regard for the Congress, or the safeguards of the legislative process. By a great coincidence, the final Rules vote was taken just 15 minutes before the President's press conference. In the conference the subject was of course brought up, and three especially interesting and unusual statements were made by the President:

First. He implied that the Rules Committee turned down the proposal because the Republicans blocked it, despite the fact that the Rules Committee is composed of 10 Democrats and 5 Republicans.

Second. He stated that he will transform H.R. 8429 into a reorganization plan, which would become effective unless a majority of either House disapproved it within 60 days.

Third. He announced that if the Department was created, its Secretary would be Robert C. Weaver, the first Negro ever appointed to the Cabinet.

This final statement is the most unfair political maneuver we have seen in a very long time. For a large segment of the population, the issue no longer was one of urban affairs, of centralization versus State control, of the best way to solve our problems.

Now it was civil rights, and a vote for the Department in some totally incongruous fashion equaled a vote for equal opportunity. And a President who had asked for and received fair treatment during his campaign now turned and stood revealed as one who himself had no qualms about exploiting the very racial prejudices which publicly he deplores. And so, as the wheel came full circle, we found Mr. Weaver himself, as reported last Sunday by the New York Times, saying that a large segment of the population would interpret a vote against the Urban Affairs Department as a vote against putting a Negro in the Cabinet.

Mr. Chairman, I have always been and always will be a firm supporter of all minorities in this country. I personally would have been delighted to see Mr. Weaver or any other well-qualified Negro appointed to Mr. Kennedy's original Cabinet and wonder why this was not done. I would be happy to see a qualified Negro appointed now to head any one of the existing departments.

If rumors materialize there will be two vacancies in the Cabinet—Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and Attorney General. Thus, the President will have two opportunities to prove his sincerity and appoint a qualified candidate from the reservoir of Negro professional and legal talent in the Nation.

But I also submit that one's views on civil rights are totally irrelevant to the issue of urban affairs, which no rational person of any race will deny. That is why I feel that it is a dark day indeed when the issue of race is injected as it has been here. Let us hope it will not happen again.

I do not feel there is a Member present who is unfamilar with the issue, who has not considered the many arguments in favor of, and in opposition to, the bill. Those of us who oppose this legislation do so because we are convinced that the centralized approach to this problem is simply not the answer. We see its potential dangers as far outweighing the rather indefinite blessings which it is supposed to distribute. We feel it would be another step—and a long one—in the direction of removing the Government still further from the people it is supposed to serve. Let me just mention some of the very considerable dangers which would confront us:

First, what our Federal system needs today is not less but more strength at the State and local level. The gradual but ever-increasing erosion of its power leads us to forget that the framers of the Constitution did not reserve such powers to the States without reason. The only solution which this administration seems able to offer, whether it be in the field of education or medical care or urban affairs, has the effect of reducing or eliminating voluntary participation, weakening States control, gathering all the power in Washington, and eventually bringing every activity under Federal control. The number and variety of urban problems suggested during the hearings on H.R. 8429 for eventual inclusion on 8429 is astounding. And when we stop to consider the history of the last Department created—Health, Education, and Welfare—and the way in which it has grown, both in terms of employees and appropriations, I think we will be doubly wary about believing the initial siren song of economy which inevitably accompanies requests for a new Department.

These are several reasons why the reorganization plan should be voted down.

It is the State, county, town, and village governments which properly possess the primary responsibility for urban growth. It is they who are composed of local citizens, intimately familiar and directly concerned with their own local problems. The fact that the problems are growing, and are becoming more complex is in my opinion a reason for increased Federal assistance, where appropriate. It is not a reason for increased Federal control.

We find that unlike every other department or agency, a Department of Urban Affairs has a geographic rather than a functional basis. Considering the spectrum of functions which proponents wish to include in the Department, we are continually at odds on whether to assign a particular function to urban affairs because a city is involved, or to an existing agency because of the nature of the function. Should the concept of function be bypassed in this area, we may start a trend which could eventually undermine our entire system of government.

The political dangers resulting from a Department of Urban Affairs are obvious. Under the Housing Act of 1961, the Secretary would have the authority to commit $9 billion of Federal funds, and thus would be able to exert enormous influence on big city officials. The ability to cut off such funds would result in a tremendously powerful Federal office, and such direct power over city government by the highest level of the executive branch is dangerous and unwise.

Moreover, this danger could be reinforced by the inevitable tendency of city governments to ignore the county governments, which are now their equal, and State governments which are properly their superior. For as large metropolitan cities find they can bypass State and local governments and deal directly with Washington, we will find a new channel of communications being established, in which State government is effectively ignored.

Finally, if we understand the basic distribution of our metropolitan population, we will realize that large numbers ordinarily included in the term "urban"—and thus presumably to be aided by the plan—are not really city dwellers at all. We often hear that 70 percent of our population lives in urban centers. However, as the National Association of County Officials points out, the central city is often equated with its suburbs, and both lumped together under the term "urban." Within the 217 metropolitan centers, approximately 50 percent of our citizens actually live in the suburbs, and present trends indicate that in years ahead this percentage will increase in proportion to the central city population.

The problems of the suburbs, as well as those of towns and villages, may or may not be shared by the central city; and the degree to which they may be shared will vary among different States and geographical areas. Therefore, it is important that these problems be analyzed by local county and State governments, rather than included in a consensus of national needs.

One of the alleged purposes of H.R. 8429, for which this plan is obviously a substitute, is to encourage the solution of urban, suburban, and metropolitan development problems through State, country, town, village or other local and private action. In hearings on this bill, however, as well as on its Senate counterpart, there was a noticeable lack of support from the county and town level. Indeed, in the Senate hearings no witnesses appeared on behalf of smaller towns or counties asking that a new Department be created. On behalf of county government within the 50 States NACO officials vigorously opposed the creation of the Department. Since representatives of the suburbs, counties, and towns do not favor the plan, it is more than likely that the new Department is designed primarily to act for the central cities at the expense of suburban dwellers who now represent 50 percent of the metropolitan centers.

I oppose the plan not at all on the grounds of civil rights. I do so because I do not believe further Federal centralization and control in the area of urban affairs is the answer to the problem.

The fact that we do not concur in the administration's solution, however, does not mean we deny that problems exist. Problems such as redevelopment, slum clearance, and water pollution are indeed multiplying and new approaches and efforts are called for to solve them. In those areas where the Federal Government is able to be of genuine assistance to the States, such assistance should be forthcoming. But let the control, and the basic decisionmaking machinery, remain close to the people. The same money which we are told can do so much in the hands of a Department of Urban Affairs can accomplish just as much—if not more—in the hands of a concerned citizenry operating directly through their State and local governments.

In order to give these local, State, and Federal Governments the opportunity to work together on this problem, with each performing the functions it is best equipped to handle, I have introduced a bill to establish in the Executive Office of the President an Office of State and Urban Affairs. This is not a particularly new idea, but it is one which I think would enable States to make maximum use of the Federal Government and still retain control over their own affairs. The bill contains the following provisions:

First. The Office would coordinate the programs of various agencies of the executive branch which have a major impact on the Nation's urban areas, such as housing, urban development and redevelopment, community facilities, water and air pollution, et cetera.

Second. The Office would compile and make available to State and local officials information concerning appropriate Federal programs, and would help in relating such programs to specific urban needs.

Third. The Office would undertake research and studies with a view toward determining what changes should be made—first, in various programs to achieve a more effective coordination of such programs with State and local programs; second, in the allocation of such programs among the various departments and agencies of the executive branch; and third, in the administration of such programs in order to achieve increased economy and efficiency, and to avoid duplication.

Annual reports of the activities of the Office would be submitted annually to the President and the Congress.

The end result would be to retain the benefits of the reorganization plan without surrendering States' prerogatives to Washington. One central office conducting the coordination, research, and gathering of information, could make known the results to all 50 States. For its part, each State could bring selected problems to such an office and receive the benefit of its experience in dealing with similar problems in other States. This partnership would be in far greater accord with both the spirit and the letter of our Federal-State form of government than the administration's proposal. I urge its consideration by Members of the House, and the defeat of the reorganization plan at hand.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, my district is all within the city of Minneapolis, Minn.—certainly a large urban area and the center, along with St. Paul, of a much larger metropolitan area. I have worked for 15 years to bring into being a tremendous urban renewal project which will make of downtown Minneapolis one of the three or four largest redevelopment areas in the entire country. Certainly I am as interested in the proper and rapid and adequate development of my city and area as any person can possibly be.

It is precisely because I want the best possible conditions for the people of my city that I am unable to support the creation of the proposed Department of Urban Affairs.

Since coming to Congress I have always subjected any proposal to increase the power of the Federal Government over the lives and affairs of our people or of smaller units of government to several tests: Is the proposal necessary? Will it actually accomplish the desired objectives? Is action by the Federal Government the only or the best way to handle the problem? Do the probable advantages of the proposal outweigh the probable delays, the increased costs and potential dangers? I do not believe the proposed new Department meets these criteria. Hence, I must vote for the resolution disapproving the proposal.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I am against the resolution of disapproval now pending before us—in other words, I favor the establishment of the new Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. I made my position clear many times in the past, and I have heard no arguments here which would lead me to change my mind. Quite the contrary. I am just puzzled as to where some of the opposition arguments were invented, because they certainly do not fit the facts as we have been able to determine the facts.

I find it ironically amusing that so many of the real-estate people have been wiring and writing in to us to oppose this proposed new Department on the grounds that it would lessen the importance of the local communities or represent some new kind of Federal meddling in local affairs.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, I serve on the Housing Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency. Most of the work of the proposed new Department would involve the administration of laws and programs originated in or recommended by that subcommittee. We are all aware of the fact that the housing programs of the Federal Government are matters of economic life and death to the real estate and construction industries. They come to us for help whenever there is a slowdown in construction or a shortage of mortgage financing. They do not fear Federal meddling in assuring a supply of mortgage financing; nor do they fear the bureaucracy of the Housing and Home Finance Agency when it comes to programs in which private enterprise shares so handsomely.

Obviously, the opposition to the proposal for raising the HHFA to Cabinet status is pure politics—nothing more. Let us not pretend otherwise.

Mr. Chairman, I recently called attention in the House to the position of the

St. Louis Board of Aldermen in favor of the proposed Department. In addition, I have received the following letter from the mayor of St. Louis, the Honorable Raymond R. Tucker, on this proposal:

St. Louis, Mo., *February 8, 1962*.

Mrs. John B. Sullivan,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Leonor: I should like most emphatically to remind you of my strong feeling that the establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing is of urgent importance.

The urban areas of our Nation, where the overwhelming percentage of the people live, deserve a proper spokesmanship at the national level. The proposed Department of Urban Affairs and Housing would not undertake any new functions but would properly group existing functions of the Federal Government. I think this Department would be a step toward a heightened efficiency in the administration of existing functions because it would provide for better coordination between different policies of the Federal Government which affect urban areas.

I think one of the most democratic developments in Government in recent years has been that of strong interrelationship between local communities, local funds, and local initiative on the one hand, and Federal policies aimed at national problems of urban impact on the other hand.

Consequently, I should like to urge your support of the President's reorganization plan establishing the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing when it comes to a vote in the House.

Kind regards.

Cordially yours,

Raymond R. Tucker,
Mayor.

Mr. Chairman, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, which is recognized as one of our greatest American newspapers, had this to say on January 27 about the President's proposal for a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing:

President Kennedy's decision to seek a Cabinet Department of Urban Affairs by the reorganization route rather than through Congress is thoroughly justified, because of the way in which the congressional route was blocked.

Five Republicans and four southern Democrats constituted the majority on the House Rules Committee that refused to clear the urban affairs bill for House action. When nine members can, in effect, prevent Congress from considering a major Presidential request, a detour is in order. In this case the detour seems both passable and fair.

Mr. Kennedy's reorganization plan establishing the new Cabinet post will go into effect automatically 60 days after it is submitted, unless it is disapproved by either the House or Senate. Thus opponents of the measure can still block the proposal if they muster a majority vote; they cannot depend on one committee or nine votes to hold it up.

Most Americans, we think, will support the President's plan to elevate urban affairs to the Cabinet, because most Americans live in urban areas—7 out of 10, the Census Bureau says. With the trend toward urbanization have come problems of slums, traffic, transit, city rehabilitation, and galloping surburbanitis. These problems deserve Federal attention today as much as did the farm and labor problems that long ago led to the creation of Cabinet posts for Agriculture and Labor.

Moreover, neither the cities nor their parent States have been able to solve urban problems fully. Outmoded State laws and malapportioned State legislatures have not been very helpful. The upper chambers of 33 States are controlled by less than 40 percent of the population. The lack of an adequate voice for urban voters spreads from the States even into Congress, because its apportionment is largely in the hands of rural legislatures. For these reasons the cities need an outpost in the executive branch.

Predominant rural interest, however, does not explain the House Rules Committee's objection to the urban affairs legislation. Rural and urban representatives were on both sides of the committee vote. What put all the committee's Republicans and its southern Democrats on the same side there is what usually creates this coalition—a community of conservative interest.

The conservative coalition opposes the very effort to help solve urban problems which the legislation was meant to provide. Action on housing or mass transportation means more spending, they think, and more welfarism. The mere elevation of these tasks to a Cabinet position will not immediately affect spending; President Kennedy's budget for housing, community development and mass transportation planning is already set and amounts only to nine-tenths of 1 percent of the total Federal budget. But the placement of urban responsibility in the Cabinet will emphasize the Federal Government's role, and that is what it is intended to do.

Urban citizens, which means most citizens, have a right to expect as much. The United States already has become a largely urban republic. Urbanization continues, and its attendant problems will grow. President Kennedy's proposal reflects his awareness of this and the Republican Party, or its members in Congress, will avoid a serious political error if they do so.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose House Resolution 530 to disapprove Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962, creating a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

There is no doubt that the present problems of urban renewal, expansion, housing, air and water pollution, and public transportation, to name but a few, will become even more varied and complex in the future. As we all know, there have been in existence for many years various agencies working in one or more of the above-mentioned areas. The President's proposal in no way contemplates establishment of an additional agency, but rather the reorganization of already established agencies into one unified department. Coordination of activities, now so widely scattered, will permit far more effective and efficient operation.

In addition, I wish to remind you that citizens directly interested in agriculture, for example, are represented in the Cabinet by a department which serves to correlate their interests; the same is true of labor. By the same token, why should not the great majority of people who live in urban areas—now 70 percent of our population—have the prestige of representation through a department whose voice will be heard when overall national policy is being considered at the highest level.

Despite the wealth of propaganda to the contrary issued by opponents of the reorganization plan, there is nothing in the plan which commits the Congress or the President to provide increased authority or power for the proposed new Department over that extant in agencies now functioning in this same field.

Nor will the rights of States or cities be violated by such a reorganization. The hollowness of such arguments is clearly demonstrated by the wide endorsement of the proposal at the community level. I am happy to say that my own county of Los Angeles, the largest urban county in the United States, has endorsed the proposal by vote of its board of supervisors, and the mayor of the city of Los Angeles has issued a statement strongly supporting the creation of the proposed new Department.

This entire subject has been thoroughly studied over a period of years by both the executive and legislative branches. All have reached a similar conclusion—the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing is desirable—now.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in favor of the creation of the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. I have been in Congress now close to 10 years. There has not been a year when major legislation concerning housing and urban affairs has not been under consideration by the Congress. The present Housing Agency expends more funds than most of the existing executive departments. The housing and community development programs of the Federal Government have a tremendous impact upon the economy of the country. In times of recession its programs are among the first to be called upon to be used to bolster and stimulate the economy. In times of major national emergencies, such as war and natural disaster, its programs are utilized to assist in meeting the emergencies. The housing and community development programs are available to assist not only large cities but all communities—even the smallest—and particularly the smaller communities. The assistance goes not only to State and local public bodies but also to private lending institutions, builders, and other large segments of our private enterprise system.

Coming as I do from the eastern seaboard, which has practically one urban strip from the southern to the northern ends of the country, I know something about the problems of urban development. Since the war our State and city officials have been hard pressed to provide the services and facilities demanded by the enormous increase in population coupled with the movement of our population to the urban areas from the more rural areas.

Even though our country is young—and probably because it is young and relatively inexperienced—our cities have grown up without proper planning. Parts of them have been allowed to deteriorate into slums and blighted areas. This must be corrected and prevented in the future. We have large problems in the field of mass transportation and community facilities and all other phases of urban affairs.

From year to year the Congress has given the housing agency more and more authority to help the States and localities in meeting these problems. Its programs are many and varied. They include insurance of loans to assist the construction, purchase, and rehabilitation of dwellings; a secondary market for housing loans; loans and grants to assist in the provision of housing for our low income families, and for the clearance and prevention of slums and the redevelopment of slum cleared areas; loans for housing for the elderly, for essential types of community facilities, and mass transportation facilities; and grants for community planning and the acquisition and preservation of open-space land.

STATES RIGHTS WILL NOT BE WEAKENED

Mr. Chairman, I have heard those who are opposed to the creation of the Department say that it would interfere with States' rights and weaken their powers. This I do not believe. No State or local public body can accept Federal assistance from the Department unless the State has enacted legislation authorizing the carrying out of the program for which the assistance is available, and the acceptance and utilization of the Federal funds. The assistance that would be provided to private lenders and other parts of private business by the Department cannot logically or feasibly be provided in any other manner. Here, too, State laws and regulations play an important part.

I have been a member of the legislature of my State. I know from firsthand experience that our State legislature protects its rights and responsibilities just as earnestly as we do as Members of Congress. They are not going to give up their control over their constitutional share of the Government of our country. Many of the Governors have asked that the Department be approved. Also the mayors and cities want the Department. They are not afraid of losing their powers or rights.

Many of the States are furnishing assistance to housing and urban affairs that supplements the assistance provided by the Federal Government. That is true in my own State of Massachusetts. My State is working with the Federal Government but is not relying entirely upon the Federal Government for the provision of adequate housing and community planning and development. Many of you from less thickly populated sections of the country have not had to face the same needs we have. Your States will do the same when the needs arise. You cannot do all these things alone.

GOVERNOR VOLPE FAVORS DEPARTMENT

The Governor of Massachusetts, the Honorable John A. Volpe, has urged the establishment of the Federal Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. He has asked the congressional delegation from Massachusetts to support the proposal. In addition, he has proposed to the Massachusetts Legislature that it establish a counterpart department in the State government—the department of economic development and community renewal. In the words of Governor Volpe, the State department "would mesh effectively with a Federal Department of Urban Affairs and Housing since it would integrate State agencies responsible for urban renewal, housing, mass transportation, economic research, industrial and commercial development and local, regional, and statewide planning." Our State has no fear from the creation of the proposed Federal Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. We believe we have much to gain and that the entire country would gain.

The creation of the Department would give its functions and programs their proper place in the Federal executive branch from the standpoint of their importance and effect upon the country. It would assure the most efficient and coordinated administration of these programs. Most of you have served in the military services. You know the importance of a straight line command. Under the reorganization plan the Secretary of the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing would be responsible for all the functions of the Department. They would be carried out subject to his direction. With this authority he can coordinate the various programs in the Department and prevent duplication and inconsistencies. With the present housing agency organization the Administrator is supposed to do this—but with inadequate authority.

The prestige and status of the Secretary of the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing would make it easier than it is for the Housing Administrator to consult with the Secretary of Commerce and other department heads with respect to programs under his direction that may be affected by programs or policy decisions in those departments. He can be sure that his programs will be given adequate consideration in top level decisions with respect to national policies and actions because he will be at the Cabinet table when they are made.

DR. WEAVER, A NEGRO, HIGHLY QUALIFIED FOR CABINET RANK

Mr. Chairman, a side issue, unfortunately, has been injected in this very important proposal because President Kennedy has said that he will appoint to the Cabinet position of Secretary of Urban Affairs, Administrator Robert C. Weaver, of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, who is a Negro.

Let me say that in my judgment, as a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee for Independent Offices which decides on the budget requests of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, Dr. Weaver is the best informed, the most knowledgeable and has the highest qualifications of any Administrator of this Agency that I have heard testify during my 8 years of service on the Appropriations Committee. President Kennedy's selection of Dr. Weaver for this Cabinet position would be excellent.

Mr. Chairman, in a recent publication that passed over my desk there was a discussion of the assertion that Congress is behind the times. We all know that big bodies move slowly. I never cease to be amazed—and I know you have all shared this feeling—when the end of each session comes at the amount the Congress has accomplished—despite the fact that only a month or two prior to its adjournment it looked as if nothing had been done and in fact everything seemed to be in a hopeless state of confusion. I am the first therefore to deny that the Congress is behind the times and that it is not doing its job. One task we must accomplish is the creation of this Department of Urban Affairs and Housing because it is needed and it is past due. I ask permission to include with my remarks a list of State and city aid to housing and urban renewal in Massachusetts, and an excellent editorial from the Springfield, Mass., Republican of February 4, 1962, in support of President Kennedy's plan to create a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

The material follows:

MASSACHUSETTS STATE AND CITY AID TO HOUSING AND URBAN RENEWAL

Municipalities financed a veterans' housing program beginning in 1946 under which the State contributed a 2 percent annual subsidy for construction of homes to be rented to veterans—1,745 units were built by 15 communities. All except 36 units have been sold and are now under private ownership.

In 1948 the State was authorized to guarantee local housing authority bonds or notes up to a total of $200 million for construction of permanent veterans' housing. The State was also authorized to provide up to 2.5 percent of development cost of the housing in annual contributions. 15,462 units were built by 88 municipalities under this program.

In 1954 a program of construction of housing for the elderly was initiated. Ninety-five projects are either occupied or under construction. They are financed by a State guarantee (up to an aggregate of $105 million) of housing authority bonds and State annual contributions up to an aggregate of $2,675,000.

The State guarantees housing authority bonds to provide relocation housing.

The State may make grants to cities and towns up to one-half of the local grant-in-aid contribution to assist urban renewal that is federally assisted.

The State may make up to $25 million in grants to localities for nonfederally assisted commercial or industrial redevelopment projects.

Municipalities may annually appropriate funds for grants to aid housing authorities in their preparation of plans for housing projects and making surveys.

The Massachusetts State Housing Board approves all housing projects of local housing authorities and the State division of urban and industrial renewal approves urban renewal projects initiated by localities.

FEBRUARY 21, 1962.

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Republican, Feb. 4, 1962]

A MAJOR REPUBLICAN BLUNDER

The great personal popularity of President Kennedy, shown by recent public opinion polls, suggests that in 1964 he will be unbeatable for reelection in spite of his razor-thin margin in 1960. That had appeared, even before the polls registered their extraordinary figures of popular approval of President Kennedy, to be the philosophy of former Vice President Nixon in thinking the 1964 Republican nomination to be of little value and that, for him, the part of political wisdom was to fix his long-distance plans on the campaign of 1968.

Before election day in 1964 there now yawn 2¾ years. That is an interval in which many things may happen, either to depress Kennedy's rating or even to raise it to a new high. But nothing could have happened in 1 day to make his reelection in 1964 seem more probable than the action on January 24, by the mass votes of all the Republicans on the House Rules Committee combined with those of racist-minded southern Democrats, to defeat Kennedy's proposal for a new Department of Urban Affairs.

As if this were the bell for the next round, the President came out fighting. He shrewdly seized the committee's action as a profitable campaign issue and challenged the GOP to battle on it. He announced that exercising his power under the Reorganization Act, he would himself establish the new Department and name Dr. Robert C. Weaver, the very able Negro whose prospective appointment had caused most of the trouble, as its first Secretary.

This announcement was at once attacked by Representative BYRNES of Wisconsin, chairman of the Republican Policy Committee in the House, on the ground that it introduced the race issue. Of course it introduced the race issue. But it did so properly and wisely. It put the Republicans on the spot, although not all of them will follow the unwise leadership of Senator DIRKSEN and Representative HALLECK. This was shown by the prompt announcement by Senator JAVITS, of New York, liberal Republican, that he would vote in favor of the new Department.

Other liberal Republicans in both Senate and House are expected to do what JAVITS does. It is again of more than incidental importance that a private poll of Republicans in both Houses as to whether or not they were satisfied with the "Ev" and "CHARLIE" leadership brought only two favorable votes, the two being cast by "Ev" and "CHARLIE" themselves. The story is possibly apocryphal but like some other such stories it undoubtedly reflects much truth.

The comment is made in Washington that the Republican leaders were trapped into their predicament by President Kennedy's not using his power under the Reorganization Act in the first place. If so, they were trapped only by their own poor judgment in once more forming a coalition with reactionary elements in the Democratic Party on the House Rules Committee. As a further factor pointing to the poor judgment of "Ev" and "CHARLIE," the Republican National Committee recently issued an analysis which emphasized that it was in the big cities that the Republicans lost the last election. This is hardly a reason for letting it be advertised to the country that the congressional leaders of the Republican Party are opposed to the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs to help deal with the acute problems which grow more acute as big cities grow bigger.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to have this privilege of expressing my position on the pending resolution. I am opposed to it. It should be defeated, and soundly defeated. When we analyze the arguments that have been advanced here in favor of the creation of a new Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, it is found that they are lacking in substance. The principal argument in favor of the new agency is that 70 percent of the American people are now classed as urban, and, therefore, we better be careful, or those of us who vote against the agency will lose a lott of those city votes.

But I fear, Mr. Chairman, that the advocates of the new agency who capitalize upon that reasoning overlook the simple fact that people who live in urban centers are also taxpayers. We all know that only the naive and the uninformed seriously believe that the creation of the new agency as proposed will not involve vast new expenditures on the part of the Federal Government. There has indeed been no attempt to conceal the real motive behind this proposal. The purpose is to concentrate the power and authority of a Federal agency to spend more money, engage in the financing of more programs, stimulate more requests for more spending, and avoid the old-fashioned idea that local people should finance their own local projects.

Aside from the billions of dollars which would be expended because of the approval of this plan, imagine the magnitude of the new, sprawling bureaucracy which would be created. The plan calls for not just a new Secretary of Cabinet rank, but in addition, an Under Secretary, three Assistant Secretaries, a General Counsel, and an Administrative Assistant Secretary to perform duties prescribed by the Secretary. But that would be only the beginning. That would hardly get the new agency into orbit. Then would come the second, the third, and many other stages, with untold thousands of new Federal employees on the payroll as the new bureau would expand its functions and its activities.

There is no need to speculate on the question. Any student of government knows the history of newly created agencies, particularly the larger ones. Once created, they expand and enlarge, and before you know it the annual appropriations double, and then quadruple, and the new vehicle for spending the people's money gets into high gear.

Take, for example, the rather recently created Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Expenditures for that Department have increased 2½ times the cost of the agency in its first year, which was 1953.

It has been estimated that if the proposed new agency should follow the course of HEW in growth rate, it would be a $165 billion department by fiscal year 1973. That is based upon the fact that the Budget estimates that as of June 30 these programs, now in existence, which would be incorporated into the Department of Urban Affairs, will have outstanding direct and insured loans totaling $52.9 billion.

The issue has been stated very simply: The issue is whether the Federal Government should take over more and more functions and activities which properly are duties and responsibilities of the local and State governments.

One of the strangest arguments in behalf of the new agency is that which has been heard here today, that because there has been a Department of Agriculture serving rural people, it is therefore proper that the city people be given a department. That is, of course, nonsense. The Department of Agriculture serves all Americans because it deals with production of food and fiber. The Department of Commerce very properly serves an all-national interest, American business. And the Labor Department likewise serves a nationwide interest, American labor and problems related to it. It happens that both Commerce and Labor relate more to urban affairs and to people who live in the cities than they do to our rural areas.

Mr. Chairman, is there no end to this lust for more bureaucracy in this country? Several new agencies have been set up recently. Some 75,000 new Federal employees were added to the payroll during the past year. Scores of new Federal functions have been authorized. And we are approaching a $100 billion annual budget to finance all this. Is there no end to it?

It is said that so long as the people demand these new and expanded Federal services, the people will get what they want. But the fact is that the people are being given more government than they want, and far more than they need. Let us put the blame where it belongs—and that is the fertile-minded politicians who dream up every sort of new spending idea in a frantic appeal for votes, and for more governmental power. That is nothing new. It has been going on for years. Let us face up to it. And here is a good place to begin.

Mr. Chairman, here is a chance to give the taxpayers a break. Here is a chance to hold the line against a gigantic spending project for which there is no sound requirement or justification. Here is a chance for us, the representatives of the American people, to reaffirm our faith in America—and in Americans. The people are quite capable of solving their own problems without this new approach, this new attempt to bypass the courthouses, the city halls and the State capitols, and bring their appeals for funds to finance purely local projects directly to the Great White Father in Washington.

The proposed new Department of Urban Affairs should be defeated.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Chairman, I know that Members of this House have studied closely the issues posed by creation of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. And I know that little said during this debate today will change their reasoned opinion on the merits of this proposal.

But I would like to set out clearly and emphatically my thoughts in opposition to creation of such a Department.

First, I doubt if any member of this House doesn't believe that creation of this Department is going to mean a tremendous increase in size and cost of the Federal Government. I predict that if this Department is created, it will surpass in size and cost within a short time two of the giant bureaucracies of the Federal Government—our Departments of Agriculture and Health, Education, and Welfare. I can cite one sentence from the Government Operations Committee report accompanying House Resolution 530 to back up such a prediction:

> Today, 70 percent of the people in the United States live on 1 percent of the land.

Mr. Chairman, it is fact, not fiction, that Federal agencies and departments have a penchant for trying to be all things to all men. If the giant Agriculture Department represents only 30 percent of our people—what in the world will be the size and cost of an Urban Affairs Department to solve all the problems of the remainder?

There must be a line drawn on how far the Federal Government will be permitted to grow—and how deep it will be permitted to interject itself into the realm of local and State authority. Certainly, there are problems of urban explosion facing our cities and States today.

But in most instances, such problems can be controlled by local and State authorities when the people demand that such be done. It is unreasonable and unwise for the Federal Government to haul vast sums of tax money from States and municipalities and turn around and send it back to solve local problems—minus the cost of operating a growing Federal system of departments and agencies.

Mr. Chairman, our people are overburdened with taxes to support the Federal Government, and relief must come soon. If you disagree with the fundamental issue of State and local versus Federal control, in the name of commonsense this proposal to create this Department should be defeated on the basis of economy alone.

Mr. Chairman, I noted with deep concern the efforts to interject into consideration of this measure the issue of racial relations, and it is with reluctance that I delve into this matter at all.

The President has seen fit to announce that Mr. Robert Weaver will be nominated to head such a Department, if it is created. And because Mr. Weaver is a member of the Negro race, and would be the first Cabinet member of his race, there have been attempts on the part of some to characterize opposition to creation of this Department on the basis of race alone. In my opinion, nothing could be farther from the truth.

From my personal contacts with the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and from all reports I have received, Mr. Weaver is doing a fine job and is a most capable administrator.

There is little doubt in my mind but that Robert Weaver will become a member of the President's Cabinet at some time in the future, even if creation of this Department is vetoed by the House. And there is little doubt in my mind but that he will fulfill his duties and responsibilities with the same ability and dispatch he has shown in the past. That is a decision that only the President can make, and the Senate confirm.

But I strongly feel, Mr. Chairman, that attempts to interject the racial question into an issue as basic and fundamental as this does a great disservice to Mr. Weaver, the President, this Congress, and our people as a whole.

I strongly urge my colleagues to consider this issue closely and to oppose creation of this Department on the sole basis of economy and lack of justification for its creation at this time.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Chairman, if this Congress defeats the President's plan for a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing it will also inflict a crushing defeat upon all the cities of this country—large and small—which are engaged in a losing struggle with the vastly increased problems of housing, transportation, the scourge of blight, maintaining their economy, finding means to support essential local services, to mention a few. It is incomprehensible to me that Members of this House can close their eyes to the needs of our cities, can turn a deaf ear to the pleas of the many mayors and other State and local officials who have begged for the assistance which would be provided by the new Department.

In the late 1880's the Congress created the Department of Agriculture. At that time 80 percent of the U.S. population lived in rural areas and it was recognized that it was necessary to have coordinated plans and action for the benefit of those in the rural areas. Today, 130 million of the 184 million Americans live in urban areas. It should be apparent to clear-thinking lawmakers that now the city people need the same kind of help we gave the farmer so long ago. There is no sound, reasonable, or justifiable argument against the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

Robert C. Weaver, the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, has pointed out the necessity for coordinating the greatly expanded Federal activities in the urban and housing fields—such expansion being due to the mushrooming needs of our cities, for our cities have borne the brunt of the population explosion. He stated that the Housing and Home Finance Agency is now an "administrative monstrosity" whose responsibilities have outgrown its capacities. He pointed out that by every test of efficiency, of intelligent management, and of good government, there must be a consolidation and reorganization, and this is one purpose of the reorganization plan proposed by the President.

The additional cost required for the proposed new Department is nominal and is no basis for concern.

I would emphasize that the new agency plan does not, and could not, create any new governmental function. Among other things, it would be engaged in the following activities:

Preparation of comprehensive plans for community development, and redevelopment and the planning and construction of such projects.

Preservation of open space in urban areas for recreation and conservation.

Preservation and development of urban transportation systems.

Financing of residential construction and rehabilitation of home ownership and home improvements.

Maintenance of a stable market for Government-insured mortgages.

It is not sensible that Government activities of such magnitude and importance to our cities should be carried on outside the highest council of Government—that is, at Cabinet level. The widely different Federal programs now in existence in these fields should be carried out under one head and one Department.

The President pointed out to us that the present and future problems of our cities are as complex as they are manifold. He stated that there must be expansion: but orderly and planned expansion—not explosion and sprawl. We recognize the need for extension of basic public facilities into the areas surrounding urban centers, but it is important that they be planned and coordinated so as to improve rather than hamper the sound growth of communities. The scourge of blight must be successfully overcome and prevented. Our cities must have help so that their economic and cultural wealth can be restored to lasting vitality. We must find means to provide a more efficient local economy and provide revenues to support essential local services. Housing must be conserved and improved and new housing created. I look forward to reaching the goal of a decent home for every American family; it is of great importance that our children have the benefit of growing up in a suitable living environment. I agree with the President that when we neglect our cities we do so at our peril, for in neglecting them we neglect the Nation.

The Department would also have important activities of service to the States; the States would be expected to assume additional leadership in the future in dealing with problems of urban areas, and the Department would maintain close working and consultative relationships with them.

Housing continues to be one of the major problems of the area I represent, the 23d District of New York. The great shortage of housing and the terrible living conditions are shocking. The new plan provides for the transfer of the Federal Housing Administration as an entity to the new Department; therefore, the vital and increasing problems of housing would receive their opportunity for discussion and suitable action at Cabinet level.

I was delighted to learn that the President plans to name Dr. Robert C. Weaver, head of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, Secretary of the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. In his present high office, Dr. Weaver has proved himself to be a brilliant administrator, an expert in his field, a man of integrity who has won great respect and admiration for the fine contributions he has made to his country in the discharge of his duties. He richly deserves the Cabinet post to which the President plans to name him.

I urge my colleagues to approve the President's plan for a Cabinet-level Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, so that we may have the necessary leadership in coordinating the many Federal programs in the fields of housing and development.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this resolution which disapproves Reorganization Plan No. 1 creating a Cabinet-level Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

To deny a segment of our society which represents 70 percent of our people a voice at the highest levels of Government would be an injustice. No other major segment of our population is denied such an opportunity. Our business interests are cared for at the Cabinet level by the Secretary of Commerce. Our working people are represented by the Secretary of Labor. For farmers, who now represent less than 20 percent of our people, we have a Secretary of Agriculture.

The problems of our cities are formidable, as has been testified to by countless mayors, city managers, and municipal associations. There is a pressing need for a rebirth and surge in the health and welfare of our urban areas. Old housing must be restored or replaced. Mass transit systems must be revived and made more effective and efficient.

More adequate community facilities must be constructed. Parking facilities are needed in most city centers. Greater efforts are needed to control juvenile delinquency, air pollution, and water pollution. Hospitals, airports, and green areas must be constructed. Projections indicate that these problems will increase as the years go by.

President Kennedy's proposal has had almost unanimous support from all groups who are directly involved in caring for the needs of our cities. The American Municipal Association supports this measure. The National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials supports it. The U.S. Conference of Mayors has given it solid backing.

It is interesting that the leading opponents to this measure have been historically opposed to legislation which enables the Nation to meet the responsibilities of the 20th century.

The arguments that this proposal would lead to the Federal control of our cities is a false one. Certainly, representation at the Cabinet table does not mean the control of the interest represented.

Nor would the President's proposal set up a growing bureaucracy with wide and far-reaching powers. The truth of the matter is that under the administration's proposal no new programs or functions would be authorized. No new additional funds would be provided. No Federal control would be extended over the States, counties, or municipal bodies. No powers or prerogatives would be taken away from the Congress.

The reorganization proposal would simply raise the status of existing agencies to the Cabinet level and provide a central body where hard-working local officials could turn when they alone could not completely cope with their growing problems. The plan would also provide the necessary coordination and administering of the Federal housing and urban programs which now exist. In order to better serve the needs of our States, our towns, our cities, and the millions of people whom all of these programs are designed ultimately to serve.

A hundred years ago, one of our greatest Presidents, Abraham Lincoln, called upon the Congress to create a Department of Agriculture to serve the needs of 80 percent of the population who inhabited the Nation's farms. Those of us who are here today would do well to follow this great President's example and insure that all important groups in our society have their place in the highest levels of government.

As far back as 1937 the National Resources Committee made a detailed survey of the problems of our cities, including the areas of proper national responsibility. In its report to the President, the committee said:

> It may be questioned, however, whether the National Government has given sufficient attention to some of the specific and common problems of urban dwellers, as it has for farmers through the Department of Agriculture.

In 1955 the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations—the Kestnbaum Commission—studied in depth the problems of Federal, State, and local government relations in the areas of housing and urban affairs. The Commission's report again pointed to the need for greater coordination of Federal programs in these areas.

In 1961 the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations made a special study of this problem, entitled "Governmental Structure, Organization and Planning in Metropolitan Areas." It too emphasized the need for better coordination and interrelationship of the various Federal programs which impact upon orderly planning and development within the large urban areas.

I trust that the effort to defeat this plan will be voted down.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, in President Kennedy's request for the establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, his basic purpose of this plan is to establish a department which will bring a maximum degree of coordination and effectiveness to the planning and execution of Federal programs, now in existence, which affect the lives and welfare of families in our cities and their surrounding areas.

The American scene is changing from a predominately rural society to a vast urban complex. More than two-thirds of the American population now lives in metropolitan centers and the figure is increasing. It is because of this expansion that a need exists to bring about the solution of problems of housing, transportation, and education in the great overcrowded urban centers.

In the past the State and local governments have coped with advancement, but the tempo has accelerated and the problems have become more difficult to resolve. Historically, in this Nation, the purpose of the Federal Government is to assist those communities who are experiencing difficulty to approach a national objective.

We live in the birth of a new era. An era so impetuous it needs careful planning for us to keep pace. And it is essential we keep pace if we are to win the race against communism's dream of world domination. For the new nations of the world are window shopping for the system that is best for their prosperity and future, and we best keep our windows trimmed most attractively and most sensibly.

By coordinating the work of presently established Federal agencies—which are designed to assist urban areas—under one Department, we can realize more efficient management and greater results in resolving urban renewal problems. It will benefit all citizens of our Nation and strengthen our world position.

I wholeheartedly endorse the idea of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing available to all local communities and officials, to work for the improvement and in many instances, the salvation of our greatest asset, the cities.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the resolution and in support of the President's request for establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

The resolution before us today could prevent establishment of such a department, and I urge my colleagues to vote against it so that the millions of American people who live in urban areas of America could have more meaningful representation at the Cabinet level in our Federal Government.

If the President's proposal to create a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing is defeated, it will not constitute a setback for the administration, but rather a serious blow to the American people who have a right to expect an orderly solution to the problems which beset cities like Chicago and other municipalities through more effective action at the Federal level.

More than 78 percent of the American population today lives in urban areas. The Congress did not hesitate to establish a Department of Agriculture in 1894, when ours was predominately a rural nation. Congress realized that in order to give the farmers of America, then constituting the majority of our people, a coordinated program of action, one, single Department should deal with all those problems of rural communities which came under Federal jurisdiction. Today, this Congress does not hesitate to appropriate some $9 billion in various assistance programs for the farmers of America. Is it asking, then, too much that we merge all of the various activities at the Federal level dealing with urban affairs into a single Department, now that the overwhelming majority of the American people live in urban communities? It is my judgment that creation of such a single Department would benefit not only those Americans living in cities but, indirectly, the 22 percent of Americans living on farms and in rural communities.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the most compelling argument in support of this legislation was given to the House Government Operations Committee by the distinguished mayor of Chicago, Richard J. Daly, when he testified before that committee. Mayor Daly stated:

> It is important to note that the proposed bill in itself adds no new powers or new funds to the new Department. That does assign additional responsibility for leadership in coordination of specific activities of the Federal Government as they affect urban areas.
>
> This is not a bill for the big cities. Of urban renewal project reservations, 28 percent has been made to communities under 25,000 population; of public housing projects under contract, 63 percent are in localities under 10,000 population; of public facility loans, 87 percent have gone to service areas with populations under 3,000.
>
> Over half of the localities with certified workable programs are under 10,000 population. There has been no new evidence presented since the hearings last summer that would basically change any of the testimony given in behalf of the bill. But there have been some issues given prominence which we believe are irrelevant to the merits of the proposal and which cast shadows on the real issues.
>
> It has been said that those who are strongly advocating the creation of this new Cabinet post come from big cities, but the American Municipal Association, which has endorsed this proposal, represents not only big cities but many small cities, towns, and villages.

It is my sincere hope that the merits of this proposal will not get bogged down in partisan bickering or extraneous issues. We have heard today various arguments in opposition to this proposal, but the one inescapable fact remains that the urban communities of America are today in serious difficulties and rather than giving them "helter-skelter" assistance, as is now the practice at the Federal level, it makes just common sense to me to merge all of these programs into a single, logical approach to the problems before us.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, last Wednesday, February 21, this body rejected Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962, which would have created a Department of Urban Affairs. During the floor debate on this subject I stated my opposition to the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs. At that time I stated that I was very much aware of the problems facing the urban areas. It is my conviction that the solution to these problems is not to be found in devising a new organizational chart. As I pointed out Wednesday, any real solution to this problem is going to be found in the development of a policy or philosophy and in the coordination of activities.

This can best be achieved through the creation of a small organization which might be called the Council of Urban Advisers. Such a council would be a staff agency set up on a continuing basis and composed of experts. It could conduct research, seek a coordination and integration of related activities, and make recommendations. Perhaps most important of all, it could think about and work toward the formulation of a basic policy which we do not now have.

This approach, which has much to commend it, is considered favorably by Robert H. Connery and Richard H. Leach in their excellent and objective examination of the question of an Urban Affairs Department in their book, "The Federal Government and Metropolitan Areas."

Profs. Robert H. Connery and Richard H. Leach are distinguished scholars of the subject area of Federal Government and metropolitan areas.

Robert H. Connery holds degrees from the University of Minnesota and Columbia University, receiving his Ph. D. from the latter. He has taught at Columbia, Catholic University, Stanford, the University of Illinois, and Duke University.

Over the past 25 years he has served as consultant to numerous Federal, State, and local governments and officials including among others the National Resources Planning Board, the President's Committee on Administrative Management, the New York State Legislative Committee on Interstate Cooperation, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of Defense, the Hoover Commission, and the city administrator of New York. He has been a fellow as well as a senior staff member of the Brookings Institution.

During the Second World War he served for 5 years in the Navy as a commissioned officer. In that capacity he was assigned to Secretary Forrestal's office to write an administrative history which later was published as "The Navy and the Industrial Mobilization in World War II, 1950." He is also author of "Governmental Problems in Wildlife Conservation, 1936," "Administration of an NRA Code, 1936," and other Government reports and articles.

Richard H. Leach is joint author of "The Administration of Interstate Compacts, 1959," of "In Quest of Freedom: American Political Thought and Practice, 1959," and of numerous articles. He was graduated from Colorado College in 1944 and received a Ph. D. from Princeton in 1951. He taught at Georgia Institute of Technology before joining the Duke faculty. He has had considerable practical experience in government as a member of the staff of the Southern Regional Education Board from 1953 to 1956, and of the Army Security Agency.

Both men are now members of the Department of Political Science at Duke University, Durham, N.C.

Mr. Chairman, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert chapter 5 of "The Federal Government and Metropolitan Areas"—"A Department of Urban Affairs: Pro and Con," into the RECORD. The authors have given me permission to quote this chapter. I commend it to all for thoughtful consideration.

A DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS: PRO AND CON

The idea of an executive agency devoted entirely to urban affairs is not a new one. A variety of possibilities have been suggested in recent years, ranging from an interagency committee all the way to a department of urban affairs at the Cabinet level. Some of the proposals have been for a temporary organization, some for a permanent one; none of them have agreed on what form the organization should take.

The simplest suggestion advanced has been for an interagency committee, to be made up of representatives from the several Government agencies whose programs bear upon urban and metropolitan areas. This proposal has been discussed informally but has never been activated. Endless variations have been suggested as to what agencies should be included and as to what its exact terms of reference should be. The proposal ran into the problem encountered so frequently in dealing with Federal programs, that no one knows precisely which agencies and what programs actually do have an impact on metropolitan government. In addition, the proposal ran afoul of the inbuilt weaknesses of all interagency committees. With no permanent secretariat, no provision for regular meetings, no delegation of precise authority, an interagency committee is at best a feeble administrative device for dealing with a problem as explosive as that of metropolitan areas today.

A Cabinet committee has also been suggested as a device to focus attention on the problem. In 1956, for example, President Eisenhower asked seven members of the Cabinet to serve as a Committee on Small Business, and in 1958 he requested five members to constitute a Council on Youth Fitness. He might do the same for metropolitan areas. If he used such a committee, however, a full-time secretariat should be provided, for Cabinet members are fully occupied in their own departments. The President might wish instead to bring in an individual for a short while to study the problem and report to him, as he did recently when he appointed Edward P. Curtis to study aviation facilities planning (1957), and Clarence B. Randall to study international trade (1958).

Another means of focusing public attention on the problem would be to make use of a special Presidential commission to study it. Thus, in 1954 the President appointed a five-man advisory committee for a national highway program, headed by Gen. Lucius Clay, on whose report the Highway Act of 1956 came to be based; and in 1956 he directed a 34-member Committee on Education beyond the high school to examine problems in that area, and on the basis of its findings to develop proposals for action. Congress provided funds for that committee's work, a series of studies and conferences was launched, and a final set of recommendations was drawn up. In other areas, President Eisenhower has appointed a Committee on Government Contracts, an Advisory Commission on Presidential Office Space, a Committee on Government Employment Policy, and a Science Advisory Committee. Such committees of prominent citizens, properly staffed and financed, can do an excellent job of analysis and recommendation.

None of these temporary and short-range devices, however, should be regarded as a good alternative to the creation of a Council on Metropolitan Areas. They are useful in educating the public and the President, but they cannot supply the President with the continuing staff assistance the metropolitan problem demands. Though any of these devices can be very helpful to the President in preparing legislation, what is needed for metropolitan areas is not the passage of a single act, but an agency which will provide the President with a continuous flow of information upon which he can base policy.

Even though the newly created Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations is to be permanent, it is not a satisfactory answer for metropolitan areas either. Growing out of the work of the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations of the House Committee on Government Operations, the Commission is visualized as a body which will bring together Federal, State and local officials on a continuing basis for discussion of the problems which concern all levels of government.

The bipartisan commission will consist of 26 members: 3 from the executive branch of the Federal Government, 3 Senators, 3 Representatives, 4 Governors, 3 State legislators, 4 mayors, 3 county officials, and 3 private citizens. It is clear from its sponsors' statements that the commission will be mainly concerned with allocation of functions among levels of Government and with Federal grant-in-aid programs. As a means of gathering information the commission has some attraction, but it will have so broad a membership base and be so indirectly involved in metropolitan problems that it will have limited usefulness, so far as the Nation's great urban communities are concerned. The establishment of a commission of this nature, indeed, may lead people to conclude that an agency which will devote its primary attention to the metropolitan area problems has been established, when in fact it has not.

PROPOSALS FOR A DEPARTMENT

The most widely supported idea for an executive agency in the area of urban and metropolitan problems is to create a Cabinet department devoted exclusively to them. The idea dates at least from 1912, when Philip Kates suggested the creation of a National Department of Municipalities. The Kates proposal would have created a research and service department which as its first task would conduct "a comprehensive and authoritative study of the municipal problem in its basic principle * * * an industrial survey of national scope, with * * * attendant investigations into causes of congestion of population, and the remedies by improved communication and transportation and other means; into sanitary conditions * * * into housing, disposal of municipal waste * * * industrial working conditions * * * the working of other municipal systems than ours, and of other theories and methods of legislation (applicable to the American problem)." The information thus collected, fully and quickly transmitted to the proper local officials, Kates thought, would give municipalities all the information which was "essential to the proper solution of (their) problems." Kates' idea interested Woodrow Wilson very much indeed, and he hoped to have an opportunity to discuss it very seriously with those interested.

The opportunity evidently did not materialize, however, and the proposal was lost in the pursuit of the new freedom and in the preparation of the United States for World War I which immediately followed it. It was revived in 1919 in a slightly altered form by Harlean James, who thought that a department of civic economy in the National Government, rightly conceived and vigorously carried out, would be invaluable in helping cities and towns to meet the challenge of the postwar period. Miss James conceived of her department of civic economy as performing primarily an educational service. Such a department, she wrote, "should conduct research studies and make experiments on a scale possible only for the Federal Government" and should make its findings available to the sleepy crossroads corner in the remote county as well as to the noisy traffic-ridden city.

Miss James' idea did not bear fruit either, and for another decade or so no new proposals toward this end seem to have been made. In 1934, however, Charles E. Merriam, then with the National Resources Board, remarked that it was important that "the voice of our cities be heard in the capital, [and] it is equally important that the U.S. Government have some responsible administrative representation in the cities. * * * there is no urban U.S. representative corresponding to the county agent in the rural districts." Although Merriam went on to profess that he did not know just what form this new development may take or whether a number of Federal agencies may not jointly share Federal responsibility, he was certain that the whole question of the relation of Federal administration * * * to city government * * * looms up larger every day. By 1942, Merriam had become convinced that a separate administrative unit in Washington was necessary in view of the proportion of our people who dwell in cities and the importance generally of cities in our political and economic system, and he recommended that there be set up in the National Government a bureau or department of urbanism.

Since the end of the war, the idea has been advanced quite frequently. Just recently, Nathaniel S. Keith, a former Federal housing official, proposed the creation of a Department of Community Development. Commenting on his idea, Keith declared that "the realities call for the establishment of a Federal department as a focus for the necessary Federal attention and assistance" to community development. The establishment of a Federal Department of Community Development would give needed stature to the Federal interest in this field and would provide Cabinet-level policy coordination for all Federal activities with an impact on community developmental problems. The following operating functions, Keith thought, ought to be consolidated in the new department; research in housing and community development problems; assistance to regional, metropolitan, and urban planning; assistance to housing; assistance to urban renewal; assistance to the planning and financing of local public works; assistance to highway development and metropolitan area transportation. "The administrative consolidation of these functions in a single Federal department," he concluded, "would provide the necessary fulcrum for consistent application of these programs in the field."

In one form or another, the idea of a department has won a number of outspoken proponents. Representative J. ARTHUR YOUNGER gave impetus to the idea in an article about it in a Sunday supplement. Since then, it has become a popular subject for newspaper editorials across the country, even in some of the small newspapers, and it has been incorporated into the last three annual policy recommendations of the American Municipal Association. A number of other organizations have accepted the idea, including the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials, the National Housing Conference, and the American Society of Planning Officials, and the hard-pressed mayors and local officials of a good many of the Nation's largest cities have pledged their efforts to its establishment.

The idea has also caught the attention of a number of Members of Congress, and several of them have introduced bills into Congress to create such a department. Three such bills were introduced in the 84th Congress, one by Representative J. Arthur Younger, Republican, of the Ninth District of California, one by Representative Irwin D. Davidson, Republican, of the 20th District of New York, and one by nine Senators, some of them from the Nation's most urban areas: Herbert Lehman, Democrat, of New York; Hubert Humphrey, Democrat, of Minnesota; Paul Douglas, Democrat, of Illinois; Wayne Morse, Democrat, and Richard Neuberger, Democrat, of Oregon; Warren Magnuson, Democrat, of Washington; Thomas C. Hennings, Democrat, of Missouri; Pat McNamara, Democrat, of Michigan; and James E. Murray, Democrat, of Montana. Each of the three bills was referred to the Committee on Government Operations of the appropriate Chamber. Only the Younger bill received a hearing, however, and no further action was taken before the end of that session. No action at all was taken on the other two bills, so that all of them died at the end of the 84th Congress.

Virtually the same bills were submitted to the 85th Congress. In the House, Representative YOUNGER reintroduced his bill, and Representative MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS, Democrat, of the 17th District of Michigan offered another. The Senate version was offered by some of the same Senators, but this time under the leadership of Senator JOSEPH CLARK, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, a former mayor of Philadelphia. Senators Jacob Javits, Republican, of New York, Russell Long, Democrat, of Louisiana, and Clifford Case, Republican, of New Jersey joined Senators Humphrey, Morse, Neuberger, Magnuson, and Representative Murray in sponsoring the bill. All three bills were referred to committee, but no hearings were held, and, as before, all of them died at the end of the session.

In the 86th Congress, four bills were introduced in the House, one by Representative ALBERT RAINS, an influential member from Alabama, another by Representative HUGH ADDONIZIO of New Jersey, and the same bills as before by Representatives GRIFFITHS and YOUNGER. In the upper House, however, Senator CLARK and the other Senators had shifted their support to the metropolitan study commission idea and did not submit again the departmental bill of the preceding Congress. Senator KENNETH B. KEATING of New York introduced a companion bill to Representative YOUNGER's.

The proposal for a department warrants analysis and discussion if for no other reason than the fact that it has won so much endorsement. One must recognize, of course, that proposals to create new executive departments are made frequently, and some of them have received a great deal of support, both in Congress and outside, without being accepted. In the past decade, proposals for Departments of Civil Defense, Transportation, Water Resources, Public Works, and Science and Technology have all been advanced without success. A Department of Urban Affairs, however, suggests an easy solution to a complex problem, which in many ways is broader in scope and more immediate in its need for action than any of the other problems. Moreover, a discussion of such a concrete proposal can do much to clarify the proper way to deal administratively with a problem of this magnitude. Since proposals for an executive department will doubtless continue to be offered in the future as the solution to the problem, it is time that the merits of the idea be thought through.

ORGANIZATION AND POWERS OF THE DEPARTMENT

All the bills so far presented to Congress have had certain similar features. All call for the creation of a new executive department, variously entitled the Department of Urban Affairs, the Department of Housing and Urban Affairs, and the Department of Urbiculture. All propose the same type of administrative organization, at least in broad terms. A Secretary, an Under Secretary, and a varying number of assistant secretaries heading major departmental divisions are provided for in each bill. Likewise, all the bills set forth the same general goal for the Department, though, as one might expect, they differ considerably in their exact wording. The Younger bills have the most limited scope. As H.R. 1019 (85th Cong.) put it, "Many of the most pressing problems facing the people of the United States grow out of the lack of knowledge and understanding of proper techniques in utilization of urban land [thus] there is a corresponding national interest in the development of the science of urbiculture. Therefore:

"Recognizing the invaluable contribution made by the Department of Agriculture in promoting increasingly efficient use of farmlands, the Congress enacts this act in order to provide a corresponding executive department to develop methods of dealing with pressing social, economic, and civic problems growing out of inadequate knowledge of the principles of using and developing urban lands, and to make these methods available to the people of the United States through suitable educational programs."

Representative GRIFFITHS' bills note "that the pressing needs of cities and metropolitan areas are such that Federal action should be taken to assist in meeting these needs through education, research, technical services, and such other programs as the Congress may later prescribe." Moreover:

"The Congress finds also that a number of important Federal programs * * * have a vital impact on local communities and metropolitan areas; and that there is need for a central place in the Federal administrative structure to assess the overall results of these programs, to help coordinate these activities, and to represent the needs of urban areas at the national level."

The Senate bill (S. 2159) for the creation of a Department of Housing and Urban Affairs was very similar. It declared:

"(1) That a large majority of the American people now live in urban and metropolitan areas, and that almost all population growth in the last two decades has occurred in these areas; and (2) that the number of Federal programs which have a vital impact on urban and metropolitan areas are numerous and varied; and (3) that the general welfare and security of the Nation and the living standards of its people require that the Federal Government * * * [assist] * * * the States and local governments in meeting the problems caused by the continuing growth and concentration of population;

and (4) that for these reasons there should be a Federal department * * * to deal with those urban and metropolitan problems in which the Federal Government has a direct or cooperating interest."

Three of the bills would have abolished and transferred the functions of certain existing agencies to the new Department: Representatives Griffiths and Younger, those of the constituent agencies of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and S. 2159, those of the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Federal Civil Defense Administration. All three bills also contained a section which would have permitted the President to "exercise his authority under the Reorganization Act of 1949 with a view to further consolidating within the Department such functions and agencies of the Government as will further the purposes" of the act creating the Department. The Rains and Addonizio bills would leave the transfer of functions, including housing, entirely to the President.

The Younger bill also provided that the Secretary should "establish research and educational programs to accomplish the purposes set forth" in the act, and the Senate bill instructed the Secretary of the Department to "conduct a continuing study of problems peculiar to urban and metropolitan areas, including problems of coordinating Federal-State programs in such areas," to "provide technical assistance to State and local governmental bodies in developing solutions to such problems," and to "make such recommendations to the Congress, as a result of the studies to be undertaken * * * and after consultation with appropriate representatives of State and local governments, as he shall determine to be appropriate."

As a result of the passage of any one of the bills, or of a mixture of them, another executive department, directed generally at urban and metropolitan problems, and combining research, service, and educational functions on the one hand with coordination and program operation functions on the other, would be added to the structure of the Federal Government. Initially, at least, no new functions would be added, but those which are now scattered throughout the Federal Government would be centralized in a single administrative unit.

ARGUMENTS FOR A DEPARTMENT

Supporters of the new Department build their case on a number of grounds. Perhaps the most frequently offered justification is the fact that in a nation which is becoming increasingly urban, special recognition of urban affairs at the Cabinet level is a necessity. Senator Clark, in a statement explaining the purpose of S. 2159 to the 85th Congress, remarked that "metropolitan growth is posing one of the greatest challenges of the second half of the 20th century. We cannot meet this challenge with government machinery designed for the 19th century." As a matter of necessity, the Federal Government must "adapt its administrative organization" to enable it to meet more effectively the problems of today's urban and metropolitan areas. Just as a Department of Agriculture was created as a farmers' agency in recognition of the primary importance of agriculture in 1889, and a frankly prolabor Department of Labor was established when increased industrialization made it seem important to "foster, promote, and develop the welfare of the wage earners of the United States," so is the development of a Department of Urban Affairs important and necessary today. Representative Younger, testifying before the Subcommittee on Executive and Legislative Reorganization of the House Committee on Government Operations in 1955 in behalf of his first bill, remarked that "very much the same argument that was advanced for the establishment of the Department of Agriculture" could be advanced for a Department of Urbiculture.

"In 1862, when the [Office] of Agriculture was established, approximately 80 percent of our population lived on farms or in rural areas, and only 20 percent in urban territory. Now, in 1955, that situation has entirely changed. * * * In 1862 the problems which came to the Federal Government for solution arose from the rural areas because 80 percent of the population lived in rural areas. With 85 percent of the population concentrated in the urban areas, naturally the problems which come to the Federal Government for solution arise from those areas. * * * I think that * * * we should concentrate * * * Federal concern over the problems that originate in the city areas into a department that [has] a head with a Cabinet status. In simple terms that is what this bill was designed to do."

Representative William L. Dawson, of Illinois, the chairman of the subcommittee, remarked upon hearing his colleague's testimony: "Here in the Congress I have noticed that the farmers are well represented. They have the Department of Agriculture as well as the legislative committee set up here. They are taken care of and, as you say, the people are no longer on the farms. I think the Congress and our Government should revamp itself to meet the situation because government is for the people.

REPRESENTATION OF URBAN INTERESTS

Creation of a department and the designation of a Cabinet representative for urban affairs, the argument continues, would provide stronger leadership for and better representation of urban interests in national policymaking. At present, there is no focal point for urban affairs in the executive branch of the Federal Government. A great many agency and bureau heads represent one aspect or another of the urban and metropolitan problem, but their efforts are often contradictory and are in no sense all-inclusive. The result is that national policy in this important field can be formed only on the basis of incomplete or inaccurate data about cities and their problems and needs. "It does seem to me," Representative Dawson noted, "that it is indicated that the problems of cities be given a departmental status, and it so seems to me from my experience as a Congressman here in Washington, and observing the various departments make their needs known to the Congress." Maintaining that farmers have the Department of Agriculture to point out their needs to Congress and to protect their interests and promote their welfare, he argued, "the problems of the cities are not voiced here as such. Because of the great impact of those problems upon not only the cities but upon the country as a whole, I think that there is a crying need to the extent that the country should begin to think about a department to handle this."

This reasoning would seem to be supported by studies in the field of public administration. Arthur Macmahon and John Millett, for example, declare that the "head of a department * * * has an individual consultative relationship to the President, to the administration as a whole, and to Congress," a relationship of such importance that the Secretary of a department becomes "the administration's natural consultant" in regard to the problems of his area. To date, there has been no such consultant available specifically for urban affairs. Schuyler Wallace finds that since the President's Cabinet frequently serves not merely as "an administrative but also an advisory agency on broad questions of public policy * * * representation [thereon is] highly desirable." Both by being available as a consultant on urban affairs to other officials in the Federal Government and by contributing the urban point of view to the determination of national policy, a Secretary of Urban Affairs would fill a need which has already been met in all other important policy areas. In a nation so predominantly urban, proponents of a department insist to deny representation to urban affairs is no longer tenable.

SIZE OF URBAN PROGRAMS WARRANTS DEPARTMENTAL STATUS

Aside from the need to have urban interests represented in national policymaking, those who advocate a department point out that by now the Federal Government has many programs which affect urban areas and that together they are important enough in the total picture of the Federal Government's activities to warrant elevation to departmental status. The Federal Government's housing programs alone, to say nothing of its civil defense program and others with distinctly urban aspects, certainly have become important enough and involve large enough expenditures of personnel and money to be raised to departmental status. They should, proponents of a department argue, be recognized as permanent interests of the Government by being given regular Cabinet status—by being, in short, combined into a separate and distinct executive department. Thus Walter B. Mills, Jr., president of the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials, in a letter to Representative Dawson in connection with H.R. 1864, declared that his organization was "strongly of the opinion that the Federal Government's activities in the field of housing, slum clearance, and urban redevelopment of urban centers have reached proportions warranting the creation of a department * * * having full Cabinet status." In the same vein, William L. Wheaton of the National Housing Conference maintained before the Dawson subcommittee that the "relative size of the Housing and Home Finance Agency as compared with other executive departments" entitled it to departmental status. "If we look at the expenditures, we find that the gross expenditures of the Housing and Home Finance Agency exceed that of five other Cabinet departments * * * [it] has more employees than one department." Certainly, Dr. Wheaton argued, the HHFA ought to be converted to departmental rank, especially when its total financial commitments are compared with those of the other civilian departments. Those commitments, Dr. Wheaton thought, "probably exceeded all of the other departments saving only the Treasury * * * and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare."

Nor did Dr. Wheaton or other proponents of a department have to look far for support of their contention. The first Hoover Commission used the same type of argument to support its proposal for the creation of a Department of Social Security and Education. Having recommended the creation of a United Medical Administration to take care of the Federal Government's health programs the Commission went on to say, there remain, however, certain most important bureaus [and] agencies relating to education which must be organized into a workable department. And as the reasons for that conclusion, it noted: "The size of these agencies * * * is * * * indicated by the fact that they embrace about 20,000 employees. The administration expenditures [of the several agencies combined] would be roughly $50 million. The grants-in-aid to be distributed would approximate $800 million." When operations of separate agencies reach such proportions, the Commission seemed to say, they naturally should be combined into one department. More recently, a proposal has been advanced to centralize the Federal Government's science activities in a Department of Science and to transfer to the new Department the functions of the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Science Foundation, the Bureau of Standards, and the Patent Office, among others. The proponents of this measure, like those of a Department of Urban Affairs, justify the action on the ground that in terms of money and manpower involved the time has come to recognize the importance of the Government's scientific interests.

For departmentalization, they assert, is the only really efficient way of handling related program operations of such magnitude in the Federal Government. Scattering of functions among a number of different units means that it is not possible anywhere to get a view of the problem to be solved as a whole. Senator CLARK built much of his case on the advantages that a Department of Urban Affairs would bring in coordinating existing programs concerned with urban affairs and in simplifying the governmental structure by reducing the number of independent agencies reporting directly to the President. The American Municipal Association in its 1956 policy statement likewise stressed the "greater * * * efficiency" which would result from centralizing the various activities affecting cities in one "unified administrative organization at the Federal level." No study which has been made of the executive branch fails to emphasize the evils attending the great proliferation of independent executive agencies that has occurred in recent years and the advantages to be gained by a reduction in their number and a coordination of their efforts. Indeed, the first finding of the Hoover Commission was precisely along this line: "Federal programs * * * must be grouped by related function and divided among a small number of principal assistants who are the heads of departments. * * * Until dispersed units are pulled together, and authority is placed in department heads as chief assistants to the President, there will be conflict, waste, and indecisiveness in administration." To bring even the housing activities together under one department, if not also those relating to civil defense and possibly others, would thus seem to be in direct accord with the principles of efficient Government administration.

FACILITATION OF RESEARCH

The creation of a department would have the added advantage, the argument proceeds, of making it possible more easily and quickly to conduct the great amount of research that needs to be done before actual solution of urban problems is possible. Research needs to be undertaken, for example, on the problems posed for urban mass transportation facilities by the rapid expansion of metropolitan areas in the past quarter century and on the problems growing out of "the lack of knowledge and understanding of proper techniques in utilization of urban land." Other questions, such as "parking, traffic * * * central business district, port development * * * [and] metropolitan governmental problems * * * including problems of annexation and metropolitan urban services distribution" offer equally great possibilities for study. All such problems could be much more effectively studied if brought together under an agency which would have the facilities to attract the services of the Nation's outstanding experts on urban problems. Such a program would have the double advantage of avoiding duplication and repetition and at the same time covering all the important questions now facing cities and metropolitan areas. Today such studies are made in bits and pieces, if made at all, and not only are they therefore uneconomical, but their results are not often widely publicized. A Federal department not only would develop information but would have channels available both to distribute it and to assist city and county officials in applying it. The Department might thus become, its proponents argue, an urban planning assistance agency for the Nation.

INFORMATIONAL CENTER

A further justification offered for a Department of Urban Affairs is that it would provide a central point in the Federal Government where cities could come for help and information. The American Municipal Association originally based its support of a department largely on these grounds: "The Congress should authorize a new Federal Cabinet post for urban affairs. Unlike other segments of our political economy, such as industry, labor, and agriculture, local governments have no place to turn to in their many dealings with the Federal Government." Instead of one place, there are many. A mayor must often make 6 or 8 visits to get a complete picture, and, to make it even worse, the information he gets at one point is likely to be contradicted at the next. The mayor of Seattle, Allan Pomeroy, expressed the feelings of many of his fellows when he pointed out that "above all, such a department would provide a central clearinghouse for all the specialized problems having to do with intergovernmental relations as they affect central cities and their metropolitan areas." And Carl Feiss, former Urban Renewal Administrator, noted the great advantages of effecting through the creation of a single department "a simplification in the lines of communication between the Federal, State, [and] local agencies so that local public officials would have a real opportunity of finding the right person at the right time for the right purposes and the right programs in order to simplify and expedite the very complicated problems that the localities are facing * * * in this tremendous urbanization that is taking place."

PRACTICAL POLITICAL ARGUMENT

Although not advanced so openly as the foregoing arguments on behalf of a Department of Urban Affairs, another argument has been as influential. This is the argument of practical politics. Gerrymandered as most State legislatures are in favor of rural areas, they have not listened with sympathetic ears to the pleas of urban citizens. In some cases, the dominant upstate (rural) areas are of one political persuasion, the downstate (urban) areas of the other, and this has further complicated the relation between the legislatures and the cities. In disgust and desperation, therefore, city officials have increasingly turned toward Washington for help and guidance. In national politics, although the cards are still stacked against urban voters, at least they are not stacked so high. City officials and urban citizens are convinced that with their own department, and even more their own Secretary, who would serve as their advocate, at last they might begin to get the sympathy and assistance they have long asked for. As Representative YOUNGER has put it, "Agencies and commissions are temporary and, what's more, they're also the stepchildren of government. The chairman of a commission * * * is many, many rungs down the ladder from the Secretary of a department who has daily access to the President's ear. The only favorite sons in Washington are the heads of the executive departments." It follows, therefore, that "only a full-time, full-ranked Secretary * * * can effectively serve the cities of this Nation."

Those who favor a new department declare, furthermore, that there is considerable evidence in other fields to demonstrate that the Secretary of a department does in fact serve as a special advocate for his "constituents." To some degree at least, every Secretary of Agriculture, Labor, or Commerce takes care of the interests of his special clientele and tries to present a good record of performance for the party's sake—and for his own—at the next election. He builds such a record by aggressive leadership in programs in the area of his responsibility. Urban matters, however, have not been carried to the political level by such an advocate. The Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Administration simply is not the political figure that a member—any member—of the traditional Cabinet is. Urban officials see the advantages to be gained in exploiting the political possibilities of a Cabinet post, and though the other justifications they offer are offered seriously and honestly, the political aspects of the situation have obviously been considered.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST A DEPARTMENT

However appealing the case for a Department of Urban Affairs may be, the other side of the coin ought to be considered carefully before a decision is made. Indeed, those opposed to a Department have the stronger case. They argue that such a Department would be politically unwise, administratively unsound, and functionally unnecessary. The creation of a Department of Urban Affairs, or Urbiculture (a Department by that too clever name seems unlikely in any event), is unwise on the ground of semantics alone. Semantics can be overemphasized, of course, but the words so far suggested for the Department's title constitute a real handicap to its adoption. "Urban Affairs" is naturally contrasted with "rural affairs," and all the old stereotypes about "rural" and "urban" would be aroused by its establishment. "Urban" means cities, and cities are still pictured as sinful and unhealthy as opposed to the farm and the country, which are equated with clean living, hard work, and thrift. Cities are thought to be dominated by bosses and political machines, in contrast with the democratic, independent way of life on the farm. It is not enough to say that this is an incorrect, distorted picture, both of urban and of rural living, nor is it sufficient to point out that cities down through the ages have been centers of freedom, that even today they are more progressive than the rural areas, which are traditionally conservative. Whatever the truth of these characterizations, the important fact is that the rural and small-town population in the United States traditionally views cities with suspicion, and these are the groups that dominate legislative bodies in the States as well as in Congress.

Added to this is the fact that urban also will be contrasted with suburban, and the suburbanite is even more anti big city than his country cousin. At least he is anti downtown big city. One of the principal reasons for the existence of metropolitan areas has been the movement of population to the suburbs made possible with the development of the automobile. To the suburbanite, the city means where he works in the daytime. It means crowds, noise, subways, and social groups he does not like. He feels differently about the suburbs. Politically, the suburbanite is becoming increasingly important. His numbers alone make him a political factor to be counted. In alliance with rural voters, he is a formidable power. Representatives from strictly rural areas may be declining in strength as population moves away from the farms, but the small towns and especially the suburban areas are steadily gaining in population, political power, and importance. All three would be against a Department of Urban Affairs. Why, they would argue, should the whole Nation underwrite a segment of the population who are quite able to take care of themselves? Cities are rich; they do not need help from the Federal Government. An executive department devoted to their interests would simply be a means by which big cities would get increased Federal aid, perhaps to their detriment.

Though opponents of a department might admit that urbanism is a national problem, they argue that ours is a Federal system of government, with certain well-defined areas of power given to the Federal Government and others reserved to the States. Problems of local government, they assert, whether in large or in small urban centers, are primarily a concern of the States and the local communities themselves. The Federal Government has no responsibility for cities as such, and therefore there is no need for a department. These may not be sound arguments, but they have lots of emotional appeal. They have been used in State legislatures for years with great success. They are and will continue to be just as effective in Congress, where smart city slickers are feared almost as much as they are in State legislatures.

POLITICAL DIFFICULTIES

Not only would these emotional factors make the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs politically difficult, but they would subject the operation of the Department to continual friction with Congress. Every time the Department's budget was scrutinized by Congress, every time a hearing was held on its legislative proposals, the tension between them would be aggravated. Could the Secretary of Urban Affairs deal successfully with Congress under these circumstances?

The very speed with which the idea has been developed and pushed also works against its adoption. Not only does Congress not like innovation, it is not apt to act on so radical a proposal without having before it conclusive evidence that the cities have done all they can to help themselves solve their own problems. To date, such evidence is not forthcoming. Congress likes even less to alter the administrtaive structure of the Federal Government until it is sure of the soundness of the proposal. In the past, periods of 30 to 40 years have elapsed between the creation of one new executive department and the next. Agencies, bureaus, and commissions are not a great affront to congressional sensibilities; but the creation of a department, affecting as it would the very core of the executive branch, is another matter altogether. Any proposal for a new department, however sound, traditionally has rough going in Congress. As one of the witnesses before the Dawson subcommittee in connection with H.R. 1864 pointed out, "A major stumbling block for H.R. 1864 is that the creation of a Department of Urbiculture would elevate consideration of urban problems so high and so fast from present levels of consideration that the sudden jump would be unacceptable to some people." Chiefly, it would be unacceptable to Congress, at least in its present state of mind and membership.

As a matter of practical politics, to propose a Department of Urban Affairs is futile at present because the idea has not built up the kind of political support which would make it possible. President Eisenhower and his top administrative officials have shown no interest in it whatsoever. On the contrary, there is some evidence that they would be strongly opposed to such a department. Nor, for that matter, has there been any grassroots support for it, notwithstanding the formal resolutions of a number of national civic organizations. Even as Representative Dawson acknowledged in the 1955 hearings: "You appreciate that there must be a public interest and demand for this legislation. * * * There must be created within this country a desire to have established a department which is concerned with the problems of the urban dwellers. * * * Sentiment for the idea * * * is necessary in this form of government to make it become a law." Until such sentiment is built up, to talk about its adoption is futile.

A Secretary of Urban Affairs, actively looking to the interests of cities in Washington, would, moreover, add greatly to the centralization of governmental power in Federal hands. As Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, of New York, who called the proposal for a Department of Urban Affairs "appalling," went on to point out, there is need for coordination of Federal programs involving urban and metropolitan areas, but to vest that power in a new department would be to create an "all-powerful coordinator * * * in Washington." "On reflection," Rockefeller concluded, "it is self-evident that a Federal department with as much power as this would require would be a Frankenstein." If such a department were ever established, "home rule would become a memory."

Finally, the creation of such a department is politically unlikely because of recent actions regarding the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Federal Civil Defense Administation, the functions of which were to be transferred to the Department of Urban Affairs. During its debates on recent housing bills, Congress has given every indication that it contemplates the continued existence of HHFA as the administrative unit for housing programs. By Executive order, the Federal Civil Defense Administration has recently been merged with the Office of Defense Mobilization, to form the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization. The probability that the functions of either agency might be shifted to a new department in the near future is remote.

ADMINISTRATIVE CONFLICTS

Not only are there strong political arguments against the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs, but there is a strong case against it on grounds of administrative soundness. Creation of a department has come to be regarded as a panacea for all administrative ills. Yet a study of the service departments over the years, and of the Department of Defense in particular, since its creation in 1947, produces considerable evidence that departmentalization is not a guaranteed cure for administrative difficulties. Establishment of a department, indeed, may only delay the cure or force it to take place in different surroundings. Back of the proposal is the idea that a simple organizational change will provide the answer for urban and metropolitan problems. This is a false belief. The mere creation of a new administrative unit is not the answer to a problem as complex as that presented by the phenomenon of metropolitanization. Creation of a department would beg the most important question of all, What is the Federal Government's proper role in urban areas? The answer is not merely to assign urban affairs to a single organizational unit. It is a matter of principle and philosophy, not of method. To create a method without first having established a philosophy to base it on is to put the proverbial cart before the horse. Coming as it does at this time, when the basic issues of intergovernmental relations in metropolitan areas are still unresolved, such a proposal is clearly premature.

Moreover, a Department of Urban Affairs as proposed would be based on a geographical concept rather than on a functional one. To admit it would be to introduce a maverick into the administrative corral. The work of such a department, if all the programs carried on by the Federal Government affecting cities were placed under its jurisdiction, would necessarily cut across the functions of a great many existing agencies and departments. Indeed, once the Pandora's box is opened, how is it to be closed? What programs do not have an urban interest, save those pertaining strictly to agriculture? If housing and related activities and civil defense are the first to be included, how can arguments for the inclusion of a host of others be denied? Thus, in the hearings on the first Younger bill, the representative of the Amercan Municipal Association declared that in his opinion the new Department "should include such items as highway and urban transit, airports and airport administration, public health matters * * * water and air pollution, and juvenile delinquency" in addition to housing and urban development and renewal and civil defense. What would be the effect at least on the Departments of Commerce, Interior, and Health, Education, and Welfare of the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs? It would certainly conflict with their organization and ongoing programs, to say nothing of the complexities it would introduce into the programs of many independent regulatory agencies. To insert an executive department based on a geographical pattern into a system primarily organized functionally would make for more, rather than less, confusion in the administrative structure.

It is argued that the new department would simply parallel the existing Department of Agriculture and serve city dwellers in the same way that Agriculture serves the farmers. But even if it be admitted that Agriculture is principally concerned with farmers, yet its organizational base is strictly functional. A comparable situation would be created if the new department were made simply the Department of Housing. This title, however, would not give it cognizance over the broad area of urban problems which its sponsors desire. What would be done with activities like airports, highways, and water pollution? Is it suggested that these functions too be divided along geographic lines and that urban highways be placed in the new Department but rural highways left where they are now? Would highway matters be divided between two departments? Would the same duplication be repeated for water and air pollution, airport construction and maintenance, water supply, hospital construction, and all the manifold other urban programs of the Federal Government? Indeed, with what department and agency of the Federal establishment would a department conceived upon geographic lines not conflict? To ask the question is to supply the answer. To create such a department would be to create an organizational misfit.

Moreover, it cannot be conclusively demonstrated that merely because certain activities of the Federal Government reach a particular magnitude they should automatically be brought together under a single executive department. The Veterans' Administration would seem to be a case in point. In terms of the number of employees, size of budget, and amounts of money distributed, it would long ago seem to have deserved elevation to departmental status. Yet it has functioned with benefit to the group it serves through the years without Cabinet status. What advantages would have accrued from converting it into an executive department? Proponents of a Department of Urban Affairs claim that one advantage would be better representation in the administrative structure. The heads of HHFA and OCDM now sit with the President's Cabinet when matters pertaining to them are discussed. What would be gained by giving them secretarial status?

But it is argued that instead of occasional participation in the Cabinet, the Urban Affairs Secretary would be a full-time member. This argument is based on the assumption that the Cabinet is in fact a policy-forming body. Actually the President makes policy, and the Cabinet may or may not be consulted. Confusing the British system, with its theory of Cabinet responsibility, and the American system, where it is sometimes said the Cabinet members are the natural enemies of the President, is responsible for this misapprehension. Under the American system access to only one man, the President, is important, because he bears the chief burden for policymaking. Entree at the White House is much more important than Cabinet status. Harry Hopkins, during World War II, was a good example of a man who did not have Cabinet status but who was much more powerful than any Cabinet officer because of his entree to the President. Indeed, entree to the King was what gave Cabinet officers in England their position of power in the first place. One of the principal prerogatives of an English Secretary of State was "the privilege of the closet," which meant the right of entree to the King and the right of consulting with him alone.

Close ties with congressional committees and well-organized pressure groups also account for the success of an administrative agency. Certainly the Veterans' Administration owes much of its prolonged success to these factors. A seat in the Cabinet for the Veterans' Administrator would not have been nearly so important in making it possible for him to carry out his agency's program. On the same basis, it cannot be maintained that departmental status and Cabinet representation alone would produce the effective "representation" of urban interests that proponents of the idea claim it would. Good entree at the White House, good working relations with Congress, and effective group pressure produce better results in many cases than a seat in the Cabinet.

BETTER MEANS AVAILABLE

Finally, the opponents of a Department of Urban Affairs argue that it is unnecessary now. Attention to metropolitan problems, they say, is not guaranteed merely by the creation of an executive department. It can be secured as well under the existing arrangement of agencies, once they all recognize "that our metropolitan communities provide the environment within which the greatest number of people live and the largest part of the Nation's business is carried out." What is needed more than an organizational reshuffling is a policy within the entire executive branch to guide all Federal agencies in their urban and metropolitan activities. If such a policy existed, "then the * * * Council of Economic Advisers would be devoting a large share of its attention to the economic problems of urban communities within the framework of the national economy. The * * * Bureau of Public Roads would have a finely articulated program for relating the construction of the Interstate Highway System to the needs and requirements of the group of cities within each of the regions of the United States. The agencies concerned with water resources would be at least as much concerned with the river basins within our metropolitan communities as they are with the problems of irrigation in the West."

Establishment of a department would not necessarily be of any assistance in achieving coordination. Coordination in the executive branch results from common understanding and a will to cooperate among the personnel concerned; these can be achieved among diverse agencies as well as in a single department. Such simple devices as the exchange of personnel between one agency and another and the institution of periodic consultation between program officers would go far toward bringing about coordination. Indeed, a department as big as the proposed Department of Urban Affairs would have its own coordination problems which would have to be settled in some way. One important objection to adopting the proposal is based on past experience within the Federal Government. Over the years, it is notorious that the housing and civil defense officials have vociferously disagreed with each other. Would bringing them together eliminate their differences? How would they be reconciled? Which interest would dominate? A solution which would ignore longstanding conflicts of personnel and philosophy is not a solution at all.

Nor can it be demonstrated that the research and educational programs which are so urgently needed with regard to metropolitan problems can be carried out best by a single department. How much research of a general nature is worth while? In regard to mass transportation, for example, must not a solution be fitted to the needs of each individual metropolitan area? Indeed, opponents of a department argue: Is there a need for the Federal Government to conduct such research at all? Today there is a host of agencies, public and private, carrying on research on these problems. Commenting on Representative Younger's first bill to establish a department, the editors of the American City said:

"In the opinion of the American City, the need for an overall * * * department * * * is much less than was the case four decades ago. This is owing, in part, * * * to the spread of the council-manager form of municipal government and the establishment of local planning and zoning boards * * * to the excellent aids to municipal efficiency rendered by such national organizations as the '1313' group with headquarters in Chicago and such citizens' associations as the National Municipal League and the Government Research Association and * * * to the effective work of the various foundations, educational institutions, State leagues of municipalities, and other agencies working for municipal improvements and civic advance. In other words, much * * * research and guidance * * * is now available for municipalities from sources other than the Federal Government, and municipal efficiency can thus be achieved with much less reliance on Uncle Sam than seemed to be essential four decades ago.

Others are willing to admit that research on metropolitan area problems is needed, but argue that this is a staff function and would best be handled by a staff agency. They say that there should be an agency in the Federal Government concerned with urban and metropolitan areas and their problems, but that it should be a staff agency whose concern it would be to develop the facts about metropolitan area problems, which the President, and his department and agency chiefs would take into account in framing policy. It is worth noting that the American Municipal Association, which advocated a line Department of Urban Affairs at its 1956 congress, had cooled off considerably toward the proposal by 1957. The declaration of policy adopted by the 1957 congress recommended instead creation of a staff agency, a Council of Urban Advisers, to study metropolitan problems and recommend solutions on the one hand, and to suggest a policy for the coordination of all Federal programs affecting urban areas on the other. Sober second thought seems to have led AMA to the conclusion that although there is truth in the argument that research on urban problems is necessary, this does not require the creation of a new executive department.

Finally, say the opponents of the department, the greatest danger of all lies in the possibility that the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs would be accepted by Government officials and others as settling the whole problem, when in reality it would provide only an organizational detail. Certainly city officials, the lobbyists they employ, and their organizations might welcome an executive department to use as a waste basket into which they could dump all the metropolitan problems referred to them and thus discharge their responsibilities.

A DEPARTMENT REJECTED

One cannot but conclude that the opponents of a department have the better case. Formulation of a philosophy and evolution of a firm policy based thereon should precede designation of the agency to carry it out. Who executes policy is much less important than what the policy is. What is needed is not merely moving chessmen around on the board, but adopting rules for the game. Given the need for focusing the attention of the Federal Government on metropolitan area problems, creation of a Department of Urban Affairs or its equivalent is not the way to accomplish the objective. The proposal does not make political sense, it is not in accord with the administrative concepts on which the rest of the executive branch is based, and functionally it would add to the difficulties of effective administration.

Perhaps the most that can be said for a Department of Urban Affairs is that discussion of the idea keeps the need for action with regard to urban problems before the public. But such a department is not feasible at the present time. It is not beyond the realm of possibility, however, that, as Federal activities in metropolitan areas continue to grow, as inevitably they will, an executive department may one day be established. If it is, past experience would indicate that it will result from a gradual evolutionary process over a period of years as was the case with the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. In the meantime, there is much greater need for a Presidential staff agency than for a new line department.

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe the administration has made a sound case for the reorganization plan under consideration today and I support its rejection.

Contrary to the hopes of many sincere people, including those who have written asking me to support this proposal, I do not think it begins to accomplish the things its sponsors claim for it.

After considerable study I have reached the conclusion that this proposal would be of little real value to the people of my congressional district, or to urban dwellers anywhere, and I am convinced that the arguments of those who support it will not stand up under close scrutiny. I should like to examine some of these arguments briefly here today.

On what grounds do the supporters of Reorganization Plan No. 1 seek its approval? They tell us that unlike the farmer, who has the Department of Agriculture, the urban dweller has no voice in the Federal Government and that this plan will give him one. They say it will bring about greater economy and efficiency in Government. They claim that the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency does not have sufficient status to represent and promote adequately the great programs under his direction.

Let us look a little more closely at some of these allegations. We are told that the urban dweller has no voice in Washington and is being neglected. I cannot accept this claim, for the Federal Government is literally filled with articulate spokesmen for our cities, both in Congress and in the executive branch. Would the proponents of this reorganization plan argue that the President is not willing and able to speak effectively for urban dwellers? Do they contend that the President's appointees—as, for example, Mr. Ribicoff, Mr. Goldberg, or Mr. Weaver—are incapable of speaking forcefully on behalf of those who live in the cities? Are they arguing that the great committees of Congress which deal with urban affairs, such as the House Banking and Currency Committee or the House Education and Labor Committee, are not doing a good job for city dwellers? I do not think the proponents of this plan mean any of these things when they charge that there is no voice for the cities in Washington. In fact, it is difficult to attach any meaning at all to this charge, which has emotional appeal but precious little substance.

But, say the supporters of this proposal, we must have someone in the very highest councils of Government to speak out on the needs of the urban masses. The farmer, they say, has the Secretary of Agriculture; the city dweller must have a Secretary of Urban Affairs and Housing.

Putting aside the issue of how much good the Secretary of Agriculture is doing our farmers, let us examine this argument for a moment. Would this proposed Secretary of Urban Affairs and Housing be the man who could speak out on problems of unemployment, juvenile delinquency, worker retraining, welfare or civil rights, all problems of great concern to the city dweller? Would he be the man who could speak out on such problems as air and water pollution? On the location of highways, expressways, airports, health centers, or hospitals in our cities?

Under the terms of this reorganization plan, the answer in every case is no, he could not, because the sponsors of the plan have done nothing to give the proposed new Secretary of Urban Affairs any authority over any of these problem areas which are so vitally important to urban living. By the admission of its own backers, this proposal does nothing to enlarge the responsibilities of the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. It adds no new functions. It gives him no authority he does not already have. Yet, somehow, it is supposed to be an unprecedented boon to our cities and the people who live in them.

Another major argument used by the supporters of this proposal is that it will solve the great need to coordinate the various Federal programs bearing on urban problems. In 1957, the Bureau of the Budget listed 21 Federal programs affecting urban areas. More have been added since then, and I definitely agree that there is a serious need for better coordination of these programs. But this proposal offers absolutely nothing in the way of improved coordination.

As I have already pointed out, this plan gives the HHFA Administrator no new responsibilities and no new programs to administer. He would have nothing more to coordinate as a Secretary of Urban Affairs than he now has to coordinate as Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. Furthermore, the proposal sets up no new mechanism for coordinating in any way the various programs in other Government departments and agencies which deal with urban problems. In short, the contention that this reorganization plan would result in better coordination is false.

As a matter of fact, however, the Administrator of HHFA already has ample authority to reorganize his Agency in the interests of economy and better coordination whenever he wishes to do so. In the 1955 Independent Offices Appropriation Act, the Congress gave the HHFA Administrator, and I quote from the act, "full authority to assign and reassign functions and to reorganize his Agency to promote economy, efficiency, and fidelity in the operation of the Housing and Home Finance Agency."

Furthermore, although this proposed reorganization plan does nothing to promote better coordination, there already exists within the executive branch a coordinating council which at least partially meets this need, the National Housing Council. The Administrator of HHFA serves as permanent Chairman of this Council, which includes the heads, or their designees, of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, the Veterans' Administration, and the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Labor, Defense, and Health, Education, and Welfare, along with other key HHFA officials. I submit that the Council holds greater promise for adequate coordination than anything contained in this reorganization plan and that, imaginatively used, it might well fill the void which now exists with regard to coordination. At least this prospect bears further examination.

Still another argument which we hear is that the Administrator of HHFA does not have sufficient stature or prestige in the Government to obtain a fair hearing for the programs under his direction. I know this is not true as far as the Congress is concerned. I hope it is not true that the President is unwilling to listen to the HHFA Administrator now or that he would pay more attention to him and give his programs higher priority if only the Administrator were a Cabinet officer.

The fact is that there is nothing magical about Cabinet status, nothing about it which suddenly makes a man more able or more successful in presenting his programs and proposals. It is a further fact that the present HHFA Administrator is a man of great energy, experience and ability and his stature, both among Members of Congress and within the executive branch, is extremely high. I am certain that his recommendations are given the full attention they deserve.

Furthermore, I am convinced that this would be true of any HHFA Administrator of the same caliber. The records of such agencies as the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Veterans' Administration, the Atomic Energy Commission or, for that matter, HHFA itself, disprove completely the contention that agencies without Cabinet status have a hard time holding their own in Washington. On the contrary, it is common knowledge that each of these agencies holds a highly respected place within the bureaucratic hierarchy and none has experienced difficulty in securing either public acceptance or financial support for its programs—$13.5 billion, or one-third of the total nondefense budget, is budgeted this year for these four agencies alone.

Finally, it is said that local communities have difficulty knowing where to go or how to get help from the Federal Government and that they are shunted from agency to agency in their efforts to secure assistance. It is implied that the Department of Urban Affairs contemplated by this proposal will, in effect, provide one-stop service for these communities.

I have already pointed out that this proposal does nothing either to consolidate or to coordinate the dozens of programs in various departments and agencies which bear on urban problems. But there is another point which I want to make and it is this: Any community which has a sound and constructive program or proposal and is willing to bear the substantial amount of responsibility necessary to put that program into effect will neither have trouble finding nor obtaining the various forms of financial assistance available from the Federal Government. This has been true of my own home area of Rochester and Monroe County, N.Y., and it is true of other progressive communities. The trouble comes when a community, or a State, wants Washington to do all its thinking, planning and financing for it. This, I am afraid, is what some city and State officials have in mind when they become so enthusiastic about a proposal like the one we are considering today.

Before closing, Mr. Chairman, I want to make just one comment about the manner in which the administration has presented this proposal to the Congress and the country. Realizing, apparently, that on its merits alone this reorganization plan was extremely weak, the administration has attempted to avoid consideration on the merits by clouding the facts and by interjecting both racism and partisan politics into the issue.

They have attempted to label those who oppose their proposal as either against the urban dweller or against the Negro race, or both. They refuse to admit that this plan can be opposed in good faith by a person who appreciates the problems of our growing urban communities or by a person who is sincerely interested in the progress of all Americans, regardless of the color of their skin. Mr. Chairman, this is demagoguery at its worst. I personally resent it and it ought to be repudiated by the House today. On its merits alone, this proposal should be rejected. Neither the reorganization plan itself nor the tactics which have accompanied its presentation are worthy of the support of the Congress.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, there is an old, old saying I am sure many of you have heard and remember, that if you do not have a sense of humor you have no place in public office; and that if the public does not have a sense of humor you will not remain in public office very long.

I have sat through a great many committee hearings in recent years, as the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Government Organization of the Committee on Government Operations and have heard numerous measures, like this one before us, for a long, long, long time.

So I have listened with a great deal of interest to some of the statements which have been made here today.

Perhaps, the best way I can describe it, when I think of that which has gone on, is to use an old southern Ohio word which some of you from the more erudite east may misinterpret, and that is, it is to say it is all funny.

I recall a good many years ago, I spent a short vacation at a little inn in Maine where, in those days in its dining room they served all of us who stayed at the inn at one large table. One guest there was a professor from one of the great eastern universities, a very distinguished and learned man, a true scholar and gentleman. I shall not mention the name of his university for obvious reasons, but one evening at the dinner table I said something was "funny." He looked at me with astonishment. He said, "Funny? Mr. BROWN, funny—funny?—what do you mean by the word 'funny'?" I replied, "I mean both laughable and peculiar." And I think that is the best description I can give when I say to you that that which has gone on here, in connection with this legislation is both laughable and peculiar—in fact it has been downright funny.

Now let us talk about this legislation for a little while. You know, rather peculiarly, the forerunner of this particular plan, Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962, was the 29th bill which had been presented to the House Committee on Government Operations to create a department like this in the past 10 years alone—believe it or not—29 bills to do the very same thing that is now being requested by the President of the United States through this reorganization plan. During those years, most of the time, and I regret to have to admit this, but it is true, my good friends on the right side of the aisle controlled the House by a heavy majority, and also controlled the Committee on Government Operations which is headed by a very distinguished man, the present chairman, the gentleman from Chicago who I call my friend, and for whom I have the greatest respect and affection, Mr. DAWSON. All of these 28 bills, in the wisdom—the innate wisdom I might add—after the careful and studied consideration of the committee were laid aside as not worth doing, and as something that should not be done. At that time there was no pressure or desire to have this kind of department set up so it was not until late last August when, all of a sudden, legislation has been for this purpose pending in our committee—where it was very quietly asleep by the way—came to life and took wings, so here we have it today in the form of this reorganization plan.

Now I rather imagine I know where the inspiration for all this sudden activity on the part of my committee came from last August, and why there have been so many positions on this issue changed, so far as members of our committee are concerned.

But let me say to you, I have opposed this type of legislation from the very beginning, as a matter of principle. I wish to clarify one thing, by the way, right now in the beginning, because I shall not refer to it further, and I am glad and I am happy that it has never been discussed at any time in my presence, throughout those years, when we were considering these various legislative bills for the purpose of creating this sort of a department of Cabinet rank has there been any racial issue or matter discussed in any way. Never has there been any personalities discussed as to who might, or who might not, be appointed Secretary, if the new Department was created as the result of the action of the Congress.

I listened with a great deal of interest to my good friend from Florida [Mr. FASCELL], one of the most able Members of this House, certainly of our committee, and who I have said, publicly stated many times, has an excellent legal mind, and is one of the best pleaders at the bar I know. He made a very telling argument in support of this plan for some 50 minutes today. For the first 20 minutes, at the beginning of his dissertation, in explaining this particular reorganization plan, he insisted it would not do anything, did not mean anything, was nothing to worry about, did not convey any real authority, and that nothing would happen under it. Then for the last 20 minutes of his dissertation he told us how badly this new Department was needed in the cities, and what great wonders it could work for the urban areas of this Nation.

So I think his arguments are both laughable and peculiar, much as I respect my good friend from Florida, because the proposed Department cannot be both.

I will not repeat here the old story of the three blind men who examined the elephant, but you know what I mean.

Seemingly, this bill, this plan, whatever you want to call it, is all things to all men, according to what they want it to be. Some say it would not interfere in city affairs, or would not do any good, and so forth. On the other hand, we have some Members, whom I suspect are going to support this plan, who opposed this resolution of disapproval when it came before our committee and insisted it should be the responsibility and the duty of the Federal Government to even remove the snow from the sidewalks and streets of our cities—and I also got in that same snowstorm on the night before inauguration. It also took me 4 hours to get from the Capitol down to a hotel—but some people really think the Federal Government ought to do something about such situations. Then we had witnesses before the committee who constantly talked about how the Federal Government should accept all the responsibilities of the cities, and of the local communities.

We have heard a great deal of talk here about urban communities. I do not know how many of you have read the bill we had before us in the committee, or how many of you know what an urban community is. In discussing this legislation they talk about the percentage variance in population of urban communities; it is all according to what yardstick you use in your definition of an urban community, but under the bill an urban community would have been any community, whether incorporated or unincorporated, which had two or more houses in it—believe that or not. Now, to me that is both laughable and peculiar. So we must also take everything into consideration.

We have heard a great deal of discussion about the Hoover Commission and what the Hoover Commission said and did. Some of the older Members may possibly recall that back in the dark ages I was the legislative father of the two Hoover Commissions, that I originated the idea, introduced the bills, and put them through Congress to create the two Commissions and spent 5 years as a member thereof. Of course we had some quotations here today from one of the recommendations of the Commission. Let us see what the Hoover Commission was to do: It was to—

> promote economy, efficiency, and improve service in the transaction of the public business in the departments, bureaus, agencies, boards, commissions, offices, independent establishments, and instrumentalities of the executive branch of the Government by—
>
> (1) recommending methods and procedures for reducing expenditures to the lowest amount consistent with the efficient performance of essential services, activities, and functions;
>
> (2) eliminating duplication and overlapping of services, activities, and functions;

That does not say anything about increasing them.

> (3) consolidating services, activities, and functions of a similar nature;

I would like to point out this plan does not do that. It just consolidates only a few of the activities relative to housing, many of which are entirely temporary in nature, unless Congress extends them under a new law.

> (4) abolishing services, activities, and functions not necessary to the efficient conduct of government;
>
> (5) eliminating nonessential services, functions, and activities which are competitive with private enterprise;

Well, if this plan would do all that, perhaps we could all be for it, because there are a lot of these Federal activities that are competitive with private enterprise.

> (6) defining responsibilities of officials;
>
> (7) relocating agencies now responsible directly to the President in departments or other agencies.

Let me say we ought to look at facts. There is not a single thing that could be done in the field of housing under this plan that is now before us that cannot be done now by persons and agencies, appointed and staffed by the President of the United States—not a single thing. This plan does not include all the Hoover Commission suggested. It leaves out a great many of the housing activities in right field, and leaves some in left field. They are scattered all over the Federal lot.

I wish to talk about one other thing, if I may, to set the record straight. Mr. YATES, and he is my very good friend, expressed a great deal of concern over what is going to happen to his home city of Chicago unless we enact, or approve, this plan.

It is a great city. I love to go there. I get a little tired sometimes of the snow and of the cold winds off the lake. But I also love the cooling winds that come off the lake in the summertime.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. If the gentleman will permit me to state, I made no reference to my home city of Chicago, not that I should not have, but I did not use the word "Chicago" once.

Mr. BROWN. The gentleman may not, but knowing he is from Chicago I am absolutely certain, in my own mind, the gentleman could not possibly take the floor and make such a speech if he did not have Chicago in mind.

Mr. YATES. I will permit the gentleman to look at my remarks and he will not find the name "Chicago" there.

This legislation is for the benefit of all cities, Chicago included.

Mr. BROWN. I am certain in my own mind, and I believe most Members of the House are, that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], who represents Chicago so ably in this body, always has Chicago in mind in whatever he may say, or in whatever he may do, and he is to be congratulated for that.

Let me go ahead because I want to help curb your fears, calm you down a bit, if I may. You do not have to worry. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] also spoke in favor of this plan, has a method that would take care of all of your problems, Mr. YATES, without adopting this reorganization plan.

Back last July the gentleman from Wisconsin made two speeches. He always speaks very ably. He suggested to the House his plan to solve the problem of Washington, by holding down the population growth of the metropolitan area close to 3 million, in order to save our heritage. He went ahead and talked about the best way to do this thing. This is the title of his address, "Saving the Nation's Capital by Orderly Relocation."

So I just want to remind the gentleman from Illinois Mr. [YATES], because he is not too far away from the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS], geographically speaking, if he does not watch himself Mr. REUSS may relocate Chicago out in the middle of some desert, perhaps some place in Nevada, for instance, then Mr. YATES will have nothing to worry about and we will not need this reorganization plan.

As I said in the beginning in the debate on this issue, the discussion of this problem, while it is a serious matter, for it would create another sprawling bureaucracy in order to satisfy the desires of those who testified before the committee, it may not amount to anything one way or the other. It cannot be halfway in between nothing and everything. So, that is a little funny; it is a little laughable and peculiar, when you stop to consider it.

We had other witnesses before us, and I want to quote now a great Governor of a great State. Because of my respect for the delegation from that State, I will not mention its name, but the Governor said he was for this plan of creating this new Department with Cabinet rank, the Department of Urban Affairs, so its Secretary could bring pressure—and he used the word "pressure" if you check the record, unless he deleted it—and we have to watch for that, you know—pressure on the legislature, to do what he thinks his State legislature ought to do, in connection with reapportioning the seats in the legislature itself, a power which, of course, belongs to the States themselves, and, under our Constitution, not to the Federal Government.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe those who favor this reorganization plan would quarrel with the statement that its major purpose is to provide the means for enlarging the Federal Government's role in dealing with the problems of our urban areas.

Indeed, the gist of all the arguments we hear in favor of creating the new department is that more Federal action is necessary to solve the problems of our cities. That, certainly, was the burden of the President's message on this plan.

The question facing us today, therefore, is not whether our cities have problems, for they have, and it is not whether action is necessary to solve those problems, for it is. The issue involved here is whether a greater Federal role is necessary and whether it will help or hinder in the solution of urban problems.

Will a new Federal department solve these problems? Those who contend that it will should tell us what wisdom resides in Washington which does not reside in our great urban centers. They should inform us how urban problems, which are as diverse as American cities themselves, are more amenable to solutions dreamed up in Washington than they are to solutions which are devised by those who live on the scene.

Is Federal money necessary to solve our urban problem? Those who say it is should tell us where the wealth of this Nation resides. I call your attention to the revealing words in the President's message on this plan which told us:

> In 1959 taxpayers in the 10 largest metropolitan areas paid over $13 billion in taxes, or 35 percent, of the total amount of individual income tax.

Certainly, this statistic indicates the heavy concentration of wealth and income in our cities. Certainly, it would be a great paradox for the Federal Government, which relies so heavily upon the wealth of our cities for revenue, to maintain that these areas cannot solve their problems without Federal money.

I contend, Mr. Chairman, that neither a new Federal department, nor more Federal funds, are needed to solve our urban problems. I contend that the brains and energy to solve those problems resides in our cities—if they are only put to use—and I contend that the financial resources to solve those problems resides in our cities, for, if it does not, then those resources just do not exist.

The hope of American cities lies within their own boundaries. It does not lie in Washington. It does not lie in some fancy Washington department. It lies in local officials, local laws, local initiative, local brains, and local funds. But, for just as long as these local instrumentalities are deluded into thinking that the solution lies in Washington, for just so long will the local problems mount and multiply. It is a tragic thing, in my opinion, that this administration has deliberately fostered the belief that the salvation of our cities lies in the passage of a Federal law and the grant of Federal money.

Moreover, I would ask you to think about the nature of our urban problems and whether a centralized approach is best fitted to deal with them. Those problems are as numerous and as different as the number of municipalities in the Nation. They are spread across the land. To solve them from a central bureau, attempting to impose centralized conditions and centralized uniformity upon them, is the height of administrative folly. These are problems which call for decentralization; they call for unique local solutions, and, if you have any doubts, I call your attention to the delays, difficulties, disruptions, and discouragements in the centrally directed urban renewal program—a typical example of an attempt to solve local problems from a Washington bureau.

Even, however, were central direction the best way to solve these problems, I ask you to consider carefully the scope of the Federal program which would be required to deal with them. The bureaucracy which would pile up in Washington if every local decision must be ratified here staggers the imagination. No single bureau can efficiently handle the problems of thousands of diverse localities. No single government can do so. If it tries, it only dissipates its energies and I need not tell you that there was never a time when the concerted energy of the National Government could be more wisely used than in the solution of problems which only the National Government can handle.

We have only one President. We have only one Congress. Their time and capacity are limited, as are those of all human beings. Yet if Washington is to be called upon to give detailed consideration to problems which can be handled more efficiently locally, then this National Government is going to be less effective in dealing with those broad world and national problems which it alone can handle, and I refer to its responsibility to provide for our national defense and security in a world divided into two armed camps, to its efforts to avoid a war which will turn our cities and villages into ashes, to its responsibilities in agriculture, transportation, communications, and industry, to those broad steps for the development and conservation of our national resources and to the maintenance of an environment in which our economy can strengthen and grow.

When the day arrives when the Federal Government will enter into every local decision, when it determines when and how our cities will take care of their own sewage and when and how they will pave their own streets or tear down their own slums, we will not only have ruined local government as we know it, but we will have made it impossible, through the sheer demand upon its time and energy, for the National Government to deal with those problems which mean life or death to us as a nation.

This plan, with its announced purpose of enlarging the Federal role in local problems, is a giant step in that direction. I urge adoption of the resolution rejecting it.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, to conclude debate, I yield the balance of the time to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, in concluding debate on the establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs, I would like to pick up some of the arguments that have been made during the afternoon and comment upon them.

My colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER], who has served with me many years on the committee, said that urban affairs are not a Federal responsibility, and he inferred that they are local only. Of course, from a legal standpoint, no one can doubt that the local counties, cities, and even the States have responsibilities that differ from those of the Federal Government. However, over the years we who have served here in the Congress know that the cities and the counties and the States have come to the Federal Government for assistance in solving their problems. Whether this is right or whether it is wrong is not the point at issue this afternoon. The fact is that they do come to Washington. Each one of us in our own district offices have these responsible officials coming and asking for flood control, for help in housing, for help in water pollution, and for help in many other fields which go beyond the borders of their political subdivisions. Therefore, the Federal programs have developed because of a proven need for help on the Federal level.

There has been some discussion this afternoon about the percentage of people who live in urban areas and those who live in the agricultural areas. Let me go back to 1862 when one of the great leaders of the Republican Party, Abraham Lincoln, whose birthday we all celebrated last week, recommended that more power be given to an independent agency that was then known as the Department of Agriculture. In 1889 that independent agency was made a Cabinet Department. Now, the argument that the people in the urban areas, whatever that percentage be, do not also deserve a spot at the Cabinet level and Cabinet distinction at the governmental table seems like, at least to me, it rests upon a fallacy as to numbers. Now, if we in 1889 could give to the rural population of 40 million people out of a total population of 60 million a Cabinet Department, then I ask you why should we not give a Cabinet Department to the people who live in the urban areas; 30 percent of the people are now in the rural areas and 70 percent are in the urban areas surrounding the cities. The position is reversed and the need for special attention to urban problems now exists.

So I say from the standpoint of the citizens' interest and citizens' problems the urban areas today almost 80 years later deserve the same kind of attention which we gave to that two-thirds of the population back in 1889 when we made a department out of the independent agency of Agriculture.

Mr. Chairman, I was somewhat amused by the statement of my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] that in 10 years we may not need a Department of Urban Affairs because the trend may be reversed.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that time is late, and we are about ready to vote, and I realize that the Members are tired, but I would like to say in the 2 or 3 minutes left me that Mr. MEADER's argument that the problems of the cities and urban areas will be solved in the next 10 years, or may be solved, is completely unfounded based upon the history of the trends of our population. All predicted population trends indicate that more and more of the people will be concentrated in the cities and less and less in the rural areas. More and more problems will stem from the concentration of population in the urban areas.

Mr. Chairman, we are faced with a reorganization plan today because H.R. 8429, a bill that was reported from the House Committee on Government Operations, was refused clearance by the Rules Committee. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] chided us somewhat because with 10 members on the Rules Committee and five Republicans on the Rules Committee we could not get this bill out of that committee. I would say to the gentleman from New York that 60 percent of the Democrats voted to get the rule out of the committee, and not 1 percent of the Republicans voted to get the rule out of the committee.

Mr. Chairman, I say to the members of the Rules Committee on the Republican side that the fact that they are in the minority does not in one degree decrease their responsibility to the 70 percent of the population who live in the cities and urban areas of our Nation. I want to say to the gentlemen, if they are thinking about their political future, as most of us do in an election year, let them look at the record of response in the urban areas of this country in the last election and let them consider well the response which will be given in the coming election, because it is in the urban areas where the people live, and it is there where the needs of people will occur.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? The gentleman referred to me. Would the gentleman care to yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LINDSAY. I would like to say to the gentleman from California, as I stated when I testified before the gentleman's committee, that I am for the reorganization plan, and I will vote for the reorganization plan. But under most parliamentary systems that I know of it is the responsibility of the majority, in order to legislate, and we gave the majority the Rules Committee.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I request that all Members be permitted to extend their remarks during the general debate prior to the remarks by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives does not favor the Reorganization Plan Numbered 1 transmitted to the Congress by the President on January 20, 1962.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the resolution back to the House with the recommendation that the resolution be not agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BROWN. I should like the Chair to state whether my understanding of the parliamentary situation is correct, that the adoption of the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida will in no way affect the final vote on the question whether or not the resolution of disapproval shall or shall not be adopted when it is voted on in the House.

The CHAIRMAN. There will be a vote on the resolution in the House.

Mr. BROWN. That is, the resolution of disapproval?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. BROWN. I thank the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. O'NEILL, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration House Resolution 530, he reported the resolution back to the House with the recommendation that it be not agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives does not favor the Reorganization Plan Numbered 1 transmitted to the Congress by the President on January 30, 1962.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALLECK. In view of the form of the resolution now before us, if one is against Reorganization Plan No. 1, his vote should be for the resolution, is that correct?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has stated the situation correctly as it exists. Any Member opposed to the Reorganization Plan No. 1, on the question will vote "aye," and those in favor of Reorganization Plan No. 1 will vote "no."

The question is on the resolution.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 264, nays 150, answered "present" 1, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 20]

YEAS—264

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Alexander
Alford
Alger
Andersen, Minn.
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Auchincloss
Avery
Ayres
Baker
Baring
Barry
Bass, N.H.
Bates
Battin
Becker
Beckworth
Beermann
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Berry
Betts
Blitch
Bolton
Bonner
Bow
Boykin
Bray
Breeding
Bromwell
Brooks, Tex.
Brown
Broyhill
Bruce
Burleson
Byrnes, Wis.
Cannon
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chenoweth
Chiperfield
Church
Clancy
Collier
Colmer
Conte
Cook
Cooley
Corbett
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis, Mass.
Curtis, Mo.
Dague
Davis, James C.
Davis, John W.
Davis, Tenn.
Derounian
Derwinski
Devine
Dole
Dominick
Dooley
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Durno
Elliott
Ellsworth
Everett
Evins
Fenton
Findley
Fisher
Flynt
Ford
Forrester
Fountain
Frazier
Frelinghuysen
Fulton
Garland
Gary
Gathings
Gavin
Goodell
Goodling
Grant
Griffin
Gross
Gubser
Hagan, Ga.
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Hardy
Harris
Harrison, Va.
Harrison, Wyo.
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hébert
Hemphill
Henderson
Herlong
Hiestand
Hoeven
Hoffman, Ill.
Horan
Hosmer
Hull
Ichord, Mo.
Jarman
Jennings
Jensen
Johansen
Johnson, Md.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Judd
Kastenmeier
Kearns
Keith
Kilburn
Kilgore
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
Kitchin
Knox
Kornegay
Kunkel
Kyl
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
McCulloch
McDonough
McIntire
McSween
McVey
MacGregor
Mahon
Marshall
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mason
Matthews
May
Meader
Michel
Miller, N.Y.
Milliken
Mills
Minshall
Moeller
Moorehead, Ohio
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Mosher
Moulder
Murray
Nelsen
Norblad
Norrell
Nygaard
Osmers
Ostertag
Passman
Patman
Pelly
Peterson
Pfost
Pilcher
Pillion
Poage
Poff
Purcell
Quie
Rains
Ray
Reece
Reifel
Rhodes, Ariz.
Riehlman
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Robison
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Roudebush
Rousselot
Rutherford
St. George
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schenck
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Scranton
Seely-Brown
Selden
Short
Shriver
Sibal
Sikes
Siler
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Miss.
Smith, Va.
Springer
Stafford
Steed
Stephens
Taber
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Thornberry
Tollefson
Trimble
Tuck
Udall, Morris K.
Utt
Van Pelt
Vinson
Waggonner
Weaver
Weis
Westland
Whalley
Wharton
Whitener
Whitten
Wickersham
Widnall
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Calif.
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Wright
Young
Younger

NAYS—150

Addonizio
Albert
Ashley
Bailey
Baldwin
Barrett
Blatnik
Boland
Bolling
Brademas
Brewster
Buckley
Burke, Ky.
Byrne, Pa.
Cahill
Carey
Celler
Chelf
Clark
Coad
Cohelan
Corman
Daddario
Daniels
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Doyle
Dulski
Dwyer
Edmondson
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Finnegan
Fino
Flood
Fogarty
Friedel
Gallagher
Garmatz
Giaimo
Gilbert
Glenn
Gonzalez
Granahan
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Hagen, Calif.
Halpern
Hansen
Harding
Healey
Hechler
Holifield
Holland
Inouye
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Karsten
Karth
Kee
Kelly
Keogh
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kowalski
Lane
Lankford
Lesinski
Libonati
Lindsay
Loser
McDowell
McFall
Macdonald
Mack
Madden
Mailliard
Mathias
Merrow
Miller, Clem
Miller, George P.
Montoya
Moorhead, Pa.
Morgan
Moss
Multer
Murphy
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen
O'Neill
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Randall
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Rostenkowski
Roush
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St. Germain
Santangelo
Saund
Shelley
Sheppard
Shipley
Sisk
Smith, Iowa
Spence
Staggers
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Toll
Tupper
Vanik
Van Zandt
Wallhauser
Walter
Watts
Yates
Zablocki
Zelenko

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Aspinall

NOT VOTING—20

Addabbo
Anfuso
Bass, Tenn.
Bennett, Mich.
Boggs
Broomfield
Burke, Mass.
Hays
Hoffman, Mich.
Huddleston
McMillan
Magnuson
Monagan
Moore
O'Konski
Pirnie
Scherer
Teague, Calif.
Ullman

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Aspinall for, with Mr. Anfuso against.

Mr. Broomfield for, with Mr. Hays against.

Mr. Huddleston for, with Mr. Monagan against.

Mr. McMillan for, with Mr. Addabbo against.

Mr. Bennett of Michigan for, with Mr. Ullman against.

Mr. Boggs for, with Mr. Burke of Massachusetts against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Bass of Tennessee with Mr. Scherer.

Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Pirnie.

Mr. GALLAGHER changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I voted "yea." I have a live pair with the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANFUSO]. If he were present he would have voted "nay." Therefore I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 431. Concurrent resolution extending the congratulations and warm good wishes of the Congress to Lt. Col. John H. Glenn, Jr., U.S. Marine Corps.

JOINT MEETING IN HONOR OF LT. COL JOHN H. GLENN

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time on Monday, February 26, 1962, for the Speaker to declare a recess for the purpose of receiving in joint meeting Lt. Col. John H. Glenn, U.S. Marine Corps.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THIS WEEK AND FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to inquire of the majority leader as to the program for the balance of the week and, if he can tell us at this time, for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. Tomorrow, George Washington's birthday, there will be the reading of George Washington's Farewell Address. There will be no legislative business for the balance of the week.

For the next week, on Monday, there will be the joint meeting to receive Lt. Col. John H. Glenn, U.S. Marine Corps. Monday is District Day and we shall consider H.R. 6747, a juvenile court bill.

For Tuesday and the balance of the week, H.R. 8399, the Manpower Development and Training Act.

This, of course, is subject to the usual reservations that any further program will be announced later and that conference reports may be brought up at any time.

ADJOURNMENT OVER FROM THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 22, TO MONDAY, FEBRUARY 26

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, is it the purpose of the gentleman to ask unanimous consent that the House adjourn over from tomorrow until Monday?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield so that I may make a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tomorrow it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder what happened to the legislation we were supposed to have for tomorrow, the manpower training bill?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, we were supposed to have it up today. We shall bring it up on Tuesday next.

Mr. GROSS. It was my understanding that the gentleman the other day, when inquiry was made concerning the legislative program, told the House that this bill was to be called up today, and that there would be a session on Thursday and probably on Friday of this week. I wonder what happened.

Mr. ALBERT. I believe I said that it might be necessary to have a legislative session on George Washington's Birthday; but the legislative situation now is such that we feel this bill may better be taken up on Tuesday next.

Mr. GROSS. That means that the T. & T. Club will be in operation again this weekend; is that correct?

Mr. ALBERT. I have no official or personal knowledge of the club to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. GROSS. I can explain it to the gentleman. It is the Thursday-to-Tuesday Club, the T. & T. Club. So it will be in operation again this weekend?

Mr. ALBERT. As I have said, I cannot answer the gentleman's question.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT]?

There was no objection.

WELFARE AND PENSION PLANS DISCLOSURE ACT

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 8723) to amend the Welfare and Pension Plan Disclosure Act with respect to the method of enforcement and to provide certain additional sanctions, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. POWELL, ROOSEVELT, DENT, SMITH of Iowa, KEARNS, HIESTAND, and GOODELL.

REINTRODUCTION OF QUALITY STABILIZATION BILL TODAY

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform the House Members that it is with satisfaction I announce that several distinguished colleagues in both the House and Senate are today sponsoring and introducing the quality stabilization bill.

The quality stabilization bill as reintroduced by me today is the same measure, except for minor clarifications in language, as H.R. 116—the Madden bill—introduced by me at the beginning of this session. In my 20 years in Congress, I have never seen developed such a determined ground swell of support. Daily I receive pleas from every segment of the distributive economy, from every section of the country, urging quick enactment of this bill. Fifty national trade associations have endorsed this measure and all agree this is must legislation. This legislation is important to all the small businessman, to labor, to the manufacturer, the consumer, and is to the advantage of the general economy of our Nation.

During the last few years, the manufacturers and retailers, both large and small, have become alarmed over the avalanche of business failures throughout the Nation. The quality stabilization bill proposes remedies that will halt this assault upon our wholesale and retail distribution channels.

The American system of product distribution is in the process of being disintegrated. The most efficient distribution system in the world is being steadily undermined. The Senate Small Business Committee has reported that small business failures—bankruptcies—businessmen giving up the struggle for survival—climbed in 1961 to the highest point since 1933.

There are about 2 million retailers in America. Eighty-eight percent of them operate in only one location from one store. Seventy percent individually own their own businesses. These are not huge outfits—over 75 percent have annual sales under $100,000.

There are 165,000 merchant wholesalers in the United States. Ninety-one percent of them are active owners of unincorporated businesses. Seventy-one percent operate from only one building. These are not huge outfits either—77 percent have annual sales under $1 million.

Out of these people—individual owners of one unit businesses—139,000 decided in 1959, according to statistics from the House Small Business Committee, that doing business in today's jungle was just not worth the kicking around they were getting. It is getting worse every day. The Chicago Tribune on February 13 reports that 400,000 small business firms failed last year.

This high rate of business failures, as a matter of statistics, is attributed to a number of factors.

But statistics do not tell the human side of the story, such as giving up the plans of years, forfeiting the hope of having a business for a son to step in and take over, and so forth. A good part of this frightening rate of failure is due to predatory, unfair, destructive competition.

Forty-one years ago Lenin stated that the United States would crumble to communism from within. He further stated that the millions of American small businessmen were the great barrier. Small business with rights to fair play, Lenin saw as the strength of America. Khrushchev, noting the increase in small business failures in this country, is joyously quoting his predecessor. There is no need for him to lie. Unless the rights to fairplay are restored by the enactment of the quality stabilization bill, Khrushchev's prediction may come true.

Unrestrained price slashing is rapidly disabling labor, industry, resellers and the public. Our entire economy will continue to deteriorate at a time when leading economists and statesmen agree we need, instead, economic growth to strengthen our Nation for survival.

Enactment of this quality stabilization legislation will contribute more toward restoring employment than any other legislation that can be enacted by Congress. When a manufacturer is forced to make 15 men do the work of 20, and is forced to employ cheaper and less-skilled labor as well as inferior materials, both American labor and the American consumer are injured where it hurts the most. Hundreds of smaller manufacturers of trademarked products have been forced to close their factories or downgrade the quality of their products to suit loss-leader operators as a means of staying in business.

I am very much interested in legislation that will protect brand name rights or trademark rights from the standpoint not only of the small merchant, but also from the standpoint of the consumer and employment.

I am not unmindful of the situation that results when a large discounter can take advantage of a product by running a loss-leader ad.

For every dollar spent by the misguided customer that is brought in on account of this ad, sacrificing a brand name or a trademark of some producer, that customer spends about $9 for other and generally inferior products at the regular or higher price. Now, what happens? It does not take long until that product loses customers. They will go into another store a month or two later and say, "I bought this product at such and such a store for such and such a price." I think it is operations of this kind that the quality stabilization bill is trying to outlaw, to protect the customer, the producer and the small retail man.

We need some protection for the small retailer, the consumer, labor, and for the man who invents and produces a new product and maybe spends years and money to advertise its brand name or a trademark.

The question has often been asked—"Will the quality stabilization bill put the discounter out of business?" I see no reason why it should. There is no doubt that there will be many brands by reputable manufacturers which will not be stabilized even though some of their brands are stabilized. The quality stabilization bill will affect discount merchants only as to the products the manufacturers place under quality stabilization. On those products the manufacturer will have the legal and equitable right to protect his property. The legislation is optional for the manufacturer, retailer, and consumer.

The quality stabilization bill recognizes that there is a place in the market for merchandise built to suit a temporary need, or a limited budget. The following story illustrates that market:

> A mother was visiting stores with her son and his bride—whom she didn't quite like—helping them select furniture and appliances for their new home. A neighbor woman, who noticed the deliveries, dropped in one evening to nose around a bit. Spotting a brand of mattress she knew, she exclaimed to the mother: "Why on earth, Jennie, did you buy such a mattress? I know the brand and it won't last." The mother whispered quietly to the neighbor: "Neither will the marriage."

There are two ideologies among manufacturers of branded products. So, to provide comprehensive competition in values according to price, we must let each bracket compete fairly with the other. That means we must empower the maker of quality products to prevent unfair use of his reputation by others who would use his good name to help destroy him.

Enactment of the quality stabilization bill in this session of Congress will help greatly in the restoration of quality manufacturing and quality distribution—while providing the consumer at the same time much needed protection and relief against shady and deceptive practices in the marketplace.

COLONEL GLENN'S ORBITAL FLIGHT

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's triumph of American space technology was heartening to the entire free world. It proves America's abilities in moving with speed in programs to benefit science and our security. It also indicates tremendous acceleration which has taken place in our space program. The expenditures which have been made in this field are being made manifest in achievement. As the NASA spokesman said, we have reached the end of the beginning.

At this point in our technology, we find our space program calling for six additional one-man launchings and a two-man launch within the next 18 months. The projection beyond that point certainly will be even more ambitious and the requirements in terms of astronauts will be even greater.

Yet, as we stand at this point in our space program, America has a total of seven astronauts trained or in training. The accomplishments of these men are a tribute to them personally and to their superb training. But I believe we must begin an accelerated training program to supply the needs of our program. We have committed this Nation to a $10 billion program to reach the moon before the end of this decade and certainly additional manned space flight projects in this period will require other substantial expenditures. We must not neglect the most important part of these mechanisms which will fly out into space—the human component. Yesterday's flight by Colonel Glenn demonstrated the difference between manned and unmanned vehicles, and the great value in having human control.

Our program is ambitious and our training program for new men in the space field must be equally ambitious.

I wrote yesterday to the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Mr. Webb, and asked that he proceed to study the needs of our program in terms of human resources, both quantitatively and qualitatively and urged him to include a program of space training and conditioning in the coming fiscal program. I ask that the text of my letter be inserted at this point.

FEBRUARY 20, 1962.

Mr. JAMES E. WEBB,
Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WEBB: Congratulations to you and your entire agency for the splendid job which culminated today in the successful orbital flight of Lt. Col. John Glenn, Jr.

The successful flight reemphasizes the acceleration which we have achieved in our space program. I know that we have six additional launchings in Project Mercury scheduled in the next 15 months and possibly an initial launching of Project Gemini. As these projects continue to progress in an ever-accelerated schedule, the need for additional astronauts will become acute.

Certainly, one of our most valuable assets within the next years in space will be competent and adequately trained personnel to carry out the vigorous program of manned space exploration. Yet our program of training has been confined to Project Mercury.

I request that you make a determination at a very early date of the number of trained astronauts that will be required over the next 5 to 10 years and a projection of specific type of scientific training which will be required for the missions that are programed. I urge that you include in your programing for the coming fiscal year the beginnings of a training program which will guarantee our Nation an adequate supply and reserve of personnel trained and conditioned for space flight.

As each of the astronauts steps into the world spotlight in missions like Colonel Glenn's, it becomes more and more obvious that we have selected fine men and trained them superbly. It is important that this great human resource be expanded to give our Nation a team of space pilots adequate for our ambitious program.

I look forward to hearing from you on this matter soon.

With every good wish, I am
Sincerely yours,
J. EDWARD ROUSH,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot overemphasize the importance of the human element in this space program of ours. We must begin to train new men to deepen our reserve of spacemen lest we find ourselves with the vehicles and the missions for great strides in rocketry and fail to have the men to man them. The men we have trained are proving their greatness. We must act now to provide them with sufficient human support to carry out our ambitious space program effectively and efficiently.

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN CARL D. PERKINS IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, ON AN APPALACHIAN HIGHLANDS PROGRAM

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I have, for several years, been studying the land and water problems in the district that I am privileged to represent. I have been searching for a means by which land use and resource programs might be developed to better fit the critical and somewhat unusual problems that exist there.

There is a much larger area which has certain significant physical and economic characteristics in common with those in my district that affect land use and economic development. This vast region of breathtaking beauty might be appropriately termed the "Appalachian highlands" and extends from New York to Alabama. It comprises all or parts of 12 States and about 347 counties.

The unusual conditions keep much of the technical and cost-sharing provisions of our national soil and water conservation programs from applying fully in the area. For that reason, many of the farmers and other landowners of the region have been deprived of the kind and amount of help they need in attacking their land and water problems and in achieving a better economic status.

Although this region has a wide diversity of soil, climatic, and farming conditions, it is generally characterized by small farms in narrow valleys with steep slopes and—except in the bottomlands—shallow soils. The terrain in areas is unsuited to mechanized farming and small operators cannot meet today's economic competition nor afford to make the needed changes in land use. Present programs of cost sharing on an annual basis do not enable landowners to make the long-term adjustments required.

This region has abundant precipitation and a generally plentiful surface water supply, but often suffers from poor seasonal distribution of rainfall. Underground water resources are limited in some places.

The soil structure is generally unstable. Runoff is high and much of the original soil has been removed by erosion which is severe throughout much of the region. Deposits of sterile eroded material on fertile bottomlands are common. Sedimentation of streams and reservoirs has been accelerated by strip mining. Native soil fertility is usually low and many of the surface soils and subsoils are highly acid.

Nearly 60 percent of the land in the region is unsuited to permanent cultivation. Much land formerly cultivated has been abandoned as cropland and it has been estimated in county-by-county surveys that there will be a further significant decrease of cropland in the next 15 years. Some 60 percent of existing cropland needs conservation treatment. More of this land needs to be shifted to improved pastures, woodland and other suitable uses. Some 70 percent of existing pasture land needs improvement.

This region has witnessed the automation of production of mineral resources, such as coal and oil, and a trend of outward migration of people since World War I. With notable exceptions such as the great valley of Virginia and Tennessee, much of the region is currently less productive per acre and per capita than the rest of the Nation.

Because of these severe soil and water conservation problems, and the somewhat unfavorable terrain and soil structure which aggravates them, together with the decline of other resources, this is a region that clearly needs a special resource program, based on the fundamental concept of integrated planning for the best possible use of all existing land, water, and human resources. Yet this is an area of unparalleled beauty and challenging recreational and natural resource development potential.

I am introducing legislation that would authorize a special-purpose regional land use and conservation program, tailored to the particular and critical land and water needs of the people in this region, and directed toward a goal of resource development and economic betterment.

I want to point out that there is a highly successful precedent for the type of approach I am proposing. Such a special-purpose conservation program has been operating since 1956 in the Great Plains, an area covering parts of 10 States extending from Montana to Texas. The Great Plains is likewise characterized by critical climatic and land use problems unique to that area. This popular program has not required the establishment of any new agency of Government, but rather has served to bring into sharp focus for the particular needs of the region all the forms of assistance that are required to achieve more efficient and safe use of land and to stabilize agriculture and improve economic conditions throughout the area. This program was authorized by Public Law 1021, enacted by the 84th Congress.

Similarly, my proposed program for the Appalachian Highlands would create no new agency of Government, but would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture upon request from appropriate local authorities to designate counties within the Appalachian Highlands in which the Department would provide assistance of the following types to local organizations and individual landowners and operators:

First. Technical assistance to farmers and other landowners and occupiers to develop a long-range plan for land and water use, resource conservation, and development.

Second. Cost sharing, related to that plan, on a guaranteed basis for the duration of the time required to carry out the conservation plan.

Third. Specially adapted credit to aid in farm reorganization, application of conservation measures, and establishment of desirable alternative land uses.

More specifically, the program would provide Federal assistance, as needed, for:

First. Cropland improvement, including erosion control; pasture development, and drainage.

Second, Development of farm water supplies.

Third. Private woodland improvements including tree planting, removal of noxious and undesirable species, and grazing protection.

Fourth. Revegetation of strip mine spoils and similar sediment source areas.

Fifth. Development of private recreation facilities, including water impoundments, wildlife, hunting, fishing, outdoor recreation, boating, and so forth.

Sixth. Streambank improvement for erosion protection and fish and wildlife.

Seventh. Reorganization and enlargement of operating units for livestock farming and woodland enterprises.

Eighth. Further development of specialized crops such as small fruits, berries, nuts, apples, and so forth.

In addition, the program would serve to expedite the application in the region of other existing programs, such as the small watershed program, the rural areas development program, rural electrification, and others, which would serve to build the resources of the region and provide badly needed economic expansion.

To insure a high degree of local initiative and to keep such a program responsive to the needs of local people, I am proposing that assistance under this program will be provided only after duly constituted local organizations or subdivisions of State government, such as soil conservation districts, have properly presented their needs, and requested designation by the Secretary of Agriculture, of those counties within which such aid is deemed necessary and desirable.

THE ARAB REFUGEE QUESTION

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvnaia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the body of the RECORD and to include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that in the debate of the Arab refugee question that just took place in the U.N., the plight of the refugees was used by Arab nations for propaganda purposes only. I am gratified that our representatives to the U.N. saw through these propaganda efforts.

I hope that in the future the United States will not find it necessary to vote against a resolution that was introduced calling for direct negotiations between Israel and the Arab countries. It is a matter of pride to me that the United States supports wholeheartedly the principle of peaceful solutions through negotiations of differences among nations. In keeping with our leadership position in world affairs, the U.S. representatives to the U.N. should always go on record in favor of such direct negotiations whenever there is an opportunity to do so.

The other day I received a copy of a communication to our great President, John F. Kennedy, from Murray H. Shusterman, president of the Jewish Community Relations Council of Greater Philadelphia, dealing with this subject. In a few words, this letter sets forth my views on the position our Government should take in the U.N. whenever the subject of the Arab refugees is considered. Therefore, I include the letter, in its entirety, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

JEWISH COMMUNITY
RELATIONS COUNCIL
OF GREATER PHILADELPHIA,
February 1, 1962.

President JOHN F. KENNEDY,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Jewish Community Relations Council of Greater Philadelphia is the coordinating agency for the 32 major Jewish religious and civic organizations listed on the side of this letterhead. We and our member organizations followed with great interest the recent debate in the U.N. on the Arab refugee issue.

We take this opportunity to commend you and the members of the U.S. delegation to the U.N. for opposing the proposals that were made by representatives of Arab nations for the designation of a U.N. custodian of former Arab properties in Israel; for the enlargement of the Palestine Conciliation Commission and a U.N. investigation of the treatment of Arabs in Israel. These proposals were not advanced to aid the unfortunate refugees but to further the anti-Israel campaign of the sponsoring countries. It is heartening that both the United States and the U.N. General Assembly saw through these propaganda maneuvers.

At the same time, we wish to express our disappointment that the United States voted against the Brazzaville resolution that called for direct Arab-Israel negotiations. We are aware that due to the intransigence of Arab nations, such direct negotiations are not likely to take place in the immediate future. However, our Government must never hesitate to reaffirm its commitment to the principle of peaceful negotiation of international controversies. Resolutions that are not possible of implementation, nevertheless serve the important purpose of keeping the aspiration and goal of peace from being forgotten.

The Arab refugee problem will come up again in the U.N. We trust that in this connection or at any other time when a call for peaceful solutions to international problems are called for, that the U.S. delegation may be counted in the forefront of those nations voting affirmatively for the principle of direct negotiations between the parties to particular disputes.

So that they may be kept informed, we are taking the liberty of sending copies of this

communication to Secretary of State Rusk, Ambassador Stevenson and other members of the U.S. delegation to the U.N. and to our Pennsylvania Senators and Congressmen.

Respectfully yours,

Murray H. Shusterman,
President.

REREFERENCE OF BILL

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 10251) to confer jurisdiction in certain cases on the Secretaries of the military departments to authorize payment from appropriated funds of the military departments of the amounts determined to be owed to contractors under Armed Services contracts, and that the bill be rereferred to the Committee on the Armed Services.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

BARKSDALE AIR FORCE BASE, LA.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I have been advised by the Secretary of the Air Force that plans exist for the disposal of the major portion of the East Reservation of Barksdale Air Force Base, La. I am in complete disagreement with this proposal and so are the people of the Fourth Congressional District. We are not in agreement for two very specific reasons.

First of all, this land was bought and paid for by the good people of Shreveport and donated to the Government for a specific military purpose. The site of Barksdale Air Force Base cost the people of Shreveport the sum of $2,250,000, including interest on bonds which were completely paid off barely 3 years ago. This was an unselfish donation made in the interest of the defense of our Nation.

Now it is proposed that this land be sold at a price near the fair market value of $1,167,500. The profit from this sale would go into the Treasury of the United States.

It is unfair to these people to take their donated land, given for military usage—declare it no longer needed—and sell it for a profit.

My second specific objection to this proposed sale is my belief that there is no one in the Government today who can accurately predict what our defense needs will be tomorrow in these rapidly changing times. To dispose of a bombing range in Louisiana at the time we are searching for one in North Carolina does not make sense.

The Shreveport Journal recently summarized the opposition that exists to this proposal and I would like to include a copy of it in these remarks for my colleagues to read.

Alternate proposals for the usage of this land are being studied for presentation to the House Armed Services Committee. One of them is outlined in an editorial which appeared in the Shreveport Times and I would like to include a copy of this editorial as well.

I hope my colleagues will read these two editorials and join with me in protesting this unfair and unreasonable disposal of this property.

[From the Shreveport Journal, Feb. 14, 1962]

Sale of Barksdale Land Could Endanger U.S. Security

Plans by the Federal Government to sell off more than one-third of the huge 22,000-acre Barksdale Air Force Base tract which it received as a gift from the city of Shreveport in 1930 constitute a breach of faith with the people of north Louisiana.

The Shreveport Journal condemns this unwarranted proposal as an ill-conceived transaction which could have the effect of destroying one of the world's most magnificent military installations.

The U.S. Air Force's contention as described by Representative Joe D. Waggonner, Jr., that it has no "foreseeable use for the land and therefore intends to dispose of it" is silly.

Neither the Air Force nor any other Federal source can say today how greatly this 8,440-acre portion of the reservation will be needed tomorrow—any more than the original planners of Barksdale could have foreseen in 1930 that today there would be busybody bureaucrats in Washington trying to make a "profit" on land given to the Government by the people of Shreveport for defense purposes.

The Air Force has placed a value of $1,167,500 on this property, exclusive of mineral rights.

If the Government of the United States is so hard up for money that it must jeopardize the future of Barksdale Air Force Base by selling more than a third of its acreage for a paltry $1,167,500, then we say—as we have said many times before—that the time is long past due when this Nation should stop throwing away billions all over the world.

Representative Waggonner and every other member of the Louisiana congressional delegation should tell the Kennedy administration—from the rooftops of the White House, if necessary—that they will never consent to the sale of a single acre of Barksdale. The Government can save plenty of money if it will quit dishing out millions of dollars annually to Marshal Tito, and other Communists.

There can be no plausible excuse for the sale of any Government defense land to obtain revenues as long as we can find no better use for the money than to give it away.

If there were any moral integrity connected with the Government's proposal to sell a part of the Barksdale reservation, the Air Force would first suggest returning the land without cost to the people who bought it and gave it to their country. The people of Shreveport would be glad to reclaim custody of this acreage and hold it in reserve for the day when the Air Force might possibly recognize it had erred as to the need for the land.

The Journal urges Louisiana's Representatives and Senators to fight with all their ability against this proposed mutilation of one of the Nation's finest defense posts. On the future of Barksdale—including the "excess" acreage—could rest the future of America.

[From the Shreveport Times, Feb. 16, 1962]

Why Not Make a Federal Preserve of Surplus Barksdale Land?

The Times believes that all local governmental and civic forces should unite in every possible step to block the planned Federal sale of 8,440 acres of Barksdale Air Force Base which the Air Force has declared surplus as to military needs.

The first step must be political and it must be directed to the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and the House.

The Air Force has certified to those committees that the property is surplus as to Air Force needs. Action within either or both of them can either push the sale forward to quick consummation, block it completely, or bring about a delay during which local forces can be regrouped and longer range plans made.

Certainly the city of Shreveport should lead in this protest to the congressional committees since the people of Shreveport put up the money to purchase the land for Barksdale to begin with—$2,250,000 in all, including interest on bonds which were completely paid off only 3 years ago.

But the city of Shreveport must have full backing of all other governmental and civic agencies of not only Caddo and Bossier but of other nearby parishes. All have a deep concern in Barksdale as a key base in national security and as an economic asset to this three-State area.

In all steps taken it must be kept constantly in mind that we are faced with these cold, hard, and irrevocable facts:

1. The Federal Government owns the land and can use it as it wishes, regardless of the circumstances under which it acquired the land.

2. The Air Force has declared the land surplus property so far as military needs are concerned.

3. Under prescribed procedures, the Federal Government can dispose of the land as it sees fit and doubtless will do so unless some satisfactory counterplan can be brought forth. We must recognize that there is little hope for success in seeking only to get the Federal Government to reverse its sale plans—and nothing more.

RETAIN FEDERAL OWNERSHIP

In view of the above facts, the Times proposes that along with immediate steps to at least halt plans for the sale through action in the Armed Services Committees of Congress, local area governmental and civic forces should unite in trying to get the Federal Government to declare the Barksdale acreage a permanent Federal preserve available for public use.

The 8,440 acres could be declared a Federal preserve with public access, such as Kisatchie National Forest in central Louisiana, or a managed Federal recreation area, or a restricted game management preserve.

Under any of these procedures, the Federal Government would retain its title to the land.

The 8,440 acres always would be available for any Federal, military, or other use at any time in the future.

The burden of upkeep and operation of land not needed by the military would be removed from the military.

By good Federal forestry practices a profit could be made on disposal of surplus timber rights even as Federal land ownership and public use of the land were maintained.

All of the people of this area thus would benefit from the action of the people of Shreveport who put up the money to buy the Barksdale site and donated it to their Federal Government for the security of their Nation.

The whole deal would be a splendid gesture of cordial and friendly public relations between Federal Government and local areas instead of another step creating local resentment against the manner in which Federal authority is used.

The Barksdale acreage could be converted into a beautiful open preserve or recreation area of a type that would be valuable not only locally but as a fine tourist attraction. Or, it could also be kept as a restricted game preserve of perhaps equal value to the public.

The steps proposed by the Times cannot be taken quickly. They will require a lot of work in Washington, a lot of action from local governmental and civic agencies, and a lot of support from Senators Long and Ellender, Representative Waggonner, and others of the Louisiana delegation.

If the Federal Government is not willing to follow the course we propose, steps then could be considered toward actual purchase of the land by the State of Louisiana. But the land was paid for by local people and given to the Federal Government. All obligations and authority—legal and moral—in connection with disposal of it now rest first of all on the Federal Government. And that is where the first moves should be made by our local governmental and civic forces.

INTEGRAL COG IN DEFENSE

The Times proposal for converting the surplus Barksdale acreage into a Federal preserve applies only if the Federal Government insists on removing the acreage from the control of the Air Force. We believe, as we always have believed, that Barksdale is such an integral part of national security that there should be no tampering with it at any time simply because of changes in weapons of war—changes which in these days may come almost overnight.

The Strategic Air Command, known as SAC, has stood between us—the United States and all of its people—and being taken over by Khrushchev and the Russians. We believe firmly that except for existence of SAC the Soviet would have forced itself upon this Nation by this time either in aggressive war or in other forms of aggression which we would not have been in position to resist.

Barksdale is part of SAC and nothing should be done to lessen its physical structure even though portions of that physical structure may not at the moment be part of the essential national security picture.

Much as we respect both SAC and the U.S. Air Force, they are no more endowed now with any special crystal ball with which to examine the national security future than were those who, when Barksdale first was established, looked on a 200-mile-an-hour B-17 plane, moved by propellers, as the ultimate in air might.

All military installations have potential war value—every war in history has proved it. From a simple business point of view, the more land the better. If this Barksdale acreage is sold, it will be surprising indeed if the U.S. Government does not find it necessary to buy back the same land, or equivalent acreage somewhere else, in the future at many times the price it could get now in public sale.

Even in this proposed sale, the Government is stipulating certain restrictions as to use of part of the acreage, lest there be interference with nearby military installations.

If there have to be restrictions of use, why sell?

If restrictions are necessary for some of the acres now, more restrictions may be needed later.

What then? Buy back the land—or buy new land elsewhere?

We recognize that the Barksdale acreage—originally a bombing range for planes when 10,000 feet was way up in the sky and hitting anywhere near a stationary target marked on the ground with a plow was accurate bombing—is not essential to immediate Barksdale military activity.

But the mere thought of disturbing anything at Barksdale becomes more and more touchy every day as the existence of a tremendous Russian base only 90 miles off our southern border in the form of Cuba is impressed more and more upon us.

For the Communists, Cuba already is a point of distribution for weapons intended to be used in revolutions in various parts of the Western Hemisphere, especially Latin America. Cuba is believed already to be an intermediate range missile base, with Shreveport within range. Cuba is only about 850 miles from Shreveport, something over an hour for a jet bomber.

One way or another, Federal title to the Barksdale acreage should be retained.

And by no way should it simply be sold to anyone for any private purpose.

It is in every way the people's land—and should be kept that way.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL AVIATION ACT

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill brought to my attention by the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, to remedy a chaotic situation in the aircraft industry which exists because of conflicting State law as to the validity of conveyances of aircraft and related equipment.

The bill does not change the substantive law of the various States but simply amends the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so that there is a uniform rule as to which State's law applies to a given conveyance, lease, or other transfer of title or interests in such equipment.

At least three rules are now in use, and the uncertainty which this creates in an industry where equipment is constantly in rapid movement across State lines is obvious. The bill would create a uniform rule that the substantive law of the State in which the relevant instrument is delivered is applicable. Comparable provisions already exist in relation to ships and motor vehicles, and I urge that prompt action be taken now to solve this problem in regard to aircraft.

Under unanimous consent, I include a memorandum explaining the bill in greater detail in my remarks:

Memorandum in Support of Proposed Amendment to Section 503 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to provide substantive Federal law relating to the validity of conveyances which affect the title to or interests in civil aircraft of the United States and related equipment. This is accomplished by providing that the substantive validity of such an instrument, i.e., a conveyance, lease, mortgage, equipment trust, contract of conditional sale, other instrument executed for security purposes, or assignment or amendment thereof or supplement thereto, is to be determined by the substantive law of the jurisdiction within the United States or its territories or possessions in which such instrument is delivered. Thus, the Federal law would look to the substantive laws (as distinguished from the adjective laws, including recording and filing provisions) of the State in which the relevant instrument is delivered and if such instrument is valid under that law and is in turn recorded under the applicable provisions of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, the instrument would be deemed valid in all jurisdictions in the United States in respect of the property covered by the instrument.

There is an urgent need for the proposed legislation so as to bring order to the chaotic situation with respect to conveyances by and to domestic air carriers.

The laws of the various States differ as to the requirements governing the validity of mortgages, conditional sale agreements, leases, equipment trust agreements and the like. Furthermore, there are at least three theories considered applicable in attempting to resolve the question as to which jurisdiction's laws should be taken into account in determining the validity of many such instruments; namely, (1) the jurisdiction in which the particular property is located at the time the instrument is executed and/or delivered, (2) the jurisdiction within which the instrument is executed and/or delivered, and (3) the residence of the parties to the transaction, particularly the conveyor. Which theory or theories should be adopted regarding a proposed financing of an air carrier incorporated under the laws of one State, maintaining airport facilities and aircraft and related equipment in many States, flying scheduled routes over many more States and seeking the financing from banks located in other States? At the time a chattel mortgage, for example, is given to the banking institution by the air carrier, its airplanes may be located in or over any number of States. Were the parties to such a transaction to follow only the first theory referred to above, at the moment the chattel mortgage on the air carrier's fleet of aircraft (many of which would be in the air) is executed the laws of many States would come into play, and a moment later the laws of different States would apply, notwithstanding any contradiction between the laws of such States. Moreover, there is no real logic in considering the law of State X paramount as to the validity of a chattel mortgage on a specific aircraft when the aircraft is at that moment traveling over the State at a speed in excess of 500 miles an hour and at a height in excess of 40,000 feet.

The proposed legislation would serve to preempt the field as to the substantive validity of such conveyances just as present section 503 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 has, since 1938, preempted the field as to the recording of such conveyances. A provision comparable to the proposed legislation has been applicable to conveyances of U.S.-flag vessels since the enactment of the Ship Mortgage Act of 1920. Similarly, a 1958 amendment to the Motor Carrier Act now provides comparable legislation as to motor vehicles.

The proposed legislation has been drafted within the framework of section 503 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958. It applies only to those conveyances enumerated in said section and does not conflict with or impinge upon the other provisions of said section or the act.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL'S TRIP

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, recently I wrote the Secretary of State in order to inquire about the purpose of the Attorney General's around-the-world trip. At that time I read into the RECORD a copy of the letter which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page 2041 on February 7, 1962.

Under date of February 9, I received a reply from the Secretary of State which I should like to insert in the RECORD, and I ask unanimous consent so to do at this point.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, February 9, 1962.

Hon. JOHN V. LINDSAY,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LINDSAY: I can assure you that you need have no concern about the visit abroad now being taken by the Attorney General, as expressed in your letter to me of February 5.

The Attorney General undertook this visit at my personal request and urging. He had received insistent invitations from high legal authorities of certain other governments which, from my point of view, I was most anxious for him to be able to accept.

Each of our great departments of government, as well as a number of independent agencies, are concerned with matters which reach across national frontiers. We receive in Washington a steady stream of high officials of other governments other than foreign ministers. It has been a great assistance to me to be able to call on most of my colleagues in the Cabinet to undertake one or more missions for us outside the United States. Apart from particular points which Cabinet officers can take up with other governments at the request of the President and myself, the return in good will from such visits is very high.

There can be no doubt about the Attorney General's eminent qualifications for the mission on which he is now embarked nor about the full coordination of his visit with the Secretary and Department of State.

It has already been stated publicly that the Attorney General's trip does not include a visit to Moscow.

Since Mr. Edward Kennedy is traveling as a private citizen and is not on an official mission, I think there is no need for me to comment upon it.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN RUSK.

Mr. Speaker, the Secretary's letter does not answer the question as to the purpose of this trip. The Secretary makes no comment whatever on the question I raised in respect of the proposed trip to the Soviet Union and any plans in this regard for the future. If there have been "particular points" which the Attorney General has been asked to take up with other governments, we have a right to know the areas in which they lie.

If the purpose of the trip was good will, we should know it. And we should also, I think, have the Secretary's opinion as to whether this kind of Madison Avenue approach is the stuff of which foreign policy is made. Hopefully it is not a substitute for policy. In any event, even assuring such behavior is entirely harmless, the time involved could be far better spent attending to the unfinished work of the Department of Justice here at home.

Mr. Speaker, I continue to be extremely sensitive to the importance of bipartisanship in foreign policy. I have supported this administration on matters concerning foreign policy in the past, and I will do so again when I believe it to be right, even when my position may be contrary to the general minority view. However, by the same token, those of us on the minority side who are concerned about foreign affairs have an equal obligation to criticize when it is necessary in the interests of full knowledge and the better administration of government and policy.

AMENDMENT OF THE JUVENILE COURT ACT

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter and tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on the District of Columbia in presenting to this body H.R. 6747, amending the Juvenile Court Act of the District of Columbia, desires that the Members of the House be fully and completely informed as to the nature of this legislation, the nature of the problem, and the need for the provisions carried in this bill.

The curbing of crime in Washington is not an academic question.

So many crimes of violence have been committed, such as rape, robbery, yoking, mugging, purse snatching, assaults on the person, and the like, that the Metropolitan Police Department deemed it necessary to issue a set of instructions to those Washingtonians who must use the streets after dark to take certain suggested safety precautions. I quote 5 of these suggestions from the list of 26:

> Always travel with a companion if possible.
>
> Stick to well-traveled, well-lighted streets, wherever possible, whether on foot or in a car.
>
> If you must enter a poorly lighted street, take a good look first to see if anyone is loitering * * *.
>
> Carry your purse hugged close to you.
>
> Keep your car door locked.
>
> Always keep the car in gear. If anyone suspicious approaches you, "take off." This is true, even if it means running a red light.

In mid-1961, five women were forcibly raped in 4 days. Four of the rapes were committed within 13 hours.

Rapes and assaults to rape have been committed in the daytime and at night, on the streets and in homes; even in business establishments. One woman who testified before our subcommittee representing one of the women's clubs said:

> Many women have for sometime hesitated to go out at night, regardless of their need, because they fear bodily harm. This is especially true when they have to rely upon public transportation.

She also told the subcommittee that women are not only afraid to go out at night; but they are afraid also to remain in their own homes alone. She said:

> Now more and more women are apprehensive about being alone in their homes. This fear is due to the increased number of outrages occurring in so many sections of Washington.

One deplorable circumstance in the District crime picture has been the greater number of violent and brutal crimes committed by teenagers, especially between 16 and 18 years of age. The table on page 14 of the committee report shows that in 1960 the felonies committed by 16- and 17-year-olds were 708, as compared to 671 committed by 18-, 19- and 20-year-olds. That table follows.

Comparison of felony offenses by age groups for the period July 1, 1959, to Apr. 1, 1960

Crime	Age 16 to 17	Age 18, 19, and 20
Rape	22	26
Robbery	257	200
Attempted robbery	17	13
Housebreaking	203	272
Auto theft	209	160
Total	708	671

Part I offenses which include all of the crimes of violence from murder to aggravated assault increased each year since 1957, and were 41 percent higher in 1961 than the 1957 figure.

The Metropolitan Police, under the effective leadership of Chief Robert V. Murray, have been doing a splendid job under very difficult circumstances. They have been handicapped by having too few policemen on the beats and in the prowl cars. Our subcommittee reported to the full committee a bill to increase the strength of the force from 2,500 to 3,000. The full District of Columbia Committee reported the bill out and the Congress passed it.

The Department finished recruiting new personnel sufficient to bring the force to 2,828 strength on February 19, 1962. Fifty police dogs were also secured and trained and are now on the streets.

In the last several months, for the first time since 1957, the constant increase of crime in the District has changed to a slight decrease.

The certainty of apprehension is a powerful factor in restraining the criminal and would-be criminal from the commission of crime. The redoubled efforts of the police are bearing fruit.

The results confirm the judgment of the District Committee and the Congress in providing the Police Department these increased personnel and facilities.

A speedy trial, coupled with adequate punishment when the trial is held, constitute two more powerful factors in the prevention of crime.

This subcommittee, interested as we are in protecting the law-abiding people of Washington and visitors to the National Capital from attacks by rapists, yokers, muggers and other thugs, set up hearings upon a Senate passed bill to amend the juvenile court law. We believed it important that the subcommittee should make a comprehensive study of the activities of the juvenile court, its methods, and its approach to the serious problem of crime prevention, and rehabilitation of juvenile lawbreakers. We instructed our staff members to secure for the subcommittee all available information, records and statistics relating to these matters.

Looking at the overall crime picture, it is obvious that something has been wrong and seriously wrong in the District of Columbia Juvenile Court.

Our subcommittee staff devoted several months to collecting information, compiling statistics taken from juvenile court records, preparing tables, and correlating the information gathered to be considered by the subcommittee.

Much of the information so prepared may be found in a progress report submitted by the subcommittee to the chairman of the House District of Columbia Committee on August 30, 1960.

That progress report was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 106, part 14, pages 18406–18409. It also appears on pages 146–151 of the printed hearings accompanying H.R. 6747, the juvenile court bill which will be considered on Monday, February 26.

This subcommittee continued its study of the juvenile court in the first session of the 87th Congress, and held public hearings on the pending legislation on May 25, June 2 and 3, and August 15, 1961.

The subcommittee then held a number of executive sessions. At the conclusion of the executive sessions, H.R. 6747, was reported by the subcommittee to the full committee, and by the full committee to the House.

Senate Bill, S. 1456, the bill upon which the hearings were originally scheduled, provided merely for two additional judges. It makes no provision for change of any kind in the existing juvenile court law. Sponsors of the Senate bill contend that the backlog of cases in the court makes two more judges necessary, but that the present law should be left as is, and not changed in any respect.

The study we have made of the court and its operation impels us to strongly disagree with these contentions. We believe that the changes provided in H.R. 6747 will do much to halt vicious crimes of violence by a very considerable segment of criminal hoodlums who have been preying upon helpless law-abiding people, knowing that they are practically immune from any substantial punishment under existing law and practices.

Present law defines a juvenile as anyone under the age of 18. H.R. 6747 defines a juvenile as anyone under the age of 16.

The pending bill, H.R. 6747, has a background of hearings in the House committee covering nearly 300 pages. Therein is found the testimony of witnesses representing the courts, the Federal and District Governments, the bar association, numerous agencies and organizations, citizens' associations and private individuals. These hearings also carry the results of statistical studies and findings resulting from the committee study of the juvenile court. The committee study of the court, if not the most complete since the court was established is certainly the most detailed study since reorganization of the court in 1938.

Some of the major provisions of H.R. 6747 are the following:

First. It creates a juvenile court branch within the municipal court of the District of Columbia to provide efficient use of judicial manpower, efficiency in management and administration, and flexibility within the court.

Second. It provides one additional judge.

Third. It retains complete jurisdiction of juveniles within the juvenile court branch.

Fourth. It provides for flexibility in the handling of adult cases—paternity, support, and so forth—either in the juvenile court branch or within the municipal court. Adult cases are now handled in the juvenile court, and make up nearly two-thirds of the backlog of cases in that court.

Fifth. It provides an age limit of 16 years which is realistically related to the local high rate of vicious offenses among 16- to 18-year-old offenders, thus balancing public safety and rehabilitation.

Sixth. It disposes of jury trials for juveniles.

Seventh. It provides for prompt determination of legal sufficiency of complaints against juveniles.

Eighth. It prevents the contradiction of concurrent charges against the same offender in both juvenile and adult courts.

Ninth. It relaxes the mandatory secrecy of the court.

Tenth. It provides for a system of uniform crime reporting in the District of Columbia.

Eleventh. It fixes the juvenile age at 16 years which will automatically take traffic cases from the juvenile court and place them in the traffic court—16-year-olds may obtain driver's license.

Our study shows that the court in the years prior to 1958 handled a heavy intake of cases, operated efficiently, accumulated no backlog, and reduced public costs by increasing court collections from fathers for the support of children.

In contrast, beginning in 1958, the cost per case reached a figure more than double the previous high; court collections dropped by $450,000; the rate of case intake declined substantially; yet a large backlog developed at the rate of about 25 percent of the annual intake, which at most would justify the need of one-fourth the time of another judge. Additionally, our study shows that substantive changes are needed in the Juvenile Court Act.

One needed substantive change is a relaxation of the mandatory secrecy requirement in the present law. Presently, the law prohibits any member of the general public obtaining information regarding any juvenile court trial or lawbreaker. The judge has no discretion in the matter.

At present any person who has not reached his 18th birthday may commit any crime, however brutal or horrible, secure in the knowledge that if he is caught, the general public may not witness his trial in the juvenile court, or obtain his name from the court, or obtain any other information regarding him, although he may be a habitual offender, and a many times repeater. His potential victim on the street has no means of knowing his record so as to steer clear of him. He may not be fingerprinted for future identification.

H.R. 6747 would modify the law to this extent: the judge, in his discretion if he saw fit to do so, would have authority to relax this secrecy provision in the case of a felony committed by a juvenile 14 years of age or older at the time of the crime. This authority would be discretionary—not mandatory. In every other case, the secrecy provision of the present law would remain in force.

On this subject matter J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, in the law-enforcement bulletin for October 1, 1959, had this to say:

> The problem of youthful crime—truly a monster of frightening proportions—exists not only in the densely populated metropolitan centers, but in each and every community in the land. Violent crime sprees and the bizarre escapades of young hoodlums, wily and hardened beyond their years, fire the imagination of other young punks across the Nation. Unfortunately, any escape from justice by youthful lawbreakers—through weak court systems, public indifference, soft-headed sentimentality, senseless preference for the rights of the criminal instead of for his victim—can only give encouragement to other young thugs.
>
> It is my firm conviction that the all-out campaign against these flagrant young criminals who commit serious crimes must include publishing their names and crimes for public information, the ready availability of past records for the information of appropriate law-enforcement officers, and fingerprinting of these young lawbreakers for future identification.
>
> At this time, when the increase in youthful crimes constitutes the bulk of the shameful rise in our national crime, serious consideration should be given to lowering the age distinction between a juvenile and an adult violator. We are dealing with vicious young criminals, and they should be treated as such.

Mr. L. Clark Schilder, with many years of experience as a Federal reformatory warden, having handled thousands of boys at Chilicothe, Ohio, and El Reno, Okla., told the subcommittee this—hearings, pages 139–140:

> I do not like to feel we should expose a kid's name in the paper. However, regardless of my own feelings, I think that I should let my mind rule my heart and say that we have a bad trend. We might as well face up to the problem that a lot of our kids are out of hand. If we do not face up to it squarely and if we let our hearts rule our minds, I think we are headed for even more serious trouble in the next decade.
>
> How would publicity react? Would it serve to alert neighbors? I would say "Yes." Would it prompt the parents to supervise better? Perhaps some of them just do not give a doggone, but I think it would keep them on their toes in many respects. If their child's name were in the papers, they would be a bit more interested in knowing what he was doing and what he was up to.

On the same subject, Inspector John E. Winters, commanding officer, Youth

Aid Division, Metropolitan Police Department, told the subcommittee—hearings, page 60:

> As I stated previously, Mr. Garber, the 16- and 17-year-olds are, in our opinion, fully aware of what they are doing. I do not think there is any doubt at all that some of them are hiding behind the protection that the law throws them behind as juveniles.
>
> Again, this is not speculation on my part, because I might point out to you that although last year was a little different, the 2 previous years the 16- and 17-year-olds were responsible for more part I offenses than the 18-, 19-, and 20-year-old groups put together. That was particularly true 3 years ago. The difference between the two the year before last was very little. The older age group was a little more. Last year it was different. The older group, 18 through 20, did account for more offenses.
>
> I have broken it down this way: Since 1954 through 1959, of all the arrests made for part I offenses, the 16- and 17-year-old group accounted for 46 percent of those arrests as compared to the 18-, 19-, and 20-year-old group. Maybe that will clear it up. It is out of proportion to the total number involved.

Illustrating the propriety of fixing the maximum juvenile court age at 16 years, Inspector Winters said this—hearings, page 47:

> Why do we say this, and what would we base this on? I would like to call the committee's attention to several acts of Congress which in our opinion have established the age of 16 to be the age of responsibility. First of all, by an act of Congress, a person 16 years of age can legally operate a motor vehicle in the District of Columbia, and I do not think anyone would say that that is not a serious responsibility.
>
> Secondly, it is the age that was established for the provision of waiver of jurisdiction. It is the age at which compulsory school attendance is no longer required. It is the age under which the rape statute is invoked, regardless of consent. It is the age under which in the Miller Sex Act penalties are doubled for the commission of certain acts against children, such as sodomy, indecent acts, prostitution, and so forth. In other words, the 16-year-old is regarded the same as far as his actions are concerned as any other adult. It is the age at which tobacco can be sold in any of its form to a person.

In our efforts to reach a proper conclusion as to the appropriate maximum age for juvenile court jurisdiction, we questioned the judge of the district juvenile court as to his reasons for insisting upon 18 years. The questions and answers are as follows—hearings, page 34:

> Mr. Davis. Why should the statute place it at 18 years?
>
> Judge Ketcham. I suppose it is a question of where you draw the line. Some parts draw the line at 21. The military draws it at 17. Schools draw it at 16 for completion of school. I do not know the background sufficiently to know why 18 was picked exactly, but it is the most common and the most universal throughout the country.
>
> Mr. Davis. In Baltimore I believe it is 16.
>
> Judge Ketcham. That is correct, sir.
>
> Mr. Davis. My recollection is that it is 16 in the State of Georgia. I have not checked many of the jurisdictions, but I am wondering if you could give us any reason why the age should be 18 instead of 16?
>
> Judge Ketcham. I am afraid I could not give anything other than examples of precedent and tradition.

Whether anyone agrees with the uncertainty expressed by Judge Ketcham, there is, or should be, some reason for establishing an age limit for juveniles. The committee believes that the local circumstances should guide in setting the juvenile age limit. These local factors include the incidence of juvenile crime, the age at which the preponderance of crimes of violence are committed, and the percentage of repeat offenders in the age group.

Evidence given the committee shows that the maximum juvenile court age in the city of Baltimore is 16; that it is 16 in New York City, and that the mayor of New York City submitted a program to combat juvenile delinquency in which he advocated a reduction of age from 16 to 15 for violent offenses such as murder, rape, and so forth (hearings, p. 141).

The committee believes that within the philosophy of the juvenile court, equal importance is and should be attached to the protection of the public and to the rehabilitation and restoration of juveniles to society. When the preponderance of repeat offenders falls within an age group and the heavy preponderance of the offenses in the age group is committed by those repeat offenders, the balance swings to the need for the safety of the community. People of the community are entitled to reasonable protection of their property from arson, housebreaking, vandalism, and theft and protection of their persons from murder, rape, robbery, yokings, and assaults with weapons.

The committee finds that under the rules of law applying in the District of Columbia, the age limit of 18 for juveniles no longer provides the necessary protection to the residents of the District or for the millions of people visiting the Nation's Capital each year.

Those who oppose the 16-year maximum age contend that the power of the judge to waive cases to the U.S. district court is ample protection against violent crimes committed by lawbreakers up to 18 years of age. An actual case of rape and robbery which occurred while the committee's investigation was being conducted demonstrates the need for reduction of the age to 16 years.

A rapist between 16 and 17 years of age, at gunpoint raped a young girl who was a student in a university here. He then robbed her of $2. The police caught him, and because he was under 18, he had to go to the juvenile court. There was no doubt of his guilt. The juvenile court had full authority to transfer the case to the Federal court, where the perpetrator of the two serious and outrageous crimes of rape and robbery could have been adequately punished.

The case was not transferred. The name of the rapist and robber was kept secret.

After a secret trial, the juvenile court ordered him to the National Training School here in Washington until he reaches his 18th birthday. If he remains in the training school until he is 18, his term will be about 18 months.

The judge could have fixed his term to run until 21 years. He could have waived the case to the U.S. district court where adequate punishment could have been meted out for his crimes against this helpless girl.

The representative of the juvenile court testifying before our subcommittee undertook to justify the court's action on the ground that the defendant appeared to be making a good adjustment in school. A portion of the testimony about the case was as follows:

> Mr. Davis. How many times did he rape this girl?
>
> Mr. Levathes. I do not know. I believe it was once.
>
> Mr. Davis. Was it not twice?
>
> Mr. Levathes. I do not know.
>
> Mr. Davis. How much did he rob her of?
>
> Mr. Levathes. $2.
>
> Mr. Davis. So at least he committed one rape and one robbery?
>
> Mr. Levathes. Yes.
>
> Mr. Davis. And that is the sort of case you say, because he was doing well in school, you thought it should not be waived?
>
> Mr. Levathes. I did not think so. The judge studied that case very carefully.

The committee does not believe that the general public can be afforded a proper measure of protection, with rape and robbery cases receiving this kind of disposition.

REHABILITATION OF JUVENILES

The reason for the establishment of juvenile courts was to achieve the rehabilitation of young offenders. The job of the juvenile court is to diagnose delinquency and to prescribe the rehabilitation deemed necessary for each juvenile. The success of the court will be shown in the rehabilitation it accomplishes.

The success of a court in its rehabilitation efforts will be indicated by the percentage of repeat offenders returning to the court. If the percentage declines, this means the court is effective. If the percentage remains about the same, the court is holding its own. If the percentage of repeat defenders increases, the court's rehabilitation is deficient. What does the record show regarding the juvenile court of the District?

Table 18 of the annual statistical report of the juvenile court for 1959 shows the percentage of repeat offenders among individual juveniles. This table reports that 49.2 percent of the juveniles of all ages before the court were repeat offenders that year. Table 7 of the statistical report for the court for 1961 shows an increase in repeat offenders by 4.7 percent to 53.9 percent of all juveniles.

Such an increase in the percentage of repeat offenders is a cause for concern when the practices and procedures of the court are such as to explain the increase. Several of the court's operations may produce this undesirable result.

First, today the juvenile delinquent is not brought promptly before the judge to determine his involvement in the offense charged. The executive assistant to the judge testified that a complete social study and investigation is conducted before a juvenile case is petitioned to the court. He stated that this study took at least 4 to 6 weeks. As a result, the rehabilitative value of prompt court action is lost to the juvenile, because the intervening time blurs the relationship between the court action and his offense. Prior to 1958, the judge then sitting determined the question of delinquency promptly, and made the final disposition of the case after the investigation and social study.

Second, the court by its own rule will make no commitment of a juvenile to the National Training School for more than 18 months or beyond the 18th birthday, whichever is longer. This is true for the most serious offenses not waived to the adult court. Existing law permits commitments of juveniles to the age of 21.

Third, the court follows no uniform policy of waiving violent and vicious crimes to the adult court. Hardened young criminals thus may be sent to training school or rehabilitation centers where they associate with and are a detrimental influence on other juveniles who do have some potential for rehabilitation.

Fourth, the court in the case of "In Re Four Youths" ruled that the statements of juveniles are unreliable, and therefore the court may exclude testimony regarding confessions or statements made by a juvenile to the police. Regardless of effective police work, this can place the juvenile beyond the reach of the court's rehabilitation because of dismissal of the case.

Fifth, many juveniles referred to the court on serious charges may never see the judge or the inside of the courtroom. Table 12 of the juvenile court statistical report for 1961 notes the following "cases disposed of by Director of Social Work without judicial action": Arson, 2 cases; aggravated assault, 52 cases; housebreaking, residence and nonresidence, 190 cases; robbery, 37 cases; rape, 2 cases; carnal knowledge, 10 cases. These are samples which serve to illustrate the point.

CORPORATION COUNSEL APPROVES H.R. 6747

The Office of the Corporation Counsel of the District of Columbia is the agency most closely associated with the juvenile court. Outside of the court itself, no other office is so fully informed of the work of the court, its handling of juvenile and adult cases, its caseload, its organization, procedures and problems. Consequently, testimony from this Office is most expert, informative, and valuable in character.

During the hearings before the committee, the Corporation Counsel and two of his assistants, proved to be the most knowledgeable among the witnesses who testified. The Corporation Counsel presented the recommendations and views of the Board of Commissioners and thereafter his own personal views concerning the provisions of H.R. 6747.

As to his preference regarding the pending bills relating to the juvenile court, Mr. Gray, the Corporation Counsel, stated:

> I am in favor of the principles set forth in the committee bill. I think it is in the interest of efficient administration of justice to have an overall administrative direction provided. I think it would be beneficial to the court for consultation and advice. I think probably the procedures would be vastly improved, particularly those relating to the adults.
>
> I think the committee's proposition of transferring those adult cases to the criminal courts is definitely a step in the right direction.
>
> So far as transferring the juvenile jurisdiction to a juvenile court branch, and changing the juvenile court from an autonomous court to simply another branch of another court, the principal function of the juvenile court is to apply those rehabilitative processes and procedures to the juveniles who are worthy or capable of being rehabilitated. But that can be done just as well as a branch of the municipal court as in an autonomous court. As I say, the benefits of the additional wisdom and experience of the chief judge of the municipal court, I think, would be very beneficial if applied to the juvenile court.

In discussing the caseload of the juvenile court, Mr. Gray was questioned concerning the separation of the adult jurisdiction from the juvenile court as recommended by the Commissioners. He supported this separation of juvenile and adult cases. Mr. Gray verified the fact that about two-thirds of the court's backlog was adult cases. When asked if two judges would be necessary to handle juvenile cases, if the adult jurisdiction were removed from the juvenile court, Mr. Gray responded:

> Well, I do not see why, after approximately 60 percent of the jurisdiction is transferred to another court, one judge should not be able to handle the remaining 40 percent.

This is essentially in harmony with the position taken by the committee in the pending bill. If one judge can handle the adult jurisdiction recommended for transfer to the adult court by the Commissioners and the present single judge could handle the remaining juvenile cases left in the juvenile court, it is obvious that the one additional judge provided in this bill is all the additional judge power needed.

Testifying before the House District Committee regarding pending legislation were representatives of ordinary citizens asking that the Congress give a realistic recognition of the crime hazards to the law-abiding citizen in his daily pursuits, and urging that crime be called crime, and that vicious offenders be dealt with and removed from society as a matter of public protection.

Mrs. Ernest W. Howard, vice chairman of the Legislative Committee of the District of Columbia Federation of Women's Clubs, which has more than 4,000 members, testified that the federation had for the third successive time affirmed its position on the lowering of age limit of juveniles from 18 to 16, and recommended passage of H.R. 6747. Mrs. Howard stated:

> We are here primarily interested in the recent crime wave. The District Federation of Women's Clubs has been represented here on the Hill for the past 29 years, coming over here for appropriations for the police, for the welfare of citizens of the District.
>
> We have been interested in and studying the juvenile court since 1932, but more especially since 1938, when they had the reorganization.
>
> We believe the juvenile court has entirely too much under its jurisdiction. It should stick to juveniles and nothing else * * * so we are very much in favor of H.R. 6747 and we do hope particularly that the age limit will be lowered.

Mrs. Howard similarly testified at the hearings on crime in the District of Columbia in May 1961 as follows:

> We in the Federation of Women's Clubs in 1955 endorsed the lowering of the age from 18 to 16. We believe that after 16 you are no longer a juvenile. We think that a 6-footer or 5-footer at 16 who is old enough to rape a woman is old enough to be tried as an adult.
>
> On April 24, 1961, we reaffirmed our stand on the lowering of the age limit.
>
> The women in the District—and even the men now—are afraid to go in the street at night. Women's organizations have had to change their meeting times to daytime. Women will not walk two blocks after the sun is down.
>
> Now we are even afraid to meet two girls on the street together. It used to be just the boys.
>
> We believe there should be punishment commensurate with the crime and we think that there is no juvenile capable of raping a woman. Juvenile facilities are for rehabilitation and not for punishment.

Mrs. Harvey W. Wiley, who has had a long and active life in the District of Columbia, having been the president and leader of at least 12 organizations, a member of the Washington Association for Criminal Justice, and the Citizens' Crime Commission, appeared representing the Kalorama Citizens' Association. She advised the committee that on June 13, 1961, the citizens' association endorsed H.R. 6747 at a special board of directors meeting. She also advised that similar action was taken by a special board of directors meeting of the Women's City Club on July 10, 1961.

Mrs. Margaret A. Fisher testified representing the Washington Council of Citizens Associations. The council is composed of 10 individual citizens' associations. Mrs. Fisher advised the committee of the council's approval of H.R. 6747 at their June 14, 1961, meeting.

Mrs. Fisher stated that the 10 associations approved the bill, "because they feel that this bill would correct many existing evils, one of which would be to treat the so-called juvenile as an adult and make him responsible when adult crimes are committed." Mrs. Fisher questioned the committee, "Is it too much to expect that our homes and streets should be safe not only for our citizens and taxpayers, but for our visitors from other States and for people from foreign countries?"

Mr. Grover M. Koockogey, president of the Kalorama Citizens' Association, supported passage of H.R. 6747, and told the subcommittee:

> Our association has been on record in favor of the principles of this bill, H.R. 6747, for sometime past. Three years ago

we passed a resolution to have the maximum age for juveniles accused of felonies reduced to 16.

Suppose we do add two judges, with staffs, to clean up the backlog. What will the three judges do to keep busy after the backlog is cleared up? Once these judges and their staffs get on the payroll, they will stay there—and every member of their staffs.

This bill is an intelligent effort to solve the problem in the best possible way—transfer judges from the other court to help out until the docket is current. While not lacking in compassion for juvenile delinquents, it is gratifying to note that it also shows some compassion for the forgotten men and women, the District of Columbia taxpayers.

At the hearings on the crime situation in the District of Columbia in May 1961, Mrs. Phyllis J. Gruverman, president of the Altrusa Club of Washington, which is a classified service club, composed of executive and professional women, testified to express the concern of the members of her organization. At that time, Mrs. Gruverman stated:

> Juvenile delinquents apparently are aware of that fact that their cases cannot be promptly heard that that in all probability they will be placed on parole or released to the custody of parents who apparently are unable to cope with them.

As is shown by the following table, prior to 1958 under the previous judge, there was no backlog of cases. This table also shows cost of operation, number of positions, number of cases filed, and amount of money collected by the court, under the former judge and the present judge:

Consolidated table on juvenile court of the District of Columbia, showing appropriations, personnel, petitions filed, petitions disposed of, backlog, collections, and unit costs per case disposed of

[Extracts from Appropriations Committee hearings, juvenile court statistics, and District of Columbia annual reports]

Fiscal year	1954	1955	1956	1957	[1] 1958	1959	1960	1961
Appropriation	$327,000	$347,000	$407,000	$428,000	$490,900	$573,000	$620,000	$689,700
Positions authorized	72	74	80	81	86	95	97	103
New juvenile petitions filed	2,657	1,757	1,877	1,846	1,870	1,593	1,725	----------
New adult petitions filed	1,407	1,516	1,797	1,578	1,027	993	1,485	----------
Total new petitions filed	3,464	3,273	3,674	3,424	2,897	2,586	3,210	----------
Backlog of juvenile petitions	----------	----------	----------	----------	270	235	502	----------
Backlog of adult petitions	----------	----------	----------	----------	522	510	1,165	----------
Total backlog	----------	----------	----------	----------	822	745	1,667	----------
Cost per petition disposed of	$94.40	$106.01	$110.77	$123.29	$236.57	$215.17	$270.98	----------
Court collections	$484,393	$599,717	$785,000	$945,677	$626,415	$511,931	$506,040	----------

[1] Present judge took office at this point.

Reasonable conclusions which may be drawn from the subcommittee hearings and the committee report are the following:

First. No backlog of cases existed in the court prior to the change in judges and the reorganization of the court during fiscal year 1958. Only about one-third of that backlog are juvenile cases, nearly two-thirds are adult cases.

Second. The court intake of new juvenile petitions and new adult informations has averaged 400 less per year beginning in 1958 than the average number received by the court in the years preceding 1958.

Third. No supportable statistics or facts were presented which demonstrate that two additional judges are necessary to dispose of the present intake of cases by the court, or to dispose of the existing backlog.

Fourth. Changes in procedures for handling juvenile cases in 1958 were followed by the accumulation of a backlog in juvenile case for the first time.

Fifth. The court discontinued hearing adult case for a period of weeks in 1958. This created the first significant backlog of adult cases.

Sixth. In the last year under the previous judge, court collections were $945,677 in 1957. These collections dropped to $506,040 in 1961, under the present judge.

Seventh. Changes in handling of adult cases in 1958 resulted in a loss of more than $300,000 in court collections in that year.

Eighth. Court collections have declined every year since 1957 and are now more than $400,000 less than in 1957.

Ninth. The cost per case handled by the court increased from $123 in 1957 to $270 in 1960.

Tenth. Present law brings juveniles into the court as delinquents on matters involving no element of delinquent conduct.

Eleventh. Present law results in juvenile cases being before the court for weeks or even months without any determination that the complaint is legally sufficient to give the court jurisdiction.

Twelfth. Under present law, the same offender may be charged in the juvenile court as a juvenile and in the U.S. district court as an adult at the same time.

Thirteenth. The District of Columbia Juvenile Court Act is inconsistent with the Federal Juvenile Act and is one of the very few, if not the only law providing for a trial by jury for juveniles.

In summary, the court prior to 1958 handled a heavy intake of cases, operated efficiently, accumulated no backlog, and reduced public costs by increasing court collections. In contrast, beginning in 1958, the cost per case reached more than double the previous high; court collections dropped by $450,000; the rate of case intake declined substantially yet a backlog developed at the rate of about 25 percent of the annual intake justifying at most the need of one-fourth the time of another judge. Additionally, substantive changes are needed in the Juvenile Court Act.

These and other findings are some of the reasons why the committee was asked to amend the present Juvenile Court Act in addition to providing the needed judicial manpower.

Various recommendations for changes in the law were presented to the committee by the Judicial Conference of the District of Columbia, the Board of Commissioners of the District, the Office of the Corporation Counsel, the Youth Aid Division of the Metropolitan Police Department, other organizations, citizens' groups, and individuals.

The House District Committee might easily have yielded to pressure by prescribing the "two judge" anesthetic to hide the ills of the court. Such action by the committee and the Congress may quiet the urgings of the "two more judges and nothing else" pressure groups. This would but make certain that within 3 to 5 years a public cry would swell up within the District pleading with the Congress to do something with an inefficient, confused, inadequate juvenile court which achieved neither rehabilitation of juveniles nor gave any reasonable protection to the public. We feel the House District Committee and the House would shirk a public duty to follow such a course.

In addition to judges, the juvenile court of the District of Columbia needs urgently efficient supervision and administration. It needs good management. It needs changes in law for more efficient operation. It needs to be oriented to a better balance between rehabilitation and public safety. The taxpayers of the District have a right to expect Congress to lift from them the burden of the near half million dollar loss in collections each year. The pending bill, H.R. 6747, is designed to accomplish these things.

The bill is designed to bring the court to a current operation basis free from backlog. It is designed to keep the court free from backlog. It is designed to provide a flexibility of operation impossible under present law. It keeps the court in the same building, with the same noncriminal atmosphere in juvenile cases, with the same court personnel. The committee found this court deep in trouble. The bill is designed to get it out of trouble and keep it out of trouble.

PRESSURE CAMPAIGN

During the past 3 years, there has been a pressure group campaign for two more judges and nothing else for the juvenile court. This campaign is still going on. It may flower again as this bill comes before the House for action.

These activities have deteriorated into a drive to save face rather than save the court. The initial mistake of these pressure people was the acceptance and use of a mass of incorrect statistical material, warped comparisons, and faulty conclusions without any real investigation or study of the court or its operations.

Some major contentions have been used in this campaign. The first contention related to the hearing load of the court. Inflated figures were used indicating that the hearings in the court in 1959 would be as high as 13,000. This argument exploded after committee examination of and the flow charting of the court's operations. Thereafter, the court's own statistics for 1959 showed 5,200 hearings, not 13,000 or even 10,000.

The second argument was based on a comparison of the District with other cities as to population and the number of juvenile court judges. This comparison purported to prove that three judges were needed in the District juvenile court. This contention became transparently faulty when a committee study showed that if the three judge court formula for the District were applied to the cities used in the comparison, every one of the other cities would have to appoint more judges.

The providing of judges for the juvenile court should be on a similar showing of need to get the business done and not on the basis of irrelevant comparisons.

Since 1906, the juvenile age limit has been increased from 17 to 18, the jurisdiction of the court has been increased, appropriations and personnel of the court have been increased at least tenfold; and an effective youth aid division established in the police department, which is active in delinquency prevention and juvenile screening, substantially reduces the number of juveniles which otherwise would reach the court. The need for judges in a court depends upon the caseload of the court and the facilities for disposing of those cases.

JURISDICTION AND OPERATION OF THE COURT

The Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia was established as, and is, an autonomous court. It is housed in its own court building where one courtroom is equipped and used. A second and possibly a third courtroom could be provided within the building if necessary. The judge of the court has complete control of its operations and is subject to no other agency or authority in the District as to its activities and management. The staff of the single judge court exceeds 100 persons, compared with a staff of 195 employees in the 16 judge municipal court.

The Congress has been responsive to the needs of the court for increased staff and funds, and both have been increased from year to year. The consolidated table on page 11 of the committee report accompanying H.R. 6747 shows approximately a 50-percent increase in appropriations and a 25-percent increase in personnel during the 4 years ending in 1961.

This consolidated table reveals clearly what has happened in the juvenile court. During the 3 years ending with 1957, the court had an average case intake 15 percent heavier than in the succeeding 3 years. The judge during those 3 years, though burdened, operated the court efficiently, accumulated no backlog, and increased court collections by $350,000 with smaller appropriations and less personnel. The successor judge, during the years 1958 through 1960, has had an average case intake of 400 fewer cases, disposed of an average of more than 40 percent less cases, built a backlog of more than 1,600 cases, allowed collections to drop by more than $400,000 even though Congress each year approved more funds and additional personnel. During this time the cost per case handled increased from $123 to $270. This presents the picture of a court in real trouble—trouble that requires a remedy beyond mere addition of judicial manpower.

While studying the needs of the court, the committee discovered other basic problems requiring attention if this court were to be restored to and kept on an efficient basis.

Contrary to the impression of many people, the juvenile court is not limited to juvenile matters. Nor are all its proceedings noncriminal in nature. The jurisdiction of the court brings before its judge both juveniles and adults. According to testimony before the committee, about 60 percent of the court's work involves adult matters and the remaining 40 percent are juvenile problems. The backlog of the court is predominantly adult cases. The latest statistical report of the court for the quarter ending December 31, 1961, shows that 60 percent of the backlog of cases are adult cases.

The criminal jurisdiction of the court involves only adult cases, such as criminal nonsupport, contributing to delinquency, violation of education and child labor laws. During the last quarter of 1961, nearly 40 percent of the adult cases disposed of by the court involved the use of the criminal jurisdiction of the court.

The judge of the juvenile court in a statement to the committee said he "chafed" under the burden of the adult cases. Other witnesses raised the suggestion of separation of the adult and juvenile jurisdiction of the court. The committee has sought to provide some modification to meet this issue.

The committee likewise found urgent need for amendment of the Juvenile Court Act to improve court procedures. I mention these examples by way of illustration.

An example of a needed amendment relates to traffic violations by licensed operators of juvenile age. At present, all traffic violations of juveniles up to 18 years of age must be referred to the juvenile court. Minor offenses such as overtime parking, improper signals, and wrong turns, which do not involve any element of delinquent conduct, must be added to the caseload of the court.

At age 16, a vehicle operator's license may be issued and the operator assumes the same responsibilities as an adult. For such violations, an adult may post and forfeit collateral. It is an imposition on the juvenile and a waste of court time to be compelled to handle such cases. The bill amends the law permitting minor traffic offenses by juveniles to be handled in the traffic court, but retains serious juvenile traffic offenses within the juvenile court.

Another example of need for amendment to the Juvenile Court Act is the practice now current under which a juvenile may be placed under restraint for an indefinite period of time, possibly weeks, without any determination of the legal sufficiency of the charge placed against him. This happens to many juveniles every year in the District of Columbia.

At present, when a complaint is filed against a juvenile, it is transmitted to the Juvenile Court Director of Social Work. A social worker investigation is then conducted. Testimony received by the committee was that these investigations required 4 to 6 weeks to complete. After this report is received, the Director may decide that the case should go to court. At this point, the complaint is referred to the Corporation Counsel to determine whether there is a legal basis for the court to take jurisdiction.

Yet, under present court practices, the Director may decide against sending the case to court. He may, without any determination of the legal sufficiency of the complaint, place the child under restraint as an unofficial probationer for an indefinite period.

Deputy Chief of Police Winters, head of the Youth Aid Division, testified concerning this procedure as follows:

> We believe that whenever a juvenile is charged with a criminal or quasi-criminal offense that we should bring our complaint to the Assistant Corporation Counsel in juvenile court as a lawyer for the purpose of legal sufficiency and prosecutive merit of the case and he should authorize the petition. We believe that the involvement of the juvenile in the offense should be adjudicated first, and we do not believe that a social investigation should be made prior to adjudication. And, then, if the case is dismissed, the social investigation has been meaningless and a waste of time. We think the court should act as a court of law and that the first thing that should happen is an adjudication of involvement of the juvenile, and then the social investigation to assist the judge in disposition of the case.

The members of the Committee on the District of Columbia felt so deeply that this provision of present law and the procedures used under it are so contrary to the most elementary concepts of freedom and justice that it could not report a juvenile court bill to the House without proposing an amendment on this point. The bill provides that the Assistant Corporation Counsel shall determine the legal sufficiency of a complaint immediately at intake.

The opponents of this bill would have you believe that there is nothing good in it unless a three judge court is provided and all else is stricken out. The fact is that the committee favors some suggestions made by the Judicial Conference of the District of Columbia some by the Commissioners of the District, by the Office of the Corporation Counsel, and by the Youth Aid Division of the Police Department. These suggestions and other provisions are combined in no other proposal which has been introduced before Congress.

The Judicial Conference recommends that the adult jurisdiction be continued solely within the juvenile court. The Commissioners recommended to the contrary. H.R. 6747 places the juvenile court within the framework of the municipal court as a separate branch. The juvenile branch retains exclusive jurisdiction of all juvenile matters. Jurisdiction over adult matters is transferred to the municipal court, and such matters may be heard either in the juvenile court branch or in the adult side of the municipal court. This leaves determination of assignment of adult cases within the determination of the municipal court whose members also belong to the Judicial Conference.

The Judicial Conference recommends that the present provisions for jury trials for juveniles be repealed. The bill reported by the committee does this. It may be noted that, under the provisions of the Federal Juvenile Act, a juvenile is brought before the district attorney as an adult and must waive his rights to a jury trial if he desires his case heard in a juvenile forum.

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia have recommended that the adult jurisdiction of the court be transferred to the municipal court. This would result in the separation of jurisdiction opposed by the Judicial Conference. The bill, H.R. 6747, supports the Commissioners' view to the extent that such transfer of adult matters to the adult court is found desirable in practical application by the municipal court.

The Commissioners also recommend that the law be amended to provide that juveniles charged with minor traffic offenses, not involving any element of delinquency, be handled under adult procedures. The pending bill so provides.

The Corporation Counsel recommended that the law be changed to provide for the early determination of the legal sufficiency of a complaint, so that a juvenile would not be unnecessarily held before the court for several weeks pending decision as to whether the complaint has prosecutive merit. This is done in the pending bill.

The Youth Aid Division of the Metropolitan Police Department concurred in the recommendations regarding minor juvenile traffic offenses and the determination of legal sufficiency of a complaint. Deputy Chief John E. Winters, head of the Youth Aid Division, also proposed that the present law regarding the waiver of cases to the adult court be changed so that the same offender would be subject to the jurisdiction on only one court, either the adult or the juvenile court. At present the same person may be subject to actions before both courts at the same time. The pending bill corrects this.

It may be observed at this point that the Youth Aid Division, under the capable leadership of Deputy Chief Winters, operates the most extensive delinquency prevention effort in the capital. The Youth Aid Division is to identify potential young juvenile offenders, and orient and redirect the juvenile toward constructive objectives. This Division screens all juvenile cases coming to the attention of the police. First-time offenders facing only minor complaints are screened out, processed through a Youth Aid hearing, and referred to community facilities. Experience shows that about 85 percent of those screened out do not become repeat offenders requiring juvenile court attention. The effective operation of this Division is largely responsible for the reduced caseload reaching the Juvenile Court following the inauguration of the new service.

A major problem facing the committee was whether rehabilitation of juveniles should be paramount; whether public safety should be given first consideration; or whether a balance be sought in the light of actual local conditions. Any answer to this question required examination of the frequency and character of crimes in various age groups, the incidence of crime by repeat offenders, and the relative hazards to the safety of the public as such study revealed.

The committee might easily have ignored this problem, continued the present age limits, approved existing waiver provisions, and won the applause of the press and possibly the support of some vocal groups opposing this bill. The committee believes that conditions in the District of Columbia and the needs locally should determine these issues and not the provisions of law in other States where local laws may or may not be adequately serving juvenile needs or the public safety.

In 1938, Congress increased the juvenile age limit from 17 to 18 years of age. There is nothing in the record to indicate that this change resulted in either more effective rehabilitation of juveniles or in greater safety to the citizens of the District. In fact, there are definite indications that the opposite is the case.

A study of the occurrence of repeat offenders before juvenile court, the statistical reports indicated that at age 16, repeat offenders averaged in excess of 50 percent; at age 17, repeat offenders averaged about 65 percent; at age 18, repeat offenders, whose violations were committed before age 18, ranged as high as almost 75 percent. The percentage of offenses ran higher than the percentage of the repeat offenders.

In testifying concerning repeat offenders, Deputy Chief Winters of the Youth Aid Division of the Metropolitan Police Department stated to the committee:

> I do not think there is any doubt at all that some of them are hiding behind the protection that the law throws them behind as juveniles (hearings, p. 60).
>
> We have on a number of occasions in the Juvenile Bureau had juveniles tell the officers or make statements to the effect that they were juveniles and therefore they cannot do anything with them. We have had that statement made to us.

Demonstration of the truth of this testimony is found in the analysis of offenses by the 16–17-year age group as compared to the 18–19–20-year age group. The following table indicates that the juveniles are inclined to be contemptuous and the deterrent effect of the law begins when these juveniles graduate, by age, to adult status. The juvenile group committed more felonies for the same period than the adult group with 50 percent greater age range.

Comparison—felonies of 16- and 17-year-olds and young adults—fiscal 1960:

Crime	16 to 17	18 to 20
Rape	22	26
Robbery	257	200
Attempted robbery	17	13
Housebreaking	203	272
Auto theft	209	160
Total	708	671

Along with the trend toward more serious crimes, the records show that the percent of juveniles who are repeat offenders is increasing. In 1959, 49.2 percent of juveniles before the court were repeat offenders. In 1961, 53.9 percent were repeat offenders.

This review of the committee study of the juvenile court, the findings of the committee, and the substance of the committee bill, H.R. 6747 has been presented to afford the Members of the House the opportunity to familiarize themselves with the juvenile court problem and the needs of this court in the District of Columbia. The committee believes that the Members of the House are genuinely interested in legislation which will meet the real problems of this court rather than proposals which provide mere palliatives.

The provisions of H.R. 6747 are designed to meet the specific needs of the juvenile court in the National Capital. It is the product of the only real study of the juvenile court in many years. It will provide an efficient, flexible court. It will expedite disposition of the court backlog and give best assurance that the caseload will be kept current in the future. It will relieve the taxpayers of the District of needless costs and provide a better balance for rehabilitation of juveniles and for the public safety.

THE RUSSIAN NUCLEAR TESTS

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I am sure we all recall the story of the monstrous horse filled with Greeks, which the Trojans were induced to take into their city by the wily lies of Sinon, a pretender of the Greek Army. Now we find Mrs. Khrushchev piously appealing via the American airways that we should forget about nuclear testing and concentrate on disarmament because the Soviet Union would never attack us first. I use the analogy of the Trojan horse not because of any similarity of the subjects but because of the similarity of deception and trickery employed.

Mr. Speaker, on September 1, 1961, our Government detected nuclear explosions in the atmosphere, beginning a series of 40 or more tests conducted by the Soviet

Union, completely disregarding what propaganda losses might be suffered among the so-called neutrals, who up to that point had always raised a hue and cry about the adverse effect of fallout. The boys in the Kremlin obviously felt that it was to their advantage to resume testing and that the plus factors in this regard far outweighed the temporary losses in adverse reaction among the neutral powers and smaller nations. Unfortunately, our Government within the past year has failed to assert our own position, and, in my judgment, we have given undue consideration to what reactions might ensue among the so-called uncommitted countries.

The Russian tests were for a variety of purposes being conducted not only in the high atmosphere, but just above the surface and also under water. Now what have we done since then? We have arranged 16 announced tests, with low yield, all in underground caverns. Admittedly the knowledge obtained from our tests was insignificant compared to what the Soviet Union gained from her tests.

During the Russian testing, the Soviet superbomb was exploded and many said the weapon had no real military significance. Some administration officials stated that it was built and detonated simply for "terror" and "blackmail" purposes. It is true that five 10-megaton bombs can do more damage—total damage—than one of 50 megatons. You can destroy five cities with five bombs and destroy only one city with one bomb, whether it is 50 or 100 megatons.

There does not appear to be any likelihood, at least at this time, that we will follow the Soviet lead and build superbombs of 50 or more megatons although Gen. Nathan F. Twining, former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, recently revealed that he had unsuccessfully advocated that the United States build such weapons. Our strategic targeting problem is different from the one the Soviet faces.

We have decided to put a large part of our retaliatory missile power in so-called hardened bases—in deep underground silos additionally protected by steel and concrete cover. Several Atlas ICBM squadrons will be above ground in soft sites, however. Despite the talk about instantaneous retaliation, it is believed unlikely that we would push the button the moment the first incoming missiles were picked up on the radar screen. Indeed, Gen. Thomas S. Power, commander of the Strategic Air Command, has asserted that—

> Our ICBM's probably would have to ride out the initial attack by an enemy.

Hardening a missile base is difficult, expensive and uncertain. It is a good deal easier for an enemy to build more accurate and more powerful rockets than it is to increase the hardening of bases. This was pointed out more than 2 years ago by a committee of the other body which warned that reliance on hardening bases was risky because of the increased accuracy that might be expected from ICBM's. Later in 1959, our own Atlases were scoring hits within 2 miles of the target.

Nevertheless, high-ranking land-based missilemen have repeatedly told the public that it would take anywhere from 10 to 30 Soviet missiles to destroy a single U.S. rocket in a hardened base. These officers did not define the degree of accuracy or size warhead they were crediting to the enemy. It is obvious, however, that they could not have been talking about a 50-megaton or larger warhead or an accuracy of 1 mile or less circular error probability—CEP. We know that Russia has detonated a 50-megaton bomb and has claimed a 1-mile CEP.

But even without the 1-mile CEP, the Soviet could make up for a shortcoming on accuracy with its giant warhead. With 50 or more megatons, and the accuracy equal to Atlas, they could destroy or put out of commission each of our hardened missiles with every one of theirs which landed on target in the United States. Fifty percent reliability, of course, would require the firing of two missiles against each target. This means it would take only 540 missiles to destroy our 270 programed Atlases and Titans and not 7,100—30 times 270—as suggested by some officials.

Thus, it may be seen that the 50-megaton warhead has a military significance of a substantial order.

Second, although it is by no means apparent that the Soviets have perfected an antimissile missile, they do seem to be working very rapidly toward it. If the Russians were able to spring another test series after stealthy preparation, and then still another, while the United States stood still, eventually the Soviets might indeed score a breakthrough on the antimissile missile front. Such a development, if unmatched by the United States, would mean that the Soviets could strike this country a full nuclear blow but that the United States would be prevented, by antimissile defenses, from striking a potent retaliatory blow. The nation which first produces such a weapon will tip the nuclear balance of terror to their own advantage. Any shift in the balance to the Soviets, once it becomes evident, could lead the Kremlin into all sorts of dangerous adventures.

Third, the longer President Kennedy stalls the more concerned our NATO and SEATO allies become. The hesitancy is keeping our nuclear scientists from proving or disproving the effectiveness of several new weapons and is making the United States look like a prime sucker in the eyes of our friends. It is hardly to be wondered that a lot of nations feel with ever-growing alarm that the Kennedy administration either lacks the courage to strike back at communism anywhere or just doesn't know how to go about doing so. Moreover, the Soviets are aware that they can use the delay in reaching a decision on nuclear air tests to build up world and U.S. public opinion against any sharing of our nuclear weapons with our allies. They knew, in the summer of 1958, that we were moving in this direction, even though slowly. To sabotage this movement, they used their vast propaganda machine to raise public fears of fallout and to mobilize this fear into an emotional force against any such distribution of nuclear weapons. They were thus able to exploit Britain's traditional fears of a resurgent Germany and to give credence to the longstanding propaganda line that Europeans can only hope to escape nuclear disaster by refusing to permit any nuclear installations on their soil. Should this line succeed, the next step undoubtedly would be to demand that U.S. troops in Europe return home since their very presence there requires them to be backed up by nuclear weapons.

Mr. Speaker, where does President Kennedy stand on nuclear testing? No one seems to know. This responsibility is the President's by his own admission. He stated:

> The Soviet Union tested while we were at the table negotiating with them. If they fooled us once it is their fault, and if they fool us twice it is our fault.

Candidate Kennedy said on October 10, 1960:

> If the present nuclear weapons test conference is still in progress when I am elected I will direct vigorous negotiation, in accordance with my personal instructions on policy. * * * I intend to prescribe a reasonable but definite time limit within which to determine whether significant progress is being made.

Despite this campaign pledge and the aforementioned Soviet achievements, President Kennedy has decided to continue what seems to be a unilateral ban by this Nation on nuclear air tests. It has been almost one-half year since the Russians exploded their first bomb in the atmosphere and President Kennedy is still trying to determine if air tests would be in the national interests. Even if the President should decide to resume air tests sometime in the future, the delay which we have experienced already may be disastrous. Mr. Speaker, at this point, I should like to include with my remarks an editorial from the Peoria Journal Star of February 12, 1961, by Charles L. Dancey:

New Nuclear Tests Coming

> The Russians are either going to "get off the dime" on a sound nuclear test ban program, or we are going to start some tests in the atmosphere. We are betting on the tests.
>
> This is the real meaning of the British-United States deal on using Christmas Island as a test site.
>
> We are not kidding. We did not go through these painful negotiations which cause the British Government some strain in its local political wars merely for show.
>
> Unquestionably President Kennedy intends to proceed at a fairly early date with U.S. tests in the atmosphere.
>
> The reason he has been taking his sweet time about it is to pacify organizations like the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy which are against testing by going through the motions of agreeing with them, of deep soul searching, and of just having to do it. (Among the sponsors of Sane are Steve Allen, Harry Belafonte, Illinois' own Arnold Maremont, and Walter Reuther. Victor Reuther is on the board of directors. They prefer to use the name of Albert Schweitzer—actually an honorary sponsor.)
>
> The President apparently is willing to go this far with them. He is willing to surrender to the Soviets the gains they made by stalling us 3 years with a phony test ban and then betraying it in their recent tests. He will say, "OK, take the gains from your

dirty trick and we'll still not test if you make a real test ban deal."

And he dangles over their heads the Christmas Island arrangement as pressure that if they won't settle for the advantage they have gained by their doublecross, we will soon begin testing ourselves and regain or extend our lead.

Thus the Christmas Island deal is designed to produce a quick showdown on Soviet "intentions," and if they don't move quickly, we will say they have no intention of anything but a further stall on our progress, and we will test.

Meanwhile, we offer them a "Christmas" present of not using the island if they quickly agree to a genuine test ban.

This constant testing of Soviet intentions is mystifying to us. Is there any slightest grounds for doubting what their intention is, on the basis of their actions, consistently, for four decades? On the basis of their doctrine? On the basis of their own public declarations and recent international congress of Soviets?

Whom are we kidding? Only ourselves.

Their intentions on nuclear testing were probed by us for three years at the end of which time they proved what those intentions were. They were to keep us from testing while they made scientific progress and prepared their own tests.

When that was done, they laughed at us and shot off about 50 nuclear bombs in the atmosphere.

And now we are testing their intentions again, while we still delay our own nuclear tests.

The tests will come eventually—but only after long, needless, pointless, and dangerous delay.

Just remember that when the first mushroom cloud goes up over Christmas Island. It will stand as a monument to years and months of absolutely useless delays that served no purpose but to let the Soviet Union gain time—and perhaps some political appeasement of the fear left in this country.

Mr. Speaker, and so we find that this country remains under the wraps of a self-imposed moratorium with none of the safeguards that the Eisenhower Administration first insisted on as a condition for prolonged suspension. When the Eisenhower administration took office it steadily concentrated the weight of U.S. military power behind the nuclear deterrent. The reorganized Army with its pentomic divisions and its new nuclear-firing battlefield weapons, is generally designed to fight nuclear actions, except in the simplest kind of holding situation. So is the Navy, with its costly new carriers armed with nuclear bombers and its Polaris-firing submarines. And the Air Force is predominantly a nuclear force. Obviously, the reasons for Eisenhower's concern were profound and went to the heart of the American strategic problem. Therefore, as far back as December 29, 1959, President Eisenhower put the Soviet Union and the rest of the world on notice that the United States, having found it impossible to reach a "safe-guarded" agreement for mutual inspection and control with the Russians, would consider itself "free" to resume nuclear tests. Evidently President Kennedy did not see fit to continue this policy, even though there were good grounds for suspicion that the Russians had already begun preparatory tests while Arthur Dean was at Geneva.

I charge that as Commander in Chief it was not militarily justifiable for President Kennedy to delay, at least the preparations, for the resumption of American nuclear tests. It seems incredible with all the industrial and organizational capacity of the United States that we should not have been prepared in anticipation of the Soviet Union's action. Why does the President continue to simply tread water on this important issue? Why does he fail to come to grips with the problem and give the green light to our own resumption of testing, which I personally believe to be essential to the future security of our country.

Nuclear scientists, such as Dr. Edward Teller, had insisted for months that Russia never had halted its nuclear testing and that President Kennedy should order a resumption of the experiments. President Kennedy did not even see fit to prepare. On September 5, 1961, under public pressure, the President ordered a resumption of testing, but it was a full 10 days before even a small underground test was detonated. One wonders how vigorously he meant to push the resumption, leading to atmospheric tests, since he has not set a reasonable but definite time limit as he said he was going to do. It is obvious, the President has not been completely frank with the American people on this point.

The President stated in his state of the Union message this year:

> We have rejected any all-or-nothing posture which would leave no choice but inglorious retreat or unlimited retaliation.

This statement is misleading but be that as it may, the nuclear deterrent should be extended across the likely range of military challenges by making it possible for the infantry, with its close-in air support, to deal summarily with other infantry. Here is the real gap in our general power to deter war: the absence of light, "clean" weapons that could be employed on a wide scale, if necessary, in peripheral actions, without laying villages and countryside to waste. It stands to reason that if the low side of the nuclear gap can be closed by invention, it should be closed The strong possibility that it can thus be closed is one of the principal reasons why the United States should not delay its atmospheric testing.

This issue is not a partisan one; influential men in both parties have arrayed themselves on the side of resumption of atmospheric tests.

Distinguished Members of the other body of the President's own party along with former President Truman have spoken up unequivocably for an end to the hesitation. Our atmospheric tests can be controlled to limit the fallout to negligible amounts which should, I am sure, be insignificant compared to the fallout of the Russian tests.

Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, of New York, in a special story to the New York Herald Tribune, made some very telling points in a recent article which I should like to have included in my remarks at this point:

Rockefeller Tells Why We Must Test

Miami Beach.—Underscoring the danger before us and the freedom-guarding role of nuclear power, Governor Rockefeller yesterday urged the Nation to resume atmospheric testing regardless of world opinion. It was his first major speech on a national issue since President Kennedy's election—and it was billed by aids as nonpolitical. Here is an excerpt:

"The facts that measure the danger before us are few, and simple, and serious.

"The Soviet Union—with massive disdain for world opinion—is finishing, in these days, a series of more than 20 nuclear tests in the atmosphere. The series has already included the greatest blast of destructive power the world has ever witnessed. And upon the completion of their tests, we must be prepared for the Soviet Union to turn its face from the scene of the blast, with an air of virtue and innocence, and say to us: 'Now, shouldn't we all stop testing these awful weapons?'

"We can prepare ourselves for the stern answer to that question by looking at a few hard facts.

"Let me summarize them briefly.

"First. While honest and expert judgments on relative Soviet and American nuclear strength have varied considerably, there is one fact on which all responsible sources agree. It is the fact that since the voluntary moratorium on nuclear testing in 1958, we have stood relatively still for the past 3 years in the development and improvement of nuclear weapons.

"Second. We know from the very nature of the recent Soviet tests that the period of the so-called moratorium after 1958 must have been used by Soviet science for intensive and major research in nuclear weapons development. There is also every technical possibility and likelihood that the Soviets engaged in underground testing not subject to detection by the outside world. The hidden preparations for the current Soviet atmospheric tests must have extended over a period of many months, perhaps a full year. And all this was done while the Soviet negotiators, conveniently dragging their feet, were ostensibly seeking agreement on a test-ban treaty.

"Third. We simply do not know the extent of the technical advances scored by the Soviet Union throughout the moratorium and in their current tests in the atmosphere. We thus confront, today, a Soviet nuclear power whose exact extent, nature, and ingenuity lie beyond our power to measure.

"Fourth. The people who most obviously do know these facts—the Soviet leaders themselves—have plainly shown the value and importance they have attached to these tests. For the very undertaking of these tests defied not only world opinion but also all the years of Soviet propaganda invested in the pretense of seeking a ban on nuclear testing. So defiant a stroke must have been well worth it—in terms of raw military power.

"These few facts tersely measure the peril that growing Soviet nuclear power now thrusts before us.

"Our response to this peril is a most urgent and important issue before the American people today.

"For what is at stake is nothing less than our having the power that is essential to serve the cause of freedom to which we stand committed:

"Power to defend ourselves against all-out enemy nuclear attack;

"Power to survive an all-out nuclear attack and strike back with a decisive counterattack;

"Power to defend freedom in any corner of the globe in which it is challenged.

"This essential power critically depends upon our nuclear weapons of defense and retaliation. And to assure the sufficiency of our weapons, in the face of the recent Soviet tests, we are now clearly compelled to conduct our own nuclear tests."

> Then Governor Rockefeller turned to specifics, listing these points essential to the Nation's future security and world peace:
>
> "1. We must reduce the weight of nuclear warheads.
>
> "2. We must develop antimissile defenses.
>
> "3. We must improve our tactical weapons.
>
> "4. We must develop new weapons.
>
> "5. We must improve methods of controlling nuclear weapons and detecting nuclear tests.
>
> "6. We must build for peace with nuclear energy."

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion the scientific-military judgment which has generally been accepted by Republicans and Democrats alike is that the security of the United States will not permit further deferral of atmospheric tests. Therefore, I think it is time for President Kennedy to putt or get off the green.

PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH AN OFFICE OF URBAN AFFAIRS IN THE EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, I have purposely delayed discussing before this House the provisions of the bill I introduced yesterday until the House acted on Reorganization Plan No. 1, to establish a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. Although this bill, which would establish in the Executive Office of the President an Office of Urban Affairs, has no direct relationship to the reorganization plan, I considered it preferable not to risk confusing the two proposals.

The House has now worked its will on the question of the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. I want to emphasize, however, that whatever the result of this vote had been—it is now—essential to approve legislation of this kind, to provide a means whereby effective coordination and overall policy direction can be achieved among the large number of Federal programs which affect urban and metropolitan areas.

Briefly, Mr. Speaker, the legislation would establish a small staff operation within the Executive Office of the President for the purpose of achieving this needed coordination and policy direction. It would be headed by a Director and Deputy Director appointed by and responsible to the President. The proposed Office of Urban Affairs would be authorized to obtain appropriate information from executive agencies and departments, to maintain liaison with such departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the States engaged in activities related to urban areas, and, at the direction of the President, to take other appropriate action so as to eliminate duplication, reduce conflicts, and increase the efficiency with which Federal programs are administered at State and local levels.

The need for such coordination, Mr. Speaker, has become universally recognized by students and practitioners of government at all levels. One of the indirect benefits of the lengthy public debate over the proposal to establish a Cabinet-level Department of Urban Affairs and Housing has been to create a much greater public awareness of the extent to which coordination of existing programs is required and to point up the obstacles which presently exist to the effective and efficient administration of Federal programs in this area.

One of the most concise statements of this need was written by Profs. Robert H. Connery and Richard H. Leach and appeared in their book, "The Federal Government and Metropolitan Areas," which was published in 1960. Professors Connery and Leach stated, and I quote:

> There is reason to believe that Federal programs are piling up on each other faster than metropolitan areas can digest them. Each is planned separately, and there is no correlation among them. Programs are launched in isolation, without reference to their impact on the areas to which they are directed. As a consequence, Federal programs are badly coordinated so far as metropolitan areas are concerned, both among themselves and in terms of State and local programs in the same areas. Federal programs having a bearing on metropolitan problems should be reexamined in order to assure better coordination and to provide the maximum flexibility and a minimum of standardization as to detail and procedure.

As a matter of fact, their excellent study of this subject can be understood as an extensive collection of case studies. These studies demonstrate, in the case of almost every individual urban area program, that the failure of adequate Federal coordination has grossly handicapped the proper administration of the program.

The extent of the problem is often minimized as a result of the failure to appreciate just how many of these programs are involved at the metropolitan or urban area level. We tend to think of the problem as being limited to such programs as highways, housing, and urban renewal. This limited view of the problem may explain, in part, why so many of the proponents of the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing appeared to place such great hopes on the capacity of a Cabinet-level department to achieve the desired coordination. Although I voted for the reorganization plan, I believe a careful study will show that the Department could only coordinate the programs that it was authorized to administsr—the very same programs now being administered and coordinated, though to a less effective degree, by the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Although these programs are, indeed, among the more significant with impact upon urban areas, they are by no means the only ones. In 1957, the Bureau of the Budget prepared a list of 21 programs operated by the Federal Government which affected metropolitan areas. These are—

First. Highway construction.

Second. Flood control and prevention.

Third. Improvement of rivers, harbors, and waterways.

Fourth. Water pollution control.

Fifth. Control of communicable diseases, including tuberculosis and venereal diseases.

Sixth. Services to crippled children.

Seventh. Health centers and clinics.

Eighth. Disaster relief.

Ninth. Civil defense.

Tenth. Housing, slum clearance, and urban redevelopment.

Eleventh. School lunch program.

Twelfth. Special problems of federally impacted areas.

Thirteenth. Airports and air terminals.

Fourteenth. Old-age and survivors' insurance for local government employees.

Fifteenth. Hospital planning and construction.

Sixteenth. Suppression of crime.

Seventeenth. General welfare assistance.

Eighteenth. Social security.

Nineteenth. Vocational rehabilitation.

Twentieth. Vocational education.

Twenty-first. Employment security.

Since 1957, of course, a number of other Federal programs have been established, including the mass transportation and open spaces programs of last year. While many of the programs I have listed are concerned with services to people, they all nevertheless result in the expenditure of money in metropolitan areas and thus directly affect the economies of these local areas.

As I have indicated, Mr. Speaker, the idea of a coordinating group within the Executive Office of the President is not a new one. Unfortunately, however, the need has been obscured by what I believe has been the exaggerated attention paid to the more dramatic proposal to create a Cabinet-level Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. The basis on which the present legislation has been prepared is one of the principal recommendations of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. The Commission, at my request, undertook in 1960–61 a detailed study of governmental structure, organization, and planning in metropolitan areas. Its recommendations included suggestions for action by local, State, and National Governments. It urged, among other things:

> That steps be taken within both the executive and legislative branches of the National Government to bring together in better coordination and interrelationship the various Federal programs which impact upon orderly planning and development within the large urban areas.

The Commission, which represents all levels of government and includes among its members Senators, Representatives, Governors, mayors, State legislators and county officials, as well as representatives of the general public, emphasized unanimously that intergovernmental relations with respect to urban affairs are being unnecessarily impaired because of inadequate coordination of Federal programs. The Commission's report pointed out that the Federal Government has tended to bypass the States in responding to metropolitan area problems and has operated on a single-purpose functional basis, with insufficient attention paid to the need for planning or coordination of the various functions on a comprehensive basis at the Federal level.

Mr. Speaker, hundreds of individual examples could be cited to demonstrate how the failure of coordination has produced waste, duplication and inefficiency in the operation of many Federal programs. The same inefficiency has tended to obstruct the efforts of State and local governments to solve their urban problems. All levels of government, therefore, have a deep and immediate interest in devising mechanisms which will assure proper coordination.

As I have pointed out, the legislation I have introduced would be essential with or without a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. By virtue of the Advisory Commission's recommendation, my proposal has in effect been endorsed by responsible officials at all levels of government, of both political parties, and from all areas of the Nation. It will not involve the expenditure of huge sums of money. It will not create new levels of bureaucracy in the Federal Government.

Everyone, Mr. Speaker, seems to want to help the areas of our country in which the largest concentrations of our people have settled, whether we call them cities, metropolitan areas, or urban areas. In terms of money, personnel, and prestige, my proposal is a modest one. But I maintain that it could be the most effective single action which the Congress could take to bring order, efficiency, and effectiveness into the administration of programs designed to help these urban areas. As a bipartisan proposal, I hope that our colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join me in sponsoring this legislation and in working for its enactment into law.

THE FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ACT OF 1962

The **SPEAKER**. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Laird] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, during the last several days I have had an opportunity to read the proposed Food and Agriculture Act of 1962 recommended by President Kennedy and avidly supported by Secretary of Agriculture Freeman.

This is an interesting, if not fantastic, approach. It deals with many phases of agricultural production, marketing, and rural life. I understand that the House Committee on Agriculture is holding hearings this week and that the Secretary of Agriculture would have an opportunity to explain the administration's proposal.

It is for this reason that I would like to discuss two specific parts of the proposed dairy program. I do this in order that the members of the committee will seek answers to several areas in the dairy proposal that perplex me.

The dairy proposal of the President's farm message recommends the establishment of a national dairy-control program. As a part of this program there would be individual dairy producer marketing allotments. By this, apparently, is meant that each individual dairy farmer would be given an allotment as to the amount of milk that he could market. If he produced in excess of his allotment he would have to pay a penalty on that milk.

In discussing the so-called producer marketing allotments the bill contains this language:

> That the Secretary may, if he deems that it will not impair effective administration of this subtitle, prescribe a minimum marketing allotment for any producer holding a marketing basis.

What, in effect, this says, if I understand it correctly, is that the Secretary can, if in his wisdom he determines it advisable, establish minimum dairy allotments.

I am puzzled as to the exact meaning of this particular section in the bill, and I hope that the members of the House Committee on Agriculture will thoroughly explore this question with Mr. Freeman.

Does the Secretary of Agriculture believe that any farmer with 1 cow, 2 cows, 5 cows, or 50 cows should be exempt from this dairy-control program? What number of cows is he thinking that should be exempt?

Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is important that Members of Congress and dairy farmers have some specific comments from the Secretary as to the number of cows or number of pounds of milk that would be exempt from this particular program. Personally, I am opposed to this legislation with its exemptions; however, I believe it is important that we know the exact thinking of the USDA people as it relates to minimum dairy allotments. I frankly am opposed to giving the Secretary of Agriculture this kind of discretionary authority. I think the Congress should assume the responsibilities for determining what, if any, the minimum allotment should be.

To leave this question to the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture will mean that if he determines it advisable, he will exempt a group of the small producers who might vote against his program. As far as I am concerned I do not believe there should be any exemptions. I believe all dairy farmers, regardless of size, should be a part of the program.

The second area in the dairy proposal that fascinates me is a section which reads as follows:

> The Secretary shall make such adjustments in a marketing basis established hereunder as he deems necessary for abnormal conditions affecting production or marketing, for relief of shortages in deficit production areas, and for such other factors as he determines should be considered for the purpose of establishing fair and equitable marketing basis.

The particular part of this section that I hope will be thoroughly explored by the House Agriculture Committee has to do with the phrase "for relief of shortages in deficit production areas." Does this mean that those areas that do not now produce enough milk to meet their needs that their marketing bases would not be cut? Could they continue to expand their milk production while others, such as my own, would have their production cut? What is a deficit production area in this year 1962 with our modern transportation? What part of the country does the Secretary of Agriculture contemplate would fall in this category? Why does he want this broad authority? Why does he want to exempt all fluid milk used in bottled sales?

Are the milk producers in the South and Southwest which import milk to be exempted from the dairy control program and allowed to continue their expansion and growth? I, of course, would like to see continued growth of the dairy industry in all areas; but I don't believe it is fair for one area to be exempt and other areas to have to take a substantial cutback in production.

These three questions need answers; namely, first, the question of what will be the minimum allotment as far as the number of cows or pounds of milk is concerned; second, what are the deficit dairy production areas; and, third, what is the basis for exempting fluid milk in the market order areas. I hope these areas will be explored thoroughly by the committee because they are important questions in the consideration of this legislation.

THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CENSUS AND GOVERNMENT STATISTICS OF THE POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, during the 86th Congress and the first half of the 87th, it was my honor and pleasure to serve as chairman of the Subcommittee on Census and Government Statistics of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. It was with considerable regret that I resigned from the committee on January 17, 1962. I want the chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Murray], and my colleagues on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee to know that I fully enjoyed our fine working relationship, and as chairman of the subcommittee, I am fully appreciative of their splendid cooperation and support.

In relinquishing my chairmanship of the Subcommittee on Census and Government Statistics, it occurred to me that my fellow Members in the House would like to know about the progress which our subcommittee made in this work. I am pleased, therefore, to give you a brief summary of our major accomplishments and also to point out those matters which require continuing attention.

NO CHEESECAKE IN STATISTICS

I should like to preface my report by stating that there is no "cheesecake" in statistics—we all want facts and figures and we all use facts and figures, but somehow when a speaker gets up to discuss statistics, especially the cost of collecting and compiling them, the audience heads for the nearest exits. At our recent subcommittee hearings in Chicago on the proposed mid-decade census, H.R. 1100, Mr. Robert J. Eggert, of the Ford Motor Co., expressed these thoughts better than I can:

> I would like to express our appreciation for your subcommittee's willingness to take time to review this important subject. The area of statistics is never a glamorous one and so it is with real appreciation that we express our feelings for your willingness to show an interest in this subject.

I should like to point out that the mid-decade census hearings were held in Chicago, Los Angeles, and New York City in October and November last. All but two of our subcommittee members attended at least one of the hearings at considerable personal inconvenience. Our distinguished ranking minority member, Mr. **ROBERT J. CORBETT**, of Pennsylvania, contributed significantly to the success of our Los Angeles hearing.

BRIEF SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES

The Subcommittee on Census and Government Statistics was first created by House Resolution 78 of the 86th Congress, with jurisdiction over matters relating to the census and the collection of statistics generally. In addition to studying and investigating the census and current statistics programs of the Census Bureau, the subcommittee undertook a broad, continuing study of all Federal Government activities pertaining to the collection of statistical information from the public, the processing and end use of such information, and the effectiveness of such programs as indicated by their impact upon the public.

CENSUS

The subcommittee accorded special attention to the 1960 Census of Population and Housing. Hearings were held in April 1959 and March 1960 on the advance planning for the census. After the enumeration, the subcommittee reviewed the census results with Bureau officials in a hearing held in May 1961.

Our subcommittee concluded that the Census Bureau had done a good job in enumerating 180 million people in 55 million households—I do not say that the job was perfect, but given the complexities of the task, especially in the large cities, it was well done and I compliment the Bureau on this performance. The role of the Census Bureau in congressional apportionment was also examined and made the subject of a special subcommittee report—House Report No. 2223.

The proposed middecade census to be held in 1965, as put forth in H.R. 1100, a bill submitted by Hon. Stewart Udall, of Arizona, has been placed under study by the subcommittee. The far-reaching implications of this bill, especially as it affects our State and local governments were impressed upon our Members in hearings held in Chicago, Los Angeles, and New York City in October and November 1961. These hearings have been printed and I urge Members to read them. After listening to the State and local government officials tell about the problems brought about by our population explosion, I am rapidly coming to the conclusion that the "forgotten man" of this generation is the local government—our counties, cities, towns, school districts, and the rest.

REPORTING REQUIREMENTS OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The reporting burden placed upon business and industry by the Federal Government has been the object of continuing study by our subcommittee. Special attention was accorded the small businessman who often finds that Federal reporting requirements are particularly costly and onerous. In December 1959 the subcommittee issued its first report on this subject, "Business Reporting Requirements of the Federal Government." Some of the recommendations contained in this report have already resulted in specific corrective actions by the agencies. I was glad to note that Secretary Ribicoff, of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, has recently announced that he has taken steps to reduce paperwork in his Department.

In analyzing reporting requirements, the subcommittee discovered that the regulatory agencies were responsible for generating an unusually large amount of paperwork; some of this was felt to be unnecessary. The Interstate Commerce Commission was singled out for the first subcommittee study, principally because of complaints received from carriers and their associations about ICC reports, some of which were never tabulated. The subcommittee's experience with the ICC is detailed in "Reducing the Reporting Requirements of Transportation Industries—An Interim Report"—House Report No. 552. Our subcommittee activity has already resulted in eliminating some unnecessary reports and reducing the scope or frequency of others. I need hardly say that the carriers are grateful for our subcommittee's efforts on their behalf.

TRANSPORTATION STATISTICS—"A CAN OF WORMS"

As the subcommittee's review of the ICC reporting system progressed, it became apparent that linked with the problem of burdensome reports in some segments of the transportation industry was the equally serious problem of large statistical voids or gaps in other segments. Transportation experts were almost unanimous in recommending to the subcommittee that steps be taken to improve the basic statistical information relating to the Nation's transportation services—one expert described our current transportation information as a "can of worms." Important as it is in peacetime to communities attempting to cope with traffic stagnation, accidents, and deaths, this situation could paralyze our defense effort in the event of war.

With the above problems in mind, our subcommittee held hearings in July 1961 on the need for improving our information about the Nation's transportation equipment and services. Our hearings were directed specifically toward the need for a census of transportation, as authorized by Congress in 1947—United States Code, title 13, section 131—but never held. At the hearings, representatives of 10 Federal agencies and private carriers and their associations urged the subcommittee to implement the existing legislation. Accordingly, in September 1961 I wrote to the Secretaries of Defense and Commerce requesting them to take steps to carry out the law and even accelerate their planning in view of the current international situation. I understand that funds to begin work on this census are included in the President's budget for 1963. I hope Congress will give ready approval to this urgently needed program.

ELECTRONIC DATA PROCESSING

Our subcommittee has had a continuing interest in the use of electronic data processing equipment—EDP—in the Federal Government. Our interest has been centered principally around two matters: First, the more efficient use of electronic data processing equipment through improved management practices; and, second, the effect of electronic data processing acquisition and use on the Federal worker and his job.

In hearings held in June 1959, and March 1960, our subcommittee reviewed the above matters with the key Federal agencies concerned with electronic data processing. Our conclusions were contained in the committee print, "Report on the Use of EDP Equipment in the Federal Government," issued in August 1960. I am glad to report that a number of the recommendations made in our report relating to improved management practices have already been put to work. I am glad also to say that the Bureau of the Budget is giving fine leadership in resolving problems related to the acquisition and use of electronic data processing equipment by the Federal agencies. Much still remains to be done, but I feel that now we are moving in the right direction.

So far, there has been no wide-scale displacement of Federal workers because of electronic data processing automation. On the other hand, this picture could change radically later in the 1960's as some of the newer sensing devices become operational. This conversion to automation in Government agencies will require constant vigilance in order that any net reductions in employment can be accomplished by normal attrition without recourse to reduction-in-force procedures. This can be done without creating unnecessary hardship if conversions are carefully planned in advance on a broad agencywide basis. In this connection, I want to take this opportunity to compliment the Federal Aviation Agency, which is planning its electronic data processing automation conversion 2 years in advance and keeping its employees fully informed of the changes which may affect their jobs. This is the kind of forward thinking which pays real dividends in improved employee morale and performance.

STATISTICAL ACTIVITIES OF THE FEDERAL AGENCIES

Our subcommittee has surveyed all executive departments and major independent agencies to ascertain personnel, payrolls, and equipment costs for data collection and compilation. The first of these surveys, "Data Compilation Activities of the Federal Government"—House Report No. 1357, 86th Congress—showed that in 1959 some $79 million in personnel and contract costs were spent by Federal agencies in collecting and compiling information gathered from the public. A second report to be released shortly, which covers the year 1961, will show that employment in these activities increased some 8 percent over 1959, and payrolls were up some 16 percent. Contracts awarded by the Federal agencies for statistical studies and surveys are also covered in these reports. In some cases, questions have been raised concerning the public need for the information collected and the desirability of Federal sponsorship. This area, also, will require careful attention.

In closing this brief report I want to take this opportunity to repeat what I have often said before: That this Government can be proud of the generally high caliber of product which emanates from its fact-gathering agencies. I make this statement with full knowledge that some official statistics have been severely criticized lately. The technical competence, for instance, of the professional staff of the Census Bureau is widely recognized both at home and abroad. I know for a fact that many of them can readily double their earnings, if they should decide to leave the Federal service and go into private work. This is only one more reason why the Federal salary scales should be raised and quickly; the Government cannot afford to lose these people and others like them.

I would be remiss if I did not also mention the fine support given to me by the staff of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. Their excellent staffwork, in no small measure, contributed to the effectiveness of our subcommittee's program.

ADMINISTRATION CHICKENS COME HOME TO ROOST IN DAIRY PRICE DILEMMA

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SEELY-BROWN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, the proposal, in House Joint Resolution 613, to continue the present support prices of $3.40 per hundredweight of manufacturing milk and 60.46 per pound of butterfat for an additional 9 months is a demonstration of the fact that the chickens the administration hatched in its farm legislation have come home to roost.

Stripped to its essentials, this resolution asks the Congress to shoulder the blame for untimely and unwise increases in dairy price support levels that were made by the administration in 1961.

In his message of January 31, 1962, the President informed the Congress that—

> Under the present law, the Secretary of Agriculture is not authorized to set the price support rate for milk above 75 percent of parity unless such action would be necessary in order to assure an adequate supply.

On the basis of present price-cost relationships, dairy price supports at 75 percent of parity would mean about $3.11 per hundred pounds of manufacturing milk of national average test.

On March 10, 1961, the administration raised the support price for manufacturing milk by 18 cents, from $3.22 to $3.40 per hundred pounds. What was the situation with respect to an adequate supply when that change was made?

National production of milk had been increasing as follows:

Month and year:	*Increase over same month of previous year (percent)*
1960—September	0.4
October	1.4
November	2.2
December	1.3
1961—January	.4
February	[1]1.4

[1] Adjusted to compensate for extra day in February 1960.

Price-support purchases also were up. In the 6-month period of September 1960 through February 1961, price-support purchases of butter rose nearly 50 percent—from less than 33 million pounds to over 45 million pounds—above the level of the comparable period a year earlier.

In both periods, purchases of cheese were negligible or nonexistent, but purchases of nonfat dry milk were up 25 percent from 239 million to 300 million pounds. As was well known, however, industry stocks of nonfat dry milk were unusually large in early 1961, because many concerns anticipated an increase in Government purchase prices. As was to be expected, these stocks were unloaded onto the Government in March 1961 after the increases. They amounted to 345 million pounds—substantially more than the Government had acquired in the 6 months prior to March 1961.

Thus, it should have been readily apparent to everyone concerned that both the national supply and the national surplus of milk were growing in early 1961. If the criterion of adequate supply had been adhered to by the administration in March 1961, there could not have been an increase in the dairy price-support level at that time.

Either the administration was incredibly naive or it was guilty of callously disregarding the economic welfare of dairy farmers when it deliberately took action that has seriously aggravated the dairy surplus situation.

It is my belief that the diehards in the Department of Agriculture who were more determined on controlling than they were on really helping the dairy farmers, considered that dairymen would be more likely to accept supply management controls if the surplus situation worsened. Thus, the trap was baited and set.

Regardless of whether it was incredible naivete or unconscionable cunning that motivated the administration's decision, there is no reason for the Congress to assume the responsibility for this costly mistake.

The law providing for a dairy price-support program delegates to the administration adequate authority—as well as a burden of responsibility—for working out a practical solution in 1962 to the problem situation largely arising from actions taken by this administration in 1961.

Postponing the day of reckoning will not help the dairy farmers who hope to stay in business, least of all those in my State of Connecticut.

PENALIZING THE WHEAT FARMER UNLESS HE VOTES "YES"

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. SHORT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, it has become a common belief in some quarters around the Nation's Capitol and elsewhere that the wheat farmer is solely to blame for the huge stocks of wheat piled up in Government bins and for the tremendous cost to the taxpayer of the Government wheat program mess. The talk even implies that the farmer is now something akin to being a rascal for doing what he knows how to do best, and for taking advantage of the private enterprise principle of producing for a profit. Nothing is mentioned about the great incentives that the Government program has provided to the farmer to produce at his maximum rate of efficiency; to use all of his know-how, experience, and up-to-date equipment to make his land yield its best.

Early last year these same people were pouring out great praise for the wheat farmer for his skill, his knowledge, and efficiency, and for the great blessing of "abundance" he had created. He was then a very fine fellow. Great talk was made then that this "abundance" would be used to upgrade the diets of all of the people of the world, and no one—absolutely no one—would ever again go to bed hungry. To implement this noble idea, the experts were set to work to figure out just how much wheat would be needed in 1962 through 1966, by countries. The idea was advanced that if we did not have enough in stock, we would set up a program to produce it. Here again, the wheat farmer would be the hero.

The experts rendered their report which indicated that, if all the people were to have a minimum adequate diet, the wheat requirement alone would be more than the world could supply. Currently, there seems to be a difference of opinion as to this proposal because the Secretary of Agriculture said in his address at the conference on food and people that we were moving about the maximum amount of wheat into foreign areas, while at the same conference the President's Food for Peace Administrator said we have to get on with the program to expand our shipments in order to raise the diets of millions of hungry people.

Now, we have the administration's new farm proposals, which provide for a complete regimentation of the wheat producer, or else. This proposal is said to be a farmer's plan and that every wheat farmer will be given a choice of alternatives—a vote—a chance to say what he wants in a program. Of course, such is not the case. If this proposal is adopted, the wheat farmer will have the opportunity to vote for rigid controls, which, among, other things will cut his operations back, will compartmentize his marketings on a multiple price basis, and generally subject his business to complete Government supervision, dictation, restrictions, and penalties for noncompliance. There is a "carrot" in that the farmer would receive a payment for land taken out of production and the various support prices on his marketings. All this if two-thirds of those voting vote "yes" in a referendum. The alternative is no program at all if more than one-third of those voting vote "no." This means that there would be no price supports for wheat, and no controls whatever on producers. "Bingo," after years of Government programs, the wheat farmer would be completely on his own. While this is not much of an alternative, it might not be as unfavorable as complete regimentation.

For fear that at least 34 percent of the voting wheat farmers would think that no program would be better than the strict controls, the proposals include an authorization for CCC to sell up to 200 million bushels of wheat out of its stocks for unrestricted use at market prices. Remember now, the farmer would have to produce and market his wheat subject to a free play of the forces of supply and demand. Remember also that if there were no Government program, the section 22 import controls on wheat would have to be eliminated. So the wheat farmer would have to sell his wheat in competition with the world supply, and—in addition—in competition with CCC as it dumped up to 200 million bushels on the market. This quantity of wheat is equivalent to about two-fifths of our annual domestic use for food, or nearly one-third of our recent high annual exports.

Think what this dumping operation would do to the wheat farmer's market, to his income, to his life's work. He would be wiped out. He would be forced out of business because he would not submit to complete Government control. This proposal has an implication of how Castro and the Communists carried out their agricultural reforms and I do not believe that the American wheat farmer will be very enthusiastic about the prospect. I can imagine that he would resent being placed in the position of having to choose between these alternatives. What has he done in the short period of a year to merit the prospect of such reversal of sympathy by his Government?

EXPROPRIATION OF AMERICAN PROPERTY BY BRAZILIAN STATE

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, despite an impression that may have been created elsewhere earlier this week, I think it should be noted that Texans are students of history. Today, I seek answers to questions that reflect our recent history; answers which certainly must have some bearing on our present and future history.

I refer, Mr. Speaker, to our relations not only with Castro's Cuba but most recently to our relations with Brazil. I find it all very perplexing. I am advised that the President of Brazil, Mr. Goulart, has accepted an invitation to visit the President of our United States on April 3. I am further advised that Mr. Goulart may be expected to discuss just how many millions of dollars in aid funds he may expect from the United States not only this year but next year and the year after, and, I suppose, for as long as the American taxpayer can shell out these sums.

I have some doubts, however, that Mr. Goulart should be given anything. For he is the same gentleman who has indicated that he is not responsible for the unwarranted expropriation of an American-owned telephone company in the Brazilian State of Rio Grande do Sul last Friday, February 16.

Mr. Goulart is saying that even though his brother-in-law, Governor Leonel Brizola, has grabbed a company belonging to International Telephone & Telegraph Co., he has no control over such actions. If that is his position, as it appears to be, I submit, gentlemen, that he is not the man to whom the United States should entrust millions and millions of aid dollars. If he refuses to accept responsibility for Brizola's seizure of an $8 million U.S. company, how can he be expected to assume the responsibility of the handling of vast sums of money which we intend to give him? These inequities are difficult to explain.

Students of history will recall that when Janio Quadros resigned as President of Brazil, many Brazilians did not want Goulart. You will recall that he returned to Brazil from abroad through Rio Grande do Sul—thanks to a sanctuary provided for him by his brother-in-law, Brizola.

Subsequently, through the machinations of Brizola, who threatened to plunge Brazil into civil war—a compromise to keep peace saw Goulart installed as president. In the light of this history, we are being asked to believe that Goulart is not responsible for Brizola's actions.

The fact is that under International Law, Mr. Goulart must accept responsibility for Brizola's unwarranted act of expropriation. But we need more information, we need more facts, before this Congress—in my opinion—should consider permitting one more dime of American taxpayers' dollars to be turned over to such a man as Mr. Goulart.

It appears to me that Mr. Goulart should be called upon to explain his statement—of lack of responsibility of the actions of one of his State Governors, and agree to see to it that prompt, effective and adequate compensation is made in the case at hand, as quickly as possible. The offer of $400,000 in exchange for an $8 million property is more than outrageous. It is, in view of our wish to send more millions to Brazil, simply beyond the realm of belief.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to Reorganization Plan No. 1.

There has been widespread publicity on the announcement of the President that he would appoint Mr. Robert C. Weaver as the Cabinet officer of this Department, and an inference has been drawn therefrom—particularly by news commentators and editors—that a vote against the President's proposal to create a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing would be motivated by racial bias.

I want to make the record crystal clear. I am opposed to the creation of this Department, not because of the President's suggested appointment, for it is well known that I have always supported civil rights legislation and never has racial bias dictated my decisions. During the years I have been instrumental in the writing of such legislation in connection with my duties as a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Reorganization Plan No. 1 would increase Federal spending of the taxpayers money and will increase Federal control over local governments and private actions.

It is estimated that approval of this plan would, in a period of 7 years, create spending programs which would cost the taxpayers $165 billion.

Congress is morally responsible for looking ahead. We have now a Government debt billions higher than we had at the end of World War II. We cannot continue to mortgage our unborn generations.

Proponents of the proposal firmly state that this plan does not increase Federal control. It seems to me that it is evident that such a department, with authority to deal with intercity and commuter transportation, parks, low-cost apartments and renovation of apartments and housing, training programs for teenagers and workers and other urban renewal projects could not help but establish Federal controls which would eventually effect every crossroad of our Nation.

The President in his inaugural address told America to "ask not what the Government will do for you, but to ask what you can do for the Government." This was a good principle and should be followed. I feel, as a Congressman opposing this reorganization plan, I am putting that principle to work.

LITTLE PEOPLE TO LITTLE PEOPLE PROGRAM

Mr. **GOODELL**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Glenn] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. **GLENN**. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the New Jersey delegation, I take this opportunity to restate that which I have said before: That ours is one of the finest delegations in the House, and I include both sides of the aisle.

As an example of my admiration, let me call attention at this point to just one of our Members, the Honorable Peter W. Rodino, who has served seven terms in this House. He is not only a capable and experienced Member but also a great humanitarian, community leader, and, last but most important, an outstanding American family man. On last Thursday, February 15, he addressed this House under extension of remarks on page 2227 of the Record, and I ask all Members to read his "The Little People to Little People Program" as an exposition of the character of this man—a far superior guide than my poor words would seek to convey.

With a colleague like him, and with a meritorious suggestion as he offers, I am proud to stand with him and offer my support in his endeavor.

CONGRATULATIONS TO COLONEL GLENN

Mr. **GOODELL**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Glenn] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. **GLENN**. Mr. Speaker, I am sure we are all conversant with the importance of public relations in all fields of endeavor, including the political arena. Most of it in these days is self-engendered, self-serving, and needless to say expensive.

So it came like a breath of fresh air to have the exploits of an American, who seeks no reward except that which comes to all Americans regardless of position, so well received throughout the world. I, of course, refer to the successful accomplishment of the orbital flight of Col. John H. Glenn. The comments of the world press on this wonderful feat show that he and his associates have generated more good will and improved our world popularity to a greater extent than all the good will junkets both official and unofficial during the past year.

If some of our publicity-minded public officials want to increase their Gallup poll standing, I suggest they undertake orbital flight as an outstanding medium.

In a more serious vein, I want to join my colleagues and all Americans in congratulations, and wish to express my sincere appreciation to Colonel Glenn and his associates in their successful flight, and to thank them for their dedication to the past 3 years of preparation. As one Glenn to another Glenn, I am proud that I bear this surname, and I am sure that I speak for the many members of my family in south Jersey, and other branches of the Glenn family in Pennsylvania and North and South Carolina, as well as all my constituents of the Second Congressional District of New Jersey, in sending Colonel Glenn a "well done."

DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. **GOODELL**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Mathias] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. **MATHIAS**. Mr. Speaker, the reorganization plan to create a Department of Urban Affairs is intended to create a new executive department and transfer to it the functions of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. In accordance with the limitations of the Reorganization Act the plan does not provide any new functions or powers for the proposed department or its secretary.

The plan does, however, provide a measure of recognition to that substantial portion of our population which lives in urban areas, estimated to be between 50 and 70 percent of the Nation, depending on the standard of measurement. By giving city dwellers a voice in the Cabinet on subjects which relate exclusively to cities, it would bring them a greater degree of success in coordinating solutions to urban problems. The initial cost of enhancing the position of the Federal agencies dealing with urban affairs would be modest; approximately $64,000 as estimated by the Director of the Budget.

I support the plan and shall vote against the resolution to disapprove it because I feel that changes on the American scene justify it. The shift from country to city living continues and the population continues to grow at a rate which commands both awe and apprehension. Under these conditions it seems to me that some reorganization of the Federal Government to meet the changing situation is both appropriate and timely.

History confirms this conclusion. Abraham Lincoln established the Department of Agriculture on May 15, 1962, when the great western farmlands had been subjected to the plow. The commercial growth of the country was recognized by the establishment under Theodore Roosevelt of the Department of Commerce and Labor in 1903, and the separation of this Department into two Cabinet posts was approved by William Howard Taft on his last day in office as President. Dwight Eisenhower created the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare by utilizing the same provisions of the Reorganization Act under which the Department of Urban Affairs is proposed.

The tremendous growth of the urban population in recent years and the continuing high rate of change from country to city living have created many new problems for our cities to solve. The Federal Government has long cooperated in aiding the cities in meeting their problems through several independent Federal agencies which are in existence today. This reorganization plan under consideration will modernize the existing machinery to better carry out the functions which provide services to all communities wherever they may be geographically located. In particular I refer to the fact that the main benefit in this plan is the removal of duplication of material and effort by merging the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Public Housing Administration into one department.

The continuing changes in living condition and rising standards of living have generated an urgent need for modern imaginative planning to provide the solutions to the problems to which our people are faced. The present Federal machinery was not designed to cope with the great urban problems that are located in every corner of our Nation today. The number of smaller cities and towns across our country have increased greatly in recent years and these communities have many interests in common with larger urban areas. The interests of all communities—from the largest to the smallest—will be benefited by the increased effectiveness that would result from giving that part of our population which lives in urban areas a voice in the Cabinet on matters which relate exclusively to cities.

By raising the status of the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Public Housing Administration the new Secretary would be more directly responsible to the Congress and the President for the effective execution of the programs now carried out by different agencies. The new Secretary will be better able to represent the interest of the 70 percent of our population which resides in cities.

TRIBUTE TO HARRY M. LIVINGSTON

Mr. **ALBERT**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Keogh] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. **KEOGH**. Mr. Speaker, one of the curiosities of our time is the publicity treatment accorded men and women in private and public enterprise. Those who achieve good records in private industry are given ample recognition and encouragement in trade publications and the general press. Too often, the public servant, unless he is in high elected office, doing an equally efficient job remains unnoticed until he retires or dies.

Taking a leaf from private industry's book, I want to call attention to the splendid record of service given to the House of Representatives and its workers by Harry M. Livingston, who is just completing 13 years as the disbursing clerk.

The magnitude of his task is not generally known. Mr. Livingston every year draws up a budget of about $52 million. He supervises 20 employees and under his direction they issue paychecks to 4,200 persons working in the Capitol and offices of House Members. In 1954, Mr. Livingston mechanized his payroll system and all of us in the House benefited by his modernization of an ancient method of paying employees.

Every year the General Acounting Office makes an audit of the House Disbursing Office and for the 13 years that Henry M. Livingston has administered its affairs they have been found to be in perfect order. A report by the Comptroller General was made on the functions of his office and it is significant that it required 37 pages to describe them.

Also of note is that the Comptroller General recommended that Mr. Livingston write a manual telling of his procedures and methods of operation. Its purpose is to continue the efficient system he has evolved as a guide for anybody who might run the office at some future time.

Harry Livingston has served a multitude of us well since 1949 and it is the sincere wish of hundreds that we will have him with us and at his post for many more years. All of us can join in saying to him: "Well done."

THE 1961 FEED GRAIN PROGRAM

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the 1961 feed grain program, developed jointly by the Congress and the Department of Agriculture, was a signal success, in which we may all feel the pride of accomplishment. The extent of the achievements of this program is reflected in a detailed report prepared by the Department of Agriculture. I am placing this report in the RECORD at this point in the thought that it will be useful to the Members of the House as we consider the next necessary steps to restore stability and prosperity to agriculture, to reduce farm surpluses, and to bring down the costs of farm programs.

This report was accompanied by various supporting tables which are voluminous and which, in the interest of economy, I am not including in the RECORD. However, any Member interested in this detailed material may obtain it by contacting the Office of Information, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

The report follows:

THE 1961 FEED GRAIN PROGRAM

This is a report bringing together the current information concerning the 1961 feed grain program carried out under legislation approved by the Congress and the President on March 22, 1961. Final information on payments is not yet available, but sufficiently complete data are at hand to indicate the extent to which the program has been successful in accomplishing the purposes intended by the Congress and the administration.

SUMMARY

In summary, these are the salient points describing the performance of the 1961 feed grain program:

As of January 26, 1962, the Treasury of the United States has received about $496 million in receipts from the sale of feed grain under the authority of the 1961 program. It represents some 500 million bushels of grain sold by the Department from the certificates issued to farmers participating in the program.

During the time these sales have been made, the market price for corn and grain sorghums has remained at a higher level than during the comparable period in 1960.

The sale of grain to date represents over half of the funds spent during 1961 to meet the pledges of farmers to retire croplands to conserving uses.

Net farm income in 1961 is estimated to be over $1 billion higher than in 1960, a rise of 9 percent. A large part of this gain can be attributed to the feed grain program and higher support prices for major farm commodities and to increased cash marketings.

Retail food prices paid by consumers for meat, poultry, and dairy products have shown great stability during the period of the program. These are the products which the feed grain market affect directly.

Without the feed grain program, the Federal Government would have been required to support feed grains for all producers regardless of the volume of production. Under such conditions, it is apparent that production would have surpassed total consumption by about 500 million bushels—all of which would have passed into Government hands.

The program, designed for the 1961 production year and operating under unusually favorable weather conditions, will reduce Government stocks by some 200 million bushels, rather than increasing stocks.

The taxpayer will benefit by millions of dollars in immediate reductions in storage, transportation, handling, and interest charges on grain which is now moving into the market. Government expenditures over the next 9 years approximately will be nearly $600 million less because of the lower level of feed grain carryover.

How well does this meet the objectives as laid down by the Congress?

In its report on the 1961 feed grain program, the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry said this:

"This bill provides for an emergency 1961 feed grain program to prevent further accumulation of supplies and begin to bring them in line with demand. Its objectives are to increase farm income, save Government funds, and hold down or reduce surplus stocks, without material effect on consumer prices. To accomplish these objectives it would (1) raise feed grain support prices, (2) condition price support on the retirement of acreage from feed grain production, and (3) provide payments in cash and in kind for participation in such retirement program."

In its report, the House Committee on Agriculture said this:

"The purpose of this bill is to establish a 1-year emergency program to reduce the production of feed grains in the crop-year 1961 and thereby alleviate conditions of oversupply and low prices which are seriously depressing a major segment of the Nation's agriculture and placing on taxpayers the burden of holding nearly $4 billion of these grains in the bins of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

"In presenting his program to the Congress, the Secretary of Agriculture estimated that it would reduce feed grain production in 1961 by approximately 1 billion bushels, would result in a saving of approximately $500 million to the Government, and would increase the income of feed grain producers approximately 10 percent. Although the committee has made some modifications in the Secretary's program, it believes that the benefits under the bill as reported will be at least as great as the Secretary estimated for his proposal."

Supporting information and statistical data on the summary material will provide a more detailed picture as to the extent to which the program has reached the objectives laid down by the Congress. As further information is gathered on the feed grain program, it will be forwarded for evaluation.

DETAIL ON THE 1961 FEED GRAIN PROGRAM

The success of the 1961 feed grain program can be demonstrated and measured in a number of different ways. Here are three of the most important:

EFFECT OF THE PROGRAM ON FARM INCOME

Net realized farm income for 1961 is estimated at $12.7 billion, an increase of $1.0 billion, or 9 percent, over the $11.7 billion for 1960. A substantial part of this increase is a result of the 1961 feed grain program and to increased support prices for many of the major commodities. Rural communities and all who sell to or serve farmers are benefiting from improved farm income. The outlook is that these gains can at least be maintained into the next year.

Another measure of the effect on the program is revealed in that the value to the producer of the 1960 corn and grain sorghum crop, computed at the season average price, was $4.4 billion; and the value of the 1961 corn and grain sorghum plus the payments for acreage reduction is estimated at $5.1 billion.

EFFECT OF THE PROGRAM ON CONSUMERS OF FOOD

The 1961 feed grain program has not increased the price of food to consumers. Price indexes computed by the Bureau of Labor Statistics show that the retail price of meat in November was 1.6 percent less than it was in January; the retail price of poultry has declined over 10 percent; and the retail price of dairy products has had normal seasonal fluctuations and was just about the same in November as it was in January. These are the principal products which could be affected by the program, and the figures show clearly that food consumers have suffered no adverse effects from the program.

EFFECT OF THE PROGRAM ON THE TAXPAYERS

Without the feed grain program approved by Congress in March, 1961, the USDA would have been required to support the price of feed grains to all producers without any limitation on production. The surplus production which would have resulted from such action would have raised the national carryover of corn and grain sorghums by about 500 million bushels. But it now looks as if the total carryover of the two grains will be 200 million bushels less at the end of the crop year than they were at the start of the year. (The total carryover of all feed grains is estimated to be 280 million bushels less than a year ago.)

If there had been no emergency feed grain program in 1961, production of corn and grain sorghum this year would have totaled about 4,900 million bushels—800 million bushels more than the 4,107 million bushels estimated in the December crop summary. Without the program, the national carryout of corn and grain sorghum at the end of the 1961 marketing year would have gone up by 500 million bushels to a total of 3,200 million bushels. With the program the carryout will go down by 200 million bushels to 2,500 million bushels.

In recent years the quantity of corn and grain sorghums in private hands at the end of the crop year has ranged between 100 and 150 million bushels. There is no reason to believe that these holdings will change materially this year. Therefore, the reduction of 700 million bushels from what would have been carried over without the program will be entirely in Government holdings; either under loan or in CCC's inventory at the end of the marketing year.

This reduction in feed grain surplus of 700 million bushels is benefiting the taxpayer right now by cutting current expenditures, but the big saving will come in the years ahead. The Government would have had to handle and store that 700 million bushels of grain for about 9 years. Government costs will be nearly $600 million less in future years because of this reduction in 1961 corn and grain sorghum crops.

ACREAGE DIVERSION AND REDUCTION IN PLANTED ACREAGE

Preliminary estimates indicate that 25.2 million acres, normally devoted to the production of feed grains, were retired to a conservation use in 1961. Of this, 19.1 million acres came from corn and 6.1 million acres from grain sorghums.

As a result of retiring these acreages to a conservation use, the total planted acreage of corn and grain sorghums in the Nation dropped about 20.4 million acres below the 1959–60 planted acres—a reduction of 20 percent. This represents a total of about 15.2 million acres of corn and 5.2 million acres of grain sorghums.

The number of acres diverted to a conservation use and the decrease in planted acreage of these two grains cannot be directly compared. This is true because the 1961 feed grain program was a voluntary program, and farmers who elected not to participate could increase their acreage of corn and grain sorghums if they desired. It was recognized from the beginning that this would occur. The extent to which those outside the program increased their acreage would offset some of the acreage diverted to conservation uses by growers who did participate in the program. On the other hand, many participants did not plant acreage which they were entitled to plant, even though they received no payment for this additional diversion.

PHANTOM ACREAGE

There has been considerable misunderstanding and half-truth surrounding the catch phrase "phantom acreage" used in connection with the 1961 feed grain program. What is meant by phantom acreage? This term presumably was invented to describe acreage paid for but not removed from production under the feed grain program. Some have even compared the amount by which acreage paid for under the program (25.2 million) is larger than the reduction in 1961 planted acreage for all U.S. producers, as a measure of phantom acreage.

Objectively, phantom acreage could be associated only with participating farms since this is the only group intending to reduce their acreage of corn and grain sorghums under the program. Applied to participating farms then, phantom acreage could only represent that part of the net upward adjustment made in arriving at the base acreage, which was not offset by underplanted acreage not paid for. Following is an examination of this in more detail:

1. Public Law 87–5 clearly authorized the Secretary to adjust 1959–60 average planted acreages "as he determines necessary to correct for abnormal factors affecting production." The 1959–60 planned acreage on participating farms was 59.7 million acres (45.3 million corn and 14.4 million grain sorghums). This average acreage was adjusted to 64 million acres (48.4 corn and 15.6 grain sorghums) to arrive at the base acreage for these farms—an adjustment clearly in line with the congressional intent of ironing out inequities, and eliminating hardships resulting from adverse weather conditions in the base years. The net upward adjustment thus was 4.3 million acres (3.1 million corn and 1.2 million grain sorghums).

2. But participating farms actually planted only 32.6 million acres (25.3 million corn and 7.3 million grain sorghums), or 6.2 million acres less than the 38.8 million acres permitted them, after diverting 25.2 million acres for payment (19.1 million corn and 6.1 million grain sorghums).

3. Summarizing then, participating farms received an upward adjustment of 4.3 million acres in establishing their base acreage, but voluntarily and without payment elected to reduce their plantings by an additional 6.2 million acres. It is clear therefore, that there was no "phantom acreage" on a national basis. Following is a summary of the statistics for these participating farms:

[In millions of acres]

Item	Corn	Grain sorghums	Total
(a) Upward adjustment in base	3.1	1.2	4.3
(b) Underplanting of permitted acreage	4.0	2.2	6.2
(c) Net phantom acreage (a−b)	None	None	None

A common misconception which has been widely circulated is to assume that phantom acreage represents the amount by which acreage paid for under the program (25.2 million) is larger than the reduction in 1961 planted acreage (20.4 million) from the 1959–60 average for all U.S. producers. This completely overlooks the fact that nonparticipants increased their acreage substantially—our information is that this increase amounted to 6 to 7 million acres. One of the important reasons why a producer did not participate is that he wanted to grow an increased acreage. The program was entirely voluntary and he could choose this course if he wished. Nevertheless, it would be completely illogical to include acreage increases on nonparticipating farms as a part of the phantom acreage.

REDEMPTION OF FEED GRAIN CERTIFICATES AND SALES FROM CCC STOCKS AGAINST CERTIFICATES POOLED BY PRODUCERS

The feed grain legislation for 1961 authorized producers to redeem certificates for feed grains from CCC stocks or to receive cash from CCC by surrendering certificates—thus authorizing CCC to subsequently sell feed grains in the market to obtain restoration of the cash paid to the producers.

Redemptions by producers and subsequent holders of certificates for grains from CCC stocks have amounted to $4,830,711 for 4,846,995 bushels of feed grains through January 26, 1962.

Through January 26, 1962, the Department had sold 500 million bushels of grain in redemption of rights represented by pooled certificates with a value of $496 million.

The actions of the Department have been and will be guided by policies which were publicly stated by the Secretary in July 1961 and which follow:

"CCC sales policy under the 1961 feed grain program is designed to carry out these objectives: To honor the Department's general understanding with cooperators that they can expect to benefit by diverting their feed grain acreage to conservation uses; to assure reasonable and stable prices to users of feed grains and consumers of livestock products; to improve farm income; and to permit feed grain prices during the marketing year generally to follow patterns, relative to harvest-time prices, similar to those of recent years."

Actions taken by the Department were as follows: To implement the authorization to sell from CCC stocks for certificates redeemed in cash, the Department first announced, on June 16, 1961, an interim offer to sell grain sorghum to stabilize market prices during the summer until the 1961 crop began to move to market. Then on July 21, 1961, with the 1961 grain sorghum harvest beginning in volume, the Department announced a continuing offer to sell grain sorghums at market prices. At that time the Secretary made the statement quoted above.

On September 13, 1961, the Department first offered CCC-owned corn for sale at market prices, initially applying this offer to those areas where supplies were needed to aid in maintaining feed grain prices at reasonable levels for livestock producers and thus helping to stabilize prices for consumers of livestock products.

On September 14, 1961, the Department offered barley for sale at market prices against certificates in limited amounts in the Pacific Northwest in order to stabilize prices to feed grain users in that area and to avert disorder in the production and marketing of livestock and poultry.

On October 27, 1961, the Department augmented the open offers to sell corn and grain sorghum by the establishing of minimum price guidelines at levels which would not permit sales by CCC at prices below generally prevailing prices received by farmers in the fall of 1960 for the 1960 crop. The Department stated also that all dispositions of corn and grain sorghum for unrestricted use, including sales of nonstorable grains, would be in redemption of feed grain certificates.

On November 9, 1961, the Department announced an offer to sell CCC-owned feed barley to livestock owners (including poultrymen) in the north-central area covering the States of Minnesota, North Dakota, Montana, South Dakota, and Wisconsin.

On December 29, 1961, the Department modified the terms of sales to provide that only sales of storable corn and grain sorghum would be in redemption of certificates or rights represented by pooled certificates.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

In February a committee of feed grain farmers met with representatives of the Department and fashioned a feed grain program. It was an emergency program, developed under the pressure of planting deadlines. It was designed to increase farm income, to prevent further buildup of the feed grain surplus, to reduce ultimate feed grain program costs to taxpayers, and to help assure consumers of fair and stable prices for meat, poultry, and dairy products.

On March 22 legislation authorizing the program was enacted and Department officials left that evening to carry the program to State ASC committees. Within 3 days every State committee in the Nation had been informed on program provisions. In record time, the State and county committeemen carried the story to producers. Although planting was already underway in Southern States at that time, signup by June 1 exceeded expectations and justified the action of Congress in giving farmers the opportunity to cooperate together toward solving the feed grain problem.

The legislation provided for a 1-year voluntary program that called upon producers to reduce their 1961 corn and feed grain acreage 20 to 40 percent below the average of 1959 and 1960 acreage. Price support for feed grains was raised to the following levels: corn, $1.20 per bushel; grain sorghums, $1.93 per hundredweight; barley, 93 cents per bushel; oats, 62 cents per bushel; and rye, $1.02 per bushel. In order to be eligible for the higher price supports, producers are required to reduce 1961 acreages by 20 percent of the 1959–60 corn and grain sorghum acreages. Producers who do not elect to participate are not eligible for price support on any of the feed grain crops.

To maintain income for farmers reducing their acreages of corn and grain sorghums, payments are made in certificates redeemable in kind from feed grains in CCC inventory. Payments compensate farmers for carrying out approved conservation practices on the retired acres. Cooperators who wish to receive the cash equivalent of grain may ask CCC to act as their agent in marketing their certificates. As agent for the producer, CCC advances the payment to the producer in cash through county ASC offices and subsequently markets the grain. Half the estimated total payment for a farm was offered to the producer as soon as he signified that he would cooperate in the program.

For retiring acreages equal to 20 percent of their base, producers are eligible for a payment equal to 50 percent of their normal production on their diverted acreage times the county support price. Actual payment computation is based on a payment rate per acre for the country multiplied by the acreage diverted and by the farm's productivity index. Such index reflects the farm's 1959–60 average yield, relative to the county average.

As an added incentive, the program provides for further reductions at a higher payment rate. This additional reduction can be any amount up to 20 percent more, and the higher rate is based upon 60 percent of the 1959–60 average yield.

The program also provides an inducement to farms with small base acreages to participate. Where the minimum reduction of 20 percent amounts to less than 20 acres, the producer may elect to divert for payment either the actual computed minimum or up to 20 acres. In addition, he may divert another 20 percent. Therefore, farms having a feed-grain base of 25 acres or less may retire their entire base acreage and receive compensation.

Producers who participate in the program are required to devote the acreage diverted from corn or grain sorghum production to conserving uses. This is in addition to the average 1959–60 acreage devoted to soil-conserving uses of the farm. Diverted acreage cannot be harvested or pastured, except under special conditions in designated disaster areas.

Producers are eligible to receive price support for feed grains even though they divert acreage to the production of castor beans, safflower, sunflower, or sesame. They will not, however, be eligible for program payments on such acreage.

ADDENDA

Tables which accompany this report and which may be obtained by contacting the Office of Information, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, USDA, are:

Table No. 1: Comparison of supply and utilization data and value of production with and without the 1961 feed grain program (millions, except prices and yields).

Table No. 2: Estimated savings resulting from the 1961 feed grain program (in millions of dollars).

Table No. 3: Total base acres of corn and grain sorghums and base acres of corn and grain sorghum on farms participating in the program.

Table No. 4: Acres of corn and grain sorghums diverted for payment and value of payments earned.

Table No. 5: Extent of farms participating in the program.

Table No. 6: Summary of planted acreage, base acreage, and acreage diverted for payment by participating and nonparticipating farms.

Table No. 7: Weekly report of feed grain certificate redemptions (producer and subsequent holder).

Table No. 8: Sales against certificate pool.

USDA'S FIRST CENTURY

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, this year is the 100th anniversary of the U.S. Department of Agriculture and its cooperating land-grant colleges. The autumn issue of Corn, published by Corn Industries Research Foundation, Inc., is a review of the services and accomplishments of USDA's first century.

I am inserting this review at this point in the Record, to make it available to all the Members of the House, because it is a fitting tribute and also an example of what other organizations can do to help celebrate this centennial.

USDA's First Century

At this precise point in our history, our population is well fed, well paid, comfortable. Hunger, malnutrition, and the prospect of famine—familiar conditions among millions elsewhere in the world—are almost unknown to us. We take food for granted.

For this happy state of affairs we are indebted to an agricultural system without an equal anywhere, and, in large part, to a single agency of Government which, for the past 100 years, has been guide and mentor to generations of farmers.

Perhaps now, on the eve of the centennial of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, is an appropriate time to take a brief look at its history, its problems and achievements in managing that basic industry which has made us the best-fed people on earth.

For agriculture is an industry, indeed the largest industry we have. Its total investment exceeds $206 billion. It employs 7.1 million people—more than the combined employment in the steel, automotive, transportation, and public utilities industries. In the production, distribution and processing of its products it creates vast employment elsewhere.

Other industries, as they grow, construct new plants, occupy more space, hire more employees. The history of agriculture reveals just the opposite trend. Today, with its production at virtually an alltime peak, agriculture occupies far fewer acres than formerly, for it has steadily lost its lands to other industries, highways, urban development. Agriculture's staff—the farmers who produce its commodities—has gradually diminished and is now at an alltime low. Today one man produces food and fiber for 25 others besides himself. As comparisons with Russia are becoming fashionable, it is perhaps pertinent to point out that the Soviet's average farmer produces food for only four or five others.

This fact of increasing production from a steadily shrinking plant, and by fewer employees, is striking testimony to American agricultural efficiency.

Back of this achievement is the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the cooperating system of land-grant colleges, with their regional research laboratories, their Federal and State experiment stations, their extension services that fan out to every country where land is farmed. The agricultural colleges teach the science of farming not only to undergraduates but via their extension departments and the county-agent system, to every farmer in the State who has a problem and needs a solution.

The USDA, in effect a Federal university of agriculture with a store of knowledge any farmer can tap for the price of a 4-cent stamp, has become what Abraham Lincoln and a few other agricultural idealists dreamed it should be.

U.S. AGRICULTURE BEFORE THE DEPARTMENT

The Department is nominally a century old but it existed, under different names and in rudimentary forms, much more than a century ago. George Washington and Thomas Jefferson had, in their different ways, the same dream which Lincoln brought to reality in 1862. History reveals that both Washington and Jefferson knew how to farm and looked to a day when their own agricultural competence would be the property of every farmer. In effect, George Washingculture, and his Mount Vernon, with its five farms, was our first agricultural experiment station.

Beyond Mount Vernon and Monticello, however, such farming as Washington and Jefferson could see was inefficient by their own standards. Both statesmen saw the need of a central organization of government to disseminate farming knowledge and to integrate the Nation's agriculture.

Yet USDA is not and never was the brainchild of any single President or statesman or bureaucrat. The Department grew slowly, evolving step by step in response to the public need and demand. Public aid to agriculture is as old as the history of government, for food is basic to life itself and to the conduct of any nation in peace or war. Droughts, floods, and insect infestations historically have demanded governmental action to save the food supply.

The U.S. Patent Office, surprisingly enough, was the true progenitor of the Department of Agriculture. Established in 1790, the Patent Office seems to have had little concern with farming until the late 1830's. Then newly reorganized and under the wing of the State Department, the Patent Office undertook to distribute seeds and collect agricultural statistics.

The first Patent Commissioner under the new setup was a farm-minded individual named Henry L. Ellsworth. Mayor of Hartford, Conn., and a lawyer by profession, Ellsworth had a solidly urban background. Yet he had his own farm and was prominent in the Hartford County Agricultural Society.

Ellsworth's first report, made to President Martin Van Buren in 1839, is a historic curiosity. Only two pages long, it summarized the agency's disbursements in a sentence: "The ordinary expenses of the Patent Office the past year, including payments for the library and agricultural statistics was $20,799.95."

The existence of a few agricultural societies in the 1830's helped to integrate the work of individual farmers under countrywide and statewide direction. Indeed, such group efforts were not new, even then. As far back as 1785 the Philadelphia Society for the Promotion of Agriculture was founded, with George Washington an honorary member. By 1860, still 2 years before USDA itself, such organizations numbered over a thousand.

In their periodic meetings they discussed their common or unique problems, and doubtless the science of agriculture was advanced considerably through such early seminars. But the spoken word, then as now, was not enough. Visual education was needed, and the permanence of print. These needs were met by the annual farm fair, exhibiting crops and livestock (one is recorded as early as 1810), and by the agricultural press.

First of a long line of periodicals to spread the gospel of farming in print was the Agricultural Museum, published in Georgetown, D.C., from 1810 to 1812. Destined for a far wider influence, the American Farmer appeared in Baltimore in 1819. The latter journal seems to have been sufficiently eloquent to spark a new congressional awareness of the importance of farm production. For in 1820 the House established a Committee on Agriculture, and in 1825 the Senate followed suit.

Thereafter, farm journals multiplied; today, well over 700 agricultural magazines and newspapers are regularly issued in the United States. Probably at least 500 daily newspapers employ a farm editor, and as many or more radio stations carry a regular farm program. Much of the output of these private commentators stems from USDA itself and the land-grant colleges. In its books, booklets, experiment-station bulletins, press releases and published speeches, the Department of Agriculture is today one of the largest publishers in the world.

THE MOUNTING NEED FOR USDA

By 1845 the science of agriculture had become a major concern of the Patent Office. Technology was asserting itself in the farm fields. The steel plow was cleaving the springtime earth; McCormick's reaper was harvesting grain; the threshing machine was separating grain from chaff. The farmer's investments were mounting; to meet his debts he needed credit and he needed broader markets for his crops. Commissioner Ellsworth's first report, for 1839, had taken two pages. His last, only five years later, constituted a book of 520 pages with an index.

On the farm, guesswork and hereditary notions were yielding to scientific analysis and research. Experiments with cornstalk sugar convinced Ellsworth (mistakenly, as history has shown) that this product would soon be produced commercially. Already Thomas Kingsford's plant in Oswego, N.Y., was processing corn kernels to produce starch, but neither Kingsford nor Ellsworth thought then of converting starch into the corn sirup and sugar (dextrose) that were to become staple food items.

In 1849, with the Patent Office now in the new Department of the Interior, President Zachary Taylor urged a Bureau of Agriculture in that Department, but Congress took no action.

Through the next decade the agitation for agricultural colleges, free land, and more governmental assistance to farmers became increasingly vocal. Such moves were consistently opposed, however, by southern Congressmen who held that the doctrine of States rights forbade Federal intervention. One land-grant college bill did win congressional blessing, but President Buchanan vetoed it as not only extravagant but unconstitutional.

By 1861, agriculture was outgrowing the Patent Office and no one knew it better than the new Commissioner, David P. Holloway. His report for that year, submitted to President Lincoln in 1862, largely omitted statistics but contained an impassioned plea for a Federal institution to serve agriculture, a calling which still occupied well over half of the people.

Holloway found reinforcement in two quarters. The secession had removed from Congress the bloc of States rights advocates who opposed Federal farm aid, and had shifted the dominant political influence from the agricultural South to the industrial North. Hence the need for farm representation in Washington was more than ever acute.

Also supporting Holloway was the influential U.S. Agricultural Society, with a membership that was virtually a Who's Who in American agriculture. The society's widely respected journal had long pressed for a Federal department. This pressure was intensified when the society's member, Charles B. Calvert, of Maryland, was elected to Congress in July 1861, and appointed to the Committee on Agriculture.

Meanwhile, accurately appraising the trend, Senator Justin Smith Morrill, of Vermont, gathered support for his land-grant college bill.

THE DEPARTMENT AT LAST

Lincoln had "suggested" a Bureau rather than a Department, but the organizational details seem to have concerned him but little.

The House committee decided in favor of a Department, without Cabinet status and in charge of a Commissioner, and the bill was so drawn. President Lincoln's signature made it law on May 15, 1862.

The official seal of the new Department depicted wheat. Later it was changed to show a shock of corn, and the wheat was removed, despite its importance as the "staff of life." The seal says, better than words can, that corn is so great a crop it can symbolize all of U.S. agriculture.

On May 20 Lincoln signed the Homestead Act, providing for the apportionment of 160-acre freehold farms from the public domain, to citizens who would make their homes on such land and till it for 5 years.

The Land-Grant College Act, fathered by Senator Morrill, received Lincoln's signature on July 2. Under this law the States were empowered to sell 11 million acres of public land, use the proceeds to endow agricultural colleges, and thereafter to operate the colleges themselves. The Morrill Act is historically and socially significant, for it signalized the beginning of Federal grants-in-aid to the States, and it opened to virtually everyone those gates of higher education to which only the privileged had hitherto possessed keys.

Isaac Newton, a Quaker of farm stock, had headed the Agricultural Division of the Patent Office, and he now became the first Commissioner of Agriculture. Newton's budget for the Department's first fiscal year was $60,000.

In its preamble, the act establishing the Department cites the duty "to acquire and to diffuse among the people of the United States useful information on subjects connected with agriculture in the most general and comprehensive sense of that word."

A glowing promise, yet it failed to quicken the pulse of the dirt farmers who produced most of the crops. The new Department faced public apathy for some time. The pressure for it had been generated largely by "gentlemen farmers" and their societies, but most of rural America believed in the Jeffersonian maxim that the best government is the least. Senator Hale remarked that the prevailing dirt-farmer attitude was "For God's sake, let us alone."

The Department's pre-Cabinet history—1862-1889—shows a gradual expansion. In 1867 Congress appropriated $100,000 for a building to house the Department, at 12th and B Streets. The structure was finished a year later, under Commissioner Horace Capron, and the Department's 47 employees moved in. A stable was built in 1879, a building for the Seeds Division in 1881, and a greenhouse in 1883.

The old Patent Office had had its troubles with statistical compilations, for crops were then largely unreported, and accurate data were hard to come by. By 1866, however, annual harvests were beginning to look impressive, reporting facilities had improved, and a demand for facts and figures was finding wide public expression. The Corn Belt had shifted from the war-exhausted Southeast, where Tennessee and Kentucky had been the top corn States, to the Central West, and the Wheat Belt was moving in a similar direction. Perhaps something ulterior was back of the public demand for statistics, however, for certain speculators were using them as guides to future market fluctuations.

Forestalling such misuse of its forecasts, USDA has for many years guarded its monthly crop estimates with the utmost secrecy until the day and hour of release.

The work of the Bureau of Animal Industry, organized in 1883, marked another extension of Federal aid to the various States. Animal diseases, particularly contagious pleuropneumonia and cattle-tick fever, crossed borders and presented problems beyond State control. The Bureau's research eradicated contagious pleuropneumonia in 5 years; later its studies of other diseases sharply diminished livestock and poultry losses.

Norman J. Colman, appointed by President Grover Cleveland in 1885, was the last Commissioner of Agriculture. His efforts helped the passage of the Hatch Act, in 1887, creating the State agricultural experiment stations and giving the Department its second bureau, the Office of Experiment Stations. The resulting Extension Service brought the knowledge acquired in research direct to farmers in every State.

CABINET STATUS FOR USDA

The 50th Congress was overwhelmed with petitions urging Cabinet rank for the Department. On February 9, 1889, the Department was raised to this status, and on February 13 Commissioner Colman was appointed the first Secretary of Agriculture.

Colman held this historic post for less than a month, for he left office with President Cleveland. The incoming President, Benjamin Harrison, appointed Jeremiah M. Rusk as Secretary of Agriculture. Farmer, tavern keeper, and eventually Governor of Wisconsin, Rusk had a sense of public relations that was rare for his day. He interested the press in the Department's work, and inaugurated the publication of bulletins which informed farmers on new findings of research. Under Rusk, USDA acquired the Weather Bureau, formerly of the War Department.

Rusk and his immediate successors, J. Sterling Morton (1893–97) and James Wilson (1897–1913), guided the Department through a kind of golden age, a tranquil time in which the problems seem minor, in historical perspective, beside those presented later by two world wars and a long depression.

Morton had two passions: saving money and planting trees. The former led him to stop free-seed distribution (it was later resumed but ended permanently in 1923); the latter earned him the distinction of becoming the founder of Arbor Day.

Under Morton, the Department obtained civil service status for its employees, then numbering 2,019, including 429 women. Despite his insistence upon economy, Morton held that most of them were sadly underpaid. (Chiefs of scientific bureaus drew $2,500 annually.) The Department's budget in Morton's final year, 1896, was $2,583,750.

In appointing James Wilson, of Iowa, to head Agriculture in March 1897, President McKinley inaugurated the longest secretarial tenure in the Department's first century. Wilson stayed in office 16 years, serving under Presidents McKinley, Theodore Roosevelt and William H. Taft.

TURN OF THE CENTURY

Wilson's era saw the Department grow faster than the weeds it attempted to control, and enormously expand its services to agriculture.

Industrial, technological and social changes which later were to revolutionize agriculture were becoming evident early in the new century. The upsurge of population demanded vastly more food; railroads were tapping new lands; the automobile and improved roads brought markets nearer the farm; machinery began to replace manpower; electricity, the telephone and plumbing gave a new and pleasanter aspect to rural life.

Keener competition put a premium upon efficiency in farm management. Many deserted farming for the cities—by 1910 agriculture claimed only 32 percent of all employed.

Wilson reorganized related USDA units into four new Bureaus: Plant Industry, Chemistry, Forestry, and Soils, with Chiefs' salaries upped to $5,000. Dr. Harvey W. Wiley, crusading for pure foods, headed the Bureau of Chemistry. Gifford Pinchot, later Governor of Pennsylvania, was in charge of Forestry.

The Bureau of Plant Industry had organized in 1901 a new farm-demonstration program. A year later, when Texas cotton was so stricken by the boll weevil that $500,000 in Federal aid was demanded, the Bureau's forces demonstrated on farms how to fight the cotton pest.

Wilson was 70 years old in 1906 but he and his Department were striding ahead. Agriculture's appropriation was now over $7 million. In the decade past, its staff had more than tripled—from 2,019 to 6,242. It increased further when the Pure Food and Drug Act was passed on June 30, 1906, and Dr. Wiley's Bureau of Chemistry was charged with the law's enforcement.

Having boosted production through research, the Department began to look now at the social and cultural aspects of farm life. In 1908 the Bureau of Plant Industry undertook a study of farm economics, and President Theodore Roosevelt appointed his Country Life Commission. With such eminent members as Henry Wallace, Walter Hines Page, Gifford Pinchot and others, the Commission sought to increase farmer cooperation in buying and selling, to promote rural social advantages, and to organize extension work on a national basis.

Secretary James Wilson, leaving office with President Taft in 1913, had laid the groundwork for much that followed.

THE FIRST WORLD WAR AND AFTER

David F. Houston, appointed by Woodrow Wilson in 1913, had been Secretary of Agriculture for 4 years prior to the United States entry into World War I. An economist, financier, and educator, Houston was more sociologist than agriculturist. The economic and cultural upgrading of rural life was close to his heart. His efforts led to several reforms: He established the new Office of Markets and was instrumental in the passage of the Cotton Futures Act. The Smith-Lever Act, broadening the Extension Service to include personal contact teaching via the land-grant colleges, was passed in 1914. By 1916, laws establishing standards for agricultural products, grain futures, warehousing, and Federal farm loans, had been enacted.

Crop production, traditionally the first aim of the Department, had not been neglected, however, and in 1917 the needs of war could be faced with confidence.

The Food Administration got underway with Herbert Hoover in charge. The Extension Service found new usefulness in teaching farmers to produce more than ever. "Food will win the war" was not only a slogan but an agricultural challenge. Farmers met it with record crops.

The boom in crop production had led inevitably to land speculation, and now the postwar aftermath of overexpanded acreage, topheavy mortgage indebtedness, declining values and surplus crops confronted the new Secretary, Edwin T. Meredith, for his brief tenure of 13 months, and his successor, Henry C. Wallace. The industrial depression of 1921, taking its toll of farm markets, added its murk to the already clouded agricultural landscape. The Department shifted its emphasis to marketing practices, cost-reducing methods, home economics.

Wallace died in office on October 25, 1924, and Assistant Secretary Howard M. Gore became Secretary a month later. Resigning in March 1925, to become Governor of West Virginia, Gore was succeeded by William M. Jardine, president of Kansas State College.

Jardine and his successor, Arthur M. Hyde, saw the somber state of agriculture falsely brightened by the reflected glow of an industrial boom and a rising stock market. Farm groups demanded further reforms: easier credit, lower freight rates, lower taxes, more aid in the farm cooperative movement. Hyde, heading Agriculture under President Hoover in March 1929, was soon to face the farm debris left by the now historic stock market crash. Meanwhile, the Federal Farm Board had been created, with authority on commodity stabilization and enabled to make loans from a $500 million fund.

By 1930 only 21.5 percent of all employed persons were farming, yet agricultural surpluses continued to plague the Department. Now it seemed that USDA and the land-grant colleges had taught production too well. Declining export markets aggravated the problem. Loans to Europe had virtually ceased; U.S. tariffs drew reprisals abroad in the form of barriers against our exports.

THE NEW DEAL AND WORLD WAR II

From 1933 to 1940, Secretary Henry A. Wallace seemed to change the countenance of American agriculture more than had all his predecessors combined. Though many of the New Deal's social and economic tenets had their roots in the past, and had been applied to agriculture under Jardine and Hyde, Wallace dramatized these principles, sometimes by actions that many deemed revolutionary.

Surplus commodities, low prices, and farm debt began to seem chronic agricultural ills. The Department focused its resources upon land utilization, elimination of waste, the balancing of crops and markets via such devices as the "ever-normal granary," and finding new industrial uses for farm products. An example of the last was the discovery, at USDA's Peoria laboratory, of corn steepwater's virtue in the production of penicillin.

The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 initiated crop and marketing controls. Surpluses were indeed reduced, but whether you credited the new farm program or the recordbreaking drought of 1934 perhaps depended upon your politics.

Other legislation reflecting governmental concern with the plight of agriculture, in the years 1933–38, included the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, and laws regulating farm mortgages, farm credit, soil erosion, rural electrification, flood control, surplus commodities, farm tenants, farm forestry, and crop insurance.

Secretary Wallace, now a candidate for the Vice Presidency, resigned from Agriculture in September 1940. Claude R. Wickard, an Indiana dirt farmer and Purdue graduate, had been Under Secretary, and he now succeeded Wallace in the top post.

Wallace had dealt with a long depression, and under his regime the Federal Government had become deeply and indeed personally involved with farmers everywhere. Other and equally grave responsibilities soon faced Wickard. World War II, with the suddenness of a thunderbolt, turned agriculture back to its old, almost forgotten aim of heavy production. For food was again a munition of war.

Organizing the agricultural front lines, Congress passed a great sheaf of new legislation and created many new agencies. The Department's wartime powers gave it far more authority than ever before. In its jurisdiction over the production and distribution of food, the Department touched the day-to-day life of every citizen.

Farmers answered history's greatest call by harvesting record crops in 1942 and 1943. Now only 18 percent of all employed persons were in agriculture, and even this figure declined through the Armed Forces buildup. Those left on the farm were often handicapped by shortages of materials. But, importantly, they knew their business. They knew how to farm, largely because the Department of Agriculture and the land-grant colleges had taught them, and their fathers, how to farm. New knowledge, uncovered by prior research but kept from full utilization by the long depression, was now applied to the hilt and helped produce the record wartime harvests.

EIGHTY—NINETY—ONE HUNDRED YEARS

CLINTON P. ANDERSON, Congressman from New Mexico, took office as Secretary in July 1945. He and his successor, Charles F. Brannan (ANDERSON resigned in 1948 to run for the Senate), faced an enormous postwar readjustment. Hitherto, agricultural problems had been largely national. Now they became international. Overseas, famine stalked across many lands. President Truman's famine relief program, in 1946, was immediately a USDA charge. A Famine Emergency Committee defined steps for the conservation of wheat, wheat products, food fats and oils.

Meanwhile, the constitution for the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization had been proposed, and agricultural groups abroad had joined with USDA in the U.N. Food and Agriculture Conference in 1943.

The Department's history under Ezra Taft Benson, in President Eisenhower's administration, and Orville L. Freeman, who succeeded Benson in January 1961, is so recent there is little need to recapitulate it here.

Benson was the first Secretary in years whose economic philosophy was rigidly opposed to price controls. The war years had geared farmers to heavy production; under both Benson and Freeman surplus crops have constituted the major agricultural malaise. Each has sought, in his own way, to effect a cure.

Freeman sees another grave problem looming in the future of agriculture, and he voiced it as recently as October 4, addressing the Graduate School of USDA. It concerns the displacement of the owner-operated, family farm by larger farms with heavier investment in machinery, access to greater credit, and hence higher production per dollar of cost. Mr. Freeman fears that able young farmers may thus be forced out of agriculture, and he acknowledges a governmental responsibility to help such men find other employment.

THE SECOND CENTURY?

The first century of the U.S. Department of Agriculture has paralleled the first century of U.S. industry. A hundred years ago the two were apart, separate entities in our economic and social life. Indeed the needs of one were often considered antipathetic to the needs of the other. As the century progressed, the two grew together, today they are interlocked and interdependent. Agriculture is said to provide 4 of every 10 jobs in private industry. Yet there could be no agriculture, as practiced today, without industry behind it, making its machines, fertilizers, chemicals, feeds. In utilizing agriculture's raw materials, industry has made the markets that have raised agriculture to its current peak.

Problems USDA has faced in its first hundred years may well appear trivial beside those that will challenge it between now and 2062. Anyone who lays his sights along the next decade can see at once a single and huge challenge to agriculture. Population, in a word. Reproduction of people challenging production of food. If we have 230 million people by 1975, as assuredly we shall unless the 50-megaton bombs begin to fall, agriculture will be faced with such extra food demands as these: 16.3 billion pounds of red meat, 47 billion pounds of milk, 20.7 million tons of fruits and vegetables, 20 billion eggs.

Likely agriculture can meet these quotas. But if the current rate of human reproduction is maintained, we will have 353 million people by the year 2000, and very close to a billion people by the close of USDA's second century.

Can agriculture feed them, on a total acreage that is shrinking day by day? Many authorities answer an unqualified yes, citing advancing farm science and greatly increased yields per acre. Others, haunted perhaps by the ghost of Malthus, shake a doubtful head or answer a flat no, and speak of ocean farming, exploiting that still-untapped 75 percent of the globe, as the key to future food.

But, considering the accomplishments of the Department and the land-grant colleges in their first century, all of us can be confident that the stewardship of our food, and our great-grandchildren's food, is in able hands for the next hundred years.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Davis of Tennessee, on February 22, on account of attendance at funeral of a friend.

Mr. Moore (at the request of Mr. Halleck), for February 21 and balance of week, on account of death in his family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Laird, for 15 minutes today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. Cooley (at the request of Mr. Albert), for 15 minutes today, on two subjects and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Hemphill (at the request of Mr. Albert), for 1 hour on Tuesday, next, February 27.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Roosevelt.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Albert) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Zelenko.

Mr. Hemphill.

Mr. Garmatz in two instances.

Mr. Downing.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Goodell) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Dague.

Mr. Dooley, to extend his remarks made in the Committee of the Whole and include a letter and a table.

Mr. Tupper.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table, and under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1126. An act to provide for the registration of contractors of migrant agricultural workers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

S. 1564. An act for the relief of Evangelos J. Marthakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1638. An act for the relief of Felix Ledina Mendoza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1841. An act for the relief of Maria Zambetoulla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1874. An act for the relief of Roland Fernando Mishutani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1881. An act for the relief of Maria La Bella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2101. An act for the relief of Aida Mary Sorino Boccalery; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 74. An act to reimburse the city of New York for expenditure of funds to rehabilitate slip 7 in the city of New York for use by the U.S. Army;

H.R. 258. An act to amend the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act to increase the rate of tax imposed on certain gross receipts, to amend the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Parking Facility Act of 1942 to transfer certain parking fees and other moneys to the highway fund, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1375. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the former owner thereof;

H.R. 4934. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to modify certain leases entered into for the provision of recreation facilities in reservoir areas;

H.R. 8625. An act for the relief of Dennis H. O'Grady;

H.R. 8842. An act to amend subsection (h) of section 124 of the Agricultural Enabling Amendments Act of 1961; and

H.R. 9013. An act to provide for the transfer of rice acreage history where producer withdraws from the production of rice.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 67. An act for the relief of Col. Samuel Hale;

S. 235. An act for the relief of Evagelos Mablekos;

S. 241. An act for the relief of Haralambos Agourakis;

S. 429. An act for the relief of Alc. Percy J. Trudeau.

S. 521. An act for the relief of Charles J. Utterback;

S. 531. An act for the relief of Eugenia Chrzastowski;

S. 1076. An act for the relief of Nancie Ellen Williamson;

S. 1348. An act for the relief of Sulzbach Construction Co.;

S. 1560. An act for the relief of Yasuko Otsu;

S. 1685. An act for the relief of Brigitte Marie Ida Kroll;

S. 1776. An act for the relief of Frances E. Sarcone;

S. 1791. An act for the relief of Dr. Tzycheng Peng;

S. 1832. An act for the relief of Susanne Rae Deremo;

S. 1866. An act for the relief of Dr. Berchmans Rioux;

S. 1870. An act for the relief of Lucia Bianca Cianto Rosa;

S. 2149. An act for the relief of Hugo Kolberg.

S. 2163. An act for the relief of Saifook Chan; and

S. 2385. An act for the relief of Dr. Hau Cheong Kwaan, his wife, Tech Phaik Koui Kwaan, and their daughter, Laura Wai Man Kwaan.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 22, 1962, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1727. A letter from the Chairman, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States, transmitting the 14th semiannual report of its activities as of June 30, 1961, pursuant to 64 Stat. 12; 22 U.S.C. App. 1621-1627, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1728. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on overcharges by the Shipbuilding Division of Bethlehem Steel Co., Quincy, Mass., for materials and supplies acquired for use under Government cost-type contracts; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1729. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on our fiscal year 1960 review of the education and training programs administered by the Veterans' Administration for the benefit of veterans of the Korean conflict and war orphans; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1730. A letter from the Director, Office of Administrative Operations, U.S. Department of Commerce, transmitting a report of foreign excess property disposed of during calendar year 1961 by the U.S. Department of Commerce, pursuant to Public Law 152, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1731. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 3470 of the Revised Statutes to authorize the heads of departments and independent agencies to appoint agents to bid on behalf of the United States, at sales, on execution at the suit of the United States, of lands or tenements of a debtor"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1732. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to declare that certain land of the United States is held by the United States in trust for the Prairie Band of Potawatomi Indians in Kansas"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1733. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain lands of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe of Indians to the Little Flower Mission of the St. Cloud Diocese"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1734. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to exclude deposits of petrified wood from appropriation under the U.S. mining laws"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1735. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting the sixth report of the Attorney General on competition in the synthetic rubber industry covering the industry's operation under private enterprise in the calendar year 1960, pursuant to Senate Report 117, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1736. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting the report of the Attorney General relating to the review of voluntary agreements and programs, pursuant to section 708(e) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. POWELL: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 10144. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment in certain cases because of race, religion, color, national origin, ancestry, or age; without amendment (Rept. No. 1370). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1371. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 9699. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to sell certain property owned by the District of Columbia located in Prince William County, Va., and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1372). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1691. An act to provide that any juvenile who has been determined delinquent by a district court of the United States may be committed by the court to the custody of the Attorney General for observation and study; without amendment (Rept. No. 1373). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8941. A bill to authorize acceptance of the gift made to the United States by the will of Esther Cattell Schmitt; without amendment (Rept. No. 1374). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1604. A bill for the relief of Spencer E. Hewitt; without amendment (Rept. No. 1375). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1918. A bill for the relief of John D. Morton; without amendment (Rept. No. 1376). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SHRIVER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3372. A bill for the relief of Barbara W. Trousil, Edward G. Trousil, and Robert E. Trousil; without amendment (Rept. No. 1377). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4563. A bill for the relief of Abraham Gelb; without amendment (Rept. No. 1378). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5686. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Willie Mae Brown; with amendment (Rept. No. 1379). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LINDSAY: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6076. A bill for the relief of Anna Maria Geyer; without amendment (Rept. No. 1380). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BATTIN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6272. A bill for the relief of Carl D. Soresi; with amendment (Rept. No. 1381). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MacGREGOR: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7549. A bill for the relief of the Lewis Invisible Machine Stitch Co., Inc., now known as Lewis Sewing Machine Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1382). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BATTIN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8886. A bill for the relief of Thelma E. McClench; without amendment (Rept. No. 1383). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BATTIN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8946. A bill for the relief of Mary R. Galotta; without amendment (Rept. No. 1384). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 9409. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Iris Ann Landrum; without amendment (Rept. No. 1385). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H.R. 10317. A bill to help achieve the objectives of the Employment Act of 1946 by providing standby authority to accelerate capital expenditure programs of the Federal Government and State and local public bodies; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 10318. A bill to help achieve the objectives of the Employment Act of 1946 by providing standby authority to accelerate capital expenditure programs of the Federal Government and State and local public bodies; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H.R. 10319. A bill to adjust the retirement and relief compensation of certain Police and Fire Department personnel of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 10320. A bill to establish an Office of Public Works Coordination and Acceleration; to authorize the preparation of a plan for acceleration of public works when necessary to avoid serious nationwide unemployment levels; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 10321. A bill to extend and improve the special education and rehabilitation services provided by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GLENN:

H.R. 10322. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to grant retirement credit for certain service in the U.S. merchant marine in World War II, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HALEY:

H.R. 10323. A bill to amend section 624 of title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Administrator to furnish hospital care and medical treatment for wartime service-connected disabilities to those veterans living abroad; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KARSTEN:

H.R. 10324. A bill to make permanent the existing temporary provision for approval of certain State plans for aid to the blind under title X of the Social Security Act which do not meet in full the requirements of such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 10325. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to replace the existing retailers excise taxes on jewelry, furs, toilet preparations, and luggage, etc., with equivalent manufacturers excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACK:

H.R. 10326. A bill making the 12th day of February in each year a legal holiday to be known as Lincoln's Birthday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H.R. 10327. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to confer insured status for disability insurance benefits thereunder upon disabled individuals who are not presently insured for such benefits but who were insured for such benefits at the time of the injury, or the inception of the disease or condition, which gave rise to their subsequent disabled condition; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 10328. A bill to place certain limitations on the authority of the Federal Communications Commission to delete previously allocated bands of frequencies, to give the Commission certain regulatory authority over television receiving apparatus, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H.R. 10329. A bill to provide for the recognition of the Polish Legion of American Veterans by the Secretary of Defense and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PURCELL:

H.R. 10330. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1961; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 10331. A bill to promote safe driving and eliminate the reckless and irresponsible driver from the streets and highways of the District of Columbia by providing that any person operating a motor vehicle within the District while apparently under the influence of intoxicating liquor shall be deemed to have given his consent to a chemical test of certain of his body substances to determine the alcoholic content of his blood, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 10332. A bill to amend section 341 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VINSON:

H.R. 10333. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a child's entitlement to child's insurance benefits shall continue despite his adoption by a great-aunt or great-uncle, the same as it would if he were adopted by a stepparent, grandparent, aunt, or uncle; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DORN (by request):

H.R. 10334. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to exclude expenses of the last illness and burial of a spouse from the annual income computation of a dependent parent in determinations of entitlement to dependency and indemnity compensation; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H.R. 10335. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, to promote quality and price stabilization, to define and restrain certain unfair methods of distribution and to confirm, define and equalize the rights of producers and resellers in the distribution of goods identified by distinguished brands, names, or trademarks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 10336. A bill to authorize the modification of the existing project for the New Melones Dam and Reservoir, Stanislaus River, Calif., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 10337. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide monthly insurance benefits for certain dependent parents of individuals entitled to old-age or disability insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SLACK:

H.R. 10338. A bill to amend the Randolph-Sheppard Vending Stand Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BARRY:

H.R. 10339. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow individual taxpayers the same 2-year carryover with respect to the deduction for charitable contributions as is presently provided for corporate taxpayers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H.R. 10340. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, to promote quality and price stabilization, to define and restrain certain unfair methods of distribution and to confirm, define, and equalize the rights of producers and resellers in the distribution of goods identified by distinguishing brands, names, or trademarks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KOWALSKI:

H.R. 10341. A bill to amend the act of June 30, 1936, the Walsh-Healey Act, to disallow certain items of excessive costs incurred by contractors and directly attributable to the employment of individuals to replace employees engaged in a strike against such contractor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUNKEL:

H.R. 10342. A bill to amend the Railway Labor Act to specify certain procedures for use by system, group, or regional boards of adjustment, including provision for the payment by the Mediation Board of compensation to referees sitting with such boards of adjustment; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 10343. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide that the spouse of an individual receiving a disability annuity may if otherwise qualified become entitled to a spouse's annuity regardless of whether such individual has attained age 65; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H.R. 10344. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to preserve the confidential nature of copies of information filed with the Bureau of the Census on a confidential basis; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 10345. A bill to amend section 503 of the Federal Aviation Act to provide substantive Federal law relating to the validity of conveyances which affect title to or interests in civil aircraft of the United States and related equipment; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 10346. A bill to provide for a conservation program for the Appalachian Highlands area; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H.R. 10347. A bill to provide that copies of information filed with the Bureau of the Census shall be immune from legal process, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TUPPER:

H.R. 10348. A bill to amend the Saltonstall-Kennedy Act so as to establish an additional fund for fishery research programs and fisheries rehabilitation and development projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mrs. WEIS:

H.R. 10349. A bill to amend chapter 14 of title 38, United States Code, to make all veterans awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor eligible for special pension; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.J. Res. 636. Joint resolution to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, to promote quality and price stabilization, to define and restrain certain unfair methods of distribution and to confirm, define, and equalize the rights of producers and resellers in the distribution of goods identified by distinguishing brands, names, or trademarks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MACK:

H.J. Res. 637. Joint resolution to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, to promote quality and price stabilization, to define and restrain certain unfair methods of distribution and to confirm, define, and equalize the rights of producers and resellers in the distribution of goods identified by distinguishing brands, names, or trademarks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H. Con. Res. 432. Concurrent resolution to prohibit training military personnel or aiding Communist nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H. Con. Res. 433. Concurrent resolution to prohibit training military personnel or aiding Communist nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. Con. Res. 434. Concurrent resolution to prohibit training military personnel or aiding Communist nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRANT:

H. Con. Res. 435. Concurrent resolution providing that no funds will be appropriated for the purpose of training military personnel from any Communist country or any country dominated by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BARRY:

H. Con. Res. 436. Concurrent resolution to explore an OECD Parliamentary Conference; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under Clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CORMAN (by request):

H.R. 10350. A bill for the relief of Sang Yong Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10351. A bill for the relief of Jung Sun Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DADDARIO:

H.R. 10352. A bill for the relief of Carmelo Rafala; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 10353. A bill for the relief of Lorenza Vedova-Rocchi Catta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAUND:

H.R. 10354. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elaine Childs Elser; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.J. Res. 638. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens who are serving in the U.S. Armed Forces; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1962

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of all worlds—

Lord of all being throned afar,
Thy glory flames from sun and star;
Center and soul of every sphere,
Yet to each loving heart how near.

Void of Thee, all is vanity, and life itself barren, joyless, robbed of its wonder, its dignity, and its beauty.

Without Thee even our wistful hopes for humanity are like winter's withered leaves, once verdant and bright—now crumpled ruins blown upon a bitter wind.

To these servants of this free land whose questing spirits seek the paths of a just peace through all the tangle and tragedy of these baffling days, may there come light out of darkness, concord out of discord, strength out of struggle, forgiveness out of guilt, and faith out of fear.

In the Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On the request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, February 20, 1962, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 67. An act for the relief of Col. Samuel Hale;

S. 235. An act for the relief of Evagelos Mablekos;

S. 241. An act for the relief of Haralambos Agourakis;

S. 429. An act for the relief of A1c. Percy J. Trudeau;

S. 521. An act for the relief of Charles J. Utterback;

S. 531. An act for the relief of Eugenia Chrzastowski;

S. 1076. An act for the relief of Nancie Ellen Williamson;

S. 1348. An act for the relief of the Sulzbach Construction Co.;

S. 1560. An act for the relief of Yasuko Otsu;

S. 1685. An act for the relief of Brigitte Marie Ida Kroll;

S. 1776. An act for the relief of Frances E. Sarcone;

S. 1791. An act for the relief of Dr. Tzycheng Peng;

S. 1832. An act for the relief of Susanne Rae Deremo;

S. 1866. An act for the relief of Dr. Berchmans Rioux;

S. 1870. An act for the relief of Lucia Bianca Cianto Rosa;

S. 2149. An act for the relief of Hugo Kolberg;

S. 2163. An act for the relief of Saifook Chan; and

S. 2385. An act for the relief of Dr. Hau Cheong Kwaan, his wife, Tech Phaik Loui Kwaan, and their daughter, Laura Wai Man Kwaan.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, it was ordered that statements in the morning hour be limited to 3 minutes.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Jack N. Behrman, of Delaware, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Maj. Gen. Harold Winfield Grant, of the U.S. Air Force, to be Deputy Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of G. Joseph Minetti, of New York, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board for the term of 6 years expiring December 31, 1967.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Amendment of Act Relating to District Training School

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for commitments to, maintenance in, and discharge from the District Training School, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1925, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Report of Board of Trustees of Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund

A letter from managing trustee and members of the board of trustees of the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund and Federal disability insurance trust fund, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that board, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

Report of Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States

A letter from the Chairman, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a semiannual report of that Commission, for the period ended June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Report on Overcharges by Shipbuilding Division of Bethlehem Steel Co., Quincy, Mass.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on overcharges by the shipbuilding division of Bethlehem Steel Co., Quincy, Mass., for materials and supplies acquired for use under Government cost-type contracts, dated February 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Review of Education and Training Programs for Korean Conflict Veterans and War Orphans, Veterans' Administration

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of education and training programs for Korean conflict veterans and for war orphans, Veterans' Administration, fiscal year 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Exclusion of Deposits of Petrified Wood From Appropriation Under U.S. Mining Laws

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to exclude deposits of petrified wood from appropriation under the U.S. mining laws (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Additional Appropriation for Rama Road

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize an additional appropriation for the Rama Road (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted at a mass meeting of American citizens of Lithuanian descent, at Racine, Wis., commemorating the 44th anniversary of Lithuanian independence; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE, MD.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, the City Council of Baltimore, Md., recently adopted a resolution requesting the Federal Government to take steps to preserve the facilities of the ship repair yards located in and around the city.

This is an extremely important matter, as is indicated in the resolution, and I ask unanimous consent that the city council's statement be printed in the Record and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Baltimore City Council Resolution Requesting the Federal Government To Take Steps To Preserve the Facilities of the Ship Repair Yards Located in Baltimore

The ship repair yards located in and around the port of Baltimore are in danger of being seriously depleted in personnel and facilities. This situation arises from drastic reductions in the number of employed workers.

Within the last 4 months, for example, the number of hourly workers employed in the Bethlehem Key Highway shipyard has dropped from approximately 2,600 to approximately 300, and it is understood that further reductions are contemplated.

These sharp drops in employment in the first instance cause hardship and misery to the employees and their families. They create havoc among the stores and shops in which these employees normally make their purchases. They cause, in general, serious adverse effects upon the entire economy of the city of Baltimore and of the State of Maryland.

They have further effects in addition which are of serious concern to the national economy and to the national safety. As more and more employees lose their jobs in the ship repair industries, they seek new avenues of employment. At the same time, young men who might normally be looking to the shipyards for gainful employment, go elsewhere. Within a short time their skills can be forever lost to the ship repair industry.

This industry, in turn, is one that will play a vital part in the event of any national emergency. In the maintenance of our national strength and security, particularly in the light of present international tensions, it is vital that the shipyards be maintained and that the skills to operate them be kept on a high and active level.

For this combination of community and national interests, it is of pressing importance that the ship repair yards in the Baltimore area be kept working on a high level of employment: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of Baltimore, That officials and agencies of the Government of the United States be requested to make every effort to maintain employment in the ship repair yards located in and around the port of Baltimore in order to help the individuals have gainful employment, and in the national interest, to preserve the skills and the facilities that would be so vitally necessary in the event of war; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the council be instructed to send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States and to each member of the Maryland delegation in the Congress of the United States.

TO PRINT ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1962—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 299); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Government Operations three thousand five hundred additional copies of the hearings on Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 2869. A bill to amend chapter 31 of title 38, United States Code, to afford additional time during which certain veterans blinded by reason of a service-connected disability may be afforded vocational rehabilitation training; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Yarborough when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McNAMARA:

S. 2870. A bill for the relief of Theodoros Skartsiaris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALMADGE:

S. 2871. A bill for the relief of Leonore Irene Margarete Gray; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. Keating):

S. 2872. A bill for the relief of Wen Tang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 2873. A bill for the relief of Claude S. Reeder and Reeder Motor Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. METCALF:

S. 2874. A bill to provide for rights-of-ways for highways for the purpose of ingress and egress to and from lands on the Crow Indian Reservation; and

S. 2875. A bill to authorize the sale or lease of Indian lands on the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 2876. A bill to extend the authority to insure mortgages under sections 809 and 810 of the National Housing Act, and to extend the coverage of section 810 to include persons employed at or in connection with an installation of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration or the Atomic Energy Commission; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 2877. A bill for the relief of Leonard Grillo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 2878. A bill for the relief of Chang Ah Lung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HRUSKA:

S. 2879. A bill to amend chapter 235 of title 18, United States Code, to provide for the appellate review of sentences imposed in criminal cases arising in the district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRD of West Virginia (for himself and Mr. Randolph):

S. 2880. A bill to provide for a conservation program for the Appalachian Highlands area; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. JOHNSTON:

S.J. Res. 157. Joint resolution authorizing the President to confer the Medal of Honor upon Lt. Col. John H. Glenn, U.S. Marine Corps; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. Johnston when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEATING:

S.J. Res. 158. Joint resolution designating February 20 of each year as Space Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Keating when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. Capehart, Mr. Proxmire, Mr. Johnston, Mr. McClellan, Mr. Scott, Mr. Randolph, and Mr. McCarthy):

S.J. Res. 159. Joint resolution to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, to promote quality and price stabilization, to define and restrain certain unfair methods of distribution and to confirm, define, and equalize the rights of producers and resellers in the distribution of goods identified by distinguishing brands, names, or trademarks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Humphrey when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading).

RESOLUTION

TO PRINT ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1962

Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 299) to print additional copies of the hearings on Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. McClellan, which appears under a separate heading.)

VOCATIONAL TRAINING EXTENSION FOR BLINDED VETERANS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to extend the time during which certain veterans blinded by reason of a service-connected disability may be afforded vocational rehabilitation training.

The purpose of this bill is to extend the termination date of the vocational rehabilitation program for a small class of blind veterans, who have unique problems arising from their service-connected disabilities which are not adequately covered by existing law. Under present law, vocational rehabilitation training for veterans will terminate on July 25, 1965, for World War II veterans, and on January 31, 1968, for Korean veterans. The legislation which I have introduced extends these dates for certain blind veterans until June 30, 1975.

The veterans affected by this legislation are World War II and Korean conflict veterans with service-connected disabilities. During the past several years, these veterans have been going blind at the rate of about 60 to 80 persons a year. It is anticipated that these veterans will continue to lose their vision at the same rate—60 to 80 annually—during the next decade.

A variety of acute problems arise from the fact that veterans are going blind over a protracted time period. Some veterans received vocational rehabilitation training while having normal or partial vision, but they have subsequently become totally blind. These individuals are presently in need of retraining, because their loss of vision prevents them from performing the duties of the occupation for which they trained. Other veterans have been self-supporting without resort to the rehabilitation program; however, they have lost their sight with the passage of time. These veterans also need special training to enable them to earn their livelihoods.

Mr. President, passage of this legislation would greatly benefit the veterans concerned and the populace as a whole. After receiving proper training, many blinded veterans are able to provide adequately for their families and dependents, and to make valuable contributions to their communities. Without such training, however, there is a danger that some blinded veterans will become a burden on their families and on society generally.

Although the benefits of the proposed legislation would be invaluable to blinded veterans and beneficial to our entire economy, the costs would be nominal. I very much hope that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare can consider the legislation at an early date and bring this matter back to the full Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter of George M. Gillispie, executive director of the Blinded Veterans Association, requesting the proposed legislation, be printed at this point in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2869) to amend chapter 31 of title 38, United States Code, to afford additional time during which certain veterans blinded by reason of a service-connected disability may be afforded vocational rehabilitation training, introduced by Mr. Yarborough, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The letter presented by Mr. Yarborough is as follows:

Blinded Veterans Association,
Washington, D.C., February 14, 1962.

Hon. Ralph Yarborough,
Committee on Labor and Public Welfare,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Yarborough: In support of legislation to extend training to veterans who are going blind, now at a rate of over 80 per year, we submit the following:

Veterans' Administration records now indicate that there are approximately 44,000 men drawing compensation for service-incurred eye injuries. It is from this group that men are now going blind.

Blindness being what it is, in most cases men need vocational training in order to reestablish themselves as useful citizens. Although some of these men have had vocational training since World War II, the objectives they have selected are not necessarily comparable with objectives a blind person must pursue. With the extension of the laws to include these newly blinded veterans, in many cases they will be able to regain their earning capacity even though they are blind. The Government now provides a fine compensation but at the present and for the next several years, most of us are faced with the most expensive decades of our careers. We have children ranging from 1 year to 16 years of age, and if the blinded veteran is to support and educate these children in a manner commensurate with today's expectations, he must be gainfully employed even though he be blind.

We of the Blinded Veterans Association, therefore, respectfully request that legislation be submitted and passed that will extend the training laws for blinded veterans of World War II and Korea.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE M. GILLISPIE,
Executive Director.

SPACE DAY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, Lt. Col. John Glenn's orbital flight, openly prepared for and publicly made, was a triumph for freedom. It was a triumph for the human spirit—which is facing the universe today. It was a monumental tribute to Colonel Glenn's own ability, to the scientists, engineers and technicians of the project—and perhaps no less to the patience and steady nerves of all concerned, who finally outwaited the weather and outwitted the elements.

Respectfully and reverently, we give thanks for John Glenn's safe return and we give thanks also for endowing mankind with the mental scope, the imagination, and the skill to explore the frontiers of scientific knowledge on earth and in the heavens. Today, in fact, we can well ask, with all humility:

> What is man, that Thou art mindful of him? For Thou hast made him a little lower than the angels, and has crowned him with glory and honor. Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of Thy hand; Thou hast put all things under his feet (Psalm 8: 4-6).

Mr. President, John Glenn's epochal flight literally carried this Nation into the future—blazing a trail of discovery across man's last frontier—the frontier of outer space. In view of the inexpressible significance of this leap from our planet into the great immensity of space, and this safe return, it strikes me that it would be most appropriate to set the date aside in our hearts and in our history to be officially designated as "Space Day."

In honor of the day and of the effort and of the continuing aspiration on the part of all men to face the unknown and to extend the knowledge of mankind, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to designate yesterday, February 20, as "Space Day." It is, appropriately enough, 2 days before the birthday of our beloved first President. President Washington extended the frontiers of constitutional experiment and political experience. Were he still alive, he would rejoice with us at this flight into outer space, by a citizen of the State which he guided upon its first weak and tottering steps.

I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

Mr. President, I hope very much that the joint resolution may receive favorable consideration by the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary which is headed by the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 158) designating February 20 of each year as "Space Day," introduced by Mr. KEATING, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> Whereas the flight of Colonel John Glenn is a triumph for the human spirit of achievement, for the many scientists, engineers and technologists who have worked on this program, and for the courage, ability and perseverance of Colonel Glenn himself; and
>
> Whereas the flight of Colonel John Glenn has extended the frontiers of American experience and of human knowledge on outer space and revealed to the world new vistas of study and exploration; and
>
> Whereas the entire American Nation offers congratulations to the brave men who have undertaken this program and offers its prayers to Almighty God for the success of these efforts in the future; and
>
> Whereas a token of recognition for this achievement is offered by an enthusiastic and grateful nation: Therefore be it
>
> *Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That February 20 of each year is hereby designated as Space Day, and the President of the United States is requested and authorized to issue annually a proclamation inviting the people of the United States to observe such a day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

QUALITY STABILIZATION ACT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce on behalf of myself and Senators CAPEHART, PROXMIRE, JOHNSTON, MCCLELLAN, SCOTT, RANDOLPH, and MCCARTHY, a joint resolution entitled the "Quality Stabilization Act."

In essence, the joint resolution introduced today is carefully designed to strengthen our antitrust laws by suppressing certain unfair methods of competition generally acknowledged as promotive of monopoly in distribution. Toward this end, the joint resolution empowers the owner of products identified by his trademark or brand name to prevent distributors handling his products from using such methods in reselling the trademarked or branded products, and thus damaging the mark or brand and associated good will. Whenever a trademark or brand name owner discovers his products being used by a distributor in any scheme involving first, misrepresentation; second, bait merchandising; or third, sales at other than the established price, he may revoke the offending distributor's right to use his mark or brand in reselling such goods. In addition, the trademark or brand name owner is entitled to injunctive relief, if the offending distributor disregards the notice of revocation and continues the challenged sales practices.

In legal theory, too, the proposed legislation is easily understandable. Basically, no more is involved than recognition of first, the property values inhering in business good will and in trademark or brand name adopted to maintain and extend it, and second, the need to protect by appropriate remedies such property rights from marketing practices producing injury.

In this light, the joint resolution is seen as merely an extension of our trademark and copyright laws—an extension enabling a trademark or brand owner to protect his property rights through the channels of distribution. Certainly, if we accept the right to own property and the corresponding right to protect such property—which are basic rights of every American citizen—then we must accept the objective of the "Quality Stabilization" joint resolution—protection of valuable investments in trademarks, brand names, and goodwill from ruinous marketing tactics. We seek to establish in the market place fair competitive practices.

It should be noted that nothing in this joint resolution would bar a distributor from removing the trademark or brand name from the product—thus separating the physical property, which he owns, from the goodwill, which is another's property—and then selling the commodity at his own price or in his own way, so long as he does so without making use of the goodwill of the latter to reach his end.

In reviewing the nature and purpose of the proposed legislation, I should like to stress the permissive character of its provisions. There is no obligation upon the trademark or brand name owner to avail himself of the rights accorded him under the proposed legislation. It is conceivable that the owner may not be interested in protecting his goodwill, trademark, or brand name from the unfair methods of competition defined in this bill. But whatever his decision, it will be his own. No one may force him to decide either way. Whether he does so act or not will be his own decision, provided his products are in free and open competition with other similar products. Similarly, those engaged in merchandise distribution—that is, the wholesalers and retailers—will not in any way be obliged to handle trademarked or branded merchandise subject to the "quality stabilization" joint resolution. As always, they will decide for themselves what products they will stock and offer for sale. American consumers, too, will enjoy full freedom of choice under the joint resolution; they will be free to accept or reject all merchandise, to pick and choose between "protected" and "unprotected" products.

It is in the interest of consumers that we encourage independent retailing and fair competitive practices. Our huge productive capacity turns out tremendous quantities of goods which provide us with a standard of living higher than that of any other country in the world. In order to distribute efficiently, our free enterprise system needs hundreds of thousands of independent retail dealers, as well as chainstore outlets. We need retailers who are responsive to the needs and wants of their customers. A system which includes hundreds of thousands of independent retailers protects the consumer against monopolistic tendencies and resultant higher prices.

The fair competitive practices which are promoted under this proposal assure the consumer that quality tested and reliable products will continue to be available. As the late Associate Justice Holmes once said:

> I cannot believe that in the long run the public will profit by permitting knaves to cut reasonable prices for some ulterior purpose of their own and thus to impair, if not destroy, the production and sale of articles which are assumed to be desirable that the public should be able to get.

Also, in terms of the economic health of the independent business community, this legislation is long overdue. According to Dun & Bradstreet's annual report on business failures, more small firms failed last year than in any year since 1933. Over 17,000 concerns, almost all small, failed last year, reflecting an 1,190 increase over 1960's bankruptcy total. Dun & Bradstreet's reported:

> Wholesalers suffered the steepest rise in casualties, with building materials, chemicals, and drug fields bearing the brunt of it. An upturn in retailing failures appeared in all major lines except appliances and television. Drug stores, general merchandise stores, auto dealers, and service stations had tolls running from 16 to 23 percent higher than in 1960.

Enactment of this proposed legislation is essential to the competitive survival of hundreds of thousands of independent businessmen in all parts of the country. Most important, its enactment will make possible the advancement of independent retailing, and, thereby, will add significant social and economic values to our free enterprise society. I know most Americans agree that independent business in America is worthy of preservation. It is the key—the strength—of a free economy based on healthy and fair competition.

At the same time, this joint resolution can do much to restore the confidence of the American consuming public in the quality standards of available merchandise and the fairness of applicable prices. No longer will the ethics of the marketplace be determined by the price-juggling operator who cuts prices on the "stars of the merchandise world", and recoups his losses by selling lesser known, higher-profit-margin goods. Replacing such practices of the "Oriental Bazaar" will be fair, honest, and vigorous competition for the favor of the consumer.

With these considerations in mind, the joint resolution deserves favorable consideration by the Senate at this session of Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution remain at the desk until the close of business on Monday next, so that other Senators who may wish to join in sponsoring it may have an opportunity to do so; and I also ask unanimous consent that the text of the joint resolution be printed at this point in the Record, along with a press release prepared by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Capehart] and myself.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution and release will be printed in the Record, and the joint resolution will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Minnesota.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 159) to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, to promote quality and price stabilization, to define and restrain certain unfair methods of distribution and to confirm, define, and equalize the rights of producers and resellers in the distribution of goods identified by distinguishing brands, names, or trademarks, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Humphrey (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S.J. Res. 159

Whereas it is recognized that, in the chain of distribution of products so identified, there may be encountered resellers having predatory interests and committing, in the resale of such products, unfair or deceptive acts or practices (such as, but not limited to, store-traffic baiting, and misrepresentation as to the size, capacity, quality, condition, model, or age of the goods), all tending to destroy unfairly the value to its owner, to smaller resellers, and to the public, of the brand, name, or trademark, and tending to disable and destroy competition, thus to create monopoly of retail distribution, contrary to public interest; and

Whereas the above-recited deceptive acts and practices and unfair methods of competition tend to diminish the volume of such identified products moving in commerce by adversely affecting the demand for such goods, thereby impairing the producer's ability, and reducing his incentive, to maintain and increase, with relation to price, the value of such goods to the public, or to maintain and increase opportunities for employment, or pay rates for labor, in his factory; and

Whereas substitutions of inferior labor and materials forced by the downward spiral of unrestrained predatory pricing on popular identified products, in the fields of foods, drugs, and beverages, endanger public health and, in other fields, endanger public safety; and

Whereas it is recognized that unless fair competitive practices can be maintained in all appropriate stages in the distribution of such identified products, the marketing of such identified products is depressed and the quality thereof tends to deteriorate; and

Whereas the distinguishing brand, name, or trademark of a product, and trade and public goodwill associated therewith, constitute property, the rights to which are entitled to protection by the owner thereof despite transfer of the product itself; and

Whereas, in order to remove the above-recited obstructions to commerce, and to remove the quality-deteriorating and value-diluting pressures resulting therefrom, in the manufacture and resale of products bearing distinguishing brands, names, or trademarks, it is found and declared that it is in the public interest to define, confirm, and implement said property rights: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) this Act may be cited as the "Quality Stabilization Act".

(b) Section 5(a) of the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding, at the end thereof, paragraphs (7) to (14), inclusive, as follows:

"(7) The owner of a brand, name, or trademark shall be deemed to retain his property rights therein, and in the trade and public goodwill symbolized thereby, regardless of any sale or transfer of the goods to which such brand, name, or trademark relates, and no such sale or transfer shall be deemed to diminish or extinguish any such rights. Any person who resells in commerce goods identified by a distinguishing brand, name, or trademark, either on the label, container, dispenser thereof, or otherwise, may rightfully employ such brand, name, or trademark, but only in effecting the resale of such goods, and subject to the provisions of paragraph (8) hereof.

"(8) When goods usable for the same general purpose are available to the public from sources other than the owner of such brand, name, or trademark, the right of any person to employ such brand, name, or trademark in effecting resale of goods so identified may be revoked by the owner of such brand, name, or trademark, on written notice, for any of the following reasons:

"(a) that the person reselling such goods has employed goods bearing the brand, name, or trademark in furtherance of bait merchandising practices;

"(b) that the person reselling such goods, with knowledge of the owner's currently established resale price or prices, has advertised, offered for sale, or sold such goods at prices other than such currently established resale prices; or

"(c) that the person reselling such goods, with intent to deceive purchasers, has published misrepresentation concerning such goods.

"(9) Nothing herein shall be interpreted to abridge the right of a person, in the regular course of his business and within a reasonable time after the date of any revocation pursuant to paragraph (8) of this subsection, to sell all such goods of which on such date he is possessed: *Provided,* That in such sale he shall commit none of the acts described in paragraph (8) of this subsection: *Provided, however,* That if and in the event that such person, promptly upon such revocation, shall have supplied to the owner of said brand name, or trademark a correct itemized listing of said inventory with a statement of the price paid per item and the total price paid therefor, together with a firm offer to sell and deliver all said inventory to said owner at any time within ten days thereafter upon payment of said total price, then such person, upon expiration of the ten-day term of said offer without acceptance, may so sell such goods in said inventory, in the regular course of his business and within a reasonable time thereafter, without restriction as to price, in which event each advertisement of, or offer to sell, such goods, shall state plainly that the right of the reseller, offering such goods, to employ in any way the brand, name, or trademark carried by the goods has been revoked as to any such goods not in that reseller's possession at the time of such revocation.

"(10) Any person whose right to employ a brand, name, or trademark has been revoked by the owner thereof pursuant to the provisions of paragraphs (8) and (9) of this subsection and who thereafter, without the express written consent of said owner, first had, resells such goods so identified, or who otherwise employs such brand, name, or trademark in effecting resale of such goods or any other goods, shall be deemed to have committed an act of unfair competition and shall be liable in a civil action for damages and injunctive relief by the owner of the brand, name, or trademark, to prevent and restrain further violations of this Act. Such owner may sue in any district court of the United States in the district in which defendant resides or is found or has an agent, without respect to the amount in controversy, and may recover the cost of suit including reasonable attorneys' fees.

"(11) In any proceeding under paragraph (10) it shall be a defense to the charge of unfair competition for the defendant to establish that the plaintiff has not used due diligence in revoking the right of all other persons in substantial competition with the defendant who are known to plaintiff to be committing any of the acts set forth in subparagraphs (a), (b), and (c) of paragraph (8) hereof.

"(12) No action pursuant hereto shall preclude action otherwise provided by law for wrongful use of a brand, name, or trademark.

"(13) Paragraphs (7) to (12) hereof shall apply to all acts and transactions in or affecting commerce which Congress may lawfully regulate, and to all acts and transactions in any territory of the United States or in the District of Columbia. As used in paragraphs (7) to (12) hereof, the term 'person' means any individual, partnership, or corporation.

"(14) No exercise of any right or remedy provided in paragraphs (7) to (13) inclusive of this subsection shall be construed to be a violation of any of the Antitrust Acts, and all such rights and remedies shall be also available to any owner of a brand, name, or trademark who, in the resale of goods identified by such brand, name, or trademark, shall compete, at any level of distribution, with any reseller offering such goods: *Provided*, That such owner shall sell such identified goods at any level of distribution at the price established for that level of distribution: *And provided further*, That nothing in this Act shall be deemed to modify or repeal the Lanham Trademark Act, Public Law 489, approved July 5, 1946; the Miller-Tydings Act, Public Law 314, approved August 17, 1937; the McGuire Fair Trade Act, Public Law 342, approved July 14, 1952, or any State law described therein."

The release presented by Mr. HUMPHREY is as follows:

NEWS RELEASE

WASHINGTON, February 21.—Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, for himself and Senators HOMER E. CAPEHART, Republican, of Indiana; WILLIAM PROXMIRE, Democrat, of Wisconsin; OLIN JOHNSTON, Democrat, of South Carolina; JOHN MCCLELLAN, Democrat, of Arkansas; HUGH SCOTT, Republican, of Pennsylvania; and JENNINGS RANDOLPH, Democrat, of West Virginia, today jointly introduced the bipartisan quality stabilization bill. Senators CAPEHART and HUMPHREY jointly issued the following statement:

"The quality stabilization bill fills a need for statutory protection of certain basic property rights.

"The U.S. Supreme Court in its decisions has recognized the existence of property rights in the goodwill associated with trademark and names. The proposed Quality Stabilization Act not only confirms these property rights, but provides the owners thereof with means to implement those rights.

"We are also privileged to say that Representative OREN HARRIS, Democrat, of Arkansas; Representative RAY J. MADDEN, Democrat, of Indiana; Representative THOR TOLLEFSON, Republican, of Washington; and Representative PETER MACK, Democrat, of Illinois, will introduce the quality stabilization bill in the House.

"The Quality Stabilization Act will be completely voluntary in operation. No manufacturer is, or can be, compelled to utilize the act. The act gives the manufacturer the optional right to build his trademarked product up to a standard of quality and value by stabilizing the resale price for that product to be sold in competition with products made to be sold at any price that suits the retailer.

"The wholesaler, retailer, and consumer each has a choice to buy or sell—or not to buy, or not to sell—the price-stabilized product. The quality stabilization bill is not directed toward any specific class of reseller. It is directed instead toward the protection of property rights in the trademark against destructive, deceptive unfair practices regardless of who commits them or where they are committed.

"The quality stabilization bill follows generally a principle of protecting resellers and the public by empowering the manufacturer to safeguard, against defamation, his property rights in his brand name or trademark. A prime purpose of the bill is to protect the public against deterioration of product quality. Such deterioration can be forced by relentless demands for cheapening of labor and materials so as to permit lower and lower retail prices. The consumer little suspects that quality disappears much faster than production costs can be reduced.

"Senator MAGNUSON, chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, has advised us that a subcommittee of that committee will conduct hearings on this bill in early March. We anticipate that the subcommittee will hear fully the views of the many segments of our economy that consider it vital that this legislation be enacted in this session of Congress.

"There is now unanimity within the small business community of the Nation behind the quality stabilization bill. More than 50 national trade associations of manufacturers and resellers are giving vigorous support to this quality stabilization bill."

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I am happy to join with the able Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and other Senators in the introduction of this joint resolution.

The Senator from Minnesota and I have spent a great deal of time on the joint resolution. We think it is badly needed in order to protect some 4 million small businesses in America, and it is also badly needed in order to protect the consuming public.

I very strongly urge enactment of the joint resolution; and I feel certain that it will help put a stop to the many, many bankruptcies which are occurring at the moment among small businesses in America. At the moment, more bankruptcies are occurring than at any other time since the deep depression.

The joint resolution is aimed at assisting small businessmen and at protecting the consumers; and, in my opinion, the joint resolution will do just that.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement I have prepared, in addition to my remarks in connection with the introduction of the joint resolution.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CAPEHART

I proudly join with my distinguished colleagues in reintroducing the bipartisan quality stabilization bill.

I am delighted to announce that there is for all practical purposes unanimity within the small business community of the Nation in support of this bill.

More than 50 national trade associations of manufacturers and resellers are on record as favoring vigorously the quality stabilization bill, and the list grows daily.

The fervency of this support for the quality stabilization bill, the intense interest in this proposed legislation, is reflected in Ray Reed's column appearing in Home Furnishings Daily of last Wednesday, February 14. Here's what this distinguished columnist had to say about the quality stabilization bill:

"Every independent retailer of home goods should actively and vociferously support the quality stabilization bill which is scheduled to come up for vote in this 87th Congress.

"He shouldn't expect 'the other fellows' to write their duly elected representatives, express their enthusiastic approval. But, as an independent retailer, interested in his own business welfare and survival, he should register his individual endorsement and reasons why, add his name to the roster of orthodox service retailers who want their representatives to vote for more stabilization in the marketplace.

"The quality stabilization bill seeks fair play, not fair trade, in the distribution of brand-name products. Realistically, it recognizes that in our dog-eat-dog, discount-off-of-discount economy trying to establish a fair traded list price by lengthy and involved legislation is a utopian impossibility.

"It aims to protect the manufacturer from those cutthroats who would despoil his name and brand acceptance; to protect the independent, service-minded retailer from unethical competition which 'cons' instead of considers the consumer and his best, personal interests.

"The quality stabilization bill enables the manufacturer to keep his hard-won product birthright, not give it away on every resale order he ships. The bill provides that a manufacturer who has built a brand name retains a property right in that brand name, can specify the conditions under which the brand name may be used, can take legal action and revoke the right to use the brand name if those conditions are violated.

"Let's quit shadowboxing on the discount facts of life. Which brand name lines are the discounters most hellbent to get, to despoil, to hang on their barn door of cut price? Isn't it those lines whose birthright and market right have been most scrupulously protected through clean, strictly administered distribution, by sales executives who have had the guts, fight and foresight to protect their highly desirable franchises which took them years to build?

"We don't have to name names. If you've been around, in the home goods business for a few years, you should know by now, should be able to separate the determined men, who have made their franchise mean something, from the weak-willed boys who swap it for a mess of pottage.

"The quality stabilization bill is not slanted to put the discounter out of business, but is honestly aimed to keep the independent service-retailer in business—keep our national distributive economy in healthy, balanced condition. It encourages rather than discourages free enterprise. But it does penalize the ruthless wrecking of established brand names, established brand qualities and consumer confidence in those two buying standards.

"It will affect discounters or other retailers only to the extent that they engage in deceptive and unfair practices involving those products which manufacturers elect to place under quality stabilization. It provides the manufacturer with the legal and equitable right to protect his product trademark, birthright, and market acceptance which have taken him years of integrity, determination, retailer/consumer loyalty to establish.

"Significantly, the National Retail Hardware Association, representing 22,000 independent retail hardware stores, has just announced its united, 'all-out support of the quality stabilization bill.'

"What are you other independents and your associations doing about it? Will you stand up and be counted or watchfully wait while the roof falls in?"

There are many reasons why I personally am working so hard to get this bill enacted this year.

One reason is what the businessmen of my home State of Indiana have told me. These merchants are honorable, straightforward men—men worried about the plight of small business in this country. They're not asking the Federal Government for a subsidy or a handout, only for legislation to promote fair competition in America.

The small retailer is in trouble because he himself is not becoming a party to unfair competition. He will not deceive his customers by joining the ranks of the destructive loss-leader operator.

The loss-leader operator travels a parasitic road of distribution. Unjustly he enriches himself by using someone else's property to attract more customers, to reap unholy profits—all to the detriment of his honest competitors and to the ultimate detriment of the consumer.

Bankruptcies last year were higher than any year since the terrible depression of 1933. There is a direct linkage, a cause and effect relationship, between these skyrocketing bankruptcies and the absence in this country of effective quality-price stabilization legislation.

Another reason for my enthusiastic support of the quality stabilization bill is that I know this story—backward and forward—from the point of view of the manufacturer. I was proud enough of the products that I built that I put my own brand name, "CAPEHART," on those products. The theorists allege the manufacturer has no real interest in the orderly distribution of his products—that he gets his profit so why should he kick how the sale is made to the consumer.

Nothing could be further from the truth.

The bulk of my distribution of "Capehart" products came from small business. Most manufacturers prefer it that way. When he depends on a handful of outlets for his sales, he's in trouble. He's subjected to all kinds of pressure for a lower and lower price, and, if he can't deliver, some other manufacturer gets the order. So, to meet such pressures, the manufacturer must sacrifice quality. Instead of attempting to find ways to add quality to his product, his research and development department for all practical purposes is closed. All emphasis is on cost-cutting in production. Quality materials, quality labor are sacrificed. The consumer is hurt, because he is going to get less and less value per dime he invests in the product. And the interest of the consumer is the third and primary reason I support the quality stabilization bill.

The loss-leader operators have created a mercantile monster that threatens to destroy the American economy. By squeezing the incentive to make high-quality products, these "fast buck" operators force manufacturers to make increasingly greater cuts in quality to meet further demands for additional price cuts.

Thus begins a vicious cycle—a cycle that encourages manufacturers to make unrealistic reductions in labor costs and the quality of their products; a cycle that prompts manufacturers to disable their distribution system by eliminating the valuable services rendered by their wholesalers; a cycle that forces retailers to curtail traditional customer services in an effort to cut prices further; a cycle that ultimately gives the consumer less and less value for his dime or dollar invested in the product.

I, too, join my colleagues in urging quick and favorable consideration of the quality stabilization bill by this Congress.

NATIONAL TRADE ASSOCIATIONS SUPPORTING THE QUALITY STABILIZATION BILL

Quality Brands Associates of America, Inc.

National Association of Retail Druggists.

National Retail Hardware Association.

National Retail Furniture Association.

National Association of Retail Clothiers & Furnishers.

National Appliance and Radio-TV Dealers Association.

National Sporting Goods Association.

National Office Machine Dealers Association.

Retail Jewelers of America.

Master Photo Dealers & Finishers Association.

Independent Garage Owners of America.

Toy Wholesalers' Association of America.

Wholesale Stationers' Association.

National Stationery & Office Equipment Association.

National Wholesale Jewelers Association.

Associated Fishing Tackle Manufacturers.

Archery Manufacturers & Dealers Association.

National Association of House to House Installment Companies, Inc.

Marine Manufacturers Safety Equipment Association.

Gift & Decorative Accessories Association of America.

Sporting Goods Jobbers Association.

Billiard and Bowling Institute of America.

American Watch Association, Inc.

Automotive Service Industry Association.

Fountain Pen & Mechanical Pencil Manufacturers' Association, Inc.

National Wholesale Hardware Association.

Watch Material Distributors of America.

National Association of Bedding Manufacturers.

The National Association of Shirt, Pajama & Sportswear Manufacturers.

National Industrial Distributors Association.

Christian Booksellers Association.

National Small Business Men's Association.

National Congress of Petroleum Retailers.

National Shoe Manufacturers Association.

Wallcovering Wholesalers Association.

American Research Merchandising Institute.

American Retailers Association.

National Art Materials Trade Association.

Motor & Equipment Manufacturers Association.

National Shoe Retailers Association.

Northamerican Heating & Airconditioning Wholesalers, Inc.

American Watch Manufacturers Association.

National Association of Women's & Children's Apparel Salesmen, Inc.

National Audio-Visual Association, Inc.

National Bicycle Dealers Association, Inc.

National Office Furniture Association, Inc.

National Outerwear & Sportswear Association.

The Automotive Warehouse Distributors Association, Inc.

National Frozen Food Association, Inc.

American Association of Small Business.

National Association of Glove Manufacturers.

National Marine Products Association.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to say that I have had the privilege of working very closely on this joint resolution with the Senator from Indiana. Both of us are convinced that the joint resolution is in the public interest and will do much to strengthen our free-enterprise, competitive economy.

I am indebted to the Senator from Indiana for his very able guidance and legislative assistance. He is a famous businessman who is highly respected as a leader in that field; and I join him in expressing the hope that at this session of Congress, much needed legislation of this sort will be enacted.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, as I said before, the able Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] has been very, very helpful in connection with this joint resolution; and I honestly believe that it will be in the best interests of the 4 to 5 million small businesses and the consumers, and also will be in the interest of creating many jobs. At this time more work, more jobs, and a healthier business community in the United States are definitely needed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1288. An act for the relief of Stanley Hayman & Co., Inc.;

H.R. 1348. An act for the relief of William Burnice Joyner;

H.R. 1352. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Aniello;

H.R. 1451. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elfriede Prischl Rogers;

H.R. 1588. An act for the relief of Fong Kai Dong;

H.R. 1615. An act for the relief of Francis Janis and certain other Indians;

H.R. 1671. An act for the relief of Edvige Cianciulli;

H.R. 1697. An act for the relief of Viola Borwick Warbis;

H.R. 2684. An act for the relief of Mohan Singh;

H.R. 2839. An act for the relief of Mildred Love Hayley;

H.R. 3696. An act for the relief of Gertrude M. Kaplan;

H.R. 5652. An act for the relief of Kevork Teroian;

H.R. 6075. An act for the relief of Capt. H. A. Rowe;

H.R. 6082. An act for the relief of Mrs. Vartanus Uzar;

H.R. 6276. An act for the relief of Athanasia Dekazos;

H.R. 6343. An act for the relief of Mrs. Izabel A. Miguel;

H.R. 6464. An act for the relief of Cecil D. Rose;

H.R. 6740. An act for the relief of Teofilo Estoesta;

H.R. 7671. An act for the relief of Louanna L. Leis;

H.R. 7704. An act for the relief of Chyung Sang Bak;

H.R. 7708. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Gerald Beaver;

H.R. 7777. An act for the relief of Elisabetta Piccioni;

H.R. 8195. An act for the relief of Ronald L. Mutter;

H.R. 8368. An act for the relief of A. Eugene Congress;

H.R. 8422. An act for the relief of Sister M. Theophane (Jane Carroll);

H.R. 8482. An act for the relief of Paul J. Pericle;

H.R. 8515. An act for the relief of James R. Banks;

H.R. 8628. An act for the relief of Joseph A. Tedesco;

H.R. 9059. An act for the relief of Maj. Leonard H. Potterbaum, U.S. Air Force;

H.R. 9060. An act for the relief of Rhea G. Burgess;

H.R. 9188. An act to relieve Theodore A. Anderson from loss of agricultural conservation program benefits;

H.R. 9596. An act for the relief of Daniel E. Moore;

H.R. 9597. An act for the relief of James N. Tull;

H.R. 9830. An act for the relief of John B. Hogan;

H.R. 9831. An act to provide relief for the heirs and devisees of Fly and Her Growth, deceased Lower Brule Indian allottees; and

H.R. 10050. An act to provide for a further temporary increase in the public debt limit set forth in the Second Liberty Bond Act.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 431) extending the congratulations and warm good wishes of the Congress to Lt. Col. John H. Glenn, Jr., U.S. Marine Corps, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1288. An act for the relief of Stanley Hayman & Co., Inc.;

H.R. 1348. An act for the relief of William Burnice Joyner;

H.R. 1352. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Aniello;

H.R. 1451. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elfriede Prischl Rogers;

H.R. 1588. An act for the relief of Fong Kai Dong;

H.R. 1615. An act for the relief of Francis Janis and certain other Indians;

H.R. 1671. An act for the relief of Edvige Cianciulli;

H.R. 1697. An act for the relief of Viola Borwick Warbis;

H.R. 2684. An act for the relief of Mohan Singh;

H.R. 2839. An act for the relief of Mildred Love Hayley;

H.R. 3696. An act for the relief of Gertrude M. Kaplan;

H.R. 5652. An act for the relief of Kevork Teroian;

H.R. 6075. An act for the relief of Capt. H. A. Rowe;

H.R. 6082. An act for the relief of Mrs. Vartanus Uzar;

H.R. 6276. An act for the relief of Athanasia Dekazos;

H.R. 6343. An act for the relief of Mrs. Izabel A. Miguel;

H.R. 6464. An act for the relief of Cecil D. Rose;

H.R. 6740. An act for the relief of Teofilo Estoesta;

H.R. 7671. An act for the relief of Louanna L. Leis;

H.R. 7704. An act for the relief of Chyung Sang Bak;

H.R. 7708. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Gerald Beaver;

H.R. 7777. An act for the relief of Elisabetta Piccioni;

H.R. 8195. An act for the relief of Ronald L. Mutter;

H.R. 8368. An act for the relief of A. Eugene Congress;

H.R. 8422. An act for the relief of Sister M. Theophane (Jane Carroll);

H.R. 8482. An act for the relief of Paul J. Pericle;

H.R. 8515. An act for the relief of James R. Banks;

H.R. 8628. An act for the relief of Joseph A. Tedesco;

H.R. 9059. An act for the relief of Maj. Leonard H. Potterbaum, U.S. Air Force;

H.R. 9060. An act for the relief of Rhea G. Burgess;

H.R. 9188. An act to relieve Theodore A. Anderson from loss of agricultural conservation program benefits;

H.R. 9596. An act for the relief of Daniel E. Moore;

H.R. 9597. An act for the relief of James N. Tull;

H.R. 9830. An act for the relief of John B. Hogan; and

H.R. 9831. An act to provide relief for the heirs and devisees of Fly and Her Growth, deceased Lower Brule Indian allottees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10050. An act to provide for a further temporary increase in the public debt limit set forth in the Second Liberty Bond Act; to the Committee on Finance.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. WILEY:

Statement prepared by himself urging the establishment of a special Transportation Agency within the Defense Department.

By Mr. HILL:

Article entitled "Congressman ROBERTS Reports on Expanding Federal Accident Prevention Activities," written by Representative KENNETH A. ROBERTS, of Alabama, and published in the February 1962 issue of the Journal of the American Society of Safety Engineers.

HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION AND STREAM CONSERVATION

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, on January 30 I introduced S. 2767, to save our vanishing streams from the roadbuilders.

It would require approval of the Secretary of Interior of Federal-aid highway plans involving fish, wildlife, and recreation resources. The bill would require the Secretary to consult with appropriate State agencies.

I have had a considerable amount of mail in support of this proposal. But some of my correspondents suggest that this be left in the hands of the States.

That this has not worked is demonstrated in State after State. The President's Pollution Control Advisory Board considers highway construction as a major cause of sediment pollution and stream destruction. Some 1,200 miles of trout streams in the Black Hills have been reduced to 160 miles. South Dakota biologists attribute the major portion of this loss to highway construction and the resultant sediment pollution.

A 1961 survey of only a few of the streams in Montana showed 78.4 miles of original channel lost to highway construction.

In Montana, leaving this question in the hands of the State has meant leaving it in the hands of the highway department, which has demonstrated no concern for protecting valuable natural resources. In the words of Director Walt Everin, of the Montana Fish and Game Department:

> We have made several requests to the Montana Highway Department that sections of proposed highways be rerouted to avoid damaging trout streams. To date, we have not had a major request granted.

LT. COL. JOHN H. GLENN, JR., AND THE STATE OF OHIO

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the heroic achievement of Lt. Col. John Glenn makes me prouder of Ohio than I have ever been before.

John Glenn is the son of an Ohio family living in the small, rustic university town of New Concord, on the old National Trail that connected the East, and finally wound its way to the Pacific.

As the little band of 48 pioneers forged their way from the Atlantic coast across the Appalachian Mountains, toward new horizons, carving the settlement of Marietta, Ohio, out of the wilderness of the Northwest Territory in 1788, so Colonel Glenn, with the same ruggedness, determination, devotion, and deep religious convictions, also sought and found new horizons.

I hope my fellow Senators will not deem me vain if I take this occasion to make brief mention of some of the contributions Ohio has made to science, literature, art, government, economy, and the social evolution of our Nation.

The rollcall of Ohioans runs from Johnny Appleseed, who planted orchards, to David Zeisberger, who taught the Indians; from Ebenezer Zane, who hacked out the first road, to Caleb Atwater, who roamed the State and wrote the first Ohio history. That long roll includes scientists and inventors, such as Edison, Kettering, and the Wright Brothers; schoolmen, such as McGuffey—with his McGuffey readers—Spencer and Ray; men of letters, such as William Dean Howells and Sherwood Anderson; humanitarians, such as Samuel Jones and Edward Allen, whose statue is here in the Capitol; military leaders, such as Grant, Sherman, Sheridan, Custer, and King; industrialists, such as Rockefeller, Proctor, Firestone, and Mather; civic leaders, such as Brand Whitlock, Tom Johnson, and Newton D. Baker; statesmen who subsequently became President of the United States—Garfield, Grant, Harding, Hayes, Harrison, McKinley, and Taft. The history of America could not be told without these names from Ohio.

On the upthrust island of Lundy, off the English coast, there is an old saying: "Scratch Lundy and you find granite." We can say: "Scratch Ohio and you find a story"; and all the stories come from the diversity and vitality of Ohio's people. We in Ohio can remember how the champions of two Highland County towns fought barehanded to decide which town would get the courthouse; how three rival towns on the Mahoning united under the name of Alliance; how a German settler in Champaign County built a mansion with a fortune made by selling horseshoes to the czar of Russia during the Napoleonic wars; how old Simon Kenton, who had privately purchased from the Indians half of Ohio and a good part of Indiana, lived serenely on a pension of $20 a month; how a Marietta crew sailed a tall-masted ship down the Ohio and across the Atlantic to carry Ohio grain to starving Ireland; how a boatload of Welsh settlers built a town in Gallia County, because their boat was stolen there; how a tavern keeper on the Chillicothe Turnpike founded a college; how a stage driver overturned a party of Congressmen on the National Road, and named the place "Congress Hollow;" how the squirrel hunters marched to Cincinnati to head off rebel raiders; how the German Zoarites laid out an Ohio garden based on a design from the Book of Revelation; how a Richland County man invited a slave-searching party to breakfast, and said a grace long enough to allow five slaves to escape from his barn; how young Harvey Firestone heard stagecoaches grind through the village of Columbiana, and got the idea of making rubber tires for buggies; how a Mansfield woman started the Friendly House for children of foreign-born workers; how the ashes of Annie Oakley were displayed along with Chief Sitting Bull's war bonnet and a signed photograph of King Edward VII in the window of a Greenville jewelry store; how Irad Kelley sailed a sloop alone over Lake Erie, to keep goods on the shelves of his store in Cleveland; how Gen. James Denver, of Wilmington, gave his name to the capital of Colorado; how the selectmen of Lancaster required any man found intoxicated to dig a stump from the village street; how Jeremiah Reynolds, of Wilmington, sailed in 1829 for the South Pole, and gave Edgar Allen Poe the material for his first tale of strange adventure.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time available to the Senator from Ohio, under the morning-hour limitation, has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Ohio may proceed for 5 additional minutes, in view of the circumstances.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. President, Ohio means variety. There is no typical Ohio story, for its folklore concerns a various and many-sided people. Their diversity is their common wealth.

We now come to Col. John Glenn. When the Nation became jittery and when it became concerned, John Glenn, with intrepidity and the ruggedness that reflected the pioneers who came across the Appalachians and settled the Northwest Territory, remained firm and indomitable.

Yesterday the people of our country and the people of the world prayed, probably as never before, for the success of John Glenn's flight. Today John Glenn takes his position in Ohio as the head of a long list of illustrious men and women.

In behalf of the people of Ohio, I express commendations and thanks to your parents, John Glenn, to your wife and to your children, without whose love, devotion, faith, sacrifices, and encouragement your achievement might not have been possible. We express gratitude to your family and to you for the high example you have set for the need of courage, ruggedness, devotion to nation, devotion to family, and devotion to the Supreme Maker.

Through your courageousness and extraordinary achievement, Colonel Glenn, you place yourself, as I have already said, not only at the head of a long list of illustrious Ohioans, but as the head of a long list of distinguished men and women of our country and of the world. You have richly added to the heritage of your State.

We are thankful to you, Col. John Glenn; we find great inspiration in the example which your parents, your wife and children have set for us in faith, sacrifice, and devotion. You have enriched the heritage not only of Ohio but the Nation, and the world.

JOHN H. GLENN, JR.—A BRAVE MAN

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, it is with great pride that I rise to pay tribute to Col. John H. Glenn, Jr., a brave man, a great American, whose magnificent and extraordinary achievement yesterday has thrilled men and women throughout the world.

I am sure that I share this feeling of pride with all of my fellow Americans who are excited about Colonel Glenn's around-the-world space flight yesterday.

He is America's—indeed, the world's—hero, and has earned a special place for himself in the hearts of all Americans and of all mankind.

Mr. President, I gladly associate myself with the remarks of my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Ohio.

As an Ohioan and as a U.S. Senator, like my distinguished colleague, I am doubly proud of Col. John H. Glenn. Colonel Glenn was born and reared in New Concord, Ohio, where his parents still reside, in the heart of that great State which I have the privilege to represent in the Senate of the United States as its junior Senator.

May I especially extend to him, his wife, children, and parents, on behalf of all his fellow citizens of the great State of Ohio, our fervent congratulations, our thanks, and our best wishes on his memorable feat.

Mr. President, may I also express the gratitude all Americans feel toward all those who worked so long, so diligently, so hard, and so well in making this hoped-for accomplishment possible.

We should not lose sight of the fact that this is not only a great achievement for our Nation, an outstanding achievement for Colonel Glenn, and a great honor for his proud parents and family, but it is a great achievement for the entire world as well.

For the first time, a human being has orbited the globe with the full knowledge and in full view of all men. There was no secrecy surrounding this flight nor the preparations for it.

We can be thankful that our Nation is not afraid to face the new challenges of our age in the open and without secrecy.

As long as mankind exists on this planet, yesterday will be remembered not only as a milestone in man's continuing thirst for knowledge, but as a day when the best in freedom, democracy, and an open society was displayed to the world.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield, provided it does not come out of my time. I think the Senator wants to comment on what the junior Senator from Ohio has just said.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am sure my colleague will join me when I suggest that we ought to explore the advisability of inviting Colonel Glenn and the other astronauts to address a joint session of the two Houses of Congress. I make that suggestion for the purpose of having it studied, and the invitation extended to address a joint session.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I think that would be a fine demonstration, indeed, to all the world.

CONFERRING OF THE MEDAL OF HONOR ON LT. COL. JOHN H. GLENN, JR., U.S. MARINE CORPS

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to authorize the President of the United States to confer the Congressional Medal of Honor upon Lt. Col. John H. Glenn, Jr., of the Marine Corps in recognition of the distinguished and courageous services he has rendered his country.

This resolution is necessary because of the provisions of section 6241 of title 10 of the United States Code, which in the past has confined the awarding of the Medal of Honor to those in the Armed Services who rendered distinguished and courageous service in time of war when engaged in mortal combat with an enemy. There are many of us in the Congress who have ourselves been under fire in time of war, and we realize the reasons for the limiting of this, the highest honor of our country, in the past to those engaged on the battlefield.

However, I feel, and I know other Members of the Congress feel likewise, that Colonel Glenn, in piloting the U.S. first manned vehicle in outer space around the earth, did voluntarily subject himself to hazards and dangers equal to those met by men on the battlefield. While on duty for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Colonel Glenn theoretically was performing a peacetime mission, but in reality was in the front line for our country and the free world in our combat with the Communist world to conquer outer space.

I am not a scientist, but I know it took nerves of steel and courage second to that of no man on earth to climb into that vehicle and to be hurled out into space not knowing whether he would return or be delivered into endless space or destroyed by any number of causes.

It is for these reasons that without hesitation I ask the Congress to approve this joint resolution and express to the world our highest esteem by having presented to Colonel Glenn the Congressional Medal of Honor.

Unquestionably, he rendered distinguished and courageous service beyond the call of duty, when, if he had declined in the beginning to perform it, no one would have criticized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 157) authorizing the President to confer the Medal of Honor upon Lt. Col. John H. Glenn, U.S. Marine Corps, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I wish to express my gratitude to the Senator from South Carolina for introducing the joint resolution.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I thank the Senator. I think it is in line with what the Senator and his junior colleague have said in regard to the service rendered by Colonel Glenn.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator very much.

COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT—AGREEMENT TO WHEEL POWER AND BUILD TRANSMISSION LINES

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the agreement announced yesterday between the Bureau of Reclamation and the private utilities to wheel power generated by the Colorado River storage project is a complete vindication of the principles for which I have fought. It appears to be sound and in the public interest. Moreover, it is a great victory for those who believe in the free enterprise system, for the taxpayers, for the preference customers, and for the project itself.

The agreement demonstrates the wisdom of the Senate Appropriations Committee which last September directed the two parties, at my request, to negotiate in good faith.

As a sponsor of the Colorado River project, my sole concern has been for the principles involved, and not for the price of the power or any of the other technical matters in negotiation. These principles are:

First. Protect the interests of the preference power customers.

Second. Assure the success of the project and get water on the land at the least cost.

Third. Make maximum use of the free enterprise system.

Fourth. Protect the taxpayers.

Fifth. Assure tax revenues for our State, our counties, and our school districts in Utah.

PREFERENCE CUSTOMERS FULLY PROTECTED

The agreement announced today completely supports these principles and goals which I have supported. One of the most important goals is the protection of the interests of the preference power customers. Congress directed that the power would be sold to them for about 6 mills, regardless of who built the lines. That will be the case under the agreement. Moreover, power will be made available to the preference customers to the same degree and extent delivery could have been made under the all-Federal modified system, had such system been constructed. In fact, they will have a stronger, better, more versatile power system than if the Federal Government had built the lines.

Preference customers can also tie in at any of the load centers planned under the Federal-modified system. These are St. George, Paragonah, Fillmore, Springville, Centerfield, Vernal, Hyrum, and Heber. This is precisely what would have been done if the Federal system had been built. The wheeling charge will be only eight-tenths of a mill, but this will not be added to the approximately 6-mill price the preference customers will pay for the power.

WATER DEVELOPMENT ENHANCED

Under the agreement, Secretary of Interior Stewart L. Udall estimates that an added $77 million will go into the basin fund for the central Utah and other water projects above that which would have been available under an all-Federal system. However, the private utilities in Utah believe that an added $93 million to $98 million will go into the basin fund in Utah alone. More millions will go to the fund from Colorado, New Mexico, Wyoming, and perhaps from Arizona.

FREE ENTERPRISE SYSTEM ADVANCED

The private utilities under our traditional free enterprise system will be permitted to wheel much of the power on existing lines as well as on those lines which the utilities have planned and which are to be built in the near future. This is the American way, to be followed whenever possible.

SAVINGS TO TAXPAYERS

The taxpayers will be benefited because they will be saved an initial Federal investment of at least $27 million. This saving will be achieved because existing private utility lines will be used wherever possible and feasible. The Federal Government will not build costly duplicating lines. In addition, the private utilities will pay Federal taxes on the lines. Utah Power & Light, for example, estimates that it will pay $10 million in taxes to the Federal Government during the life of the project.

MORE REVENUE FOR SCHOOLS AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT

The school districts, together with State, county, and other local governmental units, will be benefited because they will receive tax revenues from the privately built lines. In contrast, the Federal Government would not have paid taxes on its lines. To illustrate, Utah Power & Light will pay $6 million in State and local taxes during the life of the project, revenues which would otherwise have been lost.

I have strongly believed, during the entire consideration of this problem, that good-faith negotiations would yield a sound and desirable solution. This result has been achieved. Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall and the Bureau of Reclamation are to be congratulated for their efforts.

I ask unanimous consent that the Department of the Interior press release announcing the agreement, together with the Department's explanation of how Utah is affected by it, be included in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the press release and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT MAKES DECISION ON COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT TRANSMISSION SYSTEM

Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall today announced that the Department of the Interior has made its basic decisions concerning construction of transmission lines for the five-State Colorado River storage project.

The plan achieves the Kennedy administration goals of: (1) maximum savings for the upper Colorado storage basin fund (which will finance all major dams and participating reclamation projects in the basin); (2) full protection of the service rights of preference customers at the lowest possible rates; and (3) strengthening of the Federal system through interconnections with facilities of private power companies.

Announcement of the plan was made possible by completion of negotiations leading to agreements with four of the five major private utilities in the Colorado Basin area (those in Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming). An agreement was not reached with the Arizona Public Service Company, but an interconnection still is under negotiation.

Acceptance of the utilities' proposals, Secretary Udall said, will mean a $27 million reduction in the Federal investment for the transmission grid and will add $77 million to the project's basin fund by the year 2042, when the 87-year payout period is completed.

Secretary Udall pointed out that negotiations with the companies were carried out in accord with an understanding reached with congressional Appropriations Committees last year when $13,673,000 was appropriated for the Bureau of Reclamation to undertake planning and initial construction of a Federal system. The Department was authorized to proceed on the entire system "unless the Secretary finds it practical and in the national interest to enter into wheeling contracts."

Negotiations, conducted by the Bureau of Reclamation under direction of Commissioner Floyd E. Dominy, have made possible a strong high-voltage power system on both sides of the Rocky Mountains, assuring delivery of power over a heavier grid than was proposed under the all-Federal system, the Secretary said. Negotiation of detailed agreements will be undertaken immediately.

Some sections in the original all-Federal proposal will now be eliminated, and others will be delayed as prior construction of privately financed lines will meet the early transmission needs. Power from Flaming Gorge Dam in Utah is expected to come on the line in 1963 and from Glen Canyon Dam, in northern Arizona, in 1964. The Curecanti unit of the Colorado River storage project will begin producing power about 3 years later.

A temporary wheeling arrangement has been agreed upon for the Four Corners-to-Albuquerque line in New Mexico and a permanent wheeling arrangement has been decided upon for Utah. Elsewhere in the system, the Department's decision entails interconnections, but not wheeling.

The four major power companies whose proposals have been accepted are: The Pacific Power & Light Co. in Wyoming, Public Service Co. of Colorado, Public Service Co. of New Mexico, and the Utah Power & Light Co. An agreement has also been reached with the California-Pacific Utilities Co., which serves southwestern Utah.

The Colorado River storage project was authorized by the Congress as a Federal undertaking by the Bureau of Reclamation to provide storage and river regulation in the Upper Basin Colorado River watershed in Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, and New Mexico. The storage project is intended to permit the Upper Basin States to meet downstream compact commitments and still make feasible upstream water-use projects, identified as participating projects.

The project will have a total installed hydroelectric capacity of over 1,100,000 kilowatts in powerplants which will be a part of multipurpose dams now under construction on the Colorado River and its tributaries.

Synopses of agreements with the companies, a map showing the interconnection system, together with changes which will be made from the originally proposed all-Federal system, and a list of changes in time or status of construction of individual sections of the line are attached.

Utah Power & Light Co. and California Pacific Utilities Co. Summary of Transmission and Interconnection Arrangements

Utah Power & Light Co. offered, in its initial proposal April 1960 which was rejected by the Department, to construct the necessary lines in Utah and wheel storage project power for preference customers for 1.55 mills per kilowatt-hour for deliveries from Flaming Gorge and Glen Canyon to the delivery points of Siguard, Heber, and Vernal and for 0.15 mill per kilowatt-hour for deliveries from central Utah project.

The company submitted a new offer for wheeling by letter of February 15, 1962, by which it would accept power scheduled by the Bureau of delivery to preference customers in Utah and make such power available to these customers to the same degree and extent delivery could have been made over the all-Federal modified system had such system been constructed. A similar offer was also made by California Pacific Utilities Co. for delivery to preference customers in its territory in southwestern Utah. The California Pacific Utilities Co. would take the power from the Utah Power & Light Co. at 138 kilovolts at the interconnection between their systems at the Iron-Bever County line.

The wheeling charge would be 0.82 mill per kilowatt-hour based on an annual load factor of 58½ percent, equivalent to a rate of about $4.20 per kilowatt-year. The wheeling charge after an initial period of 50 years would be reduced to cover only ad valorem taxes, and operation, maintenance, and replacement costs as actually incurred; estimated by the companies to be about 50 percent of the initial charge.

The Utah Power & Light Co. also would take power from the Bureau system at Shiprock, N. Mex., and Montrose, Colo., for the Western Colorado Power Co. in exchange for a like amount of power from the company delivered to the Bureau's customers in north-central Utah. There would be no wheeling charge on the exchange power delivered to preference customers by the company.

It is estimated the cost for wheeling under the offers of the Utah Power & Light Co. and the California Pacific Utilities Co. would average about $785,000 annually during the power payout period for the storage project.

Acceptance of these offers would eliminate construction of Federal lines estimated to cost about $22 million having an average annual cost of about $1,500,000 during the power payout period. The average annual savings in transmission costs of about $715,000 would correspondingly enhance the basin fund.

EMBARGO ON SOVIET FURS

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I was shocked last week to read in a national newspaper that the White House has informally indicated that it will oppose my bill, S. 2825, which would continue the embargo on furs from the Soviet Union and Red China.

In an article in Women's Wear Daily of February 13, 1962, it was stated:

> When a White House official was asked Monday if Senator Bennett's interpretation of the repeal action, in H.R. 9900 (sec. 248-C), was correct, the reply was:
>
> "Sure, we want to repeal the embargo. It has no place in general reciprocal trade legislation."

The only country which would benefit if the embargo is allowed to expire is the Soviet Union. Imports from Red China are also barred, but presumably they would be barred anyway because of our present embargo on all trade with Red China.

If the article in Women's Wear Daily is correct, the White House favors importing mink and other furs from the Soviet Union regardless of the fact that such trade will undoubtedly benefit the Soviet Union more than it would us and that the mink producers of this country are now forced to sell much of their fur at, or even below, cost.

I think the administration is carrying the principle of free trade further than it really intended to, because this is not an issue which should be confused with our relationship to the Common Market, or our trade policies in general.

This involves only trade with the Soviet Union, and the only beneficiaries would be the Communists.

It is true that before the fur embargo was put into effect in 1952, imports from Russia were relatively small, only about 59,000 skins per year. But at that time the Russian mink industry was just getting established. Today, it would be a much more serious threat, perhaps even meaning the end of the American mink industry. If the statement reported in this article is correct, I think it is obvious that the administration's infatuation with the free trade idea has gone much too far. If the report is not correct, I think the White House should clarify its position at the earliest possible moment, so that the fur producers of America will know where they stand.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Women's Wear Daily be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Kennedy Favors Lifting Embargo on Soviet Furs

Washington.—The White House favors lifting the 11-year-old U.S. embargo on imports of seven types of furs from the Soviet Union, it was learned Monday.

The administration, because of this policy decision, will oppose a bill (S. 2825), introduced last week by Senator Wallace Bennett, Republican, of Utah, to keep the embargo in effect.

Senator Bennett, a member of the Senate Finance Committee, smoked out the Kennedy administration position on this. When the White House sent to Congress its proposed Trade Expansion Act of 1962 (H.R. 9900), there was no hint that the administration was bidding for repeal of the fur embargo. The repeal of section 11 of the Trade Agreement Extension Act of 1951, which had authorized the fur embargo in the first place, was tucked away among other technical language in the bill.

When a White House official was asked Monday if Senator Bennett's interpretation of the repeal action, in H.R. 9900 (sec. 248-C), was correct, the reply was:

"Sure, we want to repeal the embargo. It has no place in general reciprocal trade legislation."

The Senate Finance Committee is awaiting reports from the State Department and other interested agencies on Senator Bennett's bill (S. 2825) to insure continuation of the embargo. The embargo could be continued in several ways, should Congress decide to reject the administration's position. For example, H.R. 9900, which is pending in the House Ways and Means Committee, could be modified to eliminate the repealer action, and the embargo would be continued without any further action on the Bennett bill.

The furs involved in the embargo are ermine, fox, kolinsky, marten, mink, muskrat, and weasel, either from Russia or Red China. The United States, for a number of years, has had a complete embargo on all trade with Red China. The specific fur embargo against Red China was covered by a proclamation issued by former President Truman on August 31, 1951, a separate proclamation covering the Russian furs was issued by the White House on January 5, 1952.

The State Department's report on Senator Bennett's bill could be the key report, since the embargo involves foreign policy. The Department is expected to take its cue from the White House and endorse the repeal of the embargo.

In 1959, the State Department, in a special report to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, said repeal of the fur embargo would benefit American consumers and have only a marginal effect on the Russian economy.

The Department said, in relation to the embargo: "The 1951 debates in Congress on section 11 [of the Trade Agreements Act] indicated that its primary purpose was to protect certain segments of the domestic fur industry.

"These segments favor its continuation. Other segments of the domestic fur industry are now anxious to have section 11 repealed. Repeal would be beneficial to the American consumer. It would be interpreted as evidence of U.S. encouragement of increased trade."

THE NEED FOR RESUMPTION OF ATOMIC TESTING IN THE ATMOSPHERE

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, on Friday of this week President Kennedy is scheduled to meet with the National Security Council to receive their final report on whether the United States should immediately resume nuclear testing in the atmosphere. It is almost a foregone conclusion that the Security Council will recommend resumption of testing, but there is considerable doubt as to how long the President may delay making a final decision as to when actual tests will begin. In fact, news sources close to the White House have indicated that it may be a month or more before an official announcement will be made.

NO REASON FOR FURTHER DELAY

Mr. President, there is no good or valid reason why there should be any further delay in the resumption of atmospheric testing. Arrangements have been completed with the British for use of Christmas Island for these new tests and the Atomic Energy Commission is preparing for an atmospheric shot as soon as the President will give his approval.

Apparently the only cause for delay at this point is the forthcoming disarmament conference scheduled to be held in Geneva commencing March 14. It is inconceivable to me that the President, out of deference to the Soviet Union, would procrastinate in making such an important decision as this in the futile hope that the new conferences may produce some productive agreement. Ever since October of 1958 the United States, the U.S.S.R. and Britain have been engaged in on-again off-again test ban talks. More than 353 conference sessions have been held without any substantive agreement being reached. As everyone knows, the stalemate centers around the issue of inspection, and Russia has purposely avoided any agreement which would result in effective and open inspection of nuclear testing or preparation for such tests.

EXPERTS AGREE TESTING IS NECESSARY

There is no question, so far as our scientists and top atomic experts are concerned, that we must resume atmospheric testing if we are to recapture our position of leadership in the nuclear field. The 40 to 50 atmospheric tests conducted last fall by the Russians gave them a tremendous opportunity to catch up or perhaps even overtake the United States in nuclear technology. The United States is striving desperately at the present time to develop an effective antimissile missile which can be successfully used against an enemy ICBM attack. The press reports last week on the failure of the Nike-Zeus to perform as planned clearly indicate the need for further testing if we are to work out a protective system against nuclear warheads. Atmospheric tests are needed for this purpose and to develop smaller more effective warheads which can be more readily used by our defensive forces.

Many scientists, including the eminent Dr. Hans Bethe, winner of last year's Fermi Award, have now dramatically changed their viewpoint and regard resumption of testing as absolutely necessary. Dr. Edward Teller, regarded as the United States top nuclear physicist and often called the father of the hydrogen bomb, has continually warned of the inherent danger of the moratorium on atmospheric testing.

"THE LEGACY OF HIROSHIMA"

I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to a new book that Dr. Teller has written, entitled, "The Legacy of Hiroshima," which will be issued by Doubleday on March 2. Extracts from this book have been serialized in three installments in the Saturday Evening Post issues of February 3, 10, and 17. I ask that some pertinent quotations from this outstanding treatise by Dr. Teller, which certainly should be read by all persons who are interested in the future of our Nation, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the extracts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> Every announcement of U.S. nuclear tests sets off a wave of agitation and emotion by misguided people. With a variety of slogans and demonstrations they want to convince us that our Government is doing a very deadly and damnable thing.
>
> These people are utterly mistaken. They do a great disservice to themselves, to our country, and to the free world. Even with the best of motives, such as deep humanitarianism, their activity aggravates the menace of war instead of minimizing it. Why?
>
> Essentially because the world is not ready for nuclear disarmament or any other form of disarmament. And any free nation that goes it alone in disarming is likely to go to its doom.
>
> Demonstrations against nuclear tests betray a new factor which has infected American thinking and influenced American policy since Hiroshima. That new factor is fear. The counsel of fear has resulted in plans and actions that are irrelevant, irrational, and even inimical to our national interest. Currently, fallout heads the list of our fears. Better psychological preparation for a campaign to halt nuclear testing would be hard to find. Yet there were other arguments between 1945 and our suspension of tests in 1958.
>
> By plausible persuasion, most Americans were led to believe that the peace of the world depended not on preparedness but on unpreparedness, that the development of weapons was inescapably the prelude to war. In this particular skein of thinking, the possession and perfection of nuclear weapons by opposing nations made an all-out nuclear war not only a possibility but also a horrible certainty.
>
> Even if we solemnly approached nuclear disarmament by treaty, it actually would be a unilateral act on our part. For an inclusive treaty could be neither policed nor enforced. It would place the United States in the highly untenable position of basing our national security upon Russian truthfulness. Why would any disarmament agreement become a dead letter in an instant at a Soviet whim? Because we have no way of detecting nuclear stockpiles nor experiments in two of the four general areas in which they can be conducted. On all those counts we would have to take the Soviet's word.
>
> Further nuclear experiments are essential to our security in several specific ways. It is most important that the weight of our major nuclear weapons be reduced. As long as our nuclear explosives are heavy, they require big, heavy rockets to carry them. These missiles are not easily protected against Russian rockets. They cannot be moved around the country inconspicuously. They require large, expensive nuclear submarines to keep them at sea.
>
> Meanwhile the Communists can steadily perfect the accuracy of their rockets that can be aimed at our missile sites. Their espionage can with little difficulty find and report the location of these sites. While the Soviet cannot hope to wipe out all of our nuclear retaliatory power in an initial attack, they may yet manage to destroy so much of it that the remainder could be shot down in the air before reaching Russia. They might do this, that is, unless we are able to decrease the weight of our retaliatory weapons through further nuclear testing.
>
> Lightweight nuclear explosives will allow a corresponding reduction in the size, weight and thrust of our ballistic missiles. These smaller weapons could be carried around the Nation by truck and railroad car with greater ease and less likelihood of detection. More of these smaller weapons could be installed in hard stations, impervious to an initial attack, from which retaliatory missiles can be launched. With smaller sized weapons the United States could launch more decoys with retaliatory rockets, increasing chances of thwarting an enemy's antimissile system. Smaller submarines and planes could carry our lightweight nuclear weapons. Without any loss of punch our retaliatory arsenal could be reduced in cost by billions of dollars.
>
> But our safety and survival should not be reckoned in dollars. The main point we must consider is this: In a rapidly changing world we can never be sure that our existing military strength is sufficient. We cannot keep abreast by standing still. By resuming nuclear experiments we are much more likely to remain prepared for all eventualities that may arise.
>
> We must assume, for all practical purposes, that the Soviet Union actually is ahead of us in the development of nuclear weapons.
>
> Secret nuclear testing by the Soviet should hardly come as a surprise to thoughtful Americans. History has a way of repeating itself in the 20th century. During the critical days of 1941 just before Pearl Harbor, Japanese emissaries in Washington assured us that they wanted peace. During the critical years between 1958 and 1961, Russian emissaries at Geneva assured us they wanted a nuclear test ban and disarmament. The situations are similar.
>
> In both instances we let ourselves be governed by our yearning for peace—and we and peace suffered for it in both instances.

FEAR OF RADIOACTIVE FALLOUT

Mr. BENNETT. The major argument often made against resumption of atmospheric testing is the danger which might be created by radioactive fallout. In answer to this fear, I ask that other extracts from Dr. Teller's book be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the extracts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> Fallout from nuclear testing is not worth worrying about. Its effect on human beings, if there is an effect, is insignificant. Yet fear of test fallout is real and widespread. This fear is influencing national policies in dangerous ways.
>
> Throughout history man has feared the mysterious and the unknown. Many natural occurrences—lunar and solar eclipses, thunder and lightning, birth and death—have caused terror. Scientific explanations have diminished many fears, but science cannot eliminate fear itself. In a rapidly changing world, new fear fixations arise.
>
> Radiation, as natural as an eclipse, has given rise to considerable fear in modern times. We have heard much about it in connection with atomic explosions. Scientists have discussed it in terms that give rise to alarm. Radiation cannot be detected by

man's senses. We cannot see it, feel it, hear it, taste it, or smell it. Yet we know it is there, and we know that an overdose can be dangerous or deadly.

Actually, there is no reason why a scientist or an informed layman should consider radiation a mystery. Our scientific knowledge about radiation is firm and detailed in many ways. We know, for example, that all types of radiation produce in the human body reactions which are alike. We know the levels at which radiation becomes a danger to humans, and we can predict the effects of certain kinds of radiation at certain levels with considerable precision. We have clear evidence that present levels of radiation in our atmosphere from natural sources and from the radioactive fallout of nuclear tests are, at best, completely safe for humans or, at worst, are causing exceedingly little damage.

ADVOCATE IMMEDIATE RESUMPTION OF ATMOSPHERIC TESTING

Mr. BENNETT. As one who has long been opposed to the moratorium on atomic testing, I see no need or logical argument which can be made for continued procrastination in this area of our national defense. On August 19, 1959, in a speech in the Senate, I first urged resumption of nuclear testing. Since that time I have made several other speeches calling for an end to the testing moratorium. As a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I have had an opportunity to be kept fully apprised of the growth and development of our nuclear program and the need for continued research and testing if we are not to fall behind in this important field.

Consequently, Mr. President, it is my hope that after the National Security Council meets with the President on Friday, he will announce that the United States will resume atmospheric testing as soon as the necessary preparations can be made. Such an announcement would greatly strengthen the U.S. position and would permit us to go to the bargaining table at Geneva and negotiate from a position of strength rather than weakness.

THE PRESIDENT'S FARM PROGRAM

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, every Member of the Congress who, as in my case, has spent his life in a rural area and is acutely aware of the problems confronting our farmers, whose percentage of the national income is further below so-called parity than the prices for their crops in the open market and where the average hourly compensation of the farmworker is 84 cents an hour compared to the average of $2.36 for industrial workers, is greatly disturbed over the fact that the farmer's stake in the expanding prosperity of our Nation is growing progressively worse instead of better. In my opinion, this unfortunate development is directly attributable to the unsound economic principle that Government control is better for the American farmer than the system of private enterprise.

We all know the responsibility our Nation undertook at the commencement of World War II to furnish a substantial part of the food required by our allies and how the American farmer was urged by our Government to step up his production to meet that demand. The response of our farmers to feed not only our Nation but our allies during World War II was on a par with the response of the youth of the country to die if need be on the battlefield for the perpetuation of democratic principles. But, shortly after the end of World War II everyone in Congress knew that the overall price-control program had broken down especially since it was not applied to industrial labor after John L. Lewis refused to be bound by the "gentlemen's agreement" of other labor leaders to hold the line on prices but in dropping price controls the Congress took no effective action to return our farmers to the previous system of private enterprise. The rigid support prices, enacted as a war measure to increase production, were continued. By the summer of 1949 everyone then in Congress knew that the farm surpluses were becoming unwieldy and that the theory of Government control of production was not working so when the House-passed farm bill came to the Senate we voted to substitute flexible controls for the existing system of rigid controls, and I voted for that bill. When the differences between the House and Senate bills went to conference, House conferees prevailed upon the Senate conferees to accept the rigid controls of the House bill and the Senate accepted the conference report. The results are well known; namely, an unmanageable surplus of certain farm products, a strict regimentation of our farmers, especially with respect to the only two programs which have not produced costly surpluses, tobacco and peanuts—and a very unsatisfactory return to our farmers as a whole.

In order that Members of Congress who do not serve on the Agriculture Committees, as well as the public generally, may better understand how the administration is now proposing in the pending farm bill to put our farm program completely under Government control, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the editorial of February 18 from the National Observer entitled "The Farmer's Almanac."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FARMER'S ALMANAC

There are not many along the New Frontier old enough to remember, but the farm program which President Kennedy has submitted to the present Congress had its origins more than 30 years ago. Same problem, same cure. And it would be an optimistic farmer, we suspect, who would count on its having anything but the same result.

The year was 1929, a date that has a curious way of marking the before and after of so many things. Herbert Hoover was President, and the Nation's farmers were troubled with the twin problems of overproduction and prices, which according to their spokesmen did not give them "parity" with the prices of industrial goods. Two leading Republican legislators—Senator McNary, of Oregon, and Representative Haugen, of Iowa—led the political fight for the Government to "do something."

What the Government did was to pass the Agriculture Marketing Act of 1929, which for the first time adopted the idea that the Government should intervene in the marketplace to support farm prices. From that day to this there has been a clear line—the first AAA of the New Deal, which plowed under the cotton and slaughtered the pigs; the "soil conservation program," which was going to cut production by cutting acreage; the ever-normal granary of Henry Wallace; the food-stamp plan; 90 percent of parity; the Brannan plan of the Truman era; flexible parity; a series of oversea surplus disposal plans; and finally the soil bank plan of the Eisenhower administration.

None succeeded. And so now Congress comes to the Freeman plan of the Kennedy administration.

In the broad sense the Freeman-Kennedy plan is just more of the same. It aims, on the one hand, to reduce the amount of acreage planted to the major crops and hence, hopefully, the overproduction that still plagues agriculture after all these 30 years. And, just like its predecessors, the plan would arrange to support the prices in the marketplace and to pay the farmers direct subsidies for not growing things.

But it differs in three major respects. In the first place, its aim is not merely to cut production back to the estimated level of market demand but to slash it below the estimated needs for several years to come. In short, radical surgery. The farmer's production would not be just trimmed back; it would be ruthlessly cut away in the manner of a surgeon attacking a cancer that has spread beyond hope of any moderate cure.

In the second place it introduces marketing quotas as well as acreage quotas in some areas. For example, currently there are no limits on the amount of wheat a farmer can market so long as the wheat is produced within his acreage allotment. The new plan would clamp fixed limits on the wheat the farmer could market for food and export irrespective of the number of acres on which the wheat is grown.

Finally, it puts sharp teeth in the penalties farmers would have to pay if they reject the Government's program. Should the farmers reject the controls on wheat and feed grains, for instance, they would lose not just a portion of the price-support level but all price supports entirely and all direct Government payments. The penalties on individual farmers who overplant their allotted acreage are also increased to a prohibitive level.

And if all this is not enough to whip the farmers into compliance, the Freeman-Kennedy program has yet another weapon. If in their referendum on the control program (this is all very democratic, you understand) the farmers should happen to vote down the controls, then the Government would have the right to dump, at once and unceremoniously, some 10 million tons of feed grains and 200 million bushels of wheat on the open market. This, of course, would break the market wide open.

In short, the choice in the Freeman plan is loss of the last vestiges of the farmer's freedom to farm his land as he will or the ending of all Government aid altogether.

One thing this program has is inexorable logic. Every other administration, from Hoover to Eisenhower, has shied away from recognizing that the Government could not on the one hand intervene in the market to raise farm prices above their market level and at the same time leave the farmer any freedom to control his own production.

In earlier programs it was thought this alternative could be disguised by an acreage allotment system. That is, farmers could be partially controlled by limiting their acreage planted to major crops while they retained some freedom in what else they did with their acreage.

But the consequences of this was itself inevitable. Land taken out of one crop was used to create new surpluses in other crops; payments to let land lie fallow were used to cultivate more intensely to remaining acres. As one intervention failed another new one was tacked on, and its failure brought another.

The history of these failures is too well known to be labored here. Except for the few years of World War II when this country supplied not only itself but half the world, the surplus has mounted steadily, year by year. The "problem" of 1929 was a molehill compared to the surplus problem of today.

Whether this logic will appeal to the Congress—or to the farmers—is another matter. Many of the farm organizations oppose it, and some of them have swung 180° in their thinking; they are now groping for some way to undo the disastrous interventions of the past generation and return farming to the freedom of the marketplace.

But logic suggests that this would not be easy. The Nation's agriculture has for long so subsisted on the narcotic of Government aid that almost every part of it now is so distorted from any relation with the reality of the marketplace that the withdrawal pains would be intense. There is, to be honest about it, no easy way any longer out of the farm problem.

Ironically, this is just what President Coolidge predicted when he vetoed an earlier McNary-Haugen bill, although there are few around the New Frontier who would remember. Said that man of sparse words: "Government price fixing, once started, has alike no justice and no end."

And there are a few other sad little ironies. It was the Republicans who started it all. It was the Democrats who, in 1928, said "the solution to this problem should avoid Government subsidies, to which the Democratic Party has always been opposed."

The question today is whether President Kennedy—or the farmers—can now appreciate the humor.

JEWS AS ECONOMIC SCAPEGOATS IN THE U.S.S.R.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to direct attention to a situation continuing in the Soviet Union, to which I have invited attention before. This is the fact that Soviet citizens of the Jewish faith in the Soviet Union are being made scapegoats by the Soviet authorities. Apparently these authorities are trying to warn the people against currency speculation in black markets, but the means chosen can only lead to serious consequences for Jews as a group in the U.S.S.R. We find new evidences of this in the death sentences against four Jews, this time in Vilna, reported on February 10 by the Soviet news agency Tass, and of 12 in the U.S.S.R. itself. There is a long and tragic series of these.

Mr. President, the Soviet Union's leaders have been very sensitive to any alleged anti-Semitism. Hence, they try to identify these people in the trials without being tagged "anti-Semitic." But, the reports themselves negate this attempt. I think this is, if anything, the same thing dressed up in different clothes, with a very calculated effort being made to identify Jews as enemies of the Soviet people in terms of these black marketeering activities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be included in the RECORD with my remarks a news report by Philip S. Cook, entitled "The Economic Scapegoats of Russia," from the New York Herald Tribune of February 14; also a report of the Jewish Minority Research of New York entitled "Discrimination Against Judaism in the Soviet Union."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Feb. 14, 1962]

THE ECONOMIC SCAPEGOATS IN RUSSIA

(By Philip S. Cook)

The Jews of the Soviet Union are once again being made the scapegoats of a carefully prepared drive to reeducate the Soviet masses to the evils of black marketeering, currency speculation, and other economic crimes.

The unprecedented treatment in the Soviet press of sensational criminal trials involving alleged economic offenses amounts to a series of didactic warnings to the Russian people: Stop all gray- or black-market activities or face the most severe punishment.

The Soviet press seldom reports on criminal or judicial proceedings. Yet in the last 3 months, major regional and national journals of the Soviet Union have described in lurid detail the conviction and death sentences imposed on 12 Jewish citizens of Russia for self-serving economic activities. In the last year, 38 other Jews received long prison sentences.

The Soviet news agency Tass announced the most recent instance last Saturday—the sentencing to death by shooting of four Jews in Vilna, the capital of Soviet Lithuania.

The scattered geographic pattern of the press reports and the careful labeling of Jewish principals make it patently clear that Jews are being used as major characters in a Soviet morality play.

A lengthy account of the Vilna trial in Trud, the trade union organ, shows a subtle appeal to traditional Russian anti-Semitic stereotypes. The villains are never openly identified as Jews, but the article declares, "The desire to make money was their only interest. The 10-ruble gold piece was their idol."

This typically anti-Semitic image of the Jew as a worshiper of gold was followed by an indictment of the Jewish community as pursuing private intrigue at odds with the rest of the Soviet people. "In the event of disputes they went to the local rabbi," the article declares. "The rabbi not only knew of the dark affairs his parishioners were involved in, but was their arbiter as well."

In every press account the defendants were indirectly identified as Jews and then portrayed as unscrupulous economic bandits who exploited honest Soviet citizens and connived with one another and with accomplices abroad to make money for themselves.

Whenever the villain of the piece did not bear an easily identifiable Jewish surname, the first and middle names were provided in place of the more commonly noted initials. I. I. Berleev became Ilya Isaakovich Berleev and G. I. became Gennady Isaiahevich Geronsky.

When non-Jewish Russians figure prominently in the illegal activity at the beginning of these accounts, they gradually recede into the background until they finally are depicted as the victims of superior cunning and whose chief crimes were stupidity and weakness in the face of temptation and bribery.

Generally, it is the Jewish defendant who is sentenced to death or given a long prison sentence, while "other members" of the "criminal clique" are listed as receiving unspecified prison terms.

UNDERTONE OF INNUENDO

Throughout these press accounts there can be found a heavy undertone of innuendo and implication calculated to evoke the traditional Russian anti-Semitic reaction.

In a trial in Tbilisi, Georgia, where Mordekh Abramovich Kakiashvili was sentenced to death last December, it was reported that "speculation went on full blast in the Lord's temple. While praying, they emptied each other's pockets." The newspaper, Zarya Vostoka, informed its readers that "even the religious books of the Torah" were used by Kakiashvili and several of his accomplices in currency speculation "as hiding places for foreign paper money."

In a number of instances the press accounts take pains to establish a close link between criminal gangs in several major Russian cities where there are substantial Jewish minorities. The offenders are pictured as scurrying around the country, holding clandestine meetings with one another and then arranging to ship their profits abroad.

In a September 16, 1961, article in Leningradskaya Pravda, entitled "A Belch From the Old World," the writer describes the ultimate goal of B. S. Oizerman, accused of buying and reselling currency, gold, and precious stones, and securities.

"Having scraped together a fortune, he dreamed of escaping abroad. It made no difference where: To his brother in England, to another brother in England, to another brother in Germany or his sister in Israel."

EDUCATIONAL EXERCISES

The implication in this and other reports is that the defendant stood apart from the rest of the Soviet people, caring only for himself.

The significance of these articles as educational exercises rests on the careful conditioning of the Soviet citizen to interpret certain unusual announcements and publicity efforts as a warning to himself.

The fact that Russian Jews, a traditionally persecuted minority, are made the principal offenders is designed, in part, to ease the awkwardness of admitting that economic offenses are widespread and remain undetected.

The apparent real goal of Soviet authorities is to intimidate the Russian people as a whole—to frighten them into less flagrant abuse of laws designed to curb black marketeering and profiteering. Such a coordinated domestic propaganda drive suggests that these abuses are now so widespread among the masses of Soviet citizens as to alarm the leaders of the Soviet Union.

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST JUDAISM IN THE SOVIET UNION

Marxist-Leninist doctrine, on which Soviet constitutional law and Soviet public policy are based, characterizes itself as materialist, scientific and atheist. In this spirit, the Soviet Constitution guarantees—and the Soviet Communist Party practices—freedom of antireligious education, agitation and propaganda, as well as freedom of worship. This is the framework within which all religions in the U.S.S.R. exist. Within this context, however, Judaism is subjected to unique discrimination in several fundamental ways.

I. STRUCTURE

Nationwide federation

The major religions in the U.S.S.R.—the Russian Orthodox Church, the Georgian Orthodox Church, Islam, and Buddhism—are permitted to have central organizations, through whose channels religious functions are governed, religious needs serviced, and religious belief and practice preserved and bolstered.

Judaism is permitted no variant of any such organization or federation of congregations. It is thus deprived of the constitutionally and legally assured instrumentalities through which it could maintain mutual communication and contact, service religious needs of believers, and perpetuate its spiritual continuity.

II. RELIGIOUS PREROGATIVES

1. Contact and communication

The other major religions are legally authorized to convene congresses and conferences of their clergy and representatives of the faithful.

Religious Jews lack this right.

2. Religious publications

(a) Periodicals: The Russian Orthodox Church publishes the official "Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate," which is the organ of the highest hierarchial body of that Church. It also publishes religious books. The same is true for Islam.

Judaism is permitted no such periodical or publication.

(b) Holy Scriptures: The Russian-language Bible, originally published for the Russian Orthodox Church in 1926, was reprinted in 1957. Similarly, a Russian-language Bible was published for the Baptists in 1958. The Koran was published for Moslems in 1958.

No Hebrew Bible has been permitted for Jews since 1917.

(c) Religious calendars: These indispensable guides for religious holidays and observances are freely available to all the major religions, regularly printed by the appropriate and legally recognized organs of the central federations.

For the most part, religious Jews have had to depend on photographed copies of handwritten calendars, circulated from hand to hand. In the very few instances—all within the last year or so—when an individual Jewish congregation, as in Moscow, was permitted to print a calendar, authorization was given late (after the beginning of the Jewish New Year) and for only tiny editions.

(d) Prayer books: These are available to the major religions in relatively ample supply.

From 1917 until 1958, no Hebrew prayer book (siddur) was printed. In the latter year, an edition of 3,000 copies was allowed—a ridiculously small figure for the hundreds of thousands (some estimates run as high as 1½ million) of religious Jews in a total Jewish population of 3 million. No other religious publication has been permitted for Judaism.

(e) Government aid: The Government officially places publishing houses at the disposal of the major religions, and delivers supplies of paper to them. The Russian Orthodox Church has a publications department which publishes its journal, prayer books, pastoral letters, etc.

Judaism has no such aid at its disposal.

3. Other religious articles

The major religions are authorized to produce a variety of religious articles, and to maintain facilities for their production—candles, crucifixes, beads, etc. The Russian, Georgian, and Armenian churches and Islam are permitted such prerogatives, which also serve as an important means of church income.

For Judaism, the production of such indispensable religious articles as the tallis (prayer shawl), tefilin (phylacteries), are prohibited. In many localities, the production and distribution of matzah (unleavened bread) for the Passover is either prohibited or harassed; shipments of matzah from Jewish congregations outside the U.S.S.R. have frequently been refused entry into the country.

III. CHURCHES AND PRIESTS—SOME STATISTICS

1. There are some 20,000 Russian Orthodox churches and some 35,000 Russian Orthodox priests. This amounts to 1 church per 1,800 believers, and 1 priest per 1,100 believers. There are some 500 places of worship and 500 ministers for the Baptist faith. This amounts to 1 place of worship and 1 minister per 1,100 believers.

In contrast, for the estimated 1,500,000 Jewish believers there are some 60 to 70 synagogues and a corresponding number of rabbis. This amounts to 1 synagogue and 1 rabbi per 22,000 to 23,000 Jewish believers.

2. In the last few years, the closing down of scores of synagogues all over the U.S.S.R. has resulted in the total elimination of a synagogue in many localities. Numerous minyanim (private prayer groups with the required quorum of 10 men) have been dispersed, thus depriving religious Jews of another means of worship. In many instances, petitions by groups of Jews to construct synagogues with their own means have been turned down. This can be contrasted with the considerable funds which the Government makes available for the restoration of Islamic mosques.

IV. RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

Most religious groups maintain educational institutions to prepare men for the priesthood and other clerical functions. The Russian Orthodox Church maintains two academies and eight seminaries. The Moslems prepare mullahs at four madrassahs.

Until 1957, religious Jews had no comparable institution. In that year, a yeshivah was established as an adjunct of the Moscow Great Synagogue to prepare students for the rabbinate and other religious functions. The level of students' preparation and the level of instruction vary widely. As of January 1962, there were only 12 students at the Yeshivah, half of them from Georgia and central Asia. Only one student is from Moscow, and there are none from any of the great traditional centers of Jewish scholarship in Russia.

V. CONTACTS WITH CORELIGIONISTS ABROAD

1. Delegations: Since 1956, numerous church delegations have visited their counterparts in the Soviet Union, and Russian Orthodox delegations have often visited abroad. Official religious delegations have visited the U.S.S.R. from the Protestant churches of Syria, Lebanon, Switzerland, France, the United States, etc. Similarly, Soviet delegations, consisting of representatives of the Russian Orthodox, Moslem, and Baptist denominations, have visited officially abroad.

No religious Jewish delegation has ever been permitted to visit religious institutions abroad. Nor are Jewish synagogues in the U.S.S.R. permitted to have any kind of official contact with Jewish religious, congregational, or rabbinical bodies outside their country.

2. Permanent religious ties abroad: The Russian Orthodox Church maintains a department for relations not only with other Orthodox churches outside the country, but with other Christian denominations as well. This relationship has been culminated most recently by the full-fledged acceptance of the Russian Orthodox Church as an official member of the World Council of Churches (Protestant).

Since 1945, the Moslem sect has been authorized to arrange annual pilgrimages to Mecca.

No such permanent ties or institutional relations are permitted to religious Jews.

3. Religious studies abroad: Other religious groups, for whom such permission is institutionally relevant, are authorized to send students abroad for specialized theological studies. Thus, for example, some young Moslem clerical students have been permitted to pursue their advanced studies at the theological seminary of Al-Azhar in Cairo. And young Baptist seminarians have also been sent for advanced study to theological schools in Great Britain. Such programs serve the twofold objective of maintaining spiritual contacts with coreligionists abroad, and of enhancing the level of religious education and practice.

No Jewish seminarian has ever been allowed to advance his studies at institutions of higher Jewish religious learning abroad.

VI. OVERT PRESSURE AGAINST JUDAISM

All these discriminations and disabilities have persisted for some time. But the pattern of pressures alongside them began to reach a climax in the period June–October 1961. During that period the following events occurred:

(a) Six Jewish lay religious leaders in Moscow and Leningrad were arrested, tried, and given long prison terms.

(b) The lay chairman of congregations in five major provincial cities were deposed.

(c) The governing council of the Yeshivah was disbanded, and its prerogatives placed in the hands of the Moscow chief rabbi.

VII. THE PRESS AGAINST JUDAISM

This pattern of discrimination is accompanied by a ceaseless campaign in the press against Judaism and religious Jews. This press campaign differs materially from that conducted against other religions.

Personal attacks against rabbis and lay heads of congregations are both more frequent and more virulent in the case of the Jews. Their names and addresses are published in the disproportionately large number of articles attacking Judaism; frequently, the names and addresses and occupations of their children are also published, holding all of them up to obloquy and social pressure.

Jewish rites are savagely ridiculed as barbarous and cruel. Jewish religious practitioners are portrayed as thieves, connivers, and alcoholics.

Above all, the most ominous theme is the consistent portrayal of the tenets and practitioners of Judaism as potentially or actually subversive. Only with regard to Jews and Judaism is the theme of subversion, lack of patriotism, and disloyalty injected into official antireligious propaganda.

In an atmosphere of widespread popular anti-Semitism, the effects of this pattern of public policy and propaganda are not difficult to imagine.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I not only denounce this course of action myself, but also I call upon all civilized men and women in our own country, and in all countries of the world, to denounce it. I believe the leaders of the Soviet Union, who are so very anxious to impress the world with their justice toward minorities, are implicated in this instance in the basic, unjust, and harsh action which can only underline a charge of anti-Semitism. I hope they will come to their senses soon enough not to affront and to insult the world by this brutal manifestation of repression which is so unworthy in view of their sensitiveness to any charge of anti-Semitism.

THE NATIONAL TRADE POLICY ACT OF 1962

PART II. THE NEED FOR AN INFORMED PUBLIC AND ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRADE POLICY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, one of the most concerning aspects of the great decisions our Nation must take with respect to trade policy is the evidence of recent polls that a vast majority of the American people may not have grasped at this stage of the debate the underlying domestic effects and the far-reaching international significance of impending congressional action on foreign trade.

A dramatic and unfortunate demonstration of the results of the public not having enough information is presented by President Kennedy's own record on trade legislation when he was a Member of the House in 1949 and of the Senate in 1955. In representing the views of his constituents, who may not have grasped the increasing national importance of a policy of trade expansion, even he was somewhat lukewarm in his support for the reciprocal trade agreements program. Now, at the head of the Nation and with a view of the total national interest, he asks us to act in meeting the urgent trade policy needs of the United States and the free world. I agree, yet I know the difficulty which will ensue without adequate support from a fully informed public.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at the conclusion of my remarks various articles: "Kennedy's Own Record on Tariffs," from the New York Post of February 15, 1962; "Ignorance on Tariffs Revealed in Poll," from the Sunday Star of February 11, 1962; and "Trade Debate" and "Protectionism's Power," from the Wall Street Journal of February 9 and January 24, 1962.

These articles highlight the need for dynamic action by public and private leaders to bring to the public the economic facts of trade; what trade does for the businessman; what trade does for the worker, what trade does for the consumer; and how trade is the necessary element in rectifying our international balance of payments, and for grasping the opportunity of the European Economic Community and meeting the grave threats of Communist economic penetration. Such educational action is essential not only now but on a continuing basis, as the Congress moves in joint responsibility with the President to implement U.S. trade policy during the coming years.

For more than a year and a half—especially in major addresses to the Senate on July 2, 1960, and on July 10, 1961—I warned of the need to start discussion of the trade issue which would face us this year and in the 1960's. In November 1960 the opening gun was fired for the administration in an address by Under Secretary of State Ball. And now we read of polls and interviews which indicate that relatively few Americans understand the tariff situation, and reveal popular ignorance of the mechanics of international commerce, together with a variety of bizarre notions about the influence of trade on the national economy.

An informed public must be created now by a crash program of Presidential reports to the Nation—otherwise it may prove difficult indeed to convince the Congress of the need for the needed great initiatives in trade policy.

The national stake in trade requires a continual national consensus on trade policy.

It is for this reason that the bill which I have introduced, the National Trade Policy Act of 1962—S. 2840—provides for an Advisory Committee on Trade Policy, composed of nine members, broadly representative of production, commerce, finance, agriculture, labor, consumer and export interests; this is missing from the present administration approach, as embodied in its bill. This council would advise the President on his implementation of trade policy and would provide the vital link with the American people which appears to be necessary.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Post, Feb. 15, 1962]

KENNEDY'S OWN RECORD ON TARIFFS

(By Sylvia Porter)

President Kennedy is challenging Congress to write into law this spring the boldest, most far-reaching program to smash world trade barriers ever submitted by a man in the White House.

No other President ever has asked as much as Kennedy is asking—and this includes Franklin Delano Roosevelt, who prodded Congress into passing the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act in 1934 and thereby into reversing America's traditional policy of protecting U.S. industries by high tariff walls.

For Kennedy is asking no less than the power to bargain away the tariff walls which guard our industries against European competition in return for similar actions by Europe. He is openly admitting that intensified foreign competition will injure many U.S. businessmen, farmers, wage earners, whole communities, and is therefore suggesting special assistance-adjustment plans to help those who are hurt. He is pleading with our lawmakers to place national interests above local interests and pass his "unprecedented measure."

How Congress will respond is still anyone's guess. But in himself, Kennedy personifies the conflicts each lawmaker will face as he tries to place national interests above the local interests who elected him and hold his political future in their hands.

As James MacGregor Burns wrote in "John Kennedy, a Political Profile," while Kennedy was in Congress, his "general position" was for liberalized trade policies but "when it came to specific tariff problems, few Senators surpassed him in his zeal for guarding local interests."

This is the heart of the battle now shaping up. It's easy for a Congressman to say he's in favor of lower trade barriers and competition from foreign imports which will give consumers a break. But will this same Congressman say this when the intensified competition threatens the life of an industry back home and throws workers in his State out of jobs?

It's easy for a Senator to dazzle an audience with the prediction that a united Atlantic Community will have the power to win the cold war against the Communist empire and that as trade expands in the free world, we'll all prosper beyond our dreams. But will his dazzling promises stick when businessmen and wage earners in his own community warn him that foreign imports are flooding their markets and they command him to work for higher tariffs—or else?

Consider Kennedy's own record in Congress.

In 1949, as a Representative, he actually voted against extension of the Trade Agreements Act—what MacGregor calls "an attack on one of the programs most sacred to the Democratic party"—and he reversed himself and voted for final passage of the law only after the attempt to kill the act had failed.

In 1955, as a Senator, he voted to extend the trade act but he was against amendments that would have eliminated protectionist and escape clauses.

In 1958, he voted for an extension of the law to mid-1962 and this brings his record up to date, for he's now President.

Meanwhile, for the folks back home in Massachusetts, he fought for and helped achieve laws and policies specifically to help protect the Massachusetts fishing industry, textile industry, and watch industry against foreign competition.

There is no doubt where Kennedy stands now. He is acutely aware that the rapidly growing European Common Market has pushed us to a turning point in our life as a nation. He is paving the way not only for a historic battle over tariff policies but also for a historic strengthening of our economic-political ties with the entire free world. He is not evading nor pussyfooting one bit now.

Still, Kennedy need only look within himself to know how tough the decision is going to be for the men and women who must vote the legislation—and that goes even for the most dedicated free trader.

[From the Sunday Star, Feb. 11, 1962]

WHAT AMERICA THINKS—IGNORANCE ON TARIFFS REVEALED IN POLL

NEW YORK, February 10.—A majority of Americans favor giving President Kennedy power to negotiate lower tariffs with the European Common Market, according to this week's "What America Thinks" poll.

However, an analysis of the explanations given by those interviewed indicated that relatively few Americans understand the tariff situation and the majority view seemed to be largely an expression of confidence in Mr. Kennedy.

This was the question asked a coast-to-coast sample of Americans:

"President. Kennedy has asked Congress for greater authority over tariffs to enable him to negotiate lower tariffs between the United States and the European Common Market. Should Congress give him this authority?"

These were the answers in percentages:

Should	54.8
Should not	29.8
No opinion	15.4

The percentage of those saying "no opinion" was high for public opinion polls. This was largely due to the fact that so many said they did not understand the workings of tariffs or what giving Mr. Kennedy more power would do.

Each person interviewed was invited to give the reasons for his or her answer, and these answers indicated the same lack of understanding of tariffs among those who favored giving Mr. Kennedy more power.

Typical of such responses were these:

A New York State housewife—"If President Kennedy thinks it is the thing to do, I'll go along with him. I think he knows what's best for the country."

A Virginia engineer—"Why elect a President if he's not going to be given the power to handle situations as he sees fit?"

The wife of a New Mexico radio technician—"Tariff always baffles me, but I have great confidence in Mr. Kennedy and think he knows how to manage the economy."

However, a minority of those who said "should" had deeper reasons. A sampling:

A Virginia banker—"We need international trade. The only way we can get the power to compete is by giving the President more authority."

A Long Islander—"We have to meet competition and be able to make quick decisions."

On the other hand, many of those who opposed granting President Kennedy power to negotiate tariffs said they knew little about the economics involved but that they did not think Mr. Kennedy should be given added powers.

A sampling:

A California housewife—"Giving one man so much authority is making him a king."

A Texas house painter—"It would be like giving a fellow a badge and a uniform. Too much authority goes to a man's head. Unless Congress is in a position to cut him off, he'll go too far."

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 9, 1962]

MANY AMERICANS ADMIT THEY DON'T KNOW WHAT IT'S ABOUT

(By Edwin A. Roberts, Jr.)

LIBERAL, KANS.—If President Kennedy fails to win popular support for his plan to lower trade barriers, the operating factor might not be the persuasiveness of the protectionists. It may just be that many people don't know what Mr. Kennedy is talking about.

Ignorance of the mechanics of international commerce, together with a variety of bizarre notions about the influence of trade on the national economy, left one visitor to five Western States wondering whether the subject has been banned from American schoolrooms. Interviews with scores of people in Colorado, New Mexico, Texas, Oklahoma, and Kansas produced no single dominant opinion, but they did produce a garden of fascinating ideas.

"The only people who get anything out of trading with foreigners are the shipowners," declares the office manager of a small Texas firm.

"Why should we import anything from overseas if we can make it in America?" says an Amarillo bank teller.

"The best thing to do is to sell our stuff to them (foreign countries) and then keep the money we get right here and not go spending it on imported 'this' and imported 'that,'" declares a Liberal, Kans., railroad worker.

"I say don't have any tariffs at all unless the Government really needs the money," urges a Clayton, N. Mex., ranchhand.

FEW IDEAS

Admittedly, these are extreme examples of the responses a reporter got to the question: Do you agree with the President that U.S. trade barriers should be lowered? But they at least reflect some thought about foreign commerce. Most people seemed to have no ideas at all.

True, it's possible to engage an oilman in this area in lengthy conversation about oil imports which, a visitor is told, threaten to bring down the Republic. Or a man with vast holdings in wheat acreage may see greater grain exports as a means to alleviate the farm surplus. But generally the man on the street responds to a question about trade much as he might to a question about the mating habits of the domesticated yak. His interest is peripheral.

Nor is there any reason to believe this blank spot is peculiar to five Western States. Talks with neighbors in our own New Jersey town indicated little concern with the rising economic challenge from abroad, especially from the Common Market nations of Europe.

Moreover, memory tells us that at least one self-conscious secondary school in the East provided not even a cursory introduction to the problems of international commerce. And from what several college graduates in the West had to say, if their alma maters gave them even a grounding in foreign trade, very little of it stuck.

HELP FOR PROTECTIONISTS

If this ignorance is as widespread as it seems, it's unlikely that Congressmen sifting their mail for a hint of the popular mood will find many constituents urging support of the administration plan for broad tariff reductions. This, of course, would clearly help the protectionists who traditionally have lobbied with far greater enthusiasm than the generally disorganized proponents of freer trade.

In one sense such popular unawareness of so basic and so tangled a controversy is surprising and in another sense it is not.

It is surprising because few sections of the country would be unaffected by an important change in the flow of imports and exports. With great new markets opened up in Europe and elsewhere, many American plants would soon hum at a higher pitch. And with more and often less-expensive imports entering the country, many other American plants would be caught in a rigorous cost-price squeeze. There would be more jobs in some factories and fewer in others—workers, merchants and service businesses, if they didn't know it already, would become quickly aware that the trade debate is something they have a big stake in.

On the other hand so much apathy and ignorance are not surprising. For one thing, many newspapers in the West carry reports of the trade controversy that are almost as short as they are superficial. And if a reader wasn't conversant with business lingo the chances are he wouldn't read beyond the first paragraph (11 of 15 people interviewed in this Kansas town didn't have the faintest idea what the term "foreign exchange" meant).

The other major sources of information, radio and television, are doing an even less adequate job. If a television news program uses more than four sentences to report a major trade story that itself is news. Radio sometimes does better with short analytical essays about subjects such as trade. But by and large the news media are not telling the people the things they should know to make up their minds about a question that's been around since before Marco Polo.

CUTTING PRODUCTION COSTS

These observations are not just the impressions of one visitor on a five-State tour. They were in fact mentioned again and again by people in the area who sought to explain their dim understanding of trade matters. "We just never hear anything about it and what I hear I don't really understand," admitted Mrs. Joe Hess, of Clayton, N. Mex.

All this should not be interpreted as a general indictment of the public's awareness or intelligence. The same people who know so little about the trade controversy showed themselves to be well informed and greatly interested in the proposed administration budget, the status of the United Nations, Mr. Kennedy's conduct as President, and other topics. And even on the subject of trade there were at least a few thoughtful observations.

C. A. Stevens, president of the First National Bank of Raton, N. Mex., comments, "What troubles me is how can this country be competitive with lower wage countries. Clearly we have to cut our production costs before we can hope to survive a wholesale lowering of tariffs. I don't mean by that that we should work people for nothing—I once carried a union card myself. But first we have to prepare ourselves for freer international competition. After that we can move ahead to reduce the tariffs."

A COMPETITIVE WORLD

And Mrs. John J. Conard, of Greensburg, Kans., declares: "Of course we must liberalize trade. We have to change with the times and remember, it's a competitive world. It's often hard for people to see beyond their own little area, but this country was built on competition. We can compete if we're not afraid to compete."

Several Kansans, incidentally, point out that former Gov. Alf Landon has urged support of the Kennedy trade plan, and this apparently has influenced their own opinions.

"I think Landon is right," says Mrs. Jenny Bauer of Pratt, Kans. "Foreigners can't buy anything from us unless we buy from them."

But this kind of comment is rare indeed. Eight times out of ten a visitor asking about the trade question gets a meaningless answer or no answer at all.

The effect of such widespread ignorance about an increasingly important political and economic issue is anybody's guess. But the causes of that ignorance should be of some concern to the Nation's newspapers, broadcasters and educators.

And the situation should interest President Kennedy. If he is to sell the people on his new trade program, he might first want to give them a short course on how trade works; after that he can explain his reasons for wanting to lower tariffs.

Then if the people disagree, it will not be because they think the President wants to make shipowners rich.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 24, 1962]

IT LIES IN GRASSROOTS PRESSURES AND LESS ACTIVE FOES

(By Robert D. Novak)

WASHINGTON.—The legions of protectionism, seemingly outgunned and outmanned by the diverse forces favoring free trade, are not about to sound retreat. Indeed, they seem more robust than at any time in a generation as another foreign trade debate looms in Congress.

Why? The secret of protectionism's power can be found within a seldom-recognized American phenomenon: This country remains, even today, far less centralized in its life than any other great power. The men of wealth, power and influence in their New York and Washington offices cannot automatically make their wishes felt across the continent. To a great degree, nameless men in crossroads hamlets can frustrate the designs of the mighty.

The apparently invincible array of powerful national organizations supporting freer trade thus is reduced to a facade in the light of political realities. "You just can't think of this issue in terms of a broad national campaign," contends a free trade lobbyist who has grappled with the protectionists in many a congressional war. "You have to consider each congressional district separately. Protectionist pressure in each district has to be balanced by pressure from us. Sometimes we can't do it."

A DEFENSIVE WAR

True, the protectionists are fighting a defensive war; there is no possibility of returning to the national trade policy of the bygone days when William McKinley's motto of "Prosperity, Patriotism and Protection" stirred the Nation. But it has been a successful rearguard action. The postwar decade saw the passage of protectionist devices to dull the impact of tariff cuts, and protectionists now threaten President Kennedy's bid for greatly expanded tariff-cutting power to cope with the European Common Market.

The appearances and realities of the opposing forces, comparative strength in the foreign trade fight can be seen by glancing at the list of witnesses that testified last month before a Senate-House subcommittee on trade problems. The long parade of free trade advocates cut across ideological, party, and social lines—Kennedy administration and former Eisenhower administration officials, Republicans and Democrats, respected economists, spokesmen for the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the AFL–CIO, and the American Farm Bureau Federation. And, cheering them on in a remarkably unanimous chorus were the Nation's most powerful newspapers and political commentators.

Opposing this impressive coalition on the witness stand was a lonely apostle of protectionism: O. R. Strackbein, a professional lobbyist with a penchant for long and repetitive oral statements. But allied with Mr. Strackbein was an unseen army, many of them members of organizations officially on record in favor of freer trade.

Whatever the U.S. Chamber may say nationally, member industries which claim injury from foreign imports—textiles, glass, plywood, minerals, pottery, footwear, and many more—will demand tariff protection from their Congressmen. No matter what the staff economists of the AFL–CIO may argue, the member unions representing these same industries side with employers in opposing tariff cuts.

ELECTION YEAR PRESSURES

And disregarding the positions of their national party leaders, Republican and Democratic lawmakers alike tend to be more receptive to the pressures and conditions of their local districts—particularly in an election year.

The interplay between local and national pressures places many a Congressman in an uncomfortable crossfire of conflicting loyalties. Take the case of Senator Lee Metcalf, of Montana, who might be expected to be fighting for the Kennedy trade program as a Democratic Party regular, a loyal administration backer and a promising young liberal leader. But Senator Metcalf is at the same time a political representative of the western mining country, a traditional stronghold of protectionism.

"How can I go to the miner or the lumber worker or the sheep farmer and say, 'We're going to put you out of business for the national interest'?" Senator Metcalf declares. "I can't, and I don't think I should." In the end, he may be more moved by national considerations and wind up supporting the Kennedy program, at least in modified form. But other lawmakers from areas similar to Mr. Metcalf's are totally preoccupied by parochial factors and probably will not.

There are, of course, powerful economic interests that benefit from expanded foreign trade, great industries with far more potential political muscle than the protectionists. But their voice on the local level seems muted when compared with the raucous cries of the protectionists. Conceding that a majority of businessmen in his State probably favor freer trade, an eastern Republican Senator adds quickly that the minority protectionists' sentiment "is concentrated, as though it came through a magnifying glass. It burns like hell."

TIME OFF TO WRITE

This burning sensation felt by Congressmen is nothing less than the threat of an election defeat. A protectionist industry in one district may employ just a few hundred workers, but the Congressman is told frankly that he will lose those few hundred votes in future elections unless he performs correctly on the floor of the House. The warning has substance; fully indoctrinated by employers and union leaders, employees of some plants are given free time away from the workbench in order to write protectionist letters to their Congressmen.

Consider the pressures on lawmakers from Connecticut, for example. The import-conscious rubber footwear and brass industries in the Naugatuck Valley emit a constant call for high tariffs. But the State's export-conscious aircraft industry barely raises its voice in arguing for expanded trade. It would be no surprise, then, if Connecticut Congressmen feel they have much to lose and little to gain politically by supporting the Kennedy trade program.

The contrast between the aggressiveness of the local protectionists and listlessness of local free traders is really not surprising. To the protectionists, this issue is a matter of economic life and death, threatening the destruction of industries and loss of jobs. The arguments advanced by free traders carry less emotional appeal inherently.

A TARGET FOR COPPER MEN?

Thus, businessmen who otherwise are apathetic about developments in far-away Washington spring to life when they consider their very existence endangered. Montana's dominant copper industry takes a tolerant attitude toward Senator Metcalf's liberal record on labor and social welfare measures. But if he should begin to support legislation that would open the dikes for a flow of foreign copper into the United States, the copper men might designate him for political liquidation.

Moreover, national organizations favoring freer trade often find it difficult to mobilize their local affiliates even if the local leaders aren't active protectionists. "It's easy enough to explain soybean legislation to a soybean farmer or wheat legislation to a wheat farmer," asserts Herbert H. Harris II of the American Farm Bureau Federation. "But it's a damn tough job to explain how the trade bill is important to him."

This pattern of local pressures does not seem likely to change any time soon. Mr. Kennedy's proposal for a variety of Federal subsidies to aid employers and workers injured by foreign imports may win the votes of a few wavering Congressmen. But it won't perform successfully the more important mission of extinguishing the protectionist fires back home.

"These industries don't want to get handouts or be helped into another line of business," maintains a prominent Republican Congressman. "They want to stay in business at the same stand."

Some pessimistic free traders believe Congress will not authorize genuinely significant tariff reductions until the protectionist din is drowned out at the local level by an even more bellicose advocacy of expanded trade. And they feel that such a grass-roots backing cannot be built until the need for foreign trade becomes less academic and—like protectionism—is a matter of economic life or death, of survival of industries, or retention of jobs.

In other words, these pessimists believe nothing approaching Mr. Kennedy's trade program can be passed until enough industries have suffered from the exclusion of their products from Europe because of the failure to negotiate effectively with the Common Market. And by the time that that happens, the country's trade problems may be far more complicated than they are today.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the fundamental point is that the public must be informed. I think the President must undertake a number of television interviews with the American people in order to inform them on trade if the trade program is to be effectively legislated in the Congress. I have tried to do that myself. Others have. There is an appalling lack of information and misunderstanding of the basic facts as disclosed by polls and interviews and other newspaper research, of which we had better take heed. I strongly urge the President to move along that line.

REREFERENCE OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 110, ESTABLISHING A GEORGE WASHINGTON CARVER COMMEMORATIVE COMMISSION, TO THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that House Joint Resolution 110, which is Calendar No. 1025, be withdrawn from the calendar and rereferred to the Committee on the Judiciary. I have cleared this, I believe, with the leadership on both sides of the aisle. I think there is a full justification for the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. ROBERTSON rose.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, we have discussed this with the distinguished minority leader. I have explained to him and to my colleague from Arkansas that there is some very material evidence which should be presented.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record my statement plus some newspaper articles concerning what I regard to be serious mismanagement of previous appropriations, all of which should be investigated before we provide a memorial for a great colored citizen, for whom we have a record at his birthplace, a memorial which cost over $600,000, and for which we are spending about $46,000 a year for upkeep.

I invite attention to the fact that if we are to have another memorial to this man we shall be doing more for him than we have done for anybody who ever lived in this country.

We have built memorials to two Presidents and we have built memorials to two colored people. One of them was Dr. Carver. He was a great scientist, but we have built a memorial to him. This is a proposal to build another one. I say before we do so we should know all of the facts.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary which reported the joint resolution, I may say that the evidence referred to has not been presented to the committee. Obviously I could have no objection to having the joint resolution returned to the subcommittee for such testimony and evidence as my distinguished friend from Virginia wishes to offer.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I thank my distinguished colleague.

Mr. President, do I have permission to insert the material?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Virginia?

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator Robertson

I wish to call attention to House Joint Resolution 110, now pending on the Senate Calendar, to establish a George Washington Carver Commemorative Commission and to authorize the appropriation of $249,000 for the Commission's expenses.

This resolution deserves considerably more study than it has received. Further study will demonstrate that House Joint Resolution 110 is both unnecessary and undesirable.

Dr. Carver was an outstanding scientist and the urge to pay tribute to him is ununderstandable, but I am convinced that House Joint Resolution 110 will do no honor to Dr. Carver.

I say the pending resolution is unnecessary because few men in our history have received the recognition accorded Dr. Carver by the Federal Government. His birthplace in the State of Missouri is maintained by the Park Service as a national monument, a distinction given only three other Americans. They are George Washington and Abraham Lincoln, both Presidents of the United States, and Booker T. Washington, who was president of Tuskegee Institute in Alabama, and, incidentally, was the one who invited Dr. Carver to do his scientific research at Tuskegee.

The opening sentence of the National Park Service brochure on the Carver National Monument says: "The congressional act which authorized the establishment of George Washington Carver National Monument insures a lasting memorial to this humble man."

The Park Service has invested at least $606,000 to make the Carver Monument a lasting memorial and annually spends some $46,000 on its upkeep. In July of 1960, a ceremony was conducted there during the centennial year of Dr. Carver's birth to recognize the substantial completion of the monument development program. This alone should make House Joint Resolution 110 unnecessary.

The official view of the Department of Interior on House Joint Resolution 110 was not requested and therefore it is not available to us in the committee report accompanying the resolution, but I have a letter from Hon. Hillory A. Tolson, Acting Director of the National Park Service, who writes "* * * it is our understanding there is no apparent interest in or need for additional celebrations of a commemorative character in the foreseeable future."

In addition to the national birthplace monument, the issuance of a George Washington Carver-Booker T. Washington silver half-dollar was authorized by the Congress in 1951. I shall have more to say about this coin later, but, for the moment, it is sufficient to say that few Americans have been honored by a commemorative coin.

For these reasons, I believe the Congress has provided amply for the continuing recognition of Dr. Carver and there is no need to establish a commission to spend almost a quarter of a million dollars duplicating what is already being done.

This proposal, frankly, is the scheme of a single promoter to lay his hands once again on Federal funds under the pretext of honoring the work of an outstanding member of the Negro race. I know of no interest in a commemorative commission for George Washington Carver that cannot be traced to Dr. S. J. Phillips, who has learned from previous experience that a federally financed commission provides excellent access to the Treasury with no embarrassing questions asked.

Phillips has played this game for more than 15 years, and it is impossible to tell how much he and his cohorts have gotten from the Federal Government. He was given authority to order and sell 5 million commemorative half dollars to finance a suitable memorial to Booker T. Washington at his birthplace in Virginia, and, while he handled more than $2 million, the only memorial that exists to Booker T. Washington at the birthplace site was created by the National Park Service with an initial appropriation of $200,000 from the Congress.

In addition, Phillips had an appropriation which amounted to a blank check for $225,000 on the U.S. Treasury to enable him to observe the centennial of Booker T. Washington's birth.

He has never rendered a proper accounting for any of this money; he has retained no records, and it is impossible to make heads or tails of any of the so-called financial statements he has circulated at various times. His addition is not even accurate in some cases. I have every reason to believe this man and a few of his friends have profited from the willingness of the Congress to provide support for what appears to be a good cause without attaching adequate safeguards.

Now that he is asking another $249,000, I think it is time some questions were asked.

You will note that the commission that would be created by House Joint Resolution 110 would be authorized "* * * to cooperate with and to assist the George Washington Carver National Monument Foundation * * *."

The president of this foundation and the chairman of the George Washington Carver Commemorative Commission is S. J. Phillips, former president of the Booker T. Washington Birthplace Memorial and former chairman of the Booker T. Washington Centennial Commission. The secretary of the Carver Commemorative Commission and five of its nine members were members of the board of trustees of the Booker T. Washington Centennial Commission, which squandered $225,000 in 1956–57, and a sixth member of the commission received payment for personal services rendered to the Booker T. Washington Commission.

In other words, the pending proposal is advanced by the same crowd that observed the 100th anniversary of Booker T. Washington's birth with liberal salaries for themselves, self-serving donations, and questionable promotions.

In this connection, the words of the president of Tuskegee Institute, Dr. L. H. Foster, take on a special significance. On February 10, 1961, soon after House Joint Resolution 110 was approved by the House of Representatives, he sent me a copy of a letter to the clerk of the Senate Judiciary Committee in which he wrote:

"Dr. Carver was a great American, and his memory should be honored. We at Tuskegee Institute believe that his work here is his outstanding memorial, and that the active research program in the George Washington Carver Foundation at Tuskegee Institute should be developed as the really significant tribute to Dr. Carver's memory. The Carver Research Foundation at Tuskegee Institute was founded by Dr. Carver with his life's savings shortly before his death. The foundation at Tuskegee is a research foundation; it is not connected in any way with the George Washington Carver National Monument Foundation or any other organization of similar name.

"We do not know the plans of the proposed commission or the projects of the George Washington Carver National Monument Foundation (not connected with Tuskegee Institute) which will apparently have large responsibility for carrying out the commemorative activities. It has seemed to us that some of the efforts to honor great Americans have been misdirected by persons and organizations chiefly interested in their own activities and not in the person to be honored. We hope very much this will not happen in any efforts to honor the late Dr. Carver."

In view of what has gone before, the president of Tuskegee has every reason to fear that the proposed commemorative efforts in behalf of Dr. Carver will be misdirected if Phillips and his cronies are involved.

To aid in a proper study of House Joint Resolution 110, I believe it will be helpful to review certain events in the not too distant past.

On October 6, 1945, Phillips made a modest investment of $7,500 to buy the James Burroughs Plantation in Franklin County, Va., the birthplace of Booker T. Washington. He obtained a charter in January 1946, from the Commonwealth of Virginia for the Booker T. Washington Birthplace Memorial, a nonprofit organization to perpetuate the ideals and teachings of Booker T. Washington. Then he turned the birthplace property over to the foundation of which he was both founder and president.

On August 7, 1946, less than a year after Phillips bought the birthplace site, the Congress approved Public Law 610, 79th Congress (60 Stat. 863) authorizing the coinage of 5 million 50-cent pieces to commemorate Booker T. Washington. Under the act, the commemorative coins were to be issued at the request of the birthplace memorial and they could be sold at a premium by banks and trust companies designated by the memorial.

The 1946 act, which was scheduled to expire August 7, 1951, was amended on September 21, 1951 (65 Stat. 334) to authorize the issuance of a newly designed half dollar that would honor both Booker T. Washington and George Washington Carver. The amended act stated that the new Carver-Washington coins could be issued until August 7, 1954, and authorized the issuance of a number equal to the unused authority in the original act plus whatever old coins were returned to the mint for melting.

In addition, the 1951 amendment authorized a second organization to order coins from the mint. That new organization was the George Washington Carver National Monument Foundation, which you will recognize as the intended benefactor of House Joint Resolution 110. Phillips founded the Carver Monument Foundation in Missouri in 1950.

In one capacity or another, Phillips ordered the manufacture of a total of 5,588,000 coins under the 1946 act and its amendment, and he returned almost half of them, 2,675,980, to the mint for remelting. It is estimated by the Bureau of the Mint that this activity alone cost the Federal Government $135,000 and reduced the funds available for the production of regular coins for circulation.

Had the costs incurred in carrying out the commemorative coin program been applied to the production of regular coins, I am advised that about 19 million coins could have been made, which would have resulted in the realization of about three and a half times more seigniorage.

The coins were issued with the understanding that they would be sold at a modest premium and that the profits would be used for a worthy cause, but I am told by the mint that Phillips deliberately limited the number of coins in circulation and gave exclusive resale rights to certain coin dealers who reaped a substantial profit, despite the protests of coin collectors.

When the authority to order and sell commemorative Carver-Washington coins expired in August of 1954, the Booker T. Washington Birthplace Memorial collapsed. The memorial went into bankruptcy in January, 1955, with debts of approximately $140,000.

Phillips left no financial records of the 8-year period during which the Booker T. Washington Birthplace Memorial existed. Some of the records were destroyed by fire in 1950, and Phillips destroyed others in 1957 because, he told the General Accounting Office, he had no storage space for them and he did not believe they would be needed again.

Last fall, Phillips sent me his own summary of the annual financial reports he made to his friends on the board of trustees during the life of the birthplace memorial. The General Accounting Office has reviewed this document and concluded that it provided "only limited information." In five cases, it was found, the yearly figures for disbursements were not even added properly, and in one case, the final total was padded by $993.

Phillips' financial report indicates that he handled more than $2 million between 1946 and 1954, and it is readily apparent to me that he produced nothing of value with the money.

For example, one of his projects was the reconstruction of the slave cabin in which

Booker T. Washington was born. The State of Virginia financed this work with an appropriation of $15,000 and later the National Park Service found it necessary to replace it because it was not authentic. The cabin that exists today was paid for by Federal funds, thus we have one cabin for the price of two.

Phillips also renovated the old Burroughs home on the birthplace site to provide space for a post office and administrative offices. While being utilized in this manner, fire destroyed the old home, which might have had some historic value, despite Phillips' alterations, had it survived.

In the beginning, I was an enthusiastic supporter of the idea of providing a suitable memorial to Booker T. Washington at the site of his birth in Franklin County, a county in which I lived as a boy. I accepted an invitation, along with many other Virginians, to serve on the board of governors of the Booker T. Washington Birthplace Memorial Foundation.

But the board of governors never met. When I received an inquiry from the Chief Postal Inspector, who was investigating charges that the memorial was using the mails to defraud in connection with fund-raising schemes involving puzzle contests and cash prizes, I advised him that the board existed in name only and was not responsible for the actions of Phillips or his trustees. Shortly thereafter, the board of governors was dissolved.

When the memorial was placed in bankruptcy in January 1955, the birthplace property was auctioned and bought in Phillips' behalf for $16,000. This was sufficient to satisfy the judgments against the property, including one obtained by the Federal Government for some $12,000 in unpaid unemployment insurance taxes.

After the auction, Phillips promptly announced the formation of a Booker T. Washington National Monument Foundation with himself as president. The foundation was incorporated under the laws of the State of Virginia in August 1955, and the trustees of the foundation created the Booker T. Washington Centennial Commission.

Phillips was back in business.

In 1956, the Congress authorized the expenditure of $200,000 to acquire and maintain the birthplace property as a national monument and Virginia's General Assembly appropriated $17,000 to pay off the indebtedness on the property, which had been incurred by Phillips so he could have the birthplace site repurchased at the bankruptcy auction.

The Congress also appropriated $225,000 in 1956 for the expenses of Phillips' newly organized centennial commission. The appropriation was made available with no requirement that Phillips render an accounting, although he was required to present vouchers or other evidence of expenditures to the National Park Service before drawing the money.

The centennial was observed for an 11-month period, April 5, 1956, until August 1, 1957, and by the time the final voucher was submitted on November 1, 1958, the total Federal expenditure for the centennial amounted to $225,047.53.

Although the centennial ended in 1957, it was June 6, 1960, before Phillips made a report on the centennial commission's activities. This report, like the alleged financial statement of the Birthplace Memorial Foundation, is of little value, and the timing of its submission—about 2½ months before the introduction of the first resolution to create a commission to honor George Washington Carver—makes one wonder whether it would ever have been made if Phillips had not had another commission in mind.

Phillips own account of his activities leaves no doubt that the centennial commission was used to promote the interests of Phillips and his friends and as a sales agency for the commemorative coins, the proceeds of which, you will recall, went to Phillips.

For instance, his report says he spent $9,810.93 for printing. This included "all basic material of a stationery or advertising nature that was used in carrying the centennial program to the Nation—letterheads, envelopes, advertising folders, and other pieces; voucher receipts, printed post cards for inserts in letters, forms and labels, statements, coin and catalog envelopes; clasp envelopes, display pieces on the life and achievements of Booker T. Washington; quotations from Booker T. Washington's writings, printed form letters, etc."

For advertising, Phillips reported spending $21,651.76. In a moment I will ask unanimous consent for the insertion in the Record of a series of newspaper articles. This series includes examples of the advertising utilized by the commission and states that the commission used Federal funds "to purchase and advertise for sale and [to] distribute products with the proceeds going to the foundation. Only one of the ads," the newspaper said, "failed to have a coupon for convenient purchase of either half dollars or books or both. In fact, it, a Christmas ad, was nothing except a pitch for buying the autobiography [of Booker T. Washington] and coins."

Phillips says he maintained an office force of 19, employed 8 writers to provide "institutional advertising," and utilized 2 public relations organizations and 9 persons to "make contacts and open channels that were often difficult to open * * *."

In addition, Phillips reports the employment of special personnel to perform jobs that could not be done by his regular staff or his public relations contactmen. As an example of the type of special service provided by the federally financed centennial commission, Phillips says he employed a home economist and a helper to work with the Housing and Feeding Committee of the National Baptist Convention at its 76th annual session in Denver, Colo., in September 1956.

He also reported the expenditure of $1,200 at the National Baptist Convention U.S.A., Inc. By way of explanation, he says he received a mailing list of 10,000 Baptist leaders and made "several small donations" to "State conventions who opened their doors to centennial representatives." He also made a donation to the "Baptist Bath House," which he described as a national religious project.

One will search in vain through the report for any mention of what Phillips may have gotten for his work with the commission, but the National Park Service record of approved vouchers shows that Phillips paid himself $21,160 for personal services and $8,152.94 for travel. His wife received a total of $3,334.40 for personal services and travel, making a total of $32,047.34 that the couple received from the commission for an active program of less than a year. This, of course, does not count any extras which may be hidden in the very general description of expenses kept by the Park Service.

Additional details of the manner in which the Federal funds provided the Booker T. Washington Centennial Commission were spent, including some hidden extras, will be found in the newspaper articles I have mentioned previously. They were written in 1957, soon after the centennial commission concluded its work and show every evidence of being based on careful and painstaking research. I should point out, however, that they were written more than a year before the final voucher was submitted to the Park Service for payment and, therefore the expenses cited occasionally are less than they actually were.

There have been no hearings on the proposal to honor George Washington Carver.

The first plan for a Carver Commission was contained in House Joint Resolution 799, introduced in the House on August 23, 1960, and passed by that body on the following day. The 1960 resolution proposed a centennial commission, but that plan died in the absence of action by the Senate Judiciary Committee prior to adjournment of the 86th Congress and the centennial year, passed, marked only by the National Park Service.

On January 9, 1961, House Joint Resolution 110 for a commemorative commission was introduced in the House and passed that same day. There were no hearings on the Senate side prior to September 15, when the joint resolution was reported in the Senate.

The Senate was designed to move studiously and deliberately so that unwise proposals would not be approved in haste. The Senate's own traditions, the American taxpayers and the memory of George Washington Carver will be well served if House Joint Resolution 110 goes no farther.

For the additional information of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent for the publication at this point in the Record of seven articles published in October 1957, by the Roanoke, Va., World-News.

[From the Roanoke World-News, Oct. 21, 1957]

BOOKER T. WASHINGTON CENTENNIAL COSTS NEARLY $225,000

(First of a series)

(By Dick Sutherland)

(Note.—Early this year President Eisenhower gave Congress a whopping budget of more than $70 billion. The country responded with a plea for economy, a cut in foreign aid, a slash in pork-barrel expenditures, and a curtailment of domestic giveaway programs. This newspaper found that the Booker T. Washington Centennial Commission, working out of Franklin County, was at work spending $225,000 given it by Congress. The new organization is a successor to the Booker T. Washington Birthplace Memorial, which went bankrupt in 1955. How the money was spent (by the centennial commission) almost half going to salaries and travel expenses, is set forth in a series of article beginning today in this newspaper.)

The year-long celebration of the 100th anniversary of Booker T. Washington's birth has cost U.S. taxpayers nearly $225,000.

The cost has been well worth the results, according to Sidney J. Phillips, president of the Booker T. Washington Centennial Commission. The commission has been the agency which spent the Federal appropriation.

Phillips says the centennial program "focused national attention" on Booker T. Washington, and "made the Nation conscious" of his great contributions. "It touched a lot of people," Phillips says simply.

According to the legislation granting the commission the $225,000, its function was to "promote the spirit of interracial good will and revive interest in the practical policies, programs, principles, and philosophies of Booker T. Washington."

Numerous means have been used to carry out this directive, Phillips says. Ads have been placed in newspapers in many parts of the country. More than 100 Negro newspapers were used to spread the commission's message. Radio was also employed.

Special programs for various groups, such as schools, churches, and civic clubs, were developed, and dispatched. Conventions received special attention.

Vast quantities of literature were sent almost anyone who might be interested, according to Phillips. Donations and scholarships were provided to increase interest in Booker T. Washington.

Speakers were available to address interested groups. A decorated station wagon with loudspeaker equipment was used for messages before large crowds, such as those attending parades.

This program was carried out through the commission, which was created by the board of trustees of Booker T. Washington National Monument Foundation. Phillips is also president of the foundation.

The memorial foundation is the successor to the Booker T. Washington Birthplace Memorial, Inc., which folded under a large debt early in 1955. It had been chartered in 1946.

Phillips purchased the land for the memorial in October 1945. When his first organization was forced to sell, he again acquired the property. The 1956 State budget appropriated $17,000 to buy the land from Phillips, with the idea of presenting it to the Federal Government for a national monument.

This has been done, and Congress has appropriated $200,000 to develop the site. A director has been named and is making his headquarters in Roanoke.

Phillips says the celebration was planned long before any Federal aid was forseen. When the aid became available the program was expanded.

Federal aid was sought as early as May 8, 1956. Phillips gives Representative Brady Gentry, Democrat, of Texas, credit for paving the way. Gentry introduced a statement by Phillips which advocated Federal aid for the centennial commission. In his statement Phillips presented the South as being in complete chaos following the Civil War, and Washington as being the man whose ideas were to set the situation straight.

He claimed the present struggle over integration has produced a situation "comparable in many ways with that produced by the Civil War."

Phillips wanted 100,000 half dollars coined to finance the program, despite the fact his birthplace memorial sank under a $140,000 debt in 1955 after selling 2,885,271 coins.

The 100,000 coins apparently continued to dominate the financial thinking of Phillips and the commission as late as June 26, 1956, when Representative HUGH SCOTT, Republican, of Pennsylvania, entered another plea from Phillips into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Phillips wanted the legislation passed before July 4, 1956, so it could be announced on that date at a Tuskegee, Ala., picnic.

However, the idea died before July 31, 1956, when the final amendment was attached to the second supplemental appropriations bill and approved.

Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois, sponsored the amendment. It was offered on the Senate floor with Senator George H. Bender, Republican, of Ohio, and Senator Herbert L. Lehman, Democrat, of New York, acting as cosponsors.

Senator CARL HAYDEN, Democrat, of Arizona, made a statement on the floor that he would accept the agreement and take it to conference. The amendment was agreed to and became part of the legislation which received approval.

Virginia Congressmen played no part in this amendment according to information available.

Phillips said Senator DIRKSEN supported the measure because he has had a longtime interest in Booker T. Washington. Perry W. Howard, Washington lawyer, and trustee and member of the centennial executive committee, was the contact with Senator DIRKSEN.

Phillips said Howard knew DIRKSEN personally, then added that DIRKSEN has many Negro friends in Illinois.

DIRKSEN himself said: "The extraordinary efforts and the sustained force of Booker T. Washington in bringing about the creation and growth in Tuskegee Institute together with his superb endeavors in bringing about better racial understanding have always been, in my judgment, an inspiring force in America and, hence, I was only too glad to lend some assistance in securing Federal funds to make the Booker T. Washington Centennial a real success."

[From the Roanoke World-News, Oct. 22, 1957]

EMPLOYEES, PHONE, TRAVEL, AND CARS COST CENTENNIAL $99,830

(Second of a series of articles)

(By Dick Sutherland)

Salaries, special personal services, field representatives, telephone and telegraph, travel and subsistence and motorized equipment account for a large chunk of the $225,000 Congress appropriated for the Booker T. Washington Centennial celebration.

Altogether, $108,300 was set aside in the commission's budget for these items. In the report he is to submit to Congress Sidney J. Phillips, president of the Booker T. Washington Centennial Commission, says $99,830.93 has been spent.

The report shows $46,282.32 spent for salaries of $47,000 allocated. Nearly half this sum actually spent has gone to Phillips and Mrs. A. V. Mundy, assistant executive director. They are the top salaried employes in the commission.

Phillips has received a salary of $660 each 2 weeks. For a full year this would amount to $17,160. Mrs. Mundy received $225.60 each 2 weeks, or $5,865.60 in the same time interval. These figures are for gross income, before any taxes are deducted.

Of the commission's 19 full- or part-time employees, 6 others are paid more than $100 each 2 weeks. They are: Mrs. Portia Washington Pittman, special representative, $200; George L. Jeffries, budget director, $196; Ada C. Chappel, office manager, $120.80; and three field representatives, J. S. Coprich, W. B. Fleming, and Mrs. V. H. Phillips, all $109.60 each.

Other salaried employees include: G. Lake Imes, assistant to the director, $97.60; Matilda Ferguson, typist-mail clerk, $60; T. C. Cottrell, part-time stenographer, $54.72; J. S. Carrington, fraternal organization, part time, $54; and H. C. Saunders, part-time accountant, $50.

Also, Rebecca King, typist, $49.60; Mary Dudley, part-time typist, $30.80; Madge Holland, part-time typist, $29.76; J. U. Mundy, part-time special service, $24.96; Doris Scott, part-time stenographer, $24.80; and Florence Field Woods, part-time research, $24.80.

Some of these people received additional funds for travel and subsistence and special services. J. U. Mundy was paid $100 for preparing radio spot announcements for the Elks and Baptist meetings.

Mrs. Pittman received $1,129.47 in travel and subsistence from September 5 until June 1, and $200 for services in August.

Mrs. Mundy was paid $1,089.19 for travel and subsistence from August 28 until June 18. Jeffries received $1,697.92 for travel and subsistence from October 7 until March 15. Coprich got $2,146.79 for his travels between November 8 and June 17. Mr. Fleming's travels cost $907.81 between September 12 and May 18. He received another $600 for the preparation of material on Booker T. Washington.

Mrs. Phillips, wife of the president, received $52 for trips in October and February. H. C. Saunders was paid $478.78 for travel between August 21 and October 22.

Dr. G. Lake Imes was paid $187.26 for special services.

Phillips himself did the most traveling, receiving $6,977.75 for his travel and subsistence between August 27 and May 24.

In addition, three of these employees, Mrs. Mundy, Mundy, and Saunders were on the payroll of the Booker T. Washington Sales Agency of Tuskegee Institute, of which Phillips is owner-president. The sales agency did some business with the centennial commission.

The centennial commission was created by the board of directors of the Booker T. Washington National Monument Foundation. Officers and trustees of the commission or firms they represent have received in salaries and for services at least $60,000. All individuals who received any money were also members of the foundation.

Phillips says the program was planned by a group which included besides himself, Mrs. Mundy, Dr. Imes, George Schuyler, New York editor of the Pittsburgh Courier; O. K. Armstrong, former Member of Congress; Perry W. Howard, a Washington attorney; W. S. Burke, of Washington; and Andrew F. Jackson, public relations counselor, of Washington.

The commission paid them or their firms for salaries, expenses of services more than $70,000.

Mobile units and their upkeep have cost $13,038.75. The commission owns a 1956 station wagon with a public address system and two 1957 sedans, one of which has a continental wheel kit. At the end of the centennial year these will revert to the monument foundation.

In addition, a 1950 convertible has been used in commission work. Phillips claimed this car belonged to the Better Worker, his magazine. The car is registered in his name. Phillips said a field representative, J. S. Coprich, used it for some work. He says, the commission had paid a repair bill of more than $100 on the car in addition to gas and oil.

For an 8-month period gas and oil cost $2,111.27, an average of $263.91 a month. No increase was noted in the gas bill after the commission acquired its two new cars.

In addition to commission cars, Phillips says two new tires were put on Carrington's car. Phillips said this was done also in South Boston. He said Carrington came to commission headquarters from the Norfolk area on business.

Gas, and at least one tire were put on Mrs. Chappel's private car. Phillips said the car was used for commission business.

Gold lettering on the station wagon cost $225.50 initially. Another $50 was spent having the lettering touched up 3½ months later.

The public address system installed cost $346.62. Another $103.46 was spent building a float for the station wagon from which 39 small American flags fly.

Phillips says of the commission's telephone bill: "In conducting a program of national scope such as that of the Booker T. Washington Centennial Commission there is need for the home office and the executive director to contact workers, organizational leaders, radio stations, etc., in many and varied sections of the country. Often conferences must be held, programs set up or worked out, explanations or appeals made, etc. To send workers to straighten out or initiate such matters would be far too costly so telephone and telegraph services are used instead."

For a 10-month period ending May 1, the phone bill was $4,576, an average of $457.60 a month. In addition, the commission paid for telephone service to Jackson, its public relations consultant. The two bills were $134.67 and $46.20. Another phone bill was paid Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. for August phone service. It amounted to $254.82.

[From the Roanoke World-News, Oct. 23, 1957]

Books, Coins Sold To Help Good-will Idea—Centennial Sale Receipts Go to Foundation Group

(Third of a series of articles)

(By Dick Sutherland)

Good-will building has been the most important goal of the Booker T. Washington Centennial Commission's yearlong program.

The legislation which gave the commission $225,000 specifically listed the promotion of "the spirit of interracial good will" as one of its objectives.

Two big items in the budget were commemorative coins and pocket book editions of Booker T. Washington's autobiography, "Up From Slavery."

The commission has disposed of 32,000 copies of the book and nearly $10,000 worth of coins. The coins were purchased at face value, according to Sidney J. Phillips, president and executive director of the commission.

The commission began its program by attempting to sell both items. The coins were to be sold for a dollar and books for 50 cents. The first 7,000 books cost the commission 18 cents each, Phillips says.

Any receipts derived from these two operations would have reverted to the Booker T. Washington National Monument Foundation, which Phillips also heads. The foundation's board of trustees created the commission for the celebration of the 100th anniversary of Washington's birth. Phillips says in his final report to Congress there were a tremendous number of requests for the book and renewed interest in the coin. Elsewhere he says 31,000 copies of the book were mailed to school people as a source of data for program material.

Nowhere in his report does Phillips say the books were ever sold. Privately, he claims only 501 were actually sold, saying the response was very slow.

As for the coins, the report says only that some were sold. Emphasis is placed on the fact they were used as good-will building devices. Privately, Phillips says 8,264 were sold for a dollar each, 2,082 were exchanged at face value and 2,786 were donated. He says there was no real profit from either the books or the coins.

MATTER OF BOOKKEEPING

That would seem to be a matter of bookkeeping. The commission could have received no profit since it footed all the bills and took no receipts. However, the foundation, which would have received any receipts from the sale of the coins and books could not have failed to show a profit. It appears to have received at least $9,000 from the coins and $250 from the books.

Phillips says he planned a pocket edition of the autobiography in October. However, Bantam Book Co. was already bringing out an edition. Phillips bought 6,000 November 23 and another 1,000 March 18. The centennial edition of the same book did not appear until late May. Phillips said he had hoped the centennial edition would appear in April.

The centennial edition carries a picture of Booker T. Washington at his desk on the cover; a letter from President Eisenhower; a chronology of the life of Washington; a note on the Booker T. Washington Birthplace Memorial by G. Lake Imes, retired secretary of Tuskegee Institute, which carries the story up to the present, but fails to mention that the old birthplace memorial organization is defunct; a laudatory biography of Phillips by O. K. Armstrong, former Missouri Congressman and member of the commission's executive committee; and a long statement by Phillips in which he lists achievements of the series of organizations which have had their headquarters at the birthplace.

The final cost of centennial edition was a little over 29 cents a copy, about 11 cents per copy more than the publishers' original edition.

The commission has been busily, almost frantically, sending these books to various groups and organizations. Copies have been sent to 16 southern colleges for teachers taking training there during the summer. All box holders in Tuskegee, Ala., and Rocky Mount, Va., received free copies.

The new material added to the book consists of about seven pages of chronology of Booker T. Washington's life and accomplishments. Approximately 11 pages are devoted to Phillips and his various organizations plus acknowledgements.

BOOK PRAISES PHILLIPS

Here are some of the things said about Phillips, "Mr. Phillips has a large measure of the vision and spirit of Dr. Washington and works with the same dedicated zeal in the interests of his people."

Elsewhere it is said of him " * * * he performed prodigious tasks which only a man of great faith and energy could have done. * * *"

And "Surely his accomplishments, carried out in a manner which has won the hearty cooperation and support of influential men and women of both races, mark a noble achievement in the great American tradition. With it all, Mr. Phillips has been diligent and persistent. A dedicated man of devotion and integrity, and at the same time a natural diplomat, able to win friends and influence people, he has given of himself without stint or personal reward in his great efforts to forever perpetuate the memory and ideals of the immortal Booker T. Washington."

The last writer was on the commission's payroll to do research on the life of Washington. The first writer received travel expense money. Both were members of the commission.

The books, not counting final distribution items such as postage and envelopes, have cost the commission $9,195.83.

This expense included $200 to Wertheim Advertising Associates of New York City for preparation of material for the centennial edition and for contacting radio and TV stations.

Phillips also used a small magazine style publication, the Better Worker, to spread the centennial news. Usually about an 8-page edition, Phillips says this was almost the "official publication" of the commission.

The magazine sells for 15 cents and Phillips says it has a circulation of about 5,000. It contains rather vague advice to employees to work hard.

Phillips had 1,500 copies of the April 1956 edition reprinted for distribution. It contained an announcement of the beginning of the centennial and the establishment of a national monument at the birthplace. There was also a brief chronology of Washington's life and an article on the centennial stamp and envelope. The envelopes were said to be available to Better Worker subscribers at a special price of 10 cents each.

The commission also offered free 6,000 copies of a collection of "Quotations of Booker T. Washington" compiled by E. Davidson Washington. This booklet was printed by the Tuskegee Institute Press, first in 1938, then reprinted in 1940 and 1957.

Quotations are grouped under such headings as the Negro race, education, labor, character, living, opportunity, success and reward. It is the one instance in which the voice of Booker T. Washington is permitted to be heard alone and clear.

A green card was also included in many of the publications sent out from the commission's headquarters.

Entitled, "I Am a Negro," it included this message: "I am a Negro and I am proud of my race and its heritage. I am proud to be an American and will defend my country against all foes whether within or without. I will support any effort that means higher standards of living and higher standards of character for all men. I will give freely of my time, talents and labor to improve my home and the community in which my children must grow up.

"I will give an honest day's work for an honest day's pay, and guard my employer's interests as I would my own. I will be fair and honorable in my dealings with my neighbor and expect him to be the same with me. I will strive to make each day come up to the high watermark of pure, unselfish, useful living. In the words of Booker T. Washington: 'I will allow no man to drag me down so low as to make me hate him.' "

[From the Roanoke World-News, Oct. 24, 1957]

Companion of Education Lauds Phillips—Speech at Birthplace Cites Him as a Second Booker T.

(Fourth of seven articles)

(By Dick Sutherland)

Dr. W. B. Fleming of Prescott, Ark., was one of the speakers who spread the good-will message of the Booker T. Washington Centennial Commission.

Dr. Fleming was introduced as a companion of the late Negro educator whose memory is being honored. He arrived at the birthplace, now a national monument, from Roanoke, in a taxi. He was attired in a long, brown frock-tailed coat, brown trousers, brown top hat and large brown four-in-hand tie.

He moved slowly, and somewhat shakily from the taxi, but had a smile and cheery greeting for everyone he met.

A group of children from the nearby Booker T. Washington Elementary School gathered to hear him. There were perhaps 30 of various sizes and in various styles of dress. Some wore primly starched dresses while others wore ragged jeans.

They were marched to the front of the brick building which houses the post office and commission offices and turned to face up a short slope. There the commission's red, white, blue and gold station wagon sat, its 39 flags rippling and choral music sliding from its public address system.

S. J. Phillips, president and executive director of the commission which was created by the Booker T. Washington National Monument Foundation's board of trustees for the observance of the 100th anniversary of Washington's birth, introduced Dr. Fleming. Phillips told how they had traveled over 30,000 miles together for the commission, as part of the good-will building program.

Dr. Fleming, using the public address system as a supplement to his wavering voice, began by praising Booker T. Washington and Phillips. He said Phillips was a second Booker T. Washington.

He told various stories, some of which he said Washington had used, and some which involved Washington. They served to illustrate such points as that Washington had a heart and loved his fellow man, that he didn't believe in excuses or makeshift arrangements, that he did believe in organization, and that the children should make themselves important, so the world will need them.

IT TAKES A GREAT MAN

The children were led away and the public address system was turned off.

Then Fleming explained what a great job Phillips was doing. He declared Phillips is "doing a job you won't find another white or black man doing today." His white beard bobbing as he talked, Dr. Fleming said, "It takes a great man to perpetuate the memory of a dead man."

"Misunderstanding is the worst thing in the world; it destroys the home and community and can destroy society," Dr. Fleming said. He explained that Phillips is "trying to make my people see the necessity of what Booker T. Washington stood for in life; to carry on his principles."

Hardship is needed, too, Dr. Fleming claimed. With it comes understanding and citizenship. "We must have men who will give their lives, suffer and serve for the good of society. He is not doing it for money. He loves Booker T. Washington. He loves our people. The age needs a man.

"It's a big job. It's not a question of race, but service, service that counts. America needs enlightenment, enlistment, enlargement. It must be made to want; it must see to want. When Sidney J. Phillips has more disciples he can enlarge his program."

This was said to be a typical good will building program. It is what has been said, with variations, to groups throughout the South and West during the centennial.

That is what a portion of the $225,000 Congress granted the centennial commission has been spent for. It represents the crux of the commission's program—good-will building.

LARGE SUM SPENT ON ADS

Another large sum has been spent for advertising in newspapers throughout the country. These ads were also part of the good-will building program.

One of the early ads appeared in a Denver, Colo., newspaper September 21, 1956, during the National Baptist Convention's annual meeting. The convention claims a membership of 4 million of the approximately 14 million Negroes in the United States. Phillips says the commission made special efforts to present its message at the meeting.

The ad said:

"You, too, may help. Buy Carver-Washington Memorial Half-Dollars, an investment in America.

"This month in Denver will be your last opportunity to get one of the historically important Washington-Carver Commemorative U.S. Half Dollars being distributed to honor the Centennial Year of Booker T. Washington. These commemorative coins have been sold in many parts of the country for as much as $2 each. This offering in Denver is being made to the public at a special price of only $1 per coin. The proceeds over the face value of the coins are being used to further the work of the Booker T. Washington Commission.

"These commemorative coins make exceptionally fine gifts for friends and are good collector's items. U.S. legal coinage, they will always have face value. Money spent for these coins furthers the progress of human relations among all Americans. With an outline map on one side and the portraits of Washington and Carver in bas-relief on the other you'll want one or more for family gifts and helpful souvenirs of this important centennial year."

After telling where in Denver the coins might be purchased, it ended "Address mail orders, $1 plus 10 cents for postage and handling, to Mrs. Portia W. Pittman, Kenmark Hotel, 530 17th Street, Denver. Mrs. Pittman is the daughter of Booker T. Washington."

Two of the ads appeared in the Roanoke World-News. The first came November 5, 1956. It read:

"An appeal to Americans of all races and creeds.

"Ours is a land where freedom of thought and expression are part of our constitutional heritage. Whether we agree or disagree with our fellow Americans doesn't matter. This is what democracy means. When disagreement, however, leads to hate, ill will or violence of sufficient magnitude to militate against the well-being of our land at home and abroad, it is a matter of serious thought for every American—regardless of his race or creed.

"The recent rulings of the Supreme Court on segregation based on race has in some areas given rise to racial tensions of such serious impact that national unity is far from what it should be. Because of these tensions the Booker T. Washington Centennial Commission has dedicated its year-long program, which pays tribute to the 100th anniversary of the birth of Booker T. Washington, to a good-will building crusade.

"The Booker T. Washington Centennial Commission believes that this grave controversy cannot be settled by hate and violence. It knows this, first, because of Divine teaching and second, from the precedent established by America's greatest apostle of interracial good will, Booker T. Washington. He came upon the American scene at a time when our land was torn with group tensions even as it is today; a time when it was far easier to think in terms of hate and destruction than it was to preach a gospel of good will and progress. He chose the hard way—the way of compromise, of give and take, of friendship and cooperation, and so admirably did he succeed that in spite of his humble origin his name is linked with those great Americans who make up the Nation's hall of fame.

"We stand on the brink of a precipice of world disorder and indecision. We need national teamwork to hold our own in these times. National unity is the care of national defense. Disaster cannot shake or danger weaken the spirit of a united people. We appeal to you—the citizens of our Nation—white, black, yellow, and brown—to help build good will in your community. Our national welfare depends—not upon whether we are North, South, East, or West—but rather upon whether every man of us has done his part in helping to make of us an invincible nation."

Largest type in the ad is saved for a small block which says: "You, too, can help celebrate—hurry. Just a few left—Carver-Washington commemorative coins $1—world famous autobiography, 'Up From Slavery,' pocket size—50 cents—order today."

Another ad appeared November 21, 1956. Phillips again cried out against racial tensions which are overtaking the Nation, and could only be averted through participation in his good-will building program.

The final paragraph said: "You can help in this good-will building crusade by purchasing copies of 'Up From Slavery,' an autobiography by Booker T. Washington, at 50 cents each and Carver-Washington half dollars at $1 each. These may be secured by writing the Booker T. Washington Centennial Commission at Booker T. Washington Birthplace, Virginia."

A coupon was attached for the convenience of those who wished to help. The coupon also turned up on the back of a pamphlet introducing Dr. Fleming. Inside is an outline which Dr. Fleming more or less followed during his talk, entitled "Booker T. Washington As I Knew Him."

[From the Roanoke World-News, Oct. 25, 1957]

PUBLIC SCHOOLS HONOR PLEAS OF CENTENNIAL—BUT PROGRAM IN COLLEGES APPARENTLY NOT AS STRONG

(Fifth of seven articles)

(By Dick Sutherland)

The Booker T. Washington Centennial Commission achieved what was perhaps its greatest response from the public schools.

School superintendents all over the country were sent copies of Booker T. Washington's biography, "Up From Slavery." They were asked to send lists of school principals. These principals were sent copies of the book and requested to have a program about Booker T. Washington and to write the commission telling about it.

Many complied with each phase of the commission's requests. S. J. Phillips, commission executive director, has a file of letters, maybe as many as 200, from school people, principals, teachers, and students, saying they have had some type of Booker T. Washington program or study.

The commission sent along on request some program suggestions. Some were practical, others seemed a bit farfetched, such as answering rollcall with wise sayings of Booker T. Washington.

The school response was the best the commission received to any of its efforts. On the individual class level, it was performing its function, promoting Booker T. Washington.

The year-end report claims a much bigger program. Part of that program has been included under public relations. The response would indicate that what was actually carried out was something less than the all-inclusive program listed in the report.

The college program, despite talk of "students in graduate divisions in some of the Nation's leading universities," doesn't appear to have been very strong, effective, or of a graduate college level.

Donations were made to two colleges and a Bible school.

One college was Lomax-Hannon College in Greenville, Ala. Phillips says this is a big Methodist college. It is not listed in the November 1956 edition of the College Blue Book. Nor is it listed among colleges affiliated with the African Methodist Episcopal Church, African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church, Colored Methodist Episcopal Church, or Free Methodist Church of North America.

Another donation went to furnish three rooms in the girls' dormitory on the campus of Selma University. Selma is not listed in the World Almanac list of colleges and universities, nor in Lovejoy's guide to colleges.

SEARCH FOR SCHOOL FRUITLESS

The third donation went to the Prince of Peace Bible School, Prescott, Ark. It is not included on the list of the Accrediting Association of Bible Institutes and Bible Colleges.

Asked about this, Phillips said it was headed by the Reverend W. B. Fleming, also known as Dr. Fleming, and a field representative for the commission. Phillips said it was a school for all denominations which conducted "short courses for ministers, and includes other speakers, as I understand it."

Phillips did not know the size of the enrollment nor the accreditation.

The superintendent of schools in Prescott couldn't find the school at all "after an intensive investigation." It was not listed in the telephone directory, the Prescott Ministerial Alliance did not know about it, nor did the chamber of commerce nor did any individuals the superintendent contacted.

Other disbursements went to alumni associations and to individuals. Biggest single item is $1,000 paid to William Boscomb of Tuskegee, Ala., for services in public schools.

Incidentally, the commission spent $180 for dental work for Dr. Fleming, charged originally to miscellaneous expenses.

The shrine in Alabama will be the only permanent physical result of the work of the Booker T. Washington Centennial Commission.

When completed it will be a duplicate log slave cabin of the one constructed at the Booker T. Washington Birthplace. The total project is expected to cost $5,177.43. Already $2,418.45 has been spent. Original estimates were that the shrine would cost about $4,000.

MATERIAL SENT FROM FRANKLIN

The cabin will be on a 5-acre plot on U.S. 80 and 29 near Tuskegee. Information about Booker T. will be disseminated there.

Materials for the shrine were shipped from Franklin County to Alabama for the construction. Everything—logs, oak boards, stones, and sand—will have come from near the educator's birthplace.

One big program was the Elks oratorical contest. In his report, Phillips claims the Elks include 500,000 members and that speaking contests were held in 468 cities on this year's theme, "Booker T. Washington and the Constitution."

The commission donated three $1,000 scholarships to the contest. It also helped outline speeches, suggesting a pattern for their thematic development.

It was suggested that conditions be presented as deplorable until Booker T. came along to straighten them out, and to show how bad they are today, with Booker T. Washington's ideas again the best possible cure-all.

Aside from the scholarships, one of the principal expense items was a $500 payment to Perry W. Howard, Washington attorney, member of the commission, and one of the planners of the centennial program, for "special services" in connection with the Elks.

Bettye Steele Turner, Elks women's grand assistant directress of education, of Tuskegee Institute, Ala., was paid $204.64 for services at State association meetings representing the commission.

Another big effort was made in connection with the National Baptist Convention. This group claims to be the largest Negro organization in the United States with a membership of 4 million.

Considerable effort was made to get the commission's story before the convention. In addition, vouchers show Dr. T. J. Jemison, convention secretary, was paid $900 for a variety of services. He received $300 for preparation of material for a pamphlet, "Booker T. Washington as a Great Religious Leader"; $200 for preparing a list of names of 10,000 Baptist leaders from the convention's mailing list; and $400 was sent him as secretary of the Baptist Bath House, national religious project, as a donation to the midwinter convention.

The ties between the commission and the convention are close. Dr. Jemison is a trustee of the centennial commission. Phillips has been public relations director of the convention. In addition, he gets paid by Nehi for working at the convention.

[From the Roanoke World-News, Oct. 26, 1957]

Newspaper Aid Disappointing, Phillips Says; Pittsburgh Paper Cooperates; Three Staffers Paid $2,280

(Sixth of seven articles)

(by Dick Sutherland)

Newspaper cooperation with the Booker T. Washington Centennial Commission was disappointing, S. J. Phillips says.

Phillips, executive director of the commission, says the commission spent $25,049.33 for newspaper ads in more than 100 newspapers. However, not much response was received when other papers were sent the same material and asked to run it free.

Most of the money was spent with Negro newspapers, and there is where Phillips says the cooperation broke down.

The commission did receive good cooperation from Phillips' viewpoint, from the Pittsburgh Courier, a Negro newspaper. Three members of its staff were paid $2,280 for preparing material.

George Schuyler, New York editor of the paper, received the most money, $1,150. A columnist, Schuyler was also one of those who helped map out the commission's program.

Robert M. Radcliffe, national news editor, was paid $600 and William G. Nunn, managing editor, received $530.

Phillips said Radcliffe was paid $150 for covering Roanoke's diamond jubilee. According to Phillips, Radcliffe wrote a good story about Negro participation.

The story carried one paragraph which said the commission had a float in the parades. A fairly short story altogether, it contained other features of the commission's program.

Another cause for Phillips' disappointment may have come from the fact Andrew F. Jackson & Associates were chosen as the advertising agency through which all ads would be placed.

Jackson happened to be another of those who planned the centennial observance. His firm was not an accredited advertising agency in the eyes of the American Newspaper Publishers Association and there was a continual hassle with some newspapers over this matter. Being unaccredited, he could not open an account until his credit had been established.

This establishing of the firm's rating led to many ads failing to be placed at the times originally selected for them.

Jackson, who died last summer, was also executive director of the Go-By-Auto Club which publishes "Go-Guide To Pleasant Motoring." The commission placed a $300 ad in this travel booklet. It did not place ads with other travel booklets.

Vouchers were made out in two ways, to the advertising firm and to Jackson personally. By June 1 Jackson had received $3,590 for public relations; $828.05 for travel and subsistence between September 17 and December 8; $259.04 for paying accounts; and $134.7 for a phone bill, a total of $4,811.76.

The firm at the same time had received $17,483.76 for ads in Negro newspapers; $2,539.42 for ads in general newspapers; $3,200 for public relations services, which would be in addition to commissions on each ad; $75 for special services, and $46.20 for a phone bill.

One of Jackson's functions was to plan the distribution of Washington's autobiography "Up From Slavery," Phillips said. At the same time, the commission paid the Booker T. Washington Sales Agency of Tuskegee, Ala., for advertising and sales promotion of the book, according to the voucher. Phillips said this $2,500 was paid for distribution plans. The book was never sold, Phillips says, all copies being distributed without charge.

Phillips is owner-president of the Tuskegee sales organization which he established around 1940. It has three other employes, all also employed by the commission: Mrs. A. V. Mundy, assistant executive director of the commission; her husband and H. C. Saunders, an insurance man. Saunders received $478.78 in travel money between August 21 and October 22. He is listed as an accountant by the commission.

STAMPS BOUGHT FROM AGENCY

The sales agency also figured in another bit of the commission's business. Two commission vouchers were made out to a bank for postage stamps. Each was for $2,100. The first was dated August 25, 1956 and the second February 4, 1956. The second voucher was first made out for "coins," but it was scratched through and "stamps" written in.

Asked about this, Phillips said it was a business deal, the same as if the stamps had been bought from the post office. "We had big mailings coming up, and we bought the stamps," the commission president said.

He explained that the stamps, ordinary postage stamps, in the amount of $4,500 were originally owned by the sales agency. They were accumulated for a promotion deal which was abandoned. Phillips says he took the stamps to the bank for "safekeeping" and as a "little collateral" on a loan.

The loan was for $4,500, Phillips said. The sales agency received the full $4,500, no interest being deducted beforehand. "We (the sales agency) bought back $300 worth," Phillips said. The remainder was purchased with commission funds. Phillips did not remember how much the interest was, but thought it was 5 percent. He said it was paid by the sales agency.

A check with other bankers reveals this to have been an unusual procedure, though perfectly legal. All bankers questioned said they would not loan full face value on stamps, having to leave a working margin in the event a foreclosure might be necessary. All said they would make a loan on stamps, though none could remember ever having done so.

The stamps the sales agency owned were not redeemable at a post office. For reasons of sanitation, the post office refuses to redeem any postage stamps.

Between the first purchase of stamps and the second, the commission purchased a postage meter machine and paid $1,000 to the post office in which it has its headquarters to have it set. Another $1,680 was spent for postage.

Phillips says the sales agency's biggest work has been in connection with Nehi. For several years Phillips was a sales representative for the company and head of the agency. He is still on the Nehi payroll, receiving $2,700 a year for his work, which he says is concentrated on the weeklong National Baptist Convention meeting.

[From the Roanoke World-News, Oct. 28, 1957]

Was $225,000 for Centennial Worthwhile? Issue Debatable, Phillips Says Objectives Achieved

(The last of seven articles)

(By Dick Sutherland)

Was the $225,000 appropriated for the Booker T. Washington Centennial a worthwhile expenditure?

That would seem to be debatable. To some people the money, or at least part of it, might seem to have been wasted. To S. J. Phillips, president and executive director of the centennial commission, its objectives were successfully achieved.

Those objectives were to pay deserved homage to a humble American who through service to his fellow men contributed greatly to the national well-being and to direct the national mind to the value of applying Booker T. Washington's philosophy, principles, program, and practices to many of the problems that confront our Nation today, particularly those that have to do with building greater good will among Americans of different races and creeds.

Of the program, Phillips says, "Millions of young Americans were introduced to

Booker T. Washington, judging from the vast number of letters, compositions, and stories written by them about him—they admired his courage, his faith in his fellow men, and his willingness to serve wherever service was needed."

Phillips continues, "They believe that he was a great American and will, we believe, revere his memory. This is as much honor as can be bestowed upon any man."

At the same time, some of the major expenditures in the yearlong campaign, newspaper ads, coins, the first books, were made with the hopes of reaping a profit. The fact they did not realize any major profit is immaterial.

The commission, organized by the Booker T. Washington National Monument Foundation, used Federal funds to purchase and advertise for sale and distribute products with the proceeds going to the foundation. Only one of the ads failed to have a coupon for convenient purchase of either half dollars or books or both. In fact, it, a Christmas ad, was nothing except a pitch for buying the autobiography and coins.

The advertising campaign cost $25,049.33, not counting amounts paid individuals for writing some material; the books cost $9,195.83; the coins cost $9,255.85. This doesn't include subsidiary costs, such as $2,500 to Phillips' sales agency for distribution plans, a sum to Andrew F. Jackson for distribution plans; postage and other costs.

Selling was behind almost every move of the commission. The school campaign was tied to an effort to sell copies of the autobiography to the schools. Elk lodges and Negro women's clubs were being asked to sell coins and books for the commission. Phillips tried to get a company to distribute the books.

Other than the direct sell, there have been such indirect attempts as sending each Member of Congress a copy of the centennial edition of "Up From Slavery." Phillips then displayed all the letters from the Congressmen. Most of these were mere "thank you for sending this book. I hope I shall have time to read it," type replies.

Almost every time Booker T. Washington has been mentioned in the commission's literature and ads, the name of S. J. Phillips has also been mentioned.

Surely no one exposed to all the centennial commission's outpouring about Booker T. Washington could have failed to remember S. J. Phillips, too. Several of the articles are definitely devoted to telling the reader what a great and noble man S. J. Phillips is, while another writer describes him as modest and self-effacing.

Phillips and his budget director, George L. Jeffries, were both fined in Franklin County court for refusing to file a State income tax return on their incomes last year. Phillips contended in a private conversation that he was not a Virginia resident and not supposed to file a return.

However, he entered a plea of guilty and paid the fine, and filed and paid his State income tax. He had refused to answer a summons from the commissioner of revenue and was arrested and brought to jail where he posted bond.

PAID WORKER LAUDS PHILLIPS

A letter from Mrs. Portia Washington Pittman, of Washington, D.C., was published in the Roanoke Times, August 22, 1957, in which Phillips is again lauded for his work at the birthplace in Franklin County. Mrs. Pittman held the position of special representative on the commission at a salary of $400 a month plus travel expenses, and is a vice president of the commission and a member of the National Monument Foundation.

Any discussion of Booker T. Washington's philosophy becomes extremely vague as far as Phillips is concerned. Mostly, he seems to think racial troubles should be settled peaceably. "Had the Negro leaders as well as the white leaders kept his ideas before the public, they would have been able to meet many problems more satisfactorily."

This is about as concrete a statement as Phillips is apt to make. However, his writings on current problems have tended to emphasize the prospects of hate and violence, and to say conditions in the country are as bad now as they were after the Civil War. He then says let's all be friends and remember Booker T. Washington.

The portion of Washington's philosophy which deals with thrift seems to have escaped the commission's mind when it purchased a 1957 car with a continental spare tire kit.

To Phillips' credit let it be said he has admitted he may have spent some of the funds differently from what someone else in the same position might have spent them.

After all, this was another Government giveaway program. The $225,000 was made available to the commission until expended. There was never any question of any money being returned to the Government, even though Phillips does say he plans to return around $15,000.

Of the total program, Phillips says:

"In bringing to a close the year-long observance of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Booker T. Washington which was designed to focus national attention upon the policies, programs, principles, and philosophies of this great Negro educator and to perpetuate his ideals and teachings in good will building, Sidney J. Phillips, president of the centennial commission, said he believes that the following statements made by Booker T. Washington, if applied to our present-day problems, would bring about a solution giving justice to both races:

"1. 'In all things that are purely social we can be as separate as the fingers, yet one as the hand in all things essential to progress.

"2. 'The wisest among my race understand that the agitation of questions of social equality is the extremist folly, and that progress in the enjoyment of all the privileges that will come to us must be the result of severe and constant struggle rather than artificial forcing.

"3. 'The highest test of the civilization of any race is in its willingness to extend a helping hand to the less fortunate.

"4. 'I will allow no man to drag me down so low as to make me hate him.'"

The centennial's president referred to these quotations as "gems of wisdom" in his summary statement in the 25,000 copies of the centennial edition of Booker T. Washington's autobiography, "Up From Slavery."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas that House Joint Resolution 110 be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

STUDY MISSION TO SOUTH AMERICA

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, on the desks of all Senators are copies of a report of a study mission to South America. A word is in order on the report.

The study mission, composed of the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], spent 26 days during the months of November and December of last year visiting the countries of Venezuela, Peru, Bolivia, Chile, Argentina, Paraguay, Brazil, and British Guiana; over 20,000 miles were traveled by air, nearly 1,000 miles by auto and jeep, and 150 miles by boat on the Amazon and Rio Negro Rivers in Brazil. Target areas were located in as geographically diverse areas as the snow-covered Andes and the steaming jungles of the Amazon. In a number of places we were among the first of very few official visitors from the United States to be seen in an area. The excitement and pride engendered by these visits served to emphasize the important gains to be harvested from more frequent visits to outlying areas.

GOALS OF TRIP

The whole intent and purpose of the trip was to attempt to gage the conditions in Latin America which would be underpinning the President's new Alliance for Progress programs and to evaluate popular attitudes toward them, both on official levels and at the most nonofficial of levels, that of the man in the street. What is expected; what is possible; and what is practical; what limitations; and what can be expected from among the Latin Americans themselves were some of the questions which guided our continual inquiries and investigations. In reviewing our foreign-aid program and other oversea operations, we sought to gain insight into the conditions and problems of this area which only a face-to-face meeting with hundreds of knowledgeable officials, businessmen, and others could give; to look, listen, and learn about the main aspects of the programs and operations as time would permit; and to report our findings to the President of the United States, the Department of State, the U.S. Senate, and to appropriate congressional committees.

The group was interested mainly in the many programs and projects outside the capital cities, in visiting with people native to the areas, and in evaluating the cumulative effects of projects developed until now, as well as in looking at new or projected undertakings. While much was learned and a great deal of data was gathered for the use of the committees, a monthlong study tour of South America is clearly not enough to supply definitive judgments or final answers; but at least it turned up clues and we hope a few educated impressions which may prove helpful.

In each country the group was briefed upon arrival by our Ambassador and his top staff. An audience or visit with the head of government, or with his representatives, was had in each country. Visits and meetings were also held with members of the legislature including opposition parties, Cabinet officers, Foreign Ministers, American businessmen, people in the agricultural, health and education fields, labor, and, last but not least, with just people.

Four Presidents, the only ones present within their respective countries at the time of our study mission, were not only generous in their hospitality, but with their time as well. In a sense they were highly complimentary in that they spoke frankly and to the point. They pulled no punches—neither did we. Exchanges with leaders of the national legislative bodies were equally fruitful. And in all countries an effort was made to discuss with opposition groups their analyses of the nation's needs and goals.

While eight countries were visited, approximately half of our total time was spent in just one—Brazil. Geography and population diversities, and size plus political uncertainties seemed to warrant it. As a result, not only did we meet with the President, Mr. Joao Goulart, the Prime Minister, Mr. Tan Credo Neves, and national legislative leaders, but we traveled mostly outside the old capital of Rio and the new one of Brasilia into nearly half the States of Brazil. Extended and fruitful deliberations were held with four State Governors, whose philosophies ran the gamut from right to left. Additionally, special focus was reserved for the particularly acute areas of the northeast of the country. To this end both briefings by trained experts and our own personal examination of some of the Sudene plan targets were undertaken.

Throughout our travels we experienced no discourtesies; no anti-American demonstrations; nothing but useful and frank exchanges of view.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

To report in detail concerning actualities and conditions in Latin America, with no other base than a quick trip through the various countries, would indeed be presumptuous and imprudent because problems and conditions vary greatly from country to country. The tendency to generalize too broadly on difficulties in the areas presents a constant danger of fumbling with inapplicable solutions in the wrong places. Nonetheless, it may be fruitful to make several general observations based upon our recent experiences. While in themselves these views must suffer from the limits of time, as well as the fallibility of human absorption, within the context of cumulative experiences and the perspective of history, they may prove meaningful to those individuals upon whom rests the weight of responsibility for making final decisions. It is within such a framework, then, that these—our judgments which follow—are respectfully submitted.

ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

The Alliance for Progress is the most exciting new idea in Latin America, perhaps in this century: It is safe to say that everywhere we visited, and among all individuals with whom we talked, the alliance was the focus of interest. Without exception it seems to have evoked great expectations. Dedicated to the proposition that Latin America can develop through evolution—not revolution—and that in reaching new goals it can also sophisticate and stabilize its own democratic institutions, the alliance has even acquired an air of credibility among many of the people upon whom its impact—and much of its burdens—will fall. And if carried out to fulfillment, it will probably become the most ambitious program ever undertaken to raise the standards of life among so many people in so vast an area.

What it envisages is a joint effort among all Americans—North and South—for clearing millions of acres of land onto which rapidly multiplying populations can be moved and from which they may be adequately fed. It means building tens of thousands of miles of roads into areas until now either uninhabited or completely out of touch with the outside world. It means the harnessing of some of the greatest rivers in the world for creating almost unlimited sources of electrical power. It means the full development of as yet unmeasured but tremendous mineral wealth. It means building the base for a powerful—and rich—new industrial potential. It means tens of thousands of low-cost housing units. It means massive slum clearance programs aimed at wiping out the favelas, the barriostas, and the ranchitos which today are blights on the skyline of every city of Latin America. It means thousands of schools and hospitals, hundreds of sanitation projects, and tens of thousands of doctors, teachers, and technicians of many sorts.

Along with the alliance, let it be said that the image of President Kennedy also has excited new hopes and great expectations. Without exception the attitude toward the President was not only good, in some instances it seemed to be almost worshipful. Heartwarming as such responses become, however, they also were sobering.

If the alliance represents new hopes and new expectations, it also has evoked doubts and skepticism. In more than one instance the doubters expressed to us their convictions that fine words were not enough. "The United States has spoken glowingly of us before," a Recife student said to us, "but nothing happened." After having waited for what they regard as a very long time—at least for most of the present century—the Latin Americans seemed skeptical of the prospects of such a bold approach ever being translated into reality.

There was evidence that among the skeptics there were those who strongly suspected our motivations. As one legislator in Bolivia put it:

> If it hadn't been for the antics of Castro, we doubt that you would have been galvanized into proposing the Alliance for Progress.

There is no question but that more than a few of our Latin friends feel that we "backed into" this new approach.

Or there are also those who see the Alliance for Progress as a gigantic money scheme by the rich Americans to buy off their own guilty consciences for having neglected the Southern Hemisphere, particularly during the years since the end of World War II.

The many reservations notwithstanding, the Alliance for Progress seems to have aroused both the spirit and the determination of the peoples south of the border to mount a new and constructive attack of their own upon human want and suffering. And thus in these terms the alliance certainly may exceed both in its extensiveness and in its imaginativeness anything yet undertaken by mankind. The degree to which it seeks to interweave the capabilities of the United States with the efforts of Latin Americans themselves has no parallels. And as one Latin has put it:

> The investment in human talent, imagination, devotion, enthusiasm—and frustration—is obviously beyond calculation.

The strength of the Alliance for Progress derives mostly from its positive approach, for it faces up to an elemental truth in our hemisphere that, Russians or no Russians, Communists or no Communists, there are opportunities and obligations which are ours in the United States for helping the people of the sister republics to the south of us in a great mutual effort to achieve a breakthrough into a better life. The extent to which we are motivated in this because it is right and just, rather than because we are desperate or afraid, will influence greatly the chances for ultimate success.

SENSE OF URGENCY

Everywhere there was the deepest sense of urgency about getting on with our program: Each of the four Presidents, and any number of the parliamentary leaders, repeatedly made the point with us that time was running out. "Hurry, hurry before it is too late," was a frequent plea. While these petitions were neither startling nor new, we were frequently tempted to take refuge from them behind the factors of recency which surround the whole idea of the Alianza para el Progreso. After all, President Kennedy had announced the alliance only last March 13, not yet a year ago; the idea had not even become an official inter-American program until August of last year when all of the American Republics except Cuba signed its charter at the Punta del Este Conference; the machinery for operating the alliance was not set up until November with the appointment of Teodoro Moscoso as its official boss; and finally, however deep the sense of urgency, any well conceived project would require skillfully drawn technical plans which again would take time.

It is the judgment of this study mission, however, even taking into account the rationale for delay, that the Government of the United States would commit a grave error were it to underestimate the critical sense of urgency in getting the Alliance for Progress off the ground.

This is not to say that nothing has been done, but mainly that not enough has been done with a visible impact in the affected area; for it is our understanding that as of this date at least $76 million of the $100 million to be administered by AID—principally for education and training and for public health and medicine—has now been programed and allocated on a country basis. Of the $394 million for the Inter-American Bank—to be used mostly for long-term loans—$115 million has been committed, and the $6 million allocated for use by the Organization of American States to strengthen the role of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council in certain areas has now been obligated.

In August of last year, the participating countries at Punta del Este agreed to introduce or strengthen systems for the preparation, execution, and periodic revision of national programs for economic and social development. Long-term development programs were to be formulated, if possible, within the succeeding 18 months. In this connection, it should be pointed out that, as of the time of our tour, only a few countries had produced comprehensive long-range development programs. It is understood that as plans are submitted and are determined consistent with the fundamental goals and objectives of the alliance, only then can the degree of our assistance in financing be determined.

A few countries have published preliminary national plans that are in need of further refinement, including the establishment of priorities; some have formally requested assistance from the Organization of American States, the Economic Commission for Latin America, or the Inter-American Development Bank, in the formulation or improvement of national development plans; three have informally requested assistance or advice in the preparation of advanced national plans, and a couple have established planning agencies by decree, but have not yet actively organized and staffed such agencies.

It is our understanding that those national development plans which have been published to date are currently under study to determine to what extent they can serve as a framework for coordinated assistance under the Alliance for Progress. In addition to review by AID in Washington and the field, the plans must be submitted to a panel of international financial experts known as the nine wise men for analysis and appraisal. As of this date, it is not possible to advise as to the quality of the plans. But again let it be stressed: It is imperative that we move more rapidly on Alliance for Progress projects. The sense of urgency which the political leaders expressed as one in addressing themselves to us is more than a political cliche or an oratorical salutation. It seemed to us that it was tragically close to the harsh facts of the public state of mind.

SPEED IS CRITICAL

Two factors accentuate the urgency. One is that, rightly or wrongly, the people of Latin America feel they have heard these same words before, and that in the past such promises of hope have been used—they believe—only to delay actions in the Western Hemisphere rather than to produce them. As they see it, for many years they have been put off with words while the substance of American assistance to the world has been reserved for Western Europe and the Far East. Therefore, the sense of skepticism and doubt referred to elsewhere have combined to shorten the patience, or conversely to intensify the impatience, of the Latin Americans themselves. While it is unfortunate that their threshold of tolerance of the necessary planning and negotiating delays is very low, this does not alter the fact that it is an approximately accurate description of a serious psychology pervading the atmosphere amid which we hope to launch the new alliance.

A second element which deepens the sense of urgency lies in the approaching national elections in many countries of Latin America. After years of talk about good neighbors and allies, a rising generation of young politicians is finding its political fortunes increasingly tied to quick evidence of American sincerity in living up to its part of the new program. If there is still no translation of expectations into visible evidence, it will be increasingly difficult for the political contenders in the approaching elections to harness the expectations of their constituency short of explosive upheavals leading to radical outbreaks of disorder and chaos. For these reasons, we strongly urge that the planning pace of the Alliance for Progress be quickened to the ultimate degree consistent with a wise and soundly based program.

QUICK-IMPACT PROJECTS

Likewise, we strongly urge that short-range, quick-impact projects be instituted at once. "Why the hurry?" is a frequent response among Americans whenever this point relating to quick-impact programs is discussed. The answer lies in the psychology of quick expectations, a psychology perhaps better understood when cast in the perspective of our own Nation's anticipation of the launching of the landings in Europe or "second front" in Asia during the last World War.

Back in 1941 and 1942, it will be recalled, there was intense public impatience in the United States over delays in landing on the continent of Europe, and in launching full-scale attacks against Japan. Yet to perform either of these feats successfully, let alone both, required lengthy and costly preparations. To appease popular impatience and to win the necessary time for adequate preparations, our political and military leaders wisely launched limited fringe operations both in the Atlantic and the Pacific which created the appearance of going on the "offensive" and thus relaxed public pressures while at the same time we pursued the longer range plans for the final assault upon our enemies both to the east and the west.

And so it must be in Latin America. Short-range, quick-impact projects would frankly be aimed at taking the edge off the psychology of impatience presently threatening the chances of the entire program and simultaneously winning a margin of time for the more fundamental, long-range elements within the Alliance for Progress to take form. For such projects to have favorable consequences for the upcoming elections in Latin America, it means that they would have to be in evidence no later than midsummer of 1962.

POSSIBLE PROJECTS

Simple illustrations of the kinds of projects which might fit this pattern could include water supply systems; vaccination programs administered through local, if simple, health centers; educational undertakings on a small scale including local-level, one-room schools; community literacy programs of the most general sort. Even specific announcement of more ambitious undertakings such as housing development, social reforms, and new marketing operations could likewise have a quick impact. Understandably, for us to move on some of these quick-impact projects fast enough will mean risks, but the seriousness of the urgency factor in this program would seem to warrant assuming such risks.

For whatever combination of reasons in Latin America, it is in all truth later than we think.

COMMUNIST ACTIVITY

The cold war has become a more considerable factor in Latin America than some have thought. While it is important that we operate from the positive and the constructive platform of the Alliance for Progress, it would be foolhardy to pretend that elements of cold war machinations were not more and more in evidence. The frequency of broadcast from Radio Moscow, for example, is a disturbing fact of everyday life in nearly every country we visited. Moreover, it is possible to visit almost any bookstand in the larger cities of Latin America where there can be purchased some attractive Communist publications, and for almost nothing. For a matter of a few cents handsomely bound pictorial studies, provocative word images, and appealing assaults on the status quo—cold war propaganda classics—are readily obtainable. Needless to say, none of these missives enhance the position of the United States. In addition, there has been a rapid increase in the number of trained Communist Party agents whose primary tasks, skillfully carried out, are aimed at preying upon unhappiness, suffering, and hopelessness. Mostly from Moscow, Havana, and Peiping, these agents are believed to number several thousands.

They possess, moreover, certain advantages which permit them the initiative of action in most of the countries of Latin America. They are free to exploit squalor and frustration without being encumbered by the responsibilities for doing something about it. As Secretary of State Dean Rusk said to the foreign ministers meeting in Punta del Este, Uruguay, a few days ago, the Communists are adept "exploiters of people's aspirations—and their despair."

Our attempts to reason with Latin Americans that the Russians have ulterior motives and that the Communists will not keep their promises met with less understanding than we had hoped. Again and again in personal conversations, it became obvious that our own harsh experiences with the Reds during the years of the cold war have not been matched by similar experiences among most of the Latin American countries. Few of them have had any direct contact with Russians. As far as many of the Latinos are concerned the preachments of communism are only the dreams for a better life. On the other hand, the stigma of broken promises or of domination that they associate loosely with the United States still crops out in their utterances. Pat phrases, such as the "Yankee imperialists" and the "colossus of the North," are cliches born of the turn of the 20th century which still roll easily off the tongues of orators in

South America. Communist propagandists exploit such dispositions to the fullest.

THE CHALLENGE

The Communists are also effectively exploiting a feeling that the Latins are only second-class cousins of the Americanos—that in the wake of two great World Wars and the Marshall plan, South America has been left out of the charitable and even generous efforts of the Yankee Americanos to build a better world. Except among the few intellectuals conversant with the history of power politics, there was very little to be gained, it seemed, in explaining that the currents of the power balances of the world have, at least until the present, tended to flow east and west around the world rather than north and south.

Recognition of the intrusive tentacles of the cold war that threaten to encircle both the politics and the economics of our fellow republics to the south is imperative if we are to win the chance for the Alliance for Progress to succeed. The stakes are high indeed. With almost untouched natural and human resources, Latin America has become a priority area for challenge from the Communist world.

But for us it is even more so. Should the Americas fail to develop their fullest capabilities, it would not only become a geographical blight in our own hemisphere, but a psychological imbalance and even danger as well. Should totalitarian dictatorships experience a resurgence in Latin America, it would most surely have a devastating effect upon the cause of freedom. In Latin America we and they are conducting the greatest experiment in representative government that the world has ever known. There is no other comparable area on the globe where representative government, free elections, and constitutional principles command such glowing prospects.

INFLUENCE OF CASTRO

Castroism and anti-Americanism run more deeply than we would like: Both stem mostly from the same roots, and the two phrases were often used interchangeably. Repeatedly, responsible leaders made the point with us that they take Mr. Castro personally much less seriously than we seem to take him in the United States. They professed not to understand in many instances why we give Fidel the top billing that our headlines suggest. Invariably, however, these same spokesmen urged upon us a caution; namely, that we not confuse Castroism with communism as far as the Latin Americans are concerned. Most of the applause for Castro, we were told, had to do with his spirit of defiance of the Yankees and his independence of posture. Among our contacts there seemed to be very little praise for Castro as a Communist.

The frequency of anti-American statements, moreover, seemed closely identified with the applause for Castro. We were able to observe firsthand the practice of local politicians of repeating their anti-American charges apparently for local political gains. It was noteworthy that statements made to us on public occasions in the presence of the press were sometimes sharper and more pointed and thus more anti-American than statements made to us in private conversations with the same individuals.

Conversely, several political spokesmen said very frankly that it had become a well-accepted practice that whenever a government, for whatever reasons, might wish aid from the United States, the quickest way to get it was to "invent" a counteroffer from the Reds.

It would appear to be a fairly safe prediction, however, that the anti-American broadsides will continue to exceed the anti-Soviet declarations. In fact, the intensity of the anti-American statements will almost certainly increase, particularly in the year 1962, because of the impending popular elections in many countries. Let this probability be cast in proper historical perspective. In our own past history there was once a day when political years or political occasions such as July 4, often evoked bitter verbal assaults upon the King or Queen of England, and that in some parts of our country the anti-British invective spelled almost certain political success—particularly in some of our larger city elections. Yet beneath it all lay a truly deep affection and respect for our British cousins.

Likewise, in Latin America today, we ought to be very careful about exaggerating in our own minds the implications of the political attacks by party spokesmen upon the United States and to reflect with some sense of understanding and moderation upon the deeper feelings that lie just beneath the crust of those outward vituperations. In most places we visited, in fact, there seemed to be among the plain people a reservoir of good will, respect, and even admiration for the people of the United States.

SUGGESTIONS

If one is willing to accept the observations outlined above; namely, first that the Alliance for Progress is a most exciting new idea in Latin America; second that there is the deepest sense of urgency in getting the Alliance for Progress fully underway; third that the cold war has become a more considerable factor in Latin America than some have thought; and fourth that Castroism and anti-Americanism run more deeply than we would like; what else, then, can the United States do to improve its position, to strengthen its endeavors, and to clarify and sharpen its image in Latin America? A list of suggestions could be endless, and it could vary with each separate study mission undertaken. A few suggestions come readily to mind, however. Without pretense of attaching an order of priority to them or assessing a value of intensity, the following invite our comment:

ACKNOWLEDGE CHANGE

First. Our attitude toward Latin America may be even as important as our deeds and in some instances more so. A frank and open acknowledgment of the importance of changing the status quo in most of South America would seem to be a necessary posture for us to assume. Too often, we were told by South Americans, the United States has given the appearance of frowning upon change. As a result, we have too often left the impression, perhaps unduly, that we oppose the forces at work in Latin America which seek to correct the injustices of the past. "Instead of looking down your noses at what transpires south of the border," a young businessman in Manaos said, "why don't you exhibit greater understanding of what is taking place?"

In many instances, individual Latin Americans made the point with us that what they seek to achieve is what we have already achieved in the United States, and that their inspiration is derived from our own example at earlier moments in our history: our Declaration of Independence, breaking colonial ties with England, and seeking political and economic betterment for our people. To see in their endeavors in South America a parallel and, in fact, a consequence of our own actions in North America is to convey a kinship of interest that may pull the two hemispheres closer together.

We should consult with our Latin American counterparts more frequently and as equals. As one government leader put it: "We are a very proud people, and it would make us hold our heads higher if you would ask us once in awhile for our opinion, if you sought our advice more often. Then even if you didn't accept our judgment but relied upon your own, you would still have done us the honor of consultation." In our own missions to the various governments, we were told again and again of how much they appreciated our willingness to listen, or to discuss in a mutual exchange, varying points of view. In too many instances, moreover, it was obvious that, if we were not the first official Americans to indulge their opinions, we were at least among the very few who had done so. It is our conviction that we could get a great deal of personal and diplomatic mileage out of a more frequent and a freer exchange of ideas and judgments.

RECOGNIZE MILITARY'S ROLE

Second. In terms of attitudes, we believe the United States ought to take a more favorable stance toward the military in most Latin American countries. While we carefully looked for evidence that military force was serving as a deterrent to democratic processes, our conclusions are to the contrary. In all instances the military groups seemed not only to be stabilizing influences but likewise to be actually promoting democratic institutions and progressive social and economic changes.

We were particularly impressed with the kinds of work the local military organizations were turning out—for example, the extensiveness of roadbuilding, jungle clearing, and other economic and social development projects undertaken and engineered by the military that were in evidence in most every country. In some respects many of the military activities were of the type associated with the American CCC program during the 1930's.

As an example of such programs by the military, it is well to mention a project undertaken in Bolivia and which we visited. Bolivian Army engineer battalions have completed 22 kilometers of all-weather road in the Caranavi area and a 15-ton steel truss bridge over the River Yara to give year-round access to the Caranavi-Beni area. They are also helping to maintain 100 kilometers of the Caranavi Road and are constructing 75 kilometers of road connecting Sanadita with Palos Blancos. This all-weather road will open up to easy access a fertile farm country and will, in addition, allow all-weather access to a potentially productive area. These same units are also improving drainage on the Tarija Civilian Airport.

Similar projects have been undertaken in other Latin American countries. The projects undertaken have been developed on the initiative of the Latin American governments but with technical and material assistance from the United States.

An increase in the amount of American second-hand construction equipment and the necessary technical assistance in its proper use would serve to enhance the effectiveness of these operations. In particular, more used road-building machinery for construction battalions of the army would speed up and widen the assault on isolated areas and would certainly contribute to resettling large regions of the continent. The consequences could only be helpful to the Alliance for Progress program and the attainment of the broader objectives it envisages.

Besides encouraging substantive changes in the social and economic faces of the countries involved, the U.S. military assistance program is making an important contribution in helping to strengthen the collective defense and internal security of the hemisphere.

A special phase of the military assistance program merits mention here, that is, the training of Latin American military officers and enlisted men at U.S. service schools under the grant-aid portion of the military assistance program. Many technical skills included in the curriculum provided at the schools attended by Latin American military personnel are adaptable to civilian use and more often than not serve to benefit the entire community. Moreover, the visiting military personnel are exposed to democratic principles and the American way of life. The United States of America—our democratic government, our mode of life—makes a deep impression upon those who see us at work and as we really are. Returnees tell the story to their relatives and friends and it is believed.

As a part of its effort to prepare Latin American military personnel for attendance at U.S. schools, the Department of Defense, under the MAP, has provided approximately 600 English language teaching booths to the armed services of the Latin American Republics.

Having observed these hopeful developments in the military programs of Latin America, we hasten to inject a note of caution. The successful efforts to the military until now to stabilize economic and political changes consistent with democratic institutions does not insure against future trends in the opposite direction. Therefore, the greatest care should be exercised in the military assistance program of the United States to see that nothing is done to foster conditions in any way encouraging military dictatorships or capabilities for military aggression.

To be specific, American military aid should consist mainly of the following types of items :

(a) Communications equipment. This involves radio gear and supporting items which would enable any central government to keep in contact with all major outlying areas for the purpose of minimizing local disturbances which might otherwise mushroom into major violence.

(b) Vehicles contributing to policing mobility. Jeeps and power wagons which can negotiate the rough terrain quickly; second-hand aircraft equipped with air-to-ground communications. Once again a stable government in Latin America requires striking power which can reach into its isolated areas.

(c) Light arms and weapons necessary to maintain order. But the weaponry ought to be confined to the requirements of internal security and policing operations only.

In particular, any military material which enables its recipient to pose an external threat to neighboring nations ought to be withheld as a matter of policy.

It is well, however, to reemphasize our overall conclusion in regard to the military. Remaining mindful of the safeguards described above, we believe that additional military assistance to Latin America is necessary and constructive. Properly limited and directed it can materially assist the processes of orderly change now underway. And within this context it can enhance the validity of Ambassador Adlai Stevenson's earlier observation after his recent tour of South America, when he noted that "the Army is proving democracy's strongest bulwark and most constructive promoter."

MAINTAIN FIRM REQUIREMENTS

Third. We emerged from the Latin American continent convinced that we ought to, and can, demand certain firm, minimum standards and requirements as conditions for our aid and cooperation. While there have been uncertainties about attaching too many strings to our aid we were repeatedly reminded by Latin Americans themselves that the firmness with which we were willing to hold to prescribed standards and predetermined directions would, in the long run, invite respect. While local politicians were likely to protest such imperialistic domination by the Yankees, it was often suggested that such protests would be for appearance's sake only and would soon die down.

If the above be a correct evaluation, then we express the hope that the Government of the United States, and particularly the administrative officers responsible for implementing the Alliance for Progress, hold firmly to demands for the social, political, and economic reforms sought by the alliance. Tax reforms in the Latin American countries; new and earnest efforts fairly and meticulously to collect the taxes already on the books; land reform and redistribution; and social responsibilities; political democracy: all would seem to be minimal demands to be insisted upon as evidence of the good faith of the Latins themselves.

As we had occasion to stress several times in our conversations, the Alliance for Progress means what it says—an alliance, a two-way effort among equals—and whereas in this report we stress a number of things that the Government of the United States might well consider in strengthening its role, this should not obscure the fact that there are equally exacting conditions to which our Latin American colleagues must likewise be held. Particularly in parts of Brazil, we noted an outspoken reluctance among some segments of the economic elite to face up to such responsibilities. A few of them went so far as to accuse us of betraying our historic friends. The fact remains, however, that our pressures to moderate the forces of extremism in Latin America should only be equaled by our pressures upon the economic and political elite to yield wisely—yet meaningfully—to the forces of change.

VIEW POLITICIANS IN PERSPECTIVE

Fourth. The United States should exercise greater care in separating the genuine nationalist leaders of South America from the known Communist provocateurs.

While we are aware that there are an undetermined number of hard-core Communist agents hard at work in Latin America, we only contribute to the ease of the task of such agents and at the same time complicate our own efforts by chalking off all of the voices of protest as Communist inspired. For example, in all too many American minds it is not a very long jump from the loose nomen "leftist" to that of "Communist." Yet, it would be difficult in all of South America to find among the new, young, political profiles those not advocating change from the status quo. From the most radical groups to the more conservative, the protests are nonetheless vigorous against the conditions of an oppressive feudalism inherited from the past. In some areas where the land ownership has been the most topheavy, or where the share in the costs of government have been borne inversely in proportion to the ability to pay, it would be difficult to imagine voices of change turned toward any direction but to the left. Given the comparative conditions of backwardness that have been allowed to survive over several centuries, there is little other choice available to them.

Also, it is well to remember that, particularly in the early stages of Latin American protest movements of a decade or two ago, Communists and the Communist Party assumed very prominent roles. Many young people in the university communities of Latin America were sincerely, if naively, caught up in this wave of protest seeking change from the past.

Some of our businessmen and technicians in Latin America, on the basis of their experiences, stressed to us, however, that large numbers of these exuberant youth have since modified their earlier positions and/or changed their affiliations. That the sharpest of distinctions be drawn between the known Communist agents and the serious-minded and nationalistic reformers is imperative in our own national self-interest.

What is called for in part is a refinement of existing visa regulations. Under present policies it is difficult, if not impossible, for political leaders who may once have had radical pursuasions to be granted visas for the purpose of visiting the United States. This seemed to be especially true among the younger, newer, and fresher faces appearing on the political horizons of most South American countries.

For example, among the emerging new leaders in Latin America, there are young men who are strongly pro-United States and anti-Communist today, but who several years ago may have been youthful members of the Communist groups. Having seen the light, they are now ready, even eager to work cooperatively with us. Yet because of their earlier Communist ties, they may actually be barred from visiting North America. It would seem obvious, therefore, that a closer look ought to be taken at some of our visa regulations. While we do not recommend granting visas to known Communists, we do urge greater flexibility in adapting existing conditions of rapid and continuous change. The need for increasing the opportunities for young Latin Americans to visit the United States is urgent. Among those with whom we visited who had been to North America, we noted particularly strong ties of attachment and pride of association.

SCREEN U.S. PERSONNEL CAREFULLY

Fifth. The Alliance for Progress personnel must be selected with the greatest of care. In every instance the demand should be for first-class individuals. Under no circumstances should we consciously permit any Latin American area to become a dumping ground for political hacks or second-rate personnel. As the success of the program depends upon the resources and the capabilities of the people of Latin America, so its direction and leadership depends upon the finest and the best that we, too, can mobilize.

Firsthand we saw instances of the kind of dedicated and expert individual Americans who were getting through to the Latin Americans; diplomatic personnel who have inspired the greatest of confidence among the leaders of the Latin American governments to the point where their counsel and help were regularly solicited; USOM personnel who were obviously revered and trusted by local people in even extremely remote areas; and private American citizens who on their own were serving as effective ambassadors of inter-American understanding and good will; and in the American official families an increasing number of wives who were conspicuously effective in broadening the base of understanding and cooperation. But while these instances were notable and heartening, it was apparent that there was a desperate need for many more of equal dedication and effectiveness.

EXPAND INFORMATION PROGRAM

Sixth. The United States ought to launch a much greater information program in Latin America. From country to country we learned that our efforts in this regard were most inadequate. Among the explanations were two which recurred more or less regularly: First, inadequate funds; and, second, inadequate media. For example, mutual discussion with a group of Brazilian legislators made it very clear that a common misunderstanding among Brazilians about the United States was that we were a nation of great monopolists and economic royalists. They seemed largely unaware of the strong antimonopoly record of our Government. Multiply the case of monopolies by the number of other twisted or misinformed facts about the United States of America and one arrives at a rather startling measure of our failure to get through with elementary information about our country and about our people. Our information effort in Latin America falls far short of our capability. For a people that has distinguished itself in producing the greatest advertising specialists in the world, we have been singularly ineffective in Latin America in getting across a strongly favorable image of the United States.

By contrast the Communists are known to be spending more on information services—radio, books, films—in Latin America alone than we spend in the entire world. As we need to step up our radio broadcasts to the countries of Latin America, we also need to increase the literature which we send in. Such American books as we saw on the bookstands in the large cities are relatively expensive in terms of the purchasing power of Latin Americans. For fairly small sums, we should make available to all public outlets cheap prints of our books even if it were necessary for our own programs to subsidize the difference between cost and sale price. Among the Latins there seemed to be a preponderant judgment that such literature should not be given away free, but it ought to be purchasable for a few cents rather than a few dollars.

We should bear in mind in this connection that, in those areas of Latin America where the printed word has meaning, its impact seems to be much greater than in our own country. Therefore it would be difficult to exaggerate the importance of literally flooding the reading markets of Latin America with very low-cost prints of books, magazines, and similar tracts.

In addition, we were much impressed with the success of the binational centers. In these programs, for every dollar the United States invests, the host country matches it with many more. Thus, at a ratio of as much as $1 to $6 in cost, we have an opportunity through personnel, books, records, tapes, audiovisual aids, effectively to expand our communication exchange. Our binational centers ought to be multiplied many times over. We enthusiastically endorse the comments contained in Senate Report No. 1777 as it pertained to the appropriation bill of fiscal year 1961 pertaining to these centers:

> It is the opinion of the committee that the binational cultural institute program is one of the most important, if not the single, most important, entity of the U.S. Information Service abroad to promote, through a variety of channels, the continued expansion and improvement of United States-host country relationships and understanding.
>
> To the average citizen of the host country, the binational centers are true community centers of many facets. In addition to language training, there are social, musical, artistic, and other contacts. The committee believes that too much U.S. Government participation in the direct support of the institutes is detrimental, as many of the patrons may get the idea that the institutes are in some way a direct branch of the U.S. governmental operations within their countries.

If the shortage of funds is one side of the coin, the restrictiveness of our information media is the other. As one individual put it to us: "It is self-evident that the North American message has not been getting through to the average person." Such efforts as we have been making have been directed almost entirely toward Latin American leaders and government spokesmen. In general, urban populations, intellectuals, and politicians have been the principal recipients. Cultural affairs programs, reading rooms, libraries, and the familiar media of press and radio have been the principal vehicles.

It is becoming obvious, however, that we have not been reaching large numbers of Latin Americans largely because so many of them are uneducated, illiterate, and living in isolated, rural areas and are relatively untouched by our customary methods of communication. Millions in the Andean regions, for example, speak only native Indian tongues which have no literature. Other millions have no access either to the printed word or that relayed through the ether. Yet these same millions, long neglected or ignored, are among those peoples now on the march, swept along hopefully by the so-called revolution of rising expectations. They must be reached in many ways, ranging from person-to-person contact to a much wider use of motion pictures. Given the physical limitations of individual personal contacts and the complications of native language barriers, an obvious area for greater activity is through imagery—principally motion pictures.

In rural areas motion pictures command a following almost beyond our imagination. There are few, if any, competing forms of entertainment to tax the time of the individual native groups. We personally witnessed the community impact of a simple motion picture depicting the peoples and wonders of the Indian regions of Peru. With almost no advance warning and publicity, and using a simply erected screen composed of a bedsheet spread between two upright sticks mounted on the back of a truck, several hundred people, most of whom were illiterate, quickly gathered one evening to view a picture story of American aid for the people of Peru. As the diversity of native populations makes other communications media difficult, the motion picture represents a common denominator which pulls them together.

This may be the place to mention in passing an effective attention-getting gimmick for local peoples; namely, the Polaroid camera. This was one of the easiest and best of friend-winning techniques. In any case a greater effort needs to be mobilized in reaching groups that once were written off as unimportant, inaccessible, or ineffective.

ACCELERATION EXCHANGE PROGRAMS

Seventh. Everywhere we were reminded of the effectiveness of our educational exchange programs. In Belo Horizonte, Brazil, for example, a group of young ladies—schoolteachers—who had studied in the United States, requested to see us at dawn one morning just to say "thank you" for the great good of their exchange experiences. They had never had an opportunity before to express their gratitude to official visitors from the United States. The great good they were doing in Belo was conspicuous. Any increase in this program in both directions—north and south—would be helpful.

In our visit to many out-of-the-way communities, it became obvious that the present educational exchange programs seems to favor residents of the large cities and to be conspicuous in its neglect of the rural areas. Therefore, it seemed to us that an educational formula ought to be injected into the present program that would insure the selection of promising young students from remote areas as well as the large cities.

In the State of Amazonas, in Brazil, for example, there were virtually no young students who had visited the United States largely because there is no university in Amazonas; and our present program tends to select only students from large Latin American universities. If young people could be selected from nonuniversity areas for shorter intervals in the States, it was felt it would serve a very constructive purpose in channeling these youthful energies in directions parallel to those which we follow. In fact, one private group in Manaos relayed through our study mission an offer to transport, at their own expense, young people every month to and from the United States if, in some way, our present exchange program could arrange to absorb them for 2 weeks, or a month, or similarly short intervals of time on an informal study tour of North America.

ENCOURAGE PRIVATE INVESTMENT

Eighth. There is a much greater area for private American business capital than has been utilized until now. Such difficulties as have arisen to date seem to be confined to a few business groups that have appeared to be uncooperative with Latin American national groups in their business enterprises. On the other hand, some American businesses have exhibited imaginative leadership—firms like Sears and Kaiser Industries are two cases in point. In each case the ownership, stocks, commodity sources, and the managerial leadership is shared in substantial proportion with the citizens of the country in which they operate. A further extension of these principles, and on a wider base in more businesses, would almost certainly open up new opportunities for American private business enterprise.

MUST INCREASE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Ninth. It was obvious most everywhere that the United States has fallen far short of supplying enough technicians. There is no limit to the need for agricultural, engineering, urban, educational, and medical technicians. Whatever the circumstances elsewhere in the world, there remains a critical need for a substantial increase in technical aid in Latin America. We did not have an opportunity to see our Peace Corps in action, but surely this can be a source of much of the technical aid needed by our neighbors to the south. Keen interest was manifested in receiving Peace Corps units.

While the above list is not intended to be exhaustive, it is at least suggestive of the possibilities which we believe all Americans should weigh carefully. Through the approach outlined above and the constructive suggestions of all others focusing now on the Alliance for Progress, it is to be hoped that this exciting new program will rise fast enough and broadly enough toward meeting the fired-up expectations of the peoples of Latin America. In its stress upon not only money and technical know-how from the United States, but also upon a really genuine effort on the part of the Latin Americans themselves, it contains the capabilities of a new partnership for achieving greater freedom and well-being of vast numbers of people.

In all truth it can fully move Latin America into the second half of the 20th century as our equals and our allies; and as Secretary of State Dean Rusk told the foreign ministers of the American States during their recent meeting at Punta del Este:

> The proponents of free society need have no apologies. We have moved far beyond the rigid laissez faire capitalism of the 19th century. The open society of the mid-20th century can offer the reality of what the Communists promise but do not and cannot produce—because the means they are using, the techniques of hatred and violence, can never produce anything but more violence and more hatred.
>
> Communism is not the wave of the future. Communists are only the exploiters of people's aspirations—and their despair. They are the scavengers of the transition from stagnation into the modern world, the wave of the future is the peaceful, democratic revolution symbolized for the Americas in the Alliance for Progress—the revolution which will bring change without chaos, development without dictatorship, and hope without hatred.

THE CENTRAL PROBLEM OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE COLD WAR

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Lost Words of Senator MANSFIELD," written by Marquis Childs and published in the Washington Post of February 21, 1962, appraising and evaluating the words of the distinguished majority leader.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LOST WORDS OF SENATOR MANSFIELD

(By Marquis Childs)

Two important statements were made last week bearing directly on the central problem of the United States in the cold war—how to stop the indirect takeover of communism through the exploitation of poverty and the revolution of rising expectations.

One was the speech by Secretary of Defense McNamara in Chicago in which he discussed the steps being taken to counter Communist guerrilla action. This is the response evolved in the National Security Council to the speech of Premier Khrushchev in January of 1961 in which he stressed the prevention of a nuclear war while declaring support for "wars of liberation and popular uprisings."

McNamara's careful outline of the measures essential to checkmate communism in these wars of liberation, while at the same time strengthening the nuclear deterrent, got wide attention. As a statement of policy it had been reviewed both by Secretary of State Dean Rusk and the White House.

The second statement, which received almost no notice at all, was a report by Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, majority leader of the Senate, to the Foreign Relations Committee, on Brazil and the U.S. policy there. MANSFIELD was saying, in effect, that unless responsible Brazilians are willing to work for essential reforms inside their own country no amount of aid from North America will be of any avail. In fact, it may do more harm than good, since failure in the end will turn the mass of the people against the United States and condition them to accept the slogans of communism as truth.

What the Senator was saying about Brazil applies with equal force to other Latin American countries giving lipservice to the President's Alliance-for-Progress program. And, for that matter, it can be applied to all areas where deep popular discontent is linked to poverty on the one hand and the rising conviction that change must bring a better life and bring it quickly.

While Secretary McNamara did not specify South Vietnam, obviously that is where the military formula he discussed is currently being applied, with more than 6,000 American troops reported to be training and supporting the Vietnamese Army.

Very large sums of American military and economic aid have been put into South Vietnam. Yet, as the able reporting by Homer Bigart of the New York Times has shown, there continues to be a question as to the degree of support given the regime of Ngo Dinh Diem in Saigon and, therefore, a question as to the effectiveness of the resistance to the Communist guerrillas.

While Senator MANSFIELD was talking about economic aid the scope of his report was such that it might well have covered the kind of military assistance being undertaken in Vietnam and, to a lesser degree, in Laos. Economic aid from the outside is no magic formula if the will to reform is not there. In the same sense no military formula can very well make up the difference if the will to resist is not present.

The question being asked here, and it will likely have increasingly political overtones, is: If 6,000 to 7,000 American troops are not sufficient to turn the tide in Vietnam, will this number be increased to 10,000 or 12,000? Will that constitute an undeclared war and how will the casualties in that war be recorded?

Secretary McNamara spoke of the need to simplify tactical weapons "so that they can be used and maintained by men who have never seen a machine more complicated than a well sweep." But, as Senator Mansfield implied, what is in the minds of the men who accept American aid and American weapons—or in the minds of the men who profess to be their rulers—may in the showdown be as important as the technical skill in handling a simplified tactical weapon.

Senator Mansfield's discussion of the realities of aid in relation to change inevitably becomes part of the debate over the aid program now beginning in Congress. Pointing out the peril of inflation in Brazil and the threat of an explosion, the Mansfield report declared:

"To recognize these problems is one thing; to act vigorously and effectively on the social ills and economic imbalances and inadequacies which underlay them is another. The predominant political tendency appears still to be to avoid such action and to seek a painless relief of the symptom."

In other words, the tendency is to ignore the realities and to go on hoping that just a little more aid will somehow do the trick.

A GRACIOUS GUIDE: MRS. JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an editorial entitled "Gracious Guide," applauding the recent TV tour of the White House with Mrs. Kennedy, which was published in the Washington Evening Star on February 20.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Gracious Guide

Although other First Ladies have done much to arouse public interest and pride in the White House, none has done a more effective job in this direction than Mrs. John F. Kennedy—with the help of television. Thousands of citizens visit the historic home of the Presidents each year, but few in the past have had the benefit of personal guidance by the President's wife. Now, through the graciousness of Jacqueline Kennedy, millions of men, women and children have been taken on a personally conducted tour, via TV. And the net effect, as Mrs. Kennedy wished it to be, was to give the public at large a sense of joint proprietorship which only an intimate acquaintance with the mansion could arouse.

Nor could the public have asked for a more charming and informative guide—one who obviously takes pride in the great house and its traditions and who enjoys preserving those traditions and telling others about them. We commend Mrs. Kennedy on the fine work she has done in this field, both through personal attention and through the special Fine Arts Committee which she has created to advise on the restoration and maintenance of the rooms and their furnishings. And we are glad to note that the President, in a similar mood, is watching carefully the plans for development of Lafayette Square, which, after all, may properly be regarded as a historic part of the White House reservation.

A POLICY OF VICTORY

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an article entitled "We Have a Policy of Victory," written by Ralph McGill and published in the Washington Evening Star of February 20.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

We Have a Policy of Victory—Patience, Wisdom, and Strength, Not Slogans, Held Basis of Effort

(By Ralph McGill)

Some of today's extreme right propagandists bring back a picture in Berlin, in Vienna. Hitler's jack-booted soldiers and his civilian mobs striding along, shouting: "Ein Volk, Ein Reich, Ein Fuehrer" and Hitler himself proclaiming his policy of victory by national socialism—a victory which would endure for at least 10 centuries.

Slogans are not enough.

One of the incredibly strained and curious arguments of some of the political right today is that our Government and the information and education systems in the armed services do not talk enough about victory. Even Senator Goldwater thinks we should make it into a slogan of national cold war policy.

The President of the United States, in his moving inaugural, and in a number of eloquent statements of policy and purpose since that time, forcefully has stated the policy to this Nation is dedicated to a victory of the principles of freedom over those of communism.

Secretary of Defense McNamara publicly has warned the Russians that we possess the capacity to destroy them and will use it if required. The President solemnly notified the Soviets that if they attempt aggression in Berlin it would be met with the full force of this Nation. Over and over again our national leadership has made all this quite plain.

Yet, there are those petty critics who prefer a daily declaration of victory. They would, presumably, be content with a slogan if it were announced each morning from the Capitol, much as the muezzins from their towers call the Moslem faithful to prayer.

The President of the United States, his Cabinet, and his chiefs of staff have made clear the purpose and faith of this Nation. They know that slogans will not win the sort of deadly contest in which we now are engaged. It will require more than threats or promises.

It is a little dismaying that adults, including some in responsible positions, peddle the weird propaganda that our national policy is not committed to victory. This is a reprehensible and dishonest piece of propaganda. It apparently seeks to reflect on the President, the Cabinet, a heavy majority of the Congress, and the people.

No normal viewpoint can fail to see that the welfare of all the American people is first in the mind of the President. He, and he alone, has final responsibility. His whole life has been a testament in Americanism, loyalty, and victory. For a handful of neurotic, retired military men, busy with their little propaganda pamphlets and speeches, cheered by their Pecksniffian sycophants and promoters, to disseminate doubt on his policy of strength and his dedication to victory for this and other free peoples is an outrageously cheap and tawdry thing.

The victory to be won will not be through proclamations such as Hitler delighted in. Over and over he pledged a reich that would conquer the world. He was, when defeat and death came for him, building at Nuremberg a massive stadium to which the representatives of captive nations would be brought in supplication and tribute.

I remember seeing him, the froth flecking from his lips in the hot lights which blazed upon him, promise victory and victory. Let those who want to win with slogans (or by going to war), read also Shelley's "Ozymandias." "My name is Ozymandias, king of kings: Look on my works, ye mighty, and despair."

Slogans are not enough to win the cold war and thereby avoid a nuclear war. There must be enormous patience. A willingness to examine the possibilities of negotiations is a requirement of victory without such a war. We cannot fail to remain strong enough to watch what grows out of the tensions in the Communist world.

Victory is composed of more than slogans and seminars. Freedom will win. For the sake of this and generations to come, we need leadership wise and strong enough to win the cold war without getting it hot. What a shameful thing it is to suggest we do not have a policy of victory.

PROPOSED DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an editorial entitled "Helping Our Cities," published in the Washington Post on February 20.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Helping Our Cities

The President's Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962 creating a Department of Urban Affairs appears to be in serious danger of foundering in the House for reasons which have little to do with the merits of the proposal. It is mired in politics and it is haunted by hobgoblins.

For the politics, the administration must bear some of the blame. GOP leaders in Congress myopically climbed out on a limb which the President could not resist sawing off. He simply called attention to the disparity between Republican hopes of winning the political affections of the Nation's big cities and Republican apathy respecting vital urban interests. This helped make a partisan affair of a measure that deserves bipartisan support.

This coloration of politics was increased by the candid acknowledgment of the President that he intended to name Robert Weaver to the secretaryship of the new Department. He could hardly have avoided disclosure of this intent in view of Weaver's qualifications. The consequence, however, was a firmer coalition of southern Democrats and Republicans.

The hobgoblins in the case arise out of the fevered fears of those who do not understand what the President's reorganization order would accomplish and who have conjured up nightmare visions of a new centralization of power. No new power would be created by the reorganization order; no new power could possibly be created under the terms of the Reorganization Act. All that the President's plan can bring about is a regrouping of the existing agencies which now deal in a somewhat haphazard way with the housing problems of the big cities so as to enable them to deal with these problems more efficiently at the level of a department and under the direction of a Cabinet officer. The reorganization order can achieve economy and efficiency but it cannot enlarge or extend the scope of Federal activity.

Seven out of ten Americans live in cities today. The dramatic urbanization of American life expressed in this startling figure brings with it a train of problems—slums, sewage disposal, mass transit, water supply and purification, public and private housing, public and private transportation, urban sprawl which, if undirected, can mar or wholly obliterate the countryside. The country urgently needs to tackle these problems.

The proposed Department of Urban Affairs is not designed to diminish local authority or local responsibility in any way. It is designed simply to offer the help of the Federal Government in dealing with difficulties that now affect the whole country. If politics and prejudice can be laid aside long enough to create this new Department, the whole country will be the beneficiary.

PAYING FOR THE U.N.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an article entitled "Paying for the U.N." by Walter Lippmann, published in the Washington Post on February 20.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Paying for the U.N.

(By Walter Lippmann)

While Congress is considering the President's request for authority to buy half of the proposed $200 million issue of United Nations bonds, we must ask ourselves what precisely is the crucial question. It is not whether the United Nations is to survive. That is a misleading overdramatization. The critical question is whether the United Nations can and should continue to enforce peace, as it has been doing since 1956 on the Israel-Egyptian frontier, since 1960 in the Congo.

The deficit, which the proposed bond issue is to cover, has nothing to do with the regular operations of the United Nations. The deficit arises wholly from these two highly controversial peace-keeping operations.

On the regular assessments for the regular budget the record is very nearly perfect. For the 4 years 1956 to 1959, inclusive, the collections were virtually 100 percent. For the 1960 assessments—those for the year when the great number of new states were admitted—the collections by the end of 1961 were already 94.6 percent. Countries in arrears do not lose their General Assembly vote until the amount owed is equal to the contributions due for the preceding 2 years. On the 1961 assessments, nearly 86 percent has already been collected. Of what has not been collected, China owes over half and the rest is owed chiefly by smaller Latin American countries.

All of this goes to prove that the normal and conventional activities of the U.N. are financially sound and that they have the support of the whole membership—West, East, and neutral.

The deficit is caused by the two special operations. One, known as UNEF, consists of about 5,000 troops under U.N. command, the troops being drawn from seven countries, none of them a "great power." These troops keep the peace along about 140 miles of the Israeli-United Arab Republic border. This operation costs about $20 million a year.

The other special operation deals with the Congo and is known as ONUC. Its average cost since July 1960 has been about $10 million a month. As of January of this year, 21 countries had contributed to the operation with a total of about 16,000 soldiers. None of the soldiers came from any of the great powers, so that the U.S.S.R., the United States, the United Kingdom, and France have no fighting men in the Congo.

The deficit is not due to the fact that these two operations are very expensive. They have been financed by special assessments, and various countries have refused to pay because they disagree with the purpose or the conduct of the special operations. Because the peace-keeping costs are not part of the regular budget, the nonpaying nations can escape the penalty of losing their U.N. vote.

The Soviet bloc and most of the Arab States have refused to pay either for the Middle East or for the Congo. France, Belgium, Italy, Portugal, Spain, and South Africa have refused to pay for the Congo. There are a few others who have not paid, probably because their governments are bankrupt. The bulk of the deficit is due to the fact that, for their own reasons, a great many countries dislike the special operations and would like to put an end to them.

We have always supported the special operations in the Middle East and the Congo and we have been paying about 40–50 percent of the cost. This sort of thing cannot and should not go on, not because we cannot afford these trifling sums but because the United Nations should not become dependent on any one great power. The true significance of the bond issue is that it opens a way out of this quandary. The central fact of the bond issue is that interest and amortization are to be covered by the regular budget if, as is expected, the International Court of Justice approves the plan. Our share of the peacekeeping costs therefore would decrease to our regular share of the U.N. budget—32 percent. And the penalty for refusing to pay the interest and amortization will be the loss of the right to vote in the General Assembly.

Without insisting that every detail of the plan as presented to Congress is perfect, it is clear that the plan, which we conceived and invented, is good for the U.N. and good for the U.S.A. It saves the U.N. from having to abandon the special operations which are playing such a mighty part in keeping the peace in the Middle East and in the heart of Africa. It brings to an end excessive dependence of the U.N. on the United States, and it brings to an end the unacceptable doctrine that a member can keep its privileges and still refuse to pay its share of operations duly authorized by the constituted authorities of the United Nations.

FISH FLOUR

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I wish to join with my colleagues who have been bringing to the attention of the Senate and the country the current conflict over whole fish flour.

Congress last year appropriated $50,000 for an expert study of this matter, and I note that the first report is now in. Dr. E. R. Pariser, now a research chemist for the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, but formerly with the Nutrition Department at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, is heading up this study, and he has told us that whole fish flour is the beginning of an entirely new fishing concept, that it can make available a cheap, high-quality protein everywhere in the world. My colleague, the Senator from Maine [Mrs. Smith], placed this report in the Record earlier this week.

It seems regrettable to me that the Food and Drug Administration should interpose objections to this product, on the basis of so-called consumer opposition which it has helped to generate.

The Department of the Interior is on record in favor of this product. The U.S. Patent Office has issued at least three patents on it, and this required a legal finding that the invention will be new and useful. Our civil defense officials are aware of the reliable stability and nutrient qualities of this food, and 10 Members of this body have spoken out in favor.

I am advised that official objections to the substitute standard offered by the Food and Drug Administration will be filed on today and that a public hearing will be requested.

I associate myself with this petition, and with my colleagues to urge that all agencies of the Federal Government unite on a scientific and forward-looking answer to this question.

I wish to include also as part of my remarks some statements that have been made by people in the field of nutrition, and I ask unanimous consent for this purpose. These statements are being filed as an appendix to the petition.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Appendix

Many of the country's outstanding food scientists wrote letters to the Food and Drug Administration in support of the original proposed standard for whole-fish flour. This impressive support was ignored in the Commissioner's summary of the evidence:

Dr. E. R. Pariser, research chemist, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries Technological Laboratory, College Park, Md: "Fish protein concentrate represents the beginning of an entirely new fishing industry; it will develop as explosively as the growth of world population; it will rank foremost in importance with but a few other industries, capable of producing a cheap, high-quality food, available to everyone, everywhere. We feel so confident about this trend that we consider it to be our duty to make a most vigorous effort for the United States to be in the vanguard of this advance."

Paul G. Hoffman, managing director, Special Fund, United Nations: "While in Peru quite recently I inquired as to the status of the fish meal experiment. Reports I received were most encouraging. On the basis of these reports, I am perfectly willing to write to the Food and Drug Administration, advising them of my personal interest in the production of low-cost, high-quality protein."

H. M. Scott, professor, animal science, university of Illinois: "If the idea of consuming whole fish flour disturbs the aesthetic sense of some people, this by itself should not deny others the right to use this material if they choose to do so. There is ample experimental evidence to indicate that whole fish flour is superior to the pattern of any single fraction of the fish. The issue should be resolved on a nutritional basis."

Margaret A. Ohlson, director, Department of Nutrition, State University of Iowa: "I can visualize many uses for the product including use in our society in the event of a major disaster which would limit our normal food supplies."

Dr. H. E. Schendel, research associate in nutrition, University of Illinois: "The availability of fish flour for enrichment of dietary protein now requires the immediate attention of statesmen. The persistence of protein malnutrition in the years to come will be a judgment which the shoulders of statesmen, rather than nutritionists, will have to bear. The evaluation of a product so vital to the survival of millions over the world should be made on the basis, not of aesthetic objections, but of more objective criterion, i.e., nutritional value."

Agnes Fay Morgan, Department of Nutrition, University of California: "If the only objection is an aesthetic one, let this be plainly stated and let the prospective beneficiaries make their own decisions, both here and abroad."

Harry G. Day, chairman, Department of Chemistry, Indiana University: "Fish flour can be of great value in meeting the nutritional needs of people in all parts of the world, including the United States. There is a great difference between fish flour and foods that are contaminated with filth."

R. Adams Dutcher, professor emeritus, Pennsylvania State University and Fellow American Institute of Nutrition: "Protein deficiency is the most important nutritional problem facing the world today. It is my considered opinion that so-called fish flour most nearly meets all the most desirable specifications for a protein-rich food concentrate."

Lucien A. Bavetta, professor of nutrition, University of Southern California: "This is a high-quality protein which has been shown repeatedly to greatly augment the biological value of the more abundant but less nutritionally balanced plant proteins."

J. A. Anderson, Ph. D., professor, Utah State University: "Fish protein should be one of the most effective proteins available to supplement man's diet."

Victor J. Stone, Esq., Law Building, University of Illinois: "I am surprised that FDA considers esthetics a part of its concern. I had thought that its job was to protect against physiological injury. To me, the notion of grinding up a whole fish and processing it into fish flour is not the least bit repugnant. I would have no hesitancy in eating products made of it."

Johnson-Metta-Schendel study, "The Nutritive Value of Fish Flour," University of Illinois: "An odorless, defatted fish flour, evaluated for its protein quality by the Mitchell method, was found to have a biological value of 88 percent. At the 10-percent protein level in diet, its protein efficiency ratio (gram grains per gram protein consumed) was 3.24 as compared to 2.85 for skim milk and 3.15 for beef. When fed as the sole source of protein, fish flour proved as adequate as casein for the reproduction and general performance of rats through four generations. All our data support the view that a good fish flour could be of real significance in helping to supply the protein needs of the world."

FAO International Conference on Fish in Nutrition, 1961, Washington, report of U.S. delegation: "The papers presented at the Conference indicate that a fish flour can be prepared so that it will retain high nutritional values, as shown in both animal and human experiments. The U.S. delegation introduced a recommendation that FAO should develop minimum standards for fish flour and adopt measures to encourage the production and consumption."

Anthony A. Albanese, Ph. D., director, Nutrition and Metabolic Research Division, Burke Foundation Rehabilitation Center, New York: "Some of the tolerances which the FDA will accept in foods serve to emphasize their complete lack of understanding with regard to fish flour. I wonder how many of our citizens realize that cow manure is a permitted tolerance in milk. Actually, the preparation of fish flour is a far cleaner process than is the preparation of gelatin from carcass residues of farm animals."

Dr. Frederick J. Stare, chairman, Department of Nutrition, Harvard University: "On the protein score, you cannot improve on or surpass the quality of fish protein. Fish should be included in the diet at least four times per week."

AN OUTRAGE ON THE SENATE

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, it was recently revealed that two Senate aids arrogated to themselves authority to interrogate Marine Corps officers and enlisted men about communism, without authorization from the subcommittee of which one is an employee, and in the absence of authority from its chairman—in fact, without his knowledge.

This action by these two employees of the Senate was in utter disregard of the separation of powers principle provided by the Constitution of our country. These two would-be vigilantes are employees of the Senate and their actions were reprehensible and inexcusable. The distinguished junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Stennis], chairman of the subcommittee involved, is to be commended on the forthright action he took in expressing his distress and ordering an investigation immediately upon learning of this incident.

Furthermore, this was an affront to the commanding officer of our Marine Corps, General Shoup, whose permission was not sought nor secured for this unusual proceeding. May I add that it was an insult also to Col. John Glenn and all other officers and men of our Marine Corps, which has a great history and a noble tradition unsurpassed anywhere in the world.

Mr. President, an outstanding editorial entitled "An Outrage on the Senate" was printed in the Washington Post on February 10, 1962. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Record at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

An Outrage on the Senate

The Senate subcommittee employees who questioned members of the U.S. Marine Corps exceeded the authority of the subcommittee, transgressed the standards of propriety and good taste, violated the plain rules of reasonable conduct, and interfered with military discipline. They ought to be discharged forthwith. They have given a very good demonstration of how committee employees can menace the good name of honorable Senators and the reputation of the Congress itself.

Their conduct is all the more reprehensible in view of the very evident willingness of General Shoup of the Marine Corps to give the subcommittee relevant and pertinent information. Those who know Senator Stennis will not be surprised to learn that he was not informed of this venture. They may be surprised to discover that such serious and dangerous missions can be undertaken without appropriate authority of the subcommittee chairman. The good name of the Senate must be protected against such irresponsible behavior by rules that preclude unauthorized adventures and by the strict enforcement of those rules.

JOHN H. GLENN, JR., PIONEER IN SPACE

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Astronaut John H. Glenn, Jr., yesterday returned from a ride that will stand in American history like the ride of Paul Revere as one to be praised forever in story, poem and ballad.

The courage of this living symbol of the space age is perhaps equaled only by the achievement in which he played a starring role. His place in the heart of Americans and the history books of America is preserved for all time.

But what Astronaut John Glenn has done, with the wonderful team of other astronauts and scientists and technicians behind him, is more than a contribution to the glory of America: it is a contribution to the advancement of mankind.

This is one of the finest achievements of American science. February 20 was "go" day for American science.

Millions of Americans shared as much as we could in Astronaut Glenn's adventure into space, by watching, listening, and praying for a successful mission. The work of the space personnel was well done, the prayers were granted, the mission accomplished, and the Nation has recorded one of its finest hours.

I have today sent the following telegram to Lt. Col. John Glenn:

Washington, D.C., *February 21, 1962.*

On behalf of the 10 million people of Texas, I congratulate you for advancing the frontiers of human achievement further and faster than any other American who ever lived. All Americans, all freemen everywhere, indeed all mankind honor you for your great flight. You have earned the esteem of the human race. God bless you.

Ralph W. Yarborough,
U.S. Senator from Texas.

I ask the unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record the following editorials:

"Go," from the Washington Post of Wednesday, February 21, 1962; and

"One of Our Finest Hours," from the New York Times of Wednesday, February 21, 1962.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 21, 1962]

Go

The first hope that filled the hearts of the millions who watched the television broadcasts of the earth-orbiting flight of Astronaut John H. Glenn surely was the hope that this brave man might complete his incredible mission through space with safety. The fulfillment of that hope surely suffused with relief the minds of those who attended his long ordeal with an intensity of interest that could hardly have been increased if all had ridden with him in his capsule. Indeed, it is probable that the voyageur himself experienced more calm than the multitudinous spectators who vicariously shared his adventure.

These first conquests of space by American and Soviet astrounauts raise hopes less personal than those that concern the safety of heroes. They suggest that man again is upon the threshhold of experiences that will broaden his horizons, multiply his perceptions, expand his knowledge and open up new vistas of achievement. We dare to hope that they and the greater conquest to come will put into the hands of man greater power to govern his environment than he ever has hitherto possessed, and that this power may be used for human betterment.

There is something in the very air of this space age that is not unlike the climate of another great age of discovery which took place in the 15th century. Then, as now, man was in a period of depression and anxiety. Samuel Eliot Morison has described that doubting decade that closed the 15th century:

"At the end of 1492 most men in Western Europe felt exceedingly gloomy about the future. Christian civilization appeared to be shrinking in area and dividing into hostile units. Institutions were decaying, well meaning people were growing cynical or desperate. Islam was expanding at the expense of Christendom. Every effort to recover the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem, touchstone of Christian prestige, had been a failure. The Ottoman Turks, after snuffing out all that remained of the Byzantine Empire, had overrun most of Greece, Albania, and Serbia; presently they would be hammering at the gates of Vienna."

The Nuremburg Chronicle, in a colophon dated July 12, 1492, left six blank pages on which to record the events from that date until the day of judgment, Morison recounts.

Then came an event that to 15th century Europe must have been quite as astonishing and breathtaking as the voyage of the *Friendship VII*. Into Lisbon harbor, came the *Nina*, sailing before a wintry gale to bring news of the discovery of the new world. That news changed the spirit of Europe. In Morison's words: "New ideas flared up throughout Italy, France, Germany, and the northern nations; faith in God revives and the human spirit is renewed."

So must these ventures into our space environment revive and renew the human spirit. And we are at the beginning There will be dates as historic as those that mark the voyages of Columbus, Vasco da Gama, Balboa, Magellan, Hudson, and the Cabots. And there will be revolutions as great in human thought, science, philosophy, and religion.

The achievements of Astronaut John H. Glenn and his colleagues fulfill ambitions of the noblest sort. Francis Bacon has rightly said that ambitions are of three types: "The first is of those who desire to extend their own power in their native country, which kind is vulgar and degenerate. The second is of those who labor to extend the power of their country and its domination among men. This certainly has more dignity, though not less covetousness. But if a man endeavor to establish and extend the power and dominion of the human race over the universe, his ambition (if ambition it can be called) is without doubt both a more wholesome thing and a more noble than the other two."

The whole endeavor in outer space is marked by this nobility and lifted by it onto a plane that distinguishes all its exertions from those that attend the petty struggle for private place or public power. And such nobility, given expression in such spectacular achievements, surely must raise among men a standard more inspiring than any that derive from national, racial, and territorial ambition. What mortal competition can compare with that engendered by the endeavor to be the first to do the most for all mankind? Let there be more of such competition. Wherever men of courage and genius gather to advance these ends, may all the conditions of their enterprise have appropriate summary in the magic word that described throughout Colonel Glenn's triumphant flight: "Go."

[From the New York Times, Feb. 21, 1962]

ONE OF OUR FINEST HOURS

The event that all America and men of good will everywhere have long been waiting for has at last come to pass. It began at 9:47 on the morning of February 20. It ended 4 hours 56 minutes and 34 seconds later as time is measured by the clock. But in a sense time stood still as countless millions watched and indeed participated in one of the greatest dramatic events of modern times.

Astronaut John H. Glenn, Jr., was not the first human to orbit around the earth, nor was he the second. As the world knows, the Soviet cosmonauts Yuri Gagarin and Gherman Titov preceded him. But Colonel Glenn's achievement added a new dimension to man's conquest of space. The Gagarin flight was carried out in absolute secrecy, while Titov's was not revealed until he had been safely launched into orbit. Nor was the world permitted to participate in the drama of his landing. In contrast, Colonel Glenn's demonstration was a feat in which the entire world was allowed to take part. It was not just one man going into orbit but, in a very real sense as President Kennedy said, it was the entire Nation, for "all of us had to work to put him there."

During the agonizing last hours of the countdown, as the Nation watched breathless over its television and the rest of the world listened over radio, countless millions were given the opportunity, as one viewer said, to "turn their hearts on simultaneously." It was in this respect that Colonel Glenn's achievement stood out.

It was not a mere technological triumph of a man in a machine. It was one of the great dramas of history, made great because millions of human beings were allowed to share in it. It was not the adventure of just one man; it was the great adventure of all mankind. And it showed the world the vast chasm that exists between the human spirit thriving in a free society, as contrasted with the way of life in a closed society.

Astronaut Glenn's flight marks the first step in America's program for the conquest of space. It will be followed by several more Mercury flights, to circle in ever greater numbers of orbits. Then will come Project Gemini, with larger satellites to carry 2 astronauts into orbit, to be followed by rendezvous and docking missions to assemble vast space ships in orbit. Then will come Project Apollo, a series of three-man flights, designed for the eventual round-trip journey of a three-man crew to the moon. And after that the planets.

As President Kennedy said, "We have a long way to go in the space race and we started late. This is the new ocean and we must sail on it and be in a position second to none." For man, as Goethe said, "demands from heaven its fairest stars, and nothing, whether near or far, can still the deep turbulence in his heart."

WILL CLAYTON: A DISTINGUISHED AMERICAN

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Will Clayton is one of that small but fortunately growing group of Americans who have first made illustrious names for themselves in private business and have then gone on to distinguish themselves in the public service. Will Clayton is known both as one of the Nation's leading businessmen, a cofounder of the world-renowned cotton brokerage firm of Anderson, Clayton & Co., and as a Government official in several responsible positions including that of Under Secretary of State. There is, however, as we should note, a common interest which runs throughout his career, a firm and passionate dedication to the values of international commerce both for the prosperity of the United States and for the peace of the world. As recently as last October he wrote, together with Christian A. Herter:

> We believe that the United States must form a trade partnership with the European Common Market and take the leadership in further expanding a free world economic community.

Let us note a few of the highlights of Will Clayton's career. William L. Clayton was born in 1880 on a cotton farm near Tupelo, Miss., the son of a railroad contractor. By the time he was 14, he was through with his formal education—and was also the fastest stenographer in the town of Jackson, Tenn., where his family had moved when he was 6. Jerome Hill, a cotton factor from St. Louis, recognized young Clayton's ability and took him back to St. Louis with him as a secretary. From 1896 to 1904 he was in New York learning about the cotton business, and in the latter year moved to Oklahoma to organize a new cotton business, Anderson, Clayton & Co., with his brother-in-law, Frank E. Anderson, and his brother-in-law's brother, M. D. Anderson. The growth of the business was phenomenal. By the middle 1920's, Clayton's was the largest cotton firm in the world, buying and selling about 14 percent of the entire American cotton crop.

Well before America entered World War II, Will Clayton recognized its dangers to our Nation's security. On June 27, 1940, he said:

> The future is so menacing that we must act as if we were already at war.

From the end of 1940 on, he held a series of increasingly important Government posts, among them Deputy Administrator, under Jesse Jones, of the Federal Loan Agency in charge of the purchase of critical and strategic materials; Assistant Secretary of Commerce; Surplus War Property Administrator; Assistant Secretary of State; and finally, in 1947, for a relatively brief period, Under Secretary of State in Charge of Economic Affairs. As one of the major proponents of the Marshall plan and one of those most responsible for the establishment of the International Trade Organization, Clayton has been aptly called the No. 1 architect of America's postwar foreign economic policy.

Although now in his ninth decade of life, Will Clayton appears to have lost none of his lifelong concern with the well-being of our country and the peace of the world. As he said in the report issued last October, already quoted above:

> If the United States is to continue to meet its responsibilities of Western leadership in preserving the freedom of the Western World, it must again, as in 1947, put the national and international interest above the short-term special interest of its politically powerful minority groups. It cannot be repeated too often that communism is waging war against the West—relentlessly, craftily, cunningly. The West will lose this war unless it can maintain Western unity and can keep the contested countries independent and out of the Communist bloc.

Despite his interest in national and international affairs, Mr. Clayton has not overlooked his home State. He has supported moves for honest and progressive government in Texas and for progress in the government of his home city of Houston. I am grateful for his personal support and encouragement in many of my own efforts for better government in Texas.

Recently Mr. Clayton was honored by his fellow citizens in Houston, Tex., who joined with the Houston Rotary Club to salute this outstanding American. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the following newspaper articles and editorials concerning the tribute to Mr. Clayton:

"Houstonians Pay Well-Deserved Tribuse to William L. Clayton," from the Houston Post of Friday, February 16, 1962.

"Clayton Is Feted by Rotarians—Distinguished Citizen's Award Given Statesman," from the Houston Post of Friday, February 16, 1962.

"Good Citizen, Statesman: Today Houston Honors Diplomat Will Clayton," from the Houston Chronicle of Thursday, February 15, 1962.

"William L. Clayton Eminent World Citizen," from the Houston Chronicle of Thursday, February 15, 1962.

There being no objection, the articles and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Houston Post, Feb. 16, 1962]

HOUSTONIANS PAY WELL-DESERVED TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM L. CLAYTON

There are few men that Houstonians honor and respect with greater unanimity than William L. Clayton, and there are few who deserve it more on the basis of both personal accomplishment and his contribution to his community, his State, his country and, indeed, the entire free world, which has been the beneficiary of his unusual talents and his expert knowledge in the field of economic affairs and international commerce.

The tribute that was paid him Thursday by the Houston Rotary Club was one in which the entire community joins with enthusiasm and sincerity. There was no special occasion for the salute, and none was needed to make it appropriate. It reflected only a desire on the part of his fellow Houstonians, among whom he has resided for nearly 45 years, to recognize the outstanding service which he has given in the public area and the example of good citizenship which he has maintained.

As a founder and executive of Anderson, Clayton & Co., Clayton has achieved great business success in his personal life. This success has been shared by Houston and has helped it to become one of the world's great ports. But no less valuable has been the service which he has given the Nation as a statesman of unusual insight and ability and as a specialist in a field that is notable for its complexity but which is of the most vital importance to the peace and progress of the Western World.

Called to Washington in 1940 by President Franklin D. Roosevelt, he worked first with Nelson Rockefeller as a Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, then as Deputy Federal Loan Administrator and Assistant Secretary of Commerce and, under President Truman, as Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs.

The free flow of international trade has been a continuing interest, and as Under Secretary of State George C. McGhee said Thursday, Clayton properly can be regarded, along with Jean Monnet of France, as a cofather of the European Common Market which is the basis for the unprecedented prosperity which Western Europe, reconstructed since World War II, is enjoying today.

And as McGhee also observed, Clayton is, as much as anyone else, a father of the Marshall plan which made the European recovery possible.

At the age of 82, Clayton could, if he chose, look back upon an unusual career with great satisfaction. But he is still looking forward, and his most recent contribution to the Nation has been as cochairman with former Secretary of State Christian Herter of the U.S. Citizens Committee on NATO. This group has as its concern the establishment of economic relationship between the members of the Atlantic community which will be to their mutual benefit.

The Post is happy to join with the Rotary Club and the rest of the community in paying tribute to the distinguished citizen.

[From the Houston Post, Feb. 16, 1962]

CLAYTON IS FETED BY ROTARIANS—DISTINGUISHED CITIZENS AWARD GIVEN STATESMAN

(By Ellen Middlebrook)

The man who jotted down a memo that provided the concept of the Marshall plan was honored in Houston Thursday as a "world statesman."

W. L. Clayton, cofounder of Anderson, Clayton & Co.; a longtime servant of the U.S. Government, and effective advocate of freer world trade, was presented with the Distinguished Citizens Award by the Houston Rotary Club.

As George C. McGhee, Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, traced the career of the internationally known Houstonian and praised him for his great vision, Clayton sat at the head table and watched him with interest.

Clayton's four daughters, also at the head table, wiped occasional tears from their eyes but the honoree maintained poise throughout the ceremonies and also later as he accepted the award with these words:

"I have a genuine feeling of unworthiness but I wouldn't be human if I were not also very proud today."

Under Secretary McGhee, who was Clayton's assistant when Clayton was Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, told how his ideas were fundamental to the postwar economic recovery of Britain, Europe, Greece, and Turkey.

McGhee said the Marshall plan ranks as one of the greatest acts of international generosity of all time and that it put Europe back on the road to a remarkable economic recovery.

He described Clayton's role as chairman of the U.S. delegation to the United Nations Conference on Trade and Employment in Havana in 1948.

The Conference produced the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, which has served since then as the basic arrangement for freer postwar trade among the countries of the free world," McGhee said.

He also spoke of Clayton's vigorous support of Atlantic Union.

"He participated in the January 1962 meeting in Paris of citizen delegates to the Atlantic Convention of NATO nations," McGhee said.

"This group issued the Declaration of Paris, which laid down a forward looking program for greater cohesion among the Atlantic nations. It calls upon the governments of the NATO countries 'to draw up plans within 2 years for the creation of an Atlantic community suitably organized to meet the political, military, and economic challenges of this era.'"

Describing Clayton's fight for freer world trade, McGhee said:

"Mr. Clayton was encouraged when on January 1, 1959, the first step was taken in the implementation of the European Common Market.

"He said that if the United States would seize the leadership of this world economic revolution, the job could be effectively finished in 10 years.

"Last August Mr. Clayton said that to protect our world trade we must sooner or later join the Common Market. Furthermore, the Common Market idea was catching on in the world; it was new and dynamic and gave hope that broader horizons of economic and political progress might be opening up."

These ideas were enlarged upon in a report Clayton and former Secretary of State Christian Herter made to the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress and it served as background for President Kennedy's January 24 message to the Congress, McGhee said.

"The Presidential message constitutes another milestone in the long struggle to bring about the freer movements of trade among nations," he said.

"In it, the President explained the fundamental new developments, including growth of the European Common Market which had made obsolete our traditional trade policy. He asked the Congress for a Trade Expansion Act appropriate to meet the new situation."

McGhee said Clayton now moves back and forth between Houston, Washington, New York, and Europe, supporting the principle that freer trade between America and the Common Market would bolster the economy of the entire free world.

He said the American people are being tested now, as they were when the Marshall plan was proposed, as to whether they can rise above the habits of the past and respond to the leadership of men such as Will Clayton in shaping a future on behalf of freedom.

A letter presented to Clayton from President Kennedy commended him for a "record of long and wise service to our Government."

"Your ideas and advice contributed richly to the development of new directions in international policy," the President wrote.

Gail Whitcomb presented the Rotary award which cited Clayton for his untiring and unselfish contribution to the preservation of the principles and ideals of the free world.

Many of Clayton's friends and relatives were on hand for the ceremonies. His four daughters are Mrs. W. St. John Garwood, of Austin; Mrs. Benjamin M. Baker, of Baltimore; and Mrs. S. M. McAshan, Jr., and Mrs. J. M. Johnson, of Houston.

[From the Houston Chronicle, Feb. 15, 1962]

GOOD CITIZEN, STATESMAN—TODAY HOUSTON HONORS DIPLOMAT WILL CLAYTON

(By Gilles Swinkels)

This is Will Clayton Day in Houston.

William L. Clayton of 5300 Caroline, former Under Secretary of State and one of the founders of Anderson, Clayton & Co., a worldwide cotton and food firm, received the community's tribute for achievements as a statesman and a business leader.

Mayor Lewis Cutrer proclaimed Will Clayton Day "in recognition of one whose character so completely exemplifies all those cherished principles of democracy upon which the United States of America was founded and grew into the greatest Nation in the world."

The tribute was planned by the Rotary Club of Houston, which invited George C. McGhee, Dallas oilman, ex-U.S. Ambassador to Turkey and Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, to speak at its Will Clayton Day luncheon in the Rice Hotel. McGhee was associated with Clayton in the Department of State during the administration of President Harry S. Truman.

Clayton also has served as an Assistant Secretary of Commerce under President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Thus, much of the latter part of his life has been devoted to affairs of Government and trade policies.

At 82, Clayton wears this eminence naturally, as if he had always expected it, even though he attended only seven grades in school.

His opinions are firm, and spoken clearly.

One recent Sunday morning, only a few hours before he flew to Paris to attend the Atlantic convention of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization nations, he stood in front of one of his Thomas Gainsborough paintings and spoke of world affairs.

There was no passion in his voice, no contempt for political opponents, none of the intonations that could indicate how deeply he was involved in the future of world trade and the Atlantic Community.

Gradually, while I listened, I felt myself being drawn into a world in which frontiers no longer exist.

Will Clayton had come far in life.

If you scan his biographical data, he appears to be nothing more than one of the many Texans who made his first million before he was 25.

He was born February 7, 1880, on a cotton farm near Tupelo, Miss.

At 15, he mastered shorthand and typing. He left school after seven grades, and went to work as a $65-a-month clerk of the chancery court in Jackson, Miss.

To make extra money, he also worked as a public stenographer in a Jackson hotel.

HILL A FACTOR

It was there that he met Jerome Hill, a cotton factor from St. Louis, who induced him to leave his home and work for him as a secretary.

In 1887, Clayton accompanied Hill to New York where they both went to work for the American Cotton Co. Clayton became its treasurer in 1904.

In the meantime, he worked like a slave, took French lessons, and read everything available on the cotton industry.

In 1905, Clayton and Monroe Anderson and Frank Anderson formed Anderson, Clayton & Co. Their capital—$9,000.

They began buying cotton from local gins and from merchants in towns and villages. Because of their knowledge of markets, they bought the cotton most in demand and sold it to American mills and to European importers for a profit.

Most American cotton merchants in those days were content to sell their export cotton to foreign merchants and let it go at that. The foreign merchants then took their profit, which increased the price spread between the farmer and the foreign mill.

Clayton was among the first to see the advantage of setting up European offices and selling direct to mills in England, Russia, and Italy.

The company grew into a wordwide firm, which is still growing. It recently entered the food field.

Clayton worked hard to build the Anderson, Clayton empire.

BEAT WALL STREET

He championed southern delivery, that famous agreement after which it was no longer needed to ship cotton to New York, only to get it shipped back to the southern mills after it had proved its physical presence to the New York brokers.

After Clayton's determined effort, Houston, Mobile, Galveston, New Orleans, Savannah, and Charleston were designated as ports of delivery. Cotton could be delivered there instead of New York. This ended the squeeze on New York futures by speculators.

At the same time, Clayton started to write essays on world trade. They included such famous publications as "The Struggle for the World's Cotton Market," "Tariff—False Talisman for Future Prosperity," "The Domestic Allotment Plan," and "Our Vanishing Cotton Markets."

All of these achievements led to his Government appointment under President Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1940, where he went to work with Nelson Rockefeller as Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs. Next, he became Deputy Federal Loan Administrator, then Assistant Secretary of Commerce and, under Truman, Under Secretary of State in Charge of Economic Affairs.

In 1940 he resigned as chairman of the board of Anderson, Clayton, to devote himself entirely to Government affairs.

Clayton is now cochairman with former Secretary of State, Christian Herter, of the U.S. Citizens Committee on NATO. Their efforts have focused attention on the European Common Market, the Atlantic community, and the proposal for establishment of an Atlantic youth and education program.

Will Clayton has come far in life.

From the day he set out in 1885, against his mother's will, saying: "You mustn't hold me back. I can never make a decent living here," he has lost battles and won them.

Jesse Jones, another Houstonian whose counsel was sought by the Government, and founder of the many businesses known as the Jones Interests, occasionally was an opponent. He once introduced Clayton: "While I am not in agreement with the plan he advocates, there is no one on earth for whom I have higher regard."

In October 1947, I. F. Stone, a well-known journalist, wrote: "This lean Texan, with the tired eagle expression, is fighting a losing battle for free trade."

UNAFRAID

Later, in the same article, he stated: "One felt of Clayton that he was not afraid of bogeymen, that he was big enough to try to understand the differences in the world, and that he was genuinely desirious of peace."

When I left him that Sunday, he went back to what he called his bench in the sun before driving to the airport for his flight to Paris.

"Whenever there is a problem that needs special attention, I save it for my 1-hour sun doze in the afternoon," said Clayton. "An old habit I picked up in Geneva while I was there to sign the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade in 1947."

[From the Houston Chronicle, Feb. 15, 1962]

WILLIAM L. CLAYTON, EMINENT WORLD CITIZEN

Today is Will Clayton Day in Houston.

Our city is used to eminent men—to successful men. We have had our share, and more, and we will go on having them. This is fair exchange in the best American tradition; a wonderful testimony to the way a free society uses and rewards its citizens.

But even in such distinguished company, Will Clayton is outstanding. His was the traditional humble beginning of the last years of the last century when young men moved away from farms and small towns into the mainstream of a nation rapidly becoming a world power. They made it one.

They made up rules for this new world as they went along, but they never lost sight of fundamental rules they brought with them.

Diligence, honesty, intelligence, perseverance—these all have a copybook ring. But it is a good copybook, and it served Will Clayton well. He helped found Anderson, Clayton on a shoestring, and then built it to the largest enterprise of its kind in the world.

At a time when some men would have thought of retiring, he moved into a new field—Government service—and carved a second, distinguished career.

Will Clayton is old now, but his ideas and his ideals are still fresh and bright. Time is but one dimension to a man who has lived so usefully.

THE GRAND DESIGN TAKES SHAPE

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled, "The Grand Design Takes Shape," in the February 1962, issue of Harper's magazine, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

In my opinion, this article by Mr. Joseph Kraft is a most important one, for it gives a new dimension of meaning to the President's trade program. What Mr. Kraft says, in effect, is that from a trade partnership among the Atlantic Community nations can emerge a full partnership involving not only economic but greater military and political cooperation as well. I commend this article to the earnest attention of each Senator.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GRAND DESIGN TAKES SHAPE

(By Joseph Kraft)

"This is not speculation about some grand design for the future," President Kennedy said in his trade speech to the National Association of Manufacturers on December 6. But there is in the administration speculation about a grand design. It is a design for Atlantic partnership. If it has not crystallized at the very top, it represents views widely and strongly held in parts of the White House, the State and Defense Departments, and the Congress. It is likely to mark, along with the Marshall plan and NATO, another spectacular leap in this country's remarkable transit from isolation to international engagement.

Exactly what new structural forms will emerge is not yet certain. No more is it clear precisely what steps lie ahead. In the progress from idea to institution, there must be a knitting of bone to bone, and a breathing in of life: organic growth. What is clear, and what is new, is that the Kennedy administration has found—in foreign-trade policy—a functional means for setting the process in motion. It is also clear that the process will go across the board. Besides economic harmony, it was involve more military and political cooperation.

Undoubtedly, the birth pangs will be severe. "Il faut reculer pour mieux sauter," the French say: You have to step backward, the better to jump forward. For this country the backward step may be as painful as the liquidation of empire has been for Britain and France. It means renunciation of the myth that there is an American patent on supremacy in world affairs. But with sacrifice go immense opportunities. Atlantic partnership will confront the Soviet bloc with a force such as the world has never known. It—and perhaps it alone—will be of a scale to cope with the tasks of developing the southern continents. And the process of creation is likely to yield for this country some surprising benefits: a shaking of the economy that will sweep aside structural obstacles to much faster growth; a clearing of the political air that will blow away the negative majorities and frustrated ideologies of the recent past. For what is emerging is a unifying intellectual principle for the New Frontier—a way to keep the country on the move.

THE SHORTEST CENTURY

When World War II began there were eight great powers; when it ended, only one. Germany, Japan, France, and Italy had been defeated and occupied. Britain had only just survived. China, in similar condition, was rent by civil war Though victorious, and with its troops spilling over Eastern Europe, Russia, literally decimated, was on the point of exhaustion. The United States, by contrast, had upped national income by half, spread its forces across the globe, and acquired a monopoly on a decisive strategic weapon. It attained, in the afterglow of near-universal disaster, an eminence far in excess of its relative strength in population and resources, and thus there was born the myth of the American century. The predictable recovery of the rest of the world, however, has made it the shortest hundred years in history. Largely illusory to begin with, this country's seemingly assured predominance has been called into question by an overwhelming problem; a challenge direct; and a friendly rivalry.

The overwhelming problem, of course, is the problem of the underdeveloped countries. What they seek is the establishment of modern nation-states with roughly the American standard of living. What they lack sounds like a litany of the damned: they lack capital; they lack skills; they lack energy and other resources; they lack political forms, social structures, administrative routines, well-demarcated frontiers, and homogeneous populations. (Every India has a Goa and every Congo a Katanga.) No man can tell how the gap will be closed. How much, for instance, does Latin America need? But there is taking place a total transformation on a universal scale. It will affect three continents engrossing half of the world's land surface and more than half of its population. It will demand transfers of capital that make the present flow look a pittance. It will last this century and beyond. Moreover, in the non-Marxian sense at least, the process of change will almost certainly be revolutionary. Wherever underdeveloped countries have begun to move, there is apparent a moralistic tone in foreign affairs, and in domestic politics a motif of good guy against bad guy, rich against poor, weak against strong, innocent against corrupt. For the political equivalent of development is convulsion, a turn of the wheel leading to rule by the oppressed. Whether that turbulent process can be held within peaceful bounds—as it has been so far—is very doubtful. It is in any case clear that the United States cannot manage the process alone. Cuba, a speck of sand on a wide strand, affords an example of the grief that comes from trying.

The challenge direct, of course, comes from the Soviet Union. Since the war, Russia has steadily made the kind of progress implicit in a large and rapidly growing population, abundant natural resources, and a highly centralized government, prepared to manipulate men and resources ruthlessly in the interests of national power. While Russia's gross national product is today only a little better than half that of this country, its rate of growth is more than double: 7 percent against 3 percent over the past decade, according to most reliable estimates. By 1975, Soviet national product will be about three-quarters of this country's. Even that measure is deceptive, for thanks to centralized control and lower consumer expectations, the Soviets channel a far larger portion of their wealth to the turbines of national strength. Probably twice as large a share of national product goes into defense. For investment in new enterprise they set aside more than 25 percent of gross national product, as against less than 20 percent for the United States. They already have better than 10 percent more trained scientists and engineers than this country and are graduating every year more than three-quarters as many as this country turns out. Certainly in some key areas, notably space, the Russians have outpaced this country.

Nor can it be assumed that Soviet economic strength rests on starving the consumer; while consumption levels are undoubtedly low, over the past 5 years the annual per capita improvement seems to compare favorably with consumption growth in the United States. The repeated pledge to overtake and surpass the United States is no idle boast. As Abram Bergson writes in his monumental study of Soviet income, "Khrushchev's plans for the future may often be overoptimistic, but they have a basis in fact." With that basis in fact, the Russians have been able to hold together an extensive bloc, and to mount steadily increasing pressures against the most conspicuous hangovers from the era of American supremacy: West Berlin and the strongly pro-Western (not to say client) regimes of southeast Asia.

The friendly rivalry comes, of course, from Western Europe. Not only has the Continent recovered, but it has enjoyed a heady boom. There was a German miracle, then a French miracle, now an Italian miracle which promises to wipe out within 5 years one of the world's chronic unemployment problems. The sign and agent of the comeback has been the European Economic Community, or Common Market, now joining 6 West European nations, but soon to include probably another 10, Britain among them. Together they will comprise, not a dozen or so tails wagged by a big American dog, but an independent force of undoubted potency. They will have a population (256 million) larger than that of Russia or the United States; a steel capacity below this country's but higher than Russia's; a rate of growth higher than this country's and only a shade below Russia's. They will comprise, by far, the world's fastest-growing market for consumer goods.

European growth, to be sure, has not been directed against the United States, but it has nevertheless posed problems. European goods have displaced American wares not only in parts of Europe and "third markets," but to some extent in this country too. European accumulation of dollar holdings has been at least the proximate cause of this country's balance-of-payments difficulties, and conversion of these dollars has led to the gold drain. That drain, in turn, has sharpened American pleas that Europe shoulder a larger part of the burden of defending the free world, and helping the underdeveloped one. Thus many Europeans who counted it the height of ambition to achieve a "third force" now speak of themselves as the "first force."

The collision of these three sets of developments has produced, since 1957, a nearly universal malaise in this country. The nation had been true to its best principles It had virtually wiped out poverty at home. It had followed peaceful policies in the world, and in some cases made unparalleled peacetime sacrifices for the benefit of other peoples. But the result was not the unbought ease of life. It was sputnik and the U-2 incident and Berlin; it was the balance-of-payments crisis and the small European car; it was Castro in Cuba and a lack of sympathetic approval almost everywhere else in the southern continents. And it gave rise in this country to a discouragement with the apparatus of politics and an ill-concealed wish for some forceful expression of authority: the program of the radical right.

EUROPE DISCOVERED AGAIN

The grand design is grand precisely because it gives promise of dealing with all these problems. Its essence is creative harmony between the United States and Europe. It would bring together in a working Atlantic partnership two separate but equal entities. On the one hand would be this country with its special ties to Canada, Latin America, and the Pacific, notably Japan. On the other would be Western Europe with its special ties in Africa and the Dominions of the Commonwealth. Between them, the two entities would command the overwhelming majority of the world's technical skills, financial resources, consuming power, and productive capacity. By cooperative arrangement, the two partners would first adjust mutual differences; and then, while combining forces to hold Communist aggression in check, apply their manifold strengths to the harmonious development of the southern continents.

Thinking along these lines has been going on for years in various bureaus of the State Department and Pentagon, in the Congress and the White House, and in the nest of universities and semiprivate agencies that serve so often as intellectual pacemakers for the Government. NATO, as early as 1949, carried the seeds of Atlantic partnership, but at that time the European countries were too weak, and too uncertain about the German problem, to hold up an end by themselves. Though other issues—Korea, Indochina, Berlin, for instance—came to dominate the news, the notion of Atlantic partnership hung on, notably among those who watched close up the progressive revival and unification of Europe. These included practically everyone of eminence in the making of foreign policy over the past 15 years; for example, Harriman, McCloy, Bruce, and Fulbright. But particularly important were, in the Truman administration, Secretary of State Dean Acheson, who shared the idea with his Policy Planning Chief, Paul Nitze; his Economic Under Secretary, Will Clayton; and the editor of his papers, McGeorge Bundy; and, during the Eisenhower administration, the Ambassador in Paris, Douglas Dillon; the head of Policy Planning, Robert Bowie; and the second Secretary of State, Christian Herter.

To that list, the Kennedy administration added one central figure: George Ball. Ball had been for 15 years the Washington representative of the chief architect of the European Community—Jean Monnet. As a task-force master in the Kennedy campaign, he had supervised penetrating studies of American foreign trade and balance-of-payments problems. In January 1961 he became Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, and in November the Under Secretary. Into his office he brought three gifted State Department career men: Robert Schaetzel, Stanley Cleveland, and Arthur Hartman—all of them long versed in the European story. Another Ball associate, Myer Rashish—a chief aide on the task-force studies and formerly staff director on Representative HALE BOGGS' Foreign Trade Subcommittee—went to the White House as deputy to the vigorous Philadelphia banker, Howard Petersen, in a special office studying American trade problems.

Even before that, the revival of Europe had led to certain ad hoc approaches toward partnership. In the economic field, in 1959, Douglas Dillon had proposed to turn the European agency for receiving American aid into an Office of Economic Cooperation and Development, linking European representatives with those from Canada and the United States. In the military field, in 1960, Secretary Herter had proposed that if the European NATO countries could get together on strategic and tactical questions, a nuclear deterrent, in the form of the Polaris submarine, might be put at the disposition of NATO.

Both these leads were energetically followed in the Kennedy administration. Backed by Under Secretary Ball and Dillon, who had taken over at Treasury, the OECD treaty went through the Congress in 1961. A high-level interdepartmental committee to study NATO was set up under Dean Acheson, including Nitze, now an Assistant Secretary for Defense; Bowie, then back at Harvard; and Henry Owen from the Policy Planning Council. Technically the committee wound up its work with a report (confirming the Herter proposals but adding important safeguards against diffusion of nuclear weapons) last May. But informal discussions continued. In one talk—between Bowie and Owen at the Department in September 1961—the idea of Atlantic partnership emerged clearly. Owen arranged for Bowie to outline his views at two high-level State Department-White House meetings. Among those included were McGeorge Bundy, the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs; his deputy and later policy planning Chief, Walt Rostow from the White House; and Schaetzel and Cleveland from Ball's office. The meetings were held on October 13 and October 17. The Atlantic idea, accordingly, was explicitly in the air.

Still these were merely ideas, bold but naked. Unfortified by anything but the vaguest general interest, they lacked also a mechanism for getting into motion: a means of political engagement. As it happened, there was thrown up in the fall of 1961 a starting mechanism deeply engaging private interest. It emerged from developments in the European Economic Community.

THE SCENT OF HARD CASH

"Europe has taken for me the value of a country." Metternich wrote in 1824 to Wellington, who did not understand. The Common Market is a little like that. The expression of a mystic, and heavily endowed with supranatural features, it goes beyond mere analysis. It denotes invisible bonds of kinship, ties that make for what has rightly been called (by Walter Hallstein, president of the European Commission) membership in the great European family. But the Common Market also has some obvious visible features.

It was set up by the Rome treaty of March 25, 1957, among the European six: France, Italy, West Germany, and the Benelux countries. It provides for the gradual leveling of virtually all barriers to the free flow of men, goods, and money among member states. Thus under Common Market arrangements, the Volkswagen concern in West Germany can sell its cars duty free on the French market—and everywhere else within the community. By the same token, Renault in France has a free crack at the German automobile buyer and his fellows elsewhere in the Community. But while fostering free trade among member states, the Rome treaty also provides for a common external tariff which all member states must apply against goods from the outside. Made up of the average of the old tariffs of the individual states, the common external tariff lowers some duties while raising others. Automobile tires from the outside world will eventually have to go against an 18-percent tariff applying to all Common Market countries. That is lower than the former Italian tariff, 28 percent; but higher than the old West German duty, which was zero.

Inevitably, the very existence of the common external tariff has enormous impact on the outside states. On the one hand it is almost bound to discriminate against nonmembers. The tire manufacturer who shipped wares duty free to West Germany obviously suffers when, under the new arrangement, he has to pay an 18-percent duty; particularly as his French competitor, being inside the Common Market, can continue to sell tires in West Germany without a tariff. Even in selling in Italy, where the duty comes down from 28 to 18 percent, the outside manufacturer is at a disadvantage; for there too his French competitor sells duty free. On the other hand, the Common Market countries represent the world's second richest and fastest-growing market—notably for consumer goods, agricultural products, and basic commodities. For those outside countries who wish access to these rich selling opportunities, the Common Market is prepared to make two kinds of accommodations. It will accept new members, providing they subscribe to the Community's principles; or, it will negotiate reciprocal tariff concessions.

The pull-and-push effect of the Common Market was markedly evident in the long tug of war with Britain. At the outset, British membership seemed to be excluded by traditional insularity, and the system of preferences for Commonwealth products which ran athwart Europe's common external tariff. Britain, however, must export to live—and particularly to the Common Market countries which take 15 percent of her products. Thus the Macmillan government was under mounting pressure from all major British producers to get a foot inside the common external tariff wall.

It first tried in direct negotiations with Common Market officials to win tariff concessions without yielding sovereignty or Commonwealth preference. These talks collapsed in March 1959. To strengthen its bargaining position Britain in November 1959 formed the European Free Trade Association (EFTA, or Outer Seven) with six other European nations outside the Common Market: Austria, Denmark, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, and Switzerland. On paper, EFTA provided for gradual reductions of tariff barriers among member states while allowing each to maintain tariff schedules as it wished against the outside world. In fact, EFTA was a device for putting the squeeze on West Germany, which sends over a quarter of its manufactured exports to the countries in the EFTA group. The theory was that West Germany, fearful of losing EFTA markets, would put pressure on its Common Market partners to make tariff concessions.

The riposte of the Common Market was to crowd on more sail. On May 12, 1960, it announced a decision to accelerate the schedule for elimination of all tariffs among members and for application of the common external tariff to the outside world. The decision had the effect of offering to West Germany immediate replacement inside the Common Market for export sales lost in EFTA. In going along, West Germany threw in decisively with the European Community. Britain was not slow to draw conclusions. Within a matter of weeks a meeting between De Gaulle and Macmillan opened the path that led to Britain's announcement, on July 31, 1961, that she would seek membership in the European Community. The pull of export markets, in short, had won over the Commonwealth, and over Englishry itself.

BEGAT BY GATT

With Britain (and the other EFTA countries) entering the fold, the American number came up. To be sure, this country, with a broad and relatively prosperous home market absorbing 95 percent of domestic production, was under only limited immediate pressure for export outlets. Distance from Europe—not to mention the Constitution—ruled out any early prospect of American affiliation with the Common Market. So did American commercial ties with Japan and Latin America. As the President put it, speaking at least for those in Government: "I have not heard proposed that the United States should become a member of the Common Market."

Still, this country had some manifestly important interests to work out with the Common Market. For one thing the United States wanted assurances the external tariff would not exclude agricultural commodities—many of them in surplus here—from the growing European markets for grains, meat, and tobacco. For another, the United States wanted to block any big hikes in industrial tariffs—the more so as sluggish American demand has suggested the future need of wider foreign markets. Third, it had a very big stake in trying to safeguard the export interests of Latin America and Japan against discrimination by the Common Market. All these claims it raised in August 1961, at the appropriate international forum—GATT (the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade), which sits in almost continuous session in Geneva.

GATT negotiations are secret, and the details of the talks have not been disclosed. But the general outline is clear. When the United States presented its claims, the Common Market negotiators, while reserving their stand on agriculture and exports from Latin America and Japan, countered with an offer to reduce industrial tariffs across the board by 20 percent. What, they in effect asked the American negotiators, did the United States have to offer in return?

It was, to put it mildly, an embarrassing question. The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, which governs American policy on concessions, has been renewed successively since 1934; but since 1951 with increasing restrictions; among them the peril-point and escape-clause procedures, forbidding concessions that threaten "injury" to domestic industry. Under the terms of the 1958 renewal, the American negotiators at Geneva had virtually nothing to trade against the Common Market offer of a 20-percent cut. Where the Europeans were proffering across-the-board terms, the Americans had to offer their terms item by item. On at least one item (automobiles) the American offer was contemptuously dismissed by the Europeans as "worthless." By mid-September, the Geneva talks were running into the ground. It was clear that unless the United States was able to hold out promise of substantial revisions in the Trade Agreements Act, the GATT conference would collapse. The issue was up to Washington.

MARRIAGE OF TRUE MINDS

Inside the administration, two groups had been preparing for renewal of the Trade Agreements Act against anticipated resistance in the Congress. One was the office of Under Secretary Ball in the State Department. The other was the special White House office headed by Howard Petersen. While basically in agreement on long-range objectives, the two groups at the outset varied in their approach to the tactical problem of getting around anticipated congressional opposition.

The Ball group favored a radical revision of the Trade Agreements Act, with authority for the President to deal on an across-the-board basis, and to make very deep cuts. To get around the political problem, it favored letting the present Trade Act expire, and then writing a new bill for submission to a new Congress in 1963. The Petersen group favored renewal of the act in 1962. As a concession to congressional opinion, it offered retention of some of the act's restrictive features, including peril-point procedures.

Between these two positions, during the month of October, there took place behind the scenes a complex bureaucratic debate. On both sides there was give and take, an articulation of points left shadowy, and in some instances a reversal of position. The upshot was reinforced harmony on principle, and a double knockout on tactical details. Against the Ball proposal for waiting a year, it was effectively argued that in allowing the act to lapse, the administration would lose the initiative. Against the Petersen proposal for renewal with limited changes, it was effectively argued that the President needed far more authority. After hearing both proposals and criticisms, the President bought the boldest features of each plan. He decided to move in 1962, as recommended by Petersen, while seeking major revision, as recommended by Ball. But with both sets of recommended concessions cut away, the Trade Act proposals were politically naked. "For this one," a White House adviser said, "we need more than a league of women voters."

At that point the stage was set for the grand design. On the one hand, Atlantic partnership held out the kind of broad, general appeal necessary to push renewal of the Trade Act through the Congress. On the other, the act was a means of dropping the Atlantic partnership into the hopper of interest politics. In the last week of October, by a process difficult to trace but familiar in government, the logic of the merger suddenly asserted itself. In many minds, in many places, the Trade Act was fused with Atlantic partnership.

The merger expressed itself almost at once in a campaign of public enlightenment that was neither quite spontaneous nor wholly coordinated. Under Secretary Ball kicked off on November 1 in a speech to the Foreign Trade Convention in New York entitled "Threshold of a New Trading World." Next day, in the first of six reports by various hands to Representtaive BOGGS Foreign Trade Subcommittee, Messrs. Herter and Clayton emphasized the need to take "a new giant step." Three days later, in the second of the reports, Congressman HENRY REUSS, of Wisconsin, outlined "The Task for 1962: A Free World Community." Within the next week, Secretaries Rusk, Dillon, Hodges, and Goldberg had all addressed themselves to the issue. Within the month, Walt Rostow in a speech had pronounced the words "Atlantic partnership."

Public reaction was surprisingly favorable. George Meany put big labor behind a more liberal trade bill almost at once. Informal indications of support came from the principal farm organizations. Large segments of the business community expressed approval. So did magazines and papers, from the New York Times to the San Francisco Examiner. And a strange restraint marked a series of hearings called by Representative JOHN H. DENT, from a district in Pennsylvania likely to be hard hit by imports of pottery and glass. At one point, in evident exasperation, Mr. DENT indicated that to get witnesses he might have to use the subpena power.

In that climate the President broached to the country a position later formally affirmed in the state of the Union message. He called, in his December 6 speech to the NAM, for "a new American trade initiative which will make it possible for * * * two great markets to be harnessed together in a team capable of pulling the full weight of our common military, economic, and political aspirations."

WHAT'S IN IT FOR US

The issue is now in the lap of an unknowable god: the Congress. No one even vaguely familiar with past tariff debates can expect easy passage. Traditionally, the external duty has been among the most divisive national issues. A tax on tea had at least something to do with the American Revolution. Not slavery, but the tariff produced John Calhoun and the States rights doctrine of nullification. Congressman DENT has already given a foretaste of what is in store.

"I am no more a protectionist than the President," he has said. "I am a survivalist."

But once the congressional corner is rounded, then the path ahead becomes clear. The administration can resume the GATT negotiations with tools that make agreement possible with, at least, more liberal treatment of industrial exports from this country. With any kind of luck in that field, it will be able to take the lead on cooperative approaches to a wide range of problems.

First on the agenda are the issues now dividing the West. By cooperative action, it would be possible to block out a common agricultural policy, providing for a gradual phasing out of inefficient producers—notably in West Germany—while assuring continuing markets to efficient producers in the United States, Canada, New Zealand, and Australia. A similar approach could ease greatly the balance-of-payments problem. Jointly the United States and the West European countries can make available a truly enormous reserve (over $30 billion in gold) to discourage speculative runs on the dollar. Consultation on interest rates can avoid the sharp imbalance which sometimes draws large sums of short-run capital away from this country. And the day may come when there will be a Europe-wide currency that will take some of the pressure off the dollar.

By itself, a better working relationship among the Western countries will be of great use in dealing effectively with the Soviet Union—notably through NATO. The alliance is now in painful disarray. On the one hand this country feels rightly that the European allies are not doing nearly enough to carry their share of the defense burden, especially in providing conventional forces. On the other hand, the Europeans argue that the provision of conventional forces is a "mug's game," the more so as they are coming to doubt—or at least say they are coming to doubt—that an American President would use nuclear weapons in defense of Europe, if it meant exposing this country to nuclear attack.

In keeping with that logic, the French are now trying to build an independent, national nuclear capability. If France succeeds, West Germany will assuredly not sit on its hands. Chancellor Adenauer, a far better European than any of his successors is likely to be, has already made rumblings. And these are being echoed by the man in the Strasse. "I have two nephews," a West German recently told the Bonn correspondent of the New York Times. "Do you think they're going to stand and fight with rifles against the Russian atom bombs?"

One way to head off the drive toward national nuclear capabilities in Europe is to provide a joint NATO nuclear capability. But it is by no means clear how that might work, or whether, indeed, it could be so arranged as to prevent development of independent nuclear forces. A far more promising suggestion was made by Alastair Buchan, a British defense expert, in the January 1962 Foreign Affairs. It is that the civilian leadership of the European countries be taken into the process of American strategic planning—hitherto a province reserved, in NATO, for the American military. Buchan argues that, with a truer grasp of the strategic realities and with a voice in shaping plans, the Europeans would settle down to building conventional forces, while abandoning the wasteful pursuit of national nuclear capabilities. In any event, a drawing together of the NATO allies is in the cards. As Buchan observes: "The restored pride of Europe will make the countries that compose it play a critical or even obstructive role in the formation of allied policy, unless a means can be found which enables them to play a constructive one."

Increasing solidarity in NATO is likely to strike a sour note in at least some of the underdeveloped countries. These at the outset are apt to regard Atlantic partnership as a rich man's club—worse, a white, rich man's club. But in fact, Atlantic partnership offers perhaps the most useful base from which the Western countries can make a genuine contribution to the development of the southern continents.

Together the Atlantic countries—and only the Atlantic countries—can ante up the huge sums necessary for loans and grants. Together the Atlantic countries—and only the Atlantic countries—can provide something much more important: stable, quota- and duty-free markets for the basic commodities which are the principal current source of income for the underdeveloped world. Moreover, together the Atlantic countries—and only the Atlantic countries—can provide what the newly independent countries will find most imperative at the stage of development which is just around the corner. That is markets for the products of light industry. Thus, far from being a thorn in the flesh of the southern continents, Atlantic partnership is a prerequisite for anything like orderly development.

Even if those goals should prove unattainable, and they may, the process of reaching for them could have a profoundly beneficial effect on the United States. Politically, Atlantic partnership will require pragmatic legislation. Programs will fill the void that has been occupied for the past decade by nonproductive, not to say bogus, issues. Instead of plunging into the constitutional thickets of the Bricker amendment, instead of indulging moral indignation in the matter of corruption, instead of exercising hindsight wisdom about who lost China, or Cuba, the Congress will be confronted with measures adjusting defense, trade, aid, and tax policies to the requirements of Atlantic partnership. Not only will the tone of politics pick up, but on the record there is no reason to believe that, faced with pragmatic choices, the representatives of the American people will make the wrong decisions.

Economically, Atlantic partnership will mean much rougher going for the marginal industries and depressed areas that are already in so much trouble. At the same time there should be a growth of action in the most efficient sectors of the economy. Presumably, there will occur a massive transfer, spurred by Government assistance, from noncompetitive enterprises and dwindling communities to those with a real future. Over the long pull, the large mass of the population that is a standing block to economic growth, the mass dependent upon subsidies, or featherbedding, or monopoly prices, or arranged quotas, will be winkled out.

For the inner meaning of the grand design is partnership in growth. The United States will be plugged into the dynamism of Western Europe. The Old World will be called in to redress the balance of the New.

THE TRADE EXTENSION ACT

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial appearing in the Washington Daily News, a Scripps-Howard newspaper, on January 26, 1962.

This editorial sets forth clearly, concisely, and logically some of the most forceful arguments for lowering our tariffs against the goods of friendly nations.

As the editorial points out, "the progress and prosperity of the United States are at stake in this further break with economic isolationism."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRADE EXTENSION ACT

The approaching crisis in U.S. trade with the world is clearly illustrated through one example cited by President Kennedy in his special message to Congress urging passage of the Trade Extension Act of 1962.

The United States and West Germany compete, for instance, for the markets of France, both paying the same French tariffs. But under terms of the new European Common Market, tariff walls between Germany and France gradually will be torn down. Unless the United States can negotiate comparable tariff concessions, we stand to lose business in the rapidly growing west European market.

The Trade Extension Act is designed to give the President power to conduct these negotiations.

Their importance is emphasized by some figures in the President's message:

We sell to Western Europe more machinery, transportation equipment, chemicals and coal than our total imports of these commodities from all regions of the world combined.

Thirty percent of our exports, amounting to more than $4 billion a year in industrial goods and nearly $2 billion in farm products, go to present and prospective members of the European Common Market. Our agricultural trade with Western Europe is 4 to 1 in our favor.

As to exports in general, one of every seven farm workers produces for export; one of every three workers engaged in manufacturing is employed in establishments that export.

Naturally, if other nations are to lower tariffs against American goods, we must lower our tariffs against theirs and this necessary reciprocal action is the basis for fearful opposition to the trade program. President Kennedy also offered persuasive statistics as to that:

The new program is an extension of the Reciprocal Trade law, passed 28 years ago. Before that act, our exports were less than $2 billion a year. Now they are more than $20 billion.

Lower pay of foreign labor does not tell the whole competitive story. American technology and machinery produce more units per man-hour. The U.S. coal miner is paid 8 times as much as the Japanese miner, for instance, but produces 14 times as much coal. Other elements favorable to America are adequacy of low cost material, electric power, etc.

Our industries which have done best with exports are our strongest, most efficient, highest paying growth industries.

Admittedly some will be adversely affected, at least temporarily, by shifts in trade patterns caused by lowering of tariffs. The President estimates this number at less than one-half of 1 percent of all workers. Likely it would be no more than those affected by changing domestic trade patterns, to which every industry must adjust constantly.

And for those who actually suffer ill effect, the President suggests aid in the form of temporary tariff relief, loans, tax concessions and technical aid for factories, plus extended unemployment compensation, retraining, and even moving expenses for workers.

As President Kennedy aptly says, this is a measure unprecedented in economic history. Its full effect will not be noted for from 5 to 10 years, but the progress and prosperity of the United States are at stake in this further break with economic isolationism.

THE EUROPEAN COMMON MARKET

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I am pleased to see that, on the whole, the country is taking a realistic attitude toward the need to revise our tariff policies and strengthen economic links with the European Common Market. Many have not been aware of the great part which is now played in our economy by foreign trade. The Department of Commerce has performed a great service in issuing a State-by-State breakdown showing the value of manufactured products exported from each State to foreign markets in 1960. The figures for Tennessee showed a total of $220.1 million worth of exports in a great variety of products. The list includes chemicals, processed food products, metals and metal products, paper, textiles, rubber and plastics, machinery, wearing apparel, tobacco products, instruments, and lumber and wood products.

The President's trade program is the approach which is needed, not only to preserve our present benefits from foreign trade but to expand and improve on them. Mr. President, the Chattanooga Times of February 5, 1962, has a concise and valuable editorial on this subject, entitled, "Tennessee Has a Stake." I ask unanimous consent that it be published in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TENNESSEE HAS A STAKE

The battle shaping up in Congress over President Kennedy's request for broad liberalization of the Nation's foreign-trade policies is not the sole concern of a few industrial or commercial interests. The ultimate disposition of his proposal to meet with bold initiative and sound flexibility the growing economic strength of Europe's Common Market will have its effect on literally millions of Americans.

A Department of Commerce survey reveals that at least 6 million workers are now employed in manufacturing plants which produce for export. Their continued earning capacity will depend in varying degrees on the ability of this country to hold its own in competition in world markets.

We can bring the matter even closer home from Commerce figures. In 1960, the Department said, Tennessee plants produced for export goods valued at approximately $220 million, a healthy chunk of the total valuation of goods manufactured in the State.

Tennessee's leading exports, by value, were chemicals and allied products, $71.1 million; food and kindred products, $35.2 million; fabricated metal products, $18.3 million; paper and allied products, $15 million; and textile mill products, $13.4 million.

The fact remains that trade is a two-way street; we must import if we expect to export—another way of saying we must buy from others if they are to earn the dollars to buy from us.

Our tariff policies must be devised to encourage the greatest possible exchange of goods with other nations, without sacrifice of essential national interests. Within that framework, there is a great deal we can do toward eliminating trade barriers and strengthening economic ties with our European allies who are on the verge of incorporating the world's most potent market.

AMERICAN MUSIC MONTH

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I should like to call attention to a matter of considerable significance. I refer to a program currently in effect, under the auspices of the American Federation of Music Clubs, hailing the month of February as American Music Month.

As I see it, Mr. President, spiritual unity, communication, and the reconciliation of the individual with society are some of the goals of a free nation. Each of these goals is served to a large degree through the performing and visual arts in general, and by music in particular.

Psychologically, the arts may be said to represent the best efforts of man to reconcile himself with society. For the artist finds a way, through his own symbols, to create a pattern of communication uniting the people into an emotional and intellectual intimacy with the forces of their culture.

It would seem to me, therefore, of the utmost importance for every responsible Government official, from the Federal level on down, to acquaint himself not only with the arts themselves, but with the efforts of those concerned with encouraging artistic endeavor in this day and age.

It is my pleasure to represent the State of New York, wherein there now exists a well-planned program for the encouragement and advancement of the performing and visual arts. The program, inaugurated by Gov. Nelson D. Rockefeller, is the first of its kind, to my knowledge. I have high hopes, however, that it shall by no means be the last.

Indeed, it must not be the last. For the preservation of our Western culture demands not only the development of technical, scientific, and productive skills, it demands also a people imbued with spiritual calm, emotional assurance, and tender faith. These are qualities that can best be provided through artistic experience.

Every year the Communist world pours billions of dollars into propaganda campaigns in which we Americans are represented as money-grubbing, grimy-fisted, sword-waving monsters. Yet, when our traveling troubadours appear in foreign parts—our singers, dancers, and musicians—the Communist lies go down like a house of cards caught in a windstorm.

Yes, music not only has charms; it also has a purpose. And that purpose is clear not only to the residents of the country where the music originates, but to those in other countries as well.

At this very time, Mr. President, one of the Nation's outstanding orchestras is now on tour in Europe, the Middle East, and Russia. The Eastman Philharmonia Orchestra is conducted and directed by Howard Hanson, and is composed of 84 students from the Eastman School of Music in Rochester, N.Y. Howard Hanson has been head of the school since his appointment in 1924 and is a composer in his own right, and one of the foremost figures in music in America today.

The Eastman Philharmonia Orchestra left the United States on the 24th of November and will return to this country at the end of this month. The tour, sponsored by a private organization, Cultural Presentation of the United States, has won tremendous ovations from Warsaw to Lisbon, from Brussels to Beirut. In the last months, the orchestra has been performing in the Soviet Union.

Through the medium of music, Howard Hanson and the Eastman Philharmonia Orchestra have enjoyed a success and established a rapport with the peoples of these countries that is probably worth more than millions and millions of words in our efforts to improve understanding between individuals and peoples.

In the fullness of time, the battle for survival will not be won with guns and tanks and missiles alone. The kind of strength and moral force found in the tranquil personality, in the beauty in faith, in the faith in beauty, in the capacity for love, and in the resources of dignity and courage—this shall endure. And those who know music, those who have music in their veins and hearts and souls, will be among those most likely to stand out in this monumental struggle.

I therefore repeat: hail to February, the "American Music Month." Let the truth of melody carry us closer to our national goals, today and every day henceforward.

POULTRY FARMERS SUPPORT JOINT CONGRESSIONAL FARM STUDY GROUP

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, last week I addressed the Senate on Secretary Freeman's so-called A-B-C-D farm program. I urged that this program be seriously scrutinized and that, in particular, the proposal for national dairy controls be defeated. I also reiterated a proposal I have made for the establishment of a Joint Congressional Study Commission on Agriculture which would permit the Congress to take the initiative in this important area. Recognizing that the administration's program is not the answer, I feel strongly that now is the time to establish such a commission composed of key representatives of major commodity groups and also representative of consumer interests.

I was delighted recently to learn that the Northwestern Poultry Producers Council, Inc., has expressed considerable interest in this proposal. They have, in fact, recommended that it be adopted.

Mr. President, I appreciate the support of this important farm group and ask unanimous consent that a very careful and thoughtful article entitled "Politics and Poultry," by Mr. Richard I. Ammon, editor of NEPPCO News, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLITICS AND POULTRY

(By Richard I. Ammon)

The specter of controls hangs heavily over our industry, tempering all our plans, our hopes, our ambitions. In this crucial time, we consider it a responsibility to tell you as frankly and as clearly as we can what we believe lies ahead for our industry and what NEPPCO hopes to do about it.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture has apparently abandoned its historic policy of neutrality with respect to farmer participation in so-called self-help programs. Today, it is actively and openly promoting Government control of agriculture—and particularly the poultry industry.

As Poultry and Eggs Weekly put it in its editorial of November 4, "In effect, the theory of government apparently is being switched from 'serving the people' to 'dictating to the people'."

This past summer, in the legislative battle over the omnibus farm bill, the administration lost its fight to give the Secretary powers over agriculture which have historically * * * and constitutionally * * * been vested in Congress. The Department's high command, however, was undeterred by this defeat. For in the bill which did pass—the Agricultural Act of 1961—they saw considerable room for action.

In the first place, turkeys and turkey hatching eggs were added to the list of commodities eligible for marketing orders.

In the second place, title I, which had been ripped to shreds by critics of the bill, was left with subtitle A which recognized the commodity approach to stabilization and permitted the Secretary to use commodity committees to initiate programs for submission to Congress.

The Secretary, it should be noted, always had this power, but it had never before been spelled out in so many words.

No one, therefore, considered this section as anything more than a face-saving gesture to the Secretary. No one, that is, except the Secretary and his lieutenants who saw in it an opportunity to do by indirection what they had been prevented from doing by direction.

That was last August. In the intervening 3 months, the Department moved with a speed seldom seen before in Washington.

It received "requests" from turkey producer groups to form a National Turkey Advisory Committee. It screened candidates through State ASC committees. It appointed a committee. It rough-drafted a pair of turkey marketing orders. It whipped the orders into final form at just two meetings of the National Turkey Advisory Committee held during October and published them November 2 in the Federal Register. It set up seven hearings on the orders starting November 12, in Richmond, Va., and ending in mid-December in Albany, N.Y. It readied the machinery for a referendum in early January.

It sent teams of top-echelon officials across the country on "speaking engagements." They addressed scores of poultry meetings—many called by sympathetic State officials; few by recognized trade or farm organizations. Significantly, most of these meetings were in the South * * * historically Democratic * * * new to the poultry industry * * * hurting most from its first major economic reversal. Opponents of supply-management claim they somehow never learned of these meetings in time to attend But the post-meeting publicity was as good as the pre-meeting publicity was bad. Week after week in late September and early October the press was reporting:

"Southeast Seeks Federal Aid," Poultry and Eggs Weekly, September 23, 1961.

"Freeman Turns on Heat to Enlist Control Allies," the Poultryman, September 29, 1961.

Cochrane "Reaffirms 'Supply Control' Proposals," Feedstuffs, September 30, 1961.

Dr. Ralph "Plugs Controls at Kentucky Meet," Poultry and Eggs Weekly, October 21, 1961.

By mid-October, Department officials had what they wanted—a clear mandate from the grassroots of the industry to act under subtitle A.

BROILER COMMITTEE MEETS

They acted with characteristic speed. A National Broiler Advisory Committee was appointed. On December 4–5 it met in Washington and, true to form, set up a subcommittee to draft a proposed marketing order for the broiler industry.

Members of the committee from the 14-State NEPPCO area include: Don T. Corbett, Ralston Purina official from Waterville, Maine; John Hargraves, general manager of Caroline Poultry Farms, Federalsburg, Md.; Edward H. Cavell, Jr., an official of J. McKenney Willis & Sons, Inc., and vice president of Burris Processing Co. of Easton, Md.; Elmer Clay, president of Clay Hatchery, Inc., Blackstone, Va.; John H. Hummel, Jr., a grower of Selinsgrove, Pa.; Roger C. Orndoff, grower and ASC committeeman of Wardensville, W. Va.; and Preston E. Workman, an integrated broiler operator of Georgetown, Del.

Meanwhile, an Egg Advisory Committee is being formed and will probably meet in the very near future to draft a control program for the egg industry.

It should be emphasized that any marketing order or production control program for broilers and eggs must be submitted as legislation to Congress. Such legislation, we believe, will not be patterned after the present turkey orders, but will contain provisions for production controls.

Are controls inevitable? Definitely not * * * not even for the turkey industry * * * though, admittedly, the turkey situation is touch and go. What is inevitable is that legislation to control broilers and eggs will be introduced in the next Congress.

Meanwhile, there are indications the Department may have gone too far, too fast. A resurgence of opposition to controls is spreading throughout the industry. If it continues to grow, there's a good chance control legislation will again be defeated next year. Bear in mind that 1962 is a congressional election year. Dr. Willard Cochrane, who masterminded the supply management approach, is reportedly on the administration's "hockey team"—skating on thin ice. President Kennedy, a real pro at political pulse taking, and already irritated over the feed-grain flop, would hardly risk a farm fight which, even if he won, could not be made to pay off before election day.

The odds are that legislation to control the broiler and egg industries can be defeated if—

1. Enough poultry trade associations will take a definite stand against such legislation, and

2. They direct their effort at Congress—where it will count—rather than jousting with Department windmills.

Where does NEPPCO stand? Where it has always stood. Against socialism * * * against further encroachment by Government into the poultry industry * * * and for the American free, competitive enterprise system.

We believe marketing orders, production controls, and other supply-management techniques currently being expounded by the Department of Agriculture will encourage, not discourage, integration * * * will speed up rather than slow down the trend toward bigness * * * and will favor the large operator at the expense of the small family farmer.

Look at what is happening right now, if you want evidence. One large feed manufacturer is busily buying a reportedly large but as yet undisclosed number of dressing plants. It already owns hatcheries, other integrated facilities. Why? Not hard to guess. If controls come, the Government automatically takes care of the manufacturer's competition for him. The feed firm will have the allotments and there won't be much question as to who owns what or who Uncle pays.

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

So many charges, countercharges, solutions, proposals, and recommendations are being made these days that the rhetorical waters are running red with redundancy. Under such circumstances we hesitate to add our own 2 cents. About the only recommendation that merits serious consideration is that we declare a moratorium on momentum.

For heaven's sake, let's slow down and give the situation some careful thought. A couple of months of quiet deliberation will not bankrupt any more people than would otherwise have been the case, * * * and it might prevent an untold number of coronaries, ulcers, and assorted other ailments.

During such a cooling-off period we suggest:

1. That Secretary Freeman carefully study the record of the turkey hearings, and if he's still determined to put marketing orders to referendum, he at least give turkeymen a reasonable opportunity to familiarize themselves with the revised orders before asking them to vote.

2. That the feed industry—particularly a few large manufacturers—and the Government stop playing "monopoly" with the poultry industry. If the Government can

> enjoin Armour, Swift, et al., from owning and operating retail food stores, why can't it stop feed manufacturers from engaging in the same type of monopolistic practices which have clearly been a major contributor to overproduction in the poultry industry?
>
> 3. That Congress adopt the recommendation of Senator KENNETH KEATING, of New York, to establish a joint congressional study project to chart a new direction for our Nation's agriculture. Last summer Congress decided against turning this responsibility over to the Secretary of Agriculture. It must, therefore, assume it for itself. This study group should chart long-range national agricultural objectives. Once we can agree on where we want to go, it shouldn't be as difficult to decide how we want to get there.
>
> 4. Finally, and most importantly, that the industry give its full support to the task force that first met in Cincinnati in October. The recommendations made by this group have not as yet received the attention they deserve, nor has the industry begun to appreciate the tremendous potential for industrywide leadership and united action which this task force possesses.

OUTER SPACE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am sure that the people of New York join in the fine words which have been spoken by my colleague from New York, in submitting his resolution. I know the people of New York wish to aline themselves with the people of the whole Nation in praise of Colonel Glenn as well as the scientists, technicians, and directors of the project and the members of all the armed services of the United States who made the orbital space feat possible.

Our hearts go out to them in gratitude and congratulations because of the tremendous implications of this feat to our own status in the world and to the technical progress of our country and to its security.

I feel that, in addition to this, another thing must be said. Because the event demonstrates so clearly that our efforts are at least in the same order of magnitude as the Russians', and in view of Chairman Khrushchev's suggestion today that our respective explorations of outer space be pooled, there would now seem to be an excellent prospect for an initiative by us to seek to bring about a treaty for the peaceful uses of outer space.

An excellent analogy is the Antarctica Treaty of 1959, between 12 nations, including the United States and the U.S.S.R., negotiated under U.N. auspices which is an ideal dedication of Antarctica to peaceful uses for cooperative exploration. I express the hope that our Government will devote itself to seeking a consummation of a comparable treaty with respect to the peaceful uses of outer space.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

JOINT MEETING OF TWO HOUSES ON MONDAY IN HONOR OF LT. COL. JOHN H. GLENN, JR., U.S. MARINE CORPS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is my understanding that at the desk is a House concurrent resolution. I ask that it be laid before the Senate for immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be read.

The legislative clerk read the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 431), as follows:

> *Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That the Congress hereby extend its congratulations and warm good wishes to Lieutenant Colonel John H. Glenn, Junior, United States Marine Corps, of New Concord, Ohio, on behalf of the people of the United States, and commends him for his personal courage, skill, and dedication in the cause of scientific achievement in his successful and epochmaking three orbital flights around the earth on February 20, 1962.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, we are all extremely happy that one of the group of astronauts, Lt. Col. John H. Glenn, Jr., of the U.S. Marine Corps, has made a successful flight in orbit three times around the globe. In his person, he typifies the spirit of the hardihood, integrity, and character of those who are associated with him—men like Commander Shepard and Captain Grissom, who did their part before Colonel Glenn, as well as those who in the future will take up their adventures, perhaps, from where Colonel Glenn has left off.

Mr. President, this is a group of able and dedicated Americans. When we honor one, we, in effect, should and do honor all.

I have discussed with the minority leader, the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and we have discussed with the House leadership, the possibility of holding a joint meeting to honor Colonel Glenn. The joint meeting would be attended by Colonel Glenn and his fellow astronauts. We have received the concurrence of the House leadership. The President has been in communication with us and is very desirous that this be done.

With the concurrence of the distinguished minority leader, I should like to state that a joint meeting of the two Houses will be held on Monday next, February 26, at 12:30 o'clock p.m. The Senate will depart in a body from this Chamber between 12:10 and 12:15 o'clock p.m., and the two Houses will meet in the Hall of the House of Representatives for the purpose of giving to Colonel Glenn and his colleagues, on our part and on behalf of all the people of the Nation, the homage which is their due.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I am delighted to concur in the suggestion that a joint meeting of the two Houses be held to honor the astronauts and to make it possible for us to demonstrate our appreciation to these pioneers in space.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 431) was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRESS AT THIS SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as of February 21, the Senate has completed action on every bill that has been reported to the Senate Calendar in 1962, but one.

A number of important measures will come before the Senate later in the session. We can expect a heavy calendar of such bills in the late spring and summer, when Senators will be interested in returning to their home States. Consequently, it is important that the Senate consider now those bills of considerable, but less than ultimate, importance.

We have a small calendar of business today. We can and should report to the Senate in the next weeks every bill that can be fully considered and approved by the committees. Now is the time to act on such bills, before the principal issues of the session come before us later in the year.

I therefore urge the chairmen of all committees and every Member of the Senate to act now on those measures in committee which can, in the wisdom of the members of the committees, be reported to the Senate.

SUCCESSFUL SPACE FLIGHT BY LT. COL. JOHN H. GLENN

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, yesterday was a high point in the history of our Nation. I feel sure every American in contact with the events of that day shared in the exhilaration of the launching and successful trip of Astronaut Marine Lt. Col. John H. Glenn, Jr. This brave and capable officer certainly had the prayers of millions who saw in his adventure a bold step forward in this Nation's efforts to maintain its position of leadership in a world threatened by those who place the welfare of the state above that of the individual. In addition to the bare accomplishment of the feat, this country again demonstrated to the world the values of an open society where the activities of the Government are in plain sight of the people to whom that Government is held accountable.

It is impossible for most of us to comprehend the magnitude of the complexities of this orbital flight, but obviously thousands of people in many different roles shared in its realization. Of course, Astronaut Glenn is the man who has made February 20, 1962, go down in history as a day of unparalleled achievement. But, as some of my colleagues may recall, Colonel Glenn made history in 1955, when, in the more conventional type aircraft, he established a transcontinental supersonic speed record. President Kennedy referred to this event in his comments yesterday when he said that Colonel Glenn had previously raced with the sun and lost, but had in his orbital flight passed the sun several times. I also wish to commend the personnel of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the people who manned the tracking network, the Navy men, and all those patient and dedicated workers at Cape Canaveral who helped to bring the mission to a successful completion.

NASA began this great task only a little more than 3 years ago, and although it was recognized from the outset that no great breakthrough was involved, because technical knowledge was already in hand, the time required to achieve the success was nonetheless a truly stunning accomplishment. This can particularly be realized in view of the fact that it normally takes from 5 to 7 years to carry a conventional aircraft from the design stage to that of production. In this respect we can see that once again the industrial complex of our free enterprise system has again met the Nation's problems head on, and that this achievement speaks well for the prospects of further advances in the space race which we cannot afford to lose.

In pushing forward, it is important for us to realize that dedicated men, working in a free and open society, and supported by our free-enterprise system can, as in the past, meet and surpass any challenge. To this end I commend Col. John Glenn and the thousands of persons who supported him in a major step toward strengthening this Nation's position in fulfilling its obligations to mankind.

VICTORY IN THE COLD WAR

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I rise to call to the attention of the Senate a few newspaper articles and columns which cause me both elation and concern. First, I refer to an article from the Washington Post of February 20, which reports that Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy has stated publicly in Karachi, Pakistan, that "we are going to win in South Vietnam." This is most encouraging news to me, Mr. President, because this is one of the few times I can recall in recent years when an administration official has stated that we are actually going to win an encounter with the forces of world communism. I commend the Attorney General for his forthright statement of victory, which I hope would have been the same even had it been subjected to the blue pencils of the State Department censorship policies and procedures. If his statement had been submitted for censorship purposes to the State Department, the censors would have had to have granted an exception to their policy against permitting speakers to mention the words "win" or "victory," according to the evidence of speech deletions I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 19, and which earlier were made a part of the record of the current hearings before the Senate's Special Preparedness Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee.

The statement of the Attorney General may be another indication that the administration is firming up its determination in the cold war, particularly as it comes on the heels of the strong stand taken by Secretary of State Dean Rusk at Punta del Este, and our evident determination not to be run out of the air corridors to Berlin. These are good signs that perhaps the administration is taking to heart some of the advice which has been offered on winning the cold war, and also the feelings of the American people, as have been expressed in thousands of communications to the White House, the State Department, the Defense Department, and to every office on Capitol Hill.

The talk about victory in southeast Asia may also be a good sign, Mr. President, unless, of course, it merely means that it will be considered a victory to force a coalition government settlement in little, embattled Laos against the wishes of the anti-Communists there, as we did in the Congo. Mr. Joseph Alsop has recently written some columns which give a very penetrating and clear analysis of our policy in Laos. In effect, Mr. Alsop says that our policy in Laos is based on one big gamble—that we can trust the Communists and also the so-called neutralist Prince Souvanna Phouma not to turn the proposed neutralist government into a Communist government. There are additional indications that this is our policy in Laos, Mr. President, judging by news reports that we are again holding up our foreign aid funds for Laos, this month, "pending further progress toward formation of a neutral government," according to an article in the Evening Star of February 20, 1962, quoting a State Department spokesman.

Mr. Alsop points out in his columns, particularly in the one dated February 21, that the so-called neutralist Prince, who has been acting more pro-Communist than proneutralist, has demanded that he be given the Ministries of Defense and Interior, which means control of the army and the police. Anti-Communist Prince Boun Oum does not trust Prince Souvanna Phouma, nor do many objective onlookers. He has reason to be skeptical, not only because of Souvanna Phouma's past actions and words, but also because of the nigh-perfect record the Communists have compiled in subverting coalition governments to communism soon after being established.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have Mr. Alsop's three columns printed at the conclusion of these remarks, together with the Kennedy article on victory in Vietnam, and the article about the United States delaying aid payments to Laos.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., Feb. 20, 1962]

U.S. AID DELAY SHOCKS LAOS

VIENTIANE, LAOS, February 20.—The right-wing government of Prince Boun Oum expressed shock today over a U.S. announcement that another monthly aid allotment is being held up.

"I and all members of the government are particularly surprised by the American action," Information Minister Bouavan Norasing said, "because we were not advised until it was made public."

A State Department spokesman announced in Washington last Saturday that this month's $3 million allotment "has thus far been withheld pending further progress toward formation of a neutral government." January's allotment was delayed until Prince Boun Oum and his military strongman, Gen. Phoumi Nosavan, agreed to a meeting in Geneva with neutralist Prince Souvanna Phouma.

Prince Souvanna, who seeks to form a coalition government, is expected here tomorrow for a continuation of talks with Prince Boun Oum.

Mr. Bouavan said later, however, that a coalition government headed by King Savang Vathana and composed of six committees is being considered by the Boun Oum government. This formula, he said, would be proposed if Prince Souvanna fails to form a neutralist national union government.

Washington's announcement of a new aid delay, Mr. Bouavan said, "had a very demoralizing effect for all of us who are struggling against foreign Communists."

The U.S. funds are used to pay salaries of the 60,000-man Lao Army, government officials, and police.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 20, 1962]

BOB KENNEDY SEES VICTORY IN VIETNAM

KARACHI, PAKISTAN, February 20.—U.S. Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, homeward bound after a tour of the Far East, said conditions in South Vietnam are improving and "we are going to win" in that Communist-threatened nation.

Kennedy and his wife, Ethel, spoke with newsmen here during a brief stop. They came from Calcutta, en route to Rome.

Kennedy said that during his visit to Japan, Indonesia, and Thailand he noticed "a growing feeling among youth that democracy is the wave of the future."

The President's brother also expressed hope that the Indonesian-Dutch problem over West New Guinea may be settled peacefully.

He said that young people throughout the areas he visited had a warm feeling for the United States and a "thirst for knowledge about our country."

Kennedy said he was grateful to Pakistan for its close friendship and alliance with the United States and the support it gave to America in times of trouble. He added that the President sent his greetings and that Mrs. Kennedy is looking forward to a pleasant visit here next month.

In Calcutta, at an earlier news conference, he said that international communism, despite the reported widening rift between Russia and Red China, poses the biggest threat to political stability in southeast Asia.

Kennedy described his meeting with Thailand Prime Minister Sarit Thanarat Monday morning as a "profitable and a very helpful one."

He added that "we discussed the situation in Laos generally and the way the United States and Thailand approached this problem."

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 16, 1962]

GAMBLE GOING SOUR?

(By Joseph Alsop)

In the past 2 months, Communist North Vietnamese troops have been continuously moving into disordered Laos. The concealed invasion—there is no other word—has approximately doubled the number of Vietnamese infiltrators on Lao soil.

When President Kennedy and his Far Eastern deputy, Averell Harriman, first tackled the thorny Laos problem, there were from three to five thousand Vietnamese infiltrators, most of them disguised as Lao and acting as cadres to stiffen the pro-Communist Lao forces. There are now close to 10,000 infiltrators; and about half of these are in organized North Vietnamese Army battalions, with few remnants of the disguises worn by the firstcomers.

The North Vietnamese military movement into Laos is obviously significant, because of its effect on the military balance there. The scale in Laos is so small that 10 more Vietnamese battalions on the Communist side make a really substantial difference.

But the question being debated in the U.S. Government, with rising anxiety, is whether this North Vietnamese movement into Laos also has another, less obvious but even more profound significance. Does it mean, in fact, that the Kennedy-Harriman policy in Laos is based on assumptions which are no longer valid?

The policy is to secure the formation in Laos of an all-party government led by the neutralist chieftain, Prince Souvanna Phouma. The gamble inherent in this policy has always been enormous. As the price of his cooperation, Prince Souvanna has demanded that the anti-Communist leaders in Laos, Gen. Phoumi Nosavan and Prince Boun Oum, hand over to him both the Defense and Interior Ministries.

This means nothing less than giving to Prince Souvanna final control of both the Lao police and the 60,000-man American-armed, American-trained Royal Lao Army. This could be downright disastrous if Prince Souvanna is less neutral than he pretends, as many informed persons rather strongly suspect.

Nonetheless, the strongest pressure has been put, and is still being put, on Prince Boun and Gen. Phoumi Nosavan to agree to the formation of an all-party government on Prince Souvanna's terms. The risk is great, since the only anti-Communist forces in Laos will pass from anti-Communist control if Prince Boun Oum and General Phoumi yield. But the gamble is that Laos will then become truly neutral and will cease, in particular, to serve as a transit route for the North Vietnamese attack on South Vietnam.

The origin of the gamble is the agreement in principle which Governor Harriman negotiated with the Russians in Geneva. The Russians pledged themselves, under this agreement, to enforce the complete evacuation of Laos by all North Vietnamese, and to stop all use of Laos as a transit route by the North Vietnamese. They swore to take two steps, which would effectively insure Lao neutrality, as soon as an all-party Lao Government had been formed under Prince Souvanna Phouma.

It is clear, therefore, that the Kennedy-Harriman policy in Laos is squarely based on two assumptions: first, that the Russians can be relied upon to carry out their clear and unequivocal pledge to Harriman; and second that the Russians have enough authority over the North Vietnamese to enforce the terms of their pledge.

There can be no argument about the key importance of these assumptions. Prince Souvanna's genuine neutrality is debatable enough in any case. But even if he wants to be neutral, he will not be able to be neutral so long as there are large numbers of North Vietnamese troops inside the borders of Laos.

Hence the massive (in Lao terms) Vietnamese military movement into Laos has special significance. It calls into question the value of the Russian pledge, though Governor Harriman is reportedly still arguing that the Russians will keep faith if Boun Oum and Phoumi will only yield. And even if Governor Harriman is still judging Russian intentions as correctly as he has generally done, the troop movement into Laos also calls into question the Russians' power to carry out their pledge.

For it is far from clear whether Moscow or Peiping now speaks with the loudest voice in the councils of the North Vietnamese Communists. After Khrushchev attacked the Chinese by proclaiming his anathema against Albania, the North Vietnamese signified support for Peiping by sending the Albanians a message of friendship. Then in mid-December, a large and high-ranking Chinese military mission paid a long visit to the North Vietnamese capital, Hanoi.

The really significant North Vietnamese military movement into Laos appears to have begun after this Chinese visit. Add up all these signs, and the level of doubt about the gamble in Laos is seen to rise pretty steeply.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 21, 1962]

DISENGAGEMENT IN LAOS?

(By Joseph Alsop)

The Kennedy administration has made a remarkably grave decision about Laos. The decision is being acted upon, and will not be reversed except for a most unexpected and violent turn of events. Yet only a tiny minority is aware of this decision, let alone understand what has been decided.

Such is the excuse for nagging along about remote, unfortunate little Laos in this space. Having offered this apology, let us try to define the decision. It is really a decision to try to disengage, to extricate the United States, to pull out of Laos—even at considerable risk of eventual Communist domination of this little country which is the transit route from Communist North Vietnam to South Vietnam, Thailand, and Cambodia.

The factors which have forced a decision at this time have been described at length in an earlier report. In summary, the fighting strength of the anti-Communist forces in Laos is thought to have declined, despite heavy investments to increase it. The power of the pro-Communist forces is known to have increased materially, largely owing to covert invasion from North Vietnam.

Meanwhile, the cease-fire in Laos is becoming increasingly "frayed"—the President's word—and hostilities may therefore be renewed at any time. If this happens, and if the balance of forces in Laos has been correctly estimated, the victory will go to the pro-Communists. Hence the problem is urgent.

The problem permits only two kinds of solution. One is an early political settlement in Laos. The other is to send American troops to Laos without further delay. Significantly, President Kennedy has recently consulted the Joint Chiefs of Staff at great length about the desirability of sending troops.

If the answers of the Joint Chiefs had been more encouraging, American combat units would probably be getting ready to go to Laos at this moment, despite the unanimous opposition to this course expressed by congressional leaders of both parties at the White House meeting on Laos last April 27. But the JCS refused to promise to hold even southern Laos (thus cutting the transit route to South Vietnam) with the kind of expeditionary force that might be dispatched.

If the Joint Chiefs are right, in fact, the only gain from sending troops to Laos would be the retention of American footholds in Vientiane and the other Mekong River towns. Thus there would be protected posts on Laos' river border with Thailand; but the much more dangerous border with South Vietnam would be left open to the Communists. In these circumstances, the decision of the Kennedy policymakers is only to send troops if the Communist faction in Laos sabotages what Washington regards as a reasonable political settlement; but meanwhile to go all out for a political settlement.

American disengagement in Laos is inherent in the kind of political settlement that is contemplated. An all-party government is to be set up, headed by the neutralist chieftain, Prince Souvanna Phouma, and pledged to maintain the true neutrality of Laos. The armed forces of various factions are to be merged and reduced. And the crucial task of military training is then to be transferred from the existing American military mission to a new French mission.

"Get out of Laos as quickly as you can," was the advice given the President by one of the most respected senior Senators a week or so ago. Our military mission in Laos is our real engagement there. Thus the Senator's advice will be followed if the contemplated settlement is achieved.

But the question then will be how this political settlement will work. To begin with, if there is any settlement at all, the Lao anti-Communist leaders, Prince Boun Oum and Gen. Phoumi Nosavan, will have to sacrifice their trump cards in the first round of play. Prince Souvanna Phouma, the price minister-designate, has flatly refused to serve unless Phoumi and Boun Oum hand over to him the Ministries of Defense and Interior, which means control of the army and the police.

Thus everything will, first of all, depend on whether Prince Souvanna Phouma genuinely wants Laos to be truly neutral. Certainly he does not want to be the mere creature of the Communists. In this sense he has a real community of interest with General Phoumi and Prince Boun Oum. He has signified as much over the weekend, which is thought to be encouraging.

Yet no one can guarantee Prince Souvanna Phouma's reliability. Furthermore, no one can guarantee that the North Vietnamese Communist troops now in Laos will be withdrawn as promised, if and when the new Cabinet has finally been installed. If these troops are not withdrawn, Prince Souvanna Phouma will remain the Communists' prisoner, whatever he may wish to do. In other words, the proposed settlement is an enormous gamble, only defensible as the least bad of the possible alternatives.

The gamble is now being attempted. At this moment, the $3-million-a-month American cash subsidy to Laos has again been suspended, in order to force acceptance of the proposed settlement by the reluctant Prince Boun Oum and General Phoumi. The possible consequences of the gamble will therefore be examined in a third and (mercifully) final report on the slow-motion Lao crisis.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 19, 1962]

BEGINNING OF AN ENDING

(By Joseph Alsop)

One of the decisive moments of President Kennedy's first year in office was his meeting, on April 27, with all the congressional leaders of both political parties.

The topic was the dangerous situation in remote, beleaguered little Loas. The question was whether to use the final remedy—whether to commit American forces in Laos, as the President had half indicated he might do at his grim earlier press conference devoted to the Laos crisis.

From all the leaders of both parties, from Senator Bridges as well as Senator Mansfield, from Representative Halleck as well as Speaker Rayburn, the President received the same emphatic advice. Perhaps the advice would have been less unanimous if the President had begun by suggesting that troops ought to be sent, instead of outlining the choices in Laos with cool clarity. But as it was, every man present, Republican or Democrat, strongly opposed any commitment of American military forces in Laos.

Another White House meeting on the same pattern may now be expected, since the slow-motion Laos crisis is at length reaching a climax, still in slow motion but promising to be decisive. But the April 27 gathering is likely to be better remembered.

Historians have a preference for beginnings of endings, and the April meeting is likely to be recorded as the beginning of the end of the long, costly American attempt to insure the denial of Laos to the Communists by a solid, reinforcing American presence.

To understand this ending which now seems to be in prospect, it is necessary to understand what has happened in the interval. In brief, the U.S. Government has pursued two parallel but complementary courses of action in Laos.

On the one hand, it has tried to deny Laos to the Communists in a new way, by urging the formation of an all-party government pledged to preserve the true neutrality of Laos under the leadership of the neutralist Prince Souvanna Phouma. Nikita S. Khrushchev has sworn to the President that he, too, wants a "truly neutral" Laos; and Soviet Ambassador Abramov has actively collaborated with the U.S. Ambassador to Laos in the long, complex, as yet unsuccessful effort to form a Souvanna Phouma government.

On the other hand, the U.S. Government has also tried to strengthen the bargaining power of the Lao anti-Communists, and to provide itself with other options in case of failure of the negotiations to form a neutral government. This secondary effort has involved a very considerable buildup of the Royal Lao Army led by Gen. Phoumi Nosavan.

Lavish aid in money and equipment has permitted the expansion of the army to a force of more than 50,000 men. An enlarged training mission has been provided, and American officers have been sent out with the Lao Army units down to battalion level and even lower.

Specifically, this part of the effort has resembled what is being done in Vietnam. But the Americans in Laos have been working under very different orders. They are required to retire if fighting breaks out, whereas those in Vietnam have orders to shoot back if shot at.

There is a decided difference of opinion about the success of this secondary effort. A good many of the Americans on the spot, who have been working directly with the Lao Army units, think that real progress has been made from the shockingly bad beginning left behind by the Lao Army's former French training mission. In Washington, however, the progress has been judged strictly by practical results.

To put it bluntly, the Lao Army has not come off well in the numerous petty engagements with the Communist forces, which have taken place despite the phantasmagorical ceasefire in Laos. Thus, the capabilities of the Royal Lao Army today, despite all the investment in it, are rated lower than they were last April.

Meanwhile, moreover, estimates of enemy capabilities have been revised upward in a dramatic and disturbing way. Speaking only of the North Vietnamese Communist troops who have covertly invaded Laos, the number believed to be present has risen from about 5,000 to about 10,000 with about half in regular battalion formations. Contrary to the last report in this space, most of this increase is attributed to belated identification of enemy units, rather than to recent entries. But the increase itself is the key factor.

Thus the anti-Communist forces are now thought to be somewhat weaker, and the pro-Communist forces are known to be very much stronger, at the very moment when the shaky Lao ceasefire is becoming more and more "frayed," as the President recently put it. In those circumstances, there is a straight, either-or choice, between moving promptly to put in large numbers of American troops—the expedient rejected in April by the congressional leaders of all parties—or a determined gamble, even against heavy odds, on a "neutral" Lao Government.

What happened on April 27 foretells the U.S. choice. Its nature and meaning will be examined in a second report.

TWO BILLION DOLLARS MORE?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, on Monday, February 19, the President sent to the Congress an executive communication proposing legislation which would create so-called standby authority for him to allocate and spend $2 billion on public works projects. The purpose is stated as follows:

> To help achieve the objectives of the Employment Act of 1946 by providing standby authority to accelerate capital expenditure programs of the Federal Government and State and local public bodies.

The communication was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. President, at this point I pause to observe that this proposal for $2 billion of spending authority for the President comes at the very time when Congress is asked to raise the debt ceiling by $2 billion.

This $2 billion raise in the debt ceiling, however, should not be confused with the $2 billion public works request, for the $2 billion raise in the debt ceiling is to take care of bills already outstanding. I venture to say that if the $2 billion Federal spending proposal is approved, there will be further requests for raising the debt ceiling again and again and again.

Mr. President, from the references to the matter in the public press, it appears that the proposal would provide $750 million for grants to be dispensed by the President or his designee to States and communities on a grant basis with the recipient matching the amount. An additional $250 million for loans to States and communities unable to put up the matching money; another $750 million to be added at the President's discretion to regularly funded public works projects; and another $250 million to divide among the three expressed objects for additional aid as he or his designee might think was needed.

As far as I was able to ascertain this noon, no bills have yet been introduced corresponding to the draft that accompanied the President's communication. I am advised that in the House of Representatives the papers were sent to the Committee on Public Works, but in the Senate to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

It is possible that the Employment Act of 1946 may have been handled by the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, Mr. President, but I respectfully suggest that if the proposed legislation deals primarily with public works projects, and particularly proposes to authorize $750 million to augment regularly authorized and funded public works projects, the proposed legislation should receive the scrutiny of the Senate Committee on Public Works. I request, therefore, that when and if a bill is introduced along the lines of the President's proposal, it be referred to the Senate Committee on Public Works either before or after whatever consideration it may be entitled to receive in the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The purpose of the proposed legislation has been said to be to forestall economic depressions. That sounds naive to me, Mr. President. Anyone with the slightest experience in such matters will realize that a bag of $2 billion in sugar plums to be handed out by Executive discretion can be used to sweeten sour political situations as well as economic recessions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Over the years public works projects have been the targets of some jibes and political thrusts, but the fact remains that the public roads systems and the river and harbor development and the flood control and prevention projects have served the Nation's good. And they have done so because the committees dealing with them have developed guidelines written into law to insure worthwhile projects properly supervised and subject to appropriations either based upon precise formulas, as in the case of roads and highways, or reviewed and recommended under standards administered by the Corps of Engineers in the case of river and harbor matters.

Whatever may be the defects in the legislative process that may now and then give rise to claims of logrolling, they are less objectionable than sugaring off the people and communities by executive handouts. Having observed the pressures in WPA days, Mr. President, I am convinced that it is far better for the Nation that projects be reviewed and authorized by the elected representatives of the people under established procedures than be handed out by political appointees as favors on the whim of the moment.

For the legislation, then, I request complete review and examination by the committee which traditionally has jurisdiction of public works projects.

TRIBUTE TO LT. COL. JOHN H. GLENN, JR.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, because of the history-making orbital flight of Lt. Col. John H. Glenn, Jr., yesterday, the eyes of the world are upon the United States, and the people of the United States have a new sense of confidence and a sense of great joy.

I should like to have the records of the Congress of the United States preserve for posterity the transcript of Colonel Glenn's conversations with ground bases or ground installations on his three circuits or three orbits of the earth, and I ask unanimous consent that the transcript be printed in the Record.

The New York Times for Wednesday, February 21, 1962, has published some of the messages to and from Lt. Col. John H. Glenn, Jr., and the description of the flight by Col. John H. Powers. These messages were compiled from recordings by the New York Times and from the wire services.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Transcript of Colonel Glenn's Conversation With Ground on His Three Circuits of Earth

Colonel Powers. T minus 10 seconds, 8, 7, 6, 5, 4, 3, 2, 1, 0.

Ignition, lift-off, the MA–6 vehicle has lifted off. Projecture looks good. The MA–6 is off the launch pad, at 47 minutes after the hour. It is climbing nicely. All systems are reported go. The vehicle is climbing freely.

Trajectory is going OK. The MA–6 vehicle is still climbing, reported go. The MA–6 vehicle is climbing freely.

Trajectory is going OK.

The MA–6 vehicle is climbing nicely, has passed through the area of maximum dynamic pressures. Pilot John Glenn is reporting all systems go. He is giving routine reports, reading off his instruments.

John Glenn reports the flight very smooth, now.

The MA–6 launch vehicle is proceeding on its preplan trajectory.

John Glenn reports his cabin pressure now holding at 6.1 pounds per square inch.

The MA–6 vehicle is still climbing on its trajectory. John Glenn reports the g. [gravity] forces building now to 6. Booster engine cutoff has been confirmed by the pilot. Telemetry indications in the Mercury control center have confirmed booster engine staging. The pilot has confirmed booster engine staging.

ESCAPE TOWER SEPARATES

The pilot reports that the escape tower has separated. Our telemetry in the Mercury control center confirms that the tower has separated.

The MA–6 vehicle is now climbing on its trajectory; 3 minutes and 5 seconds of flight time. It is flying on its preplan trajectory. The pilot reports that the g. forces are building up once again under the acceleration of the sustainer engine.

Bermuda reports that it has acquired telemetry signals from the spacecraft. John reports everything looks good.

The MA–6 vehicle is climbing nicely on its trajectory. John Glenn reports his fuel system as planned; his oxygen system is A–OK. He reports his electrical power all OK * * * reports it has a valid track on the MA–6 vehicle.

John Glenn reports his cabin pressure holding at 5.8 pounds per square inch.

John Glenn reports all systems are go.

The MA–6 vehicle is approaching its sustainer engine cutoff point. John reports all systems in the spacecraft are go. The flight trajectory still looks good.

We have a report from the Mercury spacecraft that the sustainer engine has cut off as planned.

John Glenn reports zero g. and "I feel fine." He says the view is tremendous.

SEES BOOSTER FALLING

Glenn reports he can see the booster turning around behind him. He advised that he thought the sight of the booster falling away behind him was a beautiful sight to see.

John Glenn reports he can see a very large cloud pattern clear back toward Cape Canaveral and says it's a beautiful sight.

Astronaut John Glenn now reports his spacecraft has turned around. The blunt heat shield is facing the direction of flight and is tilted up about 34° above horizontal. This is the desired preplan orbital attitude.

All indications here are that we will be able to confirm orbit within a matter of a couple of minutes.

This is Mercury control. I would like to confirm the lift-off time as 9:47 a.m. (eastern standard time) at Cape Canaveral.

The *Friendship 7* spacecraft and its pilot, John Glenn, is now in contact with Bermuda.

This is Mercury control. I have the figures on the cutoff conditions—that is the engine cutoff conditions—from the MA–6 vehicle and the orbital velocity and insertion details.

Atlas 109–D, carrying the *Friendship 7* spacecraft, cut its final engine off approximately 503 miles east of Cape Canaveral at an altitude of approximately 100 miles.

Its velocity at that time was approximately 17,500 miles (an hour). That means that the orbit of the *Friendship 7* spacecraft will vary from a low altitude of about 100 miles to a peak altitude of about 160 miles.

We estimate at this time that the period of the orbit will be approximately 89 minutes. All of these numbers will undoubtedly be clarified somewhat as we get more data on the orbit.

GLENN'S ORBIT DESCRIBED

Under current conditions John Glenn in the *Friendship 7* spacecraft is traveling at a velocity of 17,545 miles an hour and is in an orbit ranging from 100 miles at the perigee, or low point, to an altitude of 160 miles at its apogee, or high point.

At this time we have the tape recording of John Glenn's voice as he lifted off from Cape Canaveral and flew the first 6 or 7 minutes of his flight.

Colonel Glenn. Six, five, four, three, two, one, zero. Lift-off. The clock is operating. We're underway.

Comdr. Alan B. Shepard, Jr. Roger, reading you loud and clear. Roger, we're programing it all OK.

Colonel Glenn. It is bumpy along about here.

Commander Shepard. Roger. Stand by for 20 seconds.

Colonel Glenn. Roger.

Commander Shepard. Three, two, one. Mark.

Colonel Glenn. Roger. Backup clock is started. Fuel 102, 101. Oxygen 78, 100. Amps 27.

Commander Shepard. Roger, loud and clear. Flight path is good, 69.

Colonel Glenn. Roger, checks OK. Mine was 70 on your mark. Some vibration area coming up here now.

Commander Shepard. Roger, reading you loud and clear, John.

Colonel Glenn. Coming into high Q a little bit. A little contrail went by the window, or something there.

Commander Shepard. Roger.

Colonel Glenn. Fuel 102, 101. Oxygen 78, 107, amps 24. Still OK. We're smoothing out some now, getting out of the vibration area

Commander Shepard. Roger. You feel max Q?

FLIGHT PATH IS GOOD

Colonel Glenn. Flight turning out real fine. Cabin path is very good. Pitch 43. Pressure coming down five seven. OK. Very smooth now.

Commander Shepard. Roger. Flight path is good.

Colonel Glenn. Cabin pressure is holding at 61 OK.

Commander Shepard. Roger. Cabin pressure holding 61. Roger. You've had some oscillations, but they seem to be damping.

Colonel Glenn. Two minutes and fuel is 102, 101. Oxygen 78, 102. G.s are building to 6.

Commander Shepard. Roger, reading you loud and clear. Flight path looks good, the pitch 25. Stand by for staging.

Colonel Glenn. Roger. Beco. Beco. (Booster engines cut off.) I couldn't see the tower go. I saw the smoke go by the window.

CONFIRMED BY TELEMETRY

Commander Shepard. Roger, we confirm staging TM (telemetry).

Colonel Glenn. Roger. I still have about one and a half g.'s; the tower went right then. I have the tower in sight way out.

Commander Shepard. Roger. We confirm on TM. Jettison tower is green.

Colonel Glenn. Roger. One and a half g.'s.

Commander Shepard. Roger. Seven. Still reading you loud and clear. Flight path looks good.

Colonel Glenn. Auto retro jettison is off; emergency retro jettison fuse switch off and retro jettison fuse switch off.

Commander Shepard. Flight path looks good. Steering is good.

Colonel Glenn. Roger. Understand everything looks good. G.'s starting to build again a little bit.

Commander Shepard. Roger.

Colonel Glenn. Roger. Bermuda, stand by. This is *Friendship 7*, fuel 103, 101; oxygen 78, 100. All voltages above 25. Amps 26.

Commander Shepard. Roger. Still reading you loud and clear. Flight path is very good. Pitch minus 3.

Colonel Glenn. Roger. Check that. Minus seven on your minus three.

Commander Shepard. Roger. Seven.

Colonel Glenn. *Friendship 7* fuel 103, 101, oxygen 78, 100. Amps 25. Cabin pressure holding at five eight.

CAPSULE IN GOOD SHAPE

Commander Shepard. Roger. Reading you loud and clear, Seven. Cape is go. We're standing by for you.

Colonel Glenn. Roger, cape is go and I am go. Capsule is in good shape.

Commander Shepard. Roger. All systems go, Seven.

Colonel Glenn. Oxygen 78, 100. Cabin pressure holding steady at 58. Amps is 26. All systems are go.

Commander Shepard. Roger. Twenty seconds to Seco (sustainer engines cut off).

Colonel Glenn. Roger.

Commander Shepard. Flight path looks very good. Ten seconds. Flight path still looks good.

Colonel Glenn. Roger. Seco. Fired OK.

Commander Shepard. Roger. Stand by.

Colonel Glenn. Roger. Zero g. and I feel fine. Capsule is turning around. Oh, that view is tremendous.

Commander Shepard. Roger. Turnaround has started.

Colonel Glenn. Capsule turning around and I can see the booster doing turnarounds just a couple of hundred yards behind me. It was beautiful.

Commander Shepard. Roger, Seven. You have a go. At least seven orbits.

Colonel Glenn. Roger. Understand go for at least seven orbits. This is *Friendship 7*. Can see clear back a big cloud pattern way back across toward the cape. Beautiful sight.

Commander Shepard. Roger. Still reading you loud and clear and next transmission Bermuda.

(This ends first tape of Glenn's conversation to ground.)

Colonel Powers. This is Mercury control. While you were listening to the tape of John Glenn's communications with the Capcom—Alan Shepard in the control center—the *Friendship 7* spacecraft has passed on its orbital track. It has now passed over the Canaries and is about to establish contact with our tracking station at Kano in

Africa. As it passed in the vicinity of the Canaries, John Glenn reported:

"I am very comfortable. All systems are OK."

He reported that the horizon was a brilliant blue and that he had the Canaries in sight out through his window.

(He said that he had a beautiful view of the African coast and that part of the Canaries were obscured by clouds. The flight appears at this time to be proceeding as planned. The *Friendship 7* is in orbit, passing in the vicinity of Kano, Africa, at this time.)

This is Mercury control.

(Second tape of Glenn's communications to ground.)

Colonel Glenn. Three three degrees. The rates are all indicating zero. I am on AFCS at present time. The clock is still set for retrograde time of 04 plus 32 plus 28. I have retrograde times OK from Bermuda. Cabin pressure holding steady at 57. Cabin air 90. Relative humidity 30. Coolant quantity 68. Suit environment is 65. Suit pressure is indicating 58. Steam temperature—————containing meat. He also has malted milk tablets aboard.

This is Mercury control. The *Friendship 7* spacecraft now coming up in the Pacific Ocean flying toward Hawaii.

(Tape of Woomera tracking ground station conversation with Colonel Glenn.)

Ground. *Friendship 7*. We read you. Go ahead.

Glenn. Hello, this is *Friendship 7*. Reading you loud and clear. Come in.

Ground. Roger, *Friendship 7*. OK, over.

Colonel Glenn. Roger. We're doing real fine up here. Everything is going very well. Over.

Ground. Very good. John. You sound good.

Colonel Glenn. Roger. Control fuel is 90, 100. Oxygen is 75, 100. Amps are 22. All systems are still go. Having no problems at all. Control system operating fine. Over.

Ground. Roger. Do you have any storm weather or observations as yet? Over.

Colonel Glenn. Roger. I was just making some for the recorders.

The only unusual thing I observed was a rather high—what would appear to be a haze layer up some 7° or 8° above the horizon on the night side. The stars I can see through it as I go down toward the real horizon. It's a very visible single band or layer pretty well up above the normal horizon. Over.

Ground. Roger. Very interesting.

Colonel Glenn. This is *Friendship 7*. I had a lot of cloud cover coming off of Africa. It has thinned out considerably now and, although I can't definitely see the ocean, there's a lot of moonlight here that does reflect off what clouds there are. Over.

Ground. Shortly you may observe the lights down there. You ought to take a check on that to your right. Over.

Colonel Glenn. Roger. I'm all set to see if I can't get 'em in sight.

FINDS NO VERTIGO

Ground. Roger. You did, as you advised, close the SL? Over.

Colonel Glenn. I had it open for a little while. It's closed now. Cabin pressure is holding in good shape. Over.

Ground. Roger. Are there symptoms of vertigo or nausea at all? Over.

Colonel Glenn. Negative. No symptoms whatsoever. I feel fine. Over.

Ground. Good show. Roger. Your one fifty VA inverter is 180° which means it's done pretty well.

Colonel Glenn. Roger. Looks like it's holding up fine.

Ground. Good.

Colonel Glenn. Roger. That was sure a short day.

Ground. What did you say?

Colonel Glenn. That was about the shortest day I've ever run into.

Ground. Time passes rapidly, eh?

Colonel Glenn. Yes, sir.

Ground. OK. Do you have any landmark observation to make? Over.

Colonel Glenn. This is *Friendship 7*. I have [the] Pleiades in sight very clear. Picking up some of these star patterns now a little better than I was just off of Africa.

Ground. Have you sighted Orion in sight yet?

Colonel Glenn. Negative. Do not have Orion in sight yet.

SENDS BLOOD READINGS

Ground. Roger. In a few seconds you should have Orion and Canopus and Sirius probably in sight very shortly thereafter. Orion will be off to your right. Over.

Colonel Glenn. Roger.

Ground. Do you have time to send us a blood pressure reading? Over.

Colonel Glenn. Roger. Stand by.

Ground. Standing by for your blood pressure whenever you tell me.

Colonel Glenn. Roger, I'm already sending it. Do they pick it up? Over.

Ground. Roger. * * *

OVER THE INDIAN OCEAN

Colonel Powers. This is Mercury control.

Our indications from the tracking network now are that John Glenn in his *Friendship 7* spacecraft has passed out into the Indian Ocean. He is now flying over the Indian Ocean, approaching our Indian Ocean ship. A report I have here from our Kano station indicates the astronaut's status is go. He sounds like he is in excellent voice.

His heart action is excellent and we have an indication that he did his first eating as he passed over Kano. He has performed a yaw maneuver and has exercised the manual control system. As of this time in the *Friendship 7* flight, the spacecraft is approaching the Indian Ocean ship. All systems indicate go at this time.

This is Mercury control—10:31 a.m.

Colonel Glenn is in excellent condition with the *Friendship 7* over the Indian Ocean ship at this time.

This is Mercury control—10:43 a.m.

John Glenn in the *Friendship 7* spacecraft is carrying on a conversation with Astronaut Gordon Cooper at Muchea, Australia, as he passes over the Australian Continent. He has reported that he has observed very bright lights and from his discussion with Gordon Cooper we have assumed that he is observing the city of Perth, Australia.

"Thank everybody for turning them on (meaning, of course, the lights)."

Our tracking station at Woomera, Australia, reports contact with the spacecraft at 43 minutes after the hour—10:43 e.s.t.

CLOUDS OVER AUSTRALIA

This is Mercury control—10:54 a.m.

The *Friendship 7* spacecraft with Astronaut John Glenn at the controls has now passed east of the Australian Continent.

As he passed over Australia he advised that he could not see the city of Woomera because he had a lot of clouds over the Australian Continent. The Woomera tracking station has reported all aeromedical data received during the past gives every indication that John Glenn is completely normal and that includes his electrocardiogram, his respiration rate, and his blood pressure.

Dr. Bill Douglas, the astronaut's flight surgeon, has just advised me that Astronaut John Glenn has two tubes of specially prepared food aboard his spacecraft, one containing fruit and one thing in good shape. Roger.

Colonel Glenn. Roger. The ground. Over.

Ground. Roger. Just off to your right now?

Colonel Glenn. That's affirmative. Just to my right I can see a big pattern of light, apparently right on the coast. I can see the outline of a town and a very bright light just to the south of it.

LIGHTS SHOW UP WELL

Ground. Roger. That is Perth and Rockingham you're seeing there.

Colonel Glenn. Roger. The lights show up very well and thank everybody for turning them on, will you?

Ground. Roger. Sure will, John.

Colonel Glenn. On down farther to the south and inland I can see more lights. There are two—actually four—patterns in that area and also coming into sight in the window now is another one almost down under me. The lights are very clear from up here.

Ground. Roger. Sounds good. You come clear on UHF [ultra high frequency]. Woomera standing by.

Colonel Glenn. Roger. Woomera.

Ground. We have your blood pressure now. It reads 126 over 90. Let's have the results of your physiologic tests.

VISUAL ACUITY EXCELLENT

Colonel Glenn. This is *Friendship 7*. I have had no ill effects at all as yet from any zero g. It's very pleasant, in fact. Visual acuity is still excellent. No astigmatic effects. My head movements cause no nausea or discomfort whatsoever. Over.

Ground. Roger, *Friendship 7*. Let's go ahead with the 30-minute report, starting with the switch panel positions. Over.

Colonel Glenn. Roger. Thirty-minute report coming up. Have tried head movements and get no effect from that. Have gone through the reach test and had no problem with it at all. My orientation is good. Vision is clear. My moving target and light spot back and forth causes no ill effects whatsoever. Running the light test at present time and all lights do check. OK in the capsule.

I am over a large cloud bank at the present time, almost extending to the left of my course, which would be to the south. Over.

Ground. Roger, *Friendship 7*. Let's continue on with this 30-minute report, Over.

Colonel Glenn. Roger. (End of the Woomera tape.)

Colonel Powers. Mercury control report.

Glenn reported seeing thousands of particles outside the capsule moving at approximately the same speed as he, as he came through the sunrise phenomena. These particles caused him no difficulty but he did observe them during the flight. They appeared to glow in the sunrise.

As he passed across the southern part of the United States Glenn reported some minor difficulties with his attitude control system. As of this time Glenn is manually flying the spacecraft on what we call fly by wire, a form of automatic pilot type device.

He made contact with the Bermuda tracking station at 26 minutes after the hour—that is 11:26 a.m.

NO TROUBLE AT CONTROLS

He is continuing to maintain attitude control with the fly-by-wire system. He reported it was very smooth and was not having any trouble controlling the spacecraft.

As he passed across the east coast of the United States he reported he had a beautiful view of the coast. He at that time could not see the cape but expected to do so shortly.

He has now passed east of Bermuda, going down the second leg of the orbit in the *Friendship 7* spacecraft.

This is the Mercury control center.

(The transcript of the audiotape conversation between Colonel Glenn and Commander Shepard at the end of the first circuit.)

Colonel Powers. This is Mercury control. The *Friendship 7* spacecraft has made contact with the Kano tracking station at 11:42. We now have the tape recordings made during the pass of the *Friendship 7* spacecraft across the Southern United States in which Astronaut John Glenn had voice contact with Alan Shepard here in the control center.

Commander Shepard. *Friendship 7*, this is Canaveral. How do you copy? Over.

Colonel Glenn. *Friendship 7* to Canaveral. Read you loud and clear. How me? Over.

Commander Shepard. Roger, *Friendship 7*, Canaveral contact reads loud and clear. Stand by please.

Colonel Glenn. Roger.

Commander Shepard. Seven, would you give us the difficulty you've been having in yaw in ASCS? Over.

Colonel Glenn. Roger. This is *Friendship 7*. I'm going on fly by wire so I can control more accurately. It just started as I got to Guaymas (Mexico) and appears to be—it drifts off in yaw to the right at about 1° per second it will go over to an attitude of about 20° and hold at that. And when it hits about a 20° point it then goes into orientation mode and comes back to zero. And it was cycling back and forth in that mode. I am on fly by wire now and controlling manually. Over.

Commander Shepard. Roger. Understand. Do you have retro fire times for two Bravo and two Charlie?

Colonel Glenn. This is *Friendship 7*. Negative.

Commander Shepard. OK. Two Bravo 015000. Two Charlie 020559. Over.

Colonel Glenn. This is *Friendship 7*. Understand one Bravo is 01 plus 50 plus 00. Two Charlie—Correction, Two Bravo is 01 plus 50 00. Two Charlie is 02 plus 05 plus 59. Is that affirm?

Commander Shepard. That is affirmative. Stand by, please.

Colonel Glenn. This is *Friendship 7*. What appears to have happened is, I believe, I have no 1-pound thrust in left yaw, so it drifts over out of limits and then hits it with the high thrust. Over.

VERY SMOOTH AND EASY

Commander Shepard. Roger, Seven. We concur here. Recommend you remain fly by wire.

Colonel Glenn. Roger. Remaining fly by wire. This is *Friendship 7* standing by.

Commander Shepard. Hello. Roger, Seven We're having a little difficulty. Start off on your 30-minute report.

Colonel Glenn. Roger. This is *Friendship 7*. Controlling manually on fly by wire. Having no trouble controlling. Very smooth and easy. Controls very nicely. Fuses are still the same on the left panel.

Commander Shepard. Roger.

Colonel Glenn. Clip is armed. Auto retro jettison is off. ASCF is fly by wire. Autogyro normal. All fuel—all T-handles are in. Retro delay is normal. I have beautiful view out the window of the coast at present time. Just departing. Can see way down across Florida. Cannot quite see the cape yet.

Commander Shepard. Roger.

Colonel Glenn. Continuing with report. No sequence panel lights showing. Only abnormal position—landing bag is off. The EPI is indicating OK. Control fuel is 80 auto, 100 manual. Retrograde time setting is 04 plus 32 plus 28. Over.

REPORTS CABIN DATA

Commander Shepard. Roger. Still reading you.

Colonel Glenn. Roger. Are we in communication yet? Over.

Commander Shepard. Say again.

Colonel Glenn. Roger. I'll be out of communication fairly soon. I thought if the other call was in I would stop the check. Over.

Commander Shepard. Not as yet. We'll get you next time.

Colonel Glenn. Roger. Continuing report. Cabin pressure 55, and holding nicely. Cabin air is 95. Relative humidity 20. Coolant quantity is 67. Temperature is 67 on the suit, 58 on the pressure. Steam temperature 50 and coming down slowly. Oxygen is 70, 100. Amps 22. Only really unusual thing so far beside ASCS trouble were the little particles—luminous particles—around the capsule, just thousands of them right at sunrise over the Pacific. Over.

Commander Shepard. Roger, Seven. We have all that. Looks like you're in good shape. Remain on fly by wire for the moment.

Colonel Glenn. Roger, *Friendship 7*. Go ahead, Bermuda.

REPORT ON SECOND ORBIT AT 12:05

Colonel Powers. This is Mercury control.

The *Friendship 7* spacecraft is proceeding in its orbital flight around the earth. It's in its second orbit around the earth at this time.

As of 51 minutes after the hour—that's 11:51—our tracking station in Zanzibar reported contact with the spacecraft. At 12:01 p.m. the *Friendship 7* spacecraft made contact with the Indian Ocean ship. Astronaut John Glenn is still controlling the attitude of the Mercury spacecraft with the fly-by-wire manual control system.

This is a system in the spacecraft in which movements of the control handle by the pilot send electrical impulses into a black box which in turn cause the valves at the perimeter of the spacecraft to open, allowing the hydrogen peroxide to escape. These are the jets that effect the changes in attitude of the spacecraft. This differs from his normal manual system in that the black box is placed between the pilot and the valves. In the full manual system he has a mechanical linkage to these valves.

Friendship 7 spacecraft is now over the Indian Ocean ship about in the center of the Indian Ocean. As a matter of interest, because of cloud cover and winds aloft, the flare experiment, which was planned from the Indian Ocean ship, has been canceled.

Astronaut John Glenn's condition remains good. His attitude is good and he is working as a test pilot.

This is Mercury control.

(Colonel Powers' announcement at 1:23 p.m. from Mercury control.)

Colonel Powers. This is Mercury control. Our Atlantic tracking ship made contact with the *Friendship 7* spacecraft at 1:12 p.m. *Friendship 7* is now proceeding toward the continent of Africa, going around in its third orbit in this first manned orbital flight of Project Mercury.

This is Mercury control.

(Transcript of Colonel Glenn's conversation:)

Colonel Glenn. I can see the whole State of Florida just laid out like on a map. It's beautiful. From this position out here I can still see clear back to the Mississippi Delta. I can see down in Area Hotel (the landing area) on the weather and it looks very good down that way. It looks like we'll have no problems on recovery.

Colonel Powers. That ends Glenn's own reappraisal of the recovery situation. He is now about halfway across the southern tip of Africa and will be moving out into the Indian Ocean for the third time very shortly.

The Indian Ocean ship located in the center of the Indian Ocean has made contact with the *Friendship 7* spacecraft at 1:34 p.m. Information available here at the control center at this time indicates the mission is proceeding satisfactorily and that John Glenn is in excellent condition.

This is Mercury control.

TALKS TO CANARY ISLANDS

Colonel Glenn. This is *Friendship 7*. The sun coming through the window is very, very warm where it hits the suit. I get quite a bit of heat from it. It's hard to understand.

Ground. Cape Flight, this is Canary System.

Colonel Glenn. Go ahead.

Ground. We just got a rolling noise from the capsule.

Colonel Glenn. Roger, understand.

Ground. It's intermittent. It just show out.

Colonel Glenn. This is *Friendship 7*. Correction. Will do horizon check now.

Ground. Roger. You're coming up. I've got you about 10° from the ground.

Colonel Glenn. Say again. You're very * * *. This is *Friendship 7*.

Ground. Roger. We got you about 10° from the ground.

Colonel Glenn. Roger. *Friendship 7*.

Ground. Now we're reading you about 14.

Colonel Glenn. This is *Friendship 7*. I have no problem at all controlling on the horizon. Over.

Ground. Roger. Understand you have no problem at all controlling the horizon.

Colonel Glenn. That's affirmative.

Colonel Powers. Speaking of difficulties with communications, we have learned that President Kennedy attempted to make a telephone call, or make a call—I don't suppose it could really be called a telephone call—get in voice contact, at any rate, with Colonel Glenn in the capsule just as it was ending its first orbit, or completing its first orbit. They were not able to do that at that time.

It's our understanding that it will be attempted again as he reaches the same point, which is roughly over the west coast of the United States, and that they will try it again when that phase of the orbiting system comes around.

(Tape of Colonel Glenn over Australia.)

Colonel Glenn. This is *Friendship 7*. How do you read us on the UHF? Over.

Ground. *Friendship 7*. Recommended you go UHF. Over.

Colonel Glenn. Roger. Going UHF.

Ground. *Friendship 7*. How do you read now? Over.

Colonel Glenn. Read you loud and clear.

Ground. You were coming in slightly garbled. Can you give us your fuel oxygen amps again? Over.

Colonel Glenn. Roger. Fuel 60, 85. Oxygen 65, 100. Amps 22. Over.

Ground. Roger. Exhaust temperature?

Colonel Glenn. Exhaust temperature 50. Over.

Ground. Roger. Are you in fly by wire?

Colonel Glenn. Negative. I am on manual at present time. I am down to 60 on automatic fuel so I cut it off and I'm on manual at present time. Over.

Ground. Roger. How is your yaw problem? Over.

Colonel Glenn. This is *Friendship 7*. I'm getting some erratic indications in all axes. When I aline everything on orbit attitude by the instruments, I am considerably off where I should be. I'm yawed some 20° to the right. I'm also yawed to the right a little bit. Over.

Ground. Roger. Understand. Are you satisfied with the fly-by-wire and the manual proportional systems? Over.

Colonel Glenn. Fly by wire is not functioning in yaw low right. Over.

Ground. Roger. Low yaw right.

Colonel Glenn. That's affirmative. When I first had trouble with it, it was malfunctioning in low yaw left.

I am controlling manually at present time. Landing bank switch is off. Sequence panel is all normal except for that. The control fuel is 60, 82. Attitudes at present time on manual control are roll 5 right, yaw 15 right, pitch 34 in orbit attitude. My time from launch is 2 plus 33 plus 60 mark. Correction. That would be 2 plus 34 on that mark. Did you receive? Over.

Ground. Roger.

Colonel Glenn. Cabin pressure is 55 and holding. Cabin air is 95. Cabin excess water light is still on. Turning it down a little bit more yet. Cabin relative humidity is indicating 20. Coolant quantity is 66. Heat is 68 on temperature, pressure is 58 indicated. Steam temperature 50 in suit and comfortable. Oxygen is 65, 100. Amps 20. Voltages main 24, 25, 25, 25. Standby one is 25, 25. Isolated 29.

Am back on main. Fans is 113. ASCS 113. I have two warning lights on—the excess cabin water and fuel quantity. Over.

Ground. Roger. *Friendship 7*. Aeromed would like to know whether you had conducted your exercise? Over.

Colonel Glenn. Negative. I have not done that recently.

Ground. Roger. *Friendship 7*. You are fading now. Standby.

CONTROL REPORTS AT 12:42

Colonel Powers. This is Mercury control. Our tracking station on Canton Island reports contact with the *Friendship 7* spacecraft at 12:31 p.m. e.s.t. and our station on Hawaii reports contact at 12:30 e.s.t. We are continuing to analyze the difficulties with the attitude control system.

The fact that the pilot is aboard and has the ability to analyze his problem and take judgmental corrective action is a demonstration of the value of man in space flight. We will continue to analyze the progress of the flight and make our decisions timely enough to make sure that we fly the mission as best as possible. This is Mercury control.

CONTROL REPORTS AT 12:45

Colonel Powers. This is Mercury control. We have now had a summary status report from our flight controller in Hawaii. He reports the astronaut's status was good. The status of the systems on board the spacecraft were good except for the difficulties with the attitude control system.

In a voice contact broadcast and relayed remotely to the control center we heard Astronaut John Glenn report that he is go for another orbit. Our analysis of the situation at this time is that we are in a go condition. Our flight director, Mr. Chris Kraft, has made a preliminary decision at this time that we are go and will continue the mission.

This is Mercury control with the *Friendship 7* spacecraft approaching the west coast of the United States coming around the tail end of his second orbit around the earth. This is Mercury control.

CONTROL REPORTS AT 12:54

Colonel Powers. This is Mercury control. We now have a contact with our Guaymas, Mexico, station at 12:50 e.s.t., and with the Corpus Christi, Tex., tracking station at 12:52. As Astronaut John Glenn passed across the southern portion of the United States and began winging his way away from the Point Arguello station. He and Astronaut Wally Schirra had a very interesting exchange. Schirra called him up and said, "John, the aeromeds are very happy with you up there." Glenn replied by saying, "I feel real good, Wally. No problems at all."

Schirra responded by saying, "Good show. See you next time around."

The *Friendship 7* spacecraft is now passing across the northern borders of Texas, across the southern United States, now committed to its third orbit. This is Mercury control.

CONTROL REPORTS AT 1:01

Colonel Powers. The tracking and communications equipment here at Cape Canaveral made contact with the *Friendship 7* spacecraft and Astronaut John Glenn at 12:56 p.m., e.s.t. Astronaut Alan Shepard talking from here in the Mercury control center carried on a conversation which began, "Good afternoon, Seven," and then they worked out retrorocket firing times, clock changes and other procedural matters.

At 12:58 p.m., e.s.t., contact was made by the Bermuda station. Passing between Florida and Bermuda, John Glenn got a pretty good look at the State of Florida and, for that matter, at the whole southeastern United States. John said:

"Have the cape in sight. It looks real fine. I can see the whole State of Florida laid out like a map. I can still see clear back to the Mississippi Delta."

The *Friendship 7* spacecraft is approximately over Bermuda or near Bermuda at this time traveling down its third orbit around the earth.

Astronaut John Glenn still sounds good and is still working hard at his mission. This is Mercury control.

(Tapes of exchanges between Glenn and Walter Schirra at Point Arguello, Calif., and Commander Shepard at Cape Canaveral.)

Ground. *Friendship 7, Friendship 7*, this is Cape. How do you read? Over.

Ground. Roger *Friendship 7*. This is California. We read you loud and clear.

Colonel Glenn. All systems are still go. I have had some erratic ASCS operation. I caged and uncaged on the nightside and it appears to be working fairly well now, although I was drifting again in roll a moment ago. It appears to have corrected itself in roll, however, without me caging again now. Over.

Ground. Very good, John. We have go all the way on this. I might give you your inverter temperatures. Your fans are 215. Your ASCS (tape interrupted). John, if you could, would give me your attitudes and we'll check those with ground.

Colonel Glenn. Roger. I'll go back into orbit attitude. Drifting toward it at present time.

Ground. Roger.

Colonel Glenn. Do you have TM solid now?

Ground. That's affirmative. It looks real good here.

Colonel Glenn. Roger. Roll is 5 left. Yaw right. Pitch minus 32 right now.

Ground. Roger. Have your readings. John, we check almost right on the button with your attitudes within 2°.

Colonel Glenn. Roger. I appear to have a little bit of drift in the scope yet.

Ground. Roger. You don't have a good reference yet, do you?

Colonel Glenn. I found it's more difficult to pick up drift than I thought it would be. Your best drift, really, is to look out the window and try and get something moving away from you out the window.

Ground. Roger. I got you there.

You understand that your capsule elapsed time is running about a second slow compared to GMT (Greenwich mean time).

Colonel Glenn. No, I did not—I was not aware of that on the elapsed time.

Colonel Powers. This is Mercury control [at 1:23 p.m.]. Our Atlantic tracking ship made contact with the *Friendship 7* spacecraft at 1:12 p.m. *Friendship 7* is now proceeding toward the continent of Africa, going around in its third orbit in this first manned orbital flight of Project Mercury.

This is Mercury control.

Transcript of Glenn conversation.

Colonel Glenn. I can see the whole State of Florida just laid out like on a map. It's beautiful. From this position out here I can still see clear back to the Mississippi Delta. I can see down in Area Hotel on the weather and it looks very good down that way. It looks like we'll have no problems on recovery.

(That ends Colonel Glenn's own reappraisal of the recovery situation. He is now about halfway across the southern tip of Africa and will be moving out into the Indian Ocean for the third time very shortly.)

(Mercury control announcement of Indian Ocean overflight.)

Colonel Powers. The Indian Ocean ship, located in the center of the Indian Ocean, has made contact with the *Friendship 7* spacecraft at 1:34 p.m. Information available here at the control center at this time indicates the mission is proceeding satisfactorily and that John Glenn is in excellent condition.

(Mercury control announcement, 1:48 p.m., from Muchea, Australia.)

Colonel Powers. Astronaut John Glenn is now in voice contact with Astronaut Gordon Cooper at the tracking station. Just a couple of minutes ago John called up Gordon Cooper and said: "Hey Gordon, I want you to send a message for me. Send a message to the Commandant of the U.S. Marine Corps that reads: 'Have 4 hours' required flight time. Request flight chit be prepared for me. Signed John Glenn, lieutenant colonel, U.S. Marine Corps'."

At this time John Glenn is in voice contact with the Muchea tracking station and with Gordon Cooper is discussing the technical systems on board the spacecraft.

The tracking station at Muchea, Australia, made contact at 1:43 p.m., and the station at Woomera, Australia, at 1:51. The flight controller at Muchea confirms the spacecraft is in a go condition as it passed over Muchea. We have about 2½ minutes of tape-recorded voice broadcast from the astronaut acquired from Australia. The tapes are prepared now and stand by for the tape.

Colonel Glenn. On the right side everything is outboard except the fuel quantity warning light, which is on. I have that switch inboard to cut the audio. The only two switches in inboard position on the right are retro adjustment and retro manual. Over.

Ground. Roger. Control settings?

Colonel Glenn. Water on cabin temp is setting No. 2. Setting on the suit temp is beyond the 1.7 mark. I repeat, beyond the 1.7 mark, which is the maximum setting.

Ground. I understand. What is your opinion on the general problem, John?

Colonel Glenn. Well, I don't know. I want to start lining up just as carefully as I can here in a minute and see whether the scanners will pick it up and correct it in so we have a good retrofire attitude. If not, I'll aline it myself. Over.

Ground. Do you have your Three Dog Easy and Hotel times from the Indian Ocean ship?

Colonel Glenn. Well, yes, I did. I got those OK.

Ground. Then I give you recommend change retroplot to 043237. On your retro using ASCS you'll be using the high port thrusters for retrofire mode. What do you feel about retro to ASCS backed up by fly by wire?

Colonel Glenn. Well, well you can't mean by ASCS and fly by wire. You mean and manual.

Ground. Right; being ready to go to fly by wire and back it up on manual proportional.

Colonel Glenn. Yes. If the ASCS appears to be programing and holding a good orbit attitude I'll let it go on ASCS and back it up with manual. If not—if it appears that the gyros are cocked as they were a little while ago—then I'll do a manual retro.

Ground. Roger. Are you in manual proportion or fly by wire now?

Colonel Glenn. I think I've lost you.

MERCURY CONTROL REPORTS AT 1:14

Colonel Powers. This is Mercury control. The tracking station on Canton Island acquired the *Friendship 7* spacecraft at 2:03 p.m., e.s.t. The tracking station on Hawaii contacted the *Friendship 7* spacecraft at 2:10 p.m., e.s.t.

As we proceeded around from Australia toward Hawaii, we detected an indication of a problem with the heat shield deployment switch. A check was made over Hawaii which confirmed that the system was operating properly and that the signal apparently was erroneous.

He is also completing now his retrofiring checklist.

This is a process by which he makes sure that all of his onboard equipment is secured, that he has checked out his attitude control system, that he is in good condition and preparing to fire those retrorockets to begin that long landing flight toward the Atlantic. This is Mercury control.

(Colonel Glenn was over San Diego at 2:18 p.m., over Phoenix at 2:20; retro rockets fired at 2:30.)

Colonel POWERS. At 2:20 p.m., e.s.t., the retrorocket firing sequence was initiated in the spacecraft. Retrofiring attitude was assumed and the three retrorockets have fired. They've been confirmed by the pilot and by our telemetry here in the Mercury control center.

John Glenn's comment was it felt like it was going to send him clear back to Hawaii. The retrorockets have fired. The reentry process will be initiated shortly. This is Mercury control.

MERCURY CONTROL REPORTS AT 2:23

Colonel POWERS. The Mercury tracking station at Guaymas, Mexico, established contact with the *Friendship 7* spacecraft at 2:23 p.m., e.s.t. We have confirmation of retrorocket firing. We have instructed John Glenn to retain his retrorocket packet at least until he gets over Texas. This is a precautionary measure to doublecheck on the seemingly erroneous switch location indication we had earlier.

John feels he held his attitude properly during the retrorocket firing process and says that he can see the coast of California. He's now reporting cloud cover down toward Mexico. The spacecraft is now arcing down its landing trajectory toward the Atlantic. This is Mercury control.

The Corpus Christi, Tex., tracking station made contact with the *Friendship 7* at 2:26 p.m., e.s.t. We are in contact with Astronaut John Glenn. As a precautionary measure we have asked him to retain his retrorocket pack. We have just made initial contact with the Mercury spacecraft at Cape Canaveral. That's at 2:28 p.m., e.s.t. On the basis of his present flight plan, we would estimate a landing at approximately 37 or 38 minutes after the hour. This is Mercury control.

MERCURY CONTROL REPORTS 2:31

Colonel POWERS. This is Mercury control. *Friendship 7* spacecraft is approaching the coast of Florida at this time during his reentry process. We have advised him that the weather in his landing area involves one-tenth cloud cover and 10 miles visibility. This should not present any hazard at all during the landing operation. He is now maintaining control of the spacecraft using the fly-by-wire system and the manual system as a backup. This is Mercury control.

The *Friendship 7* spacecraft is now encountering the atmosphere off the east coast of Florida. He is encountering the atmosphere. We estimate that an ionization layer involved in the reentry process is preventing us from having direct communication with him. This is Mercury control.

The Mercury spacecraft is in its reentry process at this time (2:34 p.m.). We have an indication that receiving equipment at Grand Bahama Island is receiving beacon transmissions from the spacecraft. We are not receiving any voice communication at this time. On the basis of his present flight trajectory we estimate that he will land within about a mile of a destroyer associated with the U.S.S. *Randolph* at the end of the third orbit. This is Mercury control.

This is Mercury control (2:47 p.m.). The U.S.S. *Noa*, broadcasting from the recovery area, has just broadcast a message indicating, "Roger. *Friendship 7*. Understand your condition is excellent." We are not receiving direct voice broadcast from the spacecraft but are receiving the ship's transmissions. This is Mercury control.

Official figures of reentry time. At 2:28 p.m. Colonel Glenn had completed three orbits, 4 hours 41 minutes after the launching, still with the capsule largely under manual control.

At 2:30 p.m. the main parachute blossomed out of *Friendship 7*. The capsule faced temperatures of 3,000° F. on the way down and Colonel Glenn said at that point, "Boy, that was a real fireball."

Five minutes later at 2:43 p.m. his capsule landed in the ocean, about 6 miles from the destroyer *Noa* in the recovery fleet.

From the launching to the splashdown, the mission took 4 hours 56 minutes.

Colonel POWERS. Reports from the U.S.S. *Noa* indicate the *Friendship 7* spacecraft was picked up clear of the water at 3:01 and finally set down on the deck at 3:04 this afternoon.

John Glenn reports:

"My condition is excellent."

They are in the process now of opening up the spacecraft to remove John Glenn from the spacecraft.

The spacecraft *Friendship 7* is now (3:09 p.m.) on the deck of the U.S.S. *Noa*. It was set down at 3:04 this afternoon. Astronaut John Glenn reports, "My condition is excellent." He is in continuous contact with the people on the ship.

They have now (3:13 p.m.) opened the capsule and they expect to be taking him out almost momentarily and give us perhaps a little fuller account of his condition. Maybe he'll have something to say.

He is still in contact with the crewmembers of the U.S.S. *Noa*. He is assisting in the egress by removing part of the instrument panel and a small pressure bulkhead on the upper portion of his spacecraft. Then he will have to push out the empty parachute cannister and crawl out through the narrow upper neck of the spacecraft.

Astronaut John Glenn should be stepping out of the spacecraft at any moment now. A report from the U.S.S. *Noa* downrange indicates Mercury Astronaut John Glenn has left the *Friendship 7* spacecraft. He is reported to be a hale and hearty astronaut after having successfully flown the U.S. first manned orbital flight.

U.S. Astronaut John Glenn is on the deck of the U.S.S. *Noa*, reported to be a hale and hearty astronaut after his historymaking flight.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD President Kennedy's statement following the great triumph of Colonel Glenn, the amazing achievement of being the first American to orbit the earth in space flight, as well as an article relating to the event.

There being no objection, the statement and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRESIDENT'S STATEMENT

WASHINGTON, February 20.—I know that I express the great happiness and thanksgiving of all of us that Colonel Glenn has completed his trip, and I know that this is particularly felt by Mrs. Glenn and his two children.

A few days ago Colonel Glenn came to the White House and visited me, and he is—as are the other astronauts—the kind of American of whom we are most proud.

Some years ago, as a Marine pilot, he raced the sun across this country—and lost. And today he won.

I also want to say a word for all those who participated with Colonel Glenn in Canaveral. They faced many disappointments and delays—the burdens upon them were great—but they kept their heads and they made a judgment, and I think their judgment has been vindicated.

We have a long way to go in this space race. We started late. But this is the new ocean, and I believe the United States must sail on it and be in a position second to none.

Some months ago I said that I hoped every American would serve his country. Today Colonel Glenn served his, and we all express our thanks to him.

PRESIDENT'S CALL

WASHINGTON, February 20.—Following is the transcription of a telephone conversation between President Kennedy and Colonel Glenn this afternoon:

"The President: Hello?

"Colonel Glenn: Hello, sir.

"The President: Colonel?

"Colonel Glenn: This is Colonel Glenn.

"The President: Listen, colonel, we are really proud of you, and I must say you did a wonderful job.

"Colonel Glenn: Thanks, Mr. President.

"The President: We are glad you got down in very good shape. I have just been watching your father and mother on television, and they seemed very happy.

"Colonel Glenn: It was a wonderful trip—almost unbelievable, thinking back on it right now. But it was really tremendous.

"The President: Well, I am coming down to Canaveral on Friday, and hope you will come up to Washington on Monday or Tuesday, and we will be looking forward to seeing you there.

"Colonel Glenn: Fine. I will certainly look forward to it."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two editorials which were published in the New York Times this morning, one entitled "One of Our Finest Hours," and the other entitled "Narrowing the Margin," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE OF OUR FINEST HOURS

The event that all America and men of good will everywhere have long been waiting for has at last come to pass. It began at 9:47 on the morning of February 20. It ended 4 hours, 56 minutes, and 34 seconds later as time is measured by the clock. But in a sense time stood still as countless millions watched and indeed participated in one of the greatest dramatic events of modern times.

Astronaut John H. Glenn, Jr., was not the first human to orbit around the earth, nor was he the second. As the world knows, the Soviet Cosmonauts Yuri Gagarin and Gherman Titov preceded him. But Colonel Glenn's achievement added a new dimension to man's conquest of space. The Gagarin flight was carried out in absolute secrecy, while Titov's was not revealed until he had been safely launched into orbit. Nor was the world permitted to participate in the drama of his landing. In contrast, Colonel Glenn's demonstration was a feat in which the entire world was allowed to take part. It was not just one man going into orbit but, in a very real sense as President Kennedy said, "it was the entire Nation," for "all of us had to work to put him there."

During the agonizing last hours of the countdown, as the Nation watched breathlessly over its television and the rest of the world listened over radio, countless millions were given the opportunity, as one viewer said, to "turn their hearts on simultaneously." It was in this respect that Colonel Glenn's achievement stood out.

It was not a mere technological triumph of a man in a machine. It was one of the great dramas of history, made great because millions of human beings were allowed to share in it. It was not the adventure of just one man; it was the great adventure of all mankind. And it showed the world the vast chasm that exists between the human spirit thriving in a free society, as contrasted with the way of life in a closed society.

Astronaut Glenn's flight marks the first step in America's program for the conquest of space. It will be followed by several more Mercury flights, to circle in ever greater numbers of orbits. Then will come Project Gemini, with larger satellites to carry two astronauts into orbit, to be followed by rendezvous and docking missions to assemble vast spaceships in orbit. Then will come Project Apollo, a series of three-man flights, designed for the eventual round-trip journey of a three-man crew to the moon. And after that the planets.

As President Kennedy said: "We have a long way to go in the space race and we started late. This is the new ocean and we must sail on it and be in a position second to none." For man, as Goethe said, "demands from heaven its fairest stars, and nothing, whether near or far, can still the deep turbulence in his heart."

Narrowing the Margin

Both for technical and political reasons, a major question arising in the wake of Colonel Glenn's trip yesterday is the degree to which his magnificent performance narrowed the margin of Soviet superiority over this country in manned space flight. The answer is that Colonel Glenn reduced the Soviet lead substantially, but there is much yet to be done.

In all the obvious indexes—number of orbits about the earth completed, distance traveled and time in space—Colonel Glenn's trip was substantially superior to the one orbit and 1-hour, 48-minute flight last April by Yuri Gagarin. On the other hand all of these indexes show the Glenn flight to have been less of an accomplishment than last August's feat of Gherman Titov, who, by Soviet account, orbited the earth 17 times and stayed in space more than 17 hours. On this score, then, Colonel Glenn's flight outshines Gagarin's but is outshone by Titov's.

The remaining gap between United States and Soviet capabilities in manned space flight, however, is probably greater than the comparisons made above would suggest.

The best available estimates indicate that the Soviet rockets that put both Gagarin and Titov into orbit had thrusts of about 800,000 pounds each, or more than twice the power of the Atlas rocket that sent Colonel Glenn into space yesterday. Indicative of the still great Soviet superiority in rocket power, too, is the fact that the crafts that Gagarin and Titov rode around the earth weighed about 5 tons each, as against only about 2 tons for the *Friendship* 7 in which our Marine colonel took his journey. One other point should be noted. Both Gagarin and Titov were landed on the ground; all three of our astronauts have had to be landed in the sea.

Clearly much work remains to be done before we have fully caught up with the Russians. Nevertheless, the brilliant success achieved by Colonel Glenn yesterday must give added inspiration for the intensive effort our Nation is making to capture world leadership.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I wish to add to what has been said about the notable exploit of Colonel Glenn that the Marines have landed and the situation is well in hand.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think the Senator's comments are very appropriate. Every marine and every American is much pleased that the situation is well in hand.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that the biographical item entitled "First American in Orbit: John Herschel Glenn, Jr.," which was published in the New York Times of Wednesday, February 21, be made a part of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

First American in Orbit: John Herschel Glenn, Jr.

The sturdy, sandy-haired man who squirmed his way into the crowded capsule atop the giant Atlas missile and was shot into space yesterday on one of the most dangerous trips ever taken by a human expressed a feeling not long ago.

"You fear the least what you know the most about," said Lt. Col. John Herschel Glenn, Jr., a remarkably uncomplicated man in a markedly complicated job. He made that simple statement recently after discussing some of his intensive preparations for his historic flight.

He spoke then as the premier mission pilot for Project Mercury. And the statement was characteristic of the 40-year-old Marine Corps officer, the "old man" of the team of seven astronauts who for 2½ years had trained for the space-penetrating venture.

PILOT IN PACIFIC WAR

A former combat and test pilot, Colonel Glenn flew 59 fighter-bomber missions in the Pacific in World War II and 90 missions in Korea. His awards include 5 Distinguished Flying Crosses and the Air Medal with 18 clusters.

To an interviewer wondering what the values of combat and test-piloting experiences were to anyone preparing for a journey into space, Colonel Glenn had this to say:

"Experience in dangerous and unexpected situations is even more valuable than good conditioning. If you have successfully controlled your airplane in an emergency, or dealt with an enemy pilot whose prime object is to destroy you, your chances of making the proper decision next time are increased.

"The space traveler, alone where no one has been before, will need a confidence only experience can give him."

Like the other astronauts, Colonel Glenn went through dozens of physical tests. They included occupying a high-heat chamber that simulated conditions that would prevail inside the Mercury capsule if overheating occurred during its reentry to the earth's atmosphere. Other rigors included spinning on a centrifuge and in isolation in a blacked-out room.

EXERCISE BEFORE BREAKFAST

As part of his personal regimen, he took a 2-mile run every morning before breakfast.

Most of Colonel Glenn's technical experiences in training for the Project Mercury flight have been likened to those of a man sitting inside a computer. The small capsule, crowded with instruments and safety gear, barely allows room for the astronaut in his custom-made contour couch.

The 180-pound, 5-foot, 10-inch officer is ruggedly handsome, with close-cropped hair, green eyes and a ready grin. He emits quiet confidence and appears to be in command of himself at all times.

Colonel Glenn was the backup pilot for the suborbital space rides made last year by Comdr. Alan B. Shepard, Jr. and Capt. Virgil I. Grissom.

READY FOR THE BIG ONE

A Marine Corps officer who served at Colonel Glenn's side for 4 years was quoted recently as having said that he knew all along that the space officials were "holding Glenn back to ride the big one."

"He could ride a cookstove back if they could find a way to throw it up there," the officer said.

The newest U.S. space hero is a Presbyterian who once said that religion should not be a sometime thing, handy only for emergencies. He was born in Cambridge, Ohio, and went to Muskingum College, leaving in his junior year to become a Naval air cadet. As a Navy test pilot, he made headlines in 1957 when he was the first man to fly at supersonic speed from Los Angeles to New York.

He is married to the former Anna Margaret Castor of New Concord, Ohio, which he calls his hometown. They have two teenage children, David and Carolyn Ann. Boating and water skiing are the family sports.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on February 16 those who love freedom honor the anniversary of Lithuanian independence. No nation in the world has suffered more at the hands of the International Communist conspiracy than has Lithuania.

In 1918 this little country of freedom-loving people waged a bloody and successful war against the Russians for political independence. In 1919 the Russian Communists solemnly declared that they gave up all rights of sovereignty over Lithuania and recognized her inviolable independence.

But in 1940, following the Hitler-Stalin Pact and the partition of Poland between Russia and Germany, the Kremlin demanded permission to station 20,000 troops in Lithuania for the duration of the war, to be removed immediately thereafter.

Lithuania had no choice but to agree to this proposal; but on the day of the signature of the treaty establishing Russian bases in Lithuania the Lithuanian leaders discovered that the phrase "for the duration of the war" had been stricken out, on Stalin's order.

Russian perfidy took its expected course. A Communist-dominated government was forced on the Lithuanian people within 8 months of the signing of the treaty; all non-Communist parties were prohibited, and Lithuania "asked" to be admitted to the Soviet Union.

The method of forceful infiltration in Lithuania was so successful that Lithuania may well be called the classic case of Communist conspiracy. In defiance of all treaties, of all international law, of all human decency, the Kremlin reoccupied a country that had freed itself from Communist domination only 20 years before. Lithuania thus marks the beginning of that long and tragic road along which so many nations of Eastern Europe have lost their cherished liberties.

Let us then join with the Lithuanian people in remembering their freedom, and in dedicating ourselves to the proposition that under no circumstance shall we consider the problem of the captive nations a closed question.

This Nation must resolve that Lithuanian freedom, and the freedom of all the other captive nations, must be the objective of a never-ending effort to free the world from the Communist scourge. The tragedy, valor, the determination, the love of liberty of the Lithuanian people should ever remind us of the task that lies ahead.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

TRIBUTE TO SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

Mr. HART. Mr. President, some 25 years ago the concept of the soil conservation district came into being. In the intervening years about 9,000 such districts have been established. Initially and understandably, they were rather limited in purpose. No one was certain exactly how they would develop.

The increase in the number of districts in the 25 years shows that the plan has worked effectively and well. As our experiences have accumulated, the purposes to which these districts can be put have been broadened. They offer great opportunity for further expansion.

I have made my remarks preliminary to asking unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the Record a resolution adopted by the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts at their annual convention on February 9, 1962, commending the distinguished Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Freeman. Following the printing of that resolution, I ask unanimous consent that the speech delivered on that occasion by Secretary of Agriculture Freeman be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution and address were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolution Adopted by the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts

We commend Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman for the recognition he has afforded to the soil conservation district movement during his first year in office. We appreciate the many actions he has taken in using the prestige of the Office of the Secretary of Agriculture to attain public recognition for advances in the district movement. We salute him for his broad vision in resources conservation matters.

We agree with his proposition that conservation concepts must be broadened to meet the resource challenge of the 1960's.

Secretary Freeman has promulgated a revised standard form for the basic memorandum of understanding with individual soil conservation districts. Its purpose is to reflect the broader resource conservation concepts which have evolved during our generation. It is an initial step in more effectively helping private landowners to move forward their soil and water conservation efforts.

It recognizes that the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized under the terms of various statutes administered by the Department to carry out a broad program of assistance to farmers, ranchers, and landowners including soil and water conservation, watershed protection, flood prevention, farm forestry, and rural areas development, and encompassing research, education, technical assistance, cost sharing and credit. It further recognizes that this program may include cooperation with and assistance to soil (and water) conservation districts in conserving and improving soil, water, vegetative, wildlife, and related resources, and in reducing damage by floods and sedimentation.

We recommend that the governing body of each of the Nation's 2,900 soil conservation districts accept this offer to enter into a modernized working arrangement with the Secretary of Agriculture. We further recommend that the governing body of each of the Nation's 2,900 soil conservation districts accept this undertaking as a challenge to develop the best possible program for their district in an up-to-date setting.

Address by Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman Before the 16th Annual Convention of the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, Grand Ballroom, Sheraton Hotel, Philadelphia, Pa., February 6, 1962

In my job I make many speeches. It is not often, however, that events conspire to give me the opportunity of addressing just the right audience at just the right time—but that is the case here today. We have come together at a most fortunate moment—one so opportune, in fact, that we may someday look back upon this meeting as a major milestone in the advance of conservation in this country.

A week ago tomorrow the President of the United States—with characteristic vigor and sense of purpose—laid before the Congress a bold and comprehensive program for American agriculture in this decade. If you have not read his message, I urge you to do so. For it opens the door to new opportunities and new achievements in developing our land and water resources wisely for the benefit of man.

Few organizations are better equipped to move swiftly and effectively through that open door than this association with its 2,900-member conservation districts—spanning the country in a network of local mechanisms—empowered by law to carry out action programs for the better use of land and water and allied resources. For you—and all others concerned with the use of land and water—the President's program is a call to action. And the burden of what I want to say to you today is simply this: That I hope you will respond with vigor, imagination, and enthusiasm.

The Food and Agriculture Act of 1962, now before the Congress, will put into practical application some basic principles which have long been evident—and too long ignored.

Speaking before another society of conservationists at Purdue University 6 months ago, I stated that—

"The farm problem and the conservation problem are intrinsically and inseparably linked;

"Our agricultural policy must come to grips with the physical problems of land use, the economics of production adjustment and farm income, the social necessities of rural rehabilitation, as a totality;

"Agricultural policy and conservation policy must merge in programs designed to relieve or eliminate rural areas of chronic distress, to enlarge and improve facilities for recreation, to harness our rivers against floods, and to provide for orderly urban and industrial expansion."

I say precisely the same thing to you today—but with this very significant difference: Today I am able to talk in specific terms about practical measures actually proposed in an agricultural program that brings to life the general principles I was talking about last July.

The elements of that program are as simple as A B C D—and in keeping with the times and the popularity of "initialese"—each of those letters has a meaning. Each represents one front of a four-sided attack on the imperative problems of our agriculture.

The "A" is for abundance—that front on which we seek to make more telling use of the output of the most productive agricultural system of all time. On this front we intend to use our abundance to combat hunger and undernourishment among our own people (and even in this affluent society many are both hungry and undernourished); and to share it with the people of friendly countries whose drive toward economic stability and political maturity can be stepped up by adequate supplies of food.

The "B" is for balance—that front on which we intend to attack the problem of agricultural surplus. It is time—and past time—to correct the imbalance between supply and demand that has plagued our farmers and the Nation's taxpayers for 30 years. This we shall do, in close cooperation with farmers, through measures that will strike a reasonable balance between what we produce and what we need, improve and stabilize farm income, and sustain the system of family farms on which our unparalleled agricultural success is built.

The "C" is for conservation and on this front we will attack the problem of using our land, water, forests and wildlife in ways that will enable more and more millions of our citizens to enjoy and benefit from them. Of the measures to be taken on this front, I shall have more to say in a moment.

The "D" is for development—that front of our four-pronged attack on which we will mount a new campaign to conserve and improve the human resources which constitute the bone and sinew of our agriculture and our Nation. To people on the land, we must give new incentive and new opportunity. We do not want them driven from the land by the same merciless economic forces that have already separated millions of farm people—young and old—from their preferred environment. We want to bring resources to rural America to provide new vocational opportunities for these people, to offer training and education to equip them for new occupations in the wholesome atmosphere of country life.

Taken as a whole the A plus B plus C plus D add up to a commonsense attack on deep-rooted maladjustments in our agricultural economy which we clearly cannot afford to ignore. It is a program that faces up to facts—and one of the facts is that we are faced today with land-use problems of a new order deriving from far-reaching changes in our economic structure and social patterns, both within agriculture and without.

This is dramatically underscored by another event which makes our meeting here today a timely one. On the day he delivered his agricultural program to Congress, the President received a report on "Outdoor Recreation for America," compiled after a 3-year study under the chairmanship of Mr. Laurance Rockefeller. Let me call your attention to some of the things this report has to say about the need for recreational facilities in this country. This is a direct quotation:

"The demand is surging—it is clear that Americans are seeking the outdoors as never before. And this is only a foretaste of what is to come. Not only will there be many more people, they will want to do more, and they will have more money and time to do it with."

By 1976, the report says, our population will be about 230 million; and by the year 2000, 350 million. Disposable consumer income will rise from $354 billion in 1960 to

$706 billion by 1976 and to $1,437 billion by 2000. People will have more free time.

The standard workweek in 1976 will average 36 hours for the entire industrial work force; by 2000 it may be down to 32 hours. Much of the extra time will go into recreation. Americans will be even more mobile. The number of passenger cars will be about 100 million by 1976—an increase of nearly 80 percent over 1959—and by 2000 it will have grown by as much again. Individual participation in some form of outdoor recreational activity during the summer period may jump from 4.4 billion "occasions" at present to 6.9 billion occasions by 1976.

In short, in a nation of active people who enjoy increasing leisure time, rising personal incomes, and a strong population growth rate, the requirements for outdoor recreation are going to add a new dimension to our conception of beneficial land use, and every agency—national, State, or local—having anything to do with our resources base, is going to have to consider that new dimension in thinking about the job it has to do.

I want to give you a few more quotations from the recreation report which ought to provoke some thought:

"The simple activities are the most popular. Driving and walking for pleasure, swimming, and picnicking lead the list of the outdoor activities in which Americans participate.

"Recreation should be considered in many kinds of planning—urban renewal, highway construction, water resource development, forest and range management, to name only a few.

"Outdoor recreation also brings about desirable economic effects. Its provision enhances community values by creating a better place to live and increasing land values. In some underdeveloped areas it can be a mainstay of the economy.

"Activities of watershed and other agricultural conservation programs should be oriented toward greater recreation benefits for the public."

"Private lands are a very important part of the supply of outdoor recreation resources."

"Private resources for recreation fall into three categories: those that are used primarily for recreation; those that are managed primarily for some other use but are also used for recreation; and those that could be developed into either private or public recreation sites."

"Legislation should be enacted to permit explicit consideration of public outdoor recreation benefits created by small watershed projects carried out by the Watershed and Flood Prevention Act of 1954."

"Since the mid-1930's the Federal Government, through the Department of Agriculture, has been sharing with landowners the cost of undertaking certain soil and water conservation practices, these programs have both direct and secondary influences upon outdoor recreation and should be administered to take account of recreation potentials."

"The development of the farm pond program, conducted by the Department of Agriculture in the interest of better soil and water conservation, has introduced a new element in recreation fishing. The number of farm ponds in the United States, which currently account for approximately 2 million surface acres of productive fish habitat, will increase by one-half million by 1976 and by another million by the year 2000. In the past these areas have provided fishing and recreation for the farmer and his immediate friends, and neighbors, but this resource could be used more fully by the general public, furnishing at the same time a source of income to the farmer."

It takes only a little vision to foresee many other ways to develop the recreational use of private lands—hunting, hiking, swimming, picnicking, camping, skiing come immediately to mind. The point is that even today, facilities for outdoor diversions are inadequate. In the next few years the demand is going to triple. And the basic requirements for meeting that demand are land and water—and imagination.

Another swiftly emerging land-use problem commands the attention of every district contiguous to a metropolitan area. This is the problem of urban sprawl—the indiscriminate gobbling up of beautiful countryside by unsightly tentacles of city and industrial growth. America already suffers intensely from this "malaise" which one California commission recently described as "slurbia."

One of the imperatives in any solution of our agricultural problem is the permanent retirement of millions of acres of unneeded cropland to other uses. Where better could this land be sought than in farming regions adjacent to our cities—and to what better uses could it be put? We can halt the encroachment of the "slurb" by creating belts of open country—easily accessible for public recreation—around many of our city areas. All of the land in these greenways need not be purchased. Some might stay in private hands under agreements covering its use; some could be controlled through easements assuring public access. But in any event, local instrumentalities will be needed through which the land can be acquired, managed, and developed in the public interest. Is there a role here for the soil conservation district?

I call your attention to still another matter which clamors urgently for attention. The rural regions of this wealthiest of nations are scarred today by pockets of poverty and economic erosion as dreadful—if not as evident—as the urban slums that blight so many of our cities. This is a reflection of the fact that about 60 percent of our farms produce only 13 percent of our agricultural output.

In 800 counties across the country, with 25,000 rural and smalltown communities and an aggregate population of some 31 million people, the searing process of economic deterioration and heavy outmigration has been underway for two decades. In many places, community and private facilities have run down and been abandoned.

Not only farm families are being caught in this downhill slide. In hundreds of villages and small towns, commerce and business has stagnated, with resulting loss of income and job opportunities for the people who live there.

The Nation is awake to the urgent needs of urban renewal. Here in Philadelphia and in Pittsburgh immense strides in urban redevelopment and rehabilitation under the leadership of Governor Lawrence, Mayor Dilworth and Mayor Barr have demonstrated what can be accomplished in our cities. Backed by new Federal and State programs, cities in every section of the country are moving forward with programs to eradicate slums, revive areas of commercial decay and put themselves in tune with the times.

Across rural America we need much the same kind of drive—a massive rural renewal program to rescue and revitalize community after community now being stifled by inadequate resources, low income, and lack of opportunity. These areas need a resource transfusion to bring them back to life and vigor.

I do not pretend to know all the means by which this transfusion can be accomplished. But the starting point, certainly, is to readjust and improve the natural resources they already possess—recombinations of farland to constitute economic units, development of forest potentials, stabilization of small watersheds to prevent destructive floods, and assurance of power supply. With this kind of a base, an area has a chance of attracting industry; and on such a base it can create new facilities of many kinds to meet the Nation's need for greater recreatio out of doors.

I have tried to tickle your imagination by exposing three great new areas for land use action, where the needs of the Nation are clear and where, it seems to me, your districts have an unprecedented opportunity for constructive service to their communities and the country.

Now let me assure you that I have not made these suggestions without any relation to reality. On the contrary, every suggestion I have made regarding the possible role of the soil conservation district—whether in providing new facilities for recreation, in combating urban sprawl, or in driving forward toward rural renewal—is backed up by provisions of the President's food and agriculture program for the sixties.

I have said that this is a program that faces facts. It does more than that—it relates one fact to another. Our economists tell us, for example, that by 1980 we will need 51 million acres of cropland less than we need now to meet our domestic and export requirements for food and fiber. The Rockefeller study reveals a need for millions of additional acres for recreation. Orderly urban expansion calls for still more open land. Rural renewal requires basic land use readjustment. The President's program does not stop, therefore, with measures to idle cropland for the sake of balancing production and demand. It surrounds those measures with others through which we can make those retired acres work in other ways for the people who own them, the communities in which they exist, and the Nation as a whole.

If the Congress responds to the President's proposals, amendments of existing law will give the Secretary of Agriculture authority to attack these problems of land use in many ways. He will be empowered, for example:

To acquire land to be developed and used for public recreation and protection of fish and wildlife.

To enter into long-term agreements with farm operators and owners for the conservation and economic use of land.

To provide assistance to local organizations for operating and maintaining any reservoir or other area in a watershed protection and flood prevention project for public recreational development.

To make loans to individual farmers for recreational uses of land and to accommodate shifts in land use.

To make loans to rural public bodies and associations for sewer development and improvement, and for recreation-conservation purposes.

To make ACP payments and cost-sharing arrangements under long-term contracts with producers to provide for changes in cropping systems and land uses for development of soil, water, forest, wildlife, and recreation resources.

Taken together, these represent a package of programs through which I believe we will be able to come to grips more effectively and more swiftly than ever before with the problems of resource use which you have done so much to deal with in the past. We are on the threshold of a new era in the management of our resources—of land and water, forest and wildlife—and our people, who are the most important resource of all, are going to gain in the process.

In realizing the promise of this new era—in giving reality to our broadened concept of conservation and wise land use—I am convinced that the soil conservation district has an immensely important part to play. I demonstrate this conviction on February 1—just 5 days ago—when I signed and promulgated a proposed new memorandum of understanding as the base of future working relations between the districts and the Department.

It is my purpose in offering this revised memorandum to up-date the splendid relationship which began a quarter of a century ago when our ideas about the aims of conservation on private lands were more limited than they are today. Then, the capacity of the Department to assist the districts was as limited as the ideas that prevailed at that time. Now we are embarking on new programs with broader aims in keeping with modern needs. I want the districts to be ready to take their full part in these programs as we move ahead.

I want to close with this final word. We are opening up new ground, charting new trails. We need your help, the benefit of your experience, the cooperation of your organizations. When you leave here, take counsel with your associates back home. Put your minds to the problems we have talked of here. Come up with suggestions and proposals.

I salute the splendid job you have done in the 25 years since the First District came into being. They have been challenging years, I know. But even greater challenges lie ahead.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, as a result of consultation with the majority leader, as I understand, the business of the Senate for tomorrow will be to convene at 12 o'clock noon, at which time the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] will read the famous Washington Farewell Message, and then the Senate will adjourn over to Monday next at 12 o'clock noon. Was that the order that was entered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that no such order has been entered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I shall set it down as the business of the Senate. The Senate will adjourn until tomorrow, Thursday, noon and following the reading of Washington's Farewell Address by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, there will be no further business of the Senate—no votes or regular business—and a motion will be made to adjourn until Monday next at noon. I make this announcement in order that my colleagues may be on notice as to what the schedule is.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the distinguished acting majority leader has stated what I understand is the agreement between the majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and the minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate at this time, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 22, 1962, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 21, 1962:

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force under the appropriate provisions of chapter 835, title 10, United States Code, as amended. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

CAPTAIN TO MAJOR

Line of the Air Force

Abersold, Edward G., 38710A.
Ackerman, Donald G., 38706A.
Adamek, Victor W., 39932A.
Adams, Clinton S., 38510A.
Adams, Donald F., 40429A.
Adams, Gerald M., 39226A.
Adams, Robert L., 17928A.
Adams, Theodore R., 38543A.
Adams, William, 39029A.
Adams, William F., 39021A.
Addy, Noel D., 40025A.
Aglietti, Corrado J., 38717A.
Ahner, Lyle L., 17960A.
Aird, William W., 38959A.
Akerland, Gustav J., 38682A.
Albright, Donald J., 40023A.
Alderman, James O., 21526A.
Aldredge, Cleo D., 39659A.
Alexander, Martin E., 39093A.
Alexander, Richard L., 40378A.
Alexander, William, 39404A.
Allen, Harry G., Jr., 40132A.
Allen, James R., 17789A.
Allen, Ledewey E., Jr., 22742A.
Allen, Marvin L., 39108A.
Allen, Milton E., 39392A.
Alley, Max P., 39794A.
Allison, Russell R., 39807A.
Almond, Julius H., Jr., 40373A.
Alston, Maurice E., Sr., 40020A.
Alvarado, Ricardo R., 26678A.
Amador, Earl M., 17944A.
Amerman, Roy W., 38656A.
Amery, Robert S., 48827A.
Anderson, Andrew B., Jr., 17791A.
Anderson, Carl A., 17747A.
Anderson, Elmer E., 37952A.
Anderson, James W., 39960A.
Anderson, John P., 40205A.
Anderson, Marvin J., 39350A.
Anderson, Mont R., 38729A.
Anderson, Roy L., Jr., 38620A.
Anderson, William A., 40416A.
Andes, Lloyd M., 38799A.
Andrecheck, Joseph P., 38624A.
Andrew, Hugh S., 23877A.
Andrews, Melvin H., 52555A.
Andrus, Charles A., Jr., 39209A.
Angenendt, Harry E., 38594A.
Annis, Edwin C., 40087A.
Anspach, Robert J., 39688A.
Antonietti, Bruno J., 38691A.
Apple, John J., 40289A.
Archer, William E., 39103A.
Archibald, Lawrence W., 38500A.
Armer, William M., 39639A.
Armstrong, Clement H., 38947A.
Armstrong, James E., Jr., 25782A.
Arnett, Harry L., Jr., 40027A.
Arnold, Franklin B., 39257A.
Arnold, Robert C., 39167A.
Arnold, William M., 40288A.
Asbury, Richard W., 39196A.
Ashbridge, George A., 39302A.
Aslett, Worthing, 40091A.
Atkins, Edwin L., 39127A.
Ausburn, Franklin E., 17939A.
Austin, Elbert H., 40007A.
Avis, Robert F., 38548A.
Axmacher, Harold G., Jr., 39708A.
Aylsworth, Clark, 39391A.
Babler, Leon H., 39355A.
Baden, Vernon E., 39693A.
Bailey, John H., 39706A.
Baird, Jacob C., 22736A.
Baird, Nolin R., 39992A.
Baker, Elmer W., Jr., 40056A.
Baker, John H., Jr., 39582A.
Baker, Thomas H., 38818A.
Baker, Walter H., Jr., 38684A.
Baker, William E., 38761A.
Baker, William F., 38897A.
Baker, William J., Jr., 39428A.
Balazik, Joseph C., 39994A.
Baldwin, James E., 25806A.
Baldwin, Richard F., 38907A.
Baldwin, William A., 40212A.
Balega, John L., 24396A.
Ball, John C., 22783A.
Ballard, Carl W., 17886A.
Balser, William D., 39928A.
Baltrusaitis, William J., 38879A.
Balzano, Daniel N., 39540A.
Banks, Ernest S., 39846A.
Barber, Alden F., 39150A.
Barber, Frank H., 39233A.
Barber, Kenneth H., 17845A.
Bare, Merle M., 40271A.
Barentine, Herbert B., 17870A.
Barker, Frank H., 39085A.
Barker, Frederick N., 60041A.
Barkwill, James W., 22785A.
Barnard, Martin J., 17956A.
Barnett, James G., 38488A.
Barneyback, William G., 52546A.
Barondes, Arthur D., 17774A.
Barr, Carl A., 26823A.
Barr, Harold E., 39696A.
Barrett, Donald E., 38937A.
Barrett, Lewis R., Jr., 37340A.
Barrow, James F., 40106A.
Barsom, George K., Jr., 39980A.
Barta, John J., 39466A.
Bartels, Charles E., 38766A.
Bartley, George S., 37765A.
Bassett, Roy B., 39507A.
Bateman, William N., 38844A.
Bates, Mary E., 39851W.
Batey, Thomas O., 52616A.
Battershell, Byron E., 40323A.
Baugh, William, 39065A.
Baughn, Richard M., 25705A.
Baum, Sheldon D., 39958A.
Baumgardner, Thor P., 40153A.
Beach, William J., 39780A.
Beatty, Charles R., 39795A.
Beauregard, Edward C., 39463A.
Beaver, George W., 39063A.
Becher, Donald F., 38945A.
Beck, Harold, 38915A.
Beckner, Alfred A., Jr., 38875A.
Beddingfield, Luther L., Jr., 40164A.
Bedenbaugh, John W., 39894A.
Bedford, Ernest D., 54926A.
Bednorz, Everist L., 39690A.
Beers, Milton E., 40043A.
Behrens, Rae A., 37503A.
Bekius, Joseph E., 27699A.
Bellamy, William R., 38661A.
Bemiss, Robert E., 39395A.
Bender, Thomas L., Jr., 38862A.
Benedict, Warren V., 39223A.
Bennett, Benjamin E., 39340A.
Bennett, Ernest J., 39640A.
Bennett, Sidney, 39056A.
Benson, Bradford L., 40297A.
Benson, Hollis A., Jr., 40326A.
Benson, Jack R., 22825A.
Benwell, Tommy, 39965A.
Berg, Maurice A., 38587A.
Berg, Robert A., 39712A.
Bergman, Lloyd H., 38835A.
Bergwin, Clyde R., 38793A.
Berkenpas, Nephi, 40017A.
Bernard, Duane R., 25615A.
Berran, Thomas F., 52459A.
Berry, Harry M., 17967A.
Berry, Jack W., 39492A.
Berry, Richard P., 17840A.
Berthold, Oscar A., 39174A.
Bertola, Arthur R., 39080A.
Bertoni, Waldo E., 17780A.
Best, Warren E., 40055A.
Bethune, John L., Jr., 39738A.

Bettis, William E., 40024A.
Beville, Jacob E., 38588A.
Biaett, Vernon L., 28338A.
Bibb, Harry L., 39052A.
Biddle, Fred O., 38721A.
Bier, Samuel, 39535A.
Bigelow, Robert O., 39927A.
Billings, Gilbert M., Jr., 52579A.
Binney, William L., 38929A.
Bird, Claude M., 38651A.
Birdwell, Fred L., 39332A.
Bisher, Harry E., 38926A.
Bishop, Charles W., 39616A.
Bishop, Lloyd R., 38969A.
Bishop, Tedd L., 17951A.
Black, Donald C., Jr., 38824A.
Black, Harlan K., 38502A.
Black, Paul A., 38805A.
Blackburn, Denny R., 40182A.
Blackman, Robert D., 54928A.
Blades, Joseph P., 39429A.
Blaine, Jay M., Jr., 39926A.
Blair, Roland J., 40172A.
Blakely, Jack A., 40299A.
Blakeney, Lewis R., 38477A.
Bland, Kenneth R., 22818A.
Blank, George W., 39293A.
Blanz, Clarence E., Jr., 39009A.
Blecharczyk, Tadeusz, 39824A.
Blenis, Ronald D., 52588A.
Blickenstaff, Robert, 39375A.
Bloodgood, Donal D., 17863A.
Blum, Edward H., Jr., 37415A.
Blum, Julius M., 40423A.
Blunt, Robert W., Jr., 52577A.
Blyth, John S., 39632A.
Bobbett, Robert L., 38991A.
Bogan, Thomas R., 39565A.
Bogie, David B., 25522A.
Bohnhoff, Wilbur C., 39368A.
Bolton, Charles F., 40081A.
Bolton, Howard F., 39724A.
Bolton, James C., 26449A.
Booher, John W., 38896A.
Borden, Robert E., 40433A.
Borsari, Evo E., 39823A.
Bortness, Lawrence E., 40420A.
Bosch, Frank L., 40253A.
Bost, John H., 17875A.
Botzong, Wilbur B., 39271A.
Boudreaux, William J., 38696A.
Bounds, Malcolm S., Sr., 38551A.
Bowen, Roy M., 38707A.
Bower, Archie F., Jr., 39883A.
Bowers, John H., 39353A.
Bowman, John H., 39417A.
Bowser, Kenneth D., 39522A.
Boyd, John S., 39603A.
Boyd, Stanley M., 38524A.
Boyden, Clair H., 39561A.
Bozeman, John W., Jr., 39641A.
Brackney, Paul J., 39337A.
Braddock, James E., 24349A.
Brandes, Harry E., 38895A.
Brandon, Durward, 39716A.
Brandt, Robert L., 39509A.
Braswell, Arnold W., 17745A.
Bratton, Keith D., 39638A.
Brauckman, Alvin J., 39003A.
Brenholtz, George E., Jr., 39348A.
Bresley, Milo W., 37754A.
Bressler, Ray B., Jr., 17891A.
Brett, Robert A., 40322A.
Brewer, Zane G., 39511A.
Brewington, Russell D., 23852A.
Brewton, James A., 39529A.
Briand, Paul L., Jr., 17882A.
Briggs, Josephus A., Jr., 38963A.
Brigham, Gordon D., 52584A.
Bright, Charles D., 23888A.
Brill, Jay R., 17767A.
Briner, Chester G., 38512A.
Brinson, Elmo, 38600A.
Brinson, Pat D., 17887A.
Brion, Leonard L., 52615A.
Britton, Charles L., 39834A.
Britton, Raymond P., 38858A.
Britton, Robert B., 40189A.
Britton, Thomas C., 23835A.
Broadway, Roy D., 39969A.

Brock, Walker J., 40061A.
Brock, Woodrow W., 39038A.
Brodien, Bernard B., 38668A.
Broga, Kenneth L., 39351A.
Brooks, Harold C., 39082A.
Brotbeck, Charles B., 38839A.
Brown, Calvin W., 49303A.
Brown, Carl H., 52569A.
Brown, Clyde W., Jr., 38820A.
Brown, David A., 39837A.
Brown, Edward L., 38565A.
Brown, Edward W., 39489A.
Brown, Gerald S., 38627A.
Brown, Harry F., 39685A.
Brown, James A., 39801A.
Brown, James F., 39215A.
Brown, James M., 39956A.
Brown, John R. Q., 39482A.
Brown, Ralph W., 39618A.
Brown, Robert D., 40143A.
Brown, William F., 39900A.
Browning, James H., 39907A.
Brudzinski, Walter M., 39333A.
Brulinski, Stephen M., 39739A.
Brunetti, Anthony W., 25528A.
Brunner, Leroy P., 60037A.
Bryant, Norman, 38938A.
Buchanan, Robert S., 18292A.
Buckley, Paul J., 39633A.
Buechler, Theodore B., 17833A.
Buettner, Frank A., 39306A.
Bugg, Raoul, 39500A.
Buie, Alton C., 38763A.
Bulger, Charles C., 39070A.
Bunch, Melvin E., 38669A.
Bundick, Paul S., 40110A.
Burcham, Loyd C., 39232A.
Burdette, James M., Jr., 17930A.
Burgess, Benjamin F., 39884A.
Burgess, Raymond U., Jr., 38724A.
Burke, Patrick J., 40382A.
Burkhart, John W. 38493A.
Burkhelder, Richard W., 17883A.
Burlingame, Colin R., 40327A.
Burman, John R., 39045A.
Burns, Julius F., 38955A.
Burns, Leigh R., 39690A.
Burnstad, Basil B., 39514A.
Burris, Rupert H., 40328A.
Burrows, William C., 17758A.
Burt, Robert L., 38683A.
Burt, Waldo F., 39034A.
Burton, Billy B., 56542A.
Burton, John C., 39303A.
Butler, Blaine R., Jr., 17803A.
Buttermore, Franklin T., 39010A.
Butterworth, Edgar E., 39691A.
Buttery, Thomas W., 39843A.
Buttrey, Wallace C., 40317A.
Butts, Edward H., Jr., 39308A.
Buzbee, Jack A., 52596A.
Byers, Herbert L., 39981A.
Byers, William E., 39217A.
Byrne, Joseph H., 52603A.
Cafarella, Joseph R., 38572A.
Cahill, Lawrence J., 38527A.
Calder, Robert L., 39317A.
Caldwell, Daniel E., 39031A.
Calhoun, Atticus A., 24271A.
Callahan, Daniel H., 39224A.
Callanan, Charles W., 38881A.
Cameron, John J., 39730A.
Cameron, Joseph E., 39568A.
Cameron, William S., 38849A.
Campbell, Claude P., 38890A.
Campbell, Richard J., 39214A.
Campbell, Robert H., 38992A.
Campbell, William F., 39252A.
Campbell, William T., Jr., 39726A.
Canady, Thomas H., Jr., 39113A.
Canfield, John O., 24415A.
Cannon, James W., Jr., 40071A.
Capraro, Thomas C., 39186A.
Carberry, James E., Jr., 39216A.
Cardwell, Jack E., 39488A.
Carey, John H., 56042A.
Carey, Richard J., 38614A.
Carey, William D., 39396A.
Cargill, Harris B., 38629A.
Carleton, Myron L., 39050A.

Carlomagno, Armand M., 23769A.
Carlson, Carl R., 39645A.
Carney, William L., 40113A.
Carroll, Arthur B., 38989A.
Carter, George M., 38983A.
Carter, Leo, 39617A.
Case, Rodolph, 38520A.
Casoli, Fred R., 38886A.
Cattron, Ward J., 38558A.
Caulfield, Thomas J., Jr., 40376A.
Caviness, Jamie N., 39227A.
Cerrone, Warren E., 38857A.
Cesario, Joseph M., 38801A.
Chady, Wincell R., 39872A.
Chamberlain, James S., 38732A.
Chamberlin, Ertel S., 38673A.
Champlin, Fredric F., 38638A.
Chanatry, Fred I., 17788A.
Chandler, John L., 39571A.
Chaney, Francis C., 2d, 38888A.
Chapin, Robert L., 39439A.
Chapman, Charles V., Jr., 39266A.
Chappelle, Ernest C., Jr., 40221A.
Charles, Harry G., Jr., 48831A.
Chellberg, Clair W., 38606A.
Chenot, Richard P., 39904A.
Chew, Harold B., 38719A.
Chikar, James E., 39486A.
Christian, James W., 40228A.
Christianson, William C., 39882A.
Chrones, Thomas A., 39004A.
Chrzastek, Myron J., 39430A.
Church, James F., 38528A.
Cibulka, Bert G., 38531A.
Clark, James B., 40329A.
Clark, Joseph L., 40262A.
Clark, Kenneth A., 40311A.
Clark, Loren D., 39342A.
Clark, Raymond S., 40040A.
Clark, Robert L., 3d, 25523A.
Clark, Robert W., Jr., 22784A.
Clark, Roy T., Jr., 24594A.
Clark, William G., 38579A.
Clark, William T., 39961A.
Clarkson, Raymond E., 39949A.
Clary, James C., 38869A.
Claypoole, Gordon, 39162A.
Clayville, Howard G., 39481A.
Clegg, John E., 39318A.
Clements, Walker E., 39047A.
Cleveland, Howard R., 38700A.
Cline, John R., 39091A.
Cline, William J., 40162A.
Cloud, Lester A., Jr., 39852A.
Coffey, John B., 39471A.
Colby, Guy H., 52543A.
Cole, Courtland T., 38492A.
Cole, Daryl D., 17953A.
Cole, Ernest A., 39772A.
Coleman, Kermit, 52637A.
Coleman, William D., 25804A.
Coleman, William R., 39797A.
Colet, David, 39763A.
Colip, Robert C., 52598A.
Collette, William E., 40127A.
Collier, James L., 39745A.
Collins, Charles A., 39996A.
Collins, William F., 38602A.
Comeau, Ulysse A., 38788A.
Comer, Thomas P., 39175A.
Compton, Milton S., Jr., 38574A.
Cone, Charles L., 40177A.
Confer, Louis C., 39673A.
Conlee, Gail D., 39083A.
Conley, Douglas C., 40279A.
Connair, Thomas J., Jr., 39160A.
Connaway, Robert F., 40179A.
Connelly, Hubert A., 39272A.
Connolly, Thomas J., 48820A.
Connor, Maurice E., 38521A.
Conover, James E., 38653A.
Conrad, Charles M., 38972A.
Conway, James T., 40330A.
Cook, Emmerson C., 39525A.
Cook, Frederick F., 39915A.
Cook, John C., 39833A.
Cook, Norman W., 39413A.
Cook, Olen C., 38785A.
Cooke, Morris H., 38562A.
Cooksey, George D., Jr., 22829A.

Cooper, Leo L., 39096A.
Cooper, Stanley, 39756A.
Coover, Jean L., 24721A.
Copeland, Joe H., 38900A.
Corbin, John H., 26431A.
Corey, Alexander E., 39149A.
Corken, Jack C., 39604A.
Cornish, Vaughn L., 38262A.
Corvey, Russell G., 39911A.
Costello, Elmer P., 39556A.
Costenbader, Henry L., 39290A.
Courlas, John G., 23803A.
Coward, Roderick W., 22842A.
Cowgill, John D., 17860A.
Cox, Rex E., 40145A.
Cox, William M., 39164A.
Crabb, Robert G., 38891A.
Crane, Charles L., 39723A.
Cranford, Gorden E., 52590A.
Craw, David W., 39060A.
Crecelius, Charles E., 40269A.
Creech, Ray T., 39971A.
Crevonis, Edward B., 40241A.
Criswell, Wallace L., 22807A.
Crites, Frank W., Jr., 40325A.
Crockett, Tom A., Jr., 39322A.
Croker, Charles J., 39398A.
Crosnicker, Mervyn T., 38632A.
Cross, Earle G., Jr., 40058A.
Cross, James U., 24719A.
Crow, Earl S., Jr., 40112A.
Crow, Olin W., 39660A.
Crowder, Rodophil J., Jr., 26476A.
Crown, John L., 52622A.
Crumley, James R., 38376A.
Crutchlow, Russell F., 52562A.
Culbertson, Richard N., 39752A.
Cullom, Robert F., 38809A.
Cummings, George R., 21510A.
Cunningham, James J., 38898A.
Cunningham, Louis W., 38918A.
Cuno, Francis T., 39179A.
Cuny, Roy A., 40331A.
Cuomo, Stephen D., 38576A.
Currie, James B., 26447A.
Currie, John W., 52534A.
Curry, Clarence G., Jr., 39431A.
Curtis, John P., 39532A.
Curtner, Paul H., Jr., 39112A.
Dabrowski, Edmond J., 39235A.
Dahl, Raymond H., 39676A.
Dale, James A., 52578A.
Dalke, Alvin D., 40396A.
Dallas, Harry G., 39612A.
Daly, Mary E., 39955W.
Dana, Richard E., 52620A.
Daniel, Dennis D., 39892A.
Daniel, John I., 3d, 17923A.
Daniel, William J., 28191A.
Daniels, Lloyd E., 40251A.
Darrow, George R., 39891A.
Davidson, Harold E., 39484A.
Davies, Bill M., 39606A.
Davis, Blair J., 39995A.
Davis, Carl F., 39189A.
Davis, Dougall M., 38507A.
Davis, Frank H., 39675A.
Davis, Glen E., 38789A.
Davis, Harold N., 40332A.
Davis, Norman E., Jr., 52557A.
Davis, Oliver R., 38643A.
Davis, Robert C., 17855A.
Davis, Robert M., 39365A.
Davis, Wayne E., 52566A.
Davison, Clark E., 39523A.
Davison, Henry O., 39534A.
Davison, Peter H., 23848A.
Dawson, Leland W., 39078A.
Dearth, Ray A., 52635A.
Deas, John, 22768A.
DeCastro, William R., 38693A.
Decima, Eleo, 23896A.
Dedecker, Charles C., 27675A.
Dee, John B. Jr., 39487A.
DeFelice, Louis F., 38919A.
Deffendall, Bryce D., 39572A.
DeGaugh, Roy A., 39123A.
DeGraaf, Henry, 38513A.
DeLaune, Harvey P., 48828A.
Delozier, Howard J., 39244A.
Deluca, Harold J., 38899A.
Dendle, William H., Jr., 40077A.
Denkler, Edward G., Jr., 38871A.
Dennis, Robert, 23901A.
Densford, Howard W., 39657A.
Deptula, Alfred R., 40152A.
Depyssler, Steven L., 40194A.
Derose, Roy L., 38608A.
Derrick, Boyd D., 39849A.
Derrington, William H., 40161A.
Desimone, Jasper V., 39503A.
Desipin, Thomas J., 38794A.
Devlin, John J., Jr., 25781A.
Dewitt, William P. 39925A.
Deyo, James E., 39101A.
Dibble, Walter E., 37638A.
Dickerson, Aaron E., 39805A.
Digris, Alphonse J., 38586A.
Dildy, Sims G., 17848A.
Dill, Kenneth, 39815A.
Dillahunty, Chester L., 48807A.
Dilley, William G., Jr., 52520A.
Dillon, Louis H., 38526A.
Dineen, Dennis J., 39386A.
Dittmar, John D., 39203A.
Dixey, Joseph R., 39699A.
Dobson, Dale A., 40011A.
Dockery, Louis A., 25823A.
Dodd, Glen A., 39273A.
Dodds, William J., 38563A.
Dodson, Leo H., 39231A.
Doesken, Melvin L., 39490A.
Donahower, Frederick L., 48834A.
Donaldson, Howard W., 39829A.
Donlon, William E., Jr., 17895A.
Dopp, Calvin S., 40100A.
Dorger, John H., 40118A.
Doria, Oswald, 38610A.
Dornstadter, Joseph L., 40333A.
Dorrer, Walter H., 39569A.
Dotson, Cecil J., 38807A.
Dotson, James E., 28025A.
Dotson, Richard A., 39008A.
Dougherty, Jack B., 39220A.
Dougherty, John, 39015A.
Dougherty, Joseph B., 22796A.
Doughty, Orville L., 40144A.
Douglas, Tommy L., 40334A.
Douglas, Wilson D., 39902A.
Dowling, William J., 40074A.
Downing, Hollis R., 39913A.
Downs, Eldon W., 38584A.
Doyle, Lawrence A., 17897A.
Drack, Warren E., 38980A.
Drake, Paul F., 39126A.
Drebelbis, Robert C., 38692A.
Dreier, George E., 39432A.
Drew, John C., 25772A.
Drinon, Marshall L., 38874A.
Driscoll, James J., 38604A.
Druckrey, Allan F., 39280A.
DuBois, Joseph M., 24455A.
Dubson, Boris N., 391176A.
Ducote, John B., 40399A.
Dudding, Carl O., Jr., 40047A.
Duden, Walter E., 39163A.
Dugard, William T., 40236A.
Dumais, Philip A., 39329A.
Dumas, Earl A., 39649A.
Dunaway, Paul E., 38878A.
Dunham, Charles I., 39826A.
Dunlap, Elmer N., 38664A.
Dunlap, Wesley W., 38665A.
Dunn, Charles B., 39433A.
Dunning, Leslie L., 39064A.
Durbin, Gerald E., 38777A.
Durbin, Richard F., 39930A.
Dutko, Francis J., 40295A.
Dyer, Kenneth A., 39646A.
Eakins, Benjamin W., 17766A.
Eanes, Edwin C., 24435A.
Eastman, Loren S., Jr., 26793A.
Easton, Read C., 39628A.
Ebersole, Howard R., 24476A.
Echabarne, Paul, 52575A.
Echols, Barney F., Jr., 39331A.
Economy, Peter, 40174A.
Eden, James I., 22836A.
Eder, John E., Jr., 39230A.
Edgarian, Arthur A., 39274A.
Edmonds, Carter M., 52535A.
Edmonson, James L., 39114A.
Edmunds, William H., 39560A.
Edwards, Asa B., 40191A.
Edwards, Harry M., 39124A.
Edwards, Jack J., 38637A.
Edwards, James E., 40428A.
Edwards, John A., 17765A.
Egan, Wesley W., 38848A.
Egbert, Harold H., 39557A.
Egbert, Howard D., 38883A.
Egginton, Jack H., 24430A.
Eggleston, Glenn I., Jr., 3960JA.
Eggleston, Ogden C., 40195A.
Eggleston, Telford S., Jr., 39282A.
Ehrhardt, Robert F., 39667A.
Eickholt, John J., 40137A.
Eilenberg, John E., 39051A.
Ekert, Roderick A., 38784A.
Elbracht, William A., 39531A.
Elchak, John, Jr., 39469A.
Elder, Carl W., 39620A.
Elder, Damon C., 38772A.
Elebash, Clarence C., 17796A.
Elkin, Clarence S., 38626A.
Ellis, William F., 39715A.
Elton, Harold R., 39888A.
Elvey, George C., 38580A.
Emerson, Russell C., 39382A.
Empey, Roland W., 39942A.
Endres, Frank I., 39213A.
Engle, Clifton G., 39701A.
Engle, Forrest W., 39247A.
Erickson, Richard B., 40426A.
Erie, Dan R., 39198A.
Ernst, Herbert W., 38743A.
Ervin, James L., 40014A.
Erzen, Paul E., 55745A.
Eschenbach, Arthur E., 38781A.
Eskridge, John T., 40398A.
Estes, Edmond E., 39259A.
Evalenko, William A., 38487A.
Evans, George W., 38645A.
Evans, John, 38838A.
Evans, Joseph B., 38596A.
Evans, Michael J., Jr., 40335A.
Evans, Richard L., 39622A.
Evans, Robert C., 28337A.
Evers, Alfred C., 39629A.
Ewing, Marvin F., 38949A.
Faircloth, James W., Jr., 39315A.
Fanning, Ivan B., 39049A.
Farrar, John H., 38498A.
Farthing, Frank, 39590A.
Favorite, Walter B., 22775A.
Fawver, Robert E., 40244A.
Fearn, Cabell J., 39773A.
Fedro, William E., 17945A.
Feeney, Edward M., 23934A.
Felch, Leon J., 38582A.
Feltey, Donald R., 39434A.
Femmer, William H., 17958A.
Fern, Robert C., 38639A.
Ferrell, Jack G., 39344A.
Ferris, John T., Jr., 40393A.
Ferriter, John J., 24397A.
Ferryman, Neil R., 38973A.
Feuerriegel, Karl T., 39822A.
Fiederer, Joseph J., 39334A.
Fifer, Reginald D., Jr., 40193A.
Filorimo, Peter J., 38928A.
Fimbel, Robert A., 52553A.
Finch, J. P., 39982A.
Finefrock, George H., 24602A.
Fischer, John C., 39412A.
Fisher, Robert K., 39516A.
Fisher, Vernon W., 39284A.
Fisler, Kenneth H., 38911A.
Fjelsted, Marquis A., 38583A.
Flagg, John B., 40206A.
Flaherty, Joseph E., 39748A.
Flake, Thomas J., Jr., 22837A.
Fleming, David, 40336A.
Fletcher, Glenn A., 40321A.
Fletcher, James D., 40130A.
Fletcher, Westwood H., Jr., 40198A
Floyd, William W., 38962A.
Flynn, Robert E., 25524A.
Fogg, Clarence H., Jr., 38842A.
Forbes, Myron D., 26783A.
Ford, Francis M., 23860A.
Ford, John R., 23767A.
Ford, Lester W., 39591A.

Foster, Cecil G., 38964A.
Foster, Charles C., Jr., 39749A.
Foster, Herbert R., 55741A.
Fosterman, Leslie E., 38615A.
Fought, Oliver C., 39467A.
Fowle, Bernard H., 39177A.
Fowler, Felix C., 38876A.
Fowler, William A., 38940A.
Frady, Ellis E., 39573A.
Fraley, Elmer E., 52629A.
Francis, Albert H., 24424A.
Frankie, Merton J., 40160A.
Franscioni, Warren R., 38597A.
Franson, Vernon A., 52583A.
Franz, Donald F., 39261A.
Frazee, Merle W., 52549A.
Frear, Carl R., Jr., 17869A.
Frey, Arthur C., 40105A.
Frey, Ivan R., 25535A.
Frey, Joseph L., 39945A.
Friss, Raymond J., Jr., 23907A.
Frost, Keith I., 39140A.
Fruit, James A., 52609A.
Fry, Loyal W., 39768A.
Fuller, Walter T., 38739A.
Fulton, Fay D., 39614A.
Funk, Donald J., 40306A.
Funk, John C., 39767A.
Funke, Robert W., 38944A.
Furnace, Earl., 24362A.
Furr, Richard H., 39698A.
Furr, William W., 39595A.
Gabriel, Joseph A., 38791A.
Gaddis, Norman C., 26772A.
Gaffey, John T, 2d., 22859A.
Gagnon, Lawrence, 40141A.
Gallagher, Gilbert G., 39494A.
Galloway, James D., 38756A.
Galloway, William A., 38943A.
Galpin, Harry T., 24348A.
Galt, John R., 39626A.
Galt, Robert, Jr., 40033A.
Galyon, Hershel E., 39286A.
Gantz, Henry L., Jr., 52648A.
Garner, Vernon W., 40210A.
Garrigus, Norman F., 39069A.
Garrison, Joseph B., 60043A.
Garrison, Robert F., 39999A.
Garvey, Joseph J., 23932A.
Gavin, Herbert J., 39013A.
Gayikian, Hyko, 39339A.
George, Edsel L., 40063A.
Georgi, William F., 38567A.
Geurtz, James E., 39130A.
Gibbs, Guy W., 52599A.
Gibson, Ben S., 52606A.
Gibson, Charles V., 40337A.
Gibson, Millard L., 40282A.
Gibson, Robert E., 38923A.
Gilbert, John P., 39674A.
Giles, Richard S., 39067A.
Gill, Albert A., 38704A.
Gill, John L., 40044A.
Gillespie, Clinton G., 17943A.
Gilliland, Billy I., 39741A.
Gillogly, Harold S., 17828A.
Giuntini, Louis J., 39131A.
Given, Robert B., 39048A.
Givens, Robert W., 49308A.
Glass, Wilbur A., 39211A.
Gleason, Joseph P., 21519A.
Gobrecht, William W., 27540A.
Goddard, Alvin E., 52612A.
Goddard, Glen, 39267A.
Godwin, Curtis B., 39631A.
Goebel, Robert J., 22843A.
Goetz, Frank M., Jr., 52649A.
Goff, Wilbur, 38744A.
Gohmert, Leon L., 40000A.
Golart, Milton J., 40248A.
Golden, James K., 38803A.
Golley, Robert W., 40272A.
Gomes, Louis A., 39796A.
Gonshor, Frank J., 39547A.
Goodale, Earl S., 39181A.
Goode, Bernice L., 38997A.
Goodman, Jack L., 39605A.
Goodman, John S., 38663A.
Goolsby, John A., Jr., 39697A.
Goon, Robert J., 40036A.
Gordon, Byfield D., 40214A.
Gordon, David T., 39583A.
Gorrell, Joseph E., 17792A.
Gosdin, Malcolm E., 39515A.
Goss, Raymond, Jr., 17859A.
Gould, Jack K., 60033A.
Grabfelder, Thomas C., Jr., 40092A.
Graff, Donald L., 40218A.
Graham, James H., 38636A.
Graham, William R., 25521A.
Granberry, James B., 38866A.
Graves, Harold L., 52572A.
Graves, Warren R., 17783A.
Gray, Clayton F., 38690A.
Gray, Prichard E., 28170A.
Green, Boren L., 40101A.
Green, Lowell B., 39607A.
Green, Robert T., 39210A.
Green, Sydney, Jr., 40403A.
Green, Thayne C., 40235A.
Greene, James W., 39827A.
Gregg, Noah B., 39435A.
Gregory, Donald H., 39743A.
Gregory, Stewart M., 38727A.
Grenci, Bruno J., 40383A.
Gribling, Richard L., 20766A.
Griffith, Harold L., 26794A.
Griffith, Sherwood B., 38581A.
Griffith, William T., 25617A.
Grigsby, Donald R., 52607A.
Grindle, Frederick W., Jr., 39669A.
Grisham, Woodie R., 39436A.
Griswold, Truman L., 26777A.
Grossholz, Theodore G., 40338A.
Groves, Frank S., 39579A.
Grubaugh, Andy J., 39256A.
Grunzke, Marvin E., 26759A.
Guarino, Lawrence N., 52573A.
Gunnarson, Kenneth I., 40010A.
Guthrie, John L., 52638A.
Guthrie, Price E., 39592A.
Guzzetta, Frank N., 39935A.
Haas, Arthur D., 40217A.
Haden, Arnold J., 40183A.
Hafey, Howard O., 39437A.
Hagen, Alvin G., 39777A.
Hagerman, Frederick B., 40391A.
Haggerty, Stanley K., 39092A.
Hagood, John E., 38757A.
Haines, Willard R., 38647A.
Hale, Homer G., Jr., 40315A.
Hale, Leland A., Jr., 39720A.
Hale, Robert D., 23757A.
Hale, Robert V., 38746A.
Hale, Verne D., 21520A.
Halicki, Chester J., 26679A.
Hall, Harold B., 38821A.
Hall, James K., 39984A.
Hall, Robert C., 52628A.
Hallmark, Kenneth H., 40374A.
Halpenny, Robert P., 39586A.
Hamblen, Braxton S., 38903A.
Hamer, Redick M., 40124A.
Hamilton, Robert R., 38958A.
Hamlin, Paul A., 38846A.
Hamlin, Ralph E., 52581A.
Hammack, Wayne, 37943A.
Hammock, Frank M., 23824A.
Hammond, Winton G., 24391A.
Handgis, Nicholas G., 39246A.
Haney, Russell K., 39830A.
Hankins, William R., 52613A.
Hanley, John J., 40406A.
Hansel, Dale E., 38950A.
Hansen, Ivan J., 39018A.
Hansen, John R., 39901A.
Hansen, Norman J., 40231A.
Hansen, Raymond A., 39929A.
Hansen, Robin, 38646A.
Hanson, George F., 52636A.
Hanson, Ingebrigt B., 39760A.
Harbison, William R., 39371A.
Harder, Max L., 40372A.
Hardtke, Gerald N., 39360A.
Hare, Warren J., 26865A.
Haripar, George E., 39161A.
Harnitchek, John J., 17933A.
Harper, Thomas W., 52601A.
Harpster, John S., 24441A.
Harris, Harry C., Jr., 38870A.
Harris, Howard F., 39828A.
Harris, Irvin J., 40072A.
Harris, John C., 39145A.
Harris, Joseph W., 38589A.
Harris, Kenneth G., 39889A.
Harris, Samuel C., 39656A.
Hart, Arnold P., 52608A.
Hart, Paul F., 38673A.
Hartig, John L., 38702A.
Hartle, Lawrence E., 39510A.
Hartmann, Ernest F., 39887A.
Hartz, Paul F., 40294A.
Harvey, Denzal T., 39719A.
Harwood, Ray D., 38774A.
Haslanger, Jack C., 39255A.
Hassett, Frank M., Jr., 38861A.
Hassing, Douglas H., 39497A.
Hathaway, Lloyd J., 40090A.
Haug, Paul E., Jr., 39076A.
Haug, Percy H., 40184A.
Haviland, George P., 39251A.
Haworth, Howard N., 40226A.
Hayes, Harry A., Jr., 40266A.
Hayes, William R., 40003A.
Haynes, William E., 25543A.
Hays, Carroll K., 39585A.
Hazle, Robert J., 38541A.
Hazzard, Herbert M., 40070A.
Headberg, Ernest A., Jr., 28265A.
Heasley, Franklin A., 39100A.
Heath, Carl T., Jr., 38802A.
Heath, John H., 52551A.
Heaton, Robert R., 25517A.
Heiser, Robert S., 38751A.
Heisler, Edmond H., 55086A.
Heller, Adam S., 38981A.
Heller, Kenneth E., 37950A.
Hellwege, Richard L., 24364A.
Heman, Howard W., 48816A.
Henage, Guy F., 38745A.
Henderson, Bruce R., 39518A.
Henderson, Donovan E., 38924A.
Henderson, William H., 38648A.
Henriet, George R., 39281A.
Henson, Archie L., 32407A.
Hepperle, John M., 39816A.
Herman, Robert F., 39983A.
Herman, Robert L., 39792A.
Hermanson, Gordon C., 39154A.
Hern, Donald W., 38678A.
Hernandez, Edward, 39785A.
Herndon, Herbert H., 39499A.
Herrin, David C., 52550A.
Herrington, Charles, 39880A.
Herrington, James R., Jr., 38406A.
Hess, Robert M., 38599A.
Hess, Roland L., 40229A.
Hess, Warren C., 38862A.
Hesse, Edward H., Jr., 39148A.
Hewit, Norton M., 39695A.
Hewitt, William W., 39630A.
Hiatt, Dean R., 52554A.
Hichew, Alan L., 39769A.
Hicks, James F., 38695A.
Hicks, Jimmy, 40381A.
Hickson, Dick, Jr., 24427A.
Higgins, Waldron T., 38996A.
Higgins, William M., 22729A.
Hight, Sterling K., 52567A.
Hildebrand, Durston N., 40220A.
Hileman, John T., 38905A.
Hileman, Lawrence R., 39682A.
Hill, Daniel M., 39132A.
Hill, Michael V., 40394A.
Hiller, James D., 39937A.
Hillman, Charles R., 39564A.
Hinck, Raymond W., 39838A.
Hinkle, Frank E., 39914A.
Hinkle, John C., 39407A.
Hiron, Robert A., 40431A.
Hitchcock, William H., 38540A.
Hobbs, Clayton B., 40202A.
Hobbs, Donald W., 39789A.
Hockaday, Billy S., 39581A.
Hodge, Phillip E., 17856A.
Hodges, Samuel L., 38977A.
Hofacker, William A., 17880A.
Hoffman, Charles E., 39678A.
Hoffman, Charles W., 39877A.
Hoffman, George E., 40414A.
Hoffman, Philip A., 39725A.
Hollman, Roy L., 38489A.
Holcomb, Jasper C., 41582A.

Holden, James R., 39908A.
Holdener, Irwin K., 38559A.
Holgate, William R., 37474A.
Holl, Albert E., 39939A.
Holland, Charles R., Jr., 39383A.
Holland, Johnnie J., 39208A.
Holloway, Clarence R., Jr., 38778A.
Holloway, Kenneth M., 40390A.
Holloway, Walker L., 40216A.
Holt, Robert T., 28174A.
Homen, William F., 39301A.
Hooper, Harley R., 39637A.
Hoover, Herbert G., 38705A.
Hopkins, Alfred H., Jr., 25878A.
Hopkins, Julian P., 39948A.
Hopkins, Robert L., 39917A.
Hoppe, Harold O., 39508A.
Hopson, Everett G., 28163A.
Horowitz, Harold, 39786A.
Horton, Woodrow W., 39997A.
Hostettler, John E., Jr., 39793A.
Houck, Rodney, 39776A.
Houlihan, James A., 39465A.
Howard, Elson I., 39121A.
Howarth, Albert R., 38920A.
Howell, John B., 38932A.
Howell, Murrell M., 38982A.
Howland, William A., Jr., 23607A.
Hoyle, Harold F., 40028A.
Hoyt, Ralph A., 39357A.
Hrebec, George M., 39666A.
Hubbard, Glenn A., 37447A.
Hubbard, Richard J., 39390A.
Hubbard, Robert S., 39125A.
Huckabay, Leo L., 39860A.
Hudak, Andrew M., 39438A.
Huddleston, Thomas B., Jr., 39517A.
Hudson, Truett, 40123A.
Huether, Clyde W., 39473A.
Huey, Joseph W., 17844A.
Huff, Donald Y., 39109A.
Huff, Warren C., 54927A.
Huffman, Roy E., 40339A.
Hughes, Leonard A., Jr., 38490A.
Hull, Junior G., 40050A.
Hume, Karl R., 40340A.
Humphreys, Charles B., 17913A.
Hundemer, Howard L., 39111A.
Hunt, Challen P., 40111A.
Hunt, Elbert J., 39387A.
Hunt, John L., 39705A.
Hunt, William T., Jr., 40371A.
Hunter, Douglas S., 40304A.
Hunter, James F., 39810A.
Hupp, Robert D., 38633A.
Hurlbutt, Wallis V., 39016A.
Husten, Harold J., 37256A.
Hutchinson, John J., 39243A.
Hutnyak, Alexander, 38765A.
Hyatt, Bland B., Jr., 39625A.
Hyland, Arthur W., 38738A.
Hynds, Kermit C., 38523A.
Hyson, Floyd R., 39275A.
Hyson, John W., 40268A.
Ingram, Kenneth E., 40341A.
Isaac, Kenneth W., 39012A.
Jackley, Leonard A., 38811A.
Jackson, Gene W., 39381A.
Jackson, Malden M., 38812A.
Jacot, Charles J., 39241A.
Jacques, Paul D., 39087A.
James, Herbert W., 39464A.
James, John W., 39818A.
James, Richard A., 39190A.
James, Robert L., 39410A.
James, Roy P., 40265A.
Janensch, William C., 38715A.
January, Jack, Jr., 38813A.
Janus, Victor F., 40342A.
Jashinski, Victor H., 24709A.
Jeancon, Wallace, 52561A.
Jeane, Grover S., 39264A.
Jee, James K., 40211A.
Jefferson, William H., 39483A.
Jeffries, Clark L., 39878A.
Jenkins, Edward D., 40257A.
Jenney, Bruce C., 39143A.
Jennings, George R., 38666A.
Jennings, Robert G., 39440A.
Jensen, Niels C., 52548A.
Jester, William B., Jr., 39506A.
Jett, John L., 38685A.
Jiru, Edward J., Jr., 39307A.
John, William E., 39802A.
Johnson, Charles D., 28233A.
Johnson, Charles T., 38595A.
Johnson, Donald E., 40104A.
Johnson, Edward E., 39104A.
Johnson, James C., 24716A.
Johnson, James G., 24436A.
Johnson, Joseph A., 40343A.
Johnson, Kenneth, 39924A.
Johnson, Kenneth V., 38545A.
Johnson, Leroy J., 39237A.
Johnson, Lloyd F., 26792A.
Johnson, Marvin W., 22848A.
Johnson, Michael C., 38718A.
Johnson, Robert E., Jr., 38064A.
Johnson, Robert L., 39765A.
Johnson, Sidney L., 39441A.
Johnson, Wilson W., 39389A.
Jolley, Edward R., 40276A.
Jones, Donald G., 25805A.
Jones, Edward F., Jr., 39225A.
Jones, Francis L., 38623A.
Jones, Glendon P., 39367A.
Jones, Henry A., 39120A.
Jones, Herbert W., 39538A.
Jones, Jack R., 39152A.
Jones, John F., 39442A.
Jones, John T., 40119A.
Jones, John W., 37177A.
Jones, Kenneth T., 40032A.
Jones, Marvin J., 39372A.
Jones, Paul E., 40187A.
Jones, Robert L., 27681A.
Jones, Thomas J., 40292A.
Jones, William H., 39166A.
Josephs, Jay S., 17793A.
Joyal, Wilfred N., 40384A.
Joyce, William A., 39105A.
Juskie, Ben, 38770A.
Kaiser, Howard H., 39718A.
Kaliher, William B., 55085A.
Kalmus, Stuart R., 39811A.
Kane, Robert W., 38864A.
Kapfhamer, Robert W., 39895A.
Kastris, John, Jr., 17837A.
Kavanagh, Donal D., 17809A.
Kayner, Howard W., 55748A.
Keay, Merlyn R., 38538A.
Kebelman, Frank L., Jr., 39134A.
Keeler, John W., 40402A.
Keeney, Ralph H., 39844A.
Keeper, George F., 39258A.
Keith, Clifford N., 39378A.
Keith, James A., 40305A.
Keller, Chester N., 39856A.
Kelley, Edmund E., 40041A.
Kelly, Eugene E., 25622A.
Kelly, Howerth E., 39183A.
Kelly, James M., 40379A.
Kelly, John V., Jr., 40377A.
Kelly, Raymond R., 39408A.
Ken, Shelton D., 38590A.
Kemp, Salvadore W., Jr., 39443A.
Kempffer, William L., 37579A.
Keneally, John T., 39044A.
Kennedy, Jack M., 38984A.
Kennedy, James S., 39039A.
Kennedy, James V., 40052A.
Kennedy, Joe W., 38712A.
Kennedy, Joseph R., 39753A.
Kenney, Paul E., 40300A.
Kent, Richard D., 38446A.
Kerchner, Frank S., 39491A.
Kerin, Leo, 38948A.
Kermes, William J., 38484A.
Kerr, Robert L., 39804A.
Kersey, Lesley L., 52556A.
Kettenacker, Frederick W., 39037A.
Key, Sydney E., 39920A.
Keyes, Karl E., 52651A.
Kidd, Elbert L., 39694A.
Kidder, Arthur W., Jr., 40138A.
Kieckhaefer, Robert V., 24543A.
Kieffer, William L., Jr., 26852A.
Kiely, Joseph A., Jr., 39862A.
Kier, Leonard F., 39374A.
Kilmain, Paul R., 40225A.
Kilpatrick, Billy J., 39444A.
Kimberlin, William T., 40084A.
Kimmey, Nelson W., 38978A.
King, Daniel C., 39476A.
King, Darryl L., 39424A.
King, Paul W., 38786A.
King, Raymond J., Jr., 40171A.
King, Welton R., 21465A.
Kinney, Charles W., 28267A.
Kinney, Oliver C., 39090A.
Kipfer, Donald C., 17819A.
Kipp, Richard J., 39962A.
Kirkaldie, Donald J., 37593A.
Kirkendall, Elmer L., 40064A.
Kirkpatrick, Arthur R., 38591A.
Kirkpatrick, Norbert W., 38556A.
Kirwan, Thomas E., 39943A.
Klarer, David B., 39680A.
Klatt, Walter L., Jr., 39061A.
Klein, Raymond W., 39116A.
Kline, Donald I., 39728A.
Kline, Russell H., 38698A.
Klingensmith, Robert J., Jr., 39707A.
Klingon, Arthur J., 39734A.
Klippel, Gilbert F., 39946A.
Klopper, Frederick H., 39663A.
Knego, George J., 39242A.
Knight, Harold W., 49307A.
Knoles, Thomas M., 3d, 17969A.
Knotts, Ulysses S., Jr., 17874A.
Knox, James B., 39988A.
Knutty, Harold P., 38617A.
Kochanek, Zygmunt K., 39714A.
Koehler, John J., 39972A.
Koezon, Chester F., 39265A.
Kong, Jane R. H., 40263A.
Kosa, Milton E., 28164A.
Kosko, Albert W., 39621A.
Kough, Edward L., 40312A.
Kramer, Richard G., 38853A.
Kramer, Roy A., 38609A.
Krannichfeld, James H., 39079A.
Kratochvil, Otto, 25618A.
Krause, Erbie H., 38570A.
Kritzer, Edward A., 17825A.
Krueger, Leroy W., 39445A.
Kuchta, Daniel J., 24465A.
Kuestner, Frank G., 39107A.
Kuhlmann, Ralph A., 39735A.
Kuhn, Charles M., 40344A.
Kuhner, George C., Jr., 40094A.
Kulenguski, Joseph A., 39703A.
Kuns, Virgil W., 40042A.
Kupec, Frank E., 40029A.
Kyle, Graham G., 38603A.
Laahs, William, 39991A.
Laclair, Earl E., 38901A.
Lacy, Martin W., 39713A.
Lacy, William E., 48818A.
Ladd, Robert E., 40222A.
Lafetra, Vincent H., Jr., 39973A.
Laforge, James L., Jr., 38611A.
Lakeman, Lyndon F., 39722A.
Lamb, Claude D., 39330A.
Lamb, James A., 39014A.
Lamb, Thomas J., 40075A.
Lambert, Joseph L., Jr., 39249A.
Lambertson, Robert T., 38930A.
Lampp, Larry L., 39263A.
Lancaster, Eugene B., 39967A.
Lane, Chester H., Jr., 40345A.
Lane, P. B., 40176A
Lang, George A., 39411A.
Langdon, Robert B., 39262A.
Langner, William K., 39974A.
Lare, John, 38618A.
Larkins, John T., 39159A.
Larrabee, Jack M., 38494A.
Larsen, Bruno M., 40298A.
Larson, Richard L., 39000A.
Larson, Robert D., 39030A.
Lassiter, Sherrod B., 40346A.
Laub, Philip F., 40274A.
Launderville, Jon W., 39248A.
Lauterbach, William R., 40053A.
Lawrence, Billy, 39478A.
Lawton, James B., 40180A.
Layman, Harvey G., 39562A.
Leaon, James S., 23731A.
Learnard, Charles R., 39652A.
Lechner, August H., Jr., 39922A.
Lee, James W., 40083A.
Lee, Leo J., 39446A.

Leesburg, William W., 39554A.
Leff, Wilbur H., 39323A.
Legg, Robert W., 40424A.
Lehn, Denis J., 39046A.
Leib, David, 48815A.
LeMaire, Alphonse J., Jr., 38760A.
Lemar, Richard B., 39118A.
Lemoine, Bennie F., 38689A.
Lenyo, Frank, 39819A.
Leonard, Edwin P., 38679A.
Lepard, Donald G., 39362A.
Lerner, Robert J., 39425A.
Leslie, Ralph I., 40147A.
Leveritt, John A., 39212A.
Levy, Irwin J., 40347A.
Levy, William, 39206A.
Lewis, David, 38644A.
Lewis, Elroy M., 39205A.
Lewis, Leslie M., 39135A.
Lewis, Richmond R., 39940A.
Lewis, Thomas R., 52621A.
Lewis, William M., 39496A.
Leyser, Harry C., 3d, 39024A.
Ligon, Delbert B., 39520A.
Lilly, Albert J., 39182A.
Limotti, Ettore T., 39865A.
Lindberg, Kenneth F., 40097A.
Linn, Wilfrid A., 40348A.
Linsley, Kenneth W., 55845A.
Lionberger, Fred R., 39985A.
Lipford, Edward T., 40186A.
Lipp, Robert A., 39859A.
Litherland, Kenneth R., 52643A.
Littman, Arthur L., 38616A.
Litz, James E., 38840A.
Livengood, Donald R., Jr., 39269A.
Livingston, Ira L., 39447A.
Livingston, Noyes B., Jr., 38564A.
Locke, W. Grim, 17800A.
Locker, H. M., 38569A.
Logwin, Frank J., 40116A.
Lohr, Thane S., 40349A.
Long, Billy J., 25817A.
Long, George W., 38979A.
Long, Harry F., 40281A.
Long, Jesse P., 38525A.
Longhill, John D., 38561A.
Longwell, Frank C., 17890A.
Looms, Richard T., 39094A.
Looney, Forrest K., 38544A.
Lorenzo, Donald W., 23936A.
Loret, Benjamin J., 17764A.
Loring, Phillip N., 38450A.
Losi, P. Peter, 39647A.
Love, William V., 39283A.
Lovell, Richard B., Jr., 40049A.
Low, David S., 38535A.
Lowery, Jack M., 38573A.
Lua, Royal C., 24554A.
Lucas, Frank C., 38571A.
Lucas, Robert E., 40369A.
Luecke, Christian J., 39033A.
Lumley, David R., 38827A.
Lund, Ralph G., 39959A.
Lunde, Berlie L., 38965A.
Lunn, Thomas J., 39636A.
Luttrell, Donald A., 24443A.
Lynch, William H., 17772A.
Lynn, George R., 40350A.
Mabie, Carroll S., 40405A.
MacCartney, Gaylord, 17810A.
MacDonald, Donald, 39684A.
MacFarlane, John F., 52592A.
MasFarran, Donald J., 23838A.
MacPherson, Stephen J., 20710A.
Macsata, Albert, 38782A.
Madden, William P., 39761A.
Maddox, Roy L., 17950A.
Maddux, Gerald M., 38537A.
Maffett, Thomas O., 52614A.
Magee, Vernon E., 40261A.
Maher, John L., 40082A.
Malanga, Ralph R., 40192A.
Malone, Grover D., 40169A.
Malone, William R., Jr., 18307A.
Mansell, Robert A., Jr., 39627A.
Mansfield, John L., 22757A.
Mansfield, Wiley G., 39326A.
Maraist, James E., 39905A.
Marantos, James, 39298A.
Marble, Robert B., 39385A.
Marin, Laddie, 39775A.
Mariner, Melvin L., 38151A.
Marion, Louis E., 38657A.
Marren, Thomas J., 38688A.
Marsh, Halbert G., 40387A.
Marsh, Howard E., 39548A.
Marsh, Otto L., 52627A.
Marsh, Robert H., 40076A.
Marsters, Thomas C., 24492A.
Martin, Albert D., 38654A.
Martin, Carl E., 40139A.
Martin, Claude L., 40351A.
Martin, Fred R., 39327A.
Martin, Gerald L., 39533A.
Martin, Harry D., 39876A.
Martin, James P., 39320A.
Martin, Lawrence H., 40264A.
Martin, Leonard W., 52547A.
Martin, Matthew R., 38852A.
Martin, Raymond L., 39869A.
Martin, Reese S., 39068A.
Martin, Samuel A., Jr., 39651A.
Martin, William R., 39683A.
Martina, Emil J., 39825A.
Martinsen, Arnold N., 38733A.
Mashburn, Mayo L., 25625A.
Mason, Arno R., 35985A.
Massie, Herbert W., 52591A.
Massy, Gerald W., 3d, 39397A.
Mastin, Edward B., Jr., 52541A.
Mathews, Thomas J., 10996A.
Mathis, Robert C., 17787A.
Matson, Charles A., Jr., 52564A.
Matsuo, Jon T., 21472A.
Maurer, Frederick A., 39857A.
Maurer, Harold L., 39964A.
Maxwell, Neil D., 40142A.
McAdow, Robert E., 40352A.
McAlister, Ray H., 39721A.
McAnaw, Robert R., 40069A.
McAuliffe, Joseph C., 39923A.
McCafferty, Wallace B., 39874A.
McCaffrey, George A., 38967A.
McCain, Clint B., Jr., 39788A.
McCall, Charles D., 39200A.
McCarthy, John W., 38892A.
McCarthy, William E., 27541A.
McCarty, Richard E., 41968A.
McClain, Howard E., 27685A.
McCleary, John P., 39363A.
McClellan, James W., 38868A.
McCloskey, Charles L., Jr., 38530A.
McCombs, Ward L., 40422A.
McConnell, Carlton H., 22853A.
McCormick, John R., 40159A.
McCoy, J. B. Leroy, 40166A.
McCracken, David L., Jr., 23740A.
McCrum, Joseph A., Jr., 39791A.
McCulloch, Robert G., 38946A.
McCullough, Donald T., 39799A.
McCurrach, David F., Jr., 38956A.
McDaniel, Juell H., 39855A.
McDonald, William A., 39858A.
McEachern, Lawrence J., 39380A.
McElroy, Eugene J., 39733A.
McFarland, Robert J., 38851A.
McGaffigan, Bernard A., 39295A.
McGarey, Robert C., 26467A.
McGauhey, John F., 39088A.
McGee, Robert E., 17924A.
McGee, Robert E., Jr., 38747A.
McGilvra, Lyle E., 39202A.
McGinness, William T., 17760A.
McGinnis, William R., 38501A.
McGraw, Warner R., 39599A.
McGuire, James, 38826A.
McHenry, Gordon D., 23749A.
McInerney, Francis W., Jr., 17834A.
McKane, William D., 38819A.
McKean, Harvey F., 39727A.
McKinney, Eugene D., 39291A.
McKnight, Fred J., 39782A.
McLanathan, Frank L., 38902A.
McLean, Harlan E., 40016A.
McMacken, Roger L., 40418A.
McMannus, Kenneth L., 39122A.
McMullen, James A., 39963A.
McMullen, Robert B., 39201A.
McQueen, Sebron A., Jr., 38808A.
McRae, John E., 39710A.
McShan, Charles W., Jr., 40018A.
McSwane, Noble J., 39635A.
McWhirter, Ralph W., Jr., 40048A.
Mechling, Harold L., 39364A.
Mederios, Everett J., 40140A.
Meeboer, William J., 39062A.
Meester, Jay J., 26433A.
Meikle, William A., 40154A.
Meiners, Eugene E., 38612A.
Mendell, Ross P., Jr., 38687A.
Merrill, Orrin S., 38884A.
Merritt, Jack, Jr., 39336A.
Messenger, Marion J., 39537A.
Messinger, Clyde L., 40286A.
Meunier, Gerald R., 40073A.
Meyers, John D., 39178A.
Michael, Florence S., Jr., 39066A.
Michela, Donald A., 39843A.
Middleton, William J., 40319A.
Mihalik, Andrew P., 39041A.
Milian, Paul J., 39110A.
Millar, Ward M., 38847A.
Miller, Don E., 39975A.
Miller, Ernest C., 38759A.
Miller, Frederick C., 39204A.
Miller, Hale L., 38985A.
Miller, Harry, Jr., 39035A.
Miller, Leroy H., 40158A.
Miller, Loman E., 39916A.
Miller, Robert B., 39345A.
Miller, Stanley W., 40385A.
Mills, Donald C., 38834A.
Mills, Harold W., 52617A.
Mills, Joseph E., 39575A.
Milsap, Galen M., 39325A.
Miner, Richard L., 17777A.
Minge, Ross S., 39821A.
Minor, Charles B., 39809A.
Minor, William T., 38649A.
Minter, Charles F., Sr., 26836A.
Mitchell, Harold E., 39402A.
Mitchell, Horace J., Jr., 38783A.
Mitchell, James T., 40201A.
Moberley, Ralph H., Jr., 25614A.
Mohr, Joseph, Jr., 39896A.
Monahan, Frank I., Jr., 39260A.
Monteith, Rowan M., Jr., 39311A.
Montoya, Eduardo M., 40417A.
Moody, Horace E., 40103A.
Moody, William P., 39027A.
Moon, James H., 38554A.
Moore, Edwin L., 39191A.
Moore, Jackie N., 21509A.
Moore, John H., Jr., 40252A.
Moore, Lawrence, Jr., 40353A.
Moore, Otis C., 17756A.
Moorhead, Rex K., 40408A.
Moorman, Alvin R., 24760A.
Moran, Joseph R., 23813A.
Moran, William M., 39658A.
Morasch, John, 39957A.
Moreland, Alvin G., 40284A.
Moreland, William, Jr., 38798A.
Morello, John M., 39151A.
Morgan, James D., 39993A.
Morgan, Rhonel E., 17814A.
Morin, Chester W., 40246A.
Morrell, Donald W., 40065A.
Morrell, Franklin H., 39893A.
Morris, Jean E., 26682W.
Morris, Joseph, 38660A.
Morris, Thomas H., Jr., 39778A.
Morris, William E., 52586A.
Morrisey, Richard J., 39563A.
Morrison, Robert A., 38550A.
Morrison, Robert B., 39361A.
Morrissey, James C., 39236A.
Morrow, Robert W., 39349A.
Mortimer, Wyndham G., 40354A.
Moseley, Mark L., 38914A.
Moss, Richard T., 49305A.
Mosteiro, Nicholas J., 39759A.
Mount, George K., 39854A.
Moy, Hugh A., 24366A.
Muehlenweg, James A., 17778A.
Mueller, Frank J., 38631A.
Mulkins, Winfield G., 40355A.
Mumma, Morton C., 3d, 17773A.
Mumme, Marvin E., 39840A.
Mundorf, George E., 39099A.
Murphy, Eugene C., 39613A.
Murphy, James F., 40002A.
Murphy, James P., 38931A.

Murphy, John J., 39861A.
Murphy, John J., 24729A.
Murphy, Martin H., 39976A.
Murphy, Paul J., 37659A.
Murra, Richard J., 40155A.
Murray, Jack G., 24490A.
Murray, Raymond K., 40389A.
Murray, Robert P., 38518A.
Musselman, Everett P., 39853A.
Myers, Andrew L., 39421A.
Myers, Charlie C., 24547A.
Myers, Harold E., 39221A.
Myers, James B., 39764A.
Myers, John E., 39750A.
Myers, Wilbur D., 39449A.
Myers, William W., 39879A.
Mykicz, John H., 39419A.
Nadler, Marion R., 40409A.
Nagel, Mark L., 39077A.
Nankervis, Jack, 38709A.
Narem, James E., 38509A.
Nase, Earle P., 25834A.
Nash, Edward J., 39416A.
Nash, William M., 39097A.
Navarre, Joseph W., 40005A.
Neale, James M., 24712A.
Nelson, Gordon P., 39839A.
Nelson, Harlan E., 38921A.
Nelson, William R., 25538A.
Neri, Charles A., 40006A.
Nesbit, Evan R., 39762A.
Newcomb, John H., 39414A.
Newkirk, John R., 39138A.
Newman, Edward C., 38730A.
Newsom, Charlie L., Jr., 40357A.
Newton, John R., Jr., 17858A.
Newton, William J., 40270A.
Newton, William M., 39934A.
Neyhart, Charles A., 26778A.
Nichols, Jimmy L., 25802A.
Nichols, Roland A., 39450A.
Nickum, Willard E., 39692A.
Nidiffer, Terry J., 38672A.
Niedenthal, Eugene J., 40126A.
Niehaus, Joseph M., Jr., 39918A.
Niemiec, Rudolph P., 39376A.
Nixon, Henry L., 25544A.
Nixon, Robert O., 38986A.
Noah, Richard B., 39751A.
Nobles, Paskell, 38734A.
Nolte, William A., Jr., 39017A.
Norden, Arthur J., 39170A.
Nordquist, Ernest O., 39314A.
Nordstrom, Paul R., 39570A.
Normand, George H., 22789A.
Norris, Basil S., 25624A.
North, Richard A., 60036A.
Norton, Charles W., Jr., 24416A.
Norton, John W., 40060A.
Norvell, Robert A., 39388A.
Norwood, Ross M., 40008A.
Novak, Joseph A., 39662A.
Novi, Frank J., 38872A.
Nunenkamp, Victor L., 39504A.
Nunn, Lloyd B., Jr., 38987A.
Nunnally, Frank W., 24433A.
O'Brien, Joseph T., 38795A.
O'Brien, Paul E., 39539A.
Odell, Ivan E., 39187A.
Ogan, Russell G., 25880A.
Ogus, Allen G., 38752A.
O'Hagan, Richard N., 39098A.
O'Hara, Joseph J., Jr., 39953A.
Ohman, Clifton P., 40273A.
Oliver, Hugh R., 40129A.
Olk, William J., 40237A.
Olsen, Matthias C., 39867A.
Olson, Edward J., 38578A.
Oncay, Frank, Jr., 40093A.
Ong, Augie T., 24765A.
Oram, Norman E., 26825A.
Oranges, Chester N., 40030A.
Orcutt, Robert R., 39644A.
Ormerod, Sidney, 60032A.
Orr, Donald E., 39420A.
Ortagus, Alvin J., 40358A.
Orth, James E., 40285A.
Orth, Paul R., 38737A.
Osborn, Walter T., 39832A.
Osburn, John C., 38935A.
Ostrowski, George S., 40375A.
Ottomann, Raymond H., 38953A.
Owen. William V., 39873A.
Owens, Grant R., 40045A.
Owens, Harold K., 39168A.
Owens, Hugh S., 40078A.
Owens, James, 38814A.
Oxley. James E., 40026A.
Oxner, Elburn R., 38577A.
Ozenick, Phillip M., 28232A.
Pagano, Thomas G., 39338A.
Page, James E.. Jr., 60039A.
Page, Richard E., Jr., 38750A.
Pagliero, Gerald J., 38735A.
Palmer, Daniel J., 40167A.
Palmer, John S., 39222A.
Palmer, Lyle F., 52604A.
Palmer, Wallace J., 24526A.
Palmore, Wilson V., 26785A.
Pape, Fred H., 39952A.
Pappas, George A., Jr., 38974A.
Paquette, Eugene M., 39740A.
Pardi, Angelo V., 60048A.
Parish, Norman W., 39451A.
Park, Richard E., 39870A.
Parker, Carl U., 39841A.
Parker, Michael N., 17929A.
Parmelee, Deane S., Jr., 38816A.
Parrish, C. T., 40310A.
Partridge, Henry L., 40267A.
Partridge, Lloyd R., 39885A.
Pate, Clarence B., Jr.. 24374A.
Pater. Robert E., 17838A.
Patrick, J. M., 39559A.
Patten, John P., 39577A.
Patterson, Edward C., 26758A.
Patterson, George A., 38822A.
Patterson, George B., 39513A.
Paul, Warren R., 39218A.
Paulson. Gerald F., 38519A.
Payne, Gilbert L., 38598A.
Payne, Robert R., 38716A.
Pearson, James D., 38970A.
Pearson, Wesley D., 38910A.
Pease, Charles M., 38557A.
Peck, J. Loren, 39084A.
Pedersen, Myron E., 38701A.
Pederson, Herbert A., Jr., 28266A.
Peede, Floyd A., Jr., 22840A.
Pendergrass, Louis A., 39866A.
Penn, James W., 39779A.
Pensyl, Jon P., 40199A.
Peoples, Lewis J., 52611A.
Perkins, Roland L., 40170A.
Perrone, Michael, 28238A.
Perry, Emil F., 39521A.
Perry. Gales P., 38505A.
Perry, Robert H., 25530A.
Perry, William E., 60040A.
Peter, Fred S., 19849A.
Peterson, Dean H., 40324A.
Peterson, Donald J., 38539A.
Peterson, Elmer L., 40359A.
Peterson, John E., 40156A.
Peterson, Maurice D.. 40188A.
Petree, Lennox I., 17865A.
Pettersen, John N., 40400A.
Petzoldt, Edward L., 40151A.
Pfeiffer, Rheuna B., 39732A.
Phelps, Ralph M., Jr., 39754A.
Philip, Willis D., Jr., 40175A.
Phillips, Daryl W., 52597A.
Phillips, Henry P., 40148A.
Phillips, John H., 39600A.
Phillips, Norman L., 24738A.
Phillips, Thomas A., Jr., 17776A.
Pichon, Martha A., 40117W
Pickering, John C., 17750A.
Picket, Paul E., 38961A.
Pierson, Leonard W., 17931A.
Pierson, William C., 51688A.
Pimentel, Frank R., 39744A.
Pinjuv, George I., 39312A.
Pinyerd, George C.. 39095A.
Pitt, Thomas F., 39370A.
Pittenger, Richard M., 28302A.
Plant, Kenneth A., 23855A.
Plotkin, Philip P., 52574A.
Poff, Edward H., 39289A.
Pogreba, Dean A., 52644A.
Poindexter, Robert W., 39384A.
Poland, Laverne W., 17868A.
Poltrock, William K., 38998A.
Pomeroy, Robert M., 17795A.
Pompan, Jacob B., 17832A.
Pool, Robert W., 38605A.
Pope, Bismark, Jr., 54925A.
Pope, Phillip W., 20729A.
Portenoy, Norman S., 38568A.
Porter, Clarence E., 39305A.
Porter, James R., 39998A.
Porter, Philip S., 17854A.
Porter, William T., Jr., 39452A.
Posner, Jack I., 22846A.
Posniak, Alexander R., 40085A.
Poss. Cecil J., 52570A.
Postlewaite, James F., 3d 39655A.
Pote, Lawrence R., 39990A.
Potter, Frederick F., 38560A.
Powell, Elmer M., 40039A.
Powell, Roy B., 39781A.
Powers Robert J., 39936A.
Pozos, Gonzalo R., 40350A.
Preciado, Robert A., 38780A.
Preston, Rollin K., 39028A.
Pribil, James T., 40410A.
Price, George H., 39966A.
Price, Thomas J., 38894A.
Priest. James M., 38725A.
Priest, Raymond, Jr., 39580A.
Prince William G., 38549A.
Prior Richard C., 38796A.
Procario. Rinaldo N., 39306A.
Proctor, Gerald E., 38354A.
Proper, Dale S., 38975A.
Prosser, Arthur, Jr., 39053A.
Provan, James A., 39462A.
Prunko, Edward S., 38952A.
Puckett, Donald L., 40088A.
Pullen, Roland T., 17936A.
Purcell, Charles H., 40131A.
Purvis, Frank R., 39399A.
Putnam, Joseph W., 40046A.
Pyles, Wayne M., 39771A.
Quanbeck, Alton H., 17790A.
Quigley, Edward S., 40388A.
Quillin, James A., 23775A.
Quimby, Richard M., Jr., 39526A.
Quinn, Bernard W., 38833A.
Rabby, Carlos J., Jr., 39180A.
Rader, Norvin E., 23884A.
Radzieta, John, 39875A.
Raffy, Alexander, Jr., 38988A.
Ragolia, Joseph H., 39898A.
Raidt, Francis J., 39553A.
Ralston, Gilbert R., Jr., 39700A.
Rambo, Gerald G., 52626A.
Rambo, Joseph S., Jr., 38831A.
Ramey, Kenneth, 38837A.
Ramsey, Frank D., 28236A.
Rank, Raymond, Jr., 39742A.
Rankin, Robert E., 40133A.
Rasco, Joe R., 40034A.
Ray, Colonel S., Jr., 26755A.
Rayburn, Everette W.. 38779A.
Raynor, Marjorie H., 39897W.
Reading, Ned A., 40181A.
Rearick, Harry R., 39354A.
Reary Purcell A., 40293A.
Rebentisch, Carl T., 39921A.
Redwine, Charles H., 39369A.
Reed, George G., Jr., 38935A.
Reed, Norman F., 39058A.
Reed. Robert L., 39073A.
Reed, Walter S., Jr., 38758A.
Reed, William. 23854A.
Reel, Donald E., 39938A.
Rees, John C., 39036A.
Regnier, Ralph R., 39906A.
Reichart, Stuart R., 24269A.
Reichert, Joseph J., 40079A.
Reid, James F., 40239A.
Reid, Joe W., 40115A,
Reid, Salvie L., 39587A.
Reilly, Colin C., 39798A.
Reslie, William J., 38951A.
Reynolds, Harold D., 40096A.
Reynolds, Robert H., 40413A.
Reznicek, Walter J., Jr., 39550A.
Riccioni, Everest E., 39919A.
Rice, Edward P., 40190A.
Rice, Henry R., 38976A.
Rice, Robert H., 52542A.

Richardson, Cecil B., 40401A.
Richardson, Lewis H., 39165A.
Richardson, Thomas R., Jr., 40121A.
Rickert, John T., 26475A.
Rickett, George G., 39025A.
Rickey, Stanton M., 38655A.
Ricks, Albert C., Jr., 38566A.
Ricks, Keith D., 40037A.
Riddle, Andrew M., 40254A.
Ridgley, David W., 38836A.
Riegel, Norbert H., 39287A.
Rihs, Robert E., 40038A.
Riley, James W., 38942A.
Rindy, Dean R., 17927A.
Ringley, Howard D., 40109A.
Riopelle, Armand C., 39686A.
Rivers, Robert W., 40249A.
Rives, James M., 40114A.
Roberds, William T., 39207A.
Roberts, Joseph B., Jr., 38850A.
Roberts, Lawrence D., 40102A.
Roberts, Thomas G., 48825A.
Robertson, Roy G., 52559A.
Robertson, Vernon M., 40380A.
Robinette, James R., 38908A.
Robinson, Fred E., 52646A.
Robinson, Jackson L., 39453A.
Robinson, John A., Jr., 52639A.
Robinson, John R., 39475A.
Robinson, Lorin E., 39480A.
Robinson, Robert C., 39032A.
Robinson, Robert M., 39304A.
Robinson, William C., 23811A.
Robson, Herbert W., 40208A.
Robson, Walter M., 40098A.
Roche, William M., 40059A.
Rockey, Gene E., 38625A.
Roddey, Wilbur C., 40392A.
Roderick, Wilson P., 38547A.
Rodgers, Jaffus M., 38634A.
Rodstein, Bernard, 25836A.
Roehling, Arthur J., 60049A.
Rohan, Francis J., 39864A.
Roll, Franklin T., 40238A.
Roll, Frederick A., Jr., 24494A.
Rollag, Stanley A., 39043A.
Rollings, Kenneth M., 38957A.
Romanick, Albert M., 39820A.
Roney, William R., 17503A.
Rookey, Earl J., 39623A.
Rose, Charles L., 39498A.
Rose, Joseph C., Jr., 39238A.
Rose, Robert W., 39253A.
Rosencrans, Evan W., 17807A.
Ross, Anello P., 39019A.
Ross, Billy L., 52582A.
Ross, Harlan P., 3d, 39296A.
Rostamo, Robert H., 39774A.
Rowden, Robert W., 39409A.
Rowe, Charles E., 38776A.
Rowland, Marvin O., 22744A.
Roy, John D., Jr., 39848A.
Royse, Romie R., 38753A.
Ruby, Robert C., 38755A.
Rucker, Carl L., 38916A.
Rucker, Emmett, Jr., 38511A.
Rude, Donald B., 52624A.
Rudolph, Richard H., 39136A.
Ruff, Howard C., 38613A.
Rundquist, Maurice A., 39454A.
Rush, Robert E., 52632A.
Rusk, Richard N., 17857A.
Russell, Floyd H., 24772A.
Russell, Homer A., Jr., 26444A.
Russell, John L., 39479A.
Rutherford, Lawrence C., Jr., 38742A.
Rutter, George W., 17770A.
Ryan, Donald F., 39558A.
Ryan, Elliott J., 38960A.
Ryan, John E., 52536A.
Ryan, John J., 39074A.
Ryan, John P., 39188A.
Ryan, John W., 39418A.
Ryan, Michael O., 39300A.
Sadler, Robert A., 52552A.
Sadorf, Richard J., 28324A.
Sagely, Commodore H., 38863A.
Salemi, Matteo A., 39137A.
Sallas, George M., 39377A.
Sameshima, Ko S., 40260A.
Sammons, Colvin L., 60045A.
Sammons, Willis A., 38994A.
Sample, Reuben A., 39139A.
Sanders, Gilmore L., 22821A.
Sandman, James G., 17762A.
Sands, William H., 38936A.
Sanford, Glen M., 39871A.
Sanford, John L., 39172A.
Sanks, Julius F., 22791A.
Sansing, James C., Sr., 39192A.
Sardonia, Joseph D., 39373A.
Sargent, George T., 52565A.
Sasser, Eldon L., 39455A.
Sausville, Robert A., 38713A.
Savage, Walter G., 40163A.
Savino, Louis J., 39309A.
Sayles, Stanley B., 38345A.
Saylor, George H., 22824A.
Scaroni, Harrison G., Jr., 38845A.
Schad, Jacob R., 40242A.
Schaeffer, Lawrence M., 40066A.
Schanberger, Frederick L., 38889A.
Scheer, Henry F., 39736A.
Schiele, Joe S., 17921A.
Schilke, Adolph C., Jr., 39989A.
Schissell, Peggy L. R., 39903W.
Schlapper, Robert A., 17894A.
Schlemm, Clayton L., 52560A.
Schleuss, Louis F., 23719A.
Schnase, William B., 40120A.
Schneider, Franklin E., 28339A.
Schneider, Jimmy L., 39986A.
Schneider, Ralph Z., 38726A.
Schoenberg, Irving B., 17820A.
Schoenfeld, Dale P., 39328A.
Schofield, James A., 40173A.
Schrader, John S., 40062A.
Schrecengost, Ray W., Jr., 28268A.
Schricker, Robert E., 39552A.
Schu, Fred R., 38787A.
Schuder, Myrle N., 40178A.
Schultz, Dwight E., 39117A.
Schulz, Paul R., 39228A.
Schussler, Harry T., 39574A.
Schutte, Lawrence E., 38806A.
Schwaab, Joseph C., 39268A.
Schwanekamp, Clement F., 60031A.
Schwartz, Joel, 39057A.
Schwendeman, Dean F., 38736A.
Schwing, Mack E., Jr., 48832A.
Scott, Edward L., 17801A.
Scott, John R., 38882A.
Scott, Lewis B., 38619A.
Scott, Melvin R., 49309A.
Scott, Roy M., 52618A.
Seale, James E., 39405A.
Sedberry, James M., Jr., 38797A.
Segal, Henry C., 39324A.
Segers, Robert B., 40125A.
Segraves, Berry A., Jr., 25803A.
Seiler, John, 39909A.
Selig, Ivan M., 17802A.
Selinfreund, Martin, 38990A.
Sellers, Claude J., 39813A.
Semingson, Percy M., 39393A.
Serviss, Martin R., 38917A.
Sewell, Ralph H., 38762A.
Sexton, Charles W., Jr., 38622A.
Shackelford, Henry S., 38971A.
Shackleford, Charles B., 39601A.
Shanahan, Billy R., 40185A.
Shaneyfelt, Willis G., 22759A.
Shapiro, Aaron, 39731A.
Sharkey, Harry T., Jr., 39800A.
Sharp, Bryant M., 28211A.
Sharp, Joseph, 39292A.
Shaw, Robert C., 39505A.
Shea, Alfred F., 39147A.
Sheeran, Robert J., 40149A.
Sheldon, Wilford H., 40219A.
Shelton, William T., 39868A.
Sheppard, James C., 39193A.
Sheppard, William R., 39313A.
Sherburne, John L., 22811A.
Sherman, Irwin, 39619A.
Shernisky, Paul, 39670A.
Shertzer, Leavitt A., Jr., 40215A.
Shillings, Clarance E., 24723A.
Shimp, Robert O., 38711A.
Shinn, Jack E., 26406A.
Shinnick, Lawrence W., Jr., 39457A.
Shippey, John J., 39944A.
Shires, Justin W., 52640A.
Shively, James C., Jr., 17849A.
Shiver, Morris E., 18294A.
Shook, Colonel J., Jr., 51691A.
Shook, Kenneth L., 39346A.
Shoup, David W., 39977A.
Shryock, Harry L., Jr., 39040A.
Shultz, William M., 39461A.
Sieg, Prentiss R., 38722A.
Silva, John L., 39270A.
Simensen, Kenneth L., 39968A.
Simmon, Robert E., 40412A.
Simmons, Joseph H., 38823A.
Simms, James W., 39704A.
Simon, Harry M., 40255A.
Simonson, John C., 60035A.
Simpson, Charles E., 38880A.
Simpson, Claus R., 39185A.
Simpson, Henry E., Jr., 38601A.
Simpson, Lawrence R., 38865A.
Sims, Coy A., 40291A.
Sims, Jesse W., 39089A.
Singleton, James L., 39042A.
Sizemore, Robert E., 17970A.
Skaggs, Edgar O., 40427A.
Skau, Norman K., 39847A.
Skeels, Warren E., 38534A.
Skelton, Eddie L., 40245A.
Skinner, Richard I., 17830A.
Skoyle, Arthur W., 40421A.
Slicker, Melvin F., 40313A.
Sloan, Frank K., 39881A.
Sloan, Walter B., 39470A.
Slover, George H., 39770A.
Slowiak, Paul F., 38522A.
Smart, Robert C., 40361A.
Smith, Bernard C., 38966A.
Smith, Carlton M., 52602A.
Smith, Charles M., 38790A.
Smith, David M., 54684A.
Smith, Delbert E., 39406A.
Smith, Donald F., 39169A.
Smith, Donald R., 38681A.
Smith, Floyd W., 38792A.
Smith, Fred H., Jr., 40362A.
Smith, Jack H., 40363A.
Smith, Jack R., 39366A.
Smith, James C., 39071A.
Smith, James D., 39648A.
Smith, James F., 39578A.
Smith, James F., 39835A.
Smith, John J., 39347A.
Smith, John P., 52633A.
Smith, Lambertus P., 40247A.
Smith, Myron G., 40223A.
Smith, Newman T., 38667A.
Smith, Obie A., 40283A.
Smith, Richard E., 39528A.
Smith, Richard M., 48830A.
Smith, Robert W., 39485A.
Smith, Todd A., 40150A.
Smith, William E., 38941A.
Smith, William Y., 17775A.
Smithwick, Edward F., 23940A.
Smorto, Alfred R., 40213A.
Snodgrass, Bartley A., 39536A.
Snow, Charles A., Jr., 39401A.
Snowden, Hiram M., 39814A.
Snyder, Rex L., 40196A.
Snyder, Richard D., 39422A.
Solomons, James I., 60046A.
Sommerich, Eugene M., 39545A.
Songer, Donald E., 38533A.
Sorensen, Gordon R., 52558A.
Sorenson, Maurice E., 40200A.
Sorge, Marlowe B., 17885A.
Sorlie, Donald M., 38652A.
Sorrell, Leo G., 40364A.
Southern, Richard W., 39459A.
Soutiere, Leonard O., 38906A.
Speier, Anthony A., Jr., 39681A.
Spencer, Edwin C., Jr., 52641A.
Spencer, John O., 52538A.
Spencer, Robert E., 39566A.
Spencer, Robert H., 38775A.
Spenny, Maurice A., 38764A.
Spiger, James A., 38546A.
Spooner, Richard H., 22832A.
Spray, Wayne M., 39468A.
Sprinkel, Roscoe E., 17957A.
Sprinkle, William C., 20760A.
Stacy, Fearl W., 40365A.

Stahl, Eugene M., 52623A.
Stainkamp, Wilbur W., 52630A.
Stair, Manning M., 17987A.
Stalk, George, 23777A.
Stallcup, Edward E., 28315A.
Stallings, James B., 40259A.
Stan, Raymond H., 39086A.
Stanley, Russell A., 28030A.
Stapleton, Robert H., 40250A.
Starr, Benjamin F., Jr., 25816A.
Stasiak, Joseph W., 39702A.
Stassi, Paul P., 39653A.
Statz, John A., 39711A.
Staudte, Raymond W., 40107A.
Steensland, Albert E., 48817A.
Steffensen, Jack A., 39316A.
Steinberg, Jacob, 38508A.
Stelling, Henry B., Jr., 17779A.
Stephens, Clarence, Jr., 39588A.
Stephenson, Clay C., Jr., 52540A.
Stewart, Homer J., 24603A.
Stewart, James S., 38703A.
Stewart, Peter J., 40203A.
Stewart, Rodney T., 39219A.
Stewart, William P., 38670A.
Stianchi, Victor G., 39664A.
Stills, James V., 52580A.
Stimson, James R., 17935A.
Stinchcomb, George J., 39584A.
Stinson, Paul, 40287A.
Stitt, Richard G., 52600A.
Stitzel, Carl N., 38723A.
St John, Herman, 37831A.
Stockhouse, Robert E., 17922A.
Stockman, Hervey S., 50436A.
Stockman, Walter, 52634A.
Stone, John W., 39842A.
Stopher, David R., 37785A.
Storms, William N., 37302A.
Stroman, Claris W., 40234A.
Stroup, Harry L., 52645A.
Stubblefield, Roger W., 17946A.
Stumbaugh, Louis C., 38748A.
Suhar, Walter, 26788A.
Sullivan, George E., 39954A.
Sullivan, Whitney B., 40067A.
Sutton, Robert C., Jr., 40197A.
Svetz, Philip, 40168A.
Swafford, Roy W., Jr., 39184A.
Swaim, Raymond J., 27697A.
Swansiger, Rudy L. V., 40432A.
Swanson, Hannis M., 39379A.
Sweet, Albert H., 24596A.
Swenholt, Donald B., 17817A.
Swenson, Carol M., 38607A.
Szczutkowski, Bernard J., 39654A.
Tappin, Francis D., 40366A.
Tashjian, Michael J., 17842A.
Tate, Ralph H., Jr., 40318A.
Taylor, Clyde M., 40407A.
Taylor, Clyde V., 38934A.
Taylor, Emmett T., 52625A.
Taylor, James, Jr., 25626A.
Taylor, James W., 38295A.
Taylor, John A., 40256A.
Taylor, John M., 38927A.
Taylor, Robert N., 39075A.
Teachout, Roger S., 20731A.
Teeven, Quentin F., 48822A.
Teske, Robert H., 39593A.
Tetrick, Jacques K., 17977A.
Tetzlaff, Elder E. C., 39987A.
Thomas, Charles A., 38909A.
Thomas, Eugene C., 39081A.
Thomas, George S., 17813A.
Thomas, James E., Jr., 40080A.
Thomas, Kenneth L., 38867A.
Thomas, Walter H., 52610A.
Thomas, William W., 39602A.
Thompson, Doyle P., 39426A.
Thompson, Earl D., 40303A.
Thompson, Earl L., 38768A.
Thompson, Fred E., Jr., 40134A.
Thompson, James E., Jr., 39423A.
Thompson, John C., 17871A.
Thompson, Joseph C., Jr., 39400A.
Thompson, Louis B., 38939A.
Thompson, Richard L., 23946A.
Thompson, Wyles L., 52589A.
Thomsen, John G., 39543A.
Thornton, James H., 23897A.
Thorpe, William J., 17896A.
Thurn, Charles J., 40136A.
Tichenor, Otis K., 38829A.
Tidd, Lloyd B., 38552A.
Tiemann, Melvin E., 40302A.
Tiernan, William C., 40035A.
Tighe, Eugene F., Jr., 40395A.
Tigner, Earl M., 39624A.
Tilford, William A., 28229A.
Tillman, Beacher M., 38641A.
Tilton, Neel, 40301A.
Tindle, Kenneth N., 39787A.
Tinker, Edward E., 39297A.
Tippie, Donald L., 40128A.
Tischoff, Tom B., 24601A.
Todd, William H., 38542A.
Tolle, Frederick F., 23928A.
Tondreau, Raymond A., 39153A.
Tooley, Bobby J., 17925A.
Todmay, John C., 23826A.
Toothman, Robert J., 39195A.
Torbet, John M., 38553A.
Totten, George C., Jr., 38496A.
Totterdell, Austin J., Jr., 39194A.
Townsend, Duane, 38771A.
Tripp, Homer A., 39615A.
Trukken, Holger R., 39634A.
Truog, Nicholas F., 55743A.
Tucker, James S., 17861A.
Tully, George H., 39115A.
Tunno, David A., 39755A.
Turner, John L., 39978A.
Turner, Willard J., 38694A.
Turnipseed, Charles E., 38575A.
Twiford, Robert M., 37180A.
Tyler, Alfred W., 40227A.
Tyler, Russell R., 37387A.
Tyner, Gene T., 28180A.
Tyson, Samuel W., 52544A.
Uebel, Lawrence F., 39576A.
Ullrey, Charles E., 39551A.
Umble, Richard L., 39157A.
Upson, Wallace C., 38503A.
Upstill, Charles W., 60030A.
Urey, Harry B., 52593A.
Vadnais, Robert C., 39589A.
VanArsdall, Robert A., 17829A.
Vanderpoel, John A., 52448A.
VanDyke, George R., 39899A.
VanFleet, Amos E., 40404A.
VanKesteren, Henry, 40012A.
VanWormer, Charles E., Jr., 52563A.
Varner, Ben H., 39757A.
Vautherot, Harry R., 39493A.
Ventura, Mario L., 48819A.
Vest, Boss E., 38120A.
Vest, Clifford L., 38828A.
Vining, Theodore C., 38714A.
Vogel, Richard A., 38769A.
Vogl, John J., 40240A.
Votaw, Virgil L., 39002A.
Vovrick, George R., 39321A.
Voynich, John J., 24713A.
Wacker, George, 40051A.
Waggoner, Horace Q., 39022A.
Waggy, William, Jr., 38659A.
Wagner, Henry J., 52568A.
Wagner, Raymond J., 40368A.
Waite, John K., 38675A.
Wakeley, Bertram E., 37209A.
Walden, Joseph P., 37672A.
Waldron, Karl M., Jr., 60038A.
Walker, Hugh R., 39341A.
Walker, James D., 39495A.
Wall, Edward J., 40243A.
Wall, James B., 40308A.
Wallace, Harold W., Jr., 38642A.
Wallace, John S., 38516A.
Wallick, Harry W., 40013A.
Walters, Charles L., 40165A.
Walters, Leroy, 39011A.
Ward, William M., 52576A.
Warden, Stacy B., 39931A.
Ware, Ivan, 22730A.
Warneck, Leo A., 38841A.
Warner, James B., 38954A.
Warwick, Harry T., 40068A.
Watkins, Eugene C., 24480A.
Watkins, George M., 52642A.
Watkins, Horace M., 38635A.
Watkins, James H., 40233A.
Watry, Charles A., 24770A.
Watson, Elbert E., 39158A.
Watson, James E., 3d, 28195A.
Watson, Robert F., 38800A.
Watson, Thomas J., 40157A.
Watts, John H., 39415A.
Waxman, Eugene L., 39335A.
Wayman, Eugene C., 40019A.
Webster, Jack A., 38585A.
Weddell, George F., 39279A.
Weeks, Donald C., 39352A.
Wegener, Kenneth B., 37529A.
Wegener, Roy A., 38740A.
Weinstein, Robert M., 52650A.
Weir, Arthur J. W., Jr., 39102A.
Weisbarth, Irwin B., 39947A.
Weld, Wayne K., 38855A.
Weld, Willis R., 40411A.
Wellisch, Lawrence M., 52631A.
Wells, Charles I., 52571A.
Wells, Walter, 38532A.
Wendt, Warren W., 39394A.
Wenrick, Robert F., 39229A.
Wenstrom, Leroy A., 39250A.
Wentz, Willard E., 52595A.
Werner, Paul D., 40275A.
Werts, Herbert A., 52594A.
Westfall, Clarence R., 38859A.
Westlake, Edward F., Jr., 39234A.
Weyland, Carl E., 39072A.
Weston, John E., 40316A.
Whatley, Douglas E., 39343A.
Wheeler, Jack W., 39933A.
Whelan, Thomas A., 39026A.
Whitaker, Bernell A., 25787A.
White, Douglas N., 39319A.
White, James M., 40095A.
White, Thomas J., 39836A.
Whitehead, Trusty M., 39277A.
Whitehouse, Wendell H., 38843A.
Whitlock, John L., Jr., 39783A.
Whittenberg, Charles J., 40386A.
Wick, Edward A., 39737A.
Wickler, Donald W., 40397A.
Wiehl, Elroy F., 48814A.
Wientjes, Joseph A., 39687A.
Wiggins, Dock E., 52545A.
Wiggins, Edsel D., 40278A.
Wiggins, Willard C., Jr., 26396A.
Wilkins, Max P., 40307A.
Wilkinson, Carl E., 38708A.
Will, Allen F., 40054A.
Willard, Robert H., 40207A.
Williams, Charles J., 38491A.
Williams, Clyde B., 39502A.
Williams, Clyde W., 39142A.
Williams, Dean H., Jr., 38117A.
Williams, Francis M., 17798A.
Williams, Julian T., 40320A.
Williams, Leroy A., 38773A.
Williams, Leslie A., 48833A.
Williams, Norman F., 40031A.
Williams, Robert L., 60047A.
Williams, Russell A., 40135A.
Williams, Walter J., 39677A.
Williamson, John P., Jr., 38804A.
Williamson, Lynwood M., 38968A.
Williamson, William R., 40004A.
Wilmeth, Joe C., 40280A.
Wilson, David S., 38671A.
Wilson, Dugald E., Jr., 39474A.
Wilson, Henry L., 39541A.
Wilson, Thomas H., Jr., 38830A.
Wimberly, Shirley G., Jr., 48829A.
Winkleman, Albert P., 39141A.
Winston, Bertram D., 38810A.
Winterhalter, James H., 38677A.
Wise, Charles W., 39910A.
Wise, Irven D., 39817A.
Wolf, Earl J., Jr., 23900A.
Wolf, Edgar P., 40425A.
Wolf, Frederick C., 38877A.
Wolf, Kenneth G., 52537A.
Wolff, Emanuel H., 49304A.
Wolter, Charles T., 38699A.
Wood, Richard A., 39611A.
Wood, Sam H., 39501A.
Woodall, James T., Jr., 38754A.
Woodley, John C., 39519A.
Woodruff, James B., 39812A.
Woods, Charles D., 39555A.

Woodside, William E., 38514A.
Worley, Clarence H., 38593A.
Wright, Edward C., 38817A.
Wright, Francis L., 22745A.
Wright, Robert F., Jr., 39598A.
Wright, Wilfred D., 25808A.
Wurster, Charles A., 17748A.
Wynne, Thomas E., 38686A.
Wyrtzen, Curtis C., Jr., 39979A.
Wytock, Harry L., 17872A.
Ximenes, Waldo E., 48821A.
Yaggy, Philip V., 38815A.
Yates, Charles E., Jr., 39672A.
Yates, Warren E., 52533A.
Yealy, James F., 38536A.
Yeandel, Francis A., 39245A.
Yinger, William E., 38506A.
Yoo, George, Jr., 39610A.
York, John K., 39542A.
Yost, William T., 39689A.
Young, Arthur P., 40146A.
Young, Bruce O., 38887A.
Young, Edward P., 39356A.
Young, Elbert D., Jr., 40258A.
Young, George W., 39527A.
Young, Jack D., 39119A.
Young, John E., Jr., 60034A.
Young, Nolan F., 39007A.
Young, Stewart, 17757A.
Zalewski, Alexander J., 40086A.
Zapinski, Leonard E., 39276A.
Zarlengo, John, 38515A.
Zeck, Francis H. C., 39171A.
Zeitz, Frederick H., Jr., 24405A.
Zettler, Vincent V., Jr., 24600A.
Ziff, Sam, 38628A.
Zoerb, Daniel J., 38650A.
Zollinger, Joe E., 17877A.
Zotz, John C., 39546A.

Medical Corps

Baker, Robert W., 25655A.
Bednarz, Wallace W., 25697A.
Brewer, Samuel J., 55761A.
Butler, Richard L., 26741A.
Chase, Ned B., Jr., 26711A.
Connolly, John M., 26373A.
Draper, David H., 26361A.
Goslin, Frederick B., 25661A.
Grissom, Paul M., 25474A.
Harris, William B., 27654A.
Hatfield, Theodore R., 27597A.
Hawkins, Willard R., 27588A.
Haycraft, Rexford G., 27647A.
Haynes, Herbert C., 25643A.
Kaufmann, Herbert H., 28135A.
Kolb, Earl J., Jr., 25480A.
Kratina, Fredric K., 29408A.
Kratochvil, Clyde H., 25663A.
Mahaffey, Gerald H., 26369A.
McNally, Joseph F., 29623A.
Newton, Dwight E., 26699A.
Nicol, William F., 25472A.
Ord, John W., 25701A.
Partyka, Leo C., 25479A.
Reams, Gerald B., 25641A.
Richey, Theodore W., 26365A.
Robinson, David L., 29913A.
Smith, George B., Jr., 29476A.
Smith, James R., 27507A.
Stone, Frederic A., 27652A.
Swan, Robert E., 27648A.
Swearingen, Alfred G., 27586A.
Unger, Howard R., 29809A.
Ward, Julian E., 26705A.
Waters, Raymond O., 26385A.
Willis, Henry S. K., Jr., 27605A.
Womack, Granville J., 32561A.

Dental Corps

Allman, Charles A., Jr., 29654A.
Barnhill, Donald E., 49702A.
Beckcom, Henry R., 61119A.
Bigbie, John D., 59485A.
Debacher, Sherman M., 29481A.
Dehan, Edward T., 29416A.
Dibble, Arthur E., 32575A.
Dubois, Berton L., 31912A.
Duncan, Elmer T., 25483A.
Fleming, Lamoyne H., 51570A.
Gadbois, Norman C., 27527A.
Greenwood, Vern R., 49703A.
Hayes, Robert W., 25702A.
Keefer, William L., Jr., 26389A.
Kiecker, Paul F., 62921A.
Klaeser, Ray L., 28131A.
Lambert, Kenneth J., 51354A.
Linthicum, Arthur T., 29482A.
Loper, Clifford E., 61151A.
Miller, Edward F., 26390A.
Nease, William J., 32573A.
Poorter, Karl K., Jr., 49701A.
Rhoades, John C., 29417A.
Robinson, Lucius L., 59558A.
Salimeno, Thomas, Jr., 29866A.
Scott, Robert H., 55872A.
Staerkel, Russell F. P., 51353A.
Stanton, Daniel B., 25486A.
Stephens, Belton S., 27997A.
Walters, Robert C., 55774A.
Williams, Donald E., 55773A.
Wright, William G., 27650A.

Veterinary Corps

Crandell, Robert A., 24229A.
Douglas, Jack D., 25331A.
Houk, Donald C., 24228A.
Howells, William V., 25672A.
Mosely, John D., 27529A.
Nold, Max M., 23597A.
Phelps, Gene C., 24230A.
Shuler, James M., 25673A.
Terry, John L., Jr., 24232A.
Watson, William H., Jr., 25334A.
Young, Robert J., 24227A.

Medical Service Corps

Albert, Paul A., 61158A.
Burge, Charles H., 25738A.
Delong, Merrill B., 29336A.
Estell, Nathan V., 48989A.
Ezell, Manie J., 48983A.
Gulley, Wayne E., 23223A.
Haas, Raymond O., 24241A.
Herberholt, Vincent W., 48982A.
Holland, James H., 48993A.
Horne, James E., 48990A.
Hutson, Robert W., 48984A.
Jackson, John K., 48987A.
Jean, Jack V., 40209A.
Jennings, Charles L., 48991A.
Kaplan, William, 48976A.
Kopas, Joseph F., 48981A.
Lappin, Paul W., 55330A.
Lindsay, Eugene K., 24236A.
McKenzie, Richard E., 48985A.
Metcalf, Robert D., 25681A.
Morgan, Fred B., Jr., 21643A.
Richardson, Floyd G., 21632A.
Sparling, Kenneth G., 21881A.
Strong, Almon B., 48986A.
Weeks, Edgar, 48994A.

Nurse Corps

Caddell, Joan M., 29343W.
Cavil, Dorothy J., 32440W.
Collier, M. Irene G., 25753W.
Dozier, Erma J., 32438W.
Geringer, June H., 59731W.
Hinds, Effie B., 49713W.
Kennedy, Elizabeth M., 21713W.
Maisey, Alberta F., 23243W.
Ryan, Margaret M., 51364W.
Sears, Virginia L., 49714W.
Shiflett, Billie L., 25750W.
Tonne, Mary A., 51365W.

Medical Specialist Corps

Deming, Elsie L., 20901W.
Vodopic, Mary A., 59987W.

Chaplains

Barnes, Charles J., Jr., 48614A.
Bedingfield, Warren, 84616A.
Bingham, Darris Y., 55129A.
Drone, Raphael E., 48612A.
Drumheller, Paul S., 48618A.
Folkers, Norman G., 27999A.
Hamstra, Kenneth W., 48620A.
Holdt, Robert P., 48617A.
Hunt, Crandall M., 55123A.
King, William J., 24685A.
Klein, Stanley H., 59995A.
Klewin, Thomas W., 59997A.
Merfeld, Vincent C., 55121A.
Montgomery, Paul A., 55130A.
Porter, Charles C., 55120A.
Pridgen, Joseph W., 32423A.
Rohrer, Clason L., 48615A.
Scahill, John J., 48611A.
Scott, Simon H., Jr., 55126A.
Shaddox, Thomas N., Jr., 25632A.
Simpson, Russell W., 55118A.
Smith, Chester L., 48619A.
Sullivan, James R., 28154A.
Thomas, John P., 27661A.
Turner, Warren H., 27670A.
Wendland, Clinton E., 59996A.
Whiteside, Robert R., 55127A.
Youngblood, Angus O., 27667A.

NOTE.—Dates of rank of all officers nominated for promotion will be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force under the appropriate provisions of chapter 835, title 10, United States Code, as amended. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

SECOND LIEUTENANT TO FIRST LIEUTENANT

Line of the Air Force

Adamson, Herbert A., 55400A.
Ahearn, Joseph A., 63104A.
Akers, Howard T., 55401A.
Allison, James W., 62002A.
Allred, Richard D., 62441A.
Alsup, Willie, 3d, 56028A.
Ames, George B., Jr., 62026A.
Anderson, David D., 55402A.
Anderson, Dennis L., 61878A.
Anderson, Frederick C., 55648A.
Anderson, Henry J., 61684A.
Anderson, James R., 55649A.
Anderson, Russell M., 55650A.
Anderson, Thomas I., 55403A.
Anderton, George D., Jr., 56235A.
Angelides, Nicholas J., 61883A.
Archino, David T., 55404A.
Atkins, Kenneth L., 61933A.
Atkinson, John C., Jr., 61930A.
Axlund, Roger C., 55405A.
Baker, Gary S., 55834A.
Balentine, Doyle E., 55999A.
Ballantine, George A., 55651A.
Ballew, Glynn E., 55891A.
Barnard, Robert K., 55406A.
Barnwell, Ules L., Jr., 55407A.
Barry, William E., 55408A.
Barthelmas, William J., Jr., 61819A.
Bartlett, Donald A., 63106A.
Bartley, Loren E., 61830A.
Barton, Ronald L., 61947A.
Bauknight, Gerald C., 56012A.
Beatty, Douglas N., 55786A.
Beckel, Robert D., 55410A.
Beckett, Robert F., 56204A.
Belew, Glen E., 56003A.
Belote, Farrald G., Jr., 55952A.
Bender, Charles G., Jr., 55411A.
Benson, Robert P., 63267A.
Berg, Robert M., 63206A.
Bergeron, Joseph L., 55980A.
Bergholz, Richard J., 63320A.
Bernd, Ronald E., 63237A.
Berry, John K. D., 61891A.
Berry, Wylie E., 61917A.
Bessette, John F., 63231A.
Beyer, Lawrence F., 61709A.
Biery, Alvin E., 63151A.
Bigelow, Richard M., 55412A.
Biggs, James L., 61735A.
Bitner, Dean A., 56231A.
Black, Jon D., 55413A.
Blackwell, James R., 55414A.
Blake, Robert E., 55415A.
Blank, Samuel A., 61824A.
Bobko, Karol J., 55416A.
Bohlen, George A., 62473A.
Bond, John T., 55652A.
Bonham, Arthur E., 63155A.
Boudreau, Jean A., 63349A.
Bowen, Thomas G., 55418A.
Boyd, Darwin D., 55417A.

Brack, Robert V., 61737A.
Braman, Ellis J., 63163A.
Brandjes, Nicholas M., 56282A.
Braunschweig, Ernie D., 61647A.
Brenny, Gerald J., 55943A.
Broeren, Quentin R., 61945A.
Brooks, Don L., 55419A.
Brown, Charles V., 63138A.
Brown, Dwight, Jr., 61738A.
Brown, Howard L., Jr., 61814A.
Brown, James W., 3d, 55420A.
Brown, Kevin, 62016A.
Brown, Willard B., Jr., 61840A.
Browne, Peter S., 61743A.
Browning, Robert L., 55421A.
Bryan, Jack B., 55422A.
Bryan, William W., 55934A.
Buchart, Carlton E., 62466A.
Buckles, Robert C., 55423A.
Burch, George W., 55424A.
Burger, Philip R., Jr., 61997A.
Burghardt, Stanley K., 55425A.
Burton, James G., 55426A.
Bush, Roger G., 63285A.
Buss, Marvin W., 55427A.
Button, Donald B., 56013A.
Butts, Lawrence E., Jr., 56004A.
Caddell, Harold L., 61902A.
Cagle, Don H., 56201A.
Caldwell, James M., Jr., 61872A.
Callaghan, James T., 56232A.
Callaghan, William S., Jr., 55428A.
Campbell, Duncan W., 55832A.
Canterbury, Henry D., 55429A.
Carlson, Michael R., 61856A.
Carnevale, Arthur, Jr., 63158A.
Carns, Michael P. C., 55430A.
Carpenter, James T., 55431A.
Carr, Gary R., 62482A.
Carr, Richard E., 55432A.
Carroll, David R., 55433A.
Carter, Charles K., 62007A.
Carter, Clyde W., 55794A.
Casey, Timothy B., 55654A.
Cassity, James S., Jr., 63281A.
Caughran, Hugh K., 56005A.
Caulfield, John J., Jr., 63118A.
Chambers, James E., 63338A.
Chapman, James E., 55434A.
Chase, Donald T., 55435A.
Chepolis, Robert J., 55436A.
Chichester, Warren F., 55967A.
Chomicz, Donald J., 55655A.
Christen, Roger L., 56199A.
Christensen, Jack W., 61612A.
Christison, Wayne L., 56203A.
Clamme, Ronald L., 56233A.
Clark, George C., 55437A.
Clark, Ronald E., 56031A.
Clemmons, Thurston, Jr., 55843A.
Clifton, Ray F., 61723A.
Cloud, Donald R., 56190A.
Cohen, Louis S., 55656A.
Cohen, William A., 55438A.
Combs, Jimmy W., 56236A.
Conant, Roger G., 55439A.
Connally, James W., 55440A.
Cook, Curtis G., 55441A.
Cooper, James T., 61827A.
Copeland, Robert O., 55657A.
Cornett, Brian D., 56014A.
Corroum, William F., 55658A.
Cotton, Lawrence F., 55442A.
Coultas, Marinda J., 61596W.
Counts, Roger L., 55443A.
Cowan, James W., 61755A.
Cox, Gary E., 56229A.
Crane, Benjamin D., 55790A.
Crawford, Robert G., 55444A.
Creveling, William I., 55835A.
Crombie, Carrol P., 61805A.
Cromer, Donald L., 55659A.
Croteau, Robert J., 55445A.
Crow, Graham P., 61786A.
Crowley, Dennis M., Jr., 56325A.
Crowley, Jon D., 61710A.
Cruse, Derald L., 61732A.
Cudlipp, Richard, 55660A.
Culler, Harry H., Jr., 55446A.
Cummings, Harold, 61623A.
Cunningham, Peter M., 55661A.
Currie, Brian H., 61925A.
Curry, Henry M., 62452A.
Cwach, Emil E., Jr., 55447A.
Czagas, Walter J., 61657A.
Czajkowski, Anthony F., 61843A.
Daab, Ford G., 61896A.
Dagampat, Richard M., 55662A.
Daharb, Louis E., 61834A.
Dakes, Michael G., 55979A.
Dalelio, Denny F., 61888A.
Davey, John M., 55448A.
Davis, Charles D., 61789A.
Davis, Charles R., 55449A.
Davis, Geoffrey C., Jr., 55450A.
Davis, Howard D., 55451A.
Davis, Leroy L., 61815A.
Davis, Roger L., 56112A.
Davis, William S., 3d, 55452A.
Davison, Robert E., 55663A.
Dearman, James E., Jr., 61736A.
Decker, Irvin B., Jr., 55968A.
Delligatti, Robert S., 55453A.
Delong, Edward E., 3d, 55944A.
Demarest, Russell S., Jr., 55974A.
Denison, Robert G., 61951A.
Denton, Donald L., 55839A.
Denton, Frank R., Jr., 61768A.
Derrickson, Thomas G., 2d, 55454A.
Desantis, Joseph G., 55455A.
Dessert, Robert A., 63190A.
Dewey, William T., 56234A.
Dickinson, Lee G., 61857A.
Dickover, Richard D., 61662A.
Diehl, James M., 61625A.
Dill, Donald W., 62009A.
Dillman, Homer C., 62435A.
Dizek, Stephen G., 61772A.
Doane, Gaylen B., 55664A.
Dodds, Charles, Jr., 62005A.
Dodds, Duncan E., 61648A.
Dolan, John W., 55456A.
Domingues, Thomas, Jr., 61860A.
Donnelly, William J., 3d, 55959A.
Donohue, Josephine E., 62481W.
Doran, Donald A., 61904A.
Dorey, Lee R., 55457A.
Doughty, John R., 61756A.
Douskey, Paul T., 55458A.
Doyle, Raymond E., Jr., 55890A.
Drane, Leslie R., Jr., 61851A.
Drozd, Robert H., 55665A.
Drye, Kenneth J., 61833A.
Duffy, Patrick, 55964A.
Duncan, Roderick M., 61837A.
Duplissey, Donnie R., 62020A.
Dwelis, Alexander C., 56374A.
Dwyer, Robert J., 55459A.
Eastep, Franklin E., 63126A.
Eastes, Raymond E., 56491A.
Eberling, Leslie G., 55788A.
Edlund, George M., 62476A.
Ehrenstrom, Robert C., 61694A.
Ellinger, Robert J., 61829A.
Elliott, Charles D., 61665A.
Elliott, Robert B., 61832A.
Elsbernd, Gerald F., 55460A.
Elser, Arthur G., 55461A.
Enz, Richard W., 61650A.
Ervin, Don R., 61971A.
Evans, Arthur C., 56206A.
Evans, Byron W., 56279A.
Evans, Jay J., 63156A.
Evans, Robert C., 61993A.
Evans, William D., 62440A.
Fagnant, James G., 62000A.
Fairchild, James C., 55948A.
Farland, Robert W., 55996A.
Fatheree, Thomas H., Jr., 61739A.
Fay, Robert H., Jr., 55462A.
Feinberg, Barry E., 61849A.
Feldpausch, Barry L., 61773A.
Ferguson, Thomas R., Jr., 61620A.
Ferrari, Charles J., 55463A.
Findlay, Gary W., 55666A.
Finneran, Gerard B., 55464A.
Firestone, James R., 55797A.
Fleming, Matthew M., 55667A.
Fletcher, James K., 55465A.
Flocken, Roger A., 61781A.
Fornell, Gordon E., 61820A.
Forrester, John, 55467A.
Forsythe, Conard O., 63313A.
Fortner, Larry D., 55466A.
Fossee, Gale E., 61636A.
Foster, Peter H., 55468A.
Fowler, Jac L., 61918A.
Fox, Robert D., 61835A.
Fox, Ronald C., 55469A.
Fraime, Charles R., 55668A.
Franks, Donald R., 61640A.
Frazer, Claude R., 61703A.
Frease, Edward D., 61909A.
Freeman, Thomas W., 63123A.
Fritzinger, George R., 55670A.
Fulleton, Allen J., 55988A.
Funderburk, John B., Jr., 55671A.
Furbush, Kenneth L., 61825A.
Furuta, Donald T., 55960A.
Gaddie, William R., 63351A.
Gagliardi, Albert A., Jr., 55470A.
Gainer, Thomas R., 56177A.
Gallios, Stephen E., 55471A.
Gallo, Jon A., 55472A.
Ganote, Marvin D., 61724A.
Gantter, Wallace F., 63305A.
Garber, Gares, Jr., 55473A.
Gardner, Gerald L., 61641A.
Gardner, Robert H., 61848A.
Garvey, Gerald J., 55474A.
Gaunt, John J., Jr., 55475A.
Gebhard, James B., 62478A.
Generale, Mark A., 63189A.
Gentry, Donald E., 62450A.
Gerbaz, Douglas N., 61670A.
Gibson, Leroy A., 63143A.
Gifford, George E., 55672A.
Gilbert, Ronald G., 61632A.
Gillman, Wallace M., 63335A.
Gilmer, William W., 61708A.
Girod, John G., 61609A.
Givens, Clarence B., 61826A.
Givens, Walter C., 55476A.
Glazener, Harold E., 62467A.
Glick, David, 61617A.
Goble, Jacob F., 61929A.
Godwin, William S., 56228A.
Goetz, Henry W., 61702A.
Goetze, Richard B., Jr., 55477A.
Goff, Henry E., 62475A.
Gogal, Robert M., 61966A.
Gold, William H., 55478A.
Goodrich, David M., 55479A.
Gordon, Glynneth M., 63214A.
Grafflin, Douglas G., Jr., 55480A.
Graham, Oscar D., 55972A.
Grant, Linwood O., 61646A.
Gray, Jerry E., 61994A.
Green, Donald C., 61699A.
Green, John H., Jr., 61769A.
Greene, Carl A., 55966A.
Greene, David E., 55673A.
Greene, Leroy V., Jr., 55481A.
Greene, Rockwell N., 63133A.
Greene, Samuel J., 63112A.
Greenwade, Donald S., 55978A.
Greenwalt, John P., 61740A.
Greer, Robert W., 61885A.
Gregory, Hardy, Jr., 55674A.
Grey, James H., 61807A.
Griffin, David E., 55482A.
Groark, David H., 55483A.
Grorud, Richard E., 62443A.
Gulledge, John F., 55484A.
Gunderson, Cleon H., 61800A.
Gunter, Gerald N., 56187A.
Gunter, James P., Jr., 55485A.
Hadfield, Thomas R., 61803A.
Hadley, Charles H., 61809A.
Hagans, George D., Jr., 61742A.
Hagg, Mickey O., 61748A.
Halac, Harry E., 63263A.
Halbower, Harlow K., 55486A.
Hall, Carlton G., 55935A.
Hall, George A., 61653A.
Hamer, Stephen A., 55487A.
Hamilton, Bart P., 62444A.
Hamilton, William C., 63148A.
Hammond, Flaye M., 3d, 55488A.
Hamrick, Kenneth J., 61818A.
Handly, Edward C., 55836A.
Hannan, George P., 55489A.
Hardage, Daniel W., 55490A.

Harnitchek, Joseph A., 55491A.
Harrell, Adrian M., 55837A.
Harrell, Donald R., 55942A.
Harrington, Jack R., 61721A.
Harrington, Timothy J., 61868A.
Harris, William O., 3d, 55675A.
Hartney, John C., 61846A.
Hary, Robert L., 61798A.
Haselbauer, Francis G., 63229A.
Haskin, Edward I., 55492A.
Haskins, Eugene H., 62468A.
Hastings, Robert P., 61651A.
Hatch, Bruce R., 63337A.
Hatcher, Darrell G., 55796A.
Haugen, Mylan A., 56039A.
Haugen, Paul A., 61877A.
Hauth, Wayne D., 56283A.
Hayes, John G., Jr., 55493A.
Hayes, John R., Jr., 55494A.
Hazlett, Howard J., Jr., 55801A.
Hearn, Max L., 61978A.
Hearst, Ronald A., 55676A.
Hebert, Harold J., 61676A.
Heiman, Neil D., 55677A.
Heimendinger, Henry L., 61908A.
Heller, Robert W., 61690A.
Hellman, Leroy H., 61941A.
Hendrickson, Alan E., 61838A.
Henkener, Billy J., 55789A.
Henry, Sheila M., 56532W.
Hermann, Gordon L., 63127A.
Herrick, Hiram F., 62442A.
Herrin, Samuel C., Jr., 61983A.
Hershberger, Leroy J., Jr., 61823A.
Hess, Robert M., 61801A.
Hester, Floyd R., 55495A.
Hetrick, Raymond H., 63310A.
Hetzel, David L., 55840A.
Hew, Alfred Y. K., Jr., 55496A.
Hilbert, Richard M., 55497A.
Hite, Robert E., Jr., 55838A.
Hitzel, Joseph M., 3d, 61924A.
Hodges, David L., 56271A.
Hohlstein, Robert P., 61874A.
Holliman, Gary J., 56015A.
Hollis, Lewis D., 63222A.
Holmes, Jerry D., 61731A.
Holmes, Paul R., 61911A.
Holmes, Ransom S., 3d, 55498A.
Holroyd, Thomas L., 55678A.
Holtmann, Ralph B., 61967A.
Hoover, Robert L., Jr., 61897A.
Horn, Phillip M., 56278A.
Hosmer, Bradley C., 55499A.
House, Thomas D., Jr., 55500A.
Houston, John G., 55501A.
Howe, Marvin D., 55970A.
Howell, John M., Jr., 55502A.
Howell, Marvin T., 61660A.
Howell, Raymond I., 55679A.
Hoy, Thomas E., 55896A.
Huddle, John P., 55830A.
Huey, Robert B., Jr., 62431A.
Hughes, Harold S., 55503A.
Humphrey, David L., 55680A.
Hundemer, John R., 55504A.
Hunt, Arch W., 3d, 55800A.
Hunt, Leigh H., Jr., 55505A.
Hunter, Paul D., 61664A.
Hurd, Thomas L., 61954A.
Hurley, Robert L., 55506A.
Hurt, James W., 3d, 55831A.
Husemoller, Robert D., 61720A.
Hutchinson, John F., Jr., 55507A.
Hyde, William H., 61810A.
Hymàs, Carl E., 63250A.
Inness, Roy G., Jr., 55508A.
Isaac, William D., 55509A.
Ivy, Ronald L., 55892A.
Jackson, Gene E., 56019A.
Jaekle, Edward F., Jr., 61802A.
Jaques, John E., Jr., 62006A.
Jaquish, David F., 61873A.
Jarvie, James G., Jr., 63129A.
Jay, Jimmie L., 55510A.
Jefferson, Wayne O., Jr., 55511A.
Jenkinson, Jerry J., 61847A.
Jennings, Robert S. F., 55512A.
Jensen, Donald L., 61681A.
Jo, Maurice S., 61950A.
Johns, Robert L., 61734A.
Johnson, Donnelly J., 61778A.
Johnson, Franklin D., 61610A.
Johnson, Hansford T., 55513A.
Johnson, Jerry M., 61794A.
Johnson, John O., 61892A.
Johnson, Raymond A., Jr., 61985A.
Johnson, Raymond L., 55798A.
Johnson, Richard A., 61948A.
Johnson, Richard G., 61683A.
Johnson, Theodore B., 55514A.
Jolly, Lawrence M., 55515A.
Jones, Harry A., 61806A.
Jones, Ward L., 55954A.
Jones, Wilford J., 61864A.
Jordan, John E., 61628A.
Josephson, Edward H., 55516A.
Jozwiak, Thomas J., 55517A.
Kaake, Charles A., Jr., 55518A.
Kafer, Frank W., 55997A.
Kaiser, Richard J., 63113A.
Kandetzki, Albert W., Jr., 56319A.
Kapeller, Royce F., 61915A.
Karpick, Thomas E., 55681A.
Kasten, Martin J., 62469A.
Katsikas, Constantinos J., 63323A.
Katz, Max J., 61793A.
Kay, Conrad M., 55519A.
Kearl, Gordon C., 61621A.
Keezell, Nathaniel H., Jr., 55520A.
Kelch, Matthew J., 55682A.
Kellar, Robert P., 61882A.
Kellogg, Robert J., 61881A.
Kelly, Robert K., 56016A.
Kelty, Vincent T., Jr., 61671A.
Kemp, Stevenson E., 61678A.
Kempton, Virgil D., 61913A.
Kennedy, James S., 61661A.
Kennedy, Kenneth J., Jr., 61630A.
Kennedy, Thomas F., 55683A.
Kensinger, John T., 55684A.
Kerber, Grant D., 62432A.
Kerzie, David A., 61919A.
Kessler, David C., 61923A.
Ketchum, William P., 61867A.
Kiefer, Dudley, 62446A.
Kingsland, Louis, Jr., 55521A.
Kinnaird, Donald, 55938A.
Kirby, Donald B., 56176A.
Kirk, Richard C., Jr., 61854A.
Kline, Robert L., 61828A.
Klipple, Temple G., 62436A.
Klute, Karl E., 62017A.
Knebel, John A., Jr., 55522A.
Knight, Roy N., Jr., 62465A.
Knutson, Orin I., 61932A.
Koch, William G., 61842A.
Kochi, Charles T., 61916A.
Kohl, Henry C., 61952A.
Kosovac, Don E., 62477A.
Kowalczyk, Robert A., 63319A.
Kozelka, Robin M., 55523A.
Kraft, Edward C., Jr., 61920A.
Kramer, Karl K., 61707A.
Kromi, Wayne A., 61927A.
Krouse, William J., 61811A.
Krueger, Lorin B., 2d, 55524A.
Kuebler, David H., 62018A.
Kurowski, Gerald J., 61972A.
Lacy, William E., 61598A.
Ladd, Robert L., 62439A.
Ladley, David O., 61790A.
Lady, Richard H., Jr., 61600A.
Laird, Ray W., 55950A.
Lambert, Wayne W., 55525A.
Lane, David M., 55795A.
Langlinais, Gedeon B., 63217A.
Langord, Joel V., 56275A.
Lankenau, Edward F., 3d, 55526A.
Lanman, Ronald T., 55527A.
Laronde, Kenneth P., 62013A.
Larson, Frank W., 55685A.
Larson, Loren M., 62464A.
Lasen, Paul S., 55528A.
Latshaw, Richard J., 55962A.
Laudise, Ernest T., 56318A.
Laurence, John R., 61987A.
Lawrence, Dymus N., 61639A.
Lawrence, Raleigh E., 61603A.
Lazier, Phillip W., 62012A.
Ledden, John M., 63348A.
Lee, Harold M., 55686A.
Lee, John E., 55529A.
Lee, Richard D., 55530A.
Lee, Robert S., 63258A.
Leeper, William J., 61836A.
Lehnertz, David K., 61599A.
Lemmon, Gary P., 61645A.
Leonard, Harry G., 61795A.
Lester, David W., Jr., 61889A.
Levander, Roger L., 55687A.
Lewis, Orthus K., Jr., 55532A.
Lierman, Dale D., 56323A.
Light, James E., 63218A.
Lilac, Robert H., 61850A.
Lilly, James, 61931A.
Lindberg, David C., 56281A.
Lindemann, Donald L., 55749A.
Lindsay, Nathan J., 63243A.
Lindsay, Norman R., 61680A.
Livengood, John J., 55688A.
Livesay, John H., 56276A.
Livingston, Donald B., 55533A.
Locascio, Nicholas J., 61962A.
Lofton, Charles M., Jr., 55534A.
Lorson, Edgar W., 61855A.
Loveridge, Robert T., 55535A.
Lovingood, Max H., 61999A.
Lovrien, Clark E., Jr., 55536A.
Lowry, Clifton L., 63284A.
Ludwig, John D., 55803A.
Ludwig, Robert H., 62449A.
Lunden, William C., 61749A.
Luther, William A., 61700A.
Lyle, Orlando W., Jr., 61674A.
Lynch, Darrel D., 56272A.
Lynch, Edward J., 55537A.
Lynch, Paul D., 61634A.
Mac Isaac, David, 61611A.
Madden, Neil B., 58627A.
Maddux, Spencer, 55539A.
Madonna, Donald E., 55538A.
Madsen, Vernon C., 61959A.
Magill, Clyde R., Jr., 61726A.
Mahaffey, Larry C., 61813A.
Mahaffey, William M., 61765A.
Maher, Thomas R., 61642A.
Mahoney, William J., Jr., 55689A.
Mahony, Leonard J., Jr., 55540A.
Maleika, Ronald D., 61606A.
Malkiewicz, Walter A., 61705A.
Malone, Burnie H., 3d, 63327A.
Mantel, John E., 55541A.
Manton, Edgar J., 55690A.
Marks, Richards S., 61704A.
Marsh, Paul, Jr., 55965A.
Marshall, Darrell C., 61761A.
Marshall, Lloyd C., 61875A.
Marshall, Robert A., 61776A.
Marsters, Charles L., 61668A.
Martin, Frank C., 55691A.
Martin, Howard L., 62025A.
Mason, Richard A., 55542A.
Maston, Eugene W., 63286A.
Maxwell, Richard A., 61750A.
May, Charles A., Jr., 55543A.
May, Robert S., 63266A.
McAndrews, Charles P., 62480A.
McBlain, John F., Jr., 55544A.
McCabe, Reynolds W., 56202A.
McCamish, Robert H., 61944A.
McCarthy, David W., 55692A.
McCauley, John T., 61787A.
McClure, Robert T., 61968A.
McCullough, Frederick W., 61712A.
McDaniel, James T., 55804A.
McDaniel, Norman A., 55957A.
McDaniel, Ronald E., 62470A.
McDaniel, William S., 55545A.
McDonald, Gerald B., 55546A.
McDonald, Jerry D., 55693A.
McDowell, Harry M., 56191A.
McGlinchey, Joseph J., 55694A.
McGonigle, John E., 61597A.
McHenry, Dale E., 63326A.
McInerney, Thomas G., 55734A.
McKee, Kenneth R., 56189A.
McKibben, Billy J., 61894A.
McLain, William L., Jr., 55547A.
McLaughlin, Richard E., 63175A.
McLean, Ross A., 55987A.
McMonigal, James C., 55548A.
McMurtry, Jon R., 55946A.

McNeil, Patrick R., 61638A.
McNeill, Charles W., 61624A.
Meier, Charles H., Jr., 55549A.
Melroy, David C., 61688A.
Melvin, Phillip L., 55940A.
Merkl, Eldred D., 62453A.
Messner, Wayne K., 55695A.
Meyer, Ross L., 61899A.
Meyer, William C., 61956A.
Miholick, James I., 55551A.
Mikolanis, Aloysius L., 61808A.
Mikus, Vincent J., 61986A.
Miller, Craig V., 55552A.
Miller, Donald W., 55553A.
Miller, Edward H., 55842A.
Miller, Max I., Jr., 55554A.
Miller, Walter L., 61764A.
Millett, Thomas O., 61995A.
Miltner, John H., 55556A.
Minard, Leon D., Jr., 55696A.
Miner, Robert N., 61679A.
Mirth, Richard A., 61903A.
Mitchell, Jay N., 55557A.
Mittelstadt, Lowell L., 61629A.
Mitts, Stuart N., 61812A.
Mock, Robert K., 62479A.
Molitoris, Michael, Jr., 55558A.
Molnar, William, Jr., 55697A.
Montavon, Kent, 55559A.
Montgomery, Edwin J., Jr., 55560A.
Moor, Donald A., 61969A.
Moore, Eugene A., 61730A.
Moore, Jack C., 61976A.
Moore, James O., 63180A.
Moore, Richard L., 55698A.
Moore, Wylie, Jr., 61900A.
Moorhous, Dudley M., Jr., 55561A.
Moorman, Edwin M., Jr., 55562A.
Morgan, David E., Jr., 55699A.
Morgan, Donald E., 55563A.
Morgan, Joseph D., 3d, 55564A.
Morgan, Sam P., Jr., 61716A.
Morrison, Glenn R., Jr., 55700A.
Morrison, John R., 55565A.
Morrow, John W., Jr., 55701A.
Murdico, Vincent A., 61616A.
Murphy, Crawford O., 63198A.
Murphy, Michael C., 55566A.
Musmaker, Patrick L., 55567A.
Nadig, Richard E., 61622A.
Nargi, Ronald J., 55702A.
Nash, Robert A., 55703A.
Navratil, Frank J., 55704A.
Nelson, Lorin J., 55793A.
Neubauer, Albert H., Jr., 61912A.
Neumann, Kenneth G., 61693A.
Nickel, Jack R., 55706A.
Niedens, Alverta D., 63264W.
Nikulla, Paul E., 61754A.
Nisbet, Colin J., 61865A.
Nitz, Larry A., 61627A.
Noebel, Peter C., 55807A.
Nolen, Luther L., 61774A.
Noones, David W., 61996A.
Norrell, Eddie C., 56277A.
Northrup, Richard A., 59051A.
Nowokunski, Edward D., 61861A.
Nugent, Edward R., 61698A.
Nupen, Harlan C., 61718A.
Nycum, Charles A., 61626A.
Oaks, Robert C., 55568A.
Obenland, Roland R., 55707A.
Oberdier, Lyn D., 55569A.
O'Connor, Paul D., Jr., 55708A.
O'Connor, Robert K., 55833A.
Odom, Lynwood D., 62438A.
Ogle, Tim Z., 61733A.
O'Hara, Thomas M., 61766A.
Oliveri, Robert A., 55709A.
Olson, John A., 55570A.
Olson, Norris O., 55571A.
O'Neil, James F., 55572A.
O'Neill, Laurence S., 55573A.
Ortman, F. David, 55574A.
Owens, Robert J., 61666A.
Packard, Barry R., 55710A.
Page, William E., Jr., 55575A.
Palmer, John A., 62461A.
Palmer, William D., 55711A.
Pang, Frederick F. Y., 55787A.
Pankratz, Robert L., 56017A.
Papp, John R., 61667A.
Parker, Brian T., 55576A.
Parker, William F., 55963A.
Parrett, William E., 61797A.
Parsons, Frederick J., 61706A.
Patton, James B., 55577A.
Paulson, Robert L., 61914A.
Pearce, Roger W., 62029A.
Pelini, Louis, 61991A.
Penland, Charles E., 61656A.
Penn, Richard L., Jr., 55578A.
Penniman, David S., 61696A.
Pensock, Edward P., 61949A.
Pepin, Gerard R., 61817A.
Perkins, Gene E., 56040A.
Perry, Ronald L., 61804A.
Peters, Robert E., 55806A.
Petersen, Ernest V., 63242A.
Peterson, Richard A., Jr., 61745A.
Peterson, Roger H., 55579A.
Pfeiffer, Charles L., 61953A.
Phenneger, Richard E., 55937A.
Phillips, David J., 55580A.
Phillips, Frank T., 63283A.
Phillips, Ragan T., 55712A.
Pianalto, Robert I., 61762A.
Pierce, John C., 61859A.
Pierson, Victor G., 55958A.
Pintler, Peter C., 56284A.
Pipkin, Frank B., Jr., 55713A.
Pittman, Wayne C., Jr., 55581A.
Pollard, Melvin E., 55582A.
Poor, Russell A., 63131A.
Porter, John P., 55583A.
Posey, Hollis D., 32019A.
Posey, William T., 55714A.
Post, Richard R., 55791A.
Pouttu, Mauri E., 61746A.
Powell, Cecil W., 55715A.
Prescott, James W., Jr., 61975A.
Prescott, Leo L., Jr., 55584A.
Price, James E., 61955A.
Pritchard, William H., 55973A.
Prosch, Charles N., Sr., 62004A.
Pump, Melvin C., 61711A.
Purins, Guntis, 63328A.
Quayle, Ronald J., 63135A.
Quigley, Norman P., 55585A.
Raab, Richard M., 62445A.
Raby, Janice F., 61775W.
Rader, Charles A., 56322A.
Rambo, Larry D., 61852A.
Ramsay, Allan C., 61906A.
Ramsower, Irving B., 2d, 61607A.
Rasmussen, Holt J., 62003A.
Ray, Edward L., Jr., 55894A.
Reardon, Michael P., 55586A.
Reed, James M., Jr., 55587A.
Rees, Clifford H., Jr., 61655A.
Reeves, John M., 55588A.
Reinders, Paul J., 61715A.
Reneau, Robert D., 55971A.
Reoh, George C., 33216A.
Rhodes, James M., Jr., 55589A.
Ricci, Arnold A., 55717A.
Richards, Raymond G., 61747A.
Richart, David K., 55590A.
Richers, Sherwood A., 55591A.
Riggers, Wilton E., 55939A.
Rinaldi, Guido S., Jr., 61876A.
Ringenbach, Paul T., 61649A.
Ringle, Kenneth H., 61844A.
Roberts, Matt A., 3d, 55718A.
Roberts, Roscoe R., 3d, 55592A.
Robinson, Robert R., 61799A.
Rodberg, Allan D., 61618A.
Roddey, John G. R., 55719A.
Rodgers, Charles S., 55593A.
Roescher, Frank A., 55720A.
Rogers, James C., 63244A.
Roland, Jay R., 55975A.
Rooney, Gerald P., 61907A.
Root, John M., 61901A.
Rosane, Edwin L., 55594A.
Rose, Carl E., 61691A.
Rose, Girard F., 61989A.
Ross, John R., 56178A.
Ross, Samuel R., 61880A.
Roth, William J., Jr., 55721A.
Ruble, John H., 61672A.
Rushnell, Winfield R., 61615A.
Russell, Richard A., 61869A.
Ruth, Francis D., 55947A.
Ruzicka, John J., 61895A.
Sabo, Edward L., 61879A.
Salyer, Phillip N., 55722A.
Samulski, Paul E., 61701A.
Sanders, Gordon L., 55953A.
Sauvage, Norman D., 61884A.
Scanlan, Joseph D., 61643A.
Scanlon, Thomas D., 61785A.
Schaefer, Robert W., 61858A.
Schaum, Craig O., 55595A.
Scheatzie, David G., 61961A.
Scheltens, Ronald K., 56205A.
Schemenaur, Roger E., 55596A.
Schmidt, Karl W., 55597A.
Schmidt, Walter E., 55598A.
Schmitt, Joseph A., 56041A.
Schramm, Wayne E., 61783A.
Schultz, Ronald L., 61689A.
Schutt, Don F., 61722A.
Schwall, Richard E., 61652A.
Schweers, George R., 61863A.
Scott, Taylor G., 62021A.
See, Dennis R., 55599A.
Seizys, Anthony W., 55600A.
Sellers, Lester H., 55723A.
Senecal, Lionel R., 62471A.
Senyk, Joseph M., 55792A.
Sewell, George H., Jr., 61644A.
Sexton, Harry, 56186A.
Shafer, Jonathan S., 55601A.
Shaffer, Jon G., 55602A.
Shatzer, Kenneth R., 62001A.
Shaw, Thomas R., 61753A.
Shearin, David R., 55603A.
Shell, Hubert R., 61770A.
Sherburn, James R., 61984A.
Sherwood, Marcia W., 63265W.
Shinn, Prescott N., 55724A.
Shore, Kenneth B., 56018A.
Shropshire, Richard A., 61981A.
Shumate, Arthur K., 55604A.
Signet, Paul A., 61921A.
Sikes, Charles P., 61979A.
Silvay, Andrew R., 55725A.
Sims, William R., 63176A.
Sinclair, Jerry L., 61816A.
Siteman, Robert H., 55605A.
Sitterly, Lewis F., 63185A.
Slocum, John M., 56230A.
Smith, Bernard W., 61729A.
Smith, Charles S., 61658A.
Smith, Donald C., 55726A.
Smith, Eric E., 63108A.
Smith, Eugene N., 55606A.
Smith, Jerry J., 61958A.
Smith, Jimmie L., 55607A.
Smith, Josh M., Jr., 61934A.
Smith, Kenneth R., 55608A.
Smith, Larry L., 61659A.
Smith, Richard E., 63103A.
Smith, Thomas M., 56020A.
Smith, Val, 55941A.
Smith, Wayne O., Jr., 55976A.
Smothermon, Philip R., 55609A.
Snowberger, Lee A., 61796A.
Snyder, Earl J., 61604A.
Solomon, Edward C., 61871A.
Soltis, William J., 56175A.
Speight, William P., 55955A.
Spiers, Joseph K., 62015A.
Spillane, William D., 61821A.
Spotts, Maynard E., 61713A.
Stack, Thomas P., 55610A.
Stafford, Michael N., 55961A.
Stambaugh, Donald L., 62463A.
Stanley, Roy M., 2d, 56237A.
Stark, Terry M., 61938A.
Starkel, Max P., 62434A.
Starrett, Samuel D., 55611A.
Stearns, William E., Jr., 55989A.
Steczkowski, Arthur F., 62010A.
Steen, Martin W., 55805A.
Stevens, Gary E., 56377A.
Stevens, John R., 55612A.
Stevens, Michael C., 55727A.
Stewart, Glenn L., 61727A.
Strom, Brock T., 55613A.
Strom, Jack A., 55841A.
Sturm, Bob L., 61613A.

Sullivan, Edward F., 56011A.
Sullivan, John J., 61677A.
Suranyi, Edward E., 63306A.
Sutherland, John D., 55802A.
Swain, Jerry M., 61922A.
Swanson, Alan C., 61965A.
Takacs, William E., 62451A.
Tatum, John H., 3d, 62447A.
Taylor, Allan A., 61942A.
Taylor, James W., 55614A.
Tedrick, Robert L., 61990A.
Telford, William D., 55615A.
Templeton, Ronald H., 55616A.
Tenhoor, Frederick G., 62022A.
Terpening, Donald E., 55949A.
Terry, James D., 55977A.
Theiss, Alvin R., 61695A.
Thomas, Eugene A., 55617A.
Thomas, Norris D., 55936A.
Thomas, William B., 63251A.
Thomas, William D., 61673A.
Thompson, Donald M., 61963A.
Thompson, Kenneth R., 55618A.
Thompson, Paul Y., 63279A.
Thomson, Laurence J., 55619A.
Thorpe, Edwin H., Jr., 61898A.
Tillman, Gray E., Jr., 62455A.
Timmermans, Philip W., 55945A.
Tinsley, Claude H., 3d, 61980A.
Todd, Harold W., Jr., 55620A.
Tompkins, Richard J., 61791A.
Toner, William L., 63223A.
Toney, William M., 55621A.
Toniolli, Johnnie S., 61605A.
Towery, Jimmy N., 61886A.
Towle, Robert W., Jr., 61870A.
Toye, Richard G., 55622A.
Trace, Thomas L., 63201A.
Tracey, Richard E., 55623A.
Trail, Richard L., 55624A.
Treu, William A., 61910A.
Trombley, Donald J., 56273A.
Tucker, Raymond B., 61792A.
Turner, Frank W., Jr., 61763A.
Turner, James R., 55625A.
Tuzo, George L., 55728A.
Tygett, Herbert C., 61637A.
Ulmer, John W., Jr., 55626A.
Unsderfer, William H., Jr., 61970A.
Valeri, James, 61614A.
Vance, James C., 55627A.
Vance, John C., Jr., 55729A.
Vance, Jon C., 56280A.
Vandusen, Maurice V., Jr., 55969A.
VanPutte, Ronald E., 61943A.
VanSickle, Larry P., 56200A.
Varner, Gerald J., 56324A.
Vickery, Charles A., 55730A.
Villiger, Timothy J., 61841A.
Vinzant, Vernon V., 61760A.
Vogel, Richard K., 61887A.
Voise, Roland R., 62457A.
Vosika, Eugene L., 55628A.
Waggoner, Hal F., 61839A.
Wainwright, Ronald G., 63273A.
Wainwright, Stanley E., Jr., 55731A.
Walker, Richard K., 61717A.
Wallace, John M., 62454A.
Wallace, Ray M., 56317A.
Walsh, John M., 62011A.
Walther, George H., 56321A.
Ward, Joe E., 55951A.
Warner, Norris E., 55956A.
Warren, Jack M., 55629A.
Warren, James E., 55630A.
Warren, James M., 61940A.
Wassall, James W., 56061A.
Waterman, Quintin L., 55732A.
Waters, Albert L., 55631A.
Watkins, Richard C., 61752A.
Watlington, Bernard E., 55632A.
Weaver, James L., 61728A.
Weaver, James R., 55633A.
Weeks, Calvin G., 61631A.
Weihe, David A., 61782A.
Weisman, Alan D., 61936A.
Welch, James C., 55634A.
Wellman, Larry N., 61751A.
Wendell, John H., Jr., 61974A.
Wensinger, Ralph R., 55635A.
West, Dale G., 62460A.
West, James E., 55636A.
West, Norman P., 62472A.
White, James E., 55895A.
White, Jerry D., 63261A.
Whitesides, Richard L., 55637A.
Whitford, James D., 61831A.
Whitmore, David C., 55638A.
Wickman, John F., 63252A.
Wideman, Hubert G., 2d, 55639A.
Wilder, Robert L., 55640A.
Wilkinson, Thomas J., 61741A.
Williams, Billy G., 61601A.
Williams, Clyde S., 61777A.
Williams, David B., 61937A.
Williams, George W., 55641A.
Williams, Gerald D., 61982A.
Williams, Haven A., 61939A.
Williams, Robert F., 55642A.
Williams, William H., 56038A.
Williamson, Ivey E., 61778A.
Williamson, Larry G., 61602A.
Willis, James L., 61619A.
Wilson, Charles W., 61935A.
Wilson, Lary W., 61988A.
Wilson, Richard W., 62023A.
Winburn, Freddie C., 56030A.
Wingfield, John D., 61780A.
Wingo, Gerald V., 61744A.
Winkler, Paul D., 56320A.
Winters, Charles P., 55643A.
Wissing, Norman H., 61957A.
Witherspoon, Ralph P., 61757A.
Wittenberg, William A., 63342A.
Wolpert, Donald G., 55995A.
Womack, Bond M., Jr., 63173A.
Wood, Dean C., 55644A.
Woods, James C., 55645A.
Woodworth, Rogers F., 56000A.
Worden, Stephen F., 61767A.
Work, James B., 63302A.
Worley, George H., 61928A.
Wright, George R., 56198A.
Wyatt, Edward W., 55799A.
Wycoff, William J., 62433A.
Wynn, Frederick B., 55646A.
Yeatts, Fredrick S., 55733A.
Yoakam, Donald E., 61926A.
York, Guy P., 63172A.
Young, Bruce E., 63164A.
Young, David G., 61866A.
Young, Martin L., 61905A.
Zahniser, Frank R., 63307A.
Zaleski, Charles D., 55647A.
Zalmanis, Andris, 61697A.
Zartman, Vance A., 56029A.
Zimmerlee, Joseph R., 63124A.
Zimmerman, Albert R., Jr., 55998A.
Zint, William L., Jr., 56002A.
Zoeller, Herbert O., 56270A.

Medical Service Corps

Ainsworth, Clayton A., 3d, 61185A.
Bassett, Bruce E., 61192A.
Fowler, Brady K., 61197A.
Furtado, Victor C., 61187A.
Giron, David J., 61198A.
Hall, Edward T., Jr., 61193A.
Humerickhouse, Marlan J., 61184A.
Kittell, Theodore H., 61189A.
Kush, George S., 61188A.
McWilliams, James E., 61196A.
Murphy, John E., 61191A.
Nantz, William C., 61200A.
Smead, Phillip E., 61195A.
Walker, William J., Jr., 61186A.
Wassmund, James A., 61194A.
Witzgall, Fred L., 61199A.

Note.—Dates of rank of all officers nominated for promotion will be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.

The following-named persons, who were appointed as permanent professors of the U.S. Air Force Academy under recess appointment provisions during the last recess period of the 87th Congress, for appointment as permanent professors of the U.S. Air Force Academy, under the provisions of section 9333(b), title 10, United States Code:

Col. Alfonse R. Miele, 12754A.
Col. Wilbert H. Ruenheck, 36459A.
Col. Wayne A. Yeoman, 17328A.

The following persons, who were appointed in the Regular Air Force under recess appointment provisions during the last recess period of the 87th Congress, for appointment in the Regular Air Force in the grade of captain, under section 8284 of title 10, United States Code, with a view to designation under section 8067 of title 10, United States Code, to perform the duties indicated, and with dates of rank to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Air Force:

To be captains, USAF (Dental)

Richard J. Camden, AO3042865.
John B. Ciampa, Jr.,
William B. Farrar, AO02239971.
Thomas R. Kampsen, AO3078400.
Donald E. Metzger.
Ronald D. Szilagyi, AO3089729.
John M. Young, AO3075210.

To be captain, USAF (Nurse)

Ann C. DeStefano, AN2242399.

The following persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force in the grades indicated, under section 8284 of title 10, United States Code, with a view to designation under section 8067 of title 10, United States Code, to perform the duties indicated, and with dates of rank to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Air Force:

To be captains, USAF (Chaplain)

Gerald H. Akins, AO2255113.
John O. Ballantine, AO3059415.
Beverly J. Barnett, AO2261877.
Ike C. Barnett, Jr., AO2261606.
John C. Bellingham, AO3059603.
John J. Benda, AO3060502.
Mack C. Branham, Jr., AO4012723.
Herbert A. Brethauer, AO2255252.
Martin J. Caine, AO2255914.
Charles C. Caudill, AO3045753.
Floyd A. Chambers, AO3059412.
James W. Chapman, AO3012637.
James W. Davis, AO2234258.
Robert T. Deming, AO2077227.
Robert S. Egigian, AO2255234.
Richard J. Fetherston, AO3060175.
William E. Flood, AO2251458.
John W. Freed, AO2233985.
Francis H. Gallen, AO2252713.
James H. Griffin, AO3043806.
Henry H. Hafermann, AO2251190.
William S. Hall, AO3046071.
Eugene E. Hannemann, AO3045583.
Allen J. Harkness, AO2253026.
John L. Howard, AO3060356.
Donald W. Huhn, AO2255214.
David P. Jordan, AO1854380.
Charles D. Keeney, AO2255207.
Theodore C. Krause, AO2253842.
Wilfred L. Krieger, AO2255036.
Lucien E. Larche, Jr., AO3045755.
George L. Mailloux, AO2253211.
Walter H. Mattison, AO3046104.
Daniel W. McCalmont, AO2251731.
John P. McClatchy, AO2255070.
Lemuel D. McElyea, AO2255365.
Henry J. Meade, AO3059865.
George C. Norsworthy, AO3045587.
Robert F. Overman, AO2251522.
Archie R. Parker, Jr., AO2255167.
Merle F. Pedigo, AO2254713.
Richard F. Poock, AO2253297.
J. Walter Poorman, AO2234142.
Omer T. Powell, AO2249241.
Byron L. Richards, Jr., AO2219346.
John F. Richards, AO3059622.
James P. Rickards, AO3002822.
Carl B. Riggs, AO716253.
Paul L. Robins, AO2255452.
Lowell A. Ronne, AO586882.
Gordon L. Roth, AO2253840.
Calvin W. Roy, AO2253850.
Robert J. Shannon, AO2255216.
Henry S. G. Sheppard, AO2255206.
John L. Smart, AO3045572.
Dale F. Stewart, AO3059511.
Charles W. Strausser, AO2255204.
Oscar L. Sylwester, AO2251820.
James E. Townsend, AO3045823.

Ralph V. Van Landingham, AO3045585.
Thomas M. Williams, Jr., AO2255217.
Arthur W. Wingo, AO2247466.
Rodney C. Wurst, AO1903279.

To be captains, USAF (Judge Advocate)

Gordon A. Ginsburg, AO3059815.
Jerrold T. Lynch, AO3059867.
Joseph S. Quinn, AO3060889.
Joan A. Schevitz, AL2236111.

To be captains, USAF (Medical)

Charles R. Bauer, AO3090341.
Louis H. Cargill, AO3077963.
Peter B. Carter, AO3075400.
Thomas G. Daniel, AO3075068.
Jefferson C. Davis, AO3079506.
Doyce B. Dees, AO3042803.
Dale R. Dunnihoo, AO3077390.
Victor J. Ferrari, Jr., AO3091323.
Gould D. Hayden, AO3090046.
Earle R. Heine, AO3044637.
Edward V. H. Henry, AO3075083.
Cruz M. Hernandez, AO3009498.
Angus Marshall, AO3111768.
Joseph L. McDonald, AO3075100.
Antonio Morales-Pereira, AO2021761.
Thomas J. Schermerhorn, AO3014743.
James A. Schoettler, AO3088615.
Myron R. Smith, AO3000158.
Edmund B. Weis, Jr., AO3078216.

To be captains, USAF (Dental)

George I. Daugherty II, AO3045265.
James P. Geracci, AO3077487.
Donald C. Kramer, AO3074944.
Frank Meister, Jr., AO3042574.
Robert M. Newman, AO3044956.
John B. Phillips, AO3111593.
Darrell E. Ross, AO2250160.
Gordon E. Starbuck, AO3111857.

To be captain, USAF (Medical Specialist)

Mary Hemenway, AM3112251.

To be captains, USAF (Nurse)

Maudie E. Bates, AN2214384.
Mary F. Clementi, AN2242914.
Patricia Crawford, AN900101.
Dorothy I. Fleming, AN795924.
Rosemary Garbett, AN2244077.
Eleanor J. Holmok, AN2214135.
Elender E. Jackson, AN2241638.
Ann M. Pulliam, AN2241572.
Marinel Richardson, AN2242803.
Erlene Thornburgh, AN1912854.
Dorothy J. Wilson, AN804191.
Zerline Winfield, AN2244531.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Chaplain)

Cammid O. Arrendell, AO788687.
Joseph W. Bomar, AO3060804.
Mark W. Fairless, AO3059590.
John J. Flattery, AO3061383.
James L. Fox, AO3059675.
Winston P. Fox, AO3059829.
Patrick A. Garzione, AO3061039.
Robert G. Gower, AO3061055.
Thomas J. Haley, AO3059664.
Jerome D. Halloran, AO3061156.
Newton R. N. Hardin, AO3059477.
John P. Healy, AO3061315.
Carrol L. Johnson, AO3060808.
David R. Johnson, AO2255201.
Douglas O. Jones, AO3061192.
James L. Jones, AO3061304.
James E. Jordan, AO3061384.
Earl J. Kingsley II, AO2230548.
Allen G. Landers, AO3059677.
John F. Leonard, AO3061060.
Paul F. McDonald, AO3061126.
Carl S. Mundinger, Jr., AO3060273.
George O. Murtagh, AO3060677.
Howard E. Nason, AO3060924.
Emilio Nebiolo, AO3061365.
Waldemar H. Nelson, AO3088386.
Frank A. Rice, AO3060779.
George M. Rushe, AO3059860.
Donald W. Ullrich, AO3061362.
Robert J. Utrup, AO3061124.
Earl F. Vaughn, AO3059736.
Robert B. Whalen, AO3061251.
Clarence E. Wiederholt, AO3061011.
John M. Wyzykowski, AO3061140.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Judge Advocate)

Paul J. Dubow, AO3047788.
Robert J. Kauffman, AO3102744.
Eugene P. Keenan, AO3103055.
Alfred W. Metzger, Jr., AO3104468.
Billie E. Morrison, AO3103217.
Gordon E. Schieman, AO3065560.
Larry W. Shreve, AO3102404.
C. Claude Teagarden, AO3066793.
Norman R. Thorpe, AO3066795.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Medical)

Richard B. Ellison, AO3089157.
David L. Holder, AO3091141.
Walter N. Zuck, AO3092944.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Dental)

Bradley H. Burrows, AO3090370.
Raymond J. Finn, Jr., AO3110788.
Charles B. Grace, AO3111346.
William J. Killoy, AO3089249.
Lawrence M. H. Lee, AO3110492.
Henry C. Manning, AO3111287.
David T. Nemanic, AO3090721.
Paul R. Swayne, AO3090493.
James M. Welch, AO3110725.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Nurse)

Arlene M. Bielefeldt, AN3075529.
Jo Ann H. Bolitho, AN3089540.
Ann M. Christiansen, AN3078934.
Glenice L. Coleman, AN3090166.
Sara J. Conroy, AN2214320.
Idalia M. Coppin, AN2243441.
Helen C. Costabile, AN2243254.
Marjorie J. Dohrman, AN3075962.
Geraldine A. Fitzpatrick, AN3044905.
Jean F. Gasbarri, AN3078429.
Eleanor G. Harrison, AN3088692.
June M. Hettinger, AN3075373.
Betty J. Jones, AN3091850.
Dolores M. Kallinick, AN3078810.
Katherine B. Kincaid, AN3092103.
Cecelia A. Kreminsky, AN3089968.
Mary C. Lynch, AN3075037.
Joyce E. O'Barr, AN3044755.
Norma J. Perlukas, AN3079352.
Mary L. Salter, AN3092960.
Frances Sanchez, AN3076937.
Kathleen D. Spores, AN3078470.
Lucille D. R. Stewart, AN3091800.
Jo Ann Toy, AN3075694.

The following persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

To be captains

Maclyn Abbott, AO1852616.
Ralph C. Abreu, AO1860693.
Nolan C. Alcock, AO3020683.
John L. Alderson, AO2009040.
Bart D. Allen, AO2238172.
William H. Alvis, AO1864110.
Gilbert N. Amelio, AO2228861.
Martin W. Andersen, AO2246998.
Edward Anlian, AO2084531.
Alvin J. Aronovsky, AO1864052.
Isaac E. Avinger, AO2215939.
Kaleem Azim, AO2253567.
Joseph B. Baggett, AO2224539.
James I. Baginski, AO3019946.
James R. Bagwell, AO3006730.
Fred E. Bailey, AO2244978.
Joseph H. Baker, Jr., AO1864488.
Eugene Bal, Jr., AO3018812.
Charles R. Balke, AO3016852.
Michael W. Balok, AO3006734.
James L. Barrell, AO3013157.
Samuel A. Barrett, AO1910693.
Kenneth D. Bauguess, AO3020762.
Earle A. Beasley, AO1910696.
William J. Becker, AO1857561.
Charles L. Beneze, Jr., AO3022471.
Allen Bennett, Jr., AO2246314.
Charles L. Bennett, Jr., AO3013209.
Robert F. Bennett, AO3011729.
Harley E. Berndt, AO945908.
Jack A. Birnkammer, AO2220950.
Stanley G. Blaum, AO3023912.
Burwell M. Block, AO3010813.
Lawrence D. Bogar, AO2234847.
Harry J. Booth, AO1860435.
Hollis B. Boston, Jr., AO3005371.
Thomas M. Bowe, AO1849902.
Nick L. Bradshaw, AO1863792.
Robert L. Branch, AO934393.
Philip A. Brennan, AO3021904.
Lloyd R. Bridgford, AO2204120.
James K. Brinson, AO2215743.
Henry B. Briscoe, AO3005372.
Clinton R. Brisendine, AO3013466.
Gene E. Brong, AO3004876.
Hubert S. Bronson, AO888487.
William F. Brotbeck, AO3006769.
Frederick J. Brots, AO696997.
Kirk A. Brown, AO3016721.
Thomas S. Brown, AO3037043.
Ronald E. Bryan, AO2247604.
Charles L. Buechele, AO3020765.
Russell S. Buker, AO1911540.
Boyd G. Burd, AO2228251.
Thomas J. Burke, AO2101213.
William M. Burkett, AO3005842.
John S. Burklund, AO2230385.
Tillman C. Burks, Jr., AO1847964.
Richard J. Burnette, AO1856943.
William J. Burney, AO2204375.
Joe H. Burns, AO2229373.
John W. Burns, AO2218626.
Paul C. Butcher, AO3035271.
Leroi H. Butler, AO3017498.
Loy A. Butts, AO1904358.
Wallis R. Calvert, AO2220472.
Theodore D. Cameron, AO2249087.
John W. Canaday, AO3018221.
Mayo Carrington, Jr., AO2245271.
Arthur M. Casbeer, AO2222786.
Donald F. Casey, AO1911637.
Terance E. Cawley, AO2237598.
Arthur F. Cayer, AO2232968.
D. L. Chapman, AO2219165.
Michael T. Chesney, AO2222025.
Johnny C. Chestnut, AO1865799.
Walter I. Christensen, Jr., AO2253831.
Charles H. Clapsaddle, AO1847725.
Ray E. Clark, AO1856339.
James D. Clendenen, AO3003031.
Thomas G. Cline, AO1848651.
Robert E. Clouser, AO2246511.
Charles J. Coen, AO1860224.
Ralph W. Collins, AO1855877.
Joseph W. Connolly, AO713057.
Daniel F. Coogan, AO3007828.
William R. Cook, AO1846747.
Leland J. Cooper, AO2222334.
Earl S. Costello, AO3014763.
James D. Covington, AO2226231.
Norman G. Cox, AO2236672.
Arthur H. Craft, Jr., AO3026263.
Thomas J. Crane, Jr., AO1852317.
George R. Crosby, AO2219767.
Wellington J. Cummings, AO3003189.
Fred J. Cuthill, AO1861006.
Ronald J. D'Aiuto, AO3012050.
Harry Dalke, AO1847763.
Leonard J. Dalzell, AO3013383.
Norbert P. Danhauer, AO2235059.
George D. Daughtry, AO2215879.
Robert N. Davidson, Jr., AO1864113.
Robert L. Deatherage, AO3013924.
Conley G. Defferding, AO2253789.
Woodrow W. Delorme, AO1858306.
Melvin T. Deschamps, AO3006434.
Anthony J. DiBaggio, AO2218456
Oakley J. Dollard, AO2221931.
William E. Dorroh, AO2218877.
Derwin D. Draper, AO3016335.
Earl M. Dugan, AO1863686.
James F. Dugan, AO2081014.
Alton B. Duke, Jr., AO1904484.
Melville E. Eaton, Jr., AO3012811.
William F. Eaton, AO2252871.
Ernest J. Edwards, AO3014016.
Harold F. Elliott, AO782843.
John M. Ellis, AO1858147.
Donald L. Erdman, AO1907651.
Donald L. Evans, AO1910727.
Gregory W. Fabian, AO2231124.
William A. Fahlgren, Jr., AO3003740.
Edward H. Fairburn, Jr., AO945464.

Charles A. Fauteux, AO978949.
Robert L. Fillingim, Jr., AO2222511.
George F. Fischer, AO1859588.
William L. Fitch, AO1857838.
Nelson T. Fletcher III, AO3012738.
James R. Flexer, AO2251800.
Robert E. Flora, AO3005037.
John J. Fogarty, AO3021462.
David B. Forbes, AO2224200.
Clarence W. Ford, AO2233315.
Walter H. Frederick, Jr., AO2081027.
Leslie L. Fredericks, AO2216163.
Peter G. Frigeri, AO2233406.
Paul F. Fritz, AO3009168.
Philip H. Fryberger, AO3089427.
Thomas L. Gaines, AO2229799.
George T. Gant, AO1850643.
William E. Gardiner, AO1863695.
Alphonse Gargiulo, Jr., AO2250017.
Nick Garofalos, AO2232559.
Thomas J. Gavin, AO2232979.
Kenneth E. German, AO2251807.
Robert D. Gerzine, AO2223624.
Delmar F. Gilkeson, AO941018.
Max Giovannini, AO2218896.
Joshua Glenn, AO1904807.
Richard H. Glenn, AO944798.
Richard A. Goldhammer, AO3011592.
Peter J. F. Graham, AO1859590.
Walter F. Grandy, AO2208407.
James T. Grant, Jr., AO3018277.
Harry W. Graves, AO1905498.
Lewis U. Green, Jr., AO944774.
William R. Green, Jr., AO2250539.
Alan J. Grill, AO3009224.
Harry L. Gronewald, AO2228783.
William D. Gutweiler, AO1849705.
Jack Hagopian, AO1905704.
Raymond W. Hall, AO2218169.
William E. Hall, AO992491.
Hughen G. Halliburton, AO3112240.
Harry R. Hamilton, AO2246323.
Robert H. Hamilton, Jr., AO2250030.
William V. Hamilton, AO2227927.
Byron E. Haner, AO1853699.
Lowell A. Hansard, AO3006912.
Dan L. Harper, AO3014878.
Douglas A. Harper, AO2206154.
Lee C. Hartman, Jr., AO2205285.
Donald W. Hartranft, AO3004690.
Ernest L. Hatchell, Jr., AO3013066.
Richard E. Haug, AO939845.
Donald T. Hawkins, AO1904318.
John W. Heath, AO2219523.
Eugene E. Hegland, AO1858377.
Carl R. Hein, AO2249298.
Floyd E. Heinzig, AO1865196.
Jack A. Henry, AO1903027.
June E. Henry, AL2250444.
Burritt E. Hill, AO1853284.
Claude C. Hill, AO2221143.
Robert E. Hines, AO939187.
Ervin E. Hiney, AO3034819.
Eugene G. Hobbie, AO2218693.
Leo F. Holden, AO2234908.
Gerald M. Holland, AO2232534.
Herbert H. Holmes, AO2220177.
Major I. Hooper, AO3020689.
William R. Houk, AO1864241.
William H. Howard, AO1910887.
Ray R. Howell, AO3013000.
Robert S. Howey, AO3018658.
Thomas A. Howley, AO2224340.
Robert L. Hull, AO1860596.
Harlan B. Hume, AO3037764.
William S. Hunter, Jr., AO2219540.
James V. Hyland, AO2229394.
Leon S. Inge, AO1859594.
Richard T. Izuo, AO2230125.
William H. Jackson, AO3003972.
Harry J. Jacobs, AO2215065.
Avon C. James, AO3006954.
James P. Jenrette, AO2090466.
Roger E. Johnson, AO3003059.
Hilton A. Jones, Jr., AO1861014.
Norman L. Jonson, AO2230219.
Jerome D. Julius, AO2253585.
Bernard A. Kaldahl, AO2215501.
Martin T. Kallighan, AO2220191.
Timothy F. Kelleher, AO2217026.
Ernest J. Kellerstrass, AO2207831.
Lloyd J. Kelly, AO1855861.
Floyd C. Kennedy, AO1848844.
Richard D. Kennedy, AO839108.
Robert W. Kennedy, AO2227578.
Robert C. Kerl, AO1850111.
Joseph H. Kerr, AO946011.
James C. Ketchum, AO2222148.
Kerry P. Kicklighter, AO3021965.
Cara W. Kidd, Jr., AO1853294.
Maurice L. Kilpatrick, AO3031289.
Murvin J. Kimbrell, AO3003876.
Earl C. Kindle, AO958134.
Alfred H. Kirk, AO1860460.
Gale F. Kirkpatrick, AO2245231.
Peter G. Kleck, AO968490.
John W. Klefstad, AO1864248.
Frederick A. Kloeppel, AO2216120.
Robert J. Knowles, AO863852.
Joseph Kundrat, AO2218466.
James H. Kyle, AO3021064.
Jack S. Lacy, AO1857978.
Jim P. Lancaster, AO3005876.
Roland P. Langenbach, AO2229949.
Warren Langer, AO705971.
Russell G. Langlois, AO2232211.
Wray C. Lasswell, AO2238487.
Jacob C. Ledbetter, Jr., AO1912316.
Edward A. Lefferts, AO3020631.
Walter A. Lenz, AO3017320.
George K. M. Leong, AO3037859.
Dan E. Lewis, AO2237436.
Richard D. Lichtwardt, AO2221226.
James E. Light, Jr., AO1909339.
Kinley W. Lindsay, AO1847830.
Forest L. Little, AO2232214.
Gerald F. Loughlin, AO3026362.
William T. Luckett, Jr., AO2220234.
Wilfred G. Mackey, AO2233948.
Robert F. Macko, AO2234940.
Richard G. Madden, AO3014134.
Harry H. Magazu, AO2250068.
Gerald D. Malpass, AO1911110.
Robert E. Malsbury, AO2233435.
John P. Marks, AO2229321.
Charles S. Martin, AO2022898.
Emlen L. Martin, Jr., AO822952.
Richard A. Martin, AO1855550.
Charles L. Mason, Jr., AO2236548.
Albert R. Masserini, AO1855651.
Joseph J. Matelich, AO3021393.
James R. Mathews, AO3003943.
James P. McAleer, AO2248286.
Ronald W. McCartan, AO2248494.
James P. McCarthy, AO3022316.
William McCarthy, AO3005773.
Harold A. McClanahan, Jr., AO2220697.
William F. McClelland, AO3015647.
James W. McConnell, AO2228703.
John W. McConville, AO2224855.
Francis T. McCormack, Jr., AO1910628.
John W. McDonald, Jr., AO869010.
Jeffrey R. McDougall, AO2224448.
Joe D. McEwen, Jr., AO3037670.
Gerald McGovern, AO2209498.
William R. McIver III, AO2221619.
James F. McKague, AO1849378.
John McKechnie, AO2090905.
Richard J. McKinley, AO1910919.
William C. McMillan, AO2249318.
Albert R. McNamee, AO2217162.
Lyle W. McNeely, AO2226183.
Joseph M. McQuaid, AO2101744.
Charles E. McWhorter, AO3003074.
Richard L. Mehr, AO2247660.
Leonard L. Melton, Jr., AO2226630.
Mildred G. Mercer, AL2236277.
Barbara L. Metz, AL2235439.
Marvin C. Meyer, AO2205542.
Warren W. Meyer, AO829525.
Burr V. Miller, Jr., AO2222299.
Louis E. Miller, AO2087823.
Andrew C. Mitchell III, AO2244907.
William E. Mohr II, AO2221812.
Ernest G. Moore, AO2248378.
Richard G. Moore, AO3036582.
John E. Morgan, AO2235444.
Edward D. Moriarty, AO2250078.
Cola R. Morris, Jr., AO1865496.
Frederick J. E. Morrissey, AO938708.
Mark F. Mullinix, AO2217355.
Andre R. Mumford, AO2248568.
Homer C. Munson, Jr., AO3002474.
Wayne G. Murray, AO3016662.
William C. Myer, AO1856197.
George Newland, AO3008512.
James L. Noffsinger, AO3018825.
Harry E. Noll, AO2216750.
Francis D. Noonan, AO3030059.
Robert E. Nugent, AO3017719.
Joseph P. Ochota, AO939869.
Lynn W. Oglesby, AO2237881.
Richard G. Ohlheiser, AO1855490.
James L. Oleary, AO2089933.
James L. Olson, AO1858125.
William E. O'Neil, AO1854352.
John J. Orabona, AO2218222.
Nicholas Ordon, AO2217510.
Loren E. Orr, AO2232568.
George S. Osborne, AO2218995.
Jimmie R. Osborne, AO1862374.
Donald W. Ottaway, AO2215236.
Marvin G. Ouren, Jr., AO2235414.
Henry D. Overen, AO3021394.
Allan L. Parks, AO2248616.
Joe H. Pate, AO1859006.
Ferdinand L. Patrone, AO2234581.
Carl E. Patterson, AO1854086.
Gerald L. Patterson, AO1864909.
Robert J. Peary, AO2224749.
Alpha E. Peden, Jr., AO2222265.
Jerome G. Peppers, Jr., AO2230578.
Wilson Percival, AO1852112.
Mario Perez, AO2228581.
Paul C. Perkins, AO752235.
Russell G. Perkins, AO1852315.
Ernest E. Personeus, AO2232998.
Joseph Petta, AO1860133.
Don L. Pfefferkorn, AO2248769.
Donald W. Pfister, AO1850968.
Charles W. Piper, AO1911818.
John S. Pletcher, AO1850834.
William G. Plunk, AO2231034.
Raymond Pollack, AO1851912.
Lawrence O. Prestjohn, AO2238088.
Darrell P. Prince, AO1866010.
William E. Rabon, AO2230777.
Kenneth Randall, AO1848704.
Dwight S. Ranney, AO1856848.
William I. Rardin, AO1861028.
James B. Rauhut, AO2220306.
Eugene F. Redden, AO1863438.
Robert J. Reddy, AO2222303.
Leon R. Reed, AO2250874.
Parker E. Reed, AO3016215.
Donald E. Reeves, AO1862549.
Donald R. Rennie, AO2232138.
Robert A. Reynolds, AO687904.
Robert L. Rhine, AO2218771.
John O. Rhodes, Jr., AO1851495.
Donald W. Richardson, AO3020016.
Russell G. Richardson, AO1863770.
William K. Richardson, AO3019483.
James W. Rigg, AO3008094.
Maurice E. Ripley, Jr., AO3004053.
Arthur J. Ritter, AO3036979.
Gerald J. Robinson, AO2228546.
Don R. Rogillio, AO3002868.
David N. Rose, AO2211135.
Richard C. Roth, AO2255799.
Richard M. Rowland, AO2227236.
Thurman C. Russell, AO2086708.
Robert S. Rutter, AO2219354.
Sam J. Ruvolo, AO2216971.
Samuel O. Sadler, AO2204265.
Albert M. Salvi, AO1863100.
Jack I. Sanders, AO2225433.
Thomas E. Sawyer, AO3016022.
Jack H. Schenaker, AO2228965.
Henry R. Schibi, AO1858772.
Darrell L. Schlotterback, AO2217515.
Robert T. Schrawger, AO1911607.
William F. Schrimsher, AO2224580.
Donald A. Schulz, AO2216605.
Ted J. Schutawie, AO2231664.
Walter Schweisfurth, AO1860394.
Earlan L. Seawards, AO1851659.
Frank L. Segars, AO1856805.
Harold R. Selfridge, AO1850412.
Clayton L. Selph, AO2236533.
Francis J. Seymour, AO2229926.
Edward E. Shackelford, AO1860463.
Dennis T. Sheehan, AO2238304.
Jack W. Sheen, AO1855256.
Robert L. Simpson, AO1912249.

Travis L. Simpson, AO2215828.
Milton H. Sipple, Jr., AO1853149.
Beverly E. Sittig, AL2234029.
George R. Sleeth, AO1852403.
Bruce D. Smith, AO3003748.
Charles E. Smith, AO2219046.
Dewey L. Smith, AO3003075.
Gerald B. Smith, AO1862611.
James A. Smith, Jr., AO1907428.
John D. Smith, AO2218788.
John S. Smith, AO1848655.
Louis A. Smith, AO2237468.
Eugene W. Snell, AO2247641.
Mirco P. Snidero, AO2252797.
George A. Sousa, AO2253025.
Robert E. Stevens, AO2220839.
Robert B. Stewart, Jr., AO2251185.
Floyd E. Stockstill, AO3012401.
Johnnie V. Stone, AO3011017.
Warren H. Story, AO2219059.
Theodore J. St. Palley, AO2076268.
Donald G. Strandberg, AO3002740.
Glory A. Sturiale, AL1910661.
William H. Sullivan, AO2233520.
Donald H. Tarrant, AO2215564.
Harold L. Taylor, Jr., AO1848821.
Jack M. Taylor, AO1865739.
John B. Taylor, AO2236349.
Stanley A. Taylor, AO3020819.
Alexander M. Teets, AO798613.
Clarence E. Teske, AO3020786.
Donald E. Thoman, AO2251009.
James R. Thomas, AO1854551.
Roland E. Thomas, AO2248943.
Charles E. Thompson, AO717918.
Glen E. Thompson, AO2219066.
Ralph H. Thompson, AO2001459.
Roy L. Thompson, AO2227930.
Theodore R. Thompson, Jr., AO3007695.
Bobby W. Thornton, AO2246423.
William R. Threlkeld, AO2216147.
Russell W. Thresher, Jr., AO2215524.
Robert A. Timmons, Jr., AO824785.
Emeal Tipton, AO2246424.
Richard D. Tompkins, AO2225336.
Arlyn F. Toppert, AO2205449.
Renato V. Trapani, AO1859616.
Charles D. Tubbs, AO1910665.
Theodore C. Turner, AO1856731.
Thomas H. A. Turner, Jr., AO1904889.
John E. Tynan, AO1846865.
Ronald Tyre, AO2231026.
Kiyoshi J. Uehara, AO1857532.
William E. Underwood, AO1851599.
Anthony M. Vaitekunas, AO2218153.
John E. Vandendries, AO1851238.
Thomas Vaneerden, Jr., AO3006315.
Jack L. Vanloan, AO2207300.
Norris E. Vanwyk, AO1848764.
Robert I. Vick, AO2215399.
Grover W. Vickers, AO2218052.
Robert A. Vince, AO2233011.
Stephen Von Phul, AO2235780.
Robert J. Wachter, AO2232317.
Gene P. Wadsworth, AO2208293.
Robert T. Wallace, AO3012766.
Leslie M. Walrath, AO2085342.
Daniel O. Walsh, AO2237118.
Kenneth L. Walsh, AO1858587.
Alvin W. Washington, AO2221480.
Sidney A. Webb, AO2216151.
Kenneth E. Weiss, AO2222476.
George R. Whatley, AO1865394.
Robert D. Whetzel, AO2232151.
Hubert M. Whitaker, Jr., AO3005049.
Bill R. Whitesell, AO695727.
Troy L. Wicker, AO1910674.
Alva L. Wilkerson, AO938243.
Robert G. Wilkins, AO2217239.
Billy J. Williams, AO2230015.
Roy D. Williams, AO3002493.
Michael E. Willoughby, AO2217107.
Stephen B. Wilson, AO3012416.
William H. Wilson, AO1904620.
Sara J. Windland, AL2219092.
James H. Windt, AO2255812.
Donald R. Wippermann, AO3004177.
Wales L. Woodard, AO3022862.
John N. Woodell, Jr., AO2215908.
Sumner R. Woods, AO1851817.
Joseph W. Wright, AO2205325.
Richard J. Young, AO3013718.
Sandy A. Zevin, AO2226887.
H. Jay Zink, AO3016410.
Carl K. Zolezzi, AO1852823.

To be first lieutenants

William D. Abballe, AO3085504.
James P. Abbott, AO3085061.
William R. Abel, AO3085391.
Maurice A. Abell, AO3066422.
Richard S. Abell, AO3093087.
James L. Abney, AO3081566.
Frank J. Abrams, Jr., AO3093828.
Jerry M. Absher, AO3072662.
Richard A. Acken, AO3085452.
Walter E. Ackerlund, AO3085517.
William B. Acly, AO3093268.
Charles G. Adams, AO3086896.
Frank D. Adams, AO3074583.
Gary A. Adams, AO3093668.
Jordan E. Adams III, AO3086897.
Joseph G. C. Adams, AO3094150.
Robert M. Adams, AO3085385.
Robert S. Adams, AO3067147.
William B. Adams, Jr., AO3086524.
John B. Aday, Jr., AO3084469.
Grafton D. Addison, Jr., AO2208820.
Thomas H. Agee, Jr., AO3069768.
Jose J. Aguayo, AO3085828.
Joseph A. Ah New, Jr., AO3066687.
Warren J. Ahr, AO3081990.
Ronald L. Akers, AO3073357.
Clifford J. Alderson, AO3049381.
William M. Aldred, Jr., AO3086898.
Dean E. Alexander, AO3027411.
Douglas M. Alexander, AO3049648.
George Alexander, AO3094218.
Jackie L. Alexander, AO3082612.
John C. Alexander, AO3066450.
Ronald S. Alexander, AO3051822.
William D. Alexander, AO3069681.
Ben H. Allen, Jr., AO3074230.
Ira F. Allen, AO3028824.
Jimmy W. Allen, AO3070216.
Lawrence H. Allen, AO3070895.
McVerlin Allen, AO3056149.
Melvin L. Allen, AO3057100.
Robert D. Allen, AO3085670.
William M. Allen, Jr., AO3087008.
James R. Allender, Jr., AO3082040.
Eugene R. Alley, AO3094592.
Byron H. Allred, AO3052087.
Ralph L. Allred, AO3052123.
Clyde R. Althouse, AO3056496.
Arturo F. Alvarez, AO3087292.
Moses L. Alves, AO3072743.
Phillip H. Ambs, AO3093829.
Robert L. Amer, AO3081885.
Michael Anaclerio, AO3071477.
Frank J. Anania, AO3086537.
Louis P. Anatrella, AO3072383.
Allen L. Anderson, Jr., AO3046811.
James A. Anderson, AO3086863.
John Anderson, Jr., AO3048154.
John D. Anderson, AO3073246.
John M. Anderson, AO3021206.
Kenneth C. Anderson, AO3072800.
LaGrande K. Anderson, AO3053914.
Melvin F. Anderson, AO3051252.
William C. Anderson, AO3086300.
Joe K. Ando, AO3051723.
John W. Anelli, AO3072273.
Donald B. Anthony, AO3068736.
Frank J. Anzalone, AO3093161.
Stephen F. Apple, AO3070487.
James Appleby, AO3094533.
Alfred H. Arbuthnot, AO3071671.
Francis X. Archeneaux, AO3072827.
Andrew J. M. Archer, AO3072744.
Jay M. Archer, AO3085913.
June Ardin, AL3060875.
Daniel K. Arita, AO3086987.
John R. Arlt, AO3094723.
Dwight A. Armstrong, AO3051545.
Frederic C. Armstrong, AO3055359.
Robert R. Arnau, AO3047899.
Ronald E. Arnett, AO3085362.
James R. Arnold, AO3058124.
Thomas G. Artman, AO3085028.
Frederick L. Ashe, AO3086086.
Paul O. Ashnault, AO3028963.
Robert L. Aspinwall, AO3083388.
Guy E. Attwood, AO3085206.
William C. Ausdenmore, AO3056396.
William H. Austin, Jr., AO3085518.
Edward W. Avent III, AO3084463.
Hernaldo R. Avila, AO3055675.
Robert R. Avrit, AO3069220.
Richard F. Bache, AO3081125.
Ronald L. Bachman, AO3083162.
George J. Backhaus, AO3074403.
Dean L. Baerwald, AO3094524.
Escar L. Bailey, AO3086448.
James E. Bailey, AO3073975.
James W. Bailey, AO3053231.
Shellie M. Bailey, Jr., AO3086273.
Charles N. Baird, AO3087070.
Bruce H. Baker, Jr., AO3086237.
James W. Baker, AO3083460.
Willard K. Baker, AO3008905.
Carl R. Balduf, AO3084490.
Charles C. Baldwin, AO2211733.
Edwin L. Baldwin, AO3086364.
Virgil L. Baldwin, AO3093223.
William F. Bale, AO3084677.
Bobby T. Ball, AO3071220.
James P. Ball, AO3071546.
William D. Ball, AO3094742.
Thurman A. Ballard, AO3086503.
William G. Ballentine, AO3056297.
Bruce B. Ballif, AO3047295.
William M. Balsley, AO3008773.
Robert J. Banish, AO3083189.
George G. Banks, AO3046729.
Jimmy E. Banks, AO3083066.
Robert J. Bannach, AO3082050.
Richard C. Barbel, AO3070719.
Newton R. Barber, AO3086933.
Raymond H. Bardwell, AO3066866.
William L. Barker, AO3081909.
William K. Barlow, AO3086012.
Stephen E. Barndt, AO3082810.
George W. Barnes, AO3094023.
Leo E. Barnes, AO3086611.
William A. Barnes, AO3083957.
Arnold J. Barnett, AO3087410.
Bruce A. Barney, AO3072773.
Robert L. Barney, AO3056308.
William C. Barnhart, AO3087071.
Kenneth L. Barrett, Jr., AO3083038.
Russell W. Barrett, AO3083809.
Larry L. Barron, AO3027538.
Claude N. Barrow, AO3084553.
Joseph G. Barry, AO3085943.
Frank C. Bartholomew, AO3069221.
Owen Bartholomew, AO3053891.
Nicholas P. Bartolini, AO3093689.
John E. Bartos, AO3093426.
Nora M. Basic, AL3060761.
Thomas D. Bass, AO3065464.
Harold S. Bassett, AO3070595.
Wayne R. Bassett, AO3074002.
Ronald J. Basso, AO3093398.
Clinton E. Batson, AO3067048.
Philip J. Battaglia, AO3067613.
Thomas E. Batz, AO3071583.
Fred L. Bauer, AO3067652.
William J. Baugh, AO3067074.
Paul K. Baumann, AO3072608.
Thomas H. Baumgartner, AO3093717.
Dale R. Baumler, AO3029799.
Marion D. Beadle, AO3039685.
Donald C. Beal, AO3087088.
George S. Beall, AO3056105.
Clark S. Bean, AO3087306.
John R. Beard, AO3071520.
James H. Beardall, AO3054351.
Kenneth S. Beatty, AO3074384.
James F. Beaumaster, AO3094750.
Robert G. Beberstein, AO3026043.
Paul H. Beck, AO3067771.
John N. F. G. Becker, AO3073964.
Robert W. Becker, AO3072669.
Donald D. Beckham, AO3083005.
Lavern D. Beggs, AO3086146.
Raymond W. Behrens, AO3047781.
Charles P. Belisle, AO3086864.
Billy N. Bell, AO3048984.
David F. Bell, AO3073318.
Robert E. Belli, AO3057415.
Donald F. Benedict, AO3046294.
Keith E. Benich, AO3101134.
Cyril A. Bennett, AO3087179.

George L. Benoit, AO3094241.
Harold H. Benoit, AO3071287.
William B. Benshoof, AO3086803.
Jeffrey P. Benson, AO3084265.
David M. Bentley, AO3083571.
Albert H. Benzinger, AO3081980.
Donald W. Beran, AO3087339.
Morton B. Berman, AO3072652.
Daniel A. Bernal, AO3085611.
Leon V. Bernier, AO3093624.
Lydia F. Bernier, AL3060775.
David W. Berrie, AO3093888.
John D. Berrier, AO3035859.
Peter F. Berrini, AO3086154.
Joseph M. Berry, AO3083477.
Laurence E. Berry, AO3085941.
Millard F. Berry, Jr., AO2219731.
Richard L. Berry, AO3065013.
Ronald L. Berry, AO3101116.
Stanley D. Berry, AO3055573.
Hubert M. Berthold, AO3071040.
Clarence J. Bertrand, AO3026054.
Richard C. Bertz, AO3082472.
Jean P. Berube, Jr., AO3086155.
Charles W. Best, Jr., AO3086240.
Duane E. Best, AO3050535.
Douglas A. Beyer, AO3071908.
Halbert A. Bickham, Jr., AO3067075.
Larry A. Biddison, AO3093718.
Richard T. Biggs, AO3094601.
Rollins E. Bilby, AO3087411.
Donald R. Biles, AO3054642.
Lawrence M. Bilodeau, AO3082751.
Walter Biolley, AO3008908.
John N. Birch, AO3086647.
Clifton A. Birchman, AO3053567.
Edward A. Bird, Jr., AO3094623.
Harry G. Birkelo, AO3068504.
Keith M. Bischoff, AO3053029.
Robert O. Bissey, AO3086462.
Gerald R. Bitney, AO3081917.
Vilhelm Bjerknes, AO3055982.
Harrison E. Black, Jr., AO3087222.
Thomas S. Black, AO3029521.
Nathan C. Blackwell, AO3101191.
Omer J. Blaes, AO3087167.
Harold D. Blagg, AO3083745.
Gary R. Blake, AO3086411.
Robert A. Blanchfield, AO3073309.
Roger L. Blom, AO3070775.
Charles W. Bloom, Jr., AO3072594.
Eugene S. Blossman, Jr., AO3054374.
Larry W. Bock, AO3093889.
Ronald P. Bockius, AO3051784.
George A. Bogert, AO3093526.
Lawrence L. Boggess, AO3064532.
Frank W. Boggs, AO3087251.
James A. Boggs, AO3083254.
William R. Boggs, AO3066277.
Donald O. Bohart, AO3093019.
Stanley A. Bohinc, AO3084569.
Robert G. Bohlander, AO3093863.
Walter K. Boileau, AO3072957.
Gerald W. Bolgren, AO3055220.
Joe A. Boling, AO3094002.
James F. Bolinger, AO3081679.
Dale W. Bollert, AO3072495.
Ronald A. Bond, AO3071858.
Larry I. Bone, AO3083385.
John A. Bonner, Jr., AO3072105.
Robert R. Boone, AO3054186.
Roy H. Boone, AO3082192.
Albert G. Boos III, AO3067310.
Edward M. Boothe, AO3085606.
Verdon Bordelon, AO3094576.
Gilbert C. Born, AO3094157.
Louis F. Borne, Jr., AO3027544.
William H. Boss, AO3086845.
David R. Bosse, AO3085914.
Walter E. Bosselmann, Jr., AO3086156.
Malcolm O. Bossier, Jr., AO3070204.
Frederick B. Boswell, AO3087910.
Raymond E. Boucher, AO3084026.
William J. Bourgeois, Jr., AO3082022.
Royce D. Bowen, AO3082093.
Hobart R. Bower, AO3053733.
Alan W. Bowers, AO3082094.
Robert N. Bowers, AO3065794.
James P. Bowler, AO3087917.
Franklin W. Bowles, AO3084027.
Hal K. Bowman, AO3055702.

Larry L. Bowman, AO3093890.
Billie F. Boyd, AO3058183.
Harry V. Boyd, AO3055835.
Henry J. Boyter, AO3058731.
Frederic W. Bradley, Jr., AO3085961.
James D. Bradley, AO3072079.
James P Bradley, Jr., AO3053788.
Vaynus D. Bradley, AO3094213.
John C. Bramlett, Jr., AO3027364.
Leonard J. Branch, AO3087759.
Paul T. Branon, AO3093918.
Gerald W. Brantley, AO3085347.
Harold L. Braue, AO3072746.
Moodie E. Braun, Jr., AO3086395.
Paul B. Breen, AO3027080.
Richard L. Brehm, AO3074185.
James P. Brenholdt, AO3085889.
Harry M. Brenn, AO3046661.
Leo H. Breslin, AO2204724.
Robert E. Bretzer, AO3072854.
Thomas H. Breunich, AO3028417.
George A. Brewer III, AO3084847.
Dennis G. Brewster, AO3086922.
Allen E. Brezinsky, AO3049891.
Jack R. Brickley, AO3071859.
Rossor E. Bridwell, Jr., AO3086042.
Edward L. Briggs, AO3084753.
John W. Briggs, AO3093578.
John E. Bright, AO3073617.
David A. Brigman, AO3051222.
Jerry L. Brill, AO3086147.
Joseph R. Briner, AO3083747.
Frederick R. Bringhurst, Jr., AO3085012.
Thomas R Briscoe, AO3082876.
John L. Bristow, AO3052760.
Benjamin W. Britt, AO3052664.
Joe F. Brock, AO3082615.
Robert L. Brooding, AO3083472.
Robert S. Brooker, AO3086043.
Phillip F. Brooks, AO3085718.
Ray E. Broussard, AO3071288.
Benjamin C. Brown, AO3087023.
Carol E. Brown, AO3074487.
Charles L. Brown, AO3071142.
Charles W. Brown, AO3093142.
Dennis W Brown, AO3067105.
Donald Brown, AO3072747.
Donald N. Brown, AO3046584.
Harry W. Brown, AO2218406.
John H. Brown, AO3046456.
Kenneth G. Brown, AO3081889.
Lloyd W. Brown, Jr., AO3086363.
Richard S. Brown, Jr., AO3086463.
Robert E. Brown, AO3056488.
William M. Brown, AO3082989.
Everett W Browne, AO3082292.
Charles W Broz, AO3069422.
David S. Brucker, AO3066887.
Wilfred A. Brugger, AO3094211.
Evander J. Brumble, AO3094455.
Kenneth D. Bryan, AO3056255.
Gordon J. Brymer, AO3101036.
Ronald V. Buchert, AO3070900.
Norman F. Bucholz, AO3083790.
Irving L. Buck, AO3069285.
Wilfred F. Buckelew, Jr., AO3073838.
Frank P. Buckland, Jr., AO3084458.
Warren P. Bullock, Jr., AO3093024.
Dean R. Bunce, AO3086286.
Joseph R. Bunce, Jr., AO3093162.
Fredrick D. Bunch, AO3094337.
George A. Burch, AO3072960.
Roy D. Burcham, AO3052378.
Joseph W. Burdett, AO3083334.
Roscoe H. Burgoyne, AO3085227.
Franklin A. Burke, AO3051850.
Theodore J. Burkett, AO3056633.
Charles D. Burns, AO3052208.
Robert M. Burns, AO3082095.
Thomas A. Burns, AO3093719.
Vincent B. Burns, AO3084769.
Kenneth E. Burton, AO3085866.
James M. Butcher, AO3085667.
James L. Butera, AO3101031.
Billy R. Butler, AO3028057.
William H. Butler, AO780216.
Robert L. Butterfield, AO3050925.
Harrison H. Buxton II, AO3051625.
Robert L. Byce, AO3093349.
Jimmy W. Byerley, AO3086014.
Joseph S. Byrd, AO3085856.

William C. Byrd, AO3087645.
Dennis J. Byron, AO3094109.
Paul B. Byrum, Jr., AO3029061.
Eugene R. Cacciamani, Jr., AO3093270.
Kenneth J. Caires, AO3093385.
Jacob J. Caldwell, Jr., AO3094669.
Max F. Cameron, AO3094297.
Russell A. Camilleri, AO3094271.
Joseph A. Cammalleri, AO3067571.
August C. Campbell, AO3085570.
Donald J. Campbell, AO3086613.
Ellsworth M. Campbell, Jr., AO3093412.
Leonard R. Cannell, AO3072053.
John W. Cannon, AO3084286.
John A. Cantey, Jr., AO3074447.
Edwin B. Cantrell III, AO2207024.
Nicholas D. Cantwell, AO3082732.
Richard P. Capp, AO3094627.
Michael J. Cardone, AO3094088.
Howard T. Cariveau, AO3085323.
Daniel S. Carlin, AO3066560.
Frank S. Carlsen, AO3053928.
David R. Carlson, AO3093389.
Dayle W. Carlson, AO3084114.
Eugene R. Carlson, AO3052801.
Bruce H. Carpenter, Jr., AO3074407.
Fred W. Carpenter, AO3072316.
Bruce L. Carr, AO3084583.
Charles D. Carr, AO3094541.
Phillip E. Carr, AO3093186.
Robert D. Carroll, AO3056593.
William E. Carroll, Jr., AO3073229.
Larry G. Carstenson, AO3087252.
Thomas B. Carter, AO3066891.
Patrick J. Casey, AO3083166.
William R. Casey, AO3085867.
Lee W. Cash, AO3094229.
Jerry L. Cashion, AO3074244.
George E. Cass, AO3074101.
Gerald G. Cassell, AO3087649.
Mel Castillo, AO3093218.
Ronald N. Caylor, AO3052870.
Wesley D. Cazel, AO3093458.
Jack R. Cearley, AO3064888.
James M. Cederdahl, AO3050619.
Peter D. Chadwick, AO3068697.
Wayne R. Chaffer, AO3085230.
Douglas R. Chambers, AO3084885.
Robert J. Chambers, AO3051838.
Wilbur L. Chambers, AO3055095.
William R. Chambers, AO3036932.
Mason T. Chancellor, AO3093064.
Ardyth M. Chandler, AL3060642.
William A. Chansler, AO3074034.
Arthur H. Chaplin, AO3085456.
Lewis M. Chapman, AO3083791.
Franklin L. Chase, AO3067051.
Robert L. Chase, AO3094192.
Jay L. Chaskin, AO3085400.
John F. Cheatham III, AO3087224.
Kenneth D. Cheney, AO3094512.
Ronald L. Cheney, AO3086515.
Billy O. Cherry, AO3054094.
John R. Childers, AO3084899.
Henry D. Childs, AO3086200.
George R. Chitty, AO3086209.
Robert N. Choate, AO3052334.
Clifford C. Chrisman, AO3055119.
Teddy R. Christian, AO3082618.
Vernon W. Christie, Jr., AO3080927.
Robert L. Chumard, AO3069287.
Bruce E. Church, AO3094459.
John T. Clancy, AO3094425.
Charles A. B. Clark, AO3086548.
Gerald O. Clark, AO3073873.
Marvin D. Clark, AO3084606.
Phillip D. Clark, AO3081142.
Stanford S. Clark, AO3073949.
Zack C. Clark, AO3054272.
Robert N. Clarke, AO3027395.
Francis X. Clasby, Jr., AO3085210.
Harold I. Clayton II, AO3028630.
Patrick J. Cleary, AO3071284.
Leroy S. Clemons, AO3046669.
Lee C. Cleveland, AO3087075.
Robert T. Click, AO3094097.
Donald F. Clifford, AO3086423.
Lawrence E. Clifford, AO2219755.
Robert R. Clifford, AO3093625.
James W. Clinton, AO2222774.
Louis L. Clipp, AO3083500.

Roderick W. Clutter, AO3029612.
George E. Coats, AO3084421.
Allen R. Coburn, AO3086684.
Harold J. Cody, AO3093164.
Robert T. Coffey, AO3082684.
Charles R. Cogdell, AO3093866.
Allan R. Cohen, AO3084754.
Donald A. Cohen, AO3028257.
Eugene W. Cole, AO3069112.
Frank D. Cole, AO3083287.
Jerry R. Cole, AO3086901.
Keith H. Cole, AO3086017.
Charles D. Coleman, AO3048884.
Gary L. Coleman, AO3069790.
James W. Colford, AO3058031.
Edward M. Collier, AO3072857.
Thomas A. Colton, AO3080928.
Wayne K. L. Colton, AO3085964.
James H. Colvig IV, Jr., AO3101054.
John M. Comalli, AO3093626.
Paul C. Comeaux, AO3071290.
Richard D. Conant, AO3050926.
William H. Condit, Jr., AO3068970.
Douglas J. Conger, AO3048379.
Davis B. Conkling, AO3027091.
Edwin J. Conley, Jr., AO3047567.
Glen R. Connally, AO3027092.
Laurence W. Conover, AO3055799.
Philip J. Conran, AO3093165.
James E. Conroy, AO3067261.
James M. Conry, AO3054274.
Merle E. Converse, AO3094527.
Marion C. Coody, AO3084813.
Dale E. Cook, AO3093429.
Donald K. Cook, AO3086995.
Geraldine Cook, AL3060867.
Lowell T. Cooke, AO3087657.
Joseph E. Cooney, AO3072117.
Sheldon H. Cooper, AO3070471.
Morris R. Copeland, Jr., AO3093764.
Charles M. Copple, AO3071702.
Robert R. Corbell II, AO3053821.
Paul Cornett, AO3028581.
Charles R. Correll, AO3093579.
James B. Corser III, AO3082832.
Wallace N. Cory, AO3086705.
David S. Corzilius, AO3049156.
Henry J. Cosentino, AO3066809.
Raymond P. Costello, AO3050429.
John P. Cotter, AO3067221.
Leonard W. Cotton, AO3072676.
Willard A. Couch, Jr., AO3046517.
Richard P. Coulter, AO3067447.
Thomas P. Courtney, AO3072387.
Philip R. Cousino, AO3093805.
Gus J. Coutlakis, AO3071114.
Edwin R. Couto, AO3093627.
Marcel A. Couture, AO3071878.
Homer, R. Covington, AO3054989.
Forrest B. Cox, Jr., AO3067089.
Idys W. Cox, AO3027944.
Mark W. Cox, AO3003695.
Ruth A. Cox, AL3060818.
Stanley G. Cox, AO3054788.
Richard L. Craft, AO3084863.
George W. Crane, AO3065618.
Robert J. Craner, Jr., AO3084547.
Daniel H. Craven, AO3087090.
Harold R. Crawford, AO3074574.
Herman L. Crawford, AO3094159.
Robert L. Creech, AO3087356.
Harrison P. Crego, AO3009045.
James A. Crews, AO3087419.
Wade H. Crews, Jr., AO3086222.
Bobby L. Crihfield, AO3009046.
Silver C. Crim, AO3101098.
Denver E. Crislip, Jr., AO3093229.
Glenn E. Crisman, AO3074247.
William H. Critch, AO3081401.
Henry H. Crittenden, AO3094491.
Alex P. Crochet, Jr., AO3071292.
Thomas N. Crocker, AO3087420.
William T. Cromwell, AO3086937.
Donald S. Croston, AO3082158.
John C. Crouch, AO3093143.
John L. Crowley, AO3085909.
Richard M. Crowley, AO3086336.
Walter C. Crusberg, AO3083914.
Steven C. Cucci, AO3068003.
William P. Cullen, AO3066810.
Dennis L. Cummins, AO3056112.
Richard R. Cunningham, AO3084667.
William F. Cunningham, Jr., AO3082478.
Albert G. Cupka, Jr., AO3051377.
Leland J. Cupples, AO3093651.
John M. Curney, AO3051088.
Alan M. Curtis, AO3083204.
Frank W. Curtis, AO2245783.
Richard L. Curtis, AO3085916.
Harlan G. Cutshall, Jr., AO3072859.
Herbert L. Dabelow, AO3081966.
Edward B. Dailey, AO3086065.
Lucian J. Dale, Jr., AO3071123.
Michael J. Danbury, AO3081941.
Urban A. Daniel, Jr., AO3087168.
Charles G. Dansevich, AO3101362.
Joseph J. Danzi, AO3087187.
Edward H. Darcey, AO3055408.
Frederick W. Dauten, Jr., AO3068470.
Thomas J. Davey, Jr., AO3066391.
Larry G. David, AO3093083.
Curtis E. Davis, Jr., AO3094640.
Duane M. Davis, AO3029892.
Edgar F. Davis, AO3086649.
Horace W. Davis, AO3084422.
Jeff W. Davis, AO3081995.
John E. Davis, AO3073795.
Jon L. Davis, AO3081001.
Raleigh M. Davis, AO3085917.
Richard G. Davis, Jr., AO3071569.
Samuel J. Davis II, AO3070308.
Charles N. Dean, AO3086337.
Merrell E. Dean, AO3085879.
William R. Deans, AO3072362.
George Dearing, Jr., AO3101207.
Francis J. Debbaut, AO3072286.
Donald E. DeBolt, AO3066750.
James G. DeBolt, AO3068509.
Henry B. DeCaluwe, AO3093693.
Ronald W. DeCamp, AO3065667.
Wilfred J. DeCanio, AO3093694.
John A De Domincis, AO3009049.
Buddy E. Dees, AO3071189.
Rocco De Felice, AO3046258.
Richard H. Defer, AO3084532.
Walter E. Deibler, AO3093400.
Donald R. Delaney, AO3094134.
Walter J. Delaney, Jr., AO3083463.
Robert A DeLapp, AO3087331.
Thomas B Delashaw III, AO3081047.
Wesley C Deloach, AO3081681.
Adam J. Deltorto, AO3085999.
Robert W Dempsey, AO3087169.
John H. Denham, AO3083193.
Michael W. Denicola, AO3094439.
Valentine L. Denninger, AO3028117.
Joseph F. Denniston, AO3066895.
Frank L. Denzer, Jr., AO3008801.
Kelam S. Derderian, AO3068701.
Eugene R. Desaulniers, AO3071085.
William B. Desmond, Jr., AO3069424.
Paul J. Des Roches, AO3013824.
Willard S. Detweiler, Jr., AO3053404.
Byron G. DeVan, AO3083335.
Earl H. Diamond, AO3094738.
Luis V. Diaz, AO3054924.
Walter E. Dickerson, Jr., AO3086770.
Everitt W. Dickman, AO3049162.
John E. Diffenbach, AO3094278.
Kenneth W. Dillon, AO3048460.
William F Dimas, AO3067167.
Alvin J. Dimond, AO3083375.
John P. Di Rosario, AO3052433.
Richard S. Disalvo, AO3087188.
Dallas C. Dixon, AO3086563.
Walter J. Dixon, AO3084734.
Clarence J. Doane, AO3085394.
Michael J. Dobransky, AO3086549.
Richard B. Dodson, AO3057868.
Richard G Doggett, AO3080713.
Jack E. Donley, AO3071726.
Vincent J. Donoghue, Jr., AO3056497.
Paul D. Donovan, AO3072431.
Darrel K. Dorman, AO3072500.
William B. Dorn, AO3072965.
William H. Dorsey, AO3087425.
Arthur E. Douglas, AO3073215.
John H. Douglas, AO3093868.
Clark H. Downey, Jr., AO3056269.
John L. Downs, AO3087426.
Brendan T. Doyle, AO3055192.
Francis X. Doyle, AO3072389.
John A. Dramesi, AO3051528.
Fred P. Drayer, AO3086806.
Joseph C. Drew, AO3083556.
William G. Driesslein, AO3093765.
Ernest C. Drumheller, AO3053104.
Joseph J. Dubiel, AO3056032.
Earl L. Ducote, AO3083670.
Paul P. Dufaud, AO3094510.
Rey L. Duffin, AO3038751.
Donald A. Duffy, AO3072390.
William Duick, AO3086639.
Dora I. Duncan, AL3101337.
John E. Duncan, AO3055409.
Tommy L. Duncan, AO3073544.
Peter M. Dunn, AO3073848.
Robert C. Dunn, AO3087030.
Robert D. Dunn, AO3052757.
Thomas R. Dunn, AO3087271.
Abbie R. Dupont, AO3085254.
Joseph Dupont, Jr., AO3074411.
Donald E. Dupree, AO3086168.
Charles G. Durazo, AO3028261.
Francis X. Durso, AO3085507.
Wendell A. Dutt, AO3071761.
Jerome F. Dwyer, Jr., AO3086773.
Frank P. Dyke, AO3071459.
Sylvia A. Dyke, AL3060274.
Stanley Dziacko, Jr., AO3093580.
Duane M. Eakin, AO3070037.
John A. Earl, AO3086967.
Donald A. Eassa, AO3055801.
James B. East, Jr., AO3054655.
Jerome A. East, AO3052219.
Willis E. Eastabrooks, AO3053588.
Richard J. Eaton, AO3093925.
Hugh D. Ebert, Jr., AO3072010.
Harry A. Ecker, AO3073605.
Theodore J. Eckert, AO3086685.
James S. Ector, AO3086450.
Robert Edgerly, AO3028977.
Robert G. Edinger, AO3072861.
Allan L. Edler, AO3083336.
Leslie E. Edmonds, AO3083376.
Walter E. Edmonds, AO3084795.
John H. Edwards, AO3074512.
John R. Edwards, AO3072550.
Richard L. Edwards, AO3084840.
Russell J. Edwards, AO3101217.
William J. Edwards, AO3069570.
David T. Egan, AO3093737.
Jerome M. Egan, AO3086989.
Clarence V. Eggert, AO3069843.
Raymond L. Ehnle, AO3093433.
Ann I. Einstein, AL3060046.
Robert E. Elder, AO3083928.
Norrell B. Eliason, AO3074387.
Webb F. Elkins, AO3093926.
John H. Ellerman, AO3087332.
Heiki Ellermets, AO3093271.
Harry A. Ellico, AO3072501.
Philip D. Elliott, AO3055777.
Kenneth N. Ellis, Jr., AO3086018.
Wendell N. Ellis, Jr., AO3084031.
Benjamin F. Elmore III, AO3083214.
Everett E. Elting, Jr., AO3093528.
Arben R. Ely, Jr., AO3080547.
Ervin C. Ely, AO3074426.
James C. Embry, AO3054189.
Merlin J. Emch, AO3086465.
Warren M. Emlen, AO3050866.
Richard H. Emmons, AO3093559.
Carl R. Engel, AO3071837.
Donald L. Engelage, AO3085807.
Juris Epermanis, AO3084555.
Louis R. Epifani, AO3055632.
Nicholas Eremita, AO3072173.
Robert J. Erhart, AO3071735.
Sigurd Eriksen, Jr., AO3093807.
John T. Erlanger, AO3094053.
George K. Eshleman, AO3054995.
Charles T. Essmeier, AO3052829.
Gregory A. M. Etzel, AO3072748.
Donald H. Evans, AO3084823.
Donald S. Evans, AO3074008.
Rowland R. Evans, AO3094502.
Charles C. Everest, AO3084116.
Randall W. Everett III, AO3069974.
Carl B. Everley, AO3028432.
Alexander D. Ewing, AO3086165.
Daniel J. Fabricy III, AO3085097.
Thomas A. Fabyanic, AO3080022.
Dale L. Fahnestock, AO3085462.

Roy V. Fair, AO3055435.
Andral P. Faris, Jr., AO3087010.
Glen C. Farnham, AO3083880.
Thomas G. Farrell, AO3086102.
Dennis Farrington, AO3080333.
Richard A. Faust, AO3086115.
Robert G. Fawcett, AO3047177.
Sylvia M. Feeney, AL3060479.
Charles C. Fellows, AO3070516.
Darrel W. Felty, AO3094746.
Warren H. Ferdinandsen, AO3094057.
Gale R. Ferguson, AO3086205.
Louis N. Ferguson, AO3086338.
Roger G. Ferguson, AO3085834.
William J. Ferguson, Jr., AO3067455.
Richard T. Fernald, AO3065166.
John B. Ferrata, Jr., AO3094212.
Robert C. Ferrazza, AO3082130.
William M. Ferree, AO3082160.
Furman C. Ferrell, AO3047254.
Richard O. Ferrell, AO3071170.
Charles D. Ferry, AO3048543.
Earle L. Fidalgo, AO3083239.
James L. Field, AO3071975.
Joseph J. Figiel, Jr., AO3086317.
Clifford R. Filleau, AO3094689.
George C. Finck, AO3051349.
Eugene H. Findlay, AO3071962.
Carl E. S. Finley, AO3094470.
Richard H. Finley, AO3093460.
John L. Finnegan, AO3029652.
Edward V. Finuf, AO3018887.
Benjamin A. Firth, AO3058987.
James W. Fischer, AO3056117.
John E. Fiser, AO3065808.
Stephen B. Fish, AO3057668.
Kenneth L. Fisher, AO3087823.
Stanley C. Fisher, AO3093461.
Thomas M. Fisher, AO3085698.
Jon C. Fitt, AO3087312.
David J. Fitzgerald, AO3086316.
Donald N. Fitzgerald, AO3066071.
Norman H. Fitzsimmons, AO3027432.
Thomas W. Flattery, AO3093739.
Ronald J. Flattum, AO3055587.
Leon P. Fleming, AO3056077.
Carlos E. Fletcher, AO3087787.
Mark A. Fletcher, Jr., AO3065168.
Dale R. Flournoy, AO3054451.
Ansel T. Flowers, AO3074495.
Edward J. Flynn, Jr., AO3083699.
Roscoe H. Fobair, AO3080247.
Burton F. Fontenot, AO3054322.
Austin L. Foote, AO3101375.
John A. Foote, Jr., AO3071143.
Morris K. Fortmann, AO3018869.
James M. Fosse, AO3087789.
Jerry E. Fossum, AO3072807.
Donald F. Foster, AO3087011.
Edward J. Foster, Jr., AO3094472.
James P. Foster, Jr., AO3055059.
John L. Foster, AO3027371.
Millard J. Fountain, Jr., AO3053284.
Alonzo R. Fowler, AO3085091.
Donald J. Fox, AO3046311.
Richard E. Francis, AO3085211.
Lawrence J. Frank, AO3068979.
Alexander M. Frankel, AO3008945.
Maury A. Franklin, AO3071872.
Robert J. Frasier, AO3080904.
Robert L. Frazier, AO3093189.
William J. Frazier, Jr., AO3053055.
Richard E. Fred, AO3073466.
Joseph F. Frederick, Jr., AO3069302.
Edward L. Freeland, AO3080548.
David E. Freeman, AO3084895.
George V. Freese, AO3085371.
Gordon S. French, AO3094151.
Sheldon P. French, AO3093274.
William J. Frew, AO3082196.
Franklin D. Frewen, AO3051852.
Richard L. Frick, AO3051966.
Robert G. Friday, AO3084138.
Ronald J. Friday, AO3086687.
Alan L. Friedlander, AO3086426.
Terry L. Fripp, AO3086538.
Eustace W. Frizzell, AO2092119.
Robert E. Frost, AO2205852.
Buddy D. Frye, AO3094611.
Richard W. Frye, AO3101224.
Edward K. Fuge, AO3101225.
Cecil B. Fulford, AO3087867.
Keith F. Fuller, AO3087746.
William O. Fuller, AO3084726.
Thomas W. Fullick, AO3093435.
Donald K. Funayama, AO3084097.
James E. Funk, AO3086076.
Dale L. Furtwengler, AO3084907.
James R. Fyke, AO3094128.
Gregory J. Fyten, AO3094318.
George N. Gabriel, Jr., AO3093769.
Joseph A. N. Gagliano, AO3070368.
James A. Galloway, AO3085859.
Donald W. Gano, AO3070773.
William D. Gant, AO3052379.
Frank J. E. Gapp, AO3067273.
Edward A. Gardella, AO3027333.
Frederick J. Gardner, AO3094642.
John H. Gardner, AO3084139.
Robert A. Gardner, AO3073267.
Joseph F. Garlett, AO3085092.
Thad B. Garner, AO3086092.
John F. Garpstas, AO3068225.
Gordon B. Garrett, AO3087313.
Larry Y. Garrett, AO3087327.
Eleanor L. Garvin, AL3059819.
Bruce C. Gash, AO3085881.
Roger L. Gavan, AO3087191.
John W. Gaylord, AO3085217.
Kenneth N. Gebhardt, AO3087793.
William L. Gee, AO3086250.
Martin A. Geisel, AO3085509.
Thomas J. Geist, AO3051012.
John H. Gelston, Jr., AO3086778.
Robert E. Genge, AO3087256.
Clayton C. Genn, AO3054659.
Richard M. Gentile, AO3074497.
Robert L. Genua, AO3071976.
Jay D. Gerding, AO3069061.
Robert B. Gerlach, AO3072057.
David B. Germann, AO3070106.
Francis J. Gerner, AO3067578.
Antonio V. Giandolfi, AO3087113.
Edward J. Gibeau, AO3085098.
Charles H. Gibson, AO3072161.
Walter C. Giffrow, AO3085360.
Billy B. Gilbert, AO3054563.
Jerry J. Gilbert, AO3084790.
Lyle E. Gilbert, AO3083986.
Thomas Gilchrist, AO3081862.
George W. Gildersleeve, AO3086939.
Warner Giles, AO3084011.
Eugene A. Gilfillin II, AO3085860.
John H. Gill, Jr., AO3028376.
Fred D. Gillespie, AO3059770.
George P. Gillette, Jr., AO3070767.
Richard F. Gillis, AO3081053.
Donald C. Gladis, AO3070419.
Leonard W. Glasson, AO3094076.
Hugo D. Glenn, AO3094258.
William P. Glenn, AO3082071.
Clinton M. Glenny, AO3055641.
Jerry D. Glover, AO3094014.
James R. Gochnauer, AO3048083.
Vernon L. Godfrey, AO3084580.
Robert D. Goertz, AO3059075.
Glen P. Goffin, AO3085651.
William E. Goggin, AO3086129.
John E. Golden, AO3101230.
Larry G. Goldsborough, AO3070083.
Stanley E. Goldstein, AO3067867.
Gerald J. Gondran, AO3053389.
John W. Goode, AO2272058.
Malvin R. Goode, Jr., AO3094293.
James F. Goodfellow, AO3027871.
James L. Goodnight, AO3072554.
Harry D. Goodrich, AO3086851.
Jerome C. Goodrich, AO3051153.
Daniel D. Goodson, AO3086045.
Kendall E Gordon, AO3073324.
Paul F. Goree, Jr., AO3086093.
William S. Gorgas, AO3051777.
Eugene T. Goss, Jr., AO3048256.
Lawrence K. Gottlieb, AO3073130.
Peter A. Goubert, AO2207762.
Nelson J. Gough, AO3072249.
Richard C. Goven, AO3074176.
Lee N. Goyette, AO3093631.
Joe B. Grace, AO3052408.
James L. Graham, AO3069378.
William A. Graham III, AO3086655.
Ned J. Grandstaff, AO3087102.
Donald D. Grantham, AO3094734.
William C. Grapperhaus, AO3093150.
James W. Grassman, AO3085641.
John M. Grathwol, AO3072289.
Connie M. Gravitte, AO3046870.
John A. Gray, AO3082624.
William C. Grayson, AO3085401.
Anthony G. Graziano, AO3093931.
John E. Greaud, Jr., AO3085700.
Donald W. Green, AO3084727.
Stephen D. Green, AO3069667.
Robert E. Greenan, AO3029851.
Abbott O. Greene, AO3067151.
Kenneth E. Greenhalge, AO3028747.
Charles D. Greenwood, AO3053583.
Donald L. Greer, AO3085883.
Gary C. Greer, AO3087352.
James D. Gregg, AO3054661.
Arthur Gregory, Jr., AO3052374.
Leland H. Gregory, Jr., AO3048174.
Raymond H. Grenier, AO3085991.
William H. Griffies, AO3052884.
Neil A. Griffin, AO3081083.
Robert L. Griffin, AO3087714.
William D. Griffin, AO3093870.
James R. Griffith, AO3094217.
Richard E. Griffith, AO3085979.
Wayne L. Griggs, AO3101236.
Donald P. Groeninger, AO3071167.
Norman G. Gross, AO3084947.
George J. Grosso, Jr., AO3054131.
Roderic R. Grubb, AO3054062.
William V. Gruber, AO3084389.
Robert J. Gryder, AO3027506.
Joseph E. Grygotis, Jr., AO3047800.
Allan D. Guggolz, AO3084591.
Thomas E. Gullick, AO3087677.
Robert F. Gummere, AO3094571.
Gary R. Gurley, AO3093723.
Wesley J. Guthals, AO3068592.
Gerald D. Guthrie, AO3029237.
Fredrich J. Haber, AO3058862.
Richard G. Hable, AO3073247.
Stanley C. Hack, Jr., AO3081330.
Richard A. Hackman, AO3055539.
Hunter F. Hackney, AO3058578.
Frank M. Hadl, Jr., AO3046266.
Roger A. Hadley, AO3071382.
Allan G. Hagen, AO3087753.
Richard L. Hager, AO3101388.
Arthur P. Hahn, AO3073455.
Larry P. Hall, AO3086706.
John E. Haley, AO3093120.
Goerge C. Halfmann, AO3083417.
Bert T. Hall, AO3054954.
James F. Hall, AO3051791.
Sam H. Hall, AO3094372.
Thomas J. Hally, AO3072419.
Samuel A. Halsey, Jr., AO1848848.
James A. Halvorson, AO3085161.
Robert C. Hamilton, AO3093837.
William M. Hamilton, AO3048653.
George R. Hammond, AO3073667.
James J. Hammons, AO3071348.
Bruce E. Hampson, AO3073184.
Fred Hancher, AO3069309.
Robert N. Hancock, AO3084093.
Ronald N. Hand, AO3084648.
John H. Haneklau, AO3094435.
Johnny M. Hanes, AO3085572.
Vincent J. Haney, AO3087920.
Robert W. Hankins, AO3087078.
John B. Hanley, AO3093932.
Philip D. Hanley, AO3086910.
Ronald V. Hanner, AO3048125.
Edward B. Hanrahan, AO3067263.
Donald S. Hansen, AO3072616.
Ray R. Hansen, AO3094484.
Robert W. Hansen, AO3080729.
Roger F. Hansen, AO3081495.
Gerald C. Hanson, AO3081944.
Gordon L. Hanson, AO3086823.
Harry Haraseyko, AO3072785.
John D. Harden, AO3094028.
John N. Hardy, Jr., AO3087233.
Jerry W. Hargis, AO3027878.
Charles B. Harkin, AO3093896.
Maurice R. Harlan, AO3048391.
Kenneth T. Harmon, AO3072712.
Pat B. Harmon, AO3085565.
Ronald L. Harner, AO3071408.
James W. Harper, Jr., AO3071933.
Robert N. Harrington, AO3067530.

Eddie W. Harris, AO3083930.
Fred F. Harris, AO2244892.
Richard G. Harris, AO3055366.
Roy V. Harris, Jr., AO3093772.
Francis J. Harrison, AL3060369.
Robert D. Harrop, AO3083144.
Lee R. Harry, AO3027373.
Charles H. Hartford, AO3093724.
John A. Hartnett, AO3093988.
Robert E. Hartz, AO3094341.
Ralph W. Hasenbalg, AO3072752.
Louis G. Hatch, AO3071494.
Frank W. Hausmann, AO3074039.
Robert W. Haver, AO3094462.
Benjamin R. Hawkins, AO3054400.
Douglas W. Hawkins, AO3070171.
Ernest H. Hawthorne, AO3086172.
Stanley I. Hayashi, AO3085352.
Dale R. Hayes, AO3085893.
Gordon L. Hayward, AO3093813.
Rex B. Head, AO3082834.
William Head, AO3070223.
Edward D. Heath, AO3094257.
James A. Heathcote, AO3069485.
William R. Heathcote, AO3073993.
Daniel W. Hebert, AO3085701.
Wesley D. Hedden, AO3093484.
Lloyd M. Hedgepeth, AO3086662.
Owen A. Heeter, AO3085687.
Frederic C. Heitman, AO3093815.
Florian D. Helinski, AO3052512.
Mark J. Heller, AO3093391.
Jack Helm, AO3087684.
Merritt M. Helm, Jr., AO3046549.
Robert D. Helms, AO3084715.
Donald P. Hemingway, AO3051708.
Billy R. Henderson, AO3054618.
Bobby L. Henderson, AO3054405.
Ray C. Henderson, AO3086003.
Roy J. Hendricks, AO3070698.
Dale R. Hendrickson, AO3083352.
Joseph L. Hendrix, AO3083315.
Charles R. Hendry, AO3072557.
Joseph Henjum, Jr., AO3066861.
Reynold N. Henry, AO3056160.
Robert L. Henry, AO3068849.
Robert E. Hensel, AO3071538.
William E. Henson, AO3065862.
George G. Herbert, AO3086725.
Robert A. Herbes, AO3069449.
Daniel I. Herborn, AO3073844.
James D. Herget, AO3085375.
Thomas H. Herndon, AO3084952.
John G. Herr, AO3086617.
John R. Herrett, AO3066727.
Armin F. Herrmann, Jr., AO3058559.
Roderick L. Hesse, AO3057331.
John W. Hesterman, Jr., AO3085870
Earl T. Heston, AO3050430.
Norman L. Heuvel, AO3086977.
Conrad W. Hewitt, AO3093584.
Robert L. Hickok, AO3071361.
Robert W. Hicks, AO3052191.
Terrin D. Hicks, AO3086078.
John M. High III, AO3084629.
Gerald A. Hight, AO3094353.
Gerald T. Hilgenberg, AO3046412.
John F. Hilgenberg, AO3070337.
Charles E. Hill, AO3027442.
Loyd V. Hill, AO3054665.
Robert O. Hill, AO3093036.
Kent L. Hillesland, AO3094501.
William H. Hine, AO3054332.
Charles M. Hineman, AO3085151.
John W. Hines, AO3066763.
David F. Hinken, AO3052084.
Kenneth H. Hinkle, Jr., AO3086079.
Travis L. Hinson, AO3051227.
Roland L. Hintgen, AO3070413.
Richard A. Hirschfield, AO3086780.
Bernell L. Hiskey, AO3066819.
Ross A. Hobby, AO3094447.
John E. Hobson, AO3086599.
George R. Hockett, AO1930592.
Seth B. Hodges, AO3053093.
Frederic J. Hodgins, AO3087573.
Gerald L. Hoefler, AO3093549.
William F. Hoeft, AO3087136.
Harry C. Hoelscher, AO3087171.
James F. Hoelscher, AO3085810.
William B. Hoenig, Jr., AO3070676.
Duane D. Hoff, AO3083379.
Nils R. Hoffhien, AO3065328.
Carl H. Hoffman, Jr., AO3087172.
Edward E. Hoffman, AO3068020.
Joseph C. Hoffman, AO3071524.
Michael L. Hoffman, AO3082933.
Richard C. Hoffman, AO3085970.
Thomas E. Hogan, AO3093465.
John L. Holcomb, AO3080751.
Carl A. Holder, Jr., AO3071362.
Curtis W. Holland, AO3055447.
George W. Holland III, AO3071145.
Otis R. Hollar, AO3085742.
Joe P. Hollingsworth, AO3087811.
Richard L. Hollis, AO3084930.
Francis E. Holly, AO3071986.
Guy H. Holt, AO3094321.
Leigh M. Holt, AO3071805.
Ronald J. Honeycutt, AO3086174.
Charles C. Hood, AO3086047.
James B. Hoover, AO3081698.
Rolland E. Hoover, AO3086117.
James K. Hope III, AO3087012.
William W. Hope, AO3086486.
David D. Hopkins, AO3053963.
William W. Hopkins, Jr., AO3086023.
James F. Hopson, AO3058669.
James R. Horn, AO3083453.
Keith G. Horne, AO3058343.
Laurie H. Hosford, AO3086228.
David H. Hostvedt, AO3069852.
Clayton E. Hotchkiss, AO3058670.
Richard W. Hottel, AO3094031.
Fern L. Houck, AO3029671.
Robert J. Hough, AO3055036.
Jack S. Houser, AO3093606.
Rita R. Houston, AL3060819.
William K. Houston, AO3084391.
Robert C. Hover, AO3072755.
James G. Hovingh, AO3087687.
George H. Howard, AO3082817.
George L. Howard III, AO3074115.
Russell G. Howard III, AO3093658.
Orrin K. Howe, Jr., AO3017887.
Robert M. Howell, AO3087572.
William C. Howell, Jr., AO3086600.
Paul H. Hower, AO3094300.
Stuart D. Howerter, AO3087257.
Robert H. Hoxie, AO3086148.
John F. Hoyt, AO3085778.
Lawrence R. Hubbard, AO3064355.
Perry R. Hubbard, AO3081460.
Edward G. Huber, AO3093839.
Hoyt M. Hudgens, AO3027880.
Edwin C. Hudson, AO3046679.
George F. Hudson, AO3085141.
George P. Huempfner, AO3085403.
Dana Huestis, AO3094246.
Dean R. Huffer, AO3085554.
George R. Huffman, Jr., AO3086379.
Carol D. Hughes, AO3082003.
Chesley C. Hughes, Jr., AO3093979.
Harold M. Hughes, AO3057562.
Joseph L. Hughes, Jr., AO3094091.
Walter D. Hugo, Jr., AO3069613.
Ted E. Huguley, AO3094508.
Edward I. Hulbert, Jr., AO3085653.
William R. Hulings, AO3085440.
Chad T. Hull, AO2207181.
Jake W. Humble, AO3094717.
Robert J. Humphrey, Jr., AO3085494.
Thomas G. Humphries, AO3049356.
Robert E. Hunsaker, AO3085591.
Thomas A. Hunt, AO3054856.
Wilfred L. Hunt, AO3101400.
Charles M. Hunter IV, AO3085609.
Jimmy M. Hunter AO3073903.
Peter A. Hunter, AO3047916.
Philip R. Hunter, AO3094603.
Russell P. Hunter, Jr., AO3087068.
David C. Huntley, AO3074639.
Ronald O. Huntsman, AO3083101.
Gerald B. Hurst, AO3054290.
Webb H. Huss, Jr., AO3055065.
John F. Hutchins III, AO3083766.
William E. Hutchison, AO3093659.
Donald G. Hyde, AO3093233.
David K. Idler, AO3093466.
Lawrence T. Imrie, AO3085992.
Charles R. Ince., Jr., AO3084976.
Robert W. Inderman, AO1864914.
Jack C. Ingle, AO3069983.
Campbell B. Ingram, AO3065912.
Richard A. Ingram, AO3101401.
Thomas M. Inman, AO3086468.
Donald L. Ismari, AO3072140.
Lewis M. Israelitt, AO3084034.
Orville H. Jackson, Jr., AO3068852.
Rollin A. Jackson, Jr., AO3046604.
Thomas M. Jackson, AO3094067.
Edward G. Jacob, AO3068922.
Joel P. Jacobs, AO3086229.
Eric P. S. Jacobsen, AO3087128.
Jackie L. Jacoby, AO3072513.
Herman E. Jaehne, Jr., AO3093245.
Theodore T. Jamison, AO3094517.
Richard B. Janisch, AO3093660.
Alan J. Jankowski, AO3093234.
Orvel K. Jans, AO3008969.
Charles W. Jansen, AO3052121.
Larry D. Janssen, AO3054669.
Robert L. Janzen, AO3072255.
David A. Jarratt, AO3093506.
John W. Jarrett, AO3068233.
James R. Jenkins, AO3048896.
Albert G. Jensen, AO3069717.
Edward E. Jernigan, AO3027353.
Lemuel N. John, Jr., AO1854230.
Lynn M. John, AO3029175.
Edward H. Johnson, AO2207283.
Glenn D. Johnson, AO3087385.
James E. Johnson, AO3082285.
James R. Johnson, Jr., AO3029564.
John A. Johnson, AO3054293.
John T. Johnson, AO3066972.
Richard B. Johnson, Jr., AO3056529.
Robert D. Johnson, AO3051581.
Robert J. Johnson, AO3072446.
John E. Johnston, AO3068723.
Douglas L. Jonas, AO3085921.
Bobbie L. Jones, AO3069512.
David L. Jones, Jr., AO3086825.
Donald W. Jones, AO3053222.
Edward F. Jones, AO3049994.
Harold L. Jones, AO3054476.
Harris Jones, Jr., AO3093564.
Jacob R. Jones, Jr., AO3093193.
Robert D. Jones, AO3083399.
Thomas N. Jones, AO3094193.
Wilbur R. Jones, AO3055506.
William A. Jones, AO3027288.
William M. Jones, Jr., AO3087116.
Norman M. Jordan, AO3074139.
Phyllis A. Jordan, AL3060791.
Robert L. Jorgensen, AO3053938.
William L. Jowers, AO3072971.
Richard N. June, AO3073881.
LaVerne G. Junkmann, AO3093899.
Weldon H. Justice, AO3087451.
George E. Kahler, AO3082664.
Edward S. Kaiser, AO3072054.
Robert A. Kalass, AO3072813.
Darrel K. Kalbfleisch, AO3066730.
Joseph J. Kaminski, AO3052106.
Clifford A. Karch, AO3051556.
Paul A. Kari, AO3093155.
Donald A. Karlson, AO3093127.
Donald J. Karpen, AO3083834.
Adolph Kastenholz, Jr., AO3008972.
Rex Kathcart, Jr., AO3074369.
John F. Kavinsky, Jr., AO3071205.
Thomas C. Kayser, AO3087333.
Joseph T. Kearns, Jr., AO3085847.
Raymond L. Keasler, AO3082047.
John H. Keenan, AO3067531.
Tony W. Keffer, AO3083242.
Richard B. Kehl, AO3085120.
George B. Keller, AO3068127.
Montie R. Keller, AO3074390.
Carl S. Kelley, AO3101113.
Francis R. Kelley III, AO3085993.
Robert R. Kelley, AO3052231.
Thomas R. Kelley, AO3083862.
David E. Kellokoski, AO3073077.
Bernard L. Kelly, AO3087259.
Gary G. Kelly, AO3051929.
Nolan R. Kelly, AO3047136.
Peter C. Kelly, AO3094593.
Forrest L. Kelsey, AO3093817.
Robert N. Kendal, Jr., AO3056041.
Charles E. Kendall, AO3074463.
Leland T. Kennedy, AO3028596.
Max C. Kennedy, AO3085117.

Philip D. Kennedy, AO3086483.
Stanley O. Kennedy, AO3068305.
David H. Kenny, AO3093531.
Barry H. Kent, AO3086618.
Craig S. Kern, AO3085343.
Edward A. Kern, AO3067708.
Ned J. Kerr, AO3093873.
Thomas W. Kerrey, AO3093818.
Peter J. Kerrigan, AO3086999.
Jerome O. Kessenich, AO3094629.
Bert R. Keyes, Jr., AO3082793.
Donald W. Keyes, AO3083382.
Bobby G. Kibby, AO3073912.
James W. Kidd, Jr., AO3093565.
Howard W. Kidwell, AO3074662.
Ernst P. Kiefel, Jr., AO3049859.
Jimmy W. Kilbourne, AO3058580.
Dean F. Kimball, AO3089994.
Harry H. Kimball, AO2232210.
Lawrence E. Kimble, AO3083273.
Shuzo Kimura, AO3084100.
Don B. Kincaid, AO3055895.
Charles R. Kinder, AO3032362.
William R. Kindig, AO3085689.
Betram A. King, AO3086347.
Cyril J. King, AO3093173.
Martin B. King, AO3085839.
Norwood J. King, AO3029568.
William C. King III, AO3094572.
Sidney K. Kingry, AO3083527.
Thomas F. Kingston III, AO3074119.
William R. Kinney, AO3094188.
Otho V. Kinsley, Jr., AO3020976.
John L. Kirk, AO3094006.
Karl D. Kirk, Jr., AO3086732.
Richard C. Kirkpatrick, AO3055491.
Clarence W. Kirkwood, AO3053880.
Donald D. Kirkwood, AO3087260.
Milton R. Kirste, AO3028984.
Edward C. Klaas, AO3073186.
Edmund I. Klein, AO3074561.
George E. Klett, AO3074286.
Jed H. Klingensmith, AO3082700.
Edmund C. Kloess, AO3072787.
William G. Kluck, AO3093983.
George K. Klump, AO3071424.
Donald F. Knechtges, AO3072582.
Hal M. Knight, Jr., AO3093053.
Wayne L. Knitter, AO3093845.
Lloyd C. Knodel, AO3086469.
John L. Knorr, AO3072256.
Tom J. Knorr, AO3086217.
William A. Kuntzen, AO3069451.
Richard W. Koelling, AO3068128.
James E. Koestner, AO3033776.
Robert B. Kohn, AO3082563.
Joseph B. Kollar, Jr., AO3082221.
Thomas V. Kolterman, AO3087455.
Bernard J. Konyn, AO3056527.
Ramon R. Koski, AO3051709.
Richard L. Kovac, AO3072869.
Stephen F. Kovacs, AO3072228.
John P. Kozimor, AO3094331.
James M. Kraft, AO3082537.
Gerald A. Kramer, AO3087457.
Richard A. Krasnigor, AO3084307.
Thomas J. Kratt, AO3093021.
Edwin J. Kraus, AO3046327.
Lorrell A. Kressin, AO3066104.
Donald D. Kreuzkamp, AO2235648.
Adam Krivoshia, Jr., AO3094361.
Donald T. Krizek, AO3072240.
Norris J. Krone, Jr., AO3028446.
Virgil R. Krull, AO3084737.
Joseph A. Krupinski, AO2208689.
Monty U. Kruse, AO3086080.
Ferdinand J. Kubala, AO3070128.
Robert G. Kuhl, AO3070842.
Richard E. Kulesa, AO3101260.
Ronald R. Kunz, AO3009194.
Arnis J. Kuplins, AO3073424.
Masami Kurihara, AO3085897.
Elmer E. Kurrus, Jr., AO3052202.
Quentin A. Kuttenkuler, AO3101121.
Philip J. Kuzmeski, AO3074016.
Richard L. LaBonte, AO3080257.
William D. Lackey, AO3086907.
William H. Lackey, AO3083864.
Dale F. Lake, AO3094221.
Vernon L. Lambert, AO3027377.
Friedrich H. Lamers, AO3072295.
George P. Lanceskes, AO3094412.
John A. Landerdahl, AO3065184.
Phelps A. Lane, AO3087462.
Morton A. Langholtz, AO3085081.
Richard A. Langley, AO3049360.
James R. Lapp, AO3027050.
Allan R. Laquey, AO3083400.
Thomas R. Larimer, AO3094163.
Robert D. Larson, AO3057275.
Wendall L. Lasher, Jr., AO3101421.
Carl W. Lasiter, AO3070414.
Emanuel Lastra, AO3101422.
Jarvis H. Latham, AO3074160.
Karl F. Lauenstein, AO3073297.
Dorris E. Laughary, AO3036959.
Richard Lawless, AO3070136.
Michael F. Lawnin, AO3086557.
Jack P. Lawson, AO3069583.
Harold D. Leach, AO3083317.
David E. Leas, AO3072975.
John T. Leatham, AO3087334.
Albert B. Leatherwood, Jr., AO3084295.
Richard D. Leclerc, AO3068479.
Charles R. Lee, AO3086604.
Gary A. Lee, AO3029083.
Joseph R. Lee, Jr., AO3086005.
Maurice F. Lee, AO3056414.
Norman W. Lee, Jr., AO3073612.
Peter J. Lee, AO3093679.
Richard L. Lee, AO3085224.
Rodney M. Lee, AO3084810.
Charles E. G. Leech, AO3052568.
Louis P. Lefort, AO3086006.
Edgar E. Legg, AO3020644.
Norman H. Leggett, AO3086689.
Stanley J. Leja, AO3056530.
Douglas S. Leman, AO3093874.
Thomas E. Lemanowicz, AO3082767.
William A. Lenz, AO3055226.
Arthur V. Leonard, Jr., AO3084177.
Neal E. Lesher, AO3072789.
Stephen Levine, AO3082242.
Carroll E. Lewis, AO3083634.
Donavon B. Lewis, AO3061955.
Louis C. Lewis, Jr., AO3082078.
Roger C. Lewis, AO3074076.
Roy C. Lewis, Jr., AO3085813.
Stuart B. Lewis, AO3086558.
Victor L. Lewis, AO3071554.
William Librizzi, Jr., AO3085475.
Oscar G. Lidstrom, Jr. AO3086786.
Philip Lieberman, AO3085527.
Richard S. Likon, AO3094264.
Monte O. Lillard, AO3085316.
Robert C. Limburg, AO3072872.
Carl O. Lindahl, AO3086289.
Charles Lindbergh, AO3094153.
Richard L. Linder, AO3086401.
Ernest K. Lindley, AO3072518.
Malcolm W. Lindsay, AO3070247.
Willard M. Lindsay, AO3066731.
James L. Lingenfelter, AO3086308.
John W. Linihan, AO3082633.
William E. Linihan II, AO3048941.
Gordon H. Link, AO3101427.
Glenn R. Linsenmayer, AO3086348.
Carl H. Lippold, Jr., AO3055198.
Franklin J. Lisella, AO3070023.
Gary E. Little, AO3084257.
Albert F. Litzler, Jr., AO3071862.
Orville J. Litzsinger, AO3085814.
George E. Livenspargar, AO3080512.
William W. Lofland, Jr., AO3087467.
Joseph F. Long, AO3028640.
William G. Long III, AO3082635.
Robert F. Lopina, AO3083770.
Johnnie I. Louderback, AO3085643.
Robert G. Love, AO3093414.
William A. Love, AO3085899.
Theodore F. Lowe, Jr., AO3083050.
David H. Lowell, AO3088257.
Joseph R. Lucas, Jr., AO3054296.
Joseph F. Ludford, AO3087198.
Gary L. Ludwig, AO3093609.
Karl T. Ludwig, AO3085528.
Algis A. Lukas, AO3086960.
Kenneth R. Lumry, AO3070304.
Max R. Lund, AO3065548.
Alex P. Lupenski, AO3067475.
Alan P. Lurie, AO3049196.
George F. Luthringer III, AO3073068.
Donald B. Lyall, AO3068727.
John J. Lynch, AO3080978.
Gerald E. Lyon, AO3087235.
Ralph B. Mabry, AO3094475.
Andrew B. MacEntee, AO3069413.
Barry J. Machado, AO3093727.
Park V. Mackall, AO3083222.
Robert L. MacKechney, AO3085928.
Leo P. Mackey, AO3070480.
Forrest W. MacNab, AO3056047.
Thomas E. Macomber, AO3048943.
Cole L. MacPherson, AO3072598.
William J. Madden, Jr., AO3093936.
Eugene H. Maddux, AO3093468.
Ray E. Maddux, AO3083635.
James A. Magnusson, Jr., AO3083968.
John D. Mahoney, AO3066232.
Timothy I. Maier, AO3083223.
Jon L. Millard, AO3087155.
Elmer Mallette, Jr., AO3087711.
Robert E. Mallon, AO3085477.
John S. Malone III, AO3086499.
Robert M. Maltbie, AO3072258.
Hershel W. Manhart, AO3070235.
Ralph G. Manies, AO3093282.
David L. Mann, AO3087335.
John F. Mann, AO3072950.
Frank M. Manning, AO3083474.
John M. Manning, AO3072178.
George S. Manspeaker, AO3094728.
Joe E. Manz, Jr., AO3093327.
Claude P. Mapes, AO3083197.
Stanley R. Maraszek, Jr., AO3093129.
Robert G. Marbut, AO3084983.
Richard L. Marchant, AO3058587.
Lawrence F. Marcum, AO3070998.
Franklin D. Margiotta, AO3055390.
Gerald L. Marino, AO3083683.
Mary C. Markevich, AL3060358.
Donald L. Marks, AO3082868.
Edward C. Marks, AO3094090.
William D. Marohn, AO3086119.
Alexander J. Marshall, AO3072792.
Eugene E. Marshall, Jr., AO3073811.
Ira G. Marshall, AO3053254.
Eugene V. Martin, Jr., AO3086258.
James R. Martin, AO3069038.
Jimmie D. Martin, AO3035778.
Robert M. Martin III, AO3093778.
Walter W. Martin, AO3085186.
Pierre A. Martineau, AO3084493.
Ralph J. Maruca, Jr., AO3086733.
Takeo Maruyama, AO3046637.
Addison L. Marvin, Jr., AO3068161.
Thomas J. Mascarella, AO3036967.
Thomas E. Mason, Jr., AO3049862.
James W. Matchette, AO3083775.
Clifford G. Mathiesen, AO3081446.
William B. Mathis, AO3101342.
John A. Matthews, AO3073661.
Leroy D. Matthys, AO3074295.
James J. Mattice, AO3094453.
Robert J. Matus, AO3092973.
Robert E. May, AO3056088.
Laurel A. Mayer, AO3093728.
Robert L. Mayne, AO3053187.
Kenneth W. Mays, AO3070423.
Dale B. Mazachek, AO3053837.
Stephen A. Mazur, AO3053565.
William P. McArthur, Sr., AO3085997.
Charles W. McBride, AO3068999.
J. Lynn McBride, AO3053915.
Bernard W. McCaffrey, AO3081106.
Alan McCanne, AO3087000.
Russell E. McCannon, AO3084330.
Donald R. McCarty, AO3069150.
George F. McCarty, AO3070746.
Edward J. McCauley, AO3093662.
Charles W. McClelland, Jr., AO3081386.
Robert N. McClendon, AO3027962.
Jim H. McClung, AO3085957.
Joseph T. McCollum, AO3085424.
Charles A. McComas, Jr., AO3085900.
Margaret M. McConnell, AL3060597.
Donald B. McCormick, AO3082490.
Fay R. McCormick, AL3060508.
Gedney J. McCormick, AO3094719.
Hugh D. McCracken, Jr., AO3083922.
Francis C. McCrane, Jr., AO3069757.
Robert A. McCullough, Jr., AO3087130.
James H. McCurley, AO3101428.

Charles A. McDonald, Jr., AO3056546.
Kurt C. McDonald, AO3094282.
Peter J. McDonough, AO3081201.
Paul T. McEachern, AO3074020.
John L. McElroy, AO3028603.
Ernest McFeron, AO3111903.
Bernice McGhee, AL3060491.
Gene D. McGinnis, AO3085816.
Mark T. McGlynn, AO3093175.
Edwin C. McGovern, AO3087200.
Jessie M. McGraw, AL3060014.
John T. McGraw, AO3071952.
Charles A. McGuire, Jr., AO3093938.
James L. McGuffey, Jr., AO3053542.
Philip L. McIndoo, AO3072329.
Charlotte A. McInnis, AL3060267.
Adelbert McIntyre, Jr., AO1860480.
Kenneth R. McKean, AO3068816.
John M. McLaughlin, Jr., AO3086428.
Tolley B. McLaughlin, AO3086668.
Rodney W. McLean, AO3068688.
J. B. McLeroy, AO3073882.
Gene L. McMichael, AO3084729.
Charles E. McMillan, AO3027966.
Raymond V. McMillan, AO3101431.
Charles A. McMurray, Jr., AO2216653.
Alan C. McNabb, AO3029657.
Lillian A. McNally, AL3060424.
Thomas W. McNally, AO3068931.
Dale R. McPherson, AO3056428.
Charles R. McQuitty, AO3049031.
Arley W. McRae, AO3056089.
James K. McWhorter, AO3071516.
Mauro L. Mecca, AO3094010.
Norman D. Mecham, AO3070258.
Manuel F. Medeiros, Jr., AO3085531.
Richard A. Medenwaldt, AO3085635.
Forrest P. Meek, AO3087715.
Paul A. Meeks, AO3059097.
Richard W. Meeks, AO3050830.
Clyde J. Melancon, AO3071628.
Carl J. Melnick, Jr., AO3101130.
Robert G. Mems, AO3084331.
James S. Menees, Jr., AO3074043.
Jan L. Menuez, AO3093237.
John Menzel, Jr., AO3093284.
Edward M. Merck, AO3080938.
Walter R. Merkel, AO3094185.
Douglas H. Merkle, AO3073026.
Donald E. Merrill, AO3101274.
Norman L. Merritt, AO3067339.
Willis H. Merritt, Jr., AO3054494.
Charles L. Messler, AO3093246.
Robert B. Metcalfe, AO3094595.
John A. Metts, AO3086050.
James F. Meyer, AO3084948.
John N. Meyer, AO3055103.
Robert L. Meyer, Jr., AO3084192.
Ronald E. Meyer, AO3086925.
Ronald J. Meyette, AO3067712.
Albert L. Michael, AO3087967.
Donald G. Michell, AO3094380.
Donald E. Michiels, AO3086693.
James R. Miears, AO3093383.
Ivan G. Mieth, AO3027170.
Douglas L. Millar, AO3082704.
Richard W. Millar, Jr., AO3093306.
Arthur R. Miller, AO3094120.
David J. Miller, AO3070984.
Eugene F. Miller, AO3057087.
Franklin R. Miller, AO3071619.
George H. Miller, AO3069003.
Jim W. Miller, Jr., AO3065112.
Jimmie D. Miller, AO3083279.
Robert A. Miller, AO3094779.
Shirley A. Miller, AL3060826.
Thomas J. Miller, AO3087132.
William D. Miller, AO3056323.
Donald J. Milliken, AO3071076.
Earl A. Minnich, Jr., AO3055140.
Richard Mitchell, AO3086381.
Homer C. Mittelstadt, AO3093512.
Leonard F. Mixson, Jr., AO3065827.
Oran D. Mize, AO3057401.
Scott W. Mize, AO3055827.
James J. Mizner, AO3069544.
George W. Mobley, AO3084259.
John G. Moffa, AO3085785.
Jack F. Moffatt, AO3067082.
Richard E. Moffitt, AO3070644.
Robert D. Mohr, AO3085958.
Barry A. Molnar, AO3068029.
Raymond T. Molony, AO3070557.
John O. Molter, AO3072075.
Richard A. Momberger, AO3072765.
Robert M. Monarch, AO3084398.
Philip C. Montagano, AO3085269.
James D. Montgomery, AO3084878.
Charles A. Monti, AO3028510.
Alfred C. Montrem, AO3081782.
Wendell F. Moody, AO3047391.
Fred T. Moomau, Jr., AO3054689.
Stewart W. Mooney, AO3052040.
Hubert C. Moore, AO3054108.
John P. Moore, AO3065447.
Kenneth E. Moore, AO3050647.
Morgan C. Moore, AO3066735.
Norman P. Moore, AO3055333.
Robert G. Moore, AO3071456.
Tom C. Moore, AO3072523.
Willard T. Moore, AO3082914.
Larry H. Mooren, AO3082938.
Fredrick C. Moors, AO3093513.
Edward Morenoff, AO3067293.
William F. Morey, AO3082540.
Jesse A. Morgan, Jr., AO3069945.
John C. H. Morgan, AO3087118.
John H. Morgan, AO3049585.
Thomas Morgan, AO3083866.
Robert E. Morozzo, AO3056654.
Charles L. Morris, AO3101446.
James L. Morris, AO3052593.
Luther G. Morris, AO3073930.
Marvin E. Morris, AO3086840.
Richard A. Morris, AO3081958.
Robert G. Morris, AO3084782.
Ronald M. Morris, AO3086495.
Donald R. Morrison, AO3094003.
Richard W. Morrison, AO3085693.
Martin L. Moskowitz, AO3093261.
Renwick F. Mottley, AO3086292.
Charles D. Mount, AO3094070.
Joe A. Mowbray, AO3068935.
Terrence D. Moyer, AO3093253.
Edwin T. Muckley, AO3093131.
Ernest L. Mueller, AO3082495.
Robert W. Muldrew, AO3094270.
Harvey D. Mullis II, AO3084063.
James F. Mumaw, AO3069391.
Nancy J. Mumma, AL3060738.
John E. Mundy, AO3082496.
Kenji Munechika, AO3084105.
Robert J. Murdock, AO3054581.
John J. Murphey, AO3093247.
Brian C. Murphy, AO3093942.
William H. Murphy, AO3086429.
Donald A. Murray, AO3071737.
John P. Murray, AO3073163.
Michael P. Murray, Jr., AO3067485.
Oliver C. Murray, Jr., AO3094129.
Dana K. Murton, AO3084477.
William R. Muscatello, AO3056436.
Stanton R. Musser, AO3086584.
Alfred F. Myers, AO3087121.
Brenton D. Myers, AO3085942.
Clarence C. Myers, Jr., AO3087718.
Robert G. Myers, AO3087294.
Howard O. Myll, AO3083900.
Charles O. Nagle, AO3093444.
William S. Nagley, AO3047469.
Ronald M. Nakatsuji, AO3069080.
Remo J. Nardi, AO3084725.
Charles M. Nash, Jr., AO3068820.
Lawrence P. Nash, AO3087203.
Willard E. Naslund, AO3058174.
Forest L. Nation, AO3085575.
Carlos L. Naumann, AO3093329.
Gene E. Neal, AO3054253.
Darwin F. Nelson, AO3073794.
Donald W. Nelson, Jr., AO3087099.
Henry R. Nelson, AO3093104.
Marshall R. Nelson, AO3074093.
Richard L. Nelson, AO3028511.
Walter D. Nencka, AO3073489.
Aurelio Nepa, Jr., AO3048693.
James R. Nerger, AO3094582.
Duane H. Nesbitt, AO3041282.
Charles H. Nestor, AO3082858.
Lester W. Newberry, Jr., AO3085357.
Alexander H. Newlands, AO3086791.
Morton L. Newman, AO3086969.
Roy I. Newman, Jr., AO3027968.
William L. Newman, AO3066736.
William F. Newnham, AO3067083.
Kenneth E. Neywick, AO3093417.
Bobby J. Nicholas, AO3092985.
Brady W. Nichols, AO3071970.
Forest A. Nichols, Jr., AO3074472.
Joseph P. Nichols, AO3070097.
James E. Niemeyer, AO3081153.
William L. Nietsch, AO3056547.
George L. Nipper, AO3069817.
Billy G. Nix, AO3056548.
Howard W. Nixon, AO3086568.
James H. Noble, AO3049330.
Nicholas N. Noe, AO3083779.
Michael E. Norberg, AO3028996.
Robert L. North, AO3093753.
Leon B. Norton, AO3087015.
Philip F. Norton, AO3086355.
Charles H. Norvell, AO3100972.
Charles E. Norwood, AO3070319.
Paul T. Norwood, AO3087239.
Robert N. Nottoli, AO3049265.
Joseph W. R. Nowlan, AO3100973.
James E. Nowlin, AO3101451.
Ronald W. Noyes, AO3028512.
John R. Nunn, AO3051999.
Edward M. Nygren, AO3064688.
Duane C. Oberg, AO3080830.
Robert H. Oberlies, AO3093782.
John R. Oberst, AO3067817.
John W. O'Brien, Jr., AO3094248.
Paul R. O'Brien, Jr., AO3082173.
John A. O'Cone, AO3092988.
Roy H. Odom, AO3085712.
John J. Ohnemus, AO3068032.
Dennis R. Ojakangas, AO3074052.
Arthur J. Oken, AO3068617.
Roy L. Oldham, AO3064441.
Carl L. Oliver, AO3087318.
Donald G. Olivier, AO2250816.
Prentis L. Ollis, AO3101137.
Eugene D. Olsen, AO3087295.
Marvin E. Olsen, AO3083548.
Gerald R. Olson, AO3083403.
Wayne A. Olson, AO3071566.
William M. O'Neal, AO3094225.
Robert E. O'Neil, AO3086634.
Preston C. Opt, AO3029436.
Robert E. Ormstedt, AO3072427.
John W. Orndorff, AO3087473.
William H. Orne, Jr., AO3085656.
John C. O'Shea, AO3082081.
Francis R. Ostdiek, AO3084794.
Warren R. Osterloh, AO3087264.
Dale E. Ostler, AO3083320.
Jack H. Oswald, AO3050177.
Donald V. Otey, AO3083244.
Alfred F. Ottaviano, AO3093729.
Robert T. Otto, AO3073874.
C. J. Ownbey, AO3034768.
Marvin H. Ownbey, AO3055961.
Robert E. Oyama, AO3066704.
James A. Ozee, AO3086494.
Edward L. Pace, AO3087596.
John W. Paige, AO3092990.
Virgil J. Paiva, AO3066928.
Roy E. Palmer, Jr., AO3086262.
Charles J. Palutis, Jr., AO3086431.
William S. Pantle, AO3086739.
Santos Pantoja, AO3085380.
Frank A. Paparozzi, Jr., AO3070736.
Dimitre P. Pappas, AO3092991.
Frederick T. Parker, AO3094063.
Thomas D. Parkes, AO3094667.
Howard F. Parks, AO3054805.
Darrell R. Parnell, AO3066978.
Robert S. Parry, AO3082708.
Thomas H. Partridge, AO3066598.
Douglas W. Pascoe, AO3085066.
Thomas Paskowski, AO3070131.
Jack L. Patterson, AO3094000.
Michael B. Patterson, AO3086144.
Robert W. Patterson, AO3094231.
Homer D. Pattison, AO3054692.
David D. Patton, AO3070882.
Robert J. Patty, AO3071035.
Frederick F. Paul, AO2204896.
Norman M. Paul, Jr., AO3048700.
Richard D. Paul, AO3072180.
Michael S. Paules, AO3087215.
Stephen W. Pavlisin, AO3085735.

James B. Paxson, Jr., AO3087598.
Malcolm T. Peachey, Jr., AO3059111.
George H. Peacock, AO3086232.
James M. Peacock, AO3073866.
Walter B. Pearson, AO3054582.
Ralph W. Pease, AO3080562.
Robert R. Pedigo, AO3081011.
Miller A. Peeler, Jr., AO3085057.
Robert J. Peisher, AO3072877.
William J. Pelham, AO3085621.
Charles D. Pellow, AO3052677.
Leonard E. Pendergrast, AO2211891.
Thomas W. Penn, AO3093068.
Rubin Perry, AO3086841.
Nathan V. Pessah, AO3072216.
Alexander A. Pestrichella, AO3070922.
James D. Petersen, AO3048144.
Nolan R. Petersen, AO3086404.
Don L. Peterson, AO3083154.
Fred H. Peterson, Jr., AO3093074.
Paul M. Peterson, AO3055292.
Albert G. Petranick, AO3047016.
Harry R. Petrie, AO3085018.
Stephen Petrik, AO3085480.
Alfred E. Pfoertner, AO3093946.
Dan L. Phillips, AO3054049.
Dennis D. Phillips, AO3086476.
James L. Phillips, AO3046164.
John D. Phillips, AO3086107.
Rex A. Phillips, AO3086671.
William F. Phillips, AO3080328.
William J. Phillips, Jr., AO3094685.
Bernard D. Pianalto, AO3093730.
Charles F. Pierce, Jr., AO3097288.
James S. Pierce, AO3092996.
Myron S. Pierce, Jr., AO3083619.
Stanley H. Pierce, AO3086418.
John D. E. Piety, AO3056337.
Fred G. Pinjuv, AO3082916.
John Pisansky, AO3086792.
George M. Piskos, AO3073679.
Charles E. Pisoni, AO3048907.
David H. Pittard, AO3072696.
George H. Pitts, Jr., AO3094338.
John J. Pixley, AO3008993.
Bruce L. Platner, AO3055228.
Diane J. Plotts, AL3060892.
Jack C. Plumb, AO3071268.
William C. Plumb II, AO3053028.
Milton M. Ply, AO3081252.
Stephen J. Pocsik, AO3083705.
Ronald T. Podsiadlo, AO3094148.
Manson L. Polley, AO3100976.
Edward L. Ponder, AO3085822.
Richard T. Poore, AO3081026.
Donald L. Poorman, AO3070250.
David S. Popa, AO3086848.
Calvin R. Popp, AO3086178.
Ronald L. Popp, AO3086382.
Ernest A. Porter, Jr., AO3085482.
William D. Porter, AO3084089.
James L. Post, AO3094645.
Paul W. Post, AO3093043.
Sheldon C. Potter, Jr., AO3083972.
Peter T. Potts, AO3083870.
Richard J. Pouliot, AO3069434.
Harold D. Powell, Jr., AO3086233.
Ramon J. Powell, AO3084336.
Roy A. Powell, AO3094202.
William D. Powell, AO3085276.
David S. Powers, AO3094776.
Richard J. Powers, AO3069417.
Charles W. Pratt, AO3072061.
Cecil G. Prentis, AO3066664.
Malcolm M. Preston, AO3069202.
Billy F. Price, AO3084436.
Harold G. Price, AO3050457.
Ted L. Price, AO3093333.
George L. Prichard, AO3070987.
Philip R. Pridham, AO3086886.
Victor T. Prislusky, AO3067196.
Ralph B. Proffitt, Jr., AO3072563.
John J. Pruss, AO3093703.
Thomas S. Pugh, AO3086293.
John D. Purves, Jr., AO3049268.
Albert D. Purvis, Jr., AO3047826.
Frank O. Pusey, AO2205675.
George W. Pyle, AO3052690.
William S. Quimby, AO3086887.
Patrick T. Quinlan, AO2210295.
Gerald N. Quinn, AO3074216.
John W. Rackey, AO3082147.
Andrew A. Radel, AO3049465.
Warren S. Rader, Jr., AO3082009.
Bernard E. Raetz, AO3072300.
Claude H. Ragan, AO3009383.
Robert J. Rajewski, AO3093821.
James V. Rampello, AO3086356.
Ronald D. Ramsden, AO3072335.
Charles H. Ramsey, AO3101143.
Dean O. Rands, AO3081704.
James L. Rankin, AO3095211.
James A. Rash, AO3085726.
David J. Rasmussen, AO3087265.
John E. Rasmussen, AO3086890.
Marvin E. Raulston, AO3093569.
Arthur P. Raun, AO3050657.
Louis R. Ravetti, AO3055996.
Claude G. Ray, AO3048194.
Hugh J. Ray, Jr., AO3053663.
Walter J. Ray, Jr., AO3055809.
Daniel K. Read, Jr., AO3072473.
John W. Reames, AO3069660.
Charley E. Reaves, AO3005792.
Darrell D. Reber, AO3085334.
Donald L. Rebtoy, AO3050914.
James B. Reddig, AO3081787.
Matthew D. Reddington, AO3046289.
Clyde W. Reed, AO3080847.
David E. Reed, AO3082599.
Donald R. Reed, AO3086179.
Gerald F. Reed, AO3066356.
Thomas B. Reed, AO3067690.
Irvin E. Reep, AO3039721.
Richard W. Reese, AO3093308.
Alfred M Reeves, AO3086741.
Richard P. Reeves, AO3068772.
Albert C. Reichert, AO3073511.
Donald E. Reigel, AO3056062.
Robert A. Remey, AO3071506.
Kenneth C. Renshaw, AO3083275.
Henry J. Repeta, AO3049934.
Joseph Repole, Jr., AO3093536.
Lawrence M. Reppert, AO3073934.
Jose G. Reyna, AO3071058.
Douglas K. Rhodes, AO3094550.
Roger T. Rhodes, AO3071059.
Allen L. Riobe, AO3093518.
Joe A. Rice, AO3066055.
Philip E. Rice, AO3081935.
Gerald R. Richards, Jr., AO3067200.
Henry C. C. Richards, AO3046613.
Jimmy A. Richardson, AO3074507.
Kenneth B. Richardson, AO3069343.
Nathan T. Richardson, Jr., AO3054907.
William A. Richardson, AO3085759.
Kenneth W. Richmond, AO3054517.
John D. Riddle, AO3048332.
Richard A. Riddle, AO3101289.
Edward W. Ridgeway, AO3047471.
Charles M. Rierson, Jr., AO3029390.
Donald A. Rigg, AO3069263.
Claude E. Riggs, Jr., AO3054908.
Olton R. Riley, AO3093370.
Algis K. Rimkus, AO3093705.
Thomas H. Rineheart, AO3093612.
Benjamin J. Rineheart, AO3080945.
Gerald J. Ringes, AO3101290.
Daniel J. Rioux, AO3100987.
Jack L. Ritter, AO3070884.
Henry A. Rivers, Jr., AO3084683.
James H. Rix, Jr., AO3050438.
Bruce D. Robbins, AO3085728.
Glen A. Robbins, AO3087606.
Roger K. Roberson, AO3086180.
Russell L. Roberson, AO3072702.
Bruce B. Roberts, AO3082671.
Charles W. Roberts, AO3093215.
Fred L. Roberts, AO3055015.
Heyward B. Roberts, Jr., AO3083042.
Joe H. Roberts, AO3071991.
Kenneth V. Roberts, AO3071784.
Paul J. Roberts, Jr., AO3082711.
Robert L. Roberts, AO3093377.
Wilbur E. Roberts, AO3086029.
Kenneth M. Robertson, AO3093296.
Leon C. Robertson, AO3071839.
Barry Robinson, AO3087002.
Howard L. Robinson, AO3054519.
Kenneth G. Robinson II, AO3071578.
William G. Robinson, Jr., AO3093075.
William T. Robinson, AO3072264.
James E. Roche, AO3072406.
Stanley D. Rock, AO3081948.
James C. Rodenberg, AO3093614.
Anthony E. Rodman, AO3094195.
Daniel R. Rodriguez, AO3084600.
Douglas H. Roe, AO3059144.
Burke C. Rogers, AO3093492.
John N. Rogers, Jr., AO3085367.
Henry E. Rohland, AO3087216.
William L. Roley, AO3085746.
Gerald L. Ropa, AO3073883.
Charles J. Rosak, AO3093109.
William H. Rose, AO3081687.
Warren F. Rosenbaum, AO3083475.
Joel M. Rosenzweig, AO3085412.
Larry E. Ross, AO3082601.
Fred J. Roth, Jr., AO3081709.
Werner G. Roth, AO3081899.
Ralph S. Rothstein, AO3085484.
Robert S. Rouston, AO3094731.
George Rovitti, AO3022257.
Bruce H. Rowlands, AO3071679.
Richard W. Rowley, AO3067691.
Thomas E. Rowney, AO3093394.
Robert J. Roy, AO3086636.
John F. Royston, AO3094360.
George L. Ruble, AO3084719.
Richard P. Rubrecht, AO3081900.
Robert D. Ruby, AO3094523.
Richard L. Rudman, AO3085188.
John W. Rulon, AO3101155.
Thomas A. Rush, AO3053152.
Thomas J. Rush, AO3093177.
Robert R. Russell, AO3052129.
James W. Rust, Jr., AO3083230.
James R. Ryan, AO3055253.
John S. Ryan, AO3049830.
Robert E. Ryan, AO3059577.
Lowell K. Rygg, AO3094681.
Deryl L. Sadler, AO3027977.
Robert R. Safreno, AO3086197.
Fernando Salaz, Jr., AO3067853.
Jake A. Saltamachia, Jr., AO3051677.
Rosaria V. Samonte, AL3060265.
Luis F. Sanchez, AO3028678.
Elsie L. Sanders, AL3060866.
Steven R. Sanders, AO3029865.
Donald T. Sandler, AO3028953.
David A. Sands, AO3080520.
William F. Sanford, Jr., AO3094540.
Orrin L. Sapp, AO3080431.
Donald R. Sargent, AO3093755.
John C. Sathrum, AO3086916.
Merrill A. Sauerbrei, Jr., AO3053512.
Bruce D. Saunders, AO3087137.
David C. Saunders, AO3094058.
Hugh A. Savage, AO3027822.
James W. Savage, Jr., AO3087243.
Douglas I. Sawtell, AO3082114.
Keith N. Sawyer, AO3086407.
Rex D. Sawyer, AO3072927.
William E. Scannell, AO3064368.
Edward L. Scarborough, AO3094117.
Carmen T. Scarpino, AO3086854.
David C. Scearce, AO3086295.
Jerry C. Schaaf, AO3094121.
Walter A. Schaal, AO3085665.
Elmo T. Schaare, AO3065656.
Ronald J. Schadler, AO3094363.
Virgil B. Schaffer, AO3085229.
Elton D. Scheideman, AO3070747.
James W. Schell, AO3086084.
Louis D. Schindler, AO3094194.
James E. Schlender, AO3085801.
Frank J. Schmidt, Jr., AO3073668.
George L. Schmidt, AO3093111.
James A. Schmitendorf, AO3066835.
Ronald D. Schneider, AO3093341.
Walter A. Schnell, AO3071720.
Howard A. Schoech, AO3068644.
George L. Schofield, Jr., AO3072337.
Charles F. Schremp, AO3082267.
Robert L. Schuette, AO3085036.
Roy D. Schuldies, AO3082228.
Carey E. Schulten, AO3084228.
Raymond M. Schulz, AO3074196.
Howard S. Schumacher, AO3085538.
Karl H. Schumaker, AO3070650.
Peter R. Schuyler, AO3074627.
C. Rickard Schwalm, AO3082543.
William T. Schwartz, AO3069398.

Harold W. Schwertner, AO3027197.
Charles D. Scott, AO3058524.
Richard T. Scott, AO3057144.
William B. Scott, Jr., AO3086282.
William R. Scott, Jr., AO3049727.
Roger D. Scow, OA3071873.
Peter J. Scrivano, AO3071335.
Nicholas E. Scronce, AO3027824.
Gordon E. Seaburg, AO3081970.
Donald L. Seamands, AO3028281.
Charles J. Searock, Jr., AO3081238.
Donald C. Sears, AO3082980.
John D. Seaton, AO3066381.
John H. Seats, AO3054305.
David M. Seaver, AO3048105.
James T. Seay, AO3009392.
Franklin L. Sebree, AO3054179.
Paul P. Sedlak, AO3086561.
Eugene A. Seeger, AO3084760.
David W. Seegmiller, AO3054872.
Ronald W. Seinwill, AO3074604.
Edward F. Seits, AO3073408.
Larry A. Selzer, AO3094329.
Joseph E. Semrad, Jr., AO3086434.
James F. Senko, AO3086990.
Virgil E. Sergi, AO3093255.
Richard P. Seroka, AO3094732.
Howard A. Setlin, AO3094739.
James B. Shaffer, AO3093989.
Robert J. Shanahan, AO3052295.
William M. Shapleigh, AO3093112.
Charles J. Sharitz, AO3086031.
Raymond P. Sharkey, AO3067567.
Lawrence F. Sharp, AO3093395.
Richard E. Sharp, AO3094147.
Charles B. Sharpe, AO3087489.
Donald L. Shaw, AO3101483.
Edwin H. Shearer II, AO3083356.
James H. Sheldon, AO3093909.
Franklin D. Shelton, AO3058393.
Glade E. Shepherd, AO3083106.
Harry R. Shepherd, AO3066087.
Hayward B. Shepherd, AO3071622.
Donald H. Sherman, AO3052440.
Peter S. Sherman, AO3086955.
Vincent J. Sherman, AO3073035.
Lewis E. Sherouse, AO3085345.
Charles J. Sherwood, AO3093159.
Keith D. Shickell, AO3071612.
Barry Y. Shimamura, AO3084109.
George R. Shindler, AO3094476.
James E. Shipman, AO3027914.
Gene E. Shipps, AO3056454.
Carl S. Shirley, AO3071241.
James A. Shoemaker, AO3053514.
John B. Shook, AO3101163.
Quincy C. Shores, AO3094072.
Ernest L. Short, Jr., AO3101484.
Oscar A. Shortt, Jr., AO3046902.
Robert E. Shugert, AO3085214.
John A. Shull, AO3070176.
Jack M. Shuttleworth, AO3073337.
Robert C. Sibert, AO3087728.
Donald W. Sibrel, AO3082086.
Richard O. Sickeler, AO3086746.
James H. Sigler, AO3069015.
Robert K. Sikes, AO3094514.
Gary L. Silcott, AO3074648.
John W. Silvis, AO2221862.
Robert A. Simmang, Jr., AO2225436.
James G. Simmonds, AO3085540.
Elmer L. Simmons, Jr., AO3087004.
Jackson S. Simpson, AO3073438.
Robert L. Simpson, Jr., AO3080308.
Vivienne C. Sinclair, AL3060164.
Ralph M. Sires, AO3086297.
Dale F. Sisel, AO3081765.
Lyle A. Sisson, Jr., AO3067557.
Thomas J. Sizemore, AO3101165.
Thomas A. Skipper III, AO3093665.
Rodney A. Skoglund, AO3086470.
Kenneth M. Skuza, AO3051586.
Gilbert R. Slade, AO3081810.
William J. Slauson, AO3070685.
Joseph W. Sloan, AO3085851.
David D. Smiley, Jr., AO3072703.
Allison F. Smith, AO3074321.
Bruce E. Smith, AO3093615.
Calvin Smith, Jr., AO3085047.
Emmett E. Smith, AO3053135.
George L. Smith, AO3082651.
George W. Smith, AO3086121.
Gerald J. Smith, AO3085430.
Glen C. Smith, AO3093788.
Joseph P. Smith, Jr., AO3026035.
Lawrence D. Smith, AO3082048.
Leon B. Smith II, AO3085346.
Mark A. Smith, Jr., AO3051299.
Marvin L. Smith, AO3071199.
Needham, B. Smith, AO3056458.
Richard R. Smith, AO3065974.
Robert E. Smith, AO3083819.
Robert E. Smith, AO3085199.
Robert T. Smith, AO3086574.
Theodore W. Smith, AO3087161.
Thomas W. Smith, AO3057699.
William A. Smith, AO3071043.
Lawrence A. Smulczenski, AO3086748.
Thor Snaring, AO3073583.
Robert M. Snider, AO3094355.
Conway G. Snipes, AO3094683.
Malcolm J. Snow, AO3087289.
Charles A. Snyder, AO3069094.
Harley B. Snyder, AO3086392.
Paul T. Snyder, AO3072602.
Richard H. Snyder, AO3051047.
Franklyn J. Soare, AO3067744.
Donald K. Soesbe, AO3082919.
David E. Sommers, AO3066851.
Hubert D. Songer, Jr., AO3070243.
Milton J. Songy, AO3085646.
Neal G. Sorensen, AO3087374.
Ronald J. Soule, AO3028732.
William L. Spacy, AO3085875.
Lloyd J. Spafford, AO3083410.
Thomas A. Sparr, AO3094347.
Thomas E. Spear, AO3087244.
Will O. Speight, AO3057473.
George D. Spence, AO3082604.
Melvin Spencer, AO3054110.
Lyle B. Spendlove, AO3073294.
Jimmie V. Spezia, AO3052132.
Robert H. Spiller, AO3069162.
George R. Spillman, AO3070634.
James M. Spindler, AO3072338.
Duane G. Sprigs, AO3069268.
Walter J. Sprigs, Jr., AO3086984.
Wendel Springston, AO3087081.
Arthur F. Sprott, AO3056357.
Lynn R. Spuhler, AO3087348.
John M. Squires, AO3094169.
Stephen F. Squires, AO3083248.
Guntis Sraders, AO3055618.
Gary L. Stadtlander, AO3085337.
Carl R. Stalzer, AO3084672.
Robert W. Stamm, AO3094749.
Harry A. Standley, Jr., AO3093008.
Edwin L. Stanford, AO3082606.
Darrell L. Stanley, AO3087871.
Charles M. Stanley, Jr., AO3101491.
J. T. Stanley, AO3027982.
Lee R. Stanley, AO3027319.
Millard P. Stanely, Jr., AO3055467.
Leonard N. Starr, AO3053614.
Joseph E. Staszak, AO3094390.
Quinten F. Staudt, Jr., AO3081968.
Donald L. Stearns, AO3068947.
Henry D. Steele, AO3093303.
Joseph C. Steen, Jr., AO3084742.
Arnold J. Steeves, Jr., AO3094519.
Julius R. Stegall, AO3057700.
Jerome P. Stein, AO3093241.
Richard L. Steiner, AO3053840.
Kenneth V. Steinharter, AO3094393.
David L. Stejskal, AO3086371.
Robert J. Stemmermann, AO3066562.
Glen Stephens, AO3072824.
Richard W. Stephens, AO3093009.
Anthony R. Stephenson, AO3087349.
Jack B. Stephenson, AO3052651.
Burton E. Stevenson, AO3073500.
James H. Stewart, AO3086842.
James R. Stewart, AO3093598.
Leigh H. Stewart, AO3086919.
Gregory E. Stillman, AO3087267.
Carl G. Stolberg, AO3083623.
Joseph L. Stone, Jr., AO3083977.
Milton S. Stone, AO3086150.
William J. Stoner, AO3083596.
Robert D. Storms, AO3074197.
Lynn D. Straight, AO3086471.
Roger F. Strand, AO3093520.
Jay M. Strayer, AO3069022.
Billie G. Stricker, AO3055111.
Richard E. Strickland, AO3029099.
Philip F. Strine, AO3074649.
Carlton B. Stringfellow, AO3085696.
Richard H. Strome, AO3009364.
Paul H. Strunk, Jr., AO3087038.
Robert G. Stuart, AO3074027.
Carl D. Stuber, AO3073074.
James B. Studley, AO3093538.
Thomas L. Stuebe, AO3094223.
Robert A. Stueber, AO3069041.
Barry E. Stump, AO3081768.
Robert H. Sturdevant, AO3071822.
Thomas W. Sturgess, AO3028039.
Byron E. Sturgis, AO3084439.
Robert A. Stute, AO3073207.
Sostenes F. Suazo, AO3093217.
Hiram R. Sullivan, AO3066837.
Lawrence D. Sullivan, Jr., AO3093756.
Norman E. Sullivan, AO3101173.
Charles E. Summers, AO3085060.
James R. Sutherlan, AO3101174.
James Y. Suzuki, AO3095102.
Edmund B. Swanson, AO3049474.
Leslie C. Swanson, AO3084404.
Frederick L. Swedberg, AO3082825.
Donald M. Sweitzer, AO3060357.
Morris D. Swensen, AO3069914.
David L. Swindler, AO3093242.
William G. Sykes, AO3086985.
Raymond B. Sylvain, Jr., AO3086330.
George J. Szabo, AO3072203.
Henry Szemplinski, AO3056053.
Leland B. Tainter, Jr., AO3093243.
Richard T. Takahashi, AO3111992.
Douglass S. Talbot, AO3072840.
Larry Talovich, AO3085680.
Jerrold N. Tamm, AO3084343.
Miles T. Tanimoto, AO3085602.
Howard R. Tarleton, AO2207620.
Cazzy C. Tatum, Jr., AO3084263.
David M. Taylor, AO3068041.
Jerome T. Taylor, AO3053667.
Raymond L. Taylor, AO3086859.
Vess J. Taylor, AO3054634.
John V. Teague, AO3086674.
Robert B. Tebbs, AO2221454.
Patrick W. Telesco, AO3085798.
Santo J. Terrano, AO3086930.
Jack E. Terry, AO3071943.
Warren Terry, AO3083054.
Jimmy H. Tesh, AO3068549.
Katharine D. Theuer, AL3059710.
Walter E. Thienes, AO3101313.
Larry E. Thigpen, AO3081612.
John C. Thomas, AO3084230.
John K. Thomas, AO3082721.
Kenneth C. Thomas, AO3027920.
Luther Thomas, AO3056364.
Wayne M. Thomas, AO3086751.
William J. Thomas, AO3093667.
Clifford A. Thompson, AO3093685.
David E. Thompson, AO3083625.
David W. Thompson, AO3028040.
John A. Thompson, Jr., AO3028523.
John E. Thompson, AO3094597.
Robert E. Thompson, AO3083538.
Robert W. Thompson, AO3101012
Thomas B. Thompson, AO3071370.
Willard L. Thompson, AO3083278.
Ronald D. Thornberry, AO3084264.
John L. Thorndal, AO3086920.
Dewey H. Thornton, AO3094565.
Larry N. Tibbetts, AO3055276.
Harwood J. Tibbits, Jr., AO3087399.
Marion W. Tierney, AO3027987.
John C. Tilley, AO3074133.
Frederick J. Tillman, AO3068950.
Ben E. Timian, AO3083978.
Virginia M. Timmerman, AL3087508.
Lawrence K. M. Ting, AO3085434.
Hollis C. Tinsler, AO3087880.
Ronald E. Tinsley, AO3072114.
Arthur J. Titus, Jr., AO3084564.
Richard A. Tokarz, AO3082174.
John S. Tomaszewicz, AO3086799.
Jack H. Tomes, AO3027260.
Thomas O. Tomtan, AO3085937.
Gerald H. Tonnell, AO3085566.
Donald R. Tonole, AO3086949.
Michael S. Tonti, AO3083708.
Louis A. Torraca, Jr., AO3072184.

James J. Torson, AO3052444.
Michael Tovey, Jr., AO3086986.
Cecil R. Townsend, AO3071012.
Robert G. Tracy, AO3087245.
Robert D. Trickey, Jr., AO3094230.
Robert W. Trieschmann, AO3094340.
Edward F. Tristram, AO3071311.
Donald E. Trombley, AO3073298.
Ronald B. Tronier, AO3071380.
Hoyt R. Truelove, AO3014649.
Wallace C. Trukki, AO3086480.
Philip B. Trussell, AO3094196.
David L. Tucker, AO3083347.
William A. Tucker, AO3074436.
Ronald F. Tudor, AO3070932.
Richard T. Tully, AO3101500.
William B. Tully, AO3085886.
Mack C. Turley, AO3054704.
Wade H. Turnage, Jr., AO3084814.
Alexander P. Turner, Jr., AO3071499.
Gene C. Turner, AO3071955.
Jack A. Turner, AO3046619.
Frederic J. Turrin, AO3093958.
Richard C. Turrone, AO3086074.
Robert L. Tweedie, AO3029475.
Richard L. Twito, AO3093976.
Wayne L. Tyler, AO3094224.
John C. Tyner, AO3086298.
Edward C. Tyson, AO3055810.
Robert I. Udelhofen, AO3081963.
Dale R. Ullrich, AO3073869.
John J. Ungvarsky, AO3070990.
Peter K. Uno, AO3055811.
Philip J. Unrein, AO3027488.
Daniel D. Unruh, AO3086198.
Carl M. Unterman, AO3086151.
James H. Upright, AO3084045.
William H. Upton, AO3080543.
Ross J. Utt, AO3101317.
Donald A. Utterback, AO3101318.
Kenneth E. Uvodich, AO3094411.
Richard D. Valen, AO3093524.
Joe Valent, Jr., AO3094589.
Francis Valenzuela, AO3086473.
Joseph L. Vallenari, AO3055834.
Kenneth D. Vanbeek, AO3085938.
James L. Vance, AO3094716.
Ralph E. Vance, AO3056025.
Thomas W. Vandeventer, AO3101319.
Donald E. E. Vanetti, AO3048915.
Orland O. VanGunten, AO3082577.
George W. VanHouten, Jr., AO3083909.
Kenneth J. VanHulla, AO3059546.
Wayne E. VanWinkle, AO3028754.
Charles F. Vanzutphen, AO3093179.
Franklin C. Varley, AO3087375.
James W. Varnum, AO3086906.
Gerard G. Vaughan, AO3093540.
Wilma L. Vaught, AL3059917.
John C. Venable, AO3094647.
Thomas L. Venable, AO3053277.
Edward G. Verderber, AO3067610.
Charles H. Vest, AO3085261.
William A. Vestal, AO3028553.
John R. Vette, AO3083412.
Richard W. Vetter, AO3093913.
Henry W. Viehmann, Jr., AO3087053.
Thomas Viglianco, Jr., AO3093045.
Stanley E. Villanis, AO3072186.
Dayton G. Vincent, AO3087005.
Peter Vives, Jr., AO3087627.
Clarence E. Vogelgesang, AO2254928.
William H. VonThaden, AO3053353.
Vernon M. H. Von, AO3046652.
James F. Voorhies, AO3093012.
George E. Wade, Jr., AO3093572.
Robert S. Wadman, AO3082922.
James S. Waggener, Jr., AO3082546.
Loreley O. Wagner, AO3087086.
Paul G. Wagner, AO3084675.
Donald B. Wakefield, AO3071175.
Thomas L. Waldrop, AO3086951.
Donald N. Walker, AO3087291.
John S. Walker, AO3082673.
Kenneth E. Walker, AO3072538.
Douglas O. Wall, AO3070050.
Billy J. Wallace, AO3017060.
Jerry L. Wallace, Jr., AO3085052.
Robert L. Wallenmeyer, AO3083458.
David E. Wallis, Jr., AO3086485.
Robert A. Walmsley, AO3074568.
Fred E. Walter, AO3094299.
Edward M. Walters, AO3093992.
William D. Walters, AO3094026.
Charles M. Walther, Jr., AO3086361.
Robert L. Wantland, AO3087247.
David G. Ward, AO3085799.
James E. Ward, AO3068328.
Wayne G. Ward, AO3083845.
Delbert D. Ware, AO3084345.
William W. Warder, AO3093542.
William J. Wargo, AO3085492.
James A. Warner, AO3094532.
Charles P. Warnick, AO3071954.
Robert J. Warren, AO3059352.
Richard E. Washington, AO3093378.
Willie F. Waterer, AO3086284.
Kent W. Waterman, AO3085569.
John A. Watring, AO3086190.
David S. Watrous, AO3093555.
Gerald D. Watson, AO2210805.
Richard A. Watson, AO3101323.
Riley L. Watson, AO3100975.
George O. Watts, AO3053843.
Edwin R. Wayne, AO3067855.
John P. Weatherford, Jr., AO3084996.
James W. Weathers, AO3094177.
Norman Weathersby, Jr., AO3085585.
Philip A. Weaver, AO3054214.
Richard C. Weaver, AO2210493.
John D. Webb, Jr., AO3093825.
Robert A. Webb, AO3081770.
Morton Wedner, AO3085448.
George M. Weeks III, AO3082256.
Rolf A. Wehr, Jr., AO3093454.
Kermit L. Wehrle, AO3069879.
Ralph E. Weida, AO3054707.
Sidney W. Weiner, AO3048802.
Orlo D. Welch, AO3054024.
Larry W. Welker, AO3086676.
Gordon L. Welling, AO3047363.
George C. Wells, AO3066800.
Richard W. Wells, AO3087322.
Robert L. Welsh, AO3093118.
Robert W. Wempe, AO3112649.
Charles J. Wendorf, AO3087085.
Richard D. Wenger, AO3068732.
James C. West, AO3086270.
James M. West, AO3036261.
Donald E. Wester, AO3048076.
Edward P. Westwood, AO3070257.
Joseph Wettlin, AO3086216.
Robert J. Whearty, AO3093715.
Charles E. Wheeler, AO3055356.
Patrick E. Whelan, AO3093716.
Bennette E. Whisenant, AO3074172.
Franklin R. White, AO3081815.
Joseph W. White II, AO3085629.
Roger G. White, AO3094423.
Ronald W. White, AO3084881.
Thomas R. White, AO3053083.
Charles R. Wh zed, AO3069744.
Conrad B. Whiteley, AO3074670.
Edgar R. Whitney, AO3073692.
Willis O. Whitney, AO3082902.
Elwyn D. Whitsitt, AO3094579.
Bert F. Whorton, AO3083692.
Charles E. Wicker, AO3068259.
Frederick G. Widicus, AO3070244.
Jim T. Wiede, AO3087405.
Walter L. Wilby, AO3056228.
Donald H. Wilcox, AO3087060.
Lawrance M. Wilcox, AO3054708.
Robert E. Wilcox, AO3087750.
David M. Wilde, AO3085043.
John D. Wilhelm, AO3083739.
Jack R. Wilhite, AO3073824.
David O. Wilkey, AO3053958.
Jackie Wilkins, AO3086576.
Lacy Wilkins, Jr., AO3054199.
Henry B. Wilkinson, AO3082019.
Robert E. Wilkinson, AO3087164.
Allen J. Williams, AO3055091.
Alma L. Williams, AO3054709.
Charles D. Williams, AO3074343.
Chester Y. Williams, AO3055565.
Dallas L. Williams, AO3052157.
Jerry F. Williams, AO3086153.
Joe A. Williams, AO3085586.
Richard G. Williams, AO3082522.
Mahlon J. Williamson, AO3021302.
Robert D. Williamson, AO3084997.
Elijah M. Willis, AO3073925.
Richard D. Willson, AO3070457.
Douglas D. Wilson, AO3068384.
James L. Wilson, AO3083664.
John M. Wilson, Jr., AO3086299.
Ronald E. Wilson, AO3072460.
William R. Wilson, AO3054755.
William T. Wilson, AO3087135.
Roger E. Wiltrout, AO3072772.
William E. Wimer, AO3093048.
Richard L. Winer, AO3094281.
Dale E. Wingate, AO3028737.
Billy J. Wingfield, AO3027995.
Bernard J. Winn, Jr., AO3082775.
George N. Winn, AO3074346.
Roger T. Winn, AO3054200.
Robert W. Winters, Jr., AO3069044.
Murrill R. Wisser, AO3082152.
George C. Witt, Jr., AO3071971.
Fred C. Witteborn, AO3055178.
George P. Wodarzak, Jr., AO3071127.
Richard C. Woelkers, AO3086756.
John V. Wolcott, AO3094075.
Jack D. Wolf, AO3083720.
Charles W. Wolfe, AO3094535.
Dean J. Wolfe, AO3093826.
George F. Wolford, Jr., AO3056475.
Richard L. Wolgamott, AO3084164.
John H. Womack, Jr., AO3055855.
William O. Womble, AO3027327.
Larry S. Wood, AO3055567.
William C. Wood, AO3064321.
William H. Wood, Jr., AO3072049.
Robert W. Woodford, AO3071581.
James J. Woodhead, AO3070894.
Franklin L. Woods, AO3086447.
John F. Wooten, Jr., AO3068557.
Robert W. Worn, AO3081165.
Forrest W. Worthington, AO3085070.
Ivan C. Wright, AO3087376.
James H. Wright III, AO3083693.
John H. S. Wright, AO3068260.
Paul J. Wright, Jr., AO3094691.
Richard D. Wright, AO3027708.
William W. Wright, Jr., AO3082021.
Norbert A. Wrobel, AO3094047.
Jerome M. Wucher, AO3074484.
Donald L. Wuerz, AO3073876.
Terrance B. Wyatt, AO3085247.
John W. Wynne, Jr., AO3073846.
David L. Wyse, AO3069214.
George N. Yamamoto, AO3066713.
Kenneth E. Yancey, Jr. AO3028213.
Hyman Yas, AO3093387.
Peter W. Yoars, AO3094113.
Ronald J. Yochem, AO3071759.
Jimmy Yoshinaka, AO3072997.
Tadashi Yoshizawa, AO3066714.
Howard D. Young, AO3082675.
Joe H. Young, AO3072070.
Perry R. Young, AO3052598.
Reid C. Young, AO3084957.
Robert W. Young, AO3054549.
Thomas N. Young, AO3093980.
Gene L. Youngstedt, AO3054025.
John F. Yount, AO3071193.
George B. Yukinaga, AO3056479.
Marie D. Yunker, AL2253599.
Stephen J. Zawadzki, AO3093860.
Walter W. Zepf, AO3094385.
John E. Zetzman, AO3085619.
Donald A. Ziegler, AO3056055.
Robert S. Ziegler, AO3072742.
Lawrence F. Zimmermann, AO3085717.
Arthur J. Zirger, Jr., AO3072343.
Richard Zock, AO3067392.
Donald K. Zurschmit, AO3087756.
Alfred B. Zustovich, AO3085800.

To be second lieutenants

Donald I. Aadland, AO3094622.
William B. Abbott, AO3097346.
Darwin G. Abby, AO3096070.
Michael W. Acker, AO3096366.
Charles D. Adams, AO3094884.
Charles F. Adams, AO3084684.
James D. Adams, Jr., AO3095914.
John R. Adams, AO3097347.
John W. Adams, AO3085878.
Martin R. Adams, AO3073273.
William E. Adcock, AO3096638.
Robert W. Aden, AO3097291.
David G. Adolph, AO3098192.
Wallace E. Aho, AO3101811.

Steven M. Ahrens, AO3095633.
Edward W. Akeyson, AO3097333.
Thomas E. Alderman, AO3101951.
Fred E. Aldrich, AO3096911.
Walter M. Alewine, AO3098693.
Howard J. Alexander, AO3097986.
William L. Alexander, AO3095450.
Jean R. Allie, AO3109759.
William D. All, AO3098650.
Andrew A. Allan, AO3105193.
Carroll G. Allen, AO3097873.
Don K. Allen, AO3102332.
James C. Allen, AO3094899.
James C. Allen, AO3109760.
John R. Allen, AO3098064.
John R. Allen, Jr., AO3098467.
Kenneth H. Allen, AO3095606.
Lacy A. Allen, AO3098649.
Matthew W. Allen, AO3095894.
James E. Allerheiligen, AO3100685.
Arlen W. Allinger, AO3086372.
Leron H. Allred, AO3099480.
Gerald F. Allsman, AO3101952.
James W. Alstrom, AO3073057.
William H. Altenhofen, AO3110167.
William T. Altman, AO3095936.
Benjamin G. Ammons, AO3094628.
Claude R. Anderson, AO3095076.
Clifton W. Anderson, AO3097954.
Frank E. Anderson, AO3097334.
Gerald R. Anderson, AO3086386.
Hugh R. Anderson, AO2210129.
John D. Anderson, AO3095874.
Larry L. Anderson, AO3096392.
Lee A. Anderson, AO3098743.
Robert M. Anderson, Jr., AO3098825.
Leonard P. Andres, AO3100103.
Leonard F. Andrews, AO3097573.
Robert D. Andring, AO3097286.
Anthony J. Anello, AO3097756.
Larry R. Angle, AO3095479.
Theodore E. Angle, AO3099373.
Joseph R. Anisko, AO3098442.
Donald C. Ankley, AO3099454.
Seth R. Anthony, Jr., AO3098630.
Wilbert W. Anthony, AO3098034.
Arthur J. Aparicio, AO3095557.
James E. Appel, AO3096743.
Carl P. Arant, AO3086161.
Curtis F. Archer, Jr., AO3098651.
James A. Archer, AO3098469.
Richard F. Arens, AO3082455.
Robert L. Armond, AO3095558.
John H. Armstrong, AO3099347.
Leroy W. Armstrong, AO3096581.
Bruce L. Arneklev, AO3101972.
John K. Arnold III, AO3095854.
Thomas N. Arnold, AO3095402.
Gerald R. Arter, AO3103442.
Linwood L. Arthur, AO3086236.
Harold W. Ashendorf, AO3093310.
David L. Atteberry, AO3098829.
Frank G. Atwood, AO3101953.
Leonard J. Augustine, AO3098443.
David W. Austin, AO3097840.
James L. Austin, AO3096151.
Richard D. Austin, AO3097012.
Stacy M. Autry, AO3097874.
Alan Avery, AO3095064.
Allan F. Avery, AO3099348.
Charles F. Avery, AO3096912.
Gerald E. Aymond, AO3096639.
James H. Ayres, AO3099029.
Alvin A. Baber, AO3093964.
Jose A. Baca, AO3095542.
Shirley J. Bach, AL3060944.
Robert J. Bacigalupi, AO3096996.
Richard B. Backus, AO3095875.
Benny H. Baddley, AO3100761.
Jerry T. Bailey, AO3101974.
Thomas W. Bailey, AO3085684.
David L. Baird, AO3101529.
William B. Baird, AO3098589.
Eugene W. Baker, AO3094199.
John A. Baker, AO3095938.
Ozrow E. Baker, AO3101954.
Ronald C. Baker, AO3102166.
Woody R. Baker, Jr., AO3098830.
Joseph R. Bakewell, AO3101983.
Robert P. Balck, AO3095683.
Richard A. Baldi, AO3095057.
Jessie C. Baldock, AO3109763.
Rey D. Baldwin, AO3099607.
Karlheinz O. W. Ball, AO3083942.
Carlton D. Ballinger, AO3098209.
Keith A. Banke, AO3098210.
Edgar L. Banks, AO3096239.
Gary M. Banks, Jr., AO3099302.
Lawrence W. Barber, AO3101956.
Paul A. Barden, AO3096913.
Franklin D. Barkdull, AO3099151.
Edwin S. Barland, AO3097129.
Clifford D. Barnes, AO3097128.
Rodger L. Barnhart, AO3101589.
John E. Barr, Jr., AO3098831.
Thomas C. Barr, AO3099545.
Edward L. Barron, AO3096701.
George E. Barrow, AO3097130.
Gary E. Barry, AO3096435.
Paul E. Bartholomew, AO3096243.
Mathias S. Bartok, AO3097757.
Frank B. Barton, AO3098211.
Robert W. Barton, AO3099455.
Terry A. Barton, AO3098065.
Leo M. Basten, Jr., AO3102544.
Gerald E. Batchelder, AO3096570.
William R. Batchelder, AO3097349.
William D. Bateman, AO3098444.
Leonard G. Bates, AO3101916.
James R. Bath, AO3100837.
Buren T. Batson, Jr., AO3109765.
Robert E. Bauder, AO3098445.
Paul R. Bauer, AO3098470.
Richard J. Bauer, AO3096073.
Kurt E. Bauermeister, AO3101988.
Robert L. Baugh, AO3098212.
John R. Baugus, AO3095939.
Gerald C. Baumer, AO3097220.
Comer C. Baxter, AO3099008.
Curtis R. Baxter, AO3099224.
Robert J. Beal, AO3099588.
Donald W. Bean, AO3101996.
Cecilio E. Beauchamp, AO3099225.
Maurice F. Beauvais, Jr., AO3084696.
Douglass D. Beck, AO3102450.
Kenneth M. Becker, AO3097813.
Lawrence W. Beckman, AO3102007.
David E. Bedan, AO3101657.
Dorris K. Bedsworth, AO3097221.
Paul F. Been, AO3099226.
Ronnie W. Beezley, AO3098352.
Richard J. Beland, AO3102016.
Alden C. Belcher, AO3096735.
John H. Bell, AO3102612.
Charles T. Bellingrath, AO3067924.
Nicholas C. Belmonte, AO3097758.
Bert H. Belt, Jr., AO3095004.
John H. Benedict, AO3101836.
Leroy A. Bengston, AO3097098.
Juan H. Benjamin, AO3097170.
Marc L. Benjamin, Jr., AO3097540.
Bruce L. Bennet, AO3097249.
James H. Bennett, Jr., AO3097250.
Richard D. Bennett, AO3105644.
Robert M. Bennett, AO3073137.
Richard L. Bennitt, AO3109767.
Eugene W. Benson, AO3102028.
Lynn H. Benson, AO3099152.
Ronald D. Bentley, AO3099523.
Anthony R. Beranek, AO3098213.
Paul M. Berens, AO3097997.
Thomas P. Berg, AO3073505.
David F. Berganini, AO3099473.
James C. Bergholt, AO3098066.
Fredrik M. Bergold, AO3098144.
Joel N. Berinstein, AO3097684.
Howard C. Berky, Jr., AO3097554.
Richard C. Berlo, AO3098145.
Gregory L. Bernard, AO3100201.
Howard M. Bernstein, AO3095480.
Donald J. Bessinger, AO3101755.
Earl P. Betts, AO3100446.
Frederick E. Betz, AO3097443.
Terence E. Beucher, AO3100722.
Martin F. Beyer, Jr., AO3097444.
Frederick A. Bickus, AO3098652.
Philip A. Bierschenk, AO3102864.
Raymond F. Biery, AO3098315.
Robert W. Biery, AO3094900.
Robert B. Biggins, AO3095144.
Billy R. Bigham, AO3095451.
William J. Billeaud, AO3094977.
Foster E. Billheimer, AO3098471.
Donald B. Billingslea, AO3110055.
Joseph W. Bills, Jr., AO3098833.
William J. Bima, Jr., AO3096153.
Richard D. Bingham, AO3102032.
Miles F. Bintz, AO3097685.
Richard J. Bird, AO3099566.
Asa O. Bishop, Jr., AO3099280.
George W. Bishop III, AO3086241.
David G. Bisset, AO3106837.
Raymond E. Bissonnette, AO3099194.
John D. Bitzer, AO3094988.
Glenn R. Bixler, AO3102333.
Nikola Bjelajac, AO3099551.
Gerald M. Blackburn, AO3109768.
Ruel E. Blackley, AO3098237.
Walter R. Blackwell, AO3096040.
Lilian P. Blahitka, AL3110183.
Edward G. Blahous, AO3096075.
Forest E. Blair, AO2253038.
Taylor H. Blakely, AO3095641.
Maxwell F. Blachard, AO3099281.
David E. Bland, AO3096076.
Tommy L. Blanton, AO3098837.
Richard W. Blatter, AO3098035.
Robert L. Blaydes, AO3096041.
Fred V. Blazine, AO3093577.
James H. Bleasdell, AO3096393.
Jack H. Bledsoe, AO3096322.
John B. Blenkiron, AO3101910.
Glenn L. Blinn, AO3097759.
Norman K. Blocker, AO3099030.
Douglas W. Blomberg, AO3104853.
Warner C. Blow, AO3097833.
Harry G. Blue, Jr., AO3110175.
Keith E. Blue, Jr., AO3098353.
James C. Bobick, AO3100104.
Robert E. Bobola, AO3096915.
Larry D. Bockelman, AO3098067.
Orvill W. Bodenstab, AO3097222.
Robert E. Boehme, AO3096543.
Robert L. Boggan, Jr., AO3095404.
Frederick H. Bohmfalk, AO3095559.
James N. Bohn, AO3096177.
Robert S. Bole, AO3095712.
Dyek R. Boles, AO3106592.
John J. Bollwerk, AO3097171.
Charles N. Bolton, AO3095405.
John R. Bomba, AO3096788.
Andrejs Bomis, AO3097013.
Robert I. Bond, AO3099787.
Ronald M. Bond, AO3098546.
Edwin B. Bookwalter, AO3098596.
Kenneth J. Boone, AO3096315.
Richard D. Boone, AO3099349.
Raymond G. Booth, AO3096487.
Eldean A. Borg, AO3096395.
Paul J. Borowitz, AO3098068.
Richard W. Bossert, AO3087209.
Melvin C. Boswell, AO3098838.
Allan P. Botticelli, AO3097601.
Jon F. Boucher, AO3105723.
Richard J. Bouckhout, AO3095560.
Anthony Boudreaux, Jr., AO3096662.
Jean L. Bouquet, AO3095846.
John A. Boussy, AO3102041.
Ferdinand C. Bouvier, AO3096720.
Joseph P. Bouvier, AO3096789.
Roderick E. Bowden, AO3099229.
William L. Bower, AO3099536.
Richard L. Bowers, AO3096545.
Stevenson E. Bowes, AO3099303.
William A. Bowman, AO3095452.
James D. Bowser, AO3098474.
James W. Boyce, Jr., AO3098840.
John C. Boyer III, AO3098475.
Winston M. Boyer, AO3097050.
Chester L. Bradley, AO3098354.
James A. Brady, AO3098841.
Rodney H. Brady, AO3084708.
Paul B. Bragdon, AO3102759.
Robert L. Bragg, AO3095406.
Marvin L. Braman, AO3096437.
Edward A. Branch, AO3101812.
Thomas E. Brand, AO3097761.
James A. Brandewie, AO3096241.
Henry W. Brandli, AO3096836.
Eugene Brandner, AO3101924.
Douglas R. Brandt, AO3097121.
Roger C. Brandt, AO3098744.
Roger D. Brandt, AO3068563.
Claude L. Branson, Jr., AO3098281.

David N. Braski, AO3097705.
Harold A. Brattland, AO3097957.
David C. Bratton, AO3103397.
Michael H. Brawner, AO3098842.
Hugh D. Braymer, AO3047107.
Myron D. Bredahl, AO3098383
Thomas M. Brennan, AO3097602.
William E. Brennan, AO3097445.
Samuel L. Brentnall, Jr., AO3095453.
Lynn D. Breon, AO3098476.
Patrick A. Briggs, AO3095895.
Paul M. Briggs, AO3106374.
Philip J. Brignall, AO3095502.
Ronald H. Brink, AO3098801.
Larry H. Brinkman, AO3098112.
Richard J. Briscoe, AO3097446.
John J. Briska, AO3097707.
William R. Broach, AO3098282.
John H. Broadbent, Jr., AO3097708.
James A. Broaddus, AO3099231.
Charles L. Broadwell, AO3101884.
Harvey K. Brock, AO3101643
Jasper S. Brock III, AO3096663.
Albert E. Brockob, AO3095753.
Robert L. Broderson, AO3096078.
Arthur W. Brodeur, AO3096790.
Loren F. Brodhead, AO3095642.
Richard A. Bronson, AO3095626.
Robert J. Brooke, AO3095651.
Gerald R. Brooks, AO3109770.
Michael C. Brooks, AO3099282.
Richard L. Brooks, AO3095454.
Theodore B. Brother, AO3086312.
Ira J. Brous, AO3097574.
Harvey C. Broussard, AO3096702.
Patrick R. Broussard, AO3110162.
Albert D. Brown, AO3099337.
Bruce A. Brown, AO3096947.
Charles R. Brown, AO3098844.
Charles W. Brown, AO3096396.
Garnett C. Brown, Jr., AO3100765.
Homer S. Brown, AO3097877.
Jerry D. Brown, AO3098343.
Laurence W. Brown, AO3096748.
Marvin F. Brown, AO3096571.
Marvin R. Brown, AO3096525.
Richard E. Brown, AO3094890.
Samuel N. Brown, Jr., AO3086243.
Vernon B. Brown, AO3098597.
James E. Browne, AO3098331.
Donald B. Browning, AO3094909.
Millard S. Browning, AO3096948.
William E. Brummett, AO3096583.
Robert B. Bruns, AO3098447.
William A. Bruns, Jr., AO3097223.
Mary L. Bryan, AL3110195.
Otis F. Bryan, Jr., AO3096887.
Roosevelt Bryant, AO3103947.
William E. Buchan, AO3099574.
Francis J. Buchholz, Jr., AO3097172.
Ronald H. Buchner, AO3098332.
Robert G. Buckey, AO3098193.
Jerrald D. Bucksath, AO3097224.
Jimmy R. Buell, AO3073897.
Richard M. Buerger, AO3098581.
Gary M. Bullock, AO3098333.
Donald C. Bunce, AO3096397.
Dan P. Bunch, AO3106792.
Thomas C. Bunn, Jr., AO3102521.
William W. Buntin, AO3097132.
Herbert M. Buran, AO3099457.
James G. Burba, AO3101724.
Gene P Burbey, AO3099456.
Delmar D. Burk, AO3098317.
Mark J. Burke, Jr., AO3097337.
Michael J. Burnett, AO3098239.
Kenneth S. Burns, AO3073560.
Belvin R. Burnside, Jr., AO3098695.
David T. Burton, AO3097383.
Robert C. Burton, AO3074151.
Herbert M. Busby, AO3100451.
Leon R. Busby, AO3103904.
Joseph J. Buser, AO3093847.
Robert W. Bush, AO3095942.
James A. Butler, AO3095713.
Jerrold L. Butters, AO3095741.
Robert Button, AO3098036.
Alonzo Byington, AO3098848.
James H. Byrd, AO3098710.
Vernon B. Byrd, Jr., AO3101788.
Eugene B. Byrnes, Jr., AO3099458.

David J. Cade, AO3096080.
Richard H. Cadmus, AO3097400.
Mary P. Cadwell, AL3101959.
Joel W. Caesar, AO3097627.
James A. Caldwell, AO3097853.
Raymond W Caldwell, Jr., AO3083165.
Rodney K. Caldwell, AO3099304.
Richard P. Callahan, AO3095829.
James R. Cameron, AO3096875.
Clarence C. Campbell, AO3095407.
Donald F. Campbell, AO3097555.
Maurice C. Campbell, AO3096439.
James V. Canavan, AO3099196.
Calvert C. Canfield IV, AO3105598.
Donald R. Canfield, AO3098019.
Robert W. Canfield, Jr., AO3098759.
Samuel A. Cannato, Jr., AO3100173.
Carl L. Cannon, Jr., AO3098711.
Ronald G. Cannon, AO3095561.
James L. Cantey, AO3096666.
John M. Capants, AO3096750.
August J. Caponecchi, AO3097710.
Julian M. Capps, AO3097879.
Gaines B. Carden, AO3098240.
Robert R. Carey, AO3098851.
Susan K. Carey, AL3110182.
Wesley G. Carey, Jr., AO3095943.
James E. Carleton, AO3098384.
Jerry L. Carlin, AO3095607.
James A. Carlson, AO3096126.
John N. Carmena, AO3096667.
Arthur R. Caron, AO3096916.
John H. Carpenter, AO3098241.
Gary S. Carr, AO3095643.
Paul L. Carroll, Jr., AO3095203.
Edward L. Carron, AO3095944.
William C. Carson, AO3106656.
Thomas L. Carteaux, AO3095916.
Robert T. Carter, AO3097384.
James B. Case, AO3085805.
Richard P. Cashion, AO3097351.
John M. Cassel, AO3097603.
Gary G. Cassell, AO3095715.
Leo M. Cassidy, AO3096917.
Charles B. Casson, AO3099563.
David E. Casteel, AO3097045.
Mural F. Castleberry, AO3097408.
John B. Catiller, AO3098214.
Morris B. Catledge, Jr., AO3102048.
Donald W. Caughlin, AO3095482.
Fred B. Cavanaugh, Jr., AO3099284.
Bill R. Cavender, AO3096369.
Robert J. Cebulski, AO3098020.
John P. Cermak, AO3097814.
Robert E. Ceruti, AO3105410.
James R. Chamberlain, AO3095672.
Jerry D. Chandler, AO3106537.
Bryce H. Chapin, AO3098147.
George E. Chapman, AO3101570.
Robert L. Chapman, AO3095783.
William R. Chapman, Jr., AO3097099.
George G. Chappel, AO3098479.
Bruce M. Charon, AO3096399.
Edward H. Chartrand, AO3097352.
David R. Chase, AO3096400.
David R. Chase, AO3098114.
John A. Chelstrom, AO3110027.
William F. Cheney IV, AO3095784.
Robert B. Cherba, AO3097016.
Millard W. Cherry, Jr., AO3097447.
Jon L. Cheshire, AO3097557.
Jack E. Chesnut, AO3100014.
Richard W. Chick, AO3096838.
Hilton I. Chodorow, AO3073567.
John P. Choisser, AO3099580.
Carl S. Christensen, AO3093834.
Larry C. Christenson, AO3097297.
John T. Christian, AO3073075.
Lawson V. Christian, AO3099097.
Doyle C. Christianer, AO3096127.
Paul W. Christoffersen, AO3099549.
Wayne L. Christoffersen, AO3097298.
Peter C. Christoplis, AO3099426.
Leo J. Ciesielski, AO3095255.
Constandino A. Cirielli, AO3097448.
Elnathan L. Claassen, AO3103638.
Leonard E. Clark, Jr., AO3098855.
Perry G. Clark, AO3099552.
Raynor W. Clark, AO3098632.
Robert L. Clark, AO3095579.
Robert M. Clark, AO3096886.

Robert O. Clark, AO3095609.
Neil Clarke, AO3098745.
Rodger C. Clarke, AO3096949.
Gordon M. Claycomb, AO3095124.
Harold A. Clem, AO3096401.
Richard B. Clement, AO3097502.
Thomas P. Clement, AO3099474.
Tommy J. Clevenger, AO3098760.
Lawrence X. Clifford, AO3099199.
James A. Cline, AO3095192.
Carl B. Close, Jr., AO3096640.
James L. Clowers, AO3096490.
John R. Clyde, AO3106726.
Kenneth L. Cochrum, AO3099056.
Edward M. Coffman, AO3095737.
William K. Cogdell, AO3100455.
Theodore Cohen, AO3097749.
Mikel W. Cohick, AO3098480.
James R. Coker, Jr., AO3098655.
Robert M. Colbert, AO3097353.
Gerry R. Colburn, AO3096857.
Ralph B. Colby, AO3096839.
David C. Cole, AO3097795.
Donald S. Coleman, AO3095066.
Bruce W. Collins, AO3093804.
Lee N. Collins, AO3098779.
Thomas E. Collins III, AO3097133.
Coy W. Colquitt, Jr., AO3095946.
Harold N. Colvin, AO3095455.
John E. Colwell, AO3098481.
John H. Colyer, AO3099609.
Ronald G. Combs, AO3098037.
Steve G. Conerly, AO3096668.
Robert E. Conley, AO3098194.
Robert J. Conley, AO3097763.
John B. Connell, Jr., AO3096275.
Milton C. Contella, AO3098857.
Charles S. Cook, AO3099427.
Darwin F. Cook, AO3099350.
David H. Cook, AO3093263.
Harold C. Cook, AO3102699.
James D. Cook, AO3109773.
Lee R. Cook, AO3099983.
William B. Cook, Jr., AO3106386.
Clifford E. Cool, AO3097576.
Vernon E. Cooley, AO3099140.
Kenneth B. Coolidge, AO3097354.
Thomas B. Coolman, AO3109774.
James L. Coon, AO3096951.
William M. Coons, AO3099613.
William J. Corbett, AO3097796.
Jerry W. Corbin, AO3099589.
Robert E. Corder II, AO3099014.
Rene V. Cormier, AO3096818.
Kenneth L. Cornell, AO3097958.
William C. Cornwell, AO3096045.
Roy L. Costley, AO3101963.
Theodore J. Cotti, AO3095545.
Austin G. Cotton, AO3099428.
Ivan R. Cottrell, AO3096952.
Joe F. Coughran, AO3098858.
Nyles B. Courtney, AO3098859.
Nicholas J. Coury, AO3097017.
Tommy R. Cowan, AO3099124.
Edward H. Cowern, AO3096919.
Fred B. Cox, Jr., AO3054442.
James E. Cox, AO3096157.
Joe F. Cox, AO3054060.
Michael S. Cox, AO3098285.
Harold M. Craddock, AO3106796.
Thomas L. Craig, AO3096670.
Walker R. Craig, AO3098860.
William R. Craig III, AO3098150.
Harold V. Crase, AO3101964.
Nedson M. Crawford, AO3101965.
Robert S. Crawford, AO3103402.
Lowell D. Creager, AO3099015.
William D. Creamer, AO3095410.
George B. Creel, AO3098861.
Raymond E. Crittenden, AO3095470.
Roland L. Crock, AO3096243.
John K. Croisant, AO3102178.
Richard W. Crooks, AO3109776.
Donald A. Cross, AO3098286.
Richard W. Cross, AO3096158.
Ivey G. Crow, AO3101940.
Charles R. Crowder, AO3096672.
Jesse L. Crowell, Jr., AO3095456.
John H. Crummie, AO3098781.
James S. Crutchfield II, AO3101936.
Edmundo D. L. Cruz, AO3109792.

Herbert Cuevas, AO3097645.
David E. Culbert, AO3098116.
John J. Cullen, AO3097606.
Delbert R. Cummings, AO3098406.
Gary V. Cummins, AO3101865.
Olin B. Cundiff II, AO3099235.
Thomas H. M. Cunningham, AO3096084.
Frederick D. Current, AO3098590.
John C. Currie, AO3101967.
Tom P. Currie, AO3097835.
Hugh G. Curtis, AO3096673.
Lloyd W. Curtis, AO3097100.
James A. Cushing, AO3109778.
Henry L. Custer, Jr., AO3097842.
Richard E. Cutforth, AO3096046.
Gene R. Cutler, AO3096528.
Charles P. Cutter, AO3098634.
James E. Cvik, AO3096081.
Raymond T. Cwikowski, AO3097176.
Gilmore M. Dahl, AO3085187.
James G. Dahlman, AO3095484.
Paul W. Dailey, Jr., AO3096323.
Robert O. Daily, AO3098049.
Kenneth A. Dalchau, AO3094911.
Curtis D. Dale, AO3099408.
Pat M. D'Amato, AO3097750.
Karl K. Damon, AO3097646.
Jacob J. Daneman, AO3095948.
Carey W. Daniel, Jr., AO3097854.
James N. Daniel, Jr., AO3099305.
Kenneth D. Daniel, AO3099237.
Tommie G. Daniel, AO3106558.
William R. Daniel, AO3098656.
Frederick J. Daniels, AO3097527.
James R. Darkey, AO3099419.
Frederick R. Daulton, AO3095686.
Leslie C. Davenport, AO3097269.
David F. David, AO3096705.
Jack L. Davies, AO3097815.
John A. Davies, AO3012803.
Thomas Davies, Jr., AO3102065.
Robert Davila, AO3098862.
Clark T. Davis, AO3099181.
Frederick L. Davis, AO3098407.
Gary D. Davis, AO3099182.
James H. Davis, Jr., AO3102064.
James T. Davis, AO3096529.
Joseph E. Davis, AO3106175.
Luther J. Davis, Jr., AO3097855.
Moses P. Davis, Jr., AO3086651.
Richard E. Davis, AO3095785.
Richard E. Davis, AO3098320.
Richard J. Davis, AO2245110.
Ronald L. Davis, AO3096179.
Roy E. Davis, AO3098864.
William D. Davis, AO3098243.
William N. Davis, AO3099098.
Richard H. Day, AO3048382.
Donald G. Dayhoff, AO3096200.
Joseph E. Daylor, AO3101968.
Allen D. Dayton, AO3071344.
Warren W. Deakins, AO3098335.
Dallas A. Dean, AO3096819.
Donald E. Dean, AO3101871.
Michael L. Deangelo, AO3097765.
Philip M. Deans, AO3097881.
Ralph E. Deater, AO3096344.
Ronald J. Degolia, AO3095687.
John E. DeJong, AO3097712.
J. David Dekraker, AO3097578.
Denis P. Delaney, AO3096791.
Jon M. DeLaune, AO3098865.
Harry Delizonna, AO3097101.
Robert L. Dellinger, AO3098657.
Bruce H. Dement, AO3106397.
Ronald S. Demijohn, AO3097355.
Oscar G. Demille, AO3094357.
Eugene F. Demmler, AO3095786.
Richard L. DeMott, AO3101718.
Nicholas K. Demuth, AO3098761.
Jerome A. Denier, AO3109779.
James E. Desroches, AO3099200.
Delmar A. Deterling, AO3098866.
Thomas S. Dewberry, AO3096531.
John Dezio, AO3097450.
Douglas H. Diamond, AO3097766.
Allen F. Dickerman, AO3073647.
Charles A. Dickinson III, AO3098484.
David C. Dickinson, AO3098483.
David H. Dickinson, AO3095787.
Joseph W. Dickinson, Jr., AO3099379.
Robert W. Dickson, AO3098356.
William W. Didlake, Jr., AO3099031.
James E. Dieckhoner, AO3098117.
Bruce M. Dieffenbach, AO3098591.
Robert W. Diercks, AO3102323.
Thomas E. Diggs, AO3099238.
Lewis R. Dillman, AO3096047.
Daniel R. Dillon, AO3102703.
George F. Dillon, Jr., AO3096820.
John J. Dillon, AO3099201.
Paul E. Dillon, AO3105607.
Rudolph G. Diluzio, AO3099547.
Ronald G. Dircks, AO3097628.
Oliver P. Ditch, AO3096707.
Walter H. Dittrich, AO3097252.
Donald A. Divers, AO3096159.
Joseph F. Dixon, Jr., AO3096821.
Reuben T. Dixon, Jr., AO3105825.
Rodney M. Dixon, AO3097882.
Troy G. Dobbins, AO3095412.
John F. Dobbyn, AO3096876.
Otto C. Dobias, AO3095019.
John R. Dockendorff, AO3096441.
Nathan P. Dodge III, AO3096877.
William C. Dodson, AO3099531.
Hugh E. Doebrick, AO3098658.
James J. Doherty, AO3095546.
Michael E. Dohrse, AO3103405.
George M. Dolinsky, AO3097503.
Charles B. Donahue II, AO3096878.
Clifford V. Donnelly, Jr., AO3101888.
John A. Donnelly III, AO3095547.
Richard J. Donohoe, AO3098592.
John M. Donohue, AO3096086.
Michael H. Donovan, AO3096921.
William G. Donovan, AO3095654.
John H. Doscher, Jr., AO3098716.
John T. Dowd, AO3097451.
Fred A. Doyle, AO3098485.
David W. Drage, AO3095717.
Robert L. Drake, AO3105910.
William S. Drake III, AO3099285.
David R. Drescher, AO3095788.
Glenn N. Dressen, AO3106401.
William B. Driggers, Jr., AO3098659.
Laurence L. Driggs III, AO3098547.
Alan J. Driscoll, AO3094581.
John A. Drohan, AO3097767.
David W. Drowne, AO3101909.
Neil E. Dubay, AO3097053.
Edward S. Dubel, AO3095766.
Regal D. Dubose, Jr., AO3095472.
Roger T. Ducharme, AO3097356.
Phillip W. Duchemin, AO3100457.
Thomas J. Dudek, AO3069472.
Thomas E. Dudley, AO3098717.
Vernon Duenas, AO3097528.
Bruce B. Duffy, AO3096922.
Henry M. Duggan, AO3094426.
Richard D. Dulin, AO3096244.
Rex L. Dull, AO3102139.
Alan C. Duncan, AO3098425.
Gary L. Duncan, AO3096547.
Warren C. Dunkin, AO3099482.
James J. Dunlap, AO3098870.
Larry L. Dunlap, AO3096548.
Charles R. Dunn, AO3103117.
Robert A. Dunn, AO3097406.
Anthony K. Dunnam, AO3101970.
Edward L. Durden, AO3095507.
Esmer L. Durham, Jr., AO3095820.
Donald B. Durrett, AO3096276.
Richard W. Dush, AO3098050.
John E. Dutcher, AO3097648.
Dennie H. Dutschke, AO3096588.
Robert C. Dutton, AO3096346.
William L. Duvall, AO3096589.
Dean A. Dversdall, AO3094317.
Thomas D. Dwyer, AO3096923.
William G. Dwyer, AO3098598.
David M. Dysart, AO3099406.
Willard M. Early, Jr., AO3095109.
Joseph J. Eash III, AO3098599.
Richard J. Eastlack, AO3096751.
Donald E. Ebrite, AO3096245.
Joseph Y. Echanis, AO3098386.
James C. Eckert, AO3098487.
John D. Eckhart, AO3098216.
Billy G. Edenfield, AO3095918.
Melvin U. Edens, AO3098697.
William A. Edgington, AO3098217.
Donald R. Edmonds, AO3105145.
John F. Edwards, AO3099202.
Roger N. Edwards, AO3096590.
Tommy M. Edwards, AO3096325.
Robert L. Eichberger, AO3099803.
Robert L. Eigel, AO3097178.
Zac R. Elander, AO3099380.
Richard B. Elder, AO3098488.
Vernet W. Eliason, AO3099351.
John N. Eller, Jr., AO3094235.
Paul G. Ellinghaus, AO3097768.
Robert M. Ellington, AO3095413.
Craig D. Elliot, AO3098636.
David A. Ellis, AO3097857.
James L. Ellis, Jr., AO3097179.
James K. Elrod, AO3098992.
Horace R. Elzey, AO3097885.
James F. Emmert, AO3095535.
Clyde W. Enderle, AO3098000.
Hermann F. Engelbach, Jr., AO3097713.
James H. Engelbach, AO3098245.
Theodore W. Engelbrecht, AO3073983.
David E. England, AO3084975.
Donald E. Engleman, AO3906622.
Gary D. Engler, AO3095580.
Evarts B. English III, AO3096722.
Dean E. Engstrom, AO3096404.
Roger L. Engstrom, AO3097077.
John N. Entzminger, Jr., AO3101971.
James P. Erickson, AO3098337.
John H. Erikson, AO3102066.
William D. Erwin, AO3095688.
Fernand M. Espiau, AO3096677.
Boyd F. Etheredge, AO3109781.
Robert C. Ettinger, AO3095689.
Benjamin R. Eulenfeld, AO3100209.
Charles W. Euler, AO3097816.
William D. Eva, AO3097357.
Bruce P. Evans, AO3095581.
Dwight R. Evans, AO3098119.
Joe B. Evans, AO3102609.
Keith J. Evans, AO3100587.
Thomas D. Evans, AO3101920.
Warren E. Evans, AO3095754.
Woodrow W. Everett, Jr., AO3095847.
Michael J. Evers, AO3074054.
Robert H. Everson, AO3097558.
Lawrence G. Evert, AO3106700.
Harleigh P. Ewell, AO3095952.
Lionel L. Ewing III, AO3101883.
David L. Faatz, AO3095718.
Henry J. Fabian, AO3096277.
Gerald B. Faigle, Jr., AO3097649.
Harold C. Falk, AO3069427.
Beverly J. Falkowski, AL3101973.
Robert J. Faller, AO3098608.
Richard D. Fannin, AO3096088.
Everett D. Fansler, AO3099420.
Curtis E. Farley, AO3103372.
Robert G. Farmer, AO3094926.
Richard L. Fath, AO3102067.
Harman E. Fawcett III, AO3096859.
Peter J. Fearey, AO3099203.
Francis P. Fehlner, AO3067225.
Gerald K. Fehr, AO3096405.
Adolph Fejfar, AO3098746.
Irwin J. Feldman, AO3097054.
Richard T. Fell, AO3096406.
Samuel J. Fenati, AO3098489.
Charles J. Fentner, Jr., AO3103305.
Emery F. Ferguson, Jr., AO3098246.
Albert T. Fernandez, AO3074259.
John J. Fernstrom, AO3096573.
Michael P. Ferris, AO3102455.
Robert J. Fetsko, AO3097843.
Robert M. Fey, AO3096623.
George H. Fichtl, AO3098803.
Richard F. Ficke, Jr., AO3097559.
Louis M. Fielack, Jr., AO3097407.
Lawrence E. Fieland, AO3098357.
Phillip H. Field, AO3096089.
Stanley G. Fields, AO3096326.
Lloyd R. Filkins, AO3099338.
Charles E. Finch, AO3096090.
Timothy H. Fine, AO3099307.
Jacquin P. Fink, AO3086550.
Edward M. Finkelstein, AO3097226.
Robert W. Finn, AO3095098.
James H. Finney, AO3098288.
August V. Fischer, AO3097960.
Hans-Joachim E. Fischer, AO3097452.

Earl M. Fisher, AO3099410.
Frank P. Fisher, AO3096003.
Phil D. Fisher, AO3087432.
Richard B. Fisher, AO3099057.
Roy E. Fisher, II, AO3097887.
Joseph S. Fisk, AO3096407.
Neil W. Fisk, AO3099205.
Joseph T. Fitzgerald, AO3097408.
James A. Fitzsimmons, AO3097019.
Bartholemew W. Flaherty, AO3097769.
James H. Fleming, Jr., AO3097157.
David G. Flinn, AO3105243.
Larry M. Flodin, AO3099352.
John P. Flood, AO3109783.
Raymond L. Florow, AO3101631.
John C. Flournoy, AO3095414.
William F. Flynn, Jr., AO3096278.
Melvin J. Fohrman, AO3073454.
Joseph P. Foley, AO3097770.
Stephen T. Foley, AO3095789.
James E. Folston, Jr., AO3098338.
Loren E. Foncerrada, AO3094953.
Richard I. Fonde, AO3098804.
Roger W. Foote, AO3100155.
Daniel F. Forbes, AO3097021.
Glenna S. Force, AL3060932.
John E. Ford III, AO3095611.
George B. Foreman, AO3095691.
David G. Forman, Jr., AO3097580.
Bennie W. Forrester, AO3098762.
William D. Forsythe, AO3097651.
Roger A. Fortna, AO3096202.
Donovan F. Foster, AO3097529.
Joseph H. Foster, Jr., AO3093319.
Kenneth L. Foster, AO3096247.
Bobby T. Fowler, AO3095919.
Frederick J. Fowler, AO3105960.
Clarence E. Fox, AO3096954.
Gary J. Fox, AO3110000.
George L. Fox, Jr., AO3095583.
Thomas P. Fox, AO3097608.
William D. Franklin, AO3097454.
Stanley K. Franks, Jr., AO3098051.
Jacob H. Frantz, AO3099240.
James T. Frantz III, AO3095457.
Kenneth C. Franzel, AO3099987.
James W. Fraser, AO3095485.
Richard R. Freda, AO3105244.
Alton B. Freeman, Jr., AO3099606.
Delbert A. Freeman, AO3098360.
Marshal L. Freemyer, AO3099988.
Frank H. Freidhoff II, AO3099583.
Charles L. J. Freihofer, AO3102943.
Albert L. Freisner, AO3098074.
Donald G. French, AO3094862.
John N. Frey, AO3096279.
James E. Freytag, AO3098877.
Charles W. Friant, AO3099241.
Ernest M. Friar, Jr., AO3097889.
Jerry L. Frick, AO3098718.
Lawrence A. Fricke, Jr., AO3097301.
Roger P. Friedrich, AO3098491.
Herbert L. Friesen, AO3096497.
John G. Friess, AO3073817.
Jack A. Frohbieter, AO3096370.
Carl A. Fronabarger, AO3098763.
Robert E. Frost, AO3096248.
John S. Fryer, AO3096371.
Benjamin G. Fugitt, Jr., AO3093767.
Allan M. Fuji, AO3098637.
Robert D. Furman, AO3103872.
Robert J. Furman, AO3105412.
Grover F. Furr, Jr., AO3099034.
Dennis S. Fusco, AO3099339.
Roger A. Gagnon, AO3096822.
Joseph C. Gaidula, AO3098493.
Paul B. Gaines, AO3101975.
Patrick E. Galbraith, AO3110142.
Earl L. Galceran, AO3098878.
Harold W. Gale, AO3105315.
Nicholas A. Galella, AO3109785.
Thomas W. Gallagher, Jr., AO3104588.
Sherman Gallay, AO3098450.
Roger P. Galli, AO3099431.
John C. Galloway, AO3096842.
John E. Gamble, AO3101976.
Robert C. Gammill, AO3097836.
Ross Gangloff, AO3097358.
Myron L. Gantt, AO3085648.
Jose D. Garcia, Jr., AO3071846.
Robert L. Gard, AO3099527.
Carl B. Gardner, AO3097158.
Robert E. Gardner, AO3096443.
Robert L. Gardner, AO3099603.
Jerome F. Garlan, AO3109787.
Robert A. Garner, Jr., AO3098719.
Ruffus E. Garoutte, AO3099330.
Larry G. Garrison, AO3098879.
Larry L. Garrison, AO3099353.
Edwin H. Garver, AO3098075.
Terry L. Gassaway, AO3099157.
John D. Gatlin, AO3098880.
Norman E. Gaut, AO3095612.
Kenneth G. Gavrell, AO3097609.
Francis J. Gawell, AO3101977.
Francis S. Gay, AO3095767.
James T. Gebara, AO3097798.
Ralph K. Gee, AO3096091.
Dennis C. Gehri, AO3099432.
Marvin Geller, AO3067281.
Rollin W. Gentes, AO3097359.
Robert H. George, AO3095524.
Donald K. Georgi, AO3096092.
Louis P. Gerac, AO3096708.
Glenn H. Gerber, AO3098494.
Robert J. Gerberg, AO3097560.
Thomas L. Gerken, AO3098001.
Frederick S. Gersh, AO3097360.
Lawrence G. Gerum, AO3099500.
Robert Gest III, AO3109649.
Louis Giacobbe, AO3110139.
Thomas N. Gibson III, AO3095954.
Richard J. Giddings, AO3101978.
Frederick W. Giessler, AO3093148.
Charles B. Gilbert, AO3101636.
Charles F. Gilbert, AO3102069.
Malcolm K. Gilbertson, AO3097653.
Wallace L. Giles, AO3086564.
Lyndel M. Gililland, AO3099099.
Daniel E. Gilkes, AO3103682.
Thomas A. Gilkeson, AO3095092.
Marlin R. Gillette, AO3087025.
Donald G. Gilmer, AO3095416.
Edson G. Gilmore, AO3099340.
Mario B. Ginnetti, AO3097000.
Richard E. Gipe, AO3094454.
Carl B. Gipson, AO3102070.
Glenn G. Givens, AO3105776.
Edward B. Glannon, AO3097714.
Arthur A. Glassman, AO3096575.
John T. Gleason, AO3098609.
Patrick A. Gleeson, AO3096130.
Joseph K. Glenn, AO3097254.
Robert L. Glenn, Jr., AO3098495.
Douglas G. Glime, AO3096465.
James M. Gloshen, AO3096408.
Brittle Glover, AO3102675.
Richard H. Goddard, AO3095755.
Alan M. Godes, AO3073065.
Allen G. Goehring, AO3098883.
Phillip W. Goertz, AO3110154.
Walter M. Goff, AO3106412.
Kenneth I. Golden, AO3052537.
Gary W. Goldenbogen, AO3098002.
James D. Golliher, AO3097229.
Thomas J. Golson, AO3097228.
Charles C. Goodwill, AO3098120.
Roy M. Goodwin, AO3098121.
Dennis B. Gorder, AO3109789.
Donald D. Gordon, AO3097654.
Thomas E. Goris, AO3096205.
Patrick J. Gorman, AO3096281.
John J. Goshert, AO3096249.
William J. Goshorn, AO3110091.
Jerald L. Gossman, AO3096624.
Edwin E. Gould, AO3086876.
James B. Gould, AO3098077.
Harold W. Gourgues, Jr., AO3096680.
Robert J. Governs, AO3099599.
Ben R. Goza, AO3102071.
Donald M. Graber, AO3098387.
Gregory J. Grabka, AO3097818.
Edward G. Grabman, AO3094726.
Paul J. Graf, AO3095058.
Robert A. Graf, AO3097787.
Herbert B. Graham, AO3096625.
John R. Graham, AO3096206.
Johnnie B. Graham, AO3098885.
Raymond G. Grammer, AO3096094.
Shelton D. Granade, AO3095418.
Ronald S. Graniero, AO3097410.
Charles E. Grant, AO3096860.
Danny R. Gray, AO3096051.
George G. Gray, AO3098699.
James F. Gray, AO3098610.
Porter H. Gray, AO3098322.
Edgar E. Green, AO3103034.
Herbert L. Green, AO3099059.
James L. Green, AO3098782.
Stephen J. Greenberg, AO3048934.
George S. Greene, AO3097411.
John M. Greene, AO3095920.
Richard L. Greenup, AO3095719.
Bruce B. Greenwood, AO3098583.
Jesse R. Greer, AO3099550.
Bruce L. Gregory, AO3098638.
Edwin W. Gregory, AO3097562.
Gordon C. Greider, AO3096207.
Lance Greve, AO3085775.
William Grieger, AO3103578.
Charles R. Griffin, Jr., AO3097892.
John W. Griffin, AO3096445.
Paul M. Griffin, Jr., AO3096681.
Robert W. Griffiths, AO3101981.
Jack L. Grigsby, AO3098806.
John R. Grim, AO3102073.
William D. W. Grimes, AO3098639.
Derwin E. Grimm, Jr., AO3102193.
Leslie N. Grinspoon, AO3096843.
Guy D. Groff, AO3102774.
Gary W. Groh, AO3097255.
Robert L. Groshner, AO3098584.
Alan Gross, AO3099521.
Roger L. Grossel, AO3102074.
Henry H. Grosskreutz, AO3097103.
Ralph J. Grossman, AO3099382.
Thomas J. Groux, AO3072394.
David C. Grove, AO3098388.
Eric G. Gruenler, AO3096131.
Thomas G. Gruidl, AO3097104.
Gary E. Grunder, AO3097655.
Raymond W. Grundmeyer, Jr., AO3096723.
Gary L. Guertin, AO3109790.
Richard A. Guglielmi, AO3094846.
Robert L. Guinn, AO3099525.
Earle V. Guthrie, AO3098993.
James J. Guthrie, Jr., AO3096626.
Gabriel J. Gutman, AO3097715.
Samuel P. Guyton, AO3097137.
Ronald R. Guzior, AO3097688.
Wayne M. Gyenizs, AO3095790.
John L. Haag, AO3094695.
Verle D. Habberstad, AO3103744.
Charles F. Haberlen, AO3109935.
Earl J. Haffey, AO3101984.
Robert E. Hagler, AO3095419.
George T. Hagstrom, AO3098585.
Dennis B. Hague, AO3100316.
Hollis B. Hale, Jr., AO3096593.
Leonard M. Hale, AO3098994.
David B. Hall, AO3098640.
Henry D. Hall, AO3095956.
Michael J. Hall, AO3097088.
Donald F. Hallman, AO3106240.
William G. Halpin, AO3102459.
James P. Halvorson, AO3098747.
Wilfred C. Hamann, AO3082355.
Harry C. Hamby, AO3098889.
Donald R. Hamilton, AO3096409.
Francis P. Hamilton, AO3102651.
Frederick M. Hamilton, AO3086116.
Gladen R. Hamilton, Jr., AO3098890.
John W. Hamilton, AO3101646.
Norman E. Hamilton, AO3102776.
Robert A. Hamilton, AO3095812.
William M. Hamilton, AO3029690.
William E. Hammonds, AO3103150.
John S. Hancock, AO3096348.
Thomas P. Hancock, AO3098496.
Russell A. Hankins, AO3099461.
William M. Hanley, AO3102076.
Dallas R. Hanna, AO3105736.
Joseph L. Hannah, AO3097893.
Martin D. Hannemann, AO3104832.
Gary W. Hannig, AO3099160.
Quince M. Hansen, Jr., AO3099159.
Clayton L. Hanson, AO3097962.
Delbert L. Hanson, AO3099355.
Edward K. Hanson, AO3105557.
Jerry A. Hanson, AO3098748.
Thomas E. Hardenbergh III, AO3049987.
Charles W. Hardie, AO3095140.
William K. Harding, AO3098497.
Mitchell G. Hargett, AO3101824.

Overton Hargett, AO3097270.
George E. Hargrave, AO3096163.
Jesse G. Hargrove, AO3098892.
Allan D. Harkins, AO3095420.
Lee L. Harkins, Jr., AO3098996.
Jerry P. Harmon, AO3098339.
Ronald L. Harmon, AO3098003.
Robert L. Harnish, AO3095769.
Edwin T. Harper, AO3029691.
William R. Harper, Jr., AO3095958.
Milfred G. Harr, AO3097230
Emmett L. Harris, AO3102916.
Robert E. Harris, AO3109578.
Thomas L. Harris, Jr., AO3095460.
William [illegible]. Harris, AO3102497.
Ernest L. Harrison, AO3095421.
Ronald L. Harrison, AO3099383.
William H. Harrison III, AO3095526.
Winston R. Harriss, Jr., AO3100282.
Albert W. Hart, AO3099462.
Arnold L. Hart, AO3097583.
Robert S. Hart, AO3083813.
Thomas F. Hart, AO3096479.
William A. Hart, AO3101936.
Stewart E. Hartkopf, AO3097459.
Paul A. Harvey, AO3098052.
Tarald V. Hassell, AO3098156.
Robert T. Hastie, AO3103307.
James H. Hastings, AO3109579.
Winfred E. Hastings, AO3098362.
Alden L. Haswell, AO3097837.
Lester E. Hatcher, AO3097160.
Peter H. Hatten, AO3096724.
Kenneth G. Haug, AO3098157.
James R. Haugen, AO3097079.
Norman A. Haugen, AO3110121.
Eugene R. Hauser, AO3097460.
Ralph E. Havens, AO3099492.
John D. Hawkins, AO3101983.
Richard S. Hawkins, AO3095922.
Robert C. Hawkins, AO3085950.
James E. Haynes, AO3095527.
Robert A. Hazel, AO3101627.
Robert Q. Head, AO3095001.
Charles B. Healy, AO3098662.
Richard P. Healy, AO3096053.
Robert D. Heard, AO3109580.
Joseph T. Hearne, AO3098894.
Robert G. Heasley, AO3105738.
James E. Heath, AO3102559.
Winfred A. Heath, AO3097894.
Francis J. Hebert, AO3098022.
Roland M. Hebert, AO3096682.
Johnnie B. Heck, AO3098290.
Robert A. Heckman, AO3097303.
John L. Heckscher, AO3087278.
Robert H. Hedenberg, AO3095613.
Isaac A. Hedges, Jr., AO3097256.
Edward L. Heft, AO3095035.
George Heidelbaugh, AO3096349.
William F. Heiden, AO3099435.
James H. Heilman, AO3098079.
William E. Heisler, AO3097717.
Kenneth Held, AO3096862.
Dennis E. Helgoe, AO3095296.
Frederick T. Helmer III, AO3097505.
Charles C. Helton, AO3097138.
Victor L. Hemer, AO3102834.
Charles E. Hemingway, AO3098219.
Jay V. Hemming, AO3094358.
Robert S. Henderson, AO3096054.
Francis E. Hendrickson, AO3100566.
Dennis E. Hendrix, AO3098896.
Will C. Hendrix, Jr., AO3098895.
Richard C. Henneberry, AO3099206.
Charles S. Henry, Jr., AO3097413.
Harley D. Henry, AO3099035.
William R. Henry, AO3097182.
Ernest E. Henson, AO3094473.
Todd E. Henson, AO3106567.
Frederick W. Henss, AO3097718.
Richard S. Herman, AO3096823.
William K. Herndon, AO3099243.
Walter K. Herr, AO3096759.
Terry L. Hershey, AO3084545.
George R. Hertenstein, AO3085980.
John F. Hertz, AO3101989.
William E. Hesselgrave, Jr., AO3101985.
Dimitri E. Hibsman, AO3093997.
Michael S. Hider, AO3098220.
Donald L. Hierman, AO3096133.
Chester E. Higginbotham, AO3101798.
Rodney F. Higgins, AO3086726.
Harlan R. Highsmith, AO3109794.
James L. Hightower, AO3101990.
Marion J. Hild, AO3097304.
Carl E. Hildebrand, AO3097362.
Robert L. Hilgendorf, AO3085871.
Harold R. Hilker, AO3096031.
Charles V. Hill, AO3085146.
Gerald E. Hill, AO3098363.
Jimmie D. Hill, AO3110125.
Robert T. Hill, AO3101991.
William H. Hill, Jr., AO3099244.
Sergei Hillery, AO3096683.
Thomas K. Hinckley, AO3087316.
Edward J. Hindle, AO3105613.
Charles W. Hines, AO3103105.
Duane M. Hines, AO3098409.
Michael L. Hinnebusch, AO3098419.
Hayes, T. Hinrichs, AO3098250.
David S. Hinton, AO3106345.
Herbert T. Hirata, AO3096004.
Jon R. Hobbs, AO3099436.
George W. Hocker, AO3098899.
Theodore A. Hodgdon, Jr., AO3105172.
Donald Y. Hodges, AO3109584.
Harold W. Hodges, AO3095962.
Thomas E. Hodgson, AO3102562.
William L. Hoese, AO3086140.
Joseph E. Hoffman, Jr., AO3073159.
Paul R. Hoffman, AO3050729.
Richard L. Hoffman, AO3099593.
Donald A. Hofmann, AO3098452.
Robert B. Hofmann, AO3095694.
James D. Hogan, AO3099036.
Joseph E. Hogge, AO3101992.
Harry R. Hoglander, AO3095861.
John H. Hogshead, AO3098158.
Kenneth J. Hohl, AO3096798.
Burton H. Holaday, AO3096098.
James W. Holaday, AO3099020.
William E. Holcomb, Jr., AO3097161.
Harry G. Holcombe, AO3098197.
John S. Holden, AO3097585.
Barnes E. Holder, Jr., AO3096725.
Andrew R. Holko, AO3098041.
Lonnie P. Holliday, AO3099598.
James H. Holloway, AO3046875.
David K. Holman, AO3096844.
David H. Holmes, AO3096863.
Gilbert B. Holmes, Jr., AO3098291.
Michael J. Holsinger, AO3097231.
Robert D. Holstead, AO3096644.
Ronald J. Holthouse, AO3096350.
David A. Holtz, AO3098004.
Melvyn A. Holzman, AO3095015.
Harry R. Honaker, AO3094973.
John K. Honey, AO3098796.
Emmitt M. Honeycutt, Jr., AO3097895.
Thomas W. Honeywill, AO3098198.
Heyward H. Hoover, Jr., AO3098721.
Ralph C. Hoover, Jr., AO3109585.
Will A. Hord, AO3096620.
Jack M. Horn, AO3099311.
William I. Hornbostel, AO3096135.
Robert M. Horne, AO3104656.
John W. Hornecker, AO3098340.
Jerry A. Horney, AO3096208.
Richard M. Horning, AO3098159.
William C. Horsfield III, AO3097415.
Donald R. Hortberg, AO3084142.
Walter Y. Hosokawa, AO3096005.
Daniel H. Hostetler, AO3097233.
Frank D. Hotter, AO3101994.
Christopher F. Hottinger, Jr., AO3098722.
Terry J. Hough, AO3097234.
James F. Houle, AO3095229.
William R. Houle, AO3097363.
Robert G. Householder, AO3098808.
William F. Houser, Jr., AO3101995.
Crosby A. Houston, AO3086781.
John W. Houston, AO3102059.
John R. Howard, Jr., AO3095963.
John S. Howard, AO3098900.
Robert A. Howard, AO3101653.
Robert G. Howard, Jr., AO3099100.
Thomas V. Howard, Jr., AO3098901.
Howard R. Howe, AO3095880.
Barry W. Hubbard, AO3096879.
Richard M. Hubbell, Jr., AO3100602.
Donald J. Huber, AO3098664.
John M. Huck, AO3096136.
Marcus R. Hudgins, AO3106429.
James M. Huffstutter, AO3109795.
William F. Huggins, AO3106853.
Ann M. Hughes, AL3102055.
Gerard W. Hughes, AO3093171.
William C. Hughes, AO3105224.
Douglas F. Huie, AO3095964.
Lyle R. Huizenga, AO3097965.
Douglas G. Hulett, AO3096994.
David Y. Hulse, AO3095862.
Robert W. Hultslander, AO3101840.
Evander L. Humphrey, AO3097945.
Harry D. Hunt, AO3097271.
Hugh L. Hunter, AO3099217.
Theodore M. Hurchik, AO3097026.
Thomas J. Hurcomb, AO3099208.
John A. Hurley, AO3073175.
Roland L. Hurst, AO3095720.
Walter E. Husten, AO3101841.
Donald D. Hutchinson, AO3095025.
Fred E. Hutchinson, AO3103643.
Daniel B. Hutchison, AO3097235.
Rayford M. Hymes, Jr., AO3097387.
William F. Imfeld, AO3097462.
Walter W. Ince, AO3099127.
Brian E. Ingalls, AO3095814.
Charles R. Ingram, Jr., AO3097519.
Robert W. Ingram, AO3096099.
Robert F. Inlow, AO3099102.
Edward C. Inwood, AO3098122.
Theodore F. Isenburg, AO3106705.
Richard B. Jablonski, AO3094451.
Franklin R. Jackes, Jr., AO3097258.
David K. Jackson, AO3096959.
James E. Jackson, Jr., AO3103510.
Ralph H. Jackson, Jr., AO3097257.
Robert E. Jackson, AO3098903.
Ronald H. Jackson, AO3095461.
Tommie G. Jackson, AO3098252.
Walter S. Jackson, AO3097364.
Cecil E. Jacobs, AO3096411.
Don E. Jacobs, AO3097530.
Richard L. Jacobs, AO3095965.
Robert E. Jaecques, AO3098499.
Neil H. Jagoda, AO3085779.
Louis G. Jamar, AO3097056.
Earl M. Jambura, Jr., AO3098410.
Andrew E. Janetos, AO3097365.
John F. Jansen, AO3097720.
Richard P. Jaques, AO3096251.
John E. Jaquish, AO3097416.
Joseph K. Jarboe, AO3096596.
John O. Jay, AO3097587.
Carl H. Jefcoat, AO3102660.
Carl M. Jeffers, Jr., AO3097846.
Bud Jenkins, Jr., AO3102894.
Edwin A. Jenks, AO3099486.
Howard L. Jenne, AO3096100.
Walter G. Jennings, AO3095644.
William M. Jennings, AO3099062.
Vernon K. Jensen, AO3109592.
Alan C. Jirik, AO3098123.
Robert E. Jobe, AO3096466.
Delman A. Johns, AO3099487.
Richard E. Johns, AO3101998.
Alton M. Johnson, Jr., AO3101999.
Carl B. Johnson, AO3098160.
Carl E. Johnson, Jr., AO3095126.
Darrell E. Johnson, AO3102000.
David T. Johnson, AO3098081.
Eugene I. Johnson, AO3096057.
Frank A. Johnson, AO3103008.
James D. Johnson, AO3095422.
James D. Johnson, AO3095721.
James L. Johnson, AO3082780.
Jay H. Johnson, Jr., AO3109796.
Kenneth L. Johnson, AO3097080.
Leslie N. Johnson, AO3097588.
Paul E. Johnson, AO3099558.
Richard R. Johnson, AO3096138.
Royal C. Johnson, AO3101831.
Val Johnson, AO3096033.
Wayland D. Johnson, AO3094663.
William E. Johnson, AO3098810.
William H. Johnson, AO3100373.
William H. Johnson, AO3095014.
Richard A. Johnsten, AO3096448.
Donald D. Johnston, AO3096412.
James M. Johnston, AO3102001.
John D. Johnston, AO3098555.
Robert F. Johnston, AO3099567.

Gordon E. Joiner, AO3099039.
George C. Jolley, Jr., AO3093324.
Raymond Jolly, AO3102531.
Donald E. Jones, AO3098766.
Gordon S. Jones, AO3101813.
Granville L. Jones, Jr., AO3098767.
Jeremy B. Jones, AO3095967.
John W. Jones, Jr., AO3095423.
Lee W. Jones, AO3095425.
Marvin P. Jones, AO3098556.
Murphy N. Jones, AO3100904.
Phil B. Jones, AO3093586.
Robert D. Jones, AO3098325.
Turner H. E. Jones, AO3095743.
Wayne T. Jones, AO3097027.
Kenneth W. Jonker, AO3096961.
Lewis E. Jordan, AO3098701.
Stuart D. Jordan, AO3109797.
Donald Jortner, AO3050107.
John H. Judson, AO3103878.
Kenneth C. Jungling, AO3096413.
Lamar D. Kammeyer, AO3097105.
Frederick S. Kamp, AO3082867.
Martin Kann, AO3097463.
John F. Kantak, AO3109587.
William A. Kantonen, AO3087151.
Jerome A. Kaplan, AO3093842.
Charles W. Karnes, AO3109974.
Nikolai Karpis, AO3097589.
Robert H. Katzive, AO3086959.
Donald L. Kaufman, AO3096599.
William A. Kaul, Jr., AO3097307.
Carl R. Kay, AO3099622.
Bernard Kazmierczak, AO3098906.
Frederic J. Kearney, AC3102516.
Edward Y. Keetch, AO3098906.
Richard J. Keller, AO3099508.
Robert L. Keller, AO3097531.
Richard L. Kelley, AO3098082.
Earl D. Kelling, AO3099437.
Billy H. Kellum, AO3099103.
James B. Kelly, AO3097272.
John E. Kelly, AO3097367.
Samuel J. Kelly, AO3098611.
Thomas J. Kempton, AO3095925.
Charles M. Kendrick, AO3095426.
McIlhaney R. Kendrick III, AO3074535.
Jerry K. Kenefick, AO3095551.
Edward H. Kenerson II, AO3097563.
Richard B. Kennah, AO3099143.
George D. Kennedy, AO3096930.
Ralph G. Kennedy, AO3098161.
John R. Kenney, AO3106263.
Orville J. Kensok, AO3097968.
Ross C. Kerr, AO3094126.
Bryant K. Kershaw, AO3098254.
Rodger L. Kerwick, AO3109800.
James C. Kesterson, AO3098811.
William E. Kestler, Jr., AO3110082.
Donald J. Ketter, AO3094343.
Robert J. Kiefer, AO3098083.
Ronald J. Kieklak, AO3098612.
Francis T. Kieltyka, AO3096931.
Bernard D. Kienow, AO3110136.
Kenneth D. Kiepe, AO3097236.
James P. Kilbourn, AO3102004.
Bernard A. Kilgore, AO3095968.
Donald W. Kilgus, AO3097046.
Joseph P. Kilkeary, AO3096284.
Jackie R. Kilmer, AO3101706.
Wesley A. Kilponen, AO3096962.
Floyd V. Kimberly, AO3098558.
Everett D. Kimmel, AO3096102.
Paul F. Kimminau, AO3096536.
William H. Kincaid, AO3101850.
Thomas D. King, Jr., AO3097520.
Robert R. Kingrey, AO3098907.
Charles A. Kingsbury, AO3055601.
Robert L. Kinol, AO3098420.
Paul D. Kinslow, AO3097542.
Harold M. Kirby, Jr., AO3103644.
James S. Kirby, AO3098255.
John R. Kircher, AO3103927.
Walter T. Kiser, AO3095882.
Gene A. Kisling, AO3086414.
Rodger E. Kitchens, AO3095490.
Lincoln C. Klabo, AO3097990.
Harold L. Klahre, AO3098502.
Herman C. Klapproth, AO3097722.
Raymond I. Klein, AO3096058.
William F. Klein, AO3109802.
John K. Kline, AO3110074.
John A. Klobuchar, AO3093587.
Glen O. Klock, AO3098342.
Neil H. Klock, Jr., AO3096686.
Woody N. Klose, AO3105249.
Bobby G. Knapp, AO3093196.
Marvin J. Knecht, AO3096211.
George A. Knight, Jr., AO3109589.
Jerry L. Knoski, AO3095513.
Robert J. Knox, AO3097859.
William E. Knox, AO3049812.
Richard C. Knudson, AO3099145.
John W. Kohn, AO3095566.
Paul J. Kollas, AO3101942.
Alois J. Koller, Jr., AO3097261.
Stanley G. Kolman, AO3097273.
Stanley F. Koloski, AO3097723.
Robert A. Komenda, AO3098025.
William M. Koplovsky, AO3099522.
Albert C. Korelishn, AO3096824.
Joseph D. Kormanik, AO3098199.
Albert L. Korpak, AO3094428.
Byron C. Kort, AO3097308.
Kenneth H. Koskela, Sr., AO3097970.
Richard S. Kosnick, AO3097690.
Paul A. Kossler, AO3096896.
Robert C. Kovarik, AO3097004.
Kenneth L. Kraemer, AO3096285.
John B. Kraft, AO3098749.
Carroll R. Kramer, AO3106954.
Gerald H. Kramer, AO3101708.
Robert A. Kramer, AO3098813.
Gerald J. Krapp, AO3097005.
Robert N. Kratz, AO3101729.
Henry J. Krauer, AO3096898.
Howard L. Kravetz, AO3096103.
Theodore J. Krawiec, AO3096286.
Charles W. Kreis, AO3102654.
David A. Krichbaum, AO3101642.
Albert R. Krisch, AO3097634.
Kenneth A. Krohn, AO3097309.
Philip S. Kronenberg, AO3096059.
Gene R. Kruger, AO3096414.
Arthur P. Kubicz, AO3102005.
Richard M. Kumaishi, AO3096007.
Paul P. A. Kumm, AO3097657.
Wesley M. Kurowski, AO3098600.
Robert F. Kurtz, AO3102624.
Harold E. Kurz, AO3109591.
Norman S. Kwist, AO3104719.
Carle B. H. La Couture, AO3096825.
Ronald A. Laferriere, AO3097724.
John P. LaFollette, AO3102006.
Harry R. Lagerwall, AO3097658.
Kenneth R. Lakes, AO3100462.
Denis J. Lambert, AO3099630.
Paul A. Lambert, AO3097635.
L. S. Lamberth, Jr., AO3099065.
Robert W. Lambertson, AO3095491.
Robert E. Lammel, AO3097310.
Gaston A. La Montagne, AO3098723.
Donald P. Lamoureux, AO3099209.
David L. Lamphron, AO3097691.
Neal E. Lamping, AO3096287.
Charles B. Landguth, AO3097089.
Bernard L. Langeluttig, AO3098429.
Bobby L. Langford, AO3098909.
Charles D. Langham, AO3096331.
Robert D. Langley, AO3102009.
Ronald H. Langley, AO3099411.
George J. Lanz, Jr., AO3098421.
Kenneth R. Lape, AO3106810.
Richard W. Larson, AO3097417.
Ronald V. Larson, AO3099066.
Honore' J. Lartigue, AO3096727.
William E. Lashbrook, AO3095645.
John A. Lasley, Jr., AO3097860.
James D. Lassiter, AO3097899.
Robert T. G. Lassiter, AO3098911.
William E. Latham, AO3104905.
Wilbur S. Latimer, AO3096899.
Ronald D. C. Lau, AO3095149.
Douglas G. Lauck, AO3098504.
Donald P. Laudenslager, AO3098364.
Stephen A. Lauer, AO3097819.
Gerald F. Laurent, AO3103009.
Richard W. Lavigne, AO3095835.
John T. Lawell, AO3100463.
John J. Lawrence, AO3096212.
Philip C. Lawton, AO3094847.
Edward L. Lay, AO3102655.
Clifford J. Leary, AO3095658.
Carol J. Leatherman, AO3097901.
Jackie P. Leathers, AO3096164.
John C. Leber, AO3099246.
Normand G. LeBlanc, AO3096826.
James A. Le Compte, Jr., AO3110119.
James R. Ledahl, AO3096964.
James R. Ledinsky, AO3109593.
Alan F. Lee, AO3099313.
Henry G. Lee, AO3095588.
John Lee, AO3098343.
Robert E. Lee, AO3102304.
William C. Lee, AO3099488.
William G. Lee III, AO3099291.
William O. Lee, AO3095427.
Charles K. Leedy, AO3098043.
Carl R. Lehman, AO3098505.
Maurice J. W. Lehmann, AO3099067.
Emil J. Leidolf, Jr., AO3098914.
Walter J. Lekki, AO3097726.
John Lemp, Jr., AO3097521.
George E. Lenertz, AO3109805.
John T. Lenihan, AO3098026.
John F. Lennon, AO3094652.
Phillip M. Lent, AO3097636.
Elliott J. Lentz, AO3097312.
Charles D. Lenz, AO3106074.
Anthony J. Lenzi, AO3109594.
Carlos E. Lerma, AO3095219.
John M. Lesinski, AO3097821.
Henry D. Lester, Jr., AO3098163.
William M. Lester, AO3097727.
William C. Letzkus, AO3086131.
Frederick P. Leucht, AO3096183.
James R. Leutze, AO3072976.
Peter L. Levengood, AO3105916.
John S. Levisky II, AO3098601.
John S. Lew, AO3050741.
Edwin D. Lewellyn, AO3102569.
Don R. Lewis, AO3099104.
Edwin W. Lewis, Jr., AO3097800.
Joseph K. Lewis, AO3095462.
Lloyd B. Lewis, AO3096765.
Palmer B. Lewis, AO3097389.
Ramon L. Lewis, AO3097341.
Richard B. Lewis, AO3096060.
Robert J. Lewis, AO3096553.
Paul C. L'Herrou, AO3097728.
Gary R. Liggett, AO3097238.
Michael C. Lightner, AO3098506.
Charles O. Liles, AO3094836.
James D. Liles, AO3103654.
Eugene A. Lilley, AO3097057.
Robert A. Lilly, Jr., AO3095815.
Donald V. Lincoln, AO3109595.
Jon S. Lindsay, AO3097532.
David A. Lindsey, AO3099105.
Lewis C. Lindsey, Jr., AO3095970.
Larry G. Lines, AO3096387.
Robert L. Linker, AO3099314.
William C. Linn, Jr., AO3102011.
Emil E. Linnstaedter, AO3098915.
Erich W. Linse, Jr., AO3096415.
Neil R. Linsenmayer, AO3096766.
Robert D. Lipscomb, Jr., AO3110060.
Richard J. Litschgi, AO3097188.
Gerald J. Livingston, AO3095971.
Thomas E. Lloyd, AO3097189.
Jackino P. Lobue, AO3098507.
Ernest V. Loewenstein, AO3011840.
Ralph D. Loewinger, AO3103377.
David A. Logan, AO3099515.
James C. Logan, AO3086332.
John W. Lolley, AO3096645.
Thomas E. Lollis, AO3106242.
Frank A. Lombardo, AO3098508.
Carl D. Long, AO3097190.
David H. Long, AO3101937.
Donald G. Long, AO3096104.
Henry A. Long, AO3099247.
James B. Long, AO3096254.
William D. Long, AO3098412.
Ray W. Lotts, AO3106813.
Kristian M. Lou, AO3096629.
Dale E. Louk, AO3099331.
Jimmy D. Love, AO3098750.
Kerman L. Love, AO3099357.
Wendell L. Love, AO3085922.
Lorin O. Lovfald, AO3102012.
Robert G. Lowe III, AO3095849.
George E. Lowmiller, AO3098084.

Ivan Lowry, Jr., AO3097141.
Paul Lowy, AO3097508.
Kenneth E. Lubel, AO3095972.
William G. Lucas, AO3099248.
Paul P. Luchsinger, AO3097661.
Robert S. Luckett, AO3109596.
Reinhard C. Ludin, AO3098430.
Frederick R. Luedke, AO3109989.
Donald L. Luke, AO3096468.
Erik C. Lunde, AO3097991.
Arthur A. Lutz, AO3098366.
Larry M. Lutz, AO3097313.
David S. Lydon, AO3095659.
John F. Lyle, Jr., AO3094420.
Charles T. Lynch, AO3047718.
William P. Lynch, AO3094008.
Lawrence R. Lynd, Jr., AO3098917.
Johnny F. Lyon, AO3098918.
Milford L. Lyon, AO3103133.
Roger W. Lyon, AO3102678.
Austin J. Lyons, AO3097774.
William H. MacArthur, AO3099476.
Ned J. MacCarthy, AO3096289.
James H. MacDonald, AO3095537.
John B. MacKenzie, AO3099292.
Thomas P. MacLennan, AO3096290.
Robert S. MacLeod, AO3103413.
Owen Y. Macy, AO3098006.
Jack L. Madden, AO3098085.
John J. Madden, AO3098613.
Thomas F. Madden, AO3096801.
Natal A. Maestri, AO3094980.
John M. Mage, AO3101390.
Don R. Main, AO3096846.
Mischa V. Makaroff, AO3097564.
Gregory J. Maleski, AO3094994.
James L. Maley, AO3097993.
Michael E. Malo, AO3097972.
Walter S. Maloney, AO3097613.
Wilson L. Managhan, AO3097289.
Guy D. Mangus, AO3109808.
Bennie D. Manley, AO3101626.
Robert M. Manning, AO3109891.
William F. Mannion, AO3095772.
Michael M. Manring, AO3099358.
Marion F. Mansfield, AO3096503.
Charles R. Maples, AO3098200.
Bernard Marcantel, AO3096713.
Gary R. Marchant, AO3099164.
Slawomir A. Marciniec, AO3097006.
Joseph R. Marckx, AO3099389.
Conrad P. Marcotte, AO3109809.
Gilberto Mares, AO3109810.
Donald L. Margolies, AO3097729.
David G. Margolis, AO3096933.
Cecil D. Marjaniemi, AO3097060.
Marilyn R. Markel, AL3110190.
Frank J. Markham, Jr., AO3099022.
John E. Maroney, AO3096847.
Mary A. Marsh, AL3110178.
Morton A. Marsh, AO3098509.
Edward L. Marshall, AO3101821.
Elliott D. Marshall, Jr., AO3099249.
William L. Marshall, AO3098053.
Charles H. Martin, AO3098344.
Edward H. Martin, AO3102307.
Gerald K. Martin, AO3096166.
James R. Martin, AO3097418.
John L. Martin, AO3092972.
Joseph W. Martin, Jr., AO3095927.
Larry M. Martin, AO3099553.
Merle P. Martin, AO3102013.
William P. Martin, Jr., AO3106243.
John D. Marwitz, AO3095722.
Mario V. Masciola, AO3095793.
Stanley P. Masiona, AO3097662.
Claude A. Mason, AO3096731.
Gerald C. Mason, AO3099218.
Norman H. Mason, AO3095529.
William F. Mason, AO3098125.
John T. Massingale, Jr., AO3098919.
Eugene K. Mastrangelo, AO3095792.
Paul D. Mather, AO3096416.
Gaynell P. Matherne, AO3096714.
Philip E. Matheson, AO3097730.
Robert A. Mathison, AO3109957.
George A. Mattson, Jr., AO3106132.
Ronald C. Mattson, AO3096631.
Gary A. Mau, AO3096255.
Michael E. Mavroleon, AO3097639.
Phillip T. May, Jr., AO3074598.
Edward L. Mayer, AO3095697.
James I. Mayer, AO3098642.
Gerald L. Mayfield, Jr., AO3085128.
Terry L. Mayfield, AO3101947.
William F. Mayr II, AO3098921.
Bruce D. McAllister, AO3095590.
John B. McAllister, Jr., AO3102015.
Robert L. McAllister, AO3099412.
Mark A. McBriarty, AO3098614.
Robert H. McBride, AO3097545.
Robert D. McCall, AO3102571.
Patrick V. McCallum, AO3098922.
Arthur W. McCants, Jr., AO3098670.
Francis J. McCarthy, AO3098454.
Richard A. McCarty, AO3102060.
John R. McCaughey, AO3099540.
Ronald E. McCleery, AO3098087.
Charles L. McClellan, AO3099068.
Robert L. McClintick, AO3097275.
Paul L. McCloud, AO3098413.
Robert D. McClure, AO3098816.
Rufus D. McCollum, Jr., AO3098785.
Paul D. McComb, AO3098672.
Larry B. McConnell, AO3097191.
David E. McCormick, AO3096185.
Robert P. McCoy, AO3095061.
James L. McCrory, AO3098769.
David E. McCue, AO3109813.
Vincent C. McDermott, AO3097192.
Dell V. McDonald, AO3099146.
Huey E. McDonald, Jr., AO3102036.
Michael E. McDonald, AO3094384.
Patrick J. McDonald, AO3097775.
William W. McDonald, AO3097262.
James S. McDonnell III, AO3093130.
Kerry T. McDonnell, AO3093225.
Myles McDonough, AO3095774.
Richard L. McElhiney, AO3095129.
George B. McElroy III, AO3099041.
Gerald M. McGauley, AO3099467.
James R. McGee, AO3102043.
Francis P. McGinn, Jr. AO3098602.
Timothy J McGrath, AO3099493.
Richard McGreevy, AO3095553.
David D. McGuire, AO3097239.
Roger K. McGuire, AO3097861.
Robert J. McHenry, AO3055204.
J. Douglas McKay, AO3098368.
Joseph F McKean, AO3097193.
George W McKellar, AO3097163.
Jerry L McKenzie, AO3102017.
Dan R. McKinney, AO3110107.
Millard J. McKissack, AO3109598.
Paul E. McManus, AO3096803.
James T. McMaster, AO3099251.
Thomas E. McMurry, AO3097194.
Glenn E. McNabb, AO3096602.
Carl A. McNall, AO3094996.
Donald L McNeal, AO3098088.
Ted A. McNutt, AO3098054.
George T. McTernan, Jr., AO3096294.
Elmer J. McVey, Jr., AO3098644.
Jeffrey T. McWhorter, AO3098770.
Erik D. McWilliams, AO3096450.
William O. Meachum, AO3097935.
Ronald E. Mead, AO3098126.
Martin P. Meer, AO3098512.
Charlie R. Megahee, Jr., AO3100284.
Herbert L. Mehl, AO3099413.
Dallas R. Mehs, AO3097824.
James A. Meier, AO3097974.
Edward G. Meints, AO3100337.
Archie O. Melchor, Jr., AO3097903.
Arnold H. Mellor, AO3099165.
Norman T. Menke, AO3102572.
Gene G. Mercer, AO3097936.
Lloyd J. Mercer, AO3085925.
Robert A. Mercer, AO3109814.
William G. Mercer, AO3109815.
William E. Meredith, AO3097195.
Douglas C. Merrick, AO3096738.
Darwin G. Merrill, AO3099186.
Don W. Merrill, AO3099177.
Lucian G. Merritt, AO3098999.
Ronald A. Metcalf, AO3103932.
Warren C. Metcalf, AO3096732.
Jack W. Meyer, AO3097316.
William W. Michael, AO3099361.
Paul J. Michaud, AO3099213.
Alfred E. Michon, AO3098455.
Richard A. Mickelsen, AO3099166.
Philip M. Middleton, AO3101955.
John D. Mielke, AO3097092.
Wallace H. Mikami, AO3096013.
John G. Miki, AO3100467.
Robert L. Milan, AO3096062.
Richard P. Milanese, AO3097663.
Dwight D. Miles, AO3093472.
John K. Miles, AO3096355.
David W. Miley, AO3097109.
Carl M. Miller AO3095756.
Charles E. Miller AO3099131.
David A. Miller, AO3103251.
David G. Miller III, AO3100810.
Edward G. Miller, AO3098563.
George G. Miller, AO3097061.
George K. Miller, Jr., AO3097904.
Gerald E. Miller, AO3095515.
H. L. Miller, AO3102019.
Jackie T. Miller, AO3099023.
Jerry G. Miller, AO3096555.
Julius H. Miller, AO3096934.
Louis A. Miller, AO3099117.
Philip S. Miller, AO3096297.
Ralph K. Miller, AO3097276.
Richard N. Miller, AO3109962.
Ronald M. Miller, AO3096106.
Theodore R. Miller, AO3096969.
William O. Miller, Jr., AO3097420.
William A. Miller, AO3109599.
Jerome R. Millhouse, AO3094546.
Leroy E. Mills, AO3099996.
William C. Milstead, Jr., AO3093040.
George E. Mims, AO3086442.
George W. Minear, AO3099118.
William C. Minick, AO3100184.
John R. Miniutti, AO3097593.
Herbert T. Minyard, AO3092976.
Ronald H. Misgen, AO3097093.
Richard T. Missman, AO3095661.
Jimmy L. Mitchell, AO3109618.
John E. Mitchell, AO3099442.
Roger D. Mitchell, AO3096332.
Monroe D. Mitchella, AO3098927.
Charles H. Mitchelmore, AO3086944.
John F. Mitvalsky, AO3096452.
Alphonse C. Moeller, AO3098928.
Gordon W. Mohrman, AO3097317.
Gennaro Mola, Jr., AO3097468.
Albert F. Moller, Jr., AO3086789.
Donald R. Monaco, AO3097390.
Patrick R. Monaco, AO3097683.
John B. Monahan, AO3109588.
Jack W. Montgomery, AO3092977.
Richard T. Montgomery, AO3102020.
Robert K. Montgomery, AO3096471.
Douglas E. Moody, AO3097142.
Dwight L. Moody, Jr., AO3096901.
Thomas M. Mooney, AO3096805.
Charlie B. Moore, AO3096687.
Don W. Moore, AO3098929.
Edward E. Moore, Jr., AO3096638.
James W. Moore, AO3098564.
Stephen F. Moore, AO3109630.
William F. Moore, AO3101726.
Donald R. Mooty, AO3099132.
A. D. A. Moraczewski, AO3102021.
Richard W. Morain, AO3098166.
Thomas P. Moran, AO3097994.
Michael J. Morando, AO3096298.
James A. Moravec, Jr., AO3097318.
Grady B. Morgan, AO3095593.
James T. Morgan, AO3098226.
Otis C Morgan, AO3097907.
Ray E. Morgan, AO3097906.
Richard J. Morgan, AO3096375.
William L. Morgan, AO3102470.
William P. Morinville, AO3103984.
William T. Morioka, AO3096014.
Kenneth D. Morris, AO3096556.
Willie L. Morris, AO3099722.
Larry L. Morrissey, AO3097343.
Donald R. Morton, AO3096035.
Stephen P. Morton, AO3095431.
Thomas L. Mosley, AO3099042.
Ellsworth A. Mosso, AO3097616.
Kenneth G. Motzny, AO3095023.
Timothy L. Mounts, AO3096063.
Rowland G. Mowrey, AO3098423.
William D. Moyer, AO3096187.
Kenneth R. Moyse, AO3097421.
Glenn C. Mueller, AO3097731.
Jerome R. Mueller, AO3097546.
John A. Mueller, AO3087202.

Robert W. Mueller, Jr., AO3087285.
Walter E. Mueller, AO3098127.
Emmett W. Muenker, Jr., AO3098931.
David J. Mugler, AO3094853.
Lado Muhlstein, Jr., AO3098932.
David N. Muirhead, AO3074200.
Joseph E. Mullen, AO3110112.
Martin A. Mullen, AO3109633.
Neil C. Mullen, AO3097862.
Henry R. Muller, AO3094259.
Joe R. Mullins, AO3097242.
Martin D. Mumma, AO3085819.
Alfred E. Munoz, AO3101584.
Rex H. Murdock, Jr., AO3099813.
Bill L. Murphy, AO3106987.
James R. Murphy, AO3096771.
Robert V. Murphy, AO3096937.
Terrance A. Murphy, AO3102068.
Charles S. Murray, AO3099318.
Joseph T. Murray, AO3093955.
Paul R. Murray, AO3104639.
Thomas J. Murray, AO3097777.
Thomas A. Musson, AO3097198.
Leroy A. Myers, AO3096356.
William A. Myers, AO3098817.
Ivan L. Nading, AO3096453.
Lester E. Nagel, AO3109602.
Robert Naismith, AO3097732.
Richard M. Nakashima, AO3095758.
Ronald Y. Nakashima, AO3099615.
Herbert Y. Nakasone, AO3096015.
Ken Nakauchi, AO3109818.
Bobby J. Naler, AO3095433.
William J. Nalewaik, Jr., AO3097094.
Thomas W. Napolitan, AO3102181.
Gailen O. Narum, AO3097976.
James C. Naylor, Jr., AO3096557.
James T. Neal, AO3072525.
Robert D. Neal, AO3106246.
William T. Neal, AO3099592.
Donald P. Neeld, AO3098565.
Norman J. Neelley, AO3099000.
James W. Neely, Jr., AO3098201.
Gerald W. Neff, AO3096376.
William T. Neff, AO3097199.
Robert S. Nelsen, AO3097391.
Gary A. Nelson, AO3093082.
James A. Nelson, AO3099723.
James C. Nelson, AO3098129.
Richard C. Nelson, AO3099342.
Stanley D Nelson, AO3095540.
Theodore A. Nelson, AO3097082.
Vincent B. Nelson, AO3102061.
Franz E. Nelsson, AO3099343.
Richard L. Nenninger, AO3097200.
Rudy R. Nessel, AO3085788.
Wilfred G. Neu, AO3099106.
Frederick R. Neufeld, AO3097693.
Donald P. Neumeier, AO3085321.
Norman L. Nevins, AO3096970.
Geoffrey A. Newcomb, AO3095596.
Peter L. Newell, AO3097595.
Richard E. Newell, AO3109603.
Bruce E. Newman, AO3099319.
Thomas S. Newman, AO3085929.
Harry G. Nichol, Jr., AO3095975.
Elmer A. Nichols, Jr., AO3102574.
James R. Niebuhr, AO3099069.
Dennis E. Nielsen, AO3096472.
William G. Niemantsverdriet, AO3095724.
Reino R. Niemi, AO3097062.
Juri Niiler, AO3098515.
Donald A. Nikunen, AO3101882.
Eric J. Nilson, AO3102157.
Joseph P. Nolt, AO3099499.
Vernon J. Nordman, AO3096734.
Thomas R. Nordstrom, AO3098168.
Dale L. Norman, AO3098297.
James E. North, AO3100866.
James R. Novak, AO3095794.
John W. Nowlin, AO3098258.
John T. Nugent, AO3095816.
Joe C. Nunez, AO3095745.
Thomas A. Nussmeier, AO3084611.
George K. Nutz, AO3097469.
Jon D. Nylander, AO3097124.
Jon H. Nymo, AO3097083.
Arthur H. Oberg, AO3102022.
Leonard A. Obohoski, AO3098677.
Ronald E. Obremski, AO3097694.
John J. O'Brien, AO3096772.

Leo F. O'Bryan, Jr., AO3084905.
Donald L. Ockerman, AO3096604.
Roger J. O'Daniel, AO3073492.
Charles F. O'Donnell, AO3093783.
Paul R. O'Donnell, Jr., AO3102960.
Gary F. Offutt, AO3099070.
James E. O'Halloran III, AO3097319.
Dean A. O'Hern, AO3096454.
Robert W. Ohlwiler, AO3083104.
John G. Ojala, AO3100468.
Joseph J. O'Kobrick, AO3097778.
Charles C. Olasky, Jr., AO3098679.
Huel J. Oldham, AO3095662.
Philip Olekszyk, AO3096971.
James B. Oliver, AO3097243.
James S. Oliver, AO3096256.
James T. Oliver, AO3103419.
William G. Olsen, Jr., AO3102075.
Frank A. Olson, AO3046235.
Richard L. Olson, AO3094970.
Thomas E. Olson, AO3097423.
Thomas F. Oltorik, AO3095839.
Patrick D. O'Malley, AO3097095.
Robert W. Opitz, AO3092989.
Bernard P. O'Prey, AO3097779.
Elwood F. Orchard, AO3102023.
Joseph B. Ornowski, AO3098130.
Terence J. O'Rourke, AO3098517.
Paul J. G. Orr, AO3082346.
Robert L. Orr, AO3099071.
Galen H. Osborn, AO3085930.
Ronald L. Osborn, AO3099528.
John R. Osborne, AO3096333.
William J. Osley, AO3095567.
Joseph V. Otterson, Jr., AO3097201.
Charles F. Overstreet, AO3095900.
Lowell D. Overvold, AO3097978.
James E. Owen, AO3099501.
Tofie M. Owen, Jr., AO3096301.
Francis L. Owens, Jr., AO3098754.
Walter J. Owens, Jr., AO3096649.
Richard H. Pabst, AO3086620.
Douglas M. Padgett, AO3097847.
Richard D. Padgett, AO3095840.
Floyd V. Palmer, AO3096559.
Fred I. Palmer II, AO3095464.
Bernard S. Panitch, AO3096973.
Harry L. Pannill, AO3099256.
Eric F. Pantzer, AO3098171.
John J. Paolino, AO3095746.
John E. Parazynski, AO3093106.
Wayne R. Park, AO3093535.
Wesley T. Park, AO3096017.
Arthur M. Parker, AO3103095.
Eben E. Parker, AO3097424.
Edward B. Parker, Jr., AO3097144.
Gary H. Parker, AO3096506.
Louis T. Parker, Jr., AO3085830.
Robert W. Parker, AO3102024.
Truman Parker, AO3106464.
Joe W. Parks, Jr., AO3095516.
Kenneth M. Parr, AO3099815.
Bobbie G. Parrish, AO3109581.
Geoffrey A. Parson, AO3095598.
James R. Parsons, AO3098936.
John Q. Parsons, AO3109820.
Arthur W. Partridge II, AO3096881.
George M. Patrick, AO3096605.
Gerald J. Patrick, AO3099541.
Paul D. Patrick, AO3105618.
Thomas A. Patronite, AO3098029.
Don R. Patterson, AO3099107.
Joseph B. Patton, AO3099168.
Earl L. Paul, AO3097009.
James T. Paul, AO3100222.
Calvin D. Payne, AO3109582.
William J. Payne, AO3095931.
Ronald L. Peaker, AO3109590.
Frank C. Pearce, AO3103255.
Charles D. Pearson, AO3097030.
Irwin L. Pedersen, AO3099364.
Robert D. Peel, AO3098797.
Julius Pegues, AO3098566.
Richard A. Pelo, AO3102432.
Joseph M. Pelissier, AO3097064.
Francisco J. Pena, AO3099072.
Harold D. Pendergraft, AO3105888.
Elwin C. Penski, AO3109606.
Dwane G. Pepper, AO3098938.
Raymond Pericola, AO3098726.
Daniel L. Perkins, AO3098680.

Keith W. Perkins, AO3086403.
Raymond D. Perkins, AO3095240.
Gilbert F. Perleberg, AO3097472.
Jane P. Perlman, AL3110191.
Donald J. Perozzi, AO3096357.
James C. Perry, AO3096715.
John S. Perry, AO3096110.
John W. Perry, Jr., AO3096689.
Sandra J. Perry, AL3102052.
Donald R. Peters, AO3098518.
James G. Peters, AO3096215.
Walter W. Peters, Jr., AO3098091.
Orval R. Petersen, AO3098371.
Carlton J. Peterson, AO3099519.
David R. Peterson, AO3097085.
Kenneth D. Peterson, AO3096064.
Kenneth E. Peterson, AO3097320.
Rexford K. Peterson, AO3094032.
Paul C. Pettijohn, AO3096455.
Clifford H. Pettit, Jr., AO3098818.
David L. Petty, AO3098939.
John O. Pewthers, AO3098260.
William A. Pfeiffer, Jr., AO3102026.
William A. Pfeiffer, AO3094965.
James A. Pfeil, AO3099443.
Dwight B. Pfenning, AO3098298.
Richard C. Pflager, AO3107022.
Basil H. Pflumm, AO3096188.
Robert T. Phildius, AO3098433.
Charles W. Philips, AO3095977.
Kenneth E. Phillips, AO3102027.
Shafter R. Phillips, AO3102728.
Sidney E. Phillips, AO3095434.
Allan S. Philp, AO3097164.
John T. Phipps, AO3096358.
Donald S. Pierce, AO3094814.
Garland F. Pierce, AO3097908.
Henry L. Pierce, AO3097374.
Louis R. Pierce, AO3098603.
Richard T. Pierce, AO3098456.
Robert E. Pietsch, AO3098030.
Ross E. Pike, AO3096507.
Ray A. Pilcher, AO3098347.
David J. Pilger, AO3096302.
Serhij Pilipowskyj, AO3099321.
Frederick A. Pillet, AO3097110.
Joseph D. Pimentel, AO3095568.
John A. Pinkston, AO3098772.
Louie N. Piper, Jr., AO3099294.
Leo L. Pipino, AO3097780.
Mitchell N. Pipkin, AO3099044.
William E. Piske, AO3096690.
Gabriel Pitacciato, AO3097473.
Peter P. Pitman, AO3109609.
Jerry Pitts, AO3095249.
Johnny G. Pitts, Jr., AO3095435.
William H. Pitts, AO3098395.
James J. Piver, AO3097909.
Samuel C. Planck, AO3096607.
Joseph F. Platz, Jr., AO3097425.
Denis P. Plewniak, AO3095267.
Robert J. Plimpton, AO3097735.
Donald G. Plummer, AO3102630.
William M. Poe, AO3105462.
Joseph L. Poirier, AO3086325.
Donald R. Polan, AO3099024.
Edward J. Polcer, AO3087280.
Augustus J. Polhill III, AO3099073.
Donald B. Poling, AO3098031.
Lloyd J. Pollock, AO3098056.
Richard G. Pombrio, AO3109940.
Charles W. Pomeroy, AO3099257.
Andris A. Poncius, AO3096423.
Earl A. Pontius, AO3096216.
David F. Poole, AO3098202.
Gary A. Poore, AO3099468.
Ernie W. Pope, AO3099322.
Dickie G. Poplin, AO3099507.
Burton H. Poppenga, AO3097474.
Peter G. Popper, AO3073038.
Barry S. Porter, AO3109825.
Charles D. Porter, AO3096424.
Richard G. Porter, AO3098299.
Lee M. Powell, AO3110080.
Richard D. Powell, AO3098520.
Richard C. Power, AO3097617.
Jonathan D. Powers, AO3096217.
Kenneth W. Powers, Jr., AO3098705.
Michael E. Powers, AO3099344.
Stanley W. Powers, AO3094922.
Richard L. Pratt, AO3073270.
Gary F. Prehall, AO3104861.

Charles A. Prentiss, AO3097426.
Paul F. Prestia, AO3098457.
George Price, AO3094398.
William T. Price III, AO3096508.
Lawrence M. Pring, AO3103198.
John C. Procter, AO3094377.
Lois J. Proctor, AL3110194.
Paul M. Propp, AO3109610.
Robert C. Proske, AO3097263.
Victor A. Prosper, AO3095599.
Ihor S. Prybyla, AO3095817.
Richard J. Pryor, AO3097065.
Zack D. Pryse III, AO3105891.
Francis L. Pugh, AO3072043.
Philip C. Purdom, AO3109826.
Milton H. Purdy, Jr., AO3097375.
Alan R. Purinton, AO3109827.
Albert C. Purvis, AO3097910.
Benedict W. Putriment, AO3095797.
William D. Putt, AO3096902.
Jerry H. Pyle, AO3102029.
Frank B. Pyne, AO3099259.
Paul W. Quade, AO3097086.
Walter J. Quattlebaum, AO3098727.
Charles D. Quinn, AO3099091.
James F. Quirk, AO3099444.
Charles E. Racine, AO3096359.
Ramon R. Rackley, AO3093334.
Victor D. Rackley, AO3097911.
Harvey H. Rafel, AO3097753.
William H. Raimer, AO3103318.
Phillip R. Raines, AO3096189.
Verne H. Rainey, AO3098604.
Fenton R. Ramey, AO3084505.
David W. Ramsey, AO3095979.
Duane K. Ramsey, AO3096509.
Michael E. Ranslan, AO3105933.
Edward R. Ranuska, AO3097510.
James L. Raper, AO3097912.
Daniel P. Rapp, AO3096306.
Dean A. Rapp, AO3096473.
Austin T. Rasco, AO3095436.
Lenox L. Ratcliff, AO3098263.
Richard K. Rathbun, AO3085793.
Paul E. Rausch, AO3098092.
Harry W. Ray, AO3097536.
John C. Ray, AO3105484.
Charles P. Rea, AO3103627.
Jay B. Rea, AO3099075.
Lowell A. Reams, AO3098227.
Francis A. Records, AO1856071.
Bass Redd, AO3098942.
Dale H. Redding, AO3096539.
Hugh M. Redmond, Jr., AO3109830.
John W. Redmond, AO3097321.
Stephen A. Redshaw, AO3097206.
Leonard A. Redwine, Jr., AO3102964.
James D. Reed, AO3095980.
Ralph H. Reed, AO3098301.
Samuel J. Reed IV, AO3095981.
Thomas J. Reese, AO3109612.
John D. Rehnberg, AO3097782.
George L. Reichert, AO3094696.
James L. Reiman, AO3096218.
Norman C. Reimer, AO3097427.
William J. Reinders, AO3095006.
William P. Reinken, AO3096561.
Paul J. Reinman, AO3097476.
Walter L. Reller, AO3098458.
John D. Remick, AO3096307.
John J. Renton, AO3109600.
Ronald L. Rep, AO3099470.
Charles W. Reynolds, AO3083871.
James E. Reynolds, AO3096259.
Jon A. Reynolds, AO3095776.
Sammie F. Rhoades, AO3095531.
Jerry L. Rhoads, AO3098435.
Guy C. Rhone, AO3102030.
Henry H. Rhyne, Jr., AO3097865.
Richard G. Rhyne, AO3105485.
Cleve A. Rice, AO3099187.
George M. Rice, AO3098173.
Bruce W. Richardson, AO3096976.
Gary L. Richardson, AO3100826.
Richard P. Rick, AO3109583.
Edward H. Riebesehl, AO3097112.
John B. Riederich, AO3095798.
Delmar L. Rieger, AO3094856.
John W. Rieke, AO3098459.
Thomas F. Riesing, AO3095761.
Roger N. Rietz, AO3096425.
John B. Riley, AO3095663.
Leon E. Ring, AO3047021.
Alvin T. Ringer, Jr., AO3095885.
Francis D. Riopel, AO3096812.
Lester G. Rippy, AO3096112.
Don C. Ritchie, AO3099188.
Keith K. Ritter, AO3096219.
Gary S. Robbins, AO3099332.
John W. Roberson, Jr., AO3098945.
Francisco Q. Roberto, AO3084123.
David J. Roberts, AO3096142.
David L. Roberts, AO3096220.
David P. Roberts, AO3099365.
John H. Roberts, AO3074217.
John J. Roberts, AO3096481.
John R. Roberts, AO3096510.
Alexander M. Robertson, AO3109607.
Dennis C. Robertson, AO3106826.
Gary E. Robertson, AO3095091.
Truman E. Robertson, Jr., AO3099047.
John W. Robins, AO3098057.
Peter G. Robinson, AO3099605.
Charles H. Robison, AO3098946.
Lee K. Rodebaugh, AO3098372.
James R. Rodgers, AO3109945.
Wills P. Rodgers, Jr., AO3097913.
Clifford H. Roepke, AO3096143.
Burton A. Roeth, AO3099539.
Thomas D. Roff, AO3097549.
Billy D. Rogers, AO3098303.
Kenneth W. Rogers, AO3095437.
Percy G. Rogers, AO3109613.
Neal W. Rohr, AO3099414.
Nicholas L. Rohrman, AO3096190.
Walter A. Romanek, AO3097666.
David R. Romlein, AO3097511.
Jon R. Romnes, AO3099446.
Paul F. Romnes, AO3099447.
Eli L. Ronnel, AO3097642.
George A. Rood, AO3096511.
John T. Rooney, AO3109615.
Eugene J. Roose, AO3096335.
John N. Rosa, AO3094345.
Herbert C. Rose, Jr., AO3105521.
Raymond D. Rose, AO3097825.
Ellis H. Rosenberg, AO3087218.
Harvey B. Rosenberg, AO3096977.
Arthur Rosenthal, AO3095640.
David L. Ross, AO3109614.
Eugene E. Ross, AO3098569.
Eugene D. Rossel, AO3097208.
Charles N. Roth, AO3095532.
John A. Roth, AO3066849.
Ronald L. Roth, AO3096066.
William F. Roth, AO3097067.
George A. Roupe, AO3073904.
Charles E. Rousenberg, AO3109616.
Ernest W. Rousseau, AO3096828.
Mervin E. Roussell, Jr., AO3101896.
Francis L. Rowe, AO3096222.
John J. Rowe, AO3096813.
James W. Rowley, AO3099415.
John F. Roy, AO3096309.
William D. Royalty, AO3096457.
Jerry W. Roylance, AO3109832.
Jon A. Rubenzer, AO3095841.
Gary A. Ruck, AO3097322.
Howard G. Ruddick, AO3095725.
John N. Rudl, AO3095152.
Claude D. Ruff, Jr., AO3098731.
Doyle C. Ruff, AO3095871.
Robert M. Ruikka, AO3095496.
Edward B. Rummell, AO3098594.
Larry J. Runge, AO3085823.
Alfred E. T. Rusch, AO3097429.
Benjamin C. Rush, AO3097914.
Charles P. Rush, AO3100224.
Bobby R. Russell, AO3098304.
Harold B. Russell, AO3098174.
Joe M. Russell, AO3096634.
Richard G. Rutishauser, AO3099628.
John K. Rutledge, AO3105840.
Scott M. Ryder, AO3097344.
Gerald F. Sacre, AO3097115.
James F. Sager, AO3099324.
Thomas A. Saleed, AO3097915.
John L. Salamida, AO3095569.
John W. Salisbury, Jr., AO3028357.
Vincent V. Salomonson, AO3095726.
Benedict M. Sampson, AO3099391.
Robert E. Sand, AO3097849.
Robert Sandberg, AO3109947.
Arvel G. Sandel, AO3098950.
Eugene G. Sander, AO3074064.
Richard A. Sandercock, AO3095299.
Larry C. Sanders, AO3093419.
Bruce J. Sanderson, AO3096512.
Cecil O. Sanderson, AO3101598.
Raymond C. Sandy, AO3099262.
Guiseppe S. Santiglia, AO3097479.
George C. Sasser, AO3097916.
Albert E. Saunders, AO3102967.
Charles M. Saunders, AO3098203.
David C. Saunders, AO3097567.
Louis Savadove, AO3098523.
George D. Savage, AO3095932.
Robert W. Sawyer, AO3097826.
Wade S. Saye, Jr., AO3095933.
Jerry W. Saylor, AO3095982.
William J. Scanlon, Jr., AO3095842.
Fred R. Schaefer, AO3102582.
Joseph L. Schaefer, AO3096310.
Theophil D. Schaeffer, AO3095166.
Joseph J. Schaffers, AO3109619.
John J. Schantz, AO3097667.
Ivan N. Schatz, AO3073168.
Paul C. Schatz, AO3097323.
John H. Schaub, AO3103124.
Lawrence P. Schaubhut, AO3096692.
Randolph J. Scheel, AO3099120.
Robert D. Scheer, AO3096635.
Frederick A. Scheeren, AO3097804.
Paul N. Scheidel, AO3095600.
Frederick J. Schenking, AO3102033.
Gerald S. Scherer, AO3105295.
Donald L. Schick, AO3096513.
Bob L. Schieffer, AO3099136.
Joseph W. Schiesl, AO3097481.
Alvin T. Schiff, AO3095621.
Richard A. Schiff, AO3097643.
Paul R. Schildgen, AO3100577.
Thomas G. Schilling, AO3095601.
Don B. Schlafke, AO3068867.
Charles T. Schlesinger, AO3097739.
Everett S. Schleter, AO3093595.
John H. Schlueter, AO3085885.
Roger B. Schmelzer, AO3097668.
Robert E. Schmid, AO3098952.
Glen R. Schmieding, AO3097324.
Conrad J. Schmitt, AO3099596.
Ross V. Schmoll, AO3097597.
Alfred T. Schneider, AO3095843.
Donald A. Schneider, AO3096515.
Edward C. Schneider, AO3096067.
Craig E. Schnell, AO3097096.
John J. Schnell, AO3097790.
Tom C. Schnell, AO3098094.
Lewis L. Schoen, AO3096785.
Robert F. Schoen, AO3098373.
Stewart W. Scholl, AO3095533.
Marvin C. Schrader, AO3097116.
John A. Schram, AO3096224.
Donald C. Schramm, AO3097211.
Ronald V. Schreiber, AO3096260.
Sandee D. A. Schroeter, AL3102034.
Louis O. Schueler, AO3096868.
Ronald J. Schuessler, AO3096377.
Robert H. Schuler, Jr., AO3096775.
Donald G. Schultz, AO3098229.
James R. Schultz, AO3099076.
William L. Schultz, AO3096514.
Jack H. Schulz, AO3096223.
Robert G. Schulz, AO3098058.
Richard G. Schulze, AO3068869.
Frederick L. Schuster, Jr., AO3098953.
Carl C. Schwan, Jr., AO3097696.
George W. Schwartz, AO3085336.
Herbert T. Schwartz, AO3095887.
James A. Schwartz, AO3096848.
Larry I. Schwartz, AO3094948.
Robert V. Schwartz, AO3109640.
Timothy C. Schwarzer, AO3109641.
Joseph B. Schweninger, Jr., AO3097210.
Uwe-Thorsten Scobel, AO3099559.
David M. Scoggins, Jr., AO3095983.
David W. Scott, AO3096980.
Frederick M. Scott III, AO3097917.
Harry D. Scott, AO3099555.
James E. Scott, AO3098175.
Larry J. Scott, AO3098306.
Richard A. Scott, AO3098305.
Roger W. Scott, AO3098233.

Wade A. Scott, AO3096652.
Frank W. Scribbick, Jr., AO3102035.
Richard D. Scrivano, AO3095519.
Brent E. Scudder, AO3105756.
David C. Scurlock, Jr., AO3097866.
Ralph W. Seabright, AO3102853.
Donald A. Seago, AO3102342.
Louis A. Seaverson, AO3099581.
John W. Seazholtz, AO3097482.
Angel L. Seda, Jr., AO3098628.
Melvin R. Sedam, AO3096336.
Donald H. Seelicke, AO3096939.
George H. Seely, AO3098525.
John C. Seely, AO3097126.
James F. Segalini, AO3105119.
Donald J. Segars, AO3100287.
Robert M. Segrest, AO3095984.
Douglass E. Seifried, AO3098176.
Richard H. Seivert, Jr., AO3086917.
James C. Selig, AO3086296.
Robert A. Senay, AO3109620.
Lawrence T. Sennello, AO3096113.
Arturo V. Serrano, AO3102037.
Aniceto J. Serrone, AO3097783.
John Serur, AO3098956.
Winton E. Severson, AO3099448.
William F. Sexton, AO3109642.
Russell N. Shablow, AO3097995.
Maxine A. Shafer, AL3110186.
Paul J. Shall, Jr., AO3098526.
Edwin G. Shank, Jr., AO3096311.
Ralph M. Shape, AO3099393.
Arthur S. Sharp, AO3096146.
Lewis A. Shattuck, AO3096869.
Cyril P. Shaughnessy, Jr., AO3109834.
Craig D. Shaw, AO3099345.
Larry D. Shaw, AO3094876.
Lynn E. Shaw, AO3097669.
Ted H. Shaw, AO3099093.
William P. Shea, AO3095802.
Thomas J. Sheehan, AO3096814.
Damon G. Shelburne, AO3099514.
Carl B. Shelley, AO3095440.
Loyd C. Shelton, AO3099537.
Freeman D. Shepherd, Jr., AO3096905.
Clyde H. Sheppard, AO3096036.
John J. Sheridan, AO3095818.
Daniel J. Sherlock, AO3106768.
Byron W. Sherman, AO3073351.
Jeredy K. Sherrod, AO3109835.
John J. Shields, AO3098617.
Ronald L. Shillcutt, AO3102880.
Edward M. Shimamoto, AO3097525.
Richard E. Shine, AO3099221.
Michael H. Shirk, AO3098234.
Edwin L. Shobert, Jr., AO3105955.
John H. Shock, AO3096776.
Alan M. Shoemaker, AO3087125.
James R. Shoemaker, AO3098265.
Gordon "A" Shogren, AO3096870.
Kenneth H. Shotwell, AO3097484.
Donald L. Show, AO3099265.
Kent E. Shreeve, AO3095534.
William R. Shriver, AO3098527.
Sandra S. Shropshire, AL3060930.
John N. Shults, AO3096360.
Richard M. Shute, AO3097393.
Neil R. Siciliano, AO3098681.
Donn K. Sickles, AO3098095.
Gaetano J. Sico, Jr., AO3103709.
Daryl J. Siebens, AO3098756.
John F. Sievertson, AO3099416.
Raymond E. Siferd, AO3098096.
Michael D. Sikorski, AO3097278.
Melvyn W. Silverstein, AO3097433.
Milton E. Simantel, AO3096114.
Antonio J. Simmons, AO3098787.
Wilbur C. Simmons, AO3098706.
Charles E. Simon, AO3097827.
William Simon III, AO3098528.
William G. Simons, AO3098374.
Troy A. Simonsen, AO3073948.
Albert J. Simonson, AO3097671.
Charles G. Simpson, AO3095906.
Charles D. Singleton, AO3098307.
Harold W. Sipe, AO3102038.
Barry N. Sisk, AO3096740.
William H. Sistrunk, AO3097165.
Norbert D. Sivils, AO3098736.
Paul E. Sjostedt. AO3097486.
Robert R. Skaggs, AO3096225.
William J. Skaggs, AO3098958.
David J. Skaret, AO3096261.
Michael J. Skehan, AO3098032.
Harry D. Skelton, AO3098398.
Raymond W. Skomra, AO3106045.
Peter R. Skwerski, Jr., AO3097488.
James M. Slahta, AO3097489.
Henry W. Slater, AO3099171.
George A. Slaughter, AO3095441.
Jackie L. Slaughter, AO3096262.
Larry L. Sleizer, AO3099394.
Neil J. Sliski, AO3097740.
Aubrey B. Sloan, AO3102039.
James F. Sloan, AO3098530.
Alfred B. Smiley, AO3098631.
Albert H. Smith, Jr., AO3102057.
Bruce E. Smith, AO3099556.
Clyde D. Smith, AO3097127.
David J. Smith. AO3096981.
Eugene E. Smith, AO3097919.
Gary S. Smith, AO3095664.
George A. Smith, AO3098399.
George W. Smith, Jr., AO3097697.
Gerald W. Smith, AO3100683.
Harvey N. Smith, AO3096849.
Jackie E. Smith, AO3098737.
James A. Smith, AO3097035.
James O. Smith, AO3095998.
Jerry E. Smith, AO3106605.
John S. Smith III, AO3095968.
Kenneth E. Smith, AO3098961.
Kenny E. Smith, AO3109622.
Merlyn D. Smith, AO3098757.
Osler F. Smith, AO3109836.
Peter B. Smith, AO3097069.
Richard C. Smith, AO3095762.
Robert D. Smith, AO5210277.
Robert E. Smith, AO3097839.
Robert E. Smith, Jr., AO3096263.
Roger C. Smith, AO3098178.
Ronald F. Smith, AO3102040.
Watson C. Smith, AO3096636.
Welby A. Smith, Jr., AO3095466.
William E. Smith, AO3098460.
William R. Smith, Jr., AO3106046.
Willis E. Smith, AO3096037.
Edward P. Smoot, AO3109623.
David M. Sneary, AO3105846.
James A. Snide, AO3098136.
Glenn W. Snyder, AO3098531.
James M. Snyder, AO3096516.
Ludwig A. Soder, AO3109837.
Walter C. Soderlund, AO3095803.
Robert H. Sokol, AO3102205.
George E. Sokolsky, Jr., AO3087213.
Donald H. Somerville, AO3097920.
Dale A. Sommerfeld, AO3099449.
William V. Sommerfield, AO3096068.
Gerald J. Sorenson, AO3099333.
Thomas P. Sorokas, AO3098461.
Charles H. Sotire, AO3099529.
Max G. Southwell, AO3100585.
Edward R. Sowinski, AO3097491.
William E. Spadie, AO3096637.
Gordon L. Sparks, AO3096831.
Jerry E. Sparks, AO3103165.
John W. Spencer, AO3096266.
Cary R. Spitzer, AO3099267.
Stephen H. Spivey, AO3097148.
John P. Spoone, Jr., AO3097939.
John P. Spraberry, AO3099004.
William T. Sprague, Jr., AO3097434.
William R. Staats, AO3083568.
Vincent J. Stabile, AO3096832.
George B. Stackhouse III, AO3109647.
Allan W. Stadtmauer, AO3097435.
Walter N. Staggs, AO3096228.
Paul J. Stahl, Jr., AO3098438.
James R. Stainbrook, AO3096192.
Jerry L. Stamps, AO3095763.
Paul R. Stankiewicz, AO3096871.
Richard C. Stanland, Jr., AO3098738.
Gordon R. Stanley, AO3097572.
William F. Stansbury, AO3096578.
George A. Stansell, AO3098962.
David B. Stanton, AO3097037.
Charles B. Stark, Jr. AO3097436.
Robert B. Stanwood, AC3103569.
George L. Stears, AO3097325.
Robert A. Steers, AO3098682.
Kenneth T. Stehli, AO3098618.
Alan R. Stein, AO3109625.
Ronald K. Steindorf, AO3099450.
William J. Steinmetz, AO3097850.
Ronald F. Stellhorn, AO3109626.
Arthur T. Stellmach, AO3095132.
Manfred Stenger, AO3097437.
Roger L. Stephens, AO3098309.
Seth H. Stephens, Jr., AO3095746.
William K. Stephenson, AO3099077.
Raymond D. Stethen, AO3096612.
Benjamin C. Stevens, Jr., AO3096778.
James F. Stevens, AO3099913.
Jan T. Stevens, AO3106620.
Archibald R. Stevenson, AO3098179.
Howard R. Stevenson, Jr., AO3097598.
Oliver L. Stevenson, AO3100028.
Hugh L. Steward, AO3085274.
John T. Stewart, Jr., AO3109835.
Ronald D. Stewart, AO3098964.
William M. Stewart, AO3086479.
William P. Stewart, AO3103589.
Jon C. Stine, AO3095888.
Paul S. Stirrup, AO3106989.
Robert H. Stiteler, Jr., AO3098965.
Ronald L. St. Louis, AO3101759.
William F. Stocker, AO3096378.
Thomas G. Stockham, Jr., AO3047887.
Robert G. Stockmal, AO3106137.
Leland L. Stokes, Jr., AO3097150.
William O. Stolworthy, AO3099172.
William T. Stolzenburg, AO3098099.
Donald A. Stone, AO3098773.
John B. Stone, AO3097166.
Kenneth D. Stone, AO3096337.
William P. Stone, AO3096885.
Oliver W. Stoughton, AO3098588.
Harrison W. Straley IV, AO3082999.
John B. Strange, AO3103544.
Christopher K. Strate, AO3098533.
Raymond D. Stratton, AO3096518.
Donald W. Stretchberry, AO3102062.
James N. Strickland, AO3098619.
Alan D. Strong, AO3096429.
Ivan F. Stuart, AO3097492.
Donald C. Stubbe, AO3109839.
Billie W. Stucky, AO3096230.
Richard J. Studinka, AO3098059.
Frederick V. Stuhr, AO3098683.
George E. Stump, AO3098181.
Robert L. Style, AO3102162.
William H. Sudbrink, AO3099422.
Cornelius C. Sullivan, AO3097493.
Edwin M. Sullivan, AO3093645.
Francis T. Sullivan, AO3095890.
Robert M. Sullivan, AO3106138.
Robert W. Sullivan, AO3096116.
Allen W. Summers, AO3100226.
Bruce Summers, AO3097494.
John M. Sumner, AO3097167.
Donald F. Surrell, AO3103771.
Ronald F. Sutcliffe, AO3096540.
David T. Sutton, AO3098267.
Paul P. Swain, AO3101861.
Robert S. Swan, AO3097568.
Leonard L. Swank, AO3098534.
Dennis E. Swanson, AO3098400.
Gordon B. Swanson, AO3095602.
James S. Swearingen, AO3103097.
David W. Swett, Jr., AO3097380.
Donald L. Swihart, AO3099298.
Robert C. Swindler, AO3096430.
Laurence N. Swink, AO3083717.
Daniel C. Sydow, AO3097264.
Edward A. Szep, AO3094875.
Charles D. Tabor, Jr., AO3095989.
Richard G. Tabor, AO3096655.
Raymond N. Tackett, AO3096779.
Ronald H. Taft, AO3100194.
Stanley K. Takara, AO3096018.
James J. Taliaferro, Jr., AO3105898.
Calvin B. M. Tam, AO3096019.
George M. Tanaka, AO3096069.
Chin T. M. Tank, AO3096886.
Charles E. Tanner, AO3098685.
Frederick S. Tanner, AO3102506.
James R. Tarr, AO3098235.
Ralph W. Tartaglia, AO3098571.
Charles C. Tatum II, AO3100195.
Robert L. Taus, AO3097117.
Ronald H. Taus, AO3099597.
Harold T. Tauscher, AO3099397.

David B. Taylor, AO3096482.
David M. Taylor, AO3096907.
Donald J. Taylor, AO3095248.
Eric P. Taylor, AO3098536.
Herbert A. Taylor, AO3106273.
Hubert H. Taylor, AO3106274.
James C. Taylor, AO3095443.
Richard I. Taylor, AO3097537.
Vernon P. Taylor, AO3098967.
William R. Taylor, AO3099490.
Douglas C. Tebbs, AO3099173.
James E. Tedrow, AO3098101.
William R. Teeman, AO3098268.
Decker L. Terry, AO3097168.
Denny A. Terry, AO3097151.
James R. Terry, AO3097513.
William F. Terry, Jr., AO3096117.
Donald C. Tetmeyer, AO3097674.
Albert R. Tetrault, AO3100072.
Frank A. Tetrault, AO3097290.
Leo W. Thacker, Jr., AO3097940.
James W. Thar, AO3096983.
Richard W. Thatcher, AO3096943.
Robert C. Thatcher, AO3097806.
George W. Thelin II, AO3096944.
Robert E. Thiele, AO3097675.
Gayle F. Thieman, AO3096362.
Neil F. Thistle, AO3095467.
Allan R. Thomas, AO3073713.
Clement J. Thomas, AO3099471.
Earl E. Thomas, AO3096268.
James E. Thomas, AO3096173.
Wayne A. Thomas, AO3095648.
Barry G. Thompson, AO3098970.
Donald E. Thompson, AO3097118.
Jack E. Thompson, AO3097869.
John W. Thompson, AO3099268.
Karl V. Thompson, AO3095990.
Luther M. Thompson, AO3097152.
Richard L. Thompson, AO3099534.
Richard W. Thompson, AO3096780.
Roy C. Thompson, AO3099621.
Wayne R. Thompson, AO3098971.
William D. Thompson, Jr., AO3109840.
John D. Thomson, AO3098572.
Attwood T. Thornton, AO3101659.
Carl H. Thresher, AO3094848.
Richard H. Thuillier, AO3097620.
Austin R. Tibbetts, AO3097119.
Howard N. Tidwell, AO3095891.
David R. Till, AO3102686.
Loren E. Timm, AO3105090.
Joseph F. Tinney, AO3098060.
David F. Tippett, AO3106105.
William E. Tipton, AO3099595.
Steven F. Tobik, AO3102391.
Emery P. Todd, Jr., AO3073257.
Hugh M. Tole, AO3097699.
Edward J. Tomey, AO3096742.
Richard J. Tonelli, AO3099398.
William P. Toole, AO3095909.
Thomas E. Topka, AO3095910.
Robert H. Torgersen, AO3097523.
Robert J. Town, Jr., AO3098061.
Gordon L. Townsend, AO3096985.
John O. Townsend, Jr., AO3109628.
Ralph D. Townsend, AO3102857.
Robert B. Townsend, AO3096231.
Dale D. Tracy, AO3099190.
John B. Tracy, Jr., AO3097676.
Robert T. Trefethen, AO3109631.
David W. Trekell, AO3099078.
John L. Trimpe, Jr., AO3096363.
Robert L. Trimpl, AO3100620.
Patrick P. Tripiciano, AO3096232.
Graydon W. Tripp, AO3097941.
Walter H. Trisko, AO3097984.
Louis C. Tronzo, AO3098537.
Robert T. Trost, AO3102042.
Richard F. Trowbridge, AO3099557.
Ronald J. Troy, AO3097011.
Corlyn J. Troyer, AO3101786.
Ross E. Truesdale, Jr., AO3106497.
Max E. Truex, AO3095631.
Paul D. Try, AO3099571.
Frank K. Tuck, AO3095999.
Stanley Tufo, AO3101770.
John R. Tuite, AO3109629.
Robert L. Turain, AO3096815.
Andre G. Turenne, AO3099223.
Dennis C. Turk, AO3105450.
Herbert R. Turner, AO3095991.
Jerry M. Turner, AO3098774.
Joe E. Turner, AO3098791.
George L. Tutt, AO3099601.
George F. Twohig, AO3097784.
Hughland L. Tyner, AO3098686.
Bobby E. Tyre, AO3095872.
Gilmer D. Ulbricht, AO3098973.
Lamar D. Ulrey, AO3100197.
Ludwig Umscheid, AO3097621.
Thomas F. Urbanosky, AO3098974.
Joseph V. Urbanski, AO3096717.
John R. Valentine, AO3102058.
Anthony A. Vanagas, AO3097495.
Frank J. Van Cura, AO3097701.
Raymond R. Van De Riet, AO3097212.
R. G. Vanderstraeten, AO3096118.
Seymour R. Van Deursen, AO3099602.
Arthur C. Van Hall, AO3096874.
Don R. Van Leuven, AO3099370.
Donald E. Van Meter, AO3098311.
William D. Vann, AO3099269.
James E. Van Noppen, AO3095764.
Thomas G. Van Norstrand, AO3097700.
Mark D. Van Slyke, AO3096433.
William G. Van Velsor, AO3097807.
Richard C. Van Wagoner, AO3085976.
Donald J. Varley, AO3098401.
James C. Vaughn, AO3096339.
Jerry B. Vaughn, AO3098775.
Charles R. Vause, AO3085843.
Michael B. Veal, AO3095993.
Edward L. Veenhuizen, AO3085939.
Richard T. Veigel, AO3097097.
John R. Velthoen, AO3085751.
Leonard N. Venen, Jr., AO3095750.
Ronald A. Venturini, AO3098439.
Herbert F. Verse, Jr., AO3093856.
William Vetrano, AO3096850.
William W. Vickers, AO3101658.
John R. Viegas, AO3093757.
Herman M. Vilella, AO3098629.
August K. Vilseck, Jr., AO3099423.
Terrill F. Vincent, AO3096614.
Victor Vizcarra, AO3095555.
Edward M. Voelker II, AO3096851.
Arthur W. Vogan, AO3095994.
Theodore C. Vogeley, AO3098102.
Anthony G. Volonis, AO3095804.
Cletus L. Von Tersch, AO3096038.
Noel H. Von Urff, AO3103665.
Philip D. Vrzal, AO3097213.
Hubert C. Vykukal, AO3098976.
Francis J. Vyzral, AO3096269.
Stephen S. Wachtel, AO3098183.
Ronald F. Wachtmann, AO3105689.
Harry J. Waggoner, AO3109634.
Richard A. Wagner, AO3096852.
Richard K. Wagner, AO3098440.
Robert E. Wagner, AO3098207.
Ronald A. Wagner, A3053817.
Clarence W. Wahl, AO3097282.
Kenneth T. Waight, Jr., AO3109844.
Meredith P. Wainscott, AO3083329.
Bruce A. Wales, AO3097439.
Belva D. Walker, AO3096658.
Bert N. Walker, AO3087337.
Cecil L. Walker, AO3097328.
David C. Walker, AO3098441.
James B. Walker, AO3103629.
Jerry W. Walker, AO3098821.
Kenneth W. Walker, AO3099512.
Robert F. Walker, AO3098312.
Robert M. Walker, AO3101372.
Thomas L. Walker, AO3098272.
Alfred J. Wall, AO3097785.
David D. Wallace II, AO3086269.
James E. Wallace, AO3073144.
John F. Wallace, AO3095521.
Ronald H. Wallace, AO3096381.
William A. Wallace, AO3096615.
William G. Wallace, AO3102045.
William J. Wallis, AO3094907.
Bruce D. Walsh, AO3105353.
Jacob B. Waltermire, Jr., AO3096718.
Clarence W. Walton, Jr., AO3095935.
Samuel K. Walton, Jr., AO3097329.
Raymond D. Waltram, AO3097622.
John L. Walts, AO3103098.
Joseph F. Wansong, AO3097216.
Calvin H. Ward, AO3029877.
David E. B. Ward, AO3105972.
George P. Ward, AO3098538.
Richard E. Ward, AO3096174.
Robert E. Wardsworth, AO3097923.
Bruce K. Ware, AO3098103.
George E. Ware, AO3109635.
Donald D. Warner, AO3097247.
Max P. Warner, AO3098062.
Robert L. Warner, AO3095733.
James B. Warren, AO3096659.
Bruce S. Washburn, AO3097678.
Donald L. Washington, AO3098573.
Russell S. Wasser, AO3102670.
John T. Wasson, AO3046484.
Joseph D. Waters, AO3097808.
Bobby K. Watson, AO3098688.
Garland G. Watson, AO3097153.
Jack O. Watson, AO3098046.
Patrick J. Watson, AO3099335.
Ted M. Watson, AO3099079.
Kenneth R. Watt, AO3099371.
Richard S. Watt, AO3073985.
Holbrook M. Watts, AO3098402.
James C. Weatherbee, AO3096834.
Floyd W. Weaver, AO3098777.
Jack R. Weaver, AO3098822.
Viven T. Weaver, AO3101777.
William C. Weaver, Jr., AO3097743.
Jeffrey W. Weavil, AO3097924.
Arling R. Weber, AO3095734.
Bobby P. Weed, AO3099532.
John A. Weese, AO3027490
Benjamin P. Wehman, AO3099121.
Frederick W. Weidner, AO3097514.
Richard J. Weiler, AO3097217.
Richard S. Weintraub, AO3097754.
Michael A. Weissman, AO3097679.
David L. Weitzman, AO3093857.
Bertrand C. Welch, Jr., AO3097852.
Anthony C. Welde, AO3102046.
Russell A. Welker, AO3066799.
LeRoy W. Welle, AO3098403.
David C. Wellman, AO3096271.
David L. Wells, AO3095603.
Don E. Wells, AO3095573.
James N. Wells, AO3109847.
John V. Wendling, AO3101922.
David J. Wenker, AO3095681.
Lawrence H. Wentz, AO3096318.
William G. Weppner, AO3097829.
Benjamin O. Werle, AO3086362.
Thomas Werne, AO3096617.
Thomas D. Wesner, AO3102322.
David L. Wessell, AO3095574.
John W. West, Jr., AO3096782.
Paul T. West, AO3104663.
Philip W. West, AO3097381.
William West, AO3097809.
Eugene D. Westhusing, AO3096520.
Michael T. Westmoreland, AO3098689.
Richard P. Westmoreland, AO3086677.
Rollin T. Wheat, AO3097682.
James E. Wheeler, AO3096121.
Kenneth H. Wheeler, AO3098106.
William H. Wheelock, AO3097810.
Gary L. Whitaker, AO3102595.
Benjamin E. White, AO3098690.
James H. White, Jr., AO3099139.
Richard W. White, AO3109929.
Robert J. White, AO3098576.
Robert R. White, AO3096195.
Ronald K. White, AO3083786.
William K. White, AO3098978.
William O. White, Jr., AO3099614.
John C. Whitehead, AO3099174.
A. J. Whitehurst III, AO3102047.
Leonard J. Whiteman, Jr., AO3098186.
Alan M. Whitman, AO3086957.
Richard L. Whitmore, AO3096382.
William A. Whittington, AO3095632.
William R. Whittington, AO3098107.
Larry L. Whyman, AO3095234.
Roger E. Wichman, AO3097331.
Robert F. Wickham, AO3102395.
Stanley J. Widman, AO3097332.
Robert E. Wiemer, AO3098189.
Roger C. Wilcox, AO3103599.
John K. Wiley, AO3096567.
Bruce W. Wilkerson, AO3096484.
Quenten L. Wilkes, AO3096462.
Herbert C. Wilkinson, AO3098208.

Philip A. Wilkinson, AO3096235.
Brian R. Williams, AO3106970.
Britt G. Williams, Jr., AO3103575.
Douglas A. Williams, AO3098014.
Edward Williams, AO3102886.
Emmett E. Williams, Jr., AO3097382.
Everett C. Williams, Jr., AO3094600.
Freddie J. Williams, AO3102010.
Harold C. Williams, AO3101980.
James C. Williams, AO3095649.
James W. Williams, AO3110073.
John L. Williams, AO3099274.
Monte P. Williams, AO3099080.
Norman E. Williams, AO3095819.
Phillip T. Williams, Jr., AO3097871.
Richard M. Williams, AO3099122.
Robert L. Williams, AO3098980.
Thomas O. Williams III, AO3099273.
George E. Williamson, Jr., AO3099006.
James R. Williamson, AO3096272.
John H. Williamson, AO3097702.
Robert E. Williamson, AO3098708.
William E. Willigrod, AO3095499.
James E. Willis, AO3099052.
Victor D. Wills, AO3095667.
Bernard E. Wilson, AO3099564.
Clifford B. Wilson, AO3094138.
Donald E. Wilson, AO3098464.
Edwin B. Wilson, AO3099272.
James W. Wilson, AO3098139.
Patricia A. Wilson, AL3110184.
Paul M. Wilson, AO3098979.
William W. Wilson II, AO3096698.
Peter D. Wimbrow, Jr., AO3102049.
Wayne S. Winch, AO3097516.
Eugene W. Winfield, AO3109848.
Charles J. Wingert, AO3096521.
Edgar W. Winkelmann, AO3099007.
Joe D. Winkle, AO3098981.
John M. Winslow, Jr., AO3099053.
David L. Winterhalter, AO3096945.
Kenneth L. Wissinger, AO3098578.
Richard L. Witkover, AO3085417.
Prentice G. Witt, AO3103941.
Ralph J. Wittrock, AO3095182.
Edward A. Woelfel, AO3098620.
Edward K. Woest, AO3098595.
Kern B. Wofford, AO3101932.
Jack K. Wolf, AO3060598.
John M. Wolfe, Jr., AO3096485.
James F. Wolff, AO3099452.
James M. Wolpman, AO3098982.
Reuben S. F. Wong, AO3085604.
Charles T. Wood, AO3102889.
George E. Wood, AO3098350.
Harold R. Wood, Jr., AO3097811.
James C. Wood, Jr., AO3099301.
James H. Wood, AO3099510.
William A. Wood, Jr., AO3098983.
James N. Woodman, AO3099404.
Lloyd Woodman, Jr., AO3094845.
Wilbur J. Woodruff, AO3097073.
William W. Woods, Jr., AO3097042.
Richard E. Woodson, AO3097218.
Alan M. Woodward, AO3097441.
Robert E. Woolsey, AO3099081.
Dennis E. Wooton, AO3098984.
Mack E. Wootton, AO3096236.
Malcolm L. Worrell, Jr., AO3109849.
Karl E. Worst, AO3099562.
David D. Wozniak, AO3096150.
Andrew R. Wright, Jr., AO3096816.
Robert E. Wright, AO3102050.
Roger W. Wright, AO3104863.
David L. Wroblewski, AO3103099.
Harry D. Wunder, AO3097745.
John A. Wurz, AO3094139.
James L. Wyatt, Jr., AO3099587.
Donald E. Wylie, AO3097517.
Donald L. Wylie, AO3103499.
Thomas O. Wynne, AO3098985.
Andrew G. Wyrick, Jr., AO3096320.
Albert L. Yantis, Jr., AO3098986.
Charles L. Yates, AO3099111.
Robert R. Yeaman, AO3098276.
Edmund C. H. Yee, AO3096024.
Charles M. Yeokum, AO3096569.
Norman D. Yetka, AO3098692.
Joan O. Ylen, AL3110189.
Thomas P. Yon, AO3098742.
John R. York, AO3096993.
Gene N. Yoshinaga, AO3096025.
Allen R. Young, AO3097747.
Edward F. Young, AO3097746.
Reginald H. F. Young, AO3096026.
William E. Young, AO3106770.
William M. Young, AO3102597.
James Youngson, Jr., AO3095708.
Richard A. Zabel, AO3099405.
Jon N. Zachem, AO3096618.
Robert F. Zames, AO3095913.
John J. Zavasky, AO3098033.
Matthew J. Zeiler, AO3097040.
Fraine C. Zeitler, AO3097996.
Robert S. Zenorini, AO3098466.
Stanley T. Zenuk, AO3099518.
Gerald J. Ziarno, AO3097074.
Richard P. Zimmerman, AO3097570.
Robert T. Zimmerman, AO3095500.
Oliver J. Zink, Jr., AO3097571.
Bogdan M. Zlotnicki, AO3097872.
Robert Zucker, AO3097793.
Grover C. Zumwalt, AO3098351.
Frederick W. zur Burg, Jr., AO3109936.

To be second lieutenants

Distinguished Aviation Cadet Graduates

Joel R. Birch, AO3121004.
Robert W. Clark, AO3118283.
Derek H. Detjen, AO3121045.
John A. Holmes, AO3118242.
Clemoth E. Jones, AO3118289.
Edwin G. Jones III, AO3118245.
Clarke R. Lee, AO3118295.
Ronald D. Mullis, AO3118259.
Gary T. Prescott, AO3118302.
John G. Proud, AO3121099.
David S. Robinson, AO3118213.
Brett A. Schriever, AO3118179.
Richard W. Waite, AO3117941.

Distinguished Officer Candidate Graduate

Donald E. Backer, AO3116702.

Distinguished Officer Training School Graduates

Daryl D. Allen, AO3116830.
William F. Anderson, AO3116831.
Philip R. Atterbery, AO3116853.
Bedford D. Blevins, AO3116840.
John A. Cribbs, Jr., AO3116848.
Myron Johnson, AO3120422.
Kenneth W. Keasey, AO3120426.
Stanley H. Morgan, AO3120540.
William D. Oliver, AO3115620.
Michael J. Regan, AO3115842.
Robert E. Reid, AO3116921.
William H. Robichaux, AO3116925.
Richard L. Speros, AO3120504
Stanley D. Stephenson, AO3120511.
Jack L. Ventling, AO3116979.
Frank E. Wellin, Jr., AO3116945.
William V. Wells, Jr., AO3120527.

Subject to medical qualification and subject to designation as a distinguished military graduate, the following distinguished military student of the Air Force Reserve Officers' Training Corps for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with a view to designation under the provisions of section 8067, title 10, United States Code to perform medical service duties. Date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

Bernard L. Flynn, Jr., AO3119192.

Subject to medical qualification and subject to designation as distinguished military graduates, the following distinguished military students of the Air Force Reserve Officers' Training Corps for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

Joseph J. Bullmer.
Curtis L. McMillan, Jr.
John F. Picarelli, AO3108707.
Albert W. Small, AO3108332.
Alexander Zakrzeski, Jr.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 21, 1962:

Assistant Secretary of Commerce

Jack N. Behrman, of Delaware, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

Federal Aviation Agency

Maj. Gen. Harold Winfield Grant, of the U.S. Air Force, to be Deputy Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency.

Civil Aeronautics Board

G. Joseph Minetti, of New York, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board for the term of 6 years expiring December 31, 1967.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Post Office Appointments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STANLEY R. TUPPER
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 21, 1962

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, probably more misinformation is generated in regard to Post Office appointments than any other nominations. I am sure this has been so regardless of which party happened to be in power.

Recently in my State of Maine certain erroneous allegations were made concerning the handling of a rural carrier nomination in 1959 by Senator Margaret Chase Smith, of Maine, a former distinguished Member of this House.

In a letter to one of Maine's largest daily newspapers, a Mrs. Barbara Hoyt Rainey asserted that Senator Smith engaged in party politics in making a rural carrier appointment that resulted in the death of her then husband. For the sake of accuracy and fairness I would like to make these facts a part of the record:

This case involves a Mr. Lawrence E. Hoyt who took a civil service examination and failed with a score of 65. Since he did not make a rating of 70, no points for veterans' preference were added to his rating.

In a letter dated December 21, 1959, to R. L. Hulick, Acting Director of the Bureau of Operations of the Post Office Department, Senator Smith notified the Post Office Department that she was declining to make any recommendation on the appointment. The end result was that the Postmaster General made the selection without any recommendation from Senator SMITH. It may be of interest to note that the Postmaster General selected an individual for this appointment making the highest grade on the civil service examination—a grade of 88.

Inasmuch as Senator SMITH did not make this appointment and even refused to make a recommendation, it is clear that any allegations to the contrary are an injustice to Maine's senior U.S. Senator.

Need for Greater Coordination of Transportation Within the Defense Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 21, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Defense Department—pursuant to a recommendation by myself and 11 other Great Lakes Senators, has undertaken a comprehensive study on overall policies relating to shipping of military goods overseas.

The report is expected to be published in the near future.

A preview of this study has revealed that—thanks to a candid, realistic evaluation of existing shipping patterns, there is a real need for greater coordination and correlation of policy.

For this reason, I am urging the establishment of a special Transportation Agency, within the Defense Department.

I ask unanimous consent to have a brief statement outlining these views printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

Traditionally, the Defense Department has created, and adhered to, shipping policies that, to a large degree, overlooked the potentials of the Great Lakes waterway system. The completion of the St. Lawrence Seaway, providing a less expensive route to ports around the world, however, offers in my judgment, a new opportunity to handle such shipping more expeditiously and less expensively. Unfortunately, the Department, as well as other governmental and nongovernmental shippers have not sufficiently reoriented their shipping patterns to take full advantage of the opportunities offered by the seaway.

The purpose of the recommended study was to take a new look at, and as necessary, revise U.S. shipping policies. In response, the Department appointed a special task force to undertake a 90-day study. Expected to be published shortly, a preview of the study reveals that (1) the Defense Department performed a forthright and realistic analysis—commendable, particularly, for its openminded self-criticism of Defense shipping policies, and (2) existing shipping policies suffer from a serious lack of uniform procedure methods, accounting methods, consideration of cost factors, etc.

Because of this situation, I believe that the establishment of a special Transportation Agency within the Defense Department would: (1) Create more uniform shipping policies—thus, more equitably serving all areas of the country and all segments of the economy; (2) result in savings of millions of dollars for the taxpayer; and (3) provide a key for more effectively coordinated transportation policy, not only in the Defense Department, but also in other Federal departments.

Manned Orbital Space Flights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 21, 1962

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I joined millions of my fellow Americans in praying silently both for the safety of Col. John H. Glenn and for the success of America's first manned orbital space flight.

In my prayers, I thanked our Divine Maker for the patience and wisdom that He gave to the directors of Project Mercury who so wisely and courageously elected to postpone our manned orbital flight attempt until they had Colonel Glenn's safety and the success of the flight itself assured. Many Americans, as you well know, Mr. Speaker, became somewhat impatient with the vexing postponements in our manned orbital flight attempt. I am sure that all of them now join with me in humble gratitude for the courage of the Project Mercury team. I am sure they now agree that a brief period of delay is eminently to be preferred to the crushing blow that would have been dealt our national prestige if our manned orbital flight attempt had ended in failure.

Mr. Speaker, the chairman of our Science and Astronautics Committee, Congressman MILLER of California, recently addressed a meeting of the Hampton Roads section of the Institute of Aerospace Sciences at NASA Langley Research Center, located in the First Congressional District of Virginia, which I have the privilege to represent. Chairman MILLER called on the IAS to do everything possible to help achieve a broad public understanding of the fact that NASA is attempting to perform a long-term scientific investigation of space.

Manned orbital space flights should never be viewed as "stunts" in our Nation's space program. Our Nation's exploration on the horizons of space will cost the taxpayers something like $50 billion over the next 5 years. This expenditure, however successful our space program, will be basically wasted unless we as Americans understand the value that will accrue to our Nation from every aspect of NASA's activities in space.

Colonel Glenn's vastly successful orbital flight is, as one of Project Mercury's directors so aptly phrased it, "the end of the beginning." We are now on the threshold of the unknown. I venture to say that no living American could accurately predict the achievements for our society that will naturally follow Colonel Glenn's epochal flight.

Our Nation's space program is worth the investment, Mr. Speaker. I hope that our most recent space achievement will lead increasing numbers of Americans to active support for our space efforts.

As a Virginian, Mr. Speaker, I am deeply proud that Col. John H. Glenn, whose bravery and ability were so notably made evident yesterday, lives with his lovely wife and teenage children in Virginia. All of us hope that they will elect to make Virginia their permanent home.

And then, too, no one should forget the team of astronauts who originally trained at Langley Field NASA near Hampton, Va., and at Wallops Island, Va. Only one man could make the orbital flight but the entire team was necessary to insure success. And that was what all seven wanted more than anything else. The courage of one was the courage of seven combined into that one.

We should be extremely proud of the directors of Project Mercury. Upon their shoulders rested the responsibility of the whole venture. If the project had failed it would have been their failure. Now that it has succeeded, it is their success.

Also there are the employees of the great Agency, NASA, who have both directly and indirectly contributed so much to the scientific advancement of our aeronautics and space exploration programs. Without them, the accomplishment we celebrate would have been virtually impossible. These dedicated men and women have met and are meeting the almost impossible demands thrust on them.

These and others too, no less dedicated, are the reasons we are joyous. We are grateful for their untiring efforts and limitless abilities.

This achievement, as great as it is, is surely only the beginning, Mr. Speaker. Americans everywhere can be justly proud.

Observance of Metropolitan Slipy Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 21, 1962

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, February 18, 1962, a solidarity celebration was organized by the Citizens' Committee for the Observance of Metropolitan Joseph Slipy Day, under the auspices of St. Michael's Catholic Ukrainian Church and the Maryland branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., at St. Michael's Hall, Lombard and Wolfe Streets, Baltimore, Md.

Several hundred Americans of Ukrainian descent, of Baltimore, with their pastor, the Reverend Petro Melnyczuk, presiding, joined in a prayer crusade commemorating the 70th anniversary of the birth of Archbishop Slipy to invite the attention of freedom-loving peoples the world over to the suffering and persecution this Ukrainian prelate has endured during the past 17 years in Soviet prisons and concentration camps.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the program as well as my message to those assembled on this occasion:

Program

(His Excellency the Most Reverend Archbishop Ambrose Senyshyn, metropolitan of Philadelphia, initiated the celebration of the 17th anniversary of the birth of the Metropolitan Joseph Slipij, who has been imprisoned by the Communists. He is metropolitan of Halych and archbishop of Lviw. St. Michael's Catholic Ukrainian Church, Baltimore, Md., with the cooperation of all local organizations sponsors this academy in honor of this occasion.)

1. "Star-Spangled Banner," piano solo, by O. Maciurak.
2. Opening address: Rev. Petro Melnyczuk.
3. Active participation in prayer: "Mighty God," girl students of parish school.
4. Lecture in English: Mr. W. Sushko; lecture in Ukrainian: Mr. J. Shawiak.
5. Movochatsky, "Our Father," sung by church choir; soloist, S. Poliszczuk.
6. Bohdan Lepky, "In the Cathedral of St. George," recitation by Andrew Tatchyn.
7. Bach, "Solfeggietto," piano solo; Florence A. Goodrich; "Caprice in C," by O. Kohut.
8. Charles Gounod: "Ava Maria," solo; Cherubini, "Mama,' solo sung by L. Korobijowska.
9. Bortniansky, "Wsi Jazytzy," sung by church choir; Jaroslavenko, "Blakytno Zowty Stiah," sung by choir of OCHUSU.
10. Church song, "My Choir of Parochial School Children"; Ukrainian hymn, combined choirs and guests.

Choir director: Mr. I. Seniuta.
Piano accompanist: Mrs. L. Shawiak.
Costume preparation: Mrs. W. Wojtowych.

Commemoration of the 70th Anniversary of the Birth of Metropolitan Slipy, February 18, 1962

It is good for us to be here. That is so because we assemble for a noble purpose—to put our voices in unison and offer a fervent prayer to Almighty God that Metropolitan Joseph Slipy, the head of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in the Ukraine, heroic sufferer for his church and nation in a Communist-ruled Russian prison, will be given the physical strength, and, yes, the moral courage and fortitude to withstand the persecution to which he has and still is being subjected. And beyond that, please God, we hope the day will soon come when Archbishop Slipy will be free to shepherd his flock without molestation.

What untold agony this brave man of God and truly modern-day martyr for his church and his people must have undergone during these past 16 years of imprisonment. On this, the occasion of the 70th birthday of Metropolitan Slipy, we welcome the opportunity to join the prayer crusade initiated by the Most Reverend Archbishop Ambrose Senyshyn, metropolitan of Ukrainian Catholics in the United States.

You Americans of Ukrainian descent, and those of us who are privileged to be with you on this occasion, are justifiably proud to demonstrate to the entire world that we will not stand idly by while those who represent the forces of tyranny and oppression deny to their fellow man the basic freedoms of liberty and justice. Freedom to worship God should not and must not be denied any man. Not only Metropolitan Slipy, but all members of the Ukrainian Catholic Church presently under communistic Russian domination, are included and remembered in our prayerful petition this day.

Less than a month ago—on January 22—we observed the 44th anniversary of the independence of the Ukrainian National Republic. Some may ask why we commemorate the anniversary of Ukrainian independence. We, of course, realize that the freedom-loving and God-fearing people are under the yoke of oppression. To those who would ask why, I say: We salute and admire these gallant people for their principled determination to be free, sympathize with them in their incredible suffering, and sustain and give them reassurance that their courageous struggle to achieve liberty again and glorious independence will not be in vain. We echo over and over to them that the free nations of the world stand by and beside the people of the Ukraine.

The city of Baltimore, the State of Maryland, and the United States of America are proud of the Americans of Ukrainian descent in our midst. We recognize that these patriotic citizens are holding on high the torch of truth, liberty, and justice for their loved ones and brethren across the sea.

With hearts and minds lifted in prayer, with a steadfast faith in the future, and secure in the knowledge that our cause is just and honorable, we beseech Almighty God to bless this Nation, our President, freedom-loving peoples everywhere and today we plead especially: Long live Metropolitan Slipy, long live the Ukrainian National Republic.

Thank you.

Estonian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 21, 1962

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, Estonians were among the numerous European nationality groups which regained their independence toward the end of the First World War. Their country on the northeastern shores of the Baltic had become part of the Russian empire early in the 18th century, and they endured the oppressive czarist yoke for two centuries. In 1917 when the czarist autocracy was overthrown by the Russian revolution, all national groups once subjected to the czarist regime were freed, regained their liberty and proclaimed their national independence. The Estonians did this on February 24, 1918, and founded the Estonian Republic.

In the newly established democratic Republic its stouthearted, patriotic and thrifty inhabitants, numbering a bare million, did wonders in the course of their free existence during the next two decades. Besides rebuilding their devastated and ruined country, they advanced in every phase of their national activity. And they were quite content with their lot in their beloved homeland. But their independent life did not last long. When the Second World War began, Estonia's independence was threatened. In 1940 the country, after being occupied by the Red Army, was made part of the Soviet Union. Thus ended the freedom of the Estonian people, and since then they have been living and suffering under totalitarian dictatorship. For two decades they have endured the oppressive yoke of their captors, and under such unenviable circumstances they pray for their deliverance from Communist tyranny. On this 44th anniversary of their independence day we wish them fortitude and courage in their struggle for their freedom and independence.

Boys Town Jerusalem Praised by the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERBERT ZELENKO

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 21, 1962

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the privilege of being a guest at the 7th annual dinner of Boys Town Jerusalem.

The very name of this institution, modeled as it is after one of the great human experiments carried out so successfully in our own country, indicates how deep the roots of democracy have been implanted in the State of Israel.

Boys Town Jerusalem was established some 10 years ago and was designed to fill a gap in the educational system of a young and still-struggling country. Although the strides made by this infant democracy have evoked the admiration of much of the world, it remains a fact that Israel's present economic level still falls short of permitting free public education on the secondary or high school level. One of the means of solving this problem was the concept that led to the establishment of Boys Town Jerusalem.

The objective was to provide academic and vocational training and a measure of spiritual guidance to boys who were being brought to Israel through emigration. What began as an extremely small operation with a student population of just 18 boys has grown into a school that is now able to give free education and auxiliary support to over 350 boys who have come to Israel from 25 different countries. Approximately half of these youngsters are orphans.

Under the leadership of Mr. Ira Guilden, a distinguished New Yorker, a group of public-spirited Americans has joined together in an American committee to provide urgently needed funds to enable Boys Town Jerusalem to further enlarge the scope of the vital service it is performing. I am happy to note that our own Government has shown a sympathetic interest in this school. We can be proud that an allocation for support of the school's program was made from U.S. counterpart funds in Israel. I know of no better way to secure the roots of democracy in a small country than by ministering to the important human needs of its youth. Boys Town Jerusalem was conceived in the image of our own free institutions and represents the priceless gift of free and open opportunity, that unique hallmark of democracy which has made our American system the envy of the world.

Private American philanthropy has made notable contributions to the school. The American committee for Boys Town Jerusalem is engaged in a campaign to raise $3 million to expand the school's present facilities, the plans calling for a school that will be able to accommodate 1,000 students, half of whom would be boarded on the school site.

The graphic arts industry of New York has made a signal contribution. Ground has been broken at Boys Town Jerusalem for what will be the largest graphic arts center in the Near East. Facilities costing $200,000 will be provided for the training of 100 teenage youngsters each year in printing and photo-offset trades. Printing presses and related equipment have already been installed and will be moved from temporary buildings where they now operate to new facilities for which contracts have been let.

I know of no better way to describe the human dimensions of the task Boys Town Jerusalem has undertaken than to cite an experience related to me by the president of the American committee for the school, Mr. Ira Guilden. His interest in the program of the school was aroused during a visit he paid to Israel a few years ago. He was particularly interested in the children who were finding their way to Israel from behind the Iron Curtain and the ghettos of Africa and the Middle East. It was while visiting these facilities giving shelters to some of these children that he discovered among them orphans who had never known their parents and indeed did not know their own names. It was this discovery that impelled him to join with other devoted Americans who see in this school an opportunity to express their deep concern for humanity, one of the treasures of the American way of life.

We live in a time when the old-fashioned virtue of gratitude is becoming increasingly scarce. It was, therefore, deeply gratifying to me to learn of a gesture of appreciation to the Congress of the United States by the youngsters of Boys Town Jerusalem. A group of these boys who had been trained in woodworking and carpentry joined together to hand-make a desk for presentation to the distinguished Speaker of the House, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, in gratitude for congressional approval of the allocation of U.S. counterpart funds for the school.

I note that the desk was presented to the Speaker in brief ceremonies in his office on Friday, February 9. I know of no better way to assess the character and achievement of Boys Town Jerusalem than to quote a brief passage from a letter the Speaker wrote to Mr. Ira Guilden after the presentation of the desk.

Our distinguished Speaker observed:

> This great human project is an outstanding illustration of democratic thought and action in operation, and what can be done where a government of laws exists, such as in Israel.

On behalf of Boys Town Jerusalem, I want to thank my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts, the Speaker of the House, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, for pointing to the human achievements that are within the grasp of humble people everywhere so long as they enjoy the blessings of freedom.

Checkoffs for Agriculture Trade Promotion and Advertising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 21, 1962

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the farmers of my congressional district, in common with their associates in agriculture everywhere, have always been allergic to controls and the whole idea of the checkoff smacks so much of the regimentation under which labor presently suffers as to make that part of the pending Food and Agriculture Act somewhat suspect.

Section 2 of title III of H.R. 10010 would amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 to authorize farmer contributions, by means of checkoffs from the returns on marketing farm products, for "marketing research and development projects designed to assist, improve, or promote the marketing, distribution, and consumption" of the product covered by a marketing order.

The bill does not say so specifically, but it seems to me that the broad language quoted would have to be interpreted as authorizing the compulsory collection of funds from farmers for industry advertising programs.

This, to my mind, raises some substantial policy questions.

So long as funds for trade promotion of particular farm products are raised by voluntary contribution, there is reason to suppose that the amount collected will not be excessive and that the funds collected will be spent judiciously to accomplish the desired purpose.

But when the collection of funds for such purpose is compulsory, the discipline of voluntary participation is eliminated, and the door is open for abuses.

No point is served in lengthy review of possible abuses. But let us look at a few likely possibilities.

One of the possibilities is that an excessive percentage of all funds collected is used to propagandize farmers for continuation of the program. Vested interests in the continuation of a program are created. It is to be expected that such interest will affect the views and actions of program administration.

Another possibility is that the funds will be used for purposes other than those intended. One of the likely possibilities here is to use farmers' money, collected for trade promotion, for legislative purposes.

Those with a vested interest in the program are likely to regard expenditures to continue legislative authorization for the program as perfectly legitimate, as well as expenditures for other legislative objectives. Nor is it unlikely to suppose that farmers' money will be used in election campaigns, either directly or indirectly, of congressmen who have supported the program.

This compulsory association for legislative and political purposes is immoral and contrary to basic political concepts of the Constitution.

The idea that Government power should be used to compel the collection of funds for trade promotion purposes for farm products is one that seems to be growing in acceptance. Yet it seems to me that some seriously adverse factors should be given greater consideration than they have in the past.

For example, at what point does it become unethical or immoral for the majority to compel the minority to contribute money for a program the minority may be opposed to.

The minority may, for example, be convinced that a proposed advertising and trade promotion program is likely to be a net cost rather than a net benefit to them.

The minority may be right. Yet irrespective of whether they are right or wrong, are they to be compelled by the majority to contribute to the program?

Let us recall that the basic concept of our form of government is not that the majority rules, but rather that each individual has certain inalienable rights which should not be taken away from him by the majority.

This basic principle is to my mind violated when we use the police power of government to compel individuals to make contributions to causes which such individuals believe are either wrong or unwise.

There is another aspect of this approach to the farm problem that should be considered.

I think it is very unlikely that the consumers total expenditure for food can be increased by commodity advertising programs. The most that can be accomplished by a commodity advertising program is to shift consumption in some small degree to the product advertised.

Therefore, even if we make the assumption that such a shift can be made, the net effect of such commodity advertising program is to induce the consumer to eat a little more of some products, a little less of others.

I can see little benefit to farmers from this. In fact, if all farm products, or even a substantial percentage of them were all advertised, the net result would be that the advertising costs would be a substantial burden on farmers, with no benefits to them at all.

Some persons seem to take it for granted that public policy should promote commodity advertising programs. Have we thought this through? If commodity advertising programs are good for farmers, are they equally good for nonfarm products?

Should law compel every manufacturer of shoes to pay money to an industry fund to convince consumers they should buy more shoes?

Would any worthwhile public purpose be served if all manufacturers of motor boats were required to support an industry program to get more people to buy boats?

The Congress has never reached any conclusion that such legislation would be desirable, either in the public interest or in the interest of the industry involved.

It seems to me we are jumping to an unwarranted and unsupported conclusion if we assume that compulsory advertising programs for farm products are in the public interest or in the interest of farmers.

This provision of the new farm bill is one that has not been thought through, that has apparently been swept up in an endeavor to roll into one package virtually everything that has ever been proposed as contributions to solving the farm problem.

It seems to be becoming clearer that perhaps the single, most important factor standing in the way of improving the farm situation is the periodic warming up of every proposal considered and discarded in the past 20 years.

Farmers have a lot of problems. Most of them are in Washington. And the pending omnibus agricultural proposal emphasizes these facts.

The 44th Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1962

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, February 17, 1962, under the sponsorship of the Council of Lithuanian Societies of Baltimore, the 44th anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Lithuania was observed at a banquet and appropriate ceremonies held at Lithuanian Hall, Hollins and Parkin Streets, Baltimore, Md. The honored guest and principal speaker was Dr. Stays Bockis, the newly appointed counselor to the Lithuanian legation. Prior to his assignment to Washington, he was the Lithuanian Minister in Paris, France. An interesting part of the Lithuanian Day program was the performance of three national dances by the Lithuanian National Dance Group of Baltimore. This group has won many prizes in the All Nations Day contests held at Gwynn Oak Park in recent years.

Mr. Thomas G. Gray, president of the Council of Lithuanian Societies of Baltimore, read a resolution which was unanimously adopted. Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I include the resolution for reprinting as well as the remarks I was privileged to address to those assembled on this occasion:

RESOLUTION, COUNCIL OF LITHUANIAN SOCIETIES OF BALTIMORE

We Lithuanian-Americans of the Free State of Maryland, having gathered this 17th day of February 1962, at the Lithuanian Hall Auditorium, in Baltimore City, under the sponsorship of the Council of Lithuanian Societies of Baltimore, after due deliberation regarding the present international situation, adopt the following resolution:

"Whereas freedom and democracy are being challenged by communism all over the world;

"Whereas February 16, 1962, is the 44th anniversary of the independence of the Democratic Republic of Lithuania;

"Whereas ever since the 13th century, the Lithuanian nation has shown her right to independence by an unending struggle against tyrannical invaders;

"Whereas the Lithuanians have repeatedly displayed their determination for freedom by their resistance against Russian imperialism in the years 1831, 1863, 1904, 1918, and 1941;

"Whereas even at this very hour the Lithuanian people are engaged in a ceaseless resistance to the ruthless persecution of their religion, culture, and economy by Soviet Russia: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we free and loyal American citizens appeal to the United Nations, in the name of our suffering kinsmen, to free Lithuania and the other captive nations from Russian colonialism; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That we appeal to the Government of the United States of America to support all efforts to free people from the bonds of communism; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That we express our profound appreciation to the Government of the United States of America for continuing the fearless recognition of Lithuania as an independent nation; and be it finally

"*Resolved*, That we express our deep appreciation for the increasing coverage by American newspapers of Soviet persecutions behind the Iron Curtain."

THOMAS G. GRAY,
President.
LUCY LASKOUSKAS,
Secretary.

THE 44TH ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY, LITHUANIAN HALL, 851 HOLLINS STREET, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1962

First, I should like to explain that I have just left the annual banquet of the Advertising Club of Baltimore in order to join with all of you as you assemble to observe the 44th anniversary of the Republic of Lithuania. I asked to be excused prior to the completion of that function so that I would have the opportunity to participate in this outstanding event in the history of the Lithuanian colony of Baltimore. Those of you who have been attending this anniversary banquet for a number of years know that I have always made it a point to be with you, regardless of other commitments I may have had.

It is good for us to be here tonight. That is so because we assemble for a noble purpose—to mark the anniversary of independence of the Lithuanian Republic. Some may ask why we commemorate the anniversary of independence each year, when the freedom-loving and God-fearing people of Lithuania are under the yoke of oppression. To those who would ask why, I say: We meet to salute and admire these gallant people for their principled determination to be free; we sympathize with them in their incredible sufferings, and give them reassurance that their courageous struggle to achieve liberty and glorious independence again will not be in vain. We echo over and over to them that the free nations of the world stand beside the people of Lithuania constantly.

We know that despite every effort to suppress it, the yearning for liberty is unquenchable among brave and heroic Lithuanians and that tyranny has only served to stimulate it rather than stifle it. The city of Baltimore, the State of Maryland, and the United States of America are proud of the Americans of Lithuanian descent in our midst. We recognize that these patriotic citizens are holding on high the torch of truth, liberty and justice for their loved ones and brethren across the sea.

Tonight, as in past years, we take courage in the fact that these brave people are spiritually and physically endowed with the necessary strength and fortitude to continue to withstand the yoke to which they are still subjected.

As your Representative in the Congress of the United States, and as your fellow American, let me assure you that this beloved country of ours will never abandon its interest in the needs and welfare of the oppressed peoples everywhere.

With hearts and minds lifted in prayer, with a steadfast faith in the future, and secure in the knowledge that our cause is just and honorable, we beseech Almighty God to bless this Nation, our President, freedom-loving peoples everywhere, particularly those of Lithuania. Tonight our voices cry out: "Long live the United States of America; long live the Republic of Lithuania."

Thank you.

Expanding Federal Accident Prevention Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 21, 1962

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, Representative KENNETH ROBERTS, representing the fourth district in my home State of Alabama, has long been interested in safety measures and accident prevention activities. He has devoted a great deal of time to the subject and recently wrote an excellent article on "Expanding Federal Accident Prevention Activities" which appeared in the February 1962 issue of the Journal of the American Society of Safety Engineers. Representative ROBERTS is currently holding hearings before the House Health and Safety Subcommittee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on his proposal to establish an Accident Prevention Research Center. I think it most timely that Representative ROBERTS' article be brought to the attention of the Members of this body and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESSMAN ROBERTS REPORTS ON: EXPANDING FEDERAL ACCIDENT PREVENTION ACTIVITIES

The loss of life, limb, and property from avoidable accidents not only is tragic from the standpoint of human suffering but in this modern age is calamitous from an economic standpoint, especially when we are straining every effort to promote economic development to provide jobs and to meet the obligations we have assumed worldwide to protect our national interests.

There is a growing public awareness of the importance of safety. Along with this increasing interest is a realization that safety is a cooperative effort. Safety engineers working directly in the safety field are largely responsible for this because they have made it their business to find out why accidents happen and what can be done to prevent accidents. Out of this has come more attention to safety on the part of press, radio, and television.

Still, I am sure we can all agree that as a Nation we are not devoting enough energy and effort to a study of the cause of accidents. For this reason I have introduced in Congress a bill to establish a National Accident Prevention Center in the Public Health Service. I do not propose to turn accident prevention over to the Federal Government or even give the Federal Government primary responsibility for research into accident prevention. My bill would set up an agency to coordinate research effort and to promote and encourage wider effort by public and private agencies.

The money appropriated by Congress would be "seed money" to encourage States and local governmental units, as well as individuals, institutions, and foundations to increase their efforts under the guidance of nationally recognized experts.

That has been the history of similar Federal programs. I need only cite the Hospital Construction Act to show how Federal aid has stimulated local efforts and brought about needed hospital facilities.

Federal funds spent on research into cancer, heart disease, mental illness, and other medical problems likewise have stimulated research. Federal approval of a project as worth while is a definite factor in attracting gifts and grants, thus encouraging substantial contributions.

My bill would do more than make Federal funds available It would coordinate research and promote the dissemination of information. Unless research results are made available to those who need the information, we are wasting valuable effort. In brief, the Center which would be established by my bill would—

Conduct, promote, and coordinate research and investigations into the causes and prevention of accidents.

Make research facilities of the Public Health Service available for such purposes.

Authorize grants-in-aid to institutions and other private and public agencies engaged in such research projects.

Establish an information center.

Obtain the advice and assistance of experts in the field of accident prevention.

The bill provides for the establishment in the Public Health Service of an Accident Prevention Advisory Board. The Board would be headed by the Surgeon General, as chairman, or an officer designated by him, and would consist of 12 additional members appointed by the President (none of whom could be a Federal employee) to be selected from among representatives of various State, interstate, and local governmental service agencies, public and private interests concerned with or affected by accident prevention, and individual experts in the field.

In addition to its general function of advising, consulting with, and making recommendations to the Surgeon General with respect to his duties in the operation of the Center, the Board is specifically charged with the duties of reviewing accident prevention research projects and approving those which it deems meritorious. The Board also would collect and make available information on studies of accident causes and prevention, and review applications for grants-in-aid and certify its approval of those projects which show promise of making valuable contributions to human knowledge in the field of accident prevention.

Determining the causes of, and finding the means of preventing accidents, has become a matter of serious concern in this country. This would be expected to follow the growing interest in medical care.

Among the areas of human activity in which accident prevention problems have received special attention are industrial, farm, home, mine, radiation, water carrier, aircraft, railways, and highway hazards. Each of these areas is now in some measure the subject of interest and responsibility of various departments or agencies of the Federal Government especially in the field of aviation, and in railway and highway hazards.

As you know, my principal interest as a legislator has been in the field of highway safety. In that field, those working to cut down the accident toll often need the counsel and advice of experts in such matters as standards of eyesight, hearing, and the effects of organic, nervous and functional diseases on the human body. This is especially important to those concerned with the licensing of drivers for trucks and buses and for passing on the fitness of elderly drivers.

We need information as to the effects of fatigue and drugs on driving ability. We need more information on what can be done about the man behind the wheel who has had a social drink or two or three.

We need to know more about driver training. We need to know more about what makes a good driver so that we can set minimum standards for the issuance of permits.

We need to know more about building safe highways.

But you may ask: Why does the Federal Government have a responsibility in this area?

The responsibility of the Federal Government in the field of interstate commerce is well known. It is also pretty generally known that the Federal Government has assumed full responsibility for making and enforcing safety rules for civil flying, whether by big airliner, or a little one-seater which may never cross a State line.

FEDERAL CENTER JUSTIFIED

In some instances, the Federal Government can provide services which would be impossible or unreasonably burdensome for the 50 States. Research is an example. Research is long and costly. It takes not only money, but manpower and facilities. Manpower is limited. Facilities are expensive. In this situation, the Federal Government can do the job cheaper and quicker than the States and local communities, going it alone. Duplication can be eliminated by a Federal program. Information can be collected and disseminated more rapidly.

That is why the Federal Center is justified. That is how the Federal Center will pay for itself by saving local tax dollars.

The Federal Government's interest in highway safety is greater than generally realized. We all know about the vast modern Interstate Highway System, financed largely with Federal money. With these improved highways we can go further and faster with fewer accidents. But good roads do not eliminate accidents. So modern, scientifically designed highways are not the answer to the accident problem. The real truth of the matter, as we all realize, is that there is no one answer. You cannot solve the problem with slogans or posters or traffic tickets or with any one of a number of other remedies which have been suggested.

But the Federal Government can do a lot more about the problem than financing better roads.

Now, let me say that philosophically I am a States rights man. You will find me generally voting that way. But the States have responsibilities as well as rights. Traditionally, the States have the responsibility of making and enforcing traffic safety laws. The States set safety standards for automobiles, issue permits to drivers, and so on.

But a long time ago we found that State control was inadequate insofar as interstate bus and truck traffic is concerned. So we have the Interstate Commerce Commission responsible for common carrier safety. No one is advocating that this control should be relaxed or abolished. Most would say that it should be strengthened, especially in tightening up on vehicle safety standards and maintenance.

The Federal Government has a responsibility to protect the public in a number of areas where State regulation is impossible or unreasonably cumbersome. I need only cite the pure food and drug laws. Would anyone claim that the Federal Government has no business in this field?

In the field of highway safety the States have been lagging in recent years. The reluctance of the States to adopt the Uniform Motor Vehicle Code which was proposed over 35 years ago is a good example. This refusal to adopt a code which has the approval of such organizations as the American Bar Association, International Association of Chiefs of Police, National Safety Council and many other outstanding organizations is the most glaring example of an "ostrich in the sand" attitude that has come to my attention. No one doubts that the adoption of this code would do a lot for highway safety.

This is the same type of do-nothing attitude which is too much in evidence when safety bills are proposed in the Congress of the United States. If the States cannot agree on a uniform code, should the Federal Government step in with legislation to fill the most important gaps, such as driver licensing, motor vehicle safety standards and motor vehicle inspection?

That is a question which is being asked with more frequency in Congress these days. What the States do in the next 5 or 6 years may determine the answer.

Regardless of the answer to that question, some things can be done by the Federal Government without interfering with the States.

Research is one. The Federal Government is spending a lot of money on various health research projects and rightly so. Not enough is being spent on highway safety, which is a major public health problem.

THE HIGHWAY SAFETY STORY

When I was appointed chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Traffic Safety back in 1956, I set out to review the entire field to see what had been done and what could be done. I might say that the hearings held by the subcommittee in 1956 marked the first effort to "wrap up" in one package the story of highway safety activity in this country.

When we started out, I found that in the early 1950's a nucleus of an accident prevention program had been established with four people in the Public Health Service. This was for all accident prevention—not just highway safety—and in 1956, the budget for this activity was in the neighborhood of $50,000. That is of interest when compared with the 37,000 annual death toll on our highways.

Now, as the 1956 hearings disclosed, there was no lack of interest in highway safety on the part of our doctors and lawyers and other public-spirited groups. The medical profession, in particular, was demanding that steps be taken to cut down the highway toll. They especially were urging the building of safer automobiles and had made recommendations to the industry which largely were being ignored.

In 1957, the Public Health Service, together with the American Public Health Association and other groups began to take greater interest in accident prevention. This increased interest in safety has been supported in Congress. This year Congress added $1 million to the budget for accident prevention.

The total staff of the Division of Accident Prevention now numbers 122, of which 34 are engaged primarily in traffic accident prevention work. The number of basic research grants in accident prevention rose to a total of 33 in 1961, of which 23 were concerned with research in various aspects of highway accident prevention.

So you can see we are making progress. But a lot remains to be done, especially in the way of research.

The Federal Government can move in other areas without infringing on the jurisdiction of the States. The Federal Govenment could and should establish minimum safety standards for the passenger-carrying motor vehicles it buys. Figures submitted to my subcommittee by the Bureau of Employee's Compensation show that for 1959 we had 3,912 Federal civilian employees injured in motor vehicle accidents, and 50 deaths. These employees lost 421,010 days from work as a result of these accidents, for a total direct cost to the Government of $4,335,307.

I have pending in the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, a bill which would do something about this. This bill, H.R. 1341, would establish safety standards for Government-owned passenger carrying motor vehicles. Extensive hearings have been held on this measure and we have accumulated an impressive amount of favorable testimony from doctors, engineers, scientists, and safety experts.

My bill not only would help to reduce the cost of highway accidents to the Government but also would promote the building of safer automobiles for the public. Forced to meet safety standards set by the Government, manufacturers would be encouraged to offer these same features as optional equipment or, perhaps, as standard equipment. Furthermore, Government approval of certain safety features no doubt would lead to widespread public demands for the inclusion of these features on models offered the public.

STIMULATED SEAT-BELT INTEREST

That is what happened in the case of seat belts. When Federal agencies, led by the Public Health Service, began installing and using seat belts, the public began to take interest. The States began to take interest. State legislatures passed laws requiring seat belt attachments on new automobiles. The industry then began offering front seat attachments on 1962 models.

In our hearings on motor vehicle safety, the American Medical Association submitted a list of safety features repeatedly recommended by physicians, researchers, and safety engineers with little success. These included seat belt anchorages, crash padding, improved steering wheel, safety door locks, removal of dangerous knobs, securely anchored seats, the elimination of pointed hood ornaments, and other hazardous exterior design features.

My bill, which passed the House in 1959, has been reintroduced and is now pending before my subcommittee. Hearings have been held but some question has been raised as to which agency should set safety standards and we have not worked out that problem. The bill was bitterly opposed on the floor of the House on the grounds that it would increase the cost of automobiles bought by the Government. Even if it did, I say the increased cost would be justified. But cutting down on deaths and injuries will save money, even if we could measure the worth of human life in dollars.

ECONOMY NOT ENTIRE REASON

Furthermore, many or all of these essential safety features could be paid for by eliminating chrome and frills which serve no useful purpose. But, you will note that some of these recommendations such as eliminating hazardous knobs and gadgets, would cut costs. So economy cannot be the whole reason.

There seems to be a pride of authorship factor working here which makes any suggestion from a mere Congressman offensive to a professional designer of automobiles. Be that as it may, the Federal Government has a responsibility to its civilian employees and military personnel to provide them with the safest passenger vehicles possible. There is no question of States rights here. It is just a question of saving human lives and reducing expenses for disability pensions and death benefits. At the same time, by putting safer cars on the market we will be making a real contribution to safety.

Earlier I mentioned the growing demands from the public that the Federal Government do more to promote highway safety. Pressure increases each year for more drastic measures to meet this problem. Now, I am not one who believes that passing a law is the ideal way to solve any or all of our problems. As a nation, we abhor regulations, and rightly so—especially regulation at long range from Washington. We like to see things which must be done accomplished voluntarily. But the fact that we have food and drug laws is proof that things, even essential things, cannot always be done voluntarily. The fact that we have Federal regulation of aviation is proof that business, even big business, cannot always regulate itself.

It is impossible now to predict how far the Federal Government will go in the field of accident prevention, especially in promoting highway safety. It is safe to say that nothing will be done that does not have overwhelming public support. I am sure that the public would rather have the States and local communities make and enforce the rules needed to protect those who use the highways.

But regardless of that, I am sure that a National Accident Prevention Center can be a big help to all of us in preventing all types of accidents. I am convinced that Federal funds spent on such a Center would be a good investment.

Congressman Roberts Discusses His Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1962

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following speech, made by Representative Kenneth A. Roberts, of Alabama, on highway safety at a luncheon meeting of the executive committee of the National Committee on Uniform Traffic Laws and Ordinances, at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington, D.C., on January 16:

CONGRESSMAN ROBERTS DISCUSSES HIS BILLS

Representative Kenneth A. Roberts, of Alabama, expressed his views on highway safety in a talk at a luncheon meeting of the executive committee of the National Committee on Uniform Traffic Laws and Ordinances, at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington, D.C., on January 16.

Congressman Roberts explained the purposes back of two bills he has introduced in the U.S. House of Representatives which have been widely discussed in AAMVA circles in recent months.

Mr. Roberts is chairman of the Subcommittee on Health and Safety of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

One of his bills, H.R. 9433, would require that a person driving a motor vehicle in interstate commerce must hold a permit from a State which has a driver licensing law substantially in accord with chapter 6 of the Uniform Vehicle Code.

"My bill has been denounced as interfering with States rights," the Congressman said. "I do not see it that way. If a State adopts a driver licensing law substantially in agreement with chapter 6 of the Uniform Code, it has no problem," he added.

His other bill, H.R. 1341, would establish safety standards for passenger-carrying vehicles purchased by the Federal Government.

"Forced to meet safety standards set by the Government, manufacturers would be encouraged to offer these same features," Mr. Roberts said. "Furthermore, Government approval of certain safety features no doubt would lead to widespread public demands for the inclusion of these features on models offered to the public."

Because of the widespread interest in Mr. Roberts' legislative proposals, and in his views as a leader in the field of highway safety, his remarks are quoted below:

CONGRESSMAN ROBERTS' ADDRESS

I appreciate the opportunity to meet with this group which has made a very substantial contribution to the cause of highway safety.

There may be some differences of opinion about what can and should be done to promote highway safety but certainly all of us here today can agree upon the need for uniform traffic laws and ordinances.

In the years I have been working in the highway safety field, I have yet to encounter anyone who does not believe that adoption of the Uniform Vehicle Code would be a substantial contribution to safety.

A great deal of time and effort has been expended drawing up the code and urging its adoption. This has been going on since 1926, when the first code was written. Some progress has been made but still we have a long way to go.

A survey made by my subcommittee a year ago would indicate that in some States the progress is practically nil. In five States an effort is not even being made to check proposed new laws against the code to see if they conform, which would indicate almost a complete lack of interest in the code.

Everyone agrees that the code is important to safety and should be adopted. Mark Twain said people were always talking about the weather but never did anything about it. A lot of people seem to be the same way about the Uniform Code.

The Uniform Code is important but it is not the complete answer to our problem. In fact, as you well know, there is no complete answer. Slogans won't do it. Good intentions are not enough. We need coordinated effort along many fronts.

NEED FOR SAFER CARS

As you know, I have had a lot to say in recent years about the need for safer automobiles. I go along with Dr. T. P. Wright, vice president of research at Cornell University, and others, on the proposition that it is easier to build safer automobiles than to change human nature or traffic regulations.

Thousands of lives could be saved if the industry would follow the recommendations of the American Medical Association in designing certain essential safety features into new cars.

Some progress is being made in the area of seat belts and safety locks but we have a long way to go.

But I will admit other things need to be done. We need to eliminate highway death traps. We need periodic inspections to get a lot of dangerous vehicles off the roads.

DRIVER REGULATIONS

Another thing we can do is to tighten up our driver registration regulations and clamp down on the chronic law violators.

That was forcibly impressed upon me a few months back. I was driving down the highway with my family when we came upon a horrible accident in which some young children were terribly mangled and killed. The accident was blamed on an elderly driver who had no business driving. That horrible scene set me to wondering what I, as an individual, could do to help prevent such accidents.

Now, as you know, traditionally the States have the responsibility for licensing drivers. Therefore, of course, the place to get action is at the State level. All of us who have been trying to get the Uniform Code adopted have been directing our efforts toward action at the State level. You know better than I just how much has been accomplished.

It is sufficient to say that I have not found anyone who thinks the driver licensing laws of all of the 50 States are adequate.

To refresh my memory, I went back and read chapter 6 of the Uniform Code. That, as you know, deals with licenses for operators and chauffeurs.

Chapter 6 is not a drastic document. If every State in the Union adopted chapter 6, a lot of people who have no business driving could still drive. It will take more than chapter 6 to eliminate all of those drivers who are a menace to life and limb every time they get behind the steering wheel of a car.

Chapter 6 would not give us the periodical physical reexamination program which has been adopted in Pennsylvania. We are going to have to have something like that to get at the heart of the problem in the 50 States.

But chapter 6, if adopted and enforced in the 50 States, would be a great step forward. A lot of dangerous drivers would be kept off the streets and highways.

With that in mind, I introduced a bill (H.R. 9433) to require that a person driving a motor vehicle in interstate commerce must hold a permit from a State which has a driver licensing law which agrees substantially with chapter 6.

Up until that time I had not run across anyone who did not agree that we would be a lot better off if all the States had chapter 6. Now I am not so sure.

My bill has brought down a storm of protest. The bill was denounced at a recent meeting of the Committee on Enforcement and Traffic Safety of the American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators and members were urged to write their Congressmen and Senators in opposition to the legislation.

My bill has been denounced as interfering with States rights. I don't see it that way. If a State adopts a driver licensing law substantially in agreement with chapter 6 of the Uniform Code, it has no problem.

Now, if we do not approve of chapter 6, that is something else. Maybe chapter 6 should be revised.

If the objection to H.R. 9433 is to the language, that can be worked out. All that H.R. 9433 seeks to accomplish is the adoption of chapter 6 by the various States.

WHOSE RESPONSIBILITY?

It is generally agreed that the States have a responsibility in this matter of licensing drivers and enforcing the licensing laws.

It may be that the Federal Government has more responsibility than anyone has cared to acknowledge. If the Federal Government puts up 90 percent of the cost of the new interstate highway system, does not the Federal Government have some responsibility?

At least, that is the question a lot of people are asking. Many citizens, appalled by the slaughter on the highways, are getting impatient. They are writing their Congressmen asking us what we are going to do about highway safety. To me, that is a good sign. People are waking up to the need for action.

All of us who drive were shocked and horrified by the highway deaths during the recent holidays. True, the killed and injured represent but a fraction of the millions using the highways but that should be no consolation.

We all were horrified, and rightly so, when 77 persons died when a plane loaded with young military recruits crashed and burned near Richmond in November. That accident is the subject of a congressional investigation now underway.

But the slaughter on the highway goes on day and night. How many people have lost their lives on the highways since the Richmond airplane accident, I don't know, but the total is a lot more than 77.

My hometown of Anniston, Ala., had a population of 33,657 in 1960. Suppose we learned this afternoon that between now and December 31 every person in Anniston would be killed in an accidental explosion or some other manmade disaster.

We would be horrified We would move heaven and earth to save Anniston. Anyone who refused to contribute whatever he could to saving the lives of these good people would be shunned as an inhuman monster.

But too many people shun their responsibilities when it comes to doing something about the slaughter of 37,000 people on our highways each year. Too many adopt a "let George do it" attitude. Some, I regret to say, seem to be horrified if they are asked to make a small contribution in the way of a tax or a restriction on their freedom of movement. A person who wouldn't think of carrying a cocked and loaded shotgun onto a crowded bus, will get in an old car with inadequate brakes and try to set a new speed record between here and Baltimore.

Yet, a drunk with a loaded shotgun on a crowded bus is not as dangerous as the respectable citizen who gets in the driver's seat of a car after an evening's drinking.

So, I say we are going to have to wake up. Perhaps the Federal Government is going to have to step in to help the States and local communities get the job done.

Now, let me say that philosophically I am a States rights man. You will find me generally voting that way. But the States have responsibilities as well as rights.

Traditionally, the States have the responsibility of making and enforcing traffic safety laws. The States set safety standards for automobiles, issue permits to drivers, and so on.

But a long time ago we found that State control was inadequate insofar as interstate bus and truck traffic is concerned. So we have the Interstate Commerce Commission responsible for common carrier safety.

No one is advocating that this control should be relaxed or abolished. Most would say that it should be strengthened, especially in tightening up on vehicle safety standards and maintenance.

The Federal Government protects the public in a number of areas where State regulation is impossible or unreasonably cumbersome. I need only cite the pure food and drug laws. Would anyone claim that the Federal Government has no business in this field?

MORE RESEARCH NEEDED

Regardless of the answer to the question of whether the Federal Government should legislate on driver licensing or motor vehicle safety standards, some things can be done by the Federal Government without interfering with the States.

Research is one. The Federal Government is spending a lot of money on medical research and rightly so. Not enough is being spent on highway safety, which is a major public health problem.

When I was appointed chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Traffic Safety back in 1956, I set out to review the entire field to see what had been done and what could be done. I might say that the hearings held by the subcommittee in 1956 marked the first effort to "wrap up" in one package the story of highway safety activity in this country.

When we started out, I found that in the early 1950's the Public Health Service had set up an accident prevention program with a staff of four. This was for all accident prevention—not just highway safety. In 1956, the budget for this activity was in the neighborhood of $50,000. That is of interest when you compare it with the 37,000 annual death toll on our highways. In 1957, the Public Health Service, together with the American Public Health Association, and other groups, began to take greater interest in accident prevention.

This increased interest in safety has been supported in Congress. Last session Congress added $1 million to the budget for accident prevention.

When we held our hearings on safety last July the staff of the Division of Accident Prevention numbered 122 with 34 engaged primarily in traffic accident prevention work. So you can see, we are making progress. But a lot remains to be done, especially in the way of research.

SAFETY STANDARDS FOR VEHICLES

The Federal Government can move in other areas without infringing on the jurisdiction of the States.

The Federal Government could and should establish minimum safety standards for the passenger-carrying motor vehicles it buys.

Figures submitted to my subcommittee by the Bureau of Employees' Compensation show that for 1959 we had 3,912 Federal civilian employees injured in motor vehicle accidents, and 50 deaths. These employees lost 421,010 days from work as a result of these accidents, for a total direct cost to the Government of $4,335,207.

I have pending in the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce a bill which would do something about this. This bill, H.R. 1341, would establish safety standards for Government-owned passenger-carrying motor vehicles. We have accumulated an impressive amount of testimony from doctors, engineers, scientists, and safety experts in support of this bill.

My bill not only would help to reduce the cost of highway accidents to the Government but also would promote the building of safer automobiles for the public. Forced to meet safety standards set by the Government, manufacturers would be encouraged to offer these same features. Furthermore, Government approval of certain safety features no doubt would lead to widespread public demands for the inclusion of these features on models offered to the public.

My bill passed the House in 1959. The bill was bitterly opposed on the floor on the grounds that it would increase the cost of automobiles bought by the Government. Even if it did, I say the increased cost would be justified. But cutting down on deaths and injuries will save money, even if we could measure the worth of human life in dollars.

Furthermore, many or all of these essential safety features could be paid for by eliminating chrome and frills which serve no useful purpose. But, you will note that some of these recommendations such as eliminating hazardous knobs and gadgets would cut costs. So economy cannot be the whole reason. The Federal Government has a responsibility to its civilian employees and military personnel to provide them with the safest passenger vehicles possible. There is no question of States rights here. It is just a question of saving human lives and reducing expenses for disability pensions and death benefits. At the same time, by putting safer cars on the market we will be making a real contribution to safety.

THE FEDERAL ROLE

It is impossible now to predict how far the Federal Government will go in the safety field. It is safe to say that nothing will be done that does not have overwhelming public support. I am sure that the public would rather have the States and local communities make and enforce the rules needed to protect those who use the highways.

The Federal Government can make a great contribution in the field of research and in disseminating information. The Federal Government can help by testing and evaluating safety devices for its own vehicles.

My bill is not intended to take away from the States the responsibility for licensing drivers and enforcing the laws to get incompetent and dangerous drivers off the highways. Its purpose is to get the States to accept their responsibility.

If we are going to cut down the highway death toll, teamwork is necessary. The Federal Government must continue to work with the States and local communities. But the States and local communities must realize that this is a national problem in which they have very definite responsibilities.

ROCKEFELLER SUBMITS PROGRAM OF RECOMMENDED LEGISLATION

Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller of New York in his message to the legislature on January 3 said, in part:

"A vital factor in making New York State a better place to live is the impressive progress which has been made in the past 3 years in our approach to the basic factors involved in accident causation—the driver, the vehicle, and the highway.

"We are heartened that our record is the best in the State's history in that motor vehicle deaths have reached a new low in relation to miles traveled.

"However, we must continue our efforts to meet the traffic safety challenge. I urge:

"Legislation to subject all school bus drivers to chauffeur licensing requirements.

"Legislation to permit convictions of traffic violations in contiguous States as well as forfeitures of bail on traffic offenses to be included within the operation of the point system, and

"Consideration of appropriate standards for legislation to permit a broader program of driver reexamination."

GOVERNOR REQUESTS 70 MORE TROOPERS IN WEST VIRGINIA

Addition of 70 men to the State police force in West Virginia was recommended by Gov. W. W. Barron in his address to the legislature on January 10.

The opening of new interstate mileage in the State adds to the need for traffic supervision, the Governor said. Due to the great distance between fuel and repair shops on these modern highways, the State police must render assistance to stranded motorists as a matter of both safety and courtesy, he added.

"Accident prevention itself is a basic police responsibility," the Governor continued. "The presence of State troopers on the highway prevents violations that lead to accidents. It also relieves congestion, and this increases the effectiveness of the State's overall traffic pattern.

"We are going to cut down the killing of our citizens on the highways—we must cut down this killing. This proposed legislation is one way in which we can do it without wasting any more time."

SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1962

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

Rev. Wilbur E. Hammaker, D.D., bishop of the Methodist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

O God, our help in ages past,
 Our hope for years to come;
Our shelter from the stormy blast;
 Unto Thee we come.

On this anniversary day, like the Father of our Country, we look unto Thee as the hope of our land and of the whole, wide world. As he in his turbulent, troubled time leaned heavily on Thee, as the Almighty One, so we, in another hour beset by ominous and fearful potentials, feel our hope to be in Thee. Illumine our encircling darkness with the light of Thy countenance.

Grant unto us, as Thou didst unto George Washington, a sense of Thy imminent grace and goodness. Be for us a pillar of cloud by day, and of fire by night.

We are mindful of the way Thou hast guided our Nation in other times of turbulent uncertainties and potential disasters. Rejoicing in our strength and continuing worldly conquests of time and space, we beseech Thee to keep us aware that "Thou art the Ruler yet." Grant that we may ever, as individuals and as a nation, hold Thee in awe, and cherish Thine ancient sacrifice, an humble and a contrite heart. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, February 21, 1962, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8723) to amend the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act with respect to the method of enforcement and to provide certain additional sanctions, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. POWELL, Mr. ROOSEVELT, Mr. DENT, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. KEARNS, Mr. HIESTAND, and Mr. GOODELL were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 67. An act for the relief of Col. Samuel Hale;

S. 235. An act for the relief of Evagelos Mablekos;

S. 241. An act for the relief of Haralambos Agourakis;

S. 429. An act for the relief of A1c. Percy J. Trudeau;

S. 521. An act for the relief of Charles J. Utterback;

S. 531. An act for the relief of Eugenia Chrzastowski;

S. 1076. An act for the relief of Nancie Ellen Williamson;

S. 1348. An act for the relief of Sulzbach Construction Co.;

S. 1560. An act for the relief of Yasuko Otsu;

S. 1685. An act for the relief of Brigitte Marie Ida Kroll;

S. 1776. An act for the relief of Frances E. Sarcone;

S. 1791. An act for the relief of Dr. Tzycheng Peng;

S. 1832. An act for the relief of Susanne Rae Deremo;

S. 1866. An act for the relief of Dr. Berchmans Rioux;

S. 1870. An act for the relief of Lucia Bianca Cianto Rosa;

S. 2149. An act for the relief of Hugo Kolberg;

S. 2163. An act for the relief of Saifook Chan;

S. 2385. An act for the relief of Dr. Hau Cheong Kwaan, his wife, Tech Phaik Koui Kwaan, and their daughter, Laura Wai Man Kwaan;

H.R. 74. An act to reimburse the city of New York for expenditure of funds to rehabilitate slip 7 in the city of New York for use by the U.S. Army;

H.R. 258. An act to amend the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act to increase the rate of tax imposed on certain gross receipts, to amend the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Parking Facility Act of 1942 to transfer certain parking fees and other moneys to the highway fund, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1375. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the former owner thereof;

H.R. 4934. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to modify certain leases entered into for the provision of recreation facilities in reservoir areas;

H.R. 8625. An act for the relief of Dennis H. O'Grady;

H.R. 8842. An act to amend subsection (h) of section 124 of the Agricultural Enabling Amendments Act of 1961; and

H.R. 9013. An act to provide for the transfer of rice acreage history where producer withdraws from the production of rice.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the order respecting the reading of Washington's Farewell Address immediately after the approval of the Journal today, the Senate may now proceed to the transaction of legislative business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON ANTENNA FOR ROSMAN, N.C., DATA ACQUISITION FACILITY

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on an antenna for the Rosman, N.C., Data Acquisition Facility; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

Report of Attorney General on Competition in the Synthetic Rubber Industry

A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Attorney General on competition in the synthetic rubber industry, for the year 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Report on Review of Voluntary Agreements and Programs

A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Attorney General on review of voluntary agreements and programs, as of February 9, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the **VICE PRESIDENT**:

A resolution of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Kentucky; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Senate Resolution 14

"Resolution relating to foreign spending

"Whereas it has become apparent that the United States has already spent over $101 billion in foreign aid from mid-1945 until now; and

"Whereas our Government has given Communist dictator Marshal Tito, of Yugoslavia, $2.4 billion, including $700 million in military aid; and

"Whereas our Government has given Premier Nehru of India $2.8 billion of aid, and they have been assured of an additional allocation in spite of his unwarranted attack on Portugal's Goa; and

"Whereas over $900 million has already been given to Communist Poland with more to come; and

"Whereas over 600 million U.S. tax dollars has been wasted on Egypt's Nasser with no tangible results; and

"Whereas Communist Indonesia's Sukarno has received over 700 million American dollars and at the same time is threatening to grab property of one of our allies, the Netherlands;

"Whereas the known Soviet bridgehead, Ghana, in Africa, has been assured of a very large grant of U.S. dollars; and

"Whereas the United States will close our current fiscal year on June 30, 1962, with an estimated deficit for the current year of $7.8 billion; and

"Whereas the United States after giving its riches over the years, now is having to turn to Western Europe for help in bolstering the hard-pressed U.S. dollar and in helping to meet some of the burdens of Western defense and of aid to the underdeveloped countries: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky:

"Section 1. That the Kentucky State Senate memorializes the Congress of the United States that all aid to Communist dominated, alined, or controlled, countries, and specifically those set forth above, be stopped at once, and to remain stopped as long as they are identified in manner with any phase of the Communist doctrine, and that the moneys and aid that has herefore been used for this purpose be spent in the distressed areas of our United States to raise their standard of living to the same level as the rest of the United States.

"Sec. 2. That the chief clerk of the senate forward a copy of this resolution to each member of the Kentucky delegation in the Congress and to the Chief Clerk of the U.S. Senate."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Government Operations:

"House Memorial 1

"Memorial petitioning the Congress of the United States of transfer of the present site and building of the Santa Fe post office, when it is declared surplus, to the State of New Mexico for the utilization of such site and building for a State museum

"Whereas the General Services Administration has announced plans to begin construction of a new post office and Federal building for the city of Santa Fe in the near future; and

"Whereas the present post office site and building located on Cathedral Place in Santa Fe, will be vacated upon completion of the new structure; and

"Whereas the architectural style and floor plan of the present Santa Fe post office building and its proximity to the historic Santa Fe plaza and palace of the Governors makes it admirably suited for a State anthropological museum; and

"Whereas the present facilities of the Museum of New Mexico are no longer capable of expansion to accommodate prehistoric Indian exhibits and other artifacts of an ethnological nature; and

"Whereas more than 200,000 American and foreign tourists, scholars, and students visit Santa Fe each year for the purpose of viewing and studying these antiquities of the West: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be respectfully petitioned to pass the necessary legislation permitting the transfer of the present site and building of the Santa Fe post office, upon its being declared surplus by the General Services Administration, to the State of New Mexico for utilization as a State anthropological museum; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate, the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Honorable Franklin Floete, Administrator of General Services, the Honorable Dennis Chavez and the Honorable Clinton P. Anderson, U.S. Senators from New Mexico, and the Honorable Thomas G. Morris and the Honorable Joseph M. Montoya, U.S. Congressmen from New Mexico.

"Jack M. Campbell,
"Speaker, House of Representatives.
"Albert Romero,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives."

A resolution adopted by the California State Board of Agriculture, Sacramento, Calif., relating to agriculture cooperatives and patronage dividends; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Federation of Lithuanian-American Roman Catholic Societies, of Dayton, Ohio, urging the United Nations be directed to make demands that Lithuania and other captive nations of Eastern Europe be given the opportunity of reestablishing their own governments by means of free and unfettered elections; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Gainesville, Ga., opposing the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing; ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. **HAYDEN**, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S.J. Res. 152. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Dr. Caryl P. Haskins as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution (Rept. No. 1210);

S.J. Res. 153. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Dr. Crawford H. Greenewalt as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution (Rept. No. 1211);

S. Con. Res. 56. Concurrent resolution to print as a Senate document "A Report of U.S. Foreign Policy and Operations" (Rept. No. 1212);

S. Res. 290. Resolution to print, with additional copies, a pamphlet entitled "Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Meeting, London, England, 1961" (Rept. No. 1213);

S. Res. 295. Resolution to authorize a study by the Committee on Armed Services on strategic and critical stockpiling (Rept. No. 1214); and

S. Res. 297. Resolution to print copies of a hearing on export of strategic materials to Soviet-bloc countries (Rept. No. 1215).

By Mr. **HAYDEN**, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment:

S. Res. 293. Resolution to investigate problems created by flow of escapees and refugees from communistic tyranny (Rept. No. 1216).

By Mr. **MANSFIELD**, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. Res. 299. Resolution to print additional copies of the hearings on Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962.

By Mr. **CURTIS**, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments:

S. Res. 298. Resolution to print a compilation of tributes to the Honorable Carl Hayden as a Senate document.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1962

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, yesterday the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan], from the Committee on Government Operations, reported Senate Resolution 299, for the printing of additional copies of the hearings on Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962, and the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration. I have checked with the members of the committee, and they give their wholehearted approval to this resolution. Therefore, Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report the resolution, and I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may be considered at this time. The reason for this unusual request in this instance is that if the resolution is agreed to it will mean a great saving in the cost of the printing of the material the committee has in mind.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. Metcalf in the chair). Is there objection to the request for the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 299) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use the Committee on Government Operations three thousand five hundred additional copies of the hearings on Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962.

PRINTING OF COMPILATION OF TRIBUTES TO SENATOR HAYDEN

Mr. **CURTIS**. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration

I report favorably, with amendments, Senate Resolution 298, and I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 298) to print a compilation of tributes to Hon. CARL HAYDEN as a Senate document, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments, on page 1, in line 3, after the word "Senate", to insert "and the floor of the United States House of Representatives,", and in line 6, after the word "that", to insert "fifteen thousand"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That there be printed as a Senate document a compilation of tributes, together with other related material, delivered on the floor of the United States Senate and the floor of the United States House of Representatives, to commemorate the occasion of the fiftieth year of congressional service of the Honorable CARL HAYDEN, of Arizona; and that fifteen thousand additional copies be printed for the use of the Joint Committee on Printing.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, the resolution is self-explanatory. Many Senators and also many Members of the House of Representatives have spoken on the life and works of Senator CARL HAYDEN. It is not my purpose at this time to add to those statements; but I point out that this is a historical event, not only in the life of Arizona, but also in the life of the Republic. I believe that by preserving in print his great record, we shall be rendering a service to the general public and to the youth that will follow. I am sure the resolution will be unanimously agreed to.

I may state, for the information of Senators, that the compilation of the remarks relating to the life and works of Senator HAYDEN will not be assembled for the Public Printer until about Wednesday of next week, so as to make possible the inclusion of any remarks made prior to that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

SENATE MEMBERS OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING AND JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 300) providing for the appointment of Senate members of the Joint Committee on Printing and the Joint Committee on the Library.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 300) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That Mr. CURTIS be, and he is hereby, elected a member on the part of the Senate of the Joint Committee on Printing, vice Mr. MILLER; that Mr. DIRKSEN be, and he is hereby, elected a member on the part of the Senate of the Joint Committee on the Library, vice Mr. KEATING; and that Mr. PEARSON be, and is hereby, elected a member on the part of the Senate of the Joint Committee on the Library, vice Mr. MILLER.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE REPORT NO. 448 ON "STUDY OF ADMINISTERED PRICES IN THE DRUG INDUSTRY" (S. REPT. NO. 1217)

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 59) to print additional copies of Senate Report No. 448, 87th Congress, on "Study of Administered Prices in the Drug Industry," and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution, which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary two thousand additional copies of Senate Report Numbered 448, Eighty-seventh Congress, first session, entitled "Study of Administered Prices in the Drug Industry", a report issued by the Committee on the Judiciary and made by its Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly pursuant to S. Res. 52, Eighty-seventh Congress.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 59) was considered and agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement explaining the purposes of this measure.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPLANATION

The Committee on Rules and Administration having considered an original concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 59) authorizing the printing for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary of 2,000 additional copies of Senate Report No. 448, 87th Congress, entitled "Study of Administered Prices in the Drug Industry," issued by the Committee on the Judiciary and made by its Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly pursuant to Senate Resolution 52, 87th Congress, reported favorably thereon and recommended that the concurrent resolution be agreed to by the Senate.

Senate Resolution 287, submitted by Mr. KEFAUVER on January 30, 1962, and the same day referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, would have authorized the printing of the additional copies as specified above. The printing cost estimate, however ($1,780.61), exceeds the maximum permissible under a simple resolution. Since Senator KEFAUVER has assured the Committee on Rules and Administration of the subcommittee's need for the additional copies of the report, the Committee on Rules and Administration is reporting this concurrent resolution in lieu of Senate Resolution 287 to accomplish the desired purpose.

The printing cost estimate supplied by the Public Printer is as follows:

Back to press, first 1,000 copies	$1,494.28
1,000 additional copies at $286.33 per thousand	286.33
Total estimated cost, S. Res. 287	1,780.61

A letter in support of Senate Resolution 287, addressed to Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, by Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, chairman of the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary, is as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON ANTITRUST
AND MONOPOLY,
February 1, 1962.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: As you know, Senate Resolution 287, which I introduced on January 30, calls for the printing of 2,000 additional copies of Senate Report No. 448, entitled "Study of Administered Prices in the Drug Industry," originally printed on June 27, 1961.

This report presents the views of the members of the subcommittee on the investigation of the ethical drug industry during the past 2 years. For this reason there has been a very great demand for copies and the supply is almost exhausted. S. 1552, the drug industry antitrust bill which I introduced last year, is scheduled for legislative action during this session of the 87th Congress. There will therefore be an even greater demand for copies of Senate Report No. 448 by the general public, by universities, and by the drug industry, but particularly by Members of the Congress. It is for this reason that I have made my request for an additional printing.

Sincerely yours,
ESTES KEFAUVER,
Chairman.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States, dated February 7, 1962, that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon, pursuant to law.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 2881. A bill for the relief of Comdr. Robert C. Olson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 2882. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 2883. A bill to modify the project for the Beaver Reservoir on the White River, Arkansas, to permit construction of certain water supply facilities; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROBERTSON (by request):

S. 2884. A bill to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, to give Puerto Rico the same treatment as a State in the election of Federal Home Loan Bank Directors; and

S. 2885. A bill to repeal certain legislation relating to the purchase of silver, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. ROBERTSON when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF REPORT ENTITLED "ADMINISTERED PRICES, DRUGS"

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 59) authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate Report No. 448, 87th Congress, entitled "Study of Administered Prices in the Drug Industry," and submitted a report thereon, which report was ordered to be printed, and the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full, which appears under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION

SENATE MEMBERS OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING AND JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 300) providing for the appointment of Senate members of the Joint Committee on Printing and the Joint Committee on the Library, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL POWER ACT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request of the Federal Power Commission, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Federal Power Act. I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Chairman of the Commission, together with a statement by the Commission relating to the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2882) to amend the Federal Power Act, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter and statement presented by Mr. MAGNUSON are as follows:

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., February 16, 1962.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Supplementing my letter of January 22 transmitting our recommended amendments to the Natural Gas Act, there is enclosed herewith a draft bill to amend the Federal Power Act. This draft is intended to carry out the Commission's legislative recommendations (items 12 through 19) as set forth in its 41st annual report (1961), pages 3-5. As stated in our earlier transmittal, no new draft is submitted to replace S. 1605 and H.R. 6956 relating to internal delegation of Commission authority. We favor this proposal (item 20) and believe the pending bills are entirely satisfactory. There is also enclosed a statement of our reasons for desiring the enactment of this group of amendments.

Sincerely yours,
JOSEPH C. SWIDLER,
Chairman.

STATEMENT TO ACCOMPANY DRAFT BILL TO AMEND THE FEDERAL POWER ACT

Our reasons for urging enactment of the various amendments are set forth below in brief. The suggested changes are discussed in the order that we followed in summarizing our legislative proposals in the Commission's 41st annual report. This sequence has been adopted for reasons of convenience, rather than to indicate priority.

I

Section I, items 1 through 11, relates to our proposed amendments to the Natural Gas Act.

II

12. Federal Power Act—Exemption of small hydroelectric projects: Pursuant to section 10(i), minor hydroelectric projects licensed by the Commission may be exempted, in the Commission's discretion, from certain conditions and requirements of the act. It is proposed that the dividing line between minor and major products be changed from 100 to 2,000 horsepower installed capacity. This change in section 10(i) would necessitate corresponding changes in the language of subsections (b) and (e) of section 10. Section 2 of the draft bill to amend the Federal Power Act would enact this recommendation.

S. 1606, 87th Congress, which has the same purpose, passed the Senate on August 14, 1961. As stated in the report of the Senate Commerce Committee to accompany that bill (S. Rept. No. 664, Aug. 4, 1961), projects of less than 2,000 horsepower do not have sufficient significance in the development of water resources to warrant their being made subject to the comprehensive conditions which are commonly attached to licenses for major projects. No control over a licensee would be sacrificed by the amendment, but there would be a saving in regulatory activity, to the mutual advantage of the licensees, the Commission, and the other agencies of the United States having an interest in licensing proceedings.

13. Federal Power Act—Abandonment of interstate facilities and service: Amend section 202 of the act by adding a new subsection (g) requiring Commission approval of the abandonment of interstate electric sales or service. Section 5 of the draft bill would effectuate this proposal. S. 1607, 87th Congress, which contains the same amendment, passed the Senate on August 14, 1961.

The Commission believes that an interstate electric service fulfilling a public need should not be abandoned without a finding by the agency that such abandonment is consistent with the public interest.

Interstate facilities will become of increasing importance as the Nation's electric systems expand their interconnections to take full advantage of the economies of coordinated operations. It is essential that the parties served by these interstate facilities be protected against arbitrary abandonment of service. This bill requiring Commission approval before interstate service could be abandoned would afford all parties this needed protection and thereby encourage greater use of a fully coordinated and more efficient interstate power supply system. The Senate Commerce Committee, in its report on the bill S. 1607 (S. Rept. 663), concluded that the change was sound and in keeping with the scheme of the act.

14. Federal Power Act—Interconnection of facilities: Amend section 202(b) of the act so as to give the Commission authority to direct interconnection of electric facilities "on its own motion" in the limited circumstances therein provided. Section 202(b) of the act gives the Commission authority to direct interconnections that will not compel the enlargement of generating facilities or impair the public utility's ability to render adequate service to its customers. This proposal would not enlarge the Commission's authority but would merely give it the right to institute the same proceedings on its own motion which may now be instituted upon application of any State commission or of any person engaged in the transmission or sale of electric energy.

15. Federal Power Act—Permanent connections for emergency use: Repeal the last proviso in subsection (d) of section 202 of the act which permits persons engaged in the transmission and sale of electric energy but not subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission to make permanent connections of facilities for the emergency transmission of electric energy in interstate commerce without becoming thereby subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission.

Section 202(d) is a loophole in our jurisdiction which permits a utility to interconnect across State lines for emergency purposes without assuming the responsibilities of other interstate public utilities subject to our jurisdiction. Interconnections among utilities for emergency operations are valuable and it is the Commission's purpose to encourage further interconnections not only for emergencies but to take advantage of all of the savings from a fully interconnected system of power supply in this country. We believe, however, that improvement in the economy and dependability of operations is more than sufficient to encourage utilities to interconnect and that the public interest requires that all interstate operations be treated alike and made subject to the provisions of the Federal Power Act. The present provision permitting permanent interconnections for use in an emergency without subjecting the utility to the other provisions of the act tends to discourage those utilities from utilizing such interconnections for other than emergency purposes. Such interconnections, once made, should be available for all purposes.

16. Federal Power Act—Importation and exportation of electric energy: Repeal subsection (f) of section 202 of the act which removes from the Federal regulatory provisions governing "public utilities" persons transmitting electric energy across an international boundary to or from a State adjacent to the boundary and in which such energy is consumed or generated. Section 4(c) of the draft would effectuate this proposal.

The subsection was added to the statute by act of August 7, 1953 (67 Stat. 461). The repeal proposed by this item is complementary to our proposal to amend the Natural Gas Act (see item 10).

Foreign commerce in electric energy is an integrally related part of the whole national power complex. Its importance is indicated by the existing requirement that exportation is permitted only with Commission approval (sec. 202(e)). We do not believe that the area carved out of the Federal jurisdiction by the 1953 amendment to the Power Act should remain a "no man's land." Transmission of electric energy by utilities operating in border States across international boundaries to or from border States is at least as much affected with a public interest as is transmission by the same or other utilities between States within the boundaries of the United States. There is no sound reason for the exemption, and every reason why an important electric system engaging in transportation across international boundaries should be subject to the same regulation as if its transactions took place with power companies in sister States.

17. Federal Power Act—Additional authority with respect to the transmission of electric energy in foreign commerce: (a) Amend sections 201 and 202(e) of the act so as to include foreign commerce within the coverage of the act and define persons engaged in the importation and exportation of electric energy as "public utilities" so far as their operations in the United States are concerned, and (b) revise section 202(e) so as to require Commission authority to import as well as export electric energy and to provide that orders issued pursuant thereto be entered upon findings that the proposed importation or exportation would not impair the sufficiency of the supply in the United States or impede the coordination in the public interest of jurisdictional facilities (rather than, as now provided, that such orders "shall issue" unless the Commission finds that the supply would be impaired or coordination in the public interest impeded). Sections 4(a) and 4(b) of the draft would enact this recommendation.

Jurisdiction over the importation of electric energy is as necessary to make effective the coordination of facilities in integrated systems as is the control of exportation now provided by the act. The amendment to section 202(e) would, in addition, place the burden of supporting any propossed importation or exportation more clearly upon the applicant where it is properly belongs.

18. Federal Power Act—Filing license and cost documents: Repeal the requirements in section 4(b) and section 6 of the Federal Power Act that statements of licensed project cost and copies of licenses be filed with the Secretary of the Treasury and the General Accounting Office, respectively. Section 1 of the draft would effectuate the repeal.

The filings have been found by the agencies involved to be unnecessary in the public interest. Both Treasury and GAO concur in the recommendation.

19. Federal Power Act—Expiration of licenses; recapture standards: Amend section 14 of the act, relating to the right of the United States to take over, maintain, and operate a hydroelectric project upon the expiration of the license therefor, so as to direct the Commission, prior to the expiration of license, to make a study and investigation and to prepare recommendations with respect to the future ownership and operation of the project works involved. Also, amend the section to declare that the standard by which the Commission shall be guided in making such recommendations shall be the most effective conservation and utilization of the Nation's water resources in the public interest. Section 3 of the draft bill would enact this proposal.

The Federal Water Power Act (now part I of the Federal Power Act) was enacted in 1920 and the first of these licenses with 50-year terms will expire in 1970. Section 14 of the act provides that when licenses expire the United States has the right to take over and operate the project works. However, the section does not fix a standard or establish procedures which would aid Congress in determining whether the United States should exercise its recapture rights. Without some procedure for determining the future of these projects there will be great uncertainty as to their status and the status of the power systems of which they are a part. There will also be uncertainty as to whether the Government's recapture rights can be made effective. The proposed amendment seeks to fill this gap in the interest of the power systems involved as well as provide a procedure to aid Congress in exercising its statutory recapture rights.

The Commission, in view of its comprehensive responsibilities relating to electric energy and its experience in licensing and then regulating the very projects which are subject to recapture, is uniquely qualified to consider the many factors bearing upon the public interest, including the effect which recapture would have upon existing power systems, as well as the most advantageous use of the project works for all public purposes. We urge early enactment of the proposal to permit the Commission to begin its studies of these projects at once so that the Commission's recommendations will be available to Congress sufficiently in advance of the time when the licenses begin to expire to aid Congress in reaching timely decisions under the recapture provisions of the statute.

III

20. Delegation of functions: Amend the Federal Power and Natural Gas Act so as to give the Commission authority to delegate (with certain exceptions) to subordinates any portion of its work, business, or functions now requiring Commission action under those acts. No new language is being submitted since the pending bills, S. 1605 and H.R. 6956, are entirely satisfactory.

The Commission has before it large numbers of more or less formal applications which involve no novel questions of policy or principle but merely a routine determination that the facts are as represented. Authority to delegate matters of this kind would conserve the time and energy of the Commissioners, permit a more orderly dispatch of its work, and permit Commission action with dispatch on matters covered by delegations whether or not a quorum of the Commission was available.

EQUALITY AS A STATE FOR PUERTO RICO IN ELECTION OF FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK DIRECTORS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 7 of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act so as to give the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico treatment similar to that of a State in the election of Federal home loan bank directors. This bill is requested by the Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

I ask unanimous consent that his letter of transmittal, together with an enclosed memorandum concerning the bill, be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and memorandum will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2884) to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, to give Puerto Rico the same treatment as a State in the election of Federal home loan bank directors, introduced by Mr. ROBERTSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The letter and memorandum presented by Mr. ROBERTSON are as follows:

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD,
Washington, D.C., February 16, 1962.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

SIR: There is transmitted herewith a draft for a bill to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act so as to give the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico treatment similar to that of a State for the purpose of election of Federal home loan bank directors. The Federal Home Loan Bank Board recommends that this proposed legislation be enacted.

The provisions of the draft are summarized and explained in an analysis which is transmitted herewith.

Advice has been received from the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the presentation of the draft bill to the Congress from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH P. MCMURRAY,
Chairman.

ANALYSIS OF DRAFT OF FEBRUARY 12, 1962, FOR A BILL TO AMEND SECTION 7 OF FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK ACT TO GIVE THE COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO TREATMENT SIMILAR TO THAT OF A STATE IN THE ELECTION OF FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK DIRECTORS

The attached draft would if enacted give the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico treatment similar to that of a State for the purpose of the election of directors of the Federal Home Loan Bank of the district in which the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico is from time to time located.

It is believed that such recognition is warranted by the degree of self-government obtained by the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and by the growth and stature which the savings and loan industry has attained in that Commonwealth.

Each Federal Home Loan Bank has a board of 12 directors, 8 elected by the members for 2-year terms and 4 appointed by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board for 4-year terms, except that in a district of 5 or more States the Board may increase the elective directors to not over 13 and the appointive directors to not more than half the number of elective directors. Such an increase has been made only in the district of the Federal Home Loan Bank of San Francisco.

Under previous law, the eight elective directors of a bank were divided into four equal groups, representing respectively the large, medium-sized, and small members and the members at large. However, Public Law 87–211, approved September 8, 1961, and effective on January 2, 1962, abolished this division into groups. It provides, instead, that the elective directorships of a district shall from time to time be allocated by the Board among the States of the district in approximate proportion to the required stock holdings of the members from the respective States, with a minimum of one and a maximum of six and an overriding grandfather clause preserving, as a minimum, each State's representation as it existed on December 31, 1960.

For election purposes the term "State" is defined, both in the previous law and under Public Law 87–211, as meaning "the States of the Union and the District of Columbia." Consequently, the members located in Puerto Rico—which is presently in the district of the Federal Home Loan Bank of New York—will not have the right to have any elective directorship specifically set apart for them. They will have the right, under other provisions of the amended statute, to be designated as "located" in one of the States of the district, and to participate in the nomination and election of directors representing that State. This, however, would merely prevent them from being disfranchised, and would not afford them specific representation on the board of the Bank.

Under the attached draft, the definition in question would be amended to read as follows: "The term 'States' or 'State' as used in this section shall mean the States of the Union, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico." If this definition were adopted, Puerto Rico would be treated the same as the States of the

Union and the District of Columbia in the allocation of elective directorships.

However, such a change in definition would not increase the number of elective directorships of the district, and under certain conditions it could result in situations in which the allocation of a directorship to Puerto Rico would mean that some other State would be deprived of an elective directorship which would otherwise be assigned to it. Further, it would not make possible the assignment to Puerto Rico of a specific directorship without the necessity of making repeated use of the grandfather clause to preserve the December 31, 1960, representation of some other State.

In order to mitigate these situations, the attached draft provides that the Board, by regulation or otherwise, may add an additional elective directorship to the board of directors of the bank of any district in which the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico is included at the time such directorship is added and which does not then include five or more States. It may be noted that if the district included five or more States the situation could then be handled, in any situation likely to arise, by the exercise of the power of the Board to increase the number of elective directors of such district.

The draft provides that the Board may fix the commencement and the duration, not to exceed 2 years, of the initial term of a directorship so added, and may fill such initial term by appointment. The Board would thus be able to provide such a directorship immediately upon the effective date of the measure. Also, the draft provides for designation of such additional directorship for the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and for the automatic cessation of its existence if the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico should cease to be included in the district. In that event the power to establish an additional directorship could be used again in the district to which the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico was transferred, assuming that the condition necessary to its exercise existed in that district.

No appreciable or significant increase in expenses of the Board would, it is believed, be caused by enactment of the proposed legislation.

REPEAL OF SILVER PURCHASE ACTS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, last November the President announced the decision to ask for the eventual demonetization of silver, except for its use in subsidiary coinage. At that time he instructed the Secretary of the Treasury to stop selling free silver and to suspend the use of free silver held by the Treasury for coinage. Instead, to meet coinage needs, the President directed the Secretary of the Treasury to use silver obtained by retiring appropriate amounts of $5 and $10 silver certificates.

The President announced at that time that he would seek additional legislation to carry out this policy. Subsequently, in his Economic Report transmitted January 20, 1962, the President reiterated his intention to recommend a revision of our silver policy.

The Senate has now received a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury enclosing a draft of a proposed bill which would carry out the decision announced last November.

In accordance with this request, I introduce the bill transmitted by Secretary Dillon, and I ask unanimous consent that the letter of transmittal dated February 20, 1962, and the correspondence between the Secretary of the Treasury and the President in November of 1961 be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and correspondence will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2885) to repeal certain legislation relating to the purchase of silver, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ROBERTSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The letter and correspondence presented by Mr. ROBERTSON are as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D.C., February 20, 1962.
Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Last November the President directed me to suspend further sales of free silver and to suspend the use of free silver for coinage. He also directed that silver to meet coinage needs be obtained by retiring $5 and $10 silver certificates. At the same time he said that he would recommend to Congress that it repeal the acts relating to the purchase of silver, that is, the acts of June 19, 1934, July 6, 1939, and July 31, 1946, as well as the provisions of law imposing a tax on the transfers of interest in silver bullion. In addition, he said he would ask Congress to authorize the Federal Reserve banks to issue Federal Reserve notes of $1 denomination.

The attached draft of bill would accomplish these ends.

The Silver Purchase Act of 1934 had for its main purpose the purchase of silver, particularly foreign and secondary silver, until silver should comprise one-fourth of our total gold and silver monetary stocks. At the time this act was enacted it was estimated that the purchase of approximately 1.3 billion ounces of silver would accomplish that end. Yet while over 2 billion ounces were purchased under the act, by the begining of 1942 silver comprised only 15.7 percent of our gold and silver monetary stocks. The act did not make purchases mandatory, however, providing rather that they should be made only at such times as the Secretary of the Treasury found it in the public interest. Since 1942, no Secretary of the Treasury has deemed it to be in the public interest to purchase silver under this act. In view of this, the act has in fact been inoperative for 20 years.

The act of July 6, 1939, provided for the receipt of newly mined domestic silver by the Treasury at a specified price, but the operating provisions of this act were superseded by the act of July 31, 1946, under which the Treasury has since that time purchased newly mined domestic silver and made sales of silver for industrial purposes. The supply and demand for silver during the period July 31, 1946, to early 1959 resulted in the Treasury purchasing 375 million ounces of newly mined domestic silver, whereas it sold less than 24 million ounces during the same period. After early 1959, market conditions had changed so that the Treasury sold silver continuously until sales were stopped on November 28, 1961, when the free stocks from which sales were made were almost exhausted. During that period the Treasury purchased only about a million ounces of silver while selling more than 115 million ounces. Since both purchases and sales under it have completely stopped, the 1946 act is not now operative.

When the Silver Purchase Act was enacted in 1934, speculation in silver futures led to the inclusion of a provision, now incorporated in the Internal Revenue Code, imposing a 50-percent tax on the gain from the transfer of an interest in silver bullion. This regulatory tax will not be needed when the silver purchase legislation is repealed. It should be made ineffective with respect to transfers of silver acquired after enactment of the repealing legislation in order to permit the establishment of a futures market in silver.

The slightly more than $2 billion of silver certificates in circulation as of December 31, 1961, constituted less than 7 percent of our total of more than $31 billion of paper currency. The Treasury is now gradually retiring these silver certificates in order to release silver for coinage needs. About 500 million ounces, roughly an 8-year coinage supply, can be obtained by retiring silver certificates in denominations of $5 and larger. The Federal Reserve System, which now provides about 97 percent of the currency in these denominations, can provide any additional amounts found to be necessary. To secure further supplies of silver it will be necessary to retire $1 silver certificates, which will provide a further 20- to 25-year supply based upon present coinage requirements. Since at present the Federal Reserve banks can issue notes only in denominations of $5 and larger, the proposed bill would provide for necessary currency in the $1 denomination by authorizing the Federal Reserve banks to issue it.

The conditions of the depression years which led to the adoption of the silver legislation no longer exist. The purchases of silver by the Treasury between 1934 and 1959 took off the market the large surplus that was depressing the price. More recently, however, industrial uses of silver have expanded so greatly, and industrial consumption is so steadily increasing, that legislation designed to support the price of silver as a commodity is not necessary. Silver is already being withdrawn from our currency reserves, and it is now time to repeal the out-of-date silver purchase legislation.

It is requested that you lay the proposed bill, which will carry out the specific recommendations of the President in his Economic Report, before the Senate. A similar proposal has been sent to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that this proposal is in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS DILLON.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., November 28, 1961.
Hon. DOUGLAS DILLON,
Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On the basis of your recommendations and the studies conducted by the Treasury and other departments, I have reached the decision that silver metal should gradually be withdrawn from our monetary reserves.

Simultaneously with the publication of this letter, you are directed to suspend further sales of free silver, and to suspend use of free silver held by the Treasury for coinage. In this way, the remaining stock and any subsequently acquired can be used, at your discretion, to contribute to the maintenance of an orderly market in silver and for such other special purposes as you may determine. In order to meet coinage needs, the amount of silver required for this purpose should be obtained by retirement from circulation of a sufficient number of $5 and $10 silver certificates.

Pursuant to this general determination, I intend to recommend to Congress, when it reconvenes, that it repeal the acts relating to silver of June 19, 1934, July 6, 1939, and July 31, 1946. The existing tax on transfers of interest in silver bullion has been necessary only to provide reinforcement for this legislation. I will therefore simultaneously propose that the relevant portion of the Internal Revenue Code also be repealed.

These actions will permit the establishment of a broad market for trading in silver on a current and forward basis comparable to the markets in which other commodities are traded. Our new policy will in effect provide for the eventual demonetization of silver except for its use in subsidiary coinage.

Although the potential supply of silver now embodied in the outstanding $5 and $10 certificates will be sufficient to cover coinage requirements for a number of years, I believe this is an appropriate time to provide for the gradual release of the silver now required as backing for $1 and $2 silver certificates. I shall therefore also recommend that legislation be enacted to accomplish this purpose and authorize the Federal Reserve banks to include these denominations in the range of notes they are permitted to issue.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D.C., November 27, 1961.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Treasury has, as you requested, been studying for some time the uses of silver in our monetary system. Informal conferences have also been held with other departments in your administration, with the Federal Reserve, and with leading representatives of both silver producing and consuming interests. It now seems appropriate to recommend several changes in our silver procedures, largely because of the change that has taken place in the world position of silver.

The industrial uses of silver have been expanding greatly and the industrial consumption of silver is steadily increasing; it continues to be used extensively in the arts; it is needed in our coinage. All together, the industrial, artistic and coinage uses of silver are currently consuming more than 150 million ounces of silver per year in the United States. The total worldwide consumption is estimated at more than 300 million. Production, however, falls far short of these totals. Worldwide it is currently estimated at 235 million ounces annually, of which only about 35 million is produced in the United States. The indicated gap between world production and world consumption, apart from changes in inventories, is thus now running at about 65 million ounces.

This gap, and it is a growing one, has for some time been filled by sales from the stocks of free silver held by the U.S. Treasury. These stocks were accumulated in earlier years when total demand was much lower and purchases by the U.S. Treasury, at the minimum price established by the Congress for monetary purposes, absorbed virtually all new domestic production. The Treasury's supply of free silver reached its peak in April 1959 at 222 million ounces. Since that time, purchases have steadily decreased and sales have increased and the Treasury's stock of free silver has declined. By the end of 1959 it was 174 million ounces; by the end of 1960 it had fallen to 123 million ounces; as of today, following unusually rapid sales in recent weeks, it has fallen to about 22 million fine ounces.

It is clear that under present procedures this stock would soon be entirely exhausted and that the Treasury would thereafter have no further silver available for public sale. It also seems clear on the basis of these developments that there is no remaining need for Government support of the silver price at 90.5 cents, as provided under current legislation. In the absence of further Government sales of free silver, the private market is quite obviously prepared to absorb all domestic production at or above the price of 90.5 cents.

The Government still has, however, nearly 1.7 billion ounces in a bullion reserve held against the issuance of a part of our paper currency. Roughly one-quarter of the total is held against $5 and $10 silver certificates, although existing legislation also permits issuance of $5 and $10 notes by the Federal Reserve, and these latter notes represent well over 90 percent of the outstanding currency of these denominations. The other three-quarters of the silver bullion reserve is used to support $1 and $2 silver certificates; under existing law, only silver certificates are authorized for currency of these denominations.

In view of the large and growing aggregate demand for silver, it does not seem to me to be either wise or feasible to continue to impound a substantial holding of silver bullion in these currency reserves. I propose that we now begin an actual, though gradual, withdrawal of silver bullion from the currency reserves, permitting substitution of Federal Reserve notes for the silver certificates withdrawn, and using the bullion thereby released to meet our continually heavy coinage requirements. At the same time, under the authority of existing law, I propose to suspend further sales of silver to the market. I further recommend that appropriate legislation be requested promptly to remove the Treasury from an active role in the markets for the purchase and sale of silver, and to permit trading in silver as a primary commodity. Meanwhile, the Treasury's remaining stocks of free silver should be conserved for possible use in contributing to orderly market conditions pending enactment of the necessary legislation.

If you should desire to implement this general policy, the first step would be a Presidential directive to the Secretary of the Treasury to suspend further sales from the remaining stock of free silver. Uses of this remaining stock for subsidiary coinage should be terminated, and to meet coinage needs I would propose to retire from circulation a sufficient amount of $5 and $10 silver certificates to release the silver required for this purpose. These retired certificates would be replaced by Federal Reserve notes.

Paralleling this action it would be desirable to recommend to Congress, when it reconvenes, the immediate repeal of the Silver Purchase Act of 1934, as well as the acts relating to silver of July 6, 1939, and July 31, 1946. Since the existing tax on transfers of interest in silver bullion is necessary only to support this legislation, it would also be desirable to propose simultaneously to Congress that the relevant part of the Internal Revenue Code be repealed so as to permit the development of a free futures market in silver.

Finally, I suggest that you consider recommending to Congress the enactment of legislation authorizing the Federal Reserve System to issue Federal Reserve notes in denominations of less than $5, thus providing an orderly, long-term means for replacing or supplementing the supply of silver certificates and thereby freeing the supplies of silver that will be needed to cover future coinage requirements.

Faithfully yours,

DOUGLAS DILLON.

NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF NOMINATION BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the Senate on February 19 received the nomination of Mr. Paul F. Geren, of Texas, to be Deputy Director of the Peace Corps, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate. In accordance with the rules of the Committee on Foreign Relations, his nomination is eligible to be acted upon after 6 days.

NOTICE CONCERNING CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Marion Mathias Hale, of Texas, to be U.S. marshal, southern district of Texas.

Robert I. Nash, of Texas, to be U.S. marshal, northern district of Texas.

Tully Reynolds, of Texas, to be U.S. marshal, eastern district of Texas.

Cornelius J. McQuade, of West Virginia, to be U.S. marshal, southern district of West Virginia, vice Russell R. Bell, resigned.

Antonio C. Baza, of Guam, to be U.S. marshal, district of Guam.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Thursday, March 1, 1962, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

RESOLUTIONS REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I send to the desk resolutions reported today by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] from the Committee on Rules and Administration. They have been cleared with the appropriate Members of the Senate. I request the immediate consideration of the resolutions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered; and the resolutions will be stated.

STUDY BY COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES ON STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL STOCKPILING

The resolution (S. Res. 295) to authorize a study by the Committee on Armed Services on strategic and critical stockpiling, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Armed Services, or its Subcommittee on the National Stockpile and Naval Petroleum Reserves, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the acquisition, storage, and disposal of strategic and critical materials necessary for the common defense.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1962, to January 31, 1963, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable, (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $30,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement explaining the purposes of this measure.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This resolution would authorize the expenditure of $30,000 by the Committee on Armed Services, or its Subcommittee on the National Stockpile and Naval Petroleum Reserves, from February 1, 1962, through January 31, 1963—"to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the acquisition, storage, and disposal of strategic and critical materials necessary for the common defense."

Additional information relative to the purposes of the proposed investigation are contained in a letter to Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, from Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, which letter (with accompanying budget) is as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
February 9, 1962.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Senate Resolution 295, now pending before your committee, would authorize expenditures of not to exceed $30,000 by the Committee on Armed Services for its Subcommittee on the National Stockpile and Naval Petroleum Reserves.

The purpose of this resolution is to permit the subcommittee to perform the investigation of stockpiling of strategic and critical materials requested by the President in his press conference on February 1.

The Subcommittee on the National Stockpile and Naval Petroleum Reserves has been in existence for several years. Staff assistance to the subcommittee has been provided by a member of the committee's professional staff. Accomplishment of a comprehensive study of stockpiling will require additional staff assistance. A copy of the subcommittee's proposed budget for the remainder of this year is attached. The expenditure authorization requested by this resolution is relatively small in relation to the magnitude of the sums involved in the stockpile program.

I would appreciate your scheduling this resolution for consideration as promptly as is convenient.

With cordial regards, I am,
Sincerely,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL.

6-month estimate of subcommittee staff

Counsel	$8,000
2 investigators	14,000
1 secretary	3,500
Sundry expenses, including travel	4,500
Total	30,000

STUDY OF REFUGEES AND ESCAPEES BY THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 293) to investigate problems created by the flow of escapees and refugees from communistic tyranny, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment on page 2, in line 17, to strike out "$100,000," and insert "$75,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the problems created by the flow of escapees and refugees from Communist tyranny.

SEC 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee from February 1, 1962, to January 31, 1963, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ on a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1963.

SEC. 4. The expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $75,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This resolution as referred would have authorized the expenditure of not to exceed $100,000 by the Committee on the Judiciary, acting through its Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees, to continue from February 1, 1962, through January 31, 1963, its inquiry into difficulties created by the flow of refugees and escapees from the Communist tyranny. The amendment adopted by the Committee on Rules and Administration would reduce the authorized expenditures from $100,000 to $75,000.

The purposes of the resolution are more fully stated in a letter from Senator PHILIP A. HART, chairman of the Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees, to Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, which letter (with accompanying budget) and letter of transmittal from Senator EASTLAND to Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, are as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
February 5, 1962.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Enclosed is the budget which was approved by the Committee on the Judiciary at its meeting on January 18, 1962, for the work of the Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees.

The committee authorized the reporting of Senate Resolution 293 to the Senate, to provide $100,000 for the work of the subcommittee from February 1, 1962, through January 31, 1963.

The program of the subcommittee is fully set forth in a letter to me from the Honorable PHILIP A. HART, chairman of the subcommittee. I am enclosing with this letter to you the proposed budget for the use of the Committee on Rules and Administration at your forthcoming meeting.

With kindest regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,
JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
January 30, 1962.

Hon. JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Enclosed is the recommended budget for the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees for the period beginning on February 1, 1962, and extending through January 31, 1963. There is also enclosed a suggested draft of a new authorization for the subcommittee identical in language with the prior authorizing resolution.

The existence of refugees is the most telling indictment of totalitarian rule. They represent the weakest link in the Communist chain of power. They are men and women who leave all to find freedom. They vote with their feet what we speak with our voices.

The subcommittee has approached the refugee problem as an opportunity for the United States to develop a series of programs which will be a positive force in expanding and unifying the boundaries of the free world. Perhaps the opportunities and the real responsibilities could not have been so clearly apparent except as in today's light and with the Cuban refugees in our midst. We believe that our work during 1961 has established a sound beginning toward that end.

The subcommittee's activities of the last year are reported in detail in two reports (1) the annual report on world refugee problems, and (2) a report on the Cuban refugee problems in the United States. These reports cover only 6 months of our activity as it was not possible to assemble a staff until June of 1961. During these months, however, the subcommittee began studies in a number of areas and two separate sets of hearings were conducted which resulted in the reports referred to above. As a result of this limited period of activity, the subcommittee will be able to return about $10,000 of last year's appropriation.

In the coming year, the subcommittee proposes intensive studies on a number of refugee problems, including:

1. Future operations of the U.S. escapee program in Europe.

2. Proposals for increased governmental cooperation with voluntary agencies in programs to assist refugees to become self-supporting instead of providing subsistence indefinitely.

3. Proposals to assist the 2 million refugees from Communist China in the British Crown Colony of Hong Kong, including the development of opportunities for resettlement in other countries.

It is my belief that the above investigations, in addition to others in the process of development, will provide useful information to the members of the Committee on the Judiciary and the Senate in their consideration of legislation and appropriations concerned with refugee problems.

Sincerely,

Philip A. Hart,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees.

Budget: Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees

Position	Number	Base salary per annum	Gross salary per annum	Monthly gross	Total for period of budget (gross)
Staff:					
Legal and investigative:					
General counsel or staff director	1	$8,040	$16,173.19	$1,347.77	$16,173.19
Counsel	1	7,260	14,802.38	1,233.53	14,802.38
Minority counsel	1	7,260	14,802.38	1,233.53	14,802.38
Editorial and research: Consultant	1	4,620	10,060.30	838.36	10,060.30
Administrative and clerical:					
Chief clerk	1	3,720	8,239.40	686.62	8,239.40
Assistant clerk (secretary to director)	1	2,160	5,079.97	423.33	5,079.97
Stenographer	1	2,160	5,079.97	423.33	5,079.97
Total	7	35,220	74,237.59	6,186.46	74,237.59
ADMINISTRATIVE					
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382, effective July 1, 1960)					426.00
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries paid)					4,825.44
Contribution to employees Federal employees group life insurance (27 cents per month per $1,000 coverage)					243.00
Travel (inclusive of field investigations)					10,000.00
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)					3,000.00
Witness fees, expenses					5,000.00
Stationery, office supplies					1,000.00
Communications (telephone, telegraph)					800.00
Newspapers, magazines, documents					300.00
Contingent fund					167.97
Total					25,762.41
Grand total					100,000.00

Note.—Funds requested, S. Res. 293, $100,000.

DR. CARYL P. HASKINS, BOARD OF REGENTS, SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 152) to provide for the reappointment of Dr. Caryl P. Haskins as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress, which will occur by the expiration of the term of Doctor Caryl P. Haskins, of Washington, District of Columbia, on April 6, 1962, be filled by the reappointment of the present incumbent for the statutory term of six years.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a statement explaining the purposes of this measure.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Title 20, section 42, United States Code, provides in relation to the Institution's Board of Regents that in addition to the Vice President and the Chief Justice of the United States, and Members of Congress, the Board shall be composed of "* * * six other persons, other than Members of Congress, two of whom shall be resident in the city of Washington; and the other four shall be inhabitants of some State, but no two of them of the same State."

Dr. Haskins' reappointment is within the classification of Citizen Regents who are residents of the District of Columbia.

A letter in support of Senate Joint Resolution 152, addressed to Senator Mike Mansfield, chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, by Dr. Remington Kellogg, Acting Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, with accompanying biography of Dr. Haskins, is as follows:

Smithsonian Institution,
Washington, D.C., February 7, 1962.

Hon. Mike Mansfield,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

My Dear Senator Mansfield: Thank you very much indeed for your letter of February 5, 1962, together with the enclosed copy of Senate Joint Resolution 152, a resolution to provide for the reappointment of Dr. Caryl P. Haskins as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

I am enclosing with this letter a brief biographical statement on Caryl P. Haskins. A much longer biography is available in "Who's Who in America."

At the recent annual meeting of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, held on January 25, 1962, it was unanimously voted to reappoint Dr. Haskins. The following Members of the Senate were present as Regents at this meeting: Hon. Clinton P. Anderson, Hon. J. W. Fulbright, Hon. Leverett Saltonstall.

Please let me know if I can provide you with any further information concerning this matter.

Sincerely yours,
Remington Kellogg,
Acting Secretary.

Brief Biographical Statement, Caryl Parker Haskins

Caryl Parker Haskins, administrator and research scientist. He is a native of Schenectady, N.Y., was graduated from Yale University and holds the degree of Ph. D. from Harvard University. He is a member of the National Academy of Sciences. During the Second World War he was active in scientific research for the U.S. Government. For this service he was awarded the U.S. Certificate of Merit. He succeeded Dr. Vannevar Bush as president of the Carnegie Institution of Washington. He is the author of books and articles dealing with scientific subjects in the fields of physics and natural history.

Dr. Haskins is a resident of Washington, D.C.

DR. CRAWFORD H. GREENEWALT, BOARD OF REGENTS, SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 153) to provide for the reappointment of Dr. Crawford H. Greenewalt as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress, which will occur by the expiration of the term of Doctor Crawford H. Greenewalt, of Wilmington, Delaware, on April 6, 1962, be filled by the reappointment of the present incumbent for the statutory term of six years.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a statement explaining the purposes of this measure.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Title 20, section 42, United States Code, provides in relation to the Institution's Board of Regents that in addition to the Vice President and the Chief Justice of the United States, and Members of Congress, the Board shall be composed of "* * * six other persons, other than Members of Congress, two of whom shall be resident in the city of Washington; and the other four shall be inhabitants of some State, but no two of them of the same State."

Dr. Greenewalt's reappointment is within the classification of Citizen Regents who are resident outside the District of Columbia.

A letter in support of Senate Joint Resolution 153 addressed to Senator Mike Mansfield, chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, by Dr. Remington Kellogg, Acting Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, with accompanying biography of Dr. Greenewalt, is as follows:

Smithsonian Institution,
Washington, D.C., February 7, 1962.

Hon. Mike Mansfield,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

My Dear Senator Mansfield: Thank you very much indeed for your letter of February 5, 1962, together with the enclosed copy of Senate Joint Resolution 153, a resolution to provide for the reappointment of Dr. Crawford H. Greenewalt as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

I am enclosing with this letter a brief biographical statement on Crawford H. Greenewalt. A much longer biography is available in "Who's Who in America."

At the recent annual meeting of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, held on January 25, 1962, it was unanimously voted to reappoint Dr. Greenewalt. The following Members of the Senate were present as Regents at this meeting: Hon. Clinton P. Anderson, Hon. J. W. Fulbright, Hon. Leverett Saltonstall.

Please let me know if I can provide you with any further information concerning this matter.

Sincerely yours,

Remington Kellogg,

Acting Secretary.

Brief Biographical Statement, Crawford Hallock Greenewalt

Crawford Hallock Greenewalt, business executive and research scientist, is a native of Cummington, Mass., and a graduate of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. He is a member of the National Academy of Sciences, and has published extensive research papers in chemistry and also in biology. He is president of the E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.

Mr. Greenewalt is a resident of Wilmington, Del.

PRINTING AS SENATE DOCUMENT OF REPORT ENTITLED "A REPORT OF U.S. FOREIGN POLICY AND OPERATIONS"

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 56) to print as a Senate document a report entitled "A Report of U.S. Foreign Policy and Operations" was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed with illustrations, as a Senate document, a report entitled "A Report of United States Foreign Policy and Operations", submitted by Senator Allen J. Ellender to the Senate Committee on Appropriations on January 24, 1962; and that four thousand additional copies be printed for the use of that committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a statement explaining the purposes of this measure.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Committee on Rules and Administration, to whom was referred the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 56) authorizing the printing, with illustrations, as a Senate document of a report entitled "A Report of U.S. Foreign Policy and Operations," submitted by Senator Allen J. Ellender to the Senate Committee on Appropriations on January 24, 1962, with 4,000 additional copies of said document being printed for the use of that committee, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the concurrent resolution be agreed to by the Senate.

The printing-cost estimate, submitted by the Public Printer is as follows.

To print as a document (1,500 copies)	$1, 167. 97
4,000 additional copies at $383.98 per thousand	1, 535. 92
Total estimated cost, S. Con. Res. 56	2, 703. 89

A letter in support of Senate Concurrent Resolution 56, addressed to Senator Mike Mansfield, chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, by Senator Allen J. Ellender, author of the resolution, is as follows:

U.S. Senate,
Committee on
Agriculture and Forestry,
February 20, 1962.

Hon. Mike Mansfield,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: I would appreciate prompt action by your committee in ordering reported Senate Concurrent Resolution 56, to print as a Senate document my report covering my tour abroad last fall, entitled "A Report of U.S. Foreign Policy and Operations."

I have received numerous requests from departments of Government, as well as some of our Embassies abroad, and many individuals, to have the report printed as a Senate document. I have already almost completely exhausted the committee print of my report, and my office is holding many requests for copies until such time as the report may be printed as an official document of the Senate.

Thanking you for your usual prompt attention to this matter, I am,

Sincerely,

Allen J. Ellender,

U.S. Senator.

PRINTING OF COPIES OF HEARING ON EXPORT OF STRATEGIC MATERIALS TO SOVIET-BLOC COUNTRIES

The resolution (S. Res. 297) to print copies of a hearing on export of strategic materials to Soviet-bloc countries was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary three thousand copies of a hearing entitled "Export of Strategic Materials to the U.S.S.R. and Other Soviet Bloc Countries, Part 2," held by its Internal Security Subcommittee during the Eighty-seventh Congress, first session.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a statement explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Committee on Rules and Administration to whom was referred the resolution (S. Res. 297) authorizing the printing for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary of 3,000 additional copies of a hearing entitled "Export of Strategic Materials to the U.S.S.R. and Other Soviet Bloc Countries, Part 2," held by its Internal Security Subcommittee during the 87th Congress, first session, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the resolution be agreed to by the Senate.

The printing-cost estimate, supplied by the Public Printer, is as follows: 3,000 additional copies at $392.48 per thousand: $1,1777.44.

A letter in support of Senate Resolution 297, addressed to Senator Mike Mansfield, chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, by Senator James O. Eastland, chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary and its Internal Security Subcommittee, is as follows:

February 19, 1962.

Hon. Mike Mansfield,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: I have introduced today a resolution providing for the printing of 3,000 extra copies of a hearing titled "Export of Strategic Materials to the U.S.S.R. and Other Soviet Bloc Countries, Part 2," held by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee during the first session of the 87th Congress.

This hearing has been the object of considerable interest. Our requests for printed transcripts are considerable, and the supply we will receive under our regular printing allotment will in all likelihood fall far short of the subcommittee's requirements.

You will recall that earlier hearings conducted by the Internal Security Subcommittee on this subject resulted in a change of procedure in granting export licenses, a change which I believe was of benefit to the Nation. The hearing which would be printed under this resolution is a further step in our examination of a vital topic.

I would be most grateful for your assistance in securing early and favorable action on this resolution by the Committee on Rules and Administration, and subsequently by the Senate.

With kindest personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

James O. Eastland,

Chairman, Internal Security Subcommittee.

PRINTING OF PAMPHLET ENTITLED "COMMONWEALTH PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION MEETING, LONDON, ENGLAND, 1961"

The resolution (S. Res. 290) to print, with additional copies, a pamphlet entitled "Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Meeting, London, England, 1961," was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the pamphlet entitled "Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Meeting, London, England, 1961" be printed as a Senate document and that three thousand additional copies be printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a statement explaining the purposes of this resolution.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Committee on Rules and Administration to whom was referred the resolution (S. Res. 290) authorizing the printing as a Senate document of the pamphlet entitled "Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Meeting London, England, 1961," with 3,000 additional copies to be printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendments and recommend that the resolution be agreed to by the Senate.

The printing-cost estimate supplied by the Government Printing Office is as follows:

To print as a document (1,500 copies)	$474. 48
3,000 additional copies at $39.27 per thousand	117. 81
Total estimated cost, S. Res. 290	592. 29

A letter in support of Senate Resolution 290 addressed to Senator Mike Mansfield, chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, by Senator J. W. Fulbright, chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, is as follows:

February 6, 1962.

Hon. Mike Mansfield,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: There is pending before your Committee on Rules and Administration the resolution (S. Res. 290) which I introduced on January 31, 1962.

This resolution would print as a Senate document the report of the Senate delegation to the last meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association in London, September 25-30, 1961.

This Association meets every 2 years, and it has been the custom for American observers, attending its sessions, to submit their report as a Senate document. It is hoped that your committee will find it feasible to continue this policy by the favorable report of Senate Resolution 290.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. Fulbright,
Chairman.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that before the reading of the Farewell Address of the first President of the United States, there may be a short morning hour.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEADERSHIP AND SERVICE OF SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE FREEMAN

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a short, but extremely pertinent, editorial by Joe Snyder, editor of the Gallatin North Missourian. The editorial is entitled "After Secretary Freeman?"

Mr. Snyder lives in Gallatin, and publishes his newspaper in northwest Missouri, one of the most important farming areas in our State and the Nation.

I am very glad to note this recognition of the leadership and the service Secretary Freeman is giving the farmers of America.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

After Secretary Freeman?

It now appears that much of the distorted news and comments being handled around the country about the feed grains program is part of a plan to eliminate Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman from the Washington scene. Whether this will be successful or not remains to be seen.

Secretary Freeman, who startled a lot of people by actually representing and fighting for the American farmer, has powerful interests at his throat. It has been a long time since agriculture had a Secretary like Mr. Freeman.

The crackdown on livestock buying practices, watered hams, wheat sedimentation testing, and several other projects, have put Mr. Freeman in a much less favorable light with some big business interests who for years have been making millions off the Government and the public—but blaming it on the farmer. They just don't like to have their little playhouse messed up.

The truth is, the feed grains program has gotten off to a fine start. It is helping to reduce the surplus despite one of the most favorable growing seasons in history. A drop in the carryover is certain. Mr. Benson, for example, could show no drop in surplus any year he held office despite the spending of $1½ billion on the soil-bank program.

The first cut in grain surplus in 9 years is a big feather in Freeman's hat.

The program is also going to cut Government costs although, as Mr. Freeman warned Congress, it won't show up this year. But what the Government doesn't take over, it doesn't have to store, so storage costs will be less the next few years.

The costs of the program will be lower than most people realize. Most of the $768 million paid to farmers will be recovered as the certificate corn is sold back into the market. At only $1 a bushel, the Government should get back, roughly, $600 million of the $768 it has paid out to farmers. Future savings cover the rest, plus some allowances for operating costs, so the program will come close to paying for itself the first year. That's almost unheard of in modern-day farm programing.

Mr. Freeman's program is not perfect but it has shown real progress. Mr. Freeman knows the weaknesses and he will see to have the abuses corrected by Congress. We hope the efforts being made to discredit Mr. Freeman and the feed grains program through pure and simple propaganda and distortion fail. Rural America finally has a Secretary of Agriculture who does something besides apologize for the efficiency of the farmer. He deserves encouragement and support.

FAKERY EXPOSED

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an article entitled "Fakery Exposed," which appeared in the Chicago Daily Tribune on Monday, February 19, 1962.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Fakery Exposed

Senator John Williams, Republican, of Delaware, in a speech used the Department of Agriculture's own statistics as a needle to burst the glorious bubble of claims blown up by the Kennedy administration that its farm program has been a grand success.

The Senator accused the administration of sheer fakery in juggling its books to show that the huge farm surplus stockpile had been reduced by $1.5 billion. "The administration," he said, "lowered its valuation on the surplus stock to show the reduction." The Senator's blast brought an immediate response from the Agriculture Department, which promptly revised its latest report of Commodity Credit Corporation surplus stocks to more accurately reflect comparisons of current holdings with those of a year ago.

Senator Williams' complaint was based on the report of CCC stocks as of November 30, 1961, which showed $7,647,236,000 worth of surplus commodities in inventory and under price supporting loans, compared with a total of $9,150,087,000 on November 30, 1960. The 1961 figure did not include an estimated loss of $1,530,503,000 from storage, handling, and transportation costs to be realized when stocks in inventory are disposed of. Before the Kennedy administraton took office these estimated losses had been included in the value of inventories.

Now the Agriculture Department has issued a report, dated the same day as the Senator's speech, to show that CCC holdings on December 31, 1961, were $7,685,946,000, compared with a revised figure of $7,908,135,000 for a year ago with reserves for losses shown separately.

Senator Williams also reiterated charges made previously by Representative Findley, Republican, of Illinois, that the administration paid $700 million to farmers for idling 20 million acres of cropland, but actually succeeded in getting a reduction of only 15.4 million acres.

"The Secretary of Agriculture paid over $150 million for the removal from production of 4.5 million phantom acres, acreage which would never have been put into feed grains anyway," the Senator asserted.

All of this demonstrates the hypocrisy with which the administration has sought to cover up the monumental failure of its farm policies, while seeking public approbation of them. The administration may not realize it, but the public—and that includes farmers—is getting fed up with political fakery and bookkeeping deception in dealing with the farm problem. Congress, in considering current administration schemes for more spending and Federal management for agriculture, should weigh the evidence and act accordingly.

A FORCE IN READINESS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, once again California's imaginative and dedicated film industry has emphasized how the motion picture can be a vehicle for communicating vital information, as well as provide engrossing entertainment to the American people.

I trust that Americans in every corner of the Nation and our friends and allies around the globe will see a Hollywood film which filled me with pride and is a thrilling portrayal of the alertness and patriotism of two resolute segments of our armed services.

It was a distinct privilege to view recently the film called "A Force in Readiness," which graphically and dramatically portrays the readiness, capability, and dedication of our Navy and Marine Corps defense team. This film depicts reassuringly the role they are fully prepared to play if our Nation's safety and our peoples' liberties ever are jeopardized by an aggressor.

The film tellingly demonstrates—and I hope for this reason that it may ultimately be shown in the so-called neutral or uncommitted nations—that a vibrant, dedicated defense force is a positive and influential power for peace. No one seeing "A Force in Readiness" can fail to come away with appreciation that even those who wear the uniform of a fighting service are fervently working and praying for peace, just as they are prepared to lay down their lives to preserve our independence and freedom.

As a Californian, I am especially happy to note that this very forceful film was made without cost to the Marine Corps. I feel our Nation owes a substantial debt of gratitude to Warner Bros., and its patriotic, generous president, Jack L. Warner, who put all of his studio's facilities into the production of this picture. Similarly we should be eternally grateful for the unselfish contributions of William L. Hendricks who wrote and produced it, Jack Webb, who did the able narration, and all the others who took part in its making.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I take special pride in the U.S. Marine Corps because its Commandant is a constituent of mine. General Shoup carries on and advances a great tradition, a tradition to which all Americans can point with pride.

This is just part of the reason why I was so delighted with a new short motion picture. It is called "A Force in Readiness." This film was produced without cost to the Government.

It is thrilling as it graphically and dramatically demonstrates the readiness of the Navy-Marine Corps team to act if the safety of our country is threatened. This outstanding motion picture portrays this team not just as a fist ready for use in case fighting is called for, but also as a positive power for peace.

"A Force in Readiness" reflects extreme devotion to America and all this blessed land stands for. It shows both our devotion to the cause of peace and our determination to fight to maintain our ideals, our American way of life. It shows the way to preservation of liberty through peace, but through fighting if need be.

I commend all those who had a part in the production of this unusual film epic. Especially deserving of praise are: Jack L. Warner, president of Warner Bros., who put all the facilities of his company behind the making of "A Force in Readiness," following longstanding patriotic practices of this company; Jack Webb, the narrator; William L. Hendricks, who wrote and produced the picture; J. Russell Graziano, supervising film editor; Larry Glickman, who provided technical work and titles; the American Federation of Musicians, and all others who participated in the production.

I recommend this film, "A Force in Readiness," to all Americans. I compliment the Marine Corps and General Shoup for providing the service and reassurance to our Nation that the motion picture represents.

EARTH ORBITING OF LT. COL. JOHN H. GLENN, JR.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, the Nation today is grateful and proud of the courage and technical excellence displayed by Lt. Col. John H. Glenn, Jr., in accomplishing America's first manned orbit of the earth.

His skill has gone a long way toward restoring the world's faith in American leadership and science. While it is an enormous advance for the astronauts, it is also a significant milestone for the Federal Space Agency and American industry.

The history that was written Tuesday will serve as an inspiration to our scientists and to future astronauts, who will take space vehicles of the United States to even more phenomenal heights and perhaps to distant planets.

The Space Agency and Lieutenant Colonel Glenn have earned the gratitude and admiration of the Nation and, indeed, the world.

This generation and future generations of American astronauts will write even more spectacular chapters in the space history. But I do not think we will ever forget this breakthrough that has been achieved by Lieutenant Colonel Glenn, which because of our open society was dramatically witnessed by all the people of the earth.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If there is no further morning business, morning business is closed.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the order previously entered, the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] will now proceed to the rostrum, to read the Farewell Address of the first President of the United States.

Mr. RANDOLPH advanced to the desk, and read the Farewell Address, as follows:

To the People of the United States:

FRIENDS AND FELLOW CITIZENS: The period for a new election of a citizen to administer the executive government of the United States being not far distant, and the time actually arrived when your thoughts must be employed in designating the person who is to be clothed with that important trust, it appears to me proper, especially as it may conduce to a more distinct expression of the public voice, that I should now apprise you of the resolution I have formed, to decline being considered among the number of those, out of whom a choice is to be made.

I beg you, at the same time, to do me the justice to be assured, that this resolution has not been taken, without a strict regard to all the considerations appertaining to the relation which binds a dutiful citizen to his country; and that, in withdrawing the tender of service which silence in my situation might imply, I am influenced by no diminution of zeal for your future interest; no deficiency of grateful respect for your past kindness; but am supported by a full conviction that the step is compatible with both.

The acceptance of, and continuance hitherto in the office to which your suffrages have twice called me, have been a uniform sacrifice of inclination to the opinion of duty, and to a deference for what appeared to be your desire. I constantly hoped that it would have been much earlier in my power, consistently with motives which I was not at liberty to disregard, to return to that retirement from which I had been reluctantly drawn. The strength of my inclination to do this, previous to the last election, had even led to the preparation of an address to declare it to you; but mature reflection on the then perplexed and critical posture of our affairs with foreign nations, and the unanimous advice of persons entitled to my confidence, impelled me to abandon the idea.

I rejoice that the state of your concerns, external as well as internal, no longer renders the pursuit of inclination incompatible with the sentiment of duty or propriety; and am persuaded, whatever partiality may be retained for my services, that in the present circumstances of our country, you will not disapprove my determination to retire.

The impressions with which I first undertook the arduous trust, were explained on the proper occasion. In the discharge of this trust, I will only say that I have, with good intentions, contributed towards the organization and administration of the government, the best exertions of which a very fallible judgment was capable. Not unconscious in the outset, of the inferiority of my qualifications, experience, in my own eyes, perhaps still more in the eyes of others, has strengthened the motives to diffidence of myself; and, every day, the increasing weight of years admonishes me more and more, that the shade of retirement is as necessary to me as it will be welcome. Satisfied that if any circumstances have given peculiar value to my services they were temporary, I have the consolation to believe that, while choice and prudence invite me to quit the political scene, patriotism does not forbid it.

In looking forward to the moment which is to terminate the career of my political life, my feelings do not permit me to suspend the deep acknowledgment of that debt of gratitude which I owe to my beloved country, for the many honors it has conferred upon me; still more for the steadfast confidence with which it has supported me; and for the opportunities I have thence enjoyed of manifesting my inviolable attachment, by services faithful and persevering, though in usefulness unequal to my zeal. If benefits have resulted to our country from these services, let it always be remembered to your praise, and as an instructive example in our annals, that under circumstances in which the passions, agitated in every direction, were liable to mislead amidst appearances sometimes dubious, vicissitudes of fortune often discouraging—in situations in which not unfrequently want of success has countenanced the spirit of criticism, the constancy of your support was the essential prop of the efforts, and a guarantee of the plans, by which they were effected. Profoundly penetrated with this idea, I shall carry it with me to my grave, as a strong incitement to unceasing vows that heaven may continue to you the choicest tokens of its beneficence—that your union and brotherly affection may be perpetual—that the free constitution, which is the work of your hands, may be sacredly maintained—that its administration in every department may be stamped with wisdom and virtue—that, in fine, the happiness of the people of these states, under the auspices of liberty, may be made complete by so careful a preservation, and so prudent a use of this blessing, as will acquire to them the glory of recommending it to the applause, the affection and adoption of every nation which is yet a stranger to it.

Here, perhaps, I ought to stop. But a solicitude for your welfare, which cannot end but with my life, and the apprehension of danger, natural to that solicitude, urge me, on an occasion like the present, to offer to your solemn contemplation, and to recommend to your frequent review, some sentiments which are the result of much reflection, of no inconsiderable observation, and which appear to me all important to the permanency of your felicity as a people. These will be offered to you with the more freedom, as you can only see in them the disinterested warnings of a parting friend, who can possibly have no personal motive to bias his counsel. Nor can I forget, as an encouragement to it, your indulgent reception of my sentiments on a former and not dissimilar occasion.

Interwoven as is the love of liberty with every ligament of your hearts, no recommendation of mine is necessary to fortify or confirm the attachment.

The unity of government which constitutes you one people, is also now dear to you. It is justly so; for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence; the support of your tranquillity at home; your peace abroad; of your safety; of your prosperity; of that very liberty which you so highly prize. But as it is easy to foresee that, from different causes and from different quarters much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth, as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively (though often covertly and insidiously) directed; it is of infinite moment, that you should properly estimate the immense value of your national union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment to it; accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as the palladium of your political safety and prosperity; watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety; discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can, in any event, be abandoned; and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.

For this you have every inducement of sympathy and interest. Citizens by birth, or choice, of a common country, that country has a right to concentrate your affections. The name of American, which belongs to you in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of patriotism, more than any appellation derived from local discriminations. With slight shades of difference, you have the same religion, manners, habits, and political principles. You have, in a common cause, fought and triumphed together; the independence and liberty you possess, are the work of joint counsels, and joint efforts, of common dangers, suffering and successes.

But these considerations, however powerfully they addressed themselves to your sensibility, are greatly outweighed by those which apply more immediately to your interest.—Here, every portion of our country finds the most commanding motives for carefully guarding and preserving the union of the whole.

The *north*, in an unrestrained intercourse with the *south*, protected by the equal laws of a common government, finds in the productions of the latter, great additional resources of maritime and commercial enterprise, and precious materials of manufacturing industry.—The *south* in the same intercourse, benefiting by the same agency of the *north*, sees its agriculture grow and its commerce expand. Turning partly into its own channels the seamen of the *north*, it finds its particular navigation invigorated; and while it contributes, in different ways, to nourish and increase the general mass of the national navigation, it looks forward to the protection of a maritime strength, to which itself is unequally adapted. The *east*, in a like intercourse with the *west*, already finds, and in the progressive improvement of interior communications by land and water, will more and more find a valuable vent for the commodities which it brings from abroad, or manufactures at home. The *west* derives from the *east* supplies requisite to its growth and comfort—and what is perhaps of still greater consequence, it must of necessity owe the *secure* enjoyments of indispensable *outlets* for its own productions, to the weight, influence, and the future maritime strength of the Atlantic side of the Union, directed by an indissoluble community of interest as *one nation*. Any other tenure by which the *west* can hold this essential advantage, whether derived from its own separate strength; or from an apostate and unnatural connection with any foreign power, must be intrinsically precarious.

While then every part of our country thus feels an immediate and particular interest in union, all the parts combined cannot fail to find in the united mass of means and efforts, greater strength, greater resource, proportionably greater security from external danger, a less frequent interruption of their peace by foreign nations; and, what is of inestimable value, they must derive from union, an exemption from those broils and wars between themselves, which so frequently afflict neighboring countries not tied together by the same government; which their own rivalship alone would be sufficient to produce, but which opposite foreign alliances, attachments, and intrigues, would stimulate and embitter. Hence likewise, they will avoid the necessity of those overgrown military establishments, which under any form of government are inauspicious to liberty, and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican liberty. In this sense it is, that your union ought to be considered as a main prop of your liberty, and that the love of the one ought to endear to you the preservation of the other.

These considerations speak a persuasive language to every reflecting and virtuous mind and exhibit the continuance of the union as a primary object of patriotic desire. Is there a doubt whether a common government can embrace so large a sphere? let experience solve it. To listen to mere speculation in such a case were criminal. We are authorized to hope that a proper organization of the whole, with the auxiliary agency of governments for the respective subdivisions, will afford a happy issue to the experiment. It is well worth a fair and full experiment. With such powerful and obvious motives to union, affecting all parts of our country, while experience shall not have demonstrated its impracticability, there will always be reason to distrust the patriotism of those who, in any quarter, may endeavor to weaken its hands.

In contemplating the causes which may disturb our Union, it occurs as matter of serious concern, that any ground should have been furnished for characterizing parties by *geographical* discriminations,—*northern* and *southern*—*Atlantic* and *western;* whence designing men may endeavor to excite a belief that there is a real difference of local interests and views. One of the expedients of party to acquire influence within particular districts, is to misrepresent the opinions and aims of other districts. You cannot shield yourselves too much against the jealousies and heart burnings which spring from these misrepresentations; they tend to render alien to each other those who ought to be bound together by fraternal affection. The inhabitants of our western country have lately had a useful lesson on this head; they have seen, in the negotiation by the executive, and in the unanimous ratification by the senate of the treaty with Spain, and in the universal satisfaction at the event throughout the United States, a decisive proof how unfounded were the suspicions propagated among them of a policy in the general government and in the Atlantic states, unfriendly to their interests in regard to the Mississippi. They have been witnesses to the formation of two treaties, that with Great Britain and that with Spain, which secure to them everything they could desire, in respect to our foreign relations, towards confirming their prosperity. Will it not be their wisdom to rely for the preservation of these advantages on the union by which they were procured? will they not henceforth be deaf to those advisers, if such they are, who would sever them from their brethren and connect them with aliens?

To the efficacy and permanency of your Union, a government for the whole is indispensable. No alliance, however strict, between the parts can be an adequate substitute; they must inevitably experience the infractions and interruptions which all alliances, in all times, have experienced. Sensible of this momentous truth, you have improved upon your first essay, by the adoption of a constitution of government, better calculated than your former, for an intimate union, and for the efficacious management of your common concerns. This government, the offspring of our own choice, uninfluenced and unawed, adopted upon full investigation and mature deliberation, completely free in its principles, in the distribution of its powers, uniting security with energy, and maintaining within itself a provision for its own amendment, has a just claim to your confidence and your support. Respect for its authority, compliance with its laws, acquiescence in its measures, are duties enjoined by the fundamental maxims of true liberty. The basis of our political systems is the right of the people to make and to alter their constitutions of government.—But the constitution which at any time exists, until changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all. The very idea of the power and the right of the people to establish government, presupposes the duty of every individual to obey the established government.

All obstructions to the execution of the laws, all combinations and associations, under whatever plausible character, with the real design to direct, control, counteract, or awe the regular deliberations and action of the constituted authorities, are destructive of this fundamental principle, and of fatal tendency.—They serve to organize faction, to give it an artificial and extraordinary force, to put in the place of the delegated will of the nation the will of party, often a small but artful and enterprising minority of the community; and according to the alternate triumphs of different parties, to make the public administration the mirror of the ill concerted and incongruous projects of faction, rather than the organ of consistent and wholesome plans digested by common councils, and modified by mutual interests.

However combinations or associations of the above description may now and then answer popular ends, they are likely, in the course of time and things, to become potent engines, by which cunning, ambitious, and unprincipled men, will be enabled to subvert the power of the people, and to usurp for themselves the reins of government; destroying afterwards the very engines which have lifted them to unjust dominion.

Towards the preservation of your government and the permanency of your present happy state it is requisite, not only, that you steadily discountenance irregular opposition to its acknowledged authority, but also that you resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles, however specious the pretext. One method of assault may be to effect, in the forms of the constitution, alterations which will impair the energy of the system; and thus to undermine what cannot be directly overthrown. In all the changes to which you may be involved, remember that time and habit are at least as necessary to fix the true character of governments, as of other human institutions:—that experience is the surest standard by which to test the real tendency of the existing constitution of a country:—that facility in changes, upon the credit of mere hypothesis and opinion, exposes to perpetual change from the endless variety of hypothesis and opinion: and remember, especially, that for the efficient management of your common interests in a country so extensive as ours, a government of as much vigor as is consistent with the perfect security of liberty is indispensable. Liberty itself will find in such a government with powers properly distributed and adjusted, its surest guardian. It is, indeed, little else than a name, where the government is too feeble to withstand the enterprises of faction, to confine each member of the society within the limits prescribed by the laws, and to maintain all in the secure and tranquil enjoyment of the rights of person and property.

I have already intimated to you the danger of parties in the state, with particular references to the founding of them on geographical discrimination. Let me now take a more comprehensive view, and warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party generally.

This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our nature, having its root in the strongest passions of the human mind.—It exists under different shapes in all governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed; but in those of the popular form it is seen in its greatest rankness, and is truly their worst enemy.

The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge natural to party dissension, which in different ages and countries has perpetrated the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism. But this leads at length to a more formal and permanent depotism. The disorders and miseries which result, gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual; and, sooner or later, the chief of some prevailing faction, more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purpose of his own elevation on the ruins of public liberty.

Without looking forward to an extremity of this kind (which nevertheless ought not to be entirely out of sight) the common and continual mischiefs of the spirit or party are sufficient to make it the interest and duty of a wise people to discourage and restrain it.

It serves always to distract the public councils, and enfeeble the public administration. It agitates the community with ill founded jealousies and false alarms; kindles the animosity of one part against another; foments occasional riot and insurrection. It opens the door to foreign influence and corruption, which finds a facilitated access to the government itself through the channels of party passions. Thus the policy and the will of one country are subjected to the policy and will of another.

There is an opinion that parties in free countries are useful checks upon the administration of the government, and serve to keep alive the spirit of liberty. This within certain limits is probably true; and in governments of a monarchical cast, patriotism may look with indulgence, if not with favor, upon the spirit of party. But in those of the popular character, in governments purely elective, it is a spirit not to be encouraged. From their natural tendency, it is certain there will always be enough of that spirit for every salutary purpose. And there being constant danger of excess, the effort ought to be, by force of public opinion, to mitigate and assuage it. A fire not to be quenched, it demands a uniform vigilance to prevent it bursting into a flame, lest instead of warming, it should consume.

It is important likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those intrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department, to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism. A just estimate of that love of power and proneness to abuse it which predominate in the human heart, is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasion of the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern; some of them in our country and under our own eyes.—To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the constitution designates.—But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield.

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism, who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked, Where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation *desert* the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect, that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.

It is substantially true, that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government. The rule, indeed, extends with more or less force to every species of free government. Who that is a sincere friend to it can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundation of the fabric?

Promote, then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it should be enlightened.

As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit. One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible, avoiding occasions of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering, also, that timely disbursements, to prepare for danger, frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it; avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions, in time of peace, to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear. The execution of these maxims belongs to your representatives, but it is necessary that public opinions should cooperate. To facilitate to them the performance of their duty, it is essential that you should practically bear in mind, that towards the payment of debts there must be revenue; that to have revenue there must be taxes, that no taxes can be devised which are not more or less inconvenient and unpleasant; that the intrinsic embarrassment inseparable from the selection of the proper object (which is always a choice of difficulties), ought to be a decisive motive for a candid construction of the conduct of the government in making it, and for a spirit of acquiescence in the measures for obtaining revenue, which the public exigencies may at any time dictate.

Observe good faith and justice towards all nations; cultivate peace and harmony with all. Religion and morality enjoin this conduct, and can it be that good policy does not equally enjoin it? It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and, at no distant period, a great nation, to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence. Who can doubt but, in the course of time and things, the fruits of such a plan would richly repay any temporary advantages which might be lost by a steady adherence to it; can it be that Providence has not connected the permanent felicity of a nation with its virtue? The experiment, at least is recommended by every sentiment which ennobles human nature. Alas! is it rendered impossible by its vices?

In the execution of such a plan, nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachments for others, should be excluded; and that in place of them, just and amicable feelings towards all should be cultivated. The nation which indulges towards another an habitual hatred, or an habitual fondness, is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. Hence, frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed, and bloody contests. The nation, prompted by ill will and resentment, sometimes impels to war the government, contrary to the best calculations of policy. The government sometimes participates in the national propensity, and adopts through passion what reason would reject; at other times, it makes the animosity of the nation subservient to projects of hostility, instigated by pride, ambition, and other sinister and pernicious motives. The peace often, sometimes perhaps the liberty of nations, has been the victim.

So likewise, a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter, without adequate inducements or justifications. It leads also to concessions, to the favorite nation, of privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the nation making the concessions, by unnecessary parting with what ought to have been retained, and by exciting jealousy, ill will, and a disposition to retaliate in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld; and it gives to ambitious, corrupted or deluded citizens who devote themselves to the favorite nation, facility to betray or sacrifice the interests of their own country, without odium, sometimes even with popularity; gilding with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation, a commendable deference for public opinion, or a laudable zeal for public good, the base or foolish compliances of ambition, corruption, or infatuation.

As avenues to foreign influence in innumerable ways, such attachments are particularly alarming to the truly enlightened and independent patriot. How many opportunities do they afford to tamper with domestic factions, to practice the arts of seduction, to mislead public opinion, to influence or awe the public councils!—Such an attachment of a small or weak, towards a great and powerful nation, dooms the former to be the satellite of the latter.

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence (I conjure you to believe me fellow citizens) the jealousy of a free people ought to be *constantly* awake; since history and experience prove, that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. But that jealousy, to be useful, must be impartial, else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike for another, cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odious; while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people, to surrender their interest.

The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations, is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little *political* connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith:—Here let us stop.

Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none, or a very remote relation. Hence, she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, or the ordinary combinations and collusions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people, under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon, to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation, when we may choose peace or war, as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel.

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice?

It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliance with any portion of the foreign world; so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it; for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements. I hold the maxim no less applicable to public than private affairs, that honesty is always the best policy. I repeat it, therefore, let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense. But in my opinion, it is unnecessary, and would be unwise to extend them.

Taking care always to keep ourselves by suitable establishments, on a respectable defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

Harmony, and a liberal intercourse with all nations, are recommended by policy, humanity, and interest. But even our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand; neither seeking nor granting exclusive favors or preferences; consulting the natural course of things; diffusing and diversifying by gentle means the streams of commerce, but forcing nothing; establishing with powers so disposed, in order to give trade a stable course, to define the rights of our merchants, and to enable the government to support them, conventional rules of intercourse, the best that present circumstances and mutual opinion will permit, but temporary, and liable to be from time to time abandoned or varied as experience and circumstances shall dictate; constantly keeping in view, that it is folly in one nation to look for disinterested favors from another; that it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character; that by such acceptance, it may place itself in the condition of having given equivalents for nominal favors, and yet of being reproached with ingratitude for not giving more. There can be no greater error than to expect, or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard.

In offering to you, my countrymen, these counsels of an old and affectionate friend, I dare not hope they will make the strong and lasting impression I could wish; that they will control the usual current of the passions, or prevent our nation from running the course which has hitherto marked the destiny of nations, but if I may even flatter myself that they may be productive of some partial benefit, some occasional good; that they may now and then recur to moderate the fury of party spirit, to warn against the mischiefs of foreign intrigue, to guard against the impostures of pretended patriotism; this hope will be a full recompense for the solicitude for your welfare by which they have been dictated.

How far, in the discharge of my official duties, I have been guided by the principles which have been delineated, the public records and other evidences of my conduct must witness to you and to the world. To myself, the assurance of my own conscience is, that I have, at least, believed myself to be guided by them.

In relation to the still subsisting war in Europe; my proclamation of the 22d of April, 1793, is the index to my plan. Sanctioned by your approving voice, and by that of your representatives in both houses of congress, the spirit of that measure has continually governed me, uninfluenced by any attempts to deter or divert me from it.

After deliberate examination, with the aid of the best lights I could obtain, I was well satisfied that our country, under all the circumstances of the case, had a right to take, and was bound in duty and interest, to take a neutral position. Having taken it, I determined, as far as should depend upon me, to maintain it with moderation, perseverance and firmness.

The considerations which respect the right to hold this conduct, it is not necessary on this occasion to detail. I will only observe that, according to my understanding of the matter, that right, so far from being denied by any of the belligerent powers, has been virtually admitted by all.

The duty of holding a neutral conduct may be inferred, without anything more, from the obligation which justice and humanity impose on every nation, in cases in which it is free to act, to maintain inviolate the relations of peace and amity towards other nations.

The inducements of interest for observing that conduct will best be referred to your own reflections and experience. With me a predominant motive has been to endeavor to gain time to our country to settle and mature its yet recent institutions, and to progress, without interruption, to that degree of strength, and consistency which is necessary to give it, humanly speaking, the command of its own fortunes.

Though in reviewing the incidents of my administration, I am unconscious of intentional error, I am nevertheless too sensible of my defects not to think it probable that I may have committed many errors. Whatever they may be, I fervently beseech the Almighty to avert or mitigate the evils to which they may tend. I shall also carry with me the hope that my country will never cease to view them with indulgence; and that, after forty-five years of my life dedicated to its service, with an upright zeal, the faults of incompetent abilities will be consigned to oblivion, as myself must soon be to the mansions of rest.

Relying on its kindness in this as in other things, and actuated by that fervent love towards it, which is so natural to a man who views in it the native soil of himself and his progenitors for several generations; I anticipate with pleasing expectation that retreat in which I promise myself to realize without alloy, the sweet enjoyment of partaking, in the midst of my fellow citizens, the benign influence of good laws under a free government—the ever favorite object of my heart, and the happy reward, as I trust, of our mutual cares, labors and dangers.

GEO. WASHINGTON.

UNITED STATES,
17th September, 1796.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I take this occasion to commend the distinguished Senator from West Virginia for his excellent and outstanding rendition of Washington's Farewell Address to the people of the United States. I think it is appropriate at this time to recall that during the darkest hours of the American Revolution, the Father of our Country said:

> Give me but a banner to plant upon the hills of West Augusta—

Which, if I may interpolate, is now the State of West Virginia—

> and I shall gather around me those men who will set this bleeding Nation free.

George Washington was a surveyor in that lovely area, and he spent much of his time in what is now the State of West Virginia. He said that midst its green and quiet hills there was to be found the very essence of freedom itself. I think it is a fitting coincidence that the distinguished and able Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] should have given us today the magnificent words of the first President, in view of the historical association which George Washington had with what is now West Virginia. I am sure that I express the sense of the Senate when I thank the distinguished Senator from West Virginia for his rendition today.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I join with the majority leader in paying tribute to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] for his reading of George Washington's Farewell Address. I know that the manner in which the Senator from West Virginia has done so has brought to all of us a deeper appreciation of the truth and values of that address. His rendition reminded me what a great intellect fathered our country, and that perhaps in this latter time we have tended to confuse great intellectual ability with mere mental acrobatics or gymnastics. There is a great difference. I only wish that hundreds more could have heard the rendition given by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia this noon.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I join the distinguished majority leader in commending the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] for his able rendition of President George Washington's Farewell Address. I wish to point out an incident in the life of George Washington that has sometimes been overlooked.

This morning television reminded us of an incident in the life of George Washington. When the Continental Army was disbanded and the soldiers were going home, we had a weak, inefficient, bankrupt, and almost no, government. When it came time to sign the more than 10,000 discharges, the staff of George Washington recommended that he delegate the duty of signing the discharges to the general of each division. The staff pointed out that George Washington's signature was long and it would be a laborious task to sign that number of discharges.

President George Washington said:

> No, I want every soldier in the American Army to have a discharge signed by me, because I want him to know that I saw his name and appreciate his service in the revolution.

So the discharge of every revolutionary soldier, not only the 10,000, but others, bore the personal signature of President George Washington. That is one little incident in Washington's great devotion to duty.

This morning the distinguished Senator from West Virginia read the address of President George Washington with much feeling, understanding, and meaning, and not as a mere matter of rote. I commend him for the thought that he has given to the great words of admonition from our greatest American.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I am glad that we are today observing the birthday anniversary of George Washington and that we have had an opportunity to listen to the rendition of the Farewell Address by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I, too, wish to add my commendation to those of my colleagues for the excellent rendition of the Farewell Address by the able senior Senator from West Virginia.

I could not help noticing during the course of the Farewell Address that portion which relates to public credit:

> One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible, avoiding occasions of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering, also, that timely disbursements, to prepare for danger, frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it; avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions, in time of peace, to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear.

I wish that more Members of Congress down through the years, including present Members of Congress, had heeded these words, because I read with great concern an article entitled "Uncle Sam Faces $1 Trillion Debt," written by Maurice H. Stans, and published in the February 19, 1962, issue of the Washington Post.

I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR CHANGING ECONOMY—UNCLE SAM FACES $1 TRILLION DEBT

(By Maurice H. Stans)

Treasury Secretary C. Douglas Dillon has asked for a $10 billion increase in the ceiling on our national debt. This would bring it to an all-time high of $308 billion.

The Congress has indicated that it will deal with this request in two installments. An increase of $2 billion will undoubtedly be authorized immediately, as an emergency measure, to permit enough new funding to pay current bills. This will bring the debt total to the magic line of $300 billion.

Above this amount, Dillon will have tougher sailing, and the Congress may give him only a part of the additional $8 billion he wants. Senator **Harry F. Byrd**, Democrat, of Virginia, long-time champion of solvent government, has announced that his Senate Finance Committee will hold hearings on the state of the Government's financial position before voting any further increases. By the time the hearings are concluded, the Senator will have some shocking news to report to the American people.

INTEREST IS $9 BILLION

The annual interest on the national debt is now running above $9 billion, and for the last several years this carrying cost, without any payment on the debt itself, has been taking 11 cents of every dollar of Federal taxes collected. And the chances that any of this debt will ever be paid off seem less and less as time goes on.

This is quite a contrast with the past. From the beginning of the Nation in 1789 until recent years, a major objective of every President was to pay off the national debt. It was done once—by Andrew Jackson in 1834. But each succeeding war built the debt to a new plateau; intervening efforts accomplished reductions but never eliminated the entire amount.

Even so, at the end of fiscal 1916, the debt was only a little more than a billion dollars. By the end of World War I, it had soared above $25 billion. From this high point it was reduced in 11 consecutive years, cutting it by more than one-third to $16 billion in 1930.

From there it began an upward climb, through wartime and peacetime, with the budget in the red 26 years out of 32. The depression years increased the debt regularly, and it had reached nearly $50 billion before the outbreak of World War II. At the close of the war it was $270 billion. Three subsequent surpluses by Truman and three more by Eisenhower could not match the costs of the Korean war and the intervening peacetime deficits. The current year's spending will push the debt to $300 billion, or more, and the end is not in sight.

CREDIT CARD GOVERNMENT

Up to now I have been referring only to the interest-bearing debt. But this isn't all that we owe as a nation. By a continuing policy of national extravagance, we have been committing the Government's future resources beyond this to an incredible degree. We have adopted in Washington a program of "credit-card Government" that is placing a burden of staggering proportions on our children and grandchildren.

As Director of the Budget, I undertook in 1960 to add up all the liabilities of our Government. Here are some of them. We owe $30 billion in unfunded pensions to retired civilian employees of the Government. We owe almost $40 billion in accrued pensions to retired military servicemen. The total of our present commitments to veterans for future pensions and compensation (not counting many other benefits) is in excess of $300 billion. All of this $370 billion is for past services and in the financial statement of a business would be accounted for among liabilities.

Then there are many other present contractual or legislated Government undertakings that will have to be financed in the future. Taking all of them—housing subsidy contracts, shipping subsidies, the Interstate Highway System, unfinished public works projects, unpaid purchases of military supplies and many others—this group adds up to more than $150 billion in further bills to be met in the coming years.

SOCIAL SECURITY, TOO

Altogether, counting the interest-bearing debt of $300 billion and the other obligations and commitments I have mentioned, we have placed a mortgage of over $800 billion on our national future to be met in taxes. This does not include untold billions of dollars in guarantees by the Government on housing loans and other mortgages, bank deposits and other savings, and so on.

Even this is not the full story. Under our social security system, we have scheduled a series of benefits that far exceed, in actuarial terms, the resources that would be available at present tax rates. This deficiency, which can only be made up out of future tax increases already provided in the law, is another $250 or $300 billion.

This makes the total present undertakings of the Government, to be paid from future taxes, in excess of a trillion dollars. And that is beyond the regular annual costs of defense, welfare, and other Government activities.

This is a national debt of more than $22,000 for every family of four in the country. Quite a spending spree we've been on for the last 30 years, isn't it?

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, it is not the present generation that will be paying this debt; it will be a burden passed on to posterity, to future generations of this country, and it will be a most ungenerous burden, too.

TREATMENT OF ELDERLY CITIZENS

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, recently we have heard that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has proposed to place all of the old age pension systems in the country upon the same time schedule. My own State has been far reaching and forward looking in the treatment of its elder citizens. The program is one in which I, as well as many other people, have had an active part. It is a program of which I am personally very proud. If the rules were to be relaxed, as the Secretary has suggested, it would cause irreparable damage to the system and the older people in my State. It would be a change that I would not like to see. I am sure that the people of Colorado would not like to see it.

Recently I received a letter from Guy R. Justis, director of the Department of Public Health of the State of Colorado, enclosing a resolution of the Colorado State Board of Public Welfare, urging that Congress take no action which would cause Colorado to lower its residence requirements for recipients of the old-age pension. I ask unanimous consent that the letter, together with the resolution, be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were ordered to be printed in the **Record**, as follows:

State of Colorado,
Department of Public Welfare,
Denver, Colo., February 16, 1962.

Hon. Gordon Allott,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Allott: Enclosed is a copy of the resolution adopted by the State board of public welfare at their meeting on Friday, February 9, 1962, urging that the Congress of the United States take no action which would cause Colorado to lower its residence requirements for recipients of old-age pension. This resolution was adopted by unanimous vote of the State board.

At the request of the State board I am forwarding a copy of this resolution to each member of the Colorado congressional delegation. We would appreciate hearing from you what action, if any, is taken by the Congress in this regard.

Sincerely yours,
Guy R. Justis,
Director.

Resolution of the Colorado State Board of Public Welfare Urging That the Congress of the United States Take No Action Which Would Cause Colorado To Lower Its Residence Requirements for Recipients of Old-Age Pension

Whereas Colorado has, by vote of its citizens, established one of the most adequate pension systems for the aged in the entire United States by providing for a minimum monthly payment of $100 which has been and may be further increased as the cost of living increases; and

Whereas Colorado in 1958 substantially improved the care for its aged citizens by providing one of the finest medical programs in the Nation; and

Whereas the 5-year residence provision in the present program is a reasonable protection against an influx into Colorado of aged people from other States, particularly adjoining States, with lesser pension programs; and

Whereas to reduce this residence requirement to 1 year would encourage substantial numbers of aged persons from other States to move to Colorado in order to take advantage of the Colorado pension system; and

Whereas the addition of substantial numbers of persons to the present program would substantially reduce the level of medical care now provided under Colorado's pension health and medical care program and cause serious dislocations in the entire program: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the State Board of Public Welfare of the State of Colorado, That the members of this State board of public welfare hereby urge the Congress of the United States to take no action which would lower the residence requirements now in effect for recipients of old-age pension; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Members of Congress of the United States from the State of Colorado.

REVIEW COMMISSION URGES BEACH AREA ACQUISITION IN REPORT TO PRESIDENT

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, all of us are aware of the fast-growing need of the people of the United States for recreational space. We are aware also that as the demand grows, the space available for preservation for public use is dwindling. Every day, new developments and new fences rise and the cost of acquisition of land is skyrocketing.

The national need for preservation of recreational areas is an urgent one and no token recognition will be acceptable. The responsibility for the vision and action necessary to provide recreational areas for a growing populace is one that must be dealt with at all governmental levels, for it is a national problem. Each step we take toward preservation of

recreational areas is a national achievement. Each opportunity we miss is a national expense, for some day these recreational areas must be provided and delay merely raises the price.

As the author of the bill (S. 4) to create a national seashore recreational area on 88.5 miles of Padre Island on the Texas gulf coast, I emphasize that the enactment of this measure would be beneficial to people all over Texas and the United States, not only for our time but for all time.

In a discussion of the availability of recreational sites, the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission recently made this statement in a report compiled for the President and the Congress:

> A most pressing problem of supply is ocean and Great Lakes shoreline. This resource is one of the most in demand, it is one of the most scarce in public ownership. The situation is particularly acute near large cities.
>
> The 48 contiguous States have almost 60,000 miles of shoreline. About one-third of this can be considered as possible recreation supply. This includes beach, marsh, and bluff areas.
>
> Less than 2 percent of the total shoreline is in public ownership for recreation—only 336 miles on the Atlantic coast and 296 miles on the Pacific coast. Yet both coasts are centers of population, and they will be more so in the future. The present supply of publicly owned shoreline for recreation is not adequate, and acquisition will be needed.

In the same report, the Review Commission made the following recommendation:

> Immediate action should be taken by Federal, State, and local governments to acquire additional beach and shoreline areas.

Dan Klepper, in a very able article in the San Antonio News of February 13, said of Padre Island:

> Unless necessary steps are taken immediately, the public will lose its right of access and use of this vast and beautiful shoreline.
>
> Next weekend several newspapermen, including myself, will make a trip down the length of this island. We intend to spend 3 or 4 days on the journey.
>
> We will fish in the surf along the way, and we will camp out at night.
>
> While it is relatively easy to negotiate the 110-mile strip of beach in a four-wheel-drive vehicle, we intend to travel on powerful, off-the-road scooters called Tote-Gotes.
>
> We will pack all of our gear, including gasoline, tents, bedrolls, fresh water, and supplies, on the two-wheeled vehicles.
>
> Our purpose in making this trip will be twofold:
>
> 1. To test the versatility of these vehicles on hard packed and loose sand. There is a possibility that this type of scooter will be invaluable to saltwater anglers who want to get well off the beaten track.
> 2. To show our readers what they might expect to find, see, and do if the island beaches are made easily accessible to them, and to show them the work of nature that will be destroyed if a Padre Island Park is not created.

Mr. President, the Congress of the United States should act now, not next year, to preserve Padre Island. There is a race for time. Developers are now putting out multicolored advertisements in trying to excite people with regard to Padre Island, which, unless action is taken soon, will mean that the prices will be too high for the Government to pay. Mr. President, we are in a race to have this beautiful beach area left as it is now, without any construction on it, for the benefit of all the American people.

To point up the growing national concern over present and future recreational needs in the United States, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the following newspaper articles, entitled "Our First National Seashore—Cape Hatteras: The First American Coastal Area So Designated, Is Attracting More and More Visitors—It Could Happen to Padre," published October 16, 1960, in the Corpus Christi Caller-Times, copyright, 1960, by the Reader's Digest Association, Inc., condensed from Today's Living; "The Outdoorsman: Will Public Lose Padre Beaches," by Dan Klepper, outdoors editor, in the Tuesday, February 13, 1962, edition of the San Antonio News; "Preservation Sought: U.S. Natural Beauty Could Vanish Quickly"; from the Sunday, February 11, 1962, edition of the Corpus Christi Caller-Times; and "Commission Proposes Resources Development," from the February 11, 1962, edition of the Corpus Christi Caller-Times.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Corpus Christi Caller-Times, Oct. 16, 1960]

OUR FIRST NATIONAL SEASHORE—CAPE HATTERAS, THE FIRST AMERICAN COASTAL AREA SO DESIGNATED, IS ATTRACTING MORE AND MORE VISITORS—IT COULD HAPPEN TO PADRE

(By Don Wharton)

Man's desire to stand on the top of some mountain is paralleled by a longing to go down to the edge of the sea. The ocean, from which came life itself, is a magnet pulling us all to the shore. But where our supply of mountains appears inexhaustible, we are now actually running out of seashore for public use.

Huge stretches have become off limits for most people, the way to the shore blocked by no-trespassing signs. In many areas use of beaches is limited to persons stopping at expensive hotels. Too often man has stripped the beach itself of all naturalness by planting it with hotels, cabanas, cabins, and concessions.

Many people have thought it would be wonderful if, somehow, great stretches of shoreline could be set aside permanently for public use and preserved as a seashore wilderness. That is precisely what has been done on the thin, windswept string of barrier islands which form the outer banks of North Carolina.

Here is a stretch of 70 miles of unspoiled beach where you will encounter only shore birds, scurrying crabs, and an occasional surfcaster; and as you walk against the salty wind, you need not worry about any slick promoter's ruining this shoreline: It is preserved and protected for you and your grandchildren and their grandchildren. For it is Cape Hatteras National Seashore, a new and unique unit in our national park system.

Only 8 years old but already attracting nearly half a million visitors a year, this national seashore was made possible by unusual teamwork between Government and private philanthropy. Congress authorized it in 1937 but voted no funds to acquire land. Sixteen years later, with still no Federal money appropriated, the heirs of Henry Phipps stepped forward and donated 2,700 acres of land at Cape Hatteras itself, the key tract worth perhaps $250,000 at the time. The State of North Carolina authorized its Governor to reach into an emergency fund and take out $618,000—to match $618,000 offered by the Mellon family. Later, with land speculators jacking up their prices, North Carolina put in an extra $200,000 and again the Mellons matched it. Thus the Nation acquired a new kind of park: A seashore for everyone for all time.

From the air the narrow islands occupied by the national seashore resemble a wishbone floating in water. The point of union is at Cape Hatteras, from which one clavicle stretches out 40 miles to the north and the other 30 miles to the southwest. At the cape the bone is nearly 3 miles wide; elsewhere it's generally less than a mile and at some points only a few hundred yards from the ocean to the sound. The whole is one of the Nation's major geographic curiosities. Some scholars believe the outer banks were once much farther out and that over the ages the ocean has driven them ever closer to the mainland. Others disagree, say they were part of the mainland. The rest of us, traveling their length again and again, simply marvel that the narrow ribbon of sand is there at all, beaten as it is by water on both sides and blown ceaselessly by winds and gales.

The Gulf Stream is only 15 miles off the cape. It comes driving up from the south, and here runs head-on into cold currents from the north. The result is treacherous Diamond Shoals, formed offshore for 14 miles. You can stand at the cape and witness one of the world's most dramatic demonstrations of the majesty of the sea. As the two major currents collide you see spectacular spray dashing 20, 30 and more feet into the air. On other shorelines you see sprays from water striking rocks; this spray is simply water striking water.

Most visitors come to the national seashore to spend a day on the long beaches or to camp in tents or trailers for a week or two smack up against the dunes. They come over on free bridges and ferries to bathe in the surf, swim in the sound—and also to wade in history.

The first English colonizing attempt in America was on sandy Roanoke Island, which lies in the sound just back of the outer banks. It was on the outer banks in 1903 that the Wrights made the first successful flights in a powered machine heavier than air. The banks might also be called the birthplace of radio. Reginald A. Fessenden is credited with achieving, in 1902, the first long-distance transmission of the human voice by wireless telephone—i.e., radio. His messages were passed between a 50-foot tower erected just north of the cape and another 52 miles away on Roanoke Island.

In 1923 still another innovator came to the outer banks—Brig. Gen. Billy Mitchell. At the southern tip of the national seashore today you can see the improvised airstrip from which his men took off to sink two old battleships anchored as test targets near Diamond Shoals. In 20 minutes Mitchell's planes changed the whole theory of modern warfare.

In both world wars German submarines haunted the area—one man today tells of climbing the lighthouse at the cape during World War II and seeing four tankers burning simultaneously. This lighthouse is the tallest in the United States, and national seashore visitors are privileged to climb its 268 steps.

But most visitors come to get away from the works of man. On this wilderness shoreline, human effort seems puny compared with the power of wind and sea. The inlet through which the English ships brought our first colonists was closed by drifting sands at least 150 years ago. The wind and sea did this huge engineering job. A few miles south, visitors see a long-abandoned highway bridge over dry land—the waters cut an inlet here around 1730, and closed it up 200 years later. The Wrights flew at the base of Kill Devil Hill, a sand dune 90 feet high. But the wind has piled up other dunes here nearly twice that height—and kept them moving, covering live forests in their paths and uncovering dead ones left behind.

The national seashore draws visitors the year around—470,000 last year against 340,000 the year before and 100,000 in 1953. More than half come during the summer, but the other seasons have their attractions, too. More and more people are beginning to recognize the particular charms of an autumn seashore—the sea, the skies, the vegetation, even the sand, take on strange and marvelous colors. Autumn at Hatteras is when fishing is at its best.

In early winter people come to watch the arrival of the greater snow geese—about 10,000 of the 35,000 known population of the fowl feed for weeks on the roots of salt-marsh grasses. Then in late winter commercial fishing begins on the beaches, and many visitors like to watch the men hauling nets in the surf. In spring come bird watchers.

Shouldn't we have more places like this? And shouldn't we secure them before it's too late? Twenty-five years ago the National Park Service made a survey of the Atlantic and gulf coasts, found numbers of unspoiled stretches of seashore and recommended 12 major strips for preservation as national seashores. The Hatteras strip was acquired, but the 11 others were lost; they have long since gone into private and commercial development.

During the past 5 years anonymous donors have provided funds for detailed surveys of all our coasts. In 10,923 miles of shoreline the survey teams found 194 areas which had potentialities for public use and recreation. Twelve of these were recommended by the National Park Service as national seashores: One on the Atlantic coast, five on the Pacific, one on the gulf coast and five along the Great Lakes. Last spring the Secretary of the Interior, with the approval of the President, recommended legislation to set up national seashores at three of these locations: On Cape Cod, on Padre Island off the southermost coast of Texas and at Oregon Dunes, about halfway between California and Washington.

All three would make marvelous national seashores. They have superlative values that warrant permanent preservation; they are geographically well separated, and they have distinctly different park characteristics. The Cape Cod area has the longest undeveloped sweep of beach in New England—backed by cliffs 150 feet high, a picturesque hinterland and much history. Padre Island, a barrier reef, offers 98 miles of remote subtropical beaches with fascinating birdlife. The Oregon Dunes area includes wide, sandy beaches, the most spectacular sand dunes in North America (450 feet high), and lakes sheltered by dense coniferous forests undergrown with masses of rhododendron.

We should move quickly to set up these three new national seashores, and we should create at least one on the Great Lakes—the Nation's longest shore line. Then—before it is too late—we should plan for still more until our great system of national parks, with their scenic wonders, is matched by an equally great system of national seashores, with their opportunities for public recreation in the inspiring surroundings at the edge of the sea.

[From the San Antonio News, Feb. 13, 1962]

WILL PUBLIC LOSE PADRE BEACHES?

(By Dan Klepper)

One of the most pressing problems in providing the American people space for outdoor recreation is the availability of shorelines.

This resource, according to the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, "is one of the most in demand, and it is one of the most scarce in public ownership."

Less than 2 percent of the total shoreline of the United States is in public ownership for recreation.

The Kennedy administration currently is making attempts to develop four shoreline regions into public areas for outdoor recreation.

These are Sleeping Bear Dunes, Mich.; Point Reyes, Calif.; Oregon Dunes, Oreg.; and Padre Island, Tex.

Efforts to establish a large part of Padre Island as a national seashore area have been in the mill for a couple of years.

To date, the attempts have been stymied by land developers and groups wanting to make the area a State park rather than a national area.

Padre Island is a thin strip of sand running approximately 110 miles from the causeway at Flour Bluff to Port Isabel. The island, which is bordered by the gulf on one side and Laguna Madre on the other, varies in width from a few hundred yards to 3 miles.

Padre Island cannot exist in its present state for many more years. Eventually, it will become one of three things: A national seashore area, a State park or a mammoth Miami Beach.

Already the southern tip of the island is being developed in the Miami Beach tradition. There also has been some development on the upper end in the Corpus Christi area.

At present, the army engineers are constructing jetties at Port Mansfield, and the channel for that port will be dredged and maintained to permit shipping. There will be development in that area.

Unless necessary steps are taken immediately, the public will lose its right of access and use of this vast and beautiful shoreline.

Next weekend several newspapermen, including myself, will make a trip down the length of this island. We intend to spend 3 or 4 days on the journey.

We will fish in the surf along the way, and we will camp out at night.

While it is relatively easy to negotiate the 110-mile strip of beach in a four-wheel-drive vehicle, we intend to travel on powerful off-the-road scooters called Tote-Gotes.

We will pack all of our gear, including gasoline, tents, bedrolls, fresh water and supplies, on the two-wheeled vehicles.

Our purpose in making this trip will be twofold:

1. To test the versatility of these vehicles on hard-packed and loose sand. There is a possibility that this type of scooter will be invaluable to saltwater anglers who want to get well off the beaten track.

2. To show our readers what they might expect to find, see and do if the island beaches are made easily accessible to them, and to show them the work of nature that will be destroyed if a Padre Island Park is not created.

[From the Corpus Christi Caller-Times, Feb. 11, 1962]

PRESERVATION SOUGHT—U.S. NATURAL BEAUTY COULD VANISH QUICKLY

(By Laurance S. Rockefeller)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—As chairman of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, which has just submitted a report 3 years in the making to President Kennedy and Congress, Laurance S. Rockefeller has devoted considerable thought to the preservation of America's natural heritage. In the following article he examines the basic philosophy of the outdoors and cites the reasons prompt action is necessary.)

During the work of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, the reply given by American GI's to a question often put to them in World War II has come to mind.

"What are you fighting for?" the servicemen were asked.

The answer, most often, hinged on the preservation of the kind of life they had left behind.

Bracketed by that answer is the total of the good life in this country. While sometimes difficult to sort out, the total includes experiences rooted in freedom and the democratic process, love of family and friends, religious expression, and the physical environment—the towns which produced the fighting men and meant so much to them, and the landscape which they either knew intimately or dreamed of getting to know.

STILL RICH, BEAUTIFUL

This environment—the vast natural setting for the American scene—is still wondrously rich and beautiful overall despite some shocking treatment. That the Nation presents as bright a face as it does must be counted a marvel, considering the magnitude of past malpractice in the handling of soil, water, forest, grassland, and wildlife.

While our natural heritage is fortunately generous, it has its limits. Our urban and industrial civilization puts special strain on the renewable resources as well as those which once taken from the ground are gone forever. In spite of past experience and new knowledge, it would appear (for instance from the amount of current pollution of air and water) that not all the hard lessons have been taken to heart.

Proper care of the outdoor heritage is inseparable from the central concern of the recommendations proposed by the 15 congressional and citizen member of the Commission: To make available to the American people that quantity and quality of land and water they want and need for recreation, which includes any array of activities vital to their way of life.

AN URGENT CALL

Taken together these recommendations are big in purpose and urgent in their call on public and private effort. They could not be otherwise and hope to keep up with the transformation in prospect for this country over the next generation.

What is involved, basically, is the proposition that every citizen is entitled to a share of the good things of this life, and among them are the enjoyment of the Nation's heritage of landscape, lakes, and seashore. Equally important—perhaps even more so—is a conviction that the character of the American people, their spirit, will, and outlook, will be shaped to a large degree in the future as in the past by the nature of their physical surroundings.

It is clearly predictable that these surroundings are going to be subject to greater pressures in the future than in the past.

Barring catastrophe, the basic forces which have changed the natural scene of the United States faster in our lifetime than ever before will continue their momentum at least to the year 2000.

It is noteworthy that more than half of the American people alive today will be around to celebrate the arrival of the next century. Between now and then, the population will increase considerably and the proportion living in metropolitan areas also will rise. People will have more of just about everything that an abundant economy and an astonishing technology can produce—including more leisure time, money, and travel facilities. Combined with the larger population, these last-mentioned factors will generate a demand for outdoor recreation greater than population growth alone would indicate.

In view of these prospects, ways and means of preserving open space reasonably accessible to where most people live are now a necessity, not merely desirable, if the quality of life and man's balance with nature are to be preserved in this country.

DEMAND NOT YET MET

It would be difficult to find anyone who is against outdoor recreation. But that is hardly the same as saying we have always been alert to the needs of the people. The great growth in the public's demand for recreation since the end of the Second World War has not been met. The public agencies involved have generally been forced to jam ever more people into the same areas.

Since no government is in the entertainment business, it is necessary to prove the serious values of outdoor recreation, to build a case for public support. What the servicemen said they were fighting for seems to me a powerful argument. Other major items can be cited, and three among them are labeled "physical fitness," the "leisure times problem," and "education."

A direct relationship exists between many kinds of outdoor recreation and physical fitness. The fact that only two of every seven American youths measure up to the current standards of the U.S. Army amounts to a national shame and scandal. The subject has lately started drawing the public attention it merits.

With further reduction of the average workweek virtually certain in the coming decades, this Nation will have the opportunity to realize more fully the great dream of mankind that the individual shall have a rich and rewarding life. This could come to an important degree from constructive use of the growing amount of leisure time.

USED IF AVAILABLE

As far as outdoor activities are concerned, there is a connection between participation and the availability of open space and facilities. Westerners go camping to a much greater extent than easterners, apparently, since we are a fairly homogeneous people, because camp sites are more plentiful and easier to reach in the West.

The same condition of availability applies to other outdoor activities—walking, fishing, hunting, swimming, to name a few. The first prerequisite for a stroll in a park is the park.

The days when most American boys and girls could become acquainted with the outdoors, nature, on the walk to school, are gone. Not only have the youngsters in the largest cities been denied this enriching experience, but those in many cities and in most of the new suburbs also have been shut out of nature close to home, except for what they find in the backyard.

THE BALANCE OF NATURE

To look across open land, hear a songbird, smell the moss in the woods—these are a necessary beginning to an understanding of the natural forces of the landscape. And man must understand he is one species among many who depend upon each other and upon the natural environment which sustains them all. This is the balance of nature, the ecological system, and our welfare—indeed it is not extreme to say our survival—is inextricably bound up in it.

It takes a department store of outdoor recreation areas to satisfy the 1-day, weekend, and vacation requirements of our people. The matching of the supply of areas with the large, varied demand is an enormous and complicated undertaking. The major problem is to preserve open space reasonably accessible to urban populations, for their enjoyment and benefit.

BOTH KINDS NEEDED

To pose the problem, as some do, as a struggle between lovers of unspoiled wilderness and those who want to develop facilities for masses of people is to straddle the target without hitting it. Both kinds of areas, and others between these extremes, are needed.

Actually, most parks, forest preserves, and other properties devoted entirely or in part to recreation contain two or more kinds of areas or are so endowed by nature that they could. A key purpose of the management agency should be to preserve scenic, natural lands on the one hand and to provide for their use and enjoyment on the other as is done, to cite an example, in Palisades Interstate Park in New Jersey and New York.

It contains beaches, picnic grounds, camping sites, ski runs, and other features, some requiring little and some requiring extensive development. Also in the park—and comprising most of its land area—are primitive stretches in which inconspicuous hiking trails are the only facilities.

A WORTHY PURPOSE

The grand purpose of preserving, developing and assuring access to the outdoors is worthy of a nation dedicated to the well-being of its people and properly concerned about its future. This is the tradition of the Frederick Olmsteds and Gifford Pinchots of other years, and of many conservationists and park experts of our own. While the scope and direction of the effort may change, the goal is unchanging: To provide for the wants and needs of the people in the outdoors.

[From the Corpus Christi Caller-Times, Feb. 11, 1962]

Commission Proposes Resources Development

On January 31 the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, headed by Laurance S. Rockefeller, submitted to President Kennedy and Congress a report called "Outdoor Recreation for America" making more than 50 specific recommendations for action designed to meet outdoor needs of the expanding U.S. population over the next four decades.

The report listed the prospects for growth in population, income, leisure time, travel and other recreation-generating forces. It concluded that a much larger effort in terms of planning and money was needed to guarantee that the benefits of the outdoors will be available to future generations. It also emphasized that changes in management policies governing public and private lands could open up many areas to recreation at relatively little cost without harming other uses of those lands.

The Commission's major proposals included:

Creation of a new bureau of outdoor recreation within the Department of Interior.

Federal grants-in-aid to provide matching funds to States to help them and local communities plan, acquire and develop parks and other outdoor recreation areas.

Immediate action by public agencies to acquire shoreline areas, on the oceans and inland waters.

Federal legislation providing for establishment and management of certain primitive areas as "wilderness areas."

Control of pollution to open up vast amounts of water to swimming and fishing.

RECREATIONAL PROPOSALS

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, last September I was numbered among a minority group, comprising Senators from both sides of the aisle, that urged careful consideration and deliberation of the wilderness preservation system, S. 174. At that time I pleaded with this body to not rush into final action on this legislation until the findings of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission were completed and several proposals for recreation and national parks were considered. Our pleas were in vain.

Now, less than 6 months later, with this information available and some of the recreation proposals before us, new concepts and plans in the outdoor recreation field are unfolding. The then current fad for single recreation use of our outdoor areas is giving way to the time-honored multiple-use concept again as is evidenced in the ORRRC report and the debate recently on the establishment of Great Basin National Park in Nevada.

Mr. President, at this point in my remarks I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Record an editorial evaluation of the ORRRC report, as printed in the Idaho Daily Statesman of Boise, Idaho.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

As a Matter of Information

The Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, set up by act of Congress, has completed 3 years' labors, and turned in its report.

It's the report we've been advised to wait for and to study before irrevocably rejecting, or precipitately plopping for, a lately trumped up scheme to lock up several thousand Idaho acres in a wilderness area.

It's advice that seems to have been pretty good.

This Commission of 15 members, with the chairman of the Rockefeller Brothers Fund as its leader and including Idaho's Republican Senator Henry Dworshak and Democratic Representative Gracie Pfost, is to be accepted as a fairly representative group.

With the assistance of a 60-member staff and with almost as many members of its advisory council, this Commission has produced a 246-page printed report, with illustrations and graphs that is a work of art.

It's a comprehensive summation of statistics and projections that pretty well covers the field from big-town playgrounds to vast wilderness areas. It pretty thoroughly appraises existing facilities for outdoor recreation, and their utilization, and then, allowing for probable increases in individual income and leisure time and, of course, increase of population, it undertakes to figure out future requirements in this field of activity.

It's so wide ranging that, like the Scriptures, it can be quoted by the devil.

It does propose the creation of a new Bureau of Outdoor Recreation in the Department of the Interior to provide leadership, coordination, and assistance, but generally its specific recommendations have been held to a minimum while it stresses the key role of State governments and the responsibility of local governments.

Of particular interest is this report's analysis of public demand for outdoor recreational facilities. It shows, for instance, that driving and walking for pleasure, swimming, and picnicking lead the list of outdoor activities in which Americans participate, and driving for pleasure is most popular of all, and that interest in boating and water sports is sharply on the upturn.

It shows that outdoor opportunities are most urgently needed near metropolitan areas, where the need is most difficult to satisfy.

It shows that 53 percent of the country's motorists travel 250 miles or less from home on vacation trips; that only 10 percent of them travel as far as 2,000 miles, and that only 2 percent of the participants in outdoor activities go in for such things as horseback riding or nature and bird walks.

These, incidentally, are statistics that indicate no very widely prevailing interest in wilderness or primitive areas in which there would be no development of public roads, permanent habitations, or recreation facilities of any sort and would be esteemed for the most part on account of their inspirational, esthetic, scientific, and cultural values.

The report points out, too, that outdoor recreation is often compatible with other resource uses.

In general, it's a report that's limited pretty well as it should be to providing information as a basis on which projects and programs in this field may be built wisely and well.

It's well deserving of serious attention.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1962—DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, Reorganization Plan No. 1 appears to be quite dead, as a result of the action taken not only by the Senate on Tuesday, but also by the House yesterday. If I recall correctly, the vote in the House was 264 to 150, against the plan, in effect.

In the President's news conference of yesterday he made some statements which possibly could carry an unfortunate inference. I believe they should be clarified.

One statement was:

> The difficulty, of course, is that many of those who do not live in urban areas are opposed to it.

He was referring, of course to the proposed Reorganization Plan No. 1, to establish a Department of Urban Affairs.

That statement may, unfortunately, raise the inference that this was a vote of rural area interests against urban area interests. Such an inference should be set aside. It should be pointed out that of the 437 Members of the House of Representatives, 300 come from districts which are classified as over 50 percent urban. Since the proposal mustered only 150 votes, it is apparent that at least half of the Members of the House who come from preponderantly urban districts did not see fit to support it.

As evidence of this classification of these districts, I refer to a release from the U.S. Department of Commerce, dated February 24, 1962. I ask unanimous consent that it may be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

URBAN OUTNUMBER RURAL DISTRICTS IN CONGRESS, 300 TO 137

Members of the 87th Congress representing districts with urban population in the majority outnumber representatives of districts predominantly rural by a margin of more than 2 to 1, according to an examination of 1960 Census of Population counts by the Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce.

The 1960 census data show that of the 437 congressional districts, as constituted for the current session, those with population more than 50 percent urban numbered 300. The rural population exceeded the urban population in 137 districts.

Of the 300 districts in which the urban population exceeds the rural population, 207 were two-thirds or more urban, including 80 districts with 100 percent urban population. Of the 137 districts with more rural than urban population, 41 districts were two-thirds or more rural.

Urban population as percent of total population for congressional districts: 1960

State and congressional district	1960	Percent urban
Alabama	3, 266, 740	54. 8
1st	441, 490	66. 2
2d	386, 075	55. 7
3d	310, 947	45. 3
4th	315, 817	42. 8
5th	305, 941	44. 9
6th	251, 765	38. 9
7th	236, 216	21. 0
8th	383, 625	48. 5
9th	634, 864	84. 6
Alaska (1 Representative at Large)	226, 167	37. 9
Arizona	1, 302, 161	74. 5
1st	663, 510	86. 5
2d	638, 651	62. 1
Arkansas	1, 786, 272	42. 8
1st	360, 183	35. 7
2d	182, 314	17. 7
3d	299, 727	39. 9
4th	301, 286	40. 9
5th	320, 757	69. 9
6th	322, 005	42. 6
California	15, 717, 204	86. 4
1st	547, 593	52. 5
2d	406, 506	35. 2
3d	665, 064	77. 8
4th	375, 371	100. 0
5th	364, 945	100. 0
6th	544, 694	80. 5
7th	293, 517	100. 0
8th	613, 625	98. 0
9th	444, 387	97. 6
10th	741, 930	90. 3
11th	407, 283	65. 4
12th	496, 859	59. 9
13th	647, 495	61. 7
14th	510, 341	57. 6
15th	389, 753	100. 0
16th	285, 038	98. 4
17th	773, 555	99. 4
18th	423, 225	100. 0
19th	643, 176	100. 0
20th	253, 360	100. 0
21st	719, 856	94. 7
22d	435, 392	98. 9
23d	532, 779	100. 0
24th	266, 659	100. 0
25th	803, 302	97. 7
26th	512, 676	100. 0
27th	503, 591	74. 4
28th	1, 014, 460	90. 7
29th	378, 296	66. 9
30th	722, 476	93. 5
Colorado	1, 753, 947	73. 7
1st	493, 887	100. 0
2d	653, 954	69. 7
3d	410, 555	66. 6
4th	195, 551	35. 5
Connecticut [1]	2, 535, 234	78. 3
1st	689, 555	83. 2
2d	411, 919	48. 8
3d	461, 229	88. 1
4th	653, 589	87. 0
5th	318, 942	73. 8
Delaware (1 Representative at large)	446, 292	65. 6
Florida	4, 951, 560	73. 9
1st	820, 443	82. 1
2d	474, 946	83. 1
3d	563, 646	52. 4
4th	982, 968	94. 4
5th	739, 006	59. 4
6th	743, 966	80. 9
7th	386, 593	61. 7
8th	239, 992	37. 4
Georgia	3, 943, 116	55. 3
1st	379, 933	56. 9
2d	301, 123	48. 7
3d	422, 198	52. 7
4th	323, 489	42. 9
5th	823, 680	90. 1
6th	330, 235	53. 9
7th	450, 740	39. 4
Georgia—Continued		
8th	291, 185	45. 5
9th	272, 154	18. 9
10th	348, 379	50. 3
Hawaii (1 Representative at large)	632, 772	76. 5
Idaho	667, 191	47. 5
1st	257, 242	41. 4
2d	409, 949	51. 4
Illinois	10, 081, 158	80. 7
1st	235, 202	100. 0
2d	348, 840	100. 0
3d	419, 509	100. 0
4th	731, 665	96. 6
5th	371, 224	100. 0
6th	345, 284	100. 0
7th	342, 901	100. 0
8th	277, 269	100. 0
9th	302, 658	100. 0
10th	433, 692	100. 0
11th	349, 016	100. 0
12th	360, 360	100. 0
13th	905, 761	89. 9
14th	605, 915	78. 3
15th	414, 347	63. 6
16th	434, 042	65. 2
17th	387, 204	48. 0
18th	352, 483	66. 8
19th	350, 515	65. 4
20th	279, 821	41. 2
21st	354, 910	51. 4
22d	392, 300	64. 9
23d	297, 544	35. 8
24th	487, 198	77. 2
25th	301, 498	42. 4
Indiana	4, 662, 498	62. 4
1st	513, 269	93. 6
2d	357, 309	37. 9
3d	472, 958	68. 7
4th	390, 010	58. 1
5th	459, 473	55. 4
6th	333, 783	46. 0
7th	329, 213	41. 0
8th	423, 929	61. 0
9th	290, 596	31. 1
10th	394, 391	53. 1
11th	697, 567	91. 2
Iowa	2, 757, 537	53. 0
1st	403, 048	61. 1
2d	465, 828	55. 2
3d	395, 657	52. 7
4th	236, 585	41. 3
5th	406, 972	75. 1
6th	289, 445	35. 0
7th	260, 359	40. 0
8th	299, 643	47. 5
Kansas	2, 178, 611	61. 0
1st	358, 852	53. 9
2d	462, 207	77. 6
3d	212, 520	57. 2
4th	580, 124	71. 0
5th	320, 202	46. 0
6th	244, 706	39. 3
Kentucky	3, 038, 156	44. 5
1st	317, 436	31. 1
2d	321, 303	39. 1
3d	610, 947	88. 5
4th	303, 431	17. 4
5th	329, 116	58. 9
6th	411, 459	50. 8
7th	420, 816	17. 4
8th	323, 648	18. 4
Louisiana	3, 257, 022	63. 3
1st	449, 491	94. 3
2d	499, 561	89. 3
3d	387, 207	49. 3
4th	391, 541	64. 9
5th	345, 013	44. 8
6th	536, 029	53. 6
7th	384, 330	53. 9
8th	263, 850	36. 7
Maine	969, 265	51. 3
1st	349, 291	58. 6
2d	304, 984	53. 3
3d	314, 990	41. 3
Maryland	3, 100, 689	72. 7
1st	243, 570	21. 1
2d	621, 935	72. 0
3d	258, 826	100. 0

[1] Connecticut has 1 Representative at Large.

Urban population as percent of total population for congressional districts: 1960—Con.

State and congressional district	1960	Percent urban
Maryland—Continued		
4th	283, 320	100. 0
5th	711, 045	60. 7
6th	608, 666	66. 9
7th	373, 327	100. 0
Massachusetts	5, 148, 578	83. 6
1st	319, 971	68. 1
2d	411, 128	85. 0
3d	348, 500	66. 5
4th	409, 912	82. 2
5th	474, 691	77. 8
6th	336, 819	89. 1
7th	281, 202	97. 6
8th	351, 794	90. 2
9th	418, 449	55. 8
10th	377, 311	100. 0
11th	272, 361	100. 0
12th	285, 056	100. 0
13th	450, 929	98. 4
14th	410, 455	71. 5
Michigan	7, 823, 194	73. 4
1st	283, 302	100. 0
2d	483, 343	53. 4
3d	427, 899	57. 3
4th	366, 991	34. 8
5th	461, 906	74. 0
6th	623, 842	75. 3
7th	664, 556	63. 7
8th	398, 106	50. 5
9th	312, 854	48. 0
10th	308, 917	40. 2
11th	240, 793	43. 7
12th	177, 431	47. 6
13th	268, 040	100. 0
14th	462, 192	100. 0
15th	337, 017	100. 0
16th	802, 994	93. 1
17th	512, 752	97. 8
18th	690, 259	88. 2
Minnesota	3, 413, 864	62. 2
1st	376, 573	47. 8
2d	374, 160	42. 6
3d	697, 572	88. 8
4th	422, 525	98. 8
5th	310, 579	100. 0
6th	332, 823	24. 0
7th	300, 762	23. 7
8th	332, 795	61. 2
9th	266, 075	30. 6
Mississippi	2, 178, 141	37. 7
1st	364, 963	28. 6
2d	237, 887	19. 7
3d	370, 554	33. 3
4th	460, 100	53. 8
5th	295, 072	25. 8
6th	449, 565	49. 4
Missouri	4, 319, 813	66. 6
1st	568, 029	97. 4
2d	543, 060	92. 8
3d	342, 469	100. 0
4th	470, 660	72. 2
5th	302, 813	100. 0
6th	361, 919	54. 0
7th	403, 253	44. 9
8th	334, 455	18. 6
9th	376, 488	35. 7
10th	301, 098	37. 9
11th	315, 569	46. 4
Montana	674, 767	50. 2
1st	274, 194	51. 4
2d	400, 573	49. 3
Nebraska	1, 411, 330	54. 3
1st	380, 532	53. 7
2d	421, 198	84. 7
3d	296, 592	26. 7
4th	313, 008	40. 3
Nevada (1 Representative at large)	285, 278	70. 4
New Hampshire	606, 921	58. 3
1st	331, 818	61. 6
2d	275, 103	54. 2
New Jersey	6, 066, 782	88. 6
1st	585, 586	84. 5
2d	316, 285	75. 5
3d	614, 125	70. 4
4th	490, 891	81. 0
5th	667, 906	81. 1
6th	504, 255	100. 0
7th	555, 555	78. 4
New Jersey—Continued		
8th	394, 279	100. 0
9th	451, 126	100. 0
10th	303, 058	100. 0
11th	308, 660	100. 0
12th	362, 914	99. 2
13th	256, 977	100. 0
14th	255, 165,	100. 0
New Mexico (2 Representatives at large)	951, 023	65. 9
New York	16, 782, 304	85. 4
1st	906, 187	79. 5
2d	506, 197	99. 3
3d	554, 571	100. 0
4th	467, 384	100. 0
5th	391, 403	100. 0
6th	507, 685	100. 0
7th	372, 215	100. 0
8th	356, 961	100. 0
9th	391, 239	100. 0
10th	353, 782	100. 0
11th	411, 988	100. 0
12th	316, 177	100. 0
13th	353, 313	100. 0
14th	339, 465	100. 0
15th	397, 276	100. 0
16th	301, 574	100. 0
17th	260, 235	100. 0
18th	269, 368	100. 0
19th	301, 499	100. 0
20th	279, 475	100. 0
21st	286, 130	100. 0
22d	327, 213	100. 0
23d	335, 166	100. 0
24th	347, 890	100. 0
25th	414, 546	100. 0
26th	402, 204	88. 5
27th	438, 409	91. 0
28th	409, 349	52. 8
29th	396, 122	37. 0
30th	339, 858	81. 5
31st	365, 249	43. 5
32d	317, 649	67. 6
33d	353, 183	41. 2
34th	385, 406	66. 9
35th	423, 028	80. 9
36th	358, 174	40. 9
37th	446, 860	64. 0
38th	413, 498	81. 0
39th	363, 824	66. 7
40th	473, 750	85. 6
41st	332, 776	100. 0
42d	500, 431	74. 7
43d	313, 595	44. 4
North Carolina	4, 556, 155	39. 5
1st	253, 511	30. 5
2d	313, 728	30. 6
3d	382, 124	21. 7
4th	442, 059	39 0
5th	408, 992	44. 5
6th	487, 159	67. 5
7th	455, 630	33. 6
8th	396, 369	23. 2
9th	364. 561	38. 6
10th	452, 732	58. 5
11th	307, 575	39. 5
12th	291, 715	31. 1
North Dakota (2 Representatives at large)	632, 446	35. 2
Ohio	9, 706, 397	73. 4
1st	375, 753	95. 7
2d	488, 368	93. 7
3d	726, 156	86. 4
4th	356, 994	46. 1
5th	298, 051	34. 5
6th	380, 847	31. 7
7th	435, 621	52. 1
8th	290, 694	54. 6
9th	456, 931	92. 6
10th	274, 441	40. 3
11th	512, 022	56. 9
12th	682, 962	92. 2
13th	389, 312	68. 9
14th	578, 884	82. 3
15th	236, 288	36. 5
16th	492, 631	63. 6
17th	375, 504	50. 3
18th	328, 921	49. 7
19th	378, 122	82. 4
20th	465, 341	100. 0
21st	421, 804	100. 0
22d	357, 998	99. 5
23d	402, 752	98. 8
Oklahoma	2, 328, 284	62. 9
1st	521, 542	77. 8
2d	368, 976	43. 5
3d	227, 692	34. 8
Oklahoma—Continued		
4th	252, 208	53. 6
5th	552, 863	89. 4
6th	405, 003	47. 0
Oregon	1, 768, 687	62. 2
1st	517, 678	51. 4
2d	265, 164	44. 1
3d	522, 813	96. 4
4th	463, 032	46. 1
Pennsylvania	11, 319, 366	71. 6
1st	260, 767	100. 0
2d	344, 174	100. 0
3d	273, 911	100. 0
4th	314, 909	100. 0
5th	461, 287	100. 0
6th	347, 464	100. 0
7th	553, 154	96. 0
8th	536, 103	77. 0
9th	488, 967	47. 0
10th	328, 127	67. 5
11th	346, 972	81. 1
12th	277, 165	57. 0
13th	516, 682	79. 5
14th	275, 414	64. 3
15th	293, 868	63. 3
16th	353, 564	61. 2
17th	332, 813	42. 8
18th	354, 043	24. 9
19th	415, 058	52. 1
20th	297, 384	50. 2
21st	352, 629	60. 7
22d	358, 173	44. 5
23d	291, 407	39. 5
24th	456, 157	62. 9
25th	434, 552	55. 2
26th	426, 035	34. 2
27th	472, 113	100. 0
28th	328, 164	100. 0
29th	426, 742	100. 0
30th	401, 568	100. 0
Rhode Island	859, 488	86. 4
1st	399, 782	89. 4
2d	459, 706	83. 9
South Carolina	2, 382, 594	41. 2
1st	421, 478	44. 5
2d	531, 555	47. 7
3d	318, 809	36. 7
4th	444, 230	49. 1
5th	272, 220	35. 2
6th	394, 302	27. 8
South Dakota	680, 514	39. 3
1st	497, 669	38. 5
2d	182, 845	41. 2
Tennessee	3, 567, 089	52. 3
1st	460, 583	32. 1
2d	497, 121	51. 5
3d	412, 664	56. 1
4th	389, 563	27. 3
5th	399, 743	87. 7
6th	324, 357	28. 9
7th	232, 652	28. 9
8th	223, 387	27. 4
9th	627, 019	87. 8
Texas	9, 579, 677	75. 0
1st	245, 942	45. 8
2d	420, 402	72. 5
3d	293, 942	48. 0
4th	216, 371	52. 9
5th	951, 527	97. 5
6th	248, 149	47. 6
7th	265, 629	38. 9
8th	568, 193	90. 5
9th	498, 775	56. 0
10th	353, 454	69. 3
11th	322, 484	64. 8
12th	538, 495	94. 6
13th	326, 781	67. 3
14th	539, 262	68. 7
15th	515, 716	71. 4
16th	573, 438	84. 9
17th	287, 889	64. 7
18th	363, 596	69. 2
19th	424, 774	63. 9
20th	687, 151	93. 4
21st	262, 742	57. 6
22d	674, 965	97. 9
Utah	890, 627	74. 9
1st	317, 973	53. 4
2d	572, 654	86. 7

***Urban population as percent of total population for congressional districts: 1960*—Con.**

State and congressional district	1960	Percent urban
Vermont (1 Representative at large)	389,881	38.5
Virginia	3,966,949	55.6
1st	422,624	63.1
2d	494,292	95.2
3d	418,081	82.8
4th	352,157	27.4
5th	325,989	27.3
6th	378,864	57.1
7th	312,890	29.4
8th	357,461	21.8
9th	364,973	19.3
10th	539,618	88.8
Washington	2,853,214	68.1
1st	420,548	95.9
2d	366,395	48.7
3d	342,540	49.1
4th	414,764	53.9
5th	399,093	65.6
6th	399,362	68.6
7th	510,512	85.0
West Virginia	1,860,421	38.2
1st	273,107	61.6
2d	276,874	22.7
3d	268,334	22.8
4th	345,208	48.3
5th	275,813	19.6
6th	421,085	47.1
Wisconsin	3,951,777	63.8
1st	434,528	65.1
2d	530,316	63.5
3d	299,265	35.8
4th	515,367	100.0
5th	520,674	100.0
6th	376,325	59.1
7th	319,547	39.0
8th	411,807	60.0
9th	307,078	28.3
10th	236,870	33.0
Wyoming (1 Representative at large)	330,066	56.8

Mr. MILLER. Another point was made in the President's news conference with respect to the defeat of the urban affairs proposal, to the effect that some day "there is going to be an Urban Department."

I sincerely trust that we will never have a Department of Urban Affairs such as that meaningless proposal which came to Congress under Reorganization Plan No. 1.

I have been pointing out for several weeks now that Reorganization Plan No. 1 would do nothing except change the label on the outside of the building from "Housing and Home Finance Agency—Public Housing Administration" to "Department of Urban Affairs"; change Mr. Weaver's title from Head to Secretary; and add an Under Secretary of the Department for Urban Affairs at $21,000 a year, and three Assistant Secretaries at $20,000 a year.

That is all that would have been accomplished. How anyone can get excited about the defeat of that proposal and consider it a defeat for people living in cities is beyond me. The only way I can explain it is that people have not read Reorganization Plan No. 1. It might be a good idea if they would do so. Then they might realize why the plan was defeated as badly as it was.

It would be something else if the President saw fit to present a proposal to establish a meaningful Department of Urban Affairs, preferably to be called a Department of Community Development—and even more preferably not a department, but a bureau within the Department of Commerce, to coordinate under one roof not only the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Public Housing Administration, but also veterans' housing, area redevelopment, the Small Business Administration, and rural redevelopment; a proposal which would be meaningful for persons who live in metropolitan cities, in suburbia, in small towns, and in the rural areas. But the proposal which was acted upon yesterday in the House came to Congress in the insidious form of classism and racism.

The Washington Evening Star of today has published an editorial entitled "Deserved Defeat," which points this fact out very well.

Also, the Washington Evening Star of Friday, February 9, 1962, published an article entitled "Against an Urban Department," written by William S. White, which showed why this proposal should be defeated.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial and article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington, D.C., Evening Star, Feb. 22, 1962]

DESERVED DEFEAT

The President's plan to set up a Department of Urban Affairs has met with a crushing defeat in the House, and deservedly so. The adverse vote was 264 to 150, and this 114-vote margin was much larger than anyone had predicted.

One reason, certainly, stems from the crude political pressure tactic used by the Kennedy administration. The first indication of this came on Tuesday when the Senate, which probably would have voted in favor of the plan on its merits, rejected a maneuver to get the Senate on record before the House could act. To do this it was necessary to discharge the Senate committee considering the plan, although it was conceded the committee had not used delaying tactics. In short, this was an attempt to use the Senate as a club with which to belabor the House, and the scheme was rejected by the decisive margin of 58 to 42.

Before the vote in the House, there was a contrived effort to inject racism into the debate. This was set up by the President when he announced that, should the new Department be created, he would appoint Robert C. Weaver, a Negro, as its head. The effect was to put pressure on the Republicans, since a vote against creating the Department would be attacked as a vote against permitting a Negro to achieve Cabinet status. Of course, this automatically assured the opposition of virtually all Southern Democrats, and left Republicans who might be against the new Department on its merits in a position where they could and would be charged with racism. To their credit, the vast majority of House Republicans refused to be intimidated by this shabby strategy, and, somewhat surprisingly, they were joined in voting against the plan by a substantial number of Democrats from the West and Midwest.

We do not think that either the Senate or the House vote is an accurate reflection of sentiment with respect to the merits of the urban affairs plan, since it might have fared better had it not been for the attempt to put its opponents in such an obviously false position. Perhaps, as the President says, an urban affairs department surely will be created later on. But the first requirement, we think, is for the administration to abandon the rash and even dangerous type of politicking which was the hallmark of this first unsuccessful effort.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Feb. 9, 1962]

AGAINST AN URBAN DEPARTMENT—ARGUMENT OF "JUSTICE" CALLED NONSENSE, HARMFUL RESULTS ARE FEARED

(By William S. White)

President Kennedy's plan to create a new Cabinet-rank Department of Urban Affairs ought to be rejected by Congress for the good of the country—and for the President's own good, if it comes to that.

Mr. Kennedy and Gov. Nelson Rockefeller of New York, who hopes to be Mr. Kennedy's GOP Presidential adversary in 1964, have been playing old-fashioned politics on the issue. The prize is the favor of miniority groups and big-city people generally.

This is not against the Constitution nor in violation of tradition. All the same, while fun is fun, there is no sound reason to involve the country in this enterprise.

To set up such a department and create in the person of Dr. Robert Weaver an 11th member of the Cabinet would be short of a national calamity. But it would have obviously harmful results. The innuendo that opposition is based on the fact that Dr. Weaver is a Negro—and a distinguished one—is unfair. It may apply to a handful of Southern extremists. It is not the controlling factor, even to most Southerners. Certainly, it is not to the Republican opposition—though it is true that the Republicans asked for the situation in a way by happily needling Mr. Kennedy about "not doing enough for the Negro."

To proclaim as solemn Federal policy that city Americans are different from other Americans would be an act of national disunion when national unity was never more needed.

To declare that city people need a special Government department to have true "representation" would be to say baselessly that they don't now have fully adequate "representation."

To set up such a department would be to gather up into one immensely powerful new pressure agency dozens of economic, social, religious, and racial groups which, now operating separately, are already quite powerful enough.

The argument is made that because there long has been a Department of Agriculture "serving country people" justice is denied until there is a department "serving city people." This is demonstrable nonsense. The Department of Agriculture serves a fundamental all-national interest, production of food and fiber. The Commerce Department serves an all-national interest, American business. The Labor Department serves yet another all-national interest, American labor.

Obviously, Commerce is already more helpful to city than to country people. Obviously, so is Labor. So is Treasury.

Another argument is that the metropolitan centers can no longer solve their own problems. The logical extension of this is that a Federal Urban Department would shortly become the great dumping ground for metropolitan problems. Who in the cities will long suffer the headaches of housing and transportation if these can simply be painlessly handed over to Washington? What happens to municipal responsibility, to local self-government?

Of course, one motive is to reduce the undue power of rural pressure groups in Congress by increasing the power of urban pressure groups in the Cabinet. This is an odd remedy, however, when one considers that the big cities already have at the very heart of the whole thing—the choosing of a President—a wholly disproportionate power both in the nominating and electing processes.

Finally, this reform is, amid our somber world realities, an unnecessarily little thing. What great cold war commander really wants to be remembered as the man who created a "Department of Urban Affairs" at an hour when national survival is in question? What hot war commander would want to be remembered as the man who improved the quartermaster's system of counting GI underwear?

NOMINATIONS FOR FEDERAL JUDGESHIPS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the Chicago Daily Tribune recently published an editorial entitled "Score: 82 to 0." The editorial relates to the action of the present administration in not adhering to its campaign assurances that politics would not be present in the appointment of Federal judges. The editorial states that of 82 nominations for Federal judgeships thus far under the New Frontier, not one has been of a Republican. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCORE: 82 TO 0

Byron (Whizzer) White, the Deputy Attorney General, was an artful dodger when he played football, and he showed that he has not lost his skill when he appeared before the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association at its midwinter meeting here. He faced the task of explaining why his boss, President Kennedy, has made 82 nominations for Federal judgeships without naming 1 Republican.

Mr. Kennedy is the same Kennedy who in August 1960, when he was a Senator, wrote to the President of the American Bar Association as follows: "I would hope that the paramount consideration in the appointment of a judge would not be his political party, but his qualifications for the office. Please be assured of my cooperation in the effort to achieve your objectives in this regard."

In an address on October 17, 1960, when he was a presidential candidate, Mr. Kennedy vowed that all his appointments would be made "on the basis of ability—without regard to race, creed, national origin, sex, section, or occupation." He added, "I want the best."

How these promises have been kept was explained by Bernard G. Segal, head of the Federal judiciary committee of the bar association. He recalled that when Mr. Kennedy took office the party affiliation of Federal judges was just about evenly divided between Republicans and Democrats.

"Now, once again," he said, "the imbalance has set in. Except for two recess appointees of the last administration and one member of the Liberal Party in New York, every other appointee of the past year was a Democrat."

Mr. Segal also reported that of the 85 Kennedy nominations and recess appointments, the bar association's Federal judiciary committee found 14 exceptionally well qualified, 41 well qualified, 23 qualified, and 7 not qualified.

These embarrassing statistics did not rattle Deputy Attorney General White. First he tried a quarterback sneak by saying that there is diversified opinion as to qualifications for the Federal bench. His next play was a long forward pass in which he insisted that all the 82 Democrats appointed by the President were chosen on the basis of ability, not political affiliation.

In football one of the most important elements is deception. Now you see the ball, and now you don't. What counts at the end of the game is the score, not the biographies of the players on the scorecard.

The old Whizzer is on a team which is so powerful that it does not have to worry about campaign promises or about the views of high-minded idealists in the bar association. So the score is 82 to 0.

COMMUNITY ACTION GETS RESULTS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the January 1962 issue of the magazine Iowa Industrial Expansion contains a short but very interesting article relating to the benefits of community action.

The article demonstrates the results which can be obtained from a city's pulling itself up by its own bootstraps, so to speak, and entering into community action. The city concerned is my hometown of Sioux City, which is in the current competition for one of the awards for All-America City.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Sioux City's Community Action Gets Results" be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SIXTEEN BIG STEPS FORWARD—SIOUX CITY'S COMMUNITY ACTION GETS RESULTS

"Sioux City has embarked upon more major improvement programs in a short span of time and has seen more concrete results of these efforts than any community of comparable size in the country."

Such a statement is not made as a boast by loyal Sioux Cityans today, but as a simple statement of fact. Sioux City's list of accomplishments is the result of total community action, says George Wimmer, manager of the Industrial Development Council of Sioux City.

The following 16 achievements are a part of the total community program that has resulted from total community action:

1. A $7 million sewage treatment plant is under construction and scheduled for completion by 1963.
2. All major highways leading into Sioux City have been improved and Interstate Highway 29 now serves as an intercity expressway connecting this metropolis with the great Interstate Highway System.
3. A $17 million flood control project in the Floyd Valley, to be completed by 1964, is underway.
4. A $4,200,000 urban renewal project is in progress.
5. The bridge across the Missouri River joining Sioux City and South Sioux City, Nebr., has been widened to four lanes. Another bridge crossing this river is contemplated.
6. Golfers will be yelling "fore" next season on a new 18-hole public golf course.
7. A $100 million Sage installation went into operation late in 1961 as an essential part of America's defense system.
8. A Capehart housing project costing more than $4 million was completed near the Sioux City Municipal Airport.
9. A master plan for Sioux City's development through 1980 has been developed, accepted, and put into effect.
10. More than $20 million has been spent on improvements by the Sioux City Municipal Airport.
11. New street lights have been installed in downtown Sioux City and along the interstate highway bordering the Missouri River.
12. Enlargement programs are in effect at the city's three institutions of higher learning—Morningside, Briar Cliff, and the National Business Training College.
13. Two multimillion dollar shopping centers have been opened, one in the fast-growing north side, the other in an 8¼-acre private enterprise redevelopment downtown.
14. A new $25 million powerplant is being built by Iowa Public Service Co.
15. New zoning ordinances for the entire city will become effective January 1, 1962.
16. Within the past 3 years, 45 manufacturers have expanded their operations in Sioux City. In addition, 10 new industries have been welcomed to the business community.

The Industrial Development Council of Sioux City and its sister unit, the Industrial Development Expansion Association, Inc., or IDEA, Inc., is managed by a full-time staff. Through its efforts the Tri-View Industrial District, a carefully engineered 90-acre industrial plot, was developed for industry.

The district faces the scenic Missouri River and is ideally located on an interchange of Interstate Highway 29.

Of the 90 original acres, only 39 remain unoccupied. There are 10 different facilities in the district including 8 manufacturers and distributors, a plush 160-unit Holiday Inn motel, and a maintenance garage for the Iowa highway commission. The baby of the Tri-View family is the 35,000 square foot Container Corp. of America plant presently under construction.

THREAT OF COMMON MARKET TO U.S. FARMER

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the Waterloo (Iowa) Daily Courier, of February 19, 1962, published an excellent lead editorial entitled "Is Common Market Big Threat to U.S. Farmer?" The editorial states that the unfortunate action recently taken by the Common Market in establishing an agricultural policy of becoming self-sufficient in agricultural matters could have a disastrous effect on future American exports of agricultural products.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS COMMON MARKET BIG THREAT TO U.S. FARMER?

As noted in these columns earlier this month, the six nations of the Common Market have decided on a protectionist policy on agricultural products which will deny American farmers a part of the export market they now enjoy.

Internal tariffs among the six nations will be gradually reduced to the vanishing point and in their place will be imposed a sliding tariff scale for all which amounts to the difference between the Common Market support prices and the world market price. This means these nations after 1965 will import only what cannot be produced internally; and high support prices will drastically stimulate internal production.

The West German support price on wheat, for example, is $3 a bushel and the French figure is $2.20 a bushel. The compromise figure is expected to be about $2.60 as compared to about $2.15 in the United States. The way in which supports with modern technology can increase production is illustrated in the case of Great Britain, which, before World War II, was feeding only a third of its population from domestic production and now is feeding half of an increasing population. The overall production increase has been 60 percent.

According to C. H. Carmical in the New York Times, "The Common Market is bound to bring about a sharp decline in imports of farm products to the six member countries. Because of the variable tariff duties, the United States would be able to sell those countries only those items they could not produce. This would be only cotton."

(The European countries do not currently produce soybeans and may not attempt to do so. However, an import levy would be imposed if they decided to produce this crop.)

Since only about 2½ percent of American feed-grain production has been exported to the Common Market countries in the past, the eventual loss of perhaps half of the entire market would not exactly be disastrous. Moreover, the loss of the market will be gradual as the Common Market builds toward agricultural self-sufficiency.

But about 7 percent of American soybean production has gone in the past to Common Market countries; and the impact of the loss of this market would be more serious. This is where the United States must use its bargaining power in trade negotiations.

That is why Senator JACK MILLER, Republican, of Iowa, declared in the Senate the other day: "Let me make it very clear that I for one do not propose to expand the President's powers to negotiate new reciprocal trade agreements with the Common Market or the Common Market nations unless I have satisfactory assurance that this is to be a truly quid pro quo arrangement—a two-way street, if you please, which will assure continuance of our agricultural exports."

PRESERVATION OF VIEW FROM GEORGE WASHINGTON'S HOME AT MOUNT VERNON

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I think it is appropriate to call attention, during our observance of George Washington's Birthday, to the fact that the 87th Congress has indicated its reverence of his memory, and those things for which his memory stands, by more than words.

On last September 20 the Senate passed what is now Public Law 87-362 authorizing the acquisition of lands and easements to lands across the Potomac River from Mount Vernon for the purpose of preserving the view from the Washington home. The House measure, which the Senate passed, was a companion to a Senate bill which I had the honor to introduce on June 6, 1961. The measure was signed into law on October 4, 1961. The authorized appropriation of $937,000 is a very modest but very important sum, for it will assure that the environs at Mount Vernon, and the view from what Mrs. John F. Kennedy has described as "the Nation's most revered house," will not be violated by a sewage treatment plant, an oil tank farm, or other development which would alter its character.

I am always reluctant to hinder or restrain business development, or governmental agencies, such as the Suburban Sanitary Commission. The business activities are desirable and essential to the maintenance of a healthy economy. The provision of sanitary facilities is a necessity but I am sure that there are alternative sites where a sewage treatment plant can be erected, one capable of meeting the future needs of the area as well as the present. And there are alternative sites for industrial and commercial development.

There is no problem involved here of making impossible desirable industrial development or construction of essential public facilities. They can be located elsewhere, and it is to the credit of Congress that we have voted that such development shall not be permitted to intrude upon the majesty of this most important historical site.

Many people and organizations are to be congratulated for their part in preserving the dignity and beauty of the environs of Mount Vernon. The distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], who held hearings and steered the preservation bill through the Senate, is one of them.

The Mount Vernon Ladies' Association has done our Nation a great service in the restoration and preservation of Mount Vernon itself, and in stimulating the protection of the area.

On the House side, Representative ASPINALL, chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Representative SAYLOR, who sponsored the bill, Representative RUTHERFORD and Representative BOLTON deserve special thanks for their leadership.

Representative BOLTON, as vice regent of the Ladies Mount Vernon Association and as a principal officer of the Accokeek Foundation, which now stands ready to donate its lands to the Federal Government, has done the Nation an especially great service, as will all of those citizens who are helping to give the Government land and easements without cost, so as to make protection of the area possible.

Mr. President, we can all take pride in Public Law 87-362 and the assurance it gives that Mount Vernon and the Potomac River area around it will be preserved as a link between living generations and the man who led his countrymen—our forebears—in the establishment of a government of freemen.

PLIGHT OF SENIOR CITIZENS WHO LIVE ON SMALL INCOMES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the grave plight of our senior citizens who live on small pensions or social security payments, when faced with the high costs of modern medical care, is a cause for deep concern. On many occasions I have risen in the Senate to present letters from individuals in my own State who are facing this plight in a very immediate way.

I have received letter after letter from older persons who fervently desire to care for themselves and to sustain a life of dignity on their heartbreakingly limited incomes. The number of these letters is borne out statistically by the fact that more than half of our senior citizens over the age of 65 have annual incomes of less than $1,000. With the high cost of hospital, surgical, and medical treatment under modern conditions, these individuals are obviously completely unable to pay for the medical services that they need. To require a means test or other form of pauper's oath is an affront to human dignity, as well as—under these circumstances—absurd in view of the fact that so many of our older people are within that category.

The sound and dignified way to provide the medical care which our senior citizens need and deserve is through the time-tested social security insurance system. Such a program of medical benefits would be self-financing and would provide these benefits, not as charity, but as a matter of right, which is as it ought to be.

Recently I received a letter from Kenosha, Wis., telling me in moving personal terms of the problem a woman faces in trying to get essential medical care while living on her social security income. I ask unanimous consent that this deeply moving letter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KENOSHA, WIS., *January 18, 1962*.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: I am an old lady 70 years old. I have only $40 social security every month. I have to pay $12.55 for hospital and medical insurance, so I have only $27.45 to live on. How do you expect a person can live?

So dear Senator will you please for God's sake vote for the bill to be passed for hospital and medical on social security?

I have not 1 cent income of my own and no home. I have to share with my son and grandchildren. My son is out of a job too sometimes. He used to work for Simmons. As you know they moved out, leaving so many workers jobless.

Hoping and praying that you vote yes,

Sincerely,

Mrs. A. R.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday, February 26, 1962.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, February 26, 1962, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

II Timothy 2: 7: *The Lord give Thee understanding in all things.*

O Thou God of all grace, on this 22d day of February, we are commemorating the birth and life of our first President, whose name shines like a star in the crown of humanity.

Our hearts expand with pride as we think of his courage in times of adversity and his loyalty to the principles of righteousness and justice which constrained him to champion the cause of the distressed colonists.

We thank Thee for his devout faith which sent him down upon his knees in prayer in order that he might know how to keep in step with the will and wisdom of God.

Grant that the memory of his life may stir and strengthen the soul of our Republic to live in the fear of the Lord and to labor for the blessedness of all mankind.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, without being considered as a precedent, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may have permission to extend their remarks in the Record and include extraneous matter for today only.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS DISPENSED WITH

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

GEORGE WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 6, 1962, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Roush] to read George Washington's Farewell Address.

Mr. ROUSH read the Farewell Address, as follows:

To the People of the United States:

Friends and Fellow Citizens: The period for a new election of a citizen to administer the executive government of the United States being not far distant, and the time actually arrived when your thoughts must be employed in designating the person who is to be clothed with that important trust, it appears to me proper, especially as it may conduce to a more distinct expression of the public voice, that I should now apprise you of the resolution I have formed, to decline being considered among the number of those, out of whom a choice is to be made.

I beg you, at the same time, to do me the justice to be assured, that this resolution has not been taken, without a strict regard to all the considerations appertaining to the relation which binds a dutiful citizen to his country; and that, in withdrawing the tender of service which silence in my situation might imply, I am influenced by no diminution of zeal for your future interest; no deficiency of grateful respect for your past kindness; but am supported by a full conviction that the step is compatible with both.

The acceptance of, and continuance hitherto in the office to which your suffrages have twice called me, have been a uniform sacrifice of inclination to the opinion of duty, and to a deference for what appeared to be your desire. I constantly hoped that it would have been much earlier in my power, consistently with motives which I was not at liberty to disregard, to return to that retirement from which I had been reluctantly drawn. The strength of my inclination to do this, previous to the last election, had even led to the preparation of an address to declare it to you; but mature reflection on the then perplexed and critical posture of our affairs with foreign nations, and the unanimous advice of persons entitled to my confidence, impelled me to abandon the idea.

I rejoice that the state of your concerns, external as well as internal, no longer renders the pursuit of inclination incompatible with the sentiment of duty or propriety; and am persuaded, whatever partiality may be retained for my services, that in the present circumstances of our country, you will not disapprove my determination to retire.

The impressions with which I first undertook the arduous trust, were explained on the proper occasion. In the discharge of this trust, I will only say that I have, with good intentions, contributed towards the organization and administration of the government, the best exertions of which a very fallible judgment was capable. Not unconscious in the outset, of the inferiority of my qualifications, experience, in my own eyes, perhaps still more in the eyes of others, has strengthened the motives to diffidence of myself; and, every day, the increasing weight of years admonishes me more and more, that the shade of retirement is as necessary to me as it will be welcome. Satisfied that if any circumstances have given peculiar value to my services they were temporary, I have the consolation to believe that, while choice and prudence invite me to quit the political scene, patriotism does not forbid it.

In looking forward to the moment which is to terminate the career of my political life, my feelings do not permit me to suspend the deep acknowledgment of that debt of gratitude which I owe to my beloved country, for the many honors it has conferred upon me; still more for the steadfast confidence with which it has supported me; and for the opportunities I have thence enjoyed of manifesting my inviolable attachment, by services faithful and persevering, though in usefulness unequal to my zeal. If benefits have resulted to our country from these services, let it always be remembered to your praise, and as an instructive example in our annals, that under circumstances in which the passions, agitated in every direction, were liable to mislead amidst appearances sometimes dubious, vicissitudes of fortune often discouraging—in situations in which not unfrequently want of success has countenanced the spirit of criticism, the constancy of your support was the essential prop of the efforts, and a guarantee of the plans, by which they were effected. Profoundly penetrated with this idea, I shall carry it with me to my grave, as a strong incitement to unceasing vows that heaven may continue to you the choicest tokens of its beneficence—that your union and brotherly affection may be perpetual—that the free constitution, which is the work of your hands, may be sacredly maintained—that its administration in every department may be stamped with wisdom and virtue—that, in fine, the happiness of the people of these states, under the auspices of liberty, may be made complete by so careful a preservation, and so prudent a use of this blessing, as will acquire to them the glory of recommending it to the applause, the affection and adoption of every nation which is yet a stranger to it.

Here, perhaps, I ought to stop. But a solicitude for your welfare, which cannot end but with my life, and the apprehension of danger, natural to that solicitude, urge me, on an occasion like the present, to offer to your solemn contemplation, and to recommend to your frequent review, some sentiments which are the result of much reflection, of no inconsiderable observation, and which appear to me all important to the permanency of your felicity as a people. These will be offered to you with the more freedom, as you can only see in them the disinterested warnings of a parting friend, who can possibly have no personal motive to bias his counsel. Nor can I forget, as an encouragement to it, your indulgent reception of my sentiments on a former and not dissimilar occasion.

Interwoven as is the love of liberty with every ligament of your hearts, no recommendation of mine is necessary to fortify or confirm the attachment.

The unity of government which constitutes you one people, is also now dear to you. It is justly so; for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence; the support of your tranquility at home; your peace abroad; of your safety; of your prosperity; of that very liberty which you so highly prize. But as it is easy to foresee that, from different causes and from different quarters much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth, as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively (though often covertly and insidiously) directed; it is of infinite moment, that you should properly estimate the immense value of your national union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment to it; accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as the palladium of your political safety and prosperity; watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety; discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can, in any event, be abandoned; and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.

For this you have every inducement of sympathy and interest. Citizens by birth, or choice, of a common country, that country has a right to concentrate your affections. The name of American, which belongs to you in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of patriotism, more than any appellation derived from local discriminations. With slight shades of difference, you have the same religion, manners, habits, and political principles. You have, in a common cause, fought and triumphed together; the independence and liberty you possess, are the work of joint counsels, and joint efforts, of common dangers, suffering and successes.

But these considerations, however powerfully they addressed themselves to your sensibility, are greatly outweighed by those which apply more immediately to your interest.—Here, every portion of our country finds the most commanding motives for carefully guarding and preserving the union of the whole.

The *north*, in an unrestrained intercourse with the *south*, protected by the equal laws of a common government, finds in the production of the latter, great additional resources of maritime and commercial enterprise, and precious materials of manufacturing industry.—The *south* in the same intercourse, benefiting by the same agency of the *north*, sees its agriculture grow and its commerce expand. Turning partly into its own channels the seamen of the *north*, it finds its particular navigation invigorated; and while it contributes, in different ways, to nourish and increase the general mass of the national navigation, it looks forward to the protection of a maritime strength, to which itself is unequally adapted. The *east*, in a like intercourse with the *west*, already finds, and in the progressive improvement of interior communications by land and water, will more and more find a valuable vent for the commodities which it brings from abroad, or manufactures at home. The *west* derives from the *east* supplies requisite to its growth and comfort—and what is perhaps of still greater consequence, it must of necessity owe the *secure* enjoyments of indispensable *outlets* for its own productions, to the weight, influence, and the future maritime strength of the Atlantic side of the Union, directed by an indissoluble community of interest as *one nation*. Any other tenure by which the *west* can hold this essential advantage, whether derived from its own separate strength; or from an apostate and unnatural connection with any foreign power, must be intrinsically precarious.

While then every part of our country thus feels an immediate and particular interest in union, all the parts combined cannot fail to find in the united mass of means and efforts, greater strength, greater resource, proportionably greater security from external danger, a less frequent interruption of their peace by foreign nations; and, what is of inestimable value, they must derive from union, an exemption from those broils and wars between themselves which so frequently afflict neighboring countries not tied together by the same government; which their own rivalship alone would be sufficient to produce, but which opposite foreign alliances, attachments, and intrigues, would stimulate and embitter. Hence likewise, they will avoid the necessity of those overgrown military establishments, which under any form of government are inauspicious to liberty, and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican liberty. In this sense it is, that your union ought to be considered as a main prop of your liberty, and that the love of the one ought to endear to you the preservation of the other.

These considerations speak a persuasive language to every reflecting and virtuous mind and exhibit the continuance of the union as a primary object of patriotic desire. Is there a doubt whether a common government can embrace so large a sphere? let experience solve it. To listen to mere speculation in such a case were criminal. We are authorized to hope that a proper organization of the whole, with the auxiliary agency of governments for the respective subdivisions, will afford a happy issue to the experiment. It is well worth a fair and full experiment. With such powerful and obvious motives to union, affecting all parts of our country, while experience shall not have demonstrated its impracticability, there will always be reason to distrust the patriotism of those who, in any quarter, may endeavor to weaken its hands.

In contemplating the causes which may disturb our Union, it occurs as matter of serious concern, that any ground should have been furnished for characterizing parties by *geographical* discriminations—*northern* and *southern*—*Atlantic* and *western;* whence designing men may endeavor to excite a belief that there is a real difference of local interests and views. One of the expedients of party to acquire influence within particular districts, is to misrepresent the opinions and aims of other districts. You cannot shield yourselves too much against the jealousies and heart burnings which spring from these misrepresentations; they tend to render alien to each other those who ought to be bound together by fraternal affection. The inhabitants of our western country have lately had a useful lesson on this head; they have seen, in the negotiation by the executive, and in the unanimous ratification by the senate of the treaty with Spain, and in the universal satisfaction at the event throughout the United States, a decisive proof how unfounded were the suspicions propagated among them of a policy in the general government and in the Atlantic states, unfriendly to their interests in regard to the Mississippi. They have been witnesses to the formation of two treaties, that with Great Britain and that with Spain, which secure to them everything they could desire, in respect to our foreign relations, towards confirming their prosperity. Will it not be their wisdom to rely for the preservation of these advantages on the union by which they were procured? will they not henceforth be deaf to those advisers, if such they are, who would sever them from their brethren and connect them with aliens?

To the efficacy and permanency of your Union, a government for the whole is indispensable. No alliance, however strict, between the parts can be an adequate substitute; they must inevitably experience the infractions and interruptions which all alliances, in all times, have experienced. Sensible of this momentous truth, you have improved upon your first essay, by the adoption of a constitution of government, better calculated than your former, for an intimate union, and for the efficacious management of your common concerns. This government, the offspring of our own choice, uninfluenced and unawed, adopted upon full investigation and mature deliberation, completely free in its principles, in the distribution of its powers, uniting security with energy, and maintaining within itself a provision for its own amendment, has a just claim to your confidence and your support. Respect for its authority, compliance with its laws, acquiescence in its measures, are duties enjoined by the fundamental maxims of true liberty. The basis of our political systems is the right of the people to make and to alter their constitutions of government.—But the constitution which at any time exists, until changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all. The very idea of the power and the right of the people to establish government, presupposes the duty of every individual to obey the established government.

All obstructions to the execution of the laws, all combinations and associations, under whatever plausible character, with the real design to direct, control, counteract, or awe the regular deliberations and action of the constituted authorities, are destructive of this fundamental principle, and of fatal tendency.—They serve to organize faction, to give it an artificial and extraordinary force, to put in the place of the delegated will of the nation the will of party, often a small but artful and enterprising minority of the community; and according to the alternate triumphs of different parties, to make the public administration the mirror of the ill concerted and incongruous projects of faction, rather than the organ of consistent and wholesome plans digested by common councils, and modified by mutual interests.

However combinations or associations of the above description may now and then answer popular ends, they are likely, in the course of time and things, to become potent engines, by which cunning, ambitious, and unprincipled men, will be enabled to subvert the power of the people, and to usurp for themselves the reins of government; destroying afterwards the very engines which have lifted them to unjust dominion.

Towards the preservation of your government and the permanency of your present happy state it is requisite, not only, that you steadily discountenance irregular opposition to its acknowledged authority, but also that you resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles, however specious the pretext. One method of assault may be to effect, in the forms of the constitution, alterations which will impair the energy of the system; and thus to undermine what cannot be directly overthrown. In all the changes to which you may be involved, remember that time and habit are at least as necessary to fix the true character of governments, as of other human institutions:—that experience is the surest standard by which to test the real tendency of the existing constitution of a country:—that facility in changes, upon the credit of mere hypothesis and opinion, exposes to perpetual change from the endless variety of hypothesis and opinion: and remember, especially, that for the efficient management of your common interests in a country so extensive as ours, a government of as much vigor as is consistent with the perfect security of liberty is indispensable. Liberty itself will find in such a government with powers properly distributed and adjusted, its surest guardian. It is, indeed, little else than a name, where the government is too feeble to withstand the enterprises of faction, to confine each member of the society within the limits prescribed by the laws, and to maintain all in the secure and tranquil enjoyment of the rights of person and property.

I have already intimated to you the danger of parties in the state, with particular references to the founding of them on geographical discrimination. Let me now take a more comprehensive view, and warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party generally.

This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our nature, having its root in the strongest passions of the human mind.—It exists under different shapes in all governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed; but in those of the popular form it is seen in its greatest rankness, and is truly their worst enemy.

The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge natural to party dissension, which in different ages and countries has perpetrated the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism. But this leads at length to a more formal and permanent despotism. The disorders and miseries which result, gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual; and, sooner or later, the chief of some prevailing faction, more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purpose of his own elevation on the ruins of public liberty.

Without looking forward to an extremity of this kind (which nevertheless ought not to be entirely out of sight) the common and continual mischiefs of the spirit or party are sufficient to make it the interest and duty of a wise people to discourage and restrain it.

It serves always to distract the public councils, and enfeeble the public administration. It agitates the community with ill founded jealousies and false alarms; kindles the animosity of one part against another; foments occasional riot and insurrection. It opens the door to foreign influence and corruption, which finds a facilitated access to the government itself through the channels of party passions. Thus the policy and the will of one country are subjected to the policy and will of another.

There is an opinion that parties in free countries are useful checks upon the administration of the government, and serve to keep alive the spirit of liberty. This within certain limits is probably true; and in governments of a monarchical cast, patriotism may look with indulgence, if not with favor, upon the spirit of party. But in those of the popular character, in governments purely elective, it is a spirit not to be encouraged. From their natural tendency, it is certain there will always be enough of that spirit for every salutary purpose. And there being constant danger of excess, the effort ought to be, by force of public opinion, to mitigate and assuage it. A fire not to be quenched, it demands a uniform vigilance to prevent it bursting into a flame, lest instead of warming, it should consume.

It is important likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those intrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department, to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism. A just estimate of that love of power and proneness to abuse it which predominate in the human heart, is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasion of the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern; some of them in our country and under our own eyes.—To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the constitution designates.—But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield.

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism, who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked, Where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation *desert* the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect, that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.

It is substantially true, that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government. The rule, indeed, extends with more or less force to every species of free government. Who that is a sincere friend to it can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundation of the fabric?

Promote, then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it should be enlightened.

As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit. One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible, avoiding occasions of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering, also, that timely disbursements, to prepare for danger, frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it; avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions, in time of peace, to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear. The execution of these maxims belongs to your representatives, but it is necessary that public opinions should cooperate. To facilitate to them the performance of their duty, it is essential that you should practically bear in mind, that towards the payment of debts there must be revenue; that to have revenue there must be taxes, that no taxes can be devised which are not more or less inconvenient and unpleasant; that the intrinsic embarrassment inseparable from the selection of the proper object (which is always a choice of difficulties), ought to be a decisive motive for a candid construction of the conduct of the government in making it, and for a spirit of acquiescence in the measures for obtaining revenue, which the public exigencies may at any time dictate.

Observe good faith and justice towards all nations; cultivate peace and harmony with all. Religion and morality enjoin this conduct, and can it be that good policy does not equally enjoin it? It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and, at no distant period, a great nation, to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence. Who can doubt but, in the course of time and things, the fruits of such a plan would richly repay any temporary advantages which might be lost by a steady adherence to it; can it be that Providence has not connected the permanent felicity of a nation with its virtue? The experiment, at least is recommended by every sentiment which ennobles human nature. Alas! is it rendered impossible by its vices?

In the execution of such a plan, nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachments for others, should be excluded; and that in place of them, just and amicable feelings towards all should be cultivated. The nation which indulges towards another an habitual hatred, or an habitual fondness, is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. Hence, frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed, and bloody contests. The nation, prompted by ill will and resentment, sometimes impels to war the government, contrary to the best calculations of policy. The government sometimes participates in the national propensity, and adopts through passion what reason would reject; at other times, it makes the animosity of the nation subservient to projects of hostility, instigated by pride, ambition, and other sinister and pernicious motives. The peace often, sometimes perhaps the liberty of nations, has been the victim.

So likewise, a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter, without adequate inducements or justifications. It leads also to concessions, to the favorite nation, of privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the nation making the concessions, by unnecessary parting with what ought to have been retained, and by exciting jealousy, ill will, and a disposition to retaliate in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld; and it gives to ambitious, corrupted or deluded citizens who devote themselves to the favorite nation, facility to betray or sacrifice the interests of their own country, without odium, sometimes even with popularity; gilding with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation, a commendable deference for public opinion, or a laudable zeal for public good, the base or foolish compliances of ambition, corruption, or infatuation.

As avenues to foreign influence in innumerable ways, such attachments are particularly alarming to the truly enlightened and independent patriot. How many opportunities do they afford to tamper with domestic factions, to practice the arts of seduction, to mislead public opinion, to influence or awe the public councils!—Such an attachment of a small or weak, towards a great and powerful nation, dooms the former to be the satellite of the latter.

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence (I conjure you to believe me fellow citizens) the jealousy of a free people ought to be *constantly* awake; since history and experience prove, that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. But that jealousy, to be useful, must be impartial, else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike for another, cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odious; while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people, to surrender their interest.

The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations, is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little *political* connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith:—Here let us stop.

Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none, or a very remote relation. Hence, she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, or the ordinary combinations and collusions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people, under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon, to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation, when we may choose peace or war, as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel.

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice?

It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliance with any portion of the foreign world; so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it; for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements. I hold the maxim no less applicable to public than private affairs, that honesty is always the best policy. I repeat it, therefore, let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense. But in my opinion, it is unnecessary, and would be unwise to extend them.

Taking care always to keep ourselves by suitable establishments, on a respectable defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

Harmony, and a liberal intercourse with all nations, are recommended by policy, humanity, and interest. But even our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand; neither seeking nor granting exclusive favors or preferences; consulting the natural course of things; diffusing and diversifying by gentle means the streams of commerce, but forcing nothing; establishing with powers so disposed, in order to give trade a stable course, to define the rights of our merchants, and to enable the government to support them, conventional rules of intercourse, the best that present circumstances and mutual opinion will permit, but temporary, and liable to be from time to time abandoned or varied as experience and circumstances shall dictate; constantly keeping in view, that it is folly in one nation to look for disinterested favors from another; that it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character; that by such acceptance, it may place itself in the condition of having given equivalents for nominal favors, and yet of being reproached with ingratitude for not giving more. There can be no greater error than to expect, or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard.

In offering to you, my countrymen, these counsels of an old and affectionate friend, I dare not hope they will make the strong and lasting impression I could wish; that they will control the usual current of the passions, or prevent our nation from running the course which has hitherto marked the destiny of nations, but if I may even flatter myself that they may be productive of some partial benefit, some occasional good; that they may now and then recur to moderate the fury of party spirit, to warn against the mischiefs of foreign intrigue, to guard against the impostures of pretended patriotism; this hope will be a full recompense for the solicitude for your welfare by which they have been dictated.

How far, in the discharge of my official duties, I have been guided by the principles which have been delineated, the public records and other evidences of my conduct must witness to you and to the world. To myself, the assurance of my own conscience is, that I have, at least, believed myself to be guided by them.

In relation to the still subsisting war in Europe; my proclamation of the 22d of April, 1793, is the index to my plan. Sanctioned by your approving voice, and by that of your representatives in both houses of congress, the spirit of that measure has continually governed me, uninfluenced by any attempts to deter or divert me from it.

After deliberate examination, with the aid of the best lights I could obtain, I was well satisfied that our country, under all the circumstances of the case, had a right to take, and was bound in duty and interest, to take a neutral position. Having taken it, I determined, as far as should depend upon me, to maintain it with moderation, perseverance and firmness.

The considerations which respect the right to hold this conduct, it is not necessary on this occasion to detail. I will only observe that, according to my understanding of the matter, that right, so far from being denied by any of the belligerent powers, has been virtually admitted by all.

The duty of holding a neutral conduct may be inferred, without anything more, from the obligation which justice and humanity impose on every nation, in cases in which it is free to act, to maintain inviolate the relations of peace and amity towards other nations.

The inducements of interest for observing that conduct will best be referred to your own reflections and experience. With me a predominant motive has been to endeavor to gain time to our country to settle and mature its yet recent institutions, and to progress, without interruption, to that degree of strength, and consistency which is necessary to give it, humanly speaking, the command of its own fortunes.

Though in reviewing the incidents of my administration, I am unconscious of intentional error, I am nevertheless too sensible of my defects not to think it probable that I may have committed many errors. Whatever they may be, I fervently beseech the Almighty to avert or mitigate the evils to which they may tend. I shall also carry with me the hope that my country will never cease to view them with indulgence; and that, after forty-five years of my life dedicated to its service, with an upright zeal, the faults of incompetent abilities will be consigned to oblivion, as myself must soon be to the mansions of rest.

Relying on its kindness in this as in other things, and actuated by that fervent love towards it, which is so natural to a man who views in it the native soil of himself and his progenitors for several generations; I anticipate with pleasing expectation that retreat in which I promise myself to realize without alloy, the sweet enjoyment of partaking, in the midst of my fellow citizens, the benign influence of good laws under a free government—the ever favorite object of my heart, and the happy reward, as I trust, of our mutual cares, labors and dangers.

GEO. WASHINGTON.

UNITED STATES,
17th September, 1796.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 26, 1962, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1737. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States transmitting a report on review of the military assistance program (MAP) for Greece, as administered by the Joint U.S. Military Aid Group to Greece; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1738. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives pursuant to section 3 of the act of July 21, 1961, (75 Stat. 216, 217), and pursuant to rule XL of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 10355. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 10356. A bill to amend title I of the National Housing Act to provide that a home improvement loan may be the subject of insurance thereunder even though its maturity exceeds the specified limits if it is made for the purpose of financing the construction of a family fallout shelter; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 10357. A bill to provide for the settlement of claims against the United States by members of the uniformed services and civilian officers and employees of the United States for damage to, or loss of, personal property incident to their service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 10358. A bill to amend section (9)(a) of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 10359. A bill to provide that for the purpose of disapproval by the President each provision of an appropriation bill shall be considered a separate bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 10360. A bill to amend section 612(f) of title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Administrator to furnish medical services for non-service-connected disabilities to those veterans receiving or entitled to receive disability pension; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 10361. A bill to amend section 3011 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that the effective date of an award of increased compensation, dependency, and indemnity compensation, or pension shall be fixed in accordance with the facts found; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 10362. A bill to amend section 314 of title 38, United States Code, to authorize total disability compensation for veterans having the service-connected disability of deafness, both ears; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GOODELL:

H.R. 10363. A bill relating to the occupational training, development, and use of the manpower resources of the Nation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H.R. 10364. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a depreciation deduction for the wear and tear of real property used as the taxpayers' principal residence; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KORNEGAY:

H.R. 10365. A bill to preserve wheat acreage history; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LIBONATI:

H.R. 10366. A bill to incorporate the Paralyzed Veterans of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 10367. A bill to provide for the appointment of two additional judges for the juvenile court of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.R. 10368. A bill to limit the authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation to sell any farm commodity owned or controlled by it; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RANDALL:

H.R. 10369. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to increase the survivor annuity from 50 percent to 75 percent of the principal annuity in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.R. 10370. A bill to increase from $600 to $1,000 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H.J. Res. 639. Joint resolution to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, to promote quality and price stabilization, to define and restrain certain unfair methods of distribution and to confirm, define and equalize the rights of producers and resellers in the distribution of goods identified by distinguishing brands, names, or trademarks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. Con. Res. 437. Concurrent resolution to prohibit training military personnel or aiding Communist nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. Res. 550. Resolution condemning the growing anti-Semitism in Russia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII:

The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass legislation that would transfer the present site and building of the Santa Fe Post Office, when it is declared surplus, to the State of New Mexico for the utilization of such site and building for a State museum, which was referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KORNEGAY:

H.R. 10371. A bill for the relief of Ferdinand A. Hermens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa:

H.R. 10372. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Michele Amodeo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Homeowners Deserve a Much Better Plan Than the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1962

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, our homeowners deserve a much better plan than the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing sponsored by President Kennedy.

I am intensely interested in legislation which will help cities combat blight and enable the Federal Government to gain more tax revenue thereby over the long run.

The spreading blight of urban decay and obsolescence is far outrunning the ability of cities and the Federal Government to deal effectively with the problems involved.

I am not in favor of the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing because it would simply increase the huge sums now devoted to grandiose city-beautiful schemes involving yacht basins, luxury apartments starting at $325 a month, parking lots at public expense disguised as slum-clearance programs, and downtown renewal schemes costing hundreds of millions of dollars.

Three-hundred-and-twenty-five-dollar-a-month luxury apartments are being provided in the Southwest urban renewal project, in Washington, D.C., in which the Federal Government has an investment of more than $70 million.

Parking lots requiring the destruction of houses which would cost up to $50,000 to $75,000 each to replace are planned in the Adams-Morgan urban renewal project area. If there is one shred of evidence that 16th Street, Columbia Road, Lanier Place, and the Kalorama Triangle are slum areas—as claimed by the National Capital Planning Commission, and the Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia—then it should be brought forward for the entire Nation to examine.

Urban renewal schemes for the renovation of the Georgetown area of Washington, D.C., have been in the news for months. Georgetown is one of the most expensive areas in the entire country to live in. If it is a slum then this is news to its inhabitants.

These are the kind of plans which have gotten the administration's plans for a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing into trouble.

There are much better plans available.

President Eisenhower's Urban Renewal Commissioner, David M. Walker, once said that he firmly believed that tax considerations can stimulate a new industry of home improvements and repair, and that the Treasury, over the long run, would gain more revenue than it would lose.

Mr. Walker considered decay and obsolescence of American cities one of our Nation's most serious domestic problems.

Among other things, Mr. Walker recommended that, first, homeowners be allowed to deduct repair and maintenance expenses in the same way landlords can at the present time, and, second, individuals who are property owners be allowed to depreciate the cost of home improvements more rapidly as an incentive to home restoration and remodeling.

I have today introduced legislation which would provide individuals with an itemized income tax deduction for depreciation of their residences. Present law only permits a deduction for depreciation of property used in a trade or business or held for the production of income. These present deductions, which both individuals and corporations can take, are not changed by my new bill.

The National Association of Home Builders supports the depreciation approach embodied in my bill. In fact, the statement of policy for 1962 of the National Association of Home Builders, item IX, reads:

> The annual depreciation in a home, through use, should be recognized by annual income tax deduction. We urge that homeowners be allowed to deduct annually an allowance for depreciation.

Ours is a representative form of government. The Congress has shown that there is little support for President Kennedy's plan to establish a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

If the President really believes in representative government then he should look into proposals such as the one I am introducing today. Certainly it is a plan which would be highly popular with all Americans.

More than 60 percent of American householders now own the homes they live in. My bill would greatly encourage homeownership.

There is nothing which would better demonstrate to the world the desirability of the American system over the Communist system than the proof that all of its citizens are homeowners.

The need for some recognition in the tax law of the wear and tear and obsolescence of a family dwelling has been obvious for some time. When a home is sold at a profit, taxable capital gain is realized; a loss is not recognized. A halfway step to alleviate the tax problem of the homeowner was taken in 1951 when a provision was added to the law postponing the tax on the gain produced by sale of a residence if a new residence is purchased or constructed by the homeowner within a specified period of time and if the new residence costs as much as the sales price of the old one. However, the tax on the gain was only postponed by the 1951 provision; it will be taxed if the homeowner sells his residence without buying or building a new one of equal or greater value, and the provisions of this bill would not affect either the postponement or the ultimate taxability. As a matter of fact, since the depreciation deduction would reduce the tax basis, the ultimate capital gain subject to tax could only be increased.

Each homeowner would be permitted to deduct an amount each year computed by taking into account the cost—or other basis of the property—the useful life, and the salvage value of the property. If the residence were acquired by gift or by bequest, then the cost to the donor or decedent would be the basis of the property for depreciation. The useful life and the salvage value shall be matters subject to proof by the taxpayer, but the Internal Revenue Service will publish regulations to provide minimum reasonable allowance.

If in any year a homeowner declined to take the itemized deduction for depreciation, electing rather the standard deduction, then the basis of the property would still be reduced by the amount allowable to him. Likewise, the cost basis of a residence for the first year when a deduction is allowable, 1962, will be adjusted downward to take into account actual wear and tear sustained by the homeowner prior to that year.

A person has to be a homeowner to qualify for this deduction; a person renting his home will not receive the benefits quite correctly, since he has no capital investment in the property and loses nothing through wear and tear or obsolescence. A person holding the property for life, however, would be entitled to the deduction. Of course, equitable ownership, though the property is subject to a mortgage or deed of trust, will qualify for the deduction.

The text of my new bill, which carries out the policy of the National Association of Home Builders, follows:

H.R. —

Bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a depreciation deduction for the wear and tear of real property used as the taxpayer's principal residence

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) part VII of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to additional itemized deductions for individuals) is amended by redesignating section 217 as section 218 and by inserting after section 216 the following new section:

"SEC. 217. DEPRECIATION OF RESIDENCE.

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—There shall be allowed as a depreciation deduction in the case of a taxpayer who is an individual a reasonable allowance for the exhaustion, wear and tear (including a reasonable allowance for obsolescence) of property owned by him and used as his principal residence.

"(b) PROPER METHOD.—The term 'reasonable allowance' as used in subsection (a) shall include (but shall not be limited to) an allowance computed in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, under the straight line method.

"(c) BASIS FOR DEPRECIATION.—The basis on which exhaustion, wear and tear, and obsolescence are to be allowed shall be the adjusted basis provided in section 1011 for the purpose of determining the gain on the sale or other disposition of such property, except that (1) the basis of a residence or any part thereof acquired from a decedent within the meaning of section 1014(b), or acquired by gift, shall be the same as it would be in the hands of the decedent or the donor, as the case may be, or the last owner by whom it was not acquired from a decedent or by gift, and (2) the basis, however determined, shall be reduced by an adjustment for exhaustion, wear and tear, and obsolescence to the extent sustained prior to January 1, 1962, either by the taxpayer or any decedent or donor with respect to whose basis the taxpayer's basis is determined.

"(d) OWNERSHIP.—For the purpose of applying subsection (a), a principal residence shall be deemed owned by the taxpayer if legal or beneficial ownership of the property is in the taxpayer. In the case of property held by one individual for life with remainder to another individual, the deduction shall be computed as if the life tenant were the absolute owner of the property and shall be allowed to the life tenant. In the case of property held in trust or in an estate, the depreciation deduction under this section shall be allowed to the individual who by the terms of the trust instrument, will, or law of succession is permitted to occupy the property and who, in fact, uses the property as his principal residence."

(b) The table of sections for such part VII is amended by striking out

"SEC. 217. CROSS REFERENCES."

and inserting in lieu thereof

"SEC. 217. DEPRECIATION OF RESIDENCE.

"SEC. 218. CROSS REFERENCES."

(c) The amendments made by this Act shall apply only with respect to taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Legislation Introduced for Two Additional Juvenile Court Judges in the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1962

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation today that will provide two additional judges for the juvenile court in the District of Columbia. The bill which I have introduced is similar to the proposal which was approved by the Senate last year.

The House is scheduled to consider the measures dealing with the problems facing the juvenile court on Monday, February 26. I hope that at that time the House will approve the legislation which I have introduced today.

I have introduced this measure to add two judges to the juvenile court after a complete discussion with metropolitan area community leaders and a complete study of the various proposals to remedy the problems caused by the huge backlog of juvenile cases. I believe that the best method of solving this problem is to strengthen the present court rather than transfer its functions to another court.

The current backlog of over 2,000 cases now pending in the juvenile court has provided the District of Columbia with one of its most serious social problems. The approval of this bill would reduce the time between apprehension and trial from 15 weeks to 5 days. The present delay in hearing juvenile cases is one cause of delinquency that can be remedied immediately by the Congress.

The plan which I have introduced is supported by the Judicial Conference of the District of Columbia, the District of Columbia Bar Association and the Washington Bar Association as well as many other civic leaders.

House Resolution 543 To Authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce To Conduct an Investigation and Study of the Adequacy of the Regulation of Nonscheduled Airlines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1962

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, when I introduced House Resolution 543 on February 12, 1962, I stated its purpose is to direct the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to make an intensive review of the manner in which the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Federal Aviation Agency have regulated the nonsked airline industry. It is my belief, based on the evidence before our special subcommittee of the House Committee on Armed Services, as well as my own investigations, that the Imperial Airlines accident is attributable to the loose regulation of these carriers by the CAB and the FAA, as well as the poor management of the carrier.

In view of the magnitude of our scheduled air carrier industry, I am not persuaded that there was a demonstrated need for these nonscheduled certificates, and in holding them illegal, the court of appeals disagreed with the CAB, too, in many respects. However, I realize that the present Board inherited this problem from its predecessors. In fairness to all concerned, I should point out that throughout the history of the nonsked problem, present CAB member Chan Gurney and his former associate, Col. Harmar Denny, of my own State of Pennsylvania, consistently urged caution in the issuance of the nonsked certificates and voted for enforcement penalties and sanctions against those who violated regulations. The CAB has leaned over backward to resolve all doubts about certifications, certificate renewal, hidden control, and inadequate financial responsibility, and managerial ability in favor of the nonskeds instead of in favor of the public. Following the Board's ill-advised actions in issuing these certificates and in failing to revoke them when knowledge of their inadequate financial responsibility or questionable managerial fitness came to its attention, the problem then shifted to the FAA.

Here again I realize the present Administrator inherited a problem in trying to keep up with the fitness of these marginal carriers.

It is quite obvious that an undue number of hours have been required on the part of FAA personnel to determine the fitness of the equipment, personnel and operations of these nonscheduled carriers. I agree with the majority's conclusion that the Imperial Airlines accident could have been prevented. I agree with the majority's conclusion that there has been inadequate attention given to the managerial capacity and financial responsibility of these carriers. I agree with the majority's conclusion that any doubt concerning legal authority of CAB and FAA should have been resolved in favor of the public interest rather than the industry, particularly where economic factors affecting safety are concerned.

But I would go further. My question is why this situation has been allowed to continue. Why the CAB and the FAA have not used all of the legal authority that they presently have to eliminate the incompetent or unfit operators, and if they do not have adequate authority to accomplish this, why have they not asked the Congress for such additional authority as they may need to deal with this situation.

I cannot help wondering how many potential Imperials there may be in the supplemental industry in view of: (a) Administrator Halaby's testimony in reference to supplemental carriers that "there are good ones and not so good ones"; (b) the admitted failure of either CAB or FAA to evaluate adequately the management and financial resources of supplemental airlines; and (c) testimony of MATS that they have found a substantial number of carriers not qualified for military traffic. I certainly feel the general public is as entitled to safe air transportation as is the military. There is too much evidence that this is not always the case today.

Both the CAB and FAA told the subcommittee they were conducting extensive investigations of these carriers. What have been the results of the investigations? What changes should be made in the legislation now pending before the Congress to bring this industry under proper control? We should insist before final action is taken on this legislation that it eliminate all possibility of incompetent, poorly financed or poorly run operators. In this connection, it is my opinion that the interim certificate authority may not be adequate to accomplish this. Why should the Congress direct the Board to give interim certificates to carriers which the Board's own findings might show are unfit, unsafe, or otherwise incompetent? Let us give the CAB and FAA authority to cut off the carriers that have filed false reports, that have operated in defiance or violation of Federal law and regulation, whose control may have come into the hands of persons whom the Board presently considers unfit. And for the future, if the Congress contemplates setting up a permanent class of supplemental carriers, let us make sure that the initial certificate standards are high, and that doubts as to the public need for fitness or ability of these applicants is resolved in favor of the public and not in the private interest.

With that in mind, I sincerely hope that my resolution, House Resolution No. 543, will receive favorable consideration and thereby direct the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to review the CAB and FAA to determine the adequacy of the regulation of nonscheduled airlines.

We Must Lead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1962

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, these words from Washington's Farewell Address come ringing down through the years, holding important counsel for us in 1962. Today we celebrate the birthday of George Washington, whose armies loosened us from the bonds of foreign domination and—as our first President—launched us on the mighty course of a sovereign state. Here are his words:

> Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence * * * the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake, since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the baneful foes of republican government.

During our development as the strongest and most progressive Nation in history, Americans have had to adjust to a changing world, a world so outwardly different from Washington's that to even compare them is to mock time itself. Even so, the unchangeable principles upon which our Republic was founded remain to guide us today when we are inextricably entwined in a larger, more complex world.

Washington's warning about the dangers of foreign influence is a guideline for present U.S. foreign policy. We must participate in the world; our history and our destiny demand that we lead as well. Washington's words that foreign influence must not divert U.S. policy—a policy which reflects the position of the United States—is as important in this age as it was in our first President's era.

A republican form of government is as sturdy as the maintenance of the sovereignty upon which it was built. Our hallmark is freedom and our challenge lies in the exertion of leadership as freemen. It is for this reason that the United States has not only inherited—but earned—its position as leader against the forces of tyranny and oppression.

All too often we have allowed ourselves to become submerged in a puddle of international wishy-washiness. A clear U.S. foreign policy, anchored by its force as the free world's leader, has subsequently become diluted. It is essential that today, recalling Washington's apt reflection, we secure our proper and vital role in assuming the leadership of freemen everywhere.

Amendment of Juvenile Court Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. CARLTON LOSER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1962

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia that considered and reported favorably H.R. 6747, amending the Juvenile Court Act of the District of Columbia, I heartily join with the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Honorable JAMES C. DAVIS of Georgia, in support of the Juvenile Court Act for the District.

The crimes of violence that have been committed over a period of years by juveniles under the age of 18 is startling. As a matter of fact, between July 1, 1959, and April 1, 1960, there were more crimes committed by juveniles of the ages of 16 and 17 than there were between the ages of 18 and 20.

Mr. Speaker, it is my considered opinion that the District of Columbia Committee has done an outstanding job in reporting H.R. 6747 to the House for its consideration. My experience in the prosecution of criminal cases in Tennessee covers a period of more than a quarter of a century, and as a result of this experience in dealing with crime I have come to a definite conclusion as to the method that should be used in combating crime. I do not believe there is a greater deterrent to antisocial conduct more effective than the certainty of apprehension, together with a speedy trial and adequate punishment.

Mr. Speaker, I was astounded to learn when I sat in on these hearings that juveniles charged with the crimes of rape and murder under the age of 18 could be tried in a juvenile court. In my State of Tennessee, our juvenile courts have no jurisdiction whatsoever in rape and murder cases, regardless of the age of the accused. Our statute in Tennessee creating the juvenile court specifically provides that persons charged with these serious offenses are to be tried in a court enjoying general jurisdiction in criminal cases.

Mr. Speaker, Judge DAVIS, the subcommittee chairman, has been most diligent in these hearings, and I believe that should H.R. 6747 become the law here in the District it will operate as a great deterrent.

It is shameful that in the Capital City of the Nation so many crimes of violence have been committed by juveniles that the police department had to issue a set of instructions to Washingtonians who traverse the streets here after dark. The police department even suggested that persons in an automobile who were approached by a suspicious looking person, immediately move off rapidly even if it means running a red light. I was shocked to learn that five women were ravished in 4 days in the middle of 1961 and that four of the rapes were committed within 13 hours. It is a matter of common knowledge that rapes and assaults have been committed in the daytime and at night on the streets and in homes and, upon occasion, even in business establishments.

I believe it would be manifestly in the public interest that the jurisdiction of the juvenile court, in handling youth offenders, should be reduced from 18 to 16 years.

The Metropolitan Police Department of the District of Columbia has an unusually effective leader in Chief Robert V. Murray, and his Department has been doing a splendid job under adverse circumstances. Here in the District we have nearly 3,000 policemen, and 50 police dogs have been secured and trained and are now assisting in patrolling this area.

Mr. Speaker, I am not greatly concerned whether the court hearing juvenile cases is called a juvenile court, or whether it is a branch within the municipal court. What this District needs is an additional judge to promptly hear and determine cases within his jurisdiction. I believe that H.R. 6747, if given a trial, will effectively meet the needs of this community at the present time. If it should develop that additional judges, other than the two provided for in the bill, are needed, the Congress can act promptly on the matter.

Mr. Speaker, suffice it to say that I heartily support the measure, as reported by the District Committee, and hope that it will receive favorable action by the House.

Estonian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1962

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the year 1918 saw the end of the bloodiest and costliest war the world had known until that time. Belligerents and neutrals alike were glad to see that human carnage stop and they all welcomed the return of peace. To some people 1918 ushered in a new era; it brought them a prize for which they had been fighting for generations and even for centuries. In that year they regained their national independence and freedom. Estonians were among these people.

The Estonian people had settled in their historic land long before our era. There in a northerly outpost of Europe they led a quiet and contented, but strenuous and hardy life. They constituted one of the smallest and most homogenous ethnic groups in Europe, seldom numbering more than 1 million souls. But they succeeded in maintaining their national identity, their distinct national traits and characteristics, and their love for freedom. In the year 1710 their country was overrun by the Russians and they were forced to accept the autocratic regime imposed upon them. For more than 200 years they lived under Russian oppression and they never liked it. Their chief desire during all that time was to be free, but they were unable to attain their freedom without help from others. Events in the course of the First World War worked in their favor. When the czarist regime in Russia was overthrown, that Government's rule over other nationalities was shattered. Then Estonians felt free, and on February 24 of 1918 they proclaimed their independence.

That was exactly 44 years ago, and unfortunately the new and independent Estonia born on that day ceased to exist very early in the last war. Since then unhappy Estonians are suffering under Communist totalitarianism, but their hope for freedom and their desire for independence is not diminished. These ideals still live in their hearts and minds; and they still cling to them as steadfastly as did their forefathers while suffering under czarist oppression. Their friends join them in the celebration of the 44th anniversary of their independence day and hope that they will again attain their cherished goal, freedom and independence.

The Resurgence of Anti-Semitism in Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1962

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, in recent articles appearing in the New York Times and in the New York Herald Tribune I have read with keen interest and a deep sense of personal distaste of the resurgence of anti-Semitism in Russia. This anti-Semitism is a milder form than that which existed in the days of the pogroms. Jews are not being executed or shipped off to Siberia, but nonetheless anti-Semitism in a more subtle but vicious form is prevalent in many parts of the Soviet Union today.

Nine years ago on the floor of this House I spoke out against the brutal Soviet policy of anti-Semitism which then existed in Russia and I do so again today. I believe it is my duty to speak out here on behalf of these oppressed people to once again ask that action be taken to place this country on record as opposing this evil.

I think the remarks that I made 9 years ago are just as pertinent today. At that time I said:

> I am gravely concerned and deeply shocked at the wave of anti-Semitism in Russia. The General Assembly of the United Nations has convened again. As a Member of Congress, I strongly urge that the United States, through its delegates to the United Nations, take speedy action to bring these Communist outrages against the Jews before the United Nations to help stop these inhuman acts which are so patently a violation of fundamental human rights.

We must immediately denounce growing anti-Semitism in the Communist world and see that the free governments and the United Nations vigorously protest against it. The persecution and killing of Jewish people behind the Iron Curtain are part of the planned Communist campaign to enslave the entire free world. The Soviet Union must not be permitted to carry out their horrible practices as Hitler did. The free world must never forget the merciless slaughter of 6 million Jews by Hitler and his Nazi henchmen.

The Kremlin's assault and persecution of the Jewish people make it quite clear that the Moscow terror has for its real target the eradication of religion itself. As an American and of Catholic faith, I have always fought against and condemned race hatred and intolerance against minorities. I have always maintained that whenever one religious group suffers persecution, no other religious group is assured of immunity therefrom. When Jewish rights and liberties are trammeled upon, likewise Catholic and Protestant rights and liberties are gravely endangered.

The arrests of Catholic priests and the brutalities inflicted upon them and the grave harm and injustices done to the Catholic Church behind the Iron Curtain are a pattern now extended to the Jewish people. The atrocities committed by Russia against such outstanding prelates of the Catholic Church as Cardinal Mindszenty and Archbishop Stepinac and others have already aroused the conscience of the free world and clearly show that Russia wants to enslave freemen everywhere. The closing of the borders by the Kremlin prevent the Jewish victims from leaving the Iron Curtain to seek shelter and refuge in the democratic State of Israel and elsewhere, and heaps cruelty upon cruelty.

The United States has always been the torchbearer of freedom and democracy. We have been and must continue to be the beacon light in the free world. The moral weight of the United States must be brought to bear against this anti-Semitism by Russia. I firmly believe that the United States and our representatives in the United Nations should strongly condemn the anti-Jewish policy of the Kremlin. I urge that appropriate action be taken forthwith. I am submitting herewith a resolution to the House of Representatives and ask that my distinguished colleagues unanimously join with me in adopting same. The resolution reads as follows:

> Whereas the entire free world is deeply concerned over the growing anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union; and
>
> Whereas the campaign of hate and persecution now being conducted against the Jewish people behind the Iron Curtain is abhorrent to all free peoples and increases the threat to the religious freedom of all free peoples; and
>
> Whereas the people of the United States, true to their tradition and heritage, vigorously condemn bigotry and race hatred and strongly believe in freedom of religion and in all the fundamental rights of man; and
>
> Whereas it is appropriate that the House of Representatives place itself on record by denouncing and opposing the growing anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union: Therefore be it
>
> *Resolved*, That the House of Representatives hereby expresses its profound sense of indignation and shock at the growing anti-Semitism and the campaign of hate and persecution being conducted against the Jewish people in the Soviet Union.
>
> SEC. 2. (a) The President is requested to convey to the Soviet Union an expression of the grave concern of the people of the United States over this growing anti-Semitism, and to seek assurances that prompt and appropriate action will be taken to stop all forms of bigotry and race hatred against the Jewish people now living in the Soviet Union.
>
> (b) The President is further requested to urge the Soviet Union to allow all Jewish persons within their borders who desire to do so to emigrate and to seek refuge and salvation in Israel and other free lands.
>
> SEC. 3. The President is requested to take all possible immediate steps, through the United States delegation to the United Nations, to bring before the United Nations and before the bar of world opinion the facts about the cruel mistreatment of Jewish people living within the Soviet Union, to the end that such mistreatment shall cease.

Cooley Supports President's Action on Barter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1962

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, in the Washington Post of February 12 there was a news story quoting a Member of Congress, one of my distinguished colleagues, as charging the President with inconsistency for permitting barter transactions under Public Law 480 while at the same time calling for a review and possible reduction of the Nation's strategic stockpile. With all deference to the gentleman, may I say that I believe he is confused about the basic purposes of the Nation's stockpiling programs and should familiarize himself with the laws enacted by Congress before commenting on the President's action.

The President's reference in his recent press conference was to the so-called strategic or national stockpile which is established under the authority of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act. Its purpose is to acquire and stockpile materials which will be needed by this country in the event of war. The requirements of that stockpile have been changed from time to time as our military strategists have modified and modernized their conception of the type of war in which the United States might be forced to engage.

The other stockpile is the supplemental stockpile which was established by the Agricultural Act of 1956 to hold for future use materials which are acquired under the barter program authorized and directed in Public Law 480, which was enacted in 1954. The basic purpose of this program is to obtain something of permanent value to the United States in exchange for surplus agricultural commodities which cannot be sold abroad for cash—and thus protecting the investment of the taxpayers of the United States in materials which are acquired under our agricultural price support program.

I do not know the full details of the particular transaction referred to by my colleague, but I do know that neither the President of the United States nor anyone else has made a mistake in taking such materials in exchange for our surplus agricultural commodities and I believe that the transactions to which the gentleman referred complied in all respects with the policies laid down by the Congress for such exchanges.

The Congress, by its enactment of Public Law 480, established various methods to reduce our agricultural surpluses and at the same time assure our country of receiving as much return as possible from these surpluses to offset the cost of our farm program. The Congress recognized that it was impossible for us to reduce our surpluses solely through the sale of commodities for dollars and therefore directed in Public Law 480 that in addition to selling for dollars or for short-term dollar credit, these commodities be sold for soft currencies, that they be donated outright in certain cases, that they be exchanged for strategic or other materials, and that they be sold on a long-term dollar credit basis.

Subsequently, the Congress specifically established priorities for these various types of disposals. We have told the executive branch that they should give preference first, to the sales for dollars; second, to short-term credit; third, the exchange of our commodities for materials of which the United States does not produce its requirements, which are not perishable, and which are cheaper to store; fourth, long-term dollar credit; and last, sales for soft currencies.

I particularly call the language of the law to the attention of my colleague because the barter transactions for lead and zinc to which he referred clearly fall within the law and the directives given by Congress to the executive branch.

First, I am informed that the United States produces only about 70 percent of the quantity of lead and zinc which is consumed annually in the United States and that our known lead and zinc deposits are gradually being used up. As to the second requirement, perishability, I am informed that lead and zinc can be stored in the open on military reservations and other Government property for generations with no deterioration whatever. In contrast, the wheat and corn which were exchanged for the lead will stay in condition only a few years even under the best possible enclosed storage conditions, and soon lose their value completely.

Third, with respect to the cost of storage, Government figures show that it costs about 12 cents a year to store a ton of lead, whereas it costs approximately $4.50 a year to store a ton of wheat or $4.82 a year to store a ton of corn in approved commercial storage. To put it another way, a ton of lead could be stored for approximately 2,000 years before the storage charges would equal the value of the material. On the other hand, studies by the Department of Agriculture show that the value of a ton of grain will be eaten up by storage, handling, and carrying charges in less than 5 years, so that within this period the value of the bushel of grain, or a ton of grain, is reduced to zero. Each year the savings in storage and deterioration losses on the counterpart wheat or corn given in exchange for the lead the gentlemen referred to will provide sufficient revenue to store the lead for a period of more than 250 years.

An even more interesting example, Mr. Speaker, is in the case of industrial diamonds. This is one of the materials for which the President has authorized the exchange of our agricultural surpluses. The United States produces virtually no industrial diamonds but we use approximately 80 percent of the world's output. The volume of this need for industrial diamonds in our highly industrialized economy is increasing yearly and we must depend upon foreign sources for virtually all our requirements. I am informed that industrial diamonds valued at $100 million can be stored and insured for less than $1,500 per year. When we exchange perishable wheat or corn for imperishable industrial diamonds, 1 year's savings in the storage and deterioration loss on the wheat and corn will provide sufficient revenue to store industrial diamonds for more than 10,000 years before we have exhausted the savings.

To me, Mr. Speaker, no part of our agricultural export program makes more sense than this program of exchanging perishable and costly to store agricultural surpluses for nonperishable materials which we do not produce in sufficient quantity in the United States to meet our requirements and which can be stored at very little cost.

I must admit that I do not understand the reasoning of those who claim that we can have too much of any of these materials. How can we possibly have too much of a nonrenewable natural resource which is absolutely indispenable to our industrial economy? Does anyone contend that we have too much oil? That we have too much iron ore? That we have too much natural gas? How, then, can it be assumed that we have too much of any other nonrenewable natural resource, particularly those which are indispensable to our economy and which are not even produced in the United States?

How can we possibly have in storage in this country too many industrial diamonds, too much chromite, too much manganese, too much palladium— materials which we must have for our national survival and for which we must depend for our supplies upon nations which may or may not always be friendly to the United States and willing to sell these materials to us? Suppose it is 300 years before we need the lead which we acquired by bartering corn and wheat last summer. When we need it the lead will be there, and the cost of storing it for that period of time will be infinitesimal compared to the cost of storing the agricultural commodities we have exchanged for it, or compared to the benefits to be derived to the United States from the mere fact that we have it available for use when we need it.

To put it succinctly, Mr. Speaker, under this program we are exchanging national liabilities for national assets.

The mere existence of these metals and other materials in the United States is a national asset and there is no reason whatever to assume that the Government, which owns these materials, cannot manage them to the best interest of private industry and the Nation as a whole. Much of our indigenous natural resources, many oil and gas reserves, many of our mineral reserves are the property of the Government—and I have seldom heard any complaint that these resources are not being managed by the Government in the best interests of the United States. There is no more reason to assume that reserves which we stockpile in exchange for perishable agricultural commodities will not be managed, likewise, in the best interests of all of the people of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress has repeatedly examined into the reasons why the previous administration practically eliminated the barter program in early 1957. Prior to that time, the program was functioning smoothly and we had received virtually no complaints about its operation. We had moved more than a billion dollars worth of surplus agricultural commodities into the markets of the free world and had received in exchange materials which not only met the criteria established by the law, but which according to the information supplied by the Department of Agriculture had actually appreciated in value since their acquisition. Materials for which we exchanged approximately $1 billion worth of surplus agricultural commodities under barter transactions were worth approximately $1,100 million in 1959 when the Committee on Agriculture conducted its most extensive examination of this program.

Obviously, the Congress knew what it was doing when it passed the so-called barter law to which our colleague takes exception. However, he might be pleased to know that he is joined in this view by some individuals in the State Department who do not believe that we should get value returned for our surplus agricultural commodities but that we should use them only for give-away purposes in an international welfare program.

The position of those who have opposed the barter program directed by Congress is that such exchanges have interferred with cash sales of our agricultural commodities. It is rather clear, however, to those of us who have followed this program carefully that the real basis of opposition is that this program has made U.S. agricultural commodities competitive in markets where they would not otherwise be able to compete. They have not interferred with our cash sales but with the sales of other countries, many of which are conducted on precisely the same barter and bilateral basis to which they find objection in our own exports. Mr. Speaker, it is not necessary for me to repeat here the many arguments that have been advanced and the reports rendered on both sides of the Congress in support of the barter program. I do state categorically that based on our committee investigations and the actions taken by the Congress we believe that disposals through the barter program have actually helped sales for dollars because of the linking of certain aspects of the commercial transactions and because they have actually made our commodities competitive on a world market. It must be remembered that both the surplus commodities and the incoming materials flow through normal trade channels and regardless of the use of the world "barter" they are handled as any other commercial transactions.

The testimony of Government witnesses before our committee has been crystal clear that prices paid by exporters for the agricultural commodities is exactly the same as if they had been purchased for cash and the prices paid for the materials which are received in exchange are at or below the prevailing market prices. Further, statistics given us by Department of Agriculture witnesses showed that as barter increased so did our sales for cash and when barter was curtailed our cash sales dropped off even more.

I, for one, my committee, and the Congress have clearly stated time and again that it is much better to receive hard diamonds or manganese in exchange for our surplus agricultural commodities than soft currencies, most of which we immediately donate back to the recipient country in the form of grants or soft loans which will probably never be repaid. As the Members of Congress individually may or may not know, it is now the current procedure of the executive branch to make sales for foreign currencies on a basis which returns approximately 75 percent of the foreign currency received to the country of destination in the form of long-term loans which will probably never be repaid. When it is remembered that on these transactions the United States pays in dollars not only the cost of the agricultural commodities but also the ocean shipping charges, it has been calculated by those who are familiar with this subject that we are receiving a return of approximately 6 percent to the American taxpayer on these commodities which are sold for foreign currencies. On commodities which are bartered for materials we will need in the future, we are receiving a return of approximately 100 percent and the ocean transportation is paid by the contractor who provides the materials.

Mr. Speaker, I think the record is clear that the Committee on Agriculture and the Congress have never refused to give the administration any authority it requested to donate our surplus agricultural commodities without compensation to other nations of the world in order to facilitate our foreign relations program. We have made available without compensation all of the stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation which the administration has told us could effectively be used in promoting our foreign relations. The only request we have made is that before we give these commodities away we do our best to obtain for American taxpayers and for this country as much actual return in value as we are able to do. This is the only request which we make now. It is the reason for the barter program. It is one way in which we can get something of value for the United States and for the American taxpayer in return for our agricultural surpluses.

So far as I am personally concerned, Mr. Speaker, and although I can speak only for myself, I believe that I reflect the sentiment of the whole Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives, I intend to insist that every effort be made to obtain something of value for the United States for our agricultural surpluses before they are given away. As far as I am concerned I do not intend to vote for one single additional bit of authority for foreign donation of our agricultural surpluses as long as arbitrary roadblocks are being put in the way of exchanging our commodities or selling them for something of real value to the United States. When I am convinced that every effort is being made to obtain for the American taxpayer as great a return as is possible for our surplus agricultural commodities, then I will be willing to go along with proposals to donate abroad as much of the rest of the surplus as can be used effectively to relieve hunger and hardship.

I have been greatly encouraged by the fact that the Secretary of Agriculture has carefully studied this problem and is currently planning to issue new directives designed to assure a greater use of this disposal method. I am further encouraged to believe that this position is supported by our Chief Executive.

On the other hand, we are disturbed by stories that notwithstanding the wording of the law and its clear intent, there still remains some residual opposition from the same staff levels that sponsored opposition to the barter program in the past administration. The Congress is convinced that this is a sound program of which we should make maximum utilization. The law on this point is clear. We agree that the program needs to be most carefully administered in the future as it has been in the past to avoid either overstimulating foreign production or creating artificial shortages in world supply. I have heard no criticism of the failure of the Department of Agriculture to do this in the past.

My distinguished colleague seemed to feel that the barter transaction to which he referred was adversely affecting domestic producers of lead in his district. I am certain that he did not know, or if he did, he failed to recognize the import of the fact, that not only was this particular transaction in strict accordance with the law and the intent of the Congress but was used as a tool to get an agreement from the foreign suppliers of this particular lead to cut back their production by 10 percent. Furthermore, it reduced surpluses of lead hanging over the market which were equally depressing world and domestic prices.

Nature has seen fit to give us the soil and the climate, which, when coupled with our technical and production methods, make us the greatest producer of agricultural commodities in the world. In order to keep our farm industry we have properly established farm programs which in part have created our commodity surpluses. On the other hand, we are a have-not nation for many of the metals and minerals without which our industry cannot function.

If we can take our agricultural surpluses and through normal trade channels secure national resources which every study made indicates we will need in our future economy and at the same time reduce our storage costs and losses by deterioration, I feel that we have a national program which is good by the standards of any reasonable man.

If this is not a good program, if there is anything evil about taking something of value in return for our perishable surplus agricultural commodities, then, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the time has come to repeal the law in its entirety. All evidence points to the desirability of the program. But the law should either be carried out or repealed, and I am confident that the President will see that the law is carried out.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the House that I have requested Congressman JONES, one of our most able and outstanding committee members, through his Subcommittee on Departmental Oversight and Consumer Relations, to make a study as to the present status of the barter program. I have directed him to make a particular effort to analyze and make public the sources of opposition to the program and the bases for this opposition. I believe that this study will prove to be illuminating and helpful, and if, as I understand to be true, we have had in the meantime an announcement as to a revised program to make greater use of the barter method of disposing of surpluses, the subcommittee can judge the effectiveness of the changed program. Certainly we need to accurately determine the value that our country is receiving from the surplus commodities disposed of through this method to reassure ourselves that this value supports our present faith in the program.

Public Law 87-362: A Fitting Tribute to George Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1962

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, today we pay homage to the soldier statesman who, because of his great and heroic efforts in behalf of this Nation rightly earned the designation, "Father of Our Country."

On this commemoration of the birthday of George Washington, the 87th Congress may take pardonable pride in its recent efforts to further protect the Nation's most beloved shrine of Mount Vernon. Last year, Mount Vernon was about to experience a serious onslaught of commercial urbanization. The shores opposite Mount Vernon have been maintained to date, much as they were in the time of George Washington. Not only has this been of significant historical consequence, but it has been an inseparable part of the character and setting of Mount Vernon, and this view from the veranda of the mansion has thrilled and inspired the citizenry of our country and foreign dignitaries alike. When the threat to establish a sewage treatment plant on the Maryland shores of the Potomac, directly across from Mount Vernon, was apparent, the Congress of the United States acted swiftly and decisively. The Congress enacted Public Law 87-362, which authorized the Federal Government to acquire the land opposite Mount Vernon for preservation in keeping with its original open and wooded character.

The overwhelming support of this measure by the Congress offers proof, beyond the words of praise, of the feeling the citizens of this country, and their elected representatives, have for the memory of George Washington.

This body has been extremely fortunate over the years to have the very capable counsel and leadership in the area of natural resources of the chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Colorado, Mr. WAYNE ASPINALL. In learning of this threat, he introduced legislation to protect properly the environs of Mount Vernon. He was joined in this leadership by the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on National Parks, Mr. RUTHERFORD. These men were acutely aware of the need for fast action, if Mount Vernon was to receive adequate protection. During the committee's deliberation it became apparent that the preservation of this area heretofore had been achieved through planning and sacrifice by individual citizens. Private covenants were established to maintain the character of the area. Local government cooperation was asked, and plans were effected to establish zoning to the end of preservation. In addition, regional organizations, charged with the overall planning and coordination of the other areas of Metropolitan Washington, cooperated in urging that the area be kept in an open or park status. The State of Maryland had initiated standards to achieve the preservation of these lands. These activities have continued for over 15 years—activities that were manifested in good government by private citizens and local authorities. Unfortunately, the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission had wide powers of condemnation and eminent domain granted to it by the State, and the groups, both private and governmental, that labored so long were unable to restrain the sanitary commission from their plans of establishing a sewage treatment plant opposite George Washington's front porch. The Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission held hearings over a year ago, on January 13, 1961, in which the majority of the affected landowners, in addition to national conservation and historic societies vigorously objected to these plans and procedures. On August 17, 1961, the Subcommittee on National Parks, under the chairmanship of the distinguished Congressman from Texas, held hearings on the measures introduced to afford Federal protection to these areas. In the course of these hearings, it became apparent that there were other locations that could better serve the area than the one chosen by the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission. A great deal of testimony was given to the committee as to the advisability of locating a much larger sewage treatment plant at the Mattowoman Creek site, and in an area already industrialized. This would be a plant more in keeping with the future needs of the area, would be a joint venture between Prince Georges and Charles Counties, in the State of Maryland, and a design and type much recommended by the Federal Anti-Pollution Control Act. Additional testimony was given that existing facilities could indeed handle the existing sewage treatment problem. No opposition witnesses appeared before the subcommittee. As a result, the proponents of the sewage plant could not be questioned. Yet despite their failure to appear, those urging the construction of such a plant continued to urge the need for speeding up this construction.

None of the supporters of the measure to protect Mount Vernon desired precipitous action. None desired to work serious hardship on the local residents. All were somewhat baffled at the insistence of the great urgency to construct this sewage treatment plant. On further investigation, it was revealed that the developers of a subdivision across the Piscataway Bay, and some distance from the area in question, had plans to create a high-density development. In order to achieve this objective, proper sewage disposal was necessary. They applied for a permit to erect a sewage treatment plant on their own area of development. They then proceeded to abandon the plans for such a plant, and indicated plans to build a marina in the area that was to have served them for proper sewage disposal. At this point, they then urged the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission to construct a sewage plant at Mockley Point, which had the effect of taking the sewage from a high-density development and dumping it onto an area of low-density development. With this knowledge and information, the committee acted to authorize the Federal Government to acquire these areas. The measure was drafted in order to avail the Federal Government of the generosity of the private foundations who offered to give their land to the Federal Government for the purposes of preservation. Our own colleague, the distinguished Congresswoman from Ohio, Mrs. FRANCES BOLTON, who is also the vice regent of the Mount Vernon Ladies Association provided from her private resources, funds to enable the Accokeek Foundation to acquire considerable acreage in order to prevent commercialization. These foundations now stood ready to donate almost 50 percent of the entire land that would be acquired under Public Law 87-362. The House, upon hearing the able presentation of the chairman of the National Parks Subcommittee, Mr. RUTHERFORD, acted without a dissenting vote to authorize this legislation.

The Senate was no less mindful of this threat to Mount Vernon, and under the capable leadership of the distinguished chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, Mr. ANDERSON, who was joined in this effort by the distinguished Senator from Nevada, chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Lands, Mr. BIBLE, introduced legislation to provide for the Federal protection of Mount Vernon. Since a number of inquiries had not been answered by those seeking to erect a sewage treatment plant, Senator ANDERSON wrote the chairman of the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission, Mr. Blair Smith, indicating that the first session of the 87th Congress was about to end, and that the Senate might better appraise the situation if it were allowed the time to do so. Senator ANDERSON then asked if any plans for construction could be held in abeyance until the Senate returned, thus affording a more ample opportunity to investigate the matter. The chairman of the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission replied that they would be happy to have the advice of the Senate, but made no commitment as to holding plans in abeyance until the Senate returned. As a result of this correspondence, hearings were scheduled quickly before the Subcommittee on Public Lands, under the able chairmanship of Senator BIBLE. Witnesses opposing the measure were members of the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission, the real estate developers and two landowners. The overwhelming majority of witnesses, however, were in strong support of the Anderson bill. The indecisive actions of the opposing witnesses appeared no match for the volume of evidence in support of the measure, and this no doubt hastened the committee, and subsequent Senate action, as the measure passed without dissent. Few measures have come before the Congress with such wide and vigorous support, and it appears that the Congress, in its swift resolve of the matter, has worked the will of the people. I should like to include, Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of my remarks, a partial list of the many organizations that have supported this legislation.

Beginning with the hearings in the Senate, the tact of the real estate developers and the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission underwent a subtle change. They renounced their earlier position of placing a sewage treatment plant at Mockley Point and assured the Senate that the area could accommodate a park and a sewage treatment plant. There were further assurances that such a plant would not be seen from Mount Vernon, or intrude in any way upon the scenic area, or be disadvantageous to the proposed park itself. This, of course, would have required a reduction in the proposed park area. Later arguments of this same group indicate not only would the plant not be visible, but it would be appropriately landscaped and blended with the area surrounding it. Evidence to this fact, they contend, is the sewage treatment plant contiguous to the Washington-Baltimore Parkway, which is so well concealed that few people know of its existence.

The proponents of the legislation to protect Mount Vernon have sought to decide these issues on the merits of the relative cases. It should be stated candidly, however, that the proponents of the sewage treatment plant are either incompetent, or they are not coming clean in their discussion of these issues. They use the analogy of the sewage treatment plant near the Baltimore Parkway. Is it their contention that their proposed sewage treatment plant on the Piscataway Bay shore of Maryland is to be of the same size, using essentially the same techniques of sewage disposal? Why do they continue to be vague as to the new location of the sewage treatment plant? Precisely where is it to be? Are we to take their word that while they will need part of the park area, it still will not be seen from Mount Vernon? Mr. Speaker, these arguments are spurious and fall by their own weight. If the plant is to be so small, why do not the developers put it on their own land? But then can it be so small, if the main reason for locating it in the Piscataway area is to serve a large area? As to the exact location, the framers of the legislation were completely aware of possible alternatives and drew the boundaries for Federal acquisition and protection of Mount Vernon with precisely this in mind. The argument that a little sewage treatment plant tucked in the corner of the proposed park would not be intrusive will not wash.

That the developers are anxious to place their sewage in this low density area, or into the park, is without question. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to include in the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks, a letter from the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission to Mr. Douglas L. Hatch, president of the Prince Georges Utilities Co., an organization controlled by one of the real estate developers, confirming that these real estate developers, through the Prince Georges Utilities Co., had offered a contribution of $500,000 to the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission, if they would build this plant in the Piscataway Bay area. Perhaps it is good business for the developers to enhance the value of their own property by paying to have their sewage dumped on someone else, but it is a serious question as to whether it is good business for the American people. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that it takes quite a degree of callousness to infer that the legislation authorizing Federal acquisition is too greedy, and too asking in terms of the need it seeks to meet, when the people making these charges are the same ones who would have public agencies bail them out of their own financial dilemma at a considerable cost to the American public in terms of a most serious intrusion upon one of the most majestic, most historic, most revered scenes of the Nation.

The concern of this country has been manifest again and again at the disappearance of open space—the encroachments upon national shrines and monuments, and the need for concerted action to preserve and protect these beneficences of nature that are irreplaceable. This is not a matter of partisan politics, but rather of deep national concern that touches all regardless of political persuasion. Those who have been active in the effort to further protect Mount Vernon represent every walk of life. The leadership in this great body to which I referred to earlier has been forthright and basic, and practiced by Chairman ASPINALL and the members of his committee. The same statement can be made of the distinguished chairman, Mr. ANDERSON, who has a like role in the Senate. The backgrounds of these men indicate the knowledgeability and wisdom that they consistently bring to these matters.

Certainly, the Mount Vernon Ladies' Association is to be congratulated for their long-time efforts in the early restoration and preservation of Mount Vernon, inclusive of all its grounds and buildings. The State of Virginia has aided and abetted the Mount Vernon Ladies' Association over the years in order to present to the American people and the world, the home of America's first President in a proper and reverent setting, and their efforts should be honored and appreciated.

Aid and invaluable assistance in this vigilance was received by the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, under the leadership of Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson, often referred to by his colleagues and Government leaders alike as "Mr. Conservation." Their concern for the dignity and preservation of monuments so cherished by this country has been long evidenced by the activities of this fine group and their judgments respected.

Of great significance, has been the appreciation and gracious demeanor of our first family for the shrine of Mount Vernon, perhaps evidenced by Mrs. Kennedy's description as the "Nation's most revered house." This is a charge to all Americans to keep it that way.

WASHINGTON SUBURBAN
SANITARY COMMISSION.

MR. DOUGLAS L. HATCH,
President, Prince George's Utilities, Inc., Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HATCH: Please refer to the commission's letter of August 26, 1960, wherein you were advised that the commission had approved the project consisting of a sewage treatment plant and the necessary sewers and pumping stations to serve the Piscataway drainage basin, subject to a contribution of $500,000. As you know, since that time considerable opposition has been voiced toward the construction of a sewage treatment plant in the Piscataway Bay area, both by letters and in person at the hearing held by the commission on January 13, 1961, at the courthouse at Upper Marlboro regarding this project.

At the hearing the commission was strongly urged to undertake a joint project with Charles County and construct a sewage treatment plant in the vicinity of Mattawoman Creek. Preliminary investigations have been made and the matter discussed with the officials of Charles County and the indications are that Charles County would not be in a position to proceed promptly with such a project. Before making any final decision on the location of a sewage treatment plant, however, the commission would like the engineering department to complete its study regarding this possibility and pursue the matter further with officials of Charles County.

One of the major objections to the construction of a sewerage system in the Piscataway drainage basin at this time is that a large part of the area is outside of the regional district of the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission and not subject to zoning controls. The Park and Planning Commission has included in its proposed legislation that this area be added to the regional district at this session of the General Assembly of the State of Maryland. If such legislation is passed it would normally be effective June 1, 1961.

At the hearing the commission presented a letter from Mrs. Wolman and Geyer, consultants to the Washington Metropolitan Regional Sanitary Board, indicating that the construction of a plant on Piscataway Bay would not be inconsistent with the regional sewerage system for the metropolitan area. The commission has been advised that the final report being prepared by those consultants is expected to be completed in June. The commission desires, if possible, that its sewerage program be consistent with the regional sewer plan for the metropolitan area.

In view of the above, the commission has decided that it is not in a position to proceed at this time with the proposed project for Piscataway Bay which it indicated it would undertake subject to a contribution of $500,000. Before definitely deciding to proceed with this project, the commission desires to have available to it the results of further discussion with Charles County, the decision as to whether the area is added to the regional district and the report of the Washington Metropolitan Regional Sanitary Board. It appears that all of this information should be available by July of this year, at which time a decision can be made as to the method of handling the sewage of the Piscataway basin. The commission realizes that this will delay your program, but it is believed to be in the best public interest to follow such a procedure.

Very truly yours,
JOHN BONIFANT, *Secretary.*

Little People to Little People Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 22, 1962

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, there are many young lads who are anxious to impress the youths of other lands as to the advantages of American life for teenagers. This situation was brought to the fore, recently, in a program initiated by Master Peter Rodino, son of our illustrious colleague from New Jersey, called little people to little people—a letter-writing crusade for peace through the exchange of correspondence between teenagers of other nations and the children of the United States.

Youth, in its natural simplicity of understanding, is basically dedicated to the simple ideologies of American life. The flourish of empty words, descriptive of nothing, are strange to their style of writing. Youth sees freedom through every experience. Youth has a sense of ascertaining the real truths of existence.

In most instances where youth has failed to meet the challenges of life, lack of straight adult thinking has been the cause of youth's failures.

We congratulate young Peter Rodino and, of course, he has made his dad very proud. The old adage seems to be the proof in this case, "Like sire, like son."

A Tribute to William Holsinger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1962

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, it is with a real feeling of privilege that I speak today on behalf of the Ohio Republican delegation of the 87th Congress, to pay tribute to one of the unusually consecrated and loyal citizens of our free America, Col. H. William Holsinger. I am particularly happy to do this today because February 22 is the birthday of Bill Holsinger. Meeting together, the Republican men of Ohio asked me to speak for them, as I do for myself in extending birthday greetings and saying "thanks for a job well done."

On December 20, 1961, H. William Holsinger retired as manager of the Cleveland, Ohio, Regional Office of the Veterans' Administration. Col. Bill Holsinger has "stacked arms" and is now beginning to enjoy the luxury of a life without schedules or deadlines. His stern Pennsylvania-Dutch heritage would not consider such a lighthearted way of life until all parts were neatly cleaned up and stored away in their proper niche. Now that is done—and with the same zeal he applied to his life of service—he is embarking on his leisure years.

William Holsinger, born on February 22, 1900, is a lineal descendant of a family with their roots deep in the soil of America. Early immigrants to William Penn's colony along the eastern seaboard and then service in the Colonial Army during the Revolutionary War is typical of the heritage bestowed on him by his forebears. Each conflict found a member of the Holsinger family enrolled in the ranks and several battlefield crosses exemplify their ultimate sacrifice. Late in World War I, young Bill Holsinger, true to his lineage, volunteered for service. An early cessation of hostilities terminated his active service in that conflict but it did not quench the inner fire of service to his country.

In the early twenties, after moving to Ohio, he joined the Ohio National Guard and shortly after became the bugler for Gen. (then colonel) Ludwig Connelly of the 145th Infantry.

This recognition of his musical ability was no coincidence. The innate love of the silver-tipped notes of the cornet had appealed to Bill very early—and with his usual perseverance he became the master of this musical instrument at an early age. To this day—hundreds of miles are but minutes away if there is a military band concert to be heard upon arrival. If he is more attentive to the trumpet section—and nods approvingly after the spirited passages of Sousa's "Stars and Stripes Forever"—it is truly the accolade of one of the finest—for Bill did play cornet under the "March King," John Philip Sousa.

A graduate of the University of Akron in 1924 and Cleveland Law School in 1927, Bill Holsinger taught and coached athletes for several years before entering the practice of law.

In the early thirties he became one of the young trial attorneys in the U.S. District Attorney's Office for Northern District of Ohio. Following this he went to other positions of trust in public service, in the city of Cleveland, and the State of Ohio. During these important early years of his career he still gave unstintingly of himself to community and charity work.

Following Pearl Harbor, Lt. William Holsinger, Infantry, ORC, again volunteered to serve his country in an emergency. He was called to active duty and immediately put in counterespionage duty in the highly industrialized Ohio River Valley. His ability was soon recognized and when the Army organized their first CIC School in Chicago in 1942, Lieutenant Holsinger was on the faculty and soon became the Assistant Commandant of that school.

While a good soldier and willing to perform his assignment, Bill wanted to get to a combat zone. Soon he was en route to the Philippines with the 80th (Wildcat) Infantry Division where he shortly entered into combat. His early training as a young Infantry officer was soon to exact its toll when the repeated firings of the heavy 80-mm. mortar in combat began to affect his hearing. Shortly thereafter he joined the 11th Airborne Division for its occupation duty in northern Japan but this was not to last long.

With the Allied decision to prosecute those guilty of war crimes, Major Holsinger was summoned for duty as executive officer of the Judge Advocate's Section of Gen. Douglas MacArthur's Supreme Allied Command Headquarters in the Far East. Because of his earlier training in the U.S. district attorney's office, and his capacity for thoroughly building his cases, he established an enviable reputation in this position and upon his departure was awarded the Army Commendation Medal.

With World War II and the war crimes trials behind him, Bill decided that he and his lovely wife Maude, whom he married on August 30, 1930, would travel a bit before he resumed his practice of law. His intentions were of the best but his ancestry was not to be denied. Soon he was deeply engrossed in his practice and a greater demand for his services in the community caused the cancellation of these well-laid travel and vacation plans. A short trip to Europe was realized but a return to Japan had to be deferred.

On October 4, 1954, William Holsinger was sworn in as the third manager in the history of the Veterans' Administration regional office at Cleveland, Ohio. He then became responsible for the veterans benefits program for over 750,000 veterans of northern Ohio.

That he was acutely aware of the magnitude of this task was evident 2 days later when he appeared before the Disabled American Veterans and pledged himself to serve the veterans and their families of his area 24 hours a day and 365 days a year if necessary to get the job done. He declared an "open door" policy for his office and invited public inspection of any and all parts of the regional office.

Every veterans' organization and their auxiliaries in Ohio soon had the opportunity of hearing this pledge of service repeated at their meetings. Incredulous at first, everyone soon found this dedicated individual meant exactly what he said from their platforms. He was in his office to hear their stories; he took their telephone calls even late at night; he responded to their letters and he appeared at their meetings. He personally set an example of service that very soon infiltrated every work level of the VA regional office.

His vigorous support of the national service officers stationed in the Cleveland regional office brought about a high degree of cooperation with these skilled representatives that made this relationship extremely unusual in VA history. Testimonials of the high regard and esteem which Bill Holsinger engendered from these worthly critics of veteran service were the plaques and honors from every service organization represented in the area of the Cleveland regional office. These were the tributes accorded the man in their midst whom they had adjudged as serving them best.

During Bill Holsinger's tenure as manager of the Cleveland regional office he met with the many changes required of his office, additional responsibilities, revised procedures, mechanization, and, finally, conversion to the automatic data-processing system being introduced into the Veterans' Administration.

As one of the pioneer automatic data processing stations, Cleveland met the problem, met the deadlines and brought distinction to the northern Ohio regional office by mastering this tremendous conversion without one single word of criticism from service organizations, press or radio. Areas of possible trouble had been anticipated and a way to correct the trouble had been devised. A delayed widow's check received important attention, and if the delay were unusual, Bill Holsinger's name was on the request to get financial relief to that widow at once. His personal interest in service to our veterans included midwinter inspections of GI home construction; his visits to the campus of Ohio schools and colleges and to night schools; his inspections of the Ohio Soldiers and Sailors Home; his many conferences with probate judges; his attendance at service officer schools, and many other unsung personal efforts which attest to the true dedication of

Bill Holsinger in his leadership of the Cleveland regional office from October 4, 1954, to December 20, 1961.

Now, this kind and understanding citizen, this civilian-soldier, this dedicated American has stacked his weapon, laid aside his pen and with his lifelong helpmate at his side is going to travel and rest, revisit old scenes and renew old acquaintances. It is a well earned and certainly a deserved respite from his busy life of service to his country and his fellow man.

Many of our veterans carry their chins a little higher; many of their families are better cared for; many are better housed and are more responsible citizens because of his personal interest, his unwavering devotion and abiding loyalty to his credo of "Service to those who served."

So to Col. William Holsinger as he enters into his retirement we say: May all your sunsets be glowing red to set you merrily on your way and all of your tomorrows be filled with the joys and pleasures of life which you so diligently earned and so richly deserve. Godspeed and good health.

Which Road for Transportation: Private Management or ——?—Part No. V

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1962

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to be one of nine men interviewed by Traffic World magazine in a series dealing with our views on the future course of our troubled transportation system. As reprinted by Traffic World in booklet form, my comments are as follows:

INTERVIEW V

(JAMES VAN ZANDT is the Republican Member of Congress for the 20th District of Pennsylvania. He was elected to Congress in November 1938. Since then, except for a period of 3½ years with the Armed Forces in World War II, he has served continuously as a Member of the House of Representatives. Mr. VAN ZANDT has always shown a quick interest in transportation, perhaps because he began a railroad career in 1916 as a molder apprentice in the Pennsylvania Railroad's shops at Altoona. He was district passenger agent for the road when he was granted a furlough to seek a career in public office.)

In the last 20 years there have been bills introduced in Congress which, to one degree or another, would give to the President of the United States authority over the independent agencies created by Congress. What is the explanation for this tendency on the part of Members of Congress to "make over" their authority to the Executive?

I have observed no tendency in Congress as a whole to "make over" to the President the authority which Congress exercises over the independent agencies. While it is true that bills to this effect have been introduced, and may be again, it is, of course, one thing to introduce a bill and quite another to get it enacted into law. The Congress will not lightly renounce its authority or shirk responsibility in this field.

There has been some experience, as of now, with independent agencies for which the chairmen have been appointed by the President. Is there any evidence that such appointments have actually made any difference in agency procedures or lessened the criticism of delay or inefficiency?

If there is any evidence that independent agencies with chairmen appointed by the President have fared better than those without, I have yet to learn of it. On the contrary, the Interstate Commerce Commission, which does not have a politically appointed Chairman, is the oldest and probably the most respected of all the independent agencies. Each of these agencies, it should be remembered, is responsible for a vital segment of the Nation's economy. The individuals selected to staff them must have not only the highest possible qualifications but must also be free to exercise their best judgment without fear of political repercussion. I cannot foresee any public benefit in making a political football of the agencies responsible for the regulation of public utilities—transportation, communications, power, etc.

Coming to the present: A bill in the Senate would give the President power to remove a member of an independent agency who was "frustrating" the President's program. Would not passage of such a bill represent an abandonment by Congress of a vital part of its power to create such agencies and to set the policies they must follow?

Emphatically, yes. I recall that one President tried to infringe upon the rights of the judicial branch by attempting to pack the Supreme Court, but Congress blocked it. We must be constantly on the alert to prevent Executive power from intruding further into the legislative and judicial branches.

Should the Reorganization Act be amended so that it would be clear that reorganization plans submitted to Congress by the President must deal only with agencies in the executive branch or with executive duties which Congress has seen fit to place in the independent agencies?

Under the Reorganization Act the executive branch and other interested parties are encouraged to express their views on the independent agencies. But I believe the responsibility for modifying these agencies must remain the responsibility of Congress. At the same time, I feel that Congress should consider promptly any agency reorganization proposal which comes from the agency itself. No one is more familiar with an agency's problems than the agency.

Is there any validity in the suggestion that the antitrust laws could be substituted in the field of transportation for the present regulatory scheme?

The field of transportation presents a unique regulatory problem in the business world. For instance in transportation an exception is necessary to the usual application of the antitrust laws in order to provide a stable rate structure upon which shippers can depend in determining transportation costs. Congress, in recognizing the unique problems presented by regulation of transportation, established the ICC to act in the public interest in this regard.

But there are things we can do right now to help solve the transportation problem. We can relax the archaic and unnecessary regulations, most of which were written 75 years or so ago, so that they are brought into line with our modern economy. To me, the key word in your question here is "scheme." That's exactly what we have now—a transportation scheme instead of a transportation plan or system. We have a hodgepodge of conflicting rules and regulations which work tremendous hardship on such parts of the transportation industry as the railroads, which need all the help they can get now—not all the hindrance.

Assuming that the present basic regulatory scheme is to be continued, can it be rolled back in any way to give a larger area for the exercise of managerial discretion and still protect the public interest?

Yes, certainly the public can be protected while giving management a greater voice in running its own business. The railroads are a classic example of this. They are regulated today as if they were a monopoly when in fact they are fighting for their lives in one of the most competitive of all businesses. For example, railroads are sometimes denied the right to pass along to shippers, in the form of reduced rates, the benefits of their inherent low-cost advantage, all the while competing with carriers subject to no rate regulation at all. And instead of correcting this obviously inequitable situation, we saw a Senate committee this year hold hearings on S. 1197, a bill to further seriously restrict the railroads' ability to lower rates.

Should some thought be given, now, to adjusting the competitive situation as between the railroads and the water carriers, air carriers, and motor carriers which use federally supported facilities and, for the future, as between the air carriers and the motor carriers of property?

I certainly believe that such adjustments should be made, and I favor the user charge principle as a means of achieving such adjustments. As you may know I introduced in the House this year a bill providing for the establishment of user charges on inland waterways to help cover Federal expenditures on those waterways.

Every President back to and including Hoover has supported the user charge principle. Last winter President Kennedy instructed his Budget Director to formulate general principles for the application of user charges for all types of Federal projects. Numerous study groups have recommended charges for the users of airways, waterways, and highways—charges in which the user pays his fair share. This matter of user charges—or rather the lack of them—works especially hard against the railroads which must acquire, maintain and pay taxes on their rights-of-way while their competitors benefit tremendously from publicly built or operated rights-of-way on which they pay no property taxes and usually inadequate user charges. This of course places the railroads in an almost hopeless competitive position.

From the standpoint of service to the entire public, the common carrier represents the mode which has emerged under the free enterprise system, and many in important positions have said that, if free enterprise in the field of transportation is lost, it will be lost in other areas of the economy. What steps, in principle, could be taken to preserve free enterprise in transportation?

I believe the key factor in preserving the free enterprise system in the transportation industry is simply the will to do so. We know the way to do it, as borne out in seven studies of the transportation industry since World War II—modernize the rules and regulations which govern the industry, stamp out the inequities, establish a transportation system instead of a transportation jumble. But do we have the will to permit free enterprise work in this case? Sometimes I wonder.

A number of bills have been offered which would permit single ownership of multiple modes of transportation as a means of coordinating the various modes. Is the view that the only true coordination would come from common ownership of end-to-end modes a valid one?

As I see it, the various modes of transportation are simply tools which should be used by transportation companies or systems in carrying out as efficiently as possible their jobs of providing the best and cheapest transportation service. A transportation company should no more be denied the use of any of these tools than a carpenter should be denied the use of his hammer or his saw in building a house. In a recent speech, A. G. Anderson, general traffic manager of the Socony Mobil Oil Co., said it was wishful thinking to believe that coordination of transportation media can be secured by voluntary cooperation. "No carrier will voluntarily give to another mode a movement that it can haul itself," he said. "Only integrated transportation companies can furnish complete service to shippers. If such integration were to be given legislative sanction, the shipper would be able to purchase from one carrier that combination of transportation facilities best suited to his needs."

Does the piggyback system, with independent motor carriers delivering the container at one end of the rail, water, or air haul, and the same or another independent motor carrier making the delivery at the completion of the rail, water, or air haul, hold the germ for future sound development of competing systems of transportation?

In transportation, as in science and technology in general, great strides are being made in improved techniques. No roadblocks should be placed in the way of putting these improvements into practice. Piggybacking is but one of many innovations in transportation, and it is important because it is a means of combining more than one form of transportation. But it is under no circumstances to be considered an alternative to providing transportation by any and all means and in any combination under competing transportation systems.

Besides piggybacking, major steps forward in the transport of freight by rail include the trilevel racks for hauling new automobiles on freight cars; hauling grain at reduced rates, in multiple-car lots, by employing new high capacity cars, and the fivefold expansion since World War II of centralized traffic control (CTC) which increases the capacity of a single-track line by 75 to 80 percent. Also entire freight trains can be reassembled now in just a few minutes in electronic freight yards.

But too often roadblocks are placed in the way of passing the benefits of these improvements on to the shipper and the public. For instance, the Tennessee Valley Authority has protested the proposed reduction of rail rates on grain and related commodities between the Ohio River and points in the Southeast. The lower rates were proposed as a result of lower costs, made possible by larger cars moving in multiple-car lots, to meet the competition of water carriers. TVA protested the rates because it said it had spent more than $200 million in Federal funds to make the Tennessee River navigable to haul grain by water from the Midwest to the Southeast, and that the proposed rail rates were designed to eliminate the barge movement of grain. I think this is a shocking situation, when a branch of the Federal Government opposes passing on to the public the benefit of lowered rail costs.

You Fear the Least What You Know the Most About

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1962

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, millions upon millions of Americans and friends of this country are rejoicing in the superb achievement of an American test pilot. The mass media have been describing to us both the fantastic details of Colonel Glenn's 81,000-mile trip and the tremendous wave of worldwide approbation which has followed that flight. We rejoice in his safety and have united to honor the steadfast courage and skill which enabled him to achieve for us and for the free world this signal advance.

We would find it difficult to express our pride in John Glenn and the NASA, however, without observing that it is due as well to the thousands of other skilled hands and minds which made the flight possible. For example, approximately 15,000 scientists, technicians, engineers, administrators, and factory workers labored for as much as 4 years in the development and manufacture of the Mercury space capsule alone in a program directed by the McDonnell Aircraft Corp., and involving 4,000 subcontractors and suppliers throughout the country. Without the educated brainpower which this program represents, Tuesday's achievement could never have been. Nor would it have been attempted without such other necessary systems as the complex global tracking network created by the NASA through the Western Electric Co. and four other private corporations with help from the Lincoln Laboratory of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

In short, then, what Colonel Glenn's flight represents is a mutual effort of the several branches of American life in a pooling of scientific know-how. It is beyond question a tribute of the highest order to American educational achievement.

It is not a final tribute, however; more remains to be done. We remember that the Soviets have launched and recovered a manned spacecraft weighing more than twice as much as the *Friendship 7*, remaining in orbit for a considerably greater length of time, and effecting a return on land. As President Kennedy observed on Tuesday, we have a long way to go in this space race. We started late.

In this and in so many areas, however, we shall move forward confidently, at a rate largely dependent upon the earnestness with which we support and further American education.

Important decisions determining our support of that education will rest with this body. I am deeply hopeful that we shall not evade our most serious responsibilities. In a letter from a hero whose birthday we celebrate today, the first President of this Nation, we find a timely reminder:

> If there cannot be money found to answer the common purposes of education it is evident that there is something amiss in the ruling political power.

If there is another hero of the day—and there is indeed—it is Col. John Glenn. It seems appropriate in several ways to quote him too. This recent observation, offered in the context of his courageous undertaking, is no less profound a comment on the goals of American education: "You fear the least what you know the most about."

There is much to know in this day of scientific revolution; and sometimes we may think that there is much to fear. On Tuesday millions of Americans stopped work to listen to news of the magnificent flight. Among them were millions of schoolchildren, into whose classrooms the radio coverage was broadcast. To them especially was this triumph of enormous significance. It is in those classrooms and the classrooms to come that such children will be offered—or not offered—worthy introduction to the mysteries of the many broadening fields of knowledge, including space science, into which they will be called. It is there that such education, if we offer it, will afford them the thorough knowledge that dispels fear and makes possible the kind of magnificent and courageous achievements which we have seen exemplified this week.

Colonel Glenn has moved us forward at the same time that he has called us back to ourselves, reminding us of what can be accomplished through the American brand of education. I join my colleagues and countless others in offering him and his fellow discoverers my sincere admiration and gratitude.

The Case Against U.S. Trading With Communist Bloc Countries—Speech by Hon. Thomas M. Pelly, of Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1962

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD a speech by Representative THOMAS M. PELLY, which he delivered before the Yale University Political Union on February 19, 1962.

The speech was on a most timely topic entitled "The Case Against U.S. Trading With Communist Bloc Countries."

As a member of the House Select Committee on Export Control which over a number of months has been holding hearings and conducting studies in regard to trade with the Soviet bloc and U.S. trade control policies, I believe it is vital that the nature of the problems confronting us in this area are known by the citizens of the Nation.

It is important in my opinion for the citizens to know the significance of trade with the bloc which helps toward building up Soviet economic and military capabilities.

I was therefore happy to see that this subject was discussed by Representative PELLY on that occasion.

THE CASE AGAINST U.S. TRADING WITH COMMUNIST BLOC COUNTRIES

(Text of speech of Representative THOMAS M. PELLY, First District, Washington State, delivered before Yale University Political Union, Monday, February 19, 1962)

Friends and members of the Yale Political Union, as a preface to our discussion on the subject of trade with Communist bloc nations, it would seem to be orderly procedure to start with a summary of U.S. policies under which our trade is conducted.

Difficult as it is to do it, the U.S. policy attempts to draw a distinction between strategic and nonstrategic goods and materials.

Yet one may fairly wonder if there are any such items as "nonstrategic" goods as far as Soviet needs are concerned. The war of two ideologies is being waged on two fronts: On the one hand it is a contest of armaments, missiles, and military strength and on the other it is one of economic competition in which the Communist leaders, I would suppose, expect to outdo us. On this latter score, it is difficult to identify products that lack significant strategic value.

Tonight I have thought to comment in a general way on sales to the Communists of commercial goods and then after that to discuss trade which more directly bears on our national security.

The policy of the United States under the Export Control Act of 1949 is to use export controls to the extent necessary (a) to protect the domestic economy from a drain on strategic materials (and with a huge oversupply of stockpiled materials at the present time, this provision can be ignored this evening) and (b) the policy is to use export controls to further the foreign policy of the United States, and (c) also the policy is to exercise the necessary vigilance over exports from the standpoint of national security.

Under the law, our policies of security export controls include embargoes to Communist China, North Korea, North Vietnam, and, as of 10 days ago, Cuba (embargoes to those four areas); and restrictive controls of exports to the U.S.S.R. and other Soviet bloc countries, limiting direct shipments of U.S. products for these latter destinations to nonstrategic exports. Controls over our shipments to the free world countries cover only a highly selected list of goods to prevent, if possible, their unauthorized diversion to the Soviet bloc.

All commercial exports from the United States, its territories, and possessions are prohibited unless the Department of Commerce has either issued a validated license or established a general license permitting such shipments.

It should be noted, perhaps, that following congressional adjournment last fall, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee had under study the operations and effectiveness of our export controls on shipments of strategic goods to the Sino-Soviet bloc; and more recently, a select committee of the House of Representatives has concluded hearings in connection with a study of the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Export Control Act. This act expires June 30, 1962, and its reenactment will come up for consideration shortly, so our discussion tonight is timely.

These House and Senate studies were the result of public concern as to the Government's wisdom in allowing shipments of certain commodities, machines, and manufactured products to the Sino-Soviet bloc.

Also, as much as anything, a sale of $365 million worth of grain by Canada to Red China and public disclosure of various transactions such as U.S. sale of jet planes to Yugoslavia were the cause of indignant protests by the American people over existing policies. Certain Members of Congress have criticized the administration and in my case I introduced legislation to ban all exports to all nations with Communist governments. Indeed, I have wanted to go further and restrict economic assistance of any kind to nations which sell so-called semistrategic materials such as grain to the Communists.

Here I must point up that the distinction between strategic and nonstrategic materials has posed a difficult problem and raised a strong difference of views in our Government. In administering the Export Act, the Secretary of Commerce consults with the Departments of State and Defense and other agencies of Government. Of course, the decision for or against trade with the Communists ultimately will be decided by the people. The force of overall public opinion, under our system of Government, eventually sets policy. Momentarily, however, the distress of many Members of Congress, it appears that the administration's desire to increase industrial output and to increase foreign trade, even with the Soviet bloc, has resulted in the lifting of restrictions on strategic commodities; either this, or we seem to have gone along submissively with our allies.

Data as to the nature and amount of trade with the Soviet bloc is very limited. This is because (1) the Communists do not publish complete and continuous information concerning their economic activities, and (2) all prices within the Soviet bloc are administered prices with frequent changes. For example, in East Germany the price of an automobile is approximately 16,000 marks, whereas the identical car can be bought in West Germany for about 7,000 marks.

Another case I have seen cited is of a tractor selling for the equivalent of 21,500 Swiss francs inside the bloc, as against 13,600 Swiss francs outside the bloc, and other similar examples have been quoted in wheat and coal sales.

Exports from the Soviet bloc are based on political considerations, while as for Soviet purchases Khrushchev has been quoted as saying: "We want to buy products in which we really are interested." He has made it clear that the Soviets do not intend to open themselves as a market for goods just because the free world is seeking a consumer outlet for its surplus production.

One of the arguments against U.S. trade with the Soviet bloc is the business risk involved which is greater than in trading with other areas. Bloc trade involves another difficulty, in the lack of commercial skills on the part of the Communists and always the dangers of unilateral breach of contract by Soviet bloc countries hangs like the sword of Damocles over East-West business transactions. Invariably, claims for damages due to breach of contract have been decided by a panel of Soviet arbitrators in Russia's favor and legal redress through Communist courts is of doubtful value.

Especially the United States stands to lose in East-West trade because of the abuse of any patent protection. The Communists have become masters of product copying, bypassing time-consuming research and development expense; and also thereby eliminating the need for further trade. There is no effective protection against patent piracy by the Soviets because there are no patent conventions.

Some American economists take the position that with the exception of munitions and arms, our official policy should be one of free trade between the Communists and non-Communists. Support for this position may be prejudiced, owning to the fact that trade with Communist countries is often quite profitable to free world traders. Price is arbitrary in the bloc countries, which often brings lucrative short-term benefits.

On the other hand many, including myself, take the position that the Soviet bloc would not purchase anything from us unless it was to their economic and political advantage to do so.

In short, without any military considerations, a good case can be made against trading with the Soviet bloc countries as far as U.S. national interests are concerned, especially since our trade with the Communists is insignificant in the aggregate and I believe that in the balance the United States is better off without it. So much for commercial trade.

Now, let us consider the sale of so-called strategic goods—items of military significance.

The Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951—known as the Battle Act—supplements the Export Control Act. The Battle Act declares it to be the policy of the United States to embargo shipments of arms, ammunition and implements of war, atomic energy materials, petroleum, transportation and other materials of strategic value to nations threatening U.S. security, including the U.S.S.R. and nations under its domination.

This act, moreover, makes it mandatory to stop any kind of assistance to any nation which knowingly allows sale of arms to the Soviet bloc. Sale of strategic materials used in war production to Communist bloc countries calls for termination of U.S. aid, unless the President decides cessation of aid would be detrimental to our security.

Unfortunately, in my opinion, the provision calling for discontinuance of aid to a nation selling materials of strategic value to Soviet bloc countries has not been used. There is not one case of the Battle Act provision having been invoked. On the other hand, there have been 19 Presidential determinations to continue U.S. assistance in spite of other nations having sold strategic materials to the Soviet bloc. These were the following countries: Belgium, Denmark, West Germany, France, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Norway, Turkey, and the United Kingdom. Fourteen determinations affecting eight countries have been classified under Executive privilege so there is no information available on these latter cases.

As to the free world system of controls, the United States consults with 14 other free world countries, Belgium, France, Norway, Denmark, United Kingdom, Netherlands, Luxembourg, West Germany, Portugal, Italy, France, Turkey, Japan, and Canada—a voluntary association of representatives of these nations known as Cocom (for Coordinating Committee) has been formed.

Cocom countries have one list of commodities under complete embargo on export to the Soviet bloc. This group of nations has as its basic purpose the denial to the Communists of materials, equipment and technical data involving technical services which would aid the military-industrial mobilization base of unfriendly countries. Or at least that was its objective at the start.

Over the years since 1950 when Cocom was organized, through its members' eagerness to increase their foreign trade, many items on the international list of embargoed commodities have been removed, even though of obvious strategic importance.

In addition to the Cocom list, in the United States the Department of Commerce has a list known as the positive list. These are called presumption-for-denial items against export to the Communists. Validated licenses must be obtained for export of these commodities to all destinations except Canada.

The chairman of the House Committee on Export Policy, Congressman Paul Kitchin, of South Carolina—a former FBI agent—stated the other day that evidence establishes that the Cocom list, the Battle Act list, and the positive list have all been eroded, meaning that bit by bit their effectiveness has been lessened by deletions and yet it takes unanimous decision of all member nations to remove an item from the Cocom list. The excuse is that willingness on our part for the removal of items from the list was to prevent a breakdown in the whole setup, but I am far from sure those administering our controls themselves genuinely believed in the control program. U.S. decisions, we are told, in allowing licenses to be issued on export commodities of strategic goods to the Soviet bloc follow a policy of granting permission on the basis that if some other country will supply an item we will approve it, too. As an example, the Department of Defense strenuously objected to approval of an application for the issuance of a license to export to the U.S.S.R. certain machines capable of producing 360,000 V-8 engine motor blocks each year.

Due to diplomatic considerations, a restudy was requested. Secretary of Defense McNamara reversed the position of all the Department experts. The reason given was that similar machines could be obtained from alternative sources abroad. These machines had been internationally embargoed by the 14 Cocom countries—but for reasons unknown had been deleted from the list.

The application, however, is still pending because the Congress is interested. Someone is fearful of public reaction to this sale which would increase greatly the Soviet production of military trucks and tanks.

At the present time, also, in the Department of Commerce there are pending export applications for many millions of dollars worth of similar commodities, classified as strategic, to the Soviet bloc countries. Since Congress has been studying export policy, there has been a marked slowdown in such approvals.

However, that does not alter the situation that prior to this study vast quantities of scrap copper, steel, and iron scrap, borates, and hundreds of other strategic commodities were allowed to go to Communist Yugoslavia. Have we so soon forgotten the tragic lessons of history—Bataan, Pearl Harbor, Midway, Guadalcanal, to name only a few—when we were on the receiving end of our own scrap iron from Japan? And, by the way, before World War II, Secretary of State Dean Rusk, a younger man then, and perhaps wiser, picketed the loading of that scrap iron for Japan at San Francisco.

Speaking of Yugoslavia, the United States has had a less restrictive policy on exports to Poland and Yugoslavia than to the Soviet Union.

Our policy has been to encourage the development of free world economic ties with Yugoslavia. For example, under that policy, through various programs we have supplied her Government with 683 planes. We have equipped and maintained her air force. With regard to Poland, we have permitted more liberal export policies so as to evidence our sympathy and support to the Polish people.

Public Law 87-195 of September 4, 1961 (so-called foreign aid), section 620(B) states: "No assistance shall be furnished under this act to the government of any country unless the President determines that such country is not dominated or controlled by the international Communist movement."

My mail tells me many of my constituents disagree with the President's determination in these two instances of Yugoslavia and Poland. I think you will agree and history will support the view of my constituents. You who have studied the Marxian philosophy—now, ask yourselves in all seriousness—on whose side do you think these nations will be in any final showdown?

The United States in recent years has exported billions of dollars worth of food and military aid to Yugoslavia, including jet airplanes, and trained their pilots under the policy that such assistance is in the interest of national defense. Tito's expressed pro-Soviet attitude at the Belgrade Conference of so-called neutrals has caused great indignation and unhappiness among the American people. Yugoslavia's votes in the United Nations—and particularly the one in favor of admitting Red China—added to the public fury. But Secretary of State Rusk takes the position our aid and trade is not designed to win friends. So he testified—I had thought otherwise.

Some of us believe communism is the same in the U.S.S.R., Poland, Yugoslavia, Cuba, or even in this country. The purpose of the Communists in some 80 of the world's countries is revolution and an international conspiracy frankly intent on destroying free governments and, as Khrushchev put it, "to bury us." Poland's position on international issues is rarely distinguished from that of the Soviet bloc. She is formally bound to the U.S.S.R. by treaties and such instrumentalities as the Warsaw Pact and her troops maneuver in East Germany. I cannot understand a policy that says she is not controlled by the international Communist movement. I cannot agree that technical assistance by Yugoslavia and Poland to Cuba, North Korea, and North Vietnam is normal and natural, as viewed by Secretary Rusk.

The President of the United States through the advice of the National Security Council determines export policy within the framework of law. In this connection, it has appeared that after his inauguration, President Kennedy embarked on a course of seeking to win Soviet good will through a change in trade policies.

One such generous impulse was an announcement in March 1961, as I recall, whereby the ban was lifted on shipment to the Soviet bloc of surplus subsidized grain. Here, the idea of allowing Russians to buy food at considerably lower prices than American housewives can buy it resulted in many indignant American consumers. And then there arose the question: Is not food a strategic commodity? Does not an army still march on its stomach? Certainly our military experts believe this is true.

Secretary Rusk argues that because of Soviet difficulties in their agricultural program, the Communists are forced to strain themselves to buy foodstuffs rather than use their foreign exchange for supporting subversion and revolution abroad. The Secretary takes the point of view it is safer for us if they use foreign exchange to acquire food rather than for purchase of other goods. This has logic.

Yet, let us look at the other side of the argument. Agriculture is one of the really serious problems of the Communists, a problem wherein they suffered their most serious failure. Why not keep as many workers as possible in the fields meeting Soviet food needs rather than in factories producing implements of war? Remember, the Soviet Union is capable of feeding its own people, provided it concentrates on production of food instead of building up its military potential.

The issue of selling grain for food is especially important in connection with Red China. Many Americans, of course, are softhearted and cannot support a policy of refusing food to people who are hungry. Other people were sharply critical of Canada when it negotiated the $365 million sale of surplus wheat to Red China. That was when the United States relented and approved of the United States supplying pumps to unload the grain in Red China. In my judgment, this issue is recognition that actually we are at war, cold though it be.

I hold the view that after three bad crop years—and little prospect of being able to feed her exploding population—agriculture under Red China's Communist system has failed miserably. The food shortage is the one way of proving to the skeptical mainland Chinese that their system cannot compete with free enterprise. Signs have appeared in China: "We want food—not machines."

So, when Canada, Australia, and more recently, France, provide food, it seems to me they are helping assure that communism in China will succeed.

Suppose we sold the 500,000 tons of wheat to Russia, an order for which Secretary Hodges, of Commerce, had under consideration—and still does, I believe—there would be no way to prevent her transshipping it on to Red China for propaganda purposes.

I feel in the long run we could do our free way of life more good by going on paying storage costs, onerous as that is. Anything, rather than help communism succeed. America cannot win a cold war without sacrifice. We cannot do business as usual, practicing the Golden Rule, unless all parties use the same set of rules. A cold war cannot be won by kindness.

Of course, the administration of our export control program is under a chairman of the Committee on Export Policy, Dr. Jack Behrman, a learned professor and author and a longtime free trade exponent, who, I am told, favors letting all bars down on trade with the Communists except on actual military weapons and the like. His argument is that Russia will make herself self-sufficient if we restrict goods she needs. I disagree. I think restrictions will hamper Soviet progress and throw the Communist economy off balance. But my point is that an administrator should believe in the policy set by Congress. His decisions otherwise could be contrary to the spirit of the law. Don't get me wrong. I am not inferring anyone is soft on the Soviets, I want to make that clear. I say some persons are soft of heart and other persons are soft in the head. We can't afford either.

Actually, when I review the commodities which have gone under export license behind the Iron Curtain and especially the industrial materials to Poland and Yugoslavia, I reach the conclusion that the United States is going a long way toward helping Khrushchev bury us. It seems sometimes that we are doing the digging, while Mr. Khrushchev looks on with a not entirely inscrutable smile.

After reading much testimony and reviewing many records, I have come to the firm conviction that a total embargo would be better in the interests of national security. Is there any doubt as to whether Tito or Gomulka hold us in any honest affection? I think not and I believe our policy of practically open trade with a so-called friendly Communist country is hurting us and helping it. No real consideration seems to have been given, in issuing export licenses, to the overall effect of building up the Communist economy and thereby we have been contributing to the success of our enemy in his economic offensive.

If the term "peaceful coexistence" had any meaning, such a policy might make sense, but the "peaceful coexistence" of Mr. Khrushchev to my mind is one of enslavement as we understand the term.

We blow hot and we blow cold. Our policy has been to use export controls on a sort of day-to-day basis of negotiation.

Congress, I hope, supported by public opinion, will be tightening the program of controls. I believe agricultural commodities such as grain and the like should be declared to be strategic.

Lenin has been quoted as saying: "As soon as they (i.e., the Western nations) start trading with us, they will prepare their own ruin." Many of his prophecies have come true. Do we want to help his batting average?

I have looked over lists of commodities for which licenses have been issued. How some of these items were deemed nonstrategic, I will never know, but when the House Committee on Export Controls sought to evaluate these lists, the Commerce Department flatly refused permission for the committe or its staff to review its pertinent files, claiming Executive privilege. The committee's efforts were thwarted but I am sure that when the final congressional report is issued it will conclude that the Government has followed a soft policy and used poor judgment in issuing export permits. For example, I asked Secretary Rusk what would happen to the output of the steel mill we helped finance in Poland. He readily admitted its production would be strategic and that the output might well go to the Soviet Union.

And how about the Polish loan to Cuba—the proceeds of which were to be used to build a shipyard and battery repair facility? Who believes such is not to provide a base for Soviet submarines? Under the provisions of the Battle Act, I cannot understand how the President can determine that continued aid to Poland is essential to our national security. But that is the only legal basis of continued aid to Poland.

Some of our allies persist in selling planes, electronic equipment, and other items to those who are our adversaries. Such an example is the 6 Vickers Viscounts the British sold to Red China a short time ago. Where will the Chinese Reds use these planes—in peaceful pursuits? Not on your life. They will use them in transporting military equipment and men to Laos and South Vietnam, and other brush-fire areas of their making.

To me this is no matter for a pained expression of regret to our British cousins. I think we could use some firmness and brinkmanship with our own friends.

Could we persuade our allies to go along on a tough policy? I don't know. But if we passed a law to cut out all aid of every nature to noncooperating nations we might be surprised. That is, of course, if we set them an example. We cannot sell jet fighter planes to Yugoslavia and expect England to refrain.

As to why we have not been tougher, there are reports that a preinaugural Presidential task force, headed by the present Under Secretary of State, George W. Ball, recommended a virtual scrapping of the existing embargo on exports of strategic materials to Communist bloc nations. Secretary Ball has declined to inform the House committee studying exports about the report, but he is the State Department official in charge of economic affairs and that aspect of the cold war.

President Kennedy a year ago called on each citizen to ask what he could do for his Government.

One of my constituents decided what he could do. He sacrificed profit and refused to sell an electronic lumber sorter to be included in a new modern lumber mill a Canadian firm was planning to sell to Russia. Patriotism and sacrifice such as that are what this Nation needs. This man's conscience told him the sale was wrong—although the State Department had approved the transaction. That lumber mill would set the Soviet system of lumber production ahead 20 years. Such trade steps up her military-industrial potential.

I cannot feel this is any time to scrap export controls. On the contrary, we should bring all the influence and leadership at our command to persuade the free world to join us and make these controls more effective. Strangely enough, it is the NATO countries who are joined with the United States in a Treaty of Mutual Protection, yet these very nations have contributed substantially toward the strength, technological progress and military capability of their potential aggressor. Soviet bloc imports in 1960 totaled $4.5 billion; $2.8 billion of this was from Western Europe. Only about $200 million was from us.

As Senator WILEY said in the Senate the other day, the Soviet Union is now scouring Western Europe in attempts to buy packaged complete plants for industry. Why? This is necessary, largely because the Soviet economy is oriented, to such a large degree, toward the output of military equipment that it lacks the capability for adequate creative technological advancement.

By attempting to buy up complete plants from the West, the Soviet Union, then, accomplishes the following purposes: First, the Red economy may continue to concentrate upon production of scientific-industrial equipment of military value; second, the Reds are saved the great, and sometimes long, trial-and-error experimental periods for developing technological advancements; and, third, the attainment of complete production plants enables them to move forward faster than otherwise could be done under the Soviet economy.

The Senator said there are no signs on the horizon of abdication of Red goals of world conquest and burying non-Communist ideologies and systems.

Consequently, he said, it is absolutely essential that the United States encourage its allies to take a new, careful, cautious look at offers from the Communist countries and to cut off materials which would strengthen the ability of the Soviet Union to commit aggression, and I agree.

Finally, consider the sadly absurd situation of Cuba on which we have just imposed an embargo. Yet Punta del Este failed to include trade curbs and Cuba is not treated as a Communist bloc country by Cocom. The United States has announced a campaign to discourage strategic trade with Cuba, but our allies may expect an increase in their commercial exports resulting from our embargo. Canada, as a matter of fact, has announced she will continue this trade.

On the heels of all U.S. foreign aid from the Marshall plan down to the present the United States seems to be a victim of policy such as described by a onetime British statesman when he said: "There can be no permanent friends—only permanent interests." Somehow, one gets the idea that nations make profits and prosperity—rather than national security—their permanent interests and overlook friendship entirely.

Finally, as to the case of trading with the Communist bloc, I myself conclude that any trade is aid—aid toward the economic or military undoing of the free world.

I cannot see why the Kennedy administration has not finally discovered that the lifting of bans on food shipments and other commodities and following a general policy of being kind to Khrushchev is not a mistake. As Theodore C. Achilles, Special Assistant to the Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, said in a recent speech to the Stanford University Foreign Policy Institute:

"Today," he said, "policies of military containment and negative anticommunism are no longer enough. It is not enough merely to be against something or to react. We must act * * *." I agree—but his boss does not seem to agree. We don't act.

To me, the way to ultimate victory is a positive program to persuade our allies to ban all strategic trade with the Sino-Soviet bloc, including Yugoslavia, Poland, and Cuba. As for ourselves, I would harden our export policy and likewise let it be firmly known to neutrals and friendly nations alike that all aid to them will stop unless and until these nations firm up their policies in harmony with ours.

The Select Committee on Export Controls of the House of Representatives will shortly be submitting a complete report to the Congress.

Meanwhile, its chairman, Mr. KITCHIN, made a statement giving his opinion as follows:

"First. The economic phase of this prolonged, tense cold war is becoming more important each day. As our military posture and that of the Soviet bloc approach a stalemate, due to the absolute destructive power of each to annihilate civilization in a nuclear military conflict, the economic phase attains the status of a prime and strategic operation.

"Second. Continued emphasis must be placed on the vital area of trade with the Sino-Soviet bloc. The cooperation of our Western allies is of paramount importance.

"Third. There must be a readjustment of our thinking as regards our present status quo attitude. It is imperative that we acquire a realistic appreciation that while we are maintaining the peace we may be losing the cold war.

"Fourth. A strong and affirmative policy on foods and fibers to the bloc must encompass a philosophy of peace for food as well as food for peace."

George Washington once expressed confidence the American people would always do the right thing if they had the facts.

Our export policy is not favorable to an informed opinion.

The Government has shrouded much of the export control policy in secrecy.

The people are unaware to a great extent of the functioning of the Cocom program and only occasionally when word leaks out of transactions such as the sale by England to Red China of planes, do they learn of its ineffectiveness.

Some matters involving security, of course, cannot be published, but secrecy is greatly overdone. The privilege is often used to cover up mistakes and to try and avoid embarrassment over error and weak decisions of both ourselves and our allies.

This attitude prevents mobilization of public opinion against continuing policy failure and ineffective administration.

What we need, it seems to me, is full and frank disclosure of the facts. The people should have the truth. If they had it, I am sure there would be a stiffening of policy and a demand for stern measures by the entire free world.

Let the peoples under the yoke of communism earn anew their freedom by hunger, hardship, and harsh sacrifice. Let the peoples under the threat of communism do the same.

On the later score, it was gratifying to read (in Saturday's New York Times) that some Americans are willing to sacrifice. A 500-member union local—Lodge 893, International Association of Machinists, Stratos Division of Fairchild Engine & Airplane Co.—invited their own loss of jobs by protesting the production of a strategic item for the Communists. Their leaders said they were shocked and dismayed to discover in their trip to Washington, D.C., that this administration has no set policy governing the export of equipment. How true.

Unless the United States sets an overriding goal and actually comes to grips with communism, unless the United States reverses its policies of compassion, appeasement, compromise, and slow retreat, I predict we will never achieve ultimate victory; and one day America will wake up and discover the free world and our allies and our economy are no longer free. Then it will be too late.

Washington's Farewell Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1962

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I have listened today with great interest to the gentleman from Indiana read Washington's Farewell Address. We who are regarded as conservatives have enjoyed a great speech. I only hope a part of it rubs off on our liberal brethren and the administration.